AUG 7 1946

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 91—PART 10

JANUARY 3, 1945, TO MARCH 22, 1945

(PAGES A1 TO A1398)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1945

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Oil Workers Go on Record for Constitutional Monetary System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in 2 years, the Oil Workers International Union has passed at its annual convention a very strong and well-prepared resolution calling for constructive changes in the monetary system of our country and a restoration to Congress of its constitutional power to "coin money and regulate the value thereof."

I take great pleasure in inserting in the RECORD with my remarks the resolution passed at the annual convention this year:

RESOLUTION 57—MONETARY SYSTEM

Whereas it is an established and self-evident fact that in order for a nation of people to enjoy economic security and freedom it is imperative that government shall have the sole power to create and regulate the value of the nation's money; and

Whereas the founding fathers of this great American Republic recognized this fact and specifically provided for the Government of the United States of America to have the sole power to create money and regulate its value by making it mandatory on Congress, as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America, to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures; and

Whereas among other great Americans we find that the scientific-minded Benjamin Franklin, the democratic Thomas Jefferson, the noble George Washington, the martyred Abraham Lincoln were all advocates of the powers vested in Congress by article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is a widely known fact that Congress has violated its own oath and trust to support the Constitution by delegating to private bankers its powers to create money and regulate its value thereof; and

Whereas the private bankers, and in particular the heads of the Federal Reserve banks (private banking institutions) have abused their powers to create money and by regulating its value to destroy money as well have caused widespread unemployment, economic chaos, loss of homes, farms, business savings, and paved the way for world warfare; and

Whereas it is a positive matter of record that the overlords at the top of the money world deliberately planned and viciously carried out the program to cause the depression, widespread unemployment, loss of homes, farms, and savings after World War No. 1; and

Whereas the same people have the same power to do the same thing after World War No. 2, unless Congress restores to itself the powers, vested in article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas the overlords at the top of the private-banking institutions can continue to exploit the American people and the resources of this Nation so long as they have the power to create our Nation's money and regulate its value thereof; and

Whereas it is a widely known fact that our Government is compelled to borrow its own money from private banking institutions and pay interest tribute to private-banking institutions for the use of its own money; and

Whereas the national interest-bearing debt is growing larger and larger because Congress has delegated its power to create and regulate money to private banks; and

Whereas the United States Government does not own 1 cent of stock in the Federal Reserve banks; and

Whereas even when the war is ended with full and complete victory for the United States of America and her allies, there can never be a secure and lasting peace so long as a few ruthless, cold-blooded, brutal private bankers have the power to bring on a condition which will cause continued economic chaos and eventually bring about either a revolution or another world war; and

Whereas our representative form of government is in the very gravest danger of being destroyed, and a dictator form of government in one of its various forms being instituted, because the intent of the blueprint for representative American democracy is being grossly violated by those sworn to uphold and defend it; and

Whereas many sincere but uninformed Americans are being seduced into embracing foreign ideologies and philosophies of economics and government, due in large part to the violation of article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is becoming increasingly necessary that American trade unions crusade for the American ideal of living; and

Whereas American labor unions can never gain their goal or objectives by simply bargaining collectively in the matter of hours, wages, and general working conditions until Congress restores to itself the power to regulate the value of the buying power of the wages bargained for; any attempt to bring about economic security for wage earners being futile while the New York Stock Exchange and the overlords at the top of the money world set the value of the buying power of the dollars earned; and

Whereas an amazing revolution has taken place in the science of production, no change in any way commensurate has taken place in the financial mechanism; and

Whereas it has become increasingly necessary for the United States of America to institute a scientific, noninterest bearing, constitutional monetary system; and

Whereas this scientific monetary system should have its supply of money so regulated as to prevent a material decline of the domestic average wholesale commodity price; and

Whereas a Government-created money interest free at source of origin used scientifically would prevent inflation, deflation, repudiation; and

Whereas an equitable and scientific Government-controlled monetary system should be based on a balance being constantly attained in order that distribution, exchange, and consumption shall keep pace with production; and

Whereas the volume of money should be increased year by year to match growth of production; and

Whereas it is an established fact that an honest, scientific, constitutional monetary system must have these essential principles:

1. It must be created and controlled by Congress.

2. It must be free from interference by politicians and private bankers.

3. It must be interest-free at the source of origin and be based on the total wealth of the Nation and not on the bonds or basic metals owned by private bankers; and

Whereas one of the main contributing factors to our present unsound monetary system is the practice of the so-called fractional reserve requirements; and

Whereas in order to secure a sound monetary system, it will be necessary to institute a 100-percent reserve requirement on demand deposits held by banks, or, in other words, a dollar-for-dollar, or 100-percent reserve being mandatory; and

Whereas it is common knowledge that many, and probably a majority, of the Members of Congress are ready to restore to Congress the powers vested in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America when they are convinced that they have the support of their constituents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates of the Oil Workers International Union in convention assembled at the city of Fort Worth, Tex., respectfully request Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, to immediately call upon Congress to restore to Congress the powers vested in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That we go on record urging the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled to immediately enact such legislation as will be necessary to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and to regulate its value as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That we go on record urging the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled to immediately enact legislation to provide for truly noninterest bearing, constitutional United States Government money; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled to seriously consider the monetary bills introduced by Congressmen JERRY VOORHIS, PATMAN, and others, and in particular the following: H. R. 112, H. R. 118, H. R. 373; and be it further

Resolved, That in order to carry out the intent of the qualifying clause of article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America, to wit, "and regulate the value thereof," we go on record urging the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled to set up a value stabilization committee of its own Members, together with representatives of labor, industry, agriculture, the professions, etc. The purpose of said committee to immediately plan, devise, or work out an equitable, just, and stabilized price schedule or value on all property, goods, commodities, and services; and be it further

Resolved, That we earnestly request and we go on record urging each C. I. O. international union, each American Federation of Labor national organization, each national railroad brotherhood organization, each legitimate national independent labor organization, the national executive councils of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, American Federation of Labor, railroad brotherhoods, legitimate independent labor organizations to adopt this resolution and urge immediate action on the part of Congress to carry out the intent of this resolution.

To Show the World the Real America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Henry Gillen, which appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Post, December 17, 1944:

TO SHOW WORLD REAL AMERICA—NEW POSITION IN STATE DEPARTMENT WILL TELL OF CULTURAL ADVANCE UNDER PURE DEMOCRACY

(By Henry Gillen)

We went to call, the other day, on a relative who lives by the side of a broad highway in the suburbs. As she opened the door for us, excitedly she squeezed our arms and said, "For heaven's sake, what is that thing there?"

She pointed to a mammoth trailer truck going by. Ensconsed on the truck was an equally mammoth machine. We told her that it was a bulldozer.

"So that's a bulldozer," she said with awestruck tones. "You know, since the war began those machines have been hauled up and down this road every day and I couldn't figure out what they were."

To any European in a liberated country, to any native on a liberated island of the Pacific, it would probably be incredible that any American did not know what a bulldozer was.

America must be all bulldozers, for they have seen them rear and roar along in the wake of the armies, filling the bomb holes, in the airports, cleaning away the debris from the streets, mowing down orchards, and pushing aside hills.

A bulldozer at work is an impressive thing and if people of foreign lands have come to interpret the mechanical giant as symbolic of the might and majesty of America, we ourselves may be to blame.

For years we have been telling the world that we have more telephones per capita than any nation on earth, more automobiles, more radios, more electric stoves, more vacuum cleaners, more automatic ice-making boxes, and more bathtubs.

We were the "makingest" people on earth, the greatest gadgeteers in history. Uncle Sam was a physical giant, with the muscles of Sandow and the fist of John L. Sullivan, striding the landscape with a slide rule in his hand, a wrench in his pocket.

We were the land of roaring factories, giant dams, skyscrapers, docks, a countryside tunneled with mines, a countryside crisscrossed with railroads, the cities tall with towers, the shores a forest of masts, the hinterlands under a constant cloud of smoke from the multitudinous chimneys.

WHO KNOWS OF SYMPHONY?

How many of those people would believe that 13,500 Bostonians the other night crowded the Hub's largest sport arena and bought almost $10,000,000 worth of bonds for the privilege of hearing the Boston Symphony Orchestra? Or how many of those people hearing of it would believe that the Boston Symphony Orchestra is the world's greatest?

The music lovers of Europe and Asia know it. The great composers and the great conductors of the world know it. The Europeans and Asians who could afford to travel and toured this land were acquainted with the fact.

But how about the average man in those countries? Does he know it? Does he know that we not only have in Robert Montgomery a celebrated motion-picture actor, but in Robert Frost one of the world's great poets?

Does he know that we not only have the world's largest factory at River Run, in Michigan, but one of the greatest of art museums in Boston and another in New York? Does he know that we not only have a factory at every crossroad but, as one Bostonian put it, "a college under every toadstool"?

It is important that the average man abroad should know it. It is important that he doesn't continue to get his impressions of America solely from a mechanical giant that went to war, or from the thriller-dillers produced by Hollywood with their synthetic Indians or drugstore gangsters.

MUST KNOW OF CULTURE

It is not only important that he knows that America is productive of Olympic game winners, but is rich in Nobel prize winners. It is not only important that he hears how many books the Boston Public Library contains, but that there is a book counter now by practically every soda fountain.

Our Nation went out in the last war in a crusading mood to lift the heel on the conqueror from the necks of the little people. Our Nation went forth solely in a spirit of restoring freedom and establishing justice. We asked for nothing for ourselves—nothing physical.

That such a spirit prevailed in the world was to the world's amazement. They had heard of it, but then they saw it borne into battle by young men who died for an unselfish purpose, died feeling that the futures which they gave away would reap a later harvest of goodness for their land and others.

But that was all wiped away a few years later when one of our gallant Allies, nettled because our Government reminded her of a monetary debt, called Uncle Sam "Uncle Shylock" in stentorian tones that rang around the world and revived the old fabrication that gold alone was the aim of our living, inferring thereby we were crass and crude.

It is important that that does not happen again for the sake of our peace and the peace of the world. Such a desire is not born of any inferiority complex or any shame for the fact that occasionally we get mud on our boots or grime on our hands earning a living.

LEISURE FOR FINER THINGS

It is only important as a means to convince the average man of earth that along with a high standard of living we have also a high standard of mind, that our love of freedom does not come from a lathe but from the heart, and that the prosperity born of the burning coals in the shop boiler, gives us the opportunity to devote more time to the finer and cultured things of life.

We have come of age in America. We have pioneered and tamed. The second, third, or fourth generations have college degrees. People stand in long lines for a rush seat at the opera. The radio brings Heifetz into our living room. The sales of nonfiction books often surpass the novels. We enjoy Lippy Durocher, Glen Davis, Abbott and Costello. But we also appreciate the art of Koussevitzky, Grant Wood, Hemingway, and Benet.

Some of us still bridle at calling it culture. We have seen samples of culture wearing a monocle, long hair, a beret or a cloak of smug superiority. We still remember the lecturers who came here and then went home to write books about our rudities and lack of manners.

Only recently we were incensed because an exponent of Old World culture and cafe society sophistication that passes as culture, aroused us because he wrote a book in which appeared a passage to the effect that on his tour of the battlefields he had little pity for little Brooklyn boys crying in hospital cots over mere battle wounds in their arms or legs.

We were incensed at such ingratitude and, in particular, because those little Brooklyn boys perhaps had more formal education than he ever did and that in bleeding on a battlefield for intangible freedom they were probably doing more than he ever did for the world—at least more than thrilling bobby-sockers gathered around a jukebox in the local tonic-parlor to listen to his whispy songs.

PLAN SOMETHING NEW

In another happier, more peaceful day, the foreign writer would have been stoutly de-

fended as merely indulging in a bit of whimsy. But one of America's celebrated book magazines, the Saturday Review of Literature, dissected him like a Johns Hopkins surgeon because the little Brooklyn boys were not some surplus clods in khaki, but intelligent, high-spirited, high-minded young men who could probably argue him into a corner on Socrates, Sibelius, or Picasso, while firing a bazooka or overhauling a B-29.

Now the President and Mr. Stettinius propose, through the medium of something new, novel, and noteworthy, a secretaryship of public information and cultural relations in the State Department, to lift the bushel off the light we have been hiding in the past.

As interpreted, its functions will be twofold. The secretary will direct the spread of information on the policy and doings of the Department to the people at home and overseas.

He will also direct the Department's activities "in connection with the exchange with other countries of scientific, technical, artistic, literary, and professional knowledge."

The Department of Commerce now tells the world how many reindeer are residing in Alaska; how many telephone poles stand in Boise; how much cotton has sailed down the Mississippi; and what is the outlook for the rabbit-skin market in Texas. Now, the State Department will add what new has been discovered at the Mayo Clinic, the latest invention at Tech, how Sinclair Lewis' forthcoming volume measures up; the response to a native American opera, tried out at the Metropolitan, or of Howard Shapley's most recent look at the stars.

SECRET IS DEMOCRACY

It is important. It will be giving the world more than information; it will be selling the average man afar a fact which is vital to him and us that it becomes an idea. It is telling him that the bulldozers which we manufacture and the battles for freedom we are fighting; the automobiles we produce and the books we write; the music of factory whistles, blowing noon, and the concert pianos trying out new symphonies, are made possible by a democratic form of government—the kind of democracy cherished by the sons of men who fled from dictatorships of other lands in order to live as free and independent people, side by side, on a vast continent, happy and continually at peace.

The Crime of Thrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no single act of the Roosevelt administration has outraged the American housewife as much as the Christmas cancelation of ration points by O. P. A. The reasons behind this act of political chicanery are well stated in an article by George E. Sokolsky which recently appeared in the Cincinnati Times-Star and other newspapers throughout the United States. This article, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein:

THE CRIME OF THRIFT

The O. P. A. has again established one fact beyond peradventure: Thrift is immoral in the United States. Honest American citizens who have not hoarded foodstuffs, who use their stamps as they went along, who have not filled their larders with sugar and their refrigerators with butter have been cruelly penalized. The hoarder, the cheat, the marketeer who went from store to store getting a quarter pound of butter here and a half pound there has benefited. The moral of Mr. Chester Bowles' philosophy is that to hoard food is always better than to save stamps in the book.

And remember this also, for it is very important: Whenever an election approaches, the O. P. A., which is a nonpolitical agency of the American people, eases up on whatever it can. When the election is passed, they tighten up so tightly that the squeeze hurts. What does it really matter? You've done your job. You've voted their way.

Now you have to take it. For mind you, it is absolutely impossible that the food statistics of this country changed radically between Election Day and Christmas Day. Mr. Bowles knew before Election Day what his Christmas present for the American people would be. He knew that this country possessed only one food surplus, wheat; that we were short of everything else; that we were, before the war, on balance a food-importing country. Yet, what has happened to Nature's windfall—six bumper crops? What have they done with the largest cattle population this country has ever known? Let them answer; no one else can. For mind you, we have not fed the countries we have liberated. We are not feeding the world. Our troops are not eating luxuriously. Perhaps if O. P. A. were headed by a practical butcher or a grocer instead of an advertising agent as Mr. Bowles was before he got his present job, or a college professor as Mr. Henderson was—we might have a more practical approach to this problem.

Well, there is no use bellyaching. It won't help at all. The thing is to use substitutes. Save every ounce of every kind of fat because fat is tremendously important in your diet. If you have a chicken use the chicken fat; if you manage to get a bit of bacon, use the bacon fat over and over again. But be sure not to deprive your children of fats and use the fat or oil, particularly animal fats, as often as possible, over and over again. Fats are important. And learn to eat fish—all the fish you can. Learn to eat what you do not like. We are in a food crisis and make no mistake about that. Think first of your children. Give them fats—all the fats you can lay your hands on and give them green and yellow vegetables as long as the butter shortage lasts. Take no chances with their health.

Now, you can take the canceled stamps which you so carefully saved for the day that you might need them and frame them. Put them up on the wall where you can see them. Remember that you saved those stamps as Americans in another generation put their dollars in a savings bank or a life-insurance policy for the proverbial rainy day. And now you know that there is no use saving for a rainy day or for a hungry stomach. Mr. Bowles has told you that it is bad economics to be thrifty and bad morals to be honest with yourself or your Government. He has proved to you that if you want to save, don't save stamps, save goods, save canned foods, save butter, save cheese, save jars of things, but do not save stamps. He has proved that profligacy is a virtue and thrift a vice. When you get a chance gorge yourself, because your stamps might be canceled or their values reduced.

Thanks very much for the Christmas present, Mr. Bowles, and for the lesson in morals. That was not the way the greatest of your breed, Samuel Bowles, of the Springfield Republican, taught the American Nation. We remember him kindly as one of the finest products of Yankee civilization. Here's wishing you the same for 1945.

Bill to Repeal the Smith-Connally Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I have introduced a bill providing for the outright repeal of the Smith-Connally law.

The Smith-Connally law is not a law in the customary sense of that word. It is a bundle of prejudices with an enacting clause. It has no place on the statute books of a free country. In forcing the enactment of that law, the zeal of labor-baiters overreached itself and exceeded all bounds of propriety.

The enactment of the Smith-Connally law was born of turbulent reactions to the conduct of John L. Lewis and it was not a calmly considered piece of legislation. To strike at John L. Lewis for his alleged misconduct was one thing. To strike at the great body of devoted, patriotic, well-meaning organized labor because of the alleged derelictions of one man was another thing. The Congress, misled by enemies of labor, sought to make a victim of labor in general and succeeded in humiliating and penalizing all labor, largely because of the acts of one man. A more erratic and unfair basis of legislation could hardly be imagined.

The enactment of the Smith-Connally bill was wrong because it left the implication that great bodies of our working men were brazenly callous to the obligations of patriotism; that they were flouting the Government and the law and were refusing to manufacture the implements needed by our soldiers on the fighting fronts—an indictment that was as untrue as it was black and foul. At the very time that indictment against our workers was made, the docks of our country were piled high with fabricated implements of war that could not be moved because of a lack of transportation facilities. It is time to nolle that indictment as being without truth and substance and the way to nolle it is to repeal the act.

Labor's record of production of the implements of war is perfectly amazing and beyond all expectations, and yet labor has to suffer the stinging rebuke implied in the Smith-Connally Act as long as that ill-fated law remains on the statute books.

Capital and industry, if they have recovered from the psychosis that gripped the country when the Smith-Connally law was enacted, will realize that its repeal is as much in their interest as in the interest of labor, for no totalitarian ruler of Europe or Asia ever had more power over industry than this bill confers on the President of the United States. He can take over plants at will and hold them; his executive instrumentality, the War Labor Board, can write labor contracts all over the United States, and,

worse still, the legislation denies any appeal to the courts.

The extent of totalitarian powers which this law gives to the President, without his asking, was shown when Attorney General Biddle cited the Smith-Connally Act as conferring plenary authority to take over and operate the Montgomery-Ward plant, which means that it could be used as a basis for confiscation of private property anywhere in the land. I do not want any President of the United States to have any such sweeping powers of life and death over industry.

I hope that Members of Congress on both sides of the Chamber will now recognize the wrong and folly of the Smith-Connally Act and that its outright repeal will be one of the early accomplishments of the new Seventy-ninth Congress. I would remind friends on the opposite side of the Chamber of the attitude on this measure of Thomas E. Dewey, the Republican candidate for President in the 1944 election, and at present the titular leader of their party. Speaking at Seattle, Wash., on September 18, 1944, Mr. Dewey said concerning the Smith-Connally Act:

It has not solved the problem. In the 12 months prior to the passage of the Smith-Connally Act there were 3,359 strikes. In the 12 months following the passage of that act there were 4,448 strikes. In other words, the number of strikes after the Smith-Connally Act was passed increased by one-third. That law—the Smith-Connally Act—will expire with the termination of the war, as it should. The provisions of this law and the other New Deal interferences with free collective bargaining should never be renewed. The right of workers to leave their jobs individually or together—the right to strike—is one of the fundamental rights of free men.

I certainly agree with Governor Dewey that the provisions of this obnoxious law should never be renewed. But I would like to submit this additional thought: It may be years before the end of the war comes and if this law is as bad as Governor Dewey's speech indicates—and I am sure it is worse—why wait until the end of the war to wipe it out? In my opinion, it should not be allowed to remain on the statute books 1 minute longer than it takes to repeal it. As long as it remains a law, it will be a cruel, stinging injustice to organized labor and a festering cause of ill-feeling in our country. In the interest of national unity and well-being, it should be repealed immediately.

Joe's Big Moment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C., of date December 27, 1944, by Frank C. Waldrop, which article is as follows:

JOE'S BIG MOMENT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

From the German winter offensive on the western front, please address your thanks to the celebrated authors of the unconditional surrender manifesto. You may also thank their agents such as United States Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, who announced that just as soon as Germany surrenders unconditionally, Germany will be reduced to a medieval goat pasture.

NOTE.—It was after the demand for unconditional surrender that the Germans brought out V-1, V-2, and the winter offensive.

It seems weird now, looking backward, but when the term IV campaign was at its height 2 months ago, Hitler was cashing in his chips very soon and it was necessary to keep the Commander in Chief on the job so he could win a victorious peace after having led us through victorious war.

Well, we have no doubt about winning the war on the fighting front, no matter how foggy the situation is at this moment along the Meuse River and elsewhere on the critical northern border of France. The ultimate weight of bombs and artillery is on our side.

But though we shall win, the price paid is now far greater than it was formerly expected to be, thanks to unconditional surrender.

Every day the war in Europe drags on the ruin of Europe is intensified.

If there are little twists of apprehension and foreboding here in Washington—as we tell ourselves that no matter what happens we will win, eventually—what do you think is going on just now in Brussels and Paris?

Those people have been kidded before, and by experts of their own governments. They don't have to theorize about false promising and nutty optimism from abroad. They know. And for misplaced confidence they have paid plenty; far more than we, so far, anyhow.

And so has arrived the perfect moment for J. Stalin to start his celebrated rescue ride as the situation in the west is blackest and everybody, including Roosevelt, is craning his neck toward Moscow.

J. Stalin, you will note from the headlines, is only too pleased to oblige, now that he has the proper cue. He has been waiting outside Budapest for us to get in trouble just as he waited outside Warsaw last summer until the Germans had smashed the Polish resistance force. But yesterday, as General Eisenhower announced the melancholy news that the Germans were just 4 miles from the strategically critical Meuse, what came from Moscow?

Here's Henry Shapiro's United Press dispatch:

Moscow, December 26.—The Red Army stormed into Budapest from the west today, after apparently completing its encirclement in a spectacular flanking sweep that doomed thousands of German and Hungarian troops to death or surrender inside the tottering capital."

If you want to know what kind of victory in peace our peerless Commander in Chief is going to deliver, just think about that United Press dispatch.

We may as well face it, citizens. Stalin is smarter than Roosevelt. This dirty old oriental who sleeps in his underwear and doesn't care who knows it, as somebody once described him, has taken the pants off our Groton-Harvard gentleman in the sport of kings.

Mr. Roosevelt has been indulging himself in happy dreams of triumph over Europe, such as Wilson dreamed in 1918.

When Mr. Wilson got to Europe, Lloyd George, of Britain, and Clemenceau, of France, knocked the dreams of triumph to dust. But history isn't repeating itself this time, for Stalin is not bothering to team up with anybody. He doesn't need Churchill to help him bamboozle the Americans. Nor is he waiting until the peace conference.

Stalin is just moving his armies across Europe with masterful strategy, to put the pressure on when it builds his own prestige to the heights, and to slacken up when he thinks we need to be shot up a bit.

Give him credit. He's the smartest player of them all. Not, of course, that the knowledge of this will console any American mother who gets a War Department telegram this week.

Livestock Price Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 weeks the Office of Price Administration has held regional meetings and issued statements on placing a ceiling on live cattle. Rumors are current that a ceiling price of $17.50 per hundredweight of live cattle at Chicago will go into effect immediately. If true—it will be an unfortunate and misguided step on the part of the O. P. A. For the cattle feeders and producers it will mean a serious financial loss. For the consumers it will mean less beef for food. This order on the part of the O. P. A. would strangle production of beef at a time we need more instead of less meat. I think I can discuss this subject with some degree of knowledge. Twenty-five years of experience in feeding cattle has familiarized me with costs of production and the problems of marketing.

During Christmas holidays I visited feed lots on my own farm and several others in my home county. Cattle feeders were never faced with more difficulties. First, the labor shortage has made it impossible to properly handle the feed necessary for feeding cattle, nor has there been sufficient labor to properly feed and care for the cattle. Most of the cattle feeding is being done by older men who feel it a patriotic duty to continue producing beef for our war effort. They are working early and late, and if the O. P. A. places a price ceiling on these cattle it will mean a serious financial loss. Second, weather conditions were never worse for cattle feeding. This means gains are more costly. A good steer on full feed is sensitive to every change in feed, weather, and handling. All of these factors have been hard to deal with this year. Third, cost of production. The cattle feeder must pay wages that will meet the wage levels that have been set by our war industries. He must feed corn that he can sell at $1 or more per bushel. The hay that he feeds can be sold for $20 per ton.

No one should ask the cattle feeder to produce beef under these circumstances at a loss. When the Government lets a contract for production of war goods they insure cost plus a fixed fee. When labor contracts are entered into they are on a basis of a 40-hour week

plus time and one-half. The cattle feeder works 16 hours per day regardless of wind or weather. The cattle producers should be entitled to the same consideration. They are not asking these guaranties. They expect and are entitled to a price in the market place that will pay cost of production plus a small profit.

The O. P. A. price ceiling on cattle in my opinion will mean greatly reduced beef production. We need more beef—not less. It might be well to analyze federally inspected slaughter records to see how rapidly we are reducing our cattle numbers and production of beef by pounds. The November slaughter of cattle was 4 percent larger than in November of 1943 and 34 percent larger than the 1939–43 average slaughter for November. November slaughter of calves was 40 percent higher this year than in November of 1943 and 74 percent above the 5-year average. More than 7,000,000 head of calves were slaughtered at 32 centers under Federal inspection during the period from January through November this year. This was 52 percent more than the number slaughtered during the corresponding period in 1943 and 43 percent more than the average during the 1939–43 period. During the January-through-November period this year more than 12,500,000 beef cattle—excluding calves—were slaughtered under Federal inspection at 32 centers. This total is 28 percent larger than the average for these months in the 1939–43 period. The high rate of slaughter for the first 11 months of 1944 assures a sizable reduction in the number of cattle on January 1, 1945, compared with January 1 of this year.

The consumers want more beef, yet the O. P. A. threatens to reduce present production and greatly reduce the quality of meat for sale. The shortage of pork can be directly traced to bungling by Government agencies. Are we going to duplicate this same result for beef? If we do the blame will fall directly on Federal agencies which are staffed by individuals who either do not understand the problem or do not care.

We the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the December 31, 1944, issue of the Lawrence (Mass.) Sunday Item:

WE THE PEOPLE

UNIVERSAL MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

The forces both for and against universal military conscription are now engaged in heavy patrol activities, testing each others' lines, probing for strong points and weak spots. The time for the public to become vocal and to enlighten their Senators and Representatives as to their views is right now.

What does universal military conscription mean? In the ordinary understanding of the term it means taking a boy from civilian life at the age of 18, placing him in an Army camp, and subjecting him to military drill and discipline. Every year after his first year he will again leave his civilian life for a period of weeks to resume his military training. The purpose, of course, is to have this country adequately prepared and protected against any future danger.

Now every man, woman, and child in the United States is firmly united on this objective. It is common property of both sides in this objective. It is common property of both sides in this debate. The split comes on the way of achieving the goal.

To us it seems that no truly sound reason has yet been advanced for this radical break with our American tradition. The arguments offered for it are based on half-truths and appeal to wartime fears and hysteria. The only calmly reasoned arguments advanced so far in the controversy have come from the opponents of this European concoction. The proponents of peacetime conscription say that their way is the only way of providing this protection so that we will not get caught again as sadly unprepared for war as we were in 1917 and again in 1939.

Their opponents counter by suggesting a larger number of naval and military academies plus military training in public and parochial schools, Father Michael J. Ahearn, writing in Our Sunday Visitor on November 19, 1944, cites the brilliant accomplishments of the Philippine officers who trained in just such a manner at the Jesuit College in Manila. Perhaps the most brilliant military mind of the war, Gen. George Marshall comes from Virginia Military Institute, a school that produced a galaxy of the old Confederate geniuses. Here is ample proof that universal compulsory peacetime training is not the only way.

Is peacetime conscription the American way? Wartime conscription has been traditionally the American way. As a nation we have always shied off from the spirit of "brass hat" rule. The fruits of that tradition is the magnificent America we have today, a country that twice within a short lifetime has been able to save the world from the fury of the war lords. The military regimentation to which universal conscription will lead is adhorrent to the whole spirit of our national history. Furthermore, in all the world's history it is crystal clear that it is the spirit of freemen, not their physical might alone that counts. From the days of the untrammeled Athenians, who toppled the military might of regimented Sparta, down to the British freemen, "the nation of shopkeepers" who smashed Napoleon's mighty battalions at Waterloo, it has been the flexible, supple, resilient spirit of a free democracy that has always emerged from the hell of war with the laurels of victory. That has been the American tradition. It once was France's tradition. But universal military training turned that spirit into something strange and brittle. Universal military training in France did not achieve what its proponents here say it will. We have no other way of judging the future except by the past. And Europe's past, hag-ridden with universal military training, offers a gruesome rebuttal of the arguments advanced by the militarists in our midst.

Is universal military training expedient? Will it bring any advantages which concomitant advantages will not cancel? American minds unfamiliar with camp life, are not alert to the moral dangers which beset an adolescent boy of 18 in an army camp. At the very time his whole character is beginning to crystalize into the man he will be is the poorest time to plunge the boy into the cynical immorality of an army camp. Too many commanders, as a rule, are notoriously indifferent to moral dangers as long as physical dangers are avoided. The types of shows they countenance and even encourage have drawn choruses of boo's from our boys themselves, who have not as yet been tainted. The home training they received has so far saved them.

The ravages to our school system which this program would work are incalculable. Teachers in high schools today can bear testimony to the demoralizing effects on the 18-year-old students' work of the lengthening shadows of the draft. Our colleges, representing millions of dollars in investment and untold years of sacrifice, stand in awful danger of complete change. This system of conscription would seize a boy at the critical year of graduation, break his stride, which he may never recover, and quite possibly ruin the best and most eager minds of the Nation for the pursuit of higher studies.

And as a final word, be it remembered, this measure is intended for the years of peace. Yet it is being advanced in the years of war when passions of fear, hate, and revenge are abroad. Why do the proponents insist on this measure now? It was during another war hysteria that we were pushed and bludgeoned into adopting a policy for peace. Once before, when the boys were away, somebody sold the Nation a gold brick. It took years to undo the Prohibition Amendment. And even yet we are suffering from its sinister consequences. Are we going to be "fall guys" once more? Any Nation can make an honest mistake once. And it is all to the good if the Nation learns from it. But if within 25 years we repeat the same old mistake, what can history record of us but the dolorous epitaph she pronounced upon the Bourbons of old, "They forget nothing; and they never learned."

Anthony Wayne Bicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ROLAND KINZER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harry Emerson Wildes, of Valley Forge, Pa., commemorating the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Anthony Wayne, that outstanding hero of the Revolutionary War:

ANTHONY WAYNE BICENTENNIAL

Two hundred years ago this month, on New Year's Day 1745, Anthony Wayne, one of Pennsylvania's greatest sons and one of the Nation's topmost military heroes, was born at Waynesborough, near Paoli, in Chester County, Pa.

It is very fitting that this Congress mark the anniversary. Wayne, who with George Gordon Meade, the victor at Gettysburg, stands in the forefront as a soldier, served his Nation well. As warrior and as statesman, as planter and as businessman, as man of letters and as surveyer, he was one of those many-sided geniuses who built America.

He is best known, of course, as a soldier. During the Revolutionary War Anthony Wayne was Washington's chief reliance in time of stress. Washington so relied upon him that Wayne became what would be called

today a trouble-shooter, an officer who was summoned in emergencies to bring order out of chaos, to restore discipline where other men had failed, to perform achievements too great for other men to do.

Thus it was Wayne who rushed to West Point to save that stronghold after Benedict Arnold had almost betrayed it to the enemy, and it was Wayne who rushed to Lafayette's rescue when that able young general was in distress at Green Springs, in Virginia. It was Anthony Wayne who held back the invaders from Ticonderoga in the early stages of the war, nor was it any fault of his that after his departure from that citadel the fort fell to alien hands. By that time Wayne had withdrawn to aid his commander in chief in the Jersies. It was Anthony Wayne who held back Guristersijo when that valiant Creek Indian seemed likely to overrun the Georgia frontier settlements. At Brandywine it was Wayne's brilliance that made possible an orderly and safe withdrawal after Howe and Cornwallis had threatened catastrophe by their pincers movement; at Germantown and, again, at Monmouth, it was Wayne who won the laurels.

Wherever the battle was thickest, there was Anthony Wayne, fighting boldly and with inspiration. Because of his impetuosity he has been dubbed, mistakenly, "Mad Anthony," but Wayne was never reckless nor incautious. In every battle and in each campaign he laid his plans with care; always he insured the safety of his men by taking pains to see that their supplies were ample and that they ran no unnecessary danger. True, he was surprised at Paoli, but there his hands were tied by the necessity of following his general's instructions to lie hidden in the wilderness; he could not dispatch the necessary scouts who could have warned him of the enemy's approach.

Wayne was never properly 'Mad Anthony"; that nickname was thrust upon him by an eccentric private soldier nicknamed by some the "Commodore" and by others "Jemmy the Rover." This fellow, a Chester County neighbor, had been a chronic deserter whose roving temperament had not been curbed by guardhouse or by other punishment. Relying upon Wayne's friendship, Jemmy broke all the rules of discipline.

When, in 1781, "Jemmy the Rover" misbehaved in some minor matter and found himself in a civilian jail, he sent a messenger to Wayne to ask for a release. Wayne, knowing nothing of the circumstances and having no authority to interfere with civilian affairs, refused to intervene. When the envoy returned with the news of Wayne's disinclination, Jemmy could not believe his ears. That Wayne, his protector and his friend, had washed his hands of Jemmy was incredible.

"Anthony is mad," Jemmy the Rover muttered. "He must be mad, or he would get me out. Mad Anthony, that's what he is. Mad Anthony Wayne."

The title stuck. No officer employed it, but soldiers in the ranks, carried away by its rhythm and its euphony, used it as a nickname. The disappointed mumblings of a half-crazed soldier became a nom de guerre.

Years later Washington Irving, wholly misunderstanding the circumstances, jumped to the false conclusion that "Mad Anthony" was so-called because of rashness, recklessness, and unbridled daring; by so doing he not only smirched Wayne's military reputation as a cautious, careful strategist who never took unnecessary chances, but in addition gave him a stigma of mental unbalance which many readers uncritically accepted. The hasty sobriquet, bestowed carelessly by an eccentric private, long detracted from a full recognition of Anthony Wayne's military genius.

But that was only part of the ill luck that dogged Wayne's whole career. For the greater part of the Revolutionary period he was denied the promotion that everyone knew to be his due because, under the quota systems then employed, Pennsylvania already had her share of major generals and there was no vacancy to which he could be named. Not until after his service at Ticonderoga did he win his brigadiership. He did not gain a major generalcy until after the war was won—and then only by brevet, which gave him the rank, to be sure, but which denied him his proper pay.

It is a stronge commentary upon the ways of democracy that Anthony Wayne, master tactician of Stony Point and Fallen Timbers, failed to reap his proper rewards. Partially, of course, that may be attributed to his withdrawal from Pennsylvania to become a rice planter near Savannah, more likely, it is due to the fact that Wayne, as a Federalist and as a staunch opponent of the radicalism that took hold of Pennsylvania after the Revolution, faced powerful political opposition. It is not necessary to rake up old political grievances today—especially as time has shown that Wayne's insistence upon fair play and justice was wholly justified—but the partisan feelings of the period worked as ill upon him as upon his old commander, General Washington.

Then, too, he suffered because his son, Isaac Wayne, later Federalist candidate for Governor in Pennsylvania, shrank from advertising his father's services. Isaac Wayne withheld from the public many of the details of Anthony Wayne's contribution to social development. Thus, not until the publication in 1941 of a new biography of Anthony Wayne, the first full-length biography to include all the available material concerning Wayne's private life and his Georgia plantation career, was the man really seen as a well-rounded personality.

Credit for this achievement belongs to William Wayne, descendant of the general, who then for the first time opened his treasure chest of Anthony Wayne's personal letters, so that his ancestor might receive his proper due. William Wayne still lives at the old Waynesborough mansion built in 1724 and now a shrine which Chester County historians frequently visit to renew their pledges of loyalty to the ideals for which Anthony Wayne always strove.

Those ideals are true Americanism. Wayne believed in liberty, in justice, and in humanity; he stood for the right of each man to develop his talents to the full without interefernce so long as there was no conflict with the equal rights of others. Wayne worked for the future of America; himself a Revolutionary soldier who had spanned more territory in his fighting than any other officer in the war, not even excluding George Washington, he knew the Nation from what he called the "snows of Canada" to the regions he described as "the burning sands of Florida", and from the seaboard to the wilderness of the Indian country on the West. He had the vision of an empire and he labored to make that vision into fact.

Chester County, Wayne's homelahd, is very proud indeed of Maj. Gen. Anthony Wayne, the trouble shooter of the Revolution. It admires him because of his achievements; even more, it admires the man because always, in every campaign that he waged, his men loved him devotedly. At Morristown in 1781 and again at York, the Pennsylvania line murmured and revolted but they never lost their confidence in Wayne; when he rushed from his quarters to inquire their grievances, they rallied to his support and they appointed him, their general, to represent them in their suit against the politicians who betrayed them. Common soldiers knew that Wayne always labored in their interests, that he argued and worked to find them food and clothing, to secure them proper pay; subalterns worshipped him because he struggled hard to win promotion for them and to give them opportunity to prove their worth. His fellow generals loved him for his friendliness and for his sociability, for his willingness to work with them for the common welfare and for his tireless devotion.

His example is vivid and alive today. In these hours of tribulation, when the fate of the world again stands at stake, the life of Anthony Wayne shines as a brilliant guide to the Nation. If it is true that liberty can only be preserved by the continuing sacrifice of personal comfort to the greater good, then the example of Anthony Wayne serves today as it served in the dark days of Valley Forge, to remind the people that America cannot fall and that men like Anthony Wayne typify the United States of America at its most glorious best.

Anthony Wayne is 200 years old this month, and though he died, while yet in his prime, at 51, nevertheless he still lives. So long as men live and labor for the Nation, so long as ideals reign supreme and the United States remains great, his name will stand high among our heroes. Chester County counts herself proud to have given the world a giant such as Wayne.

House Bill No. 1—A Bill for the Relief of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, House bill No. 1 of the new Seventy-ninth Congress is a bill introduced by me for the relief of veterans.

I requested and was granted the first place on the House calendar of bills introduced for this measure, which is intended to relieve large numbers of veterans from what may well be described as "unjust discrimination."

The bill provides disability benefits for members of the armed forces who are discharged on account of disabilities which were declared to exist by the draftee or inductee at the induction center or which were revealed by the induction examination.

In my handling of veterans' claims I have encountered many cases of obvious injustice which this bill will correct. Men who are known to have a history of disabilities are taken into the service, nevertheless, and when later they are discharged they are denied disability benefits with the curt explanation that they had the disability before they were taken into the service. This simply is not right. If the induction authorities are given fair notice, either by the inductee's own declaration at the time of his induction, or by the induction examination, that a preinduction disability existed it does not lie in good conscience for the Government to say after the man's disability has grown worse and he is thrown out of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps:

"You are not entitled to relief because you had the disability before you entered the service." If the Government accepts a man because it regards him as a good physical risk it should stand by its bargain and in all fairness accord to him as generous treatment as it extends to all other men who are taken into the service.

The text of the bill I have introduced is as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That in any case where a member of the armed forces on his induction, enlistment, or commission in any of the armed services notifies the authorities at the induction center that he has had a case history of a certain specified ailment or that he is suffering from a certain specified disability, or when the induction examination reveals that he has such an ailment or disability, and when later, after he has been taken into the service, said ailment or disability or some development or outgrowth of said ailment or disability becomes evident to the extent that it becomes necessary to discharge said member, the said ailment or disability shall be assumed to have been aggravated by service and said member shall be entitled to be paid disability benefits at the usual disability compensation rates.

Burning the Candle at the Wrong End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents have requested that I introduce legislation to abolish Roosevelt's time and restore God's time. I am today, therefore, introducing a concurrent resolution to restore standard time. The daylight saving, war time, fast time or Roosevelt time, which was inflicted upon us has been one of the most ridiculous, infamous, and diabolical of all the curses we have had to bear under the cloak of wartime necessity. It has wasted manpower on the farm. It has encouraged absenteeism in the factory. It has increased consumption of power, light, and fuel in every home and place of business. It has contributed to juvenile delinquency. It has interfered with school attendance. It has increased crime, especially assaults upon women workers who must go forth upon the streets at the unholy hours dictated by daylight-saving time. It has increased traffic accidents on darkened highways and increased the wear on motor vehicles. It has deprived many of needed sleep for nobody wants to go to bed in daylight and get up in the dark. It has increased the death and illness rate due to the exposure it necessitates when laborers, school children, and others must go forth to the day's work long before sunrise and often wait for busses and streetcars on cold and darkened streets and highways. It has added turmoil and distress to the war situation. It has shortened tempers and broken homes. It has added to confusion because many citizens refuse to change their clocks to accord with the mandate from Washington. Some people keep two clocks, one to run the radio by and one to work by. It interferes with evening church services because it forces them to be so early in the day folks won't come or if they are set for an hour after dark they run too late for those who have to get up and off to work early. It is about as sensible as if you wanted to lengthen a skirt and to do so cut off the top and sewed it on the bottom. It has not helped war industries because most of them are on a 24-hour schedule. The cows and chickens on the farm don't understand this new time and do not abide by it, all of which adds to the farmer's woes. In short, except as an aid to golfers, it has failed to accomplish the salutary effects prophesied for it by the Washington bureaucrats who fancy themselves as modern Joshuas. They sit around with their feet in the waste basket, hands in the public trough, and their heads in the clouds trying to dream up new ways to regiment the people, interfere with the laws of nature and the customs of generations.

Taking Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a poem entitled "Taking Over," written and set to martial music by two young men from Massachusetts—Alfred Santosuosso, Jr., and W. Andrew Daly. We swell with pride as endless and glowing accounts reach us of the exemplary conduct of our boys who are "taking over" throughout the world. Our pride is pardonable because it is both parental and patriotic. Their excellent behavior is evidence that their home training has stood them in good stead. These clean-cut young men serve as living proof to a disillusioned world that our free American way of life builds character and courage. As our handsome lads march down those famous streets of the old world, the cheering throngs, as they watch them through tear-filled eyes, can see that America still holds to the principle: "A sound mind in a sound body."

To these young warriors, clear-eyed and confident; spirited and sturdy; manly and mannerly; gentlemen, everyone of them, and American to the core; to these liberty-loving and tyranny-hating youngsters, is dedicated the following verse:

TAKING OVER

Taking over, over everywhere,
Fighting Yanks, on land and sea and air
Are out to blaze a trail of glory,
So shout it from shore to shore,
That every nation on this earth of ours,
Will live forevermore,
In a peace that they have never known,
With a freedom like our very own.
A cheering world awaits
Our own United States,
Taking over, over everywhere.

Economy and the Pauper's Oath for Veterans, but Billions for World Boondoggling Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph Leib, vice commander, Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C.:

General Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, finally admitted in a letter dated December 27, 1944, addressed to Representative JAMES MORRISON that economy and lack of adequate facilities are the cause for forcing veterans to swear under oath that they are paupers or could not defray the expenses in order to obtain necessary hospitalization.

Therefore, how in the name of logic can the Government pretend that it gives veterans special benefits when it compels a poverty-stricken statement sworn under oath and flanked by penal provisions before granting them medical attention?

Everyone knows that a veteran can go to a private or charitable hospital and declare that they are without funds, and should there be a bed available, professional attention can be obtained akin to that accorded by a veterans' facility. And there have been occasions when veterans have secured medical benefits at the hands of charitable or local public institutions in a more gracious and humane spirit than have been accorded many former soldiers at veterans hospitals. What's more, they are not obliged to swear to a pauper's oath. So the Veterans Administration claim that they are giving veterans special hospitalization benefits while forcing them to swear to a pauper's oath is hypocrisy.

In another letter to Representative SPRINGER on December 1, 1944, General Hines further revealed that his Administration increased its hospital beds by merely 8,404 since June 30, 1941, or approximately 6 months before Pearl Harbor. Think of it. While over one and one-half million World War No. 2 veterans have been discharged from the armed services for disability reasons, with more than 300,000 drawing health pensions, the Veterans Administration saw fit to add only 8,404 beds to its facilities to date. Ponder, too, that these veterans are all potential hospital cases of this war alone. These figures do not include the veterans or needy hospital cases of other wars.

Why? What's behind this scandalous situation? General Hines is quick to assure us that he is planning and recommending additional beds; but the question remains,

What has been holding them up and on what definite date will these beds be available? We are not interested in promises, but in facts.

Furthermore, it is pertinent to our post-war situation to know what assurances the Congress has, if any, that the armed-service hospitals throughout the United States will not be dismantled or destroyed as they were after the last war, leaving needy veterans to the mercy of charitable organizations.

Let us not dismiss the fact that veterans of the First World War are getting older and will require greater medical attention than in previous years, or that the casualties and the disability cases of this war will be beyond comprehension.

If the Roosevelt administration has the money to waste on boondoggling projects throughout the world, then certainly it should have the funds to provide for the rehabilitation and hospitalization of its own veterans. General Hines is now on record as willing and anxious to economize when it comes to veteran hospitalization, and the shooting is still going on. What can be expected from this official when the war and the hero stuff is over?

Is there anything more important in our post-war problems than to provide for needy and worthy veterans the best of hospital treatment, recreation facilities, adequate and necessary equipment to start them off on civilian life again? A grateful Government would give these benefits to sick and wounded veterans willingly and without red tape, and would not have to be forced or coerced into doing so.

The Relation of the Federal Government to Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the best discussions of constitutional problems which are now before Congress has recently been written by Charles W. Briggs, a distinguished attorney of St. Paul, Minn. I am sure my colleagues will find this of great interest. It contains not only information but powerful argument in connection with matters that are sure to come before Congress in the not too distant future. He entitles his article of October 1944, as follows: "The Relation of the Federal Government to Sovereignty." It reads:

THE RELATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO SOVEREIGNTY

(By Charles W. Briggs)

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate (1) that there does not exist in the Federal Government nor in any branch thereof power to surrender or delegate sovereignty that resides in the people of the United States, and (2) that there is a vital distinction between such a surrender or delegation and agreements by treaty or otherwise by the Federal Government to exercise its power in various ways.

It is the firm belief of the writer that it is the duty of all citizens, and of lawyers in particular, to practice straight, logical, and down-to-earth thinking on these momentous subjects. When we talk about a "reign of law" among the nations, let us remember that some government, duly constituted, has to make the law and enforce it.

At the outset the unique character of the Federal Government must be kept in mind. It is but an instrumentality or agency created by the people to exercise a part only of the total governmental power that resides in the people. In the United States sovereignty does not rest in the Federal Government. It rests in the people. To that agency, in respect of domestic or internal affairs, were delegated expressly or by necessary implication, certain powers, and those only. In respect of foreign or external affairs, the Federal Government possesses powers either delegated to it or inherent in, incident to, or a concomitant of nationality. The exercise of these powers is limited by the express or implied restraints of the Constitution. All Federal powers are held in trust to be exercised consistently with the existence of sovereignty in the people of the United States. All remaining powers reside in the people. The Federal Government has no power to do as it chooses. It cannot act beyond the scope of its authority. If delegated or inherent Federal authority cannot be found, it does not exist. It may seem trite to announce these principles, but even so, a reemphasis is proper in view of wide misconception of our governmental structure. What follows is an application of these principles.

SOVEREIGNTY

What is sovereignty?

It is defined by Mr. John Austin, in his work on jurisprudence, as "the supreme, independent, and undivided power to govern." In this connection, the word "independent" means exemption from external authority.

Our own American scholar, Judge Cooley, defines sovereignty as "the supreme, absolute, uncontrollable power by which a state is governed."

As expressed by a noted French writer: "La souverainté est L'indépendence complête qui peut se manifester à deux points de vie; l'un extérieur, l'autre intérieux." (Sovereignty is complete independence which exhibits itself from two points of view; the one exterior, the other interior.)

Sovereignty embraces power to rule the subjects of a nation and also to deal externally with other nations in the field of international relations. Laws are its precepts.

It is unnecessary here to deal with the origin of sovereignty. In the modern world sovereign nations as above defined do exist, and the United States is without dispute one of them. The concept of sovereignty is real and understandable. The word "sovereignty" has a definite meaning, and is a familiar idea conveyor in the vocabularies of statesmen who are shaping the affairs of the peoples of the world. The meaning and existence of sovereignty is what invites the antinationalists to attack it.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAY NOT DELEGATE THE EXERCISE OF ITS POWERS

To Congress is given the following principal powers:

1. To lay and collect taxes.
2. To borrow money on the credit of the United States.
3. To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.
4. To establish an uniform rule of naturalization.
5. To coin money and regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin.
6. To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.
7. To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations.
8. To declare war.
9. To raise and support armies.
10. To provide and maintain a navy.
11. To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.
12. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

The powers of the President are described as follows:

1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States.
2. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.
3. The President shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

The powers of the Supreme Court are defined as follows:

1. The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.
2. The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law or in equity arising under the Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made or which shall be made under their authority, in all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction or controversies to which the United States shall be a party, etc.

The above powers are all attributes of sovereignty with which the Federal Government is clothed.

Nowhere in the enumeration of the above powers or in any other provision of the Constitution is there found a suggestion that any branch of our Federal Government may confer upon any external tribunal whatsoever the exercise of these powers. One branch may not even delegate its functions to another branch under the established doctrine of the separation of powers.

The very granting of the above expressly enumerated sovereign powers to the Federal Government rebuts any claim that the grantee of these powers may transmit them to another grantee. They are to be exercised by the Federal Government on behalf of the people as principal, and by no one else. Did it ever occur to the framers of our Government that by creating a Federal agency they were giving to that agency or any branch thereof the right of conferring upon any external government power to pledge the credit of the United States for borrowed money; to regulate our commerce between the States and with foreign nations; to say who shall be citizens of this country; to control our monetary system; to declare war in which the United States must participate; to raise and support an army or navy among us or to make rules regulating these forces? Did it occur to them that the same agency could redelegate to some external tribunal judicial power of the United States which they had vested in the Supreme Court and other inferior courts? Did it occur to the framers that they were conferring upon the President power to revest his authority in the President of another state, or constitute some other executive the commander in chief of our Army and Navy? Did it occur to them that by conferring treaty-making power upon the President and the Senate they were providing that the President and the Senate might empower some superstate to make treaties for us, treaties in which sovereign powers delegated to the Federal Government would be redelegated? The answers are certainly "No."

The question now to be further and more meticulously explored is: "Does the treaty-making power lodged in the President and the Senate, or the power over international relations resting in the Federal Government as an incident to nationality, carry with it the power to transfer sovereignty to an external state?"

We answer this question in the negative.

The Constitution imposes no restrictions upon the ultimate sovereignty of the people, neither does it augment that sovereignty. In

recognition of a dual system of government it left with or delegated to the Federal Government the exercise of certain powers only.

The people, possessing complete sovereign power that devolved upon them when separated from Great Britain, may regulate the administration of their external or foreign affairs in any way they see fit, and through whatever agencies they choose. The people did elect by express language in the Constitution to repose in the Congress power to declare war, and in the President and the Senate power to make treaties. It must be asumed, therefore, that the people had in mind what could be done by treaty as that term was ordinarily understood in the parlance of international affairs, subject, however, to limitations naturally arising from the very form and structure of our Government, could be done by the President and the Senate.

We need not take time here to discuss the question of to what extent Congress, with the approval of the President, may provide for the consummation of international agreements which have not the dignity, but the effect of treaties as contractual engagements of the Nation. (See *Altman* v. *United States* (224 U. S. 583, 600–601).)

In the case cited in the note the Supreme Court validated a commercial agreement made by the President under a tariff act as an international compact. The Court said: "While the arrangement technically was not a treaty requiring ratification by the Senate, nevertheless it was a compact authorized by the Congress of the United States, negotiated and proclaimed under the authority of the President." The Court gave the compact the effect of a treaty. If under the treaty-making power possessed by the President and the Senate they may not surrender or delegate sovereignty, then for the same reasons Congress and the President may not.

Admittedly the scope of authority in international relations under the treaty-making power is very broad.

The nature of a treaty must ever be kept in mind. A treaty is a contract between sovereign nations. It sets up no third power of enforcement. It is not a limitation upon sovereignty. The general principle has been recognized since Grotius that a treaty does not detract from sovereignty. A treaty depends for the enforcement of its provisions on the interest and the honor of the governments which are parties to it. A treaty lays no direct obligation upon signatory nations to conform their internal law with its principles. It creates no repository of governmental power to control the peoples of nations that enter into it.

That the United States as a sovereign power may fail to enforce or renounce its treaties and in effect abrogate them as part of the municipal law has long been established. (See *Rainey* v. *United States* (232 U. S. 310); the *Chinese Exclusion Case* (130 U. S. 581); *Whitney* v. *Robertson* (124 U. S. 190); *Head Money Cases* (112 U. S. 580); *Taylor* v. *Morton* (2 Curtis 454).)

In his opinion in *Chew Heong* v. *United States* (112 U. S. 536, 564), Justice Field uses this vigorous language, quoting from an opinion of the Attorney General:

"The 'Constitution does not say that Congress shall pass no law inconsistent with a treaty, and it would have been a strange anomaly if it had imposed any such prohibition. There may be cases of treaties so injurious, or which may become so by change of circumstances, that it may be the right and duty of the Government to renounce or disregard them. Every government must judge and determine for itself the proper occasion for the exercise of such a power; and such a power, I suppose, is impliedly reserved by every party to a treaty, and I hope and believe belongs inalienably to the Government of the United States. It is true that such a power may be abused; so may the treaty-making power and all other powers. But for our security against such abuse we may and must rely on the integrity, wisdom, and good faith of our Government.'"

In his opinion in the *Chinese Exclusion Case* (130 U. S. 581, 600), Justice Field justifies the repealability of a treaty in the following language:

"It will not be presumed that the legislative department of the Government will lightly pass laws which are in conflict with the treaties of the country; but that circumstances may arise which would not only justify the Government in disregarding their stipulations, but demand in the interests of the country that it should do so, there can be no question. Unexpected events may call for a change in the policy of the country. Neglect or violation of stipulations on the part of the other contracting party may require corresponding action on our part. When a reciprocal engagement is not carried out by one of the contracting parties, the other may also decline to keep the corresponding engagement. In 1798 the conduct towards this country of the Government of France was of such a character that Congress declared that the United States were freed and exonerated from the stipulations of previous treaties with that country."

He thus boldly brings out the distinction between a surrender of sovereign power and the nature of a contractual obligation under a treaty to exercise that power in designated instances.

The scope of treaty making is well stated as follows:

"That the treaty power of the United States extends to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and the governments of other nations is clear. This power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or of its departments, and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent. But with these exceptions, it is not perceived that there is any limit to the questions which can be adjusted touching any matter which is properly the subject of negotiation with a foreign country." (See 15 R. C. L., p. 148, sec. 59.)

The very nature of the Federal Government as an agency of the people repels the thought that any branch of it may commit the people to obedience to an external will, thus impairing the independence of the United States. Witness the following expressions of Justice Field in the Chinese Exclusion case:

"To preserve its independence, and give security against foreign aggression and encroachment, is the highest duty of every nation, and to attain these ends nearly all other considerations are to be subordinated.

* * * * *

"The power of exclusion of foreigners being an incident of sovereignty belonging to the Government of the United States, as a part of those sovereign powers delegated by the Constitution, the right to its exercise at any time when, in the judgment of the Government, the interests of the country require it, cannot be granted away or restrained on behalf of anyone. The powers of government are delegated in trust to the United States, and are incapable of transfer to any other parties. They cannot be abandoned or surrendered. Nor can their exercise be hampered, when needed for the public good, by any considerations of private interest. The exercise of these public trusts is not the subject of barter or contract" (130 U. S. 581).

If the Federal Government cannot irrevocably bargain away by treaty the right to exercise sovereign power in the matter of controlling the entrance of aliens into this country, how indefensible is the idea that any branch or branches of the Federal Government may surrender that very power to a supernational authority?

If the Federal Government cannot delegate or impair the sovereign power of the people to exclude aliens, then it cannot impair or delegate the sovereign power of the people to control their entry into war, to raise and support an Army and a Navy, and to regulate their use, to regulate their commerce, to regulate their money, or to lay upon and collect taxes from them, nor can the Federal Government invest another with power to dictate the terms of peace between the people of the United States and other nationalities.

It is germane here to consider the doctrine laid down by Justice Sutherland in *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation*. (See 299 U. S. 304, and following language of Justice Sutherland's opinion at page 318: "It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality. Neither the Constitution nor the laws passed in pursuance of it have any force in foreign territory unless in respect of our own citizens (see *American Banana Co.* v. *United Fruit Co.* (213 U. S. 347, 356)); and operations of the Nation in such territory must be governed by treaties, international understandings and compacts, and the principles of international law. As a member of the family of nations, the right and power of the United States in the field are equal to the right and power of the other members of the international family. Otherwise, the United States is not completely sovereign. The power to acquire territory by discovery and occupation (*Jones* v. *United States* (137 U. S. 202, 212)), the power to expel undesirable aliens (*Fong Yeu Ting* v. *United States* (149 U. S. 698, 705 et seq.)), the power to make such international agreements as do not constitute treaties in the constitutional sense (*Altman & Co.* v. *United States* (224 U. S. 583, 600–601); Crandall, Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement, 2d ed., p. 102 and note 1), none of which is expressly affirmed by the Constitution, nevertheless exist as inherently inseparable from the conception of nationality. This the court recognized, and in each of the cases cited found the warrant for its conclusions not in the provisions of the Constitution, but in the law of nations. In *Burnet* v. *Brooks* (288 U. S. 378, 396), we said 'As a nation with all the attributes of sovereignty, the United States is vested with all the powers of Government necessary to maintain an effective control of international relations.' Cf. *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.*, supra, page 295 (298 U. S. 238).")

That there are certain powers vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality not expressly delegated to it in the Constitution there is no doubt. Justice Sutherland mentions or refers to the power to acquire territory by discovery and occupation, the power to make international agreements as do not rise to the dignity of treaties (such as agreements regulating foreign commerce entered into by the President under authority of legislative enactment) and the power to expel undesirable aliens, but none of these incidents involves relinquishment of sovereign power to another nation. On the contrary, each of them amounts to a preservation and exercise of that power in behalf of the people.

It remains to be considered here whether the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and the executive head of foreign relations, may by his actions delegate or bargain away to a foreign state the sovereign powers we are talking about.

It is true that a President is in a position by his actions to create incidents which, to all intents and purposes, put the country into a state of belligerency, followed by actual war—a fait accompli. And this has been done. A President on occasion may make commitments and involve the country in situations from which the people cannot retreat without embarrassment. They may ratify his actions through the duly constituted organs of government or merely acquiesce in them. They may, through the same organs, in the exercise of sovereign power, renounce what he has done as they may renounce a treaty. No President has ever undertaken to clothe an external authority with power to do what he may do.

The validity of executive agreements with foreign countries regulating commerce pursuant to congressional enactments is no foundation for the argument that the President has the right, by executive agreement, to entrust another nation with power to control our commercial activities. Whether the presently approved course of action with respect to reciprocal trade agreements constitutes a step to supplant or sidestep the treaty-making power of the President and Senate, we have no concern here. The course has been validated as a proper exercise of Federal power. The same thing could be accomplished by treaties with the several countries involved. The power to regulate commerce with foreign nations is vested in Congress; is held in trust, and cannot be bargained away either by Congress or by the President under agreement made by him pursuant to a declared legislative policy.

The well-known maxim "delegata potestas non potest delegari" applicable to the law of agency in the general and common law, is applicable in the case of the sovereign people who by their actions vest governmental power in a Federal agency. This principle accords with the very spirit of the Constitution, and is inherently necessary to the preservation of an indissoluble and independent union.

THERE IS NO SUPERNATIONAL LAW THAT IS BINDING ON A SOVEREIGNTY WITHOUT ITS CONSENT

International law consists of a body of rules and usages which should be observed by nations in peace and war. It stems from no paramount legislative authority in the society of nations. It has no law giver. There is no common judiciary to interpret it. There is no superpoliceman to enforce it. Its rules are recognized and enforced only by the voluntary submission and compliance of sovereign nations.

International law was never thought of until there were nations. It is the product of their mutual consent. It followed the establishment of sovereignties. If nationalism were destroyed there would be no international law.

It is idle to say that the Constitution recognized a higher secular authority than the people of the United States. If such proposition is maintained, who was that higher authority? It will be remembered that England claimed the right to impress our seamen, and we went to war in 1812 to stop the practice. We took one view of international law, and England took another. In a trial by battle we established the rule that suited our own convenience.

There is no force in international law which vests in the Federal Government power to yield sovereignty to external controls or requires it to recognize any supernational authority vested in a so-called community of nations. The founders had no such idea. In declaring and making good their independence of Great Britain they were not at the same time acknowledging sovereign control over themselves by Great Britain as one of the members of the family of nations. A curious concept of sovereignty has been developed by one branch of the school of internationalists. It runs this way:

"It may be held that 'national sovereignty,' so called, is merely an honorific term for such power as the family of nations has seen fit from time to time to bestow upon its several members; that in other words, the family of nations is the only real sovereign, and that the so-called sovereign nations are in the contemplation of International law merely its organs and appendages." (See Corwin's "The Constitution and World Organization," 1944, p. 2.)

This is the acme of perversion of the concept of sovereignty. Whence came sovereignty to this family of nations? When and how was this family of nations created? By what governmental process were nations made mere organs or appendages of this family? One cannot imagine the founders setting up the Federal Government as such an appendage.

Lord Chief Justice Coleridge said: "International law is an inexact expression, and it is apt to mislead if its inexactness is not kept in mind. Law implies a law-giver, and a tribunal capable of enforcing it and coercing its transgressors, but there is no common law-giver to sovereign states, and no tribunal has the power to bind them by decrees or coerce them if they transgress."

The framers of the American Constitution and the political writers of their day realized and acknowledged that there was no secular will or body of law superior to the will of the American community or to the internal laws adopted by them. Witness the language of Tom Paine, the philosopher of the Revolution and of the Colonies when they transformed themselves into a sovereign nation: "In republics such as there are established in America, the sovereign power or the power over which there is no control and which controls all others, remains where Nature placed it—in the people."

Whether the positive or naturalistic theory of law is accepted no "brooding omnipresence in the sky" (Justice Holmes) has yet been discovered that bends the sovereignty of the United States to its will. From international law as it existed in 1787 and has existed since can be gleaned nothing that permits, much less requires, our Federal government agency by delegation of its powers to subject us to external rule. In the whole scheme of international law our people have presupposed the sovereignty and independence of the United States.

* * * * *

At this point it may be confidently stated that no branch or branches of the Federal Government may delegate sovereign powers vested in it. It is just as certain that no attempt will be made to do so.

But the picture is not yet complete.

APPROPRIATE BRANCHES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAVE AUTHORITY TO AGREE THAT SOVEREIGNTY WILL BE EXERCISED TO CARRY OUT SPECIFIED TERMS OF A TREATY

There is a probability strong enough to excite the concern of all of us that the Federal Government may in the sphere of action of permissible conduct of international relations create obligations and make commitments of far-reaching significance to us and of serious and unpredictable impact upon our internal affairs. Obligations and commitments may be undertaken for this sovereign power to fulfill and carry out, either the fulfillment or justifiable nonperformance of which will cost us just as much or more trouble than we would have experienced if we had never undertaken them.

It cannot be doubted that the President and the Senate, under the treaty-making power may agree that the United States exercise the powers granted to the Federal Government in certain ways. This, of course, does not amount to a surrender of governmental power to a supernational tribunal.

It is conceivable that a treaty might be entered into which would obligate the United States to declare war or impose sanctions on other nations under certain circumstances; to regulate the commerce of the United States both within and without our boundaries in certain ways, to establish rules of naturalization, to make rules for the government of our land and naval forces, to adopt a money system and regulations of the same, etc. These would be contractual obligations, the performance of which would rest with the sovereign people. Entering into these obligations would not create an external governmental authority, nor would it sanction entry into the United States by governmental officials to carry out the terms of such a treaty. Independence of action on the part of the United States would still be preserved except to the extent that serious embarrassment in foreign affairs and war might result in case the treaty provisions were not fulfilled. Performance of the treaty obligations would remain a matter of internal government by the sovereign people, and they would have on their hands the consequences of nonfulfillment. The future repercussions of such actions it is given to no man to know. Better that we look before we leap.

What, it may be asked, is the difference in practical results between a surrender of sovereignty to a superstate and an agreement to exercise sovereignty in certain designated ways?

By the latter is obviated the necessity of even attempting to solve the following problems:

1. The structure of a superstate, and representation therein by member nations.

2. The enumeration and fixing of its powers, legislative, judicial, and executive.

3. The establishment of an international military, naval, and air force, and providing for its constituent elements and their allocation, command, and employment.

4. Allocation of the burdens of maintaining a superstate and providing it with necessary financial support.

By the latter the dubiousness and dangers of reliance upon collective security are avoided.

Let us suppose that a superstate is created and discretionary power is lodged in it to take possession of all strategic or critical areas for the good order of the world. Let us suppose that the superstate decrees that its forces shall take possession of the Panama Canal, and they do so. We must assume that these forces would be much superior to ours, otherwise they would be useless. And we must not assume that these forces would never be used against the very member nations that create them, including the United States. What then would be the position of the United States? If it chose to resist it would face a war of insurrection against the superstate with its strategic line of attack and defense strangulated. We would face the necessity of military preparation as we were faced with it in 1941, this time with a superior antagonist in our front yard.

On the other hand, let us suppose that the United States enters into an agreement with other nations, that the Panama Canal will be controlled by the United States in certain ways for the benefit of other nations. We have now a limited type of such an international agreement in the Clayton-Bulwer and Hay-Pauncefote treaties, under which we guarantee the use of the Panama Canal to the commerce of the world on equal terms. Under such an arrangement governmental control (which is sovereignty) remains in

our hands, and it may be assumed that we will maintain adequate and flexible forces of our own to defend ourselves in case we are attacked because of nonfulfillment of the treaty. Justifiable reasons may make nonfulfillment necessary.

The situations are obviously different in their practical aspects.

We have every reason to believe that the United States will act in good faith and without sinister motives. Unless other nations are willing to cooperate with us in the same vein in opposition to aggression, any concert of action is apt to prove a snare and a delusion.

WHAT WORLD PLAN DO THE OPPONENTS OF NATIONALISM PROPOSE?

In the first place, those who would subvert nationalism—those who would be wreckers of actually existing sovereignty by the simple device of calling it a "rubber word" or a mere verbal concept—seem to treat a world organization as an entity separated from the everyday life of the citizens of this country. There is some disposition to picture such an organization as some sort of "New Atlantis" of whose presence the good people need not be aware except when blessings are showered upon them. What the people are to pay and do for these blessings is glossed over. But this divorcement cannot be accomplished. Whatever is done by an international organization to which the United States is made a party will have a direct impact upon the affairs of every citizen in this country. We now well know the bearing of Federal controls upon every individual citizen. So the people have a right to be informed, or at least given an inkling of what the impacts of a world plan are going to be. Unless they are thus treated, no plan has a chance of ultimate success.

The statesmen who are to shape the destiny of our people should have a 20/20 vision. Many who now attempt to do this shaping are so farsighted as to see only objects on the blurred horizon of distant hope. Matter of fact things close at hand escape their attention. One of these things is the human being and his make-up, to which all plans must be accommodated. Many planners even positively abhor taking a look backward along the paths of human progress and reflecting upon what human beings have done in spite of lofty ideals readily accepted. Furthermore, our world planners will not succeed by polarizing the light they shed so as to make their proposals seem what they are not. If our world planners are proposing a superstate, then it behooves them to tell us how the Federal Government as now constituted may validly surrender our sovereignty, or any part of it, to such a state. It is no answer to say that the sovereign people themselves may surrender their sovereignty. If they were consulted within the constitutional processes of our system they would not set up a superstate to rule over them if they knew what they were doing.

If we are to have a supernational government to which the United States is to be a party, it is fair to ask what powers do the United States propose to grant to that government—legislative, judicial, and executive. It would be absurd to suppose that the United States or any other nation would endow such a government with power to do anything it liked just to have peace. It would be just as hopeless to advocate that such a government be endowed with power to do anything within the discretion of its officers for the general welfare of nations. What then are the powers to be conferred?

We should never lose sight of the eternal argument about the limits of enumerated federal powers, and the restraints on the same. We should note the recent expansion of those powers by interpretations unforeseen by previous generations.

If the United States is to be incorporated into a superstate, then it becomes the business of every citizen of every other member state to participate in governing us, and the business of every American to take part in governing the people of other member states. But where is there any indication that other nations are advocating any such an arrangement? China, for instance, has staged a bitter contest for generations to eliminate foreign controls and extraterritorial rights, and that contest now has an increased tempo. Russia is developing an intense nationalism, and even in the hour of her greatest peril she balks at any semblance of external domination. Mixed controls for military purposes among allies in time of immediate common danger to their national existence constitute no ground for thinking that these controls can be perpetuated after that danger has passed.

It is not conceivable that a fully panoplied supergovernment could be instituted. It took centuries to translate a growing concept of Republican or Democratic government into successful action. The most successful attempt has occurred in the United States. But it is still in an experimental stage. To extend this principle to the world through a workable system will take generations of development, education, and gradual adaptation, if such an effort ever comes to fruition.

All through the life of our dual system of government there has been the struggle between autonomy of the States and power centralized in the National Government. That contest is still going on. A superstate would in turn impair the autonomy of the United States and further magnify the difficulties and evils of remoteness of control over the life our our citizens.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF FORMULATING A DESIGN FOR A WORLD ORGANIZATION ARE APPARENT

The most significant thing about proposals for a world organization is the total absence of designs on the trestle board. This organization is sometimes spoken of as a family or community or society of nations, a world state, a security council, or such like. No plan has been blueprinted or even sketched. It cannot be. Powers to be granted have not been delineated. An architect of a building can give no idea of its structure or utility without drawings and specifications. No more can the architect of world peace present as a supergovernment structure resolutions, preambles, postulates, or principles containing only a statement of general objectives. A preamble to a constitution embodies no framework of government nor machinery to carry it out. It is easy to advocate the creation of a security council to maintain peace. But who has said how that force is to be organized, who is to govern and command it, or on what occasion it shall be applied? Who shall have power to name the aggressor against whom the force is to be put in motion, or kept in motion.

Suppose the members of a prospective body politic would assemble and resolve that an organization be set up to prevent sin and crime, or to accomplish justice under a reign of law. That is about as far from accomplishment as anything could be imagined. A government is not instituted by a resolution that there be one to eliminate war and the causes of war any more than a proposed new game of football to eliminate roughness could be played without established rules. Certainly a world umpire would have his hands full controlling the plays and the players by improvisations on the field.

It is common to speak of a world organization in terms of our own Federal Constitution. Can it be envisioned that other nations would surrender governmental power to a framework with which they have had no experience? Would our separation of executive, legislative, and judicial powers be accepted? Would our judicial veto on unconstitutional legislative action be accepted? Such notions are not practiced even in England, let alone other countries who are expected to be cooperators in a supernational undertaking.

A good example of nebulous thinking concerning international organizations for the accomplishment of idealistic aims is the convention known as the Holy Alliance. This alliance illustrates the futility of mere generalization in international affairs, and is satisfactory proof that intentions verbally declared are not tantamount to accomplished facts in the field of such affairs.

The sovereigns of Prussia, Austria, and Russia became, in 1815 parties signatory to a document containing among others the following solemn declarations and covenants:

"They solemnly declare that the present act has no other object than to publish in the face of the whole world their fixed resolutions both in the administration of their respective states and in their political relations with every other government, to take for their sole guide the precepts of that holy religion, namely, the precepts of justice, Christian charity, and peace, which far from being applicable only to private concerns, cannot have an immediate influence on the councils of princes, and guide all their steps, as being the only means of consolidating business institutions and remedying their imperfections. In consequence, their majesties have agreed on the following articles:

"PRINCIPLES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

"Article I. Conformable to the words of the Holy Scriptures which command all men to consider each other as brethren, the three contracting monarchs will remain united by the bonds of a true and indissoluble fraternity, and, considering each other as fellow countrymen, they will on all occasions and in all places lend each other aid and assistance; and regarding themselves toward their subjects as fathers of families, they will lead them in the same spirit of fraternity with which they are animated, to protect religion, peace, and justice.

"FRATERNITY AND AFFECTION

"Article II. In consequence, the sole principle of force, whether between the said governments or between their subjects, shall be that of doing each other reciprocal service, and of testifying by unalterable good will the mutual affection with which they ought to be animated, to consider themselves all as members of one and the same Christian nation."

The practical Metternich of Austria immediately characterized these lofty generalizations and commitments as "a loud-sounding nothing." The vigorous Castelreagh of England described them as "a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense." Both of these eminent diplomats continued to conduct the foreign affairs of their respective countries on an understandable and realistic basis, despite the attempt of Czar Alexander to make these vague principles the basis of an universal union or a general confederation of Europe. Noble as these pious aspirations were, they were not and could not be carried out. There was no workable machinery by which they could be translated into action. The concrete but sinister manifestation of the Holy Alliance was an attempt to preserve monarchial power and extend it to the Western Hemisphere. This was met by the equally concrete Monroe Doctrine as a counteraction by the United States and Great Britain.

In the very nature of things, no generation and no Congress can bind future generations and future Congresses to the laws and institutions of today. As Justice Sutherland puts it: "Rulers come and go, government ends and forms of government change; but sovereignty survives." (See *United States*

v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation* (299 U. S. 304, 316).) It hardly need be mentioned that we have departed from the ways and reactions of our forefathers and the generations that followed them. The people are not static in their make-up. They change in their ideas of governments and social and political institutions and Congresses change with them. It would be quite impossible now to set up an international organization with discretionary governmental powers that would be acceptable to future generations.

Hardly less nebulous than the Holy Alliance is a resolution endorsing as a primary objective "establishment and maintenance at the earliest possible moment of an effective international order among all nations based on law and the orderly administration of justice." What is to be the law, and what is to be the administration of justice upon which such an order is to be based? Who is to make the law, and who is to administer it? Are we to have a world bureaucracy making law by administrative processes? How would the people of the United States be represented in the lawmaking body? Remember that the problem of representation of the States in the Federal Government was the rock upon which the formation of the Union nearly foundered. The generic terms "law" and "justice" standing alone convey nothing. Law is the mandate of a sovereign in action. Until we know what the international order is to be, how can we envision what the laws will be? Would anyone recommend that the United States invest a supernational order with power to run our domestic and international affairs as justice may require? Justice means many things to many people. It envisages no concrete action in world affairs. No lawyer could find the principles that apply to the problems of his client by looking in a digest under the heading of "Law" or "Justice."

Without doubt, realizing all of these things, high authority has recently outlined the only sensible course that presents possibilities of success in the field of our international relations:

1. No surrender of sovereignty.
2. No world government.
3. No world police force.
4. Individual national military and naval forces adequate to the needs of preventing war and of making impossible deliberate preparation for war.
5. A council of nations for the purpose of working out through international cooperation the problems of world relations.
6. An international court of justice to deal with justiciable disputes.

Well is it appreciated, from the field of diplomatic relations and from experience with the causes of war and international disagreements, that the disputes that give rise to war are political in their nature and not subject to judicial determination.

No more clear-cut and definite statement can be made today. Furthermore nothing is therein proposed that transcends the powers of the Federal Government as now constituted.

Within the ambit of the international policy as so outlined we may cooperate with foreign nations to the fullest practicable extent in making use of the power of this country, military and otherwise, to prevent future wars and aggressions, by treaties, alliances, or other agreements, formal or informal. There is in it no suggestion that any government external to our own shall have power to plunge this country into war. At the same time our independence and opportunity to weigh decisions as they may affect our security will be preserved as they should be. Solutions will have to be worked out in the light of the interests and dispositions of nations at the time. Cooperation and the results thereof can rise no higher than the real desire of the most powerful nations to get along together translated into action.

The above attitude, adopted after mature deliberation, reenforces the conclusion that cooperation between nations will be cast in the form of treaties or other agreements, and that no commitments will be made until they have been carefully considered as to their character, definiteness, and consequences, and their effect upon the security, institutions, and liberties of the American people. It is only fair to presume that no plan will be effective unless approved by the people in complete observance of constitutional processes.

Well may profound minds that have pondered the problems of international policy in all their ramifications pause before recommending a pattern for a world organization to eliminate the causes of war. These causes run deep in human backgrounds—commercial rivalries, crowded populations seeking expansion of their territories, racial antipathies and philosophies, religious differences, social ideologies, disparities in respect of wealth, position, and territory, downright jealousy, and lust for power. Nations, so minded, can cooperate to minimize the threats that lurk in these causes. They can also, with force as the ultimate sanction, cooperate to prevent wars. But the causes will persist to an undetermined degree. There is no basis for a conclusion that nations will cease to be self-interested; but enlightened self-interest should dictate that nations be disposed and prepared to curb world-menacing aggression at the threshold. In the attainment of the desired end of peace we are not yet ready to submit this country to the uncertain and dangerous course of domination by a superpower. To say that the United States will abide by decisions, legislative, executive, or judicial, without its consent, that affect its very security and existence, is expressing a pious hope and nothing more.

What Shall We Believe—Truth, Half Truth, Rumor, Propaganda?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech delivered by United States Attorney Alexander M. Campbell before the Kiwanis and Quest Clubs of Fort Wayne, Ind.

During these days when it is of the utmost importance to the war effort that we give careful judgment to the rumors and propaganda to which we are constantly being subjected, I believe we might all consider with profit this excellent address. I believe it to be an effective guide and admonition to all of us in our search for the truth.

The address follows:

Since man first became cognizant of the mental processes of reasoning, assimilation of facts, understanding, and imagination, all of which eventually gave dignity to human intelligence, man has been in the constant search of truth. The most imaginative story of man's conquest of truth is, I believe, the story of Sir Galahad and the Holy Grail. You will recall that the gallant knight of old searched throughout the then known world for the Holy Grail. It was to reveal to its finder the perfect way of life. It revealed itself only to those pure of heart.

History is replete with the adventures of men striking out in search of truth, crusading, fighting, praying in order that they might find the ultimate truth to life. Each pagan war lord felt that he was on the road of right—Alexander, Charlemagne, Caesar, Napoleon, Confucius, Lamarck and Diogenes, Sun Yat Sen, and scores of others too numerous to mention have left their mark on the historic pages of human progress by persevering toward an ultimate goal which to them represented truth. Modern man continues the search. The less we talk about it and the more we live up to it, the greater will be our influence. There is no propaganda, there is no advertising, that compares with conduct. Somewhere it has been written, "To this end I was born and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." Ultimate truth has never been revealed to mankind, possibly because the search for it is more necessary to man's development than the knowledge of it.

The problem of what to believe has always been intriguing to me. The idea of evaluating many-sided concepts of various problems originated quite naturally throughout the course of handling several thousand cases in the past 9 years as a Federal prosecutor and public defender in our Federal courts. Especially during this wartime period, when the case load is extra heavy, and when the atmosphere at time became filled with goblins, half-truths, rumors, and propaganda, the acumen by which we judge who is guilty and who is not, who should be prosecuted and who not, of necessity required a daily sharpening. Reports come to the F. B. I., United States attorney, and other governmental agencies daily and for a time after Pearl Harbor, hourly, with respect to the personal or so-called political conduct of persons among us in the northern district of Indiana. "He is a Nazi sympathizer, he has been listening to the short-wave radio from Berlin, Tokyo, or Hamburg. He is for Hitler. The man in the third house from the corner is dangerous to the internal security of the Nation. There are many cars gathering at the rear of the saloon each Friday night and all the occupants go down in the basement; it should be investigated." These reports, all of them which came to us, have been investigated and 95 percent of them have been unfounded.

The test we use in determining what we shall believe is whether or not we can prove it. When the Government investigators bring us a case, we examine the facts and say, "Can you prove it beyond a reasonable doubt?" We have interned some people in northern Indiana for the duration of the war. We have sent others to prisons for violating the war laws but only after a thorough examination of the evidence and a sincere conviction that we believed and that we had evidence to prove that we believed concerning the violations of law.

I do not suggest this rigid test in our every-day walk of life because the average person is too busy to prove everything he says. However, much misunderstanding would be avoided in our daily affairs if we uncocked our verbal gun concerning those around us. We are all given to pronouncing half-truths without knowing for certain if what we say or what we charge is something we really believe. Again we are perhaps given to the human frailties of passing on rumors which is one of the most thoughtless and can be one of the most dangerous proclivities of human conduct. The best example which I can cite to you is the erstwhile rumor which permeated every home in Fort Wayne with respect to the last of the three unsolved murders in our city. (Within recent months three Fort Wayne young women have been murdered. Their assailant has not been appre-

hended.) Persons of fine stature, reputation, and standing in the community called me and stopped me on the street to tell me who had committed the atrocious crime. The example just cited is a severe one but it serves well and brings us up short and aware of the tremendous harm which can come about as a result of the passing of idle rumors, unchecked and unproved.

Many persons have stopped your United States Attorney on the street to inquire when we are going to do something about the three unsolved murders in our midst and then, of course, we must explain that they are violations of State law and not of Federal law and that only in instances where there is murder on Federal property or where a Federal agent is killed does the United States court assume jurisdiction of murder cases. "We heard that you were investigating the cases or we heard that the F. B. I. was on the trail is the usual reply."

Again we see where loose talk has resulted in the misunderstanding with respect to the jurisdiction of the respective courts of the land.

Propaganda, its composition, transmission, and dissemination has taken a great deal of our time and interest. Many of us could well admit that at times we are often bewildered. However, there never was a time when it is more important for us to know what we think and what we believe than this very hour.

Since January 30, 1933, when Hitler came into power, the world has been filled with propaganda. Foreign agents have been within our shores as a matter of actual proof in our own Federal courts since 1926 disseminating the propaganda of the Nazi Party, of the Hitler youth movement, of the Nazi Women's Auxiliary, of the German-American Bund, and of the Nipponese as well. In this country, yes, in the northern district of Indiana, where we have a large colored populace, the Japanese agents have been very active. I refer, of course, particularly to Lake County, Ind. The Japanese propagandists have been somewhat effective among our colored people here and elsewhere throughout the Nation. We have had to investigate these activities with respect to the formation of subversive organizations in Gary and Indiana Harbor particularly, where our colored people have been meeting in both public and private assembly to both hear and read propaganda emanating from Tokyo sources. These meetings, usually in a private home, have been attended by from 10 to 200 colored people. This matter has been investigated by a Federal grand jury and we have determined that the Japanese Government sent to this country in 1934 an organizer by the name of Naka Nakane. This man has appeared in Gary, Chicago, Detroit, and throughout the country addressing the various colored groups. He is now serving a prison term, but not until he had well-organized groups throughout the United States among the colored people and disseminated dangerous propaganda which had as its fundamental purpose the creation of race hatred, misunderstanding, and intolerance. The Japanese propagandists preach race equality, that Japan will win the war, and they encourage willful noncompliance with the Selective Service Act.

Quoting from page 16 of the Federal grand jury investigation, which we conducted, one of the witnesses testified that at such a meeting the listeners were advised as follows:

"When the Japs come to invade this country, you are giving in to them and surrendering to them, without resisting them, and you will gain the freedom and possessions they have for you and others that obey this order."

On page 17 of the investigation, we find evidence that at the opening and closing of the meetings those in attendance would stand up, face the east, and repeat the guiding principles of the organization. That there was usually a discussion of the then Japanese advances and victories and they all seemed elated when advances were made by the Japanese. Further, that these meetings were particularly enthusiastic about the time the Japanese landed on the Aleutian Islands. The testimony is to the effect that "now the Japs have gained a foothold on the American Continent—it would not be long until they would be in the United States itself."

These colored persons in attendance at these meetings were told that the Japanese and Negroes are colored people and therefore they must stick together.

At page 23 of the investigation there appears the testimony of a young colored woman who said at one of these meetings:

"The Japanese will come over here before you know it, and it will be too bad for the whites. You whites have kept us down too long. The Japanese will come over here and get the whole bunch of you."

The investigation also revealed that at these meetings the Negro men were advised when any of these men are drafted in the Army and come in contact with any Japanese armed forces they are to lay down their arms and go over with the Japanese and fight with them.

One of the subjects of our investigation revealed that he had received his instructions from his parents at home when we interviewed him with respect to spreading anti-American propaganda among pupils in one of the Lake County schools.

We have testimony to the effect that two boys named Ned and Jesse were at kindergarten when the students pledged allegiance to the flag. The younger boy refused to stand up and the teacher asked him if he was going to pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States. The young colored boy at kindergarten said, according to the testimony, "No; my mother tells me I don't have to pledge allegiance to the American flag."

When a boy by the name of Haile stood up in front of his class and stated that he wanted the Japanese to win; when the teacher said, "You have evidently made a mistake, haven't you?" Haile said, "No; my mother tells me the Japanese are friends of the colored people, and when they come over here they are going to treat us right, and they are going to give us the jobs of mayor, and chief of police, and chief of the fire department."

The teacher testified that further interrogation of the lad after school revealed that the boy's parents had been attending the meetings heretofore referred to.

A certain colored woman whose first name is Bessie has been telling white people with whom she works that "Hitler and the Japs would be over here, and you whites will take dictation from them instead of us taking it from you. The colored people and the Japs, along with Hitler, will tell you what to do."

This type of propaganda is, of course, greatly injurious to the national welfare, to our internal security, to the future of our people, and to national unity.

In view of the fact that this is election week, I should like to refer to another type of propaganda which, of course, is in a much lighter vein, but, nevertheless, which many of our fellow citizens believe. In 1940 national leaders proclaimed that if a certain candidate was elected or reelected to the Presidency of this great Nation that representative government would vanish from our way of life. That there would never be another election in the history of America and that we would no longer be freemen. The proof of that ridiculous propaganda is the fact that we have had two national elections since—the recent one in the midst of the greatest war in the history of civilization. We are still free. We still may vote for whom we please. Whether or not the candidate of our choice was elected and is to lead us for the next 4 years, I think we can all believe that so long as we maintain faith in ourselves and in our religious education and political institutions, representative government will endure forever. Yes; there will be an election for the Presidency of the United States every 4 years for generations long to come.

It is our considered judgment that the propaganda which has done the most harm in this country is that which has emanated from Berlin. A well-conceived and highly organized propaganda campaign has been coming from Nazi sources for many years. It has come through the short-wave radio, through the magazines and newspapers edited by the Nazi hierarchy, the leading one of which is the Free American, the official publication of the German-American Bund. In these periodicals no opportunity has been missed to undermine our faith in democracy. In addition to the printed propaganda the organization of the bund has sponsored speakers throughout the country who have flooded their listeners with the Nazi aims and purposes. Some of our citizens have unwittingly believed some of this propaganda. I have had responsible people say to me, "Well, maybe Hitler was right with respect to the Jews, or we did not give Germany a just peace in the last war or the treaty of Versailles was too severe." These bits of propaganda are picked out, retained, and believed from the mass of untruths sponsored by the Nazi leaders who believe themselves to be supermen.

In our work in attempting to ferret out the truth and to see that the innocent are saved from prosecution and that the guilty are convicted, we have examined volumes of periodicals printed and distributed by the Nazis in this country. From these issues I have chosen a few choice excerpts of the Hitler propaganda.

For example, on June 23, 1934, there appeared in the Deutsche Zeitung on page 6 the following:

"Nobody can force us to give our soul to America, as many of our countrymen have done. No one can demand that we become German-American mongrels (translators note: alternative translations are 'bastards,' 'cross-breeds'), who do not know where they belong. We are and we remain Germans, Germans in America."

In Deutscher Weckruf appeared an article quoting an address by Josef Schuster on August 9, 1935, in which he said, referreing to the bund members in America:

"Adolf Hitler, remain firm. * * * You will find in us a defender at an advanced post, of whom you can be proud."

In Deutscher Weckruf on October 10, 1935, there appeared the following:

"We are in politics in this land of freedom, but not trivial party politics. Our goals are higher. The goal of German policy in this country will be reached when at some future time a German man in Washington conveys his thoughts from a German heart to the public."

In Deutscher Weckruf on July 23, 1935, appeared an article by Carl Nicolay, the German-American Bund organizational leader for the "Gau East."

"(We must) strengthen our sacred homeland, the Third Reich, by constructing a mighty phalanx of German blood in the American body politic, so that it becomes impossible for all time to ever again involve Americans in a war * * * against Germany."

On April 22, 1937, there appeared an article by Fritz Kuhn, in the Deutscher Weckruf:

"Consequently, the community of our German destiny, out, over, and beyond all national borders, is expressed. We may have various citizenship papers lying in the closet

and yet we are all German people and members of one great racial community (Volksgomeinschaft), of one hundred million which has branched out and extended itself from the German ancestral homeland out over the seas and continents."

As free people and as Christian gentlemen it seems to me that we have inherited a duty to conduct the long search for ultimate truth. We have an obligation to resist and to cast aside the half truths, rumors, and propaganda. It may become laborious at times to separate the chaff from the wheat. Talk is cheap, yet sacred. Words, conversation, speech, those are the means of intercommunication among men. They are the priceless gifts. Men think by means of words and communicate with each other through this medium. This most noble and profitable invention of speech is man's proudest triumph over nature, without it among men there would be neither commonwealth, nor society, nor contract, nor war, nor peace. Stanley Baldwin once said:

"Words are the currency of love and friendship, of making and marketing, of peace and war. Nations are bound and loosed by them."

When ideas, statements, or principles conflict only the most careful weighing of pros and cons will yield the real choice. The ability to decide such matters wisely is not easily attained. Yet it is the wisdom of truth that can in the end set us and our children free from the tyranny of falsehood and establish more securely the thing called truth.

Preaching is not enough. Somehow we must plant the ideal of truth in the very marrow of our children's bones, in their habits and conduct, in their way of thinking, in their attitudes toward other children, so they become deeply honest.

Today democracy is at stake on the five continents and seven seas and one part of our job of defending and developing it must be the directing of our children and the rededication of ourselves to the highest principles of action, the highest goals of human fulfillment. Together with the knowledge to find and the ingenuity to apply the truth can only we insure a world that is worth living for and worth fighting for. You need the habit of truth. It is our greatest national asset. The undergirding truisms of American life today—the four pillars of our organized society—are the home, the church, the school, and the state. An enduring civilization requires that these four concepts of truth must stand forever. Truth will keep us free.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a recent statement on social security by the Northwestern National Life Insurance Co., of Minneapolis. It presents so concisely and cogently the truly American way to build together both private and public enterprise, each in its proper sphere, for the greater good of all.

In January 1937 this company, in its national advertising, welcomed social security to the American scene. We felt then, as now, that through this law the Nation had struck a telling blow at an age-old and dangerous enemy—destitution.

Social security is not yet a perfect instrument, but the ingenuity and common sense of the American people should steadily improve it. We look forward to the day when a blanket of basic protection will cover every American family.

This will cost money. For social security is paid for by taxes, which do not themselves create wealth, but come from wealth created by the people. Only the savings and labor, the ingenuity and enterprise of an energetic, productive nation make social security possible. But such a nation can gladly assume its cost, in the conviction that a decent country must somehow maintain minimum living standards for all its people.

As we see it, social security is a proper instrument of a democratic society, by which it protects itself against the destructive effects of poverty.

Life insurance, on the other hand, is an instrument of the individual, by which he lifts his family as far above society's minimum standard as his own industry, intelligence, and enterprise permit.

This is in the American tradition: For all the people, the things the Nation needs—broader education, growing vision and understanding, assurance of the basic essentials of decent living. For the individual, the thing the individual needs—freedom to learn and earn as much, to go as far and as fast as he can and will.

Remove Joker From Maloney-Monroney Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, legislation will soon be considered by the Seventy-ninth Congress which will extend the time of the joint committee created by the Maloney-Monroney resolution which provides for study and to recommend changes with a view to improving the legislative machinery.

There has not been the least opposition to this movement, the press, radio commentators, columnists, as well as the public, agree it has been too long delayed.

Mr. Speaker, by reason of my experience in serving on several committees charged with reporting legislation providing for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, I fully realize the difficult task that confronts this committee.

I want to express the hope that the resolution that passed several weeks ago be amended so that the committee be given power not only to recommend changes but also to report resolutions to carry out their recommendations and to give such resolutions a privileged status. As I see it, this committee is responsible to the House and Senate and not to a standing committee. If the power I suggest is not in the resolution, then standing committees of the House will hold the veto power. If the committee is given this authority, then Members of the House and Senate will have the authority individually or collectively as the case may be to approve or disapprove the recommendations.

While I feel this is very important, still there is another matter I desire to discuss. Section 2 of the resolution adopted December 15 reads as follows:

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with oter branches of the United States Government and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of personnel by the Members and the committees of the Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to recommend any amendment to or change in the parliamentary rules governing proceedings in either House.

I ask you to analyze this section. In one sentence you direct the committee what to do then you come to the proviso that absolutely nullifies the directorate because you say:

Provided, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to recommend any amendment to or change in the parliamentary rules governing proceedings in either House.

How can this committee to the job under the proviso?

No matter which way you turn you run into the words I quoted.

We either want to improve the machinery under which we operate or we do not.

One thing is absolutely certain, if this committee is restricted to creating jobs and increasing salaries we will be ridiculed throughout the country by those who are now supporting the movement.

Rule X found in the House Manual creates the standing committees. Rule XI defines jurisdiction. Therefore, the minute the committee thinks of standing committees it is restricted by the proviso. Committees are certainly part of the parliamentary procedure of the House, and an outstanding part. Our parliamentary laws provide when a bill is introduced it is referred by the Speaker to the standing committee having jurisdiction, the Parliamentarian advising the Speaker as to where the bill should be referred.

If the committee feels there should be a reduction in the number of standing committees it cannot even so recommend due to this proviso. It is foolish on the face of it to instruct in one sentence and nullify the instructions in the next.

It might be the committee could recommend an increase in the Legislative Drafting Service, set up a research division either separately or under the Drafting Service, also to provide for a congressional fiscal investigating division but beyond that it could hardly go other than to increase salaries and create additional jobs.

Ratification of treaties by a majority vote of both Houses, the Kefauver suggestion to have Cabinet Officers attend sessions to be questioned, create joint committees and other suggestions, all having to do with parliamentary procedure and are affected by the proviso.

A study of the resolution adopted December 15 will convince anyone my argument cannot be assailed.

Much as I am in favor of this meritorious movement I would rather see the study delayed than to hamstring the committee as does the original resolution.

The proviso was added to the original resolution. Why, I do not know, and we certainly are entitled to some information before we are asked to vote for it again.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein certain excerpts:

THE CONGRESSIONAL FRONT

(By Congressman EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois)

WHERE DO YOU WORK-A JOHN (ON THE DELAWARE LACKAWANN')

Do you recall that old ditty about "Where do you work-a John, on the Delaware Lackawann'." It comes to mind as more and more is said and written about 60,000,000 jobs. Haven't you wondered perhaps how many people out of the entire population do work—and where they work—and what they did before the war—and during the war—and what they may do after the war. If we knew how many would be available for work after the war—and the kind of work that should be done to keep up the high standard of living, it might save many headaches and vain speculations. And for that matter, it might save us from certain delusions.

BACK TO 1940

When the Census Bureau finished counting noses in 1940, here's what they reported. There were 45,166,000 persons working. Where? Well, roughly there were about 10,500,000 working in factories, about 3,000,000 in mining and construction. Those two classifications account for about 30 percent or slightly less than 1 out of every 3 persons then working. Another 12,500,000 were working at the business of running stores, working on railroads, selling insurance, practicing law, working in banks, selling real estate, running garages and beauty parlors, etc. This is essentially service work. The remaining 19,500,000 were working on farms or operating farms, engaged in fishing as an industry or working for some branch of government whether National, State, or local. So, about 30 out of every 100 workers were in industry, mining, or construction, 28 out of every 100 in service trades, and the remaining 42 out of each hundred on farms, fishing, or government work.

HOW MANY WANT WORK AFTER V-DAY?

Will a larger or smaller number want jobs when the war is over—or the same number? Here we must move into the field of estimating. By 1946 or 1947 let us say, if population continues at a normal increase, we should have about 140,000,000 people in the continental United States. Let's divide them up into groups. About thirty-three and one-third million will be under 14 and of school age, about eleven and one-fifth million from 14 to 24 will be in schools and colleges, an estimated two and two-fifths million may be in the Army and Navy, about eight and four-fifths million will be retired at 65 or over, about one and four-fifths million will be in jails, asylums, and other institutions, about two and one-half million will be in the fringe group (folks who go for easy money and live by their wits) leaving about forty-nine and three-fifths million who are working or who seek work. Let's call it 50,000,000. It would be about 4,000,000 more than the number working in 1940. But it would be far short of the 60,000,000.

AREAS OF EXPANSION OF JOBS

To get a proper viewpoint, it is necessary to get over the idea that all jobs were found in factories. The 1940 census figures easily dispel the idea. We can then better examine the areas where jobs may best be found. Obviously the number of construction workers will increase in the post-war period. So will service industries such as garages and air lines. The G. I. Act, enacted by Congress, should swell educational ranks. In all this is real hope that the job can be done.

THE CONGRESSIONAL FRONT

(By Congressman EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois)

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH COTTON?

If you live in a section of the country where they grow corn or wheat or fruit or soybeans or some other crop besides cotton, cotton may not mean much. And yet it does. It is the cash crop for a substantial area and a large number of farmers. How much cotton they produce, and what they get for it, determines what and how much they buy of the goods and commodities produced in other sections. But the cotton business is sick. The soil in the deep South is getting thin from overusage. Fertilizers must be used constantly. The quality is not what it should be if it must compete against cotton grown on better and newer soils. It is still a one-mule crop and costs are high. The outlet for our cotton in world markets is not too bright. There is the usual mass inertia about changing to other crops. The effort to hold up the price, by artificial methods is of only temporary effect and is a bit dangerous when considered from the standpoint of our future.

SOME SIGNIFICANT FIGURES

Thirty years ago—and that's not so long ago—the United States produced 64 percent of the world's cotton. Now it produces 40 percent. That's a pretty substantial decline. Thirty years ago 32,000,000 spindles were spinning cotton into cloth in this country. Today there are only 25,000,000 spindles. That's quite a drop. It's even more significant if you consider that the number of spindles for the world increased from 143,000,000 to 146,000,000. That means keener competition from other countries with cheaper labor. In other words, the cotton business is losing ground in the world market.

PRODUCTION AND USE

Now look at our production and use of cotton. Roughly, we produce about 12,000,000 bales a year and use about seven and one-fifth million bales. The cotton we do not use must be sold in world markets or must go into warehouses and be held. If world production continues to come up our production must go down or provide an excess which we cannot sell unless we subsidize the sale to the tune of 5 or 6 cents a pound with money out of the public Treasury. Of the seven and one-fifth million bales we use every year, about two and seven-tenths million bales go into clothes, about one and eight-tenths million go into household uses such as gauze, quilting, and what not, and the other two and seven-tenths million go into industrial uses such as cord for making tires. But look. Rayon is getting cheaper and becomes a vigorous competitor for cotton. That's not only true of clothing uses such as women's hose but industrial uses also. The War Department made some tests and issued a report saying that cord for tires which is made of rayon is better than cord made from cotton. That's not so good for cotton. Think also of how paper has come to displace cotton for towels, napkins, and a lot of other uses. So what? Uses for cotton decrease and we don't need as much cotton. But what about that host of one-crop cotton farmers who depend on it for cash.

COMES NOW THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Recently Secretary of Agriculture Wickard suggested to Congress that the subsidies and supports on cotton prices be withdrawn and that subsidies be paid to cotton farmers direct if they would gradually switch from cotton to other crops, and if the production of cotton would be mechanized so more could be produced at lower cost. Of course, this is a program that will take time, but it would result in cheaper cotton that could compete with paper and rayon and also in world markets. Now why is this so important? Well, you can see from the figures quoted above that if production drops, if consumption drops, if this trend continues, and if spinning spindles decrease, it also means that jobs will disappear. And then what about the 60,000,000 job program you've heard so much about? Funny how you get back to that old admonition in the Scripture, "No man liveth unto himself alone." Nor does any section or any country live unto itself alone.

THE CONGRESSIONAL FRONT

(By Congressman EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois)

MEN MAY COME AND MEN MAY GO

The records of the Civil Service Commission indicate that there is a constant shift of people in government. In July 144,000 quit and 177,000 new placements were made. In October 150,000 quit and 148,000 new persons came in. Such is the fluidity of people in government. But we want to tell you about a particular person who is leaving and before we do, you may want to know a bit about him. His name is Ernest I. Olrich. He is the president of the Munsingwear Co., one of the Nation's largest manufacturers of undergarments. He is an expert merchandiser and was brought into government as an assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury to look after the disposition of surplus war goods.

INTERESTING JOB

It was a job that offered a variety of experience. Mr. Olrich's job was to sell surplus stuff at a rate of about $15,000,000 per month, get top prices for it, and also protect the market and the dealers against heavy and hurtful competition. The types and kinds of goods he was called upon to sell would have taxed the capacity of the most ingenious salesman in all the world. For instance, where would you sell 2,800,000 gas masks? or 39,000 pairs of women's white, low-cut shoes? or 16,000,000 square feet of sheepskin? These are but a few of his items of merchandise. Others include a million used mattresses, 954,000 used pillows, 27 tons of fruit jar rings, 623 collapsible rubber rafts, 667,000 pairs of antigas rubber gloves, 10,000 carrier pigeons, 5 live monkeys, 59,000 shotguns, 22,000,000 flashlight batteries. One interesting item was 15,000,000 catgut sutures. These are those special threads used in sewing wounds. If they were dumped on

the market, it wouldn't be necessary to produce a single suture in the next 6 or 7 years.

WHERE DOES IT COME FROM?

Where and why do they have such items of surplus? An illustration will make it clear. Soldiers' and sailors' clothing of certain types came equipped with zippers. These were made of metal which contained zinc. Out in the Pacific area as a result of the effect of salt water and salty air, these zippers soon corroded. So plastic zippers had to be supplied. Consequently there were some 10,000,000 of these metal zippers that couldn't be used and could therefore be sold as surplus.

BUT BACK TO OUR MAN

But now, back to the man whose job it was to sell this stuff. In selling Government property, he operated under the ceiling prices established by the O. P. A. In that capacity therefore, he supported O. P. A. and the O. P. A. policies. But on the other hand, he was in difficulties with O. P. A. because that agency had filed a suit against the firm of which Mr. Olrich was the president. He believed he was in the right and his conscience dictated that he should resist any O. P. A. policy that he considered wrong. Thus, he found himself on both sides of the O. P. A. fence and he felt in honor bound to resign. Thus does a good man go out of Government. He is but one of many as the Civil Service figures so well indicate.

THE CONGRESSIONAL FRONT

(By Congressman EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois)

SOCIAL SECURITY IN REVIEW

Sociay security is in the air. It has been much discussed. Both political parties declared for its expansion in the last campaign. That means the inclusion of new groups such as seamen, maritime workers, farmers, farm hands, State and local employees, domestics, and others. It means a reappraisal of the purposes and objectives of social security. Thus a brief review of the present program and its achievements might be timely.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

This function is commonly known as old-age pensions. For the fiscal year which will end in June of 1945, it is estimated that 1,968,000 persons, age 65 or over, will be receiving old-age pensions. The average monthly payment is estimated at $28. Some get more, some get less. In Mississippi the average is $9.40 per month. In California, it's $47.75. Total cost of this program is $696,000,000, of which the Federal Government pays $339,000,000. Operating cost of the program is about $33,000,000. Largest number of recipients of old-age assistance is in Texas. It has 181,000. Delaware is lowest with 1,000.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

The Federal Government pays about one-half the cost of this program. For this fiscal year, 613,000 children in 248,000 families will receive this aid. Total cost is $142,000,000, of which the Federal Government will pay $55,000,000. The operating cost is about $12,000,000 per year. This aid averages $43.18 per family for the whole country, which means about $17.74 per child.

AID TO THE BLIND

About 55,000 blind persons will receive this aid in the present fiscal year at a total cost of about $20,000,000, of which the Federal Government pays about $10,000,000. The various States pay the rest. It averages about $27.49 per person for the whole country. Largest number of blind beneficiaries is in Illinois, where 5,000 persons share in the program. Several of the smaller States have 100 persons or less. The three foregoing programs, namely, old-age pensions, aid to children, and aid to the blind, are paid by means of direct appropriations out of the United States Treasury.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION GRANTS

Each State now has a system under which weekly benefits are paid to persons who have worked and who then become unemployed. Funds to pay unemployment benefits are derived from a Federal tax on all employers of 8 or more persons. If the State in which the employer does business has a satisfactory unemployment-compensation law, not to exceed nine-tenths of the tax which is levied is returned to the State with which to pay such benefits. In some States benefits begin when a man has been out of work for a week. In some States it is 2 weeks. The amounts paid per week vary with the different States. In 1944 weekly benefits were paid to an average of 104,000 persons every week. New York leads with an average of about 16,000 persons. Wyoming was lowest with only 6 persons receiving average weekly benefits. The operating cost of this program is about $31,000,000 per year.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

About 40,000,000 persons, which represents just about two-thirds of all people over school age in the country, are covered by the social insurance program. Workers and employers each pay a pay-roll tax of 1 percent which goes into a trust account, one of which benefits are paid. There are now about 900,000 retired workers, wives, widows, children of deceased workers, and aged parents who enjoy these benefits. These benefits are available to workers and employers; was graduated to begin at 1 percent in 1937 and to reach 3 percent on each, or a total of 6 percent by 1949. However, the tax has been frozen at 1 percent and an effort is presently being made to freeze it for another year. This part of the program is essentially an insurance project and is expected to be self-sustaining. Here then is a broad outline of the present security program, and in due time legislation will be offered to extend it to classes not now covered and to include certain health insurance features.

Lower the Voting Age Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial dated December 23, 1944, which appeared in the monthly news of the Automotive Workers Industrial Union, Inc., Chicago, Ill.:

LOWER THE VOTING AGE NOW

Political scientists will generally agree that democracy works best when the greatest possible number participate in the selection of the leaders.

The Australian ballot, which is used throughout the United States, guarantees to every voter secrecy of the ballot. However, the secret ballot is not enough to insure us democratic principles of life unless everyone with a mature sense of reasoning is allowed to participate in the selection of the administrative, executive, and legislative representatives in our various governments. Up to this year the right to participate in elections was limited to those persons who had at least attained their twenty-first year. The State of Georgia broke this tradition and allowed its sons and daughters who had attained their eighteenth birthday to participate in the local, State, and National balloting conducted in November. A survey of the results indicates that a greater number participated in the election than at any time heretofore, and as a result the expression of the electorate was more representative of the will of the majority than at any other time. No basis of criticism has yet been found to indicate that the persons between the ages of 18 and 21 years who participated in the election did not exercise sound discretion, and it is generally agreed that most of those physically able in that age bracket did participate. Certainly if it has proved successful in Georgia there is no fundamental reason why it should not produce the same result in all of the other States of our great Nation.

In January of 1945 a new Congress will convene in Washington, and in practically every State capital throughout the country new legislatures will assemble for the purpose of drafting legislative measures to meet existing conditions in their respective jurisdictions. No more beneficial legislation could be drafted and enacted by these bodies to bring about a greater participation in government than the lowering of the age requirement to 18 for the purpose of voting.

During the past few weeks we have had expressions from the Secretary of War to the effect that members of the military forces from 18 years up will be sent into the front lines for immediate action. Certainly, if these gallant fighters are old enough to participate in the defense of their country, and yes; even to give their lives for their country, there is no further reason why they should be denied the privilege of fully participating in that government.

Those of us at home have seen male and female workers from 18 years upwards on the production line turning out the materials of war. All of these young people between the ages of 18 and 21 have given a marvelous account of their ability to be absorbed in the industrial life of our Nation, and apparently age has not been a handicap to their efficiency. Again, if these young people are old enough to toil in the production of the necessary materials for war in defense of our country, is there any basic reason why they should be further denied the right to vote?

There is no great mystery in the exercise of the voting privilege, and no one has yet contended that our citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 years do not possess sufficient intelligence to exercise their right to vote properly. On the other hand, it is generally admitted that the minimum age of 21 is archaic, and some State legislatures have heretofore enacted laws in which they have lowered the age at which both males, and especially females, attain majority status for legal purposes.

This minimum age requirement is a matter which should be adjusted now, while we are at war, and should not be allowed to wait until our gallant sons and daughters are returned from battle and production lines to their normal mode of living. We cannot impress too strongly upon the State and National legislators who will be meeting in the next month or so that this is a precedent which should be set aside, and that all States follow the example of Georgia and adopt voting-age requirements that are more consistent with the spirit of Democracy and modern life.

AUTOMOTIVE WORKERS INDUSTRIAL UNION, INC.,
By THOMAS M. LAW, *President.*

How Can We Best Implement Dumbarton Oaks?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proceedings from the Forum for Democracy entitled "How Can We Best Implement Dumbarton Oaks?" November 30, 1944, Times Hall, New York City:

The second session, How Can We Best Implement Dumbarton Oaks? convened at 8:45 p. m., in Times Hall, Mr. Samuel L. M. Barlow presiding.

Dr. M. SHERMAN. Friends of the Forum for Democracy, this is the regular second session of our forum, the first having been devoted to the question, "If I were at the peace table."

During the interim of these two sessions a national election took place, as you know, and it was a great indication of the fact that an informed public opinion usually acts rationally in accordance with that information, and that is one of the fundamental reasons why the Forum for Democracy is in existence: to give you those facts, so that you can act rationally.

Tonight we have a second question which is very vital at this moment. Everybody's thinking about it. A great many people do not know too much about it, but we hope before the evening is over that you will not only learn a great deal about it but that you will do something in regard to the question itself.

The chairman of tonight's meeting, Mr. Samuel Barlow, has just returned from lecturing at the University of Puerto Rico, and before that he was on a tour of South America with a Carnegie endowment. He is an internationally known artist. I think most of you know him very well as a student and traveler, and that being the case Mr. Barlow usually has an international point of view.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce the chairman of the evening, Mr. Samuel Barlow.

Chairman SAMUEL BARLOW. Apparently, ladies and gentlemen, we are going to have to catch up a little bit on time, because we were a little late in starting.

World peace has been the object of speculation and aspiration for centuries. By the year A. D. 32 it was the promised goal of the religion most of us profess.

Whenever in history it was partially achieved, it was done under the leadership of some one empire, like the Roman, and sustained by coercion, tyranny, and annihilation.

Later, the notion of a peaceful federation of Europe was cherished in France; and Pierre Dubois in the fourteenth century published a working plan for it. Henry IV took the matter up; and Victor Hugo, Comte, and Renan and Briand only rekindled an old fire. Then the League of Nations, lopsided and unimplemented, came into existence.

To those who say world federation will not work because it never has worked, I would answer that Leonardo da Vinci made drawing for an airplane. Yet, it has taken 400 years to get the darned thing off the ground. And I thought we in America prided ourselves on our ability, our desire to make things work—as Edison did—after countless trials and failures. What great and desirable end—like perfect health or Christianity or a real knowledge of electricity—does work 100 percent? Nothing does.

Now we are at a precise moment, with the preliminary canters over. The promising hurdles of the Atlantic Charter, of Casablanca, Moscow, Cairo, Teheran lie behind us. These were taken when the war was going against us, mind you; when the military exigencies conditioned all our thoughts. Now we face a proposal—and remember one thing, that it is but a proposal; the Dumbarton Oaks is but a proposal, but for all that it is something that can collapse for want of understanding and support. Now we face a proposal, not in defeat today but with a certainty of victory before us. It is no longer a proposal how to win the war, it is a proposal how to win the peace. Here we have a plan for international cooperation—for purely preventive measures, as I read it—against aggressors, and for the maintenance of that understanding, good will and liberal growth, without which a lasting peace has no chance whatever.

Now, I presume no sane voice can be raised against proposals to establish world peace. And the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are just such proposals. But the carpers are carping, in the usual frog ponds, forgetful that if you carp and nibble away the foundations of the future the future falls, not on us but on our children.

Recently, from the anvil chorus, came the voice of John T. Flynn, arguing that our Congress and the governments of our allies would never permit their representatives on some world council to launch their respective countries into war by using force against aggressors. But it is an odd suggestion, is it not, that a policeman can do nothing until the thug has hit him on the head with a blackjack; and then he has to call up the board of aldermen and find out whether he can make an arrest? On the contrary, if the United Nations Council is implemented to stop aggression—not stop war, only aggression—only so can we be kept out of war. Here, the only possible question would be one concerning the definition of aggression, which you will doubtless have before the evening is over. But as far as an armed police is concerned, there would seem to be but one statement: aggressors make war. Stop aggressors and you stop war making. And aggressors recognize force and force alone—and I don't mean moral force.

Mr. John Foster Dulles, addressing a group of clergymen, and probably swathed in a surplice and chasuble "d'occasion," also raised his voice against an international police force. He hoped that moral force would suffice.

Now, moral force, alone with a great many admonitory outcries—so many, in fact, that some people thought we were selling our birthright for a pot of message, if I may so express it, and a few sanctions—did not prevent the invasions of Manchuria, Ethiopia, Czechoslovakia, or Poland.

This is indeed, I will admit, a real and realistic world, and I agree with Mr. Dulles that moral force is as real as armed force. But moral force back of armed force is very different from gangster morality back of armed force. And gangster morality must never again be allowed to arm itself.

So let us here tonight consider the implications of Dumbarton Oaks and note and discuss those questions that were left for future settlement; so that we here, and our friends, your friends, my friends, and the future audience on the air tonight, and all who cling to liberality and justice and to reality, can think clearly upon these questions, and then raise our voices and push our pens, and clamor for the liberal realization and implementation in morality of the United Nations Charter.

To remain mute, my friends, to remain mute is the curse of the timidly fair-minded. Mutely, they slip into the easy corruptions of silence. We have got to work and work hard to get the kind of a peace we want. Rather let us note what St. Augustine says and said beautifully: "The desirable treasure resteth in the mouth of the wise; the fool swalloweth it down."

So let us speak up, and so that we may forever hold our peace. [Applause.]

Now, with that introduction over, I am going to introduce three speakers. We are, by the way, extremely fortunate tonight. To whet our knowledge, we have for you the sharpest brains.

First I want to introduce to you Congressman CELLER. He is the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, a Member of Congress for 22 years, and a consistent supporter by the organized international police organization. He has been on the liberal side, and a great comfort to us regularly. He is a great thinker and a gifted speaker. Congressman CELLER. [Applause.]

Congressman EMANUEL CELLER. I heard with a glow of pride that very flattering introduction, but as I sort of walk around myself and survey myself, I fear I cannot live up to all those high-sounding phrases. But being a good businessman, I will settle for half. [Laughter.]

DUMBARTON OAKS PLAN

Congressman CELLER. Molotov, Eden, Hull, and Foo Ping-Sheung jointly declared for their governments at Moscow on October 30, 1943, that "they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a joint international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security."

This principle was overwhelmingly adopted by the House in the passage of the Fulbright resolution by a vote of 360 to 29 and adopted by the Senate in the passage of the Connally resolution by a vote of 85 to 5. Both the President and his opposing candidate, Governor Dewey, in the recent election campaign, voiced strong sentiments in favor of the establishment of an international structure to maintain peace and for the invocation of sanctions against offending nations.

But as far as China, Russia, England, and even France are concerned, and many other nations, there is sufficient evidence that we are in the rear of the procession for some sort of comity of nations.

Recently, representatives of four great nations: United States, the United Kingdom, Soviet Russia, and China, met at Dumbarton Oaks and formulated broad, tentative proposals for the maintenance of peace and security and "to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace."

These proposals are most laudable. They will, however, become as worthless as rain water in an umbrella stand unless backed and abetted by an informed, enlightened, and militant public opinion. Otherwise, we shall have a return to the tragedy of "power politics," "balance of power," "triple alliance," "triple entente," which divided nations and sowed seeds of dissension and war.

The efforts at formulating an international community failed before. It should not fail again. Once bitten, twice shy. But some of the enlightened, selfish, reactionary, chauvinistic groups that knifed the League in the back still stalk the land brandishing these weapons. Lodge, Borah, and company have been replaced by a new battalion of death. An American Axis press screeches its stuff. It yells for sovereignty and all the other cliches, little realizing that bitter experience has taught us that the price of complete sovereignty is nothing less than recurrent wars.

Rabid isolationists in and out of Congress have not yet been consumed by the poison of their own mouths. The Ananias Club still has a full roster. The recent election did not free us of enough of those who still scoff at the Atlantic Charter and a comity of nations as a pipe dream, and who, again, if given the opportunity, will scuttle the ideas formulated at Dumbarton Oaks. The answer is: such opportunity must not be given and the opportunity will not be given if an aroused public opinion makes its wishes known.

The Dumbarton Oaks plans, as unfolded, are not perfect. The plans are man-made. It would be the height of folly to demand perfection. Even the sun has its spots. As Secretary Hull said, the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are "neither complete nor final." They are offered as a basis of discussion at a conference soon to be called. Meanwhile, the public must carry the ball. Its opinions must be molded; its voice must be made articulate. Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, has already served notice that no commitment by the United States with respect to plans for such an organization will be ratified prior to the cessation of hostilities. Like those who scuttled the League in 1919, he and those like-minded want the treaty of peace together with a new charter for a comity of nations to be in one document. The treaty of peace should be considered separate and distinct from any such charter. The combination of the two was the fatal mistake of the last time. The United States had to take the charter together with the treaty or leave it. It simply gave the traducers of the last peace more to shoot at.

It is pertinent to ask, if they don't want the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, what do they offer? What proposals have they made? Apparently, the present 30-year war has failed to instill in their minds and hearts the need for some antidote against war. They still fail to realize that the internal structure of America is just as much affected by a Mussolini invading Ethiopia or a Hirohito seizing Manchuria as an attack upon the coast lines of the United States. They fail to realize that facism or nazi-ism is a cancer that cannot be confined to its place of origin. To change the metaphor, if such a flame flourishes anywhere in the world, it sears us as well.

The four Republican ranking members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate are HIRAM W. JOHNSON, of California, ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, and ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan. The only ray of light I can see on the Republican side of the committee is WARREN R. AUSTIN, of Vermont.

In addition to the those isolationists so powerfully placed in the Senate, we have Senators WILEY, of Wisconsin; WHEELER, of Montana; CLYDE REED, of Kansas; GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont; STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire; C. WAYLAND BROOKS, of Illinois; HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska; TAFT, of Ohio; TOBEY, of New Hampshire; HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, of South Dakota. The roll is incomplete. Remember, a treaty of peace or any league of nations must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of a quorum. That does not mean two-thirds of the 96 Senators. A quorum is one more than a majority. This means that a mere handful, 17, willful, obstructionist Senators can ditch a new league.

Urgently needed is a constitutional amendment providing for a ratification by a majority of both Houses. Such a measure is now being considered by the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am ranking member.

Approval of a constitutional amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the State legislatures. Forty-four of the State legislatures meet in 1945, but that remedy may be abortive, since it is doubtful whether the Senate, jealous of its rights, would yield its power in this regard and concur in the proposal of such a constitutional amendment. Remember, power is never surrendered.

Of course, there is another way open to amend the Constitution, and that is through a petition by the legislatures of two-thirds of the States petitioning Congress to call a convention to consider amendments, in which event there would be no need for the Senators to act. This method has never been used and would offer insuperable obstacles. At such convention the entire Constitution might be open to amendment.

Thus, we are confronted with the anachronism of some 17 Senators who have it within their power to break the will of our own people and the backs of the world. These willful men can utterly disregard the mandate of the people as expressed in the recent election.

This cabal of Senators are sharpening their axes. They hack away at one provision in order to topple the whole structure. They already tell us that they will not write out a blank check for the use of our armed forces to any superpower.

Frankly, any effort to set up a comity of nations without approved use of force to invoke sanctions and prevent aggressions would be like making bricks without straw. It just cannot be done. Furthermore, this cabal will refuse to entrust to the designated representative of the United States to the Security Council the power to use demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land of the United States armed forces in concert with the other members, without reference to an act of Congress relative to each specific instance. Only Congress, they maintain, can declare war. Of course, to my mind, their arguments are so much gibberish. The representatives of other nations will have such power. The United States cannot limp behind, for if it does, the other nations cannot march. And there go the hopes of the world again.

A declaration of war requires congressional action, but the Constitution also places the responsibility for prompt action upon the President in the protection of national interests, and the President has a right to delegate that authority. He has the right, as Commander in Chief and head of the executive department, under the Constitution, to employ our armed forces for the protection of United States citizens or agencies abroad, for the defense of the territory of the United States and for the prevention of offenses against the laws of nations or violations of treaties. This power is supplemental to and not in derogation to the power of Congress to declare war. There was no declaration of war on France in 1798 or on Tripoli in 1801, or Algiers in 1815, nor was war declared in the matter of the Mexican border in 1913.

Some of these situations have been called mere fracases and others have been called wars. The Civil War began when President Lincoln called forth the militia and proclaimed a blockade to suppress insurrection.

I admit it is difficult to define where the President can act alone and where he cannot. In other words, it is not easy to determine when hostilities and war begins. Nonetheless, there is ample constitutional authority for the United States to arrange for the use of force to be immediately available to the international council for acts against aggression without the need for congressional action. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. Ladies and gentlemen, we have with us tonight a notably lovely voice, a voice to which it is usually a pleasure to listen over the air. Tonight we are doubly privileged in being able to use our eyes, too. I wouldn't go so far as to say that the eyes have it [laughter]. However, I introduce to you Europe's first woman commentator. She is now on the Blue Network and is a brilliant analyst. Miss Lisa Sergio. [Applause.]

Miss LISA SERGIO. Thank you, Mr. Barlow, for that introduction. I will see you later outside. Probably Mr. CELLER will also see you later for his. [Laughter.]

We were asked to come here tonight to try to answer the question of how we could implement Dumbarton Oaks. Congressman CELLER has told you something which is the profound truth of the matter; that for the first time the four representatives of the four great powers which gathered at Dumbarton Oaks arrived at the tentative outline of the machinery which could preserve the peace.

Congressman CELLER also showed you, however, that while the United States is a vital part in that force to preserve the peace, there are within the United States other forces that might try to keep us out of that international organization. I think we are all agreed—and it is perhaps useless even to insist on this point—that unless this unity is preserved for the common purpose of preventing other wars; unless, in other words, the great nations which are now able to speak more or less decisively of the victory to come, can preserve their joint force to prevent other such wars, we cannot prevent those wars.

And just to illustrate briefly how great is the danger of another war, let me just ask you to look toward South America. It was not later than last week that we heard that the Government of Argentina had set up a program for so-called health training for all the schools of Argentina. In reality, military training for all the children of Argentina.

We have been learning in the course of the last several weeks that many of Germany's top-notch industrialists in the war industries have been reaching Argentina; that a great deal of their money has been brought over to Argentina, not only for safety but also as a good investment.

Now what is the way in which you can make a good investment pay interest when that investment is in war industries? Obviously, by starting a war. Agentina is building up very definitely and unquestionably an enormous machine for war. It is not able to build it up with the speed, I presume, that it would like to use, because the materials are not available to her in sufficiently large quantities, but the idea is there. This indicates also to us, therefore, that the occasion to prevent an aggression is going to be there sooner than we think, and that therefore the necessity of implementing Dumbarton Oaks is vital, is urgent, is stringent.

I think that if you look back in history and try to wonder why it is that every war has been followed by something that we called a peace, but in reality had only been followed by an armistice—because another war always followed—you would find that the reason was that the people, as a whole, never were behind the peace as they had to be, whether they liked it or not, behind the war. For the first time, I am sure, in the history of mankind, nations that are getting together to plan a peace are asking the people to analyze those plans and to discuss them. You know perfectly well that the Department of State has circulated—and I believe you in this particular hall have received copies—of the text of the tentative plan drawn up at Dumbarton Oaks. You are being given home work to do. I wish we had all been given home work to do after the other war. Maybe we wouldn't be fighting this one. It is home work in which you have to read what this tentative plan means, and see whether you are going to be willing to stay behind it.

One of the essential points of discussion is going to be whether we are going to agree with Mr. Dulles that moral force is enough, or whether we are going to agree with this plan—that you need military force to back up the moral principles. Naturally, it is essen-

tial that we also should have a moral force. But a moral force is only an effective weapon when we all think of morals in the same terms. You never heard a Nazi say that they had no morals. You heard them say that their morals were so much better than ours, that they were going to impose them on us. It is just a question of what you think are morals.

Now, we are looking at the world today on the eve, perhaps, of the end of the war; protracted eve, you might say, if the war is going to last well into 1945. But we are looking upon many problems derived from the fact that even among the Allies we do not have the same notion of moral values. I would like to quote to you just one instance; the instance of the Italian situation.

We have a nation there that, supposedly, was an enemy, in reality was an enemy; that accepted unconditional surrender; was made a cobelligerent in a moment of love and enthusiasm on the part of the Allies; was given promises which today, well over 1 year after Italy's invasion and surrender and cobelligerency, are not only not being fulfilled but are being destroyed, being negated.

We said to the Italian people: If you will throw out the Fascists, we will no longer consider you enemies. We will come to your rescue. Throw out the Germans, and then you will fight with us. We arrived in there, and we found that the Italians were much closer to our conception of democracy and liberalism than we imagined. They had very definite ideas about what to do the moment they threw out the Fascists. For 20 years they have been mulling them over in their minds; finally they had an opportunity, and they were going to do something about them. And their notions were entirely different and very far removed from all the crazy concepts of politics and economy and social legislation that they had in 1920, at the end of the other war, and very far even from some of those same concepts as they obtain today in the minds of a few gentlemen maybe in our own Government and maybe in the British Government.

The result has been that immediately in the Italian situation there has been created a moral conflict which is losing for us as Allies, and which would be losing for us tomorrow as an international organization, the support of one people. No organization such as the one we contemplate at Dumbarton Oaks is going to survive if the nations that are part of it, little nations or large nations, gradually drop out of it because their people do not support it. Having one representative in an organization is going to do no good, because, unless that representative stands there to impersonate the full strength of all the millions of people which constitute his country, he might as well go for a walk and not be there.

No individual who sat in the League of Nations represented the people of his country. They represented ideas of their own, interests of their own. The fact was, that when some of those delegates enforced the sanctions on Italy, all of the miners in England, who didn't understand the moral implications of the Italian aggression in Ethiopia, got up and said, "We are not going to stand by the sanctions imposed on Italy by the League of Nations, because we don't want to lose our jobs by not sending coal to Italy."

And so it was with all the rest of the working and producing people of Europe who refused to back up the sanctions; who refused to accept the disturbance that was going to be created by enforcing the economic sanctions. They repudiated the pledge made by the representatives, and the result was that the sanctions might as well have not been enforced, because Italy walked away with everything she wanted in Abyssinia, and paved the way for the war which we are now fighting.

Now, we can create a very good organization at Dumbarton Oaks, patterned on the plan we read of today, which can mean absolutely nothing if every individual who sits at that table isn't absolutely convinced that all of the people in his own country are going to be behind him to the last drop of blood, to support the principles that he is going to fight for. Otherwise, you will never have a working organization.

Today we are already seeing that there is a discrepancy between the things we promise and the things we do. There is a discrepancy between everything we have said in the Atlantic Charter and the political policy we are practicing in every one of the liberated countries. This goes for Italy, Greece, Belgium, and it went for France, which, in its perennial stubbornness got itself where it wanted to be and where it should have been all the time.

Now, if this discrepancy continues between the things we promise today and the things we do tomorrow, before Dumbarton Oaks becomes a reality, we are already demolishing the strength and faith and support of Dumbarton Oaks, which we are going to need tomorrow.

Now, you and I, as people, have a tremendous role to play both in implementing Dumbarton Oaks and in seeing that today we build up the foundations on which that structure can be erected. Remember, all we are looking at today is a blueprint. We haven't even cleared the ground on which the structure is going to be erected, let alone sink the foundation into the soil. That hasn't been done yet. That will happen when the various governments get together and discuss the plan and accept it. But before that takes place there comes your role and mine. We have got to, as Americans, do one most important thing. We have got to see that we can coordinate our public opinion behind the acceptance of the tentative outline of Dumbarton Oaks, to such an extent that it will be stronger than the voice of those 17—if they are only going to be 17—isolationist Senators who could ruin the whole plant. Those 17 gentlemen—and maybe Congressman CELLER is an optimist when he thinks that only 17 are going to show up; maybe 23 are going to show up that day, so you will have more than one-third—their opinion has got to be counteracted; has got to be offset by something stronger.

What can that be? It can only be a violent wave of public opinion that will push the other Senators, the other 60 Senators, the other 67 or 68 Senators, some of whom never show up, to go into the Senate and vote. The trouble with the Senate always is that a lot of them never know what their mind is, and therefore haven't the energy—most of them are perhaps too old to have the energy—to make up their minds. But at any rate, if they have a mind to make up, they don't make it up. Those gentlemen don't even show up at the meeting, and that leaves the situation Congressman CELLER presents, that 17 individuals are enough to wreck the plan.

Now, we cannot change the figures, but we can compel all of the Senators to think that they've got a mind, and that their minds work like yours and mine. We've got to do this act of telepathy. Let's use our sixth sense, for mercy's sake. Even if we don't believe in it, let's develop it if that's the only way we can put over this thing. We've got to compel those Senators to go in there and vote for the plan.

But that is not all. That is going to take some organization, I tell you. We've got to, each of us, belong to some already organized group, whether it is the League of Women Voters, or some league of women's clubs, or any one of 20 organizations that I could name that are working for just this thing. Let's get into them; let's get behind them and let's add our signatures to theirs and let's (at the final hour when the Dumbarton Oaks plan, more complete than it is today, comes into the Senate)—let us have the whole American public opinion standing as if behind one man to push those gentlemen to say "Yes." That is our first job, and we've got to begin to organize today.

Secondly, we've another job to do. We've got to use our same influence of public opinion on our own Government today to see that we abandon our hands-off policy in Europe, where our keeping our hands off means allowing some one of our Allied powers to practice a policy that is not democratic and that is opposed to the Atlantic Charter.

You know there is nothing worse than standing by and doing nothing. If a man breaks into a house and commits burglary and you were just standing at the door to see that the policeman isn't coming, when that burglar is caught you will also go to court for trial because you were an accomplice, although you didn't touch the material that was stolen. If you stood at the door, you were an accomplice.

We are, in that way and to that extent, accomplices of any policy that is practiced that antagonizes the people of Europe, because we are in Europe in such a magnificent way—with a magnificent fighting army, bringing relief, bringing liberation—that it cannot be said that our voice cannot be heard in political matters. In Greece today there is one great cry rising everywhere, "Where is America?" They don't like the policy that is being practiced at the moment by our allies, the British. They are turning to us because they know that we have no ax to grind, no territorial aims, and no power politics to play. They want to have us as an active participant today in making real the things that we promised in the Atlantic Charter.

Remember that if our participation in Dumbarton Oaks is going really to mean that we are going to have peace, we must today prove to the world that, as an international power, we are willing to stand by every promise we make. And it is today, in carrying out the policy of liberation and democratization of Europe, that we prove to the world whether or not we are fit as international leaders in any organization such as Dumbarton Oaks. Remember, there may come a day in which we may carry out a policy so untrue to the Atlantic Charter, before Dumbarton Oaks is set up, that the world might think our contribution to Dumbarton Oaks not any good because we were not willing to stick up for the principles we expressed there.

The test of our value as a moral presence in any international organization is taking place today. So, as people, I think we have a double job to do—organize ourselves at home to see that we do participate in Dumbarton Oaks and break down the isolationism that would keep us out. And, above all, show ourselves to be so thoroughly awake to the moral issues involved in the whole question of what we mean by bringing people liberation and democracy that we will guide our own Government to instill in the people of the world faith in the word we pledge.

The two things cannot be separated. What we do today in Europe, among people who want democracy, is going to be the proof of what we will be able to do tomorrow, when we become one of the most important elements in an international organization. And I think it is a job that we must begin to think of and to do right now. Thank you. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. Thank you, Miss Sergio. Ladies and gentlemen, I have to watch the time, and I know that one of the most brilliant speakers here is Dr. Arthur Upham Pope, and I am going to ask him to cut his time a little bit so we can have our question period. Because I think that is probably the most valuable part of the evening.

Dr. Pope is the director of the Iranian Institute; chairman of the Committee for National Morale, which published the two valuable books, German Psychological Warfare,

and Axis Grand Strategy, which were used, and still are used, by our military and Navy. His latest biography, of Maxim Litvinov, has been a best seller. Long an advocate of American-Soviet friendship, he is now an outstanding authority on Soviet Russia. He is now doing a work, at the request of our Government, for our men and women overseas, on international peace organization. Therefore, I call upon him with great pleasure. Dr. Arthur Upham Pope. [Applause.]

Dr. ARTHUR UPHAM POPE. You have heard the principal character of the project of Dumbarton Oaks. You have heard an impassioned and valid plea to implement that by moral force. Those are the two most important things.

One or two random comments I might make—that we shall implement Dumbarton Oaks best first by having a vivid and precise knowledge of what the alternatives are.

Peace has always been desirable. Now it is a necessity. The last war was bad enough; the next war will consume our children and what is left of civilization and initiate an era of a thousand years of barbarism. We've got to face that. The development of weapons since the last war is ferocious and terrifying. They are going to be able to use solar energy; various kinds of electronics. They have speeded up the splitting of the atom. The next cataclysm will sweep away the accumulated 6,000 years of suffering, travail, imagination, love, and hope. That is the inevitable outcome unless we take the Dumbarton Oaks plan and infuse it with moral fervor and make it work.

There are some practical things which you can do. First of all you will hear, as I heard from a good many people in the Army, "It's no use. History proves that man is incorrigible, and innately belligerent, and that human nature does not change, and that inevitably we will have war in the future, and so we had better not try to spend any time trying to prevent it. It is fatal."

But there is no blind fate that pushes man into mutual slaughter, and the archeologist, the psychologist and the social scientist are technicians. They know their stuff. They say that's only a superficial and clumsy generalization from a badly misunderstood history. Man has no innate necessity to battle. The archeologists show that in the earliest communities of men they had neither the weapons not the intent for mutual destruction. It came later, in competition, perhaps, for food. But there is nothing fundamental about it. The necessity is that man shall learn to live together or else perish.

Another thing, very practical and very urgent, is that we shall maintain trust and confidence in our allies, and that does not mean excuse them for any shenanigans behind the scenes.

It is a very obvious fact to us all that by sacrifice, by gallantry, by common danger, by tears and bloodshed in floods, that the Allied Nations are bound together by a great common interest and the people of these common nations that have suffered so much together have a great stake in the future. And unless we can see that that stake is made clear and vivid and compelling, then there will be malign forces that will be active in promoting dissension.

And so, we need knowledge—knowledge and faith and courage. And if we have knowledge we will not be subject to every little whim of propaganda. We will not be the credulous dupes of malign forces, and they are at work all the time.

A new campaign, a hate campaign, has been spreading in the country for 6 months against Russia and taking in thousands of serious and able people, normally sensible people, by means of artful calumny. Watch out for it. See how it is done and do not allow yourselves any longer to be, in this great emergency of mankind, thinking in terms of slogans and talking in terms of headlines.

Now, it is true that some of our allies have been doing things that we do not approve of. The pressure that Great Britain has brought to bear upon Italy, the veto of Count Sforza, is not in accordance with the nature of our common understanding, our common purposes, or our common obligations.

Russia has been accused of bringing unfair pressure on Iran. Are our records clear? Are we doing any sharp practice behind the scenes? Were there any of our oil men who tried to beat the gun in Iran and grab off concessions contrary to their general agreement? That is quite possible.

So before we believe the things that are said about our allies let us be informed and let us be sure, and then we can bring pressure to bear upon them when their conduct has not been in accordance with the necessities of the situation. And their conduct will not be in accordance with the necessities of the situation unless they can trust us. Unless they can be sure that these 17 capricious men in the Senate—or 23, or whatever it is—unless they can be sure that the public of America will roll them down and declare and make triumphant the deep conviction of this country—unless our allies know that—they are going to protect themselves.

Russia has a vast and dreadful problem of reconstruction with probably twenty million dead and devastation as big as the eastern third of America. How is she going to do it? She's got to be sure that there is going to be a genuine organization of peace before she will give up the ways of securing her own safety.

Great Britain faces a terrible problem. She's got to double her trade of 1938 or take her place among the derelict nations. She knows that she doesn't want to spend money on armaments; wasting her substance; frustrating all kinds of social progress, but if we are not going to play ball Britain had better know and had better mend her fences and look out.

The responsibility rests clearly and squarely upon the shoulders of America. No such responsibility and no such opportunity was ever given to any generation of any people at any time. And if you will organize; if you will set fire to our purposes so they will consume meanness and dishonesty and obstruction, then America will play her role, our allies will trust us, and we can build that international organization of security which will make possible for the first time for man to live the distinctly human life in all its unfathomable, infinite possibility for happiness and well-being. The issue is squarely up to the American people. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. Thank you, Dr. Pope, for your eloquence and your brevity. [Laughter.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we only have, before we go on the air, a short 20 minutes for questions. I think the best way to conduct this would be if you will raise your hands, and as I see them, if you will then rise so I can hear you. It is a little easier if you rise. I see here that the questioner is to name himself. Does that mean he is to say "My name is Tom Jones?" Do you like that idea? All right, he is to name himself. Then he is to ask his question. Or perhaps better still, just rise, say his name, and say, "I would like to ask"—any one of our three solons. Name which one, and tell us what the question is. I will take it down, I trust; meanwhile, if I slip, you can correct me on that. But I will try to get the question straight and repeat. Do I see any hands?

Question. I would like to ask the question whether it isn't important here to discuss the definition of aggression, which was mentioned by all of the speakers. So I would like to dump the question in the laps of all of them.

Chairman BARLOW. It makes it easier if you will designate; or do you want to ask me that? Because I happen to have the answer to that. I have the official Geneva Protocol right in my hand, because I knew somebody would ask it. Now, this may not be the real answer to your question.

Question. May I say, in regard to that, I would like to hear your answer, and ask if the others want to volunteer after you.

Chairman BARLOW. According to the Geneva Protocol an aggressor is "the nation refusing to settle a dispute by any of the various means offered and threatens or breaks the peace."

Is there any better answer than that?

Congressman CELLER. That is an excellent answer, in my estimation. The definition of aggression is not in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. I presume that later on there will be included in the proposal something that was in the Geneva Conference, as was just read to us. I think the definition read meets every situation as far as I can envisage it.

Dr. POPE. If the learned Congressman would forgive me, I would like to enter a dissent. I do not regard that as a proper definition. That definition was formed long before psychological warfare was fashioned as one of the most evil instruments of destruction. To take an actual case, take the case of Finland.

If a small country does not resort to arms, but makes entirely improper arrangements with an aggressor power like the Nazis; that makes all kinds of intrigues; that allows its land to be made as a springboard of all kinds of attacks upon a neighbor, but does not take arms; yet refuses to adjust the complaints of other countries—that nation is an aggressor.

It is laying the foundations of war and general public disaster. And the fact that it did not shoot does not excuse it. You may be arrested for assault and battery for merely making a gesture against another person, just as you can be held, as Miss Sergio says, as an accessory after the fact in murder for just standing by.

Now the technique of aggression today, that Hitler has defined and beautifully elaborated on in Mein Kampf, is to take small nations and to buy their precious sovereignty, and to develop in there by various well-known means of intrigue and of planning for trouble, to make of that nation a danger spot to all of its enemies. That nation is an aggressor. [Applause.]

Congressman CELLER. Dr. Pope, the Dumbarton Oaks proposal provides for a set-up of an international court of justice, and that court undoubtedly would define what aggression would be. And I am quite sure that the cases that you cite will come within the embrace of the word "aggression," as would be determined by an international court of justice.

Dr. POPE. I agree.

Miss SERGIO. I would like to add one point. I think that the Kilgore report in the United States Senate on the question of cartels was very definitely designed to prevent a certain type of the most dangerous aggression; that is, the creation of the cartel, which, though it does not consist of shooting or any other tangible aggressive measures, has certainly been the means whereby countries that even saw aggression coming no longer had the power nor the strength to prevent aggression because they had been made economically so weak by the cartel system.

Chairman BARLOW. Yes. I suppose the definition of that is that we might change the word agression to coercion, because as a matter of fact, as you know, economic coercion is one of the most pregnant and fertile of wars, and it is also the one that slips by most easily.

Congressman CELLER. Well, let's assume there wasn't an aggression within the confines of what you read. But there was something that might tend to disturb the peace

of the nations or the economic peace of the nations, and then the Security Council, or the assembly of the proposed charter would state that there should be economic sanctions imposed; and if the economic sanctions are imposed and the culprits still persist, that certainly would be aggression. And then there could be invoked the force that is contemplated by the proposal.

Chairman BARLOW. Any other question?

Question. Under chapter 8, section A, paragraph 7, it says that the foregoing "should not apply to situations or disputes arising out of matters which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the State concerned."

Well, under that you couldn't intefere with any domestic problem, and even if fascism were arising within a state you would have no means of preventing it or doing anything, because as such it would be only within a state, and you can't interfere with domestic problems.

Congressman CELLER. I admit that. I agree with the young lady. I should want even to interfere on occasions in domestic affairs. For example, if the Falange in Argentina or the Fascist government in Spain so conducts itself whereby it sends emissaries abroad to proselyte other nations, as Argentina does, and Spain does through the Falange, I think that the security council or the assembly should take heed of that and endeavor to bring Argentina or Franco Spain back into line.

Under the present wording I do not think this international set-up would have that power to interfere domestically. I think that is a mistake, and I do hope that the wise minds that will continue to work on these proposals will see that error.

Chairman BARLOW. But, of course, you have got to be very careful that we are not interfering in local matters, because we wouldn't like it if any power came here and said, "obviously the future of the world depended upon Mr. So-and-so being elected in this country," or had done anything like that. That obviously cannot be done. But I am sure that some way will be found whereby, if the people of a country rise and, through their elected houses or their king or whatever they may have, protest that they are being encroached upon and coerced, they would be heard. I think it is implied in the Dumbarton Oaks plan now, that they can protest. They have a law court through which they can protest. They can go to a perfectly good law court. Incidentally, that is one of the things that you can point out to people that object to the armed power clause; protests go to the court first.

Congressman CELLER. Take immigration. We have tremendous masses of land still not settled with any appreciable degree of population. Take the land masses of Africa controlled by Belgium, France, and England. They have set up immigration bars to preclude the entrance into the confines of those lands. We have other nations which are overcrowded; Belgium, for example; Italy, for example. There should be some mechanism by which those nations which are thus selfishly inclined with reference to their huge land masses could be at least sharply advised and brought back into line. I do not thereby suggest undue interference into domestic affairs but on occasion advice might effectively be given.

Now, that may be interfering domestically; nevertheless the evil aimed at may have international implications.

Question. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Miss Sergio a question. I would like to know, with the contribution that the Negro people of the world are contributing toward the war and their sacrifices, what acknowledgement has the Dumbarton Oaks Conference given to their sacrifices, if any?

Miss SERGIO. I do not think that the Dumbarton Oaks plan takes into account anything quite as specific as the contribution of any one race or people. It isn't intended to. It is intended to provide a machinery whereby the nations that have the power to preserve the peace will preserve it for all of the nations that desire the peace.

I do not think that you would find, if you read this, which contains the whole of the text of the proposals, any reference to any one people or race; not even any reference to any one of the major countries involved. I think that where, perhaps, you begin to enter into that problem would be where there is discussion here of setting up councils that have to do with social or economic problems, and when those councils are set up they would have to then take care so that complete recognition were given to the contribution, say, of the Negro race, or of any other races to the common effort of the peace.

But I don't think the Dumbarton Oaks proposal was ever set up to deal with any such specific matter. I mean, it is too vast to come down to any such detail.

Chairman BARLOW. There is a proposal that would cover that. You see, in this, the Dumbarton Oaks plan, there are going to be a great many commissions, and one of them is right in front of me, which would cover it perfectly: the establishment of a commission to study the organization of peace has suggested a United Nations' Commission on human rights as one of the agencies of the international organization. It would be the duty of this organization to advance the basic freedoms of the individual. Which is the only time, I think, in the whole pamphlet or in the whole Dumbarton Oaks proposal that the word "individual" is used, because they are dealing with relations between countries and not between races, quite properly. It will be the duty of this organization to advance the basic freedoms of the individual, including his freedom of communication of religion throughout the world, and so forth from there on. That is definitely part of the plan.

Congressman CELLER. Of course we must be careful in the way the word "international" is used. It is "international economic, social, and other humanitarian problems" with respect to human rights and freedoms. But it is the international aspect.

Chairman BARLOW. Yes, international aspect. We cannot go into that further now, but that is the kind of thing you have to get your people to ask for and to implement it in the expanding of the United Nations' charter. Because, after all, we are only dealing with proposals now.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to address this question to Congressman CELLER, because I think he would be best able to answer it. I am sure he is used to pressure groups, being a national legislator. I want to know exactly and specifically: What can people do to implement the principle of Dumbarton Oaks or any similar plan like that? I imagine that the State Department sent the pamphlet out as a feeler, to see what the public reaction is.

What should they do? That is, should they join some existing organization? Should they write letters? Should they see their Congressman? What are the processes you would recommend?

Congressman CELLER. Your question involves really the answer. An enlightened public opinion is very essential; a militant public opinion is very essential. It is an old adage and a true one, that the wheel that squeaks the most gets the most grease. Importune your Representative.

Chairman BARLOW. Can I cut off that question now? Because we only have about 3 minutes more and I want to put that question on the air, and I shall address it to Congressman CELLER later on.

Any other question?

Question. May I ask, inasmuch as the Dumbarton Oaks proposals suggest forceful measures to keep the peace, why should they invite the nations to join? Why don't they force all the nations to join in the beginning and then conduct democratically from then on?

Chairman BARLOW. That would be like forcing people to join a police force, which has never been done. I really believe that is a perfectly good answer.

Question. Dr. Pope, please. What do you think is the attitude of the peoples of the participating nations toward these Dumbarton Oaks Proposals?

Dr. POPE. I don't know as there has been a very clear expression of popular will. So far as I have been able to follow reports, the Dumbarton Oaks Conference has been received in general with warm approval everywhere. And the fact that, at this first and most difficult conference, there was complete agreement by the representatives of the great powers on all except one or two small points was, it seems to me, proof that the plan is a practical one; at least the beginning of a practical one, and so accepted.

Chairman BARLOW. Now I am going to ask Miss Ragonetti to come up here, if she will be so kind. She is with the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, of which Mr. Clark Eichelberg is the Chairman. I want her to say, if she wants to, a word or two; if not, I will ask her to come in and join the round table.

Miss RAGONETTI. I would like to say a word or two.

There is lots that individuals can do by joining organizations, both on the educational level and on the political level. You can help to understand; you can help to serve as speakers, as discussion leaders, and when the time comes, you can work politically for it. And I do hope that you will join with organizations. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. Now I am going to ask Professor Handler also to join us, but not to speak at the present time. He was special counsel for the Foreign Economic Organization and an associate public member of the War Labor Board, and is professor of Columbia University Law School—and there he is. [Applause.]

Question. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Miss Sergio a question, if I may. This is to Miss Sergio. If I understood correctly, you said—or I inferred from what you said—that when fascism fell, with our aid, in Italy, that democratic manifestations were apparent, and that the Allies had promised to promote democracy when they entered Italy, and that they haven't been fulfilling their promise.

If that is so, I would like you to clarify it just a little bit, if you will.

Miss SERGIO. Well, yes; that is precisely what I said, because that is precisely what has happened. I think we have a very clear instance of our failure to fulfill that promise. In the case of the election of the mayor of Naples, we asked the people of Naples to elect their mayor, because we know that that is the democratic process, and when they came and submitted the nominees for that job we turned every one of them down and didn't permit them to elect them. We turned them down for no reason except that, politically, their views were slightly too much to the left.

Now, it would have been much better then to say that we want democracies that are entirely reactionary, if such things can exist, because every one of the people that we have supported have been people with reactionary social and economic views in Italy. We have supported men like Badoglio and Prince Humbert, who is, of course, not to the left, in spite of Mr. Matthews. [Laughter.] Prince Humbert can waver when he is in the middle, but he can never fall to the left, because there is nothing that can possibly be strong enough to attract him there.

I happen to know him very well, so I know what I am saying.

When we tell people they must apply the democratic process of election, then we must take the risk that they will elect the people they want, and we have then no right to prevent that choice.

That is where I say we have not fulfilled our promise. And there are many others such as this. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. Now I am going to ask Dr. Sherman to take the floor until we go on the air.

Dr. SHERMAN. You have all noticed tonight—I am going to make it very brief, because we haven't much time that we are doing the thing we set out to do; we are trying to create an enlightened public opinon through the Forum for Democracy; and we are trying, secondly, to move public opinion to act in accordance with this enlightenment.

The speakers here this evening have pointed to the necessity of everybody here—everybody in the country who will listen to us tonight over the air—participating, actually participating in the events that surround us, in the vital things that affect us in our day-to-day living. And we hope that out of this meeting such design for action will actually eventuate.

Now, the next meeting of the Forum is planned for January 4 in this hall. We are going to have—we—hope Senator KILGORE, Henry Kaiser, and perhaps Mayor LaGuardia. They have all been invited to appear on this program. The subject will be Reconversion Problems Towards Full Employment.

On January 25, also a Thursday, the subject will be Antidiscriminatory Legislation, present legislation, and the kind of legislation that we need to effect equal opportunity for all Americans. On that program we are inviting Dr. Channing Tobias, Malcolm Ross, the Chairman of the F. E. P. C., Lillian Smith and Howard Fast, authors.

The meeting in February will be devoted to the role of labor unions and management in a changing world. We hope at that meeting to have present with us Senator PEPPER and J. Raymond Walsh, the educational director of the C. I. O.

But you see, it is totally up to you to support these programs. We depend upon you, as subscribers to the forum, as participants, perhaps tonight for the first time, and for subsequent meetings, to help us put these programs over. As you leave the hall tonight there will be two nice young ladies on the outside who will try to sell you the idea of becoming a part of our forum—those of you who are not already. The subscription price of $4 is all that you will need to pay, because this meeting already is deducted from the original price of $5, and will include the next five meetings which will be held.

So we urge you all to join with us; we urge you all to be a part of us. And those of you who would like to have transcripts of the previous meeting, and of this meeting—they are all being taken down word for word—and if you feel we should publish these transcripts (they are expensive, you know), please let us know by sending in a little notation and your comments on the meetings. We would like to have your comments anyway. Send them to our central office at 15 East Fortieth Street, as printed on the program.

You will notice that we try to give you as much information as possible about the particular subject that we are covering, and that is why we handed to you, as you walked in tonight, this Dumbarton Oaks document on international organization, so that you could be prepared, at least, on the basic elements.

Any other suggestions that you have, please send them in to us. Primarily, the first thing to do is to join with us; support this organization. It is an organization that will be unique in American life. We expect to put this on a national hook-up. We are laying plans now with one of our members on the advisory council, Norman Corwin. It is solely up to you, so let us know whether you want it. And that will be determined by how many suggestions and subscriptions we get from you tonight and in the next couple of weeks. Thank you, very much. [Applause.]

[On the air.]

Chairman BARLOW. Good evening. Before we begin the round-table discussion it might be well to tell you what we have been doing here. We have had three very brilliant speeches by Dr. Pope, Congressman Celler, Miss Lisa Sergio, and then we had a question period. The questions about how to implement Dumbarton Oaks, the proposals, have been extremely interesting. The question of what is aggression was brought up. The question of the contribution of Negroes to the war was asked. We decided that was to specific, too individual, to be answered as yet by any great international council. We had the question, What can people do to help establish these proposals as something concrete, as something that will save peace in the world? And we have heard about what you can all do, what we all must do, in order to see that we get a just and lasting peace. We have heard also a question on what is the attitude today of other nations across the waters to Dumbarton Oaks, and Professor Pope allowed as how he felt that they were very much in favor of it. And we have heard about fascism and moral force from Miss Lisa Sergio.

Now, to begin this discussion here, which will be quite informal, I would like to ask a question of Congressman CELLER, and that is, if he will speak to us briefly about the question of mandates?

Congressman CELLER. I believe that is a very, very important and vital question. Under the mandated system, or the mandate system of the League of Nations, France and England and Japan were entrusted with certain territories. For example, England was given Palestine, Japan was given the Marianas and the Gilbert Islands and other Pacific islands. France was given Lebanon and Syria. But unfortunately those nations used those possessions as though they were their own. They did not exercise stewardship or trusteeship over those lands. They, in common parlance, believed they had those territories in their vest pocket and could do with the lands and their peoples whatever they saw fit to do with them, and for their own selfish purposes.

Now, I am firmly of the conviction that there must be a decided change. Possibly there might be set up a condominium of nations—say three nations—to act as trustees of Palestine, of the mandated islands in the Pacific, of the former German territories in Africa, so that one nation could not indulge in a sort of imperialism against the inhabitants of the country mandated to the offending nation. Either or both of the other trustee nations would forbid.

In that way, I think, with, say, three nations operating as trustees, we could have some elements of justice and equity meted out to the peoples of those mandated countries.

Chairman BARLOW. That would, I take it, go for air bases and everything else that would then become wardships under the United Nations Council.

Congressman CELLER. That observation is very sound. I agree with you.

Chairman BARLOW. Now, I want very much to know, for my own benefit, about the great powers and the satellite states, and I believe this comes under the term of "regionalism." It has been one of the great stumbling blocks in the thoughts of a great many people, and a great howl has gone up about it. I cannot find it objectionably stated in reading the document, and I have seen interpretations of it which do not seem to me to tally with the document. I would like to ask Professor Handler if he will tell me.

Dr. HANDLER. I find nothing objectionable in the documents about regionalism. The documents proceed upon the assumption that very frequently quarrels that occur in localities can be best handled by those in the localities that are familiar with the causes of the dispute, rather than by those situated at a great distance from the scene of potential conflict.

The doctrine of regionalism is entirely sound. It may be perverted into a doctrine or theory of local power politics, where the world is divided into power zones. And I am afraid that those who are fearful of postwar power politics are reading a great deal into the regionalism provisions of the document which actually are not there.

Chairman BARLOW. Thank you, sir. I seem to be the only person asking questions here, and I had hoped that the five astute brains——

Congressman CELLER. Can we vouchsafe some information on that? Of course, the success of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal depends upon the bona fides of the nations involved. If they have good intentions, why, everything will work out well. We have, for example, our Monroe Doctrine, which provides for a sort of bloc of nations in North and South America. Russia rebelled against the so-called cordon sanitaire, which was her negative Monroe Doctrine. She wants to be certain that there will be friendly nations in the Baltic and in the Balkans and in Central Europe.

England has her Commonwealths, her British Empire, which is a sort of a bloc also. Now, if England, for example, wants to extend her bloc so as to include the Low Countries and other nations, and balance her power against the Russian power, which will include the Baltic and the Balkan states, such manipulation and maneuvers would breed jealousies and trouble and economic and political disturbances and aggressions, then you will have the Dumbarton Oaks plan scuttled.

I repeat that it all depends upon the good intentions of the nations involved, particularly the United States, Russia, and Great Britain. Of course, we could, in the event of imperialism on the part of Russia or Great Britain, exercise our great moral influence. I think we would. Perhaps we wouldn't have to do so. If those nations mentioned mean to do the right thing, then we have nothing to worry about, nothing to fear, and it would be well to have minor difficulties and differences within certain spheres, regions, and territories with their orbits settled by either Great Britain or Russia or the United States.

Chairman BARLOW. While we are on that I think it would be pertinent to ask Dr. Pope if he feels that Russia intends to dominate eastern Europe.

Dr. POPE. It all depends on what you mean by dominate. I think it is very clear that Russia has no intention, nor is it to her interest, to exercise over the states of eastern Europe anything like a military or political hegemony. They are not trying to bolshevize or communize Europe, as the Russian haters here are trying to make us believe. The reason being, for one thing, that it is not for Russian interest. If the states like Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Jugoslavia, and the others remain free, independent, and democratic, as Russia has repeatedly declared it is her intention and wish they should be, then Russia is protected by other nations on her borders against the resurgent and vengeful Germany, which she deeply fears. She is afraid we are toying with a soft peace; she hears of the forces in England that are really puttering along with this problem, and she wants assurance.

Now, the best assurance is that, between her and Germany, there are some real states, but she will not tolerate on her borders (what would be, in a sense, a kind of aggression), the cabinets or the governments of those powers that do not represent the people; gov-

ernments that are themselves subject to Fascist and Nazi influence; that are manned by those who have a long record of hatred and intrigue against Russia.

She would not allow it any more than we would allow the same thing to happen in Cuba, nor would we allow it to happen in the vicinity of the Panama Canal. No nation can tolerate dynamite and disease lying at her doorstep, and Russia will not. But she wants strong, free, independent, and genuinely democratic countries there. And if they will set them up, they will have Russian protection. If they will not, if they intend to go on with the old way of bending their sovereignty to the first criminal nation that will bribe or coerce it, then Russia will have to protect herself.

Once more it depends upon America. If America clearly and forcibly and unanimously, and with a deep passion of meaning, affirms its membership in an international security organization, then Russia will not be hard-pressed to defend herself by such means. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. Since we are on the regional, or rather, from the mandate to the regional thing, I would like to ask Professor Handler a question which touches us very nearly, and that is the powers of the delegates under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. When it comes to the regional use of force, or at least the use of interference in regional matters, we might interfere as we have at the present moment in spots in Europe. Later on, when this thing is implemented and working, the delegates may advise us, perhaps too nearly shall we say, in South America——

Dr. HANDLER. During the last campaign the President took the position that the delegate representing the United States on the United Nations Council should have power to act, without coming back to Congress at each turn to obtain specific congressional approval for the actions which the United Nations Council decides must be taken to quell aggression. There isn't any question that under the Constitution there are various methods by which our delegate can be given the power to act in concert with the other nations to preserve the peace. That would not constitute a declaration of war and it would be simple police action to prevent war. If that action proved unsuccessful and war had to be declared, Congress then would have the opportunity under the Constitution to decide whether or not to declare war.

Chairman BARLOW. In that case, will you go further and tell us the answer to that double question about the President's power to declare war, and in what manner our delegate can assume it?

Dr. HANDLER. The President has no power to declare war. That is a responsibility imposed upon the Congress by our Constitution, but, as Congressman CELLER already pointed out in his prepared address before, there are innumerable instances in our history when force has been used by the Executive without congressional consent and approval or without any declaration of war. It is a very difficult thing to draw the line between the force that the Constitution permits the President to use and the force which constitutes war. The point, however, is that not all use of national force is the equivalent of war and Congress by proper action, whether it would take the form of treaty or statute or resolution, can delegate the powers which it has under the Constitution to the President, and through the President to the American representative on the United Nations Council.

Congressman CELLER. I want to say before there can be any settlement of a dispute in a region by one of the members of, say, the Security Council, knowledge thereof and authorization must be had from the Security Council as a whole and that Council must act by unanimous consent. With reference to the granting of authority to use force under direction of, say, the representative of the United States Government, I would say that it would be utterly ridiculous to handicap our representative to require congressional debate before any action would be taken. You would have a congressional field day, a sort of Donnybrook Fair for the amusement of the partisans, and we compromise the Council immediately. I think the whole business would die a-borning if we would require congressional consent before any action could be taken in the way of sanctions involving the use of our air, land, and sea force. The British Parliament wouldn't have to be consulted; the Soviet wouldn't have to be consulted, and the Kuomintang wouldn't have to be consulted; but our own Congress would have to be consulted. We then would have a very anomalous situation.

Chairman BARLOW. I am glad it is you, Congressman CELLER, that made those comments upon our Congress and not we.

There are some questions that come up. I would like to go back for a moment to what Congressman CELLER said a little while ago when he used the words "good intentions." We all agree that that is the basis of any settlement we can possibly have for any duration. The moral force that must be behind any act, whether it is the armed force or the judicial end of the Dumbarton Oaks plan—the moral force is supreme. I want to ask Miss Sergio to say a word about it.

Miss SERGIO. I think you could translate your words "good intentions" into "real sincerity." I think that it is tremendously important—and this occurred to me when Dr. Pope was speaking a moment ago about Russia and her need for friendly powers on her borders—that we should really know whether we have the same scale of moral values. That is the whole point. I think that even in the League of Nations there were some elements that could have made for peace and organization had it not been for the fact that some member nations thought of their own interests before anybody else's. They didn't live by a scale of values that was common to all of us.

"Good intentions" is a very good phrase but what I think we need most is the sincerity—the absolute conviction—that everybody who pledges himself to keep certain promises within the Dumbarton Oaks plan has the same kind of sincerity about them. I think that is why the Dumbarton Oaks plan, if it has one failure, one lack is that it doesn't say enough about moral principles. It only speaks about peace-loving nations. If you listen to the Germans, they are a peace-loving nation; we pushed them into war, they never wanted such a thing. They told us that a thousand times. The question of calling people peace-loving nations as being the only ones that can enter that assembly, that committee, is ridiculous. I think that we ought to demand that in the Dumbarton Oaks plan—whatever name it will have later—there is something more specific said about what we call the democratic system under which the world is going to live. Because, unless we are all agreed as to human rights, as to economic rights, and so forth, as being the bases of a democratic world, when the disputes come we will find ourselves at loggerheads even on the system for solving them.

We need more than good intentions. We need sincerity and a moral basis that is accepted equally by all of us.

Chairman BARLOW. I quite agree with you and I think there is an analogy there. Dumbarton Oaks is a mechanism at the moment. Quite frequently we realize that other nations admire us. If you go to South America, you will find that they are mostly impressed with our machines. One of them once asked me about one of our machines and said, "Wasn't that the greatest thing ever done?" And I said, "No, I didn't think it was. It isn't anybody that could learn to drive that machine. The important thing is, if you drive that great tractor, it only has value to civilization if you have the Gettysburg Address in one pocket and the Declaration of Independence in the other." I really think that is true. Look what has happened to the world, to Japan and Germany, because they drove our tractors and they didn't have the documents that go with them and the minds that go with them, and they have used them for death instead of fertility and life. And I think that is exactly the same thing with the Dumbarton Oaks plan—it is a machine we can breathe a soul into, and the soul that goes into it should have the Declaration of Independence, the Gettysburg Address, and any other address you want, and I'd throw the Bible in for good measure. [Applause.]

Miss SERGIO. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to ask, don't you think tonight we have failed to discuss one of the most important things in this whole plan? That is the fact that, when they met at Dumbarton Oaks, they were not able to decide what procedure they were going to adopt to vote in the Security Council, to define whether or not, in a certain case, the time had come to take measures to prevent aggression. You know the famous question—whether the vote should be unanimous or not. I think probably the audience would be interested in hearing the opinion of such gentlemen as Congressman CELLER or what he thinks will be the final result of that undecided issue.

Congressman CELLER. From a practical standpoint, I don't see how we could compel a unanimous vote in the Security Council; compel Russia and China and Great Britain and the United States, for example—the four larger powers, and subsequently France—to act exactly alike. If Russia does not want it, I don't see how—because of the greatness of Russia—the other nations could coerce her or force her to bend her knee by the use of economic or military sanctions. A global war would result. And the same would hold for the United States. So, for practical purposes, I think it should not be essential to have a unanimous vote of all the members of the Security Council. To say that a majority vote or a two-thirds vote should bind all members of the Security Council would get us nowhere, except into trouble. The Council, say, by a vote of 4 to 1, could not successfully coerce the United States or Great Britain. I for one don't feel there need be a unanimous vote. From a democratic standpoint, possibly, the majority vote should generally prevail in the assembly. With the exception of the two-thirds-vote requirement, in the case of matters impinging upon international security, I believe it would be better in the assembly to have the majority vote, but we may have no choice as to the controlling vote in the Council. I don't think it would necessarily militate against the success of the entire project to comply with Russia's insistence that no summary action be taken against her.

Chairman BARLOW. Mr. CELLER, if a judge is impeached, doesn't he have to leave the bench during the proceedings?

Congressman CELLER. That is true, but the cases are not comparable. I say I would prefer that the offending member refrain from voting, but I don't think it would cause the scuttling of the whole plan, if action against any member of the security council is precluded without its consent. Theoretically, of course, that is not a democratic procedure, but we must be practical. We are facing conditions not theories. If Russia will not subscribe to the charter unless it contains the provision that definite action cannot be taken against her without her consent, what choice have we? That may be part of the price that must be paid for a charter of nations. Better that than nothing at all.

Dr. POPE. As I understand the arrangement, it is not that the demand was that one power should have a veto over the decision of the security council but that all the members of the security council should be allowed to be

present and vote on a case that concerned them. And for that there is a good reason—not a very agreeable one—but I think it is useful for us to look squarely at the facts. The only power that was a member of the League of Nations that was dramatically and swiftly punished was Russia. She was expelled from the League of Nations in a matter of almost minutes of discussion without any hearing or examination of her case when the Finnish-Russian War broke out. The western nations took no account of the fact that Finland had planned with the Nazis to attack Russia; were ignorant of the fact that Finland had made great air bases and great runway strips for big bombers to be used; were unaware of the fact that there were secret agreements between the Fascist minority and the Finnish Government or National Party; or that Hitler's portrait was to be found on every ship; or that officers of the army were entirely pro-Hitler or pro-Nazi; or that there had been established in Finland a veritable Gestapo, a Nazi machine, and all the paraphernalia that went with it.

We didn't care. We weren't interested. We didn't find the facts. Gamelin reported in the spring of 1940 that he had made the plans and was ready to attack the Baku oil fields and completely obliterate them, but the operation would take until July 1. On the 5th of February 1940 Daladier said in the Chamber of Deputies that the troops were ready to march and the English troops were also ready to march at the same time. In short, the allies were ready to make war on Russia as late as the spring of 1940.

Now, that means that Russia, looking around and remembering some of the very savage things that Winston Churchill said the same year, found the western allies ready to take judgment; ready to take severe and drastic action without a proper hearing; without knowledge, and without sympathy, and Russia wants to know: Have the western nations really reformed in their attitude? Are they willing to treat Russia as a coequal member? And will they take as much care to see that Russia gets justice, and that Spain and Italy are let off easily from the penalties they so richly deserve? That is back of this question and we've got to find an answer to it. [Applause.]

Dr. HANDLER. As the Moderator pointed out before, dealing with the matter of mechanics rather than with the spirit of the Dumbarton Oaks plan, if the five great powers begin to fight among themselves the Dumbarton Oaks plan becomes a scrap of paper, whatever its provisions may be.

Chairman BARLOW. Certainly we've got to hold together under any circumstances at the moment. My feeling is that, the sooner the Dumbarton Oaks plan gets implemented the better, because I feel myself it should be co-equal with the peace, not a child of the peace, a parent preparing the peace because it is simply our earnest, our good will to run the world as carefully in peacetime as we have been running it together faithfully during war. We have United Nations for war; it must not break up for peace. Because peace can only happen if there is unanimity and cooperation. I think cooperation is the word, the best word, to use, cooperation between nations.

Now, I am going to ask Miss Ragonetti to give us one or two words. She is with the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, of which Clark Eichelberger is the chairman. I want her to tell us what we can do about it.

Miss RAGONETTI. The Commission is one of the many groups that endorsed the Dumbarton Oaks plan as a framework in which both great and small powers can work together for the maintenance of peace, to promote economic and social welfare and also justice.

The question most people ask is, What can I do to help promote the acceptance of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals? We feel that the first thing is to really understand what the proposals provide for. Read the document. Know what the purposes are. Understand the machinery that it sets up. Once you understand that, help your friends understand it. There is a tremendous amount of educational work that must be done throughout the country. If we win the peace this time, it will be done because of the efforts on Main Street; people everywhere helping to promote an understanding of the agreement. Later, when the question comes before America to accept or reject the charter, there again the American people can fulfill a big job. I urge all of you to join with organizations both in the field of education, such as ours, and in the field of political activity. If Dumbarton Oaks is translated from a charter on paper to a working mechanism, it will be done because the people want it to be done. You can have a perfect constitution, but it won't work unless it has understanding and the will of peoples. [Applause.]

Chairman BARLOW. Thank you.

Now, in summing up the round-table discussion held tonight by the Forum for Democracy in the Times Hall, New York City, a discussion of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for a United Nations charter, namely, a cooperative federation to maintain peace—we have all agreed that some such council must exist, and the sooner the better; and that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are an excellent springboard.

But you, each and every one of us, must keep track of it, must urge it, must fight for it, to put the moral force into it that will be the real excuse for its living and the means of its success. For in Dumbarton Oaks we deal with the future, and the future does not belong to us with our temporary prejudices and private aberrations. The future belongs to our children. What they do with it depends on what we have prepared for them, done for them. They cannot reap better than we sow. They will support democracy if democracy has brought them peace. They will support and prolong our liberal theories in economics, religion, ethics, and government only if those theories have brought them comfort of spirit, security of opportunity, and the possibility of growth and vigorous living. We owe them at least the foundations of peace.

Thank you and good night.

Farms for Returning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, that the Farm Security Administration is alert in making provisions to enable returning veterans to obtain farms on reasonable and satisfactory terms is indicated by the following article in the Indianapolis Star, written by Maurice Early, a distinguished staff writer:

There will be approximately 25,000 Indiana veterans of this war who will want farms—something that is guaranteed by the G. I. law to those who are qualified to make a living in agriculture. But the big question is where will they find the farms at reasonable prices? Government agencies do not want to see the veteran doomed to ultimate failure on the land by purchasing a farm at present inflated land values.

In an effort to crack this nut all the regional heads of the Farm Security Administration for the eastern part of the United States met in Indianapolis yesterday with Frank Hancock, National Administrator of the F. S. A.

This special meeting is part of a national survey ordered by President Roosevelt to make certain that machinery will be in motion to care for the returning veterans who want to farm. Of course, many veterans who are experienced farmers with some capital will not need to seek farm ownership through the F. S. A., the organization designed primarily to aid those who have little or no capital and cannot obtain credit from other lending institutions.

Mr. Hancock explains that F. S. A., in its two programs—one to lend money to purchase farms and the other to make short-term loans to stock a farm with machinery, seed, and livestock—is more than a lending institution. Borrowers are given guidance by county supervisors in order to develop crop plans and management which will give reasonable assurance of success.

As far as F. S. A. is concerned, all the machinery is set up to aid the returning veteran and the war-plant workers who want to return to the land, Mr. Hancock said. But there are two big obstacles. First is the need of appropriations by Congress to keep the program in operation. The other is finding farms at reasonable prices.

There will be some Government land in Indiana to sell to the veterans. But it will be only a drop in the bucket. This is the farm land purchased in excess of needs at such vast munition plants as the ones at Kingsbury, Charlestown, and Terre Haute. But Mr. Hancock gives assurance the first to be served by F. S. A. will be the returning G. I.'s.

Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson's Contribution to the Conservation of Fish and Wildlife Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson has made an outstanding contribution to the fish and wildlife resources of our Nation. He is a resident of my district and I have had occasion to know his effective work in this important field for many years before he became the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Richard L. Neuberger has recently written an interesting and instructive article on Dr. Gabrielson's life and work which appeared in the magazine section of many of our newspapers. I include the article as a part of these remarks:

MODERN NOAH
(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Chubby-faced Ira N. Gabrielson is a twentieth-century Noah. As Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, he watches protectively over America's wild creatures. Animals are his life.

Where animals are concerned this No. 1 guardian of the Nation's wildlife has a sixth sense.

Once I was walking with Gabe along a woodland path in Oregon when he stopped

and motioned for silence. "I heard a winter wren chirp," Gabe whispered.

He tiptoed up the trail, peering carefully through the trees. Then he pointed to a birch 2 or 3 rods away, where a little bird sat. "I thought so," said Gabe as he swung along the path once more.

Gabe lives, breathes, and talks wildlife. He manages 275 wildlife refuges, with a total area larger than the State of West Virginia. Gabe knows that such refuges, affording animals protected places in which to breed, increase our big-game population. So he takes a real interest in them and roams this vast domain with the enthusiasm of a small boy looking after his house pets. Canadian mounties know him from his trips to the Arctic, and Mexicans game wardens recognize his fat form and short legs from pilgrimages to winter feeding grounds of birds.

They all call him "Gabe," although he holds a doctor of science degree from Oregon State College and heads one of the largest permanent agencies of the Interior Department. When hunters in Missouri shoot down a bird they can't identify they say, "Let's send the skin to Gabe. He'll know." When anglers on a California river pull out a rare trout they have never seen before one of them is certain to suggest, "Better send this to Gabe. He'll know."

And sure enough Gabe always does know.

YOU CAN'T STUMP HIM

No question on wildlife ever stumps Gabe. On a field trip to Wyoming with a group of stockmen he looked at a paw mark in the snow. "Timber wolf," one grizzled rancher ventured. The others agreed. Gabe shook his head. "Coyote," he insisted.

"Betcha," said the rancher.

"Betcha," said Gabe.

Dogs tracked the maker of the paw mark to earth. "Gabe," said the grizzled rancher apologetically, "I oughta known better than to argue with you."

An Idaho trapper once remarked to me, "That fellow Gabe may be built like Santa Claus, but he's got more information about wild critters than anyone I ever did meet up with."

The bulk of this information has been collected on the spot. Gabe is no library biologist. He gets too much pleasure and satisfaction from watching animals, fish and birds in the flesh. A fawn licking salt off his hand, a friendly black bear nudging his pockets for sugar—these are experiences which stir and excite Gabe.

Nearly 10 years ago Gabe became custodian of America's wild creatures. The men of the Fish and Wildlife Service discovered immediately that the new boss was "some sort of cross between Noah and Daniel Boone."

On Gabe's first voyage to Alaska, field men planned to "stretch the chief's short legs a bit." A hiking trip was arranged into the mountains back of Juneau. As they wound up the steep ramparts of the Coast Range the Alaskans waited for their fat superior to tire.

The going got tougher. Finally one of the Alaskans dropped beside the trail and lay gasping on the ground. "What's the trouble?" Gabe inquired. "Sick?" The played-out Alaskan shook his head. "Well, I'll go on ahead then," said Gabe. "I don't want to waste any time."

The Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service moved on up the mountainside. "He must have an electric motor in him," one Alaskan said. "I didn't think anyone, fat or thin, could climb this range like that." When at last the exhausted Alaskans struggled up to the first night's camp they found a roaring fire built, spruce boughs laid out for beds, and their chief talking enthusiastically about a "dickie bird" he had been photographing on a near-by crag.

"Gabe is so engrossed in wildlife that he never knows he is tired," says Charley Jackson, his assistant. "When we visited the great seal rookeries of the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea, Gabe didn't close his eyes for nearly 60 hours. He roved around the island with a lantern studying the habits of the seals. He sat up another night writing notes on birds which live among the seal herds."

Ira Gabrielson's interest in wildlife goes back to his boyhood in Sioux Rapids, Iowa. His mother had a garden full of yellow currants and jacks-in-the-box, and Ira took pictures of these with a box camera that had been a present on his tenth birthday. At Morningside College he majored in biology and read about the slaughter carried on by white men in a frantic search for furs and hides. He decided that his career would be spent trying to save the wildlife which had survived.

In 1912, when he was 23, Gabe married his college sweetheart, Clara Speer, and then went to work for the old United States Biological Survey. He was sent to Oregon, where much of the country's big game was making its final stand. In Oregon he became a woodsman as well as a biologist.

He followed the Columbia to its distant headwaters and clipped the fins of fingerling salmon, so he could tell whether Chinooks actually returned to their birthplace to spawn. He banded ducks and shot such animal marauders as coyotes, lynxes, and cougars. And he begged the public to stop stream pollution, wasteful lumbering, soil erosion, forest fires, and reckless hunting and fishing.

"Otherwise," he warned, "we are going to discover this great land of ours bare of the wildlife responsible for much of our character, traditions, and wealth."

BIRD SKINS EVERYWHERE

Gabe and his family now reside in a suburb of Washington, D. C., and one look inside the door will indicate Gabe's preoccupation. Bird skins hang everywhere, part of Gabe's collection of 5,000, all treated by himself. Etchings of birds and fish cover the walls. Above the davenport is a painting of antlered elk in the Jackson Hole country of Wyoming. Books on wildlife weigh down the tables.

The Gabrielsons have four daughters. "Yes, we're all wildlife fans, too," comments Mrs. Gabrielson with a smile. "Who wouldn't be, around Gabe? Right around Washington he shows us birds and plants and animals we never had known before."

Gabe conducts a census each year of all the wild creatures in the United States. He likes to get out in the field, gathering the data, talking to farmers, trappers, ranchers, and forest rangers. His gray eyes shine when he finds that some particular species has survived hunters' guns or polluted water to register a gain.

Gabe is particularly proud that there now are 4,487 buffalo in the United States. "This animal is deep in our consciousness," he points out. "It is on our nickel coins. It is on the great seal of the Department of the Interior. It is on the official crest of Canada's famous force of Mounted Police. Once 16,000,000 buffalo mantled the Great Plains. Then a fearful slaughter reduced them to only 800. I am glad we have built them back so that a few still graze in Montana, Wyoming, South Dakota, and Oklahoma."

People are always surprised, says Gabe, at the results of the annual animal inventory. Everyone expects the wide open spaces of the far West to lead in deer, but actually the industrial State of Pennsylvania, where 775,000 white-tails forage, tops them all. Arkansas, often known as the "Bear State," can boast a mere 30 black bears while California has 17,020 and the State of Washington 12,840.

In his office in the Interior Department at Washington, Gabe mulls over the census figures. When certain statistics alarm him, he sends for his assistants. Often he packs his boots and old plaid mackinaw and goes out to Oregon or Arizona or Nebraska to see for himself. "Gabe knows how to handle animals," comments Charley Jackson. "When he bands a mallard or pintail, that old duck sits in his hand as cozylike as if he were in his favorite marsh. And he's the best fisherman between Maine and Puget Sound."

Gabe is a zealous defender of America's remaining big game. Once Gabe was confronted in his office by a delegation of ranchers who wanted to wipe out a herd of elk which they claimed were eating their crops. "Now, now, gentlemen, take it easy," cautioned Gabe, "After all, you know that the little old molly cottontail does more crop damage than all other species of game combined."

GABE STALKS A BIRD

The enemies of the elk could think of nothing to say; you can't get very angry at a little cottontail rabbit.

When Gabe thinks he spies a new species of beast or bird he forgets everything else. In Alaska last summer Gabe was patiently stalking a white-splotched "dickie bird." The bird had stopped on a little hummock of ground. Gabe crawled forward on his hands and knees, taking care not to rustle the leaves and twigs. Suddenly the "dickie bird" gave a frightened chirp, flew straight into the air, and Gabe found himself staring down the long snout of a gigantic Alaskan brown bear.

The bear had been stalking the same bird from the opposite side of the hummock.

For a split second the rotund Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the huge Alaskan carnivore eyed each other surprisedly. Then both wheeled and ran pell-mell in opopsite directions, until even the tireless Gabe was out of breath.

"Golly, Gabe," said Charley Jackson, who had seen it all. "You're sure lucky that big brown bear was as frightened as you were."

"Darn that bear," panted Gabe. "He scared away my 'dickie bird.' I think it was a rare species, too."

Henry Clay and Thomas Jefferson Advocated and Built National Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a certain article taken from a Boston newspaper pertaining to the Federal Government participating in the building of national roads and national highways.

On several occasions in the last 8 years, I have called attention to the fact that as far back as 1806, Thomas Jefferson advocated the building of public highways.

In fact, it was in 1806 that at his request Congress appropriated the first $30,000 to start work on the Old National Pike or the Old National Highway, now Route No. 40, running from Baltimore

west through Hagerstown, Cumberland, Uniontown, Columbus, and St. Louis.

The article I here include emphasizes the fact that Henry Clay, after riding over this road in a stagecoach, said:

This is more like a city avenue than a mountain road. I remember when I was returning home over this road only a few years ago it took almost a whole day to travel a distance of 9 miles from Uniontown to the top of the Laurel Hill. Now, you see, we have done 70 miles in the same time.

The article follows:

HENRY CLAY WAS AN ADVOCATE OF "INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS"

The stagecoach Washington, carrying Henry Clay westward, rolled smoothly and briskly along the Maryland uplands. The soft spring sunshine glinted on the backs of its four swift horses, on the whip, and the horn of the driver, and on its side panels gaily painted with a crude picture of General Washington. Within the body of the coach, which was shaped like a football and hung from the wheels by heavy leather straps, were three crossways seats accommodating three persons each, nine passengers in all. On this day those who had been lucky enough to obtain seats on the end were craning eagerly from the windows, regardless of the fresh breeze that endangered the gentlemen's hats and blew the ladies' veils back in their faces.

For the coach was entering the Cumberland Road, the new highway built by the Federal Government to span the Allegheny Mountains between Cumberland, Md., and Wheeling on the Ohio.

Strange as it may seem to us now, there had been much opposition to this enterprise. Many thought that the Constitution did no give the Government the power to construct roads. But Henry Clay and other advocates of internal improvements thought otherwise, and thanks to their efforts in Congress the great road linking East and West had just been completed.

Our first national highway was 80 feet wide, with a 30-foot strip through the center packed down hard with fine gravel. At intervals there were iron mileposts and solid, handsome stone bridges. Henry Clay, pleasantly conscious of the smoothly rolling wheels under him, thought of the narrow, muddy trails and rushing streams he had struggled through on his first trip west, and smiled with satisfaction.

The amount of traffic already showed how much the Cumberland Road meant to both Easterners and Westerners. The Washington passed lumbering, canvas-topped Conestoga wagons laden with West-bound goods from Philadelphia or Baltimore; it encountered droves of cattle, sheep, and hogs being driven to eastern markets. Every mile or so the three blasts of the driver's horn meaning "Make way for the stage," echoed through the mountains.

"Why, this is more like a city avenue than a mountain road" exclaimed one of the lady passengers.

With miraculous ease the stagecoach ascended Laurel Hill, the highest mountain on the road.

"We used to dread this mountain," said Henry. "A stagecoach couldn't reach the top unless some of the passengers got out and pushed. Sometimes we were stuck in the mud for hours. I remember when I was returning home only a few years ago it took almost a whole day to travel the distance of 9 miles from Uniontown to the top of Laurel Hill. Now, as you see, we have done 79 miles in the same time."

"Hurrah for internal improvements!" cried a gentleman on the back seat. "Hurrah for Henry Clay!"—From Henry Clay, by Barbara Mayo. (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1943.)

Palestine—Hope Deferred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over Station WNYC, the Municipal Broadcasting Co., Friday, December 22, 1944:

The Palestine resolution in the United States Congress has again been scuttled. The administration has again insisted upon deferring consideration thereof. In doing so, it has balked the will of the American people, seeking earnestly to find a haven and a home for the helpless and the hopeless Jews attempting to escape the Nazi scourge. The action of our President and of Secretary of State Stettinius is past understanding. It is with extreme regret that I voice such criticism.

The purpose of the resolution was to express the deep resentment of the American people agains tthe nefarious British white paper that slams with a bang the doors of Palestine to Jews. The Jews may no longer enter except by the will of an Arab majority. And, as we all know, that majority will never give consent.

I need not dwell upon the repudiation thereby of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 wherein "His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people." Nor need I point out the unilateral infraction of the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924 wherein England agreed that no one shall be excluded from Palestine on the ground of race or religion. The same white paper was submitted to the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations. That entity not only refused to approve but unanimously rejected and condemned it. You know well the betrayal by the British who made a mighty promise to the Jews of the world and to the members of the League. Relying on that promise, the lowly and the powerful, the worker and the pioneer, throughout all of world Jewry, labored to reclaim Palestine, and as a result, from the dessert had blossomed the most successful colonization in the history of the modern world.

I need not emphasize here—to you the story is a familiar one—how the Palestine administration manipulated and maneuvered to defeat the sacred trust of the mandate—a mandate approved by 52 nations, including our own.

Remember Palestine is not the property of Britain. She was entrusted with the Palestine mandate to administer it in such a manner as to develop eventually an independent Jewish homeland and commonwealth. She has abused her trust. She has acted as though Palestine were in the pocket of her voluminous apron. Forsaking her role of stewardship, she has closed the doors to Jewish immigration and has precluded any further land purchase by Jews. She has done all this at a time when the driven Jew seeks vainly for a land that might give him succor and make him welcome. Some have described cruelty as comparable to taking candy from a baby. Putting a padlock on the gates of Palestine could be compared to whipping the proverbial straw from the reach of a drowning man.

Britain has defaulted miserably at a time when the fate of the Jew seems like a sea without a shore. It is our immediate and urgent concern to reopen the doors of Palestine to mass Jewish immigration.

The economy of a war-torn, hatred-seared Europe will not welcome the returning Jew en masse. In not a few exceptions, the deported Jew will not want to return to the scenes of horror and tragedy. Immigration bars all over the world will not be lowered. There is as yet only one place of hope—Palestine. But the light over the gate of Palestine has been dimmed well-nigh unto darkness.

It is significant that at the Evian Conference on Refugees in 1938, to which over 50 nations sent representatives, havens of refuge for Jews and other minorities were sought. Significant, too, that the Australian delegate arose in his seat and tersely and tragically utter the conclusion in the minds of all the delegates. "We in Australia," said he, "have no racial problem, thank God, and don't intend to have one started." The conviction seems inescapable. There is no place in the whole wide world where the Jew is wanted—save by his fellow Jews in Palestine.

All decent Jews deplored the assassination of Lord Moyne, late High Commissioner for Palestine. The cause of Palestine was seriously wounded by that unhappy event, just when it needed all the strength it could muster. Opponents of the establishment of a Jewish homeland are using this as a pretext to topple over the whole Jewish structure in Palestine. Even Winston Churchill, professed friend of a Jewish national homeland, made it an occasion for some very deprecating remarks that, unfortunately, contained a veiled threat. But Mr. Churchill neglected to state that, so long as the Jews themselves are not allowed to bear arms to defend themselves, their task to bring down the elements of terrorism and gangsterism is made more difficult. As the Jews are not allowed to bear arms to defend themselves, the Jewish community cannot be held responsible for maintaining order or be blamed for the acts of any criminals such as members of the Stern gang.

If anybody is to blame, it is the British Colonial Office for its perfidy and faithlessness to a solemn trust. There would be no Stern gang if the British had honored their Balfour pledge, their League Mandate, their 1924 Treaty with the United States. The cause of the Sternite assassination must be laid at the door of 10 Downing Street, London.

Colonial Secretary Oliver Stanley declared recently in the House of Commons that the current events in Palestine would affect unfavorably the application of the Mauritius internees for certificates of entrance into Palestine, as if one had anything to do with the other. The cruel vindictiveness of the colonial secretary is almost heartbreaking, especially when we recall to mind the plight of these poor Jews now interned on the Island of Mauritius in the Indian Ocean.

I remember the steamship *Struma* and the steamship *Patria*, the two ships which were carrying the fleeing refugees to Palestine. The *Struma* carried about 750. It sank in the Black Sea as a result of a Nazi bomb and only one was saved, after the ship had been denied the right to dock in Palestine. The *Patria*, carrying some 1,700 Jewish refugees banned from Palestine, was waiting at Haifa with its cargo of deportees. It was rocked by an explosion and 200 were killed. The survivors were then admitted, but to undo the extreme generosity of the Palestine government, the officials promptly deported 2,000 refugees who had previously been in Palestine, held in a concentration camp. These men, women, and children were taken from the cots at night and shipped to the maleria-infested of Mauritius where they still remain, half clothed and half fed. Like Moses of old, they saw the promised land

but were denied entrance. These poor victims must remain in Mauritius because of a stony-hearted colonial secretary and a wretched white paper.

How can anyone in his right senses regard the British administration in Palestine as anything but hostile?

Indeed, there would be no assassination of a Lord Moyne if there had been no Malcolm MacDonald White Paper, which caused Churchill to state, when he was in the opposition benches: "I could not stand by and see solemn engagements into which Britain has entered before the world set aside * * * what is the white paper but the destruction of the Balfour Declaration? What is that but a breach of faith?"

He continued by calling the white paper a filing of a petition in moral bankruptcy. I am sure that those words, in contemplation, must often stick in his throat. Anthony Eden may use the tragic event of assassination to set up a cloud of dust to hide the real issues. He may seek to conceal the white paper and the problems of Palestine behind the shroud of Lord Moyne just as he used the bugaboo of possible Arab disturbances.

The British Government has stayed the hand of the American Congress in the passage of the Wright-Compton resolution, which approves and urges untrammeled Jewish immigration into Palestine and applauds the setting up by Jews of a commonwealth in the home land.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee approved the resolution but strange things happened behind the scenes. Approval by the Rules Committee to bring the resolution before the House was imminent but English gremlins with Oxonian accents began pulling the resolution off beam. Secretary of State Stettinius, in a new abasement to Britain, killed the resolution before the Rules Committee of the House. This disservice to the Jews was repeated before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That committee shelved an identical resolution. Following its deferment, it is significant that 12 Senators of this important committee—two-thirds of the total of 18 members—made the following declaration:

"Although the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, at the request of the State Department, postponed action for the time being on the Palestine resolution, we wish to record our own personal approval of the resolution which calls for the free entry of Jews into Palestine and full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may as soon as practicable reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic commonwealth"

Be it remembered that both political parties, during the recent Presidential campaign, came out in favor of the resolution. Is a political platform something to stand upon or merely something to get in on? Seventy-eight Senators, 318 Representatives, a total of 396 Members of Congress from 48 States, in writing, approved the resolution. That betokens an overwhelming public sentiment in favor thereof.

Why did the distinguished new Secretary of State allow himself to be used as a broomstick to be put between the legs of the members of the House Rules Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee? Can the President of the United States forget so soon his statement of October 15, 1944, as on record? He wrote, "* * * in accord with the traditional American policy and in keeping with the spirit of the "four freedoms," the Democratic Party, at its July convention this year, included the following plank in its platform:

"We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

"Efforts will be made to find appropriate ways and means of effectuating this policy as soon as practicable. I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim and if reelected I shall help to bring about its realization."

Incidentally, as a member of the committee on platform and resolutions at the Democratic Convention in Chicago, I helped draft the plank in the Democratic platform on Palestine.

Well may we ask for how long, Mr. President. Alas, too long. As the White Queen said to Alice at the tea party, "The rule is: Jam tomorrow and jam yesterday, but never jam today." When the Jews ask for aid they are told, "Yes; you may have havens tomorrow, you might have had havens yesterday, but you cannot have them today."

Secretary of War Stimson recently said: "* * * I do feel that the military considerations which led to my previous action in opposing the passage of this resolution are not as strong a fact now as they were then. In my judgment, political considerations now outweigh the military, and the issue should be determined upon the political rather than the military basis."

Back in March, when favorable action was about to be taken on the aforesaid resolutions, Secretary of War Stimson had sought to draw a military red herring across the trail. So strong was the sentiment for the resolution that he was compelled to bring up his heaviest battalion. Chief of Staff Marshall appeared at a hastily called session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and asked that action be deferred. No one questioned his integrity nor the accuracy of his statement, yet by that time Rommel had been eliminated, our lines of communication were no longer crossing Palestine, and the Levant was no longer a logistics problem. The Senators sharply questioned Chief of Staff Marshall, and, while they all differed with him, they felt they could do nothing and bowed in silence. Two days after the statement of the Chief of Staff the President made a pronouncement indicating utmost sympathy with the Jewish problems in Palestine and with reference to the white paper promised that justice would be done. Many newspaper columnists, including Arthur Krock, distinguished writer on the New York Times, contrasted the President's statement with that of the Chief of Staff. They pointed out the utter inconsistency. Many Members of the House and Senate offered angry comment and indicated that they had "been taken for a ride." Thus the matter stood until the announcements of the Republican and Democratic platforms and the statement of Candidate Dewey and the pronouncement of President Roosevelt as aforesaid.

The whole question was lifted out of the realm of politics and the majority leader of the House, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and House minority leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts; majority leader of the Senate, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky; and minority leader, WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., of Maine, all enthusiastically supported the respective resolutions.

Popular fervor for the enactment of these bills took on the aspect of a holy crusade. Jews and non-Jews throughout the Nation advocated passage thereof and it was felt that the prophecy of Isaiah would be fulfilled and the Jews could again "go rejoicing into Zion."

Winston Churchill was reported by Dr. Chaim Weizman, great Zionist leader, to have recently stated: "America ought to take a hand in the solution of the problems [of Palestine]. It would make everything much easier." He went on to say that he welcomed an expression on Palestine from the Congress of the United States and that such an expression would strengthen his hand.

In the name of common sense and logic then, why this deeply laid scheme to vitiate the resolution?

The Secretary of State's observations concerning deferment before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was as "ghastly as a laugh in hell." Now, by negation, and failure of action, the Arabs for example may assume, the imprimatur of approval has been placed on the outrageous white paper.

It should be obvious that a Jew who has drowned in the Mediterranean because of the policy of the Palestine administration refusing him entry is just as dead as a dead Greek soldier on the streets of Athens. It is as violent a betrayal. Yet, our State Department has protested British action in Greece and Italy. This protest was a straightforward denunciation of high principle but that consistency, applied to Greece and Italy, suddenly becomes all knotted and entangled when confronted with Palestine. We are bold with reference to Greece and Italy. We challenge British imperial maneuvering but we cringe before the Palestine question.

I shall not remain indifferent. I shall not permit Palestine to be sold down the river. I shall do my utmost to prevent Palestine from being transformed into an Arab British state with a Jewish ghetto.

We are told that it would be unpatriotic to speak up now in the midst of world turmoil, that the peace conference will settle the vexing question. But when the hostilities cease the peoples who are now silenced will be presented with a fait accompli. Palestine will be closed to the Jewish people, the Jew will continue his 2,000-year-old trek while rehabilitation committees seek for havens everywhere but in the one place where the Jew would be welcome, Palestine. Heed now must be given to the words of David ben Gurion, Palestinian Zionist leader, who, in hard-hitting words, reaches the crux of the situation. He said:

"It is through our blind assumption that what happened once will happen again, that we talk today about a peace conference after the war. One can say indeed that a peace conference is already taking place, while the war is still going on. When Churchill met Roosevelt at Casablanca that meeting was part of the peace conference. When Eden, together with Halifax, held discussions with Cordell Hull in Washington, that was one of the sessions of the peace conference. When one of the representatives of the Anglo-Saxon world meets representatives of Soviet Russia this, too, is part of the peace conference. The provisions of the post-war settlement are being planned now, not only in Washington, London, and Moscow, but also in Cairo, Baghdad, Jidda, and Jerusalem. And we forget," he added, "that in fact the new order to be introduced in Palestine is absolutely ready."

It is not my purpose to create disunity among the Allies. I yield to no man in my admiration for the British men and women and their magnificent efforts in this tremendous crisis. The common man in England has performed heroically the superhuman tasks occasioned by this greatest scourge in civilized history. I repeat my avowal of admiration for England's saintly sacrifices that have saved us and the world. But how reconcile that with her attitude toward Palestine? "Honest and sincere criticism among the Allies," said Brendan Bracken, British Minister of Information, "even during the heat of war is not out of place. Fair criticism is the life of democracy."

The MacDonald White Paper must be set aside. Palestine must be opened to mass Jewish immigration at once, otherwise Festung Europa will continue to be a massive Jewish sepulcher.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

It is highly fitting that in the midst of the world struggle for liberty we should remind ourselves of the spiritual realities by which the ideals of freedom are nourished. The principle of human brotherhood is the source of our political democracy and this principle is rooted in the faith which our fathers knew and which we have lived by. One God is our Father and all of us are brothers and sisters in His family. We worship at different altars and express this faith in many ways. But deeper than the differences is the spiritual unity that makes us one people.

On battlefields throughout the world Americans of many cultural backgrounds stand together in one fighting force that presents an unbroken front against the enemies of freedom. We move forward to victory—one people dedicated to one flag in the service of justice and peace for all. As these men and women of the fighting forces carry on their struggle against tyranny overseas they dream of the homeland in which equal opportunity for the good life is open to all. It is, therefore, a solemn duty for us to live and work in the United States to keep our country free of prejudice and bigotry so that when our fighting men return they may find us living by the freedom for which they are ready to give the full measure of devotion.

The United States is the greatest team of free men and women that the world has ever seen. This is the hour for us to decide that our determination shall be in peace, as in war—teamwork. I am happy, therefore, to welcome the twelfth anniversary of Brotherhood Week, February 18–25, 1945, under the auspices of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. I hope that our people will come together this week to renew and strengthen their determination to serve the high principles of liberty through spiritual unity.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Patton Should Have Four Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., under date of December 31, 1944.

Time and experience have not only proven that Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., is one of our most colorful generals but also one of our very best generals. In fact, I am sure that history will record him as one of the great generals of all times. His ability as a tactician, his daring, courage, and leadership are an inspiration to his men, who dearly love him, and to the entire Allied world. We of the United States can thank God for George S. Patton, Jr. He is entitled to our eternal thanks and should have our full moral and material support.

The editorial follows:

PATTON SHOULD HAVE FOUR STARS

If there is any man who deserves promotion in the United States Army to the rank of four-star general, it is Three-Star Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Jr.

In five critical and tragic moments in this war, Patton has stood forth as strategist, tactician, and leader of men to victory against odds that often seemed overwhelming. He has had a larger number of really tough field campaigns than any of our generals, with the possible exception of Five-Star MacArthur, and has smashed his way to victory for his men, his country, and himself every time.

In the invasion of north Africa, Patton was given the one truly tough task—invasion from sea, with armored forces, of Casablanca, where resistance was sure to be great, where tides were so rough and tricky that only for a few hours each day could men or equipment be put ashore to overcome powerful and fixed defenses. He did the job, magnificently, commanding both Army and Navy invasion forces. His tactics have been cited by Army men as saving thousands of American lives in that combat.

When Rommel tore up an American Army corps at Kasserine Pass, Patton was called to stem the German onslaught. He did it, rallied faltering troops, reorganized them, and pointed the way to final victory in Africa.

In Sicily he completed conquest of the island in 39 days when all experts expected at least 90 to 100 days to be consumed. He did it by magnificent strategy and tactics, despite the flop of the British Eighth Army in a critical stage of the campaign. He organized the Army that carried out this invasion, planned the strategy, directed the tactics.

After the invasion of northern Europe, his Third American Army made a drive from Normandy to Paris that still has tacticians gasping at its speed and efficiency. With hardly a breath of time for reorganization he led this same army in an equally spectacular drive to the German border. This drive was stopped not by the enemy, but by inability of those in the rear to keep Patton's forces supplied with gasoline for his vehicles and ammunition for his guns. If he had been given both, no one knows where he might have gone.

And now, in the past 2 weeks, when the Germans ripped through the American First Army and drove to the shores of the Meuse and almost within shelling distance of Sedan, it was Patton and his Third Army again that saved the day with a magnificent drive of 22 miles into the tough side of the seemingly invincible German forces. There's no telling where that Nazi break-through would be today but for Patton and the Third Army.

Retired Gen. Peyton C. March, World War No. 1 Chief of Staff, bluntly charged a few days ago that the American and Allied High Commands in Europe had failed to "punch the enemy on the nose" when real slugging might have been decisive. Patton always has punched the enemy on the nose—with both fists, regardless of the opposing odds, with no quarter asked and none given. It is worthy of thought that in every campaign from Africa to the German border, except one, the American forces have met at least one tragic and unexpected debacle at the hands of a supposedly routed enemy. The one exception was Patton's campaign in Sicily, which military experts say will be a basis of our military textbooks of the future.

General Patton merited four stars long ago. Just about everyone in the Army knows that he would have had them but for the wild, exaggerated, overplayed, and partly false versions given to the utterly unimportant incident when he followed a rather well-established and recognized course of slapping a soldier, in Sicily, in an effort to see if he was really battle fatigued or just "dogging it."

The United States has many fine generals from one star to five star. Perhaps many of them are fully comparable in leadership, strategic ability, and tactical ability to Patton. However, it would be hard to find any, unless it be MacArthur, who has done more under tougher conditions. He deserves four stars—and more.

Christmas Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. MALONEY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address I made on Christmas Day over WNOE in New Orleans, La.:

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish for you and your loved ones near and far a happy day.

My hope, my prayer, and my effort, like yours, is for a quick return to normalcy and a fireside at every home where everyone of the family can be present.

No power possessed by man, no genius born or yet to come into creation, can take precedence over the power of belief in the Prince of Peace.

It is, in a sense, a mockery by the hand of mankind to find this world torn apart for the fifth consecutive Christmas by men killing men and nations attempting to destroy other nations.

It is indeed a pathetic plight.

Lives are being cast away each moment. Physical and mental impairment take place each second.

Homes, families, towns, States, and nations are torn from their moorings of centuries past.

I ask you upon this day of reverence, What sadder plight could befall us? And may I answer my own question by saying mankind could face nothing worse than the present predicament thrust upon us by the savage, un-Christian villains who originated this bloody, world-wide conflict.

It has not been my practice in the 12 years I have served in the Congress of the United States, nor in my life for that matter, to cast my lot with the group or the individual who cries loud at each opportunity.

I have observed life, both private and public, closely, and, in my opinion, it is hard work, a humble attitude, the refrainment from careless and unfounded talk, the open belief in one's fellowman, and the attitude of tolerance that makes America what it is.

It is those characteristics, plus the unconquerable spirit of our fighting forces, that eventually will bring victory to our side, which is the cause of true righteousness.

I hold in thorough contempt the man or the agency that would wittingly or otherwise misrepresent the facts as they relate to the progress of the war.

There are few homes in our fair land that will not have one or more vacant chairs at the dinner table on this feast day.

All of our homes are eagerly scanning every report on the progress of the war, but my good friends, I have said before and I repeat now, it never was a normal attitude to believe that today, this Christmas, would find the war in Europe ended.

Such estimates of the past, and I care not from whom they came, raised false hopes in the breasts of mothers, wives, and loved ones.

I claim no power of the prophet, nor do I possess a technical knowledge of warfare, but I say in all candor to everyone of you, all utterances and all writings that trifle with the prophecy of the time our boys and girls will be home are mere expressions of unthinking individuals who have grown careless with words, and further they are devoid of feeling for the loved ones of our fighting forces.

I decry with all power of my body and soul these malicious, loose-talking and loose-writing individuals.

There can be no question but that the price yet to pay is high—extremely high.

Need I tell you this?

I say no, for the thoughtful among you never have assumed for a moment that our task was anywhere near accomplished.

If you have believed to the contrary, I invite a fair and intelligent perusal of the facts at hand at this moment.

No, we are not going to lose the war. That I definitely say.

We are going to win.

Of that result I am convinced, but my good friends, we will have to pay a tremendous price in lives and every other conceivable way.

Let no one tell you to the contrary.

If he does, seek from him the record thus far, and ask him to estimate the possible turn of events.

It is utter folly to think this war, the most gigantic undertaking thrust upon mankind in the history of the world, can be settled as quickly and as inexpensively as some would attempt to have us believe.

I repeat, we will win.

Yes, we cannot fail with our power of determination and resources, but right now, unfortunately, we are drifting rapidly into a spirit of optimism that can and will mean one thing—namely, lengthening the war and adding to the cost of lives and destruction of property.

In my estimation we have drifted, and are continuing to drift from the task at hand.

It is not a pleasant picture to unfold before our eyes that our European commander has to appeal to and press us for more ammunition. None of us is proud of this condition, yet it is a fact.

The Nazis have counterattacked. We don't like that. But it is also a fact that cannot be denied.

Chaos has beset many of the small and even large nations that we have liberated, and what do we see and hear daily?

How to make the peace. Peace at this price. Peace at that price.

Well, let me tell you, my good friends, how to get peace, and you won't misunderstand me, I hope.

There is only one way to get a peace, and that is by whipping daylights out of the enemy on the field of battle.

Only then can we have peace. Don't let anyone tell you different.

All effort, all talk, and all of these resolutions are so much wasted effort when we attempt to write the peace before the curtain has fallen on the act of war.

I sincerely appeal to you to concentrate on winning the war and not on arguments as to the peace.

Our job is to back up the battle fronts so that we can win the war.

Our men of state affairs are alert to the phase of peace that should be apparent at this stage of the war.

Talk optimism down.

It is a sad commentary, indeed, when our American boys are shedding their blood and giving their lives in this death struggle and talk of dividing the spoils of war becomes a dominant subject. That is a significant reason for much of this overoptimism that can only hinder our fighting forces.

Victory is not ours until the enemy has laid down his weapons or until we have beaten him to absolute submission.

Neither of these conditions now prevails, and until one or the other does prevail it must be war to the hilt.

Accordingly I humbly ask your recognition of facts as they exist.

I shall return to Washington at the end of this month for the convening of the new Congress and shall dedicate my best efforts to bringing this world-wide war to a victorious end for our country and our allies.

It has been a pleasure to speak as a guest of this fine station WNOE today.

Now, in conclusion I wish you a most pleasant day, and may the coming year hold much for all of us—particularly for our fighting forces, who are spread over this world in the defense of you and me and our great Nation. Thank you.

Hitler's Speech Seen as Significant News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of January 2, 1945:

HITLER'S SPEECH SEEN AS SIGNIFICANT NEWS—PETTY QUARRELS BETWEEN ALLIES WILL PROLONG WAR, WRITER SAYS

(By David Lawrence)

Hitler's speech can be dismissed as the effusions of an egotist who is desperately trying to bolster the morale of the German people, but there is nevertheless in his New Year's broadcast some significant news.

Undoubtedly Hitler prepared the address with an idea of what arguments would appeal most effectively to the German nation, and it is interesting to note what extensive use he made of the petty quarrels among the Allies, and especially of their plans to dismember German territory.

It is to be noted, too, that he spoke scornfully of the tendency of the Allied statesmen to count their chickens before they are hatched, and especially did he seem to gloat over the delays that frustrated the Allied plans for victory in 1943 and then in 1944. Persons who are given to overconfidence and wishful thinking can ignore these comments of Hitler as inconsequential, but a careful reading of what he said ought to be made by those who are responsible for our so-called psychological warfare.

It is commonly assumed that psychological warfare is the routine business of some underling in a Government agency or of some subordinate unit in the Office of War Information. But the persons who really conduct psychological warfare for the Allies are Messrs. Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill and that group of apologists in our midst who have begun already to belittle the democratic process by arguing that anything which the Big Three may say or do is right or is above criticism.

HITLER'S OPPORTUNITY

Hitler's opportunity to keep his nation fighting frantically will grow rather than diminish and the war will be prolonged exactly as many months or years as the Governments in power at Washington, London, and Moscow are indifferent to the things that can make a lasting peace as distinguished from the things that keep enmities alive and hatreds perennial.

There must be candor and frankness in discussing international affairs today. The world must be delivered from the so-called experts who come from that practical group of Chauvinists and reactionaries who tell us now that ideals must be abandoned because ideals are an evidence of lack of imagination and practicality.

Such outbursts, for instance, as that which came from the London Economist the other day are a natural consequence of the diplomacy of today which believes in hush-hush and official camouflage of real points of difference among allies. The British people have evidently never been told how strong isolationism has been in the United States and how dangerously Mr. Roosevelt had to stretch the statutes to come to the rescue of the British with destroyers in 1940.

British publicists, now that Britain has been saved by American help once more, must not assume that they can do again as they did after the last war, namely, brush aside American idealism and expect America always to come to the rescue when power politics and spheres of influence bring on European wars. Maybe the next time the British really will misfire and forfeit American aid through sheer stupidity.

In Britain, fortunately, however, there is a growing liberalism which frowns on the materialistic ruling classes who think more of monarchies and class distinctions than they do of ideals. The imperialists have already begun to carve up not only Germany but the whole world, and the sad part of it is that they have American influences allied with them which echo that same selfishness and narrowness of view.

STEP TO TOTALITARIANISM

When we begin to read that ideals are worthless, we must be prepared to hear that the might-makes-right doctrine is best, after all. This is but a short step to the philosophy of the exponents of totalitarianism.

One would think from reading recent comments from the British experts and some of their American brethren that the truths in the Atlantic Charter are of no binding importance at all and that the parents of the young men who have made the supreme sacrifice can be bluntly told that their sons were killed in order that imperialism may live on. For it looks as if we already are being given the same anesthetic that was administered when Lloyd George and Clemenceau carved up Wilson idealism at Paris after the last war.

Ideals, if sincerely and honestly expressed, can end this war where swashbuckling boasts and threats have failed. But men who have themselves compromised with truth and principle cannot speak with conviction. The Allied cause needs a new leadership and new spokesmen, because its premiers and presidents have proved themselves lacking in idealism. Maybe the national legislatures can supply the missing soul.

The hope of the world perhaps lies in a few men of vision in the British Parliament and the American Congress who are not afraid to insist on ideals, even though inconvenient to tradition, unpalatable to pride, or expensive to someone's post-war pocketbook.

Extemporaneous Remarks Made by His Holiness Pope Pius XII in His Private Study on December 15, 1944, to the Members of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives Who Were Introduced to the Holy Father by the Honorable Myron C. Taylor, Personal Representative of the President of the United States to His Holiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the visit of the House Committee on Military Affairs to the western and Italian fronts and to a number of countries in Europe we were privileged in being introduced on December 15 last to His Holiness Pope Pius XII by the Honorable Myron C. Taylor, personal representative of the President of the United States to His Holiness. The following remarks of the Holy Father on this occasion are of inestimable importance not only to the members of the Military Affairs Committee who had the pleasure of an interesting audience with him on that occasion but to every Member of this House of Representatives:

Honorable Members of Congress, when His Excellency, the personal representative of your President, asked us to receive the congressional committee now visiting Europe, we at once assured him that it would give us real pleasure to do so; we wish to repeat the assurance of that pleasure now to you, honorable Members here present. To one and all, our heartfelt welcome.

At this critical moment in human history the legislators of the nations of the world carry a particularly grave responsibility. The questions that they are called on to decide have more than a passing political significance. They reach down to the roots of human society, to the inviolability of the human person, to those inalienable, God-given rights that are antecedent to the state and that no state dare infringe without jeopardizing its own existence. Foremost among those rights is the freedom to practice religion founded on faith in God and His revelation. To the legislators of today and tomorrow has been confided the noble task to insure that those rights shall not perish but shall be protected, defended, and held in honor among all peoples.

Oh, how earnestly we pray to God every day, that His grace may illumine the minds of lawgivers and heads of states to see and give them the courage to choose the path that leads to the peace that their hearts crave for. The master mind of Augustine came to realize that the human heart can never rest unless it rest in God; and what is true of the individual, is true of the multitude which forms our human society. This war will end; but the peace that men will clutch at, will crumble in their hands, unless God has first place in the councils of nations, unless His Ten Commandments and the truths given to men by Christ are at the foundations of the new world that all men of good will are hoping to see erected for the betterment of mankind.

That that new world may also bring an increase of glory to God, We pray heaven's blessings on those who chiefly have its making in their hands, and in particular upon you, honorable Members of Congress. God bless you, your families, all your dear ones at home, and your beloved country.

Progress Made Against Our Enemies in 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, our failure to defeat Germany in 1944, as had been predicted by many, and the unexpected German counter-offensive which began on December 16, causing heavy American casualties, made the ending of 1944 one of gloom and pessimism.

A brief recapitulation of what was accomplished by the Allies against the Axis powers in 1944 is contained in an editorial entitled "Year's End," appearing in the New York Times on December 31, 1944. This article shows that we have much to be grateful for and that considerable progress was made on all fronts in 1944. I think it is worthy of reproduction, and under leave granted, same is presented herewith.

I agree with the statement therein that for the progress we have made during the past 12 months we have paid a great price—thousands of our boys have given their lives and the casualty list lengthens daily.

May we not forget the sentiment expressed in the last sentence of this editorial, which would be an appropriate New Year's resolution for the American people, "Let us pledge ourselves to build on the sacrifices they have made for us a peace strong enough to do them honor."

The editorial follows:

YEAR'S END

If the old year ends on the somber note of the losses we have suffered in a savage, unexpected German drive, and on the further losses we must take to nullify these German gains, we should be unfair to 1944 if we did not try to set the present battles in perspective, and if we failed thereby to realize how far these last 12 months have brought us toward the achievement of our goals. Let us think back a bit.

When 1944 began, not a single Allied soldier stood at any point on the soil of Europe north of the Gulf of Gaeta or west of the Pripet Marshes. Hitler still dominated the Continent. The great Anglo-American invasion from the west was still an unattempted feat, a task formidable in its proportions, terrifying in its risks. The Russians still fought deep in their own territory. Odessa and Minsk and the Crimea were still in German hands. In Italy Allied troops still fought on the unyielding Cassino line. Rome was German territory. Whether it could be liberated without heavy casualties to its civilian population and vast destruction of its architectural treasures was a deeply troubling question. Paris was in Hitler's hands. Over all Belgium and all Holland, all Finland and all Greece, all the Balkan States from the upper Danube to the Aegean Sea marched the hobnailed boots of the German soldier.

In the Pacific the distances which separated us from the other citadel of Axis power were immensely great. We held Guadalcanal. We had taken Tarawa with heavy losses. We were fighting successfully in New Guinea. But much more than a thousand miles of blue water lay between us and the Philippines. The Japanese Fleet was still formidable. Truk stood as an apparently irreducible Gibraltar in the pathway of our progress. An island base so near Japan as Saipan seemed a distant dream. And no American airmen had ever carried the war to the enemy on the broad wings of a B–29.

For the progress we have made in these 12 months we have paid a great price. The lengthening casualty lists tell the story of young lives lost, bodies maimed, the heartbreak of those for whom there will be no homecoming soldier. But that progress has been made, vast obstacles overcome, and the force of avenging justice brought far closer to the evil men who made this war is manifest on the record. We can look back on 1944 with deep pride in the young men who went to battle for us, profound humility in the face of their great heroism, thankfulness for what they have accomplished, and a firm resolve to give them in the new year the full support to which they are entitled. Let us pledge ourselves to build on the sacrifices they have made for us a peace strong enough to do them honor.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a communication received by me from Maj. Gen. E. Reybold, Chief of Engineers, War Department, under date of December 28, 1944, containing information regarding the advancement of flood protection on the lower Mississippi River.

Many of you will recall the provisions of a bill which was introduced in the Senate by Senator JOHN OVERTON and by me in the House, providing for the abolition of what was then known as the Eudora spillway and the construction of the levees in Arkansas and Louisiana up to a height and grade considered sufficient to control the waters of the Mississippi River during any flood stage within the leveed walls of that river. This bill finally became law through the efforts of the Members of Congress from Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi, and because of the favorable consideration by the Congress and the President.

The Office of the Chief of Engineers has done a magnificent job under the provisions of this law, as will be shown by the communication from Major General Reybold, which is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, December 28, 1944.

Hon. W. F. NORRELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NORRELL: Reference is made to your recent request for information concerning the advancement of flood protection on the Lower Mississippi River.

I am pleased to be able to inform you that the so-called Boeuf fuse plug levee extending from Yancopin, Ark., to the vicinity of Vaucluse, Ark., has now been brought to the 1941 revised levee grade and cross section. The 1941 enlargement required between Vaucluse and Lakeport is now completed or under construction. Upon the completion of this latter work, the controlling levee between Red Fork and the Arkansas-Louisiana State line will be at least as high as the 1941 revised net grade. In addition to this work, the levees on the south bank of the Arkansas River above Red Fork have been strengthened and maintained by the construction of seepage berms, and levee setbacks.

The enlargement of these levees now completed or under contract for completion will require the placement of approximately 22,000,000 cubic yards of material at an estimated cost of $5,500,000. The seepage berms, dikes, and four levee setbacks made necessary by the 1943 and 1944 floods on the Arkansas River required the placement of approximately 5,000,000 cubic yards of earthwork at an estimated cost of $1,700,000. All of this maintenance work is now completed except for one setback (at Adkins Lake) which is under construction.

The enlargement of the levees above Red Fork to the 1941 grade will require the placement of about 14,000,000 cubic yards at an estimated cost of $5,000,000. The strengthening of the levee cross section between Lakeport and the State line will require the placement of about 1,200,000 cubic yards at an estimated cost of $500,000. This work will be placed under contract as rapidly as future appropriations and available equipment will permit.

Between Pine Bluff and the Arkansas-Louisiana State line we have completed 62 miles of levee and have 19 miles under contract. The completion of the Boeuf-Eudora fuse-plug section provides flood protection for all the alluvial valley lands in Arkansas lying below the latitude of Red Fork, aggregating about 700,000 acres, which is equal to or better than that previously assured other lands protected by levees constructed to the 1928 project net grade and cross section. The construction of the Boeuf floodway would have dedicated 362,000 acres in Arkansas to occasional flooding. The construction of the Eudora floodway and its extension would have dedicated 190,000 acres to occasional flooding.

This progress in flood protection could not have been made without the abandonment of the Boeuf-Eudora floodway as authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, and the subsequent appropriation acts providing funds for the work. All this legislation was obtained through the tireless effort and cooperation of the legislators representing the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi; certainly it could never have been possible without their very able assistance.

Very truly yours,

E. REYBOLD,
Major General,
Chief of Engineers.

Mobilization of Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from the vice president and general manager of the Beech Aircraft Corporation of Wichita, Kans., relating to the manpower situation, which, in my opinion, presents a realistic logical view from a vital war plant which it is hoped will be heeded by the governmental agencies dealing with this subject:

BEECH AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
Wichita, Kans., January 2, 1945.

The Honorable ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCRIVNER: We again see discussions in the public print about war manpower mobilization by directive or executive decrees, or even by possible congressional action. Because there seems to be a school of thought in certain circles in Washington which contends that war production would be benefited by forced recruitment of war workers, we wish to respectfully submit our opinions based upon practical experience.

During the months of October and the early part of November, we experienced great difficulty in retaining our working force at a constant level. Terminations increased far beyond previous levels, and an analysis of these terminations indicated that many of them were for the purpose of taking post-war jobs. We consider that this was an entirely natural development which was caused directly by the overoptimistic statements made by many of the most prominent individuals in positions of high authority among the Allied Nations, with regard to the anticipated early termination of the European war. The public press at that time carried almost nothing but statements about post-war reconversion, cancellation of contracts, termination, cutbacks, and post-war planning. The Government officially acted through its various agencies to continually warn the manufacturer of these factors, and to prepare him for these anticipated events.

It is no wonder that this strong emphasis on the early termination of hostilities should have produced the result which it did produce, that of inducing people to leave war industries to seek peacetime jobs. The reaction was entirely normal for people with American traditions of self-reliance. Our people felt that they could look out for themselves better than any Government agency could look out for them, and, therefore, they took it upon themselves to find new post-war jobs, even though such jobs paid much less income than the jobs that they were leaving. Anyone who admires the spirit of self-reliance must admit that the action of these people was reasonable and correct under the circumstances then existing.

It was impossible for us to controvert the statements which were published in the newspapers and which were attributed to such persons as General Eisenhower, Winston Churchill, and others of comparable rank, regarding the early termination of hostilities. There was too much weight of reputation behind these statements to permit any counterstatement to carry any important weight in the minds of our employees. Although we stated that our war contracts were of such a nature that they would continue without interruption, our people simply did not believe that we knew what we were talking about.

The recent reverses in Europe have entirely changed public psychology among war workers. They now know that the former optimistic statements were mistaken, and the problem of personnel terminations has been reduced correspondingly. It is our opinion that no drastic manpower controls are necessary under present circumstances, and that the invocation of such drastic controls would do more harm than good.

It should be remembered that there is a certain inertia to governmental opinion and action. It always follows the event by a considerable period of time. This fact is caused by the necessary delay in collecting and correlating statistics, and the development of opinion based upon such statistics. In other words, the Washington opinion of today is based upon the events of October and November, which, in turn, were caused by unwise public statements made by impressively prominent individuals. We feel that it would be unwise to take action upon the question of drastic manpower controls until a sufficient time has elapsed to actually study the situation which exists at this time and which is steadily improving. On the other hand, we approve of the restrictions which have been put upon nonessential and nonproductive activities, such as race tracks and dog tracks and other activities which produce nothing and which are for amusement only.

It is our opinion that voluntary effort and voluntary cooperation is always far more effective than any form of coerced effort or activity. This was proved in an interesting way about a year ago, when we found considerable dissatisfaction among our working force with the regulations concerning the necessity for a formal release from the employer for anyone who wished to take another job. Because we felt that an unwilling employee was not worth keeping, we published a policy statement on all bulletin boards that anyone who did not wish to work for us could obtain a release at once after an interview to determine the causes of his or her dissatisfaction, if any. The percentage of voluntary terminations of employment decreased instead of increased after the publication of this statement; which has been in effect ever since.

We wish to thank you for the opportunity of bringing our opinions to your attention and hope that they will be of some value to you in connection with consideration of these matters at the Washington level.

With warmest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

BEECH AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
JOHN P. GATY,
Vice President-General Manager.

Unhappy Augury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 2, 1945:

It is scarcely to be doubted that the Lublin Poles, in declaring themselves to be the Polish provisional government, have Moscow's full approval. In view of the recent collapse in negotiations between Russia and the Poles in London, the development is not surprising, but it is discouraging nevertheless, since it brings nearer the time when we shall probably see what Prime Minister Churchill has called "the unhappy spectacle" of the Big Three openly divided on the question of which group legitimately represents Poland.

The general assumption is that the Soviet Union will soon extend recognition to the Lublin Poles, but it is considered doubtful that Britain will and it seems almost certain that the United States will not. Both the Churchill government and our own have consistently recognized the Poles in London as the sole existing Polish authority, and even though that authority may have some serious shortcomings, there is little likelihood that it will suddenly lose Anglo-American support merely because of what the Soviet-sponsored Lublin group has done. So the prospect is that as far as the political status of Poland is concerned, Moscow, London, and Washington are about to follow different paths.

This is an extremely unfortunate situation, not only because it may encourage civil strife among the Poles themselves inside Poland, but also because it will place the Big Three in the position of having failed to act in unison in the first important test of allied cooperation outside the military sphere. Whatever may be the merits of the Lublin group's arguments and of Russia's claims, the fact remains that the problem has so far been worked out in a unilateral manner and that the impression is growing—rightly or wrongly—that the Stalin Government is more interested in setting up a puppet regime in Warsaw than in establishing a truly strong and independent Poland.

This impression, together with the unilateral character of the proceedings, can hardly be said to augur well for the idea of genuine post-war collaboration among the United Nations. In this instance the idea just simply does not seem to be working out, and there is no use trying to blink that fact. Coupled with other events elsewhere, it clearly indicates that when they meet again, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin will have a very delicate and very serious job to do if the current allied political deterioration is to be checked. For the sake of the next peace we must hope and pray that every effort they make to this end will bear rich fruit.

Pay Increases for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House of Representatives, I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press of December 15, 1944, Pontiac, Mich., on the proposal to increase the salaries of Members of Congress.

I believe the sentiment and opinion expressed in the editorial reflects the views of a vast majority of the people of the United States.

PAY INCREASES FOR CONGRESS

Labor—and that means everyone that draws a pay envelope—has been frozen at a 15-percent increase over 1941. Probably this has been the main cause in checking uncontrolled inflation. Thus, the bulk of Americans are better off financially than they would have been otherwise.

However, we now are confronted by the amazing spectacle of Government itself suggesting much bigger pay increases for the President, Senators, and Congressmen.

Apparently 15 percent is good enough for you and me, but Senators and Representatives would receive a modest boost of 50 percent. Members of Congress now draw $10,000 a year and the proposal would add a mere 50 percent to their annual stipend, or $5,000 a year in place of the $1,500 which represents the 15 percent that suffices for the rest of us.

When the suggestion reached the Presidency, it proposed a $25,000-a-year increase, raising the annual award from $75,000 to $100,000. One of the arguments for upping Mr. Roosevelt cited the fact that Frankie Sinatra gets even more than this, and surely Frankie R. must be worth as much to the Nation as Frankie S.

This we grant.

In fact we go further and contend that the newest colored sweeper in the South, starting at the lowest wage paid, is worth more than Frankie. (Frankie S.)

Hence this argument collapses.

Furthermore, it was Mr. Roosevelt who advocated a top "take-home pay" of $25,000 a year for anyone, so he would undoubtedly oppose the step himself.

The Press believes the Senators and Representatives deserve more. However, we would like to see them cheerfully follow the War Labor Board measures they have placed over the rest of us. Before their pay is increased 15 percent (perish the thought of 50 percent) we believe they should fill out form 10 and send it to the nearest regional office and go through the same machinery as the millions and millions of civilian employees.

We especially invite their attention to the clause which suggests that this increase in pay will not be used as a means of justifying the increase in the price of the commodities they handle.

That means the cost of government.

A 15 percent increase in Federal pay rolls in these circumstances would be the cheapest step the taxpayers ever took.

Also, we should like to suggest that the full 15 percent is not for executives according to Government edicts. Those above $5,000 in back-home life must be satisfied with lesser increases—so we propose 6 percent for Senators and Representatives, and 2 percent for the President.

Conditions in Europe Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently one of the publishers of the New Orleans newspapers, Mr. Ralph Nicholson, of the New Orleans Item, made a trip to Europe at the invitation of the British Government. His observations during this tour are most interesting and I believe worthy to be called to the attention of this body.

These observations appeal to me not as the observations of a newspaper reporter but appeal to me as the warm, down to earth expressions and reactions of an American citizen, the man on the street, who has been given an opportunity of seeing at first hand conditions as they are in Europe today.

May I offer them to you for examination in the exact manner in which they were presented to the readers of the New Orleans Item:

HOME'S BEST

The very best thing about my recent trip to Great Britain and France was getting back to New Orleans. Home never looked better to me than it did a few days ago, when I returned. That doesn't mean that I regretted having made the trip. The contrary is true. The reason I accepted the invitation of the British Ministry of Information was that I hoped it would result in increased knowledge and a better understanding on my part of what is happening now in Europe and what might be expected to occur in the future.

No specific discernible effort was made while I was in England on the part of anyone there to sell me on any particular point of view. I couldn't help, however, absorbing some new ideas or modifying others that I previously had.

One of the many things that impressed me in England was the almost unfailing courtesy and good humor of the people that I met. Five years of war had not given them the jitters, worn their nerves ragged, and made them ill-tempered. I scarcely heard a raised voice from anybody any place. That goes for taxi drivers, and cabinet ministers, and the host of people in between those stations of life.

Some of the little things were as outstanding as comparatively large ones. The taxicabs in London, for example, were bright and shiny, neat, and clean outside and in. There was very little horn blowing and no arguments. The attitude of the drivers toward their passengers and drivers of other vehicles was in sharp contrast with that observed daily in New Orleans.

The streets of London, Paris, and of the cities in Scotland I visited, were almost spotless. The citizens of those cities didn't throw their refuse in the street, and whatever got there that was out of place was quickly removed. Street cleaners worked continuously on the job with gratifying results.

So many of the people that I met were completely fascinated with New Orleans. They considered it the one city in the United States they wanted to visit. The British Army doctor on the ship on which I returned, planned to come down here during the next few days, just to see New Orleans. He don't care, he said, if he got a Pullman reservation; he would gladly sit up both ways just to be able to spend a few days in this city.

Dozens of people had read books about New Orleans. The one most prominently mentioned was Crescent Carnival by Frances Parkinson Keyes. If persons to whom I listened are typical of Britain's 45,000,000, we are going to have a great influx of visitors from across the Atlantic when the war is over.

ROBOMBS AND ROCKETS

Friends with whom I talked here since my return early in December from Great Britain and France have expressed considerable interest in the robot bombs reported in the newspapers to be falling in southern England.

I would not be telling the truth if I did not admit that this subject interested me considerably, too, while I was in southern England. I heard a few of the first type of flying bombs. They were called robots, flying

bombs, and doodle bugs. They were described to me as looking somewhat like a small airplane with wings, and propelled by a small motor. They make a noise like an airplane and travel at a moderate rate of speed. Many were shot down by ack ack and airplanes. Others arrived at their destination. When the fuel is exhausted the motor cuts off. Sometimes the bombs drop precipitously and other times they glide for a considerable distance before hitting the ground and exploding. I saw some of the places where such bombs had fallen. The devastation was terrific.

The V–2, or rocket bomb, is another kind of death-dealing missile. I was told that one of these bombs weighs about 7 tons, 5 or 6 tons of fuel, and metal and explosives weighing about 1 ton. These are launched from various sites on the continent, said to be in Holland and Germany. The rocket goes nearly straight up at the outset and then levels off at a height of about 60 miles. When the fuel is exhausted, or nearly so, it descends at the estimated speed of 10,000 miles an hour. This is faster than sound. The first knowledge that anyone in the vicinity usually has of the arrival of the rocket bomb is a terrific explosion which sounds like very loud thunder or a big gun being fired. Then there is a second noise made by the passage of the rocket through the air which arrives after the explosion. The rocket penetrates the building that it hits and makes a deep crater many feet in diameter, which is usually partly filled with the debris of wrecked buildings falling into the cavity.

The people of southern England go about their business apparently without paying much attention to these bombs. I was told that if one fell far enough from where I was, so that I could hear it, I had nothing to worry about. And that if it was so close that I didn't hear it, I felt no pain. That seemed to be an accurate appraisal of the situation.

I concluded that one reason the people there were no more concerned over these bombs than they appeared to be was that it was a matter of comparison. There were fewer bombs now than there were last summer, and those that fell last summer were in many respects not as bad as the blitz of 1940. In their experience the situation was improving.

London was not, at first glance, as badly wrecked and scarred as I had anticipated. The principal reason for this was that the wrecked buildings and debris were cleared away in remarkably short time. A good many of the holes in the ground where buildings had stood were filled with water as an added precaution against fire.

BRITAIN AT WAR

Sometimes in New Orleans we are inclined to complain about shortages of food, beverages of various kinds, cigarettes, houses and apartments, and many other things. Compared with the people of England, however, we are living in a land of luxury and go our accustomed way without hindrance or restrictions.

Life in Great Britain for the residents and for the visitors is regimented almost beyond belief. An alien needs many kinds of identification papers and moves from one place to another under scrutiny and restrictions. This is particularly the case when one is about to leave the country.

Nearly everything in Great Britain seems to be rationed. Scarcely any article of clothing can be purchased without coupons. As I recall, a man could buy about one suit a year if he didn't purchase anything else in the way of apparel during that period.

Food seemed to be sufficient in quantity to feed the people, but substitutes or processed concoctions seemed to be the order of the day. Sugar, like butter and other fats, is very scarce. So is fuel. Some of the hotels in which I stayed, and private homes that I visited, were very cold. At the home of newspaper friends in the country near London, where I spent the night, the central heating system was not used because no fuel was available. People seemed to get used to this, however, and didn't do much complaining.

Food at the hotel restaurants looked attractive, but to me was almost tasteless. It seemed that they could have done as well by taking compressed air, extracting its flavor, if any, and mixing it with equal parts of flannel finely chopped, and served with some kind of colorless and tasteless sauce.

I read one story in a London paper to the effect that infant mortality is now lower than before the war, because of the better distribution of milk under the Government program of subsidy and rationing, than had been the case before the war.

There was a conspicuous absence of fresh fruits, both in restaurants and in food stores. There were some apples and some fancy grapes, the latter being very expensive. There were no oranges, lemons, grapefruit, or bananas, although some citrus fruits were promised from Spain in time for Christmas. That announcement made front-page news in the London newspapers.

Brussel sprouts, cabbage, and potatoes were ever present. I saw few other vegetables. The coffee was surprisingly good, and the tea up to pre-war standards in quantity and quality. The milk supply was so limited, however, that one family, as I recall, was restricted to 3 pints a week.

In Paris the situation seemed to be worse. I was told that food was abundant in Normandy, but the transportation facilities were inadequate as yet to supply Paris.

I ate at the Army mess provided for war correspondents while in Paris, and visited no French homes and can give no first-hand report of how bad their conditions really are. I am convinced, however, that the shortages were acute.

YANKS SAY "ALL O. K."

One of the questions frequently asked me by friends here since I returned a few days ago from a visit to Great Britain and France concerns the opinions there about how long the war will last. I regret that I cannot give any consensus of opinions on this subject. I have been trying to remember what people said about the date when the German war would be finished and can't recall very much conversation on this subject.

In both London and Paris the English and Americans—civilians and those in uniform—with whom I talked seemed to have settled down to making the war their primary business, doing today what was required, and not paying very much attention to the question of how long it was going to last.

Of course, both the men and women in uniform, and the civilians, have greater reason than most Americans to be concerned over the duration. All reports that I received indicated that the going was very tough and the hardships indescribable all along the western front.

The American soldiers on the streets of Paris, however, were magnificently dressed, particularly in comparison with the shabby Parisians. They looked well and strong. They were ruddy-faced and cheerful, even those that had just come in after weeks and weeks at the front. I talked to many of them. Their attitude was that everything was O. K. I heard no gripes. I saw no misconduct on the part of any American in uniform. They made me proud of them and of my country.

Another evidence of the great might of America was the big trucks filled with war materials that I saw on the streets.

One hardship that our men in uniform are experiencing in France, which seems to me to be unnecessary, is the unfavorable rate of exchange officially established of 50 francs to the dollar. I heard of instances of civilians exchanging dollars for francs for as many as 200 to the dollar. This makes buying anything in France very expensive for our troops. Perhaps there are important reasons why this official exchange rate is necessary. The rate of sterling is at the same scale—the franc being worth 2 cents. I was told that it was a court-martial offense for Army personnel to exchange American or British currency at any rate other than the official one.

Cigarettes, as scarce as they are, prove to be a very useful medium of exchange in a barter transaction. I have forgotten how many packages of cigarettes it reputedly took for a bottle of perfume. But the G. I.'s I talked to were very suspicious of the quality of the perfume offered when it seemed too cheap in terms of cigarettes. They were not suckers by any means.

THE PRICE WE PAY

Since returning last week from a short visit to Great Britain and France I have been trying to determine the effects of the trip on my own thinking. I believe that I have become more tolerant of persons and things that I disagreed with and disapproved of in this country. These differences do not seem as important as they did previously, particularly in comparison with the war and the task of maintaining peace after it is won.

Here at home I found much to criticize in the way our Federal Government functions. I am still convinced those criticisms are justified. On the other hand, however, I saw so much evidence abroad of successful management of the war that I have a better opinion of our over-all effort than previously. It may well be that we couldn't have everything and that the price we are paying in inefficiency and corruption within the country is not too high for the successful conduct of the war. I would like to have both, but if it is a matter of alternatives, I prefer the latter. I hope that the internal management of the country during the next 4 years, however, will more closely approximate the efficiency of the war program.

I believe that the closer a person gets to the actual battle fronts and the more he sees of war's destruction of lives and property the more he fears and hates war and the more interested he becomes in trying to prevent its recurrence.

We cannot expect perfect harmony among the Allies. There will always be differences of opinion. One of these will doubtless concern the number of men and the volume of material contributed by each. Some of our allies may not be doing their just and proportionate share. We may be doing more than ours. I am convinced that we have at least twice as many men on the western front as all of the other allies put together. Our percentage may even be higher than that. I don't know whether or not that is more than our fair share. I don't know how many troops the other allies have in the other theaters of war. There may be inequities and injustices.

Be that as it may, I am convinced that every effort should be made to keep the total price, particularly in lives, at a minimum; but it is certainly essential to our existence to win this war.

Our relations are closer with England and her Dominions than with any other peoples. Therein lies opportunity for friction. Regardless of what we dislike about the English, we would find more to dislike in other peoples. We can get along better with the English than with anybody else. We have more in common with them. It is essential that we work closely during and after the war with the British.

I don't mean that we should give them everything they want. On the contrary, I am

convinced we should try to be as good traders as they are.

Great Britain and the United States can prevent another war if the peoples of these two countries make up their mind to do it. There have always been wars in Europe. That situation will not change without our active participation in maintaining the peace. Even throwing in our full intelligence and power may not accomplish the objective.

I am convinced it will never be achieved without us however. The chances of success are better if we are eternally vigilant. We must contribute to the cause of peace whatever is required to maintain it. As I see it, we cannot afford to do otherwise. I am convinced that the Germans will make another attempt to conquer the world if given an opportunity to do so. They have the ambition, the scientific genius, and perhaps the resources to make this possible. If they are let alone they will devise war machines that will lay waste the cities on this continent, in my opinion. The safety of ourselves, of our children and grandchildren in this country depends on our taking whatever action is required to prevent the Germans from preparing for and launching another attempt to conquer the world.

What Does America Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, because the following two paragraphs, taken from an editorial entitled "What Does America Want?" by James H. McGraw, Jr., expresses my convictions better than I can express them in words; I include them in my remarks for the consideration of my colleagues, and also as a declaration concerning my own feelings and convictions:

Within the past few weeks there has been a wakening conviction in this country that the determination of international arrangements cannot safely be put aside until victory has been won. For we have seen actions taken in Europe seemingly without full consultation and agreement of the Allied Powers, which may profoundly affect the design of the post-war world.

A declaration of American policy is needed, and it should be accompanied by a statement of our firm intention to exert full effort to procure its acceptance and furtherance. Emphatically, this does not mean that an American platform should be put forth as an ultimatum, which other nations must accept totally, or reject at the cost of having the United States withdraw from collaborative participation in, world agreements and organization. On the contrary, the first plank in such an American platform should be a firm commitment on our part to participate with our associate nations in building a general system of world security and order. By definition, this requires that each participant be willing to accommodate its purely national interests to a program that can be accepted as fairly representing the interests of all. But equally, there is imposed on each participant an obligation to state honestly and openly what it conceives its individual interest to be, as well as its concept of what measures will best serve the general interest.

Christmas Greetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following Christmas greetings:

GREETINGS

God grant you peace within your heart
This time of Holy Birth.
May the Prince of Peace declare his might,
And bring to all the earth
The balm that He alone can give
To nations far and wide.
To every lonely, longing soul
At this the Christmastide.
May the richness of His blessings
Be yours throughout the years;
May the presence of His guiding hand
Obliterate your fears;
May your fondest aspirations,
Your hopes and dreams come true,
And all that's fine and beautiful
Have a rendezvous with you.

—*Jenette Doughty Van Raalte.*

The author of this poem is one of the outstanding young women of my home community. Her great grandparents were some of the early settlers in our section of Wisconsin. The families have always been and are now among the leaders in the civic, religious, and educational life of the community.

Mrs. Van Raalte has been a very successful school teacher. She is now carrying on while her husband is in some foreign country with the armed forces. Her Christmas message is particularly appropriate at this time in the history of our country.

Post-War Transport and the Bronx

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copy of an address delivered by Mr. Walter P. Hedden, director of port development of the New York Port Authority at the fifty-first annual meeting of the Bronx Board of Trade on December 21, 1944, in New York:

This Nation is still deep in a war within the borders of Germany and the borders of Japan. All of our production and transport activity must continue to be oriented toward the winning of this war. However, the time is coming, and I hope not too far distant, when more ships and planes can be diverted to overseas peacetime commerce; when railroad cars will be available for carrying weapons of construction instead of destruction; when tires and trucks can be put back into civilian use; and when steel and wood and concrete can be made available for construction of highways, bridges, terminals, and other transportation necessities for an expanding and prosperous America.

The Bronx is part of the great metropolitan community whose very lifeblood is efficient transportation. It enjoys rail service from great trunk-line railroads. It is traversed by some of the primary highways into New England and the Hudson Valley. It has great connecting bridges south, east, and west. It has water-front and potential airport space.

In any appraisal of the post-war future of the Bronx, and of the port district of which it is a part, it may be well to pause and see what added transport service and facilities are needed.

For over a year the Port Authority has been engaged in surveying some of the transportation and terminal features of the metropolitan area which seems vital in the post-war picture. In the limited time which we have, I can mention only a few that may interest you.

It is obvious that our future depends upon retaining a position as the crossroads of transportation, whether by sea, air, or land. There is no doubt that we face a vast increase in transport of passengers, mails, and high-value freight by air in the decade following this war. The pattern of this air service overseas, and to important points in North America, is now being established by the recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the international negotiations that flow from it.

During the past year the Port Authority has taken an active part in five leading cases before the Civil Aeronautical Board by presenting facts and recommendations in regard to the post-war air service pattern. Our witnesses have emphasized the fact that nearly two-thirds of the overseas travelers come from a territory within 300 miles of the port of New York, and 40 percent of them from the States of New York and New Jersey alone. Also, that 50 percent of the international air express shipments, and an equal portion of the mails originate in this area. In cases involving the establishment of routes between the port of New York and the Pacific Northwest; between the port of New York and Latin America; between the port of New York and Europe and Africa, we have stressed that there exists a demonstrated need for the most direct, one-carrier service which will give the businessman of this community contact with these other important trade areas without delay, without changing plans, without circuitous detours.

When we realize that service can be made available which will put mails and business executives in South Africa in 3 days instead of 22 days as at present, and in South America in 2 instead of 14 days, and in Europe in a matter of hours, we begin to understand why a network of crossroads service of this type is essential to the future of the port district.

And highways for motor traffic too. A greatly expanded new network of arterial systems for both passenger cars and motortrucks is in the making. The port authority, operating, as it does, the great bridges and tunnels which are essential links in the highway connections between territory east and west of the Hudson River, is vitally interested in this matter and cooperated in the successful campaign to have an equitable portion of Federal funds allotted to New York and New Jersey for post-war urban-highway improvements.

One of the most recent fields of activity in which we are engaged, which will interest you, is that of carrying forward a terminal unification program particularly in the field of mixed-load package freight. As you know, over 10 years ago the port authority constructed the first union railroad less-carload freight station. More recently announcement was made of the acquisition of property

for a union motortruck terminal. Few of us, I believe, realize the extent to which the handling of freight by over-the-road motortruck has increased in recent years. Counts show a daily movement in each direction of over a thousand over-the-road carriers during every 24 hours on the Boston Post Road. From all directions the daily number of inbound trucks reaches 5,000. Many of these are common carriers, and half of their traffic is mixed loads which must be delivered to or picked up from not 1 but many shippers. The operations of these motor carriers in making terminal deliveries in the city streets presents a serious problem in cost and congestion.

This matter strikes home to the Bronx businessman. His ability to manufacture and distribute his products and to draw his raw materials in competition with merchants and manufacturers in other centers depends in large part on the freight-rate situation. For some months, with the cooperation of Mr. Matthews and others of your organization, together with the commercial groups from Queens, Brooklyn, Manhattan, and northern New Jersey, we have been negotiating with motor-carrier conferences and even participating in proceedings before the I. C. C. in an endeavor to eliminate excess charges which are made in this area as compared to others.

It might astound you to know that a shipment of 500 pounds of third-class freight moving north-bound from Greensboro, N. C., is subject to a higher charge for delivery in the Bronx than to Boston, Mass. The basic rate per 100 pounds to the Bronx is 95 cents and to Boston $1.16, but an extra delivery charge is assessed—40 cents—in the Bronx, bringing the total charge on Bronx deliveries to $1.35 per 100 pounds, or 19 cents more than the rate to Boston. A similar shipment from Boston to the Bronx costs 6 cents more per 100 pounds than a shipment to lower Manhattan.

As part of our activity in protecting the commerce of the port, these matters are being continually checked and followed up with the regulatory bodies, but the motor carriers continually point to their high terminal costs in justification. Hence the port authority, in accordance with the principles laid down by the two States to govern a better development of the port, is seeking to unify operations wherever practicable and provide for elimination of duplication of effort and inefficiencies which result from the present lack of unification. Adequate union facilities should be established at strategic points which will keep the large trucks out of narrow streets and congested areas, permit efficient platform handling and organized zone deliveries to and from the shipper's door by consolidated route trucks.

Since the port authority operates, as you know, without burdening the taxpayers, it is necessary to progress this program in accordance with a program which will make the terminal self-supporting, and at the same time bring about a saving to the business community by removing the excuse for higher charges in this area.

Our plans for the first unit in lower Manhattan are well advanced. Our surveys show a need for and a willingness on the part of the carriers, to cooperate also in a terminal in northern New Jersey. There is a substantial quantity of freight delivered or picked up in the Bronx, but today only two comparatively small individual terminals are functioning in this borough, and most of the freight is handled to Manhattan and retrucked.

Our staff believes that the long-run picture will show the need for union terminals of this character in several sections of the port. The Bronx, as a great traffic-producing center and a gateway for service to and from New England and upper New York State, is one of the logical areas for consideration. In our surveys we will attempt, with the cooperation of shippers and carriers, to ascertain how much of the freight actually originates or is destined to the Bronx so that we may determine whether there is a concentration sufficient to justify from an economic standpoint a separate station in this borough. We will welcome the assistance of the business community and organizations such as the Bronx Board of Trade in this activity.

Looking further ahead it would appear that the establishment of a concentrating point for all types of mixed merchandise freight should follow, a place where air freight, steamship freight, and rail freight, as well as truck freight of this character, could be assembled and dispatched either direct to destination by over-the-road trucks or transferred by truck to airports, to rail loading terminals, and to steamship piers for loading into planes, cars, and ships.

The problem of bringing such projects from a planning stage to actuality requires a thorough and sound knowledge of the situation because of the necessity that these projects be of a self-supporting type. It is interesting that editorials have recently appeared in a number of metropolitan newspapers, all the way from Boston, Mass., to Topeka, Kans., pointing to the value of having an authority set up for this type of public work. However, we find that many representatives of these other communities who come to us, fail to realize that the mere legal creation of an authority waves no magic wand of self-support, and that the ability to establish a credit for financing projects depends upon sound planning and sound execution, plus the wholehearted cooperation of the business community.

I welcome this opportunity to talk with you about some of the problems which face us after the war, and I hope that we may continue to have the cooperation of the Bronx Board of Trade in the field of developing, protecting, and maintaining the commerce of the district, and in carrying forward such plans for physical improvement as fall within the scope of our legal and financial powers.

H. R. 674: A Civil Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill, H. R. 674, providing for extensive amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, amendments which are greatly needed if civil aeronautics is to progress in this country in the future as it should.

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which was enacted by the Congress in approximately the same form as it was originally reported from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, was passed at a time when the aeronautical interests of this country were at a very low ebb. Our air lines with few exceptions were in financial difficulties. Private flying was extremely limited, and our airport system had reached its then very limited capacity by reason of work-relief appropriations. Under the provisions of that act, as administered by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, enormous strides have been made in the development of civil aeronautics in this country. Our air lines and civilian flyers were placed in a position where they could be of maximum aid in the prosecution of the war when the need for their assistance arose. Our aeronautical training facilities contributed heavily to the training of wartime pilots. Our airways system made possible an enormous amount of military and civilian flying essential to the war effort.

Notwithstanding the great strides which have been made under the Civil Aeronautics Act, experience has shown that in numerous instances modernization of that statute is necessary to provide an adequate statutory foundation for the new era of aeronautics which will be ushered in by the restoration of peace.

Many of the provisions of the bill are similar to provisions of the bill I sponsored during the last session, H. R. 3420, but the latter bill has been substantially revised in order to cure defects found to exist in that bill and to provide solutions for new problems which have come up since that bill was written. I will urge the committee to hold hearings on this new bill as soon as those interested in the legislation have had an opportunity to study it and formulate their comments. I hope that all interested in aviation legislation will examine this proposed legislation with care and give the committee the benefit of their constructive criticisms. The future problems of aviation are difficult and their proper solution is important to our national interest. All those who can contribute to such a solution should do so.

I will outline briefly the principal provisions of the bill.

AIRPORTS

Everyone recognizes that a most essential need for proper aviation development is the establishment and maintenance of an adequate system of public airports. I emphasize the fact that it is a system of airports that is needed; not just many scattered landing fields placed here and there without proper consideration of their size and location. A substantial amount of public funds—Federal, State, and municipal—has been and will continue to be spent for the construction and maintenance of airports. We should make certain this money is spent in the places where needed and for airports so located and developed as to provide their maximum usefulness.

In the last session of Congress the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported and passed House Resolution 598 requesting the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to submit to the House a report upon the establishment of a system of airports and landing areas throughout the United States. On November 28, 1944, the Acting Secretary of Commerce forwarded the Administrator's report submitted in accordance with this resolution. This is a very extensive report and specifies in detail what now appears to be necessary in order to establish an adequate system of airports throughout the United States. The Administrator recommended that the Congress provide for a program of airport

construction and improvement extending over a 5- or 10-year period.

H. R. 674 provides for the establishment of such a program. It authorizes appropriations during the first 10 postwar years of not to exceed $650,000,000 for the construction and improvement of airports. This appropriation would be used by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, under general regulations issued by the Civil Aeronautics Commission, to make contributions for airports sponsored by public agencies. The contribution of the United States would be limited to not more than 50 percent of the total cost of the project. In order that the maximum usefulness can be secured from airport development performed under this statute, the Administrator is required to prepare and currently maintain a national airport plan. All projects to be eligible for a Federal contribution would have to be in accordance with this plan.

It should be understood that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is not committed to the detailed provisions of this bill. Hearings will be held and the committee will welcome suggestions or information from anyone interested which may aid the committee in bringing to this House a constructive piece of legislation dealing with this important subject. We are expecting to find a rightful bill after the hearings.

INDEPENDENT STATUS FOR CIVIL AERONAUTICS

The bill also provides for the restoration of the independent status of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. In the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 the Congress established an independent agency, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aeronautics. Through a reorganization order issued in 1940 the Civil Aeronautics Authority was transferred to the Department of Commerce. It placed the functions of the Administrator under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce, changed the name of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Civil Aeronautics Board, and placed it under the jurisdiction of the Department for certain purposes. The House by a large majority voted in favor of a resolution disapproving this reorganization order, but it failed to pass the Senate.

The problem here is not of personalities, but a problem of proper organization of a commission which is a creature of Congress set up to perform its delegated functions. Of the six great legislative commissions, this is the only one that is placed under an executive head. Complete in iself for efficient administration, it has a superimposed executive department which necessarily created duplication and delay in the performance of its functions. This bill provides for an independent Civil Aeronautics Commission to eliminate the present duplication.

The 1938 act provided for an independent investigation of aircraft accidents by an Air Safety Board. This Board was abolished by the 1940 reorganization order and its functions transferred to the Civil Aeronautics Board. Independence of accident investigation has such an important bearing upon safety in civil aeronautics that it seems clear the principle originally established in the 1938 act should be restored. This bill creates the Office of Director of Safety, which officer will be independent of both the Commission and the Administrator, and will be solely responsible for the investigation of aircraft accidents and the reporting of the causes thereof.

STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER AERONAUTICS

The bill provides for a clarification of the jurisdiction of the States and the Federal Government in the regulation and promotion of civil aeronautics. Its purpose is to eliminate conflicts between State and Federal agencies which necessarily result in detriment to the development of the industry and to eliminate duplication of effort between State and Federal agencies. Such conflicts, where unnecessary, result in needless expenditures of public funds and harassment of the persons regulated. The bill attempts to preserve constitutional distinctions between State and Federal jurisdiction as to matters affecting interstate and intrastate commerce. The bill attempts to leave with each agency of Government those activities which it is best equipped to perform.

In view of the inherently interstate character of civil aeronautics and the vital necessity of uniformity in regulation, this bill provides for the issuance of safety regulations by a single Federal agency, but permits the enforcement thereof by State agencies. This provision follows the bill the House passed in 1925 which, after amendment in the Senate, became the Air Commerce Act of 1926.

The bill also provides for economic regulation by the Federal Government of all air carriers and air contractors who carry interstate traffic. This includes the issuance of certificates of convenience and necessity, the establishment of rates, and similar functions. The economic regulation of air carriers and air contractors who do not participate in interstate traffic is left completely to State regulation.

This proposed division of functions between State and Federal Government is substantially different from that which was proposed in H. R. 3420, in that it leaves more jurisdiction to the States.

REGULATION OF CONTRACT CARRIERS

H. R. 674 provides for limited regulation of contract carriers by air. The present law does not provide in any respect for the regulation of such carriers except as to certain general safety standards.

The contract carrier, without any economic regulation, is under no obligation to the public to perform its service. He can confine his transportation to those cases that suit his convenience as to weather, time, place, and load. He can skim the cream off the available traffic and leave the less desirable to the common carrier. Without some regulation, he has an unfair relation to the common carrier with whom he may compete. Regulation would afford a more just relation to common carriers and maintain and promote the welfare of contract carriers.

The proposed regulation of contract carriers does not apply to them when they do not participate in the interstate traffic. This bill would authorize appropriations for the maintenance of civil-pilot training. The existing authorization of this service will expire this year on June 30, 1945.

AERONAUTICAL TRAINING AND EDUCATION

The original Pilot Training Act of 1939 contributed enormously to the creation of our air forces in all theaters of the war. There may be no immediate need for this activity, but it is believed that the authority for it should be maintained in permanent law and available whenever a backlog of pilots and aeronautical technicians are required.

It is provided that the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics shall foster the development of aviation education. As we enter the air age it seems essential that the youth of the Nation be made thoroughly familiar with basic aeronautical principles. Just as the mechanical experience of our youth has stood us in good stead during the present war, aeronautical experience will stand us in good stead in any future war.

AIRPORT ZONING

One of the prime essentials to the maintenance of a system of airports is the elimination and prevention of hazards such as surrounding trees and buildings. The value of an investment in an airport can be impaired or completely lost if hazards are permitted to grow up around it and destroy its safe use. Consequently, in order to protect our investment in airports, it is essential to have zone protection.

State and local governments can best perform this service. Federal legislation can and should aid them, however, through the establishment of uniform zoning standards and providing methods to aid them in the acquisition of land and rights of air space.

This bill I have just introduced requires the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to establish uniform zoning standards throughout the United States and authorizes him to aid the local governments if such aid is requested through the use of the Federal power of condemnation of land and air-space rights. This zoning authority, of course, permits requirements to be adapted to the various physical conditions where airports may be located.

INTERNATIONAL AVIATION

The bill also directs the Commission to report to the Congress with respect to the development of this Nation's international air transportation. No effort has been made in the bill to deal extensively with the problems arising out of this phase of air transportation. The relation of our air navigation to international air service is not yet sufficiently developed to determine the extent to which legislation is necessary. The Civil Aeronautics Board is making progress with the hearings of cases involving international routes. It appears that sev-

eral of these cases will probably be brought to a conclusion before the end of the war in Europe. In view of the present uncertainties as to the effect of international arrangements on this commerce, the provisions of the bill dealing with international aviation are limited to a request for a report from the Commission for its information and appraisal of our international aviation problems and its suggestion as to legislation that it deems necessary to meet the needs of the situation.

TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL BY AIR

The Commission and the Postmaster General are required to report to Congress with respect to the carriage of various classes of mail by air in order that the Congress can determine the extent to which air-mail service may be expanded for speedier delivery and the economic benefit of the country.

ESTABLISHMENT OF LOCAL SERVICE

This bill includes provisions designed to aid the Civil Aeronautics Board in developing local air service. Under the present law as interpreted by the Civil Aeronautics Board, it is required to take up feeder line applications case by case. That requirement is a handicap to the efforts of the Board to coordinate these local services throughout the country into the national system of air transportation. The bill would permit the Commission to decide tentatively where interstate feeder lines should go, thus facilitating the proper adjustment of local services on a national basis. The Board's tentative findings would then be subjected to a hearing by all interested parties before a final approval would be made.

Other technical amendments made would facilitate the issuance of certificates for feeder service.

MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In addition to those changes specifically discussed above, the bill includes many others which experience under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 has shown to be necessary.

The bill provides for the codification of all civil aviation law into one statute, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, in order to eliminate confusion due to the fragmentary aviation legislation on the statute books at the present time.

It proposes that the Weather Bureau have greater power to provide international meteorological service and otherwise perfects the aviation law dealing with the Weather Bureau.

Pilots and their crew members on air carrier aircraft are authorized to exercise the control necessary to prevent breaches of the peace similar to that possessed by the master of a vessel in water navigation.

The administrative procedure of the Civil Aeronautics Board is proposed to be amended to facilitate the performance of its work during the crucial period into which we are now entering.

Outside of military pilots, the largest group of operators of airplanes is now the private flyer group. The numbers of this are exceeded by the military only on account of the war emergency.

Permanently, the private flyers will constitute the largest group of users of the airplane; in relative importance, it will be the greatest group.

This proposed bill will accomplish, among other things, three outstanding ones for the private flyer:

First. It will make it easier for the private citizens to acquire his license to fly and operate his machine;

Second. His one license will give him a right to operate in every State and under uniform regulatory provisions; and

Third. The adoption of a national system of airports, including numerous fields—coordinated as to location and provided with uniform navigation facilities—will in effect give the private flyer a new air age in which to operate his plane, both for utility and pleasure purposes.

The provisions of this bill are designed to aid the private flyer and the commercial operator alike.

The general purpose of this bill is to give air navigation and its related industries their just place in our transportation system and consistently with the economic welfare of the Nation.

Radio Talk by Chester Bowles Concerning Pressure Tactics on O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith a recent radio talk by Mr. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, relative to pressure groups and lobbyists. It is as follows:

Hello everybody, from time to time we all hear talk about pressure groups and lobbyists, and their efforts to influence Government actions. We in O. P. A. have often been the particular object of pressure attacks, as selfish groups attempt to secure the advantage of higher prices.

Recently a pressure-group plan was brought to my attention which illustrates vividly some of our problems in holding the line against inflationary price increases. If only one group were involved, I should let it go as another misguided, unfortunate effort on the part of a minority group, not worthy of your time or my time, once it had been detected.

But evidence has come to me that other groups are considering the same type of activity, to bring pressures on our Congress and to break down O. P. A. price regulations.

So, after a lot of thought, I've decided to talk to you about it this week. I'm going to show you just how this pressure-group machinery works—so that we can all be on our guard to distinguish real from synthetic public opinion.

Like almost all such pressure group activities, this latest case is the work of a misguided minority. They are a small group of manufacturers from an industry which is on the whole one of the most patriotic and forward-looking business groups in this country. I refer to the stove industry.

Many members of the stove industry, shocked by the efforts of some of their associates, have already called to assure us that the plan in no way represented the desires or the viewpoint of the stove industry as a whole.

Now I am going to start this pressure group story from the outside looking in. I'd like to show you how you as an ordinary citizen might have come across it yourself.

One morning recently, let us assume that you opened one of the leading newspapers in the country. You saw this headline: "Economists assail O. P. A. price policies." You might have found this same story also repeated in another leading paper devoted primarily to business and financial news. The gist of the story you read was that O. P. A. price ceilings prevent the stove industry in particular from making a profit. This statement was signed by a substantial group of economists, with their university connections mentioned.

It certainly looked genuine.

Actually, however, this genuine-looking story is a news counterfeit. It was only one of a series of many steps deliberately planned to influence your opinion and the clear thinking of your Congressmen. It was only one of many steps planned by a publicity firm specifically employed by a minority group in the stove industry to help raise prices for their already profitable industry.

As I speak to you from the radio studio here in Washington, I have in my hand the papers and letters issued confidentially by this publicity firm to their little group of clients in the stove industry. These papers and letters show the steps that led up not only to this single article in the press but to the whole series of carefully laid plans to influence your thinking and that of Congress in favor of higher prices for stoves. I am going to tell you, step for step, what those plans are. But before we start you might ask: Mr. Bowles, how did you get hold of these confidential papers and letters? The answer is simple—simpler, perhaps, than you think. These papers didn't come into the hands of O. P. A. by any devious gestapo method. They were given to us by several members of the stove industry itself.

These men sent the confidential papers to us because they resented the effort by a small minority to involve the stove industry as a whole in counterfeiting public opinion for selfish purposes.

Now for the story of the pressure groups' plans. It is easy and interesting to reconstruct them.

As long ago as last May a gentleman came into touch with certain members of the stove industry. He represented a publicity firm, the name of which is not important to my story. He saw that this little group of manufacturers wanted higher profits. He offered his services to get those profits for them. He outlined for them a plan by which he felt Congress and the O. P. A. could be intimidated into granting higher stove prices.

It is that plan which I now have in my hands. Let me read parts of this plan to you to show how he and his clients expected to operate.

On page 5 of his plan he says that: "For background editorial use," copies of the presentation urging higher prices are to be "sent to some 700 newspapers as well as to all leading business editors, financial writers, economists, and radio commentators."

Further, he says—let me quote—"We have prepared several editorials on the * * * situation high-lighting the industry's viewpoint for publication in small papers throughout the country. The first two of these," the plan goes on to say, "have been sent out to several hundred papers and probably will * * * be published in many of them."

I am sure the alert and public-spirited newspaper editors in this country will be interested to know that such editorials are headed their way.

Also, on page 5 of this publicity plan we find this interesting clue: "We have also prepared a statement" to be made by certain economists. He then names the economists whom he is going to get to lend their reputations to his words. They are the same economists who later appeared in print uttering the very words prepared for them.

The plan in my hands also states that one of these same economists is preparing a special article on the stove industry's need for higher prices and expects publication soon in one of the leading financial papers. We at O. P. A. were very interested to see that this article did appear only a few days ago in the leading financial paper named in the report in my hands.

The report goes on to say that by personal contact with influential men in business, in radio, in civic, and labor groups, it is hoped that interest will be aroused for the cause of higher stove prices and result in—let me quote—"an increasing mass of public opinion to which Congress and even the O. P. A. are susceptible."

The publicity firm and their clients also plan, according to the report in my hands, to appeal in a skillful way to all of you who are waiting to buy stoves. Magazines and newspaper articles are planned which will play on your need for a new stove and apparently will state that higher prices to the industry would somehow mysteriously produce them. As all of you know, the reason we do not have enough stoves now is the fact that the materials and manpower which are ordinarily used to make stoves are now going into the production of tanks, machine guns, and battleships.

Another and very important part of the high-pressure plan is a widespread appeal to all members of the stove industry to join in this campaign for higher prices and to put pressure on Congress.

One letter addressed to a member of the stove industry, and signed by the publicity man who invented this plan, contains this ominous suggestion:

"I will give you the signal and furnish the working material when the time is indicated for you to go to work on your own Congressman."

I am very happy to tell you that as far as we know only 14 stove manufacturers—only 14 out of the several hundred in the whole industry—have written their Representatives in Congress in the manner suggested.

I believe that this is a great tribute to the fine judgment and honest above-board business practices of the stove industry as a whole, and a testimonial to their generally excellent relationship with O. P. A.

Now, before I get to the final and important point of this talk, I think you may be curious as to what the facts really are about profits in the stove industry.

We have recently surveyed the wartime earnings of a substantial group in the stove industry. We have found that the firms largely continuing in stove production—and selling their stoves at O. P. A. ceiling prices—made three times as much profits before taxes, in the first half of this year, as they averaged in a similar period before the war. The firms concentrating largely on war work averaged four times as much profits.

In a handful of cases, however, a few stove manufacturers have really been squeezed by rising costs. In most of these cases, special price adjustments have been made by O. P. A.

These adjustments were arrived at according to our usual O. P. A. procedure. We studied each case individually, discussed it thoroughly, and then made our decision, based on these facts.

One small group in the stove industry, however, lacked confidence in the fairness of this essentially American and democratic way of doing business in wartime.

I have described the unfortunate methods into which misguided advice took them. What happened to their plan to counterfeit public opinion you now know.

If this selfish effort had succeeded, and if stove prices were increased—only by as little as 10 percent—the industry as a whole stood to gain—and the public to lose—twenty-two to twenty-five million dollars.

Now I come to the important point—the reason I have told this unpleasant story. I believe it illustrates vividly a danger, not only to our economy and our efforts to hold prices and rent from going upward, but to our whole system of democratic government. Friendly and honest discussion is the basis of our democracy. Differences of opinion are not only inevitable, but they are a healthy proof of our democracy.

But when behind closed doors public opinion is counterfeited, it is time, I believe, particularly during this war period, that all of you should know about it.

I am told that other such plans are in preparation by other small minority groups in some industries. Already sincere and honest businessmen have warned us of three of them. We are watching these developments with interest.

Let me make this point emphatically clear: Businessmen from one end of the country to the other, with relatively few exceptions, have played fair with O. P. A. They have not always agreed with the way we have gone about our job of holding down prices and rents. But as a rule they have played their cards on top of the table. They have known that price control is a national wartime protection for all groups—businessmen, workers, farmers, consumers.

As long as we pursue a policy of full, frank, open discussion, I am sure the great bulk of our people will remain solidly behind their Congress, and behind the O. P. A., in resisting any pressure group methods. I'm sure you will support us in the big democratic job of protecting all of us against inflationary increases in wartime costs, wartime prices, and wartime rents.

Next week I shall not be on the air. So let me wish you now the very happiest Christmas that we can expect, until this great war has been finally won.

Mr. Bowles, in commenting on this speech, stated:

This speech was based on a plan developed by a public relations firm at the request of a minority group in the stove industry. This plan was sent to us by a group of people in the industry who resented these pressure tactics. The plan was complete in all its detail, including copies of the "canned" editorials and careful instructions on just what everyone concerned was expected to do.

The purpose of this program was to increase stove prices, which, for the great majority of the industry, are certainly ample at their present levels. For the few who have been threatened with hardship, we have made special price adjustments.

Of course, we all know that these pressure group programs exist, but this is the first time I have had an opportunity actually to see one in all its detail.

The stove industry as a whole is an unusually fine group and one which has cooperated fully with us from the beginning. For this reason I hesitated for some time to publish the facts about the plan developed by a small minority among them. However, I decided to go ahead because rumors have come to us about several other such plans which seem to be in the early stages of development.

We have, as you know, established methods of working very closely with industry. We have nearly 500 industry advisory groups, most of which hold frequent and regular meetings. In addition, there are hundreds of informal groups in each industry which are working closely with us at all times. It does seem that these meetings offer industry a means of free, frank, open discussion without the need for developing synthetic public opinion as proposed by the stove group plan.

I am hopeful that this speech will have a quieting effect on many of these underground efforts. We will, of course, take every step to make it emphatically clear that this plan is in no sense typical of industry's attitude as a whole.

Increase of Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, while I was overseas last month with the House Committee on Military Affairs this House of Representatives, with only one dissenting vote, passed H. R. 4715 which provided a permanent increase of $400 per annum to the postal employees of the United States. I had actively campaigned in behalf of this meritorious and deserving legislation and was quite disappointed when I learned that a point of order against it was raised and sustained in the Senate.

I trust that this body will immediately pass a bill similar to H. R. 4715 so that our deserving public servants in the post office may immediately obtain an increase in wages which will permit them to meet the increased cost of living.

The following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of December 28 last accurately presents the views not only of all the constituents in my congressional district but the thoughts and convictions of the entire population of the Borough of Brooklyn:

NEW CONGRESS SHOULD PROMPTLY VOTE PAY RAISE TO UNITED STATES POSTAL WORKERS

With its dying breath, the recent Congress denied to the postal employees of the United States a request for a raise in wages to meet the upped cost of living. These valiant public servants have not had a lift in their salaries for over a quarter of a century. Yet Senator BAILEY called the plea the first step on the road to inflation.

There are many ways to kill a cat, the saying goes. These are, evidently, a variety of methods to bypass the Little Steel formula, but not for the weather-beaten veterans of the postal routes. Here is a deserving case. In sleet, in snow, in torrid temperatures, the mails go through. At holiday times when the rest of us look forward to a bit of relaxation, the burdened pack-bearers of greetings to all trudge along their weary ways in faithful, undeviating service.

Thousands and thousands of these employees are family men. They are the kind of governmental workers who have cast their life's work with the system and are at the mercy of the Congress for a fair return for their labors. No giant national affiliated unions rush to their defense. They are on their own and their own is not enough.

We suggest that public-spirited citizens add one little extra burden to the mailmen's already overweighted pack by dropping a note to Members of Congress asking a better break for these faithful workers. That is one letter any one of them would be delighted to deliver.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of January 2, 1945:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

Since the return of Gen. Charles de Gaulle from Moscow, where he signed an all-out treaty of alliance with Russia, the French press has taken an even more critical tone toward the United States than formerly.

This is regarded as an interesting indication of the shape of things to come. When newspapers in the United States or Great Britain carry unpleasant or antagonistic stories or editorials concerning other nations, they represent the views of the writers or possibly of the newspapers themselves. But articles published in the press of countries where there is a strict political censorship and where the writers are confined to expressing only the views of the government, have a totally different significance.

It has been known in Washington for some time that a strong anti-American propaganda was started in France even before the invasion of Normandy. And it was not the Nazis and the Vichy government alone which were responsible for such a propaganda. Certain sections of the underground movement, those which were more political than militarily minded, had received instructions from their chiefs outside of France to criticize severely the American policies and their authors.

It was believed, however, that after the liberation of France, accomplished principally through the efforts of the American forces, there might be a change of heart as far as the "inspirers" of the censored French press were concerned. But nothing of the sort has happened.

On Christmas Day three important Paris newspapers, Ce Soir, Combat, and France-Tireur, celebrated editorially the assassination of Admiral Jean Francois Darlan, whose collaboration with the allied forces which landed in North Africa on November 7, 1942, had been accepted by the American Government for reasons of military expediency. These newspapers, representing the new political forces of France, which are centered around the FFI, charged that the Anglo-Saxons have not abandoned the Darlanist policies and are trying to place, by force if necessary, other Darlans in key positions in the very country they are liberating. The Paris press insisted that the crises which exist today in Belgium, Italy, and Greece are the result of "bourgeois" control of policies in Washington and London.

Obviously, because of the new treaty of alliance with the U. S. S. R., the French writers or the political censors who are turning on the green or red lights did not mention the fact that in the countries liberated by the Red armies no government can exist unless it is fully approved and installed by the Russian military commander and unless it is following the policies ordered by Moscow.

American diplomats who wish to minimize these trends and still believe that eventually the old close relationship with France will be reestablished say that such outbursts as those in the Paris press are natural. The French are now fighting principally a political war. Less than 50,000 soldiers are actually at the front fighting the common enemy. Since their government is satisfied that Germany is going to be defeated by the other Allies and France will receive a large share of German territory, the main preoccupation of the French people should be the reorganization of the world along new lines.

After the 1940 disaster and the subsequent years of servitude to the Germans, the French feel that their previous political systems—monarchy and democratic republic—have failed and something else must be tried. The inspiration for the new experiment comes from Moscow. This the Government of France has shown not only by signing a very comprehensive defensive-offensive treaty of alliance with Russia, but also by its refusal to negotiate a similar pact with the British, who were more responsible than any other government for the establishment of General De Gaulle as head of the French Government.

Recently returned Americans say that France, like the rest of the countries which we are now liberating, is bound to be antagonistic to the "bourgeois" American Government for a while at least.

Address by Hon. Robert F. Wagner, of New York, at National Lawyers' Guild Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], on December 13, 1944, at a dinner meeting of the National Lawyers' Guild, in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Lawyers Guild, and friends, I am very happy to be here tonight—happy to be among so many of my old friends—even happier to be among those who one and all have been the friends of the same liberal causes that I have. These are indeed the times that try men's souls, when every personal interest must be submerged in the great issues which affect all mankind. And that is why I am glad this meeting was postponed until after the recent election, so that no flavor of personal candidacy would be present on this occasion.

With singular consistency, the National Lawyers Guild has enlisted in its membership those who are acutely aware of the new world and the critical age in which we are living. The guild's action on public questions has made it clear that it looks upon law as a living and growing institution. To all of you, precedents are but the lamp-posts along the path we have traveled, rather than Chinese walls to imprison our future course. Tonight, I am here to summon your ever-increasing interest in a great cause, to ask you to embrace a historic opportunity—the opportunity of contributing a share, great or modest, in the establishment of law and order among nations.

There is no problem of defining the objectives for which mankind is yearning. Mankind craves peace and tranquillity, the reign of law and justice in international conduct, coupled with freedom from fear of external aggression. This generation has been given the task of realizing this goal. Toward this end the blood and treasure of all civilized communities are being poured forth, conscious that if we miss this great chance now it may never come again.

What are the obstacles to success? It is not the unwillingness of the plain people anywhere. It is not their resistance which might cause us to fail as we failed once before. The obstacles exist rather in the voluntary subservience of many of our statesmen to the slavery of words. They are fettered by words like "sovereignty." They are shackled by phrases like "liberty of action." They would hesitate to enter the Garden of Eden until they knew the name of every tree that grew therein. And as usual, there are those who have uncanny capacity to find in our Constitution the letter that killeth instead of the spirit that giveth light.

I suppose that the quibblers and the doubters have always been with us. Beyond question, among the great throng that stood at the base of Mount Sinai to receive the Ten Commandments, there were some who were ready with amendments and reservations.

But we must always remember that the history of our law and the history of our Nation—in fact, the whole history of Anglo-American institutions—have subordinated logic to experience and have fashioned new ideas to meet new facts. Consider the inventive resourcefulness which entered into the development of equity alongside the vastly more rigid common law. Reflect on the genius which, unguided by a written constitution, fashioned a modern democracy out of a once feudal kingdom like England. I have no doubt that, in 1789, there must have been legalists who said that the concept of a sovereign nation composed of many sovereign states was logically impossible. But the great lawyers who sketched the outlines of our Federal Union were not legalists.

It is astounding to contemplate how much progress we have made in our system of common law, in our legislation, and in our practice of national government, while by contrast in international relations we are still veritably in the horse-and-buggy age. The ethical concepts, the moral concepts, the practical concepts, which have thus far prevailed in our international thinking are extraordinarily primitive. When we speak of personal honor, we think of obligations and not of rights. But when we speak of national honor, we think solely of some right that might be affronted. When we speak of a great citizen, we mean one who has labored for the common weal. But when we speak of a great power, we think only of its strength and armaments. When we think of individual liberty, we realize that it is attainable only under a uniform and democratic system of law. But when it is suggested that a sovereign nation subscribe to similarly established international law, a shudder goes through the starched shirts of the junior clerks in every state department and foreign office.

The twentieth century cries out for a newer and richer concept of the place of a nation in the family of nations. We must reach for practical devices that balance obligations with power, that place justice above self-will, and that replace isolationism with responsibility. The people are more than ready for such a concept. The lawyers must not stand in the way. The lawyers must not even be neutral. The lawyers must invent the symbol for the concept, and the practical machinery for its effective application.

In the light of these considerations, we may well reflect on the current hotly debated constitutional issue; whether the American representative to the council of the proposed international security organization should

have power to commit a predetermined contingent of our armed forces for use in restraining aggression? This is not the time to enter upon a complete discussion of this question. But I believe that such a provision in the constitution of the new international security organization is crucial to the success of the enterprise. It is crucial because of the very fact that the democratic nations are also peace-loving nations. They are not ready to declare war on slight provocation. They move only when it is manifest that there is no course other than war. They act only when the danger is clear, imminent, and overwhelming. But by that time, the little aggression has become a major aggression; the little conflict has become a great war. What might have been prevented by prompt show of force must be undone at the price of wholesale slaughter.

Thus no action was taken when Manchuria was attacked. Thus no effective action was taken when Ethiopia was trampled underfoot. Thus we find the world in the midst of its present agony and tragedy.

No one seriously disputes the proposition that an international security organization must, beyond all else, have the military means at its disposal for prompt application. But we are told that this is unattainable because the Constitution vests the war-making power exclusively in Congress. We are told—and how many times have we not been told before—that we cannot attain a supremely important objective because the Constitution forbids it.

Let me not be misunderstood. I am familiar with the long struggle of the people to curb the war-making propensities of their self-appointed kings and rulers, by forbidding them to make war without the consent of the people's representatives. That long struggle is one of the noble chapters in the march of human freedom. I would not impair one iota of that progress. The authority to declare war and the power to make war must remain in the hands of the Congress. On that issue, our Constitution is eternally right and eternally clear.

But the plan now under discussion does not propose that the President or the American delegate should possess authority to declare war.

It does not propose that any individual shall have power to appropriate funds or mobilize American manpower or resources for war making. The plan proposes merely that the President and the delegate shall have available the use of a police force—a police force constituted initially, so far as this Nation is concerned, by Congress—and operating ab initio so far as this Nation is concerned, for purposes defined in general by act of law.

This proposition is not shocking, or even novel. In Tripoli in 1801, in Algiers in 1815, in China in 1900, in Mexico, Nicaragua, and Haiti, Presidents of the United States have used force without congressional declarations of war. They have used only such force as Congress, and only Congress, had made and could make available for the purpose. The question of whether, in the particular instances I have cited, the decision to use force was wise or unwise is beside the point—for that same question of wisdom in the light of history might be raised with respect to some of the wars which Congress declared. The only significance of the illustrations is this: Throughout our history, the use of a police force to enforce the laws and treaties of the United States has not been regarded as war. This distinction has been recognized and lived by. Its success in practical application is the best evidence that our Chief Executives, as well as our judges, have given that living construction to our Constitution which is the essential spirit of that great charter of our liberties.

Let us not be disturbed by the difficulties of formulating some pretty definition, which would distinguish between war making and international policing, in a manner to satisfy the most critical of textbook legalists. Nobody has ever had written a final definition of interstate commerce, or of the respective powers of our Nation and our States. Through more than 150 years of our constitutional history, we have been weaving that definition into the pattern of our national existence by deciding cases as they arise.

Year by year, necessity has supplied refinements in the definition to meet new cases and new controversies. It is incomprehensible to me that we, who have accepted this pragmatic philosophy in dealing with the relatively smaller matters of the daily business of our courts should reject this pragmatic philosophy in dealing with the supreme problems of world peace.

The lay public, I am profoundly convinced, has a deep understanding of the fundamental issue here involved. It is our task, as lawyers, to prevent public opinion from being dazzled or dissuaded by any false show of legalism, emanating from skilled obstructionists. You, ladies and gentlemen, as members of a profession learned in the Constitution and its history, have a high and solemn duty to perform.

Charge yourselves, therefore, with the obligation to relieve any public concern—so that this Nation may speak with a united voice in the councils of the world—and so that America may discharge fully its obligation for the maintenance of an honorable peace throughout this one world in which we live.

Christmas Address by the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Christmas address by the President, broadcast to the people of the United States on Christmas Eve last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is not easy to say "Merry Christmas" to you, my fellow Americans, in this time of destructive war. Nor can one lightly say "Merry Christmas" tonight to our armed forces at their battle stations all over the world—or to our allies who fight by their side.

Here, at home, we will celebrate this Christmas Day in our traditional American way—because of its deep spiritual meaning to us; because the teaching of Christ are fundamental in our lives; and because we want our youngest generation to grow up knowing the significance of this tradition and the story of the coming of the immortal Prince of Peace and good will. But, in perhaps every home in the United States sad and anxious thoughts will be continually with the millions of our loved ones who are suffering hardships and misery, and who are risking their very lives to preserve for us and for all mankind, the fruits of His teachings and the foundations of civilization itself.

The Christmas spirit lives tonight in the bitter cold of the front lines in Europe and in the heat of the jungles and swamps of Burma and the Pacific islands. Even the roar of our bombers and fighters in the air and the guns of our ships at sea will not drown out the messages of Christmas which come to the hearts of our fighting men. The thoughts of these men tonight will turn to us here at home around our Christmas trees, surrounded by our children and grandchildren and their Christmas stockings and gifts—just as our own thoughts go out to them, tonight and every night, in their distant places.

We all know how anxious they are to be home with us, and they know how anxious we are to have them—and how determined every one of us is to make their day of homecoming as early as possible. And—above all—they know the determination of all right-thinking people and nations, that Christmases such as those that we have known in these years of world tragedy shall not come again to beset the souls of the children of God.

This generation has passed through many recent years of deep darkness, watching the spread of the poison of Hitlerism and fascism in Europe—the growth of imperialism and militarism in Japan—the final clash of war all over the world. Then came the dark days of the fall of France, and the ruthless bombing of England, and the desperate Battle of the Atlantic, and of Pearl Harbor and Corregidor and Singapore.

Since then the prayers of good men and women and children the world over have been answered. The tide of battle has turned, slowly but inexorably, against those who sought to destroy civilization.

On this Christmas Day, we cannot yet say when our victory will come. Our enemies still fight fanatically. They still have reserves of men and military power. But, they themselves know that they and their evil works are doomed. We may hasten the day of that doom if we here at home continue to do our full share.

We pray that that day may come soon. We pray that until then, God will protect our gallant men and women in the uniforms of the United Nations—that He will receive into His infinite grace those who make their supreme sacrifice in the cause of righteousness and love of Him and His teachings.

We pray that with victory will come a new day of peace on earth in which all the nations of the earth will join together for all time. That is the spirit of Christmas, the holy day. May that spirit live and grow throughout the world in all the years to come.

The Use of Statistics in the Formulation of a National Full Employment Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, before a meeting of the American Statistical Association, held at the Willard Hotel, in Washington, D. C., on December 27 last. The address is entitled "The Use of Statistics in the Formulation of a National Full Employment Policy."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY A. WALLACE

Each statistician can well remember when he or she first began definitely to use statis-

tics for a specific purpose. I, myself, first became intrigued with statistics in the calculation of corn-hog price ratios back in 1915. A little later the problem of using multiple correlation coefficients to determine the relationship between summer rainfall and temperature, on the one hand, and corn yields on the other hand, resulted in a paper which the Weather Bureau was kind enough to publish in 1920. In December 1923 I presented a paper before this association on the determination of hog prices by hog supplies and business activity. The statistical aspects of Fisher's quantitative theory of money intrigued me and in 1920 I became one of the vice presidents of the Stable Money League. This brought me into contact with Carl Snyder and Randolph Burgess, of the New York Federal Reserve Bank. Carl Snyder strongly believed in aristocratic capitalism and endeavored to prove in every field of human activity that the dispersal of human ability followed the Pareto distribution curve. I believed in both economic and genetic democracy, and therefore Carl Snyder and I would have many a long argument whenever we got together at the time of these annual statistical and economic gatherings.

I have also found myself interested in the quantitative approach in political analysis. About 1928 Carl Snyder began to develop his statistical method of forecasting elections. In 1936 Louis Bean, working independently, developed his method, and I followed the analyses of both very closely in comparison with the sampling surveys that Gallup and Roper started.

In the election campaign this year I had an opportunity to merge economic forecasting with political forecasting. The evening of October 28 I heard over the radio the President's Chicago campaign speech and immediately sent him a wire saying: "Your goal of 60,000,000 jobs is perhaps high, but I glory in your daring, and, as you say, America can do the seemingly impossible. We are predicting you will carry 36 States and have a 3,000,000 popular majority."

The President wired back on November 1 that he was glad I liked the Chicago show and that he promised to make good on the 60,000,000 jobs if I would do the same with regard to my predictions concerning the 36 States and the 3,000,000 popular majority.

History will record that something was done toward the formulation of economic policy for this country in that interchange of statistical wires. In practically every campaign speech I made from November 1 onward I would tell my audience about this interchange of wires and then say, "The President has put me on the spot. I've got to make good on this election prediction and I want you to help me." In some of the extemporaneous speeches I think I even went so far as to say, "If you will vote for Roosevelt you help get me off the spot and put him on." The people smiled at the joke. Seriously speaking, the President in his address to Congress last January 11 and again in his Chicago October 28 campaign speech, referred to his economic bill of rights. This bill of rights must be translated into legislative action. That's what the vote meant on November 7. Item No. 1 on the economic bill of rights is "the right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation."

Full employment in the United States is the first step on the road to permanent world-wide peace. Other nations look at the tremendous economic power of the United States, at the violent fluctuations in the American business cycle, at the previously demonstrated ineptitude of the American Government in dealing with the problem—and, after seeing all this and looking toward the future, they shudder and pray. They pray for full employment in the United States, not because they love the United States, but because they know that without full employment here there is a world-wide trouble.

Without full employment here we undermine world price levels and world trade, the results of which reach into the economic and political fabric of every other country. Without full employment we cannot have a successful foreign economic policy of reduced trade barriers and a high volume of both exports and imports.

In the next session of Congress one of the first bills to be introduced will no doubt be the full employment bill of 1945, designed to carry out item No. 1 on the economic bill of rights. This bill or some other bill dealing with full employment will, in my opinion, become even more significant for the future than the agricultural bills which Congress wrestled with in the twenties. "Equality for agriculture" was the farmers' battle cry beginning in 1924. That which gave definitive striking power to the phrase, "Equality for agriculture," was a statistical price concept worked out by Hugh Johnson and George Peek back in 1921. They presented this concept to Harding's agricultural conference in January of 1922 but it was not put in legislative form until 1924.

The abstract concept of justice in terms of prices was given a mathematical formulation by the young economic statisticians in the Department of Agriculture in the middle 1920's. As the years went on, the idea of parity price more and more gripped the imagination of farm leaders. I well remember the exultation in the voice of George Peek when the concept of justice for agriculture was written into the preamble of the farm legislation back in May of 1933.

For worker, businessman, farmer, and, above all, for the statesman interested in preventing the hardships which create revolution in other countries, the concept of jobs for all is even more important than price equality for agriculture. Farmers are much better off with price equality and full employment than they are with price equality and unemployment. In other words, a medium piece out of a big pie of consumer purchasing power may be a whole lot larger than a large piece out of a small pie. What the economic statesman wants is the biggest possible pie for the whole world in order that all the nations, all the regions, and all the groups may have a good slice.

Jobs for all should and will be the economic battle cry of all the peoples of the world for the next 20 years. A phrase of this sort is good as a political slogan, but if it is ever really to amount to anything in the life of the Nation it must have a statistical formulation of some kind. Somebody must do for the economy as a whole what General Johnson and George Peek did for agriculture when they worked out the underlying statistics of the phrase "equality for agriculture."

Impetus recently was given to the coming battle for full employment by Jim Patton, president of the Farmers' Union. I didn't learn the story from Jim Patton or from any Farmers' Union member. A Government statistician told me how Patton, pondering on the role of investment for a post-war gross national output of $200,000,000,000, was impressed by the Simon Kuznets national-income data. Here he found that over any 10-year period about 20 percent of the total volume of goods and services produced in this country was represented by so-called capital formation. As I understand it, gross capital formation as used by the statisticians in the Department of Commerce and the National Bureau of Economic Research consists of new construction of all kinds, including buildings, roads, and plant and equipment, for both replacement and expansion. In 1929, when there was substantially full employment, these items amounted to around $20,000,000,000 and the total national product of goods and services was around a hundred billion dollars.

In order to have full employment after the war, Jim Patton reasoned that it would be necessary to have a total product of $200,000,000,000 at present prices and wages, and therefore an annual expenditure on capital goods amounting to around $40,000,000,000. He was anxious to stimulate discussion and hoped the $40,000,000,000 figure would serve that purpose. Patton was a friend of Senator MURRAY, of Montana, who also was chairman of the War Contracts Subcommittee. He therefore submitted to this subcommittee a rough draft of a legislative measure designed to have the Government provide for a forty-billion-dollar level of capital investment every year. The subcommittee forwarded this proposal to the various Government agencies. Some of them assumed that Patton meant to rely on the generating power of capital investment as the sole source of economic activity. Others felt the forty-billion figure did not necessarily represent the precisely correct amount of investment which might be necessary to secure full employment in any given year, and some felt that fiscal policy, wage levels, foreign trade, and other matters should also be dealt with. As a result of these criticisms the original draft was broadened.

Its present form is the proposed full employment bill which was brought forcibly to public attention by newspaper stories on December 18. When both the New York Times and PM give a bill a big front page play on the same day, there must be something to it. The President's figure of 60,000,000 jobs and Senator MURRAY's full employment bill of 1945 have in them great thought-provoking power. I am sure there are many improvements which must be made in the phraseology and content of the proposal but the Murray bill does have the supreme merit of focusing attention on the key spot.

I know many of the statisticians and economists here in the various agencies who have in recent years developed the basic data on the national income and have been drawing up patterns of national expenditure and income for full employment. This bill capitalizes on this constructive work.

This is not the occasion for any detailed discussion of the legislative, administrative, and economic features of this bill. In brief, the bill declares it to be the national policy to secure as much employment as possible through private enterprise and in addition provide for sufficient desirable Government programs to insure the jobs necessary for all who want to work. It calls for setting up an annual Nation's budget for jobs in addition to the annual Federal Budget. It calls for estimating the number of jobs needed during the ensuing year or years to provide full employment, and for estimating the gross national product or total expenditures at the expected level of prices by business, consumers, and Government required to provide that total number of jobs. It further calls for estimating the prospective volume of investment and other expenditures by business, consumers, and Government including expenditures in foreign trade. In case the prospective expenditures are likely to fall short, Government is directed first to encourage increased private employment, and then, if necessary, a general program of increased Federal expenditures to make up the difference, these expenditures to include assistance to business, useful public works, public services for health, education, slum clearance, conservation, and development of natural resources and other programs.

I find in this proposed bill something that has hitherto been lacking in most of our post-war planning, namely, a clear understanding of the necessity for active interplay between the executive and the legislative branches of our Government. The bill recognizes the key role of the Congress in determining our basic national policies. At the

same time it provides a method of dramatizing economic programs, of raising to the level of high politics the economic deliberations of our President and of the Members of our Senate and House of Representatives. Under this bill, there would inevitably be basic disagreements between various political groups as to how much emphasis should be put upon measures to stimulate private enterprise and how much emphasis upon direct Federal investment. There would inevitably be conflicts between the President and many vocal groups in the Congress. In actuality, the common man would have no guaranty of his right to a job unless he were politically organized to see to it that his President and his Congress adopted those specific policies and those specific programs that would actually assure full employment. Which is just as it should be.

Under the bill, however, if the wrong policies are adopted, it would be infinitely easier for the average man and the average woman to point the finger at the political leader or the political group responsible for those policies. In short, the proposed national production and employment budget would provide a method of political accountability to the people of our country, a yardstick by which the common man could measure the extent to which he has been properly served by his representatives in the Government.

With the bill in operation, both Government and business would be under the necessity of informing the public much more promptly of forthcoming fiscal policy. Business, for its sake, needs prompt information as to Government policies. Likewise Government needs prompt information as to future investment plans of business. The bookkeeping of future investment in both fields can be of the greatest value in molding Government policies and removing business uncertainty. Specifically, I think that the full employment bill might well be amended to provide that tax measures are always to be enacted by June 30 of each year, so that business can know in advance what the fiscal policy of the Government is really going to be.

If the President, as the proposal provides, were to set up a nation's budget along these logical lines, and if, as the proposal further provides, this budget were to be submitted for detailed study by a new Joint Congressional Committee on the Budget, I can foresee considerable extension in the use of the national statistics now available, and the development of a great deal more information on production, employment, incomes, and consumption by regions and by industrial and occupational groups. In a hasty survey of Government statistics required and available for estimating requirements of the proposed full employment bill, made for me by Dr. Stuart Rice, I find that a bill of this sort would lead to filling up certain statistical gaps which must be filled up if unemployment is to be anticipated and prevented. Above everything we must have a more adequate basis for estimating in advance the volume of investments, current and prospective by business, by consumers and by governments.

These inadequacies and gaps in our statistical information should not deter us from making full use of what we have in relation to emerging economic policy. I have always been a believer in exact and complete data, but much progress in policymaking can be made by the use of statistics for operating purposes that may be only 80 to 90 percent complete.

Statisticians and economists, working on national income and national expenditures, seem to be moving in the same direction in various parts of the world. For example, the same line of thought contained in the full employment bill, is emerging also in both England and Australia. In both these countries we find the same emphasis on the public responsibility for maintaining a high level of general purchasing power, and the same concern with the three chief sources of expenditures for funds and services—namely, the consuming public, private business, and government. There is even emerging a common pattern in the statistical lingo and in the handling of the basic facts with regard to consumers' purchases, business investment in plant and equipment, and Government expenditures for ordinary administrative purposes, for war purposes, and for developmental purposes.

Sir William Beveridge has just published a report on Full Employment in a Free Society which I think transcends in importance his masterpiece on social security 2 years ago. Social-security programs, desirable as they are, constitute a minor part of the total stream of purchasing power required to sustain a high level of production and employment. I quote two paragraphs from Beveridge's new book. The first deals with responsibility, the other with the means through a new type of budget.

Bear in mind that this report is based on long study of British prewar and war experience. With regard to state responsibility Beveridge says:

"Employment depends on outlay. Full employment cannot be attained unless outlay in total is sufficient to set up a demand for the whole of the labor that is available for employment. * * * During war a large part of the total outlay is undertaken directly by the State. During peace the bulk of the outlay can, and in a free society will, continue to be private. But the ultimate responsibility for seeing that outlay as a whole, taking public and private outlay together, is sufficient to set up a demand for all the labor seeking employment must be taken by the State, because no other authority or person has the requisite powers. No private enterprise can survey the whole field of industry or insure at all times a demand for all that industry can produce at a price covering its costs. No private enterprise can make finance its servant rather than its master. The outlay of every person or authority other than the state is limited rigidly by the financial resources of that person or authority. The central proposition of this report is that the responsibility of insuring at all times outlay sufficient in total to employ all the available manpower in Britain should formally be placed by the people of Britain upon the state. That first and foremost is what is meant by adopting a national policy of full employment." So much for the Beveridge ideas on governmental responsibility.

With regard to the new type of budget, he says the following:

"The instrument by which the state has influenced outlay in the past has been the annual budget presented, usually about April of each year, by the Chancelor of the Exchequer. This budget has determined directly the sale of public outlay undertaken by the central government; it has to a very large extent determined the outlay of local authorities; by the taxation proposed it has influenced both the extent and the direction of outlay by private citizens. It is through the same instrument of public outlay and of taxation that the state in future must pursue its new objective of adequate total outlay. Adoption of a national policy of full employment means a revolution in national finance—a new type of budget introduced by a minister who, whether or not he continues to be called Chancelor of the Exchequer, is a minister of national finance."

In Australia the head of their Ministry of Post-war Reconstruction, Dr. H. C. Coombs, has adopted very much the same approach. In a recent lecture on "Problems of a High Employment Economy" he states that "The appropriate policy of Government would appear to be as follows:

"(a) To determine a basic public investment program, including all works which it considers of sufficient urgency to be undertaken whatever the level of private investment;

"(b) To discover from private enterprise the scope of their plans;

"(c) If these two programs are judged insufficient, to supplement them by—

"(i) Further investment by private enterprise prepared at the request of and perhaps assisted by the government; and/or

"(ii) The inclusion of projects for public investment of lesser urgency than the basic program already included;

"(d) To have ready numbers of emergency works which could be readily put into operation to supplement the planned program if it proves insufficient."

As the common man, the statistician and the statesman look toward the future, they know that supreme emphasis must be placed on full use of all resources of man, nature, and technology to raise the standard of living of all the world. Both the scientist and the statistician know the productive potentialities are enormous. And this knowledge must make for daring economic projections and bold statesmanship to bring them about. On the statistical side we must have the courage of certain governmental economists who, back in 1940, when most of us thought a 100-billion-dollar output of goods and services was beyond the realm of the probable, cited a firm statistical base for thinking that within 2 years it was physically and technologically possible to raise our annual output to the present equivalent of nearly $200,000,000,000.

Almost no one believed them. The war has proved them right. Contrast their imaginative daring with the fearful, halting attitude of certain nostalgic editorial writers or with those who would have us wait until unemployment is upon us before taking coordinated, preventive measures. Not in such a spirit shall we solve the very great problems of the post-war years.

The war in Europe and in the Pacific has yet to be won and that task must continue as the first preoccupation of our hands, hearts, and minds. Nevertheless, the Seventy-ninth Congress will undoubtedly carry on its shoulders full responsibility for devising full employment legislation. Looking ahead to the day when Congress sees definite signs of peace, the statisticians must anticipate the types of statistics which will inevitably be required. To anticipate the congressional need accurately the statisticians must be necessity acquaint themselves with all that the economists of the Anglo-Saxon and European world have learned as a result of World War No. 2 and the depression following World War No. 1. They must meet with forward-looking Congressmen who are anxious to move with speed when the time comes. They must meet with those business, farm, and labor leaders who are eager to see the United States go ahead with full steam. In the economy of the future the only true national deficit will be labor unemployed and statistical terminology will be more and more concerned with the full use of our resources.

I have given you examples of very specific policy proposals made here and abroad for achieving full employment. As I have said, I am not here concerned with the administrative mechanics of a full employment policy, but rather with the principles it should follow. Whether or not we formalize the Nation's Budget, we must adopt the idea it represents. The essential idea is that the Federal Government is ultimately responsible for full employment and can discharge its responsibility only by planning in advance to synchronize all of its programs with the programs of private enterprise so that the whole national income will be maintained at the full employment level.

Fraternalism, a Source of Adequacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Fraternalism, a Source of Adequacy," delivered by me before the Grand Lodge of Maryland, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, at the Maryland Casualty Co. auditorium, Baltimore, Md., on December 11, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to be with you this evening. When I was asked to speak, my only problem was what the subject should be.

In this fast-changing world, it is well sometimes that we briefly turn away from the immediate problems and refresh ourselves in talking and thinking about great ideas and great principles.

We hear so much about post-war problems—national and international. We read in the paper how in Greece, Greeks are fighting Greeks. We read of the vast difficulties encountered by the liberated peoples in Belgium, France, Poland, and elsewhere.

In this country, too, we hear a great deal of talk on the weighty subject of international collaboration and cooperation—so much talk, in fact, that many people fail to remember the lesson of history. Bluntly, that lesson is this: No agreement between nations will be of any effect no matter how solemnly signed or undertaken unless there is back of the promised and written word the integrity of purpose, the mutuality of interest, the sense of sanctity of international promises.

But tonight, I shall not speak to you on these problems.

I have chosen, rather, the subject Fraternalism—A Source of Adequacy, a subject which is just as shallow as each of us may make it, or just as deep as the infinite spaces. When we plumb its depths, we find adequacy. And is not that what each of us owes his day and his generation—to be individually adequate?

I hope that this will not be simply a common occasion, but a great one. Would it not be wonderful if we could start some dormant human being this evening up Jacob's ladder? Would it not be a rich experience to plant in the mind of some listener a seed that would bear fruit, making him or her a great living force for good in this community and Nation? It would not be the first time that a common man has seized a common occasion and made it great.

Before a man can lift himself he must live his thoughts. He must keep his mind open to the great truths that constantly seek to enter into his portals. Then, once they have entered, he must act upon them.

The world recognizes that ideas are power. It knows that in every life "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." It knows that throughout history, the great man and woman has been he or she who has become possessed of and by some great forward-moving idea.

Let us turn, then, to our immediate subject, fraternalism.

First, we need here what Goethe asked for with his dying breath, "more light." Fraternalism is one of the three great ideas presented by Rousseau before the birth of our Republic. The other two ideas were liberty and equality. The dictionary defines "fraternity" as a gathering together of folks for the purpose of exemplifying brotherhood. Fraternalism radiates friendliness. There can be no brotherhood or fraternalism without those qualities known as friendship, charitableness, fellowship, love, and truth.

Mere words, you say. Yes; to some—to others they are filled with the light of life; they are aflame with inner meaning. Life has meaning.

Having this in mind, let us see some examples of true fraternalism.

1. I know an individual who had not awakened to the thought that it was her duty to expect great things of herself. One day a man, exemplifying the spirit of fraternity, brought home the great truth that this was a duty of each individual. He said:

"It doesn't matter what other people think. If your plans and your airms are right, no matter if they call you a crank or a dreamer, just believe in yourself."

The result of his action was that woman's dedication of her life to service.

It was Marie Corelli who said:

"If we choose to be no more than clods of clay, then we shall be used as clods of clay for braver feet to tread on. If you want to paralyze your own future, think of yourself as a weakling, not as good as others."

You remember the story of the eagle which had been chained. It was captured as a young bird, and it could never get away. It used to march out to the end of the chain and back again. One day a link in the chain broke, and the eagle marched out beyond its former limits, spread its wings and flew. A man who is self-reliant, positive, optimistic, and has faith in himself, begets poise, assurance, and confidence. The churchman quotes, "According to your faith, be it unto you."

There is a difference between mere egotism and the faith that comes from consciousness of being one with the Infinite, and possessing, therefore, the necessary ability to go ahead.

Today, civilization needs this mental poise, this confidence, this faith in self. Paul had it when he said, "Now are we the sons of God." Through this powerful statement, he secured the might of the Infinite behind all his endeavor. Always, he lived so close to the Divine Presence that he drew forth almost limitless power to move forward.

Was it not faith that maintained the spirit of Columbus when he was jeered at, and Fulton when he attempted his first trip on the *Clairmont* up the Hudson?

Now, please understand me, I am not asking you to believe in your mortal bigness. I am asking you to believe in the grandeur that is you—the Divine within.

2. "The next time the thought comes that you are a failure, kick the intruder out." This is the remark I heard a man say once to a fellow who was discouraged and needed a warm manifestation of fraternalism.

Some years ago I saw many men who had lost money and property and position, and in spite of the loss, had come through with a smile. These men had learned it didn't pay to drag the ghost of yesterday along with them into the present or into the tomorrow. They had found out that if they did a lot of foolish things, made a lot of imprudent investments, lost their money, that they still had no right to destroy their happiness by bringing up these phantoms of the past. They had found they had no right to waste their energy worrying over the dead. "Let the dead past bury its dead." They had found that there is one way, and only one way, to carry on with bitter experiences and blunders and mistakes, and that is to bury them. They had left "their low-vaulted pasts" and "were building more stately mansions for their soul."

3. If we really want to be fraternal in our actions, we must transmit a feeling for beauty to our fellows. Why are so many folks unhappy, soured on the world, pessimistic? Because they do not appreciate the beauty that is around them—the entrancing sunset, the starlit night, the falling leaves—the beauty in Nature, in human beings, in music, in art, in literature, in religion.

The Great Teacher said:

"Consider the lilies of the field; they toil not, neither do they spin, yet Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these."

One of the great experiences of life is to become a lover of the beautiful. The star that twinkles at night, the running brook, the budding flower, all bid us to look for the Author of the beautiful. Without an appreciation of the riches of beauty, no life can be poised or symmetrical.

Read the story, The Green Light, and see how the dean eradicated the drabness in human lives and replaced it with the love of beauty, the love of man, the love of service.

Remember in Hawthorne's story of the Stone Face, the lad who looked at the benign countenance until in old age he himself reflected all the virtue of that face.

Several years ago, standing at the edge of the great canyon, there was revealed a picture of such beauty and majesty, that my whole soul thrilled with the sense of sublimity and grandeur.

A contemplation of the subject of beauty has transformed many a plain face. It has done away prejudice, selfishness, envy, and anxiety. It has beautified the countenance more than cosmetics or massage will.

4. The main function of brotherhood is to be a discriminate giver. Do you realize the importance not only to yourself but to others of carrying pleasant news?

It is a medical fact that mental discord saps vitality, lessens courage, and shortens life. Someone has said that for every living creature a bath of love and good will is more important than a water bath. Therefore every individual must realize that in being good unto others he is being good unto himself.

The greatest giver is not he who doles out he most money. It is he who, like the Master, brings to the lives of all whom he contacts the great ideas of strength, courage, and love which remake their spiritual desert into a fertile orchard.

Tolstoi had the idea when he was approached for alms by a palsied beggar on the street of Moscow. Tolstoi gave him instead an idea. That afternoon the beggar was no longer palsied. With starry eyes he repeated, "He called me 'friend.'"

I wonder if I am conveying the full import of my message? We may discuss this matter of "fraternalism" very glibly, failing to recognize that within it can be found the solution of many of our problems, social, economic, and political. In addition, it can be the deciding factor in our entire personal happiness. There is something wrong when we become so worried and absorbed in making a living that we cannot make a life. We were made to express joy and prosperity, gladness and pleasure. We were made to believe in ourselves.

When two workmen were helping Sir Christopher Wren build St. Paul's Cathedral in London, and one was asked what he was doing, he replied he was hammering out rock; the other, "I am helping Sir Christopher build a cathedral."

It was Arnold, of Rugby, who saw in the English brats "a spark of the divine." And it was this insight that changed the course of English history.

When I think of the great "brothers" of the world, those men who demonstrated best what we mean by fraternity, I do not call to my mind men like Carnegie and Rockefeller,

fine as their gifts may be; for they bestowed treasures of worldly wealth.

But there comes to my mind those great givers who gave eternal truths that cleared the beclouded intellects of men. I think of those who inspired others as did the lowly Nazarene who taught man that he was not mere mud, but a spark of the Infinite; the Nazarene who taught also that man's conception of himself and of Diety were erroneous, that instead of a vengeful God, Deity was Love; who taught that the real man never stops existing, and that no matter what his earthly vicissitudes, man in the spirit is one with God.

I have spoken seriously. I have not interspersed my remarks with any jokes. For I deeply feel that it is time that leaders like you men and women resolve to accept the great challenge of adequacy.

We must advance from our state of arrested development. We must awaken from this dream existence, and in the solution of our daily problems we must discover within ourselves and display unto others more vision, more fraternity.

I repeat, then, my message: Be ye adequate.

Tribute to Edwin A. Halsey by Gould Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute paid by Mr. Gould Lincoln and published in the Washington Star, to the very capable and popular Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Edwin A. Halsey.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, a few days ago, Mr. Gould Lincoln, one of the leading columnists of the city, wrote a very fine article about Col. Edwin A. Halsey, Secretary of the Senate, which my distinguished colleague the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has asked to have printed in the RECORD.

I endorse all that Mr. Lincoln says about Colonel Halsey, whom I have known intimately for a period of more than 30 years. He is not only one of the best of men but a most efficient and excellent official of the Government. I do not suppose the Senate ever had a better Secretary. He is popular with all Senators and does a good job in a most pleasant and gracious manner. I take great pleasure in paying this tribute to him.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

The Senate is about to do honor to the ninety-seventh Senator—and at the same time honor itself. It will reelect, at the opening of the new Congress, Col. Edwin A. Halsey, of Virginia, secretary of the Senate—the highest office at its command.

For 12 years Colonel Halsey has served in this capacity. His total service with and for the Senate, however, covers a period of nearly 48 years. From his home, Fern Moss, Tye River, Va., in 1897, he came with his uncle, the late Senator John W. Daniel, to be a page in the Senate.

The office of secretary of the Senate is a proud one. Samuel A. Otis, of Massachusetts, the first to hold it, came to the First Congress from the Continental Congress—and he was retained for a quarter of a century. Party lines were not so closely drawn in those days. Colonel Halsey has been continuously secretary far longer than any others in the last 50 years.

He has, indeed, become an institution at the Capitol, a friend and confidant of Senators and others high in the Government. It was written of him several years ago; "Behind the fanfare, oratory, and glamour of senatorial prestige, a clock works to keep the Senators running. The man who winds the clock is Colonel Halsey." Always he is the right-hand man of the Senate leader—on and off the floor—in the routine work of the Upper House. His spacious offices just across the corridor from the Senate Chamber are the meeting place of Senators, a refuge, and the scene of many luncheons, at which Cabinet officers, members of the Supreme Court, and the great and near great in and out of public service are frequently entertained. It is there that party policy is discussed informally and far reaching decisions are sometimes made.

The colonel, as he is known, by virtue of appointment to the staffs of two former Virginia Governors, is a Democrat by choice and inheritance. His service to his party has been almost as extensive as his service to the Senate. For years he served as sergeant at arms of the Democratic National Committee and as sergeant at arms of the Democratic National Conventions. He has been chosen time and again to be secretary of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. Time and again he has compiled the records of achievement of the Democratic Congress and of the administration for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under his direction the Senate has published many pamphlets dealing with political campaigns for both primary and general elections.

Despite his devotion to the Democratic Party, Colonel Halsey has many friends among the Republicans of the Senate to whom he has been universally fair in his dealings. He is a friendly man, a big man with a broad outlook. His many kindnesses are not confined to Members of the Senate—they go to his many subordinates in the big force of Senate employees.

The duties of the Secretary of the Senate are many. Under his direction are handled the financial affairs of the Senate, and all the clerical work is done. He signs all bills and resolutions which are adopted by the Senate. On occasion it has been his duty to call the Senate into session and to preside for a brief moment over the body. Visiting royalty, kings and queens, have passed through his office when they have been guests of the Senate.

Colonel Halsey has seen history in the making, and many historic events, in the course of his nearly 50 years' service with the Senate—and in more recent years he has played his part in that making. Years ago as a page he was on hand to see the Senate rise and cheer when word came that Admiral Dewey had bottled up and defeated the Spanish Fleet at Manila. When President Woodrow Wilson delivered his epochal address, calling for a declaration of war against Germany, and later the Senate adopted the war resolution, he was there—as he was when this country declared war on the Axis Powers in 1941.

Service is Colonel Halsey's middle name. But of no service of his own is he as proud as that of his son, Lt. Edwin A. Halsey, Jr., United States Navy, who has been with the American naval forces in the South Pacific.

Commercial Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dealing with the subject of commercial rent control, which I sent to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, and in which the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] joined.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. THOMAS E. DEWEY,

The Governor, Albany, N. Y.

DEAR GOVERNOR DEWEY: I have read with interest the text of your message to the legislature and was pleased to find that a portion of your message was devoted to the commercial rent situation and that you have recommended the enactment of appropriate legislation.

For some time I have been deeply concerned with the seriousness of the situation which has developed in New York City. As you may know, I introduced a bill in November which would have authorized the Office of Price Administration to halt the inflationary rise in the rents of business properties. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am chairman, held public hearings on that measure in the course of which a considerable number of interested organizations, including proponents and opponents of the legislation, appeared. In the hope that the record of the hearing will prove helpful to you, I have sent you, under separate cover, three copies of the transcript.

The record shows that a serious situation already has developed in New York, and there is every indication that it will grow worse unless prompt and effective governmental action is taken. Rents have already increased in unwarranted amounts. Many more extreme and widespread increases will undoubtedly be demanded at the end of January 1945, when a substantial number of leases of commercial property will expire.

The city of New York has attempted to prevent such rent increases through a rent mediation board, but this board lacks power to enforce its recommendations. It recognizes that more effective action is required, and officials of the city have requested that either the State or Federal Government take such action.

In your message to the legislature you expressed a preference for Federal action, in the following words:

"It would have been better had the Federal Government procured from the Congress additional powers so as to extend its existing control over dwelling rentals to commercial rentals. The Federal Government did not do so, however, and the State must, and I am sure it will, act."

Among the witnesses who testified during the hearing on my bill were Senator JAMES M. MEAD and Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration. Senator MEAD, as a member of the Senate Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprise, testified in support of the legislation on behalf of himself and Senator MURRAY, the chairman of the Small Business Committee. Mr. Bowles expressed great concern over the effect of the commercial rent situation on the

stabilization program and urged the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.

At the close of the hearing, I moved for a favorable report but the motion was defeated by a vote of 11 to 7, the 9 Republican members of the committee voting solidly against the legislation.

In connection with the preference for Federal action which you expressed in your message on Wednesday, it is significant that those who voted against such action did so on the ground that the problem is centered primarily in New York and shou'd, therefore, be handled by the government of New York State. The result might have been different if you had indicated your interest in this matter in November and had transmitted your views to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee at that time.

However, that may be, I agree with you that the situation can be corrected by the State of New York and that it is the duty of the government of the State to act promptly.

Complaint is sometimes made that the Federal Government is encroaching on the power of the States. In a situation which calls imperatively for governmental action, I can see no legitimate basis for complaint if the Federal Government acts after the State has failed to do so. It is a function of government to protect its people, and if State governments will not assume the responsibility, the Federal Government must.

If prompt and effective action is taken by the State of New York, it will eliminate a very serious inflationary threat. Such action would also have a salutary effect upon the tendency to inflationary rent increases in other parts of the country and, thus, may eliminate the need for additional action by the Federal Government.

Senator MEAD has authorized me to state that he agrees with the views set forth in this letter and he joins me in urging you to use your good offices to the end that legislation may be promptly enacted which will deal effectively with the commercial rent situation in our State.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. WAGNER.

The Renegotiation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from a manufacturer of tools and equipment for the war effort, in which he sets forth in factual terms his experience with the Renegotiation Act, and his conclusions with reference thereto. I believe that, as a matter of national interest, each one of us might well take the time to read it. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Mr. R. E. Werner, manager of the Equipment Co., Detroit, Mich., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We understand that a bill will be presented promptly to renew the Renegotiation Act of 1943, Section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act (Public Law 528, 77th Cong.), for an additional year or for a longer period.

We wish to stress reasons why this act should not be renewed and suggestions for correction if it is renewed.

1. Without considering armament work done for other countries prior to 1942, the procurement agencies have had 3 years in which to establish sources at favorable prices. They have more than ample field forces to do this.

2. The fact that a manufacturer of standard catalog items for the war effort maintains October 1, 1941, prices or lower does not permit him to effect any gain through the vitally necessary maintaining of production regardless of how badly the war effort has cut into his working forces.

3. An enormous part of the war effort, particularly in subcontracts, is borne by companies doing less than $1,000,000 per year in war work and perhaps more than $300,000. These companies will be consistently better off if they produce less than $500,000 and avoid renegotiation. Bear in mind that labor has continually had endless strikes throughout the country which have been highly publicized and which are certainly unpatriotic; much of management in the class of companies mentioned above feel that it is perhaps not quite fair to ask them to be greater patriots than labor, and to use their best abilities at a lower rate.

4. The depreciation on machinery and equipment allowed by the Internal Revenue Division does not cover, in a majority of cases, the actual wear out and replacement of machinery and with earnings limited by renegotiation, as well as exceedingly high taxes, independent industry feels that it cannot come out even no matter how it operates.

Naturally, machines working less hours and producing less do not wear out as fast as machines operating 20 to 24 hours a day. Also, by running the machines less, a greater net profit may be retained if it results in bringing the total volume under $500,000 per year and out of renegotiation.

5. The interpretation of the renegotiation law has been left to various offices in many instances. We have a case, for instance, where a company owned by an individual and doing less than $500,000 per year business has been declared under "common control" of another company owned by another individual from whom the first company received most of their subcontracts, and has been renegotiated for the year 1943. Due to the combined 1942 and 1943 income-tax set-up, this company being renegotiated on a total volume of business of less than $500,000 actually has to pay out in cash in income-tax and renegotiation charges for the year 1943 approximately 20 percent more than their total net profits. Bear in mind that 1942 was not renegotiable. The renegotiator merely told the company they were lucky that they were not renegotiated in 1942. The loss sustained was due to the enormous reduction in 1943 income through renegotiation which made 1943 the lower of the 2-year net income and allowed extremely little tax forgiveness. Yet this company operating in 1943 at a loss of their total net income plus 20 percent was rated as the most efficient company in production of any cases handled by the renegotiator who handled this case. Also, the company had made price reductions in 1943 and again in 1944, of their own accord and were given clearance on future pricing, or approval of their current prices. We consider this a vicious socialization policy and yet it was carried out under the renegotiation law and settlement is being approved at the recommendation of a leading legal firm rather than take the risk of carrying it through the courts where precedent on renegotiation has not been established.

We can readily see that on new items brought out in large quantities for the armed services pricing might be difficult, particularly if the procurement agencies have not firmly established evaluations. We therefore recommend, if the act is renewed, that the following changes be made:

1. That any manufacturer of standard catalog items selling at October 1, 1941, prices or lower be eliminated from renegotiation. This does not refer to direct armament work, which is entirely to blueprints, etc., and is not standard, but must be estimated.

2. That manufacturers doing less than $1,000,000 per year business be eliminated from renegotiation as there are a much greater number of shops in this category than those doing over $1,000,000 per year business and this would tend to secure their maximum production.

3. That in paragraph 6, the words "or controlling or under common control with the contractor or subcontractor" be either defined or eliminated. We have a case mentioned above, and evidently an unjust one, where the legal division of the Renegotiation Board have interpreted the words "common control" to include two entirely separate companies under entirely separate ownership for renegotiation. "Control" or "common control" certainly should be defined as having something to do with ownership, as it is very evident that an individual owning a company must control it. Under any known legal definition the two above companies could not possibly be declared under common control. We, therefore, stress that this section of paragraph 6 must be removed from the law or else there must be included a definition of exactly what Congress intends these words to mean, or further injustices will be perpetrated on countless industries.

The big prime contractors cannot run their assembly lines unless these lines are fed by the thousands of smaller subcontractors and cases like the above certainly do not offer any inducement to the smaller subcontractors.

While the above injustice is due to a legal interpretation by a Renegotiation Board, and certainly not due to intention of Congress, we feel that the future should certainly eliminate such possibilities insofar as they can be eliminated.

THE EQUIPMENT CO.,
R. E. WERNER, *Manager*.

The New World of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a condensation of an address entitled "The New World of Business," delivered by the Vice President, Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, before a meeting of the Progressive Businessmen, Inc., in New York City, on November 2, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Full steam ahead is just a way of saying that this great country has the ships, the machine tools, the modern factories, the forward-looking businessmen and the present manpower to build in our America the greatest prosperity ever known.

The war has demonstrated that unemployment does not exist when people have the will and the need to work. There are more needs in peace than there are in war. Certain gentlemen of the large banking houses will deny this. Certain gentlemen of the counting houses who respond only to immediate red and black ink will tell you that war makes full employment but that peace cannot provide full employment. But in this brave new world ahead, it will be known by all men that full employment is not a monopoly of war. Full employment can and must be the business of peaceful men guaranteed in liberty and security, in religion and home. We shall build upon the political freedoms of America—a new economic freedom unbound as we throw off the fetters of those who would make servants of us all.

I do not doubt that our American system of free enterprise may provide adequate jobs, if there is sufficient imagination and confidence among business leaders and their bankers.

As we move ahead, there will be a friendly government for those who serve the public welfare, but a most unfriendly and determined government watching those who would seek abnormal profit through artificial scarcity. The unpoliced private cartellist, the patent monopolist, the money man of figures planning artificial profits through price fixing will find himself scorned, as a busy people march on toward the horizons of economic freedom.

There should be provided a clear road ahead for inventive genius and enterprise, wherever found, which is willing to devote itself to enriching the world with goods and services. Specifically, any business, old and new, seeking to expand should have tax incentive to accomplish its purpose.

All capital invested in genuine new enterprise should be income tax free for a period of 5 years or until the owner of such capital has received his investment back in the form of profit, either through income or sale, provided the investment is one in which two-thirds of the capital is spent on labor or materials. Business should be permitted to write off up to 20 percent in any 1 year its investment in machinery or buildings, provided these amounts shall be spent within a specified time for new facilities. Railroads should be given tax incentives to modernize. For the sake of young and growing businesses the excess-profits tax should be eliminated as soon as possible.

Many a small business, honestly capitalized, cannot expand because the tax gatherer hurts the little man with a big idea more than a big man with no idea. There are thousands of cases where small businessmen have had to pay up to 95 percent of their annual profits in taxation. They do so gladly in war, but in time of peace such men want to go ahead. They have proven their effectiveness. They want to grow. A wise government will stimulate by taxation the sluggish and the miserly, big or little, so that risk capital can be gotten back into productivity and growth before the tax gatherer takes it all. In the long run under such policies the tax gatherer will get more, not less.

(At the C.I. O. annual convention in Chicago November 21, 1944, Mr. WALLACE said: "Some type of Government pay-roll insurance must be found to tide sound, young businesses over temporary depressions. Possibly a modification in tax laws will serve the purpose. Large, old concerns must be prevented from increasing already overlarge pools of dead capital. Vital, young concerns must be given an incentive to employ more people. Little men with big ideas must be given a chance to employ labor. To meet this problem means that post-war, daring over-all concepts must be put promptly to work. Without such concepts vigorously carried out some form of Government socialism is a certainty.")

Wherever the normal banking system cannot provide, because of the length of the loan, an adequate credit for sound proposals, there should be a modern, realistic R. F. C. We have made a wonderful start under the R. F. C. and taken care of the railroads, the large corporations, building war plants, the insurance companies, the bond and mortgage people, but we must now adequately take care of the little men with big ideas—the future Kaisers and future Higgins of a peacetime world—if we are to reap the harvest of activity and full employment in the days to come.

It is most urgent that we modernize our patent laws so that all patents applied for and granted are available to all industry under proper rental provisions. The present practice of trading patents between corporations for exclusive use, the practice of pigeonholing, the practice of charging exorbitant rentals which favor the big and block the little must go. There must be a patent court and proper executive machinery in the Patent Office to police the evils out of our present system and provide for full use. Otherwise the job production itself is stymied; otherwise old and doddering capital structure will fight for profit and greed against a modern world of full production and full employment.

There can be no permanent prosperity in American heavy industry unless the world is the market. American heavy industry is the backbone of the consumer goods industry. The two together constitute jobs for all.

There are more than 2,000,000,000 people in this world. Some economists would have them eke out a bare existence and not compete with a highly-industrialized country. They would have us make things for a China or a Mexico which has not the living standard to pay for the goods. They fear competition. They seek monopoly of the American market by refusing industrial credit to the development of the backward areas of the world. America must export great quantities of credit to modernize this world.

The main picture which we must see is that 2,000,000,000 foreign customers need the things that our American industrial machine makes. To get these things and to pay for them is a job of very great magnitude. Either an international R. F. C. or American Government agencies supporting self-liquidating industrial and construction loans abroad must be provided at low interest and long term, if the Brazils and the Mexicos and the Chinas are to raise their standard of living sufficiently to buy American autos, American machine tools, and American permanent capital goods and know-how.

You can't have your cake and eat it too. You cannot live forever in a world of greedy capital, overinsistent labor with the strike as the only weapon, and a prostrate consuming public. Civil war in industry must go. The right to strike must be maintained as long as and until labor itself is satisfied that work and free citizenship without preference is guaranteed as firmly as our civil rights under the Constitution. Congress and a wise Executive leadership will be backed by all citizens in the battle against idleness both voluntary and involuntary.

The Sixth War Christmas

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of an official English translation of Pope Pius XII's Christmas message today entitled "The Sixth War Christmas." It begins citing the Epistle of Titus iii: 4: "The goodness and kindness of God our Saviour appeared":

For the sixth time since the opening of the dreadful war, the Christmas liturgy again hails with these words, redolent of peaceful serenity, the coming into our midst of God our Saviour.

The humble, mean cradle of Bethlehem, by its wonderful charm focuses the attention of all believers. Deep into the hearts of those in darkness, affliction, and depression there sinks and pervades a great flood of light and joy.

Heads that were bowed lift again serenely, for Christmas is the feast of human dignity, "the wonderful exchange by which the creator of human race, taking a living body, deigned to be born of a virgin, and by His coming bestowed on us His divinity" (First Antiphon of First Vespers for the Feast of the Circumcision).

But our gaze turns quickly from the base of the crib to the world around us, and the sorrowful sign of John the Evangelist comes to our lips: "And the light shines in darkness, and the darkness did not comprehend it" (John 1:5).

For alas, for the sixth time, the Christmas dawn breaks again on battlefields spreading ever wider on graveyards where are gathered the remains of victims in ever-increasing numbers, on desert lands where a few tottering towers tell with silent pathos the story of cities once flourishing and prosperous, and where bells fallen or carried off no longer awaken the inhabitants with their jubilant Christmas chimes.

They are so many silent witnesses to denounce this blot on the story of mankind which, deliberately blind to the brilliance of Him who is the splendor and light of the Father, deliberately straying from Christ, has descended and fallen into chaos and into the denial of its own dignity.

Even the little lamp is out in many majestic temples, in many modest chapels, where before the tabernacle it had shared the watches of the divine guest over a world asleep. What desolation. What contrast. Can there then be still hope for mankind?

DAWN OF HOPE

Blessed be the Lord. Out from the mournful groans of sorrow, from the very depths of the heart-rending anguish of oppressed individuals and countries there arises an aura of hope. To an ever-increasing number of noble souls there comes the thought, the will ever cleared and stronger, to make of this world, this universal upheaval a starting point for a new era of far-reaching renovation, the complete reorganization of the world, thus while the armed forces continue to engage in murderous battles with weapons ever more deadly, the statesmen, responsible leaders of nations, meet for talks, for conferences to determine the fundamental rights and duties on which should be built a community of states, and to blaze the trail toward a better future, more secure and more worthy of mankind.

A strange paradox this, of a war whose bitterness bids to reach the limits of paroxysm, and of the notable progress made in aspirations and proposals for a solid and lasting peace; undoubtedly one may well discuss the worth, the feasibility, the efficacy of this or that proposal; judgment may well be suspended in their regard, but it remains nonetheless true that the process has begun.

THE PROBLEM OF DEMOCRACY

Moreover—and this is perhaps the most important point—beneath the sinister lightning of the war that encompasses them, in the blazing heat of the furnace that imprisons them, the peoples have, as it were,

awakened from a long torpor. They have assumed, in relation to the State and those who govern, a new attitude—one that questions, criticizes, distrusts.

Taught by bitter experience, they are more aggressive in opposing the concentration of dictatorial power that cannot be censured or touched, and call for a system of government more in keeping with the dignity and liberty of the citizens. These multitudes, uneasy, stirred by the war to their innermost depths, are today firmly convinced—at first perhaps in a vague and confused way but already unyieldingly—that had there been the possibility of censuring and correcting the actions of public authority the world would not have been dragged into the vortex of a disastrous war, and that to avoid for the future the repetition of such a catastrophe we must vest efficient guaranties in the people itself.

In such a psychological atmosphere is it to be wondered at if the tendency toward democracy is capturing the peoples and winning a large measure of consent and support from those who hope to play a more efficient part in the destinies of individuals and of society?

It is scarcely necessary to recall that, according to the teaching of the church, "it is not forbidden to prefer temperate, popular forms of government, without prejudice, however, to Catholic teaching on the origin and use of authority," and that "the church does not disapprove of any of the various forms of government, provided they be per se capable of securing the good of the citizens" (Leo XIII: Encyclical "Libertas," June 20, 1888).

If, then, on this feast day which commemorates both the benignity of the incarnate word and the dignity of man (both in its personal and social aspects), we direct our attention to the problem of democracy, examining the forms by which it should be directed if it is to be a true, healthy democracy answering the needs of the moment, our action shows clearly that the interest and solicitude of the church looks not so much to its external structure and organization—which depend on the special aspirations of each people—as to the individual himself, who, so far from being the object and as it were a merely passive element in the social order, is in fact, and must be and continue to be its subject, its foundation, and its end.

Given that democracy, taken in the broad sense, admits of various forms, and can be realized in monarchies as well as in republics, two questions come up for our consideration: First, what characteristics should distinguish the men who live under democracy and a democratic regime? Second, what characterization should distinguish the men who hold the reins of government in a democracy?

I

CHARACTERISTICS PROPER TO CITIZENS IN A DEMOCRATIC REGIME

To express his own views of the duties and sacrifices that are imposed on him, not compelled to obey without being heard, these are the rights of the citizen which find in democracy, as its name implies, their expression.

From the solidity, harmony and good results produced by this between the citizens and the government one may decide which democracy is really healthy and well balanced, and what is its life energy and power of expansion.

If then we consider the extent and nature of the sacrifices demanded of all the citizens, especially in our day when the activity of the state is so vast and decisive, the democratic form of government appears to many as a postulate of nature imposed by reason itself.

When, however, people call for "democracy and better democracy" such a demand cannot have any other meaning than to place the citizen ever more in the position to hold his own personal opinion, to express it and to make it prevail in a fashion conducive to common good.

PEOPLE AND "THE MASSES"

Hence follows a first conclusion with its practical consequence. The state does not contain in itself and does not mechanically bring together in a given territory a shapeless mass of individuals.

It is and should in practice be the organic and organizing unity of a real people. The people and a shapeless multitude (or as it is called "the masses") are two distinct concepts.

The people lives and moves by its own life energy; the masses are inert of themselves and can only be moved from outside. The people lives by the fullness of life in the men that compose it, each of whom—at his proper place and in his own way—is a person conscious of his own responsibility and of his own views.

The masses on the contrary wait for the impulse from outside, an easy plaything in the hands of anyone who exploits their instincts and impressions; ready to follow in turn today this flag, tomorrow another.

From the exuberant life of a true people an abundant rich life is diffused in the state and all its organs, instilling into them, with a vigor that is always renewing itself, the consciousness of their own responsibility, the true instinct for the common good.

The elementary power of the masses, deftly managed and employed, the state also can utilize. In the ambitious hands of one or of several who have been artificially brought together for selfish aims the state itself, with the support of the masses, reduced to the minimum status of a mere machine, can impose its whims on the better part of the real people. The common interest remains seriously and for a long time injured by this process, and the injury is very often hard to heal.

Hence follows clearly another conclusion: the masses—as we have just defined them—are the capital enemy of true democracy and of its ideal of liberty and equality.

In a people worthy of the name the citizen feels within him the consciousness of his personality, of his duties and rights, of his own freedom joined to respect for the freedom and dignity of others.

In a people worthy of the name all inequalities based not on whim but on the nature of things, inequalities of culture, possessions, social standing—without, of course, prejudice to a justice and mutual charity—do not constitute any obstacle to the existence and the prevalence of a true spirit of union and brotherhood.

On the contrary, so far from impairing civil equality in any way, they give it its true meaning, namely that, before the state, everyone has the right to live honorably his own personal life in the place and under the conditions in which the designs and dispositions of Providence have placed him.

As against this picture of the democratic ideal of liberty and equality in a people's government by honest and far-seeing men, what a spectacle is that of a democratic state left to the whims of the masses.

Liberty from being a moral duty of the individual becomes a tyrannous claim to give free rein to a man's impulses and appetities to the detriment of others.

Equality degenerates to a mechanical level, a colorless uniformity. The sense of true honor, of personal activity or respect for tradition, of dignity—in a word all that gives life its worth—gradually fades away and disappears.

And the only survivors are, on the one hand, the victims deluded by the specious mirage of democracy, naively taken for the genuine spirit of democracy with its liberty and equality; and on the other the more or less numerous exploiters who have known how to use the power of money and of organization in order to secure a privileged position above the others, and have gained power.

II

CHARACTERISTICS OF MEN HOLDING POWER IN A DEMOCRATIC STATE?

The democratic state, whether it be monarchical or republican, should like any other form of government be entrusted with the power to command with real and effective authority.

The absolute order itself of beings and purposes, which shows that man is an independent person, namely, the subject of inviolable duties and rights, who is the source and end of his own social life, comprises the state also as a necessary society endowed with authority, without which it could neither exist nor live.

And if men, using their personal liberty, were to deny all dependence on a superior authority possessing coercive power, they could by this very fact cut the ground from under their own dignity and liberty, by violating, that is, the absolute order of beings and purposes.

As they are established on this same foundation, the person, the state, the government, with their respective rights, are so bound together that they stand or fall together.

And since that absolute order, in the light of right, reason, and in particular of the Christian faith, cannot have any other origin than in a personal God, our Creator, it follows that the dignity of man is the dignity of the moral community willed by God, the dignity of political authority is the dignity deriving from its sharing in the authority of God.

No form of state can avoid taking cognizance of this intimate and indissoluble connection—least of all a democracy. Accordingly if those in power do not see it, or more or less discount it, their own authority is shaken and social morality and that specious appearance of a purely formal democracy may often serve as a mark for all that is in reality least democratic.

Only a clear appreciation of the purposes assigned by God to every human society, joined to a deep sense of the exalted duties of social activity, can put those in power in a position to fulfill their own obligations in the legislative, judicial, and executive order with that objectivity, impartiality, loyalty, generosity, and integrity without which a democratic government would find it hard to command the respect and the support of the better section of the people.

The deep sense of the principles underlying a political and social order that is sound and conforms to the norms of right and justice is of special importance in those who in any kind of democratic regime have, as the people's delegates, in whole or part, the power to legislate.

And since the center of gravity of a democracy normally set up resides in this popular assembly from which political currents radiate into every field of public life—for good or ill—the question of the high moral standards, practical ability, and intellectual capacity of parliamentary deputies is for every people living under a democratic regime a question of life and death, of prosperity and decadence, of soundness or perpetual unrest.

To secure effective action, to win esteem and trust, every legislative body should—as experience shows, beyond doubt—gather within it a group of select men, spiritually eminent and of strong character, who shall look upon themselves as the representatives of the entire people and not the mandatories of a mob, whose interests are often unfortunately made to prevail over the true needs of the common good—a select group of men not restricted to any profession or social

standing but reflecting every phase of the people's life; men chosen for their solid Christian convictions, straight and steady judgment, with a sense of the practical and equitable, true to themselves in all circumstances; men of clear and sound principles, with sound and clear-cut proposals to make; men above all capable, in virtue of the authority that emanates from their untarnished consciences and radiates widely from them, to be leaders and heads especially in times when the pressing needs of the moment excite the people's impressionability unduly, and render it more liable to be led astray and get lost; men who in periods of transition, generally stormy and disturbed by passion, by divergent opinions and opposing programs, feel themselves doubly under the obligation to send circulating through the veins of the people and of the state, burning with a thousand fevers, the spiritual antidote of clear views, kindly interest, a justice equally sympathetic to all, and a bias toward national unity and concord in a sincere spirit of brotherhood.

Peoples whose spiritual and moral temperament is sufficiently sound and fecund find it themselves and can produce the heralds and implements of democracy who live in such dispositions and know how effectively to put them into practice.

But where such men are lacking, others come to take their places in order to make politics serve their ambition and be a quick road to profit for themselves, their caste, and their class, while the race after private interests makes them lose sight of completely and jeopardize the true common good.

STATE ABSOLUTISM

A sound democracy, based on the immutable principles of the natural law and revealed truth, will resolutely turn its back on such corruption as gives to the state legislature an unchecked and unlimited power, and moreover, makes of the democratic regime, notwithstanding an outward show to the contrary, purely and simply a form of absolutism.

State absolutism—not to be confused, as such, with absolute monarchy, of which we are not treating here—consists in fact in the false principle that the authority of the State is unlimited and that in face of it—even when it gives free rein to its despotic aims going beyond the confines between good and evil—to appeal to a higher law obliging in conscience is not admitted.

A man penetrated with right ideas about the state, and authority, and the power that he wields as guardian of social order will never think of derogating the majesty of the positive law within the ambit of its natural competence. But this majesty of positive law is only inviolable when it conforms—or at least is not opposed—to the absolute order set up by the Creator and placed in a new light by the revelation of the gospel.

It cannot subsist except insofar as it respects the foundations on which human personality rests no less than the state and the government. This is the fundamental criterion of every healthy form of government, including democracy. It is the criterion by which the moral value of every particular law should be judged.

III

NATURE AND CONDITIONS OF AN EFFECTIVE PEACE SETTLEMENT; UNITY OF MANKIND AND SOCIETY OF PEOPLES

We were anxious, beloved sons and daughters, to take the occasion of Christmastide to point out along what lines a democracy befitting human dignity can, in harmony with the law of nature and the designs of God as manifested in revelation, secure happy results. Indeed we are deeply convinced of the supreme importance of this problem for the peaceful progress of mankind.

But we also realize the exalted claims that this form of government makes on the moral maturity of the individual citizen; a moral maturity to which he could never hope to attain fully and securely if the light from the cave of Bethlehem did not illumine the dark path along which the peoples are going forward through the stormy present toward a future which they hope will be more serene.

But how far will the representatives and pioneers of democracy be inspired in their deliberations by the conviction that the absolute order of beings and purposes, of which we have repeatedly spoken, comprises also, as a moral necessity and the crowning of social development, the unity of mankind and of the family of peoples?

On the recognition of this principle hangs the future of the peace.

No world reform, no peace guaranty can abstract upon it without being weakened and without being untrue to itself.

If, on the other hand, this same moral necessity were to find its realization in a society of peoples which succeeded in eliminating the structural defects and shortcomings of former systems, then the majesty of that order would regulate and inspire equally the deliberations of that society and the use of its instruments of sanction.

For this reason, too, one understands why the authority of such a society must be real and effective over the member states, in suchwise, however, that each of them retain an equal right to its own sovereignty.

Only thus will the spirit of sane democracy be able to pervade the vast and thorny ground of foreign relations.

AGAINST WARS OF AGGRESSION AS SOLUTION OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

There is a duty, besides, imposed on all, a duty which brooks no delay, no procrastination, no hesitation, no subterfuge; it is the duty to do everything to ban once and for all wars of aggression as legitimate solution of international disputes and as a means toward realizing national aspirations.

Many attempts in this direction have been seen in the past. They all failed. And they will all fail always, until the saner section of mankind has the firm determination, the holy obstinacy like an obligation in conscience, to fulfill the mission which past ages have not undertaken with sufficient gravity and resolution.

If ever a generation has had to apreciate in the depths of its conscience the call: "War on war," it is certainly the present generation.

Having passed, as it has, through an ocean of blood and tears in a form perhaps never experienced in past ages, it has lived through the indescribable atrocities with an intensity such that the recollection of so many horrors must remain stamped in its memory, and even in the deepest recesses of its soul like a picture of a hell against which anyone who cherishes a sense of humanity desires more than anything else to close the door forever.

FORMATION OF A COMMON MEANS TO MAINTAIN PEACE

The decisions already published by international commissions permit one to conclude that an essential point in any future international arrangement would be the formation of an organ for the maintenance of peace, of an organ invested by common consent with supreme power to whose office it would also pertain to smother in its germinal state any threat of isolated or collective aggression.

No one could hail this development with greater joy than he who has long upheld the principle that the idea of war as an apt and proportionate means of solving international conflicts is now out of date.

No one could wish success to this common effort, to be undertaken with a seriousness of purpose never before known, with greater enthusiasm than he who has conscientiously striven to make the Christian and religious mentality reject modern war with its monstrous means of conducting hostilities.

MONSTROUS MEANS OF CONDUCTING HOSTILITIES

Unquestionably the progress of man's inventions, which should have heralded the realization of greater well-being for all mankind, has instead been employed to destroy all that had been built up through the ages.

But by that very fact the immorality of the war of aggression has been made ever more evident. And if now, to the recognition of this immorality there is to be added the threat of a judicial intervention by the nations and of chastisement inflicted on the aggressor by the society of states, so that war will always be subject to the stigma of proscription, always under surveillance and liable to preventive measures, then mankind, as it emerges from the dark night in which it has been so long submerged, will be able to hail the dawn of a new and better era of its history.

ITS CONSTITUTION EXCLUDING UNJUST IMPOSITION

But only on one condition, namely, that the peace settlement which should be strengthened and made more stable by mutual guaranties, and, where necessary, economic sanctions, and even armed intervention, should not give definite countenance to any injustice, does not imply any derogation of any right to the detriment of any nation (whether it be on the side of the victors, the vanquished, or the neutrals), and does not impose any perpetual burden, which can only be allowed for a time as reparation for war damage.

That any peoples, to whose government—or perhaps even partially to themselves—the responsibility for the war is attributed, should have for a time to undergo the rigors of security measures until the bonds of mutual trust, violently broken, should be gradually welded together again, is quite understandable from a human point of view, and in practice will in all probability be inevitable.

Nevertheless, even these peoples must have a well-founded hope—commensurate to their effective collaboration in the work of reconstruction—of being able, together with the other States with equal consideration and with the same rights, to be associated with the great community of nations.

To deny them that hope would be the reverse of far-seeing wisdom, it would be to assume the grave responsibility of barring the way to a general liberation from all the disastrous consequences material, moral, and political, of the gigantic cataclysm which has shaken the poor human family to its very foundations, but which, at the same time, has shown it the road to new goals.

THE STERN LESSONS OF SUFFERING

We will not renounce our confidence that the peoples, who have all passed through the school of suffering, will be able to retain the stern lessons learned.

And in this hope we are strengthened by the words of men who have had a greater share in the sufferings of the war and who have found generous words to express, together with the insistence on their own need of security against any future aggression, their respect for the vital rights of other peoples and their aversion to any usurping of those rights.

It would be vain to expect that this sage judgment, dictated by the experience of history and a high political sense should be—while men's spirits are still burning white-hot—generally accepted by public opinion, or even by the majority.

Hatred and the impossibility of mutual understanding have given rise in peoples that have fought against each other to a mist too dense to hope that the hour has already come when a ray of light may shine out to clear

the tragic panorama on either side of its dark wall.

But one thing we know: that the moment will come, perhaps sooner than the people think, when both sides realize that, all things considered, there is only one way of getting out of the meshes in which war and hate have wrapped the world, namely, a return to the solidarity, too long forgotten, a solidarity not restricted to these or those peoples, but universal, founded on the intimate connection of their destiny and rights which belong equally to both.

THE PUNISHMENT OF CRIMES

No one certainly thinks of disarming justice in its relations to those who have exploited the war situation in order to commit real and proved crimes against the common law, and for whom supposed military necessity could at most have offered a pretext, but never a justification.

But if justice presumed to judge and punish not merely individuals but even whole communities together, who could not see in such a procedure a violation of the norms which guide every human trial?

IV

THE CHURCH AS GUARDIAN OF MAN'S TRUE DIGNITY AND LIBERTY

At a time when the peoples find themselves with duties such as perhaps they have never met before in the course of their history, they feel deeply in their tortured hearts the desire, impatient and almost instinctive, to take the reins of their destiny in their own hands with more independence than heretofore, hoping that thus they will find it easier to defend themselves from the periodic invasions of violence which, like a boiling lava torrent, spares nothing of all that they hold sacred and dear.

Thank God, one may believe the time has passed when the call to moral and Gospel principles to guide the life of states and peoples was disdainfully thrust aside as unreal.

The events of these war years have given ample evidence to confute, in a harder way than one could ever have imagined, those who spread such doctrines.

The disdain that they affected toward this supposed unreality has been changed into stark reality; brutality, iniquity, destruction, annihilation.

If the future is to belong to democracy, an essential part in its achievement will have to belong to the religion of Christ and to the church, the messenger of our Redeemer's word, which is to continue His mission of saving men. For she teaches and defends supernatural truths and communicates the supernatural helps of grace in order to actuate the divinely established order of beings and ends which is the ultimate foundation and directive norm of every democracy.

By her very existence the church rises before the world as a shining beacon to remind it constantly of that divine order. Her history reflects clearly her providential mission. The struggles, which coerced by the abuse of power, she has had to sustain in defense of the liberty given her by God, were at the same time struggles for man's true liberty.

The church has the mission to announce to the world, which is looking for better and more perfect forms of democracy, the highest and most needed message that there can be: The dignity of man, the call to be sons of God. It is the powerful cry which from the manger of Bethlehem to the farthest confines of the earth resounds in the ears of men at a time when that dignity is tragically low.

The holy story of Christmas proclaims this inviolable dignity of man with a vigor and authority that cannot be gainsaid—an authority and vigor that infinitely transcends that which all possible declarations of the rights of man could achieve.

Christmas, the great feast of the son of God who appeared in human flesh, the feast in which heaven stoops down to earth with ineffable grace and benevolence, is also the day on which Christianity and mankind, before the crib, contemplating the "goodness and kindness of God our Saviour" becomes more deeply conscious of the intimate unity that God has established between them.

The birth of the Saviour of the world, of the restorer of human dignity in all its fullness, is the moment characterized by the alliance of all men of good will. There to the poor world, torn by discord, divided by selfishness, poisoned by hate, love will be restored and it will be allowed to march forward in cordial harmony, toward the common goal, to find at last the cure for its wounds in the peace of Christ.

V

CRUSADE FOR CHARITY

We do not want to close this Christmas message without addressing a word of heartfelt gratitude to all those—states, governments, bishops, and peoples—who at this time of untold misfortunes have lent us valiant aid as we hearken to the cry of suffering which reaches us from so many parts of the world and give a helping hand to so many of our beloved sons and daughters whom the misfortunes of war have reduced to extreme poverty and misery.

And in the first place it is but just to record the immense work of assistance achieved in spite of the extraordinary difficulties of transport, by the United States of America, with regard to Italy in particular, by his excellency the personal representative of the President of the Union.

It is a pleasure for us to express equal praise and gratitude for the generosity of the head of the State, the Government, and people of Spain, and the Governments of Ireland, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Italy, Lithuania, Peru, Poland, Rumania, Slovakia, Hungary, and Uruguay who have vied with one another in noble rivalry of brotherly love and charity, of which the echo will not resound in vain through the world.

While men of good will are endeavoring to bridge the gulf and bring the peoples together, this purely disinterested act of charity assumes an aspect and a value of unique importance.

When—as we all wish—the dissonance of hate and discord that dominates the present moment will be but a tragic memory, the good effects of this victory of active and magnanimous charity over the poison of selfishness and enmity will ripen into even a larger harvest of good.

May all who have had a share in this crusade of charity receive as an incentive and a token of gratitude our apostolic benediction and the thought that on the feast of love from numberless hearts in anguish, but not forgetful in their anguish, there rises to heaven the grateful prayer for them: Deign to reward, O Lord, all those who do good to us for Your name's sake with eternal life.

How Now, England?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I for one, am very tired of British criticism of the part the United States is taking in this war. Do the British critics of our contribution in men and material to the war believe that the United States is furnishing its fine young men to be slaughtered, maimed, blinded, and imprisoned for any other purpose than to help win the war? I challenge the British critics to show anything more heroic on the western European front than the "Conquer or die, but never yield" spirit of those who steadfastly stood, fought, and died to stop Marshal Von Runstedt's hordes at La Gleize, Belgium. These smug British critics would be singing a different tune had not our heroic lads gone gloriously to death and to immortal fame by holding out against the Hun horde headed toward either Antwerp or to a channel port from which to strike at England with robot bomb and long-range guns.

There has been an infiltration of English propagandists into this country who seem to think that their arrogant criticism will be tolerated by Americans with the same abject spirit of servitude which is so evident in the caste system of England and in some of her possessions.

This war is not so far won that the British will find it to their interests to now charge the United States with plotting to grab some portions of the British Empire after the war. The people were told that there was an Atlantic Charter and that it was for the ideals expressed therein that our boys were to fight, not for a territorial grab.

Under leave to extend an editorial I here insert one from the Washington Times-Herald under date of January 5, 1945, as follows:

HOW NOW, ENGLAND?

On December 29, the London Economist denounced the United States as hypocritical, preachy, and entirely too vague about its foreign policy, especially its post-war intentions. Maybe, hinted the Economist, Britain after the war had better team up with Russia.

We didn't pay much attention to the British weekly's blast at the time; thought it might have resulted from some editor's consuming either too much or too little Scotch at Christmas.

On January 2, however, the Yorkshire Post, owned by Mrs. Anthony Eden's family, chimed in with an editorial entitled, "Will America Kindly Say?" endorsing the Economist's blast, and adding that the United States seems to be plotting to grab some pieces of the British Empire after the war "such as bases the United States would like."

ATTACKS FROM BRITISH PRESS

The next day, the London Times, looked on as virtually the press mouthpiece of the British Government, crashed through with an editorial, saying that the United States shows an ingrained "unwillingness to accept political responsibilities in Europe." The Yorkshire Post, the same day, took exception to "silly (American) press sneers at Field Marshal (Sir Bernard L.) Montgomery, one of the greatest of soldiers."

We'll agree on that estimate of Marshal Montgomery. But we read numerous newspapers, and we'll add that we have never yet seen or heard of a sneer at Montgomery in an American newspaper. The American press and public generally, we are convinced, admire Montgomery as a soldier as much as do the British people.

Replying to these concerted British complaints that we aren't holding up our end in the war and don't intend to do so afterward, we'd like to point out first that Von Rundstedt did indeed break through American troops in his December 16 counteroffensive, but that he was also stopped by American troops. There weren't any British troops in that part of the line.

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

We'd like to point out further that an estimated 75 percent to 80 percent of all Allied troops on the western front are American troops.

BRITAIN AND RUSSIA VERSUS UNITED STATES?

As to the reasons why our men are in western Europe, it can no longer be argued sanely that they are defending us against German attack—or England against German conquest. Germany can neither defeat England nor invade us in this war.

Our official position is that we are fighting in Europe to defend the future, by making it impossible for Germany to start another war. In addition, it would seem that we are now fighting in Europe to bolster up Britain's power to influence western European affairs after this war, so that Russian power and influence may not flood all Europe.

The British and the Russians are playing power politics against each other in the middle of this war, while we, at least at this moment, do most of the fighting.

If Britain feels like teaming up with Russia after the war and leaving us out in the cold, the United States can get along all right—if necessary, against England and Russia at the same time. That is, of course, if we keep on the defensive and don't go over to Europe to fight them. Our productive and military achievements in this war forecast that. And if things should regrettably come to such a show-down, there are several potential British hostages in this hemisphere.

All this is said without any animosity toward Great Britain. We admire the British people for their historic achievements; and Great Britain is mama to the United States, even if mama has grown a bit querulous in her maturer years.

TALKING BACK TO BRITAIN

We made these frank remarks because we are aware that the British do not respect people who do not talk back to them. Whether that attitude is wise or unwise is not for us to opine. But that is the British attitude by and large.

The Churchill government, for reasons best known to itself, has opened a barrage of anti-American propaganda via British publications which work hand in glove with the Churchill government. If Americans take this British scolding meekly and without retorting to it, there will be more of the same, and the consequences can be most unpleasant, if nothing worse, for all concerned.

We'll get along much better with our British allies and friends, both during and after the war, if Americans will take to retorting frankly (though politely, of course), whenever influential Britons talk out of turn about us.

Vivisection—Progress in the Art of Saving Human Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, through letters coming to me from various sections of my district it is apparent that many of our citizens are becoming greatly disturbed by the practice of vivisection in our medical and surgical centers. Evidently there has been much misinformation given to the public regarding this practice.

The dictionary tells us that vivisection—as it is practiced in these centers—is operation on a living animal for physiological or pathological investigation and information. This work is largely done on dogs. Strange as it may seem to the laity, the anatomy of the dog and human being is exactly alike. Except that dogs walk "on all fours," the functions are the same. Structurally and organically, including the nervous and circulatory systems, there is no difference. This being true, the purpose of vivisection is to give to the surgeons of the world the opportuniites for experimentation from which much of the progress that has been made in surgery down the years has resulted. Obviously there is one purpose and one purpose only in this activity, and that is to secure knowledge which will enable the scientists to save human life. If experiments were not made on the lower animals, they would necessarily have to be made on human beings. Obviously the former is desirable.

Recently there was introduced in the House of Representatives a bill providing for the extension of general and scientific laboratory facilities at the great Naval Medical Center, at Bethesda, Md. Most of this extension is designed to house physical, chemical, pathological, bacteriological, and similar laboratories, a diving tank and facilities for studies on the effects of environment in which human volunteers are used to gain data as to their efficiency and general well-being under conditions of service.

Animal quarters are included in the plans, but only for the purpose of improving the housing of animals by providing them with more comfortable and healthful living conditions.

I have made it my business to investigate the conditions surrounding vivisection, and I have learned that in no case are there practices which could possibly be described as torturing or even pain producing.

The members of the staff at the Medical Center, many of whom are as fond of dogs as anyone can possibly be, and all of whom are certainly persons who take a much greater interest in their patients than is generally supposed, are all humane individuals and of the highest character. Even the simplest procedure involving animals is undertaken with the sole purpose of securing information which will result in the saving of human life, and is conducted with the utmost consideration. If progress is to be made in the art of saving human life and suffering, experiments are necessary. It must be agreed that those experiments be made on the lower animals rather than on humans.

The whole structure of medicine and surgery, and the measures now being employed in our armed services, and generally throughout the country, which are so successful in saving the lives of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers and sailors and the the public generally, are recorded in observations and information made possible only by utilization of the lower animals. There are millions of people alive today, who a long time ago would have passed on had it not been for the information our scientists have secured through the medium of vivisection. I feel certain if all our people could know of the benefits which in the past have come to us in this way they would realize that the practice of vivisection cannot be stopped without jeopardizing the lives of future generations.

Warren Points the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C.:

WARREN POINTS THE WAY

It is good to see that Thomas L. Stokes is exposing the "influence boys" in Washington and their part in sneak legislation. Their successful lobbying is a disgrace to them and also to public officials in the legislative and executive departments of Government. In 1943 a provision slipped into the revenue act which specifically exempted a certain type of Federal employees from the ban in the existing law under which no official could prosecute a claim against the United States until 2 years after leaving Government service. At that time Comptroller General Lindsay Warren called attention to legislation under which officials have resigned from public office to make big money as attorneys (a respectable name for lobbying), now prosecute claims in departments about whose affairs they are familiar. Naturally, they have the inside track over lawyers who have held no such position of trust.

Corruption and favoritism and lobbying practices ran riot in Grant's second term. They were so flagrant that in 1872 an act was passed prohibiting any officer, clerk, or employee of any Government department from acting as counsel, attorney, or agent in prosecuting any claim against the United States pending in any department while he was in the Government service until 2 years after he had left the service. That law helped stop the evil now prevailing in Washington during the Spanish-American War and the World War. But now, when the law is most needed, a provision was quietly slipped into the 1943 Revenue Act and the 1944 Contract Settlement Act which modified, if it did not repeal, the wise act of 1872. And now the sky is the limit.

Writing of this public scandal, made possible by the repeal, Mr. Stokes says:

"One prominent Government official has spoken out bluntly and plainly against a 'joker' put through Congress which would permit war agencies' employees who handled war contracts—and consequently have the benefit of inside knowledge and contacts—to go out after they leave the Government and represent claimants against the Government.

"This is Comptroller General Lindsay Warren, one-time House leader, who is the agent for Congress as head of the General Accounting Office delegated to check expenditures of Government departments.

"He expressed his opposition and concern in a letter last May to Representative

SUMNERS, Democrat, Texas, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

"Mr. Warren advocated repeal of this Revenue Act provision and substitution of a bill of Representative SATTERFIELD, Democrat, Virginia, which would forbid employees of Government agencies or Army and Navy officers from accepting compensation within 2 years after leaving the Government, in 'prosecution of claims against the United States arising out of any contracts or agreements for the procurement of supplies, materials, construction work, or services for the Army, the Navy, or any other agency of the Government which were pending or entered into while the said officer or employee was associated therewith.'

"The Satterfield bill was adopted in House and Senate as an amendment to the 1944 War Contract Settlement Act, but was changed in conference later so that employees of any agency still could go out and prosecute claims immediately upon leaving the Government, except for those they handled directly, in which cases they must wait 2 years.

"Speaking of the earlier revenue act exemption, which has been superseded by that in the Contract Settlement Act, Mr. Warren pointed out that the departments and agencies named 'are the principal purchasers of materials and supplies for war purposes—already costing billions of dollars.' He added: 'I am firmly of the opinion that the said law results in the removal of a restriction in a class of cases where control is most vitally needed.

" 'Aside from the fact that, in some instances, certain individuals might be instrumental in reviving claims which otherwise would lie dormant, it is felt that such a practice generally is as morally and ethically wrong as it would be for an attorney for one client to become the attorney of his former client's adversary, or for a judge to become counsel in the same cases in which he had presided.'

"He explained that after the last war 'there mushroomed into existence a great number of private organizations holding themselves out as able to offer special facilities in the adjustment of contracts, and representing or implying in many instances that their services were of particular value by reason of a former connection of persons in these organizations with the Government and intimating that their services were indispensable to the contractors in order to secure a satisfactory settlement.'

" 'Since,' he said, 'the number of Government supply contracts during World War No. 1, and the amounts involved, were rather insignificant compared to the number and amounts of the financial obligations incurred by the Government during the present conflict, it would appear evident that the necessity for such legislation at this time is correspondingly intensified.' "

As soon as it reconvenes Congress ought to go back to the 1872 law with such new, strong measures as will put a stop to the evil that act made illegal. It should go further: Make the act apply to ex-Members of Congress and all lobbyists.

P. A. C. Overestimated Its Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the P. A. C. may have elected the President; the administration and the Democratic Party may clear everything through Sidney. About that I do not know. But the first battle fought in the new Seventy-ninth Congress demonstrated that the combined forces of the New Deal and the P. A. C. do not have absolute control over Congress. Both the administration and the P. A. C. lost the first pitched battle.

The Dies committee exposed not a few left wingers and Communists who held policy-making positions in the New Deal administration. Almost from the beginning, its activities were opposed by the administration and on one or two occasions by Mrs. Roosevelt, who personally appeared before that committee with some individuals with communistic leanings.

Ever since the Dies committee was created in May of 1938, the Communist leaders, the C. I. O., and still later the P. A. C. have criticized its activities, disputed its findings, demanded that it be abolished.

There is no doubt but that the Dies committee made many mistakes; that at times it was inaccurate; but the same can be said of the New Deal and, for that matter, of any other organization which operates on a large scale over a period of years and on controversial issues.

Nevertheless, it is of record that not only the Department of Justice but the F. B. I. and the Intelligence Service of the Navy, Army, and the State Department, benefited immensely by the evidence which it gathered, analyzed, and made available.

The P. A. C. boasts that it brought about the defeat of at least three members of that committee, two of them Democrats, and that it frightened the chairman, Martin Dies, into declining to be a candidate at the last election.

Flushed with victory, both the P. A. C. and the administration thought they had an easy task to bring about their long desired purpose—the end of the Dies committee, the end of its investigation of subversive activities.

But, on January 3, the administration forces in the House, taken by surprise, were soundly defeated and the P. A. C. learned that, notwithstanding its political influence, its millions of dollars available for the defeat of Congressmen who opposed it, it could not intimidate Congress on this issue. Both the administration and the P. A. C. with its would-be political bosses learned that the Congress, when it comes to the fundamental issue as to whether it will back those in the armed service by establishing a permanent committee to investigate and propose measures to curb subversive influences here at home, has no hesitation whatever in making its decision.

Instead of waiting and creating a special committee to continue the Dies committee activities, the House, under the leadership of JOHN RANKIN, in a surprising parliamentary move, amended the rules of the House and established a nine-man permanent committee to continue the job begun by the Dies committee.

Not a few Members voted against establishing this committee, because they believed that a special committee would better answer the purpose and because they wanted the Speaker to appoint its members. The House, however, was determined to take no chances on the creation later of the special committee, so adopted RANKIN'S motion and now the committee has been made permanent. Its chairman and membership will be selected by the Democratic and Republican organizations of the House, will not be appointed by the Speaker.

Should any attempt be made to thwart the will of the House by packing the committee, the House might again assert itself and make its own selection of the members of that committee.

This, the first nonroutine official action of the House, is encouraging and it demonstrates once more that a coalition of southern Democrats and northern Republicans, who believe that not everything that happened back in the "horse and buggy" days was wrong, can be effective when it chooses.

The Best Argument for the Missouri Valley Authority Is Benefits That Have Accrued to States as a Result of the Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, seven Governors whose States are served by the Tennessee Valley Authority have at the request of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch submitted their views in connection with its operation. What the T. V. A. has accomplished for the Tennessee Valley is evidence what the M. V. A. will do for the Missouri River Valley.

Under permission granted me, I am including as part of my remarks the interviews:

BY J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA

To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

I have found T. V. A. to be most cooperative, and have only praise for the agency's operations in this State.

In distributing fertilizers for soil improvement tests on more than 5,000 North Carolina farms, T. V. A. has worked with State and county agencies. All the county farm agents with whom I have talked have commented on the fine service and the cooperative spirit of this Federal agency, which is free of arbitrary methods.

Minerals research has been carried on in cooperation with State agencies, including work on kaolins, vermiculite, olivine and mica. Experiments in the T. V. A. ceramic laboratory at Norris Dam have increased use of North Carolina pottery clays. Whenever we have a problem pertaining to minerals, we find T. V. A. invariably ready to lend a helping hand. The agency has agreed to staff and equip a laboratory for research on clays which we are erecting in Asheville.

New and improved farm machinery is now in use in North Carolina. These improvements include a barn hay-drier and a small trailer-thresher developed by T. V. A. The trailer-thresher is manufactured by a North Carolina firm.

I am a strong believer in States' rights, but T. V. A. has done nothing which to my mind embodies any threat to the rights of this State. In building Fontana Dam, for example, it was necessary for T. V. A. to pond a highway. The agency agreed to build a satisfactory substitute road and also to extend a park area. There was nothing arbitrary about this, the whole thing being arranged through amicable negotiations.

Swain County has been deprived of a large part of its taxable land values by ponding for Fontana Dam, it is true, but this loss has been largely offset by T. V. A. payments in lieu of taxes. Certain T. V. A. revenues are paid into the State treasury, and this money is distributed to the affected counties on the basis of a formula recognized as equitable and satisfactory.

My only complaint about T. V. A. is that power generated in North Carolina is used by factories located mainly in other States. I would like to see the Federal Government place more war industries in this State, but I cannot hold T. V. A. responsible for the Government's policy in this regard.

To sum up, North Carolina has found T. V. A. to be thoroughly competent and cooperative, and public sentiment in the State is highly favorable.

J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON.

RALEIGH, N. C.

BY PRENTICE COOPER, GOVERNOR OF TENNESSEE

To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

The people of the United States are entitled to development of their country's natural resources. The only instrumentality capable of effectively developing a great river valley is the Federal Government.

T. V. A. benefits not just a region but the country as a whole. The agency is justified from the standpoint of national defense alone. Our country needs to develop great power resources in the interior, where installations are less vulnerable to attack than in coastal regions.

T. V. A. already has effected tremendous savings in flood control, and will provide extended protection after the war, when additional dams are constructed and reservoirs are operated for this purpose. National commerce has benefited from improvement of the inland waterways and cheap transportation rates.

People throughout the Tennessee Valley are enjoying low electric rates which the private companies used to tell us were fantastic and impossible. Our farms have been electrified, and rural life has been made more profitable and enjoyable. You will notice that, in speaking of T. V. A. benefits, I have placed several things ahead of cheap power. Power development is only one of the phases of this regional plan.

I have heard the argument that a regional authority centralizing control over a major drainage basin interferes with States' rights, and I consider it an example of cloudy thinking. It comes from failure to recognize what is a natural field for the Federal Government. From the beginning of this Nation, development of natural resources has been considered a Federal field.

I believe in upholding States' rights. I have served as head of the Southern Governors' Conference, and I drafted the resolution, which was unanimously adopted last year at the national conference of governors in Columbus, Ohio, calling for strict guarding of States' rights against Federal encroachment. During my 6 years as Governor of Tennessee, I certainly have had ample opportunity to study T. V. A., and I can say that the rights of this State and its citizens, far from having been restricted or violated by activities of this Federal agency, have been enlarged through enriched opportunities.

To those who contend that T. V. A. eliminates large areas from local taxation, let me say that these taxes have been more than replaced in Tennessee by T. V. A. contributions, both in the form of direct compensatory payments to the State treasury and in indirect benefits.

T. V. A. has proved an uplifting, progressive, civilizing influence on our people, and whatever opposition once existed in Tennessee has completely disappeared. The agency represents one of the best investments ever made with taxpayers' money. It would be little short of a crime if the benefits of such unified regional planning were not extended to other regions with undeveloped resources. The Missouri River Valley is only one of the regions capable of such development. We would like to see our Cumberland River Valley similarly developed.

PRENTICE COOPER.

NASHVILLE, TENN.

BY COLGATE W. DARDEN, JR., GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA

To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

Only a small part of Virginia is in the Tennessee River watershed, and T. V. A. has no construction projects in this State. Our experience with T. V. A. has been principally in soil conservation work. In this field the Federal agency has made a notable contribution, and farmers in southwest Virginia are enthusiastic about it.

Virginia has many test-demonstration farms using T. V. A. phosphate fertilizers. I am told that the State extension service, reporting results on 98 farms after 8 years, showed a 30 percent increase in farm income based on 1935 prices, 40 percent increase in crop yields and carrying capacity of pastures, a 25 pecent increase in livestock, and a 20 percent increase in labor efficiency.

T. V. A. has provided millions of seedlings for planting on eroded acres, and has established selective cutting demonstrations on farm woodlots.

T. V. A. operations in Virginia have not resulted in any encroachment on State rights. Of course, impairment of State rights might develop in the long run, and is a possibility to be borne in mind. But to date there has been no such impairment.

Virginia has enormous coal deposits at the expense of which hydroelectric power projects may be organized. I do not know whether such hydroelectric projects, financed with tax money, really provide cheaper electricity. It is a moot question, and T. V. A. production of power was the subject of considerable controversy before the war thrust most other considerations into the background.

COLGATE W. DARDEN, Jr.

RICHMOND, VA.

BY SIMEON S. WILLIS, GOVERNOR OF KENTUCKY

To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

T. V. A.'s work in Kentucky centers around the gigantic Kentucky Dam, $110,000,000 structure controlling the Tennessee River near its mouth. The dam, designed to extend the navigation channel 184 miles upstream and to reduce flood crests on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, is nearing completion.

The operational test for T. V. A. in Kentucky is yet to come. My experience with the agency during 1 year in office has been confined largely to the building stage. I can say that during this period there have been no conflicts between the State and the Federal agency. As far as I know there were no land controversies in preliminary work on the big dam.

There is no reason why T. V. A. should not be able to operate without encroaching on States' rights. The idea underlying the regional valley authority is sound, and it is perfectly reasonable for State and Federal governments to work together to realize all the varied advantages accruing from unified control of an entire drainage basin.

Of course, something has to be done to compensate local governmental units for loss of revenue in taxes on property taken over by T. V. A. The agency recognizes this, and has made substantial payments in lieu of taxes. I have only a preliminary report on these payments at present. The subject is under study, and is a matter for future development.

Anything improving the home life and the income of farmers naturally is welcome. T. V. A. has numerous test-demonstration farms in Kentucky, and has provided tons of phosphate and nitrate, with the result that there have been increases in net farm sales and livestock carried, and a reduction in labor required. To encourage sustained-yield forest practices, selective cutting demonstrations have been established on Kentucky farm woodlots. Municipal and cooperative systems supply T. V. A. power to a number of Kentucky consumers.

Development of Kentucky Lake, which will have a 2,000-mile shoreline, should provide a popular recreational area. T. V. A. has transferred 9,000 acres of land to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for inclusion in the Kentucky Woodlands National Wildlife Refuge.

SIMEON S. WILLIS.

FRANKFORT, KY.

BY THOMAS L. BAILEY, GOVERNOR OF MISSISSIPPI

To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

Mississippi was the first State in which T. V. A. power was distributed, commencing with Tupelo early in 1934. I was a member of the State legislature when this development was proposed. I supported this as well as subsequent T. V. A. measures.

We are largely an agricultural State, and any program, Federal or private, designed to bring electric power to rural sections is definitely a step forward in the development of the State. The life of our people has been greatly enriched by T. V. A. and the Rural Electrification Administration, the development and extension of cheaper electricity having proved sound and wholesome from every point of view.

Use of electrical appliances has lifted many of our burdens. In the northeastern part of the State, we are milking cows, pumping water, cutting wood, refrigerating food and giving decent light chiefly with T. V. A. power. Better refrigeration means not only a saving of food but improved health, while the electric pump, tank, water system, and sewage disposal facilities are likewise of incalculable value to public health. These vital things we owe largely to T. V. A., and to the power companies operating in our State.

I do not feel that the role played by this Federal agency in Mississippi has constituted any encroachment on our State rights. We have cooperated with T. V. A., and it has cooperated with us and our State agencies. The result has been satisfactory.

Development of cheaper electricity in other sections of the country, either through Federal agencies or private companies, where feasible and practicable, is in the interest of the Nation's welfare. In addition, such development would help provide jobs for returning service men and women and war workers, at the same time encouraging resettlement on the farm by giving to farm life the many blessings which would result from the use of electric energy.

THOMAS L. BAILEY.

JACKSON, MISS.

BY CHAUNCEY M. SPARKS, GOVERNOR OF ALABAMA

To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

At the inception of T. V. A. 11 years ago, I publicly stated that I considered this the

greatest experiment in empire building this Nation ever had undertaken. I have had no reason to change that view.

Under the leadership of David E. Lilienthal, T. V. A. Chairman, the agency has kept free of politics. Not only that, but T. V. A. has been careful to work with our State agencies and local communities. In its far-reaching soil-improvement experiments, T. V. A. has cooperated with the State extension service, and in developing industry it has worked with chambers of commerce and other local groups. There has been no question of a Federal agency coming in and riding roughshod over the State and local agencies.

T. V. A.'s fine record has impressed business, agriculture, and labor alike. In recent years I have found no opposition to T. V. A. Conducted as it has been conducted, with vision and regard for local agencies, it has made a tremendous contribution to public welfare.

Taxation is the major potential field of conflict between State and Federal rights. In this connection I should like to point out that the Federal agency makes an annual contribution to the State in lieu of taxes, appraising the value of lands taken over and making a contribution from its power earnings. Last year T. V. A. contributed $447,869 to the State treasury in lieu of taxes. In addition, it makes a settlement with each city and county affected on an ad valorem tax basis.

Taking into account what T. V. A. has done in improving flood control, navigation, power distribution, agriculture, cattle raising, dairying, soil conservation, and home life in general, I can say that the State has gained immeasurably more through service to its citizens than it has lost in mere taxes on lands taken over by the agency.

CHAUNCEY M. SPARKS.

MONTGOMERY, ALA.

BY ELLIS ARNALL, GOVERNOR OF GEORGIA

To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

The only complaint I have regarding T. V. A. is that its influence has not permeated this State further. Activities of this agency have been of great benefit to the people of Georgia, and we would welcome extension of T. V. A. operations from the northern to other sections of the State.

There once was talk about the danger of such a Federal agency wrecking local government and upsetting the tax structure. Such fears have proved unfounded. There has been no encroachment on States' rights, and I believe the States actually have received more money under the T. V. A. system of payments in lieu of taxes than they did before the Federal agency went into operation.

If we are going to industrialize the South and the West, we must have wider distribution of electric power. I might add that privately owned utilities have benefited from the advent of T. V. A., having been stimulated to render more service, with the result that their profits increased.

T. V. A. has been particularly active in cooperating with Georgia institutions in programs for development of the State's resources. Extensive work has been done in developing a flax-growing and processing industry with the Georgia School of Technology. In cooperation with several State institutions, T. V. A. was instrumental in setting up 30 community dehydrators in 1943 as a first step toward complete community food-processing plants.

This has been done in addition to rural electrification, establishment of test-demonstration farms, erosion control, forest fire control and selective cutting demonstrations for better utilization of forest resources. The mountain lakes T. V. A. has created in north Georgia have given marked impetus to our developing tourist industry.

People in all walks of life—business, agriculture and labor—have benefited from operations of this agency, and are grateful for T. V. A.

ELLIS ARNALL.

ATLANTA, GA.

Throat Operation Performed With Jackknife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by war correspondent Lee McCardell:

AID MAN WITH JACKKNIFE DOES THROAT OPERATION—INCISION IN WINDPIPE, HELD OPEN BY FOUNTAIN PEN, SAVES WOUNDED SOLDIERS' LIFE

(By Lee McCardell)

With United States Third Army, Germany, November 29.—A "tracheotomy" or windpipe operation performed with jackknife and fountain pen by a 19-year-old medical-aid man on a wounded American soldier under fire near Metz is believed to be one of the most remarkable pieces of battlefield surgery thus far reported in the war.

"Timely, resourceful, daring, and intelligent," was the description which Capt. David Dunn, of Westminster, Md., 5th Infantry Division surgeon, applied to the operation performed by Pvt. Duane N. Kinman, of College Place, Washington.

APPARENTLY SUFFOCATING

Kinman was binding up a chest wound and fractured ankle of another soldier when a mortar shell fragment struck a rifleman of his company in the throat. The rifleman fell in the mud and thrashed about from the pain caused by his slashed throat muscles, of what medical men later called a "perforation wound in the neck, with the wound exit over the tracheal area, and fracture of the trachea."

He was turning blue in the face, gasping and apparently suffocating from the windpipe injury which had cut off his breathing, when Kinman reached him.

Recollecting two lectures he had last year in basic training, Kinman whipped out his jackknife to perform an operation which is delicate even under the best surgical conditions. He knew he would have to open the wounded man's windpipe and he knew he would have to have a tube or wedge to keep it open. He noted the fountain pen in the wounded man's pocket.

BATTLE STILL RAGING

The battle was still raging. Under machine-gun fire and mortar fire, with a muddy field for an operating table and an overcast sky for light, without any anesthetic, Kinman cut into the wounded man's throat while another soldier held him down.

"I don't like to do this," said the aid man, "but it's the only way he's gonna live."

He made a clean incision of 1½ inches in the wounded man's windpipe at a point where a slip of the knife into the jugular vein would have been fatal. Into the incision to hold it open he slipped the rounded end of the infantryman's fountain pen.

"Keep that in and you'll be O. K.," said Kinman. "You can't breathe through your nose or your mouth, but if you keep that pen in your windpipe you can breathe through the cut I made."

WALKS TO AID STATION

Supported by Kinman, the wounded infantryman walked into the battalion aid station a few minutes later. The battalion surgeon stared at the improvised tracheotomy in amazement. Having no facilities to improve upon it, he sent the patient on back by ambulance. The wounded man was now able to stand up and breathe without difficulty.

At the clearing station of the Fifth Medical Battalion, Captain Dunn, surgeon on duty, marveled at the patient, now almost nonchalant about his injury. Captain Dunn removed the pen and inserted a regular tracheotomy tube.

From Captain Dunn's clearing station the wounded man was sent farther back to the field hospital where, after a brief period of observation by astonished doctors, he was evacuated to an evacuation hospital without further treatment.

Kinman, 5 feet 10 inches tall, had completed two years' high school and was working as a truck driver when inducted into the Army in September 1943. He joined the Fifth Division last September as a replacement medic when the Fifth was fighting in the Moselle River bridgehead.

Don't Buy Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published by the Onancock (Va.) News with respect to a speech made by the Honorable James A. Farley before the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce at Birmingham, Ala.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T BUY BUSINESS

Mr. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, recently spoke in Birmingham, Ala., advising the people of the South to balance their agriculture with industry and to make it possible for the people, through increased incomes, to satisfy their wants and their needs.

In addition, Mr. Farley urged that no effort be made to buy business, declaring that "I am not one who would advocate giving free sites to industries, years of tax exemption, special concessions and franchises, guaranties of roads and highways, waterworks, etc."

The New Yorker puts his finger on one of the rackets of modern industrial progress. Very often a community is faced with demands from a prospective industry that it provide, free of charge, certain essentials which are the legitimate expense of business. The people proposing the new enterprise are anxious to get as much as they can for nothing and are adept in playing one community against another. As localities bid against each other, the net result is the loss

of considerable revenue and the donation of considerable public funds.

Mr. Farley asserts that "real legitimate business does not ask, does not expect, and would not have these baubles hung in front of their faces." He adds that "the business that demands these is worth looking into—it savors too much of speculation and too little of permanency; it rings too much of theory and too little of practice; it's long on hope and short on know-how."

We thoroughly approve the sentiments expressed by Mr. Farley and give them publicity. Nevertheless, we have no illusions that what he says will persuade industry-hungry localities from attempting to buy business. In the long run, however, we are convinced that there is no net gain.

Sixth War Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message from the Territory of Hawaii:

JANUARY 6, 1945.

Subscriptions to the Sixth War Loan in the Territory of Hawaii were more than double the quota set for the islands.

The office of the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, was informed of this record in a wire from Honolulu today following an announcement by Fred Kanne, collector of internal revenue at Honolulu, telling the results of the drive and speaking in the highest praise of the response from all elements of the civilian population, including many thousands of war workers, and men in the armed services to the Sixth War Loan drive.

In confirming the results of this drive, the Treasury Department informed the Delegate that Hawaii had subscribed 210 percent of its quota.

The goal in the Territory was twenty million. Subscriptions up to last Wednesday were in excess of $41,100,000.

The total subscriptions to series E bonds were $14,200,000, with a quota of $10,000,000. Subscriptions to other bonds reached $26,900,418.

Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us who supported the amendment making the Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities a standing committee, hope that it may become a positive force in American life. We hope that it may increasingly define the real meaning of the word "America."

It is time we were brought to realize, to use the vernacular, that "we've got something here" in America that others do not have. Without the spirit that built America, without the atmosphere that can and does make divergents live peaceably together "peace on earth among men of good will" is altogether impossible.

I was much impressed with an article in the Washington News for January 6, 1945:

FREE ENTERPRISE

(The author of this challenging article is A. L. Swim, a staff writer for the Scripps-Howard Memphis Press-Scimitar and a member of the American Newspaper Guild. He is also president of the Memphis Industrial Council, C. I. O.)

The people who are talking loudest about "free enterprise" are not the people who stood in bread lines during the depression, or walked picket lines while organized labor was fighting to establish itself, or dug ditches for W. P. A.

This is unfortunate because the group that did those things is large and politically powerful.

It is unfortunate that the campaigners for "free enterprise" are too easily associated in the minds of wage earners with the closing of factory gates and the employment of strike-breakers.

And it is unfortunate that those now fighting to preserve the fundamental American way of doing things haven't a better slogan than "free enterprise."

If any radical change is made in the American system it will come with the support or at least the approval of those who did the picketing and the ditch digging.

This support or approval will result from their dissatisfaction with what they have had in the past and their desire for something better.

They will remember that they went through their worst period of economic stress under "free enterprise."

They will recall that it was the Government which fed and clothed them when "free enterprise" failed to do the job.

They will be inclined to forget that "free enterprise" built the factories and the railroads that gave them the jobs they lost during the depression, and to skip over the fact that the United States, under a "free enterprise" system, advanced further and faster economically and politically than any other nation ever did.

It's human nature to remember the bad forget the good—and that's why too many people associate "free enterprise" with land grabbing, long hours, low pay, bad working conditions, indiscriminate firing, the lockout, labor spies, and strike breakers.

Somebody should hang a new tag on the type of enterprise that has made America great. And there should be less talking about ideology and more about results—the things that really count.

The average person who works for a living—whether on the farm or in the city—measures his progress by the groceries he buys, the house he occupies, the clothes he can provide for himself and his family, the medical and educational services he can get, the amount of work he has to do and the money he can save.

He's more interested in pork chops than in isms—and this is no reflection on his intelligence.

Why don't the "free enterprise" campaigners take advantage of this? Why don't they use plain facts instead of fancy phrases?

What facts?

Facts like these:

The worst an American employer can do to an employee is fire him.

In a government-controlled state—such as Russia—the employer (the party in power) can and often does "liquidate" offending employees.

In the United States, in peacetime, a person can change jobs when he pleases, eat where he pleases, sleep where he pleases, have his fun where he finds it, and buy his groceries and clothes at stores of his own choosing.

In communistic Russia a person is told where he must work—and that's where he works. He eats in a government-designated restaurant, plays in a government-operated recreation area, buys his merchandise at noncompetitive government stores.

In this country a person can begin at the bottom of the economic heap and work to the top—if he has the ability.

In a socialistic state one gets to the top because of political connections or stays at the bottom because of lack of them—with working ability playing little part in his progress.

An American industrial worker can rise in a union meeting and declare that his boss is a dirty bum, a lousy chiseler, a pinch-penny tightwad—and get by with it.

Totalitarian states have concentration camps and firing squads for workers who talk that way about their bosses—the political party.

An American farmer can, without fear of reprisal, yell across the fence to his neighbor that the Secretary of Agriculture is a crackpot and that "the President doesn't know any more about farming than a hog on ice."

When you farm for the state you do what you're told and keep your mouth shut.

Facts? There are plenty:

The men in America's depression breadlines dressed better than the men who queued up in front of Russian stores at the height of Russian prosperity.

Workers who have been smarting under wartime controls that "froze" them to their jobs and limited their pay increases have had only a slight taste of what Government control can mean.

Landlords irked by O. P. A.'s rent freezes know just a little about Government "direction" of business.

Anybody who has tried to get W. P. B. priorities knows only a bit about Government red tape.

Let's cite the facts. Let's compare actual living in this country with that of socialistic states.

And America's "little people"—the important John Joneses and Mary Smiths who make up the Nation's backbone—should never forget this:

Under the American system of enterprise you can fight back at those who take advantage of you. Sometimes you win and sometimes you lose—but you can fight without being jailed or shot.

Nineteen Hundred and Forty-five Food Outlook Is on the Lean Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the best over-all statements of the food supply situation from a nongovernmental source was contained in an address recently made by Paul S. Willis, president of the Grocery Manufacturers of America, reported in the New York Times of January 2, 1945. It contains so much information of vital interest to food distributors and housewives it seems to me

worthy to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Due to a variety of reasons, the food supply situation for this new year will be tight in many areas. I am sure Members will benefit by learning the facts from so well informed an authority.

The titles of the article summarize the story. They are: Nineteen Hundred and Forty-five Food Outlook Is On the Lean Side; Willis Predicts That Less Meat, Butter, and Sugar Will Be Available for Civilians; World Factors Blamed; Milk, Eggs, Cereal Products, and Margarine Expected To Make Up Other Deficits.

The article is as follows:

1945 FOOD OUTLOOK IS ON THE LEAN SIDE—WILLIS PREDICTS THAT LESS MEAT, BUTTER, AND SUGAR WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR CIVILIANS—WORLD FACTORS BLAMED—MILK, EGGS, CEREAL PRODUCTS, AND MARGARINE EXPECTED TO MAKE UP OTHER DEFICITS

American civilians will have less meat, butter, sugar, and certain processed foods during the next 3 months than at any time since the war began, but they will eat at least 7 percent more per person of food of all kinds during 1945 than they averaged in the years 1935 through 1939, according to Paul S. Willis, president of the Grocery Manufacturers of America.

Milk, eggs, cereal products, margarine, certain vegetables and fruits—and perhaps even an increase in turkeys—will make up the deficits in other food items, Mr. Willis indicated in a food-supply analysis and forecast.

Declaring that the return to rationing last week of many foods that had been point free had been made necessary by the unexpected military reverses in Europe and by other distressing world factors, including record floods in Europe and a drought in Australia, Mr. Willis said that the Office of Price Administration's action was heartily endorsed by well-informed leaders in the food industry.

FLEXIBLE RATIONING SYSTEM

Although the return of so many food items to the ration list was "grim and disappointing news to many people," said Mr. Willis, it was fortunate that the rationing system was flexible enough to change quickly with changing conditions.

"When foods were more plentiful early this fall," he said, "it was clearly indicated that rationing be relaxed. Now that an unexpected reverse has halted our military progress, it is wise to revert quickly to our fair share system of distributing available supplies."

Mr. Willis made the following statement about the food situation:

"Just as the German offensive in Belgium and Luxembourg has forced us to revise our estimates of how quickly the United Nations can achieve victory on the western front, so it has also forced us to revise downward our estimates of the food supplies that will be available for civilian use in 1945.

"Only a few months ago, our military leaders seemed sure of victory in 1944. America had just harvested bumper crops, and food manufacturers had set new high production records. With VE-day in sight we could then expect some surplus foods and the return of competitive selling in 1945. But as the fortunes of war shift, so must our home front estimates."

PROSPECT IS FOR LESS

"Because of steeply increased military requirements the prospects now are that in spite of huge production there will be less meat, less of many processed foods, less butter, and less sugar for civilian use in the first quarter of 1945 than at any time since the war began.

"Not only our temporary military setback in Europe, but other unfortunate world conditions indicate that the drain on American food supplies will be very great in the coming year.

"The most significant news comes from Europe and Australia. Europe is experiencing its worst floods in 100 years—floods that are seriously damaging large areas of some of Europe's most productive farm land. In peace times Europe supplies about 90 percent of its own food supplies. According to early optimistic estimates, most of Europe's needs in 1945 could be met if Germany had been defeated in 1944. However, because of the continuation of the war and destructive floods, European relief feeding requirements will be far higher in 1945 than any previous estimates would indicate.

"On the other side of the world, in Australia, the farmers are suffering a drought of calamitous proportions. Only the droughts of 1902 and 1914 equal it.

"Wheat production in Australia is expected to be less than one-half of last year's crop. Large numbers of sheep are being slaughtered because of the shortage of fodder.

"The past dependence of the American armed forces on Australia for food supply, as well as Britain's dependence on food imports from the dominions, makes the drought losses very important in our own forward thinking. In order to conserve shipping space, a very large proportion of the subsistence supplies for United States armed forces in the Pacific area have come from Australia. Shipping space is somewhat more plentiful today, but the number of men in the Southwest Pacific area has been greatly increased, so this advantage is largely canceled out."

BRITAIN'S PLACE VITAL

"Britain's place and problems in the world food picture are also vital in estimating the 1945 food situation in the United States. The British Minister of Food has announced that England will purchase all surplus beef, mutton, and lamb from Australia and New Zealand until June 1948. Canada is to supply nearly 12,000,000,000 pounds of bacon through 1946. All exportable sugar from the colonies and dominions up to 1947 is to go to Britain.

"All this spells one thing for the United States: We are soon to face the problem of supplying practically all our food for our own military forces and can place less dependence in the war years to come on nearby Allied sources.

"In spite of these gloomy prospects, the total civilian supply of food in America in 1945 is expected to continue about the same as in 1944, when per capita civilian consumption was at least 7 percent above the pre-war average, 1935–39 period.

"Just as the floods in Europe and drought in Australia are upsetting previous estimates, so the weather this coming year here in America may be the key factor. We have had 5 straight years of extraordinary fine growing weather. The law of averages is against a repetition in 1945. But if we have normal growing weather, it is possible to approximately estimate production.

"Supplies of some fruits, turkeys, and beef may be larger next year, but supplies of pork, potatoes, butter, and, perhaps, chicken and some fresh vegetables probably will be smaller. Civilian food supplies will not be generally changed by the end of the European war since noncivilian requirements will continue to take a substantial proportion of the total food supplies throughout 1945.

"For the year 1944, as a whole, civilian supplies of most of the manufactured dairy products, canned fruits and vegetables, better grades of beef and turkeys have been short of civilian demand at ceiling prices. However, relatively large supplies of cereal products, lard, margarine, eggs, pork, canned fruit juices, and the principal fresh fruits, particularly citrus, have been available for civilian consumption. Even though sales of fluid milk and cream have been restricted, their consumption reached a new high and has been very important in meeting civilian nutritive needs.

"Civilian meat supplies, particularly pork, were very large until last summer. Since then, they have been reduced considerably by seasonal decreases in production during the summer and by markedly increasing war requirements for the last quarter. However, meat consumption for the year as a whole probably will be from 140 to 145 pounds per capita. In 1945, it appears that civilians will get much less pork but more beef. Per capita consumption of all meat will fall but probably will be still above the 123-pound average in 1935–39.

"Egg consumption in 1944 has been unusually high, even with the very large meat consumption. It is probable that civilians will consume at least as many eggs next year. Chicken supplies for civilians probably will be reduced a little because of some decrease in production. Turkey supplies may increase somewhat.

"Butter supplies for civilians next year might be below the level of 1943 and 1944 because production may fall off again next year. Fluid milk supplies will continue at a near record level. Cheese and evaporated milk probably will continue to be short of full civilian demand. If noncivilian requirements continue at the 1944 rate, less lard would be available for civilians next year because of the reduction in hog slaughter. Supplies of shortening and edible oils for civilians may be about the same in 1945 as in 1944, but smaller than in 1943. However, margarine supplies will be slightly increased.

"FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

"Civilian fruit and vegetable supplies in 1944 have been about the same in total as in average pre-war years, 1935–39, and, if weather conditions are about average, there probably will be little change in over-all supplies next year. Canned fruits have been short, but there have been large increases over 1943 in the consumption of canned fruit juices and fresh fruit, particularly citrus, and some increased consumption of dried fruits. Canned fruits will continue short in 1945. Increased supplies of bananas and other fresh fruits from outside the country might balance possible decreases in fresh deciduous fruit production.

"Similarly in vegetables, fresh supplies in 1944 have been large, but supplies of some of the commercially processed vegetables have been somewhat short of civilian demand. During 1945 supplies of some fresh vegetables may decrease from the very high levels of 1944. However, supplies from Victory gardens and home canning may be expected to continue large."

Address by Bernard M. Baruch at Federation Day Breakfast Meeting, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Bernard M. Baruch at the Federation Day breakfast meeting, New York City, on Tuesday, December 12, 1944.

No man in America, in my judgment, has contributed more generously and effectively to the public good of our Nation than has Mr. Baruch. The great things he has accomplished and the success of his efforts are evidenced in many ways, although he himself does his best to avoid publicity.

America owes a great debt of gratitude to Mr. Baruch for his services, which I am happy to say, are recognized generally, and greatly appreciated.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your invitation to be here today brought certain thoughts to my mind—thoughts that are as applicable to all other religions or communities as they are to the Jews. Therefore, I think they may be called American.

If we want to retain the system of personal initiative, we must support private charity; the two go hand in hand. Abolish private charity and the State takes over, in a grim, organized, statistical way.

The day of the old poorhouse will return, because bureaucracy will lack the personal touch possessed by our present highly developed system. This is enlightened self-interest. Yes; I am willing to call it that. What motive in life is not open to that perfectly proper interpretation?

I do not like classes or groups that come together for special pressure purposes, as opposed to the general good. I believe in the preservation of a broad front, without cleavages into special interests. But, charity is not special. Because, it is for another we give—not for ourselves, except for the joy in giving.

There are primary liberties to which this country is consecrated. Those liberties have to do with the basic rights of all peoples. After these liberties come certain privileges.

I want to give my life—I hope I can say continue to give my life—to the protection of freedom of speech, of worship and of assembly. Upon these things rest social justice, social progress and economic privileges. No matter what organized society may do, however, each one must finally rely upon himself.

The system of individual effort, which we call the capitalistic system is the best in the world. It has proved itself so in peace and in war. I believe in trying to better that system, instead of tearing it down. I believe it rests upon the elements that I have named, and that the protection of these essentials leads to certain social and economic levels, which promise progress.

These levels cannot be attained without fully realizing that the enterprise system carries personal obligations and that one of them—charity—is greatest at this moment.

The Jew has always tried to take care of his own. That characteristic has always been a proud badge of the members of this faith, and is even a prouder one these days when paternalism is so soft and beguiling.

We must proclaim the lessons we learn—that we live by the sweat of our brow—that helpfulness to others is helpfulness to ourselves; that these are measures of a social conscience, which we freely accept and enact, rejecting a pauperizing, strength-destroying form of statism, against which the whole spirit of America is committed.

Another Jew said, 1900 years ago—the fighting St. Paul: "And now abideth faith, hope, and charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." (New Testament—I Corinthians xiii: 1–4, 13.)

Let us go forth and follow this preachment.

Tragedy of One-Man Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, under date of December 21, 1944, the eminent columnist, David Lawrence, presented in the daily newspapers of the country in an article entitled "Tragedy of One-Man Rule," certain thoughts and observations which I consider of value. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, December 21.—This has been a week of tragedy in Government. For in the midst of a war being fought to establish the "four freedoms," democratic government acquiesced in what may be termed the crucifixion of principle.

Whether the plan for the partition of Poland proposed by Marshal Stalin and defended by Prime Minister Churchill is right or wrong, and whether the forces of dissension in Belgium and Greece should have been handled by a military government instead of by political puppets—all these questions are being debated in the House of Commons. But should the Senate of the United States, as a coordinate branch of government in the matter of advice on foreign policy, remain silent?

The American people must, indeed, be bewildered as they read the press dispatches from world capitals today. First, the British Prime Minister makes an extended speech to the House of Commons in which he plainly and openly introduces a violation of what the whole world had understood to be the principles of the Atlantic Charter, then a day later the Prime Minister says he had "a lapse of memory" and was referring to a different document which apparently was in conflict with the Atlantic Charter.

On top of this, when the whole country is waiting for some expression from President Roosevelt in comment on the Prime Minister's speech, the President indulges in a half-humorous discussion of how the actual Atlantic Charter was never signed, how it consisted of a number of scribbled statements by himself and the Prime Minister aboard a warship in the Atlantic in August 1941, and how, when an important treaty embodying the Atlantic Charter was to be signed, nobody could find the document, and there was no ink in his fountain pen to sign it, etc., etc.

Certainly when anybody wants to wiggle out of a contract a dozen excuses can be found. The President gave the impression that maybe the exact language of the Atlantic Charter wasn't so important after all because it was not signed by anybody but was merely a "press release" containing principles that could now be variously interpreted or applied.

The World War has gone on for 3 years so far as the United States is concerned, and our casualties have passed the 500,000 mark, and mothers and fathers of the boys who are making the sacrifices are being told, in effect, that our war aims really never had any binding basis on our allies and that the principles could be altered to suit the whims or the ambitions of the statesmen of other countries.

The root of the trouble is that three men—Churchill, Stalin, and Roosevelt—are handling the world's affairs without regard to parliaments, legislatures, or congresses. Discussion has been discouraged on the theory that it would hurt the solidarity of the Big Three heads of state. But much more important than this is the morale of peoples, especially the American people whose manpower and whose resources are bearing the brunt of the struggle.

If, however, the President failed to see his true responsibility this week, the Senate failed also. Jealous about its power of treaty making and ready and willing to oppose any change in its authority, the Senate nevertheless did not have a session of its Foreign Relations Committee to formulate and present to the President and the Secretary of State its advice as required by the Constitution in the making of international understandings.

Territorial rearrangements and shifts of population abroad are very much a matter of concern to the Senate. It would be a grave mistake if the Senate waited until after these Executive agreements had been made and disappointments had been engendered throughout the world, sowing the seeds of a third world war, before saying anything about the circumstances now being unfolded.

One-man government plunged Germany into the war after one-man government had made a treaty of alliance between Russia and Germany in 1939. One-man government is the root of all the tragedy this week because national legislatures are not being informed and hence peoples are also in the dark. The indifference of the Congress is incomprehensible. It may or may not be the result of the indifference of the American people themselves to what is happening before their eyes.

Biddle Bargains Bioff-Browne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, again we have further evidence of the incompetency of Attorney General Biddle. A few years ago this country was shocked by the revelations in the trials of Willie Bioff, a professed panderer and George Browne, international president of a union and an intimate of Capone gangsters. These men were shake-down artists of a high order and were found guilty and sentenced to prison. Then the Attorney General made a deal with these criminals and now to the further astonishment of the people, these crooks are given their liberty after serving 3 "soft" years. It is about time Mr. Biddle was removed from office by impeachment.

As a part of these remarks I include herein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal:

BIOFF-BROWNE PAROLE

Willie Bioff was a panderer. George E. Browne was a pal of Capone gangsters. Browne was president of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees. Bioff was his personal representative in Hollywood. Together they extorted at least $550,000 from the motion-picture industry, threatening to call strikes if the blackmail was not paid.

These men, who betrayed their positions of leadership of 125,000 persons, whose actions were destructive to the very life of honest unions, who extorted huge sums by gangster methods, were found guilty and sentenced in November 1941. Bioff got 10 years and Browne 8 years. They also paid fines—$10,000 each, mere tokens of the amounts they extorted.

Months ago there were rumors that the Attorney General's office had promised Bioff and Browne paroles in a deal to secure their help in convicting six other Chicago crooks. The deal was denied.

But what happens now? After having served only 3 years—not too arduous years, at that, with many months spent at somewhat less than hard labor while they were kept available as Government witnesses—these two crooks are given their parole freedom because of their aid in the trial of the six. The Attorney General's Office does not oppose the parole. No deal, eh? That is hard to believe. And Judge Knox doesn't talk about their conviction as "a breath of fresh air," as he talked at the time they were convicted. Rather, he explains that these two men have "really aided the Government with their testimony."

Must Uncle Sam bargain with panderers and gangsters to get testimony?

The Ghost of Mr. Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun of January 5, 1945:

THE GHOST OF MR. DIES' COMMITTEE COMES TO LIFE

It turns out now that obituaries written to mourn or to celebrate the passing of the Dies committee were premature. By a tour de force of parliamentary strategy, Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, succeeded in reestablishing the Committee on Un-American Activities as a permanent standing committee of the House of Representatives on the opening day of the new session.

This committee was the personal vehicle of Congressman Dies, and when he failed to run for reelection the common assumption was that it would pass quietly out of existence. To be sure, as a vehicle for Mr. Dies, it has already gone beyond recall. The question now is, What useful role can the revived committee play?

The Dies committee was not an unmixed blessing. True, it did much to enlighten the public on the activities of those who employ the constitutional immunities of our system for the purpose of working against that system. This was useful work, and work of a kind which could have been done only by a congressional committee endowed with a congressional committee's special powers. The black fury of the persons whose activities were thus aired, though it impressed the gullible, does not alter the fact that through the committee the people of this country learned a great deal about the political methods and objectives of the extreme Left and the extreme Right, which they had never learned in school.

On the other hand, Mr. Dies' methods of work were hardly above criticism. On occasion he showed small scruple for some of those same constitutional immunities which it was his sworn purpose to defend. Too frequently he played the part of a prosecuting attorney rather than a disinterested investigator, showed indications of personal malice and vindictiveness, disregarded the accepted rules of evidence, and used his position to "pillory" individuals on very doubtful grounds.

All that was bad; and that is what explained the suspicion in which the Dies committee was held by so many men of good will.

Now that the committee has been given a new lease on life, and has been shorn of Mr. Dies, the House of Representatives should insist that its methods of procedure be placed above criticism. The work of public enlightenment can properly go on; and a congressional committee is well equipped to perform it. But Congress should beware of creating a private gestapo, an inquisition, a vehicle for some congressman's personal witch hunt. A continuing congressional investigation of some of those matters which concerned the original Dies committee is not only justifiable but perhaps desirable. However, it is investigation, not persecution, that is wanted.

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, with great pleasure I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very excellent editorial recently appearing in the Lewistown Democrat-News of Lewistown, Mont. This newspaper, edited by the Honorable Tom Stout, a former Member of Congress, has presented to its readers a clear and forceful editorial supporting the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority. While many newspapers are engaged in confusing the issues involved in this proposed legislation, Mr. Stout has presented a convincing argument in its support. I am most happy to ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NONPARTISAN APPROACH NEEDED

As the lines tighten for the battle over who shall develop the Missouri River Basin and how it shall be done, there is evident need for a common-sense approach to the whole problem.

As we hear and read the opinions on the subject both in the Halls of Congress and from leaders here in the State, we have become concerned over the selfish partisanship that has entered the debate. Here we stand on the eve of the greatest development of our region in history—development that promises far-reaching changes in our whole economic life—and some factions choose to confuse the principles behind the project with fencing in pure partisan language. Where name calling begins, there reason leaves off. And there is getting to be too much name calling in this matter.

The sole issue must be which method of procedure in development of the river basin will do the greatest number the most good. As pointed out before, the reclamation interests and the Army engineers have resolved some of their differences, which is indicative of progress in the matter. Many of the proposed dams have been agreed upon. But there is still conflict, however, over whether flood control or irrigation should take precedence in the development. That is largely an upriver versus a downriver clash, for the floods downstream are just as pressing a problem as the need for irrigation is upstream. The matter of maintaining a navigable channel also enters the picture.

The proposed Missouri Valley authority would pattern the development organization after the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is winning increased recognition as an eminent success despite the bitter fight conducted by private power interests to discredit it. The problems of the Tennessee Valley were to develop cheaper electric power and control floods. The T. V. A. has accomplished that and given residents of that valley a new economic outlook.

The Missouri Valley is vastly larger and its problems more complicated. To needs for abundance of cheap electric power and flood control are added the needs for vast quantities of irrigation water for reclamation projects in the semi-arid West. The problems are more complex in our valley but the principle of an all-valley panning project cannot be successfully challenged, whether it is the M. V. A. or called by some other name. A pattern must be worked out for the entire valley and development follow those lines. There can be no place for individual State planning and development, for that would result in an endless hodge-podge of inadequacies and conflicting State interests.

Protect State rights within reason, yes; but don't sacrifice the future of the valley for a political principle. A balance of interests of all people through the valley must be struck and serve as a guide.

There is no reason why flood-control and irrigation interests cannot be meshed. In fact, by all appearance they seem complementary; downstream they don't want the water, and we do. More common sense must enter the planning.

Beware those who condemn any plan as entirely wrong, or who hold up the bugaboo of bureaucratic control. They are talking from selfish or partisan motivation. The stake of all residents of this valley in its development is too great, the interests of the individuals or individual companies are too small to let partisanship dictate the program.—Lewistown Democrat-News.

Mr. Dies' Political Ghost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this new Congress a most unusual step was taken when the rules of the House were amended in order that a new standing committee might be created. In my judgment this was not only bad procedure, but the committee so established, unless very carefully conducted, can become a real danger to the

ideals of American democracy. Millions of Americans realize the menace of the old special committee popularly known as the Dies Committee. Those same Americans, shocked by the action of Congress on its first day, are now hoping that the unusual step then taken will not have the serious consequences to this Nation that are potentially present.

I am very much impressed by the following editorial from the New York Times January 5, 1945, and should like to include it here as a part of my extension of remarks. It seems to express in succinct fashion the hopes of many of us:

MR. DIES' POLITICAL GHOST

A shift of a dozen votes would have defeated the parliamentary offensive by which Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, succeeded on Monday in resurrecting the ghost of the Dies committee. Mr. RANKIN and his southern Democrats and northern Republicans worked fast, and one can only conclude that they feared defeat if their measure had proper consideration. Some indication of what the public thought of the methods of the old Dies committee may be had from the election returns. Mr. Dies and three others out of eight failed to return to Congress. If Mr. Dies didn't even venture to run it was plainly because he knew he could not be reelected.

The Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities suffered from ambiguity at its birth. Just what is an un-American activity? The law defines crimes against the state, and persons committing such crimes are admittedly un-American. But is it un-American to hold an unpopular opinion? Is it un-American to hold an opinion or take an attitude that is also held or taken by Communists? The Dies committee, or rather Mr. Dies for the most part, seemed to think so. Had he pushed his position to its logical end more than half the population of the United States might have been denounced, for surely most of us wished for the success of the Communist arms and for friendly relations between Washington and Moscow. Still, most of us were not un-American. Moreover, even when Mr. Dies was pursuing a border-line offense or a totally imaginary crime he used methods that old-fashioned persons regard as un-American—indictment by innuendo, refusal of defense testimony, prosecution, and sometimes persecution, in place of impartial investigation.

There are, of course, un-American activities, and possibly the F. B. I., the State and local police, the local, State, and Federal courts are not competent to deal with all of them. Perhaps a few congressional amateurs are required to supplement the existing and time-honored agencies. If this is so, let us hope that at the least the resurrected committee will not itself indulge, as Mr. Dies' committee surely did, in un-American practices. Let it be impartial. Let it respect the rules of evidence. These changes would be an improvement that might make the committee useful.

America's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Edgar H. Bierly, of Emporium, Pa.

AMERICA'S PRAYER

Our Heavenly Father, hear our prayer,
Bless Americans everywhere,
Whether on land or on the sea,
Headed for endless eternity,
Bring them back to Thy loving care,
This, O Lord, is our earnest prayer.

If we should fall or go astray,
Or walk in our own will, or way,
As we are sometimes tempted to do,
And even crucify our Saviour anew,
Forgive us and take us back into thy loving care;
This, O Lord, is our earnest prayer.

We thank Thee, Lord, from day to day,
For what Thou hast done for the U. S. A.
Continue to guard us forevermore;
Keep all tyrants from our shore;
Guard us and guide everywhere;
This, O Lord, is our earnest prayer.

God protect America, our native land;
Firm may she ever stand.
Continue to guide by Thy loving hand,
Until before the "judgment bar" we stand,
Then take us all home to Thy loving care;
This, O Lord, is America's prayer. Amen.

—*Edgar H. Bierly.*

A Reason Why Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported the Dies committee since its original establishment as a special committee. I have voted for every appropriation made in its behalf. I would vote for a similar resolution at the proper time, but I shall not vote for the pending motion and take that position with no excuse, alibi, or apology therefor.

The reasons offered by the majority leader in opposition to the proposition are sound and adequate. We are confronted by an attempt to establish a new and standing committee out of order, prematurely, in amendment to if not in violation of the existing rules of procedure. There is no exigency which demands the use of such high-pressure tactics at this time in the session.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the action that is proposed by the pending amendment to the rules of the House to create a standing Committee on Un-American Activities is, to say the least, a rather singular proceeding.

The matter has not been presented to the Rules Committee in line with the customary procedure. The jurisdiction and the number of members on the committee proposed by this amendment has been considered by nobody other than the author of the amendment. It is in every respect so unorthodox that, as a former Speaker of the House of Representatives, I am compelled to pause and consider carefully our contemplated action today from a parliamentary standpoint.

A standing investigation committee is in itself a most unusual committee. If it be the purpose of the House to have a permanent committee to conduct investigations, then surely the committee should be larger and its jurisdiction and scope extended so that it might well serve at least as a kind of investigatory pool.

But there is an even more persuasive reason why I shall vote against this proposed amendment of the House rules. In the very last week of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the House passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the creation of a joint committee of the House and Senate to examine into and to make recommendations covering the broad subject of the reorganization of Congress. That committee was appointed. I have the honor of membership on it.

Among other things, the resolution whereby that committee was created provides for a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress. It is authorized to make recommendations with a view to the simplification and strengthening of this body, parliamentarily and otherwise.

Furthermore, the resolution authorizes the study of the "structure and relationships between the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress."

There is general agreement that this study is long overdue. The very purpose of this study is to so improve the techniques, the processes, the organization and the operations of the legislative branch as to improve its effectiveness and to recapture the prestige and position which it has always occupied in public esteem.

Here, however, is proposed without adequate consideration or study, the creation of a new committee of unknown and uncertain authority in the very face of the action taken in the last week of the preceding Congress. It doesn't make sense. What's the hurry? Why not defer this matter? Why not let it become a part of the subject matter to come before the Reorganization Committee? Why not approach this problem in a rational and proper manner and afford the consideration which is due a matter of such importance?

I would find myself in a most illogical position were I to vote approval of the pending amendment. For that reason I shall vote nay. I feel certain that I express the sentiments of my colleague from Illinois, for he has already indicated his position by voting against the amendment as has also my colleague from Oklahoma, both of whom are members of the special committee Congress has selected to help clean up some of these things.

I am opposed to the resolution. My objection is directed at the parliamentary processes involved in the premises. The work, duties, and responsibilities of the Dies committee or its successor are not an issue or involved in this vote. I am opposed to the method and manner of submitting the proposition to amend the rules to increase the number of regular committees of the House without further study of the situation.

Capital and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, we are told the great industrialist, Charles M. Schwab, once said that the three M's were the essentials of success—men, management, and money. In the present trends in our political economy, it seems our labor leaders are prone to overlook the part that management and capital plays in support of prosperous industry and a balanced national economy.

There recently came to my desk a treatise on capital and labor which I have rearranged and condensed for the consideration of my colleagues. I regret that the original has been misplaced, and I am unable to give credit to the author. However, the condensation is inserted herewith:

Some people say that capital is the enemy of mankind; and capitalists can succeed only by exploiting labor and oppressing the poor. The theory is false.

The average cash investment for each American worker in industry is $6,000. This investment provides, on the average, six horsepower of installed and motivated mechanical equipment for each employee to use. It is this capital investment which makes the higher man-hour production possible and justifies the correspondingly higher pay and higher standard of living.

Seldom can the workman himself furnish this $6,000 investment. Some investor (capitalist) puts up the money in hope of getting greater yield from superior tools, thus speeding up the worker's production.

Compare what capital and labor receive from an average investment in American industry. According to the best available figures, stockholders received 4 to 6 percent on such investments over the past 10 years. Wages, as a result of this same investment, have doubled; climbed twice as high as the English standard, three times the earning of men who use the still cruder tools familiar to continental Europeans. The average American worker has increased his income nearly 300 percent as a result of capital invested by the American industrialist, while the capitalist himself gets only a 6 percent return. The average is even less.

Under the American system, labor benefits more from the capitalist's investment in industry than does the capitalist himself. In other words, capital is labor's benefactor—a friend without which American labor would be living on European standards—yes, without which all labor would be living on the standards of China.

China's interior had a civilization before the year 1. America was a jungle long after Christopher Columbus was laid to rest. Now, 500 years from start, America's interior has railroads and tank cars and moves kerosene 200 miles a day for 1 cent a gallon, but the Chinese still lug their oil on the end of a stick 100 miles in 10 days at 10 cents a gallon. Chinese coolies draw a dime a day and walk; American railroaders get $8.50 a day and ride. It is a matter worth looking into.

There are great opportunities in China and the people who live there see these opportunities and let them pass. Why? Simply because they don't dare invest their money in anything. The economic system is such that both bandits and government rob business. Capital hasn't got a chance. Under the local war lords, whose tenure is by force, it is a government of grab. If a wealthy man, or an association of well-to-do men, or a rich corporation of small stockholders invests money in something, it's gone. They lose it. The rulers take it if bandits don't beat them to it. Private business on any new scale, as soon as it prospers, is confiscated. As a result nothing prospers.

In America we have an average investment in tools of $3,000 per farmer. Counting the value of the land, farm investment averages $6,000 per farmer. With good tools, each workman of the soil cultivates 50 to 400 acres. He can't eat up a modicum of what he raises. The surplus is exchanged for improved equipment and learning; for automobiles, refrigerators, and radios; for dress suits, jewelry, and oriental rugs that a Chinese family spent their lives weaving. With an investment like the Chinese enjoy, American farmers would till few acres, have little or no surplus and do without practically everything—even health.

Any move against invested capital is backward in America's path of unique progress.

Montana Wants a Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, when a Missouri Valley Authority which would solve the many problems confronting the States in the Missouri River Basin was originally suggested, some characterized it as a dream, but after mature study there was a great change in public opinion. The action of the President in endorsing the proposal brought it to the attention of the Nation.

The President last week approved the flood-control bill with the understanding that it in no way jeopardizes the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority.

He said the legislation in general "is a step forward in the development of our national water resources and power policies."

Noting that the bill authorizes construction by Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau of improvements in the Missouri River Basin which he recommended last month be developed and administered by a Missouri Valley Authority, he said:

My approval of this bill is given with the distinct understanding that it is not to be interpreted as jeopardizing in any way the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, the establishment of which should receive the early consideration of the next Congress.

Similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority development, a $400,000,000 program for the Missouri River Basin is authorized. This was prepared by the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau with the approval of the President.

Public-spirited citizens in Montana have taken the lead and organized the first State Missouri Valley Authority Association. As part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 20, 1944. It follows:

MONTANA LEADS FOR M. V. A.

A group of public-spirited Montanans has done a splendid thing in organizing a Montana-Missouri Valley Authority Association. We should like to see all the States of the Missouri Valley follow Montana's lead.

There is much work, and much-needed work, for State M. V. A. associations to do.

The Montana Missouri Valley Authority Association has wisely chosen to make the informing of the public one of its first objectives. Many of the 7,000,000 people of the Missouri Valley do not have anything like a full knowledge of M. V. A. or of its living, working prototype, T. V. A. Some of them have actual misunderstanding.

It is not hard to realize why this is so, for powerful interests have worked night and day for 11 years to spread misinformation about T. V. A., and the Missouri Valley is too far from the Tennessee Valley for most of its people to be able to learn the facts for themselves at first hand.

The Montana association is also well advised to urge the M. V. A. idea upon its State legislature. As a means to political action, the association will undoubtedly find it helpful to encourage discussion by all sorts of groups at every opportunity. New ideas need to be chewed thoroughly before they can be digested, and to much of our great valley M. V. A. is a new, novel, and only partly understood idea, which calls for discussion.

In all these and in other ways, the Montana-Missouri Valley Authority Association can be of service to Montana and to the Missouri Valley. May this movement for organization, started at the headwaters of the Missouri River, percolate down through all the valley.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact we have spent several hundred million dollars on the Missouri River the flood waters continue to increase. The following letter received by me from the Chief of Engineers will be of interest:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, December 21, 1944.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: Reference is made to your letter of December 8, 1944, in which you ask to be advised of the approximate amount of money expended in the Missouri River Basin during the past 30 years. You further ask for a figure for the average rainfall in the Missouri Valley for the same period.

The amounts of funds spent by this Department or the accomplishment of its authorized works in the Missouri River Basin for the past 30 years are $313,000,000 for rivers and harbors projects and $20,000,000 for flood control projects, or a total of $333,000,000. These amounts are divided between new work and maintenance as follows:

Type of work	Expenditures for past 30 years	
	New work	Maintenance
Rivers and harbors improvements for navigation	$276,000,000	$37,000,000
Flood control improvements	14,000,000	[1] 6,000,000
Total	290,000,000	43,000,000

[1] Expenditures principally for emergency repairs to local levees.

Regarding your request for a figure on the average annual rainfall for the Missouri River

Valley, it should be noted that there are wide variations in the average rainfall in the various parts of the river basin. For instance, throughout the drainage area of the Missouri River, which includes approximately 530,000 square miles, the rainfall may vary from a few inches in the arid regions of the northwestern portion of the basin to as much as 40 inches per year near the mouth of the river. It is also known from the records of climatic conditions that, over the period of years 1900 to date, the Missouri River Basin has experienced periods of wet years known as wet cycles and periods of dry years known as dry cycles. For example, from 1900 to 1929, the flood stage at St. Joseph, Mo., was equaled or exceeded 13 times out of the 30 years. Since 1929, the flood stage at this point has been equaled or exceeded in 4 years only out of the 15, all of these occurring since 1938. In other words, the period from 1900 to 1929 is considered to be a period known as a wet cycle, whereas the period from 1930 to 1941 is a dry cycle of unusual severity as compared with the period prior to 1930. For your information, the Department, in its report on the Missouri River Basin, printed as House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, has stated that the average rainfall for the area of the Missouri Basin between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth varies from 26 inches at Sioux City to about 40 inches near the mouth. An over-all average of rainfall records for the seven principal States in the Missouri River Basin, disregarding the variations mentioned above, shows an annual figure of about 21 inches for the 30-year period 1914 to 1943.

Sincerely yours,

E. REYBOLD,
Major General,
Chief of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this tremendous expenditure is it not time to provide a Missouri Valley Authority?

Prohibition Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARYLAND STATE AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERATION OF LABOR,
December 7, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of our members and many thousand right-thinking citizens of the District of Columbia we are sending you 469 petitions of 14,072 signatures in protest against the consideration by Congress of any prohibition legislation. We had prohibition once, but we never want to return to those terrible days again.

Will you therefore please have our protest entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, showing the total number of signers, at your very earliest convenience.

Thank you for your assistance and best wishes for your continued success.

Very truly yours,

R. J. BAUXBAUM.

P. S.—In addition to the above, we are sending you 328 petitions containing 10,838 signatures of citizens of the State of Maryland likewise protesting against prohibition. Will you be so kind as to enter these along with those from the District of Columbia in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the section provided for petitions?

R. J. B.

A Soul-Stirring Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure all Members of this Congress know, one of the great radio commentators of the country is Cedric Foster of Boston, Mass. Some Members however, may have missed his wonderful Christmas message in his broadcast of December 25, 1944. It is a soul-stirring, heart-warming message that should be preserved for posterity.

Therefore, under the permission granted me, I am including as a part of my remarks the Christmas message of not only a great news analyst and commentator but of a philosopher and a Christian gentleman:

This is Cedric Foster speaking from the studios of WNAC, in Boston, the key station of the Yankee network in New England.

Because of the fact that this is Christmas Day and the nature of today's broadcast, there will be no interruption in this program, and I bring to you today at the request of many hundreds of listeners a broadcast which I delivered 2 years ago on the 23d of December. I've just left my home at 20 Chestnut Street here in Boston, on Beacon Hill. I've just left the laughter of a child, who spends with us today her second Christmas; a child who, with sparkling eyes, said to her daddy, naval Lt. Jim Britt, of Detroit, Mich., and her mother, Peggy: "This is the most wonderful Christmas I've ever had." A year ago her daddy was on the island of Tarawa. A year ago last night, on Christmas Eve, her daddy, riding with his skipper, Commander Eddie Saunders, of the Naval Air Squadron 137, completed a bombing run over the Japanese-held island of Nauru, a mission from which all were most fortunate to return. And so it is not surprising that today Judy, so vibrantly alive with the thrill which comes only to an 8-year-old child, should speak the words which she did. Before I give you my broadcast of 2 years ago I want to send greetings from all of us, from Mrs. Foster, from Shirley, and from Sarah Ann, now recovered from her accident, and from the Britts as well. I can't answer the hundreds of Christmas cards on my desk. All I can do is to thank you all with a grateful heart, all of you who remembered me on this day.

It was 2 years ago that Thomas F. Woodlock wrote in the Wall Street Journal an article on post-war Japan and Germany. He says in that article that Ambassador Grew's report from Tokyo is a very simple one. It tells us that in Japan we have an enemy with whom we can no more negotiate than one negotiates with a man-hunting tiger in the jungles of Bengal. It tells us that like that animal it won't yield even when it is cornered, but it will fight until it is killed. It tells us that our enemy is strong in weapons and in morale and skilled in every form of killing known to man. It tells us in all of these things that the Japanese are virtually united as one man. And it tells us that these people possess all of the appliances of modern science and that they use all of the gadgets which make up the material panoply of western civilization. It is a picture of 100,000,000 human beings with whom we can have no normal, human intercourse. This in the twentieth century of the Christian era.

Mr. Grew tells us that he knows; that it is his business to know; that he spent 10 years in Japan. We must presumably believe him, but it is difficult to fit what he tells us into our imagination, even though we have had already some factual confirmation of its truth. Thus, our two enemies are beyond the scope of negotiation, for by now we all agreed that we can't do business with Hitler. This is the first time in modern history that such a war has broken out. Two groups of people, both armed with all of the resources of modern science, are engaged in a fight which, seemingly, must be to the death. Yet neither can exterminate the other. Japanese and Germans will continue to exist in this world. They will live side by side with the United Nations, even though their fighting strength is annihilated, as, no doubt, it will be. No nation such as these can be kept perpetually in protective custody. Were such a thing possible, it would mean a bankruptcy of civilization itself, but it isn't even possible. At the end of the victory road we race the greatest problem of all: How shall the Germans and the Japanese be readmitted to membership in what we know now must be a real world order? Sooner or later they must be, if there is to be a world order, for such an order cannot exist any more than could we half slave and half free.

Mr. Woodlock then declares that it is easy enough to see what must be achieved to reach the goal. There must be a common ideal, a common purpose and a common will to effect that purpose, one in which Japanese and Germans will join the United Nations. It must be the fully human ideal and purpose, and the will must be present. Germans and Japanese are human beings like ourselves. Like us, they have intellect and reason and will. They have proved themselves our match in all human techniques, peaceful and warlike. They have demonstrated skill and courage and tenacity equal to our own. We are not dealing with pure animal instincts but with free human wills.

This war, for all of its complicated mechanical aspects, is first, last, and always a conflict in the spirit and it is in the order of the spirit alone that it can and must be ended. Our victory in the battlefield will be no victory unless we are victorious in the spiritual field. We already know that, at least in a general way, for we stand ready, when the fighting is done, to bind up the wounds of our conquered enemies, to supply them with food where they need it and with material needs for the resumption of a normal life. We are prepared to give them every opportunity to enrich that life, for we know that in so doing we shall enrich our own. So far, excellent. We offer to these enemies, as to all, the freedoms which we claim for ourselves. Again excellent. We hope that these things will evoke the one thing necessary, the common will.

But all of these, Mr. Woodlock points out, are means—they are not ends. Our enemies had them in sufficiency for what they deemed their needs. They had every opportunity to increase them as the years went by. Yet they took the road they did. A crushing military defeat will, no doubt, convince them that the road is forever impassable. Military defeat can change the policies of our enemies but it is a change of heart that must be achieved. Nothing so vividly demonstrates the disease that has been sapping the vitals of our boasted western civilization as does the fact that it should have produced this appalling problem. Whatever else we do in preparation to deal

with it, one thing is indispensable, and that is to search our own hearts to see to what extent we, too, are sick with it. We already half-suspect its nature. Vaguely we feel that we have forgotten or ignored something in our calculations. That something is our own nature and its origin. There is stirring amongst us, of that there is no doubt, a long-forgotten or ignored sense of religion. We have at last reached the point where we aren't ashamed to speak the word with apologies.

In conclusion, Mr. Woodlock declares that the more we restore religion to a true place, to its place amongst ourselves, the better hope we can indulge for restoring it amongst our conquered enemies. There is no other thing upon which a common ideal, a common purpose, and a common will can be founded among nations.

Mr. Woodlock's discussion in the Wall Street Journal is particularly appropriate in this Christmas season, the commemoration of the birth of the Prince of Peace. We have too oftentimes in the past refused to view Christmas in its aspect, to accept it for what it actually is: The anniversary of the birth of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, whose hands and feet were nailed to a cross that the sins of the world might be washed away. We have refused to evaluate Christmas for its real worth because we have been afraid, in a rankly materialistic world, of being accused of sentimentalism, of being marked as a Godly man or women, as being out of the usual run of humans who walk blindly down the road of life refusing to admit that there is an all-power Being who rules this universe. But we are now getting away just a trifle from the crassness of things. Possibly we have been motivated in this change by a fuller realization of just how fleeting our earthly existence is. Life today is touch and go as it never was before. When we say "good-bye" to loved ones, who depart for fields of battle, we know full well that we may never see them in body again. But when they have departed, when they have gone in body, the spirit remains. Actually the spirit is the only thing that counts. The body does nothing but house the spirit, if you want to use that term. Those of us who fail to realize that fact, who gain no consolation through faith, through the belief that the spirit is eternal, those people are poor, indeed. Such faith and belief are the only anchors to the windward that humanity has as it tries to outride the storm. Once you are convinced that the spirit of man is eternal, and that God will never allow that spirit to be destroyed, then you can attain a calmness and a serenity of life that eases, and eventually dissipates, the sorrows and the sufferings of this world. There are those who will scoff at and ridicule such a statement but they know not whereof they speak. When the sands of time are running out and the hot breath of death is fanning the cheek, the scoffers and the ridiculers disappear.

Men fight today a bitter fight for freedom. We fight this war on many fronts for the preservation of the ideals which gave birth to our Republic, the United States of America. We fight this fight because we believe that God meant man to be free. In that fight we cannot afford to lose sight of God, Himself. You may think that this broadcast is like a revival meeting; that a news commentator or analyst has become a preacher; that he's got religion. That isn't true. But this I do know. Those who refuse to turn to God in prayer when assailed by trouble are refusing to take advantage of the strongest rock of refuge available to mankind. There isn't any use in living without faith in God—in a Supreme Being. If we have that faith, then we will deal with all mankind in a manner dictated by God. We will apply the Golden Rule of treating others as we would wish to be treated ourself. We will do it whether we are Protestant or Catholic or Jew. That doesn't mean that we won't punish our enemies. To the contrary it means that we will press the prosecution of this war with all of the strength at our command. But when we attain the victory, as we certainly shall, we will build on a foundation of quicksand if we fail to extend the hand of friendship to all the peoples of the earth. That doesn't mean that those who would destroy our civilization will not be punished. The God whom we all worship is a just and righteous God and His judgments are righteous altogether.

It was Patrick Henry who asked the questions with a voice choked with emotion: "What is it that the gentlemen want? What is it that the gentlemen wish?" We may well ask those questions in regard to the peace to follow this war. What kind of peace do we seek? Do we seek one which will eliminate future wars or will we write a pact which will be a festering sore and which will breed the germs of future battles? We can have either kind of peace. Ours is the choice. As we ponder this problem on the birthday of the Christ Child we should remember that Christianity is a great religion. It is truly a great religion. It is one of the tragedies of mankind that it has never been practiced.

Phil Spitalny and His All-Girl Orchestra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the work of Phil Spitalny and his all-girl orchestra in their presentation of hymnal music on their weekly Hour of Charm program merits commendation. The orchestra on the air show has been featuring hymns for the past 10 years. The hymns being featured now are those requested by members of the Army, Navy, and Marines. Servicemen have written to express their appreciation. Those in distant lands write to say that when they hear these hymns they are carried home and are once again with their families listening to the inspirational music. Thus, music and faith are combined to bolster morale on a world-wide scale, helping the American fighting man and strengthening his will and spirit on his road to victory and peace.

United States Merchant Ship Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following press release from the Maritime Commission showing United States merchant ship production from 1936 to 1944:

United States merchant-ship production, 1936–44

	Number of vessels	Total	Deadweight tonnage	Total
1936		9		107,938
1937		18		194,788
1938		25		289,765
1939		28		341,219
1940		55		641,056
1941		99		1,137,163
1942:				
January	16		197,628	
February	26		289,549	
March	26		291,473	
April	36		401,632	
May	57		619,779	
June	67	746	749,654	8,089,732
July	71		791,667	
August	68		752,774	
September	93		1,016,112	
October	81		889,737	
November	84		892,536	
December	121		1,197,191	
1943:				
January	103		1,007,680	
February	130		1,236,481	
March	146		1,513,244	
April	157		1,603,307	
May	176		1,782,836	
June	167		1,670,442	
July	158	1,896	1,669,341	19,238,626
August	164		1,690,411	
September	160		1,652,571	
October	163		1,675,311	
November	164		1,692,763	
December	208		2,044,239	
1944:[1]				
January	124		1,204,730	
February	134		1,372,864	
March	152		1,538,357	
April	154		1,593,691	
May	155		1,537,915	
June	145		1,379,994	
July	126	1,677	1,274,433	16,343,436
August	119		1,157,602	
September	124		1,185,997	
October	145		1,310,295	
November	154		1,430,660	
December	145		1,356,898	

[1] Production decline in 1944 reflects conversion of high-production yards to Victory ships and military types. Total production 1936 through December 1944 is 4,553 ships and 46,383,723 dead-weight tons.

America Must Be American To Remain Great

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Telegram:

AMERICA MUST BE AMERICAN TO REMAIN GREAT

The American people will be well advised to stop worrying about what kind of government Spain, Italy, Poland, New Guinea, and India are going to have and begin making up their minds what kind of government the United States is going to have. The more intolerant we become of all kinds of isms in other countries, the more tolerant we seem to become of the encroachment of foreign isms into our own. The more insistent we are upon American ideals and the democratic form of government for other nations, the more vague we seem to become on the meaning of these things in our own land.

In the past 12 years we have made tremendous strides toward the belief that government can—and must—do everything for us. We have not yet begun to realize that the more government does for us, the more government demands of us; of our substance and of our liberties. For everything government does for us we must give it a little more authority, so that by and by it has authority over the whole course of our lives.

Whether this is good or not, it is not what we have always identified as the American ideal. It is not the ideal on which our country was founded and by which it became, in a century and a half, the greatest nation and the most privileged people in history. It is nowhere visible or intimated in our Declaration of Independence or Constitution. It is either socialism, fascism, or communism, and if we come to it we shall find it will be no different in the United States from the same brand elsewhere.

But the thing we should face now, before we are committed to any of these offshoots of excessive paternalism is this: All these European contrivances for Utopia are the confessions of peoples that they cannot take care of themselves; that they have not the energy, enterprise, or courage to create their own affairs and administer them. Therefore, they turn them over to one person, or a coterie of persons representing an idea. That idea, under whatever name, is always the same. It is that this one person or coterie has all the enterprise, energy, courage, and wisdom, and the people have none. The people themselves have admitted it. Individuals who deny it are dealt with to whatever extreme the arbitrary will or petulant caprice the rulership may dictate, for that rulership exists only for the perpetuation of its own power, aggrandizement, and wealth. This is Utopia. It has been tried many times. The result has always been rebellion, civil war, bloodshed, and generations of sorrow. It is as foreign to America as the Grand Mogul, the Emperor of Japan, or Hitler.

There is no compromise between liberty and tyranny. Tyranny does not destroy one-half or one-third of a people's liberties and leave the rest. There is no compromise between legislation enacted by elected representatives of all the people and the edicts issued by a dictator. There may be advantages to both. But we cannot have them both. They are antagonistic to each other to the death. It has to be all or none.

Yet, at first sight they do not appear to be antagonistic. They seem alluringly susceptible to compromise. The delusion of compromise creeps in so insidiously, and by such pious protestations for the "common man," as to be unnoticed. It creeps in by what appears to be the will of the people. But it is not the will of all the people. Many problems arise to blunt and confuse the general will. The seeds of minority power begin to germinate. At such times the whole structure of government of a people is confronted by a grave danger, the danger of the shifting but persistent coalescence of dynamic minorities for the gaining of special privileges. That is the compromise we should see now and face with our eyes open and with our eyes on the future of America.

America was made great by enterprise and daring; the enterprise and daring of individuals. Our place in the world is testimony to it and nobody in his sane mind can deny it. Individuals pioneered in new frontiers, in invention, in manufacture, in transportation, and in science. Beyond a few land grants and some often dubious tariffs the Government had nothing to do with these adventures, other than they were made within a structure of laws sanctioned by our Constitution.

Certainly these laws were often broken, and there were instances of rapacity and ruthlessness and corruption, and laws were not always administered with even-handed justice. But does anybody with sense—or with faith in the inherent power of righteousness—believe we could have come to greatness if the great march of our progress had not been dominated by honor, decent kindness, justice, and enlightenment? Only the stupidly ignorant could believe that we did, or could. All these things were the soul of America's greatness, just as personal vision, enterprise, courage, and opportunity, were its power.

We are not a defeated nation, to backtrack for defense into ancient morasses. More swiftly and surely than any other nation in history we have come a long way. Unless that means that we have a great inheritance of character and of soundly founded institutions there is no sense or order in human affairs.

But suppose our Thirteen Colonies, finding themselves a sovereign nation, had decided that the way to progress and the happiness of the people had been to pass a law which gave the Executive power to say that every worker must join a union, not of his own selection, or be barred from the opportunity to earn a living. Suppose the union had been liberated from all legal restraints that applied to other associations, had no need to account to its members for the money they paid in to it, and could compel any member to contribute, on pain of losing his livelihood, to a political cause fostered by it (against the law but by Executive indulgence) no matter how antagonistic the member might be to that cause.

And suppose, though the union could do anything against the employers, even to the destruction of their property, the employers had been forbidden under the severest penalties to protest, argue, or even comment to a worker on the undesirability of any course of conduct, or of any one union, or express any preference for another. How far would our Thirteen States have gone toward becoming the great United States of America? It is doubtful that they would have lasted 25 years. But that is one of the ways we are now being told leads to the great highway to Utopia. Fortunately, the Thirteen States did none of these things. They wrote a Constitution and Bill of Rights, and these carried them through far greater vicissitudes than we now have.

History did not begin in 1932; nor did humanitarianism. There had been great labor leaders and great leaders in management, and great strides of equity and conciliation had been made. The care for the welfare of labor does not threaten our American system. It is a part of it and will strengthen it. What threatens our stability is the herding of labor into a minority and antagonistic group by parasite leaders intent only on exploiting it either for their own profit or for the propagation of a foreign political system. It is the creating, for political expediency, of laws or directives, or inconsistent interpretation of laws or directives, by which one group of Americans can do a thing that is a felony for another group of Americans. It is the fostering of the arrogant belief that a union can forbid one group of our citizens to join it, because they are Negroes, and at the same time forbid that group to work without joining. It is the negligent point of view that allows our Executive to punish a political enemy for disobeying an administration order and to plead that he has no authority in law to punish a political friend for the same refusal.

And there are other things that threaten our system, though not so visibly: The belief that there is a concrete evil in wealth and a concrete virtue in poverty; the belief that Government can redeem every personal failure or misfortune by bounty or by confiscatory legislation; the belief that our Constitution is outmoded and should be ignored or perverted; the belief that it is useless to combat "ideals" that would subvert our independence and our personal energy of spirit.

But it was our faith in these things that made America great. And it is by our integrity to these things that we shall overcome our difficulties, our conflicts, and our mistakes, and make our Nation ever greater. The false magic of will-o'-the-wisps will lead us only into the mire. To know what that mire can do we have only to look at the map of Europe.

Providing Post-War Markets for Our Agricultural and Manufactured Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an address given recently by Mr. Curtis E. Calder, president of American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., at the thirty-first national foreign trade convention, New York City, on October 10, 1944.

In view of the necessity of providing additional post-war markets for our agricultural and manufactured products, I thought the membership of the House might be interested in these timely and thought-provoking observations.

The address follows:

The approaching end of the most devastating of modern wars, evolving out of a period of social and economic turmoil, finds us, as a nation, confused in our thinking and inadequately prepared, psychologically, for our new role on the international stage. It is quite understandable that we should be having this difficulty. Our shift from debtor to creditor came upon us very suddenly during World War No. 1, following 140 years of financial immaturity. After that war we immediately entered into an era of tremendous industrial expansion and technological progress. We were flush with money. It was in this spirit that we blithely set sail, without chart or compass, upon the troubled sea of international finance. In the 1920's we were in no mood to study commercial navigation. We invested billions in foreign mines, agricultural lands, public utilities, and manufacturing plants. Some projects were wildly speculative, others were for genuinely productive purposes. The petroleum resources of Venezuela and Colombia were developed; Habana plantations were established in Central America; rubber plantations were set out in various parts of the world; manufacturers of cement, textiles, electrical products, glassware, and automobiles established plants and branches abroad; and nearly a billion United States dollars went into the public-utility industry in South America, Europe, and Asia.

Meanwhile the older creditor nations were adding to their foreign holdings. The British and the Dutch were particularly active. There was this difference, however: They had been able to secure and hold their places as great creditor nations by opening their markets to the exports of their debtors. Although highly industralized like ourselves, they were, first of all, trading nations. As a nation, we still placed all the emphasis on selling. Pressure groups representing var-

icus interests campaigned for and obtained higher tariffs against the products of the very countries who were our debtors. When the pleasant trade winds failed us and we found ourselves in the grip of the economic hurricane which had been brewing, unheeded, along the course we were traveling, there was no financial haven in which we could take refuge. Caught in the same economic storm, our good neighbors found that no one was interested in their foodstuffs and industrial raw materials, and they quickly learned that we had lost our appetite for foreign loans and credits. To conserve dwindling resources of foreign exchange, our debtors instituted exchange restrictions and import controls, blocked the remittance of earnings by foreign enterprise, and defaulted on foreign obligations. After 1939 few new foreign investments were made.

Although we were disturbed by the wave of defaults that swept over our foreign bond list, and by our inability to earn a fair return in dollars on our direct investments, our basic, friendly feeling toward the major recipients of our foreign loans and investments were unaltered. The good-neighbor policy was received by our businessmen and investors with genuine acclaim. Misgivings soon arose, however, then nationalistic politicians and demagogues in good-neighbor countries began to use this policy as a shield for unfair attacks on American interests and seizure of the property of American nationals. The trade-agreements program was also hailed as a constructive step although as a nation we were far from being sold on the free-trade principle.

Faced with the immediate necessity of converting and expanding the capacity of our heavy industry for the production of unheard of volumes of war materials, we quickly realized it was vitally important that the economies of our good neighbors be kept in a healthy condition. Although we tried earnestly to keep our friends supplied with the necessities which they were accustomed to buying from us, we were no longer interested in selling as such. On the other hand, our purchases of strategic materials soared to fantastic levels, and we continued to import large quantities of the agricultural products which formed the traditional bases of the economies of our sister republics. Overnight the countries of Latin America, which had been the major recipients of our investment funds, found themselves accumulating dollar exchange in excess of immediate needs.

As the war approaches a climax we realize that we stand alone as the only large-scale creditor nation on earth. The world looks to us for social, economic, and financial leadership, and we cannot retire into our economic shell. The entire world is in debt and has only the alternatives of increased production or repudiation. This will mean increasing our exports of capital, capital goods, and also of men possessing the technical skill and administrative ability to protect our expanding international investment position.

Now that we are exporters of capital, we are indifferent as to whether foreigners choose to invest in our domestic enterprises. However, our investments in other countries will become of more and more importance to our economy—an importance measured least of all by the return in dollars and cents to the investor. We are all familiar with the slogan "trade follows the dollar" and, where direct investments are concerned there is a lot of truth in it. The introduction of American methods of doing things and the higher living standards made possible by increased productivity are reflected in orders for our goods. Imports are vital to us in peace and war, and our foreign investments make one of their most significant contributions to our economy by making it possible for us to obtain the things we need from other nations.

Our foreign investments are so valuable as to make their protection a matter of great public interest. The first responsibility in protecting them lies with the individual or the organization putting up the money. Many of the countries most needing help will not be good credit risks for private capital, and our Government will have the problem of working out measures for the protection of its commitments. I would like to emphasize the need for making a clear-cut distinction between our loans to foreign countries, and those contributions which should be labelled as gifts.

As to the private investor, his best protection will continue to be his own good sense and business judgment. In the carefree 1920's, many investors thought that a high rate of return was their best protection against political and economic uncertainties surrounding foreign investments. They now know that while a high rate of return may be a measure of the risk, it is an inadequate protection against the hazards of default and repudiation. Our present-day investors are fairly realistic. They seek, and have a right to expect, a reasonable return on their money. They are ready to take the normal business risks which are characteristic of private enterprise; but ventures which are exposed to the hazards of capricious and discriminatory legislation by foreign countries are not normal risks. Since political and economic hazards cannot be entirely eliminated, the investor will be well advised to secure as much diversification as possible, dividing his commitments among several different countries.

Some protection against political hazards can be obtained, and public relations can be improved by inviting the participation of local capital in foreign enterprises. The foreign investor or industrialist is unwise to try to buck any tide of rising nationalism. Management's first obligation, however, is to the stockholders and creditors who have made the enterprise possible. Operating efficiency must be maintained through the selection of the best available technical and administrative personnel, either local residents or foreigners. Representatives of investment interests are not the only ones who have something at stake. The countries whose economies are being strengthened and diversified by infusions of new capital should be equally interested in its protection.

Countries seeking foreign capital should take a realistic attitude toward the foreign-personnel problem. They should discourage antiforeign agitation, as such, wherever it appears. Foreign capital, abusing its privileges, should be subject to the same penalties as apply to local capital in similar circumstances, but the offenders should be castigated as individuals and not as foreigners. Finally, a government seeking to attract additional foreign capital should avoid taking unilateral action against the interests of law-abiding foreign companies. If the law permits recapture of companies exploiting natural resources, the terms and conditions under which expropriation can take place should be made perfectly clear to the concessionaire before, not after, he commits his capital to the undertaking. Political intervention in the affairs of friendly nations is a thing of the past, and happily so, but there are many occasions when our Government can use its good offices to remove causes of friction between its citizens and foreign nations. There is every reason, then, for our Government to take the lead in evolving a code of international ethics applying to the treatment of foreign capital to which all nations interested as importers or exporters of investment funds might subscribe.

Every American has something at stake in these foreign investments. A large and influential segment of our population are still political and economic isolationists at heart. They still talk about expanding our exports and maintaining high protective tariffs, in the same breath; they still think we can insulate ourselves and let Europe and Asia stew in their own juices; and they oppose our participation in the industrialization of China, Russia, and Latin America on the grounds that we are cutting ourselves out of markets and setting up business competitors. We who, because of our business background and international contacts, can take the broader view. We should support our Government in its trade-agreements program, its good-neighbor policy, and its plans for post-war economic cooperation with other nations.

The more we invest in other countries, the more we must be concerned with their production, selling, and exchange problems. I refuse to believe that, when this world conflict is over, we and the nations which need our help will be so bereft of vision as to be unable to reconcile any possible differences in viewpoints, so that we can pull together and, in a spirit of mutual confidence, employ our separate gifts and attainments to promote the welfare of all.

Placing of a Ceiling on Live Cattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in the past several weeks there have been numerous meetings and press releases relative to the placing of a ceiling on live cattle. The O. P. A. in this respect has been conforming to the law by holding conferences with both the producer, the feeder, and the processor of beef. I believe the record will show that in all of these meetings the producer and the feeder of livestock have been generally opposed to this new regulation. They are opposed to the regulation because it brings confusion, misunderstanding, and uncertainty as to the future of the livestock industry. We have in Nebraska a great many feeders who fill their yards with stock cattle with the understanding that they might make a reasonable profit out of their feeding operations.

From a conference with Mr. Vinson, the Economic Stabilizer, it appears that after weighing all of the evidence, most of it from the Office of Price Administration, he is about to issue a directive which will place a ceiling of $17.50 a hundred on good and choice cattle at Chicago basis. The good and choice cattle make up about 9 percent of the cattle coming into the central markets. There is to be an additional 50-cent-subsidy on this type of cattle. The subsidy will be raised from $1.10 a hundred to $1.60 a hundred. Such a regulation will cause the men who are now feeding cattle to take a considerable loss on their feeding operations. If the payment of the subsidy was reflected to the producer and feeder, it might be the difference between a profit and a loss. These regulations

will probably further discourage the feeding of cattle which in turn will mean less meat to our armed forces, our allies, and the citizens at home. If the administration really wants to raise meat and satisfy these demands, then there must be some feeding of cattle from the range. The price suggested by the Economic Stabilizer will not reflect a profit. The incentive for raising and feeding cattle is the profit incentive. The cattlemen are not unreasonable when all they ask is a reasonable profit for their work.

The production of meat is of first importance to the world. The livestock industry has certainly done its part in support of the war program and the production of meat. It would seem that the Government agencies should set a policy which will not continuously disrupt the livestock industry. It takes a long time to produce a calf with sufficient meat for the consuming public. There has been entirely too much rumor of changes, entirely too many threats against the cattle producers that it is difficult for them to make their plans to continue intelligently in the production of meat.

This is not the first time the Administration has changed the rules in the middle of the feed lot. It is apparently being done this time at the request of the citizens of New York, who have been buying black-market meat and are forced to pay an exorbitant price for the finished product. If the order would eliminate the black market it might be worth while.

The cattlemen do not want this ceiling but if it must be inaugurated, they hope it will succeed in eliminating the black market. I personally feel the move is a mistake. It may well mean that good beef will become seasonable like fruit and vegetables except in the black market, which will find expanded operations. It means breaking faith with the feeders and a distinct loss to them. It will probably mean there will be less meat for the world.

At this point I desire to insert a telegram addressed to the Honorable Fred Vinson, the Stabilizer Director, which was sent to him by Harry B. Coffee, the president of the Union Stockyards Co. of Omaha:

JANUARY 3, 1944.

Hon. FRED VINSON,
Stabilization Director,
Washington, D. C.:

Price incentive essential to encourage increased feeding operations and beef production. Inequitably low wholesale price ceiling on beef makes it impossible for any packer to pay more than $16 per hundredweight for choice cattle Chicago, for sale through legitimate channels without loss, proposed additional 50 cents subsidy included. Over-all price ceiling of no benefit if only black-market operator can pay the established ceiling price without loss. Suggest restoring wholesale and, if necessary, retail ceiling prices that prevailed before roll-back subsidy program inaugurated. Heavy liquidation of feed-lot cattle and curtailed beef production anticipated unless wholesale beef ceiling price raised.

HARRY B. COFFEE,
President, Union Stock Yards Co. of Omaha.

Paper and Pulp Industry in Central Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, recently the following editorial appeared in one of Wisconsin's leading newspapers, the Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune. It indicates the interest and importance of reforestation in this territory.

REFORESTATION PLAN

A vigorous plan which Wisconsin Rapids and central Wisconsin should weigh thoughtfully is that advanced by Virgil L. Dickensen, of Augusta, Wis., a member of the Wisconsin Conservation Commission, which is intended to solve the immense job of reforestation in Wisconsin. Dickensen proposes as a vehicle for extensive post-war employment the creation of a quasi public forestry corporation in which 17 of the central, northeastern, and northwestern counties of the State which have great areas of cut-over or nonfarm lands, would participate as corporate bodies.

The corporation would be capitalized through loans from one of the several Federal agricultural lending agencies on a long-range basis. Dickensen suggests 50 years. The vast tree-planting needs on thousands of acres of lands not suited for agricultural production thus could be financed and dividends paid in forest products.

Dickensen suggests the following counties in central Wisconsin: Adams, Clark, Jackson, Juneau, Marquette, Portage, Waupaca, Waushara, and Wood. "Much of the land in these counties is more adapted for the production of forest products than farm crops," the conservation commissioner says. He makes a strong point of it that even in growing pulpwood those lands can be made to return a steady, annual profit where they now are sterile and completely valueless.

"For much of Wisconsin, central and northern especially, there never has been a more profitable crop than its forests," he says, "It also remains that private investment has not and will not do the entire job of reforestation. Forestry differs from both agriculture and industry because of the length of time involved in getting a return from the original investment. Therefore it must be considered from a different angle," he explains.

The commissioner proposes that a reforestation corporation be authorized by specific legislative charter and that it be managed by a board chosen by the participating counties. He believes that capital probably could be obtained from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or some like United States agency. According to Dickensen's proposal, the corporation could purchase or lease land and harvest timber at maturity with all returns being applied to repayment of the loan principal and interest.

The corporation would be sufficiently capitalized to pay land taxes on property acquired or leased and it could also reforest private lands on a customs basis. All work would be in close collaboration with specialists of the conservation commission and the Universty of Wisconsin.

The commissioner contends that there is a fundamental need for the development of Wisconsin resources to broaden the tax base, to perpetuate existing industries, and encourage new ones seeking raw material supplies. He rightfully believes also that the welfare and prosperity of the many communities in the forest regions of the State would be protected.

"An infinitely valuable land resource is waiting to be used for that which it is best adapted," Dickensen says, adding that it is a challenge to Wisconsin's ingenuity and foresight. "It is up to us now to take the initiative and act for the future welfare of the State. There never was a time in history when the natural resources of Wisconsin's forests were depleted as fast as they now are due to the pressure of war."

Mr. Dickensen's plan is well conceived and its execution would mean much to Wisconsin Rapids and vicinity. There may be one flaw, however, in that the lending agency might attach a few strings in the form of controlling power. Then anything could happen.

Mr. Speaker, the communities where paper mills are located realize that if these mills are to have a permanent supply of raw materials permanent jobs will be provided, permanent civic, religious, and business institutions will be maintained, and permanent homes will result.

Looking Back 158 Years and Looking Ahead 50 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in seeking to advance civilization after the present war many thoughtful people are proposing plans for a new world government—modeled on the plan of our United States.

The following is taken from Babson's book Looking Ahead 50 Years:

The Constitution, however, involved the surrender of certain sovereign rights possessed by the Colonies, and the transfer of these to a Federal Government. Thereby, the Federal Government was empowered to declare war and make peace, to raise and support armies and a navy, to establish a common currency, to regulate foreign and domestic commerce, and to do other specified things. All rights and powers not definitely specified remained with the States which were thus left free to manage their own internal affairs. The new Government was thus implemented for action in the common interest of all the States. This is what must sometime be done again, but on a world-wide basis. The price which the nations must pay for permanent peace and prosperity is the surrender of some of their sovereign rights and the transfer of those rights to a world-wide league or federation.

The international problem therefore presents a dilemma for the American people who, after the war, must choose between isolationism and a drastic readjustment of their economic life. For a league or a federation to be effective, it must control—within limits at least—international tariffs, subsidies, currencies, sea routes and immigration. Whether or not the American people

will within 50 years agree to these restrictions is problematical. They surely will not do so except on a graduated-scale basis. Some think only a severe depression or a great spiritual awakening would bring about such radical changes in our policies. Yet, such changes are necessary to insure world peace.

The O. P. A. Decides To Regulate Church Suppers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I want to call attention to a recent regulation from the O. P. A. I have come to the conclusion that the "O." in O. P. A. must stand for Olympus, for I cannot think of any word suggesting a place from which such Godlike powers could emanate, self-assumed, of course. In the current regulation, the O. P. A. attempts to regulate church suppers, luncheons, and similar events. You understand, Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. does not call them that; the O. P. A. never uses language which can be so easily understood, not even in the O. P. A. This regulation is directed to "Occasional Users of Ration Food."

I have here, Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Santa Ana Register, of Santa Ana, Calif., referring to this new regulation. It offers a "Tip to the O. P. A." It is amusing, but I suggest that it is more serious than amusing. At a time when the ineptness of this agency is about to produce a genuinely serious meat situation, and when the O. P. A. has confessedly broken its promises about the cancelation of ration stamps, it seems to me there might be something more important in those offices than rationing "occasional users of ration food."

It is plain to me, Mr. Speaker, that the writer of this new gem from the O. P. A. never attended a strawberry festival, nor an oyster supper, nor even their modern equivalent, the church supper. The editorial follows. It is from the Register of December 23:

TIP TO O. P. A.

The O. P. A. has issued a new regulation covering "occasional institutional users of ration food." Translated—as most O. P. A. terms must be—this means people who now and then serve a church supper or similar eating function and charge money for it.

The "occasional institutional users" must now make application 30 days before the date of the meal, and specify how many persons are going to attend. They must also account for any unused rationed food within 10 days "after the last service of food during the period covered by the application."

Now this may be very well, but it is clear to us that the regulation was drafted by some city slicker in Washington who never attended a church supper.

If he had he would know that he was dealing with an old and inflexible American tradition in which two things inevitably happen:

1. The "occasional institutional users" never know how many are going to attend their occasional function, and (2) no amount of planning is going to prevent the late comer at said function from getting a superfluity of hot biscuits and cole slaw, and something less than a minimum of creamed chicken.

Our advice to the O. P. A. is to forget the whole thing.

T. V. A. Should Be Applied to the Missouri Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I enclose an editorial that appeared in the New York Times Sunday, January 7, 1945. It follows:

"THE T. V. A. IDEA"

The Tennessee Valley "experiment," as T. V. A. Chairman David E. Lilienthal describes it in our magazine today, has now reached a stage where it has to be regarded as a pattern for other river-valley developments. Its record sustains the four claims which Mr. Lilienthal makes for it. T. V. A. has achieved a unified engineering control of a river, and through cooperation, not compulsion, a unified economic and social growth is being brought about in the Valley of the Tennessee.

In order to carry out its mandate, T. V. A. was compelled to supersede one private enterprise—the production and sale of electric power—in its area. With this single exception there has been an increase, not a decrease, in the volume of big and little private enterprise. On farms and in factories the pioneer spirit of self-reliance has actually been strengthened by this governmental intervention. Thirdly, T. V. A. has shown that government itself can be decentralized. Its own roots are in the valley, not in Washington. Fourthly, all this has been done outside the scope of partisan politics. The result is that after 11 years T. V. A. has almost no enemies in its own territory. It is supported by chambers of commerce, by labor organizations, by farmers' organizations, and by men of widely differing political views.

The T. V. A. pattern, as Mr. Lilienthal says, "is no cooky cutter." It could not be laid down exactly in the Missouri, the Columbia, or the Arkansas Valley. But the main idea, of unified development, of governmental decentralization, of reliance on the energy and initiative of the people residing in an area, of nonpartisan cooperation for the common good, can certainly be widely applied. There is no reason why it should not be applied in the Missouri Valley, for instance, despite the wide difference in climatic and other conditions between the Missouri and the Tennessee. A new sort of governmental agency has been invented, one of which Jefferson as well as Hamilton could consistently approve. It has worked with brilliant success. Why not expand its use?

Persecution Fails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, again, as often happens, persecution, malice, hatred, and intolerance, however, masquerading, has finally been disclosed in its true light.

Because a few people attempted to expose what they sincerely believed to be a plan to destroy Christianity, overthrow popular government throughout the world and more especially here in America; carried on a crusade originally designed to unify patriotic Americans in opposition to a movement which would have destroyed our constitutional liberties, they became the object of persecution.

Spurred on by certain groups, the Department of Justice of the Federal Government assigned one William Power Maloney to make an investigation. Assisted by Dillard Stokes, using two aliases, certain individuals were induced to mail anticommunistic and anti-Semitic literature to Stokes here in Washington. That was all Mr. Maloney needed to start his inquisition. In passing, it might be said that William Power Maloney's conduct came before the United States Supreme Court and, on March 1, 1943, of him that Court had this to say:

At a time when passion and prejudice are heightened by emotions stirred by our participation in a great war, we do not doubt that these remarks addressed to the jury were highly prejudicial, and that they were offensive to the dignity and good order with which all proceedings in court should be conducted.

Prior to that statement Maloney had, by associating the names of some 10 or 15 individuals whose only offense appeared to be that they were anticommunistic and anti-Semitic with the names of certain convicted individuals, created the impression, aroused the suspicion, that the individuals so named might be linked in a conspiracy with those formerly convicted of a criminal offense.

Some 30 individuals were indicted, and for more than 2 years the case had been dragged through the courts and through the public press, and was only brought to what may be a temporary halt by the death of the presiding judge.

For something like 7 months, testimony was taken and, while I never heard a word of it, never attended a session of the court, newspaper accounts indicate that, insofar as the majority of the defendants were concerned, it in no way indicated that they were engaged in any subversive activities.

The testimony did show that some of them were violently anti-Semitic. Prejudice because of race, color, creed, or land of origin has no place here in America. I have no such prejudice and have never

by word or act given justification for anyone to think that I harbored such views. Nevertheless, in common with thousands of others, because some of those charged in the so-called sedition trial had circulated some of my speeches which went into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the unanimous consent of every Member of the House, I, too, was a subject of a campaign of hate and misrepresentation.

Under the public eye, the trial became so clearly a persecution, some of the defendants so evidently the victoms of persecution, that even the Washington Post, which had much to do, through its reporter, with the collecting of evidence and through its editorials with the creating of prejudice and the return of the indictment, was finally forced to admit that the trial itself was a farce, that justice was not being meted out to the defendants.

In the Saturday Evening Post of January 6 is an editorial which probably as clearly and concisely as any states the overwhelming editorial opinion of the press of the country. That editorial is as follows:

LET IT BE OUR LAST MASS TRIAL

It is probable that the Department of Justice long ago realized that the sedition trial in Washington was a particularly obstreperous white elephant, but it was not until the death of the trial judge, Edward C. Eicher, that the Department had the opportunity to cut its losses and save its face. For our part, we hope that this is the last time that American justice is made to look silly by an effort to emulate Nazi-Communist propaganda trials.

The so-called sedition trial was an effort to lump in one basket the sins and irregularities of a variety of cranks and dissenters, ranging all the way from Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling to the late Elmer J. Garner, age 83, who died during the trial in a Washington rooming house, leaving, according to Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, 40 cents as his sole assets. The 30 defendants were accused of various manners and degrees of sedition, but there was no reason to try them en masse, since their alleged unrelated offenses were committed in places as far apart as New York and California. The idea seems to have been to stage a patriotic rally in a courtroom.

Months ago, the Washington Post, which has done its share in ferreting out evidence of actual sabotage, reached the conclusion that the case would "stand as a black mark against American justice for many years to come." A touch of courage in Washington—a willingness to defy the asinine charge that an end to the farce indicated sympathy for traitors and appeasers—would have disposed of the long-drawn-out indignity before it reached the depths of absurdity. As things were, however, only the death of Judge Eicher availed to release American justice from an exhibition far more appropriate to the courtrooms of Berlin and Moscow than to those of the United States of America.

The fact that only the death of the trial judge could put an end to the show must stand as a warning to every citizen that the right to a full and fair trial as an effort to render justice, and not as a means of making a good show to stimulate morale or for some other extraneous purpose, is one which can be maintained only by constant vigilance and labor. The protection of American justice from such showmanship ought to rest on more secure ground than the mortality of Federal judges. Perhaps the poor reception enjoyed by the Washington performance will make its repetition less likely.

The IV–F Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JANUARY 3, 1945.

Congressman CHESTER H. GROSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: I am writing to you against the pernicious and dangerous plan now brewing in our powerful bureaucracy. Problems arise. What happens? Many are not solved by democratic principles. Voices immediately arise: "Turn on the machine of regimentation. Set the wheels in motion. Hence strange laws are passed." Now another problem, the problem of labor. We have 4,000,000 men classified in IV–F. Millions of men and boys caught in the grip of intolerance and bigotry. Yes; caught, because reputable physicians say they are unfit for the rigors of military life. Yes, caught by handicaps; countless thousands of whom have not brought this upon themselves, but have been afflicted by nature.

I speak from experience. My own son has a heart condition since boyhod. Naturally, he was rejected. He, like millions of others, suffered from intolerance and bigotry. I have gone through trying hours in which my son has been filled with depression and discouragement. I know many other fine, clean youngsters in this same category and they are not slackers. The majority of them hold positions. My son being unfit for factory work is taking a course of studies to fit him to take a place in our national life. Pitiful but true, these men and boys are scorned by some citizens, others in Government, and a few commentators who constantly point fingers of accusation and ridicule at them. I should like to face some of these accusers in Government while I ask them a few questions. What have you done to aid and rehabilitate the millions of fine men and boys? Have you tried the American way of planning to revive their broken spirits and proud hearts? Have you made these citizens feel necessary in our war effort? As human beings and not robots? Have you studied some broad plan in which you may find a gold mine among this class; yes, a gold mine of brilliant minds and potential leadership? Of late, have you read some biographies of the great? Do you realize that many of them came from this handicapped group? Have you thought far enough ahead to think about the days of reconstruction; that it will be among these despised IV–F'ers, in which the Nation will largely have to find talents and leadership; knowing full well that when millions of our boys return from the battlefields, they are going to be war-weary and disillusioned? All they will ask for is the fireside, peace, and a good job. There will also be among them the maimed and mentally unfit; while thousands will have passed on tragically to their eternal rest. No; you have no plan in which you will find heartfelt cooperation. You want regimentation; also battalions of labor for military camps, filled by the very ones whom reputable physicians claimed unfit for military service. Battalions of exterminated humanity. Few men will hold out under these circumstances. They will be crushed physically and mentally. Through this act we may lose a Jefferson or Lincoln, and many a brilliant career, because a Government could not find a way to lift up the morale and dignity of these citizens.

I will now give you an example of one classified as a IV–F. This lad was a victim of infantile paralysis as a baby, leaving him with varicose veins. He was turned down several times, when the patriotic urge once more made him hitchhike many miles to an induction station. He was turned roughly away and told not to return, and then wearily trudged back home, arriving the following day. I saw him in the afternoon, a pitiful and pain-racked youth with ankles swollen twice their size while his feet looked as though they would burst through his shoes. Do you call this youngster a slacker?

Have you heard young men sob with bitterness because they have been left behind? Are you going to continue this harsh treatment in dealing with a human problem, or turn about face and find the ways and means to fill the demands of the war effort with talented leadership and needed labor? This can be accomplished by realistic planning and human understanding. If so, we shall have plenty of cooperation. Proud Americans have learned at home and in the schools the true meaning of democracy and proud men will not tolerate Old World ideologies.

Will Congress give away the tremendous powers that Mr. Byrnes requests for himself and the few? Will Congress dare to endanger the sacred principles which have been entrusted to them by the great immortals; a principle of living that has made us the greatest and freest Nation on earth? Will Congress dare to entrust such power in the hands of the few; in which it is said physically handicapped boys will also be thrown into the machine of regimentation in which precious lives may be lost? Will Congress dare to trust free enterprise in the hands of a few when something may arise, when our whole economic system may meet its end on the auction block to be sold to Uncle Sam? The businessman fears that this will happen some day. Many have discussed the situation openly with me, and yet I cannot believe Congress will so jeapardize the faith of our fathers, by giving away these powers which belong in their hands, and not with the bureaucrats.

I still have faith in Congress that they will defend and protect the Constitution of these United States and remember that this is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people; and they will see to it that our freedom here at home will be kept intact. What could be a worse tragedy than to lose it here, while our men are fighting and dying for it across the seas. Freedom is not lost in a day, but it can come slowly but surely, like a thief in the night, if a Nation is caught napping. We all must remember that the rights and liberties of a free people have always been bought through privation and even bloodshed, and yet it is a harder and more difficult task to keep this freedom after attaining it.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

ELMINA BINDLEY MANTOR.

Ration Board Service Is Thankless Task

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, an important factor indispensable to the war

effort which receives scant mention in news columns is the home-front service of the volunteers operating county ration boards. These volunteers give unstintingly of their time and talent in keeping informed on O. P. A. regulations, receiving, reviewing, and approving thousands of applications for rationed items, and issuing ration books and certificates of purchase. They receive no remuneration, no medals for meritorious service, and little appreciation.

Typical of the extent of the work of a ration board is a feature story appearing in the Lewiston Morning Tribune of December 31, 1944, concerning the activities of the Nez Perce County (Idaho) Ration Board, which I offer for inclusion in the RECORD as a tribute to all of the other county boards in the Nation serving so faithfully and so inconspicuously:

SERVING ON RATION BOARD IS THANKLESS TASK

(By Tish Erb)

Three years ago, a scant 3 weeks after the sneak attack at Pearl Harbor, the nucleus for the Nez Perce County war price and rationing board was formed when the Governor of Idaho appointed a committee of three Lewiston residents to make preparations for compliance with O. P. A. regulations for wartime distribution of tires for civilian use. As the war progressed and other commodities were added to the ration list, the original committee was expanded from time to time until today there are 20 members on the ration board, 19 of whom were appointed by the civilian defense council and approved by the O. P. A. district office. Hobart Burns, chairman, is the only one of the Governor's three 1941 appointees remaining in the organization.

Starting from scratch with no precedent to follow, no fund for expenses, and few instructions, the committee first set up headquarters in the chamber of commerce office. Within a short time more space was required and the ration office was moved to the foyer of the ballroom of the Lewis-Clark Hotel, which also became inadequate as the program advanced. In the spring of 1943 the ration headquarters were again moved to the present location at 859 Main Street, where a clerical force of a chief clerk and six assistants, a corps of volunteer workers, and seven board panels serve the public in carrying on the activities of the O. P. A. for distribution of food ration books, tires, sugar, gasoline, shoes, and rubber boots, automobiles, stoves, and fuel oil, as well as price-control surveys.

Indicative of the volume of work handled at the ration office is the gasoline program for the 8-month period, April 1 to December 1 of this year, when coupons were issued covering 2,320,731 gallons. This work included processing and issuance of 4,135 A books each containing coupons for 120 gallons, or a total of 496,200 gallons; 5-gallon B coupons totaling 219,385 gallons; 5-gallon truck coupons totaling 920,630 gallons; 1-gallon coupons for nonhighway gasoline use for running woodsaws, washing machines, and other equipment, 25,201 gallons; 5-gallon C coupons totaling 141,375 gallons; and 5-gallon coupons for tractor, combine, and other farm uses totaling 517,940 gallons.

BOARD WORKS IN PANELS

During the same 8-month period 2,712 applications for purchase of tires were approved and certificates issued.

More than 150 tons of canning sugar were issued at the ration office in a program carried on entirely by volunteer women workers. Coupons issued totaled 60,950 for a total of 304,950 pounds of sugar.

Fuel-oil applications approved totaled 4,190. Each fuel-oil book must be tailored to the number of coupons allowed the applicant with each book containing a different amount.

For the convenience of civilians and for concentrated activity of board members, the ration program was divided into panels early in 1943. Each panel is required to be familiar with the voluminous O. P. A. regulations, amendments, and rescissions affecting the particular panel department. From 20 to 25 printed pages of instructions are received daily at the ration office from the national and district headquarters, and it is no small task for the panels to keep abreast of their duties in keeping informed on the regulations.

PANEL MEMBERS

The panels and personnel include:

Transportation, Roy Charboneau, chairman; Hayden Mann, Edward D. Sanman, J. Leslie Hardin.

Food, J. C. Mackey, chairman; Mrs. M. F. Ward, G. R. Braum.

Fuel oil, E. H. Sloat, chairman; Marion Montague, G. W. Tarbet.

Miscellaneous, Jay B. Watson, chairman; M. M. Belknap, Carl Gerding.

Price control, W. W. Force, chairman; Ed Klonick, Mrs. Robert Mullin.

Community service, W. E. Bitter.

Volunteers, Mrs. Janette Perkins.

Member-at-large, Corbett Lawyer, Lapwai.

VOLUNTEERS INDISPENSABLE

The board meets twice a month but panels meet at least once a week and oftener if applications are on hand for review or special cases are presented for consideration.

Volunteer workers, besides board members, have included in the last 6 months 57 women working 369 hours in issuing A gasoline ration books; 127 women working a total of 1,123 hours issuing canning sugar coupons; 56 workers 202 hours on price control; 14 clerical volunteers, 57 hours; and an unspecified number of people working 120 hours in the educational program speaking at clubs and other organizations on the purposes and importance of the O. P. A. program.

Neither board members nor volunteer workers are allowed to incur any personal expense in behalf of the work they are doing. When trips through the county are necessary, the board member is issued coupons for the mileage to be covered but must purchase the gasoline from personal funds. When the non-salaried chairman makes trips to the district office at Spokane, which he is frequently required to do, he must bear his own travel and sustenance expense.

GRUMBLERS ARE FEW

Violations reported to the ration board are investigated but the board is not constituted as a policing force. In cases where complaint or evidence is submitted alleging violation of an O. P. A. regulation, the board issues a summons to the person accused and holds a hearing. During the last year one violator was denied the privilege of selling gasoline until rationing is taken off and in other cases gasoline rations were canceled for varying periods of from 30 days to 1 year.

"Rationing started on the basis of cooperation between civilians and the Government to prevent waste, conserve commodities likely to become scarce, and to prevent inflation," said Mr. Burns, who has been chairman of the board since April 1942. "As a general rule, Nez Perce County residents have complied goodnaturedly with the regulations, although they have been caused considerable inconvience thereby. About 3 months ago, however, as war news became optimistic and victory looked near in Europe, irritation became noticeable in the attitude of the people making application for rationed items. They simply felt the ration program was no longer necessary, but with the recent setbacks on the military fronts and the tightening of regulations on the home front, there is a perceptible change and a willingness to cooperate.

"There has been a minimum of grumbling the last few days because new regulations invalidated unused red and blue stamps. The few grumblers failed to appreciate the fact that, if they had been forced to use the stamps instead of buying freely of the rationed commodities, they would have been in far worse plight than they imagined themselves with the sudden announcement of cancelation of the stamps."

BOARD EXISTS FOR FAIR PLAY

"Panic seizes a great many people when they find any commodity is to be rationed but they soon learn that they get along fairly well with the use of their ration books."

Mr. Burns said he believes there are fewer black-market operations in this community than the average throughout the country. Black-market operations reported to the ration board are referred to the district office and an investigator is sent to cover the case.

"The O. P. A. district office does not dictate to the board in any way as long as we follow the regulations," declared Mr. Burns. "Any time an applicant is dissatisfied with the decision of the county board, he has the privilege of appeal to the district office, and from the district office to the regional office and then to the national officials at Washington, D. C.

"The ration-board obligations are to the people of Nez Perce County and not to the O. P. A. We exist for the purpose of seeing that there is an equitable distribution of the rationed commodities to the people entitled to receive them."

PATRIOTISM PROMPTS WORKERS

"Too much credit cannot be given to the volunteers who assist with the ration program. With only seven paid employees in the office, it would be impossible to handle the peak loads such as issuing A and T books, fuel-oil coupons, and sugar certificates and in making price surveys.

"No advance information has been received by the board on rationing except that shoes are not going off the ration list. So far as we know, no other item of clothing is to be added to rationing."

Besides presiding at meetings, Mr. Burns devotes himself untiringly to his duties as chairman of the board. He spends 3 hours, 5 days a week and all day Wednesday at the ration office supervising the work, attending to correspondence, familiarizing himself with regulations, and holding conferences with official callers.

Board members and volunteers receive no emoluments nor medals from the Government and few accolades of community appreciation and yet this home-front activity is a necessary part of the war effort. The only recognition for service is a pin award for volunteer service beyond 200 hours and a certificate to board members signed by O. P. A. officials and President Roosevelt.

The third anniversary of preparation for rationing in Nez Perce County passed without fanfare or observance of any kind, an omission befitting the modest demeanor of the board and the volunteers, whose service is actuated solely by patriotism.

Fair Employment Practice Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am

including a public statement issued by me on January 3, 1945, with reference to H. R. 481, a bill to establish a permanent F. E. P. C. which I introduced on that date:

I again introduce and again commend to the Congress this bill to establish a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, with the sober and humble realization that it constitutes a potent win-the-war weapon. True, it is only one of the many weapons that this Congress will be called upon to forge in winning and insuring the peace, but it is one that strikes at the heart of prejudices that even today sabotage our production of guns and tanks and planes.

This bill would make the Fair Employment Practice Committee a regular agency of Government, responsible to the Congress and to the courts, and with full authority to carry out the mandate that there shall be no discrimination in employment because of race, color, or creed.

This is no new proposal. I hope I shall be joined in its sponsorship by a group of my colleagues of both parties. In the last Congress this very same bill received the support of practically all the major national union, civic, and religious organizations—Catholic, Jewish and Protestant—and of many community organizations throughout the country, whose representatives came to Washington last summer to testify in its behalf before the House Labor Committee. The Labor Committee reported it favorably, and only shortness of time prevented final House action.

In reintroducing this bill I am helping to initiate the implementation of the platform of my party, fulfilling my pledges to the voters who returned me to Washington, and serving notice to the world that we intend to practice at home the policies of equal economic opportunity we preach abroad.

If anyone had any illusion that our manpower problems were being met under existing Executive regulations, those illusions were dispelled on New Year's Day with the release of the report of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

"We cannot be complacent yet." Mr. Byrnes declared in his letter of transmittal to the Speaker of the House. "We must man our war plants to the fullest extent necessary to meet the requirements of our military leaders. We must do this in the face of a further withdrawal from our available manpower supply to provide replacements for the Army and to build the Navy up to the strength which it requires to man its ships."

I read with great interest and concern Mr. Byrnes' description of the steps he has taken to fill the demands for manpower in war industries. I read carefully his recommendation for legislation to carry labor and industry through this war and through reconversion. I am impressed by the thoroughness of his approach and by many of his proposals. But nowhere in his communication do I find any recognition of a fact we all know to be true—that prejudice still stands between our minority citizens and vacant jobs.

Mr. Byrnes reports that he has taken steps to tighten selective service, War Manpower Commission, and War Production Board regulations. He has ordered the suspension of all race meets and is appealing to the 60,000-odd employees of the racing industry to enter war production. He is ordering a review of IV-F's and appealing to Congress to consider compulsory war industry service for those physically unsuited for military service. But nowhere does he appeal to industry and labor to take all comers on the basis of ability and without regard to race, creed, or color.

Mr. Byrnes recommends that Congress strengthen the authority of the War Manpower Commission. He recommends that Congress strengthen the authority of the War Labor Board—I quote—"to enable it to enforce its decisions in the courts without resort to seizure."

But nowhere does he recommend the strengthening by legislation of the Fair Employment Practice Committee so that it may enforce its decisions. That is a most regrettable oversight. Surely the little president knows of the cases cluttering the files of the President's F. E. P. C.—cases representing workers kept from jobs in violation of the President's executive order—because the F. E. P. C. has no authority. Has he forgotten that the President had to seize the Philadelphia transit lines last summer to enforce a decision of the F. E. P. C.? Has the little president forgotten the campaign promises of the big president?

The people have not forgotten.

The Negroes, the Jews, the Catholics, the Spanish-speaking Americans have not forgotten. They cannot forget because they suffer discrimination here today while their sons face the lack of munitions overseas tomorrow. The Members of Congress must not forget theirs is the privilege and the obligation to remove every possible barrier that stands between men and machines. And the barrier of prejudice must be the first to go.

Mrs. Ruth Hanna Simms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include as a part of my remarks a brief tribute paid the late Mrs. Ruth Hanna Simms in an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune of yesterday. Ruth Hanna Simms was my valued friend and those of us who had the pleasure of serving with her in the Congress knew her splendid qualities of mind and heart. She was an able, accomplished, and fearless woman, a really great American.

The editorial is as follows:

MRS. RUTH HANNA SIMMS

Mrs. Ruth Hanna Simms ranks with Mark Hanna, her father, among the great leaders of the Republican Party. She was, too, an inspiring pathfinder for women in assuming and acquitting extraordinarily well heavy responsibilities in public office and party councils. She grew up with politics, twice married men whose first interest it was. Her father inducted her as his secretary when she was 18 and often she was his companion at the Washington breakfasts where the Republican Party's fortunes were molded in the McKinley era. She aided the political career which carried Medill McCormick to the Senate. She herself served in the House of Representatives from 1928 to 1930, when she barely missed election to the Senate. She supported Theodore Roosevelt's Progressive Party break, crusaded for women's suffrage and for child-labor laws. Some years after Senator McCormick's death she married Albert Gallatin Simms, who had sat next her in the House, and continued her political activities, including energetic support of Governor Dewey for President, from a New Mexico ranch.

Her interest and influence in politics were the natural products of both inheritance and environment, but her constructive contributions to her country, her party, and her sex were the products also of a fine mind and heart, of a forthright zeal and an indomitable faith. We pay this tribute to her although we did not agree with her views—isolationist views too typical of the Midwestern States, where her influence had been greatest—on the war and on the obligations of this country to help secure the peace. For hers was the sort of shining faith, the boundless energy, and the inborn competence which builds nations like America.

State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Washington Star, under date of January 7, 1945:

STATE OF THE UNION

President Roosevelt takes on full stature as a wartime leader of all the people in his 1945 message to Congress on the state of the Union.

In the words of Winston Churchill, he has exposed the "grim bare bones" of the problem confronting this country as we move into what is unquestionably the most critical phase of the war. Stated in its simplest terms, the problem is to win this war of national survival at the earliest possible time and to make certain, so far as it lies within our power to do so, that the world will not again have recourse to arms in the settlement of international disputes.

If this is to be done, we can no longer tolerate half measures. For long, tortured months the men at the battle fronts have been fighting a total war. Many of us at home have yet to learn what that term means. But the pressures of total war are irresistible, and this year will find those pressures closing in around us.

The President, in calling for a maximum effort from the whole Nation, kept his sense of proportion. In 3 years of war our armed forces have made splendid progress. Mr. Roosevelt reported on that progress with justifiable pride. The military victories were made possible by production of an infinite variety of weapons—an accomplishment which has been the marvel of the world.

Yet the fact remains—and the experience of the battlefield confirms it—that we are not doing enough. In 1945, and perhaps in 1946, there must be even more production, more effort, more sacrifice, more of that will-to-win which counts no exertion as being too great. And, with all of this, there must be the firm resolve to move forward toward the ultimate goal of a strong America in a secure world.

To meet immediate demands the President asked for amendment of the Selective Service Act to provide for the induction of nurses into the armed forces. He requested the immediate enactment of legislation permitting use of IV-F's in whatever capacity is best for the war effort. He declared that we must have universal military training after the war as an "essential factor in the maintenance of peace," and he said that he would submit a special message on this subject. These are minimum requests, and it is reasonable to expect that they will be granted. The real test of the intentions of Congress—and indirectly that means the intentions of the people—will come in the

action taken on the President's forthright and unqualified appeal for adoption of a national service act.

As Mr. Roosevelt put it, the fighting man wants, needs, and is entitled to insist upon our full and active support—now. That is a simple statement of fact, and the only question is whether the people at home really want to give the fullest measure of support to the men they have sent off to war.

The President had asked for a national service act a year ago. But his request at that time was qualified and weakened because it was conditioned on the adoption of other things—a "realistic" tax law, a "cost-of-food" law, etc. "Unless these other measures were adopted," he said, he "would not recommend" a national service law, and that reservation proved fatal. But this year his request is unconditional and urgent. The hope of victory in Europe in 1944 is gone, the war is mounting in its fury, and first things must be put first.

Underlying the urgency of his appeal is the knowledge that American men are suffering and dying around the world while other men are quitting their jobs in war plants; while still others, men and women, should be, but are not, in essential work. Underlying it, too, is the President's knowledge that, despite excellent past performances, manpower shortages are causing lags in critical production programs, are delaying the return to action of damaged fighting ships, are impairing the output of new and better weapons which, in the hands of our troops, would mean the loss of fewer American lives. In a word, we are capable of more than we are doing. The voluntary methods of the past 3 years have been tried and found wanting. If we are to give our fighting men that last full measure of support which the furious character of the war demands, the Government must be empowered to use compulsion on the home front when all other means have failed.

To those who have been clamoring for blueprints and formulas precisely defining America's position in relation to every conceivable international problem, the President's views on foreign policy will be read with something less than satisfaction. But considering the present state of the world, with the war reaching new peaks of violence and with the internal politics of the liberated and semiliberated lands unavoidably in a condition of either flux or confusion, it is difficult to see how Mr. Roosevelt could have expressed himself better or more specifically.

The United States, says the President, still adheres to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and will do its best, now and in the future, to secure so far as is humanly possible the fulfillment of those principles. Economic and military strength is an important and inescapable factor in international politics, b it in keeping with the charter and with American tradition, the policy of this country is that all such power must be linked with responsibility and obliged to defend and justify itself within the framework of the general good. Thus, for example, power cannot very well defend or justify itself if it is used during this troubled interim period in the liberated lands to block the eventual exercise of the peoples' right freely to choose the government and institutions under which, as freemen, they are to live. Accordingly, as a matter of policy, we and our allies have a duty, which we cannot ignore, to use our influence to the end that no temporary or provisional authorities, in Poland, Greece or elsewhere, will be allowed to prevent popular elections later on when it will be possible to hold them.

But in reaffirming these and other principles the President wisely emphasizes that this is an imperfect world and that although the Atlantic Charter is a good, useful, and essential statement of objectives, those objectives do not provide rules of easy application to each and every problem now pressing for solution or still in the making. He is frankly concerned about situations like those obtaining in Greece and Poland, but there is no simple answer to them from the American standpoint. His views seem to reduce themselves to the basic thesis that while the objectives of the Atlantic Charter must be sought after with the utmost earnestness, the making of a sound peace also requires that the American people, and other peoples as well, cultivate an understanding, tolerant, and patient frame of mind. For we and our allies are not always going to see and think alike, and international cooperation and progress are not helped by any nation assuming that it has a monopoly of wisdom and virtue. Perfectionism can be as dangerous and it is unrealistic. If we are to guard against extremes of disillusionment, then we must take the mistakes, the disappointments, and the imperfections in stride, realizing that they are almost inevitable.

It is a wholesome frame of mind that President Roosevelt appeals for. If we can have it, then we can proceed at once, as he urges, to enlarge upon what has been achieved already at Dumbarton Oaks and establish without delay, during this year, the permanent machinery for the maintenance of world peace.

The keynote of the President's discussion of domestic affairs, unrelated to the prosecution of the war or to foreign policy, is that "an enduring peace cannot be achieved without a strong America—strong in the social and economic sense as well as in the military sense."

His conception of a socially and economically strong America is based on acceptance of that "second bill of rights" outlined to Congress last year, of which the "right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation" is fundamental. In painting an outline of the post-war prosperity to supply 60,000,000 post-war jobs, the President wields his brush in broad strokes.

We shall rely "as much as possible" on private enterprise, based on "initiative and vigorous competition," freed of monopolies and cartels, with the Government standing by to share the risks involved in private financing of new facilities, plants, and equipment.

Along with the development of natural resources, which the President exemplifies in the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority, will come the construction of civil airports and great highways, urban redevelopment and provision of decent housing—needed undertakings which, on top of a resumption of normal manufacture, should supply "millions of productive jobs" under private enterprise, yielding and maintaining a national income high enough to "provide for an orderly retirement of the public debt along with tax reduction."

It is not necessary to accep' in detail this alluring prospect of post-war America in order to catch and feel something of its inspiration. Most of us have some faint idea of the problems to follow the collapse of our war-supported national economy. Yet the amazing feats of production accomplished already in this war have given us the faint outlines of new and promising horizons that peace will make more attainable. The progress that can be made toward these horizons by American initiative and resourcefulness, without dependence on Government spending, controls and restrictions of indiivdual freedom will measure our real progress. The only spirit with which to face this future is the spirit of confidence in the American people.

There will be debate, as there should be, over putting into immediate effect the revolutionary measures in total mobilization of civilians for which the President has asked. But no citizen now can remain unconscious of the silent pleadings in support of those measures, pleadings which take form in the lengthening columns of names on every new list of the wounded, the missing, and the dead.

The Nation's Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted by the House to include in my remarks a short item, I offer it for its excellence and solid thought. Preserve the bonds of home, keep the schcol bells and the church bells ringing in our favored land, then the starry flag with all it represents of freedom, opportunity, Christianity, and equal justice for all will not perish from the earth.

THE NATION'S STRENGTH

I know three things must always be
To keep a nation strong and free.

One is a hearthstone bright and dear,
With busy, happy loved ones near.

One is a ready heart and hand
To love, and serve, and keep the land.

One is a worn and beaten way
To where the people go to pray.

So long as these are kept alive,
Nation and people will survive.

God, keep them always, everywhere,
The hearth, the flag, the place of prayer.

Atlantic Charter Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith a timely editorial from the Janesville Gazette of Janesville, Wis., as of January 4, 1945:

ATLANTIC CHARTER HOAX

President Roosevelt now says the Atlantic Charter, admittedly in the diplomatic discard, was never a signed or binding document. It was a statement of principle, a verbal agreement between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill as to what would be best for all the nations of the world when war had ceased. It was a mental picture of an ideal situation, when all the peoples on this earth would dwell together in harmony.

To bring about all the wonderful things outlined in its phrases it would be necessary, of course, to have the official endorsement and signatures of the three great powers. Both were lacking. In fact, no effort was made to convert what amounted to a mental memorandum into an official document, from which the future course of the world was to be charted. By no stretch of the imagination could it be termed an open covenant, openly arrived at.

Churchill has known this all along. Russia has proceeded in respect to Poland as though Stalin had never heard of the charter.

All of which must come as a shock to the peoples of those European nations that regarded the charter as their means of salvation. They had pinned their faith to the paragraph which said: "We respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and we wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored." It was misleading and poor diplomacy, never agreed to by the American people.

Accomplishments of Committee on Small Business of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege during the life of the Seventy-eighth Congress to have served as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business. It is my belief that the work done by this particular committee has been of extremely high value to both the small-business men of this Nation and to the Government as well. Serving with me on this committee have been such able Members as Mr. ROBINSON, of Utah; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mr. JACKSON, of Washington; Mr. KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana, who resigned from the committee last fall to take on duties which he felt were temporarily more pressing; Mr. LEONARD HALL, of New York; Mr. PLOESER, of Missouri; Mr. STEVENSON, of Wisconsin; and, as successor to Mr. HALLECK, Mr. HOWELL, of Illinois.

The Small Business Committee of the House has not been as highly publicized as some of our other select committees, but, in my opinion, its record of performance is no less impressive for that reason. The committee has neither spent as much money as most committees nor has it employed as large a staff of investigators as have other committees. Despite this effort to be truly economical in its handling of its assignment, I feel that we can point with pardonable pride to a very creditable list of committee achievements, many of which are already reflected in improved conditions for small business and improved relationships between small business and the various important Federal agencies.

Following is a general idea of the activities in which the committee has had an interest since its inception on the first of the year, 1942:

In the year 1942 the committee held 40 public hearings, during which a total of 663 witnesses were heard. The following subjects were investigated in the course of these hearings:

Problems of the automobile dealers.
Problems of the tire dealers.
The scrap metals shortage.
Problems of the retail druggists.
The fire insurance industry.
The sugar shortage.
The refrigerated locker industry.
The distribution of war contracts to small business.

In the year 1943 the committee held 30 public hearings and 1 hearing in executive session, at which 445 witnesses were heard. These hearings were held on the following subjects:

Problems of the small meat packers.
Problems of independent oil producers.
Effect of O. P. A. rulings on various retail groups.
Problems of the lumber industry.
Disposal of surplus Government-owned property and its relation to the problems of small businesses.
Operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.
Problems of the trailer coach industry.
Problems of the smaller freight forwarders.

During the year just passed the committee held 8 public hearings, at which 167 witnesses appeared. The problems taken up in these hearings consisted of the following:

Disposal of surplus Government-owned property, continued.
Operations of Smaller War Plants Corporation, continued.
Manpower and contract problems of small manufacturers on the west coast.
Problems of the independent oil producers.

To date the committee has issued six interim reports to the House of Representatives, as follows: I. Operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation; II. Petroleum Supply Situation in the United States; III. The Control, Disposition, and Sale of Government-Owned Surplus Property; IV. Current Lumber Industry Problems: Part 1, the National Lumber Situation as of January 1, 1944; part 2, Problems of the Southern pine industry; V. The Surplus Property Problem from the Viewpoint of Small Business; VI. Current Problems of Independent Crude Oil Producers: Part 1. Unfavorable Effect of Present Price Policies; part 2. Trend Toward Monopoly in Crude Oil Production.

The problems that have come to the committee have come from both industry-wide groups and from individual firms. No problems have been too small when it was clearly indicated that assistance was needed in seeking the answer to a question or ironing out a difficulty or misunderstanding with any of the various Government agencies. The committee files contain countless letters of appreciation from small firms whose principals could not afford nor spare the time for a visit to Washington.

SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS WASHINGTON REPRESENTATION

As a result of the wartime tempo and resultant business problems, many businesses have found it advantageous and in some instances necessary to have Washington representation. Big business can well afford to maintain its representative or representatives in Washington for such emergencies. Unfortunately, very few firms in the category of small business can afford to maintain a Washington office. The total expenditures of the committee can well be justified if only on the basis of having performed services for these individual small firms and keeping in business many that would otherwise have been victims of war through no fault of their own.

LUMBER INDUSTRY

As an example of industry-wide problems, I might cite the committee's investigation of the problems of the lumber industry. The committee was in receipt of reports from many small lumber producers that they had or were going out of business for various reasons beyond their control. A preliminary study disclosed that thousands of small mills had gone out of business in the face of an over-all lumber shortage that threatened to be a major factor in the successful prosecution of the war. The committee reported that its study indicated that the production of lumber in 1943 would fall short of essential military and civilian needs by 6,000,000,000 board feet. This figure was disputed by various Government agencies, but was subsequentiy found to be all too true.

The committee found that there was insufficient coordination of the activities of the various Government agencies whose rulings affected the lumber industry, and that as a result, the maximum efficiency of the industry was not being realized. Therefore it was recommended by the committee that an over-all policy committee be organized, the membership of which would be a representative from each Government agency having some degree of control over the lumber industry.

The wisdom of that recommendation can best be reflected in the following quotation from a letter received from a representative of an association which speaks for a sizable segment of our lumber industry:

> It was at the suggestion of your committee that the Log and Lumber Policy Committee, composed of representatives of various agencies concerned with lumber's part in the war, was established. This policy committee provided the means to correlate activities of various governmental agencies, eliminated unnecessary duplication and conflict between agencies, and resulted in a more orderly and efficient handling of the lumber industry's complex war problems. It was an outstanding example of how the legislative and administrative branches of the Government can cooperate with industry. We hope this type of cooperation will continue after the war. The recommendations of your committee have been sound and indicative of an understanding of the lumbermen's problems.

Following is a quotation from a letter from an official of the War Production Board and a member of the Log and Lumber Policy Committee:

> I would say, however, that during this committee's existence that it was unquestionably the largest single contributing factor to progress on governmental and logging problems that existed. May I take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of your sympathetic understanding and support of all of us in the solving of these problems. We hope we shall continue to have your active interest.

As a result of our study of the problems of the lumber industry, we were petitioned by representative members of the southern pine industry for assistance. This segment of the lumber industry consisted almost entirely of very small producers, hundreds upon hundreds of

whom were falling by the wayside as war-production casualties. As a result of a price squeeze, the small business committee recommended and prevailed upon the Office of Price Administration to depart from its normal procedure in making an industry price survey. It was pointed out, as a result of the committee's study, that the resultant delay in compiling cost data from firms representing the usual required percentage of production would only result in additional mill failures and additional loss in production of a critical material. Too great a percentage of southern pine is produced by the very small mill, known as the peckerwood mill, to make a cost survey under the usual procedure. A great percentage of these small mills are of such a size that the owner is often the principal worker and actively engaged in the physical production of lumber himself.

The records of these mills are often of the check-book stub variety and hopelessly inadequate for use in the compilation of cost studies by the Office of Price Administration. The Small Business Committee therefore recommended that cost data be obtained from a representative group of producers and thereby eliminate the danger of further delay in arriving at definite cost figures upon which relief to the industry was based. The gratitude of the southern lumber producers is adequately proven by the volume of letters of appreciation in our files.

TRAILER-COACH INDUSTRY SAVED

As another example of industry-wide problems, I can point to the hearings held by the committee in November 1943, in behalf of the small firms manufacturing trailer coaches. Due to arbitrary action by the National Housing Agency, 82 percent of these small manufacturers were obliged to either close their plants or go out of business entirely. After investigation by a subcommittee, a recommendation was made to the War Production Board which resulted in a transfer of responsibility for this program from the National Housing Agency to the War Production Board. As a result of the committee's action and positive recommendation to Mr. Nelson, the majority of these manufacturers are now being permitted to manufacture trailer coaches for war and essential civilian purposes.

Following are a few quotations received from members of the trailer-coach industry:

The trailer industry has been crying in the wilderness for over 2 years and has never been given an opportunity to present its side of the picture. Finally through your efforts they have been allowed to present their case. I therefore personally wish to thank you and your committee for the unselfish efforts given to this small industry. (A Detroit manufacturer.)

Following is a quotation received from an official of the Trailer Coach Manufacturers Association shortly after the hearing:

The 1-day hearing before your subcommittee has done more to clarify our problem and the attitude of the Government agencies interested in our industry than 6 months spent in calling upon these agencies, writing them letters, and supplying them with masses of information.

As a further indication of the feeling of the industry, a final quotation from a gentleman active in trailer dealer organizations in a bulletin to its members:

The House Small Business Committee has proven its worth and sincerity to small businesses in general and particularly to the trailer coach industry. You will remember that it was this committee that held a hearing on November 11 of last year to hear the business problems of the trailer coach industry. After this hearing they advised that the N. H. A. divorce itself from the regulation of the trailer coach industry and that the W. P. B. inaugurate a program to permit the manufacture of trailer coaches. These recommendations are both being carried out.

DISTRIBUTION TRADES

The committee has also been active in the field of distribution trades. One of the controversial issues in this field which engaged the committee's attention was the so-called community ceiling price plan which seriously affected thousands upon thousands of small retail grocery merchants. The O. P. A., in establishing this method of apprising the public at large of ceiling prices, used the principle of publishing a price list of the four groups of retail grocers predicated upon volume of sales.

Group I represented independent grocers with sales of less than $50,000 per year. Group II consisted of independent grocers with sales from $50,000 to $250,000. Group III were stores with annual sales of less than $250,000 but not independent. Group IV were predominantly chain stores operating four or more units with sales of over $250,000.

These four lists of prices were published in daily newspapers and in large sheets containing the prices of all four groups and were widely distributed to consumers. The consumers were able to compare prices of these four groups. This caused an uproar of complaints from retail grocers in classes I and II. The operations of these smaller stores normally is on a service basis with credit, and delivery, and clerk service. They were forced, under the regulations to advertise their larger competitors' prices, who almost without exception operates without credit, delivery, and clerk service. It became a practice for operators of big stores to use newspaper space in advertising to the public the price differentials in an effort to undermine group I and II grocers.

It was insisted by the committee that these regulations were unfair to the small grocer and Administrator Bowles of the Office of Price Administration changed the entire plan. Grocers in either group now display only their own prices and not those of their competitors.

INEQUITIES IN DISTRIBUTION CORRECTED

Also in the distribution trade, the committee became actively interested in certain inequities in the distribution under the low-cost garment programs of the War Production Board.

A survey was conducted by the committee of one of these orders issued by the War Production Board for the allocation of cloth to make women's house dresses and slips, men's shirts and shorts. The order contained an "equitable distribution clause" based on purchases in 1943 by customers of these manufacturers. Also affecting this program was an order by the Office of Price Administration. The survey disclosed that upward of 90 percent of these scarce items were disposed of by the manufacturers to large distributors such as mail-order houses, metropolitan department stores and chain-store corporations.

Wholesalers who provide the outlet for small retailers received less than 10 percent. On this basis there was no equitable distribution. The smaller merchants, who normally represent the bulk of distribution, received comparatively little of this low-cost merchandise.

Partly responsible for this was the O. P. A. order which provided that manufacturers would allow wholesalers a discount of 8 percent from their prices as a small payment to act as wholesale distributors. The manufacturers took the most profitable way out by selling direct to the large retail distributors because of the additional 8 percent profit they were able to thus make.

To the credit of the War Production Board it should be said that Chairman J. A. Krug took immediate action when our committee insisted that unless there was more equitable distribution and its order enforced, no future orders of this type should be promulgated. Mr. Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, also acknowledged the unfairness of the 8-percent allowance to wholesalers and asserted future price orders of this type would not be issued. As the allocation order and the pricing order worked out in practice, they tended to create a monopoly in the hands of the larger distributors while many civilians were unable to obtain any supplies of this merchandise.

The same principle has followed the distribution of what is called piece goods, which housewives use for making clothes for the family. There has been a scarcity in small stores of this material. A price differential enabled the large retail distributors to pay more for such merchandise—contrary to usual policy—than wholesalers. This has enabled them to obtain large supplies of this scarce merchandise and has seriously handicapped small merchants who depend on wholesalers for their supply of merchandise.

The manufacturers made the extra profit by selling to large retail distributors due to the 4-percent feature.

ALL GOVERNMENT ORDERS SCRUTINIZED

These are the kinds of maladjustments which the House Small Business Committee has endeavored to see corrected or avoided by the Government agencies. This kind of work requires close attention to the wording of all agency orders which affect small business and the committee has been very vigilant in the daily scrutiny of such orders.

There has been a material change in the administration of the Emergency Price Control Act. While not attributed solely to this committee's efforts, it has contributed its share to a better understanding of the problems of business.

News releases have been issued periodically, but only when there has been a definite point involved. The fact that

the newspapers and trade publications have invariably given these releases space shows their value.

There has been no desire or effort made to issue releases promiscuously to propagandize the committee. The committee has consistently endeavored to do a constructive job in behalf of all small business enterprises. The large number of letters expressing sincere thanks for accomplishments is the best evidence of the service rendered by the House Committee on Small Business.

INDEPENDENT OIL PRODUCERS

At present the committee is cooperating with the Office of Price Administration in seeking a solution to some of the problems of the independent oil producers of America. As a result of recommendations made by the committee—Sixth Interim Report: Current Problems of Independent Crude-Oil Producers—the Office of Price Administration is now making a survey of operating costs and revenues in the producing and refining fields, and, in compliance with our committee's request, has also appointed an industry advisory committee to represent the crude-petroleum producers.

FUTURE WORK OF COMMITTEE

The work of the Small Business Committee is far from done. The reasons which prompted the House of Representatives to create the committee in the first instance are not history. We are still in the midst of a total war effort and while we are all hopeful, naturally, of an early victory, we are warned that production must continue at peak levels on the assumption that the war in Europe may last at least another full year, and the war in the Pacific for some time after the end of hostilities in Europe.

Many of the problems of fitting small business into the war-production program are still with us and it is the duty of the Congress to maintain a committee that will continue to keep a watchful eye open in behalf of the small-business men and small firms of the Nation.

Aside from the committee's interest in the problems of small business during wartime, the committee should be, and is, engaged in studies that have a definite bearing on the future of small business in this country. Among these studies are:

First. Tax relief for small business.

Second. Methods of inducement to private capital to invest in competent small business.

Third. Effect of present Government controls on small business with a view to eliminating such controls as quickly as possible, yet, also, with a view to determining the possible unfavorable effect on small business if all controls should be suddenly withdrawn at the end of the war emergency period.

Fourth. Degree and nature of governmental assistance desired by small business after the war.

During the past year, we have placed considerable reliance upon the use of our staff in personal investigations and contacts to eliminate as far as possible public hearings and to save the time of our Members. The effect of this has been to greatly increase the efficiency of the committee and, in practical results, has enabled us to cover many more subjects of current value to small business, including problems of individual firms, than could othewise have been covered and still leave the Members free for attendance upon their regular duties.

Small business faces an uncertain future. It is not organized into powerful associations and has no powerful voice here in Washington. It needs and relies upon the Congress to understand and help it in the solution of its many problems. We have a special duty to see that this vital segment of our Nation shall be preserved and adequately protected. We must maintain a favorable climate not only for big business and labor but also for our established small manufacturers and distributors, the employers of so many of our citizenry.

In addition, we must prepare to see fed into our economy other and newer small enterprises which shall have an equal opportunity to survive and grow to maturity and to do so, not at the expense of our established small firms and others, but because we have vision and plans which are based upon practical observation. To this end, the House Small Business Committee has performed and can continue to perform a very useful function.

In conclusion, it must not be forgotten that both President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey, in their pre-election campaign remarks, spoke emphatically of the need for protecting small-business enterprises of all types. If there is to be full employment at fair wages in order to maintain a high standard of living, the full use of small-business facilities must be had. This will not be possible through big business alone.

In his address to the Congress January 6, 1945, on the state of the Union, the President reiterated his support of programs to aid and preserve small business in the following words:

> We Americans have always believed in freedom of opportunity, and equality of opportunity remains one of the principal objectives of our national life. * * * We are opposed to restrictions, whether by public act or private arrangement, which distort and impair commerce, transit, and trade. We have house cleaning of our own to do in this regard. * * *
>
> We must make sure that private enterprise works as it is supposed to work—on the basis of initiative and vigorous competition, without the stifling presence of monopolies and cartels.
>
> During the war we have guaranteed investment in enterprise essential to the war effort. We should also take appropriate measures in peacetime to secure opportunities for new small enterprises and for productive business expansion for which finance would otherwise be unavailable.
>
> This necessary expansion of our peacetime productive capacity will require new facilities, new plants, and new equipment.
>
> It will require large outlays of money which should be raised through normal investment channels. But while private capital should finance this expansion program, the Government should recognize its responsibility for sharing part of any special or abnormal risk of loss attached to such financing.

On December 18, 1944, the committee gave a statement to the press calling attention to the dependence of the Nation upon small businesses as well as large ones if we are to attain our objective of full employment of 60,000,000 persons after the war. At that time public statements made by both the President and Governor Dewey in this regard were quoted. A statement carried by the press at that time follows:

> WASHINGTON, D. C., December 18.—The future safety of small business may well take second place in importance to winning the war and establishing a firm peace, said Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, today.
>
> The recent election, he added, carried with it an injunction to the Seventy-ninth Congress for an all-out effort to fulfill the pledges of President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey to give aid and comfort to the free enterprise system. They committed the Democrats and Republicans, Mr. PATMAN said, to support the free enterprise system wholeheartedly. There is, therefore, no controversial issue involved if there ever had been any heretofore.
>
> Moreover, upon the continuance of small business depends largely the aims of President Roosevelt to provide the 60,000,000 jobs in the post-war period through an expansion rather than a contraction of business "if we are to avoid the collapse which took place following the period after the First World War," said the Texas Congressman, who has been a consistent advocate of the protection of all small business concerns.
>
> Chairman PATMAN called attention to the speech of President Roosevelt at Chicago on October 28, when the President said small business must be protected "from the selfish and cold-blooded monopolies and cartels."

THE PRESIDENT'S VIEWS

Mr. PATMAN further quoted the President as saying in that speech:

> "I believe in free enterprise—and always have.
>
> "I believe in the profit system—and always have.
>
> "I believe that private enterprise can give full employment to our people.
>
> "And if anyone feels that my faith in our ability to provide 60,000,000 peacetime jobs is fantastic, let him remember that some people said the same thing about my demand in 1940 for 50,000 airplanes.
>
> "I believe in exceptional rewards for innovation, skill, and risk-taking by business.
>
> "This administration has been mindful from its earliest days, and will continue to be mindful, of the problems of small business as well as large.
>
> "Small business played a magnificent part in producing thousands of items needed for our armed forces. When the war broke out, it was mobilized into war production. Money was loaned to them for machinery. Over 1,000,000 prime contracts and subcontracts have been distributed among 60,000 smaller plants of the Nation.
>
> "We will make sure that small business is given every facility to buy Government-owned plants, equipment, and inventories. The special credit and capital requirements of small business will be met.
>
> "And small business will continue to be protected from selfish and cold-blooded monopolies and cartels. Beware of that profound enemy of the free-enterprise system who pays lip service to free competition, but also labels every antitrust prosecution as 'persecution.'"

GOVERNOR DEWEY STATES POSITION

Speaking at Buffalo on November 1, Governor Dewey also spoke plainly on the subject of small business and enunciated these policies of assistance:

> "Proposal 1: Direct all Government policies toward the goal of full employment through full production at a high level of wages for the worker with an incentive for the businessman to succeed. Your next administra-

tion will work out the problems affecting labor, agriculture, and business in full consultation with all three and without discrimination against any class or section of our country, or any race, creed, or color.

"Proposal 2: Change and lower the income tax on business so that it can be encouraged to expand and help create the millions of jobs we need.

"Proposal 6: Survey forthwith the millions of reports required of big and little business every year by Government and immediately abolish the greater part of them. We have done this in New York and we can do it in the Nation."

"It is apparent from these quotations," said Congressman PATMAN, "that both the President and Governor Dewey are fully aware of the importance of small business in the future economic welfare of the country. It is also obvious that we cannot be a prosperous Nation without full employment. This is not possible unless all sections of the United States have industries employing workers at a wage scale that will enable them to provide the buying power to sustain this prosperity.

"I believe this view is concurred in by every member of the House Committee on Small Business and that they are in full sympathy with promoting the interests of such enterprises as the only means whereby we can accomplish the much-desired program of full employment and opportunities as laid down by the recognized leaders of both parties."

Urges Congressional Action To Streamline Veterans' Administration and Its Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous complaints in the past from disabled veterans of World War No. 2, that their applications, while acknowledged did not receive prompt attention. In some cases there was a delay of some months. Then, I have observed other cases where some serious mistake was made somewhere. The veteran feeling he had exhausted his remedy, accepted the decision of the Veterans' Administration.

I recall when I spoke on August 13, last, at a farmers' gathering at Plymouth, Ohio, there was a disabled veteran of World War No. 2 on the platform, who was hardly able to walk, and who was at least 90-percent disabled, receiving his disability in an airplane crash, and he stated that before the G. I. bill was passed the Government paid him $10 a month for his disability, and that after the G. I. bill passed he received an increase of 15 percent, or $11.50 a month. Of course, he and his parents were rather bitter over the situation. I was sure that there had been some mistake made, and I suggested to this veteran that he take the matter up further with the Veterans' Administration.

I, therefore, am glad to include in my remarks an article by Joseph Leib, vice commander, Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C., including the resolution passed by that post:

URGES CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO STREAMLINE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION AND ITS FACILITIES

(By Joseph Leib, vice commander, Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C.)

The Veterans' Administration must be modernized in order to efficiently care for the servicemen of both World Wars. This Department has limped along for some 24 years under the handicaps of a model-T machinery. It is woefully in need of repair and streamlining.

Obnoxious red tape, pettifogging, and bewilderingly long delays are rampant throughout its conflicting bureaus and subdivisions. It has become one of the major monstrosities of bureaucratic fumbling in the whole Federal Government. At present, due to the "G. I. bill of rights" legislation, it has gleefully been engaged in pyramiding additional bureaus, causing interdepartmental jealousies and petty conflicts. Yet it steadfastly refuses to initiate a comprehensive study directed to reform its antiquated, topheavy, and cumbersome bureaucratic machinery that is costing the taxpayers untold sums in money. Unless immediate action is taken it will slumber into a greater colossus of impotence than we now find it.

The welfare of approximately 12,000,000 new service cases will soon be added to the already overburdening functions and responsibilities of the now existing Veterans' Administration.

In line with these considerations I respectfully urge the introduction of legislation calling for congressional study and revamping of our sadly neglected Veterans' Administration.

The Costello Post recently adopted the following resolution, which is self-explanatory and worthy of serious study:

"Whereas members of this post have reported that the Veterans' Administration facility on Wisconsin Avenue, known as Mount Alto Hospital, Washington, D. C., is not able to provide care to which veterans in this vicinity are by law entitled; that the institution is understaffed and overcrowded; that veterans in need of hospital care cannot obtain such care; that the present buildings, besides being inadequate for the needs of this vicinity, are badly in need of repair; that the hospital has a general gloomy and 'poorhouse' atmosphere not conducive to high morale or rapid recovery af patients; and

"Whereas Mt. Alto Hospital is the diagnostic center for the Veterans' Administration and therefore not strictly speaking a hospital for the care of veterans in this vicinity; and

"Whereas we feel that it is a cardinal duty of the American Legion to see to it that adequate and competent hospital care under pleasant and comfortable conditions is made available to veterans in need of such care as provided by law: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia in regular meeting assembled this 2d day of January, 1945, That the executive committee of the department be urged to order a comprehensive survey to determine (a) the requirements of veterans in this vicinity for hospital care, including clinic facilities, (b) the extent to which and the manner in which such requirements are being met by existing Veterans' Administration facilities, and (c) what additional facilities or corrective measures are necessary to assure adequate care for all veterans; that a committee be appointed by the department commander to make this survey and that the committee be instructed to present its report to the department executive committee at the earliest practicable date, but in no case later than 1 month prior to the 1945 department convention.

"Unanimously adopted, January 2, 1945.

"THOMAS A. COSTELLO, *Commander.*

"DAVID E. MILLER, *Adjutant.*"

The F. B. I.—One of the Greatest Organizations in the World Today—Thanks to J. Edgar Hoover and His Splendid Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the amazing capture of the two German spies—William Curtis Colepaugh, 26, and Erich Gimpel, 35—who were well schooled and taught the art and cunning of sabotage and spying at the special German SS School at The Hague, Netherlands, recently in New York City, who had previously landed in Maine, is another remarkable feat accomplished by the F. B. I.

J. Edgar Hoover again demonstrated that his F. B. I. is the finest and best organization of its kind in the world. There were many regretable and costly acts of sabotage in the last World War and there probably would have been even more in this war without Hoover's great F. B. I. The comparatively few minor acts of sabotage in World War No. 2 is little short of a miracle and can be safely attributable solely to the uncanny and remarkable work of the F. B. I.

F. B. I. ALWAYS ON THE JOB

When the German spies, several months ago, landed on a coast in Florida and again on the Atlantic coast, the amazing agents of Hoover's organization lost no time in grabbing them. When one thinks how much damage they could have done in even a few months, our people cannot help but shudder at the consequences, and thereby be exceedingly thankful that our great Nation has such an efficient, able, and scientific organization.

HOOVER LEAVES NOTHING UNDONE

J. Edgar Hoover, who has devoted all of his talents and energies for the past 20 years as head of the F. B. I., is not only America's No. 1 gang buster in the minds of American youth, but he is America's No. 1 protector in the minds of all Americans. And remember that German spies in this war have been schooled to a far greater degree and know a great deal more about the cunning operations of spy work than in the last war. That is why J. Edgar Hoover and the F. B. I. deserve our best appreciation and congratulations for a great and difficult job well done.

HOOVER LOOKS AHEAD

Not content with wiping out major criminals, dangerous spies, saboteurs,

and the like, Mr. Hoover has done another great job. His program of handling juvenile delinquency and his program to wipe that out in America will bring tremendous dividends to this Nation in the prevention of future crimes.

Thanks again to J. Edgar Hoover and his great organization for a job well done. All America is justly proud of you.

Punishment of War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT ON PUNISHMENT OF WAR CRIMINALS

FOREWORD

This statement on the punishment of war criminals was submitted by the American Jewish Conference on August 25, 1944, to Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

Among its recommendations, the American Jewish Conference urges that "In all trials of those guilty of crimes against civilian populations, criminal acts performed against the Jewish people shall be duly specified as part of the indictment." This demand is prompted not by a desire for vengeance but by the moral and practical implications of just punishment. The Jewish people have been singled out by the Nazis for total annihilation. Those who sought this annihilation may try to continue, even after the war, their anti-Jewish agitation and terror, extending their activities to countries beyond their present reach. They must be made to realize the consequences they will have to bear.

It is therefore the moral obligation of the United Nations, who are fighting to establish a world of freedom and security, to bring to justice the perpetrators of crimes against the Jews of Europe. Such punishment should serve as a warning against future attempts to instigate or commit similar crimes.

This statement on punishment of war criminals is one of a series on the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Jewish life in the post-war period.

Since their rise to power, the leaders of the Nazi regime in Germany have repeatedly and consistently proclaimed the extermination of the Jewish people as a major aim. Both before and since the beginning of the war, they have pursued this aim with unrelenting vigor and brutality, utilizing every measure of degradation and despoliation, including forced labor, starvation, deportation, and mass murder. This campaign of terror and annihilation has been carried out with unexampled bestiality in consort with Axis allies and associates, and with the connivance of Nazi followers and subordinates in their home countries and their collaborators in occupied territories. These crimes cannot go unpunished without destroying the legal and moral foundations upon which our civilization rests.

The United Nations, being aware of the manifold crimes committed by the Axis Powers against the Jewish people, have solemnly and officially affirmed as their policy toward all those guilty of these crimes the exaction of full and just retribution.

Thus, the Inter-Allied Declaration signed at St. James' Palace on January 13, 1942, though not making express reference to the Jews, proclaimed that the signatory powers "place among their principal war aims the punishment, through the channel of organized justice, of those guilty and responsible for these crimes (against civilians), whether they have ordered them, perpetrated them, or in any way participated in them."

Subsequently, in a joint declaration issued simultaneously at London and Washington on December 17, 1942, the United Nations took formal cognizance of the fact that "the German authorities * * * are now carrying into effect Hitler's oft-repeated intention to exterminate the Jewish people in Europe," and thereafter "reaffirm their solemn resolution to insure that those responsible for these crimes shall not escape retribution, and to press on with the necessary practical measures to this end."

In conjunction with the historic Moscow Conference, the heads of the Governments of the United States, the U. S. S. R., and Great Britain, "speaking in the interests of 32 United Nations," issued on November 1, 1943, "a solemn public declaration." As Secretary of State Cordell Hull stated on November 18, 1943, before a joint meeting of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the declaration promised that "due punishment will be administered * * * to the perpetrators of the bestial and abominable crimes committed by the Nazi leaders against the harassed and persecuted inhabitants of occupied territories—against people of all races and religions, among whom Hitler has reserved for the Jews his most brutal wrath."

On March 24, 1944, this policy was clearly and emphatically reiterated when President Roosevelt, with the approval of Prime Minister Churchill and Premier Stalin, made a public pronouncement calling attention to the fact that the extermination of the Jewish people was "begun by the Nazis in the day of peace and multiplied by them a hundred times in time of war," and stating in part: "we again proclaim our determination that none who participate in these acts of savagery (against Jews and other civilians) shall go unpunished. The United Nations have made it clear that they will pursue the guilty and deliver them up in order that justice be done. That warning applies not only to the leaders but also to their functionaries and subordinates in Germany and in the satellite countries. All who share the guilt will share the punishment."

In view of the solemn and unequivocal declaration of policy embodied in these and similar official statements, which leave no doubt as to the intention of the United Nations to visit just punishment upon those guilty of crimes against civilian populations, and notably against the Jewish people, the American Jewish Conference, representing the Jewish community of the United States of America, urges that in carrying out this policy the United Nations take cognizance of and proper action upon the following considerations:

1. Among the crimes to be made punishable under this policy, there be expressly included the publicly announced intent of the Axis nations and their allies and associates to annihilate the Jewish people, and all acts whereby they sought to accomplish this aim, before and during the war, within their own and occupied territories.

2. In all trials of those guilty of crimes against civilian populations, criminal acts performed against the Jewish people shall be duly specified as part of the indictment.

3. Those charged with specific crimes against individual Jews, or with acts designed to bring about the ultimate annihilation of Jewish communities, such as deprivation, starvation, deportation, unendurable forced labor, and mass murder by whatever means, in territories occupied by the enemy, shall be prosecuted with the utmost energy and vigor in the national courts of the States where such crimes were committed, irrespective of the nationality of the accused or of the victims.

4. The prosecution of those guilty of these acts against the Jews in Germany and in the territories of her allies and associates, as well as of crimes not confined to single territories, shall be within the jurisdiction of the contemplated international court for the trial of war criminals.

5. The United Nations shall agree among themselves to declare as common criminals, and shall so desire, all those guilty of these acts against the Jews, and shall require the Axis Nations, their allies and associates, the neutral nations, and any other country where the criminals may seek asylum, to surrender or extradite all persons thus designated. Provision for the surrender of these criminals by the Axis Powers, their allies and associates, shall be included in the terms of the armistice.

6. Representatives of the respective Jewish communities shall be consulted in the preparation of evidence against these criminals, and shall be recognized in the national courts as amici curiae, and provision shall be made to this effect.

7. Representatives of the Jewish people shall be officially admitted as amici curiae before the contemplated international prosecuting body and the international court for the trial of war criminals. The constituting acts of those bodies shall contain the necessary provisions to this effect.

8. The Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes, or such other body as may be constituted for this purpose by the United Nations, shall receive and give due consideration to all suggestions which may be submitted to it by a representation of the Jewish people, and it shall grant such a representation a locus standi.

AUGUST 28, 1944.

E Pluribus Unum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Robert J. Goode, executive vice president of the Motor Vehicle Association of Alabama, has recently given us all something to think about by writing an article which he calls E Pluribus Unum—A Trade Barrier Discussion.

Alabama born and bred, graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, and former commissioner of agriculture and industries of Alabama, Mr. Goode is a gentleman whose character, ability, and studious attainments make anything he has to say worthy of consideration.

The article follows:

Just before the present World War, a party of foreign newspaper correspondents paid a visit to our so-called United States. They planned to make a sight-seeing trip from New York to San Francisco and back by bus. A company with whom they discussed chartering a bus tentatively agreed on a price of 25 cents a mile pending a check of the laws and regulations of the States through which they would travel.

Here is what was found.

California would charge $231 for operating in the State—$140 in taxes and $91 license fees. New Mexico would charge $25 for passing through its borders. Arizona would re-

quire $6.30 plus an undetermined gross weight charge. Oregon had to get $2.50 for registration plus 6 percent of gross revenues. Montana called for $15 filing fee, $2 insurance, and one-half of 1 percent of gross revenues. Wyoming $5 and one-half mill per passenger-mile. Missouri $5 plus $3 per day vehicle tax. Kansas 2 cents per mile. After checking that far it was decided that the services of several lawyers, expert auditors, and accountants, together with a battery of adding machines and comptometers would be required, so the trip was called off. This sounds unbelievable, but the figures given were actually correct and were not as bad as could have been found on some other routes.

As we all remember, the Thirteen Original Colonies declared their independence of Great Britain in a document adopted by the Second Continental Congress on July 4, 1776. In it, the new Nation was called the "United States of America." In fact, however, the American States were in no sense actually united. Their only bond at that time was their mutual desire to free themselves from Great Britain.

The more foresighted, however, realized that the Colonies must be united in fact, and 8 days after the Declaration of Independence was signed a committee started to draft the Articles of Confederation. Under these loose articles, the American Revolution was successfully fought. Under them, the last red coat was unfrocked and a treaty of peace was signed with Great Britain.

The peace treaty with Great Britain had provided that each of the Thirteen Colonies should be "a free, sovereign, and independent State." This was the purpose of the war. Each State was saturated with the ideal of independence. Each State fought to preserve its own independence. Each State had, and used, its sovereign right to tax the goods imported into it, not only from foreign countries but from neighboring States as well. The result was not a "United States of America" at all. It was a group of loosely tied, independent nations, each one of which was waging a bitter economic war with the other twelve. It is all too plain to us now that this internal strife nearly cost the life of the new-born nation.

New York imposed tariffs on New Jersey vegetables, chickens, and eggs. In retaliation, New Jersey taxed New York $1,800 a year for the privilege of maintaining a lighthouse on Sandy Hook. Wood cutters, who turned the apparently inexhaustible forests of Manhattan Island into firewood, found their business jeopardized by shrewd Connecticut Yankees who brought firewood to Manhattan and undersold them. But that was easily fixed. New York merely imposed a heavy duty on Connecticut firewood. Enraged New London businessmen staged a mass meeting and unanimously resolved to discontinue any and all business with New York.

And so it went.

During 4 long years the discord mounted. During this trying period there were many who confidently predicted that the struggling infant would never survive these growing pains. It was perfectly obvious that if the Nation was to survive something had to be done to end this internal warfare that had, in some incidents, actually resulted in bloodshed. It was imperative that the United States become united in practice as well as in name.

In 1787 the Congress of the Confederation issued a call for a Convention to meet at Philadelphia for the purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation. With the exception of Rhode Island, all the Original Thirteen States sent delegates. George Washington presided at the Convention. Benjamin Franklin was one of its leaders. And the voices of Alexander Hamilton and James Monroe were frequently heard in the convention hall.

After sitting for 5 months, the framers of the Constitution decided that their work was finished, and the new Constitution was submitted to the various Sates for ratification. By July 1788, 11 States had ratified it, and that short, simple document thereupon became the lifeblood of our Nation. The Constitution is as cherished by Americans as the Declaration of Independence, but for a different reason. The Declaration of Independence established the freedom of America. The Constitution gave us the only means of implementing our unity and strength in maintaining this freedom.

It was fully realized by the founding fathers that if the general welfare was to be safeguarded, there must be a power which exceeded that of the several States. Each State, therefore, was given jurisdiction over its own territory. But the power to regulate interstate commerce was placed squarely in the hands of the Federal Government. The very first article of the Constitution, the tenth section, states, "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws." In their wisdom, the writers of our Constitution knew that only by the establishment of free trade between each of the States could this country expand and prosper.

During the first century of our country's history this free trade area was preserved intact. Then—slowly and insidiously—States began taxing imports in an effort to protect their own businessmen. But these were more or less isolated instances and at the time they gave no warning of what was to follow. And, finally, there arrived a rainy Friday in late October of 1929, a day which altered the course of American history in many ways.

Prices on the New York Exchange collapsed and they continued to stumble and fall for nearly 3 years, as the United States was held firmly in the grip of the worst business depression in the country's history. Squeezed in the vise of depression, State politicians increasingly lost sight of the first principles. In their eagerness to balance budgets they forgot the general welfare. They forgot the chaos which resulted from the imposition of state trade barriers in the 1780's. Desparately in need of additional revenue with which to meet new demands for relief and other public expenditures at a time when normal revenues had shrunk, they chose what seemed like an easy way out. They decided to increase State wealth at the expense of their neighbors. Simultaneously, in State capitols throughout the land, politicians began taxing the goods and products of other States.

Money-tight, local businessmen urged them on. Grasping at straws, these businessmen, applying the old national tariff argument for "protection"—cried out for State protection—from real or supposed competitors in neighboring States. Railroads howled a bit louder than the rest. Beginning with the depression years, railroads began losing an ever-increasing amount of traffic to motor vehicles. Believing that their problems would be at least partially solved by the imposition of taxes and license fees on trucks and busses, railroads eagerly called out for such impositions. And, inevitably, States whose goods were taxed answered in kind. An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, you have taxed my goods and now I am going to tax yours.

In the early depression years these barriers to interstate trade, taken individually, seemed relatively harmless. There was so much else to think about that no one gave them much consideration. But after a few years of steady building it was suddenly realized that these walls between States had reached such a height that they could no longer be scaled. These dwarfs had banded together and collectively they had the strength to constrict the trade of an entire nation. The cost ran into billions of dollars.

Thus, except for isolated instances, the policy of unity enunciated in the Constitution was maintained throughout the years until the dark days of the great depression following 1929. Then here, there, and yonder, with increasing tempo, the States began to fortify their borders against their neighbors.

Picking a few examples at random, North Carolina refused to permit Louisiana strawberries to enter the State. Maine charged its brewers and distillers who used Maine products a license of $100 but charged those that used the products of any other State a license fee of $3,000. Out in Idaho all persons employed on public construction, repair, and maintenance work had to be bona fide residents of the State, and all contractors in order to work in the State, had to be local taxpayers. Connecticut, forgetting all about the firewood incident that had occurred 150 years before, required that all milk products used in frozen desserts had to be pasteurized within the State.

Cities and towns took up the hue and cry. In a small village in Wyoming a retailer one day became aware that he was losing business to itinerant peddlers, so he went to the local chamber of commerce, which, in turn, was instrumental in having passed an ordinance forbidding house-to-house canvassing except by the invitation of the occupants. This ordinance became a test case in the courts and it was upheld. As a result, hundreds of other cities and towns followed suit in one way or another.

One night a few years ago a municipal power plant in the town of Old Hickory, Tenn., was struck by a bolt of lightning which left the 9,000 inhabitants without lights, water, or fire protection. A rush order for a length of copper cable was sent to Chicago. To insure prompt delivery, a motor carrier was quickly dispatched. Suspecting that the truck driver might run into red tape, the shipper gave him a letter asking that, even though the truck might not fully conform to State regulations, it be allowed to pass in view of the emergency. Kentucky inspectors found the truck just 12 inches longer than the law allowed and refused to let it pass. Not until the money was telegraphed to pay the fine did the truck get through, and then only after a delay of 60 hours.

Another example: A Nebraska nurseryman located 20 miles from the Kansas line got an order to deliver some rose bushes to a Kansas customer. He started out with the bushes in his truck and was stopped at a port of entry on the Kansas State line. There he had to buy a Kansas commercial license for his truck, show insurance papers covering it, submit to an inspection of all his equipment, have his truck weighed, buy a Kansas permit to haul a commercial load on the State highway, report his destination and the highways over which he would travel, and deposit $50 to guarantee payment of a one-half mill tax per ton per mile for use of the roads when he should leave the State. He then had to buy a permit to sell nursery stock in Kansas, had to prove that his stock was free of pests and disease, and had to show that his rose bushes were labeled as to color and variety. One such experience was enough for him. It was his first and last attempt to do an interstate business in the State of Kansas.

Thus, did the cancerous growth of trade barriers gain strength and momentum. Thus it was that there grew up in the decade from 1930 to 1940 a situation which is threatening the Union exactly as it was threatened in the period immediately following the American Revolution. Just as something had to be done then, so must something be done now.

Today, in the distressing light of world conditions, it is more important than at any time in the country's history that we be united.

Today, virtually every State in the Union has imposed some form of trade barrier. There are well over a thousand of these restrictive measures on the statute books of our States. The result is bitterness, retaliation, boycotts, and border wars. At a time when, as a Nation, we are engaged in a war for the very preservation of life and liberty, there are guards on the borders of several of our States ready to enforce with guns these internal barriers to trade between each other.

Thus are we killing the goose that laid the golden egg. Thus are we destroying the very thing which made the United States the most prosperous country on the face of the earth, a free market in America for American goods and services. It is of the utmost importance to America today that we get back to the original premise under which the Nation was established—"United we stand; divided we fall."

Among trade barriers, nothing has been a more serious obstruction than the multifarious highway trade barriers which have been imposed by every State and many municipalities.

The web of numerous and conflicting State laws and regulations which today hold motor carriers helplessly enmeshed is such a burden on the public that it is, inescapably, a public problem. In a single year over 10,000 bills affecting transportation by trucks were before the legislatures of our States. Over 1,200 were enacted into laws.

That the railroads were the godfather of many of these laws, which are today keeping trucks off the highways, is attested by the very laws themselves. Texas, to cite only one of many possible examples, passed a law permitting only 7,000 pounds weight, unless the truck were taking its load to a railroad station, in which event, 14,000 pounds was permitted. You may guess just once who had that law passed.

"Consider a picture of barricaded roads and highways guarded by men in uniform," says a recent bulletin of the National Highway Users Conference. "Envision long lines of travelers awaiting their turn to pass through the required formalities of proving their fitness to enter the country. Observe the arbitrary levying of imposts, the delay, expense, and inconveniences—and, finally—the issuance of the precious clearance certificate.

"Such is the picture of a frontier—not a frontier of Manchukuo, Soviet Russia, or a Balkan State—but a picture that is being witnessed along the invisible boundary lines between our States * * * right here in the United States."

Not only are these laws myriad in number, but many of them are in direct conflict with each other. "An Iowa farmer," says a bulletin of the National Highway Users Conference, "recently started for St. Louis, Mo., with a load of cantaloups. He was stopped by the Iowa highway patrol at Mount Pleasant, where he was forced to install three green clearance lights. Shortly after dark, he parked in a Missouri town. Emerging from a restaurant after a hasty supper, he found his newly acquired green lights being torn from his truck by an irate policeman, who soundly berated him for violating the Missouri law.

Restrictions governing the width, length, weight, and equipment for single-unit trucks, tractor semitrailers, and other combinations vary for almost every State. Not only must truckmen conform to these multiple restrictions but they must first find out what they are, which is a most difficult task because of their complexity and because they are subject to such frequent changes.

On top of all that most States have some kind of license requirement and tax which must be met by out-of-State vehicles. Trucks entering most States are required to do one or more of the following: Register, deposit a cash bond, obtain a license or permit, pay ton-mile taxes, gross-receipt or personal-property taxes. It is self-evident that in some parts of the country these restrictions make a haul through several States utterly impossible.

Innumerable instances of the burden on traffic could be given, but a record kept by one company of costs during 1 year for fines and penalties amounting to $14,651.13, with an additional $3,000 to $5,000 for preventing arrests—pay-offs—is a good enough example.

Not only does the operator have these kinds of obstacles imposed by the States but there is an increasing tendency for municipalities to add to it by the imposition of various municipal licenses and taxes.

The problem of interstate trade barriers is by no means local in its scope and effect, but is national. Every trade barrier, however small the area of its immediate application, has the effect of increasing costs and restricting trade and commerce to all the people of the Nation.

Our system of mass production requires the free and unimpeded flow of commerce—physical goods—between the States. It becomes each year an increasinbly large part of all business. In the time when each community produced only a sufficient supply of processed goods or commodities for its own use there was very little interstate traffic in such goods. But with the development of mass production by which the cost of production was decreased sufficiently to overbalance the cost of long-distance transportation, interstate trade was greatly increased.

To provide full employment to our returning soldiers and workers now engaged in war production, it is esesntial that all obstacles to the free flow of goods—from any manufacturer anywhere in the United States to any consumer anywhere in the United States—be removed. It is only in this way that continuing production, employment, and purchasing power may be stimulated.

Interstate trade barriers deny to the American public the full benefits of mass production. They always raise prices, and, therefore, curtail production, thus actually reducing rather than increasing employment. Mobility of material is as essential to our peacetime economy as to the efficient operation of an army.

While it is true that the people of a State which has erected trade barriers around it do not pay more for many standard products and articles than anyone else, the increased cost of transportation and other restrictions is reflected in the price to all consumers.

Thus, by setting up trade barriers, a State works against the interests of all others of the 47 States, not just the ones immediately surrounding it. Trade barriers erected by Alabama raise prices in California, and trade barriers in Ohio raise prices in Alabama.

For these reasons, all our people should be acquainted with the ill effects of trade barriers on them. All manufacturers, retailers, taxpayers, and consumer groups should see to it that barriers lifted during the war shall not be replaced and that current barriers be removed.

Because of their effect on everyone and because it is believed that the public should be advised of the multiplicity of harmful barriers which effect them, a few of such interstate trade barriers will be briefly mentioned.

In the field of dairy products, essential to the health of all, there has been a great mass of legislation, presumably for the purpose of protecting the health of the consuming public and stabilizing the purchasing power of dairy farmers; but which, in fact, has been used to restrict the market area of the products and uniformly added to their cost to the consumer.

All States and most cities have enacted laws and regulations governing the sale and distribution of milk. It is entirely right that the health of the consumer be protected from diseases and epidemics which may be spread from diseased herds or by milk produced under unsanitary conditions. However, it is entirely wrong when these health provisions are used to interrupt the flow of interstate and intercity business.

Numerous States and cities will not permit the sale of milk, cream, or butter in the areas over which they have jurisdiction unless they, personally, have inspected the farms on which the products were produced. Local dairymen were protected by the simple expedient of refusing to inspect other than local farms.

For example, during the recent depression, when prices had dropped to extremely low levels, the State of Connecticut refused to register out-of-State dairies and may still refuse registration to farms beyond the State's natural milkshed. This natural milkshed is, of course, closely confined to Connecticut's boundary lines.

Because of great technical improvements in refrigeration in recent years, it is now possible to safely deliver milk from midwestern farms in eastern cities. But, by bigoted sectionalism, this scientific progress is thwarted and our national market of 3,000,000 square miles is broken up into a thousand or more tightly closed trade areas.

Rhode Island has an extremely arbitrary law requiring that all milk shipped into the State must go direct from the farmer to Rhode Island dealers or consumers. To enforce this law, the Rhode Island dairy commissioner is authorized to add red coloring to illegal milk. Not long since, over 5,000 gallons of perfectly good Vermont milk was colored "Rhode Island red" for a minor infraction of the law. Naturally the Green Mountain boys rose up in righteous wrath. Sad to relate, however, Vermont's own record was none too clean. Back a few years ago, Vermont, in an effort to protect its own dairymen, decreed that all margarine must be dyed an unattractive shade of pink.

This suggests what has been and still is one of the most unjust, unfair, and undemocratic discriminations in the entire histary of internal barriers to trade—the high taxes and innmerable restictions placed upon the manufacture, distribution, and sale of margarine.

Just as railroads have been instrumental in imposing restrictive taxes and conditions on motor vehicles, so has the dairy industry been instrumental in imposing these taxes on margarine. Without cataloging the numerous taxes and restrictions, suffice it to say that the manufacture and sale of margarine is more restricted than any other product sold in America, with the possible exception of narcotics.

And what is this product which requires such strenuous regulation and restriction? Merely the scientific combination or mixture of pure vegetable or animal oils, pasteurized skimmed milk and salt, and to most of which is now added the requisite amount of vitamins. It is a healthful product equal in its nutritive value to the best butter. There is no earthly reason that it should not be sold on its own merit free of artificial restrictions, except that certain dairy interests have had sufficient political power to enact Federal and State barriers by means of which low-income consumers who cannot afford butter are denied the right to purchase margarine.

Thus, is the war between our States being fought today. Thus, have we established in our country a hundred frontiers on each side of which there is bitterness and ill will.

Thus, are we defying our Constitution, that document which has made it possible in a war-torn world to retain our status as the freest and the richest country on earth.

Anti-chain-store legislation, by placing restrictions on one of the important agencies beyond interstate commerce, has added fuel to the fire which is today consuming our national unity. Since 1925 there has been active opposition to chain stores. But it was not effective until the United States Supreme Court held valid the Indiana chain-store tax. That was in May of 1931. Now 23 States and more than 50 cities are enforcing anti-chain-store license taxes.

On other frontiers similar battles are being waged between our States. Today, 28 States will buy nothing for State institutions that is not produced within the boundaries of their own particular State. Thirty States have enacted measures making it compulsory that local residents be favored in public employment. Foreign insurance companies are discriminated against taxwise by practically every State in the Union. And sad but true, the otherwise progressive State of California will not permit her students to study from any textbook that has not been printed in a California press.

Among other discriminatory trade barriers could be mentioned quarantines and inspections against both livestock and nursery products; grading, labeling, and packaging laws; State-financed advertising of farm products; State taxes on the manufacture and sale of out-of-State alcoholic beverages; prohibition of the sale of prison-made goods; municipal taxes and licenses; and others too numerous to mention.

All such barriers, regardless of their intent or the means by which it is attempted to justify them, are bad. They restrict trade and commerce; add unjustifiable costs to goods, commodities and services; and reduce the national income which is so necessary to provide the full employment we must have if we hope to enjoy post-war prosperity.

And what is being done or can be done to rectify this reprehensible situation?

There are two schools of thought as to the remedial action to be taken. First, and the most desirable one to our way of thinking, is by State action. The other, less desirable but which may be brought about by the failure of the States to act, is Federal legislation.

Already, strong and important influences are under way to correct by State action these laws and regulations which subvert and circumvent the plain intent of the Constitution. Much progress, largely sponsored by the Council of State Governments, has been made by mutual and cooperative agreements between the several States. As indicated by the name, the council is composed of official representatives of all the States. Each State should have a council of cooperation affiliated with the national organization in order that any needed reciprocal agreements might be easily arranged.

The greatest draw-back to getting the barriers removed by State action alone is that such action is slow and can be held up indefinitely by recalcitrant and selfish groups in certain States. Examples of such delays may be found in the failure of Kentucky to permanently remove its fantastically unreasonable truck weight limitation of 18,000 pounds gross weight; or, of a number of the dairy States in retaining their prohibitive tax barriers to the sale of margarine.

That the Federal Government is not unaware of the gravity of the situation and is in a mood for remedial action can probably best be exemplified by quoting from a letter recently written by President Roosevelt to Governor Cochran, of Nebraska, then chairman of the Council of State Governments, as follows:

"Interstate trade barriers have arisen in many instances from the same causes that resulted in mounting tariff walls between nations—accountable for so much of the world's unrest in recent years. The Federal Government is seeking to break down trade walls between this and other nations of the world, and to remove the hampering restrictions that have been placed upon world commerce.

"Interstate trade barriers, if allowed to develop and multiply, will, however, constitute social and economic problems even more serious than international tariffs. It is a matter which demands the immediate attention of all the people of our country, and it is my earnest hope that the several States will take effective steps toward the removal of all barriers to the free flow of trade within our Nation."

Again, at the Federal-State Conference on War Restrictions called by the President to clear away the "legal obstacles arising from a desire for regional and local advantage" so that an unimpeded all-out war effort might be prosecuted, it was clearly indicated that the States must, or the Federal Government would, remove their principal barriers to the free flow of goods, supplies, and personnel during the emergency. The Conference resulted in an admission by the States of the worst of such barriers and an agreement for their voluntary removal by the States for the duration.

There has also been a midway proposal by which the Congress would provide for the appointment of Federal-State commissions authorized to study and propose joint Federal-State action on any questions of interstate commerce. It was thought that, since the Congress, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, clearly has the power to regulate interstate trade, such a commission would provide the opportunity for each State to take the requisite action in such a way that there would be no invasion of State's rights. On the other hand for unreasonably recalcitrant States, provision could be made for relieving interstate commerce of such unreasonable restrictions.

Our feeling is that the States should take the necessary action to remove these barriers to commerce which are burdens on the public. However, there is no doubt but that the Constitution gives a clear field to Federal action in the event States fail to act. It is not unlikely that, in such cases, some such arrangement as that suggested with respect to a Federal-State commission may be the answer. Certainly, we should advise our business friends and associates of the conditions. Many of them do not know that such conditions exist, or that we all are paying for such narrow and short-sighted restriction on our commerce. Public knowledge of the conditions will influence a desirable result more quickly than anything else.

In their wisdom, the writers of our Constitution established the principle of free trade between each of the States so that the entire Nation could expand and prosper. Through the years, the original 13 States became 48. Not only geographically, but agriculturally and industrially, did this great Nation spread its wings and soar. To America came a higher standard of living than to any other nation in the world. Americans became free citizens in a vast realm, the envy of the world. Why? Largely because there existed a market of over 3,000,000 square miles—from the Atlantic to the Pacific; from Canada to Mexico—in any part of which any American could sell—unhampered—the fruits of his labor.

Only by maintaining and jealously guarding this principle of free trade among ourselves, can we continue to soar.

Overtime Pay for Government Employees?—Why They Don't Even Get Straight-Time Pay for Overtime Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the House an analysis of the present overtime pay plan for United States Government employees and the inequities caused by that plan. At a time when the Federal Government is requiring private industry to pay its employees time and a half and more for overtime work, it is neither logical nor just for the Government to require its own employees to work extra hours at a rate of pay which is actually less than the rate paid for the regular day's work.

In addition to this, it is recognized that the cost of living has risen rather sharply, and this rise has, for the most part, been matched by increases in basic rates for employees in private industry. Government salaries have not been adjusted in more than 10 years.

The table presented herewith shows that Government employees are paid today at a lower rate than they were prior to the compulsory 48-hour week. Among all the salaried workers in the country, they alone have had their rate of pay reduced while their cost of living has been advancing, and while their neighbors who work for private employers have had adjustments in pay scales to meet advancing living costs.

The computations in the chart are based upon the following data:

Prior to the 48-hour week order, Government employees worked 39 hours each week—7 hours for 5 days and 4 hours on Saturday. There were 8 regularly recognized holidays on which they did not work. Thirty-nine times 52 minus 56 equals 1,972 hours. The base annual salary divided by 1,972 gives the hourly rate of pay for the 39-hour week.

Under the 48-hour workweek Government employees work 48 hours each week and are excused on only one holiday, Christmas Day. Forty-eight times 52 minus 8 equals 2,488 hours. Total salary paid—base plus overtime—divided by 2,488 gives the hourly rate of pay for the 48-hour week. The difference between 1,972 hours and 2,488 hours or 516 hours is the overtime worked each year.

The information shown in columns 1 to 4, inclusive, is taken from tables published by Government agencies.

The figures shown in column 5 are computed by multiplying the base rate shown in column 8 by 516, the number of hours of overtime.

The figures shown in column 6 are computed by adding column 2 and column 5. This represents the pay an employee would receive if he were paid

straight time at his pre-war basic rate for the additional hours he is required to work.

Column 7 shows the additional amounts employees would receive, at the rates shown, if they were paid for all the hours they work, at original basic rates.

In columns 8, 9, and 10 hourly rates are compared.

It will be noted that while all employees receive less than straight time for the hours worked, those employees who occupy positions compensated at more than $2,900—basic salary—are subjected to a discrimination which appears to be wholly illogical and unjustified.

Under certain conditions employees are compensated for hours worked in addition to the present standard 48-hour week. That provision is not covered here. My purpose is simply to call attention to the apparent inequity of the Government's plan for compensating its employees for the additional work required of them under the 48-hour week by existing legislation.

Government employees have to meet higher living costs; they have to pay higher taxes; they are making a creditable record in the purchase of War bonds and in contributions to the Community War Fund, the Red Cross, and all the other welfare and war fund drives.

Is it not time, Mr. Speaker, to review the Government salary tables and bring them into harmony with 1945 living conditions?

Analysis of present U. S. Government overtime pay plan

Grade	Base rate	Overtime paid	Total salary paid	Overtime earned at base rate	Total salary earned at base rate	Total earned less total paid	Hourly rate, 39-hour week	Hourly rate, 48-hour week	Hourly overtime rate
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
CAF-1	$1,320	$300.00	$1,620.00	$345.41	$1,665.41	$45.41	$0.6694	$0.6511	$0.5814
CAF-2	1,440	312.00	1,752.00	376.78	1,816.78	64.78	.7302	.7042	.6047
	1,500	324.96	1,824.96	392.52	1,892.52	67.56	.7607	.7335	.6298
CAF-3	1,620	350.88	1,970.88	423.89	2,043.89	73.01	.8215	.7922	.6800
	1,740	376.80	2,116.80	455.27	2,195.27	78.47	.8823	.8508	.7302
CAF-4	1,800	390.00	2,190.00	471.00	2,271.00	81.00	.9128	.8802	.7558
CAF-5	2,000	433.20	2,433.20	523.33	2,523.33	90.13	1.0142	.9780	.8395
CAF-6	2,300	498.24	2,798.24	601.81	2,901.81	103.57	1.1663	1.1247	.9656
CAF-7	2,600	563.28	3,163.28	680.35	3,280.35	117.07	1.3185	1.2714	1.0916
CAF-8	2,800	628.32	3,528.32	758.83	3,658.83	130.51	1.4706	1.4181	1.2176
CAF-9	3,200	628.32	3,828.32	837.31	4,037.31	208.99	1.6227	1.5387	1.2176
CAF-10	3,500	628.32	4,128.32	915.80	4,415.80	287.48	1.7748	1.6593	1.2176
CAF-11	3,800	628.32	4,428.32	992.11	4,792.11	363.79	1.9227	1.7799	1.2176
	4,000	628.32	4,628.32	1,046.65	5,046.65	418.33	2.0284	1.8603	1.2176
	4,400	628.32	5,028.32	1,151.30	5,551.30	522.98	2.2312	2.0210	1.2176
CAF-12	4,600	628.32	5,228.32	1,198.41	5,798.41	570.09	2.3225	2.1010	1.2176
	5,000	628.32	5,628.32	1,308.32	6,308.32	680.00	2.5355	2.2220	1.2176
	5,400	628.32	6,028.32	1,412.96	6,812.96	784.64	2.7383	2.4230	1.2176
CAF-13	5,600	628.32	6,228.32	1,465.34	7,065.34	837.02	2.8398	2.5033	1.2176
	6,000	628.32	6,628.32	1,569.98	7,569.98	941.66	3.0426	2.6612	1.2176
CAF-14	6,500	628.32	7,128.32	1,700.79	8,200.79	1,072.47	3.2961	2.8651	1.2176
	7,000	628.32	7,628.32	1,851.65	8,851.65	1,223.33	3.5497	3.0660	1.2176
	7,500	628.32	8,128.32	1,962.45	9,462.45	1,334.13	3.8032	3.2670	1.2176
CAF-15	8,000	628.32	8,628.32	2,093.31	10,093.31	1,464.99	4.0568	3.4680	1.2176
	8,500	628.32	9,128.32	2,224.11	10,724.11	1,595.79	4.3103	3.6690	1.2176
	9,000	628.32	9,628.32	2,354.92	11,354.92	1,726.60	4.5639	3.8699	1.2176
CAF-16	10,000	628.32	10,628.32	2,616.64	12,616.64	1,988.32	5.0710	4.2718	1.2176

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK FELLOWS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Hon. ROBERT HALE at Portland, Maine, on January 2, 1945:

Ladies and gentlemen, I make no apologies for speaking to you tonight on the topic of American foreign policy. The topic was of your selection in the first place, and even if it had not been, I think that one can no longer gainsay its importance and interest. In the 5 eventful years since Hitler invaded the unhappy Nation of Poland, the American people have had borne in upon them the fact that foreign policy shapes their lives fully as much as domestic. If we had had a sounder foreign policy from 1919 down to 1941 we should not have had to pass the Selective Service Act, the Lend-Lease Act, the War Powers Act, the Emergency Price Control Act, or any of the other far-reaching pieces of war legislation which now shape our lives from the time we get up in the morning until we go to bed at night.

Nor do I hesitate to discuss American foreign policy for lack of information as to what that policy is. I may be quite as helpful in telling you what I don't know as in telling you what I do. The American people are not nearly as well informed about their own Government policies as the British people are.

It is unnecessary to remind you that we are now at war with Germany and Japan. The common hypothesis is that we shall victoriously conclude the war in Europe before we can conclude the war in Asia. I see no present reason to reject this hypothesis and on it I shall predicate my observations tonight. Indeed, as the European situation is obviously far more critical than the Asiatic, I shall speak tonight of Europe only.

There lies at the very heart of our foreign policy the question of what we propose to do with a conquered Germany. Until we have made that decision, if indeed we ever do make it, it is impossible to say what responsibility we are going to assume in the other parts of the world. Unfortunately I do not at all clearly know what our Government intends to do with a conquered Germany. Neither does any one of you. I am not certain that Secretary Stettinius or President Roosevelt knows and I might at this time confess a fear that the President is somewhat better informed about our foreign policy than the Secretary of State himself. For often in the last few years the President has served as his own Secretary. Such are the evils of highly personalized Government under which we are now living.

It can be assumed that we do not intend to let Germany off easily and that we do intend to make a peace which, if possible, will prevent the recurrence of war in Europe. Such a peace will certainly comprehend the complete disarmament of the German people, whether anybody else disarms or not, at least some occupation of German territory, some punishment of so-called war criminals, and possibly some attempt to reeducate minds defiled and distorted by Nazi doctrine.

Other countries are clearer in their minds about what to do with Germany. They have a better defined comprehension of their own interests. Russia means to retain German prisoners to rebuild Russian cities. She means to annex eastern Poland (referring to the boundaries of Poland in 1939) and to compensate the Poles by giving them East Prussia west to the great port of Danzig with some 200 miles of frontage on the Baltic. This wipes out the old Polish Corridor, or widens it, if you prefer to express it that way. But it involves a transfer of population on a scale never before attempted so far as I know. The nearest precedent is the transfer in 1919 of the Asia Minor Greeks back to their own country. This was successfully consummated, but the number of people involved was less and the Polish and East Prussian populations are more urban in character. You can make a farmer swap farm A for farm B, but it is not so easy to take a skilled technician in one trade in Lwow and turn him into a skilled technician in a different trade in, say, Königsberg.

This Poland-East Prussia game of stagecoach has received Churchill's blessing but not Poland's nor ours. Churchill expressly says that the Polish plans do not alarm him. As to us, you will recall that Churchill said (December 15): "I find great difficulty in discussing these matters because the attitude of the United States has not been defined with the precision which the British Government have thought it wise to use. All I can say is that I have received no formal disagreement during all these long months upon the way in which the future of Poland seems to be shaping itself or is being shaped." Mr. Drew Pearson is authority for the statement that the President rejected the so-called Curzon line in the spring of 1942.

In western Germany, France means to take the land west and south of the Rhine, which includes the Rhineland, so-called, the Palatinate, the Saar Valley, in addition to her old lands of Alsace and Lorraine, which have changed hands so often.

Churchill will bless this arrangement. It is substantially what the French wanted in 1919 but were induced to give up on the assurance that their territorial integrity would be guaranteed by Great Britain and the United States. As everyone knows, we never came through on this guarantee. These partitions of Germany have been practically agreed to elsewhere. Shall we go along? I don't know. Who does? Are we going to sit on the fence while other countries decide on European boundaries and then say, "Yes, yes," or "No, no," when the blueprint of the new Europe is handed to us. And if we say "No, no," what happens then? Bear in mind that boundaries are not unimportant details of international relations. They mean the life and death of nations—no less. Yet it has been stated that we shall not discuss boundaries until after the war. This may be feasible as to some boundaries, but certainly not as to all.

Sumner Welles, in his book, The Time for Decision, published last summer, makes a forcible argument for partitioning the German Reich into three states, a Prussian state in the east (including Pomerania, Brandenburg, Mecklenburg, Silesia, and South Sax-

ony), a South German state (Bavaria, Wurtemburg, Baden, and the Rhineland); and a West German state (Hanover, Westphalia, North Saxony). Emil Ludwig, the Swiss writer, favors cutting Prussia off from the rest of Germany. Many people, on the other hand, feel that such a partition of Germany would be ineffective for the prevention of war and would do more harm than good. Such, I confess, had been my own view, but the arguments of Welles and Ludwig have a good deal of persuasive force. For better or worse, I believe that some sort of partition will be carried out.

Sumner Welles points out, as have many other writers, that the belligerent tendencies of Germany have emanated from the German general staff, which has been predominantly Prussian. The theory is that if you can destroy the influence of the general staff on the German state you can destroy the belligerent propensities of Germany. No one can say that that theory is sound, but, at least, it seems as sound as any other. It does seem to me that our State Department should have long ago made up its mind what it is going to do with Germany and should have concerted an agreement with the British and Russian Governments. It is possible that such an agreement was reached at Cairo, Teheran, Moscow, or Quebec. But if such an agreement had been reached, I would have supposed it expedient to give some inkling, at least, of its terms to the Nazi government, and over its head to the people of Germany. The only intimation that we have given to the German Government is "unconditional surrender," a phrase first used by General Grant and agreed upon between Churchill and Roosevelt at Casablanca. This phrase has always seemed to me rather meaningless, as some conditions must in fact be attached to any surrender. If the Germans knew what the conditions were, it might conceivably weaken their resistance.

I am aware that the counterargument is that announcing the conditions might lead to a negotiated peace which would not be durable. I do not see why this should be so. It implies no weakness on our part to define the terms which we propose to exact. If, for example, we do not propose personally to "try" or punish any German except incumbents of certain high offices, why not say so? Then a German who knows he is not going to lose his head at our hands might be more willing to risk losing it at Hitler's or Himmler's. President Wilson's Fourteen Points in the last war are generally credited with expediting Germany's surrender. In my opinion, our difficulties after the last war were due not so much to having procured a German surrender before exterminating the German Army or marching to Berlin as to the unwisdom of some terms of the Versailles Treaty and the unwillingness to enforce it.

In any case an essential of any peace terms would seem to be to make possible some sort of an economy under which the German people can live. There will be no German economy left after the war. It would obviously be more humane to send 60,000,000 men, women, and children to the firing squad or the Vernichtungslager than to have them starve to death over the years. The suggestion of Secretary Morgenthau to destroy all German industry would have left no assurance of any economic future for Germany. The problem is to leave the Germans with an economy under which they may live but not rearm. I confess that this seems to me one of the most difficult problems any nation has ever had to work out and no sound conclusion can be reached without the assistance of economists and technicians. There must clearly be close surveillance over German industry through the next few decades, or at least until we have reason to suppose that the belligerent propensities of the German people have been curbed.

This leads to the most difficult question of all, the reeducation of the German mind. Not long ago I talked to a flyer who had been shot down over Germany and escaped with assistance from elderly residents of Germany. He told me that the Army had cautioned him above all to keep away from young people from 10 to 21, as these had the most fanatical Nazi minds. This is a testimonial to the effectiveness of German education at the hands of the Nazis in the last 11 years.

If we are really to undertake the reeducation of German youth whom can we get to do the job? On what basis are teachers to be selected? The whole history of attempts to educate a people by imposing on them foreign teachers is a history of failure. I confess that the idea of having American teachers and college professors going into German schools and universities seems little short of grotesque.

On the other hand, if Nazi theories of race and culture and the Nietzschean philosophy of military aggression for world conquest are going to be taught in Germany after the war as before, there seems little hope for the German mind. If our State Department has reached any conclusions on these difficult questions it would comfort most Americans to know it. I confess that I have never seen any solution of the German problem which satisfied me; nor have I been able to make one for myself. I am able here merely to outline the problem. But our State Department has definite responsibility for reaching this solution, and I hope we may assume that it has done a thorough and intelligent job to that end. I am glad to take this occasion to say that I have confidence in our new Secretary of State. Paying all possible respect to Secretary Hull, I am glad that, with the difficult problems which lie before the State Department, it is to be headed by a man of Mr. Stettinius' comparative youth and apparent robust vitality. But Mr. Stettinius must rely for success on the thinking that the Department has already done and the commitments, if any, already made at Teheran or elsewhere.

When Secretary Hull addressed the House of Representatives on November 18, 1943, he said: "As the provisions of the Four Nation Declaration are carried into effect, there will no longer be need for spheres of influence, for alliances, for balance of power, or any other of the special arrangements through which, in the unhappy past, the nations strove to safeguard their security or to promote their interests." I should welcome an opportunity to tell you tonight that we have progressed so far in the spirit of this Four Nation Declaration that we had outgrown or at least were outgrowing spheres of influence, plans for the balance of power and the similar special arrangements. Unfortunately the fact is precisely contrary.

The Russians in the teeth of the Atlantic Charter have announced the intention to devour Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The fate of Poland has formed the subject of countless discussions and long negotiations over the last 3 months. I was in the gallery of the House of Commons on October 29 when Mr. Churchill reported on his visit to Moscow then just concluded. He made another important speech to the House of Commons on the subject of Poland December 15. I shall not try to detail these negotiations. Suffice it to say that eastern Europe appears to be becoming a Russian sphere of influence, the Mediterranean a British sphere, and western Europe partly British, partly French. Upon all this has been imposed the Franco-Russian Treaty just negotiated by De Gaulle. De Gaulle has a clear idea of French foreign policy and is acting on it. He seems to be one of the clearest headed men in Europe.

Russian acquisition of territories to the west from Poland or the Baltic countries violates: the first paragraph of the Atlantic Charter that the signatories "seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other"; the second paragraph that they "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned"; and the third that "they respect the rights of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Mr. Churchill seems to recognize the practical necessity of ignoring the charter in special cases. Mr. Roosevelt has virtualy repudiated the charter as a series of longhand notes written out by radiomen. He may not have intended—probably didn't intend—the inferences that have been drawn from his remarks but they were irresistible inferences.

It seems to me only fair to recognize that the charter is being scrapped. This has led Dr. Goebbels to say: "The whole Atlantic Charter was an arch fake. It never even existed on paper. It was just a crude confidence trick of which we were to be the victims." For once the doctor is nearer the truth than any of us likes.

My own view is that we ought at least to seek from our allies compliance with the terms of the charter. A very able newspaper writer in Washington has made to me the comment that we have the right President at the wrong time, that we lost the peace in 1919 because Wilson was an idealist and a bad politician, while we shall lose it in 1945 because Roosevelt is a smart politician and a wavering idealist.

Like all over-neat comparisons this is not exact, but there is food in it for thought. It is unfortunate that certain defects of the American mentality are now beginning to manifest themselves. Our subconscious isolationist instinct will not let us stick out our international neck. We have, too, a complacency which tells us that other nations are so inferior to us morally that everything is hopeless. Cooperation with them appears a waste of our noble effort. Thus we decline to accept leadership which we could take for the world's advantage and our own. When, having rejected the opportunity for leadership, things go wrong, we attribute the consequences to the moral depravity of all peoples but our own.

The British situation in Greece is a painful affair. Churchill justified intervention in Greece as simply the maintenance of civil order on the British line of communications to the Balkans. He denies any ulterior attempt to control the Greek Government, to dictate the country's internal affairs. I have said publicly that I think Mr. Churchill entirely honest in his statement of the British case. The fact remains that by intervening thus far ineffectively he has caused considerable bloodshed, has failed to maintain order, has exposed his government to the ugliest accusations and misgivings, and has detained in Greece troops sadly needed in Germany. The British people are no more pleased about this than ours. There is some evidence that we washed our hands of Greece in advance. However that may be, it is only too plain that Russia, France, Britain, and the United States should have a concerted diplomacy and haven't one. Their disunity is alarming and is being felt at the front. We badly need the Council of United Nations promised at Moscow.

The plight of the liberated countries is a pitiable one. Their economies are still wrecked. Even where democratic impulses survive, as in France, the mechanism for

elections have been impaired or destroyed. Voting lists have been lost. Voters have died or disappeared into German prisons, or have moved their residences. Restoration of democratic processes must be slow.

I regret to say that I have met and talked with bumptious and ignorant Americans who take the troubles of the liberated countries of Europe lightly, and say that we are suckers for trying to help their people, that no liberated nation will be grateful to us for so doing. And so on. There could be no more mistaken attitude. The purpose of a foreign policy is not to incur gratitude—at best a very fallible and fugitive emotion in either the foreign or domestic field. The purpose of any American foreign policy is to preserve our own sovereignty and independence in the most effective and cheapest way. Fighting a global war every quarter century is not a cheap or necessarily an effective way to preserve our sovereignty. It would be cheaper to build now a Europe in which the dragon's teeth will not grow. We shall not do that by intervening irresponsibly in the local affairs of occupied countries beyond the point of seeing that some government, however created, can stop shooting and maintain order. Above all, we should not make the mistake of supposing that communism can be suppressed by foreign bayonets. Kolchak, Denikin, Yudenich, Wrangel solidified the Bolshevik regime in 1919.

In a hungry and demoralized Europe, there is a fertile breeding ground for communism particularly of that comparatively mild west-European type which is little if any to the left of the New Deal and none at all to the left of Adolf Berle or Rexford Tugwell or perhaps Eleanor Roosevelt. Pay rolls, crops, transportation, food, peace will best combat this type of communism.

The people of Europe are as civilized as those of America. There is little if any evidence that man for man the people of Europe are morally inferior to the people of America. We owe the peace that we have enjoyed on our continent to constructive statesmanship and we ought to take some responsibility for a constructive statesmanship in Europe, not for the sake of helping Europe but to preserve America and keep ourselves from the menace of future wars in which neutrality is and always will be impossible.

In Washington as elsewhere, we are plagued by the people who hate and fear Russia and the even more numerous people who hate and fear Britain. I have no patience with these groups. They aid Hitler who even now needs no aiding. I shall not repeat the things they say over and over again. I should like it better if Russia were more generous to Poland and Britain were conserving bullets in Greece. If our allies seem mistaken in their policies, it is appropriate for us to tell them so through the ordinary official channels and to cooperate with them to better policies. But the cheap formulae "I always told you that Russia would commit such and such outrages," and the "British are just a dirty lot of people trying to gyp us" certainly help no one but Hitler and Von Rundstedt.

These demonstrations of our thinking and our attitudes emphasize all the more the urgent necessity of perfecting our security organization along the lines announced by Cordell Hull, heretofore pursued by our Government all too falteringly, and the necessity for formulating a more articulate and less clandestine foreign policy. Let us hope that the new year will see victory over Germany, pease in Europe, security for America and a better day dawning for the sons of men.

Christmas Night Address of Raymond Gram Swing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, ever since the first population to become numerous enough to enable its elders to indict youth without exclusive reference to their own children, quite a few members of society have seemed to make it their favorite indoor sport to talk about the degeneracy of the younger generation.

It is encouraging, therefore, to hear a voice raised now and then in praise of those so frequently condemned.

On Christmas night such a voice was heard. It was that of Raymond Gram Swing, who had just achieved the unique distinction of being for the third successive year crowned on merit as king of American radio broadcasters. It gives me pleasure to quote a part of his script:

Today has been a Christmas of separation. As a nation we have been separated from the very ones who are serving the Nation with the highest devotion. It has been separation physically; it is more, it is separation in experience. The men fighting in western Europe, in Italy, in the Philippines, the millions waiting overseas, the men on ships and at air bases, are not close to us mentally, nor are we close to them. One of the great hardships of war is the gulf between the front and life back at home. Anne O'Hare McCormick, writing in the New York Times yesterday, said: "Soldiers from the front don't talk about battle to people at the rear. They can't. An officer just returned from a short leave in the United States"—Mrs. McCormick was writing from Rome—"says he couldn't discuss at home what he saw and felt in the war theater, because it didn't seem to fit into the context of normal life. He was desperately homesick after 2 years of overseas service, but when he got home he felt restless, alien, and eager to get back. There is no getting away from the fact that millions of men in battle zones are living abnormal lives in an abnormal world that comes, in time, to seem more normal than the one they have left." There is more to it even than Mrs. McCormick points out. Living is a language which one can communicate only to those who know the language from their own lives. The men at the front have as real a life, and one even more rich with value and worth in some respects than what Mrs. McCormick calls normal life—our life back home. But they cannot translate it to us because we don't know the words. So they are silent. They can't share themselves, and so they remain apart. But what is true is that not they are apart, we are apart. I am not suggesting that we can do much to overcome our isolation from them. But we can, at least, recognize that we are finding ourselves incapable of joining them even though they are in our service. And we can think consciously and devotedly of our gratitude to them.

We Americans can have a very special gratitude for the character and quality of our young men. And in days when the preview of the future is confused and dismaying, we can have faith in the future because they are going to have to make the future, and inde l are at work making it now. I am going to quota something about these young men, what they believe and what they think, not derived from questioning them now, but from a study made of a good many of them when they graduated from high school 2 years ago. It is contained in a survey reported at the time in Fortune, and reexamined by Elmo Roper in the New York Herald Tribune. These boys were from 16 to 18. They had grown up during our depression years. At the time of their graduation, not many of them had an idea that they would be in the Army today. But they had no doubt about the war being worth fighting. "Taking everything into consideration," they were asked, "do you feel it is worth while to keep on fighting this war, or do you think it would be better to try to make peace as things stand now?" "Keep on fighting," was the answer of 91 percent. These high-school seniors were asked for their conception of what the war was being fought for. Less than 1 in 12 thought we were fighting to protect our country—this was in the June after Pearl Harbor—but having said the war should go on, nearly half of them conceived it as a war for freedom and liberty, 1 in 4 thought of it as a war for democracy and American ideals; just over 1 in 6 thought of it as a war to stop fascism and nazi-ism, and less than 1 in 10 as a war to establish peace. So 80 percent saw the war as being fought for something positive, not for something purely negative.

The boys were asked to rate the things they hold valuable in life. What would they be willing to give up first if they had to give up something? Would they give up freedom of speech, freedom of worship, the vote, the right to trial by jury, the right to change jobs if they wanted to, the right to earn more than $3,000 a year? Well, the boys rated these rights in just the reverse of that order. Sixty percent would be ready to give up the right to earn $3,000 a year, about 20 percent the right to change jobs, less than 5 percent the right to trial by jury, less than 5 percent would give up the right to vote, less than 3 percent would give up the freedom of worship, and only 1 percent the freedom of speech. There wasn't much materialism in that outlook.

These lads already had a sense of the importance of the form of government, and when asked if they agreed that human lives are too important to be sacrified for the preservation of any form of government, three out of four said, no. Nor did they face the world skeptical of the possibility of achieving real peace, or of dealing intelligently with social problems. A statement was made to them: "In spite of all our efforts for peace, nations just can't live together peacefully, so we might as well expect a war every few years." To this 67 percent said, "No" and less than 29 percent said "Yes." And to the statement: "The world is in such a muddle that no one really knows what people should do—so why try?" Ninety-three percent answered, no. As to religion, only 1 boy in 10 had not made up his mind or thought there was no God or no life after death. More than 8 in 10 believed in a God who rewards and punishes after death.

It is not a complete study of our young fighters by any means. But it is clear as to certain fundamentals. And anyone who does not feel he can trust these youngsters—yes; with the intricacies of the post-war world—has lost touch with America. For they are the best of America.

As a simple expression of the soul of a soldier of democracy, I am going to close by quoting a short poem, not by an American boy but by a British soldier, whose outlook on the fundamentals undoubtedly is quite the same. During the war in north Africa, the British Eighth Army held a poetry contest

for soldiers, and a volume of their contributions has been published, called Poems From the Desert, by the British Eighth Army.

The stanzas I am going to read were not submitted in the contest. They were found in a slit trench. The author has never been identified. These are the lines:

"Stay with me, God, the night is dark,
The night is cold: my little spark
Of courage dies. The night is long,
Be with me, God, and make me strong.

"I love a game, I love a fight,
I hate the dark, I love the light.
I love my child, I love my wife,
I am no coward. I love life.

"I'm but the son my mother bore,
A simple man, and nothing more.
But, God of strength and gentleness,
Be pleased to make me nothing less.

"Help me, O God, when death is near,
To mock the haggard face of fear,
That when I fall—if fall I must—
My soul may triumph in the dust."

Tel-Aviv

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick from the New York Times of January 6, 1945:

ABROAD—AMERICAN BOYS FIND TEL-AVIV LIKE A HOME TOWN

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

TEL-AVIV, January 5.—Forty percent of the Jewish population of Palestine lives in Tel-Aviv. One of the world's youngest cities, better planned, more modernistic than the Florida boom towns it resembles, it is suffering today from a housing shortage as acute as that of the oldest cities in ravaged Europe. This is because a large proportion of the refugees of war years have found shelter here.

These Zionists created by Hitler are easily distinguishable from Zionists by conviction. The original settlers built their dream of new Zion with such fervor into schools, boulevards, and cooperative houses that their joy and triumph pervade the town like the bright atmosphere here of these crystalline winter days.

Certainly, the first impression produced on the visitor from the sad lands on the other side of the Mediterranean is that here at last are people who want to be where they are and are following a way of life that satisfies them.

Tel-Aviv boasts that it is the first all-Jewish city in the world. It is so completely Jewish, indeed, and within its expanding limits so independent, that it does not reflect fairly the problem of Palestine as a whole. Largely self-administered and self-taxed, it does not feel, as mixed populations ordinarily do, the close pressure either of the Arab majority or the mandatory power.

Almost in spite of itself Tel-Aviv is cosmopolitan and international. In a lively little restaurant attached to the garden of the hotel, American and British officers on leave enjoy the best meals procurable this side of New York. In the evening they dance with WAC's, Red Cross or local girls, to the music of a first-class three-piece orchestra. The genius of the place is a plump, soft-voiced, warm-hearted Russian whom everybody calls "Mama Weis."

She is a personality as well as an expert restaurateur. She ran three restaurants in Berlin until 1933, when she saw the handwriting on the wall, left the Nazis to "liquidate" her establishments—which they did—and came to Tel-Aviv with £5,000 to start over again.

Mama Weis treated us to a kummel—"Palestinian and very good," she explained—and talked at length of Zionism, the world, and the future. She, as a Zionist, is thrilled by Tel-Aviv and its proofs of what urban Jews can make grow on barren ground, but as a successful businesswoman before she came to Palestine she is less lyrical than the Zionists who escaped from the dark ghettos of eastern Europe. She described herself as Russian.

The eyes of Mama Weis were not the only eyes wet with tears as a violin sang songs of old Vienna. In that room in Palestine, where the Zionist dream comes true, one felt a wave of homesickness for a lost world. Maybe only the older generation or recent immigrants are pulled by instinct and emotion to the countries they have left.

"You don't look back," they say, and it would be strange if a generation brought up here or rescued from the horror of Hitler's Europe should elect under any circumstances to return.

Certainly these half-articulate nostalgias, of a section of the old for the countries they still feel they belong to, of a section of the young for another land of promise, are elements in a situation that becomes more complex the nearer you approach it. Even in this 100-percent Jewish community it is evident at first glance the problem is not a simple antithesis between Zionist and anti-Zionist or between Arab and Jew. It has as many tentacles as an octopus, each as sore as an exposed nerve.

There is one new element, for instance, in the reaction of American soldiers to a personal view of this problem country. Palestine in general, Tel-Aviv in particular, is a leave center for thousands of officers and G. I.'s from all parts of the Middle East, Africa, and Italy. The main leave camp is within a few miles of Tel-Aviv. Boys on furlough flock to this town, where they see American movies in clean American model theaters, meet girls who speak English, and stroll on streets that look like Main Street.

In the peculiarly warm and affectionate atmosphere of a Jewish household they are entertained by scores of motherly women like Mama Weis. "Don't ask me to discuss politics," she says. "My only policy is to serve good food, good drink, and make the doughboys happy." The doughboys like it. They like Tel-Aviv. The so-called Arab world isn't their world. They feel alien and uncomfortable in its strange sights, sounds, and smells. Here they feel at home. "It sure feels good to see something like an American town," said the inevitable boy from Texas, mailing postcards in the Tel-Aviv post office this morning. "This is the best place I've seen since I waved good-bye to Old Lady Liberty."

The result of this experience is likely to make these soldiers strongly Zionist when they get home. It may be argued that these passing personal emotions are unimportant beside hard realities and irreconcilable interests interwoven in the Palestine problem. So they are, but the problem would not be nearly so hard to solve if it were not also a conflict of emotions. While feelings are violently engaged on all sides, anything that swings the balance of sentiment in the United States cannot be ignored.

The first thing one discovers here is that the attitude of America will have a powerful influence in deciding the future of Palestine and, by extension, the wish for this is the keypiece in the puzzle—the future of this restless and troubled part of the world.

Teamsters Union Asks Repeal of Wagner Act and End of National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. GIBSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an article appearing in the January 9, 1945, issue of the New York Times. My purpose in inserting this article in the RECORD is not to endorse the same in toto, but to bring the contents of said article to the attention of the membership of the House as information and for such study as the membership may think the contents deserve.

I do know, and I do not hesitate to say, that the leadership of the C. I. O. is exercising, and being permitted to exercise too much authority in the operation of our Government, which to me is a most dangerous condition. Anyone who has kept up with the activities of labor during the crisis that our Nation and the world has faced for the last few years, must agree that the American Federation of Labor as a whole has endeavored to cooperate with our war effort and to avoid strikes and shut-downs and to produce as rapidly as possible the much-needed war materials. It must be further recognized by those with an open mind that this cannot be said of the leadership of the C. I. O. In far too many instances they have put their greed and hunger for power over and above the preservation of human life on the battle fronts.

The article follows:

TEAMSTERS UNION ASKS REPEAL OF WAGNER ACT AND END OF N. L. R. B.

CHICAGO, January 8.—The International Teamsters Union, A. F. of L., headed by Daniel J. Tobin, today came out openly for repeal of the Wagner Labor Relations Act and abolition of the National Labor Relations Board, which the union described as a standing committee of the C. I. O.

The demand was made in an article in the union's magazine, the International Teamster, for January, just passed, written by Thomas Flynn, executive assistant to Tobin. Labor circles viewed the authorship of the article by Mr. Flynn as an expedient to avoid embarrassing Mr. Tobin in his relations with the White House, and to avoid prejudicing Mr. Tobin's chances for appointment as Secretary of Labor, a post that he is known to desire.

"The N. L. R. B. has been used by both employers and the C. I. O. to disorganize the teamsters union," Mr. Flynn's article said.

"Scarcely a day goes by that we do not receive an order from the Board calling for a collective bargaining election in some place we have organized.

"We used to receive such orders three or four times a month. Now we receive them every day. The Board is playing hand in glove with the C. I. O. in taking advantage of wartime conditions in an effort to take away our membership.

"The way it works is this: one of our unions petitions for a wage increase for certain of its members. The employer passes the buck the War Labor Board. The W. L. B. is snowed under with cases and cannot handle the case promptly. Knowing there will be a delay, the C. I. O. goes to work on our members, promising if they will affiliate with the C. I. O. that the C. I. O. will get the wage increases the teamsters cannot.

"After a certain amount of this agitation based on misrepresentation, the C. I. O. petitions the N. L. R. B. for an election and the N. L. R. B. breaks its neck to comply with the request of its friend, the C. I. O.

"We will not sanction any strike by our members during the crucial period of this war, no matter how great the provocation or how unjust the treatment we have received. The C. I. O. knows that and the N. L. R. B. knows that, and they both take advantage of it. The N. L. R. B. authorizes raids by the C. I. O. after the W. L. B. has failed to reach a decision in our cases and the men have become exasperated and inflamed by the C. I. O. agitators.

"CLAIMS THEY ARE PENALIZED

"Thus we are placed in an incongruous position of being penalized by two agencies of the General Government because we are keeping the wartime pledge we made to the Government. We are in a football game in which both the referee and umpire are on the opposing team and, whatever we do, we are penalized.

"We have nothing to hope for from the N. L. R. B. It is thoroughly biased and is working for the C. I. O. rather than for labor as a whole. We have tried long and patiently to get a reorganization of this Board. That appears to be impossible.

"Therefore, our only recourse appears to be to ask Congress to repeal the Wagner Act and wipe out the N. L. R. B., which has become nothing more than a standing committee of the C. I. O."

Capt. Louis H. Tankin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Baltimore News-Post of August 15, 1944.

This article shows the true and courageous spirit of Capt. Louis H. Tankin, of the Army Medical Corps. Since this article was written, Captain Tankin has been reported missing, and only recently his family was notified that he is a prisoner of war in Germany.

I have known him practically all of his life and I believe he typifies the spirit of the real American fighting man.

The article follows:

CAPTAIN TANKIN WINS PLEA TO STAY AT FRONT

Rather than be sent from the combat zone, Capt. Louis H. Tankin, Army Medical Corps, with one of his legs banged up pretty badly in the early days of the Normandy invasion, has won his plea to remain in a hospital in France.

Decorated with the Bronze Star and Purple Heart, Captain Tankin, who is attached to an armored division, rejected hospitalization elsewhere because he wanted to recover quickly and rejoin his unit as soon as possible, it was revealed today.

MARRIED 3 YEARS

The decorated Army physician's wife, Mrs. Ruth E. Tankin, resides at 36 North Milton Avenue. They were married 3 years ago. He is a son of Dr. Harry J. Tankin, a coroner during the administration of the late Gov. Harry W. Nice.

It was a long time before his wife knew about his wounds. He had been sending cheerful letters home with no mention of them until the War Department let the cat out of the bag with the customary official family notification in such cases.

"BANGED UP BADLY"

Then he wrote home:

"I've been banged up pretty badly. Don't worry. I'll be O. K."

His last letter read, in part:

"I'm now trying to walk without aid of crutches and hope to get back on duty soon."

Captain Tankin first saw action at Casablanca. He was there almost a year. While there, he treated a French nobleman who presented a jewel-studded sword, an heirloom and prize possession, to him, in appreciation of his service.

Captain Tankin was an intern at Sinai Hospital when he entered the service. He received his degree of bachelor of arts at Johns Hopkins and his degree of medicine at the University of Maryland.

Captain Tankin's last letter to his family said:

"Sherman was right about war, but I am anxious to remain and see it through."

Dr. Tankin has another son in the service, Pvt. Richard S. Tankin, a member of the Medical Corps, who is undergoing training at a Government hospital.

What an Officer That Leads Our Soldiers in Europe Thinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, so many patriotic citizens devoted to the principles of good government laid down in the Atlantic Charter are asking what our country is fighting for—that it is interesting and informative to have a statement of principle submitted by an American officer leading his men through the thick of the fighting in Europe, whose name, for obvious reasons, must be withheld.

This officer, prominently mentioned in recent war dispatches, is performing an extra service beyond the call of duty while bravely leading his forces in battle, by giving us an insight into old world conditions and revealing to us what a man at the battlefront thinks his report and recommendation is submitted for the consideration of my colleagues:

A SOLDIER CRUSADER SPEAKS

AUGUST 31, 1944.

We have talked about this war, its causes and aftermath, so frequently that there is probably little I can add that I have not previously said; but we have a lull in the battle to refit for another engagement, and, as I cannot talk to you, I am moved to write again of my ideas.

This has become a crusade to me. I have seen more of my men dead on the field starring with glassy eyes at the sky than I care to contemplate. Frequently I have paused to look at some youngster scarcely older than our boy and ask myself, "For what did he die, and will others like him die again in a few years for the self-same reason?"

UNITED STATES MUST ACT NOW OR LOSE THE PEACE

I wish you would try to bring the arguments I have so frequently advanced to the attention of someone who can awaken our leaders to the need for concerted action. If our Congress does not act promptly, we shall inevitably lose the peace. Perhaps I am pessimistic in this, but I have heard little to make me think otherwise. General de Gaulle will assert his efforts to safeguard the French Empire, as did Clemenceau before him, and Mr. Churchill will make certain that the British Empire not only thrives but expands upon the spoils of war, as Lloyd George did 25 years ago. The United States, divided in its efforts, will have small success in planting its ideals in the receptive minds of the common folk of Europe.

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

If we are fighting to reestablish the small countries of Europe on the standards which previously existed, Prince Paul to his throne, King George to his, etc., then the cemeteries along the road to Rome must house restless heads indeed. Those self-same cemeteries will be enlarged within a few years with the bodies of young Americans from the same States.

Punishment will certainly not achieve a lasting peace, nor will an international police force which would eventually fall from the weight of its cost. The present war could not have happened except that the people of Europe had many very real grievances. In one fashion or another, these actual or fancied wrongs were used by the leaders to steer the public toward war. Poverty and unhappiness are fertile ground in which it is easy to plant the seeds necessary to convince people that they must fight to improve their lot. Their leaders elected the road of force to secure their ends. Future leaders will probably try the same means, unless the present conquerors—the Allies—seize upon this opportunity to destroy the evils which are basically responsible for the tragic European conflicts.

LACK OF UNITY SPELLS WAR

In the past, France and England in particular, have thrived upon the lack of unity throughout Europe. This is the underlying reason of the unrest which has made it possible for unscrupulous leaders to gather a fanatical following intent on improving their lot. Surely now even England will be able to see the importance of taking steps to forever eradicate another such catastrophe as that which has already well-nigh destroyed Europe. A peace based upon reparations will be the foundation about which fanatics will eventually organize to right their fancied wrongs. Now is the time, if there ever was such a time, to establish peace on earth, good will to all men.

FOUNDATION FOR PEACE IN EUROPE

The secret of future peace in Europe depends upon unity. If the United Nations will insist upon a unified Europe west of Russia the collosus Mars will die for lack of encouragement while his prospective subjects labor competitively, as in the United States, to improve their lot.

There are but a few steps that must be taken to pull Europe together into a united nation. These steps are drastic but not impossible. The troubles of Europe spring from the many nationalities, each with different standards of living. These small countries must be amalgamated until individuals feel that they are citizens of Europe and not of their small countries. Only time can bring about the necessary changes, but unless a farsighted plan is established to break down the barriers between countries there can never be any permanent peace.

The victorious Allies can require anything they wish, and if such plans were based upon farsighted ideals, suitably explained by propaganda and education, Europe could be brought under a single government within the period of two decades.

A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

If a United States of Europe were created such as visualized by the one-time Premier of France, M. Aristide Briand, peace within Europe would be insured. Such a nation would give uniform privileges to all citizens of Europe, freedom of travel, freedom of trade, a single monetary system, a single language and government by and for the people. If the conquering Allies could block cut as their goal this plan, we could really feel that the dead had not died in vain.

An entire book could be written on this matter but the broad picture is simple to understand. Only one who has traveled a great deal in Europe knows how little one country knows of another. Millions of people live and die without visiting a country so close that it would be a mere week-end picnic with the family automobile in the United States. The matter of visas between countries, the different languages and customs, different monetary systems, etc., make a formidable barrier which is seldom passed by the average individual.

AMERICA CAN SHOW THE WAY

American genius, ingenuity, and ambitions have their roots in the people of Europe. If these peoples were given a chance they would respond by improving European conditions. I have talked with hundreds of people of Turkey, Transjordan, Italy, and citizens of the world—from all ranks of life, soldiers, diplomats, and peasants, and when you mention the possibility of a state such as I suggest their eyes gleam and their voices thrill with hope.

I am sure that there are a multitude of people in our diplomatic service who have the vision and are qualified to work out the details to begin the change of government which I have outlined. I will, however, discuss briefly in the following paragraphs some of the methods which seem to me entirely feasible to secure a workable solution to this vast subject.

HOW TO SECURE A SINGLE LANGUAGE

Europeans are natural linguists. A large percentage of the people already speak two or three languages. French and English predominate among the languages of commerce. If one of these languages or if a composite Esperanto were made the language of Europe, it could be made universal within two decades. Europeans are accustomed to complying completely with government orders. If schools taught the new language and it was made as a requirement for employment in key firms, and that an increased percentage of employees be required to speak the new European tongue each year, with a view of 100 percent of all employees speaking the language at the end of 10 years, there is no question but that the language would be studied enthusiastically. If radio broadcasts and advertisements were begun at once in the new language with a definite goal that the sole language used for such purposes, throughout all Europe at the end of 5 years would be the new language, the results would startle the world. If anyone questions the feasibility of such a plan, study carefully the achievements attained in Turkey under the forceful efforts of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Such a language would go far to remove one of the present intangible barriers.

GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE

Let us assume two houses of government, the controlling house to be at the outset occupied by representatives of the victorious allies. As years pass, representatives of various countries could be given increasing voice in this ruling house until at the end of a suitable period of transition—possibly 30 years—Europe would be solely the master of her destiny.

Simultaneously, in the lower house would be the immediate representatives of the people. Here even Germany would be represented from the beginning. People would elect their representatives on a basis of population so that their wishes, desires, and ambitions might be known to the governing house and through this body to the world. Some of these countries would, at the outset, be given no vote in the recommendations to be submitted to the governing house but, however, would have full right to present their pleas and recommendations. This house, like the governing house, would advance in authority with the years until finally each of the European states would be given equal representation and the ruling house of the government must needs have the consent of the house of represesentatives to create a new legislation.

Eventually the European electorate would elect a president, congress, and a house of representatives—or whatever names might be agreed upon for the governing houses.

FREEDOM OF TRAVEL AND FREEDOM OF TRADE

These are matters which can be solved with a single stroke of the pen by the conquering Allies. Revoke for all times the restrictions which require people to have permission to travel between countries or to engage in competitive trade. This would achieve the results in a peaceful way that Germany has attempted to secure by force of arms during two wars. It would attain an understanding among the peoples and a common level of living based upon the amount of energy people are willing to exert to improve their lot.

Under the present system, restrictions on visas from one country to another make it almost impossible for the ordinary individual to travel, and the required police identification at every hotel insures strict explanation of the reasons for any visits and increases the difficulties of the average citizen. Altogether, there are intangible but formidable barriers which make it impossible for the average individual to improve his lot within the present confines of Europe. A man born a peasant must die a peasant, and a son of a servant, regardless of mentality, grows to manhood serving the master his parents served before him.

Freedom of trade can be secured as automatically as freedom of travel with the removal of duties and embargoes between states. This would help materially to level the standard of living throughout all Europe, would increase competition, and give increased incentive to the inventive genius of Europeans. Duties received from imports from outside countries would be prorated systematically and sensibly among the governments of the several European states.

In conclusion, I want to reemphasize the statement that peace in Europe can only be secured by some such vigorous method as I have outlined. I have thoughtfully observed the people of Japan, China, India, Turkey, Germany, Italy, France, Belgium, England, and have talked with a multitude of their peoples, and I feel that it is cowardly for any of us not to fight unceasingly for what we know is the only solution. The armies of the Allies are equipped to a large extent by American money, and a goodly number of Americans have died or been maimed because of the injustices of various countries. It is the duty and right of our country to take the place in the world that God intended for us.

Selective Service Classification of Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, a letter from Gen. Lewis B. Hershey for the information of selective-service boards, stating the position of the President concerning those in the 18 through 25 age group, deferred under the Tydings amendment, is of great concern to New Hampshire farmers. General Hershey's letter is as follows:

Recently the Office of War Mobilization stated that the President of the United States has found that the further deferment of those now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as for the urgent need of those same men for our Army and Navy.

The President feels that in view of the present military situation, agriculture, like all other war industries, can with few exceptions be carried on by those in the older age group.

Registrants in agriculture are classified under the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service and Training Act and the Selective Service System has been authorized to take whatever action is necessary to provide to the fullest extent permitted by the Tydings amendment for the classification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group of 18 through 25.

The effect of a literal interpretation of this letter might well be a general breaking down of agricultural production in New Hampshire. It is my understanding, however, that young men in the above age group will not be inducted unless it is clearly evident that older men or other substitute labor is unavailable to conduct any given farm enterprise, and that unless the deferment is clearly outside the conditions enumerated in the Tydings amendment.

The results of the above letter will depend upon the fair-mindedness of the local boards. Unless there continues to be a realization of the paramount importance of farm production, the Nation may well find itself in an irreparable food scarcity.

To illustrate the concern of New Hampshire people in this subject I quote a letter just received from the president of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation together with a telegram which he has sent to the War Food Administration:

NEW HAMPSHIRE FARM
BUREAU FEDERATION,
Concord, N. H., January 4, 1945.

Hon. SHERMAN ADAMS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SHERM: Farm people in this State are very much concerned over press releases that have come from Washington with reference to the drafting of young men on farms who under a reasonable interpretation of the Tydings amendment would be continued in class II–C and would continue to make their contribution to full production. These reports from Washington seem to indicate that Selective Service, with the approval of the President and Stabilization Director James Byrnes were considering the production requirements of those occupying deferment under II–C to such an extent that it would practically eliminate the purpose for which the Tydings amendment was passed.

War Manpower Director J. Ralph Graham conferred with me on this subject recently and he is seriously concerned with the present situation and feels that if those men who are not rendering efficient service on farms were taken off, it would be impossible for New Hampshire to meet its production quota as asked by the Federal Government. Commissioner Felker feels the same way and I am sure from the reports I get that the farm labor situation is going to be more serious in 1945 than in 1944, and that if any tightening of the regulations as provided in the Tydings amendment were made, we certainly would not be able to produce what we are asked to do.

It has been suggested by some that part-time help such as war prisoners, boys and girls out of school, Jamaicans and others might take the place of these competent farm hands. The number has been reduced to such an extent that if any more are taken it will be impossible for us to do the job.

I am enclosing copy of a telegram I sent to Hon. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, today which states in brief our feelings in the matter. Reports from the O. P. A. office indicate that on many food products there is no surplus at the present time and as stated in my telegram to Mr. Jones if they were to take away these necessary and efficient workers on the farms, and if coupled with that we should have a poor crop this year, no one can tell what the effect would be on the winning of the war. We must all remember that there is one reason for our record production in 1943 and 1944—due to people on the farms, the entire family, men, women, and children, working overtime. Many of these people have reached the age and have so exerted themselves during the past 2 years that they are tired and worn out and less efficient than they were in 1943 and 1944.

We all want everyone to be in the place where he can render the greatest service toward winning the war, and we have lost in this State hundreds of boys off the farms who voluntarily enlisted, and in addition to that others have gone into industrial plants, and now if Selective Service takes many of those left I certainly don't know what will happen to food production the coming year and I don't want to have the boys come back home and say, "If you had only given us the food, we could have won the war much sooner."

I am also enclosing copy of an article which appeared this afternoon in the Concord Monitor, written by Mrs. Irene Shook after conferring either personally or by phone with Commissioner Felker and Mr. J. Ralph Graham, chairman of U. S. D. A. War Board, and myself, which gives a pretty clear picture of what our people are thinking—those, I mean, who are in a position to know fully about the situation.

I hope you will, as a Member of Congress, use your influence to protect the food production program as established by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration officials as being necessary to provide necessary food for the Army and civilian population.

Thanking you for giving this matter your serious consideration, I am

Very sincerely yours,
GEORGE M. PUTNAM,
President.

JANUARY 4, 1945.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administration,
Washington, D. C.:

Farm people and officials responsible for supplying labor for farmers in this State greatly disturbed over news stories from Washington that rules as to essential farm workers under Tydings amendment are to be so modified as to make the law ineffective. Situation this State will not permit further drafting of competent farm labor if production quota to be met. Urge you continue to oppose any action that will lessen present supply of competent farm labor or invalidate the purpose of Tydings amendment. Record production of past 2 years result of all-out effort of all people on farms and very favorable weather conditions. With competent farm-labor supply reduced and unfavorable weather conditions I hesitate predict what might be the effect on the winning of the war.

GEORGE M. PUTNAM,
President, New Hampshire
Farm Bureau Federation.

Postal Workers Lose Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago American, Chicago, Ill.:

POSTAL WORKERS LOSE AGAIN

The legislative log-jam at the close of the Seventy-eighth Congress prevented action by the Senate on a measure providing pay increases for postal employees, and thus prolonged the Federal policy of injustice against these vital Government workers.

This is an unmitigated betrayal of the most grievously and inexcusably underpaid group of workers in the United States.

The thousands of postal workers who would have been the beneficiaries of this measure have not had an increase in basic pay for nearly 20 years.

They actually work overtime at a lower rate of pay than that applying to regular time.

Congress had every moral reason to pay this bill.

It had plenty of time to pass it.

The House of Representatives, in fact, did pass it in ample time.

But the Senate, to its shame, simply did not get around to it until the final hour of the closing session—and then found itself lacking a quorum.

This is a bitter experience for America's postal workers, but an all too familiar experience.

It is a particularly bitter disappointment for their families at holiday time, and the Members of Congress responsible for it are guilty of a shameful act of negligence and discrimination.

The next Congress, convening in January, should make it the first order of business to put an end to the prolonged disappointments and discouragements of the Nation's postal workers.

It is little short of a national crime that these essential, overworked, and underpaid employees of the Federal Government should continue to be victims of congressional negligence and discrimination, and the new Congress should deal with their cause according to its obvious and acknowledged merits.

R. F. C. Gives Aid to Little Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Sunday Star of January 5, 1945, contains a splendid article by Hon. Jesse H. Jones in his capacity as Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. As one of the Federal agencies engaged in rendering financial assistance to small firms, R. F. C. diligence and effectiveness in aiding worthy small firms is portrayed in considerable detail by Mr. Jones in this well-documented news story.

It is indeed gratifying to me as one of the many Members who have always had the interest of these small manufacturers and distributors at heart to read this splendid account of the achievements of this fine agency. For the benefit of those who did not have occasion to read this article, I am inserting a copy of it herewith:

R. F. C. GIVES AID TO LITTLE BUSINESS—SEEKS TO REVERSE MORTALITY TREND RESULTING FROM WAR

(By Jesse H. Jones)

Little business operates on the commercial frontier of the United States.

In that field, lie the risks and adventure, but also the hopes and profits of individual initiative.

The forces arrayed against little business are not those the early settlers faced as they moved West, but they are no less real. Competition, depressions, and wars create many hurdles for little business, frequently, too many for the man or woman imbued with the laudable desire to be his or her own boss.

Because the impact of war imposes the most severe strain little business has had to face, its problems and how little business can best be encouraged and protected in our day of mass production and distribution are of great concern.

EARLY WAR MORTALITY HIGH

When the United States first entered World War No. 2 and for many months

thereafter, the mortality rate among little businesses was high. There are many failures in this category during more normal years, but, over a long period of time, new ventures have exceeded those which have found the going too rough. After we became involved in the war, this trend was reversed. The establishment of new businesses failed to equal those which closed their doors and between 1939 through 1943, the net decline in the number of business establishments—large and small—totaled $536,400, an average of more than 1,100 in each of the 48 States.

At the present time, the decline appears to have been checked and the number of little businesses in operation is remaining fairly constant. The year 1944 may even show a slight increase. We are at the point from which we must go forward if small business enterprises are to survive.

We in the Department of Commerce and the R. F. C. have not only had actual private experience in little business, but a great deal of experience in the relationship between Government and little business. The personnel of the R. F. C., including its directors and other executives, have spent their entire lives in business—small business. Executives and experts in the Department of Commerce are also experienced in small business.

NO EXACT FORMULA

We know little business, its problems and its difficulties. There is no exact formula for defining little business.

The man who operates a shoeshine stand, an independent drug store or corner grocery is certainly a little-business man, but there are little businessmen in the steel industry, in the field of automobile manufacturing, in the production of tobacco products, the operation of hotels, restaurants, radio stations, and many other lines.

Suppose we say that any business which needs financing up to $100,000 is regarded a small business and for the purpose of this discussion, that figure is probably as accurate a measure as we can arrive at.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made more than 19,500 individual loans in this category, but if $100,000 strikes you as being a lot of money, the R. F. C. has made approximately 7,000 loans under $5,000, 3,400 loans between $5,000 and $10,000, and 4,500 loans between $10,000 and $25,000.

It has actually disbursed $1,008,675,948 to business institutions in the 10 years in which it has possesed the authority to make business loans. It has made more than 22,000 such loans—some in every State of the Union. The fact that we have made and offered to make business loans, both directly and in cooperation with banks, has made credit available to thousands of independent businesses on terms that they could hope to meet—and usually do meet—loans on terms that banks have heretofore, for one reason or another, been reluctant to make. This reluctance was due in some cases to banking laws or customs against longtime loans and many times because the loan did not appear to be a risk that the bank could take.

MANY SAVED FROM FAILURE

These figures and facts demonstrate that the R. F. C. has appreciated the importance of little business to our economy and has been active in making credit available for it. Our experience in making these loans has demonstrated that with proper attention, encouragement and advice, many small businesses that otherwise would have failed have survived.

R. F. C. has not competed with private lending institutions but has cooperated with them. It has made many loans that the banks did not feel justified in making and has taken participations in 5,000 loans made by banks, R. F. C.'s participation running as high as 90 percent of the loan, the bank making and servicing the loan. R. F. C.'s experience in making industrial loans has clearly shown that, had the banks been energetic enough and taken the trouble to make the loans and nurse some of them, they could all have been made. This is proven by the fact that R. F. C.'s losses on such loans have averaged less than 1 percent. This percentage of loss can be taken from a reasonable rate of interest and still leave a proper profit for the bank. After all, money lending is much like insurance. Rates can be adjusted to fit the approximate risk.

Few, if any, private institutions, which skim the cream off the loan field, have a better record and few have worked as hard as R. F. C. to make such loans. This is demonstrated by the fact that in hundreds of cases, after R. F. C. examiners and officials have reset the financial structure of some small business, local bankers have decided that the loan which they had turned down, because of the risk, was really a loan that the bank should make.

BOOM FOR SMALL PLANT

There has always been romance in American business and there has been plenty of it in the record of R. F. C. loans to business.

Consider the small machine shop in Miami with a book value of $32,280, which, before the war, made fishing tackle. Its biggest year, 1940, resulted in sales of $40,000.

With the outbreak of the war, the proprietors conceived the idea of using their equipment for the manufacture of aircraft parts.

On August 8, 1941, R. F. C. made a loan of $20,000 to provide working capital for the first contract. An additional $25,000 was authorized in November of that year and, by April of 1942, contracts which the company had obtained justified a loan of $600,000.

To date the loans which have been authorized to this little company aggregate $8,463,000 and only $568,000 is outstanding as unpaid.

Or consider, if you will, the $7,500 loan made in 1938 to a man and his wife who were in the grocery business in Washington. At the time the money was advanced their profits were not sufficient to meet the payments on their store fixtures.

Today they owe R. F. C. only a few dollars. Their life savings have been protected and they, themselves, with several helpers, have been kept at work.

Out in Spokane, Wash., a loan, amounting to only $2,800, assisted a woman in establishing a small drug store in 1939. She has been kept in business and her loan has been substantially repaid.

AID FOR TELEPHONE COMPANY

The residents of Whiteville, N. C., are dependent upon a small independent telephone company for service. The financial picture of this company in June 1938 was discouraging. R. F. C. authorized a loan of $12,500, which made possible expansion of service. The company has shown a very much improved earnings record and the loan has been almost entirely repaid.

A woman in Demopolis, Ala., needed assistance in 1939 for the installation of a cold-storage locker plant. The R. F. C. advanced her $7,000. The plant has been successfully operated and the proprietor has had no difficulty in meeting her payments.

Out in Helena, Mont., a small oil and gas company needed funds to save its business. R. F. C. made $25,000 available to it in 1943 and its business was saved.

At Newborn, Ga., a man was making wooden slat blinds in 1938 when he was faced with disaster for lack of working capital. R. F. C. made a $1,600 loan, which had not been entirely repaid when the war forced a discontinuance of the business.

The borrower did not give up. He is making his repayments from wages as a machinist in a war plant and expects to reopen his shade business after the war.

Fittstown, Okla., is supplied with electric power by a small local company.

FISH COMPANY SAVED

In December 1941 R. F. C. made a loan of $15,000 to it to pay a mortgage, install new facilities and provide working capital.

The loan put the company in good shape and enabled it to provide additional badly needed facilities. The company is succeeding.

In Nanticoke, Md., there is a small fishing company that has been in business since 1917.

It found the going rough in 1942 and obtained a $1,900 loan from the R. F. C.

It needed $275 more in May 1943 which it got.

The company has been able to stay in business, thereby providing employment and badly needed food products.

We are inclined to think of shipbuilding in terms of such companies as those operated by Henry Kaiser, Todd Shipbuilding Co., Newport News Ship, Bethlehem, Cramps, and New York Shipbuilding—all of which are tremendous operations.

But we, in the R. F. C., have knowledge of others.

Take, as an example, the small shipbuilding and repair yard in Seattle, which needed to install additional facilities to participate in the war effort.

R. F. C. in August 1941 took a 70 percent participation in a loan of $150,000 made by a local bank, the bank taking the other 30 percent and servicing the loan.

TERMS TO BANDOLEERS

This was only the beginning. Since that time, R. F. C. has cooperated with a local bank, in loans aggregating $23,564,000 and the company has assisted materially in the construction program of the Navy Department.

The present outstanding balance is only $775,000.

A small fern packing firm in Florida faced difficulties because it could no longer obtain boxes to ship its products.

It decided it could make bandoleers if it could obtain the necessary financing.

The R. F. C. provided it and a small plant employing 40 to 50 persons was kept in operation.

These few typical loans are only examples of thousands of others like them which R. F. C. has made.

The record of the past is, however, mainly useful as a signpost for the future—a future which for the present can be devoted only to an all-out war effort, but which on a day we cannot now foretell, will bring peace to the world and provide opportunities for thousands of little businesses.

With the coming of peace, there will be many opportunities in the field of small business and many men and women anxious to challenge the opportunity. A great many men now in the service will want to go back to their former jobs or businesses, but many will want to try their own wings. They have been risking their lives to preserve freedom and our way of life and may want a business of their own, however small. They must have that chance and it will be small business. Estimates made by experts in the Department of Commerce indicate that the war has created a deficiency of 270,000 small businesses in the field of retail distribution alone.

STORES SUFFERED MOST

The net change in the number of firms in retailing is particularly important since the number of businesses in retailing account for nearly half of all enterprises.

Wartime casualties particularly included grocery stores, eating and drinking places and filling stations, but many small manufacturers were put out of business in the early years of the war. Some of these were later given orders which enabled them to start up again. Relative to the total number of various types of retail stores in existence at the end of 1941, household appliance and radio stores, meat and seafood markets, automobile dealers, filling stations, and shoe stores suffered most severely. In each of these lines, there was a net decline during 1942–43 of a fourth or more of the number of stores operating at the end of 1941.

In retailing, as in all other industry groups, roughly nine-tenths of all business discontinuances occur among firms employing fewer than four workers. This proportion has remained relatively constant throughout the 4-year period, 1940–43. About nine-tenths of all new enterprises also hire less than four workers, but the proportion has tended to decline during the war years. The net decline in the number of businesses has, therefore, been greater among small (i. e. those with less than four employees) than among large firms.

There will be plenty of released veterans and discharged war workers to fill this gap and more. We must, in fact, if we are to achieve the President's goal of 60,000,000 jobs, find a place in our economy for 750,000 to 1,000,000 new small merchants.

Much emphasis in post-war discussions has been placed on our increased productive power and it is certainly the keystone of future prosperity, but if the products of our mills and factories lack free and full outlets to the consumer, we will have created a dangerous bottleneck. Little business will have to supply the channels through which goods and services move.

What can Government do, in addition to seeing that credit is available to little business to aid in this situation?

It can and should provide operating and management counsel and advice. The high-mortality rate in the field of little business over the years proves that this is true. Too many men and women attempt to set themselves up in business with no experience and scant knowledge.

Too many people, unfortunately, have believed that possession of a little capital, some energy, and a great deal of ambition provided sufficient equipment for entry into the small-business field.

GREATER AID IS URGED

They have found to their sorrow that there is more to commerce and trade, whether it be big or small, than these attributes.

Many have succeeded with no better initial equipment, but they have learned as they went along. There will, of course, always be failures.

Certainly it is the responsibility of Government to make available fundamental information which can be used by anyone who wishes to set himself up in business and thereby give him as good a chance as it is possible to do.

The Department of Commerce has, for some time, asked Congress to take a step in this direction through the expansion of its field offices—already in existence—so that there may be provided for business a service similar to that which Government has for years placed at the disposal of agriculture through county agents.

This does not mean that we think there should be a representative of the Department of Commerce in every county in the United States, but even a limited number of men—able to give sound advice and pass along to the newcomer in business the experience of thousands of others—would be of great value and avoid many needless failures.

MUCH ADVICE AVAILABLE

As an illustration of what can be done, I cite the program which is already under way through cooperation between the War Department and the Department of Commerce.

Specialists in the Department of Commerce have prepared or are preparing 17 textbooks dealing with the establishment and operation of the most populous small-business lines. They have been written in complete cooperation with industry, so that they contain not only the advice and counsel of Government experts but the practical suggestions of men who have already established themselves firmly in business.

These books deal with the establishment and operation of automobile repair shops, retail bakeries, electric appliance and radio shops, grocery stores, metal-working shops, painting and decorating businesses, real estate and insurance brokerage businesses, small sawmills, shoe-repair shops, apparel stores, beauty shops, building contracting, hardware stores, service stations, general merchandise stores, dry-cleaning establishments, laundries, and restaurants.

The War Department will only distribute these textbooks among soldiers whose desire it will be to go into business for themselves upon demobilization.

They spell out the financial and physical needs in each class of business and try to show the things that will be helpful and how to avoid the things that will spoil the chances of success.

EXPERTS ARE NEEDED

They should be generally available, and there should be on hand experts who could discuss with men and women the situations which the books set forth.

Moreover, the time will come, after a small business has been established, when the operators will need help and guidance which Government should be in a position to provide, and there will always be new developments which it is the Government's duty to pass along to its citizens.

We will need the aid of every citizen to keep our economy functioning in peace just as we have needed the cooperation of every one for war production. Banks should occupy the leading role in this field. It is their responsibility to meet the credit needs of the country, and if it takes a little extra trouble to look after a small businessman, the banker should welcome the opportunity. He should know that if he does not meet it, the Government will, and his natural field will get narrower and narrower.

The future of small business does not, however, lie entirely in the hands of those who may enter it after the war.

There are, at the present time, 2,500,000 establishments which may be classed as small business. They, for the most part, have weathered the stresses and strains of operation in wartime and their problems are concerned not so much with the present, which, because of consumer demand, is relatively bright—but with what will happen after the war.

Representatives of the Department of Commerce in the past 6 months, have met with many groups—geographically well distributed—in order to find out what was worrying these businessmen.

The distributors, mostly retailers, were primarily concerned with the sale of surpluses to speculators rather than through regular channels, with upgrading of merchandise by manufacturers, making it impossible to maintain low and medium priced goods in stock; and with post-war competition from large manufacturers with their own outlets and chain stores, which could buy up new merchandise as fast as it came on the market.

Some retailers were disturbed by growing competition from consumer cooperatives, manpower shortages, job freezing, and inequitable freight rates.

The manufacturers, almost all of whom employed 100 or less people at the time, were almost uniformly concerned over the distribution of surplus goods; their inability under present tax laws to build up a cash reserve essential for quick reconversion to civilian production; need for equitable freight rates.

TAX CHANGES VITAL

In both categories, credit needs were most frequently advanced under the discussion of taxation. The solution to the problem of post-war risk capital was uniformly taken up as a tax question, not in terms of borrowing more funds.

I do not take this cross-section of small-business opinion to mean that there will be need only for tax relief in the reconversion period, but income-tax rates, regulations, and schedules will need to be revised if the smaller units in businesses of all kinds can pay their debts from earnings over a reasonable time, and there is no other way for them to pay their debts other than from earnings.

We cannot expect business, little or big, to put risk or venture capital to work under a tax system which does not enable the investor of the money to get either a profit on his capital or the opportunity of amortizing his obligations in an orderly way.

We cannot abridge the right of honest and ambitious men to enter the business field because our financial institutions are unwilling to take a chance on the future of the United States.

As a matter of fact, there is little or no risk involved for the banker. The R. F. C. has for a good many years and is still willing to participate with banks in making industrial loans in any degree up to 90 percent. No system of guarantied loans could reasonably go any further than this and certainly any banker should be willing to take at least a 10 percent share with his Government in the advancement of his own community.

SMALL LOANS NOT HURTFUL

To put it another way, a loan application made by a fellow citizen in which a local bank is not willing to take some of the risk is either a very poor loan or a great reflection upon the fitness for his job of the banker who turns it down.

I do not believe, however, that the bankers of the United States are going to make the mistake of denying credit to reputable men and women of character in amounts appropriate to the circumstances. And as for little business and little loans, I would remind the banker that no bank ever got seriously hurt from small loans.

In many communities banks have either already established credit pools to finance small business or are in the act of doing so. Some of these pools will contain as much as $100,000,000. They should be operated on a constructive basis. The R. F. C. stands ready to participate with these pools so that there may be no lack of credit for legitimate enterprise, regardless of size, that will provide employment and opportunity.

This proposal, which we will be glad to consider in any part of the country—if the banks want R. F. C.'s cooperation—will not only provide a greater amount of available credit but will be, in effect, a participation by the R. F. C. in any loans which are made.

The banks of the country ought to go to work post-war just as every one else to assure a high level of production and employment. Too stringent policies in the operation of the credit pools will make them ineffective. Liberal policies may mean some losses, but there again, there will be profit enough in the interest rate to cover them.

Our experience has convinced us that an organization operated along constructive business lines—as the R. F. C. has been—can provide sound and helpful assistance to all business with no net loss. And no loan is too small or too large to be given serious and prompt consideration.

I repeat, and wish to emphasize, that there is profit enough from reasonable interest rates to cover any net loss on small-business loans.

Estimated number of all operating business firms (small and large) in 1939 and 1943

	1939	1943	Number	Net change, 1941–43,[1] percent decrease (increase) since 1941
All industries	3,316,700	2,861,600	−536,400	−15.8
Mining and quarrying	21,400	26,200	+3,800	+16.2
Contract construction	202,100	158,100	−85,700	−35.2
Manufacturing	214,200	228,600	+2,800	+1.2
Transportation, communication, and public utilities	207,700	188,000	−21,200	−10.1
Finance, insurance, real estate	286,460	261,200	−23,800	−8.4
Wholesale trade	144,800	114,800	−31,400	−21.5
Retail trade	1,601,400	1,330,400	−290,400	−17.9
General merchandise	36,800	34,500	−2,500	−6.8
General stores with food	37,700	29,700	−6,100	−17.0
Grocery, with or without meats	241,500	284,300	−62,500	−18.0
Meat and sea food	39,900	28,500	−10,200	−26.4
Other food stores	120,000	93,500	−20,100	−17.7
Liquor stores	15,300	13,800	−1,600	−10.4
Automobile dealers (new, used)	38,400	30,900	−10,100	−24.6
Other automotive	15,100	13,700	−3,000	−18.0
Apparel and accessories	73,000	66,700	−6,200	−8.5
Shoes	13,100	10,400	−2,800	−21.2
Home furnishings and equipment	29,500	28,100	−4,500	−13.8
Appliances and radio	15,000	10,300	−4,500	−30.4
Drugs	52,200	47,200	−4,400	−8.5
Hardware and farm implements	37,900	34,800	−3,900	−10.1
Lumber, building materials	31,300	27,200	−4,800	−15.0
Eating and drinking places	295,400	250,800	−57,000	−18.5
Filling stations	226,700	170,900	−56,700	−24.9
Other retail	182,700	155,100	−29,500	−16.0
Service industries	638,700	554,300	−89,500	−13.9
Hotels, boarding houses, etc	27,500	24,400	−4,700	−16.2
Laundries, dry cleaning, etc	86,700	92,900	−3,400	−3.5
Barber and beauty shops	203,400	183,400	−30,100	−14.1
Other personal services	93,000	73,100	−8,600	−10.5
Automobile repair	77,500	59,100	−18,500	−23.8
Amusements	44,200	38,000	−6,600	−8.5
Business services	106,400	83,400	−17,600	−17.4

[1] 1941 was the peak year for the total number of operating businesses.

Livestock Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Nebraska Farmer, Lincoln, Nebr. The cattle ceiling directive, when put into effect, will have a disastrous result for the feeder of livestock. The feeders filled their feed yards with the understanding that there would be no tampering with the price of cattle. This directive will cause the feeders to lose from $15 to $25 on every head they feed.

It would seem that the Government's experience with the attempt to control pork prices should have been a sufficient warning that further manipulation and directives relative to cattle raising and feeding would have a similar result.

This directive is being placed in effect to satisfy a few consumers in New York City. It will not eliminate the black market, because it would cause a further scarcity of beef. The only way to eliminate the black market is the production of more beef which the consumers want and are able to buy. The consumers want good beef, not the utility grade which now is flooding the market.

The O. P. A. and the Office of Economic Stabilization will put this order into effect against the considered judgment and advice of the producers and feeders of livestock.

LIVE-CATTLE CEILINGS

As we go to press the O. P. A. is on the verge of announcing a $17.50 rigid ceiling on live cattle over the protests of producers and feeders. This action has been threatened for some time in spite of promises made during the summer that cattle price relationships would not be disturbed, and the obligation of the O. P. A. to consult representative producer groups before making any change. The closed meetings being held with a few producers and industry men can hardly be called representative of the livestock industry nor conducive to a full public understanding of the problems involved.

The reasons given for a live ceiling are, first, to curb the black market in beef which makes it difficult for packers to obtain their slaughter needs without paying above the previously announced flexible ceiling and, secondly, the difficulty of eastern meat retailers to get enough meat to supply their trade.

Fat cattle have sold as high as $18.50 per 100 pounds in recent months, so the proposed ceiling would bring loss to many feeders who have already filled their yards at a cost which does not allow a reasonable profit with a $17.50 top. Such operators will be inclined to cut short their feeding in order to reduce the loss while others will not feed at all, thus contributing to a reduction in beef supplies which are already inadequate for the demand. The Government's experience with hog ceilings which have resulted in more curtailment in pork making than desirable should serve as warning of what to expect from beef producers.

It is doubtful if a live-cattle ceiling will control the black market in beef. The black market thrives because of a scarcity of supply and high consumer income which encourages some people to pay whatever price necessary to get the product. If feeding is reduced still more the black-market traffic will increase. The best curb for black market is more beef of the kind consumers want and are able to pay for. Right now that is not the utility grade. Furthermore, the difficulty in buying cattle under fixed live ceilings will permit practices which may often penalize the seller and cause general dissatisfaction.

The trouble arises from an impractical understanding by Government officials of the fundamentals and economics in the beef making business, from a divided and confusing authority between the O. P. A. and W. F. A., and from their failure to adopt a policy which the industry has recommended, based upon the consumers' ability to buy good meat, and adequate price margins to encourage more feeding and therefore a bigger supply of meat.

We Had To Fight This War—Better Now Than Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind.:

WE HAD TO FIGHT THIS WAR—BETTER NOW THAN LATER

Because we seem to be getting away from the promises of the Atlantic Charter and the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks some of the old isolationists are rising to insist that they were right all along and that it is impossible to win security through collaboration with Russia and Great Britain.

But what do they suggest? Isn't it another try at the very isolationism which got us into this war?

"Oh," they say, "we did not get the country into this war. Roosevelt and the interventionists did that. If they hadn't started out to save Britain and had adhered to a strictly neutral policy the war would probably have been over and the United States would have had no part in it."

But what a picture that is. The war would have been over but both Britain and Russia would have been conquered and the world outside of North America would now be ruled by Germany and Japan.

That picture does not seem to bother some isolationists. They say that every country must selfishly look after its own interests and therein lies progress and peace.

They have no sense of being their brother's keeper. The practice of Christianity, they say, has no place in the affairs of nations and only brings disrepute and loss of place and possessions.

Roosevelt, it is charged, has turned the conduct of our foreign affairs over to Russia and

Britain and these countries are now parceling out Europe and the things we are supposed to be fighting for are being lost in the grab for power.

There is some truth in the charge about Russia and Britain grabbing for power, but none at all in the claim that we would have fared better had we let the Germans subjugate Britain and Russia.

Anything that can possibly come out of this war will be better than that, for the defeat of Britain and Russia would have put right up to us the job of protecting ourselves against Nazi savagery for unnumbered years.

Defeat of a Nazi world organized against us would have been impossible and yet without defeat it would have remained a constant threat to our very life. The United States, tiring of being a Nation in arms, would probably have succumbed to the ever-growing threat.

It is impossible to say, on the other hand, that we have reached the goal we set out for in this war. Somewhere our leadership failed. What we want is an international organization to keep the peace and we seem to be getting an international alliance which is not respecting the integrity of small states.

Naturally there is criticism, harsh criticism, and some of it is probably deserved. However, we must realize that we do not have a free choice of what the world after the war will be like. That world will be a result of compromise.

Russia is setting up on her western border a string of countries which will be oriented toward her rather than toward the west. If that is merely because she fears the west time may assuage that feeling.

Particularly may this happen if we can get a league of nations organized and a workable peace established so that the league may be given a chance to function.

Let us remember that the other league had a great deal of experience and therefore the new league will start with a much better understanding of the way it must go. Then, too, its greatest weakness—the absence of the United States—probably will not affect the new one.

Yes there are reasons for being dissatisfied with the way world political affairs are heading but none whatever for having got into the war. We had to fight for our lives—later if not now.

It should not be necessary to go through another period like that following the last war when we were led down a blind alley because we were too ignorant of international affairs to understand the meaning of the terrifying advance of technology. It will destroy us if we do not control it and we can control it only with an international organization.

That was true 25 years ago and it is tenfold true today with the emphasis of facts which everyone can understand.

Draft of Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as one representing a thoroughly agricultural State at large, I feel it my duty to present to the Congress the farmer's side of the proposed draft of farm workers which I shall do in a detailed manner under special orders Thursday of this week. I herewith attach a telegram from Mr. Glenn Talbott, president, North Dakota Farmers' Union:

We are very much alarmed at recent reclassification and induction into military service of farm boys in 18 to 26 age group. There may be areas where surplus of farm labor still exists. However, North Dakota has long ago scraped the bottom of its agricultural manpower barrel for military service if maximum food production is vitally imperative as is indicated by food goals established for 1945 by W. F. A. and U. S. D. A.

We believe maximum output from our farms to be of equal importance in winning the war with maximum output from our mines, factories, and shipyards; particularly is this true if there are to be several more years of war.

Additionally this war is being fought to destroy the totalitarian ideology of fascism. The destruction of fascism is the major prerequisite of building for our people and the people of the world a decent peace under which the will of the people may be expressed and their needs may be served through governments and economic systems of their own choice. For these reasons the winning of the war and the peace must be an inseparable process. With few exceptions the induction of North Dakota farm boys between the ages of 18 and 26 means an inevitable reduction in our food production from the maximum which effective prosecution of this war and the establishment of a lasting peace will require.

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS' UNION,
GLENN TALBOTT, *President.*

Letter From Melvin B. Wehler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LITTLESTOWN, PA., *January 6, 1945.*

Hon. CHESTER H. GROSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Every time I open my mouth to criticize government, I imagine I can feel the results later in the arrival of groups of auditors from Internal Revenue, Wage and Hour, Social Security, O. P. A., W. P. B., and others. It is less trouble to keep quiet, say nothing—but silence gives consent.

It burns me up to hear shouting from high places, pleading for patriotism toward the war effort, threats to draft farm boys who already are putting in 50 percent more hours without time and a half, and at the same time these high officials passively approve boondoggling in war industries actually causing slow-downs. We even seize industries to enforce these humanitarian working conditions. The elves tie down the giant with thread.

Why must we hear stories such as the following?

1. It is rumored that right here in the York Safe & Lock Works, union stewards prohibit a good worker from turning out more than just so many pieces in 8 hours, even though 100 percent more could be done. Good workers are held down to make the output of faithful dues-paying loafers look better.

2. In the shipyards, why must an oiler be required only to oil an engine 15 minutes morning and noon, and sit there for the balance of the day doing nothing? Do we have enough suckers to lay $75 on the line for a War bond to pay this oiler's wages each week for just oiling?

3. Who makes the rules at our ports where the carloaders do a certain piece of work that the stevedores cannot touch, while dozens of them stand there and look on? Later the stevedores work and the carloaders must look on. Neither can touch the other's work—war goods wait.

4. Why cannot a truck driver carry his cargo through the door into a warehouse? Another man must do this.

5. Why do a lot of merchant-marine sailors get 45 days shore leave after only about 60-day periods in transport?

6. If made work was questionable in peacetime depression, is it even tolerable in wartime?

Visible facts make the shorten-the-war speeches look like ballyhoo. Do the high politicians really want it to last a while?

Yours very truly,

MELVIN B. WEHLER.

Manpower Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith a very timely editorial from the Renville Star Farmer, of Renville, Minn. The writer, Mr. L. F. Reid, believes that the answer to the shortage of manpower is to have the Government draft workers for essential industries.

He cautions, however, in this article, that the supply of manpower on the farms should be looked into very carefully so that food production is not retarded in any way.

The editorial is as follows:

MANPOWER PROBLEM

When it seemed imperative that the teenage boys be drafted into the armed services, there were no dilatory tactics employed, either by the administration or by Congress in passing the necessary legislation for drafting the young men.

Right now, a far more serious situation has arisen, relative to the prosecution of the war, as well as the ultimate object of fighting to a victorious finish just as quickly as possible. The boys are fighting the good fight on all fronts. They are putting in all they have, that Germany and Japan may be quickly brought to their knees. We realize that both foes are hard bitten and well grounded in the art of modern warfare. They also have slave labor to produce the necessary war materials to carry on a long war.

According to reliable reports, the Allies are short of some critical materials, due to a manpower shortage in factories turning out munitions of war. If it is true that the effort to win the wars we are engaged in as quickly as possible is being seriously hampered by a shortage of manpower, why does not the Government do the obvious, i. e., draft workers for essential industry?

There are a great many comparatively young, able bodied men in every community throughout the land capable of working long hours in manufacturing or shipbuilding plants, even though they have been deferred for one reason or other from the

armed services. Many of them are working in or conducting nonessential businesses. There is also a backlog of manpower on the farms, though that should be looked into very carefully so that food production is not retarded in any way. In this day and age of labor-saving machinery it takes a smaller amount of labor to run the average farm than was the case before the invention of the tractor, the corn husker, and other time-saving devices There are cases where there can be found an extra husky youth on a farm not essential to the efficient operation of the farm.

I believe that serious consideration should be given by Congress to the matter of drafting manpower for essential work, so that the flow of necessary munitions may not be halted and the war brought to a victorious conclusion in the shortest space of time possible. Every hour the fighting is allowed to drag on for any reason at all, means the killing of many young men.

If this method outlined for filling the ranks of labor in war industry were followed there would naturally come up the question as to what the unions would think about it. In case the labor bosses would object to any fair system of employment that would be of help in getting the necessary war materials produced on time, I would say the said labor leaders should be declared out for the duration. There is no reason why, when the Nation is in the serious situation it is, with its young men out in the mud and snow fighting and dying, that anyone should have the right to halt production of war material for 1 hour.

We can and must go the limit in putting in our best punches, now that the enemy is on the ropes, ripe for the kill.

Jurisdiction and Distribution of Water Between the Several States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution relative to the jurisdiction and distribution of water between the several States. The resolution upholds the superior rights in the use of water for agricultural purposes.

This resolution is from Attorney T. F. Neighbors, chairman of the resolutions committee at Scottsbluff, Nebr.:

Resolution 2

Whereas there have been introduced in the Congress bills proposing the creation of valley authorities for the purpose of undertaking, among numerous other things, the development, utilization, and management of waters of the several valleys named in the bills, generally referred to as authority bills; and

Whereas authorities provided in proposed legislation are Government corporations, vested with unlimited powers, clothed with Government immunity from responsibility for their acts, free from ordinary congressional controls, beyond the jurisdiction of the General Accounting Office, established by Congress for supervising the expenditure of public funds; would deprive the States of jurisdiction over the distribution and use of waters within their boundaries; prevent compacts between States relating to such waters; drastically interfere with and seek to control the economy of the affected States; unreasonably and unwisely centralize in a Federal agency powers and duties more appropriately lodged in and efficiently performed by the States; bring into public ownership large segments of privately owned property, displacing tax revenues and thus increasing taxes on remaining property; and, finally, build unwholesome and undesirable Government monopolies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association, in regular meeting assembled, does hereby declare its opposition to the enactment of regional or valley authority legislation for the rivers of the Nation of the type and character contained in proposals now before Congress.

T. F. NEIGHBORS,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, one of the questions concerning which all of us are receiving many inquiries, and which will be the subject of consideration and discussion in the present Congress is that of some program for universal military training. In response to the large number of inquiries as to my stand on this question I have prepared the following statement, which has already been made public, and which I wish to insert in the RECORD under permission granted for the extension of my remarks:

The subject of military training for our young Americans is one of our most important post-war problems and one upon which many will differ, and lack of space will not permit complete presentation of these personal views.

History is filled with stories of broken treaties, unsuccessful peace pacts, and shattered alliances, all wrecked upon the rocks of power diplomacy and selfish national interests—sometimes selfish personal interests.

Through the service of the churches, their missionaries and their members, the world has improved through the years, but sufficient change has not yet taken place in the nature of human beings or of nations to demonstrate that the peace to follow this war can be much more successful than many of its predecessors, unless we adopt a practical peace policy backed up by the strongest civilian military population in the world. The world has not yet been converted to the Christian principle that peace and harmony cannot exist where selfishness, avarice, envy, jealousy, hate, and malice are in the hearts of men and of nations.

The United States will emerge from the war with many enemies. Its unshattered factories, homes, and cities will stir up envy; its industrial power will be jealously eyed; and, deeply in debt as we are, our comparative wealth will be coveted. Nations will undoubtedly look selfishly to but one thing—their own national welfare. Evidence of this, in spite of the veil of secrecy, is already apparent.

For these and many other reasons the view of future peace is not optimistic. War can come suddenly from any one of many quarters with no time to train, possibly not enough to mobilize, our forces. Although we have given freely of our families, factories, and fields, our back-log of potential friends as future allies is limited. We, ourselves, must retain the power to prevent another war and to avoid the future slaughter of our young men.

Twenty-five years ago an army of young men, including myself, came home from France. Virtually all realized that had they had a year's training prior to the war they could have given their country much better service. It was generally agreed that had we maintained a strong, trained army and navy, Germany would never have committed any act that might bring us in against her.

After 25 years, I am of the same opinion. Had we been militarily prepared, Japan would not have defied us, among other acts, with the sinking of the *Panay;* for which we accepted dollars, not having the strength to venture war. Having this as one example either of our lack of fighting courage or of our weakness, it is no wonder that Japan dared to attack Pearl Harbor. Weakness invites attack. A strong, well-equipped and well-trained army, a two-ocean navy, and a superior air force, I am certain, would have prevented the disgraceful disaster of December 7, 1941. Had the Allies had the force and courage to back their early demands against Japan, Italy, and Germany this entire World War might have been prevented.

For 25 years the American Legion has favored universal military training. For many years it cried out for preparedness. For many long years Legionnaires begged for a larger army, for the best air force in the world, and for a two-ocean navy. These prayerful petitions were ignored.

We've paid for our lack, not only in dollars—a mountainous public debt which will not be paid for generations—but also in the lives of the finest youngsters American homes ever produced; none of them replaceable. That was the price of unpreparedness and war. The price of peace and preparedness would have been great—but far, far less. Lack of a military-training program did not keep us out of this war.

One year's service could be—if it is the kind that leaders in Congress are urging it shall be—of the greatest value. Among other things it would give American youth physical stamina, self-confidence, self-reliance, a disciplined mind and body, the ability to "take it," consideration (tolerance) for the opinions and rights of others regardless of their walk or position in life or of their religion, race, or political affiliation. It would bring maturity of mind and purpose; a broader, less selfish, vision; a greater love of country, and respect for its Constitution, its institutions, and its flag.

Let there be no misunderstanding. This must be a strictly military program—not merely an excuse for a glorified social and educational program; not an occasion for such regimentation or propagandizing as of Hitler's youth with its goose-stepping, blind following of a dictator whose word was law. It should be equal service for all—with no pampering or preference to any youngster, either by reason of wealth, position, or political prestige. Each should serve as best he can in view of his particular physical and mental ability.

The delay of a year in beginning higher education might prove beneficial, as I'm sure it did in my case, since the value of additional education would probably become apparent. The more mature mind would be better able to discern, grasp, and retain facts.

Adoption of this program should not, with safety, be too long delayed, yet, in all fairness, and in view of the extreme change from our traditional attitude, at this time I cannot now see reason for undue haste. The proposed training program should be honestly, frankly, and thoroughly discussed. Since there are now more than 10,000,000 of our men whose sons—because in the absence of a grave emergency there must be

no drafting of our daughters—will be affected, action should be deferred until a majority of these fighting men have returned and have had an opportunity to express their views, based upon their own experiences. These same men will form an adequate reserve of trained men to cope with military situations which might arise during the discussion period.

These new veterans may—and many to whom I have talked do—agree that a preparedness program such as has been proposed in the past by groups of older veterans was a good one—good enough to be tried for our future safety and security.

Nearly 2,000 years ago Christ, the Prince of Peace, said, according to His friend, Luke (11:21): "When a strong man armed keepeth his palace his goods are in peace."

About 1900 years later a great American said: "Speak softly, but carry a big stick."

On the Nurse Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of January 5, 1945:

ON THE NURSE SHORTAGE

Despite the acute need for nurses for the armed forces, and a parallel but much less acute shortage on the home front, there are several phases of this total nurse problem in which the various agencies that deal with it or have an influence on it appear to be working at cross purposes.

The United States Public Health Service, which seemed slower than it should have been in throwing its full weight behind the drive for nurse recruitment for the armed forces, finally got into a better stride. Quite aside from the question of whether it had too large or too small a staff for peacetime, it was virtually a hoarder of nurses when the armed forces had a desperate need for them.

Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, is now exerting great efforts to get public health nurses to enlist. He has also sent excellent letters to senior student nurses, to the directors of nursing schools and to hospital administrators, urging nurses to enlist.

But there is still a policy of the United States Public Health Service that hampers nurse recruitment. The U. S. P. H. S. furnishes desirable scholarships for nurses to do graduate work. These scholarships are now rather easy to get. A considerable number of understandably ambitious nurses are therefore leaving active nursing to pursue graduate studies. In peacetime this would be highly commendable, but now—with the acute nurse shortage—it is taking nurses out of service when they are most needed. Why doesn't the United States Public Health Service cease offering these scholarships in this war period

The health department of the city of Milwaukee likewise does not seem to be making the fullest use of its nurses, in view of the war emergency. The department has been generous in releasing city nurses who wished to enlist, but city health nurses work only 40 hours a week, whereas the vast majority of Milwaukee nurses work 48-hour weeks. The city might help relieve the nurse shortage, and certainly could remove a source of complaint by other nurses, if city nurses—for the duration—worked 48 hours.

Alaska Prosperity, Safety, and Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present for the consideration of the Congress a most timely article by Mr. Edward W. Allen, of Seattle. This article was printed in the Argus, December 16, 1944, and deals with one of the outstanding industries of the Pacific Northwest:

ALASKA PROSPERITY, SAFETY, AND FISH

(By Edward W. Allen)

(Edward W. Allen is United States Commissioner and Chairman of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission; United States Commissioner and secretary of the International Fisheries Commission; author of North Pacific, La Perouse, A Check List, and miscellaneous articles on international law, fisheries, and Alaska.)

Thousands of Americans in the past, when they thought of Alaska, thought of gold. Since the tragedy at Pearl Harbor an increasing number associate Alaska with Japanese aggression and national defense. But comparatively few people are acquainted with the prosaic fact that in peacetimes the fundamental basis of Alaska's economy was the fishing industry or that had it not been for the salmon packers having their fleets of cannery vessels available where needed for Army and Navy use, Dutch Harbor might have furnished a disaster more tragic than Pearl Harbor. Not only the Pacific coast but the entire Nation might well have been confronted with the threat of an enemy entrenched within our own continent of North America.

What are these fisheries? First in importance is salmon. When explorers such as James Cook, George Vancouver, and Jean Francois Galoup de Laperouse came to the Northwest coast they found fish similar in appearance to the European salmon. So "salmon" they called it. Now, although ichthyologists say it is technically a different fish, the name "salmon" sticks to this Pacific Ocean species, and probably always will.

Salmon belong to that class of fish which spawn in fresh water, but live most of their lives in salt water. Five varieties, pinks, reds, medium reds, chums, and kings—each with an array of other names—range in weight up to a hundred pounds. Pinks, the smallest variety, have a life cycle of only 2 years. They spawn in fresh-water streams, the young go forth to the ocean. In the second year they return to fresh water to spawn and die. Red salmon normally extend the life cycle to 4 years, 5 years in the Far North. Except in the case of pinks, as to which scientists are still arguing, it is believed that salmon return to the identical streams in which they were spawned.

Because salmon only return to fresh water when they feel the sexual urge, and because it is at that time that they have built up the necessary energy to drive their way upstream and have therefore reached the maximum size and quality, also because that quality in turn decreases coincidentally with their ascent of the fresh-water streams, the logical time to catch salmon is as they approach the coast from the sea.

And because Pacific coast salmon spawn but once, then die, it is essential to the annual recurrence of the runs that a sufficient number of salmon be permitted to reach the spawning grounds each year. Accordingly, maximum production can be maintained only by restricting salmon fishing to the salt waters adjacent to the coast and carefully ensuring adequate escapement into the streams. These factors make it necessary to prohibit exploitation of salmon fisheries by invading foreigners whose sole interest is to obtain the largest immediate catch regardless of the disastrous effect on the future supply. On the other hand, the regularity of the salmon life cycle lends itself to systematic regulation by Government authorities clothed with proper authority.

The future of the Alaska salmon industry is assured except for two threats—one foreign, the other domestic. A few years ago, the Japanese, operating in complete contempt for our conservation measures, made serious inroads. No misguided altruism should be permitted to write into the peace of any other treaty, provisions which would permit the Japanese or any other exploiters to defeat the sound plans evolved by the United States and Canada for the perpetuation of their Northwest fisheries.

The domestic threat is one of almost unbelievable inconsistency. The Fish and Wildlife Service, which has done such constructive work in fishery conservation, is now a branch of the Department of the Interior which, through one of those peculiar quirks of the present Secretary, is sponsoring a movement to take the fisheries of Alaska away from the white fishermen and operators and turn them over to a handful of Indians. This is on the quaint theory that because a century ago natives caught what fish they needed to eat, they are now not only entitled to continue to do so (as they are) and to fish in equal competition in the commercial fisheries (as they are), but that they are entitled also to a monopoly of the commercial fisheries.

Alaska with its normal pack of more than 6,000,000 cases of canned salmon (a standard case consists of 48 1-pound cans) produces more than one-half of the entire world's supply. Prior to the war a small portion of this pack was sold abroad but most of it was consumed by the American public. With the war came a new appreciation of the special value of this product because of its essential protein and vitamin content, its palatability, and the facility with which it may be transported, stored, and distributed, regardless of climate.

Second Alaska fishery in importance is that for halibut. This also has international complexities. Halibut are found in that part of the high seas which are over the so-called continental shelf, the comparatively shallow portion of the ocean bordering the shoreline but extending sometimes as much as a hundred miles seaward. Halibut are also found in the numerous salt water channels of Southeastern Alaska and British Columbia.

Overfishing following the First World War so depleted the halibut stock that it became hardly worthwhile for the fishermen to visit the banks. Then Canada and the United States tried an experiment. They created the International Fisheries Commission; first had it investigate the situation, then gave the commission power to formulate regulations which, when approved by the executives of the two nations, have the effect of law within each country and as to the citizens and vessels of both countries on the high seas. So successful has this cooperation been that these North Pacific banks now furnish the finest halibut fishing in the world.

It is believed by the Commission that the stock of halibut is still capable of substantial increase. There are also those who believe that if similar methods were applied to black cod and other fisheries, similar results might be achieved, resulting in further opportunities for employment and the production of an increased quantity of wholesome food.

Other Alaska fisheries are herring, cod, crab, and shrimp. Some of these, particularly the crab, show opportunity for increase. Prior to the present war, the Japanese came to the Alaska side of Bering Sea, caught and canned crabs caught there, and then sold the product largely in this country's markets. It is hoped that Americans will now develop this important fishery. But it is probable that the largest undeveloped fishery in Alaskan waters is for so-called bottom fish through the method known as trawling.

Trawling consists of dragging a net, which has a widely extended mouth, along the ocean bottom. The type of net now in general use is known as an otter trawl. In the North Sea trawling has been done for many years, but only recently in this country. Thus, New England figures go back only to 1905, yet in 1943 trawlers from Boston, Gloucester, and Portland, Maine, landed almost 300,000,000 pounds of fish. And in the State of Washington the number of trawlers has increased from about half a dozen in 1930 to almost 200 in 1944.

The rocky bottoms common in many southeastern Alaska channels do not lend themselves to this kind of fishing. But Government investigation just before the war disclosed the existence of huge bottom areas to the westward which are ideal for trawling. Great quantities of sole, pollock, gray cod, and crabs were procured by this method. Japanese successfully engaged in trawling on the American side of Bering Sea by "mothering" their trawlers with large vessels equipped as floating refrigerator plants. By similar practice, or by the erection of conveniently located shore cold-storage facilities, American operators have an opportunity to build up a substantial new phase of the fishing industry in Alaskan waters.

Alaska fisheries now afford more employment than all other industries of the Territory. They pay more taxes. They are the backbone of its present economy. Some of these fisheries approach as great an annual production as is reasonably to be expected. Others disclose prospects for further substantial development. If Alaska could be relieved from being an experiment station for bureaucratic control, its fisheries should furnish opportunities for many more Americans who, like Alaska's present fishermen, dare face Nature in her rugged grandeur and are not afraid of work.

Set-back in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 6, 1945:

SET-BACK IN POLAND

Although it had been clearly foreshadowed, Russia's recognition of the Lublin committee as the provisional government of Poland can hardly fail to aggravate the political differences among the principal Allied Powers.

Poland is a member of the United Nations—the first to resist Nazi aggression. It has suffered as much as any Allied country, if not more, at the hands of the Germans. Yet the outlook for the Poles, even after victory, is not hopeful, for the establishment of the Lublin committee as the functioning government may mean that Poland has fought one form of totalitarianism only to be engulfed by another.

In the political sense, this latest development presents the most serious difficulties. Moscow, having extended recognition to the Lublin group, which has been operating under Russian auspices, presumably will refuse henceforth even to discuss the future of Poland with the Polish Government in exile. London has announced that it will continue to recognize the government in exile for the time being, although Prime Minister Churchill has evidenced sympathy with the Russian territorial demands on Poland. Our own Government has not wavered in its recognition of the government in exile, and, in fact, the State Department took occasion to reaffirm its recognition immediately after the latest Russian move.

If the British adhere to their present position, the result would be a political deadlock with respect to Poland between London and Washington on the one hand and Moscow on the other. But the Russians are not apt to let matters rest there. The Red Army already stands just across the Vistula from Warsaw, and before many months have passed it will in all probability have driven the Germans from the entirety of Poland. Then the Lublin group will function in all of Poland as it has been functioning already in the liberated areas—as the Polish government in fact. When that time comes it seems quite likely that the Russians will come to an agreement with the Lublin group on all outstanding Polish issues, and we, and perhaps the Brtish, would then find ourselves confronted with a settlement of the Polish question which we might disapprove, but which we could hardly undertake to disturb.

If we had ground for belief that the Lublin group was truly representative of the Poles, the outlook would be less disquieting. But that, unhappily, is not the case. The most reliable authority on this point is Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, who resigned as Polish Premier when the government in exile refused to support his program for coming to terms with Russia. Mikolaczyk supposedly is looked upon with favor in Moscow. Mr. Churchill has said that he has the greatest respect for him. Yet Mikolajczyk declared earlier this week that Russian recognition of the Lublin group would be counter to the wishes of the great mass of the Polish people, and he added that if the American, British, and French Governments were to follow Moscow's lead, the result would be a Communist and, therefore, a puppet Poland.

Statesmen or Politicians?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following editorial from the Fort Smith, Ark., Southwest Times Record, appearing January 7, 1945, as follows:

STATESMEN OR POLITICIANS?

The Seventy-ninth Congress, which opened Wednesday, will enact legislation which will affect the life of every citizen of the United States in the immediate future and for generations to come. The decisions it reaches will influence standards of living, taxes, wages and salaries, and every other condition of life—directly or indirectly—of the people of Fort Smith and of every other community in the land.

What are these men in whom so much power and responsibility are vested—politicians or statesmen?

Let's save time and admit that they are all politicians while some may prove to be statesmen. The important question is: What kind of politicians are these representatives of the people?

Here are two Webster definitions of politics: In the positive sense it is "the science and art of government; the science of dealing with the organization, regulation, and administration of the business of a state, in both its internal and external affairs"; in the negative sense politics is a "dishonest management to secure the success of political candidates or parties."

Which of these is to characterize the work of Members of this Congress? Probably every Member of the body went to Washington in high hope of proving himself an able practitioner of the positive brand of politics. Some will not succeed. There will be those who fail for lack of tact or other similar personal qualification, and there will be others who yield to temptation to practice negative politics—to work for personal success and that of the party instead of placing first emphasis upon the welfare of the country.

Well, is the matter out of the hands of the people who elected them?

Not unless the public is willing to sit back and leave its representatives without guidance.

The man who goes to Washington to voice the will of his constituents cannot consistently do that unless he is kept informed, not by pressure groups, but by the people themselves. With the best intentions in the world, he may yet be misguided as to the changing sentiment of the public. Naturally, he is not a mere machine for the unreasoning casting of ballots as he has been instructed. He was elected in the hope that he had sufficient intelligence and wisdom to formulate judgments and initiate legislation on his own. But he was elected also in the hope that he would do these things in the light of the will of the citizens of his State or district. He cannot do this through intuition alone. If the people fail to keep him informed as to their attitudes, they have no right to complain if he acts on a basis of such expression as has been forthcoming and it develops that this expression came from selfish interests.

As for the legislator who is tempted to stray into the field of negative politics for benefit of self and party, or who shortsightedly believes this is the best way to serve his people, adequate expression of the opinions of his constituents will probably straighten him out.

In other words, the private citizen's share in representative government is not fulfilled when he casts his vote in an election. He has the additional duty of keeping himself informed upon vital questions and of helping his Representative or Senators keep informed as to true public sentiment.

This does not mean that every citizen should be a chronic writer of letters to Congressmen. He should write letters on occasion—and this should not be done only in those situations in which he has a selfish interest. There are other ways, however, in which public sentiment makes itself known. The important thing is that this sentiment be based on knowledge and understanding. This cannot be true unless citizens are consistent students of the affairs of the national enterprise of which they are part. How many of us qualify?

If the new Congress includes some nincompoops and men who are less than honest, so does the public it represents—and in greater proportion. Taken as a whole the Seventy-ninth, like its predecessors, is made up of capable men who want to do what is

best. They cannot do this successfully without the help of the general public. One way in which the individual citizen can help is to follow news reports and interpretations day by day, analyze them to the best of his ability, lend his support to that which seems for the general good, and oppose that which is calculated to serve selfish interests—including his own.

A Wrong to Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday there appeared in the New York Herald Tribune a report of an address delivered by Frederick C. Crawford, former president of the National Association of Manufacturers, before a gathering of that body. To say the least it was an amazing exhibition of self-assurance that cannot but lay the speaker wide open to the charge of misrepresentation. None can now speak of conditions now existing in Norway with any degree of accuracy since nationals of the Allied Nations are not allowed to visit the country, which is held in an iron grasp by a ruthless invader. Many have tried times without number to get detailed and reliable information on what is going on in Norway, also as to the condition of the people, but to no avail. It is more than strange that Mr. Crawford has been able to get such information, especially since he did not visit Norway on his recent trip to Europe. Doubtless there are elements in all underground movements in the occupied countries that may be radical but to say that they constitute a majority is to make a statement that is not susceptible of proof. Certainly that is true as it applies to Norway whose people have for centuries been known for their industry, integrity, and frugality. Permit me to append herewith a letter written to the Herald-Tribune by the Ambassador of Norway in reply to the unfair and unfounded statement attributed to Mr. Crawford, which appeared in yesterday's issue:

A WRONG TO NORWAY

MR. CRAWFORD'S STRICTURES ON HER UNDERGROUND MOVEMENT RESENTED

To the New York Herald Tribune:

In your issue of January 5 you publish a report of a talk given by Mr. Frederick C. Crawford before the New York State Chamber of Commerce. The following statement is laid to Mr. Crawford:

"The underground in France and Belgium was composed largely of Communists, young people and underworld ex-convicts, who robbed 10 peaceful French families for every train that was blown up. A similar situation," Mr. Crawford said, "exists in Norway."

Mr. Crawford is grievously wrong.

The Norwegian people's unyielding resistance to the Nazis for more than 4½ years is a people's movement and is known in Norway as the home front, rather than the underground. Ninety-nine percent of the population, under the leadership of the bishops of Norway, the justices of the supreme court, the president of the University of Oslo, and others, have taken their uncompromising stand against the new-order barbarians. Not one report has come out of Norway of one single instance of a peaceful Norwegian family having been robbed by members of the underground or home front. The very idea of such a thing happening seems preposterous to every Norwegian. The ranks of our home front comprise men and women and children of every walk of life and every stratum of society.

The dark and bloody pages of Norwegian history covering these years are replete with known and anonymous fighters of the home front, who, against dreadful odds, have beaten down every Nazi attempt to bend the freedom-loving Norwegians to the Herrenvolk's will. Many of our most prominent citizens have paid with their lives for resisting the Nazis, and countless others are languishing in concentration camps in Norway and Germany. Surely these people, martyrs of a noble cause, can not and will not be placed in the categories drawn up by Mr. Crawford with such lack of familiarity with actual conditions and indifference to the spiritual quality of the fight against Nazism.

To tell the factual story of Norway's home front on would need the space of a hundred heavy volumes rather than the limited columns of a busy newspaper. I shall, therefore, have to refrain from going into detail. But it is of more than passing interest to note that the man in Norway whose position in peacetime would correspond fairly closely to that high post held by Mr. Crawford as former president of the National Association of Manufacturers is Mr. Paul Frank, president of Norway's Commerce Association, and that Mr. Frank has spent a considerable part of the last 4½ years as a prisoner of the Nazis for his fearless resistance to the "new order."

W. MORGENSTIERNE,
Ambassador of Norway.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 6, 1945.*

Editorial Comment on the President's Annual Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Humanity Will Not Permit Our Failure," published in the Chicago Sun, and also an editorial entitled "State of the Union," published in the Washington Star of January 7, 1945, both editorials dealing with the President's message to Congress on the state of the Union.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun]

"HUMANITY WILL NOT PERMIT OUR FAILURE"

President Roosevelt, in laying his report on the state of the Nation before Congress yesterday, knew that he was addressing a deeply troubled America.

Our people, and Congress, are concerned over the immediate progress of the war in Europe. Our people, and all responsible Members of Congress, are even more concerned about the shape of the peace.

So is the President—on both those scores. His message grappled with the realities which America wants met. In grappling with them—if he failed to give us blueprints for solution of all the problems we want solved—he gave us sane and strong advice. He gave us promise of enlightened leadership. With fighting courage, he told us that we can and we shall, with devotion and good will, win a coalition war and a democratic peace of unity. We shall not surrender to the disillusionment of 1920.

As regards the war itself, the President's ringing confidence is based on solid realities. We have taken a hard blow on the western front. Germany will never be defeated until the last Nazi surrenders; but the tide has turned in the West; we are attacking. Whatever the immediate fortunes of battle, overwhelming power that spells total victory over Germany and Japan is in capable Allied hands. Only a political wedge between the Allies could save the warlords of either land. There is no wedge deep enough today to stave off their defeat; and in President Roosevelt we have, as this message demonstrated once more, a pillar of strength against division.

But the burdens of war are great. The casualties will be heavy. Essential goals of war production are not being met. That means a clear obligation of the American home-front and the American Congress, and the President did not mince declaring it.

If we are to give the support that is due to the average, hard-fighting young Americans who carry the weight of battle, Congress will enact a national service act, assuring that our civilian manpower fairly and democratically meets production necessities.

Pending full-scale national service, legislation to mobilize IV-F's for essential war work, as asked by the President, can be a partial, stop-gap solution—but it is no substitute for the full solution.

The call for legislation to apply selective service for Army nurses is obviously an emergency must. Our wounded must have care, the heroic nurses now serving must not be forced to break under the strain.

Our supreme objective, aside from victory in war itself, is defined by the President as it should be defined: The organization of the world for peace; an organization democratic, flexible, serving security through justice; an organization which must be the justification of all the dreadful misery that this world has endured. It should be launched early in 1945.

In itself, this organization can be the most powerful of all antidotes to the specific political sores and diseases which trouble us and trouble the President—problems like the Greek and Polish crises and their menacing effect upon full allied unity. Once America convinces the world that we are wholly committed to collective security, then can we wield trebled influence for the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which the President upholds, as against actions of unilateral might.

But rightly—and, we earnestly trust, with tremendous resolution—the President indicated that our Government would meantime wield its utmost weight for sound specific solutions. We shall, he says, use our influence now to secure as far as is humanly possible fulfillment of the Atlantic Charter's principles. This means that the President, in his forthcoming meeting with Messrs. Churchill and Stalin, has a vast assignment to help bring light over Poland, Greece, Italy, and other tortured lands. The Nation's prayers will go with him.

Yet there was nothing in his address, and no reality before the Nation, more urgent than his warning against betrayal by perfectionism. Disillusionment because we behold injustice can, as the President declared, as

surely destroy the peace as can the power politics or the blatant isolationism which he decries.

We cannot permit democracy to fail, we cannot permit our alliance to be split. That is the dual framework within which we must work. We shall not, as after World War No. 1, doom peace by preferring international anarchy to international cooperation with nations which did not see exactly as we did." In building the justice of the United Nations, the aroused conscience of humanity will not permit failure.

The task belongs to the President, to Congress, to our allies, to us. If we are worthy of it—1945 can—in truth, be the greatest year of achievement in human history. And it needs to be.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of January 7, 1945]

STATE OF THE UNION

President Roosevelt takes on full stature as a wartime leader of all the people in his 1945 message to Congress on the state of the Union.

In the words of Winston Churchill, he has exposed the "grim bare bones" of the problem confronting this country as we move into what is unquestionably the most critical phase of the war. Stated in its simplest terms, the problem is to win this war of national survival at the earliest possible time and to make certain, so far as it lies within our power to do so, that the world will not again have recourse to arms in the settlement of international disputes.

If this is to be done, we can no longer tolerate half-measures. For long, tortured months the men at the battle fronts have been fighting a total war. Many of us at home have yet to learn what that term means. But the pressures of total war are irresistible, and this year will find those pressures closing in around us.

The President, in calling for a maximum effort from the whole Nation, kept his sense of proportion. In 3 years of war our armed forces have made splendid progress. Mr. Roosevelt reported on that progress with justifiable pride. The military victories were made possible by production of an infinite variety of weapons—an accomplishment which has been the marvel of the world.

Yet the fact remains—and the experience of the battlefield confirms it—that we are doing enough. In 1945, and perhaps in 1946, there must be even more production, more effort, more sacrifice, more of that will-to-win which counts no exertion as being too great. And, with all of this, there must be the firm resolve to move forward toward the ultimate goal of a strong America in a secure world.

To meet immediate demands the President asked for amendment of the Selective Service Act to provide for the induction of nurses into the armed forces. He requested the immediate enactment of legislation permitting use of IV–F's in whatever capacity is best for the war effort. He declared that we must have universal military training after the war as an "essential factor in the maintenance of peace," and he said that he would submit a special message on this subject. These are minimum requests, and it is reasonable to expect that they will be granted. The real test of the intentions of Congress—and indirectly that means the intentions of the people—will come in the action taken on the President's forthright and unqualified appeal for adoption of a national service act.

As Mr. Roosevelt put it, the fighting man wants, needs, and is entitled to insist upon our full and active support—now. That is a simple statement of fact, and the only question is whether the people at home really want to give the fullest measure of support to the men they have sent off to war.

The President had asked for a national service act a year ago. But his request at that time was qualified and weakened because it was conditioned on the adoption of other things—a "realistic" tax law, a "cost of food" law, etc. Unless these other measures were adopted, he said, he "would not recommend" a national service law, and that reservation proved fatal. But this year his request is unconditional and urgent. The hope of victory in Europe in 1944 is gone, the war is mounting in its fury, and first things must be put first.

Underlying the urgency of his appeal is the knowledge that American men are suffering and dying around the world while other men are quitting their jobs in war plants; while still others, men and women, should be, but are not, in essential work. Underlying it, too, is the President's knowledge that, despite excellent past performances, manpower shortages are causing lags in critical production programs, are delaying the return to action of damaged fighting ships, are impairing the output of new and better weapons which, in the hands of our troops, would mean the loss of fewer American lives. In a word, we are capable of more than we are doing. The voluntary methods of the past 3 years have been tried and found wanting. If we are to give our fighting men that last full measure of support which the furious character of the war demands, the Government must be empowered to use compulsion on the home front when all other means have failed.

To those who have been clamoring for blueprints and formulas precisely defining America's position in relation to every conceivable international problem, the President's views on foreign policy will be read with something less than satisfaction. But considering the present state of the world with the war reaching new peaks of violence and with the internal politics of the liberated and semi-liberated lands unavoidably in a condition of either flux or confusion, it is difficult to see how Mr. Roosevelt could have expressed himself better or more specifically.

The United States, says the President, still adheres to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and will do its best, now and in the future, to secure, so far as is humanly possible, the fulfillment of those principles. Economic and military strength is an important and inescapable factor in international politics, but in keeping with the charter and with American tradition, the policy of this country is that all such power "must be linked with responsibility and obliged to defend and justify itself within the framework of the general good." Thus, for example, power cannot very well defend or justify itself if it is used during this troubled interim period in the liberated lands to "block the eventual exercise of the peoples' right freely to choose the government and institutions under which, as freemen, they are to live." Accordingly, as a matter of policy, "we and our allies have a duty, which we cannot ignore, to use our influence to the end that no temporary or provisional authorities—in Poland, Greece, or elsewhere—will be allowed to prevent popular elections later on when it will be possible to hold them.

But in reaffirming these and other principles the President wisely emphasizes that this an imperfect world and that although the Atlantic Charter is a good, useful and essential statement of objectives, those objectives do not provide rules of easy application to each and every problem now pressing for solution or still in the making. He is frankly concerned about situations like those obtaining in Greece and Poland, but there is no simple answer to them from the American standpoint. His views seem to reduce themselves to the basic thesis that while the objectives of the Atlantic Charter must be sought after with the utmost earnestness, the making of a sound peace also requires that the American people, and other peoples as well, cultivate an understanding, tolerant and patient frame of mind. For we and our allies are not always going to see and think alike, and international cooperation and progress are not helped by any nation assuming that it has a monopoly of wisdom and virtue. Perfectionism can be as dangerous as it is unrealistic. If we are to guard against extremes of disillusionment, then we must take the mistakes, the disappointments and the imperfections in stride, realizing that they are almost inevitable.

It is a wholesome frame of mind that President Roosevelt appeals for. If we can have it, then we can proceed at once, as he urges, to enlarge upon what has been achieved already at Dumbarton Oaks and establish without delay, during this year, the permanent machinery for the maintenance of world peace.

The keynote of the President's discussion of domestic affairs, unrelated to the prosecution of the war or to foreign policy, is that an enduring peace cannot be achieved without a strong America—strong in the social and economic sense as well as in the military sense.

His conception of a socially and economically strong America is based on acceptance of that second bill of rights outlined to Congress last year, of which the right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation is fundamental. In painting an outline of the post-war prosperity to supply 60,000,000 post-war jobs, the President wields his brush in broad strokes.

We shall rely "as much as possible" on private enterprise, based on "initiative and vigorous competition," freed of monopolies and cartels, with the Government standing by to share the risks involved in private financing of new facilities, plants, and equipment.

Along with the development of natural resources, which the President exemplifies in the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority, will come the construction of civil airports and great highways, urban redevelopment and provision of decent housing—needed undertakings which, on top of a resumption of normal manufacture, should supply "millions of productive jobs" under private enterprise, yielding and maintaining a national income high enough to "provide for an orderly retirement of the public debt along with tax reduction."

It is not necessary to accept in detail this alluring prospect of post-war America in order to catch and feel something of its inspiration. Most of us have some faint idea of the problems to follow the collapse of our war-supported national economy. Yet the amazing feats of production accomplished already in this war have given us the faint outlines of new and promising horizons that peace will make more attainable. The progress that can be made toward these horizons by American initiative and resourcefulness, without dependence on Government spending, controls and restrictions of individual freedom, will measure our real progress. The only spirit with which to face this future is the spirit of confidence in the American people.

There will be debate, as there should be, over putting into immediate effect the revolutionary measures in total mobilization of civilians for which the President has asked. But no citizen now can remain unconscious of the silent pleadings in support of those measures, pleadings which take form in the lengthening columns of names on every new list of the wounded, the missing, and the dead.

Go North, Young Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Alaska, our largest Territory, has played an important part in the prosecution of the war. In the post-war period it is destined to become of strategic importance by reason of our war experiences. The Alaskan Highway, the airway from continental United States to Asia and the Old World over Alaska, and the key position of the territory in our national defense, have brought this great northland to our attention. Alaska will become in the post-war period the one remaining frontier with the resources for national development and the territory for our increasing population.

Governor Gruening of the Territory of Alaska, has performed an outstanding service in his administration of this great Territory and in making known to the people of America the possibilities of this intriguing country. Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, who was aide-de-camp to General O'Connor of the Northwest Command during the days of the construction of the Alaskan Highway, has written an interesting and instructive article on the Alaskan Territory and the role played by Governor Gruening, under the title "Go North, Young Man," which I include in these remarks.

The article follows:

[From Collier's of December 23, 1944]

GO NORTH, YOUNG MAN

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

(That's the motto of Ernest Gruening, Governor of Alaska. He wants colonists for his Territory, believing that, as the last American frontier, it offers a great future to young men and women of courage and resourcefulness.)

Whitehorse, on the Yukon River, can get very cold indeed. Scotch whisky has been known to freeze there (so has the antifreeze solution for United States Army trucks and bulldozers. Whitehorse is the place where a young clerk in a log bank named Robert Service wrote about Dangerous Dan McGrew, who was "pitched on his head and pumped full of lead" by a stranger from the Klondike diggin's. It also is where a chunky man with wide shoulders and chubby cheeks walked back and forth impatiently along the Yukon's icy shores on a recent winter morning. The Honorable Ernest Gruening, Governor of the Territory of Alaska, had a message in his parka pocket which he had to deliver the next afternoon to the opening session of the Alaska Territorial Legislature at Juneau, 220 wilderness miles off to the south.

But how to get to Juneau?

This was one of Whitehorse's cold days. It was 61 below. The tiny narrow-gage White Pass and Yukon Railroad was immobilized. The locomotives were frozen. The water towers were frozen. The switches were frozen. The roundhouse doors were frozen. Everything was frozen. Otherwise, the Governor might have jolted down to the gold-rush settlement of Skagway at tidewater, from where the Coast Guard would buck frigid seas to reach Juneau.

The Governor trudged to the barracks of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Could a dog sled get through the drifts in the Chilkoot? Inspector Croknhite regretfully shook his fur-topped head. The snow in the pass was over a malemute's head and up to a constable's armpits.

Next, the Honorable Ernest Gruening rode in a jeep at 61 below to the United States Army Air Force hangar on a bluff high above the frozen Yukon. Would the Air Force take him to Juneau? Weather looked at the Governor. "Governor," said Weather, "it's 61 below here. Maybe it's 75 below up above. And a heavy ground fog covers the airport at Juneau like a blanket. I wouldn't advise it, Governor."

The Honorable Ernest Gruening fingered the speech in the pocket of his parka. "I've got to get to Juneau," he repeated. "If anyone will fly me, I'll try it."

"I'll fly you, sir," said a blond young captain, putting on his fur jacket.

"Good boy!" said the Governor.

"Are you sure it's wise, Governor?" asked Col. Ken Bush, Chief of Staff of the American Army's Northwest Service Command.

"I'm going to Juneau," said the Governor.

Americans and Canadians lined the runway with prayers and crossed fingers as the Beechcraft skidded along the icy sod, and they hung grimly to the telegraph ticker until Juneau reported 3 hours later that the plane had slipped through a hole in the fog the size of a doily and deposited a slightly frozen Hon. Ernest Gruening on the airfield at the territorial capital.

Alaska's Governor is like that. In the 5 years since he came to the Far North in 1939, Ernest Gruening has tried to demonstrate personally that his country's vast Arctic outpost can be lived in and traveled in, the calendar around. In Aleutian williwaw and Yukon blizzard, he has visited every settlement in Alaska—the first Governor in Alaskan history to do so—and he has journeyed by any and all possible means of conveyance in doing it.

Gruening has traveled by dog sled along the shores of the Arctic Ocean, by passenger bus on the new Alaska Highway, by canoe on Kuskokwim River, by whaleboat in the Bering Sea, on foot to Indian villages in the Wrangell range, and by plane over nearly every acre of Alaska's 56,400 square miles. He has sold War bonds to Eskimos on St. Lawrence Island, and he has administered first aid to a trapper who stuck his foot in his own bear trap. He has visited the far-flung posts of scarlet-coated Mounties in Canada's adjacent Yukon Territory, and he was in the bleak Aleutians when American soldiers wiped out the first invader of this continent in more than 100 years.

This ubiquitous behavior on the part of Alaska's 57-year-old Governor is due to a conviction which has become almost a shibboleth with him. He is convinced that Alaska has never had so great an opportunity to develop from a sprawling wilderness into an integrated part of North American civilization. He would like to have seven-league boots so that he could roam the territory at will, doing his share in the conversion.

"This is the biggest hour in Alaskan history," Gruening told Congressman HOMER ANGELL of the House Committee on Territories when they conferred at the high-pillared executive mansion in Juneau. "Several hundred thousand soldiers, sailors, and Coast Guard men have served on Alaskan soil since 1941. These men know Alaska, and they are the Alaskan frontiersmen and settlers of the future. The clock has struck for Alaska. If Alaska hears the tones, Alaska will be the forty-ninth star in the American flag. I predict statehood for Alaska within a reasonable time."

And when he fished for halibut and salmon in Auk Bay with Alaska's most distinguished visitor of all Gruening repeated his contention that Alaska does not need to remain a vast solitude, with scarcely more civilian residents now than it had during the gold rush of 1898. He told President Roosevelt as they dipped their lines in the blue waters of the Inside Passage that Alaska's inhabitants numbered 64,636 when tooth-sized nuggets were being sluiced out of Bonanza Creek and only 72,524—nearly half of them Indians and Eskimos—almost 50 years later. Where else under the American flag had time stood so still? The Governor cited the fact that Alaska, 14 times the area of Iceland, cannot begin to match Iceland's population.

And so it was that on his return from the North the President said to the Nation: "We were told that a number of officers and men are considering settling in Alaska after the war is over. I do hope that this is so, because the development of Alaska has only been scratched and it is still the country of the pioneers. I am going to set up a study of Alaska as a place to which veterans of this war, especially those who do not have strong home roots, can go to become pioneers. Alaska is a land with a very small population, but I am convinced that it has great opportunities for those who are willing to work and to help build up all kinds of things in new lands."

ON A PAR WITH SCANDINAVIA

This was music in Gruening's ears. In his opinion, few Americans realize the measureless expanses yet unsettled in Alaska. Timbered uplands and broad valleys are tolled off there by horizons rather than miles. The 12,000,000 people of the Scandinavian countries dwell in a smaller area than Alaska's handful of natives and whites. Trondheim, Norway, is near the same latitude as Ketchikan, Alaska, but Trondheim supports 55,000 inhabitants and Ketchikan 4,500.

President Roosevelt had this in mind when he said at Seattle that Alaska's "climate and crops and other resources are not essentially different from those of northern Europe—Sweden and Norway and Finland, where the people, in spite of the cold and the winter darkness, have brought their civilizations to a very high and very prosperous level."

Ernest Gruening believes that history justified these high hopes for Alaska. The men who came home from the War of 1812 opened up the plains beyond St. Louis. Veterans of the Civil War first broke the sod of many mountain valleys along the Pacific seaboard. Gruening is sure that Alaska will be settled and colonized by the soldiers of this war.

"Young men, following Horace Greeley's advice, have always gone West when they returned from the battlefields," he said not long ago. "This time I think they will go north. That is our motto now in Alaska: 'Go north, young man, go north.'"

The War Department, echoing Gruening's optimism, has just issued a discussion pamphlet for G. I.'s entitled "What Has Alaska to Offer Post-war Pioneers?" The pamphlet tells soldiers: "Alaska, America's continental outpost, is our last frontier. In its own way, it is as rich and varied as the land to which the Pilgrims came more than 300 years ago. It is almost unsettled in comparison with similarly situated lands in northern Europe. The war has greatly speeded up its development, has linked it with the rest of the United States by a new system of highways and airways, and has brought into its borders thousands of young men and hundreds of young women who would never otherwise have visited it. Alaska offers twentieth-century pioneers a challenge—and an opportunity."

In the three-fourths of a century since Czar Alexander II of Russia parted with Alaska for something like 2 cents an acre, no governor has seen such momentous events as Ernest Gruening. When in 1939 he jour-

neyed north with his first Presidential appointment in his brief case, the sole military installation in the Territory consisted of three companies of infantry at Chilkoot Barracks near Skagway—and their guns pointed not westward toward Japan but northward toward our Canadian allies. The post was a hold-over from the gold rush, when soldiers and Mounties patroled the border.

Today, 5 years later, Alaska is one of the most heavily defended areas under the American flag. Bases dot the volcanic Aleutians. On huge airfields in the interior, lend-lease fighters and bombers are transferred to Soviet crews. The Alaska Highway is a first land link with the rest of North America. Along the highway, the United States Army Signal Corps has built a 2,000-mile telephone system, tying Alaska by voice as well as by truck to the interior of the continent. And from countless Alaskan coves and fjords and inlets extend docks and wharves and breakwaters for the use of the Navy, Coast Guard, and Army Transport Service.

Watching all this from the colonial-pillared executive mansion at Juneau, Ernest Gruening came to the conclusion 3 or 4 years ago that it was now or never for Alaska. He began visiting Army bases in all kinds of weather. He chatted with thousands of officers and enlisted men. He sold a number of officers on plans for a post-war hunting lodge within sight of Mount McKinley's 20,300-foot ramparts. He convinced Brig. Gen. James A. "Patsy" O'Connor, engineer builder of the Alaska Highway, that a dairy farm amidst the meadows near Juneau could be an ideal place to retire when peace comes once more. And he assured G. I.'s from every State in the Union that Alaska offers a future to young men with imagination, courage, and resourcefulness.

After Gruening's hair-raising flight from Whitehorse at 61 below, his friend E. L. (Bob) BARTLETT, who has just been elected Alaska's new Delegate in Congress, observed, "Ernest would fly in a chicken coop held together with Christmas-tree tinsel in weather cold enough to freeze a polar bear, if he thought he was on his way to talk to some soldiers about settling in Alaska after the war."

Ironically enough, this man who believes so fervently in the post-war possibilities of the Arctic wilderness has been a dyed-in-the-wool inhabitant of great cities during most of his life. And even more ironically, although he was brought up to be a physician and actually has an M. D. degree, he did not lift a stethoscope or scalpel for 25 years until he discovered that an Alaskan Governor visiting far-flung Indian villages and isolated mining camps might well combine medical assistance with civil administration.

The Governor of our loneliest land was born in our biggest city in 1887. Ernest's father, Emil Gruening, was a celebrated eye, ear, nose, and throat specialist, and Ernest followed in the family tradition. He went to Harvard Medical School, graduated with honors and was assigned to the surgical service of the Boston City Hospital. But he read travel books instead of anatomies, and on ambulance rides he watched newspaper reporters at work.

One December day he took off his surgical gown and applied for a job on the Boston American. When he was accepted, his career in medicine was at an end. Journalism, he decided after a few weeks, was definitely his field. He had a flair for it. Writing came easily to him. He thought up all sorts of crusades and campaigns. Two years later he was managing editor of the Evening Traveler.

Gruening resisted Boston's rigid censorship and defended the quality and propriety of books and plays which had been banned in that city. When his paper retracted an accusation against a wealthy politician—an accusation Gruening believed to be true—he removed his name from the masthead, called his staff together and announced his resignation.

A CRUSADING JOURNALIST

He moved back to the place of his birth as managing editor of the old New York Tribune. During the first World War he enlisted in the field artillery. In 1921 he went with The Nation and commenced a crusade against what he called "dollar diplomacy" in Latin America. This got him interested in Mexico, South America, Canada, Alaska, the Philippines and other neighbors and possessions. He began to write books advocating a policy which he termed that of the "good neighbor." He demanded an end to the occupation of Nicaragua by our marines, and a series of articles from his pen helped bring about an investigation by Senator Medill McCormick of American military occupation of Haiti.

Gruening moved to Maine, where he founded the Portland Evening News and carried on a vigorous campaign against the Insull utility empire. One of his principal allies was a young politician named OWEN BREWSTER, now United States Senator from Maine.

In all these causes, Gruening occupied a strictly middle-of-the-road position. He denounced interference in the affairs of Latin-American countries by American banks and industries, but he also warned of the deteriorating influence exercised by Communists and extreme radicals. In 1924, Gruening took a leading part in the Presidential campaign of "Battling Bob" LaFollette, and 8 years later he was an active supporter of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

One of the new President's first acts was to send Gruening to Montevideo as adviser to the United States Delegation to the Inter-American Conference. There the policy of the good neighbor became the official policy of the United States Government. A year later Gruening was appointed director of the newly created Division of Territories and Island Possessions, in the Department of the Interior. This took him to Alaska on numerous inspection trips, and he became an enthusiastic advocate of the future ahead of the vast arctic outpost.

In 1939, President Roosevelt named this booster for the land of Boreas to be Governor of the country's largest Territorial possession. A few months ago he appointed Gruening to another 4-year term, and the appointment was unanimously confirmed by the United States Senate.

In this arctic domain, Gruening is an exponent of "the strenuous life," once championed so ardently by Teddy Roosevelt. He hikes up the lofty mountains which tower behind Juneau, and he and his wife, the former Dorothy Smith of Boston, go swimming in the chilly waters of the Inside Passage. Congressional visitors dip in one toe, look up at the glaciers which nourish the fjords and then decide to do their bathing back in the Executive Mansion in the bathtub.

THE GENERALS COULDN'T TAKE IT

Gruening is chunky and strong. On a hike up the slopes of Mount McKinley National Park with Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner and Lt. Julius Edelstein, aide to Admiral Leahy, the Governor made both his companions holler "Uncle" before he consented to rest. He eats big meals with lots of meat and smokes a dozen fat cigars a day. Alaskan meats—moose, reindeer, caribou, mountain sheep—are among his favorites. All his annual reports to Secretary Ickes emphasize the condition of the Territory's nomadic reindeer herds.

Gruening especially rejoices in the fact that two-thirds of the 162,071 reindeer in Alaska are owned by Indians and Eskimos. He has learned the language of the natives and he spends a large portion of his time visiting their villages. He is particularly angered when he sees a cafeteria or hotel in an Alaskan town with the sign "We Do Not Cater to Native Trade." He hopes the coming session of the Territorial legislature will enact a law forbidding discrimination against Indians and Eskimos.

"The ancestors of these people were living here when the first white men came to Alaska," Gruening once declared indignantly. "They saw Baranof and Vancouver and Bering and all the other explorers land on Alaska's shores. How in righteousness and justice can we shun them in their own homeland?"

But the Governor's principal interest now is the development of Alaska by the veterans of World War No. 2. He has great hopes for Alaska as a tourist center. Frequently he has pointed out that Alaska has higher mountains than Switzerland, more fiords than Norway, finer fishing than California, better hunting than Ontario.

"The kind of tourist business to which Alaska is entitled," he said recently, "would employ thousands of people and would be highly appropirate for returning servicemen, particularly those who have been on duty in Alaska. They could combine guiding, ranger work and the management of small camps and lodges, of which Alaska can use many hundreds."

Soldiers all over the globe have written Gruening asking advice on how and where to settle in Alaska. This interest encourages him. He kept in his wallet a clipping from Yank, the Army weekly, telling that Sgt. William Koeninger, of Chillicothe, Tex., had selected an upland lake along the Alaska Highway as a place to open a tourist camp.

"That's the kind of specific plans we need," the Governor said. "Alaska will be the tourist mecca of the Western Hemisphere. Air lines have been developed by the Army and Navy. Alaska is on the direct route to Russia and the Orient. One highway already leads overland to Russia, and I am sure that other roads and perhaps even a railway will be constructed as post-war projects. Thousands of men and women will see Alaska's scenery and they will choose for themselves places to locate in the Territory."

The arrival in Alaska of the first Army nurses was warmly applauded by the Governor, as well as by the G. I.'s. He has always deplored the fact that Alaska has nearly three white men to every white woman. He also believes that the soldiers who have disliked their Alaskan service have been influenced mainly by the absence of female companionship.

"Alaska needs families, real families," Gruening has said many times. "I believe that a lot of soldiers will want to come back here with their wives after the war is over. I always am glad to see nurses, school-teachers, stenographers, and girl clerks come to Alaska. They get married and that adds to the wealth of the Territory, for the value of any land is in the homes and hearths it maintains."

However, the Governor has often warned that pioneering in Alaska is not a bed of roses. Few of the rural areas have electricity. Indoor plumbing does not exist on a frontier. Clearing brush and stumps from virgin land is the hardest kind of work. Lonely surroundings and the prolonged winter darkness present stern psychological handicaps. The North can strike swiftly and savagely against its challengers. An entire patrol of Mounties, veterans of the Arctic, once perished on the Yukon Trail from Dawson to McPherson.

"There is ample opportunity in Alaska," said Governor Gruening to a group of congressional visitors at Juneau, "but it is not opportunity of the magic-carpet variety. Neither is it opportunity involving great wealth and sudden riches. No longer can a man kneel on the edge of a creek and sift out a thousand dollars' worth of nuggets in a

few days. The opportunity in Alaska now demands persistence, elbow grease, a rugged physique, and the willingness to forego many of civilization's pleasures and comforts."

Three main areas offer a chance to farm. They are the timbered Kenai Peninsula, the Tanana Valley near Fairbanks, and the Matanuska colony, where 200 families cultivate 80-acre plots in the shadow of Mount McKinley. The growing season is approximately 115 days. All crops common to North America will thrive except corn, tomatoes, and the orchard fruits. American soldiers on duty in Alaska have eaten strawberries as big as a fist and potatoes the size of elephant's ears. Last year Alaskan farmers sold the Army $750,000 worth of produce; the Army would have bought more had it been available.

Yet Governor Gruening has warned that agriculture in Alaska will never be on a stable basis until marketing arrangements have been worked out which will enable Alaskan settlements to get many of their products from near-by farms instead of from far-off Seattle. "I know of instances," he has said, "in which peas or beans have been transported 1,200 miles from Puget Sound to Alaskan towns that could actually buy their vegetables from local Alaskan farmers."

Blame for this situation has been charged by Gruening to wholesalers who insist that they furnish every item sold by Alaskan merchants. In fact, Seattle and the Canadian prairie city of Edmonton are now engaged in a furious economic battle over Alaska's trade. Seattle was once the only gateway to the Far North, but the new air route pioneered by the Army now takes off from Edmonton. This is the series of wilderness fields via which planes are delivered to Russian crews at Fairbanks. The Alaska Military Highway connects these fields, and so for the first time since the thinly clad cheechakos traveled northward to seek gold in '98, Seattle has a rival as the portal to the Arctic.

Gruening is opposed to absentee ownership of Alaskan resources, regardless of from where it stems. He has frequently criticized the employment of nomadic workers who earn money in the Territory and then go outside by boat or plane to spend it. The election of BOB BARTLETT as Alaska's Delegate in Congress inspired Gruening to a long cheer because both BARTLETT and his wife were brought up in the Territory and got their education at the University of Alaska in Fairbanks. BARTLETT, who is Gruening's closest friend, once panned for gold in the creeks near Circle on the Yukon River, and then was secretary to Delegate Anthony J. (Tony) Dimond, who will be sworn in next month as Federal judge at Anchorage.

There are two definite schools of thought on the subject of Alaskan settlement. Tony Dimond, who has served longer in Congress than any other delegate in the history of the Territory, is sure that Alaska can rival the highly developed Scandinavian lands. He believes that Alaska equals Scandinavia in many resources and even surpasses it in others. For example, he contends that Sweden, with an agricultural population of 2,700,000 people, has less than half the farming and grazing area of Alaska. Doctor Vilhjalmur Stefansson, the noted explorer, backs up Dimond's contentions. In addition, Doctor Alfred H. Brooks, first head of the Alaskan Branch of the United States Geological Survey, long ago predicted that Alaska in time to come will be the home of at least 10,000,000 persons.

On the diametrically opposite side of the question are those who maintain that Alaska has been oversold to the American people. They think that only about 8,500 men and women can be added to the population of the Territory in the years immediately following the war, with fewer than 500 of these on farms. This group advocates a slow bell on any plans for Alaskan development and colonization. Its members have not forgotten that the late Maj. Gen. Wilds P. Richardson, for whom is named Alaska's largest military post—Fort Richardson at Anchorage—once cautioned against arousing false hopes about the economic possibilities of our vast northern bulwark.

PIONEER-TYPE SETTLERS WANTED

Gov. Ernest Gruening exudes optimism over the future of Alaska, but he believes that the potential settlers must fully realize the difficulties they will be up against. "We don't want to encourage any arctic replica of the Oklahoma land rush," he said recently. "Yet neither do we want to be so cautious and deliberate that Alaska fails to take advantage of this great opportunity. If caution had always prevailed in every council, Daniel Boone would not have gone to Kentucky, and Lewis and Clark would never have seen Oregon. I think Alaska can support a considerably larger population. But the men and women comprising that population must be prepared for hard knocks, strenuous work, drenching rainfall, long hours of darkness, and, in the interior, 60-below winters."

Post-war opportunities in the Land of the Midnight Sun, according to Gruening, will be highly diverse. He is sure that dairy farms and livestock grazing, commenced on a modest scale, can be conducted as successfully on the Kenai Peninsula or in the Tanana Valley as in many parts of Norway or Sweden. Fur farms, too, will thrive, he adds. Southeastern Alaska is mantled with a great green cloak of Sitka spruce, the best airplane wood in the world. Rafts of these lordly trees have been tugged 1,000 miles to Puget Sound for use in Mosquito bombers. Lesser forest species will support a pulp-and-paper industry producing nearly one-fourth of the needs of the United States, in the opinion of Lyle F. Watts, Chief of the United States Forest Service.

Governor Gruening thinks that a large permanent military establishment will be kept in Alaska, after the war. He has not overlooked the fact that the late Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell, our pioneer advocate of airpower, believed "he who holds Alaska holds the world."

"In post-war Alaska," the Governor has pointed out, "there will be soldiers and soldiers' families. These people will require grocery stores, newspapers, barber shops, beauty shops, beauty parlors, movie houses, jewelry stores, and bus lines. This means countless chances in business. Service shops and small businesses of all sorts will be needed. Alaska will be a place for a man with relatively little capital—perhaps $3,500 or $5,000. Opportunities of this sort are typically American in our best tradition."

Ernest Gruening and his wife have two of their sons, Hunt and Peter, in military service. They are both in the Army Air Corps, the elder pilots a B-24. A third son, Ernest, Jr., died in boyhood.

"My sons and millions like them in the armed services will be looking toward the horizons of the future when this war is over," the Governor of Alaska has said. "I should want nothing better for my own sons than that they might be pioneers—whether pioneers in business, agriculture, or professional life—in a new land on a new frontier. That is the opportunity Alaska offers our soldiers."

Equipment of the Army of the United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress, and particularly the Military Affairs Committee, an article by Hanson W. Baldwin appearing in the New York Times of January 5. This gentleman is rather generally accepted as an able and fair authority on military affairs. He makes the charge that the new German tanks have proven far superior to ours and he suggests very strongly to the Congress that it is high time an investigation be made as to this and other matters of policy in the War Department itself.

Mr. Speaker, I do not make this statement in any spirit of undue criticism, but I am seriously concerned, and I feel we all should be. The Congress has appropriated, as it should, whatever has been requested for our national defense. The Congress should determine whether our boys are getting the best type of equipment to meet the enemy. I feel it is time the Committee on Military Affairs look into the matter.

The article to which I refer follows:

THE GERMAN BLOW—NEW GERMAN TANKS PROVE SUPERIOR TO OURS—INQUIRY BY CONGRESS URGED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Allied troops, fighting through zero temperatures and driving snow, made progress yesterday in their attempts to nip off or eliminate the German Ardennes salient.

But in the Seventh Army sector from Bitche to the Rhine our thin line of doughfeet still gave ground slowly to the enemy, who has now eliminated nearly all our footholds in the Saar and is commencing to threaten communications of our forces in the Wissembourg gap and at Strasbourg.

Our drive against the Ardennes salient, moreover, will be handicapped—though it may well triumph over this handicap—by the technical superiority of the German tanks to our own.

Why, at this last stage in the war, are American tanks inferior to the enemy's?

That they are inferior the fighting in Normandy showed and the recent battles in the Ardennes have again emphatically demonstrated. This has been denied, explained away and hushed up, but the men who are fighting our tanks against much heavier, better armored and more powerfully gunned German monsters know the truth. It is high time that Congress got at the bottom of a situation that does no credit to the War Department.

This doesn't mean our tanks are bad. They are not; they are good. They are the best in the world—next to the Germans.

GERMAN TANKS BEST

The Germans are now using as the spearhead of their assault forces the Hunting Panther and the Royal Tiger tanks. These tanks, and the earlier models from which they were derived—the Panther and Tiger—are better all-round tanks than anything the Allies now have in the field. They are 10 to 37 tons heavier than the largest tank the Americans now have in battlefield use. With their new 88-millimeter guns, very heavy frontal armor, and wide tracks, they have more armor, more hitting power, and are better mudgoers than our tanks. They have a lower silhouette and their interior is less cluttered and more comfortable.

Our apologists have repeatedly said that we prefer a lighter tank with more maneuverability, but the Germans have demonstrated time and again the maneuverability of 45- to 72-ton tanks, and bridges and rivers have been no obstacle to them. And relatively recently we have been forced—belatedly and after too many men have died in lighter tanks—into building heavier tanks, some of which, it is to be hoped, may soon appear on the battlefield.

Other apologists have said that tactically we don't believe in fighting tanks with tanks. To which the only possible answer is an expletive. Every campaign of this war has sooner or later involved tank battles; practice, not theory, is the best guide to tank construction.

Still other apologists say that we can knock out the best of the German tanks. Of course, we can; no tank can be built that cannot sooner or later be knocked out, just as no ship is unsinkable. But the point is the relative degree of invulnerability, and, tank for tank, the German tank has more protection and is more sure of steam-rollering its way to a breakthrough than ours are.

UNITED STATES GUNS OUTCLASSED

We knock out the German tanks, but the 37-millimeter and 57-millimeter guns and even the short-barreled 75-millimeter are too light to do the trick, unless they get in close-range lucky side shots. Even the bazooka no longer holds its former terror for some of the German monsters. Our 76-millimeter high-velocity gun and the 150-millimeter can punch through the heaviest of the German armor, but only at relatively close range and provided the projectile strikes with a favorable angle of impact. Both guns are definitely outclassed for tank and anti-tank use by the new German 88-millimeter.

The 90-millimeter tank, antitank, antiaircraft and artillery piece, is the best of our high-velocity weapons, but the improved long-barreled German 88-millimeter is as good or better. We have 90-millimeter tank destroyers but do not yet have a 90-millimeter gun in any tank now fighting in France, so far as is known. We knock out the German tanks, but too often we have to do it the hard way; two or three guns against one German tank; several bazooka teams, or two or three of our M-4's against one German monster to get in a side shot against the weaker German side armor.

This condition is a well-known one along the fighting fronts. Americans at home, who take it for granted their sons are fighting with the best equipment in the world, are surprised at the German qualitative superiority. The British public seems to be better informed about the German qualitative tank superiority than our own, and for a time this question became an issue in Parliament, as it should become in our Congress. A recent dispatch to the British Information Service from London, spoke of the more heavily armored and armed German tanks and, in effect, said that we were opposing the German quality with quantity.

This deficiency and others almost comparable to it are not the faults of our designers and technicians. Far better better tanks than any we have in the field undoubtedly exist on the drawing boards or even in the factories in this country and may soon be in action. But the point is, the Germans always—save for a brief period in north Africa, when the enemy sent the first of their Tigers to Russia—have been ahead of us on the battlefield. And it is battlefield service that counts.

INVESTIGATION URGED

The reasons for this time lag are complicated and not easily determined; that is why Congress should investigate. They appear primarily to be a product of conservatism and traditionalism in the Army mind, complicated organization in War Department and supply and technical services in this country, plus lack of adequate liaison between these services and too much paper work. Too many checks act as delaying agencies between blueprint and battlefield, very few as expediting agents.

The Ordnance Department lays the blame on Army Ground Forces, Army Service Forces, or Armored Center; the Armored Center blames Ordnance, etc., ad nauseam. The links in the chain of procurement are many and some are clearly weak. The War Department General Staff, the Army Ground Forces, the Army Service Forces, the Ordnance Department, the Armored Center, the Armored Board, and several other subagencies, including the so-called "coordinating concern," the Requirements Division of the Army Service Forces, all have a finger in the pie.

The consequences are that we get good tanks on the battlefield at long last, but by the time they fight they outmatch the German tank of yesterday—not the German tank of today. Of course, we get them in greater quantity than the Germans, but shouldn't we have qualitative superiority, too?

FOE AHEAD IN OTHER ARMS

The adverse comparison of some of our weapons with the German does not stop with tanks. In antitank guns, mines, and mining technique, and self-propelled guns, the Germans have been consistently ahead of us on the battlefield. The Germans beat us to the battlefield with rockets. They were the first to use robot bombs, giant rockets, and jet-propelled planes. The Army Air Forces swell with false pride in announcing that by using a captured German robot bomb as a model their engineers have built a better robot in 60 days. So what? The proof is on the battlefield. The Germans have been using their's since June; our's are not yet in use; when they are the enemy will be another step ahead of us.

The same thing is true of the jet plane. In design, in pilot models, in technique and theory, and blueprints we are probably equal to, or ahead of, the Germans. But their jet planes are in use in the skies over Europe; ours are not.

There is no lack of American inventive genius, no lack of engineering skill, no lack of devotion and energy, but there is a superfluity of red tape; there is over-organization and there is lack of clear, directive vision. There is far too much time lag between design and battlefield use.

Congress should determine why.

For only by getting the facts and then willing facing them—no matter how punishing to our conceit—can we rid ourselves of the national habit of boastful self-deceit. And only if we put more emphasis upon quality will we get it. Today we are in danger of sacrificing qualitative standards for quantitative success.

Critical Meat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I addressed to the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Director of Office of Economic Stabilization; Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration; and Marvin Jones, Director, War Food Administration:

CRITICAL MEAT SHORTAGE

On July 3, 1943, after months of study of the meat problem which confronted the Nation and which had become most acute, I wrote to you, to the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and to the Director of the War Food Administration, urging a workable meat program.

Since that time, we have witnessed surpluses, shortages, sudden reversals in the market, and maldistribution, all of which have been harmful to the war effort and to the furnishing of adequate civilian supply.

I am again repeating the general purpose statement of my program of July 1943, together with the recommended program, in brief, with comment which is directly applicable to the acute meat situation of today. I am of the opinion that had this recommended program been put into effect in its entirety many of the present-day difficulties would not now exist. Because of only partial willingness to meet the problem squarely, we today in America have unnecessary confusion.

GENERAL PURPOSE STATEMENT, JULY 3, 1943—APPLICABLE TODAY

1. Statement July 3, 1943: Bring meats and poultry from producer to consumer in adequate amount to properly feed all our people.

Comment January 8, 1945: The administration has failed to accomplish this purpose, as is evidenced by meat strikes in the East, critical shortages, and market congestion. New York City, many other points in the East, and cities throughout the country are unable to obtain supplies of beef because under W. F. A. regulations the armed forces are now confiscating 60 percent of the slaughterers' kill on many grades at a loss of $40 per head to the slaughterer. This leaves the slaughterers, for civilian sale, 40 cattle out of each 100 cattle killed, and it results in a consequential loss of $100 per head if sold to the wholesaler or retailer at O. P. A. ceiling prices, and a reduction of the kill.

2. Statement July 3, 1943: Provide ample supply for war needs.

Comment January 8, 1945: The administration failed to provide ample supply for war needs. Military and naval demands have fallen short; and the war needs have first priority over all other needs. The meat program, as carried out by War Food Administration, and the price program, as carried out by the Office of Price Administration, have so hampered processing and movement of meat in the market that they have restricted supply to both military forces and civilian requirements.

3. Statement July 3, 1943: Increase production of meats and poultry.

Comment January 8, 1945: The administration failed to adequately increase production of meats and poultry because of—

(a) Lack of faith upon the part of producers, processors, and packers in programs set forth by W. F. A. and O. P. A. All programs have been established after procrastination, which has been harmful to any plan for producers. Uncertainty of market value of crops engenders immediate uncertainty in plans for increased production.

(b) Mismanagement of feeding is direct result of maladministration on the part of the Department of Agriculture, O. P. A., and W. F. A.

(c) Had a sensible feeding program been adopted, there would have been an increase in the production of ammunition fats. Today we suffer a shortage.

(d) Allocation has been mentioned in amendment 10 to Ration Order 16 (O. P. A.) as a matter of policy, but O. P. A. then failed to implement policy with action.

4. Statement July 3, 1943: Function in conformity with the spirit and letter of the Price Control Act.

Comment January 8, 1945: The mismanagement of the Price Control Act has effectively created black markets.

5. Statement July 3, 1943: Bring to the consuming public adequate supply at a fair price.

Comment January 8, 1945: With the operation of competing markets—regular (which is price control) and black (which is out of control)—the public does not know what the fair price of meat products is today.

From January 1, to November 30, 1944, Lend-Lease has shipped 58,821,000 pounds of lamb and mutton to England, but the administration has not in any way planned, through official circles, to have the English Commonwealths of New Zealand and Australia ship an adequate supply of this meat to Great Britain. Both of these commonwealths could ship many times this amount without depleting their stocks; neither has the administration permitted importation of lamb and mutton to make up United States shortages. With proper functioning on the part of the United States agencies, Great Britain might have been supplied with lambs and mutton from her own commonwealths.

6. Statement July 3, 1943: Eliminate the black market.

Comment January 8, 1945: Black markets have not been eliminated and have not been diminished. They have been accelerated by the poor policies in price regulation.

7. Statement July 3, 1943: Protect the health of the Nation.

Comment January 8, 1945: Lack of meat proteins in the diet endangers health. Health controls on meat were destroyed by the growth of the black market, which is uncontrollable. Black-market meat is a constant danger to the public health.

8. Statement July 3, 1943: Provide an adequate program to supply post-war needs.

Comment January 8, 1945: Immediate effect on post-war needs has been the crippling of the independent meat industry in America. (This includes packer, processor, wholesaler, and retail butcher.) Lack of a workable program has left a great portion of the industry in bankrupt condition, and therefore, unable to effectively function either now or in post-war.

9. Statement July 3, 1943: Preserve the small-business units in the meat and poultry industry, and encourage them to greater production.

Comment January 8, 1945: Small business units, by virtue of the regulations of O. P. A. and W. F. A., have been in a life and death struggle for a mere existence. Greater production has frequently meant greater loss or bankruptcy.

10. Statement July 3, 1943: Expedite the war effort.

Comment January 8, 1945: Obviously, from the foregoing comments, O. P. A. and W. F. A. have operated to the direct injury of the war effort.

I think it is very important that the same recommendations made on July 3, 1943, be remade now. They were given in good faith as a constructive suggestion. I repeat them with the same interest, together with supplemental recommendations and with comment resulting from experience of the past 18 months.

RECOMMENDED PROGRAM, JULY 3, 1943

1. Recommendation July 3, 1943: Revision of War Meat Board, as follows:

(a) Creation of Industry Section of 15—Beef, Pork, Lamb, and Veal.

(b) Creation of Industry Section for Poultry. (Detail omitted.)

Comment January 8, 1945: I recommended on July 3, 1943, that a representative revision be made of the War Meat Board, so as to bring in people representing all branches of the industry involved; people who would competently understand day-to-day problems. When my recommendation was made, there was a change made in the personenl in the War Meat Board, but not in accordance with the representative feature of the recommendation, nor with the general purpose to obtain proper spirit and attitude.

2. Recommendation July 3, 1943: Establishment of retail ceiling on all grades of dressed beef, except Government grade AA. Ceiling on all other grades of beef, lamb, veal, pork, and poultry to be that now established by O. P. A., which is the rolled-back level. (Detail omitted.)

Comment January 8, 1945: This recommendation has been acted upon in part. Failure to carry out this recommendation completely has reduced the average weight of beef animals, and has shortened the supply for both military and civilian needs; and has shortened the supply of fats for ammunition.

3. Recommendation July 3, 1943: Establish wholesale ceiling which allows a reasonable profit mark-up for retailer. (Detail omitted.)

Comment January 8, 1945: This recommendation was partially complied with, but the break-down due to pressure not eliminated as suggested in other recommendations, has shortened the wholesalers' supply. There is a reasonable profit only when there is merchandise with which to trade. This seems to be difficult for the Administration to understand.

4. Recommendation July 3, 1943: Establish a slaughterer's selling price which is based on the cost of live animals and poultry plus operating cost and shrinkages with allowance for minimum profit. (Detail omitted.)

Comment January 8, 1945: Failure to carry out this recommendation is the basic reason for most of the present difficulties.

5. Recommendation July 3, 1943: A feeder's selling price ceiling should be placed on all but cattle which will grade AA when dressed. Likewise the feeder must be protected by placing a ceiling price on stocker and feeder cattle and beef calves. (Detail omitted.)

Comment January 8, 1945: This recommendation still holds today and it has been carried out (virtually) on pork. Why is beef neglected? The same principle is involved. Why does W. F. A. and O. P. A. continue to procrastinate and accentuate the shortage? In my recommendation on July 3, 1943, I stated that the present loss of live beef weight approximated 200 pounds per head of cattle; and that this total loss annually approximates over 2,000,000,000 pounds. Today that loss is in excess of 3,000,000,000 pounds. This is an important contributing factor to the acute shortage and it emanates from the stupid program to reduce weights.

6. Recommendation July 3, 1943: Producers and feeders of cattle should be protected in their feed costs. (Detail omitted.)

Comment January 8, 1945: Our feed crop now is more than adequate for a production program to increase the weight of beef cattle to be marketed. The United States Department of Agriculture in 1944 underestimated the corn crop and there is such a large supply on hand now that we have adequate corn available for cattle.

SUMMATION

In my plan of July 3, 1943, it was noted under summation:

"The plan outlined above is equally applicable to lamb, veal, pork, and poultry when the peculiarities of their production are analyzed similarly. Beef is the No. 1 problem of maldistribution and consumer shortage. There is not a shortage of live cattle. Lacking proper consumption and distribution, a critical shoratge may easily develop. The entire beef problem can quickly be solved by (a) proper adjustment of byproduct prices; (b) protection of feed costs; and (c) proper proportionment of the retail price."

It is not, by any stretch of the imagination, possible to attribute the beef shortage of cattle population in the country. According to the Department of Agriculture, as of January 1, 1942, the United States had 75,162,000 head of cattle; January 1, 1943, 79,114,000 head of cattle; and January 1, 1944, 82,192,000 head of cattle; and it has been estimated that we now have at least 81,000,000; and that the supply of feed cattle in 1945 will probably be as large as it was in 1942.

It is obvious, therefore, that the problems of production and distribution of beef have been accentuated by poor management. Government agencies, alone, must take the full responsibility for the beef shortage to both the military and the civilian consumer.

Raw fats and tallow have been priced so low by the O. P. A. that we are unable to increase our production of fats adequately, or to even import tallow to supplement our shortened supply. The bad price regulations on beef accentuate this. This is causing a shortage of fats for soap, glycerin, explosives, and drugs, and is seriously affecting the war effort.

In 1943, I pointed out the need of corrective measures and the need is clearly evidenced by present conditions. If the proper price were paid for fats, tallows, and hides, a lower price for edible beef could be obtained.

We are unable to obtain hides from Brazil or Argentina at O. P. A. ceiling prices and the British are reaping a full benefit from this by obtaining, at a higher price, the leather that would normally be allotted to us. It is the British influence which prevents these needed adjustments by O. P. A. on leather, and accordingly, directly injures our domestic supply during the war and our post-war foreign trade in shoes and leather goods.

Had the program recommended in 1943 been adopted promptly, it is probable that the following additional and supplemental recommendations would not have been necessary. Since additional aggravation has been suffered, I suggest the following supplemental recommendations:

1. That the President appoint a single executive food authority responsible to him and to the Congress.

2. Livestock ceilings, with Federal producers' subsidies, if necessary.

3. Control of livestock ceilings through the present normal trade mechanism, namely, accredited livestock exchanges and livestock markets. Subsidies should not be paid on cattle purchased by slaughterers when such cattle has not been passed through accredited centers. Certificates could accompany each sale. This would diminish black markets tremendously, if not eliminate them.

4. The Government should pay for all meat purchased for the armed forces and lend-lease—cost plus a reasonable profit to slaughterers. This is done on every other commodity for our war supply. Why not on meat?

5. Put into effect a rationing program separating from meat the cheese, butter, and other items not related to meats.

The foregoing has been submitted in the hope that you will urge it upon the W. F. A. and upon the O. P. A., thereby adequately supply the armed forces and the consuming public with meat food.

Respectfully submitted and recommended.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
Member of Congress.

Bradley Sees Nazi Thrust Backfiring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of statement of Lt. Gen. Omar N. Bradley from today's Washington Post:

TEXT OF STATEMENT

The German attack was the direct result of pressure exerted by the Ninth, First, and Third American Armies—and the forces of the Sixth Army group (Seventh, United States, and French armies)—against the weakening German defense line.

The advances made during November and December were threatening vital Grman areas. It was necessary that the Germans launch some diversionary attack in sufficient strength to cause the Allies temporarily to stop their offensives against these vital areas and to try to gain time.

The build-up of German forces had been observed in the Ardennese area for some weeks before the attack, and the possibility of a German attack through the Ardennes was thoroughly studied by me and my staff.

In leaving the Ardennes line lightly held, we took what is known in military terminology as a "calculated risk," to strengthen our northern and southern drives. In other words, instead of employing our surplus divisions in the then-quiet Ardennes, we used them to attack in other sectors. This technique—of striking boldly while taking calculated risks—is what has gotten us to the German border.

FOE FOUND SLIM PICKINGS

In my opinion, had we followed more cautious policies, we would still be fighting west of Paris. We felt, in the case of the Ardennes, that we could take this risk because this territory contained no strategic objectives or large supply installations, and when Von Rundstedt sent his troops into action with orders to live on American dumps, they found slim pickings in an empty pocket. Many of the prisoners we have captured have been hungry and we have now captured many tanks and vehicles stalled for lack of fuel.

The actual timing of the attack and its strength were somewhat of a surprise. The attack was skillfully launched. Field Marshall Von Rundstedt's movement of his reserves from the Colcgne area to the jumping-off position in the Siegfried Line was masterfully executed. This was made possible by a period of bad weather which restricted our air reconnaissance.

In considering the possibilities of a German attack through the Ardennes, we recognize that it might meet initial success, but we felt the nature of the terrain and the size and mobility of our forces would justify our taking a risk. They would enable us to meet and stop an attack before it could do too much damage. This is exactly what happened.

ENEMY'S SCHEDULE UPSET

The enemy's schedule for his attack was upset by the heroic resistance of our troops and by the speed made by all three armies in shifting divisions to meet the attack.

The result was that wherever the enemy turned along the north flank, groping toward a place where he could break out in the Belgian lowlands, he was met by troops of General Hodges' First Army. He found blocking his way the same American divisions which had been soundly thrashing his best ever since the beachhead days of Normandy.

An even greater surprise to the enemy was the quick appearance of General Patton's (Third) Army on the south flank. Matching the speed with which General Simpson's Ninth Army and General Hodges deployed their divisions from the north, General Patton's forces first relieved Bastogne—which was, of course, a key to the whole battle—and then attack with such fury that the enemy was forced to slow his drive on the north. He had, in fact, to move some of his best SS Panzer divisions across the salient in an attempt to check General Patton's unexpected advance.

WEATHER HAMPERS YANKS

The German attack, launched on December 16, cut our direct telephone communication to the First Army and direct roads over which personnel contact was normally maintained. The weather prevented us from making frequent personal contacts with the First Army by plane.

It was therefore decided that the Twenty-first Army Group (originally comprising Marshal Montgomery's Second British and First Canadian Armies) should assume temporary command of all Allied Forces north of the salient (including the First and Ninth United States Armies). This was a temporary measure only, and when the lines are rejoined, the Twelfth Army group (First, Ninth, and Third Armies) will resume command of all American troops in this area. The soundness and flexibility of our Allied command is illustrated by the ease with which this change in command was made.

Field Marshal Montgomery has made a notable contribution. Even before he took this temporary command of the First and Ninth Armies at 12: 20 a. m. on December 20, the field marshal had moved to station his British and Canadian forces in position to protect Antwerp in event of any unforeseen breakthrough. It can now be announced that British troops were at that time dispatched to the tip of the salient. These troops served with distinction, engaging the covering forces of the Germans near their farthest advance.

GERMAN LOSSES ENORMOUS

Whenever the weather permitted, American and British air forces have seized every opportunity to strike together, and the effect of their coordinated blows has been of very great importance.

German losses in this offensive have been enormous. Our artillery and air forces have been able to punish him much more severely in the open than had been possible while he remained in his fortifications. Even in the matter of taking prisoners, despite the fact that the enemy had taken the offensive, the total number taken since December 16 by the First and Third American Armies is much greater than the number of United States troops reported missing in action or captured. His dead and wounded must be many more times the number we have suffered. Events may prove that the losses in men and matériel and the loss in morale when the salient eventually is reduced, may materially affect the Germans' ability to resist on the western front.

I do not mean to imply by this that we can assume the Germans are on the verge of collapse. They are not. We have known for some time there will be considerable fighting ahead. But we have never had any doubt about the outcome, and we have none now.

YANKS KNOW EVERY TRICK

What the American soldier has done in the Ardennes in the last 3 weeks is to my mind one of the greatest stories in the history of fighting men.

Most of our Army are veterans now and know every trick of the trade. But there were a lot of men who stopped the Germans in the Ardennes who had only joined us a short time ago and had only what they had been taught in their training—and their native courage and character—to carry them through the battle. These Americans, veteran and newcomer, fought against picked German soldiers especially trained, rested, and equipped just for this offensive.

The Germans had thinned the Siegfried line to make this force possible. Their soldiers were given a pep talk before the attack and told this offensive would take Antwerp in a few weeks and end the war.

WHIP NAZIS' BEST

They believed what they were told and fought with skill, and in places, with suicidal determination. So it turned out that the American soldier met the best fighting force that German militarism had been able to put in the field, and licked it to a standstill again and again.

In many places the Panzer tactics temporarily split our troops up into small isolated units. The men then fought even more determinedly than they had in the attack. They used an enormous variety of weapons with deadly effect. The stories of individual heroism that you have read in our own Army paper, the Stars and Stripes, and ably reported in the press, are far from being exaggerated, and have been, to my certain knowledge, if anything, understatements. And, of course, only a small minority of the things that went on out there could have been observed or reported. The American people can be deeply proud of the achievements of their sons and brothers on this battlefield.

New Year's Eve Address of Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on December 31, 1944, over the Columbia network from Station WQAM, at Miami, under the auspices of the United Nations Educational Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow countrymen, in a very real sense this is a grim New Year's eve. We now know that the devil Hitler still lives and does his evil work. Our men upon the western front are locked in a death grapple with a resurging enemy who has broken out of his defenses and hurled himself in a vicious and desperate assault upon our forces and the areas which we recently liberated. We have experienced the shock of realizing that the war is not over upon any part of the far-flung battle line. The enemy is still strong, determined, and desperate. He is better equipped, stronger, and more confident than we thought he was. We now realize that the road to victory is long and hard and that it will not be given to us, but we shall have to win it with blood, sweat, and tears. This New Year, therefore, must be for us all a time of rededication to the high purposes for which we entered the war. And those objectives, vital now as ever they were, must again be declared. We must state them so clearly that we shall not only see them but never lose sight of them nor let them escape from us.

We know that we were attacked on December 7, 1941, by a dastardly enemy, greedy for conquest and power. As a part of the same assault, Germany and Italy and their satellites declared war upon us. Of course, we would defend our soil and our integrity, and we had no alternative but to accept the gage of battle to the death with the strongest enemies we have ever faced led by the evilest

men who ever wrought their satanic wills into war.

Yet, we cannot say that these attacks were unforeseeable, for the world, for decades, had seen the Japanese engaged in a war of conquest upon unoffending China and had observed that this yellow snake was coiled ready to sink its fangs into any prey which it might be able to strike down.

And for nearly a decade the world had listened to the fiery words of the monster Hitler. All who could see and hear knew that these wretched creatures were bent upon war upon the world and upon civilization. They wanted to uproot and turn over the way of life we know, with its satisfying freedoms and privileges, and put the yoke back on man's neck and the shackles upon his feet and his mind; the clutch of tyranny about his throat and his conscience. War was a-borning long ago.

So when we took the gage of battle with these enemies, we took up the fight not only for our own security but against the tyranny they would impose upon mankind. Moreover, we entered the fight not only against such dictatorship in the present but against the wars such dictatorships would torture mankind with in the years ahead.

With high purpose and pure resolve our might was mobilized and hurled into the path of these on-rushing foes, with a single determination in us all that neither they nor their wicked purposes nor their accursed aims should pass.

We have marvelously progressed in the struggle. We have grown from weakness to strength. We have moved from defense to offense, with but a little bend in the line upon a battle front that circles the earth and winds about over the continents and the oceans and reaches from the thin air to the dark ocean depths.

If there are signs of weakness in our lines they are not along the battle front, for there men and women are strong in courage and purpose. They are not afraid. Indeed, in all those millions, our American men and boys who have, day and night, in the mountains, on the rivers and deserts, on the oceans and in the skies, faced dangerous and desperate foes, not one, by the records of our armed forces, has flinched or turned his face from his antagonist—not one American has been a coward, it is officially reported by our Government in this war.

But there are unmistakable evidences of weak places in our might and armor.

The corrosion is in the moral sphere, in the field of our thinking and our feeling.

In the first place, confusion about the high aims for which we fight has crept into our understanding. Men throughout all history have fought best when they had a great cause for which to fight, even a cause which was greater than their own preservation. Men are never such irresistible warriors as when they fight for sheer right. We fought another war a generation ago against this warrior-hearted Germany under the moving impulse not only to keep our land safe but to make the world safe for democracy. We had seen a series of unhappy circumstances steal away the realization of that high aim from those who gave their lives and their limbs, their futures and their families to achieve it.

There were many of us, therefore, who felt that when we entered this war it was to carry on the great crusade to which those gallant boys from homes and firesides of America gave their fresh lives in 1917 and 1918. We thought we could almost say again, in the sentiment of Lincoln, that we rededicated ourselves to the completion of the unfinished work to which they gave the last full measure of devotion.

We, in our hearts, felt that we would not let this scourge of war continue to come again and again and again to generation after generation of guiltless boys. We felt that if by our failure to win the last peace we had to pay the price of the terrible war this, at last, must be the last war.

Accordingly, on New Years day 1942, when the shock and shame of Pearl Harbor was still stirring us, there was organized in our White House, under the inspiration of our President, the United Nations, twenty-six, I believe, solemnly subscribing their names to a document without precedent and covenanting not only that they would wage war to victory against the common enemy and not make a separate peace, but that they subscribed to the high purposes and principles of the Atlantic Charter declared unto the world by two great hearts and gallant spirits in our own Western Hemisphere in August 1941. It was also in the spirit of the "four freedoms" which our President had taken out of the hearts of good men and women everywhere and declared to the Congress on an early day in 1941: freedom of conscience everywhere in the world, freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world, freedom from fear everywhere in the world, freedom from want everywhere in the world.

This was the spirit which moved America to a single unity and purpose against the enemy in those dark days.

Now the war has progressed. The enemy has been pushed back veritably to his own shores and borders. He has been cut down and weakened. We know we have made great strides, therefore, toward victory.

And we have also gone far toward realizing a concert of nations through which the security and the well-being of the good peoples of the world may be preserved and advanced. We have organized the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, through which many nations are working as one to feed and clothe and shelter and repair the broken world. We have, in a common conference, drawn the outlines of an international bank to stabilize world currencies and prevent the sort of collapse which produced Hitler in the chaotic Germany which came after the last war. We have set up a council of the United Nations to promote the revival of learning after the war. And we have set up a council through which some common expression has been achieved of the United Nations.

Far more significant, the representatives of Great Britain, Russia, China, and the United States have gathered in our own National Capital and for weeks have labored upon the draft and outline of an organization to be called the United Nations, which will translate into reality our unity as nations and be the machinery and the force through which we may preserve the peace and promote the welfare of the nations and the peoples of the world.

We called this the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. We have wisely striven to draw up and to set in motion this international organization while we are fighting in order to help us fight better together and to be the means through which we shall effectively win the peace as well as the war.

But before this organization has been consummated, and because we have not had it, there are ominous signs of our falling apart as United Nations and there are clouds upon the horizon which dangerously obscure the high aims, for which so many have already died and so many others are yet to give themselves.

In Europe, separate alliances are being entered into between nations for mutual defense in the future. So-called regional arrangements are being made. Spheres of influence are being set up and recognized. Large nations are interfering in the kind of government little nations have for the ordering of their own lives and destinies. The smell of the old order is in the air already. The seeds of future wars are swelling and sprouting.

Those who in the new days of this year are to lay themselves upon the altar of the future have a right, before they surrender themselves up, to know that we shall keep the faith we have declared to them. They have a right to know that we are capable of building upon their altars those institutions which shall be worthy of their sacrifice.

As we resolve that a nation shall gird its loins for the final stages of this awful struggle, holding back nothing, giving everything needed to speed the victory, can we not also resolve that we shall call upon those who speak for us to redeclare the high aims for which we fight and without further delay to progress the forming of that organization upon which we pin our faith for peace in the future? Is it not right that we in America for this new year shall also resolve that there is but one place for this mighty Nation in world affairs and that is at the front, showing and leading the way to all others, pressing for and never yielding on the principles of right and justice among nations as among men willing to fight for those things because we know that at one time or another we shall have to fight for them?

As I speak to you, therefore, under the auspices of the United Nations Educational Committee, established jointly by the League of Nations Association and the committee to study the organization of peace, I believe I speak the sentiments of us all when I say that it is our new purpose in this new year, God helping us, not only to undo the enemy, but to move on toward the greater victory, the kind of true victory of which Abraham Lincoln spoke 78 years ago when he said: "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

American Leadership in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "American Leadership in Foreign Policy," delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] before the Kiwanis Club of Atlantic City, N. J., on Thursday evening, January 4, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On November 7 last I was honored by the voters of New Jersey in being elected to the United States Senate to fill the unexpired term of my close friend, the late W. Warren Barbour. As I was filling an unexpired term, I was duly sworn in as a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress on December 7. Consequently, I served in the Senate during the closing days of that session. As a freshman Senator I had the responsibility of being called upon to vote on some vitally important legislative matters, and also to participate in the confirmation of certain Presidential nominations. I want to speak particularly

of the nominations made by the new Secretary of State, the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of his assistants in the new State Department reorganization.

In spite of objections made by a few Democratic Senators, as well as certain Republican Senators to some or all of the nominations submitted by the Secretary of State, I voted to confirm all of them. During the recent campaign, and in fact long prior to it, I took the position that the development of an American foreign policy should be a nonpartisan matter and that Republicans as well as Democrats should cooperate fully with the Executive in the declaration of it. Immediately after the reelection of President Roosevelt and my election to the Senate, I stated:

"The election is over and the people of the United States have made their choice.

"I am happy to extend my sincere congratulations to President Roosevelt on his reelection and to pledge him my full loyalty and support in the all-American job that faces us.

"Our first objective is a speedy final victory with the return of our men and women from the front as soon as possible.

"Our second objective is the writing of the peace and the establishment of a world organization including all nations, large and small, to preserve that peace. Partisan politics must not, in any form, enter into these important negotiations, nor should in any way interfere with the effective setting up of this world organization to prevent future aggressions."

In light of this statement and my deep conviction that the times are far too serious for us to inject partisan politics into foreign policy issues, I felt that I should support the President and the new Secretary of State in their nominations, though I was urged even by left-wing new dealers in the Senate and by the CIO-PAC group to hold them up.

This action of mine was the logical consequence of a consistent attitude which I have taken even before Pearl Harbor, advocating the removal of the foreign policy issue from the late campaign and urging a bipartisan approach to the determination of the fundamental position of the United States. As a member of the Republican National Committee in 1942, as a member of the Republican Post-war Advisory Council which met at Mackinac Island in 1943, and as a candidate for the United States Senate in 1944, I have supported the policy of international cooperation by the United States with other nations to preserve the peace of the world. This is the same policy as that incorporated by Secretary Hull in the Moscow Conference of 1943, and adopted by the United States Senate by an overwhelming bipartisan vote in the now well-known Connally Resolution.

I feel it is proper at this time to digress for a moment to acknowledge my indebtedness to President Woodrow Wilson who was Professor of Political Economy when I was an undergraduate at Princeton University some years ago. Woodrow Wilson's international idealism, both during my undergraduate days and during and after World War No. 1, made a profound impression on my thinking during those periods, and left me with an eagerness to contribute what I might toward the establishment of the rule of law for the rule of force in international affairs. I admit to my own disappointment when the United States failed to join the League of Nations after World War No. 1, although I was keenly aware of the limitations of the League of Nations covenant, of the mistake in attaching it to the Versailles Treaty, and of the unfortunate and much misunderstood controversy in the United States Senate over its adoption. This is no time to attribute blame to either one of our parties or to individuals; this is the time to profit by the mistakes of the past and to think constructively and positively of the future.

With this evolution of my international thinking, it was natural that I should have taken the side of a liberal foreign policy, as evidenced by the Connally resolution and the Moscow Agreement. It was natural also that I should have found myself in general sympathy with the principles laid down by the so-called Atlantic Charter which seemed to express the ideals of an international philosophy which might be the ultimate goal of international collaboration. Therefore, I felt it consistent, during my campaign for the Senate, to insist that we stand for these declarations of principle, and to support the President and Secretary Hull so far as they represented this position, as opposed to what seemed to me to be the narrower, hands-off attitude of some members of both the Republican and Democratic Parties.

With these convictions as the foundation of my attitude toward the participation of the United States in foreign affairs, I am compelled now to admit a feeling of disillusionment and discouragement over what seems to be a lack of leadership on the part of the President in not seizing the opportunity for placing the United States in the forefront of the nations of the world in establishing as post-war international policies those principles for which we have claimed the war is being fought. We have before us an amazing example of inconsistency in the conduct of our foreign relations, especially in light of the adoption of the Connally resolution and the prior declarations of the Atlantic Charter.

Our military and naval cooperation with the other United Nations and particularly with those who are carrying the major burden of the war effort, namely, Great Britain, Russia, and China, has been magnificent. We worked effectively through conferences between the military leaders of the United Nations for the joint prosecution of the war. We determined our military objectives and we went after those objectives vigorously.

But when it came to the political problems of Europe and other parts of the world, which will inevitably involve the future peace, the President thus far has failed to accept the responsibilities of leadership. Much has been accomplished by the destroyer-base exchange, the lend-lease policy, and our participation in international conferences, such as the food conference of a year ago, the Bretton Woods monetary conference, the relief and rehabilitation set-up, and the most recent Dumbarton Oaks proposals. But these policies and activities, as important as they are, are not adequate in themselves if we are once and for all to put an end to the traditional power politics of the past.

In light of the strategically strong position we were in from the moment we declared war and joined Britain and Russia in the Allied offensive, we should have insisted through the President, who was our spokesman, on the setting up of a United Nations Council which would deal with the political problems of Europe and of the world in the same united way in which the joint Chiefs of Staff deal with the military problems.

By failing to insist that such a council be set up, we have left the impression that our policy was to postpone the decision of major political questions until after the terms of the peace have been determined upon. Nothing could have been more disastrous for the future peace of the world than this policy on the part of the United States. The President should have conferred with the leaders of both parties in the United States Senate and should have insisted on the setting up of the joint council before what has now happened could possibly have taken place. Had there been such a joint council to consider and attempt to solve these problems, it would not have been possible for England and Russia to tackle them unilaterally, or for both England and Russia to tackle them together.

America must fight for morality in international affairs. The Atlantic Charter gave us the hope of open covenants openly arrived at and of people having the right to choose their own governments without the tyrannies of power politics. A United Nations council, with its policies made known to the peoples of the respective countries, would be a step toward the realization of a lasting peace based on justice and understanding. No system of world organization, however, can be a substitute for integrity and trust. With the right united spirit we can go forward. Let us demand team play as between the nations. If other nations refuse to cooperate, if they prefer the old game of world power politics, they will have to take the consequences at the bar of world opinion.

What actually has happened? Instead of open covenants or understandings openly arrived at, according to the sound Wilson doctrine, there apparently have been star-chamber conferences between President Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, out of which have grown all sorts of uncomfortable rumors, especially, for example, as to what was decided at the Tehran Conference. It looks now as though the President agreed to give Russia a free hand in determining the boundary questions of central Europe, or else told Russia and England to determine those questions together, and that it was no concern of the United States. Whatever happened at Tehran, the principles of the Atlantic Charter seem to have been forgotten in light of the most recent developments. These developments which were obviously inevitable in the absence of the interest of or participation by the United States were brought to light by the most recent incidents which seem to threaten the future cordial relations of the United Nations leadership.

For example:

The British single-handed action in Italy and Greece—apparently with Stalin approval;

The Stalin determination of the Polish boundary question—apparently with Churchill approval; and then following these a belated and feeble announcement by the President through the new Secretary of State that the United States favored the fundamental right of small countries to determine their own future governments.

In light of the way in which the situation has developed, I feel that the President, representing the United States, was to blame in letting these issues drift, leaving Britain and Russia, who are most intimately concerned with the problems, to act alone. In view of our failure to act promptly with our allies in developing a policy in these matters, we cannot blame Great Britain for seeking single-handedly to maintain order in the Mediterranean area which is so vital to the British life-line to India, nor can we blame Stalin for seeking a solution to the problem of the western boundary of Russia which means so much for Russia's future security.

Had the action taken by Great Britain in Italy and Greece been taken by a United Nations Council the uproar and even bloodshed might readily have been avoided if it had been clear that the motive was the preservation of the peace in these areas and the protection of the people in their right to self-determination. Britain's unilateral action was bound to be suspected as a part of British imperialistic designs. The same might be said of the Polish boundary question. Had a United Nations Council sought a fair solution to this question, which would have recognized the independence and safety of the Polish Nation, as well as Russia's security problem, it might have been possible to come to an amicable solution with regard to the boundary. A Council decision might even have accepted the Curzon line in light of the other changes proposed, without leaving the feeling that it was a grab by Russia.

The United Nations Council could have been aware of the legitimate problems of England and Russia and the fact that there may be spheres of influence for important nations which need not threaten the security or peace of the world. We have a similar sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere, which we are inclined to forget when we criticize other nations. These are policies which I am convinced could and should be tackled immediately by the United Nations Council and not allowed to drift.

What have these incidents meant to the American people as a whole? It is my judgment that they have definitely undermined our confidence in our national leadership. As one who has been eager to see an aggressive and well-rounded foreign policy developed, I feel that we have been woefully let down. It is even more serious than that. I fear that the American people, unless we check the present trend, will definitely lose faith in any program for world cooperation and that we may move promptly toward an isolationism which it will be difficult to resist.

The spectacle of the Atlantic Charter is illustrative of what I have in mind. All of our people rejoiced when in 1941 the principles of the charter were enunciated, which was followed by the United Nations agreement incorporating the charter. Everyone thought that the charter was a declaration of principles, agreed to by both Great Britain and the United States through their Chief Executives. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21, 1941, we find the terms of the charter set forth with what appear to be the signatures of both Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt. Yet, in a recent press conference, the President states that any document such as the Atlantic Charter never was in existence, that the principles were simply contained on separate, scribbled slips of paper, that there were no signatures and it was merely radioed to the world, apparently as sort of a pious declaration. If now it has been destroyed and there is to be no joint effort to see that its terms are carried out, our people will ask, What is the war for anyway? Are we simply drawn in to strengthen the dominance of imperialistic nations? Are we simply a cat's-paw to perpetuate the traditional European power politics?

Our people do not know what it is all about and they are entitled to know. Those of us who represent them in the United States Senate, which has a joint responsibility with the President in determining our foreign policy, must insist that the facts be disclosed immediately, and furthermore that prompt action be taken. Our people have always been able to accept the truth when they know it, but they have always resisted and they always will resist misrepresentation or falsehood or vacillation in leadership. It is perfectly obvious that unilateral action by any one of the great powers is today a definite threat to world security, and the same is true of bilateral action by any two of the great powers where the rest of the world has not been consulted.

And so we come to the question of what can be done and should be done immediately, and I submit that this is a question which must be answered by the statement that we must act and act at once. How must we act?

I propose:

1. A United Nations Council to act with our joint military forces as trustees of the peace until the permanent world organization is set up.

2. This United Nations Council to deal with political issues no matter how difficult.

3. This United Nations Council to act promptly to prevent misunderstandings between members of the United Nations which may endanger the prosecution of all-out war to final victory.

4. This United Nations Council to set up military governments in the occupied countries as fast as they are released from Axis domination, until properly regulated prebiscites can be held to determine the will of the people of those countries as to their future governments.

5. This United Nations Council to merge its identity as soon as possible with a new world organization for peace.

As we cannot wait for the detailed completion of our world organization plan, there must be prompt action in the setting up of a United Nations Council under the initiative of the United States to prevent the disintegration of the United Nations and to preserve the immediate peace of the world after the present war is terminated.

America will emerge from this war the most powerful Nation in the world and must definitely and courageously accept its responsibility to lead in the perilous years that lie immediately ahead. In recognizing this responsibility, this does not mean that we will paternalize the world, nor does it mean that we are to establish international W. P. A.'s for world rehabilitation. We could not finance the restoration of the world if we would. That is not what the world needs. What the world needs is the preservation of order until it emerges from chaos. What the nations of the world need, and especially the little nations, is assistance to help them help themselves and to determine their own forms of government.

In conclusion, let me suggest that we do not complicate this immediate demand for prompt action by the raising of irrelevant issues. Let us make it clear that we are prepared to participate in these international settlements, not in the interest of power politics, but in the interest of the future peace of the world. Let us make it clear that we will do our share in the trusteeship that we are insisting on establishing, and in the facing of the economic, political, and social adjustments that the post-war world calls for. Let us make it clear that we believe these things can be accomplished, and that we will never accept a philosophy of despair or a turning back hopelessly to the power politics and alliances of former periods.

Democracy has a moral and spiritual foundation. If we expect to see democracy become the pattern for world government, we must strengthen its moral foundations at home. And let us believe, and dare to say that we believe, that there is an overall purpose moving in the world which has a divine foundation and which mankind can find if they will submit to its leadership, submerging purely national selfish considerations to the larger objectives of peace on earth to all men of good will without regard to race, creed, or color.

And let me close finally with the insistence with which I opened: We must act and act now.

The Manpower Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "More on Manpower," published in the Washington Post of January 5, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE ON MANPOWER

The tapping of the pool of farm-labor deferments is the latest action to relieve the manpower crisis. It is evident that all means will be explored before resort to a request for national-service legislation. The reason is not far to seek. The coutnry has long been painfully conscirous of inefficiency in the use and administration of manpower. For that reason a national-service law would mean at best a protracted debate. But needs are urgent, and must be met, therefore, by a program which has a chance of early enactment. As we se it, that program falls into three parts:

1. Enforcement powers for the W. M. C.: The man-hours lost by the hoarding of labor in the factories and the turn-over of labor can no longer be afforded. They can be saved for the war effort by the delegation of statutory authority to the W. M. C. and the use of existing sanctions against recalcitrants. In respect of employers, the W. M. C. should be enabled legally to fix and hold ceilings of employment. Sanctions in the form of the power to allocate raw materials to recalcitrant employers should be employed. The same power should be invoked against plants whose nonessential products we can dispense with.

Hitherto sanctions have been divorced from controls. As Mr. Baruch said 18 months ago, in the report on west-coast shortages of airplanes, "the proper handling of manpower has been made impossible by the failure of Government agencies to work as a team with a clear, uniform program." Mr. Byrnes' new assistants seem to constitute such a team for the purpose of dovetailing controls and sanctions. In respect of employees, turn-over could be arrested by rigid control of hiring and by application of veto power on the acquisition of new jobs by quitters for 2 months. These are already W. M. C. rulings. They should now be given the force of law.

2. Better utilization of manpower by the armed services: There is probably as much waste of manpower in the armed services as in civilian life. Examples are plentiful in everybody's experience of men in uniform who are not being used, whose services are merely formal, who are doing inappropriate jobs. Senator KILGORE is the latest complainant. As he said, IV-F's could replace the many able-bodied men who are doing desk jobs and post duties. If work or fight applies to the civilian front, fight or work should apply to the military front.

The armed services could likewise save a good deal of manpower in industry by more efficient procurement. The latest report of the Mead committee, which got no attention at all because it was issued on the last day of the Seventy-eighth Congress, contains a devastating bill of particulars against the Army procurement authorities. Lack of standardization of materials is noted both as between the armed services and as between military and civilian needs. The committee says there is no reason known to them why there should be different sizes and specifications for towels, blankets, sheets, and hundreds of other items. There is no reason known to anybody else. The committee also cites for condemnation overbuying, acceleration of delivery dates, carelessness in negotiating prices, indirect buying, and decentralized control of procurement. Case after case of waste is given. Added up, they show dissipation of manpower, and Mr. Byrnes might well call attention to this mote in the service eye while attending to the beam in the civilian eye.

3. Use of French manpower: The drain on our manpower for the armed services might be eased considerably by arming the French. This was requested by the French 5 months ago. At that time General Eisenhower refused the request, not because the French

would not make excellent soldiers, but because he had no need of more men. The situation since then has changed drastically. The military estimate proved wrong, and the military now have to revise their budget for manpower and materials as a result of the German offensive, coupled with the tremendous drain caused by the operations in the Philippines. The French request might usefully be reviewed. The French want to save our manpower, and use of the French would be a demonstration of an efficient and economical as well as a proper utilization of manpower, since the French are in Europe, eager to fight, and in varying degrees of training.

Abolition of Jackson Hole National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD three editorials dealing with the President's veto of House bill 2241, a bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument. These editorials come from widely separated points in the Nation. The first, entitled "Minority Rule," is from the Waterloo Daily Courier, of Waterloo, Iowa, of January 1, last. The second is from the Charleston News and Courier of Charleston, S. C., and is entitled "Wiping Out Wyoming." The third is from the Los Angeles Times, of December 30, 1944, and is entitled "President Sets Judgment Above Congress and People."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier of January 1, 1945]

MINORITY RULE

President Roosevelt's pocket veto of the bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument in Wyoming raises a fundamental issue in American Government.

Regardless of the desirability of the project, the fact remains that Congress refused to authorize a national park in the area and the President, by a subterfuge, set aside these 222,000 acres as a monument. Congress during the last session then approved the bill to abolish the monument and the President has let the bill lapse without signing it. If the legislature wants to enforce its will, therefore, it will have to approve a new bill and then pass it again by a two-thirds majority over an expected veto.

In other words, the process used here permits the President with the approval of a minority of Congress to thwart the will of the majority. Congress is reduced to the status, not of passing laws permitting the President to do certain things, but of attempting by two-thirds vote to prevent the President from doing things. That is entirely antagonistic to the theory of American Government and representative democracy.

Under an independent court system, the judiciary might prevent the President from using a subterfuge of this kind to thwart the will of Congress. But the President has now been in office so long that the majority of judges are his own appointees, personally loyal to him and imbued with his own philosophy. Thus the whole process of Government has ben perverted.

The Jackson Hole monument is a relatively minor issue. But if the President is successful in using the method in this instance, he will dare to attempt it in others. Eventually, that will result in the President passing the laws and keeping them in force as long as he retains sufficient support in Congress to prevent Presidential vetoes from being overridden. This question is every bit as important as the President's earlier court-packing scheme.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of January 3, 1945]

WIPING OUT WYOMING

One reads and hears much about State's rights, and one is not convinced that they will not fade out completely. The President, Mr. Roosevelt, has vetoed the act of Congress abolishing the Jackson Hole Monument, created by him, under some queer law or other, whereby some millions of acres of land in a State called Wyoming have been seized by the Federal Government.

A newspaper of New York City, the Times easily understands that no one would wish the entire State of Wyoming or the entire State of Arizona bought up and set aside as a national monument, but it reassures—as if it knew—this is not threatened. The New York City publication defends the veto, saying that beyond the State's borders are millions of Americans who will benefit if a few notable spots of scenic and historic significance can be set aside for the general use and that it does seem that in this as in many similar instances, the good of the greater number will be served if the reservation stands, and that no injustice will be done to anyone."

The argument of the New York Times is entirely consistent with the Rooseveltian, the urban, notion that the right of a State to veto appropriation of millions of acres of its lands by the Federal Government no longer exists. Jackson Hole, be it noted, is not coveted for the national defense, the President, the New York Times, and other liberalities, would have it set aside and federally owned for the reason that Julius Caesar bequeathed his orchards and gardens "this side Tiber," as read in his will by Mark Antony, namely, for the enjoyment of the Roman populace.

Of the American populace 7,300,000 are dwellers on Manhattan Island and in its vicinity, while in the State of Wyoming the inhabitants are about 260,000. Should a fourth-term President heed the voice of an American State when the populace of great cities and people-packed regions covet spots of scenic and historic significance? King Ahab's coveting of a vineyard was equally defensible.

It is the State right of Wyoming to dismantle, to destroy, its monuments if that be its foolish will and pleasure.

Had the Virginians foreseen that one day the United States could and might seize the notably scenic monument known as the Natural Bridge and had the hard-headed people of Massachusetts suspected that the Federal Government would set up that it could take possession of Plymouth Rock, those two independent commonwealths would not have entered the American Union. Has the poet's phrase My Maryland meaning nowadays? Whose Maryland is it?

Whether the seizure of Jackson Hole is expedient or not for the American people or beneficial to them has nothing whatsoever to do with the case. Has Wyoming the right to existence as a sovereign State? If the answer be "Yes," its right is to hold its land against the world, except and only except when it may be needed to defend the Republic against foreign enemies. To save the Republic from foreign enemies the right of the United States to take possession of every acre of South Carolina we concede.

Rights of no State will be defended against the encroachments of the Washington Government as long as the people of the States can be bought or hired with offices and subsidies to surrender them.

[From the Los Angeles Times of December 30, 1944]

PRESIDENT SETS JUDGMENT ABOVE CONGRESS AND PEOPLE

In his veto of the bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument, President Roosevelt again set his judgment above that of Congress, and of the people of Wyoming who unquestionably are opposed to having this great area locked away from its accustomed use. Congress has twice spoken on this subject, once when it refused to add the Jackson Hole area to the Teton National Park and again when it sought to set aside the creation of this monument; and both times it acted in consonance with the opinion of Wyoming.

The President says the region is "an outstanding example of a valley formed by block-faulting and glacial action and has as significant a story to tell of these great forces of nature as has the Grand Canyon to reveal of erosive processes." These features would remain if it were not a national monument.

The worst aspect of the veto is the President's calm assumption that he knows what the States and people should have better than they do. Yet democracy itself is based on the theory that the judgment of a great many people is better than that of one.

Freedom of the Press in the New World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the two daily newspapers which are published in the city of Lincoln, Nebr., combine their publications on Sunday and issue a joint newspaper known as the Lincoln Sunday Journal and Star. Recently, in connection with the Sixth War Loan drive, they offered a prize of $1,000 for the best article submitted by a student on the subject of Freedom of the Press in the new world peace. The prize was won by Robert C. Pfeiler, a young student in the Lincoln High School. I believe that the essay is of such quality that it merits a place in the appendix of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed there.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS IN THE NEW WORLD PEACE

(By Robert C. Pfeiler)

(Fifteen-year-old Robert C. Pfeiler, of 1627 Woodsview, Lincoln, is a twelfth-grade student at Lincoln High School. The following is the essay which won for him the first price of $1,000 in War bonds in the Lincoln Sunday Journal and Star Sixth War loan contest.)

The United Nations are engaged in a life-and-death struggle to bring about a world in which all men are free, and in which all nations are at peace. Unless a peace is made which includes the freedom of the press, the objectives of this war will be lost. The press is the means of representing the unrepresented. The voice of those in the minority and of those who are downtrodden can be heard only through a free press.

We are all familiar with the fact that dictators get into power and remain there through the control of public opinion. Goebbels dictating the day's news at a morning press conference represents the high-water mark of controlled opinion. The people of these dictatorships have been presented with this type of news which is distorted and often has no basis in fact. They and the rest of the world have suffered terribly and will continue to do so until the "slough of ignorance" is cleaned up. In the countries occupied by the Nazis, people have endured torture and death in order to print the true facts. In France, in spite of the Gestapo, newspapers and books were published which ultimately played an important part in the liberation of Paris. We learn from Jan Karski's book, Story of a Secret State, how the Polish people learned of the true situation even under German rule. In Bucharest, Rumania, recently freed from Nazi control, the number of newspapers has increased to 20, 10 more than they had previous to the war. Correspondents say the demand for honest newspapers is now insatiable. This proves that people thirst for the truth.

It will be the responsibility of the United States and the other United Nations to see that freedom of the press is established in the peace plan and preserved. This will not be easy. Many people will have lost confidence in their government. Civil war has been raging in Greece, and threatens in Italy, Belgium, and France, and may break out in other countries at any time. Nothing will do more to rebuild the confidence of the people in themselves and in their government than freedom of expression. Since the United States has long been known as the citadel of democracy, suppressed peoples will expect us to take the lead in sponsoring its principles. Suppression of the press makes people suspicious that something is being put over on them. The functions of a free press are to inform the people about the facts, and to stimulate constructive criticism about governments and existing conditions. A free press also educates the people in the principles of democracy by promoting free and open discussions of problems. People kept in ignorance and given only one side of an issue tend to lose their sense of discrimination and become less able to decide a question on its merits.

An indirect cause of war is false or incomplete presentation of international news. During the peace conference after the last war the people were not kept completely informed of the proceedings at the peace table. At the coming peace conference the representatives should know the people's wishes and the people must be kept up to date on all questions and actions of the conference. This can be done only through a free press.

Without knowledge of facts, and with confusion and suspicion within and between nations, fear of the uncertain and the unknown leads to distrust, hatred, and eventually to war. If countries are well informed of conditions within their own borders and throughout the rest of the world, there is no problem which could not be setfled peacefully by arbitration. Men are made free by truth, and freedom of truth makes permanence of peace.

Thus two things are to be done. First is to see that freedom of the press is a part of the peace plan of the world, and the second to make sure that this freedom is preserved everywhere. All countries must cooperate in achieving these ends.

But what are the concrete steps to be taken? There should be no governmental or monopolistic control of the press. It must not be under the thumbs of certain individuals or interests. Great news cartels must be broken up. They should no longer stand in such a position as to control the news. News organs must be free to print the facts. There should be no censoring of the news or information in peace years, unless it is proved to be scandalous or fraudulent. The source of all information should be known and given in order to check rumors and propaganda which either intentionally or unintentionally would throw fear or hatred into the people. There should be a free and unlimited exchange of news in all countries, and the foreign correspondents should have the right to send any news without being restricted or censored. Throughout every country all reporters should have an equal chance to search for, to gain access to, and to transmit news at equal and reasonable rates. To guarantee these fundamental conditions a strong international organization should be created with the power to enforce this plan.

The Associated Press, under the management of Kent Cooper, and the United Press are leading the way toward a free international press. A word of praise should be given to these organizations, as well as to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, for the manner in which they have set the example and have launched the program of preparing the world for freedom of information in the coming world peace.

That the men and women who die in this war shall not have died in vain we must have a free press, which is indispensable if we are to achieve a just and lasting peace.

Eulogy of Seventy-eighth Congress by Fulton Lewis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in recent years it has been considered somewhat the smart thing to belittle the Congress, and it is refreshing to find a gentleman who is a close student of national and political affairs who sums up the Seventy-eighth Congress in most complimentary language. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD that portion of the broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on Wednesday, December 20, 1944, eulogizing the Seventy-eighth Congress.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here in Washington, the Capitol was cavernously empty today. It is almost miraculous the way those 531 Senators and Representatives, with their respective families in many cases, were able to clear out of here last night, when the Seventy-eighth Congress adjourned, sine die, shortly after 8 o'clock.

In the estimate of average American thinking, and from the standpoint of average American tradition and principles, it was a good Congress, a very good Congress. I think the Washington news correspondents, who have seen Congresses come and go over years past, would agree that it probably is the best and most courageous Congress that we have known since the days of the last World War, and perhaps for even longer than that.

It probably made mistakes, but the Congress is the people, and it's the right of the people, in a free self-government, to make mistakes, if they want to. That, as a matter of fact, is one of the great tests of free self-government.

This much is certain: It did more to revive and restore the dignity and integrity and the prestige of the legislative branch of the American Government than any other Congress in many, many decades. And, as if it were conscious of that very fact, and had almost made a crusade toward that end, one of its last acts was the setting up of a special, bipartisan joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, to make a thorough study and present a definite program for the reorganization of the machinery of Congress, and the modernization of its procedure, to further continue that building in the future.

If it had done nothing else, that one act justified its 2 years of existence.

Incidentally, that special committee, headed by Senator FRANCIS MALONEY, of Connecticut, as chairman, and Representative MIKE MUNRONEY, of Oklahoma, as vice chairman (they being the two gentlemen who sponsored the resolution authorizing this study) held its first meeting today, and Senator MALONEY told me that in that opening session they made a general review of the various fields of study that are to be undertaken, and in a preliminary way, mapped a general program of procedure. However, no active investigating will be done until after the holidays, one simple reason being, among others, that the funds of the committee do not become available until January 1.

On at least two occasions, this Seventy-eighth Congress passed major legislation over a Presidential veto—first on the Smith-Connally Act, and second on the new tax law, both of which bills you may have disagreed with. The essential point, however, is that they asserted their independence. They proved, not only in this case, but in numerous others, that they were not supine, rubber stamps, like the yah-yah process of a Reichstag. They stood up and fought for what they thought was the right thing—whether it was or not—on numerous occasions, including among others, the issue of the roll-back subsidy. Sometimes the President overrode them, and made it stick; sometimes they won out. But the important thing was that the processes of American Government, under this Seventy-eighth Congress, were functioning and functioning effectively. When that is true, you can count on it reliably, that the ultimate outcome will be 90 percent right.

There was just one more striking contribution, and that was the manner in which this Congress wrote its legislation. Unlike many that came before, it did not blindly issue a lot of blank checks, either for money or for power. This Congress wrote specific legislation, saying in the name of the people, exactly and in detail what the people wanted done about this or that; specifying in much greater detail than before, just what appropriations were to be used for, and how. And once again, that is good government.

So, having done its job, we might well give it a salute of a job well done, and we might dub it, in congressional history, the Great Seventy-eighth.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the city of Milwaukee has an advisory council to the mayor, which represents some 46 civic groups. The public service committee of this advisory council recently submitted a report and resolution relative to the St. Lawrence seaway, which was unanimously adopted by the council.

For the information of the Congress and the people of the country, I am pleased to incorporate this report as part of these remarks:

To the Advisory Council to the Mayor of Milwaukee.

GENTLEMEN: The Public Service Committee of the Advisory Council was directed on Wednesday, January 12, 1944, to review and make recommendations relevant to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and its relative potentialities to the port of Milwaukee and to make recommendations to bring about its realization if the project were in keeping with the best interest of the city of Milwaukee.

Your committee has diligently pursued its assignment. It has reviewed the history of the controversy which dates back to the last quarter of the nineteenth century. It has reviewed the opinions of the various Great Lakes port authorities. Your committee has also collected the statements and opinions of the United States Senators and Congressmen who have given their expressions to this enterprise. They have also interviewed several Members of Congress. Your committee has also considered the expressions of various interested parties representing industry, labor, transportation (both maritime and rail), local and State officials, and the military and naval departments of the Federal Government. Your committee has taken full cognizance of the more than four decades of controversy during which the people of both the United States and Canada and especially in the regions of the Great Lakes and Upper Mississippi Valley have been evaluating the benefits of bringing the ocean to the doorway of the Middle West.

The proposed St. Lawrence seaway project consists of:

1. Twenty-seven foot navigation in reaches of the St. Lawrence River where shipping is now restricted to vessels which can use 14-foot canals, enabling ocean cargo vessels to reach all Great Lakes ports.

2. Two million two hundred thousand horsepower of the most economical power on the continent, to be developed at the navigation dam in the International Rapids section of the river. Half this power will belong to the United States and half to Canada.

3. The net cost to the United States of providing oceangoing navigation into the Great Lakes after deducting what the State of New York would pay for power development will not exceed $200,000,000, which includes 25 percent for contingency. These estimates are from the United States Army engineers.

The current motivating force now sponsoring this project centers around the enabling legislation known as the Aiken-Pittenger bill (S. 1385) jointly introduced by Senator AIKEN of Vermont and Congressman PITTENGER of Minnesota. Much of the discussion in Congress evolves around the issue whether the act should be consummated by treaty which requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate or by executive agreement which requires a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

The committee is of the opinion that the St. Lawrence Seaway should not be viewed as a narrow and sectional demand. What is good for the Great Lakes region is good for the Nation as a whole. If the prosperity and commerce of the Great Lakes region is enhanced the benefits will be Nation-wide. As we in the Great Lakes region recognize the economic benefit of projects such as the T. V. A., Boulder Dam, and Grand Coulee, which we have helped to finance, we ask that other parts of the Nation recognize the national benefits to be derived from the St. Lawrence project.

The committee is convinced that had the St. Lawrence Seaway been available at the opening of World War No. 2, the military efforts of United States and Canada would have been far more effective and the war could have been undoubtedly shortened. Despite the fine harbors, the great industrial plans, and the shipbuilding equipment of this area, less than 2 percent of the tonnage constructed in the United States has been built in the Great Lakes Basin. Had the seaway been available, 10,000 cruisers and liberty ships could have been constructed in sheltered Great Lakes harbors and sent directly into service. Great economies in the national defense effort could have been achieved through mass movement of raw materials and finished equipment via the seaway. The future safety of our country requires that national defense industries be located in interior areas and this further emphasizes the need of the seaway for mass transportation of raw materials and finished goods. Stock piles of strategic materials could be concentrated in Great Lakes harbor if the seaway were open to permit their movement in mass quantity.

The committee is of the opinion that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway during the immediate post-war period will aid in providing tens of thousands of jobs in useful and productive work and the favorable economic effects of the seaway will undoubtedly create thousands of additional jobs in harbor cities of the Great Lakes region. The project, therefore, is a necessity to assure full revival of post-war employment.

The committee concludes and is unanimous in its opinion that the St. Lawrence seaway will be a great and lasting benefit to the United States of America and to each and every portion thereof. That the areas of and adjacent to the Great Lakes and upper Mississippi Valley will be benefited by having a sea road and removing its present landlocked limitations. That the port of Milwaukee and its metropolitan area will be afforded immeasurable foreign trade opportunities. It will benefit through the removal of restraints upon the transportation of raw materials and products by excessive freight charges. It presents great possibilities for shipbuilding and drydock facilities in this area. It will provide full use of our natural harbor. It will provide efficiency in distribution for our commerce on a world-wide competitive basis. It will provide Milwaukee with new employment and economic benefits in this city's position as one of the outstanding ports of a territory which is considered the industrial and agricultural heart of the Nation.

The committee, therefore, concludes and unanimously recommends that the advisory council to the mayor of Milwaukee adopt the attached resolution:

"Be it resolved, That the advisory council to the mayor of the city of Milwaukee hereby endorses without reservation the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and recommends that the Honorable John L. Bohn, mayor of Milwaukee, shall exercise the authority and influence of his office to aid in bringing about enabling legislation in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the interested Senators and Congressmen be advised of this action and that they be encouraged to exercise the authority of their office in consummating this project; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this report and resolution be printed and be placed in the hands of the delegates to the advisory council and other interested parties for the purpose of aiding in the passage of Federal legislation which will bring about immediate consideration of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project."

B. H. BARG, *Chairman,*
ARTHUR G. APLIN, *Vice Chairman,*
HARRY SCHACHTSCHNEIDER,
WALDEMAR STECHER,
O. V. HANSEN,
CHAS. E. BALDWIN,
CHESTER V. SALOMON, *Ex Officio,*
Public Service Committee.

Rendezvous With Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable J. H. Blundell, regional information executive, Office of Price Administration, of Dallas, made a very interesting and instructive speech before the Lion's Club at St. Louis, Mo., November 15, 1944.

It contained such interesting information relative to wartime problems and post-war problems, I am inserting it herewith.

It is as follows:

This generation has had its rendezvous with destiny—the generation that was too soft, too weak; the generation that was bred in the lap of luxury; that Hitler bet would never fight found its soul at Pearl Harbor.

How surely, how courageously, how eagerly this generation of Americans kept its rendezvous with destiny has already been written indelibly upon the pages of history. On Bataan Peninsula, at Guadalcanal, Salerno, and Anzio, on the beaches of Tarawa and Saipan and among the hedgerows of Normandy—there is history's evidence. Every day new chapters are being written—today in the Philippines and at the Siegfried line—tomorrow in Berlin and Tokyo.

But Berlin and Tokyo will not be the final chapters in this brilliant history. Strange as it may seem, the gallant authors of these magnificent chapters will not have the privilege, or opportunity of writing the closing and final chapter. Destiny has assigned that rendezvous to you and me.

Despite the fact that history repeats itself, it has taken the American people a long time—a century and a half and six wars to learn that wars must be won at home after the enemy has been defeated abroad.

Throughout our history we've never lost a war—nor won a peace.

It has taken us 168 years to learn that war is inevitably followed by inflation; that inflation is inevitably followed by deflation; that deflation is inevitably followed by depression; and that depression loses wars always won.

War, inflation, deflation, depression—that's the history lesson it took us so long to learn. Let's take a quick glance at a few pages of history.

Valley Forge! Does it make you proud when you hear the words? Every American should hang his head in shame because Americans and not the British were responsible for what happened at Valley Forge. Why? Listen to a part of a committee report written in 1776: "This committee, taking into consideration the unbounded avarice of many persons, by daily adding to the now almost intolerable exorbitant price of every necessary and convenient article of life * * * which at this time of distress, unless a speedy and effective stop be put thereto, will be attended with the most pernicious and fatal consequences."

It was the greed of some of our own American people who caused the little handful of patriots at Valley Forge to freeze, hunger, bleed, and die. General Washington could have had food and clothing and heat for his men except that a wagon-load of supplies cost a wagon full of paper money.

Did we learn anything from Valley Forge? Listen:

"The houses of the most prosperous planters were found denuded of almost every article of furniture and in some sections women and children accustomed to luxury begged from door to door * * *. In the larger towns the weary soldiers found business prostrate except with the sutlers in full possession now that the merchants were ruined and these sutlers were amassing fortunes through profiteering without shame." (I had never heard the word "sutler" before. We call them war profiteers and black market operators now.) "There was no shipping in the harbors where the piers were decaying rapidly. Cows were feeding on the vacant lots and grass was growing between the paving stones in the principal streets. Warehouses were deserted. Banks had closed their doors. The insurance companies had failed. The one hope for restoration was the resumption of old normal activities in the country, the cultivations of the plantations as of old."

Eighty-nine years after Valley Forge, that was the America to which those brave soldiers on both sides came home after the War between the States.

By 1914 we had grown up as a Nation. Little business had become big business. We were smart in the ways of money and economy. We knew how to produce and provide jobs. Let's see how smart we were.

We finally learned that war always caused inflation and we decided to do something about it. So we set up a few brakes on the American economy for war. Only a few.

From 1917 to 1920 the American war costs were $32,000,000,000 actually spent. But calculations based on 1913 prices or 1930 prices indicates that little more than half of that amount would have been spent had it not been for wartime inflation. Without such inflationary price increases the taxes during the war and the Government indebtedness after the war would have been much lower.

Do you remember those $25 silk shirts? Four dollar shoes you paid $20 for? The long lines at the grocer's waiting to get sugar and to pay 29½ cents per pound for it when they could get it? Had we learned anything?

No. We even did away with the few brakes we had immediately on the signing of the Armistice. Prices went higher. Anticipating continued increases, merchants scrambled for inventories, bid against each other in order to stock their shelves and storerooms so they could benefit and profit from the higher prices.

Inflation didn't end with the Armistice. The cost-of-living index continued to rise, until in 1920 it reached 200 from a 1914 level of a hundred. When the Armistice was signed, the cost of living stood at 160. It rose 40 more points after the war had ended.

Now some businessmen may say, What's wrong with high prices? Let's see what happened as a result of these good prices. In 1919 corporation profits were six and a half billions of dollars; in 1921 there were no corporation profits in this country. In two short years the reserves built up during the war had not only been wiped out but profits had turned to losses. Factory pay rolls which increased greatly during the war continued to increase through 1918 and in the year following amounted to $240,000,000 per week; within 1 year the weekly take-home pay of factory workers was reduced to 150 million, or nearly a hundred million less in 1921 than in 1920.

Let's see what happened to the farmer who could and did get one to two hundred dollars an acre for his land during the war. When the farmer prospers, everybody prospers, so we should be able to learn something from looking at the condition of the farmer's income.

He was pretty well off during the war. Annual farm income in 1918 amounted to $9,000,000,000. This income held fairly firm until the latter part of 1919. But when the cost of living and wholesale and industrial prices had not quite reached their peak, and when corporation profits and factory pay rolls were still increasing, the farmer's income began to drop. That should have been warning enough that something was about to pop, but apparently it wasn't. For farm income really started down in a hurry. During 1919 and 1920 it fell from the peak of 9 billion to 3 billion.

That's the story of how well we learned our lesson. When the war ended we went back to our economic philosophy that Providence had blessed this Nation with unending security and we went merrily on our way. We hadn't learned that inflation brings on deflation and that deflation is followed by depression.

There are some experts who maintain that war without inflation is an economic impossibility; that it is inevitable; too much money competing for too few goods; this is the explanation offered by some of those who insist nothing can be done to avoid inflation. Even after a century and a half and six wars, they maintained that we should allow the natural laws of economics—supply and demand, etc.—to take care of things.

But there were some who said it must not happen again and who were determined to do something. With more money and fewer goods we would have been on the high and wide road to inflation had it not been for the far-sightedness of the Congress and the Chief Executive.

For more than 2½ years we have all been trying to maintain a stable economy and in general our efforts have been successful. Since the spring of 1942 industrial prices have risen only 3 percent. During the same period the cost of living—prices of items purchased by the average middle-income family—has risen only 9 percent. Nearly all of this 9 percent occurred during the early days of the war when we were trying to get our economic feet on the ground. For the past 18 months there has been little or no increase.

There were some who said this might be done, but only at the expense of many of our economic groups. Let's see about that:

While prices have been held in line, corporate profits have increased nearly $5,000,000,000 over 1939—and that's after taxes. Farm income last year was thirteen billion compared to four and a half in 1939! Last year, in spite of wage controls, factory workers in this country took home every week of the year $800,000,000.

Now who's been hurt by price control?

The Office of Price Administration has the responsibility for the actual pricing of 8,000,000 products and services and the establishment of rents for 14,500,000 dwelling units. Without past experience and in many instances forced to use trial and fail, trial and success methods, it has been a tremendous job. Naturally there have been mistakes, delays, and irritations, but the job has been done and prices and rents have remained stable.

We have come a long way but we've got a long way to go before the over-all job is complete. Like every businessman in America you are interested more in the future than the past. Like every father in America you are interested in what can be done to provide a better country for those younger Americans who are every day meeting their destiny without hesitation. Like every citizen in America you are interested in making this country one in which all four freedoms, including the freedom from want, can be enjoyed by even the humblest among us.

Our job here at home is twofold.

We must, first of all, continue to hold the line. The danger is not past. That danger is complacency on the part of our people. With victory in sight there may be a tendency to let up, to ease off, to let go, to cash our bonds, buy another car (if we can find one), spend our savings, maybe even pay a little more than the ceiling price for some things. We dare not. What would you say if our soldiers, sailors, or marines should conquer the Philippines, get to Manila, and say it looks like it's about all over so maybe we can take it easy from here on? Or, if the boys in Germany should say we're nearly to Berlin; it's only 300 miles farther, so let's take it easy and coast the rest of the way?

The answer is apparent. Suppose those same boys hear that we are letting up, that because of our apathy and complacency the cost of living starts up, and they know that every cent increase means fewer cents in those small allotment checks which are keeping their wives and kids from having to accept charity! You know what they would say. They wouldnt like it either.

We owe it to them to see that the line is held until all danger to their monthly allotments is past.

The second part of this twofold job is to discharge the trust and confidence those boys have placed in us to make certain they will return to a secure nation. Secure from want, from unemployment, breadlines, bonus marchers, and all the other evil results of the unpardonable sins of apathy and complacency we committed after the last war.

That's our job.

In the first place, you as individuals can refuse to buy anything above the legal ceiling and everything you buy has a ceiling. In order to do that you must compare the prices quoted you with top legal prices and refuse to pay more. And you can get your families to do the same thing. That's the first part of the job. But it is not enough if we just hold the line. We have to remember the lessons of history.

Do you think for a moment that we could live with ourselves, go to sleep at night with a clear conscience if we permit a repetition of what has happened after every war in which this Nation has engaged? Are you willing to welcome back our boys from the fighting fronts after they have finished their job and have them find business prostrate, with the war profiteers in full possession, amassing fortunes through profiteering without shame; or do you want them to return to this country to find no shipping in our har-

bors, piers decaying, cows feeding on the vacant lots, and the grass growing between the paving stones in the principal streets?

If we permit even a small part of the 4,000,000 men now fighting overseas to come home and find that we have forgotten them, may the Lord have mercy upon us.

Many people have said that we should see to it that our boys come back to the things they left and the kind of country they sailed from to fight for. You and they are going to want and demand a better America than the one they knew before.

What does all this mean? It means that we have a sacred responsibility, that we too have a rendezvous with destiny.

And that brings us to what we must do to get the second part of our job done. According to the Department of Commerce, if we produce only as much as we produced in 1940 we will have 19,000,000 unemployed in this country. For in 1940 we produced 30 percent less than we are now producing. We don't want to go back to 1940 in any respect. In fact, we cannot go back. We have to go forward.

There is only one answer and that is full production in our factories and on our farms. Without full production in our factories, labor cannot purchase the products of the soil. Without full production on our farms, farmers cannot purchase the products of our factories.

This is not the vague dream of economic theorists but it is the cold-blooded calculation of farsighted businessmen.

If we are to go forward, achieve full production—which will mean full employment, there are several steps which must be taken.

We must continue the teamwork of industry, labor, and agriculture and government, which has been developed during the war. We must not go back to the days of open warfare between labor and capital, between agriculture and labor—the days of monopolies, cartels, and other practices which prevent free enterprise and full production.

Second. During the critical period of reconversion and the period immediately following the peace, we must continue to maintain a stabilization program so long as the threat of inflation is even remotely apparent; until the natural laws of economics can again become operative.

Third. The Congress must enact tax laws which will encourage the greatest possible investment of risk capital and which will discourage the hoarding of savings of corporations and individuals.

Fourth. Competitive free enterprise must be protected and encouraged in every possible way.

Fifth. Particular encouragement must be given to small business because small business is the heart of competition.

Sixth. Farm income must be kept at its present high level.

Seventh. Social-security benefits must be increased and broadened.

Eighth. We must provide for a broad and vigorous program of housing and slum clearance.

Ninth. Major works program must be developed to provide for reforestation, flood control, irrigation, highways, medical centers, hospitals, schools, and recreation facilities.

Tenth. Exports must be given every encouragement because one of our three greatest markets in the post-war era will be our exports to foreign countries, many of which are so badly in need of the products of our factories and our farms.

Eleventh. We must get rid of restrictive controls, so necessary during the war and post-war period, as soon as it is safe to do so.

If we are to maintain full production, provide jobs, avoid a depression, and create a prosperous America, this program must have the assistance and backing of businessmen throughout the country.

With full production in this country we can increase consumer expenditures to such an extent that the American people can purchase 40 percent more food than was purchased in 1940. We can buy 45 percent more clothing than we bought in that year. We can increase our purchases of electrical equipment by 55 percent, household furniture by 70 percent and the farmers of America will be able to purchase 50 percent more farm machinery than they did in 1940. We will be able to construct 250 percent more new buildings than we built in that year.

If we go back to 1940 production, if we operate on the theory of minimum production at a maximum price instead of maximum production and distribution at the lowest possible cost per unit, we will have a situation in this country which will exceed the depression of the early 1930's.

In 1940 there were 9,000,000 unemployed. Since 1940 the growth in our population has provided us with 2,500,000 additional workers. In the meantime, productivity of industry and technological improvements have grown steadily, enabling us to produce our 1940 volume with 8,000,000 fewer workers. On this basis, if we go back after the war to 1940 production we will find ourselves with 19,000,000 unemployed.

That's the final chapter yet to be written in the history of this generation, which had a rendezvous with destiny. That's the chapter which has been left for you and me to write. If we keep our rendezvous as well, as courageously as the younger members of our generation have kept theirs, we will deserve and receive the gratitude of the millions of young Americans whose sacrifices have caused our meager contributions to pale into insignificance.

On the other hand, if we do not keep that rendezvous, if we become complacent and apathetic, the blood will be on our hands, and I pray again that when we meet those boys face to face, the Lord will have mercy on us.

Statement of Dr. Andrew F. McBride, of Paterson, N. J., on His Seventy-sixth Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Andrew F. McBride, often referred to in the Paterson (N. J.) press, as that city's No. 1 citizen, reached his seventy-sixth birthday last Thursday and reporters who sought him out found him working as usual.

Dr. McBride has a distinguished record. He was thrice mayor of Paterson, and during World War No. 1, he was a lieutenant colonel in the Medical Corps. In 1923 he became our State's first commissioner of labor. Presently he is chairman of the Paterson Savings Institution Board, Passaic County chairman of War bond drives, Passaic County chairman of the Selective Service Appeals Board, a trustee of the Medical Society of New Jersey, and a delegate to the American Medical Society. Besides these activities he has a very active medical practice.

Last Thursday he gave the press the following statement bearing on his philosophy on kindness:

Life at best is short. If God gives one good health and a reasonable mind and a desire to work, He has richly endowed that individual. Now if that person in turn fails to appreciate these gifts by sharing them with his less fortunate brothers, then he, indeed, misses much in life that is worth living for. We are our brothers' keepers. We should bend our every effort toward helping people who really deserve and need to be helped.

In my humble opinion, those entrusted by their fellows with the operation of government have the greatest opportunity possible to do service to mankind generally. I sincerely believe in honest, efficient, economical, and intelligent government, believing as I do that if all the peoples of the world had this manner of government, there never would be wars. It is only through governments of nations seeking something to which they are not entitled that wars breed and are fomented. Therefore, I believe that people generally should be most careful in the selection of those whom they place in prominent positions and public offices.

My sincere and fervent hope is that this terrible war may soon be over and that a just and lasting peace will follow—a peace that will mean equal opportunities and the right of the individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If such a peace can be assured the people of the world, then I am certain everybody will be benefited thereby and then indeed we will have the ideal world.

My further hope is that a miracle will develop from the terrible conflict and that a chastened and better group of nations will emerge because of the terrible loss in human life and materials.

These are my thoughts as I mark this anniversary.

What We Owe to the Wounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 8, 1945, is so timely and pertinent that I hope it can be brought to the attention of every civilian in this country. It charges us with a great responsibility, an everlasting debt. May we not forget.

WHAT WE OWE TO THE WOUNDED

(By Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General of the United States Army, in the New York Times Magazine)

(Disabled or disfigured ex-servicemen are neither freaks to be stared at, nor seekers of pity, says Army general in charge of hospitalization and rehabilitation; they dread the family's tears; civilians must let them do things for themselves and avoid misplaced solicitude.)

There are some wounds that doctors cannot cure—wounds to the spirit caused by curious or shuddering stares, prying questions, pity and misplaced solicitude. This type of wound concerns the staffs of our Army hospitals and convalescent centers because they see men who have been disabled

leave for their convalescent furloughs with high hearts and eager spirits—and all too often come back disheartened, pugnacious, or bitter.

Some men joke about it to hide their real feelings. One man tells this story: He had been standing on the corner waiting for a traffic light to change when he heard two women whispering behind him. One said, "I'm sure it's artificial—I heard it squeak."

He turned around and said, "Yes, lady, it's a wooden leg. Want to see it?" and pulled up his trouser leg. To use his own expression, "They squealed and ran like hell."

NOT WOODEN FEELINGS

Of course, these women hadn't expected their remark to be overheard. I hope it taught them a lesson. Soldiers may have wooden legs, but it doesn't follow that they have wooden feelings.

Tears and pity are harder than curiosity for the men to take. The elderly gentleman who dolefully patted a disabled man on the shoulder and said, "My poor boy, I feel for you," and the motherly lady who burst into tears as she asked, "Where did you lose it?" were both, no doubt, motivated by honest sympathy. But think how the soldier trying to enjoy his furlough felt.

Some of these very people who are the most inconsiderate when they meet these men outside the hospital might be shocked if they were to visit a convalescent center and see the rugged treatment these convalescents take—and like. The insistence on a man's getting along "on his own" after adequate instruction is all part of a carefully planned medical program that aims to restore the disabled soldier's confidence in himself and his independence of those around him.

But merely restoring a handicapped soldier to physical independence is not enough. Measures must be taken to help these men back to a healthy, normal outlook and imbue them with the spirit to become an asset to their community when they return to civilian life.

HOW PUBLIC CAN HELP

The real test comes after the soldier leaves the hospital and returns to the world of civilians. He leaves the hospital with his chin up. He thinks of himself not as a handicapped ex-soldier but as Johnny Jones, or whatever his name happens to be. He thinks about going home again, and getting out and having fun again, and eventually of going back to work again.

What happens to Johnny Jones and the thousands of other handicapped ex-servicemen whom the war is sending home—will eventually be up to you. How can you help?

First of all, control your emotions when you see a disabled or disfigured man on the street. Remember that this soldier wants only to be accepted as the individual he is. He does not need or want your pity. He expects and is entitled to decent consideration. He is not a freak in a side show to be stared at and whispered about. Chances are he does not want to be reminded of the circumstances under which he was injured—whether his injury was received in combat overseas or in an accident.

If the man is your son or husband, your attitude will have a lasting effect on his future. More than anything else when he leaves the hospital, a soldier dreads his family's tears and pity. Don't think of him as a cripple and he won't be. Let him do things for himself. Smoothness and skill come only with practice and may take years to acquire. An overanxious or overly protective attitude can undermine all the good that has been accomplished in the hospital, and even reduce him to a dependent state again.

RIGHT JOB IMPORTANT

This does not mean that families should go to the other extreme of appearing unconcerned about the disabled soldier's problems or his future. But he should be treated like a normal, mature man.

Next to this social reassurance, economic reassurance is most essential to the disabled soldier's future. This means something more than financial compensation for his injury, or Federal aid, or even job preference. He not only wants a job but wants the best he can handle. To give him less is sorry payment for the sacrifice he has made. To give him work for which he is not qualified is equally an injustice; it foredooms him to failure.

The disabled soldier who applies for a job and who never worked before entering the Army fresh from school has matured, learned to take orders and overcome difficulties, and probably acquired skills that have commercial value.

SELECTIVE PLACEMENT NEEDED

The man who was employed before he entered the Army may return with a higher earning power than before. He may have increased his earning power by taking one of the vocational or educational training courses open to veterans.

Many offices and factories already have a number of disabled men on their pay rolls. Some are taking former employees back without regard to their disability. This is just as much a mistake as to turn them away. Selective placement is not only essential to the successful utilization of this highly valuable man power; it is a debt that business and industry owe our handicapped soldiers.

After employment, during the period of adjustment to civilian life and the new job, understanding on the part of the employer is just as essential to the handicapped ex-soldier as understanding on the part of his family.

Every handicapped soldier has made a very great sacrifice. It is the grave responsibility of us all to see that this sacrifice does not limit his way of life in the future.

Resolution of Polish-American Democratic Organization of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted December 20, 1944, and presented on January 2, 1945, to the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Secretary of State, by a delegation representing the Polish-American Democratic Organization of Chicago, Ill., headed by Victor L. Schlaeger and Joseph P. Rostenkowski:

We, the undersigned, have the honor to transmit to you the following resolution unanimously adopted by the Polish-American Democratic Organization.

As American citizens of Polish lineage, we earnestly reaffirm our allegiance to our country, the United States of America; we pledge our unyielding and ceaseless support in the winning of the World War, in which our kinsmen are actively engaged on all fronts; and we adopt the following resolution:

Whereas recent statements by officials of other governments have made it appear that the fate of Poland, our first ally, has been prejudged; and

Whereas the Secretary of State of the United States has unequivocally reiterated the steadfast policy of the United States Government, to preserve, maintain and restore the independence of the United Nations; and

Whereas we conceive it to be of paramount importance to concentrate all our energies upon the successful prosecution of the war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Polish-American Democratic Organization, hereby express our sincere hope and trust that controversial matters appertaining to Poland as an independent and sovereign nation, shall be resolved upon the cessation of hostilities in Europe, in accordance with the policy of the United States Government, with the ultimate objective of preserving the territorial integrity of Poland as it existed September 1, 1939.

Polish American Democratic Organization: Frank Bobrytzke, president; John Prystalski; Stephen Love; Peter H. Schwaba; Victor L. Schlaeger; Ludwik Lesnicki; Leo Kocialkowski; Joseph P. Rostenkowski; Casimir Griglik; John A. Szumnarski, executive committee.

I had the pleasure of introducing this group of prominent Americans of Polish descent, and expressed to the Secretary my appreciation and deepest interest in his pronouncements regarding the Polish-Russian controversy, and urged the upholding of the principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter, concerning Poland.

I further reiterated that the exiled Polish Government in London is the only representative body of the Polish Nation that is being recognized by the United States and other democratic powers who are allied together to defeat our common enemy.

I also presented this group to the Honorable TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and to the Honorable SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, who received them very cordially.

The Ship-Air Transport Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the American merchant marine is at the crossroads. It is at the most crucial period of its entire history. If cannot meet the competition of foreign maritime nations unless it is given the opportunity to meet them on common ground.

Our merchant marine must be given the right to operate overseas air transport in identically the same manner as Britain and other competing maritime nations. Those nations have no civil aeronautics board to make restrictive rulings detrimental to their merchant-marine interests.

Because it is a merchant-marine matter of supreme importance to which the

House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has given close attention in the last Congress, and because it has been forcefully presented in a splendid editorial which recently appeared in the San Francisco Examiner, under leave to extend my remarks and include it therein, I invite the attention of every Member of the House of Representatives to that editorial:

THE SHIP-AIR TRANSPORT ISSUE

The Merchant Marine Committee of the House of Representatives has unanimously recommended to Congress that American steamship companies be given the right to augment their services with supplementary air lines after the war.

This is a realistic recognition of the conditions under which American foreign commerce will have to be conducted when peacetime competition is resumed.

"All the other great maritime powers," the committee reports, "have already cleared the way for combined ship-air operations by their merchant fleets. * * *

"The American merchant marine should not be handicapped by denying it the right to use aviation service."

The United States has, of course, a great opportunity in the field of post-war foreign commerce—but it must first get in a position to take advantage of its opportunity.

The plain truth, as this alert committee of Congress has pointed out, is that other nations, while lacking our present equipment in ships and planes for foreign trade and other capacities for producing more and better ships and planes in the future, are offsetting these factors.

British interests, for instance, are getting out ahead in several important ways.

In the matter of ship-air operations, as we learn from the report to Congress, the British already have an advantage.

They are constantly making other advantages.

In evidence of this is the British program, as the London Daily Mail recently said, for:

"A national pool of air lines from which companies, whether publicly or privately owned, could charter the planes they need for air-line operations all over the world."

That provides a measure of the ambitious competition British foreign-trade interests are contemplating.

The same British publication further discloses:

"The organization might be expanded still further for the convenience of dominion air-line operators and even for foreign lines wishing to use British planes and equipment."

In fact, says the Daily Mail:

"A powerful cooperative scheme between Empire air services all over the world is * * * being worked out quietly behind the scenes."

Plainly, American foreign-trade planners are going to find themselves competing with experts in the post-war field of international commerce.

It will stand them in good stead to become experts on their own account, for it is the considered and competent opinion of American authorities best informed about this situation that 5,000,000 Americans will depend on foreign trade for their post-war living.

And much more than American prosperity will depend on realization of our advantages and opportunities in our future commerce with other nations, for as Mr. John W. Davis, vice president and trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, has said:

"Our exports of American goods after the war, with their related imports, will not only assure us an expanding trade that will be reflected in prosperity at home—such trade will serve in a practical way to cement our friendly relations with the nations of the world."

The House Merchant Marine Committee, in its advocacy of an American ship-air foreign trade policy preserving the advantages and opportunities accruing to us by reason of our present great maritime and aviation establishments and our even greater productive capacities, has demonstrated commendable understanding of its responsibilities.

On Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of yesterday:

ON FOREIGN POLICY

There was nothing either exceptional or exceptionable in the rather brief statement on foreign policy that President Roosevelt included in his message to Congress. Its generalities have met with widespread approval both at home and abroad. Certainly no one could disagree with the President in arguing that we must stand together with the United Nations in war and peace; that the period of readjustment following liberation will be as hard for the freed peoples as it was for us after the Revolutionary War; that differences among the victors are certain to arise; that we must not let these differences divide us, but that international "cooperation on which enduring peace must be based is not a one-way street."

The President took note of the current agitation against power politics which is engaging both perfectionists and obstructionists in somewhat astonishing fellowship. Power is a fact. It has to be used, as the President said, in international no less than in national affairs. It is against the "misuse of power" implied in the term "power politics" that we stand, not, as he implied, the organization of power which will enable the great powers to meet their responsibilities in peace as in war. In our view the Atlantic Charter serves as the only restraint pending the codification of world law against the misuse of power. And we were accordingly glad to see that the President reaffirmed his stand foursquare on the principles of the Atlantic Charter; that it is "our purpose to respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they are to live" and that we intend to use our influence to the end that "no temporary or provisional authorities in the liberated countries block the eventual exercise of the people's right freely to choose the government and institutions under which, as freemen, they are to live." All those positions have been generally applauded.

There was particular gratification to be found in his announcement that steps are new being taken to equip large new French forces with the most modern weapons. This is a move which the Post had strongly advocated. It would be absurd to call for total mobilization in the United States while leaving the French half-armed. The pity is that the step was not taken when General de Gaulle asked for arms. But, better late than never; the arming of the French will relieve the pressure on American manpower while giving the French themselves a chance to make themselves count against the German militarily. The need is to put more French in the firing line without delay. It is to be hoped that General de Gaulle will give proof of French determination to fight to the full by allowing French regiments to be brigaded with their Allies as soon as they are armed and trained. The war will not wait for whole armies or even divisions to be put in fighting condition. French prestige would be further acknowledged by widening the scope of the impending meeting of the big three to include General de Gaulle.

That the President did not descend from the general to the concrete is doubtless due to the impending meeting of the big three. In several respects this country has been overtaken by events. When the meeting occurs, it is to be hoped that the statesmen will come to grips with the problems at issue, particularly the future of Germany; and, what is even more important, give the people an accounting of their decisions. There would not be today the dubiety over the existing power decisions if there had been some foreknowledge and understanding of the power system that the grand alliance has worked out.

The True Spirit of Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I was recently privileged to participate in a program sponsored by the Institute for American Democracy, Inc., upon the occasion of the unveiling of the first of a series of historic posters designed to graphically portray the true spirit of unity.

Local municipal officers, representatives of the clergy of various denominations and faiths, and representatives of civic and patriotic groups were in attendance at this ceremony.

I was privileged to make the following address on that occasion:

The Institute for American Democracy, Inc., sponsors of this program, is composed of people of all faiths, creeds, races, and colors who earnestly believe that unity among our people is essential to decent American life and the preservation of true democracy in this Nation. Its sponsors and members fervently believe that real unity among our people can be achieved only by sympathetic understanding of the fundamental principles upon which this democracy was founded. Because I subscribe to that belief, I am pleased to participate in these ceremonies and to briefly refer to some of the principles for which this organization stands.

It is well to recall that the able and religious men of the original Colonies wrote a Declaration of Independence that through the years has clearly stated the aims, purposes, and ambitions of all people seeking liberty and freedom. It is well to recall the ringing declaration incorporated in that immortal document wherein is expressed in a

few terse words the underlying doctrine of democratic government.

Listen: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

True Americans and true believers in human rights, human liberty, and human freedom have clung to this declaration as fundamental in any democratic society. In these days of great trouble, stress, uncertainty, and sorrow more and more people are turning to the faith of our fathers for inspiration and guidance. Americans as never before now realize, as did the framers of the Declaration of Independence, that regardless of race, color, or creed, we as a free people hold certain fundamental principles in common trust. We cling to the ancient doctrine that Almighty God intended that any noble purpose can be achieved only by unity of thought, action, and deed. Time and again in the historic utterances of our great men attention has been called to the necessity for unity among our people if we are to achieve the ultimate ends of human freedom under a democratic form of government.

Here tonight we reaffirm the great moral principle quoted from the Declaration of Independence and declare without equivocation that every citizen, regardless of race, color, or creed, has fundamental rights that are guaranteed and protected not only by the grace of God but by imperishable principles grounded in the fundamental law of this land. What are some of these principles?

First. The equality of men with respect to their fundamental rights.

Second. The sacredness of human personality, and

Third. A proper conception of a government instituted to preserve, protect, and defend those rights.

Each of these fundamental principles finds its source in the moral law. Today, amid the trials and tribulations of the most devastating catastrophe in the world's history, our people in amazing numbers are turning to God for guidance and comfort. If we are to achieve real unity, we must carefully avoid circulation of baseless rumor. We must learn to segregate subversive propaganda from truth. We must spike every effort to divide us on the home front. We must be vigilant in seeing to it that no canard, no half-truth, no vicious insinuation, is circulated unchallenged. We must educate and persuade Americans everywhere to think straight on basic American principles. We must all at all times realize that this great country which we all love is composed of people of all faiths, colors and creeds and that any person who agitates for the persecution or suppression of any racial or religious group is doing so in violation not only of the great moral law upon which our country is founded, but in violation of the common conscience of the millions of Americans who on the battle fronts of the world are fighting and dying to preserve liberty and freedom. Faced by a common enemy, they stand or fall together, Catholic, Protestant and Jew—they are joined in a common bond of brotherhood.

We on the home front owe it to them to face the complex problems here with the same courageous unity of purpose. We are Americans, and pulling together we shall face the future unafraid—secure in the knowledge that a renewed and inspired faith in the moral concept upon which our Government was founded will lead us through, not only to victory on the battle fronts, but to victory here at home.

It is in this spirit that there will shortly be unveiled the first of a series of historic posters graphically portraying the basic philosophy, the true spirit, of unity.

Butter Production Drops Off as Result of Unwise Government Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota State Department of Agriculture has recently released some interesting figures on the production of butterfat in Minnesota for the year 1943.

In spite of the great demand for butter, it is rather surprising to note that Minnesota, one of the outstanding butter-producing States in the Union, is falling short of the production of previous years.

As compared with 1941, the 1943 production of butter in Minnesota has decreased every month. During May 1943, production had dropped approximately 6,000,000 pounds from the production peak for that same month in 1941.

According to the Modern Dairyman, a publication published by the National Creameries Association, butter production for October of 1944 fell to the lowest level for that month since 1925, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics announced recently.

Production for the month totaled only 100,135,000 pounds for the Nation. This was 6.4 percent less than the October 1943 figure and was 22.6 percent under the 10-year October average.

For the first 10 months of 1944 the output of creamery butter was 1,312,425,000 pounds. This is 11.5 percent under the 1943 production for that period and 13.3 percent under the 10-year average for the period.

Despite an increase of 361,000,000 pounds in total milk production for the month, the butter decrease was registered. Observers see in this evidence of the inroads made upon the raw materials of butter by other products.

On the other hand, total dry-milk production jumped from approximately 35,000,000 pounds in 1937 to about 48,000,000 pounds in 1940. As a result of the war demands, the production figures jumped from 48,000,000 pounds in 1940 to over 127,000,000 pounds in 1943 and the trend was upward for 1944.

Partly responsible for this increase is the larger subsidy payments being made by the Government to farmers producing whole milk for milk-drying plants, compared to the butter subsidy being paid to farmers producing butterfat for production. Butterfat prices should be increased to 75 cents per pound.

During the past few months I have been receiving increasingly large numbers of letters from farmers and also from persons engaged in the operation of creameries in my district on the subject of butterfat prices and production.

Following is a letter from Mr. Maurice Sorensen, of Pelican Rapids, Minn., one of the outstanding creamery operators in the country and director of the ninth district of the Minnesota Association of Local Creameries, which outlines in part some of the dangers menacing creameries because of present Government policies:

PELICAN RAPIDS, MINN.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HAROLD: Thank you for your reply to my letter about the leveling of the prices of butterfat and milk.

This subsidy paid by the A. A. A. for milk is almost twice as much as is being paid for butterfat in cream. It is resulting in the building of more milk-drying plants, and these plants will eventually help close up many of our smaller creameries, thus making our State more of a centralized affair than cooperative, which we have prided ourselves on in the past. I blame this situation more or less on our Government agencies which are now, and have been for some time past, favoring milk over butter in subsidy payments.

I think they are overdoing it when there are milk-drying plants being constructed in territories like Roseau, Ada, Fosston, and towns or territories where we know for sure that there is not enough milk to supply them.

We have been drying buttermilk for human consumption for some time and at present we are not able to sell it within about from 3½ to 4½ cents under the ceiling prices set by the O. P. A. Skim milk will soon follow and by the time these plants now in process of building get going, it is going to take a lot of subsidy to cover them all.

We have the following places near here under construction: Fergus Falls, Perham, Sebeka, Fosston, Ada, and Roseau. Browerville, Alexandria, and Brainerd are already going. If it were not for this special subsidy offered at present for milk over butterfat, it is doubtful if any of these plants would ever have started.

M. SORENSEN.

Streamlining Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an article which appeared in the American magazine recently by that eminent statesman and experienced legislator, Mr. Justice James F. Byrnes. While it is true that this article was written by Justice Byrnes while he was under the impression that he was retiring as assistant to President Roosevelt, its force, logic, and effect are the same. And while the Members of Congress and the public generally may not agree in toto with the conclusions reached by Mr. Byrnes, I am confident nevertheless that the article is very timely and contains many constructive thoughts.

The article follows:

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

(By James F. Byrnes)

The new Congress will face decisions perhaps as fateful as any in our history. And

yet it convenes in a certain atmosphere of doubt whether a legislative body, many of whose procedures and techniques date back to the gaslight era, is equipped to deal with the swift-moving complexities of modern government. More and more frequently, in recent years, people have been asking:

"What is the matter with Congress?"

It is not so generally known that Congress itself is asking the same question. Last August the Senate passed a resolution, sponsored by Senator MALONEY, of Connecticut, providing for the creation of a joint bipartisan committee of House and Senate to explore the whole question of "strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution."

A similar resolution was introduced in the House by Congressman MONRONEY, and awaits passage.

Here is a matter of deep concern to us all. Our system of representative government cannot function properly without a strong, vital, efficient, well-informed, and vigilant Congress. Writing not as a public official, but as a citizen, I venture to make some comments based on my 25 years' experience in the House and Senate.

I disagree with those critics who believe that Congress is lacking in intelligence or patriotism. But I agree that there is opportunity for reform of the legislative machinery just as there is opportunity for reform in the executive and judicial branches of the Government. Here are some of the ways in which I feel that Congress can be streamlined and its efficiency increased:

The individual Senator and Congressman should be given adequate staff assistance to allow him more time for legislation, and should be better paid in accordance with his heavier modern duties.

The entire committee system should be revised in accordance with present needs. The number of congressional committees should be reduced. Chairmen of committees should constitute a congressional cabinet to meet with the President, thereby promoting a closer relationship between the White House and Capitol Hill. This would permit an allocation and concentration of responsibility which would bring out existing qualities of leadership in both Houses, and promote both a stronger and closer relationship with the White House.

A permanent staff of trained career men should be built up to aid and advise the committees on legislation.

An improved procedure should be devised for handling and checking on appropriations of funds.

And finally, for the better information of the legislators, members of the Cabinet should be authorized to appear upon the floor of Congress on invitation to answer questions.

Such changes as these would help the Members of Congress, already able as individuals, to rise to their full responsibilities as a group.

Many factors have contributed to the lessened influence of Congress. For one thing, when in 1911 the House increased its membership from 387 to 435, its effectiveness was impaired and its power lessened. Legislation can be enacted only as a result of debate and compromise, and obviously it is more difficult to secure an agreement of 435 men than it is of 387 men. As a practical matter, this cannot be remedied by Congress, since to do so the House would have to reduce its membership by voting its Members out of office. The State legislatures would have to do the job by redistricting, thus taking out of Congress' hands the determination of which Members should go.

Again, with each passing year there was transferred to the Federal Government powers previously exercised by the States. One would think this would increase the power of the Congress and of Congressmen. As a matter of fact, it lessened the influence of Congressmen as legislators. The Congress could only enact laws fixing general policies; it could not determine in advance just how these general policies should be applied to many varied situations arising in all sections of the country. It became necessary to delegate to the executive branch of the Government the power to issue regulations in order to carry out the general purposes of laws.

As an example, when the States, in order to augment their funds for public roads, agreed to the Federal Government supervising the expenditure of Federal-aid funds, Congress, in turn, delegated this supervision to the Bureau of Public Roads.

The necessary effect of such delegations was to leave to the executive departments considerable discretion in determining how these laws should be applied in individual cases. This resulted in greatly increasing the business of citizens with the executive departments in Washington. This might have lightened the work of the Congress, but it did not lighten the work of the Congressmen. On the contrary, it so increased the demands made by citizens upon the national legislators as to make it almost impossible for a Senator or Congressman to find the time necessary to attend to his legislative duties.

The people of a congressional district have come to look upon a Congressman not as their representative in Congress, but as their representative in Washington. The average man who has business with a department of a State government seldom thinks of communicating with the State legislators, but if he has business with the executive departments of the Federal Government he calls upon the Senator or the Congressman to attend to his business with the Government.

It is now not unusual for a Senator to have 25 or 30 people a day come from his State to Washington on business with departments. They ask the legislator to leave his duties at the Capitol and accompany them to various departments to attend to their business. The people who come are people of political influence. If they are not personally known to the legislator they bring letters from personal and political friends, and it is difficult to refuse their requests.

If the legislator should attempt to comply with all requests to visit departments, the only way he would know what is going on in Congress would be by reading the newspapers. He would never get an opportunity to read or answer any of his mail, and the average Congressman each day receives at least 100 letters, many of them requiring not only answers, but the writing of other letters.

This does not include the inspired propaganda which the Congressman soon learns to detect. It is nothing new. I recall the day I became a Member of the House, Speaker Champ Clark, addressing the new Members, stated that each day we would receive so many letters advising us how to vote on every pending question that we would be apt to conclude every voter in our district was writing. He declared, however, that not more than 5 percent of the people would ever write a Congressman, but that 5 percent would constantly write, and it was the duty of a Congressman always to remember the 95 percent who attended to their business and trusted him to represent their interests properly.

So, if you think the trouble with Congress is that Congressmen do not devote enough time to legislative problems, the answer is that the people who elect men to serve in the Congress then work diligently to keep them from doing what they were elected to do.

The appropriations for the staff of a Senator or Congressman should permit the employment of one person at a salary of at least $6,000 to enable the legislator to secure someone to help look after the business of constituents with departments. The Congressman should also have sufficient funds with which to employ an efficient office staff. In increasing its clerk hire fund, Congress should take steps to protect itself against criticism because of nepotism.

Senators and Congressmen should receive higher salaries. The Washington representatives of labor, farm, and business organizations as a rule receive higher salaries than the Senators and Congressmen who represent all the people. In addition, they have expense accounts. Congress authorizes the payment to officials in the executive departments of salaries higher than their own salaries. But daily men are leaving the executive agencies to accept appointments in private corporations at three and four times their Government salaries.

Having voted for the stabilization law preventing any increase in the compensation of private citizens, Congressmen would not at this time vote to increase their own salaries. But with the termination of wage control, Congressmen should promptly increase the salaries of Senators and Congressmen from $10,000 to $15,000 a year.

It is in the interest of good government that the retirement law which covers other officials and employees of the Government should be extended to cover Members of the Congress on the same terms and with the same contributions to the retirement fund.

Congressmen come from every walk of life, and necessarily from every section of the country. The thing about these men that has impressed me is their absolute honesty. Daily they are subjected to temptations, and yet of the 2,000 men with whom I have served I know of only 2 who were convicted of dishonest acts. These 2 were political accidents, elected in political landslides. But I can give you the comforting assurance that political accidents are seldom reelected to Congress.

Another criticism of the Congress is that it is subservient to the Executive because of the desire of Senators and Congressmen for patronage. The fact is that Members of Congress get few jobs in Washington for their constituents. Such few jobs as they do get may make a few of their constituents happy, but many more of their constituents are likely to be unhappy because their friends did not get those jobs. You can appoint any man, even an ex-member of Congress, head of an executive department, and that individual, anxious to make a record for himself, will appoint in his department the persons he believes most competent. He takes little interest in the political welfare of the Members of Congress. In the regular departments the selection of personnel is left to the chief of a personnel division who is a civil-service appointee. He will hold his job under Republican and Democratic administrations, and he has little interest in the legislative program of the administration and less interest in the political future of the Senators and Congressmen.

Since the postmaster and practically all other employees have been placed under civil service, the idea of patronage controlling the Congress is a myth.

Congress really legislates in committee rooms. When a Member of Congress drops a bill in a legislative hopper it has to clear many hurdles before it goes to the White House for approval. Committees, in most instances, hold the power of life or death over proposed laws.

If a House committee, for instance, reports on a bill, it goes to the calendar. If there is no opposition, it can be passed.

Otherwise, in practice it cannot be considered unless the House Rules Committee reports a special rule, making it in order to consider it. Then the measure is debated on the House floor and voted on. If passed, the bill then goes to the Senate, and again is referred to a committee. If the committee favors the bill, it is reported to the Senate calendar for consideration. If passed, the bill in most cases is amended, which sends it to conference to iron out differences. When both the House and Senate accept the conference report, the bill is engrossed and goes to the President for his signature. If it is vetoed, it requires a two-thirds majority by both Houses for the legislation to become law.

During the present Congress approximately 9,289 bills and resolutions have been introduced, but only 867 have become law.

While legislation for the most part is written in committees, no one will seriously attempt to justify the number of committees in Senate and House. The Senate has 33 permanent committees. Some of them meet only once or twice in a session. Some Senators are on so many committees that they would not be able to name all of them.

The jurisdiction of the Senate committees is not clearly defined, nor is care taken to insure that the composition of the committees is such as to make them a fair cross-section of the Senate. As a result, if a Senator has a bill in which he is particularly interested, when he introduces it he asks that it be referred to a committee of which he is a member. The rule of courtesy in the Senate is so adhered to that no Senator objects to this reference, even though it is obvious it should be considered by some other committee.

The House has 45 committees. More rigid rules govern the reference of bills to committees in the House than in the Senate, but no greater care is taken to insure that the committees fairly represent the views of the House as a whole. As a consequence, even more in the House than in the Senate the fate of a bill may depend upon the particular composition of a particular committee.

The number of committees in each House could be reduced to 10—certainly not more than 12. The jurisdiction of a committee should correspond to the jurisdiction of the executive departments. In the House, the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Agriculture should be continued with their present jurisdiction.

The Ways and Means Committee should have jurisdiction of bills now referred to the Banking and Currency Commitee and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

A Committee on National Defense could combine the work of the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs, and consider bills now assigned to the Commitees on Pensions, World War Legislation, Invalid Pensions, and War Claims, which should be abolished.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and the Committee on the Revision of the Laws could be abolished and their functions conferred upon the Judiciary Committee.

A Committee on Commerce could assume jurisdiction of matters now referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Merchant Marine Committee, the Patent Committee, and the Census Committee. A Committee on Labor and Public Welfare could well handle matters now referred to the Committee on Education and matters affecting social security, which are now considered by the Ways and Means Committee.

There could be a Committee on Interior and Public Works and it should absorb the jurisdiction of such Committees as Public Lands, Mines and Mining, Irrigation, Indian Affairs, Insular Affairs, and Territories, all of which subjects are under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department. It should also have jurisdiction of Public Buildings and Grounds, Rivers and Harbors, and Flood Control.

The Post Office and Post Roads Committee should take over the Committee on Roads.

The Rules Committee could take control of such matters as are now considered by 3 election committees, the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representative in Congress, and the Committee on Memorials. It could also assume the work of the Accounts Committee and the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

Such committees as Civil Service and the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers could be abolished. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should be abolished and the work performed by the Appropriation Committees and by the committees having charge of legislation for the various departments.

Instead of the two Houses of Congress having committees on the District of Columbia, there should be a joint committee, so that one City Council would handle District legislation.

The Committee on Claims should be abolished. The Government is now doing business in so many fields, and so many departments are operating automobiles and trucks, that there is a great increase in the number of claims presented to Congress. Senators and Congressmen do not have time to consider them properly, and the Court of Claims should be empowered to consider all claims.

The committees of the Senate, of course, should be reorganized along the same lines.

This reduction of committees would concentrate responsibility. It would lessen competition between committees for control of bills. It would lessen the demands upon the time of busy officials in executive departments, who are constantly called to appear before committees. I recall in the spring of 1941, when General Marshall was building the great army we now have and initiating the program for its equipment, one morning he attended the Senate Appropriations Committee. He informed me that as soon as he had answered the questions of various committee members, he had to appear before two more committees that morning. He had arrived by plane from the West coast at 9:30 a. m. and it was certain he would not be able to reach his office before 1 p. m. This was not an unusual day for General Marshall.

It may be argued that in order to assign the entire membership of Congress to only 10 committees, the committees would be large and unwieldy. However, the House Appropriations Committee has 43 members. It is better to have the entire membership on 10 committees that consider all legislation than to have, as at present, half the membership on 10 committees that consider important bills and the other half on 33 other committees that seldom get a chance at significant legislation.

In each House of Congress the majority party now has a steering committee, to guide the course of legislation. These committees seldom meet and never steer. They should be abolished, and the 10 committee chairmen should constitute a steering committee which meets regularly with the majority leader.

In addition, the steering committees of the two Houses should meet with the President at least once a month. The President now has frequent conferences with the four congressional leaders. This is not enough. If at stated intervals the President met with this congressional Cabinet, it should eliminate much of the friction between the legislative and executive branches of the Government. These meetings, however, should not prevent the President's continuing to invite members of both political parties on a committee to consult with him when an important matter is pending before that committee.

Much of the friction is due to lack of appreciation of problems. Not only does each committee go its own way, but each member of the committee goes his own way. When the majority leader of either House expresses an opinion as to pending legislation he realizes that it is binding only on as many of his colleagues as value his judgment. He does not assume to speak for all members of his party. This is equally true of the minority party.

The more responsibility is thus divided, the farther we get away from the two-party system and the greater encouragement is given to groups and blocs. The agricultural bloc of the Senate within recent years has met more often than has the Democratic membership of the Senate. Closer cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches would better enable the people to place responsibility for the Government's policies.

Much of the complaint of Executive domination of the Congress, as I have said, is unfounded. The Congress needs more, not less, leadership. In many cases the Executive is forced to assume leadership because congressional leadership is lacking. That does not mean that the Congress lacks individual leaders. There are many able leaders in both Houses, but neither House is so organized that its leaders can speak or act for the House as a whole. And until the Congress does so organize itself it is very unfair to the executive branch to put upon it all the blame for the lack of better cooperation between the two branches of Government.

In addition to the permanent standing committees, the Senate has 10 special committees and the House has 7. If there is a reorganization of committees and competent staffs are provided, there is little excuse for continuing special committees.

In recent years effective investigations by two or three special committees have resulted in remedial legislation. But there are many special committees that have contributed nothing in the way of legislative accomplishments. And that is the only object of an investigation.

One objection to a special committee is that frequently it is difficult to end the investigation. For example, a Senate Special Committee on Conservation of Wild Life Resources was created April 17, 1930, directed to ascertain facts upon which legislation might be based. It is still in existence. It has no authority to report a bill. A House special committee on the same subject was created in January 1934, and is still investigating. If there is need for a separate committee on the subject, it should be made a regular standing committee. If not, it should make a final report.

The special committees have been given the right to call on executive departments for assistants. When Congress adjourned in September there were detailed to congressional committees 105 employees of Government agencies who were drawing salaries at the annual rate of $382,927. Congress should hire its own employees and stop a practice that is bad for many reasons.

You cannot expect an independent investigation of the executive departments to be made by employees who, when their job is done, must return to the executive branch of the Government. It prevents the Congress and the public from knowing what is the actual cost of the investigation. It gives to the executive departments from which the employees are taken, an argument to justify additional appropriations for clerical workers to replace those loaned to Congress.

It tends to place the legislators under obligation to officials of executive departments for the services of particular employees.

There are other objections. Some ambitious young lawyer in a department will seek the assignment to an investigating committee. He wants the opportunity to promote

a cause dear to his heart. If, as counsel, he is given the power to cross-examine the citizens who are summoned as witnesses and to influence the thinking of Senators, he has all the power of a Senator, without any of his responsibility.

Only members of the committee should be allowed to interrogate witnesses. This would insure that committee members would keep posted as to the scope of the investigation.

Many of these objections could be avoided if the Congress had a permanent staff of career men selected for their qualifications.

Each House now has an Office of Legislative Counsel. No important bill is reported without a representative of this drafting service assisting the committee. The public has never complained about the cost of this splendid service.

In the Congressional Library the Congress now has a legislative reference service with about 75 employees. It has a number of very efficient men engaged in research work, but this service is not used as much as it should be. It should have an office on each side of the Capitol so that the legislators would have opportunity to consult the most capable men on its staff. The personnel should be augmented and should include outstanding economists, career men who would make studies of the subjects engaging the attention of a committee and be able to advise committee members.

The joint committee on internal revenue taxation employs a staff of tax experts. They confer wtih the tax experts of the Treasury, study the operation of the tax laws, and advise the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate on necessary amendments to existing laws. This staff is doing a splendid job and the committees of both Houses are enthusiastic about its work.

A similar staff of experts on appropriations should serve the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate. The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses are divided into many subcommittees having charge of the appropriations for the various departments.

The House Appropriations Committee has as its chief clerk Mr. Marcus C. Sheild. He has been with the committee for nearly 35 years. All Republicans and Democrats who have served in the House in recent years will agree he is the best-informed man at the Capitol as to the business of government. The Senate Appropriations Committee has, as its chief clerk, Mr. Everard Smith, second only to Mr. Sheild in knowledge of the Government's business.

These two men could organize one staff to serve the Appropriations Committee of House and Senate. If they were given the needed assistants, they could, during the year, check the manner in which the appropriations are expended. When the department officials came to justify their estimates for appropriations, the committees would be well informed by this staff of experts as to the inside workings of the departments. This would be an effective way to control the purse strings.

The staff should be adequate so that when a bill passed the Congress the employee who had assisted with that bill could, during the rest of the year, keep in touch with the department concerned to watch how the money is being spent. He could also keep in touch with the official of the Budget Bureau charged with the preparation of the budget for that department, so that the following year, when the committee hearings were started, he would be able to advise the committee where appropriations could be reduced.

It is a mistake to believe that a careful investigation is not now made of appropriations. The hearings of the House Appropriations Committee on any one of the bills appropriating large amounts continue daily for many weeks.

Some years ago, when Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., had been Assistant Secretary of the Navy for some months, he attended the naval hearings along with the chiefs of several bureaus. After hearing the cross-examination of the bureau chiefs, he told me that he had learned more about the Navy Department that day than he had learned since his appointment. Thereafter for 3 weeks he daily attended the hearings. His example might well be followed by other assistant secretaries.

It is urged that the seniority rule in the selection of chairmen of committees should be abolished and committees be allowed to elect their own chairmen. This may be wise, but I do not think it would prevent the election of the members with longest service. In order to be elected, the Congressman has to convince his constituents of his ability. The selection as chairman of the man who has served longer than any other Member will not affect the standing of the other Congressmen with their constituents. But if a man who has just been elected to the committee should be made chairman, it would reflect upon the qualifications of those who had served on the committee for years. The Member with longest service would, as a rule, still be made chairman, but in those instances where his selection would be particularly unfortunate, the fact that there was no inflexible rule as to seniority might be helpful in securing the selection of a better-qualified Member.

The principal vice of the seniority rule is not the premium it places on experience, but the obstacle it presents to the development of leadership representative of and responsible to the House as a whole.

An innovation is being urged by Congressman KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, who wants Cabinet members to appear on the floor of the House and Senate upon the invitation of committees. From time to time this proposal has been made, but never before has it received the support it is now receiving. Members of the Cabinet now attend committee hearings. I have heretofore thought this was sufficient opportunity for the Congress to acquire information on any particular subject, but I am now inclined to think that it would be wise to give to Cabinet members the privilege of the floor.

The Secretaries would be informed in advance of the subject on which information was desired, so that they could prepare. Written questions would be submitted by the committee. But provision would be made for some oral questions. The rule should provide that questions must be relevant to the question under discussion. If the Secretary deemed the question irrelevant or that the quesion was of such character that it should not be answered as a matter of public policy, he could decline to answer.

It would be helpful to the average Congressman who is not a member of the committee having jurisdiction of the subject and would not otherwise secure first-hand information. At the same time it would give to the Secretary an opportunity to present accurate information which might prevent a lot of misunderstanding.

There is no place where accurate information is of greater value than on the floor of a legislative body. This is because Representatives and Senators have so many duties to perform that it is difficult for them to acquire information on subjects not within the jurisdiction of the committees to which they belong, and also because there are always a lot of people anxious to give legislators misinformation, provided it suits their purpose.

Seldom can individuals function as a group with the same efficiency and responsibility that they function with as individuals. But group responsibility is essential in a democracy. The trouble is not with our Congressmen but with the Congress. The Congress falls too far short of being the sum of all its parts. To work together responsibly the Congress must be better organized and better staffed.

Minnesota's Career Service in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William P. Kennedy, native of Lake City, Minn., and dean of the Capitol Press Galleries:

MINNESOTA'S CAREER SERVICE IN CONGRESS

(Written for the Minnesota Historical Society by William P. Kennedy, Litt. D., native of Lake City, Minn., and dean of the Capitol Press Galleries)

Minnesota—thirty-second State to enter the Union, May 11, 1858, when Henry Mower Rice, who had previously served as a Delegate in the Thirty-third and Thirty-fourth Congresses, and James Shields, native of County Tyrone, Ireland, who had previously served as United States Senator from Illinois (and later from Missouri) were elected as first Senators from the Gopher State—is maintaining its career service record in this Seventy-ninth Congress.

Minnesota's outstanding career employee of Congress, Marcellus C. Sheild, clerk of the House Appropriations Committee, resigned at the close of the year, after having served 37 years. His resignation was accepted only with the understanding, written into the House records, that he would be subject to call as an esteemed House adviser, especially on fiscal matters. The House extolled him for hours in the closing days of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and 80 fellow employees, with terms of service running to upwards of half a century, tendered him a banquet, presented him with a gold watch and a parchment scroll of tribute which was prepared by another veteran Minnesota employee, of both House and Senate, Ansel Wold, clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing, of which Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, is chairman.

Mr. Wold is now in his forty-fifth year of Government service, of which 42 have been at the Capitol. Seventeen years ago he compiled a monumental work, that is considered the most valuable book of reference the Government ever printed—the Biographical Directory of the American Congress, from 1774 to 1927. In the present Seventy-ninth Congress Mr. Wold will still be carrying on, for he will be making another revision of this valuable compilation, which will bring the work up to date at the close of this Congress. It will include an authoritative biographical sketch of every man and woman who ever served in Congress.

(Career sketches of Marcellus C. Sheild and Ansel Wold will be found below.)

Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, of St. Cloud, Wadena, and Manhattan Beach, Minn., has advanced in the new Congress to ranking Republican member of the most important Ways and Means Committee (since "the power to tax is the power to destroy") and as

such becomes the spearhead of popular opposition to excessive taxation by the party in power. Mr. KNUTSON, who was for years the Republican whip, is now dean of the Minnesota delegation after 28 years of consecutive service. He has brought to the Capitol as his chief aid in his taxation, duties and revenue work James A. Tawney, Jr., son of the late Congressman James A. Tawney, who when chairman of the Appropriations Committee in 1908 brought Marc Sheild from Winona, Minn., to become his right-hand man. Thus James A. Tawney the second begins another generation of career service at the Capitol.

The Minnesota delegation and the entire Nation suffered a severe loss in the fall elections in the defeat of Representative Melvin J. Maas, after 16 years of service, who was ranking Republican member on the Naval Affairs Committee, and did excellent teamwork with Chairman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, in the amazing upbuilding of the long-neglected American Navy into a two-ocean navy to meet war needs. Mr. Maas had for years warned against the Japanese menace; and had vigorously protested against including the island of Yap in the Japanese mandate, because of its proximity to Guam and the Philippines, under the Versailles Treaty. Other seasoned men in the delegation are Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, with 18 years, and WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, with 12 years of valuable experience.

Another veteran loss in which Minnesota is especially interested is the defeat of Representative Usher L. Burdick, at large from North Dakota. He is in the eighth generation of descendants of Robert Burdick, one of the Roger Williams followers. The Burdicks were early western pioneers. Congressman Burdick graduated from Minnesota University, during his school days interviewed pioneers and historic Indians, and has written many western books from these notes. He has cooperated for years with the Minnesota Historical Society.

Not only in Congress and at the Capitol has Minnesota given career service but its sons have given foresighted leadership, especially in promotion of agriculture and cooperative assistance to the farmers. From Revolution days the "feeding farmers" have expressed discontent; before the Civil War a mutual protection meeting was held in Centralia, Ill. But it was a Minnesota man, a member of the Lost Kelley Tribe, who spark-plugged the National Grange and kindred organizations, while a Government clerk in Washington, in 1867. Far from the farms, in the National Capital, the first national organization of farmers was instituted, officially known as the Order of Patrons of Husbandry. O. H. Kelley, of Sherburne County, Minn. (where a monument today marks the site of his former home) with six of his fellow workers started the Grange movement, and established a school of instruction. The following February Kelley resigned his position and devoted his entire time to organization work. The first State Grange was organized in Minnesota in 1869, by Kelley and D. A. Robertson of St. Paul. Some of the most successful farm organizations in the country today have their headquarters in Minnesota, and a former Congressman, Sidney Anderson, has taken prominent part in bringing farm cooperative organization work up to date, especially as it concerns Minnesota interests.

Within 10 years after Kelley of Minnesota organized the Grange, another Minnesota man, who had been working for a quarter of a century to attract farmers to Minnesota, William G. Le Duc, of St. Paul, became Commissioner of Agriculture, and it was a direct result of his administration that this agency of Government service was given Cabinet rank. Le Duc had been commissioner to the World's Fair in New York in 1851, displaying a remarkable bull with Indian attendants. He continued to promote immigration, and railroads. He laid out West St. Paul; projected the company that built the first bridge over the Mississippi River; laid out Hastings, Minn., and engaged extensively in farming.

Le Duc was promoted from Captain to Brigadier General in the Civil War; returning to Minnesota projected and in part constructed the Hastings and Dakota Railway. While he was United States Commissioner of Agriculture, 1877–1881, he established a tea farm in Summerville, S. C.; introduced from foreign countries olives, tea, Japanese persimmons and other plants which have become acclimated in the United States. He organized the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Division of Forestry and generally built up the Federal aid to, promotion of and recognition of agriculture as one of the industries most important to national welfare.

Minnesota is represented in Statuary Hall in the Capitol by a statue of Henry Mower Rice (1816–94); pioneer, Delegate in Congress from Minnesota Territory, United States Commissioner in making Indian treaties, and one of the first Senators from the State of Minnesota. The unveiling exercises were held in Statuary Hall, February 8, 1916. Miss Matilda Whitall Auerbach, a granddaughter of Mr. Rice unveiled the statue. Mrs. Charles R. Davis, wife of the veteran Congressman, represented the Daughters of the American Revolution of Minnesota. Speeches were made by Senators Knute Nelson, who presided, and had been chairman of the Rice Statue Commission, and Moses E. Clapp, and Vice President Thomas R. Marshall. In the Senate acceptance exercises were held on February 19, 1916, when addresses were made by Senators Nelson, of Minnesota; Underwood, of Alabama; Harding, of Ohio; Gallinger, of New Hampshire; and Clapp, of Minnesota. The acceptance services in the House were on March 11, 1916, when the speakers were: Representatives Davis, Steenerson, Miller, Volstead, Smith, Lindberg, Van Dyke, Schall, Anderson, and Ellsworth, all of Minnesota.

At the unveiling ceremonies Vice President Marshall said: "In blazing paths for others to follow he made the first survey of the Sault Ste. Marie; he aided in forming the friendly alliances with the Indians; with Stephen A. Douglas he drew up the act authorizing Minnesota to form a State constitution preparatory to admission to the Union, and fixed he boundaries of the new State. His services as a Senator were painstaking and patriotic and without desertion of his party he remained a defender of the Union of the States."

Washington has another memorial to Senator Rice in what has for 88 years been known as Minnesota Row—a row of three 4-story brick houses, on the north side of I Street near Second NW., which when erected were the most spacious homes in the Capital City, with a frontage of 48 feet and gardens extending 300 feet north to K Street. Associated with Senator Rice in this enterprise in 1857 were Stephen A. Douglas, then Senator from Illinois, and John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, then Vice President. These three made these their homes, Rice occupying the middle structure, was later occupied by the Washington City Orphan Asylum for a time, and was later rented to the District government for use as a school. The Breckinridge home was successively bought by friends of General Grant, and presented to him, and when he became President was bought by friends by General Sherman and presented to him. General Sherman divided the house, and the last mayor of Washington, Matthew G. Emery, lived in one half. The Douglas house was the home of Richard Wallach while he was mayor of Washington, was later occupied by Justice Bradley, and was at one time the Papal Legation.

Senator Rice and his brother, Edmund, who 30 years later also served in Congress, were real Minnesota pioneers. They were both born in Waistfield, Vt., Henry in 1817 and Edmund 2 years later. After residing for a time in the Territories of Iowa and Wisconsin, Henry Rice moved to Minnesota in 1839; was post sutler for the United States Army at Fort Atkinson; engaged in the fur business; settled in St. Paul in 1848; negotiated a treaty with the Winnebago and Chippewa Indians in 1847. Through his personal influence he secured the consent of the objecting Sioux Indians to confirmation of the treaty of 1851 whereby all Minnesota west of the Mississippi River and south of Ojibway County was opened to white settlers. He was a member of the board of regents of Minnesota University from 1851 to 1859; was a candidate for governor in 1865. He was president of the State historical society. He served as United States commissioner in making several Indian treaties in 1837 and 1838.

Edmund Rice, after having served as a first lieutenant and acting assistant quartermaster in the Mexican War, moved to St. Paul in 1849, when he was clerk of the Supreme Court, member of the Territorial Legislature, commissioner of Ramsey County in 1856, president of the Minnesota & Pacific Railroad Co. (1863–72), and of the St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. (1863–72; president of the St. Paul & Chicago Railroad (1863–77); served in both branches of the State legislature; was mayor of St. Paul, 1881, 1883, 1885, and resigned when elected to Congress in 1887.

James Shields, one of the first two United States Senators from Minnesota held the unique distinction of having been elected to the United States Senate from three States, and the first time before he had been a citizen the number of years required by the Constitution. He was a general in both the Mexican and Civil Wars, appointed Governor of Oregon Territory by President Polk, was adjutant general and railroad commissioner of Missouri. His uncle, James Shields, also born in Ireland, served in the Twenty-first Congress from Ohio.

The first elected Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota, whose credentials were presented on May 13, 1858 and who were sworn in on May 22, were James M. Cavanaugh, of Chatfield and William W. Phelps of Red Wing. Cavanaugh was born in Springfield, Mass., July 4, 1823, engaged in newspaper work, studied law, practiced in Davenport, Iowa, and moved to Minnesota in 1854. His election to Congress from Minnesota was his first public office. He served only one term, moved to Colorado where he was a member of the State Constitutional Convention in 1865, and later returned to Congress as a Representative from Montana (1867–71).

William W. Phelps was a lawyer and register of the United States Land Office at Red Wing before coming to Congress in 1858, at the age of 32. He remained in Congress less than a year.

Here is a brief summary of some Members of Congress who have given Minnesota outstanding service and prestige:

Cyrus Aldrich, appointed by President Lincoln in 1863 as a commissioner to examine claims for indemnity of those who had suffered in the Sioux War of 1862.

William Windom, who served in both House and Senate, and served as Secretary of the Treasury in the Cabinets of both Presidents James A. Garfield and Benjamin Harrison.

Ignatius Donnelly, said to be the most erudite man who ever sat in Congress, one of the founders of the Populist Party, and its candidate for Vice President.

Alexander Ramsey, appointed by President Taylor as Territorial Governor of Minnesota, on April 2, 1849, and who served until 1853,

had previously been a Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania (1843–1847) and later was elected Governor of the State of Minnesota (1860–63) and United States Senator (1863–75). He was the first to tender State troops to President Lincoln at the outbreak of the Civil War—the First Minnesota Regiment, which had a large part in ending the fratricidal strife by turning back Pickett at Gettysburg, July 2, 1863, when Hancock sacrificed Colonel Colvill's regiment in order to save time. Of the 262 officers and men in the charge 215 were killed or wounded. He was appointed Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President Hayes (1879–81); was chairman of the Edmunds commission, dealing with the question of Mormonism in Utah (1882–86). He was president of the Minnesota Historical Society (1849–63 and 1891–1903). He was a delegate to the centennial celebration of the adoption of the Federal Constitution in 1887.

In the Forty-first Congress, Minnesota had four Senators, due to filling a vacancy by death. Again in the Forty-seventh Congress there were four Senators, for the same reason.

William S. King, who was Postmaster of the National House of Representatives from 1861 to 1873.

William D. Washburn, one of four brothers who served in Congress from as many States, who was both a House and Senate Member, was appointed United States surveyor general of the State by President Lincoln in 1861, and engaged for many years in different manufacturing industries and railroad building.

Knute Nelson, born in Norway, Member of both House and Senate, and Governor, who, on his eightieth birthday, received congratulatory messages from the King of Norway, the president of the Norwegian Congress, President Harding, and addresses of felicitation in the Senate.

Years ago Senator Nelson told the writer an interesting story of how he was paid two pigs by a Yankee farmer in the then wilds of Minnesota, in 1871, when he migrated to the State, for winning his first law case, which had previously been decided against his client. He had to pay $3 hire for a horse to drive 20 miles to argue the case. He also told of eating mule meat while a prisoner of the Confederates after he had been shot during the storming of Port Huron.

John Lind, born in Sweden, who served in the Spanish-American War, was Governor, president of the board of regents of the University of Minnesota, appointed by President Wilson as his personal representative to investigate the affairs of this Government in Mexico in 1913.

John B. Gilfillan, born in Vermont, moved to Minneapolis after holding minor political offices, was a member of the State senate for 10 years, and regent of the University of Minnesota 8 years; then served in the Forty-ninth Congress (1885–87).

Cushman K. Davis, during the Civil War, had been assistant adjutant general on the staff of Gen. Willia A. Gorman (1862–64) before he moved to St. Paul, and 2 years later was in the State legislature. He was Governor of Minnesota (1874 and 1875). He then served in the United States Senate until his death (1887–1900). He was a member of the commission which met in Paris, France, in September 1898 to arrange terms of peace for the war between the United States and Spain.

Darwin S. Hall, familiarly called "Dar," had served in the Civil War before moving to Minnesota and engaging in agriculture. He founded a newspaper, the Renville Times, in 1876, and was register of the United States land office at Benson (1878–86). After service in the State senate he was elected to the Fifty-first Congress. He was appointed chairman of the Chippewa Indian Commission by President Harrison in 1891 and served until 1893, and again in 1897. He helped to nominate Harrison and Reid at the Republican National Convention in Minneapolis in 1892. He was manager of the Minnesota State Agricultural Society (1905–10).

Kittle Halvorson, born in Norway, moved to Minnesota after he had served through the Civil War, and engaged in farming. He was conspicuous in the Fifty-second Congress (1891–93) as the only Farmers Alliance Member from Minnesota.

James T. McCleary, born in Canada, president of the Minnesota Educational Association, Second Assistant Postmaster General in the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, secretary of the American Iron and Steel Institute, New York City.

Charles A. Towne was a Representative and Senator from Minnesota and a Representative from New York. He was judge advocate general of Minnesota (1893–95); was elected as a Republican to the Fifty-fourth Congress. Then three times he was unsuccessful as the Democratic candidate. He declined nomination for Vice President on the Populist-Silver Republican ticket in 1900. He was appointed to the United States Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Cushman K. Davis, and served less than 2 months. He died while on a speaking tour for the Smith-Robinson ticket in Tucson, Ariz., October 22, 1928.

Frank M. Eddy, who had taught in a rural school and been a land examiner for the Northern Pacific Railroad Co., was the first native of Minnesota to be elected to Congress. He served 8 years as a Republican (1895–1903). He was a member of the Minnesota Immigration Bureau in 1916, and later a clerk in the office of the secretary of state of Minnesota. He was quite a wit, and on one occasion, when accused of being "two faced," answered, "If I had another face, do you suppose I'd be wearing this one?"

Joel P. Heatwole had been a school superintendent, editor, and publisher before he moved to Minnesota from Indiana. After being employed by various newspapers he established the Northfield News. He was appointed a regent of the State University in 1890. He was president for three terms of the State Editorial Association. He served four terms in Congress (1895–1903).

Frederick C. Stevens was born in Boston, educated in Maine, studied law in Iowa, and admitted to the bar in Minnesota. He served in nine Congresses (1897–1915).

R. Page W. Morris was born in Lynchburg, Va., home town of the venerable CARTER GLASS. He taught mathematics in the Virginia Military Institute and the Texas Military Institute, and was professor of applied mathematics in the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College. He returned to Lynchburg to practice law in 1880. After serving as municipal and district judge he was elected to Congress and served from 1897 to 1903. Thereafter he was United States district judge for Minnesota (1903–23), when he retired from public life.

Moses E. Clapp, attorney general of the State, vice president and general counsel of the North American Development Corporation.

Charles R. Davis was born in Illinois but moved to Minnesota with his parents when he was 5. He was prominent in law practice and became prosecuting attorney of Nicollet County (1879–89 and 1901–3). He served as captain in the Minnesota National Guard; served in both branches of the State legislature. He was elected to Congress as a Republican and served from 1903 to 1925, the longest service of any Minnesota Member until Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON surpassed his record.

Andrew J. Volstead is best known as author of the prohibition law.

James Adam Bede, of Duluth, was a former teacher, Washington newspaper correspondent, editor and publisher, lecturer, author and wit. After an absence of 32 years from Congress he was again advising House Members in 1941. At the age of 85 Mr. Bede prepared an authoritative historical statement regarding the St. Lawrence seaway project pending in Congress which was presented by Representative WILLIAM A. PITTENGER. While a House Member, Mr. Bede introduced legislation proposing to "swap the Philippines for Ireland, and let's raise our own policemen."

Halvor Steenerson, Member of Congress for 20 years, vice president of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union.

Charles A. Lindbergh, born in Sweden, father of the famous aviator.

Sydney Anderson, Spanish War veteran, chairman of the Congressional Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry (1921–22); chairman of the National Wheat Conference in Chicago (1923); president of the Wheat Council of the United States (1923–24); vice chairman of the research council of the National Transportation Institute (1923–24); president of the National Millers Federation.

Thomas D. Schall, the blind Representative and Senator.

Carl C. Van Dyke, commander in chief of the United Spanish-American War Veterans.

Frank B. Kellogg, United States Senator, Ambassador to Great Britain, President Coolidge's Secretary of State, negotiated the Kellogg-Briand Treaty, judge of Permanent Court of International Justice, awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for 1929, Grand Cross of the French Legion of Honor, Honorable Bencher of the Middle Temple, Order of Olive Branch of Argentina.

Walter H. Newton, regent of the Smithsonian Institution, private secretary and administrative assistant to President Hoover, member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, author of The Hoover Administration (1936).

Magnus Johnson, born in Sweden, succeeded Senator Knute Nelson in the United States Senate.

Marcellus C. Sheild was born in Bellevue, Ia., April 13, 1885, moved to Sycamore, Ill., in 1889, and to Winona, Minn., in 1902. He attended Winona High School, graduating in 1904. He was captain of the high-school football and baseball teams and coach of the girls' basketball team. He attended the University of Minnesota academic and law departments, and later the National Law School in Washington, D. C. He is a member of Phi Delta Theta academic college fraternity, and the Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity. His brother, Rexford M. Sheild, a graduate of the University of Minnesota Law School, is practicing law in Salem, S. Dak., and a member of the State Senate.

While in Winona Marc Sheild stayed out of school between college and high school and was employed at the Chicago Great Western Railway shops, and was employed as a stenographer at the freight offices of the same railroad.

At the University of Minnesota he served as steward of the fraternity chapter house, as stenographer and typist for the head of the department of electrical engineering, and as "masseur" in the football training quarters. His father was general agent for the Chicago Great Western Railway Company in Winona.

Marc Sheild entered the employ of the House Appropriations Committee on January 1, 1908 by appointment of Chairman James A. Tawney (Republican) representing the First Minnesota District. He served 8 years as a stenographer and assistant clerk. He served his apprenticeship under James C. Courts, who was clerk of the committee for 32 years and previously assistant clerk for 7 years—a total of 39 years.

Promoted to be clerk of the committee after the death of Mr. Courts in 1916 by Chairman John J. Fitzgerand (Democrat) of New York, Mr. Sheild served continuously in that capacity for 29 years, making a period of total service with the committee of 37 years.

The Appropriations Committee was established in 1865—80 years ago. In that time it

has had only three clerks—Robert J. Stevens for 19 years, appointed by Chairman Thad Stevens of Pennsylvania (Republican); James C. Courts for 32 years, appointed by Chairman J. D. C. Atkins (Democrat) of Tennessee, and Mr. Sheild for 29 years, appointed by Chairman Tawney of Minnesota (Republican). Courts and Sheild together have held the clerkship of the committee for 61 years.

Mr. Sheild served under 11 of the 22 committee chairmen who have headed the committee—6 Democrats and 5 Republicans: Tawney, Minnesota; Fitzgerald, New York; Sherley, Kentucky; Good, Iowa; Madden, Illinois; Anthony, Kansas; Wood, Indiana; Byrns, Tennessee; Buchanan, Texas; Taylor, Colorado; and the present Chairman Clarence Cannon, Missouri.

He served as clerk and adviser to the Select Committee on the Budget of the House in the Sixty-sixth Congress, which prepared the legislation resulting in enactment of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and the inauguration of the National Budget System. He participated in the conference and assisted in formulation of the procedures which rearranged the supply bills and prepared the way for the submission of the Budget under the new plan.

He also served as clerk to several joint committees of the Senate and the House charged with the readjustment of salaries and employments for Congress. Similarly he served as clerk to the special subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which conducted an investigation into the operations of the War Projects Administration.

During his 37 years of service the appropriations have increased from $1,000,000,000 in the first session of the Sixtieth Congress to the high war total of $147,000,000,000 in the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

The Committee on Appropriations is the only House committee which, since its inception, has had a continuous policy of training its own personnel and retaining an experienced force without regard to the political complexion of the House or committee or the political predilections of the employees. Democratic and Republican chairmen, alike, have retained the experienced personnel and in filling vacancies have endeavored to keep the staff at a high level of experience and competency. One attempt, in this long record, was made to remove an experienced clerk and substitute a political appointment. A Republican chairman endeavored to remove James C. Courts, who had been appointed by a Democratic chairman. Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, affectionately known as Uncle Joe and at one time denounced as Czar, then a member of the committee resisted his own chairman's action and was sustained by a majority of the committee in preserving the committee policy of keeping experienced personnel.

The very important and exacting task ahead of the veteran career man, Ansel Wold, in this Congress is to bring up to date as of January 1, 1946, a thorough revision of the dictionary of the United States Congress and the general Government published in 1859, and again revised in 1869 by Charles Lanman; the Biographical Annals of the Civil Government of the United States in 1876, by Charles Lanman and James Anglin, and the Lanman edition of 1876 as corrected by Joseph M. Morrison in 1887; the Political Register and Congressional Directory of 1878, by Ben: Perley Poore; the Biographical Congressional Director of 1903, by O. M. Enyart, and the Biographical Congressional Directory in 1911.

The present volume contains 1,740 pages—and nothing like it was ever produced before. It is a compilation of 9,000 biographical sketches, and yet there are only about 12 Senators out of the 96, and 40 House Members out of the 435 whose biographies appear in that volume. The revision is long overdue, and when the work is completed this session it will be in such shape and under a system so that it can be kept current.

Ansel Wold, whose Big Book is rated as a best work of reference in all libraries and colleges throughout the country, was born in Madelia, Minn., September 17, 1881. He was a clerk in a country general merchandise store under his father until he was 18 years of age. He was appointed from the Second Congressional District of Minnesota as a clerk in the Census Office by Gov. William R. Merriam, of Minnesota, who was then Director of the Census, upon the recommendation of Senator Knute Nelson. He was employed in the Census Office until February 19, 1902, when he resigned to accept a position as clerk in the document room of the Senate.

Transferred to the Office of the Secretary of the Senate in May 1902 he served in various capacities until February 1910 when he was appointed printing clerk of the Senate and served until April 20, 1921, when he was unanimously elected by the committee, without solicitation, clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing to succeed George H. Carter, who was appointed Public Printer.

Mr. Wold is a member of Madelia Lodge No. 66, F. and A. M., and a member of the City Club and National Press Club of Washington, D. C.

The Allegiance of an Idaho Editor to the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the human race, coming down through the murk of war of the ages and the anguish of misrule and oppression, have prayed for a guide to righteousness and good government. When at least the founders of this Nation, guided by the experience of the ages, devised and gave us a charter of good government, they gave the greatest boon that mankind could receive—the Constitution—the charter we are all sworn to preserve and defend; a charter that should be emblazoned on the clear blue of the sky for all to see and to follow.

In the murk of war and uncertainty of our day it is heartening to hear the clarion call of a country editor to preserve this priceless boon for ourselves and our posterity. I submit for the consideration of my colleagues an editorial from the pen of E. M. Ohmstead, of the Idaho County Free Press, of Grangeville, Idaho:

THE CONSTITUTION

No matter what may happen to the Atlantic Charter, the Dumbarton Oaks Conference or the coming meeting of the "Big Three," thank heavens the Constitution of the United States still stands as our original guide post to our Nation. It has been plastered with mud, shot at by brain trusters, and in instances has been superseded by bureaucratic and Executive orders, but like a great tree, the branches still cover the 48 States with the roots firmly imbedded in the minds and the traditions of the greatest Nation on earth.

The Constitution still divides the Government in three separate and yet interlocking divisions—the Congress, or the voice of the people, the Executive, whose duty is to see that the laws of Congress are properly and impartially executed; the Supreme Court, that is to rightly judge that the Congress does not overstep its limitations.

The Constitution of the United States, the greatest human document we proclaimed—built to defend and protect the rights of the people, and the greatest obstacle to the insane ideas of tyrants or the whims of those in power.

So, no matter what happens in 1945 or in 1946, let us stick to the Constitution, believing in its justice and integrity, and defying any and all who would attempt to emasculate that document that gives us the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," is the firm belief and hope of one who simply signs himself—

POP.

Decay of the Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE M. REED

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Decay of the Atlantic Charter," which appeared in the December 28 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DECAY OF THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

When the Atlantic Charter was first made public, in August 1941, it was hailed far and wide as a new charter of human liberties. Winston Churchill, addressing the House of Commons, grew eloquent in describing his conference with the President and the signing of the document:

"This was a meeting which marks forever in the pages of history the taking up by the English-speaking peoples, amid all this peril, tumult, and confusion, of the guidance of the fortunes of the broad, toiling masses in all the continents; and our loyal effort without any clog of selfish interest to lead them forward out of the miseries into which they have been plunged back to the broad high-road of freedom and justice. This is the highest honor which could ever have come to any branch of the human race."

It was accepted eagerly by the oppressed and embattled peoples. Chinese, Belgians, Frenchmen, Poles, Czechs, Russians, Filipinos and others voiced their endorsement and gratitude. The Greek statement, by Prime Minister Tsouderos, is typical, and ironic today:

"This declaration officially recognizes that the war aims of the Allied Powers remain on the same high level which they have occupied in the conscience and soul of the free democratic countries of the world since the beginning of the struggle. We are all fighting for an ideal; to destroy the violent and brutal method of force used by the aggressors and to liberate the peoples of the world. Inspired by these ideas, and with an unshakable confidence in the triumph of our cause, I accept the resolution now proposed."

The United Nations formally embraced the charter as the basis of their alliance in the joint declaration signed January 2, 1942. The text of this document, together with that of the charter, is reprinted on this page today.

Mr. Roosevelt now says that the charter never existed as a formal signed document, although the signatures appear on every copy of the text, wherever published. Yet in his statement of August 14, 1943, he spoke of that date as "the second anniversary of the signing of the Atlantic Charter." A few days later he vigorously attacked its critics, and in terms strikingly different from his recent off-hand remarks about its objectives being a long way off. He said in 1943:

"I am everlastingly angry only at those who assert vociferously that the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter are nonsense because they are unattainable. If those people had lived a century and a half ago, they would have sneered and said that the Declaration of Independence was utter piffle. If they had lived nearly a thousand years ago, they would have laughed uproariously at the ideals of Magna Carta. And if they had lived several thousand years ago, they would have derided Moses when he came from the mountain with the Ten Commandments."

Praise for the charter continued to ring and fresh pledges of its enforcement. Thus, Viscount Cranborne, Lord Privy Seal, reiterated the British view in June 1942:

"The British Government regards itself as absolutely pledged to carry out all the articles of the Atlantic Charter."

And Clement R. Attlee, Secretary of State for the Dominions, said much the same: "The Atlantic Charter remains the basis of His Majesty's Government's policy."

From American spokesmen, too, came new endorsements. Said Vice President WALLACE:

"The Atlantic Charter provides the broad base of general principles to safeguard our decisions. It is a charter of faith that must be worked out to endure; and the American people intend that it shall work and that it shall endure."

Said Sumner Welles, then Under Secretary of State, on November 11, 1941:

"Those high objectives set forth in the charter of the Atlantic must be realized. They must be realized, quite apart from every other consideration, because of the fact that the individual interest of every man and woman in the United States will be advanced consonantly with the measure in which the world where they live is governed by right and by justice and the measure in which peace prevails."

But even while the first hosannahs were ringing, the process of limiting the charter began. When it was asked if its principles of self-determination applied to the Orient, particularly to British holdings there, Churchill gave this interpretaticn, barely a month after the charter was framed:

"The joint declaration does not qualify in any way the various statements of policy which have been made from time to time about the development of constitutional government in India, Burma, or other parts of the British Empire. * * * At the Atlantic meeting we had in mind primarily the restoration of the sovereignty, self-government, and national life of the states and nations of Europe now under the Nazi yoke."

This, although the charter spoke of "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they live." Mr. Roosevelt said he did not agree with the Churchill amendment. When Wendell Willkie returned from his world tour in 1942 and reported that the oriental peoples doubted our good faith in applying the charter to them, the President authorized this quotation: "The Atlantic Charter applies to all humanity, as the Secretary of State and I have said several times before."

Again, Churchill modified the charter by saying that it did not apply to Germany, though, in point 4 of the charter, mention is made of "all states, great or small, victor or vanquished." A few days ago, he gave a purported quotation from the charter which proved not to be in the text. A secretary hastily explained that the Prime Minister had suffered a lapse of memory.

Seldom if ever in world history has a document within a short time been so highly praised, so variously interpreted by its authors, so lightly and offhandedly treated and virtually disowned.

Is it any wonder that all around the world people are seriously disturbed by the apparent decay of what they had regarded a charter of freedom and fair play, by the confusion as to what the Allies' war aims really are?

It is still time to abate the cynicism now provoked when the Atlantic Charter is mentioned. Mr. Roosevelt can speak out candidly. The Big Three can meet again and re-define its provisions—with, let us hope, a signed document this time as the result of their deliberations.

Constructive Moves in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Constructive Moves in Foreign Policy," written by Mr. Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of today. Mr. Krock refers to my observations made yesterday in the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—CONSTRUCTIVE MOVES IN FOREIGN POLICY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 10.—The contribution made by Senator VANDENBERG today toward the solution of foreign-policy problems should be measured by three yardsticks to determine its importance.

1. He is the most influential Republican spokesman in Congress on matters of foreign policy; and the leader of a "middle" bloc of former anti-interventionists whose votes conceivably can make or deny a two-thirds Senate majority on treaty proposals.

2. He committed himself and those who follow him to what has been known as an entangling alliance by proposing an interim and immediate military agreement of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, China, and France to demilitarize Germany and keep it demilitarized by the use of force which can be employed by the Executive without recourse to Congress. (At present any treaty policing Japan must lack the signature of Russia.)

3. On behalf of the Republicans in the Senate—or those who can form the voting balance of power—he supplied the President with political material for his next meeting with Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin on which a satisfactory four-power entente can be founded if fear of future German aggression is the true source of unilateral action in Europe.

THE PROPOSED PROGRAM

The administration was nervous in advance of today's debate because what was expected was a reiteration of demands for information on the Government's foreign policy, present and future, and denunciations of Allied acts which would erect more obstacles to the goal set at Dumbarton Oaks.

But Mr. VANDENBERG'S speech was a very different affair. He offered a program. He gave to Mr. Roosevelt detailed measures whereby the immediate purpose of Dumbarton Oaks can be carried out without recurrent congressional obstruction and debate. He lent hope to liberated peoples who have political decisions made for them by powerful neighbors of future review and revision in normal times, and in an atmosphere free of the threat of the Axis. And this program came, not from a Senator of the party which received a favorable popular mandate last November for its interventionist position, but from a Senator whose party was attacked for opposition to that view.

THE MAIN DISPUTE

The main dispute over the world security organization was revealed at Dumbarton Oaks to center on the proposals that permanent members of the Security Council shall be judges of charges of aggression against themselves and each have the power to veto the use of force. Thus, the United States, Great Britain, Russia, China, or France, if anyone were accused of threatening world security and force were proposed as a remedy, could not only vote itself not guilty but by its single ballot prevent the application of that remedy in any case.

The failure of the United States to fight these proposals has raised new doubt that the United States expects to participate in the use of force against a new German menace after the war has been over for some years. This doubt is based on our past performance. The dispute is unsettled and has delayed the formulation of a security treaty for approval by all the United Nations. If the single right of veto remains in the finished draft, the doubt of our enduring participation will remain.

Senator VANDENBERG'S program goes to the heart of this trouble. For if the chief Allies at war with Germany, and those at war with Japan, preliminary to the general security treaty make a military alliance by which Germany and Japan will be kept demilitarized, with the use of pledged force at Executive disposal, the chief fear of other powers will be removed. Insofar as the main problem—future German and Japanese aggression—is concerned, this country will be committed to keep it down by swift and strong measures in concert with the cosignatories of such treaties.

MR. VANDENBERG'S ARGUMENT

Senator VANDENBERG pointed out that the unilateral actions in Poland and Greece, of which we complain as violative of our policies and of the Atlantic Charter, are all justified by the argument that security against Germany and local fascism require them. But, as he also said, our signature with those of the others on the treaties he proposes will dispose of the argument and therefore will aid in the eventual establishment of political and territorial integrity for the immediate victims.

His other two proposals were equally constructive, but dependent for their value on the acceptance of the first. For, if German and Japanese aggression are held down by the treaty powers, including the United States, it will be much simpler for the victim of a current unilateral decision to seek and receive redress from the new world security organization. And if the demilitarization treaties are signed, there will be more persuasion for the German people in his suggestion that the Allies announce the price of unconditional surrender will be the cheaper the sooner. Also, the entire program tends to remove the cause for the recent bilateral treaties among our allies.

This view is founded, of course, on the premise that Great Britain and Russia are sincere about Dumbarton Oaks. Those who disbelieve in that will find no solution for the world's misery in anything.

The Proposed Labor Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in a report to James F. Byrnes made on September 17, 1943, Barney Baruch said:

Proper handling of manpower has been made impossible by the failure of agencies to work as a team with a clearly defined program. Measures undertaken by one agency have been undone by the conflicting actions or inactions of other agencies. * * * The war manpower and draft acts and the priority and commandeering laws have never been adequately used.

In the face of this indictment by an administration supporter how can the President justify his recommendation for a universal service act? Why does he not make use of the laws now on the books?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune. It is worth careful consideration by Members of Congress before we act upon the President's recommendation:

THE LABOR DRAFT

Mr. Roosevelt says he wants a labor draft to win the war, which up to November 7 he wanted the voters to believe was virtually won. He wanted a labor draft last year, and Congress thought his arguments for it unconvincing. His present reasons are, therefore, of interest.

"There are three basic arguments," he says, "for a national service law.

"First. It would assure that we have the right number of workers in the right places at the right times.

"Second. It would provide supreme proof to all our fighting men that we are giving them what they are entitled to, which is nothing less than our total effort.

"And third. It would be the final, unequivocal answer to the hopes of the Nazis and the Japanese that we may become halfhearted about this war and that they can get from us a negotiated peace."

The last two arguments can be considered jointly. We are told that the way to convince our enemies and our own armies that we are in earnest is to permit Mr. Roosevelt and his bureaucrats to beat us over the head a little harder than they are already doing. We are supposed to be suffering from complacency and the cancelation of ration stamps to offset the Nazi break-through at Christmas time was not enough to change our mood. We are supposed not to know there's a war on. We never read the casualty lists, or receive telegrams from The Adjutant General.

Incidentally, it hasn't been the failure of more people to go to work in war plants that has angered and embittered the soldiers. It has been the conduct of the people already in the war plants, the strikes, slow-downs, and absenteeism of some of Mr. Roosevelt's C. I. O. pets.

The primary argument for national service—a labor draft—is that with it we shall have the right number of workers in the right places at the right time. As evidence, Mr. Roosevelt offers reported shortages of various type of munitions. He carefully avoids mention of the billions of dollars' worth of surpluses, some of which are already being liquidated, and the bulging warehouses all over the country.

Those surpluses were accumulated by the same people who would supposedly put labor in the right places at the right time. Is there any reason to believe that the Roosevelt bureaucrats would be any more efficient and effective in allocating slave labor than they have been in buying the right war materials?

Already fearsome measures are being hinted at in Washington, pending the enactment of the labor draft. Men who refuse to take war plant jobs are to be drafted into the Army. They won't get veterans' benefits. They won't fight. They will be, in some bureaucrat's phrase, "permanent kitchen police," assigned to so-called work battalions.

The Army hasn't said it has any use for work battalions. The men might as well be in jail for all the good they will do the prosecution of the war. They are, by this account, to be given their choice of signing up with Sidney Hillman and sitting out the war in some munitions plant, or of being inducted into the Army where they will neither fight nor help sustain the civilian economy.

And for many of them, if a labor draft is passed, their compulsory employment would literally mean sitting out the war. Strikes and absenteeism are not the only reasons why war production suffers. Some unions are still applying peace time limitations on production, designed to spread employment, in times of war manpower scarcity. Mr. Roosevelt has done nothing to end that. Neither has he done anything to stop the hoarding of labor in some war plants, of which there is considerable evidence. Instead of making efficient use of the present labor supply, he would put more people to work under the same wasteful conditions.

War plant labor is not fully efficient, but American labor is still the most efficient in the world. It outproduces, by far, the workers of both our allies and our enemies. It does so because it is free labor. Mr. Roosevelt would sacrifice this advantage.

The plea for a labor draft is typical. Instead of seeking ways to increase the efficiency of the war plants and his procurement organization, Mr. Roosevelt aims to make a slave of every American citizen. It is the same old song. If he were only given more power, he wouldn't fall down on the job.

Great Record of Fifty-sixth Fighter Group, Eighth Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is only fair that tribute be paid where tribute is due.

Last fall while on a visit to England and France I had occasion to visit the station of the Fifty-sixth Fighter Group, Eighth Air Force, and to become acquainted with some of its officers and men. The Fifty-sixth is one of the finest groups of men and air fighters anywhere, and its record for enemy planes destroyed is unexcelled. The group includes many aces and many strikingly interesting characters. Its commander is Lt. Col. Dave Schilling, of Traverse City, Mich. Dave Schilling is a dashingly attractive and competent fellow who does not care for hell or high water. He is now, according to late newspaper reports, the leading ace on the European front.

My old friend, Maj. Dave Robinson, of Columbia, S. C., is getting a little along in years now, and they will not let him fly; but he is doing a grand job as administrative officer and is imbued with all the esprit de corps of the Fifty-sixth. Dave Robinson, admittedly one of the best lawyers in South Carolina, did not have to get into this war but went anyway and has been separated from his devoted wife and family for more than 2½ years.

To this air group belonged Lt. Roach S. Stewart, Jr., of my home town, Lancaster, S. C., a fine young fellow who gave his life in air battle over France. There was also Maj. Mike Cladych, "the flying Pole." I wish to insert at this point an Associated Press article from the Washington Star concerning his exploits:

FAMED POLISH ACE WITH YANKS LACKS LEGAL STATUS AS FLYER

AN EIGHTH AIR FORCE FIGHTER BASE, ENGLAND, December 28.—The exploits of Maj. Mike Cladych, the Flying Pole, are becoming legendary among Allied fighter pilots.

Major Cladych has been serving with the Fifty-sixth Thunderbolt Group—which has a record of 800 Nazi planes to its credit—for more than a year without any official status. The American pilots chip in each month to give him spending money, and meanwhile he goes on taking Thunderbolts over Germany to shoot up anything bearing the hated swastika.

The story of this amazing airman has been pieced together, bit by bit, by other flyers. It forms one of the most fantastic tales to come out of the war.

Major Cladych, now 35, was a member of the Polish Air Force when the Nazis overran Poland, killing his parents, his sweetheart, and many of his friends. He escaped by plane to France and joined the French Air Force. Shot down in a German-occupied area, he was hidden by a French doctor in an insane asylum while the Gestapo searched for him.

WAYLAID IN PARIS

Later he was waylaid in a Paris alley by the Gestapo, who left him for dead after beating him on the head with lead pipes, but the French doctor managed to get him back to the asylum and treated him there for months.

He did not fully recover until after all France had been occupied by the Nazis, and then was smuggled to Britain. He joined the R. A. F. and fought in the battle of Britain, later becoming a member of the Polish squadron formed by the British.

A year ago he was assigned to the Eighth Air Force for detached duty. He asked to be sent to the 56th Thunderbolt Group after hearing of its reputation for knocking enemy planes from the sky.

Major Cladych checked in with the 56th for 48 hours, has stayed a year and wants to stay another.

SILENT ON EXPLOITS

Garbed generally in a gray uniform with the Polish eagle insignia, Major Cladych will not talk of his exploits. Apparently all he wants to do is kill Nazis, but the men of the fighter group, intent on keeping up their record of kills, have a hard time pumping from him the number of his victories.

"Maybe I get two planes," he says unconcernedly when asked to report on the outcome of a dogfight. "But I cannot count

because I am too busy shooting what's ahead of me instead of looking back to see what I left behind me."

His wing cameras show he has shot down at least 11 enemy planes, but his buddies say he actually has accounted for at least 15 more. During his time with four different air forces his total is believed to run to perhaps 45.

The following is an Associated Press dispatch about the great record of Dave Schilling. I believe he is a full colonel now; if not, he ought to be.

FIGHTER GROUP LEADER BECOMES LEADING ACE

LONDON, December 23.—Col. Dave Schilling, who commands an ace fighter group in Europe, became a leading ace himself today by getting 5 German planes, making his total bagged 34½—of which 24½ were in the air and 10 on the ground.

The 26-year-old Traverse City, Mich., pilot led his group into one of the fiercest dogfights of the war when they tangled with 250 German Messerschmitts and Focke-Wulfs and shot down 35 of them.

I understand that since this dispatch Schilling has been credited with still more air victories.

There are many others of the group who deserve to be mentioned; but it would take volumes to tell their whole story.

My hat is off to the Fifty-sixth Fighter Group of the Eighth Air Force.

Permanent F. E. P. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, as I join my Republican and Democratic colleagues in sponsorship of this permanent F. E. P. C. bill, I want to enter an urgent plea that it be pushed to the top of the list of win-the-war legislation.

Congress now faces the grave responsibility of manning our war machine to the hilt, of improving manpower regulations so that every war job is filled by a man or woman competent to fill it. Every minute we lose in removing every obstacle that now stands between a worker and his job may cost the lifeblood of an American boy.

We have got to face the fact that the greatest single obstacle that now impedes our war production is that of racial or religious prejudice. And we owe it to that American boy overseas and to his brother working overtime here to call upon labor and management to remove that altogether unreasonable, unjustifiable, and un-American obstacle wherever it still exists.

The man who fires the bullet does not care whether it was made by a Protestant, or a Catholic, or a Jew, a Negro, or a white person, so long as he has that bullet when he needs it. Yet the Western Cartridge Co., of Alton, Ill., will not hire a Negro.

The man who stands guard on the deck of the convoy ship does not care who built that ship, so long as it holds together and sails the sea. Yet the Houston Shipbuilding Corp., of Houston, Tex., imports white welders from other parts of the country rather than hire Negro graduates of a Houston welding school.

Add these up, and add to them scores of other cases on record in Washington, and the total of man-hours lost would be appalling, if the injustice alone were not deplorable enough.

Our minority citizens are not being fully utilized in this war effort. A permanent F. E. P. C. with statutory and legal authority will go a long way toward shortening this war. We cannot let our minority citizens down—they want to do their share. We cannot let our soldiers down—they want to get it over with and come home. Let us bring that day of victory closer.

Mr. President and Congress: Speak Up!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune of January 4, 1945:

MR. PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS: SPEAK UP!

The Seventy-ninth Congress convened yesterday in an anxious Nation, with a world looking on just as anxiously, awaiting its momentous decisions.

Probably the greatest issue to unfold will be reaction to recent emasculation of the Atlantic Charter—the Casablanca pronouncement which for a time seemed to bind all United Nations, but which now appears not to have been a document at all to insure the liberty and freedom of all peoples.

Both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, at the first real approach to the Polish boundary question raised by Marshal Stalin, fell limply away from its tenets and in one stroke erased the idealism to which it held forth for all peoples who were to be guaranteed boundaries and a form of government of their own choosing.

And just as quickly, isolationism again popped up in this Nation as something not to be as much ashamed of as it was considered to be during the heat of the recent Presidential campaign. This will be one of the major differences argued when the new Congress gets fully under way—a real issue superimposed on the momentous issues of war itself.

President Roosevelt will come in for severe criticism on his failure to be specific, or to state at all, the policy of this Nation with regard to differences among major allies on the shape of things to come in post-war Europe.

The President has said there is little hope that all Allied differences can be composed at the projected meeting of the Big Three, but vigorous voices will be heard in Congress demanding that the United States assert itself plainly and unmistakably on peacetime policy, to take issue with both Stalin and Churchill who are bent upon carving our spheres of influence which set the stage for World War No. 3.

On the other side of this question lies the road back to isolationism in the United States, the feeling that once more we shall let European problems remain European, and retire in the mood of being "fed up," to our own side of the world.

These are the dangerous and precarious problems we face—problems which cannot with the hope of amicable settlement in the spirit of fair dealing to all nations, await the end of the war. Our position must be made clear now, so that when the hand of victory is turned face up, the world shall know where we stand in the face of temptation to let matters slide after the shooting is over.

America is not a nation to claim selfish credit nor to boast of its achievements in this war, but neither has it been, up to now, a nation which has had great say about the ways and manner of the peace. We simply have said nothing, affirmatively. The one occasion when we did speak was only to renege on the Atlantic Charter pronouncement and thereby emphasize our vaccilation.

People or nations do not claim credit for saving their own lives and way of living, which is precisely what we are fighting for, in the first instance. To save our national life is the job of the American serviceman—and he is delivering in the best tradition, as the world knows.

But in the second instance, it is likewise the job of American diplomacy to follow up American brilliance in the field by stating now, and holding tenaciously to a position which guarantees, so far as it is possible to guarantee it, that American sons of another generation shall not have to go back for the third time.

That is what this war is about. That is the phase the American soldier is giving his life to win and to assure. But unfortunately, the phase we seem too timid to win, or to assert ourselves in, is that which will seal up permanently the job which the doughboy and flyer and sailor is doing.

The new Congress has this work upon its hands. It has the responsibility of prying a courageous course for peace from President Roosevelt if he persists in failure to enunciate it—to settle now, while we have the arms and the gear to back it up, the problems which shall inevitably come back to involve us again if we don't.

The gallantry of the American soldier, who believes in what he is doing, certainly is worthy to be matched by diplomatic gallantry. Anything less is not only to cheapen, but to make mockery of every American life lost, to say nothing of the fakery of honest dollars and honest effort put into the war by every citizen living.

It is time to speak up—if, indeed, we are not already tardy.

German Savagery Verified by British

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of January 4, 1945:

GERMAN SAVAGERY VERIFIED BY BRITISH—TWENTY-FIRST ARMY GROUP PUBLISHES DOCUMENTED ACCOUNT OF TORTURES IN BELGIUM

TWENTY-FIRST ARMY GROUP HEADQUARTERS, January 3.—The British Army, in its first

official account of German atrocities, published today a document disclosing that Belgian civilians had been subjected to tortures rivaling those of the Spanish Inquisition.

It said that some prisoners in their agony and despair had frequently scratched crude drawings of the head of Christ on the walls of their cells. The document declared that every statement taken from surviving prisoners had been carefully checked for veracity.

It deals with the notorious Breendonck concentration camp near Malines, the Tir National in Brussels—where Nurse Edith Cavell was executed in the First World War—and 16 other prisons and torture or execution depots in Belgium. Witnesses were quoted as saying that approximately 1,000 persons had been shot at the Tir National during the German occupation and at least 350 had been executed by firing squad or hanging in Breendonck.

An imprisoned Austrian doctor said that more than 500 men had died during the 3 years that he spent in the moated Breendonck Prison, including 300 shot, 15 hanged, and about 200 who succumbed from starvation and other ill treatment. Six methods of torture outlined in the document included: Blows across the face or body, particularly below the belt, with a truncheon or cat-o'-nine tails; binding the victim across a table and thrashing him; hoisting him to the ceiling by a pulley and lashing him in mid-air, or releasing him to fall on sharp-pointed wooden blocks; burning with cigar ends; crushing fingers in a medieval-style screw press, and burning with a four-pointed electrical needle instrument.

A typical daily menu in Breendonck was given as: Breakfast, one slice of dry bread and a mug of coffee; lunch, a bowl of scalding, watery soup; dinner, one slice of bread, sometimes with a small piece of butter or margarine, occasionally a potato or a salted sardine, and a mug of coffee.

Forty-eight prisoners were jammed into rooms 42 feet long, 21 feet wide and 13 feet high, with blue painted windows at each end of a series of triple-decker bunks and a few small tables and stools. There were also iron-barred cells 6 feet 8 inches by 4 feet 5 inches, equipped with wall shackles.

"All rooms and cells were lit by electricity, but that was used only for inspection by the guards," the document added. Orders were given in German and prisoners who did not understand were punished by the guards, who invariably carried whips or crops.

The "more dangerous" prisoners were kept in handcuffs or shackles night and day and forced to eat dog fashion on all fours. Black hoods were thrown over their heads when they were taken out for 4 or 5 minutes daily.

People Should Rule Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the future foreign policy of the United States is now being considered and debated in the Senate. The people of the world, as well as our own people, are tremendously and vitally interested in what the foreign policy of the United States is to be. Even the smaller weekly newspapers are expressing their views through their editorial columns. My attention has been called to an editorial appearing in the Manchester (Mich.) Enterprise, a weekly newspaper, which editorial apparently meets with the approval of a number of my constituents. Pursuant to the privilege given to me, I present the editorial to Congress. It is as follows:

PEOPLE SHOULD RULE OUR FOREIGN POLICY

There is a vast difference between the creation and maintenance of a foreign policy, and the day-by-day conduct of foreign affairs. There have been but two foundation stones in what might be classed as America's foreign policy structure. The one was Washington's warning against involvement in European entanglements, and the other was Monroe's demand that Europe keep out of Western Hemisphere affairs.

In peacetime these two have constituted our foreign policy. When war has come we have invariably gone on the day-by-day basis of conducting foreign affairs. That has been in line with the wishes of the American people and no administration dared challenge such wishes.

If, as it would seem, the time has come to change or enlarge upon America's foreign policy, the American people should have opportunity for discussion of what that future policy shall be. It would seem we can no longer think and act only on our day-to-day interests. We must lay down a new line that we can, and will, hew to in both peace and war times. What that line shall be should be debated pro and con, by the best minds of the Nation, and the findings be so presented to the people generally as to win unqualified and, as near as possible, unanimous approval. When that has been done, when a definite and continuing foreign policy has been decided upon, we should hew to that line regardless of all partisan politics. It should be considered a fixed policy, not subject to partisan squabbles. If it is time to change from the President Washington pronouncement, let us make the new policy as fundamental as that one has been.

Future Defense Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1945, I called the attention of the House of Representatives to the vital need for the construction of adequate highways and bridges in defense areas to meet any national emergency involving national defense. Among other things, I invited attention to the failure of the last Congress to include a provision in the Post-war Federal Road Act allocating specific funds to important defense areas; that under some State laws, including California, a special act of the State legislature is necessary to include some of these important highways and bridges in the State road system in order that Federal aid might be given; and I urged that the Public Roads Administration take cognizance of these facts and use its good offices to influence State highway commissions to see to it that these important links of our national defense be included in their programs.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include therein an excellent editorial which recently appeared in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin dealing with this subject, I invite the attention of Members of the House of Representatives to the following:

FUTURE DEFENSE ROADS—HIGHWAY COMMISSION SHOULD PLAN FAR AHEAD FOR FIRST PRIORITY ROADWAYS TO VITAL POINTS

The State highway commission expects to hold hearings with local officials throughout the State to plan post-war construction projects under provisions of the $3,000,000,000 Federal Aid Authorization Act passed by the recent Congress.

The legislation does not actually appropriate any money; it merely authorizes a later Congress to make the funds available for matching by the States on a 50–50 basis. California's share would be about $22,000,000, with an equal amount to be provided by the State.

The highway commission should be ready to get started on this construction program immediately after the war is over. That means extensive planning now, and that is the purpose of early conferences with local officials.

The law does not include an amendment proposed by Representative WELCH, of San Francisco, requiring that a certain percentage of the allotment to each State be allocated for roads and bridges leading to areas of national defense. That, in our opinion, is a serious mistake.

But the individual State highway commissions can remedy that by adopting a policy of giving priority rating to such projects. That is a necessary safeguard against bottlenecks that might delay, at critical times, the movement of troops and supplies.

The Golden Gate, Carquinez, and Bay Bridges, together with connecting roads, are local examples. The linking of port and other facilities here with military and naval establishmentts, such as Mare Island and Hamilton and McClellan fields; with coast and inland plants producing war materials, and with food collection and distributing areas in valley points, have been the means of expediting shipments to our troops overseas.

More such links will be needed in the San Francisco Bay area and in other districts of the State. These should be a part of our national preparedness program. They are important adjuncts to our Army, Navy and merchant marine.

The California State Highway Commission should give consideration to these matters and it should make certain that such projects are placed at the top of the list of its construction program.

Letter From Sgt. Roland Martino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was written by Sgt. Roland Martino, a son of Mrs. Mary Martino, of 12 Grove Avenue, Auburn, N. Y., from a hospital at Cherry Point where he is recovering from wounds received in action. It is addressed to his aunt, Mrs. Charles DeAnglis, whose son was killed in the invasion of the Normandy coast:

I know it is hard to take and a stunning blow. It is to me and I can imagine what

it is to you. Vince was a boy any parent or family would be proud of. He was a typical example of good American youth and won the admiration of many. We were all proud of him and now at this moment more proud as we know he chose to fight and knew what he was fighting for—you, his sisters, and what he thought was right.

We are all fighting for that. He gave his life for us and we admire him now more than ever. He faced death like a champion and there is no doubt he fell like a champion.

There are many mothers, fathers, and sisters facing the same news you received. There are more to receive such news every day. Now, more than ever, we must all take this sad news and hold our heads up in pride and prayer and try and finish what he started.

He gave his life so we all could live in peace and merriment and without fright. He is gone now, but you can still help him by showing courage and a continuance of his ideals of life. We all know what they were—to see that you and his sisters received every opportunity to have what you and they want.

War is a horrible dream of reality, and someone must always get hurt. God chose Vince as many others. I am sure he left us prepared and hoping we would carry on for him. I intend to, now, more than ever before. He gave his life and I am ready to do likewise for the same reason.

God bless you all for I know you are taking the news like Vince would want it, proud of him at a time when he especially desires you to be proud. Now is the time to be strong, not only in mind but heart. You must know now where he inherited his unsurpassed courage and bravery. Don't let him down.

Answer to Mr. Rich, of Pennsylvania, on Wool Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] last Monday, Mr. RICH made the following statement concerning wool:

When the Government took over the wool for this period and set the price on domestic wools, it embarked upon an operation under which the Government is today accumulating all the domestic wools. The foreign wools are coming into this country, and all we can do is buy foreign wools, because the domestic wools are 18 to 20 cents a pound more than the foreign wools. The fact is that the Government is holding the bag now. We are not using domestic wools. All the manufacturers are buying foreign wools because they can buy them more cheaply.

My investigation of this matter discloses:

In March 1941 the War Department decided to grant price premiums on wool textiles made from domestic wool. Accordingly, the price of domestic wool began to move upward and on March 28, 1941, domestic wools were selling at $1.09 a pound with Australian of comparable grade at $1.03 to $1.08. This was a reversal of the normal situation with domestic wools selling below imported. O. P. A., in the first quarter of 1942, froze the situation as it found it at that time. The War Department purchase program had been in effect for some time and the Office of Price Administration simply accepted the price structure as it found it. Now—as of January 5, 1945—domestic wool is at $1.19, Australian averages about $1.07, with an average difference of 12 cents per pound. There is a further differential due to the difference in put-up or preparation for market. Australian wools are skirted so that each fleece has removed from it the belly roll, neck and leg pieces, and so forth, giving it a greater degree of homogeneity than the unskirted domestic wools. The market normally reflects this difference by a price differential of 5 to 8 cents per pound. If we add this to the 12-cent differential noted above, the total differential runs between 17 and 21 cents.

Since April 25, 1943, the Commodity Credit Corporation has taken practically all of the domestic wool. This means that between that date and the present time they have acquired 577,000,000 pounds. Of this they have sold approximately 48 percent so that they now hold about half of the total which they have acquired.

As for the statement that all manufacturers are buying foreign wools because they can buy them more cheaply, this can be said: Manufacturers have shown a preference for the foreign wools because they have felt that such wools were better graded and for other reasons were easier and cheaper to work. The manufacturer who acquires domestic wool and uses it can obtain an offsetting premium price himself on sales to the War Department so that from the price viewpoint there would not appear to be any incentive in the existing arrangement which would lead manufacturers to use foreign wools if there were no considerations other than price involved.

In summary, the Government is acquiring nearly all the domestic wools and, rather than holding the bag, it has already disposed of about half of the total it has acquired. The manufacturers are using foreign wools because they consider them better to work with, not because they are cheaper. The lower acquisition price on foreign wools is offset by the fact that the manufacturer can obtain a higher price on his product if he uses the more costly domestic wool.

It is my prediction that within a few months practically all of the domestic wool will be consumed. If I am right in that prediction, and I believe it can safely be made, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] does not, to my mind, have a complaint that is justified.

Census Department Fees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1943, I introduced H. R. 2687 to exempt certain persons from the requirement for paying fees for certain census data. I have reintroduced the bill. One of the requirements which must be met before an aged person can receive old-age assistance is the proving of the age of the individual who desires to receive the assistance. Many of our aged do not have sufficient records to prove their ages and it becomes necessary that they call on the Census Department for age proof. The Census Department now charges $1 to search the records for an individual who desires to prove his age and $3 if the given individual desires that the search be made more rapidly than the usual searches are made. There are several States which pay on an average of less than $12 per month to their aged who receive old-age assistance. Obviously $1 or $3, with living costs high as they are, is a very significant sum for these individuals. In my opinion, the Government should furnish this information to them free. Furthermore, I would extend the provision of this bill to enable veterans, widows of veterans, and service people to obtain proof of their ages without having to pay the Census Department these fees. I hope the Census Committee will report soon this legislation, and that the Congress will pass it, thereby helping materially our aged and perchance in some cases our veterans and service people.

I wish to include in the RECORD a letter I received from Mr. Paul V. McNutt on June 15, 1944; also the bill I introduced:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, June 15, 1944.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I believe that the legislation that you propose would result in a service to applicants for old-age assistance or old-age and survivors' insurance who need to utilize the Bureau of the Census as a resource in establishing proof of age.

However, the Social Security Board encourages the use, in the administration of both old-age assistance and old-age and survivors insurance, of the most reliable evidence as proof of age which is readily available to the applicant or claimant. It has been the experience of the Board that in most instances persons have in their possession information that can be considered satisfactory proof.

Nevertheless, legislation which would enable applicants for old-age assistance or claimants of old-age and survivors insurance who are obliged to have recourse to the Bureau of the Census for proof of age to receive the necessary information free of charge, would, we believe, be desirable.

We believe the bill should provide for the obtaining of the information on behalf of an individual by the administrative agency concerned in instances in which the person is unable to request the information himself.

I believe that we can say with assurance that the State agencies administering old-age assistance will agree with us in this opinion.

I am advised by the Bureau of the Budget that legislation to discontinue charges for age and citizenship certificates should not be considered as being in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Administrator.

H. R. 358

A bill excepting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data

Be it enacted, etc., That section 18 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses

and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 13, sec. 218), is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ": *And provided further*, That no charge for supplying a certificate shall be made and no payment of the cost of searching the records shall be required in any case in which the individual requesting the data is a member of the land or naval forces of the United States or has been honorably discharged therefrom, or has been retired therefrom, or relieved from active duty therein, under honorable circumstances, or in any case in which the data is requested by an individual as proof of his age for the purposes of his eligibility for old-age assistance or old-age and survivor insurance benefits."

Clare Hoffman Gives Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York PM of January 10, 1945:

CLARE HOFFMAN GIVES WARNING

Certain remarks were made on the floor of the House of Representatives last Thursday by CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan. The leadership of the Democratic Party cannot afford to ignore them.

These remarks clearly indicate the use which anti-administration elements, Republicans and southern Republicrats, intend to make of the newly authorized permanent Dies committee.

HOFFMAN said those who voted for the Rankin resolution to make the Dies committee permanent "are neither bigoted nor prejudiced, but they do believe it is their duty to keep those who would destroy constitutional government from boring from within."

Whom did HOFFMAN have in mind? Was he thinking of the pro-Nazi termites and rats who assiduously spread the Goebbels line in this country, who spread race hatred and defeatism, who send poisonous letters to the mothers of men who gave their lives for their country?

Not at all. HOFFMAN'S attack was upon "the Reds and the radicals." If there is anyone so naive as not to understand what HOFFMAN means by "Reds and radicals," let him read HOFFMAN'S own explanation on the floor.

HOFFMAN attacked "left-wingers, parlor pinks, New Dealers—who advocate the remaking of America, who prophesy the destruction of private business and hope the procedure will be bloodless; any or all of those who do not believe in constitutional government."

The intent of the Republican-Republicratic coalition which supported the Rankin resolution is to use the new Dies committee to harass the administration, to smear the New Deal, to weaken the President and the Democratic Party with the country.

The leadership of the Democratic Party in the White House and in Congress cannot weakly ignore this intention. It should hardly be news to them.

The Dies committee was established in May 1938. That was 2 months after Munich, and the direction from which peace and democracy were menaced was plainly visible.

The main purpose of the committee was thought to be an inqury into Nazi activities in this country. This was indicated by Dies' assurance that his investigation would not be aimed at Germań-Americans as a group. It was also indicated, in reverse, by the fact that both Social Justice and the Chicago Tribune were at first very wary of the Dies committee, though they later became its ardent supporters.

Within a few months, the real direction of the committee's efforts was made clear. In a series of unfair and sensational hearings that year the committee helped defeat two New Deal gubernatorial candidates, Murphy in Michigan and Benson in Minnesota, and tried to defeat a third, Olson in California.

Dies declined to call off hearings until after the election, as requested by HEALY and Dempsey, two Democratic members of the committee. And on October 14, THOMAS of New Jersey, the leading Republican member, made a Nation-wide broadcast, linking the New Deal with communism and pointing to evidence obtained by the Dies committee as proof of a "plan to sabotage the capitalistic system by placing upon that system burdens of restrictive legislation and staggering taxation."

In every election since, whether congressional or Presidential, the Dies committee has been used to hurt the President, his supporters, and the Democratic Party.

The HOFFMAN speech on the floor, the anti-New Deal coalition which voted the Rankin resolution, the fact that MARTIN of Massachusetts made support of the resolution a matter of party discipline, all indicate that the new Dies committee is to be used in exactly the same way.

The question we want to ask Democratic leadership is whether it intends weakly to stand aside and permit the enemies of the party and of the New Deal to reestablish the Dies committee.

If the leadership contains men of courage and resolution, they will act now—for the fight is by no means lost. A shift of 11 votes would have defeated the Rankin resolution and a vigorous fight could force out of the Rules Committee and through the House the Hook resolution to revoke the Rankin resolution and to kill the Dies committee before it can get started again.

Past experience amply illustrates that neither changes in personnel—several times made—nor pledges of fair procedure—often given and as often broken—are likely to prevent the committee from slipping back into the old familiar pattern.

We ask Democratic leadership to take its courage in its hands and act now, when something can still be done.

I. F. STONE.

A Department of National Health in the Cabinet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the bill to provide for a Department of National Health in the Cabinet is being introduced in order to bring all of the Federal activities relative to health under one umbrella.

The Federal Security Agency has 12 different Government services concerned primarily or secondarily in some phase of health. The main one is the United States Public Health Service, and then we have the Office of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Office of Community War Service, Committee on Physical Fitness, the Food and Drug Administration, and several others.

In addition to the programs under the Federal Security Agency, we have some 20 other Government agencies having programs relating to some phase of health. We have the Veterans Administration concerned with the welfare of returned members of the armed forces. The Army and Navy have specific programs for their personnel. The Department of Agriculture has a Bureau of Home Economics, Bureau of Nutrition, Bureau of Dairy Industry, Farm Security Administration, and the Extension Service. These agencies are all dabbling in some phase of health.

In the Labor Department we have the Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau. The Children's Bureau was originally set up to look after child delinquency, hours of labor for children, and infant mortality, and has now branched out into a good-sized health department dealing with all phases of health. They have a definition that a child is a person under 18 years of age. They have a crippled heart division and a crippled children's division. They have a division which administers the maternal health of the wives of the military in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades. The Children's Bureau administers grants and aids to the States for crippled children and maternal services. They conduct programs of immunization. They have a prenatal delivery and post-natal care for the mother, including hospitalization with medical and nursing care as needed for the infant during the first year of life.

There are many other agencies dealing with health which should be administered under a secretary of health. This should help reduce expenditures, increase efficiency, and could consolidate and reduce the number of agencies having similar functions. Some agencies that are not necessary could be abolished. This would eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort. It should provide a better service for the people with a saving of funds. The bill does not include the War or Navy Departments of Government.

Preference for Veterans and Farmers Under Surplus Property Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress passed the Surplus Property Act it was the desire and purpose of many of the Members that veterans and farmers receive special consideration in their need for and in their efforts to procure available surplus property. Thus far, in my opinion, they have

received little if any extra consideration in the disposition of surplus property. It is my sincere hope that the new Surplus Property Board will issue rules and regulations in the near future which will carry out the intent of the law in the reference to certain preference for veterans and farmers.

I wish to include two letters I have recently received concerning the disposition of surplus property and also a short statement I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD November 27, 1944:

SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1945.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Please pardon my delay in answering your letters of December 20 and 27, which was occasioned by the fact that I took my oath of office only yesterday. You may be certain that the Board will shortly consider how to help farmers and veterans in the disposal of surplus property and will issue appropriate regulations.

I shall be very happy to keep in touch with you.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD H. HELLER,
Surplus Property Board.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
PROCUREMENT DIVISION,
Fort Worth, Tex., December 20, 1944.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Reference is made to your letter of December 21, 1944, requesting information as to what is being done for the servicemen and veterans in connection with surplus property.

Pending the issuance of regulations by the Surplus War Property Board described in the Surplus War Property Act of 1944, the Procurement Division is selling consumer items through normal trade channels, with special emphasis being given to the encouragement of small businesses.

Under the provisions of the Surplus War Property Act, it is anticipated that certain preferential treatment will be given to veterans as well as other specified categories.

If there is further information which we can furnish you regarding the policy of this office with respect to the sale of surplus property, we shall be glad to develop such information as you may require.

Very truly yours,

HAMILTON MORTON,
Regional Director.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

(Extension of remarks of Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Texas, in the House of Representatives, Monday, November 27, 1944)

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter I have received concerning the disposition of surplus property:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 21, 1944.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Your letter of November 17 addressed to Secretary Morgenthau has been turned over to me for reply since I am in charge of the Office of Surplus Property here at Treasury Procurement. To the several questions in your first paragraph, the answer at the present time is in the negative. In other words, we give no preference to soldiers, farmers, or soil-conservation districts. We do not sell direct to consumers but through regular dealers. We do have an arrangement whereby a farmer who can obtain a letter from his county A. A. A. agent to the effect that he is badly in need of a truck can take this note to a dealer and obtain priority over other prospective purchasers who do not have similar notes.

The situation will change as soon as the Surplus Property Board has been appointed and set up regulations. In other words, according to section 16 of the Surplus Property Act, the Board shall prescribe regulations which will result in aiding veterans. Section 17 of the act directs that farmers and farmers' cooperative associations shall have equal opportunity with others to purchase surplus property. We are selling to farm cooperatives at the present time but not directly to farmers. What regulations the Board will establish under this section remains to be seen.

With regard to the size of profits which dealers are permitted to make, this is controlled somewhat by the fact that surplus property must be sold in accordance with O. P. A. regulations. We, too, are bound by O. P. A. regulations. Since we have experienced businessmen at the head of our various merchandise divisions, we obtain what our ceiling price is for the property we sell. Those who buy from us must sell at or under O. P. A. ceilings and in this way their profits are presumably held to reasonable limits. On a percentage basis, profits will vary considerably from transaction to transaction and from type of merchandise to type of merchandise. It is impossible to give you any one figure.

Businessmen in your State who desire to purchase surplus property should write to our Fort Worth office asking to be placed on the mailing list to receive notices regarding available property in the lines which they usually carry.

Requests should be addressed to Mr. Hamilton Morton, regional director, Procurement Division, United States Treasury Department, 609 Neil P. Anderson Building, Fort Worth 2, Tex.

We are issuing a surplus reporter to all interested parties on our mailing list. The copy which is sent out of the Fort Worth office will list not only the property available in that region, but also throughout the country.

I hope that this information is what you wanted and that it will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. OLRICH,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Furthermore, I wish to quote sections 16, 17, and 12 of the Surplus Property Act which the Congress passed not long ago. So far I fear section 16 and section 17, insofar as it pertains to individual farmers have been meaningless:

"DISPOSITIONS TO VETERANS

"SEC. 16. The Board shall prescribe regulations to effectuate the objectives of this act to aid veterans to establish and maintain their own small business—professional or agricultural enterprises—by affording veterans suitable preference to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of this act in the acquisition of the types of surplus property useful in such enterprises.

"DISPOSITION IN RURAL AREAS

"SEC. 17. The Board shall devise ways and means and prescribe regulations in cooperation with the War Food Administrator providing for the sale of surplus property in such quantities in rural localities and in such manner as will assure farmers and farmers' cooperative associations equal opportunity with others to purchase surplus property: *Provided, however,* That in cases where a shortage of trucks, machinery, and equipment impairs farm production, a program shall be developed by the Board in cooperation with the Agricultural Adjustment Agency whereby a reasonable portion of the surplus supply will be made available for sale in rural areas to farmers and farmers' cooperative associations.

"UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 12. (a) It shall be the duty of the Board to facilitate the transfer of surplus property from one Government agency to other Government agencies for their use; and the transfer of surplus property under this section shall be given priority over all other disposals provided for in this act.

"(b) It shall be the responsibility of all Government agencies, in order to avoid making purchases through commercial channels, continuously to consult the records of surplus property established by the Board and to determine whether their requirements can be satisfied out of such surplus property. It shall also be the responsibility of the head of each Government agency to submit to the Board such estimates of the needs of the agency and such reports in relation thereto as the Board may deem necessary to promote the fullest utilization of surplus property. It shall be the responsibility of the Board to determine whether Government agencies are acquiring surplus property to the fullest possible extent, and to notify agencies whenever, in its judgment, they are not so doing.

"(c) The disposal agency responsible for any such property shall transfer it to the Government agency acquiring it at the fair value of the property as fixed by the disposal agency, under regulations prescribed by the Board, unless transfer without reimbursement or transfer of funds is otherwise authorized by law."

It seems to me the time to do something to materially assist all veterans, servicemen, our farmers, who compose soil-conservation districts, who compose Agricultural Adjustment Agency units, and individual farmers, is when there is something available they need, can advantageously utilize and perchance could not otherwise procure.

This country is committed time and time again to endeavor to assist our Spanish-American War veterans, our World War veterans, our service men and women, and all our farmers. The intent of Congress with reference to helping these groups should not be evaded.

There definitely is a place for dealers and retailers in the orderly disposition of surplus property. I feel they should have reasonable profits, too; however, I feel the first thing the new board should do is to set up rules, regulations, and machinery whereby a serviceman or veteran or farmer may buy when they are available if he wants just one, a jeep, a truck, a tractor, or a bulldozer without having to pay an unconscionable profit.

Noted Commentator Flays Committee for Constitutional Government—Says Passage of Proposed 25 Percent Tax Limitation Amendment Would Be "a Tragedy for Every Farmer and Wage Earner and Small Businessman in This Country"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Stanley Dixon, able commentator who broadcasts for the Mutual Broadcasting System every Sunday, has again picked up

the cudgels to assail the activities of the Committee for Constitutional Government in seeking passage of the proposed nefarious twenty-second amendment to the Constitution. In his regular Sunday broadcast on December 31, Mr. Dixon warned his listeners to be on the look-out for the activities of this group within their own respective States.

Because of Mr. Dixon's reputation for clear thinking and because we cannot be warned too often of the disastrous effects which the passage of this amendment would have upon the veterans and their dependents, upon those who now receive old-age assistance from the Government, and upon all farmers, wage earners, and small businessmen who are in the low-income brackets, I quote below from Mr. Dixon's broadcast of the 31st, as follows:

There is something State legislatures must not do, and that is to adopt a resolution favoring a proposed amendment to the Constitution which would limit the income tax to 25 percent. The Committee for Constitutional Government is promoting the plan, one of the most dangerous ever conceived. It would mean that millionaires who now pay about $800,000 on a $1,000,000 income would only pay $250,000, while people with small incomes would pay at least one-quarter of their income; a man with a $2,000 income who now pays about $175 would have to pay $500 with no exemptions. Remember that this would be a glorious windfall for the war profiteers who have made incredible billions of profits out of this war. It would be a tragedy for every farmer and wage earner and small businessman in this country. Furthermore, inheritance taxes would also be limited to 25 percent, which would mean huge losses to the Treasury in taxes on vast fortunes.

The loss in revenue due to this amendment would be so tremendous that the Government would have to follow one of two courses: either impose a large sales tax on everything, including food, perhaps a 20 percent tax to cover the costs of Government, or else they would have to repeal all veterans' aid bills, including the G. I. bill of rights. All pensions to veterans and old people would be stopped. All social security would be abolished. All veterans' hospitals would have to be closed. The Committee for Constitutional Government is trying to get 32 States to pass this resolution. It is being done very quietly. Some of the legislators don't even know that it has gone through, but if 32 States should pass the resolution a Constitutional Convention would have to be called. And if it were, all the money powers in the country would be behind this infamous proposal.

Sixteen legislatures have adopted this resolution, but these can be withdrawn. If you are a wage earner, or a veteran, or an old-age pensioner, or a small businessman, or a small farmer, anyone in fact with a small income, this is your fight. For full information about this racket, write to Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Washington, D. C., or write to me and I will forward your letter. Contact your union and get them working. Contact the local branch of your political action committee. Contact the Farmers Union. If possible, write to your State representatives and State senators and let them know that you want none of this proposal. But don't dally, for if you do you may find that America has been turned into a paradise for millionaires, and "you know what" for the little man, the veteran, and the pensioners.

The President's Epitome of His Annual Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on the evening of the 6th of January the President delivered over the radio an epitome of his message delivered to the Congress earlier in the day. I ask unanimous consent that the radio address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, in pursuance of my constitutional duty, I sent to the Congress a message on the state of the Union—and this evening I am taking the opportunity to repeat to you some parts of that message.

This war must be waged, it is being waged, with the greatest and most persistent intensity. Everything we are and have is at stake. Everything we are, and have, will be given.

We have no question of the ultimate victory. We have no question of the cost. Our losses will be heavy.

But we and our allies will go on fighting together to ultimate total victory.

We have seen a year marked, on the whole, by substantial progress toward victory, even though the year ended with a set-back for our arms, when the Germans launched a ferocious counter attack into Luxemburg and Belgium with the obvious objectives of cutting our line in the center.

Our men have fought with indescribable and unforgettable gallantry under most difficult conditions.

The high tide of this German attack was reached 2 days after Christmas. Since then we have reassumed the offensive, rescued the isolated garrison at Bastogne, and forced a German withdrawal along the whole line of the salient.

The speed with which we recovered from this savage attack was possible primarily because we have one supreme commander in complete control of all the Allied armies in France. General Eisenhower has faced this period of trial with admirable calm and resolution and with steadily increasing success. He has my complete confidence.

Further desperate attempts may well be made to break our lines, to slow our progress. We must never make the mistake of assuming that the Germans are beaten until the last Nazi has surrendered.

And I would express a most serious warning against the poisonous effects of enemy propaganda.

The wedge that the Germans attempted to drive in western Europe was less dangerous in terms of winning the war than the wedges which they are continually attempting to drive between ourselves and our allies.

Every little rumor which is intended to weaken our faith in our allies is like an actual enemy agent in our midst, seeking to sabotage our war effort. There are, here and there, evil and baseless rumors against the Russians, rumors against the British, rumors against our own American commanders in the field.

When you examine these rumors closely, you will observe that every one of them bears the same trade-mark, "Made in Germany."

We must resist this propaganda—we must destroy it—with the same strength and the same determination that our fighting men are displaying as they resist and destroy the panzer divisions.

In all of the far-flung operations of our own armed forces, on land and sea and in the air, the final job, the toughest job, has been performed by the average, easy-going, hard-fighting young American who carries the weight of battle on his own shoulders.

It is to him that we and all future generations of Americans must pay grateful tribute.

But, it is of small satisfaction to him to know that monuments will be raised to him in the future. He wants, he needs, and he is entitled to insist upon, our full and active support—now.

Although unprecedented production figures have made possible our victories, we shall have to increase our goals in certain weapons even more.

Our armed forces in combat have steadily increased their expenditure of ammunition. As we continue the decisive phases of this war, the munitions that we expend will mount day by day.

I shall not go into the details of war production and the requirements of war materials. They are contained in the message that I sent today, and I hope that many of you will have an opportunity to read that in full.

But there is one very human need that I do want to mention.

We need 20,000 more trained nurses for our Army and Navy.

Those nurses that we have, are rendering gallant service to our sick and wounded men, but they have been called upon to do more than their share. More than a thousand nurses are now hospitalized themselves, and part of this is due to overwork. At Army hospitals in the United States there is only one nurse to 26 beds, instead of one to 15 beds, as there should be.

Since volunteering has not produced the number of nurses required, I asked the Congress in my message, to amend the Selective Service Act to provide for the induction of registered nurses into the armed forces.

The need is too pressing to await the outcome of further efforts at recruiting. However, I urge registered nurses throughout the country to volunteer immediately for this great service.

The only way to meet our increased needs for more weapons and new weapons is for every American now engaged in war work to stay on his war job—for additional American civilians, men and women, not now engaged in essential work, to go out and get a war job. Workers who are released because their war production is cut back should get another job where war production is being increased. This is no time to quit or change to less essential jobs.

There is an old and true saying that the Lord hates a quitter. And this Nation must pay for all those who leave their essential jobs—for all those who lay down on their essential jobs for nonessential reasons. And that payment must be made with the life's blood of our sons.

Last year, after much consideration, I recommended that the Congress adopt a national service act as the most efficient and democratic way of insuring full production for our war requirements. This recommendation was not adopted.

I have again called upon the Congress today, to enact this measure for the total mobilization of all our human resources—men and women—for the prosecution of the war. I urge that this be done at the earliest possible moment.

It is not too late in the war. In fact, bitter experience has shown that, in this

kind of mechanized warfare where new weapons are constantly being created by our enemies and by ourselves, the closer we come to the end of the war, the more pressing becomes the need for sustained war production with which to deliver the final blow to the enemy.

There are three basic arguments for a national service law:

First. It would assure that we have the right numbers of workers in the right places at the right times.

Second. It would provide supreme proof to all our fighting men that we are giving them what they are entitled to, which is nothing less than our total effort.

Third. It would be the final, unequivocal answer to the hopes of the Nazis and the Japanese that we may become half-hearted about this war, and that they can get from us a negotiated peace.

National service legislation would be used only to the extent absolutely required by military necessities. In fact, experience in Great Britain and in other nations at war indicates that use of the compulsory powers of national service is necessary only in rare instances.

National service would provide against loss of retirement and seniority rights and benefits. It would not mean reduction in wages.

The contribution of our workers in this war has been beyond measure. We must now build on the foundations that have already been laid and supplement the measures now in operation, in order to guarantee the production that may be necessary in the critical period that lies ahead.

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have written me a letter in which, speaking of present war needs, they said:

"In our considered judgment, which is supported by General Marshall and Admiral King, this requires total mobilization of our manpower by the passage of a national war service law. The armed forces need this legislation to hasten the day of final victory, and to keep to a minimum the cost in lives."

That is the testimony of those best qualified to know the situation which confronts us.

Pending action by the Congress on the broader aspects of national service, I have recommended that the Congress immediately enact legislation which will be effective in using the services of the 4,000,000 men now classified as IV-F in whatever capacity is best for the war effort.

In the field of foreign policy, we propose to stand together with the United Nations not for the war alone but for the victory for which the war is fought.

It is not only a common danger which unites us, but a common hope. Ours is an association not of governments but of peoples, and the people's hope is peace. Here, as in England; in England, as in Russia; in Russia, as in China; in France and through the Continent of Europe and throughout the world; wherever men love freedom, the hope and purpose of the people are for peace—a peace that is durable and secure.

It will not be easy to create this people's peace. We have seen already, in areas liberated from the Nazi and the Fascist tyranny, what problems peace will bring. And we delude ourselves, if we attempt to believe wishfully that all these problems can be solved overnight.

The firm foundation can be built—and it will be built. But the continuance and assurance of a living peace must, in the long run, be the work of the people themselves.

We ourselves, like all peoples who have gone through the difficult processes of liberation and adjustment, know of our own experience how great the difficulties can be. We know that they are not difficulties peculiar to any continent or any nation. Our own Revolutionary War left behind it, in the words of one American historian, "an eddy of lawlessness and disregard of human life." There were separatist movements of one kind or another in Vermont, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Maine. There were insurrections, open or threatened, in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. We worked out for ourselves these difficulties—as the peoples of the liberated areas of Europe, faced with complex problems of adjustment, will work out their difficulties for themselves.

Peace can be made and kept only by the united determination of free and peace-loving peoples who are willing to work together—willing to help one another—willing to respect and tolerate and try to understand one another's opinions and feelings.

In the future world, the misuse of power, as implied in the term "power-politics," must not be a controlling factor in international relations. That is the heart of the principles to which we have subscribed. In a democratic world, as in a democratic nation, power must be linked with responsibility, and obliged to defend and justify itself within the framework of the general good.

In our disillusionment after the last war, we gave up the hope of achieving a better peace because we had not the courage to fulfill our responsibilities in an admittedly imperfect world.

We must not let that happen again, or we shall follow the same tragic road again—the road to a third world war.

We can fulfill our responsibilities for maintaining the security of our own country only by exercising our power and our influence to achieve the principles in which we believe, and for which we have fought.

It is true that the statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter does not provide rules of easy application to each and every one of the tangled situations in this war-torn world. But it is a good and a useful thing—it is an essential thing—to have principles toward which we can aim.

And we shall not hesitate to use our influence—and to use it now—to secure so far as is humanly possible the fulfillment of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We have not shrunk from the military responsibilities brought on by this war. We cannot and will not shrink from the political responsibilities which follow in the wake of battle.

To do this we must be on our guard not to exploit and exaggerate the differences between us and our allies, particularly with reference to the people who have been liberated from Fascist tyranny. That is not the way to secure a better settlement of those differences, or to secure international machinery which can rectify mistakes which may be made.

I must admit concern about many situations—the Greek and Polish for example. But those situations are not as easy or as simple to deal with as some spokesmen, whose sincerity I do not question, would have us believe. We have obligations, not necessarily legal, to the exiled governments, to the underground leaders, and to our major Allies who came much nearer the shadows than we did.

We and our Allies have declared that it is our purpose to respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. But with internal dissension, with many citizens of liberated countries still prisoners of war or forced to labor in Germany, it is difficult to guess the kind of self-government the people really want.

During the interim period, until conditions permit a genuine expression of the people's will, we and our allies have a duty, which we cannot ignore, to use our influence to the end that no temporary or provisional authorities in the liberated countries block the eventual exercise of the peoples' right freely to choose the government and institutions under which, as free men, they are to live.

It is our purpose to help the peace-loving peoples of Europe to live together as good neighbors, to recognize their common interests, and not to nurse their traditional grievances against one another.

But we must not permit the many specific and immediate problems of adjustment connected with the liberation of Europe to delay the establishment of permanent machinery for the maintenance of peace. Under the threat of a common danger, the United Nations joined together in war to preserve their independence and their freedom. They must now join together to make secure the independence and freedom of all peace-loving States, so that never again shall tyranny be able to divide and conquer.

International peace and well-being, like national peace and well-being, require constant alertness, continuing cooperation, and organized effort.

International peace and well-being, like national peace and well-being, can be secured only through institutions capable of life and growth.

One of the most heartening events of the year in the international field has been the renaissance of the French people and the return of the French nation to the ranks of the United Nations. Far from having been crushed by the terror of Nazi domination, the French people have emerged with stronger faith than ever in the destiny of their country and in the soundness of the democratic ideals to which the French nation has contributed so greatly.

Today, French armies are again on the German frontier and are again fighting shoulder to shoulder with our sons.

Since our landings in Africa, we have placed in French hands all the arms and material of war which our resources and the military situation permitted. And I am glad to say that we are now about to equip large new French forces with the most modern weapons for combat duty.

I am clear in my own mind that, as an essential factor in the maintenance of world peace in the future, we must have universal military training after this war, and I shall send a special message to the Congress on this subject.

An enduring peace cannot be achieved without a strong America—strong in the social and economic sense as well as in the military sense.

I have already set forth what I consider to be an American economic bill of rights, and the most fundamental of these is the right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation.

In turn, others of the economic rights of American citizenship, such as the right to a decent home, to a good education, to good medical care, to social security, to reasonable farm income, will, if fulfilled, make major contributions to achieving adequate levels of employment.

In the message that I sent to the Congress today, I discussed the general approach to the program that we have in mind for the provision of close to 60,000,000 jobs.

Although we must plan now for our postwar economy, and enact the necessary legislation, and set up the appropriate agencies for reconversion from war to peace, and lay the foundations for that transition period—all of which we are now doing—it is obviously impossible for us to do anything which might possibly hinder the production

for war at this time, when our men are fighting on the frontiers of Germany and dropping bombs on the war industries of Japan.

In these days, our thoughts and our hopes and our prayers are with our sons and brothers, or loved ones who are far from home.

We can and we will give them all the support of which this great Nation is capable. But no matter how well they may be equipped with weapons and munitions, their magnificent fight will have been in vain if this war should end in the breaking of the unity of the United Nations.

We need the continuing friendship of our allies in this war. Indeed, that need is a matter of life and death. And we shall need that friendship in the peace.

I quote from an editorial in the Stars and Stripes, our soldiers' own newspaper in Europe:

"For the holy love of God let's listen to the dead. Let's learn from the living. Let's join ranks against the foe. The bugles of battle are heard again above the bickering."

That is the demand of our fighting men. We cannot fail to heed it.

This new year of 1945 can be the greatest year of achievement in human history.

1945 can see the final ending of the Nazi-Fascist reign of terror in Europe.

1945 can see the closing in of the forces of retribution about the center of the milignant power of imperialistic Japan.

Most important of all, 1945 can, and must, see the substantial beginning of the organization of world peace—for we all know what such an organization means in terms of security, and human rights, and religious freedom.

We Americans of today, together with our Allies, are making history—and I hope it will be better history than ever has been made before.

We pray that we may be worthy of the unlimited opportunities that God has given us.

That Spurious Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States were astonished and shocked when, at his press conference of December 19 last, President Roosevelt is alleged to have made what he himself called an amazing statement. That statement gave the impression that the so-called Atlantic Charter which had constantly and repeatedly, for more than 3 years, been represented and held out to the American people and the peoples of the world as the hope of the world under a signed agreement between the leaders of the two great democracies, was merely a myth, that there was no such agreement, nor had one ever been signed by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt.

One of the daily papers in my district reacted with the following editorial:

SO IT IS ONLY A JOKE

A country heartsick over the war's mounting casualties and the certainty that present reverses will add immeasurably to the deadly toll is in no mood to echo the President's uproarious laughter over his disclosure of what recent world events had already hinted—that there really is no such thing as the Atlantic Charter.

It was just something scribbled, he said, on scraps of paper—a phrase ominously reminiscent of von Bethmann-Hollweg's description of the way European agreements were treated when it became convenient to discard them. Neither Mr. Roosevelt nor Prime Minister Churchill signed anything nor agreed other than verbally to adhere to its principles. The fact remains, however, that on August 14, 1941, at the conclusion of Roosevelt's and Churchill's dramatic mid-Atlantic meeting—an event hailed at the time as of historic significance—the two enunciated eight common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world. (The agreement on Polish boundaries violates principle No. 2; intervention in Greece, Italy, and Belgium No. 3.) Furthermore, the President announced to the world that the agreement had been signed.

The fact remains, also, that these eight principles, widely promulgated throughout the world as the hope of oppressed peoples everywhere, especially those then under the Nazi heel, lent to the allied cause the aura of a holy crusade. It was under that guise that the war we went into the following December was being fought until the familiar pattern of spheres of influence, power politics, and armed intervention began to emerge.

The fighting is bitter on the western front. The winter cold is bitter, too. But they are no more bitter than the sacrifice of our fighting men and their loved ones at home will be if the cause they are bleeding for turns out to be the aggrandizement so piously forsworn in principle No. 1 of the Atlantic Charter.

The President assured the Nation that he personally still subscribes to the principles of the Atlantic Charter. But perhaps he has not made that sufficiently clear to the British. That explanation of the confused state of allied policy over liberated Europe is suggested in Anthony Eden's statement that "there was no question of Britain's armed intervention in Greece without consulting our allies."

Certainly, nobody blames Mr. Roosevelt for what goes on in Europe. It is not his fault that allies, like relatives, are sometimes inclined, when given an inch, to take a mile. No doubt the President went into this war as thoroughly imbued with the high-minded principles of the Atlantic Charter as the rest of the country. But now that this idealism stands starkly revealed as capable of whatever interpretation suits the expediency of the moment—now that the Atlantic Charter is disclosed to be as mythical as its principles—please, Mr. Roosevelt, don't laugh about it. Dying for a misrepresented cause is no laughing matter.

That editorial stated a fair example of the reaction heard in the pulpit, the home, the office and the street throughout the District. And I am still receiving letters and telegrams from the District asking for a reaffirmation of the pledges contained in the Declaration of Peace Aims as uttered and published over their alleged signatures in the Atlantic Charter on August 14, 1941, by Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill.

Now I am also going to make what may be considered by some as an amazing statement, and that is that in my opinion the joint declaration of principles and peace aims, a copy of which was transmitted to the House of Representatives and incorporated in House Document No. 358, was in fact signed by President Roosevelt for the United States, and by Prime Minister Churchill for the United Kingdom.

It would seem conclusive that an opposite opinion would have to accuse Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill of falsehood, fraud, deceit, and a betrayal of the American people, as well as accusing President Roosevelt of uttering and publishing a forgery, and that we cannot believe.

Let us examine the evidence. First we have Document No. 358 of the House of Representatives' Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, which I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks, which was a confirmation of a similar release from the White House on August 14, 1941. It reads as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Over a week ago I held several important conferences at sea with the British Prime Minister. Because of the factor of safety to British, Canadian, and American ships, and their personnel, no prior announcement of these meetings could properly be made.

At the close, a public statement by the Prime Minister and the President was made. I quote it for the information of the Congress and for the record:

"The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, have met at sea.

"They have been accompanied by officials of their two Governments, including high-ranking officers of their military, naval, and air services.

"The whole problem of the supply of munitions of war, as provided by the Lend-Lease Act, for the armed forces of the United States, and for those countries actively engaged in resisting aggression, has been further examined.

"Lord Beaverbrook, the Minister of Supply of the British Government, has joined in these conferences. He is going to proceed to Washington to discuss further details with appropriate officials of the United States Government. These conferences will also cover the supply problems of the Soviet Union.

"The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked, and have made clear the steps which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

"They have agreed upon the following joint declaration:

"Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

"First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

"Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to fur-

ther the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

"Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

"Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

"Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

"Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

"(Signed) FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
"(Signed) WINSTON S. CHURCHILL."

The Congress and the President having heretofore determined, through the Lend-Lease Act, on the national policy of American aid to the democracies which East and West are waging war against dictatorships, the military and naval conversations at these meetings made clear gains in furthering the effectiveness of this aid.

Furthermore, the Prime Minister and I are arranging for conferences with the Soviet Union to aid it in its defense against the attack made by the principal aggressor of the modern world—Germany.

Finally, the declaration of principles at this time presents a goal which is worth while for our type of civilization to seek. It is so clear-cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept compromise with nazi-ism; or to agree to a world peace which would give to nazi-ism domination over large numbers of conquered nations. Inevitably such a peace would be a gift to nazi-ism to take breath—armed breath—for a second war to extend the control over Europe and Asia, to the American Hemisphere itself.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to call attention once more to the utter lack of validity of the spoken or written word of the Nazi government.

It is also unnecessary for me to point out that the declaration of principles includes, of necessity, the world need for freedom of religion and freedom of information. No society of the world organized under the announced principles could survive without these freedoms which are a part of the whole freedom for which we strive.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 21, 1941.*

It will be noted that over his signature Mr. Roosevelt not only states that the joint declaration has been signed by them, but by the "signed Franklin D. Roosevelt" and the "signed Winston S. Churchill;" he represents to the Congress and the American people that these are copies of original and genuine signatures to that identical document.

It will further be noted that over his signature in the second paragraph on page 1, President Roosevelt says:

At the close—

Of their several important conferences at sea—

a public statement by the Prime Minister and the President was made. I quote it for the information of the Congress and for the record.

Now, I ask in the name of reason, how could the President say over his signature that at the close of these several conferences at sea a public statement by the President and the Prime Minister was made, if in reality nothing had been done except to make inconsequential scribblings on scraps of paper? How could he say that it was a public statement by the Prime Minister and the President when it was in reality only scribblings by the Prime Minister, the President, Sumner Welles, and Sir Alexander Cadogan? How could the President say, "I quote," when what he purports to quote had no reality? And why would he make the statement that he quotes it for the information of Congress not only, but for the record?

It is a reasonable inference that at least a part of the consideration for which Prime Minister Churchill signed this declaration of principles was the aid proposed to be extended to the United Kingdom, Soviet Russia, and other nations through lend-lease.

At least, the President, over his signature, says on the last page of Document No. 358:

The Congress and the President having heretofore determined, through the Lend-Lease Act, on the national policy of American aid to the democracies which East and West are waging war against dictatorships, the military and naval conversations at these meetings made clear gains in furthering the effectiveness of this aid.

Furthermore, the Prime Minister and I are arranging for conferences with the Soviet Union to aid it in its defense against the attack made by the principal aggressor of the modern world—Germany.

The last paragraph above quoted was undoubtedly the inducement for Soviet Russia later to declare, through its Ambassador in London, Ivan Maisky, that Russia was in agreement with the fundamental principles of the declaration and would defend the right of every nation to independence, territorial integrity, and form of government of its own choice. This was on or about September 24, 1941.

At all events, if there is any question about whether Lend-Lease was a consideration for the acceptance of the Atlantic joint declaration of peace aims and an agreement to be obligated thereby, I point to article VII, contained in all the master lend-lease agreements. It says:

To the end * * * to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariff and other trade barriers; and in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the joint declaration made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

Again I ask, If there is no such joint declaration made by President Roosevelt and the Prime Minister, then of what effect and validity is the above clause in all our lend-lease agreements? There must be a joint declaration.

Then in the next paragraph on that page the President said over his signature:

Finally, the declaration of principles at this time presents a goal that is worth while for our type of civilization to seek. It is so clear-cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept compromise with nazi-ism, or to agree to a world peace which would give nazi-ism domination over large numbers of conquered nations.

And the next paragraph on that page is significant. It reads:

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to call attention once more to the utter lack of validity of the spoken or written word of the Nazi government.

If it was not one cohesive statement, how could the President say:

It is so clear-cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept compromise with nazi-ism.

Again—and I say it with all respect—how can we believe that the President would be so loose with his written word over his own signature and yet call attention to the utter lack of validity of the spoken or written word of the Nazi government?

House Document No. 358 in itself is convincing evidence that the declaration of principles therein enumerated were so enumerated and written by Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt. And, as I said before, a contrary conclusion would lead to the inevitable admission that President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill are guilty of fraud, deceit, and betrayal of the American people; and that President Roosevelt, in uttering and publishing an instrument as signed by Winston Churchill, when in truth such instrument was not signed by him, is guilty of forgery. The American people rely upon that signature by Churchill as at least one advantage to be gained from lend-lease, namely, that the United Kingdom acknowledged and subscribed to the fundamentals of a just peace, and that we thereby had overcome at least one of the serious obstacles which, regardless of who may be to blame, constituted a failure of the League of Nations after the First World War.

To believe that this document as represented in House Document No. 358 was not signed would leave no other conclusion than that Mr. Churchill had put over a fast one on Mr. Roosevelt—in fact, had sold him a gold brick—and that Mr. Roosevelt let Mr. Churchill put this over on him, selling him a gold brick, in the belief that he had a signed agreement, when in fact he had gotten nothing but scraps of paper with noble sentiments scribbled on them. The American people can never accept nor believe such a conclusion.

We are further fortified in our inability to accept and believe that there was no such joint statement of peace aims by a proclamation of President Roosevelt on August 14, 1943, the second anniversary of the Atlantic Charter, when he said:

> Today, on the second anniversary of the signing of the Atlantic Charter, I would cite particularly two of its purposes and principles on which we base our hopes for a better future for the world.

This was 2 years after the event, and the President specifically emphasizes the signing as well as its form as one cohesive instrument.

Next, in examining the evidence as to whether there was a cohesive statement signed by Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt, let us examine what Prime Minister Churchill said about it 10 days after its execution. In a broadcast made on August 24, 1941, Prime Minister Churchill said:

> We had the idea when we met there, the President and I, that without attempting to draw final and formal peace aims or war aims it was necessary to give all peoples, and especially the oppressed and conquered peoples, a simple, rough-and-ready wartime statement of the goal toward which the British Commonwealth and the United States mean to make their way.

This speech was made 3 days after Mr. Roosevelt had published House Document No. 358 to the Congress and to the world. Would anyone be so naive as to claim that Mr. Churchill was not acquainted with that message proclaimed 3 days before when he speaks of "a simple, rough-and-ready wartime statement of the goal toward which the British Commonwealth and the United States mean to make their way." Does he make any reference to heterogeneous wishes or sentiments scribbled on scraps of paper by several persons?

Moreover, if my memory serves me well, there was considerable discussion in the newspapers at the time of the execution of the Atlantic Charter, so-called, about Prime Minister Churchill's inserting in paragraph 4 the clause, "with due respect for their existing obligations" Paragraph 4 reads:

They will endeavor to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

The words "with due respect for their existing obligations" were inserted after the first three words, "They will endeavor", and, of course, protected the favored or preferential trade agreements between the various units of the British Empire.

Now why, I ask, would such an insertion be made unless it was a cohesive statement, signed by the parties, in which one of the parties made an exception reserving certain rights to itself?

Again, Prime Minister Churchill, in his famous speech in the House of Commons, as late as December 15, 1944, made the statement:

> It must not be forgotten that the words are inserted in the Atlantic Charter, "No changes before the peace table except changes mutually agreed."

It is true that the Prime Minister was in error in that quotation, and, as one of his private secretaries said, he had a lapse of memory in speaking of Poland on December 16, and confused the wording of the Atlantic Charter with a British Government statement on foreign policy drafted in 1940.

But again I ask, why did Prime Minister Churchill speak of words inserted in the Atlantic Charter when the so-called Atlantic Charter consisted of mere scribblings on separate pieces of paper by different persons which were never drawn together in one formal statement? It is simply inconceivable.

But let us go a little further in our examination as to whether the so-called Atlantic Charter was one cohesive statement of facts, and whether or not it was signed by Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill, as President Roosevelt uttered and published the document and signatories to the world, and especially in House Document No. 358. Following is a quotation from Geoffrey Crowther, editor of the London Economist, found in Foreign Affairs, volume 20, No. 1, October 1941, page 1 and following pages:

> If the declaration of the Atlantic Charter * * * is taken merely as a restatement of the democratic faith in international relationships, nine-tenths of its significance will be lost. The ideas are not particularly new nor its language unduly inspired. Its true signifiance lies in the identity of the signatories and in the place where it was signed. The declaration marks, in effect, the assumption of two great English-speaking democracies of the leadership of the free world. It serves notice that, when the victory has been won, the ideas that will be dominant in the world will be the faiths and the aspirations and the doctrines that are common to Britain and America. The fact that its only date line is the Atlantic Ocean is as significant as the signatories.

How are we going to believe that this important statement in this important organ of the English press, that "Its true significance lies in the identity of the signatories and the place where it was signed," was false and misleading, and that both Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill let it go unchallenged? It was the fact that it was signed by the leaders of these two great nations rather than the inspirational nature of its wording that gave hope and encouragement to the people of the United States as well as the peoples of all peace-loving nations.

Again, how could Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt encourage Ivan Maisky, the Soviet Ambassador in London, to express Russia's official attitude when on or about September 24, 1941, he declared that Russia was "in agreement with the fundamental principles of the declaration and would defend the right of every nation to independence, territorial integrity, and form of government of its own choice" if they themselves were not bound by a written agreement to that effect, and when there was no such declaration in truth and in fact?

Furthermore, it may well be asked now as it surely will later, of what validity is the United Nations declaration of January 1, 1942, except of course on the common determination to crush the Axis Powers, if the so-called Atlantic Charter is a myth and never existed? The only reference to the peace aims is in the first paragraph, and then refers to something which does not exist. For the text reads:

> Having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration of the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter—

Is it not just common sense that if there is no joint declaration known as the Atlantic Charter, then there is no binding joint declaration of the United Nations on war aims? If there is no definite, cohesive statement and declaration signed by Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt, then who is going to say what is binding and what is not binding, what was included in the discussion and alleged understanding and agreement, and what was not? And can anyone believe that our administration was so inept, stupid, and negligent as to base such an important, vital, and fundamental agreement affecting the whole world to its very foundation, on a nonexistent myth? What have the 23 nations who signed it originally, and the additional 13 nations agreed to? Nothing. On the other hand, if the signed agreement does exist or has existed, it prescribes an obligated course of conduct on the part of all the United Nations in the Dumbarton Oaks proposed international organization. Why forego so great an advantage to peace-loving and suffering humanity?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the so-called Atlantic Charter, properly called the Atlantic peace aims, was in the form of a connected and cohesive statement, signed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill in the order named.

President Roosevelt could make the unequivocal statements that there is no Atlantic Charter, and the Atlantic Charter was never signed, and in each statement he would be speaking the absolute and unvarnished truth. A charter is a grant from a sovereign to a subject, the first great example of which was perhaps the great Charter of St. John to the barons. The signatories to this joint agreement were neither empowered to give anything, nor did they have anything to grant. That will be the function of the international organization after the war is won. That declaration of August 1941, which Churchill properly called "a simple, rough-and-ready statement of the goal toward which the British Commonwealth and the United States mean to make their way," was no more a charter or an Atlantic Charter than night is day. I think I made this distinction clear in a speech in the House on February 4, 1943.

But does Mr. Roosevelt make such an unequivocal statement? No, indeed. I do not think he can be accused even of qualifying it with what another Roosevelt called weasel words. On the contrary, the President said, "and there just is not any copy of the Atlantic Charter, at least I have not one," and that it was signed in substance and all agreed to it.

Now, it is the substance and the signing of it that we are interested in, so let us turn to the record and examine the reports of a few of the correspondents

present at that conference for their respective newspapers.

Christian Science Monitor:

He said there just isn't any original copy of the Atlantic Charter as such, at least he didn't have one. * * * Mr. Roosevelt said nobody ever signed the Atlantic Charter. "It was signed in substance."

Washington Star:

President Roosevelt told his news conference yesterday that there isn't any copy so far as he knows. * * * "No one signed it," he said. Later it was said: "It wasn't a complete document, the President responded, repeating that there was no formal, complete document signed by the two chiefs of state. It was signed in substance, however," he said.

Also:

Presidential Secretary Stephen Early showed reporters the document received by radio from the *Augusta* in August 1941. The communication was signed simply "Roosevelt," but it began with instructions to Mr. Early on releasing a statement to the press and then quoted the text of the statement itself. That statement incorporated the Atlantic Charter and it was signed: "Franklin D. Roosevelt" and "Winston Churchill."

Washington Post:

Making what he called an amazing statement, the President said that nobody ever signed the Atlantic Charter. As far as he knows, there isn't any copy in the formal sense in existence. He said he didn't have one, nor did the British. Nearest thing to a formal copy may be in possession of the radio operators on the two ships, he said.

Also:

The President insisted, however, that it was signed in substance and agreed to by all present.

New York Times:

The Atlantic Charter entered the questioning with a query whether Mr. Churchill had ever signed it. Mr. Roosevelt replied that nobody ever signed it. Asked where it was now, he said there wasn't any copy of the Atlantic Charter, as far as he knew. Also, "It was signed in substance," he suggested, explaining that it was a memorandum to the press and radio.

In making these quotations, I am, of course, quoting the newspapermen or rather newspapers and not the President. The newspapermen do not pretend to quote the President, for under the rules of Presidential press conferences they are not permitted to quote the President unless he gives them express permission to do so. They may only say what they think or believe he said, or their interpretation of it.

The press conference of December 19 with reference to the peace aims was in this category, so whatever we have heard of that conference is purely hearsay and not official. This gives me an additional argument for my position, for the President has never officially denied all the documentary evidence and evidence of record preceding December 19 on the so-called Atlantic Charter. Neither the Congress, the people of the United States, the people of the world, nor Winston Churchill, nor any individual has, therefore, any official denial of the Atlantic Charter upon which any action or belief can be based. This would require at least another message to Congress or some official proclamation or similar statement from the President himself, with the same dignity and authenticity of House Document No. 358.

I repeat, in my opinion there is in existence what has been known as the Atlantic Charter, signed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. And neither the President nor anybody else has in substance denied it. Is it not significant that at no time has Mr. Roosevelt hinted at anything that sounds as though he has looked for it or tried to dig it up? Apparently at no time has he even ascertained what copy the commanders of the *Augusta* or *Prince of Wales* might have in their possession, as he said they may have.

Again I repeat either there must be in existence a joint declaration incorporating in one statement the peace aims signed by Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill as represented in House Document No. 358, or we have absolutely nothing at all. For otherwise who will say what is in the declaration and what is not? If the Atlantic Charter is a myth, or if it has been conveniently and permanently lost, then it will be not only a reasonable but a sound inference from the message in House Document No. 358 that the whole world, except those believing in Nazi-inspired philosophies, have been misled and gold-bricked.

It was most unfortunate that the alleged loss or nonexistence of the Atlantic Charter should become the subject of conversation when Russia in Poland and other Central European crushed democracies, and Great Britain in Greece and Italy, are seemingly violating its express terms, and at the same time our gallant fighting forces, in a baptism of blood, were struggling in the first great setback in what they believed was a holy crusade for the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Our beloved Speaker, on January 3 last, in response to his election to that high office, spoke of the gallantry of our fighting men, and said:

A wise man once said, "Men fight better with ideas at the end of their bayonets."

Mr. Speaker, what a let-down it must have been for all our fighting forces on all the far-flung battle lines, and especially for those in that Belgian crucible, to have the President's press conference of December 19 take all the idealism and ideas of the Atlantic Charter from the points of their bayonets. And what a let-down for their parents and dear ones, yes for all liberty-loving Americans. As I said before, disappointment, dismay, and confusion have robbed the indomitable determination to crush the Axis of those ideas at the points of those bayonets. Everywhere was heard, "What are we fighting for outside of crushing the Axis Powers?"

Mr. Speaker, the American people know that President Roosevelt is under tremendous pressure. Many of them understand the pressure upon President Wilson in the League of Nations failure. They know that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for an international organization is as much cherished by President Roosevelt as was the League of Nations by Mr. Wilson after the last war. They are with Mr. Roosevelt in the objective this time. They are agreed that if humanly possible, the scourge of war must be stopped.

The American people realize that this is a tremendous job after we have accomplished the first step in crushing the Axis Powers. It is significant that the carrying out of the principles and ideals of the Atlantic Charter under the Dumbarton Oaks plan will be the responsibility not of the general assembly composed of all the members, but of the Security Council, composed of Russia, Great Britain, the United States, China, and later probably France, as permanent members, and a half dozen smaller nations in rotation. Already the big stumbling block is whether each of the Big Four can sit on the jury and prevent a unanimous verdict in case she is charged with aggression. It is obvious that the Atlantic peace aims as a fundamental law would be a stumbling block of the same nature for those who place sovereignty above law.

To deter or possibly prevent the scourge of war, we will in all probability have to be satisfied with something less than the ideals of the Declaration of Peace Aims. I also realize that on this rough-and-ready statement, selfish minds may differ with honest minds on its interpretation; and so in certain instances it may encourage chaos rather than curing it.

Notwithstanding these and other considerations, I believe that one of the greatest contributions Mr. Roosevelt can make toward unity of our people and all peace-loving peoples; toward the speedy winning of the war; toward a deterrent and outlawry of the scourge of war, is to dig up not an Atlantic Charter, or any charter, but what Churchill called "a simple rough-and-ready wartime statement of the goal toward which the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States mean to make their way." And if it is really lost and cannot be found, that he ask Mr. Churchill to sign a duplicate with him.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are grimly united and determined to win this war, come what may. But it would put ideas on the points of their bayonets both on the fighting and the home fronts, and it would restore hope and faith for a better world to all peace-hungry humanity to revitalize that simple, rough-and-ready wartime statement.

Needless Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, frequently men in the armed service write me in protest against the many strikes on the home front. Especially do they

resent wildcat and jurisdictional strikes. Only the other day a Minnesota boy serving with General Patton wrote me that they were being held back because they do not have as much ammunition as they could use. What he had to say about the subject of strikes was illuminating but not surprising.

For 30 years I have carried a card in the typographical union because I believe in collective bargaining, and, above all, in good wages that will keep the national income up. I dare say there are millions of union members who deplore and condemn the tactics being used by some of their labor leaders. This does not apply to the typographical union, which enjoys an uninterrupted history of 120 years of constant progress largely attained through peaceful negotiation. Unfortunately for the country and the war effort all unions are not governed as wisely and ably as is the typographical union.

For more than a month the city of St. Paul has had on its hands a strike called by the teamsters union on December 13, which has not yet been settled. This strike was called to determine which union is to collect and hold the dues of those now on strike. Sounds rather silly, does it not? Silly or no, it is tragic to contemplate that the country should be torn with labor strikes and dissension at a time when there is such great need for national unity, and maximum production to supply critical needs, both on the battle front and on the home front.

A few days ago the Long Prairie Leader, a most excellent newspaper published at Long Prairie, Minn., commented editorially on the St. Paul teamsters' strike which should set labor leaders to serious thinking before it is too late. The editorial, which follows, reflects the sentiments of a vast majority of our people in all parts of the country:

THE PUBLIC IS ENTITLED TO PROTECTION

Another strike which shows the need for laws that will put an end to some of the injustices by labor unions is the teamsters' union strike in St. Paul. As long as the law permits a union to do what this union is doing in that city, no individal in America is free and no firm is safe in the conduct of its normal business.

In this strike which has been in progress since December 13, which has closed down all the plants affected, thrown 1,500 persons out of work, cost the Federal Government more than $1,000,000 in beverage taxes and a loss to date of more than a third of a million dollars in wages, there is no issue whatever except a row between two rival unions.

Neither of the two unions involved has any wage dispute with the employing firms. There is no controversy as to wages, hours, or working conditions. Relations between the several companies and their employees are entirely amicable and friendly. There is no employer-employee dispute whatever. The plants are now unionized and have been for years.

Then what could cause this costly strike with which the city, the business firms, the State of Minnesota, and even the Federal Government in Washington seem helpless to cope?

Well, believe it or not, the trouble is this: Two unions are fighting with each other over which is to collect and keep the membership dues.

For many years the brewery workers' union has represented the employees. Recently the teamsters' union sought to horn in. It signed up some of the truck drivers and then demanded of the State conciliator that an election be held to determine who the bargaining agent for those of the employees who are drivers and helpers was to be. The older union objected to the threatened encroachment on its domain and asked the National Labor Board in Washington to call an election at which all the plant employees would vote and again choose their bargaining agent. At a hearing in Washington, the teamsters' union objected to having its case decided by a vote of all the employees and demanded that the drivers and their helpers vote separately and decide for themselves whom they wanted to represent them. The National Board decided against the teamsters' union and ordered a plant-wide vote. The election was held January 2 and out of 1,092 eligible employees, 857 voted for the old union and 139 for the new union. In the meantime the teamsters' union had held an election of its own, under an authorization by the State labor conciliator, in which only the drivers and their helpers participated. In this election, in which about 70 employees participated, a majority favored the teamsters' union.

The firms affected although involved in no controversy with their employees, were whipsawed between the two rival unions. If they had agreed to the teamsters' union demand, the brewery workers' union would have objected. If they continued the old contracts with the brewery workers' union, the teamsters' union would have objected. In the dilemma, in which they were merely the innocent victims, the firms decided to continue to recognize the brewery workers' union, that being the union that had won the election called by the National Board.

In the meantime, not waiting for the result of the National Labor Board election, the teamsters' union ordered a strike and threw a picket line around all the plants. There are other employees than the brewery workers and truck drivers. These are the craftsmen such as the carpenters, electricians, plumbers, and others. They have their particular unions. Under union rules no member is permitted to cross a picket line, so none of these employees, notwithstanding they were in no way concerned with the row between the rival unions, would pass through the picket line. This had the immediate effect of closing down the plants. They have been closed ever since.

Long Prairie is a long way from St. Paul and some may think our citizens are not concerned with this strike. But as a matter of fact we all are concerned. If a union can close a business firm in St. Paul because of a row with another union, then it can close the Long Prairie creamery for the same reason. It can close down any business firm anywhere. The public is directly and vitally interested.

The situation demands action by our lawmakers in St. Paul and in Washington. Jurisdictional strikes should be prohibited. They should not be permitted to play any part in employer-employee relations. If two unions get into a row, let them fight it out between themselves and not be permitted to injure a community or innocent business firms.

Furthermore, it would seem to be simple justice and a protection to the people to make unions responsible for what they do. Unions are now immune from prosecution. They cannot be sued for damage they cause. Hence many of the reckless and arrogant things they do. If this teamsters' union, for instance, could have been sued for damages, in all likelihood this strike with its appalling losses would never have been called.

With such a flagrant case before them, why should our legislature or Congress wait any longer in taking steps to protect communities from these irresponsible and reckless actions?

I also insert a news item which appeared in this morning's New York Herald Tribune:

TOBIN IS URGED TO END STRIKE IN CERTIFIED MILK—MEDICAL GROUP CITES NEEDS OF INFANTS AND INVALIDS—SUPPLY CUT 16,000 QUARTS

A telegram appealing to Daniel J. Tobin, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, to end the strike cutting off delivery of Walker-Gordon certified milk in the New York area, was sent yesterday by Dr. J. Howard Brown, chairman of the council of the American Association of Medical Milk Commissions, Inc., 1265 Broadway.

Local 680, of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, an American Federation of Labor affiliate, called the strike last Tuesday after failing to unionize the 150 dairy employees at the Walker-Gordon farm at Plainsboro, N. J. The union first ordered home-delivery men or their local, who work for distributors in northern New Jersey, and members of a brother local in Westchester County to refuse door-to-door delivery of Walker-Gordon milk.

The situation continued until Saturday, when, after a meeting of Local 680 on Friday in Newark, 10 drivers of the local were ordered off the job. They are employed by individual contractors who deliver the daily output of 23,000 quarts of certified milk from the farm to distributors in the New York area, southern New Jersey, and Philadelphia.

NONE REACHED MARKET

None of Saturday's production, intended for use here yesterday, reached the market, according to Alfred S. Cook, sales manager for the company. Every day the firm makes up an estimated 500 formulas of modified milk, which is prepared from certified milk and includes special food concentrates, and also ships about 5,000 quarts of raw, whole certified milk. The latter is brought into the city under a doctor's prescription, a regulation of the New York City Department of Health.

"These special milks," said Dr. Brown, who is chief of the department of bacteriology in Johns Hopkins Medical School, at Baltimore, are "medical food." Patients such as infants and invalids can "get along" without the milks but, he added, "at considerable discomfort."

The primary responsibility for these strikes rests with the President and the Congress. What, if anything, will they do to bring about the return of freedom and stability to our country. If they do not act, I can foresee anarchy and chaos in this great land of ours.

Conscription for Civilian Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

CONSCRIPTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of the aggressive war in the Pacific and the ever-increasing casualties in Europe, some 900,000 men will be needed as replacements in the battle areas. Hundreds of thousands of others will be needed on the supply lines over which must go millions of tons of supplies. Hence, the call for the conscrip-

tion of all able-bodied men under 30 during the coming year.

From every countryside in this land additional young men will be called and sent to the front. As long as we are at war there is no way to avoid this heart-rending procedure.

CONSCRIPTION FOR CIVILIAN JOBS

On top of the conscription of men for military service, the administration is now asking conscription of IV-F's and others for civilian jobs. Farm production must be stepped up if those at the front, we here at home, and all hungry people throughout the world are to be fed.

But, in my judgment, the drafting for service abroad of those skilled in farm work and replacing them with IV-F's will not give us an increased production, but rather a jump from efficiency to inefficiency.

Another thing, we cannot step up farm production by shipping abroad farm machinery urgently needed here at home and a scarcity of which makes it impossible to farm our own land efficiently.

The IV-F's all too often have been unjustly criticized, covertly sneered at because they were not in the fighting lines. IV-F's, as a rule, are IV-F not from choice, but because of a Government edict, though now and then some one of them may be IV-F by choice.

This war has demonstrated that voluntary effort, the patriotism of our people, will produce more of better quality and in less time than will regimentation. So why draft—regiment—men for civilian business?

The scarcities, real or fancied; the confusion, the senseless regulations of the O. P. A. convince those who know the facts that Washington is not infallible; its bureaucrats cannot successfully compete in efficiency with our workers, farmers, merchants, or industrialists.

Official Washington, insisting upon production of various items, today has on hand more than a hundred billion dollars worth of surplus material. Just one example, millions of surgical bandages, because of a change in regulations, are to be sold as dustcloths, or otherwise. There is no excuse for such waste, especially when we need every productive effort for the war.

In my judgment, giving this administration power to conscript men for civilian jobs would hinder the war effort.

So, you ask, What is your answer?

Let the Government adopt reasonable, effective measures to hold down the cost of living and then end its practice of paying wages—which come out of the taxpayer, including the farmer—in war industries which inevitably take the workers off the farms and out of nonwar jobs.

End the practice of limiting the amount of work which a man in the factory can do, which he wishes to do.

End strikes, slow-downs, work stoppages and lock-outs by paying a fair wage, freeing workers from coercion from any source.

End the practice, sanctioned by the administration, of compelling a man or a woman, as a condition precedent to getting or holding a job, to become, be, or remain a member of a union which shares in his pay check.

Quit using the officers and men who are already in the Army to seize and attempt to operate a civilian retail business like that of Montgomery Ward & Co. Let such disputes be settled by the courts.

The Meaning of Jackson Day in 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1945

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, for a number of years the outstanding dinner held by the Democrats in Baltimore each year has been called the Jackson Day dinner, and has been held under the auspices of the old and historic Concord Club. This year the guest speaker at that dinner was the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. His address was eloquent, persuasive, and timely. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We assemble tonight at the climax of the most appalling and devastating war of all time. No cataclysm of nature has ever wrought even a fraction of the destruction of life and property which is the product of this conflict among men who call themselves civilized. Whole continents have been laid waste. The earth, the sea, the waters under the sea, the sky, and even the stratosphere are the theater of battle. There are no noncombatants. There is no sanctuary from the unrestrained fury of the men and nations who have sought to bring the whole world under the domination of arbitrary power.

Obviously this meeting with such a background is not an occasion for mere partisan self-congratulation. It is not a moment to rejoice at party victory or to indulge in the polite compliments and the confident listing of political achievements which, in normal times, would be altogether fitting. We meet while men are dying. We dine while the youth of America in winter blizzard and jungle heat are making of their bodies a shield for us.

Thousands of them will never return. Other thousands will have no future because, broken in body and some in mind, they will have sacrificed all their potentialities that our future and the future of mankind may be secure.

We can best show our gratitude for what they have done, for what they are doing, and for what they are still to do by taking advantage of gatherings such as this to reexamine the principles upon which our Government was founded; to reappraise our own motives and intentions, our own actions, both public and private, and to decide what kind of a world we want to live in when this, the greatest crisis mankind has ever faced, shall have passed into history.

THE WORLD WE HAVE KNOWN IS PASSING

We are completely unaware of what is transpiring in the world if we do not comprehend the fact that the shape of the world we have known is passing. Empires are shaking to their foundations. Nations and peoples are undergoing alterations that will leave their marks for centuries to come. New forms of national, international, political, and economic structures are arising, and the relationship of man to the authority which governs him is undergoing one of its most profound tests. Unless we are firmly grounded in the historic faith of America that the people are the source of authority, that neither Government organization nor economic organization has any power save as it is derived from the consent of those whom it affects, we shall drift in the whirlpool of force now released upon the world and find ourselves the victims of power and authority which we cannot control. We shall find that the people, instead of being the source of authority, have become its subjects.

It is appropriate that we who are affiliated with the Democratic Party should choose Jackson Day for such a reexamination of principle, just as it will be equally appropriate for our friends who call themselves Republicans to use Lincoln's Birthday for the same purpose. We shall find that both of these great American statesmen drew their inspiration from the same rock of American tradition. Each of them in his time struck his rod against the barren rock and there gushed forth a new torrent of liberal humanitarianism. It is not without significance that both Lincoln and Jackson were defenders of the Federal Union, that both saw in the Government of the United States an instrumentality of the people for the promotion of freedom and human welfare.

It is not my purpose to review the story of Jackson's life, but rather to attempt to point the moral which his character, his courage, and his convictions as displayed in the crisis of his era hold for us in this momentous crisis of our time. In the most memorable and far reaching political conflict of his career, Jackson was pitted against all the strength and subtlety of central economic power. He fought against an agency which had found the way to influence most of the avenues of public information of that time, an agency that lost no opportunity to defame him. It was his battle against the bank, the conflict of the people's champion against a rich and powerful money monopoly that revealed the depth of his faith in the doctrines of popular sovereignty. So great was the power of the monopoly that even now it is scarcely possible, in reading the history of those times, to escape the effect of the false pictures it painted of Jackson and his policies.

VAN BUREN'S OPINION OF JACKSON

Long after his death, long after his friend and successor, Martin Van Buren, had himself withdrawn from the active political scene, the latter, in his autobiography drew a dramatic picture of the old general which I am sure correctly presents his figure:

"On the night of my first appearance at the White House, after my return from England," writes Van Buren, "he (the President) exhibited when stretched on a sick-bed a spectre in physical appearance, but as always a hero in spirit—an impressive illustration of his profound and unspeakable trust in the people. Holding my hand in one of his own and passing the other through his long white locks, he said, with the clearest indications of a mind composed and in a tone entirely devoid of passion or bluster, 'The bank, Mr. Van Buren, is trying to kill me, but I will kill it!'"

Again, in the same volume, Van Buren describes the General, as his friend called him until the end, in these words:

"In the course of my public life, I have not met with another man who came up to General Jackson's standard as well in respect to the strength of his belief in the certainty that a public servant, honestly laboring for the welfare of his country, would receive the good will and support of the people as long as they remained confident of his integrity as in his constant readiness to stake his

political reputation upon that faith regardless of consequences merely personal to himself."

I cite these quotations from Van Buren not for the purpose of introducing a discussion of the controversy over the United States bank, but to show the deep faith that Jackson had in the people and to illustrate the determination which he always displayed to conduct the Government in the manner best calculated to maintain opportunity for them.

JACKSON'S FAITH IN THE PEOPLE

It was not by mere chance that under Jackson the party of Jefferson came to be known as the Democratic Party. It was because his devotion to popular welfare was not the product of a pale philosophy, but the fervid conviction of a courageous heart which knew how to fight for the principles to which it gave its loyalty. He was the type of leader whom the people love, the type of which our party has produced many examples—like Wilson and Roosevelt in our own time, men who by the strength of their own faith have had the faculty of inspiring in the people a corresponding loyalty and faith in them.

Jackson's creed was made clear in the memorable veto message by which he carried out the promise made on his sickbed in the conversation Van Buren relates.

"It is to be regretted," said President Jackson in that document, "that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes. Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue every man is equally entitled to protection by law; but when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics, and laborers—who have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their Government. There are no necessary evils in government. Its evils exist only in its abuses. If it would confine itself to equal protection, and, as heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and the low, the rich and the poor, it would be an unquaified blessing."

Again, in his message to Congress on the nullification issue, he exhibited his underlying principle in these words:

"The rich inheritance bequeathed by our fathers has devolved upon us the sacred obligation of preserving it by the same virtues which conducted them through the eventful scenes of the Revolution and ultimately crowned their struggle with the noblest model of civil institutions. They bequeathed to us a Government of laws and a Federal Union founded upon the great principle of popular representation. * * * and I fervently pray that the Great Ruler of Nations may so guide your deliberations and our joint measures that they may prove salutary examples not only to the present but to future times, and solemnly proclaim that the Constitution and the laws are supreme and the Union indissoluble."

POPULAR GOVERNMENT NOW ENDANGERED

Never were these exhortations more appropriate than now, for never was the principle of popular government in greater danger than now, and never have the people of America had a greater opportunity than now to hold forth to all the world an example of the power of a free people to deal justly with all others and to promote the welfare of mankind. The terrible trial through which the world is going in these days is the result of lack of faith in the capacity of people to guide their own destiny. Arbitrary power has arisen because of the belief held by both imperial and totalitarian governments that people are not to be entrusted to shape their own lives, that they should be controlled and guided and either patronized or exploited by those who have the power to seize authority over them or to steal their resources.

This lack of faith in democracy is exhibited in both political and economic spheres, and the danger to human freedom has multiplied in the degree that science has created new instruments by which arbitrary power may compel obedience. The technological advance which gives central power terrible weapons with which to enforce its will makes more difficult the task of free men because there is now no refuge anywhere on earth from the destructive effect of the modern instruments of warfare. It is therefore more important than ever before that men should understand precisely the thing for which they are fighting and correctly appraise the sacrifice they must be willing to make if they desire to prevail.

Surely this is clear now—there can be no permanent peace and no freedom for mankind unless the people of the world reach an unshakable determination that all future disagreements among nations, of which many are inevitable, shall be adjusted in an orderly and reasonable manner by peaceful negotiation instead of by the application of force.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE OR MILITARISM

The people of America are faced by this alternative. They must lead the world in the establishment of an international security organization or else, in self defense, they must be prepared to keep this Nation as it is now, the most powerful military force on earth The knowledge that the latter alternative is the negation of everything for which we have stood should make us stronger in our purpose to preserve national unity in the struggles and sacrifices that must be made if an organization for peace is to be achieved. It should make us beware of divisive counsels that would magnify misunderstandings among our allies, for we must know that to escape militarism in the future we must win this war and erect the structure for the preservation of world peace.

It detracts nothing from the great contribution which the people of England made to the preservation of freedom by their heroic resistance after the fall of France to point out that there is no salvation for mankind in either political or economic imperialism. It detracts nothing from the unconquerable achievements of the patriot forces in France to say that the restoration of the colonial policies of the past is not the object for which this war is being fought. It is no reflection on the courage and heroism of the Russian soldier who built a barrier of blood and flesh across the path of Hitler to say that communisim is not democracy, that mankind cannot hope to find liberty in any dictatorship whether it be the dictatorship of the proletariat or the dictatorship of vested economic power.

These are the evils of the world that is passing—imperialism, monopoly, dictatorship, the eternal and implacable enemies of liberty.

God made men free. He endowed them with a free will. He endowed them with the power to decide for themselves whether to be sinners or saints. There is no human power that can rightfully deprive them of that freedom. Dissident members of the Soviet State who died in the Red purges are just as dead as the Jews who were slaughtered by Hitler. They were both created free in the divine plan and there can be no peace in the world until this principle of individual human freedom is recognized as the very basis of human society. Without freedom, there is only force.

THE CAUSE FOR WHICH WE FIGHT

The American Revolution was fought and the Government of the United States was established by patriots and statesmen who believed in the rights of man. The new world will be built by patriots and statesmen who believe in the dignity of man.

Let no one imagine that we are in any doubt as to the nature of the objective for which we fight. We are fighting against the application of ruthless force to men. We are fighting the prostitution of science by men who have used it to forge chains for the human spirit. We are fighting anew the battle of human freedom against enemies more terrible than any that have ever been overcome in the past.

Only yesterday I received a letter from a young infantry captain who has now spent his third Christmas overseas in direct contact with the foe and whose unit even now is in the midst of the struggle along the Rhine. He had recently inspected a German concentration camp with its machine guns, its gas chambers, and its crematoria. He writes that every day makes him a better American, that every day makes more clear to him the blessings of liberty. He knows what the torture chamber and the firing squad mean in the hands of men who will not tolerate dissent from their views and their purposes.

Let every American ask himself this question: By what fortunate circumstance, by what divine providence does it happen that it was some defenseless European, some poor Ethiopian, some trembling Asiatic who endured the torture instead of me? If we tolerate arbitrary power to commit such outrages anywhere on earth, we invite it to do so here.

That is why we fight this war. That is why we labor to shape a new world in which there shall be no thralldom for the human spirit. That is why this new world for which we fight will have no place for puppet governments, whether of the right or the left, no place for totalitarian organizations by which the leaders become the masters rather than the servants of the people.

THE PEOPLE ARE WINNING THIS WAR

It was not the British Empire that foiled Hitler and preserved freedom on the beaches of Dunkerque. It was the indomitable free spirit of the people of England who were ready to die in defense of their homes. It was the little craft of the seagoing heroes along the English Channel which effected the evacuation of the escaping army. It was the heroic spirit of a pitifully few airmen who intimidated and finally drove off the aerial hordes of the Hun.

It was not the totalitarian dictatorship that defended Moscow and saved Leningrad. It was the nationalist spirit of the people of Russia defending the sacred soil of their ancestors. The dictatorship made common cause with Hitler against Poland in 1939, but it was the people of Russia following the example of their ancestors in the time of Napoleon and in previous ages who rallied to cast out the invader.

Here in America also it has been the people who have built the most powerful navy that ever sailed the seas, who have organized and equipped an army the like of which was never before beheld. In factory and on farm we have produced the implements and the food by which all of the United Nations have been helped to hurl back the tyrannical totalitarianism of both Germany and Japan. American boys who knew nothing but the arts of peace until they were called to the colors have become the most effective military force ever created. We have sent them out to every continent and every sea, under the oceans and over the mountains; and we, the people of America, have built a bridge of ships across both the Atlantic and the Pacific to keep them well supplied.

All this has been done, but not without mistakes, not without setbacks, not without flaws, both at home and abroad, but when history tells the story it will be seen that the majesty of the American effort has dwarfed into insignificance every little cause of criticism that may now be voiced.

WE ARE NOT TOTALITARIANS

To accomplish this we have been compelled to adopt the methods of the authoritarian state. All our resources of men and materials are being welded into a single instrument to win the victory, but let no one make the mistake of assuming that we have adopted the philosophy of the totalitarian. Because Germany and Japan had, with careful forethought and years of preparation, mobilized every human and natural resource for the purposes of war, we had to do likewise when confronted by their massive power. But if we are appreciative of the sacrifices that have been and are being made by the men and boys whom we have called to bear the brunt of battle, we must possess a determined will that when the survivors of this war return to their homes they will return to a country in which the people are still the masters, in which enterprise is really free, and in which authority proceeding from the citizen may be exercised by the state, not in an arbitrary manner but solely in accordance with the law which the people themselves shall prescribe.

I say this not because there is, in my judgment, any significant element of our people who consciously believe in totalitarian principles. Of course, there have been authors and orators whose words would seem to indicate a belief that democracy is outmoded and must be discarded. Such theories, when openly proclaimed, would receive few adherents; but it would be unwise to close our eyes to the fact that there is a danger, a danger of drifting into the expansion, in times of peace, of the authoritarian methods we have had to use for self-defense in time of war.

We must make up our minds not to drift, but with open eyes to pursue a policy the object of which is to restore in all our economic and political affairs the authority of the people to govern themselves. Here again we find it well to consider for a moment the character of the task that Andrew Jackson performed. When he became President he found the Government manned and directed by many who were of the belief that even in the new republic of the western world there was such a thing as a governing class. He found the whole economic system in the control of a central bank from the management of which even the Government's members on the board of directors had been excluded. He found a system which elevated efficiency and management skill above freedom. He destroyed the economic monopoly and he restored the Government to the people without division of class. He brought the Nation, both politically and economically, back to its fundamental principles as a nation, an organization of free and equal citizens with equal opportunity for all.

ECONOMIC IMPERIALISM CAUSED THE WAR

We shall have failed to understand the causes of this great war unless we realize that they are to be found in the doctrines of economic imperialism. It was because the political and business leaders of the world had not learned how to preserve economic opportunity for the masses in the highly technical industrial organization of our time that the arbitrary state rose to power. Economic centralism, which dominated world trade by the arbitrary decree of international chemical, industrial, and trade organizations, had divided the whole globe into spheres and areas of influence in which men could not freely support themselves except by the favor of their economic rulers. When this resulted in unemployment, as it could not fail to do, it resulted also in the growth of arbitrary government. Economic monopoly leads directly to political monopoly.

If we are permanently to destroy arbitrary government, we must first make up our minds to establish economic freedom, for the lesson of this war is clear—there can be no political liberty without economic freedom. The free state is the creation of the free citizen who, as an inalienable human right, can support himself and his family without seeking concessions at the hands of any central power, economic or political.

The modern world has produced what has been aptly called the managerial revolution. No longer is our economy carried on by the capital and the labor of individuals alone, but rather by the capital and labor of huge aggregations of individuals. The machine age has been marked by the development of industrial organizations which are financed in many cases by the capital contributions of individuals who exercise no actual control over the properties they own and which are operated by literal armies of employees who have no ownership stake in the enterprise. The whole aggregation of collective capital and collective labor is then directed by a small group of managerial experts whose decisions affect, for good or ill, whole communities into which they sometimes have never placed a foot. Central expert management has been the characteristic mark of economic organization in this era and it has been accompanied by a steady diminution of local economic independence. Whole communities, great regions and sometimes even States themselves have become dependent for their economic existence upon the decisions of management rendered far beyond their borders.

Some of the modern industrial organizations have been richer and more powerful than most cities and some States. Many of them, in the number of their stockholders and in the number of their employees, have industrial populations far greater than most of the communities of the land, and yet the conveniences, the luxuries and the necessities of the modern world would have been impossible without them.

This country could not have armed itself and its Allies for this war without these industrial giants. Yet, it is perfectly clear that of themselves they could not have done the job. What they accomplished was achieved because Government provided the capital necessary to purchase their output and Government also established the bureaus of central management which alone made it possible to coordinate all the skills and all the facilities of the huge industrial plant.

THE PROBLEM OF READJUSTMENT

What has been accomplished by the creation of the greatest national debt that this or any other country ever had and the establishment of Government management under central authority represents as it were the apex of central power. It presents a problem of readjustment in the days that are to follow the war of a magnitude that would be difficult to overestimate.

We know now from the huge purchasing power that has been developed by full employment for war among all the people that a high degree of economic activity can be maintained provided a new market is developed for the product of our agricultural and industrial plant when the Government stops buying the output of entire plants and sometimes of huge areas for purposes of war. The Government is now the principal purchaser of all commodities that go upon the market. When the Government ceases to be the principal market, there must be a new market or there will follow unemployment and economic distress.

The purchasing power of the people for the building of new homes, the reconstruction of cities, the development of undeveloped areas and regions, the conscious utilization of all our resources for the purposes of peace and the improvement in our standard of living, these must be the objectives toward which our minds shall turn. All this can be accomplished, not, it seems to me, by continuing the trend toward central control, but by releasing once again the capacities of the people in their local communities.

The great secret of American success in this war, the secret of the triumph of our citizen soldiers and sailors over the trained armies and navies of Germany and Japan is to be found in the natural initiative of our men. They are able to meet emergencies as they arise. They are resourceful as well as efficient. They are capable of independent judgment as well as amenable to discipline, and when a situation develops for which there is no plan, no order, they are not at a loss because they have been trained as free men. They have become the greatest military force on earth because they have breathed the air of liberty. They are the product of the system of government bequeathed to us by the founders of this Nation, a system that was designed to preserve opportunity for men of initiative rather than to foster the growth of monopolies of any kind to exploit them.

The faith which moved Jackson in his official career to make the government the guardian of opportunity for all the people is the American ideal of government. It is the ideal which proclaims and maintains that all the organizations which men form, both political and economic, are created to serve, but not to control them. It is the ideal that America has nurtured so successfully that the whole world now knows that democracy is not outmoded.

The free man is and of right ought to be the master of his own destiny, the captain of his own soul. Andrew Jackson defended this heritage in his time. We will defend it in ours.

MacLeish's Successor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Archibald MacLeish as an Assistant Secretary of State brings to the attention of the American public the great importance of getting the President to name as his successor a distinguished librarian.

Mr. Carl Vitz, Minneapolis librarian and president of the American Library Association, has stated:

The Library of Congress is actually and potentially the greatest library in the world and needs a top-flight administrator.

His job is to preserve knowledge, make it available, and to diffuse it on a popular level. He should be an expert in the acquisition of materials and in organizing them for the greatest usefulness—in others words, he should be a distinguished librarian.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star Journal of December 30, 1944:

MAC LEISH'S SUCCESSOR

Carl Vitz, Minneapolis librarian and president of the American Library Association, has

appealed to President Roosevelt to name a competent librarian to succeed Archibald MacLeish as Librarian of Congress. It is strange that such an appeal should be necessary—but it is.

Our national library is one of the two or three largest institutions of its kind in the world. Besides performing research and other services for Congress, it offers excellent facilities for the work of serious scholars the world over. It extends various important bibliographical services to libraries throughout the country and is the center of an important Nation-wide interlibrary loan system.

Yet neither the man who is leaving as head of that institution nor some of the men most prominently mentioned to succeed him are librarians at all. MacLeish is a poet. Robert Sherwood is a playwright and Carl Sandburg is another poet.

If the United States needs a poet laureate, let us by all means have one and call him that. But the job of running so important an institution as the Library of Congress should not be confused with a ceremonial honor.

We don't make the year's outstanding boxer chief of our Army General Staff nor the winner of a cake-baking contest president of a milling firm. Excellence in etching does not fit a man to be Secretary of the Treasury. Why should the fact that a person writes good, bad, or indifferent verse qualify him to direct the important and complex responsibilities of the Library of Congress?

Top librarianships call for as much academic training and practical experience as do university presidencies. We owe it both to our national dignity and to common sense to put a really competent leader in his field at the head of our national library.

The Nation's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the Nation's foreign policy which I delivered yesterday over the Mutual network on the Reviewing Stand program sponsored by Northwestern University.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every American knows pretty well what the foreign policy of our country is and has been since the foundation of the Republic:

1. To preserve the peace of our people;

2. To promote the well-being of the Nation; and

3. In a general way to stand up for what is right and decent in the world.

What has changed from time to time—yes, thank God, in the last few weeks—is the way we carry out that policy.

Nearly all of our people came to this country at one time or another to escape from the wars or the woes, or both, of Europe. George Washington warned us against permanent alliances and Thomas Jefferson told us to stay out of entangling alliances.

Our fifth President told Europe to keep her system out of the Western Hemisphere. That was the Monroe Doctrine.

For a century, then, the way we attempted to preserve the peace of our people was to stay out of Europe's disputes and to try to keep them out of this hemisphere by the threat to fight them in the Atlantic Ocean and in this hemisphere if they tried to come over here.

To the casual observer these tactics to carry out the general strategy of our policy seemed to work well. Then came the European war of 1914 and by 1917 we saw we had to get into it or Germany would conquer western Europe and become dominant in the Atlantic Ocean instead of Britain, which for a century had worked with us in the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine. In short, we discovered that if we were to be at peace and safe over here we had to keep Germany on the other side of the Rhine River.

President Wilson and a majority of the American people, therefore, saw that we had to change our methods of furthering our old general aim of preserving the peace and promoting the welfare of the Nation. He—that is, President Wilson and a majority of the people—saw that our old policy of doing nothing to keep the Nation at peace had failed. From then on it was clear that the only way America could stay out of a major European war or a world war was to see that no such war got started.

President Wilson, therefore, with the British, entered into an alliance with France to join her in resisting any new German aggression. The British Parliament unanimously ratified the agreement, but the United States Senate, having defeated the Treaty of Versailles, never even took up Wilson's treaty of assurance to France against certain German attack of the future.

President Wilson also took the lead in setting up the League of Nations so that all the nations might join together to keep down war in the world; but the Senate killed that. So America went back to isolation after the last war to wait for the next.

But the significant thing is that it was not the Executive nor the country which held us in the grip of isolation but the United States Senate. The big question even now is, Has the Senate changed? We are in a terrible war, which is the fruit of isolation.

Last year we had an election. The Republican Party the leadership of which for the last quarter of a century has been isolationist, thanks to such great and wise leaders as the lamented Wendell Willkie, and now Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, has had a new vision of this Nation assuming a new responsibility for peace through an affirmative policy of our taking our full part of the difficulties and dangers of the peace of the world.

But the Senate Committee on Foreign Relation can still hold a treaty indefinitely if it or a minority of it wants to kill it. There is still the power of filibuster on the Senate floor when another "little group of willful men" may form another battalion of death against world peace. There is still the iniquitous two-thirds rule in the Senate by which not a majority of the Senate or a majority of the Senate, and a majority of the House of Representatives as I am trying to bring into the Constitution may ratify a treaty but two-thirds of all the Senators present must agree to a treaty before it can become effective.

The future peace of the Nation and the world lies, in my humble opinion, in the last analysis, nowhere but right in the Senate of the United States.

I am hopeful. But it must be remembered that the victory can come only from the determination of the American people that we shall at last destroy this monster war, which even now is swallowing up their sons, and their daughters and their substance, and wringing out of their hearts unspeakable agony.

Conduct and Aims of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD copy of a radio address delivered by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] over the Columbia Broadcasting System from Washington, D. C., on Tuesday, January 2, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Throughout all America millions of American homes have been and are holding solemn vigil awaiting news of their loved ones who have been ordered and dispatched by their Government to fight in one of two terrible wars, each of which is being conducted thousands of miles from their main base of supplies.

I share this concern, and all that I do or say is done with the hope that it may aid our fighting men and that the great suffering and sacrifice we have been and will be compelled to make before our vicious enemies are finally beaten and disarmed will result in some definite gain.

In the last war I served humbly, far removed from high places where generals and statesmen ordered events. In that capacity I accepted orders without question and carried them out to the best of my ability until I finally fell wounded in the front line in France.

At the present time I have the honor and responsibility of serving in the United States Senate representing the State of Illinois—a State of almost 8,000,000 people who have contributed approximately 800,000 of their sons and daughters to this war. In my official capacity, I have done my level best to support the fighting sons and daughters of America. This I shall continue to do constantly.

However, I am deeply concerned about the conduct of the war, for we are, at present, carrying the brunt and burden in both the war on the western front and in the Pacific where already over 620,000 of our gallant men and women have been killed, wounded, are missing in action, or are being held as prisoners of war.

Millions of these courageous men and women have been away from their families and homes for more than a year and are now facing indefinitely prolonged wars in Europe, the Pacific, and in Asia.

The political and military leaders who are conducting the wars warn us that our greater battles and sacrifices still lie ahead.

In the face of such advice, it is difficult indeed to understand why Russia and Great Britain are diverting so much of their fighting strength to force governments of their own particular liking in liberated countries, while we face the bloody brutality of the German armies.

Certainly the battles we have fought and the sacrifices we have made alone on the western front in the last 3 weeks give force to the parting admonition of George Washington when he advised, "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation."

We Americans know what our military aims are—they are to completely defeat Germany and Japan so decisively that they will never again threaten the peace of the world.

But what are the political aims of our allies and to what extent have we secretly been committed to these aims?

Two theories were advanced as America was led into war:

The first was, that if Hitler succeeded in overrunning all of Europe and established his new order, we would live in constant fear of invasion; and if Hitler established his new order in Europe, he would develop a completely totalitarian system that would destroy eventually our economic structure by producing with slave labor to undersell us everywhere in the world.

The second was an ideological motive so superbly pronounced by President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill in what was represented to be the Atlantic Charter under which declared that "their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other; they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned; they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

These reasons and ideals, plus the natural and inherent sympathies of all Americans for the minorities and little nations who had been the subject of unbelievable atrocities, were held out before the American people as they were led and finally blown into war.

These fears and ideals were drummed into the ears and minds of the American people when Russia was fighting so desperately to save her invaded homeland and England was bombed and bleeding. They called for help—first for tools, for supplies, for food—and we sent them. Then they called for a second front, and we established that. We drove the enemy back from the approaches of England; we cleared France; we relieved the pressure from the eastern front against Russia; and today we carry the real burden of actual fighting against the German Army on the western front and the fiendish Japs in the Pacific.

On the very day when Germany's crack troops were driving and beating us back on the western front, in what may well prove to be our most costly battle in men and material in this entire war thus far, the news came that the Russian troops were successfully advancing against Budapest, where the Russians will establish their "friendly" government in Hungary, and that Winston Churchill had dramatically flown to Greece to aid in the British troops in establishing their "friendly" government in Greece.

While we must keep high and foremost our military objectives to defeat Germany and Japan and devote—every one of us—our continued best effort at whatever task we may perform to aid and strengthen our fighting forces, it is only natural that the American people should ask and demand of our leaders answers to fundamental questions.

Do our allies have the same all-out objectives to conquer at the earliest possible moment Hitler and his Nazi forces in Germany? If so, why not demand that they follow through and throw their full military and naval might against the German Army now to support our fighting forces for which they pleaded not long ago?

Will we have full cooperation and fighting support from our allies against Japan after we have supplied millions of men and billions of dollars' worth of materials to safeguard the future of the Russian and British Empires, or will we struggle on alone in the vast Pacific and in Asia?

The danger of Hitler's success of creating a new order in Europe is over. Germany has lost at least 6,000,000 men. The German cities and many industries have been bombed and ruined. Most of the invaded countries have been liberated, at least of the Nazi forces.

The danger of a Hitler totalitarian Europe is past, but will Russia and Great Britain throw their fighting might to invade and completely conquer Germany or will they let us bleed and die while they play the ancient game of European power politics in further proof of the truth of Washington's advice that "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation."

To what extent have we, the American people, been committed in the highly secret agreements reached at Quebec, Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran?

What is the foreign policy of our Government for which so many men must die and all America, present and future, must sacrifice?

During the recent debate in the United States Senate over the confirmation of the President's nominations of the men to serve in our State Department, Senator PEPPER, of Florida, announced, after a conference with the President, that "the President authorized us to say * * * that if any of these gentlemen in the discharge of his duties did not properly carry out and express his (the President's) policies, he would be promptly removed."

The question constantly arises now, What is the President's foreign policy? To say that the policy is to defeat Germany and Japan is not enough. We know that those are our military objectives and we know, further, that we are carrying the brunt and burden of battle of both wars on the western front and in the Pacific in addition to furnishing billions in precious supplies to our allies.

Are we going to bleed America white in Europe to help advance Russia's control over all the Balkans and Baltic states and reestablish the kings to their thrones in Italy and Greece?

We hear much talk about America taking the lead in the future peace of the world; that we should lead the way in creating a world organization to stop all future aggression; that we should help create a world financial and economic organization and pledge our armed forces, our economic and monetary resources to maintain future peace.

We have all of the able-bodied men in America of military age under arms, trained, fighting, or prepared to fight throughout the world today. We have regimented our unprecedented industrial capacity to win two wars. We have imposed rigid restrictions and restraints upon our homes and private lives to win wars for future peace based upon justice.

Now is the time to use our influence and our might to demand future freedom for smaller nations. After the war it will be too late. Now is the time for the President of the United States to announce what our foreign policy is.

Are we going to continue to sacrifice so much to advance communistic philosophy in the form of controlled governments throughout the Balkan and Baltic States and help with our blood and tears to establish another totalitarian system the like of which we feared so much would be established under Hitler?

Are we going to carry the overwhelming brunt of battle against the German armies at so great a cost while the people of Italy and Greece are forced to agree to a particular government to secure the future life line of Great Britain in the Mediterranean?

We have followed the policy of letting these questions of future governments in liberated countries wait until after the war, but our allies are using our supplies and their armies to set up their sphere of influence now.

Are we to continue to make the greater sacrifices to beat back the German armies while Russia and Great Britain grab the control of these smaller nations and then join a world organization and pledge our armed forces to maintain these arbitrarily established governments?

Are we in America at long last to say to the subjugated and smaller nations of the earth that we who fought for our own freedom—now that we have grown great, prosperous, and strong as a free Nation—are we going to fight off one totalitarian power while another takes them over, and then use our forces to prevent them in the future from fighting for their freedom?

There will never be a time when our influence and force will be so powerful in world affairs as now. What is our policy?

I realize that there are those who will say that foreign policy has always been the duty of a select group, and those few have regarded it as a sort of sacred rite to mold our opinions and we must follow obediently and without quetion.

But, ladies and gentlemen, the foreign policy has reached into every home in America today. We are all a part of it. It affects the details of our living, and our loved ones will pay for it with suffering, sacrifice, and with their lives.

We are in two terrible wars at one time, and no one can tell us when they will be over. But since power politics is diverting so much of the armed strength of our allies, we have a right to know what the political as well as the military aims of our Government are, and we should demand that the complete and undiverted armed strength of both Russia and Great Britain be hurled at the German armies now.

Ladies and gentlemen, we all, each one of us, have a tremendous responsibility to support in every manner and means our fighting men and women who serve and suffer so far away from home. We must give them our level best.

The President of the United States has a much greater responsibility as President and Commander in Chief to announce to us, to our allies, and to the world, our war and peace aims and then utilize our tremendous power and influence (while we still have it) to bring about a unity of action and purpose so that our sacrifices and sufferings will not again have been in vain.

Our soldiers overseas expressed their call for this unity of action against our common enemy in an editorial in the overseas Stars and Stripes, and I quote them:

"Unity and solidarity were strong when the United Nations were militarily weak and the war was in a bad way. Well, the bugles of battle are heard again above the bickering. For the holy love of God, let's listen to the dead. Let's learn from the living. Let's join ranks again against the foe and toward the future."

Taxation and Cooperation as Affecting Western Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD part of the address of C. C. Cogswell, master of the Kansas State Grange, before the seventy-third annual session of the Grange, held at the Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans., on December 12. Mr. Cogswell gives expression to some practical views on the subject of taxation and cooperation as they affect the interests of western farmers at this time.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXATION

Our enormous public debt amounting to around $10,000 per family will ultimately demand an overhauling of the entire tax structure. Three important factors present themselves in connection with taxation—the levying of the tax, the collecting of it, and the expenditure of the funds. Each is important and care should be taken that no advantage is given to any class or individual.

Various groups and classes are at all times demanding favors from public funds. When the question of such favors arises the public should take due notice of who gets the favors, who pays for them, and who has the controlling voice in the distribution of them.

The unprecedented increase of Federal employees in civilian life during the past few years is just cause for alarm. In some States there are many more Federal employees within the State than there are workers on the State pay roll. This cannot be continued and States' rights be preserved.

We endorse the tax program of the National Grange and insist that the public be often apprised of the facts that debt can be paid only from wealth which has already been produced. The tax program we have heretofore submitted is as sound today as ever before and we refer you to our former declarations and to the former declarations of the State grange for study.

In our own State we should insist that the State levy on personal property shall be eliminated. Under the present taxing program the State levy has but two values. Its patronage value which enables office holders to add to their employment rolls and its "buck passing" value which enables the State tax commission and the county commissioners to keep the taxpayer confused by passing responsibility from the courthouse to the State capitol and back.

The people should be taxed as fairly and equitably as possible and tax funds used solely for the purpose of buying such commodities and services as are necessarily for the use of the public generally and which can be provided more economically through governmental agencies. Taxes should never be used as a whip nor to destroy any particular method of doing business.

COOPERATION

The cooperative effort of farmers, and other groups as well, have met with outstanding success during recent years. The year just past has brought many worthy achievements to true cooperative effort. The average individual thinks of the cooperative movement, first, as a means of saving money. Important as is this feature of the cooperative effort, there are other accomplishments which come to us as a result of cooperation that are even more important.

The cooperative effort of farm organizations made possible the enactment of cooperative laws for the protection of those desiring to transact business under these principles. Some business cooperatives have made the mistake of forgetting the service rendered them by the general farm organizations, but always their memory is revived when threatened with danger. An outstanding example is in the fight now being waged against cooperatives by big business interests that would deprive cooperatives of their right under the law in the exemption of patronage dividends which certain groups, unfriendly to cooperatives, have attempted to classify as profits. The value of general farm organizations to the cooperatives in this attack was immediately recognized. Because of the soundness of the principle at stake the general farm organizations, without exception, rallied at once to the support of the cooperatives.

The cooperative effort of the general farm organizations in molding public opinion, in promoting sound legislation, and in discouraging unsound legislation, in the Kansas legislative bodies, is recognized throughout the Nation. The farm organizations of no other State in the Union have surpassed those of Kansas in this field. Some capable Kansas farm leaders have been taken from this field through employment by groups whose purposes were in conflict with those of agriculture. Scarcely a State-wide farm spokesman remains today who has not refused employment, at greatly increased pay, from one or more of these groups. Farm organizations in other States have long been inquiring of the Kansas farm organizations for detailed information regarding their cooperative legislative activities.

Shall We Have More T. V. A.'s?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times Magazine, Sunday, January 7, 1945, entitled "Shall We have More T. V. A.'s?" The author of this article is David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the T. V. A., through whose successful direction the T. V. A. has demonstrated a new and distinctive method for the development of the great river basins of our country, thereby making one of the most notable contributions to our American economic system in its history.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL WE HAVE MORE T. V. A.'S?

(By David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority)

MUSCLE SHOALS, ALA.—During its far from tranquil existence since June 1933, a good many words have been used to characterize the T. V. A. Some have been sulphuric, some extravagantly enthusiastic. But the expression most commonly applied has been "experiment."

Congress and the President did launch the T. V. A. as an experiment, and from the outset we have administered it in that spirit. The chief importance of the T. V. A., it seems to me, is as a demonstration of a new and distinctive way for a people to develop their natural resources of rivers and waters, land and minerals and forests. After a decade the T. V. A. is now able to throw the light of actual experience—not just theories or talk—upon a fundamental problem of universal concern.

The stakes of such an experiment, in a new way to perform an old task, are high. For not only in the Tennessee Valley, but in a thousand valleys the world over the hopes and aspirations of all peoples rest upon their natural resources, the universal foundation stones of economic life.

What have T. V. A.'s new methods demonstrated? What lessons are there in T. V. A.'s story that other valleys and natural regions may profit by? More specifically, does the record of this pilot plant in the Tennessee Valley bespeak the creation of more T. V. A.'s?

A substantial body of American opinion seems to think so.

In the vast Missouri Valley, for example, a region extending from the Mississippi River to the Great Divide, bills to create a T. V. A. on the Missouri, an M. V. A., sponsored by a Senator from an Upper Basin State (Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana) and a Congressman from a down-river district (Representative JOHN J. COCHRAN, of St. Louis) have the vigorous support of some of the most influential newspapers of the region, the Farmers Union in seven Missouri Basin States, labor organizations, and a number of civic and business leaders.

Support has come from outside the valley as well: Collier's magazine in an editorial, Let's Try an M. V. A.; the Washington (D. C.) Post, the Christian Science Monitor, and so on. In a recent editorial entitled "The T. V. A. Principle," the New York Times has stated: "The best argument, in principle, for T. V. A. developments on the Missouri, Arkansas, and Columbia Rivers, recommended by the President in a special message to Congress, is the record and present status of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

On April 10, 1933, President Roosevelt, recommending to Congress the creation of T. V. A., said: "If we are successful here, we can march on, step by step, in a like development of other great natural territory units within our borders." On September 21, 1944, the President, referring to the T. V. A.'s record, urged that the time had come to march on in other valleys by the creation of agencies similar to T. V. A.

Opposition to the idea is equally ardent. And so today, throughout the valley of the Missouri, Members of Congress, Governors, civil leaders, and newspaper editors are actively studying and debating the T. V. A. and its possible application to their region.

Interest in the T. V. A. is not confined to regions of the United States; the Tennessee Valley is being visited these days by a constant stream of men from almost every other part of the world. Sometimes they come for a few intense days; often as resident students for a year or more. They come from Brazil and New Zealand, from Poland and Norway and France and Czechoslovakia, from Calcutta and Sydney and Tegucigalpa, from the distant valleys of the Yangtze, the Dnieper, the Ganges, and the Sao Francisco. There are officials and businessmen, as well as many technicians, covering the score or more special fields within the scope of the T. V. A.'s undertaking.

They speak many languages and are from the most diverse points of the globe, but they come to see the Tennessee Valley to try to answer the same question that is in the minds of the men from St. Louis and Billings: Can we adapt the T. V. A. idea to our region?

What is the answer? Will this work elsewhere? Should there be more T. V. A.'s?

Without bothering to examine the evidence the dogmatists of both "left" and "right" have entered a confident verdict of "no." Everyone else will want to appraise the demonstration before reaching a conclusion. An adequate statement, such as I endeavored to make in a recent book, T. V. A.—Democracy on the March, is of course quite beyond the limits of this article. But for those interested in results rather than abstract doctrine, in judging whether the T. V. A. idea should be and can be adapted elsewhere, I would invite scrutiny and consideration of the following four distinctive and essential characteristics of this undertaking.

I. DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES IN A UNIFIED WAY

The T. V. A. idea represents a departure in American national policy, in this, that one Federal agency, the T. V. A., not a dozen or so (as is customary), is responsible for the

unified, not the divided, development of resources in a natural region.

These new principles of unity of resources and unity of responsibility for their development are now, after more than 11 years of work, written into the very landscape and the life of a resurgent region.

As one concrete result of this new way of doing things, a major river has been made to do what it is told to do, by a unique control of its waters for the benefit of men.

America for over a century has puttered at the job of developing her rivers; the work has lagged far behind our proud technical standards in almost every other field. Last month, when the largest of the T. V. A.'s new structures—Fontana Dam and Kentucky Dam—went into service, modern, unified river control became an accomplished fact on an American river—the first river in the world of which this can be said. I venture the assertion that it will not be the last.

The Tennessee River system has been dealt with by T. V. A. as a comprehensive whole, not as a series of unrelated sites for dams. Each dam was seen as a part of that whole, made to yield all of its potential value—not a navigation channel alone, or flood control only, or power as a separate asset, or recreation. The series of T. V. A. dams—the largest job of engineering and construction undertaken by one organization in American history—has made all those assets available from each dam.

By this system of dams, designed and operated almost as if they were one dam, the waters of the Tennessee River system can now be turned on and off from the T. V. A.'s central water dispatcher's office with almost the same precision with which you handle vessels of liquid in a laboratory.

When rainfall is heavy and floods threaten, the reservoirs hold back the excess till the crisis is past—and that crisis may be at Cairo on the Ohio River, hundreds of miles away. When the dry season comes in the fall and the water is needed to keep deep-water navigation moving, enough water can be let down to maintain a nine-foot channel. (We have ample rainfall in this valley, so irrigation is not one of the multiple uses made of the water; it could be, if that were needed.)

As water is released from behind the dams, it turns water wheels that produce electric power in great quantities. T. V. A. is today the largest electricity-producing system in the United States, the paying partner of the enterprise with an annual gross revenue of over $35,000,000 from sales of electricity, that (through 130 locally owned and operated distribution systems) serves 550,000 homes, farms, and factories in 5 States. At the levels of the past 5 years it will take only 30 years to repay Uncle Sam the total power investment, with net income remaining after operating expenses, depreciation, taxes to local agencies, and other costs.

The success of the idea of unified development is written not only on the river but on the changed face of the land of the region, and in the forests and woodlots. The land was not dealt with separately from the river, the customary method. In nature land and streams are a unity. Everyone knows that what farmers do on their land affects the flow of waters both on the land and in the rivers. Minerals affect the fertility and hence the water-holding ability of land; the same is true of forests.

The T. V. A. principle required that the same unity of resources that in fact exists in nature should be reflected in the way men develop those resources.

The results of the new method are to be seen on every hand, as one travels through the region. Farmers, many thousands of them, work on their own acres, with the aid of science, to restore the fertility and security of the soil of their farms and the growth of their timber. They are consciously paying heed to the oneness, in nature, of land and river, of forests and minerals.

A half-dozen or more different Government agencies, having separate responsibilities and policies and different sources of authority, could hardly perform such a unified task. In any event, they never have done so. Congress had to create a new kind of government tool, the T. V. A. This regional development corporation was to have "the flexibility and initiative of a private enterprise"; so it was not put within any of the old-line Washington departments and bureaus. It was to function under a congressional charter explicitly defining its duties and prescribing the policies its administrators were to follow.

That charter fixed responsibility for results squarely upon T. V. A. for an entire undertaking of many parts, all interrelated. This was, and still is, almost a revolution in Government administration, though to a manager it seems the plainest sense. In the development of the river, not flood control alone, or navigation or power, but all the water's uses, together, were made the responsibility of one public agency, the T. V. A. Not water resources in one compartment of government, dealt with separately from soil or forests, nor farming separately from industry, not industry separate from transport and electricity.

The T. V. A. has responsibility to see that things happen—but no powers of compulsion. We were given no power in 1933, and we want no power in 1944, to issue orders to farmers, owners of forest land, businessmen—citizens generally—or to local or State governments. Coercion will not do a democratic job.

The fact is that the changes one sees in this valley are chiefly due to T. V. A.'s record in successfully enlisting the active participation of the people, their private enterprises, and their local and State public institutions. That federation of interests was achieved and is held together by a common understanding, one that is growing in this valley—and to me this is more impressive than the massive dams or even the new green-clad slopes. That understanding is this: That our natural resources are the region's entire capital, and their development must be in accordance with the unity of those resources in the plan of nature.

II. THE INCREASE OF INDEPENDENT ACTIVITY AND ENTERPRISE BY PRIVATE CITIZENS

In the early days of the T. V. A. a notable adversary said over and again that private business would decline in the Tennessee Valley because men and investors would fear and avoid a region where Government played so important an economic role.

The contrary has been the case. What T. V. A. has accomplished in stimulating and encouraging private undertakings in manufacturing, commerce, farming, transportation, forestry, and other fields is now widely known. As the Baltimore Sun said editorially on November 16, 1944, "Far from withering private enterprise, T. V. A. has afforded the means for a variety of new businesses to spring up in the valley."

By the presence of abundant low-cost electricity and a new 650-mile waterway, by industrial research in new uses of the region's raw materials in private industry, by protection from floods that damage business, and by making available facts about resources in a form that businessmen require for their decisions, there has developed in this region a unique relation between T. V. A. and small and large business. This has been expressed in large private investments and plans for continued expansion.

Since T. V. A. was created the figures show that private enterprise in this region has made greater progress than in the United States as a whole during the same period—whether the measure of progress be increase in retail sales, number of new manufacturing establishments, bank deposits, value added by manufacture and persons engaged therein, or any other index. The New York Times summarized the matter in accordance with the facts when it said editorially recently: "There is abundant evidence in big as well as little businesses in the Tennessee Valley that private initiative has been encouraged, not stamped out."

That Government activity can nourish and encourage the expansion of industry, commerce, and agriculture is no new idea, of course. But in the Tennessee Valley the demonstration affects so many varied kinds of business activity and has resulted in such huge permanent private investment that with the fair-minded it should lay to rest any notion that public investment and public technical leadership necessarily exclude private investment and initiative.

The important question is, What kind of public activity? It is now clear to most observers that the T. V. A. is the kind that helps and multiplies private activity, investment, initiative, and profit.

III. A METHOD OF ACHIEVING GENUINE DECENTRALIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Congress and the President created T. V. A. as an autonomous corporation rooted in a region rather than as a remote bureau of a Washington department. This is the first major exception in more than 50 years to the trend toward centralized administration of Federal functions.

T. V. A.'s administrators, engineers, and technicians were selected from all parts of the country. But they live and work in the Tennessee Valley. That is where the problems of the people are; that is where the decisions are made. Local delegations don't have to go to Washington to get an answer where the T. V. A. is involved. The men they want to see are right in the valley.

This experiment in government in the open air has developed a body of experience of general usefulness. The T. V. A. has shown, under none too easy circumstances, that in the field of resource development there is an alternative to ever larger departments in Washington and to cumbersome, top-heavy, overcentralized government.

This decentralization from Washington made it possible for T. V. A. in turn to decentralize within the region. To that end we have entered into scores of contracts with State and local agencies and private groups. As a consequence of this deliberate policy, most of the changes wrought in this valley are not affected directly by T. V. A. at all.

They result from the combined efforts of hundreds of local, State, and private agencies, such as farmers' associations, State universities, rural electric cooperatives, and city power boards, State and community planning boards, State and local conservation agencies. It is this aspect of the T. V. A., this citizen partnership and participation, that strongly impressed visitors who are wisely fearful of bureaucratic domination.

IV. A DEMONSTRATION THAT POLITICS CAN BE KEPT OUT OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF AN IMPORTANT PUBLIC ENTERPRISE

Congress itself, in a rare provision of law, prohibited politics in the administration of T. V. A. We took that direction literally. Furthermore, we have observed the corollary—that we of T. V. A. keep strictly out of politics.

No technical enterprise can possibly succeed on any other basis. It is more than a matter of patronage; the integrity of every decision on a technical or business question would be in doubt were any other rule observed.

The significant thing in the T. V. A.'s experience is that the public has fought off any attempt to tamper with T. V. A.'s uncompromising position on this matter of politics. Whenever someone, however powerful, seeks to inject political considerations into T. V. A.'s operations, there are widespread public expressions of protest from almost every quarter.

The people understand the issue: T. V. A.'s broad policies are matters for Congress and political institutions; but they don't want political administration of their business.

The general assumption of public apathy concerning the conduct of public business we have not found to be true; quite the contrary.

It will be apparent that all T. V. A.'s accomplishments are due to the distinctive methods it has employed. It is coming to be recognized in many parts of the world that it is those methods that embody what is known as the T. V. A. idea.

After 11½ years of observation it is my opinion that these methods, adapted wisely to the variety of circumstances in a thousand regions of the world, can be made to work elsewhere.

It is obvious, of course, that the T. V. A. pattern is no cooky cutter, not something to be copied. The T. V. A. idea will be useful elsewhere by the process of intelligent adaptation.

The results in the Tennessee Valley led the Wall Street Journal to observe a few days ago: "President Roosevelt's proposal for T. V. A.'s in every important watershed in the country has a certain logical foundation—no doubt about that. If T. V. A. has been a good thing for the Tennessee River region, it should be a good thing for every other river region."

Similar developments elsewhere will be a good thing only if it is clearly recognized that the distinguishing features of T. V. A. that I have here summarized are essential—one agency doing a unified job; that agency decentralized, adapted to stimulate private development at the grass roots and free from politics. These essential characteristics are not dependent upon the physical circumstances peculiar or distinctive to the Tennessee Valley. They can be adapted to other regions and other problems.

Surplus Property Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, last fall the Senate and the Congress spent much time and effort on the all-important problem of surplus-property disposal, which resulted in legislation and the appointment of a surplus-property board.

Prior to the enactment of the surplus-property bill Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, at the request of the President, made a comprehensive report on this subject to Justice Byrnes. Since time and the war effort have not stood still, on January 5, last, I wrote Mr. Baruch a letter asking him some specific questions on this subject, in the light of present-day developments. I believe that his reply is very important, and I therefore ask that my letter and his reply may be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 5, 1945.

Hon. BERNARD BARUCH,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BARUCH: Having in mind your experience with the problem of surplus property following World War No. 1 and your more recent surveys and studies of the current problem, I am anxious to have your views.

As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I know of your deep concern and your devoted and painstaking study of it, and I am familiar with the report you made to the President which was a forerunner and formed the basis for the legislation recently enacted by Congress. No one has taken a more constructive interest than have you.

Much has happened lately to modify some of the aspects of this problem. Property that appeared to be surplus a few months ago seems now to be critically short. Then, too, property that may be surplus to the Army and Navy may be extremely short insofar as civilians are concerned.

No one can deny that the volume, velocity, and manner of disposal of the huge amounts of surplus property that will be on hand at the end of the present war will have a tremendous impact upon the economy of this country, but what are some of the details?

What about our supplies of low-grade ores and improved methods of processing them—a subject in which the West is tremendously interested? What do your studies indicate as to the short- and long-range supply of vital resources of metals?

What about the effect of so-called surplus property upon the future economy of America?

What is surplus property? Is property surplus when civilians need it desperately, even though the armed forces have no military use for it?

There are many additional angles to this whole subject upon which I should like your viewpoint.

Sincerely,

ED. C. JOHNSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 12, 1945.*

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: The following are comments that occur to me as a result of your letter of January 5.

Suggestions for the Surplus Administrator are made in the report on war and post-war policies made by John Hancock and me. They still hold good and are, as follows:

1. Sell as much as he can as early as he can without unduly disrupting normal trade.

2. Listen to pressure groups but act in the national interest.

3. No sales, no rentals to speculators; none to promoters.

4. Get fair market prices for the values, with proceeds of all sales going to reduce the national debt.

5. Sell as in a goldfish bowl, with records always open to public inspection.

6. As far as practicable use the same regular channels of trade that private business would in disposing of the particular properties.

7. No Government operation of surplus-war plants in competition with private industry.

8. No monopoly, equal access to surpluses for all businesses; preference to local ownership, but no subsidizing of one part of the country against another.

9. Scrap what must be scrapped, but no deliberate destruction of useful property.

10. Before selling surplus equipment abroad, assure America's own productive efficiency on which our high wages and high living standards rest.

In other parts of the report we repeated what I consider very important, and must never be lost sight of:

"The business of all the disposal agencies should be conducted in a goldfish bowl, with the facts on all sales open to public inspection at the point of sale and each agency submitting reports, summarizing these sales regularly to Congress through the Surplus Administrator."

In dealing with the question of a surplus, the first decision that must be made by a Government agency is what constitutes a surplus to it. Then the surplus must be transferred to the Surplus Administration, where it will have to be considered from the standpoint of national interest.

Any surplus of nonperishable items produced outside of the United States continental area, which have been acquired for war purposes, should be retained unless it can be sold with the idea of preventing inflation and then with the understanding it could be repurchased.

These surpluses should be kept for two purposes:

1. In case of war.

2. To prevent combinations, cartels, quotas, or other barriers to our economy.

The mere possession of these things, produced outside the United States continental area, will be worth more to us in the way of self-confidence and respect from others than the money we would get from the sale.

So far as the other nonperishable surpluses and plants are concerned, each should be considered from the national and international standpoint. For instance, we will have a large supply of copper metal. Inquiry should be made as to what the resources of copper in this country are in ore and the facility or ability to turn that into copper metal, and how many years this ore will last. Then we should take the ore plus such surplus metal and determine what, if any, copper should be retained; and if not retained, how much should be sold each year.

The same should be done in regard to every other metal. In this way we will determine from a national standpoint what is surplus and what is not.

In coming to a conclusion, consideration will have to be given also to American holdings in other countries and what freedom of movement there will be in case of war, and whether there is a possibility of any other country or countries combining together in a cartel, quota, or any other form of barrier against us.

The same inquiry should be made with regard to agricultural products, whether they be perishable or not. Efforts should be made to have this country develop self-containment in a very short time. This would not be done for the purpose of injuring any other country, but of giving constant evidence of our ability to take care of ourselves if we are forced to do so. It is not a threat to a peace. It is a threat against war.

One of the matters that should be inquired into immediately by the Surplus Administration is the necessity for a continuing research under the Bureau of Mines of the various low-grade ores necessary to our economy. This should include production of oil from coal and shale.

In addition, the Department of Agriculture should be pressing an inquiry into the use of farm byproducts. Both of these should be done in connection with a research council for peace activities such as is now conducted by Dr. Vannevar Bush for war.

Until you know all these factors you cannot decide what is surplus raw material.

Things like trucks, tires, and all kinds of machinery that can be used in road-building, farm and civilian life should be turned loose in order to bridge over the hiatus between the great demand and the ability to get ready for production.

One more thought—the retention and nonuse of plants too long will lessen their value to anyone for any use.

These are my general views. I should be glad to give further particulars if you desire.

Yours very truly.

BERNARD M. BARUCH.

The Charter Not a Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following column by George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the New York Sun and other papers under date of December 26, 1944:

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)
THE CHARTER NOT A HOAX

Mr. Roosevelt's Atlantic Charter was not a hoax. He may now believe that it was a mistake. He perhaps has discovered that it is an impediment to improvisation. Too many remember it and believe in it. Too many want it to be true. But it was never a hoax.

Once I was debating Leon Henderson on the Wake Up America forum, and he said authoritatively that Maxim Litvinov had signed the Atlantic Charter. Well, I suppose I should not have done it, but thrilled at catching a famous New Dealer, I handed him a volume containing the Atlantic Charter and asked him to show me Litvinov's signature. It wasn't there. Nothing was there but Roosevelt and Churchill. Mind you, they were both present in this officially published document but no Litvinov. And no Stalin. Not there. Henderson was puzzled and I was petty about it. He knew a signature should be there, but he had said "Atlantic Charter," and I stuck to that.

Now, we were looking at page 114 of my particular official book. Had Henderson turned a leaf, he would have had me by the heel, for there, on page 116, is the declaration by the United Nations, signed in Washington, January 1, 1942. This is a very different document from the declaration by two elderly gentlemen at sea thinking great thoughts. For when the Atlantic Charter was given to a panting world, the United States was not at war with anybody; that is, not officially. The President of the United States is not permitted by the Constitution to declare war all on his own or even in private converse with Mr. Churchill. The Congress declares war. And the Atlantic Charter, by its nature, could only be issued by a pair of belligerents in time of war. So Mr. Roosevelt is right when he insists that there is no such legal document, for its very nature is illegal—in fact, illegitimate.

However, the declaration by the United Nations is different. The United States was, upon its issuance, actually at war. It was the focal country by a group of belligerents associated against a common enemy. And these associated nations pledged themselves:

"Having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter, being convinced that complete victory over their enemies to defend life, liberty, independence, and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands, as well as in other lands, and that they are now engaged in a common struggle against savage and brutal forces seeking to subjugate the world, declare:

"1. Each government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war.

"2. Each government pledges itself to cooperate with the governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies."

There you have the Atlantic Charter in unquestionably official form. No matter who wrote it on what scraps of paper, once incorporated in the declaration by the United Nations, it ceased to be the private conversation of a pair of amateurs in English composition, but the formal declaration of nations at war. And all signed officially as representing nations, as, for instance, the United States of America, by Franklin D. Roosevelt; the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, by Winston Churchill; on behalf of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Maxim Litvinoff, Ambassador; the Republic of Poland, by Jan Ciechanowski—and many others. That is official, terribly official. It was even official so far as Poland is concerned. And that cannot be killed by Mr. Roosevelt or the O. W. I. or the humiliations of Churchill or the elations of Stalin. It will not be killed, because it is the only statement of war aims issued by this association of nations—or by anybody officially to date.

The Patent Grant: Remedies To Prevent Its Monopolistic Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on December 18, 1943, I addressed the House on H. R. 3874, An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes. I have again introduced the bill as H. R. 97. This bill would provide that a patent holder can no longer enforce his patent if he is found in regular judicial proceedings to have illegally used his patent in restraint of trade and commerce. Briefly, the bill would:

First. Authorize the United States to intervene in Federal court proceedings involving the infringement or validity of patents. This is to assure representation to the courts of the public interest, so often disregarded in patent litigation.

Second. Require registration of patent agreements. This proposal has been advanced by industry and Government agencies.

Third. Render unenforceable patents which are illegally used to restrain trade or commerce. This is the heart of the bill.

Fourth. Permit determination of the validity and scope of patents in antitrust proceedings.

In many respects this bill is an extremely conservative measure. It does not interfere with the validity of the patent grant. It does not provide for compulsory licensing of patents. It is not intended to diminish in any way the basic rights of a patent holder. This bill would strengthen the patent system. In providing for the cancelation of a patent which has been employed as a part of an illegal conspiracy or monopoly, the bill will give assurance to the public that patents will be used for the purposes within the constitutional grant, namely, for the promotion of science and the useful arts. The bill adopts a principle frequently applied by the Congress in other legislation. A patent, after all, is only a monopoly grant from the United States Government. The Supreme Court refers to the patent as a property right but it is after all a property right which has been created by Government action and which would not exist without that action. A lease granted by the Government as to valuable mineral properties, for instance, is also a property right, but it is common practice in all legislation authorizing such leases to provide—to quote from a typical statute:

> If any of the lands or deposits leased under the provisions of such sections shall be controlled by any device so that they form a part of or are in any wise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust or form the subject of any contract or conspiracy in restraint of trade the lease thereof shall be forfeited by appropriate court proceedings.

The bill which I have introduced would attach to the patent grant this customary limitation in the public interest. In view of the thoroughly documented history of the abuses of patents in restraint of trade during the last decade, I doubt very much whether a patent system can survive without this kind of protection.

The necessity for this bill is made all the clearer because of the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the Hartford-Empire Co. against United States which was handed down a week ago. In that case, more than 600 patents have been used in a joint conspiracy to restrain trade. The entire glass-container industry is controlled through a gigantic patent pool. The result of this patent pool is to make consumers pay more for food products put up in glass jars. It has kept new companies from going into the glass-container industry. By keeping new firms out of the business, the Hartford-Empire Co. has indirectly kept people out of work. In other words, here is a price-fixing conspiracy in a field of necessities and the very basis of the conspiracy is the intentional misuse of patents. Or to put it another way, this very conspiracy has been made possible, or at least has been built upon grants by the United States Government of valuable property rights.

In establishing and utilizing its patent position, the monopoly failed to disclose information which it was obligated to reveal to the Patent Office, established private patent tribunals, practiced fraud on the courts, and carried on a continuous campaign of threats of infringement suits. Its real objective was to maintain control of producers, production, and technology. The conspiracy upon which the monopoly was built encompassed a gross abuse of the patent privilege before the Patent Office, in the courts, and in business practices.

There is no doubt whatsoever about the facts in the Hartford-Empire Co.

case. The majority opinion of the Supreme Court, given by Justice Roberts, states:

The district court found that invention of glass-making machinery had been discouraged, that competition in the manufacture and sale or licensing of such machinery had been suppressed, and that the system of restricted licensing had been employed to suppress competition in the manufacture of unpatented glassware and to maintain prices of the manufactured product. The findings are full and adequate and are supported by evidence, much of it contemporary writings of corporate defendants or their officers and agents.

He further stated:

It is clear that, by cooperative arrangements and binding agreements, the appellant corporations, over a period of years, regulated and suppressed competition in the use of glassmaking machinery and employed their joint patent position to allocate fields of manufacture and to maintain prices of unpatented glassware.

Justice Black, in his dissenting opinion, in describing the efforts of the conspirators to monopolize the glass-container industry, states:

Their efforts were rewarded by complete success. They have become absolute masters of that domain of our public economy. They achieved this result largely through the manipulation of patents and licensing agreements. They obtained patents for the express purpose of furthering their monopoly. They utilized various types of restrictions in connection with leasing those patents so as to retain their dominance in that industry. The history of this country has perhaps never witnessed a more completely successful economic tyranny over any field of industry than that accomplished by these appellants. They planned their monopolistic program on the basis of getting and keeping and using patents, which they dedicated to the destruction of free competition in the glass-container industry.

The conspirators had a definite program to misuse patents; that is to misuse public grants from the Federal Government. They stated that they acquired patents with an intention "to block the development of machines which might be constructed by others, and to secure patents on possible improvements of competing machines so as to 'fence in' these and prevent their reaching an improved state." As Justice Black states:

These patents were the major weapons in the campaign to subjugate the industry.

The Supreme Court found that Hartford-Empire had grossly violated the antitrust laws. Nevertheless, the majority four judges—since three judges did not sit—felt that it did not have the power under the existing antitrust statutes to keep Hartford-Empire from enforcing in the future the 600 or more patents which it had acquired for the very purpose of misusing them in restraint of trade. The Supreme Court referred to the fact that the Congress had failed to pass supporting legislation providing imposition of a penalty as to patents used in violation of the antitrust laws. My bill, H. R. 97, would correct that.

I am not a lawyer and I do not wish to pass any judgment upon whether the majority opinion or the dissenting opinion was correct on the issue of whether the Court in the absence of legislation could have provided for this forfeiture. I do know, however, that it is completely anomalous for the Federal Government to remain powerless when the very grants which it gives are used as weapons in an illegal conspiracy against the public interest. The use made of these patents is illegal under our present laws; it takes no amendment of the antitrust laws to make this use in restraint of trade illegal. As the majority Supreme Court opinion states:

Little need be said concerning the legal principles which vindicate the district court's findings and conclusions.

The opinion quotes a case decided in 1912—the Standard Sanitary case—in which it is said:

Rights conferred by patents are indeed very definite and extensive, but they do not give any more than other rights a universal license against positive prohibitions. The Sherman Act is a limitation of rights, rights which may be pushed to evil consequences and therefore restrained.

The only question, therefore, is whether admittedly illegal conduct in the use of a patent should not result in the loss of the patent. The majority four of the Supreme Court did not think that they had the power to grant this public relief. If that is so, then Congress should make it clear that the courts have such power.

It would be a great and a tragic mistake to think of the abuse of patents as though it were an ordinary criminal act. It is more than an ordinary criminal act. It goes to the very heart of our economic system. The Supreme Court was writing about patents but the effect of its decision will be felt when this country has to provide for 60,000,000 jobs and it will also have far-reaching implications in the foreign economic relations of this country. The abuse of the patent system has been the very foundation on which international cartels have been built in order to restrain American production and to keep American companies from selling their goods in other parts of the world. The Hartford-Empire case reminds us that the patent system has also been used to restrain technology at home and to keep out those new companies and new enterprises which we must have if we are going to have high levels of employment. The question is really whether we are going to make a free and competitive enterprise system work.

The patents in the Hartford-Empire case and in the more than 30 international cartel cases brought by the Antitrust Division during the last few years were used as instruments in the derogation of one of the most fundamental policies of this Government. The letter of the President to Secretary Hull, dated September 6, 1944, sets forth this fundamental policy. The President said:

During the past half century the United States has developed a tradition in opposition to private monopolies. The Sherman and Clayton Acts have become as much a part of the American way of life as the due process clause of the Constitution. By protecting the consumer against monopoly these statutes guarantee him the benefits of competition.

This policy goes hand in glove with the liberal principles of international trade for which you have stood through many years of public service. The trade-agreement program has as its objective the elimination of barriers to the free flow of trade in international commerce; the antitrust statutes aim at the elimination of monopolistic restraints of trade in interstate and foreign commerce.

Unfortunately, a number of foreign countries, particularly in continental Europe, do not possess such a tradition against cartels. On the contrary, cartels have received encouragement from some of these governments. Especially is this true with respect to Germany. Moreover, cartels were utilized by the Nazis as governmental instrumentalities to achieve political ends. The history of the use of the I. G. Farben trust by the Nazis reads like a detective story. The defeat of the Nazi armies will have to be followed by the eradication of these weapons of economic warfare. But more than the elimination of the political activities of German cartels will be required. Cartel practices which restrict the free flow of goods in foreign commerce will have to be curbed. With international trade involved, this end can be achieved only through collaborative action by the United Nations.

I hope that you will keep your eye on this whole subject of international cartels, because we are approaching the time when discussions will almost certainly arise between us and other nations.

The President has repeated this policy most recently in his message to Congress on the state of the Nation. He said:

We must make sure that private enterprise works as it is supposed to work—on the basis of initiative and vigorous competition without the stifling presence of monopolies and cartels.

If one of the major policies of this Government for 50 years has been to prevent restraints of trade in an effort to maintain a free-enterprise system, then, surely, monopoly grants by the Federal Government—which can only be given to promote science and the useful arts—should be withdrawn if these grants are used against the fundamental policy of this country. Take the basic patents in the synthetic rubber field, for instance, through a cartel agreement between the German I. G. Farben Chemical Trust and Standard Oil of New Jersey, the German Government, acting through the I. G. Farben cartel, received and retained control over valuable monopoly grants from the United States Government. They used these grants to prevent American industry from developing and producing synthetic rubber. The same thing happened with magnesium and a host of other crucial industries. Once it becomes known that these patents are being used in an illegal conspiracy, they ought to be canceled just as leases on valuable mineral properties by law today must be canceled if they are so used. Patents today have become of increasing importance because new industrial processes have been developed during the war. New industrial enterprise will not be able to survive if illegal monopolies bar access to these processes. Those who oppose increasing Government control and increasing Government operations in the field of business should think twice of the consequences of what is the present state of the law; namely, that according to the

majority of four justices even when the patents controlling these processes are improperly used for the very purpose of maintaining prices and of keeping out new enterprise, the Federal Government which gave the patents is powerless to enforce a remedy. New jobs will be forthcoming if production and new enterprise are not blockaded by monopolistic patent abuses. This is why I say that the Hartford-Empire case strikes at the very center of the free-enterprise system.

A further look at the Hartford-Empire case will show the anomalous position in which the United States Government finds itself. The Court said that the patents were illegally acquired and illegally used. There were more than 600 such patents. The Court said that this was a violation of the antitrust laws. It then decided that in the future this monopoly of patents should be able to get a reasonable royalty under its licenses. In plain terms, this means that it should be able to charge admission before allowing the public to go into the glass-container industry. Its right to charge admission is based on the illegal combination of patents. In other words, the defendants are to be permitted to make what is called a reasonable profit out of their illegal acts. When a bank robber is caught in the act of robbing a bank, we do not customarily say to him that he will be permitted to get a reasonable amount out of the bank and no more. Yet, to a layman, that is precisely what the Supreme Court has permitted in the Hartford-Empire case and the defendants were smart enough, apparently, to guess this is what would happen. Justice Black, in his opinion, recites a memorandum in which an officer of one of the defendant companies set forth the benefits to be obtained even though the monopoly was illegal. He states:

Of ccurse the Court might order that we transfer the entire Federal licensing business to some other party and turn over to that party the Federal patents. This, of course, would simply restore to a certain extent the existing situation and establish a competitor. I do not see much danger of having any of these deals upset. If they are upset, I still believe that by that time, we will be in a better position even with such dissolution than we would be otherwise; and I see no danger whatsoever of any criminal liability because the cases are necessarily so doubtful in the matter of law that they could never get any jury to convict and I doubt if any prosecuting officer would ever attempt any criminal action. Criminal action in cases of this sort, so far, has practically been nonexistent.

After this decision, the responsibility for affirmative action which will strengthen the patent system and will take the value out of illegal conduct in the misuse of patents rests with Congress. The Sherman Act has been regarded as the fundamental statement of legislative policy in the field of economic doctrine. I still regard it as such. We should reaffirm it. Erosions of the effectiveness of the antitrust law should be prevented, particularly when the danger arises from implications based on congressional action or nonaction. I offer H. R. 97 for this purpose.

This bill is in my judgment needed if the Congress is to do the job of preventing increasing monopolistic control of American industry; and Mr. Speaker, in all probability our No. 1 danger as far as our domestic problems are concerned in the post-war period will be the increasing march of monopoly until at last all of our much vaunted and highly praised economic liberty is gone in the United States. Such an eventuality we simply must prevent. The Supreme Court decision is inadequate to do so. Indeed it leaves a very wide door open for the continuance of these practices. For that reason, I must earnestly urge consideration of this piece of legislation by the appropriate committee of the House which is of course the Judiciary Committee to which the bill was referred. I hope that consideration can be given at an early date.

The Nation's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, recently the special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, authorized by the Senate, made a report on the health situation of the country in which it endeavored to disclose some statements of the factual situation and particularly to emphasize its relationship to the ability of the Nation to continue to wage the war. An editorial upon that report appeared in the Journal of the American Medical Association which has given some pleasure and confidence to the committee and those interested in the subject. Certain letters which the committee has received from important officials in the medical field of the Army and Navy and otherwise, and sundry editorials affecting the subject also encouraging to us, I ask to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have had made an estimate which indicates that the cost of printing will be $130.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of the Americal Medical Association of January 6, 1945]

THE PEPPER COMMITTEE REPORT

The Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education, a subcommittee of the United States Senate Committee on Health and Labor, has just issued its interim report. The Journal makes this report available in full in this issue. Attention should be called particularly to the emphasis on the use of Government aid in the development of medical facilities where the need can be shown, Government aid to medical education, medical research, and the development of medical prepayment plans, and Government assistance in certain situations in which the needs are clearly apparent for preventive medicine and for general health and planning toward a Nation-wide network of medical facilities.

The report makes no specific recommendation in regard to health insurance but does point out that some form of group financing is desirable. It considers voluntary prepayment plans, compulsory sickness insurance, tax-supported medical service, or various combinations of these methods as technics to be considered.

Especially significant is the following paragraph from the report, which emphasizes State planning and control:

"In order to permit local initiative and control, State programs should be drawn up by State health-planning commissions in cooperation with local authorities. In drawing up State plans the commissions should consider the needs of all sections of the State, should include in the plan all suitable existing public and voluntary hospitals, and should plot the new construction as well as the expansion or replacement of existing facilities needed for adequate service. Before Federal funds could be granted, however, over-all State plans and individual projects should be reviewed and approved by the United States Public Health Service to make sure that they meet certain minimum standards of construction, operation, and complete coordinated service. There should be reasonable assurance that a new facility will have enough patients to justify its existence. In communities where sufficient income from fees of individual patients does not otherwise appear probable, provision for group prepayment plans or tax-supported services, or both, should be required."

The report reaches us just as the Journal goes to press. The time is too short for detailed consideration of the various aspects of this report. The report, in general, would seem to be a more scientific, carefully considered document than has heretofore been available as a result of previous hearings in this field. The committee emphasizes that its findings are preliminary and that the subcommittee expects to continue its work with further hearings and with studies of the various aspects of the health problem, such as rural, industrial, and school health, the health needs of veterans, medical research, and medical education.

[From the Washington Post of January 15, 1945]

OUR BAD HEALTH

Senator PEPPER'S Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education has delivered a diagnosis of the Nation's physical condition which is anything but reassuring. It has given us as a people, indeed, the sort of shock an individual sometimes receives when he goes belatedly to his physician for a check-up and is told bluntly that he had better begin to take care of himself. Health is no less the most precious asset of a nation than of an individual. Ours, we now know, is in a critical state. We need look no further for evidence of this than to the record of selective service rejections. "In all," says the Pepper report, "it is estimated that at least 40 percent of the 22,000,000 men of military age—between eight and nine million men—are unfit for general military duty." Illness and disability have had a serious effect upon war production, too. They cost more than 600,000,000 man-days annually, the committee estimates, observing that "this is about 47 times the amount of time lost through strikes and lock-outs of all kinds during 1943."

Certainly this condition must be attributed in part to the inadequacy of our medical facilities. "The quality of American medicine," the committee notes, "at its best is very high. Unfortunately, American medicine at its best reaches only a relatively small part of the population." Forty percent of our counties, with an aggregate population of more than 15,000,000, have no registered hospitals. Many communities, particularly those in rural areas, have too few doctors and nurses; 81 counties are reported to be without a single active physician. This finding of maldistribution of medical

care confirms a study made by the Office of War Information about 18 months ago.

As a remedy, the Pepper committee recommends a planned network of facilities. These would comprise health centers with offices for local physicians and dentists, together with emergency medical, surgical, obstetrical, and laboratory facilities; rural hospitals within easy reach of the health centers, serving areas which could not support specialists' services of their own; district hospitals; and finally base hospitals as the hub of each major medical service area, with teaching experts in every medical and surgical specialty and equipment for complete diagnostic services.

To establish these networks, the committee recommends Federal grants-in-aid to the States without delay. It withholds judgment on the controversial Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill for compulsory health insurance, although it does come to the flat conclusion that "the 'pay-as-you-go' or fee-for-service system which is now the predominant method of payment for medical services, is not well suited to the needs of most people or to the widest possible distribution of high-quality medical care." Plainly this points to some system of prepayment or insurance, especially for those in the lower income brackets. To dismiss proposals looking in this direction on the ground that they amount to a "socialization of medicine," is to fly in the face of vital national needs. We must see to it that adequate medical care is within the reach of all Americans, economically as well as geographically.

[From the Washington Star of January 8, 1945]

HEALTH IS WEALTH

The Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education, headed by Senator PEPPER, has not been winning many headlines, but that it has been doing a highly constructive job for some months past is made clear by the excellent interim report it has just issued.

As Americans we rightly take pride in our standard of living, but that standard is not nearly good enough. A few figures from the report will illustrate the point: (1) In 40 percent of the 3,070 counties in the United States there is not a single full-time local public health service, a deficiency which can be translated immediately into terms of unnecessary sickness. (2) Illness and injury—largely preventable—are costing the Nation an estimated annual loss of 600,000,000 man-days of industrial labor, or about 47 times the amount of productive effort lost through strikes and lockouts of all kinds in 1943. And (3) of the 22,000,000 men of military age in this country, at least eight or nine million, including the 3,500,000 IV-F's, are not able-bodied enough for general military duty.

Although the Pepper committee emphasizes that we are by no means a nation of weaklings and that the number of military rejects is not quite so alarming as it may sound, the figures are sufficiently shocking to indicate that we have not the slightest reason to be complacent about our physical fitness and that it demands much more attention than we have been giving to it. To this end the committee lays special stress on the importance of working out effective methods for the early treatment and correction of defects in children and outlines a far-reaching program which it regards as essential if the riches that lie in our human resources are to be properly conserved and utilized. The program, calling for local, State, and Federal cooperation—with Federal grants-in-aid where necessary—looks forward to the establishment of a great Nation-wide network of medical centers and other health facilities designed to serve individuals of every economic status and in every community, rural and urban.

The committee does not underestimate the difficulties involved in effecting such a program, and it makes clear that considerable study remains to be done, one of the problems being how best to insure that the people at large will be able to pay for more frequent visits to the doctor without establishing a system of socialized medicine. Yet the committee's report leaves little room for doubt that the old maxim holds true—that health is wealth—and that the Nation is bound to profit in the long run if it undertakes this great expansion in medical care.

[From the New York Times of January 7, 1945]

NATIONAL MEDICAL CARE

Senator PEPPER'S subcommittee on wartime health and education has submitted an interim report which focuses attention once more on the need of better medical care for the population as a whole. Because of the lack of hospitals and diagnostic laboratories in rural communities the committee proposes regional medical centers around which hospitals, nursing homes, and similar institutions would be clustered, with all the laboratory facilities necessary for practice and research, as well as schools in which nurses, internes, resident physicians, and post-graduate students would be taught. An integration of medical care, research and teaching is proposed—an integration which is essential if medicine is to be practiced in accordance with the newest approved principles. Since health depends on sanitation as well as on medical care the grant-in-aid system is to include the provision of urban sewerage and water supply and the pasteurization of milk. Such a plan can be carried out only with the aid of local governments. Hence State and other health departments would be expected to amalgamate their hospital and other facilities into the Federal system and to expand them with Federal aid if need be.

Whether such a nationally supported service is to be paid for out of taxes or out of some form of voluntary or compulsory insurance Senator PEPPER'S committee does not decide. It rightly doubts the efficacy of insurance because the unemployed are not reached, and it is convinced that the fee-for-service system will not do because it postpones a visit to the doctor or the hospital until a crisis in sickness is reached. It also believes that physicians should be freely chosen.

The evidence is strong that if cities of metropolitan size have more physicians than they need in normal times the small towns and rural districts have too few and that one reason for this is the lack of hospitals and medical schools. Community purchasing power and degree of urbanization are also essentials, but with these no medical plan can possibly cope. There is nothing cocksure about the report. The committee contents itself with making preliminary observations and recommendations, but these constitute a basis for a more detailed study out of which something better than the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill should emerge.

[From the Philadelphia Record of January 7, 1945]

SOUND PRESCRIPTION FOR HEALTHIER AMERICA

American medical service today resembles an infant garment on a grown child.

It's sorely in need of expansion. Something must be added to meet the ever more articulate demand of the American people:

Adequate medical service for all.

With that as a goal, a United States Senate subcommittee on wartime health and education recommended last week an impressively sound program.

The committee, headed by CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat, Florida), studied a series of sobering facts, which should deflate any jingo who might be inclined to prate about the golden age of American medicine. Among the committee findings were:

Nine million men of military age, more than 40 percent of the age group, are estimated to be unfit for general military duty.

Six hundred million man-days a year are lost to industry because of illness and injury. That, incidentally, is 47 times the amount of time lost in 1943 through strikes and lockouts.

The medical profession, of course, is not entirely to blame for such a deplorable state of national health.

But had it retailed its wares over the years with the same vision and evangelical spirit of business in getting its product everywhere those figures would not be so discouraging.

PEPPER'S committee called for "more and better distributed medical facilities and services in order that all the people may benefit from modern medical knowledge."

That reflects expressed public opinion. Sixty-eight percent of Americans want social security extended to cover payment of doctors and hospitals, according to the National Opinion Research Center.

Fortune magazine, following a survey, stated the American people mean to have medical security—through cooperative prepayment plans sponsored by the medical profession, or—if the doctors fail as they have in the past to take the lead—by Government-compelled, Nation-wide insurance.

The Pepper committee recommended group financing of a health insurance program under which patients would have free choice of physicians, and democratic participation by physicians and public in policy making would be provided.

A virtue of the Pepper committee report is that it presents a well-rounded program, in which health insurance is only a part. It proposed interrelated health centers and hospitals to furnish every American community with preventive, diagnostic, and curative medicine. It called for mental hygiene clinics to serve all groups.

It covered public health construction, school health programs, medical research, and other problems related to the whole—the national health.

"We have seen what neglect of opportunities for better health has cost us during this war," stated the committee. "We must resolve now that never again, either in war or peace, will the Nation be similarly handicapped."

That, we believe, is the will of America.

[From the Tampa Morning Tribune of January 8, 1945]

WIDER HEALTH SERVICE

A soldier who is wounded in battle is taken without reasonable delay to a field hospital, where he receives preliminary treatment and his case is diagnosed and classified. Then he is transported to a base hospital for such further surgical or medical attention as he may need.

We have nothing quite like this for civilians, not even in the largest cities. However, we may have something like it in time if the recommendations submitted the other day by a Senate subcommittte are followed.

This Committee on Wartime Health and Education, headed by Senator PEPPER, has outlined a vast national-health program centered about post-war Federal-State construction of hospitals and health centers. It calls for the establishment of outlying clinics in the sparsely populated districts, small hospitals in rural communities and base medical centers in larger communities. The sick would be transferred from one to the other as disease or injuries demanded.

In addition, these clinics, hospitals, and medical centers would serve as teaching institutions and laboratories. The aim is to

bring medical schools, laboratories, and hospitals closer together so that medical knowledge and new discoveries could be put quickly into practice.

Under such a network of hospitals and medical centers, physicians who practice in small communities would be able to transport patients who need special care to the nearest clinic or hospital. Patients who could be treated at home would also benefit, because their physicians would have the assistance of local hospital laboratories.

This proposal, and it is only one of several offered by the committee, is important, of course; but there immediately arises the question whether we can afford such a program. A better question is whether we can afford not to have it.

The fact that some 4,500,000 young men in the prime of life have been rejected by the Army and Navy because of physical and mental defects certainly proves that too many of us pay no attention to physical well-being. And what of the old men and women who are not subject to examination by draft boards? Simply because they are older their condition must be worse. We all know that the Nation's health is not good enough, and it may be found that the cost of the proposed program would be less than that spent now on improper treatment, long suffering, and poor health.

The conviction is spreading that something must be done to correct the long-standing inequalities in medical care. On this all the authorities agree. At the same time, there is general opposition to the abolition of private practice. The Senate committee's suggested program should meet with the approval of even the severest critics of any form of socialized medicine.

ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1945.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: I wish to thank you for your courtesy in sending me an advance copy of the interim report of your subcommittee on wartime health and education. This is an exceedingly interesting document.

Nowhere have I seen a more concise statement of the health needs of this country. The discussions of some of the problems to be encountered in providing broad health services for the Nation are illuminating, and the subcommittee seems to have taken a wise view in pointing out that there is no easy formula by which some of the difficulties can be easily resolved.

I hope that your committee will continue to explore special aspects of the broad problem of national health, for by so doing I am sure it will be rendering a service to the Nation.

Very sincerely yours,
NORMAN T. KIRK,
Major General, United States Army,
The Surgeon General.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1945.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: I wish to acknowledge with thanks the interim report of the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education, which you so kindly sent to Dr. Hoge and me.

We have studied this report which deals with the many wartime and post-war health problems with much interest. Our reaction is that the report is an excellent piece of work. In particular, we feel that the sections relating directly to my testimony ably reflect the ideas and opinions which we tried to express.

I feel sure that the information which has been assembled here will enable your committee to exert a profound influence in bringing about the many needed improvements in our public health, as demonstrated in your report.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS PARRAN,
Surgeon General.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1945.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of December 29, 1944, with which you forwarded an advance copy of the interim health report of the Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education.

I have read the interim report with interest and believe that the approach to the problem under consideration is sound. The recommendations of the subcommittee if put into effect would contribute materially to improvement and protection of the health of the Nation.

Very truly yours,
FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC
HEALTH ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., January 3, 1945.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: I have read with much interest the material which you enclosed with your letter to me of December 28 including the interim health report of the Senate subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education.

It seems to me that you and your committee have done a very commendable public service in bringing these matters out in such succinct and readable form. I am hoping that there will be wide coverage in the press and that the report itself may be the basis for study by many groups across the land.

It is gratifying to see that the work of the American Public Health Association, in proposing the creation of sufficient full-time public health districts to cover the country, is recognized. I would wish that mention had also been made of the declaration which the American Public Health Association adopted last October setting forth some principles on medical care in a national health program. I enclose a copy of the association's report which I think illuminates certain of the declarations made by your subcommittee.

The public health profession, by and large, will find themselves in agreement with the conclusions which your group has reached and in particular will approve the plan to continue the hearings, especially while the country is in this very dynamic phase of its interest. We stand ready to lend any assistance we can to make your studies most productive.

Faithfully yours,
REGINALD M. ATWATER, M. D.,
Executive Secretary.

Encl.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, January 9, 1945.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of the interim health report of the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education. I attended most of the hearings of your committee and have read the report carefully.

May I say as a personal expression and not on behalf of the health advisory council of the chamber since that council has taken no action in the matter, that I feel the committee has done an outstanding job, and that its preliminary recommendations are sound and if put into effect should carry us a considerable distance down the road to sound national health.

May I say, too, that I was particularly impressed with the manner in which you have presided over the hearings. You were dispassionate and fair in your attitude and you were, I think, exceedingly skillful in bringing out through your questions the essential thinking of each witness.

I hope the committee will continue its studies and will eventually bring in definite recommendations for medical care plans and organization.

Sincerely yours,
HOWARD STRONG,
Secretary, Health Advisory Council.

James F. O'Connor, Late Congressman From Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Montana and the entire Pacific Northwest has suffered an irreparable loss in the passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JAMES F. O'CONNOR. He was so truly a part of the great outdoors which he had the honor to represent, and actively participated in every endeavor for the upbuilding of his State—agriculture, mining, banking, and the development of all natural resources. He gave to every interest his best, and the regard and respect of all his associates came back to him. This trait was indicative of the man who knew life at first-hand and who was able and eager, out of his own experience, to devise ways for smoothing the pathway of those who needed most the help of kindly hands. Always he mingled with strong men in crowded places. Always his hand was outstretched to aid his fellow men.

The people of Montana, as well as his colleagues in Congress, will long remember JIM O'CONNOR, lawyer, banker, rancher, and statesman.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago there was some discussion on

the floor of the House about the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. This organization has made a wonderful record. The Commissioner, Mr. John H. Fahey, has commented on the remarks that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in letter to me of date January 13. It discloses a remarkable record of orderly liquidation. The letter is as follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: My attention has been called to your explanation and defense of the work of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation this week on the floor of the House. It is very evident that your colleague from Pennsylvania, whom you answered, was unfortunately misinformed. Your helpfulness in bringing the facts to his attention and to the attention of Members of the Congress is greatly appreciated.

No one is more fully aware than I that the record of the Corporation, like all other business operations, has not been perfect. Having been associated with its work from its beginning in June 1933 to date, I am keenly conscious of that fact. Nevertheless, and largely because of the wise plan Congress incorporated in the law to make possible assistance to millions of distressed home owners, it has accomplished great good for the country. While the record of the Corporation is fairly well known, its full significance is not generally realized. I should like briefly to call a few of these facts to your attention.

As provided in the terms of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, the Corporation made loans only to those home owners who were unable to retain their loans with original lenders or to refinance elsewhere. Thus only defaulted loans or those which no private institution would take could be refinanced by Home Owners' Loan Corporation. By taking over these loans the Federal Government, through H. O. L. C., not only saved the homes of these owners but by stopping the mortgage panic it prevented hundreds of thousands of additional foreclosures and saved large numbers of financial institutions from bankruptcy.

You will recall that the Corporation received nearly 2,000,000 applications for loans involving over $6,000,000,000. During its lending period from June 13, 1933, through June 12, 1936, it closed 1,017,821 loans having a dollar value of $3,487,656,260, including advances chiefly for insurance, taxes, and repairs.

In the 10½ years of its operations the Corporation has collected more than $3,000,000,000 in principal and interest, and, at the same time, has saved its borrowers more than $600,000,000 in loan charges and other carrying costs. During fiscal year 1944 it collected from its borrowers at a rate in excess of $1,185,000 every working day. The Corporation has carried out its operations at a lower cost per loan account and a lower cost of administration than has any other large-scale mortgage financing institution in the history of our country. In addition, the loan plan the Corporation has employed, as directed by Congress, has led to the general adoption of the simple long-term, low-interest rate, direct-reduction amortized mortgage, which is now accepted as one of the most practical aids ever offered for safe, gradual acquisition of debt-free home ownership.

Since June 1936 the Corporation has concentrated on the orderly liquidation of its assets. As of January 1, 1945, its mortgage investments and acquired properties had been reduced by over 68 percent. If conditions continue to be favorable, instead of costing our taxpayers half a billion to a billion dollars, as predicted when it began operations, the Corporation will conclude the work without costing the Government or taxpayers one cent.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY,
Commissioner.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from the West Side Association of Commerce, Inc., in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. The letter is as follows:

WEST SIDE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., January 9, 1945.

The members of the West Side Association of Commerce a membership corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, in regular session assembled on the 9th day of January 1945, herewith reiterate the position which the association has consistently held since 1933 in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. A continuing study of this proposal made over a period of more than 10 years offers evidence that it is economically unsound and undesirable and that once and for all it should be disapproved by the various interested agencies of Government.

We take this opportunity to express our commendation to the United States Senate for the decisive rebuke which on December 12, 1944, it gave to a limited number of its Members who endeavored, without hearings or other consideration, to force the adoption of the proposal by attaching it to another Senate bill. We hope the Seventy-ninth Congress will be just as decisive in 1945 if the proponents again advance this undesirable undertaking. We likewise commend the work of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, with which this association is affiliated, for the dignified and businesslike manner in which it has kept Members of Congress informed as to the reasons why the seaway should not be approved.

The association at this time expresses its disapproval of the recommendation recently made to the New York State Legislature by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey to the effect that New York should initiate construction of the seaway if early action is not taken by Congress. It must be evident to everybody that New York will not initiate construction of this waterway which is opposed by the public in every part of the State except in the immediate area of the St. Lawrence River. We may presume, therefore, that recommendations of this nature are part of the proponents' plan to frighten Congress into taking action. We are convinced that this strategy will not accomplish its purpose. The country as a whole has made it clear that it is opposed to this seaway, which has failed of adoption every time it has been presented to Congress, and we do not believe that the congressional leaders from other States will be frightened into reversing their position through any fear of New York's possible participation.

It is inconceivable to this association that anyone, particularly a New Yorker, would recommend that this State should spend the hundreds of millions of dollars necessary to make the St. Lawrence a navigable waterway west of Montreal when the said proposal, which would have to be paid for by the taxpayers, would benefit only a limited number of growers and shippers in the Middle West. This association remains convinced, as it has for more than a decade, that the seaway could not be an economic success and that the expenditure on it of more than a half billion dollars would be an unconscionable waste of public funds. On the other hand, if it were as successful as its proponents claim, then it would injure practically every commercial, industrial, labor and transportation interest in the State of New York. We estimate, on the basis of figures of the Department of Commerce exhibited by the proponents of the seaway, that New York City alone might lose from 20 to 25 percent of its foreign and intercoastal commerce, while Buffalo, one of the Nation's greatest inland shipping centers, would be bypassed by practically every incoming and outgoing steamer. We cannot comprehend the logic of a proposal which asks the State of New York to pay hundreds of millions of dollars for a proposal which either is economically unsound or which would divert a large part of the trade of its municipalities, waterways and railroads with consequent heavy losses in employment.

Anyone who believes that New York is interested in initiating construction of this seaway should take note of the fact that nearly 50 labor, trade, and commercial organizations in every section of this State from Buffalo to the end of Long Island have joined with 175 similar groups in 29 other States in opposition to the project. It must be evident to any impartial observer that there is something radically wrong with a proposal which has aroused Nation-wide opposition from coal miners, longshoremen, railroads, steamships, chambers of commerce, municipalities, governors and other diversified groups.

JAMES W. DANAHY, *Secretary.*

Protesting Against the Scrapping of the Atlantic Charter by Our Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President of the United States:

DECEMBER 23, 1944.

HIS EXCELLENCY, THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am addressing you as the father of two boys on the western front and an American citizen and one of your supporters in all four campaigns; and I am writing you because I am very much disturbed about the conduct of our allies and the very evident intent to scrap the Atlantic Charter. It appears now that our boys are fighting to restore the status quo of 1938 and prior.

It disturbed me very much when the French assumed the right to take back their north African colonies just as nonchalantly as if we had acquired no say so in the matter

whatsoever by virtue of having expelled the Germans.

It disturbed me very much to read from time to time how British, Dutch, and Belgian civil authorities stepped into the management of the islands and territories of the Pacific as quickly as we were able to expel the Japs.

The conduct of our allies in Belgium, Poland, Greece, and Italy seemed to me to be very highhanded to entirely disregard any right to determine the future of these countries by reason of our sacrifices and to express an evident intent to revert to the same sort of international politics and diplomacy which in the past has proven a fertile seed bed for wars.

To show you how the boys who are fighting the battles feel about this, I am going to quote from a letter received from my son, who is a private in the Sixty-second Coast Artillery, written from north Africa on February 3, 1943:

"Mr. Sanchez is more or less a big shot here and is very enthusiastic about the richness of north Africa and its capacity for producing instead of exporting raw materials and importing manufactured goods. The miles upon miles of fertile soil, the mines, the latent water-power sources and the multitudes of cheap intelligent workers are truly an opportunity for someone who could convince post-war France that a rich colony is an asset in itself and even more so than a rich source for its own industrial supply. If France, through possession or low international tariffs has the Saar, surely she could allow north Africa to develop on her own.

"I'm really interested in the Arabs and Moros as laborers. They seem to work very hard for their meager existence and have no inclination to get fat and nasty or to engage in anything but defensive politics. If they were treated squarely from the beginning in an industrial revolution, I'll wager they'd make one of the finest groups of civilized people. They are a clean, fierce, and self-respecting lot when you see them away from the softening effects of the city. Even here there are many. Of course it is pure heresy as far as they are concerned, for an upstart Christian with only 1,943 years of civilization behind him to speak of introducing them into the civilized world. I would like to know just how worldwide the knowledge of their ruling class and their upper class is. Probably quite capable of taking its place immediately. Their church is still quite orthodox and I wonder if its leaders are open to the civilization of its people.

"Seeing little, old, nothing-at-all north Africa certainly impresses on my mind the responsibility of nations after this war toward the exploited and undeveloped parts of the world. The cry for an advanced policy on these matters in the American press is well founded, and I know I'd be willing to fight harder for those people and others (as well as our men) if I knew that they were going to get as much of a chance as the big imperialistic countries who make the peace after the war. They are all so friendly and grateful for liberation and the little we have done for and are giving to them it might be of enormous help in actually winning the war if they were assured of their proportionate place after the war."

These boys feel that they are fighting, and dying if need be, to restore the right of self-determination to the underprivileged peoples of the world. We cannot afford to let them down and it is not too late to tell Britain and Russia that we are fighting for this, and if we cannot get it, we will step out.

It is not too late to withdraw our forces from European theaters. I imagine Germany would be only too glad to give us time to get out. What is the use of going on if we are going to revert to the same situation we had before the war started? The United States has played the role of sucker internationally entirely too long. Let us call a halt.

Wishing you the compliments of the season, I beg to remain,

Respectfully yours,

MATT S. WALTON.

Cancelation of Ration Points—With Reference to Fulton Lewis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on January 10 I addressed the House on the subject Cancelation of Ration Points by O. P. A. Justified. At that time I quoted parts of two broadcasts of Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr. These quotations, which were furnished to me by a third party, strongly condemned the O. P. A. for its procedure. On the strength of these quotations I stated that, in my opinion, Mr. Lewis was guilty of irresponsible, biased reporting on this subject.

It has been brought to my attention more recently that the full text of Mr. Lewis' broadcasts also contained arguments in support of the O. P. A.'s procedure. In fairness to Mr. Lewis, I feel that an apology for my inadvertent mistake is due him. Although I frequently disagree with Mr. Lewis in his comments and conclusions, and think that in many instances during the past campaign his comments were slanted in favor of the Republican Party, I would not knowingly be unfair to him. I regret a lack of the full text of Mr. Lewis' broadcasts on this subject caused me to err in my evaluation of the fairness of his comments.

Unconditional Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Unconditional Victory," which I think should be considered by every citizen in this Nation. It follows:

UNCONDITIONAL VICTORY

To speak of conditional surrender is to speak of something that is no surrender at all. It is an acknowledgment of stalemate, of mutual defeat, of a situation in which neither warring power can achieve a decisive victory. Senator BURTON K. WHEELER may not have intended such an acknowledgment when he broadcast his attack against the Allied unconditional-surrender policy toward Germany. He has since denied that he ever advocated a negotiated peace. But there can be little doubt as to the accuracy of Secretary Stettinius' assertion that the Senator's remarks "will be understood in Germany and in Japan as meaning that if these countries can resist long enough and can kill enough American soldiers, the will of the American people to achieve a complete victory will be broken and a negotiated peace can be secured."

Senator WHEELER announced his own peace terms for Germany, and we doubt that they will promote the conditional surrender he seeks. He insists, for example, that the German people "should get rid of Hitler, Goebbels, and Himmler." But this is bound to be altogether unsatisfactory to these worthies who hold absolute dominion over Germany and will expend its last resources to protect themselves from punishment. We could have peace even more quickly on still less exacting terms. Such a peace would mean, however, that American lives would have been not only lost but utterly wasted. And the American wives and mothers for whom the Senator presumes to speak would be called upon to sacrifice still another generation of their husbands and sons to resist aggression in the future.

Unconditional surrender carries with it no implication of enslavement. We take it to mean simply what Prime Minister Churchill said it means, "No bargaining with the enemy." The term is employed today in the sense that it was employed by General Grant when he was asked for an armistice by General Buckner at Fort Donelson: "No terms except an unconditional and immediate surrender can be accepted." General Buckner thereupon surrendered unconditionally, because he was unconditionally defeated. Just such a surrender must be wrested from the Germans because just such a defeat must be inflicted upon them if we are to be secure against another attempt at conquest by them.

Senator WHEELER might profitably read the account, in Marshal Foch's own words—recorded by his aide de camp, Maj. Charles Bugnet, in the volume, Foch Speaks—of the marshal's interview with the German emissaries seeking an armistice at Rethondes on November 8, 1918:

I asked them: "Who are you?" They gave their names. "Have you any papers? We must examine them." Then I asked them: "What do you want?"

"We wish to know your proposals."

"I have no proposals to make."

"We would like to know upon what conditions an armistice would be granted."

"I have no conditions to give you."

Erzberger wished to read me a paper—President Wilson's note—but I stopped him. "Do you wish to ask for an armistice? If so, say so."

"We ask for an armistice."

"Good."

It is, to be sure, fundamental to the policy of unconditional surrender that the Allied governments should know what terms to impose upon the Germans when the surrender comes. And it is here that a vacuum of policy appears to exist. If we do not come to an understanding with our allies as to the kind of situation we intend to promote in Germany when the Germans have laid down their arms, we shall lose the opportunity to capitalize our victory. Unconditional surrender is merely the prerequisite of this opportunity. It is at once an expression of the moral indignation of mankind and an essential condition for the re-creation of an orderly world. It is neither brutal, as Senator WHEELER called it, nor unreasonable nor unjust. Indeed, it would establish the only condition under which we could afford to deal generously with the Germans.

Letter From Mrs. Annie B. Nicholson, Oakland, Calif., 90 Years of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including a letter from Mrs. Annie B. Nicholson, of Oakland, Calif., my congressional district. Mrs. Nicholson is 90 years of age, and the reason I am inserting her letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is that during my 12 years in Congress, having received thousands of letters, I deem this letter of Mrs. Nicholson's one of the best written, clearly expressed, without an error in the spelling, and an intelligent letter. It is one of the best I have ever received during my tenure in office.

I think it is very salutary for us to consider the valuable experiences and suggestions contained therein, for it gives us an insight into the views of the other people who made this great country. They have never lost interest in it, and, God bless their souls, we owe them an everlasting debt of gratitude.

Her letter is a strong argument that we cannot afford to be penurious or overlook the welfare of these great Americans. Never in the history of the world has any child lived to see the day that he regretted taking care of his father and mother and neither will any nation go into decay by taking adequate care of the aged and by providing adequate old-age pensions. I am proud of this letter and proud to have it spread on the RECORD of the House of Representatives of the United States so that it will endure forever:

OAKLAND, CALIF., *January 8, 1945.*

Congressman TOLAN, of California,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am an old lady, my name is Annie Brown Nicholson; I came from Indianapolis, Ind. I am now 90 years old. All my people having passed away, I came here to be with my niece, who was a widow, and the only one left of my family.

I am now going to talk to you, not verbally but by pen and ink, in behalf of the old people and myself.

I see in the paper and hear over the radio that the taxpayers are very much aroused over the President asking for a raise to 2 percent on the Social Security Act.

I wonder if this generation ever stops to think who built this Nation, and paved the way for a better world. Now, they are reaping the benefits of our hard labor. We are weakened from all the hardship, tears, pain, and sorrow we have had to bear. Having very little schooling, the rule of three being as far as we could go, those living in town had a better time than we in the rural district.

Edison invented the electric light that you see by today. He worked for years on it; he did not sit around wasting his time.

Elwood Haynes was a dear neighbor of mine; he was a fine man. He invented the automobile that you all ride around in.

The young people now have a chance to improve and finish our work.

I have lived to see the fruit of our labor.

In 1861 President Lincoln called for men to defend this Nation; my father, with hundreds of other men, flew to the colors. I was about 7 years old when he left for the battlefields of the South; he joined the cavalry. He had a fine horse, and carried dispatches from one general to another. He fought under General Burnside. My father loved the Stars and Stripes, and laid down his life for this Nation.

My mother was left with two little girls and a baby boy; life was one battle after another, with no help from the Government.

I am now old and feeble, and the niece that I came to live with passed away 2 years ago.

After I was here 5 years, President Roosevelt passed the Security Act, and gave me a pension of $35; the first dollar I had ever had from the Government.

At that time I noticed an article in the Oakland Tribune by a Mr. Dwyer, who made a speech to a class of college students, that any old person who asked help from the Government should be exterminated, and the money taken to build playgrounds for children to play on. It struck me like forked lightning. I said, "Oh, God, is that what our colleges are teaching?" No one, except a rabbi answered him, and said it would cause a revolution. His speech was a disgrace to every star and stripe in the flag.

Our great and grand President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, stands as a monument to a cause so grand in its scope, so glorious in its certain ultimate issue, as a security act. His name will go down in history as the greatest humanitarian that ever lived in the White House. His heart is with the poor and needy, and helps to uplift humanity. He stands for the man who carries the bucket, and pays the big house rent.

I hope and trust that you will read this, as I stamped the ballot three times for you. In God I trust.

Sincerely,

ANNIE B. NICHOLSON.

P. S.—You may let any Congressman read this who cares to, so that they may know how the old people feel on this subject.

International Trade Agreements and Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gilbert H. Montague, of the New York bar, before the Connecticut Valley branch of the Foreign Policy Association in Springfield, Mass., on December 2, 1944:

The United States is now feeling its way toward an American national policy regarding international trade agreements and cartels.

After World War I American businessmen thought they knew what that policy was.

Broadly, that policy seems to be this: That the philosophy of free and unrestrained competition governing our domestic economy and expressed in our antitrust laws stops at the water's edge; that international trade should follow the old adage that when we are in Rome we should do as the Romans do; that accordingly our nationals in foreign trade should meet foreign cartels and foreign competitors with the foreigners' own style of foreign trade customs, arrangements, and competition; provided always that nothing be done by our nationals abroad that would so react upon the American domestic economy as to impair within our own borders the continued operation of our antitrust law philosophy of free and unrestrained competition.

To American businessmen after World War I this policy appeared to be plain and simple.

It was expressed in the Federal Trade Commission's report in 1916 on cooperation in foreign trade, and was reiterated by President Wilson in several messages to Congress, and it was the policy on which President Wilson and Congress acted in 1918, when Congress enacted upon President Wilson's insistence the Webb-Pomerene Export Trade Act of 1918.

Quite a different prospect, however, confronts American businessmen now facing the post-war world after World War II.

Webb-Pomerene associations that for years have been reporting to the Federal Trade Commission are now being drastically investigated by the Commission and the Attorney General's Antitrust Division.

One of the oldest of these associations is today being prosecuted by the Attorney General on the charge of restraining and monopolizing foreign and domestic trade of United States in violation of the antitrust laws.

On similar charges dozens of indictments and injunction suits have recently been filed by the Attorney General against a number of the largest and best regarded corporations and businessmen in the United States and Great Britain.

Since 1938 the Supreme Court has been narrowing its interpretation of the patent laws, and stretching its interpretation of what the antitrust laws forbid, so that today there is legal doubt about limitations and conditions in patent agreements which before 1938 rested securely on Supreme Court decisions in which had concurred such precursors and stalwarts of the New Deal as Justice Holmes, Justice Brandeis, and Justice (now Chief Justice) Stone.

In many of these criminal indictments and injunction suits recently filed against American and British corporations and businessmen, the Attorney General is attacking international trade agreements which at the time they were made rested upon Supreme Court decisions whose authority was unquestioned before 1938.

Antitrust laws are in a real sense ex post facto laws.

Defendants in these cases are judged, not by the law as it was judicially interpreted at the time they were doing their acts, but by later judicial interpretations of the law current at the time of the trial and in many instances laid down by the Supreme Court and other Federal courts long after their acts were done.

This has always been characteristic of antitrust cases and is greatly intensified when, as now, the Supreme Court and other Federal courts are repeatedly expanding the interpretation of the law and bringing within its penalties a rapidly expanding area of transactions.

In wartime, all these characteristics are accentuated.

Agreements that were normal and highly beneficial to this country when entered into years ago between our nationals and nationals of other countries then at peace with this country can years later be unfairly distorted so as to appear sinister or even unpatriotic after war has broken out between this and other countries.

In the heated politics of wartime the temptations to this distortion are well-nigh irresistible.

Foreign trade that in no way involves patent agreements is also engaging the attention of the Attorney General.

A typical foreign-trade pattern is this:

An American national gets a foothold in a foreign country and its success attracts competition in that country from other American nationals, and from nationals of that country and from nationals of other foreign countries.

American nationals continue competing in that foreign country with one another, and with nationals of that country, and with nationals of other foreign countries, until the nationals of that country, or the government of that country, or both, become restive and critical of the extent to which American nationals are winning the market in that country.

Thereupon the nationals of that country, or their government, or both, intimate to these American nationals that unless they consent to an arrangement restricting their proportion of the market in that country, or limiting their competition in that country with one another and with nationals of that country and with nationals of other foreign countries, the government may enact a tariff, or impose import quotas, or establish a government monopoly, or take other measures to prevent American nationals from continuing the business they have built up in that country.

On other continents outside North America, arrangements for limiting competition, pooling profits, and allocating or dividing markets are customary, lawful, and encouraged by governments, and by public opinion, and by generations of judicial decisions and trade custom.

Arrangements analogous to these have repeatedly been upheld by judicial decisions of the House of Lords and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which are the highest courts of Great Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Not as a complaint against our Supreme Court and our antitrust laws, but as a plain statement of fact, it is axiomatic that American nationals doing business abroad must frequently condition themselves to customs and pressures of foreign governments, foreign-public opinion, and foreign competitors, compelling arrangements which, if made and operative within the United States, might be contrary to recent decisions of our Supreme Court and other Federal courts.

Viewing this scene, Milo Perkins, formerly Vice President WALLACE's chief aide and Executive Director of the erstwhile Board of Economic Warfare, declares in the November 1944 Harpers Monthly in italicized language that "pressure of circumstances will tend to make us accept cartels, because other nations accept them."

"Our opposition to them is really a half-hearted opposition, says Mr. Perkins. "We Americans preach free competition, but we don't really practice what we preach."

Without mentioning Vice President WALLACE or Vice President WALLACE'S anticartel speeches, Mr. Perkins continues:

"Our support of it (i. e. free competition) is stronger in our speeches than in our action," says Mr. Perkins, "We love to tell each other with a good deal of righteousness that free competition is the 'American way.' But in the market place there's a wide gap between our oratory and our actions."

The elder J. P. Morgan once remarked, "Never sell America short."

Can it be that Mr. Perkins is now "selling short" the true viewpoint of American businessmen regarding cartels?

American antitrust laws are peculiar in this respect, that nobody seems to like them, and nobody enjoys having to comply with them, but everyone seems to want to have them observed by everyone with whom he deals or competes.

Occasionally some pressure group, like labor or the farmers, is politically strong enough to get a special exemption from the antitrust laws.

With these minor exceptions, the antitrust laws after 50 years now seem to be so tenaciously rooted in the American way of life that they appear to be practically irrepealable and almost unamendable.

Nine-tenths of American business is domestic, and therefore has long been obliged by law to comply with the philosophy of free and unrestrained competition expressed in the American antitrust laws.

Partly because American businessmen have so long been enured to these laws, and partly because the achievement of American business in all-out war production has been so astounding, many American businessmen now seem to be confident that they can prosper wherever this American antitrust law philosophy prevails, whether at home or abroad.

Highly significant is the recent episode of the British-American Petroleum Agreement signed in Washington on August 8, 1944.

For more than a year the preparation and negotiation of this agreement occupied officials of the British Government, the British Embassy, the British Treasury, and the British Oil Board, and officials of the United States Department of State, the Petroleum Administration for War, the Foreign Economic Administration, and the War and Navy Departments.

Executives of British petroleum companies participated in these negotiations, but no executive of any American petroleum company was a participant.

When this agreement was finally announced, it was stated that it was negotiated for Great Britain by Lord Beaverbrook and several other high officials of the British Government, the British Embassy, the British Treasury, and the British Oil Board, and that it was negotiated for the United States by Secretary of State Hull, Petroleum Administrator for War Ickes, Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, Under Secretary of War Patterson, and Foreign Economic Administrator Crowley, and several other high officials of the Petroleum Administration for War and the State Department.

These illustrious names, British and American, are a guaranty that nothing but the public interest could have been considered in preparing, negotiating, and executing this British-American Petroleum Agreement.

In this confidence President Roosevelt on August 24, 1944, submitted this agreement to the Senate, where it is now awaiting consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Special Committee on Petroleum.

Dealing with a natural resource that is exhaustible and absolutely necessary to the national defense and the national economy of all nations it would be hard to imagine a better subject on which to arrive at an intergovernmental agreement that at any rate would be free from objections from the standpoint of public interest.

Nevertheless it now seems likely that this agreement may not be pressed in its present form before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or the Senate Special Committee on Petroleum, and that it may be changed in order to meet objections from the standpoint of public interest.

These objections, all of which relate to the public interest, have not been raised, be it noted, by professional watchdogs of the public interest who so often accuse businessmen of plotting monopolistic cartels, but have been raised by businessmen in the American petroleum industry itself.

If these objections are met, the British-American Petroleum Agreement may have to be clarified and changed in a number of respects.

It may have to make clear that it is not a petroleum cartel, with production and sales quotas following the lines of many so-called intergovernmental commodity agreements.

It may also have to make clear that it is not an instrument by which our Government may gain control over the domestic industry or the foreign operations of our nationals.

It may also have to make clear that it is not an instrument of force or compulsion, but is only an administration that will proceed upon a consultative and advisory basis, arriving at its recommendations upon findings of the highest technical proficiency, which recommendations shall be open to voluntary acceptance by operating units, with no restrictions imposed upon our nationals when complying with such recommendations.

Finally, it may have to make clear that government and industry will both be represented in such administration, since both are joint parties in interest.

In the International Business Conference at Rye, N. Y., in November 1944, businessmen from 52 nations listened to the cartel presentation by delegations from Great Britain and other nations, and then adopted a recommendation that is far more guarded than Mr. Perkins' conclusions:

"We therefore strongly recommend," says this recommendation, "that the governments concerned, in association with their respective business interests, should immediately take steps continuously to study and consult together on the various issues raised, and in particular to consider the effect of such agreements in relation to employment, standards of living, industrial development, prices and volume and flow of trade. Further, it is vital to economic cooperation between nations that they reconcile their views and practices in regard to these agreements over as wide an area as possible and establish rules and standards to govern such agreements in international trade."

Writing to Secretary Hull on September 8, 1944, President Roosevelt contrasted the American and foreign viewpoints on cartels:

"During the past half century," said President Roosevelt, "the United States has developed a tradition in opposition to private monopolies. The Sherman and Clayton Acts have become as much a part of the American way of life as the due-process clause of the Constitution. By protecting the consumer against monopoly these statutes guarantee him the benefits of competition."

"This policy," continued President Roosevelt, "goes hand in glove with the liberal principles of international trade for which you have stood through many years of public service. The trade-agreement program has as its objective the elimination of barriers to the free flow of trade in international commerce; the antitrust statutes aim at the elimination of monopolistic restraints of trade in interstate and foreign commerce.

Reviewing the cartel situation abroad, President Roosevelt stated:

"Unfortunately, a number of foreign countries, particularly in continental Europe, do not possess such a tradition against cartels. On the contrary, cartels have received encouragement from some of these governments. Especially is this true with respect to Germany. Moreover, cartels were utilized by the Nazis as governmental instrumentalities to achieve political ends. The history of the use of the I. G. Farben Trust by the Nazis reads like a detective story. The defeat of the Nazi armies will have to be followed by the eradication of these weapons of economic warfare. But more than the elimination of the political activities of German cartels will be required. Cartel practices which restrict the free flow of goods in foreign commerce will have to be curbed. With international trade involved, this end can be achieved only through collaborative action by the United Nations."

In conclusion President Roosevelt adjured Secretary Hull:

"I hope that you will keep your eye on this whole subject of international cartels because we are approaching the time when discussions will almost certainly arise between us and other nations."

In the same key, President Roosevelt wrote to Foreign Economic Administrator Crowley on September 29, 1944.

In November 1944 it was reported that the Interdepartmental Executive Committee on Foreign Economic Policy, headed by Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson, had completed 3 years' work on cartels, and was recommending that the United States take a firm stand against "restrictive" international agreements of all kinds, except for purposes of national defense, or to conserve scarce and vital commodities, or in cases involving public health and morals, such as narcotics, or in cases of acute crisis.

After all these developments, it is hardly surprising that Assistant Secretary of State Berle and the American delegation in the International Civil Aviation Conference in Chicago in November 1944 resisted so strenuously the British proposals for a post-war cartel of international aviation.

All this shows that today there is immediate and pressing need for a conference of representatives of this and other nations which will consider all phases of this subject upon a consultative and advisory basis.

Secretary Stettinius is now planning such a conference.

Such a conference, but on a permanent and continuously functioning basis, is now being urged by many important organizations and publicists.

In such a conference there can be debated, with particular application to specific problems of international foreign trade, the philosophy of free and unrestrained competition expressed in the American antitrust laws and the rival philosophies of Great Britain and other nations.

Perhaps we can convert Great Britain and other foreign nations in such a conference to accept some of our philosophy with respect to some specific problems of international trade in which we claim a special interest.

Perhaps, however, Great Britain and other foreign nations can convince us in such a conference that in our larger political and economic interest in the international and foreign field we can approve in respect of some specific problems some modification of our antitrust law policy of free and unrestrained competition without serious sacrifice to our economy.

When the recommendations hammered out on the anvil of such a conference come up for debate before the American public, it may happen, more frequently than some think, that American businessmen, as in the case of the British-American Petroleum Agreement, may line up in that debate on the side of the American antitrust law philosophy of free and unrestrained competition.

Only the President and Congress can decide what our national policy shall be regarding international agreements and cartels.

In this decision they need all the help they can get, for on it may depend the success or failure of the whole post-war world.

Another decision, even more momentous, confronted another President and another Congress in a dark hour of our Civil War.

President Lincoln's words to Congress on that occasion may well be repeated now:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. We, even we here, hold the power and bear the responsibility. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

Magazine and Book Attacks on Boston Should Be Taken as Tribute to This City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following article by John Griffin which appeared in the Boston, Mass., Sunday Post January 14, 1945:

MAGAZINE AND BOOK ATTACKS ON BOSTON SHOULD BE TAKEN AS TRIBUTE TO THIS CITY—CERTAIN GROUPS OF SO-CALLED LITERATI USUALLY MANAGE TO PRESENT FALSE PICTURE TO SUPPORT THEIR OWN PHONY NOTIONS

(By John Griffin)

Instead of getting angry at the most recent attack on Boston in a national magazine, the people of Boston ought to feel flattered. You don't bother attacking someone or something you consider unimportant, so it must be that Boston has something which arouses envy in certain publicists in other parts of the country, particularly New York.

The campaign against Boston has recently been stepped up to a new high. Previously the attacks were confined to a group of publicists who have access to the magazines of national circulation, to syndicated columns, and to the big New York newspapers.

Now even the Associated Press has joined in. The other day that news agency sent out a story telling about the popularity among servicemen of two novels which had been withdrawn from sale by Boston book sellers. The Associated Press made much of the fact that these novels had been taken off the shelves in Boston, yet seemed to make a great hit with the servicemen.

SAME OLD CROWD

Actually, of course, the reason so many servicemen read them is that they were on a list selected by a committee and were, therefore, sent out to servicemen. The committee was composed of the members of the same group which have been trying to ridicule Boston for some time.

The latest belittling effort is the layout of picture and text in the current issue of Life magazine. Life and Time are put out by the same outfit, which is presided over by Mr. Henry Luce, husband of Representative CLARE LUCE and known to those in the organization as Il Luce.

Both Time and Life are two of the smuggest publications that have ever seen daylight. Both apparently are operated on the theory that when they have spoken, all others should be silent for they are giving the last word on every subject.

They do manage to infuriate people on that account, but in this case it looks as if Life has become infuriated by Boston. For it has resorted to cheap, scurrilous action in order to cast ridicule on Boston.

It presents pictures, for instance, of slum areas. Of course, there aren't any such sections in New York, or Chicago, or Baltimore, or other American cities. Of course, such pictures are typical of Boston and no other city.

PHONY PHOTOGRAPHS

It presents a posed photograph of three youngsters who were asked to pose looking tough, and the caption calls them tough Irish kids. Of course, they aren't tough Irish kids at all. They are American kids, and if the war lasts a few years longer they will probably be fighting in the service of America.

It presents South Boston as a whole slum of the worst sort, and says nothing at all about the honest, hard-working citizens who comprise the majority of the residents of that district, people who do an honest day's work, live modestly, raise their children to become outstanding men and women, and, one more thing, walk and act like God-fearing men and women.

It tells about "bleak little alleys" of South Boston "where children play in the street or not at all." Perhaps the editors of Life would benefit by a visit to South Boston, and they might see the municipal beaches which are the envy of other cities of this and other countries.

The retort that Life's editors would undoubtedly make to criticism is that such scenes as they pictured do exist in South Boston. That is the half-truth which is usually resorted to by those who don't want to be completely honest but still want to be able to offer some justification for their actions.

For, although there are "bleak little alleys," there are also broad boulevards; although there are some tough kids there, they are not the majority of South Boston kids; although there are thousands of people of Irish descent in South Boston, they don't rate the slurring title of "lace-curtain Irish."

That's like the old vaudeville gags that went out years ago. Life doesn't have to be patronizing to the people of Irish descent, and those of any other blood. Especially in wartime, for it is doubtful if any area in the whole United States can show a better record of war service than the Irish kids of South Boston.

WHAT'S THE STORY?

Well, what is the story of the campaign against Boston, and where does it come from? Everybody knows where it comes from. As mentioned above, the group of New Yorkers, who dictate the literary tastes of most of the United States through their access to the source of national publications, promote the campaign.

Everything that is New York is wonderful; everything Boston is benighted and backward.

Supposing someone set out to depict New York in the same manner that Life presents Boston to the world. Certainly a false picture would be given.

ONE VIEW OF IT

New York could be presented, in that technique, as the city where the antics of drunks in night clubs are considered of such importance that they fill the front pages of the newspapers and are sent out in print and on the air by peek-hole columnists.

It would be set forth as the place where a great public issue is made over whether or not a play about perverts should be staged for the public.

It could be shown as the home of thousands of phonies, of gyps and crooks who would stoop to anything to get hold of a dollar.

But it wouldn't be New York, because New York is also the place where great businessmen, great professional men, and great scientists live and work. It is the place where great artists work. It has millions of people who never see the inside of a night club or a Broadway theater, either.

Well, perhaps it pays the politicians to get mad and issue angry statements calling for the suppression of magazines like Life. But Boston shouldn't really get too upset about it. They wouldn't all be shooting at Boston unless it represented largely what New York is not. On such a basis, Bostonians are probably content to let it go at that.

Churches, Hospitals, and Charitable Organizations Would Be Adversely Affected in Their Activities by Passage of Proposed Twenty-second Amendment—Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen High Official Castigates Subversive Forces of Gannett-Pettengill Committee on Constitutional Government Attempting To Put Over Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that the passage of the proposed twenty-second amendment to the Constitution which is being so vigorously advocated by the Gannett-Pettengill Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., will work an irreparable hardship upon charitable organizations.

If this amendment should be adopted, it would mean that the Federal Government would not only lack funds with which to pay veterans and their dependents, to pay old-age assistance requirements and soil conservation payments to farmers, but the Government could no longer afford to grant tax exemptions to persons on that portion of their incomes they now devote to charitable purposes.

The churches, many of our great hospitals, and many of our great charitable institutions which are impartially dedicated to the public weal rely for the most part upon substantial donations which are liberally made because they are now exempt from Federal taxation under our present tax laws.

As the Division of the Tax Research of the Treasury Department has so accurately pointed out in its careful analysis of the effects of this proposed amendment, the Government would not only be short of sufficient funds with which to meet normal revenue needs if this amendment should pass, but also practically all exemptions now granted to taxpayers who contribute to worthy charitable causes would have to be revoked.

When I first commenced my study of the possible effects of this insidious program, I was more concerned with the possible depletion of Federal funds which we all agree should be applied to necessary social security measures long since approved by the Congress. It did not occur to me that the amendment might also wreak havoc in the field of social service which is handled by our great private charitable and religious institutions. A reexamination of the maximum amount of revenue which would be collectible from taxpayers if the amendment should be adopted convinces me that the Government simply could not function in its normal administrative programs without the adoption of legislation which would revoke these tax exemption benefits now adhering to contributions to charitable and religious organizations.

To me, this is the last straw. The selfishness, the lack of consideration for anyone but themselves and their already fat purses, on the part of the sponsors of this vicious amendment is almost beyond human comprehension. To realize that they have already succeeded in foisting their ideas successfully upon the legislature of 16 sovereign States, shows only too clearly the amount of underhanded tactics and misrepresentation these men and their paid agents must have employed to have gone this far toward accomplishing their ends.

In my fight against this measure, it gives me great encouragement to know that some of the great labor organizations are fighting shoulder to shoulder with me in this fight.

President A. F. Whitney of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen was the first great labor leader to my knowledge to call attention to this dangerous measure. The official publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen has published several statements by President Whitney in opposition to this amendment.

In a letter to all State legislative representatives of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, dated November 24, this alert and far-sighted official once again urged his men to be ready for the effort that would be made by the Gannett crowd to put this matter through additional State legislatures in 1945, commencing in January of this year. In discussing this vital work, Mr. Whitney said to his State legislative officers, "begin now to fight the subversive forces that are attempting to put over this proposal. If your State has already enacted this resolution, you should at once have a repealer introduced."

The full text of Mr. Whitney's instructions to his men is worth quoting. It reads as follows:

To All State Legislative Representatives, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

DEAR SIRS AND BROTHERS: You will recall that in the past we have had a considerable amount of correspondence regarding a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution, a twenty-second amendment, by which a ceiling of 25 percent would be placed on all income, estate, and gift taxes. I am in receipt of a letter dated November 17 from our good friend Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, in which he says the following:

"By the way, I hope you continue to be active in the campaign against the adoption of the so-called twenty-second amendment. The people who sponsor it do not have the nerve, or gall, or the courage, whatever you want to call it, to come right out and be opposed to World War veterans receiving pay for their war injuries or to the granting of assistance to aged, but they are willing to sneak in the back door with an amendment to the Constitution which, if adopted, will make it impossible for the Government to raise more than enough money to service the national debt and to pay skimpy operating expenses.

"The following States will be asked in the early part of 1945 to adopt this so-called twenty-second amendment: Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia."

There probably never was a legislative proposal that more seriously threatened a complete break-down of our Federal Government than this vicious proposal. Its proponents are working in the most deceitful and underhanded manner, and they have been able to persuade the legislatures of some 15 States to memoralize Congress to call a Constitutional convention for the purpose of adopting this amendment. Their work has been so underhanded that very few people have known about it until it had passed the State legislatures and we have many statements in our files indicating that State senators and State representatives in those States which passed the resolution were amazed to discover that it had been enacted at the very time that they sat in the legislatures of their States.

This is a vitally important matter. Begin now to fight the subversive forces that are attempting to put over this proposal. If your State has already enacted this resolution, you should at once have a repealer introduced. Please keep this office advised and leave nothing undone in your fight to defeat the sinister forces that would place this amendment in the Constitution of the United States.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,
A. F. WHITNEY,
President.

Quentin Reynolds on the Home Front, on the War Front, and on Elected Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Quentin Reynolds is one of the outstanding war correspondents. I doubt that any war correspondent has been under fire in this war more than he. He is not only an outstanding war correspondent, but he is a fine example of a loyal, true, patriotic, intelligent American.

I am inserting herewith a part of the last chapter of his book The Curtain Rises, which is as follows:

I've been home for a month now and for the first time in 7 months I'm completely bewildered. It was a shock to pick up the papers and read columns of criticism of our war effort. Everything I saw in the war zone led me to believe that our matériel was the best in the world; that a military miracle had been achieved in the rapid training of our troops; that our war effort was being handled with a minimum of red tape, lost effort, and inefficiency. I knew that neither General Marshall nor General Eisenhower could wave magic wands and have the ships arrive in the Mediterranean right on time, loaded with just what we needed for combat. I felt that somebody back home must be doing a wonderful job of organization and administration to effect this result. I knew that when an American soldier set foot on an enemy beach he had the best equipment possible. He had everything that human ingenuity could give

him to protect himself and to minimize his danger. He even had two ampoules of morphine and a package of sulfa powder in his pocket. His emergency rations were the best ever devised, and they even included something which, to the G. I., is more important than food—cigarettes and matches. Somebody back home must have been responsible for all this. The Army couldn't do it alone. Yet, from the papers, one would think that Washington was a madhouse inhabited by certified lunatics, crooks, or shady politicians. It was disheartening, because when you're first home you're so filled with pride at the great job America has done and is doing that you feel like waving a flag. You get so impatient with the snide, petty criticism of our leaders that you end up by diving into the sports pages. You read the most senseless, absurd speeches by some of our duly elected Members of Congress, and you shudder and wonder why they don't inform themselves about conditions before they spout at great length and always within the framework of their preconceived political convictions. When you return you are laboring under the apparently absurd delusion that we are at war with Japan and Germany. Reading some newspapers, you might be pardoned for thinking that we are at war with Britain and with the President of the United States.

Article by Rev. Paul C. O'Connor, S. J., of Kotzebue, Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, all Alaskans recognize and pay tribute to the splendid work being done in the Territory by the Catholic missions. Without thought of self, facing many hardships without complaint, the small but devoted group of priests and nuns who staff these missions have earned an abiding place in the hearts of Alaskans regardless of religious beliefs.

One of the best known of these priests is the Reverend Paul C. O'Connor, of Kotzebue. For the Alaska Catholic, published at Juneau by my good friend, A. B. Cain, Father O'Connor recently wrote an article about aviation in the Arctic and life in the Arctic which will be of widespread interest. The article follows:

I would like to invite you to spend a Christmas with me up here in the Arctic. This invitation is no longer fantastic. Planes wing their way up here almost daily. Jump into an Army transport at Minneapolis. It will land you in Fairbanks with only one or two intervening stops in about 10 hours. From Fairbanks to Kotzebue grab some commercial plane and you will be with me in something like 8 hours. Of course, once you go beyond Fairbanks you are at the mercy of the elements. You will need all the fur accessories that belong to the Arctic. Outside shoes, no matter how warm, must be discarded for mukluks or moose moccasins. One good Army major shod in regulation galoshes landed here with frozen feet.

The trip over Canada is merely routine; the plane has been in constant ground communication; there are good emergency fields everywhere. You fly high and comfortable. At Fairbanks you are amazed to find a city modern to the smallest details, where even though the weather be 30 or 40 below, heated and luxurious taxis pick you up at the airport and whisk you to a hotel with all the conveniences of life. The city itself is ablaze with light and has everything from a daily paper to an air-conditioned theater. Expenses are high, but luxury in the far North cannot be otherwise than costly.

ALASKAN PILOTS ARE EXPERTS

From now on you are on your own. Commercial planes are efficient but cold. The pilots, though, are the best in the world. The Army has come to respect our Arctic flyers, and with reason. Most of them are big fellows—thoroughly familiar with the freaks of weather and the country, generally dressed in a grease-streaked sealskin jacket and pants, not much to look at but warm just the same. Big roomy mukluks will cover their feet. When you come to the plane you will find them carrying out their oil which has been previously warmed in the hangar. A mechanic will have a warming pot hidden under the folds of a long canvas heating up the engine. The frost on the wings will unceremoniously be whipped off with a rope. It is early morning, still dark. You are timorous and reasonably so. No telling where you will land once the plane lifts from the ground. Bad weather may cause the pilot to go 300 miles out of his way and then he will stop at some village indefinite miles from nowhere. Still the pilot has carefully tabulated the weather all over the Arctic. He knows just what he is doing. You will reach your destination sometime, somehow. Time means nothing up here. A 2 weeks' lay-over in some tiny Arctic village is not a bit unusual in stormy weather.

MAGNIFICENT SCENERY IMPRESSES

You look around for other passengers. There are none. The plane, though, is loaded with all kinds of packages—all emergency stuff—medicine for some sick Eskimo, or a spark plug for some distant C. A. A. station. All available space is taken. You can hardly wedge yourself in by the pilot. He gives you a good-natured grin. The engine whirls to life. The frost on the windows is brushed off by the impact of the wind from the propeller. The pilot suddenly lifts up the tail of the plane and jars and skiis loose from the snow, and before you know it the skiis are skimming over the smooth snow of the runway. You slip into the cool air and push up into the skies. Off to the left high mountains arise. Mount McKinley, the highest peak in North America, glistens in the morning sun, and Fairbanks is left behind.

To rise gradually up from the gloom of earth and meet the rising sun as it unfolds its splendors behind steep mountain ranges is a sight whose beauty will linger in your mind long after the trip. You notice that the pilot for the most part follows the path of rivers, skirting the mountains and seldom beyond landing distance on the Tanana, Yukon, or Koyukuk Rivers. Arctic pilots are cagey. They have been forced down too often to take unnecessary chances in isolated mountain recesses.

Beyond the broad frozen ribbon of the Yukon there is a distinct change in the air. Mountains rise higher, the plane gets jumpy, and off toward the west a huge fog bank appears. It is the steam from the still open waters of the Arctic Ocean. Far up in the interior of Alaska there is no sign of villages, or any human habitation below. The sun is no longer seen. Yet, the pilot nonchalantly pushes on and on.

ONLY 45 BELOW

Finally, a tall mountain ridge is crossed with the plane jumping at crazy angles. The pilot opens his window to get a better view. As he turns you see a lake below. Down you go until the plane bounces to a landing, and staggers to a halt. The pilot grins again. A dog team shoots through the bushes. Two sturdy Eskimos jump off and grab your sleeping bag and grip, and with no more ado, you climb on the sled, Arctic taxi. What a contrast between a roaring motor in the skies and these soft-footed dashing malemutes—yet how comforting withal. In the twinkling of an eye you are brought up to a snug little trader's dwelling, all by itself, 10 miles from the nearest village.

Your host, a gray-haired man, has his room furnished with three radios which keep him well informed and up to the minute on the progress of the war. You sit down to a steaming reindeer stew that was already prepared for you. The pilot and trader are old friends. Everything was prearranged. The trader knew that the plane was coming, also that Kotzebue was shut off by a bank of fog. Radio had done it all. You inquire about the temperature. "Only 45 below" is spoken as if it were the ordinary thing.

Sleep comes without effort and you dream of endless mountain vistas covered with everlasting snow. The smell of bacon and eggs awakens you in the morning but the pilot has long since been up and warmed and serviced his plane. He has his motor idling when you round the bend in the dogsled. Up you are again with all the casualness in the world. The plane takes a good beating as it is flung back and forth by variable air currents rushing out from innumerable mountain passes. At last you leave the mountains and cross the Kobuk Lake. Dog-team trails are now discernible. The pilot points to a black streak in the distance. It is Kotzebue, the geographical center of some seven villages and the hub of the Arctic.

AIRPLANE ARRIVAL BIG EVENT

As you step from the plane you are surprised at the number of people that have popped up from nowhere to check on the new arrival. In less than an hour every soul of our 400 will know who you are, what your business is, and how long you are going to stay in the village. You may be a little dazed by the exuberant welcome. Well, remember that it is sometimes years before I see a friend from the States.

You are amazed at the coziness of my little igloo (really it is more than that). Your amazement increases when I usher you into my little church. A beautiful crib, an altar loaded down with flowers, gay streamers and tinsel floating in the air hide a little shabbiness here and there. But wait! At the stroke of midnight the church is crowded to the brim. Even shy Quakers have come and stand curiously in the rear. You hear the Latin prayers spoken loud and clear by almost half of the congregation. An Eskimo organist plays the Mass of St. Basil while every man and woman and child takes part in the singing. This is the only mass celebrated in the entire Alaskan Arctic, but it is celebrated as it should be, with priest and people combined in words, song, and act. Your one and only conclusion is that the Infant Saviour really means something to the Eskimo. You are right—the Arctic loses its gloom and its chill in the warm glow of Christ's coming on Christmas Day no matter how cold the day.

National Service Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Milwaukee Journal of January 12, 1945:

NEED A NATIONAL SERVICE LAW

For nearly 2 years the War and Navy Departments and those nonmilitary leaders in the war effort who have faced the manpower question frankly have been trying to get Congress to pass a National War Service Act. They have gotten nowhere.

Again, the need for such an act is being explained by the Secretary and Under Secretary of War, the Under Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and the Acting Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. They are trying to convince the House Military Affairs Committee that such a law is necessary now.

The delay in passing such legislation is a sign that Congress and the American people have been unwilling to face the unpleasant facts of this war, although there is reason to believe that public opinion has been far more favorable to a national service law than Congress has been.

All other great nations in this war, friend or foe, have found national service legislation necessary. Basically, such a law means that a legal obligation is created by which every person is liable to serve his country in the way that he can be of most use. The millions in the armed forces are doing their part, and more. And most of them have had no choice. Industry, also by law, has no choice as to whether it will serve in the war effort.

But the rest of us have had the choice of going merrily along, helping to the full with the prosecution of the war or doing less than our share, as we happened to choose. How can such a system be tolerated, especially in view of the sacrifices that millions of our young men and women are called upon to make?

We have met our manpower crises, so far, with threats, cajolery, and wage bribery. We have patched and improvised and stretched the Selective Service Act far beyond its intent, sometimes degrading military service by using it as a sort of threatened punishment for those who won't work.

But we have refused to adopt the obviously fair and democratic and effective approach of a national selective service act. It should not now take Congress long, if it has the moral stamina, to pass such a law. Congress does not have to start from scratch. The Austin-Wadsworth bill was painstakingly drawn and provided with safeguards against abuse. It has been before the American public and Congress for nearly 2 years. With only minor modifications in wording, it could usefully be passed now.

National service is proposed for the war only. It is to expire with the end of the war or by concurrent resolution of Congress. It would protect seniority rights of persons changing jobs and the right of workers to join, or not to join, unions.

It would be for one purpose only—to distribute the burdens of this war more evenly and help to win it sooner. National selective service is designed to shorten the war and to save lives.

Canceled Ration Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Dallas Times-Herald, December 30, 1944, carried a splendid editorial on the subject, Before Victory We Shall Have More Inconveniences. This editorial defended the action of the O. P. A. in canceling certain rationing stamps.

The significant statement was made:

With 5,000,000 of our loved ones overseas and with the certainty that thousands of them will never return, it is hardly in order for us to fret over a few canceled ration stamps.

It is as follows:

The fact that many food ration stamps which were to be valid indefinitely were nullified suddenly by the O. P. A. has vexed many consumers, who feel that they have been deceived.

However, the O. P. A. officials in Washington bow gracefully to the criticism and admit that is is not unjustified. They express regret that they found their action necessary.

The explanation is, broadly speaking, that the volume of outstanding, unused stamps was so large that cancelation was essential to protect the dwindling supply of certain items.

It is pointed out, for instance, that sugar stocks are lower than at any time since the war started, and that the number of unused canning stamps was so great as to be enough to cause a widespread shortage of the commodity in a few weeks. It seems that boats which might have been bringing sugar to this country have been used to carry supplies to our armed forces.

In view of the fact that the war situation is far more serious than we were thinking a few months ago that it would be by this time, it is not astonishing that some of the O. P. A. calculations have gone awry. Many generals and admirals have had to revise statements they made during the summer and early fall.

It is regrettable that the O. P. A. and War Food Administration cannot devise a method of collaboration to prevent misunderstandings and miscalculations. It might be possible for them to see farther ahead than they do and avoid misleading the public. But the fortunes of war are so uncertain that long-distance planning is extremely difficult. Even the military command must frequently revise its calls for supplies and equipment.

The plain truth is that we are involved in the most terrible and most far-reaching war in history and that our enemies still have millions of well-armed and well-trained troops in the field. And, furthermore, we have only begun to be fully engaged in the struggle and to feel heavy losses in manpower and equipment. American forces have only recently come into real contact with the enemy. For many months, an increasing number of dreaded telegrams will be received in American homes.

The O. P. A. assures us that this country will have food enough, and that the only problem is even distribution. This is more than can be said by the food agency of any other major nation that is involved in the war. In spite of vexations and annoyances, some of which may be due to official bungling, we should be thankful.

So far, the only Americans who have really suffered are those who have gone into naval and military service and their loved ones. With all the inconveniences of war, the average American is better off than before the conflict. When we have endured even one-fourth as much hardship as the Russians, Britons, and Chinese, we shall know more about the tragedy of war. With 5,000,000 of our loved ones overseas, and with the certainty that thousands of them will never return, it is hardly in order for us to fret over a few canceled ration stamps.

Address by Rev. Joseph V. Demers, S. M.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following address delivered by Rev. Joseph V. Demers, S. M., formerly of St. Anne's Roman Catholic Church, Lawrence, Mass., but now pastor of the Immaculate Conception Church, Westerly, R. I., to an extremely large gathering of members of the Holy Name Societies of the Catholic Churches of Greater Lawrence, consisting of the city of Lawrence, the towns of Methuen and North Andover, in attendance at the annual union service of this organization, held in St. Anne's Roman Catholic Church on Sunday afternoon, January 7, 1945. The address of Father Demers was most interesting, inspiring, and instructive, and was exceptionally well received by all in attendance. It follows:

Reverend Fathers, men of the Holy Name Society of Greater Lawrence, in the name of the pastor of this parish and in the names of your own pastors and directors, I bid you welcome to these impressive services in honor of that name at the sound of which "every knee should bow of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth." Your presence here in such large numbers, despite the stress of the times, is a sublime act of faith which is very comforting and consoling in these days when the dark clouds of hate and bitterness and unbelief hang over such a large portion of the world.

The church, the state, need more men of the caliber of the Holy Name men, men of sound Christian principles, who by their words, and still more by their deeds, exemplify the meaning of Catholic action and strive to bring about a reign of peace on earth. A few short days ago the Christmas message rang out again in the ears of a heedless world: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will." The message could hardly be heard above the din of battle and the cries of hate. The world is too pagan, too materialistic; too much taken up with greed, hatred, jealousy, and self-seeking; too busy with horrible deeds of destruction and unbounded lust for conquest to understand the things that might be for its peace and happiness. The statement may sound very trite to you—trite and commonplace for having been so frequently uttered from thousands of pulpits throughout the world and for having been embodied in so many pages of the written word—but it is nevertheless very true, that the world's greatest ills are spiritual rather than economic and political. "There are too many people in our generation who are satiated with the materialistic philosophies that fill our stomachs and starve our souls."

On His first coming Christ was unknown, ignored, despised. It was truly said of Him that "He came into the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not; He came unto His own and His own received Him not." The world of Bethlehem and Nazareth and other Jewish cities did not know that the long-heralded and long-expected Messiah had come; and the pagan world of Rome and of Greece, like

our own modern pagan world, was oblivious of all save war, and pleasure, and the uncertainty of life, and the sureness of death.

"He came unto His own and His own received Him not." And His own still receive Him not. When they do receive Him and accept the sacred principles which He came to implant in the hearts of men and which He so beautifully set forth in His Sermon on the Mount of the Beatitudes, then—and only then—can there be peace and happiness on earth. There will be this peace of Christ on earth when individuals learn to rule their relations with one another by charity; when capital and labor strive honestly to establish the reign of social justice according to Christian principles; when rulers and statesmen determine their policies, not by the dictates of a narrow nationalism, but in the light of our common brotherhood in the Mystical Body of Christ. Then, and only then, will we no longer have before our eyes the sad spectacle of brother in arms against brother in private strife, class against class in industrial hostility, and people against people in national conflict.

Come, let us adore—such was the invitation of the church on the festive commemoration of the Saviour's birth. In the course of the years the world has been saying, and is still saying: "Come, let us adore," let us adore wealth and power, pleasure and self-seeking; but it is not in that direction that lie our peace and happiness. During these blessed days a Little Babe has been tugging at our heartstrings, the same who, when grown to sublime manhood, with arms outstretched as though He would embrace the world, said: "Come to Me all ye who labor and are heavily laden, and I will give you rest and you shall find peace to your souls." Come, let us adore. It is a cold and cheerless cave to which we are drawn, but it is only there that the world may learn anew the long-forgotten lesson of love and humility, of total self-abnegation and detachment which it so needs today; it is only there that we can adore a God who was great enough to become small, strong enough to become weak, wise enough to become a little child and thus find His way to our hearts; it is only in the cold cave of Bethlehem that we can hope to find Christ, and with Christ, peace and happiness.

But the loving invitation seems to have been all in vain. The godless, hate-blinded, war-crazed nations and their leaders will have nothing to do with the humble cave of the peace-loving Saviour. They do not want to be hampered in their lust for blood and power by such outmoded Christian virtues as meekness, poverty, self-abnegation, humility, and brotherly love. They turn a deaf ear to the stirring and eloquent appeals of the Vicar of Christ on earth to seek again the things that are God's and are intended for their peace. The last Christmas message of our Holy Father is a masterpiece on the meaning of human dignity and of democracy greater in scope and more comprehensive than the monumental Magna Carta. And yet, the atheistic press of the world, and in particular, of God-hating Russian communism, will have none of it.

The world does not seem to be looking for, nor does it seem to want, salvation—not to say salvaging. But the world is full of such enigmas and contradictions. Did you ever pause to think of the many startling contrasts presented by our modern, so-called, advanced civilization? On the one hand the nations lavishly pour forth their treasure and generously consecrate their time to ameliorate the lot of the poor, of the sick, and even of the criminal; nor is it satisfied with helping the suffering children of the human race, but it stretches its protecting arms over the brute. On the other hand, its peace is only a preparation for war, and the highest training of the citizen is for the slaughter of the soldier. Never before did history tell such appalling tales of reckless, ruthless, remorseless massacre as we read in our daily newpapers. The inspirations of military genius, the science of military destructiveness, the wealth of centuries of industry, and the valor of millions of men are being combined, concentrated, and hurled into horrible collision in order to bring about the poverty of many nations, the hatred of races, the agonizing anxiety and grief of womanhood everywhere, and the merciless butchery of the manhood of the world.

Again, there is the contrast between the paganism of our age and its religion. In part the contrast consists in this, that the modern man who is a pagan is more thoroughly pagan than ever pagan before, while the modern man who is really religious is still more really devout. In part the contrast is also evident in the fact that many modern pagans borrow not merely the language but even the ideas of religion, while many Christians or even Catholics who would resent as an insult their being called by any other name, yet act and think and speak like pagans.

There is a very evident reason for this last anomaly which we see exemplified around us daily. Men have been attempting the impossible task of separating religion from the routine of their daily lives. They want to lead a dual life, a sort of Dr. Jekyll-Mr. Hyde existence; two lives that are distinct and independent and mutually exclusive: their religious life on the one hand, and on the other their political or professional or business activities. The principle, fundamentally wrong and illogical, obtains among many Christians of our day. But religion is a necessity of every day, of every moment of our lives; as intimately united with all our actions as the soul is to the body which it vivifies. It is a power that should permeate and influence every phase of our human journeying. Charity, honesty, meekness, humility are virtues to be practiced not only on Sunday, not only in our intercourse with God, but virtues that must come into play in our daily relations with our fellowmen.

No; religion is not to be confined to cathedral or church, or chapel or meeting house. It should reign supreme in the family circle. It should be the ozone that gives life and health and buoyancy to the atmosphere of the schoolroom. It should be present in the wheatfield or vineyard, where soil and air combine to produce sustenance for man, and to fill his heart with food and gladness. The sweet breath of religion, of God's presence and all-seeing eye, should not be excluded from mine, or workshop, or factory, where matter is made to assume new form for the necessity or comforts of mankind. Its beneficent and guiding spirit should look down and guide the hand of inventor or philosopher, of poet or philanthropist or statesman, when evolving some thought or theory for the development of matter, the expansion of the mind, the alleviation of suffering, the elevation of the race. Wherever God is, and work is to be done for man; wherever the hungry one is fed, or naked clothed, or outcast saved, or solace given to the crushed and bleeding heart—there religion is and there religion should be.

As a stimulation for us in our hope for a better world, it is frequently said that war brings about a revival of religion. Have no illusions: war does no such thing. War is destructive, not constructive; and destructive of the very things that men hold most dear. It is very possible that in times of great stress such as we are undergoing there may be a temporary awakening and a perceptible turning to God. Thus our churches were crowded on D-day with men and women who were undoubtedly most sincere in the petitions that they sent forth to their Creator to obtain peace and the early return of their dear ones. Again we are told that the boys in all the branches of the service are flocking to divine worship and to their chaplains to seek spiritual aid, and strength, and courage to carry them through the ordeal of fire and blood that they are undergoing. This is undoubtedly true and admirable.

It is not hard to believe that there are no atheists in the fox holes of Bataan. I do not mean to be cynical nor pessimistic, nor irreverent when I say that, for many, this is just a religion of emergency, of expediency, which may last for the duration; and the end of the war will again find us with the same deplorable reign of immorality, unbelief, and absolute contempt for all laws, human and divine, which we witnessed after the last war. Such religion of expediency might well be compared to the resolutions made by Sir Lancelot of the Lake when he lay in a cave, sorely wounded from the diamond joust. He made—

"Full many a holy vow and pure resolve.
"These, as but born of sickness, could not live."

Of this you may be sure: The future after the war will not bring a social, industrial, or religious millennium. Nothing is impossible to God's mercy in answer to prayer and when peace comes the nations may turn to God. But the reform must start with the individual and the family. That must be the program of every right-thinking man if we are to hope for a better and happier world. To nations, as to individuals, it has been said, "Without me you can do nothing." "Unless God build the house, they labor in vain that build it." Irreligion is fatal to true liberty and social order. A corrupt man is a selfish man; an appeal to duty or to a higher law finds no response in his conscience. A people without a belief in God, or in a future state, cannot long remain enlightened and free. By the soul, and by the soul only, can nations preserve their greatness and their liberties.

Men of the Holy Name, by your strong faith, by your solid piety, by your conscientious discharge of all the duties of civic, social, and religious life, you will have a powerful influence on all who come in contact with you and you will thus contribute to make this a better and happier world—a world in which the Saviour of the world and His divine precepts are better known, loved, and obeyed.

Diplomatic Change-over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of January 10, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC CHANGE-OVER

(By Mark Sullivan)

ATTITUDE TOWARD RUSSIA

Our diplomacy toward Russia, to express it in a word used in Washington, is "hardening"; this spirit was guardedly expressed in President Roosevelt's message to Congress last week. This is expected to be the attitude he will take when he meets Premier Stalin, in the anticipated conference of the two with Prime Minister Churchill. We are going to ask Russia to concede something, something not for ourselves but in the interest of the whole post-war world.

This is the first time we have asked Russia for anything substantial; always heretofore we have been in the position of giving. The change is a turning point in history. To understand it, a brief recital of past relations between the two countries is desirable.

Russia did not become one of the United Nations of her own choice. On the contrary, during the early period of the war, she had a treaty of amicable nonaggression with Germany. Jointly with Germany, the two seized Poland and divided it between them. That made Russia, in effect, an enemy of Britain, even though not in a military sense, for it was to preserve Poland that Britain had taken up arms. During this early period Russians and Americans said harsh things of each other. When Mr. Roosevelt began to lean toward helping Britain, he was denounced by Communists in Russia and in America. When Russia made war on Finland, Mr. Roosevelt, in February 1940, said that "American sympathy is 98 percent with the Finns"; that is, against Russia.

This period of Russian-American relations was ended in June 1941, when Germany turned upon Russia, invaded it. Russia fought back. She fought not as a member of the United Nations and not for their war aims, but wholly in self-defense. At once, however, we and Britain gave help to Russia. The spirit in which we did it was expressed by Prime Minister Churchill: "No one has been a more consistent opponent of communism than I have. I will unsay no word that I have spoken about it. But all this fades away. Any [country that] fights against nazidom will have our aid. We have offered the Government of Soviet Russia any * * * assistance which is in our power."

That is how Russia became one of the United Nations.

We, with Britain, made Russia strong. We made her strong for the purpose of defeating Germany. If now Russia uses her strength in some ways we do not like, this is merely fate. We had to make Russia strong in order to defeat Germany, and Germany is being defeated. The purpose we had in making Russia strong is justified and is being accomplished. The unintended consequence that now arises, Russia now using her strength to do things which we and Britain do not approve, is one of those turns that history sometimes takes.

It is said now, with the facility of hindsight, that before we made Russia strong, before we gave her lend-lease aid, we ought to have asked for promises—a promise, for example, that Poland should be independent. Perhaps it would have been wise. Russia, in desperate fear of being conquered by Germany, almost certainly would have given the promise. Yet it is also true that we had to give the aid, promise or no promise. Our wish that Russia be made able to stand up against Germany was as great as Russia's own. If failure to demand the promise was an oversight, there was an excuse for it. The transaction took place at a time of critical desperation, when there was acute fear that Germany might conquer the world.

We now deal with a strong Russia. By actions and utterances she intends to extend her boundaries by acquisitions of territory, and to reduce the independence of small nations along her western boundary. These steps are counter to the war aims of the United Nations, as repeatedly expressed in the Atlantic Charter and elsewhere. These steps, unless Russia is dissuaded from them, make not for a new world order but for the old. They make for the old practice of spheres of influence, power politics, maintenance of great armed forces. These old practices have never prevented war; they have led to war. Mr. Roosevelt's problem is to persuade Russia to assent to the new plan, expressed in the Atlantic Charter and in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, for an international organization to prevent war.

Why the Haste?—Can't We Wait on Peacetime Conscription Until Peace Conference?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, Hon. William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Capital Times, is one of the most prominent public speakers of the Northwest. He long has been a strong supporter of the present administration, but he has always reserved the right to differ with it when he disagreed with its program.

Very recently, Mr. Evjue sent the following telegram to the President:

I regret your announcement in favor of universal military training. Are we now going to adopt the very thing we are fighting?

On January 7, Mr. Evjue delivered a radio address over a State-wide hook-up of nine radio stations on the same subject. His able address merits the attention of Senators and Congressmen. It was as follows:

For 169 years the United States has followed a tradition of antimilitarism. Throughout its entire history the United States has never approved military conscription in a time of peace. Is this tradition of peace now to be thrown overboard at the very time we are fighting a war to end wars and aggressions based on the Prussian pattern of military conscription?

These questions are inspired by persistent reports emanating from the Nation's Capital that a strenuous effort is to be made to jam through the new Congress a bill providing for compulsory military training for American youth following the endorsement of such a proposal by President Roosevelt. It is said that congressional leaders plan to rush the bill through before American sentiment can be mobilized against such a proposal and before the millions of young men now in service return to the pursuits of peace with their hatred of war and all its works. Under the bill proposed in Congress every American boy, upon reaching the age of 17, will be conscripted for 1 year's service in training camps under the supervision of United States military authorities.

I believe that the adoption of such a proposal by the United States Congress in advance of the peace conference to follow this war will be a national tragedy and a blow to the cause of world peace. Millions will be shocked by the President's approval of peacetime conscription. We will be serving notice upon the nations of the world that we have abandoned all hope of a world peace based on international agreement and understanding, and on a world organization that will promote peace, that will exalt such concepts as decency, justice, and good will above those of brute force, terror, and aggression.

When the time comes for taking part in the peace conference, will we be able to convince other countries that we are sincere in our desire to become a member of the family of nations while back home, for the first time in 169 years, we are inaugurating a system of peacetime military conscription based on the Prussian pattern which we have been fighting as a threat to mankind?

Are we now going to publicly admit that after the horrible slaughter of American boys in this war that we are not going to alter the system under which war will remain, as the only means for the settlement of disputes between nations? Will not military conscription in a time of peace in this country make a mockery of all that we have been fighting for in this war?

Strangely enough, the cause of isolationism will be advanced by these advocates of peacetime conscription who have been denouncing isolationists throughout this war. How can any American citizen consistently advocate a peace based on international action and a system of peacetime conscription at one and the same time? Doesn't one contradict the other? If we are to support peacetime conscription now doesn't it mean that we have but little faith in any program of international agreement and understanding? Aren't we in effect saying that international action may be all right, but it is better to depend on our own military might and power? Isn't that exactly what the isolationists have been telling us?

We seem to live by slogans in America. There are two plausible slogans which will bring the support of thousands to the cause of peacetime conscription. There is the argument: "Future Hitlers will think twice before starting trouble if the United States is prepared." There is the other argument which will bring thousands of recruits to peacetime conscription: "Do we want to be caught again as we were at Pearl Harbor?" But does history bear out the claim that aggressors have withheld their attacks because the countries they picked upon were well armed? In the last World War the Kaiser did not hesitate to attack France and Russia simultaneously, although France had a splendid army and the Russian Army was the largest in the world and not suspected of being as weak as it was.

The world is still wondering why Hitler attacked Russia when he had not yet conquered England and the United States was beginning to get into the picture. In 1903 Japan atacked Russia in what at the time seemed overwhelming odds. In this war Japan launched a naval atack upon the United States despite the fact that Japan had nothing like our resources when it struck at Pearl Harbor. All history reveals that physical might and power have never been guarantees against attack.

After all, is there such a thing as preparedness for modern war? If we are to agree now that we must prepare for war because another war is possible what will the pattern of the next war be? Who knows? Are we going to train these young men for the infantry? Are we sure that there will be any infantry of present-day standards in future wars? What type of air warfare will come? I have always remembered what George Bernard Shaw said when war broke out in Europe and the military might of Nazi Germany was being compared with an unprepared England. Mr. Shaw pointed out that England would at least start from scratch and that as soon as her new planes were placed in the air the planes built by Hitler in 8 years of military preparedness would start to become obsolete. How quickly that very thing happened.

Remember how that little band of R. A. F. fliers stood off all that German air might could send against them in that historic battle over London? Within a year, because of the tremendous strides made by English and American plane builders, the planes built by Hitler during 8 years of military preparedness became so much junk. Today, right in the midst of a war, we are witnessing the likelihood that the latest fighters and bombers designed by American and British engineers are becoming obsolete because of new developments in V-bombs and jet-propulsion planes. Today a B-29 Fortress is manned by 10 or 12 men, but at this moment we are witnessing the development of jet propulsion, radio-controlled planes that can attack an enemy hundreds of miles away without a man aboard. In all

of the countries engaged in this war there are undoubtedly billions of dollars of war material lying around because it is obsolete.

If military preparedness is the answer to national security then what is the explanation for the fact that Germany, after having reared the greatest array of military armament in human history, is now going down to defeat?

Those who know of the traditional opposition of the American people to peacetime militarism and conscription are seeking to disguise the bill in Congress as much as possible. Instead of stressing the military phase of the bill they are emphasizing the benefits which they say will come to American youth through physical-fitness training for citizenship and discipline. It is obvious that no individual is going to be physically fit at 19 who neglected or was deprived of opportunities for physical fitness up to 18. The years of adolescence are crucial years.

But there is a good way to test the sincerity of those who maintain that physical fitness is a primary purpose of this military program. Go back over the years and you will find that the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and other big corporate interests that are now supporting peacetime conscription and voicing their solicitude for the physical well-being of youth were the same interests that fought nutritional programs in the schools, child-labor legislation, community health centers, better medical care, higher standards of living, and all other activities designed to protect and to promote the physical well-being of youth.

Peacetime conscription as an instrumentality for promoting good citizenship and discipline can also be challenged. Our whole educational process is designed to afford self-expression and to develop self-reliance among the millions who come within its reach. Military training is authoritarian. Military training demands a slavish obedience to a military caste that makes decisions and the regulations—a training that is antagonistic to self-expression and self-reliance.

Think of the opportunity that powerful privileged interests would have to indoctrinate youth with their own economic ideology and to insulate youth against any social proposals distasteful to the entrenched economic order under a system of compulsory military training. I do not think that anyone will deny that the professional military caste is conservative in its political and economic thinking and is the defender of the status quo. Have you ever thought of the implications in the large number of military officials who upon retirement take big salaried jobs with big business? There is significance, too, in the fact that the Members of Congress who are supporting these peacetime conscription bills are the Members who will be found voting against labor and all bills designed to promote the social welfare, including that of youth.

I wonder if labor is aware of the danger that confronts it in compulsory militarism during a time of peace? The enemies of labor have always favored a large military establishment as insurance against unions and strikes. Labor should remember that under this plan members of unions could be forced to become strikebreakers.

There is another phase of this program which is important. The Negro problem is now looming as one of the most serious problems that will confront this country. During this war we have witnessed how the Negro has been segregated and reduced to a menial status in the armed services. He has been excluded from many branches of the service. Increased tension between the whites and the Negroes has resulted. The treatment we have given the Negro is a black mark against our professions of democracy. While the spokesmen for compulsory military training are trying to sell the idea to the American people on the representation that if we will promote democracy, good citizenship, and physical fitness among youth, is there any reason to believe that the professional military caste will treat the Negro any differently under peacetime conscription than under wartime conscription? Will not such a system continue to aggravate the tension between white and black?

But I repeat that it will be a national tragedy if peacetime conscription is jammed through Congress in advance of the peace conference. What a blow that will be to the efforts that have been made to build a structure of peace based upon the determination of the nations of the world to join together to abolish the ugly institution of war. If we now hurriedly jam through Congress this proposal for peacetime conscription we will be telling the rest of the world that the "four freedoms," the Atlantic Charter, and Dumbarton Oaks represent nothing more than empty rhetoric. We will be notifying the world that we still believe that war will continue to be the method by which nations will settle their disputes.

Is it too much to ask Congress that action be withheld on this bill until after the peace conference? Is it too much to ask that action be withheld until the millions of our boys who have been fighting militarism in other parts of the world can return and their viewpoint learned? Where is there any mandate from the American people for peacetime conscription and the abandonment of a tradition that this country has stood for for 170 years?

Today I would like to make an earnest appeal to every listener within sound of my voice. Write to your Congressman and to our United States Senators at Washington. Tell them that action on peacetime conscription should be held up until after the peace conference. If you are a member of a religious, fraternal, civic, or labor organization make an effort to get your organization to adopt resolutions against this proposal and forward these resolutions to your Congressman and United States Senators. We lost the peace in 1920 because we torpedoed the attempt that was then made to get the nations of the world to join together to outlaw war. If the American people are now going to take the position that war will continue to be the method of settling disputes what are we going to say to American boys in the service when they return? What have they been fighting for?

Insurance for Old-Age Recipients

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD upon the subject of insurance for the recipients of old-age assistance, I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government make additional funds available for use by the States in providing an insurance policy, either private or State operated, which will guarantee the recipients of old-age assistance adequate medical, surgical, dental, hospital, and nursing care.

There are several insurance companies interested in such a plan.

At the present time the States give some additional funds to the recipients of old-age assistance, but only after a careful check-up by some social-service worker to establish the need. These additional funds amounting to from $4 to $10 a month can be used for the necessary health protection. The recipient does not always use it for health. They frequently need more acutely the necessities of life.

Many of the illnessses which the older people now have are due to worries—worries about their health, about medicine, and whom to call should they become ill.

The moneys now being expended for supposedly health facilities could provide an excellent insurance policy which could be operated by the States in much the same manner as that of the compensation courts. I believe that such an insurance policy could be written under a limited profit basis and could be operated in most part by private insurance companies.

The patient-physician relationship should not be disturbed. This should be scrupuously maintained. The old-age beneficiaries should have the right to call the physician of their choice.

Such a plan can be put into operation with little additional expense. It would meet the growing needs of additional care for the recipients of old-age benefits.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of January 8, 1945:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

President Roosevelt's annual message to Congress, only 2 weeks before his inauguration as the man chosen to lead the country through 4 years to come, is too largely a recounting of recent history. The time and the occasion demanded that we look forward—all of us—as a nation. The only way we can look forward intelligently on such complex problems as foreign affairs is for the President to be specific and revealing. He was not that.

On the domestic side, Mr. Roosevelt asks for service legislation to meet many manpower needs. This is on the principle which many have come to recognize of "the duty of every citizen to do his or her part in winning the war," as the letter he quotes from Secretaries Stimson and Forrestal puts it. All must realize that the magnificent work being done is not evenly shared; that while many are working overtime, many others look on war work as the job of someone else.

It is recalled by some observers that, although the President asked for a national service act, he did not fight for it as he has for many of his recommendations, and Congress left the business to one side in a session showing little leadership worthy of the national emergency.

Mr. Roosevelt fails to give the explanation and discussion most hoped for—the statement on international policy, for which the country has been waiting. This is the most significant omission in the longest message he has sent to Congress. He says some excellent things, particularly his warning that "It will not be easy to create this people's peace." He warns also against those who criticize proposals because the set-up is not perfect. "Perfectionism," he says, "no less than isolationism or imperialism or power politics, may obstruct the paths of international peace." He adds that after the last war we "preferred international anarchy to international cooperation with nations which did not see and think exactly as we did."

This is well said and will be remembered. Nearly all Mr. Roosevelt says is well said. Yet one reads and rereads the message with a sense of something missing—of much missing—that ought to have been said. We are ordinary people. When something occurs that shocks us, when the promises of the Atlantic Charter seem to be lightly treated by the President, we need something definite about it. We are thinking of the future—the future for which so many millions are working and fighting and hundreds of thousands are dying.

It was an occasion for the President to restate the principles which motivate—must motivate—this Nation in its greatest war. That was needed more than history.

Waste and More Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, letters that come to my desk indicate an increasing uneasiness on the part of the people back in the district over the manner in which the home front is being governed. From these communications I have decided to insert in the RECORD one that discusses the entire subject calmly, fairly, and without bitterness. The writer is a very successful farmer who has done his full share in the war effort back here. For obvious reasons the writer's name and address are omitted:

MINNESOTA, *January 3, 1945.*

Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you for two reasons.. First, I want to express our deep appreciation for the service you rendered us last summer which enable us to obtain a power cultivator in time to care for our crop. We received the power lift in the fall so will be fairly well equipped for the coming year. We are very thankful.

Secondly, we want to lift our voice against the move to draft IV-F and civilians for war work. It seems that nearly every civilian possible has already pulled up and gone into war work, and with rationing being tightened all the time. In rural districts the largest percentage of draftees are being taken off of farms now and the production will naturally have to go down.

But back to war workers. There is hardly a day but we meet and talk with someone who is either in war-production factories or closely connected with it and we always hear the same story regardless of what part of the United States they come from. They all tell of days whiled away without any work accomplished. Big wages and no labor. Most of them would much rather work but are not allowed to by their bosses. Then why draft more men? Why not pass some legislation to get at the heads of these labor rackets. My brother has traveled for 2 years doing electrical wiring with these construction workers. He says many days six workers only three lengths of pipe in a day. If he were working on his own he could do that much alone in less than one-half day. Out in Pasco, Wash., seven carpenters put on one 16-foot board in a day. One man we talked to a couple of days ago who has been working for a long time in California, and was back here to dispose of his farm before going back to work, when asked about it said, "No; we sure don't do much." I have heard them tell of sitting with large torches heating up piles of iron to keep warm. Men tell of being told by their bosses to keep out of sight when not busy so they do a little bit and then sit in a basement and talk. I could go on for hours rehearsing the reports direct from those who see and know; I am sure you have heard them from other sources. My brother-in-law, who is now in the armed services, worked for a long time at the Rosemont plant and at the shipyards in Portland and he surely told many stories of waste, both in material and manpower. He said the truckers of which he was one, driving large semitrucks, would read a magazine a day while they sat in their trucks with the motors running.

What is this United States of America coming to when labor unions are allowed to run everything. The Government continually calls for War bond sales to support these loafing millions while the boys die and die and die. It seems to me they are endeavoring to dislodge every civilian in the country.

Another thing that raises our indignation is the Government seizure of Montgomery Ward & Co. Where is the free America that the boys are giving their lives for? If a company cannot hire a person that does not belong to a union, then people cannot earn an honest living unless they join the union. The Bible says, "The servant is not greater than his Lord," but this administration gives the servant the right to tell the owner who he can hire, what he has to pay, and how much work they have to do. If he doesn't cooperate they go into his place of business and do thousands of dollars' worth of damage and the Government supports them and seizes the business.

We have been in hopes that Congress could do something to halt this mad rush to destruction. I Thessalonians v tells us that when they shall say "peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them. Therefore, let us not sleep as do others, but let us watch and be sober." The way things are going, it need not be long before we "cannot buy or sell without the mark of the beast," as the Scripture tells us.

I just heard a report on the radio that the President believes agriculture can be carried on by older men and all agriculture deferments should be taken away from young men. In my mind, they cannot expect top production on farms where only older men are left. Farming is a lot of very hard labor and hundreds of men will just retire from their farms rather than try to kill themselves producing. I don't believe these men know anything about the work on farms where hay has to be put up and crops cared for and harvested. The farms will become, as they already are starting to, the property of land agents and bankers and held for speculation. What kind of a famine will we be seeing. In some cases, it seems, draft boards use their powers to favor banks and land sharks. I don't know if it is too late to do anything or not, but I do believe our only hope is in the acts of Congress.

Yours for a better country and with best regards to your personally,

P. S.—Farmers as a whole greatly resent the Government expecting them to do the work of 4 men and buy bonds to pay big wages to war workers that sit and talk and waste their time. If people believed their money was helping the boys, they would give to the limit and without reserve, but they are tired of making millionaires and being played for suckers.

Build Now for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the question of America's foreign policy is now being carefully considered by our people in all walks of life, intent as they are upon seeing to it that the peace which follows this war is not only just and honorable, but enduring and enforceable as well.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to an address entitled "Build Now for Peace," which was delivered by Pennsylvania's former United States Senator, James J. Davis, on January 14, 1945, before Philadelphia Lodge, No. 54, Loyal Order of Moose, which has an enrollment of approximately 10,000 members.

This is Mr. Davis' first public address since his retirement from the United States Senate. It is an address which might well be read by every American citizen who is sincerely interested in the problems of world peace, and under unanimous consent I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

Since the challenge of infamy was hurled down upon us at Pearl Harbor, we in America have responded in full resolve and full vigor to turn back the tides of aggression and to preserve human freedom throughout the world.

That we and our allies have achieved a significant degree of success in this effort is strongly attested to by the fact that in every theater of war the enemy is on the defensive, mustering a final, desperate effort to stave off his inevitable defeat.

We in America are mindful of the many sacrifices made and being made by our fighting men and our fighting allies. We are mindful of those who suffer in hospitals and rehabilitation centers. We are mindful of those lonely and distressed Americans who cling to the fringe of life and hope behind the barbed wire of some dismal foreign prison camp. We are mindful of the blue and gold stars in the windows, of the broken homes in America.

And mindful of all these things, we have resolved that the peace which follows this war shall give to us and to all men a world worthy of the innumerable sacrifices which have been and are being made in the name of peace.

To this end we have pledged ourselves to the creation of a just and lasting peace among all nations. We have pledged ourselves to and have largely enacted a program to aid in the rehabilitation of our returning veterans, to the end that those who fight our battles shall never come to want.

And, finally, realizing that the economic fate of this Nation rests largely upon the buying power of our people, we have pledged ourselves to attain a sustained program of economic progress in the post-war era which

will provide all our people with decent jobs at decent rates of pay.

Now the achievement of all these goals is absolutely essential, if the great and inspiring efforts of our people on the fighting fronts, and in the mine, mill, and factory are not to be in vain. And in vain they will be, unless we and our allies stand united together and build now for peace.

A number of outstanding events in recent weeks—among them the sudden counter-offensive of the Germany Army, the recognition by Russia of the Lublin Committee as the bona fide government of Poland, the announcement by Great Britain that Russia's territorial claims in pre-war Poland must be recognized, and the tragic uprising in Greece—all these events have served to focus our attention and the attention of the world generally on those highly important problems of world peace and foreign relations.

We in America have repeatedly been told that we are fighting for a just and lasting peace—a peace which shall embrace and recognize the cardinal points contained in the Atlantic Charter. And in recent days, notwithstanding the fact that the nonexistence of that document has now been officially admitted, we in America are assured that the principles of the Atlantic Charter continue to remain the principles for which we fight, and that this Government shall do its utmost to see to it that the forthcoming peace is built upon the principles of that charter.

Meanwhile, our most powerful allies in this war, faced with concrete and realistic situations, have made far-reaching political and military decisions in Greece, Poland, and elsewhere on either a unilateral or a bilateral basis. But the action thus taken is not wholly without justification.

History, both past and present, has amply demonstrated the fact that the greatest menace to the peace of Europe and consequently to the peace of the world has been the powerful, militaristic state of Germany. And in both World Wars, the Nations of France, Russia, and Britain suffered and are suffering almost irreparable damage at the hands of the Teutonic warriors.

The nations of Europe are determined above all else to see to it that their lands are never again invaded, that their cities are never again destroyed, and that their population is never again decimated by the armed power of Germany.

Therefore, as the war has unfolded, as the German legions have been slowly but relentlessly driven back inside their own borders, Russia, Britain, France, and other nations have taken such action as they have in order to secure themselves against any future German aggression.

Now, the developments in Greece, Poland, and elsewhere in Europe have assumed their present form and substance largely because of the fact that the Government of the United States has thus far failed to come forward with any sound and clear-cut statement of its international policy.

It is now conceded in many quarters that had the United States taken a strong stand for an all-inclusive system of international cooperation, the nations of Europe would have devoted their energies to the implementation of that system, rather than to resorting to the methods of settlement they have thus far used.

This Nation and its allies are not fighting this war solely for the purpose of defeating Germany and Japan on the field of battle. We and our allies who have suffered millions of casualties, we who have expended countless treasures and endured endless sacrifices, are in reality fighting this war for the purpose of creating and securing a system of peace which will, for many generations to come, insure to all men everywhere a decent, uplifting human existence, free from the clutches of fear, want, and uncertainty.

Surely this is the type of peace we must secure if we are not to witness some future blacking-out of the lights of human freedom and civilization—a blacking-out which bids fair to become permanent this time, for many there are who feel with all sincerity that our civilization could never withstand the terrifying strain of another world war. Therefore, we must begin now to fashion a system of peace for the world which will stop all attempts at aggression in their infancy and maintain peace and equilibrium among all nations.

Now there are some who say that it is wholely impossible to take any definite steps toward world peace until we have fully and completely defeated our enemies on the field of battle. With that thesis, I most heartily disagree. The time for action is now. For too long a time we have been dealing in vague generalities and high-sounding ideals.

Current events have shown us that concrete action is necessary—that unsupported ideals must inevitably fall before less idealistic acts, where such acts are supported by a definite plan of action.

It has been said by others that these unilateral settlements and bilateral agreements are being made in Europe because there is skepticisim in certain quarters as to whether or not the United States will participate fully in an international organization to preserve the peace of the world. If ever there were any reasons to hold such a belief, the events of recent date in our own United States Senate should certainly have fully dispelled them.

Let me say that one of the great stumbling blocks to America's participation in the old League of Nations can be traced to this very tendency to wait until the war ends before any settlements looking toward peace are undertaken.

I was in Paris when Woodrow Wilson went there to attend the peace conferences. And you will recall, I am sure, that when he arrived at those conferences, Wilson was almost immediately confronted with a whole series of international agreements, many of which contained secret clauses. You will also recall that many of these agreements were themselves in direct conflict with one or more of Wilson's Fourteen Points. These treaties contained arbitrary and far-reaching territorial adjustments; they also contained military and political commitments which were diametrically opposed to certain of the Fourteen Points. And it was these secret commitments, more than any other single factor, that caused the United States to reject the covenant of the old league.

Thus, if we would achieve our ideal of a lasting peace—a peace which will do full justice to our fighting men and to the heartbreak and oppression which have been endured all over the world, we must cease talking in pious platitudes, we must cease deferring action. We must immediately undertake to organize the United Nations for peace as fully and as effectively as we have organized them for war.

We should, at the earliest possible moment, invoke the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, and establish the peace machinery it authorizes, with such modifications as are deemed necessary. We must put the council, the assembly and the world court to work solving the problems of the hour.

After this machinery has been put into operation, we should bring all international disputes before it for final settlement, and all unilateral and bilateral actions thus far taken should be subjected to the final approval or disapproval of the council.

By this type of early action, and by this type of action only, can we avoid the creation of a veritable network of separate alliances and agreements which, by the time the war ends, may render any concerted international plan for peace totally incapable of realization, and cause the nations of the world to resort once again to the old power-politics system of competing alliances which have heretofore succeeded only in bringing the nations of the world into recurring world wars.

Today the United States of America stands ready with open arms to welcome a just and honorable peace and to lend its full power to an international organization created and equipped to maintain that peace by whatever means it may require.

This Nation seeks no territorial aggrandizement, no booty, no unworthy aim. This Nation seeks peace—a peace that renders full justice to the great and the small alike. This Nation seeks also an international organization which accords equal dignity, equal power, and equal voice to the great and the small alike. This Nation seeks to create a world order of progress, stability, and peace for the great and the small, for the weak and the strong alike.

This Nation, which has always extended a helping hand to the downtrodden and the stricken; this America, which has twice spent unstintingly of its treasure and its blood to secure honor, decency, and peace in the world, must begin now to prosecute its aims of total peace as thoroughly and as completely as it has prosecuted and will prosecute its aims of total war.

No longer should we remain silent. No longer should our policy remain open to doubt. Let us proclaim our united stand to the world. Let us strive to build a union of all the nations of the world—a union that will promote the general welfare of all nations as fully and as effectively as that great union of States has done which we created here on this continent many generations ago.

Let us turn our eyes and our thoughts toward the realm of reality. Let us fashion that new and enduring world of lasting peace before the winds of adversity destroy it before our very eyes.

Uniform Air Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very fine and appropriate editorial from the El Dorado Daily News, El Dorado, Ark., on uniform air laws:

UNIFORM AIR LAWS

The 44 State legislatures meeting this month and next will have before them 3 bills of national importance. They are the proposed uniform air laws which have been drafted by the National Association of State Aviation Officials and the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, after consultation with the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The bills are titled "The State Aeronautics Department Act," "The State Airports Act," and "The State Airport Zoning Act." Their general purpose is to avoid, before post-war flying expansion begins, the mistakes and Federal-State conflicts that have plagued other forms of transportation in the past.

Under the first act the C. A. A. would still make the regulations governing the competency of flyers and airworthiness of planes, as it does now. But the registration of Federal licenses and the enforcement of these uniform regulations would be in the hands of the States. By this act the States would adopt regulations consistent with the Federal rules, and would define their rights to estab-

lish and maintain airports and to finance and otherwise assist developments by the States' political subdivisions.

The State airport act would give the States a uniform law generally concerned with Federal aid, financing, and taxation of State, county, and city airports. The State zoning act would protect planes, pilots, and passengers from such hazards as high-tension wires and tall buildings in the immediate vicinity of flying fields.

These proposed laws are the result of careful study and the consensus of many minds. And they seem eminently commendable for a variety of reasons. Perhaps the most important is that their passage would avoid the creation of another great bureaucracy in Washington.

It is not extravagant to predict that a half million air line, private, and commercial planes may be flying American skies before many years have passed. The intricacies of licensing and regulating them will require a large force which might more safely and practicably be distributed among the several States.

The present C. A. A. requirements for pilots and planes have worked out successfully. But a State government cannot enforce Federal laws. So, if air control is to be decentralized, it will be necessary to duplicate these requirements in State laws and assign enforcement to the States.

It is true that some legislatures have a touchy feeling about Federal dictation. But it seems to us that in this case the dictation, endorsed by several State governments, is beneficial. To combat it would be disservice to the States as well as to the country as a whole.

Farm Labor Situation in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I make a part of the same copy of a letter, dated January 10, 1945, from Mr. C. H. Hyde, of Alva, Okla., one of the outstanding farmers in my congressional district, directed to the senior Senator from my State.

This letter quite correctly analyzes the situation in respect to farm labor throughout the Eighth Congressional District in Oklahoma and I call it to the attention of Congress and the country for the reason that it comes from one who actually knows conditions as they exist in respect to labor on Oklahoma farms. It would indeed be advisable for the various agencies having to do with the manpower situation in the country, including Selective Service, to consult actual farmers such as the writer of the letter referred to, before making any drastic changes in respect to farm labor. We should remember the admonition that bare backs and empty stomachs will not win wars.

The letter follows:

ALVA, OKLA., *January 10, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.

FRIEND ELMER: There is a lot of talk now about drafting farmers. On my part, it does not make any difference. In threshing bundles I shocked last year, here is the crew we had: One boy 8 years old driving tractor; one boy 9 years old, the same; the threshing-machine operator is about 50 years old, and his 10-year-old son run the tractor to pull it. We had four boys under 15; three between 17 and 38, and all three of them have taken examinations now for the Army; one 40 years old, one 60, and one 65 years old, and myself who is 76.

They have taken about all of the farm help now. They have made a mistake; if we should have a fair crop this year, I do not know how we can harvest except possibly with the combine.

Oats and barley should be cut with the binder and threshed out of the shock. I know one man who has two sons in the Army. He is probably 60 years old. He ran his combine this year, and his 13-year-old girl ran the tractor. His wife hauled wheat in the truck to Alva. When they could not unload wheat in Alva because of car shortage, he unloaded the wheat, and his wife ran the combine.

I am going to the State farmers union convention next week. Personally, I do not expect much out of it, but do not get alarmed about taking the farm boys, because they have got them now.

Your friend,

C. H. HYDE.

Vital Committee Posts in House Go to P. A. C. Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, those who know me will testify that I am not a pessimist given to gloom and forebodings.

I have always tried to have faith and believe, often in spite of evidence to the contrary, that God is still in His heaven—all is right with the world.

It goes without saying that I have always had an abiding faith in the principles as advocated by the Republican Party; as well as a firm conviction that come what may the time-honored and tested principles of the real Democratic Party would ever hold fast to the fundamental principles of our Republic.

However, after reading of the action taken in closed session by the Democrats of the House on yesterday, I am convinced that the leaders of the present Democratic Party have not only lost the ball, but are not even calling the signals.

Earl Browder calls the signals while Sidney Hillman's open field runners carry the ball to the left of center and are making steady gains.

I submit the following as evidence to support this statement and most reverently say "May God have mercy on us" if those of us in both the Republican and Democratic Parties, who still have faith in the fundamental principles of our Republic, fail or refuse to form an all-American team and again get possession of the ball. We cannot win games when the other team has the ball.

VITAL COMMITTEE POSTS IN HOUSE GO TO P. A. C. MEN

(By Willard Edwards)

In a closed caucus session marked by heated bickering House Democrats yesterday gave official recognition to the invasion of their party by Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee.

Posts on more than a score of leading committees were awarded to new Members listed by the C. I. O.-P. A. C. as owing their elections to Hillman's organization, which spent one and one-third millions in the campaign.

COMMITTEES LISTED

On such important committees as Military and Naval Affairs, Agriculture, Banking and Currency, Foreign Affairs, Immigration, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Labor, Rivers and Harbors, and Roads the Hillman bloc landed from three to seven Representatives.

Conservative Democrats made one effort to contest the rise of the left wingers to power by moving to deny Representative MARCANTONIO (American-Labor), of New York, a seat on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. MARCANTONIO long has been regarded as pro-Communist and is the pet Congressman of the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party.

Representative BOREN (Democrat), of Oklahoma, argued that the American Labor Party Member was not entitled to endorsement by Democrats, but Speaker RAYBURN, of Texas, talked against the motion, and it was defeated by voice vote.

DEMOCRATS AT PEACE

There was no fight against the six Democrats picked for the new Committee on Un-American Activities. As previously revealed, Representative HART (Democrat), of New Jersey, will be the successor to former Representative Dies (Democrat), of Texas, and Representative RANKIN (Democrat), of Mississippi, who led the fight to make the committee permanent, will be ranking majority member.

The two new women Democrats, EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, of California, both listed by the C. I. O. as Hillman followers, were rewarded with seats on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Representative RYTER, of Connecticut, another freshman, who is a member of the Hillman bloc, also was selected to fill a vacancy.

The P. A. C. scored a clean sweep in connection with the Naval Affairs Committee, securing all five vacancies. Representative DE LACY, of Washington, member of organizations stamped subversive by the Attorney General, and well known on the west coast for his Communist leanings, was one of these. The others are Representatives FOGARTY, of Rhode Island; MADDEN, of Indiana; HAVENNER, of California, and BIEMILLER, of Wisconsin.

ON MILITARY COMMITTEE

Two of four vacancies on the Military Affairs Committee were given to Hillmanites. They are Representatives HOLIFIELD, of California, and PRICE, of Illinois.

The House Labor Committee will be almost wholly under C. I. O.-P. A. C. domination as a result of the Democratic caucus action. There were five vacancies, and Hillman bloc members got them all.

Chairman of the committee is Representative NORTON, of New Jersey, a bloc member, and another hold-over is Representative LESINSKI, of Michigan, similarly labeled. The new members are Representatives HOOK, of Michigan; PATTERSON, of California; GEELAN, Connecticut; GREEN, of Pennsylvania, and POWELL, of New York. The last-named is the new Negro Representative whose leftist leanings are well known.

For a Modernized Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 11, 1945:

FOR A MODERNIZED CONGRESS

Of the many men who have learned our Government in the school of experience and should be useful counselors on the better functioning of our instruments of national control, there are few who equal James F. Byrnes in personal knowledge of the legislative, the judicial, and the executive departments.

He has, therefore, performed a real public service in showing how Congress can be reconverted from its present concentration on constituents and cumbersome committees, to a really efficient coordinate branch of the Federal Government. His views are presented in the Mirror of Public Opinion on this page today.

Mr. Byrnes disagrees with the criticism of the intelligence or patriotism of Congress. Rather, he feels that the Congress falls too far short of being the sum of all its parts—the trouble isn't with the individual Congressman, it's with Congress as a clumsy, slow-moving machine.

To bring it to the true coordinate rank he proposes five changes: Adequate staff assistance for the individual Member, together with better pay; thorough revision of the committee system, reducing the number in each House to 10 or 12, and making their chairmen a congressional cabinet, to meet with the President; a permanent staff of trained career men to research for and advise the committees; better appropriation procedure; and the proposal for questioning Cabinet members on the floor of the House.

Of his five major recommendations, that which would benefit Congress the most, in our opinion, is the complete reorganization of the committee system. As Mr. Byrnes points out, both Houses function through committees excessive in number, overlapping in coverage and cumbersome in operation. Were the number in each House reduced to 10 or 12, as he urges, and the indispensable tool of trained staff provided, Congress could probably amend its slow and slipshod ways. Woodrow Wilson, in his Congressional Government, published in 1884, pointed out this flaw, which is even more grievous now than then. This reform cannot be made too soon.

The Nation, probably, would benefit the most from the ex-Justice's companion idea that the chairmen of these 20 committees should constitute a congressional cabinet to meet with the President, thus promoting a closer relationship between the White House and Capitol Hill. Here would be a major move toward bridging the gap on Pennsylvania Avenue. Also, it would be a move toward the British parliamentary system—perhaps as large a one as our mores justify. It would go far toward making a team out of executive and legislative departments.

The individual legislator needs, as Mr. Byrnes says, adequate staff assistance, to take off his neck some of the constituent service which now "make it almost impossible for a Senator or Congressman to find the time necessary to attend to his legislative duties." Added to this help for the Member as individual, the legislative collectivity must be implemented with the tool of research performed by a permanent staff of trained career men of good minds and judgments to aid the committees.

Better pay would in the long run improve the caliber of the national legislators, just as would the sense of accomplishment and personal dignity that would come from a more resultful functioning of the legislative mill.

Irrespective of the details of the Byrnes program, the fact that he would articulate it should indicate the importance of congressional reform. It is greatly to be hoped that the spirit manifest in the last three Congresses, that now is the time to modernize, will be catalyzed into action.

Prices Must Be Kept to the 1941–42 Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks, I have been assured, this Congress will be given the opportunity to consider legislation on the most important problem to come before this session of Congress, the problem of providing a stable, highly productive post-war economic system in this country. This is the most important problem before us because on its successful solution will depend not only the welfare of the American people, but also the preservation of the American system of production and the American way of living. I do not think it is at all an exaggeration to say that the possibility of maintaining international peace also depends on our ability to solve the problem of post-war full employment. For, unless we can have stability and prosperity here at home, how can we hope to have it in our international relations?

Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, recently told the National Industrial Conference Board that, "a high level of consumers' expenditures is the basic requirement for post-war prosperity." He went on to say that "a high level of consumers' expenditures is not possible without a large volume of wage and salary income. If our economy is to operate at full capacity, average wage and salary incomes must be high enough at normal hours of work to give the people sufficient purchasing power to take the product off the market. When, after the war, hours return to normal and overtime pay is discontinued, total wage and salary income will decline sharply. If we are to avoid sharply declining prices and loss of markets which discourage production and business expansion, a gradual upward adjustment will be necessary in the wages and salaries of the great mass of comparatively low-paid workers. This must be accomplished without increasing prices. Otherwise the desired increase in consumption would be absorbed by a rise in the cost of living."

Let me repeat the last part of this quotation because it is so important now. Mr. Eccles says:

This must be accomplished without increasing prices. Otherwise the desired increase in consumption would be absorbed by a rise in the cost of living.

Because this point is so important, I want to call to the attention of this Congress a most important statement on reconversion pricing recently issued by the Labor Policy Committee of the Office of Price Administration. It bears the signatures of the representative of the three largest labor groups in the country, the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., and the standard railway labor organizations. It is called, What Workers Can Do About Reconversion Pricing.

I especially want to urge that this statement be given consideration by the Office of Price Administration, and by every other agency of the Federal Government, because there is no use in even considering legislation for full employment if the Federal agencies are going to permit prices to go up and thus wreck the possibility of our people being able to buy the output of our plants and our workers.

Under the permission granted me, I am including the statement on what workers can do about reconversion pricing:

WHAT WORKERS CAN DO ABOUT RECONVERSION PRICING

THE PROBLEM

After the war, full employment will depend on the people being able to buy everything that our workers will be able to produce. This means that prices must be low enough and wages high enough so that there is money enough to buy all ıe goods and services which our farms and factories can provide.

If 1941–42 prices were to prevail, prices would be so high in relation to present wages that widespread unemployment would be forced upon the people of this country.

However, most industries which were converted to wartime production are demanding even higher than 1941–42 prices for their new peacetime goods. Every increase in prices over the 1941–42 level will increase the number of unemployed, and increase the number of jobs which Government will have to provide to save the country from a severe post-war depression.

While O. P. A. can do nothing to force prices back below their pre-war level, labor is convinced that O. P. A. must not permit prices to go any higher than they were in 1941 and 1942. For this reason labor is urging O. P. A. to require producers, with very few exceptions, to stick to their old prices when they go back into civilian production again. This position is supported by competent, impartial economists, by the evidence produced by governmental and other fact-finding agencies, and even by the statements of a few of the Nation's enlightened business leaders.

You can help to protect your job and the welfare of your country by helping to get these facts out to labor and the general public.

(NOTE.—We are talking about goods which have been out of production and will soon be coming into production again. Don't let anyone confuse the issue by dragging in questions about goods which have been continuously in production during the war. That is another issue which must be dealt with, but it's different from the one we're discussing here.)

THE FACTS

1. The cost of labor has gone down during the war

Even while wages go up, the cost of labor may go down. This can be true because new machines and new processes increase output per worker. In some industries productivity has increased as much as 40 and 50 percent.

Business analysts say that the possibilities of reducing labor costs through improvements already made have not yet been exhausted and that the benefits of these improvements can be carried over into peacetime production. We believe that this will be found true in most mechanized industries.

2. The prices of materials have gone up very little during the war

Steel prices have not gone up since 1941. The prices of other metals and materials are up about 5 percent. However, new metals which are cheaper and stronger will be available for use in civilian production. Also, many industries are redesigning their products to make them lighter.

As a result of these things, the cost of material used will in many cases be lower even where the prices of the same quantities of these materials may be a little higher.

3. Production at capacity will be low-cost production

Soon after the war ends production can be at capacity levels because demand will be great. This will reduce production costs because the cost of producing each unit goes down as volume goes up.

The public must not be required to pay high prices for goods produced at low cost.

4. Reconversion costs are already paid for

Prices on war production were set high enough so that industry could set aside money to pay reconversion costs. Over $40,000,000,000 has been put aside by industry for this purpose.

The public paid the costs of reconversion once—in advance. We should not pay for them again through increased prices on peacetime production.

5. Industry has other protection against short-time losses

Congress has insured industry against losses for 2 years after the war. The Government will refund taxes already collected from industry to pay for losses which may be incurred during the first 2 years after the war. Long before this period is over, production will be at a high, profitable level.

6. Selling and promotion costs will be way down

For sometime after the war demand will be high, and sales resistance will be at an all-time low. Consumers will buy without urging. Since the cost of distribution is such a large part of the price of an article, this should save manufacturers and dealers millions of dollars.

7. Exceptions will be few and far between

A company may require a price increase because it paid scab wages before the war and is paying a union scale now. Some other unusual conditions may justify a price increase, but such conditions will be rare.

Moreover, such conditions among few manufacturers should not justify a price increase for many, nor should such a condition in a plant be used to boost prices more than is necessary to cover the increase.

WHAT TO DO

Talk about it in your shop, your union, and your neighborhood—prices need not be and must not be higher than in 1941 and 1942.

Nobody knows better than the man in the shop that new processes and labor-saving devices have been developed. Tell everybody you can what this has meant in increased production per hour of work and in savings in materials used in production.

Arrange with your O. P. A. Labor Advisory Committee to talk the matter over with the O. P. A. district director and his price staff. Give them the information that will help them to see why prices must—and can—be held.

Have your union show you what the profits have been in the company you work for. Find out what that means in the ability of the company to absorb temporary losses while production is still going up. Tell that story to those who feel that higher prices are necessary for the period immediately following reconversion.

Get articles and letters into your union paper and the daily press. Have meetings in your union hall; send speakers to community meetings to explain that prices can be held down and must be held down for post-war prosperity.

If management tells you that an increased price is necessary to protect your job or your wage rate, demand the facts before you accept that statement. Tell management to prove to you—

1. What has happened to the labor cost per unit during the war? Remember that labor costs may go down while wage rates go up. Wage adjustments should therefore not be used as an excuse for automatic price increases.

2. On what level of output is management figuring? Remember that how high costs go depends on the level of output at which a plant operates.

3. What is the financial condition of the company as far as reserves are concerned? The Federal Reserve Board says that, in general, small corporations as well as large are in good position to finance their reconversion costs out of savings.

4. What tax refunds are available to the manufacturer in case his earnings should be temporarily reduced during reconversion? Congress has already provided for tax refunds to offset reduced earnings that manufacturers are expected to encounter when war production ends and before civilian production gets fully under way.

5. In saying that his labor costs are higher, has the manufacturer taken into account the lower average hourly costs of labor due to the reduction of overtime, night shift differentials, etc.?

6. When he says that material costs have been increased, is he allowing for possible saving in material due to technical improvements developed as a result of war expense?

Get everybody you can to see that prosperity depends on high wages and jobs, and jobs depend on low prices.

Write to your Congressman as often as may be necessary and to the Federal agencies involved in economic stabilization: The Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the Office of Economic Stabilization, the Office of Price Administration, and the War Production Board.

Remember that prices can be kept to their 1941-42 level. Do your part to keep them there.

National Support of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project by Leaders of Both Parties, Governors, Mayors, Farm and Labor Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 4 I introduced in the House a bill (H. R. 671) to implement the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941, and to authorize post-war construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The bill, H. R. 671, is identical in terms with the bill, H. R. 2280, which I introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress on March 23, 1943, and with the bill, S. 1385, introduced in the Senate on September 28, 1943, by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont. Both the House and the Senate bills followed the terms of the Mansfield bill, H. R. 4927, Seventy-seventh Congress. That measure was approved by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors by a 2-to-1 vote after extensive public hearings and after an inspection of the project site by the members of the committee in 1941.

We thus have before us in the Seventy-ninth Congress a bill to provide for post-war construction of the most beneficial and the most needed navigation and power project in the world, under legislation which is nonpartisan and non-sectional in its origin and in the character of its sponsorship and support.

WIDESPREAD ENDORSEMENT OF BILL IN PRESENT FORM

The bill in its present form has been recommended for enactment into law by the President, in his message to Congress in 1941, and in his letter to Senator AIKEN March 3, 1944; by the former great Secretary of State Cordell Hull, letters of June 7, 1941 and April 10, 1944, by Secretary of State Stettinius, December 4, 1944, by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, War Department; by the United States Maritime Commission; by Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, who testified before the Rivers and Harbors Committee in behalf of the bill on June 23, 1941, and again strongly recommended its passage on May 30, 1944; by the Power Authority of the State of New York; by the Governors of many States and the mayors of the principal cities in the seaway area; by the National Grange; by the National Farmers Union; by more than 900 labor organizations and trade-unions; and by all of the official and engineering agencies of the Governments of the United States and Canada which have repeatedly surveyed the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin and helped to perfect the existing plans for completion of the seaway.

I am confident that during the Seventy-ninth Congress the St. Lawrence seaway and power project bill will receive the favorable action which it richly deserves on its demonstrated merits.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON MERITS OF BILL

While the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the Seventy-seventh Congress approved the project and the bill, as I have stated, after complete hearings, no hearings on the merits of the measure were held in the Senate in the Seventy-seventh or the Seventy-eighth Congress. This accounted for the adverse vote when the bill S. 1385 was offered as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill on December 12, 1944, and was rejected in the Senate. Many of those who voted against the adoption of the amendment

have publicly stated that they are favorable to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project but felt that public hearings should be held on its merits by a Senate committee before the bill was presented for final action.

The supporters of the St. Lawrence project are certainly entitled to be heard by this Congress on an improvement which means completion of a seaway directly benefiting more than 50,000,000 landlocked producers and consumers and the development of 2,200,000 horsepower of low-cost hydroelectricity, all at a net cost to our Federal Treasury of less than $200,000,000.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE AREA ENTITLED TO PARITY WITH OTHER RIVER BASINS

We cannot consistently exclude this great project from consideration as a part of our post-war program when we have just enacted into law a flood-control bill carrying authorization of $950,000,000 and have before us in the present Congress a rivers and harbors bill authorizing other river projects of a first cost of about $500,000,000.

Unless the St. Lawrence seaway and power project bill is enacted into law, the entire Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system will receive virtually nothing from the authorizations carried for post-war improvements in the great river basins of the country, and the entire Northeast will be excluded from the benefits of development of the largest of its water-power resources.

GOVERNOR DEWEY REAFFIRMS STRONG SUPPORT OF SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

To illustrate the nonpartisan and nonsectional character of the support for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, I wish to have printed in the RECORD a number of recommendations and endorsements which have recently been presented urging this improvement in the strongest terms.

On January 3, 1945, on the day preceding my reintroduction of the St. Lawrence project bill in the House, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, reaffirmed his support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project in his message to the New York State Legislature, as follows:

[Excerpt from Gov. Thomas E. Dewey's annual message January 3, 1945]

After 20 years of discussion, the tremendous power potential of the St. Lawrence River still remains undeveloped. Its estimated 1,620,000 kilowatts would be the second largest project of its kind in this continent. Its beneficiaries would be the residents of this State and nearby areas.

At the last session of the legislature, upon the recommendation of the State administration, resolutions were unanimously adopted declaring for the prompt development of the St. Lawrence River by measures which would provide low-cost power from these resources under the inalienable ownership of the people.

On December 12, 1944, the United States Senate rejected a measure for the completion of the seaway and power project, in accordance with the terms of the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941. However, it has been announced by the sponsors of the measure that it will be reintroduced at the first session of the next Congress.

I recommend, therefore, that the State continue vigorously to assert its substantial rights and interests in the St. Lawrence development.

For years I have advocated the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. During the past decade the means have been found and billions in Federal funds have been appropriated, to develop great rivers in other sections of the country, for power, navigation, flood control, irrigation, and like purposes. The incomparable resources of the St. Lawrence River should no longer be wasted. If the Federal administration is unable or unwilling to proceed, then the State of New York itself should undertake to complete the project on a self-liquidating basis in cooperation with the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario.

The Governor of New York is to be congratulated upon his consistent advocacy of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. In 1940, in 1942, and again in 1944, Governor Dewey as a candidate for office, issued public statements pledging himself to work for the completion of the entire seaway and power development.

NONPARTISAN SUPPORT OF THE AIKEN-PITTENGER BILL IN NEW YORK AND OTHER STATES

A review of Governor Dewey's record on the St. Lawrence improvement was presented in the Senate on December 12, 1944, by Senator AIKEN and is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. It includes a reference to the fact that over the period when Governor Dewey has been strongly supporting the St. Lawrence development, the Democratic Party of the State of New York has likewise pledged the improvement, declaring in its 1942 State platform:

We urge construction of the St. Lawrence power and seaway project. (Adopted at Democratic State Convention, Brooklyn, N. Y., August 20, 1942.)

On December 12, 1944, Senator WAGNER, of New York, voted for the adoption of the St. Lawrence amendment to the rivers and harbors bill. This was entirely consistent with the platform pledge referred to above, and with the public statement made by Senator WAGNER April 20, 1944, and published in the Watertown Times of April 25, 1944, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1944.

MR. HAROLD B. JOHNSON,
Watertown Daily Times,
Watertown, N. Y.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: In response to your recent request I am happy to send you a statement of my views on the constructive plans now pending for the improvement of the St. Lawrence River.

There is overwhelming sentiment for the earliest possible use of the power resources in the St. Lawrence River, resources essential for the post-war development of New York and the Nation. For half a century the people of New York have carried on a ceaseless battle, first to prevent these resources from falling into private control and more recently since the Power Authority Act of 1931 passed in the administration of Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt, to develop and distribute the power for the public good. This power project has had my fullest support throughout my service in the State legislature and the Congress.

I am convinced that the enactment of the Aiken bill, S. 1385, furnishes the most direct means of achieving these public benefits and I am therefore giving that measure my active support.

I should be glad to have you make this statement available and to express my greetings and good wishes to all those participating in the nonpartisan conference on the St. Lawrence project, at the meetings scheduled at Ogdensburg and Watertown.

With best wishes, I am

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. WAGNER.

As another evidence of the widespread nonpartisan support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, I wish to insert in the RECORD a public statement in support of the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941, which was issued on June 20, 1944, by 12 Republican Members of the United States Senate, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS,
Republican National Convention,
Chicago, Ill.:

Through the cooperation of the United States and Canada dating from the administrations of President Theodore Roosevelt and President William H. Taft, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system has been steadily improved step by step until the seaway project is now complete over 90 percent of the distance from the Midwest to the Atlantic.

The Republican Party, whose administrations initiated and built the Panama Canal, has consistently pledged completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project as an improvement that would serve the whole Nation, in war and in peace. Two world wars have fully demonstrated the soundness of this policy and the continuing need for the low-cost transportation and power facilities which this development will provide.

Completion of the project was pledged in platforms adopted at the Republican National Conventions of 1924, 1928, and 1932. Development of the St. Lawrence River for navigation and power and the removal of the last obstacles to the use of the seaway has been strongly advocated in public statements issued in the years indicated by:

President Harding, 1922; President Coolidge, 1923; President Hoover, 1924, 1928, 1944; Governor Lowden, of Illinois, 1926; Governor Landon, of Kansas, 1933, 1936; Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, 1938, 1941, 1942; Governor Dewey, of New York, 1940, 1942, 1944; the Republican Governors of more than a score of States since 1924, and many other Republican leaders.

A bill authorizing post-war construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project, sponsored by Republican Members of the Senate and the House, is now pending before Congress. In the interest of agriculture, industry, and productive employment of labor in useful construction of permanent value to the entire Nation, we urge the readoption at the 1944 Republican National Convention of the plank heretofore endorsed by our party and by Republican Presidents and other outstanding Republican leaders, in substantially the same form, as follows:

"The Republican Party stands committed to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. Recognizing the inestimable benefits which will accrue to the Nation from placing the ports of the Great Lakes on an ocean base, the party reaffirms allegiance to this great navigation and power project and pledges its best efforts to secure its early construction under the terms of legislation now pending in the Congress of the United States."

GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont; HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, Minnesota; ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Michigan; RUFUS HOLMAN, Oregon; ARTHUR CAPPER, Kansas; HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan; JOSEPH H. BALL, Minnesota; CLYDE REED, Kansas; JOHN THOMAS, Idaho; EDWARD V. ROBERTSON, Wyoming; GUY CORDON, Oregon; KENNETH WHERRY, Nebraska, United States Senators.

It will be noted that this statement refers to the legislation then pending in Congress, the Aiken-Pittenger bill, and favors enactment of that measure to implement the United States-Canadian Agreement of 1941. While neither the Republican nor the Democratic national conventions in 1944 adopted planks dealing specifically with the projects then pending for improvement of the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Columbia, the St. Lawrence, or other rivers, both party conventions did pledge broad, general post-war programs to provide for such river developments. And on October 24, 1944, President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey, both singled out the St. Lawrence development in pre-election messages to the Detroit Seaway Conference and joined in renewing their pledges for its completion.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S ENDORSEMENT OF THE AIKEN-PITTENGER BILL

On March 3, 1944, President Roosevelt endorsed the St. Lawrence project bill, in the form in which I have reintroduced it in the present Congress, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 3, 1944.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I am convinced that the time has come for a nonpartisan effort to secure congressional authorization for the St. Lawrence development in order that the project may be available for early post-war construction.

The undertaking will offer such important benefits to many States that I am sure it will provide a desirable stimulus to industrial and business activity which will assist the entire country in its reconversion to a stable peacetime economy on a continued high-production level. Many competent studies have shown that it will not hurt the railroads or ports through which foreign commerce now flows but will ultimately increase their business.

I am advising interested Federal agencies that your bill (S. 1385) modified to provide for construction as a post-war project, has my approval.

I have appreciated your consistent support of this great undertaking.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident, in the light of the record, that the nonpartisan pledges made by the leaders and the Presidential nominees of the two great political parties of our country will be redeemed at the present session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

SEAWAY ALREADY COMPLETE 90 PERCENT OF DISTANCE FROM DULUTH TO ATLANTIC

No other project which has heretofore been presented to Congress has promised such navigation and power benefits to the entire Nation on so large a scale, at so low a cost, as the St. Lawrence seaway and power development.

The project to provide a minimum depth of 27 feet in the connecting channels of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River is already complete over more than 90 percent of the distance to be cruised by ocean cargo vessels from Duluth at the head of the Lakes, to the open waters of the Atlantic Ocean. The Great Lakes now carry a commerce of 100,000,000 tons bottled up within the Lakes.

The chief remaining obstacle to the completion of the seaway lies in the International rapids section of the St. Lawrence, a 48-mile stretch of the river. This section will be improved under the United States-Canadian agreement and under the terms of the bill, H. R. 671, to replace obsolete 14-foot depth canals with modern dual-purpose dams, locks, and other works, creating 2,200,000 horsepower of the cheapest energy in the world and simultaneously removing the existing bottlenecks with a new channel of a minimun. depth of 27 feet.

PRE-WAR AGREEMENTS BY SPECIAL INTERESTS AGAINST PROJECT EXPLODED AND DISCREDITED

It has at last become evident to all thoughtful and impartial observers that we have sorely needed the St. Lawrence seaway and power project during the present war for shipping, power, and other essential purposes, and that we shall need it even more to maintain a high level of production, increased foreign trade, and full employment after the war. The position taken by Governor Dewey, Senator Aiken, Senator Wagner, and other advocates of this project in the Northeast in support of the seaway and power development evidences the fact that its benefits to all sections of our country alike are now clearly recognized.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on December 11, 1944, appears the testimony of former Governor Lehman and Mayor LaGuardia, of New York City, given before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in 1941, that the seaway would not result in any net diversion or loss of railroad or ocean shipping from existing rail centers and ocean ports, but would create an enormous new tonnage to the benefit of New York City, Buffalo, and other cities.

To say that an increase of 10,000,000 tons in American shipping through the St. Lawrence seaway could adversely affect New York Harbor with an annual tonnage of 100,000,000 tons, and destroy the commerce of Boston, Baltimore, and our Gulf ports, as charged by special interests which have obstructed the project, is too preposterous to mislead the Congress or our constituents. Such arguments will no longer fool an enlightened America as we tackle our post-war problems, determined to create new opportunities for our 12,000,000 returning veterans, our wage earners, industries, and agriculture.

COOPERATION OF ALL SECTIONS NEEDED TO REDEEM PLEDGES FOR POST-WAR DEVELOPMENT THROUGHOUT THE NATION

We of the landlocked interior States of this country have voted billions in the last two decades to complete the Panama Canal, to build Boulder Dam, T. V. A., and Bonneville-Grand Coulee, to protect the Mississippi and the Ohio from the ravages of floods, and to provide navigation, power, flood control, and irrigation improvements on nearly all our major rivers.

We now ask the cooperation of the West, the South, and the East in completing the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, our greatest single natural resource for navigation and power.

The President and the highest officials of this administration have repeatedly pledged the improvement and have received the wholehearted support of the Governors of New York, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and other States over the past 12 years for this undertaking. I, therefore, appeal with confidence to Members of the House, regardless of partisanship, to join in redeeming the pledges which have been made to complete the St. Lawrence seaway and power development, as an essential part of the post-war program now in the making before this Congress.

South More Self-Sufficient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the astounding progress made in recent years by the Southern States, I insert a clipping from the Charlotte Observer of December 22, 1944:

SOUTH MORE SELF-SUFFICIENT

In one sense the entire South is now in improved position to promote its own industrial development during the years ahead on its own power.

No longer need our section lament or apologize that it is lacking in financial resources to do for itself what formerly it was so dependent upon foreign capital to accomplish.

The South has attained to a position unique in this respect in its history of the past 80 years, or since the Civil War.

Some simple facts bear out this contention. They are presented by the Southern States Industrial Council through its director of research, Thurman Sensing.

In 1880, 15 years after the close of the Civil War, the total deposits in all the banks of the 15 Southern States from Texas to Virginia, amounted to no more than $190,000,000. At the present time, these deposits amount to approximately $20,000,000,000, or 100 times the deposits of the South 65 years ago and 10 times more than the deposits in the banks of the entire 48 States 65 years ago. It is an amount sufficient to have paid off the entire national debt in 1932.

To put it still another way, the per capita deposits of the South in 1880 were only $10, while today they are $475.

Moreover, since 1900 at least, the deposits of the South have increased proportionately faster than for the Nation at large, being 16 times larger than they were 45 years ago while the deposits of the Nation are only 8 times larger.

The most striking increase in the deposits of the South has been made during the past 4 years—due considerably to the stimulus of war contracts allocated to the South—increasing from $11,000,000,000 in 1940 to the present total of $20,000,000,000, or practically doubling in 4 years.

Mr. Sensing properly observes that there is an immense reservoir of capital now available in the banks of the South, such an amount, in fact, that the people of the South can now begin to guide their own destinies so far as their industrial progress is concerned. The opportunity the South has been awaiting for so long is now here. Once this has been realized and acted upon, the people of the South are destined for such prosperity as they have never known before.

Drafting Manpower for Industrial Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress have received information from both union men and employers residing in their districts to the effect that the manpower available is not being used to the fullest extent.

Some of us have verified some of these complaints and found that they were justified.

Shortly before July of last year an editor of Mill and Factory, Carl C. Harrington, caused an investigation to be made and his report as published in Mill and Factory contains some pertinent information.

Investigation should be made to see whether the conditions to which he refers still prevail and if they do, appropriate remedy should be applied to end the waste of manpower. His report follows:

HOW SOME DETROIT LABOR UNIONS SABOTAGE PRODUCTION

(By Carl C. Harrington)

Concerned over the many strikes and reports of labor irresponsibility in the Detroit area, I decided to visit personally some of the better known plants engaged in essential war work and examine their labor reports. These reports contain a detailed description of each labor grievance, work stoppage, slowdown, and strike, the names of the employees participating, and its effect upon production. They, therefore, quickly provide an authentic picture of labor conditions in each plant, together with a factual day-by-day history of its labor relations. They revealed a condition far more serious than I believed could possibly exist in the United States of America, at any time, and one completely inconceivable during a war period when our fellow citizens are fighting for their lives with the very weapons these men are producing.

I hesitate to publish the facts revealed by this investigating study, as I will be branded immediately and vehemently as an enemy of labor. But the facts must be brought into the open, both for the good of the country and for labor itself. They are in no way meant as a condemnation of all union labor, but are a very bad indictment against those large, irresponsible sections of union labor which are doing the cause of labor irreparable harm.

The cases discussed in this report are all taken from the records of Detroit plants working nearly 100 percent on war production. The records are on file in the company offices and substantiate each case.

I visited the offices of one company working 100 percent on war products which has experienced nearly 300 work stoppages in the past two years. These ranged from a walkout of 20 employees for the disciplining of one member for habitual absenteeism, to the striking of 15,000 workers over the reorganization of a department.

CONTRACT AGREEMENTS

A great many records of work stoppages which I saw indicate that local Detroit labor leaders either cannot or will not see that their members live up to contract agreements between the company and the union. There are hundreds of records where, after the company and union have laboriously agreed on hours and production rates, as well as rules and regulations, these agreements were completely ignored by the employees when something arose that did not suit them. Contracts invariably include a specified procedure for handling employee grievances in order to minimize interruption of production and to afford a sensible and rational way to settle complaints. In spite of these agreed-upon procedures, cases occur every day where the entire grievance machinery is ignored and a plant or department stops work. The following instances are typical of the records I saw:

Several women were transferred to a department in another building. Later, when the supervisor came through the building, he found the women sitting around doing nothing. They refused to work because there was no restroom adjacent to their washroom, as there had been in their former department. No grievance or anything else had been filed. They merely stopped work.

In one plant an entire department quit work because employees heard a rumor that there was to be a change in rates. No notice or official word had been given concerning such a rate change. The employees merely heard a rumor and stopped work.

One department of a company was far under its production quota. The union agreed to a time study being made and further agreed on the increased individual production rates shown possible by the study. Two men in the department refused to meet their quotas, even after warnings from management and union. When they were finally discharged, the entire department walked out.

Many records show that even when the union agrees with the company on transferring employees from one department to another entire departments will occasionally quit work.

PLANT DISCIPLINE

With the growing strength of their unions and the further knowledge that the Federal Government will almost invariably back their causes, union members in many industrial plants are becoming more and more irresponsible and demanding. They resent the slightest restrictive rules and regulations, even if established for their own good.

Employees in a certain department of a company I visited, where the work was hazardous to unprotected eyes, refused to wear safety goggles supplied by the management. These employees even went so far as to seek a court injunction to restrain the company from insisting that they wear the goggles.

Smoking restrictions, even in hazardous locations, seem to be universally resented. There are numerous cases where entire departments will walk out because one of their number was caught smoking and given a day or so off.

In some cases, to show their defiance of management, 30 or 40 employees in a department will wait until the superintendent is walking down their aisle, then deliberately turn around facing him and light a cigarette. Furthermore, if these employees are given a disciplinary lay-off, all the employees in the department, or even in the entire plant, are apt to stop work. This in spite of the fact that in the union contract there may be certain designated penalties agreed upon for breaking the no-smoking rule.

Even disciplinary action against rank and abusive insubordination may cause the shutdown of an entire department or plant. Many reports I saw show that employees like to see just how far they can go in violation of common ethics as well as in breaking company rules.

There was a record of one union committeeman who refused to show his identification badge to the plant guard at the gate. He insisted on entering without showing his badge and became very abusive when he was denied entrance. As a result, he was given a week off. His entire department of 200 employees walked off in sympathy with him.

Another employee who was discharged because of drunken and abusive behavior, during which he slugged a foreman, was the cause of his entire department stopping work.

There is another instance where 350 workers struck for 3 days because one of their members was sent home for pushing a foreman around.

Another strike of 1,000 people occurred because a woman was sent home for persistently ignoring a safety rule.

Over 2,200 employees quit work for 2 days because the company refused to discharge a foreman who had disciplined 2 workers.

The foregoing cases are typical of what I read in the daily labor reports of many unionized companies. They are in obvious violation of union-contract agreements as well as common sense. In no way are they mere isolated instances used intentionally to paint a black picture. Moreover such instances are increasing in frequency and in some cases are admitted by management to point toward a complete break-down of company discipline.

UNION POLITICS

The managements of several companies I talked with claim that politics within the local unions are one of the greatest causes of labor unrest. There are generally two or more factions striving for union power. Union committeemen who are elected by the members of each department are continuously "electioneering." To keep their job or to be elected in place of the current committeeman these individuals have to keep promising more and better things to the "voters." If and when these men are elected committeemen, they have to make some show of fulfilling their campaign promises. More often than not they have promised the moon, and cannot possibly deliver. This in turn gives the opponents something to talk about, and so the cycle repeats.

All this pulling and hauling keeps the various departments in a state of unrest. A good committeeman must always have a pocket full of grievances, all duly signed by some employee. By union agreement he is permitted a certain amount of time away from his company job to work on these grievances. There are instances reported by workers where committeemen have approached them with a filled-out grievance form and ordered them to sign it. "You've got a grievance and this is it," they are told.

Multiplied by the numerous departments in a large plant, it is easy to realize the continuous unrest that this union activity creates. Elections of committeemen by departments are often staggered, so that there is almost always an election being held by some group of workers. In one plant visited in June, elections had been going on since the previous December.

Committeemen, who are the departmental representatives of the union, often show as little respect for the union contract as do the rank and file.

In one case brought to my attention, a supervisor walked into a certain department and found the machines standing idle and all the employees over at one end of the room. He was told that the committeeman decided to hold a meeting and the employees had to attend.

A 2-day strike of 1,200 workers resulted after a committeeman and several workers were discharged because they refused to do the work assigned them.

A strike of 400 workers and a strike of 2,000 workers both resulted from the dismissal of union committeemen for just causes. Another strike of 1,300 workers followed the light disciplining of a union committeeman.

WORK RESTRICTIONS

Reports shown me indicate a widespread policy of actual production limitations, or

subtle work slow-downs, either openly or surreptitiously enforced by the union. This, even during a period when every piece of war equipment was urgently needed and there was no sign of production curtailment. Some plants report that they are working at from 50- to 70-percent efficiency, in spite of production-boosting campaigns, morale-building programs, and numerous other methods designed to encourage employees in boosting their production. There are many cases where endeavors to increase production, with union agreement, have resulted in strikes and work stoppages.

In one foundry a number of metal pourers held their production at a certain number of heats per day, then stood around the rest of the day doing nothing. When they were ordered to increase their output, the entire foundry of some 1,500 workers, walked out for 6 days.

One thousand workers struck for a day when the number of workers operating certain machines was reduced from 12 to 10.

Two ex-sailors working in a plant quit because the union committeeman insisted that they reduce their productive output. The company could do nothing to override the committeeman without precipitating a general strike.

WE DON'T LIKE YOU

Labor unions are loud in proclaiming racial equality and equal opportunity for all. To dispute their sincerity, I saw records of strike after strike which occurred purely because of the member's refusal to work with Negroes.

A 4-day strike of 1,400 workers occurred at a Detroit company's plant because nine employees were sent home for refusing to work with four Negro women.

Another strike of 125 workers resulted when employees refused to work with 2 Negroes.

Numerous strikes and stoppages have occurred because workers did not like certain people in their plant.

A 2-day strike of 2,200 workers occurred because the company refused to discharge a foreman who had disciplined 2 workers.

A strike of 3,800 workers was caused by a company's refusal to discharge a personnel man.

There was big news in Detroit on Friday, June 3. It was the first day in many months when there was not a strike of some sort in the area. This record was immediately ruined the next day.

This area has justly earned a reputation for strikes and labor dissension. Labor violence appears to be an accepted means for union members to negotiate. In May of this year over 4,000,000 man-hours were lost due to walk-outs in the Detroit area. This, of course, does not take into account the hundreds of work stoppages that continuously occur in individual departments of plants and cause an untold amont of lost time and production.

CONDITIONS UNBELIEVABLE

The conditions I found in some Detroit plants are unbelievable to outside industrial visitors. During the recent foremen's strike, which caused the idleness of some 52,000 workers, there were instances of idle employees having a catch with a soft ball right inside the plant; being abusive to company executives, and breaking the windows in their cars; and glorifying in the elimination of bosses. One union newspaper published an editorial pointing out this ideal state of affairs. This is reproduced on these pages and states that the members "* * * are for once enjoying the freedom and the democracy that we are supposed to have. * * *" The statement is carried under the byline of the president of the local union.

It is no wonder that R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers, C. I. O., recently warned his union members against wildcat strikes and stated that public opinion has become "inflamed" against his union. If the public could read, as I did, the records of these labor disturbances and thus obtain a picture of what is going on in some industrial plants in Detroit today, "inflamed" would be no word to express the revulsion and rage that would sweep the country. If the public could see as I did how these vital war plants, during nearly every month for the past 2 years there have been hundreds of work stoppages, dozens of strikes, and thousands of man-hour losses over petty grievances, or if the public could realize the extent of union-fostered slowdowns and job restrictions that have artificially held manufacturing efficiency at from 50 to 70 percent of what it should be normally, short shift would be given to these Detroit unions who set themselves up as being responsible for workers' discipline and the betterment of their members and fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the morning paper carries a statement from theater owners in St. Louis, Mo., the substance of which is that they are compelled to employ stand-by operators.

That, too, should be investigated as should the reputed practice of insisting upon stand-by jobs in various occupations. In wartime there is no excuse for an able-bodied man, capable of contributing to the war effort, being paid for doing nothing.

The practice of Petrillo's musicians and Dan Tobin's teamsters who insist upon loafing, while other men perform the work for which they are paid, should end without any further delay.

The Four-Point Plan of the Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a copy of the four-point program adopted by the Ohio Department of the Disabled American Veterans at the twenty-third annual convention held in the city of Columbus, Ohio, August 25, 26, 27, 1944, and which was prepared and presented to this convention by its very able department commander, Frank B. Brown, of Canton, Ohio.

This is the most reasonable and complete program for the care of America's service disabled that has ever been brought to my attention. The Disabled American Veterans, commonly called the D. A. V., is composed exclusively of those who have served our country in time of war, and who were wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled in some way as a direct result of their service.

The D. A. V. in Ohio has rendered a most valuable service to this particular group of veterans and to the widows and orphans over a long period of years. During the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the representatives of this organization at the offices of the Veterans Administration at Dayton and Brecksville, Ohio, arranged for 1,104 hospitalizations, obtained 2,061 physical examinations, received 14,376 letters from veterans regarding their claims, addressed 15,291 letters to veterans regarding their claims, personally interviewed 14,981 claimants, made 2,598 personal appearances before rating boards for veterans, and reviewed the claims files of 13,939 veterans.

The Ohio Department of the D. A. V. is leading all States in membership in the organization for the seventh consecutive year, has more members than the combined total of 26 other States, more life members than the combined total of 38 other States, and more chapters than the combined total of 21 other States. About 80 percent of the entire membership in the D. A. V. in Ohio are either part paid or fully paid life members. More than 45 percent of the entire membership in the D. A. V. in Ohio are fully paid life members. This is a record that is unequaled by any State organization of any kind in the United States.

I have had particular opportunity to observe the work of Senator Albert L. Daniels, who is the State adjutant-treasurer for the State department of Ohio. Senator Daniels is an able speaker and has given of his time and energies in speaking all over Ohio and in other States.

Likewise I have observed the activities of Mr. W. K. Adams, of Portsmouth, Ohio, who is the legislative chairman for the Ohio organization. Bill Adams has always been ready to do his part in this program. He has given to his job very efficient service.

I want also to compliment my friend, Hon. Benjamin F. Turner, of Pomeroy, Ohio, who is a member of the State board of the Ohio department. As a member of the State legislature he has had opportunities to carry on the work of this veterans' organization with great efficiency. Mr. Turner has always been a stalwart friend to the disabled veteran.

I can pay worthy compliments to other members of the State organization, but these three above named come from my section of the State of Ohio, where I have had a chance to observe personally their very efficient and devoted service.

The following is a copy of the four-point program to which I have heretofore referred:

FOUR-POINT PROGRAM, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF OHIO

HOSPITALIZATION

We advocate that an immediate program of construction be instituted to enlarge the existing veterans' hospitals or to build new ones, so that necessary accommodations are available at all times to provide adequate treatment for honorably discharged veterans of all wars, and especially those with service-connected disabilities. It is our opinion that in no case should a veteran with a service-connected disability, who is in need of hospitalization, be placed on the waiting list, but should be admitted to the hospital immediately upon application. We advocate that everything possible be done to maintain an efficient medical staff in every hospital, as it is our opinion that America's disabled defenders are entitled to the best care

medical science can offer. We believe the Government should provide a more complete method in the hospitalization of veterans suffering with nervous disability, that a more extensive study and follow-up on this type of case be made with outside guidance in lieu of vocational training until such veteran arrives at a more stable state, and then be given the opportunity of vocational training. We oppose committing any veteran suffering with mental or nervous disorders to a State institution. We advocate a more generous policy of authorizing out-patient treatment, and believe this should be given special attention in cases of tropical diseases.

COMPENSATION AND PENSION

We advocate adequate compensation for the wartime disabled. We oppose the use of the word "pension" in connection with payments made to veterans of World War No. 2 for service-incurred disabilities and advocate the use of the word "compensation"—in connection with payments made to veterans of all wars for service-incurred disabilities. We oppose the present policy of the Veterans Administration which virtually restricts service-connected disabilities of World War No. 2 veterans to disabilities that are actually noted on the official service department records. We believe this policy should be broadened and that this group should be eligible to service-connected disabilities for any chronic disease that should manifest itself within 1 year following discharge. We advocate a more generous rating schedule that will more adequately compensate and include disabilities not recognized under present schedules.

EMPLOYMENT

We advocate the enactment of legislation that will guarantee the physically handicapped veteran an opportunity to secure gainful employment and we believe such legislation should apply to both governmental and private employment. We believe it is important to the future security of this Nation that partially disabled veterans be assured gainful employment. We further believe that the employment of these partially disabled veterans should be such as would utilize and be within the limits of the full capability of the veteran, and as such would assure maximum benefit to both Government and employer. We urge that the present regulations providing for preference for disabled veterans in matters of appointment be strictly adhered to, and we believe the Government should set the example for private employers by giving preference to disabled veterans.

EDUCATION

We oppose the present system of vocational training or education on the basis that it favors the veteran with the best background or prior education. We advocate legislation that will give preference in the training program to veterans with service-connected disabilities. We believe special emphasis should be placed on the training of those with service-connected disabilities—so that they may enjoy the benefits of gainful occupation. We oppose the Government's attitude of encouraging veterans discharged with disabilities to go into war work and believe these veterans should be encouraged to prepare themselves for the future by taking suitable training and we ask for the cooperation of the Government, management, and labor in the training program of America's disabled defenders.

Submitted by Frank B. Brown, commander, Disabled American Veterans, Department of Ohio, and adopted by the twenty-third annual convention, Columbus, Ohio, August 25, 26, 27, 1944.

Hon. Melvin J. Maas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, entertained the members of the House Naval Affairs Committee, high ranking naval officers, and the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, at a buffet luncheon at his office for the purpose of bidding farewell to our former colleague the Honorable Melvin J. Maas, ranking Republican member of the Naval Committee, who is now on active duty as colonel in the Marine Corps. A token of esteem was presented to Colonel Maas in behalf of the committee by the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman, and it is my pleasure to include in my remarks the statements which he made at that time which reflected the thoughts of each member of the committee:

Mr. Secretary, members of the committee, by the vicissitudes of the American way in which we choose our Congressmen, the Naval Affairs Committee, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, will not have the benefit of the counsel and advice of our former distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Maas.

Much to our regret he was one of the political casualties of the "Battle of November 7." However, he has the satisfaction of knowing that during the long years he was a member of our committee he played a conspicuous role and was a tower of strength in fixing naval policies and passing legislation which has in turn enabled the Navy to meet and defeat the enemy and bring victory to our cause.

For 10 years Mr. Maas had been a member of the committee and during the last 7 years he was the ranking member of his party on it. However, no one could ever tell there was either a majority or minority party, for the committee acts and is guided by what it considers and deems to be, to the best interest of the country, and party denomination fades away in our deliberation.

I have never served with a member who was more intensely devoted and interested in the welfare of the Navy than Mr. Maas. His one thought was what he could do to increase the efficiency of the Navy and to maintain the morale of its personnel at its highest degree.

During the years he served on the committee more constructive and beneficial legislation was enacted for the Navy than ever before in its long and glorious history and he was an outstanding factor in helping to bring it about.

As a reserve officer, having come through the ranks to his present high grade, he was ever the champion of the cause of the reservists, for he knew intimately their trials and tribulations and every pulsation of his heart beat in harmony and unison with theirs.

Mr. Secretary, the Navy should be everlastingly grateful to Mr. Maas for the intense interest he has shown in the Navy and the Marine Corps as well as for the results that have been accomplished through his foresight, energy and aggressiveness.

I have never worked with a member of the committee where the relationship was more cordial and if we had different viewpoints we sat down and ironed them out in a friendly manner, for we both had the same objective—to contribute our best for the welfare of the Navy and the country.

Mr. Maas enjoyed not only the confidence and respect of every member of the committee but also that of the entire House. We will miss him in our deliberations in the Seventy-ninth Congress, for he was a Member with vision. He had a thorough grasp of every phase of the Navy, thoroughly conversant with the intricate personnel problems, as well as its complicated broad logistic matters.

I say to you from the bottom of my heart, I was profoundly sorry when I read the news that he had fallen by the political wayside for the time being, for during our long years of intimate association I had grown to rely immensely upon this man of outstanding ability.

I know that I speak for each and every one of our committee, when I wish for him in his tour of duty in the Marine Corps, wherever it may be, the very best.

Mr. Maas, on behalf of the committee, it is my very great pleasure to present to you this token, which is small and insignificant in comparison with the high regard and esteem in which you are held by the committee, and wherever you go always remember that you have the best wishes of your old colleagues and friends on the committee.

Rights Imply Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am most happy to include an editorial which appeared in the Labor World, published in Spokane, Wash.

This editorial is by Ruth Taylor, and I think it is splendid. All of us should realize that no privilege can long exist unless each of us realizes our individual responsibilities which spring from those privileges.

The editorial follows:

RIGHTS IMPLY RESPONSIBILITIES

(By Ruth Taylor)

The Bill of Rights is a favorite topic with all American speakers, no matter what their viewpoint or their politics. It is the one sure-fire hit.

We all believe in the principles embodied in the Bill of Rights. We proclaim it as the foundation stone of our democracy. We brag of its insurance of our liberties as we wave the flag. We flaunt its great phrases in the faces of our enemies.

But do we live up to the ideal it embodies? Do we carry out in our national, in our community, in our personal life its great teachings?

We emphasize the equality before the law for which it stands. We say we oppose discrimination—that this is the abhorrent idea of the so-called master race. But are we free from the taint of discrimination? How do we judge our neighbors? Bigotry and intolerance can be allowed no place in our own

lives if we would be true to our own heritage and destiny.

The people have, through the Bill of Rights, the inalienable right to the furthering by the state of equality of opportunity. But they have it not merely as a state-given right but as a God-given one. Freedom from discrimination is a spiritual as well as a material condition for human development.

This does not mean that all people must have equal amounts of everything; but it does mean that they must have an equal opportunity to develop their talents, to do profitable and worth-while work, without being hampered by discriminations based upon anything other than their ability and their willingness to work with their fellow men.

The only way we can defend our liberties is to see to it that the law is administered impartially and equally to all the people of the country. The pledge to our flag makes this clear:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

The last two words—"for all"—are the essence of the Bill of Rights; but before we brag too much about them let us do a little soul-searching and see if we live up to them in our own lives. Rights imply responsibilities.

Letter From Rev. David Bogard, of Little Falls, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, our leadership seeks constantly to emphasize that the war we fight on so many battle fronts is a people's war. I believed it so when I voted for the war in December 1941 and I believe it so today as I repeatedly cast my vote for new authorizations and appropriations to expedite the victory.

At the same time, however, I can well understand the increasing feelings of dismay and disillusionment among our people as they seek to obtain facts about the progress of our military fortunes and our foreign policy.

The extent to which our people's representatives have been bypassed in this matter is disheartening. Consequently, I am glad to note that General Marshall and Admiral King have plans to move closer to the people's representatives and will report to them facts on our military operations. At the same time, it is pleasing to note that the new Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, has indicated he will move closer to the Congress in pursuing the problems of foreign policy. I cannot help but feel that the President and Commander in Chief seeks to do likewise and will move closer to the Congress and the people as he speaks out in his fourth inaugural next Saturday.

I have in my hand a letter from a clergyman in my district. He has never written me before. The Reverend David Bogard is pastor of the Second Reformed Church of Little Falls, N. J., and he is the father of a boy in the service. The thoughts he pens are similar to those going through the hearts and minds of millions of our people in these trying days:

JANUARY 5, 1945.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am exercising my prerogative as a citizen of your district to write you about matters that trouble me, relative to the conduct of the war.

None of us on the home front have any doubts about the courage and ability of our fighting men. Nor have we lost confidence in our military leadership, in spite of the recent disasters in Europe. I also have confidence in the idealism of our fighting men. They are willing to face any hardship to attain a worthy goal. We at home can bear the heartaches too, provided there is something worthy of the sacrifice.

Of late, however, a wave of frustration and futility has swept over us. With the Atlantic Charter tossed into the waste basket as an impractical collection of memoranda; with Europe being carved up before our eyes, in total disregard for the principles of that charter, what in God's name are we now fighting for?

Did we not enter the war with the idealism of the Atlantic Charter as our chief stimulus? Much as we hated war, this was worth fighting for. But now—even before the military victory is achieved, the very goal that led us into war is already scrapped. As it stands, we may, and undoubtedly will, win a military victory, but unless there is a decided change of heart, we have already lost the war.

It might surprise you to know how widespread is this angry sense of disillusionment. It is my business, as a pastor, to visit people and give comfort where I can. Almost daily I receive letters from the battlefronts. The tone of these letters and of the conversations would make our political leaders tremble if they could hear them.

Must we stand idly by, while the best blood and brains of our Nation are being sacrificed? Must we be led, "as sheep to the slaughter"? Or is this still a "Government by the people and for the people"? Perhaps you, as one who represents us, can do something.

Cordially yours,

DAVID BOGARD.

Platform of the National Grange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in charting a course for the guidance of our country to achieve the blessings of good government, the National Grange stands in the forefront among our national organizations working for the advancement of the American people.

In studying national issues, it appears that the money plank offered both the great political parties by the National Grange would do more to stabilize our national economy and bring permanent prosperity to this country than any financial program offered by any political party at any time when the Grange submitted this legislative program, from which I quote:

Agriculture demands a monetary system providing an honest dollar, one just to the debtor and creditor alike, with constant purchasing power preventing uncontrolled inflation, or the disastrous effects of deflation.

Since the Grange platform containing that monetary plank was presented to the country the Grange has met again in its national convention at Winston-Salem, N. C., in November of last year and adopted another platform with a declaration of principles for which that great farm organization stands, which it is my privilege to submit to my colleagues for their consideration:

GRANGE PLATFORM FOR AGRICULTURE

1. Organized agriculture and the rural people pledge continued maximum effort for winning the war.

2. The Grange recognizes that permanent world peace is of paramount importance. Steps to achieve this should include:

(a) An effectively implemented organization of sovereign states, including a world court, but with the right to declare war retained solely by Congress.

(b) Development of international trade on an equitable basis.

(c) Rehabilitation of productive industry in devastated lands.

3. The continued prosperity of America depends upon an economy of plenty, shared equitably by agriculture, industry, and labor. The American farmer is entitled to the American market to the extent of his ability to supply it, and he should share with other groups the American standard of living.

4. It is recognized that agriculture in wartime has stepped up production beyond normal demands for its products. The price ceiling structure has prevented building reserves to tide over price declines, and it is therefore a national obligation to avert losses which lead to widespread depression, by a realistic program for meeting the surplus problem.

5. Support prices should be used to insure needed production and to prevent collapse due to temporarily glutted markets. Marketing agreements should also be used to maintain parity prices for those crops having occasional or regional surpluses.

6. On crops with exportable surpluses a two-price system offers a simple method to obtain parity of income for agriculture without using funds from the Public Treasury; the consumer to pay a price which would reflect parity on that portion of the crop consumed at home. Each farmer would then be free to determine the extent to which he would produce for the world market at world prices.

7. The obsolete parity formula by which farmers' prices are measured should be modernized and such formula should include farmers' labor costs.

8. Taxes must be maintained at high levels during the war to help pay war costs from current revenues and to aid in preventing inflation. Taxes should never be used as a means of promoting social reforms or for discrimination against any form of business, including cooperatives.

9. Continuance of certain controls to prevent inflation is recognized as necessary, but these should be relaxed as rapidly as conditions will permit.

10. Cooperatives afford the means by which individual farmers in the exercise of private enterprise may pool their efforts for economy and efficiency, and such cooperatives are of

benefit to farmer and consumer alike. Cooperatives should be encouraged and protected from attacks, including unfair taxes and unjust discriminatory legislation.

11. A dependable system of sound farm credit should be administered cooperatively, with Government supervision in the hands of a bipartisan board. Crop insurance should be developed on a practical basis.

12. Agriculture must assume its responsibility in planning for the post-war period, in cooperation with labor, industry, and other groups, for coordinated national economy and to assure well-balanced and lasting prosperity.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE FAVORS

Federal aid for highways, apportioned to the States on the basis of one-third population, one-third post roads, and one-third main roads.

Improvement of rural schools wherever they are below reasonable American standards, coupled with development of youth leadership training.

Extension of social security to include farmers and farm workers.

Continuation of a congressional committee to investigate un-American activities.

Termination of rebates on Government shipping over land-grant railroads.

Conferences between agriculture, industry, and labor for discussion of common problems, in the interests of national welfare.

Extension of rural electrification as rapidly as practicable, with continued support of the R. E. A.

Revision of the Lend-Lease Act to prevent its use for nonwar purposes.

An amendment to the Constitution of the United States to divide the electoral vote within the States as nearly as possible in line with the popular vote.

Continuation of appropriation to help alleviate farm-labor shortage.

A constitutional amendment to forbid citizenship to children of persons ineligible for citizenship.

Simplification of income-tax return forms.

Production control for tobacco, together with support prices.

Formulation of a program for cotton based on soil conservation, Government loans, and support prices; with an export policy which will make it possible to reach foreign markets during the period necessary to bring cotton production into adjustment with domestic and foreign outlets.

Assurance that all projects involving irrigation, reclamation and development of power be administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Development of voluntary rural health and hospitalization programs.

Elimination of abuses in manipulation of prices and weights in marketing of hogs or other products.

Modification of International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to give those who furnish the most capital greater control; also elimination of international monetary fund because better handled by the bank itself.

Making available, under royalty or otherwise, the use of any patents which have been withheld from the market against the public interest.

Establishing congressional agencies to provide Congress with accurate information on current expenditures, disposal of Government properties and similar matters.

Appropriations to pay expenses of O. P. A. advisory committees so that no group may be barred from participating because of lack of funds.

Vocational training for youth and returning veterans.

Encouragement for credit unions, with wider distribution of literature explaining their purposes and possibilities.

Agricultural representation in all agencies authorized to make trade agreements.

The right of Congress to revoke any trade agreement within a reasonable length of time after its adoption.

Establishment by local granges of memorial forests in honor of servicemen.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE OPPOSES

Continuation of interstate trade barriers.

Subsidies in lieu of fair prices.

Continuation of daylight-saving time.

Federal control of insurance.

Attempts to bottle up the sale of public power.

Automobile use taxes and Federal gasoline taxes, as an invasion of the rights of States.

Freight-rate increases by the railroads.

Trend toward immoral motion pictures and literature.

A Federal sales tax.

Sales of intoxicating liquors in public parks.

Restrictions on cooperative farm enterprises through taxation or otherwise.

Spread of corporation farming as a threat to the family sized farm and to highest rural interests.

National Catholic Rural-Life Conference Explains Truth About Taxation of Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very gratified and honored to have the opportunity to include with my remarks an article which appeared in the December 1944 issue of Land and Home, the official publication of the National Catholic Rural-Life Conference, and which deals factually and effectively with the whole question of taxation of cooperatives:

ROCHDALE AND TAXES

(By Martin Schirber, O. S. B.)

On the hundredth birthday of the Rochdale Cooperative Movement, cooperatives in America are being subjected to an attack that gives every promise of being a fight to the finish. The attack does not come as a bolt from the blue. Cooperative leaders have known for some years that they are being gunned for—that the growth of the cooperative movement is an invitation to battle with the interests that are being stepped on as cooperatives expand. Expansion since 1940 has been so rapid that it is more than some private enterprisers can stand.

When the business of farmer-owned cooperatives leaps 30 percent in 1 year to a total of three and three-quarter billions, and when membership increases in the same period by a quarter of a million, the competition of farmers' elevators and of greasy little co-op oil stations begins to take on a different cast. When these little ventures, which were innocent enough in the beginning, begin to unite into regionals to do a more efficient job of marketing and purchasing, they become positively un-American.

Spearhead of the movement to squash these un-American tendencies is the National Tax Equality Association, which was organized in 1943, after a couple of false starts, as a clearing-house for the dissemination of information on tax inequalities, Government subsidies, and the preferential treatment accorded to the competitors of private business. N. T. E. A. is headed by Ben C. McCabe, president of the International Elevator Co., of Minneapolis. Its other officers include representatives of firms dealing in grain, lumber, and coal.

N. T. E. A's approach is what you would call indirect. It disclaims any antagonism for "true" cooperatives which, although "set up by a foreign pattern," are designed to "help the farmer by permitting him to sell his products with other farmers and to buy certain needed supplies at wholesale costs." (Note the weasel words!) What it objects to is the growth of these organizations "to great size and in fields far removed from the original concept"—whatever that was. The reason for this growth, according to Mr. McCabe, is that "they are specifically exempt from the high Federal income taxes which are today taking most of the earnings of all corporations."

Mr. McCabe's mental distress becomes understandable when it is realized that his principal cooperative competitor in the Northwest did a business of $100,000,000 in 1943 and saved its members $2,000,000; and that the patronage dividend in that year was at a rate which exceeds the commission it is obliged to collect from affiliated country elevators for selling their grain on the exchange. In other words, because of careful management and because of other operations carried on by this large regional cooperative, it is able to pay a patronage dividend to member elevators which is larger than the commission which nonmember elevators must pay to have their grain sold for them.

It is this patronage refund which Mr. McCabe and the N. T. E. A. are after. They assert that cooperatives do not have to pay Federal income taxes and thus derive a special advantage which makes it impossible for private business to compete with them. They would like to see the patronage refund taxed away while still in the hands of the co-op, rather than refunded to the farmers, so that farmers would have less incentive to patronize their own businesses.

The reaction from the grass roots has been strong and spontaneous. Cooperatives are coming together as never before to meet the attack, because they are convinced that all the patter about tax equality is just a blind to hide a campaign to make the world safe from cooperatives. As one cooperative editor put it, farmers are recalling the advice of Mary Ellen Lease during the Populist campaign "to raise less corn and more hell." State councils and associations of cooperatives are springing up or undergoing reorganization from coast to coast; and a National Association of Cooperatives has been formed to carry on the fight at the national level.

The common danger has unified the movement as nothing else could. Cooperators for the life of them can't see why they should scrap their well-organized cooperative institutions and pay a middleman to market their products when they can do it more cheaply and efficiently themselves. Nor can they see why they should pay for the crosshauling, back-tracking, and buck-and-winging of trucks operated by half a dozen competing oil dealers when they can concentrate their patronage on their own co-op oil station and eliminate untold duplication of facilities. (See Farm Petroleum Delivery Bulletin P52, Iowa State College.)

Why do farmers feel so righteous about their cause? Is it true that their co-ops don't pay taxes and therefore enjoy an unbeatable advantage over private enterprise? The first thing a cooperator will tell you is that his co-op does pay taxes. It pays real-estate taxes, capital-stock taxes, excise taxes, and perhaps taxes on earnings not distributed as patronage refunds. It pays no income tax on income that is refunded to patrons on the basis of patronage, because that income is an overcharge which does not belong to the co-op.

If a marketing co-op gathers and sells its members products, and after charging the

competitive commission has a surplus which it refunds to members, it has received no income. It merely overcharged them for the service it performed as agent, and now it refunds the difference to the principals.

If a purchasing cooperative charges the current market price for goods it supplies to its members (one of the Rochdale rules) and finds that there is a margin remaining after all expenses, it has overcharged its members and therefore reimburses them by paying a patronage dividend.

In either case the members will have a higher income because their costs were reduced (except in the case of the purchase of purely consumers' goods) or their sales price higher, and they will pay income taxes on that increased income. To an open mind it is an arrangement about which everyone should be happy. England, the home of cooperatives, has settled this question two times over by the exhaustive reports of Royal Commissions.

American courts have repeatedly come up with the same decision. As long as any corporation, whether cooperative or not, is obligated by its bylaws, etc., to pay out its earnings to patrons, so that its directors have no discretion in the matter, those earnings are not taxable while in the hands of the corporation. In fact, members can vote to leave their patronage refunds or savings with the cooperative, and as long as the co-op evidences its indebtedness to the members therefor or allocates the retains to the respective members' accounts, it is not legally bound to pay income taxes thereon. The individual members whose income is enhanced by the patronage refund will pay increased income taxes at the proper time, depending upon when it is considered that they received the refund.

If patronage dividends which the co-op is obligated to distribute to patrons are nontaxable while in the hands of the co-op—in fact, lawyers believe that it would require an amendment to the constitution to make them taxable—why does the N. T. E. A. get so worked up over the "legislative favoritism" in virtue of which "their earnings are classed as 'savings'—not as profits?"

What about Mr. McCabe's assertion that cooperatives are mushrooming on all sides because they are "specifically exempt from the high Federal income taxes that are taking most of the earnings of all corporations"? It is true that co-ops meeting certain requirements are exempt from Federal income taxes. But this exemption by statute does not affect the inherent untaxability of patronage refunds which are paid pursuant to contract (e. g., bylaws, etc.). This exemption merely frees the co-op from paying taxes on income which it actually distributed as patronage refunds, but which it was not obliged by contract to distribute, and from paying income taxes on earnings withheld without consent of the members or without specifically allocating the retains to individual members. Such income would be such a small amount that it would not be worth the trouble of collecting the income taxes on it, and the repeal of the exempting statute would merely be annoying, not devastating.

The ominous thing about the attack is that N. T. E. A. knows this very well, but if it can misrepresent the issue sufficiently and arouse public opinion to the boiling point, it may be able to swing discriminatory legislation which will tax cooperatives in defiance of all rules of justice.

Where N. T. E. A. has a point, however, is that some cooperatives have not always treated their earnings as a fund held in trust for their patrons, while others have traded indiscriminately with members and nonmembers, without paying a patronage refund to the latter. If the attack of the N. T. E. A. forces such cooperatives to put their house in order, it will have performed a service for the cooperative movement and for the country as a whole.

On two counts, then, the N. T. E. A. attack should be considered the opposite of an unmixed evil. In the year of the Rochdale centennial, it is rallying the badly divided cooperative movement under one standard, and it is making cooperatives from coast to coast aware of the necessity of cooperatively correct operations, methods, and records. In the words of William E. Sanderson, president of the newly organized Wisconsin Association of Cooperatives, "Ben C. McCabe may unwittingly become one of the movement's unsung heroes."

The Manpower Shortage

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the problem of manpower shortage. Men in high places advise that there is a critical shortage of the materiel needed by our boys in the front lines. I take it for granted that every American will do whatever may be necessary in order to promptly correct that situation. It has been estimated that 700,000 additional war workers will be needed within the next 6 months to produce the tools of war. At the same time the armed forces are calling out an additional 900,000 men.

In order to provide the men for the armed forces the Selective Service System has ordered the reclassification of all deferred farm workers. It is estimated that there are approximately 364,000 farm boys between the ages of 18 and 26 who have been deferred as essential agricultural workers. I am advised that the Selective Service System believes that approximately one-half of these boys will be called to military service. In nearly every case these boys were born and reared on the farms of America, and it goes without saying that they are the most efficient farmers in the Nation. In the main these boys are irreplaceable, and in view of the critical shortage of farm help in every community of the Nation, I venture to say that it will be wholly impossible for agriculture to produce the food and fiber so vital in the war effort. It seems to me that the various boards over the country have construed the recent directive of the Selective Service System as a mandatory order to disregard the plain intent of the Tydings amendment to the act. The advisability of taking these boys from the farms is still left to the sound discretion of the local boards, but I fear that most of the local boards in the farming areas have concluded to call to the service these boys who have been deferred as agricultural workers because they have construed the directive as an order from Washington. To my way of thinking, this can result only in an increase of the acute shortage of food so badly needed here and abroad. I seriously doubt the wisdom of this directive because of the fact that this might create a serious shortage of food, which would interfere with successful prosecution of the war, and most assuredly curtail the available supply of food not only for our own people but will most assuredly decrease the amount of food for our allies and the unfortunate people of occupied countries.

It is proposed also to draft legislation for limited compulsory service for all men from 18 to 45. A compulsory service law to provide labor for private employers is entirely foreign to the American system and is a long step toward totalitarianism. Labor battalions are the European way, not the American way of life. American production has amazed the world, but I am very fearful that such a move would have a demoralizing effect on the productive output of America. It seems to me that this legislation will hinder rather than help production.

We have 4,500,000 boys classified as IV–F. General Hershey made the statement that in his judgment all but 10 percent of these boys would voluntarily cooperate and do whatever they could to assist in the war effort. Now, I think the general was mistaken. I think these boys are just as patriotic as any of the rest of us. I think that less than 1 percent of them would fail to respond and do anything they could to help out during these critical times. If some responsible agency of the Government would tell them precisely what was expected of them, I am positive that they would respond almost to a man. I think these boys have been kicked from pillar to post long enough. After 3 years of war we are told that thousands upon thousands of men are working in nonessential activities, or not working at all, when there is a critical shortage of manpower in war activities. Still, at the same time, we do not have an up-to-date survey of the available workers of America.

I am firmly convinced that there is a better approach to the problem of efficient use of America's manpower than the compulsory service proposal. I think this Congress can work out a plan to achieve better results by the voluntary cooperation of the people in every community of the land than by means of compulsory legislation. While I recognize the seriousness of the problem, still at the same time it must be recognized that the need for 700,000 additional war workers is over a period of the next 6 months, and not as of this moment. I think a plan for the joint cooperation of labor, management, and Government in every community of this country, with the power of public opinion behind them, will work out this problem far more satisfactorily on a voluntary basis than any yet proposed. In order to solve this problem, it seems to me that we must have an up-to-the-minute Nation-wide survey and reappraisal of the manpower of the country. Millions of men between 18 and 45 are working in war activities or war-supporting activities, but we have no way of telling how much of this manpower is wasted. Last week the American Federation of Labor and the Railway Brotherhood leaders,

after a joint conference, said they had evidence of flagrant wastage of manpower and money by Federal Government agencies and by private industries engaged in war production. To my way of thinking, that strikes right at the heart of our trouble, and in the main, that is a local problem which can only be solved intelligently by the full cooperation of labor and management wisely guided by Government representatives in each community.

Last Friday morning I saw a big limousine driven to the Capitol by a liveried chauffeur, with one passenger, and I noticed painted on the car the words "Federal Housing Administration." My curiosity was aroused and I inquired from the Bureau of the Budget the number of automobiles furnished by the Government in Washington, and I am informed that there are 667 automobiles furnished to Government agencies and officials, about 90 percent of which have chauffeurs. This number does not include 240 cars furnished to the F. B. I., Secret Service, and other law-enforcement agencies, or 960 cars furnished to the Army and Navy in Washington. This certainly is evidence of wastage of manpower in the Government service. Without question, thousands upon thousands of men are employed in the Government service who could well be released to war industries without in the least impairing the service, and in fact, it would undoubtedly improve it.

Just recently I received a letter from a constituent who has been working in a war plant for a year and a half, which reads as follows:

OGDEN, UTAH, *January 7, 1945.*

Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish that I was sitting talking to you this morning as we used to in your office at Lusk, Wyo., instead of typing a letter to you as I could do so much better, but due to the fact that the talking is impossible, I will relieve the tension on my mind on this typewriter.

I feel that I am in a position to give some information that I have gathered in the last 2 years that might be of considerable help to you as I am in a position to gather the type of information that is hidden from you Congressmen. I went into defense work and it is to this I wish to refer.

No nation, America, or any other, cannot sustain a program of waste such as I will refer to and accomplish the desired result. We hear that to buy bonds will hasten the conclusion of the war and now if this is true and it should be then sure as ——— the correct expenditure of that money would likewise hasten the same conclusion of the same war.

I do hope that you can find the time to weight the things I write, as they are vital. I have worked at O. A. T. S. C. Hill Field, Utah, since * * * and have witnessed thousands of manhours wasted and millions of dollars.

Now, wait, Congressman; I don't mean the waste that is necessary to all large programs, but when I finish you will see what I mean.

Not one thing which I mention is without absolute proof * * *, and it is high time that someone turns the gate open on such sabotage, and sabotage it is.

I will not attempt to cite to you all of them, just a few.

I have witnessed B–24 airplanes, known as Liberators, bombers that could easily have been repaired, put under the saw and hauled out to the scrap heap. * * *.

We have absolutely hundreds of B–24's sitting at Hill Field not being used. We reconditioned 26 B–24's at Hill Field so as to fly them to Florida to put them under the saw for scrap, and what is done with the scrap? It is hauled out and dumped over a bank, tons of it laying at Hill Field.

On January 3, when the grease rags were put out, they were blue denim jackets and G. I. coveralls, many without a hole in them and not a button missing, much better garments than those worn by the workers, and some of the workers took some of them and put them on to work in, but they were severely rebuked and forced to use them to wipe grease with. We can't buy denim coveralls for our children, but we can use them to wipe grease on. Many of these garments have never been laundered more than once.

No wonder we hear, "What kind of a war are we fighting?"

I saw gasoline dumped in the sand in lots ranging as high as 200 gallons at one time. No; not dirty gasoline, but gasoline which was put in an airplane and because the fuel cells leaked it was drained and not used in trucks or other equipment but drained into barrels and hauled out and dumped in the sand by men who could obtain enough gasoline to get to work with only by lying to a ration board.

This added to their morale.

Two of our inspectors were dispatched to Oakland, Calif., to inspect some P–47's—these are the noted Thunderbolts—and to estimate the time needed for repair, and when they arrived they were taken to the C. O.'s office and met the request that they condemn everything they could. I ask you why, and at who's command?

Twenty of these P–47's had been shipped to the islands in the Pacific and returned, to test packing methods. With our boys fighting in hell itself, we here practice such tommyrot.

They witnessed (R–2800) engines—these are the type that the Thunderbolts are equipped with—laying on the scrap pile; engines which had only a few hours' flying time and yet left to the elements to destroy.

When we reconditioned the 26 B–24's referred to before and sent them to Florida, we had hundreds of people idle at Hill Field who were being told by their supervisors they would have to make certain jobs last for long periods of time as there was nothing for them to do.

On January 1 we instituted a time-card system that had been tried here before and had proved a failure with the result that hundreds stood in line for 2 hours to get into the clock house, and although they were supposed to clock in by 7:30 a. m., many of them were still in line at 9:30 and a bulletin was put out on the board to the effect that if they clocked in before 10 they would not be considered tardy. Let's save man-hours is the cry heard from our Chief.

Then who is responsible for actions of this sort, but the fact still remains our boys still fight while manpower is being wasted.

I have seen times when it took 7 days to get a part from the warehouse that was located less than a quarter of a mile away because of the red tape involved. Oh, yes, the part was there and the mechanics needed it to repair our fighting machine but we had to go through channels to get it with this kind of a result. Meanwhile the mechanics were up in the air, so to speak, and cussing and saying what kind of a system, only to be told they would have to be patient.

Perhaps the next day someone would come around to sell bonds to hasten the conclusion of the war.

We have now in hangar No. 2 an airplane known as airplane No. 42–52288. It is a B–24, yes, a Liberator bomber, which cost above $300,000, four engines and it will use about 250 gallons of gasoline per hour and we have equipped this airplane with fine flooring, inlaid linoleum, chairs that cost $111.16 each, loud speaker for the radio, and many other; oh, yes, an ice box. Well, we have put in a little over 4,500 hours of manpower and an estimated $10,000 in equipment and this airplane is to be used by Gen. G. H. Beverley to fly around over the country with.

I tell you the Sixth War loan went to town when this thing came in for such, and it is to be released for flight the 10th of this month.

This is sure to help win the war.

I tell you, Congressman, I sure am full of such when I see those kids coming back in the condition they are in and we sit and let a bunch get away with such.

I say again that the correct expenditure of our money may mean a lot to some youth, maybe yours and maybe mine, and this kind of foolishness can only mean one thing, that being to kill the morale of our people.

Is it possible that Congress is in a position that nothing can be done?

Yet Congress is being urged to enact legislation to draft labor into jobs of this sort and the fruits of their labor to be destroyed before their own eyes and they forced to destroy it.

We have a fuel cell known as self-sealing so that when it is punctured it will seal itself from leaks. Now, some of these cells are equipped with a fitting which would no doubt cost about $5, but we have been forced to condemn the entire cell which would cost about $500 because they say they are unable to obtain that fitting from the fuel-cell manufacturers.

What kind of a war are we waging and when will we make an investigation that will rock from coast to coast.

I challenge the Chief or Congress—give me 12 men in work clothes and men who can't be bought and I will uncover a lot of tommy rot that will smell to the high heaven.

When you in Congress come along, of course, everything is fine, but come in work clothes and see what is being done.

In the year I have been at Hill Field I have never heard one person complain of working too hard but I have seen them quit by the dozens because they could not work.

Thousands of man-hours are wasted each and every month by some clean-up order because some general is coming through and many times they don't even enter the hangars.

I have seen the workers sweep the floors until they shone just to have something to do, and I have heard them say, hundreds of times, "Some way to win a war."

Does our Chief know these things?

Men who come in skilled in certain lines are sure to be put where they know nothing about their work. I will say in 7 cases out of 10 this is the case.

I have seen every activity close down and people put to sweeping floors and wiping dust from window sills because some general or general's stooge was coming along.

The packing at the warehouse has been closed down and the laborers put to sweeping up, and directly here would come someone in an automobile down through the warehouse and look from side to side, and then all was fine, but the man-hours were a loss.

Congressman, are you to stand this kind of a monkey business with your son out there?

I will answer it as I believe you will, and, knowing you and the fight that I believe you have in you, I firmly believe that you will say, "By the eternal, we must use every effort to see these kind of procedures are stopped."

I have watched your actions in Congress thus far and will freely state that I think Wyoming can well be thankful for the efforts you have put forth in her behalf.

You may show this letter to whom you choose or tack it on the walls in Congress, but I think that it is time to see that things of this type are investigated and some real action taken when they are found to exist.

I will be glad to cooperate in any way I can and welcome an investigation of these things being true.

I feel that it is absolutely unfair and a regrettable fact that our Chief would suggest that a draft measure be enforced upon labor when they have worked the way I have seen them when the work was to be done.

I have seen women in the shipyards carrying heavy pieces of iron who will never see their sixtieth birthday again, trying to do their bit while some guy in fine clothing acted as a slave driver or a king looking for a salute.

This may sound like I am soured, well I will admit that with the conditions as they are, I am thoroughly convinced that some of the waste I have witnessed has not been unintentional and that back of some of it has been a spirit of indifference and irresponsibility. * * *

I will appreciate a note from you that I may know that you received this newspaper.

If this was all the waste I knew about I would not have written you about it but it is only a very few illustrations.

Thanking you for the time to read it.

Yours very truly,

Mr. Speaker, by reason of the widespread public opinion that there is a flagrant wastage of manpower in the Government service, it is high time that the matter be thoroughly investigated. On Monday last, I introduced H. R. 1421 which I desire to call to your attention.

My bill provides that the Selective Service shall reclassify all men between 18 and 45, except those in I–A. All those who are found not to be employed or engaged in war activities, including agriculture, war-supporting activities, or in occupations necessary for the civilian economy of the country, or in the Government service necessary to the civilian economy or the proper administration of the Government or the war effort and who are physically qualified, shall be required to state in writing if they will respond to a call from the proper Government agency to work in the war activities. I am convinced that this will provide a huge reservoir of manpower. In addition, the bill will require that the Director of Selective Service cause the various local boards to make a survey of the manpower of defense plants and other industries in their respective jurisdictions to determine if full use is made of the services of the men working in both governmental and civilian employ.

Under the bill, the boards are furnished necessary technical and other help to carry out this work. The boards are empowered to require persons to appear before them and give evidence as to the facts. When any board finds evidence as to wastage or hoarding of labor it shall require employers to certify a list containing the names and addresses of their employees whose services can be dispensed with. And these too will be added to the reservoir of available manpower.

To my way of thinking, on the whole the American people are intensely patriotic and are extremely anxious to do whatever may be necessary to get on with the job of producing the goods so that our boys can win this war as quickly as possible. I am convinced that in the main this is a local problem that reaches into every community in America and that under the intelligent cooperation of labor and management, with the proper guidance from the Government we will get the job done in the real American way. Public opinion and public sentiment, if properly aroused, will be a far more effective method in my opinion than any compulsory means.

Hardly a family in America but has some relative in the service, and I have great faith that they will intelligently and patriotically cooperate if given the chance.

Imperialism Is Indicted as a Cause of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Congress and the country I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a newspaper report of a speech recently delivered in South Dakota by Dean E. Smith, of the Redpath Bureau, and an editorial growing out of his address. Both come from the Mitchell Gazette, published in Mitchell, S. Dak.

While it occurs to me that the speaker may have over-emphasized somewhat the unsavory aspects of British and Russian imperialism his address does serve to call attention to a situation which the United States must face up to in its dealings with other nations in the post-war world if our leadership is to achieve world peace and anything resembling the extension of the "four freedoms" to over half the people of this earth.

We gain nothing by refusing to face the facts. Let us rather analyze the facts as they are and then exert enlightened world leadership in our international conferences to the end that freedom may become a possession rather than a phrase for the hundreds of millions of people on our side of this great war who continue to live under intolerable conditions. If the facts are as reported by Dean Smith, corrective steps should be taken; if they are not as bad as Mr. Smith reports but still seriously disturbing, remedies should be proposed; if they are entirely out of line with Mr. Smith's analysis the American public and the right thinking people of the world should be given the true picture supported by documentary and completely authentic evidence.

It seems certain that a prerequisite of permanent peace is the establishment of conditions of self-government and economic opportunity which will give people everywhere the satisfied feeling that they can live in their natural habitats as free citizens enjoying equity and justice to the full extent of their ability to develop such advantages for themselves unhampered by the imperialistic designs or dynasties of the so-called great powers.

IMPERIALISM IS CONDEMNED BY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SPEAKER—DEAN SMITH TELLS BUSINESSMEN THEY MUST BE ON GUARD AGAINST BRITISH IMPERIALISM AFTER WAR—SAYS CAN BE NO PERMANENT PEACE UNLESS IT IS CURBED—AMERICA CAN DOMINATE WORLD WITH PRINCIPLE OF FREEDOM—"IMPERIALISTS HATE UNITED STATES," BUSINESSMEN ARE TOLD

The United States must continue to fight with unabated energy and must continue in full cooperation with Great Britain and Russia to win the war; but after it has been won, it will become the solemn obligation of this country not to surrender any of her sovereignty to the imperialism of Great Britain, nor to lend any aid to the rebuilding of that imperialism, or the communism of America's other wartime ally, Russia.

This summarizes, in a sentence, the address of Dean E. Smith, of the Redpath Bureau, Chicago, before the Mitchell Chamber of Commerce at the annual meeting in the Masonic temple Monday night. Mr. Smith sees in the imperialism which he declared has dominated Great Britain's activities prior to the war, during the war, and will continue after the war has been won, a threat to democratic government in other nations, a stumbling block to world peace. While emphasizing the importance of wartime cooperation to defeat imperialistic Japan and Germany, the speaker took off his linguistic gloves in a two-fisted denunciation of what he termed "British imperialism" in all its phases.

POWER BREEDS DESPOTISM

Declaring that "power breeds despotism," the speaker said it is the duty of the citizens of a republic to refuse to be governed except by their own consent. "We must conquer Germany and annihilate Japan everywhere except in her own island; but while we are destroying one monster, let us be careful not to create another Frankenstein that will rise up and destroy us sometime in the future. * * * In the current war we must view the peace to follow. * * * We must deal with men and nations, not as we would like them to be but as they are."

Dealing directly with the British empire and its imperialism, Mr. Smith declared that "three-fourths of Britain's colonists would tear down the British flag and spit on it, if there wasn't a bayonet pointed at them. * * * America stands for freedom of individuals and of nations. It causes the imperialists to shudder when they contemplate our position. Imperialists have no use for republics," he averred.

AMERICA TOO GENEROUS

Touching on what he inferred was the impractical generosity of the United States in the matter of canceling the financial obligations of World War No. 1, Mr. Smith declared it to be the opinion of many citizens of Europe and Asia, where he has been living for the past 27 years, that if we had insisted on the full payment of Europe's debt, World War No. 2 might never have been started.

Taking up the Polish question, the speaker declared that in the numerous partitionings of that country, the partitioning had never been done by the people of other nations but by the heads of government, with the people not knowing and not caring. And then back to the theme of his address—British Imperialism—"Let us see that the United States is not accused by Great Britain and Russia that 'If you had not helped to maintain our imperialism, maybe we would not have gotten into whatever mess we are involved in 25 or 50 years after the war.'"

"Let us see that we get some results from this war, in the way of establishing American

principles," he challenged. "We are being misled in this country by imperialists. * * * Imperialism is the system where one man tries to dominate another. * * * Let us see to it that our strength is not used to perpetuate imperialism. * * * If the United States had stood for its principles we could dominate the world for those principles. The peoples of the world love us; the leaders of the world hate us."

Speaking out of his long experience in foreign lands, Mr. Smith declared: "Hundreds of millions of people in Asia and Europe are thinking of freedom as you and I do; and they are thinking against the imperialists. * * * They will look to America after the war, to make freedom the real force of government. * * * They want a world organization that will insure peace, but know it will not last unless it is based on the American principle of freedom."

The speaker, avowing that he was revealing nothing that has not already appeared in print, quoted statistics to show that Great Britain has close to a million civilians imprisoned in India for political reasons. Russia, he declared, has 10,000,000 civilian prisoners who are kept behind steel bars and barbed wire because they don't believe in communism—"because they think as we do." And then:

"Are we going to surrender part of our sovereignty to that nation?"

DOESN'T FEAR COMMUNISM

Touching on phases of the current war with which he is familiar because, as manager of the Standard Oil properties in Burma for a period of 20 years, he was a resident of India, Burma, and China, Mr. Smith told the Mitchell businessmen that the Burma road could have been opened 2 years ago for the shipment of war materials into China, but was not opened "because Great Britain does not want to see a strong China emerge from this war. * * * That country does not want a China that will be strong enough to destroy imperialism."

Regarding Russian communism, Mr. Smith said that America has nothing to fear from communism if informed how unsatisfactorily it works.

"The United States started out on the right path; let us continue on that path," the speaker urged, in concluding his address. "Let us continue on with our boys and our money in a fight for American principles; that all nations may be free." But he warned against a post-war program that would use American money and American resources to rebuild and maintain British imperialism. "Great Britain has two or three times as much oil and other resources as the United States; why should we use our resources to rebuild her after the war * * *. If we do, they will use it to bolster their imperialism. If we do not help them after this war, they are going to be forced to cooperate with their own people * * *. The greater power the people have, the greater potentiality for peace * * *. Russia and Great Britain will not become a threat to the world, unless we help them develop their imperialism."

STRONG INDICTMENT OF BRITAIN

It was a strong indictment of Great Britain that Dean E. Smith delivered in his address before the Mitchell Chamber of Commerce in its annual meeting Monday night. Strong really is not the proper adjective. It was more than that; it was violent. Because Mr. Smith was manager of the Standard Oil properties in Burma, India, and China for close to a quarter of a century, he was at least speaking out of an abundant business experience and contact with the British imperialism, which he is now attacking so bitterly. One may hope that a lecturer who is highly recommended by the Redpath Bureau would not allow personal vindictiveness to color his addresses on so vital a subject or to influence his condemnation of America's closest ally in the current war; but whether Mr. Smith is allowing personal animosities to add violence to his charges against Great Britain, or his addresses are based in calm deliberation of what British imperialism has done, is doing, and will do, he certainly is giving his audiences something very serious to think about.

There is nothing new in charges of British imperialism. The charges are as old as the facts. But for a noted platform lecturer, a man of Mr. Smith's knowledge of events, to declare that British imperialism is still standing in the way of an all-out effort to get war supplies to China, that it is the cause of starvation of many thousands of Chinese, that its continuance will wreck any plans for permanent peace is to create an attitude of public mind in America toward this ally that is anything but healthy.

It may not make a lot of difference what Mr. Smith said before an isolated meeting of businessmen in a midwestern town, but if he is making this address in all parts of the United States, it does make a difference—a great deal of difference. And the fact that he is sponsored by a nationally known and highly respected lecture bureau is indication of the fact that the things he is saying must be pretty much the truth and his opinions highly considered.

A man in the public eye does not repeat idle phrases and get by with them for long; and one must accept the declarations of Mr. Smith as pretty much based on fact, else he could not continue to repeat them over and over again, from one end of the country to the other, and still retain his place with the lecture bureau which sponsors him.

Phrases such as these, taken from Mr. Smith's Mitchell address, would not go long unchallenged, if they did not hit pretty close to the mark:

"While we are destroying one monster (the Axis Powers), let us be careful not to create another Frankenstein (a post-war British Empire) that will rise up and destroy us.

"Three-fourths of Britain's colonists would tear down the British flag and spit on it, if there was not a bayonet pointed at them.

"We are being misled in this country by imperialists * * * Let us see to it that our strength is not used to perpetuate imperialism.

"The peoples of the world love us; the leaders of the world hate us.

"Are we going to surrender part of our sovereignty to that nation." Meaning Russia, which the speaker declared has 10,000,000 civilians behind bars and barbed wire "because they think as we do.

"Great Britain has"—probably meaning through her colonies—"two or three times as much oil and other resources as the United States; why should we use our resources to rebuild her after the war?"

These are but a few samples of the challenging charges made in Mr. Smith's address, reported elsewhere in today's Gazette. Their effect should not be to lessen our efforts to cooperate with Great Britain and Russia in winning the war; but to caution our own statesmen in their wartime and post-war demands on Great Britain and Russia.

Pick's Pike Opens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in the good war news of the day was the announcement that the first truck convoy from India in 2 years had reached Myitkyina and the new Ledo road was now in operation.

Aside from the general interest that attaches to this achievement, the event has special interest for those who know the man who was in charge of the construction of that road, familiarly known as Pick's Pike. This military road, built under the eyes and often the fire of the Japanese, was constructed in record time by forces directed by Brig. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, who was division engineer for the Missouri River division, United States engineers, prior to his assignment to the big job in India and Burma.

His assignment to that job, of course, was the natural result of the way he had handled his previous assignment. In the Missouri River division he directed over a billion dollars' worth of Army construction in 1 year. He took jobs that were behind schedule and whipped them to schedule and finished them ahead of schedule. General Pick knew how and knows how to get things done.

And on top of the construction program he directed a battle against the big flood of 1943 and brought out a program for the control of Missouri River floods so comprehensive and challenging that it at once took his name up and down the valley as the Pick plan.

Although he went on to India, the flood-control plan he proposed was embodied in an authorization passed by Congress last year and now law. Under permission given by the House, I now place in the RECORD this morning's front-page story from India:

[From the Washington Post of January 16, 1945]

FIRST TRUCK CONVOY FROM INDIA IN 2 YEARS REACHES MYITKYINA

NEW DELHI, January 15.—The first truck convoy carrying war supplies to China in more than 2½ years has arrived in Myitkyina, north Burma, after a 262-mile trip from Ledo, India.

Chinese troops under the command of Lt. Gen. Daniel I. Sultan now are battling the Japanese in the Wanting and Namhkam areas along the China-Burma border, and only 25 miles of the overland route remain in enemy hands.

When that stretch is cleared one of the toughest jobs in the United States Army engineering history will have been completed—a 2-year battle against jungle diseases, driving monsoon rains, and Japanese troops by workmen of four nations—the United States, China, India, and Burma.

The new China supply line, more than 2,000 miles long, will be in two sections. The western portion, winding through malaria-infested jungle from Ledo to Myitkynia, and known throughout the theater as Pick's Pike, was constructed under the guidance of Brig. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, of Auburn, Ala. It was officially declared completed yesterday. The eastern section will run from Myitkynia to Kunming.

For most of the first string of vehicles now marking time in Myitkynia it will be a one-way trip. They will remain in China because Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's armies are badly in need of trucks.

The new road will replace the old Burma Road, which will not be reopened.

The gravel-surfaced artery will carry more than the Burma Road ever carried, but at best it probably never will equal the pace now being set by American Air Transport Command planes flying the hazardous Himalayan hump from Assam to Kunming.

The United States flyers have increased their air supply service day by day and have built it up to 23,000 tons per month over the world's most dangerous air-line route. It has been the only means of getting men and supplies to China since the Japanese drove the British out of Burma in 1942.

Troops of the Chinese First Army now are knocking at the doors of Namhkam, the last key Japanese defense position guarding the final lap of the main Ledo Road. It is the only Burma zone where the enemy has been putting up determined resistance.

Farther south, where the British Fourteenth Army has swept to within 30 miles of Mandalay, there has been only token Japanese resistance.

Army Nurses

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this article by Catherine Coyne, of the Boston Herald's war correspondents who has served with our armies overseas for some 7 or 8 months, describes two nurses who were in the same hospital where Miss Slanger was killed. These two nurses were in the same tent with her, and Lieutenant Powers, of Lowell, Mass., a friend of mine and a very fine woman, was wounded. Lieutenant Powers in this article speaks of the magnificent privilege it is to serve our wounded men overseas and of the idolization of the nurses by the wounded they serve in the hospitals. She speaks with feeling to the effect that it would be unfortunate to have any nurses drafted or have to be drafted to take care of the wounded. I should like to state that of course we must have the nurses. I do not know whether the draft will be absolutely necessary, but we must secure nurses by some means to provide the best care for our service men and women. We should fail in our duty to them if we did not do everything in our power to secure them. We must not fail.

I should like to state that 75,000 of the nurses in this country have volunteered for service with the armed forces—one-third of the entire nurse population of the country. It is only proper to pay tribute to this patriotic group.

The article I referred to, from the Boston Herald of January 16, 1945, follows:

LOWELL NURSE IN THICK OF WAR 7 MONTHS EARNS TRIP TO PARIS—LIEUTENANT POWERS CHIDES NURSES AT HOME ON DRAFT, HIDES HER DECORATIONS BUT NOT HER FEELINGS

(By Catherine Coyne)

SOMEWHERE IN BELGIUM, January 15.—Lt. Elizabeth F. Powers, attractive nurse from Lowell, who hid her Bronze Star and Purple Heart ribbons inside her jacket so no one would ask questions, was leaving the front today.

First American nurse to land in France in this war, she has been up front since the fourth day of the invasion when she jumped from a barge into water up to her chin and waded to the beachhead to minister to the wounded. She following the infantry through the hedgerow fighting, arriving in Cherbourg the very day that seaport fell, then went along on the lightning dash through France and Belgium right into Germany.

Though fully recovered from a wound in her right arm caused by shrapnel from the shell that killed her tentmate, Lt. Frances Slanger, of Roxbury, she was on her way today to less rugged but still strenuous duty at a station hospital.

As she boarded the train she admitted she wasn't sorry to leave the front, to swap the nomadic life of a platoon chief nurse with a First Army hospital and tent living for the routine of a big behind-the-lines hospital. Yet she worried about the wounded.

"There have been times," she said, "when we could have used many more nurses. Any American nurse who wants the Army to draft her to care for our wonderful G. I.'s ought to hang her head in shame."

She and her companion, Lt. Mary W. Reynolds, Bangor, Maine, were proud and had every reason to be proud of their service on the continent. They regard it as a rare privilege to have a share in saving the lives of hurt American boys.

"I can't understand," Lieutenant Powers said, "why any American nurse would avoid the opportunity to serve here, nor can I understand why any nurse once here would want to go home before the war is won. There is so much to be done. Nurses help not only in the professional care they give the wounded but even by their very presence."

IN FIRST DEVENS CLASSES

"The news that a hospital has moved into the area," Lieutenant Reynolds added, "gives the boys a wonderful morale boost; they idolize us. It's not us as persons, of course, but as American nurses. If the nurses at home knew the magnificent privilege that is ours for service, they wouldn't wait to be drafted."

These two New England women were among the first to answer the call for nurses. Lieutenant Powers was a member of the first class to be graduated from the nurses' basic training course at Fort Devens and Lieutenant Reynolds was in the second class.

They were by turns coolly professional and excitedly feminine today, professional in their appraisal of the work of the nurse in the Army, and feminine in their joy over prospect of a day's leave in Paris and a night's sleep in a real bed between white sheets.

Their last home here was a canvas tent with snow packed around the base. There was no tarpaulin on the ground; their beds were canvas cots and khaki wool blankets.

"I haven't slept between sheets since June. Lieutenant Powers said, "I haven't worn a skirt since I was in England, actually not since the end of May. I'm not sure how I'll behave when I get back into a skirt."

RECALLS FAMED LETTER

"I've got a skirt," Lieutenant Reynolds said, "but they won't let me wear it. Imagine going to Paris in field clothes, wearing trousers stuffed down into high boots. Oh, well, we'll see Paris, anyway."

Lieutenant Powers is the daughter of John Powers, of 69 Norcross Street, Lowell, and sister of the Reverend John Powers, St. Joseph's Church in Boston's west end. She was graduated from St. Elizabeths Hospital, Brighton, and worked in New York hospitals before joining the Army.

She was one of the signers of the now famed letter, beloved by soldiers, written by Lieutenant Slanger in their tent the night before the latter was killed. In that letter the Roxbury nurse expressed admiration of her tentmates for their magnificent courage and awesome patience, and for the delightful, if impudent, humor of wounded Americans.

"Frances mailed that letter the morning of the day she died," Lieutenant Powers recalled today. "Margaret Bowler and I were standing on cots fixing the black-out curtains when that shell—a 150—came. We had had quite a bit of artillery, so we didn't pay much attention to it. It's a miracle we weren't all killed.

DID WHAT THEY COULD

"We did what we could for Frances, but there wasn't much we could do. She told me she was dying. All we could do was to put her on her cot and crouch there beside her, screaming for help. The shells were coming in and no one could hear us for a long time. It wasn't until afterwards that I realized I had been hit, too."

These girls have bronze stars for 6 months of meritorious nursing service in combat zone. Their nerves are all right, but these two nurses have earned a rest, and to work under less tense conditions. Yet, as they left tonight for their safer posts, it was with misgivings. They worried about nurses to replace them, they fretted over slowness with which their colleagues at home were responding to the Nation's desperate need for Army nurses.

"If only they knew the privilege that would be theirs," murmured Lieutenant Powers as she left.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a radio address which I delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System last night.

The address follows:

WHY WE NEED A PERMANENT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Fellow Americans, first I want to thank the Columbia Broadcasting System for giving me this opportunity of speaking to you for a few minutes on a subject that vitally affects the very life of this Nation—that of protecting this country against the subversive activities of un-American elements within our gates.

On January 3, 1945, the opening day of the new Congress, I arose in the House and submitted to that body the proposition of establishing a permanent or standing Committee on Un-American Activities to succeed the special committee known as the Dies committee, which had expired with the previous Congress.

The House adopted my proposal in what has been termed an unprecedented action by a vote of 207 to 186.

Now, why did the Members of the House do this? Why did your Representative in Congress vote to establish this permanent Committee on Un-American Activities? I will tell you why.

They did it because they wanted to save this great Government of ours for which your sons are now fighting and dying all over the world. They did it because they wanted Congress to continue the valuable work of the Dies committee, which the House set up in 1938 and which has been active since that time, ferreting out and exposing the subversive and un-American elements throughout this country.

They did it because they wanted to preserve the valuable records amassed by the Dies committee, which contain the names of over 600,000 individuals in the United States who have identified themselves with the subversive activities of the Communists, the Nazis, the Fascists, the Japanese, and other such organizations operating in this country. These records have been of tremendous value to the Nation during this war in supplying information to the various intelligence units of the Government, such as the F. B. I. and the War and Navy Departments.

As an illustration of this service I should like to remind you that thousands of agents of this Government in the past 2 years have called at the committee's office for this information.

The Congress is concerned that the people be informed as to the true purposes of these individuals and organizations who are masquerading under high sounding titles, but who, in reality, are seeking to destroy our form of Government, and our American way of life, if not our entire civilization.

The Members of Congress are desirous of having a vigilant committee, now and in the post-war period, to expose the alienisms and ideologies that will grow out of the chaos of this conflict. We must never let down our guard. The war drove many of these subversive elements underground, but make no mistake about it, they will reappear under new banners and with new slogans. We must therefore be alert and ready to point them out and expose them at all times.

And lastly, the Members of the House established this permanent committee because they were reflecting the concern of a vast majority of the American people over what is happening throughout Europe, and what might happen to this country if we should relax our vigilance or fail to maintain the proper safeguards. Our people are determined that our sacred institutions shall not be destroyed by secret enemies at home while our brave young men are fighting so desperately to protect them from our enemies abroad.

Now, what is the real significance of this new permanent committee? It means that every citizen of this country has a right to petition the Congress to investigate matters which he or she considers to be un-American.

Under this new set-up Members of Congress may introduce resolutions requesting investigations. These resolutions will be referred to this standing Committee on Un-American Activities. This committee will have the staff, and the authority, to make thorough and complete investigations. It will have the authority to use the powerful weapon of subpena, which no executive agency of the Government has. It can report legislation to the House, and assist in writing laws to curb un-American forces at work in this country at any time.

This committee will be made up of nine members—six Democrats and three Republicans. To say that I was disappointed that more Members were not placed on this committee who favored its creation, and who have supported the Dies committee at all times expresses it but mildly. It is likely to prove embarrassing to some members of this new committee, especially if they attempt to block our efforts to rid this country of these un-American activities.

I have been urged by the members of the American Legion and other patriotic individuals throughout the country, including my own colleagues, to accept a place on the committee. I have hesitated to do this for many reasons, which I will not take time to explain, but which I think you will understand. I refused to consider taking the chairmanship of this committee, for the reason that I did not want to give up my chairmanship of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

I have finally decided to accept a place on this new committee, for the time being at least, in order to assist in steering the committee on a course that will reach all forms of un-American activities, whether they be in high or low places, and to preserve the valuable records of the Dies committee.

If the members of this committee will exercise that degree of fairness and diligence which the country has a right to expect, then the results of the committee's work will be a real and lasting service to the Nation.

This is a great Republic—the greatest the world has ever known—but because it is a Republic, it was inevitable that there should be among our 130,000,000 people many individuals who would seek to destroy the very foundation upon which it rests, and which gave them their rights and their liberties—especially when we have among us so many dangerous aliens.

They are the poison in the blood stream of our Nation. Poison like the American Communists who since 1920 have used ever-changing tactics to undermine and weaken our Government, wipe out the Constitution and destroy everything our fathers have built, in the hope that out of chaos they might seize power. And mind you, I am speaking now, not of our gallant allies, the Russians and their brave soldiers—I am speaking of the American Communists, many of whom have been run out of Russia, who have used the cloak of American citizenship to hide their treasonable activities against America. The hundreds of thousands of Communists in America, along with the Nazis, Japs, and other un-American elements, must be watched and spotlighted because their aim is the destruction of our system of Government, and our way of life.

Poison like the German Bund members in America who under Fritz Kuhn established outposts for Hitler in 36 States before we were aware that they were conspiring to substitute Hitlerism for our democracy.

Let me remind you that there were thousands who goose-stepped and heil'ed Hitler every Sunday in these camps—they are still in our midst.

Poison like the thousands of so-called Japanese-Americans in the United States who, although born in this country hold their allegiance to the Emperor of Japan, and take their orders from the Black Dragon Society, one of the most dangerous and far-reaching organizations that ever conspired to stir race trouble in this country.

They are still here.

And then there is the poison of the smear bund whose members have done so much to destroy the character and reputation of men in public life who do not agree with them on national and international affairs. They constitute the propaganda front for these un-American elements.

Thus you can see why we must have a Committee on Un-American Activities to strip the mask from these imposters and show the American people what they are and what they propose to do.

I fear the American people will never know what a lasting debt of gratitude they owe to Martin Dies and the other patriotic members of his committee for the splendid work they did for the protection of this country against these subversive elements during the last 7 years. Mr. Dies is no longer a member of Congress, having been compelled to retire because of poor health. But his name will live and his services will be remembered by a grateful Nation long after his defamers shall have slumbered in forgotten graves and the subversive elements he fought shall have been driven from American soil.

I took up this fight where he left off and had this Committee on the Un-American Activities made a standing committee of the House. I want these criminals to know that the grand jury would be in session from now on.

At this time I want to thank the American Legion, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and other patriotic organizations for their encouragement and support in this fight, and to urge them to continue their activities in this great cause. I hope every post, every camp, and every unit of all the great patriotic organizations throughout this country will join us in this fight with the same determination and enthusiasm now being manifested by our fighting men on every battle front in the world.

I also want to thank those thousands of patriotic individuals for their messages of encouragement in this trying hour. I feel that in carrying through this fight to have this permanent Committee on Un-American Activities established I have been privileged to render my greatest service to my country.

But we need your continued help. Let your Congressman know how you feel on this all-important issue. You may rest assured that those subversive influences this committee is designed to watch will be writing in and doing everything they can to discourage and discredit its work.

Eternal vigilance is the price of our liberty! We are going to need the active and enthusiastic support of every real God-fearing, liberty-loving, patriotic American to help protect this country at home while your sons are defending it abroad, so that when they return they will find that those glorious institutions for which they fought have not "perished from the earth."

Thirty-fifth Anniversary of the Sentinel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at a dinner given at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago, Ill., January 6, 1945, in commemoration of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Sentinel, a progressive American-Jewish newspaper, under the able direction of Messrs. J. I. Fishbein and J. M. Feldman as associate publishers:

I am asked to speak tonight on different subjects. The subjects are unity and the post-war world. I might ask, the unity of what? The unity of nations, the unity of faith, the unity of people, the unity of the press?

And, as we have assembled here tonight to celebrate the thirty-fifth anniversary of the publication of the Sentinel, which is a Jewish paper, the thought occurs to me that we should dwell on the efforts of the Sentinel to promote unity among the Jewish people.

A time of celebration should also be a time of stock-taking. We must take an inventory of our past and present achievements and our future intentions, to determine whether or not a celebration is warranted at this time. Celebrating a date such as the thirty-fifth anniversary of the publication of the Sentinel has no value unless the succeeding years have been years of accomplishment. Every event, as every person, waxes old. There is nothing remarkable about that. Old age is meaningless unless you have something to show for it.

Later on in my address tonight, I intend to take inventory of the accomplishments of the Sentinel, past and future. But for the

present I will take the second half of the dual subject given me—the post-war world.

We attempt to picture the post-war world. Books are written on the subject, and the papers are full of articles telling us what will be and should be. My own consideration of the subject causes me to dismiss details, because it is impossible to foresee in detail what is to come. I confine myself to principles. These cannot fail, because they are based upon truths that are immutable.

Among these principles I can mention two or three that underlie all that we can foresee of the post-war world.

First, and most important of all, is the principle of liberty—the urge of mankind for freedom. This war has taught us many things, one of which is the fact that liberty is under constant siege and can be preserved only by eternal vigilance. Another thing we have learned is that mankind is struggling for liberty. The world is marching toward broader freedom. This march is as irresistible as the movement of a glacier—and almost as slow, as a rule; but now it is quickening. No tyrant nor combination of tyrants can stop this march, or divert it from its goal. Therefore I draw one conclusion: That the nations already possessing liberty will redouble their vigilance so as to make sure that their liberty shall be secure. They will discover that a movement toward liberty, anywhere in the world, by any people, no matter how hopeless the struggle may seem on the surface, is a movement that fortifies liberty, even in the strongest and freest nation. So the free nations will help those that are striving for liberty.

Second, and next to liberty itself, I note the extension of the principle of cooperation among peoples and nations. By cooperation the American people achieved their more perfect Union, and thus secured the blessings of liberty. Gladly would we hail the establishment everywhere of governments patterned after the Government of the United States, as ordained by our Constitution; but we know that conditions in many countries are not ripe for such a system.

There can be cooperation, however, among the people in every region, and when this cooperation hastens the advent of liberty it contributes to the welfare of the whole world. This movement within a region can be helped by the supreme authority of each nation, and by neighboring nations. Thus, by the cooperation of nations, we hope to see a system established on the basis of the Dumbarton Oaks plan, whereby the whole world shall be made both free and secure, and kept at peace.

That would be the supreme triumph of the principle of cooperation—the victory of lasting peace over war.

Now, out of the increase of cooperation among men and nations must come improvement in every-day welfare as well as progress in freedom. Although the urge for liberty is the driving force behind cooperation, we discover that cooperation brings other blessings besides making freedom more secure. Cooperation makes for friendship and intercourse, exchange of ideas and goods, and universal betterment.

I have mentioned only two basic principles which I believe will operate upon the nations after this war. Within these principles of liberty and cooperation are scores of blessings, such as education, culture, interchange of inventions and discoveries, better labor conditions, emancipation of human toil by larger use of machinery, and many others. All of these are attainable by all nations if they will take the opportunity awaiting them after this war.

Now, when you ask me for a blueprint of the world peace system that will emerge from this war, I confess that I have none. Who has one? He may as well tear it up, for no one can foresee the details of what is to come. Why waste time trying to predict future action on matters that are still the sport of time and war? No sane nation will commit itself in advance to a course of action which might be pure insanity or stupidity in the light of better knowledge. But this applies to ways and means, methods and agreements upon details, and not to cooperation for the sublime objective of human liberty and peace.

President Roosevelt was right when he laid emphasis upon the principles that hold the United Nations together and carry them to victory. He is not worried over the subordinate questions that arise daily in this struggle, so long as the peace-loving nations are united in adopting the principles of liberty and cooperation. The President very properly dismisses the technicality of a signed document embodying the principles of the Atlantic Charter. What does it matter whether Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill signed a document or not? Is their declaration in harmony with mankind's march for liberty through cooperation? If so, it stands. If not, it falls. There is no such document as the constitution of Great Britain, but we know what it is, and we know that it stands. No one can find any document bearing a signature to the Ten Commandments. Magna Carta itself was not signed, while our Constitution was; but it is the spirit of each that counts, not the perishable parchment, signed or unsigned.

We know that the Atlantic Charter embodies the principles of liberty and the cooperation of nations. Therefore we may be sure that the post-war world will adopt a system harmonizing with the Atlantic Charter as well as with the Constitution of the United States. The truths underlying these and other charters and constitutions of peace-loving nations are eternal truths, always in harmony with themselves and with God's law. They breathe the universal prayer of mankind, striving for freedom and peace.

This war can have but one end, and that end is the triumph of liberty. That means that this war is a war between the United States Constitution and its enemies. How could the war end, except in victory? Anything short of victory would merely signify a continuation of the war until victory came. Victory signifies opportunity to make liberty more secure by the cooperation of all lovers of liberty throughout the world, nation after nation lining up to hammer the rivets upon the arms of oppression and to knock the shackles from men that are bound. That opportunity opened by victory is the golden hour for mankind, the hour granted by the Almighty wherein the nations may have a chance to cooperate and thus make their liberty secure. God is with us. He fights our battles when we fight to establish His rule on earth. He endowed us with liberty as a birthright. He bids us and all nations to go forward. As freemen we hear and we obey.

Now, may I return to the first part of my subject, that of unity. We celebrate here tonight the anniversary which marks 35 years of endeavor by the Sentinel, which from the time of its establishment has devoted itself to promoting unity in Jewish life. From the very first it has been a wise defender of Jewry against dangers from without and a fearless mentor of failings within. Firm at all times in its opposition to every form of spiritual self-obliteration or revolution in religion, it has given its utmost support to all movements that stood for Jewish life and the deepening of Jewish self-respect.

In establishing an American-Jewish newspaper, the founder invited a responsibility far transcending that of an ordinary newspaper. Such a paper must not merely present to the public week by week an acceptable and attractive sheet so as to gain popular support, for the object of the American-Jewish press is something infinitely wider and altogether bigger. It is charged with maintaining the sense of the oneness of the House of Israel and urging the preeminence of the abiding truths of Judaism. It seeks the elevation not merely of the individual but of the Jewish people.

That the Sentinel has squarely met and accepted this responsibility is shown by the eminent place it has won in the field of American-Jewish journalism. Its issues give a vivid survey of the condition of the Jews and Judaism throughout the globe. As its readers know, its records and chroniclings and comments are dominated by the one supreme desire to rouse and maintain in the hearts of its readers the spirit of unity, and in the minds of its non-Jewish readers a thorough comprehension of the essence and mission of Judaism.

The Sentinel has been the champion of the Jewish cause without minimizing Jewish faults; it has come into Jewish homes as a friend and has therefore been received as a friend as well as a comforter and guide. It has taken the lead consistently in the defense of the community against slander and attack. It has not evaded the issue by feigning nonexistence or pretending that attacks are directed against someone else. It has been the communal watchdog against libels in the press and on the platform. Truly, the Sentinel has lived up to its name; it has not only reported but guided and inspired.

The thread on which the different good qualities of human beings are strung as pearls is the love of God. When the fastenings of this love are unloosed, the pearls roll in all directions and are lost one by one.

To labor in the vineyard of the Lord is and should be the only objective of the American-Jewish press.

As I look on the tiny scroll of the Law (the Torah) on my desk, I think of the American-Jewish press and its future; and I wish to apply to it the beautiful passage of our ritual when the Torah is being placed in the ark:

"It is a tree of life to them that grasp it, and of them that uphold it everyone is rendered happy. Its ways are ways of pleasantness, and all its paths are peace."

Charles M. Hay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, last night there was a war casualty, not on the battle front, but on the home front when Hon. Charles M. Hay, the Executive Director and assistant to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, died of a heart attack at his apartment in Washington.

In the last few weeks when the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission was abroad, Mr. Hay was acting in his place. Not only did he absorb the duties of the Chairman in Washington, but he made several trips out of the city settling war manpower problems of great importance. In his capacity as Acting Chairman of the War Manpower Commission only a few days ago he appeared before the Military Affairs Committee of the House, urging the adoption of legislation that would be beneficial in connection with the crisis that confronts

the country on the home front at the present time.

Mr. Hay was a resident of the State of Missouri and had been active in political life for nearly 40 years. He was greatly disappointed in his inability to participate in the campaign last fall when he sought to resign his position in order to go throughout the country and make speeches for the reelection of President Roosevelt. Due to the manpower situation he was prevailed upon to retain his position. He had been connected with the War Manpower Commission since 1943 when he was appointed the general counsel and later became the executive director of the agency.

He had on other occasions been a member of the War Labor Board and one of his outstanding services to his Government was as assistant to the Attorney General, when he successfully defended the Railroad Retirement Act in the Federal courts. In view of his success in connection with the Railroad Retirement Act he later became associated with railway labor, representing them in connection with wage disputes.

Mr. Hay had held numerous positions in the State government of Missouri, serving in the legislature and later as chairman of the board of election commissioners as well as chief city councilor.

He was an outstanding American, always defending our institutions and recognized as one of the great orators of the country. His family has lost a devoted husband and father; the country and the State, a great American; and I, a very close personal friend of over 35 years. To his wife and children I extend my deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

Shall the American Taxpayer Pay for European War Devastation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1945

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my extension of remarks a letter written me by Secretary of State E. R. Stettinius, Jr., together with a statement issued by him regarding the policy of the State Department on Poland. Paragraph 3 of this statement states that it is the announced aim of the United States Government, subject to legislative authority, to assist liberated countries in Europe in repairing the devastation of war. This means that we are to finance the reconstruction of Europe. While I am willing to help feed Europe in the interim and until those liberated countries can raise their own foodstuffs, I am absolutely opposed to taxing our people to help reconstruct Europe.

The letter and statement follow:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 10, 1945.

The Honorable ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ENGEL: With further reference to your letter of December 27, 1944, concerning the statement on the Polish question which I issued on December 18, I am happy to enclose a State Department press release giving the text of the statement in question. You will note that the passage relating to the transfer of national groups reads as follows: "If as a result of such agreement the Government and people of Poland decide that it would be in the interests of the Polish State to transfer national groups, the United States Government in cooperation with other governments, will assist Poland, insofar as practicable, in such transfers."

The complex question of the transfer of populations is receiving constant study in this Department, and in issuing this statement I had in mind no specific method by which American assistance could be extended. Such a large-scale transfer of populations would involve many problems including transportation, organization, and supervision apart from any possible direct assistance to the persons concerned. The words "insofar as practicable" were used in the statement with the object of insuring that this Government would be free to determine, in the light of the actual conditions and circumstances of any transfer, both the method and extent of the assistance which it would render. At the same time I am sure you will agree that for humanitarian reasons as well as because of our desire to further stable conditions in post-war Europe this Government will have an interest in rendering such assistance as may be feasible.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.

(Enclosure)

STATEMENT OF MR. EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR., SECRETARY OF STATE

The United States Government's position as regards Poland has been steadfastly guided by full understanding and sympathy for the interests of the Polish people. This position has been communicated on previous occasions to the interested governments, including the Government of Poland. It may be summarized as follows:

1. The United States Government stands unequivocally for a strong, free, and independent Polish state with the untrammelled right of the Polish people to order their internal existence as they see fit.

2. It has been the consistently held policy of the United States Government that questions relating to boundaries should be left in abeyance until the termination of hostilities. As Secretary Hull stated in his address of April 9, 1944, "This does not mean that certain questions may not and should not in the meantime be settled by friendly conference and agreement." In the case of the future frontiers of Poland, if a mutual agreement is reached by the United Nations directly concerned, this Government would have no objection to such an agreement which could make an essential contribution to the prosecution of the war against the common enemy. If as a result of such agreement the Government and people of Poland decide that it would be in the interests of the Polish state to transfer national groups, the United States Government in cooperation with other governments, will assist Poland, insofar as practicable, in such transfers. The United States Government continues to adhere to its traditional policy of declining to give guaranties for any specific frontiers. The United States Government is working for the establishment of a world security organization through which the United States together with other member states would assume responsibility for the preservation of general security.

3. It is the announced aim of the United States Government, subject to legislative authority, to assist the countries liberated from the enemy in repairing the devastation of war and thus to bring to their peoples the opportunity to join as full partners in the task of building a more prosperous and secure life for all men and women. This applies to Poland as well as the other United Nations.

The policy of the United States Governments regarding Poland outlined above has as its objective the attainment of the announced basic principles of United States foreign policy.

Reduction of Prison Sentences of William Bioff and George E. Browne

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, where they were inserted under leave to extend his remarks, I read a statement by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], together with an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, concerning the action of the Federal district court in New York in reducing the prison sentences of William Bioff and George E. Browne.

I contacted the Department of Justice and asked for the facts of these two matters. I now have the facts in the form of a statement by the Attorney General of the United States, and I ask leave to insert it at this point in the RECORD:

I have just seen a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6 by Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH to the effect that the reduction of sentence in the cases of William Bioff and George E. Browne was the result of a deal between these men and the Attorney General.

Mr. SMITH is misinformed. The facts are these: There was no prior agreement or commitment by the Department of Justice or any of its representatives. At the time of their trial in November 1941, for violation of the Antiracketeering Act, it became apparent that Bioff and Browne had associates who participated with them in their crimes but whose identities were not known to the Government. The defendants refused to divulge this information, and the Government recommended and the court imposed, upon conviction, sentences of 10 years for Bioff and 8 years for Browne, plus fines of $20,000 each.

Subsequently, the two convicted criminals turned informer. Information and testimony given by them and other witnesses aided the Government in breaking a gang in Chicago that had succeeded to Al Capone's power in the Chicago underworld.

Therefore when motion was made by attorneys for Bioff and Browne to reduce sentences of these two informers, the Government interposed no objection. Judge John

C. Knox, who had sentenced Bioff and Browne and had kept the term of court open in their cases, reduced their sentence to time already served—3 years, 1 month, and 1 day—as of December 22, 1944. On the recommendation of the Government, the court left one count of their conviction undisturbed, placing them on probation for 5 years. It should be noted that Browne had become eligible for parole in July 1944 and that Bioff would have become eligible in March 1945.

This is a customary procedure of the court in recognizing the services of convicted criminals who have turned informer.

The facts prove the gentleman's remarks to be inaccurate, to put it mildly, and the editorial, based on wrong premises, in all decency should be corrected editorially by this newspaper. Sentence was imposed on Bioff and Browne by one of the ablest and most distinguished members of the Federal district bench, a jurist with more than 27 years of faithful service in the southern district of New York, the Honorable John C. Knox. Entirely aside from the gratuitous slur upon the Attorney General, it is shameful to imply that Judge Knox would be a party to or could be imposed upon by a "deal" with convicted criminals.

The facts are that Judge Knox reduced the sentences of Bioff and Browne to time already served—3 years, 1 month, and 1 day—after all fines had been paid, and, at the specific request of the Department of Justice, left one count of their convictions undisturbed, thus placing them both on probation for a period of 5 years.

The proper and fair course for anyone to follow before making any such charges would be to investigate and ascertain the facts before writing an editorial or using such editorial on the floor of the House. The charge that a deal was made is without foundation.

Why Not Crop Insurance?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we saw the wheat-cotton insurance program revived with one war crop—flax—added to the list. The platforms of both parties pledged support to crop insurance but not insurance for only a small part of agriculture.

This legislation is of particular significance at this time, when the acting War Food Administrator is asking that cotton acreage be maintained and wheat acreage be increased even when manpower, transportation, and ships are being used to export the declared surpluses of cotton and wheat.

In order to present a picture of the importance of these crops, I include the following official table from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

	Hay	Corn	Wheat	Cotton	
				Lint	Seed
1939 farm value	$685,427,000	$1,465,075,000	$512,401,000	$536,996,000	$102,933,000
1939 acres harvested	69,097,000	88,279,000	52,668,000	23,805,000	
1940 farm value	$718,011,000	$1,521,692,000	$554,878,000	$621,284,000	$114,817,000
1940 acres harvested	71,919,000	86,738,000	52,988,000	23,861,000	
1941 farm value	$910,915,000	$2,008,881,000	$890,832,000	$914,313,000	$216,961,000
1941 acres harvested	71,776,000	86,186,000	55,642,000	22,236,000	
1942 farm value	$1,132,515,000	$2,871,400,000	$1,069,878,000	$1,219,716,000	$237,221,000
1942 acres harvested	72,645,000	89,021,000	49,200,000	22,602,000	
1943 farm value	$1,502,723,000	$3,407,902,000	$1,146,584,000	$1,135,605,000	$244,059,000
1943 acres harvested	74,345,000	94,455,000	50,648,000	21,652,000	
1944 farm value [1]	$1,597,706,000	$3,679,495,000	$1,527,413,000	$1,298,849,000	$262,546,000
1944 acres harvested [1]	74,067,000	97,235,000	59,309,000	20,098,000	

[1] Preliminary.

The corn crop in acreage and value exceeds any other two crops. If we are to have a crop-insurance program, we should have a program that includes all crops, especially those needed for the war.

We have programs based on political expediency and sectional favoritism when we should have programs for the general good of agriculture and not for the few at the expense of the many.

Don't-Fence-Me-In Albano

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Congress the exploits of Lt. Raymond Albano, of Heron, Sanders County, Mont. He has been cited for exceptional bravery, and single-handed has captured 31 German prisoners, killed 82, taken 21 machine guns and cannon. His comrades refer to this outstanding soldier as Don't-Fence-Me-In Albano.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a part of his life history, taken from the Sanders County Independent Ledger, of Thompson Falls, Mont.:

Raymond Jay was born October 14, 1919, at Salmon, Idaho, in Clark County. In January 1941 he was one of the first two men from Clark County to enter the Army under the 1-year training plan. He was stationed at Fort Ord, Calif., with the Seventeenth Infantry, in the Seventh Division, until the summer of 1941, when the Ninety-fifth Division was organized at Camp Swift, Tex., and the Army took the better-trained noncommissioned officers from the Seventh Division for the newly formed Ninety-fifth Division. While with the Seventh Division he was especially trained to use trench mortars. Here he won an award as the fastest and most expert gunner in his battalion. Since that time he has been awarded several honors, among them the expert rifleman's and expert infantryman badges. He went overseas in August.

To his family in Heron I extend my sincere best wishes; and to them the people of Sanders County, the State of Montana, and the Nation say, "We are proud of Ray."

Review, November 7–January 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph-Forum.

Mr. Speaker, the writer of this editorial, Mr. Rowland R. Peters, goes straight to the heart of the matter he discusses. The observations made here can, of course, be of no value insofar as correcting past mistakes are concerned. But such words as are spoken here can be worth much to us for the future. The Machiavellian conduct which Mr. Peters disparages is perfectly natural to the regime in control of our Government. It may be expected the practices which the administration has indulged in will not only continue but will become worse so long as this regime remains in power.

I wish every person in the United States could read this editorial:

REVIEW, NOVEMBER 7–JANUARY 11

Before last election day we were led to believe by one who delights in referring to himself as the Commander in Chief when all is going well on the battle front that the war was practically won. In fact the spoils were being divided by his allied friends. All we had to do was to keep Roosevelt in office and the world would soon be at peace. Since then the Germans have launched a disastrous offensive which has cost many American lives and limbs.

Since then, too:

Roosevelt has been forced to admit that the Atlantic Charter, by reason of which he received many votes, does not exist and it, in fact, is nothing more than a "scrap of paper." General Eisenhower has found it necessary to send a group of his soldiers back to the States to report a munition shortage on the western front; Winston Churchill and Joe Stalin have returned to their old roles as power politicians; the court martial to determine responsibility for Pearl Harbor has been sidetracked for good as far as this administration is concerned; ration points have been canceled overnight; race tracks have been closed; conventions have been canceled; a ban has been placed on decorative lights; and we have been asked to live in houses and apartments with temperatures no more than 68.

The American people have demonstrated their willingness to conserve anything or do anything that will shorten the war and insure complete victory. The people have given their Government everything the Government has called for. They have abided by every edict and they have endured foolishness. This they have done for their country and for the men who are fighting for it, the men they want back home at the earliest moment it is possible for them to return.

These people know now as they should have known again and again and again that they were tricked before election day, tricked by the golden voice of deception, and lulled into a sense of peaceful security by talk of early victory at a time when the Commander in Chief knew there was not sufficient ammunition in Europe. He knew, too, what was in the minds of Churchill and Stalin and he knew there was no such thing as an Atlantic Charter. Until a few years ago it was inconceivable that American history would ever contain such a story of deception that has been written into it since March 4, 1933.

The Late Honorable Thomas Riggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death in this city Tuesday of Hon. Thomas Riggs will be learned with sorrow by thousands of his Alaska friends. By reason of outstanding qualities of mind and heart he has earned an abiding and affectionate place in the history of the great Territory of Alaska.

Governor Riggs' death followed an illness of several weeks but until the last it had been hoped and believed he would recover.

The name of Thomas Riggs will always stand in the first rank of those who have labored hard and accomplished much for Alaska. His career in the Territory extended over a long period of years and was climaxed by his appointment as Governor of Alaska in 1918. In that position he served with ability and devotion and patriotism until 1921. Governor Riggs was first in Alaska in 1897 and remained there until 1901. After an interval in continental United States he returned to the Territory with the United States Geological Survey and later served as engineer for the Alaska boundary survey. When construction of the Alaska railroad was started in 1914 he was appointed as a member of the Alaskan Engineering Commission and was placed in charge of building on the northern end of the line. His preeminent qualities as an engineer and as a man enabled him to accomplish a tremendously fine job of pioneer railroad building and earned for him an outstanding reputation.

For several years past Governor Riggs has been American member of the International Boundary Commission and of the International Highway Commission.

Surviving Governor Riggs are his wife; daughter, Lisette Isley, an officer in the Spars; and son, Thomas, Jr., United States Army, recently returned to this country from active duty overesas.

During the years which have gone by since he left Alaska Governor Riggs never for a moment lost his interest in that frontier land. With all his great ability he continued to work for its advancement. On behalf of all Alaskans who knew and respected and loved Tom Riggs, I wish to extend the deepest sympathy to the bereaved ones of his family. Hard as the blow is, it will be tempered even now, in part at least, by the thought and knowledge that the world is better for Thomas Riggs having lived in it and that history will remember him as one of the American builders of a frontier country.

Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown from the Washington Times-Herald of January 17, 1945:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

The tragedy of today's admitted shortages in manpower and production lies largely in the fact that President Roosevelt did not warn the country in time.

Instead, the President, in his fourth-term campaign addresses, painted such a rosy picture of American armed might that the people were lulled into a sense of false security.

This led inevitably to a let-down. Unfortunate, but true.

Thus it is not to be wondered at that the revelations now being made have come as a shock to Congress, which was lulled along with the rest of us.

For reasons obviously political Democratic spellbinders in the Presidential and congressional campaigns put such emphasis upon the terms of peace that were to be inflicted upon Germany and Japan as to lead the layman to conclude that the end of the war was "just around the corner."

Now we know better. Now we are being told better, by those who should have informed us in October and November of what they are revealing to us in the new year 1945.

It was not until about the first of December, a month after the election, that President Roosevelt admonished his executives to put on the soft pedal. Meanwhile the mischief had been done.

It was the President's speech at Philadelphia, on October 27, 1944, which more than anything else gave to the Nation that feeling of false security from which it has now been rudely awakened.

At that time Field Marshal Von Rundstedt's counteroffensive had not taken place, nor had it been contemplated, and this is true also of the first week in December, when the President sounded his first warning.

Thus it is clear that it is not this counteroffensive which has caused such an alarming increase in manpower and production estimates. The warning came before that.

Said the President at Philadelphia in one of his most optimistic orations of the fourth-term race:

"The war in Europe has reached the final, decisive phase—the attack on Germany itself."

That was a good campaign argument. And the changes were rung upon it everywhere. The main argument came down to this, that Mr. Roosevelt must be given a fourth term in order that he might preside over the peace table, very effective indeed, for the people longed for a victorious peace.

We are now being told in January by spokesmen of the administration that the battles still ahead will be long and tough. The suddenly revealed recuperative powers of the German Army also have told us that.

Yet at the end of last October we were led to believe that in manpower and production everything was 100 percent perfect. Said the President:

"Never before in history have the soldiers and sailors of any nation gone into battle so thoroughly trained, so thoroughly equipped, so well fed, and so thoroughly supported as the American soldiers and sailors fighting today in Europe, Asia, and the Pacific."

The accent was on thoroughness. No hint of shortages. A little later in the same political address the President said:

"All these operations had to be planned far in advance—and that does not mean merely drawing arrows on maps. It has meant planning in terms of precisely how many men will be needed and how many ships—warships, cargo ships, landing craft—how many bombers and how many fighter planes, and how much equipment and what types of equipment down to the last cartridge."

That was Candidate Roosevelt speaking. Today we are being told by Chairman Krug and Secretary Stimson how many more cartridges we shall need and how many more men.

The planning the President spoke of so glowingly on the stump in October does not now appear to have been "precisely" as perfect as he made out to be the case.

Representative O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a fine and deserved tribute by Horace C. Carlisle to our late colleague and friend the Honorable James F. O'Connor:

REPRESENTATIVE O'CONNOR

In the untimely passing of James F. O'Connor,
Our great country sustained a great loss—
His devotion to that divine grace, sacred honor,
Gave him strength for this life's every cross,
Which he bore with a fortitude, rich in assurance,
That someday he would lay his cross down,
At the end of his long, weary siege of endurance,
And receive both his robe and his crown.

In Montana, the passing of James F. O'Connor
Is bemoaned by his friends everywhere;
For he loved his home State, and reflected upon her
That true courage which conquers despair;
And his State loved him with an increasing devotion,
That grew sweeter with each passing year,
And Montana's great heart overflows with emotion,
As she pauses beside his still bier.

But a home in Montana, when James F. O'Connor
Bade adieu to his neighbors and friends—
And his wife, with this grief thrust so sadly upon her—
Have sustained the loss that never ends;
But when they look aloft, from life's valley of shadow,
Disappointment, distress, and despair,
They can see at the top of faith's ascending ladder
Representative O'Connor there.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, daily, letters come to my office making inquiry about veterans' legislation and the rights and privileges of servicemen generally. In an effort to be helpful to servicemen, their friends and families, I wish to insert in the RECORD a brief summary of some of the more important laws passed by the Congress pertaining to veterans' affairs. During 1943 and 1944 this Congress passed more than 50 bills relating to people in the service and their dependents. It was my privilege to support all of this legislation, realizing that much of it was imperfect, and that we would need to pass a great deal of perfecting legislation during the present Congress.

We realize, of course, that there is no way to compensate men for military service. There is no way to repay their families for anguish or suffering. A grateful country should never cease, however, to aid the veterans and their families in every possible way.

Recently there has been great interest and many inquiries as to the provisions of the so-called G. I. bill of rights. In order that there may be general knowledge of the provisions of this bill, as well as other legislation concerning veterans and their dependents, I am summarizing briefly some of the provisions of these laws.

Promptly upon his discharge there are a few things a veteran should do: First, report to his Selective Service Board in person or by letter within 5 days of his discharge. Second, apply for his old job within 90 days of his discharge. Third, pay the premium on his national service life insurance in order to keep it in force. Fourth, put his records in order for the future. These records include his service serial number, discharge papers, disability claim C number, insurance policies, social security card, birth certificates of himself and his dependents, marriage certificate, any divorce decrees, last will and testament, selective service registration card. I cannot lay too much stress on the importance of such records. Many a veteran's claim for compensation has been disapproved because records were not in order.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

A veteran discharged under honorable conditions automatically receives mustering-out pay ranging from $100 to $300 depending on his length and place of service. A veteran discharged before the law was passed may obtain payment by applying to his own branch of the service.

SECURING A JOB

The United States Employment Service has offices throughout the country, and maintains a special representative in each office whose duty it is to assist veterans in finding suitable positions.

Those who were civil-service employees, other than temporary, upon entry into the armed forces should apply to the agency where last employed within 90 days of discharge, or to the Civil Service Commission in event difficulty is experienced in getting reinstated.

Those veterans who did not have civil-service positions but wish to enter the Government service will be given special preference in civil-service examinations. This preference is also extended to wives or widows of veterans under certain circumstances.

APPRENTICE TRAINING

Virtually all the 30,207 apprentice-training programs in the United States extend opportunities to returning veterans. Veterans may be employed as apprentices and be paid as they learn, getting not only a steady job but training which prepares them for skilled jobs. Information may be obtained from the United States Employment Service or the nearest facility of the Veterans Administration, which for our section is the Veterans Administration, Waco, Tex.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

A veteran who has a service-connected disability resulting in an occupational handicap can probably be taught a new type of work which will not be hindered by the disability. The Veterans Administration is in charge of this training. If the disability is not service-connected, or occurs after discharge, vocational training may be secured through the State board of vocational education, which is a Federal-State program.

EDUCATION

Veterans who were discharged under honorable conditions and were not over 25 at time of entrance into service, or, if over 25, who can show their education or training was interfered with by service, or who desire a refresher or retraining course, are eligible to receive educational aid from the Veterans Administration. Such education must commence not later than 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later.

The length of training consists of 1 year or its equivalent in part-time study. If the veteran completes these courses, excepting refresher or retraining courses, in a satisfactory manner, he will be entitled to additional education or training not to extend beyond the time he spent in active service—not including A. S. T. P. or Navy college program—and no course of training shall exceed 4 years.

For an ordinary school year the Veterans Administration will pay up to $500 in tuition, fees, and certain other expenses for the education and training of a veteran. In addition a subsistence allowance of $50 a month is paid the veteran with no dependent, and $75 a month to those with dependents.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Weekly allowances of unemployment compensation are available through a Federal program if the veteran is not eligible under a State program. If he qualifies under both, money received under a State plan is subtracted from the Federal allowance. Under the Federal plan 4 weeks' allowance is made for each calendar month of active service after September 16, 1940, up to a total limit of 52 weeks.

LOANS TO VETERANS

The Veterans Administration will guarantee loans to veterans of World War No. 2 up to 50 percent of any such loan, provided the amount guaranteed does not exceed $2,000. The applicant must show that the borrowed money will be used in purchasing farm or farm equipment or business property, or for purchasing or repairing a home. Special provisions are made where a principal loan is approved by a Federal agency and for eligibility under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, subject to the $2,000 limitation.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE

Medical service, dental care, and hospitalization, including out-patient service, are provided if the veteran's condition was caused or aggravated by his service in the armed forces. Hospital treatment is also made available, within the limits of Veterans Administration facilities, to all veterans unable to pay the cost of treatment for disabilities not shown to be due to service.

DISABILITY COMPENSATION OR PENSION

Veterans discharged from the armed forces under conditions other than dishonorable and who have a disability due to service are entitled to compensation or pension. The amount payable, based upon wartime service, ranges from $10 a month for 10-percent disability to $100 a month for 100-percent disability. Beginning June 1, 1944, these sums have been increased by 15 percent. There are special rates and allowances for specific injuries and more serious disabilities. The peacetime rates are approximately 75 percent of the foregoing rates.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

As distinguished from compensation paid to veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities, pensions are payable to war veterans for non-service-connected disability. Such pension is

payable to World War Nos. 1 and 2 veterans only when the disability is held to be permanent and total, and provided the annual income of the veteran, if single, does not exceed $1,000, or, if married or with minor children, does not exceed $2,500.

SOLDIERS' HOMES

A veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may apply for admission to one of the numerous national soldiers' homes for disabled, located throughout the country, where former members of the armed forces may live and receive care.

CIVIL RELIEF

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act protects service men and women up to 6 months after their discharge by making it possible for the courts to suspend enforcement of certain civil liabilities during that time, such as lawsuits for collection of debts, contracts, repossession of property, collection of certain taxes, sale of property for taxes, eviction of dependents for nonpayment of rent, insurance premiums, and rights in public lands.

BURIAL

A sum not exceeding $100 may be allowed on the burial, funeral, and transportation expenses of any honorably discharged veteran of any war, a veteran discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, or a veteran receiving pension for service-connected disability. Men and women who die in line of duty while in the armed forces, and veterans whose last discharge was honorable are eligible for burial in a national cemetery. Under certain circumstances arrangements may be made for the burial beside him of his wife or widow, and in some of these cemeteries for the burial of minor children and unmarried adult daughters. In most cases an American flag for draping the casket of a veteran may be obtained from the Veterans Administration or any county seat postmaster.

Headstones are supplied for veterans, without charge, upon application to the Quartermaster General, United States Army, Washington 25, D. C.

DEPENDENTS' ALLOWANCES

Most people are familiar with the family allowances act whereby the Government contributes to the support of dependents of enlisted men in the armed forces, and with the provisions of the law extending maternity care to the wife of any enlisted man in the service who is in the four lowest pay grades. Free medical and nursing care is provided for the wife and infant, and the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life. The maternity-care program is administered by the various States.

PRISONERS AND MISSING IN ACTION

As long as a service man or woman is a prisoner of war or interned in a neutral country, or is listed as "missing" or "missing in action," dependents continue to receive family allowances as previously, and any allotments that are for their support and have been so designated.

GRATUITY AND BACK PAY

When a man dies while in the armed forces a gratuity payment in an amount equal to 6 months' pay is made to the family, subject to limitations and conditions outlined by the armed forces. The balance of any pay account remaining due a person who dies while in service is paid to the next of kin. Unpaid portions of mustering-out pay may be claimed by a surviving wife; if none, by surviving children; or if no surviving children, by a parent or parents.

INSURANCE

A serviceman may take out national service life insurance policies in amounts starting at $1,000, and more in multiples of $500 up to $10,000. Upon the death of a person who carried Government insurance, the Veterans Administration should be notified and will furnish the necessary blanks to the beneficiary named by the insured. Payments of this insurance are not made in a lump sum but in equal monthly installments, depending on the age of the beneficiary.

This insurance is originally issued on what is called the 5-year-level premium term plan. Any time after it has been in force a year, and before the 5 years are up, it may be converted into ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life. The original policy must be converted before the expiration of the 5-year period in order to keep it effective. The new policy will have regular cash value after the first year from which a veteran can borrow if necessary. All veterans are urged to keep their insurance in force.

DEPENDENTS' PENSIONS

When a member of the armed forces dies in action or in line of duty, or a former serviceman dies as a result of service-connected disability, his dependents are entitled to compensation or pension benefits. The rates of these pensions, which are the same for World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child (with $13 for each additional child)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100)	38
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or 1 only	45

The widow and minor children of any deceased veteran of World War No. 1 who was released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable after serving 90 days or more, or for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, are also entitled to pensions. Furthermore, the widow and minor children of a veteran of either World War who had a disability incurred in or aggravated by his war service, but who died from another cause, are entitled to pensions. Rates of these pensions are as follows:

Widow, but no child	$35
Widow with 1 child (with $5 for each additional child)	45
No widow, but 1 child	18
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	27
No widow but 3 children (equally divided)	36

With $4 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided. Payments are limited to an aggregate of $74 in any one case.

I count it a privilege to be of all possible assistance to all veterans or their dependents. Please write me about your problems, or address your inquiries to the Veterans Administration, Waco, Tex., whose duty it is to furnish veterans with full information on all matters pertaining to their rights and privileges.

Team Play and Free Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of January 14, 1945:

TEAM PLAY AND FREE SPEECH

We are still in the midst of a great war. We have been threatened, we may still be threatened, with a serious disaster on the western front. Our progress, and that means the progress of all the United Nations, toward victory has been checked. There will be other crises, other set-backs which will have to be overcome. The road to victory will be hard. But if the allies work well together, victory is inevitable, and the only hope of our enemies is that misunderstanding and dissension will break out between the allies.

Every word of dissension is picked up and carried to enemy ears. This encourages the Germans and their forces, strengthens their will to resist, and means the loss of more American and English lives. Is it not clear, then, that those who, by word or act, stir up ill feeling between the allies, are giving aid and comfort to the enemy?

Yet during recent weeks there has been much criticism from American writers of England's plans and policies, and a cacophony of complaints from broadcasters. The English are making bitter observations about our policies. It doesn't make much difference who was the first to offend or to say, "You're another."

Perhaps we must preserve free speech, whatever the cost. On this, at least, this country and England seem to agree. But great privileges need not be abused, and it would seem as if those in each country who have no responsibility for any decisions affecting the war, and who cannot know all the facts and considerations which determine these decisions, might have the patriotism, if not the decency, to refrain from offhand criticisms which can and do stir up inter-allied difficulties.

Such irresponsible men—and there are offenders in both this country and England—have lately been particularly vociferous. The gravity of the situation in Europe seems to stimulate them. At no time have cooperation and good will between England and ourselves been more important, yet this is the very time these self-appointed diplomats and foreign-policy experts sound off most loudly.

Perhaps it is permissible for a mischief-making Englishman to criticize the foreign policy of his own administration. Perhaps it is appropriate for uninformed Americans

to condemn the foreign policy of our administration. The expressed opinions rampant on the air show a strange mixture of would-be omniscience, unthought idealization of vague terms, and a point of view so confused as to leave one in doubt whether the speakers believe in Hitler or St. Paul as a guide for diplomacy.

A chronic critic of his teammates spoils the spirit of any team. If he should speak in such a vein during the crisis of a contest, even in a mere sport, he would be disciplined. He imperils success. The same principles apply in this greatest of all contests.

At least, we should show, by every possible means, our contempt for those critics who are doing so much to stir up uncertainty and ill feeling between the Allies. Freedom of speech need not be abused to be preserved, nor should it be used to aid those who would destroy it forever.

The Manpower Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter bearing on the very serious manpower shortage:

OXFORD, MD., *January 8, 1945.*

Representative DUDLEY G. ROE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ROE: It may seem presumptuous for a small businessman to question the view of the President of the United States, but on the other hand, the backbone of this country is business, especially small business and our Chief Executive's lack of early training in the fundamentals of business becomes more and more apparent.

We have listened with great interest to the President's speech on the state of the Nation. The manpower situation seems to be the President's chief domestic worry. An ordinary citizen cannot help feeling that the President's plea for a manpower draft would carry more weight if there were any reasonable effort being made by the Government to put its own house in order first.

Even a very small businessman with a limited point of view can see this situation all around him. All this winter there has been a converted yacht with a full crew of able-bodied young sailors lying in the Choptank River. Of course they may be winning the war, but they seem to be on nice days making a new survey of the Choptank and Tred Avon Rivers. This certainly cannot be a big worry to either the Germans or the Japanese and could well wait until after the war. There are more able-bodied men tied up on this one seemingly unessential job than will be obtained by draft from this entire town.

Another instance would be a 38-foot motor launch returned to our yard here by the Coast Guard. A crew of five, a lieutenant, a petty officer and three enlisted men, brought this vessel down from Baltimore. Two more enlisted men came down from Baltimore with a station wagon to pick them up. In all seven men took 2 days to do work that two men should do in 1 day, a labor wastage of 600 percent.

These are only isolated cases, but I am sure that if you have been around any of the large bases or shipyards doing Government work on a renegotiation basis, you will agree that the criticism is fair and the situation general.

That the Government itself is wasting all kinds of man and woman power in the civil service, in the armed forces and in industrial plants, is hard to deny. Some of this wastage is to be expected in the confusion of a war, but a lot of it must be stopped before the ordinary citizen can take the Chief Executive seriously.

Very sincerely yours,

RALPH H. WILEY.

Cancelation of Ration Points

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, having sat here and heard it said how the women of this country reacted to the cancelation of the ration-point coupons, I should like to insert a letter I have received from my home town on the subject. I might add that although I have received many letters, I have not had one solitary letter from anyone in my district taking an opposite view.

The letter follows:

MARIETTA, OHIO, *January 14, 1945.*

The Honorable P. W. GRIFFITHS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GRIFFITHS: I am one of those who resent Senator PATMAN's sweeping statement that the women of this country are solidly back of those responsible for invalidating our coupons after allowing us to believe that they would be honored when we needed them.

I have written the following to Senator PATMAN, sending it special delivery, and I am hoping that it will reach that gentleman instead of going by way of a secretary into the wastebasket. And now to the letter:

"Although realizing and resenting the fact that this administration began by breaking every promise but the one to bring back liquor before Christmas, I was one of those who kept faith with the Government by declaring every can of food on my shelves, my sugar, and truthfully revealing my age.

"Perhaps this leaves me a shade more bitter about the last dishonest move put over on the women of this country who have been complacently believing the promise that our coupons would be honored when we faced emergencies in our homes.

"Also perhaps this leaves me a bit more indignant over your sweeping statement that the women of this country are solidly back of the move to deprive them of their use. Of course, I realized that the removal of points was a political move because of the time when it was made, but I was stupid enough, with thousands of others, to believe that I need have no worry as to the danger of their being invalidated.

"I think that now even the most loyal New Deal women have learned a lesson that we have all been slow in learning and that we will not wait again for real need of canned food or for shoes.

"I am wondering how many office windows in Washington are open these days to give comfort to the coatless Government workers in the overheated rooms, as was the case last winter, while it is demanded that homes be kept uncomfortably cold.

"Notwithstanding what I regard as criminal extravagance, and despite blundering incompetence in Washington, the odoriferous John L. Lewis' $600,000 gift, the Browder-Hillman, and many other episodes, I have supported the President in many of his foreign policies, beginning with lend-lease.

"I am hoping that some day before the war is over, he will come forward with the positive statement of our principles, which, to many of us, seems an imperative necessity.

"It is unpleasant to write a letter of this kind to a Senator, but I cannot allow your statement to pass unchallenged. All the women of this country are not solidly back of those responsible for the coupon hoax.

"There are still many of us who revere the truth and despise trickery from whatever source."

I want you to know, Mr. GRIFFITHS, how much I admire your aggressive services in Washington. It is a comfort to us to have a man who stands for integrity and decency and who is fearless, never dodging an issue, representing us.

I hope that you approve of this letter to Senator PATMAN. Do you think there is the remotest chance of his seeing it?

Very respectfully,

MYRTIE R. SIBLEY.

Selection of Farms for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article in the January 11 issue of the Adams County Times published at Adams, Wis., should be of interest to every citizen in our country:

FARM LEADERS TO HELP VETS SELECT FARMS

Agricultural leaders of central Wisconsin are already planning to help returning war veterans locate only on land suited for farming rather than to repeat the mistakes after World War No. 1 where too many were attracted to the farm regardless of its value or its adaptability to successful operation.

Members of the veterans' advisory committee, which has been formed in Adams County, are Mr. I. S. Jones, Friendship; Mr. Owen Owens, Friendship; Miss Shirley Young, Westfield; Mr. Leo Baggot; Wisconsin Dells; Mr. B. A. McBride, Adams; Mr. H. O. Spindler, Grand Marsh; Mr. Jerry Filip, New Rome; Mr. J. C. Lambert, Grand Marsh; and Mr. Merton Thurber, Strongs Prairie.

Emil Jorgenson, district agricultural extension leader, reports that central Wisconsin counties are well dotted with farms whose operators will retire when the war is over but who have kept on farming because it was a patriotic effort to aid food production.

One of the main objectives in central Wisconsin, he adds, is to encourage local boys to settle on good land in their home counties and to keep poor land off the market.

Unless a war veteran has had adequate farm training and experience, has lived on a farm, and has adequate financing, he may be cautioned to go slow in deciding to start farming, say members of the county advisory committees. In this connection it is also pointed out that some veterans would be better off, if, instead of acquiring farm ownership, they would become tenants or hired

men on farms until they acquire a nestegg and more experience, rather than to go on the land without enough money or experience to make it go.

Veterans advisory committees have been formed in most counties of the central area to work with the county service officer in advising returning veterans as to the opportunities as well as the hazards in farming. County agents have been designated liaison officers by the United States Department of Agriculture between the veterans and the advisory committees.

Mr. Speaker, you will note from this article that Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, made a wise decision when he asked for the cooperation of rural people in connection with farm purchases under the G. I. bill.

You will also note the alertness of the Agricultural Extension Service of Wisconsin in that they are giving this project immediate attention. The State of Wisconsin has been making a land-use study for over 20 years and the agricultural college is in a position to render excellent service in farm selection.

The people of the State are evidently not going to be content with flag waving when the veterans depart for service—they are going to give a practical application to the welcome home.

Hebrew Group Seeks F. D. R. Aid in Palestine Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following letter which was written November 29, 1944, by Mr. Peter H. Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, Washington, D. C., to the President of the United States; this letter was published December 29, 1944, in the New York Journal-American:

HEBREW COMMITTEE OF
NATIONAL LIBERATION,
Washington, D. C., November 29, 1944.
HIS EXCELLENCY, THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: We take the liberty to request the assistance of the Government of the United States by using its good offices to intervene in the present deadlock which has arisen in the conflict between the policy of the Government of Great Britain and the interests of the Hebrew nation.

The territory of Palestine was mandated to Great Britain for the purpose of transforming it into the national home of the Hebrew people. This League of Nations mandate was ratified by the Government of the United States and recognized in the American-British Treaty of 1924.

The mandatory power of Palestine was obliged and did report annually to the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations on the progress of its administration. No policy regarding Palestine could be put into effect without the approval of that Commission.

Palestine now is being administered in accordance with the policy announced in the white paper of April 1939, which was submitted to the Mandates Commission and rejected by it as being incompatible with the terms of the mandate.

The Government of Great Britain, however, saw fit to persist in its strict adherence to that unauthorized policy and in accordance with it, has barred all entry of Hebrews into the territory which is, under international law, the Hebrew national home.

In view of the diabolical campaign of extermination which Germany and her satellites have been conducting in recent years against the Hebrew people in Europe, the closed doors of Palestine have helped in a way to deliver hundreds of thousands of Hebrews into the hands of their murderers.

It is justifiable to say that more than half of the estimated 3,000,000 Hebrews who lost their lives in Europe could have been alive in Palestine and elsewhere if not for the white paper policy, which closed to them this main avenue of escape and, indirectly, all other avenues of escape.

We believe that the Hebrew nation is a cobelligerent in this war and is of right, though not recognized, a member of the United Nations and therefore an ally of Great Britain. We have, therefore, repeatedly stated that the settlement of the Palestinian political and boundary problems ought to be postponed until after the war, when they should be settled together with other interallied problems.

It is because of this that we advocate full cooperation with the mandatory for Palestine. But the fact we are allied in a war against Axis tyranny certainly does not compel or oblige us to acquiesce in the internationally illegal policy which stood, and still stands, in the way of the rescue of hundreds of thousands of martyred human beings. We therefore took issue with the Government of Great Britain on the question of the right of every Hebrew in Europe to escape to Palestine.

In our deep anxiety to maintain good relations between allies, we offered a series of compromise proposals, culminating with the suggestion that there be established in Palestine emergency rescue shelters into which all Hebrews should be admitted temporarily, without prejudice to their future status, so that their lives might thereby be saved and so that the political controversy not continue to stand in the way of saving them.

We were willing to accept temporarily the status of foreign refugees for Hebrews in their own national home, a status similar to that of the European refugees in the emergency rescue shelters in the United States and French and middle eastern territories. Even this was rejected.

All the above-mentioned facts compel us to seek the help of your great country in bringing to an end a tragic situation and one which throws serious aspersions on Great Britain's adherence to the very principles for which the United Nations are waging this costly global war.

We maintain that the Hebrew nation has already suffered staggering losses in this war and should not be called on to continue the suffering endlessly and aimlessly. The Hebrews in German-occupied territory should not be abandoned to death at the hands of the Germans because of an unjustifiable and stubborn policy of Great Britain, and the Hebrews in the liberated territories of Europe should not be forced to remain, to be starved and humiliated, in their shattered ghost-ridden homes, amidst the scenes of horror and destruction which they miraculously survived.

But the Government of Great Britain continues its present policy in Palestine despite the horrible toll of suffering and death for which this policy is responsible.

In view of all the above, the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation respectfully requests your assistance in order to bring this tragic conflict to an early end. We propose that you, Mr. President, take the initiative to convene a round-table conference between representatives of the British Government and representatives of the Hebrew nation in which, under the guidance of your representatives, animated by impartial justice and equal friendship for both sides, it should not be too difficult to arrive at some understanding and bring to an end the present intolerable situation.

Our confidence in the success of such a conference is due to our conviction that the present deadlock is not a result of cruelty or bad will, but rather a result of inertia fostered by the confusion of the Zionists themselves, and once scrutinized under the guidance of American good will and common sense, it will become easy to eliminate misunderstandings and the relatively minor obstacles which are now responsible for a very tragic situation.

We beg to submit, Mr. President, that the confusion and the lack of status of the Hebrews in Europe today not be permitted to stand in the way and block the realization of our proposal as it has blocked every constructive effort to solve this problem in the past. Let not the deluge of organizations amongst American Jews and the perpetual debates amongst them be the reason for continual inaction, for it does not concern them. It concerns solely Hebrews—those people who are persistently misnamed and referred to as refugees, as Germans, as Hungarians, or stateless Jews, but never by their own name—Hebrews.

There are no Hebrews in the United States. There are Americans of Hebrew descent or Americans of the Jewish faith. It is not a religious problem that we are dealing with, and American clergymen (of the Jewish faith) should not be asked to determine it. We ask the help of the United States to solve the present conflict between our need for survival and the policy of the British Government.

American Jews have no conflict or the right to have a conflict with the British Government. They have appreciation of and sympathy for us Hebrews, the victims of that conflict, as indeed have the overwhelming majority of the American people.

In view of the lack of an as yet recognized national representation or authority to speak for the Hebrew nation, we propose that the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation be invited to compose the Hebrew representation, which would include those members of the Jewish Agency for Palestine who are Hebrew nationals, barring, of course, the participation of those members of the Jewish Agency who are nationals of other nations owing exclusive allegiance to those nations and therefore ineligible to be spokesmen for the Hebrew nation at any international conference.

Mr. President, not only the people of your great Nation but the people of many lands—indeed humanity at large—are already indebted to you for your magnificent leadership in world affairs. Throughout the earth men thank God for having given you the greatness, the vision, and the strength for such leadership. On behalf of our martyred nation, which has reached the very end of its endurance, we appeal to you to apply the genius of your initiative and leadership for the restoration of life and dignity to our ancient nation.

I remain, Mr. President, with respect and admiration,

Faithfully yours,

PETER H. BERGSON,
Chairman.

The Ratification of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on the ratification of treaties delivered by me before the General Court of New Hampshire on January 17, 1945.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Dale, members of the Governor's council, president of the State senate, members of the general court and guests, you of the New Hampshire Legislature by inviting me to speak from this rostrum today have conferred upon me a singular honor. I recall with keen pleasure my service in this house as chairman of the committee on ways and means in 1939. It is delightful to be here again and to renew my many acquaintances. The friendships I made during my service in this house are among my most treasured possessions. You were good to me in the 1939 session and subsequently you have aided me in my several campaigns for Congress. It is a privilege to serve my State in the National Capital. For this opportunity I am most grateful to the electorate of New Hampshire.

I wish to express my deep appreciation to you for the invitation extended to me by the legislature of my own State to discuss here this morning the subject of treaty ratification. This issue, aside from winning the war, is, I believe, the most important single question of the day. It is a subject to which we must give our careful attention since on its correct solution may well depend the happiness of future generations.

THE PEACE—A VITAL CONCERN TO ALL

We are winning the most devastating war in history; a war fought for democracy and the institutions of freedom. This conflict reaches the lives of all our people. You who are listening have sons, daughters, or other relatives in the armed forces. Just as this unparalleled struggle touches each individual in the country so will the peace be a vital personal concern to every man, woman, and child in the Republic. Our major objective then, following the winning of the war, is to lay the foundations for a just and lasting peace so that our posterity will not be required to sacrifice, bleed, and die in another international clash of arms. We must keep faith with those who are achieving such notable triumphs on every fighting front. The statesmanship of the Republic must succeed in pointing the way to permanent peace. The United States of America is a great and growing world power and with power comes the responsibility for exercising constructive leadership. As a Member of Congress I will tirelessly devote my energy to forging the governmental machinery essential to the construction of a peaceful world order. I will work with all the ability I possess to assist in preventing another global war. If the leaders of this Nation and other powers fail in charting the way to a world free from war then the youth of America are today making their incalculable sacrifices in vain.

ISOLATION IMPOSSIBLE

This world is shrinking with astonishing rapidity. We no longer live in an age of horse-drawn carriages. This is an era of instant communication, swift transportation, and super air liners. On Thursday, January 4, I flew from Washington to New Hampshire to attend the inauguration of His Excellency Governor Dale, completing the trip from the Capital of the Nation to the city of Manchester in 1 hour and 40 minutes, an average speed of 262 miles an hour, or over 4 miles per minute. It is utterly impossible for the United States or any other country to remain in isolation. There are no longer any remote points on the surface of this planet. The philosophy of isolationism by the impact of modern science has been ground to dust. We are a part of, and will continue to remain a part of, the onrushing stream of world affairs. We must win victories at the peace table as well as on the battle fronts if we are to take our proper place as a leader among the powers of this earth. Constitutional changes in our governmental procedures are imperative to allow effective participation in world affairs. The magnitude of our responsibility is seemingly without bounds. It's weight is sobering. Our tasks must be approached with the most thoughtful and prayerful consideration.

THE CONSTITUTION ON TREATIES

After hostilities have come to an end, treaties of peace will be written. Under our antiquated constitutional procedure these treaties will be made by the President and to be effective they must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate. In the words of the Constitution: "He"—the President—"shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." One of the most needed constitutional reforms is to change this section so that a simple majority of both Houses of Congress will be empowered to validate treaties.

TWO FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS

In the discussion of this subject we find there are two fundamental questions involved. First, should treaties be acted upon in the Congress by a majority or by a two-thirds vote; and second, should the House participate in the ratification of treaties. In the consideration of these issues it will be helpful to review the history of the two-thirds rule.

REASONS FOR TWO-THIRDS RULE NO LONGER EXIST

The United States is the only great Nation requiring a two-thirds vote of a branch of the legislative body to ratify treaties. There is absolutely no political theory on which the two-thirds rule is based. The reason motivating the writers of the Constitution to insert the requirement have long since disappeared. The Articles of Confederation providing for treaty ratification by a vote of 9 out of the 13 States were in the immediate background as the makers of the Constitution did their work. The document was to become effective when ratified by 9 States. At that time there was serious doubt that even this number would join the Union. If but 9 had adopted the Constitution, then the Senate would have consisted of only 18 Members. The two-thirds provision was inserted to prevent treaty ratification from being placed in the hands of the President and 3 or 4 States. In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 no one ever dreamed that the Senate would become a body of 96. In the beginning the House itself was to consist of only 65 Members.

Demand for the two-thirds provision came from the jealousies and suspicions of the original States. The South was interested in navigation on the Mississippi River. The New England States were concerned in protecting fishery rights. Sections were fearful lest treaties might be made which would interfere with their respective economic interests. State sovereignty was prominent at the time of the Constitutional Convention. The fathers intended that the President should consult and advise with the Senate. It was believed that secrecy would prevail in the small Senate and that treaties would be made in executive sessions. All of these reasons no longer exist. With the growth of the country they have passed out of existence, and today the United States of America stands alone as the only great Nation to employ the cumbersome, obstructive, and senseless two-thirds requirement.

THE RECORD OF THE SENATE

The record of the Senate in the handling of treaties for the settlement of international disputes is most disheartening. In writing this record the Senate has ably demonstrated its inability to act constructively in international affairs. Peace treaties and treaties of arbitration have suffered irreparable mutilation at the hands of the Senate. Since the Spanish-American War the United States has been a world power. Again and again during the last 50 years the Senate has frustrated moves to substitute the peaceful settlement of international disputes for war. The Olney-Pauncefote Arbitration Treaty of 1897 was rejected. The Hay Arbitration Treaties of 1904 were emasculated. The Senate maintained a stranglehold on the Root Arbitration Treaties of 1908 and 1910. The life was taken out of the Taft Arbitration Treaties of 1911. The Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations were destroyed by the two-thirds rule of the Senate. In recent years few treaties of any great consequence have been ratified by the Senate. One is forced to the conclusion that no treaty of far-reaching importance in connection with the establishment of peace can be ratified under the two-thirds rule.

NATION NEARLY HELPLESS

The Nation is thus left almost helpless to assist in establishing permanent peace. The President cannot speak for the people since whatever he does is subject to a veto by one-third of the Senate. Other nations have grounds to seriously doubt the ability of the United States to play an active role in organizing the world community after the war is won. In the two-thirds rule the Constitution contains a major defect. The Chief Executive in the United States ought to have the same freedom in international negotiations as is enjoyed by the heads of other governments. Leaders in other countries are reluctant to enter into agreements with this country since they know that a minority in the Senate can doom the constructive plans of any Chief Executive. Our negotiators go to international conferences handicapped. The hands of the American diplomats would be strengthened if treaties could be ratified by a majority vote of both Houses of the Congress.

MAJORITY RULE

A fundamental principle of democracy is majority rule. The present method of treaty ratification is undemocratic in the extreme. The population of Nevada is 110,247; of New York 13,479,142. Since the adoption of the seventeenth amendment Senators are elected directly by the people. In treaty making the vote of a Senator from Nevada is worth twice that of a Senator from New York. The power of a voter in the State of Nevada is the same as that of a hundred and twenty voters in the Empire State. Pennsylvania has a population of 9,900,180. The 2 votes from Nevada could cancel the votes of the Senators from Pennsylvania and New York. Thus the Senators representing 110,247 can override the will of Senators representing 23,379,322. This is a most undemocratic process. There are no logical arguments to sustain the positions that the vote of a legislator who objects to a treaty is worth twice as much as one who favors it.

One-third plus one of the membership of the smaller House of Congress has in its hands life and death power over treaties. Under existing procedure if the entire Senate membership of 96 were present, Senators from 17 States voting against a treaty could cause its defeat. Were the Members opposed to a treaty to come from 17 of the smallest States, rejection would result by the action of Senators representing States with a population of approximately 10,500,000 people, according to the census figures of 1940. If the remaining Senators, representing States with a population of 120,000,000 people should all vote for the treaty, then their will could be overruled by the Members who represent 10,500,000. Should only a quorum of the Senate be in attendance when a vote on a treaty is taken, 17 Members could prevent ratification. If the 17 votes should come from the smallest States and the 32 votes from the 16 largest States, the Senators from States with approximately 3,500,000 could thwart the will of Senators from States with a population of over 88,000,000. These are, I realize, extreme cases and the alinement to which I have referred may never occur. The situations I have pictured are, however, possibilities under our system and speak eloquently for the undemocratic character of our constitutional procedure of treaty ratification. By including the House we would require, if we go to extremes, at least 110 Members of that body plus 25 Senators to reject a treaty. This would be the situation in the event only a bare quorum existed at the time of voting. Majority approval by both Houses would be infinitely better than the two-thirds rule we now follow.

Opponents to the proposed amendment call attention to the unanimous consent required by juries; to the two-thirds provision for the impeachment of a President; to the two-thirds vote necessary to override a President's veto; and say that more than a majority are necessary in certain decisions of vast importance. They then conclude that in the matter of making treaties we should retain the two-thirds requirement. These cases are not analogous to the two-thirds provision for treaty ratification and have no bearing on the question at hand.

A majority of both Houses of Congress is sufficient to enact Federal statutes. A majority is deemed ample to commit the Republic to such a program as lend-lease and other policies of great national and international moment. A simple majority of Congress is sufficient to take us into war. Surely the formulation of the peace is as grave a matter as making war, yet it is easier for this Government to declare war than to write a peace. There is no conceivable reason why a majority of both Houses is not enough to validate peace treaties. Under the present system a treaty of far-reaching importance, a treaty embodying principles on which the structure of world peace might be erected could be rejected by a militant minority of the Senate even if a majority of the Senate wished to ratify it; even if a majority of the House of Representatives desired its acceptance; yes, even if a majority of the American people demanded its validation. The treaty section of the Constitution is a serious handicap to our leadership in international cooperation. To continue the two-thirds rule for ratification by the Senate is to impair, if not to imperil, our successful participation in the conduct of foreign affairs.

It is reasonable to assume that a majority of the people's representatives in both Houses of Congress can better safeguard our interest in international affairs than a minority of the Senate. The architects of the Constitution themselves were not in favor of minority control. In the early days of the Republic traveling conditions were bad. The Senate was expected to be small. It was anticipated that there would be many absentees. One of the reasons for adopting the rule under discussion was to prevent minority dictation of our foreign policy. By abolishing this rule we would have a workable system. The Federal Government would be more responsive to the will of the people. The argument that a majority control of treaty making would result in hasty, ill-considered, and unwise action is the weakest of all arguments coming from those who hold that this power should be vested in one-third of the Senate. If a majority of Congress cannot protect our interests, then nothing can save us. The burden of proof rests on those who contend that less than a majority of one House of Congress should direct the foreign relations of this great Nation in the post-war period.

CIRCUMVENTION BY AGREEMENTS AND RESOLUTIONS

The foreign relations of the United States are becoming constantly more complex. Conventions, agreements, and joint resolutions are being resorted to to circumvent the two-thirds rule. Many matters which would have been considered by the founding fathers as treaties have been handled as executive agreements and resolutions. Congressional influence in foreign affairs is constantly diminishing as a result of these practices. The continuation of the two-thirds rule is an insurmountable encumbrance to our successful participation in the councils of the nations. It is rendering increasingly ineffective the voice of the Representatives of the people in international affairs. For self-preservation and for augmenting its own influence in foreign relations the Senate itself should be the first to enthusiastically accede to the growing demand for this constitutional reform.

THE HOUSE SHOULD HAVE A VOICE IN TREATY MAKING

The House, much closer to the people than the Senate, should have a voice in treaty making. This branch of the Congress is in a far better position to act in accordance with the wishes of the majority. So intricate have become human affairs that domestic laws are closely interwoven with foreign policy. The laws affecting the merchant marine, the size of the Army, the exchange of materials of war, tariffs, and appropriations to implement treaties are illustrations of subjects in which the House has a voice and are matters closely connected with foreign policy. It is impossible to draw a line between local problems and the issues connected with foreign affairs. Few treaties can be sustained without implementing legislation requiring the concurrence of both Houses of Congress. There is no valid reason why one type of legislation should be possible by only a two-thirds vote of the Senate when legislation implementing this must receive the sanction of the other House. No foreign policy agreed upon by the Senate can long endure unless it has the wholehearted support of the people. This can best be given by the House of Representatives.

Under article VI of the Constitution treaties are a part of the supreme law of the land along with the Constitution and laws enacted in pursuance thereof. This is a compelling reason for associating the House with treaty making. The majority of Congress may abrogate a treaty by voting for conflicting legislation or failing to pass subsidiary legislation. The agencies of Government empowered to abrogate a treaty should be consulted in the formulation of a treaty. By including the House in treaty making undue delay by the Senate would be greatly lessened if not entirely prevented. With the House voting we would actually be able to establish a people's peace.

DUMBARTON OAKS

The now famous Dumbarton Oaks proposals or a modification of them for the establishment of an international organization to maintain peace and security will undoubtedly be presented in treaty form. Abolition of the two-thirds rule will increase the chances of this Nation joining a world organization to preserve the peace. Furthermore, many treaties supplementing the original Dumbarton Oaks proposals will have to be agreed upon. To insure our successful participation in building a peaceful society it is imperative that the two-thirds provision be stricken from the Constitution. I, for one, am not willing to leave the question of the United States joining a world organization for peace and security in the hands of one-third of the Senate. Those who feel that we shall become a member of such a group under our present system are indulging in unwarranted optimism.

PRESENT STATUS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

On the 20th of November I debated this issue on the floor of the House. Later the Committee on the Judiciary held hearings and finally reported favorably a resolution to amend the Constitution. This came so late in the last session that the question did not reach the floor. On the 3d of January I introduced House Joint Resolution 16, which is as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"SECTION 1. The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Congress, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members present in each House concur.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

The Committee on the Judiciary will undoubtedly consider this proposition again in the near future and since a resolution similar to the one I introduced was reported favorably in the Seventy-eighth Congress there is every reason to believe that it will be reported favorably in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I hope that in the near future the subject will be discussed on the floor of the House and that a resolution to submit the proposed amendment to the State legislatures will be passed by far more than the necessary two-thirds vote.

STATE LEGISLATURES IN SESSION

Over 40 of the State legislatures are convening this year. If the Congress acts at once it is possible for the amendment to become a part of the Constitution within a few months. The Seventy-ninth Congress could perform no act which would so increase the faith of the people in representative government as to give the State legislatures an opportunity to vote on this question. Now is the time for the National Legislature to rise to a high position of leadership and make an incalculable contribution to future generations by developing governmental procedures to meet the problems of this modern age.

HOUSE MUST ASSUME LEADERSHIP

The House must assume the leadership in this matter just as it took the leadership in passing the Fulbright resolution approving United States membership in an international organization to halt aggression. The statements presented to the House Judiciary Committee were almost unanimous against the two-thirds rule. There are very few people outside of the United States Senate who believe that the present method of rati-

fying treaties should be continued. Recent polls show that a majority of the Nation is in favor of striking out the impeditive two-thirds requirement. If the House will soon vote upon this question, the Senate may be prodded into action. This would give the State legislatures, in session this year, an opportunity to vote on the suggested amendment.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION—ONLY ALTERNATIVE TO WAR

The present system plays definitely into the hands of obstructionists; into the hands of those who still cling to isolationism and into the hands of those who would have this Nation try to retreat from the theater of international affairs after the tanks have ceased to move and the bombers have completed their missions. The only alternative to recurring world wars is an international organization sufficiently powerful to check an aggressor when he first begins his march of conquest. By actually participating in an association of nations to effect world unity we will be doing our part as a great power in seeking a way to avoid international anarchy. Many responsible leaders in both major political parties have expressed themselves as favoring an international organization, implemented by force, to preserve the peace. Here is an excellent opportunity for them to demonstrate their sincerity by putting their influence behind the proposed constitutional reform. This is the first major step in accomplishing their objectives. The Congress has stated that is is in favor of entering a world organization. Here is an opportunity by voting for this amendment to prove that we meant what we said when we passed legislation pledging our participation.

I believe that the first step in developing an enlightened foreign policy, is to amend the Constitution so that a majority in both Houses may validate treaties. Such an amendment would strengthen the hands of our negotiations at the peace table. Such an amendment would permit a majority of the people's representatives to participate in creating a just and enduring peace. Such an amendment would strip from the hands of a small minority the dictation of our foreign policy. Such an amendment would be an announcement to the world that the United States of America actually intends to assist in organizing a peaceful society and in laying the foundations for international goodwill. Such an amendment would remove a glaring defect in the Constitution and would make this Republic far more influential in the direction of world affairs. It would end our impotence in concluding treaties and would give new hope to those of the present generation as well as afford the means by which the people of the future may escape the curse of war.

WILL PRESS FOR ACTION

I am frank to say that I, along with many others, will fight this battle to the finish. We will press for action until the question reaches the floor of the House. Now is the time for every legislator, yes, for every citizen to let his position be known on this question as we enter the struggle to establish a just and lasting peace.

The antiquated, obstructive, undemocratic, and indefensible method of approving treaties should be ended. I hope that the country will rally to the support of this amendment and by so doing make the first move in establishing our leadership in the struggle for world unity. Just as the boys are fighting for military successes on the battle fronts, so must we work for victories on the home front. If those in our armed forces are not to be let down by the country and by those who are privileged to move in that distinguished group referred to as statesmen, then we must act promptly to preserve the fruits of their victories.

WE MUST NOT HESITATE

Let it not be said by the historians of the future that this Republic hesitated at this crucial juncture in world affairs. Let it not be said that we failed to use our position of unparalleled power to lead the nations in the struggle for universal peace. If we hesitate, if we do not keep faith with those who are fighting, if our statesmanship is incapable of solving the questions of this hour, and if we do not lay the groundwork for an enduring peace, then the generations of the years to come will by our failure be condemned to the recurrence of devastating wars. Let us be resolved that our country shall lead the march toward good will, brotherhood, and peace.

Laws Affecting Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
HUGH SMITH THOMPSON, 3D,
CHAPTER, 17,
Castle Point, N. Y., January 10, 1945.

Hon. E. CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We desire to call to your attention injustices and inequalities affecting disabled veterans under existing laws.

A service-connected single disabled veteran who enters a hospital for treatment of any kind receives $20 per month either as compensation or pension for his service-connected disability. Under the present law there is deducted $95 per month from his monthly check. In other words, he is forced to pay his own way in a Government hospital while he is totally and permanently disabled while undergoing treatment for his service-connected disability. Prior to the enactment of the Economy Act of 1933 these men received full benefits while hospitalized. Returning disabled veterans of World War No. 2 are very much disillusioned to find that their benefits are reduced to $20 per month during periods of hospitalization for service-incurred disabilities, while in the service they had been receiving $50 or more per month.

Many single disabled veterans, particularly those with tuberculosis which requires an extremely long period of hospitalization, leave Government hospitals before maximum treatment is reached in order to secure full benefits due them as they have obligations contracted prior to hospitalization such as insurance and family obligations which the Veterans Administration does not recognize as dependency. A veteran who leaves a hospital in this manner not only jeopardizes his own health, but is a menace to the public in general. Legislation is required to correct this injustice.

We should also like to suggest for your consideration the matter of statutory awards. A statutory award of $50 monthly throughout life was granted for the benefit of World War No. 1 veterans with an arrested case of tuberculosis. World War No. 2 veterans do not share in this protection. Instead, they are rated by the Veterans Administration Rating Board semiannually upon discharge from the hospital, and in many cases their benefits are reduced to the minimum (which can be nothing) as quickly as 1 year after discharge. The statutory award was granted to compensate for the reduced earning capacity of the veteran in the labor market due to his disability. It is not only recognized by employers that a veteran with arrested tuberculosis is unable to exert himself fully, but the veteran himself knows that to do so would be to court a recurrence of the disease. Legislation is also required to correct this injustice.

Another point of vital interest to veterans of World War No. 2 and their families is the matter of converted insurances. Discharged veterans of World War No. 1 were permitted to convert their service insurance into any of the following forms: 20-year-payment life, 20-year endowment, endowment at age of 62, 30-year-payment life, 30-year endowment.

All of these policies contained a disability clause for permanently and totally disabled men. Payments were made at the rate of $5.75 per thousand per month while permanently and totally disabled. World War No. 2 veterans are permitted to convert into the following forms only: 20-year-payment life, 30-year-payment life.

These converted policies do not contain any disability provisions whatever. Comparatively, this matter of insurances is very unfair to the veterans of World War No. 2. Legislation is also required to correct this injustice.

We ask your cooperation in furthering legislation to effect these very necessary amendments to existing laws.

Our national service director, Mr. Millard W. Rice, Disabled American Veterans, 543 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., will be pleased to enlarge upon any of these matters at your convenience.

Assuring you of our high regard and esteem, we are,

Respectfully,
WILLIAM R. CLEARY,
Commander.

Our Right to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Our Right to Peace," which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., January 15, 1945:

OUR RIGHT TO PEACE

The average American, slow to anger, can be a pretty tough hombre when aroused.

The colonists, aroused in 1776, cut themselves free from a despot.

In 1812 we went to war to assure the freedom of our commerce on the high seas.

In 1861 we fought to banish slavery.

In 1898, we resented Spain's high-handedness and rolled up our sleeves once more.

In 1917 we objected to Germany's plunging our fellow citizens to death in the icy seas and in 1941 we took up the cudgets again, this time to halt the sweep of Nazi dominance and to avenge the Americans killed by a sneak Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

We have never lost a war and we shall not lose this one.

But isn't it barely possible, that glorious as all our victories have been, the greatest battle of our history will begin when the last gun is silenced in the present conflict? Isn't it time we began giving some thought to the battle for enduring peace, not only for ourselves but for all people everywhere?

Is there any more sublime objective to which we, as a Nation, can dedicate ourselves?

It is obvious, even to a school child, that the next peace, if it is to be worth anything, must have teeth. We cannot abruptly lay down our arms, busy ourselves with domestic concerns, forget the rest of the world and not expect another international eruption 25 or 50 peace hence. Hitler will die, nazi-ism will pass, the pagan fanatics of Japan will be subdued, but what guaranty have we, as of today, that new Hitlers will not arise, new cults attract frenzied followers somewhere else on the globe and new quarrels provide the spark for another explosion?

It seems to us that out of all the welter of discussion of how lasting peace can be secured, only one man, an American, has thus far taken a single practical step toward enduring international amity. That man is Kent Cooper, executive director of the Associated Press, who proposes a free exchange of news among all nations so that people everywhere will know what is going on. That, obviously, is step No. 1. Americans should fight for Mr. Cooper's plan, and see to it that their Government representatives, from the President down to the lowliest diplomatic attaché in Siam, fight for it until it is assured of world-wide acceptance.

Step No. 2 is an international police force. The United States should insist on this at the peace table. Force is the only language that the hoodlum down the street or the international gangster across the ocean understands. Some day, we all pray, it will not be necessary to police the world, but at this writing it is imperative and is likely to be for many decades to come until men learn that no great moral issue is permanently settled by hurling explosives at human beings or ramming a bayonet through a fellow man's body.

Step No. 3 is education. A truly enlightened people recognizes the futility of war, but there are millions who look upon it as the highest calling of man, the supreme expression of racial supremacy. Education is the most effective antidote for such nonsense.

Step No. 4 is a more militant Christianity. We as Americans profess to be Christians. Our Nation was founded on belief in a just and beneficent Deity. Was there ever a more perfect design for peace offered man than that given us by Christ? Can we honestly say that we have fulfilled our destiny as a nation until we take steps to make sure that people everywhere are given an opportunity at least to know what Christianity means, of the solace and hope it has brought to millions? A sincerely Christian world will be a peaceful world.

This is an ambitious program—a program that will overshadow the most heroic of all previous American efforts. We cannot accomplish it alone. We've willingly poured out our blood to make an ignorant Negro free or the lowliest laborer king in his own home. Neither Mr. Stalin, nor Mr. Churchill, nor anyone else should be permitted to let his own nationalistic concerns stand in the way of an attempt to make the next peace stick. It's time the human race became of age and that a sincere, concerted effort were made to enable man, in the few brief years allotted him on this earth, to enjoy the blessings of his Creator, the wealth of nature, the products of his own skill and industry, and the bliss of family life without periodic interruptions of strife and carnage.

We Americans have been tough on Saipan, at Leyte, on the Murmansk run, in Africa, Sicily, Italy, and the western front. Let us here highly resolve to be equally tough when the next peace is designed so that the heroic sacrifices of our sons will be translated into enduring benefit for all mankind. No one, certainly, has a greater right than we to say what kind of world our children and grandchildren are to inherit.

Farm Labor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the farmers whose sons are fighting for liberty under law stand aghast to see the plain intent and spirit of the Tydings amendment bypassed by those in authority who are sworn to execute all laws passed by Congress. The evidence that is pouring in to Members of Congress in support of this statement furnishes eloquent illustrations of the principle that "where law ends tyranny begins."

The Tydings amendment was enacted as part of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. Its purpose was to protect the farmers from being stripped of labor necessary to carry out a program of food production. It was to enable the farmers to achieve by extraordinary efforts a volume of food production necessary to feed the Army, Navy, and civilian population during war. The burden placed upon the farmers by the Government has been expanded far beyond the original intent. Now it is expected that the farmers will not only supply the Army, Navy, and civilian population during war, but also feed the people of the liberated nations now and after the war.

No group of people in the United States has responded more willingly, without regard to hours of labor or income, to a degree that is not only admirable but almost superhuman, than the farmers.

Now, at a most critical time when the War Food Administration, through its Administrator Marvin Jones, is requesting an increase of 3 percent in farm output, the President of the United States has joined in a directive signed by General Hershey known as advice to the State directors and addressed to the subject Reclassification of Registrants in Agriculture, Ages 18 to 25, the intent of which is undoubtedly to cause draft boards and State directors to nullify the purpose and intent of the Tydings amendment.

There is no group outside of the officers and soldiers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force that has made a greater sacrifice to meet the demands of the Government during this war than the farmers. They have seen their boys taken from the farms when they were sorely needed to meet the demands of the Government for food; they have seen the farm machinery, which they required, shipped abroad, and now they see an attempt to destroy the little protection that they should have under the Tydings amendment.

The letters that are coming in from the farmers of this country presents a tragic picture. Notwithstanding all this, the administration is pursuing a course of totalitarian methods which our boys on battlefields throughout the world are attempting to destroy.

I have before me a letter which is typical of what is taking place at the present time regardless of the Tydings amendment. A farmer, aged 25, with two small children and another soon due has just been examined and ordered for induction by Presidential order. This man is the only man to operate one of the best 250-acre farms in my home county. He was even refused an appeal, so I am informed, because he was inducted under Presidential order. There is no Presidential order that can supersede the Tydings amendment nor the right of appeal. This man has always farmed and his request for deferment was denied on the ground apparently that he bought a larger farm and moved on there last fall. There is nothing for such a man to do but to sell out or at least to let the farm stand idle. This penalizing a farmer for enlarging his acreage does not make sense at a time when the Government requests an increase of 3 percent in farm output. The Congress ought to take action and take action promptly lest our farm program completely fail to meet the exigencies of war. We have had a shortage of war material in the way of large guns and shells. Let us not endanger ultimate victory by failing to furnish adequate food to our Army, Navy, and to our own people as well as others.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Wednesday, January 17, 1945:

W. F. A. REQUESTS INCREASE OF 3 PERCENT IN FARM OUTPUT—MARVIN JONES ASKS ALL-OUT PRODUCTION TO MEET 1945 GOALS ON FOOD AND FEED

WASHINGTON, January 16.—Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, called anew on the Nation's farmers for all-out food and feed production this year as he announced final agricultural production goals for 1945.

These goals represent the total of State goals recommended by farmers, farm leaders, and State agricultural officials, and are approximately the same as were recommended by the W. F. A. last November 15.

This year's crop acreage goal totaled 363,635,000 acres, nearly 3 percent more than the 1944 planted acreage and a little more than the 363,616,000 acres which had been suggested by the W. F. A.

Goals for flaxseed, sugar beets, and clover crop seeds were increased substantially over 1944, while moderate increases were decided upon for acreages for dry beans, potatoes, and tobacco. Legume hay seeds and soy bean acreages will be maintained at the record 1944 levels, Mr. Jones said.

LARGER SLAUGHTER ASKED

The W. F. A. called for a larger slaughter of cattle to meet increased military and civilian demands. The cattle and calf slaughter suggested by the W. F. A. was 35,000,000 head, an increase over the 33,900,000 in 1944. Slaughter goals were not established on a State basis.

State recommendations called for an increase in the goal for spring pigs from 55,925,000 in 1944 to 57,563,000. The W. F. A. had suggested 57,000,000. Farmers were urged to keep more sows for spring farrowing to help meet the goal. The number of sows to farrow in the spring was set finally at 9,569,000, compared with W. F. A. suggestions of 9,429,000 and the 1944 estimate of 9,187,000.

W. F. A. announced extension of the price support period on hogs to March 31, 1946, to cover the period when the spring pigs of 1945 will be marketed.

The national wheat goal was set at 67,731,000 acres. This compares with 65,454,000 acres planted for harvest in 1944.

The corn goal was fixed at 99,098,000 acres, compared with 98,722,000 acres planted in 1944.

MILK GOALS INCREASE

Increased milk production also is called for in the final national goals. The final State-recommended output for 1945 was 120,582,000,000 pounds, 582,000,000 more than W. F. A. recommended and above the estimated 1944 production of 119,200,000,000 pounds.

W. F. A. said that because of recent changes in needs, the 1945 egg goal was increased by about 10 percent over the preliminary goal and was fixed at 4,350,000,000 dozen. The W. F. A. had suggested 3,920,000,000 dozen, which was considerably under the estimated 4,790,000,000 last year.

State-recommended goals for chickens totaled 745,000,000, the same as the estimated 1944 production but above the 700,000,000 the W. F. A. proposed.

"Increased military needs," Mr. Jones said, "have resulted in higher pack goals for vegetables for processing."

America's Part in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address, entitled "America's Part in World Affairs," delivered in New York City last evening by our colleague the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in the New York Times Forum.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Profoundly disturbing to all peace-loving citizens are the events of the past 6 weeks. The military reverses have been serious. The savagery and destructive power of our enemies, just as we thought them weakening, have shocked us. But our military performance is not the source of our greatest concern. Few have lost faith in the ability of our generals and none have lost faith in the courage and skill of our fighting men.

Our apprehension springs from another source. It springs from the hesitation and timidity, the lack of forthrightness in the management of foreign affairs by our own Government. Why is it that with all our military power and our enormous contribution of material goods to the cause of war, we are unable to secure even the semblance of unity among our allies in dealing with the problems of peace in the liberated countries? These problems in the liberated countries cannot wait. Disorder, starvation, and death face these peoples and something must be done. What is wrong with our policy?

Sixteen long months ago, in September 1943, the House of Representatives declared that it favored the "creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world and as favoring participation of the United States therein." The essence of this declaration by your Representatives is the participation of the United States. And yet, in spite of this unequivocal statement, by an overwhelming vote, your Government has not yet created the appropriate machinery by which we can participate in the solution of problems leading to the establishment of peace.

Participation is a positive, a dynamic, word. It means to share in common with others; to share by common action. The declaration by the representatives means that we should share actively, affirmatively, in the negotiations and decisions which have any bearing upon the shape of the world to come. It means that our counsel, and our entire influence, should be brought to bear, jointly with our allies, upon all the difficult and vexing problems which are bound to arise out of the confusion created by the Nazis throughout the world. It means that we must assume our just share of the responsibility for all the settlements being made now, as well as for those to be made at a peace table.

That statement of the representatives does not mean that, if some especially difficult problem cannot be solved to our complete satisfaction, we should withdraw and disavow any responsibility therefor. It clearly does not mean that we have no interest in the character of the governments to be formed in either the liberated or the enemy countries. It does not mean a hands off policy in the trouble spots of the world. It does not mean that we participate merely by giving charity to stricken peoples while refusing our influence in the reestablishment of law and order within those unfortunate countries. Above all it does not mean that we should engage in petty bickering and criticims of our allies, at least, until we have demonstrated in concrete terms, our willingness and determination actually to participate in the burdens of peace as we have so magnificently participated in the burdens of war.

In spite of the 16 months in which to proceed, our Government has presented us with nothing more than an incomplete blueprint. We still lack the machinery for arriving at decisions, decisions based upon the give and take of mutual consultation. Conferences have been held, broad principles have been stated, but decisions by mutual agreement, with joint responsibility for specific action, have been largely avoided.

The making of peace does not consist merely of a beautifully drafted constitution or a magic formula. The making of peace is a continuing process that must go on from day to day; from year to year so long as our civilization shall last. Our participation in this process is not just the signing of a charter with a large red seal. It is a daily task, a positive, creative participation in all the little details and decisions which together shape the final structure. If this be true why is it that we are forever waiting for another conference, or for the signing of another document? Why are we not participating now, positively and definitely in the decisions which are shaping the world of the future?

As in the war we deluded ourselves that the battle was won, so with the peace there are those who declare that isolation is dead. But only 12 days ago the most distinguished, and the shrewdest of all the isolationists was so encouraged by the apparent paralysis and the confusion of our Government, that he boldly reaffirmed his faith. He said on January 5, I quote "tonight I make not even the pretense of an apology for the position I have held both before and during this war." Then he proceeded "Dumbarton Oaks is a grim hoax. No nation today trusts the other nations sufficiently to warrant a single gesture towards risking its security on the success of an international organization." Obviously Senator WHEELER has found much in our hesitation and reluctance to assume responsibility to warrant his saying, "I told you so."

The reason for the Senator's outburst, and the cause for our concern is the failure of the three great powers to act jointly in the solution of the difficulties that have already arisen in Europe. The impression is current that each country goes its own way with no thought of mutual or cooperative action. There is little evidence that the United States has insisted upon its right to participate in many of these decisions. If this is not true then in the words of Assistant Secretary of State MacLeish, "The people have a right to know."

They have a right to know why 16 months is not enough to create at least the initial machinery for mutual consultation and agreement. They have a right to know if this failure is due to the devotees of protocol and the status quo in the Department of State, or to the opposition of Stalin and Churchill. There is a suspicion current that it may be the former who have contributed so much to the vanity of our present position. The people have a right to know why the futile diplomatic procedures which reveal, but seldom reconcile, the differences among the nations, are not abandoned.

It is in the nature of things that differences should exist among the three powerful Allies and that no one of them can in every instance have its way.

If there were no differences there would be no need for security measures, indeed there would be no war. In considering these differences in policy, it is unfortunate that we are so quick to attribute unworthy motives to all other peoples. It surely is not unthinkable that the British, the Russians, and the French desire peace and security just as fervently as we do. Their judgment as to the most effective methods to secure it may be at variance with our own. But the variance does not in itself warrant the automatic condemnation of their policies and actions. The fact is that until this country demonstrates more definitely and specifically its determination to share in the responsibility of creating a world order, there is good reason for the skepticism of our allies. So long as we follow a hands-off policy our criticisms of their actions are especially offensive. Furthermore, a hands-off policy on our part is a justification for the unilateral agreements which we so freely condemn.

We in the United States are suffering, as we did at the end of the last war, with a bad attack of self-righteousness. We never admitted in the last war, nor have we in this, that we are in it to save our own skins. We have pretended that we fight only to save democracy or human freedom, but never for our own personal benefit. We feel that our friends never appreciate our virtues or our sacrifices. We are forever feeling abused and mistreated. But isn't it true that we have a bigger stake in human liberty and material prosperity than any other nation, and I cannot see why we do not admit that we are fighting to preserve and protect it. I happen to believe that the best way in the long run to save our own skins is to promote and perfect an international security system in which we share fully in the responsibility for its success.

The very fact that these recent differences have arisen among the Allies is the most persuasive and compelling reason for our Government to proceed immediately and without delay to the creation of the appropriate machinery suggested by Congress 16 months ago. Our present difficulties should not be the occasion for a cynical and disillusioned return to isolation, the bloody fruits of which we are now harvesting on the battlefields of the world. These difficulties, on the contrary, are the supreme and unanswerable reason why we must, with all haste, proceed at once to the creation of the machinery as outlined at Dumbarton Oaks. If for any reason this should be impossible, then a temporary council of foreign ministers surely can be formed now, to consult and to agree upon solutions for the problems which will not wait. The one unforgiveable sin for our Government is to do nothing. As a great man

once said, "I do not believe in a fate that falls on men however they act; but I do believe in a fate that falls on them unless they act."

On January 6 President Roosevelt said to the Congress and the Nation, "We shall not hesitate to use our influence—and use it now. We cannot and will not shrink from the political responsibilities which follow in the wake of battle."

This is a fine and encouraging statement. But many of our present difficulties may be traced to the reiteration of high principles during the past 16 months followed by the postponement by our Government of action on concrete problems. High principles serve a useful purpose, but are futile alone and unsupported. The time for action has arrived. The difficult and trying task of reconciling those principles with the hard facts of fear, and of hatred, of physical suffering, and of prejudices, must now be met.

Great inspirational conferences at long intervals are not alone sufficient. Patient and persistent participation in the daily affairs of this troubled world is required. Of paramount importance is the character and wisdom of the men who represent us. It will take boldness and imagination on the part of these men if we are to avoid the extreme nationalism which has contributed so much to our troubles. To resurrect and defend that old order of lawlessness and national irresponsibility will be inviting disaster. Our goal is not to defend a bankrupt system. Our goal is to create something new in the world; a system in which binding rules of conduct are accepted by all nations by agreement, rather than by force.

Out of the continuous process of adjusting differences and establishing order, new standards of national conduct, standards without precedent in this confused world, standards of economic, political, and moral conduct, must be created and accepted, if mankind is to avoid complete self-destruction.

American Infantry

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has spoken of the pride of the Infantry. I should like to supplement her remarks briefly and to point out that the pride of the Infantry is the pride of the entire United States, and the United States should know why that is so.

The profile system of selection for the armed services of the young manpower of America which has been in effect for about 6 months now, divides the youth of this country into three categories—those with A, those with B, and those with C profiles.

The A profile represents those young men whose bodies are normal as to function and stamina and whose minds are evenly coordinated with those bodies—the old sound mind in a sound body, of the Romans. The B profile men are those who do not quite measure up to this championship standard. The C profile men are those who are in a still lower category.

In overwhelming percentages today—the A profile men are assigned automatically to the Infantry. So that the Infantry today represents the cream of the crop. It is the championship youth of America—and therein also lies its pride in itself and therein also should lie the pride of the mothers, fathers, wives, sisters, sons, and younger brothers of Infantrymen.

If a young man on induction and reception is assigned to the Infantry—it is an accolade. He is that fine type of youth who by his physical condition and his mental coordination, is the kind of boy we all hope our sons will grow up to be. If he does not make the required standard, he is not good enough for the Infantry, he fails to make that branch of the service and must go elsewhere.

The profiling is done on induction, done again at reception centers, and again about 6 weeks later. It is a triple screening process that allows of scant final doubt. This top physical condition and mental coordination of the A profile men carries with it something else which you might like to know of. An extensive comparison of the Army general classification tests—which determine what civilians call the I. Q.—it has been found that those with the A profiles have, generally speaking, high A. G. C. T. scores as well. So that the sound mind in the sound body also carries with it a high degree of intelligence.

You therefore not only have a great percentage of mentally and physically well-coordinated youth going into the Infantry but a large percentage of the most intelligent American youth as well.

Time was when the general opinion was that only the boys with the strong backs and the weak minds went into the Infantry, but if that ever was so—and I doubt it strongly—it is no longer so today. Today the Infantry of the Army of the United States represents the cream of the youth this country produces. The Infantry is the best there is in America, and therein lies its pride and the pride of the country.

In no other way can we continue the gruelling monotony of front-line combat—the dirt, cold, hunger, shock of it, the in-fighting, and the hardship, and the vista of the still long road ahead to victory—in no other way except with a championship team.

Your American Infantry today is that championship team.

First Combat Infantry Band

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on the 18th of December I made an announcement about the First Combat Infantry Band, from the floor, which I would like to amend slightly and elaborate on. The First Combat Infantry Band which is a most unique organization inasmuch as all of its members have been returned from overseas service in all theaters of operations—is a musical organization of the first water. Some of its members have been decorated for bravery and some have been wounded in action. It did not play overseas as a complete band, its membership representing many bands, some of them from the band that played under fire at Anzio beachhead for the morale of the troops there—some from other equally famous infantry regimental bands. Some of its members are musicians who served overseas as riflemen.

The First Combat Infantry Band has recently returned from an extended tour in Massachusetts where it was loaned to the Treasury Department for the sixth war loan drive which it was most helpful in bringing to a gratifying conclusion. The Treasury Department's appreciation for the work the band did in Massachusetts was most emphatic. It leaves shortly on a tour of general hospitals, at the request of the Surgeon General.

When I first called the First Combat Infantry Band to your attention, I announced that the band would play here in Washington at the request of the Disabled American Veterans on the 21st of January in a room in the Congressional Library. The date has been changed to Monday, the 22d of January, and the place has been changed to the Interdepartmental Hall at Constitution Avenue and Thirteenth. I know you will be very glad to hear this band on that date and also to pay it and the thousands of fighting American infantrymen it represents, your tribute by attending.

The bulk of the audience on that evening will consist of disabled veterans from nearby hospitals, but I have a limited supply of tickets which I will be glad to give to those Members who are seriously interested.

I might say that the Infantry as a branch of the service which has born the brunt of battle ever since we entered the offensive phase of this war 2 years ago, has little to publicize it beyond its performance in the field and nothing to glamorize it as some of the other branches have.

But the Infantry asks for no glamor nor does it seek it. Instead, it has a deep conviction of its vital job in war and a deep pride in doing it, and there it ends. This First Combat Infantry Band is typical of the Infantry's attitude to itself. It is not a glamor band picked only for its musical excellence. According to the musical critics who have heard it, it has most noteworthy musical excellence, but the men who make that excellence possible are first of all soldiers, and soldiers in every case who have completed extensive tours of duty overseas in combat with the enemy. The pride of the Infantry, I might say in conclusion, rests on the fact that all of the Infantry sees combat—cooks, chaplains, medical personnel, clerks, staff officers, and bandsmen—everyone, and more mothers,

wives, and sisters in America have their loved ones serving in the Infantry today than in any other branch of the service, serving in the hardest, toughest branch of the service, in front of which there is nothing but the enemy.

Blue Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article pertaining to the Blue Star Mothers published in the magazine Editor and Publisher, of New York City:

BLUE STAR GROUP THIRD ANNIVERSARY PLANS ARE MADE

The Blue Star Mothers of America, a newspaper-sponsored association, will celebrate the third annual founder's day January 12, it is announced by Mrs. Edna May Standing of Cleveland, national president.

The organization was founded as a result of the Pearl Harbor attack by Capt. George H. Maines, military editor of the Flint (Mich.) News Advertiser and the Johnson newspapers in Greenville and Coldwater. The Flint News Advertiser financed its early activities as a home-front and war-aid association.

Blue Star Mothers are war mothers of men and women serving in the armed forces of the United Nations and have an internationalist viewpoint, according to Captain Maines, former promotion-circulation manager for the New York Daily Mirror, a founder of the American Legion and national chairman of the Americanism Commission of the Army and Navy Union. He designed the Blue Star Mothers membership card and emblem, wrote their first constitution and bylaws, and designed and created their duration window banners and chapter flags. The first annual national convention held in March 1942, voted him honorary life membership and the position of founder and national organizer.

After the Flint newspaper's sponsorship of the first Michigan chapters in January 1942, about 44,000 war mothers were enrolled with free memberships, the cards and window emblems being given away by the newspaper. The Cleveland Plain Dealer, through John Crawford, promotion manager, enrolled more than 80,000 members in 2 years, starting in May 1942

Last year the Blue Star Mothers gave away $270,000 worth of necessities, wheel chairs, crutches, musical instruments, fountain pens, playing cards, and gifts, to service men and women in hospitals in this country without deducting any funds for expenses. No Blue Star Mother official receives a salary. There are more than 600 active chapters in the 48 States.

The Governors of several States have designated December 7 as Blue Star Mothers' Day. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has carried several articles about the organization and its purposes. Application for a national charter has been read twice before the United States Senate and referred to the Committee of the Judiciary.

A unique feature of the group's leadership is the appointment of war mothers representing all races, creeds, and color to serve on an advisory board to the national president. The members cooperate with the American Red Cross, the O. P. A., and the Government agencies associated with the war effort, in providing women power to sew surgical dressings, as blood donors, assisting in rationing, and in the sale of War bonds, among other activities.

The News Advertiser still finances the founder's efforts and much of the organizing expenses.

Maines attributes the idea for the Blue Star Mothers largely to a remark made to him by General Pershing on his eightieth birthday—"Maines, the Army never knows what it is going to do. But it must be ready. You help the morale of the men and help the mothers of those in service."

In 1923–24, when Pershing was Chief of Staff and Colonel Marshall (now general) was his aide, Maines served as a press relations officer for C. M. T. C. work. After Pearl Harbor the idea of helping mothers grew in Maines' mind and he set to work.

"General Pershing's advice was being carried out," he recalled this week. "Of course, I have had the natural opposition to be expected by those who cannot conceive of a man who sincerely wants to put over a national program without thought of personal gain. I watched the thing grow and kept a hand on it so it would not become a racket anywhere. Now that we have excellent leadership the women are carrying on and I cooperate when invited."

Agricultural Workers

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the House to two letters which I received this morning from my district; one from the United States Department of Agriculture War Board, of Madison County, Ohio, one of the richest agricultural counties in America, and another from a young farmer of 29 with three children who has produced 188,000 pounds of meat alone in the last year, relative to the drafting of farm workers under the recent order issued by the President and Director Hershey of the National Selective Service. I include these letters in the RECORD at this point. Each speaks more plainly than I can as to the dangers involved to our food supply if essential farm workers are taken off the land. It is even possible many Americans may go hungry unless the recent unwise draft order is quickly changed:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORKS,
IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
London, Ohio, January 16, 1945.

Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Essential farm operators and agricultural workers are being drafted at this time from Madison County farms at an alarming rate. Announcement has been made publicly that all registrants between the ages of 18 and 26 would be ordered up for preinduction physical examination and that all those deemed physically fit for military service would be inducted regardless of their status as agricultural workers and farm operators.

To date, all of this group has been ordered up for physical examination and in many cases inductions have resulted. Numerous sales of agricultural equipment and livestock have been held during the past few weeks, and if the present rate of induction continues, many more will necessarily follow. We are enclosing several copies of sale announcements which indicate clearly that they are a direct result of the present induction program. These copies include farm operators farming large acreages of land and producing sizable quantities of livestock products for the market.

The farm sales being held in the county represent only a portion of the reduction being made. Many of the farm operators who will continue to operate are being forced to reduce their acreage of grain crops, to increase the acreage of land laying in grass, and to reduce the units of productive livestock all because of the extreme shortage of labor here. We cannot count on the older men, especially those beyond 60 years of age, to continue operating these farms to their greatest capacity.

The local selective-service board has further informed us that this group would be exhausted by spring and if the calls for men continue at the present rate, it will be necessary for them to begin taking men out of the 26- to 29-year-old group; furthermore, that it is possible that most of the physically fit in this group will be called for induction.

This board has no objection to the taking of all the men needed to bring the war to a successful close, but if this older group is taken along with the 18- to 26-year-old group from this county, it will be out of the question to meet the production goals requested. It is the opinion of the war board that the induction of the physically fit in the younger age group between the ages of 18 and 26 will reduce the production of food approximately 5 percent. It undoubtedly will change the method of operating the farms with a diversion from livestock to grain farming. It will force needed livestock on the market without a doubt but if the older age group is to be taken it will mean the loss of more than 50 farm operators. More farms will need to be sown down to grass or left idle and we believe will result in the loss of 15 percent of our farm production during 1945.

It seems to us the question to be decided is this: Do we need these essential men more in the Army than we need the food which would be produced by their efforts as farmers? We assure you that if it is decided that these men are needed more in the service, that every man left on the farm in Madison County will do his utmost but definitely feel that they cannot be expected to reach the requested farm-production goals.

Farmers of this and other agricultural areas have been spending 70 and more hours weekly during the past season in an effort to keep agricultural production up to the high level requested of them. The drafting of these young men from our county is taking the men who bear the brunt of the heavy work on these farms. Anyone familiar with farm work, including that of sowing the crops and later harvesting them, and with the care of large amounts of livestock, can readily see that it is a young man's work. These same young men and others have saved the country's food supply and have made possible an even greater production of crops and livestock in the face of farm labor and machinery shortage. It is this group that has been the operators of the farm machinery and the men who are most able to keep the available machinery in repair and working.

It is the opinion of the Madison County War Board that the situation is becoming serious in the county from an agricultural standpoint. It is felt that if we were to have an off-growing season, the absence of all of these young men deemed by us to be essential for the agricultural interest and for the

production of food, might prove almost disastrous so far as our contribution to the food supply of the country is concerned.

Madison County is a county of large farms, the eight- and nine-hundred-acre farm being quite common here. Operators of these farms are therefore in a position to furnish large quantities of food above that required for maintenance of the farm family. Hogs represent 50 percent of the income from Madison County farms, dairying ranks second, and beef cattle are increasing in importance.

Many farmers are raising the question of the legality of inducting all of these young men who had previously been given a deferred status because of their having been declared essential workers in the production of food and farm products.

There is no disposition on the part of the Madison County War Board, the farmers, or anyone else in the county to slow up the flow of men for replacement in the armed forces, but we feel that the matter of food is of prime importance even at this stage of the war, and the inducting of all 26- to 29-year-old-men with II-C deferments will have its serious effect on the 1945 food production.

Only by the retaining of these essential farm operators and farm workers in a II-C deferred classification and a reasonable assurance that they will remain so classified through the 1945 crop season will Madison County's food-production goals be met; for only that portion of the farm program will be started for which there is assurance of sufficient labor to carry on throughout the season.

We would appreciate your thorough investigation of this situation and any assistance you might render in this connection.

MADISON COUNTY U. S. D. A. WAR BOARD,
G. PRUGH OVERTURF, *Chairman.*
W. B. WOOD, *Secretary.*

FAIRVIEW FARMS,
New Vienna, Ohio, January 15, 1945.

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Representative of Seventh District of Ohio, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Have followed your work and your interest in investigating various problems which occur down at Washington that affect the people of the seventh district and the general welfare of our Nation. The draft of Clinton County farmers is going to cut food production tremendously if it keeps up at the present rate. My brother, Donald, 25, married and one child, and I, 29, married, 3 children, have been put in I-A. We live on separate farms of 100 and 125 acres, but farm together as one unit.

Our 1944 farm-production records is as follows: Hogs sold 701, 170,060 pounds, 85 tons of pork; cattle sold 12, 8,760 pounds; sheep sold 89, 6,626 pounds; 38 pure-bred registered Southdown rams used for breeding purposes; wool sold, 803 pounds; chickens sold, 2,260 pounds; 188,509 pounds of meat and wool plus 38 Southdown rams and 3,076 dozen eggs, a great percentage of which go to the Townsley's hatchery.

Not because it is us, but when they start drafting men with farm productions like the one above, I believe it is high time somebody is investigating the draft of farm men, and especially the draft of Clinton County farm men. One member of the local draft board in the income-tax office just recently said now that they had several of the key men in agriculture, and named them, they wouldn't have any trouble sending the rest of them.

What is the latest regarding the drafting of essential farm men, and has there been any change since the "Tiddings" amendment?

Thanking you for your help and interest in the past, I remain,

Very truly yours,

ROBERT BERNARD.

Francis M. Peters, Jr., a Gallant Young West Virginian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of West Virginia are not, either by choice or through opportunity, a seafaring people. From earliest childhood their eyes look up to the hills and it is a far cry from their hills to the sea. As wooded mountains and upland pastures do not ordinarily constitute a suitable environment for the development of mariners, it would not seem strange should the youth of the State show little inclination to "go down to the sea in ships." And yet, in apparent contradiction, we have today a splendid body of naval officers and enlisted Navy men, natives of West Virginia, serving upon all seas of the world and making brilliant records of courage, efficiency, and devotion to duty.

Only recently has my attention been called to one such record made in the far Pacific by a young naval officer from my home city of Bluefield, W. Va. I refer to Commander Francis M. Peters, Jr., who, for his courage and gallantry in action, now wears on his uniform the Silver Star, a decoration pinned there by the then Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, shortly before the death of that distinguished official.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and in order that the record of the courageous action of young Commander Peters be preserved to this and coming generations, I include herewith a news item published in the Bluefield (W. Va.) Daily Telegraph at the time the decoration was awarded to the young naval officer. The item, in which is quoted the language of the citation, is as follows:

COMMANDER PETERS GIVEN MEDAL

The Silver Star Medal for conspicuous gallantry as commanding officer of a high-speed mine layer, during action against Japanese forces in the Solomon Islands area has been awarded to Comdr. Francis M. Peters, Jr., United States Navy of Bluefield and Baltimore.

Commander Peters was born January 22, 1908, in Bluefield, and is the son of Mr. and Mrs. F. M. Peters of Bluefield and Charleston. His father is a member of the State liquor control commission. His wife, Mrs. Virginia Page Peters, lives at 5600 Wexford Road, Baltimore.

First announcement of the award was made by the fifth naval district here yesterday, upon receipt of a copy of his citation, signed by Secretary Frank Knox, which said:

"Although under continual threat of enemy submarine attacks and frequently subjected to severe aerial bombing and shelling by hostile shore batteries, Commander Peters (then a lieutenant commander) successfully transported troops and supplies through extremely hazardous Japanese-infested waters in support of the vital landing operations on Rendova Island and the subsequent occupation of the New Georgia group, skillfully driving off the enemy attacks and bringing his vessel through undamaged.

"The expert seamanship and aggressive fighting spirit displayed by Commander Peters contributed materially to the success of our forces in this area and were in keeping with the best traditions of the United States naval service."

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell from the Washington Times-Herald:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

The boys up on Capitol Hill are getting a bit snorty these days when it comes to the cold-turkey observation: "Is papa down in the White House telling us the truth?"

Time was, when even the mere suggestion that the great white father wasn't leveling with the boys would have aroused patriotic howls, breast beating, squeals, indignant squawks—all to the end that any citizen of the Republic who dared in wartime to question the personal veracity of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was just a dirty so-and-so, who should promptly be laid by his heels (and the sooner the better) by J. Edgar Hoover's F. B. I.

Now comes Congressman the Honorable BARTEL J. JONKMAN, of Grand Rapids, Mich., who calmly puts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for posterity 12 solid columns of type, the over-all gist of which is to indicate that neither Congress nor the American people can trust or accept as truth any observation that comes from the lips of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, of Hyde Park, N. Y.

The idea, as we get it, is that the Member of Congress from Michigan thinks that F. D. R. simply doesn't tell the truth and that he intends to put his observation in print.

Representative JONKMAN took as his theme in the House the phrase "that spurious Atlantic Charter." Then, and this much more importantly, he went into the cold banking proposition that if the Atlantic Charter were spurious (which it is) so is all lend-lease, so is all reverse lend-lease which after all is nothing more than the psychological juggling of non-existent cash by a bankrupt panhandler who wants to argue the point that he will cut you in on his take if he happens to make it with your money.

Representative JONKMAN, blowing the whistle on the cold fact that no such thing exists as an Atlantic Charter despite the White House bellowing and praying of former days, raises the question:

Are we not a bit sanctimonious and a bunch of mealy mouthed double talkers when we try to crack the whip over the Germans, accuse them of violation of international law and insist that United States lend-lease, in fact, was in accordance with punctilious observation of international law, of neutrality which we ordered—by White House decree—all United States citizens to observe?

Said Representative JONKMAN:

"Again—and I say it with all respect—how can we believe that the President would be so loose with his written word over his own signature and yet call attention to the utter

lack of validity of the spoken or written word of the Nazi government?

"President Roosevelt could make the unequivocal statements that there is no Atlantic Charter, and the Atlantic Charter was never signed, and in each statement he would be speaking the absolute and unvarnished truth.

"A charter is a grant from a sovereign to a subject, the first great example of which was perhaps the great charter of King John to the barons.

"That declaration of August 1941, which Churchill properly called 'a simple, rough-and-ready statement of the goal toward which the British Commonwealth and the United States mean to make their way,' was no more a charter or an Atlantic Charter than night is day.

"But does Mr. Roosevelt make such an unequivocal statement? No, indeed. I do not think he can be accused even of qualifying it with what another Roosevelt called weasel words. On the contrary, the President said, 'And there just is not any copy of the Atlantic Charter, at least I have not one.'"

The real snapper in the House declaration of Representative JONKMAN comes when he uses such tough words as "fraud, deceit and betrayal" tossed in the teeth of such distinguished wartime figures as President of the United States Roosevelt and Prime Minister of Great Britain Churchill.

They appear way back in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, on page A131, to be exact, and state, in JONKMAN'S reference to the "signed" and written Atlantic Charter sent to Congress by F. D. R.

The Congressman insisted that if the Atlantic Charter did not exist today (which it doesn't) as it did when F. D. R. sent it to Capitol Hill, then:

"A contrary conclusion would lead to the inevitable admission that President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill are guilty of fraud, deceit, and betrayal of the American people; and that President Roosevelt, in uttering and publishing an instrument as signed by Winston Churchill, when in truth such instrument was not signed by him, is guilty of forgery.

"The American people rely upon one advantage to be gained from lend-lease, namely, that the United Kingdom acknowledged and subscribed to the fundamentals of a just peace, and that we thereby had overcome at least one of the serious obstancles which, regardless of who may be to blame, constituted a failure of the League of Nations after the First World War."

Not All Is Profit for the Farmers During These Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, on November 16, 1944, the following article appeared in the Times of Thief River Falls, Minn.:

Not all classes of livestock are fetching high prices on the market these days, judging by the returns recently received by George Barnett, of this city, on a young 100-pound sheep shipped to South St. Paul. Gross returns on the animal were $3, which, after deductions, left Barnett with net returns of $1.66.

Following is a break-down of the expenses and commissions referred to in the above newspaper article:

Hauling charges	$0.70
Federal tax on hauling	.03
Yardage	.09
Hay	.02
Fire insurance	.01
Weighing	.02
Loss and damage insurance	.17
Commission	.30
Total expense	1.34

In addition to the expenses listed above, the farmer-producer had to deduct from the $1.66 which he had left after his lamb was marketed, the costs of raising the lamb and fattening it for market.

Are all farmers making money on all produce they raise? The answer is "No" and there is no need for further comment.

Adequate Incentive Payments Needed to Produce Flaxseed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a belief growing in the minds of people that under our present system of government we must be confronted with the problem before devising a solution.

In other words, we scramble for a cure when the problem becomes serious instead of working out a preventative beforehand. To some degree, this criticism is true.

Recently I received letters from many farmers and farm organizations, including the State president of the Minnesota Farmers' Union, Mr. Einar Kuivinen, of New York Mills, Minn. He sounded a warning that unless bold and adequate steps were taken relative to a Government flax program this Nation would face a serious drop in the production of flaxseed this year.

He has analyzed the need for increased production, and he and M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn., have made several constructive suggestions as to how to secure this needed increased flax acreage.

A copy of his letter follows:

DECEMBER 8, 1944.

The Honorable HAROLD C. HAGEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are calling to your attention a situation which is definitely serious and which therefore, will require definite planning if we are going to avert seriously hindering the prosecution of the war effort, and jeopardize the 1946 economy program in the field of building, reconversion, and rehabilitation.

This situation relates to the importance of producing flaxseed which is a vital war crop, and as such deserves specific and immediate attention.

All statistics indicate that the present supply of flaxseed, after setting aside the required amount necessary for the 1945 production, is so low that by the spring of 1945 we will be scraping the bottom of the barrel.

Naturally the supply of linseed oil and linseed meal for 1946 will depend entirely on the production of flaxseed in 1945, and according to figures afforded us by M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., the minimum supply needed will be 55,000,000 bushels, which will take approximately 6,000,000 acres, to raise this crop. About 85 percent of the total flaxseed production is to be found in the four Northwestern States of Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana. The rest is largely in Kansas and California, so the 1946 requirements must be met by what is produced in the Central Northwestern States in 1945.

The only countries we could import flaxseed from would be Canada and Argentina. Unless this country offered an incentive for the Canadian farmer, we could not get more than 5,000,000 bushels. The Farmers Union feels that this incentive should be paid to our own farmers and keep the money at home. We cannot get it from Argentina for several reasons. This year they are harvesting a flax crop that is the smallest in 21 years and out of a normal yield of about 70,000,000 bushels, they are only going to have about 30,000,000 bushels which they will need themselves, and, on the other hand, our international relationship is such that it dispenses with all hopes of getting flaxseed from there.

This shortage can be met right here in the Northwest, provided our farmers are given the proper consideration to make it worth their while and for your convenience, I am quoting from a letter written by M. W. Thatcher, president of the Grain Terminal Association and also president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, to Hon. B. K. WHEELER, Senator from Montana, in which he outlines the methods to be used in order to get the required increase in flax production in 1945.

"The only way to get production in 1945 is to deal with the farmers as business people, just as this Nation deals with the Douglas Aircraft Corporation. The way to do that is to make a firm business deal with the farmers. Under present plans, we are going to get more wheat seeded than is needed, and less flaxseed. The prices are guaranteed for wheat in the ways you know, and it is almost a certain crop, if there is rainfall. Flaxseed is the most hazardous crop of all. At parity price for wheat around $1.65 in Minneapolis and parity price for flaxseed at $3.10 in Minneapolis, it is ridiculous to think that a farmer would put in the hazardous flax crop when he can raise more certain crops with a greater return. To get a farmer to plant flaxseed he must have three times the wheat price and four times the corn price which means $4.50 a bushel in terms of flaxseed. But we still have not met the hazards that obtain in flaxseed production as compared with the other crops. So there is just one way to get it, and that is to guarantee the farmer $15 an acre for putting in flaxseed and an incentive payment of $1.50 a bushel. The farmer wants some chance to gain. If he has a crop failure, which is more likely than with any other crop, he will know that he will get $15 and, if he raises 10 bushels, he will get the same $15. But anything he raises over the 10 bushels at $1.50 he would get a further payment of $1.50 a bushel as extra reward. Nothing short of what I have just stated to you will get the seeding or production. The programs that were put out recently by the Department of Agriculture are just a laugh to the farmers. We went into the country and had some meetings. They just won't go for it on the present program for the simple reason that it does not

pay. There is no point in taking the lid off the present price of flaxseed at $3.10 or parity price because, if you do, we will have a wild price market without any more supply on hand than we now have, and, of course, it will mean we would have to take the ceiling off all the articles into which linseed oil is introduced as a part of the cost—so changing ceilings and lifting the price at the market place through such procedure does not make sense."

The Minnesota Farmers Union fully concurs with the program as outlined by Mr. Thatcher, and because only the Congress of the United States can appropriate the necessary funds in time so that farmers will know before spring where they are at, so that they can make the necessary changes in their farm plans and get the needed additional flax acreage in, we are bringing this vital issue up for your fair and considerate appraisal.

May we have your earliest reaction on this letter.

Sincerely,

MINNESOTA FARMERS UNION,
EINAR KUIVINEN, *President.*

Congress did take some action, as is well known by this time. We provided for $30,000,000 for flax incentive payments.

These will be paid out to the farmers in $5 per acre payments rather than on an acre and bushel basis as many thought would be more advisable.

Payments will be made on each acre planted up to each individual grower's flax goal. A new national goal of 5,000,000 acres will be distributed among the 19 flax-growing States of the Union.

Following is an excerpt from a letter which I received from an agricultural conservation committee in one of the counties in my district of Minnesota:

We are advised that $30,000,000 has been appropriated for the growing of flax up to 5,000,000 acres. We are of the opinion that payment should be made on the per bushel production basis and not on a flat rate per acre as has been proposed, because a lot of low producing land put into crop will not insure our reaching the production goal desired in that marginal and submarginal areas would fail to come through with a complete harvest excepting under most favorable conditions and the per acre would not be a fair inducement to the more productive and highly fertile areas—the region we should try to encourage to grow flax and where larger yields with more assurance of a complete harvest is widely certain.

In my contacts with the Department of Agriculture, I have urged that the appropriation of $30,000,000 be distributed to flax growers on the basis of both acres planted and bushels produced. In this way, the best ground would be utilized to produce the greatest number of bushels possible. On the other hand, in some of the areas where the bushel production is relatively low, the acreage payment would be a guaranty of at least cost of production and thus encourage more acres planted.

Combined with this plan, I urged that the crop-insurance program include flax wherever sufficient statistics have been developed to insure successful operation of the insurance program.

Department of Agriculture officials seemed to agree with the suggestions made by myself and the others, but because of the lack of time, and due to the specific wording of the law authorizing the expenditure of the incentive payments, they felt it advisable to conform to the letter of the law and make the payments on an acreage basis only.

Although there is doubt in some quarters as to whether or not this program will bring about the maximum production of flax, we will watch the program with interest, and probably the experience of this season will provide a better program for next year.

Why Strip the Farms of Essential Labor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, assuming that the administration is at war for other than political purposes, I suggest that before it ignores the Tydings amendment and strips the farms of labor to overcome man shortage, that it examine the overstaffed war industries, including navy yards, both public and private. I have a letter from a man with an unimpeachable record of patriotism and an admirable record of service who writes to me as follows:

Representative REED.

DEAR SIR: I noted with some enthusiasm your comment anent W. M. C. demand for 1,600,000 more men for war work and military service. Either this W. M. C. is fooling a lot of people or they have an ulterior motive which fits in and looks to furtherance of a plan or program which of necessity, because of its nature, must remain sub rosa.

You said: "The war plants could be reduced by 25 percent of their employees, and production would meet all demands." I am of the opinion that this is the most forthright statement emanating from any Member of Congress for some time. If the W. M. C. does not know this, then they don't know what it is all about. It seems to me that the War Government in Washington is none other than the W. P. A. government of a few years back. Characteristics of both are so similar.

But to get back to manpower shortage, I can say without fear of contradiction, because the records available to you will prove it, that the Boston Navy Yard has been overmanned for 3 years at least. These are the figures: Approximately 50,000 men and women employees; absenteeism averages about 12 to 14 percent daily. (This is shown by shop tallies even though the master record has been doctored up a bit to conceal this fact.) At the lowest percentage of absenteeism, this would give us 12 percent of 50,000, 6,000 employees absent daily. Each employee works 9 hours a day. Therefore, this gives us $6,000 \times 9$ hours, 54,000 man-hours daily; for 6 days, 324,000 man-hours lost each week by absenteeism, and notwithstanding this loss of manpower, 324,000 man-hours weekly, the Boston Navy Yard has met every schedule to date. This proves conclusively that, meeting every schedule with 6,000 employees absent each day, the Boston Navy Yard was and is overmanned by 6,000 employees. This does not include manpower or man-hour losses due to loafing on the job by those who report for work. An impartial survey of labor in the Boston yard, one which does not make concessions to friendly Members of Congress, or one that bargains for political aggrandizement, but one which seeks the truth, would find that there is hardly a man or woman in the employ of the Boston yard who actually works 9 hours a day. The amount of loafing depends largely on how well one "fits" with shop masters. In such case the intermediate supervisors, who themselves are beholden to shop masters, don't dare enforce an assignment. This type of man-hour loss runs as high as 5 and 6 hours daily, and where there is a tie-in, the minimum loss per individual is 1 hour daily. * * *

If this is the same picture which is presented by all navy yards, private shipbuilders, and war industries, the War Manpower Commission is kidding somebody.

There always was and now is a manpower shortage in the Boston Navy Yard, but never a man shortage. With the loss of 93,000 man-hours per day the yard has kept its schedule. Obviously, to that extent, the yard is overmanned, to say nothing of the 44,000 man-hours lost daily because of loafing on the job, which, reduced to terms in men and women, represents an additional 4,500. It is apparent, therefore, that at least 12,000 employees could be dropped from the rolls at the Boston Navy Yard without affecting its efficiency. This agrees with your statement that 25 percent of employees in war plants could be dispensed with without affecting production.

Radio and Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on New Year's Day, Edward J. Noble, chairman of the Blue Network, made a short talk on the importance of freedom of news to a lasting peace. In it he referred to the attitude of Kent Cooper, executive director of the Associated Press, a statement of importance in discussing the necessity for a free press and a free radio within every country as a foundation for a democratic world at peace.

Following is his address:

Ladies and gentlemen, at the start of 1945 we cannot be happy in our hearts at the state of mankind, but we can be determined in our minds that this year will build for us great strength for war and great hope for peace.

The Blue Network is privileged today to broadcast to you brief forecasts of developments in 1945 from leaders of significant activities in American life. You and I are apt to accept such broadcasts as being commonplace in a democracy, not appreciating their importance in a world at war, or understanding their significance in maintaining the peace to come.

Kent Cooper, the able executive director of the Associated Press, has long recognized the necessity of freedom of news to a lasting peace. He advocated, unsuccessfully, in 1919 that the following declaration be included in the Treaty of Versailles:

"Peace can only be maintained by short-circuiting self-seeking predatory governments through letting the people of each nation really know the peoples of other nations. This can best be brought about through the medium of a world-wide free press and freedom of international news exchange that will establish an international community of interests."

When the peace comes, the principles expressed by Mr. Cooper 25 years ago can become a reality. Our Government favors freedom of news as a world policy.

Under international covenant of the United Nations I believe each country should guarantee free access to news both to its own citizens and to the world at large. Violations of such an agreement should be punished as vigorously as an act of aggression.

Since the last war radio has emerged as a vital news medium. It is the most direct means of communicating the news and significance of an event to the people. If the potentialities of radio are to be fully realized, the peace treaty must provide for radio to operate without censorship or political control in any country.

There are many who still doubt the ability of the peoples of the world to live peacefully together. Surely that is not to be the destiny of humanity. There are many things that the peace settlement must provide, but I sincerely believe that one of the most essential is the establishment of freedom of news in all countries. A free press and free radio within each country can be the foundation for a democratic world at peace. Toward this end, we pledge the resources and energies of the Blue Network.

O. P. A.: Begotten by the Blue Eagle—It's a Bird

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, while nobody will believe it, I hesitate to discuss a subject which I have in mind to talk about.

Yesterday at the invitation of the minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, I attended a meeting addressed by some of the ablest and most distinguished gentlemen who represent the textile industry of the United States, who are very much disturbed, and rightly so. I listened with very great interest to their complaints with respect to the rulings made by the Office of Price Administration vitally affecting that particular industry countrywide, in general, and with regard to New England in particular.

This was not a new experience nor a new subject matter insofar as I was concerned except in that it referred to the particular industry which these gentlemen represented.

I contended, and I so stated, that the rulings of which they complained were made so arbitrarily with regard to the net worth profit formula and modified editions of it as to be entirely and completely in violation of specific laws passed by the Congress and that, moreover, the rulings were made deliberately, contrary to the intent of Congress as the O. P. A. has been told over and over again and as appears from the hearings and from the law itself, to which the O. P. A. officials pay no attention, seemingly.

Some of the very ablest lawyers in this country, hired for the worth of their opinions without regard to their partisan leanings, and lawyers both in and out of Congress agree that there is no justification for the rulings O. P. A. has made except that which stems from its desire to exercise the power it has usurped.

I am in complete agreement with the Cotton Textile Institute, Inc., in their opposition to the net worth profit formula of O. P. A. They state:

1. It strait jackets the industry's entire profit to the percentage return on net worth, before taxes, in the 1936–39 period.

A. This means that total profit permitted the industry will amount to $35,000,000 compared with $29,500,000 in 1936–39.

B. It bears no relation to volume. In the base period, industry worked its spindles 88,900,000,000 hours and produced 8,600,000,000 yards. In 1941–44 the industry worked its spindles 127,800,000,000 hours and produced 11,000,000,000 yards. Under this formula, industry will get no more for this big increase in working time and production. It would discourage instead of stimulating badly needed production of goods.

2. By limiting profit to $35,000,000 net worth formula would slash profits on sales to 1.75 percent. This means that any increase in raw material or other costs would wipe out profits overnight and bring many mills to brink of bankruptcy.

A. With taxes substantially higher now, application of 1936–39 yardstick would mean bringing net profits way below amounts for even that depressed period.

3. This formula would sharply curtail industry's contribution to the United States Treasury. In 1942 and 1943 Federal taxes of $99,000,000 and $97,000,000, respectively, were paid by only 245 cotton textile mills, or more than 2½ times the $35,000,000 the entire industry would be allowed under the formula.

A. Formula constitutes 100 percent profits tax with Treasury getting no benefit whatsoever.

B. It means that tax base for all manufacturing industries would fall to base period level of $2,700,000,000, on which taxes of $581,000,000 were paid, compared with $14,700,000,000 in 1943, on which taxes of $9,800,000 were paid.

C. It means Government would sacrifice enormous revenue with no benefit to consumer.

4. In theory, formula would aid the consumer but in fact it would help only processors and merchandisers beyond the mill level who would not be compelled to pass lower costs to consumers. It is in these fields that greatest price increases have occurred. Consumers actually would suffer, since it would discourage production at time when civilian and military requirements are at highest point in history.

I have heretofore protested for other industries against the unwarranted assumption and use of nongranted power and prerogatives and authority by the Office of Price Administration but to no avail against those hired, I think, to hold Congress in contempt and for the purpose of finding some way, if possible, to obviate and to avoid the law and the intent of Congress. That is exactly what I think, and I have reasons to support my contention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the questions submitted to the O. P. A. by the Cotton-Textile Institute, Inc., are entitled to the careful consideration of every businessman and every citizen, for I assure you they will not be answered by O. P. A. in the interests of the businessman and the citizen if precedent be followed. They are all-important questions; they are well thought out by some of the ablest legal minds in this country, which, I regret to say, are not found in the O. P. A. in Washington. The only answer, in general, lies in the fact that the O. P. A. has no authority in law to do what it is attempting to do, despite all its alibis to the contrary. Did you ever hear the questions which the Cotton-Textile Institute, Inc., has submitted to the O. P. A.? Well, here they are, and I read:

1. Will you describe in detail (a) the industry earnings standard; (b) the product standard; (c) the conditions which determine the choice of the standard; and (d) the method for determining the raw material cost?

2. Is the industry earnings standard, with its emphasis on over-all profits, in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Bankhead amendment?

3. Will you list the items which you consider major items and indicate the percentage of total production which they represent?

4. According to O. P. A., the cotton-textile industry earned during the base period 3.8 percent on net worth, or about $29,526,000. Since then, according to O. P. A., net worth has increased 25 percent. In the revision of interim prices, or if and when the industry requests a price revision of any item, will the result of O. P. A. policy be to limit the industry dollar profit to $29,526,000 (adjusted for changes in net worth) and the dollar profit on the major items to their proportionate share of this figure?

5. Would the target-profit figure, resulting from O. P. A. policy, be fixed at the level calculated above, regardless of the volume of production?

6. At what assumed level of capacity operations will unit costs be calculated?

7. If unit costs are calculated on a high percentage of capacity and actual production declines below the assumed level, will costs be recalculated and prices increased to assure the industry a return equal to the dollar return in the base period? If the revision of prices is a question of administrative feasability, we should like your best judgment as to how frequently the industry price revisions will be made.

8. If the answer to question 7 is "Yes," then may it not be said that the industry earnings standard formula is a device not only for fixing price and profit ceilings but also for fixing price and profit floors?

9. If the answer to question 7 is "Yes," does it not follow (a) that the industry will receive as large a dollar return for a small volume of output as for a large volume; and (b) that the industry earnings standard rewards a decrease in production and penalizes an increase in production?

10. Do you believe that an over-all profit of $35,000,000 on sales approximating $2,000,000,000, or a return on sales, before taxes, of 1.75 percent, is an adequate return for capital and management, and commensurate with the present great risks? Do you believe that an over-all profit of $35,000,000 is sufficient for this industry when three retail organizations with sales of $460,000,000 made profits of $45,000,000 in 1942, and two of these organizations in 1943, with sales of only $368,000,000, made a profit of $37,000,000?

11. Is there anything in the law which indicates that Congress intended industry to be deprived of profits arising from increases in volume?

12. Labor now receives a greater income for its longer workweek than it received in the base period for a shorter workweek, and the farmer receives a greater income for his present larger crop thar for his smaller base

period crop. Is there any reason why industry should be discriminated against by limiting its over-all profit to the base period, although its present output is very much larger than in the base period?

13. According to a representative sample of financial statements available to us, income taxes in 1942 and 1943 absorbed, respectively, about 63 percent and 67 percent of this industry's profit. More specifically, the companies in this sample paid income taxes of $99,000,000 in 1942 and $97,000,000 in 1943. If total dollar profits are limited to the dollar profits of the base period, $29,526,000 (adjusted for changes in net worth) what will happen to this industry as a source of Federal taxation?

14. Is it not a fact that the use of the industry earnings standard, as applied to the cotton textile industry, is in effect a 100 percent excess-profits tax on additional production, although the Government is not the beneficiary of the tax?

15. During the base period net income (before taxes and reserves) of all manufacturing corporations in the United States averaged around $2,700,000,000, on which income taxes of about $581,000,000 were paid. In 1943 net income, it is estimated, increased to $14,700,000,000 on which taxes of $9,800,000,000 were paid. Assuming a substantial prolongation of the war and the general application of the industry earnings standard, what would be the effect on the Federal Treasury of a profit limitation of $2,700,000,000, adjusted only for changes in net worth?

16. In view of the fact that increases in mill prices of yarns and fabrics have had a negligible effect on the cost of living and that increases in textile prices have been greatest beyond the mill level, what is the O. P. A. doing to restrict the cost of textiles and textile products beyond the mill level?

You Members of Congress had better give attention to this matter and to what I say. You know I am opposed to all this attempt to circumscribe and circumvent the law and the intent of Congress for the purpose of undertaking to establish in perpetuity the O. P. A., ill-conceived as the illegitimate child of the N. R. A., fathered by the blue eagle. What a bird!

Our Wasteful Manpower Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, someone ought to introduce Food Administrator Jones to Selective Service Director Hershey so they could get together a little better on their policies. On the one hand we have the War Food Administrator urging that farmers increase their production above the record-breaking production of 1944. On the other, we have General Hershey threatening to take every able-bodied man under 26 off the farm. If that policy is carried out it will mean a brazen and flagrant disregard of the Tydings amendment which provides that men who are actually engaged in agricultural prpduction and necessary to that production and who cannot be replaced, shall be deferred. If these men whom General Hershey is now trying to induct were necessary to agricultural production last year, when our goals were less than they are this year, they are certainly necessary now. They cannot be taken into the military service without utterly disregarding the Tydings amendment which Congress passed to protect our food supply, which is just as essential as munitions in winning the war. As a matter of fact, the bottom of our manpower barrel, as far as farmers were concerned, was reached last year. There are no reserves. Every man who is taken now means just that much less agricultural production. We used all the women and children last year. Farmers worked just as long hours as they possibly could work last year. They had just as much machinery last year as they are going to have this year, perhaps more. Manpower is going to be the determining factor in our agricultural production and we cannot meet our goals if every able-bodied man under 26 is going to be taken off the farm.

I do not believe the people of this country generally understand just how far Selective Service has gone in taking essential men off the farm already. Let me read you some extracts from letters which I have recently received from my district. It will be noted that in some cases essential men were being taken off the farm even before the recent directive.

Here is a letter from Edwards County, Kans., reading in part as follows:

I have one son in France, the other at home doing the work of two men, farming 1,200 acres of land, doing practically all the work himself. On top of that I have 185 head of cattle. They will have to be put on the market if he is called into service. I help all I am physically able. I have passed my eighty-first birthday.

Here is another:

I am 59 years and 9 months of age and due to arthritis, or more commonly called rheumatism, I am unable to do any heavy farm work. I and my son are, and have been, operating 1,120 acres of good land in Ness County, Kans., for a number of years. And whereas in 1942 my other son entered the armed services of his country, who is in the European theater of operations serving somewhere in Germany, leaving the registrant as the only help available. This farm consists of 900 acres of cropland and 200 acres of grassland and building sites. For the year 1944 we produced 5,025 bushels of wheat, 1,350 bushels of oats, 1,575 bushels of barley, 1,400 bushels of grain sorghums and corn, 30 acres of sweet sorghums for forage. We have sold 14,270 pounds of beef cattle, 1,542 pounds of hogs, 2,098 pounds of poultry and 1,398 dozen eggs. We have on hand at the present time 81 head of cattle of which 7 cows are kept for milking purposes; 7 head of hogs, and 225 laying hens. All of the above livestock were produced on this farm except 7 weanling pigs.

This registrant and myself have done the work and produced the products required of farmers in this part of the country. If the registrant is taken to war, I will not be able to carry on, and the farm will have to be shut down and all the machinery used in carrying on this project will necessarily be left idle. Furthermore, the registrant has never done any other kind of work except what has been done on this farm.

Here is another from Meade County, Kans.:

My husband is farming 1,700 acres of land and has 450 acres of pasture also. At the present we have 132 head of cattle, 26 hogs. We sent our boy, the only help his father had, to Leavenworth for induction into the service September 10, 1944, although we asked that time be granted him until the wheat was sold and feed cut. Our boy had worked 16 to 18 hours a day all summer, Sunday, too, to try and get as much work done as he possibly could so his father would not have too much to do alone. * * * Another boy, 19 years, was called to the service September 10 also. His mother is a widow woman with 6 smaller children to support. She farms about 700 acres of wheat, and her 5 older boys are in the service. What will she do?

Here is a letter from Kiowa County, Kans.:

We are farming 1,500 acres, both wheat and spring crops; also have a dairy herd of 20 cows; raising 100 lambs a year. You know enough about farming to realize that this program is a big one for 2 men full time; and if my boy is taken, I cannot continue.

Listen to this from Reno County, Kans.:

We have nearly 500 acres to farm; have over 100 head of cattle, all of which we have raised. Included among these cattle are 1½ dozen milk cows, also other livestock. * * * With the help of my son, we have been doing 3 men's work by working extra long hours, for there isn't any farm labor available here.

The following letter is from Sumner County, Kans.:

My son received notice to go to Leavenworth for his examination Friday, January 19. We are farming 720 acres of land, most of which is cultivated. Besides, we keep some livestock. I am not physically able to do the work myself and it would mean a serious reduction in our farming if my son has to go to the Army. The farming in this community was carried on with an absolute minimum of help last year, and I believe it is that way in all parts of the country.

These letters are typical of conditions in my district. There men, women, and children are working 70 to 80 hours a week trying to do their best to meet the goals which have been set by the War Food Administration. They cannot do more than they are doing now. Contrast this with the waste of manpower which is going on in our industrial plants. A banker in my district recently sent me the following affidavit made by a man who was told that there was a shortage of labor in our shipyards and who went all the way from Kansas to California to do his part in meeting this alleged shortage of help. The affidavit speaks for itself and reads as follows:

STATE OF KANSAS,

County of Morton, ss:

I, E. O. McCammon, being duly sworn, depose and say that I am a resident of Rolla, Morton County, Kans.; that on or about the 20th day of November 1944 I went to California to work in the shipyards, as I understood they were short of help and needed more men in order to meet the demand for new ships. I secured a job with the California Ship Yards of Wilmington, Calif. The first thing they did with me was to send me to what they called a school. In this school, that taught practically nothing not already known to the average man on the farm; they told me this school was to fix a person so they could do the jobs ahead, and for this schooling the school charged, for a 10-day course, $700 per pupil, or $70 per day per pupil was what the school got out of it.

After I had fooled away 10 days of time I could have been doing something worth while, I was then sent to the plant and after spending 11 days in the ship yards, during which time I loafed all but about 1 hour each day, there were more men there on the job than they could possibly use, being standing in one anothers way, I told the manager where I came from we were supposed to work when we were on a job and that if they could not use me if they would give me a release I would go where I was needed. They refused to give this release but inasmuch as I could not stand the terrible waste I quit anyway and will later try another place if I can find where I am needed. To the best of my knowledge I would say that ship yard had at least 2,000 more men than they had use for and in keeping them they are just adding that much more of the taxpayers' money on the cost of the ship than was necessary. In my opinion I would say if these jobs were not a cost-plus there would be a lot of men released for jobs where they are needed.

E. O. MCCAMMON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of December 1944.

[SEAL] GEORGE L. HAYWARD,
Notary Public.

My commission expires January 6, 1945.

Every Member of Congress knows that the conditions reported in this affidavit are not unusual. They are typical of the waste which is going on in our industrial plants all over the country. Thousands of witnesses could be marshaled to testify to the same things that Mr. McCammon has stated under oath. We have a War Manpower Commission which is supposed to be doing something about the manpower situation in this country. Why does it not do something about the conditions that prevail in these war plants? Why has something not been done about strikes, about absenteeism, and the hoarding of labor on the part of employers? If we are so short of help why not increase the hours of labor in our factories slightly? If farmers can work 70, 80, or even 90 hours a week why can we not slightly increase the hours in our manufacturing plants where the average hours of work per week, according to the latest report from the Department of Labor, is 45.6 hours?

It all adds up to the fact that this administration has utterly failed in its handling of the manpower problem. Now, to cover up that failure, it comes to Congress and asks for a universal draft which means dictatorship or, in lieu of that, work or fight legislation. We may have to pass some legislation, not because there is any real need of it, but because this administration has shown itself utterly incapable of meeting the situation otherwise.

America's Obligation to Contribute to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "There Is No Ivory Tower for Us," written by me, and published in the New York Times of January 14 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE IS NO IVORY TOWER FOR US

(By JOSEPH H. BALL, United States Senator from Minnesota)

WASHINGTON.—Any lingering illusions in the United States that the beautiful, peaceful post-war world for which we hope would become a reality without plenty of hard work, patience and faith on the part of ourselves and our allies were shattered rudely by events of the past few weeks.

Britain's veto of Count Sforza for the Italian Cabinet, the mess in Greece, Russia's exclusive little party in Rumania, signs of increasing exhaustion and possible upheavals in China and dragging of the explosive Russo-Polish row into the open left very few of us dreaming happily in our ivory tower about the wonderful new world that peace would bring, without, of course, our doing anything unpleasant or difficult about it.

As if these political headaches were not enough, the Germany army, which we had figured was practically down and out, suddenly came out slugging, ending our hopes of a decision in the war early this winter and piling up heavy casualties for us as well as the enemy.

War headlines, both military and political, made grim reading the past weeks and left in their wake a tide of pessimism regarding the future in America—a tide far wider and deeper than the facts justified.

Psychiatrists recognize as one of the common personality types the manic-depressive, described as a person who alternates between moods of geat elation and fits of despondency. If such terms can be applied to groups, then it would fit us Americans about as well as any. We seem to go up and down like a roller coaster. A few months ago, when our armies were plunging across France, the Philippines invaded successfully and Dumbarton Oaks announced the foundation for an international organization to preserve peace, we were on the crest of the wave. The war was almost won and the peace assured.

Then, as a result of military reverses and some nasty political developments internationally, we hit the trough in December, and our pessimism knew no bounds. Now, unless I misread the signs, we are snapping out of it in typical American fashion, buckling down to the grim job of winning the war and demanding that our Government do something effective to stop the political disintegration of the United Nations and get our feet planted again on a workable path toward international organization to prevent this thing from happening again.

There is no doubt that the unmistakable signs of the discredited power politics, spheres of influence pattern showing up in liberated Europe are danger signals. At the least they handicap the chances for success of a "general international organization based on the sovereign equality of all nations, great and small," toward which we are working. It would be a difficult task to impose that democratic and just pattern of international relations on a Europe already set in the mold of cynical power politics and make it work. At the worst, these developments might cause such deep antagonism in the United States as to endanger our participation in the proposed international organization. Certainly they have given the opponents of collective security plenty of "I told you so" ammunition.

But, despite these clear dangers, I believe that in the long run the dragging into the open of these difficult and explosive political issues in Europe is beneficial. It has blasted us out of our ivory tower and into the middle of this unregenerate and troublesome world in which, perforce, we must somehow live. We do not like the picture we see, but that typical American demand, "Let's do something about it," which has been at the base of much of our progress domestically, is heard again. I can testify that Members of Congress are hearing that demand from their constituents, and from what I read in the newspapers the executive branch of our Government is getting its share of it, too.

Already something has been done; unfortunately, not by the United States. Prime Minister Churchill, pocketing his pride, flew to Greece, met with all political groups there, and came out with a demand for a regency acceptable to all of them. That, after his speech in Parliament, was a great performance by a great leader who knows when to change course. Would that our Government were as alert to public opinion in this country.

The Polish situation, in the meantime, has continued to deteriorate, with the Lublin committee proclaiming itself the provisional government of liberated Poland. It promises to be a much tougher problem to solve than Greece. I believe we have a great deal in common with the Russian people, that many of our vital interests are the same or complementary. But it is also true that we in America have a very deep feeling for Poland, first to fight the Nazis, and the difficulty of getting together with the Russians to talk it over does not make a solution any easier.

But perhaps before we proceed to castigate Britain and Russia too much for the present deterioration of political unity among the United Nations it might be a good idea for us in the United States to look inward. How much of the present situation is due to failure of the United States to formulate a clear and specific policy toward these immediate problems and assume its share of responsibility for carrying out that policy? Have we ever proposed any different solutions to these specific problems and backed up our proposal by a commitment to do specific things if our solution is accepted? If so, it is not in the record.

We have had plenty of statements of American foreign policy objectives, all in nice, general, and harmless terms. We are for international law and order. We are for self-determination for all peoples. We are for no changes in boundaries without the consent of the people involved. We are for a lot of other very fine objectives, like the four freedoms and Senator BURTON K. WHEELER's international bill of rights. There is no controversy or difficulty over fine objectives. Everyone is for them. Practically every nation in the world ratified the Kellogg-Briand pact outlawing war, including two-thirds of the United States Senate, but that tough little problem of how it was to be done was left conveniently blank.

How do we propose to secure as much self-determination as possible for all peoples in choosing their governments and how far are we willing to go to back up our solution? How would we settle boundary questions, how tough are we willing to be in supporting our position, and how far will we go in supporting the boundaries so drawn? Are we willing to join a full-fledged world government to enforce our international bill of rights, the only practical way to do it? I doubt if Senator WHEELER would be for that.

These are the tough questions in foreign policy; the how and what and how far. They are the ones we have not yet answered to our own satisfaction, let alone that of our allies. I believe it is because they are unanswered, because we Americans are groping for clear and specific answers, that we hear on all sides today, the question, "Just what is our foreign policy?" On the Greek situation, for instance, were we prepared to propose a solution and back it up with our support if necessary? If not, what business have we to criticize what Britain did?

One reasonably familiar with the facts could present a good defense of British policy in Greece, a reasonable case for Russia's position on Poland. I do not intend to do that. There is one fact I believe we should always keep in mind in our negotiations with both countries. That is the fact that they and their peoples have been much closer to this war and taken much heavier losses than we. War fatigue is a factor with both countries. What that difference can mean was brought home vividly to me by a story I heard of a conversation at the recent air conference in Chicago.

An English delegate was trying to explain their different viewpoints to an American. "When you in America hear a plane overhead," he said, "you look up into the sky. You are thrilled. An airplane flying is a symbol of progress to you. When we in England hear a plane overhead, we don't look up. We look for the nearest air-raid shelter."

These developments in liberated Europe, tough as they may appear, fall into more proper perspective when viewed against the background of three facts to which our foreign policy must be oriented.

First of these is that we never achieve political objectives at one bound and there isn't a chance of achieving a world utopia in that fashion. We advance toward our goals—social security, a workable labor relations code, control of monopolies—step by step, and sometimes the steps are painfully slow.

We've been working at this system of democracy for 150 years, but we still have our corrupt municipal and State political machines, we still have millions of citizens to whom the Bill of Rights seems at times a mockery, and we still have our Teapot Dome scandals and our free-enterprise advocates playing the cartel game. We take it in our strike and sweat away at the job of improving these bad spots.

Why expect miracles in international politics that we've never been able to achieve in domestic affairs? Politicians who have been playing international power politics all their lives won't reform completely overnight because we think they should. It will take years to change their approach or get rid of them.

The second and most important fact is that a third great war will finish western civilization if we permit it to happen. The B-29's, the rocket guns, the flame throwers and V-1 and V-2 are bad enough. We can imagine what the V-5, or maybe the V-10 that science will have for the next war, will be like, or can we? We are getting a slight glimpse of the mess this war will have in its wake now. We dare not risk another. That means we must do everything and anything, join in every measure that offers any hope of preventing another great war.

That brings us to fact number three, that an international organization generally along the lines proposed at Dumbarton Oaks, whatever its weaknesses and shortcomings, offers greater hope than anything else likely to be agreed upon by the nations involved of preventing future great wars. At least it will be a joint effort of many nations, including all of the major powers, to solve this greatest of all problems facing our world. And, when the charter is finally drafted and agreed upon, it will be the only such proposal for joint action open to us, whatever background of power politics and spheres of influence maneuvering may intervene between now and then.

The only alternative to joining whatever comes out of the Dumbarton Oaks beginning is to try to retire to our ivory tower of isolation that V-1 and V-2 have turned into rubble. It just isn't there any more. The alternative to the best kind of collective security we can achieve is increasing militarization of this Nation, universal military conscription, ever-mounting taxes, more and more governmental control of industry, so basic in modern war, and at the end of the road almost certain war. That is not an alternative for a democratic people. It is suicide.

And what of these smaller nations—Greece, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia—about which we are rightly concerned? What happens to their independence and self-determination if we satisfy our moral indignation at power politics in Europe by staying out of an international organization and thereby wreck any chance for collective security in the world? Their chances of maintaining any real independence wouldn't be half as good as were Austria's in 1936. Their only hope for democracy, real independence, and self-determination lies in a strong collective security system.

Both for us and the world, despite the difficulties and the unregenerate ways of humanity, there is only one solution. Our ivory tower is gone. We are in the world for better or worse. We are in Europe for the second time in one generation, 2,000,000 strong. Let's roll up our sleeves and little by little help make it a better world and at least a more peaceful Europe.

Review of Book Entitled "The Philadelphia Lawyer"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Allen Nevins reviewing the book entitled "The Philadelphia Lawyer."

The article is from the Book Supplement of the New York Times. The book was written by George Wharton Pepper, a former and distinguished member of this body.

Mr. Pepper is well known not only as a legal authority but also as an ecclesiastical authority, and I am reminded of what a Federal judge said to me a few years ago, that Mr. Pepper never expressed an opinion but always had an authority on both legal and church matters.

I am sure his former colleagues will enjoy reading this review.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA LAWYER—AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY BY GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER

(Reviewed by Allan Nevins)

This is a revealing book; more revealing even than the frank and loquacious Mr. Pepper intended it to be. It gives a more illuminating picture of Pennsylvania conservatism, with all its virtues and defects, than perhaps any other volume in print. Before the reader has gone halfway through these interesting pages, rich in local lore, in political anecdote, in personal sketches, he realizes that ex-Senator Pepper is more than an individual—that he is a type. As churchman, attorney, Republican leader and general leader in good causes, he expresses the quintessential qualities of a special kind of mind in a certain class in the elder generation of Philadelphians.

The special characteristics of this type (George Apley's first cousins in the Quaker City) are admirably indicated by Mr. Pepper's opinions. He indulges the illusion that he is a middle-of-the-road liberal, but that phrase has to be read in a Victorian connotation; for he remarks that his attitude toward public questions is almost precisely that of Mr. Hoover. He thinks highly of the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930. He holds that history will yet do full justice to the achievements of Harding. He expresses the warmest admiration for Coolidge. Indeed, he goes so far as to remark that Coolidge "will of course be denied by posterity the rank of Pitt, but he may in time be recognized as the Palmerston of our political history." Joseph N. Pew, he tells us, is grossly misunderstood. He is not really boss, and he has no selfish aims; "he seems to have only one objective, and that is the upbuilding of a strong Republican Party patterned after the major political parties in England."

Mr. Pepper's antipathy to the Democratic Party was strong in the days of Woodrow Wilson, whom he treats as a misguided if not sinister figure, and it has grown stronger as the years have passed. The last Democrat that he regarded as tolerable was Grover Cleveland. He holds the New Deal in abhorrence, and recalls with gratification the part he played in arguing against the triple A in the Supreme Court. When the books are balanced, he tells us, the New Deal will be found to have robbed both the working people and the propertied class of all opportunity to live a more abundant life. He excoriates "the dictatorial drift," the extravagance, "the Court-packing bill," and what to him seem other baleful features of Mr. Roosevelt's work. Mr. WALLACE he dismisses as a man whose only title to notice was his apparent ability to win farm votes.

Even the foreign policy of the administration has irritated him. Back in the Wilson period Mr. Pepper, as Senator, did his full share in helping put the League to death—an exploit in which he still, incredible as it may seem, takes pride. Strong vestiges of isolationism clung around him till 1940, and he frankly states that he never honestly believed that Germany was "potent enough to enslave the world or even that Hitler seriously contemplated the subjugation of America."

The record for our Philadelphia type might seem dark if we could say no more than this about the author. But Mr. Pepper has been more than a close associate of Joseph Pew and Dave Reed, a glorifier of Mellon and Coolidge, a hater of all Democrats, an enemy of the League and of the original World Court idea. Justice to the Apley cousinship, to the great clan of Whartons, Peppers, Wisters, Mifflins, and other Philadelphia conservatives, demands that the more creditable side be mentioned.

For there is a creditable side. Mr. Pepper took Pinchot's case in the legal battle against Ballinger and caught fire with conservationist enthusiasm. He refused political support from Boss Vare, of whose dirty methods he offers a vivid description. He deplored the use of the Federal injunction in labor disputes when that use was still common. He favored the submission of the child-labor amendment to the Senate and wanted it ratified. He suggested Owen J. Roberts for the job of investigating Teapot Dome, and thus helped give the Government an able public servant. He supported Wendell Willkie for the Republican nomination in 1940, though, of course, he deplores some of those defects which marked Willkie's divergence from Hoover.

His autobiography proves, too, that he has been a genial lover of humanity, or at least of the well-washed and well-schooled part of it. Now and then he has even slapped a Democrat on the back. The volume abounds

in good stories. One concerns Ollie James, who remarked that the Republican watchdogs in Congress were just like our "Kaintucky watchdogs—they don't bark at the home folks." Another presents the comment of Mrs. W. R. Newbold on being asked to sign a petition for expelling the strait-laced Smoot from the Senate. "I do not think I shall," she said. "I prefer a polyg that monogs to a monog that polygs." This formal, cautious Philadelphian found in the crisis of the war that he had more emotion than he supposed. We can almost forget his fight against the League as we read one passage:

"All through 1940 the unreasoning call of the blood grew stronger as the position of Britain became more perilous. May saw the Netherlands overrun. The 9 days wonder at Dunkerque quickened my admiration. When the collapse of France in June left Britain standing alone I was deeply moved. When the night raids on London began in August and continued thereafter with fierce intensity, I began to feel as if my own home were being bombed. Finally, when the British people, after intense suffering and strain, were found to be about equally divided on whether reprisals would be justified, I gave myself up to the luxury of unrestrained emotion. I said: 'These people deserve to win; and we must help them do it.'"

Assembly Line for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the January 1, 1945, issue of Pathfinder:

ASSEMBLY LINE FOR DEMOCRACY

"If we Americans want common rights and privileges, we must be educated to entail the responsibilities. The school's great challenge today is to prepare men fit for public office and to prepare those who vote to choose wisely."

Harry Carman lolled with one leg curled over the arm of a green leather chair. The sun cast frosty rays across the Navajo rug at his feet. From the hall came the clatter of G. I. heels as the naval cadets changed classes. Talk had swirled, for an hour, out from the green leather chairs to the American tomorrow when 10,000,000 fighters would come home from the 5 continents to take up the task of building democracy in a world made alarmingly small by the airplane, the radio, and science.

Leadership in a republic cannot be concentrated at the top, Harry Carman had pointed out. "It must permeate the body politic. There must be leaders of opinion in every village, in every club, in every classroom. Democracy is measured by the number of its leaders. One way to increase our amount of democracy is to increase the number of our true leaders. * * * Development of this talent for bringing intelligence to bear on our national needs is the task confronting American educators today. It means that education of the future must concentrate on 'social engineering.'"

THE HUMANITIES

This was no stuffed shirt pedant, talking, although it was the dean of Columbia College at Columbia University. Dr. Harry James Carman is a part-time farmer from Greenfield, N. Y., who taught in one-room schoolhouses 40 years ago and was, for years, principal of a school in a Hudson Valley farm village. A nationally known historian and member of the Board of Higher Education for Greater New York City, he still spends summer vacations in operating an up-State farm. He is one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on agricultural history. So his concept for public education in the post-war reach from Morningside Heights to Podunk Center, spanning the cultural distances between with an philosophy that says education of the future must be based on "the humanities" rather than pedantic routine and "pat facts for specialists."

"Today," he said, "many of our customs and ways of social thinking and acting have been outmoded. Too many of our people are not aware of the new demands and new responsibilities placed on all of us by technological improvements.

"We glibly talk about our scientific age and of the need for the scientific habit of mind. We mean by these things a recognition of the fact that our lives from the kitchen to the battle line are shaped by the influence of machinery embodying scientific principles. * * * Yet, in spite of 50 years of teaching the sciences in our schools and colleges, the grasp of scientific method which is necessary for intelligent leadership in public life is largely lacking. Our schools have not taught science for laymen or science for leaders but science for specialists. One result is that in public life we are ruled by scientific ignoramuses while in the scientific laboratory we have, for the most part, political and social illiterates."

PRACTICAL CONCEPTS

Future courses in science should be designed principally for nonscientists, he contends, but should be compulsory for all students. These courses would explain the nature of science, "the concepts that apply to its various branches, the basic results achieved and an account of the way in which results can be achieved."

Comprehensive studies of history are also essential to future education. "The world of today is the result of an historical process," he said. "We are the past embodied and acting under new circumstances. That part of the past which is still alive in us must be studied in its origins before our motives and our desires can be fully understood. Hence a future leader must have at his command a knowledge of the development of modern man and his institutions. He must know how and why representative democracy was developed."

Third essential factor in post-war education, he feels, must be instruction in the humanities * * * philosophy, literature, music, and the plastic arts. "They have direct bearing on practicality and leadership. They deal with morality. There is no better way to get young people to think about the moral life—the life of right action and right feeling—than through the study of the humanities."

The G. I. heels died away down the hall. Dr. Carman spoke with a final gesture.

"We must have a pyramid of leaders reaching from the broad base of the grass roots to the Chief Executive, each man leading ideally in what he can do best and taking orders from another leader when another enterprise requires. Education for this leadership must not be restricted to any economic group. If we do restrict it, we are merely breeding up a ruling class * * * the last thing a democracy can desire or endure. There is, therefore, a great and difficult job facing the American colleges, the job of finding and financing the submerged brains of the Nation. Of whatever economic level, of whatever color and creed, the young men and women with good minds must be found and fostered; they are our greatest natural resource.

"If there are not hundreds and thousands of such young people among Americans, democracy hastens to its death. When you have no leaders in the sense I have developed, you get a Fuehrer."

Charles M. Hay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to pay tribute to the late Charles M. Hay, Deputy Chairman and Executive Director of the War Manpower Commission, and most recently its Acting Chairman.

It was with a distinct shock and deep sense of loss that I received the information on Tuesday night that he had been stricken suddenly at the dinner table and had expired. With his untimely passing, Charlie Hay had completed a full and active life of service to his neighbors, his community, and this Nation. He began the practice of law in Greenville, Mo., in 1904. Because of his brilliance as an orator, the depth of his learning, and his highly developed sense of justice, he attracted State-wide attention so that while still a young man he was invited to full partnership in a large, active, and successful law firm in St. Louis.

A man of strong convictions, sincere in his purpose, his vigorous advocacy of the things in which he believed stemmed from his sincerity. He was courageous in his support of the things he believed right but tolerant in admitting the right of all others to their own personal convictions. Once the majority had spoken, he was strong and zealous in defending that verdict. A champion of the downtrodden, he had the satisfaction of helping to formulate and establish some of the fine progressive labor legislation of this decade. He was a deeply religious man, blessed in his family life, and walked with humility in the sight of his God and his fellow men even in the moments of his greatest triumph. He was a lover of our democratic processes, and in recent years he dedicated his golden eloquence to preaching the gospel of "what's right with America." Intensely patriotic, Charlie Hay no doubt realized he was shortening his life when he answered the call to duty and gave unstintedly of his strength. It was my privilege to be his friend and neighbor, his associate in the city counselor's office, and his Congressman. The people of the Eleventh District join their fellow citizens in mourning the passing of this fine American.

Utah's Steel Guinea Pig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article deals with a problem of tremendous importance and interest to the people of Utah and the entire West, namely, the future of the steel plant located at Geneva, Utah:

[From Collier's of December 22, 1944]

UTAH'S STEEL GUINEA PIG

(By Murray Moler and André Fontaine)

It started slowly. First there was a handful of surveyors in high-laced boots who did things with transits and chains out near the rotting remains of the old summer resort, Geneva, Utah. They appeared, stayed around for a few days, then were gone without anybody paying much attention to them. In the green fields which sloped gently below the towering Wasatch Mountains, the farmers went about their eternal work without much thought that perhaps in a few months their whole way of life would be changed. The engineers came next, dropping off trains at Provo without any brass bands and disappearing into the city's population with scarcely a ripple.

The people knew, of course, what was coming; they'd read in their papers weeks before that a gigantic new steel plant was to be put up nearby. There had been talk about it along the irrigation ditches and on the front porches of the white frame farmhouses in the evenings; but there was as yet no change in their daily lives. It wasn't real for them until the construction superintendents began to arrive and the employment offices opened up and everybody was asked, either directly or indirectly, to come out and go to work.

There was no resentment at first, except possibly on the part of the Mormon Church, which didn't like the idea of a big industry intruding on the peace of the valley. But resentment began when the stories of neighbors having to leave farms their grandfathers had pioneered started to get around. And when it became necessary to import men from other counties and other States to fill out the construction crews, the resentment grew stronger.

The first letters began to come in to Ernest Rasmuson, editor of the Provo Herald, complaining about the boisterousness of some of the construction men, and the older residents buttonholed Mayor Maurice Harding with dire prophecies that the whole valley would be ruined. But the noisy, dusty, ceaseless action out on the shore of Utah Lake near Geneva drew the valley people like a big fire in a small town.

The draft hadn't really bitten deep into the ranks of Utah County's young men yet—it was still early in 1942—and in the long evenings they used to drive their jalopies out to the lake and watch the work. In no time they became experts on all the statistics of the operation. The work was being done for the Defense Plant Corporation by the United States Steel Corporation, and when it was finished Geneva would be the first completely integrated steel plant west of the Rockies, the first to gather its own raw materials and fashion them into the finished product in one plant site. Two hundred and sixty miles away is the rich Iron Mountain for ore, 130 miles southeast are the vast Rocky Mountain coal fields, and a few miles to the south is a limestone mountain to provide the flux.

REVOLUTION—IN ROUND NUMBERS

They learned that, when finished, Geneva would have cost $200,000,000 and would employ 5,000 workers. The construction at its peak would use 10,000 men. The plant's 143 buildings would cover 3,703,000 square feet of what had been meadow; the contractors would have moved 1,500,000 cubic yards of earth, poured 650,000 cubic yards of concrete, laid nearly 100 miles of conduit and 76 miles of railroad track, and put up more than 100,000 tons of structural steel. And all in 2 years—they hoped.

For their parents, these figures, enthusiastically recited at supper tables, spelled one thing: revolution. And they began to worry about what it would mean to their lives and their countryside.

Across the Nation—mostly in the West and South—other parents had similar worries as new war plants began to go up in many a rural area. In Jacksonville, Ark., a huge ordnance plant which would eventually employ 13,000 workers was being built in a town of 400 population. Parsons, Kans., sleepily content as a division point on the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railroad, was jerked awake to the realization that it was host to the Kansas Ordnance Plant which would employ about 9,000 workers.

At Las Vegas and Gabbs, Nev., two basic magnesium plants suddenly began to appear, swept the towns into a frenzy of war-consciousness and prosperity. Lake Charles, La., content with its memories of two past heydays as a lumber center and later as a resort town, found itself making new memories—perhaps—as the site of a petroleum refinery, a butadiene plant and a copolymer works.

As the construction gangs moved in, the older people in these and other places who remembered the First World War's ghost towns worried about what would happen to them after the war. The younger people didn't worry; they simply took the lucrative new jobs and enjoyed them. The rest of the people watched prosperity wash around them and were thankful. But now that the end of the war is in nearer sight, everybody is worrying. The subject of that worry is now the Nation's No. 1 problem.

What is to be done with these gaunt new plants that sprang up in cornfields? Almost everyone seems to agree that they should not be operated by the Government, but should be sold to private industry or junked. Suppose private industry doesn't want these factories that have boosted America's ability to produce higher than ever before, what is to happen to the scores of thousands of workers who migrated from every State in the Union to populate cities which grew where hamlets had been?

If the plants close, are they to be left to become a second jalopy hegira like the Okie trek to California in the thirties? And how about the millions of dollars that have been invested in new buildings and new businesses in these mushroom cities? Is this all to be part of war's waste?

Because it is in some ways typical, and because it is so important to the region it is located in, the Geneva Steel Works is a good guinea pig to examine, observe, and understand. In a sense, Geneva typifies the problem of all the new war plants, and not the least of its problems is geographical. The majority of the plants that sprang up in rural areas appeared in the West and South, neither of which had been noted for their industrialization. By and large, the people of those areas are now determined to keep the plants and keep them running. This is particularly true at Geneva.

Before the war the steelmaking capacity of the far West was relatively low, with the Columbia Steel Company, a subsidiary of United States Steel, and Bethlehem Steel Co., the chief producers. Westerners know that steelmaking is basic in any program of industrialization and consequently are determined that Geneva shall not be closed. For many of them, the fate of Geneva has become the key in the industrial battle of East versus West. They feel that the West has been an economic stepchild of the East for years, that freight and shipping charges have so boosted the cost of materials that it could not compete with the East, that all financing is controlled from the East and, naturally, the East has been favored when new industrial opportunities came along. The westerners, not inclined to meekness anyway, are bound and determined that this won't continue after the war, and they have made Geneva the watchword of their fight.

The East's answer is strong and pertinent: It has the industrial plants, the workers, and the financial set-up already in existence and running smoothly. It also has the larger part of the national market within short—and cheap—hauling distance. Granted that the country can consume just so much of the products of industry, why junk a producing machine that has been doing well for years, just to keep a war baby healthy?

FIERCE LOCAL RESENTMENT

It is reported that President Roosevelt personally picked out the site for the Geneva works in the days when no one could be positive that the Panama Canal wouldn't be blown up and our steel-hungry shipyards on the west coast be thus isolated from the steel-producing East. But even that distinction probably carried little weight with the 58,000 fiercely independent Mormon farmers, miners, and businessmen who populated Utah County.

They didn't like the trailer camp that sprang up near Geneva, and some of them were unhappy about the tremendously increased business the beer parlors in Provo were doing. They objected to the sudden overcrowding of everything from stores to homes. They resented the sudden, mushroom growth of nearby American Fork, Pleasant Grove, Lehi, and Orem. Dr. Fred W. Taylor, elderly retired physician, warned the new Provoans that they needn't be too fussy. After all, he said, it was the Mormon pioneers who had come into the valley when it was no more than a desert beside a muddy lake. It was they who had dug irrigation canals, cleared the land, and built the homes.

The Mormon Church felt the same way. A church has a long memory, and the sacrifices that Brigham Young and his followers made to establish a home where they would be unmolested were still too fresh. So they deeply resented the intrusion of big industry, and still do. Quite recently the church refused to let Geneva officials take part in a series of round-table discussions which were held at church-owned Brigham Young Univerity in Provo.

But the tide they were bucking was too strong; it was a flood of dollars. Letters came into the Provo Herald office charging that the old-time residents were too clannish and thin-skinned, that they had no real reason to resent the few slighting remarks the newcomers had made. After all, this was progress.

During the next months, Provo's population climbed steadily to a high of 24,000, an increase of 30 percent, despite the loss of 2,000 young men to the armed forces. The population of the county bounced to 65,000, and in 1943, the peak construction year, the county's pay roll hit forty-five million. It is now leveling off at about twenty million, but that is still double the peacetime normal.

In the face of such prosperity no resentment could last long. The letters to the editor dropped off, the Mormons began to welcome the newcomers with the simple geniality they have made famous and even helped them form clubs designed to keep up home ties—like the Chicago Club, the Pennsylvania Club, and the Alabama Club. It wasn't long before they developed a pride in the big new war baby that had been left on their doorstep.

Even those men who didn't know a sintering plant from a coke oven began to boast that Geneva was an engineer's dream and to explain in detail just why. They were right, of course; most steel plants have grown slowly, have had to compromise with topographical eccentricities and difficulties of financing. At Geneva the engineers were given their heads in designing the most efficient plant possible and in picking a site. As a result, Geneva's production costs will be among the lowest in the country when the bugs are out of the machinery.

AN EPIC OF PRODUCTION

There were plenty of other things for Provoans to boast about. The Geneva works has been known to make hard-shelled steel men think in poetry. Its three blast furnaces can turn out 1,150,000 tons of iron a year, its 9 open-hearth furnaces can pour 1,283,400 tons of steel ingots each year, and its two rolling mills can slide out 700,000 tons of plate and 200,000 tons of structural shapes.

United States Steel's share in the program was unique. The mighty corporation engineered the construction of the plant without profit of any kind, with the Government merely paying all the costs—about 200,000,000 When it came time to operate, United States Steel set up a new subsidiary, the Geneva Steel Co., to do the job, again without fee or profit. Benjamin F. Fairless, United States Steel's president, didn't stop there, either. He assigned his veteran vice president in charge of all production, Walther Mathesius, to boss Geneva, named the ace production man from his Chicago plants, Robert G. Glass, to be vice president in charge of operations, and Peer D. Nielsen, a 39-year-old production wizard, to be general superintendent.

In addition, Fairless loaned Geneva a nucleus of trained steelmakers ranging from top executives to open-hearth furnace men. The rest of the workers were recruited from Utah County or any other county in the United States of America in which they could be found. Geneva had, and still has, serious trouble getting the 5,000 workers it will need when it reaches capacity production. It has about 4,000 now, and they're as enthusiastic as they are unusual.

Bob Graham, superintendent of the rolling mill, has a crew of 650 men and 200 women. Only 35 of the men had ever seen a steel mill before. Many of them are farmers, and Graham says that's one of the chief causes of absenteeism: They're farmers first and steel men second. When the fruit crops are ripe they go back to their farms for the harvest. Steel, they say, can wait, fruit can't.

The real boss of the big open-hearth building, its superintendent will tell you, is shapely Beulah Baxter, ex-housewife, who was recruited from her home in nearby American Fork. She's the housekeeper, and her vacuum cleaner looks like an overgrown tractor with brushes. Her reaction to Geneva is typical: she wants to keep her job after the war. "But," she adds, "if any soldier wants my job I'll be glad to give it to him."

John Cutler, who can roll a cigarette before you can pull a tailor-made from its pack, also wants to keep his job as third assistant pourer on the No. 3 open-hearth furnace and thinks he has a pretty good chance of doing it. A former miner, he comes from Springville, about 10 miles south of Geneva. Three other Utahans who work near him—Harold Taylor, of Salt Lake City; Rex Dimick, of Price; and Harry Wadley, of Pleasant Grove—agree that steel is a fine business and are determined that Geneva shall not be closed after the war.

A GOOD PLACE TO LIVE

An understandable fondness for a good job at nice pay is apparently not the only thing that makes some of the non-natives equally determined. Ed Shnore, for instance. He quit a job as inspector at the National Tube Co., near Pittsburgh to join the marines. When he got his discharge 3 years later he became a speed operator at Geneva; he controls the speed of the red-hot slabs as they travel through the stands that flatten them into ship plates—and he likes it.

"I'm never going back East," he says. "The Utah climate is wonderful, and you can go hunting and fishing whenever you want."

But the people of Utah, native and newcomer, constitute only one in an intricate mesh of forces that will finally determine whether Geneva will live or die. From resentment of Geneva, they have graduated to curiosity, to pride and finally to a fierce resolution that it shall not be taken from them. "Provo," says Mayor Harding, "is tied up, body and soul, to Geneva. If the plant should go out you'd see a depression like you never saw before. Men who used to make $4 a day get $8 easily now. Without the plant we'd have almost as much income as before, but there'd be a terrible psychological depression."

Beyond Provo and Utah County, a good portion of the entire West feels pretty much the same way. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana, Democrat, who heads the Senate Small Business Committee, recently held a 2-day session in San Francisco to hear west coast businessmen on their reconversion problems.

After it, he said: "Our conferences have brought out the fact that the full operation of the Geneva and Fontana (Henry J. Kaiser's plant near Los Angeles) steel mills is indispensable to any sound plans for full employment in the West. The legislation which Congress enacts on the disposition of Government plants must provide for the operation of these plants at full capacity. It must guarantee the people of the West that western steel, properly priced, will be available for the industrialization of the western States."

All western governors and Congressmen are stoutly behind MURRAY on this point, and, with the exception of most of the largest steel companies in the East (who, understandably enough, are not too anxious to have a new competitor), most of the rest of the country probably agrees that Geneva should be kept in full operation. But there is a big difference between "should" and "can" when you're dealing with $200,000,000 investments and a system where the chief incentive for production is profit.

Benjamin F. Fairless takes a businessman's view. He says he doesn't know whether Geneva can be economically operated after the war or not. At a press conference in Salt Lake City he said that United States Steel would be glad to own and operate Geneva in peacetime if "there was a reasonable prospect of doing so at a profit." As things stand now, he said, United States Steel's connection with Geneva will end with the war. And, so far, the firm isn't doing much to extend that connection. They're making market and cost surveys, and waiting.

There are, for instance, freight rates (Geneva is 850 to 1,100 miles from its four chief market centers on the coast), shipping rates (if Geneva is to compete with eastern steel), west coast markets, foreign markets, the price which would have to be paid for Geneva (steel men figure the construction cost about double what it would be in peacetime), and how much it would cost to convert it from production primarily of steel plates and shapes to production of the much broader range of steel that peacetime markets demand.

As far as markets are concerned, Fairless said the peacetime consumption of the 11 Western States was 2,400,000 tons a year. Present production, at full capacity, of western plants is 3,500,000 tons. And you can't use up more than a million tons of steel every year by making more paper clips.

Freight rates don't make the picture any clearer. The normal rate for finished steel products from Geneva to the coast was $12 a net ton. This was cut to $8 under special wartime provisions, and everybody expects the rate to be finally fixed at less than $12 after the war.

Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge has recently filed an antitrust suit against 17 western railroads that may affect this rate. What happens to that suit may make a whale of a difference to Geneva's chances of running at a profit. Berge charges the railroads got together and fixed rates at a level higher than they would have reached under unbridled competition. If he is successful in providing this and in forcing the roads to compete actively for the business of Geneva and other plants, the resulting lower rates may go a long way toward helping Geneva's eventual operator show a profit.

Foreign markets are anybody's guess; but United States Steel seems to think that even if China, for instance, decides to industrialize overnight, there will be a long time lag between the peace and the shipment of the first large order across the Pacific. And, besides, shipping rates to the Orient from the east coast are only about 20 percent higher than from the west coast—a difference which definitely does not put a plant located right on the east coast, like Bethlehem Steel's Sparrows Point, Md., works, out of the running.

The question of how much Geneva's ultimate owner will have to pay for the plant is one of the most important factors in determining the plant's future. It is pretty well agreed that if anyone has to pay the original cost—two hundred million—he'll have about as much chance of operating the plant profitably as Hirohito has of signing the peace in Washington. What the eventual price will be is tied up with Government policy on disposal of war plants, and that is something which not even Nostradamus himself could predict.

The little item of reconversion is somewhat clearer. United States Steel estimates it will cost about fifty million to shift the plant over to peacetime uses. The Defense Plant Corporation is also studying this subject, and is playing with the idea of doing the job itself, so that the eventual purchaser would not have that financial haymaker landed in his breadbasket the minute he takes over. If the D. P. C. does this, the chances of a western combine's buying the plant are greater, because it could handle the reconversion cost on easy payment terms.

The possibility that just that will happen is beyond the idle-talk stage. First Security National Bank, which does business in Utah, Wyoming, and Idaho, once said it was willing to talk terms on Geneva. First Security was organized and formerly headed by Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, who now stoutly denies he's interested. Another candidate is the ubiquitous Henry J. Kaiser, who seems to like the taste of the steel business which he is getting with his Fontana plant. Fontana was built with a Government loan of ninety million and has a capacity of about half of Geneva's 1,200,000 tons a year.

When you go outside the steel business for prediction on Geneva's future, you run into a quite different point of view and a lot more variables. Provo's Mayor Harding, for instance, is confident that Geneva will not close. He gives four reasons: (1) A large steel industry is needed in the West to supply the region's demands without transcontinental hauling; (2) World War No. 2, particularly in Russia, has taught the necessity of decentralization of industry; (3) the country realizes that population should not be crowded into a few sections; and (4) politics.

Harding rates No. 4 as the most important. He thinks the Government won't "let the plant be taken away, because the entire West wants it, and our politicians are organized to make sure it stays here. After all, it

doesn't take many of these States to swing an election."

Harding hopes Geneva will be sold to a western outfit because "the temptation is too big for the eastern interests to curtail western operations—or shut them down entirely—if demand slackens and lucrative production by their eastern mills is threatened. We've seen situations like this in the oil fields where big companies shut down the smaller operations when their biggest investments were threatened."

Utah's Gov. Herbert B. Maw is just as flat-footed in his determination that Geneva shall not be closed. When he returned recently from a trip to Washington on Geneva business, he stated that prospects for continued operations of the plant are tremendously bright.

"Utah," he said, "will not permit her mill to be closed down and her rich ore shipped east, where high-grade iron ore is rapidly becoming exhausted." Furthermore, he added, the Federal Director of Contract Settlements, who will play no small part in deciding the fate of war plants, is Robert H. Hinckley, a Utah boy from Ogden.

One of the most complete studies of the Geneva situation was printed a few weeks ago by Dr. J. R. Mahoney, director of the University of Utah's bureau of economic and business research, who has made the entire United States steel industry his hobby for years. He thinks Geneva will live.

WHY GENEVA WILL SURVIVE

To support this, he points to the efficiency of its operation. It costs only $10.76 to mine and deliver to Geneva the ore, coal, and flux needed to make 1 ton of pig iron, he says, and this is the lowest in the country. Next lowest is at the United States Steel subsidiary at Birmingham, Ala., where it costs $11.40. (This, it should be noted, is one of the most favorable items for cost comparison which Mahoney could have chosen. While other plants may not be able to deliver materials as cheaply as Geneva, their over-all production costs may be comparable. For one thing, the comparison will surely be affected by how much is ultimately paid for Geneva.)

Mahoney dismisses freight rates as not too important, feeling certain that they will be brought into line by competition. He's enthusiastic about Oriental markets, especially since Japan's steel plants have been catching hell from our B–29's. He points out that Geneva's continuous plate mill is the most modern of its kind and says that "only a few additional units will be necessary to equip the mill to produce a full line of various flat-rolled products or tubular pipe—which constitute the bulk of steel used in manufacturing or by western industry."

So, concludes Mahoney, "the economic factors that will determine the chances for successful post-war operation of Geneva are on the whole favorable. Such problems as do exist present no obstacles which are insurmountable. Geneva * * * can be operated successfully on a substantial part-capacity basis in the economic situation that may conservatively be expected to prevail at the close of the war. Business conditions in the West may even be vigorous enough to require the full capacity of the plant. In any event, a continuation of the western trends of industrial growth should soon lead to harmony between plant capacity and markets."

But Provo's Editor Rasmuson is not so sure. He gives Geneva a 50–50 chance. "Even if the politicians are confident," he says, "you begin to wonder when you hear such men as Fairless who see the situation only in cold-blooded commercial terms."

In the welter of cross-statements and conflicting forces, there is at least one thing of which Utahans are absolutely certain. Things will never be the same as they were before that 1942 "invasion."

Prosperity in the Post-war Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address entitled "Post-war Prosperity—Or Not?" delivered by John Brandt, president of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, at the organization's twenty-eighth annual meeting, in Chicago, Ill., December 6, 1944.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have recently passed through a national election with all its bitterness, arguments, criticisms, and certainly the most glittering promises of unbounded prosperity for the future that this Nation has ever known. We did it in the midst of the world's greatest war emergency. We came out of it as a nation ready to get down to business and go to work on the job before us. The political campaign and the election itself had very little effect if any upon the actual prosecution of the war.

Through the campaign we listened to the presentations and promises of the leaders on both sides. We listened to the statements pro and con as to how one or the other would not be best fitted to fulfill these promises, but have you ever stopped to think how little we heard or were apprized of the concrete planing or the means by which these promises could be fulfilled.

We were promised the fullest employment—sixty million fully employed at wages higher than present levels, a take-home income in the coming peacetime equal if not better than in wartime; industrial expansion for satisfying the wants of a fully employed and high-earning population; lower taxes to encourage industrial expansion, and higher earnings and bigger dividends in business; greater expansion in agriculture at high-price levels; more people encouraged to go into farming through mustering-out compensation and supplemental easy loans to our soldiers; shorter hours of work and more time for leisure, the production from which is to all be assimilated in a home market and in a world of international trade that knows no tariff or other regulation barriers in competition with and to people whose hours of labor per week will be twice that contemplated for our people and whose take-home pay will be a minor fraction of that which we are promised—but who among us now knows or understands how this utopia is to be accomplished?

Few people believe that the promises can be fulfilled for all, and we now go merrily about our planning for individual groups with the thought in mind, that we will look out for ourselves first and let the promises take care of the rest. If the American people haven't as yet made up their minds, they'd better do it right away, that the fulfillment of promises of prosperity cannot be accomplished by borrowing on the future for the satisfaction of today. By the time the war is over we already will have passed the peak of our ability to borrow on the future without seriously affecting our monetary valuations. Therefore, in spite of all the promises that have been made, it becomes the combined duty and obligation of all groups—business, labor, and agriculture—to try to protect the already inflated-dollar value from further inflation or complete repudiation.

It is the combined job of these groups to consider the possibility of maintaining national income at a figure sufficiently high—at least 150 to 160 billion dollars a year—to enable us to meet the fixed obligations of government and still have something left over to carry on our desired standard of living. Business cannot expand to give jobs to labor and continue to pay the high percentage-wise income tax now assessed against it. Labor cannot buy farm products unless it is fully employed at a high wage level, but neither business nor labor can accomplish its end unless it builds toward the goal on a foundation of a self-supporting agriculture. The prosperity of the three groups must be associated with an American standard and way of living that is peculiar to America alone. Our association and trade with the rest of the world must be developed in such a manner that it will not interfere with or reduce our own standards. Otherwise, we must either face extreme inflation of our dollar values or ultimate repudiation of our war debt.

In the inflated position we find ourselves as a Nation, we cannot hope to liquidate this indebtedness in an orderly manner except through the means of taxation against a high national income, a national income that is high enough that even a high percentage-wise taxation will not absorb so much of the net income so as to break down the standard of living we are capable of maintaining, provided, however, that the fullest production is attained. High wages and high earning power alone will not do the job. It must be associated with high production per individual in order that the high earning power after taxes are deducted will be able to buy in a fully supplied market at reasonable prices.

It is essential that we check the present trend toward further depreciation of the value of the raw material that goes into the finished product. Of late we have been drifting farther and farther toward a position where the price of raw material as it leaves the farm, the mine, or the forest, is of little consequence with respect to the retail price at which the consumer must make his purchase. The road to higher purchasing power for the earned dollar can only be shortened through the channels that the raw material passes in its processing, manufacturing, and wholesale and retail handling.

It is paramount that the people of this country recognize this fact. Otherwise they will continue to lay the blame on the producer of raw material—a blame which is already bringing about misunderstanding and clashes between groups in their battle for economic security.

So far as the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation is concerned, I am satisfied that our membership is unselfish in its desire to bring about the proper balances between the various groups and is willing to cooperate in any way and on a basis that is fundamentally sound. We ask for no special privileges or gratuities from the public treasury. We only ask for a price at the market place for such of our products that we produce for home consumption that will permit the farmer to receive a return for his efforts that will match the hourly return for other groups, and we are willing to put forth effort that engrosses our time for the full 365 days of the year, as we have in the past, in order that America shall have all that it needs of the best food produced in the world.

If our farmers' efforts produce more than can be consumed in our home markets and this surplus needs to be diverted into other markets, which include world markets, at prices below those to which we are entitled for goods sold in home markets, we do not ask to be subsidized or to be the objects of governmental gratuities. We are perfectly willing to take such loss ourselves. We are a grown-up member of the family of American

business institutions and can and should stand on our own feet.

Much discussion has taken place and many articles have been written concerning the possibilities of maintaining a high degree of prosperity in America. Much stress is given to the manufacture of durable goods as a means of maintaining full employment and high earning power in industrial activities, with the contention that full employment and high volume of business turn-over will furnish purchasing power to the extent that farm prices will follow the same high level and result in prosperity for agriculture. It is intended that the combination of all these circumstances will furnish the source of tax income to alleviate the tax burden as it applies percentagewise to the total national income. Furthermore, such a combination of circumstances in America associated with a wide-open and most liberal policy in international trade relations, is to furnish the basis for an outlet for continued expansion of the possibilities of the great American resources.

All of this planning paints a beautiful picture of prosperity springing from the roots of a devastated world where many of the natural resources have been depleted during this world emergency. However, dreams and word pictures blow up like bubbles unless founded on factual actualities, upon which foundation the future world must build for its prosperity, otherwise we will have a "flash in the pan" prosperity that will be the result of the spending of money that is called national savings but is largely spending borrowed money that is not derived from creative wealth.

Much of the savings now in the hands of the American people is already mortgaged in full and is secured by a tax lien that must be paid, and it can only be liquidated through a sound program of the utilization of all productive forces which have a full balance so far as the various groups that make up American citizenry are concerned. It must be a program of a high degree of self-sufficiency for all classes and world trade built on realities of a nation first supplying itself from its own resources and then drawing on its neighbor for the balance of its needs.

The development of world trade must fully recognize the conditions that exist in other countries, which include social and living standards, all of which are part of the wage and other income relationships. Here in our own country if we depend upon durable goods for the maintenance of full employment and high business turn-over, we miss the biggest field of opportunity and we will fail following this war as we did following the last one. But it will not take quite as long for the bubble to break. This field furnishes a very minor portion of business and employment opportunity and runs its course in a short time, as durable goods, which have a general depreciation turn-over of about 10 years, only temporarily fill the gap of consumer demand left empty during the wartime period.

It is agriculture, food processing, and distribution, and various types of small business that hold the key to a stable, high degree of prosperity. Take, for instance, the automobile industry in its fullest capacity for the employment of labor and investment in business turn-over, which reaches down into the steel industry. We find that agriculture alone presents an investment opportunity of ten times that of the entire business investment in the manufacture of automobiles and employs twenty times as many people. Agriculture's job is one of liquidating inventories nearly ten times as fast as that in the production of durable goods.

Then let's take small business—the barber shop, the beauty shop, the corner grocer, the bowling alley, the recreation center, and the thousands of small individual businesses. In these the turn-over in business activity and the liquidation of inventories is a daily or monthly operation, and it is upon these that we must depend to establish a foundation for long range and stabilized prosperity. In agriculture alone America has at least 35,000,000 of the Nation's best customers. While the opportunity of sale of the products produced on the farms is dependent upon high earning power for workers and industrial expansion to furnish labor for such workers, neither high wages for workers nor industrial opportunity can be more than temporarily sustained unless the large group that lives on the farm and produces wealth from the soil is maintained in a prosperous position.

There are two problems that seem to continually plague the world. One is that of not having enough, and the other is that of having too much, and the funny part of it is that both of these problems can be in effect simultaneously.

America's first problem is that of our home situation. We cannot maintain American prosperity with agricultural prices at world levels. We must find a home for American surpluses through a program of segregating temporary, seasonal, or real surpluses from the home market requirements—these surpluses to be disposed of either through chemurgic development, or through foreign trade at prices that admittedly cannot be on a level at which American people can afford to sell if we are to sustain a high national income.

The American farmer is not asking anyone to pay his bills. He is asking for legislation that will legally permit him to segregate such products as he produces in excess of the needs of the American market, and to organize the machinery to dispose of these products in other than normal American outlets. He fully realizes that the day has come when we must all think in terms of paying off our national debt rather than incurring additional obligations.

A two-price system must be inaugurated, one for the home market and one for the utilization of farm products in other than normal channels and the sale of our excess production in foreign markets. If this is done, the American farmer will do his share in maintaining a high national income so necessary in the support of prosperity following this war.

World Organization for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column entitled "This Morning," written by John Temple Graves, which appeared in the Birmingham Age-Herald on January 13, last. The caption over the column is "While we read history we make history."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS MORNING

(By John Temple Graves)

"WHILE WE READ HISTORY WE MAKE HISTORY"

Those of us who have believed that the threat to this century's second chance at world peace is from isolationists on one side and sentimental champions of a world all love and white wonder on the other, and that the greater threat may be the second, have a friend now in Franklin D. Roosevelt, it would seem. "Perfectionism," he declared last Saturday, "no less than isolationism or imperialism or power politics, may obstruct the paths to international peace. * * * In our disillusionment after the last war we preferred international anarchy to international cooperation with nations which did not see and think exactly as we did. * * *" The President warned that the Atlantic Charter "does not provide rules of easy application to each and every one of this war-torn world's tangled situations. * * * It is a good and useful thing * * * to have principles toward which we can aim."

If the President is thinking of world organization for peace now not as a de novo and arbitrary thing based in Utopia, but an organic one grown out of history-long trial and error and world-wide present-day ties and antagonisms, his thought is the hope of the world. And that begins to seem to be his thought and the thought of America.

In history there have been four devices for keeping the peace. All have failed. There was the Pax Romana, maintained through the ancient world by the might and police power of one nation—Rome. That peace died when Rome, for want of competition, turned soft and corrupt and the barbarians swept in. There was the Holy Alliance after Napoleon in 1815, when the Emperors of Russia, Prussia, and Austria joined to hold the fretful realms in awe. That peace died when the alliance became an agency of repression and dark reaction, against which our country laid down its Monroe Doctrine and revolutions all over Europe in 1948 launched a quarter of a century of disorder. There was the peace then after Germany and Italy became nations, preserved in balance of power between the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria, and Italy, and the Triple Entente of England, Russia, and France. The shot at Serajevo ended that in 1914. The balance had grown to be, for want of an umpire, not a balance but a rivalry of power.

Then there was the Woodrow Wilson peace of 1919. A League of Nations undertook to umpire the competition of nations, limit their rivalries, hold them together in synthetic unity under a parliamentary law. That peace was destroyed when, with America leading, the League was ignored, and in developing crises nobody cared enough or believed enough to stand fast.

Pax Romana, Holy Alliance, balance of power, League of Nations—all four have failed. But in each there was a truth. And in the failure of each a lesson. Is it not possible that the peace we seek once more—and must have for very existence's sake this time—may be hoped for in an organization embodying the truth in all four plans and employing the lesson in the failure of all? A peace based on a police power such as Rome possessed, but without that lack of competitive effort and balancing that let Rome decay. A peace maintained by a concert of greatest powers such as the Holy Alliance was, but with some element to make more certain of holiness, democracy, for example. A peace based on genuine associations of interest in balance, such as were the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, which balanced power before 1914 but with an umpiring and cohering organization above them to keep the balance a balance rather than a sharpening rivalry. A peace of true world organization like the League of Nations, but rather than one synthetically contrived and arbitrarily maintained, one grown and growing on a basis of natural spheres of interest and power among the nations, regions, and hemispheres.

And isn't such a peace through such an organization what is attaining form in America's mind out of the contributions of Walter Lippmann, Sumner Welles, Cordell Hull, and Messrs. Hill, Hatch, Burton, Ball? A world organization as complete as was the League

of Nations, as organically arrived at as the balance between the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, as realistic in recognition of nations in whom greatest power resides as was the Holy Alliance, and as physical in control against disorder as old Rome?

It is possible to see such an organization taking shape or in promise. It is possible to look ahead now to world organization based on the tripod of power which Russia, England, and America make, but including all other nations, with recognition of organic realities that concern Russia in one part of the world, England in another, the United States in another, and with a sufficient police force in being, whether jointly or separately maintained, to make sure that no nation, not even one of the great, may hope to achieve anything by war. Or, more simply, an organization for umpiring the competition, balancing the power, and policing the hot spots of the world.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Washington Post on January 15, 1945:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

(By Janet R. Keith)

CANADA READY TO PROCEED

Governor Dewey has just recommended that the State of New York should proceed with development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, in conjunction with the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario. This suggestion followed closely upon the heels of defeat in the United States Senate for an amendment which would have tied the St. Lawrence project into the rivers and harbors bill.

Senate objection to the seaway was not based primarily on criticism of the project itself. Opposing Senators, led by Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, felt that the agreement should be made the subject of a treaty rather than of a routine Congress vote.

However, it is expected that a new attempt to get congressional approval of the project will be made soon after the Seventy-ninth Congress convenes. President Roosevelt recently gave his unqualified support to the seaway plan:

"Of course, I want action as soon as possible on the St. Lawrence seaway. It is logical and inevitable. The quicker the better."

The idea of a great seaway which would permit oceangoing vessels to move in and out of the Great Lakes is not new. Investigations and negotiations have been going on since the beginning of the century. As far back as 1905 the Government of Canada and the United States appointed a Joint Standing International Waterways Commission "to report upon the conditions and uses of boundary waters." This body was later replaced by the International Joint Commission, which conducted a thorough investigation in 1920 and 1921, and recommended a combined development of the upper St. Lawrence for deep-water navigation and for power. In 1924 an International Joint Board of Engineers commenced a thorough study of the project from an engineering point of view.

Defeated in 1934

The culmination of all these investigations was the St. Lawrence Deep Waterway Treaty of 1932, signed by Canada and the United States. The treaty provided for a 27-foot waterway from the head of the Great Lakes to Montreal, and a combined power-navigation project in the International Rapids section enabling development of 2,200,000 horsepower, to be evenly divided between the two countries. When the treaty came before the United States Senate in 1934 for ratification, it fell 12 votes short of obtaining the necessary two-thirds majority. (The Niagara Convention of 1929, which had provided for preserving the scenic beauties of Niagara Falls and expanding power production in that area, was also defeated in the Senate.)

The next important step was the signing, in 1941, of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agreement, which embodied the main features of the 1932 treaty and the Niagara Convention. This was an Executive agreement which could have been ratified by a simple majority vote in both Houses. But when the United States went to war, the seaway plan was shelved to make way for pressing wartime legislation.

But now the St. Lawrence scheme is back in the limelight once more. This time with all governments thinking anxiously about providing full employment in the post-war period, the seaway is being advanced as a vast public works project, which would employ between 50,000 and 100,000 men for a period of from 4 to 6 years.

Transportation costs

Then, of course, there is still the basic argument that the seaway would cheapen transportation costs over a vast area. The commodities most affected would be bulky products with comparatively low value per ton; grain, ore, and coal. There have been widely differing estimates as to the exact savings which would be effected by the seaway route. The most recent study of the economic aspects of the project, carried out by the Office of Foreign Economic Administration, estimates that wheat charges from Duluth to Liverpool by the St. Lawrence seaway would be 5.2 cents per bushel less than rail-water routes now available. This would amount to a difference of $1.74 a ton.

Opponents of the plan point out that the seaway would be closed to navigation during 5 months of every year. And they also contend that the savings to be effected by the scheme would not be commensurate with the high initial cost. In the case of export goods, the savings in transportation costs might actually be passed on to the buyers in the form of lowered prices rather than to the producers on this continent who will bear the cost of the seaway.

Enormous power

But it is possible that the navigation aspect of the scheme may ultimately be of less importance than the power development. The F. E. A. study estimates that "the electricity developed at the International Rapids section from one dam will be as much as the total waterpower development in the Tennessee Valley since 1933, and three times as much as the power developed at Dnieper Dam, the pride of Russia."

Since the treaty of 1932, the St. Lawrence project has been approved by every committee of Congress which has considered it. Canada is prepared to place the matter before Parliament as soon as the United States has taken legislative action. Governor Dewey is so much in favor that he wants the State of New York to proceed with the matter on its own. And the position of Ontario, which would be the Province most affected by the power development, was stated recently by Premier Drew:

"We have indicated our desire to proceed with the development. It constitutes one of the most important projects for this Province, providing in the first place a very considerable amount of employment in the construction, and then providing a large source of new industrial and agricultural development from the power produced."

Drafting of Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the New York Sun of January 9, 1945, by the distinguished columnist, Dave Boone.

I personally have an open mind on the question of drafting nurses, and am awaiting the report of the Military Affairs Committee, which presently has this matter before it. The good, sound common sense of Mr. Boone, however, appeals to me, and I commend his article to the consideration of the Military Affairs Committee:

I think President Roosevelt's appeal to nurses will bring thousands into the services quicker than you can shake a stick, provided he does something to cut the red tape and bureaucratic fumbling that's made it hard for 'em to get in.

I'll take the country's nurses ahead of all other female groups when it comes to sacrifice and response to a mercy call. They ain't holding back. In fact, they're pretty indignant at the pettifogging tactics that have kept thousands out.

They're being rejected for the minor physical defects like warts and freckles, and they can't get in at all, they say, without a high-school diploma. A high-school diploma hasn't much to do with a good, brave nurse.

Gosh, some of the stuff they get in the high schools today are about the last things that would help in caring for the wounded and dying. It takes things to be a nurse that ain't found exclusively in high schools. Florence Nightingale would have been a great nurse, high school or not.

It would be almost as sensible in wartime to bar 'em from nursing if they ain't Frank Sinatra fans, can't do the samba, and never posed in a mink coat for a magazine ad.

On Sabotage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel:

ON SABOTAGE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEWS-SENTINEL:

The word "sabotage" is a very recent addition to the English language, and is of French derivation. It is defined as wanton

destruction of an employer's property; thus, it would seem to be more applicable to destruction or violence occurring during labor troubles or strikes than to other acts; but during World War No. 1, it was used to describe any act that could be construed as obstructive to our military effort. Thus, it could be applied to any act that would be either obstructive or destructive of the rights of any citizen, or unit of government.

Shortly after our involvement in the present war, several Germans were executed for attempted destruction of plants that were essential to our conduct of the war, the object being to accomplish our defeat for lack of material, which would increase our casualties. This was classed as sabotage.

But, since the election, we learn that the conduct of the war has been retarded for lack of supplies, despite the preelection assurance that all military requisitions were being delivered in abundance, and right on time—this, of course, to keep the labor vote in the bag. Just previous to the election, the head medicine man made a speech, in which he minimized the effect of strikes in our war production and, by half-truths, by his failure to state the number of man-hours lost by nonstrikers due to the tie-up of material by a smaller number who were actually on strike, he brought it about that many votes were garnered at the expense of our sons and brothers, many of whom are beginning to wonder what they are fighting for.

Could this, by any chance, be classed as sabotage?

Despite labor's no-strike pledge, we are again confronted with an attempt to sabotage privileges that were guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, of an employer, whose business has no connection with war production, by calling a strike in order to tighten the stranglehold of labor leaders and thugs, under the fraudulent guise of war necessity. And in order to force the hand of the W. L. B. many unions, who are wholly engaged in war production, threatened a support strike, despite the fact that we are told that we are 40 percent behind in our deliveries to the fighting front. Might not this be classed as sabotage?

And the great Atlantic Charter, which was acclaimed as a second Magna Carta, the document that was to guarantee liberty and self-determination to all nations, great or small—coming from the leaders of nations that are classed as democracies—created hope in many small nations that their emancipation was at hand; that they would not become puppet states, or be seized by stronger powers who know not the meaning of democracy. Now the framers of that charter have classified it as being on a par with what was once called campaign oratory.

Would it be sacrilege to suggest that this be classed as sabotage of the hope and faith of those weaker nations?

All prediction being based on the fact that coming events cast a shadow before—recent events prove that those who predicted increased weight of the mailed fist were not false prophets. Reverting to the Montgomery Ward case, and all of the illogical factors involved, the most glaring and preposterous of the whole dirty mess is the idea of aiding the war effort by those who are totally engaged in war production—their threat of betrayal of those on the fighting fronts, with the threat of a support strike for the selfish purpose of forcing a firm who is not engaged in war production to bow to an order of the W. L. B. in the interest of certain employees who are receiving compensation far in excess of those who are doing their fighting and dying, and who would be shot at sunrise for acts less obstructive, and the rendering of less aid to the enemy. And the irony of it is the thought of their brothers in uniform being used to enforce such an order, which, if upheld by the courts, will be but another milepost passed on the road to totalitarianism.

All who reverence our Constitution should rejoice in the knowledge that there is one man—Sewell Avery—who is still possessed of enough of the spirit of '76 to make a legal protest in the courts against the sabotage of constitutional rights; and let us hope and pray that the scales of justice be not balanced on the side of totalitarianism.

E. A. NUTTLE.

Do Justice to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been closely associated with Polish people who are now naturalized American citizens. They are rearing their families in America and by precept and example are teaching their children to become genuine Americans.

I admire the many virtues of these people and realize that they are based on principles that they brought with them across the sea.

Consequently, my sympathies go out to the Poles who still dwell in the mother country, and my hope is that when this war is over and the peace shall be established the principles of the Atlantic Charter may be applied to this people.

Unless the smaller nations, all of them, shall be granted self-determination—shall be permitted to decide for themselves what kind of government they want—the war will not really have been won and the permanent peace which is now the hope of the world may not be realized.

It is my hope that the principles of the Atlantic Charter shall be insisted upon in the final post-war adjustment.

The Neglect of Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky, from the New York Sun of January 8, 1945:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

THE NEGLECT OF PROCESS

Just as a matter of record, I have never been to an American race track in my life. Nor have I bet any money on a horse. It is not a matter of morals with me; just that I prefer other amusements. Nevertheless, I think that the procedures employed in closing the tracks were all wrong. In fact, there were no procedures; no action by Congress; no conference among interested parties; no consideration for close to a quarter of a million Americans who directly or indirectly earn their livings by this industry; no consideration for the States which have been receiving enormous revenues from racing.

I am not criticizing the closing of the race tracks because I do not know whether they should or should not be closed. But I note that British, Canadian, and even Russian tracks continue open and as the British manpower shortage statistically should be greater than ours, I note the fact and try to appraise it. But when I recall that horse racing is a tremendously popular sport among the British, whereas with us the most national of all sports is listening to a crooner on the radio. And as between a crooner and a horse—well, it is a matter of taste.

But to return to procedures, the question constantly obtrudes itself that we are nowadays an extraordinarily disorderly people. Take, for instance, this entire manpower trouble that led to the closing of the race tracks. Bernard Baruch called attention to it before the war started, several times since the war began and about a year ago when he gave the Government a definite program for handling it.

So instead of an orderly consideration of a major problem, the unions proceed as though there were no war, insisting upon all their rights which include such idiocies as Petrillo's hold-up and the persecution of independent unions even in companies with an outstanding war-production record. Suddenly, there are terrible shortages in war materials. General Patton's brilliant advance into Germany is held up for lack of supplies—a lack due to inadequate production on account of improper utilization of manpower. I wrote two articles about this last summer—before the election. But there was an election, and during elections bad things are not discussed by those in power, and for some reason the opposition avoided discussing this question. So, the people believed that our soldiers were getting everything they needed at any time anywhere that they were—which was untrue.

But the facts came upon us. They hit us square in the face. They hit us with a bang. So we closed the race tracks. Exactly what did that solve? What could it solve? That was one of those spur-of-the-moment brain waves, without procedure, without consideration, which sound grand but mean not a single constructive thing. On balance, it is the bunk.

Liberals are always irked by what the conservatives call the due process, which often becomes an addiction to red tape. It is, of course, an impediment to brain storms, to the brilliant improvisations which shock and give hope of something wonderful. But in the end due process saves us from useless motions, vast injustices, and oppressive government.

Really, I cannot get terribly excited about the closing of the race tracks. But I do become worried when I see a respected citizen like Mr. Byrnes, a former United States Senator, a former Supreme Court Justice, act by ukase instead of by some procedure which gives to those who have a stake in the particular industry an opportunity to protect themselves.

Prohibition which crept upon an unnoticing people ceased to be the suppression of the consumption of alcohol; it became the principal moral issue because out of it arose a contempt for government from which we have not altogether recovered. Suppose, for the sake of argument, we admit that every step taken by every agency of government during this war was correct and worthy, we still must insist upon respect for procedure, for the rights of citizens, for an avoidance of anything that even resembles tyranny. Best results can be accomplished by democratic procedures, giving those directly interested an opportunity for just treatment.

Gold and Silver As Money in the Post-war World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including an article written by Mr. Francis H. Brownell, chairman of the board of directors, American Smelting & Refining Co. Mr. Brownell is a distinguished American in his chosen field. This article is very thought provoking and worthy of serious study:

Before considering the future of gold and silver as money it may be helpful to review briefly their history after mankind had generally adopted them as money.

Until after the Napoleonic wars gold and silver at various ratios to each other (usually 15, 15½, or 16 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold) were used as money by all important nations. But the prices of both gold and silver were constantly varying with supply and demand. Hence, they were also constantly varying with each other in ratio as the market of either metal changed. Credit could not be granted with the option of paying in either metal at the existing legal ratio without probable loss to the creditor and gain to the debtor, since the latter would pay in the cheaper metal. Even if the debt were specified as payable in one metal—for example, gold—the situation was not much improved, for gold might be and often was of a different value at the time of maturity of the debt than it was at the time the debt was incurred. If the price of gold had advanced when the debt became due, the lender made an unbargained-for gain, with corresponding loss to the debtor. If the price fell, the creditor made a loss and the debtor a corresponding gain.

When England, after final victory in the Napoleonic wars, came to reorganize its monetary system, it decided to try to avoid the evils of a money varying with supply and demand as both gold and silver had previously varied. Its statesmen realized that the most important function of money is that of being a permanent standard or measure of value of all other goods and services. If gold and silver, either or both, are used as money, their value in themselves, i. e., their market price, must not change, as otherwise they become a variable measure of value of other commodities. This fact had not been realized in any previous monetary system. But England realized it and in order to provide an unvarying standard, decided to try to peg the price of gold. It chose gold because it happened at the time to have more gold (in value) than it had silver and because gold, having greater value in the same weight, is better adapted to international trade. Accordingly England made its unit coin consist of a specified number of grains of gold and then fixed or pegged the price of gold by directing the Bank of England to purchase all gold on offer in unlimited quantities at £3 17s. 9d. per standard ounce, and to sell all gold on demand in unlimited quantities at the same price, plus a small handling charge of 1½d., about 3 cents in United States money. This price of gold pegged by England was equivalent, in United States money to $20.67 per fine ounce, delivered at United States mint.

The price of gold was thus effectively pegged and it remained constant, notwithstanding wide fluctuations and large increases in the supply of gold from time to time, as the great gold fields of California, Australia, South Africa, Alaska, and Canada were successively discovered. The annual production of gold increased over 50 times, from less than 400,000 ounces in 1816 to over 21,000,000 ounces in 1914, when the First World War broke out. But the price never changed. As a standard measure of value, the result was all that could be desired. The effect was magical. It made London the banking center of the world and contributed very largely to the commercial and banking supremacy which England achieved during the nineteenth century. The beneficial effects were so pronounced that ultimately it led the newly created German Empire to adopt gold monometallism after the Franco-Prussian War of the early 1870's, and Germany's action soon compelled other nations to do the same. Even the United States abandoned in 1873 the free coinage of both gold and silver at a fixed ratio.

For the remainder of the nineteenth century and until the First World War, a period of about 50 years, the gold standard, with a pegged price for gold, reigned supreme.

But the price of siver was never pegged as was the price of gold. So far as silver was used as money, it continued to be an unstable standard, varying in price from time to time with changes in its supply and demand. No wonder that silver lost its prestige and came to be regarded as too changeable in price to be used as money. As gold was sufficient in quantity at that time, there was no incentive to peg the price of silver as gold was pegged, and so the use of silver as money was gradually lessened, almost abandoned except as subsidiary coinage.

The First World War threw Great Britain and many other participating nations off gold temporarily. At its conclusion there was no hesitation on the part of all these nations in desiring to return to the use of gold. In Central Europe, particularly in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, there was a demand for new silver coinage because of people's loss of confidence in paper money. No money was considered trustworthy unless adequately backed by gold or silver, or both.

England went back to gold in 1926, but notwithstanding gallant attempts to stay upon the gold standard, she was forced to abandon it in 1931, and her example was shortly followed by other European nations. In 1933, even the United States went off gold and in 1934, stopped all new gold coinage, withdrew all gold then in circulation and made it a penal offense for any individual, including corporations, to own more than $100 worth of gold except that specifically allowed in process of mining and fabricating or held in fabricated form, such as jewelry. In the same year, the United States raised the price of gold to the $35-per-ounce level, but did not adopt measures to peg or stabilize it at that figure, since it would not sell freely at that price.

Today there is no nation on the gold standard in any actual true sense, nor has there been for 10 years or so.

The breakdown of the gold standard is complete. And it was not caused by the present World War. It happened before that war began—several years before. The physical insufficiency of gold was the main cause.

After the breakdown of the gold standard, Great Britain went to a "managed currency" system. It sought, through stabilization agreements with many countries, to substitute the English pound in place of gold over as wide a world area as possible, often referred to as "Sterlingaria." Other countries were forced to develop national bargaining in the exchange of commodities, a quota system or various other substitutes, all of which proved to be inadequate to carry on international trade at anything like its former volume. When the United States raised the price of gold to $35 per ounce in 1934, much of the European gold came to the United States in payment of its balance of trade. In short, the world monetary condition between 1931 and the outbreak of the present World War was one of great uncertainty and confusion.

The experience with overissues of paper money in the First World War was relatively small as compared with the overissues and the monetary chaos that will exist at the end of the present war.

Let us now briefly survey the monetary situation of various nations at the close of the present war since the future monetary use of gold and silver will be largely dependent thereon.

First, Great Britain: One would naturally expect that, as the first to peg the price of gold and so to originate the single gold standard, to her own great benefit, Great Britain today would be, as it was after the last war, the leading advocate of a return to the former gold standard. No definite policy has been announced as yet, but the statements of some of her leading economists and statesmen, and action so far taken, all seem to indicate a future monetary system which controls the external value of the pound in accordance with its internal value. Such a managed monetary system probably will, but may not, utilize gold. Just how gold would be used is not yet disclosed. But it would seem that in carrying out the main purpose of maintaining control over the external value of the pound, one of the two following alternatives would necessarily result in use of gold:

1. If the price of gold is not pegged by the United States, Great Britain must act as if the price of gold is not pegged but a flexible market price substituted. This, in effect, would be to return gold to its status prior to the Napoleonic wars. It no longer would be a fixed, constant measure of other commodities. Its price would again vary with supply and demand. It no longer would be an invariable yardstick of values. Or—

2. If the price of gold is pegged (by the United States, with or without other nations, including England), the number of grains of gold in the monetary unit will not be a definite quantity, but either (a) will be changeable to the extent necessary to keep the external value of the pound the same as its internal value, or (b) the pound and sovereign will not be tied to gold at all, but gold might be accepted in international exchanges as the equivalent (at its pegged price) of the pound at it changeable values.

It seems highly improbable that Great Britain actually desires that the use of gold as money be ended. The British Empire produces over 60 percent of the newly mined gold of the world, excluding Russia, from which we have no figures. Of the British production, the three Dominions—South Africa, Canada, and Australia—produce nearly half of the total production of the world. South Africa alone supplies over one-third of the new annual world production, excluding Russia. Great Britain itself produces no gold.

But however much Great Britain might like to favor the interest of its three large dominions, she dare not endanger her own economic situation in order to help Empire gold production. We must remember that Great Britain had a bitter lesson in attempting to return to the gold standard after the First World War. She was unable to remain on gold and she is now much less able to return to that standard because of the greatly increased exhaustion of her wealth caused by the present World War. The nation's indebtedness owed at home has more than doubled. She was compelled to block Erg-

lish sterling and so now owes other nations, including India, several billion pounds, estimated to equal about $12,000,000,000. The stocks and bonds owned by her nationals in foreign companies have been commandeered and sold to purchase war munitions. During this war, her foreign trade and foreign banking have been practically lost. Looking to the future, Great Britain's chief aim must be not only to regain, but greatly increase, the export position she formerly held and also to regain her former position in shipping and in world banking. She has not sufficient gold (or ability to get it) to enable her to return to the gold standard unless the United States helps. So Great Britain plans returning to the monetary policy followed between 1931 and the beginning of this war, viz, to tie to the English pound (which is not convertible into gold) the currencies of the rest of the Empire and of as many other nations as possible, particularly those of western Europe—France, Belgium, Holland, the Scandinavian countries, Portugal, Spain, etc. This will naturally be followed by tariff agreements. The following account in the Wall Street Journal of October 6, 1944, describes the plan.

"LONDON.—Sir John Anderson, Chancelor of the Exchequer, has announced that he has signed, on behalf of the government, an Anglo-Belgian financial agreement, soon to be followed by a similar Anglo-Dutch agreement. This announcement is taken here as marking the first stage of a prospective western European system of monetary cooperation intended to stabilize exchanges and facilitate reciprocal trade.

"It is expected that France, Norway, and Denmark will arrive at similar agreements with Great Britain as well as with each other, thus completing the western European financial link-up.

"Complementary tariff agreements have not yet been formally discussed, perhaps because a resumption of trade, except on a most limited scale, will be impossible for many months to come. But it is reasonable to interpret the completed or prospective monetary agreements as preparing the way for them.

"The Anglo-Belgian agreement follows closely the lines of the recent Belgo-Dutch arrangements, the avowed object of which was to facilitate commercial exchange under a free trade or at best a low tariff. The first step has already been taken in waiving all duties on reconstruction goods exchanged between the two latter countries."

Russia: Owing to her form of government, Russia's position is radically different from that of other nations. Little, almost no, Russian money has been allowed to go outside the boundaries of Russia. Her foreign trade is carried on by the Government itself, which ultimately owns all of the commodities produced in Russia. She can sell those commodities in whatever country best enables her to acquire the products she needs. Hence, Russia will probably take relatively little interest in the settlement of the money question, except that she will be anxious to have gold retain its value because of her own mine production, which probably will not be used as money at home but in settling any adverse balances of trade abroad.

Continental Europe: It is quite certain that present German paper money will be worthless. The nations under the Russian sphere of influence—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia—have seen their paper moneys also become practically worthless. Probably an utter distrust of inconvertible paper money and a desire for gold and silver will force the use of as much gold and silver as can be obtained. These countries are less likely to tie their currencies to the English pound than are the other countries of Europe.

Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, Greece, Italy, Spain, and Portugal will be very likely to tie to the English pound and go on a managed-currency system, until at least the United States makes known its own definite policy. After their bitter lessons in paper moneys, these countries would prefer a gold and silver base for their currencies; but if they cannot get an adequate amount of either metal, it will be impossible for them to do otherwise than go to a managed-currency system.

Asia: Japan has been issuing the paper money necessary to carry on the war. It, like that of Germany, probably will be utterly worthless when the war is over.

China has financed its war on paper money. Its issue is so vast that a new currency will have to be established. An article in the New York Herald Tribune of October 29, 1944, says:

"The flood of paper money has created a physical problem. Businessmen in some sections hire coolies to carry the bulging bags of legal tender as they go about keeping appointments. Shoppers tuck loads of it under their arms as they go to market."

India: The people of India, as in the First World War, are demanding silver. Both gold and silver are selling at a premium in India. The great mass of her people has always required silver, and it is quite probable that in the relations that will exist between England and India after the war the needs and desire of the Indian people for a greater use of silver and for the stabilization of its price will be met.

United States: The United States owns nearly 60 percent of the world's monetary gold and over half of its monetary silver. It is a large mine producer of both metals. Obviously, its interests will be furthered by the retention of both gold and silver as money in the future world. Private ownership of gold except in fabricated form is now not allowed. Government-owned gold is not sold except under severe restrictions, and then only to other governments or their central banks. While the United States buys all gold that may be offered at $35 per ounce, it makes no effort to peg the price of gold, since it will not freely sell it at the same price or, for that matter, at all except under very limited restrictions. Gold is now selling at the equivalent of over $35 per ounce in many nations.

How far the other nations of the world can resume the monetary use of gold and silver after the war will depend upon the action of the United States. It is impossible for them to go back to a gold standard when owning only about one-third of the total monetary gold of the world, while the remaining two-thirds are held locked up in the United States. This is a most important fact not generally realized. And in the case of silver, while one-half of the monetary silver is held in the United States, it is difficult to see how the world can return to silver to the extent many of its people will desire. It seems certain that if the United States wishes gold and silver to continue to be used as money, it must find some way in which its excess gold and silver can be utilized by the remaining nations of the world. How can this be done?

The former gold standard broke down several years prior to the beginning of the present war, mainly because of the physical insufficiency of gold to meet the demands of the enlarged volume of world trade. Also, what gold there was became concentrated too much in one nation—the United States.

But the physical insufficiency of gold can be met by fixing or pegging not only the price of gold but also that of silver, so that the price of both metals would be pegged just as the price of gold was pegged in the days of the supremacy of the gold standard. The value of silver, thus stabilized, would be, in effect, an addition to the supply of gold Such a system is just as workable as is the single gold standard and under existing conditions far more advantageous. It in no way impairs or diminshes the full use of gold. On the contrary, it continues to use all gold as much as under the single gold standard, and so retains every advantage of the gold standard, plus the additional advantage of curing its physical scarcity.

Under such conditions, either gold or silver, or both, could be used as best fitted the necessities of each individual and each nation. Each metal would be a standard measure of value. Each would have a constant, fixed, pegged price. Any fluctuation in the market price of both metals would become impossible, regardless of increases or decreases in their production. Gresham's Law would have no chance to operate, because the prices of both metals could not move out of line, either with the mintage ratio or the ratio of each to the other. The world would then have the equivalent of a larger supply of gold and the added benefits of a monetary metal with the traditions of thousands of years behind it, one which is more widely distributed than gold today, and one which seems to be necessary to satisfy the monetary needs of much the larger part of the world's population in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and parts of central Europe. These people would like to use silver as the chief medium of exchange. They have few or no banks and could not use them if they had, because their transactions are too small. Paper money cannot meet their requirements, not only because they have no confidence in it, but also because it is subject to loss by fire, perspiration, disintegration in a warm, moist climate, etc. Coins of the equivalent of from 10 to 50 cents and having that intrinsic value are necessary, and silver is and always has been best suited for such needs, since gold coins of such values would be too small for use. Unless such coins have a fixed, constant value, confidence in them becomes impaired, a condition which, as we have seen, greatly lessened the use of silver as money.

Some way should be found under which Great Britain and the United States will agree upon the use of gold and silver, fixing and pegging the price of each. The United States can well afford to make the necessary loans of gold and silver to bring this about. It would be calamitous for these two great nations to engage in a serious and prolonged battle over monetary systems.

But if Great Britain and the United States fail to agree upon a monetary plan, what then? Obviously, the United States cannot afford to see the use of gold and silver abandoned. She must fight for their retention. The United States alone should undertake to fix and peg the price of both gold and silver. For nearly 10 years she has pegged the minimum price of both gold and silver, and during that time bought an amount equal to the total new production of each metal and, in addition, much of the previously mined supply of both. The United States has actually demonstrated its ability to peg the price of both metals at the same time. Should the United States adopt the system of pegging the price of both gold and silver, it would have the best currency in the world. It should then freely coin and circulate its redundant gold and silver. Latin America, Asiatic nations, most of those nations whose currency has been ruined by the present war, would much prefer to tie to such a money rather than tie to a "managed currency" system of England, assuming England does not join in the plan. In short, the then money of the United States would give it the same advantage that the action of England, in pegging the price of gold after the Napoleonic wars, gave to it. The United States would become the financial and banking center of the world, for, like England in the nineteenth century, it would become the world clearing house because of being the nation having the best and most stable money in the world.

All other nations would want to avail themselves of that money.

In concluding, I venture the opinion that, however much the statesmen and leaders of nations harassed by debt, shortage of gold and silver, and overissues of paper money may wish to work out some system of "managed currency," such currency will not command the confidence of the people, as would gold and silver. The fundamental demand of the overwhelming majority of mankind, based upon its age-long experience, accented, even multiplied, by that of the two World Wars of this century, ultimately will compel again the use of both gold and silver. Paper money will continue to be used, but tied to gold and silver and convertible thereto. This cannot be done so long as the United States locks up nearly two-thirds of the world's gold and one-half of its silver. Our country now has the opportunity to win both commercial stability and international leadership by establishing the soundest monetary system the world has known.

Wages Should Meet the Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD a resolution relative to wage adjustments, passed by the council of the city of New York on December 21, 1944.

War-production workers in New York City are doing an extraordinary job of meeting the needs of our armed forces for war materials. Most of the war plants in New York City are small establishments employing less than 1,000 workers. These firms, for the most part, do not pay adequate wage rates and have, therefore, experienced difficulty in obtaining a sufficient number of skilled workers. In one instance that has come to my attention, the Army has released 50 skilled workers to a plant on furlough so that war-production schedules may be met.

It is well known that the cost of living in New York City has made it very difficult for workers whose wages have been frozen at 15 percent above the levels of January 1, 1941, to support their families, maintain an adequate diet, buy necessary clothing, and pay the rent. Surveys indicate that the cost of living is now 45 percent above the levels of January 1941. Although some official figures have indicated a smaller rise in the cost of living, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the source of all estimates of the cost of living, has admitted that "the index does not show the full wartime effect on the cost of living of such factors as lowered quality, disappearance of low-priced goods, forced changes in housing, and eating away from home. It does not measure changes in total living costs—that is, in the total amount families spend for living. Income taxes and bond subscriptions are not included."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that the Government carry out the intent of the price-control law of October 1942, which was supposed to stabilize prices, wages, and salaries. Reduction of working hours, elimination of overtime pay and wartime bonuses will cut workers' take-home by at least 33 percent in the reconversion period. Coupled with the workers' present inability to meet current cost of living with their wages frozen, this situation can result in a loss of purchasing power that may paralyze our economic system.

The only practical remedy, as the council of the City of New York, has pointed out in its resolution, is to permit wages to advance sufficiently to meet the present cost of living.

The resolution follows:

Whereas wage earners engaged in the production of front-line war materials, principally steel, planes, tanks, machines, and electrical and radio instruments, have petitioned the National War Labor Board for an increase in wages to meet the increased cost of living; and

Whereas these wage earners have achieved unprecedented records of production for our victorious armed forces by personal sacrifice and by scrupulously living up to the no-strike policy in the interests of a United Nations victory; and

Whereas the compensation of wage earners in other fields has also lagged considerably behind the increase in the cost of living; and

Whereas the rise in the cost of living has been seriously felt by our workers in the city of New York; and

Whereas without a wage rate adjustment, the reduced buying power of these wage earners will affect their welfare and the welfare of their families; and

Whereas it must also be recognized that it is vital for the welfare of all in this country that further inflation be prevented: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of New York does record itself as favoring the application of the aforesaid workers for a wage adjustment to meet increased living costs now pending before the National War Labor Board to the fullest extent that such increase can be granted without inducing a further rise in the cost of living and stimulating the menace of inflation; and be it further

Resolved, That the view of this council be conveyed to the Members of Congress from the city of New York, to the National War Labor Board, and to the President of the United States.

Adopted December 12, 1944.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

"John Banker" Says—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, and, as a matter of fact, for the past 2 or 3 years, there has been a considerable discussion throughout the country with respect to 100-percent-reserve plan in connection with the operation of our commercial banks.

Recently an important official in the banking world made some observations which are pertinent, and which should be considered at this time in connection with the Government's fiscal policy, the placing of such fantastic sums of Treasury issues in the portfolios of the commercial banks, the enormous earnings which banks are now receiving as a result of their investment in Government issues; and altogether these matters should be borne in mind in view of the discussions and charges and comments which will be made pertaining to bank earnings and bank legislation immediately in the post-war period.

The Washington News Bureau, under the management of Mr. U. V. Wilcox, editor, calls the following to our attention:

"JOHN BANKER" SAYS—

(The following is from an official within the banking world. He is observant, analytical. His views are sincere. He has asked that he remain anonymous.)

LITTLE BANKS SAVE THE BIG BANKS?

WASHINGTON.—I have become confused in my own mind about the meaning of the 100-percent-reserve plan. Does the 100-percent-reserve plan mean that all of the banks must carry all of their reserves with the Federal Reserve banks or does it mean that the banks must carry a 100 percent reserve on all demand deposits? Or, does it mean something else?

Here is the big thing that is worrying me: The banks are full of Government bonds. The banks have purchased these bonds in an effort to help the Government finance the war. At the same time, the big banks are making a tremendous profit out of Government bonds. The big banks are making these profits largely by using the balances of the country banks by investing these balances in Government bonds.

Too many big banks have made too much money speculating in Government bonds during the last decade.

Here is what I am afraid of. After the war there will be a certain bloc of Senators and Representatives urged on by certain demagogues who will make an investigation of this affair. They will examine into the profit the big banks made out of the speculation of Government bonds. They will examine into the profit the big banks have made during the war. There will be a hue and cry go up—"Why pay the banks the interest on the national debt? Why not save this for the taxpayers?"

There will be some advocates for the nationalization of banking and it will be a beautiful time to do it because the banks will be full of Government bonds. One of the first things that will happen will be to pass a law forcing all banks to carry all their reserves with the Federal Reserve rather than with city correspondent banks. I think with this concentration of reserve in the Federal Reserve banks, it will permit the Federal Reserve banks to purchase and hold the vast volume of Government bonds. Then the Government will purchase the Federal Reserve banks from the private banks and redeem the stock to the member banks of the Reserve System. Then the profit on the Government bonds now held by the banks will go to the Federal Government itself.

The big banks will be used as the whipping post. And, in many ways the big banks are vulnerable.

There is only one thing that can save this. The little bank, the country bank, the small independent banks may be able to save the banking business from Federal nationalization because the little banks have a lot more political potency than do the big banks. If ever the big banks will need a friend that friend will be the little banks when this show-down comes.

But too many of the big banks are blind to what may happen to them after the war. Too many of the big banks are interested in the small banks for only one reason—that is the business the big bank receives from the little bank. As far as being sincerely helpful and trying to fight the little bank's battles, the big banks show only an apathetic interest.

Somebody should begin to call this to the attention of the big banks.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on January 14, 1945:

FLYING BOMBS ADD ARGUMENT FOR SEAWAY TO OPEN MIDWEST—PROPONENTS OF DEEP WATERWAY TO ATLANTIC POINT OUT THAT SUCCESS IN NEXT WAR MAY DEPEND ON EASIER ACCESS TO ARMS AND FOOD PRODUCED IN AREAS BORDERING GREAT LAKES

(By Lloyd Gladfelter)

National security has added a new and urgent emphasis to the demands of half the Nation's people for the St. Lawrence seaway and power development. No longer must the Congress consider only the appeals of the Middle West for a deep waterway over which to send its industrial and agricultural products to the world. No longer is it a case of cheap electric power for New England, New York, and parts of Pennsylvania. The new Congress may well decide the fate of the Nation when it votes this year on the seaway and power development.

Recent statements by responsible Army and Navy bigwigs, warning that robot bombs may soon strike at seaboard cities and their teeming war industries, has placed in proper focus the strategic value and comparative safety of the Middle West. Few believe that buzz bombs will rain on New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington, D. C., tomorrow or next week, though that is possible, as London found out. Men wise to the ways of war are now thinking of what may happen in the next war.

They have seen the Middle West produce all of the sinews of war. They have witnessed the phenomenal production of agriculture to feed not only the American people and their Army and Navy, but multitudes of other peoples; they have watched the industrial cities of the Great Lakes region produce mountains of tanks, guns, planes, engines, ships and parts for every weapon of warfare. The prodigious productivity of the people in these States has never before been so clearly proved.

POWER AND TRANSPORTATION

They also have seen railroads staggering under the demands of war when those systems could easily have been supplemented by quick, efficient, and cheap water transportation—if the St. Lawrence seaway were completed.

"What," ask the advocates of the seaway and power development, "might not power-starved New England and New York have produced more quickly to help the war effort, if they had had access to the 2,200,000 horsepower which dams in the rapids of the St. Lawrence are capable of generating?" "Why," they also ask, "is the greatest single untapped power source in the world kept unharnessed?"

Already Representative PITTENGER (Republican, Minnesota) has introduced one bill in the House authorizing that the United States and Canadian Governments carry out the enterprise jointly. Another soon will be introduced by Senator AIKEN (Republican, Vermont), for years a leader in the fight. Whether Congress finally will be asked to pass upon the project as a treaty which would require a two-thirds vote of the Senate, or as an executive agreement, upon which a majority of both Houses would decide the issue, has not yet been determined.

KILLED IN DECEMBER

Late in December the Senate voted for the second time in the last 25 years on the seaway proposal. It killed AIKEN'S maneuver to attach the seaway and power development plan to the rivers and harbors bill by a vote of 56 to 25, largely because of the Senate's jealousy over its power to approve or reject treaties. Many Senators have assured Senator AIKEN that they will support the seaway if it is submitted as a treaty. In 1934 the Senate voted, 46 to 42, for a seaway treaty, but the accord failed because a two-thirds vote was not obtained.

For nearly a century the Middle West has had a direct access by water to the sea through canals and locks of limited dimensions. The smallest locks are those in the International and Lachine Rapids sections of the St. Lawrence. They accommodate ships less than 260 feet long, 44-foot beam, and 14-foot draft. These dimensions limit the size of the ships that can enter the Lakes from the sea to approximately 1,500 tons. Others of larger rated tonnage can get through with light cargoes.

Everywhere else in the Lakes, their connecting rivers and in the St. Lawrence River, ocean-going vessels drawing 25 feet can navigate. The bottleneck is the Lachine-International Rapids sections. It is there that the United States and Canada would spend $543,000,000 to build wider and deeper canals, larger locks for navigation, and power dams to benefit the Northeastern States, New England, and Canada. The cost to the United States would be $272,000,000, that of Canada $271,000,000. But Uncle Sam's bill would be reduced by a $93,000,000 contribution from the New York Power Authority, created by the late Gov. Alfred Smith, which would take control of electric generation and distribution in the United States. Canada would share equally in the power developed.

NEW LOCKS AT SOO

Wisconsin and middle western seaway advocates point out that with the new locks at Lachine and International Rapids 859 feet long, 80 feet wide, and 27 feet deep, 92 percent of the shipping of the world could reach Great Lakes ports. The Welland Canal, completed in 1932 by the Canadian Government at a cost of $128,000,000, lifts and lowers ships across the Niagara escarpment between Lakes Erie and Ontario, a height of 327 feet, in its locks. These have approximately the same dimensions as the ones proposed at Lachine and International Rapids.

They also point to the huge new MacArthur Lock built at Sault Ste. Marie by the Army 2 years ago to help wartime delivery of iron ore from Minnesota to the steel mills in the East as the largest in the world perhaps with the exception of the new ones at Panama. In its 1,300- by 80-foot bosom the MacArthur Lock can lift or lower simultaneously two of the newest type of 18,600-ton ore carriers.

Of the 2,687 miles of waterway from Duluth to the Atlantic, only 258 miles remain to be widened and deepened to carry large ocean-going ships. Rivers connecting the lakes, harbors, and the St. Lawrence River have been dredged to such a depth that they are ready now to accept their roles in the seaway scheme.

PORT DIRECTOR'S VIEWS

Harry C. Brockel, Milwaukee's port director and one of the leaders in the seaway fight, had this to say on the national-security issue:

"The midcontinent will be relatively safer than the seaboard in any future war when enemy planes, enemy fleets, or enemy robot bombs may be expected to attack our coasts. Because of the sheltered position which the Great Lakes area enjoys, the Government must plan to locate vital industries, arsenals, and shipyards in this region."

Since the United States entered the war, Brockel said, it has built 50,000,000 tons of shipping, only 1,000,0000 tons of which was turned out in Great Lakes yards.

"The Great Lakes has the greatest concentration of steel manufacturing and the greatest reservoir of skilled workmen in the world," Brockel points out. "Our industries now build all parts used on a ship and send them by rail to coast yards. Our shipyards could build anything up to and including 10,000-ton cruisers—if we had the seaway. We have built submarines successfully at Manitowoc, escort vessels and seagoing tugs in Milwaukee and other Wisconsin yards, and many other types of vessels.

"What do we do with them? Give them their sea trials on the Lakes, take them to Chicago, where their superstructures are removed and their masts taken down. Then they are floated down the Illinois waterway to New Orleans, where they are reassembled again. The extra work of tearing apart and reassembling costs $100,000 per vessel. If we had the waterway, our Lakes-built ships could proceed to the Atlantic fully equipped and ready for service—or action, as the case might be."

SAFER ROUTE TO EUROPE

One-third of the hazardous and frequently submarine infested Atlantic crossing could be eliminated, also, he added, by assembling convoys in the Lakes or the protected headwaters of the St. Lawrence. The distance from New York to Liverpool, he said, is 3,219 nautical miles as compared with 2,647 from Quebec, far from the open sea.

Another argument also was advanced by Brockel: That during this war the Nation has depleted its sources of essential high-grade raw materials—iron, petroleum, and lumber. In another future war, it may be necessary to bring these and other raw materials from Russia, Sweden, Brazil, Cuba, and Chile. Why not have the seaway ready so they can be carried in large volumes to the protected Middle Western industries which will need them? he asks.

FOREIGN LINES PLIED LAKES

Records show that in the 6 years before the outbreak of war in Europe, Milwaukee and other Great Lakes ports experienced a revival in direct water-borne trade with western European ports. The Fjell line, a Norwegian company, built eight new vessels exclusively for the Great Lakes trade. In 1939, just before hostilities opened, Fjell was joined by a Dutch company, the Oranje line, which gave it competition with three new ships, especially designed for freight and passenger service into the Lakes.

Through 1940 the Fjell and Oranje lines operated between England and Lakes ports, but with the fall of France, the invasion of Holland and Norway, the British and Dutch placed all of them in essential ocean service. Several have been reported sunk.

These vessels carried wood pulp, cod liver oil, canned fish, Scotch whisky, tool steels, tools, chemicals, special machine parts and other commodities, and carried back grain, foodstuffs, tractors, farm machinery, refrigerators, automobiles, drugs, and motorcycles; all products of the Middle West.

SAVING IN COST SHOWN IN SHIPPING BY WATER

Direct service from the Lakes to Europe offers a shipping economy which combined rail-and-water service do not. In a recent Senate statement, Senator FERGUSON (Republican, Michigan) reported that grain shipped from Duluth direct to Liverpool would save $1.74 a ton. This saving, he argued, would be passed on as a bonus to the American farmer and would not depress the price of wheat. Other commodities, with different rates, would enjoy commensurate shipping benefits as compared with combined rail haul to the eastern seaboard and thence by water to Europe and elsewhere.

"The opponents of the seaway are trying to nullify one of the immutable laws of transportation: That shipping will always penetrate to the head of navigation, wherever it is, without transshipping cargoes," one seaway champion said recently. "Our head of navigation for oceangoing ships is the upper end of the lakes, but most of them can't get there because of the lack of a deep channel."

Brockel said study of rate schedules proves that direct service from Europe to Milwaukee costs only 10 percent more than the rate charged by Atlantic vessels carrying cargoes to the eastern seaboard. Swedish wood pulp was brought to Milwaukee and Wisconsin paper manufacturers at a cost of $6.50 a ton, which is less than the rail rate from the Atlantic seaports to Milwaukee and the Fox River Valley mills.

FACTS TOLD IN RATE FIGHT

In the fight which Great Lakes ports waged successfully to destroy the exclusive patronage contracts which north Atlantic shipping conferences forced upon midwestern shippers up to 1939, M. I. Adams, traffic manager for the Cutler-Hammer Co., testified that the Milwaukee firm could lay down a shipment of insulating material in England by using direct service, in competition with manufacturers located along the Atlantic.

Similar testimony was given before the United States Maritime Commission by representatives of other midwestern firms. After hearing many witnesses, the Commission held the contracts were coercive and invalidated them. No longer were middlewestern shippers required to ship all their products for foreign consignment by rail and water to obtain a preferential rate.

Seaway advocates do not overlook employment and business opportunities which the deep waterway will bring to the Great Lakes region. It will, they are convinced, produce new avenues for labor, with increased water front, trucking, and rail activity; broaden the horizon for customs brokers, freight forwarders, and even banks.

"In Milwaukee I look for the creation of several thousands of new jobs," Brockel predicted.

FLIGHT OF POPULATION

The seaway also would halt the ominous flight of population from the Middle West to the South, East, and Pacific areas, it is argued. Little attention has yet been paid to the United States Bureau of Census report for 1943 which showed that 20 of the 23 States tributary to the Great Lakes had lost population since 1940. The heaviest sufferer was North Dakota, with a decline of 15.5 percent. Wisconsin lost 4.1 percent in 3 years.

An economy with a definite downtrend in population is a sick economy and needs strong medicine to restore it, seaway enthusiasts claim. Only by creating greater business and industrial activity can that be achieved and the best "shot in the arm" would be the deep waterway, they claim.

The fight for the St. Lawrence project was likened to that for the Panama Canal many years ago. Railroads bucked the short cut, all-water route to the Pacific on the ground that it would ruin their business and reduce employment. Quite to the contrary the Panama Canal brought a boom to the Pacific coast and now the rails are hauling more tonnage than they ever did before the Canal was built, because of increased populations and expanding industries.

RAIL AND COAL OPPOSITION

Eastern trunk railroads, along with certain eastern public utilities, eastern and Gulf seaports, and coal-mine owners constitute the bulk of seaway opposition. They lobby diligently against every bill.

The railroads argue that the seaway would cut their tonnages, drain their revenues. Seaway adherents predict greater business for the rails, citing the experience of Panama, followed by lower rates, benefiting the public.

Coal operators and miners contend the hydroelectric development will displace coal, hurt their business, and lessen employment. Advocates of the seaway reply that whereas the T. V. A. area used only 540,000 tons of coal a year before the Tennessee hydroelectric dams were built, industrial activity increased afterward to such an extent that industry in the same area now is using 1,891,000 tons. Growing industrial activity, they contend, always means increased consumption of coal.

Southern and eastern ports fear diversion of traffic to Great Lakes harbors. While they may lose a small percentage of their foreign trade, most or all of that loss would be offset by gains in coastwise traffic out of the Lakes, waterway experts only.

POWER AT LOW COST

In reply to the utilities, they say that St. Lawrence water power can be generated and distributed for half the cost of steam power. The New York Power Authority in a recent survey estimated that consumers would save $25,000,000 a year.

The stand of the utilities was blasted by Senator LA FOLLETTE in the December seaway debate. He charged that a syndicate of eastern utilities, after studying the potentialities of the St. Lawrence for water power, offered to build all the dams, install the generating equipment, and build all the canals and locks if they were permitted to take the electric energy. Al Smith created the New York Power Authority to save a great resource for the people, LA FOLLETTE declared.

SEAWAY IDEA DATES BACK TO FRENCH EXPLORERS

When Jacques Cartier, the French explorer, sailed up the Gulf of St. Lawrence in 1534 and again in 1536 to claim the great wilderness of Canada for King Francis I, of France, he unwittingly forged the first link in the chain of events which led to the bitter fight to win for the entire Middle West, tributary to the Great Lakes, a deep-water outlet to the sea.

Cartier never saw more than the fringes of the great land which he placed under the French flag. Indeed, he believed he had reached China; hence he named one of the series of rapids Lachine. In Cartier's footsteps followed a great line of French explorers and colonizers—Champlain, Radisson. Pere Marquette, and Joliet, who landed on the shores of Green Bay in 1634, and La Salle. These men took title in the name of France to most of the North American Continent.

They early foresaw the need for a direct water route from the sea to the vast inland empire. At their suggestion the French Government, with primitive tools 300 years ago, built the first system of canals around Lachine and International Rapids. They were only 2 feet deep, not even equal to the average millstream. They were designed to carry the bateaux of the adventurous French voyageurs around the Rapids barrier.

But the idea was there. The French subsequently lost all of Canada to England by the treaty of Paris in 1763. The English soon recognized the waterway need by deepening and widening the canals and expanding the locks.

Milwaukee was only 8 years old when the first cargoes of Wisconsin hides and grain were shipped in sailing vessels direct to Liverpool. That was in 1856. Four years later 40 vessels left Milwaukee with grain, lumber, barrel staves, hides, and food products for European ports. The trade continued active until the seventies and then fell off because a lusty competitor, the railroads, improved their service.

The direct services to Europe revived again after World War No. 1, when the Scandinavian nations sought new markets and began to infiltrate to the Lakes regions. The British soon followed.

The Great Lakes are in the major leagues when water-borne commerce records are compared. In 1944 the commerce they carried in all types of bottoms exceeded 200,000,000 tons, with an estimated value of at least $3,000,000,000.

SOO OUTDOES PANAMA

The Soo locks alone handle more than 80,000,000 tons a year, mostly ore and grain. But that record puts it in the No. 1 place for all canals in the world. In fact, the Soo handles more traffic in an average year than Panama, Suez, Kiel, Manchester, Welland, and the New York State barge canal combined.

Milwaukee has a big stake in the future seaway. The Federal Government has invested $7,500,000 for a breakwater and other harbor improvements; the city, through its harbor commission, has spent another $7,500,000 in developing port works on Jones Island and in purchase of the old Illinois Steel Co. site. Private docks and shipping interests have another $30,000,000 worth of facilities.

Direct services between Europe and our own coasts would bring a shipping boom that would break the 8,000,000-ton record of 1914 for the entire port. It would benefit industry and the average citizen by lower costs of foreign and many domestic products. It would create new markets for Milwaukee industry and Wisconsin farmers. The same benefits would be spread throughout the entire Plains area from the Rockies to the Alleghenies and in the upper Mississippi Valley. What helps the Middle West helps the Nation.

Union Condemns Bioff-Browne Release

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in support of my original insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6 regarding the release of the thugs and panderers, Willie Bioff and George Browne, I am inserting as part of my remarks a letter received today from Harold V. Smith, business representative of the International Sound Technicians, together with a copy of two resolutions.

The Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, and the Department of Justice, who have become parties to this nefarious release, should hang their heads in shame. Truly, the Department of Justice of the United States has reached a new low. No amount of excuses can correct the record that has been made in this case. The people of the United States are the

sole judges as to whether or not a deal was made in this matter.

The letter and resolutions:

INTERNATIONAL SOUND TECHNICIANS OF THE MOTION PICTURE, BROADCAST, AND AMUSEMENT INDUSTRIES, LOCAL 695,
Hollywood, Calif., January 13, 1945.

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

YOUR HONOR: Attached hereto find copies of resolutions adopted unanimously by the general membership of this organization under date of January 7, 1945.

We have noticed in the papers that you are quite concerned over the release of Browne and Bioff after serving such a short time. We greatly laud your fight on the subject matter, and we hope that you will be able to use the attached resolutions in your activities.

Please be assured that any way you may find it possible to aid in this matter and to bring to trial immediately the pending 2-percent-tax case in the United States Federal court in New York City will be greatly appreciated by the members of this organization and many other members of the international alliance.

We look to you to aid us in clearing up the present situation that has greatly injured the international alliance and every clean worker in American labor organizations. We need men like you to champion our cause so that men such as Browne and Bioff will be permanently restricted from further activities directly or indirectly involving labor unions. Your aid in clearing this organization of these racketeers on a permanent basis, so that union members can hold their heads up again, will be greatly appreciated.

If there is any further information that you believe would be of assistance to you, please call upon us and we will promptly supply you with the same. Thanking you on behalf of the members of this organization for your excellent activities to date, and thanking you in advance for your cooperation in aiding us as set forth herein, I am, with kindest personal regards and best wishes,

Very truly yours,

HAROLD V. SMITH,
Business Representative.

Resolution 1

Resolved, That we, the members of the International Sound Technicians' Union, Local 695, of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Motion Picture Machine Operators of the United States and Canada, who are employed in the motion picture studios of Hollywood, Calif., request and demand that the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate investigate the recent actions of United States District Judge Knox, of New York, in permitting George Browne and Willie Bioff to walk the streets at liberty after serving only 3 years out of the 8- and 10-year sentences imposed upon them respectively for their crimes.

These men injured every clean worker in American labor organizations by their crooked gangster actions and associations and their equally evil conniving with certain persons.

These are the last men in America to whom any true friend of labor or justice should show clemency.

The Senate Judiciary Committee is hereby requested to find out why Judge Knox released these proven gangster scoundrels into activity again, and particularly, the Senate Judiciary Committee is asked to find out if Judge Knox has required Browne and Bioff to refrain from any activities either directly or indirectly involving the affairs of the I. A. T. S. E., and if suitable precautions were taken to prevent and/or detect any such action if attempted; and if Judge Knox did not require such an accounting or provide suitable protection for the members of the I. A. T. S. E. against their connivance or control, request is hereby made of the Judiciary Committee that these men be brought before it and that they find out such matters for the benefit of the 50,000 members of the I. A. T. S. E. and the good of all organized labor; and if Judge Knox has required as a condition of their freedom that they reveal what they did with the millions of dollars they collected by way of the 2 percent tax on earnings assessed against the members of the Alliance during their reign of terror and for which, to this day, there has never been an accounting.

The local union states that the conviction of Browne and Bioff is helping to clear the air in order to give decent leaders of union labor a chance to raise their heads again proudly. The release of such men before they have served their merited punishment is a blow to honest labor leaders and labor members, and a threat to the union which Browne and Bioff formerly exploited.

This union asks for an immediate investigation and the airing of all reasons and influences that put these gangsters back on the streets of America again, and that a copy of this resolution shall be sent to every local union of the I. A. T. S. E. and to United States District Attorney Kostelanetz, of New York City, and a copy shall be sent to all present international officers of the I. A. T. S. E. with the comment that this is their opportunity to do their duty to the members of the I. A. T. S. E. by protecting the organization from any actions or influences on behalf of these men, and to make an investigation if necessary of the disbursement of the 2 percent tax and to give a complete detailed report immediately to the members of the Alliance as to who received this money and as to what it was spent for, and if any of the current officers are concerned with or involved in such expenditures; if so this will give the international executive board a reason for expelling them for the good of the I. A. T. S. E. and the labor movement.

Resolution 2

Whereas George Browne and Willie Bioff have been recently released from prison after serving a period of only 3 years of their sentences of 8 and 10 years respectively; and

Whereas it has been alleged that George Browne and Willie Bioff are guilty of illegal expenditure and disposition of the moneys belonging to the members of the International Alliance, particularly the 2 percent assessment funds that were levied upon the Alliance membership during their reign of crookedness and corruption; and

Whereas it is to the best interests of the Alliance and the membership of the Alliance that these men be held to answer and give an accounting for such alleged expenditure and disposition of said moneys, and that all legal and proper efforts be used to recover said funds to the benefit of the injured members: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the International Sound Technicians of Local 695, of the I. A. T. S. E. & M. P. M. O. in regular membership meeting do hereby request the international executive board of the I. A. T. S. E. & M. P. M. O. to immediately take the necessary steps including all possible legal action against George Browne and Willie Bioff for not only an accounting of all the moneys expended by them or either of them out of the 2 percent assessment fund collected during their corrupt administration from the wages of all of the member workers amounting to a sum of approximately $2,000,000, but also for the return of said moneys: Further, be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to every local of the I. A. T. S. E. and to United States District Attorney Kostelanetz, of New York City, with the urgent request that he prosecute the case now pending in New York City on this very issue.

Post-war Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a speech delivered by me at the annual convention of the American Road Builders' Association in Chicago, Ill., on January 17, 1945:

When this organization met about a year ago most of us believed that by this time Germany would have surrendered and that we would be much nearer the close of this terrible conflict than we appear to be at the present time. Our discussions at that time centered largely around a post-war highway program. At that time a bill had been introduced in Congress which, it was thought, would if passed provide an adequate post-war program.

Since that time the Roads Committee of the House has spent a great deal of time on hearings and in the preparation of the bill that was discussed in your convention a year ago. And after months of discussion and hearings there has been passed through the House and through the Senate and signed by the President a highway bill which should be adequate and which will provide the funds and the leadership for a post-war program that will lay the foundation of a great highway system for the future; and that will also furnish employment for thousands of people throughout our entire Nation who may not have employment during the post-war period.

I think you should all know that while this bill was introduced in the House by me, and while it had the endorsement of the Public Roads Administration and the American Association of State Highway Officials, it is not my bill, nor is it their bill. It is a law enacted by your Congress, and each member of the Roads Committee of the House and the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the Senate has contributed largely to this legislation. The bill represents the composite views of the committees in Congress that have the prime responsibility of road legislation.

As a matter of keeping the record straight, I want you people to know that my views are in direct conflict with the views expressed by our mutual friend, Representative MOTT, of Oregon, with reference to this not being a post-war highway bill. It is true that a large majority of the witnesses who appeared before our committee testified that, in their judgment, the Federal Government should appropriate $1,000,000,000 a year for 3 consecutive years. However, there were other witnesses who appeared who thought that a half billion dollars a year was too much. The bill that was then under consideration provided that the Federal Government's share of the contributions should be 75 percent and the States' share 25 percent. Therefore the maximum amount for each year under the terms of the bill as originally introduced would be one and a half billion dollars. This

bill did not provide any money for the forest roads, nor for national-park roads, nor for parks and parkway roads, nor for Indian reservations. As the bill passed, over a hundred million dollars was appropriated for these various items. So that the legislation that finally passed has an authorization of over $6,000,000,000 per annum, and provides that the States, so far as the $500,000,000 is concerned, shall match this on a 50-50 basis. As a matter of actual money to be spent on the post-war program, there is not a great difference between the amount recommended by even the most optimistic and the amount actually appropriated. The committee took the view that this amount was all that could be economically used. This bill appopriates the largest amount of money that has ever been appropriated for peacetime operations in the history of this world so far as I can ascertain. And therefore, while some few may be disappointed in the amount, I want this organization to feel that a real accomplishment has been made through the passage of this bill.

The gentleman from Oregon also stated that he thought the committee should go to work immediately and pass a real post-war highway bill. And he also stated that the bill as passed was merely the usual Federal-aid highway bill, providing for a little larger sum of money than usual. This bill is not the usual highway bill. It differs in many, many ways from any highway bill that has ever been passed. And I am sure that, so far as the Committee on Roads is concerned, there is no thought of considering another post-war bill in the immediate future. We believe that Congress has carried the ball in this field and has done a splendid job and that it is now up to such organizations as yours and to the States to put this legislation into effect and make it workable. If as good a job is done by the States as has been done by Congress, we are sure that we will not only build great highways for the future but we will furnish employment for thousands of our veterans who return and who should be employed.

This bill has been spoken of by many as the first complete highway measure ever passed by Congress. Although during the past 30 years many Federal-aid highway bills have been passed, we now have for the first time an act which gives full recognition to all of the various classes of highways—the primary Federal-aid system, the urban extensions, and the rural feeder roads. The program of improvements it calls for will make a major contribution to safety. The streets and highways over which we operate our cars, trucks, and buses must be made as safe as it is possible for modern engineering and construction to make them. This act also calls upon the States to set apart within the primary Federal-aid system a special national system of interstate highways, which also represents an attack against the work-relief type of highway project—the type of project whose evils were so well expressed by the American Road Builders Association report on the relationship between construction and national income. It appropriates $500,000,000 per year for each of 3 years to the various States, and it is somewhat significant that this amount is almost the exact amount that was spent by the Federal Government in each of the years from 1934 through 1941 for work-relief highway projects. While in those same years the regular Federal-aid highway program, following an accepted and sound system of contract construction, averaged only $200,000,000 per year. Obviously we were sacrificing much-needed work in the last depression in order to indulge in work-relief highway projects.

If the States have planned properly and if they will proceed to carry out the spirit and purpose of the act now passed by Congress, they will avoid these mistakes, and they will see to it that highway funds will be spent on permanent and needed improvements and under the private construction system. However, the passage of this highway legislation by the Federal Government is only the beginning of an important road program, the execution of which depends upon the State highway departments and on their ability to establish working relationships with the county and local governments to carry out the new and expanded post-war highway program contemplated under the act.

During the early part of this year 44 State legislatures will be in session. Most of these will not meet again for 2 years in regular session. In almost every State some legislation is necessary in order to take full advantage of the Federal Highway Act. Therefore, it is necessary that this legislation be examined carefully by the highway divisions of the various States in order to secure necessary legislation.

Too much stress cannot be placed on the fact, and I think the members of this organization should fully understand and appreciate, that Congress and the Public Roads Administration are not seeking to have the State highway departments usurp the road functions of our local governments. Those of you who are familiar with the long history of Federal-State highway relationships know that the Public Roads Administration has endeavored constantly to strengthen the "grass roots" government in the local administration of our highway program. The new Federal-Aid Highway Act calls on the States to establish cooperative relationship with the county and local highway departments. If any State through misguided motives sought to take unfair advantage of this new highway legislation, I am certain that Commissioner MacDonald would follow in full the spirit of the mandate from Congress that he see to it that the State local relationships are cooperative rather than coercive.

There has always been considerable discussion over the question of bureaucratic government, and federalization of government is very often overemphasized and looked upon with a great deal of fear on the part of local government officials. Under the bill which has just been passed, we have made an honest effort to strengthen State and local governments by giving them the money to help carry out one of their major public-works functions, that of building adequate roads and streets. The proper performance of a function is the best guaranty that the function will never be removed from the jurisdiction of the agency performing that function. The States are required by law under this new act to cooperate with county and local governments if they obtain Federal aid. The States ought to cooperate, and the Public Roads Administration has a mandate from Congress to see to it that this cooperation takes place in reality and in spirit. The preservation and strengthening of sound local administration of the highway function requires that county and local governments meet the State half-way. There will be difficulties and a need for give and take on all sides.

What I am trying to say with all sincerity is that the way to preserve State and local highway administration and avoid the federalization which all of us oppose; and which the Public Roads Administration has fought for nearly 30 years, is for local and State highway administrators to realize that this new Federal highway bill gives an excellent opportunity to strengthen and preserve their highway functions. Both sides must accept this challenge. If they do not, then certainly in the not very distant future there will be established some super agency of the Federal Government that will take over the job that State-local-Federal cooperation and the profit contract system failed to do.

In the State-by-State application of these general principles it is assumed that local traditions and practices will dictate the final form of State enabling legislation. It is my hope, as I am sure it is the hope of the entire Congress, that no person or agency associated with road building will read into the principles set out in this legislation anything except an attempt to make the new Federal highway legislation workable in every State on the basis of intelligent cooperation by State and local governmental agencies.

Soon after this law was passed the American Association of State Highway Officials sent to its members eight points which it was suggested should be considered in preparing a legislative program in the light of conditions created by the passage of the Federal Highway Act. I think it is well worth our while to review these eight points and to explain them in some detail, because if legislation is necessary to put into effect the present highway bill in any of the various States, then this organization here should understand what is necessary to be done and should immediately organize to do this work. These points are as follows:

No. 1. Legislative authority may be required to permit the State to cooperate with county, city, or other local highway officials in the selection of road systems provided in the Federal Act, and in the actual construction of the systems with Federal aid. The State highway department should have rather broad powers in negotiating with county and local officials regarding the secondary system in order to permit considerable latitude with respect to matching funds, method of construction, and responsibility for maintenance. We must keep in mind that the Federal Government deals only with the States on projects. State officials should have considerable discretion. Changes in the State law may be found desirable later, but the State highway department should not be unduly restricted in the initial application of the new law, or we may find the new program unworkable—which is an invitation for another W. P. A. program. The State Department may also require legislation to permit work on secondary roads outside of the present State highway system, and to use State funds to match Federal funds on such projects.

No. 2. The need for broad authority to cooperate with municipal authorities on urban construction, including the power to designate urban areas as defined in the act. In certain States the State highway department is prohibited by law from cooperating on urban projects.

No. 3. Authority to acquire adequate rights-of-way by purchase and condemnation. The right of immediate entry on land acquired by condemnation is essential to the success of the new highway program. The States also should have the power to acquire rights-of-way on behalf of local governments in cases where this might be necessary.

No. 4 deals with the question of the diversion of road-user revenue for nonhighway purposes.

The first highway-user tax, in the modern sense, was the automobile registration fee levied by the State of New York in 1901. This tax, small at first, was soon adopted by other States and rapidly expanded into a source of considerable revenue for road funds. It was not until 18 years later, however, that the State of Oregon imposed the first gasoline tax. Other States quickly followed suit, and New York, which had imposed the first registration tax, was the last to impose a gasoline tax when it levied a charge of 2 cents per gallon in 1929. In recent years these taxes have constituted practically the entire source of current State revenues for highways and have been used in most States in large amounts to support local roads and city streets.

Unfortunately, a practice grew up in many States of assigning these road-user taxes to other purposes than highways. In 1933 the diversion of these highway-user taxes

amounted to more than $147,000,000. Congress took cognizance of this situation and its effect on the progress of highway work by including an antidiversion provision in the Hayden-Cartwright Act of June 18, 1934. Section 12 of this act reads as follows:

"Since it is unfair and unjust to tax motor-vehicle transportation unless the proceeds of such taxation are applied to the construction, improvement, or maintenance of highways, after June 30, 1935, Federal aid for highway construction shall be extended only to those States that use at least the amounts now provided by law for such purposes in each State from State motor-vehicle registration fees, licenses, gasoline taxes, and other special taxes on motor-vehicle owners and operators of all kinds for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of highways and administrative expenses in connection therewith, including the retirement of bonds for the payment of which such revenues have been pledged, and for no other purposes, under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate from time to time: *Provided*, That in no case shall the provisions of this section operate to deprive any State of more than one-third of the amount to which that State would be entitled under any apportionment hereafter made for the fiscal year for which the apportionment is made."

While this provision rather vigorously condemns the diversion of road-user revenues to other than highway purposes, the penalty of withholding part of any State's Federal-aid apportionments in violation of the section applies only where the diversion exceeds that authorized by State law at the time of the passage of the act (June 18, 1934). Since the passage of this act only three States have been penalized. Other States have found it necessary to make restitution to highway funds of funds that have been diverted. However, the existence of this antidiversion legislation has been a powerful influence in assisting the friends of highways in State legislatures in defeating antidiversion proposals. Section 12 has accomplished its purpose of preventing further diversion.

It is my firm conviction that the great majority of the public is opposed to the diversion of road-user revenues to other than highway purposes, although they will cheerfully pay such special taxes when they know they are to be used for needed highway work.

During the past year 2 States passed constitutional amendments making it illegal to use road-user revenues for other than highway purposes. This makes 16 States that prohibit diversion by constitutional amendment, and more States are being added to this list every year. In addition there are several States with statutory provisions against diversion. For the past several years there have been no new apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds, but with the recent passage of the post-war highway legislation making large sums again available for Federal-aid highway work in cooperation with the State highway departments, it becomes more important than ever for the States to consider the effect their present practices with respect to road-user revenues may have on their highway program.

The following is quoted from the certificate of apportionment of the $500,000,000 authorized for the first post-war fiscal year made by the Federal Works Administrator on January 6, 1945:

"That the sum apportioned to each State, the District of Columbia, the Territory of Hawaii, and the island of Puerto Rico, shall be subject to such reduction, if any, as the Federal Works Administrator may find is required by reason of the diversion of road-user revenues in violation of the provisions of section 12 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 995)."

The taxation of highway users is so easy, the collection process so simple, and the returns so certain that the procedure is being misused in many States. These taxes were designed and are justified only to provide funds for road construction and maintenance. Well-organized and selfish groups, however, have succeeded in diverting large amounts of revenue that are needed to develop the highway systems, or in imposing additional taxes on highway users to raise money for non-highway purposes. It must be remembered that highway users are subject to all of the other taxes paid by the general public: The highway user pays the income tax, the property tax, the sale tax, the social security tax, the tobacco tax, and all of the others levied for non-highway purposes. It is particularly worth noting that several States which refund the tax paid on gasoline not used on the highways still use a considerable amount of their gasoline tax money, paid only by highway users, for non-highway purposes.

Let me give you an idea of the size of diversions: In 1925 a little over $7,000,000 was diverted; in 1931 more than $23,000,000 was diverted; and in 1932, at the bottom of the depression, the amount jumped to nearly $77,000,000, of which the State general funds took more than half. The amount increased year by year, until in 1941 it was more than $215,000,000. Even in 1943, with greatly curtailed highway-user revenues due to rationing and other wartime restrictions, the diversion was over $155,000,000.

In the past 10 years many so-called emergency highway-user taxes, particularly for relief, have been imposed to raise funds for both highway and nonhighway purposes. The passing of the emergency, however, has not prevented legislatures from reenacting these taxes, even in some States with unprecedented surpluses in their treasuries. If the trend in diversion is resumed in the post-war period, it will prevent the development of an adequate system of highways. It may place such a heavy tax burden on highway users as to restrict development of highway transport. Either result would be detrimental to the Nation as a whole. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that diversion is an expensive and unwise expedient.

Since nearly all of the State legislatures meet this winter, it is my hope that, where necessary, legislative action will be taken to prevent loss of Federal-aid highway funds because of diversion. Even though the diversion in a State is not such as to make necessary the withholding of Federal aid under section 12, it is highly desirable that the legislature give careful consideration to the reservation of all highway-user taxes for highway purposes, as they will be certainly needed to rehabilitate and improve our highway systems in the post-war period.

No. 5 deals with the designation of the national highway system or State highways by joint action of the State highway department of each State and the adjoining States. In some States the systems are designated by acts of the legislatures, so such legislation may be needed.

No. 6 deals with the authority to acquire model limited access highways. There has been widespread misunderstanding of this proposed legislation to permit the building of limited access interstate highways. It should be made clear that the interregional highway report specifically recommended that no limited access routes be constructed unless and until traffic conditions justify such design. The stress was put on the need for the legal power to limit access in the future and the power to control certain roadside developments which affect the safety and capacity of our highways. We have wasted many millions in highway funds and wasted many lives through traffic fatalities because our engineers have had to concern themselves only with the roadway itself and have had nothing to do with what happens along the roadside. If our post-war investments are to be protected from early obsolescence and from new accident hazards due to unsound roadside encroachments, it is absolutely essential that our highway builders be given the power to limit road access if and when such limitation becomes necessary to the safety and traffic capacity of the road. Seventeen States, including many of our largest ones, now have such legislation, although in some instances the legislation needs revision. Every State needs such legislation, not to build limited access routes in any large volume at the outset but to have the protection of being able to limit access if future conditions require. That legislation will save large sums of money and permit the highway program to move forward with the assurance that the new roads are permanently protected from roadside influences of the wrong type.

No. 7 concerns legislation permitting the State highway department to enter into agreements with airport authorities regarding the relocation of roads where the land is needed for airports, and the building of roads giving access to airports. Unless such agreements are made, Federal highway funds cannot be used for the rebuilding of roads to serve airports.

This provision was inserted to prevent recurrence of certain wasteful practices which already have resulted from lack of consultation between airport and highway officials when new airports were developed. It should encourage the practice of joint planning of airport-highway facilities, and in several other ways appears to be a very sound provision. As post-war airport developments increase, the provision will become more important.

No. 8 concerns a possible need for modifying State laws pertaining to the amount of contribution railroads must make toward grade crossing elimination projects. The new Federal legislation provides that Federal funds can be used to pay the full cost of constructing such projects, and half the cost of rights-of-way. However, it provides that the railroad must pay to the United States Government a sum equal to a portion of the benefit of the project to the railroad—the portion being a prorata share of the net benefit, based on the Federal share of the total cost of the project, but not more than 10 percent of the cost.

The net effect of this provision is that grade separation projects need no longer be delayed pending agreement by the railroad as to its contribution, or its willingness to participate. At the same time, the arrangement gives the railroads protection from unreasonable demands. But changes may be required in State grade-crossing elimination laws, insofar as Federal-aid projects of this type are concerned.

We think that Congress has passed a good, workable, highway bill. We also believe that we have been far-sighted in planning a post-war highway program: First, by passing a bill authorizing a contribution of money to the States for planning purposes and, second, by the passage of an act which will give the States money to take care of all of their highway needs over a period of 3 years. When the war ends, or the emergency is over, it will be the problem of the States to carry out the intent of Congress and to enlarge upon our great system of highways.

A majority of the Members of Congress think that the amount of money authorized in the bill is all that can economically be used during the 3-year post-war period. However, if the road administrations of the various States tackle this problem enthusiastically and courageously, there is a possibility of more money being used economically than is authorized in this legislation.

But when the success of the program as outlined is completely demonstrated, then if it should develop that more funds are necessary, I feel sure that organizations such as

yours and other road enthusiasts could come back to Congress and present a good case for additional appropriations, and in such an event you can be assured that Congress would be sympathetic to your problem.

Legion Supports Dies Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding organizations of this country that stands for America and American principles, at all times, is the American Legion.

The Legion has its posts in practically every county, and its membership on guard in every precinct throughout this great country.

In my efforts to create a Standing Committee on Un-American Activities, I had the unqualified support of the Legion, as I explained in the debate at that time, when I read from its resolution of endorsement.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article which appeared in the National Legionnaire for January 1945, which I hope every Member of the House will take the time to read.

The article referred to follows:

UN-AMERICAN INVESTIGATION WILL CONTINUE—DIES COMMITTEE PERMANENT AS RESULT OF RANKIN AMENDMENT

The American Legion scored a smashing victory in its battle against spies, saboteurs, and disloyal elements on January 3 when the House of Representatives voted 207 to 186 to make its Committee on Un-American Activities a permanent part of the House organization.

The resolution not only to continue the committee but to make it a permanent standing body instead of a special temporary one was introduced by Representative JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, soon after the Seventy-ninth Congress convened for the first time.

Within a few moments an overwhelming combination of Republicans and Democrats adopted the resolution and saved the committee from extinction.

"It was a signal victory," said Francis M. Sullivan, legislative director of the Legion.

CREATED IN 1938

The committee was first created in 1938 in conformance with a mandate of the nineteenth national convention of the American Legion in 1937. Former Representative Martin Dies, Democrat, of Texas, was named its chairman. It was continued for 2 years in 1940, again in 1942 and for 1 year in January of 1944.

During its stormy career it was frequently the target of pacifist, Communist, and other critics, but Congress stood its ground, providing $675,000 for the committee to carry on its work.

Had the committee been permitted to pass out of existence with the Seventy-eighth Congress, its voluminous files and thousands of documents bearing directly on subversive activities and disloyal elements were threatened with disposal, although they had many times proved valuable to the armed forces and the F. B. I.

COMMITTEE'S RECORD

In the course of its work the committee, among other things, did the following:

Exposed Communist group instigation in several labor disturbances.

Disclosed that the German-American Bund was foreign backed with the result that Fritz Kuhn and James Wheeler Hill, bund officers, were convicted of subversive activities.

Disclosed the Communist Party plan to seize control of the American labor movement by infiltrating in labor groups.

Revealed the American Youth Congress as Communist-controlled.

Exposed the Transocean News Service, American Fellowship Forum, Germany Library of Information, and the German railway agencies as channels for distribution of Nazi propaganda.

Investigated and exposed the Kyffhauserbund as an organization of former German soldiers and officers during propaganda work.

Exposed Joseph Curran, president of the Maritime Union and vice president of the C. I. O., as a member of the Communist Party.

Revealed Communist activities within the American Newspaper Guild, and in the California aircraft industries.

Built up a complete file on fifth column organizations containing the names and records of hundreds of thousands of individuals.

Investigated and exposed Communist Party fraud in obtaining signatures to nominating petitions used in the 1940 elections, with the result that party officials were indicted in several States and party candidates ruled off the ballots.

Exposed the activities of Harry Bridges, Fascist leaders James E. Campbell, George Deatherage, and Charles Hudson, and Silver Shirt Leader William Dudley Pelley.

There were many other accomplishments, also, which brought bitter opposition to continuance of the committee, but it continued its work.

As a permanent, standing body, the committee now has power under rules of the House to recommend specific bills, whereas previously it could merely file reports. It also is entitled to a regular appropriation from House funds. Heretofore, a special resolution was necessary every time money was needed and the ensuing fights sometimes threatened existence of the committee.

Army Troop-Rotation Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the troop-rotation policy of the War Department has been the subject of much discussion from time to time. I have been most interested in the return of selected servicemen to the United States for short rest periods after long months of overseas service. As an incentive to the enlisted man and to the officer for a high standard of service, it is much sought after. As a morale builder for the veterans in foreign lands after months and years of weary service it is without an equal.

On December 5, 1944, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson wrote to me a very fine letter on this subject. On January 13, 1945, replying to my inquiry, I received a letter from Gen. George Marshall, Chief of Staff, regarding the same subject. I feel that the subject contained in these two letters are of such general interest to the people of the United States that I ask they be printed in full below.

The letters are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 5, 1944.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: I appreciate your personal interest in the recent announcement of the national commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, with regard to our rotation policies, and am pleased to have this opportunity to discuss a matter of such general concern. This is an extremely complex matter, as you know, and we, therefore, have had difficulty in making it generally understood why more soldiers cannot return home while the war is actively in progress. The attached study of the entire subject may be useful to you in this regard.

It would be helpful if your correspondents on this subject are informed not only that the Army is doing everything it can consistently do and at the same time prosecute the war vigorously, but also, from the factual standpoint, that the Army has returned since Pearl Harbor well over 750,000 men to the United States; that sick and wounded soldiers are now being returned by air at the rate of over 4,000 a month; and that we are now returning soldiers on rotation, leave, and furlough, at the rate of over 30,000 a month, or 360,000 a year. In considering these numbers it is well to bear in mind that we have done this while exerting prodigious efforts to increase our overseas strength, and at all times we have been under heavy pressure from our enemies.

In view of the restrictions which must govern our actions in wartime—and with our soldiers serving all over the world—I believe you will agree, in considering the above figures, that our efforts to implement a working rotation plan have been more than merely substantial. I believe this will be even more evident when it is pointed out, as explained in the attached study, that from 4 to 7 soldiers must be immobilized for every soldier who is returned on rotation and temporary duty, with the result that our present program deprives the Army of the equivalent of from 8 to 14 divisions. I believe this fact is not generally recognized but is, in itself, a rather graphic reason why an expansion of this program while the war continues, or certainly until the defeat of Germany, would be in neither the military nor the national interest. Since, as stated in the enclosure, the return of soldiers to this country on rotation is the function of the theater commander, the War Department cannot predict when specific individuals can be returned.

The statement in the article to which you refer, to the effect that "our military experts are too cautious in their willingness to substitute replacements for seasoned combat troops" is not only incorrect, but, in my judgment, is the type of assertion which, when disseminated, can only hamper our efforts to implement this program. The simple truth of the matter is that we do not have an inexhaustible reservoir of soldiers, despite the popular impression to the con-

trary. The shortage of qualified replacements, not our hesitancy to use them, is the greatest limiting factor in the rotation program. I believe the attached study will demonstrate this fact.

The best we can do, therefore, is to reiterate that we will return as many men as possible consistent with the prosecution of the war. General Marshall and I certainly share your hope that this will permit the return of our men in the southwest Pacific area at an early date, and you can rest assured that if changed military conditions eventually permit us to increase the rotation quotas, this will be done without delay.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, January 13, 1945.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: I have your letter of January 9 regarding our rotation plan and regret that I can add little to Mr. Stimson's letter of December 5 to you on the same subject. A copy of that letter is attached.

Since Mr. Stimson's letter was sent to you, however, we have removed all limitations on the number of soldiers who may be returned on leave or furlough, without replacements, for 1-month visits in the United States. Consequently, theater commanders may now return any men they can spare for 1 month, plus the several months' travel time involved. The number of soldiers returned on temporary duty under this procedure will probably increase markedly within the next few months.

Under this procedure the selection of those to be returned will remain entirely a function of the theater commanders in which the War Department will not be involved.

I should like to reiterate Mr. Stimson's comment in the attached letter that if military conditions eventually permit an increase in the rotation quotas, this will be done without delay. The Army's manpower limitations at this time are so severe, however, that an expansion of this program, at least until the defeat of Germany, appears very unlikely.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

Ratification of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times of January 16, 1945:

NOT A QUESTION OF PRESTIGE

Some Members of the House of Representatives are displaying great enthusiasm over the proposal that future treaties be ratified by a majority vote of both Houses, instead of by two-thirds majority in the Senate, as is now required.

The feeling on the part of these House Members seems to be that the prestige of their branch of the legislature is involved.

It is doubtful that the project will have the slightest chance of approval if this question of prestige is kept in the forefront. In dealing with the problem of treaty making, the Nation is not interested in the prestige of the House—or of the Senate, for that matter.

The country's welfare requires that a mode of treaty ratification be used which will produce wise decisions, based not just upon temporary conditions but upon the long-term welfare of the United States and of the world.

From this standpoint, the rule requiring two-thirds vote approval in the Senate is sound. If a treaty is desirable, and if it has the endorsement of most Americans, then the assumption is that a two-thirds majority can be obtained. If a two-thirds majority cannot be obtained for any given treaty, then it is reasonable to suppose that it lacks merit, or that the American people do not strongly approve it.

The proposal to drop the two-thirds requirement would make it possible to put through Congress a treaty of which a majority of the people did not approve. A treaty so adopted would lack the validity derived from overwhelming public support and might be put aside at any time an aroused majority took action to rescind it.

Whereas the two-thirds rule tends to put the Nation squarely and wholeheartedly behind any treaty which the Senate approves, the majority rule would leave the question of public support strongly in doubt and would weaken any structure of international peace in which the United States participated.

If a change in the method of ratifying treaties is required—and no conclusive evidence of the necessity has been presented—the change should be made not on the basis of prestige or expediency but on the basis of what the Nation's welfare requires.

Over past decades, the Senate has not done badly as a treaty-making body. A simple majority in both Houses might produce much less satisfactory results.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the pitiful plight of Poland is brought into sharp focus by the poignant plea contained in the following telegram from a group of Americans of Polish descent.

COUNCIL 63,
POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE,
Kansas City, Kans., January 18, 1945.

Hon. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Appeal to you to raise your voice in protest against Russia's land grab in her unilateral settlement of her dispute with Poland as sanctioned by Churchill. The future peace will be endangered if Poland is again wronged.

JOSEPH KSIAZEK,
President.
FRANK KUSTRA,
Secretary.

Democracy's Mandate in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESÚS T. PIÑERO
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tables, showing the results of the last three elections held in the island of Puerto Rico, during the years 1936, 1940, and 1944.

All figures are taken from the official reports of the Insular Board of Elections, San Juan, P. R., and clearly show the decline of the old party alinements and combination of parties seeking to hold, and sometimes holding, control of the government through various strategic schemes. They also show what I believe to be a clear democratic expression of the will of the people of Puerto Rico and of their unqualified support of the legislative and administrative programs and accomplishments of the Popular Democratic Party:

	1936	1940	1944
Voters registered	764,602	714,960	719,759
Votes cast	549,500	568,851	591,978
Union Republican Party [1]	152,739	134,582	101,779
Socialist Party [2]	144,294	87,841	68,107
Coalition total	297,033	222,423	[3] 169,886
Liberal Party	252,467	[4] 130,299	38,630
Pure Agrarian Party	----------	[5] 1,272	----------
Popular Democratic Party [6]	----------	214,857	383,280

SENATE OF PUERTO RICO (19 SEATS)

	1936	1940	1944
Union Republican	7	[1]	1
Socialist	7	4	1
Liberal	5	0	0
Popular Democrats [6]	----------	10	17
Total	19	19	19

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (39 SEATS)

	1936	1940	1944
Union Republicans	[1] 14	11	1
Socialists	13	7	0
Liberals	12	[4] 3	1
Popular Democrats [6]	----------	18	37
Total	39	39	39

[1] The Union Republican Party and the Socialist Party nominate the same candidates for all insular elective offices and for Resident Commissioner in Congress. They have always been known as the coalition parties.

[2] One of the coalition parties (see above).

[3] In 1944 the two coalition parties (Union Republicans and Socialists) and the Liberal Party nominated the same candidates for all insular elective offices and for Resident Commissioner in Congress. Their aggregate total was 208,516.

[4] In 1940 the Liberal Party went to the polls under the name of Puerto Rican Tripartite, Unificacionist Party together with two groups known as the Reformist and the Labor Parties. These last two groups were not registered as parties and the figure represents the aggregate total.

[5] This party only registered for the 1940 election. It nominated the same candidates as the Tripartite group. (See footnote 4.)

[6] Founded by Hon. Senator Luis Munoz-Marin in 1938 and was finally registered in 1940.

In 1936 Mr. Iglesias, the Coalition Party's candidate for Resident Commissioner in Congress, was elected by a 44,566-vote majority over the Liberal Party's candidate.

In 1940 Mr. Pagán, the Coalition party's candidate for Resident Commissioner in Congress, was elected by a 7,566-vote plurality over his nearest contender.

In 1944 JESÚS T. PIÑERO, the Popular Democratic Party's candidate for Resident Commissioner in Congress, was elected by a 174,764-vote majority over all the other parties' combined votes.

Our Power Strike and Mr. Roosevelt's Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Cleveland News of January 16, 1945, which gives a realistic picture of a great city's helplessness under present conditions:

OUR POWER STRIKE AND MR. ROOSEVELT'S LAW

While the Illuminating Co. strike and its threat to this city are in our minds, let us discuss a fundamental national cause of it which will have to be remedied sooner or later if we are not to be menaced again with a strike which means darkness, shut-down, and helplessness.

We submit that a few hundred men under a handful of union leaders ought not to be allowed the power to go on a strike and set up picket lines aimed to shut down our electric power supply in defiance of the misfortunes of the rest of 1,250,000 people of greater Cleveland.

This was the premeditated intention, as is shown by the union leaders' bargaining for Friday's strikers return to work and abandonment of coercive picketing.

Let us understand that this union, the leaders, the few hundred men who took direct action, have authority negatively founded in law to take Cleveland this way by the throat, and that this authority was most deliberately placed in these irresponsible or revolutionary hands by President Roosevelt, the New Deal Congresses, and the National Labor Relations Board as the result of the Wagner law, enacted in 1935 to benefit unions and union organizers.

Until this law is amended to compel unions to perform duties, the power plant workers may strike again, as often as they see fit.

Mr. Roosevelt has resisted all attempts to amend and equalize this law; he vetoed one other law which sought to equalize a little of the unbalance. Let us understand that he wants the unions and the organizers to have exactly this power that the Illuminating Co., C. I. O. union, wielded last Friday.

The Wagner law penalizes industries or employers which resist the union organizers or employee unionizing movements; no matter even if these organizings are with fraud or coercion. As the National Labor Relations Board interprets the law, the employer may not advise employees about a union or about their conduct as a union. The Board has been swift to put any employer on the defensive who has spoken out, or put him in a position calculated to turn employees against him.

With intention, the law imposes no limits or responsibilities or duties on the union or its organizers. The unions and the organizers have understood perfectly this purposeful omission of restraints on them. They know they may do all the proposing and talking to employees, including strike proposals, and that the employer either will be silenced or narrowly limited.

No law compels a union to keep its word or its contract. The Illuminating Co. union breached its contract by its strike Friday, but the law compels the company to maintain the union nevertheless as if nothing had happened.

The natural effect of this legal onesidedness is to give union officers and organizers the whip hand over employees' conduct. We repeat, this is as intended by Mr. Roosevelt. And the evidence abounds that his intention has not changed today.

In the Graphite Bronze strike of last year, enforced by picketing in which men and women workers were assaulted by nonemployees, the Government permitted its War Labor Board to remain helpless after ordering the strikers back to work. The War Board could do nothing because of the license given the union in the Wagner law.

Two elections at Thompson Products have gone heavily against the C. I. O. organizers, leaving no doubt of the overwhelming desires of Thompsbn employees. But the N. L. R. B. threw out both union defeats on technical interpretations, has set another election, and plainly wants C. I. O. to win.

The clearest present intention of the administration is shown in the attempt of Sewell Avery, of Montgomery Ward, to test the legal one-sideness of the Wagner law, which he chose to combat. Courts to which he appealed told him that Mr. Roosevelt's wartime powers from Congress are now employed to prevent such a Wagner law test during the war period. All during the war, on the other hand, the National Labor Relations Board, administering this law, has gone quietly but busily along opening all doors to the union organizers, silencing employers, and holding elections designed to give unions a bargaining contract.

This city thereby could come to the realization Friday night that the few hundred strikers at the power plants held the rest of us in a tight grip, with the express consent if not the permanent direction of the President of the United States. Let us put the fundamental credit—if that is the word—where it belongs.

We see no way of release from this peril to the rest of us without Wagner law amendment aimed to make unions and their organizers just as responsible and limited in their conduct as are the employers. The "few hundred" still have their loaded gun, they are merely not digging it into our ribs at this moment.

The amendment to the Wagner law will take hard work by our Congressmen, and conversion of some of them. This will not take place unless we the people tell our Congressmen what we feel must be done. It may be that at least our Cleveland Congressmen are now appalled along with the rest of us at the strike last Friday and the dreadful prospects it presented.

Servicemen's Paper Supports Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting excerpts from an editorial which appeared in the National Tribune of January 11, 1945, an ex-servicemen's paper published here in Washington.

It reads as follows:

The veterans and all other patriotic organizations of the country were vindicated last Wednesday when the House of Representatives, by a record vote listed elsewhere in this issue, expressed itself strongly in favor of a permanent committee to investigate un-American activities. Ever since the so-called Dies committee was founded in 1937, they have supported strongly its purposes and have defended as strenuously any and all attacks upon it. They did so not because of its weaknesses and shortcomings, but rather for its strength and the world of good its members were accomplishing.

That committee went out of existence with the adjournment of the Seventy-eighth Congress just before Christmas. It was revived with a bang on the opening day of the Seventy-ninth Congress in an unprecedented move that assures permanency under the rules of the House and that in all probability promises an investigating group that will possess all of the virtues and few of the vices of the old committee. It will have the power to consider and report remedial legislation when such moves seem advisable, and it can do so under the standing rules of the House.

Before the surprise action on the birthday of the new Congress, there was feverish activity in the headquarters of most of the major veterans' organizations. Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, a proven friend of veterans and chairman of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, has been appealed to and had agreed to lead the fight to restore the life of the investigating committee that had in its day performed a great service to the Nation in ferreting out elements that opposed our American form of government. Communications went out to veterans' leaders and their memberships to contact their Representatives for support of the Rankin resolution. Responses flooded in. Most House Members had also been advised that Spanish War Veterans, the Legion, the V. F. W., the D. A. V., groups allied to the old Grand Army, the Daughters of the American Revolution and other organizations with intensely patriotic backgrounds desired to see the work of the Dies committee continued. Their confidence in Congressman RANKIN was proven justified; their faith in the Congress itself was shown to be warranted.

During formal adoption of the House rules, RANKIN offered an amendment to set up the investigating body as a permanent committee with all of the prerogatives of such. The move was opposed by the leadership as vigorously as RANKIN advocated it. It went down on a teller count but passed by a vote of 207 to 186 on a roll call. Some who voted against the amendment did not like the method of procedure. Others followed blindly a notoriously well-known opposition to the continued investigation by the administration in power, and there were those who have objected consistently and in good conscience to the committee's continuance. Also there were those with left wing tendencies who have fought it tooth and nail for 7 years, to the delight of followers of * * * Adolph Hitler and worshipers of the Sons of the Rising Sun. Nevertheless, 207 tried and true Americans went on record for American principles, and JOHN RANKIN enjoyed a personal triumph of no mean proportions and the Nation's patriotic sons of war were sustained in their objective. Within 2 hours after the Seventy-ninth Congress had met, it showed itself strong enough to do right by an act that will be applauded generously in real American homes.

* * * * * *

The Dies committee erred. Its friends recognize that as do no others. Nevertheless, it uncovered some of the most pernicious

anti-American agencies that ever attempted to destroy free government. The Attorney General of the United States admitted that the Department of Justice had failed to cooperate with it as it should. Its pitiless publicity separated many admitted Communists from Government pay rolls and drove countless others to their rat holes. The Federal Bureau of Investigation finally utilized the files that had been threatened with destruction. The Dies committee proved itself to be of inestimable value to constituted authorities, and—mark this—no member of the group ever had his patriotism questioned.

It is axiomatic that citizenship, even domicile within this country's borders, carries a responsibility to understand the privileges and freedoms guaranteed by the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights. To that principle the Dies group devoted itself. It promoted active, alert Americanism. It heeded warnings that are still apparent to all who will see. It proclaimed that communism and fascism are doctrines not acceptable to the American people, and it insisted that American institutions must remain untrammeled in the world. Those assurances are worth nurturing.

As yet there is no indication who will serve on the new House committee, but it should be composed of the best qualified, the most reliable and the most earnest patriots in the House of Representatives. That is the grave responsibility of the leadership, and it must accept its charge if the new body is to avoid the unwarranted stigma of bigotry, demagoguery, Red-baiting and worse that was attached to its predecessor group.

Much of this war is yet to be fought. The public learns of the arrival by U-boat of some Axis spies and of probable balloon landings of others; it knows little or nothing about the many aliens who plot against our country from within its borders and it is loath to believe that traitors among our citizens now lead fomenters of revolution. Real enemies are already girding themselves to fight the new committee. In the words of Congressman RANKIN, "This is no time to relax our vigilance."

The Nurse Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the shortage of nurses for the armed services and in connection with any proposed legislation to assist in this respect, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the short letter of January 16, 1945, from Dr. Charles M. Griffith, Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, showing a shortage at the present time of 2,000 nurses. The letter is as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1945.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BROOKS: This will acknowledge your letter of January 12, 1945, in which you request information as to the number of nurses presently employed by the Veterans' Administration. You also inquire whether the Veterans' Administration has a sufficient number of nurses or if there is a surplus.

You are advised that as of November 1, 1944, there were 4,150 nurses on duty in the various facilities of this Administration, with approximately 1,000 vacancies in authorized nurse positions. It is estimated that an additional 2,000 will be needed to care for additional beds being added to care for the new facilities being opened between now and July 1, 1945. Our immediate need for nurses is urgent.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Very truly yours,

CHAS. M. GRIFFITH,
Medical Director.

Individual Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial by the Honorable Thurman Sensing, director of research, Southern States Industrial Council. It is a thoroughly American statement and should awaken in the minds of every citizen the realization that individual freedom is the priceless heritage of being an American. Let us preserve it.

The editorial follows:

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

(By Thurman Sensing, director of research, Southern States Industrial Council)

The most valuable possession owned by a citizen of the United States is individual freedom. Moreover, individual freedom is owned not by just a favored few, not by just the wealthy or by the educated, not by just the clergy or the lawyers or the doctors or the politicians or the diplomats—it is owned by every citizen of the land.

Individual freedom means, among other things, the right of a citizen to carve out his own career, the right to work when and where he pleases, the right to vote for whom he pleases, the right to live where he pleases, the right to study, the right to save, the right to trade, the right to accumulate property.

The benefits of individual freedom are the greatest that man can have. Individual freedom makes it possible for a man with energy and ambition to rise to any height to which he aspires. Time and time again in this country, individual freedom has made railroad presidents out of section hands, has made bank presidents out of office boys, has made owners and operators of all sorts of businesses from men who started at the bottom—has moved men from log cabins to the White House.

Individual freedom depends on the type of government we have. So long as the people control the Government, then we have individual freedom. When it comes about that the Government controls the people, then there is no individual freedom.

This individual freedom was the fundamental basis of the Government established under our Constitution. For the first time in the history of the world, our forefathers were able to establish the kind of government men had been struggling for from the beginning of time—a government that would serve the people. Heretofore peoples had existed for the benefit of their governments; our fathers established a government that would exist for the benefit of the people—a government built on individual freedom.

There is serious danger that we may lose individual freedom in this country, and that soon—as it has been lost in other countries of the world. There is serious danger that in our search for economic security and in our demand that the Government guarantee us a living that we shall relinquish our freedom, that we shall turn over to the Government the right to order our lives, that we shall make the same fatal mistake that has often been made before in history—that we shall "sell our birthright for a mess of pottage." Individual freedom is a very personal thing in the life of a people—with it, they are masters; without it, they are slaves.

Unquestionably those who have most to lose in the surrender of individual freedom in this country are the great middle classes of the country—the working man, the average man. When individual freedom is surrendered, then the average man will no longer have the opportunity or the incentive to rise higher in the world, to make better provisions for his family, to accumulate property, to own his own business.

Every one of us should realize more keenly now than ever before that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." We should realize that we can't play the ostrich and stick our heads in the sand and say "everything will come out all right." We should keep our eyes open and not be deluded by false promises of those whose real purpose is to gain control of the freedom which we all have as individuals.

This is not a matter of politics or political parties—it is a matter of principles of government. We shall not be worthy of our ancestors who fought with Washington at Valley Forge or those who fought with Lee and Grant at Gettysburg or those who fought with Pershing at Belleau Wood—and we shall not be worthy of our sons and brothers who are fighting now all over the face of the world—if we let anyone or any organization take away from us our most precious possession—the individual freedom of a freeman in a free country.

British Women—Orchids to Some Gallant Ladies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Walter Winchell from his column:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

BRITISH WOMEN—ORCHIDS TO SOME GALLANT LADIES

Britain is the only country that has conscripted women for the fighting forces. Of about 16,000,000 women in Britain between the ages of 14 and 59, over 7,000,000 are in the services or in paid employment. Of the single women between 18 and 40, 9 out of every 10 are in essential war work; the rest are either physically unfit or engaged in taking care of younger brothers and sisters or elderly parents—467,000 are in the services; 56,000 are doing full time civil defense work; 6,500,000 are in industry.

In 42 British Government ordnance factories, 6 out of every 10 employees are women. Half the employees in the chemicals and explosives industries and 4 out of 10 in the engineering and allied industries are women. In the iron and steel industries British women do 950 types of jobs—working at blast furnaces, at smelting, in forges and foundries. In aircraft manufacture they are engaged on 150 processes. In May 1942 the British Ministry of Labor ruled that women industrial workers must work a minimum of 52 hours a week unless they were married and had domestic responsibilities.

On the British railways near London 105,000 women have been employed—releasing 100,000 men for the armed forces. They do the dirty work with the clean. The London Passenger Transport Board employs 3,500 women on engineering, 7,000 as bus conductors, 600 as porters, and 450 as ticket sellers. Thousands more are employed on bus systems in other parts of the country. Half the total number of post-office employees are women—more than 125,000 of them. The Auxiliary Territorial Services (A. T. S.) has over 200,000 members who work at more than 60 trades beside the men in khaki. They work, for example, as switchboard and teleprinter operators, dispatch riders, cooks, draftsmen, auditors—and many work on experimental ranges, in gunnery research, on antiaircraft duties, radar duties, and with searchlight batteries.

The Women's Royal Naval Service (WRENS), with over 40,000 members between the ages of 17½ and 50, recruit girls to replace men in nearly 80 categories of shore duty, besides manning small motor launches in harbor waters and undertaking certain duties at sea. The Women's Auxiliary Air Force (WAAF) has over 100,000 women who work with the R. A. F. as armorers, electricians, metallurgists, photographers, parachute repairers, bomb plotters, laboratory assistants, code and cipher clerks, and so forth. The strength of the W. A. A. F. is now greater than that of the R. A. F. in September 1938.

The Women's Voluntary Services, with over a million members, has organized women volunteers to help in every kind of civil defense and war emergency work. President of the organization is Lady Reading, who is assisted by an advisory council of representatives from over 60 women's organizations. It was women of the W. V. S. who organized the evacuation of congested areas at the time of the blitz—compiled registers of houses to which children were to be sent, helped to take evacuees to the refugee areas, providing meals on arrival, and local transport.

The Women's Auxiliary Police Corps was recruited to supplement the small number of regular policewomen employed in peacetime and now numbers more than 5,000 policewomen in England and Wales. The Women's Section of the Air Transport Auxiliary consists of paid women pilots who ferry aircraft from the manufacturers to air force stations and blood banks to hospitals.

The Mechanized Transport Corps is an organization of volunteer drivers whose work has been approved by the Minister of Transport, and who undertake no work not guaranteed as essential by the Government. They buy their own khaki uniforms and many work without pay. The Women's Legion is a London organization of women drivers operating as a voluntary corps. It recruits women up to the age of 58 who are exempt from serving in the regular auxiliary services, and operates mobile canteens and drives for various government agencies.

Virginia-born Lady Astor, comparing ordinary English girls with some extra-healthy female members of the master race, once quipped: "Give me a woman from the East End of London with adenoids and varicose veins and she will have more guts." Five years later, buzz bombs and rockets prove Lady A. can pick winners.

Four out of every 10 antiaircraft guns in England are "manned" by women—with Winston Churchill's pretty daughter, Mary, in charge of one of them. Under the command of General Pile, many women ack-ack crews went into action against the flying bombs when they were London's most serious threat. Now several female crews—hardened in action against buzz bombs—are manning guns in France. It was a woman, Flight Officer Constance Babington-Smith, of the British WAAF, who first spotted a robot bomb in an aerial photograph of a mysterious experimental station at Peenemuende. A woman's sharp eyes prevented the Nazis from achieving the surprise they hoped for when they boasted that robot bombs would win the war for them.

Average feminine wardrobe in England—now only two and one-half pairs of stockings and four dresses. Milady has only one one-hundredth of her prewar underwear supply. In one branch of the service they have collected some American wedding dresses—for renting to fighting brides—rental about $3 and the cost of cleaning. Girls conserve scraps of lipstick, keeping perfume, powder, stockings, and dresses for special occasions—going on dates, getting married, having babies, as Nazi terror weapons fall not far off.

Smart, sophisticated Lady Edwina Mountbatten, who social-butterflied her way through the 1920's and early 1930's, is now backing up her fighting husband all the way. No polite rolling of bandages or easy knitting and sewing—but back-breaking work among the wounded. As superintendent-in-chief of the joint Red Cross and St. John's ambulance organization, she has done more than her share—but modestly calls herself "just the wife of a commando."

These are the women—the British—who teach us what to expect from our American girls. With every third house in England bombed, British women can still greet the buzzbombs with remarks like: "Just as I've tidied the place up, down it comes!" At least one little town—the village of Alnwick—has started a memorial to the war effort of its women. The memorial—a new maternity hospital. And Ernie Bevin, Britain's Minister of Labor and National Service, has said: "Our women tipped the scales of victory." Which is why this reporter—tips his hat to them.

Let's Win This Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis chapter of the Rainbow Division Veterans' Association has presented to the country in a very forthright manner its views in regard to the establishment of a durable world peace and problems of post-war reconstruction.

These views are set forth in an article printed in Snow, the organ of the association entitled "Let's Win the Peace."

The article is being widely acclaimed by combat veterans of World War No. 1 who say that it expresses in simple words what all of them are thinking.

I am glad to present this article to the House for its consideration and to ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article referred to is in full as follows:

LET'S WIN THE PEACE

Win the peace! Everybody and his brother are shouting and writing, "win the peace." And what are we doing about it? Following the same pattern exactly of the last war. What do you suppose the buddies we left behind in France a quarter of a century ago are thinking now as they see the picture unfolding? My guess is that they are saying, "Well, let's go, this is where we came in."

All this is only a personal opinion but it seems to me that now is the time for every person in this country and especially every veteran to speak up. Stop and think a moment of the things that are happening in this world today. The mess in Greece. The confusion and chaos in Italy and Belgium. The Polish situation. The Jewish question in Palestine. The Balkans. The set-up in China. The picture in Spain and in certain South American countries. Isn't it about time someone spoke up? Does anyone have a better right to speak out than the man who has fought for his country?

For years now we have listened to that glib remark: "Well, you fellows didn't finish the job in 1918." I am —— sick and tired of it. We did finish our job, turned it over to the politicians and they made the —— mess that was ever created. That is all past history you say and not important. The present is important isn't it, and the future? Well I wonder then if the picture beginning to emerge now looks the same to you as it does to me. The grab for more territory, the scramble for more power, the determination to control other countries, the egotistical stubbornness of certain men and groups of men to have their own way, the secret agreements, the bickering, the distrust, the endless red tape, the evasions and double talk, the large words and small deeds, the empty promises, the starry-eyed dreaming. Doesn't it all look and sound familiar? To me it looks exactly like a repeat performance of the bungling, pussyfooting years following the First World War.

I'm not talking or thinking about any particular man or any particular political party. I'm thinking and talking about politicians of all parties. We have the tragic example of what happened when so-called statesmen attempted to straighten out the world in the years following 1918. Do we have to have another lesson? Can we survive another lesson? Are there any indications that the politicians of today are any smarter than those of 25 years ago? What do you think? Votes and the next election still seem to be the criteria by which the destiny of nations is weighed. It has always been that way and always will be as long as you and I and millions more liks us sit unconcernedly and say, "Aw, what the h——." We let our own battle dead down because we were too —— lazy, blind, and indifferent as to what was going on in the years after 1918. Are you going to let your own boys and their buddies down too?

What can we do, did you say? Well for one thing what's the matter with the Rainbow starting the fight right now to see that some fighting men have a hand in making this peace? Is anyone more entitled to sit at the peace table than the man who pushed the bayonet, threw the grenades, manned the machine guns, slept in fox holes, lived on cold rations, went hungry, froze and still kept going? And I don't mean some one general sitting down with all the politicians and international smoothies. Some figurehead appointed by the politicians as a sort of grand beau geste to the fighting men. I mean a fighting man at the head of the table—a MacArthur, an Eisenhower or a Hal-

sey—and around the table other fighting men, buck privates and second lieutenants, sergeants and captains, corporals and majors—in short the men who did the fighting. You say it wouldn't work. Militaristic? Prussianism? Nuts.

I would rather trust the future of my country and my own future freedom to a MacArthur and Eisenhower or a Halsey than to any of the politicians who have strutted across the world stage in the last 25 years. Why the hell wouldn't it work? Do our politicians or those of any country have a mortgage on all the brains and common sense and guts in the world? If they have, they have kept the fact well hidden.

Let's have men make this peace who know how to speak plain English and have guts and sense enough to speak it. Men who have fought for their country, bled for it; who have frozen and gone hungry for it and have seen their friends die for it. Men who know what a wonderful country this United States is; men, who on a thousand far-off battle-fronts have learned to love the Stars and Stripes and everything it stands for. Let's have men like these make this peace instead of politicians who have spent years on the public pay roll, in an air-conditioned office behind a mahogany desk and whose greatest hardship has been finding a pack of Luckies.

Instead of having men who know exactly which fork to use, who are graceful on the dance floor, who know when to wear striped pants and when to wear white tie and tails—instead of having men like this make the peace this time, let's have men who can bring a bomber home on one engine—men who can hit the beach in a hail of machine-gun fire—men who know what it means to sweat out a night in a jungle foxhole—damn it, let's have men make this peace and not stuffed shirts.

How far do you think these Old World diplomats with their suave blather and double talk would get with Sgt. G. I. Joe at the peace table. I have a feeling that the sergeant might tell them something about like this: "Gentlemen, we are going to use but one language in this conference, just plain, ordinary English and wherever possible words of one syllable. We will say exactly what we mean and mean it. This entire conference will be open to the press. What we do here will affect every man, woman, and child in the world, and they have the right to know what is going on here at all time.

"We are all agreed on one thing, we want no more war. We want the guilty punished and by punished we mean shot. Regardless of what the international lawyers tell us about not being able to punish the head of a country, the head of any country which has practiced mass murder and torture will be shot. Do I make myself clear on that?

"Now, gentlemen, your countries are broke, your cities in shambles, your roads, railroads, and bridges destroyed, your empires falling apart, your people hungry, despondent, bewildered, and fighting among themselves. You need help, you need it now and lots of it.

"My country can and will furnish that help to the best of its ability—but, only under certain conditions. First, we want a peaceful government in your countries. The kind of government is up to your own people. If they want a free democratic government so desperately they are willing to fight for it as my country did, that is their business. We will not interfere—but you will get no help from us until you do have a stable, peaceful government. As the kind of rule your people want is none of our affair, likewise we expect and will see to it that you keep your nose out of our government. We want no isms of any kind in our country. Secondly, this habit some of you have of trying to control the smaller nations will stop now. It is none of your concern who rules in those countries as long as it is a peaceful rule. Third, there will be no more secret meetings, treaties, and agreements. As I said before this entire conference is open to the press and in addition everything we say here is being broadcast to the world. The day is past when half a dozen men sitting around a table in secret can play god over the rest of the world. Fourth, we expect you to pay for this help—in cash, in goods, in services, and in good will. My country is not a Shylock demanding his pound of flesh—but we have learned, gentlemen, that neither does it profit a man nor make him friends to give away his shirt and pants. Fifth, and this applies especially to you gentlemen representing the countries which have claimed to be neutral. Frankly your countries did not hold hands in this pot and some of you held very peculiar ideas about neutrality, so there is very little for you to say. And you might as well understand right now that we expect you to hand over to us any of the murderers who take refuge in your countries. If you do not hand them over we will simply walk in and take them.

"Now gentlemen those are the terms on which you can get the help you need. If my words sound blunt and harsh to you, just bear in mind that this is the second time in one generation my country has been called upon for help and drawn into your Old World fights. We are damn well fed up with your back yard quarrels. My people are people of good will who want to live at peace with the world, work with your people for the good of all—but, if you don't want to play by rules which are above board and open to the world—then if there must be a top-dog in this world to keep the peace and run things, my country will be that top-dog."

Sergeant Joe would probably express himself a lot better than I have but in the main I believe these would be his sentiments. Would it work? I don't know. The other way didn't work so why not try this method? It would be refreshing at least to hear our representative talk in such definite terms for a change; and I wouldn't be at all surprised but what Marshal Stalin might appreciate such plain talking and might even say, "The kid has something there, what are we waiting for, let's get to work."

And I am sure the old Rainbower whose luck ran out back in '18, looking down from the Halls of Valhalla and hearing, perhaps your son or maybe his own son make such a speech would turn to his buddies and say, "By the gods, our country has come of age at last."

Swell stuff you say, but what can I do about it? Damn it you are a free American aren't you? You can talk and write and fight can't you? All right, start fighting then for God knows you will never have a better cause for which to fight. Make no mistake about this—we are going to have to fight like hell to win this peace.

Every veteran and every veteran's organization ought to be able to agree on something like this. Think what twelve or fifteen million men could do if they pulled together. When a politician pulls one bonehead play after another, straddles every question, pussyfoots on every issue, talks big and does nothing—then start raising hell. And 15,000,000 men could raise quite a little hell if they got serious about it. You think the politicians would listen to 15,000,000 votes?

For God's sake let's have men make this peace who don't give a tinker's damn about personal glory or the next election. We don't give two whoops whether they are Democrats, Republicans, or believe in voodooism—whether they represent labor, capital, or the Saturday night pool and poker club. We want men who will represent 130,000,000 Americans and not just a few. Men damn it; fighting men who have fought for their country; men who know what war is like; men who believe in their country, love it, and have proven they are willing to die for it.

If we could do this, then when our number is called and we gather in Odin's Hall for that big reunion, we can face our old buddies and the thousands of fine kids who have joined them and in a clear voice report, "Soldiers, we didn't let you down this time."

A Time for Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of January 15, 1945:

A TIME FOR TRUTH

In their efforts to know the truth from the ponderous mass of propaganda, distortion, and censorship, the American people are rapidly approaching the point where they are measuring the changing tides of war on maps by geographical gains, rather than on the basis of official announcements from their own and other Allied Governments.

Like the reports of the mythical Swedish commercial traveler who is always flying to Stockholm from Berlin to announce that the German people are at the end of their rope, the official and semiofficial announcements of the Allied Governments are received with a generous sprinkling of salt.

Thus, when the great Soviet offensive in Poland was announced by the Germans and confirmed by the Russians, the average American pardonably said, "If it's true it's about time." This may be unfair to the truly great contribution the Russians have made to winning the war, but it is a direct result of exaggeration of war news at its sources thousands of miles from the American scene.

There is so much that is inconsistent about all news affecting the war, both at home and abroad, that the growing skepticism of the American people cannot be ignored. There is, for example, the question of the shortage in cigarettes. The grim story of that situation is beginning to come out—of French civilians trading with a thieving minority of American soldiers who were stealing carloads of cigarettes.

It seemed preferable to the American command in France to let the millions of men at the fronts believe that civilians at home were greedily grabbing all the cigarettes, with the result that the troops went on short rations, rather than to explain that the American cigarettes being sold in France by civilians at $3 a pack had been stolen and placed in circulation in the black market.

Perhaps it was hoped that the people here at home would believe that the De Gaulle government was able to exercise complete authority in civil affairs if the story was suppressed. But we at home know that black markets on such an enormous scale can only operate if civil authority is weak or venal, and that French civil government is still in a state of flux.

Military authorities have been learning the hard way that the Americans at home can take their bad news in stiff doses, and resent any attempt to condition or cushion the bad news.

It is high time that Washington learned the same lessons. The involved maneuvers with manpower, job freezes, slow-down of conversion to civilian production—all part of a concerted drive for a national service act—will only cause greater dissension than ever. If a national service act is necessary it should be passed on its merits and not

as a result of hysterical and half-baked pressure.

Statistics can be made to prove anything, and Washington is over fond of statistical proof of the need for such far-reaching measures. It is an affront to sincere, patriotic, and self-sacrificing Americans to seek to bend them to an objective by assuming that the vast majority of us are scheming ways to circumvent controls necessary for winning the war.

We are aware that no one is infallible, and that great and small mistakes have been made. Perhaps Chester Bowles accomplished more for O. P. A. when he frankly admitted a mistake had been made in estimating food supplies than all the phony whoop-la which had preceded that forthright and honest statement.

We need fewer inspirational inventions and more facts, and it must be realized that facts are not half-truths and distortions, but plain, unadorned truth.

Guaranty of Full-Time Employment at Standard Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered to the National Industrial Conference Board in New York City on Thursday, January 18.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT CAN GUARANTEE FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AT STANDARD WAGES

Ladies and gentlemen of the National Industrial Conference Board, it is a great pleasure to appear again before your Board, which for so many years has conducted a sound, impartial survey of economic problems and set an example now followed by many organizations. I am sure that none has investigated questions with a more realistic and impartial approach, and that none has more successfully assembled the basic facts on which every sound economic policy must be based.

In the last year or two we have seen the announcement of a new theory of government or economics that every man and every woman is entitled to a full-time job at good wages, just as he or she is entitled to police protection and the possession of his own home. The necessary corollary has followed that the Government must guarantee him a full time job at good wages. This is an attractive and plausible theory and it has made substantial headway throughout the United States with very little critical examination of its soundness. Your purpose here this evening is to examine the basis for this new theory.

1. FULL EMPLOYMENT AT STANDARD WAGES IS OUR GOAL BUT NOT A RIGHT TO BE GUARANTEED BY LAW

We can all agree that full employment at good wages for every man and every woman who wishes to work in the United States is a goal devoutly to be wished. It is an ideal to be strenuously sought, and no questioning of its existence as a legal right in any way detracts from the desire of the questioner to attain the ideal. Good wages means, perhaps, $2,500 a year. Obviously a goal of $5,000 a year apiece, or $25,000, is even more desirable. Even the most-hard headed realists will agree that utopia itself is a proper goal to seek.

The distinction is between an ideal or a hope, and a right which can be conferred by law. Thus we can agree on the desirability of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," but even the President today admits that these are merely a hope and not something to be guaranteed by a world government. This proposed new legal right certainly goes far beyond the Declaration of Independence which mentions only the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Constitution while promising to secure the blessing of liberty, only proposes to promote the general welfare. It seems impossible to me, to assert the legal duty of our Government to guarantee full-time employment. It may take many steps toward that goal and adopt many methods which are more likely to secure it than others.

However, the means by which we have raised our standard of living to a higher average than any other country in the history of the world and in a shorter time, have been the application of freedom to individual activity, not the guarantee to anybody of anything other than freedom. The economic machine of America created out of that freedom has made this country the most powerful in the world. That freedom can be qualified so that it does not include the freedom to throw monkey wrenches in the machine. The economic machine can be oiled and speeded up and improved. But I believe I can show not only that a guarantee of work by the Government to every individual is impossible but that it is wholly inconsistent with the very freedom which has produced and animated the machine which provides jobs at good wages.

2. THE NEW PROPOSED ECONOMIC BILL OF RIGHTS

Just what is this theory of a Government guarantee of employment? My attention was first called to it in the National Resources Planning Board Report of January 1, 1943, in which that Board stated its belief that it should be the declared policy of the United States Government "to underwrite full employment for the unemployed and guarantee a job for every man released from the armed forces or the war industries with fair pay and working conditions." The whole report of that Board was based on that theory, without the slightest consideration of cost or taxation. It proposed a vast spending program for the United States Government as a means of producing prosperity. The Government was not only to underwrite full employment but it was to "underwrite effective demand for goods and services" and "underwrite the attainment of high production."

President Roosevelt adopted the so-called economic bill of rights of the Board in his address to Congress in January 1944, and reaffirmed his position this year, saying that "of these rights the most fundamental, and one on which the fulfillment of the others in large degree depends, is the right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation." He adds that the full employment means not only jobs but productive jobs at standard wages.

The C. I. O.-P. A. C. platform of January 1944 commends the President's new bill of rights and says that the full employment program must "be guaranteed by the Government with a prepared program of jobs at useful work, with standard wages and working conditions, if and to the extent that private industry falls short of the guarantee."

The Kilgore subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, largely dominated by the Political Action Committee thinking, proposed the enactment of this theory into law. Their bill would require the President each year to inform Congress as to the prospects of employment and national production and if his estimate falls short of full employment, to recommend a specific program of Federal expenditure to fill the gap. The policy crystallizes into the proposal that the United States Government shall guarantee 60,000,000 jobs at $2,500 a year.

The whole policy sounds so easy and attractive that it has been thoughtlessly accepted by many without analysis. Even the Committee of Economic Development, made up of hard-headed businessmen, at first rather undertook to assume for industry the responsibility of guaranteeing from fifty-three to fifty-seven million jobs. A guarantee of employment by private enterprise of course is even more difficult than one by government, because there are millions of employers wholly unable to employ more men than economic conditions permit, and wholly without the power to combat nation-wide economic forces. The danger is that if employers undertake the responsibility and fail in any degree because of conditions beyond their control, it would open the door for the claim that the Government must step into the breach with the complete guarantee.

3. WHY SHOULD WE GUARANTEE ANY SPECIFIED NUMBER OF JOBS?

The first question that arises is whether it is necessary or wise to provide, or try to provide, 60,000,000 or even 50,000,000 full time jobs. There are only 35,000,000 families in the United States, and this would provide two jobs for many million families. Should there be an obligation to provide a full time job for every woman who wants to work when perhaps her husband or other member of the family is perfectly able and willing to support her? Is it perhaps not better to keep boys and girls longer in school, and retire the aged at a lower age? How can we say that there must be 60,000,000 jobs when perhaps 50,000,000 workers can do all the work of the Nation? Doesn't a nation have a higher standard of living if the work can be done by a fewer number of people in fewer hours?

4. A DIRECT GUARANTY OF A JOB TO EVERY MAN AND WOMAN IS IMPRACTICAL

In analyzing the soundness of this new doctrine, a good many questions arise as to its exact meaning. What is full employment and what is a good wage? Is there to be a guarantee of any job a man wants in any industry, or is it to be such a job as the Government chooses to provide? Who is to decide what a good wage is? Men have a way of overestimating their own ability and few are going to be satisfied with the wage the Government thinks adequate. Is the Government going to guarantee a flat wage for all, or a wage having some relation to the amount and quality of work that a man does? Who will decide when his wages are to be raised?

The President says every man has the right to a job in the "industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation." The total number of men employed in these categories is only thirty million. How can they be increased and why should they be? Millions are employed in other types of service. The Census of 1940 showed 9,758,000 employers and own-account workers, including farmers. How will the Government guarantee this kind of a job, or guarantee that these can make a living wage? Some 2,300,000 people are listed as in domestic service. Is the provision of such a job going to be a performance of the Government guarantee?

5. DIRECT GUARANTY INVOLVES COMPLETE REGIMENTATION

It is clear to me that any direct guaranty of full-time jobs at good wages would in-

volve the Government in the placement of every man and woman in the country, and ultimately the assignment by the Government of every man and woman to the job selected by the Government. This is exactly the system pursued in Russia today, as anyone can see by reading the recent articles in the Readers' Digest by William L. White. It is in contradition of the whole American tradition and is bound to destroy the very freedom for which our armies fight throughout the world. It is obvious to me that the proponents of the theory would very quickly back away from any literal interpretation of the supposed guaranty. They must quickly disown the theory that the right to work is one which can be ordered by the Government and protected by court decree.

6. GUARANTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT ON PUBLIC WORKS IMPRACTICAL

How then is this guaranty to be carried out? The Political Action Committee suggests that it is to be done by direct Government employment of all those not employed by private industry. The unthinking popular view is that the jobs are to be guaranteed by the planning and execution of public works. The President says that full employment means employment in productive jobs and therefore the public works must not be make-shift or make-work projects, but must be real public works. I have yet to hear of the most ardent new dealer who has devised a system of spending more than $5,000,000,000 a year on productive public works.

A billion dollars a year for public housing is about the largest single proposal for the expenditure of public money on public works. We passed a public-road bill proposing the expenditure of approximately half a billion dollars a year of Federal money, and I doubt if it will all be spent. We passed a billion-dollar flood control bill but it will certainly take 5 years to carry it out, so that it only provides two hundred million a year. Rivers and harbors expenditure is likely to be even less. Supposing we can find $5,000,000,000 a year of worth-while projects for the expenditure of Federal funds, that would mean about two and one-half million jobs. But we are trying to provide 60,000,000 jobs. We can get many more jobs by tuning up the private-economic machine by 10 percent, than by the largest public-works program anyone has conceived.

We found in the great depression that the employment of a man on public works cost three to five times the amount expended on work relief programs per man, and six to ten times the cost of direct relief. Furthermore, public works are only a stop-gap, because most such works cost money to maintain after they are constructed. The construction of a factory may give employment to many men year after year. But a courthouse or a new road or a new school costs more to maintain and more taxes than before. Of course, there are some productive public works, but most of them produce no permanent jobs.

7. GUARANTY OF EMPLOYMENT BY GOVERNMENT INVOLVES GOVERNMENT ENTRY INTO BUSINESS

The lack of public works available to meet mass unemployment suggests to those who advocate direct Government employment that the Government would have to go into many fields of non-Government activity. Most employment in any nation must be in the making of goods and the furnishing of service. The Government could take over factories and make clothing, food, and other necessities to be given away to the low-income groups. We saw a start in that direction in the 30's. The difficulty is that the moment the Government enters such a field, private capital is afraid to go ahead. You hamper and discourage the recovery of the very economic machine on which you are relying to produce prosperity. No individual can successfully compete with the Government. Constant Government experimentation and interference in the 30's delayed recovery far beyond the time required in foreign countries, or in past depressions in this country. The expenditure by the Government of 30 or 40 billion dollars a year to give direct employment on a full-time basis and good wages to, say, 15,000,000 men would add that sum to the public debt and certainly discourage any attempt at real recovery.

8. GUARANTY THEORY IS THE OLD KEYNESIAN PUBLIC SPENDING THEORY IN A NEW DISGUISE

When the difficulty of direct employment, and the limitations of any public works program, are pointed out the proponents of the guaranty theory turn to another policy which they probably intended to follow all the time.

Public works shall be only one branch of the means by which jobs are to be guaranteed. The other branches are set forth in the President's recent budget message of January 3, most of which passed unnoticed in the excitement of the war and foreign relations.

That message proposes many different methods of additional Government spending after the war. The borrowing authority of the Farm Security Administration is to be increased $60,000,000 for rural rehabilitation. The Commodity Credit Corporation is to spend two billions more in the purchase of crops. The Federal Government is to give aid to all common school and high school education, leading ultimately, according to the National Resources Planning Board, to a Federal expenditure of $3,000,000,000.

Federal loans and guaranties are recommended to stimulate private construction after the war. Federal salary rates are to be increased. Taxes on consumers are all to be reduced while there is no indication that progressive income taxes on high incomes are to be reduced. Rather they are to be increased. Unemployment compensation payment rates are to be increased. Six billion dollars is to be turned over to the proposed international monetary fund and the proposed international bank. This aid to foreign countries is to be supplemented by loans extended by the Export-Import Bank not only to cover short and medium-term commitments to finance exporters but in the form of long-term loans for reconstruction and development. Finally the President's program is to include provisions for extended social security, including medical care; for better education, health, and nutrition; for the improvement of our homes, cities, and farms; and for the development of transportation facilities and river valleys. To this he adds compulsory military training, which may easily cost $2,500,000,000 a year.

When we add to all these proposals the expenditure of $6,000,000,000 for interest on the public debt, five or six billion dollars for the post-war Army and Navy, the expense of the regular Government departments, and the expenditures already authorized for veterans we find a Federal Budget which may well amount to $50,000,000,000 a year. Many of these expenditures are frankly urged as a means of guaranteeing full employment. It is said that we have had full employment during the war because of vast Government spending and the only way we can fulfill the new guaranty is to continue this Government spending in time of peace. In this form the supposed guaranty of employment merges into the same old Government-spending theory advocated by Keynes and Hansen—the theory that a nation can spend itself into prosperity, that deficits are a blessing in disguise, that we need have no concern about our public debt because we owe it to ourselves. We tried this theory in the thirties, and it left us with a large debt and 10,000,000 unemployed. Any huge spending, whether for direct employment or to prime the pump for indirect employment, leads to the same result. The post-war Budget of the Government will be at least $20,000,000,000 for expenses that we cannot escape—four times our pre-war Budget. It may be just possible to find a tax system that will produce this much income in time of peace without discouraging all initiative. If we add the additional Government spending proposed by the guaranty theory, we will run the Budget up to forty or fifty billion dollars. Either a tax system must be imposed at even higher rates than the war system now in force, or we must increase the debt by somewhere between fifteen and thirty billion dollars a year. Either of these alternatives would destroy the economic machine upon which our prosperity has been based. Either would destroy the system of private enterprise to which the advocates of this new theory, even Earl Browder, give lip service.

9. HUGE GOVERNMENT DEFICITS MEAN THE END OF FREEDOM

If the present tax rates on business are continued, there will be no incentive to anyone either to put his money into new business or to expand old business. If the present rates on individual incomes are continued, there will be little incentive to any man to exert himself to build up his income with the hope of providing a better living for himself and a better education for his children, or a better provision for his family after death. The incentive created by the American system of rewards for genius, initiative and daring will disappear, and it is vain to hope that the expansion of private industry will continue. One industry after another will become unprofitable, just as the railroads became unprofitable before the war. The Government will have to finance necessary expansion and will gradually absorb one industry after another.

The advocates of the theory, however, do not really contemplate any such tax system. They are disciples of the Keynesian theory that the public debt can be indefinitely increased.

To me it is obvious that this can only end in extreme inflation. Because of Government deficits, we have had an increase in the cost of living of approximately 30 percent during the war, in spite of the most rigid price and wage controls. In my opinion, while controls of this kind can be enforced to some extent in wartime, in peacetime in America they would suffer the fate of prohibition. A steady increase in prices would force increases of wages and a cycle of rising costs which could not be checked while Government deficits continued.

Such an inflation would lead to more attempted Government regulation of everything and everybody and more Government expense and finally a complete break-down of the financial and banking structure upon which our commerce, business, and currency are based. It would mean the destruction of the private industry system. We could point out that it had been sabotaged by its enemies, but I am afraid it would be like Humpty Dumpty, and, once fallen, all the king's horses and all the king's men could not put it together again. We would have to reconstruct our business and price system completely and that would only be done on the basis of 100 percent Government control and operation. In my opinion the more radical wing of those who advocate the spending theory, and this Government guarantee of full employment, really look forward with pleasure to that result. It is the best and surest method of destroying the system which they detest.

10. FOREIGN TRADE NO PANACEA FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

One interesting phase of the full employment program and the spending theory is the plan to lend money abroad in large sums. It is frequently said, and generally accepted without analysis of any kind, that we cannot provide full employment without a tremendous increase in our export trade. We are exporting about $12,000,000,000 worth of goods a year, about 80 percent under lease-lend. It is said that that volume must continue even though we have to lend all the money to continue it.

Of course, in the immediate post-war period it will be necessary to lend money for humanitarian reasons, and perhaps in an amount sufficient to enable the foreign countries to set their own economic machinery in motion, but continued Government lending can only have the same effect which we saw in the twenties with private lending. Sooner or later it becomes glaringly apparent that the loans will never be repaid. Thereupon the lending stops and the employment created thereby comes to a sudden and disastrous end, producing or accentuating a depression; and the debt is added to our own debt and our citizens pay the interest on it. Obviously, it can be of no advantage to our workers to produce goods and give them away, and that is what foreign trade means if it is created only by large loans which cannot be repaid. Like the other forms of spending, it will produce employment at the cost of ultimately destroying all employment and all freedom with it.

The sounder advocates of a stimulated foreign trade realize that we must import goods if the trade is to give us any permanent increase in employment. But if those imports reduce employment in our home industries, why is there any net increase in employment, except a very small advantage comparatively in buying the imports cheaper? The theory is that by manufacturing goods to be shipped abroad, we create an additional purchasing power in the workers who produce those exports, which can be used to pay for imported goods without interfering with our own industries. Since, however, it is admitted that exports are of no use unless paid for by imports, and that an American market must be created for those imports, why isn't it just as easy to create an additional home market for home goods as it is to create an American market for imported goods?

The truth probably lies between the two extremes. Some additional market can be created for imported goods which is not available for domestic production. But the idea that foreign trade can produce any tremendous increase in employment, unless we are going to give away our products at the expense of the taxpayer, is a mirage. And one thing is certainly clear. There can be no sound expansion of employment by the Government guaranteeing expanded exports, but only by the gradual building up by hard work of a foreign trade based on mutual advantage in the exchange of certain types of goods. Tariffs can be lower, but they cannot be so reduced as to destroy established industries in this country.

11. THE SPENDING THEORY IS FATAL TO THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

So also the path to prosperity and happiness at home cannot be solved by any panacea of public spending or a Government guarantee of full employment. It can only be achieved by the gradual speeding up of the great private economic machinery upon which our prosperity depends. That is indeed a difficult task because the economic machine is infinitely delicate. To secure the best results prices must bear the right relation to wages and wages to prices, There must be an accurate adjustment between the production of capital goods and consumers goods. There must be incentive to save and invest and work and open up new fields. There must be a continued reward for hard work and ability and the willingness to take a chance. There must be a free choice of employment so that every man may choose that profession or calling to which he is best sulted. These results can only be brought about by sound fiscal policies, proper encourragement of spending, and the maintenance of individual freedom. The progress which we have achieved under the American system in the last 150 years at least suggests that we had better rely on it a while longer. It has the advantage of being based on freedom of the individual as no other economic system is based. Let us not give up our guarantee of freedom for a spurious guarantee of employment.

For the spending theory on which the legal guarantee of full employment is based is a false god. It is fatal to the very prosperity which it seeks to attain. It is fatal to sound government because the spending of money becomes its own justification regardless of the soundness of the project for which it is spent. It teaches the people that they can obtain something for nothing and that every man is entitled to the same living from the Government whether his ability and his willingness to produce justify it or not; and therefore it is fatal to the character of the people who fall down and worship it.

Time To Take Stock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address entitled "Time To Take Stock," delivered by former Governor Alf M. Landon, of Topeka, Kans., before the annual meeting of the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Cleveland, Ohio, on January 18, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am especially happy to have this opportunity of addressing this group of outstanding young businessmen of the great State of Ohio. The opportunity carries with it a heavy responsibility, because the future of the Nation and of the world is in the hands of the on-coming generation. What you think, the opinions you form, the attitude you take, will determine the course of future history. Therefore, it behooves any man who addresses you, to guard well his lips. I shall do that; if for no other reason than that I know no one could pull the wool over your eyes if he wanted to.

In a peculiar way, this terrific war which we are fighting, is your war. Your generation is fighting it; you and your children and your children's children must pay its staggering costs. And for the rest of your life the world you will live in, will be the world which emerges from this war, its shape, and its spirit determined by what we do today. It is of the highest importance, then, that you should know what it is all about: What are the United Nations fighting for? What is our ultimate purpose? What are we doing to attain that objective? How wisely and steadfastly are our leaders moving toward the desired end?

Pertinent questions. And the answer is: You don't know. Through no fault of your own, you don't know. Nobody knows for sure.

At a time when our every thought and effort should be directed to winning the war and establishing a lasting peace, the American people are in a state of confusion, dazzled one day by high-sounding phrases of idealism, and bewildered and dismayed the next day by acts which belie the Allies' avowal of high intentions.

When we should have kept our discussions in accord with the character and the needs of the American people, we were wrangling about how we were going to stew the rabbit we hadn't caught; about world restoring, reforming, mythmaking with fine words—all adding to the burdens of our forces in the field.

The American people are in the dark as to the real relationship existing among the Allies. We have not been able to get a clear concept of real conditions. Every effort to inform the public of the enormous difficulties in our path has been hushed. Even questions have been resented or brushed aside by a cynical wisecrack. Every attempt at honest discussion has been met with hysterical screams of "isolationism," or "Red baiter," or "British hater." Even in Congress attempts are made to smother discussion. This black-out, this confusion and uncertainty, creates unrest and suspicion among the people, which may lead to dire results. A fatal dissension among the United Nations may be produced by heat generated by smoldering as easily as by friction.

We are in one of the darkest hours of our entire history. There is urgent necessity that we come down from the Olympian heights and get our feet on the ground. We must stop dodging the crucial fact that the necessary teamwork is lacking among Russia, Britain, and America—that those differences are well known by the enemy and are of major encouragement to them. These differences cannot be solved by refusing to mention them, nor by pretending that they do not exist.

Those differences must be composed with realistic frankness but with every respect and toleration for the fundamentally different backgrounds from which Russia, Britain, and America approach this war—if we are to achieve a victorious peace.

Without taking our eyes for one moment off the ultimate aim, right now I am more concerned about winning the war than anything else. Three years ago, when we caught our breath after Pearl Harbor, we were going to bomb the treacherous Japs off the face of the earth within 6 weeks. But we didn't. Three months ago we were ready on account of optimistic campaign oratory to roll right into Berlin. But we didn't. Despite our heroic and masterly efforts in the Pacific and on the Continent, we are now told we have only just started.

We are in the perilous position of conducting a two-ocean war, one 6,000 miles from our shore, the other nearly 5,000 miles from our center of production, without a common political policy and seemingly without a common military policy among the Big Three.

Russia has at last moved on the vital eastern front with gratifying results; but for months press dispatches from Washington said our high command was "in hopes" of a Russian offensive sometime, but was in the dark as to Russia's definite intentions. Such uncertainty was pregnant with terrible disaster. We have every admiration for what Russia did in the face of terrible handicaps when Hitler turned upon her. Her armies and people made history. Her sacrifices and heroism are epic. But it must not be forgotten that we were her active, cooperating part-

ner in that time of peril. She performed wonders in her production of war material; but, as Stalin has gratefully acknowledged, if it were not for the supplies America poured into Russia and Great Britain at a time when we were equipping ourselves to strike hard and often, the outcome would have been vastly different. Russia could not have driven the Germans back without our aid. It was that which established the bond between us.

The good news of today should not eclipse the basic fact that we could ring Germany's neck in shorter time if we had the means for the exchange of definite military information that would enable each of the Big Three to fit its war plans into the others.

Being partners, we have a right, then, to insist that Russia take her place on the joint military staff with Britain and America in order to formulate a common military policy.

If the joint military staff knew how many guns, how many soldiers, how many sailors, how many airplanes, and when and where each of the Big Three would furnish, it would be able to put together a more coherent, efficient, smooth-running battle machine on all fronts.

No one of us can win the war alone. If we cannot have mutual confidence and coordinated effort in the war today, how much more difficult, then, is the task of achieving cooperation in building a lasting peace when the Nazi peril is past?

There may be good reasons for Russia's refusal to give us bomber bases in conquered eastern Poland, from which we could attack the Nazi factories in eastern Germany—the chief source of German war material. But we ought to know what those reasons are. There may have been good reasons for the ejection of our military missions to Rumania and Bulgaria, but Washington should have known those reasons in advance and we should know them now. Suppression of facts creates mystification and leads to unrest and suspicion of an ally which may be wholly without foundation. In justice to Russia, to say nothing of our own morale, we ought to know.

Naturally Russia may not now make any announcement of her policies in the Pacific after the Nazis have surrendered. I can only hope that Mr. Roosevelt has succeeded in getting definite commitment. In the absence of such commitment, we must face the grave consequences that we may never have the use of the Russian bases.

We have lost our air bases in China, the cutting of China in two by the Japanese is a colossal calamity. Those reverses will balance the splendid Philippines victories of our valiant forces, if Japan has time to construct an inland coastal route that will facilitate her access to needed supplies. The outlying islands will become of less strategic value if Japan is able to complete her conquest of China. The Pacific war then is changed from basically naval operations to a slugging land war comparable to the European war, except that it is twice as far from home and we have even with the Phillipines no base comparable to England from which to start our invasion of either the Japanese islands or of China. Yet there are those who still cling to the hope that air power and the Navy are all we need to do the trick.

Due to a lamentable lack of accord between Washington and London, the backing and filling over recognition of General De Gaulle, only a fraction of the men the fighting French could put into the field are in action so far, while we are frantically extending the draft in this country. And this is not the fault of France alone.

On the political front, all Europe is divided into three parts: Russian, British and German. The Communists in France and other liberated countries are carrying on vigorous anti-American propaganda. They are crushing everywhere not only the monarchist but the liberal, democratic and socialist anti-Nazi underground, in their attempt to establish Communist states by terrorist methods. That issue surpasses any boundary dispute in importance. Of even greater importance, the Communists treat friendly allied nations the same as enemy nations. Britain and America must bear their share of the responsibility for failing to be better prepared to meet the problems of liberation. We may agree with the Pope's Christmas message that the cause of the war was a "concentration of dictatorial power."

Our interest then, in lasting peace forbids closing our eyes to the consequences of puppet dictators springing up like mushrooms all over Europe. The disorder and insurgency in Greece, Belgium and Italy has forced the British to divert men and materials from their front in order to prevent complete anarchy, a most serious threat to our forces. The Greek situation is a case of Greeks fighting Greeks, and Greeks fighting British and Russians; just as the Spanish civil war developed into Spaniards fighting Spaniards and Spaniards fighting Russians, Italians, and Germans.

The Secretary of State made an official contribution to disunity when he publicly rebuked the British for pursuing a policy in Greece which they claim had been previously approved by the President himself. That seemed to be the straw that broke the camel's back in England and caused their explosion of resentment at us for which we must bear some measure of responsibility.

America is showing tragic symptoms of dividing also between the Lion and the Bear. One group advises that we should line up with Russia in order to achieve permanent peace. Another says we should place our bets on Great Britain in order to maintain stability and peace in the world.

On the economic front, from August 1939 to date, the destruction of property values through war has been greater than in the entire period from the downfall of the Roman Empire to August 1939. Our banking system is more entangled with Government finance than Germany's was before the advent of Hitler.

Here is where I believe that we can win the war and lose the peace. We cannot let the cost prevent or even retard victory. Our valiant forces are entitled to the best war equipment, not only in quantity but also in quality. Howevery, a farsighted government should estimate where we are going to come out "at," as the saying goes. Any individual must estimate the cost of any project he is engaged in, and government, even in war, must keep in mind the immutible laws of economics.

Our first job, of course, must be in concentrating on winning the war. Our first job in winning the peace must be concentrated on leaving the United States in the strongest possible financial condition. We will probably wind up the war with somewhere between a third and half a trillion dollars of national indebtedness. Yet, outside of a few voices crying in the wilderness, too little attention is being given to what that means. We are content; that is, the majority is content, with assurances that old economic laws belong to the horse-and-buggy days. Because we are living in a streamlined machine era and a streamlined government era, we are told that all our financial troubles will be solved by brand-new streamlined economics.

In my judgment failure to achieve a lasting peace will not come from our inability to work out some form of collective world security so much as it will come from chaos, misery, and abject human suffering caused by the collapse of economic stability of governments all over the world. Dictators are created out of the misery that results from economic collapse of governments.

I am not so much worried about our inability to carry the financial burden of this war, as I am our failure to give it the attention now that its importance warrants.

If we are to bear our share of reconstructing the kind of civilization we believe in, that our strength warrants, our humanitarian instincts demand, and our strength requires, we must be on a sound basis financially.

We won't solve the problem by being afraid to discuss it for fear of alarming the American people. It is bigger than the economies that could be made in the nonmilitary expenses of our governments. Although that is one of the steps we should have taken long ago we admit there is waste and inefficiency in all governments. But the false theory that we could spend our way to prosperity has resulted in abnormal government extravagance.

We must first dismiss from our minds the crackpot schemes of managed currency and permanent deficit financing. Just as we set up in the Atlantic Charter an ideological banner for this war, we must set up a sound financial base to cling to. The crux of the whole business lies in the problems of production wages and profits. Therefore, the entire range of Government policies toward business is involved.

If the United States is not a sound financial mooring post for the world to tie to in the post-war years, then we along with other nations will travel a merry gait to hell, regardless of the form of international organizations for peace. The problem of a durable peace includes economic stability as well as political and military agreement. The great and pressing need for food, clothing, and shelter is a powerful force in shaping the destiny of many nations.

As great as the destruction of property values, even more terrifying is the destruction of moral values. We were told we were fighting with Great Britain under the banner of the Atlantic Charter. Beautifully engraved copies by the tens of thousands with the purported signatures of Churchill and Roosevelt were distributed over the land by the O. W. I. But only a few weeks ago the President shocked the world by his admission that no such formal document ever existed. The Sacred Covenant was nothing but scribbled pieces of memoranda—some of which have been lost. Neither he nor Churchill had ever signed it. Their signatures proved to be a misrepresentation of a Government agency. That misrepresentation was never corrected until the President laughed it off when pressed for the facts.

Never has the moral leadership of America and the world received such a blow. No wonder the world is confused as to our foreign policies. No wonder it questions the characted, the integrity, the salf-respect, and the intentions of a people whose Government resorts to such trumperies. The integrity of Government, with its people, is the backbone of a Nation. As Plato well said "As a government is, so are the people."

The Atlantic Charter, which we now discover had only a phony physical form, seems to be about ready to give up the ghost and lose its spiritual form as well. If tragically it shall be laid in the tomb of oblivion, we doubtless shall be told that it was a thing of beauty but far too fine and ethereal for a realistic world. And, if you will reread it in the light of what is happening in Greece, in Poland, in the Balkans, and the Baltic states, you will see that the distinguished world leaders who did not sign it are in position to say "We merely gave you something to shoot at." And in truth that is all they did. They merely set forth certain principles upon which they based their hopes and wishes, and desires and belief. Those are the words they used—no positive commitments. They did announce that their countries seek no aggrandizement, and they did promise to

aid and encourage practical measures which will lighten the crushing burden of armaments. That was good; though, to be sure, manifest destiny may again force unsought territory upon some of the Allies, and disarmament may be found not practical. Nevertheless it was a noble document—or at least a bunch of scraps of paper with noble aspirations.

Do not mistake me. I would not belittle the Atlantic Charter nor the great service it rendered in heartening the peace-loving peoples of the world. It was a noble document. A thousand years from now it may rank with the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence, if, and only if, we turn its noble wishes and desires into living, breathing actualities. The time has come when the American people and the peoples of the world have a right to know whether it means anything or not; whether it is real or phony; whether the leaders to whom we have given power will regard it as a sacred promise to be kept at whatever cost, or will complacently ignore it. You have a right to know and to know now, lest you become another disillusioned generation such as World War No. 1 produced.

To be sure the realization of the ideals held before us when we entered this war, present difficulties and trying problems. We knew that when the Atlantic Charter was hailed with such loud acclaim. We knew that neither war no diplomacy is a Sunday-school picnic. And that is all the greater reason for our wanting to know what is going on in world politics. If we or any of our allies are fudging we have a right to know how far they fudge.

Another conference of the heads of the United Nations will be held, we are told, in the near future. May we hope that our President upon his return will follow the precedents set by Mr. Churchill after previous conferences, and make a report to the Nation of what occurred and what was decided? Mr. Churchill found it safe and desirable to make such reports. But we have never had such reports from our President.

Our self-respect received another blow at Dumbarton Oaks. Like the Moscow Conference, it could be ballyhooed as a great achievement only because of its indefiniteness. It has yet to be completed as to its vital parts. The talk of transposing the accord now existing among the United Nations shows an almost childish refusal to recognize the existing condition of discord. I say the first job is to tie together our war efforts. Let us create accord before we talk about transplanting it in a new field.

We must have a better understanding than we now have of the gigantic international problems to be solved, if anything is to be saved out of the present world-wide wreckage.

We must recognize that we are actually pursuing an isolationist policy with regard to Europe, where the seeds of the next war or peace are being planted.

We must understand that despite all the fine words in the Atlantic Charter, the Moscow Pact, and at Dumbarton Oaks, we are giving the green light to Russian imperialism and British imperialism, and we also are squinting in that direction ourselves.

The proopsed swapping territories to satisfy the conflicting claims of the victorious coalition is a return to the old order of things with a vengeance.

The movement of populations around like cattle is as old as the Jewish captivity in Babylon.

Peace has never come to longing mankind by such methods, and never will. Always victorious statesmen have dealt in emotional thinking and the short term view.

Always permanent peace could be obtained by a "universal union" in the form of an alliance against some "awful" nation. The French were "it" after the Napoleonic wars. Before them were the "terrible Swedes," and the Spaniards.

Always the form rather than the substance has been emphasized. Always the front of high and noble purposes—rather than the hard, grueling, and unpopular task of writing a just peace that attempts the long view of removing some of the causes of war. In face of the new devil's stew of secret alliances based on the balance of power theory, of strategic borders, the seizure of territory, enemy and Allies alike, people are increasingly asking why are we in this war.

Well, as I said early in 1942—"Our hides are now at stake." We must face the grim facts of a two-ocean war—neither of them won, chaos in the liberated countries of Europe and the lack of vital collaboration between the principle allies.

Civilized people have the right to expect—to demand—willing cooperation among their governments, in preventing the destruction and disaster of future wars.

With the victorious conclusion of World War No. 2 there comes once more another opportunity for man to save himself from destruction. That means creating a new type of international relationships. But so far we are only following the old, old pattern.

Our policy of fearing to question our allies has contributed to the failure in creating adequate joint machinery for either peace or war. The hush-hush, everything is hunky-dory treatment no longer can conceal from the American people the friction between ourselves and our allies. It has definitely added to the difficulties of reconciling those differences. It can result in a disastrous explosion if nothing consistently constructive is done to meet and forestall dangerous consequences.

Part of our national tradition is a patient skepticism which does not like to be driven or shouted at. It is as natural for an American to argue the topics of the day with his neighbors as it is for a dog to scratch his fleas.

Like the blacksmith at an anvil, we hammer out the tools of conviction and the sparks fly. Argument is the bellows with which we keep alive the fires of democracy, and is the essential beginning of the process. This is not confusion; it is not disunity. It is the way, the indispensable way, to freedom.

Once we know where we are at we can spit on our hands and gird our loins for the long pull. And also to reach an effective coalition for maintaining peace.

If the fundamental differences between the United Nations will not stand public airing, we had better find it out before we enter into a permanent union.

Every American, as a matter of sanity, desires political and economic peace among nations of the earth. That high ideal was implanted in men's minds and hearts when the herald angels sang nearly 2,000 years ago. The ideal has never died. Mr. Chamberlain desired peace and thought he had achieved peace in our time by appeasement at Munich, but his wishful thinking only made more certain the most devastating war in human history. He was, to say the least, overly optimistic. He did not face realities.

We easily can make the same mistake. Our hope of establishing lasting peace through international organization, based on collective security, is in perilous danger today and for the very same reason, namely, an overly optimistic appraisal of the realities of conditions in the rest of the world, and the surrender of our ideologies to the theory that might makes right.

America's War and Peace Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on America's war and peace aims, delivered by me before America's Town Meeting of the Air, in New York, January 18 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What are America's war and peace aims? A trite answer is: "To win the war, and establish a just and enduring peace." We shall not win the war, however, until we compel Germany and Japan to disarm; prohibit their rearmament and construction of planes, and cause to be removed from power the warmongers of these nations.

That we shall win the war eventually is certain. That we shall have a just and enduring peace, is not so certain. As Hamlet said, "Aye! There's the rub." Let us turn to Patrick Henry's guide, "The light from the lamp of experience." Twenty-five years ago, a so-called peace was made. It proved to be a farce. Let us ask ourselves whether we have learned anything from the bitter experiences of that war. One recalls the ironic comment of Briand, who said, "The only lesson we learn from experience is that we learn nothing from experience."

A few years ago, Mr. Churchill and our President gave to the world a statement of aims and purposes, called the Atlantic Charter. It was endorsed by every Allied Nation. Millions of plain people, the world over, took courage and new hope. Let them not be swayed from its principles by any statement that it never was formally executed, and that it cannot be carried out. The pronouncements in that charter are graven in the hearts and aspirations of millions, here and abroad, and the principles it expressed stimulated the deepest emotion of all, the yearning for freedom by the people. It is for that ideal we thought we were waging this war.

Soon another vital conference is to be held. The prayers and hopes of the Nation will be with the President. Nothing would unite public opinion more than a statement by our President, reaffirming the principles of the Atlantic Charter and promising to use his great influence to make it a living reality in the provisions of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. Such a statement now would result in a united public approval which would constitute a "vis a tergo," or strength at the back of the Executive, as he proceeds to the conference.

My colleague, Senator VANDENBERG, has shown the way to an interim treaty pledging our resources to our allies against Nazi and Nipponese aggression. For such assurance we should ask that our allies pledge their allegiance to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which each has accepted.

That great liberal, the late Justice Brandeis said, "If we would guide in the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold." I believe the present situation calls for bold, constructive action on the part of the Exevcutive, and the Nation will be behind him if he will practice it. There are precedents. In 1899, at the time of the Boxer Rebellion in China, the great powers decided to dis-

member China. Then in stepped America, boldly, through John Hay, Secretary of State, and served an ultimatum—"the integrity of China must be preserved"—and there was no dismemberment. That was America in bold action.

As one who supported and worked for the League of Nations 25 years ago, I strongly favor our participation in an association of nations, with power to put down aggression when it shows its head. I favor a world court, an international bill of rights, and a code of fundamental principles of international law.

If free people are bound together in an association of nations, which can enforce international morality upon any aggressor nation, I believe there is hope for a lasting peace.

And the time to make such commitments is now, while the Allies are dependent on each other; for if we wait until the shooting stops, it will be a case of every one to his own way.

Coming events will prove whether or not the world is ready for a real peace. There are obstacles in the pathway. Some of the strongest nations are approaching the matter with reservations, and from a standpoint of self-interest. We need to learn the great lesson of interdependence.

Each of the Allied nations must be willing to surrender some of its prerogatives for the common good, or else we shall fail.

As an able editor in my own State recently said, "Here in this country we organized a great Nation by surrender of some of the sovereignty of the several States, to the central government. That unity, which obtains among the States of our Union, is essential in the world, if world peace is to come."

An Outstanding Governor Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Outstanding Governor Retires," from the Columbus Dispatch of Sunday, January 7, last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OUTSTANDING GOVERNOR RETIRES—GOVERNOR BRICKER HAS CONTRIBUTED MUCH TO BOTH STATE AND NATION

To most conscientious American citizens who recognize the worth not only of Government in all its manifestations to themselves, but also their own importance to it, the standards by which the good administration of Government may be measured are easily defined.

The first and most frequently asked question of any public officeholder is, Is he honest? Perhaps next is, Is his judgment sound? These questions appear in various forms and include such queries as, Is he sincere? Is he economical? Is he aware of the needs of the time? and so on through an increasing list.

Ohio, in the main, has been fortunate in the caliber of its Governors. Under a long line of chief magistrates, many of them outstanding for ability, the State has prospered and progressed and, under the administration of law based on the Ordinance of 1787, which created the great Northwest Territory, has been politically progressive.

Gov. John W. Bricker, who tomorrow retires from the governorship after 6 years of service in that position, has been one of the most successful and most notable of Ohio Governors, judged by any standards.

Under Governor Bricker, the State has been efficiently and economically operated. The vast network of departments has been well administered by reason of almost universally excellent appointments. The large responsibility which devolves upon a Governor who operates with a legislature of his own party and therefore is publicly charged with the errors of government, as well as publicly credited for its accomplishments, has been easily and commendably borne. The people have been well served in the matter of law enforcement, education, restrained taxation, good highways, industrial relations, the efficient use of funds, in welfare and in all the other complicated series of services which come under the gubernatorial direction.

The executive and the legislative branches have worked harmoniously together and by a course of moderation have succeeded in forwarding the best interests of the State.

In addition, Governor Bricker has in the fortunate circumstance of his candidacy for Vice President of the United States served the interests of Government well through the instrument of party by a vigorous definition and discussion of the basic principles of government.

A superior man, someone once said, is one who is able to rise to his responsibilities. This Governor Bricker has done to the eminent satisfaction of the vast majority of his fellow Ohioans during one of the most difficult periods in Ohio's—and for that matter, the Nation's—history.

The problems of government have not been easy during this period of change and unrest. Nor have the problems of administration. Not only questions of political importance, but questions of economic and financial importance and those of social importance as well grew to huge proportions during Mr. Bricker's three terms as Governor of Ohio.

Governor Bricker's record in office stands as a complete refutation to those radicals and theorists who would alter our form of government and take from the States their rightful and important powers and center them in the hands of a Washington bureaucracy. Governor Bricker has proved not only the correctness of the principle upon which the founding fathers built the Federal Union, but has demonstrated to a generation which appears confused in its knowledge of and faltering in its allegiance to America's first tenets of home rule the necessity of that principle.

He has thus served not only the State which has honored him with the highest office it has to bestow on anyone, but he has served well the Nation in a time when the examples of purposeful and sincere men so much outweigh in importance the endless words, glittering generalities and boundless theories with which we are all too familiar.

He leaves a record difficult to surpass, but one which cannot but serve as an inspiration and as a source of fortitude and assurance for all who follow him in the governorship.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on compulsory military training, delivered on January 18 by Brig. Gen. Albert L. Cox, at the Central High School in this city under the auspices of the Parent-Teacher Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I favor military training for all able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 21, inclusive.

I favor the establishment of such training within 12 months after the cessation of the present hostilities.

We have no reason to think that the world has undergone such a change that conditions following this war will be much unlike those that have followed other wars. Christianity teaches that peace and harmony can exist. But those other human characteristics—envy, hatred, and malice—have long prevented the ascendancy of peace and harmony. The role of a victor, while superior to that of the vanquished, has ever been one to guard with exceeding care. This country will emerge a victor in the greatest of all world wars, and likewise will have many enemies. What other nation will have its homeland intact? Jealousies from covetousness, coupled with political and economic conditions, do not present an optimistic picture of a future peace.

In the past, due to friendly nations, America has always had time to prepare after war has been declared. We cannot continue to rely on such circumstances in the future. We must expect war to come suddenly upon us, as it has upon other nations of the earth and, in consequence, we must be ready to defend ourselves, as any reliance upon others for such defense may be found to be misplaced. War is not won by untrained men. The plight of China is conclusive proof of this, but our own early losses due to lack of trained and equipped men add to that proof. In all wars, the advantage is decidedly with the side that is ready.

The future does not belong to us but to our children and to our childrens' children. The future of America lies in their hands. Unless we give them the training, the opportunities, and the facilities for turning their talents and their genius into a powerful and disciplined machine, we cannot view a bright future for our land. If we extend training to our youth we will make our greatest contribution to national security. The maintenance of a peace is with those who come after us.

The experience of history demonstrates the necessity for universal military training. Few people volunteer for war. The majority must be actuated by legislation. This is a natural trait in all animal natures, and not a manifestation of cowardice. The only animals which have deliberately sought combat were the saber-toothed tiger and the rogue elephant. The saber-toothed tiger is extinct. The rogue elephant is berserk.

Every means should be employed to the end that there will never be another war. Ultimate success is extremely doubtful. The fallacy lies in the word "never," for in using that term we deal with infinity, which is an unknown quantity. The introduction of an unknown quantity into our equation makes the solution thereof extremely doubtful.

To illustrate, and in no sense to criticize, the war in Europe is far from over, and yet two mighty nations are already engaged in consolidating their respective spheres of influence. You have but to glance at a map of the Mediterranean to see the extent of the interest which Great Britain and Russia there have. Since the days of Peter the Great, Russia has desired a warm-water outlet from the Black Sea through the Dardanelles to the Mediterranean. If that desire is now obtained, Great Britain's only opportunity to enjoy free communication lies through Greece

and her adjacent isles. This is vital to Great Britain as her life line runs through the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal to the Far East. She cannot be blamed too much for making it secure.

However, illustrations such as this do not make for perpetual peace, but on the contrary, breed war.

We are now in the midst of the Second World War in which we have engaged in less than 30 years. We were fortunate in World War No. 1 in that Germany withdrew vitally needed troops from the French front for service in East Prussia, and such withdrawal cost that nation the first battle of the Marne. Germany's second great blunder was in its failure to do everything possible to keep us out of that war, and, third, that nation's straddling the situation during the great offensive of March 1918, saved the British from being driven into the English Channel.

In World War No. 1 and in World War No. 2 the Germans thought we could not get ready in time to do any good. Both times they have been wrong. We can't depend upon such blunders forever. Had we been ready and had we demonstrated to the world our readiness and our willingness to act, there would have been no World War No. 1 and no World War No. 2. We would then have saved ourselves half a million casualties in World War No. 1 and, to date, approximately three-quarters of a million casualties in World War No. 2, with the end not yet in sight. If the saving of lives already sacrificed and of those yet to be laid down is not worth the price of military training, then the destiny of this Nation is being risked for a mess of pottage. To stop the slaughter of our youth, we had best not forget George Washington's reminder, "In time of peace, prepare for war."

Generalship of today is not alone concerned with the handling of large masses of troops, but also with problems in industrial engineering. The armed power of a nation is now measured by the size of its heavy industry. To shift our factories from peace to war production and to make such production available, in the light of experience, requires some 18 months. To assure ourselves of this period of time we need:

1. Outposts reaching far into the Atlantic and into the Pacific, of sufficient strength and sufficiently manned to hold back a hostile force until our production for war is assured and our armies trained.

2. Air and naval strength sufficient to keep open the supply lanes for such outposts.

While strategy and tactics remain much the same, implements of war are ever undergoing change. We now base our strength on a flow of weapons, and not upon a stockpile. To endeavor to create an excessively large air force would be but to emulate the unfortunate experience of France in 1930. In building the largest air force in Europe, the French Air Ministry failed to recognize how much war planes suffer from obsolescence, and was therefore unable to cope with the Luftwaffe when Germany attacked. The most useful air force will be relatively small, but with a high rate of turnover in order that technical developments may be used to advantage. Such a statement as well holds true for other branches of our armed forces.

As new machines of war are developed, so, too, must men be trained in their use. We must avoid developing a training program which too soon will become outmoded.

The training of our young men should include a rehabilitation or personal hygiene period. It should take the place of the sort of adventures and excitements which too often lead to a lack of discipline. It should be so planned that interference with education and interference with the ordinary work and duties of young men should be at a minimum.

I fully see the need, as I have heretofore said, of universal military training. I do not see the necessity, however, of segregating such young men for 12 months of their time in military posts or military camps. Long experience has shown me that a perfectly green youngster can be quickly taught the school of the soldier, from which progresses the school of the squad, the school of the platoon, the school of the company, and the higher echelons.

There are two classes of these young men for whom provision must be made. First, those who wish and plan to go to college and, second, those who for good and sufficient reasons do not plan such a course.

For the first group I favor the enlargement and development of our Reserve Officer Training Corps, knowing the splendid instruction which it has accomplished in our schools and colleges in the past.

For the second group I favor giving military training much in the manner in which the National Guard has been trained and, in the same way, without preventing the occupations in which these young men are engaged. I am satisfied that a course of training could be provided at our armories, and at other centers, of sufficient scope to give these young men benefits equal to those they would receive at military posts or training camps. Instead of concentrating these men in large training areas and sending them hundreds even thousands, of miles from home for their preliminary training, such training, intelligently planned and covering the development of a soldier up to field training and the hardening process, can be done efficiently while the soldier continues to live and to work at home. The men involved would continue their civilian pursuits while receiving training in military fundamentals.

I would follow the work done by the young men in the R. O. T. C. and the work done by the young men at the armories and at other places of instruction by more intensive training in larger groups, to be given from the middle of May until the middle of September, a period of 4 months, when the days are longest and when the opportunity for outdoor training without interruption is best. The 8 months' training received at college or in the armories would be sufficient to equip these young men for the 4 months of intensive summer training.

At the end of their 12 months' training I would insist upon these young men continuing in the Regular Army, the National Guard, or in the Reserves for a period of from 3 to 5 years, that they might have specialized training and improve the lessons they had learned, and that they might be available for training the classes which followed. I would likewise encourage these young men to fit and qualify themselves for the performance of duties of noncommissioned officers and of officers as well.

There is nothing revolutionary about such an idea, but rather it is a method of training which has proved to be efficacious and worth while.

The uniforms, the rifles, and other munitions, the tanks, and other necessary vehicles, and the cadres of instructors would be no more than are necessary in the large training camps. Armories have been built all over this land where the men could report in the evenings and on week-ends for their uniforms and equipment and to receive their training. The country is filled with men of much service who would make excellent drill masters and who would glory in the opportunity that was theirs to so engage their time.

With the short time at my disposal I do not attempt to go into details, but merely to express what seems to me, and to many to whom I have spoken, to be a real solution to a definite problem.

As Army Field Service Regulations state, "Even a defective plan, boldly and resolutely carried out, is far better than the hesitating search for the ideal."

Six Full Days Work Every Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a plan proposed by the Kiwanis Club of West Point, Va., for the purpose of encouraging all available persons to work at least 6 full days every week in essential industry so that, by unified and 100 percent war effort, the war may be terminated at the earliest possible time. I am informed that this plan has worked very effectively in actual operation, and I feel certain that it is worthy of consideration and support by other communities throughout the country.

There being no objection, the plan was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLAN TO ENCOURAGE FULL-TIME WORK IN ESSENTIAL INDUSTRY BY EVERY AVAILABLE PERSON

Total war on the fighting front requires full-time work on the home front. Believing that one of the greatest needs on the home front is to get every available person to work full time in essential industry, the West Point Kiwanis Club adopts as a primary objective for 1945:

A PLAN TO CREATE PUBLIC OPINION WHICH WOULD ENCOURAGE ALL AVAILABLE PERSONS TO WORK AT LEAST 6 FULL DAYS EVERY WEEK IN SOME ESSENTIAL INDUSTRY

A. Action by individual members of this club

1. Every member will devote himself wholeheartedly to the furtherance of the war effort.

2. Personal contact by members of this club with employers and employees in this community.

3. Requesting each employer in essential industry to carefully explain to those employed by him both directly and indirectly how his particular work fits into the war effort.

B. Action by the club

1. Requesting all advertisers to convert their advertising to the promotion of this program in behalf of the war effort in this community.

2. Using every available avenue of publicity to further this program.

3. Requesting the churches, both white and colored, to bring to the attention of their members the necessity for every available person to work 6 full days in essential industry as his contribution to the war effort.

4. Requesting the schools to instruct the pupils, and through them the parents, of the necessity for every patriotic citizen to work at least 6 full days per week in an essential industry, pointing out to them which businesses have been designated by the Government as essential and how each contributes to the war effort.

5. Contacting each women's club and civic organization in the community and requesting them to cooperate in the promotion of this program.

6. This program is based on the patriotic duty of every citizen to do his full share in the war effort and should be approached and developed from this angle. When, however, all other means have proved unavailing in an

individual case and it is found that a person who has been deferred from active military service because of the nature of his work, or granted special rationing of tires and gasoline because of his occupation, is failing to work regularly and full time in essential industry, this fact should be brought to the attention of the local selective-service board and local war-price and ration board.

Be it resolved by the West Point Kiwanis Club:

First. That it heartily and unanimously adopts the foregoing plan of action as one of its objectives for 1945;

Second. That the president of this club appoint a committee of five members to be known as the war-work committee, whose duty it shall be to put this program into effect throughout this community, and that the chairman of each of the standing committees of this club is authorized, upon the request of the war-work committee, to undertake and perform any duty assigned in furtherance of this program;

Third. That the war-work committee contact representative civic organizations in each of the following counties in Virginia, present this program and plan of action to them, with the request that if it be deemed sound, practical, and patriotic, that they sponsor a similar program in their respective counties: King William, King and Queen, New Kent, James City, Charles City, York, Gloucester, Mathews, Middlesex, Caroline, Essex, Richmond, Lancaster, Westmoreland, Northumberland, King George, Accomac, and Northampton; and

Fourth. That a copy of this be sent to Kiwanis International, to the governor, and to the secretary of the Capital district of Kiwanis International, and to the president of each Kiwanis Club in the Capital district.

Is There a Manpower Shortage or Only Labor Hoarding and Organized Confusion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the most critical question before the Congress and the country is manpower for essential industry—the building of the implements of war and the production of food for our armed forces, our own people, and our allies.

There are now before the Congress—or shortly to come before the Congress—several pieces of legislation designed to correct this situation. Personally, I question the desirability or efficiency of labor draft or compulsion; certainly until a careful examination has been made of the contributing causes. I do not think there is a manpower shortage if this matter is intelligently handled.

That there is much labor hoarding and uneconomic use of labor, there is little question. I am submitting a letter from a most reputable Idaho citizen holding a responsible position in a defense industry. For obvious reason his name is withheld, but I shall gladly furnish it to any congressional committee and have him appear personally as a witness, if they will protect his rights as an honorable and patriotic citizen. The letter follows:

HANFORD, WASH., *January 15, 1945.*

The Honorable COMPTON I. WHITE,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: Since there has been so much fuss stirred up the past few days about manpower shortage, I am compelled to offer a word of protest.

I want to say that the people are getting damned tired of hearing all this bunk, when in reality there is no manpower shortage generally speaking.

There is no doubt a shortage in certain areas, and that is caused by two things, first of which is wage differential, and second is hogging of labor, both skilled and unskilled, by war plants.

If Mr. McNutt would get some good practical men in the field, or else let Congress do it and investigate the actual conditions around these plants, both on construction and operations, he will learn that many of them have twice as many men as they need.

I have been 2½ years on this work, and I can assure you that what I have personally observed is enough to make any soldier throw down his gun and accept a court martial.

Not only is this true of the jobs I have seen, but I have talked with hundreds of men from different types of war work, and they all tell the same story; in fact the men themselves are disgusted with the way the management are wasting manpower, and something had better be done about it before they start drafting labor.

If there has ever been any effort to check on this directly on the job, I have never heard of it, but from what I can find out they have conferred with the management, which, after all, don't mean a thing, for each one of them will swear they are short of men when men are simply falling over each other.

It is high time that somebody looks into this matter, and I am sure if they go about it in the right way they will get the biggest surprise of their lives in Mr. McNutt's office.

If you want to get the low-down on this, don't ever go to the management, but go direct to the foreman on the job, put him on his honor to find out just how many men he actually needs to do the job, and you will be surprised; in fact I have tried it out a little myself and I know the foremen and the men both feel as I do about it.

I wrote Mr. McNutt a few days ago about this matter, but so far he has not answered my letter.

Now, Mr. WHITE, if some action is not taken at once to look into this matter, a bunch of us are going to get in the papers on this and see that something is done.

I know you will do anything you can to assist, but it will take more than one man to do it, so I am writing our new Senator TAYLOR along these same lines, and I hope between the two of you that you can get something started.

Thanking you for your early consideration in this important matter, and trusting you to see that the matter is brought before the manpower commissioner with sufficient force to get action.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————.

It is inevitable, under proposed legislation, that there would be a constant conflict and much duplication between the 6,500 selective-service boards in the United States and the 1,500 United States Employment Service offices, if these offices were designated to handle draft of labor. I believe both functions should be handled by Selective Service through their 6,500 local draft boards. The members of these boards are, in every instance with which I have come in contact, reputable citizens of their community, and answerable to the people of their community. Augmented with competent paid assistants, they are just as qualified to designate who should work and where, as they are to designate who shall go to the armed forces. This would eliminate the confusion, duplication, and conflict which would result from service and labor draft being handled by different organizations. By consolidating the two agencies, harmony would result, as well as a decrease in the cost of operating two separate agencies.

Drafting of Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to the following thought-provoking editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Pacific Rural Press.

Any reckless drafting of farmers or farm workers without due consideration to the food-production needs of this country and our allies can very seriously impair the war effort.

DRAFT OFFICIALS PICK ON THE FARMER

Farmers are in no way responsible for the fight-power and manpower embarrassments of Government, but are asked to take the rap for it under the latest draft orders.

It is fair and factual to remind that farmers have not maintained a 30-hour week, as have Harry Bridges' ship loaders. They have not had a 48-hour week as has Government. Farmers have not been labor hoarders, as have some war manufacturers accused of holding two men to get one man's work done. Farmers did not stage any of the record number of strikes in 1944, including such monkey business as the Montgomery Ward strikes to enforce a closed shop and check-off system. Farmers wasted no time at horse races, night spots, and gambling halls. They hit the ball.

It is probable that the farmers' record is unequalled in increasing production with depleted manpower and limited equipment.

But Government, forced to have more fight-power and manpower in a hurry, does not suggest repeal of the 40-hour week; does not forbid strikes; does not make work-or-fight rules which mean anything.

If you say this is harsh talk, we say it is true, and we direct attention to the effort to take it out on the farmer.

The new order is that draft boards shall take farmers between the ages of 18 and 26 years without referring the cases to the county war boards for further discussion of needs for deferment.

However, and this is important, the county war boards have the right and the moral duty to support appeals when deferment is just and vital.

In the past, county war boards have often muffed it because they did not present enough factual data to the appeal boards. Appeal boards act only on the information presented to them and they should have all the facts. In the absence of such data, the approval of induction is almost automatic.

There is something wrong with the figures given out regarding deferments of young farmers. Dave Davidson, chairman of the California war board, says he cannot understand or reconcile them.

It has been asserted by draft officials that California has proportionally about twice as many deferred young farmers as has the Nation—a statement which farm leaders have never believed.

Now draft officials are saying that California has 6,505 of these and the Nation has 364,000. Well, California has 2.17 percent of all the farms of the United States, and if we had proportionally double the deferees, our share would be 15,878. If we were just average, we would have nearly 8,000.

So it seems somebody owes us an apology. We have actually furnished more than our share of the fighters from farms.

Not only that, but the farmers left on the land to produce food munitions have done much better than an average job, because California farmers, want to do less than their share of the fighting for victory on the battle fronts, but they should not hesitate to fight for rights and equality when an attempt is made to load the mistakes of others on their already burdened shoulders.

That's not the way to win the war.

Every county war board should be alert and active in this situation. It doesn't pay to be chicken.

Meanwhile everyone should unite in demanding that draft boards be given authority to ask employers for the work records of deferred men.

For the Government to protect absenteeism, slow-down tactics, and general slackerism in time of war is a raw deal to the patriots who are doing their part, and a disservice to the country.

The Relationship Between Industry and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech, The Relationship Between Industry and Government, delivered by Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, before the American Road Builders' Association at Chicago, Ill.:

President Brown, President-elect Skelly, our chairman of the morning meeting, and the officers and gentlemen of the conference: I should like to say, in prefacing my regular remarks which will come under the subject of the relationship between industry and Government, that I believe those of you who are members of this association and reside in the various States, would like to know from one Member of Congress that which could be substantiated by many others if they had the opportunity to speak.

That statement is this: That the informed and convincing testimony which Mr. Upham and those who speak through your State units have given on legislative matters in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States, causes me to believe that the American Road Builders' Association is of valuable assistance in the formulation and the proper passage of those bills directly affecting the highway programs of this country.

I am sure that the distinguished and able chairman of the House Roads Committee, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, and those other five Members who have come to this meeting, Representatives ANDREWS of Alabama, WOLCOTT, MOTT, and CUNNINGHAM join with me in saying, at the very beginning of this convention, that we want to express our appreciation for the splendid spirit of cooperation which has been given by those who have acted as the spokesmen for your great organization in the legislative halls at Washington, D. C. [Applause.]

First of all, I desire to make myself clearly understood prior to the actual subject matter of this talk. It is this: There is one paramount task before the American people today, and that is the No. 1 job of the successful prosecution of the war. We subordinate all other thinking, certainly all other acting. I am sure that it is with such spirit that the members of your organization have come to Chicago for this forty-second annual gathering.

Nothing that I shall say, or certainly none of the deliberations that will take place during the 3 or 4 days that you are to be here, can be construed in anywise as weakening or even attempting to divert our major considerations from the winning of this global conflict into which all the resources of America—mental, physical, moral, and spiritual—are being thrown during these troublous times. But I am going to talk with you about certain conditions which I believe exist in the Government of the United States, not always wholesome, yet they form the fabric which is being woven today in our National Government.

We have a responsibility to consider these problems and to see what we can do to alleviate many of what I believe to be the mistakes which are being made.

Mr. Brown made mention of a directive in connection with a certain program which had been enunciated during this war. I make no criticism of the President of the United States. I realize, welcome, and support the fact that Franklin Roosevelt is Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States and, by and large, is giving a great leadership to our war effort. I do say this morning, however, that the Congress of the United States in the future must be on guard to retake unto itself certain rightful powers which have been lodged there by the founding fathers and under constitutional authority of the United States.

We have had, under this national administration, 3,600 directives that have been issued. Many of them—and this is no carping criticism of what has been done—have no basis whatsoever in constitutional law or in the statutes of our country. Certainly in the future our Congress, be it Republican or Democratic, must return unto itself the rightful lawmaking responsibility and exercise it, not only in peacetime but also insofar as possible under the impact of war. [Applause.]

The Congress of the United States itself, by such action, is weakly giving ground to directives and decrees, and also to authority which should be vested within its elected body. Failure to function doesn't gain the credit for Congress that it should possess with the citizenry of the United States.

Now, for the speech theme, let us firmly believe that both big and little businesses must be given every proper incentive to use venture money. The incentive to use such funds comes first, I believe, with the assurance that the Federal Government will see to it that taxes are assessed sanely and proportionately.

In Congress we have been trying to develop solutions to certain phases of the tax question. Three measures have been approved which are reasonably good attempts to solve portions of the problem.

The Contract Settlement Act attempts to prevent crippling loss and undue delay in the adjustment of those terminated war contracts. The Surplus Property Act prevents the dumping of materials which would stifle private industry for an indeterminate period. The Reconversion Act was drawn, also, to prevent distress and lack of purchasing power resulting from possible unemployment.

These legislative steps are somewhat negative however, for they foresee commercial illness, always commercial illness, and they prescribe remedies.

There is, I am sure, in the minds and hearts of all of our people universal agreement that thriving private industry is essential to the fullest employment and national prosperity in our post-war period.

Now, this three-point program that I have spoken of still lacks the positive, active stimulus that private industry has a right to expect. We must bring vital venture capital again into production. A workable plan must also be provided to induce industry to expand its present plants or build for the production of new and improved products. It is only by such means that fairly steady employment will be made available to our returning veterans and our displaced war workers. Without this provision, the fourth and most important feature of our post-war program will be missing.

Now, taxes that are so high as to be practically confiscatory have been unavoidable during the prosecution of the war. Our Government has needed the revenue from these taxes to pay the emergency costs of the prosecution of this terrible conflict.

Excessive taxes, however, always tend to stifle private initiative, and I declare this morning, in no uncertain terms, that I believe we have reached the saturation point from the standpoint of the levying and the collection of taxes. Who will risk capital when they know in advance that, if the venture is successful, taxes will absorb all the gain? It is a case of "Heads, the tax collector wins; tails, the investor loses," and make no mistake about it. Those of you who are in private industry know the full import of the words that I have just spoken.

I digress for just a moment to recall a story. Down in my West Virginia hill country we had a little mountain church that was very desirous of raising some needed funds for a worthy project.

The preacher, at a social one night, was exhorting those in the congregation to raise the necessary money. He understood full well that he had a great many stewards in the church that were tightwads; he knew that. So he was putting on all the steam, as it were, in an attempt to get from their pockets some of this money.

Now, one of the members of the congregation, during the minister's appeal—a practical joker we will call him—went unobserved and poured a quart of liquor into the punch bowl and gave it a little stir.

The punch was later consumed by the entire congregation, including the parson. They were all feeling strangely elated in a few minutes, and one of these tightwad stewards came to the preacher and said, "Pastor, here's my check for $1,000 for this worthy cause."

The pastor smiled back, put his hands on the steward's shoulders, and said, "Old boy, I greatly appreciate this, but I don't need the money." [Laughter.]

Now, I say to you this morning that your Government has needed and will continue to need the money with which to carry forward this mechanized struggle. However, it is apparent that, with war's end, taxes should and could be reduced. The Government will not require as much money, except as it sets in motion unnecessary programs which will re-

quire it. But what, if any, will be the reduction of these taxes when war ends? Industry has not been advised. Assurance could be given, and given now; it doesn't have to come later. Tax relief can provide the needed stimulus to business. And tax relief, also, through legislation enacted now, to become effective when victory comes, would remove doubt and uncertainty which today continue to prevail

Those who have participated, and the Members of the Congress who are with me today, in the writing of tax legislation, would readily agree that we cannot draft a completely new tax bill without the most careful consideration. Horizontal reductions in the existing tax structure could, in my opinion, be enacted now. They would give investors and industry the incentive to start planning. Then, with the war's close, the channels of trade would have been cleared by clear thinking prior to the actual V-day. The time lag during the planning period would be eliminated and millions of jobs might immediately become available.

I think it is noteworthy that we read the significant statement made by the President of the United States in his message to the Seventy-ninth Congress, delivered on January 6. Mr. Roosevelt said: "We must overhaul the wartime tax structure to stimulate consumers' demand to promote business investment."

The President, correctly, has given thought to what will be necessary in the post-war period. If you read carefully the President's message, you will see it is divided into two general themes: The first part, the story of our Nation at war's end; in the second place, the necessary story of what we must do when peace comes and our Nation once again goes into the channels of an economy which we all pray will shortly come to America and the world.

Not only is the expression of the President significant but also the statement yesterday in Washington by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, should be taken into consideration. He is formulating a program by which 23 House Members, of the minority party, will make an exhaustive study of our entire tax structure.

Mr. MARTIN makes the assertion that we must convert our tax structure today into a tomorrow where we will go from a punitive to an incentive system. He is correct. Our President of the United States and Mr. MARTIN and all others who are thinking logically have a definite responsibility now, not later, to set such programs in motion.

Now, those persons who are here today will agree with me that this is no partisan problem; it is a matter which should have the wholehearted support of Republicans and Democrats, although being a Democrat, I should say "Democrats and Republicans." I want, however, to be very considerate and gracious, to the recently defeated opposition. [Laughter.] We must assure our people of continued prosperity in the American way.

I have made a study of this subject of venture capital. Of course, I realize that it is only a partial approach, but I have introduced H. R. 280, and some of you might, after this convention has recessed, get the bill and study its provisions. It would attempt to encourage venture capital by amending the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, so as to give an exemption for security issues from the present ceiling of $100,000 to $300,000, offering, as it were, an opportunity for the business interests to form themselves into active industry and commercial enterprise.

Now, members of the convention, the impact of this global war has forced our Government to the realization that it was necessary to utilize small manufacturing plants in the production program, in order to meet the full battle requirements. But now we are forced to consider a new set of economic problems which are going to confront us as we approach nearer to the end of this conflict.

The war, a few months ago, reached a point where cut-backs and termination of production contracts occurred at such a rate as to threaten serious confusion in our internal affairs. Although the picture has changed somewhat, it is necessary that we now provide a program to meet the problems which are certain to face the American people in the coming months.

At this point it is well to consider the place occupied by private industry during the prosecution of this war. I know of no man who has stated the case better for private industry than Dr. Harold Glenn Moulton, the president of Brookings Institution. He says:

"Instead of sealing the fate of private enterprise, the war period has brought to the American people as a whole and, I believe, to our Government a new realization of its vital importance."

He continues: "This profound change in Government attitude is due to two principal factors: The remarkable achievement of private enterprise during the war, and a growing recognition that employment and wages depend upon business expansion under a private-enterprise system unless risk assumption is encouraged by the chance of reasonable profits."

He concludes by saying: "Repeated emphasis on the many freedoms that we are fighting for has inevitably, if unconsciously, carried over into the field of our business enterprises. I do not mean to imply that all Government regulations of business will henceforth be abandoned or that it would be desirable to scrap all forms of proper regulation. I do mean that the excesses of recent years are likely to be modified and a new spirit prevail."

I believe that Dr. Moulton has thus stated the case, and our hopes, in a manner that we can all place our stamp of approval upon his utterance.

The stake of business in this complex and many-sided reconversion picture has been of vital concern to the Members of Congress and to members of your own American Road Builders' Association. It is a concern, which I have had, growing out of a deep conviction that sound and healthy business spirit is an indispensable bulwark against monopoly and any threat to our democratic way of living. Sound industry is the keystone in the arch of our free enterprise.

I therefore believe that it is in the national interest to maintain and strengthen the competitive position of industry and to assure it always the fullest opportunity for devolpment.

In this development I have always rejected the proposition that small business constituted a special interest that requires some type of favored treatment at the expense of other groups. Small business seeks only to be recognized as a vitally important part of our national economy and to be protected against practices which interfere with its rightful course of free competition. Nothing else will do justice to these manufacturing and commercial concerns which constitute the backbone of American economy.

To quote a saying which has become famous for its truth: "Little business incorporated is the biggest business in America."

That statement is to express the viewpoint, I am sure, of the vast majority of those who are present.

In thinking of the American business outlook and certain trends which are developing, I believe it is well for us to consider in just a sentence the essence of what must be done with Germany and Japan, so as to prevent the future wars of aggression.

It will be absolutely necessary not only to have military control, at least for a period, over those countries but there must be a close supervision of the key industries in those nations. That, perhaps, is more important than the temporary military control. We will have no permanent peace plan if such a courageous stand is not taken by the American people.

The assertion is often made that we face a problem of permanent unemployment in the United States of America. According to this view—it is popular with many—there would be hundreds of thousands of American citizens who are physically and mentally capable of earning a substantial income but they must, through no fault of their own, live in a state of near pauperism or actually pauperism itself. I do not subscribe to that concept of the future of our Republic. To me, it is unthinkable that any American who is able and willing to provide himself with the necessities and some of the luxuries and conveniences of life by honest work, should not be given the opportunity to do so.

The chief obstacles to such opportunities are frequently of a national character. We cannot forget that. If such, they are beyond individual control.

As a Member of the Congress—and other Members are joining in the program—I have tried to use very resource at our command to see what we overcome in those national, economic difficulties which are too great for an individual to solve himself or surmount alone. But I am convinced that men and women everywhere should depend upon their own physical and mental resources to rise above those obstacles when they are within the source of individual achievement.

This distinction is necessary if we are to maintain a strong, healthy and self-reliant people as the citizenry of this country.

I don't believe that in 1945 or 1950 or 1960 we are going to get too much of the true American spirit in this country. I pay a tribute to the sterling men and women of the long ago, because they had those qualities of character which constructed the fabric of our great country. I don't want us to lose sight, for a moment, of the essentials which went into their way of thinking and their way of doing.

I repeat, you can't get too much of the sound Americanism which is exemplified by those who have gone before us. They builded better than they knew. Bless their memories.

I think of another church in my West Virginia hills. We have many churches. [Laughter]. I joke just now, but before telling the following story I pay tribute to the principles of a Christian citizenship. Peace will never completely come to the world until the spirit of the Christ possesses the hearts of men and of nations.

I remember this old friend. He had just one way of beginning every prayer. He always said, "O Lord, past blessings have gone with past necessities, and tonight finds me the same needy creature as ever." Then, one evening, at testimony meeting, he launched into an appeal, and said "O Lord, send me barrels of apples, barrels of potatoes, barrels of sugar, barrels of salt, barrels of pepper," and he stopped a moment and cried out, "Oh, hell, that's too much pepper."

I repeat you can't get too much of the true spirit of Americanism in the dangerous days that loom large for this country of yours and mine.

I introduced a scientific research bill, first in 1935, which I believe might help to increase the number of jobs available in private industry after the war. I have ever believed that the dollar you spend in research comes back ten- or a hundred-fold. It is the expenditure that gives a real dividend for the payment of whatever sum you put in it as a Government or other political subdivision.

If industry is to provide a continually increasing number of jobs, one of the first requisites is the stabilization of business conditions. This is based upon adequate regulation of the supply and demand for capital, either by limiting the supply or by increasing the demand, or by the use of both.

In this proposal I believe we formulate the foundation for a sound research program from which new industrial and commercial developments can spring. As these developments appear, new and profitable outlets of capital will be provided, as well as new and better jobs for hundreds of thousands of workers.

Consequently private investment may ultimately be substituted for Government expenditures and borrowing as the chief element in the demand for capital. Business will then be able to carry on under its own power as it receives constant stimulation from the flow of new opportunities and private investment. Federal funds spent for roads and airports, both vital to our transportation demands, constitute Government leadership in the field of public works which generally finds ready support from our people. We must, by carefully selected projects, cushion the period from total war to the step-down to peace. I believe that a Government with a tax policy must be as eager to promote a constructive peace as it is to prosecute a destructive war.

The soundest sense that I know is the one that gives to the Americans a low rate of tax, insofar as possible, on a high volume of income or business. I think that is the only way to avoid the subterfuges of inflation, due to the debt to be repudiated, and I think it is the American way to bring a high volume of business with, as I said before, a low tax rate.

Suppose for just a moment, as I finish, we consider the opposite conception of taxation. Suppose we say, "let's have high tax rates and put it on a low volume of output. What will happen?" I believe you will agree with me that the American family Ford would become the tenant farmer's mule. I believe you would agree with me that our wives would go back to the washboard and the spinning wheel of our grandmother's day, and the man that would hold the mortgage this time would be Uncle Sam and the tax collectors of the Federal Government. That condition would be almost tragic.

High rates on low volume is nothing more, to quote a colleague, that "government of the government, by the government and for the government," and that, certainly, is not the American way of doing business.

I want to return to the subject of taxes, with which I began this talk. We must consider our present and our future structure. We cannot expect at reduction in our present income tax structure on the incomes of 1945, and it is also likely that corporation normal and surtax will remain unchanged. It is possible that the tax rate on excess profits will be reduced on 1945 incomes. I believe we can definitely look toward a downward trend rather than an upward trend in connection with the payment of taxes for the remainder of the war.

When tax reductions come our excess-profits tax, in the case of corporations, must be eliminated. That is not only my own viewpoint but, certainly, that is the viewpoint of many of those who hold key positions on finance and banking committees in the Congress of the United States. And, also, profits paid as dividends should be taxed at lower rates. It is only just that we must change the present double taxation of profits, in the first place, as income in the keeping of corporations and, second, as income in the hands of those individuals who have been receiving dividends.

I hope that the White House thinking embraces the idea that our national tax policy must support the need for incentives, so that we will find both individuals and corporations working more in the future rather than working less.

Congress should proceed toward this desired goal even in the face of pressure groups who sponsor governmental paternalism instead of a practical relationship between Washington and the Main Streets of our country.

In closing, I wish to make observations which have nothing of a direct bearing on the set address, and it is briefly this: Senator VANDENBERG, a Republican, who a few months ago was charged with being an isolationist, gave what to me is one of the great utterances, from the standpoint of a pronouncement, on the purposes of peace, that has been given not only in this country in years but in the entire history of America and the world. Speaking about the principles by which we carry on the war, he said:

"They march with our armies; they sail with our fleet; they fly with our eagles; they sleep with our martyred dead."

The spirit of VANDENBERG or any other Member of the Congress or citizen of the United States today, be he or she a Republican or Democrat, must be the spirit of the prosecution of this war to a successful conclusion and to a lasting peace.

In Chicago a few months ago I found, in one of the morning newspapers, these words paraphrasing that poem of other years, In Flanders Fields:

"We cannot sleep, though poppies grow
Between the crosses, row on row;
We cannot sleep, for in the sky
Instead of larks, the bombers fly:
The crashing gun, the screaming shell
The hissing flame, as if from hell,
The rumbling tank, the roaring jeep
And marching men disturb our sleep
In Flanders Fields.

The torch we threw fell on the sands,
Dropped by supine and greedy hands;
For shame, move over, buddies, and make room
For those who now must die;
Since they broke faith with us who lie
In Flanders Fields."

Regardless of our political preference, regardless of our creeds, let us go united from this convention, as from every group meeting, with not only victory as a proper goal but a permanent peace for America and all the peoples of the world as an even higher goal. That determination is one which we must not allow to be thwarted by any charge of power politics, by any mistakes which are made within our own government or those that are joined with us in this cause. Let us rededicate ourselves again and again to the proposition that America, great enough to join with others in winning a war, must be great and good enough to join with others in the writing and the keeping of the peace of the world.

Plan for a Limited Government of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD and for the consideration of the membership of the House a plan for limited government of the United Nations. The plan was prepared by Pvt. (1st cl.) Clifford R. Hope, Jr., serving overseas in Belgium with Headquarters Battalion, Sixteenth Field Artillery. The plan offered by Private Hope is a most interesting and constructive one. Since the proposal is submitted by a young man serving in the armed forces and being the result of his study of this problem with the background of his present experience, it is worthy of the consideration of the membership of this House. I trust the Members will read it.

Private Hope is the son of my colleague, Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas.

PLAN FOR A LIMITED GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

1. By "limited" I mean that such a government, at first at least, would not have all the authority and functions of what we generally assume in the connotation "government."

In these plans I have made two basic assumptions:

1. Surrender or armistice terms have already been definitely agreed upon by the Big Four:

2. World peace machinery must gradually evolve from below and cannot be successfully imposed from above.

The plan in brief is to have a United Nations Executive Council, a United Nations Legislative Assembly, a United Nations Supreme Court, and eight United Nations commissions, dealing with the most striking international problems. The functions of each are numerated below:

1. The United Nations Council would consist of 11 members, 1 each from China, France, Great Britain, the United States, Russia; 2 each from Latin America and the rest of Europe; and 1 each from the British Commonwealth of Nations and the independent nations of Asia (including Liberia and Ethiopia). Their method of selection would rest with their own national government (or governments, with the intent that eventually they would be either directly elected or elected by the legislative assembly). Those members elected by a group of nations would be elected by a group of delegates from those nations, each nation holding the seat (or seats) in rotation. Their term would be 4 years (with a president elected by them, from their number for the same period of time) and they would be eligible for reelection once.

The functions of the Council would be (at first) to direct the activities of the eight United Nations commissions and to decide when and where force should be applied to would-be aggressors. Decision would be by a vote of at least 7 of the 11. Gradually, the Council's activities would become those of any executive branch of government, to direct the administration of measures passed by the legislative assembly.

2. The United Nations Legislative Assembly would consist of 1 member per 5,000,000 population or fraction thereof represented, but no nation represented would have less than 2 members. Thus the legislative assembly would be large enough to be a true assembly, yet not so large as to become unwieldy. At first, regardless of the number of its representatives, each member nation would have 1 vote; in time, when satisfactory minimum voting standards have been established in each nation, each representative would have 1 vote and the assembly would become a true legislature. At first, of course, primary responsibility would rest in the Council, but gradually the Assembly would revert from its "debating society" status and would pass legislation either initiated by the Council or written within its own ranks.

3. The United Nations Court's (taking over the functions of the present World Court)

primary function would be the arbitration of disputes between nations. Its decisions would be enforced by the Council. Associated with it for a necessary period would be a war guilt court for the trial of war criminals. The United Nations Court would consist of 9 (or any odd number from 7 to 13) justices, appointed in rotation, 1 by each nation (by its own prescribed methods). Every 3 years 3 justices would be replaced by 3 more from 3 different nations. As the authority of the Council and Assembly increases, the field of jurisdiction of the Court would likewise increase.

4. The United Nations Defense Commission would consist of the Combined Chiefs of Staff of the United Nations and the forces made available by each member nation upon the basis of population and seapower. The head of the Commission would be appointed by the United Nations Council and subject to removal at any time by it. The amount of available armed forces would vary according to need. The United States Council member should be voted authority by the United States Congress (renewable every 2 years) to vote for the use of United States forces made available to the Combined Chiefs of Staff. The United Nations Defense Council's primary responsibility would be the quelling of any armed clash between two or more nations (but not within one nation).

5. The United Nations Occupation Commission would be essentially a temporary agency in charge of administering the government of occupied axis territory, including Korea, for an indefinite period. Undoubtedly, detailed occupational plans have already been made by the Big Four.

The United Nations Occupation Commission's job would be to carry out those plans. As with other United Nations commissions, its members (of any flexible number) would first be appointed by individual nations, but in time its membership would be appointed by the council with the approval of the assembly. The U. N. O. C.'s work would terminate when, in the opinion of the council, occupied axis territories would be ready for membership in the United Nations.

6. The United Nations Colonial Commission would be primarily an advisory and regulatory commission. Its agents would be stationed in every colonial territory to report upon the preparations of the native population for self-government and economic development of the colony. Any nation found wanting in its duties and responsibilities to the native population would be reported to the U. N. Council for appropriate action. In addition to the above duties, the U. N. C. C. would directly administer former Italian colonies.

7. The United Nations Monetary Stabilization Commission would be charged with administering the plans of the Bretton Woods Conference and with recommending to the United Nations Council additional plans for the solution of international monetary problems.

8. The United Nations Trade and Communication Commission would be charged with lowering trade barriers, abolition of world-wide cartels, regulating international transport (including air traffic) and communications, and developing and integrating all colonial areas into a world economy, and encouraging new productive business enterprises.

9. The United Nations Labor Commission would continue the work of the International Labor Office of the League of Nations. Particularly would it seek to raise labor standards in colonial areas.

10. The United Nations Resources Commission's primary job would be the direction of the development and utilization of all world national resources for a constantly expanding world economy, particularly in undeveloped areas. A research bureau would foster development of new industrial and agricultural processes.

11. The United Nations Commission on Education would seek to raise educational standards throughout the world, to make literacy universal, to develop a wide program of exchange students between nations, to make education a true pattern for living, with particular emphasis upon the re-education of the entire population of the Axis nations.

Let it be emphasized that the entire limited government suggested is aimed at alleviating the causes of world war, that such peace machinery must necessarily be simple and flexible, with a ready means for expansion; that future problems such as the admission of new states must be dealt with as they arise.

It can readily be seen that such an organization is far from a constituted government (which is impossible at this time) but it is certainly a step in the right direction.

Its success depends upon good faith to the cause of world peace by the participating nations and, ultimately, upon the sincerity and devotion of every individual in the world to the world to the cause of preventing another world-wide conflagration.

Tydings Amendment and the Food Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the House Members to the tragic consequences which will follow the induction of critical and essential farm labor at this time. A directive sent out is a clever and slippery and tricky device typical of the New Deal in seeking to adroitly override existing law by indirection. The Tydings amendment is still the law of the land. The food problem is critical as would seem to be indicated by the many restrictions imposed by the O. P. A. and other agencies. It is also evidenced by the urgent request on the part of the War Food Administration to increase the production of foods by at least 3 percent. It must be known, or should be known to the officials of this Government that every farm is a factory that will not operate without adequate manpower. The Tydings amendment was intended to make secure enough labor to each farmer to meet the full demand of the Government for a greater production of food. Plain common sense seems to have been thrown to the winds and instead of drawing on hoarded labor for manpower the New Deal seeks to strip the farms of necessary labor and thus reduce the food production instead of increasing it at a time when the farmers of this country are asked to supply food for civilian population, our Army and Navy and the peoples of liberated countries. The Congress is the last refuge of those engaged in a basic and vital war industry, namely the farms of this country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the New York State Horticultural Society with reference to the food supply:

FARM LABOR

Whereas farmers at the quest of the Government have met food production requirements for several years. This has been achieved through favorable weather; long hours and hard work. In planning for 1945, the odds are against another year of favorable weather, and farmers are unable to accomplish more work per day; and

Whereas the average age of farm workers has risen and there are now on farms less workers than a year ago; and

Whereas the supply of new farm machinery has been inadequate and the supply of existing machinery has become less dependable and repair parts more difficult to obtain and fewer competent repair men; and

Whereas any further drain on the supply of farm labor will jeopardize the supply of food for the armed forces and the consuming public, because the young men on farms are the ones who operate the machinery and are key men, and are not replaceable; and

Whereas the recent order from selective service to the local authorities is making it impossible for farmers to plan their operations for 1945, and these plans have to be made at this time of year: Be it

Resolved, That the New York State Horticultural Society request selective service to use the greatest care and consideration in any reduction in present numbers of men on farms which will affect the national war effort adversely. And that copies of this resolution be sent to all Congressmen and Senators from New York State; to Governor Dewey; to Chester Du Mond, commissioner of agriculture and markets; to Norman Hurd, State manpower director; Harold Stanley, chairman of the State Food Commission; and E. S. Foster, secretary of the State Agricultural Defense Committee.

Race Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NED R. HEALY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a magazine article by Hon. Frank Murphy, Associate Justice, United States Supreme Court.

The article follows:

[From Liberty of January 6, 1945]

RACE HATE—THE ENEMY BULLETS CAN'T STOP

(By Frank Murphy, Associate Justice, United States Supreme Court)

The end of the war is in sight. All that our armies and the armies of our allies have struggled for is in our grasp or within our reach. To accomplish this we have given unstintingly in men, in materials, and in money, We have made many sacrifices, and we are prepared to make many more until final victory over all of our enemies shall be ours.

What has been the justification for this enormous expenditure of American lives and American resources? Why have we made these sacrifices? For conquest? For power? For vengeance? No. Our war aims lie deeper than any of these.

All that we are fighting for, all that we seek in the council of nations, is determined by one fundamental purpose: to safeguard this Nation as our forefathers created it, as later

generations preserved and extended it, and as we intend to hand it on to our children. If we lose in this, we lose in all else.

Victory in this war could be snatched from us by a secret enemy here at home even as our statesmen are signing the agreements which would end military hostilities. This enemy can't be stopped by guns. It can be stopped, and overcome, only by an awareness on the part of each one of us of the real nature of our country's glory.

The true greatness of our country is to be found in an idea—an unshakable belief in the essential goodness of man, in the basic God-given equality of all men, in man's right to personal liberty and to the respect of his neighbors. Our ancestors—those who came here 300 years ago and those who came 30 years ago—all saw in this belief the hope of a new, better life. They came here to escape the hatreds and animosities of the Old World, to live in a land where men could be truly free.

The founding fathers of the United States drew up a Declaration of Independence proclaiming that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. Among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Once independence had been won, the framers of the Constitution secured these rights in law by incorporating them into a Bill of Rights guaranteeing freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and equality before the law.

This, the mainspring of American life, is what our enemies would have us destroy even while our armies are winning victories overseas. They would have us forget our belief in the equality of man and adopt their own false standards of race supremacy. They would see us divided against ourselves, our national strength consumed in racial and religious hatreds. The America our troops sought to preserve would then have been destroyed by our own hands.

This attempt to bring about civil strife has met with more success than many of us care to admit. Propaganda aimed at setting one group against another has found its mark in many instances, and we have seen the sorry spectacle of religious bigotry and racial hatred rise where none had existed before. Or, where misunderstandings already existed, we have seen these misunderstandings somehow turned into animosities bitter enough to involve an entire city. And largely because a few hate-spreaders have accomplished their assignments.

Taking advantage of the high emotional state which prevails in any nation at war, these hate-spreaders have toiled systematically toward a set of definite objectives. Their ultimate aim is not merely to kill innocent people, or to slow our industrial production, or even to hamper our war effort by a temporary reign of terror. Their plan is to crush our trust in one another and so make it impossible for our Republic, and our way of life, to survive. And after the war they will exploit whatever confusion and uncertainty may arise during the transition from a war to a peace economy.

Racial friction and religious persecution are unfortunately not new. Even the history of this country has not been entirely free from outbursts of bigotry. The Quakers of New England were early victims of religious intolerance. In the nineteenth century a political party, the notorious know-nothings, turned against newly arrived immigrants and sought to deny the privileges of American citizenship to all but native-born Protestants. Still later, within the memory of our parents, Irish immigrants who came to America in large numbers were greeted with abuse and derision.

But none of these sordid movements ever dominated the American scene. The American people as a whole defeated the designs of a few hatemongers and continued along their determined path of liberty and democracy.

Now, in our day, irrational hatred has again reared its head, aided by the strain of war and abetted by those trained in the ways of the Nazis. One species of this hatred is perhaps more threatening than any other. It is anti-Semitism.

Anti-Semitism, as an organized means of disrupting the unity of a democratic people, is a Nazi invention. It is aimed not only at the Jews but at democracy and Christianity as well. If we can be persuaded to use this crafty device to destroy ourselves from within, then the Nazis—and not the forces of the United Nations—will have won the war. The weapon which the defeated Nazis will have placed in our own hands will be the cause of our national suicide. At some future date a new breed of Nazis, foreign or domestic, will reap the spoils of real conquest.

This is not fantasy. Hitler has boasted publicly that the seeds of nazi-ism and anti-Semitism which he has sown will rise to plague us long after the German high command has been forced to surrender.

Now is the time to stamp out all the traces of this Nazi-inspired bigotry, before it has a chance to get out of hand. The existence of anti-Semitism challenges every man and woman in the United States. Not only is American democracy threatened; Christianity is also threatened, and so I believe we Christians have a special mission to perform.

We must unite to combat anti-Semitism as a threat to both American and Christian principles. Fully conscious of the right of freedom of speech, we should not seek to throttle those who unwittingly are spreading ill-will. Instead, we should point out the falseness of their arguments and, above all, expose the made-in-Berlin source of their wares. As for those who are deliberately seeking to destroy all that our fathers fought for, and all that our sons are now fighting for, we should fight their propaganda with all the means in our power.

Total victory over these enemies of God and man cannot be won easily. The basic cure lies in the purification of our own hearts. Traces of racial suspicions and misconception lurk in the hearts of the best of us. They cannot be rooted out in a moment. A complete searching, cleansing process is necessary.

If you are tempted to utter a single anti-Semitic remark, no matter how harmless it sounds, or to commit a single anti-Semitic act, ask yourself if this word or deed violates your belief in the dignity of the individual, the right of personal liberty, or the equality of all mankind.

What are the means of which the anti-Semites hopes to turn us against American Jews and eventually against the fundamental ideals of American and Christian life. The first method is to convince us that the Jews are to be blamed for anything and everything we happen not to like. The second method is somehow to create the impression that Jews are different from the rest of us—queer, impossible to understand, alien to American ways.

These charges are historically false as well as morally evil. Yet, they have sometimes been accepted by Christians who are innocent of any malicious intent. These Christians cannot know very much of history, or else they would realize that everything now being charged to the Jews was once charged to the early Christians. The church fathers were accused of belonging to an inferior people, of being aliens and agitators and of tainting the "racial purity" of other peoples. It is heartbreaking today to witness Christians, who were once a religious minority and subject to all the persecutions now inflicted upon the Jews, spread propaganda which—whether they realize it or not—is not only anti-Jewish but anti-Christian as well.

By anti-Semitism we mean something quite different from criticism of individuals who happen to be Jewish. There are good and bad Jews, just as there are good and bad Catholics, good and bad Irish, and good and bad persons of every other description. It is when we attribute our ills to Jews as a whole that we become guilty of passing on some of the poison brewed by our enemies. Or when we accept the master-race myth that a type of people called "Aryans" is in some mystic way superior to all others.

This notion of racial superiority is without any foundation in science, but is seized upon by some persons as solace in their troubles. They think their troubles are eased by the satisfaction of looking down on someone "beneath" them. What a low sort of satisfaction this is.

Each time a person says or does something derogatory to his Jewish neighbors he lowers himself and detracts from the spiritual progress of the human race. While he is injuring himself spiritually, he is also starting something which will lead to his own physical downfall. For bigotry is like a landslide: it gathers momentum as it spreads, finding one victim after another until everyone has suffered. It is true that the first victims of rampant anti-Semitism would be Jews, but the course of history has shown unmistakably that one form of hatred breeds another. Hate-maddened people would turn on a second minority and then on a third. Each one of us in America is a member of a minority in some way or another. Thus we would see our country torn into a multitude of warring groups.

Anti-Semitism and the other forms of group hatred have caused incalculable harm in the world, but never the slightest bit of good. Far from helping in the solution of any national problems, they destroy the very basis on which any problem can be solved—the spirit of mutual understanding and good will. Men's minds are diverted from the problem, and, instead of tackling it, they seek a scapegoat to blame for its existence. In short, hatred cannot remove any of our difficulties—economic, social, or political. It can only add new and more dangerous ones.

And how can any Christian honestly harbor any hatred of a group of his fellow men and still profess to believe in Christianity? Christ commanded us: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." He taught us that all men are neighbors, no matter what their nationality or convictions. The brotherhood of man cannot be accepted piecemeal. Genuine Christianity does not allow for love of one neighbor and hatred of another any more than it allows for obedience to one of the commandments and not to all of them.

It was in keeping with this great Christian tradition that Pope Pius XI spoke of anti-Semitism: "It is a movement in which we Christians can have no part whatsoever. Anti-Semitism is unacceptable. Spiritually we are Semites."

The true Christian cannot stain his conscience with hatred of those of differing religious beliefs or ancestry. Nor can he remain indifferent to their sufferings under the tyranny of others. He will protect them from their enemies, give sanctuary to them in their need, and lend a brotherly hand in restoring to them peace of mind and physical security. To remain silent while the forces of evil are abroad is to give those forces aid and comfort, and this the true Christian cannot find in his conscience to do.

Today, of all times, is not a time for silence. The virus of anti-Semitism has already been well planted. I do not cry "Wolf!" when there is no wolf. The enemy is real. The forces of evil are not preparing to attack us; they are already battling us, under cover, cunningly, and with growing strength. The time to crush this enemy is now. One hundred million volunteers are needed to circulate sober, hate-quenching facts in every

American home, farm, factory, union, church, and school, in the press and on the air. But, first, each volunteer should search his own conscience. Our first victory must be won within ourselves.

If we are true to ourselves and our traditions, this Nation cannot but fulfill its rightful destiny. There is in us all a real capacity for human kindness. The brotherhood of man is a living, growing reality. The future lies with those who will tear asunder the shackles of bigotry and reassert their faith in the dignity and independence of man. Our Christian tenets and our American heritage call us to this task. In deepening our love and understanding of our neighbors, we become better Catholics, or Protestants, or Jews—whatever our creed may be. In building a firmer spirit of unity among the peoples of our land, we become better Americans.

Out of this war must be born something better than the old hatreds in modern guise. The sufferings and sacrifices of our sons must not have been in vain. It is our duty to bring forth a nation more firmly devoted to its ideals, more invulnerable to the counsels of hate, and more fully conscious of its mission of justice and righteousness. Working together, we can achieve this lofty goal. Proud of the power of our country, we can be prouder still of our unflinching defense of the rights of man. We shall have remained true to the promise of America.

Southern California's Post-war Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, let us pause for a moment and consider what our situation will be in southern California following the end of the war:

We have had a wartime increase in our population in southern California of 632,933. The air-frame industry in Los Angeles County in January 1940 had a total of 26,816 employees, and this notwithstanding the fact that we were making a great many war airplanes for our allies at that time. At the present moment, the air-frame industry in this county has 173,000 employees. The shipbuilding industry in this county in 1939 had 864 employees and today the shipbuilding industry here is employing approximately 110,000 employees. In 1939 the concerns now engaged in making aircraft parts—then making other items—were employing 20,000 people. Today these 600 plants are employing 100,000. The rubber fabricating plants were employing 5,855 employees in 1939 and are now employing 19,000. The petroleum refining industry in this county in 1939 employed 6,458, and today is employing 10,500.

When World War No. 1 ended the shipbuilding industry in this area disappeared overnight and was never revived until World War No. 2. We know that during World War No. 2 we have already constructed a greater number of ships than can be employed in a peacetime economy.

A tremendous change is bound to take place in our aircraft industry. Unquestionably we will maintain our position as the No. 1 aircraft producing center of the world. But the types of airplanes being produced for military purposes, I am informed, are wholly unsuited for peacetime use. Hence, with the termination of the war and the cancelation of contracts for military planes, the airplane industry must to a large extent suspend operations until it can retool for the manufacture of new types of planes suitable for peacetime use. When you realize that we only employed 150,000 people in industry in Los Angeles County in 1939 it will be a great problem to find post-war employment for the 350,000 excess war workers who will be released from our major war industries as soon as the war is terminated.

You may be interested in a few of the figures resulting from a survey recently made to ascertain the intentions of our war workers and soldiers with regard to their future employment. The survey recently completed indicates their intention to leave southern California. The first survey showed that 89 percent of the men in our war industries plan to live here after the war. The second survey reveals that only 75 percent intend to remain here. Of the immigrants who have but recently come into Los Angeles County and entered war industry, the first survey showed that 79 percent desire to remain here. The second survey shows that even a lesser percentage desire to remain here. Whereas only 3 percent of the female war workers had done factory work before the war, 42 percent want to continue in factory work after the war. Thirty-six percent of all of our women in war industries were housewives before the war and 34 percent of our female workers say they wish to be housewives after the war. Eleven percent of our women in war work were domestic servants and waitresses. Of our local boys in the military services, 95 percent wish to return to southern California for post-war employment, and of those who intend to return to California, 72 percent desire to return to their former employers.

Notwithstanding the fact that 75 percent of the men in our war industries now indicate their desire to live and work here after the war, many of them apparently realize that there is a serious risk of their not being able to find satisfactory post-war employment in this area, and today we are greatly embarrassed by finding that thousands of our war workers are leaving the State in order to reestablish themselves in the communities from which they came to California. Careful surveys recently made in the airframe industry and in the rubber industry indicate that from 38 to 40 percent of the people now leaving those industries are also leaving the State of California. And when you consider that the average monthly quits in the airframe industry are now around 20,000 per month, you will see that of this group approximately 8,000 a month are leaving the State.

The necessities of war have caused this State to assume the role of a great industrial center. That position we will not willingly relinquish in the post-war era. The Seabees have a motto: "We defend what we build." That will be the motto of industrial California in the post-war period. That California is destined to be one of the greatest industrial centers in the world, I have no doubt. But before we can change from the great peak of war production to a stabilized peace economy, we have many hurdles to jump, some great problems to solve, and it is going to take courage and foresight and the expenditure of a lot of money and fair treatment by government, and agencies of government, to carry our industry through the critical post-war reconversion period. The road ahead is by no means lined with insurmountable obstacles. But the thoughts of a painless victory and an easy post-war period might as well be dispelled.

Very properly you may ask, what do I think we could or should do to pave the way for an early return to a proper peacetime economy in California. I will give you my idea of some things we should do, or strive to do:

First. Insist that California shall have as fair treatment as any other part of the country in being permitted to start now with the manufacture of peacetime commodities. Such a policy would give us a fair break with our competitors and materially assist us in solving our post-war unemployment.

Second. Urge procurement agencies of the Government not to thrust on this State a disproportionate part of the war production after VE-day, other than that which it is absolutely necessary that we undertake—just because we are the closest to Japan.

Third. Urge that the number of Federal employees be reduced to the lowest minimum at the earliest possible moment, so as to reduce the cost of Government to a point that it can be financed with a reasonable burden of taxation. The first plank of the Democratic Platform in 1932 read:

> We advocate: 1. An immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Government.

During that campaign of 1932, President Roosevelt supported that platform with words that could not possibly be misunderstood. He said:

> I accuse the present administration—
>
> Hoover's—
>
> of being the greatest spending administration in peacetime in all American history—one which piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs or reduced earning power of the people.

Fourth. Keep the expansion of our social-security program within the limits that we can afford without ruinous taxation.

Fifth. Along with the reduction in our Federal expenditures, cut down the taxes on business, so that business can expand and increase the rate of production, and thus raise our national income to a point where we can sustain a reasonable Federal budget.

Sixth. Insist that we put an end to the control of business by the withering hand of Government. To succeed in the future we must produce greater wealth. Germany found that government control of business had failed to solve its economic necessities, and it started a war of aggression to acquire by force the raw materials and foodstuffs with which to carry on its national existence.

Seventh. Use our influence to bring to this State a cheap and abundant supply of steel and other metals to enable us to keep and develop our heavy metals industry. This may mean that we should encourage the maintenance in the future of the steel mills that have been constructed in the West during the war.

Eighth. Exercise every influence to preserve for this State its commanding position in the aircraft industry and air transport, and endeavor to maintain a permanent position for our shipbuilding industry, which we have developed so successfully for our Government during the war.

Ninth. Endeavor to secure the maximum amount of the trade of Latin America. We like the people of Latin America. They are our neighbors. Why should not California enjoy the bulk of the Latin-American trade? That desirable trade should not go back to Europe.

Tenth. Work in close harmony with labor. Put an end to the philosophy that management and labor are natural enemies. Let organized labor look to prewar Germany for an example of what such a system offers to labor for a future. We are all fellow Americans, working for a living and for the good of the same country. Management and labor have a great deal in common.

Eleventh. Put an end to paralleling in this country the economic policies which have proven a failure in continental Europe, and which destroyed the freedom of the people, both labor and management, and brought on this devastating war. Our national income is six times as great as that of any other six nations combined. Our living standard is twice that of England, three times that of any nation of continental Europe, and six times that of Russia. And these results have been achieved by private industry working under a free enterprise system. We must cherish and preserve that economic system under which we became the leading Nation of the world. In the perpetuation of that system lies our only hope. If America fails, the economic structure of the entire world will fall into chaos for generations, if not for centuries.

Twelfth. Fight for the elimination of price controls at the earliest possible moment after the cessation of hostilities, and insist that the establishment of hours of work and wage rates by the Government be abandoned. Having achieved full Government control, the Government must arbitrarily limit the price of labor, and has done so in all totalitarian governments. That is the ultimate end toward which labor must look forward if it follows the socialistic pied piper over the hills to the promised land.

No matter how rough the road ahead may seem, no matter how great our fears may be as to our future, I venture the opinion that our problems are less formidable than those which faced the 49'ers who fought their way across the plains and built an empire in this State. With equal courage and determination, we can succeed in the period ahead of us.

This Program Is Difficult To Justify in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years with more and more Government control we have witnessed the allocations of vegetable oils and the allocation of animal fats. We have also witnessed the subsidies to the various vegetable oils and some of the animal fats.

An animal fat, such as lard, has been allocated to the soap industry in large amounts. In fact, some soap companies hire time on the radio and announce the giving away of soap, a year's supply, for a contestant answering some question.

In January 1944, I received the following letter from the War Food Administration:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 13, 1944.*

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of December 30, addressed to Mr. W. H. Jasspon and your letter of January 3, with reference to the use of lard in the production of soap.

From July, the first month in 1943 in which lard was used in soap, through November which is the last month for which figures are available, soap makers were granted approval to purchase a total of 128,430,000 pounds of inspected and uninspected lard. Seventy-three million eight hundred and twenty-six thousand pounds of this total was purchased during the month of August at which time fats suitable for use in soap production were in very short supply. For your information, as of December 10, soap makers were advised that they could no longer purchase inspected lard for use in soap, but could use such quantities as they may have had on hand. They are still permitted to purchase and use uninspected lard.

If there is any further information you desire, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely yours,

S. R. SMITH,
Deputy Director.

In January 1944 I also received the following letter:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF DISTRIBUTION,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1944.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of January 24 in which you ask for a list of the soap companies granted approval to purchase lard for use in the manufacture of soap. The following companies elected to use lard and were granted approval during the year 1943:

Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Lever Bros. Co., Cambridge, Mass.

Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co., Jersey City, N. J.

S. Strunz & Son, Inc., 708 Bingham, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Lanman & Kemp-Barclay Co., Grand and Columbia Avenues, Palisades Park, N. J.

Fels & Co., Seventy-third and Woodland Avenue, Philadelphia (42), Pa.

Manhattan Soap Co., Inc., Bristol, Pa.

Armour & Co., Thirty-first and Benson Streets, Chicago, Ill.

In our letter of January 13 we advised you that as of December 10 soap makers were informed that approval of the use of inspected lard would no longer be granted. We regret to state that this date was incorrect, and should have read December 18.

If there is any further information you desire, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. KITCHEN,
Acting Director.

You will note that in this letter that the soap makers were informed "that approval of the use of inspected lard would no longer be granted."

The allocation of lard to the soap makers had evidently continued in 1944 up until November 14, 1944—or 1 week after election—as shown in the following letter:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, January 15, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR REID: Your letter of January 2, 1945, addressed to Mr. J. A. Krug, Chairman, War Production Board, inquiring as to the number of pounds of lard allocated to soap manufacturers in 1943 and 1944 and the names of the soap manufacturers receiving allocations, has been referred to us for reply.

No specific allocation of lard has been made to individual soap companies. The purchase of lard for soap has been prohibited since November 13, 1944, under War Food Order 42-b, amendment 1.

The Bureau of the Census reports the use of 74,000,000 pounds of lard in soap during 1943. This represents 4.3 percent of the reported 1943 use of primary fats in soap. Approximately 126,000,000 pounds of lard were used in soap during the first three quarters of 1944. This increase over 1943 was due primarily to the heavy seasonal production of lard in 1944, when other storage and shipping space was unavailable.

Statistics are not yet public for the fourth quarter of 1944. However, we estimate that approximately 45,000,000 pounds of lard purchased prior to November 13, 1944, have been used in soap during the last quarter of 1944.

We trust that the foregoing provides the information you require, and we would be pleased to furnish any additional information you desire regarding this subject.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

What are the facts brought out by these letters: First, that a good animal fat in the form of lard with 4,000 calories per pound has been allocated to soap making when the housewife was compelled to pay points to obtain lard to feed the family; second, that even in 1944 171,000,000 pounds of this good food was allocated for soap; and, third, that in addition many millions of dollars were appropriated to subsidize the production of vegetable oils such as soybean oil, and peanut oil at the very time the animal fat lard was being allocated for soap making.

It is heartening to note that the diversion of this good food product to soap making has at last been discontinued. We have been listening to much propaganda as to the available food supplies that is not in keeping with the facts.

The food situation has now reached the point where more reliable information should come from, and more constructive approaches should be made in, high places.

An American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, several months ago it was my privilege to get admitted to the gallery several college girls who wanted to witness the proceedings of the House. Among those was Miss Nancy Hanck, 17 years of age.

Miss Hanck is now a student of the George Washington University of this city, having won a scholarship in June 1944. She is a lieutenant colonel of the Girls' Cadet Corps and on the junior staff of the college paper, besides being secretary of the freshman class, as well as president of the Alpha Delta Phi pledges.

This young lady is a talented dancer and has volunteered over 1,000 hours in entertaining in military camp shows for servicemen in the Military District of Washington.

A short time after her trip to the Capitol she wrote what I consider a very outstanding essay about her visit, which she called An American Heritage, and sent me a copy of the same. In times like these, Mr. Speaker, it is very refreshing to read articles on our American heritage and I am pleased to insert Miss Hanck's essay in the RECORD. It reads as follows:

AN AMERICAN HERITAGE

The lights are shining brightly in the red brick house on the corner. In the window there is a service flag with two stars on it. The family is gathered around the fireplace, reading newspapers or a magazine. The sound of laughter, mixed with radio music, echoes through the big house. All of this is part of an American heritage. The service flag in the window shows that two members of this family are fighting to keep it.

All of you have probably heard the words "American heritage" many times before, and today I would like to tell you exactly what I think those words mean.

I know that I had never even thought about it until last summer, and then something happened that made me stop and think and be glad. A friend of mine was visiting me from California, and as it was her first visit to Washington, she naturally wanted to go sightseeing. The Capitol was first on her list. We told my aunt from Oklahoma about this, and she said that since she knew a Congressman from Oklahoma, she would see if she could get passes for us to see Congress in action. She called him and told him about us, and not only did he give us the passes, but he acted as our guide through a tour of the Capitol. After we had seen all of the interesting places in the building, we went up in the gallery to watch Congress in action. As I was sitting up there in the gallery, watching and listening to all of the men that I'd read about in the papers, I began to think just how wonderful it was for me to be able to sit there and watch the law-making body of our Government. I mentioned this to Congressman STIGLER and he told me that it was all part of an "American heritage."

When you drive through Virginia and see the birthplaces of men like Henry Clay and Patrick Henry, you realize that they are all part of this heritage, as are the men that fought at Bunker Hill and in all of the battles of the Revolutionary War. But men are not all that make up this heritage. There are documents * * * The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. And there are wars * * * the Civil War, the War of 1812, World War No. 1. And someday the present World War will take its place alongside the others. All of these things go to make up this heritage of ours.

But just exactly what is an "American heritage"? Is it democracy, freedom, loyalty, or what? I think that it is all of these things, plus a great many others. Things like being able to get as much education as you want, and reading the newspaper that you prefer. It's being able to go to the movies that you want to see, or staying at home if you want to. It's being able to stand up in a classroom and critize the foreign policy of the President of the United States, if you don't agree with it. And it's also being able to fight for your country.

A few days later, my friend and I visited the Lincoln Memorial and those two words, "American heritage," were even more firmly impressed on my mind. They were no longer just two words; they were a real, living picture. The white stone pillars, gleaming in the sunlight, seemed to bring this out. And as I walked up the steps, and looked at the statue of the Great Emancipator, the stone image seemed to gaze into both the past and the future with the same strength and serenity. And I realized that here was the true personification of an "American heritage."

Resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution from the Governor of Arizona, Hon. Sidney P. Osborn:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
STATE HOUSE,
Phoenix, Ariz., January 16, 1945.

Hon. RICHARD F. HARLESS,
Member, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DICK: I am enclosing herewith a certified copy of Senate Joint Memorial 2, regular session of the Seventeenth Arizona Legislature, being a joint memorial requesting the Senate of the United States to ratify the treaty with Mexico relating to the waters of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Tia Juana Rivers, which memorial was adopted by the Arizona State Senate on January 11 last without a dissenting vote and adopted by the House of Representatives on January 12, there being only one dissenting vote cast by that body.

I am sure you will agree that the almost unanimous action of the members of both houses of the Seventeenth Arizona Legislature reflects the true sentiment of the people of Arizona on this important matter.

May I not hope that you will use all of your influence to the end that this treaty be ratified by the United States Senate at the earliest opportunity.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

SIDNEY P. OSBORN, *Governor.*

Senate Joint Memorial 2

Joint memorial requesting the Senate of the United States to ratify the treaty with Mexico relating to the waters of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Tia Juana Rivers

To the Senate of the United States:

Your memorialist represents: That it is the belief of this body that the pending treaty between the United States and Mexico, respecting the waters of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Tia Juana Rivers, signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, as clarified by the protocol signed November 14, 1944, will, as it pertains to the waters of the Colorado River, prove very beneficial to the United States and to the State of Arizona.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

1. That your honorable body ratify the proposed treaty at the earliest possible date.

Adopted by the senate January 11, 1945, by the following vote: 15 ayes, 0 nays, 4 not voting.

Adopted by the house January 12, 1945, by the following vote: 48 ayes, 1 nay, 0 absent, 9 excused.

Approved by the Governor, January 15, 1945.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state, Januar 15, 1945.

"Lift Up Now Thine Eyes"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I submit for the RECORD the profound and timely address delivered by Dr. Peter Marshall in Washington Cathedral yesterday afternoon as a part of the service sponsored by the Washington Federation of Churches, in reaffirmation of the Nations faith in God, following the inauguration of the President of the United States.

Dr. Marshall, a native of Scotland, is pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church in Washington, and has served churches in Atlanta and New York City.

Incidentally, his address, Quicken the Spirit Within You—the Only Foundation for National Greatness, is carried as the feature article by the current issue of the Reader's Digest.

Dr. Marshall's philosophy might well be expressed by the concluding paragraph in that address:

"Choose ye this day whom ye will serve." For it is an imperishable verity: "No man

can serve two masters. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." That is the choice America must make we must choose God—or go to hell!

In addressing a distinguished gathering, including representatives from the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government, at Mount St. Alban yesterday, Dr. Marshall said:

Text: Genesis xiii: 14, 15:

"Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever."

We in America pride ourselves upon being realists.

Let us therefore look at the situation which confronts us as individuals and as a Nation, with all the realism we possess.

Let us be clear-eyed—yes even hard-headed about it.

Against our wills, and certainly without planning it so, we are engaged in the most gigantic conflict in world history.

American boys are engaged in bloody fighting in every part of the globe.

Already this conflict has cost us many American lives, and billions of dollars, and the worst is yet to come.

The biggest and bloodiest battles are yet to be fought.

Furthermore, all of us are most uneasily aware of the fact, that, having fought the war through to a bloody but victorious end, the great battle to win the peace must then begin.

We shall be standing where Woodrow Wilson stood in 1919.

Certain questions haunt us:

Can we make a permanent peace this time?

Do we have any way of guaranteeing the rights of small and relatively helpless nations?

Can we establish economic stability in our world?

How may the German people be rehabilitated—reeducated?

How may the poison of nazi-ism be drawn from their hearts?

How can the peace be preserved so that our sons will not have to march off to another world war 25 years hence?

When we face these and similar questions squarely, let us admit that many among us are frankly skeptical.

"After all, it's a pretty rotten world," they say. "We'll just have to do the best we can—that's all we can do—and hope for the best."

A few months ago a board of four men discussed the question, What can be done with Germany?

One of the men was a Belgian, the former editor of a large Belgian newspaper. He was, he said, a realist, and his attitude was, quite frankly, that the German people were hopeless.

He felt that nothing could ever change them; therefore he had not the slightest hope for enduring peace.

The very most that would be accomplished, he thought, was to crush Germany as completely as possible. If Germany was pulverized enough, then perhaps the Third World War might be postponed for, say, 30 years.

He felt, further, that in the next war Germany will probably jump over Belgium and even England, and attack the United States. He repeated at the end of his statement that he was a realist.

Is that all to which we can look forward? Is that really the most for which we can hope, after all this misery, bloodshed, and sacrifice?

I am here to say to you that I believe with all my heart that it is the most we can hope for; if we depend solely upon human resources and human wisdom.

The stern, hard, cold fact is that the men at Versailles thought that they were using the very best of human wisdom, all the ingenuity they had, and they failed.

Do we really think that if we rely upon the same resources we shall succeed where they failed?

We would be departing from our realism, and would be taking an excursion into the realm of wishful thinking to believe that.

Let me make a suggestion which will seem fantastic perhaps, to some of you.

Let me suggest with all the fervor in me that, all other resources having failed, we seriously consider using the power and the wisdom of an infinite God to solve the problems which confront us.

That power has been available to us all the time—and we have not used it—not even sought it—just as the power latent in the Mississippi River was there for hundreds—yes, thousands of years before it was harnessed.

Men used the mighty power of the Mississippi for amusement, if they wanted to swim, to fish, or to sail; sometimes its beauty beguiled them and inspired songs and poems and pictures; sometimes it was simply an obstruction, a barrier to expansion and a hazard for their wagons of commerce and trade.

So has God's power been to many of us.

Some have regarded God's great promises in the Old Book as amusing—entertaining—even interesting—but have concluded that that sort of thing was all right for the simple orientals, for the naive and imaginative nomads of the desert, adapted to simple Galilean fishermen, but too abstract and idyllic for this hard-boiled twentieth century.

Yes, perhaps it might have been all right for them—living in far-off Palestine in the dim and distant days when the moon was a child's bubble—instead of the synthetic pearl it is today; but these men didn't have to deal with the complex problems of twentieth century civilization—and God didn't know Washington.

Some among us have used the beauty and the grandeur of God's promises in the Old Book to garnish a speech much as we use parsley on a plate of meat.

Sometimes they have even proved an obstruction when we were primarily concerned with the selfish interests of individuals or pressure groups which pose as Government.

The idea of believing them, trying them out, might be helpful to invalids and shutins, might be good for children to learn in Sunday school, but for Presidents and prime ministers, for secretaries of state and foreign ministers, for Senators and Congressmen, for captains of industry, bankers, and statesmen, they remain the one thing untried, because while they can never be forgotten, somehow they are never quite believed.

When will we become so discouraged with our repeated failures that we shall be willing to give God a chance?

How can we find God's wisdom and tap His power? I believe this verse provides a technique:

"Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art.
"Lift up now thine eyes."

Every undertaking which succeeds, which takes civilization a permanent step forward, begins with the upward look, with a vision, with a dream, an idealistic dream, if you please, planted in someone's heart.

Abraham Lincoln looked up, and dreamed a dream of a Nation without slavery. Many of his contemporaries said that dream could never become reality, it was much too idealistic.

But it did become reality, although the Emancipation Proclamation freed the slaves from their masters, but did not make them free. Lincoln's promise has still to be fulfilled.

Florence Nightingale looked up and dreamed a dream of medical care and nursing for wounded soldiers—of angels in white ministering to the casualties so that they need not die for want of care.

Out of her dream came the glorious order of the Red Cross.

Edison looked up and dreamed a dream of a lamp that would need neither oil nor wick. Men said he was mad.

He had seen an indication that an important achievement was possible, and he experimented with it, by methods, all of which failed.

His assistant tried to sympathize with him by saying, "It's too bad to do all that work with no result."

"But," said Edison, "we have a lot of results. We now know 700 things that won't work."

Woodrow Wilson looked up and dreamed a dream of permanent world peace and a permanent world organization which would solve international problems by arbitration as they came up—in a world court.

It was idealistic—yes; as all dreams are. It failed—not because the idea was bad but because the conditions for its success were not met.

In the meantime we have discovered many more things that won't work.

Is it not time that we were willing to give God's way a chance? One would think that the rulers of the nations, the statesmen, and the politicians would be tired of trying to devise new human methods, new formulas, new declarations, new charters, new treaties, when there is an old one that has never been applied.

A famous American journalist has recently spoken of what he called the morass of Wilsonism, but you can't dismiss a dream that way. Certainly not one that has fired the hearts of the Nations; one that had more to do with Germany's collapse in the last war than anything else, and produced more hope in the hearts of men and women all over the world than anything that has happened in our time.

There has been a tendency recently to feel that because after the last war we were idealistic and aimed too high. This time we should be more cynical, more suspicious; have less faith and expectation, and aim much lower. That, we say, is being realistic. The means we used did not achieve the ends we desired. But why conclude that the end itself was wrong, just because the means proved inadequate?

Is that realism? Is it even common sense?

Our true aim is after all, exactly what Wilson's was, namely, permanent world peace, based upon a community of nations, seeking to settle international disputes without resort to war.

When our men went marching off to war in 1917 it was to certain slogans which have been sneered at by the unthinking and the cynical.

They went into this war "to end wars." That was their purpose as it was Wilson's dream. Well, it could have ended wars, if the Nations, including our own, had been willing.

They crossed the Atlantic "to make the world safe for democracy" and in order to do so they swept through the cobbled streets of Chateau Thierry and through the dark forests of the Argonne.

Despite the sneers of the men they protected at home they did exactly that—they made the world safe for democracy. It was not their fault that their valor, their sacrifice and their effort failed to produce that result for which they were willing to give their lives.

Permanent world peace, and an organization of the nations of the world to preserve that peace is our aim in this present world struggle.

No other aim is worthy of the sacrifice of millions of our sons, young, full of life, and the zest for living, our hope and our pride,

but it will not suffice us then to aim lower and achieve even less.

We are right to feel that we—on the human level—can now bring our dream of world peace into fulfillment, but we dare not leave God out again.

Our first step, then, is to "lift up our eyes unto the hills from whence our help cometh."

If we look up, we, too, can catch that dream and sense its possibility in the power of God guiding, supporting, nerving human hearts.

The second step is to look from the place where we are.

We are inclined to regard God's solutions as impractical, but they are not.

God begins with us where we are, and as we are.

If we want ripples to spread over a pool, they must begin with a minute circle in the middle and spread outward. There is no other way.

Which is to say that if we desire peace, unity, and harmony to spread over the world, it must originate with us and go outward.

There is no other place where we can begin, except with ourselves.

It is here that God's solution—far from being impracticable—is so practical that we cringe, and many of us immediately shy away.

For we love peace, but we do not always love the qualities of mind and heart that make for peace.

Let us be clear about this: God's guidance is not a question of hokus-pokus. It can only come through individuals, as we are willing to get quiet enough to hear the whispering of that voice in our hearts, as we are willing so to be cleansed ourselves that there will be nothing to obstruct the clear channel of guidance.

The guidance of God is not an empty phrase.

I personally know that full well. That God can and does guide men in real-life situations is one of the verities that has been deposited in the crucible of my own experience, for God has guided me every step of my way, from a machine shop in a tube mill in Scotland across the Atlantic because He wanted me in the ministry, to where I stand at this moment.

We must look from where we are, as a Nation.

We can see clearly enough the splinters in the eyes of other nations, the Germans and the Japanese, yes, even in the eyes of our allies, but let us not overlook the beams in our own eyes.

We are not without blame for the chaotic condition of our world.

We have been very smug, very materialistic, very selfish.

We have been very reluctant indeed to be our brother's keepers in any sense, until now we are forced into a corner where we see that the only way to keep out of the ditch ourselves, is to pull our brothers out and keep them out.

America has the opportunity to lead the rest of the world spiritually with moral power and force and to lead the way into a new and bright tomorrow. America has the wealth, the natural resources, the prestige, the ability, the brains, the genius, and the skill; the means of communication, the political forms, the people to do this. But is America good enough?

Are we good enough to assume world leadership?

That seems to be what God is laying before us—for the second time in 25 years.

Surely we all realize that it is not enough to join in singing:

"God bless America, land that I love;
Stand beside her and guide her through the night with a light from above.
From the mountains to the prairies,
To the oceans white with foam,
God bless America!
My home sweet home."

God has blessed America—in the past—and He will bless America now and in the future—if we become worthy, and if we will keep the conditions He has laid down.

"If My people, which are called by My name, will humble themselves, and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from Heaven, and forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

There are the conditions, and not until they are kept can God's blessings now be ours.

This call to repentance is sounding through America now. It is coming in many ways to many people. Your presence here indicates your own response to it.

America will never repent until you and I repent. America will never keep God's conditions, until they are kept in your life and in mine. For we are America.

America is made up of 130,000,000 people like you and me. We must learn our lesson this time—before it is too late.

God has a plan for America. Her history is proof of that. God's hand has been in her history from the beginning. No thoughtful student of American history can doubt it.

Washington said: "No people can be bound to accept and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of man, more than the people of the United States.

"Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been destined by some token of Providential agency."

God's hand is upon us—at this hour—God is looking to us.

If our Nation was founded under God, as we believe it was, then a great responsibility rests upon us.

America may be humanity's last chance. We don't know. But it certainly is humanity's latest chance, God's latest experiment.

And if America fails to realize her destiny under God, then the opportunity may go to another nation. God has waited—waited a long time. He will not wait forever.

We know, as Christians, that lasting peace issues from righteousness. The eternal order is righteousness first * * * and then peace.

God has said so, and history verifies the Word of God.

Christ must be the Unseen Delegate at the peace table. He is vitally concerned. Can we doubt that for a moment? God is more anxious to have peace than we are.

Surely Christ will be at the peace conference—with His wounds—the marks of the nails—and His crown of thorns. Surely the shadow of a cross will fall over the peace table.

But how can these men see it? How can they be made to feel it?

This we can say, with all the fervor and conviction of our Christian faith—unless the spirit of Jesus Christ pervades the peace conference—they will labor in vain who write their signatures to any treaty.

God must be consulted about the peace: about the solution of the problems that vex us, the problems that keep our statesmen awake at nights. God has the answers to them all, and He will give them to us if we seek them, and are willing to follow His guidance.

Miracles could happen at the peace conference. Miracles must happen, if another world war is to be avoided, and it is for these miracles that we pray. And the miracles will happen here in America, too. The President yesterday took the oath of office—an impressive oath which ended with these words: "So help me God."

God will help our President. God wants to help him. Without God's help he will surely fail.

He must seek God's help. So must every man and woman sharing responsibility of government under him. So must every Senator and every Congressman. So must every man and woman in America.

God helping us, we cannot fail this time. God helping us, we shall keep faith with the men who have fallen, and those who will give to the last full measure of devotion that we might have another chance to make America what we want her to be—God's own country!

Present Agricultural Programs Not Based on Maximum Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the present farm-labor problem is primarily due to the false food pictures presented by the political agriculturists during the past few months. In addition to the word pictures, we have witnessed the inauguration of programs that most assuredly have misled the American people as to the food supplies of the Nation.

For example, did you know that wheat was being exported up until April 1943 and that 25 to 30 cents per bushel was spent to get rid of it? Did you know that on November 15, 1944, this export program was again put into operation, and that already "Exporters have agreed to export a total of 265,908 bushels of wheat"? Did you know that "the average amount that will be payable upon exportation is 33.43 cents per bushel"?

Did you know that 131,349 bales of cotton with an export subsidy of $20 per bale was paid since the export program was revived in November?

Does it make sense to use manpower, fertilizer, and production subsidies for crops such as wheat and cotton and then turn around and pay 33 cents per bushel and $20 per bale in order to get rid of them to say nothing about the manpower, transportation, and shipping space used in order to dispose of them?

The following letters and articles are evidence of the situation:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, September 12, 1944.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR REID: Reference is made to your inquiry of August 22 concerning the subsidizing of exports of wheat to Mexico.

No agency of the Department of Agriculture or War Food Administration is subsidizing the exportation of wheat or wheat products to Mexico. We believe your reference may be to a flour subsidy program administered by the Defense Supplies Corporation.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

The following is an article which appeared in the Chicago Journal of Commerce of October 19, 1944:

C. C. C. AND TRADE AGREE ON WHEAT EXPORT SUBSIDY

WASHINGTON, October 18.—Agreement on the general principles to govern wheat and flour export subsidy programs designed to take care of this country's surpluses was

announced by the Commodity Credit Corporation today following meetings held with industry advisory committees. However, another meeting between flour millers and C. C. C. officials, or a joint meeting of flour and grain trade representatives may be necessary before details of the program can be fully developed.

Although both industry groups and C. C. C. are reported in agreement on the general outlines of the program as a result of two meetings held here last week, some points still remain to be cleared up. Chief among these is whether exporters will be required to buy C. C. C. wheat or whether they can buy on the open market and still be eligible for the reduced rate.

C. C. C., it is understood, favors a plan whereby agency-owned stocks of wheat would be offered first to exporters, and grain trade representatives are in agreement. The millers, however, do not want to be compelled to buy C. C. C. wheat. While there is no objection to buying agency-owned wheat, officials of the industry said, they want some freedom of choice as a protection against out-of-position stocks or the wrong types of wheat.

Although generally referred to as a subsidy program, the actual plan probably will be a sort of exchange-sale agreement, with no direct subsidy payment, according to C. C. C. officials. Tentative plans provide that exporters will buy wheat at prevailing domestic prices, sell it to C. C. C. at the same rate, and then buy back at the established export rate.

The export rate will be a price which will permit competition with other exporting nations, at present about 40 cents under the New York market level. Under the tentative program, prices at which C. C. C. will resell at each market will be announced each day, sometime after the Chicago market closes. If no announcement is made, the preceding day's prices will remain in effect. Differentials between markets will be geared to world competitive prices, it was explained.

Official estimates of the program's cost are not available, but if the United States exports approximately 72,000,000 bushels this year at a price 40 cents below the market price, approximately $28,000,000 would be needed. A congressional appropriation is expected to be asked as soon as Congress reconvenes in November.

The following is a letter received from Grover B. Hill, Acting Administrator, War Food Administration, dated December 26, 1944:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, December 26, 1944.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This will acknowledge your letter of December 11 inquiring as to whether or not we currently have an export program for cotton. We are enclosing a copy of the announcement of November 11 giving the details of the export program for cotton and wheat.

The exports of raw cotton are currently being made at an export differential of 4 cents per pound. The Commodity Credit Corporation owns a large stock of cotton, and we are, as much as possible, liquidating these stocks through the export program. If the Corporation does not have stocks available to meet the requirements of the export market, the exporter purchases the cotton in the open market, sells the cotton to the Corporation, and the Corporation, in turn, resells the identical cotton to the exporter at the 4-cent per pound export differential.

The funds of Commodity Credit Corporation are used in making exports of this kind. We are endeavoring to handle the export program so that the maximum amount of cotton will be sold from the stocks of the Corporation and that the minimum amount of cash will be required.

Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. HILL,
Acting Administrator.

The following is a letter received from the Commodity Credit Corporation dated January 5, 1945:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of December 30, in which you requested information concerning wheat, wheat flour, and cotton export programs.

The following data in regard to wheat and wheat flour are based on transactions entered into through December 28, 1944, as reported to this office.

No actual exportations of wheat have taken place under the program. However, exporters have agreed to export a total of 285,908 bushels of wheat in the form of wheat. The average amount that will be payable upon exportation is 33.42 cents per bushel.

Exports of flour equivalent to 6,680 bushels of wheat have been made under the wheat flour program. However, exporters have agreed to export flour equivalent to 4,906,816 bushels of wheat and the average payment per bushel when exportations are made will be 14.92 cents.

The program was inaugurated on November 15, 1944. Payment rates for exports in the form of wheat under the program have been as follows: For Atlantic coast and Gulf ports, 34 cents per bushel from the time the program was inaugurated until the present time; for exports through rail points to Mexico, 6 cents per bushel for the entire time the program has been in effect; for exports from Pacific coast ports, the rates have been 29 cents per bushel from November 15 through November 27, 30 cents per bushel from November 28 through December 4, and 29 cents per bushel from December 5 to the present time. Effective January 4, 1945, the foregoing rates are used only in determining the export payments on flour since the program was temporarily suspended with respect to exports in the form of wheat.

The payment rates for flour are determined by subtracting the flour-production payment of Defense Supplies Corporation from the rate established for exports in the form of wheat. For exports from the Atlantic coast and Gulf ports the payment rate was 16 cents per bushel from November 15 through November 30, and 15 cents per bushel for the month of December. There is no payment on flour exported by rail to Mexico. For exports from the Pacific coast the payment rates have been 11 cents for November 15 through November 27; 12 cents for November 28 through November 30; 11 cents for December 1 through December 4; and 10 cents for the remainder of December.

Data requested in regard to the cotton export program are as follows:

Exporters had registered sales, through December 30, covering 131,349 bales of cotton for export under the program.

The export price of cotton, as announced November 15, is based on the domestic price less 4 cents per pound gross weight, or approximately $20 per bale difference in the domestic and export price.

Sincerely yours,

C. C. FARRINGTON,
Vice President.

My point in presenting the above are, first, it would be a constructive aid to the war effort if programs that were of questionable value in peace were discontinued during the war.

The second constructive suggestion is that it would be well to foster a food production program based on war needs rather than on one that wastes manpower and fertilizer in producing crops that require an export subsidy in order to get rid of them with added waste of manpower and transportation.

The following article is from the December 29, 1944, edition of the Los Angeles Times:

WHEAT PILED ON OPEN LOT WILL BE USED

Disposal of 26,000 tons of Australian wheat now stored on an open lot at 5945 Malt Avenue, is certain when current supplies of United States-grown feed grain run short about February, officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Federal agency in charge of grain, declared yesterday.

The wheat, arrival and processing of which was first reported in the Times, November 1, is the remainder of a contract for 50,000 tons purchased in Australia last February at the behest of the California State Department of Agriculture when a shortage in feed was forecast.

SOME TO BE SALVAGED

Rain will injure only the top layer of the pile, Earl C. Correy, regional director of the C. C. C. said here yesterday, and added that even much of the rain-soaked wheat will be salvaged for hog feed.

A plant to roll the grain is being completed on a lot near the mountain of wheat and will be in operation January 20, Corey said.

The Miller Malting Co. provided the storage lot free of charge to the Government. A "live wire" fence guarding the pile is intended solely to keep away livestock grazing in the area.

The Australian wheat is restricted to the seven southern California counties not growing wheat because of an Australian disease called flag smut.

ARRIVES LATE

When the wheat was first purchased in Australia it was thought that it would arrive here not later than May to help in alleviating feed shortages. Due to diversion of ships, the cargoes didn't arrive until October 4 and then in rapid succession at a time when the Nation enjoyed a bumper feed crop.

Because storage facilities were lacking 26,000 tons were stored in the open and the other 24,000 tons were distributed to feeders. The total cost of the Australian contract was about $2,000,000, Corey said.

From reading the letters and articles is it any wonder that President Roosevelt, General Hershey, and the local draft boards have been led to believe that food is not as important as it really is?

When our agricultural powers promote programs that expend millions of hours of manpower and millions of dollars in money to produce a crop and then turn around and spend millions more hours of manpower and other millions of dollars of money in order to get rid of the crop, it is pretty difficult to make anyone, not familiar with the situation, believe that there is a serious food problem.

The departments of the W. F. A. have been carrying on many activities that in my judgment are not contributing to the highest production of food, nor in making best utilization of manpower.

What Is An "Un-American Activity"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, "What is an un-American Activity?" In an effort to secure considered and intelligent answers to that question, I sent out letters last Saturday to 100 prominent American citizens asking them to let our newly created standing Committee on un-American Activities and the Congress have the benefit of their thinking as this unprecedented standing committee begins facing up to its great responsibilities.

As a member of the former Dies committee and as one of the only two members of that committee to be reappointed to serve on this new House Committee on un-American Activities, I know from personal experience some of the problems and the pressures which our group will face as we proceed with our work. In order to best assure the success of our committee activities and to best serve the interest of this Republic, it seems to me it is highly important that we set up certain sound and workable criteria for determining what is and what is not an un-American activity.

To that end I have written this group of 100 Americans some of whom have looked with favor and some with disfavor upon the work of the preceding House Committee on un-American Activities. A study of the list of names to whom my inquiry was sent will indicate, I feel certain, that a cross section of replies received from this group should accurately and fairly reflect prevailing American opinion.

Our committee will begin its work with new and increased authority, under a new chairman, with substantially a new membership but its mandate remains the same as that given the Dies committee—to expose and eradicate un-American activities in the United States. We begin our work with whole cloth and a new pattern. I sincerely hope that those to whom letters were mailed on Saturday will respond with frank and helpful letters. For the information of the Congress and the country, I am including with these remarks a copy of the letter which I mailed in this connection together with a copy of the data sheet which accompanied it:

COPY OF LETTER SENT BY CONGRESSMAN MUNDT TO EACH INDIVIDUAL NAMED ON ATTACHED LIST

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1945.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: May I take just a few minutes of your time to discuss with you what I believe you will agree is a very important topic? * * * What policies should be followed by the recently created, permanent House Committee on Un-American Activities?

The writer was for the past 2 years a member of the former Dies committee and is one of the only two members of the newly appointed committee who were selected from the old membership of the Dies committee. Consequently, I know something of the problems and the pressures which face our new committee.

One of the factors which disturbed me often as a member of the Dies committee was the absence of a suitable and working criterion to determine what does and what does not comprise an un-American activity. We all know that there are some activities which are un-American—whether we are at war or at peace—and I am sure all right-minded Americans oppose such activities. I feel that a committee which limits its functions to exposing and helping to eradicate activities of this type should have, and will receive, the support of Americans in every walk of life. It is my hope that this new committee may so serve America.

This letter is being sent alike to important Americans who were supporters and critics of the former Dies committee (a list of those receiving this letter is enclosed). It is a sincere effort to determine and define the proper scope of activities for this new committee. Will you, therefore, please write me your suggestions with regard to the proper scope of activities which should engage the attention of the new House Committee on Un-American Activities? Your considered reply will be appreciated and it will be most helpful to our committee in developing criteria for determining whether certain activities should or should not come within the purview of our authority. If you so specify, your suggestions will be kept in confidence although their maximum helpfulness will accrue if you permit their full use in helping the committee and the Congress chart the course to be taken by the standing committee on un-American activities.

Too often in America, we are all inclined to attribute un-Americanism to the political, economic, and social theories with which we disagree. Obviously this is not the proper test. Unless you feel that there are no un-American activities in this free land of ours, I shall therefore appreciate your writing me the benefit of your own thinking in connection with the question posed in the preceding paragraphs.

With kindest regards, and hoping to hear from you before February 10, I am,

Cordially yours,

(Signed) KARL E. MUNDT,
Member of Congress.

DATA SHEET MAILED WITH FOREGOING LETTER TO PROMINENT AMERICANS IN VARIOUS FIELDS OF ENDEAVOR AND WITH DIFFERING POINTS OF VIEW

(From the office of Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota, room 1206, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C., former member of the Dies committee, member of the newly created Standing Committee on Un-American Activities in the House of Representatives)

The accompanying letter is being sent to the prominent Americans whose names appear below. It is being sent to these citizens because each of them is helping to shape public opinion and determine public policy in America and because they represent an honest cross section of opinion concerning the past activities of the Dies committee and with regard to the wisdom of the House of Representatives in establishing a permanent Standing Committee of the House on Un-American Activities.

Regardless of whether you think the establishment of this committee was wise or unwise, it is now an accomplished fact. This action is unprecedented in American history and your recommendations are solicited in response to the question, "What criterion should this committee use in determining the type of activities which this committee should classify as 'Un-American' and to which it should devote its attention?"

Obviously, neither witch hunting nor white washing can be a part of this new committee's performance if it is to render a worth-while public service. This is a new committee; it is not a creature of the old. We start our work with whole cloth and a new pattern. Will you please help design the pattern governing our activities by sending me your concept of what comprises an "un-American activity."

The following list is a complete enumeration of those receiving this request:

The Governors and one leading newspaper of each of the four most Democratic States in the Union and of each of the four most Republican States in the Union, as indicated by statistics of the last national election:

Gov. Thomas L. Bailey, Mississippi.
Gov. Ransome J. Williams, S. Carolina.
Gov. Ellis G. Arnall, Georgia.
Gov. Chauncey Sparks, Alabama.
Gov. Andrew F. Schoeppel, Kansas.
Gov. Dwight Griswold, Nebraska.
Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, South Dakota.
Gov. Mortimer R. Proctor, Vermont.

W. W. Ball, editor, News and Courier, Charleston, S. C.

Frederick Sullens, editor, Jackson Daily News, Jackson, Miss.

Ralph McGill, editor, Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga.

George Cox, editor, Mobile Press, Mobile, Ala.

Milton Tabor, editor, Topeka State Capital, Topeka, Kans.

H. E. Newbranch, editor, Omaha World-Herald, Omaha, Nebr.

Fred C. Christopherson, editor, Daily Argus Leader, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

E. F. Crane, editor, Vermont Free Press, Burlington, Vt.

Heads of the following influential organizations: The American Legion, Edward N. Scheiberling, Albany, N. Y.; Veterans of Foreign Wars, Carl J. Shoenenger, Kansas City, Mo.; Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Frank J. Lonegran, Chicago, Ill.; Knights of Columbus, Francis P. Matthews, New Haven, Conn.; National Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. John L. Whitehurst, Washington, D. C.; American Association of University Women, Dr. Helen C. White, Washington, D. C.; Federal Council of Churches, Dr. G. Bromely Oxnam, New York City; Daughters of the American Revolution, Mrs. Elizabeth M. Cox, Washington, D. C.; Imperial Potentate of the Shrine, Alfred G. Arvold, Fargo, N. Dak.

Prominent radio commentators: Walter Winchell, H. V. Kaltenborn, H. R. Baukhage, Richard Harkness, Raymond Gram Swing, Fulton Lewis, Jr., Drew Pearson, Upton Close, Lowell Thomas, and Earl Godwin.

Prominent newspaper columnists: David Lawrence, Mark Sullivan, Gould Lincoln, Arthur Krock, George Rothwell Brown, Ray Tucker, Marquis W. Childs, Arthur Sears Henning, Thomas L. Stokes, Ernest K. Lindley, Eleanor Roosevelt, Dorothy Thompson, Walter Lippman, Paul Mallon, John O'Donnell, Constantine Brown, Lowell Mellett, Samuel Grafton, Frank Kent, Westbrook Pegler.

Editors of leading magazines in public opinion field: Time, Henry R. Luce; Saturday Evening Post, Ben Hibbs; Colliers, Wm. L. Chenery; Liberty, Fulton Oursler; News Week, Malcolm Muir; Look, Harlan Logan; Reader's Digest, DeWitt Wallace; Cosmopolitan, Frances Whiting; The American, Sumner Blossom; Pathfinder, Robert West Howard.

Editors of selected metropolitan newspapers: New York Times, Charles Merz; New York Herald Tribune, Ogden Reid; PM, J. P. Lewis; Hearst newspapers, Wm. Randolph Hearst; Chicago Tribune, Col. Robert McCormick; Chicago Sun, Marshall Field; Chicago

Daily News, J. S. Knight; Des Moines Register-Tribune, W. A. Waymack; Los Angeles Times, S. D. Hotchkiss; Washington Times-Herald, Eleanor Patterson; Washington Star, T. W. Noyes; Washington Post, Eugene Meyer; Washington News, John T. O'Rourke; Denver Post, W. C. Shepherd; Kansas City Star, H. J. Haskell; Minneapolis Star-Journal, B. L. Walter; New Orleans Times-Picayune, L. K. Nicholson; Christian Science Monitor, Erwin D. Canham.

Prominent counselors of American thought: Archbishop Francis J. Beckman, Dubuque, Iowa; James Farley, New York City; John W. Davis, New York City; John T. Flynn, New York City; Robert Hutchins, Chicago, Ill.; Samuel L. Pettingill, South Bend, Ind.; William Green of A. F. L., Washington, D. C.; Harry Emerson Fosdick, New York City; Gen. Robert E. Wood, Chicago, Ill.; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, New York; Rabbi Abba Silver, Cleveland; Herbert C. Hoover, New York City; Harold L. Ickes, Washington, D. C.; Henry A. Wallace, Washington, D. C.; John L. Lewis of U. M. W., Washington, D. C.; Philip Murray of C I. O., Washington, D. C.; Fiorello LaGuaria, New York City.

It will be greatly appreciated if those whose names appear on this selected list will write their recommendations to Congressman MUNDT before February 10 so that their suggestions may fulfill the maximum public service in developing a sound, workable set of criteria for directing the activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Radio Address of Hon. Chester Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks and include therein a radio address by O. P. A. Administrator Chester Bowles concerning the problems of servicemen's families.

Hello everybody, I have as my guests this week two people who are going to tell you about the most important money in the country. It is not a big sum. Not the confusing billions you are probably tired of hearing about. It is quite a small sum. Only $80. Yet I think you'll agree it is the most important money in the country when you have heard from these two people.

One of them is the wife of a serviceman who, with her little girl, is living on a dependency allotment of $80 a month. The other is a veteran of this war * * * a marine who was wounded at the Marshall Islands and is now finding his place again in civilian life.

The problems and plans of these 2 people represent the problems and plans of nearly a sixth of our Nation. Yes, nearly 21,000,000 Americans. That includes all our servicemen and their eight to nine million wives, children, and parents who depend on servicemen's allotments. To all these people, our fight to keep down prices and rents on the home front is just about the most important battle of this war. For it is a battle whose outcome will determine how much, or how little security and happiness all of us in America will have in the months and years immediately ahead.

In that battle every conscientious American should enter with an alert mind and vigorous action. The great majority of businessmen, of labor leaders, of farmers and consumers have already done so. They stand solidly behind our efforts to hold down prices and hold down rents. They have given full and loyal support to O. P. A.'s price and rent control program.

But if those few greedy, home-front saboteurs of our war effort—the chiselers and the pressure groups—do get the upper hand in our battle against higher prices, if their efforts should succeed and O. P. A. should fail, all groups, all families would have to pay the price in hardship and privation.

But the wrecking of price and rent control would strike most brutally at one group in particular—our servicemen and their families.

My first guest here tonight is the wife of a serviceman, Mrs. Nelson Post. Mrs. Post has had some first hand experience with living on an allotment of $80 a month and I want her to tell you about it. Mrs. Post, suppose you tell us first just where you live.

Mrs. POST. I live with my mother, Mr. Bowles, in Silver Spring, Md. When my husband went into the air corps last April we decided that was about the only thing I could do because of the baby. I know I'm lucky that mother was able to have me stay with her.

Mr. BOWLES. What did you plan to do—share your rent with your mother?

Mrs. POST. Yes. I was to share half of all the expenses. But I found out that even half the rent was more than I could pay with only $80 a month coming in. So what I've done is to have two roomers who help me pay my share. Now I pay just $20 a month rent out of my allotment.

Mr. BOWLES. How about food expenses, do you keep track of your food costs.

Mrs. POST. Yes. They come to about $7.50 a week for myself and the baby. That's about $30 a month, really $35 when I add the milk bill. We get plenty to eat on that, but it's plain food, just the essentials.

Mr. BOWLES. Do you buy different kinds of meals now from those you had before your husband went into the Air Corps?

Mrs. POST. Oh, yes. We just—well, never have any of the luxuries any more. I always get the fruit and vegetables we need, especially for the baby, of course. But I mean we have stew more often instead of a nice piece of meat, and more things like spaghetti and macaroni to help fill out. I can save almost $1 a week that way. Maybe $7.50 seems a lot just for food for myself and a 2-year-old baby. The truth is some of it goes for company. We can't afford to go out now and so having friends in is our recreation, you might say. It helps when you're alone. But when company comes we just have family meals, nothing fancy.

Mr. BOWLES. Then, as I understand it, altogether you spend $35 a month for food and $20 for rent. That's $55 spent already out of your $80 monthly allotment. What happens to the other $25?

Mrs. POST. Well, $10 of it goes for clothing expenses—mostly for the baby. She grows out of things and wears them out so fast I just have to replace them. When I buy any big things for her—like a snowsuit—I have to spread the cost over several months to come out right.

Mr. BOWLES. I don't believe you can buy much new clothing for yourself at that rate.

Mrs. POST. Well, no, I can't. Even a cheap dress is out of the question. I get along on what I have. I've kept one outfit pretty nice for when I go out—and I guess I still look presentable.

Mr. BOWLES. You certainly do. Now after that $10, there's still $15 left of your $80 a month to be accounted for. Where does that go? I know these are pretty personal questions, Mrs. Post, but I hope you won't mind answering. I think it will help many people understand just how closely a serviceman's wife with a child has to budget to make ends meet on an $80-a-month allotment.

Mrs. POST. I guess many service wives are spending just about the same way I do. So what I'm telling isn't really very personal, Mr. Bowles. Well, about that other $15. Ten dollars of it goes to keep up the car. It's an old car, and so many things need to be done for it all the time. It always seems to come to about $10 a month.

Mr. BOWLES. So that leaves $5. From what you've told me, any expense except rent, food, clothing, and your car has to come out of that last $5 a month.

Mrs. POST. Yes, it does, Mr. Bowles. A movie sometimes, but not very often any more—or a little gift for mother. And stamps to write letters to my husband. Stamps mount up to a lot when you write often as I do—almost $1 a month. That $5 doesn't last very long.

Mr. BOWLES. What have you done when there was some large, extra expense—say a dentist bill, or doctor bills for the baby?

Mrs. POST. Well, there was only one thing I could do. That was go into some of the savings my husband and I put by before he was drafted. I mean the savings we had in the bank—not the War bonds. I hope I won't ever have to touch those. Those are for the time my husband gets back and we can really, well, start a home together. I don't want to do anything to spoil that. Our whole life now is just waiting for that time.

Mr. BOWLES. I want to ask you a very frank question, Mrs. Post. What would you do now if prices went up—if rent went up? Let's put it like this: Suppose the efforts of the pressure groups and profiteers were successful in raising prices and rents. Suppose the cost of living had risen as much as it did by this time in the last war. The $80 allotment you get now would be worth only $56 today. Fifty-six dollars instead of eighty. What would that mean to you? What would you do?

Mrs. POST. Well, I couldn't pay more than I do now for anything and still make the $80 a month go around. I guess there would be only two things I could do. I could take the War bonds we've been saving and live for a little while, anyway. That would mean nothing left for our future together at all. Or I could leave our baby with mother and go to work. I wouldn't want to leave the baby—it means so much to me, and I think to her—when my husband isn't home. I would be afraid to tell him, I think, if price control stopped. He would worry about us all the time. He would never be sure we were all right. And I would never be sure either if prices and rents were not controlled.

Mr. BOWLES. Thank you, Mrs. Post. I'm sure that your story sounds familiar to a great many who are listening. Not only those eight or nine million of you who as wives, children, or parents are dependent on our servicemen's allotments but all of you who must live on small salaries or pensions or incomes that simply will not stretch any more.

Now, let's hear what one of our servicemen thinks about price control. My next guest is Mr. Bernard Redmont, until recently a sergeant in the marines. Where did you serve with the marines, Mr. Redmont?

Mr. REDMONT. In the Marshall Islands, Mr. Bowles. I was wounded in action there and got my discharge papers last September.

Mr. BOWLES. You have a family?

Mr. REDMONT. Yes. I'm married and we have a 2-year-old son. When I was overseas they had to depend on their $80 a month allotment just like Mrs. Post.

Mr. BOWLES. How did they get along?

Mr. REDMONT. Now that I'm back, I know it was plenty tough. I suspected it when I was away, though her letters were always cheerful. So I worried, just like all the other guys with families back here, no matter how cheerful the letters are they get from home.

Mr. BOWLES. Do the servicemen you met think our O. P. A. program here is doing a good or bad job of keeping prices and rents down?

Mr. REDMONT. They think it's such a good job they can't quite believe it. That's why they worry. They're afraid the chiselers and cheaters will mess things up. Of course, most servicemen have a chip on their shoulder about the home front. It's only natural. Most of us are young. We were just getting a start in life. We hadn't time to put aside much in the way of savings. We all had a lot of plans that had to be shelved. And now * * * if we're lucky enough to come through it all * * * we'll have just been * * * well, marking time for 2 or 4 or I don't know how many years. It makes you see things differently. Price and rent chiselers would change their tune if they had to answer to a group of servicemen. Your G. I. knows the O. P. A. boards and O. P. A. rent people are doing a great job and deserve a whale of a lot of credit for the way they're protecting servicemen's families today from those chiselers.

Mr. BOWLES. Our local O. P. A. boards and O. P. A. rent office do deserve a lot of credit, Mr. Redmont. And not only for the tough, day-to-day job they're doing. By their work in keeping down prices they're building a good, bedrock foundation for a post-war prosperity that will insure jobs of all returning servicemen. I'll tell you why. Do you have any War bonds?

Mr. REDMONT. Sure. That's where I've put all the money I could save. Not much, maybe $10 a month while I was in service. But those bonds are a start toward our future home.

Mr. BOWLES. Our servicemen altogether have put over 1½ billion dollars in bonds since the war began.

Well, you wouldn't remember what happened after the last war. But that time, the selfish pressure groups who wanted higher prices had their way. If they could do it again, if price increases were allowed to reach to the inflationary peak they did in the last war, every $100 you save today would be worth only $61 before that inflation ended. And that's only part of it. Like the last time, the inflation bubble would burst. And our servicemen would come home * * * not to jobs and the future they deserve * * * but to another depression.

Mr. REDMONT. From what I've seen, servicemen just wouldn't stand for that, Mr. Bowles. Price control has got to work. I've heard too many servicemen say, "They'd better make it work."

Mr. BOWLES. Thank you, Mr. Redmont. Yes; all of us together had better make price control work.

Our servicemen fighting on Luzon, on the frozen ground of Belgium and Italy, are not here to fight our home-front battle against higher prices. That battle they have entrusted to us, for the protection of us all. But through the letters they get now, and in what they find when they come home, they will know how well we are doing the job they have entrusted to us. They will know. And if that job is not done, if price control fails, they will know who its enemies have been.

All of us working together must do this job of protecting servicemen's families, as well as ourselves, from the soaring rents and prices that cause inflation. We must not fail. With your help, we will not fail.

Good-bye to you all until next week.

Tydings Amendment Still Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, last January 10, 52 Congressmen of both parties met and discussed the now famous directive No. 288 put out by General Hershey to the State directors of selective service on January 3.

A bipartisan committee of 11 was appointed at that gathering and at the call of this committee nearly 200 Congressmen and others met with General Hershey last week and he was urged to review the directive as put out by himself and send out a clarification thereof.

As one of the members of this committee of 11 who were interested in securing prompt action before untold damage has been done to the farm labor supply of America, I was personally glad to be invited to the executive meeting of the House Committee on Agriculture yesterday. General Hershey at that meeting agreed to send out a correction on State directors advice No. 288 and at this point I quote that explanatory directive sent to all State directors and then to all local boards:

Questions of interpretation of State directors advice No. 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

The directive of January 3, 1945, State directors advice No. 288 did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State directors advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

Section 5 K of the Selective Training and Service Act, known as the Tydings amendment, places upon each local board the responsibility to determining, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Notify all local boards immediately.

It is my feeling that the confusion arising out of the January 3 directive will be erased and corrected to a large degree by the issuance of this explanatory directive by General Hershey. We, as members of the unofficial committee of 11 who commenced the agitation for reconsideration of directive No. 288, appreciate the action of General Hershey in collaboration with the House Committee on Agriculture in seeing that this procedure was followed.

I submit a letter from Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, to Director James F. Byrnes of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion relative to the farm labor situation:

JANUARY 17, 1945.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DIRECTOR BYRNES: The recent instructions sent out by Selective Service System Headquarters requiring reexamination and preinduction physical examinations of all deferred registrants in agriculture are causing a lot of confusion.

We are getting many distressing appeals by telephone, telegraph, and letter indicating that a great many farmers are panicky over the situation, as they do not see how they will be able to continue operations at present levels and meet their food production goals, if they lose these trained key men. Apparently the impression has gone out pretty generally over the country that these regulations mean, for all practical purposes, the nullification of the Tydings amendment requiring the deferment of all essential agricultural workers who cannot be replaced.

Another thing which is very upsetting is the requirement for preinduction physical examination. The mere fact that every man is called up for a physical examination before his essentiality is determined, creates such uncertainty that many of these young men will leave the farm, even though they are urgently needed.

As you know, the supply of farm labor now is the lowest on record, and farmers have been able to meet their food production goals only by working long hours and by utilizing large numbers of elderly people, women, and children. There are a great many cases where the person deferred under the Tydings amendment is the only able-bodied person, and is the key man upon whom the whole farming operations depend—his work being supplemented by an elderly person and, in some cases, by children, who could not carry on the farming operations at their present level without this key person.

It is my understanding that these resources of deferred registrants have been pretty thoroughly combed over already. I am convinced that if any large number of these key essential workers are taken off the farm it will result in a substantial reduction in production of food.

We understand that it was your intention that the provisions of the Tydings amendment be strictly observed. The reports coming to us indicate that the recent instructions are being interpreted in such a manner that may result in largely nullifying the Tydings amendment.

I wish to respectfully urge that you immediately review this whole situation in the light of the possible effects on food production and take such additional steps as may be necessary to reassure farmers by clarifying the intent and purpose of your recent order with respect to farm deferments and assuring farmers of an adequate supply of dependable labor necessary to meet their food-production goals.

Another phase of the farm-manpower problem which we believe needs immediate attention is the holding of the farm men or men who are rejected for military duties because of physical disabilities. Under the present interpretation of the regulations, many of these men may be lost to agriculture unless some further instructions are given to draft boards.

I wish to strongly urge that appropriate steps be taken immediately, instructing local draft boards to prevent all deferred registrants in agriculture who are rejected for military service because of physical disabilities from leaving essential activities in agriculture unless the draft board determines they have good cause. It is our understanding that orders were issued recently requiring this to be done in the case of industrial workers. We feel that the same protection should certainly be given agriculture.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

Mr. Speaker, the unofficial committee of 11, heretofore referred to, worked for several days in drawing up a resolution to be submitted to the Congress by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], chairman of this committee. I am pleased to note that Senator BUSHFIELD, of South Dakota, yesterday introduced in the Senate this resolution as prepared by our committee of 11.

Furthermore I have received the following statement of Mr. W. R. Ogg, director, Washington office, American Farm Bureau Federation, before the House Military Affairs Committee on January 18:

Farmers can rightly be proud of their war record. Despite a growing shortage of farm machinery and ever-growing shortage of labor, and many other handicaps, they have produced record-breaking supplies of food, for 4 successive years, in order to meet the needs of our armed forces, our allies and our civilian population. As a result of this all-out effort, our armed forces and our civilian population have been better fed than in any other war in our history.

There have been no strikes on the farm front, and no slow-downs of production. Despite harassing restrictions and impractical regulations, farmers have gone about their production job trying to do their utmost to meet their food-production goals. They have only been able to accomplish these phenomenal results by working much longer hours and by utilizing large numbers of elderly people, women, and children. Farmers do not have a 40-hour week, with time and a half for overtime, and double pay for Sundays and holidays. The farmers' work week is much longer than the national 48-hour week in war industries. Farmers in general have worked 60, 70, and as high as 80 hours a week to produce food and fiber needed for the winning of the war.

Congress recognized early in the war that food was just as vital as munitions for the winning of the war and enacted the so-called Tydings amendment requiring the deferment of all essential workers in agriculture who cannot be replaced. No responsible farmer or farm organization seeks any selfish advantage or protection for any worker engaged in agriculture who can be replaced. The lists of agricultural deferments, especially those between the ages of 18 through 25 years, have been repeatedly combed over thoroughly, and it is our belief that the agricultural deferments have been combed down to the point where, with very limited exceptions, they are the most efficient of all agricultural workers.

Farmers are greatly disturbed over the recent directive issued by Justice Byrnes and the regulations issued by selective service directing the reexamination and requiring preinduction physical examination of all deferred registrants in agriculture between 18 and 26 years of age. Apparently, the impression has gone out pretty generally to the country that this represents virtual annulment of the Tydings amendment. We took up this matter with Selective Service headquarters and were assured that this was not the intent of the new regulations. Nevertheless, these regulations are being almost universally interpreted as the first step toward induction. Again I want to repeat that I am sure that all responsible leaders in agriculture have never in the past nor are they now interested in protecting the agricultural deferment of any unworthy registrant, but we are convinced that if any large number of the deferred registrants 18 to 26 are removed from farms at this time, it will result in a substantial reduction in the over-all production of food, that it will result in a substantial reduction of livestock and dairy cattle, and later in a substantial reduction in production of soil crops. We feel that it is our obligation at this time to give to the Congress and to responsible administrators in government the best judgment of farm people with respect to this situation.

These deferred registrants, particularly in this age group, are keymen. In many instances they are the only able-bodied men on these farms, and the elderly people and children who are supplementing their work would be unable to carry on the farming operations at their present production levels if these men are taken and are not replaced.

It should be borne in mind also that on December 1, 1944, according to the report published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, there was the smallest farm employment for that date on record. The 1944 annual average number of hired workers was about 13 percent below the 1935–39 average. Even the number of family workers, despite the increased dependency upon family labor, was 7 percent less in 1944 than in 1935–39, according to B. A. E. The report further stated that farm operators worked on an average 12.1 hours per day on September 1 and 10.8 hours per day around the 1st of December, and that hired workers averaged 10 hours per day and 9.3 hours per day, respectively. This, even in the less busy season of December, represents a weekly average of more than 60 hours per week for the farm operator not counting any work on Sunday, and every farmer knows that the farm week, particularly in the dairy industry, is a 7-day-week enterprise. A 12.1-hour day adds up to more than 80 hours per week for the dairy farmer. I am sure that you are well aware that the average workweek in industry is far less.

In face of all these conditions farmers cannot understand why so much emphasis is now being placed upon the induction of these key workers in agriculture who are so vitally needed to produce the food required and to enable farmers to meet their food production goals, and especially when there is so much wastage of manpower in nonagricultural occupations by reason of persons engaging in nonessential activities, and by reason of slow-downs and strikes and by reason of the continued production of luxury goods and other nonessential materials with corresponding wastage of manpower. They believe that this wastage of manpower should be corrected.

In order to enable farmers to meet their food production goals we believe that immediate steps should be taken to suspend or clarify the recent instructions with respect to induction of key farm workers.

We also believe in the principle of work or fight, which has been proposed in various bills introduced in Congress, under which workers engaged in essential industries would be required to stay in these jobs unless they secure the approval of their draft boards, or unless the draft boards find they have good cause for leaving, and authority given to bring about the transfer of workers from nonessential occupations to essential occupations.

We believe that this legislation, however, should be properly safeguarded so as to assure that the placement of all such workers will be carried on in the manner now provided by the War Food Administration and the War Manpower Commission. As a further safeguard, we believe that civil penalties should be provided instead of induction under penalty conditions.

Robert E. Lee—A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a speech which I delivered in Statuary Hall, here in the Capitol, under the auspices of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, on Friday, January 19, 1945, the one hundred and thirty-eighth anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee.

The speech follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, permit me to express to you my profound gratitude for honoring me with the invitation to address you on this historic occasion, the one hundred and thirty-eighth anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee.

On June 3 last year, the one hundred and thirty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Jefferson Davis, I enjoyed a privilege that will never come to another Member of the Congress of the United States—that of introducing to the House of Representatives an ex-Confederate soldier, in the person of Gen. Julius Franklin Howell, acting commander in chief of the United Confederate Veterans.

His appearance, and his address to that body, will go down in history as one of the most unusual occurrences this Capitol has ever seen. Erect as an Indian, dressed in the uniform of a Confederate general, bearing his 98 years with the manhood and dignity of a real soldier, General Howell delivered an address that, taking everything into consideration, has never been surpassed on an occasion of its kind anywhere in the world.

We are now engaged in a great war in which the brave and generous sons of both the Blue and the Gray are grappling with our enemies on every battle front in the world. In the hall of the House of Representatives, yonder, and over there in the Senate, are the sons, grandsons, nephews, and other relatives of those brave men who from 1861 to 1865 struggled for the supremacy of the New World.

While our brave men are fighting to protect American institutions abroad, these Americans, the offspring of the men who fought on both sides of the War between the States, are now striving to protect American institutions at home. They recognize the safety of this Nation, and the perpetuity of our American institutions, as issues that rise high above the scramble for party vantage or the noisy clamor of men for place and power.

While we are gathered here to commemorate the achievements of our own brave men in gray, it is not our purpose, nor is it our intention, to in any way discredit the loyalty and patriotism of the men who wore the blue. They were all Americans, fighting for what they believed to be the best interests of their respective countries.

As I said, today is the anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee, perhaps the greatest Christian leader who ever commanded an army in all the history of the world.

Theodore Roosevelt called him the greatest captain of the English-speaking race, and General Maurice, of the British army, in his Life of Robert E. Lee, placed him above Wellington as the greatest commander the English-speaking race has yet produced.

He is to me the most magnificent, the most sublime, and the most serenely inspiring figure on the horizon of human history. I am sure that all real Americans are now glad to claim kindred with his spirit. As was said by Senator Ben Hill, of Georgia, "He was Caesar without his ambition, Frederick without his tyranny, Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward."

Standing beside his manly statue here is that of Jefferson Davis, the Great White Chieftain of the Confederacy, who, as Caleb Cushing once said, "was wise among the wisest in counsel, eloquent among the most eloquent in debate, and brave among the bravest on the battlefield."

He needs no eulogy at my hands, or at the hands of anyone else, to commend him to the consideration of all fair-minded men.

As Bishop Galloway once said of him, "Marvelous, many-sided, masterful man. His virtues will grow brighter, and his name be writ larger, with each passing century. When another hundred years have passed away, no intelligent voice will fail to praise him, no patriotic hand will refuse to place a laurel wreath upon his radiant brow."

We shall never cease to honor those untold thousands of brave Confederate veterans who went through 4 years of bloody war, as well as through the dark and bitter years of reconstruction.

Greater soldiers in time of war, or greater citizens in times of peace, this world has never seen. We honor them today for the services they rendered and the sacrifices they made for the cause of home and country.

But they could not have accomplished what they did, in either peace or war, had it not been for the loyalty and devotion of the patriotic women of the Confederacy.

Their examples of unselfish sacrifice and unyielding heroism under the most trying circumstances have seldom been equaled, and never surpassed, in all the annals of mankind. As someone has said:

"Glorious women of the South. Fashioned in Paradise, wreathed in graces and virtues that blossomed like flowers plucked from the green fields of Eden, led down to earth by angels along a pathway of stars, to be the joy, the blessing, the inspiration of noble men."

Our country is today at the crossroads of her destiny. While we are engaged in a world-wide conflict, testing whether or not our form of government and our civilization shall continue to endure, we are also engaged in a desperate struggle at home with the enemies within our gates, who would overthrow this Government, destroy our sacred institutions, and impose upon the American people an alien and un-American system that would mean the end of everything that is near and dear to us.

On the opening day of the present Congress I secured the adoption of an amendment to the Rules of the House setting up a permanent Committee on Un-American Activities, with all the necessary powers of investigation and subpena. I want to appeal to you, and to all other real Americans, to give that committee your enthusiastic support.

This great Government of ours will never be destroyed by the descendents of those men who wore the blue, or the ones who wore the gray. They are real Americans, they believe in the American form of government and are now dying all over the world to defend it.

But we have an infiltration of what Prime Minister Churchill on yesterday called Trotskyist-Communists who, as a rule, have been run out of the countries of their births and who have joined with other subversive elements to try to undermine and destroy this Government, as well as that of the British Empire.

In the early days of the war they joined hands with the German Nazis, the Italian Black Shirts, and the Black Dragon Society of Japan, whose agents have been busy stirring race trouble and buying up firearms and ammunition in almost every community in America. While many of these elements have been driven under ground temporarily, they are still with us, and still plotting against our country.

In the words of George Washington, we want to "put only Americans on guard," so that while your sons, your husbands, and your brothers and your fathers are shedding their blood to protect this Nation abroad, we can adequately defend it against these destructive elements at home.

As I have said before, I have no desire to outlive this Republic. It is the greatest Government the world has ever known. God grant that I may never live to see it destroyed, or dominated by those alien ideologies of atheism, anarchy, and infidelity.

But when we have won this war and restored the peace of mankind, let us pass this great Republic unimpaired to our children and our children's children. So that when generations yet unborn shall emerge from the stream of time they may find a government more powerful than the Athens of Pericles or the Rome of Augustus, more splendid than the France of Louis or the England of Queen Elizabeth, shedding her blessings alike upon the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor, holding high the torch and making light the way up which all other civilized countries of the world must come in "God's appointed time."

Are We Being Deceived About the Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, what is inflation? I suppose most people would answer that inflation is an extreme rise in prices. However, inflation might be better understood if it were defined as a extreme decline or deterioration in the purchasing power of a nation's money.

The following definitions from Webster are helpful to the citizen who would like to know what inflation is and whether inflation is being prevented:

Inflate: To expand or increase abnormally or improperly, to extend imprudently; as, to inflate the currency.

Inflationist: One who favors inflation, especially of the currency, by the issue of paper money.

Inflationist period: The time of suspension of specie payments, from 1862 to 1879.

The foregoing dictionary yardsticks seem to indicate that the United States has been inflating since 1933, when the gold clause protecting our bonds and currency was repudiated and paper money in circulation began to increase.

The January 1945 National City Bank bulletin has an informative report on inflation in France and Belgium. The bulletin points out that "currency and bank deposits have been inflated enormously, while supplies of goods have been depleted." The following data gives the financial breakdown of their inflation, and I have added the corresponding financial indicators for the United States:

Wartime expansion of note circulation, bank credit, and public debt

[In billions of national currency]

	August 1939	September 1944	Percent change
France (francs):			
Bank deposits	70	250	+257
Notes in circulation	142	600	+322
Public debt	445	1,650	+271
Belgium (francs):			
Bank deposits	29	83	+186
Notes in circulation	26	100	+285
Public debt	59	120 (a)	+233
[In millions of dollars]			
United States:			
Bank deposits	27,255	[1] 64,200	+135
Notes in circulation	7,171	23,555	+228
Public debt	40,891	209,496	+412

[1] As of June 30, 1944.

The foregoing facts, yardsticks of inflation, defy all efforts on my part to adequately portray their ominous significance.

However, they do give a clue to the situation behind the fantastic buying of real estate and other tangible property by shrewd and cunning people all over the land. Black markets, jewelry sales, and hoarding of valuables of all kinds is reportedly reaching spectacular proportions. Yet, the average citizen has been relying on his Government's pledge that there is no inflation.

I invite Mr. Bowles, or any administration expert on preventing inflation, to explain how America will avoid the tragic effects of a deteriorating currency when the financial fever chart indicates a condition worse than that of France and Belgium.

Are we being deceived about inflation? Is inflation galloping on, with the tragic effects being hidden by subsidies, price-fixing, and an O. P. A. American Gestapo?

Is it true, as Harold Moulton, of the Brookings Institution, has warned, that—

With unlimited debt expansion we cannot prevent inflation without the use of totalitarian methods of control. No compromise or halfway measures can adjust the difficulties. The choice is between regimentation and inflation.

The foregoing analysis serves to disclose the gravest danger with which the United States is now confronted. Unable or unwilling to perceive basic inconsistencies, or to choose between clear-cut alternatives, we drift toward the deep financial waters from which there is no return other than through repudiation in one form or another.

To the interested citizen, these facts will indicate that, unless this administration has the courage to apply the brakes on its reckless spending, the fate of our middle classes is sealed.

In Europe the inflationary loss in the purchasing value of Government bonds is bankrupting the middle classes and

leading everywhere to Socialism and the end of human liberty.

Our inflation, thus far, has followed a similar pattern—though at a somewhat slower speed.

A careful study of these figures should warn every patriot of the dangers involved in the global spending plans now pending in Congress. The American people must learn this economic truth: New Deal deficit spending will wind up either in ruinous inflation or a slave economy that eliminates human liberty.

These facts and these dangers call for forthright and courageous action now. Many times I have called the attention of the administration and the majority to this problem. I hope and pray that the administration will meet this critical problem honestly at last. They must do so, or else the greatest struggle in which the American people are involved—the preservation of the sound currency on which our freedom and our civilization is based—will be lost by default.

Shortage of Staple Cotton Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from one of the merchants in my district who sells all types of dress goods, shoes, hosiery, ready-to-wear, notions, and gentlemen's furnishings. As this letter is typical of many I have received during the past few months I think it it well to call the attention of the House to a serious shortage of work clothes which are badly needed in the rural areas. The rural areas must have an additional supply of cotton and woolen work clothing which would include such items as overalls, shirts, gloves and underwear. My complaints indicate that it is most difficult for farm families to purchase overalls and jackets for boys who are of school age. Merchant after merchant complains to me about the shortage of cotton flannel husking gloves and mittens. One interesting phase of the complaint on husking mittens is that there are none for sale locally in the district but a farmer could send an order to a mail order house in Chicago or Kansas City and receive an immediate shipment of any quantity he wanted to buy.

I am calling this matter to the attention of Chester Bowles, Administrator of the O. P. A., urging his cooperation in relieving this serious situation.

The letter reads:

SHARON SPRINGS, KANS.,
December 16, 1944.

HON. FRANK CARLSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There is a very acute shortage of staple cotton goods in our community. We are the only store in Wallace County that handles yard goods and in the past year we have had about one-half of 1 percent of the demand of staple cotton goods for this community. We have notified our wholesaler of this acute shortage but as yet we have not had made available to us, through our wholesaler, goods to relieve, even in part, this extreme shortage of goods.

I hope that you will use your assistance in any possible way to see that merchandise is allocated through the regular channels of trade for distribution, especially to the rural population, some staple cotton goods to relieve in part this shortage.

While we know the war situation is not the best, still it is necessary that the people in the rural communities have clothing and textiles to care for their acute needs.

We feel that a preference should be given to the needs of the rural population over those of lend-lease or foreign distribution of these cotton goods and that lend-lease of goods for foreign consumption should not have priority over those of our own people.

Yours very truly,

C. V. MILLER.

Brass Tacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of January 19, 1945:

BRASS TACKS

The Post backed national service as soon as the Japanese fell on Pearl Harbor. Total war called for it—the consecration of all that we have and are in an unrelenting struggle in all the seven seas. The need to assure the fighting men of equality of sacrifice was a formidable argument in its favor. We should have been farther on the road to victory today if there had been national service. With it the present danger of post-war social and economic difficulties might have been avoided. For instance, we face a shortage of doctors within the next 5 years, in part because we allowed older doctors to volunteer for service. Under national service the right man would have been kept in the right place. The life and death premise is still valid as the basic argument for national service, but the evidence before the May committee undermines the ground upon which the administration has chosen to fight for it. That ground is the manpower shortage in war industry.

The cry of general shortages of materials traceable to shortages of manpower simply cannot be sustained under the withering blast it has got from business and organized labor. The cry is sound and fury signifying nothing without the facts. And the plain fact is that the armed services have only the foggiest idea of what they possess in the shape of war supplies. How, then, can they talk of shortages? The Mead committee, which seems to see no need for national service, has repeatedly scored the Army for its shortcomings as a business agency; bad scheduling, inadequate utilization of labor, and lack of coordination. Labor and business have now added to the indictment. Whatever the President may say, the members of the committee who heard the testimony of the A. F. L. and the C. I. O. were visibly impressed. We are at a loss to see how anybody could fail to be impressed.

The emerging picture from the testimony before the May committee is a befuddling one of surplus and shortage. In case after case of shortage complained of, C. I. O. investigators found not shortages but surpluses. Philip Murray gave chapter and verse for the officials to disprove. He came to the same conclusion as A. F. of L.'s Lewis G. Hines, who had also declared that the charges of widespread shortages were fictitious. That conclusion was that where shortages existed, they were local, and in the main due to changing Army orders, which, in the exigencies of warfare, cannot be coped with by advance planning, but must be remedied by local readjustments. Both witnesses were not content with defending the situation in industry. They acknowledged that hoarding of labor existed, but said flatly that the Government was the No. 1 hoarder of the Nation. The Mead committee in its last report gave plenty of instances of waste of manpower in the business operations of the Army. Mr. Murray went further, and pinned the bee on Government-run plants as the prime hoarder.

The public has become completely mystified by the conflict between official data and demands, and the facts made available by the men in the best position to know. It is said that the Mead committee intends soon to make a definitive study on manpower. That would be helpful in clearing the air. In the meantime Army needs must be given attention. The Army estimate is that 700,000 extra workers are needed in the next 6 months. How this figure was arrived at, in view of the fact that the Army doesn't know either its inventory or its wants, is a mystery. But, granted the need, granted the positing of the problem as a local one, all that Congress can do at present is to give the W. M. C. the powers available for making its local orders stick.

The existing bewilderment is not helpful in building up a case for national service, limited or general. It makes for confusion, not production. Why raise new problems when the old problems remain unsolved? Power is no substitute for efficiency, and will not create it; and it is efficiency that produces the goods. The present confusion, which labor and business have exposed, underlines the chief objection against national service, namely that the administration of our manpower could not be trusted with national service. It would be better to concentrate on giving W. M. C. statutory powers than to keep up the wild shooting that is going on for national service. This is missing the mark even as a booster of morale at home and abroad. A real need exists, the need to put teeth into W. M. C. controls, and the whole energy of the Administration should be mobilized back of it.

Amendment To Define Commerce Among the Several States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am including a resolution adopted by the Town Hall Committee of Wichita, Kans. The Town Hall is a nonpartisan group and is organized in the interest and support of

sound government under the Constitution. The resolution read as follows:

Whereas the tendency of the Federal Administration in ecent years toward construction of what constitutes interstate commerce has gone far beyond the wishes and beliefs of the public; and

Whereas the Town Hall Committee of Wichita, believing that the abuse has reached the point where some action should be taken to correct the tendency; and

Whereas the effect of the recent construction of interstate commerce has been to eliminate and curtail free enterprise and bring practically every business within the control of Federal bureaus;

Now, therefore, we the Town Hall Committee of Wichita, recommend to Congress that it give full and immediate consideration to an amendment to the Constitution that will limit and define "commerce among the several States" as set forth in the Constitution so as to better meet the needs of the people in protecting their liberties and property and in this connection: we cite, as outstanding examples, the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the *Southeastern Underwriters Association*, and *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111), the latter case holding in substance that a farmer cannot feed his own wheat to his own livestock because to do so would depress interstate commerce.

How Can Business Help Preserve Constitutional Government and Free Enterprise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on January 23, 1945, before the National Association of State Chambers of Commerce:

Mr President, in accepting the invitation to address this group I recognized but one obligatior and that was to speak my own mind, to do it humbly, but very plainly. Naturally I should like to please, but if that cannot be so, then I hope not to offend.

My friends, unless we face some facts realistically, this Nation is apt to end up under a dictator.

There has been for several years a powerful and concerted drive against our constitutional system of government, our free enterprise system of economy, and our free system of society.

This movement, wholly subversive in its intent, wholly surreptitious in its methods, wholly dishonest in its representations, and wholly menacing to everything that makes life worth while in America, has finally crystallized into a definite pattern.

The first part of this pattern was to subjugate the Federal judiciary to the executive branch of the Government. That attempt, turned back by the Congress, was finally accomplished through time and human frailties.

The second pattern was to subjugate the legislative branch of the Government to the executive. The Congress resisted this movement; thereupon a powerful, concerted barrage of vilification, ridicule, falsification, and slander was laid down against the Congress as an institution. It still continues.

The third part of this pattern was to destroy business, big and little, or so tie its destinies to the largesse of the Federal Government as to enable the bureaucrats to hold control over all business in America. This is the pattern of a planned economy.

The fourth part of the pattern is to condition Americans to obey rationing, regimentation, sudden changes of administrative orders, and the breaking of administrative promises.

The Congress, and the Congress alone, now stands between the people, including business big and little, and war powers so expanded and extended that post-war America would be operating under a political bureaucracy at Washington headed by one man. That would be absolutism.

I am not talking about individuals as such. I am discussing a very definite trend toward the very definite pattern in which individuals simply fit into the scheme of things. That great student of American Government, James Bryce, stated the case when he wrote in his American Commonwealth:

"A bold President who knew himself to be supported by a majority in the country might be tempted to override the law and deprive the minority of the protection which the law affords it. He might be a tyrant, not against the masses but with the masses."

There is nothing new in the tendency we are witnessing today. The founding fathers knew that power too long possessed and exercised does something to the individual. They knew that even men with the highest ideals and the most noble motives will, in time, become hypnotized by the possession of power, enamored of the exercise of power, and corroded by the adulation they receive from those always ready to flatter power.

Edward Livingston, a great thinker, expressed it clearly when he said:

"The gloss of zeal for the public service is always spread over acts of oppression, and the people are sometimes made to consider that zeal as a brilliant exertion of energy in their favor which, when viewed in its true light, would be found a fatal blow to their rights. In no government is this effect so easily produced as in a free republic; party spirit, inseparable from its existence, aids the illusion, and a popular leader is allowed in many instances impunity—and sometimes is rewarded with applause, for acts which would make a tyrant tremble on his throne."

We are now compelled to recognize that anyone who insists on some consideration of the freedom, soundness, and financial solvency of the United States will be assailed bitterly by those who would barter away American resources in exchange for world power. These people who lust for world power protest their great love for our constitutional from of government, for our men and women fighting and dying on battle lines eveywhere in the world. But they are, at the same time, insisting that America nurture all other peoples of the world at her breast, regardless of whether or not it so depletes us that we become financially insolvent and lose our liberty.

We must consider the welfare of the United States of America. Mr. Churchill is very definitely, very emphatically, very consistently, a British Empire nationalist. I do not blame him for that. I think he ought to consider the British Empire first.

Joseph Stalin is first, last, and at all times, a Soviet Russian nationalist. I do not blame him for that. He ought to be for Russia and Russians first.

Therefore, we who believe in giving some consideration to the welfare of the United States and our own people certainly ought not to let any blush of embarrassment mount our cheeks; we ought to offer no apologies whatsoever because we insist that the welfare of America have some consideration in this plan of some self-appointed guardians of the world for us to rebuild all the war-torn countries on the globe; restore their shattered factories; rehabilitate their wrecked agriculture; and then undertake to change their cultural habits and traditions, their religious convictions, and their economic practices, to coincide with ours.

Daniel Webster, a century ago, summed up this situation as it is today as well as it could be stated by anybody now. Let me quote him briefly:

"It is hardly too strong to say that the Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions, real or pretended. * * * There are men in all ages who mean to exercise power usefully—but who mean to exercise it. They mean to govern well—but they mean to govern; they promise to be kind masters, but they mean to be masters. They think they need but little restraint upon themselves. Their notion of the public interest is apt to be quite closely connected with their own exercise of authority. They may not, indeed, always understand their own motives. The love of power may sink too deep in their own hearts even for their own security and may pass with themselves for mere patriotism and benevolence."

There is a growing number of people in the United States today who appear to prefer security to freedom. They have organized to bring the weight of numbers against free enterprise and the Constitution. These people have become adroit at campaigning. They work very largely under the guidance of Communists or fellow travelers. It is their determination to control the Congress. They, themselves, say so. They want to socialize all industry—and with them socialization means that they will boss the jobs and the people. They, in turn, will be bossed by somebody up at the top. In that way America will be dragged into totalitarianism willy-nilly. If, as, and when that happens, our heroic men and women who have given their lives in past struggles, and in this present struggle, will have died in vain.

You gentlemen know just as well as I do what the P. A. C. means to do politically, if possible. You know as well as I do what the labor racketeers mean to do to and with American labor, if they can.

That is why I was very happy to come here today to talk to you on the subject of how business can help to preserve constitutional government and our free-enterprise system of economy.

Any rational analysis of the question of the survival of free government necessarily involves an analysis of free enterprise. By free enterprise, I mean the orderly processes of production and distribution of goods on a properly regulated competitive basis.

The first declaration for free government and free enterprise in the United States of America is found in the Declaration of Independence itself. It is the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The founding fathers didn't mean a planned economy. They didn't believe a man should have to pay a fee to some labor racketeer for the right to labor in defense of the Nation.

We must perfect our distribution system, which is faulty. We have solved the problem of production, but we have not solved the problem of distribution. But there is the human equation which must be taken into consideration.

If all humanity were perfect, if all men were equally capable, honest, energetic, diligent, imaginative, and determined, then certainly we might talk about providing every man with a job, and of taking care of him when he didn't have one. But the fact is, and we all know this, there is a large percentage of humanity that will work only

under the lash of economic necessity—the necessity for something to eat, something to wear, and a place to sleep and get in out of the storm. There is a large percentage of humanity that, if it could, would sit on the sunny side of the cabin and idle away the hours, dream away the days, while the county, or the city, or the State, or the Federal Government provided the housing and the clothing and the food for the family.

We have got to be careful, my friends, that our altruism does not become misguided—that we do not continue to put a premium on shiftlessness and a penalty on thrift.

Our American system of government would never have survived the vicissitudes through which it has passed except that our economic system was based on free enterprise. Conversely, free enterprise never would have grown to its present magnitude and efficiency had it not been protected by free government, as expressed in the Bill of Rights.

All men are created equal in their opportunities, in their right to pursue life and liberty and happiness to the best of their individual abilities and capacities. And that means the right to work at a job without paying a stiff fee to some union overlord.

Of course, some lose out in the race of life. The problems of existence are too intricate for many. Some are stricken by disease or accident and rendered incapable of providing for themselves. We in America have never allowed our fellow citizens who were thus handicapped to starve to death. They have always been provided for; they are provided for by the States and the counties and the municipalities and their neighbors.

Now, many of these self-appointed world saviors think we should make ourselves responsible for all the sick and halt and lame and blind and ignoble and thriftless and lazy people in the world. You and I know we cannot do that. We cannot work hard enough, we cannot produce enough in the United States of America to sustain the whole world. The only way under God's heaven we can help the rest of the world is first to be safe, free, sound, and solvent as a nation ourselves. Under such circumstances we then can help other peoples to help themselves—to rehabilitate their own industries, their own agriculture, and their own lives.

Contrary to the utterly despicable assertions of many, the United States of America was not responsible for this war. We were not responsible for the blight that has hit these other nations. It was not our responsibility to try to run the nations on the continent of Europe or of Asia. It was none of our business until the marauders started so rapidly to subjugate the rest of the world that it became a matter of world welfare for us to intervene. Even now we are being told to keep our hands off of European political affairs.

Free enterprise is the essence of free government because it is the people, the consumers, who are constantly exercising, in their choice of goods and services, that high degree of selectivity which, in turn, constitutes both a compulsion and an incentive for competitive enterprisers constantly to strive to turn out better goods and services and to reduce costs and prices. It is obvious, of course, that such a constant discriminating selectivity could not possibly be exercised by any government, no matter how able and efficient the heads of governmental bureaus might be.

It was precisely through such wise compulsions and incentives that the American free-enterprise system was forced and encouraged to experiment, to study, to strive for better quality and more efficient methods. Thus, we reached that state of productive efficiency which enabled American industry to overcome, in about 3 years, the concentrated efforts and all of the skill in war preparation exercised in Germany for 12 years under Hitler; in Italy for 20 years under Mussolini; in Japan for 40 years under the war lords.

Free government is always under the same system of discriminating selectivity. Every 2 years the people choose all of their Representatives, and a third of their Senators; every 4 years they elect their President. Such frequent elections also characterize State, county, and local governments. The people's privileges under the Bill of Rights have enabled them to exercise the same degree of criticism, the same degree of approval or disapproval of the acts and policies of their public service, that they have all exercised under their free economy, in their selection of goods and services produced by their industries and their professional people.

These compulsions, and these compulsions alone operated to inspire and build our great system of American free government, as they operated to inspire and build our great system of free enterprise in this Nation. Thus two great systems, plus our rich natural resources, have come down to us from our ancestors, not as our absolute possession for this generation alone, but as our trust for generations to follow us. Thomas Jefferson saw this fact clearly and expressed it in these words:

"Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

And I might add—butter.

Jefferson also detected something which I think is the very essence of the plots of those who conspire for a planned economy today.

"Dependence begets subservience and venality, suffocates the germ of virtue, and prepares fit tools for the designs of ambition."

These words might have been spoken yesterday. They were prophetic.

Now, the question is: How can you, as businessmen, help to preserve free government and free enterprise?

Well, the first thing you can do is to refuse to apologize for being big businessmen, or little businessmen, and assert your pride in the fact that industry is the structure of our modern economy, and the wellspring of our rich American life. It has not been the bureaucrats, the Communists, the P. A. C., the labor racketeers, who have given America the highest living levels, the highest wage levels, the greatest individual luxuries, and the greatest freedom ever enjoyed by any people on the face of this globe. It has been business—businessmen and business managers—agriculture, industry—those who put up the money and furnished the direction for agriculture and industry—who have made this the greatest Nation in the world. Business and businessmen ought to be proud of that fact.

These bureaucrats and these professional slanderers of business, and of the Congress, like to tell the people businessmen are in a category along with horse thieves and bank robbers. The best way for you to help America is to hurl the lie back in their teeth and stand by your guns. You have made mistakes; so have governors made mistakes; on very rare occasions it has been known that bureaucrats have made mistakes, too. So, instead of shrinking and defending yourselves against your traducers, stand up in your justifiable pride of achievement and tell them that while they were busy traducing you, who are in business, and industry, and agriculture, you were busy preparing this Nation to fight the biggest war in which it has ever been engaged.

Tell them it was industry and agriculture, it was business and agricultural management, working together with the people in the workshops with the tools created by industry, if you please, that overcame that 12-year lead in Germany, that 20-year lead in Italy, that 40-year lead in Japan, so that today our forces are fighting on the offensive, and the dictators and marauders and pirates of the world now can see death on the gallows, or by the firing squad, staring them in the face.

Those who howl most loudly against business are people who never knew what it was to do anything more than work in another man's factory or on another man's farm.

Partisan henchmen and subversive plotters who have wormed their way to the top of many of the governmental bureaus like to say a businessman is untrustworthy, selfish, and dishonest. They insist a politician is a fellow who can straddle the fence, keep both ears to the ground, and look behind him all at the same time. Well, maybe so. But a bureaucrat is a fellow who shuts his eyes and stops his ears and leaps before he looks. You can take your choice.

We certainly cannot entrust our post-war economy to bureaucratic theorists who want to stop the butchering of "female" steers and who want farmers to take the horses' shoes off at night to save wear.

No Member of Congress objects to fair criticism of himself. But when anybody, business men or women, or any other citizen, lends himself or herself to the plan to ridicule and abuse the Congress to the point where the people lose their confidence in it as an institution, then that individual is lending himself or herself to this plot to destroy constitutional government and free enterprise in America.

It is perfectly amazing how many writers and speakers consider it humorous—with a touch of realism—to speak of Congress, and the Members of Congress collectively, as self-seeking politicians, boobs, or fakers.

Now, if the American people want to change their form of government, if they have so far lost their love for liberty as to prefer a dictatorship, and the regimentations, and rationings, and compulsions of a bureaucracy, then it is the undeniable right of the American people to do so. But we ought to be sure they see clearly what they are about, and what the consequences of such action would be upon their own lives and happiness.

It would be tragic, not alone for America but for the whole world, if the greatest experiment in human freedom and in free government—that is, the United States of America—were to prove a failure. It would throw the human race back centuries in its progress toward the higher ideals of life. Businessmen should uphold the legislative branch of the Government as an institution and as a necessary part of that free government.

Another way in which you, as businessmen, may help to preserve our constitutional government and our free enterprise system is to meet and turn back this propaganda that industry must furnish all the jobs in the post-war period.

I have noted somewhere, and I think the figures are approximately correct, that the manufacturing industry furnishes about 37 percent of the jobs and that agriculture and the professions furnish the balance. The United States Department of Commerce (in its 1941 edition of Trade and Professional Associations of the United States) states that 20 percent of our labor is engaged in agriculture, 4 percent in contract construction, 11 percent in Government, 25 percent in manufacturing, 2 percent in mining, 6 percent in miscellaneous, 7 percent in service and finance, 13 percent in trade—wholesale and retail, 6 percent in transportation and public utilities, and 7 percent unemployed.

Whatever changes may have taken place in these figures since 1941 will not affect my use of them to illustrate what I mean.

The foundation is being laid right now by those who want a planned economy, who

want the Government to control all industry, to accuse business later on of falling down on its responsibilities of providing jobs for the returned service people. You will remember, back before we got into this war, businessmen were vilified as tories, economic royalists, aristocratic anarchists, and what not. Then, when we were suddenly engulfed in the war, to whom did we turn to prepare our defense? To industry, business, and agriculture, and the people. It was a national job, not a partisan one.

It is a singular fact—or maybe it isn't—that those who talk about sixty, and sixty-five, and seventy, or eighty million jobs most loudly, are those who never raised a dollar for industry, or a company, or for an agricultural project, and who never managed a successful business in their lives. Those who rail most loudly against business forget—or ignore—the fact that it has been business and industry that furnished the tools and the workshops in which American citizens could better their working and living conditions.

There is a great danger in this country of overcentralization of business. I think there ought to be some decentralization of business. But some businesses need to be centralized. They are more efficient and economic that way. There are some businesses in which huge sums of money have to be invested in research, experimentation, and plans, before some product is ever ready for the market at all. Then, when it is produced, other huge sums of money must be invested to create the market for it. Obviously, the individual, or the small business, cannot undertake such gigantic expenditures and such long periods of experimentation and research. I am thinking of nylon, rayon, stainless steel, plastics of various kinds, a thousand and one new things, each one making a great contribution to the richness and the pleasure of life in this Nation, which have been provided, and which could only have been provided by the courage, the initiative, and the vision of men willing to invest millions, to go through years of research and experimentation, and then to build up markets for the marvelous products they produce.

Anybody who wants to berate big business and free enterprise ought to remember the days when the automobile, and the telephone and the sewing machine were the rich man's luxury, and which have, through the very planning and management of industry, been so reduced in cost that today they are the poor man's commonplace, everyday equipment to enrich his life.

Those who would destroy constitutional government and free enterprise have skillfully organized themselves. They are well financed. Those who wish to preserve free enterprise and constitutional government must be prepared to furnish the money to carry on the fight—because a fight it is. and a fight it will continue to be for many years to come.

There is just one way to meet the threat of the P. A. C. That is to adopt the methods of the P. A. C., and get to the grassroots and the doorbells of this country with the facts about industry and agriculture, with the facts about constitutional government and the Bill of Rights, before the subversionists hypnotize the people into believing free government is something no longer to be desired.

There are some facts—platitudes if you will—the people must not be allowed to forget. Let me mention them briefly:

Success is not a crime; it is to be desired.

Failure is not a virtue; it is to be avoided.

Wealth in itself is not evil; it should be put to good use.

Poverty in itself is not good; it is a misfortune.

Honesty, intelligence, thrift, ability, and initiative should be encouraged.

Incompetency, extravagance, idleness, and inefficiency should be discouraged.

The American way to national prosperity and security is not in limitation of opportunity for some; it is in equality of opportunity for all.

Business can be big without being bad; it can be bad without being big.

Big business naturally requires closer scrutiny than small business, because of its greater power for good or evil.

Ninety-nine percent of American business is honest and law-abiding. It must be preserved and encouraged. The crooked one percent should be eliminated without penalizing the honest ninety-nine percent.

Business can succeed under proper governmental regulation; it will fail under governmental domination and competition. Prosperity and security in this Nation lie in free enterprise fairly conducted.

The welfare of finance, industry, agriculture, and labor is in mutual ccoperation. It depends upon prosperous consumers.

Our Republic functions at its highest efficiency only under an administration wholly sympathetic with constitutional government.

Control and regulation by a political bureaucracy mean tyranny and retrogression; self-government by the people assures freedom and progress.

Experience and caution are to be preferred over experimentation and rashness in government.

America is still sound. We can win the war, recover prosperity, put our people back to work in peacetime private industry at good American wages, without giving up a single essential liberty or privilege.

By achieving these goals we can render ourselves and our posterity secure, and by example make free constitutional government the strongest incentive to other peoples to give up the ways of war and to follow the paths of peace.

We who believe in free constitutional government, in free enterprise and free society, must organize more carefully, more thoroughly, than ever before. We must carry this message and this fight to the "grass roots" and the doorbells of America. We must make the rank and file of the people understand what is happening to them and to their Government.

The necessities of war have required that we live under a practically totalitarian form of government while the struggle is on. The people are hedged about in every conceivable way by rationing, by regimentation, by a whole system of bureaucratic "do's and don't's." Business is menaced and leg-ironed by priorities, tax accountants, Treasury snoopers, labor agitators, unfair governmental decisions, and regimentation by the bureaus. These things come about during war. But they are the concomitants of a totalitarian government. Peoples, under dictatorships or autocracies, everywhere in the world, at every stage of history, have had to endure such privations, such regimentations, such bureaucratic arrogance, and stupidity, and mistakes. They are inherent and inescapable in absolutism.

As businessmen, you will have to carry the battle to the subversionists instead of remaining on the defense. If business is half as bad as these subversionists tell the people it is, then free enterprise ought to be extinguished. If business is not as bad as these subversionists say it is—and we know it isn't—then the lying propaganda of these subversionists ought to be extinguished.

I am for the American system of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise. It is the essence of our constitutional system. But I am dead against deceit, treachery, lying, and dishonesty in high places, and the use of Government bureaus as a subterfuge to sabotage and wreck free government in the name of sweet charity or noble justice.

We must carry this fight to the people on a basis the people can understand. It is difficult to argue with a man that he should quarrel with a pay envelope which has two or three times as much money wages in it as he ever was able to earn before. We have got to make him understand that he is not getting three or four times as much real wages as he did before. And we must make him understand the further fact that these lush wages will last only so long as he can be lured into consenting to a totalitarian form of government; whereupon he will find himself in work battalions, working for what some dictator in Washington says he may receive—whether it be much or little—and under the dictators it has always been little.

Capital must be found to finance organizations adequate to get to the "grass roots" and the door bells and carry the facts to the people to counteract the propaganda being spread throughout every nook and cranny of this land by these subversionists who wish to destroy our Government, our industry, our agriculture, and our freedom.

You businessmen must procure public cooperation if industry is to provide its share of the security and abundance along with agriculture and the professions. This it cannot do unless it can persuade a constructive public action to insure industry conditions and circumstances under which it can survive and thrive.

As a result of wartime controls, regulatory legislation which has been enacted in the last 12 years, and the tendencies which have grown up in Government under this giant bureaucracy which bestrides this Nation like an old man of the sea, industry is faced by obstacles which alone it cannot overcome.

The barrage of propaganda to poison the people's thinking against industry must be met before legislative relief can be brought about for industry. Without legislative relief, you gentlemen know, industry cannot successfully accomplish the task of providing jobs and of helping Americans to achieve greater security.

Industry simply cannot hope for sympathetic political action until it has convinced the public of its own good motives and the soundness of its economic leadership.

You must work out a positive program—of which I believe you are fully capable—specifying the action you intend to take and the ccurse you intend to follow.

You must convince the American people you can do the job. You must build confidence among the American people that you will do the job, and that you mean to do the job as a choice between a free economy and a governmentally controlled economy—a choice between the liberties offered by the one and the sacrifices and hardships offered by the other.

If industry is to be able to meet the demands upon it for reemployment of returned service people and defense workers, our tax rates must be readjusted. Our tax system must be incentive instead of punitive in its operation and its administration. The Government must assume a sympathetic instead of a hostile attitude toward business. We cannot make a whipping boy of business for partisan political purposes and still expect business to produce jobs and wages for American men and women.

Someone has well said the surest way to make a cow go dry is to keep clubbing her and chasing her all over the meadow. The surest way to dry up jobs and wages and prosperity is to keep clubbing industry all over the lot, and chasing it all over the map with hostile administrative attitudes and orders.

Business must have a program for post-war reemployment, but in order to do that, business must first be able to have some glimmering of what the post-war economic pattern will be. Secondly, business must know that the attitude of the Government is going

to be friendly instead of hostile and suspicious. And, thirdly, business must know that it is going to be given a chance not only to finance itself, but to operate without interference by a lot of theoretical, inexperienced bureaucrats who do not understand business operation at all.

I think much of the job you have to do is a psychological one. I think when the people are in a victory mood may be the time for you to act. You must establish the necessary psychological background for the general industrial effort.

We will have to guard ourselves against inflation—if we can. I shall not take your time or try your patience by giving you figures on the inflation of the currency. Probably you know them as well as I do, or better. One thing is sure; that is that if the Congress permits inflation to get out of hand, it will operate to destroy business more quickly than anything else. Inflation is the greatest single danger that confronts industry and agriculture in this Nation today.

As I said a while ago, this is a job for the people to do—this job of rescuing their Government from the hands of the bureaucrats and the subversionists, and reestablishing it on a basis of freedom. It is your job, as businessmen and industrialists, to help rally the people around the Constitution once more, and to turn back this growing wave of communism and socialism and totalitarianism which has started to sweep across the world and which may wash up in tidal proportions across our own land unless we have courage and very great wisdom and foresight.

John Stuart Mill summed up the problem which confronts us today as concisely and completely as I think it can be put into words. In conclusion, I want to give you that quotation:

"A people may prefer a free government, but if, from indolence, or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if by momentary discouragement or temporary panic or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet even of a great man, or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions; in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty; and though it may be for their good to have had it even for a short time, they are unlikely long to enjoy it?"

It is your job and my job to persuade the people to prefer a free government; to render the exertions necessary to preserve a free government; to refuse to be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it.

How can I better close my remarks than to use Jefferson's words when he said:

"The station which we occupy among the nations of the earth is honorable, but awful. Trusted with the destinies of this solitary Republic of the world, the only monument of human rights and the sole depositary of the sacred fire of freedom and self-government, * * * to what sacrifices of interest or convenience ought not these considerations to animate us? To what compromises of opinion and inclination, to maintain harmony and union among ourselves, and to preserve from all danger this hallowed ark of human hope and happiness. * * *

"My God! How little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of and which no other people on earth enjoy. * * *

"The last hope of human liberty in this world rests on us. We ought for so dear a stake to sacrifice every attachment and every enmity."

God illumine our consciousness and strengthen our hearts for this battle for right, for justice, for liberty.

Distribution of Income-Tax Blanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the Ridgely Bank, Ridgely, Md., in my district. It seems our people have been unable to get blanks on which to make their income-tax returns and to pay their income taxes. Certainly, this is an oversight of the Treasury Department and any persons who are delayed in making their return because of their inability to obtain blanks should surely have their delay excused.

The letter follows:

THE RIDGELY BANK,
Ridgely, Md., January 18, 1945.

Hon. DUDLEY G. ROE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROE: I desire to call your attention to the mess our Treasury Department made in getting in the January 15 tax returns. First of all, they are supposed to send blanks to those people who have made reports in the past. I do not believe that 10 percent of these people have received any blanks to date.

Then they publish in the papers that blanks can be had at the banks and post offices. The post offices have never had any, and our bank wrote for blanks at least 3 weeks before January 15. On the 12th we received about 10 Form 1040. None for farmers, and as a consequence, our farmers have not sent in any returns.

I suggest that you introduce a resolution requiring the Treasury to send full supplies to all banks, and those post offices where there is no bank in the town. The present system certainly makes a lot of confusion and causes considerable uneasiness.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

G. L. WILSON, *Cashier.*

National Commander of the American Legion Supports Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement made by the national commander of the American Legion, Hon. Edward N. Scheiberling, before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, on yesterday, January 22, with reference to the creation of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Since this question of protecting this country against un-American activities of all kinds will undoubtedly be an issue in every congressional district in the United States in the primaries next year, as well as in the general election, I hope every Member of this House will read Commander Scheiberling's statement. He represents the greatest organized group of Americans in the country.

The matter referred to follows:

Commander SCHEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I want to express now, on behalf of the American Legion, our grateful appreciation to this committee for the bill which was enacted into law in December, H. R. 1744, the widows' and orphans' pension bill, which was the fourth plank in our four-point program of 1933; and after 11 long years of struggle, through the efforts of this committee, and particularly through the efforts of the man who sits up there as chairman, JOHN E. RANKIN, this bill was finally enacted into law.

That was a great achievement for the American Legion. We sent word to all of the members of the Legion, telling them of the work of you men and Mrs. ROGERS on this committee, what you have been doing for the members of the American Legion, and what you did to get that bill enacted into law.

So we are grateful, and I am happy to have the opportunity of saying it here personally on behalf of the entire American Legion organization and of our auxiliary.

On the very first day of this session, again through the generalship and leadership of JOHN E. RANKIN, the Committee on Un-American Activities was not only continued but it was made an official standing committee of the House with broadened powers. The American Legion is happy at that effort. That doesn't apply to your committee, I know. That is something else; that is not World War Veterans' Committee stuff; but, nevertheless, the man who is the head of your committee is a leader, not only in the things that pertain to veterans and their rehabilitation, but he has likewise assumed a position of leadership in the House on matters which are for the best interest of the American people, along the lines of Americanism, to suppress un-American activities. And we are grateful for that.

The job is well done, Mr. RANKIN. It was a marvelous piece of work. We know the forces which were alined against you, and I think in this case, like the general in battle, you adopted the element of surprise, which is a great thing. [Applause.]

If you catch the other fellow off guard, when he has not got his forces properly mustered and then go through, you will accomplish something.

Chairman RANKIN. At this point, Commander Scheiberling, let me interrupt you to say that I simply followed the tactics of one of my idols of the Confederate Army, General Forrest. I "took a short cut and got there first, with the most men."

Mr. SCHEIBERLING. And you did a grand job. I was in southern California when it happened. I picked up the paper at Riverdale and, on the dead level, Congressman, I threw away my speech—I had a prepared speech—and I talked about this resolution of the House to continue the Committee on Un-American Activities, and particularly I talked to them about JOHN RANKIN. If you could make your district in southern California, Mr. Chairman, you would go over like a house afire. Not that you're doing so bad where you are.

Those are the things that count.

Why Copy the Nazi Slave-Labor Scheme?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an address delivered by myself over radio station WOW, Omaha, January 19, 1945:

Fellow Nebraskans, these are critical days in America's history. So it is important that your Representative in Washington should report to you frequently his beliefs and views on important public questions. For this reason I have taken this radio time to talk to you about the President's proposal for what he calls a National Service Act.

Of course, you will understand that Members of Congress are in a difficult position. I am desperately anxious to vote for any measure that will win the war quickly and get your boys back home—back to the normal lives of American citizens—back to their parents and sweethearts, or to their lonely wives and children whose nightly bedside prayer is for their daddy to come home quickly—back to the friendly neighborhood, church fellowship, and wholesome atmosphere of the average American peactime community.

On the other hand, I am faced with this solemn responsibility. I must not vote for some law cleverly presented as a measure to win the war quickly—only to find that law being used to enslave the working people of America.

So we must study this proposal carefully, with this fact in mind: In today's world the people who give up control of their government take a step from which they cannot turn back once those in power have solidified their position. Such is the monstrous power of arbitrary law, war regulations, and government propaganda that can destroy opposition by smear campaigns. The workers of Germany, Italy, and Japan have learned these lessons the hard way—are we in America going to make the same mistake?

Oh, yes; I know they will tell you some other countries have national service, but they don't tell you about the cruel tragedies it causes. Take the case of Joseph Henry Wright, of Burslem, Stoke-on-Trent, England, whose young life was snuffed out by the operation of the British national service law.

Joe Wright was killed, at the age of 18, in a pit explosion on New Year's Day, 1942. His father was a miner, too, and when he was injured in the pit he advised his son at all costs to get out of coal mining and seek other work. The young man did this. In the spring of 1941, his father died from injuries received in the mine. Then a few days before the end of 1941, the son was ordered by the Government to go to work in the mines because his father had been a miner. As Joe was getting ready for work, on New Year's Eve, he asked his widowed mother who should let the New Year in. She said he could do this when he left the house for the mine. So Joe opened the door to the New Year, and calling out a "Happy New Year" to his mother, started down the road. Joe never came back.

Joe's father tried to save the life of his son. He failed because an all-powerful government was heartless and cruel. Joe was only a miner's son, so it was easy to use national service to force him into the mines and to his death.

Now, the death of 18-year-old Joe Wright was sad, but, of course, many boys are dying today on far-flung fronts. The fact that is terrifying to me is that Joe Wright was sent by his government, against his will, under national service, to a private job where he lost his life.

I told you about Joe Wright some months ago, over this same radio station and indicated that I was opposed to that kind of a deal for American workers. On the job in Washington, I had seen the warning signals of this danger. Now it is on our doorstep.

A national-service law would have the effect of directing every citizen where, how, and under what conditions he would work. Such a law would set up the most absolute controls over the lives of the American people.

Now, suppose Congress would pass this national-service act, and when the boys come home, we would be forced to confess to them, "We are sorry, but while you were away fighting to liberate the world, we lost your freedom at home."

What a tragedy and what a mockery that would be—a nation enslaved while its patriots were abroad trying to liberate other peoples.

On the basis of the known facts, I cannot understand the demand for this now. But I tell you frankly that all the facts are not given to us. In this case we are asked to pass a measure that will enslave our own workers—yet we are not given the truth about what is going on, and what are the conditions that justify taking away your liberties.

Here is my conviction. Not only Congress, but the fathers and mothers, wives and sweethearts, whose every waking hour is tormented by doubts and fears over the fate of their loved ones—are entitled to all the facts and the whole truth about this war. I, as their representative, should certainly not vote for laws that will add new anxiety and troubles to these patriots at home, while their flesh and blood is risking everything on the battlefields of the world.

A year ago, I said, "When the boys return, the American people will have the right to make this country a socialistic state, adopt communism as a way of life, or even subject themselves to the tyranny and arrogance of a military dictatorship. But no one has any right to move in that direction now."

Since the beginning of the war, all patriots have favored eliminating luxuries, and restricting wasteful pleasures. The amazing thing, to soldiers and their families, has been that the Government has allowed to continue, and has even encouraged such waste of manpower and materials for so long.

But it is hard to make sense out of this demand for national service now. It comes at least 2 years after we should have passed the critical point in the war. If national service were necessary, why wasn't it called for 3 years ago when Japan controlled almost the entire Pacific, when Hitler's legions were overrunning Africa, at the gates of Stalingrad—and Allied armies were fighting with their backs to the wall everywhere? Why was national service not called for then? It could only be for one of two reasons: Either those in power wanted to put over this totalitarian scheme by little steps, one at a time; or they have bungled their job since then and want additional power to cover up their failures.

A national-service law now reminds me of the drunken driver of a good team who got into deep mud and then started whipping and beating the horses. A good driver does not often get stuck in the mud. If he does, he gets out to lead his horses and does not use the whip. Apparently the administration, like the clumsy driver, chooses instead to lay the whip on the backs of the people with a conscript-labor law.

Let us measure this scheme against the facts that are available to us. We find that America is asked to submit herself to the slave-labor methods of the Nazis after we have freed 41,000,000 in France, 7,000,000 in Greece, many millions in north Africa and Italy, 8,000,000 in Belgium, at least 3,000,000 Serbs and others. Moreover, we have eliminated the active opposition of 13,000,000 Rumanians, and millions of Finns, Bulgars, and other Nazi satellites. Haven't all these great achievements toward victory, including the addition of at least 60,000,000 people to our active allies—haven't these great gains eliminated any present need for such drastic laws?

For example, David Lawrence reports that 3,000,000 Frenchmen and Belgians of draft age are available for fighting the Nazis, and that these millions are not being utilized. Why? This war is their fight—it's in their backyard—and these allies are already fed and housed near the battlefields. Why aren't these men used to fill the ranks of the Allied forces, instead of draining America for men who must be fed and maintained at the end of a 4,000-mile supply line? The American people should have full answers to all these questions before they are asked to put themselves in the chains of serfdom. They should have a factual report, made by a group whom the people can trust, about the hoarding of manpower in war plants, and about the idleness and over-staffing existing in Government offices, and in the Army itself.

The scheme reminds me of the Aesop's Fable that you and I learned in the first grade about the quarrel between the horse and the stag. The horse went to a hunter to ask his help to take revenge on the stag. The hunter agreed, but said, "If you desire to conquer the stag, you must permit me to place this piece of iron between your jaws, so that I may guide you with these reins, and allow this saddle to be placed upon your back so that I may keep steady upon you as we follow after the enemy." The horse agreed to the conditions, and the hunter soon saddled him and bridled him. Then with the aid of the hunter, the horse soon overcame the stag, and said to the hunter, "Now, get off, and remove those things from my mouth and back."

"Not so fast, friend," said the hunter, "I have now got you under bit and spur, and prefer to keep you as you are at present."

The lesson is plain—if we permit the Government to saddle and bridle us while we follow the enemy, the Government may decide to keep us as pack horses.

That is why a historian reports that the record of all history can be told in one sentence, "People gain freedom from their rulers by a long slow struggle over hundreds of years, and then lose that hard-won freedom by being persuaded to give it up in a moment of crisis, only to lose it forever."

Is this the step now being forced on us by the administration?

If there are critical problems in production and in the ranks of war nurses, etc., how should these problems be solved? In my mind the answer is clear. It is to give the American people the truth about the war. Give the folks back home the good news and the bad—the whole truth. That has been my plea from the beginning. If the American people, or even 5 percent of them, are faltering, it is because their Government is not giving them full and honest reports about the war.

Fathers, mothers, and loved ones of soldiers have written me many fair questions about the war that I cannot answer because of the hush-hush censorship policy. Democratic Senator Gillette, of Iowa, pointed this out in his farewell speech to the Senate:

"If we are not to commit national suicide, if we are to maintain the confidence of the world in our leadership for peace security in a free world, we must take the American

people into as full confidence as the military situation will permit."

As far as I am concerned, this question is not a political issue. There is nothing political about the worries and the suffering of the millions of average Americans in these trying days. These people can go through this period of heartbreak and trouble with courage and loyalty if their Government will trust them as patriots should be trusted. The truth about the war will strengthen their souls to carry them through the long, weary hours of suspense and suffering.

Let me close with this personal request. If you have any facts that may be helpful on this or other problems, send them to me. Moreover, if you have any problem or matter connected with the Government at Washington on which I might help, do not hesitate to write. While my duties are heavy, I feel that my first responsibility now is to those with loved ones in uniform. If you have occasion when you say to yourself, "I ought to write my Congressman about that"—obey the impulse. You and I have the job of helping to preserve human liberty in America until the boys come home, and that job is going to take the best efforts of all of us, working together.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing radio transcript did not include two further questions which should be asked regarding this proposal.

First. If free labor is better than slave labor, why should we abandon it in favor of slave labor battalions?

Second. Why wasn't national service presented as an issue in the campaign, so the people could have had a voice in settling this issue—the most vital decision in 160 years?

Both of these questions deserve honest and straightforward answers when this measure comes before Congress.

Induction of Young Farmers Into Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

WHITLEY COUNTY U. S. D. A. WAR BOARD,
Columbia City, Ind., January 16, 1945.

Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: During the first 2 weeks of January 1945, the Whitley County U. S. D. A. War Board met a number of times with township committeemen, the selective service board, and other farm leaders of this district for the purpose of reclassifying Whitley County farmers between the ages of 18 and 25 years, inclusive, preparatory to induction into the armed services.

After much discussion, it was found to be the opinion of the board members and 46 other farm leaders that continued induction of the young farmers from this district will bring about a grave situation. It will cause abandonment of fertile farm land throughout the county and serious food production curtailment.

Those discussing the situation thought it would be well to mention the matter to you.

Sincerely yours,

WILSON BENNETT,
Chairman.
GLEN C. BOWMAN,
Secretary.
RONALD T. NEWMAN,
T. GENE WARNER,
B. V. WIDNEY,
LEROY HARTMAN.

COLUMBIA CITY, IND., *January 17, 1945.*

Representative GEORGE W. GILLIE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of directors of Whitley County Farm Bureau at their last regular session January 13, instructed me as secretary to advise you of the serious shortage of manpower arising on the farms of Whitley County.

Representatives from each and every township reported that in studying the activities of draft-age men in their respective localities, if these experienced men are taken from the farm food production will be greatly impaired.

They contend that with the ever-rising average age of farm operators, with machinery becoming over-worn and in almost constant need of repair while in operation; with seasonal help impossible to find, with increased demand for food, and with soil fertility constantly diminishing, it will be impossible to meet our past record of production.

Some of the main factors they relate are:

(1) The boys now remaining on farms are doing a remarkable job of production. In practically all cases they can outperform their fathers or elders in the operation of present-day machinery.

(2) There is always a certain amount of choring, repair, and managerial work essential about a farm which one man has to perform. In most cases the young men put in many more hours in field and livestock operation than their elders can.

(3) Present equipment must have experienced operators or else stand idle too long to get the work done.

(4) On the whole if industrial workers averaged the same hours as the farmers there would not be such a serious manpower shortage.

(5) These boys are not replacable at a time when a man of any age cannot be had to handle even a fork or hoe, let alone operating complicated machines.

We will concede that possibly a few cases, all of which could be counted upon the fingers of one hand, might have abused deferment privileges by perhaps the father going to other work and the son operating the farm to get deferred; but we even question if many of those were purposely guilty.

Whitley County Farm Bureau membership is fully aware that it cannot possibly maintain high food production if the Byrnes directive is carried out; therefore, we deem it absolutely essential that these experienced young men be left to continue their fine efforts on the farms of Whitley County.

Every farm family has been working wholeheartedly with physical endurance strained almost to the limit in order to accomplish the wonderful production of past years. We fear that the big bosses down there are getting the idea that they can do most anything to our labor or supply situation and the farmers will still deliver. You and I know better.

Please use whatever influence you can to prevent the Byrnes directive, which scraps the Tydings amendment, from depleting the farm-labor supply to the point that we cannot produce the needed food supply to win the war.

Very sincerely yours.

WHITLEY COUNTY FARM BUREAU, INC.
JOSHUA C. NIERMAN, *Secretary.*

Drafting of Farm Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to file my protest against the directive issued by General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, on January 3, whereby he notified the draft boards that all farm boys in the 18 to 25 age bracket would be placed in I–A. To me this is a mandatory directive and I feel it is so taken by the local draft boards of my district.

If General Hershey and other military leaders are going to dictate to the local draft boards and not allow them to consider each case on its own merits, then why have local boards?

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that some of our leaders, both military and civilian, do not realize that food is produced from the soil, and by long hours, hard work, and sweat of the brow of the American farmers—specialists in their trade. If the leaders who are responsible for these directives, or orders, do not soon recognize that farming is an essential industry and necessary to the winning of the war, we will so find ourselves short of food and those of us who served in World War No. 1 fully realize that a soldier cannot fight on an empty stomach.

Must Defeat Nazis Utterly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to include my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Robert L. Norton, which appeared in the January 21, 1945, edition of the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Post, entitled "Must Defeat Nazis Utterly":

MUST DEFEAT NAZIS UTTERLY — SENATOR WHEELER'S FIGHT FOR LESS THAN UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER WINS LITTLE POPULAR SUPPORT

(By Robert L. Norton)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—It is doubtful if Senator WHEELER's diatribe against an unconditional surrender of Germany has made any impression upon Congress, the American people, or our fighting men. Whatever else may be the differences between the United Nations, on this point they are in firm agreement.

Premier Churchill reaffirmed the attitude of Britain in a recent speech to Parliament and Mr. Roosevelt has stressed the fact that we may have to continue fighting in Germany until the last Nazi is wiped out. There is certainly no change in the viewpoint of Marshal Stalin, if the official utterances of Pravda are consulted.

The terms to be extended to Germany after unconditional surrender is something else

again and the Montana Senator offers no plan on this score, which constitutes the very nub of the problem to be faced by Messrs. Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt in their coming conference.

Those who have any sympathy with the Wheeler viewpoint should realize that the German mentality is such that it can only grasp the idea of unconditional surrender. Any other terms would be regarded as an indication of softness on the part of the Allies and a weakening of the unity which has governed the conduct of the war in a military sense, however this unity may have been ruffled through political considerations.

MIGHT PROLONG WAR

Any divergence from the decision of the Allies would be regarded by the Germans as an admission of a stalemate and an acknowledgment that they, the Allies, lacked the might to bring about a decisive victory.

The net effect of Senator WHEELER'S speech on the Germans might well mean the prolongation of the war, since the enemy could conclude that, by killing more American soldiers, ultimate defeat would be postponed; that the will of the American people and their fighting forces to carry on to a finish had been weakened, and a negotiated peace could be secured.

The same feeling might conceivably be shared by Japan, with the same results in the war in the Pacific. Vengeance and brutal retaliation for the murdersome excesses of the Germans is not necessarily associated with the idea of unconditional surrender, although it does imply the distribution of stern justice, along with severe penalties to prevent another world war.

As a matter of fact the Germans, in the final analysis, might fare much better under the agreed policy of the Allies to demand unconditional surrender.

It is certain that the Russians would not accede to any other terms, but the Germans have reasons to experience a profound fear of what might happen if the agreement was declared off and the Soviet armies reached Berlin first.

Americans are reasonably well acquainted with the meaning of the term unconditional surrender, through the historical remark of General Grant when he was asked for an armistice by General Buckner at Ft. Donaldson. Replying to the Confederate general he said, "No terms except an unconditional and immediate surrender can be accepted."

There is also the example of the last war. Describing Marshal Foch's interview with the German emissaries seeking an armistice at Rethondes on November 8, 1918, Maj. Charles Bugnet in the book, "Foch Speaks," quotes the Allied commander in chief:

MARSHAL FOCH'S WAY

"I asked them: 'Who are you?' They gave their names. 'Have you any papers? We must examine them.' I asked them, 'What do you want?'

" 'We wish to know your proposals.'

" 'I have no proposals to make.'

" 'We would like to know under what conditions an armistice would be granted.'

" 'I have no conditions to give you.' Erzberger wished to read me a paper. * * * President Wilson's note * * * but I stopped him. 'Do you wish to ask for an armistice? If so, say so.' 'We ask for an armistice.' "

It is doubtful if any great number of the American people would agree with Senator Wheeler in condemning the policy of unconditional surrender as a brutal and asinine contention.

But on the other hand, it must be stated in all truth that going hand in hand with the demand for unconditional surrender is the crying necessity of some declaration on the part of the Allies saying what conditions will be imposed upon the Germans when they do surrender.

Presumably these conditions will be formulated at the coming conference of the chiefs of the United Nations.

Unless there is some agreement as to the terms which will be forced upon Germany after her defeat, there can be no guaranty against a renewal of aggression in the future, more particularly if the Allies pursue separate and arbitrary policies when the Nazis finally succumb. The Junkers and the German military staff will have a better understanding of what the future holds for Germany if they are convinced that the Allies present a solid front in the matter of conditions upon which unconditional surrender is predicated. It is idle to think that Germany will respect anything but the use of force.

NOT BRUTAL DEMAND

Unless an understanding is reached with our allies as to the kind of a situation we intend to promote in Germany when the Germans have laid down their arms, we shall lose the opportunity to capitalize our victory. There is nothing brutal in the demand for unconditional surrender. Such a demand is nothing more than an expression of the moral indignation of mankind. It establishes the only condition under which we could afford to deal justice, spiced with generosity, to the Germans.

While Mr. WHEELER insists that he does not favor a negotiated peace, the logical outcome of his attacks upon the integrity of the Allies in carrying out the expressions of the Allies, as contained in the Atlantic Charter, would be the making of a separate peace between this country and Germany. Such a conclusion would be highly unfortunate.

To consider the viewpoint of the Montana Senator. He declares that the war is developing into a struggle for a new balance of power.

Despite the many democratic proclamations on the part of our allies, he asserts that there is no real unity on the one hand between the British and the Russians, who are attempting to create their own sphere of influence in a new balance of power, and on the other hand, the American people, who are still hoping to justify the sacrifices of the war by achieving a lasting and fair peace. He described the so-called unity between the Big Three as merely the result of a shotgun wedding, and there was very little resemblance between the proclaimed principles of the major allies in the realm of political and military affairs.

CLAIMS COST IN LIVES

He assailed the Dumbarton Oaks Conference as evidence of moral degeneration within the ranks of the Allies, "proposals which emasculate the good-neighbor policy, override the principle of sovereign equality of nations, offer in the place of a genuinely international society of nations a grim military alliance, destroy the very concept of neutrality, approve as a cardinal principle the use of brute force, and cleverly disguise the deliberate omission of the Atlantic Charter by referring to a new United Nations charter that is to be formulated in the future."

The Senator maintains that the continued use of the term "unconditional surrender" is costing thousands of lives.

His alternative is the adoption by all nations of a universal bill of rights; the immediate creation of a United Nations political council to provide for a democratic settlement in harmony with the principles of the Atlantic Charter of territorial questions that have arisen in Europe and may arise elsewhere; a pledge by the United Nations to support free plebiscites under international supervision in the liberated countries; the immediate creation of a United Nations economic council to improve living standards everywhere; and, finally, the creation of a United States of Europe which, he declared, was the only way in which peace could be assured on the Continent.

NOBLE ASPIRATIONS

This program represents noble aspirations to which no person committed to the United States using its full power for world peace after the war could object. But to a degree it typifies that demand for perfectionism to which Mr. Roosevelt referred in his message to Congress and which the President maintained only served a masked purpose to bring about disunity between the Allies.

Nowhere in the declarations of the Montana Senator is there anything approaching a realistic program, describing the terms which will be imposed upon Germany whether she consents to unconditional surrender or a negotiated peace. Neither did the Senator make any proposals for dealing with war criminals in Germany or indicate that he would approve the United States joining in an effective security organization.

On the contrary the Senator is opposed to giving the American delegate on the security council of the proposed international organization any authority to determine even when limited United States forces should be used against the aggressors. This means denying such power to the President.

Resenting the term "irresponsible perfectionism," as used by the President, Senator WHEELER states there is no use in attacking his position on this basis.

"Who was the perfectionist when this matter was originally brought up?" he asks.

"On January 6, 1941, in his annual message to Congress the President said: 'The fourth freedom is the freedom from fear * * * which, translated in world terms, means world-wide reduction in armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any other nation in the world. If that is not perfectionism, I do not know what it is.' "

LIKE FIRST WORLD WAR

Much the same line of discussion as that now precipitated by Senator WHEELER took place in the First World War. A note was sent to President Wilson, saying that the newly organized German Cabinet accepted his famous Fourteen Points as a basis for negotiation. At that time both Senator Lodge and Theodore Roosevelt were demanding unconditional surrender. Writing to Colonel Roosevelt, the Massachusetts Senator said:

"I am living in a constant state of anxiety now of the sudden plunge of the administration for a negotiated peace. At this point, if we make an armistice we have lost the war and we shall leave Germany about where she started.

"I am sure that the people want a complete victory and an unconditional surrender. They want to win this fight on German soil and every man who comes here, who has been fighting on the western front, says the soldiers are determined to go into Germany and would resent it bitterly if they were held back."

President Wilson sent the German Government a reply inquiring whether it was meant that the terms were accepted so as to leave for discussion only the practical details of their application. He demanded in this note that the Central Powers consent to withdraw immediately from invaded territory. His note was denounced by some of the German leaders, who declared that it virtually demanded unconditional surrender. While in the United States, on the other hand, it was denounced because it did not demand unconditional surrender.

NO NEGOTIATED PEACE

In the finality, President Wilson succeeded in breaking down German morale and secured every concession for which he asked.

If the Germans accepted Senator WHEELER'S views as representing the views of the American people, then they would be justified in suing for a separate peace with this

country. But this is not the fact. Whatever else, Americans generally are determined upon an unconditional surrender of Germany. A negotiated peace would constitute a betrayal of our fighting men, and such a peace would mean that American lives would have been not only lost, but utterly wasted. All of our great sacrifices would have been in vain.

Strengthening Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of January 21, 1945:

STRENGTHENING CONGRESS

What's the matter with Congress?

As every American schoolboy knows, our form of government consists of an interlocking set of checks and balances. The executive, the legislature, and the judiciary were intended to be coequal members of this system. Each was provided by the Constitution with a sphere of original authority. But the same instrument also clothed each of them with certain powers designed to curb the possible abuse of their authority by either of the other two.

That tripartite arrangement, in general, worked well for about 150 years. Devised at a time when our ancestors were acutely aware of the danger an overconcentration of power in any branch of the Government would present to their basic liberties, it had shown itself remarkably adaptive to new circumstances. Even today there is no disposition openly to propose that it be scrapped or to advocate a revision of the Constitution for this purpose. We are not a people given to tampering with the structure of our democracy.

Recently, however, political observers have begun to point to the enormous accumulation of authority in the executive department and to ask whether we are not, as a matter of fact, steadily shifting away from our concept of checks and balances. Congress, they say, seems not only to be able to impose less and less real restraint upon the President but to be delegating more and more of its original authority to him. As a result, in their opinion, both the actual power and the prestige of the National Legislature has been progressively declining for a considerable period.

These same observers note that the tendency of Government increasingly to regulate private enterprise and to furnish additional services of one sort or another was apparent long before the current war. It is not, they argue, the product of a temporary emergency but the outgrowth of long-range forces operating in our national life. Whichever political party has charge, according to their view, we must expect the zone of governmental activity to continue to expand after the war.

We shall have some control over the speed and scope of such an expansion, the observers contend, but we cannot reasonably hope to stop the process, much less to reverse it. Therefore, they declare, the problem before us is to determine how the mounting governmental influence is to be exercised and, in particular, whether it is to be vested almost altogether with the President and his administrative subordinates (as now appears to be the tendency) or Congress is to reassert its function as an effective check against the centering of so vast an authority in the executive branch.

As this thesis runs—and there are few today to dispute its essential accuracy—the trouble with Congress is largely organic. It has failed to keep up with changing condition. The executive and, to a smaller degree, the judicial branches of our Government have altered their organization and procedures, to meet new requirements. The legislative has not. Fundamentally, it is still set up as it was in the last century. In the words of one critic it is attempting to handle the problems of a machine age with hand tools. Its organization is unwieldy. Its procedures are inefficient. And, as a consequence, Congress can no longer adequately perform the duties assigned to it by the Constitution.

That verdict is widely accepted by persons in touch with our national legislature. So is the corollary that the machinery of Congress should be modernized, although a minority group is not inclined to insist on such action, presumably because it prefers to see more power in the hands of the executive department—even at the cost of permanently disrupting the equilibrium of authority and running the risk of dictatorship. But there agreement ends.

In what direction and how far Congress should be reorganized are still matters of debate. Congress, itself, has established a joint committee to inquire into the subject and make recommendations. This committee has just sustained the loss of its chairman, Senator Francis Maloney, of Connecticut. Meanwhile, public discussion of the question is at last commencing to gain momentum and the available literature is growing.

A former secretary of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations, Roland Young, has written This Is Congress, a book in which he analyzes the weakness and strength of that body and offers some suggestions for its improvement. And James F. Byrnes, drawing on an extensive legislative experience, considers the same problem more briefly in the latest issue of the American magazine. The most comprehensive study yet conducted, however, has produced the Heller report, which was published a few days ago under the auspices of the National Planning Association and advances a 14-point program for increasing the efficiency of Congress through a general reorganization.

The Heller report is the work of a business management consultant of Cleveland and, in its entirety, consists of about 300 pages of factual analysis and conclusions. The National Planning Association, which sponsors it, is a nonpolitical body that includes representative figures from American business, labor, and agriculture. All three groups within the association, incidentally, have considered and endorsed the Heller report. The assembled information and recommendations last week were placed before the Maloney committee.

It is unfortunate that initial accounts of the Heller report have dealt so largely with its salary and pension proposals. These are integral but minor parts of the program. Far more important are the sections which call for a drastic reduction of the number of standing committees in both Houses, the creation of majority and minority policy committees in each House, provision of competent secretarial staffs for all committees, expansion of the research and legislative reference services available to Congress, more effective control over executive expenditures, and an experiment with a question period at which members of the executive branch could be interrogated.

At present the Senate has 33 and the House 47 standing committees. Many of these have overlapping jurisdictions. The report recommends that the number be diminished to 15 in each House, their jurisdiction be carefully redefined, and that, as far as practical, the committee structure of the two Houses be paralleled to avoid confusion.

The chief innovation proposed by the report is the establishment of the new policy committees, consisting in the case of the majority party of the chairmen of all the other committees and in the case of the opposition party of the ranking minority members of the same committees. The functions of these policy comittees would be to formulate the legislative programs of the respective parties in Congress, to center responsibility, and to give each party a really authoritative spokesman in each House.

The staffing and research provisions are intended to take a load of detail off individual Congressmen and, at the same time, to make them independent of the experts now furnished them on request by the executive departments which may themselves be under congressional scrutiny. The report urges that Congress should not continue to go into great detail on appropriation bills, a procedure which consumes much time, but that the duties of the General Accounting Office be enlarged so that Congress may be constantly informed of the way in which the money is being spent and can take prompt remedial action where necessary.

The report suggests various other means of tightening the legislative procedures; among them discontinuance of the practice of tacking irrelevant matter to bills in the form of riders and abolition of the filibuster. It agrees that selection of committee chairmen by seniority is illogical, but offers a choice of substitutes, rather than a fixed recommendation. The report further attempts to set up clearer channels of communication between the executive and legislative branches of the Government through both the policy committees and the question period.

The Heller contention that abler Congressmen could be obtained in the long run by raising their salaries to $25,000 a year and assuring them of retirement pay was bound to provoke controversy. But it should not be allowed to obscure the main propositions of the report calculated to improve the machinery of Congress in line with trends commonly accepted by American industry.

Several of these propositions—notably the reorganization of the committee system, the creation of policy committees, and the provision of better research facilities—had been previously outlined by others. The particular virtue of the Heller report, however, is that it seeks to offer a comprehensive program of reforms, virtually all of which can be initiated by Congress itself.

In the past Congress has been curiously reluctant to revise its internal structure and procedures. Whether it meant business when it created the Maloney committee remains to be seen. But no one can very well challenge the assumption that our National Legislature is badly in need of greater efficiency in its operations—or that the congressional balance in our system has been growing dangerously light.

Cancelation of Rationing Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in Mr. Chester Bowles' weekly statement last

week he discussed the cancelation of rationing stamps.

It appears that there was a clash of obligations. One obligation was to equally and fairly distribute the food among the people so that every person would have an opportunity to obtain his or her share. The next obligation was to make it possible for people who held these stamps to obtain the commodities it was possible for them to obtain with them.

Obviously there were too many stamps out, and both obligations could not be honestly performed. Therefore, it was necessary that the administrative officer, in this case Mr. Bowles, take the responsibility of doing what was the nearest fair and right thing under the circumstances.

PULLMAN ACCOMMODATIONS MAY BE TAKEN

In this war many obligations will probably be broken, not because any person wants to break an obligation, but because of situations brought about by the war which make it impossible to perform them.

For instance, if a person has a railroad ticket and space in a Pullman from Washington to St. Louis, or between any two points in this country, and he gets on the train and occupies his Pullman space, and it should happen that there is a disabled serviceman traveling between these points accompanied by a nurse or doctor, the railroad company, not having accommodations for the disabled serviceman, will take the Pullman space, although the passenger has paid his fare and has actually occupied it. There is a case where an obligation will be broken, and it is being broken every day. Of course, the passenger could scream to high heaven that he had his ticket and his accommodations paid for and there was an obligation on the part of the railroad company and the Government to protect him in his contractual rights, but it would not do him any good.

If it is necessary to cancel stamps and points to furnish adequate food to our fighting men the ones holding the canceled points are in the same position as the passenger on the train who has his space taken by a serviceman.

GOLD CERTIFICATES

Another case is gold certificates. We have billions of dollars of paper money outstanding that says on its face "payable on demand in gold." For reasons brought about by the world situation, it was impossible to redeem these certificates in gold without disturbing and possibly paralyzing our domestic economy. So there being a clash of obligations, the nearest fair and right thing had to be done, and that was to prohibit the payment of these certificates in gold. The people are not injured in their rights because any money they obtain is worth just as much as gold, but at the same time it can be contended that there is a breach of faith on the part of the Government.

Mr. Bowles' statement is as follows:

We have received many comments of approval on the changes made in the rationing program. We have the wholehearted support of the consumer groups, whose advisory committee has been studying the facts with us. Many business groups who know the food-supply picture also have commended the action. A splendid statement by Paul Willis, president of the Grocery Manufacturers Association, is a good example. Labor groups also have indicated their approval.

On the other hand there has been serious criticism from many other people who have not understood the reasons for the change * * * particularly the cancelation of old stamps. We knew many would feel hurt and some would be seriously disappointed when they learned that the old stamps were no longer valid. But we simply had to face this situation, difficult and unpleasant though it was, and to make the only decision which was fair.

The facts are that, while overall food supplies will be ample in 1945, the supplies of meat, sugar, canned foods, and butter available to civilians at least in the first part of the year will be lower. In addition, we know that in the last quarter of 1944 there was bad maldistribution of meats, sugar, and butter in many parts of the country. District after district reported short supplies, so that many people found none of these items at their grocers or butchers, time after time. While there were canned foods on store shelves, we were using up our supplies much too fast and they must last until next summer.

It was apparent, therefore, that, as we started the new year, each family would have a little less of each of these foods. So, many additions to the rationing list had to be made.

The next question was how to handle the 2½ months' supply of extra ration stamps in the hands of about 25,000,000 families. We had only two possible choices—both difficult. Either we could increase point values, thus cutting the rations per person, or we could cancel this excess currency.

The first alternative, I believe, would have been completely unfair. It would have required the majority to get along on even smaller amounts of these scarce foods in order to provide additional amounts for those who had been able to save old stamps.

Some of these had kept their stamps in order to conserve the Nation's food supply. Our surveys reveal, however, that most people didn't buy because they didn't need the food.

Our surveys also show that 30,000,000 of America's 40,000,000 families say they have no more stamps than are required to meet their normal needs, while 10,000,000 families say they have stamps in excess of their needs.

The second alternative seemed to be much the lesser of the two evils. In taking it we have earned the disapproval of the 10,000,000 families who lost stamps through invalidation. But if we had taken the other road and reduced ration values, we would have imposed an extra hardship on 30,000,000 families.

Of course, it is natural that many people were bitterly disappointed. I can understand how they felt. It was the toughest decision we ever made.

But I believe O. P. A. made a decision which was right. I believe it was the only fair decision. I hope you'll do what you can to explain the reasons for it to your family, friends, and neighbors, who certainly have a right to know the facts.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES.

I am also inserting herewith a letter from the President of the National Council of Women, a letter from the President of the American Home Economics Association, and a letter from Mr. Bowles which answers many of the criticisms that have been urged against O. P. A. because of the cancellation of points and stamps:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN
OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N. Y., January 11, 1945.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Stricter rationing is the only democratic method of assuring an equitable distribution of scarce consumer goods. The new rationing program may meet with resistance for a while, until its urgent necessity becomes understood; but eventually I believe the general consuming public will accept it as an essential step toward victory.

After all, it is a matter of simple arithmetic. We cannot increase food stocks at the fighting fronts, to supply our vastly increased overseas forces, and at the same time maintain surpluses at home. There can be no question as to the priority of our fighting men, even if we on the home front find it more difficult to find the foods we want. Though we shall have to change our eating habits to conform to the revised program, it would be ridiculous to call this a sacrifice, in the face of the terrible hardships endured by our own sons on the battle fronts, or the gallant sacrifices of civilians in our Allied Nations. After all, we are a long way off from K rations or a substandard diet, even with stricter rationing.

Sincerely yours,

LUCY R. MILLIGAN,
President.
MRS. HAROLD V. MILLIGAN,

AMERICAN HOME
ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1945.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. BOWLES: May we congratulate you on your determined stand to insure a fair division of scarce supplies as shown by your recent action returning many foods to the ration list and canceling the backlog of unused ration stamps. We are well aware of the courage it took to act in the face of inevitable criticism and misunderstanding. However in view of the war needs and the supply situation we believe no other action was justifiable.

Because of our great concern over the situation we are calling to the attention of our members the reasons which made these changes in the rationing program necessary.

With this information I am confident they will continue to take active leadership in securing public support of necessary wartime price and rationing controls.

Very truly yours,

DORA S. LEWIS, *President.*

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1945.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I am writing to you to explain the nature of the action which we are now taking in connection with rationed foods. I will not, in this letter, attempt to give you all of the details, point values, and other data involved in this action. If you are interested in these figures, you will find them in the press release which you can get by contacting our liaison offices on the Hill. It is my intent to confine the letter to matters of broad significance and policy.

I should like to emphasize the fact that the tighter rationing program on which we are now embarking, is not a program which takes supplies away from the average person. It is rather a program which will help to assure him a better balanced consumption and a wider access to food products. It means very little to have certain food items on the point-free list if they cannot be purchased. By

restoring them to the point list, it is my expectation that more of these items will be available to the average consumer.

In brief, the action we are now taking has two phases. First, we are restoring to the point list most meat items and most processed foods, and, at the same time, are raising the point value of butter and prolonging the period between the validation of new sugar stamps. All of these steps move in the direction of a tighter rationing program. Second, we are canceling unspent ration stamps which have been built up since this program started.

A TIGHTER RATIONING PROGRAM

It was necessary to make the rationing program tighter because civilian food supplies were reaching low levels and were threatening to drop below the safe level at which our distribution machine could operate. The butter supply for 1945 is expected to be smaller than that for 1944; the meat supply will be 10 to 15 percent less in this coming quarter than it was in the same 3 months of 1944. On December 1 of this year, supplies of commercially canned vegetables available for civilians were approximately 56 percent of the quantity available for civilians at the same time last year. It is now expected that there will be in 1945 9 percent less sugar than in 1944 available for civilians for use in the home and by bakeries, bottlers, candy makers, etc.

Against these short supplies, we have a built-up backlog of ration stamps which stands as a threat against any ration-point program which might be established. A survey made in October by the Census Bureau showed that blue stamps outstanding equal 2.8 months' supply of processed foods and outstanding unspent red stamps equalled 2.5 months' supply. In the case of sugar, unspent stamps were equivalent to about 2 months' regular consumer ration and this report did not cover stamp 33 which became good on September 1.

CANCELATION OF UNSPENT STAMPS

Because we had this large supply of unspent ration currency, we had to make this most difficult decision to cancel unspent stamps. This is probably not nearly so great a hardship upon those holding such unspent stamps as we were at first inclined to believe might be the case. No rationing system which applies to 130,000,000 people can be so perfectly tailored as to provide each person with exactly that ration currency which he needs. We can only hope to set our point values in such manner as will most equitably move the available supplies of scarce civilian commodities into the public market. This means, of course, that some holders of ration books will have less need for coupons than will others. Undoubtedly there are some people who, for patriotic or other reasons, have refrained from spending all their stamps and coupons during the months when they first became valid. They will, accordingly, not have spent all of these coupons and will, from month to month, accumulate a surplus without in any way sacrificing or depriving themselves of necessary food supplies.

Our survey showed that the surplus stamps were held mainly by four kinds of families.

One was the family producing a good deal of its own food from a garden, such as a suburban family or rural family with a victory garden or the farm family. Families of this kind which didn't need all of their ration stamps in 1944 probably will go right along adding in an important way to the Nation's food supply by producing a large share of their own food. They likely will wind up the next year again with a lot of unused ration stamps. None of these people will think it a hardship to begin the new year on an even basis with all other families.

Another kind of family had some accumulated ration stamps on hand for the simple reason that they felt the patriotic thing to do was to draw on the Nation's limited wartime food supply to as little extent as possible. These patriotic families will continue to be patriotic. They will not feel unhappy at the thought that in buying rationed foods in 1945 they will have for use only the stamps to be made good in 1945, and that they are sharing equally with all others in these supplies.

A third large group of families holding accumulated stamps was made up of people, war workers for example, whose wartime way of living demands that they eat a good many meals in restaurants. This same way of living is still open to them, and this group, like the others, will not deem it a hardship to have to depend only on 1945 ration currency to buy 1945 foods.

Still another group was made up of people who had been saving stamps to buy a roast, or a ham, or a can of pineapple for use on some special occasion. For the moment, these people will feel a keen disappointment. We sympathize with them; but had we not wiped out the old currency, and had a buying spree developed, this very same housewife probably would not have been able, after all, to get the roast or the ham or the can of fruit. While our action seemingly deprived her of the special item she wanted at the moment, actually it preserved for her the opportunity to meet her day-to-day needs for rationed foods in an orderly way through the months ahead.

With sugar the supply problem was serious. Already consumers were having difficulty in some parts of the country in finding sugar available in the stores. Immediately ahead is a much tighter sugar-supply situation than that of the last year. Old sugar stamps and 1944 home canning coupons in consumer's hands represented between five hundred and six hundred million pounds. We reasoned that when the story on the 1945 sugar supply was published advance buying of sugar beyond current needs would be stimulated, depleting stocks already low. The result would have been more stores out of sugar and unable to meet consumers' immediate needs as the year advanced.

This, too, was a difficult step for O. P. A. to take. We regret being compelled to take it. But the fact is the public welfare could have been served in no other way.

When we reach a period such as that which now confronts us, with supplies at a low level, points must be restored or raised on the critical items. If we allowed these unspent ration stamps to remain valid, we should be starting this new phase of the ration program by giving to those with surplus stamps—those who have had less need for their allotted ration currency in the past—a considerable "edge" over those who have found it necessary to use all their stamps in the past. This I think you will agree would not be fair. We have, therefore, canceled unspent ration stamps which had been validated before December 1944, leaving in effect the new red and blue stamps which were made valid in December and the most recently validated sugar stamp, No. 34.

NEW STAMPS TO BE VALIDATED

With the restoration of these various food items to the point list we will, beginning with the end of December, validate five new red stamps for the 4-week January meat-ration period. A similar number of blue stamps will also be validated for the month of January. Previously in recent periods we have been validating only three red stamps per ration period; this marks the addition of two new stamps worth 20 points and will give consumers 50 red points for the ration period.

I am not going to outline for you the various point values which are being established under this program. You can find them, if you want them, in the press release available through our liaison offices on the Hill. I want this letter to provide answers for you to questions which you may be asked in connection with this program. If my letter does not answer some of these inquiries or if you have additional questions yourself, I should be very glad to have you write me and discuss any aspects of the new program in which you are interested.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES, *Administrator.*

The Barre Granite Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted to extend my remarks I am including an editorial from the Barre Times, of Barre, Vt., The Granite Center of the World, relative to the prosecution of the industry and the individuals by the Federal Government for fixing prices.

The public is entitled to be advised with respect to the circumstances involved in the case, and will find the following an extremely fair statement in that respect, though to those of us who have lived in the Granite Belt all our lives, it minimizes the efforts of the victims to bring themselves within the law in order to maintain the business on a living basis for labor and industry. It does not emphasize sufficiently the benefits derived therefrom by the public, from the fact that order was established out of chaos by them, at their expense of time, effort, and now of money paid in fines, as it turns out.

The editorial follows:

THE BARRE GRANITE CASE

There is more than meets the eye in the news accounts of Federal court proceedings in Burlington yesterday, when fines aggregating $75,000 were imposed on the Barre Granite Association and some 60 companies and individuals among the manufacturers and quarriers of the Barre district. Before denouncing the defandants for conspiring to fix prices, the public should be willing to examine the long chain of circumstances which culminated in the indictments and pleas of nolo contendere.

From the unequivocal nature of the pleas it can only be concluded that the industry went too far in its efforts to substitute order for chaos. There must have been errors of judgment in designing the program for stabilization. When it comes to censuring the defendants, however, no one on the sidelines should ignore the fact that the very people who are supposed to be adversely affected by price fixing are the ones who appear to have shared greatly in the benefits of a fairly dependable price level on Barre granite monuments. We refer to the retail dealers of the country, who, with significant unanimity, are said to have welcomed the existence of a fairly firm floor under Barre prices and an end to selling below cost. Equally significant has been the apparent absence of any clamor from the purchasing public.

One need not have been active in the granite industry to remember something of the unhealthy state of its activities for more than a decade prior to 1940. Before 1930 the record was dismal enough, but the early years of the depression ushered in the wildest orgy of price cutting in the annals of Barre. Wage variations, selling below production costs, and

a bewildering dossier of other unethical practices unquestionably sparked the disastrous strike of 1933.

Arbitration ended the "industrial holiday" and restored a uniform scale of wages. It resulted also in the early establishment of the Barre granite pay-roll clearing house, a surviving agency which has been repeatedly hailed by unions and industry throughout the country as a desirable meeting ground for labor and management and an effective method of insuring wage stability.

Arbitration did not stabilize prices, but it brought from the arbiters a recommendation which struck directly at the core of the industry's besetting weakness. With President Ernest M. Hopkins, of Dartmouth, as its chairman, the arbitration board consisted of a prominent Vermont industrialist and a leader of the Vermont bar, the selections of management; and two college professors, one from Harvard and the other a member of the faculty at Syracuse University, who were chosen by labor.

The taking of evidence consumed nearly a week. It covered every nook and corner of the industry, including the smelly ones, When the arbiters came to announce their findings as to wages they appended a recommendation which is worth quoting in the light of recent developments:

"The board would venture further to suggest the desirability of organization of the trade for the active control of the industry and for the definition of desirable and standard practices, with the appointment of an official who should have the title, privilege, and authority to safeguard the common welfare. A further purpose of such an official would be to enhance the economic stability of the granite industry in the Barre belt."

Before the industry was ready to adopt the letter of the recommendation, the National Industrial Recovery Act came into being. Under its provisions the Government legalized a form of price maintenance and the act operated beneficially in the granite industry until the Supreme Court clipped the wings of the Blue Eagle.

Still groping for a means of putting the industry on a sounder footing, the local association sought the assistance of the Federal Trade Commission in holding a trade-practice conference. For various reasons the resulting set of rules failed to effect the hoped-for results.

These approaches to a solution of the ills of the trade have been cited by those active in the industry today to show that the border line between legal attempts to install ethical practices and the activities now determined to be beyond the pale of the law was not always clearly discernible.

The value of stabilization within the industry has been stressed by organized labor and the public here at home. Both groups were liberally represented in a community committee which offered its good offices in the efforts of the industry to introduce remedial measures. Inconstestibly both labor and the community at large are co-beneficiaries of any cause that promotes the welfare of the granite industry.

Let us not be hasty in reproaching those who have been penalized. Patently in its latter-day striving for a pattern or ordered existence the industry went over the bay. But the record is replete with palliative factors, all of which undoubtedly would have come out in evidence had the case gone to trial.

It is probable that the Department of Justice weighed these factors in its recommendation of fines, which counsel for the defense did not oppose in view of heavier penalties recommended by the department in similar cases involving other industries. It is not inconceivable that the court, in imposing sentences, also took judicial notice of extenuating circumstances.

Early records indicate that pricewise the Barre granite industry got off to a bad start as long ago as the 1830's. In that period granite for the statehouse was sold at 12 cents a cubic foot, or 20 cents delivered in Montpelier. The producers lost money.

There have been recurring setbacks in the history of Barre granite. None of them as yet have proved permanently hurtful.

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, the men whose names have been listed among those fined, are embarrassed by the publicity. They need not be, so far as those of us who know them are concerned.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the public generally, that no more respectable, loyal group of unselfish, law-abiding, patriotic, public-minded citizens can be found anywhere than is found in the group, from the area which I have the honor to try to represent, who are the unwilling and unintentional victims of the litigation instigated by the Government, to which they contributed so much in time and effort and money in an attempt to discharge their obligations as citizens of a country in which, I assume, they hope there is equal justice for all under the law.

Butterfat Prices Should Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, rationing and price-ceiling policies have seriously curtailed production of butter and has deprived millions of people on the home front of one of the most important food supplies.

The O. P. A. has recently increased the number of red points required to purchase a pound of butter from 20 to 24 points without a corresponding increase of red points for butter substitutes. Thus, by Government action, one industry booms to the detriment of another.

The O. P. A. will argue that the shortage of butter is responsible for the action resulting in the increase of red points on butter. They fail to point out, however, that production had dropped off as a result of the low prices being paid to the producer for butterfat in comparison with other farm products. It has become more profitable for the farmer to sell whole milk to dry-milk processors than to sell butterfat to creameries to be manufactured into butter.

On January 4 the Blackduck American, a weekly newspaper of Blackduck, Minn., had the following to say about the butter situation:

If butter were not the No. 1 item on America's daily menu, there wouldn't be such hue and cry as there is today, now that butter's ration value has been increased from 20 to 24 points per pound.

So declared John Brandt, president, Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., in a statement this week. "Aside from the first and foremost factor that the military and lend-lease rightfully have first call on our butter production," Mr. Brandt declared, "there are several things which can be done to ease the critical situation of tight butter supply.

"Probably the chief contributing cause of the present butter shortage is the matter of price disadvantage with respect to prices of other farm commodities. If this price disparity continues," Mr. Brandt observed, "butter production must continue to decline."

From a health standpoint alone, he pointed out, today's tremendous unbalance of butter distribution is a serious menace to the Nation.

"Current price ceilings on butter fail to consider cost of production of dairy products," said Mr. Brandt. "Such items as labor and feed, for instance, have washed out the net income to the producer. O. P. A. price calculations that have been based upon the old parity formula have scrambled the balance with respect to net income against dairy production, all of which brings us all back to the fight which the milk producers group put up several years ago and has continued to espouse, namely, the enactment of legislation that would force the inclusion of the item of labor in reckoning parity and establishing a price basis for dairy products."

Mr. Brandt hastened to point out that rationing is necessary to equitably distribute what supplies we have. "However," he declared, "rationing neither increases nor decreases the available supply. If we want to lower points on butter we will have to have a better return to the farmer than the present price, which is 5 cents per pound less than the average price paid by the consumer in the peacetime years of 1921 to 1929. Such a situation in wartime, when all other prices are high, cannot be justified and cannot result in other than a decrease in butter production. And," he concluded, "if butter production continues to decrease, ration points for butter are going to continue to go up."

The Late John B. D'Alesandro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including an article from the Baltimore Catholic Review, also a letter from the War Department, relative to Pvt. John B. D'Alesandro, brother of our colleague, THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr., who was killed in action on November 25, 1944, while serving as a rifleman in the vicinity of Longeville, France, during combat operations.

I know the entire membership of the House joins with me in expressing our heartfelt sympathy to Congressman D'ALESANDRO and the members of his family.

[From Catholic Review of January 19, 1945]

PVT. JOHN B. D'ALESANDRO

Pvt. John B. D'Alesandro, 33 years old, son of Thomas D'Alesandro, Sr., 905 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, and the late Antoinette D'Alesandro, and the brother of Congressman THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr., was killed in action on November 25 last. He previously had been reported missing in action.

Private D'Alesandro was the father of three children: Antoinette, 12; John, Jr., 10; and Dolores, 9. He concluded his last letter home with these words: "Don't worry about me, I am feeling fine. Take care of my children. God bless you all."

A solemn high requiem mass for the repose of his soul was celebrated at St. Leo's Church on Monday by the Reverend Louis Lulli, P. S. M., pastor of the church. The Reverend Angelo Caso, P. S. M., was deacon, and the Reverend Maximillian Haarpaintner, P. S. M., subdeacon. The Right Reverend Monseigneur Harry A. Quinn was present in the sanctuary. Five nephews of Private D'Alesandro served as altar boys. The church was filled with many friends of the deceased.

Father Lulli in his sermon said that the family and friends of Private D'Alesandro should receive great consolation in the thought that he gave his life so that this world might be a better place in which to live.

Private D'Alesandro, a former altar boy at St. Leo's, was educated at St. Leo's Parochial School and Calvert Hall College. Besides his father, his three children, and Congressman D'ALESANDRO, he is survived by two other brothers, Thomas and Anthony, and three sisters, Mrs. Catherine Costantini, Mrs. Mary Cardegna, and Mrs. Jessie Granese.

Private D'Alesandro was inducted into the service on April 7 last year. He received his training at Fort McClellan, Ala., and went overseas last October. He was assigned to the Eightieth Division.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1945.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: I am again referring to my letter of January 9, 1945, concerning your brother, Pvt. John B. D'Alesandro, who made the supreme sacrifice in the service of his country.

A further report containing the circumstances of the death of your brother has just been received and reveals that he was serving as a rifleman in a rifle platoon which made an attack against the enemy in the vicinity of Longeville, France, on November 25, 1944. While actively engaged in this operation, Private D'Alesandro sustained gunshot wounds to the legs and back which, I deeply regret, resulted in his death on the same date. This information has been conveyed to his sister, Mrs. Mary Cardegna, 903 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

Permit me to again extend to you and the other members of your family my deepest sympathy in your bereavement.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT H. DUNLOP,
Brigadier General,
Acting The Adjutant General.

Address by Dr. Nahum Goldmann, Chairman of the Executive Committee, World Jewish Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered by Dr. Nahum Goldmann on January 21, 1945, who is chairman of the executive committee, World Jewish Congress, at the annual convention of American Jewish Congress, New England division, at the Hotel Bradford, Boston:

At the first of three annual world Jewish conferences, in 1932, in Geneva, preliminary to the establishment of the World Jewish Congress, I was asked to analyze the world scene. Since that time, it has been my privilege, year in and year out, to repeat this analysis in the various international Jewish conferences which took place between then and the outbreak of the war. From the beginning it was a tragic task and it became more tragic as Nazi Germany gained in power and its anti-Jewish policy began to unfold itself in all its ruthlessness and devilish thoroughness. Year after year I had to analyze the Jewish situation—a situation which was going from bad to worse with all the portents of a catastrophe threatening the very existence of large parts of our people. Then came the war and we were separated, one from another, for 5 years.

Today, speaking before the first international Jewish conference since the outbreak of the war, the report I must make is, unfortunately, not merely one of a catastrophe impending—of a disaster which one senses in the air—but of a tragedy which has taken place—a tragedy much more terrible than any of us could ever have imagined. It is, perhaps, too early to discuss this catastrophe in exact figures. Some of the Nazi-occupied countries in Europe are not yet liberated, and who knows what will happen to the remnants of Jews in these countries in the last moments before the final collapse of the Nazi regime. But even from the countries which have been liberated, there is as yet no accurate statistical survey, though all the reports indicate that our worst fears were surpassed by what actually happened. At best countries which had millions of Jews are left with a few hundred thousand; countries of flourishing Jewish communities are left practically Judenrein—a hundred thousand more or less can no longer change the terrible fact, which is beyond doubt, that the vast majority of European Jewry has been massacred.

It is easy to say that Hitler and nazi-ism are responsible for it. But that does not cover the problem. Terms like "moral responsibility" do not apply to men like Hitler and his criminal gangsters. When a mad dog bites you, you don't hold the dog responsible. You destroy it. But you do hold the owner responsible. It would be very easy for the democracies to let us put the whole blame on Hitler and his Nazi gang. This would free the democracies from all obligations, because no one would expect Germany, after its defeat, to be in a position to make restoration for its crimes. The real moral responsibility for the tragedy lies with our whole generation. The entire phenomenon of nazi-ism is the responsibility of the world of today. No law in history or nature had made nazi-ism necessary or inevitable; and with a greater degree of moral courage and sense of solidarity among the nations, the catastrophe of the last decade, culminating in the war, might have been avoided. If there ever was a period in history when the punishment for lack of human solidarity and moral callousness was visited on the generation responsible for it, it is this generation. Millions of lives have been destroyed because governments and peoples were indifferent to the menace of nazi-ism and each one thought it might escape by letting the other suffer.

And what is true in general is doubly true for us. Nazi-ism did not start its anti-Jewish policy by killing Jews; it took even Hitler and his gang years of preparation to go from anti-Semitic propaganda and the Nuremberg laws to the death chambers of Maidlonik and Treblinka. Nor can the democracies say they were not warned. Since 1933 some of us assembled in this hall have again and again warned the leaders of the great democracies and pleaded with them either to stop Hitler's persecution of the Jews or at least to enable them to get out while there was yet time. Most of them regarded our warnings as exaggerations of panic-stricken Jews. When we asked them to intervene with Germany, the reply was that anti-Jewish policies are the internal affair of a country whose sovereignty forbids other countries to intervene. When we asked for the opening of the doors of other countries, especially Palestine, the reply was that immigration policies are the internal affairs of a sovereign state. And England's appeasement policy toward the Arabs led the English to shut the doors of Palestine at a time when their opening was more essential than ever before. Even during the war, when the news of the extermination began to reach us, doubted at first by the governments but later confirmed by their representatives, and we asked for bold policies to save hundreds of thousands of Jews, the reply was routine methods, red tape, and the rejection of measures proposed by us and other Jewish organizations.

Speech of Fred Bennett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Fred Bennett, president of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders Association, at that organization's annual dinner held at the Roosevelt Hotel, Tuesday, January 9.

I deem the address of such importance that I am inserting it in the RECORD with the hope that it will be read by all who are interested in foreign trade and its important place in the post-war world. The speech is as follows:

We welcome to this, our twenty-seventh annual dinner, our distinguished guests and all of our other friends in the steamship, railroad, insurance, bank, and allied industries. This dinner marks an end to another year but, each year's end is also a year's beginning.

You can reflect with a sense of satisfaction on the part you have played this last year in helping to bring about a substantial change in the war situation from what it was at the end of 1943. As a railroad man or a steamship operator, or in one of the other industries here represented, you were an effective force in the prosecution of the war. You have worked side by side in this global struggle with other representatives of our industries, who are stationed all over the world in the various theaters of action.

We hope that before another annual dinner the war in Europe will have been ended but, until we can see the end clearly in view, we must place before any other interest whatever our job, to insure victory at the earliest moment.

But, in the midst of hostilities, and to the extent that we can do so without interruption to our efforts toward victory—we should give a thought to the fact that our industries must play an important part in the establishment and maintenance of peace. The services here represented are an important link between our people and those of other lands. We are, in a sense, the vanguard in the approach to understanding with other nations.

The banks, insurance companies, the merchant marine, the foreign freight forwarders are necessary to a successful foreign-trade transaction. These services are as important to the future place of a product in the markets of the world as quality and price. The exporter is tragically shortsighted who, through his terms of sale and payment, relinquishes his interest in the selection of the services which handle his goods for shipment abroad.

On our part, we must make it a matter of pride to our foreign-trade merchants that there are no better services in the world. I believe this to be true, but, on the other hand, I remain in doubt that the available facilities have been organized as well as has been done in other countries. The tendency exists in the United States to emphasize individual units without regard to the over-all effect; this is a policy which may have its advantages in domestic trade but which has a definite disadvantage in the field of international trade. You cannot properly treat an international transaction without regard to the fact that all parts are of an integrated whole.

The key to peace is foreign trade and it is only as an integrated whole that we can translate principles and policies into practicalities and open the door to world peace. We can make more progress in this direction than we have done heretofore. We are all-out for a world's record of peace and understanding, for progress and prosperity. We cannot ignore our place in the future nor can we evade our responsibilities to work in close harmony with each other toward this end.

And so we can say on this occasion, "This much has happened up to now; this much has been done and this remains to do."

Farm Labor Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial on farm labor recently printed in the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal-Tribune:

FARM LABOR THREATENED

War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes and War Food Administrator Marvin Jones do not see eye to eye on a question relating to manpower requirements for the armed services on one hand and the labor demand for farm production on the other. Unless a wise decision is reached in settling this controversy between the two highly placed officials, great harm may come to us as a Nation and people. And at the moment it looks as if Mr. Jones, in protesting against further raids on farm labor, is on the right track, and that Mr. Byrnes, if permitted, might go too far for the good of the country.

A new crop season is ahead. Farmers are making their plans the year around for production. They must know months ahead of the actual work what will be available to them in both equipment and labor. Farmers also must make plans, and they cannot do it intelligently unless they know what the situation is to be months hence.

Mr. Jones has let the farmers know what is expected of them in 1945. He has told them, as has the Department of Agriculture, that another banner crop will be needed. He has urged them to produce again this year as they did in 1944, that foodstuffs in great quantities are needed. For it is to be a longer conflict than was believed a few months ago. Therefore the call to the farmers to produce again as much as is humanly possible.

Some 1,600,000 men of military draft age have been deferred as farm workers. Mr. Byrnes has reported to the White House and to Congress that it may be necessary to reconsider the standards governing the deferment of agricultural workers, so additional manpower for the armed services may be had. Mr. Jones is opposing this. He wants agriculture to have all the labor now available, for he knows the production desired would be difficult, if not impossible, if farm workers in large numbers had to don uniforms.

According to Government figures agriculture right now has the smallest number of farm workers in 34 years. Yet the call from the Government to the farmers is for them to maintain production at 1944 figures, which constituted a record, to meet military and civilian requirements and the need for certain fibers that go into war production.

The deferred agricultural workers represent about 18 percent of the total number of farm operators and hired men on the farms as of December 1 last. These workers are considered, as one Government official put it, "the backbone of the farm labor supply." The other 82 percent is declared to be made up largely of landowners, women, children, and older men. The quality of the farm work is said to have decreased year by year for the simple reason that older men, women, and children of tender years are unable to do as much as workers of military age.

The farm people of the country have done a grand piece of work in responding to the call for greater crop yields. But they cannot keep it up year by year unless they are given the help they need. If any raids are made on the deferred farm workers for the military services and the Government fails to provide replacements, decreased production of foodstuffs will demonstrate the seriousness of the error in judgment made.

Once again let it be said that if Federal officials only looked into another barrel that has plenty of manpower that could be made available for war production or the armed services, they could leave the farm labor supply undisturbed. That barrel is quite close at hand for Federal officials. It is the one in Washington, and it holds hundreds of thousands of Government employees who could be spared from Uncle Sam's pay roll. Why don't the Federal officials take some of these workers out of the way of others so those remaining can perform their tasks to better advantage and in order that manpower requirements can be filled? The suggestion is directly made to Mr. Byrnes, himself.

Gov. Ben W. Hooper, of Tennessee, Champion of Honest Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, for many years election frauds have hung like a pall over many counties in east Tennessee. The good citizens of McMinn and Polk Counties have been disfranchised for the past 10 years. The Biggs machine of Polk County and its Cantrell satellite of McMinn County in these two counties have substituted the rule of the pistol and blackjack for the ballot. Through their control of the State criminal court and the favors of the Federal judge having jurisdiction of election offenses in these counties they have openly and flagrantly defied the laws, both State and Federal, protecting the right of suffrage.

These outrages, like a creeping paralysis, have extended to other sections of the State.

They invaded Cocke County. There they were met and stopped in their tracks by former Gov. Ben W. Hooper. Governor Hooper has rendered great service to his State as legislator, soldier, prosecuting Federal attorney, Governor, judge, and as a lawyer, churchman, and civic leader. As chairman of a committee of 500 citizens he has smitten the election thieves of his county, hip and thigh, and restored honest elections in his county.

I deeply appreciate the following note from him:

JANUARY 17, 1945.

They've been trying to "McMinn and Polk" us up here in the mountains. But the folks got riled, riz up, rared back, and raised a ruction. Your good example has been worth a lot to us. You have rendered a great public and party service.

BEN W. HOOPER.

And his report as chairman of the committee of 500 citizens is so full of vital truth and exalted Americanism, I give it to good citizens everywhere as a call to arms in support of the right of the citizen to cast his vote and have it counted as case:

To the Committee of Five Hundred:

This communication is in the nature of a report made by your chairman in compliance with the requirements of your committee. It is obvious that an organization of such large membership cannot often be called together, but, at a convenient and suitable time, there should be another general meeting.

Since your organization was perfected, considerable progress has been made in cleaning up Cocke County elections. This has been accomplished by a quiet, determined effort upon the part of private citizens.

Our officials, as a rule, have not yet realized that a large element of the best citizenship in both parties would rather have their chicken roosts robbed than their ballot boxes. A man can be a citizen without a chicken or a dollar, but not without a ballot. And the man who steals your vote commits a far greater crime against you and the State than the man who picks your pocket.

THINGS ACCOMPLISHED

Among the things accomplished so far in behalf of honest elections in our country are the following:

1. The licensed sale of liquor, which had been forced upon the people of Cocke County by wholesale frauds of unprecedented flagrancy, was overwhelmingly revoked at the ballot box, but it required litigation and strenuous exertion upon the part of citizens, first, to get an election held and, second, to protect and preserve the rights of the majority at the ballot box.

The ministers of Cocke County and many other earnest men and women, who are not customarily active in elections, gave competent leadership in this fight. The same intelligent aggressiveness would have easily prevented the original local-option-election steal, for it was crude, open, and easily provable.

2. An ouster suit was brought in the chancery court against a county election commissioner by 39 citizens. The commissioner filed in the court on the morning of the trial his accepted resignation, which ended the suit.

3. A stolen election in the town of Newport was set aside—an election in which 100 illegal ballots were stuffed into the ballot box and 100 names forged on the scrolls at the Memorial precinct. If this fraud had been allowed to stand, the city recorder would have been named by a few election crooks, rather than by the people, as the law commands.

This was an instance of Democrats robbing one Democrat for the benefit of another, demonstrating that election thieves are not respecters of person or party.

4. An election of two justices of the peace in the first district was set aside for gross frauds and illegalities of the sort so frequently and notoriously practiced in that district for many years. Hugh Huff Burnett and Haze Moore and the people of that district deserve great credit for refusing to submit to this outrage.

5. A Republican primary for county offices was held last April which broke all records for fairness and freedom from fraud. It was, perhaps, the first time in the history of our county when election officers were appointed for the sole purpose of holding a fair election rather than promoting the interests of some candidate. But the candidates and voters cooperated in a fine way when they saw that a genuine effort was being made to hold a perfectly fair primary; and there was not a complaint or criticism when it was over.

Some Republican primaries in this county have been filled with fraud, but, at that, none of them have ever reached the point of simply padding and "writing up" the returns, as has become the fixed practice of the so-called Democratic organization in this county. Democratic primaries in Cocke County, as a rule, are travesties on democracy, and so far, there is no real effort in prospect for their reformation.

Illegalities and frauds in Republican or Democratic primaries pave the way for similar practices in regular elections.

6. The recent November election was finally held with reasonable fairness and legality, although extensive plans had been made to steal it. This scheme was blocked by the watchfulness and activity of many citizens over the county. The preceding November election of 1942 was one of the most shameless steals that ever disgraced a Tennessee county. One glaring example was the voting of sixty-odd so-called absentee ballots in the Edgemont precinct, every one of which was fraudulent and most of the frauds committed against men in the armed services of their country.

RECENT FRAUDS

But, notwithstanding some of the successful efforts that have been made to protect the ballots of the people, quite a number of illegalities have recently been perpetrated, which, although they may appear to be simple happen-so's, are far-reaching threats to the integrity of our elections.

For example, in the local option election a year ago the returns from Padgett's and Briar Thicket precincts were smuggled and suppressed and never canvassed and counted. No election supplies ever reached the Read Hill precinct, and, consequently, no election was held there. Thus, three entire precincts were totally disfranchised. In the same election, Bogard and Edgemont precincts experienced inexcusable difficulty and delay in obtaining election supplies. It just happened, of course, that all five of these precincts were voting heavily against licensed liquor.

In the last August election some 40 or 50 voters were disfranchised in the Grassy Fork precinct because of a lack of ballots.

In the recent November election the postal cards notifying Republican election officers of their appointment did not go out until Monday morning, November 6, the day before the election, although the law requires that the notices be given 10 days before the election. Some of the appointees received their notices after the election was over and one never did receive his.

The mailing of these postal cards might have been delayed still further if attention had not been called to the fact that they had not been mailed at a public meeting in the courthouse Saturday afternoon, November 4.

The failure of an appointee to receive his postal-card notice furnishes an excuse to prevent him from serving, and thus affords the opportunity to deprive Republicans even of the meager minority representation given them by the law.

In this election there was also much difficulty and delay in getting election supplies in the Long Creek precinct.

Such illegalities can easily change the result and thwart the will of the majority.

Another practice that has come into vogue in the last year or so is the failure of the election commissioners to file in the county court clerk's office one set of the original returns from each precinct in a November election and copies of both sets of returns in any other election. A failure to comply with this law denies the public the right to see these returns and is a direct aid to the concealment of fraud and the suppression of evidence, either in a civil suit or a criminal prosecution.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The work that accomplished the favorable results mentioned in the first part of this report has been hard and burdensome on a comparatively small number of men, but its value to the people of Cocke County has been great. Personally, as your chairman, I have given more time, strength, and money to this cause of maintaining the right of our citizens to vote than a man of my feeble health, advanced years, and limited means should have given, but I do not regret it. I do, however, mean to call upon the members of this committee of 500, and all other good citizens to cooperate in the future even more fully and actively in this work of freeing our country from election thievery and the threat of disfranchisement. This is a condition that never confronted our country before in all its history of practically a century and a half.

As to myself, I regret that I shall not be able hereafter to devote to this vital public cause quite the time and attention I have heretofore. But my interest will be undiminished, and that interest is not personal nor partisan. I have reached an age where I entertain no political ambitions and am not actuated in connection with these matters by personal animosity or political prejudice. I do not want to see any man of any party unlawfully deprived of his right to vote, and I revolt at the thought that our State or any of its counties shall ever be dominated by the perpetrators and beneficiaries of stealage and fraud, committed against the political and civil rights of free men and women, who, must bear their fair share of the burdens of their country in peace and in war.

This problem is worthy of the anxious thought and the active exertions of all patriotic citizens. The right of suffrage lies at the foundation of free government. When that right is threatened, there immediately arises the greatest and most fundamental of all political issues, transcending all partisan considerations.

This work must not lag in our country. While this same problem exists in certain other sections of our State, we are most directly responsible for conditions in our own county.

Our people must carry on with vigilance and vigor or they will lose the ground they have gained. The returns of the election of November 1942 were so completely falsified that they bore not the slightest resemblance to the vote actually cast by our people, but, in the recent November election, the returns measurably, but not perfectly, reflected the voice of the voters. In the one instance, the electorate utterly failed to avail itself of such protection as the law affords; but, in the latter case, it asserted its rights under the law. Hereafter, whether you are sovereign citizens or political eunuchs will depend entirely upon whether or not you insist upon your constitutional rights.

While American boys are laying down their lives on all the battle fronts of the world for the preservation of human freedom, surely those of us at home will not permit the destruction of free government by the desecration of the ballot box and the disfranchisement of voters by force and fraud.

If this Republic of ours should ever perish it will not be at the hands of outside foes, but from conditions of internal disease that have rotted its heart and vitals—the sacred right of free, untrammelled, unobstructed, and undenied suffrage, the right to name at the ballot box the men who make, who interpret, and who execute our laws.

BEN W. HOOPER,
Chairman Committee of Five Hundred.

P. S.—This report should be preserved, as it contains information of permanent value.

Mr. Speaker, in due season, I shall place before this House the outrages perpetrated against the sancity of the ballot box and the citizen's right to vote in McMinn County and in Polk County, Tenn., in the November 1944 election, and what, if anything, has been done about it by those whose sworn and paid duty it is to enforce the laws of this Nation.

Work or Fight and the Tydings Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, at a congressional committee hearing on January 16, 1945, General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, stated:

If anybody in Idaho or anywhere else is telling the draft boards to disregard the Tydings amendment, they are not speaking for the Director of Selective Service.

The Tydings amendment provides:

Every registrant found by a selective service board, subject to appeal, to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

Despite the above, my office is being deluged with letters of which the following is a fair sample:

BOISE, IDAHO, *January 19, 1945.*
Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On December 27, 1944, our son was taken to the Army.

Glenn was born at Donnelly on the ranch in May 1921, age 23 now, and has been on the ranch all these years.

We do a great deal of farming by ourselves and has been up to Glenn to run and service the three tractors and three combines and other machinery.

Last year we harvested 12,000 bushels of grain and 48,000 pounds of clover seed, fed a carload of beef, pastured 400 head cattle, and irrigated 600 acres. We operate 1,320 acres in all.

By taking Glenn this leaves me alone to do this farming and I am not able to carry the load.

I appealed to the State board for reclassification, but the assistant in the selective service board said they were not interested in the hardships of the farmers, that they were out to get an Army. He said it was up to the employment office to get help for the farmers. I have asked them for help, but they say they do not have anything along that line.

The President calls for a work-or-fight program, and if doing all this farming isn't work then please tell us what work is.

We had a recommendation from the county war board that Glenn be deferred and a letter from the employment office stating they could not replace him, and a letter from a doctor saying I could not do that heavy work, but they ignored all this.

According to the Tydings Act he is still in the agricultural deferment class, and it seems to me someone has overstepped his authority in taking him.

Please advise us as to what steps can be taken to get him back on the farm.

Would surely appreciate an early reply.

Very truly yours,

FLOYD LOOMIS.

Union Rating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has long been a widespread opinion, not only among people generally but among employees as well as employers, that the N. L. R. B. has been the organizing and the coercing agent of the C. I. O.

The hearings of the House special committee investigating the N. L. R. B. headed by HOWARD SMITH, disclosed that all too often the charges of the A. F. of L. that the N. L. R. B. in days gone by was not impartial; that it favored the C. I. O., were true.

Perhaps the tieup has not of late been apparent to the same extent but that the opinion still exists is evidenced by a letter received today and which reads as follows:

INTERNATIONAL MOLDERS' AND
FOUNDRY WORKERS' UNION OF
NORTH AMERICA,
Kalamazoo, Mich., January 15, 1945.

No doubt by this time you have read the article printed by the International Teamsters Union on the C. I. O. dominated National Labor Relations Board.

It is indeed with regret that in order for this organization to survive that any Federal agency must favor it in all instances, especially where they have no organization and with the aid of the N. L. R. B. they place themselves in the position of disputing other organizations that have successfully dealt with various companies for years.

With the C. I. O. completely governing the N. L. R. B., a major part of the N. L. R. B. and the P. A. C. claiming full responsibility for the return of the present administration and a number of the Congressmen and Senators, it seems, at times, somewhat useless to attempt the continuation of the necessary flow of production to our boys in the armed forces.

All of us have close relatives in this conflict, and I am of the opinion that the greater number of the working class desire to see that plenty of materials are delivered in order to bring them back home safely in the shortest possible time. But due to the N. L. R. B. controlled by the C. I. O., they are only forced to go out and get 20 percent of the employees' signatures on their authorization cards and the N. L. R. B. will make an investigation as to the possibilities of having an election. During the time the Regional War Labor Board, the O. P. A. and the Economic Wage Stabilization Director, which usually takes from 4 to 12 months, the C. I. O. attempts to enter into the picture, telling the employees how much control they have on the various boards and if they will become interested in their organization they will get the dispute settled, thereby creating a feeling that tends to disrupt production and making a great number of dissatisfied workers.

I think all of us realize that foundries are the most critical of all industries, and with the wages paid in this industry we have enough trouble continuing their operation under normal conditions without the C. I. O. being assisted with the N. L. R. B.

A hearing was conducted in Kalamazoo last week, between our organization, the C. I. O., and a representative of the N. L. R. B., regarding a plant that we have had under contract for 43 years, but due to their desire to assist the war effort they converted over to another line of work and are doing a wonderful job, but the C. I. O. is attempting to wreck this membership when they realize that this company is paying the highest wages in the city with the best of working conditions, in fact they can get absolutely nothing for the employees, but are spreading their false propaganda of what can be done.

Tomorrow the N. L. R. B. is going to make another investigation on one of our plants, as the C. I. O. has petitioned for investigation, where we have a contract that covers six foundries jointly and, with the exception of one clause has been extended for another year. Here is a case where it took the W. L. B. just 1 year, lacking 13 days, to finally give a decision and this decision would not have been given at this time if the union had not made concessions to company in order to get the matter over with. We do not know how many authorization cards the C. I. O. has produced to get this investigation, but we do know that it happened some months ago when the employees were dissatisfied on the slowness of the W. L. B., as our committee contacted each employee this last week and got 141 signed cards out of a possible 155 employees, reaffirming their desire to continue with our organization, yet if there is any possible way, the N. L. R. B. will attempt to force an election.

We are not seriously worried about what is happening here, as a former employee of our union was more or less forced to resign from his position due to a difference in his accounts, and then joins with the C. I. O. and regardless of his past record is welcomed with open arms, but we do hope that some action can and will be taken so that we at least can go into any hearing and present our case and realize that we are going to get by on our merits, as we want nothing that we are not justly entitled to.

We are proud of our organization; we have been in existence since 1859; each and every one of our officers or representatives have been actually employed at the trade in the foundry, as we like to understand the problems of our members and be able to speak their language. We pay strike, sick, and death benefits and have one initiation fee throughout the United States and Canada, which is $3 and $5 and weekly dues of 35 and 75 cents, according to the benefits desired. It makes no difference where you join or work, the amount is the same, set by our constitution.

I hope that you will read the report on the N. L. R. B. as carried in their journal, as it is very explanatory and hits the nail on the head.

Something must be done to curb any Federal agency taking part in any organization, especially where a case is supposed to be decided on its merits.

I have been informed that in one city the N. L. R. B. has become affiliated with the C. I. O. and are members, and I hope to get more information on this report, as to me it seems like the end of our democracy if anything like this can happen.

Thanking you for your patience in the reading of this and hoping that Congress takes some action to see that our agencies represent all the people and not part of the people, even if it be A. F. L.

Very truly yours,

JOHN P. WARNER,
District Representative.

Mr. Speaker, special favors should not be granted by the administration to any special group.

Labor's Interest in Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware, I think, of the seriousness of the forest situation in the United States. This was well brought out in the report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry in March 1941. Since that time, I am informed, this adverse situation has been made even more serious, partly as an unavoidable result of the war. According to the United States Forest Service, the total volume of standing saw timber in this country was reduced almost 40 percent in the 30 years ending with 1938, while today our remaining saw-timber supply is being cut or destroyed twice as fast as it is growing. Personally, I have long been convinced that public action, such as is advocated by the Federal Forestry Service, is necessary if this trend is to be reversed and the forest resource again be built up to the point where it can contribute its full share to the economic and social welfare of our people. However, it is heartening to me—and I feel will be to many

of us—to know that labor organizations are taking an increasing interest in the forest situation. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Richard T. Frankensteen, vice president of the United Automobile Workers, before the Washington section of the Society of American Foresters:

LABOR'S INTEREST IN FORESTRY

(By Richard T. Frankensteen)

It is a real pleasure to be here with you this evening. The president of our organization, R. J. Thomas, was scheduled to give this talk but has instead gone to other battle fronts—to tour England and France with a group of labor leaders.

I say other battle fronts in jest, but with more than a grain of seriousness. For reasons too complicated to discuss tonight the average technician, and I am afraid the average forester, has viewed labor unions and labor leaders with a dubious if not hostile eye. I am not going to abuse your hospitality by giving you an organizing speech. I do hope to show you, however, that there need be no hostility between us; that we have interests in common and that we can help each other.

A COMMON PHILOSOPHY

The chief foresters of the United States, from Pinchot to Watts, seem to have had as their basic aim the greatest good for the greatest number. As foresters they have added to this sound democratic philosophy something which a lot of us have overlooked, namely, the greatest good for the longest period of time.

The labor movement, and especially the organization I represent, has been guided by this same philosophy. An objective study of organized labor's role in American history will bear out this statement. Labor's fight against slavery, against intolerance, against monopoly, against child labor; and labor's fight for free schools, for the opening of the West, for decent wage levels, for protection of women in industry, yes, and its fight for conservation, all demonstrate that there is a basic harmony of interests between you and labor.

To get a little more concrete, I should like to cite a community where our people are now working. At Iron Mountain, Mich., there is a Ford plant which is engaged now in the manufacture of gliders. Before the war this plant produced bodies for station wagons. They use plywood, made out of maple and birch. You people know that there is serious danger of depletion of the timber resources in that community. I am told that the timber is again being mined, with no thought to the future, as it was mined in the pine forests of Michigan 40 and 50 years ago.

You know what happened then to the communities which had developed around the forest industries. You know what happened to labor, to business, and to the general public. You know better than anyone else that Iron Mountain faces the same prospect unless a permanent, sustained-yield program is developed for the utilization of its timber resources.

Neither you nor I want to see Iron Mountain collapse as did hundreds of other towns in Michigan two generations ago.

PERMANENT FOREST INDUSTRIES ESSENTIAL

I do not know the answer to the Iron Mountain problem. But it seems to us that the public interest, the general welfare if you will, demands that the timber owners and operators conform to cutting practices which would maintain the timber. And if the owners cannot or refuse to conserve—if they are not conservatives—then we feel the Government should step in. We have no program for Government intervention. You people have developed and must develop more of the answers. The Iron Mountain case is more typical than exceptional. As director of the legislative department of our union, I have noticed with satisfaction the recent passage of the Sustained Yield Unit Act which takes an important step toward making forestry a permanent industry through the pooling of Government and private timber.

We believe the type of program recommended by the Joint Forestry Committee of Congress is needed for the same reason. And while I am on the subject of the Joint Forestry Committee, I should like to call your attention to the significant evidence introduced in their hearings to prove that the future of the Nation's forest resources is inextricably bound up with labor conditions in the woods. You will find evidence that the worst cutting practices occur precisely where the labor conditions are the worst. This is no mere coincidence. The fly-by-night operator is no more concerned about his labor than he is about his timber or his community.

The Joint Forestry Committee went beyond the easy step of fixing the blame for these condition on the peckerwood mills. The striking part of their findings, which have been confirmed by United States Labor Department inspectors, is that these conditions are the direct results of procurement and production policies of some larger operators. You people know this to be true—not only in the lumber industry, but in other forest industries such as pulpwood, chemical wood, etc., where the real employers evade their responsibilities for labor conditions and for cutting practices by the use of the independent-contractor device. The operations of such firms as Crossett in Arkansas show what can be done. They pay a fairly decent wage (helped by the presence of the union), and they accept their responsibility for labor conditions in the woods. And they cut their timber on a sustained yield basis.

I cannot speak for the lumber and logging workers. But I feel safe in saying that they are willing to accept part of the responsibility of helping to maintain a permanent forest industry. They and labor generally gladly cooperate as taxpayers in the maintenance of the Forest Products Laboratory for the development of the industry. They support with real interest the United States Forest Service and the various State forest services in their work.

LABOR'S CONTRIBUTION TO A MORE STABLE FOREST ECONOMY

We in the Auto Workers, of course, have very little direct contact with the forest industries. Even though you may somtimes feel that your car is made with wooden springs, ours is a metal industry. But as America's largest union we have a responsibility for helping to maintain a stable economy. We have a responsibility for helping to maintain our natural resources. We would welcome your suggestions as to how we could help more directly.

Meanwhile it occurs to me that we are helping indirectly to establish a permanent American forest industry by the following:

1. First and foremost, we are doing everything we can to help win the war and win it soon, which is the basic condition for the survival of all American industry.

2. We, along with the rest of the C. I. O., are seeking an annual wage. This would help stabilize the forest industries and all American industry. More specifically, a guaranteed annual wage would provide a vast market for homes—and thereby open the largest single potential outlet for lumber.

3. By our payments of dues to the C. I. O. we are helping to organize the largely unorganized lumber industry. We believe that organization will eliminate sweat shops. The elimination of sweatshop conditions, you will agree, will help stabilize the industry.

4. We are not awaiting the outcome of our fight for an annual wage to press for a decent housing program. Our union is working actively with public and private housing groups to develop a public and private housing program which would meet some of the country's vast needs and provide a steady market for lumber. In this task we seek the advice and guidance of wood technicians such as you have at the Forest Products Laboratory and elsewhere.

5. We actively support the Government's priority, rationing, and price-control programs which limit the sale and prices of lumber as well as other materials. In fact, we have, as industry has, spent many thousands of dollars and assigned some of our best brains for the preservation of these wartime controls. Without these controls, and especially price control, I suspect that destruction of the forests would have been much more serious than it has been during the war.

We are entering into the final period of the war. Now, more than ever, national unity is imperative. Such unity among all classes of people will be just as imperative after the enemy surrenders, if we are to gain a decent peace, prevent future wars, and obtain full employment in America. I hope that the traditional indifference or hostility of professional and technical people toward organized labor will melt during the crucial days ahead. What we seek for our people should not create fears in the hearts of any section of the population, whether it be business, government, the middle class, farmers, or technical men. I repeat that we wish the greatest good for the greatest number, and—with a bow to you—for the longest period of time.

POST-WAR RECONVERSION

The labor organizations are today engaged in a campaign to obtain passage of legislation for an orderly reconversion from war production to civilian production. In backing the Kilgore bill we are not seeking a dole, as the newspapers would have you believe. We approach this problem with certain cold facts in mind.

First, the best estimates place surplus war property at seventy-five to one hundred billion dollars, including plants, equipment, and supplies. It is officially estimated that 20,000,000 jobs will disappear at the end of hostilities. Ten million jobs will be needed for demobilized servicemen. For full production and employment, United States industry must turn out 60 to 70 percent more than in 1939, or approximately the current dollar volume of production.

To meet these gigantic problems, the Kilgore bill would:

1. Establish a single authority to deal with full production and employment problems.

2. Coordinate easing of Federal wartime controls, with full production as an objective.

3. Establish a national production-employment board with industry, labor, farm, and Government representatives.

4. Set up programs for orderly resumption of civilian production, surplus-war-property disposal, and retraining of war workers and veterans.

5. Compensate the unavoidably unemployed, including war veterans.

6. Continually review the effectiveness of these measures.

In a C. I. O. booklet on the post-war outlook, we call the surplus war plants a new form of public domain, as important as the western lands which the Nation owned a century ago. We believe that this vast so-called surplus property should be treated as public domain and not as surplus. The very word surplus suggests that we regard it as something burdensome, as a distant relative thrown into a household, something we want to get rid of at the earliest possible moment, without caring particularly how we get rid of him or it. We believe that labor should have a voice in the disposal of this property;

that the persons buying the property should be required to operate under decent wage standards and working conditions, and above all with some guarantee that they will operate it and not permit it to be idle. We think this program is essential if we are to avoid chaos after the war ends.

FRIENDSHIP AND COOPERATION

I thank you for this opportunity to get acquainted and give you our aims. I am happy to offer you the hand of friendship and cooperation from ours, the largest labor organization in America. I hope we can work together.

The Tydings Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members who are not familiar with the Tydings amendment relating to the deferment of essential agricultural workers, I am including the amendment as a part of my remarks:

TYDINGS AMENDMENT

Section 4 (k), Public Law 772, Seventy-seventh Congress, which amends section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940:

"(k) Every registrant found by a selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work."

I am also including as a part of these remarks, the clarification order issued by General Hershey under date of January 22, 1945, to the State Selective Service directors, which restores congressional intent contained in the Tydings amendment and places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by the Tydings amendment.

GENERAL HERSHEY'S CLARIFICATION DIRECTIVE TO STATE DIRECTORS AND LOCAL DRAFT BOARDS OF JANUARY 22, 1945

Questions of interpretation of State directors advice No. 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

The directive of January 3, 1945, State directors advice No. 288, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State directors advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

Section 5K of the Selective Training and Service Act, known as the Tydings amendment, places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Notify all local boards immediately.

Dated January 22, 1945.

I want to stress the importance of General Hershey's clarification directive, for it restores to local draft boards the exclusive authority, subject to appeal, to determine whether or not a registrant meets the conditions of the Tydings amendment to be qualified as an essential agricultural worker. No letter, directive, or order from the National Director or State director can set aside the exclusive authority of the local boards to apply the tests specified in the Tydings amendment. The only manner by which either the National Director or State director or any other officer of the Government can override the decision of the local board in respect to the application of the Tydings amendment, is for such officer to take an appeal to the appropriate appeal board and to be sustained by such appeal board.

A Bill To Preserve Peace in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House an amended version of H. R. 2034 which I introduced during the seventy-eighth session of Congress. This bill provides for the financing and allocation of exchange-student teachers selected from among the teachers colleges of the American republics. It has the support of several officials in the State Department and of a great many American educators. Its new number is H. R. 1740 and it has been referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to ask for hearings on this legislation before our committee at the earliest available opportunity. While my bill was introduced early in the last session the State Department at that time expressed only a mild interest in the legislation and while seemingly favoring it the Department was inclined to believe that since little could be done about the exchange of students during the war there was no need for pressing for early action. Consequently, the chairman of our committee failed to schedule hearings. Mr. Speaker, I think it is now generally agreed that this is the time to begin laying the plans and preparing the procedures for maintaining increasingly friendly relations with our sister American republics after this war. Surely, there is nothing to be gained by delay on a project which has general approval.

It is my hope that, under its new leadership, our State Department will follow the forward-looking and progressive policy of supporting legislation which looks beyond the war and which can produce immediate dividends of good will whether or not it is possible immediately to put the mechanics of the legislation into operation. I have discussed H. R. 1740 with members of the State Department, and knowing the officials of the Department as I do, I have every confidence that they will join me in this session in support of my proposal to establish exchange scholarships among the American republics.

In his able address of last Sunday, which many of us heard in the Washington Cathedral, Dr. Peter Marshall said in part:

If we want ripples to spread over a pool, they must begin with a minute circle in the middle and spread outward. There is no other way.

Mr. Speaker, that is a splendid text upon which to build an argument for the passage of H. R. 1740. There is no better way to start ripples of friendship and mutual understanding spreading out among the common citizens of the American republics than by beginning with a minute circle of student teachers, who in turn will go into the schools of our republics and convey to boys and girls of school age the information and inspiration which these exchange teachers will thus have acquired. In no other way can we bring knowledge and understanding to so many by making these attributes available to so few.

My bill provides that each year 1,000 students from the recognized teachers colleges of the United States shall be selected for a year's residence and training in similar institutions of the republics of Central and South America. It also provides that a like number of student teachers will be selected from the teacher-training institutions of the republics to the south of us for residence and training in the teachers colleges of the United States. Once this bill is adopted, I expect to supplement it with a legislative proposal which will establish a similar exchange system for student teachers of Canada and the United States.

These student teachers are to be selected during their freshman year, but their year of residence and training away from home will not come until their junior year in college. This is proposed so that the students selected will have their sophomore year in which to study the language of the country they are to visit and to acquire a background of information about the habits and mores of the people with whom they will be associated in college. In turn, they will be back on their home campuses during their senior year so that they can enrich their own student bodies by their experiences in the college of a friendly and neighboring republic.

Mr. Speaker, while many citizens both in and out of the educational profession have expressed an interest in this bill, I am especially indebted to the forward-looking faculty of Indiana State Teachers College, of Terre Haute, Ind., inasmuch as members of this group have worked with me closely in the preparation of this legislation and in bringing it to the attention of other educational centers. I also appreciate the assistance given this project by Mr. Nelson Rockefeller when he was Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and I am sure that it will continue to have his support now that he has received a well-merited promotion to an administrative position in the Department of State.

Finally, I hope that Members of Congress with teachers' colleges in their States or districts will send copies of this legislation to these institutions and that, in turn, educators throughout this country will contact their Representatives in Congress with letters expressing their reactions to this proposal.

It is my sustained conviction, Mr. Speaker, that a few pennies spent in cultivating the garden of peace will prevent the necessity of spending billions of dollars in eradicating future weeds of war. Hence, the annual cost of $3,000,000 proposed by H. R. 1740 is indeed a pittance in terms of the rich dividends of sustained peace and better understanding which it will help provide among the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

Despite Great Wartime Increase in National Debt, American Taxpayer Better Able To Carry His Share of Debt Retirement Load Today Than in Former Years—Increased National Income and Prudent Management of Government's Financial Programs Combine To Make This Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the prophets of gloom and the critics of this administration would have us believe that the great size of our present national debt creates a tax load under which the American taxpayer must eventually stagger and fall into personal and national bankruptcy. A careful analysis of the true facts in the case shows the utter falsity of this assumption. We must keep the debt down as much as possible, but we should continue to use money and machines to save men. We should not, in this war, send a man to do a hazardous job against the enemy when a machine could be sent, regardless of the cost of the machine.

It is true that the Federal debt in 1944 is nearly 10 times its amount in 1920, nearly 13 times its 1928 total, about 7 times its 1936 total, and more than 5 times its 1940 pre-war amount. Without further examination of other pertinent data one might readily jump to the conclusion that the individual taxpayer and wage earner was being subjected to a personal tax load which he could not possibly support. Again I point out that this does not coincide with the true facts.

In 1920, for example, the United States Government was obliged to pay an annual average interest rate of more than 4.3 percent on its bonds and other borrowings. Through the administrations of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, the annual average interest rate paid by the Government declined only slightly from this figure and, in 1928, the year of alleged great prosperity, we were still obliged to pay more than 3.9 percent for our Federal obligation interest rate.

FIFTY PERCENT REDUCTION IN INTEREST

During the administrations of the present incumbent in the White House, under the able management of Mr. Henry Morgenthau, this interest rate has been steadily reduced until today we can look back and see that we only paid an average annual interest rate of 1.919 percent on all Federal borrowings outstanding during 1944. This reduction of more than 50 percent in the Government's cost of money hire is one of the great offsetting factors to the fears of the prophets of gloom and is a tribute to the prudence and foresight of a great Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau. It is an obvious fact that the amount of the interest charge is the greatest single factor in determining the total amount of the annual over-all debt service charge. With low interest rates at the Government's command, more of the principal can be retired each year and the burden upon the individual taxpayer is proportionately lessened thereby. Full production and full employment will keep our national income up which will make our large national debt easier to pay.

In 1920, the Government paid out $1,032,000,000 in interest charges on the public debt. In 1944, with the debt nearly 10 times greater, but with greatly reduced interest rates, the Government paid out only $3,002,000,000 for interest.

BURDEN LIGHTER ON TAXPAYERS IN 1944 THAN IN 1932

In 1920, the national income per capita was $656. In 1932, under the Hoover administration, the per capita national income was only $320. In 1944, this figure rose to a per capita income of $1,132. How much easier it is for the average wage earner and taxpayer to carry his pro rata share of the national debt burden under these circumstances is obvious to all. It is easier for a wage earner who receives $1,132 a year to pay 1.91 percent of it or $21.62 as his part of the annual interest on the national debt than it was for a $320-a-year wage earner in 1932 to pay 1.59 percent or $5.08 as his share of the interest on the national debt for that year.

This increase in the Federal debt has been matched by the increase in savings of consumers, business, State, and local governments and the debt is a safe place in which consumers have invested their savings. These savings will obviously increase the demand for goods after the war, thus increasing the production of civilian and other goods and concurrently helping us to maintain the present high level of national per capita income so essential to the easy liquidation of the public debt and for other purposes. I am not advocating a huge debt, I am showing it is not as bad as some believe. Personally I favor paying more of the debt than we are paying during this war.

As Mr. James H. McGraw, Jr., president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., and a noted writer on business subjects from the viewpoint of the businessman, writes "A huge debt may so draw out the hidden powers of a people that it makes the Nation wealthier rather than poorer, stronger rather than weaker."

Of course, as the President points out in his Budget message, the manner in which the public debt is retired is the essence of this matter. As he so clearly states it, I quote as follows:

> The management of the public debt is bound to have a profound influence on the economy for a long time to come. Retaining high taxes on the masses of the consumers for general reduction of debt held by financial institutions may destroy purchasing power and create unemployment. But the use of progressive taxes for the redemption of bonds held by millions of individual savers may have a stabilizing influence on incomes and employment. I favor a policy of orderly but steady debt reduction, consistent with the objectives of long-run economic policy. The mistakes in debt management and tax policy after the last war should not be repeated.

In his long-range view the President is supported by a well-known business expert on taxation and debt retirement, Mr. Beardsley Ruml. A few months ago Mr. Ruml, who is generally credited with reflecting the taxation views of large business interests, had the following confirmatory statement to make:

> The retirement of the debt and its liquidation should in every case be consistent with the maintenance of a high level of employment and production. If we keep that as our cardinal feature, we will have no problem with respect to the management of the debt, except technical problems I am sure can be overcome.

Thus I say, as has been better said before me, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," and I trust that taxpayers, one and all, will examine all of the facts before accepting at face the doctrine of the prophets of gloom who would have us believe that the great wartime debt of today is a crushing load and cannot be borne by the American taxpayer.

In conclusion, I submit pertinent statistics in support of my personal optimistic view of this situation. These statistics are computed from information contained in the various publications of the Treasury Department and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and may be easily checked by those who desire to verify them. The figures are as follows:

Population, national debt, national income, and interest on the debt for selected dates, 1920–44

Year	Population	National debt at end of the year		Interest paid		Average interest rates at end of year	National income		Interest on national debt as percent of national income
		Millions of dollars	Per capita	Millions of dollars	Per capita		Millions of dollars	Per capita	
1944	138,710,000	230,630	$1,662.68	3,002	$21.64	1.919	157,000	$1,132	1.910
1940	131,970,224	45,630	341.21	1,078	8.17	2.566	77,574	588	1.390
1936	128,053,180	34,407	268.69	795	6.20	2.570	64,924	507	1.224
1932	124,840,471	20,806	166.66	638	5.11	3.407	39,964	320	1.596
1928	120,501,115	17,310	143.65	708	5.87	3.903	88,200	666	.882
1924	114,113,463	20,979	183.84	917	8.04	4.134	70,100	614	1.309
1920	106,466,420	23,982	227.39	1,032	9.69	4.311	69,800	656	1.478

President Again in Error

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in his inaugural address, the President referred to those Americans who wished to avoid war, who are not enamored of the New Deal, as "ostriches" and "dogs in the manger.

As usual, he assumed that he and those who agree with him are the possessors of all knowledge and foresight; are the only truly good, kindly people in the world. That assumption is a characteristic of those who are intolerant, egotistical and self-satisfied.

Many of us who would be classed by the President as "ostriches" thought we knew very well what was coming. Some of us believed we saw, as the result of the President's foreign policy, inevitable war. Many of us believed then, as we believe today, that, America never having tried a policy of isolationism, might well do so when this war is over, instead of following a course which has already involved us in three wars; seems certain to keep American youth indefinitely policing Europe, fighting to maintain first one nation, then another in a position of power.

Many of us are quite certain, and we have Churchill's statement that we are the most powerful nation in the world to strengthen our belief, that no nation or combination of nations can successfully invade the United States of America.

As for the statement of the President that some would act as "dogs in the manger," it is matter of common knowledge that the United States has always been first to extend aid to every nation which suffered either from earthquake, fire, famine, or war.

This is the land—and the only land—to which the oppressed peoples and the oppressed nations turn for and get unselfish aid in their days of adversity.

The thought is so well expressed in an editorial from yesterday's Chicago Tribune that it is printed herewith:

WHAT OSTRICH AND WHAT DOG IN THE MANGER?

"We have learned," said Mr. Roosevelt in his fourth inaugural address, "that we must live as men, not as ostriches nor as dogs in the manger."

We'll take these one at a time, and ostriches first. Mr. Roosevelt's simile was intended to say that those who opposed his foreign policy were so misguided as to pretend, in the presence of overwhelming danger to their country, that there was no danger.

But, in fact, were they so misguided? They said there was relatively little reason to fear an invasion of this continent, even by a victorious Hitler, and events seem to have borne them out. It hadn't been proved in 1940, though it seemed probable, that our Navy and our Air Force could prevent an invasion. We know it now. We know now, with as great certainty as anything can be known, that our safety is in nowise dependent upon the support of the British Fleet. In other words, neither Germany nor Japan, nor Germany and Japan in combination, presented a threat of invasion to us that was so grave as to require a preventive war.

Moreover, we know now, as the opposition suspected at the time, that Hitler could have sat on the occupied countries for a generation without crushing their will to independence. That being so, he would have risked everything he held in Europe if he had undertaken an attack on America, for the moment he turned on us all Europe would have risen against him.

Mr. Roosevelt says that before Pearl Harbor, while the great debate over foreign policy was still in progress, his opponents had their heads in the sand. But it was Mr. Roosevelt who said, again and again, that his policy would never lead this country to war. And it was the opposition who reminded the country that war meant huge casualty lists and a debt of hundreds of billions. Who was looking facts in the face then, and whose head was in the sand?

And, for that matter, whose head is in the sand today? Those of the opposition who, seeing what is happening in Poland, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Italy, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia say that another unstable peace is in the making? Or Mr. Roosevelt, who refuses to face these realities and pretends that the next peace is going to be inherently durable?

Mr. Roosevelt says, also, the members of the opposition were dogs in the manger; that is, they selfishly sought to deprive the rest of the world of the peace and plenty enjoyed by the American people.

There was one moment in this generation when the American Government unquestionably acted the part of a dog in the manger. It was in the spring of 1933, when Mr. Roosevelt broke up the London economic conference because he didn't want to sign an agreement that might restrict American currency manipulations. He thought he saw in his policy an advantage to be gained for the United States at the expense of all other nations. Mr. Hull was horrified, as he had every right to be. The best change to avert the present war, as we can now see, was lost by Mr. Roosevelt's short-sighted selfishness.

Foreign nations accuse our Government of selfishness in its tariff policy, but that surely cannot be charged to Mr. Roosevelt's opposition. He and his party have been in power for a dozen years. If there's anything wrong with the tariff it's their fault.

Were we dogs in the manger when we stayed out of the League? After 1920, Mr. Roosevelt didn't raise his voice on behalf of the League, and neither did his party.

As might have been expected, the British press rejoiced at Mr. Roosevelt's reference to the dog in the manger. Well, who has been playing dog in the manger lately in Greece and Italy? Who has played dog in the manger in Africa, India, Burma, Hong Kong, and a great many other places, and who, as the King's first minister, intends to keep on doing so? Perhaps the Russians, likewise, were rejoiced; if so, their attention is invited to what they are doing to eastern Europe.

It might be well if those who have never been shot at in any way—although some of them have had an opportunity to take an active personal part in four wars—would do a little of the fighting, less of the talking which leads to war.

How American Will the Un-American Activities Committee Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System Tuesday, January 23, 1945:

Last week, over this station, Representative RANKIN looked upon his work in resurrecting the Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, and found it good. I cannot match his enthusiasm for the past accomplishment of the Dies committee. It did not, as far as I can see, trail any clouds of glory.

The Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities is now a standing investigatory committee with power to initiate legislation.

I mean this to be a direct talk. The vaudevillian antics, the brass band tactics, the star chamber proceedings of the Dies committee have put all of us on notice. Bluntly then, the present committee can make its choice. It can either adopt the Dies course of unfounded character assassinations, lynch-law, prosecutor-jury and executioner all in one, or it can proceed in a manner consonant with the American tradition of the right to be heard, the right of counsel and the right of confrontation of witnesses, placing emphasis on investigation of all foreign isms with honest judicious objectivity. If we are to have again an extravaganza of persecution, a deep-seated mania of embracing some individually conceived notion of alienism, we face again a betrayal of our basic constitutionally guarded rights. The power to investigate is a great public trust. And we ask the newly constituted committee not for one instant to forget that.

In the final count, it remains with the American people whether it will countenance the continuation of the former practices of the Dies committee. Illegality will never solve the problem of political lawlessness. As we have seen so clearly demonstrated in Europe, hate breeds hate and the vicious circle revolves with all its attending madness.

Let the over-zealous be reminded of Hawthorne's description of those "who go all wrong by too strenuous a resolution to go right."

You will remember without difficulty the publicity pursuits of the Dies committee; how reports by the chairman and paid employees, without knowledge of the whole committee, gained credence as a studied committee report; how the Consumers Research was written off as a Communist-front organization without a single hearing and without a single accused person called to the stand. You will recall how thousands of Federal employees were publicly listed as engaged in subversive activities without even a chance to defend themselves.

Accusations get headlines; denials come too late.

You will remember the untidy proceedings of the Dies committee concerning Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, and Robert Morss Lovett wherein the committee actually succeeded in having passed a bill of attainder, that is, the imposition of punishment without a trial, an act expressly forbidden by the Constitution. You recall as well, I am sure, the unsavory incident of Shirley Temple, the then child actress.

From a study made of the Dies committee and signed by over 100 distinguished attorneys, I quote the following: "That the Dies committee, while giving lip service to impartiality and fair play and proclaiming its devotion to Americanism and American institutions, used its hearings, the forum provided by Congress, for the dissemination of irresponsible slanders against honest public servants and private individuals and against public-spirited organizations, one testimony consisting of surmise, conjecture, unfounded opinion, unsupported conclusions, and unwarranted deductions, without any attempt at verification or confirmation, all of which no self-respecting fact-finding agency anywhere would consider—a proceeding wholly unworthy of the committee of the legislative body of a great and free republic."

In a particularly careful study of the Dies committee by Brother August Raymond Ogden published by the Catholic University of America Press in 1943 we find: "The study of the Special House Committee for the Investigation of Un-American Activities indicates that the said committee is neither an ideal nor a desired means of exposing subversive activities."

Thus for 7 years a total of $625,000 of the taxpayers' money has been spent mainly for looking for ghosts under the bed, to chasing only those tidbits that make lurid headline reading, to, indeed, establishing precedents in congressional investigations that must necessarily destroy that which the committee professed to protect—namely, the democratic processes in the United States.

It has been charged that 600,000 individuals engaged in subversive activities are abroad in this land. If this is actually so, then the Dies committee has been woefully derelict in its duty. How many convictions had it obtained? How many of those alleged 600,000 are now lodged in jail. I fear me that the Dies committee has labored like the mountain and has not even brought forth the mouse.

I want to point to another instance which has just come to light. A political advertisement inserted in the San Francisco Chronicle of Monday, October 30, 1944, carried false accusations of communism against Representative FRANCK HAVENNER, then running for reelection to Congress in which was set forth unsupported testimony given before a so-called Dies subcommittee on July 16, 1940, in Beaumont, Tex., at which Mr. Dies was the only member of the committee present. On January 11, 1945, Mr. HAVENNER, Representative from California, rose on the floor of the House and stated: "At the time of this meeting of the subcommittee I was a Member of the House of Representatives and had been for 3½ years next preceding that date. I had never received any notice of this hearing prior to the time it was held and have never received any notice of the hearing up to the present time. The first knowledge I had that such a subcommittee meeting was held was more than 4 years later, when I read this political advertisement * * *. I have never been given an opportunity to appear before that committee to face my accuser or to reply to his testimony. If the chairman of the committee believed that this sworn testimony was true it was his duty to report it to the House of Representatives and recommend that I be brought before the bar of the House and expelled. If there was any doubt in his mind as to the truth of this testimony, it certainly was his duty to notify me and call me before his committee to disprove the testimony if I could * * * instead, the record of this * * * secret meeting was pigeonholed for more than 4 years, when suddenly and mysteriously it was made available for use against me in a political campaign."

The whole episode speaks for itself. I might add here that only through a newspaper article published the other day did I find out that I, together with Senator PEPPER of Florida and Senator THOMAS of Utah and other Members of the House, am the subject of one of the Dies committee's files.

Time will not permit the pointing out of additional illustrations of these "riding out on a rail" tactics. I am reminded of an old comment: "The more you poke an old pile, the worse it smells."

It is not my purpose here tonight to hark back to the past. I seek only to clarify the dangers that await us if all of us, you and I, complacently and unquestioningly, accept the activities of the newly constituted standing committee without examining its effects upon the structure of our Government.

Let the committee be guided by a true knowledge and understanding of the individual rights of citizens. Because a man does not agree with you is no basis for calling him un-American. It was for this very purpose, this protection against governmental tyranny, that the Bill of Rights was written into the Constitution.

Secret investigations against private individuals, organizations, public officials, and Members of Congress without opportunity of rebuttal are Gestapo methods. We want none of that here. Consider its danger to parliamentary government in the United States when Members of Congress investigate other Members of Congress, making accusation against them without their knowledge and without opportunity of defense and discussion. It is a tragic threat against the freedom of expression and the free exchange of thought both in and out of the Halls of Congress. It is a stifling of freedom of speech and press. The fear of reprisal, secretly activated, may deter many an honest expression of thought. The consequences to democratic processes can be foreseen by every thoughtful American. Congress would become a House divided—subject to civil strife.

What is Americanism? It has been pertly defined as "being able to preserve one's status as an individual potato instead of being forced to lose one's identity by being mashed." But Dies' theory was to smite and mash all who disagreed with him. I do not want to speak in premature condemnation. There is work, much work, to be done in uncovering subversive activities in the United States. The scope of a congressional investigating committee is wider and freer than the scope, let us say, of the F. B. I. or a court of law which are rigidly bound by the strict rules of evidence. The standing committee can work harmoniously with the executive branches of the Government. It is no secret that the Department of Justice could not work with the Dies committee, which so often tumbled all over itself to spill some juicy item for headline purposes before full evidence was gathered, hindering in many instances the F. B. I. in its round-up of legal evidence. The Attorney General called the Dies committee a committee of espionage.

The new committee can and must work as a whole committee without permitting the self-aggrandizement of one member or two above all others. The bias and bigotry and special peeves of individual members cannot take precedence over the considered judgment of the whole committee.

It is the judicious mind that the committee needs most. Its counsel and investigators should be chosen only after the most careful scrutiny as to their impartiality and their ability to separate the wheat from the chaff. Irresponsible informants, indeed all informants, should be made to submit their complaints in writing and under oath lest the committee be turned into a nice comfortable back room where each personal little ax can be ground. Hearsay and unreliable testimony must be given its proper weight and the right to cross-examination should not be denied.

The new committee should not cry out against one ism to the exclusion of others. It must not focus its attention only upon Communists and overlook the Fascist and Nazi dangers, and vice versa. We have as much to fear from one ism as from the other.

The new committee dare not withhold its fire against the many anti-Catholic, anti-Semitic, anti-union, anti-Negro propaganda groups and especially those bigots who peddle the anti-religious and anti-racial poison under the false label of "constitutional" and "good" government.

If the new committee remembers that it is a committee and not a backdrop for a one-man show, much useful work can yet be done.

It is fervently to be hoped that the Dies committee will have served at least one useful purpose in its sorry career, that of being a constant reminder to the new committee how not to conduct its affairs.

March of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105, of The American Legion, has purchased land in my district on which it intends to build and equip a home of its own. Pursuant to unanimous consent granted by the House, I submit, for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a self-explanatory letter from one of its members, James Patrick McGovern, of the District of Columbia Bar, who served as a captain in the A. E. F. during the First World War, together with its accompanying and thought-provoking poem entitled "March of Freedom":

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 21, 1945.*

Hon. JOSEPH A. CANTRELL,
Commander, Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105, The American Legion,
Bethesda, Md.

DEAR COMRADE: I am enclosing my check for $100 as a contribution to the fund being raised to build and equip a home for our post. On this occasion I offer to The American Legion the accompanying poem, entitled "March of Freedom," which may be found expressive of the American ideals our country

has fought for in the past, is fighting for in the present, and is destined to fight for in the future.

With every good wish to all, I am,

Yours to command,

JAMES PATRICK MCGOVERN.

MARCH OF FREEDOM

Our valor now makes live each yesterday
Of bitter struggle wreathed with heroes' deeds,
Since first our fathers blazed their dauntless way
Through virgin tracts and sowed their hearths' new seeds.
Our homes then grew in beauty, love, and peace
Within the fortress of our fruitful land,
Which promised that our State would never cease
As long as justice ruled the heart and hand.
But freedom is an ever restless sea;
It must be always wooed and won again.
To change is life, to strive is destiny;
The rust was never deep for sword and pen.
Our future thus must give our past its due
Of victory again, of peace more true.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

The Ship-Air Transport Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 6, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent of the membership, I am causing to be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks, an editorial of the utmost importance, an editorial which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner of January 4, 1945, under the significant title of "The Ship-Air Transport Issue."

As the question of whether or not the American Merchant Marine, now the master of the seven seas, is to be permitted to continue to exist in the post-war world, a survival that can only be assured through the removal of the fetters which render it impossible for American shipping to compete successfully with foreign-operated lines, will soon be presented to the Congress, the arguments which are contained in this editorial expression will be, I am quite sure, not only helpful to the membership but informative as well.

The editorial to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

THE SHIP-AIR TRANSPORT ISSUE

The Merchant Marine Committee of the House of Representatives has unanimously recommended to Congress that American steamship companies be given the right to augment their services with supplementary air lines after the war.

This is a realistic recognization of the conditions under which American foreign commerce will have to be conducted when peacetime competition is resumed.

"All the other great maritime powers," the committee reports, "have already cleared the way for combined ship-air operations by their merchant fleets.

"The American merchant marine should not be handicapped by denying it the right to use aviation service."

The United States has, of course, a great opportunity in the field of post-war foreign commerce—but it must first get in a position to take advantage of its opportunity.

The plain truth, as this alert committee of Congress has pointed out, is that other nations, while lacking our present equipment in ships and planes for foreign trade and other capacities for producing more and better ships and planes in the future, are offsetting these factors.

British interests, for instance, are getting out ahead in several important ways.

In the matter of ship-air operations, as we learn from the report to Congress, the British already have an advantage.

They are constantly making other advantages.

In evidence of this is the British program, as the London Daily Mail recently said, for:

A national pool of air lines from which companies, whether publicly or privately owned, could charter the planes they need for air line operations all over the world.

That provides a measure of the ambitious competition British foreign-trade interests are contemplating.

The same British publication further discloses:

"The organization might be expanded still further for the convenience of dominion airline operators and even for foreign lines wishing to use British planes and equipment."

In fact, says the Daily Mail:

"A powerful cooperative scheme between Empire air services all over the world is * * * being worked out quietly behind the scenes."

Plainly, American foreign-trade planners are going to find themselves competing with experts in the post-war field of international commerce.

It will stand them in good stead to become experts on their own account, for it is the considered and competent opinion of American authorities best informed about this situation that 5,000,000 Americans will depend on foreign trade for their post-war living.

And much more than American prosperity will depend on realization of our advantages and opportunities in our future commerce with other nations, for as Mr. John W. Davis, vice president and trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, has said:

"Our exports of American goods after the war, with their related imports, will not only assure us an expanding trade that will be reflected in prosperity at home—such trade will serve in a practical way to cement our friendly relations with the nations of the world."

The House Merchant Marine Committee, in its advocacy of an American ship-air foreign-trade policy preserving the advantages and opportunities accruing to us by reason of our present great maritime and aviation establishments and our even greater productive capacities, has demonstrated commendable understanding of its responsibilities.

The Future of 50,000,000 Tons of United States Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Business Forum radio broadcast No. 78 by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., over Station WMCA, New York, January 17, 1945. Mr. Neal Dow Becker, president of Intertype Corporation, and also Commerce and Industry Association president, acted as moderator. The speakers included W. N. Westerlund, president of Marine Transport Lines, Inc.; Almon E. Roth, president of the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc.; and myself.

The program follows:

ANNOUNCER. Business is the foundation of American democracy. Upon the welfare of commerce and industry depends the welfare of you and your family. We, therefore, invite you to listen to the business forum—devoted exclusively to the problems of business. This program is presented as a public service by WMCA in cooperation with the Commerce and Industry Association of New York. Tonight the forum will discuss the future of 50,000,000 tons of United States ships. And now may we present Mr. Neal Dow Becker, president, Commerce and Industry Association of New York, who will moderate tonight's forum. Mr. Becker.

MODERATOR. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. According to a recent survey brought to my attention, I understand that the post-war competition for both the domestic and foreign branches of the American merchant marine will be the keenest the country's shipping operators have ever faced.

For our discussion tonight, on the future of 50,000,000 tons of United States ships, we have a most capable and informed panel of speakers: Congressman EMANUEL CELLER; Mr. Almon E. Roth, president, National Federation of American Shipping; and Mr. W. N. Westerlund, president, Marine Transport Lines, Inc. I present now our first speaker of the evening, the Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, Mr. CELLER.

Mr. CELLER. By the end of 1945, under present calculations, more than 5,300 merchant vessels of more than 50,000,000 tons will have left the ways. This tonnage will be 5 times that of our pre-war fleet. The cost to us will have been more than $18,000,000,000.

The slogan has already been heard, "Don't give up the ships." Of course, slogans will not run ships; slogans are no substitute for cargoes. Cargoes are necessary to keep the ships going. But this is certain, America is back on the seas to stay. The spirit of the old clipper ships has been revived.

Admiral Land, the redoubtable and able head of the Martime Commission believes that we can profitably use from fifteen to twenty million tons of our fleet after the war ends.

Not all of our merchant marine fleet would be engaged in foreign commerce because normal peacetime requirements incident to domestic transportation necessities alone would absorb a considerable volume of the proposed tonnage.

In addition to those ships needed in domestic and foreign commerce, there would be the need for maintaining a substantial stand-by fleet. This would comprise mainly Liberty ships which could not be operated for commercial profit. They would be held "in sanctuary," sterilized, and only used in cases of a national emergency. They would be a sort of national defense reserve.

The Army and the Navy would continue to maintain a personnel to transport supplies and equipment to our possessions and island bases. This might involve an additional 3,000,000 tons. I personally believe that these ships should be operated by private companies.

This will leave roughly 30,000,000 tons of cargo vessels.

We will suffer again unless we heed the lessons of the past. Post-war international cargoes will be dependent upon our national commercial policies and the directions of our foreign trade. This will involve loans, tariffs, quotas, barter, subsidies, discriminatory treaties, preferential systems, and commodity controls.

Remember, however, rising tariffs at home and abroad will spell reduced cargoes and idle ships. High tariffs are a luxury we can no longer afford. They invite retaliation by our foreign competitors. We thus cut off our nose to spite our face. Unless goods cross borders, armies will.

As President Roosevelt stated in a letter to me, "The principal consideration, of course, will be our willingness to take the products of other countries. This has been true to some extent for many years; it will be even more true after the present war."

MODERATOR. Thank you, Congressman CELLER, for your very informative views on this most vital subject, and after we have heard expressions from our other speakers, I am going to ask you to expand on some of the facts you have just mentioned. Our next speaker of the evening will be Mr. Almon E. Roth, president of the National Federation of American Shipping. Mr. Roth.

Mr. ROTH. There is hardly a family in this broad land which does not have a very direct and personal stake in the adequacy of our American merchant marine. Millions of our sons and daughters have been carried to far-distant shores in merchant ships. The speed with which they will be returned to their homes and families, when the war is ended, will depend largely upon the number of ships available for their transportation. In the meantime, their comfort, their health, and their efficiency as fighting men will depend upon our ability to furnish them with requisite equipment and supplies. No single factor bears more directly upon the probable length of this war than our ability to transport men and equipment by ships and to keep them properly supplied.

At this very moment our commanders in both the European and the Asiatic theaters are pleading for additional ships to meet their most urgent requirements.

As a result of the difficulties which we have faced due to the lack of shipping, and because of the important role which merchant ships will continue to play throughout this war, the American public is for the moment merchant marine-minded.

But we must not be misled into false security.

If history repeats itself, the popular interest of the moment is no guaranty of continued support for a strong merchant marine once the war has ended.

The First World War, like this conflict, found us woefully unprepared with shipping facilities. Then, as now, we built shipyards and ships, without regard for cost, in a frantic race against time.

When the war ended we immediately folded our hands and allowed our new merchant marine, built at such great cost and effort, to rust and rot.

If we have learned anything out of the bitter experiences of this war, it should be the folly of repeating this mistake.

MODERATOR. Thank you, Mr. Roth. You, too, will be questioned further after we have heard from our third speaker. * * * Mr. W. N. Westerlund, president, Marine Transport Lines. Mr. Westerlund.

Mr. WESTERLUND. Our minimum ocean-carrying needs must be gaged by national-security considerations. So far as I am aware, military authorities have not declared the needed merchant-ship capacity related to our Nation's responsibility for maintaining peaceful world conditions and to provide minimum transportation insurance for military emergencies. Early efforts in this war were handicapped because of ship scarcity. Probably more than 50,000,000 dead-weight tons of American ships will survive the war, with carrying capacity exceeding five times our pre-war fleet. Minimum requirements for national security should be operated as a going fleet, manned with trained personnel, and kept modernized by new construction. Admiral Land has offered a target of 15,000,000 dead-weight tons as the size of a post-war going fleet. The stated objective points the need of increasing our carrying about 60 percent over pre-war levels. Furrows are deepening on the brows of those pondering the problem of employing such a fleet.

About two-thirds of the United States fleet was engaged in domestic trade before the war, therefore, the domestic field should offer the best hope for increased ship utilization. A program looking toward promoting maritime transportation in the domestic service should become part of our national shipping policy. Additional ship employment will develop in servicing our increased world-wide Naval and Army activities, and United States vessels should have a greater share in overseas-commercial trade. In 1939 the enemy nations had 14,000,000 dead-weight tons of ships. How much will be permitted then after the war is conjectural but it is assumed that their trading will be substantially curtailed, with resultant advantage to United Nations and neutral shipping. Nonliner services carried about one-third of the traffic between United States and foreign lands in 1939. American ships competed only for liner business before the war. We must provide nonliner transportation as well as regular lines to meet foreign competition and to attain the objective of carrying one-half American foreign commerce. Nonliner employment would mean brand new business for United States ships. American ships have participated but little in trade between foreign nations. Such interforeign transportation also offers a field for increased American ship employment.

MODERATOR. Thank you, Mr. Westerlund. And now we return to Congressman CELLER. Mr. CELLER, assuming that we are going to be faced with the problem of surplus ships, just what would you propose doing with them?

Mr. CELLER. Of course, Mr. Becker, the present inventory can be whittled down quite a bit. Some of the vessels will be overaged and ancient, and can and should be readily scrapped. A number of ships taken from countries like Norway and Denmark will be returned.

The present shipping companies should be given every favorable consideration by the War Shipping Administration in the transfer to them of all the ships they need.

Every inducement should be made to develop tramp ships under the American flag. Most of the tramp shipping in the past was in the hands of the British and Norwegians and some in the hands of the Japs and Greeks. American shipping companies were unable to compete because of low seamen's wages. Encouragement of tramp shipping will involve subsidies.

In Great Britain, in Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and Greece, there is a market for our war-built ships. These countries have lost heavily and have built little.

We agreed with Britain that she would confine her efforts mainly to naval construction while we would be builders of merchant ships. We are somewhat under moral obligation to bareboat some of the Libertys to the British, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Chinese, and so forth. Such a plan will involve a maritime headache since these ships will compete with our own in foreign trade. Therefore, there should be a limitation that no fast ships should be sold or chartered to foreign operators and there should be as many guaranties exacted as may be necessary to safeguard American interests.

Whatever surplus ships remain should be sent to the bottom of Davy Jones' locker as war casualties. If this is not done, these idle ships, aside from ships kept on ice, will hang over the shipping world like a Damoclean sword.

MODERATOR. What should be done with the ships of the Axis Powers?

Mr. CELLER. As part of reparations, I humbly believe Japanese, Nazi, and other Axis ships must be scrapped and dismantled and put out of the service. Axis shipping trade should be redirected as follows: One-third to the United States and two-thirds to the Allies. There should be a ban on any future building of Axis ships for a period of years.

MODERATOR. Mr. Roth, I have seen published estimates of the probable size of the United States post-war merchant fleet ranging from 12,000,000 dead-weight tons to over 40,000,000 dead-weight tons. Can you give us your estimate of the size of the American post-war fleet?

Mr. ROTH. Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 it is the declared policy of this country to maintain a merchant marine adequate for purposes of defense and sufficient to carry our domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of our foreign trade. Unfortunately, at this moment it is not possible to translate these requirements into actual tonnage, owing to many uncertainties and imponderables. So far as I know, no one in authority can say at this time what our defense requirements will be, nor what the world-trade opportunities will be. Our defense requirements will depend in large part upon how successful we are in developing world-wide machinery to insure peace. Our trade opportunities will depend upon such uncertainties as the time required for economic rehabilitation of the foreign nations; the volume of their national incomes; the ability to finance purchase of goods, and the extent to which restrictions upon the freedom of commerce, such as tariffs, embargoes, and quotas are established. I must, therefore, decline to attempt any estimate of the specific tonnage. I am sure that everyone, including the man on the street, is convinced of the need of a more adequate American merchant marine than the one which we operated at the beginning of this war.

MODERATOR. Mr. Westerlund, you have suggested that domestic shipping should be encouraged. Do you have in mind legislative steps which might be appropriate to accomplish the end suggested?

Mr. WESTERLUND. Legislation over the past few years has tended to restrict ocean-shipping opportunities in domestic trades. Administration of regulatory laws so as to prevent judicial ratemaking and restrictive conditions of operation would promote greater expansion of coastwise and intercoastal shipping. Members of the shipping industry have advocated that regulation of domestic shipping be under the United States Maritime Commission, which has the mandatory duty of promoting and encouraging American ship operation.

MODERATOR. Mr. CELLER, what would be a reasonable amount of post-war export trade and how would it affect our ships?

Mr. CELLER. Our exports are now about $12,000,000,000 annually; I believe that includes lend-lease. They will, undoubtedly, decline. We cannot allow them to drop to the pre-war level of two or three billions. We need not do so. They should be at least $10,000,000,000. The rest of the world will need an unprecedented quantity of American goods. Our productive capacity can fill the needs of western Europe, Russia, China, India, and Latin America as a hand fills a glove. Fifteen to twenty million tons of ships should be the transmission belt of these goods. But it will not be so unless our customers can be possessed of the American dollar. For this purpose we must square lend-lease accounts, stabilize international currencies, encourage private investment abroad, repeal the Johnson Act to encourage private

loans to countries now in default, make foreign loans abroad through the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and, above all, we must purchase increased quantities of foreign goods and services. As to wiping the lend-lease slate clean, we should bear in mind the President's words, "victory and a secure peace are the only coin in which we can be repaid."

If we do all these things, the rest of the world will have plenty of American dollars to buy our goods and keep our ships afloat.

In addition, we must avoid the Hawley-Smoot tariff which was a terrific "left to the jaw" of our Britsh and Canadian trade. England replied with a solar plexus blow with her Import Duties Act of 1932 and Imperial Preferences. These acts of mutual trade hostilities snuffed out a large volume of trade with Britain and her dominions. Giving tariff blow for counterblow is a negation of our good-neighbor policy with South America.

MODERATOR. Are reciprocal trade treaties a material aid in foreign trade?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Becker, reciprocity treaties have accomplished much good. But the logic of our present condition requires a broader base of operation. Reciprocal trade agreements and bilateral bargaining are slow and cumbersome and too limited. Far preferable are multilateral conventions whereby all nations pledge expeditious action in the simultaneous and sharp reduction of all trade barriers. This would be in line with the Atlantic Charter which speaks of free access to the raw materials and production of all lands. It means foreign trade is not a one-way traffic. One cannot continue to sell unless one buys.

MODERATOR. You have stated, Mr. Westerlund, that American vessels should have a greater share of overseas trade. In view of the fact that it has so often been claimed that American ships should carry 50 percent of the traffic between the United States and foreign countries, and I understand that during the last pre-war years our vessels had less than one-third of such trade, would you care to mention some specific steps that appear practicable in seeking the increased share of this American foreign transportation which is implied in the goal of 50 percent participation?

Mr. WESTERLUND. We must carry our commerce, both export and import, at no greater cost to the shipper than foreign competitors are able to offer. Disparities in operating costs, notably ship wages have long militated against American ships in foreign trade. Steps should be taken to achieve parity of costs. Emphasis has been placed on the need of balancing our exports and imports. American shipping companies should be thoroughly aroused to the part that they must play in informing our shippers and foreign traders of opportunities in their areas of service. A program similar to the railroad measures of extolling advantages to new industry and other activities along their rail lines would be fruitful in promoting our foreign commercial opportunities. If we are to develop our trade opportunities on a level with other nations, we should follow their example by encouraging our people to live abroad to a greater extent, at least for a part of their lives, as do the nationals of the great trading countries, for the purpose of relating the homeland opportunities to those of other lands in an intimate and much better informed manner.

MODERATOR. In considering the post-war position of American shipping a number of writers have touched upon the fact that foreign countries pay in part for exports from this country with dollars earned by carrying American goods. They then draw the conclusion that the United States cannot afford to maintain a large merchant marine since this would involve a disastrous loss in exports. Do you agree with this philosophy, Mr. Roth?

Mr. ROTH. I certainly do not. The importance of foreign shipping services as a form of exchange in payment for American exports has been grossly exaggerated. From statistics issued by the Department of Commerce, it appears that net foreign earnings from transportation did not cover, on the average, in the period between World Wars No. 1 and 2, more than 1 percent of the value of our exports. Furthermore, even if it could be shown that there would be a reduction in the relative volume of our exports brought about by smaller earnings of foreign shipping, this would be counterbalanced to a great extent by increased domestic employment due to the existence of a larger American merchant fleet and the stimulation which improved American shipping lines would give to export trade.

MODERATOR. Mr. Westerlund, you have stressed the greater importance of domestic water-borne traffic in ocean vessels. You did not mention the liquid cargoes, principally petroleum and its products carried in ocean tank vessels, and we would be interested in knowing whether this tanker transportation was included in your general reference to domestic traffic.

Mr. WESTERLUND. Yes; ocean tanker traffic was taken into account in my general observations concerning domestic trade. Over 3,000,000 tons of ocean tankers were in the domestic trade in 1937. Post-war use of the emergency pipe lines would materially reduce the traffic for tankers and in order to maintain tankers in operation and available for military emergency, it is important that we refrain from operating the pipe lines. Of course, the pipe lines should be kept in good condition for future emergencies. Idle tankers would deteriorate far more rapidly than idle pipe lines.

MODERATOR. Mr. Roth, you haven't mentioned the domestic shipping as yet. Would you care to comment on the importance of this branch of our merchant marine?

Mr. ROTH. There is a tendency on the part of the public to think of our merchant marine problems solely in terms of foreign competition and prospects for international trade, and to pay little attention to the fact that domestic shipping is concerned with competition with rail lines, trucks, and buses.

In this connection it is important to note that as of June 30, 1939, our active American merchant marine amounted to 9,303,228 tons of which only 2,803,900 tons were engaged in foreign commerce. The balance, or roughly 70 percent, was employed in domestic trades.

If we are to have an adequate American merchant marine, both domestic and foreign shipping must earn a reasonable profit under competitive conditions which are quite distinct and different.

MODERATOR. Mr. Roth, is it true that the American merchant marine is the only transportation industry engaged 100 percent in war operations?

Mr. ROTH. That is true. The shipping industry began converting to a full wartime basis long before Pearl Harbor. Every one of its ships, practically all of its facilities, are engaged in full-time war pursuits. Not many Americans understand that the major portion of our tonnage is actually operated by American private shipping firms. In cooperation with the War Shipping Administration our private operators have kept American ships moving in all the seven seas. At the moment, this country is operating in excess of 40,000,000-deadweight tons of shipping, which is equivalent to about four times the amount of overseas shipping which we had at the beginning of the war.

MODERATOR. Mr. Roth, how has it been possible to obtain the personnel required to man this enormous number of ships?

Mr. ROTH. The crews of these vessels have been obtained through voluntary enlistments. With the rapid expansion of our merchant marine and the drain upon our national pool of manpower, it is becoming increasingly difficult to recruit the number of experienced men required to man our merchant fleets. The Maritime Commission has done a marvelous job in training men, and the 160,000 seamen who sail our ships are entitled to much credit for the fact that we have driven both the Japs and the Germans back to their own doorsteps. More than 6,000 of these brave men have already lost their lives. Their magnificent achievement will be recorded as one of the most dramatic stories of courage and devotion to duty in all our history.

MODERATOR. Mr. CELLER, in your opinion should maritime companies be permitted to operate airplanes?

Mr. CELLER. I say "Yes" emphatically. I am opposed to the present attitude of the Civil Aeronautics Administration which seeks to keep maritime transportation separate and distinct from aerial transportation. Railroads operate busses; busses operate trolley companies; some railroads operate ships and for the same reason shipping lines should be extended to include airplane routes. Otherwise, maritime companies will be unable to compete with foreign cotraders. For example, the Cunard Line and Holland Lines might operate air lines across Africa or the Dutch East Indies. The American company stopped at the sea coast might be compelled to avail itself of these competing airways and be forced to pay hijacking rates. Under reasonable restrictions both levels of transportation, air and water, must be operated by maritime companies.

MODERATOR. Are free ports or foreign trade zones an aid in keeping ships afloat?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. The ancient idea of free ports has always been a boom to foreign trade. They were availed of by Germany, Scandinavia, and the low countries. Although the United States has been "Johnny-come-lately", in this field, the foreign trade zone in the port of New York has activated in the retranshipment and consignment of goods millions of dollars of foreign trade which otherwise would have gone to other nations.

Diverse international trade currents converge at the foreign trade zone and contribute to the growth of our foreign trade.

MODERATOR. You have stated, Mr. Westerlund, that the participation of United States vessels in carrying trade between foreign lands has been negligible, and I believe this is what is referred to as indirect trade. Would you mind commenting upon the reason why American ships have not engaged in this indirect or interforeign traffic?

Mr. WESTERLUND. Under the Shipping Act, American vessels in indirect trades would not receive subsidy payments to equalize the cost of operation against foreign competitors. Equalization allowances have been confined to trade between the United States and foreign countries and then only to the extent of operations on what have been certified by the Maritime Commission as essential liner routes. It seems clear that some system of parity payments would be needed to advance American shipping employment in the indirect trades and in nonliner transportation between the United States and other countries.

MODERATOR. Mr. Roth, you've referred to the wartime functions of the American merchant marine. How about its peacetime functions?

Mr. ROTH. The peacetime functions of our merchant marine are of vital importance to this Nation, even though they are not so obvious or spectacular as its wartime usefulness. The importance of an adequate peacetime merchant marine as insurance against war has not been sufficiently stressed. All potential aggressors realize that our naval forces would be of little value without an adequate tonnage of supply and auxiliary vessels. Unless we have such auxiliary vessels the effectiveness of our great Navy, as

protection against war, will be greatly minimized. No one can doubt that Japan's decision to wage war was predicated upon the knowledge that this country lacked not only fighting ships, but also the merchant ships which would be required to wage an immediate and effective war in the far-distant reaches of the Pacific. No doubt Germany, by the same token, counted upon the inadequacy of the Allies' shipping facilities, including our own, in appraising her chances for success when she plunged the world into conflict.

MODERATOR. Thank you, Congressman Celler, Mr. Roth, and Mr. Westerland for your views on this most interesting and complex subject of the future of 50,000,000 tons of United States shipping.

ANNOUNCER. You have been listening to the Business Forum—a weekly series of programs devoted to the interests of business. This program is presented in cooperation with the Commerce and Industry Association of New York.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway project has recently received consideration in the Congress of the United States, and this great and meritorious project will again be placed before Congress for consideration in the next session; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence Navigation and Power project will provide vast quantities of low-cost hydroelectric power; will extend the benefits of direct ocean transportation to the city of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin, and the entire Great Lakes area; will permit Milwaukee industries to import raw materials at low cost, and by utilizing direct ocean service, to expand greatly their foreign trade and to reach new foreign markets; and in general will enhance the economic prosperity and well-being of the Great Lakes area and the entire Nation; and

Whereas the present world conflict has demonstrated the absolute necessity of the St. Lawrence seaway for the national defense and the military security of this Nation by providing a safe and landlocked basin for national defense industries, for storage of strategic materials and for construction of naval and merchant vessels; and

Whereas the agricultural and industrial resources of the Great Lakes area could have been more effectively employed, and the present conflict could have been appreciably shortened had the St. Lawrence seaway project been completed and available for use at the outbreak of hostilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That we commend Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, for his statesmanlike presentation of the St. Lawrence Power and Navigation project to the Senate of the United States; that we commend Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, and other Senators who have demonstrated their vision, enterprise, and statesmanship by joining Senator AIKEN in the fight to make this great project a reality; and that we urge all Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin to lend their best efforts to assure the construction of the seaway as an early post-war project to assure adequate employment in the post-war period, to permit expanded foreign trade, and to insure the national defense; and be it further

Resolved, That his honor, the mayor, and the board of harbor commissioners are authorized and instructed to continue their efforts to advance the St. Lawrence seaway project to completion as quickly as possible, thereby reaffirming the unalterable belief of the city of Milwaukee and its citizens in the merits of this great project which holds vast potentialities for the future welfare and prosperity of the city of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin, and the Nation at large; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, and to Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin.

Hon. Hallett Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me today to speak of a former resident of the Eleventh Congressional District of New Jersey, Mr. Hallett Johnson, who has recently been appointed United States Ambassador to Costa Rica.

His grandfather, Watson Matthews, lived on Vose Avenue in South Orange for many years.

His father, J. Augustus Johnson, served as consul general in Beirut as a young man, and thereafter practiced law in New York, where he became the president of the Federated Government Clubs. He was active in the campaign which secured the election of Seth Low as mayor of New York.

In the early part of this century he built a house on the corner of Scotland Road and Montrose Avenue, where he and his family lived until he died.

Hallett Johnson lived in South Orange until he entered the diplomatic service in 1912. He had many friends in that part of the State, and he also has many friends from the State who are in Washington.

His first post was that of third secretary of Embassy in London, and he has served as either second secretary, first secretary, or counselor of Embassy in Constantinople, Santiago, The Hague, Brussels, Stockholm, Madrid, and Paris. In many of these positions he was Chargé d'Affaires when the Chief of Mission was absent. For the last 4 years he has been adviser in one of the economic political divisions of the Department of State. He will leave shortly to assume his new duties.

The Foreign Service of the United States today consists of a hard-working, trained group of men who exert themselves to the utmost to forward the political and commercial objectives of the Government. In the difficult world situation of today, it is obviously necessary to increase and strengthen our representation abroad, and it is gratifying to see a man with the experience and ability of Hallett Johnson named Ambassador.

The Threat of Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, Mr. Thomas L. Stokes wrote in his regular column under the heading "The threat of cartels." What he had to say in that column is of such significance at the present time that I am asking consent to include it with my remarks in the RECORD:

THE THREAT OF CARTELS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, January 10.—A paragraph in President Roosevelt's message to Congress, which attracted little attention generally, was nevertheless most gratifying to quite a number of people in Congress and the Government concerned with a major post-war economic problem.

It reads:

"We must make sure that private enterprise works as it is supposed to work—on the basis of initiative and vigorous competition, without the stifling presence of monopolies and cartels."

The groundwork for a campaign to enlist American business and the public in support of moves to outlaw cartels, those international monopolies which stifle trade and free enterprise, is being laid in special committees of Congress—the small business committees of both Houses and the Kilgore committee in the Senate.

CAN BE DANGEROUS

Available to them is the comprehensive story of the operation of these giant international monopolies dug out over the last several years by the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, first under the direction of Thurman Arnold and later under the present head of that Division, Wendell Berge.

In a series of antitrust suits—of which there are still more to come—it was revealed how these private international monopolies, operating beyond the pale of law, so to speak, handicapped our preparation for war by restricting and cornering strategic materials of all sorts, so that we were faced with crippling shortages. This was a well-planned phase of the Nazi war program.

They can be dangerous, similarly, after the war. They threaten all the plans now being discussed so hopefully for freedom of commerce, for access to raw materials.

THREAT NOTED

Businessmen have become aware of this threat to free enterprise, it is indicated, when even the National Association of Manufacturers condemns cartels. There are other signs of an awakening among businessmen.

But, along with this, there is also a lot of lip service. For running parallel to it and particularly noticeable lately there is begin-

ning to creep in a tendency to rationalize, to compromise. It is cropping up in propaganda stressing the difficulties of doing away with cartels. This is dangerous.

There is much being said and written these days about the spread of totalitarianism through planned economies, with emphasis on the danger in this country. What is not always realized is that international monopolies, with their restrictions, also beget monopolies and restrictions within individual countries, calling for all sorts of regulations of domestic economy. This promotes and hastens a completely planned economy.

TRADE BARRIERS

There were two developments toward this end in the twenties and the thirties, in which, incidentally, were the seeds of the war. There was the rise of nationalism, with nations raising trade barriers against one another, so that each in trying to live to itself necessarily had to plan its economy. At the same time, there were the restrictive cartel agreements among big business enterprises across nations' borders which, in the case of Germany, were fitted right into the national economy with government backing. Both developments stifled trade and enterprise, requiring each nation to regulate its domestic economy more closely.

That happened in this country under the New Deal, as it happened elsewhere.

Continuation of monopolies and cartels will only mean the continuation of this process, as President Roosevelt recognized in touching upon this subject in his message to Congress. 'Businessmen often are inclined to overlook this in the temptation to enter restrictive agreements which make their operations easier by eliminating competition.

It is to their advantage to uphold the President in seeking to eliminate the monopoly and cartel economy.

Questions of Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Labor Press of January 18, 1945:

QUESTIONS OF MANPOWER

With the cry for increased manpower—directed mostly against labor—it might be well to look into the question of whether some of our manpower is being wisely and effectively used.

The armed forces—and goodness knows, nobody for a moment would deny them the use of every man actually needed in this war—at times seem to be hoarding manpower much as some industrial users of labor do. For instance, we have a lot of public relations men; press agents, to be plain. This office, for instance, has been receiving for months letters, including a franked return envelope to send clippings about doings of officers at Glenview, Ill., hardly a single one from the Milwaukee area.

Two young newspaper men from Milwaukee were inducted into one of the services. They both appear fit for combat work, but they write stories about their services. One even found time to write a history—for public sale—about the service he was in.

Some public relations work, from a morale standpoint, at least, may be needed. But if the Army combed as carefully through its ranks for manpower as it expects industry and labor to do, it might find some of those men Secretary Stimson declares are so badly needed.

The Poisons of Intolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial was voted first place in the Nation-wide Americanism newspaper editorial contest sponsored by the National Americanism Commission of B'nai B'rith. It was written by Mr. Bradley L. Morison, editor of the Minneapolis Daily Times:

THE POISONS OF INTOLERANCE

The program sponsored by Governor Thye's interracial committee at the State fair on Monday reaffirmed the eloquent truths of brotherhood and justice that must always stand, like a foundation stone of granite, under every great democracy.

As a Nation we cannot look upon those truths too often, nor strive too hard to perpetuate them in our daily life. For unless we do perpetuate them, we must ultimately see our American democracy shaken and racked by the most violent forms of minority intolerance, and in that day, having forsaken the spirit of democratic justice, we shall find the whole structure of our greatness crumbling about us.

Governor Thye is magnificently right: "While we are going to win the war on the battlefields, we will sustain a major defeat if we permit the Nation to become tainted with hatred."

It is one thing to speak of maintaining cordial and cooperative relationships with the nations of the world, and to stand as a country united on the solid ground of international collaboration. That is fine. We must do that at all costs, if we are ever to play our part in a world order marked by peace and justice.

But at the same time we must not neglect the equally important business of maintaining cordial and cooperative relationships among ourselves.

We must be as vigilant in combating the ugliness of racial and religious intolerance at home as we are militant in combating the ugliness of war and lawlessless on the world level.

Otherwise, we shall grow weak and divided at home, a Nation retched by the poisons of minority prejudice and hatred, and as such we cannot hope to sustain a good and vigorous role in any decent post-war order.

We think that the great majority of Americans reject these poisons, and abhor the despicable uses to which they are put. But a passive rejection, or a passive abhorrence, is not enough.

If we are ever to eliminate these poisons from the body politic, we must deal with them positively and actively, discouraging all the vicious innuendos that are craftily spread about minorities, helping in the enlightening tasks of education, insisting at every step of the way that the rights and privileges of our democracy shall be shared to the greatest possible extent.

It is not enough for anyone to say: "I am against racial and religious intolerance." The good precepts must be absorbed into the very lifestream of the individual, the family and the Nation.

If there is one thing that we should have learned from the experience of war, it is this: That Americans of all races and religions and colors are fighting and dying in it to preserve the liberties of Americans, and that without exception, the representatives of every minority group have proved their essential courage, dignity and worth.

To recognize this fact, and to proceed from it to a broader base of minority justice and tolerance than we have ever known before, is one of the most urgent tasks ahead of us.

The few who vent their un-American intolerances in the smashing of windows or in retailing gutter nonsense about the "international Jews" render a poor service to the nation. For as a house divided, we can never hope to stand up beneath the strains and stresses of the post-war world that looms forbiddingly ahead of us.

First Combat Infantry Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald:

INFANTRY BAND DELIGHTS AUDIENCE WITH G. I. HITS

(By Glenn Dillard Gunn)

The First Combat Infantry Band, under sponsorship of the Surgeon General, played a concert last night in the departmental auditorium that delighted a capacity audience.

The members of this group have all served overseas, some in Africa and Italy, some in the Pacific. Not all of them served as musicians. Many were riflemen or machine gunners, or attached to some other branch of the Infantry. They have been assembled under the leadership of Warrant Officer Whiting, who also saw service in the Pacific.

They played music such as pleased the majority of G. I.'s—popular songs, excerpts from Oklahoma and other Broadway hits, Gershwiniana, a Strauss melody, swing version, and some stirring marches, including one by their leader entitled "Americal," and written on Bougainville while the Japs were bombing and strafing. It's a good march, one might add, and doubtless will find a permanent place with other music that belongs especially to the Infantry.

SONGS FOR MEN IN LINE

For part of the program these returned fighters formed themselves into a glee club to sing songs that have cheered the men in the line. Some of these were new, like Isa Lei, to a text in some South Sea language. Some were ancient, like the fifteenth century Flemish war song which they sang in the original language.

One, simulating the various instruments in the band, was, I am assured, of Polish origin. There was also a highbrow, or "long hair," moment on the program when Corp. Stanley Weiner came forward with his violin to quote Hora Staccato, Danse Espagnole, and other items from the Heifetz repertoire.

What these returned warriors sang and played was of less importance than the spirit in which it was done. They were confident,

even a bit cocky. They imparted a certain swank and swagger to the entire program and this in turn stimulated a reaction from the public that indicated the maximum of listener participation. Everybody liked the First Combat Infantry Band and all its members and everybody was determined to prove it.

Mr. Biddle, Mr. Corcoran, and Settlement of Savannah Shipyards Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD another excerpt from the memorandum submitted by Mr. Norman Littell to a Senate committee on January 8, 1945. It will supplement that part of the memorandum submitted by me in the RECORD on January 22, 1945, at pages 426–430.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this report is highly important to the United States. Every citizen should be made aware of its existence for it is an effort by a former conscientious public servant to show what has been going on in a very important governmental agency. It hardly seems possible that it could have occurred in this country.

In the excerpt, hereinafter set forth, the truth and veracity of the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, have been put in issue on his own statement. This calls for a full investigation in this matter. If Tommy Corcoran is as influential in the office of the Attorney General as appears, then the people should know about it. The amazing story of Savannah Shipyards and Tommy Corcoran follows:

1. Tommy Corcoran's representation of Savannah Shipyards Co.: Mr. Biddle says (p. 63) that Corcoran did not represent the Savannah Shipyards Co., but represented certain interests in the Empire Ordnance Co., the parent company of the Savannah Shipyards. Either Mr. Biddle is not telling the truth or he has been imposed upon by his good friend Tommy Corcoran, as the following facts reveal:

I did meet with counsel for the Savannah Shipyards Co. to talk settlement on April 29, 1942, after we had filed condemnation proceedings to acquire the property. We reviewed all costs of construction claimed as compensation. Among these costs were excessive salaries for inexperienced executives in the Frank Cohen Get-rich-quick Wallingford Co., and also legal fees for seven law firms located respectively at Savannah, Indianapolis, Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Newark, and Washington, D. C. Fees for all, with interest at 7 percent were demanded, together with promotion costs for a bond issue which was never issued, and $73,000 charged by the Chatham Construction Co. (another wholly owned Frank Cohen-Empire Ordnance creation brought into being for the specific purpose of building the Savannah shipyards, also wholly owned by Frank Cohen, at 17½ percent commission—later reduced to 7½ percent). In this set-up, the left hand was charging the right hand for cooperation—shipyards which had never launched a ship, with a school-book publisher as president, with construction work so defective as to challenge an investigation for sabotage except that incompetence was so obviously the cause, was the subject of every conceivable charge in the costs of constrution. No ships, but six law firms were launched—among them, Dempsey & Koplovitz, Tommy Corcoran's associates.

Mr. Biddle says Tommy did not represent the Savannah Shipyards Co. This is not true. Before I dropped the conference of April 29 and told counsel that we would meet them in court before paying any such extravagant claims, I inquired about the legal fees of Dempsey and Koplovitz and Tommy Corcoran. My notes of this conference on April 29, 1942, show the admission of William Koplovitz that the firm had up to that date received $10,000 for legal fees from the Savannah Shipyards Co.; they had also retained Tommy Corcoran to consult with him from time to time because of his special experience with R. F. C. Koplovitz said they had already paid Tommy Corcoran $5,000 [1]—that was Tommy's cut up to that date.

It is perfectly clear then that Tommy did represent the Savannah Shipyards Co. Furthermore, he sat in the conferences in Washington, D. C., when arrangements were made to procure from the Maritime Commission a contract for constructing ships.

Mr. Biddle said that there was "some kind of interlocking interest between Empire Ordnance and Savannah Shipyards" with which he was not familiar (p. 63), but it is contrary to ordinary reason that at this late hour Mr. Biddle should not be fully advised that the Savannah Shipyards Co. was wholly owned by Frank Cohen and the same associates who owned Empire Ordnance Co. Mr. Biddle is an extremely naive man if he has never asked that question of his "good friend" Tommy Corcoran. For all of these reasons, it is, therefore, quite impossible that Tommy Corcoran should have been, as Mr. Biddle said, an "outsider" in the Savannah Shipyards matter. Plenty of additional evidence can be submitted on this point.

Mr. Biddle says (p. 65) that he never saw Tommy Corcoran in regard to this case "nor have I ever discussed the Savannah Shipyards case before or after with Mr. Corcoran in any way, nor with Empire Ordnance. I never discussed either case with Mr. Corcoran merely asking that Littell be required to confer with Dempsey and Koplovitz in regard to settlement of the Savannah Shipyards case" and expressing the belief that "it could probably be settled for about $1,000,000" (p. 64).

Again Biddle's story is at variance with the records and files of the Department of Justice. The defendants claimed in their answer $2,187,000 for the ship yards. Dempsey and Koplovitz in the conference which was called by Biddle in his office on June 3, 1942 (see my memorandum of Nov. 27, 1944, p. 4), talked about $1,900,000, admitting they would cut that somewhat "in the interest of being fair." Neither Corcoran nor his "front" firm ever offered to settle for $1,000,000.

I was ready to recommend that the Government settle for $1,000,000 plus interest, the Government's valuation, but the defendants never went that low. Lest this seem self-serving at this late date, let me remind Mr. Biddle of Admiral Land's letter of July 16, 1942, which said:

"MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Settlement of the case of United States of America against a certain tract or parcel of land in Chatham County, Georgia, et al., has been the subject of several conferences between the Commission and the Lands Division of the Department of Justice.

"At a meeting of the Commission on July 4, 1942, Assistant Attorney General Norman M. Littell recommended to the Commission that the case be settled for $1,000,000, plus 6 percent interest from January 3, 1942, the date of taking of the property. The Commission agreed that it would concur in a settlement for this amount, or a somewhat greater amount if recommended by Mr. Littell.

"Since that time the Commission has been advised that Mr. Littell offered to settle the case at $1,000,000, plus interest from January 3, 1942, that this offer was refused, and that the case has now gone to trial at Savannah, Ga."

The telephone conversation which Biddle admits with Tommy Corcoran, which started Biddle's personal negotiations with me as early as May 1942, could not possibly at that date have discussed a $1,000,000 settlement.

In any event, that one telephone conversation with Tommy was extremely successful because it kept the Attorney General of the United States hopping on the settlement of this matter from May 13, 1942, when Jim Rowe first telephoned me at the Attorney General's instructions, and May 14, when the Attorney General himself called me in regard to it, and May 22, when Jim Rowe took me aside at the Attorney General's house to discuss settlement at Biddle's request because they (Corcoran, Dempsey, and Koplovitz) were "our friends" and we had to do something about settling this case, and June 3, when we conferred with Dempsey and Koplovitz, through June 30, when there was a final conference with Biddle, when on my insistence he dropped his attempt to settle because "it would be another Sterling Products case."

It was common knowledge that Tommy Corcoran had been in and out of the Department every day for several days, as one of the Attorney General's close advisers twice told me in urging me not to permit settlement of the case in the interest of the Department of Justice and in order to protect the Attorney General himself. (See my memorandum of November 27, p. 5.)

Maritime Commission declines settlement: To conclude the point briefly, there was an offer to settle the case for $1,085,000. In a letter of July 20, 1942, drafted by myself, signed by the Attorney General, and addressed to Admiral Land, I stated that I would be happy to approve a settlement in about that amount if the Maritime Commission recommended it on the grounds that they were unable to spare, as witnesses during trial, men who were vitally needed for constructing ships. The Maritime Commission declined to make such recommendation. Other facts in my possession, bearing on value, as stated by Government counsel, did not justify settlement at that figure.

3. Questions for Mr. Biddle: As stated above, the jury brought in an award for $1,285,000 to be paid to the Savannah Shipyards Co. for its properties, although all but two or three of the jurors (as counsel later found out) favored the Government's figures of about $1,000,000 until the night before the verdict was reached, and yielded only to effect a compromise, with two jurors insisting upon a higher award. If Mr. Biddle considered the award of the jury to constitute a loss to the taxpayers of about $300,000, let him answer the following questions:

(a) When Mr. Biddle went to Savannah, Ga., not long after the trial and discussed this matter with Judge Lovett, who was "surprised" at the Attorney General's knowledge of one case in the district court, why did Mr. Biddle express himself as personally pleased with Judge Lovett's instructions to the jury and with the outcome of the case and state that there would be no appeal? (For the Attorney General thus to pass upon a matter of appeal was just as much out of

[1] Corcoran admitted this payment in testimony before this committee. See Truman committee report on Empire Ordnance Co.

order in the Departitent of Justice as to attempt to negotiate a settlement of the case in the first place. Recommendations for and against appeal proceed from the division in charge of the case to the Solicitor General and are within the latter's jurisdiction).

(b) After I succeeded in having the case appealed to the circuit court of appeals from the district court in Savannah, in spite of this irregular commitment to the contrary by Mr. Biddle, and after the circuit court of appeals had stated clearly that the allowance for attorneys' fees, bond promotion charges, and an item of $73,000 to the Cohen-owned Chatham Construction Co. were wholly improper and should not have been allowed by the district judge as elements of cost in constructing the shipyards, why was not Mr. Biddle zealous to take the case to the Supreme Court of the United States, as I recommended to the Solicitor General of the United States? These items total $125,000. The circuit court holding confirmed as a matter of law what I had said at the conference with opposing counsel on April 29, 1942. While there may have been doubts in this case, as there usually are in most cases, as to whether a petition for certiorari should have been filed, a member of the Solicitor General's staff, who worked on this case, agreed with me in recommending that a petition for certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States be filed, but it was not filed. Mr. Fahy apparently agreed with Mr. Biddle.

(c) Why, if Mr. Biddle regrets this alleged loss to the taxpayers of the United States, did he not seek to file suit for damages against the Savannah Shipyards Co. for breach of its contract with the Maritime Commission to construct ships, as requested in letter of July 16, 1942, from Admiral Land to the Attorney General recommending as follows:

"Mr. Littell has advised the Commission that it is not practical to offset damages which the Government has suffered by reason of the breach of the contract between the Maritime Commission and Savannah Shipyards, Inc The Commission recommends, therefore, that if, in your opinion, it is legally advisable, the settlement of this case be followed by the institution of a suit by the United States against Savannah Shipyards, Inc., its officers and directors, for damages, based upon the breach by the Savannah Shipyards, Inc., for the contract between Savannah Shipyards, Inc., and the United States of America represented by the United States Maritime Commission, dated November 25, 1941."

Attorney General Biddle replied by letter of July 20, as follows:

"In respect to the comment in the last paragraph of your letter, in regard to offsetting damages which the Government has suffered by reason of the breach of contract between the Maritime Commission and the Savannah Shipyards, Inc., Mr. Paul Page, your counsel, concurred with Mr. Littell that it was not practicable to advance any such claims in this case; consideration will be given to your suggestion that such damages be made the basis of a separate action."

Lest this matter be overlooked in the pressure of other matters in Mr. Biddle's office, I sent a memorandum on July 28, 1942, to Frank Shea, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Claims Division, which division would normally handle such a suit for the United States Government, suggesting that this matter be explored for the purposes of recovering damages from the Savannah Shipyards Co. Nothing has been done on that score. Why?

These are not the only questions which Mr. Biddle must answer in contending that my failure to settle the case resulted in a loss. He confronts far more grave responsibilities to the taxpayers, as set forth below.

4. Failure of S. E. C. to give results of its investigation of Savannah shipyards to Department of Justice for fear they would pass right through to Tommy Corcoran, due to Biddle and Rowe.

(a) Admission of Ganson Purcell on March 4, 1942: As pointed out in my memorandum of November 27, 1944, to this committee, attorneys for the Securities and Exchange Commission declined to make available all information bearing upon the Savannah Shipyards case in spite of an order from the White House to do so, when Government counsel were preparing the condemnation case for trial. The records and files of the Department of Justice so show. It was finally admitted just before trial that the reason for this evasion was that the S. E. C. did not have sufficient confidence in the Department of Justice and feared that any information given would "pass right through to Tommy Corcoran" due to the close association of Biddle and Rowe to Tommy Corcoran. Mr. Ganson Purcell, chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, admitted this in reply to my questioning in a conference held in Mr. Biddle's office on March 4, 1943, at 5:35 p. m. (See my memorandum of November 27, 1944.)

Never before the present time was this admission by Mr. Purcell challenged in any way, but the Attorney General now says, "I am authorized to say specifically on the record, by Mr. Ganson Purcell, that such a statement is absolutely unwarranted, and that after careful inquiry with other members of his staff and the Commission, that Mr. Purcell is convinced that such is not the fact."

Before commenting on this startling reversal by Mr. Ganson Purcell, let me assure the committee that I will prove at any time desired that the reason assigned for withholding the S. E. C. information regarding the Savannah Shipyards Co. from the Department of Justice was fear that such information would "pass right through to Tommy Corcoran." (At the moment I wish to relieve subordinates in the S. E. C. and Department of Justice from the embarrassment of having their names mentioned.) That this admission by Mr. Ganson Purcell of the reason for withholding the S. E. C. information was made in the conference of March 4, 1943, in the Attorney General's office, is clearly set forth in my personal notes of that conference and was also stated in a memorandum of April 3, 1943, to James Rowe, Jr., the Assistant to the Attorney General in connection with another issue. The material portion of the latter memorandum is attached hereto as exhibit E. A copy of this memorandum was sent to Mr. Biddle and later discussed with him. The admission by Mr. Purcell was never denied by Mr. Biddle or by Mr. Rowe, until now.

It is therefore shocking indeed that Mr. Biddle and Mr. Ganson Purcell now join in this assertion by Mr. Biddle "that such a statement is absolutely unwarranted * * * and that such is not the fact." It, therefore, becomes necessary to consider whether Ganson Purcell may have had such a connection with Tommy Corcoran as to compel his alinement with Biddle and Corcoran, even to the extent of joining with Mr. Biddle in not telling the truth about the conference of March 4, 1943.

(b) Ganson Purcell, S. E. C., the New York Stock Exchange, and Tommy Corcoran: Why was Purcell, a young man of 35 years, appointed in 1941 as a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission over men who were his senior in years and experience? One year later he was made Chairman of that board.

If the committee looks into this matter, they will find the following: Ganson Purcell was the head of the Trading Section of S. E. C. in 1941. On his desk was evidence that Charles Harding, chairman of the board of the New York Stock Exchange and a member of the firm of Smith Barney & Co., one of the most powerful companies having seats on the exchange, had violated the law and the stock-exchange regulations, such as by "trading against the book." Purcell was pressing for Harding's prosecution. Following so closely on the Whitney scandal, there was a great desire within the stock exchange to avoid another shock to public confidence. Tommy Corcoran, who had left the Government in the summer of 1940 and was "practicing law" in Washington, D. C., arranged for Emil Schram, then at R. F. C., to become president of the stock exchange. Mr. Purcell was elevated to a position on the Commission, and the charges against Harding were not pressed.

Has Purcell's indebtedness to Tommy Corcoran anything to do with his present rallying to the cause of Mr. Biddle and his "good friend" Tommy Corcoran by denying now a clear and unequivocal admission which Purcell had previously made on April 3, 1944?

A very challenging further question is raised as to whether or not there was not a conflict of forces within S. E. C. at the time when I was endeavoring to secure material information for the trial of the Savannah Shipyards case. Perhaps faithful public servants in that organization were genuinely concerned, as I know some of them were, lest information given to the Department of Justice should "pass right through to Tommy Corcoran," thereby aiding him in resisting the threatened indictment of his client, Frank Cohen, and others in the Empire Ordnance Co. On the other hand, one is compelled by Mr. Ganson Purcell's present aid to Biddle and Corcoran to wonder whether or not he may have been willing for quite different reasons to have the material information withheld from Department of Justice attorneys.

In any event, the S. E. C. did not render any material assistance to the Department of Justice Lands Division attorneys to win a case against Tommy Corcoran's client, the Savannah Shipyards Co. What were the consequences?

(c) Consequences of S. E. C. refusing information to Department of Justice: While I have already fully answered the Attorney General's charge that my refusal to settle the Savannah Shipyards case for $1,085,000 cost the taxpayers about $300,000, the failure of the S. E. C. to give the results of the investigation of the Savannah Shipyards Co. to the Department of Justice attorneys, as related above, placed upon Mr. Biddle very considerable responsibility for the jury's award of $1,285,000 for the following reasons:

(1) Financing construction costs of Savannah Shipyards Co.; lend-lease funds diverted by Empire Ordnance Co.: In one of the statements of the Savannah Shipyards Co. made in reference to securing a contract to build ships it was said:

"We borrowed no money from the Government; we got no money from any public; all the money invested in the Savannah Shipyards came from our own resources and from our own companies. * * *

"When we came to the Maritime Commission and told them that we would build the yard, and that we could not afford more than $40,000 or $50,000 per week. We told them that this money would be invested by the various affiliated companies of the Empire Ordnance Corporation."

Such assertions were not true. Had the S. E. C. investigations been made available to Department of Justice attorneys it would have revealed that the construction of the Savannah Shipyards was financed in the first instance by diverting lend-lease money advanced to the Empire Ordnance Co. for other

purposes. While the British Purchasing Commission brought an end to this practice after discovering the diversion of funds advanced the Empire Ordnance Co. for the manufacture of guns, nevertheless, several hundred thousand dollars of lend-lease money were used to finance the construction of the Savannah Shipyards—all of which would have been revealed in detail by the S E. C. report which was not made available to me before trial of the Savannah Shipyards case.

Government counsel in charge of the trial of the Savannah Shipyards condemnation case wished to have all such information in regard to the financing of the construction costs, and might successfully have contended, if such information had been available, that no reimbursement of costs should be made by the Federal Government to the extent that diverted lend-lease money was used, on the theory that a resulting or constructive trust was created in favor of the United States—and most certainly, no interest would have been allowed by any court on such expenditures. Interest alone was a substantial sum. One cannot now appraise the effects on the outcome of the case if Government counsel had possessed this evidence, but certainly the verdict of the jury of the amount paid by the Government would have been materially less.

Furthermore, other aspects of inter-corporate financing between the various subsidiaries of Empire Ordnance Co. and below the level of the audit in respect to which the S. E. C. had been requested for information might well have affected the Government's case and reduced the amount of the verdict. We know that there was great difficulty in getting access to the books of the Savannah Shipyards Co. and that a special set of books had been prepared for the purposes of the case. Government counsel wished to know what write up in the prices of materials might have been made in the sale of equipment from one subsidiary of the Empire Ordnance to another. There was every reason to be suspicious in the matter as Frank Cohen, president of the Empire Ordnance, had started the company with a shoestring personal investment of $5,000 as exposed by the Truman committee and he had been under investigation by the S. E. C. on numerous occasions.[2]

What the effect of full disclosure of the intercorporate relations of the Empire Ordnance Co. and its subsidiaries with the Savannah Shipyards Co. might have been, and what effect the possession of this information by Government counsel at the time of trial might have had in reducing the verdict of $1,285,000 is, of course, a matter of speculation; but it must be remembered that the failure to get this information was due to Mr. Biddle's connection with Tommy Corcoran, as stated to counsel for the Government just before the Savannah Shipyards case went to trial. It is also appropriate to ask Mr. Biddle what he did with the full and final report of the S. E. C. investigation regarding Frank Cohen's Empire Ordnance Co. and its numerous subsidiary and affiliated corporations, after the report was referred to the Attorney General from the White House. Did he have the report examined to see whether the Government could, to any degree, recoup its position by proceedings of any character against the Savannah Shipyards Co.?

[2] Frank Cohen was seriously involved in high financing in the life-insurance business, particularly in respect to an Indiana life insurance company. He was the subject of an indictment in the State courts of New Jersey where the cases were not brought to trial and he is barred from engaging in the life-insurance business in about 26 States.

Strain of War Seen Affecting Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from Washington Evening Star of January 20, 1945:

STRAIN OF WAR SEEN AFFECTING CHURCHILL—MISSES POINT OF UNITED STATES CRITICISM ON "POWER POLITICS," SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

Prime Minister Churchill is apparently beginning to show some of the effects of the war strain. His latest speech indicates not only a certain amount of irritation over what has been said in the United States, but it also may indicate that, with all the vast sources of information which the British may have in this country, their officials are inclined to do too much wishful thinking, and evaluate information from America on the basis of what some of their ardent friends and champions tell them rather than what is really disinterested public opinion here.

Certainly it seems that Mr. Churchill has completely missed the point about American criticisms of what is commonly called "power politics." In his speech, Mr. Churchill says:

"The expression 'power politics' has lately been used in criticism against us in some quarters. I would anxiously have asked the question, 'What are power politics?' I know some of our friends across the water so well that I am sure I can always speak frankly without causing offense.

"Is having a navy twice as big as anybody else's in the world power politics? Is having the largest air force in the world with bases in every part of the world power politics? Is having all the gold in the world power politics? If so, we are certainly not guilty of this offense. I am very sorry to say that they are luxuries far away from us."

IMPRESSION ON AMERICANS

The foregoing might create the impression on American readers that the United States deliberately built up the biggest Navy and Army and Air Force in the world in order to accomplish some purpose connected with our own commerce or trade or political objectives in this world. Yet, Mr. Churchill should know, above all other things, that when we did the same thing in the World War in building up our Army, Navy, and Air Force to an unprecedented size, we immediately thereafter went back to a peacetime basis, and nobody can point to a single square foot of land annexed, either directly or indirectly, to the territories of the United States as a consequence of the World War.

When the United States made its pledge last time that it did not want to annex any territory, it kept that pledge. But Great Britain obtained a mandate covering all the German colonies in Africa and various other territories in the world which have since been practically annexed to the British Empire. The misuse of that power of mandate is an example of power politics. Will it happen again?

Furthermore, the American people do not like to see alliances between Government and private business such as have called forth the criticism of "imperialism." This is a term the British do not understand because they believe in using the power of their Government in a political and diplomatic sense to extend their trade and commerce, whereas, in the United States, under the New Deal particularly, the tendency is to scuttle foreign investments and keep the American Army, Navy, or Air Force from being used as a tool of commercial interests.

Mr. Churchill quotes approvingly President Roosevelt's definition of power politics and says that the British are in agreement with it. That definition, expressed in the President's annual message to Congress recently, is as follows:

"In the future world, the misuse of power, as implied in the term of 'power politics,' must not be a controlling factor in international relations. That is the heart of the principles to which we have subscribed. We cannot deny that power is a factor in world politics any more than we can deny its existence as a factor in national politics. But in a democratic world, as in a democratic nation, power must be linked with responsibility, and obliged to defend and justify itself within the framework of the general good."

DEFINITION AND PRACTICE

But is Mr. Roosevelt's definition and British practice the same? The British policy in Greece was to some extent aimed at the maintenance of the royal family there, and the British policy in Italy had similar characteristics. England has confessed to a desire for a "sphere of influence" in the Mediterranean, and it is often sarcastically flung back at Americans that the United States has a similar "sphere of influence" in Latin America.

The truth is that the United States Government has never at any time had or asked for a special preference position in the matter of trade with any country in South or Central America. Likewise, the famous "open-door policy" which has been America's traditional position toward trade in the Far East has always been based upon equal opportunity for all and special preference for none. This is a far cry from the British conception of "sphere of influence."

It might have occurred to Mr. Churchill, too, that the United States does not today possess the biggest Army, Navy, or Air Force because of any premeditation. The fact that the British did not build up their Navy, Army, or Air Force to meet the German threat from 1933 to 1939, and the fact that France failed likewise has placed upon this country the burden of becoming the "arsenal of democracy."

It seems passing strange that the Prime Minister who begged America to help save Britain is now hinting that perhaps all this was done in order to gain some advantage in world politics even in its finer sense. Merely to state the record is to reduce Mr. Churchill's proposition to absurdity, and Americans can only hope that the war strain will be lightened so that the Prime Minister, who knows America so well, will not be tempted again, even for reasons of clever debate, to imply that the United States has any imperialistic or "power politics" purpose in fighting this war against Germany and Japan.

A Tribute to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following resolutions adopted by citizens of

Greater Boston January 14, 1945, at their mass meeting in Faneuil Hall, on matters confronting the United Nations, with particular emphasis on Poland:

Whereas Poland, the first nation in Europe to reject appeasement, was the first to fight Nazi tyranny in the cause of freedom and civilization; and

Whereas Poland continues to fight valiantly on land, sea, and in the air for her cause and that of the United Nations; and

Whereas Poland is a country whose people have always throughout its history guarded the achievements of western civilization, and the democratic traditions of individual liberty and the freedom of conscience; and

Whereas Poland, in this tragic hour, despite her efforts in the cause of the United Nations, is being threatened with partition and the possible loss of her independence through the disregard of justice, international law, and the principles of the Atlantic Charter: Be it

Resolved, That we, citizens of the United States, gathered at Fanueil Hall, the cradle of liberty, on the 14th day of January 1945, at Boston, Mass., firmly condemn a policy of settlement and power politics in the course of the prosecution of the war.

Resolved, That while it is in the best interests of the Allies to maintain unity and to fight together in loyalty for their cause and for the hopes that have rallied 36 nationalities in the 6 continents to the banner of the United Nations, we declare it is equally important that the peace settlement reached after the war is won shall be based on the democratic principles of justice, law, and the respect of the rights of all nations.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions shall be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State, and to each of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee.

ROMAN F. PUCKO.
LILLIAN J. NEMEAOSKI.
FRANK NOWAK.
GLADYS PIEKARAKI.
ELAINE H. PROABOSAGCZ.
JOHN SOKOBOUSKI.

A Resolution in Praise of the Public Service of Gordon L. McDonough, a Representative-Elect From California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, among those who will this day for the first time take the oath as a Member of this deliberative body will be the Honorable GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, a Representative-elect from California, a Member who will, I am quite sure, rapidly gain stature as a statesman of no mean ability.

Prior to his election to the Seventy-ninth Congress, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] served for 10 years as an elected member of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the governing body of a rapidly growing community of almost 4,000,000 people. Upon his retirement from the chairmanship of that governing agency to become a Member of this deliberative body, his colleagues in his former service, those who remain upon the board, passed a resolution in high praise of his public service which should find a place in the record of this day's proceedings. It is one of which he can be justly proud.

In accordance with the unanimous consent of the membership just hereinbefore expressed, I hand a copy thereof to the Public Printer and ask that it may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The resolution to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

Whereas GORDON MCDONOUGH has rendered outstanding public service as supervisor of the second district of the county of Los Angeles since August 1933; and

Whereas as chairman of the board of supervisors from December 1942 to December 1943, Supervisor MCDONOUGH's enlightened leadership assisted greatly in improving the standards of county service and elevating the public esteem in which they are held; and

Whereas by his natural ability and understanding, his untiring zeal to better human welfare, and through his integrity and fairness and courage, he has set an example of public service which will always be remembered; and

Whereas Supervisor MCDONOUGH has particularly endeared himself to the many thousands of county employees by the sympathetic interest which he has always shown in the improvement of employees' relations; and

Whereas these high qualifications have been recognized by an appreciative electorate which has chosen him as its Representative in Congress from the Fifteenth District: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors, in recognition of his splendid record, expresses its appreciation and esteem.

WILLIAM A. SMITH,
Supervisor, First District.
JOHN ANSON FORD,
Supervisor, Third District.
RAYMOND V. DARBY,
Supervisor, Fourth District.
ROGER W. JESSUP,
Supervisor Fifth District.

Living to Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. CURLEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of his excellency the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, archbishop of Boston, at Boston Chamber of Commerce members' luncheon, Thursday, December 21, Imperial Ballroom, Hotel Statler:

There was once a man who was found sitting on the pavement beating his head against a wall. Someone said to him: "Why on earth are you doing that?" The man replied: "Because it feels so good when I stop." Many people think of work like that. They live for the moment when they can stop. Work, for them, has become something to escape from, not something to honor and cherish. They think of work as a necessary evil because it is a means of making money; and if they could only make enough money, they would never do any more work. You may know of people who came into money and so gave up their life-work, whatever it was, and then retired into a state of unhappy boredom. When they stopped working, they really stopped living.

Now, there is something wrong with that joyless view of work. Work is not merely an activity to produce external commodities; it was intended by Divine Providence to become a means of personal development. Unless you can build your life around some form of congenial work—unless you have what is called a career—you cannot live a full human life. Work which impairs human character, which stunts human faculties and results in human degradation, however productive of material effects it may be, contradicts the essential purpose of human existence. In the Christian view, we should not have to work just to live—that is slavery: we should live to work—that is freedom.

There are two great basic truths on which this view of work rests; first, everyone has a right to be a maker, a creator; second, everyone has a right to create something that will serve society.

Everyone has a right to a life-work, and to a life-work which is a congenial form of making something, of producing something. Such work is not just a job. It is life, the life of an artist painting a portrait on the canvas of time. I am not saying that we all ought to be poets or painters or authors or inventors. That is one of the weak things about society today; we think of makers as a very small group of painters, poets, musicians, and so on. But in the Christian view of work, the artist is not a special kind of man, but every man is a special kind of artist. And I am not insinuating that we all ought to be making pots and pans—things with our hands. If we can sail a ship well, if we can cook a good meal, if we can drive an engine, plow a field, be a lawyer, a doctor, a street sweeper, or a businessman—if we can do any of these things, we are makers.

In addition, men and women have a right to that sort of work which enables them to make something for the betterment of society. Of course, there are endless ways in which you can be such a maker. Most people, if they are going to be fully alive, need the kind of making which consists of marrying, of having a family, of helping to build up the life of their community, their town, their country, and the world. You are businessmen; your happiness depends on your success as makers of something that enriches society. For example, you make it possible for the average man to buy what he needs. You make it possible for your employees to be makers in your business, which in turn brings added service to the community. You are living to work, not working to live.

Now, you do not have to be a college graduate in order to make something for the betterment of society. God has given some sort of creative talent to everyone. Every living, breathing mortal was created by God to live on this earth and to enjoy his work, with the consoling conviction that no matter what kind of work he was doing he was contributing to the well-being of the community. Most of us who are in the priesthood, for instance, came from the poor. Probably some of our fathers, who made possible our education, were in the employ of some of you. They were workers, but workers with an aim, a goal. Their goal was to give their sons and daughters what they did not receive—an education to equip them for the higher things in life. And if you would like to know of their success in reaching that goal, let me reveal to you a startling fact—as far as I know, there is only one Catholic bishop in all this country, in all the United States, who is the son of a man who ever set foot inside

a college. I would hazard the opinion that a similar statement could be made of other professions. Work like that, however humble it may be, springs from the serene and unshakable conviction that the goal of the worker is a benefit to society.

The extent of large-scale production in our society presents a spectacle unique in human history. Other civilizations have brought together large numbers of workers in colossal projects like the pyramids and the Roman roads, for instance. But these were feats extraordinary in their day, uncommon. In our day a plant which assembles vast numbers of human beings for the task of production is a commonplace. In 1929 for example there were 210,959 manufacturing establishments in the United States. One hundred thousand employed 90 percent of the workers in the manufacturing industry. Two hundred and six establishments employed 2,500 workers or more, 996 establishments employed 1,000 workers or more.

Large-scale industry is the sheltering framework within which most of our population (laborer and professional man alike) must find the means wherewith to live. But can a man find a fully human life within this framework? Can he live to work, to make, to create? Can he create in the secure knowledge that what he makes will benefit society? The present pattern of our industrial system is a pyramid with responsibility allocated in a diminishing scale from top to bottom. Creation, making in its truest sense, work in the Christian sense, belongs in fullest measure only to the manager, to the executive, to the man at the top. He has responsibility, not only for his own actions but for those of thousands of employees under him. Creative making belongs only in its most truncated, diminished form to the man at the bottom—the man at the assembly line—the man who has responsibility only for a single minute and highly simplified mechanical operation.

Two things militate against a fully human life within this framework. First, it condemns large numbers of people to hard, uncreative work—to drudgery. Not the drudgery of physical work, which the machine eliminated, but the mental drudgery of endless monotony. Second, it assigns human labor to an inferior place in the scale of human values.

There is a great difference between drudgery and hard work. Drudgery is hard work without the joy of accomplishment; and nothing more. If that is all we have we are in a sorrowful plight. Making things is hard work, too; only it is fascinating, because at the end you can say: "That is my handiwork; that is my creation." That sort of hard work is stimulating and therefore good for us. We hear a great deal nowadays about the danger of developing tensions; about the value of relaxing. Yet—after all, when you're totally relaxed you're dead; to win a baseball game, to run a mile, to beat last year's sales record, to plan next year's production peak—you have to be full of tensions; alive; living to work.

In earlier days, man was concerned with the making of the necessities of life. The doing of those necessary works called forth the creative and contemplative faculties of man. The old-fashioned maker of bricks, who made them one by one with the simplest of apparatus, had to have in his mind an image of the brick he was about to make and, strange though it may seem, that image had to be called up afresh each time. In the days when nails were made one by one, the same applied even to nails. But—the demand for bricks and nails and such things increased. Brickmaking and nailmaking became routine work. Brickmakers and nailmakers used less and less imagination. Creative making gave way to the physical drudgery of the first factories.

Machinery destroyed physical drudgery; it replaced it with a mental drudgery which is no less irksome. To reproduce thousands of copies of a newspaper in the days before the steam printing press was undoubtedly a grinding toil, but, if your physique would stand it, it is probable that you would rather spend 12 hours a day sawing wood than 12 hours a day pushing one button in and out. It is hard to imagine anything more stultifying, more demoralizing than a prolonged routine mechanical operation. It makes people as depersonalized as the man in the production line who was interviewed by a reporter. The newspaperman was visiting one of our large mass-production industrial plants to gather material for a human-interest story. He walked beside the long conveyor belt and chatted with each man in turn. He asked their names and the nature of the small operation that each man was performing. Finally, he came to one fellow and asked him who he was. And the man replied "I'm nut 39." Today one hears much about the ideal of the leisure state; if that means abolition of drudgery, it is indeed an ideal, and let us hope that it may come about; but if it means the abolition of personal "making," it would be practical slavery, because we should soon be half dead, half dead from boredom, half dead from standing watch at a belt line.

Drudgery, like taxes, is always with us. Most jobs are a mixture of drudgery and making, and we manage to take the first in stride because of the fun of the second. But if there has to be work which is sheer drudgery, whether mental or physical, then it should be distributed, just as it is shared in any decent family. And why? Because we are a family. We talk about the brotherhood of man, and we ought to mean what we say. We are our brother's keeper. As businessmen and employers you can render a great service to the joy and happiness of your employees by convincing them that their daily task is not one of monotonous, hopeless drudgery, but that it is the work of a maker, of a creator, the work of one who shares, the work of one who is making a definite, constructive contribution to the business that employs him and also to society. Such employees are contented and happy, helpful to one another and to all about them. They, indeed, work not to live, but they live to work. And the business is prosperous.

If drudgery stultifies human faculties, a system geared exclusively to the profit motive reduces human labor to the status of a commodity—something to be bought and sold on the sole basis of supply and demand. The grossest outrage committed against the worker in our time has been the materialistic philosophy that the pursuit of wealth and station is the highest and most honorable pursuit that a man can follow; the philosophy that ascribes a halo of righteousness to men who have achieved material success, regardless of the methods which they may have employed to gain their end. Here is the way a wag once expressed it by paraphrasing the comparative degrees of an adjective: "Young man, get on; get honor; get honest."

That philosophy leaves out one great fact; the highest type of Christian humanity is Christ Himself, a worker with His hands, the son of a worker, the friend and associate of workers. By choosing the vocation of a carpenter He dignified manual labor for all time. The work of the craftsman's hands produces wealth, it is true; yet it has a true nobility of its own as the worker has been inspired by his love for the work, as long as he is living to work. But if he is motivated solely by the spurs of avarice, the nobility of his work vanishes into thin air.

You are probably saying, how about the profit motive? There is nothing wrong with the possession of honestly gained wealth; but wealth brings social obligations and social responsibility; the selfish possession of wealth is degrading. This idea of responsibility was once expresed like this: "If a man will not work, neither let him eat." Karl Marx didn't write that; St. Paul did It means that you have a right to a reward in terms of wages or profits or interest if you have done something for society that merits a reward; if you have been a maker, a producer of something that betters society. You have the right to enough prosperity to secure for yourself and your family a dignified and fairly comfortable way of life.

But—and it is a big "but"—while there is nothing wrong with the profit motive, there is everything wrong with a society built exclusively on the profit motive. First, there is everything wrong with the man who says, "My only motive in working is to make money." Secondly, there is everything wrong with the man who says, "This is going to pay, and that is all I care about it." If you want to do a thing because it pays, all right; but you must make sure that it does not harm society and that it is just in itself.

So, within the framework of our modern industrial structure two factors, drudgery and the extreme of the profit-motive, militate against a full human life. What is the remedy? For joyless, mechanical, slaving hard work of drudgery, I would substitute the thrilling joy of craftmanship, of creative making. For overemphasis on the profit motive I would substitute a new emphasis on love of God and neighbor.

Man, like God, stamps his image on his works. Something of our personality, something that no other force in the universe can contribute, goes into our labors and makes them really a part of ourselves. This is the foundation of the price, the affection, even the tenderness of the true craftsman for the finished product of his labors.

We have lost much of the exquisite joy of the old craftsman who would leisurely run a hand over the smooth perfection of the work he had just completed. What a time he had getting this particular part of the work done; how he planned, dreamed, worried; how eagerly he went back to the job as his dreams began to take shape; what secret pride there is in this child of his genius, even though none of his works seem quite to catch the elusive beauty and breath-taking grace of his dreams.

Watch a carpenter (a real carpenter); he never bullies the wood, he never mauls it or forces it against the grain; he knows its qualities and treats them with respect. And so what he makes, he makes well and beautifully If we believe that the wood is God's creature, like ourselves, and that what we make is our offering to God, there will be a dignity and warmth about what we make, even if we are not first-class workmen. It is because careful craftsmanship has lent beauty even to the pots and pans of bygone civilizations that we treasure them and keep them in our art galleries. Can you imagine future civilizations keeping specimens of our kettles in their art galleries, except, perhaps, as curiosities?

The craftsman worships God in his work. This keeps his work social. Experience has taught us that the economists were terribly wrong when they constructed their hypothetical "economic man" who would serve society best by serving his own selfish interests first and last. We are always tempted to play our own hands for our own sakes, regardless of the rest of the world. We may be devoted to the cause of humanity; but it is odd how easily that can become a devotion to one part of humanity and a hatred of other parts, unless we are continually being called to account by something greater than humanity. That something is God. And for that reason I would substitute for our present overemphasis on the profit motive a renewed and vigorous emphasis on love of God.

God must be in our work, in our business, in every phase of our daily life. We must become the sort of people fit to share the life of God. Then we shall in fact be just—and more than just, for the law of love goes far beyond the law of justice. Herein lies the essence of genuine happiness. It has been proved over and over again that if you set out simply to find happiness, you never find it. Just as you think you have it in your grasp it eludes you. It is only when you abandon the idea and set out to make other people happy, to do good unselfishly, that you suddenly discover that you are really happy at last.

I think the same is true of society. There may be trials and heartaches before us, and the problems that arise may be great, but we have the stuff of happiness within us. In helping others to happiness, we are on the road to the same goal ourselves. But if we set out simply to build a paradise on earth for ourselves, we shall surely fail. You remember the famous saying after the last war was over: "Now we're all brothers—all Cains and Abels."

A very practical application of the foregoing point comes to mind. Before many months will have passed, it seems inevitable that we shall have in our midst many young men who have returned from war bearing permanent evidence of their heroism on their bodies. Some of these fine young men will be partial casualties. They will probably come to you looking for employment. A war which was not of their making has seriously disarranged their life. Once they will have returned, they are going to look for a chance to begin again. It will be the most natural temptation to reject them, for it may seem that their physical handicap will seriously mar their usefulness. But I ask you to remember that a handicap may often be the incentive that will drive them on to even greater accomplishment than they might otherwise have achieved.

Recall, if you will, that the famous historian Francis Parkman suffered from nervous exhaustion and eye trouble which permitted him to write with difficulty but six lines a day for months at a time. Did Parkman abandon his ambition to become a historian, as many a one would have done under the circumstances? On the contrary, he dug himself in more resolutely, struggled for long hours over original manuscripts scarcely legible, through innumerable documents and volumes, and wrote his superb histories on paper with a wire screen to guide his hand.

In spite of ill health which baffled him every day for 40 years, Charles Darwin worked continuously over his data until, as he said, his mind seemed to have become a sieve for the sifting of facts, until from the travail there emerged his epoch-making book, The Origin of the Species, which furnished at least a generalization that has enriched all branches of biological science.

William Wilberforce was a small, frail man in the constant throes of ill health. Boswell went once to hear him speak in the House of Commons and said afterward: "I saw what seemed a mere shrimp mount upon the table; but as I listened he grew, and grew, until the shrimp became a whale." For 20 years he was obliged by his physician to resort to opium to alleviate the pain that wracked his body, but he had the courage never to increase the dose. His own sufferings enabled him to appreciate more keenly the lot of the afflicted and the downtrodden and to the mitigation of their misery he devoted the energies of a lifetime, fighting with a stout courage that would have done credit to the strongest of men. His labors won for him the title of "Attorney General of the Unprotected and the Friendless."

Over his tomb in Westminster Abbey is carved one of the noblest inscriptions to be found in the entire Valhalla of England's honored dead. "He removed from England the guilt of the African slave trade," it read, "and prepared the way for the abolition of slavery in every colony in the Empire." Here, indeed, was the conversion of the liability of continuous ill health into the assist of a glorious achievement. For if Wilberforce had enjoyed robust health, he would probably never have acquired, one suspects, that profound sympathy for the afflicted that constituted the compelling motivation of his life.

I would prefer his epitaph to any found upon the tombs of generals. For unlike military leaders who march to fame over the bleeding bodies of men, Wilberforce won his niche in the hearts of the people of England by lifting up from their condition of suffering and degradation the most unfortunate of God's children.

The great masterpieces of literature, oratory, art, and music have not come as a rule from some shining Apollo or robust Hercules free from the handicaps of ill health, poverty, and affliction. They have come from the handicapped and the shut-ins—from dyspeptics like Carlyle, from hunchbacks like Pope, from neurotics like Poe, from the blind like Homer and Milton, from initial stutterers like Demosthenes, from the deaf like Beethoven. They are the type of men whom history discloses struggling over blood-stained roads and

"Toiling up new Calvaries
Ever with the Cross that turns not back."

Robert Louis Stevenson, dogged by tuberculosis that sunk its teeth so deeply into his lungs that no medicine or change of climate could loosen their hold, could have become a sour cynic questioning the justice of the universe and throwing his pen away in futile disgust. But no! He teased from his affliction its hidden elements of value. It brought his thoughts more frequently to God and His providential government of the universe and of human life as well. More revealing became certain verses of the Bible to which he had paid but scant attention before, such verses as: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not, therefore, better are you than many sparrows."

A new tenderness crept into his poetry, a mellow wisdom and beauty into his prose. Into poetry of what wistful tenderness did he transpose the sentiment of St. Peter, "Casting all your care upon Him, for He hath care of you," when, with the shadows lengthening about him he wrote from his island home in the Pacific:

"The embers of the day are red
Beyond the murky hill;
The kitchen smokes, the bed
In the darkling house is spread,
And the great woods are still
So far have I been led,
Lord, by Thy will;
So far have I followed, Lord,
And wondered still.
The breeze from the embalmed land
Blows sudden toward the shore
And clasps my cottage door.
I hear the signal, Lord, I understand.
The night at Thy command comes.
I will eat and sleep, and will not question more."

Perhaps the physically handicapped young man who comes to you seeking employment will be a great craftsman. Nature always offers compensation after the loss of a faculty. The blind develop keen perception through the senses of hearing and touch. The young man who can no longer walk may acquire uncanny skill with his hands. And as you personally help him to live to work, you will surely be making a genuine contribution to society and your fellow man. You, too, will be living to work. For a man's life work is not only for himself. It is his way of helping the human family. And you will necessarily be happy because you are serving another, because you are doing good. You will have the loving patience of the true craftsman as you shape and mold this broken life into one of usefulness. You will have the happiness and satisfaction of knowing that you have spared a fellow man a life of drudgery; instead of working to live, you will have taught him how to live to work. You will stand amazed like the craftsman before the beauty of this work, wondering how you could have produced it.

In a program of this sort there will be failures; not all men will respond to your kindness or your training. But neither are all your investments good. Unless you are going to make profit the sole motive in all your dealings, you will be willing to chance a loss of this sort, especially when it pays such munificent dividends if the experiment works. It will make you a responsible and happy maker.

The war has brought us one tremendous blessing; it has restored to us a corporate sense, the feeling that we are a family. Many people are happy in a way they never were before in spite of all the horrors of war, for the simple reason that they are living something of a family life with their fellow men, helping them and being helped by them. It is absolutely vital that we should cling fast to that when the war ends. If we do not, if we sink back again into the old spirit of selfishness, we shall be in a sadder state than ever before. But if we do cling fast to it and set about remaking the world for God and for one another, perhaps we shall succeed beyond our dreams.

That form of making, however, means hard work. It is no use to be idly wishing for it. It means hard thinking, and thinking together. It means a united and invincible will that, when the means are thought out, they shall not be made ineffective by stupidity or guile, by greed or selfishness; but they shall be put into effect with speed and thoroughness, so that America may be a land where all men may hold securely to their human heritage, the heritage of being makers, and therefore of being fully men, and therefore of being freemen.

All this means a revolution in our ways of thought. It means refusing to think in terms of cash returns, but trying instead to make as God makes—for the goodness and joy of the job. It means having the power and the courage to say, this or that is not worth making; this or that is not worth doing; and because such things are not worthy of us as free and responsible men, we cast them aside and will have nothing to do with them. But it means also having the will to declare ourselves in this fashion; and we shall not have the will unless we think like makers and not like servants of Mammon; we shall not have the will unless we live to work and not just work to live.

Let no one dare to say that it is impossible. It is not only possible, it is actually being done, now, at this very moment. When we are making weapons of war, we do not ask whether or not the job will pay. We ask one thing only, will the product be good? The revolution has been brought about perhaps without our realizing it. This is the danger; we did not bring it about and perhaps, when the pressure of events which brought it about has passed, we shall be ready to lapse back into the old ways. That is why a revolution is still necessary; a revolution within ourselves. How hideous it would be to have to confess that the thing that can be done under the pressure of the desire to kill cannot be done when the motive is to bring life and dignity to America. How hideous to have to say that once more we have chosen Mammon and rejected the Kingdom of God and His justice.

It is for us to say once and for all: "That shall not be." It is for us to see to it that it shall not be. It is for us to say:

"I will not cease from mortal strife,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem."

the city where finance is made sound by serving industry, and industry is made sound by serving man, and man is made happy by serving God and neighbor and loving God and one another.

The World Rubber Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the Members of this body to the importance and significance of the current meeting in Washington, D. C., of the rubber study group of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

This meeting, which opened on Monday, January 22, and which will continue through Saturday, January 27, is expected to form the basis for the future policies with respect to the world's rubber supply.

As a member of the House agricultural subcommittee investigating rubber, I am extremely interested in the present and future status of the rubber industry, with particular reference to the needs of the United States, the world's largest users of this vital material.

In this connection I wish to call attention to a study made by Mr. John L. Collyer, president of the B. F. Goodrich Co., of Akron, Ohio, who is a member of the United States group participating in the international conference.

Mr. Collyer is one of the world's outstanding authorities on rubber, and since his observations are so pertinent and timely I commend them to everyone of you. The salient points of his statement follow:

"What to do about rubber?" is a long-standing question that has compelled the attention and action of the American people. With the capture by the Japanese of areas which normally supply 90 percent of the world's natural rubber, this question took first rank among our country's wartime problems.

The United States can be proud of the way this problem has been handled to date. Industry, science, and government have teamed to provide a vast tonnage of American-made synthetic rubber to speed the United Nations' progress in a war that would have been lost but for this achievement. We have succeeded in solving our past rubber problems because we have dealt soundly and realistically with the factors involved.

We accumulated a natural-rubber stockpile because we faced the fact that we were then almost totally dependent upon distant sources and would need time in which to develop alternative sources if an emergency arose.

We spent about $700,000,000 for facilities to produce American-made synthetic rubber because we were up against the hard fact of an almost complete shut-off of natural rubber within a few weeks after Pearl Harbor.

Today America's giant synthetic-rubber program is approaching capacity operation. Production in 1944 reached a rate of 800,000 tons per year, and the practical capacity of approximately 1,000,000 tons a year.

This includes the annual capacity output of such important operating companies as the Copolymer Corporation, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., General Tire & Rubber Co., the B. F. Goodrich Co., Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., National Synthetic Rubber Co., and United States Rubber Co.

The output of privately owned American plants and of foreign plants will raise the world's total of synthetic rubber to about 1,200,000 tons annually. The world natural-rubber supply will total approximately 1,600,000 tons, including the output of the three largest producers of crude rubber, which are British Malaya with 620,000 tons, the Netherlands Indies with 620,000 tons, and Ceylon with 100,000 tons.

Thus the after-the-war annual potential rubber production of the world should be 2,800,000 tons.

That is more than twice as much rubber as the entire world used in the highest year on record—1941—when estimated world consumption was 1,300,000 tons.

There are many unknown factors in the long-range problems that situation will create.

First. The American people have spent about $700,000,000 on our synthetic-rubber program. Improved plants and processes might make the present facilities obsolete. Their value hinges upon the day-to-day progress of our scientists and men of industry in increasing the utility of synthetic rubber and in reducing its costs.

For the large tonnage uses, natural rubber today has the advantage.

But here, for example, is what happened to market prices per pound of three basic materials over a 25-year period:

	1918	1928	1935	1943
Aluminum	$0.33	$0.24	$0.22	$0.14
Magnesium	1.81	.55	.30	.20½
Rayon (yarn)	[1] 4.77	1.50	.57	.55

[1] 1919.

Synthetic-rubber costs are following a similar pattern, and no one can tell today what results will have been achieved by the time hostilities have ended and governmental controls are no longer required as wartime measures.

Second. The magnitude of our synthetic-rubber production may depend not only upon technological advances but upon the policies which the American people, through their Government, adopt for the disposal of our existing Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants.

Third. The peoples of the other nations have a large stake in the production of natural rubber. Our progress in synthetic rubber may be a major factor in determining to what extent large-scale plantation operation will prove economically profitable.

Fourth. For many years rubber has been America's No. 1 import in terms of dollars. Its post-war position in international trade will be affected by whatever action is taken by the nations of the world to reorganize international trade.

The American people have learned through bitter experience how vital an assured supply of rubber or synthetic rubber is to the maintenance of their military security. In our opinion they will require that a minimum annual production of 200,000 tons of American synthetic rubber be maintained—regardless of economic factors—purely as a national defense measure, just as arsenals, naval bases, and air bases are maintained. But the division as to how this insurance can best be provided in the future is yet to be determined by our people, and it undoubtedly will exert an influence on the world rubber situation.

But certain facts are known today, and certain developments may occur in the reasonably near future. Some new factors should now be taken into consideration:

No. 1. The United Nations in the coming months may gain access to major natural-rubber-growing areas while the war is still on. The trend of war in the Southwest Pacific indicates recapture of Borneo, Java, Sumatra, perhaps even the Malay Peninsula, before the final defeat of Japan.

No. 2. Even if the rubber-growing areas of the distant east are reoccupied, the probability is that it will take at least 2 years before normal operations are restored.

No. 3. During this restoration period the United States and the world will require unprecedented quantities of rubber for military and vitally essential civilian needs.

It is our estimate that consumption of natural and synthetic rubber in the United States following recapture of the far-eastern plantations will average 850,000 tons; and that world consumption will approximate 1,600,000 tons a year.

No. 4. For at least 2 years from the date of reoccupation, this 1,600,000-ton annual world demand for rubber cannot safely be met with either synthetic rubber or natural rubber alone. Big as it is, our synthetic-rubber program cannot do it alone. Natural rubber and synthetic rubber both will be needed for at least 2 years after reoccupation.

No. 5. While both natural and synthetic will be needed during this period, the usage of natural rubber will increase and, unless the price of natural rubber rises sharply from the 1941 level of 18½ cents f. o. b. plantations, usage of synthetic rubber will decrease.

These important developments are brought out in the following analysis: If we assume that rubber trees in the plantation areas are found to be in reasonably good condition, but that equipment and labor will have to be obtained,

here is how we may expect natural rubber to come back:

	Receipts from unoccupied territories	Receipts from reoccupied territories	Total receipts
First year after reoccupation:	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*
First quarter	46,000	28,000	74,000
Second quarter	47,000	46,000	93,000
Third quarter	47,000	76,000	123,000
Fourth quarter	48,000	145,000	193,000
Total	188,000	295,000	483,000
Second year after reoccupation:			
First quarter	40,000	192,000	232,000
Second quarter	40,000	230,000	270,000
Third quarter	40,000	268,000	308,000
Fourth quarter	40,000	305,000	[1] 345,000
Total	160,000	995,000	1,155,000
2-year totals	348,000	1,290,000	1,638,000

[1] This is at the rate of nearly 1,400,000 tons a year—higher than the total for any year in history.

But this 1,600,000 tons which we may expect to obtain in a 2-year period after reoccupation would equal only 1 year's estimated world needs for raw material. That is why we will still have to depend upon synthetic-rubber tonnage in addition to that required for national security.

The following figures show how much synthetic rubber will be needed to satisfy over-all consumption demand. They clearly indicate the tapering-off of the minimum need for synthetic rubber as large tonnage of natural rubber again becomes available:

	Estimated rubber consumption	Potential natural-rubber receipts	Minimum synthetic requirements
First year after reoccupation:	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*
First quarter	375,000	74,000	301,000
Second quarter	375,000	93,000	282,000
Third quarter	375,000	123,000	252,000
Fourth quarter	375,000	193,000	182,000
Total	1,500,000	483,000	1,017,000
Second year after reoccupation:			
First quarter	400,000	232,000	168,000
Second quarter	400,000	270,000	130,000
Third quarter	400,000	308,000	92,000
Fourth quarter	400,000	345,000	55,000
Total	1,600,000	1,155,000	445,000
2-year totals	[1] 3,100,000	1,638,000	1,462,000

[1] Of this, United States consumption is estimated at 1,700,000 tons.

In formulating our rubber policies we should avoid making commitments extending beyond the emergency period which involve Government controls that compromise the basic principle, that America's long-range policy, for rubber as well as for other goods and services, is founded on the principle of competitive enterprise.

The advantage to the American people of a sound basis for dealing with natural- and synthetic-rubber production and prices may be appreciated from this fact:

A difference of 10 cents a pound in the price of the basic raw material—based on the anticipated American consumption of 850,000 tons a year when peace is restored—would mean a total difference of $190,000,000. These savings in 4 years would be equivalent to America's expenditure for the war-necessitated Government synthetic-rubber plants.

Such savings, moreover, would continue for many years if sound policy is adopted for maintaining natural rubber and synthetic rubber in an equilibrium based on efficient production and low prices.

It will add strength and flexibility to wartime production and transportation. The adoption of a sound policy to be put into effect at the time the far eastern rubber lands are recaptured will:

Provide time—perhaps 2 years—for fact finding and investigation of the long-range rubber problem.

Smooth the transition to normal peacetime operations for producers and consumers of synthetic rubber and natural rubber.

Reduce the costs of the war to the American people and to the peoples of the other United Nations.

Forestall the growth during wartime of trends which might lead to vicious price spirals and speculation in the early years of sharp demand, with tobogganing declines later on.

Serve as a guide to the handling of other similar problems involving the interest of the American people in efficient, low-cost production with benefits to their standard of living.

But more important than all these fruits of this action will be the foundation laid for the long-range rubber policy—a policy which will assure:

American military security;

Progress through competitive enterprise; and

Resulting lower-cost raw materials, making possible broader markets for rubber, increasing employment and a constantly rising standard of living for the peoples of the world.

The Farm-Labor Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PEVELY, MO., *January 22, 1945.*

Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: I am a director for Sanitary Milk Producers, an organization of some 2,700 dairy farmers in 53 counties in Missouri and Illinois who supply inspected milk for St. Louis.

I have been recently selected by the organization to represent them on national legislation. Therefore I am interested in dairy farmers as a whole and not as an individual.

It is impossible to get farm labor and to complicate matters more than ever the only farm help we have are the men between the ages of 18 and 26 and are the ones who are on the very highest producing farms and have done an excellent job.

Some have already been called into service and the remaining few have all been placed in class I–A and ordered to report for preinduction examination in the very near future, which means if these boys are taken into the armed forces the dairy and agriculture industries are going to be crippled beyond estimation at the present and very likely permanent.

To give you a better picture of the situation, I am going to outline a specific case briefly:

This man is 24 years old and works on a 470-acre dairy farm. This farm has 38 dairy cows and 11 head of other cattle. In 1944 this farm had 80 acres of corn, 25 acres of barley, 7 acres of rye, 15 acres of alfalfa hay to harvest four times, 20 acres of soybeans, filled 125-ton silo with ensilage, and sowed 45 acres of wheat beside all fence repair and what other work goes with farming. I think this is only one average case, and there are many others equally as good as this one and some better, but our draft board has placed them all in class I–A and ordered preinduction examination.

Therefore, I think you, as well as myself, can readily see what the dairy industry is facing. I feel that this is something that must have immediate attention and I will appreciate very much whatever you can do to help this situation.

Yours very sincerely,

C. MONTE CRAFT.

Independent Tire Dealers Appeal to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one aspect of the monopoly problem in America which should receive the immediate attention of the Congress is the plight of the independent tire dealers and independent filling-station operators of the country.

In this connection, I am including herewith, first, the front-page article appearing in the National Independent, a journal of the Independent Tire Dealers and Tire Rebuilders of America, for December 1944. Second, I include the article first printed in June 1941 and later reprinted in the December 1944 issue of this same paper to which reference is made in the lead article.

It is my earnest hope that Congress can take some constructive action on these very important problems in the near future.

The articles follow:

[From the National Independent of December 1944]

INDEPENDENTS DOOMED UNLESS CONGRESS ACTS

(By George J. Burger, tire-marketing consultant, representative of tire independents in the Nation's Capital)

On page 5 of this issue is reproduced the lead story of our issue of June 1941—the story which exposed the ties existing between major oil and major rubber companies.

This is an exception to our policy of not repeating. It's an exception because of its importance. Members of Congress must

know the facts—dealers must be reminded—if independent enterprise in the tire industry is not to suffer another severe set-back.

Let's look at the record. For 3 long years independent tire dealers have informed the Members of Congress of the nature of these rubber-oil hook-ups. All this led the Senate Small Business and Banking and Currency Committees to consider a bill, S. 1122. This bill, had it received action expected, would have meant freedom of enterprise to at least 300,000 independent establishments, tire dealers, automobile dealers, filling-station operators, and garages, in the rubber-tire field.

This bill was, naturally, opposed by the oil industry. The oil companies told Congress that their ties with tire companies were being made solely to enable their filling-station outlets to complete their retail lines. They told Congress of their interest in their retailers. They didn't stress the fact that by the tie-ups they were lining their own purses with much velvet. They didn't mention the overrides, the commissions, and special deals they were receiving. And they said little or nothing of coercion of their retail outlets.

That's past history. We considered those ties an evil—we still do. We say they must be broken. They should be.

Formerly it was the tire dealer who complained of these tie-ups. Now let's see who's doing the talking—

Filling-station operators themselves, as reported in the Gasoline Retailer (September 30, 1944) through their own association in executive session solemnly resolved to oppose the tire, battery, and accessory policies of the oil companies. They said that some major oil companies were bringing pressure, which amounted virtually to compulsion, on their outlets to handle tied-in lines. They admitted that this situation would become progressively more acute, especially in the post-war era when the oil companies planned expansion of these lines.

The above is from the retail gasoline trade. The article on page 5 is from the retail tire field. The facts in both are identical. The conclusions are inescapable, as we see it—

The relations between the rubber and oil companies will continue. Goodyear is tied in with Sinclair. Kelly is hooked up with Sun. Goodrich—through its Hood division—is connected with Tidewater. U. S. is making Atlas tires for Standard. Goodyear has another tie with Shell. American is tying with Mansfield. These are all in addition to similar ties which existed before Pearl Harbor. The trend is obvious.

If this condition continues it will mean that the position of independent enterprise in the tire industry will be further weakened—probably disastrously so.

The only thing that can save this situation is prompt, affirmative action by the Seventy-ninth Congress to examine and explode these rubber-oil ties.

[From the National Independent of December 1944]

RUBBER-OIL TIES AIRED—STATIONS ARE FORCED TO HANDLE ONLY APPROVED TIRE LINES—OVERRIDES STILL GIVEN OIL COMPANIES; FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION RULING APPARENTLY IGNORED

(Reprinted from the June 1941 issue of the National Independent)

NEW YORK, June 14.—Unless independent tire men handle a line of tires that is approved by the major oil companies, they must regard the stations owned and operated, or leased, by these petroleum makers as a 100-percent closed market so far as their sales efforts are concerned. Such was the unanimous opinion of all reporting members of a representative Nation-wide group of tire dealers surveyed recently by the editors of this paper on the major tire manufacturer-major oil company relationships.

This, in effect, resulted in depriving all but 1 of every 10 replying dealers of the privilege of supplying those outlets which last year accounted for the sale of substantially more than five and one-half million replacement tire units. And it means that Goodyear, Goodrich, Firestone, and United States have, for all practical intents and purposes, a virtual stranglehold on the whole of the market.

GUARANTEE TIRE ACCEPTANCE

The major oil companies assure the tire manufacturers with whom they have relationships, of exclusive rights of successful solicitation by various means. For, despite the fact that the petroleum marketers are ever proclaiming their stations are operated largely by independent businessmen, it is not difficult to discover that so far as having the right to select a brand of tires is concerned this vaunted independence is, in reality, nonexistent. Dealers admit that the oil companies would not go so far as to send out any letter or written order demanding that the leased station refrain from handling any specific line of tires. But, as one dealer wrote: "Here is what happens to these leased stations. If they want a man badly enough they will, if he is a good boy, stands on his hind legs, jumps through the hoop, and rolls over and is an obedient dog, charge him for example, from fifty to one hundred dollars a month for his lease. But Lord help him if he even attempts to display his independence. In that event they would say 'All right, you handle any lines of tires, batteries, or tubes you want, but from now on your rent will be from $350 to $500 per month, so take your choice.'" Other dealers reported that in certain instances they had definite proof of threats to cancel leases unless unwanted brands of tires were removed immediately. The means of keeping the station operators "in line" seemed chiefly threats to jump rents or cancel leases. Their effectiveness was demonstrated in many instances by concrete examples.

WIDESPREAD CONTROL EXERCISED

Additional evidence of the widespread control exercised by the four major tire manufacturers (through their oil-company connections) over the tire-through-oil-station distribution set-up is derived from the following facts. There were, on the average, 274 filling stations selling tires and tubes in the average reporting dealer's locality. Of this number, on the average, only 60, or about 22 percent, were said to be free to buy their tire and tube requirements where they wanted, while, on the average again, 214 or approximately 78 percent were not free.

RECEIVE 5 PERCENT FOR DELIVERY

Eight out of every 10 dealers admitting that they effected deliveries to the leased stations claimed that they invoiced either the station itself or the oil company for sales, while on an average 2 out of 10 reported that their tire-manufacturer suppliers performed this task for them. For this service some report that they receive the magnificent sum of 5 percent for their services. Evidently this is not always in cash, for other dealers report that their commission is paid in the form of a warehouse credit issued by their suppliers. Still others report that they are reimbursed with credit given to them by the purchasing leased station.

Further proof of the extensive control which the 4 major companies wield over the filling-station field through their exclusive supplying contracts is found in a compilation of the relationships reported. For of the 15 tire-oil-company hook-ups noted, the major tire manufacturers controlled 13 and 2 smaller companies, 1 each.

SPECIAL ARRANGEMENTS EXIST

When asked whether or not they believe there were any special arrangements that the major petroleum companies had with the major tire manufacturers in the matter of deferred payments on tires and tubes sold to the consumer through leased or owned filling stations no few dealers cited the credit cards which are accepted only on approved brands of tires. Whether or not the oil company carried the burden of the credit assumed on these sales or whether the tire manufacturers did so was not made clear. However, these cards have a two-edged effect, in the first place they tend to discourage consumers from buying any other than the approved brand of tires from stations they may patronize, and in the second place, they make it most attractive for leased station operators to handle the line of tires specified, thereby discouraging buying of other makes. In some sections it was reported that certain rubber manufacturers had gone so far as to set up full budget departments in their leased station customer's premises. Taken all in all, dealers who reported had no doubt that many special sales arrangements existed.

OVERRIDES STILL GRANTED

Although the Federal Trade Commission in a report prepared some time ago for the Temporary National Economic Committee stated that "Investigations and complaints brought by the Federal Trade Commission have gone a long way toward eliminating the practice of tire companies of granting over-riding commissions" to the oil companies for permission to sell their stations tires and tubes, dealers feel that the major oil producers must still be receiving a quid pro quo for their efforts to induce their stations to handle only "acceptable" lines. That they must be is only logical in view of the efforts they exert. One dealer said that he had actual knowledge to the effect that one major tire manufacturer had up to 6 months ago at least, a petroleum company connection and allowed that oil concern a 10 percent cut-back for the privilege of selling its accounts. Other dealers report that that mutual agreement exists whereby the tire companies are able to purchase their oil and gasoline requirements at prices lower than those accorded oil station operators. Still others report, as proof of the existence of over-riding arrangements, that where the rubber company sells direct to stations the billing is done on industry program, but where the oil company bills the station it receives dealer prices, and the rubber company pays its dealers the delivery commissions.

CONCLUSIONS

From the evidence gathered in this survey three principal conclusions at once become evident. They are as follows: (1) through their relationships with the major oil companies, the four major tire manufacturers have an unquestionable, unbreakable, stranglehold on the tire-through-filling-station market, consequently successful competition with them for this market is impossible. (2) through these relationships those tire makers have not only closed the field to the smaller tire manufacturers and their dealers, but have also reduced their own dealers' potential profits on sales to the owned and operated, or leased stations, to the vanishing point, and (3) reciprocal relationship still do exist, and over-riding commissions are still being given the major oil companies by the major tire manufacturers as inducements for the former to permit the latter exclusive rights to solicit and service their stations.

One World Is Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting an article prepared by Fred W. Layman, an attorney at Casper, Wyo. This article, One World Is Possible, sets out a plan for world peace.

The outstanding feature of his plan is that it goes back to the people themselves who fight the wars and suffer the ravages of wars.

Mr. Layman is an outstanding attorney in the State of Wyoming and has spent considerable time and thought on this subject.

The article follows:

ONE WORLD IS POSSIBLE

One world is possible through the adoption of the following compact by all the people on this earth.

THE COMPACT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD

"We, the people, desiring to promote perpetual peace for ourselves and our posterity, do hereby forswear war, as hereinafter defined, for ourselves, our posterity and the nations of which we are the constituents and whatever form such nations may hereafter take, territorially or otherwise, and by means of a plebiscite, with a greater than a majority vote registered by the people, under the principle that those who have voted against are nevertheless bound by this majority vote, have authorized and directed the governmental heads of the nations of which we are constituents to subscribe to this declaration for us and our nations, binding us and our nations against engaging in any act of war at any time in the future and in order to insure peace and promote harmony among ourselves and the nations subscribing to this declaration we hereby direct the governmental heads of the nations of which we are a part:

"1. To organize an International Police Force, drawn from our ranks, proportionately and by volunteers only;

"2. To organize a League of the nations of which we are a part;

"3. To maintain, through such League, such international police force and direct its activities;

"4. To maintain international peace by using international police force to arrest persons who, singly or jointly, disrupt international peace by damaging or destroying property or injuring or killing persons, and by meting out the punishment to such persons as may be directed by a proper board of the League and after their guilt has been established by a proper tribunal of the League: *Provided*, That this provision shall operate only when the nation of the people injured or where the damaged property is situated requests such action;

"5. And through such League to promote harmony among us and our nations by promoting the free flow of commerce throughout the world, and by conducting such other activities through such League as may be necessary to promote peace and friendliness among us and our nations;

"*Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to limit our right and the right of our nations, individually or collectively as nations, to bear arms and use them in the defense of our lives or property in such manner as not to constitute war as hereinafter defined, or to wage war against nations not signatory hereto.

"*Provided further*, That the internal affairs of the nations of which we are a part shall not be subject to regulation, control, or interference by the League or the International Police Force unless it be to enforce the provisions for permanent peace and the punishment of transgressors as herein provided.

"War is defined as the exercise of any force other than economic, by nations individually or collectively other than through the League, causing destruction of life or property either within the territory of another nation or its possessions or upon the high seas.

"This compact shall be signed by the governmental heads of the nations of which we form a part, who customarily sign and execute treaties between nations, and shall be dated, and sealed when signed, and shall become binding and effective as and when 20 nations have joined themselves together by this compact. Other nations may join this compact in the same manner as provided for the first 20, and shall become members of the League of Nations organized as provided herein, with equal status."

There are numerous plans for establishing world peace, but no plan has received public attention which is founded upon action of the people, the source of all political power. Neither is there a definite commitment in any plan whereby the nations forswear war permanently amongst themselves. This compact herein outlined is clear and specific on the question of future wars and it permits the people of the nations of the world to take a direct part in outlawing war and creating a league of nations. Power politics, where the big nations direct the destinies of the smaller nations, is still possible under this compact but the enforcement of the policies of the big nations can be carried out only by economic force or pressure. Economic pressure by one nation against another cannot be controlled or eliminated unless nations are willing to transfer their sovereignty entirely to a superstate and as yet the nations of the world are not prepared to cooperate that far. Today and in years past no nation had a guarantee against economic pressure from any other nation unless it be by treaty. So far as the United States is concerned the people under the compact would decide, and not Congress, whether we shall forswear war and establish a league of nations. Once the plebiscite of the people of the United States was taken on this compact, Congress would fully understand what would be expected of it in supporting the provisions for creating a league of the nations.

Assuming that the people of all nations join this compact—what would be the result?

The answer is: There could be no wars. In case the governmental heads of a nation ordered its armed forces to invade another nation, and in so doing destroy property and lives in such nation, they and their armed force individually would be guilty of murder. It would then be the duty of the International Police Force to capture them, and for the League to mete out the proper punishment. A soldier of such armed force, ordered to invade another nation, could and probably would refuse to carry out such an order, knowing that such invasion would be a breach of international peace which the people of his nation had sworn to preserve, and his status would become that of a criminal. Nations could not use their armed forces to invade another nation to protect the property of its nationals. That may appear bad, but it has been many years since any nation tried to do that. Our relations with our South American neighbors would improve immeasurably when they realized they had no fear of the military power of the United States. Such problems would be for the League to solve. With the provision that individuals may still bear arms to defend their lives and property, a nation could still maintain an army and navy; but when it becomes apparent that a large force is not necessary in view of the efficient functioning of the International Police Force, there would be a steady shrinkage of the size of this force. The International Police Force would consist of an army and navy, its units scattered about the world in strategic places and in numbers according to danger spots that are known to exist. A secret police would operate in all countries, securing information on any plot to damage property or take lives of people in other nations.

Being cosmopolitan, the police force could be used in such a way that soldiers would never be involved in arresting persons of the same nationality in a breach of the world peace. Since the police force would be composed of voluntary enlistments, there would never arise the occasion where heads of governments could say "why should we interfere and lose the lives of our soldiers because an enlightened nation like Italy wants to subdue and conquer a nation of black people like Ethiopia?"

A league of all nations would be set up, and provisions would be made to improve commerce between nations. Other activities engaged in by the former League of Nations could be adopted. The heads of the League would be engaged daily first, in maintaining peace, and second, in administering other regulations of the League.

Assuming that the people of some nations refuse to join the compact and the League, then their refusal would be notice to those in the League to watch those nations for warlike actions and to maintain an army and navy commensurate with the forces maintained or being built up by those noncooperating people and nations. Under such circumstances no nation need be caught unprepared. The League might even arrange to defend any of its member nations against those uncooperating nations who might engage in war.

Like any new approach to the problem of attaining perpetual world peace, this plan is far from perfect; but it does offer the people of this world an opportunity to take part directly in the establishment of a world peace and, being founded upon their undivided participation, the results are more apt to be everlasting.

FRED W. LAYMAN.

CASPER, WYO., *November 15, 1944.*

Global Alphabet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention of the House to a letter from former Senator Robert L. Owen, president emeritus of the National Popular Government League. Senator Owen explains his project of the global alphabet to which he is now devoting his time to promote world literacy and world knowledge of the English language. As an exponent of early governmental reform

and progress, Senator Owen's record is long and distinguished and filled with the strong desire for national progress. The letter follows:

NATIONAL POPULAR GOVERNMENT LEAGUE,
Takoma Park, D. C., December 25, 1944.
Hon. JUDSON KING,
Director, National Popular Government League.

MY DEAR JUDSON: When you and I organized the National Popular Government League in cooperation with Hon. George Norris, of Nebraska; Hon. William Kent, of California; Hon. Edward Keating, now editor of Labor, and others, December 6, 1913, it was with the avowed purpose of establishing processes by which to safeguard the bulwark of fundamental democratic popular government.

We have sought the enactment in effective workable forms of such progressive measures as: the initiative and referendum; the recall; the mandatory direct primary; a more flexible method of amending the Federal Constitution; corrupt practices acts; publicity of campaign funds; protection of civil liberties; conservation of natural resources, including Federal control of the Nation's water resources, and public ownership and operation of electric power, and rural electrification by farmer cooperatives.

You will recall that during the years I was president of the league I was fighting in the United States Senate for the stabilization of money, for child labor legislation, for the equal rights of men and women, for public health laws and like progressive measures.

In the field of international relations we have opposed secret diplomacy and have pointed out the economic causes of war and the danger to permanent peace and world organization from private monopoly and international cartels.

I congratulate the devoted members of the National Popular Government League who have through foul weather and fair supported its work; and I congratulate you and Mrs. King with all my heart for your years of devoted self-sacrifice. In directing the affairs of the association, your integrity, your industry, your efficiency, and your disinterestedness have never been questioned.

We have all been privileged to do our part in a tremendous world movement springing from the people for political, economic, and social democracy which, as Victor Hugo long ago predicted, will make the twentieth century "the century of man." That movement is making great progress at this time.

I call your attention to the recent action of the United States Senate in supporting the principles of the Atlantic Charter. I call your attention to the unbroken commitments of our President to the principles of freedom from aggression, and the great organization to be established to protect and safeguard liberty throughout the world. I profoundly believe that nothing can now stop or prevent the establishment of these principles.

I call your attention to the frequent commitments of the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain, as well as the Governments of Russia, of China, and of the United Nations by the Moscow Conference, the Cairo Conference, and the Teheran agreement in support of these humane principles in which the dignity and rights of every human being in the world can be preserved.

We have already entered a new era with new forces in control of the world affecting public opinion on the entire globe, made possible and certain through the improvement of communications and transportation on land, sea, and air. The radio speaks to the whole world instantaneously.

In the United States, which represents only 6 percent of the world's population, we had about 1,700 broadcasting stations and 57,000,000 radio receiving sets as of December 1943. The airplane has put every nation in the world in close contact. All of the leading nations are now manufacturing these radio receiving sets, broadcasting sets, and airplanes.

The modern airplane has abolished space and made all nations subject to methods of destruction for those who dare deny the fundamental principles of human liberty to which we are dedicated.

The Kuo Ming Tang of China has accepted our principles, as the Chinese Minister informed our league at the Norris dinner, December 1939. The people of Russia are using such principles in their Soviet socialist system.

The suffering and agony of this global war now promises to guide the world into an acceptance of the truth of the unforgettable words of Christ on the night before his crucifixion, when he said to Peter, "Put up thy sword."

We have entered the new world in which illiteracy and poverty can now be supplanted by world-wide intelligence, abundance, understanding, and world peace. As you well know, I have been devoting myself to the development of the global phonetic stenographic alphabet. This alphabet can be learned in 1 day. It can be used to enable the people of the whole world to immediately print in their own language with the modern printing press letters enabling them to pronounce with comparative accuracy every word in any language, thereby giving the people of the world a further means of quickly understanding each other and learning each other's language within an incredibly short space of time and at a negligible expense. The compositor from the keyboard of the monotype and linotype machines can now set the type to print any language in the world in this alphabet. This plan has "revolutionary potentialities." It is capable of rendering "prodigious service" in the increase of human understanding, knowledge, and production.

I enclose Senate Document No. 250, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, just published by the order of the United States Senate, which explains this system.

I call the attention of the members of the National Popular Government League to this document and to Senate Documents Nos. 49 and 133, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, on the same subject.

With kindest regards,
Your friend,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

Mounting Tide of Resentment Against Activities of Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.—Arkansas State Legislature Rescinds Former Action Favoring Adoption of Proposed Twenty-Second Amendment—National Education Association Journal Publishes Strong Article Condemning Gannett-Rumely Group—New Hampshire, However, Joins Lists of States Favoring Tax Limitation Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a mounting tide of resentment against the underhanded activities of the minions of the Committee for Constitutional Government is more apparent every day. As the true implications of the program advocated by this Fascist group are called to the attention of our State legislators by wage earners, white-collar workers, and small businessmen—those most vitally affected by this group's proposed twenty-second amendment to the Constitution—it is indeed gratifying to learn that one of our State legislatures has already rescinded its former action which favored adoption of this proposed amendment.

ARKANSAS REPEALS

I was very happy to learn that the Arkansas General Assembly has adopted, as of January 16, House Concurrent Resolution No. 4, introduced by Hon. Emory Thompson, which totally rescinds the prior action of the 1943 Arkansas General Assembly favoring the passage of this nefarious amendment.

NEW HAMPSHIRE HAS PASSED IT

On the other hand, since discussing this matter last, I find that the sovereign State of New Hampshire, through its 1943 legislature, did adopt in both houses a resolution favoring the adoption of this amendment. Little or no publicity was given this resolution or its purposes when adopted and I find now that several members of this legislative body were not informed as to the real purposes of this particular resolution.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO PROPOSED TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT

The Journal of the National Education Association for December 1944 carries a splendid article by Joy Elmer Morgan denouncing this proposed amendment and its sponsors. The National Education Association article calls attention to the fact that persons opposed to this amendment are not organized while the forces working for the amendment are apparently highly financed. The article, in referring to the refusal of Dr. Edward Rumely to submit the names of the contributors to his organization—the Committee for Constitutional Government—to the House Campaign Expenditures Committee says:

> If it is important for the public to know the source of funds used to buy elections, is it not equally important to know the the source used to buy amendments to the Constitution? Why should any group with an honest purpose object to giving the people, who in a democracy are the government, full information?

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION NOT RESTRICTED

Another organization, Prentice-Hall, Inc., in a recent report to businessmen on taxation and Government regulations, gives impartial but noticeable treatment to this serious matter in its bulletin of January 22. Prentice-Hall's bulletin says:

> What few people realize is that a constitutional convention would not be limited to the specific proposal urged by State legislatures. Convention would be "wide open." Seventeen States have already petitioned Congress to call a constitutional convention to consider this amendment. If 15 more (making a total of two-thirds) pass the same resolution, Congress must comply.

FORM OF RESCISSION RESOLUTION

So that the Members may know the exact form which this proposed resolution takes when it passes a State legislature, I append herewith a copy of the resolution passed in 1943 by the Arkansas General Assembly. This particular resolution, as I report above, was rescinded by that body, however, a few days ago. This typical resolution reads as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United Statets to amend the Constitution of the United States, relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing limitations on taxes so levied; and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes of incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing for a limitation of taxes thereon; and

Whereas the people of the State of Arkansas are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State Senate of the State of Arkansas (the House concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows: That application be and it hereby is made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE 22

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said day to collect any tax on incomes, for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December made in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect"; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested to provide, as the mode of ratification, that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Arkansas be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each Arkansas Member thereof.

The full text of the article in the National Education Association Journal and the quotation from the Prentice-Hall bulletin are as follows:

[From the Journal of the National Education Association December 1944]

SHALL THE PEOPLE SIGN AWAY THEIR BIRTHRIGHT?

"The National Education Association opposes any amendment to the United States Constitution which provides for a limitation on Federal income, inheritance, and gift taxes, and recommends to State education associations their vigorous opposition to such amendment."

This resolution, adopted by the N. E. A. at Pittsburgh, deals with a matter of the utmost urgency. A proposal is being pressed upon the State legislatures, which if adopted bids fair to turn the tide away from democracy at the very time our men are laying down their lives to safeguard democracy.

Great concentrations of irresponsible wealth have ever been the enemy of liberty. It was such wealth that financed Hitler and Mussolini during their struggles for power and supported the war party in Japan. And now in the very midst of a war which is being fought to protect their lives and property, we have a proposal to exempt multimillionaires from paying their share of the cost by limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes (corporation and private) and estates to 25 percent.

This proposal would repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, overwhelmingly adopted by the people, which went into effect in 1913: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

It would substitute a long, involved, and confused article limiting Federal taxes to 25 percent, with the exception that Congress by a three-fourths vote of both Houses, while the United States is actively engaged in war, might go above the limitation for 1 year. What a perfect dodge for enabling multimillionaires to escape paying their just share of the war debt.

As pointed out in the N. E. A. Leaders Letter No. 19, "while we believe the best business leadership of the country is opposed to such a measure, powerful interests are behind the drive. * * * The opposition is not organized. The forces working for the amendment are apparently highly financed. Turned down in Congress, their strategy is to go around Congress and concentrate on one State legislature after another. Their propaganda is clever and highly misleading. It is designed to appeal to bankers, small businessmen, and farmers against their own welfare, since the effect of the amendment would be to destroy private enterprise by concentrating wealth more highly and fostering gigantic monopolies. An estate of $100,000,000 under this amendment would leave $75,000,000 tax free so far as the Federal Government is concerned, and such fortunes would concentrate in States least inclined to tax them."

The resolution applying to Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the tax-limitation article, to be known as the twenty-second amendment, was passed by the State Legislature of Wyoming in 1939. It has since been adopted by 16 other legislatures: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, and Wisconsin

A powerful drive is now under way, which would take advantage of the preoccupation of our people with the war and absence of our men overseas to get enough additional legislatures to act early in 1945 to make up the 32 needed to require Congress to call a convention proposing an amendment which would become effective when ratified by 36 State legislatures.

Propaganda for the proposal has been widely circulated by the Committee for Constitutional Government, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City, referred to in newspaper headlines as the Gannett group. This committee, when called before the Committee on Campaign Expenditures of the United States House of Representatives on September 8, refused to reveal the contributors to its fabulous campaign funds. If it is important for the public to know the source of funds used to buy elections, is it not equally important to know the source used to buy amendments to the Constitution? Why should any group with an honest purpose object to giving the people, who in a democracy are the government, full information? Should the Corrupt Practices Act not require publicity for such funds?

One of the arguments for the tax limitation amendment is the old States' rights slogan. If States should attempt to place high taxes on inheritances and incomes, people of great wealth would establish their residences in other States where they could seek most favorable terms and most easily dominate the legislature.

This amendment would obviously benefit the superrich. Present surtax rates run as high as 91 percent on incomes above $200,000. If Congress were unable to apply higher taxes on larger incomes, it would have to increase taxes on smaller incomes and maintain them over a longer period of time after the war.

An article in Standard and Poor's Outlook for September 13, 1943, claims that the amendment would not unduly weaken the Nation's taxing power and argues that in a pre-war year it would have involved a theoretical loss of revenues of only $286,000,000. This is obviously a gross understatement since the war has profoundly changed the tax situation. But even if this figure were true, it could, if properly distributed, create 286 new millionaires each year in a Nation where wealth is already too highly concentrated.

A book which should be read in this connection is Divided We Stand, by a great historian and scholar, Walter Prescott Webb, of the University of Texas.

This is a matter of such importance to the future of our Republic that every citizen should give it his earnest attention. Every State and local education association should adopt as early as possible a resolution similar to the N. E. A. resolution and should urge lay groups to do the same. Send copies of these resolutions to your governor and to Members of State legislatures and Congress.

Members of legislatures in the States which have been misled into requesting Congress to support such an amendment should be urged to reconsider their action and to withdraw their request to Congress. Representative PATMAN, of Texas, calls the group working for this amendment "The most sinister lobby ever organized."

JOY ELMER MORGAN.

[From the Prentice-Hall Bulletin of January 22, 1945]

WHAT'S HAPPENING IN TAXATION AND GOVERNMENT REGULATION—WHAT'S HAPPENING IN WASHINGTON

TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT FEDERAL TAX LIMIT

Proposed twenty-second amendment provides that Federal taxes on incomes, inheritances, or gifts, shall not exceed 25 percent, except in time of war. With 44 State legislatures in session this year, the next few months may decide whether Congress must act upon this proposal. Seventeen States already have petitioned Congress to call a constitutional convention to consider this amendment. If 15 more (making a total of two-thirds) pass the same resolution, Congress must comply.

States that passed the resolution in both Houses: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Six States have passed the resolution in but one house: California House, Louisiana

Senate, Nevada Senate, New York Senate, Ohio Senate, Virginia House.

Under article V of the Constitution, State legislatures may petition Congress to call a convention to propose amendments. To become effective, amendments must be ratified by three-quarters of the States (36), either by State legislatures or by State conventions as Congress may direct.

What few people realize is that a constitutional convention would not be limited to the specific proposal urged by the State legislatures. Convention would be wide open. It could reject the 25-percent tax-limit proposal which brought it into being; it could submit any number of other amendments; it could even undertake revision of the entire Constitution.

Sponsors of the 25-percent tax limit think the country's present mood is conservative and that any other proposals would be moderate. Most likely to be considered: Limit of two terms upon Presidency; treaty ratification by majority of both Houses; abolition of poll tax; abolition or revision of electoral college. However, sponsors really hope that Congress will not wait for a petition from 32 States. They want Congress to propose this amendment on its own initiative.

To the Leaders of the Allied Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a poem entitled, "To the leaders of the Allied nations," by Edna St. Vincent Millay.

TO THE LEADERS OF THE ALLIED NATIONS

(By Edna St. Vincent Millay)

Do you deceive us? Do you? Yes? No?
Speak. It is time to speak. You have talked enough.

This was a war for Freedom; so we thought it;
And so we fought it.
You knew this, all of you.
You promised us a new
World—a decent one this time, a world a man might live in without shame.
How is it going forward, this great enterprise, this plot
To outwit Evil?—Are the blueprints done?
And may we see them? No? Why not?

"The time is not yet ripe," you state.
We say: "The time is ripening fast."
We say: "Before the time is ripe, the time will rot
At the core, too late
For harvesting, the proper moment passed."

Speak! And speak soon! The time grows big and sweetens with our fate
Let it not wait
Too long! Let it be plucked, and placed
Where it can ripen to our will and to our taste,
Within eyes' easy reach, daily observed and turned, on a cool shelf
Beside the hot and hurrying mind; not
Ripen by itself, drop plop
Into the grass,
Or let a chipmunk push it from the twig, to be the feast of crickets, in our own unthrift and waste!

Surely you did not mean merely to mend—
Patch with a few bright patches here and there
Where most the wear and tear are shown:
Elbows, and knees, and seat of breeches—new cloth sewn
On old—bright patches which the faded fabric will not bear
For long, but will at every seam reject—
Oh, surely you could not expect
That we again, ever again, would wear
This garment, this Old World, by us so long ago outgrown?

What do you plot
In camera, behind closed doors?—
Something that we,
Your loyal citizens and subjects, doing our distasteful chores,
Not without, here and there, some bravery,
Would work, would die (for so you have concluded) more contentedly

If we do not,
Than if we should know?

For I have heard soft footfalls here and there
Running along beside the deeds you do,
Of some most furtive thing.
What can this creature be?—
Expediency?
Steel? Iron? Oil wells?
Intrigue? Cartels?
Come, fetch us forth its name!
We have a mighty, nagging wish to know.

Here it comes back again. I do not see it;
But I smell cat-fur.
Now, neighbors, let us beat about these fellows with stout staves—
And maybe we shall wound it; it will go,
Perhaps, in any case. If not, yet we may know
How, on the eve of Peace-to-be-Determined, it behaves; and so
Decide: whether we wish its paws to pad about them there at the long table; yes or no.

Gentlemen, you go too far. Believe me that you do.
There is no object, rumor, purpose, fantasy—no shore,
No myth, nostalgia, dream,
No nebula, no moon
Moving devotedly about some planet by us conjectured, at some time spinned off
From some great sun by us conjectured, through our greatest telescopes
Never seen—
There is no province into which the intellect may not with full propriety and calm decorum go,
No region it may not explore.

But you, gentlemen, the wielders (and the welders, so you told us) of all humankind,
Of you, my lords, we ask, oh, so much less!—
But just a little more.

We have appointed you:
Not with such wistfulness
About your recent, slightly sanded-over Past to roam.
We have appointed you: to stay right here
And now, upon this troubled planet we call Home!—
To deal with Us, the Living, with our Present, and its Future,
And our hopes.

But you have said soft words, to put to sleep
The minds of people that were thinking deep
Of what great issues this war must decide
If it, in any way, be justified.
Have you some pattern, you,
Our private sacrifice, our love, to halt, or to undo?—
We who at this war's end
Not only hope, but yes, by God, intend
To see our dreams come true!

Do you deceive us? Do you? If you do,
The more incautious you.
Come, gentlemen, the plan!—
Produce it. Spread it out before us. Show,
Though it be intricate, its prime simplicity:
Namely, that men and nations, shall be free.

We do not ask your plan in full—
You must revise it, you are bound to do,
From day to day, being subject to such accident and chance as may befall—
We only want to hear you say again
Some things you said before
And feel you mean them still, just as we felt you meant them then.
For the time being, for this difficult now, no more.

This is not capital, not labor, gentlemen,
Which now in this wide forum does address you in so great a throng:
We are the common men
Upon whose soil you sowed uncommon seed,
Swearing that it should grow.
Now: did you mean it when you swore it?
Answer yes or no.
But answer: we are many millions strong.

Out with it now. We have the right to know
What you are up to—we
Who placed you where you are, and pay your salary;
Who, for your waste, your blunders—broken crockery
By truckloads carted off—do dearly pay;
And for vast ovens, in their size and number every day increased,
Where sits and sulks a bread that does not rise, for you forget the yeast.

Unfold it, spread it out, the plan:
We have the right to see,
To bend above in study, question, scan;
Yes, we the people; we, the undistinguished man;
The Demos in the word democracy.

Address by Hon. Tom Connally, of Texas, at Presidential Electors' Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] at the electors' dinner in honor of the inauguration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and HARRY S. TRUMAN, held in Washington on January 19.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Mrs. Roosevelt, Mrs. Wilson, members of the electoral college, and guests, this distinguished assemblage bears eloquent proof of the fact that in the recent campaign the overwhelming verdict of the American people was cast in support of the foreign policy of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Applause and cheers.]

Tonight, as we face the issues of winning the present war completely and crushingly, and then the establishment of permanent peace machinery, these issues are so challenging that they draw upon our courage,

upon our wisdom, and upon our will to achieve.

Tonight the planet is trembling under the marching feet of more armed men than were ever gathered under the banners of Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar, and Napoleon and all of the conquerors of the past. We have our heroic and courageous men fighting in many distant parts of the earth, from the scorching tropics to the snow and ice of the Arctic regions; upon the waters and in the air and on the sea they are marching on to victory, to crush and overwhelm our cruel and treacherous enemies.

The United States did not seek entrance into this war, but when we were treacherously and savagely attacked at Pearl Harbor, honor and security demanded that we accept the gage of battle and when we did so, Germany—Hitler's Germany—declared war upon us also.

Now, my countrymen, the American people not only want to win this war completely, but when it is won they desire that Hitler's Germany and Hirohito's Japan shall be completely and permanently disarmed. [Applause.] We propose to sterilize their war-making factories [applause]; we propose to strike down the places where the gods of war have been shaping and fashioning their instruments of destruction and aggression.

These are mighty tasks. Tonight we are fighting by the side of gallant allies—Russia, Great Britain, China, and others of the United Nations. [Applause.] If these great allies are worthy to stand by us and we by them in the line of battle to win the war, they are worthy to stand by us in bringing about a permanent peace, to shield the nations from the horrors and the treachery of another war. [Applause.]

It is our hope and ambition to set up an international organization to preserve the peace of the world. That organization must not wait until the final and definite treaty of peace is written. It ought to be set up now, and we are already at work upon its implementation through the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and we hope that within a very short time there will assemble representatives of all of the United Nations to improve upon and perfect the work of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference so that it may be submitted to the nations for ratification. [Applause.]

There are certain points of incompleteness with reference to this instrument, some of which may be removed by the early conference of Premier Churchill, Marshal Stalin, and President Roosevelt. Let me say to you that a part of this plan has been most marvelous cooperation between the Executive and the Congress of the United States. [Applause.] Secretary Hull, during his tenure, for more than 2 years conferred almost weekly, sometimes more often than weekly, with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, undertaking to enlist coordinated effort toward setting up this structure of international peace. [Applause.] All the world is saddened by the illness which struck down Secretary Hull and forced his retirement; but his successor, Secretary of State Stettinius, has carried on. [Applause.] He has carried on in the same fashion, and we have frequent conferences with the Secretary of State. Only this week he was before the Committee on Foreign Relations and spent 2 hours in discussing, after questions and general discussion, the whole field of foreign relations.

These mighty tasks attract the ambitions and the high and lofty purpose of peace-loving nations everywhere. Let me say that our efforts for international peace are going to cost something. The United States must accept its responsibilities and its duties. The final draft of the treaty will not be perfection. There will be those who do not like this feature and someone who does not like that feature, but I know of no constitution on earth, I know of no code of laws, that has not had criticism and objections.

There have been filed 3,000 proposals to amend the Constitution of the United States, and in every session of Congress thousands of bills are introduced to modify the statutes of the Republic. So I would say to those who are straining to find some defect that we must appraise the organization in the long picture and in the long years. It must be considered in its entirety, and it must be remembered that we are building it out on the frontier; we are building it in land where no traveler has ever left his footprints. It is true that prior to World War No. 1 President Taft advanced and advocated the League to Enforce Peace, and it is remembered that in the Treaty of Versailles the great, talented, and heroic Woodrow Wilson [applause] had written into the treaty the structure of the League of Nations, but we know with what tragic result it was received by the Senate of the United States.

But let me say to you that World War No. 2 has so vividly reminded us of the necessity for a world organization that I now believe that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States is in favor of a world organization to preserve the peace of the world and to prevent armed aggression. [Applause and cheers.]

A brief word, and then I am done. As you know, the organization will consist of a council and then of an assembly representing all of the United Nations. We realize more than ever that the employment of peaceable measures, conciliation, diplomacy, and mediation by the organization will seek to compose many differences, but we have at last come to know that in certain emergencies, in certain critical periods, those mad ambitions of aggressors cannot be conquered or arrested by soft words, so that this organization in the final analysis, and for the emergencies, must possess power to employ armed force to prevent the violation of the peace and the rights of nations. [Applause and cheers.]

No power is given to the League for recklessly considering the employment of armed force, and all of the peace agencies must be first exhausted, but when a willful and a determined aggressor seeks to violate the laws of the nations and the laws of humanity with the sword, there is no other recourse to arrest the mad designs except by armed force. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, pending the final, definitive treaty of peace, there will be from time to time brought to the attention of the Nation many vexing and troublesome questions. It is my own view that matters of boundaries, the demarcation of boundaries, the transfer of territories, and all similar questions growing out of this war ought not to be settled by unilateral or bilateral agreements now, but must be submitted to all of the United Nations in the final treaty of peace. [Applause.] These are the things that cause wars; allocation of territories, and the demarcation of boundaries breed war. The present war, you will remember, so far as its acts of pretext are concerned, grew out of the Polish Corridor, the argument with Germany over the rights in the Corridor. So these questions ought to be resolved, not by the wishes or the will of one or two of our allies, but with all of the Allies, including the United States of America. We have fought the war together, and we have got to make the peace together, with America's voice heard in the councils of the nations. [Applause.]

Now, my countrymen, let me say to you that the President of the United States, President Roosevelt, is soon to go across the seas to consult with Marshal Stalin and with Premier Churchill, not alone with relation to military measures or pushing the fortunes of the war, but for all of the mighty problems relating to the war. God grant that he may have a safe voyage. [Applause.] God grant that when he goes into conference with these great figures, Providence may give strength to his arm and uplift his spirit so that he may feel that behind him is a united America, so that he may speak the voice of America and the view of America in this great world-wide forum. [Applause.] Let him speak not alone with bayonets and cannon in prosecuting the war; let him speak with a word of prophecy; let him speak with high trust in the future of the world and in the democratic processes of the world. Let Europe know and all the world know that while America seeks no spoils from this war, while we thirst for no indemnity, while we have no hunger to possess conquered lands and conquered peoples, we do have an interest in the security of all the peoples of the earth.

Our interest, primarily, of course, is in our own country, but when we give greater security to other nations, we are giving greater security to ourselves. When we assure the freedom of other nations of the world, we are assuring in greater degree the freedom of our own people and of our own land.

So, Mr. President, as you go into foreign lands, carrying your message to the great rulers and great figures of the earth, God be with you. God give you strength and courage that you may speak with the voice of a prophet until the views and the voices of America may be known in the councils of the world.

[The audience arose to applaud and cheer.]

Britain Writes a New Chapter in Hebrew Martyrdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the American League for a Free Palestine, printed in the New York Post of January 8, 1945:

BRITAIN WRITES NEW CHAPTER IN HEBREW MARTYRDOM; RAISE YOUR VOICE AGAINST INTERNATIONAL INTIMIDATION

BEYOGLU, *January 2, 1945.*

PETER BERGSON,

Washington, D. C.:

Turkish Government was willing authorize use ship for refugees, but British sent note canceling promise Palestine visas Jews arriving Turkey. Also requested prevent ships from transporting refugees. Six hundred Rumanian Jews arriving 21. Steamship *Stalingrad* refused transit accordingly. Further stay unproductive. Recalling Klarman and desire return.

ERI JABOTINSKY.

The above telegram is from Eri Jabotinsky, special representative in Turkey of the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe. Mr. Jabotinsky's mission was to organize evacuation of as many as possible of the Hebrews of eastern Europe who are in dire danger of death or starvation.

His trip to Turkey was made possible by our own Government which provided him with

the necessary traveling facilities and priorities. After months of ceaseless endeavors and disappointments, he succeeded in obtaining permission of the Turkish Government to charter the steamship *Tari*, with a capacity of 1,500–2,000 passengers, to shuttle between Constanza and Palestine. The Rumanian and Bulgarian Governments expressed their willingness to cooperate to the full extent of their abilities.

The Russian authorities in Rumania were generous and humane in their attitude, adhering to the policy of the Soviet Government which saved hundreds of thousands of Jews by evacuating them from invaded territories into the Russian hinterland. The ship *Stalingrad* mentioned by Jabotinsky and which is scheduled to arrive in Turkey on the 21st, is a further proof of this humanitarian policy.

But the British Colonial Office not only keeps the doors of Palestine shut, but intimidates the Turkish Government, compelling it not to issue further transit visas. The result is that those who will manage to escape, even from occupied Europe, will be sent back to the Gestapo in the best traditions of the Struma and the Patria.

Yet Palestine is not even British territory—it is a mandated land of the League of Nations.

(The J. T. A. correspondent in Bucharest cabled on January 2: The Turkish Government today asked the Rumanian Foreign Office to prevent the emigration of Jews from Rumania to Palestine via Turkey and said that Turkish transit visas will not be issued to such emigrants. In making this request, the Turkish Government emphasized that it is no longer able to issue transit visas to Jews in view of the fact that the Palestine government is restricting Jewish immigration into Palestine. The Foreign Office has notified the Zionist leaders in Bucharest of the Turkish request.)

LEAVE OR DIE

Many outstanding men and women in this country, as well as in England, have placed great hope in Mr. Jabotinsky's endeavors, for before their very eyes a great illusion of humanity is being dissipated; the liberation of territories by the triumphant armies of the United Nations brings no cessation of the sufferings of the Hebrew people of Europe. In that valley of death of eastern Europe, where three or more millions of Hebrews were exterminated, the survivors are still in dire danger, starving, with no clothes nor shelters. The New York Times correspondent in Istanbul cabled October 22:

"Out of 270,000 Rumanian Jews who survived massacre, deportations, and forced labor camps, 150,000 face starvation or death from cold. They are without clothes or food, and without roofs over their heads. A vast majority of the children are undernourished and rachitic, while their parents are on the verge of tuberculosis. Medical supplies are nonexistent, and most of the sick are left to die."

Another representative of our movement, Mr. Joseph Klarman, in Rumania wires: "At least 100,000 Hebrews must leave immediately or die."

ANGLO-HEBREW ROUND-TABLE CONFERENCE IMPERATIVE

It is futile to delude ourselves any longer: the Hebrew people of Europe are no longer victims of German savagery alone. A new chapter of its martyrdom is now being written by a prominent member of the United Nations—a cosigner of the Atlantic Charter—Great Britain. Of course, not the Great Britain of the plain people who fought at Dunkerque, endured the blitz, and stoically faced up to the robot bombs; and of course it is not the Great Britain of Wedgwood, Strabolgi, Davies, and Lloyd George. It is the Great Britain of the Tories, of the Cliveden set, of the Colonial Office clique, of all those who for the sake of imperialistic interest "appeased" Hitler into trying to subjugate the world, and who now, when he has failed, proceed themselves in many respects to emulate his policy in Greece, Italy, Belgium, and Palestine. These and other lands in similar condition constitute a wide front of peoples fighting for freedom and self-determination. The Palestinian sector of this front fights not for freedom alone but first of all for mere survival.

Is humanity really ready to give up its freedoms? Is it ready to resign itself to the facts that the day of the Atlantic Charter is done, without a fair effort to implement it?

On the contrary, we believe that the Hebrew problem is a test case for humanity and democracy, that humanity and democracy have a chance now to cry out "halt!" before it is too late; to declare that the Hebrew people have a right to live and be free; that the Hebrew people must be recognized as a member of the United Nations, for it has been Hitler's first and paramount enemy and his greatest victim; that every Hebrew has a right to enter his national territory—Palestine—without restraint.

Join us in these demands. Back the request of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation to President Roosevelt that he use his good offices to intervene in the present deadlock which has arisen in the conflict between the policy of the British Government and the interests of the Hebrew nation. Only an immediate Anglo-Hebrew round-table conference under the guidance of the President, or of another American delegated by him, can prevent further persecution or complete extermination of the Hebrew people in Europe.

Let your Government know that you are against the rule of international intimidation. Let your President know what you feel and think about this tragic problem. Let your Congressman know that you are for the survival and freedom of the haunted Hebrews of Europe, that you are for facilitating their entry to Palestine. Let your Senator know that the *Stalingrad* must go through. Let your Government know that you hope that the plans of the Emergency Committee in Turkey, where Jabotinsky must remain, and in Rumania, where Klarman must remain, will be carried out, because you believe in the sanctity of human lives.

We think the American people, heirs to a glorious tradition, keepers of a sacred flame of justice, we must take a firm stand on these demands. We must not nullify the ideals for which our sons and brothers are dying in France and Germany, in Italy, in the Pacific islands, and on the seven seas.

In the name of humanity, for which the America of Washington, Lincoln, and Tom Paine stands, won't you join us in our struggle to remove this blot from the record of the United Nations?

AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR A FREE PALESTINE, INC.

Mail Boxes—R. F. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star:

MAIL BOXES—R. F. D.

Some day a historian will write a history of country living in terms of the R. F. D. boxes that stand like inverted exclamation points along hundreds of thousands of miles of roads. No one who lives in cities and towns where the gray-uniformed man trudges up to the door and deposits the mail, can fully appreciate the meaning of the R. F. D. box on a country road 3 or 4 miles from the village.

It is a cosmopolitan sort of box. It has a range of style as comprehensive as the fashions that adorn milady's tresses. There are some R. F. D. receptacles that will hold half a bushel of newspapers, magazines, and the bulky mail-order catalogs. On these capacious boxes that sit on posts before big, prosperous farms, one often sees the name of the farm in red letters. In the last few years art with a capital A has come to the Rural Free Delivery containers. There are cute little bungalows and birdhouse styles; some like to use copies of old-time stagecoaches; a favorite is a reproduction of a covered wagon pulled by a pair of red-and-white oxen.

But the real, genuine, honest-to-goodness R. F. D. box is a humble, everyday sort of affair. It is rectangular with a curved top to shed rain and sleet. It has a small, red, metal flag that goes up to tell the mailman a letter is waiting for him. If he leaves something in the box, he puts the flag up. The box sits on a weathered, splintery post by the side of the road.

Through that plebeian gray box has passed a part of the heartbeats of a nation. Farm boys and girls write for the things that interest them. The family far from urban centers may use the mail-order firms for the things needed by humans and the farm. Boys and girls who have left home to seek the trail of life's adventures in distant cities write letters that come through it. And today, with lads fighting freedom's battles in foreign lands, mother watches from the kitchen window for the R. F. D. man. The mail box sitting beside the country road is a link of the chain that binds a nation into one people.

State Aviation Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a short letter from Hon. L. Welch Pogue, along with a table showing the status of State aviation laws:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, January 20, 1945.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: As requested in your letter of January 3, I am enclosing a table showing the present status of State aviation laws. This table brings up to date the similar table submitted to you with my letter of November 8, 1943.

Sincerely yours,

L. WELCH POGUE,
Chairman.

	Safety regulation								Provision for zoning	Economic regulation, certificates of convenience	Regulatory body		
	Federal license		Federal or State		State license		Air-traffic regulation	Airport development			Aeronautics Commission	Other commission	No commission
	All aircraft	All pilots	All aircraft	All pilots	All aircraft	All pilots							
Alabama					X	X	X	X	X		X		
Arizona	X	X					X	X		X		X	
Arkansas	X	X					X	X	X		X		
California	X	X					X	X		F			X
Colorado	X	X						X		X	X		
Connecticut					X	X	X	X	X		X		
Delaware	X	X					X	X					X
Florida	X	X						X	X				X
Georgia	X	X						X			X		
Idaho	X	X					X	X	X			X	
Illinois	X	X					X	X	X	X	X		
Indiana	X	X						X	X				X
Iowa	X	X					X	X	X		X		
Kansas	X	X					X	X	X				X
Kentucky	X	X					F	X			X		
Louisiana	X	X						X	X		X		
Maine	X	X					F	X	X		X		
Maryland			X	X			X	X	X		X		
Massachusetts	X	X					X	X	X		X		
Michigan	X	X					X	X	X		X		
Minnesota			X	X			X	X	X		X		
Mississippi	X	X						X	X				X
Missouri	X	X					X	X					X
Montana	X	X					F	X	X				X
Nebraska	X	X						X	X		X		
Nevada	C	C					X	X		X		X	
New Hampshire	X	X					X	X	X		X		
New Jersey			X	X			F	X	X		X		
New Mexico	X	X					F	X	X	X		X	
New York	X	X					F	X	X				X
North Carolina	X	X						X	X				X
North Dakota			C	X				X	X	X		X	
Ohio	X	X					F	X			X		
Oklahoma	X	X						X	X			X	
Oregon			X	X			X	X	X		X		
Pennsylvania	X	X					X	X	X	X		X	
Rhode Island	X	X					F			X		X	
South Carolina	X	X						X	X		X		
South Dakota	X	X					F	X	X		X		
Tennessee	X	X					X	X	X			X	
Texas	X	X						X	X				X
Utah			X	X			X	X	X		X		
Vermont	X	X					X	X				X	
Virginia	X	X			X	X	X	X				X	
Washington	X	X					F	X					X
West Virginia	X	X						X		X	X		
Wisconsin	X	X					F	X	X		X		
Wyoming	X	X						X	X	X	X		
Total	40	40	6	6	3	3	24	47	34	11	25	11	12

"C"—Applies to commercial aircraft, pilots, or operations only.
"F"—Indicates either statutory instructions or administrative policy of promulgating rules substantially the same as those of the Federal Government.

Government by Fiat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, after Hitler drove into western Europe, the call went out to draft before summer 900,000 young men to serve with the combat forces as replacements.

Was it because the Army and the Navy considered the farm boys more healthy, more brawny, and more vigorous than others, or because farmers as a class voted last November against the fourth-term candidate, that the President decided to take all farm boys off the farms? Mr. Byrnes was authorized by the President to write General Hershey that the President found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.

Hershey immediately passed the word along to the State selective-service directors and Michigan's director, Brig. Gen. LeRoy Pearson, instructed local boards to place all qualified farm workers between 18 and 26 in class I-A.

The result was that many local draft boards immediately began to ignore the Tydings amendment and send essential farm workers who could not be replaced into the armed service. That course, if continued, would have resulted in a loss of food production which would have seriously interfered with all military operations.

Upon learning of General Hershey's instructions, which were based upon the President's statement as repeated by Byrnes, some 250 of us formed an unofficial committee and called Hershey to a conference in the Old House caucus room. General Hershey was unable to satisfactorily explain the President's position, or the legality of his instructions, and he finally agreed to notify all State directors that his previous order was erroneous and to instruct them to comply with the provisions of the Tydings amendment and defer every farm worker who was found to be necessary and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation, or whose work was essential to the war effort, so long as he remained so engaged and until a satisfactory replacement could be found.

Whether General Hershey, State directors of selective service, and local boards will now comply with the law and defer farm boys, remains to be seen. The law is clear—there was no excuse for disregarding it, for sending hundreds of young men from the farms into the armed service, when they were expressly exempt by the provision of the Selective Service Act.

This is not the first time that directives have been issued without any legal authority back of them. The order of the War Labor Board, directing Montgomery Ward & Co. to incorporate a security of membership clause in its contracts with the unions, is now admitted by the Government to be without legal force and has so been declared by the courts. In that particular case, the Government now insists that, under the President's general war powers, he has authority to seize and operate retail businesses.

JONES VERSUS WALLACE

The President's letter firing Jesse Jones, a faithful, efficient, public official who had jurisdiction over the handling of some $40,000,000,000 and over many Government corporations, and stating that he had given that vital job as a political reward to Henry Wallace for supporting him for a fourth term, did not surprise anyone here in Washington familiar with the President's political maneuvers.

The letter was amazing only because of the President's confession that he was using a public office and public funds to pay a private political debt.

Back over the years the youth of our land have been told to look to the official acts of Washington and Lincoln as examples of honesty, of truthfulness, of faithful public service, devotion to one's country. The boys and girls were inspired to follow in the footsteps of those true Americans; to strive to be honest, truthful, self-sacrificing, and wholly devoted to our country and its institutions.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt's firing of Jones, whose record of disinterested public service he praised, to make available a highly important public office as a reward for political work, is a sorry, sordid, example to place before American youth. It tends to disillusion them, impair their faith in public officials.

Tribute to Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], written by Mr. McClellan Van de Veer, and published in the Birmingham Age-Herald of January 11, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMAS OF UTAH

One of the truly superior Members of the Senate is ELBERT THOMAS, of Utah. He is, we think, the kind of man—in character, in ability, in intellectual caliber—that a Senator of the United States ought to be. He is a scholar, having been a university professor of political science before he entered Congress. His is no dry and detached scholarship, but that highest type of learning which grows out of a passion for understanding the situation of man and bettering his lot in a mysterious and different world. His scholarship is not simply an end in itself, but a means of implementing his service. His grasp on the past gives the greater reality and scope to his high vision for the peace. His spirit and purpose are of the kind that immediately convey themselves and command confidence. He is a colleague to whom many other Senators turn for counsel. He is modest and quiet, yet forceful.

We are not campaigning for Senator THOMAS' reelection—that, fortunately, was recorded only last November. These words about him are prompted by his selection for the chairmanship of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. He brings great strength and capacity and a fine sanity to an important job.

Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Birmingham News-Age-Herald of December 31, 1944:

LABOR

(By Robert W. Kincey)

William Mitch, president of district 20, United Mine Workers of America, strikes a broad and sound basis of reasoning when he calls attention, in a current statement, to what he terms special privileges enjoyed by Government subsidies which contribute to a comparatively few at the expense of all, especially the working man.

Taking the T. V. A. as an illustration of a Government-owned water-power project that victimizes the workingman, Mr. Mitch points out that cash, property, and revenues totaling more than $800,000,000 are represented; that in the fiscal year 1943 T. V. A. paid only $778,300 interest, whereas interest at 3 percent would have been $24,000,000.

"Thus," he says, "on this one item alone, T. V. A. enjoyed a special privilege worth to it more than $23,000,000 in 1943. The burden of supplying it with that special privilege fell upon all Federal taxpayers, but largely upon the workingman."

The statement emphasizes that T. V. A. and the agencies that distribute the power it generated have an investment of more than $550,000,000 in electric properties; that for the fiscal year 1943 they paid only $3,900,000 in taxes, none of which went to the Federal Government.

"Taxes," he said, "took a large part of the wages of the worker. Had T. V. A. and its distributing agencies paid taxes proportionately with others in the electric business, it is estimated such taxes would have amounted to $25,000,000 in 1943. Here is another special privilege that should be removed."

Pointing out that it is generally recognized that electric energy can be produced cheaper in coal-fired steam plants, now being erected, than it can be produced in water-power plants, Mr. Mitch analyzes the "special wallop" Government-owned water-power projects carry for the coal miner this way.

"The T. V. A. system, for instance, has an installed capacity of some 1,890,000 kilowatt-hours, only 365,000 kilowatts of which is steam-electric generating units. Such units supplement water-power capacity.

"When the war ceases it may well be that some or all of the steam units will stand idle. Thus the coal miner, the laboring man, has been and is being deprived of the market for his services necessary to mine the coal to supply 1,500,000 kilowatts of steam-electric generating capacity."

Mr. Mitch estimates that power produced at plants constructed by the Government or T. V. A. in 1943 totaled 7,173,574,810 kilowatt-hours, and that it would have required 4,375,881 tons of coal to produce that power.

"In an article in the September 1944 issue of Coal Age," he says, "the editor tabulates the output of bituminous coal per man shift for the years 1938 through 1942; and he estimates 1943 to have been 5.05 tons per man shift. Thus, according to these careful calculations, the operations of T. V. A. in the fiscal year 1943 displaced 866,000 man shifts.

"Certainly to supply the estimated 4,375,000 tons required to operate coal-fired units requires some hauling of coal by the railroads from mines to steam plants. It would be difficult to estimate the tons the railroads would consume, but it is easily seen they would consume a large number of tons. And the coal miner is being deprived of pay he would get for mining such coal.

"The only fair and democratic and economically sound thing to do is to remove these two great special privileges (1) by requiring T. V. A. and all Government-owned water-power projects constructed in the future to pay interest at a fair rate upon all funds employed in the building of the projects, and (2) by requiring T. V. A. and all Government-owned water-power projects to pay taxes—Federal, State, and local, just as others in like business are required to do."

Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, in connection with the report made by Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE, chairman of the committee of 11 appointed at the request of more than 200 Members of Congress who met spontaneously to protest the confusion in the drafting of farm labor, and especially the directive No. 288 to all State directors issued by General Hershey, I am glad to have been one of the members of that committee, and I believe that it is proper that the names of the Members of Congress who made up this Committee should be inserted in the RECORD. The committee was composed of the following Representatives: LEMKE, Republican, chairman, North Dakota; REED, Republican, New York; LARCADE, Democrat, Louisiana; O'Connor, Democrat, Montana; VURSELL, Republican, Illinois; RAINS, Democrat, Alabama; H. CARL ANDERSEN, Republican, Minnesota; ROGERS, Democrat, Florida; HORAN, Republican, Washington; O'HARA, Republican, Minnesota; WHITE, Democrat, Idaho.

As pointed out by Chairman LEMKE, as a result of the interest of this committee in this matter we were able to enlist the support of the House Committee on Agriculture, and after that committee called General Hershey before their committee, at which members of our committee of 11 were invited, General Hershey issued a clarifying directive to all State directors which will clear up the misunderstanding of the directive No. 288, which our committee urged had been misinterpreted by many of the draft boards throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, representing one of the largest and most important agricultural districts in the United States, this matter was of supreme importance to my constituents, and in evidence of our argument I wish to include in the RECORD one of the newspaper reports on the drafting of farm labor, as follows:

[From the Jeff Davis Parish News of January 18, 1945]

TWENTY-FIVE FARMER YOUTHS SENT FOR TESTS—THAT NUMBER GO TO NEW ORLEANS YESTERDAY FOR PRE-INDUCTIONS—ALL UNDER 26—STILL RETAIN II-C CLASSIFICATIONS, BUT MANY WILL BE CALLED TO UNIFORMS

Twenty-five farm youths, all under 26, still retaining their II-C classifications, were sent to the New Orleans reception center yesterday for their pre-induction examinations.

With tightened demands for all youths under 26 for military service, it is probable that many will be sent later to the armed services. The group is aside from other farm youths who have already taken their pre-inductions and have been accepted as physically fit. In the group of farm boys going yesterday were:

Welsh—Dallas Lee Benoit, Gus Comeaux, Emerson Edwin Tate, Gilbert Meche, Elmer Guillory, Roy Adam Mott, Eugene Charles Todd, and Johnny Robert Benoit.

Elton—Frank E. Landry, Jr., Medwyn D. Garbarino, Elmer Henry Goebel, and Preston Miller.

Lake Arthur—Conrad Lee Hensgens, Maynard Milton Hartwell, Nicholas Anthony Hensgens, and Darrell Dwight Gillett.

Others going were Whitney William Manuel and Curtis William Langley, Kinder; Henry Lee Andrus, Alta Loma, Tex.; Wilbert Vidrine and Gwinn Bowers, Iowa; Wilbur Wade Williams, Thornwell; Allen Sylvester Keller, Fenton; Charles Dwight Precht, Jennings; and John Jasper Daigle, Lacassine.

Mr. Speaker, I could include others from all parts of my district, but I think the above is typical of the press reports on this subject, and I will not take up any additional space for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include a copy of a letter received by me from the commissioner of agriculture of the State of Louisiana on this subject, to wit:

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
Baton Rouge, January 22, 1945.

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HENRY: I am writing you in reference to the matter of drafting farm labor, and especially the indiscriminate drafting of those between 18 and 26.

You are well aware of the tremendous shortage that now exists and further inroads would jeopardize the production of the necessary food, feed, and fiber to take care of our armed forces and civilian population.

Hoping to have your cooperation in this matter, and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HARRY D. WILSON,
Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, likewise I could include dozens of letters and telegrams from constituents from my district, but I think the above is sufficient to fortify my position, and for the RECORD.

The Parade Passes By

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by W. G. Vorpe from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 21, 1945:

AS THE PARADE PASSES BY

(By W. G. Vorpe)

I should like to depart temporarily today from my usual nostalgic reminiscences to turn attention to more serious discussion of current problems. I am persuaded to do this by the recent flurry over manpower both for the war front and the home front, a flurry that should have come much sooner. The message and radio talk of President Roosevelt, in which he advocated immediate action to get deferred IV-F's into service for war either at home or in noncombat activities, a national service act, and the drafting of nurses for duty will bring results that can't help but contribute much to the war effort, but he probably won't get all he asks for despite the need at a most critical time. Party politics, selfish interests and prejudices will erect barriers hard to hurdle unless Congress has the courage to do drastic things when only drastic measures will win this war within the next 3 years.

Speaking plainly, I am for immediate action on these three fronts:

Use of all IV-F's between the ages of 18 and 28 either at the fighting front in noncombat work or in a critical industry.

A national service act with proper restrictions that will keep it from being a political football and will insure men taken from a nonessential job into one more critical against financial loss or loss of their seniority rights.

The drafting of registered nurses for war work unless the volunteer method meets the present urgent need.

I suppose I am only one of many selective service board members who have long been dissatisfied with the procedure adopted in the case of many of the young men classified as IV-F. The fault has not been of the draft board's making. The registrants, for some reason or other, have been turned down by the medical examiners at the induction stations and the boards had no alternative.

These young men were deferred either for physical, mental, or moral reasons. For physical reasons many were turned down who really wanted to get into the service, even for noncombat work if they could not be used as fighters, but they didn't get a chance. Some persisted, and later processing got them an acceptance. Psychiatrists at the induction stations turned down, on rather flimsy grounds, many who were sent up by draft boards. And for a time all who had criminal records were turned back. Later the rules were lifted in cases of minor lawbreakers.

Now there is a desire to change all this. Boards are asked to review all who are classed IV-F, to put into critical industry all that can get jobs and send back for further preinduction examination those whose ailments seem to have been halted. Even those who had minor mental disturbances can be given another chance. These men, if not able to get into the combat line, will be utilized, if possible, as limited service draftees, though limited service as a classification was discarded some time ago by national selective service officials. Whether many of these IV-F boys will be used depends upon how strictly the Army authorities carry out the rules and follow the suggestion of President Roosevelt. As this is written, Congress is trying to shape legislation to correct the IV-F evil.

That some of the physical and mental IV-F's have suffered unjust criticism because of their deferment when they desired to give war service has been very apparent, but there are many cases of men deferred who have merely taken advantage of it to earn a good living in a nonessential industry. Young men who can play professional baseball, football, and hockey, perform for the entertainment of the public in the boxing ring or on the wrestling mat have been kept out of service and one wonders why. One who goes to a hotel or night club where a floor show is given sees husky young males of draft age dancing, singing, or otherwise entertaining the paying guests. Why are they at large? If they are disqualified for combat duty there ought to be work they might do which would relieve some better equipped young man for front line work. It seems likely that soon a lot of these will be either in critical war work or in line for the armed services.

But what is going to be done about the moral IV-F's, the young men with criminal records who are allowed to escape all war duties, free to roam about and menace the communities while honest and upright young men and fathers are fighting for their country? The Army and Navy says it doesn't want these men. Good soldiers object to associating with them, and we can't blame them. Yet these men can be used just the same. Why not segregate them under hard-boiled officers? One of the best fighting groups of modern times was the Foreign Legion and it was made up largely of ex-criminals or men with criminal tendencies. Service in that rough group made good citizens out of some of them. If they can't be used as fighters they can be sent to concentration camps, where under military regulation, they will do useful work. The Government should do something about it and at once. Maybe a national service act will solve that problem, and some sort of an act along this line is badly needed. It should have come 3 years ago. Such a law would save selective service boards severe headaches caused by irate neighbors who write or telephone constantly about some husky young fellow in their community who is swaggering about, loafing in poolrooms or driving his car and bragging that the Army can't get him. The draft boards are powerless because his past bad actions make him exempt. The public still doesn't know the rules laid down in Washington despite the fact that these have all been told many times in the newspapers.

The drafting of nurses is another serious problem, and the President favors such a method. I am inclined to the belief it will be necessary, though there may be a solution short of a real draft of women, which is a severe measure. There must be, however, either a large increase in volunteers for war nursing or a scheme evolved to allow enlistment of nurses who do not go through the Red Cross for war service. The only alternative is a draft.

In any discussion of nurses, a two-edged problem arises. At home every community suffers from their lack. Hospitals claim their staffs have been reduced to the danger point, yet it is evident that those who are wounded fighting for our country need nursing if they are to recover, and theirs is by far the greater need. At home we will have to depend more on women who will give a part of their week to helping in the hospitals. And any woman who is able should consider this a part of her patriotic duty in wartime.

In my opinion, national Selective Service officials should make a change in the act's classification of police and firemen. Under rules which were put into effect months ago, police and firemen were considered essential as contributing to the health and safety of their communities. Therefore, they went into the classification II-A. But now, under the directives, it is necessary for all draft boards to draw on men in the II-A class to fill their quotas for induction into armed services. Thus, no longer are police and firemen of draft age exempted. The depletion of their ranks has reached the danger stage. How long selective-service boards can defer these men who are really doing a great service is questionable unless a definite order for deferment is issued by the big boss in Washington.

Many board members believe these men should be in II-B as critical workers. How can we combat sabotage without an adequate police force, and how can we fight fires that may destroy plants making war products without sufficient firemen?

It is a serious question.

Bill To Establish Americans All—Immigrants All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House of Representatives an amended version of House Joint Resolution 162, which I introduced during the seventy-eighth session of Congress. This bill provides for the institution of Americans All—Immigrants All program, and in order to fully acquaint the Members of the House of Representatives with the object and purposes of this organization I include herewith an address delivered by the Honorable Robert C. Moore, of Carlinville, Ill., who for 20 years was a member of the board of directors of the National Education Association and for 25 years the executive secretary of the Illinois Education Association:

AMERICANS ALL—IMMIGRANTS ALL

We, the people of the United States and our allies must win the war—and the peace. This is the preeminent, world-wide objective

of the United Nations, and all other projects are now considered in their relation to it and their value is measured by their efficacy in promoting this paramount objective.

Before outlining a new project, let us consider the present world situation and some of its causes. Any statement of the present situation may seem trite; but it cannot be stated too often or too impressively, since it is apparent that many American citizens fail to realize fully its seriousness, the impending doom of civilization if we lose the war, the terrifying cost in money and lives, sacrifice and suffering, toil and blood and tears necessary to win, and the dangers in the myriad of baffling problems of the ensuing peace.

When we view the world scene, we observe that instead of international law we have international anarchy; instead of the orderly practice of civilized procedure we have confusion, turmoil, and chaos; instead of a reign of reason, justice, and humanitarianism, we have a jungle-like struggle of force, terror, and murder; instead of peace we have war. In the last 4 years millions of men have been slaughtered; millions of women have suffered all the physical and mental agonies that war can bring to sensitive womankind; and millions of innocent children have been starved physically, mentally, and spiritually for lack of food, education, and spiritual uplift, and their moral ideals have been perverted by the brutal strife of their elders. All these terrifying results were brought about by race hatreds, distorted ideas of superior races, class struggles, sectarian jealousies, the unleashing of predatory instincts, and the intensely selfish practices of greedy, aggressive nationalisms. These social and political vices resulted in the present immensely costly and destructive war and the hatreds incident to it, which in many respects have set back our civilization for a century.

Any organization having plans, purposes, and procedure tending to prevent or to remedy such a hideous situation as now afflicts the world should be welcomed enthusiastically by all our people; and if it is well adapted to prepare and condition our people to participate effectively in the peace and the rehabilitation of civilization after the war, it should be most heartily supported. Such an organization exists, and is called "Americans All—Immigrants All." As a creator of reciprocal understanding, tolerance, respect, goodwill, and cooperation among the various racial groups, nationalities, religious sects, and other classifications of our heterogeneous population, its efficacy has been proved by trial, and it has stood the test. At least one community testifies that it has furnished a revealing and inspiring interpretation to the phrase, "we, the people."

This movement had its origin and first test in Illinois. It was conceived in the mind of a dynamic young man only two generations removed from Mediterranean culture, who had been appointed by the Governor to serve as executive secretary of a State commission on citizenship and naturalization, and it was born in the labor of his problems and experiences in that position. It was entirely fitting and proper that it should have its origin and first test in Springfield, the shrine city of the great Lincoln who preached the doctrine of "malice toward none, with charity for all," "a house divided against itself cannot stand," and "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

The name, "Americans All—Immigrants All" was inspired by the same thought as was expressed by Calvin Coolidge when he said: "Whether one traces his Americanism back 3 centuries to the *Mayflower*, or 3 years to the steerage, is not half so important as whether his Americanism is real and genuine. No matter on what various crafts we came here, we are all now in the same boat."

As compared with most other nations, America has had a brief existence and history. Only 400 years ago its only inhabitants were the American Indians with their very crude civilization. Therefore, as measured by historical time, we or our ancestors came to America only recently; and the designation, "Americans All—Immigrants All" is meant to imply that in a sense we are all immigrants, and in another sense that we can all, whether early or recent arrivals, be good Americans. It further implies that, since we are all now in the same boat, it will be well to eradicate all false distinctions of pride and prejudice and work together harmoniously as brothers and fellows in the great cause of true democracy.

The organization is based upon the belief that after the united efforts and participation in its program and activities by all the races, nationalities, sects, and other groups in a community, all these varied peoples will have a better understanding of one another's backgrounds, a higher appreciation of one another's cultural contribution to American civilization, and a mutual respect that will produce a more hearty cooperation and a greater solidarity to withstand the onslaughts of the enemies of democracy who disseminate suspicion and hatred.

The movement is essentially an extension of our educational system; and it has an appeal not only to the youth in our schools but also to mature adult citizens. It has in it elements of geography, of history, and of ethics, and a more potent element of civics or good citizenship. It teaches that, although America has a population of heterogeneous origins, they all have contributed to our greatness as a Nation. It tends to eliminate the feeling of racial inequality, to soften nationalistic hatreds, to eradicate bigotry and sectarian prejudices, and to cultivate a unity of purpose to be brothers in the common cause of Americanism. It develops the spirit of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and encourages the collective action that has made America a world power. Its activities generate the warmth that fuses into unity the contents of our melting pot.

Americans All—Immigrants All is incorporated as a nonprofit association under the laws of Illinois. It has a board of directors, president, secretary, treasurer, and other officers and committees necessary for its administration and the promotion of its purposes, which are modestly but plainly stated as follows:

1. To bring within the main stream of our population the many cultural and racial groups of this Nation without destroying the valuable contributions of which these groups are capable.

2. To promote through the various channels of education and publicity mutual understanding and appreciation among the several segments of our population regardless of the political affiliation, religious faith, or racial or national origin of each such segment.

3. To unify all racial and national groups residing in the United States.

The constitution and bylaws provide also that the general office shall be at Springfield, Ill., but that branches may be organized in other States and Territories with local chapters in communities interested. Annual dues are $1 for general membership, $5 for sustaining members, and from $100 up for patrons. The originator of the idea, who also supervised its first test in Springfield, was chosen executive director. Although it is necessary to have a complete organization for the general or national office, the founders realize that the actual achievement of its purposes must be through local organizations and community projects.

The literature of the organization outlines general directions for planning and operating such a community project; but it is realized that plans and procedure must be adapted to the size, character, conditions and resources of the various communities. The national office also has literature describing just how its plans and purposes were so successfully carried out in Springfield. In general it accomplishes its ends through an active local organization with an inspired leader, who enlist the newspapers, radio, and cinema; who promote discussions in public gatherings, class rooms, and lecture halls; and who plan and present community pageants which are wide in scope and dramatic in presentation.

An excellent example of the successful operation of Americans All—Immigrants All was its first test in Springfield in 1939. Its original promoters secured the support of the Governor of the State and several other civic-minded local leaders, and secured also the endorsement and cooperation of the United States Office of Education. Local committees were appointed, which secured the enthusiastic cooperation of the newspapers, the mayor of the city, local churches, schools, labor organizations, and many individual citizens. Weekly programs of activities were outlined for 26 consecutive weeks; and for that full time the newspapers headlined accounts of the activities, studies were made in the schools, sermons were preached in the churches, and there was a marked increase in the demand for library books. The sons and daughters of many nations and races flocked to the meetings to give testimony concerning (1) what motives had brought them here, (2) how they got here, (3) what they believed they had contributed to America, (4) what America had done for them, and (5) what their problems had been and what problems still remained.

This comprehensive program directed attention not only to the benefits and blessings of American civilization, but also to the contributions made to it by the various races and types of people making up our population. Different weeks were assigned to such groups as the English, Irish, Scots, Scandinavians, Italians, Germans, Slavs, Jews, French, Dutch, Russians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Rumanians, and Negroes. People of each and all these types participated in the programs, and their contributions to our culture and material progress were called to public attention by newspapers, schools, radio, pulpit, and forum. From all this there emerged a general public realization that their community is a product of the varied gifts of all laid on the altars of the arts, crafts, science, industry, education, religion and social progress. "We, the people," learned to know one another, to respect and understand one another, and to cooperate heartily in the support of community and American activities and institutions.

The culmination of the project was an Americans-all jubilee held in Springfield with the main program carried out in the spacious State armory. Here 340 talented amateur artists in colorful costumes and amid beautiful stage settings brought their varied contributions of music, folk songs, folk dances, and other expressions of art, all under the supervision of an expert pageant director. The performers were divided into 14 different groups of as many races and nationalities, and each group presented its characteristic program, opening with an Indian song by Illiniwek and closing with a grand finale with all groups on the stage and participating in the inspiring song, God Bless America. Each number was announced and introduced by a speaker costumed as Uncle Sam.

The armory was filled to its capacity of about 5,000 seated, and another 1,000 seated

in the aisles and standing around the walls; approximately 3,000 people were turned away when the doors were closed. On request a repeat program drew 25,000 people at the Illinois State fair grounds.

The people of the city and surrounding country considered the project a great success; and the community is still reaping the benefits of sympathy, understanding, reciprocal respect, unity, and cooperation resulting from it among its heterogeneous population.

The influence and effects of this demonstration extended far beyond the local community. The United States Office of Education cooperated by contributing a series of radio programs developing the basic theme and delivered over the Columbia Network; this series was voted by the Woman's National Committee as "the most original and informative radio program presented on the air during the radio season," and the series was awarded the gold medal for that season. The plan was endorsed by resolutions unanimously adopted by the municipal government of Springfield and also by the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois. The newspaper accounts and the radio broadcasts of the programs attracted wide public attention and created much interest throughout the Nation, as was proved by the numerous letters received by the local management inquiring about the means and methods of devising and carrying out such a project.

In response to this widespread interest, the organizers of this movement are offering it to the Nation. They have a firm conviction born of experience that it is specially applicable to our country's needs in this time of war and its stress and strain. Our philosophers, statesmen, and other leaders all plead for unity, which includes the harmonizing of our racial and other differences, the elimination of class struggles, nationalistic prejudices, race riots, and all internecine strife that weakens our war effort and gives comfort and advantage to our enemies. These are the purposes for which Americans All—Immigrants All was instituted. No doubt the general public interest was inspired by a realization that the general dissemination of the organization and its teachings throughout the country would not only improve group relations in local communities but would also add much to the strength of the Nation, and would remove conditions that are harmful at any time but are actually perilous to our very survival in time of war.

After the shooting stops there will continue even a greater need for the teachings of this organization. The making of the peace, the reorganization of wrecked governments, and the rehabilitation of civilization will present the most intricate and difficult problems that ever challenged the mind and moral judgment of man. Order must succeed chaos, and good government must supersede anarchy. Practically all the people of the world earnestly hope that such a cataclysm of horror, death, and destruction as now afflicts the world shall never recur. Therefore, the paramount objective of the peace conference will be to banish war forever from the earth. But this most desirable end can be attained only by treaties whose integrity is sacredly respected, or by the enforcement of some kind of world government. Whatever plan is chosen will involve at least negotiation, probably cooperation, and possibly the establishment of a world government.

Americans All—Immigrants All has no blue prints to offer or definite plan to present for adoption in making the peace. It is not its purpose to advocate any certain plan until a plan is agreed to by our Government; but it is serving now by offering an essential national program of adult and youth education—education by actual participation in real peace activities. Its program and activities carried on throughout the Nation would not only promote understanding, good will, and unity among the people of our own Nation, but would also prepare and condition their minds to understand other nations and to support and defend whatever plan may be adopted by Congress and the President.

This essential national program is doing its part in unifying America to win the war, to participate effectively in making the peace, and to take its place among the nations in preserving the peace. And then after peaceable relations among the nations are permanently established, its principles and activities will help guide the spirit of America, and we hope of the world, toward the same noble ends as those listed in our American Constitution: "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The Chamber of Commerce in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, over 170 years ago the movement, later to be known as the chamber of commerce, had its beginning. Today such an organization is in existence in almost every city in the United States, both large and small. The record of these organizations is one of the great contributions to our American life. Through this movement great things have been accomplished in every community in which such an organization exists. Men have learned to pool their efforts in a common interest in behalf of the community in which they live. Such an organization is thoroughly indispensable in the community life of every city and town today throughout America.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include herewith an editorial from the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., dealing with the history of the movement, the chamber of commerce in the United States:

WORKING TOGETHER

One-hundred-and-seventy-odd years ago a group of American businessmen conceived the notion that by working together they could do more for the betterment of trade and industry than could be achieved solely through their individual efforts. So they formed an organization in which they could pool their talents and energy and called it a chamber of commerce. The idea was a good one—it paid dividends—and other chambers were started as time went on.

Years later men decided they could not continue to do business indefinitely in any place unless they helped make it a better community. Their chambers then began to be active in civic affairs and gradually evolved into civic-minded bodies, interested in community development as well as commercial matters.

Today the chamber of commerce is an accepted American institution—widespread, strong, active, and backed by nearly a million men and women. Its record of accomplishment for business, industry, community well-being, and national strength is outstanding.

And yet the possibilities for achievement through the medium of the chamber of commerce have never been fully utilized. Too many people still do not realize just how much can be done when united thought and action are applied to common problems. All too many others do not care.

The over-all aim of chambers of commerce in 1945 is a greater measure of achievement—to do more to end this war speedily and to prepare for peace. As always, the degree of attainment in every chamber will depend upon the extent to which those in the community are willing to work together. Boiled down, it is as simple as that.

And, as R. H. Barry of the Fargo Chamber of Commerce recently suggested, there should be a closer cooperation between the various communities for the good of the whole State. Commenting on Mr. Barry's suggestion the Valley City Times-Record recently said:

"Frankly, we think Mr. Barry has something there.

"There are times when cities pull against each other because prejudices from earlier arguments continue to rankle. There just is no denying that varying interests will find cities divided in opinion on some matters. For instance, the matter of roads, airports, the Missouri diversion—all these things can easily result in different ideas.

"It is expected that each community will fight for the things it considers to its best interests. What Barry urges, and what we concur with, is that after that fight is over, after the road has been built, the airport spotted or the dam built, then for Pete's sake why can't we forget that argument and pull together for a bigger and better North Dakota?

"No one would want a newspaper or a businessmen's group to sell its community short. The editor or organization who would do that is not entitled to exist. The community welfare is the first thing to be considered.

"However, after the heat of battle has died, and the smoke has cleared, the healthy thing to do is forget the water which has gone over the falls and join hands again in working collectively for those things which are good for North Dakota.

"A community rent by petty jealousies between its businessmen, torn by prejudices and dislikes, cannot succeed. Neither can a State in which its cities and towns spend half their time fighting each other."

Such sentiments put into practice will carry North Dakota forward to great accomplishments.

Roosevelt's Fourth Inaugural

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my request for permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I want to include therein the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

As long as this Nation remains a democracy and as long as the people assert their right to choose their own leaders, men of destiny will continue to direct the affairs of the Government. Our beloved friend and President was once again

chosen by the people of this country to lead us through the difficult years ahead. He is entitled to the support of us all. Why was he chosen for a third, and yet a fourth, time, unique among the chosen few of this Republic? In a splendid editorial, both lucid and honest, the Philadelphia Record gives the answer. Here it is:

ROOSEVELT'S FOURTH INAUGURAL—WHY DID UNITED STATES END TRADITION OF TWO TERMS?

Saturday was a date the historians will write down in their books with heavy emphasis.

For the first time an American President completed three 4-year terms and took the oath for a fourth.

Utterly unprecedented, Saturday's inauguration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. No other President ever was nominated three times. Here is a man nominated and elected for not only a third term but a fourth. In office already for 12 years, his total span as Chief Magistrate will be 16, barring the unforeseen.

Why did a substantial majority of Americans thus smash one of our most cherished traditions—"Two terms are enough for any man"?

EXPLANATION

Viewing President Roosevelt and his works at close range—which, of course, is not in the historical manner—the Record believes it understands why this great Nation elected the same President four times:

Because, to a greater degree than any other President, he lived his Presidency in close understanding, even in companionship, with his fellow citizens.

Because he shared their aspirations and had the skill to turn at least a few of the people's dreams into reality.

Because in a world suffering the turmoil of revolution the majority of Americans were sure he was abler than any other American to lead his country to military victory and to help lead the world to a lasting peace.

ABNORMAL TIMES

Mr. Roosevelt could hardly have been elected to a third term, certainly never to a fourth, had his country and the world been progressing happily in a normal orbit. Nor would the man willingly have sought such honors.

He could not quit at the end of his second or his third term without leaving a tremendous task undone, without shirking the responsibility of allowing the American people to decide if they wanted him to finish it.

Lincoln was a minority President when he went to Washington in 1861. His majority for a second term was relatively small. Roosevelt's majorities in each of four elections have been resounding, though always he was opposed by rich and powerful interests. He has truly been beloved by millions of the common people.

MADE ENEMIES

Yet, like all our strong Presidents—Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson—Roosevelt has made implacable enemies. To them he is the evil dictator, as was Lincoln to his foes; the muddleheaded nitwit in a job too big for his capacity, as they said of Jackson; an arch-radical seeking to destroy free enterprise, as Jefferson was described by his bitter opponents; an egomaniac with delusions of grandeur, as Philadelphia and New York editors often wrote of Washington.

Greater changes in the fabric of American life have taken place during the three Roosevelt terms than in any other Presidential era.

There is a school of philosophy which believes that events and circumstances beyond the control of man largely chart the course of human destiny; that even the most powerful and ablest rulers of governments may merely guide their craft advantageously through these storms not of man's making.

That can be true. If it is, then Roosevelt was a master helmsman of our ship of state in days of economic depression as well as in days of tyrannous oppression abroad.

His enemies declare he has destroyed the America that was. It is true that the America of the past is gone, and forever. It went in 1929. But for the majority of the people the kind of America we are looking forward to can be better by far than the so-called "glories" of a dead past which isn't so glorious except for a very few in high places.

We cannot be sure, of course. History must evaluate events and circumstances as well as men, in the future as it has in days gone by.

History, written calmly by intelligent men who reasoned objectively, has placed our Presidents of the past in their proper perspective. So they will place Roosevelt. A sound forecast is that his niche will be among the greatest.

Tribute to General Chennault

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, General Chennault's position in China, aside from his status as Commanding General of the United States Fourteenth Air Force, is unique, and could perhaps be termed as "unparalleled." As an unofficial ambassador of good will between the Chinese and Americans he has the admiration and very nearly the reverence of the Chinese people. To the Chinese, General Chennault symbolizes America and Americans. To most Americans, Chennault is a romantic and legendary character. The daring exploits and success of the American Volunteer Group are accountable for the American view of Chennault. But to the Chinese, both military leaders and civilians, the A. V. G. is only a part of the reason for his position and popularity in China today. As Chief of Staff for Air under the generalissimo his opinions and advice which are confined only to conduct of air operations of both Chinese and American Air Forces are accepted without question by the generalissimo and are carried out fully.

The Chinese do not place confidence lightly. They know Chennault as a man of careful consideration not given to snap or hasty decisions, who stands behind all of his judgments and decisions with implacableness and force. They know him for his even temperament and fairness. They know him for his kindly and yet blunt decisive way of dealing in all matters. But these qualities do not account for the implicit confidence which they have imposed in Chennault. That confidence is based on his proven ability as a great military leader. He has a keen insight and understanding of the limitations as well as the capabilities of the commanders, pilots, and men under his command. He has full and detailed knowledge of the performance, characteristics and operation limitations of all the types of aircraft in his command and he operates those aircraft strictly within those limits. An unusually retentive memory of topography, distinguishing landmarks and of generally existing weather conditions of localities where he has been but which have since been taken by the Japanese makes it possible for him to give instructions in close detail as to the conduct of missions of his bombers and fighter planes against Japanese targets. His close study of Japanese air and ground tactics, and the performance and characteristics of their aircraft over a period of 7 years, enables him to plan campaigns and missions against targets which could not be conducted successfully were this knowledge lacking.

General Chennault was retired from the United States Army Air Corps in 1935 as a captain. In 1937 he came to China, just 1 month prior to the outbreak of hostilities between Japan and China at Shanghai. In the role of air adviser to the newly formed Chinese Air Forces from 1937 to 1941 he devoted all his energies, not only toward the molding of the embryonic Chinese Air Force into an effective tactical unit, but also toward the elimination of Italian and German air advisers and methods which he was convinced were intended to cripple the Chinese efforts rather than aid them in their unequal struggle. During this period he organized and directed training schools for pilots, toured and flew the length and breadth of China to find suitable location for airdromes for future use, and also found time to study and analyze in close detail the methods and tactics of the Japanese Air Force which was at that time causing large scale destruction in Chinese cities and against Chinese ground armies.

Sensing that the Japanese efforts would in the future be directed against the United States, his efforts during the years from 1937 to 1941 appear to have entailed not only the planning and action for the needs of the moment but also a long-range planning and dispersion of air fields which would be strategically located for effective large scale offensive air effort in the future. The Chinese Air Force, although never large enough to defeat the Japanese air effort in China, still, under his tactical control created havoc with the Jap aircraft when operating defensively and made many offensive missions which were successful because of their unexpectedness, timing, and the tactics employed.

The record of the A. V. G. is essentially a part of the record of General Chennault. In the role of chief advocate for its birth and foundation, he spent months in Washington pleading, explaining, and exhorting Washington officialdom to support such an undertaking. In the role of instructor, the only instructor which the group had, to the small group of pilots which he had succeeded in obtaining from the United States armed services, he spent nearly 5 months in the jungles of Burma, holding daily classes in tactics, chalk in hand, before a blackboard, from which classes

the pilots would then take off in their planes to practice what he had taught them, while he watched for hours on end with his eyes glued to his binoculars to see how well they carried out the tactics he had taught them, which he was convinced would be most successful in defeating the Japanese airmen. During this period he also completed preparations at his advanced bases in China, organized his ground staff which for reasons beyond his control was both incompetent and inadequate, organized his command post radio net in China, and was engaged in the procurement of the supplies necessary to support the group's activities.

Although the A. V. G. was startlingly successful in its encounters with the superior forces of the enemy, and in a period of less than 8 months destroyed 298 Japanese aircraft confirmed and twice the number probables, the true contribution can perhaps never be accurately measured for it was a psychological factor at a time when it was most needed. The loss of the Philippines, Guam, and the Indies, the almost complete destruction of the Asiatic Fleet, and the rapidity and destruction with which the Japanese accomplished these victories, was not disheartening to the Allies. At a time when the Japanese air squadrons appeared to be nearly invincible, the A. V. G. met them in air combat in Burma with less than 15 planes, and in 3 combats between December 20 and December 24, 1941, shot down over 65 Japanese planes against the loss of 2 A. V. G. pilots and 3 planes. Understandably, the Chinese morale was low during the first months of 1942, but the news of the A. V. G. victories did much to dispel the pessimism and gloom which the sweeping Japanese victories over the American, Dutch, and British forces in the Pacific had undeniably caused.

The sparkplug of A. V. G. resistance in Burma did much to delay the fall of that country and enabled huge quantities of war goods to still reach China over the Burma Road, which would otherwise have been captured by the enemy. No reinforcements having reached the A. V. G., either in planes or pilots, during this entire period up to the last of April, the small remnant of the volunteers who were in Loiwing and who were flying almost continuously in Burma and were war-weary, tired, and discouraged, rebelled against the low-flying hazardous patrol missions which they were being asked to make and handed in their resignations en masse. Although they were in civilian status, and could not have been held against their will in either Burma or China, General Chennault, through sheer force of personal magnetism and character, dissuaded them from leaving the A. V. G. and they resumed their missions on the following day.

It is not a pretty story, but the pilots had been driven almost beyond human endurance in the effort to stem the Japanese advance through Burma, and with no reinforcements or replacements the outlook seemed rather gloomy. That General Chennault was able to turn them from their purpose and order them to resume their missions is but one of the many similar indications of General Chennault's character and ability as a leader, which I have observed.

The Japs finally broke through all allied opposition and drove toward Yunnan with incredible speed. All organized Chinese resistance in Burma had ceased and there were few troops ready in Yunnan which could stop the forward drive. Owing to the almost continuous daylight activity of the A. V. G. against the motorized, mechanized, and cavalry units which were driving up the Burma Road, and the destruction of thousands of troops by strafing with machine guns from the planes, the advance slowed down and stopped at the Salween, giving the Chinese a chance to reorganize and establish the Salween front from which General Stilwell's forces are now operating in an attempt to regain Burma.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley to Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the annual dinner meeting of the Fall River Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, Fall River, Mass., on January 16, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests and ladies and gentlemen, it is very encouraging to see so many people gathered at a function of this kind, laying aside their business responsibilities in order to show an interest in boyhood and in this great agency, the Boy Scouts of America. It shows a clear realization that especially now in time of war the growing boys are not only our responsibility here on the home front, but, as the citizens of tomorrow, are the bright promise of the Nation.

I believe this is typical of the feeling throughout the country today. We are all of us very much more aware of our responsibility to youth than we were a generation ago. When I was a boy, growing up in a small town, there were no such organizations as the Boy Scouts. We had no neighborhood clubs for boys. We went fishing, swimming, skating, coasting down hill, played baseball and now and then got together for a little social diversion. Nobody directed us; nobody assumed any responsibility for us; we just went along on our own power. But we were lucky at that. In the cities, the boys fared much worse. There were no playgrounds for children. There were very few parks. When cities did have parks they were usually removed from centers of population. The only places for recreation were the city streets, and the only recreation director was the corner cop. Only of course neither he nor the kids thought of it exactly that way.

Today the picture has changed. We realize that youth ought to have a number one priority on our devoted attention. Our young men are needed to fly our planes, to drive our tanks, to absorb the shock of battle. We need our young men desperately today, and we realize that when we ask them to take the brunt of battle, we have no moral right to accept their sacrifices unless we do everything under heaven not only to help them to get readjusted when they come back, but to educate, to train and provide the right sort of experiences for their younger brothers.

Now the Boy Scout movement invests in the future and it is one of great tokens of the fact that America is awake to her obligations to youth. Under God and the fitness of things, I believe that we ought to strengthen the oncoming generations of youth to repay the sacrifices which their older brothers are now making for them and for us, and we ought to highly resolve that our young people will be properly equipped to take the leadership that they will have to assume in years to come.

Well, what have our boys and girls a right to expect of us? Are we, you, and I really fulfilling our obligation to them? We pick up our newspaper and we read that juvenile delinquency is up 40 percent, 50 percent, and in some places I have seen it estimated as high as 60 percent. Why? Everyone has an answer. The war, the war conditions, overcrowding, this thing, that thing, the other thing. There is nothing the matter with our boys and girls today except the same thing that has always been the matter. The problem is not juvenile delinquency, but adult indifference. Boys want adventure. Of course they do. They always have. The thing to do is to give them the right sort of adventure. The time to stop juvenile delinquency is before the boy becomes delinquent.

There are four things to my way of thinking that play a very important part in the life of a boy, that have everything to do with fixing the way his future life will be. First is the home. In nine times out of ten if a boy gets into trouble, you will be able to trace the cause of it to bad conditions at home, bad example, indifference, neglect.

The second great influence on a boy is the church. It is impossible to overestimate that influence. Religion should be a real and compelling thing in the life of a boy. The time was when the atheist was just one in a mob who cried out, "There is no God!" But today in Nazi Germany atheism is organized and for the first time in the history of the world a new generation was educated on an anti-Christian and anti-God basis. We have seen the results in the lives of the young people in Nazi Germany, who were taught that the state is above God.

How much better off the whole world would be if all observed the twelfth Scout law. Let me read it to you. I know you are familiar with it, but I would like to emphasize it at this time. "A Scout is reverent. He is reverent toward God. He is faithful in his religious duties, and respects the convictions of others in matters of custom and religion." If that had been the law for boyhood all over the world, there would have been no racial persecution in Germany, and the world would not now be embroiled in the bloodiest war in history.

The third important influence on youth is the school. There is no need to elaborate on that. We all know how necessary a good education and vocational training are for the future of a boy. What the home and the church do for the heart and soul, the school does for the mind.

But in our complex modern life when the home, and the church, and the school have

done their part, there still is need for something more in the lifetime of a boy. He is a social being. He naturally looks for companionship, and he looks for adventure, something to do in his spare time. That is where the Boy Scouts of America comes into his life, and does a job which in my judgment, no other organization can do more effectively. What are some of the things that this scout program gives the boy to round out his equipment for life?

In the first place, the scout program gives him wholesome recreation. None of you, no matter how sold you are as leaders, on this movement, should ever kid yourselves for one minute that boys become scouts for any other reason than the fun they get out of it. You and I may know that a lot of other things are important, but to the boy today, just as to us, when we were boys, the great thing is adventure and fun. Now there are all sorts of commercial amusements available on every street corner—many more than when you and I were in our 'teens. There is the motion picture—a great institution and a powerful educational source for good, in its better phases, but there are also, unfortunately, cheap motion pictures that pander to the boy's love of excitement, without doing anything constructive for him. There are the pool room and the dance hall, harmless enough in themselves perhaps, but not constructive influences in the life of a growing boy. In contrast to these and other commercial amusements, the scout movement gives the boy the whole world of the out of doors—camping, a chance to sleep out in the open and to fill his lungs full of fresh air; a chance to cook his dinner over a fire; a chance to go swimming, to learn how to handle a boat and maybe to save a person's life.

That brings up the second thing that I think is valuable in the Scout program. It gives the boy things to do that appeal to him as worth while—that appeal to the man already beginning to take shape in him. He learns to take care of himself and he learns to help other people.

Not long ago there was an item in a New York paper, not a big item, only about a quarter of a column. The headline read, "Boy Scout rescues pair felled by gas." The article told about how his knowledge of artificial respiration enabled a 14-year-old boy to save the life of an elderly couple who had been overcome by fumes from a gas heater. When this boy came home from school in the afternoon he smelled gas as he entered the hallway of the apartment building where he lived. He traced the odor to an apartment on the fourth floor, and got no response. But he did not give up for this boy was a Scout. He knocked for one of the other tenants, climbed through the window of his apartment onto the fire escape and looking through the window next door saw the couple lying on the floor. With help from the neighbor he broke open the window. He took the pulse of the unconscious man and woman and started to work on the man because his pulse was weaker. At the same time he directed the neighbor how to revive the woman and yelled down the fire escape to someone else to send for help. By the time the police and ambulance got there both those old people had been saved, because a 14-year-old boy knew what to do and how to do it.

Now this is a common enough story. I dare say you can duplicate it many times in the pages of your local press and elsewhere all over the country. But think of the satisfaction that that Boy Scout and all the other Boy Scouts in his Scout troop, and in other Scout troops, get out of the knowledge that they have learned something worth while that enables them actually to save a person's life.

Right now in the city of New York, as here in Fall River, and in every other community, large and small, all over the country, young boys are having a chance to help our country win the war in ways that would never under the sun have been possible if it were not for the Boy Scouts of America. This is not only a very well worth-while service for our country, but is an important thing in the lives of these boys. Waste paper drives, bond selling, planting crops, helping the Red Cross, you see these Boy Scouts all over doing a man-sized job at a time when we have a serious manpower shortage.

Think of the inexhaustible energy of boys. What boundless capacity of energy, enthusiasm and vitality are wrapped up in boys. Think of their unspoiled powers. Not merely their bodily agility, but the surging tide of their youthful emotion, not spoiled by overexcitement—their active will power, eager and ready to give service to other people. All of this is utilized through the activities of the Boy Scout program.

Then another important thing that the boy gets in his scout troop is companionship. The right sort of companionship, the right sort of impressions, are of critical importance to a boy. I ask you men and women here to look back upon your own youth and consider honestly how much of what you are now has been affected by the friends and companions you had when you were in your teens. How important it is for every boy to have a wholesome recreation, and worth-while things to do, with the right sort of companionship. And I think you will agree that boys are tremendously susceptible not only to the influence of companions of their own age, but also to the influence of adults. Boyhood is perhaps the most important period in a man's life, then his ideals are acquired, his character formed. He needs to have the right kind of man to supply his ideals and to become his hero. Every boy is a hero worshipper, and he tries, albeit unconsciously, to make himself like his hero. If the men with whom he associates are cheap, are crooks, are gunmen or gangsters, that is the sort of hero the boy wants to resemble. It is up to us to see that he has the right sort of companionship and the right sort of leader to follow.

At this period boys are having a hard time. Their older brothers are away, their fathers in most cases are keeping longer business hours than ever before, and crowding in a lot of wartime activities also. Many of the wholesome things that the family used to do together are not possible now, because of war work, or restricted travel conditions, or gasoline shortage, or other reasons. Boys have time on their hands. Tens of thousands of boys are nightly on our streets looking for amusement, seeking a venture, yearning for companionship. This situation is a challenge to us on the home front. Is it not up to us to provide places where these boys can meet and play, be entertained and instructed, and at the same time be under the influence of men of the right kind?

This is a practical thing to do. It can be done. It has been done, thank God, all over America. But why are we not, in every community, undertaking it in a big way? All of you men and women here tonight are interested in boys and willing to work for them. That is why you are taking part in this occasion, but are you interested enough and do you care enough? If each one of you would lead a one-man crusade to provide more opportunities for the boys of Fall River to get the benefits of this Scout program, your city could be an immeasurably better place when your sons come back home than it was when they left.

This job is up to us. It depends upon us whether these boys will have the opportunity to learn how to be good and worth-while citizens, or whether they will be woefully neglected during these important formative years. We cannot turn our backs and ignore existing conditions. It is up to us to accept the challenge and lend ourselves for the task. It is a man's job, and it needs men of mettle, who will put something of themselves into the understanding.

In meeting our obligations to youth, we have come a long way over the conditions that prevailed a generation ago. But this is as critical a time for our youth at home as it is for our young men who are fighting on our battle fronts. We can all give some time; we can all spare some effort for boys. Let us put it where it can do a lot of good—into the Scout program.

It is my profound conviction that the boy who subscribes to your Scout promise, who has a chance to learn the things that scouting teaches him, and to associate with the right kind of man as leader, will go a long way to make an honest, upstanding straightforward citizen of this country, and that in the tomorrows which are coming he will be found in the very front line of the citizens who will maintain the cherished and sacred traditions of America.

Our World Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our World Aims," written by Mr. McClellan Van de Veer, and published in the Birmingham Age-Herald of recent issue.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR WORLD AIMS

Four United States Senators—PEPPER, of Florida; TOBEY, of New Hampshire; ELLENDER, of Louisiana, and CHAVEZ, of New Mexico—talked about America's war and peace aims in the Town Meeting of the Air Thursday night.

There was encouraging agreement among them on the necessity for international collaboration that a better world may be established.

As one Senator suggested, our war and peace aims may be summarized as complete defeat of the enemy nations and the establishment of a good and durable peace. Beyond that, there was the common idea of continuing cooperation among the nations to prevent a recurrence of conflict.

As in most discussions of that problem, the chief reliance seemed to be simply on power. There was emphatic insistence that the United States must maintain its own strong military establishment, at least pending the establishment of an effective international organization which would make possible the scaling down of national armaments. There doubtless is widespread support for this view among the people of the country. But, of course, there are grave difficulties in such a policy. How far can genuine international collaboration get if the great powers are unable to find a feasible program of mutual disarmament? If Germany and Japan are disarmed and strictly controlled after their defeat, against what particular dangers would the victorious nations maintain large armed forces? If there is fear of trouble among themselves and with any other nations, to what extent will large armaments aggravate distrust and apprehension?

If unilateral and group settlements of political problems of concern to all nations

are a handicap in the building of a system of general collaboration, would not extensive national military programs be a difficulty in the way of achieving an over-all system of international justice and lead toward a disastrous competition in armaments?

Suppose, for example, Russia maintains a vast military establishment outside the area of its understandings with other nations? Or suppose the United States does? Would that not, in the first place, imply a lack of faith in collective security which would be bound seriously to hamper its development? Would that not be comparable to unilateral political action by a member nation on an issue affecting all nations in the organization?

Yet, it may be logically asked, how can there be any individual disarmament until there is effective collaboration?

If there is any hopeful answer to that difficult question, it seems to lie in a great renewal of faith and the establishment of new power based on justice, reason and good will; and in a new pioneering to that end. But seldom has the world been more lacking in faith in the power of reason and good will. It seemed to the Age-Herald that the talks of the four Senators sadly emphasized that lamentable reality.

What did we hear from them in the way of specific ideas on getting into operation a system of international settlement and justice? On getting at the basic causes of war? On means of keeping Allied nations in unity? On improving economic and political conditions among all the nations?

It is definite ideas and techniques in such fundamental fields that are needed for a creative progress toward true peace. All else tends toward efforts at control by sheer power, which always involve the danger of deteriorating into embittering oppression.

The real problem in establishing a genuine and creative peace has to do with how faith in mutual cooperation can be established among the nations. That faith can be firmly founded only on a realization that honest collaboration is in the interest of all. Mutual faith will depend on evidences being given by nations, in attitude and action, that they are resolved to live up to joint commitments and are even ready to make some sacrifices in the interest of the world as a whole. Yet what we now mostly have from the nations are evidences of their own self-seeking.

Can that trend, so incompatible with true cooperation, be reversed? Can anything more be expected?

Certainly not without a great rebirth of spiritual leadership and faith.

Meantime, we can expect continued preoccupation with improvisations and expediencies in the sterile techniques of physical power. If the nations cannot achieve a higher level in their relationships, the result in all probability will be only a deeper and deeper hopelessness culminating eventually in new and still greater catastrophe.

Military Training for National Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I believe we are all indebted to Mr. Ben Hibbs, editor of the Saturday Evening Post, for the fine editorial from his pen entitled "Military Training for National Safety," which appeared in the issue of the Post of January 27. The editorial refers to the necessity for universal military training, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY TRAINING FOR NATIONAL SAFETY

Gen. George C. Marshall has proposed, for the post-war years, a citizen Army implemented by universal military training. The Saturday Evening Post endorses that proposal. It does so a little reluctantly, with certain frank misgivings, and only because such a course seems imperative for national safety. The Post has always hoped that this country would not have to adopt compulsory military service as a permanent peacetime measure, but, considering our experience of the past 3 years, looking at the probable world of the future, it is hard to see how we dare do otherwise.

I shan't attempt, in this editorial, to answer all the objections which have been raised against compulsory training. Some of the objections are valid. It can hardly be denied, for example, that, when all the able-bodied young men of a nation are trained in the arts of war, there is danger that in the end that nation may itself become warlike in its thinking and attitudes. It is a danger that we shall have to guard against the best we can—with all our heart and integrity. On the other hand, the accusation that universal training is a wicked plot contrived for their own interests by a selfish hierarchy of Army officers is nonsense. The same may be said of the cry that big business is at the bottom of the scheme because of the profits it would garner from the sale of equipment. The simple fact is that the cost in taxes—and business always pays the big end of the tax bill—would far outweigh the profits. I know a great many businessmen, including some manufacturers of military equipment, and I find them about as evenly divided on the question of compulsory training as are people in other occupations.

Universal military training is being advocated by honest people who have the welfare of America at heart. It is being opposed by equally sincere people. It would be a fine thing for the country if both groups would recognize this obvious fact and keep the debate on a high level. Anger and personal recriminations will get us nowhere.

The Post's reason for backing compulsory training is strictly one of national safety. Even today, more than 3 years after Pearl Harbor, few Americans realize how close we were to defeat throughout 1942 and during the early months of 1943. The Nation's attitude from the very beginning of the war—even during the black days of Bataan and Corregidor—has been one of confidence, and probably that is as it should be. It is through this high faith in ourselves that we Americans have always achieved. Yet the history books of the future will tell us that it was a near thing during the first year and a half of the war. The top men of the Army and Navy, who were in a position to understand our peril better than anyone else, know that this is true. The Post doesn't want to see this country, ever again, in such a desperate spot.

Furthermore, there is good reason to believe that if we had been really strong in 1941—if we had had a powerful navy and a mighty air force and a great reservoir of trained men ready to call to the colors—Japan probably never would have attacked. Even if she had attacked in the face of such odds, our strength would have materially shortened the war, and lives would have been saved. Because we were deplorably weak on December 7, 1941, and for 18 months thereafter, Japan was able to entrench herself strongly in the Western Pacific—so strongly that today, more than 3 years later, we are still a long, long way from ultimate victory in the Asiatic war. Surely, we are smart enough nationally to draw the obvious lesson from this experience. Surely, one of the best safeguards against war—and, by the same token, one of the best ways to keep wars short if they come, thereby saving lives—is to keep ourselves strong.

It is often argued that the adoption of peacetime compulsory military training would be a tacit admission that we have no faith in the peace we shall make when our two wars are ended or in the international organization we hope then to have. I do not follow such reasoning. I believe very earnestly that we must do everything under heaven to establish an enduring peace, and I also believe that we stand a reasonably good chance of success. On the other hand, I think it would be completely unrealistic to let down our guard and trust everything to diplomacy in a world where it is still entirely possible for madmen and international plunderers to run amuck, where the peril of mob mania still exists. Theodore Roosevelt's advice to "speak softly and carry a big stick" is as sound in 1945 as it was in 1900. We must try for a stable peace, but we should keep gun in hand for a long time, on the chance that statesmanship alone might fail. We dare not make too long a gamble. The future is too unforeseeable. The stakes are too high.

If these things are true, if we must stay militarily strong, then the alternatives seem to be either a citizen Army, rooted in compulsory training, or a very large professional Army. The Post agrees with General Marshall and with Brigadier General Palmer, the War Department spokesman who has written two Post articles on this subject, that the former is the better of these two choices—that a citizen Army would give us greater potential strength, that it would be more economical and more democratic, that it probably would be less likely to breed a warlike national attitude than a large standing Army.

The opponents of compulsory training, viewing the advance of technology, sometimes insist that in the future it will be quite futile to train our manpower in the arts of war. The argument is that the development of rocket bombs and other such terrifying devices will make large armies impotent if another war comes. The same claims for technology were made after World War No. 1, and yet in World War No. 2, it is still the Infantry that has to slug it out and take the objectives when all the chips are down. Also, the above argument is rather like saying that because a boy is going to medical school or engineering school, he should skip high school. Even if we assume that in any future war all soldiers would be technical men, handling amazing new types of weapons, they would still have to go first through their basic training. There are certain fundamentals that all soldiers must have. Part of the strategy of national defense, certainly, is to keep our military research going and to maintain a powerful Navy and Air Force, but those alone are not enough. We cannot be strong without trained manpower.

As yet, the Post has no very definite or detailed ideas as to how such a training program should be worked out. Obviously, it is to be hoped that certain educational objectives could be combined with soldiering, so that the proper preparation for civilian life would not be completely interrupted. Also, it should be understood clearly—and so stated in any bill which may be passed—that compulsory training is strictly for the purpose of national defense and is not to be confused with, or muddied by, sociological

experiments. The Post most definitely does not subscribe to the President's somewhat vague scheme to combine military training with some sort of vast youth movement or glorified C. C. C. program. If we are to train all our boys in the arts of war, let us have it understood that our reason for so doing is, quite simply, national safety, and that alone. Let us serve notice on the social planners to keep their hands off.

Finally, I should like to be a bit personal. I have a 10-year-old son, whom I love as any normal father loves a son. If we have compulsory military training, he will have to subtract 12 months of his life, along with millions of other boys, from the brightest years which God gives us—the incomparable years of youth—and hand them over to his country. I do not relish this thought. I get no comfort out of the argument that it will help make a man out of him. I still have enough faith in parenthood, and in our school system, to believe that a boy can be made into a man without military training. But I'd much rather see my son give a year of his life to peacetime Army training than to have him help fight another war. And, to repeat, I do believe most earnestly that one of the ways to keep the peace is to build, in the sight of all, such bastions of national strength that the madmen of this earth will think thrice before they set forth on the trail of blood and pillage.

BEN HIBBS, *Editor.*

Roosevelt Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Roosevelt Today," written by Mr. McClellan Van de Veer and published in a recent issue of the Birmingham Age-Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOSEVELT TODAY

Just as Lincoln's reelection in 1864 was the prototype of Roosevelt's reelection last fall—in being the result of a campaign held during wartime—so today's inauguration, particularly as it involves a presidential address in circumstances of unique solemnity, makes Americans understand why, in keeping with the tone and spirit of a modest ceremony Mr. Roosevelt's contribution to the occasion gives promise of being as brief and weighty as were Lincoln's words of dedication 80 years ago. Then Lincoln spoke in expectation of an early end of civil war, but while the fighting was still intense. Now Roosevelt speaks in expectation of an end to an international conflict, unprecedented in human history, which is still raging.

It is not surprising that the President is said to be planning to keep his speech within the scope of 500 words. Other things considered, he can scarcely go much beyond that mark. To keep such an address from being perfunctory is harder than to prepare an ampler statement. To make such an address consonant with the great hour is in the nature of a supreme test. Lincoln, it will be remembered, presented the moral significance of the Nation's plight and concluded with an immortal declaration: "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right; let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

History does not repeat itself, but it has its own rhythm. Mr. Roosevelt speaks today under the shadow of a wider conflict, but he speaks also at a moment when there is need for moral affirmation, there is need not for hatred but for justice, there is need for a resolute march to the goal of victory, there is need for making ready for the aftermath of war at home, there is need for "a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." Lincoln's address barely exceeded 600 words. Yet he spoke for the ages. Mr. Roosevelt, in terms of today, at least, is no less the historic figure. As he takes his oath of office at this pregnant hour, Mr. Roosevelt embodies the emergence of a new earth under an old heaven, a fresh dispensation of prophetic righteousness among men and nations under the beneficence of God.

The Important Facts Concerning the Drafting of Farm Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the Nation are tremendously interested in the controversy raging over the taking of necessary farm help into the Army.

To understand this controversy one must know the facts concerning three very important matters: First, the Tydings amendment; second, Director Byrnes' letter; and third, General Hershey's order after many protests were made from all parts of the country.

The Tydings amendment to the selective-service law proved to be of great benefit to the farmers. It reads, in effect, as follows:

Every registrant found by a selective-service local board * * * to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

Director Byrnes in an effort to get more men into the Army wrote a letter to General Hershey, a part of which is as follows:

I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.

A fair interpretation of Mr. Byrnes' language would mean that the President was in effect advising that the Tydings amendment should be superseded because he, the President, considered agricultural work not as essential as some other kinds of work.

Following the receipt of the letter from Director Byrnes, General Hershey, by directive or some kind of communication, advised State directors of the President's finding with the result that many men were drafted contrary to the Tydings amendment.

After many protests were made because of the action of local boards, who apparently were trying to follow the President's wishes, were received by General Hershey and Members of Congress, General Hershey has sent out a telegram to the local draft boards of the Nation to the effect that the Tydings amendment is still in effect and that the findings and opinions of the draft authorities should give full consideration to the same.

The following is in substance a copy of General Hershey's telegram:

Questions of interpretation of State Directors Advice No. 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

The directive of January 3, 1945, State Directors Advice 288, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State Directors Advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

Section 5K of the Selective Training and Service Act, known as the Tydings amendment, places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Notify all local boards immediately.

It is unfortunate that thousands of farm boys have been taken into the service while this controversy has been raging. Appeals from local boards to the district boards can be made, but when a boy has once been inducted into the service there is no appeal. Registrants should bring out before the local board all the facts upon which they rely to justify their claim for deferment. If they do not bring out any facts, they leave nothing upon which to appeal.

I hope that the agitation stirred up by the people and the Congressmen will have a salutary effect.

Older Farmers Can't Do It Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE F. ROGERS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include the following article by L. B. Skeffington, which appeared in the Democrat and Chronicle, Rochester, N. Y., January 11, 1945:

OLDER FARMERS CAN'T DO IT ALONE
(By L. B. Skeffington)

The other morning at Sodus 60 young men boarded busses and started on their way into military service. A few hours later they had

subscribed to the oath, had been inducted formally and were part of the Military Establishment of the United States. This happening was not unusual; the same events were taking place all over the country. But among the well-wishers, parents and others who saw the boys off from Sodus there was much reflection and some comment.

As stated by one man, a farmer, who for several years has worked literally night and day to overcome many and varied obstacles to produce food, it was something like this: "Every bus load of young men that leaves here for the Army and Navy makes us wonder more and more how we are going to get by on the farms this year."

When I talked with him, he was not resentful, he was not unpatriotic, nor did he in any way intimate that he was going to reduce his own efforts. But he wondered frankly where the dividing line was, or was going to be, between sharing manpower for productive and fighting needs.

The Sodus draft board covers the northern half of Wayne County. Another board operates in the southern half. Wayne is a rural county. There are no cities and few large villages in the county. Most of the population is engaged in agricultural pursuits; that is, in producing, servicing, or handling farm products and supplies. In most of the villages the major industries are food canning and processing plants, packing houses, milk plants, cold storages, and agencies that handle farm machinery, fertilizers, feeds, etc.

In normal times the county never had much able-bodied population in excess of that employed in these occupations and in the usual retail and service establishments found in every community. Before the war there was the usual trend of young people away from the farms. Some of the villagers worked in the city. Since the war this process has been speeded up. Large numbers of men and women have found jobs in city war plants.

Only with extreme difficulty have farm-labor requirements been met. Seasonal shortages have been particularly acute. So far the picture is about the same as many other agricultural counties. There has been little complaint upon the part of the farmers, for they are Americans engaged in war. Some nonfarmers who have heard the farmers worry out loud about their labor and production problems have shrugged it off with, "They have gotten by, haven't they?"

Now, in 1945, it looks as if the situation may "bite" into productive capacity of the farms unless there is understanding and careful consideration. The farmer I referred to summoned it up: "I am unable to agree with Judge Byrnes, war mobilization director, that older men can carry on farm production at the pace we have been going. Judge Byrnes says it is necessary to take our young men. At the same time he says it is necessary for farmers to maintain production at the peak levels of last year, because food is more necessary than ever.

"To farmers, no matter how patriotic or willing, this does not seem possible. Judge Byrnes says it will be necessary for the older man to produce the required amount of food. It seems possible that he has overlooked all the favorable elements of weather conditions generally for several years, but farmers know they cannot count on them. This may be the year when weather will delay our operations and reduce yields.

"However, let us assume that all the natural conditions will be nearly as good. We ought to have more men and more machinery to meet normal replacements, and to make up for the continuous drain of the draft on manpower. There is not enough new machinery available. Production has been restricted for several years and existing machinery requires more tinkering to keep it running. We can assume we are not going to get much more machinery in time to be of any use.

"Only by the fullest use of machinery have we been able to beat the labor shortage so far. It is the young men who operate the machinery on the farms. It is the young men who put in the longest hours, are most adept with repairs, and who can take the hard going. Anyone who has ridden a tractor around the fields 10 or 12 hours a day knows the riding is hard. Older men on farms avoid this kind of work as much as possible. They can't take it for as long hours as the young fellows.

"Taking out the young men on the farms now has more serious possibilities than ever before of crippling production. Farmers know there is not much sense in planning or starting work they cannot hope to finish. Until recently they had assumed their labor problems would be more difficult than a year ago, but they had not expected a specialized drive to draft the young men who have been doing a good job."

Several farmers have told me that they will have to know soon just which men they are going to lose or retain, so that they can plan accordingly. Many of the young men will not themselves make any effort to stay on the farms. They feel they have been singled out—as many of them have complained in the past—as draft dodgers. Their attitude is that the decision is up to Uncle Sam.

Consumers may just as well make up their minds that stripping the farms of able-bodied youths is something that concerns them.

Resolution of the Polish Welfare Council of Schenectady, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution which was unanimously adopted at a plenary meeting of the Polish Welfare Council of Schenectady, N. Y., comprising delegates of 55 fraternal organizations, held Thursday, January 4, 1945, at the Polish National Alliance Community Home:

We desire to commend the Government of the United States on the recent pronouncement relative to the continued recognition of the Polish Government-in-exile in London as the legal representative of Poland, despite the determined attempts of certain communistic elements in liberated Poland to set up a puppet government subservient to every whim of Soviet Russia.

The international political situation, as shown by recent events in Europe, has aroused profound apprehension throughout the Nation.

Mr. Churchill's recent speeches in the House of Commons clearly indicate a victory for the concept of spheres of influence contrary to democratic principles espoused by the United States.

A victory of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, reaffirmed in their validity by our President on December 22, 1944, as well as of the principles of the liberty of man and nations everywhere in the world, is not only the condition of a stable peace and of the survival of our civilization, but also the basic condition of American security.

The Polish Government in London, the only legal representation of the Polish nation is recognized because of the constitutional continuity by the United States of America and other democratic powers. This meeting urges you to continue its recognition.

The Polish Government in London cannot arbitrarily cede any Polish territory without or against the will of the people of Poland and must await their verdict after the determination of hostilities and the reestablishment of law and order in that martyred country.

Any repetition of the Munich appeasement methods in relation with any totalitarian power of aggression spells world catastrophe and the subjugation of freemen to serfdom and slavery.

A clear and definite support of justice, law, and decency by the duly elected representatives of the people of the United States in Congress assembled becomes imperative in the face of totalitarian threats to democracy everywhere in the world.

The declaration of the State Department over your signature can be interpreted only by every American as a reiteration of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and as an expression of the determination of Americans to reach the goal toward which we were aiming when as a free Nation we made our great decision to send our manhood to war for democracy and justice for the rest of the world.

Our sons are now offering their lives so that these aims be achieved. Our homes are full of sadness that can be relieved only by the hope and knowledge that this supreme sacrifice of our own blood shall not be in vain.

A fifth partition of Poland would indeed frustrate our efforts and shatter our hopes in the belief that out of this tragedy of mankind a new world would emerge, a better one, based on principles compatible with the tradition of the American Nation, on moral tenets and not on spheres of domination by force. We are convinced that the overwhelming American public opinion is opposed to unilateral and arbitrary settlement of international disputes, and in favor of extending the democratic processes to the international sphere as well as using them at home: Now be it therefore

Resolved, That this meeting of delegates of Americans of Polish extraction, representing 55 Schenectady organizations, authorize the undersigned representatives to present the contents of the hereinabove described facts, thoughts, and desires to BERNARD KEARNEY, Representative of the Thirtieth Congressional District of New York State, with the urgent request to lay this resolution before the House of Representatives and to act thereon in order that proper safeguards may be devised, instituted, and applied to counteract the plans of the fifth partition of Poland, for the subjugation of 30,000,000 of free Polish men, women, and children to foreign expression and slavery.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH CZYZEWSKI,
ADAM STEPAN, *Secretary*,
C. S. OGONOWSKI, *Chairman*.
Rev. LADISLAUS E. GUZIELEK.
For the Resolutions Committee.

A Soldier's Letter To His Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks

in the RECORD, I am including a letter from Pvt. (1st cl.) Ramond Gritton. The father of this soldier is employed with the House of Representatives. This letter is especially interesting. I believe it reflects the feeling of a good many of our boys who are fighting over seas. I trust you may take time to read it. Private Gritton is a member of the Eighty-first Chemical Battalion that helped take the Normandy beachhead on D-day. The members of his battalion were awarded citations for outstanding courage under fire and for maintaining the beachhead for 12 days until relief came. Incidentally, this citation, I am informed, is equivalent to the Presidential citation.

The letter follows:

GUESS WHERE, *December 2, 1944.*

DEAREST MUZ AND DAD: It is now only 6 p. m. and it's (as usual) raining like the devil. All I can say is that I'm dry and warm, and have been sleeping thus far quite a long time. We have really been on the move, but it is bringing the war closer to an end.

I have been reading the paper and see by it that there is a shortage of ammunition. I think it's bad enough to fight the weather as a hindrance, but to slow the war down because of the home front's negligence and stupidity makes my blood boil. We fellows are giving our all for the people at home, and I, for one, am very proud to be fighting for swell parents, a home, and country that have been undoubtedly blessed by God. We do our share of griping, but there hardly is any one of us who would stop now just because it looks like the job is done. No job can be called complete on appearances alone. If only the people at home, sitting snugly before a fire or a meal fit for a king, could be suddenly transported to the fighting front, to little holes in the ground, or spend the night in a house which had had Jerries in it the night before, they would be thankful for what they have.

May I say this: I am now a fervent believer in God. I pray sincerely—not from force of habit or to ease my conscience—every night to the Lord to keep my soul. I believe He is with me at all times; therefore, I am not afraid.

Contrary to many opinions, honest prayer to God can and does bring a soothing relief, and a comfort is found in this belief.

Yes; I have changed in that way. When I get home, I shall be only too happy to go to church where I can pray without hearing guns and shells screaming. Yes; peace is indeed wonderful.

Well, I am going to close this part of my letter, which you may term fanatic, and turn to a letter from you and one from dad which I received tonight.

First of all, may I say I have read many letters starting "Dear Son" but the sincerity and pride with which dad writes is most touching, and makes me the happiest guy in the world. And, Muz, the love and deep concern with which your pen moves in these welcome letters to me make me feel that all this is well worth it.

Dad, you said you had just finished some of those seemingly unending odd jobs around the house. Yes; winter is coming, and I hope the war ends before it hits full force. It won't be for lack of trying, that it doesn't end soon, believe me. You ask how much longer Jerry will hold out. That is a question which has bothered me since D-day. The Kraut is a good fighter, but we are better. We are fighting on the side of what is right. It will end when He says so, not before. To that I am reconciled. So I ask you to be patient, as I try to be. I'm not unhappy, just tired. We all want to say "The hell with it," but a Yank won't quit. It's not his nature. His uniform is worn with a certain amount of pride; that's as it should be. We are a powerful nation and are trying to show other nations how to live.

I, too, will be glad when I can sit back and relate verbally my many experiences, but patience is a virtue known well by the American soldier, because he knows he has no place to go for the present.

Muz, please don't worry about my hand, because it's O. K. now. My health is tiptop at present, and I want to keep it that way; so, Dad, you and I can have that wild party when I get home.

I am enclosing two propaganda leaflets dropped by Jerry. It shows the absolute ignorance the German higher-ups have of the American soldier. To think such trash could sway the determination in the minds of such proud guys as Yanks, does at least show the microscopic minds of the Germans.

Well, my mail comes pretty regularly, and I know you and dad are writing when you have some news.

As you have asked, I shall keep you informed as to whether or not I am still alive and kicking. I know how you must worry, so there's no use in asking you not to be so concerned.

Pleasant dreams, my darling Muz, and to you, dad. Goodnight; I shall be seeing you soon.

Your loving son,

RAY.

Is the O. P. A. Imposing on the Public Schools?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, the parents of school children in Pueblo, Colo., are not very happy about the O. P. A. using schoolrooms to propagandize their program. Recently about a ton of printed matter was placed in the Pueblo schools by the O. P. A. for distribution to the children, from the primary grades on up. I presume this same attempt to reach the homes through the children is being made in every part of the country. The suspicion is created that the O. P. A. is seeking to perpetuate itself by creating the impression it is indispensable and an integral part of our Government.

One teacher made the observation that the O. P. A. is expecting the teachers to carry the ball for this agency, recalling that the teachers handled the registration for sugar, food, and gasoline ration books, and states they are now being used to peddle O. P. A. primers. It seems that several Mother Goose anti-inflationary rhymes were handed out, including one on jack-in-the-box as follows:

We don't like inflation
It causes alarm,
But if we don't start it
'Twill do us no harm.

For the sixth grade an O. P. A. price primer was supplied. This is a typical problem contained therein: "A grocer listed his ceiling price on sugar as 5 pounds for 35 cents. When Mrs. Jones weighed the sugar on reaching home she found it only 4½ pounds. What was her loss in money, and what was her loss when computed in percentage of sugar?"

I am advised that some of the teachers told the children to work these problems. Others threw the material in the waste basket. Certainly our teachers have enough to do without acting as agents for the O. P. A. to distribute their propaganda, to say nothing of the waste of paper and manpower involved.

I wish to include in my remarks an editorial from the Pueblo Chieftain which expresses my sentiments on this subject:

IS THE O. P. A. IMPOSING ON THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

No public institution supported by taxpayers' money has given more hearty cooperation to the Government in all of its many drives than the public schools, both officials and teachers, with scholars also doing their part in a splendid manner each and every time they have been called upon to do their bit to help win the war.

Recently, however, O. P. A. officials in Denver or Washington sent out to schools in both Pueblo districts several hundred pounds of miscellaneous printed matter containing about everything from a crossword puzzle to primary rhymes and other poetry. As usual, the teachers followed directions and did as they were requested, handing the literature to their scholars whether they agreed with the contents of the propaganda or not. That, however, is not the point. The point is that taxpayers' money is being wasted, paper is being wasted, and the time of both teachers and pupils is being wasted in trying to do what the Government, the O. P. A. section of it, wants them to do about 90 percent of which is absolutely nonsensical and unnecessary.

On some of the material sent to schools for distribution only one side of the sheet is used, and, on what is used, about 50 percent of the space is wasted, while boys and girls in all schools are doing their level best to gather up scrap paper to help win the war.

The Star-Journal and Chieftain have received many complaints about the O. P. A. trying to impose on the schools to put out such nonsensical propaganda. No complaint has been made against the schools, but there has been plenty against the O. P. A., and which, in our opinion, is entirely justified.

The Right Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent which I have received I am submitting for printing in the RECORD an article appearing in the Philadelphia Record of January 23, by the Reverend Daniel A. Poling, pastor of Baptist Temple in Philadelphia. Dr. Poling is one of the best-known clergymen in our city and he has the affectionate regard of citizens of all

religious persuasions. I felt that this inspiring article would be of interest to all the Members of the House.

The article follows:

AMERICANS ALL

(By Daniel A. Poling)

THE RIGHT ANSWER

One night as I sat in a hotel just off Grosvenor Square in London, I received word that our son, first reported missing in action, must now be recorded "lost in action." At 9.30 the British radio unexpectedly blared the unwanted information.

The next day I went up to our SOS headquarters on the west coast of England. Two days later I was still in the daze of that announcement when I returned to London. My friend, the commanding officer, Lt. Gen. John C. H. Lee, invited me to come back with him. I occupied the apartment adjacent to his on the military train.

Where death is always so close to so many, matters such as mine are generally not subjects for conversation, but always in the service there is an understanding silence. A~ I was retiring that night a knock came on my door and almost immediately the senior chaplain, Colonel Ternan, entered.

We sat together on the edge of my berth. He dropped a strong hand on my knee and said as though picking up a conversation previously begun, "Yes, it is so, sir. You will be helped to remember that God also gave His son. Tomorrow morning in the mass, I shall pray for you and his mother and wife and little boy."

He went out then and left me, but I was not alone. The Roman Catholic had comforted the Protestant.

On an island in the Pacific, a Catholic boy died in the arms of his Protestant chaplain—they had served together for more than a year and had come to know each other well. And now as may be under such circumstances and as he was trained to perform the service, the Protestant chaplain gave a modified form of the last rites of the Roman Catholic Church to the soldier.

The boy was bleeding to death and nothing could be done about it. His eyes were dim but he was not afraid.

Searching for his friend's face, gathering strength for his last words, he said, "Chappie, why can't we be like this—always?"

And the chaplain answered, "Son, we will be like this always."

Yes; that was the right answer. Where the boy was going and where he now is, there are no schisms and no divisions—all are one in the Father of us all.

Repeal of Daylight Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in response to inquiries through the mail and from Members of the House, I submit herewith a letter from Chairman J. A. Krug, of the War Production Board, which is self-explanatory.

It will be noted that Chairman Krug says both he and Mr. Donald Nelson desire to remove these wartime restrictions as soon as the war-production picture justifies.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter of September 14, 1944, enclosing excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD approving the enactment of your bill, H. R. 4489, to restore standard time, I have had the material analyzed, as you have requested.

We have also received a great deal of correspondence on this subject in the past, and the objections to war time, which you printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, correspond very largely in tone, in origin, and in subject matter with about 90 percent of those which we have received. It is characteristic of such correspondence that more persons will write letters of protest than of commendation.

Two sources of criticism are particularly important, although they appear to be from a minority group: (1) The inconvenience to farmers whose dairy operations and truck-garden operations are least adaptable to war time has always been a matter of concern to us. We have, however, felt that much could be done by working out revised schedules of operation for some farmers, if not for all; (2) in the case of school children, the school hour has been turned back in many communities, we believe, to meet the crowded conditions in local transportation services caused by wartime restrictions on the gasoline supply of private motorists. The city of Washington, D. C., like many other cities, has staggered opening hours for Government, business institutions, and schools. The example given of local schools which do not open until 9:30 a. m. seems to us a very intelligent method of handling the problems created by morning transportation congestion and the inconvenience to little children who would otherwise have to get up and go to school in the dark.

The great mass of the correspondents are, because of personal inconveniences, opposed to war time and for the reasons set forth in Mr. Nelson's letter to you in the spring of this year, we feel that personal inconvenience is not sufficient to outweigh the great benefits to war production which we have derived from war time. There are some communities, however, which, because of their relative position in the time belt, have suffered inconvenience perhaps without any corresponding benefits to the wartime electric-power savings. The Interstate Commerce Commission has not seen fit to change the time belt, over which it has authority, with respect to the location of these communities, and the Congress refused to grant to the President in the original War Time Act authority, which he had requested, to exempt certain communities from war time. We, therefore, believe that there is no action which we can take on these communities' requests.

Mr. Nelson has expressed his desire in his letters to you and to other Members of the Congress to remove these wartime restrictions as soon as the war-production picture justifies removal of such controls. I share his opinion and his desire in this matter. As soon as I am informed that the progress of the war justifies relaxation of controls, I shall be only too happy to recommend the termination of war time. At this present critical period in the coming victory in Europe we are utilizing every resource at our command to complete the most urgent programs, particularly in ammunition and in trucks. The repeal of war time will involve either a dislocation of certain essential electric-power services or a rationing of electric energy for nonessential uses. I believe that many communities can make the necessary changes to avoid individual inconvenience, particularly in the case of schoolchildren and some farmers, so that the benefits of war time may be secured without any serious injury to the national health and morale, and without the need of additional rationing machinery.

I am very glad to have your friendly letter of inquiry on this matter, so that I may reaffirm both my belief that war time is still essential, and my hope that we shall soon be able to see such achievements in war production that we shall no longer need to retain these controls. The contributions of war time in the winter months are the most important of the entire war time savings statute. I understand the importance of your request, coming at this time of the year, but, having reviewed the entire situation, I have been unable to come to a conclusion now favorable to the enactment of your bill.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG, *Chairman.*

Mr. Biddle, the Breakers Hotel Case, and the Surplus Property Disposal Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am incorporating herein, another excerpt from the memorandum submitted by Mr. Norman Littell, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, to a Senate committee on January 8, 1945. This excerpt will supplement two other parts of the memorandum inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 22, 1945, pages 426–430, and on January 24, 1945, pages A268–A270.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Government is engaged in the important job of rehabilitating our sick and wounded veterans of this war, when good hospital facilities are wholly inadequate, it is amazing to learn the real facts behind the Breakers Hotel case and the Attorney General's refusal to assist in keeping the hotel as a hospital. The facts in the Surplus Property case are just as surprising. So that the people may know the facts, I am incorporating them below:

THE BREAKERS HOTEL CASE, TRUMAN COMMITTEE

1. THE ISSUE

Mr. Biddle has not fully grasped the issues in his statement regarding this case. He gives the impression that this was wholly a War Department matter and that I intruded into it. The fact is that jurisdiction over the condemnation case by which the property was acquired was squarely and unequivocally in the Lands Division.

Having acquired by condemnation a leasehold interest for 18 months and having been unable to agree with the Florida East Coast Hotel Corporation on the rental value, the War Department, as usual in such instances, surrendered jurisdiction over the case to the Department of Justice Lands Division to determine the rental value by trial in court or by settlement negotiations. Liability for rental, plus the cost of conversion to a hospital and reconversion to a hotel might well

be so great as to suggest the wisdom of buying the property outright to continue this hospital for use during the war and resell it later, thereby avoiding a great economic loss. I telephoned to General Somervell on February 24, 1944, to point this out, and to say that a question of policy might well be raised thereby for the War Department. General Somervell invited submission of a memorandum after I interviewed the owners, appraisal witnesses, and lawyers on my staff in Florida.

Such memorandum was handed to General Somervell by me on March 14, 1944, and in a conference on March 23 in his office, he reaffirmed the decision to abandon the general hospital and turn it back to a hotel. He declined to consider buying it outright.

Considering the matter only from the economic viewpoint, this decision challenged consideration on a higher policy level than Somervell's, because it was wasteful of taxpayers' money and because many were convinced, as I was, that continuous pressure to return the property had been brought to bear by the Florida East Coast Railway and its subsidiary, the Florida East Coast Hotel Corporation, together with gambling interests in Palm Beach, which did not find such lucrative trade among wounded veterans as among the fashionable habitues of the famous Breakers Hotel. These interests wanted the hotel restored.

2. MR. BIDDLE AND THE TRUMAN COMMITTEE

The Truman committee was vitally interested. Mr. Biddle states positively that I had not been requested to furnish information on the Breakers Hotel, and that I had merely volunteered my statement; he also stated the belief that I had not testified before the Truman committee. These statements are untrue.

I had testified before the Truman committee on February 16 in executive session, with the approval of the Attorney General's office, on land-acquisition work in general and the Florida hotel acquisitions by the War Department in particular. The acquisitions of and subsequent disposal after short periods of time of the Breakers Hotel, the New Richmond Hotel, in Seattle, the Stevens Hotel, in Chicago, and other properties were specifically discussed as examples of wasteful "changes of mind" by the War Department. (See Truman committee report of March 4, 1944, regarding Florida hotel acquisitions by War Department.) Senator TRUMAN had himself visited the Breakers Hotel property and was strongly opposed to returning it to the hotel corporation.

It was most natural and wholly proper to give the Truman committee a copy of my report because of their continuing interest. That committee could and later did get all of the facts in a much broader investigation than my own. My report was a mere convenience to the committee.

When discussing Somervell's decision with counsel for the Truman committee, pursuant to past requests to keep the committee advised of developments, counsel asked for and I provided a copy of my report.

Although Mr. Biddle repeatedly labels my report as "confidential," there was no military secrecy involved; it was a plain matter of business judgment and a waste of taxpayers' money.

Again an apocryphal conversation is related by Biddle (p. 52) in which I am supposed to have told Mr. Fahy, then Acting Attorney General, "I don't think it was appropriate for me to take that down to the committee before asking the Attorney General about it." Sheer improvisation. I have always thought it was perfectly proper to provide the report and still do.

I said to Mr. Fahy however, that purely and simply because the Attorney General of the United States was so hypersensitive about testimony before congressional committees, that the submission of my report might possibly be construed by him as a technical violation of the Attorney General's rule against testifying without permission. If Mr. Fahy thought it was, I could get the report back. He did think so, and I did get it back.

This was a very foolish business, because my investigation of the matter and the existence of my report was well known. The evacuation of the wounded soldiers from the hospital had been postponed at Somervell's order from the end of March to the end of April in order to give time for Somervell to consider my recommendations, and this had been reported in the press. Of course, an official request was immediately written to the Department of Justice asking for my report and behind that request lay the power of subpena.

When the Attorney General put himself in the ridiculous position of refusing to surrender the report, it was subpenaed from him.

3. MR. BIDDLE AND SENATOR TRUMAN'S SUBPENA

Mr. Biddle says again that the subpena issued to him by the Truman committee was withdrawn. It was not withdrawn, and Senator TRUMAN so advised Mr. Biddle over the telephone. Mr. Biddle marked the original subpena canceled on phone before it went into the files and to the Lands Division, but this was not true. (The original subpena did not seem to be in the files later, but see photostatic copy attached as exhibit B). Neither was his statement to Senator TRUMAN that he did not have a copy—that Somervell had it. There were at least a dozen copies in the Department of Justice. Mr. Biddle furnished the report to Senator TRUMAN pursuant to subpena and there is no nimble way of escaping from that fact.

4. MR. BIDDLE AND GENERAL SOMERVELL'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

While the Attorney General needlessly belabored the use of the word "confidential" in describing my report on the Breakers Hotel, and denied the report to the Truman committee on those grounds, at the same time he refused General Somervell's request to send me or another representative to a conference in the War Department on Monday, April 17, to review the entire matter because of the great public clamor against closing this hospital, on the ground that this had been my personal report. There was no reason, he said, to send a Department of Justice representative to determine the War Department policy.

While the War Department advisory committee appointed by Somervell was composed of subordinate officers who were not inclined to buck the decision of their commanding general, still there were conscientious men on that committee in the War Department who would have sought the truth only. Mr. Biddle's decision cut off from them the only objective analysis of the problem from outside of the War Department which was available to them, and which could have influenced the judgment of that committee. Naturally, Colonel O'Brien of the Real Estate Section supported Somervell's decision and gave figures to support that conclusion showing a much greater cost of acquiring the property outright than was justified by the facts in my opinion and in the opinion of disinterested experts in my staff who were the best qualified in every way to judge the matter. (See my memorandum of November 27, 1944, to this committee, showing that the hotel could have been bought for about $3,200,000 and resold after the war, thus minimizing cost and maintaining an excellent hospital while needed during the war, instead of paying about $1,400,000 for less than 2 years use. See also, Truman committee report on Breakers Hotel).

The advisory committee appointed by General Somervell therefore advised him to do what he had decided to do—turn the hospital back for use as a hotel. This was done even though the independent investigation by the Truman committee later reached the same conclusions I had reached—that the property ought to be acquired outright and used as a hospital at least until after the war. A major mistake in the war effort was thereby confirmed, the wounded men were removed and the restoration of the hospital to a luxury hotel has just been consumated at a great cost to the taxpayers—notwithstanding that the flow of wounded men from Europe is now rapidly exhausting hospital capacity to a point where new hospitals will be demanded.

Thus, a matter of vital public concern to the taxpayers, and of morale and principle in dealing with our wounded men, went by default without all available light being thrown on the subject in the War Department.

Mr. Biddle now says that he had no opinion on the merits of whether it ought to be kept, or whether it ought to be abandoned. Then he should not have denied to the War Department the competent well formed opinions of those experienced in the field.

5. MR. BIDDLE TAKES CHARGE OF THE CASE

It ought to be added that without consultation with me as to the history of the case, with no opinion on the merits, and acting with obvious and admitted exasperation over my supplying the Truman committee with a copy of my report, Mr. Biddle's first act on March 30, 1944, upon returning to Washington after an absence from the city during the controversy, had been to take the case entirely out of my hands. On Monday, April 3, written instructions were given that I should take no further action of any kind in the matter whatsoever.

I never at any time had a conference with Mr. Biddle in regard to the Breakers Hotel. In taking charge of the case—the only one which he ever took out of my hands—he acted in retaliation for my cooperation with this committee. It ought to be added that characteristically he thereafter did nothing in respect to the proper manangement of the case—the appraisal work and the highly complex problems of reconversion to a hotel being then in process of negotiations between counsel on my staff and counsel for the owners of the hotel. These matters hung in suspense for awhile until Mr. Biddle's attention passed on to other matters and then, in order to carry out the War Department's instructions to settle the case and turn the property back to the owners for hotel purposes by December 1944, the Lands Division finally resumed jurisdiction of the case. This has now been done, and the fashionable Breakers Hotel is again in full swing at Palm Beach, Fla.

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL—TESTIMONY BEFORE TRUMAN COMMITTEE

1. REQUESTS AND AUTHORITY FOR TESTIMONY BEFORE SEVERAL COMMITTEES

The incidents relating to my testimony before this committee on August 17, 1944, respecting the penetration of the National Assdciation of Real Estate Boards' lobby into the disposal policies of Mr. Will H. Clayton are recounted in my memorandum of November 27 and are well known to this committee. That week in Washington was journalistically called, "Surplus Property Week," as the Surplus Property bill absorbed almost the entire time and attention of Congress. Mr. Biddle was on the west coast.

Mr. Biddle implies in saying that these incidents "for some reason occur when I am away," that there was some sort of collusion between this committee and myself in regard to testifying, although as counsel and members of this committee know, the request by telephone to appear before your committee came to me out of the blue, with no advance knowledge whatsoever on my part. I promptly referred the request to Acting Attorney General Fahy and thereafter received instructions over the telephone from

him that my appearance before the committee was approved.

Mr. Biddle fails to see that after almost 6 years as head of the Lands Division, engaged in land acquisition work for all agencies of Government throughout the war effort, it was more than natural that any committee considering this subject would call me as a witness. When the request came from the Truman committee, I had already testified before the Manasco committee earlier in the year (with Mr. Biddle's approval), and again before the Manasco committee only a few days before the Truman committee hearing was to be held on August 17. I was also to submit a memorandum to, and possibly appear before the Military Affairs Committee in the Senate on the succeeding day, August 18, all with the approval of Mr. Fahy, Acting Attorney General.

Mr. Fahy had cleared with counsel for the Truman committee as to my appearing there. I never for one moment assumed that there would be anything but the broadest latitude of inquiry, just as there had been before the Manasco committee earlier in the year, nor did I doubt that I was fully at liberty to answer completely any questions the committee members saw fit to ask me. I stated the facts fully regarding the penetration of the National Association of Real Estate Boards' lobby into the counsels of Mr. Clayton, and these facts have not been refuted.

If Mr. Fahy confused the scope of this Senate investigating committee with the narrower technical questions which were to be discussed as to the Clayton bill pending before the congressional committee and the Senate Military Affairs Committee, this was not my responsibility.

2. MR. BIDDLE ON CLAYTON'S POLICY BOARD

Mr. Biddle complains also that he himself was on Will Clayton's Policy Board "composed of representatives of the various administrative bodies of the Government" and that Mr. Biddle was "a very active member of the board" * * * because "he thought it was so tremendously important." He sat on the policy board from February to August, and with all his tremendous interest, hadn't the slightest idea of what Clayton was doing or of what was going on in respect to the assignment of surplus agricultural lands for disposal by R. F. C. or the activities of the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

I was also tremendously interested. In fact, immediately upon returning from a business trip to the Pacific coast in June 1944, I called Mr. Clayton to inquire as to certain policies which I heard were being followed. In correspondence which ensued between us and in collateral inquiries from sources available to me, I discovered Clayton's devious methods of routing agricultural, grazing, forest, mineral, and miscellaneous lands into R. F. C. as a liquidating agency—also the extraordinary degree to which the National Association of Real Estate Boards' lobby was dominating the situation. My views were well known among trained land-acquisition men in the Government and Clayton's views were widely discussed.

When I was summoned before the Mead committee I stated these facts. With such vital legislation pending, I should have been remiss in my duties as Assistant Attorney General not to do so. The public interest was clearly served by my doing so. Nothing could have been accomplished by approaching Mr. Clayton directly; I had already done so and was as rudely cut off by him as the Secretary of Agriculture had been when he asked Clayton for consideration before assigning agricultural lands to R. F. C.

3. PUBLICITY

Again, Mr. Biddle is bothered by publicity and he objects "that the papers headlined it that Will Clayton, in league with the real-estate agents, wished to have lands sold by the R. F. C. instead of Agriculture. There was a blast in the newspapers * * *."

That was exactly true, but it was this committee and not the writer which held the open hearings and rightly so. Congress and the country needed to know the facts. Publicity was inevitable due to the significance of the facts and public interest in surplus disposal. Mr. Biddle was not concerned with the truth or falsity of what was said—and the truth still stands unshaken—he was concerned solely with "publicity."

4. BIDDLE'S AGREEMENT WITH MY TESTIMONY

At this late date he ventures to say, "I entirely agree with Littell's point of view in that. In fact, in none of these cases do I disagree with the results of his efforts or the purpose."

In the midst of "surplus property week" when Congress was trying to adjourn, as in the Elk Hills case, could it be expected that Congress would postpone its hearings on surplus property until the Attorney General returned from a trip to the west coast? If he had returned in time, would he really have said to Will Clayton, as he now claims (p. 58), "Will, I think it is a great mistake for the R. F. C. to distribute this land, and I am going to tell that to Congress," or would he have taken the position he did in fact take in his letter to Will Clayton of August 22, written by Acting Attorney General Fahy, at Biddle's instructions over the long-distance telephone, wherein he first instructed Mr. Fahy to say that my testimony expressed my "personal views only" and that he hoped the incident would not affect the cordial relations and cooperation which had existed between Mr. Biddle's office and Mr. Clayton's?

Only after the score was in and Mr. Biddle found that his only support in the press was in the trade papers of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, along with their heroic defense of the unhorsed Mr. Clayton, did he finally determine that I was right.

At the time it was overwhelmingly clear that my testimony before this committee was to be the subject of discipline. As Mr. Fahy said, when in contact with Mr. Biddle by long-distance telephone, this was "the third time this had happened" (i. e., testifying before a congressional committee)—once in the Elk Hills petroleum reserve matter, once in the Breakers Hotel case, and now in surplus property, and that as far as he was concerned it had "happened once too often" and that he "didn't care to consider the merits."

In what contrast is the Attorney General's present testimony to this effect: "I think it would not have been inappropriate for Mr. Littell to say to me, 'Don't you think, Mr. Attorney General, that land should be distributed by Agriculture or Interior?' before testifying before the committee. I would have said, 'You were dead right,' and I say so still. I would have said, 'Go down and say that.'"

A Judge Views Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. Grover M. Moscowitz, United States district judge, eastern district of New York, at the annual banquet of the New York Members Association of the Commercial Law League of America, on December 11, 1944:

Before evaluating the system under which bankruptcy is presently administered, it is well that we look to the history which must form the backdrop for any current philosophy we may have on this subject. The concepts which were originally embodied in bankruptcy legislation have undergone revolutionary changes since the early English statutes in this field.

The first laws in England became effective in 1542[1] but it can hardly be said that they concerned bankruptcy in the sense that we now understand that term. They applied only to the class known as traders and were no more than an authorization to creditors to seize the property of a debtor who had either fled the Kingdom or "kept house." Following the acquisition of individual rights under Magna Carta, one of those most zealously treasured was the freedom from illegal invasion of one's house by officers of the Crown. As is unfortunately so often the case, unscrupulous traders soon capitalized on this sanctuary and concealed property in their homes. The word "bankrupt" comes from the Italian for broken bench or bank and referred to the termination of the trader's commercial activity by literally breaking the bench on which he plied his wares, the creditors seizing his property and dividing it amongst themselves. There were no exemptions nor was the debtor discharged of his obligations. In 1571, three more acts were added to those justifying the seizure of the debtor's property.[2] Outlawry and imprisonment for debt under the writ of capias ad satisfaciendum were two and the third was to fill a loophole; being precluded under the earlier law from keeping property at home, it seems that churches offered a haven for concealing assets and it required special legislative enactment to render this practice equally vulnerable.

The Constitution of the United States grants to Congress the power to establish uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies[3] and Federal jurisdiction is paramount to the extent that Congress has chosen to assert it.[4] Prior to the act of 1898, pursuant to which, as amended, bankruptcy is today still administered, federal legislation was evidently for emergency purposes only. A national law on the subject was enacted following each of three major depressions and promptly repealed again upon the return of prosperity.[5] During this whole time, individual States had insolvency laws seeking to control various aspects of a debtor's embarrassment. For the short intervals of asserted Federal control, these State laws were merely suspended insofar as they were in conflict with the national legislation and were revived when Congress repealed its measures. It has been held that State insolvency laws are valid and continue operative to the extent that they do not conflict with the paramount Federal law.[6]

The first act of Congress (1800) embodied the concept that a bankrupt debtor is ipso facto dishonest, which had prevailed under the English system enforced in the Colonies

[1] 34 Henry VIII, ch. 4.

[2] 13 Eliz., ch. 5.

[3] Art. I, sec. 8, cl. 4.

[4] *Sturges* v. *Crowninshield* (17 U. S. (4 Wheat.) 122, 4 L. Ed. 529); *Atlanta F. & Insulation Co.* v. *Aberdorfer Ins. Agency* (5 Cir., 1943, 136 F. 2d 457).

[5] Act of 1800 (2 Stat. 19) repealed 1803 (2 Stat. 248); act of 1841 (5 Stat. 440) repealed 1843 (5 Stat. 614); act of 1867 (14 Stat. 517) repealed 1878 (20 Stat. 99).

[6] *Ogden* v. *Saunders* (25 U. S. (12 Wheat.) 213, 6 L. Ed. 606); *Stellwagen* v. *Clum* (245 U. S. 605, 38 S. Ct. 215, 62 L. Ed. 507, 41 Am. B. R. 1); *Johnson* v. *Star* (287 U. S. 527, 53 S. Ct. 265, 77 L. Ed. 473, 22 Am. B. R. (N. S.) 63).

prior to the revolution. It likewise applied only to traders and a discharge of the debtor by his taking the initiative was unknown. It was not until the second Bankruptcy Act (1841) that the discrimination to traders was eliminated and that provision was made for a voluntary discharge, thereby recognizing that a debtor might be honest but unfortunate and that society might benefit most if such a debtor were given a chance to start anew with a clean slate.

The purpose of permitting a person in effect to compel his creditors to release him from obligations which he had consciously incurred is to enable an honest and well-intentioned debtor to relieve himself of a noose which might otherwise remain around his neck for life. Just as will be the case in many instances after the present war comes to an end, unpredictable circumstances sometimes catapult even a person of undoubted integrity into a state of financial stress from which he will be totally unable to extricate himself. In these cases, it is just and proper that a debtor be permitted to surrender all his nonexempt assets to the court for equitable distribution amongst his creditors and to be relieved of those claims. In contrast, the willful refusal to pay just debts should be zealously guarded against in administering bankruptcy laws.

Gradually the theory of composition and creditor control has gained a commanding position in our system of bankruptcy. The recent depression—perhaps the only one our youth permits us to remember—introduced the new philosophy of rehabilitation of honest debtors as the best means of serving the social and commercial interest of the Nation. It was realized that the dumping at sacrifice prices required by a forced liquidation only further unsettled an already disturbed market. To effectuate this new philosophy and to clarify and improve the entire administration of bankruptcy, the Amendatory Act of 1938, better known as the Chandler Act, was adopted.[7]

A number of rehabilitation schemes are provided for in the revised act. Arrangement proceedings under chapter XI take the place of compositions and extensions of unsecured debts under sections 12 and 74 of the old act, as amended. Chapter XII deals with real property arrangements by persons other than corporations and chapter XIII concerns wage-earner plans which have been designed to relieve wage earners from the harassment of garnishments and attachment proceedings and employers from the trouble and expense in connection therewith. The very important corporate reorganization provisions appear in chapter X, successor to section 77B. These rehabilitation sections apply to one who is insolvent in the equity sense; i. e., unable to meet his legally incurred debts as they mature, as distinguished from the ordinary insolvency, which is the inadequacy of the debtor's assets, at a fair valuation, to pay his liabilities. That the constitutional grant of power to Congress to enact uniform laws concerning bankruptcies extends to these cases has been judicially passed upon and upheld.[8] The uniformity required is geographical and not personal.[9]

Bankruptcy might be defined as the status of a debtor declared by judicial process to be unable to pay his debts. This definition suggests the error of interchangeably using the terms "bankruptcy" and "insolvency"; one who is insolvent is not a bankrupt until his status has been judicially declared. Bankruptcy is an in rem proceeding, and insofar as the adjudication declares the status of the debtor it is conclusive upon all the world, and even strangers to the decree may not attack it collaterally, but it is not res adjudicata as to the facts or as to subsidiary questions of law upon which it is based except as to parties to the proceeding or their privies.[10]

Despite the valiant attempt by the legislators in the Chandler Act revision to minimize abuse of the true purposes of bankruptcy, inequities sometimes still appear but it is the creditors themselves who are in large part responsible. Lack of proper investigation before credit is extended and a general apathy toward the bankruptcy proceeding when the credit has gone wrong are two mistakes which business would do well to remedy. I suppose competition for customers in normal times brings about the former but that is out of my line and I shall leave it to you to ponder. The writing off of an account as soon as a petition in bankruptcy is filed, presumably with the thought that to pursue the matter further would be sending "good money after bad," is a showing of little foresight.[11]

Only by vigorous prosecution of bankrupts who violate criminal statutes or the penal provisions of the Bankruptcy Act,[12] will frauds be deterred. The United States Attorneys' office has an enviable record of convictions of bankruptcy fraud perpetrators, largely due to the indefatigable pursuit of suspects by the Federal Bureau of Investigation agents but the Government does not act until its attention has been called to a criminal violation. It has happened that creditors who filed specifications of objections to a bankrupt's discharge have been bought off, thereby permitting the unopposed discharge, since the statute in its present form requires the court to grant the applicant a discharge unless one or more of enumerated unauthorized acts is alleged and proved.[13] All unsecured creditors are to be treated alike and settlements with individual creditors are prohibited.

The theory of bankruptcy is creditor control and this is intended to mean by representatives of a majority. Yet it frequently develops that an active minority in fact controls the proceedings. All the creditors whose claims are scheduled are entitled to attend a meeting, of which they are given notice by the referee, and at that meeting to elect a trustee who will be charged with the duty of pursuing all the bankrupt's assets and converting them into cash for distribution. In practice, it too often happens that many creditors do not appear or take any interest in the matter, only to wake up too late to the loss which they have suffered by their indolence.

The Bankruptcy Act appears to set forth in unambiguous language the contents of a proof of claim entitled to be allowed.[14] But judicial emasculation has rendered this requirement nugatory and anything which a strained imagination may construe as apprising the referee that a claim is being made has been held to satisfy the statute, so as to permit amendment later in accordance with subdivision (n) of section 57.[15] Our Circuit Court stated only a few days ago that there has as yet been no authoritative determination of the question whether the Chandler Act has established stricter requirements which make inapplicable cases involving the liberal amendment of claims under the statute as it formerly existed.[16] There is thus no excuse for a creditor not filing some notice of his claim within 6 months after the date set for the first meeting of creditors, the time prescribed by the statute, and he may regret not having done so.

A rather harsh result possible under the old law of creditors not seasonably filing their claims was remedied by the amendment of 1938. The omission to file where there were few or no scheduled assets was not considered significant until assets were unearthed by the trustee after the time had expired for filing. Formerly, if the assets in an estate were sufficient, after administration expenses, to pay all creditors whose claims had been allowed, any surplus remaining went to the bankrupt. Section 57 (n) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. A. 93n) now provides that when all claims which have been duly allowed have been paid in full, the court may fix a time for the filing of claims which were not filed within the prescribed time and these, if approved, shall be allowed out of any surplus remaining. The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit recently considered this section of the act and held that "paid in full" meant that interest was also to be paid on the allowed claims before application of any assets to the payment of claims of equal priority not seasonably filed.[17]

Another factor materially increasing the number of bankruptcies is the ease with which a corporation may be formed in New York and some other States and the absence of public control over its financial status. To the extent that it is our public policy to permit incorporation for the purpose of limiting personal liability,[18] we are all indirectly to blame for this situation. Individuals with no sense of moral responsibility are not seriously concerned when they can organize a corporation with few, if any, assets, incur obligations, and when the corporation is adjudicated a bankrupt, repeat the process with a new corporation. I am not suggesting the abolition of corporations as such but I do think that many of the abuses arising from dummy and fly-by-night corporations could be eliminated by requiring public disclosure of the assets to be invested upon formation and of periodic balance sheets thereafter.

Another result of the Bankruptcy Act in its present form which is glaringly inconsistent with its purposes is illustrated by this factual statement. A negligently[19] injures B in an automobile collision and a verdict of $10,000 is rendered against him on the trial. Though A have an annual salary of $15,000 or more, he may nevertheless file a voluntary petition in bankruptcy and be relieved of this obligation by relinquishing his present assets.[20] B is without a remedy, whatever his plight.

A proposal currently receiving considerable attention would go far toward curing some of the evils to which I have alluded and would effect a most significant change in bankruptcy

---

[7] Act of June 22, 1938, ch. 575, 52 Stat. 840.

[8] *Continental Illinois Natl. Bank & Trust Co.* v. *Chicago Rock Island & Pac. Ry Co.*, (294 U. S. 648, 55 S. Ct. 595, 79 L. Ed. 1110); *In re Utilities Power & Light Corp.* (D. C., Ill., 1939) (29 F. Supp. 763).

[9] *Hammer Natl. Bank* v. *Moyses* (186 U. S. 181, 22 S. Ct. 857, 46 L. Ed. 1113).

[10] *Gratiot County State Bank* v. *Johnson* (249 U. S. 246, 63 L. Ed. 587); see also *In re Waxaid Co.* ((D. C., Md., 1943), 55 F. Supp. 289).

[11] In a scholarly and practical article entitled "Democracy and Bankruptcy," appearing in the January 1943 issue of Credit Executive, at p. 201, your toastmaster, Prof. Samuel C. Duberstein, dubbed as "swivel chair strategists" those creditors who renege on their democratic duty of taking an active part in bankruptcy proceedings.

[12] Sec. 26, 11 U. S. C. A. 52.

[13] Sec. 14 of Bankruptcy Act, 11 U. S. C. A. 32.

[14] Sec. 57 of Bankruptcy Act, 11 U. S. C. A. 93.

[15] I considered the authorities which compel this conclusion in the matter of *Weco Equipment, Inc.* (56 F. Supp. 532).

[16] *Avidon* v. *Halpert, No. 116,* decided Nov. 30, 1944.

[17] *Hammer* v. *Tuffy* (2 Cir. 145 F. 2d 447), decided Nov. 2, 1944.

[18] *Elenkrieg* v. *Siebrecht* (238 N. Y. 254, 144 N. E. 519); *Newark Fire Ins. Co.* v. *Brill* (7 N. Y. S. 2d 773); cf. *African Metals Corp.* v. *Bullova* (288 N. Y. 78, 41 N. E. 2d 466).

[19] As distinguished from "willful and malicious injuries to the person," the liability for which is not dischargeable (sec. 17 of Bankruptcy Act, 11 U. S. C. A., 35).

[20] Sec. 63a (7) of the Bankruptcy Act, 11 U. S. C. A. 103a (7); *In re Locker* (D. C., N. Y., 1939), 30 F. Supp. 642.

administration. I have reference to the suspension and conditioning of discharges, a practice which has been employed in England and in Canada for some time. The Committee on Bankruptcy of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges, under the chairmanship of Judge Orie L. Phillips, recommended the adoption of this practice into our bankruptcy system and in its September 1944 report to the conference incorporated its preliminary draft of a proposed bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to effectuate the suggestion.

The bill drafted by the committee would require the court to suspend the discharge for a period not exceeding 2 years if satisfied from such evidence as has been adduced "(1) that the assets of the bankrupt at the commencement of the proceedings were not of a value equal to 50 cents on the dollar of the amount of his provable debts, unless he satisfies the court that such fact has been due to circumstances for which he cannot justly be held responsible; or (2) that he contracted any provable debt within 4 months prior to the commencement of the proceedings without having at the time of contracting it any reasonable or probable ground of expectation of being able to pay it; or (3) that he has brought on, or contributed to, his bankruptcy by rash and hazardous speculations or by unjustifiable extravagance in living, or by gambling or by culpable neglect of his business affairs."

The bankrupt would be required to turn over to the trustee all the nonexempt assets which he had at the time of adjudication and all that he acquired during the suspension period, excepting a reasonable allowance, fixed by the court, for living necessities of himself and family and, if the court permits, property necessary for the conduct of a business in which he is engaged. The bankrupt would be required to submit to the trustee periodic reports of his assets, income, and expenses. If the court finds at the end of the period that the bankrupt has attempted in good faith to comply with the terms of the suspension order, he may be discharged; otherwise, the discharge may be denied.

I believe the proposed 2-year limitation on the period of suspension is too short. In England, for more reasons than the three embodied in the committee's bill, a discharge may be suspended for a period not less than 2 years, no maximum being prescribed. An exception is made where the only fact proved is inadequacy of assets at commencement of the proceeding, in which case the court may order suspension until such time as the assets attain the specified proportion. The English act also provides the additional feature of authorizing the granting of a discharge on condition that the bankrupt make prescribed payments out of future earnings, no reference being made to his personal or family necessities, although the court presumably would take that factor into consideration in setting the amount to be paid.

It is also interesting to note that since the act of 1914 a bankrupt in England incurs criminal liability if, being engaged in trade or business and having incurred debts therein, he contributes to his insolvency by gambling or rash or hazardous speculation during 2 years before the filing of the petition. Perhaps such an extreme damper would not be welcomed by the chance-loving American people, but it does seem advisable that at least some provision, such as the suspension of discharge, should be available to limit the speculation of debtors.

In one more respect the English bankruptcy law is more liberal to creditors than that of our own country. You all know that an involuntary petition may be filed against a debtor who is insolvent and who has committed an act of bankruptcy prescribed by the statute within the preceding 4 months. It may well be that the assets of an insolvent debtor will be dissipated before an act of bankruptcy is committed so as to justify the filing of an involuntary petition. The English law is similar but the act of bankruptcy most frequently relied upon is a "notice of bankruptcy," a summary device not provided for under our law. It appears to be no more than a notice by a judgment creditor ordering the debtor to pay, secure, or compound the debt within 7 days; failure to comply is an act of bankruptcy.

A heavy burden rests upon one who subsequently becomes a bankrupt to keep, maintain, and preserve books of account or records appropriate to the financial activities in which he engages. Creditors should not be required to guess, speculate, or surmise what disposition the bankrupt has made of his assets. A bankrupt who is engaged in business who has failed to keep or preserve books of account or records from which his financial condition and business transactions might be ascertained is not entitled to be discharged in bankruptcy.[21] At the beginning, when the bankruptcy law was first enacted, this provision was not so strictly enforced as it is now. In a recent prosecution for fraudulently concealing and transferring property from the trustee, it was held to be a proper inference for the jury to make from the keeping of inadequate books that this was done with an eye to future bankruptcy.[22]

A bankrupt who has obtained money or credit by making a materially false statement in writing respecting his financial condition is not entitled to be discharged.[23] The purpose of holding a bankrupt to strict accountability in filing truthful financial statements is to encourage greater honesty in business transactions and one who violates this requirement is given short shrift in the bankruptcy courts.[24] In one respect, this law may be too harsh. A person honestly seeking a discharge from substantial debts may have made a statement in applying for a $50 loan many years ago that he had no other debts, when in fact he owed another obligation. Both that obligation and the $50 may long since have been repaid but his having made that statement, which was relied upon at the time, will forever bar his being discharged in bankruptcy.[25] Some discretion should exist in the court to rule out such an objection. It has been suggested and not without force that an investigative agency be set up to look into the acts and conduct of a bankrupt who seeks a discharge. This would be particularly effective if the court were empowered to suspend or condition discharges.

The present war has become a factor in bankruptcy administration in more ways than one. Easy war money has left its mark on the bankruptcy courts. In 1943, the number of new bankruptcy cases brought in the United States was 33.4 percent less than in the year before and in 1944 the number declined another 44 percent, aggregating a reduction of 62.5 percent in just two years. In figures, the drop was from 52,109 new cases in 1942 to 19,533 during 1944. This leaves a lower number of cases pending than at any time during the past 30 years.[26] This situation has become a matter of serious concern to the referees, many of whom in our metropolitan areas devote their full time to their official duties and have become expertly familiar with the details of bankruptcy administration. It is desirable that they be retained for the performance of their functions when the inevitable recurrence of bankruptcy cases in normal numbers materializes after the war. At present, referees are compensated on the basis of fees only and with the decline of cases mentioned, many referees are not earning enough even to maintain their offices. A bill is pending in Congress (H. R. 1107) which would put referees on a salary basis and its advocates state that the present cost to the Government could be reimbursed from contribution of the parties in high volume years. Bills are also pending in Congress (H. R. 4131, 4132, S. 1620, 1622) which would carry into effect another current suggestion, which is that the existing prohibition against referees acting as United States commissioners be removed so as to permit expedient combining of the duties of these two offices.

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940[27] seeks to protect the civil rights of persons in the armed services. The law provides for the temporary suspension of certain legal proceedings and transactions which might prejudice those rights and enjoins the entry of default judgments in some cases, requiring the court to appoint an attorney to represent the defendant who is or may be in the service. In what was apparently one of the first constructions of the effect of this legislation upon bankruptcy proceedings, I held that where there were a large number of bondholders in a chapter X reorganization, whose interests were all on an equal basis of priority, some of whom were directly represented by counsel and disinterested trustees who were appointed to protect the interest of all the creditors, the matter could proceed to final determination and title to real property would be marketable even though some of the bondholders not actively participating might be in the armed services. The mandatory provisions of the act do not apply to a chapter X proceeding. However, under the discretion vested by the statute in the court to appoint an attorney in any case, I appointed the attorneys for the indenture trustee to represent bondholders who are or may be serving in the armed forces.[28]

An interesting question incident to our wartime economy is whether the bankruptcy courts, in selling property of an estate, are bound by price ceilings promulgated by the Office of Price Administration under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.[29] The Bankruptcy Act requires the sale to be at public auction to the highest

---

[21] Sec. 14c (2) of Bankruptcy Act, 11 U. S. C. A. 32c (2). My most recent occasion to apply this provision was In the Matter of Charles H. Schwartzman, No. 45511, opinion dated Nov. 25, 1944. See *Benjamin* v. *Jaspan* (2 Cir., 144 F. 2d 58), certiorari denied, Nov. 27, 1944.

[22] *United States* v. *Rosenberg* (2 Cir., 145 F. 2d)—decided Nov. 3, 1944.

[23] Sec. 14c (3) of Bankruptcy Act, 11 U. S. C. A. 32c (3).

[24] The Circuit Court of Appeals has gone so far as to affirm a holding, where a debtor answered in proceedings supplementary to judgment that she was not employed, when, in fact, she was earning a weekly wage of $25 that she had thereby concealed property with intent to hinder, defraud, or delay creditors which, under sec. 14c (4) of the Bankruptcy Act, 11 U. S. C. A. 32c (4), barred her discharge. *Kaganowitz* v. *Manufacturers Trust Co.* (2 Cir., 145 F. 2d 754), decided December 4, 1944.

[25] I recently applied this law in the matter of *Frank Savarese* (56 F. Supp. 927).

[26] These statistics were taken from the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, September 1944.

[27] 50 U. S. C. A., App. 501, et seq.

[28] *In re Realty Associates Securities Corporation* (53 F. Supp. 1015). This case is discussed at length in (1944) 18 J. Nat. Assn. Ref. in Bankruptcy 117.

[29] 50 U. S. C. A., App. 901 et seq.

bidder,[30] so as to procure the greatest advantage to the creditors. Those who maintain that the limitations apply argue that the war powers acts are statutes enacted for the safety of our national existence and that Congress could not have regarded the rights of creditors in a bankruptcy proceeding as more important than the objectives of the war effort.[31]

Those holding the contrary view urge that the declared purposes of the war powers acts will certainly not be violated in a judicial proceeding. It is asserted that a court of justice will not be presumed to encourage speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal price increases or to do anything else that is not in the interest of national defense.[32] Under this construction the Bankruptcy Act is deemed to be a specific, complete, comprehensive statute, permanent and exclusive in its operation, whereas the price measures are temporary and general and thus cannot by implication repeal or supersede the Bankruptcy Act.

I could go on making more suggestions for better bankruptcy administration and giving you more views as to what creditors should do and what lawyers should not do, but in the long run it is only through the cooperative efforts of all those who play a role in this field that we may hope to achieve the objectives we have stated. Bankruptcy laws should aid the honest debtor and discourage dishonest ones. Creditors, attorneys, accountants, credit agencies, enforcement officers—all must recognize their obligations in the democratic system under which bankruptcy proceedings are conducted in our country. Vigilance reaps rewards, if not compensatory in a particular instance, certainly contributive to the improvement of bankruptcy administration as a whole and that result can only redound to the ultimate advantage of all.

[30] Sec. 30 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. A. 53) provides that all rules, forms, and orders as to procedure and for carrying the act into effect shall be prescribed by the Supreme Court. General Order No. 18 (11 U. S. C. A., following 53) states that "All sales shall be by public auction unless otherwise ordered by the court." General Orders of the Supreme Court have the effect of statutes. *Orcutt Co.* v. *Green* (204 U. S. 96, 27 S. Ct. 195, 51 L. Ed. 390). Competitive bidding is the essence of an auction and the highest price must be obtained. *Porter* v. *Graves* (104 U. S. 171, 26 L. Ed. 691.)

[31] For instance, see *United States* v. *1.94 acres of land* ((D. C., Pa., 1943), 51 F. Supp. 162).

[32] *In re Freeman* (D. C., Ga., 1943), 49 F. Supp. 163, 167; *In re 325 East 72d Street, Inc.* ((S. D., N. Y.), No. 82556, Bright, J., Sept. 11, 1944); cf. *In re Bender Body Co.* (D. C., Ohio, 1942), 47 F. Supp. 224.

Lincoln-Douglass Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address on Lincoln and Douglass by Lt. George W. Lee, one of the South's outstanding colored men, delivered over Station WMPS February 12, 1944, together with an introductory statement by Columnist Nat D. Williams.

INTRODUCTION

W. C. Handy placed the colored man's feelings in musical notes, and set a style in tunes which swayed the shoulders and tickled the feet of kings and potentates, who, even at their dizzy heights, could catch and hold the lowly but potent meanings of a lyric which says, "Been working on the levee for a dollar and a dime a day, gave the dollar to my baby and threw the dime away." Handy materialized the Negro's feelings in song.

When another Memphian, a friend and contemporary of Handy, not a musical troubador, but a staid and progressive businessman, not a musician who played with brass and tympanic instruments, but at heart a poet who caught the rhythm and emotional currents of his time and environment and curled them around words to produce a peculiar music of their own, he did for the Negro's feelings in words what Handy had done for them in notes of music.

His books, Beale Street (Where the Blues Began), River George, and Beale Street Sundown, constitute the one and only authentic and polished literary expression of the blues idiom of the Negro expressed by a Negro. Just as Handy took the white man's musical notes and apprehended and presented the emotions of his people, Lt. George W. Lee, Beale Street, author businessman, civic leader, and World War No. 1 hero, took the white man's language, and with unparalleled wizardry and an unmatched mastery for a neat turn of phrase expressed in the rhythm of the blues, the Negro's feelings in books.

Lieutenant Lee is chairman of the colored division of the Memphis-Shelby County War Finance Committee. His division in previous war-loan campaigns has made Memphis the Negro War bond capital of America, utilizing the lieutenant's unique flair for showmanship, a flair which has bobbed up with telling effect in each of the previous campaigns, tonight's program is an endeavor of the division to pay tribute to Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass, whose birthdays are at hand, through encouraging the purchase of thousands of dollars in War bonds as a tribute to the memories of these two great Americans.

NAT D. WILLIAMS, *Columnist.*

ADDRESS OF LT. GEORGE W. LEE

My friends, both white and colored, I am speaking to you tonight on two great Americans. They are symbolic of the American communities, that like so many sunflowers turn their faces to the warming focal point of their ambitions and hopes.

One was born a slave, but in manhood's morning he broke the fetters that chained him to the black barge of miserable oblivion, and rose from bondage despite overpowering oppression and inhuman contempt. His name was Frederick Douglass. He was the finished painting of a glorious pattern, revealing a startling picture of what Lincoln saw, deep beneath the surface of the abject blacks. Through Douglass, the symbol of the American Negro, the Declaration of Independence, in whose text is found a divine flavor, was proved. The Constitution vindicated and freedom itself was loosed from the ugly grasp of night.

The other was born in the lap of freedom, but was handicapped by economic slavery. He was nursed in a cradle of despair and grew up in a windowless cabin on a hard dirt floor, as a gangling farm boy. Something occurred in the life of this farm boy and he became conscious of his inner powers; powers that lifted him gently on to the towering peaks of his Shangri La. No one knew when the eternal miracle occurred in the life of this boy. It may have been at the noon, when he plowed along through the field, turning up the fresh brown earth, or it may have been on a flat boat drifting down the river through the dreamy woods and the lonely countryside, it may have been in New Orleans, where he saw slaves exchanged for whole cotton fields, pressed into silver coins.

The world knows him today as Abraham Lincoln. A plain homespun American, with simple rugged honesty. He was the personification of the common people, the embodiment of all that was, and all that is, distinctively American. He saw through the experience of suffering, and appreciated all that suffered. He felt the touch and pangs of sorrow, experienced by every creed, and extended a hand as ancient as the sun. His was a lifetime of ceaseless struggle, to lift all humanity out of the quagmire of a lowly existence. He carried with wisdom the understanding of unspeakable divinity, and like a tree planted by the water, could not be moved by the ceremonies of human judgment. He heard the cry of a people borne down with distress, and comforted them in dark and troubled hours.

Carl Sandburg in describing him said, "That when light sprang into the grey eyes and fires of emotion flooded out over the sacred tissues, then sometimes it appeared as if Lincoln's soul was fresh from the Creator."

Lincoln was not of the North, he was not of the South. His country was the universe, and all humanity was his brother. He stood in the center of two extremes, the extremist of the North and the extremist of the South. His love lingered with the South, but destiny called him to the North, to Illinois, where the stage was set for him to carry out the lonely and majestic task that had been started by Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia. Thus, Virginia and Illinois became twin sister of Liberty.

Both Douglass and Lincoln were called upon to make two great decisions upon which the whole course of their lives would be determined. The decision that Douglass made when he refused to go with John Brown to Harpers Ferry serves as a pattern even until this day to those leaders of the minority group, who are fighting to keep, "Race militancy below the danger point of violent reaction." The decision that Lincoln made to sign the Emancipation Proclamation is an admonition to leaders of the majority group to battle the angry storm of race and religious hate, before the crushing waves of intolerance engulf us, and thus poison the blood stream flowing from the warm heart of American life, with the polluted blood oozing from the wounds of Fascism.

It was a hard decision that the black man, Douglass, was called upon to make. Leonard Ehrlich gives a graphic description of the meeting of Douglass and John Brown in an old abandoned shack, well back in the hills.

"I knew you would come, Douglass; I knew you would not fail me," John Brown said. Now, for the first time, he spoke aloud his plans. What were those plans? "A silent night march into Virginia, the arsenal at Harper's Ferry captured, liberty spreading southward like a trail of fire, do you see it, Douglass?"

"Brown," Douglass gasped. "The Nation roused, chains dropping," consternation flooded Douglass. "In the name of God, what madness was this, Brown; it's mad, it's mad, I tell you," the black man exclaimed. The words were like a sudden blow to the fevered old man. "I say it's mad, and you cannot do it," Douglass continued. Brown stood frozen. A sickness rose in his eyes, "You, too, Douglass, are going to fail me." "God, Brown," Douglass exclaimed, "can't you realize what you'd be doing? You'd be attacking the United States Government, it would be treason. The whole country would turn against us, the whole movement would be set back 50 years; you want to help the slaves, why then do you think of doing the very thing that would harm them most?" So Douglass' decision was against John Brown, because he thought in his heart

that Brown's plan would bring down the Nation's anger upon the whole slave question.

When Douglass turned away from Brown and went home, he put love of country above love of race. I believe he knew in his heart that America with so many races could never achieve her destiny if one race placed its welfare above the welfare of the country.

The decision that Lincoln made was no less difficult. He had resolved on his course. He told his ministers he had not called them together to ask their advice, but to lay the subject matter of his proclamation before them. Thus, he read aloud the original draft of the Emancipation Proclamation.

The Declaration of Independence declared the liberty of a free people. The Proclamation of Emancipation was the completion plan of the Declaration. It was the culmination of what Jefferson had begun.

Jefferson wrote something that the world had tried to write for many centuries. Lincoln accomplished what the world had tried to accomplish for many centuries. Destiny stood behind him and pushed him on to a distant goal, to the towering and unattainable peak of a mighty idea. Step by step, he fought his way up against the opposition of men both North and South, until he had led the Nation from the shades and shadows to the glorious dawn, where men both North and South realized at last that a house divided against itself could not stand, and that our nationalism accept no North, no South, no East, no West, but one country, one flag, with the Eternal God as our refuge, and over all His everlasting arms.

There are five elements that made Lincoln great. Destiny, the invisible hand that pushed him on through the great forest to the highest pinnacle of earthly grandeur and renown; his wife, of Southern extraction, discovered in him his true worth and lashed him into action; the Negro whose shackles gave him the spring board for action.

Gen. Robert E. Lee, who refused Lincoln's invitation to command the Northern Army, and whose intrepid leadership inflicted such heavy losses upon the North, that Northern opinion was forced to yield to Lincoln's idea of emancipation as a desperate measure to stave off defeat. General Lee had furnished the great drama of the war. Even though he was fighting against the Negroes' liberation, he wrote with his own hands the passes that enabled his slaves to cross the southern line and enter territory held by the Union forces.

Lincoln's fulfillment of the great command, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto Me," caused H. G. Wells to name him one of the six great men of all times. But a few years later, General Lee was to almost match this splendid Lincolnian tolerance. Simmons draws a lively picture of the scene.

A lonely, downtrodden ex-slave moved down the center aisle of the most fashionable church in Richmond, Va., and went to the altar and knelt and began to weep. Consternation swept over the white congregation. The priest looked on with amazement and cried, "Take him away."

The most illustrious figure Virginia ever produced raised himself from his seat in a majestic manner, moved down the aisle and knelt by the side of this black man on the Altar of God. He was Gen. Robert E. Lee.

No man of American life carried a greater burden than Lincoln. No President had as many attempts of assassination made on his life. He heard the rumble of the storm of civil strife. He dreaded the terrible consequence in the making. He would have given his life to prevent the disaster, and as his heart became sad and lonely, he cried out, "This is the hardest trial of my life. Why is it? Why is it?" He must have been thinking of another who hung upon the rugged cross, long after the sun of Golgotha had gone down. Lincoln was no more anxious to stop the extension of slavery, than he was to preserve the Union. He was no more anxious to free the blacks, than he was to make the whites humane. It meant as much to him that no freeman could be a slaveholder, as it did that no slave could any longer be a slave.

In this fateful period of world history if Douglass could speak, I believe he would say, I have no doubt that you don't have grievances, and just ones at that, but complaining will not settle any grievances, however just, it will only embitter the relations between the races, and only give more ammunition to those who are against you in these tragic times.

You must not become so deeply absorbed in thought of persecution against you that you forget your guilt of being biased, in your own interests. You cannot grow indifferent to your country's needs. You cannot give up the struggle for a better and brighter day, for a bigger and better America, it is your job to help make democracy work.

For in spite of slow-lifting shadows, of bruising words, of unkind speech, all of hopes, all of triumph, that the American Negro may tell are found in the annals of his native land. The road is hard and the day is long, you should work hard and take every chance that comes your way to prove your worth. You should not be disappointed if progress is not rapid. For people's minds must be changed before you can change their actions. Buying War bonds and sharing in the communities' burdens should make for tolerance and good will, should convince the majority group that you are entitled to a fair deal. You should lay away a dependable nest egg for tomorrow in Government bonds and not commit racial suicide by reckless spending.

The day of plenty is at hand, but the day will end and night will come to those who have spent their pocketbooks empty, and the day will again dawn upon millions of unemployed standing in the breadline with millions of cook stoves cold and meal barrels empty, with millions of mothers clutching infants with hungry arms, who cry for the bare necessities of life.

If Lincoln could speak to the world today, I believe he would say that "70 years ago I preached about a free nation."

As long as we can keep the ideals of democracy befors us, we are advancing toward its fulfillment. We can do this if we keep emphasis on the side of goodness, kindness, self-sacrifice, justice to all. These simple democratic acts would soften humiliation and stand as a bulwark against agitators who come not to build, but to destroy the American way of life. It is not too much to assure the Negro that he will be included in the blueprints of a free world. It is not too much to assure him that the best in his race will be free from attacks by the worst in the white race and that he will have the full protection of the law and the opportunity to work and achieve his destiny.

If one-third of the Negro population could be persuaded to purchase one $25 Government bond each month, in 24 months, the race would have added $3,000,000,000 worth of wealth to its total, or more than it has saved in 79 years of freedom.

Seventy-nine years ago, I said to you, "Liberty is your birth right. God gave it to you as he gave it to us, but you must try to deserve this priceless boon. Let the world see that you merit it, and are able to maintain it by your good works."

Seventy-nine years ago, when Lincoln left us trembling on the verge of a new life, and Douglass lay down to pleasant dreams, we couldn't read nor write. Today, we have dipped our pen in the ink of immortality, and have written into the copybook of time, Native Son, the great American novel, and God's Trombone, the great American poem.

Seventy-nine years ago, we had never seen inside of a school room. Today, we have dipped our pen in the blood and sweat of slaves and have written into the curriculum of time * * * a new system of industrial education.

Seventy-nine years ago, we didn't have a song * * * today, haunting folk music comes in quick tears and laughter straight from our unhappy hearts as an enduring gift to the world, and yet we have only begun the long climb from the awful depth where Lincoln found us, and Douglass inspired us.

Our pace may have been slow, but we were conscious of a double mission of advancing ourselves and fulfilling an obligation to Lincoln and other Americans who first lighted the torch of liberty about our heads.

Soil Conservation in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1945

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the Fifth Congressional District of Iowa, we have a very strong advocate of soil conservation in the person of Mr. George Ver Steeg, editor of the Pella Chronicle. Personally and in his paper he is doing his utmost to bring to the attention of the people the need for soil conservation. Marion County, Iowa, the county of his residence, has more than 400 farmers cooperating in a county soil conservation program. On December 14, 1944, Mr. Ver Steeg gave an address at the annual meeting of the Marion County Soil Conservation District, Knoxville, Iowa, and under unanimous consent, I include his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Friends, first, I want to thank Clay Barnett and the men of the service who work with him for the invitation to speak to you. One year ago I had prepared an informal talk, but the hour grew late and I had to forego that pleasure. However, all of the past year I have carried the ideas I had wanted to express and now I shall get them off my chest.

Pleasing it is to know that along with the soils district commissioners and the Farm Bureau the Knoxville Community Club is sponsoring this meeting and businessmen are here. Businessmen in general have been apathetic to the soils-conservation movement. They have been interested in crop abundance or failure, drought, and flood, all things that touch them very intimately in the purse, but they have not been concerned over a very real danger—permanent loss of business and prosperity because of eroded and abandoned lands. I will enlarge on this a bit later.

My topic is the Soil Conservation District and Movement from the Editor's Viewpoint. I want to say that I speak not as an outsider. I am not viewing this movement in a detached manner—I am enlisted just as you are. For nearly 7 years, or as long as I have been editor of the Chronicle, it has been my hobby and especial pleasure to put in licks to help conservation along. Nothing has given me greater pleasure than seeing here and there small evidence of my work and receiving commendation from my farmer friends and business associates. It has all been very worth while.

Let's have a look at the history of agriculture in Marion County. It was nearly 100 years ago that the the plow was first put to

land in this county. There was abundance everywhere, there was no need to conserve, there were always new frontiers and the soil seemed inexhaustible. At the turn of the century we began to hear that men from the agricultural college at Ames were concerned about erosion and wasteful land use. They made trips to farms here and there giving advise on erosion control and recommending retirement of eroded and worn-out farm lands to grass. For 30 years there was only half-hearted interest among farmers and public interest was almost nil.

It was less than 10 years ago that we in Marion County began to show interest. That was when the civilian conservation camp was established and the young men were put to work rehabilitating some of our worst land. Those farms are today demonstration areas that teach us the value of conservation—the treatment worked; the farms are back into high production and erosion has been controlled. Then came the establishment of the English Creek Watershed where thousands of acres came under the supervision of the men of the Soils Conservation Service. And finally came the soils district which has enjoyed such substantial growth and in which nearly 400 farmers and landowners are enrolled as cooperators. We now have our feet on solid ground—we are ready to go forward on a broad front.

We know that we still have thousands of acres of eroded land in this county. We know that some of these lands have been abandoned, that thousands of acres are unfit for the plow, they are worn out, mortgaged, buildings on them are tumbledown. But their future is not hopeless. They can be rehabilitated and will be through the cooperation of all in the soils district.

Now whose concern is this problem of ending wasteful land use in Marion County? Is there a single businessman who cannot see how his future is bound up in continued fertility and productivity of our land? Agriculture is almost the sole source of our wealth and every businessman should be conscious of the fact that up to the time of the establishment of the soils district he was facing an ever-diminishing return, a narrowing horizon, and that there would be even less for his children. Contrast this outlook with the one we have now—an ever-widening horizon as more and more land comes under agreement with the district, fertility is restored, erosion ended, and prosperity returning to the men who till the soil. Isn't it worth while being interested in? Should not the vision of the ever-widening horizon, increased trade for the town and the individual, security for both farmer and businessmen stir the imagination and bring every businessman into the soils-conservation movement? Indeed conservation is the business of every businessman. What can he do? He can wholeheartedly endorse the movement, speak an encouraging word to his farmer friends, join with his colleagues in the community club to push the movement along and at every opportunity speak out in favor of good land use. Best way to do that intelligently is to go with the conservation workers and farmers on demonstration tours and see what has been done. Last summer Congressman PAUL CUNNINGHAM went on such a tour and he was so impressed that he returned to Washington with a very much better understanding of the soils-district movement and with enthusiasm that will make him an even better friend of conservation than he has proven himself to be in the past. PAUL CUNNINGHAM has an interest in prosperity in Marion County—so does every businessman and every citizen.

Now I want to point my remarks at the farmers here. What about the farmer? What obligation has he to farm 'round the hill? There is not a farmer here who owns 1 foot of the land he tills. He is only holding it in trust for his short lifetime and he will be responsible to those who come after for his stewardship. He can be blessed or he may be cursed, according to the way he used the talent given to him in trust.

Short years ago farm folks might have felt that they were on the defensive when they endorsed conservation. Now, with a great beachhead of nearly 400 cooperators in the district there is no need to apologize to anyone. On the contrary, there is a great need to show your neighbor by example and to tell your neighbor at every opportunity about that grand feeling of security that comes with farming right—nailing down the soil and diverting it to better use so that it may be safe and grow yearly more fertile while the farm enterprise grows more profitable.

Gentlemen—cooperators, you are not on the defensive. You are the privileged men of Marion County. Never give an inch, give no ground, make no concessions, fight for what you know is right. Have a real stake in this project and take pride in it as it goes forward year by year. It is the most important movement, for you and yours and for me and mine, of this generation.

What can the newspapers do about it? Time was when soils-conservation news was a short item between the obituaries and the patent-medicine ads. That time is over. A good country newspaper exists only because it serves its community. A newspaperman who senses the importance of this movement will inform himself, keep in touch with both district workers and farmers, bring stories into print so that all his readers may know of pogress, publish pictues of men doing the job and of the projects—be the interpreter of the movement to every farmer enlisted and even more to all farmers. Yes, there are still some who are stubborn, many who are careless, many more who have just not taken time to learn what it is all about. The newspaper can help to enlist them all.

Now, we have a team here, the soils-district workers, the cooperating farmers, the business and professional men and the newspapers. A tiny waterfall will wear away the hardest stone if it keeps everlastingly at it. Don't be disccuraged; don't give it up. Do get enthusiasm—catch the vision. Together we shall wear down the apathy, shall show our people the wisdom and the profit in joining this movement and sticking with it. Our reward? The knowledge that we helped to preserve for our children those things we were given so freely and which we used so wastefully until we saw our duty and our course laid out so plainly short years ago.

Behind us, and we hope for always, is the era in which we squandered our talents and the horizon narrowed each year. Before us is the ever-widening horizon. In closing I am reminded of a little story. A smart guy hailed the driver of an old bus with a query, "Hey, Noah, is the ark full?" And the seedy old driver replied, "Nope. Just need one more monkey, so hop in." True, some people may look upon our bus as only a monkey-wagon but we know better—it is the finest Greyhound on the road. It will carry us all to security. We must not miss this bus.

Irrigation and Nebraska's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the first annual convention of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, held at Lincoln, Nebr., on January 20, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, and honored guests, I want to express my gratitude to you for your kind invitation to speak on the program today and I hope that in these few minutes I may say something that will be of lasting benefit to each of you and to my beloved State of Nebraska.

We are in the first month of a new year, the second month of our fourth year of war. Our materials are flowing in ever-increasing streams to our fighting men in Germany, in northern Italy, and in the far-off Philippines. As I speak, right now, American blood is being spilled with the blood of our allies—Chinese, Australian, British, French, and Russian—so that in this year of the world's history, our enemies might be decisively defeated and our arms victorious.

I wish that I could bring you the promise of a quick victory, but there is no talk of quick victory in Washington today. There is a grim determination to see it through. And underneath it all, there is a sad foreboding of bloodier battles to come. Yet, in the night of despair, hope lights our hearts. As we read of the brave actions of our men on every fighting front, we know that final victory will be ours.

A new Congress has been seated—the seventy-ninth in our Nation's history. Today, Franklin D. Roosevelt will be inaugurated President of the United States for the fourth time. I would not be honest either with you or with the deepest feelings of my heart if I hinted to you that I am joyful about the prospects of our fourth term. I hope you will believe me when I say that I would feel the same if it were a Republican taking office as President of the United States for the fourth time. I have been, and am now, and forever will be convinced that more than two terms in the office of President for any one man are fraught with peril to our free institutions. A long tenure of office for one man, no matter what the office, puts a terrific strain on our democratic processes. As Ely Culbertson has so well put it, a government of angels if continued long enough in power, eventually becomes a government of devils. We have seen the effect in cities and States of political boss control and now are witnessing its blighting effects on our national life.

I refuse, however, to throw my hands in the air and say that representative government is dead. I say that it is being threatened, terribly threatened, due to the fact that a majority of our people in America have adopted the leadership principle of the old world, but I believe that when the issue has been made crystal-clear—that when freedom is an issue, the people will never falter, they will never fail.

Meantime, there is work for all of us to do. There is work in Washington and there is work in Nebraska. I hope to prove faithful in knowing what to do and in doing the right thing in the position of great trust and responsibility to which the people of Nebraska have sent me.

That brings me to a great work that is very close to my heart today. It brings me down to a very practical project on which we can all unite, whether we be Republicans, Democrats, or Independents. That great project is building up the State of Nebraska, economically and culturally, at every opportunity.

One of Nebraska's great opportunities to rebuild economically is now before us. It is that of irrigating tens of thousands of new

acres and supplementing the irrigation of other tens of thousands of acres not yet adequately irrigated. It was Shakespeare, writing in the play Julius Caesar, who said:

"There is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.

"Omitted, all the voyages of their lives are bound in shallows and in miseries."

Nebraskans by the tens of thousands today face such a time in their lives—a time when they can take advantage of irrigation projects that will come on an unprecedented scale, if they are willing that these come; a time when the State as a whole can get ready for servicemen who even now are being mustered out and will be coming home in increasing numbers as this year passes into history; a time when Nebraska can increase its real wealth immeasurably and thereby increase the real wealth of the United States. Irrigation of upward of a million irrigable acres in our State could mean more than the finding of gold or the striking of oil. It could mean more in the terms of spreading employment, of returning Nebraskans who migrated in the drought period, and in terms of stabilizing our agriculture and hence our business.

The recent rather confusing and long drawn-out fight by irrigation interests and navigation interests found conflicting support in Nebraska during debate on the flood-control bill. Nebraska is the only State entirely inside the Missouri River Basin. I have consistently maintained that the two interests, irrigation and navigation, could be harmonized. I believe history yet to be written will prove that I am right.

When I think of the fights that have taken place in Congress in conflicting national irrigation and navigation policy, and when I consider the incipient struggles again showing up here and there, I am reminded of the story of the Kentucky cobbler who unexpectedly inherited a small fortune.

He locked up his shop and went out on a wild spending orgy. In time, of course, all of his money was gone, so he went back to his humble cobbler's bench, apparently none the worse for his experience with money.

Not long afterward, a lawyer appeared in his shop and told the cobbler that he had inherited another fortune. The cobbler put down his tools, looked up from his bench and said with some exasperation:

"Lord A'mighty! Do I have to go through all that again?"

There is no real, basic reason why we should have to go through contest fights either here or anywhere else in regard to water, as long as the people know all the facts and are reminded constantly of those facts. That is one way this association can do a great work here in Nebraska, just keeping the people informed. Because I do not want more fights between this agency and that one, I voted for the O'Mahoney-Milliken amendment to the flood control bill, for this amendment requires that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineers shall get together and iron out administrative differences relative to control of our Nation's waters.

This amendment does not hinder navigation interests in their legitimate desires, and requirements, but it does prevent headlong action that would render null and void the work of hundreds of thousands of people over a period of many decades. It directs the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to work together—and that is something we will all welcome.

On irrigation, there can be no shadow of a doubt about Nebraska's basic interest. Irrigation in Nebraska has been demonstrated affirmatively by the successful operation of the North Platte project, located jointly in Nebraska and Wyoming. Although parts of western and central Nebraska in some years receive enough rainfall for cereal and forage crops, the maintenance of a stabilized agricultural economy, except for the eastern portion of the State, depends upon irrigation. I could stand here all day and recite instances of farmers who have used irrigation literally to lift themselves by their economic bootstraps here in Nebraska.

Nebraska has more miles of live water, that is, flowing stream water—than any other State in the Union. Nebraska has the greatest amount of underground water of any like area in the United States, and Nebraska is among the leading States in undeveloped irrigable acreage.

To me these three facts point to only one conclusion: Nebraska is facing the greatest opportunity for the development of irrigation in its history, an opportunity that promises a great increase in real wealth, a reclaiming of much lost population, a chance for tens of thousands of our farmers to take the road to better living.

I realize that I do not have to prove these statements to members of this association. And I realize that I do not have to prove my loyalty to the ideal of irrigating every possible acre in Nebraska in the coming post-war years. As most of my friends know, I have a farm I have been irrigating for years, and I have been talking and voting for more and better living for my thousands of farm friends since I have been in political life. I shall keep up that talking and I shall continue that method of voting.

It is evident from recent population studies made by Dr. J. O. Hertzler, professor of sociology at the University of Nebraska, that Nebraska needs irrigation development, if for no other reason than to regain lost population. Professor Hertzler's study shows that 12 to 13 percent of our population left Nebraska in the 1930–40 period, and that the counties without irrigation projects were hardest hit by population losses.

Under the program brought before Congress last year by the Bureau of Reclamation, an imposing number of irrigation and multiple-purpose projects would be undertaken nationally in the post-war years.

A summary of the irrigation units planned on the Niobrara, Platte, and Republican River basins would include the Narrows Unit (which would be constructed only in the event of the completion of transmountain diversions that have been proposed), the Sargent unit, the Farwell unit, the Lower North Loup unit, the Cedar Rapids unit, the Albion unit, the Loup Valley unit, the Plum Creek unit, the Grand Island unit, the Prairie Creek unit, the Osceola unit, the Bellwood unit, and the Schuyler unit, all in the Platte River basin; the North Republican unit, the St. Francis (Kans.) unit, the Wells unit, the Frenchman unit, the Meeker unit, the Red Willow unit, the Cambridge unit, the Almena unit, the Oxford unit, the Franklin unit, the Red Cloud unit, the Superior (Courtland) unit, the Republic unit, the Scandia unit, Kirwin unit, the Webster unit, the Glen Elder unit, the Wilson unit, the Cedar Bluffs unit, and the Kanopolis unit.

New lands which would be irrigated in Nebraska and Kansas under these projects would include some 1,284,000 acres, with 21,804 acres receiving supplemental water.

Proposed reservoirs for irrigation and other purposes serving these units include the Pioneer, Bonny, Wray, Culbertson, Harvey, Norton, Harlan County, Medicine Creek, Kirwin, Webster, Glen Elder, Wilson, Cedar Bluffs, Kanopolis, Plum Creek, Boelus, Davis, Dismal, Erickson, and Loretta Reservoirs, with an aggregate capacity about equal to that of all of the present reservoirs in the Platte River watershed. This proposed program is for Nebraska and Kansas, but it is easily seen that Nebraska would reap much the greatest advantage if all these projects were constructed. By the time we add the acreage in the Niobrara Basin for which the Bureau cannot yet give us a figure, the program really assumes proportions which are not easily grasped. Let's just go over the Bureau's proposed programs for Nebraska to see how it sounds. I get a great deal of satisfaction out of just repeating these:

There is the Mirage Flats project on the Niobrara River, which was under construction before the war began, but was stopped by order of the War Production Board in December 1942. Clearance from the W. P. B. to resume construction was obtained in February 1944. The project will irrigate an additional 12,000 acres, through use of an earth dam and canals. It is costing $557,000.

There is the Frenchman-Cambridge project on the Republican River, both for irrigation and flood control, which will put 36,000 acres under irrigation by means of two earth dams and several canals. It would cost $9,678,000, and when completed will remove the frequent flooding by Medicine Creek and the lesser flooding by Frenchman Creek.

There are the five well pumping units on the Republican River, which would put 23,500 more acres under irrigation and furnish 9,000 acres with supplemental water, by means of wells, pumping, and canals. This would cost $1,147,000.

There is the Bostwick project on the Republican River, for irrigation, flood control, and electric power, which will put 25,170 acres of new land under irrigation, with the use of an earth dam and canals. This project would include a power plant, with a firm power capacity of 1,000 kilowatts. It would cost $30,188,000, including the Harlan County reservoir.

Miscellaneous projects listed by the Bureau of Reclamation for Nebraska would cost about $2,500,000.

Out of the total irrigable acreage of 1,284,000 acres yet to be developed, the Bureau of Reclamation proposes to fully prepare in 1946 for starting construction on projects totaling 170,000 acres, to which water would be carried for the first time and to 20,000 acres for which supplementary water is sought. These latter projects, not including the Harlan County reservoir, are estimated to cost $33,380,000, which is less than we have been spending on one day of waging war in the past 3 years; in fact, it is about what we are spending for 3 hours of war! No estimate has been released to date on the total cost involved of all projects proposed. But I do know that the development of flood control and irrigation facilities in the Republican River Basin alone will cost from $100,000,000 to $125,000,000, depending upon the post-war costs of labor and material. It would not surprise me if all projects awaiting the attention of your organization would exceed one-third of a billion dollars.

The flood control bill recently passed by Congress approved the Bureau and Army plans in the Republican Basin and specifically authorized construction of the North Republican, Frenchman, Cambridge, Bostwick and Well Pumping projects. The United States Engineer Corps had previously testified before congressional committees that they had authority under former flood control bills to construct up to five reservoirs upstream on that river, in addition to the Harlan County dam, which would be the key structure in the flood-control plans for that dangerous stream. But this bill made their authorization statutory. The United States engineers are now engaged in a review of their former studies of the Kansas and Republican Rivers, a report of which is to be released April 1, 1945. It should be emphasized, however, that the folks along the Republican have been working diligently for 4 years, and it is only natural that more of their program has been ready for congressional authorization. The Bureau of Reclamation in the last month has established a general office at Lincoln and a branch office at Grand Island to speed up Nebraska work and particularly the work in the Platte River and Loup River Basins.

One of the important bills which failed of enactment due to a legislative snarl in the Seventy-eighth Congress, just ended, was the important rivers and harbors bill, which included authorizations for work on the Missouri River. This omnibus bill, containing projects scattered throughout the country, died through failure to secure agreement on the size of irrigation tracts to be included in the Central Valley project in California. I hope the bill will be revived early in this session. I do urge you people to study carefully the 160-acre limitations, for I am confident that it might prove a hardship in many instances in Nebraska.

I have no hesitancy in saying now that I am in favor not only of all of these projects, but of any others that are proven feasible, and are shown to be for the welfare of the people of Nebraska, or the people of other States whose interests in particular cases do not conflict with our interests too greatly. This program, nationally, means much to America. This program in Nebraska in the post-war years means millions of dollars in new pay rolls; it means humming factories in this and adjoining States; it means more money for our farmers; it means that this whole, vibrant, grand America of ours is going forward; it means we are building a better America for a better world.

Since the beginning of irrigation in this country, some 21,000,000 acres have been irrigated both by public agencies and private individuals. The Bureau of Reclamation has completed more than 50 irrigation systems serving more than 4,000,000 acres of these productive farming lands in 15 Western States. The Bureau right now is working on projects in Oklahoma and Kansas—the sixteenth and seventeenth States, respectively, in which it has carried on its activities.

As we all know, reclamation projects many times are multiple-purpose—for irrigation, for flood control, for silt control and for generating electric power. More than 2,000,000 kilowatts of power are generated from plants on 14 projects of the Bureau of Reclamation, which this year will produce more than 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy. The greater part of this power is now used in war industries. But in the post-war years, this power will be an important factor in the development of our whole West. In addition to its industrial uses, I hope much of such power as might be generated on Nebraska streams might find an outlet in the lighting and equipping of our farm homes. There is no question but that the expansion of the rural electrification program wherever population density makes it practical, will do much toward making our farm homes safe, sanitary, and more productive, as well as more pleasant. Through the extension of rural electrification, and through development and use of our water resources, Nebraska's population can show a tremendous growth. Scottsbluff County was number 21 when our present method of designation of county auto license numbers was established some years ago. Today if we were amending the numbers to correspond with current populations, Scottsbluff County's number would be 3 instead of 21. This great growth and development is due entirely to irrigation. It is common knowledge that for each additional farm resident, there is an increase of two town or city residents. The development of our irrigable acres would mean perhaps an additional 100,000 farm residents and an increase of about 300,000 for the State of Nebraska.

We are indeed fortunate at this meeting to have with us representatives both of the Bureau of Reclamation and of the Army engineers. I hope that my friends with the Bureau of Reclamation will not think I am trying to unduly compliment their military friends when I point out that for 150 years now, the Army engineers have been working on rivers and harbors. They have been going upstream all the time, taking in more and more territory as our country became more and more developed, and as there were expanding uses of the rivers and canals for navigation by huge basic industries.

In 1902, at the insistence of the President, Theodore Roosevelt, the first act providing for irrigation of our millions of arid acres was passed. Since that time, 43 years ago, the Bureau of Reclamation has been working in the upstream areas. As time has passed and as the need has increased, this great Government organization has been going downstream. Now, the two have met. There we have the crux of the reasons for the so-called battle between the navigationists and the irrigationists. There you have the reasons why the O'Mahoney-Milliken amendment was necessary. There you have the basis of the supposed conflict between the two agencies.

But I do not think that that conflict is going on and on. I do not believe that it is necessary that that conflict continue. I believe that both the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation can work together for the good of the whole country, from both an administrative and an engineering standpoint.

I might add that I do not think that another superagency, put above both of these long-time agencies, would resolve any conflicts, however much you might think so by reading certain newspaper columnists and hearing certain radio commentators. In this connection I want to pay tribute to the work of that great American, the great Nebraskan, George W. Norris, whose recent death saddened all of us. It was his great fight for the Tennessee Valley Authority—and resultant wartime success of that agency—that makes the Missouri Valley Authority a political talking point today. Yet the two ideas are not at all the same. The factors that brought them up are not at all the same. The situations are not the same. The net result would not be the same.

T. V. A. was conceived for an admittedly backward region, a region exploited by many private power companies; a region filled with poverty and economic distress; a region containing already a great Government project, Muscle Shoals, which was lying idle. None of these conditions fit the Missouri Valley today. The Missouri River Basin is not poverty-stricken. Its people do not live in log cabins. Its electric rates, by and large, are not exorbitant, and its capital is not being drained to giant corporations with watered stock in New York. Nebraska power development and distribution systems are rapidly nearing complete public ownership. The Missouri River Basin did not just learn the other day that rivers cause floods and that floods can be prevented. We of this basin have been cognizant of these facts for many years and, with the aid of the Bureau and the Army engineers, are defeating the ravages of nature by harnessing the power of our water to make it work for our purposes.

We have watched the Army engineers work efficiently and we have watched the Bureau of Reclamation work efficiently. Those two groups, working with and coordinating their programs with the United States Department of Agriculture, can and will make of the Missouri, or any other western watershed, a safe, productive, and stable farm and business area. These agencies, together with the Department of Agriculture and our State University, can solve our agricultural and land-use problems. We know that these agencies, through a combined experience of more than 200 years in being, have attained a know-how that no other super-agency could attain in a few months under three lame-duck Congressmen who might be appointed to head it. We have seen how political management can be put in control of the disposal of over 100 billion dollars of surplus property, how political management can seep into any Government agency that is created these days, and we have no hankering for any political management in the Missouri Basin.

This is not to say that I am opposed to a Missouri Valley Authority for all time. There may be a time in the future, far or near, when the need for such an agency will become apparent. If so, I assure you, and I assure everyone who has the slightest interest, that I will fight for it. I have an open mind on the subject, but at this time I simply cannot see the need for such a superagency. The work is being done and is being done well by existing agencies. I see no reason for Nebraska farmers to start growing cotton just because it is grown successfully in Tennesse, and I see no reason for Nebraskans to get excited about a valley authority just because one down South happens to be enjoying popular favor at the moment. Let us wait and see. Meantime, let us build with what we have, let us carry out and enlarge the program at hand, and retain a better measure of independence. Character does not thrive on paternalism.

I want to pay tribute to your president, Edwin Van Horne, and to your other officers, who are generously giving of their time and efforts to get this program started. I want to congratulate Harry Strunk who has been the sparkplug in the Republican Valley Conservation Association, and now joins you to help in this even larger assignment. I am sure that you can count on Governor Griswold, Wardner Scott, Dan Jones, and other State officials, to assist you at every turn. I can promise you that the entire Nebraska delegation in Congress will stand ever ready to do their share when your programs reach the point that they are ready for congressional consideration. Problems involving water conservation and irrigation will always have a high priority on the time and attention of all of us in Washington. Nebraska is the only one of the 17 western States not now a member of the National Reclamation Association and I assume you will want to associate yourselves with this very effective group whose interests and objectives are wholly like your own.

You're going to enjoy your work in this association. You'll have a great satisfaction in worth-while achievement. But it won't be easy. And it isn't a job for a thin-skinned man. Ahead of you lies the task of arbitrating some of the knottiest problems which will face Nebraska in the next decade. Our State water code is far from complete. It will have to be rounded out, and finished off. Frankly, if you don't do your job, we in Congress will be almost helpless. It will be quickly apparent to you that if advocates of two different programs on the same stream, or in the same basin, appear before us, we will be helpless to judge the merits of the two cases. You men in this association will have to compose the sectional differences, the little conflicts which will arise, precisely as the Army and the Bureau had to compose their differences. Then when your spokesmen appear before us, we will know that they speak for the majority, and are advocating a single program which has been deliberated upon. And we can go down the line with them on everything they seek.

Sometimes when I get a glimpse of the Missouri River, among the largest in the United States, and its tributaries, I think of all the potentialities there are in the water that rolls on and on. I think of the cities and towns that it passes; of the goods that are carried over it; of the homes that are nourished by its irrigation, and lighted by its flowing power. At such times, my heart leaps up to the great potentialities of our

great America. America is not finished. It need never be finished. We in this association, we in Nebraska, we in America, must lift up our eyes to the hills from whence cometh our water and our strength. We must catch a new vision of a growing, expanding, building America. We can have that America. We can build on this continent the mightiest civilization ever known to man. And in so doing, we can help to build a better world.

National Service Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Do We Fight With One Hand Tied, or With Everything We Have?" written by the distinguished, able, and competent Under Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson. The article was published in the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO WE FIGHT WITH ONE HAND TIED, OR WITH EVERYTHING WE HAVE?

(By Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War)

I believe it is time for the people of America to come to a decision about themselves and about their country.

It is a decision which is not easy to make, nor can it be made casually, because it involves the lives of every one of us, the rights of every one of us, and the fundamental decency of every one of us.

I believe it is time to decide whether we are going to fight the war with one hand tied behind our backs, or whether, by adopting a national service law, we are going to fight the war with everything we have.

TWO IN TWENTY-FOUR

Suppose, for example, that 24 Americans gathered in your home tonight. And that these 24 people represented the entire Nation. Only 2 would be in uniform. Those two would be the only ones required by the Government, under present laws to take part in the war effort. So long as that situation exists, we as a Nation are fighting the war with one hand tied behind our back.

In great national issues such as this, the simple realities sometimes become distorted, and everyone is bewildered by complicated statistics, involved arguments and clever catch-phrases.

Let's make it simple. Think of our Nation as a family of four or five hard-working, average people, living on a farm in Ohio. It's a summer afternoon, and everyone is busy at his own job. Cousin Ben is out in the front yard, trimming rosebushes. Suddenly, the barn catches fire, and dad calls for help to put it out. Everyone rushes to his aid—everyone, that is, except Cousin Ben. He keeps right on trimming rosebushes.

HE NEEDS COMPULSION

Now it won't do any good for Cousin Ben to help put out the fire a week from now. What we need is for him to quit trimming rosebushes and start fighting the fire, right now. And since he won't do it voluntarily, there has to be a way, for the good of the whole family, to compel him to do it.

There are millions of people who are voluntarily devoting themselves to the war effort, just as millions would volunteer for military service even if we had no selective service law.

But in modern war, volunteers are not enough, either on the battle front or on the home front. Other Nations know this. Our enemies know it. America, however, is the only one of the great powers which does not have a National Service law, or its equivalent.

MANPOWER IS WASTED

There have been charges that manpower is wasted. Every conceivable effort is made to prevent such waste, but of course it occurs. War, by its very nature, is the most colossal waste known to man. No employer, be he the head of a great corporation, or the manager of the corner grocery store, or the Government, or a farmer with two hired men, can keep every employee fully occupied every moment of every day. We just haven't become that efficient.

In this Nation's great, urgent need for manpower every case of wastage is, of course, to be deplored and corrected. But even if we eliminated all waste—and some is inevitable—we still need more war workers than we now have. The isolated cases of wastage make headlines—but headlines do not make tanks and artillery shells which are the things our fighting men need.

When the news from the fighting fronts looks good, many of us are inclined to lean back and relax, and to figure the war is just about over, and all this speed and urgency really isn't necessary. We should remember always that we are fighting powerful and resourceful Nations who, as they have demonstrated, ars fully capable of inflicting serious counterblows.

To talk about today's gains and victories is easy. To predict tomorrow's is extremely dangerous. The pipe line of supply to our forces in Europe and in the Pacific is a long one. It takes many weeks to transport all of the materials from the factory to the front. We cannot afford to gamble the lives of our men and the future of our Nation on when somebody thinks the war will be over. We have got to keep the supplies going forward, day and night, week in and week out, whether good news or bad comes over the wires. To do less would be criminal folly.

There is one great national characteristic of all Americans, whether they live in Pennsylvania, or Indiana, or Texas, or California. That characteristic is a deep-seated sense of fair play.

WAR INVOLVES ALL

Is it fair play for us to say to 12,000,000 of our sons and brothers and fathers in the armed services that "you happen to be between the age of 18 and 45, and able-bodied, and so we are sending you into combat to defend us with your lives," and at the same time to provide no legal obligations or responsibilities, so far as the war is concerned, for the 16,000,000 other American men between 18 and 45, who remain at home?

This war was declared, not in the name of those 12,000,000 who fight, and not by those 12,000,000. It was declared by and in the name of all the American people.

Is it fair to send Jim to work, and suffer, and perhaps to die in battle, and not even require Jack, who remains at home, to make the things Jim needs with which to fight, or clothe himself, or bind his wounds?

It has been argued that Government officials cannot be trusted to administer a national service law fairly and effectively. We are trusting General Marshall and Admiral King with the lives of our soldiers and sailors and marines, and certainly no one would contend that the lives of those men are any less valuable, or any less sacred, than the material comforts of those of us who remain at home.

MILLIONS ARE WORKING

It is difficult to express our urgent and pressing need for more manpower without seeming to overlook the millions of loyal, sincere men and women in civil life who are working wholeheartedly in the war effort. I have seen them in the ammunition plants, the aircraft plants—many of them working on the midnight shift—many elderly men and women—working to arm and equip their loved ones who are fighting overseas. In all kinds of weather they travel many miles from their homes to work for the winning of the war. No one can see them without being deeply touched by their devotion.

They are a great and a proud army, doing a job which is just as necessary and just as vital as are the men in uniform. Without them and their magnificent record of production there would never have been a D-day. But there aren't enough of them. There are too many who are not fighting the war at all—either on the home front or on the battle front.

TAKE A LOOK

Tomorrow morning on your way to work look around you. You will see people who are not contributing to the war in any way—who are busily engaged in activities which are well and good in peacetime but totally unnecessary in war. Wouldn't you rather have those men making guns and tanks and airplanes and battle jackets and blankets and jeeps and bomber tires—things your sons and brothers need, and need badly?

We need thousands of men in munitions factories, in aircraft, rubber, and textile factories, and we need them now. When we landed in France we committed ourselves. Our men at the front can't stop and wait for ammunition and food and gasoline. They have got to have it now, and they have got to have it a week from now, and a month from now, and 6 months from now, and every hour of every day so long as the war lasts.

A great many statistics have been cited on both sides of this great issue. The opponents of national service, in listing our manpower resources, generally neglect to include the fact that between now and June 30 the armed forces will take 900,000 more men out of civilian life and jobs. Or that we will have to fill 700,000 additional war jobs during the same period.

WE NEED MORE

But statistics, after all, don't help very much. You can't stop a Tiger tank with statistics. You can't very well go over to France and tell Jim, who's trying to blow up a German pillbox, that "here are some statistics proving that we've got all the war workers and all the war production we need." Because we haven't.

We need more.

Jim needs more.

Now.

Lend-Lease Not Responsible for Cigarette Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following communication sent me by the Honorable Leo T. Crowley, Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration, refuting the statements that the lend-lease program is responsible for the current cigarette shortage:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 22, 1944.

Hon. SOL BLOOM,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 90, part 11, page A4755, Mr. DWORSHAK raised the question of the relationship of the lend-lease program to the cigarette shortage and his comments implied that there was such a relationship.

Enclosed are some figures and comments which disprove any such contention and which I thought you might like to include in the Appendix to the RECORD for this session.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

The question has been raised by a Member of the House concerning the relationship of the current cigarette shortage to the lend-lease program. The latest figures show that not only is the shortage not attributable to the lend-lease program but that the total amount of cigarettes and unmanufactured tobacco exported, both commercially and under lend-lease, is less than the amounts which were exported in the 4 years preceding the lend-lease program.

In those 4 years, total cigarette production ranged from 169,969,000,000 to 189,371,000,000 a year. Annual exports varied between 3.3 percent to 3.7 percent of total production. Since the inception of lend-lease, total cigarette production increased from 217,935,000,000, in 1941, to 247,000,000,000 in the first 9 months of this year. Of this increased annual production, total exports, commercially and under lend-lease, ranged only from 1.1 percent to 3.5 percent and, despite the increased production, a smaller total number of cigarettes were exported than in the preceding 4 years. No cigarettes at all were lend-leased in 1941, and but a minute fraction of a tenth of 1 percent, 0.2 percent, and 1.5 percent of the cigarettes produced in 1942, 1943, and 1944, respectively, have been lend-leased.

It has been our concern, and rightly so, to see to it that American soldiers overseas should have cigarettes. To that end, for the first 9 months of this year, apart from the exports referred to above, 63,000,000,000 cigarettes, or 25.5 percent of our total production, have been shipped overseas. Similarly, the cigarettes which have been lend-leased, a total of 4,302,000,000 in 4 years, have all gone to the fighting forces of our allies. No cigarettes have been lend-leased for distribution to civilians.

The picture on exports of unmanufactured tobacco is substantially similar. Total exports, commercially and under lend-lease, are generally less than in pre-war years. Since April 1943, all of the tobacco which has been lend-leased has been lend-leased for the use of Allied armed forces.

For the information of the Members of Congress, I include two tables which give the figures on production and exports, commercially and under lend-lease, of cigarettes and unmanufactured tobacco, from and including 1936 to the end of September of this year:

Cigarette exports and production

[Millions of cigarettes]

	Exports [1]			Production	Exports in percentage of production		
	Lend-lease	Commercial	Total		Lend-lease	Commercial	Total
					Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1936		4,629	4,629	158,893		2.9	2.9
1937		5,667	5,667	169,969		3.3	3.3
1938		6,368	6,368	171,686		3.7	3.7
1939		6,761	6,761	180,667		3.7	3.7
1940		6,577	6,577	189,371		3.5	3.5
1941	0	7,569	7,569	217,935	0	3.5	3.5
1942	5	2,905	2,910	257,521	.002	1.1	1.1
1943	686	3,523	4,209	308,800	.2	1.2	1.4
1944 [2]	3,611	2,798	6,409	247,000	1.5	1.1	2.6

[1] Export figures do not include shipments to United States forces overseas. Such shipments in the first 9 months of 1944 amounted to approximately 63,000,000,000.
[2] January to September.

No cigarettes have been lend-leased for distribution to civilians.

Tobacco exports and production

(Unmanufactured tobacco).

[Millions of pounds]

	Exports			Production [1]	Exports in percentage of production		
	Lend-lease	Commercial	Total		Lend-lease	Commercial	Total
					Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1936		425	425	1,155		37	37
1937		435	435	1,563		28	28
1938		489	489	1,376		36	36
1939		358	358	1,874		19	19
1940		236	236	1,462		16	16
1941	90	180	270	1,262	7	14	21
1942	183	56	239	1,409	13	4	17
1943	233	162	395	1,400	16	12	28
1944 [2]	51	134	185	1,356	4	10	14

[1] Production figures are on a farm-sales-weight basis, whereas export figures are on a declared-weight basis.
[2] January to September. Production is three-fourths of the total 1944 production.

No tobacco is currently being lend-leased for civilian use.

Opposition to St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a resolution adopted by the New York State Retail Solid Fuel Merchants Association with offices at Albany, N. Y. The subject of the resolution is in opposition to the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project.

NEW YORK STATE RETAIL SOLID FUEL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Albany, N. Y., January 27, 1945.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: The officers and directors of the New York State Retail Solid Fuel Merchants Association, Inc., at a meeting held at the Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse, N. Y., on Wednesday, January 24, 1945, representing 1,012 retail coal merchants selling over 85 percent of New York State's solid fuel tonnage, hereby record their earnest opposition to the construction of the said St. Lawrence waterway and power project.

Whereas agitation for congressional ratification of the United States-Canadian agreement for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway and prower project has again been revived; and

Whereas legislation intended to accomplish such ratification is now pending before the United States Congress; and

Whereas the construction of a deep water canal in the International Rapids of the St. Lawrence River and the deepening of connecting channels of the Great Lakes system in the United States would open the ports of the Great Lakes to invasion by foreign shipping; and

Whereas the proposed depths of the waterway are insufficient to permit profitable operation of the American Merchant Marine on such waterway as a result of which international commerce, which would otherwise be transported by American flag vessels, will be diverted to foreign tramp ships; and

Whereas such diversion of traffic to foreign flag tramp vessels with their relatively low-paid crews and substandard working conditions will exclude American flag vessels from such service; and

Whereas the diversion of such international commerce from existing Atlantic and Gulf ports will greatly injure such ports; and

Whereas such diversion to said foreign-flag tramp steamers will deprive American railroads of tonnage now moving between the Great Lakes area and the Atlantic and Gulf ports, greatly to the loss and detriment of said railroads; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence River will be closed during approximately 5 months of the year due to freezing, thus requiring the railroads to maintain equipment and facilities for the movement of transportation during said approximate 5 months' period which would not otherwise be required, thus imposing an unnecessary and undue burden on said railroads; and

Whereas the construction of said project will facilitate the importation of cheaply manufactured foreign products to be sold in competition with American-manufactured products; and

Whereas the construction of such waterway will undoubtedly result in the importation of foreign anthracite and bituminous coals mined by low-paid foreign labor and transported to the United States at rates prevailing for ballast, all of which will injuriously affect the coal industry and its employees; and

Whereas the enormous cost of said project is not warranted in the light of the minor benefits, if any, which may accrue to limited sections of the country as against the damage and injury to American industry and commerce and American labor: Be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the meeting of the directors of this association and that copies thereof be sent to the Governor of the State of New York, the Lieutenant Governor, and all members of the New York State Senate, to the speaker and members of the New York State Assembly, and to United States Senators and Members of Congress from New York.

Yours very truly,

C. B. NELLIS,
Executive Secretary.

Farm Machinery and Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following communication and release which I have received from the Honorable Leo T. Crowley, Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration, which clears up several misunderstandings about the lend-lease program which I feel should be brought to the attention of the Members of the House.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington D. C., December 30, 1944.

Hon. SOL BLOOM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLOOM: Speaking on the floor of the House on Friday, December 1, Representative A. L. MILLER submitted a report on his trip to England in the course of which he discussed phases of lend-lease operations. Several statements which were made should, I believe, be replied to, in order to keep the lend-lease record clear.

For example, Mr. MILLER said that he had visited a place about 60 miles north of London where there were "at least a square mile of American-made farm machinery, new tractors, plows, harrows, and disks packed close together." This material he indicated, had been sent from the United States under lend-lease, and he quoted a colonel who accompanied him as saying that: "This type of lend-lease should have stopped long ago." He added that he presumed that equipment "was on order and someone felt it necessary to complete the order."

Actually, the place visited by Mr. MILLER was a depot where a type of American tractor with ancillary equipment was stored preparatory to shipment to France to build military roads or assignment on war projects in England such as the clearance of ground for air bases. Normally there are about 200 crawlers at this depot awaiting shipment and at certain times before and after the invasion of France there had been as many as 500 or 600. They are continually moving either to the battle lines or to war tasks behind the lines, assigned them by the Combined Munitions Assignment Board acting for the Combined Chiefs of Staff. There may possibly be a dozen pieces of agricultural equipment among these. But, the overwhelming bulk of the equipment which Mr. MILLER saw and which can so readily be mistaken as machinery for agricultural use was equipment required for military operations.

I would like to emphasize that shipment of equipment to England as lend-lease is recommended by the accredited representatives of the United States Government, including some of the highest ranking American officers, stationed in England who are constantly in touch with the war situation and who recommend only when they are convinced this equipment will serve best in the winning of the war. The lend-lease equipment present at the depot at the time of Mr. MILLER'S visit, had been sent there pursuant to such recommendations.

Mr. MILLER, following his discussion of this equipment, which he mistakenly believed to be agricultural machinery, says that England has increased her domestic production of food from 35 percent to 75 percent of her need. He adds that this has been accomplished through lend-lease of farm machinery and that, "It is very evident now, however, that this type of lend-lease should be stopped."

England produced about 40 percent of her domestic consumption before the war and now produces about 70 percent. The United States supplies about 10 percent of Britain's food needs, and we have sent her some equipment and fertilizer and seed which, of course, have helped make possible the increase in her domestic production. However, we have sent to all of our allies no more than 2 percent of the total farm machinery manufactured in the United States. Certainly, the crisis in food in England has not passed. The British are still living on an extremely strict diet. Of the total of lend-lease exports to the United Kingdom from the inception of the lend-lease program in March 1941 through October 1944, 26.8 percent consisted of foodstuffs and agricultural products. In the first year of lend-lease, food was the largest single item of lend-lease aid sent by this country to the United Kingdom. At one time the British had been reduced to a 7-day supply of food. That the situation remains critical, however, is indicated by the fact that in the first 10 months of the current year, 1944, 18.4 percent of our lend-lease exports to the United Kingdom was still foodstuffs and other agricultural products.

It would seem obvious, therefore, in view of the fact that our lend-lease exports to Britain are determined after the closest possible study of conditions within that country by our representatives on the scene, and after conference with Government agencies in this country such as the War Production Board which are responsible for the maintenance of our domestic economy, that lend-lease supplies are sent abroad to our allies in accordance with the intent of the Lend-Lease Act to strengthen the defense of the United States by strengthening the defense of our allies without crippling our domestic economy.

Discussing the recent report of the President to the Congress on the operation of reverse lend-lease, Mr. MILLER, after citing that phase of the report dealing with transportation of American troops to England in British ships, said that the President "did not state how much money the War Department or some agency was paying in addition for the transportation of these troops." He indicated a desire to ask someone "representing the administration" the following question: "What, if anything, is it costing this country when troops are transported to England on English ships? Is this a part of lend-lease; if not, why not?"

In the seventeenth report to Congress on lend-lease operations it is pointed out that approximately one-third of all the supplies and equipment currently required by our armed forces in the European theater of operations between June 1, 1942, and June 30, 1944, was supplied by the British as reverse lend-lease aid, without payment by us. The British supplied us with everything we needed that they were able to produce in sufficient quantities. This includes transportation on British ships for which the United States does not pay anything. Our men have been and are being carried in British ships as a phase of reverse lend-lease.

In his remarks Mr. Miller used a quotation which he attributed to a statement issued by Secretary of State Stettinius, Secretary Morgenthau, and myself, as a special committee of the Government on lend-lease and reverse lend-lease discussions with the British. The quotation was as follows:

"Lend-lease aid to the United Kingdom will be liberalized following the defeat of Germany to include materials for improving British living conditions."

This sentence did not appear in our statement, as an examination of a copy of the statement, which I am enclosing, and which was issued to the press on November 30, 1944, will disclose. In the statement we reaffirm the frequently repeated statement of lend-lease policy to the effect that—

"From the beginning of the lend-lease program in March 1941 lend-lease aid has been extended for one purpose, and for one purpose only, the defense of the United States and to enable our allies to bring the full weight of their men and resources to bear against our common enemies."

We add—

"That policy will be continued without change."

The only paragraphs in our statement which would seem to have any kinship with that of Mr. Miller were the following:

"After the defeat of Germany the United Kingdom and the United States will both use all the fighting power that is required for the earliest possible defeat of Japan. It is likely, however, that both the United Kingdom and the United States will be able to reconvert part of their resources on an equitable basis to meet essential civilian needs in the period between the defeat of Germany and the defeat of Japan. As a result of such a partial and equitable reconversion there will be some improvement in the conditions of life of the British people. For 6 years, first standing alone against the enemy and later fighting alongside our own forces on battlefields, on seas and in the sky all over the world, they have endured privation in diet, had their houses destroyed about them and have been sent to distant parts of the country to work wherever the needs of war called them. After the defeat of Germany, it is necessary that their inadequate diet be improved, temporary emergency housing be provided, and such other measures adopted as may relieve in some degree their present extremely difficult circumstances.

"This committee believes that a program which will help in achieving this objective is a matter of necessity for the most effective prosecution of the war against Japan, and that it expresses in some measure the common bond which has carried our countries through the hard days of the war to approaching victory."

However, these paragraphs only state once more that we intend to maintain lend-lease in its traditional role, as an arm of our allies' and our own defense in the fighting of this war.

I have gone to some length in setting the record straight on the lend-lease picture because I am anxious that we shall not appear to be breaking faith with the men who are giving more than matériel to this struggle. I believe in justice to them, and to their parents and friends also, that we should not permit mistaken impressions which would indicate that we on the home front are not doing everything possible to protect their interests to be freely circulated.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator; Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury; and Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Acting Secretary of State, acting as a special committee of the Government on lend-lease and reverse lend-lease discussions with the British following up the Quebec Conference, today made the following statement:

"Throughout the war the lend-lease and reverse lend-lease requirements of the United Nations have been reviewed from time to time in the light of the military strategy for the war against Germany and Japan.

"Such a review has been carried out in discussions now concluded between the appropriate military, naval, air, and civilian representatives of the United States and United Kingdom Governments. These discussions concerned the lend-lease and reverse lend-lease aid required to enable the carrying out of the strategic decisions made at Quebec for winning victory over both Germany and Japan at the earliest possible moment.

"The programs of lend-lease and reverse lend-lease aid should be continued in accordance with the fundamental principle laid down by the President that: 'Until the unconditional surrender of both Japan and Germany, we should continue the lend-lease program on whatever scale is necessary to make the combined striking power of all the United Nations against our enemies as overwhelming and as effective as we can make it.'

"The amounts and types of supplies required continue to be subject, as always, to adjustment from time to time in accordance with the changinig conditions of the war. When finished munitions are produced and available for delivery, they are assigned by the Munitions Assignments Board under directives of the combined Chiefs of Staff in the light of the strategic considerations prevailing at the time of the assignment. Similar procedures are and will continue to be in effect for other war supplies that each country may make available to the other.

"From the beginning of the lend-lease program in March 1941, lend-lease aid has been extended for one purpose—and for one purpose only—the defense of the United States and to enable our allies to bring the full weight of their men and resources to bear against our common enemies. That policy will be continued without change.

"Since lend-lease aid is made available to our allies only when it contributes directly to the winning of the war, lend-lease articles have from the beginning not been available for reexport commercially. That policy will also be continued without change. There will be no change in the principle as laid down by the Government of the United Kingdom and in its white paper of September 1941 that no articles received under lend-lease from the United States shall be exported commercially.

"After the defeat of Germany, there will be no impediment to the United Kingdom's exporting articles, so far as war conditions permit, which are no longer supplied under lend-lease and are obtained out of their own production or purchased from this country for cash.

"To some degree lend-lease aid for the United Kingdom will be reduced even before the defeat of Germany. It is now expected that some raw and semifabricated materials—such as iron and steel—will no longer be provided by the United States to the United Kingdom under lend-lease after January 1, 1945. This will have the effect, under the terms of the white paper itself, of removing products made from such materials from limitations that will continue to apply to articles received under lend-lease. Such materials no longer obtained under lend-lease will, of course, be available to the United Kingdom in commercial exports only after the overriding considerations of war supply and war shipping are met.

"The committee understands that, as in the past, the United States and the United Kingdom will both endeavor to insure, to the extent practicable, that neither United States nor United Kingdom exporters receive undue competitive advantage over the other as a result of the war situation.

"It appeared in the discussions that in the period immediately following the defeat of Germany, the British need for lend-lease assistance would be not much more than one-half of that currently furnished in 1944.

"After the defeat of Germany the United Kingdom and the United States will both use all the fighting power that is required for the earliest possible defeat of Japan. It is likely, however, that both the United Kingdom and the United States will be able to reconvert part of their resources on an equitable basis to meet essential civilian needs in the period between the defeat of Germany and the defeat of Japan. As a result of such a partial and equitable reconversion there will be some improvement in the conditions of life of the British people. For 6 years, first standing alone against the enemy and later fighting alongside our own forces on battlefields, on seas, and in the sky all over the world, they have endured privation in diet, had their houses destroyed about them, and have been sent to distant parts of the country to work wherever the needs of war called them. After the defeat of Germany, it is necessary that their inadequate diet be improved, temporary emergency housing be provided, and such other measures adopted as may relieve in some degree their present extremely difficult circumstances.

"This committee believes that a program which will help in achieving this objective is a matter of necessity for the most effective prosecution of the war against Japan, and that it expresses in some measure the common bond which has carried our countries through the hard days of the war to approaching victory.

"Since lend-lease and reverse lend-lease are concerned solely with war supply, problems of post-war foreign trade throughout the world did not enter into the review of these programs. Economic and financial cooperation by all the United Nations in many different forms will be required to meet these separate post-war problems. Effective measures in this field will require both international and national action by the respective governments, including in many cases, legislative action."

Nonessential Travel

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the membership of the House a directive issued by Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion James F. Byrnes, appealing for curtailment of nonessential travel; particularly for a cessation of group meetings, such as conventions and trade shows not necessary to the war effort.

I want to commend the civic, patriotic, fraternal, and trade associations of the Nation. They respected his request. However, I was amazed when I read an article in the San Antonio Express, which was forwarded to me, which states, and I quote:

A program of continental interest and importance will bring 1,500 farm representatives from the rural electric cooperatives of 45 States to San Antonio for the third annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at the municipal auditorium on January 16 and 17.

This convention was a direct contradiction and utter disregard for the Byrnes directive. How can we expect the American people to respect War Mobilizer Byrnes' directives if those associated with the Government show an utter disregard for his request and proceed to hold a meeting of 1,500 representatives from 45 States? He states in the directive that a committee composed of representatives of the War and Navy Departments, the War Production Board, and the War Manpower Commission would pass on applications for the holding of group meetings which are attended by more than 50 persons to determine if the need for these meetings is sufficiently in the war interests to warrant the tax on transportation and service. I wonder if Government permission was secured for this meeting?

It seems as though Government employees pay little attention and care less as far as directives are concerned. The civilian Government agencies are the worst violators of this directive. How can we expect the American people to cooperate when the Government itself pays no attention to these matters that they say are necessary to the war effort?

It is about time the employees of Government agencies cut out unnecessary conventions and travel during the war period, and this goes for individuals as well as groups.

Mr. Byrnes' directive follows:

Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion James F. Byrnes appealed today for a curtailment of nonessential travel and particularly for a cessation of group meetings, such as conventions and trade shows not necessary in the war effort.

This action was taken with approval of the President who has told Mr. Byrnes that even the invitations to the inaugural ceremonies on January 20 are being restricted as never before because of demands the war has brought about, particularly on transportation and housing. The great majority of the invitations to be issued, it was said, therefore, will go to Members of Congress, officials of our Government, and others who already are in Washington—who need no transportation and have their housing accommodations.

Justice Byrnes pointed out that in 1942 after Pearl Harbor, American associations voluntarily canceled many conventions and trade shows. However, during the past year, the optimism which led so many of us to believe that victory was at hand, also led to a substantial increase in the holding of conventions and post-war trade shows.

"This has added a substantial load to our already overtaxed transportation and hotel facilities, with an increasing demand for additional manpower," he said.

"I am advised that our railroads have 38,872 coaches and other passenger units now as compared with 53,941 in 1918. Our organized military movements alone in 18 months of this war have required the transportation of 16,000,000 persons as compared with 6,500,000 in a corresponding period during World War No. 1.

"We have about the same number of coaches and only a limited number more Pullmans now than we had in 1939. The military are using 10 to 15 percent of the coaches and almost half of the Pullmans. In the face of this, revenue passenger-miles have increased from 22,600,000 in 1939, 29,000,000 in 1941, and 53,600,000 in 1942, to an estimated 96,000,000 in 1944.

"Similarly, our hotels are crowded to the extent that persons traveling on important war assignments, and our servicemen find it difficult and sometimes impossible to obtain accommodations."

Mr. Byrnes added that he recognized that some meetings were desirable in the best interests of the war. However, it was his belief that these could be much fewer in number and much smaller in attendance than at present.

Justice Byrnes announced that, with the approval of the President, Director J. M. Johnson, of the Office of Defense Transportation, had been asked to head a committee to be composed of representatives of the War and Navy Departments, the War Production Board, and the War Manpower Commission to receive and pass upon applications for the holding of group meetings which are to be attended by more than 50 persons to determine if the need for these meetings is sufficiently in the war interest to warrant the tax on transportation and services.

He stated that it is expected that this committee will act not only on requests from the public, but also on requests from the civilian government agencies.

Justice Byrnes requests that all conventions to be attended by more than 50 persons and scheduled to be held after February 1, 1945, be canceled unless approved by this committee as necessary in the war effort. He expressed the hope that group meetings of less than 50 be held to a minimum. He requested that all post-war trade shows be canceled. He particularly appealed to hotel management to decline reservations for unapproved group meetings and trade shows.

Justice Byrnes said that he was so certain that his appeal would receive immediate public support and general cooperation that he has taken no measures to determine Government enforcement procedures which might be instituted.

He also stated that he was writing the heads of all Government agencies to ask them to institute procedures to examine all travel of Government employees with a view to reducing such travel to the minimum consistent with their responsibilities.

He urges the general public to defer nonessential trips.

Four Slices of Bread for the People of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a letter which I have addressed to the Secretary of War, the Honorable Henry L. Stimson. This letter is written in an effort to obtain for the people of liberated Italy 300 grams of bread a day which represent four slices of bread:

JANUARY 26, 1945.

HON. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary, Department of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the month of October 1944 the President, by letter, directed that the bread rations for the people of liberated Italy be raised to 300 grams per day.

1. Is the food available?
2. Are shipping facilities available?
3. If food and shipping are available why hasn't the President's directive been carried out?
4. Who blocked the President's order?

In the light of the suffering of the people of liberated Italy an early reply will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

VITO MARCANTONIO.

Law Question Raised in Naming of Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence in the Washington Star:

LAW QUESTION RAISED IN NAMING OF WALLACE—OBSERVER CITES ACT OF CONGRESS BANNING POLITICAL JOB REWARDS

(By David Lawrence)

Did President Roosevelt disregard a law of Congress forbidding political rewards when he sent to the Senate the nomination of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and Federal loan administrator?

The statute referred to became law on August 2, 1939, when it was signed by President Roosevelt. Section 3 reads as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible in whole or in part by any act of Congress, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election."

This is what President Roosevelt wrote in his letter of January 20, 1945, to Jesse Jones:

"Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued.

"He has told me that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, for which he is fully suited, and I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the new administration."

REWARD FOR ACTIVITY

The foregoing reveals that the office of Secretary of Commerce, which was created by act of Congress, was bestowed on Henry Wallace as a reward for political activity. Neither the President nor the Vice President are exempted from the provisions of the section in question.

If it is unlawful for a President or any other Federal official to give a public office as a political reward, is it lawful for the United States Senate to confirm a man who receives the reward? This is a question which bears on the spirit, if not the letter, of those statutes which have long been looked upon as a means of keeping Government free from pernicious influences. Offenses under not only the Federal Corrupt Practices Act but the Hatch Act are subject to fine and imprisonment if convictions are obtained.

There is nothing in the law which limits the making of the promise to any action taken or promise made during a campaign. The bestowal of a reward after the campaign is apparently as much banned as a promise. For the statute speaks of "reward for any political activity" and this logically could not materialize until after the service is rendered and a campaign concluded and the victor is in a position to award his plums to those who have helped him win.

INTIMATION IN WIRE

There has been some intimation that, even during the campaign—in fact, shortly after the convention was held which nominated Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term but rejected the renomination of Mr. Wallace for Vice President—a telegram was allegedly sent by Mr. Roosevelt to Mr. Wallace bearing on the subject of a promise of future office.

William K. Hutchinson, head of the International News Service in Washington, in a dispatch on Monday of this week, said that, after the unsuccessful fight made at the convention, Mr. Wallace received a telegram from Mr. Roosevelt purporting to read as follows: "Tell Mrs. Wallace not to make any move to leave Washington. There will always be a place in my household for you."

Mr. Wallace didn't bolt the ticket but went ahead to give it his active support. For several weeks there was public speculation last summer and autumn as to what post Mr. Roosevelt might have in mind for the retiring Vice President. This telegram, however, would not be persuasive except in relation to the January 20 letter. The words of the statute which bar any reward for political activity alone need to be considered in view of the fact that the President now publicly admits that he is giving a public office as a political reward to Mr. Wallace.

Food Trade Drive Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following statement by Mr. R. B. Caywood, president of the National-American Wholesale Grocers Association, on the perils of inflation, which appeared in the Journal of Commerce, January 19, 1945:

FOOD TRADE DRIVE AGAINST INFLATION

While continuance of the war food program must be the No. 1 "must" on the schedule of all in the food industry, continued vigilance against the perils of inflation on the home front must be exercised by the food distributing trades as an outstanding contribution to this program.

The fight against inflation has just started. Those of us of World War No. 1 well remember that, while the war continued, it was relatively easy for us, individually and collectively, to support the limited price control that was operative in those days.

However, with the armistice, wholesale grocers, in common with influential businessmen in all lines of production and distribution, were successful in inducing Washington to revoke the few controls existing.

INFLATION RECALLED

We sought "freedom" and "normalcy." What we got was inflation—wild inflation. Wholesale grocers soon were signing wholly unilateral contracts to which irrevocable letters of credit were attached. The retribution was quick and terrible.

To some extent our suppliers had protected themselves. Our customers in too many cases refused deliveries on contract prices or were not able to absorb the ensuing losses. The wholesale grocery industry passed through a disastrous squeeze period, and many were forced into bankruptcy—either immediately or later on as an aftermath of this condition.

Is the wholesale grocery industry going to repeat this performance or will we not be the first to demand continuation of price and ration controls until it is clearly evident that supply and demand are in a safely balanced position? We had better.

Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include the following newspaper article by George Rothwell Brown which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of January 17, 1945:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

The tragedy of today's admitted shortages in manpower and production lies largely in the fact that President Roosevelt did not warn the country in time.

Instead, the President, in his fourth-term campaign addresses, painted such a rosy picture of American armed might that the people were lulled into a sense of false security.

This led inevitably to a let-down. Unfortunate, but true.

Thus it is not to be wondered at that the revelations now being made have come as a shock to Congress, which was lulled along with the rest of us.

For reasons obviously political Democratic spellbinders in the Presidential and congressional campaigns put such emphasis upon the terms of peace that were to be inflicted upon Germany and Japan as to lead the layman to conclude that the end of the war was "just around the corner."

Now we know better. Now we are being told better, by those who should have informed us in October and November of what they are revealing to us in the New Year 1945.

It was not until about the 1st of December, a month after the election, that President Roosevelt admonished his executives to put on the soft pedal. Meanwhile the mischief had been done.

It was the President's speech at Philadelphia, on October 27, 1944, which more than anything else gave to the Nation that feeling of false security, from which it has now been rudely awakened.

At that time Field Marshal Von Rundstedt's counteroffensive had not taken place, nor had it been contemplated, and this is true also of the first week in December, when the President sounded his first warning.

Thus it is clear that it is not this counteroffensive which has caused such an alarming increase in manpower and production estimates. The warning came before that.

Said the President at Philadelphia, in one of his most optimistic orations of the fourth-term race:

"The war in Europe has reached the final, decisive phase—the attack on Germany itself."

That was a good campaign argument. And the changes were rung upon it everywhere. The main argument came down to this, that Mr. Roosevelt must be given a fourth term in order that he might preside over the peace table, very effective indeed, for the people longed for a victorious peace.

We are now being told, in January, by spokesmen of the administration, that the battles still ahead will be long and tough. The suddenly revealed recuperative powers of the German Army also have told us that.

Yet at the end of last October we were led to believe that in manpower and production everything was 100 percent perfect. Said the President:

"Never before in history have the soldiers and sailors of any nation gone into battle so thoroughly trained, so thoroughly equipped, so well fed, and so thoroughly supported as the American soldiers and sailors fighting today in Europe, Asia, and the Pacific."

The accent was on thoroughness. No hint of shortages! A little later in the same political address the President said:

"All these operations had to be planned far in advance—and that does not mean merely drawing arrows on maps. It has meant planning in terms of precisely how many men will be needed and how many ships—warships, cargo ships, landing craft—how many bombers and how many fighter planes—and how much equipment and what types of equipment down to the last cartridge."

That was Candidate Roosevelt speaking. Today we are being told by Chairman Krug and Secretary Stimson how many more cartridges we shall need, and how many more men.

The planning the President spoke of so glowingly on the stump of October does not now appear to have been "precisely" as perfect as he made out to be the case.

The Wallace Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the recent nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce has provoked widespread editorial comment. It is refreshing to note that many editors, who have consistently and ardently supported the President in the past, view with alarm the implications to be found in the President's letter to Mr. Jesse Jones.

Mr. Charles E. Broughton, editor of the Sheboygan Press, of Sheboygan, Wis., former Democratic National Committeeman from the State of Wisconsin, who has consistently and vigorously supported the administration in all of its actions, writes an editorial under date of January 25, 1945, entitled "A Sad Spectacle." It is worthy of note that even such a vigorous and consistent supporter of the New Deal cannot stomach such a plain political appointment.

Mr. William J. McHale, fearless and independent editor of the Chilton Times-Journal, describes the appointment as the political pay-off.

Mr. David Lawrence in his syndicated column appearing in many newspapers throughout the country asks the pertinent question: "Did President Roosevelt break law in giving reward?"

I am including these three editorials as part of these remarks as indicative of the thinking of the people of America on this very important question:

[From the Sheboygan Press of January 25, 1945]

A SAD SPECTACLE

When we are trying to weld together a coalition of men of all political parties with the aim of winning the war and the peace that is to follow it ill behooves the President to make an appointment that in his own words is "political," and to replace a man whom Mr. Roosevelt declares has rendered an excellent service to his Government.

We refer to the letter written by President Roosevelt to Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, retiring him from office and recommending for confirmation in his place Henry Wallace, former Vice President.

The weakness of Mr. Roosevelt's letter is found in these words:

"DEAR JESSE: This is a very difficult letter to write—first, because of our long friendship and splendid relations during all these years and also because of your splendid services to the Government and the excellent way in which you have carried out the many difficult tasks during these years.

"Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued.

"He has told me that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, for which he is fully suited, and I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the new administration.

"It is for this reason only that I am asking you to relinquish this present post for Henry, and I want to tell you that it is in no way a lack of appreciation for all that you have done, and that I hope you will continue to be a part of the Government.

"During the next few days I hope you will think about a new post—there are several ambassadorships which are vacant—or about to be vacated. I make this suggestion among many other posts, and I hope you will have a chance, if you think well of it, to speak to Ed Stettinius.

"Finally, let me tell you that you have my full confidence and that I am very proud of all that you have done during these past years."

Jesse Jones has the confidence of the business world, he is in close touch with the war situation, and to replace him with a man who has had little experience is bound to divide the United States Senate at a time when unity is so greatly needed. The letter of the President stunned the American people, for fitness was not the requisite, but

politics. The President made this clear in his own language, for he said of Mr. Jones "your splendid services to the Government and the excellent way in which you have carried out the many difficult tasks during these years."

There was no such a recommendation for Mr. Wallace, simply the statement that Mr. Wallace had asked for the post and in return for political favors, he was going to give him recognition in the new administration.

Mr. Wallace, it is true, lent his efforts to the Democrats, but there were thousands of others who acted as keymen, and it would be a rank injustice, a miscarriage of justice, to say that tried and true servants should be replaced to pay a political debt. Mr. Wallace and Mr. Jones have clashed, and the appointment will only tend to widen the breach, and it will work injury to the administration. We predict that this wound to a man, who is kicked out, will never heal, in face of the statement that he had the full confidence of Mr. Roosevelt.

Seldom have we been forced to take issue with President Roosevelt, but when a post of this importance is to be bartered off on the grounds of politics, rather than efficiency, it bodes no good for the future. Mr. Roosevelt was elected for a fourth term, based on his familiarity with the war situation and because the people felt he could best serve in rounding out a just and lasting peace. According to his own letter to Mr. Jones, there had never been anything other than "splendid relations" and "splendid services."

In private industry nothing like this would be warranted and our public servants should have the same in mind.

But to go further, Mr. Roosevelt asks Mr. Jones to make the same approach that Mr. Wallace did, and ask for an ambassadorship or some other desirable post. This is the height of unstatesmanship. We can quote the Bible, and yet would these words help: "But whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."

[From the Chilton (Wis.) Times-Journal]

THE POLITICAL PAY-OFF

We all know that a lot of unsavory things are done in the name of politics. Public jobs and honors are the currency in which political favors are paid. Usually, however, those who deal in this kind of currency try to camouflage their actions under a cloak of decency. They bide their time until the friend can get his recompense without outraging public opinion.

Not so with President Roosevelt in the payment of his political debt to former Vice President Wallace. He asks Jesse H. Jones, with whom he had a "long friendship and splendid relations," and who has "rendered splendid services to the Government," to vacate the job of Secretary of Commerce that he might reward Mr. Wallace for having displayed "the utmost devotion to our cause" in the election campaign last fall.

Thereby he set forth for the record what observant people knew for many years—that Government jobs, all the way up to a cabinet post, are on the auction block for political devotion to him.

Mr. Wallace had an ardent desire to be Mr. Roosevelt's running mate last fall. He was dumped in the ashcan, plainly and ungraciously, by his revered chief before the nominating convention got under way. Most people thought at the time that Mr. Wallace, his sense of pride wounded by the rebuff, would retire to the sidelines and let the campaign take its course. But Mr. Wallace's pride, if he had any, didn't suffer a dent. He went right out and whooped it up for the New Deal just as if he had not been kicked in the pants.

The President's wish now to make him Secretary of Commerce, and place in his hands the multibillion dollar R. F. C. lending agency, suggests that this little barter transaction may have been arranged before the campaign got under way rather than after it was over. That's the kind of grease that would soothe Mr. Wallace's wounded pride, and Mr. Roosevelt is a shrewd enough politician to have sensed it.

Anyway, Mr. Wallace's campaign meanderings are to be appropriately compensated out of the public treasury—if the Senate doesn't prove so ungracious as to upset the apple cart by divorcing the juicy R. F. C. from the Commerce Department.

If Mr. Wallace has business and financial ability, he has managed rather successfully to keep it a dark secret. To most people he is a dreamy, visionary politician whose basic wish is to keep out in front of the gang if he can manage in time to guess which way the gang is bound. The direction doesn't matter, but to be out in front does.

Mr. Wallace has Presidential ambitions and he has the powerful "pink-tinted" C. I. O. political committee behind him. What better break could he want for that ambition than to be at the head of the multibillion money-lending agency.

That great repository of the science of government, W. P. A., and lend-lease, Mr. Harry Hopkins, could give Henry some authoritative tips on that point. And it may be that Mr. Hopkins of "spend and spend and elect and elect" fame did have something to do with inducing Mr. Wallace to crawl out of the political ashcan into which he had been rather unceremoniously dropped, to give "of his utmost toward the victory which ensued."

DID PRESIDENT BREAK LAW IN GIVING REWARD?

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Did President Roosevelt disregard a law of Congress forbidding political rewards when he sent to the Senate the nomination of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator?

The statute referred to became law on August 2, 1939, when it was signed by President Roosevelt. Section 3 reads as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for, or made possible in whole or in part by any act of Congress, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election."

This is what President Roosevelt wrote in his letter of January 20, 1945, to Jesse Jones:

"Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued. He has told me that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, for which he is fully suited, and I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the new administration."

The foregoing reveals that the office of Secretary of Commerce, which was created by act of Congress, was bestowed on Henry Wallace as a reward for political activity.

Neither the President nor the Vice President is exempted from the provisions of the section in question.

If it is "unlawful" for a President or any other Federal official to give a public office as a political reward, is it lawful for the United States Senate to confirm a man, who receives the reward?

This is a question which bears on the spirit, if not the letter, of those statutes which have long been looked upon as a means of keeping government free from pernicious influences.

Offenses under not only the Federal Corrupt Practices Act but the Hatch Act are subject to fine and imprisonment if convictions are obtained.

There is nothing in the law which limits the making of the promise to any action taken or promise made during a campaign. The bestowal of a reward after the campaign is apparently as much banned as a promise. For the statute speaks of reward for any political activity and this logically could not materialize until after the service is rendered and a campaign concluded and the victor is in a position to award his plums to those who have helped him win.

There has been some intimation that, even during the campaign—in fact, shortly after the convention was held which nominated Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term but rejected the renomination of Mr. Wallace for Vice President—a telegram was allegedly sent by Mr. Roosevelt to Mr. Wallace bearing on the subject of a promise of future office.

William K. Hutchinson, head of the International News Service in Washington, in a dispatch on Monday of this week said that, after the unsuccessful fight made at the convention, Mr. Wallace received a telegram from Mr. Roosevelt purporting to read as follows:

"Tell Mrs. Wallace not to make any move to leave Washington. There will always be a place in my household for you."

Mr. Wallace didn't bolt the ticket but went ahead to give it his active support. For several weeks there was public speculation last summer and autumn as to what post Mr. Roosevelt might have in mind for the retiring Vice President. This telegram, however, would not be persuasive except in relation to the January 20 letter.

The words of the statute which bar any reward for political activity alone need to be considered in view of the fact that the President now publicly admits that he is giving a public office as a political reward to Mr. Wallace.

Clear Everything With Sidney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Times-Herald of January 24, 1945:

CLEAR EVERYTHING WITH SIDNEY

The Republicans used "clear everything with Sidney (Hillman)" as a slogan in the 1944 Presidential campaign and, while it aroused much interest and excitement, it wasn't enough to elect Dewey President.

"Clear everything with Sidney" was what President Roosevelt was reported to have told his henchmen at the Chicago convention which renominated him for a fourth term. Hillman, a capable and energetic operator, headed (and heads) the C. I. O.-Communist Political Action Committee, or P. A. C., which wanted Henry A. Wallace renominated for Vice President.

The P. A. C. was unable to cram Wallace down the craws of the conservative southern Democrats, but it was able to block nomination of those Democrats' favorite, Jimmy Byrnes. A compromise was reached in the person of Harry S. Truman, now Vice President.

Should Mr. Roosevelt move on to a better world some time in his fourth term, as could happen to any man of his age who works as hard as he does, we think Mr. Truman would make a pretty good President. He has never exhibited an ambition to have all the power in sight, and his long experience in Congress must have accustomed him to working with Congress, whereas Roosevelt likes to dominate completely. At least we can all be thankful that Wallace cannot succeed to the Presidency in the next 4 years.

However, Hillman's favorite has now bobbed up with Roosevelt's nomination to the post of Secretary of Commerce, plus controller of the numerous governmental lending agencies heading up in the R. F. C. This work has long been handled by Jesse H. Jones, a banker and businessman who does not make loans without reasonable likelihood of repayment.

The R. F. C. and its subsidiary corporations have about forty billions in resources. They can make loans from this money, or manipulate strategic materials, or build factories, or buy and sell real estate—and they do. Under Jones, these operations have been conducted in businesslike fashion. In the period of reconversion after the war these agencies will be fully as important as they are now. What it adds up to is that this job which Roosevelt and Hillman want to give to Wallace is the second biggest job in the Government.

Wallace is the man who said the war was being fought to give everybody in the world access to a quart of milk a day; also, that after the war we should knock down our $750,000,000 synthetic-rubber industry to pilot-plant size and go back to importing rubber halfway around the world. If once again some foreign power should cut us off from those rubber sources, Wallace would have us once again caught perilously short on rubber.

This is the man to whom the President, spurred by Hillman, wants to give all of Jones' Government jobs.

The furor over the Wallace nomination has pretty much obscured Mr. Roosevelt's nomination of Aubrey Williams to be Rural Electrification Administrator. Williams is an old-time leftist social-service worker, once head of the National Youth Administration, and quite a favorite of Mrs. Roosevelt's.

One important and frequent job of Rural Electrification bureaucrats is to make a shrewd estimate on whether some farmer who wants a public power line run into his place is likely to pay for the power.

Dear Aubrey has had no training in this kind of work. His ingrained love for the less fortunate part of the common people would incline him to give Government power to all who asked for it, and let the taxpayers foot the bills of those who couldn't or wouldn't pay their own bills.

Looking over these Roosevelt nominations, we feel that Mr. Roosevelt made an understatement when he said recently that he was still "a little left of center."

He is still evidently clearing important matters with Sidney—meaning he is a long way left of left of center.

His administration's ultimate objective seems to be some kind of totalitarianism for the United States—maybe fascism, maybe communism, maybe some combination of these two European systems. The technique evidently is to slide totalitarians into positions of power in the Government, detouring Congress when possible, and bulldozing it when it has to be consulted.

If we all find ourselves presently living in a totalitarian state, with our traditional American liberties destroyed, the majority of the voters in the 1944 Presidential election can look at themselves in their mirrors and say, "Well, you asked for it."

Nomination of Henry A. Wallace To Be Secretary of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Star of January 23, 1945, commenting on the nomination of Henry A. Wallace for Secretary of Commerce. The editorial is entitled "Brazen Political Pay-Off." I believe it reflects the opinion of a large majority of the people of the Middle West.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAZEN POLITICAL PAY-OFF

The action of the President in pushing aside Jesse Jones to make a place for Henry Wallace is one of the rawest political deals in the Nation's entire political history.

It is a brazen pilitical pay-off openly made as such—a pay-off not only to Wallace for his work "for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country," as the President frankly states, but a pay-off to Sidney Hillman and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee for their same work for "the success of the ticket."

And this Cabinet-post pay-off goes to a man who literally has never had a day of experience to qualify him for the responsible office to which he is named—Secretary of Commerce and administrator of more than $32,000,000,000 in authorized loans to business and for economic purposes of various kinds in this country and abroad.

The President does not even cite any Wallace qualifications for the office. He does say that the retiring Vice President is fully suited for it; but that evidently is based upon Wallace's own statement, that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce. The whole import of the President's letter demanding that Mr. Jones step out is that Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. And Henry Wallace deservies it, in the President's view, because he worked so hard "for the success of the ticket."

That's the upshot of the whole business. An experienced, capable man is kicked out so that Henry Wallace can get what he wants—as a man who not only is totally without business experience but as a man of demonstrated incompetence through his management of the Board of Economic Warfare.

The President's action not only is an affront to American industry, business, and finance which the Department of Commerce is expected to serve, but it is an affront to the American people.

The President calls for and expects national unity and support, especially in wartime. He has made such appeals on the basis of patriotism. As President he is expected to serve all the people, the Nation's interest—first—and politics second if at all in wartime.

Yet right in the midst of wartime, with urgent calls upon the Nation's manpower and all its people to do their utmost and to make all necessary sacrifices in support of the Government—the official head of the Government himself flouts every consideration of unselfishness and openly, without finesse or apology, serves purely political interests as a pay-off for work "for the success of the ticket."

It is deeply discouraging to the millions of earnest and patriotic Americans who have tried to forget politics and put the Nation and the cause of victory ahead of everything else while they sacrifice to support their Government.

This is bad enough in wartime. It will be worse in peacetime so far as the Wallace appointment is concerned. As Secretary of Commerce and authorized administrator of billions in loans, Wallace will be in a key position in the whole set-up of reconverting industry and providing millions of jobs for retired war workers and returning veterans.

In this post Jesse Jones was the only link between the administration and American industry. He had the confidence of practical men who are directing the war production job and who must direct the peacetime job. It is needless to ask how Wallace will perform in the office, with his head full of grandiose dreams and schemes for making America over. His appointment is like placing a high official of the National Association of Manufacturers at the head of the Department of Labor.

Wallace does not have and he will not be able to get the confidence of American industry which must be depended upon to plan, expand, produce, and thus provide those millions of jobs.

This appointment in the first hours of the President's fourth term leaves millions of Americans in humiliation and dismay.

Nomination of Henry A. Wallace To Be Secretary of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter signed by Benny Austin, addressed to the editor of the Washington News, and printed in the January 24, 1945, issue of that newspaper. The letter refers to the Wallace-Jones brannigan.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENNY WRITES HIMSELF A PIECE ABOUT WALLACE, JONES, AND US

You know, I like your paper. But sometimes I can't make out whether your editorials are written by some little boy who can't remember more than a couple of years back, or by some old gaffer who lives, mentally, in the McKinley era as portrayed by the late Horatio Alger.

Take this Wallace-Jones thing. You say we mustn't have Hank in there because he's an idealist and while every town needs one, it doesn't want an idealist as the town banker, because a banker should have at least one glass eye so he won't go all emotional on you and give the depositors' Christmas savings away to the first sad case he meets. I haven't your paper before me, but I think that was the gist of your editorial.

As I say—it must have been a very little boy or a very old man who wrote it, because he either never heard of, or has forgotten that little '29 crash thing.

Lots of bankers were caught with your dough and my dough. And then out town

banks tumbled, one knocking the next one down like a lot of duck pins, smashing our little nest eggs and suddenly we were stony.

That was not the doing of idealists like Hank the Happy. In charge of operations were those cold, efficient lumps of ponderosity like Jesse the Jowl. Money men. Men of substance. Men with the know-how. Farseeing business men and Great Engineers, even. Nuts!

Actually, of course, bankers are incurable romantics—about themselves. But we are not called upon to match with equal naivete their own childish faith in their own judgment, which the record shows is completely unwarranted.

In particular, if half of what TRUMAN'S committee said about Jonesey is true, he should have had the "can tied to him" long since by an irate and patriotic citizenry.

Now take the other side. Is Wallace this weird combination of political slicker and do-good? Let's see.

He ploughed under the dear little pigs and slaughtered the tall corn. Was that an act of a politico or a do-good? Hardly the latter. He did it to keep up prices. He was trying to control production, not on the basis of need, but on the basis of profit. So he suddenly seems to more nearly resemble those cartel fellers you rant against, like the tin magnates and aspirin kings, some of whose best friends, I am told, are bankers. Why, as I think of it, Henry is changing in my mind's eye, growing bigger and sloppier, and talking with a Texas drawl.

So why not a big-city editorial on the real kernel of this W-J brannigan? One that would show that this is an interesting but strictly political fight over a rather game bloke with a possibly slightly phony homespun facade, politically ambitious, definitely wedded to capitalismus, but whose liberal leanings have won him a certain support which makes him, as the result of a political pay-off, the focus of an interesting fight between two factions of the Democratic Party, one side abetted by the Republicans.

As to Hank being a political slicker, I think he is kind of slick that way. But since when should that horrify Congress and the peepul? Franklin D. is kind of slick, and so is your boy, Dewey, although he got away out of his weight and class in the recent tournament.

At any rate, please don't give us that stuff about Hank, who would have been President if Roosevelt had died, who ran the Department of Agriculture, not being able to run even a country bank; it's too corny. Try Wallace's Hy Bred, or maybe he'll mix you up something special.

BENNY AUSTIN.

National Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely editorial entitled "Forging New Chains," which appeared in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of January 22.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORGING NEW CHAINS

With the emergencies of war as the handiest excuse, Mr. Roosevelt once more is attempting to put over a national service, or labor slavery, bill.

His desire for such a law, which would place in his ambitious hands the destiny of every working man and woman in the Nation, has become with him a fixation.

He sees such a law, not primarily as a solution of any manpower problems which exist, but as a means whereby he may forge new instruments of power over the electorate.

That some manpower problems do exist cannot be wholly denied, but they are problems of maldistribution, chiefly, and these could be solved, if the President so desired, by efficient use of the manpower which is available.

Furthermore, there is absolutely nothing in the record of the New Deal administration which indicates that it could, even with a national service law, solve any of the manpower problems which have not been solved to date.

As a matter of plain fact, there is plenty of reason to believe that such legislation, administered by the hordes of bureaucrats which now infest the country, would be a means only of creating complete chaos and an actual shortage of manpower.

It is on the record that the administration has done virtually nothing to stop the continued outbreak of unauthorized strikes. It has done nothing to stop the slow-downs which are fostered by scores of unions.

It has done nothing to stop the hoarding of labor by industries which are growing financially fat under the "cost-plus" system of paying for goods. It has done nothing to see to it that factories make the most efficient use of the labor which they have.

One of the reasons the administration has failed to act in these instances is because it fears reprisal at the hands of the powerful unions.

Moreover, we are entitled to a strong suspicion that the administration has not been eager to make the most efficient use of available manpower, because if it had, it would not now have any "logical" excuse for assuming an iron dictatorship over American labor.

We are entitled to the suspicion that the reactionaries in Washington, from Mr. Roosevelt on down, may have "planned it that way."

As always, Mr. Roosevelt wants the slave labor legislation jammed through Congress in a hurry. Speed is always his watchword, when he reaches out for new powers. He wants it hurried through so quickly that Congress will not have time to examine the need for such legislation, and so will give him the power he seeks, without question.

This technique has always been used by Mr. Roosevelt, who has been able each time either to find, or to create, an emergency which whips up fear on the part of the people and the Congress, and thus puts a ready weapon into his grasp.

As always, he promises to use such power fairly, and sparingly.

And who can believe that? Mr. Roosevelt has never used any of the powers granted him "sparingly," and he has not always used them fairly.

Indeed, it has been but a few days since the Senate Judiciary Committee, one of the most important of all legislative committees, sent a report to the Senate in which it charged that the President had issued orders which had no statutory or constitutional basis; that he was attempting to rule by executive decree; and that the express intent of some laws had been misinterpreted by Mr. Roosevelt.

It goes without saying that the "misinterpretations" were not accidental.

Mr. Roosevelt has long since lost faith in the traditional American system of a representative republic.

He believes that he, and he alone, has the brains and ability to rule, and that all fundamental powers should be turned over to him, and that Congress should relegate itself to a position comparable to that of the German Reichstag, which merely puts its stamp of approval on any decree the dictator issues.

There is no need in this country for national service laws, by which American labor would be enslaved, and by which it could be shuffled about at the whims of some pay-roll stooge, and be forced to work where the stooge directed, and at whatever pay he decreed.

All that has been said, or can be said, about a national service bill can also be said of the un-American "work-where-we-tell-you" bill which has just been approved by the House Military Affairs Committee.

This proposed piece of Fascist legislation would provide a maximum fine of $10,000 or 5 years in prison, or both, for any man between 18 and 45 who refused to leave the job he is on, and take one which some Government stooge directed.

Think, if only for a minute, what such a law could mean to America.

Any critic of the administration, any political enemy, any man who didn't bow to the will of Mr. Roosevelt and his clique of power-mad bureaucrats, could be harassed throughout the rest of the war. His home could be broken up, his mind and health ruined. If he owned a business, he could be removed from its management and forced into bankruptcy.

The emergency which came into Mr. Roosevelt's hands at this propitious moment was the Allied set-back on the western front. The administration is straining to make Congress and the electorate believe that this emergency is enough to justify relinquishing one of the last of our freedoms.

It was a serious set-back. But not that serious. Nothing has happened in this war yet so serious as to justify scrapping our Constitution, and placing American labor in the chains of slavery, which would be but little better, if any, than that endured by the Negroes of pre-Civil War days.

America's last fortress, between the people of this Nation and the overriding ambitions of its Chief Executive is the Congress.

If it fails the Nation in this instance, and gives in to the will of the Nation's power-greedy leader, it may as well order itself disbanded, and go home.

American liberties will, at long last, have been dealt a mortal blow.

A Banker Who Serves as a Private

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Banker, 48, Serves as Private in Line," published in the New York Times. The banker happens to be a distinguished South Carolinian.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANKER, 48, SERVES AS PRIVATE IN LINE—EDWARD J. ARTHUR, OF UNION, S. C., WITH UNITED STATES SEVENTH ARMY—THREE BROTHERS ARE COLONELS

(By Richard J. H. Johnston)

With One Hundredth Division, United States Seventh Army, January 25.—A former

bank vice president and mayor of Union, S. C., Pvt. (1st cl.) Edward J. Arthur, serving with a quartermaster company in this division, is probably the oldest enlisted man on the Seventh Army front. This soft-spoken, graying veteran of the First World War, enlisted 2 years ago at the age of 48.

"I just wanted to get in the service and help out," he told me today. "My family are well taken care of, so I enlisted."

Private Arthur, who has three brothers who are full colonels on active duty, was for a number of years after the last war a commissioned officer in the National Guard.

"Bars and stripes carry too much responsibility," he said, explaining why he had consistently refused promotion.

CHANGES HIS OPINION

A prosperous automobile dealer in Union, he told how he changed his opinion of war after an experience on the western front in the last war as a machine-gunner with the Fifth Regiment, Second Marine Division, which fought at Champagne in the Argonne Forest and at St. Mihiel. When he returned to Union in 1919 he vowed he would permit none of his sons to get into any service.

"At that time I said," he declared, "that I would shoot him in the foot first, but later I changed my mind."

Several years later he enlisted in the National Guard and served for 12 years.

"When the war came I signed up," he explained, "to help out, and I am not leaving until the Germans are cleaned up, but," he added hastily, "I am not staying in the service any longer than I have to—I could be enjoying life at home right now."

Private Arthur, who was described by his officers as an excellent soldier, was formerly a commander of the Union American Legion Post, vice president of a bank of which he and his three brothers are part owners, and head of an automobile business.

TRAINING A LITTLE TOUGH

He said he found training at Fort Screven, Ga., and Camp Sutton, N. C., a little tough, but he underwent all the rigors of training beside the youths without too much trouble.

He has four children—Miss Arthur, a teacher in Barstow, Calif., High School; Miss Lucy, 20, who works in the offices of the Southern Railroad in Atlanta; Edward J. Arthur, Jr., a student in Union High School; and Miss Kathleen Arthur, 22, a secretary at Barstow High School.

Private Arthur's brothers in the service are Col. Joseph D. Arthur, a West Point graduate, now serving in the Engineering Office in Washington; Col. Harry M. Arthur, formerly commander of the One Hundredth Division special troops, who is now in China serving with the infantry training school; Col. John M. Arthur, chief of staff at a United States Marine Corps base in the Central Pacific.

Analysis of H. R. 1752

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

UTILIZATION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE REGISTRANTS, 18 TO 45, UNFIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE, AS WORKERS IN WAR INDUSTRIES

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have made an analysis of H. R. 1752, now under consideration. I hope this may prove of help to those members who have not had the time to attend the hearings on the bill or to read the rather voluminous record.

Having listened to all of the hearings on the above-named bill, I submit herewith an analysis of the bill and answers to some of the questions that will arise as to the need for and purpose of the bill. This is prepared to clarify my own thinking on the matter and also to give what little help I can to Members who are not members of the Military Affairs Committee and who, consequently, had no opportunity to hear the testimony on which the bill is based.

My purpose is to help avoid misunderstandings, already numerous, as to what the bill proposes to do and the means used to obtain the objective sought.

GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to mobilize the civilian workers of the Nation so as to keep production at the peak, in every requirement of the military forces. Our total war requires an uninterrupted flow of every kind of equipment and munitions to the fighting forces, now occupying nine theaters. A slow-up of one single item may slow up a drive and cause it to lose momentum, acquired at great cost of life. If the momentum had been retained, it would have hastened victory and a consequent saving of lives. Every facility—labor, management, Government, and agriculture—will be used to get the men necessary into the special type of work which is critical. The selective service, which registered the men and which deferred them, is the agency that will get the men and locate them in the right places and permit them to be changed from former essential occupations to critical occupations. This is the general procedure:

The Director of War Mobilization shall designate and certify plants and facilities, activities, and farms, and so forth, which are essential to the war effort. He may make classifications on the basis of areas, types of activity, occupations, facilities, and farms. Any registrant in work of the type certified as essential shall retain his job until his selective service board permits him to leave it.

Also, the Director of War Mobilization shall certify, after consultation with management, labor, agriculture, and Government, to the Selective Service Director the extent to which areas, plants, facilities, and farms are unable, by voluntary recruiting, to meet manpower requirements. Then the Director of Selective Service designates the categories of registrants not in essential war production and not deferred under the Tydings amendment—which is not changed—or by reason of being engaged in essential war production. That group is the one liable to perform essential war work. The men in this group who, in the judgment of the Director, can transfer to the essential work with the least disruption to the civilian economy and themselves, must respond first. Then the local selective service boards are directed by the Director to request such registrants to voluntarily become employed in essential war work, within the time set by the Director.

The local selective service boards may order those who have not responded to this request to make application for employment, in occupations certified by the Director of War Mobilization, and to accept such employment when accepted therefor. The registrant directed to obtain employment shall have a reasonable choice of employers.

To help the local selective service boards, the Director of War Mobilization may assign to such boards, in an advisory capacity, representatives of other agencies of Government.

Conscientious objectors are directed to find employment in some activity or employment in the national interest.

The time the registrant is employed in essential work—including not over 15 days' time for transfer from one to the other—is excluded from the 90-day period a veteran has to claim his former job.

The registrant entering the work provided by this act shall be accorded the rights; first, to reenter his former occupation within 90 days after leaving essential war work; second, his seniority rights in his former employment; third, a determination by the United States district court—free of legal costs or fees—that he is entitled to his former job; and fourth, help of the selective service organization in personnel problems and reinstatement in his former job.

The persons taking employment under this act in essential war work, as designated by the Director of War Mobilization, shall receive travel pay and subsistence the same as if inducted in the military service to and from the place they enter essential war work under this act.

A violation of this act shall constitute a violation of the selective service law, which the millions inducted in the military service were required to obey. An alleged violator has the defenses that the selective service board acted arbitrarily or that he had a justifiable reason for not complying with the board's order.

This act terminates with hostilities or earlier by concurrent resolution of Congress.

Persons employed under this act voluntarily or by order shall be accorded the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, freedom from suits, protection against lapse of life insurance, extension of mortgages, and so forth.

Please read the attached questions and answers, which further explain the bill and questions that will arise as to its provisions.

WHAT ARE THE MANPOWER NEEDS TO BE SATISFIED BY THIS ACT?

The testimony is that by July 1, 1945, the military forces will need 900,000 men and the production forces 700,000. Of the 900,000 for the military, it was estimated that 330,000 will have to come out of industry and the ranks of those who have been deferred.

WILL MANAGEMENT, LABOR, AND AGRICULTURE GOVERNMENT BE USED IN ADMINISTERING THIS LAW?

Yes. Page 3 of the bill provides that these agencies will be used to voluntarily recruit manpower requirements. Only after these voluntary methods fail may

the board compel a man to seek and take employment in a war industry.

WILL THIS ACT DECREASE TO A MINIMUM THE TURN-OVER OF WORKERS?

Under Secretary of the Navy Bard estimated before a Senate committee that procedures similar to those in this act would recruit workers and conserve workers to such an extent that scarcely no compulsion should be required. If turn-over in war industries such as the Mare Island Navy Yard and others could be reduced to the peacetime level, or even approach it, that saving alone would almost solve the manpower problem in critical items. The consequence would be that it would minimize the necessity of seeking new and untrained workers.

DOES THIS BILL REPEAL OR LIMIT THE TYDINGS AMENDMENT?

It does not. The Tydings amendment is specially referred to and recognized. As a practical matter, this act extends the Tydings amendment by adding to it farmers who are classified IV-F's. It might add cannery workers and other workers who are connected with or incidental to farming, should the Director of War Mobilization place them in such a category. Some crops might be placed on the critical list and the workers for those crops would benefit by this legislation. The farm-implement problem might be helped by this legislation. The Director of War Mobilization might decide that the food situation was critical because of a lack of essential farm implements to get the crops in and harvested. He could then certify that workers were needed for the farm-implement industry.

DOES THIS BILL STIGMATIZE IV-F'S?

Decidedly not. Most IV-F's would break a right arm to get in the service. They cannot because of handicaps. Most of them would like to work at something that contributes directly to the success of the soldiers and sailors. This bill provides a way, on a selective basis, to give them a chance to take jobs contributing directly to the war effort. Also by selectivity it gives those most able to respond the first chance. Those who cannot respond, because not placed in a category to respond, have official sanction then to work in the ordinary civilian economy, without feeling that they are shirking. This would definitely raise civilian morale.

IS THERE ANYTHING NEW OR NOVEL ABOUT THIS BILL?

There is not. It merely provides a method of obtaining badly needed men for production, when all voluntary methods fail. The principle is in the Tydings amendment. This act extends the principle of the Tydings amendment to IV-F farm workers and others. Also, there is nothing new in the furnishing of labor for war production in an emergency, by the services. Stevedores have been furnished by the Navy when there was a shortage but an acute need for them in San Francisco, and labor and management could not furnish them. Soldiers and sailors have been furloughed to help harvest crops. The Seabees are really a group who do special construction jobs, and what a grand job they have done. Soldiers and sailors have been called upon in almost every theater of war to do special kinds of work, that should have been done by civilians.

IS THIS A SLAVE BILL?

Decidedly not. All workers will have an opportunity to respond to the request for entry into an essential or critical war employment, if they are not so engaged. Present recruiting agencies will help give workers this chance. War and Navy authorities believe this will fill the need and not make necessary the ordering of the recalcitrants to accept a war job.

If they are required and ordered to take such a job they will be in the same category as their millions of fellow registrants who have been inducted and as their hundreds of thousands of fellow registrants who have been killed or wounded. If these few recalcitrants and stubborn workers will not accept a necessary war job without being ordered to do so, they will not be slave workers any more than the millions of men and women in the armed services, most of whom were inducted. Many of these workers were deferred and that means that the one who took the place which was theirs, but for the deferment, may have lost his life that his country might be free and the man deferred might be secure. This is only a mild step, which the chiefs of the military services think necessary in order that victory may come sooner and lives saved.

WERE THERE ANY SHORTAGES IN 1944?

Yes; there were. This is from testimony of Col. Lewis Sanders of the Office of the Chief Staff—record of hearings, page 411:

Shortages in 1944

	Percent
Medium heavy artillery ammunition	6.2
Mortar ammunition	11.5
105-howitzer ammunition	7.8
Bombs, grenades	9.2
Heavy trucks	6.0
Air-borne radar	22.4
Dry cells for batteries	23.8
Cotton duck	13.7
Tires, heavy truck	9.7

And that is not a complete list of the shortages. It is all I have got the survey on up to this point.

Tribute to the Late Senator Francis Maloney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very beautiful acrostic poem written by Horace C. Carlisle in tribute to our late colleague Senator Francis Maloney, of Connecticut.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR FRANCIS MALONEY

S-enator Francis Maloney was known,
E-verywhere, as an American who
N-ever forsook, in a crisis, his own—
A-lways at all times his big heart beat true
T-o the appeals of truth, justice, and right—
O-n all occasions, it was his delight,
R-eadily, for these, to speak and to fight.
F-riend to his country and friend to his State,
R-ecognized for the kind deeds that he's done,
A-nd for an influence, lasting and great—
N-ever disparaged, though he lost or won—
C-autiously chose he the words that he spake
I-n the great Chamber where he sought to make
S-ure he was right, ere he drove down his stake.

M-en come and go, but their influence still,
A-fter them, keeps keeping on keeping on
L-iving, in silent activity, till
O-ften all that ever knew them are gone.
N-ever neglectful was he of a friend,
E-ven on down to his untimely end—
Y-ea, he was one on whom God could depend.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Address of Hon. Harry W. Bashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAL HOLMES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address of Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, which was presented to the annual meeting of the American Railway Development Association in Chicago recently by Goodrich W. Lineweaver, Assistant to the Commissioner. The address deals with the Importance of Reclamation and Methods Recommended for Settling, Clearing and Leveling Project Lands. I am sure I do not have to call the attention of the House to the important place Federal Reclamation has in the economy of the West—not only from an agricultural standpoint but for what great reclamation projects like Grand Coulee Dam are contributing to the prosecution of the war through hydroelectric power production.

The other phase of Mr. Bashore's address deals with settling, clearing, and leveling reclamation project lands to aid settlers and to assure the return of the Federal investment. I am glad that the Bureau of Reclamation is giving attention to this phase of reclamation operations. In my own district the Roza Division of the Yakima Project is under construction as a war-food project and the land which is now being watered for the first time will provide opportunities for settlement of returning servicemen. The veterans will find the Roza Division lands as productive, I am sure, as are other divisions of the Yakima Project, which is a prize development in reclamation annals.

The outstanding post-war development, in my opinion, that the Bureau of Reclamation has scheduled is the Columbia Basin irrigation project which will be watered from Grand Coulee Dam. Practically all of the million acres of

land in this project are in my district. I am exceedingly anxious that the Bureau of Reclamation will work out and put into effect a comprehensive, effective settlement program under the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 which will give returning servicemen who are qualified for irrigated agriculture every opportunity to settle where they can be self-sustaining and make every possible contribution to the development of the Pacific Northwest.

In order to achieve this result it will be necessary for the Bureau of Reclamation to have its plans ready, so that construction work on the irrigation system can begin as soon as war conditions permit. A comprehensive program for settlement and effective land use is also essential.

Our first job is to win the war, but we will have an equally big job in giving returning servicemen every possible chance for successful careers in the walks of life for which they are best fitted. There are thousands of young men from the Pacific Northwest and other sections of the West who will be qualified to settle on the irrigated lands of the Columbia Basin Project and they must have that opportunity.

The text of Mr. Bashore's address is as follows:

Members of the American Railway Development Association, the subject I have been asked to discuss today is The Importance of Reclamation and Methods Recommended for Settling, Clearing, and Leveling Project Lands. I am sure you recognize the importance of reclamation. Railway men know what Federal reclamation has contributed to the irrigation of some 21,000,000 acres of arid land in the West and what irrigation has meant to the railroads that serve the West—or for that matter to the transportation lines that carry goods, materials, and machinery from and to the Midwest and East.

There is sufficient water available in the West to double the acreage now irrigated. We believe that using all the available water for beneficial purposes would increase the population of the 11 most Western States from around 15,000,000 to about 30,000,000.

What is more, building of dams for irrigation has an extremely important byproduct result. An enormous quantity of electrical energy is produced at low cost. From this low-cost power hundreds of industries are springing up throughout the western territory, which otherwise would not have been economically possible. This has opened up a new vista for individual enterprise and initiative, which many thought had been closed. Bringing under irrigation 22,000,000 additional acres of arid land would make possible some 400,000 new farms, and this, too, would stimulate individual initiative on a grand scale.

The two-way traffic created by the agricultural and industrial developments of the West to date indicates what further expansion would produce. The railroads of the West and the Nation have a direct interest in the future of water conservation for irrigation and its partner—hydroelectric power.

If you want further evidence of the importance of irrigation to the railroads, I can cite a few figures.

Take the Columbia Basin project just south of Grand Coulee Dam in Washington, where more than 1,000,000 acres of now dry land will come under cultivation when water is applied. It is estimated that this development will mean an increase of $36,000,000 in railroad revenues annually for the four lines which reach the project—the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, the Milwaukee, and the Spokane, Portland & Seattle branch of the Union Pacific.

On the basis of actual figures on the Yakima and Okanogan projects in Washington, to which 69,000 carloads of industrial and agricultural freight were shipped in 1929 when the peak was reached, the Columbia Basin project should create a market for several hundred thousand carloads a year from the East and Southeast. This tremendous traffic would create a demand for labor in the industrialized regions of the country and step up the movement of farm products from the East, for the West never has grown enough food to feed itself.

I could multiply examples of this sort indefinitely. The building of great engineering works in the West necessarily results in tens of thousands of carloads of freight from the Midwest and East, where farm machinery, electrical equipment, and household supplies are manufactured. But you know that story as well as I do.

There are other angles on the importance of reclamation in the post-war world, however, that are worth mentioning. In the period of economic adjustment from war to peace it is mighty important that there be projects ready which can absorb a large number of workers, men who have been employed in munitions industries and demobilized servicemen.

The nucleus of a post-war program of the Bureau of Reclamation is represented by authorized projects. First is a group of about 30 authorized projects, work on which has been halted or retarded by the war. The cost of this work is estimated at more than $800,000,000 at pre-war costs. This group has been augmented by authorization of a limited number of small projects under the war food program.

Great impetus was given Reclamation's post-war activities this week when the Congress completed and sent to the President the flood-control bill through which were authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation more than 30 projects in the Missouri River Basin. These projects represent the initial stages of the Bureau's Missouri Basin plan, and when constructed will transform more than 2,600,000 acres of dry land where agriculture has had an uncertain existence into irrigated land where crop production every year can be assured. The total cost of the particular Missouri Basin projects is estimated at nearly $400,000,000, and the flood-control bill authorizes an appropriation of $200,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of their construction.

Totaling up the authorizations, the Bureau of Reclamation can proceed with work on nearly 70 projects in 17 Western States as soon as construction funds, manpower, and materials are available. Our plans call for the advancement of field investigations and other preconstruction activities without interference with the prosecution of the war so that the actual dirt can begin to fly when the need is most urgent.

The authorized projects would provide irrigation for approximately 5,000,000 acres in addition to serving multiple purposes including power development, flood control, and related uses. Supplemental water also would be provided for an additional 5,000,000 acres now inadequately irrigated.

With these authorized projects in its program, the Bureau of Reclamation is well on the way to providing immediate employment and settlement opportunities on irrigated land for returning servicemen.

Anticipating even larger needs and opportunities last summer, the Bureau presented an over-all inventory of potential Reclamation developments for the West totaling some 200 irrigation and multiple-purpose projects. This number includes practically all of the presently authorized projects.

At the peak the over-all program could give work to some 200,000 men building dams, reservoirs, power plants, and distribution systems for both water and electric current. At least as many more would be employed in the workshops in other parts of the country making equipment and materials. These would be immediate direct results of the Bureau of Reclamation's post-war program. The indirect results fan out and multiply all through the West and the country.

Another thing must be mentioned. At one time it seemed to our students of population growth that we were reaching a saturation point in this country. That was a time when we were not making full use of the great advances of science. At least we were not distributing their economic benefits as broadly and equitably as possible. I think the post-war period will be one in which the tendency to spread the economic advantages of scientific development will be accelerated greatly, and that the result will be a new impetus to population growth.

This would mean that we would have to find much more land upon which to raise food, if we were not to become like the countries of western Europe dependent upon other parts of the world for a very large part of our food supply. Even as it is, agricultural economists figure that we shall need to bring in between three and four million additional acres of land each year for agricultural production, just to keep up with present population growth. The Bureau of Reclamation's over-all plans contemplate the early development of only about 8,000,000 newly irrigated acres, and supplemental water for nearly 10,000,000 acres now inadequately irrigated. In view of the recognized need for expanding acreage under cultivation, our program appears by no means excessive.

But you want to hear something also about the settlement program the Bureau of Reclamation is developing.

Let me start in by saying that the Department of the Interior was set up in 1849 as the agency designed largely to administer the homesteading program of the Government. The Bureau of Reclamation, established in 1902, continued the homesteading policy by extending settlement to public lands that could be brought under irrigation. That is how the area of a quarter section, or 160 acres, came to be the limitation applied to reclamation projects.

From the beginning of the Bureau its policy has been to encourage land settlement through the building of family-size farms. This was the pathway toward agricultural and industrial prosperity it was felt. Experience has proved this concept to be sound, and development of the family-type farm remains the fundamental land settlement policy of the Bureau of Reclamation.

* * * * *

In the early days there were no qualifications, except citizenship, required of homestead entrymen on a reclamation project. Anyone who was a citizen and hadn't exhausted his homestead right could go in. But in the early twenties it was felt that a thorough investigation of reclamation projects should be made, and acting upon a mandate of Congress, the Secretary of the Interior appointed a fact finders' board composed of persons not in Government employ, who studied the situation and recommended legislation. The Fact Finders' Act of December 5, 1924, which resulted from the report of this committee, provided that the Secretary of the Interior establish standards for the selection of settlers based on character, experience, and financial competence. As a result of these standards local boards composed of responsible citizens pass on each applicant who wishes to make entry on Government land on a reclamation project.

Although there is no obligation on the part of private owners of land on reclamation

projects to apply the same standards, a number of privately owned and managed irrigation districts cooperate with the Government in applying similar standards to prospective settlers.

There have been a number of checks made as to how well this method of selection has worked, and on the whole it has been found to be fairly good.

We realize, nevertheless, that the standards found useful in 1924 may not be equally applicable in 1944, and that those desirable today may be outmoded by new and more scientific methods of selection 10 years hence.

For instance, one of the minimum requirements for acquiring public land on reclamation projects from the Government today, when such is available, is cash or its equivalent of about $2,000. Actually, it requires considerably more than this to develop a reclamation farm most efficiently and rapidly—but that is a basic minimum.

Just the same, it may not be reasonable to ask men who have come home from fighting Nazis and Japanese to lay this amount of money on the line out of their own pockets. While the people at home working in war factories may have had the opportunity to accumulate $2,000—some of them much more—it is very hard to get that much together on the fighting front, and probably we should help these men with their financing if they desire to establish permanent farm homes. Most of us will agree they are entitled to it, even if there is a greater than normal failure to make good.

At the same time we shall also be faced by the fact that the demand on the part of servicemen after the war for irrigated farms certainly will exceed the supply of available farms. Even though we may be able to provide 135,000 additional irrigated farms in the 8 or 10 years following the end of hostilities, that will not satisfy all of the servicemen who wish such farms.

It is clear that the problem of giving servicemen opportunities to make a place for themselves at home is going to be a far greater problem after the present war than after the previous war, if for no other reason, because there will be many more of them to care for. In World War No. 1 there were 3,000,000 in the armed services. Already in this war there have been more than 11,000,000 men and women in military services, and if the war with Japan lasts for several years, or Germany continues to resist for much longer, there may be many more.

The Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation foresaw the need for providing new farms for returning servicemen in World War No. 1, but the legislative restrictions and lack of appropriations deprived us of the opportunity to offer adequate settlement opportunities when the time came to do so. The Department of the Interior after World War No. 1 received some 200,000 inquiries from servicemen who wished to establish themselves on the land, but because of the severely limited reclamation program of the 20's, less than 2,500 public land farms on our projects were opened to entry from 1920 to 1940. About a third of these were settled by veterans under the meager preference law and their record compares favorably with those of other settlers.

Under the projects now authorized, including the Columbia Basin in Washington, the Bureau could provide about 30,000 farms on public lands or other lands the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase and dispose of to veterans or others. The greater part of the acreage which would be served by the projects in the Bureau's postwar plan would be privately owned, and the extent of our participation in the settlement of the privately-owned land will be governed by future legislation.

This time it is extremely important that we place very much greater emphasis upon creating conditions that will pave the way for veterans to make a success of irrigation farming, and I don't mean that we must regiment their lives or lead them around.

Obviously the first step would be to devise a system of selection that would connect those best qualified with the opportunity they need. The Bureau has been giving considerable thought to that problem.

More thought is being given to ways of making sure that veterans who settle on irrigated farms may be provided with enough capital to aid them in getting a start. Consideration is being given by the Bureau of Reclamation to leveling the land in advance of settlement.

In this connection the findings and recommendations of a special committee named to study the problem as it will apply to settlement of the Columbia River Basin is illuminating. The committee recommended that on all Government-owned land heavy leveling be performed by the Government at times convenient to the settler and safe from the standpoint of wind erosion. The cost of such work would be added to the appraised value of the land. In order to reduce the equity of the owner as little as possible, however, it was recommended that he be given full opportunity for utilizing his own labor by leaving him to final preparation of the land surface and construction of the farm irrigation system. It was also recommended that publicly-owned equipment be made available by the Bureau of Reclamation on a contract or lease basis to owners of private land, the leveling performed with such equipment to be controlled by contract. Roads within the farmstead were to be the responsibility of the farmer.

The settler, however, will need technical assistance and advice if he is to perform his part of these operations most economically and quickly. It was recommended that adequate engineering assistance and agricultural advice be made available to him.

It is more and more the viewpoint of those responsible for the development of Reclamation projects that assistance to the settler shall extend beyond engineering aid, and that it be continued throughout the life of the project by providing a service that will bring right down to the grass roots all of the advantages that modern science and engineering can provide. Ordinarily the scientist does not publish his findings in terms that the farmer and the rest of us can understand sufficiently well to use fully the benefits that modern science can provide. If the Bureau can help him toward such an understanding and point the way through which he can get the full advantages of the age in which he lives, the prosperity and well-being of the individual and the irrigated communities will be advanced.

The hope of all of us who are interested in the reclamation program is that funds and manpower will be provided quickly enough without interference with the prosecution of the war to allow us to proceed vigorously toward the completion of field investigations and blueprints. In that way, reclamation developments will assure settlement opportunities on irrigated land for returning servicemen and civilian workers in war industries as demobilization begins.

The Case Against Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel:

THE CASE AGAINST SLAVERY

The essential fraud, as well as the fallacies, behind the New Dealers' plea for a national labor slavery law, can only be brought out by a somewhat detailed study of the case against it.

It is significant that not only the Nation's true liberals are bitterly opposed to such legislation but that both industry and labor are fighting side by side against this, the reactionary administration's latest attempt to fasten new shackles on America.

Organized labor well knows that such a law could easily sweep away its gains of the last half century. It knows that unions could be made impotent, as they have been made under every totalitarian government in the world.

Industry's case against labor slavery, recently projected by the National Association of Manufacturers, sums up the evidence and puts the plea to the people's "jury" in this way:

"If national manpower legislation could provide the answer (to the alleged manpower shortage), industry itself would be the first to call for enactment of a national service law. But the very nature of the manpower problem today is proof positive that national legislation—a blanket law—would not and could not solve the crisis."

Government estimates show that at the present time about 150,000 additional men and women are needed in industry throughout the country. Figures taking into account the number of present industrial workers who will be drafted show that by June 1 as many as 700,000 to 900,000 may be needed.

Now, as the N. A. M. points out, the 150,000 workers needed at the present time constitutes only about one-fourth of 1 percent of the present labor force of the Nation.

Why, then, is it deemed necessary to subject more than 99 percent of the American labor force to involuntary servitude, regulations, and compulsion in order to obtain the one-fourth of 1 percent now needed for industrial work?

The answer, of course, is that it is not necessary.

The N. A. M. directs attention to one of the dog-eared arguments of the neo-Fascists, who say that, if it is all right to draft men for the Army, it is all right to draft them for work.

One might as logically say that, since wood alcohol is a good thing to put in your car in cold weather, it ought to be good for a man to drink.

The soldier has to be drafted (not very many of them love war enough to volunteer), and he has to be regimented and strictly disciplined, because upon these things his life depends; and he makes a better soldier because of it.

The very opposite is true of the laborer, who will never work as well, nor produce as much, in slavery, as he does now as a free man.

As the N. A. M. clearly states its case:

"Conscription of men for services on the assembly line * * * is the essence of the Nazi-Fascist philosophy we are fighting against. Placing a drafted worker alongside a voluntary worker in a factory will damage all worker morale. * * * Industrialists have estimated that the delay, confusion, and red tape that a national service act would inject into a factory would cut war production from 10 to 15 percent, instead of boosting it.

"Workers can be drafted physically, but their will to work cannot be regimented, nor can their devotion to duty be disciplined. * * * Compulsory labor is a denial of the very thing Americans are fighting around the world to preserve."

The N. A. M. report also recalls that 2 years ago the President in a message to Congress asked enactment of labor draft laws,

and although the manpower situation was more serious then than it is today, the problem was solved without such a law.

The manufacturers' association said then, and it repeats now, that "Production would suffer, not benefit, from labor compulsion, because there is no substitute for the initiative and willing effort of free men. Free labor and free industry is the combination that has made and can preserve our American economy."

The case boils down in two questions regarding the conscription of labor under any sort of a national service act:

Is it necessary?

Will it work?

The answer to both questions is an unqualified "No!"

A Dissenting Opinion on Congressional Junkets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Neuberger in the Progressive of October 2, 1944:

A DISSENTING OPINION ON CONGRESSIONAL JUNKETS

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

With Members of Congress being panned in so many places, I would like to submit a dissenting opinion from a different viewpoint.

In the 21 months that I served in Alaska with the American Army our outfit was visited by five Senators and two Representatives. The visits occurred at widely scattered times. The men who came to see us included Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, veteran Congressmen and newcomers.

Congressmen may not be popular in some quarters, but I can testify that their visits did a lot to boost morale and esprit de corps among the American soldiers who saw them. I remember Senator WILLIAM LANGER spying a couple of North Dakota soldiers at Fort Nelson on the Alaska Highway. He strode over to see them in mighty strides. For the next month Army units along the wilderness road talked about "that visitin' Senator fellow" who recognized a couple of soldiers as his constituents from back home.

The five Senators who came to our particular base in Alaska were C. DOUGLASS BUCK, Delaware; HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan; HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia; JAMES G. SCRUGHAM, Nevada; and WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota. The two Members of the House were Representative HOMER D. ANGELL, of Oregon, and ANTHONY J. DIMOND, the veteran Delegate from Alaska itself.

SHARE AND SHARE ALIKE

All the officers and men whom I know had a favorable opinion of these visitors. They proved regular fellows. No expedition was too much for them to undertake. They made plane trips in hazardous Alaskan weather, and you must experience Alaskan weather to know what aerial hazards really are. They visited lonely, out-of-the-way installations. They shared pot-luck and slept in sleeping bags and wore G. I. parkas. They were not affected or stilted or high-hat, and they showed a genuine interest in the problems of the average American soldier in that bleak theater of war.

Many of these Members of Congress are men more than 60 years old. Yet they never spared themselves in seeing what was really going on in Alaska. Representative ANGELL flew north of the Arctic Circle to Fort Yukon. Delegate Dimond flew far out in the Aleutians and traveled by Coast Guard cutter along the coast of the Alaskan Panhandle. Senators KILGORE and FERGUSON visited the airports on the vital air route to Soviet Russia. Senators SCRUGHAM, BUCK, and LANGER rode for many miles on the Alaska Highway.

THOSE PENTHOUSE CRITICS

I have seen considerable criticism of so-called official "junkets" to visit our fighting men. Westbrook Pegler never tires of ridiculing Mrs. Roosevelt's trip to the Southwest Pacific. The President has been attacked for his cruiser journey to Hawaii and the Aleutians. Members of Congress have been assailed for their trips to the various fighting fronts all over the world.

I am sure that those who criticize official trips to the theaters of war—whether the trips are by the President or his congressional opponents—have never served in those theaters. It is easy for a newspaper columnist, sitting in an air-conditioned penthouse or a steam-heated apartment, to be cynical about a Senator or Cabinet member flying to Alaska or Italy. But the soldiers in Alaska or Italy think quite a different way.

I am a Democrat. I served in the Oregon State Legislature as a Democrat. Representative HOMER ANGELL is a Republican. But when I saw him in the heart of the Yukon River watershed, I said, "Here is the Congressman from my home town. Here is someone who can take back a message to my mother and dad. Here is someone who has enough interest in the war to travel thousands of miles to see for himself what we are doing and how we are getting along." And Democrat or Republican, liberal or conservative, that meant something to me.

Soldiers like to be recognized. This is particularly true of men stationed in far-flung outposts. A United States Senator getting off a plane or boat indicates to those men that they are not forgotten, that someone is deeply concerned with their welfare. When Representative ANGELL visited Watson Lake, an airport high on the divide between the Yukon and Mackenzie watersheds, an air corps corporal said to me, "Golly, captain, is that guy really a Congressman? Who'd think we'd ever meet a Congressman way up here?"

Cynicism is an attitude confined to those fighting the war from night clubs and saloons. When the President's wife visits a lonely island in the Pacific, it is easy to laugh it off as a political gesture. When a Senator flies to an airport on the Bering Sea, it is equally easy to say he is trying to build himself up back home. I have never heard a soldier say this, though. I have seen Senators and Representatives writing down messeges to take back home with G. I.'s crowded around them like a football huddle.

One of the inspiring features of this war has been the way leading people of the Nation have taken their time and risked their lives to visit the theaters of war. Mrs. Roosevelt, Vice President Wallace, many Senators and Representatives, countless members of the entertainment industry, innumerable newspaper correspondents, these people have showed up everywhere, all the way from Alaska's icy shores to the coral beaches of the southwest Pacific. Conspicuous by their absence, of course, have been some of the more bloodthirsty inhabitants of cafe society who are quick to ridicule and scoff at such trips.

The greatest encouragement which can come to a soldier in a lonely place is assurance that he is not forgotten. A comedian from Hollywood, a slim-legged chorus girl from New York, a Senator from Washington, D. C., a newspaper correspondent from Chicago—all of them are indications to the fighting man that the solid people of his country appreciate what he has done. Journeys to the battlefronts and outposts may be "junkets" to the cynics, but they are tonics to the men who carry the flag.

The O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, several citizens of my district have requested that I insert in the RECORD the following in regard to the O. P. A., which was written by Mr. Lon Pawell and published in the Zionsville Times of January 25:

THE O. P. A.

On the seventh of November,
When folks had their say,
The majority voted
To keep the O. P. A.

To get rid of the bunch,
I did my best;
But they've taken my points,
So I'll starve with the rest.

A certain amount of rationing
May be all right,
But the Board's word
Should be good at least overnight.

We need very much now
Some things we haven't got;
To mention a few,
The pigs that were shot.

Maybe to obtain butter
And other essential grub
We should have become members
Of the Thousand-Dollar Club.

Looking the situation over,
I have a hunch
We are serving under
An incompetent bunch.

If rationing was stopped
And folks allowed to buy,
No one would hoard—
There'd be no reason why.

If the Board can prove these
To be untruthful digs,
Then they can do to me
What they did to my pigs.

Of course, if they call me on the carpet,
And walk out with a gun,
I'll swear I wrote this article
Only in fun.

—*Lon Pawell.*

The above is an expression of the feelings of many people about the O. P. A. and its record of mismanagement and inefficiency and its misuse of rationing powers for political purposes, as was so well demonstrated in rationing orders during the few months previous to the last election and the orders made subsequent to the election. It is little wonder that the people have become thoroughly disgusted and have lost all faith and confidence in the O. P. A.

The Wallace Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am asking that the following article written by Mr. Frank Kent be printed in the RECORD:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—C. I. O.-P. A. C. SOUGHT WALLACE APPOINTMENT TO TEST POLITICAL STRENGTH, SAYS KENT

(By Frank R. Kent)

Under any ordinary circumstances the departure of Mr. Jesse Jones from his post as Secretary of Commerce, which carries with it control of the gigantic R. F. C. and various allied financial agencies, would be a cause for regret by those who admire competency and character in high public office.

But, after 12 years of outstandingly fine performance, to have Mr. Jones thrown out to make room for Mr. Henry Wallace because of pressure from the C. I. O. bosses and in order to appease the screeching New York radicals ought to cause regret to be mixed with widespread indignation.

That such has been the general reaction is attested in various ways. The truth is that this incident reveals Mr. Roosevelt in a particularly unpleasant light. He has made no appointment more wholly political; none in which there has been so little consideration of merit; none in which the qualifications of the man have been so wholly ignored.

It is significant that in his letter asking Mr. Jones to resign for Henry, the President, with almost no pretense, admits that he made the request in order to reward Mr. Wallace for his support in the recent campaign and because he had asked for it.

He does not mention the C. I. O. and its radical allies, but he did not need to, as, except for those two groups, Mr. Wallace has no personal following and no political strength and there exists no excuse for his recognition.

CLAMOR FOR RECOGNITION

These groups, along with Mr. Wallace himself, have been clamoring for this recognition for many weeks. They have made the Wallace appointment the test. Their journalistic and political spokesmen made it clear that unless Mr. Wallace was taken care of his left-wing friends would regard it as a betrayal of the liberal cause by Mr. Roosevelt, whom they had so ardently—and noisily—supported.

This, of course, is nonsense, but it was, nevertheless, trumpeted almost daily.

And Mr. Roosevelt yielded to the clamor and the threats. He said in his letter to Mr. Jones that "this is a difficult letter to write." It is easy to understand that. He had to explain to a faithful official and a loyal friend that he was displacing him for a man immeasurably less well qualified and for political reasons only.

Neither Mr. Jones nor a very large number of the American people regard his explanation as adequate. The fact is no one save the President's and Mr. Wallace's political friends will so regard it. To offer Mr. Jones a diplomatic post was trivial and Mr. Jones properly rejected it. It is refreshing, too, that Mr. Jones did not take the President's action with the unbecoming meekness with which various others whom Mr. Roosevelt has "ditched" for political reasons, while professing personal friendship, have taken it.

So far as the business interests of the country are concerned the appointment is certainly a shock. Mr. Wallace, of course, is an honest man, but he is entirely devoid of any sort of business experience and any talent for administration.

In addition, his C. I. O. and radical friends are bitterly hostile to industry and tend, as he does, toward greater, not less, governmental control over business. When one considers that the R. F. C. alone has commitments of more than $50,000,000,000 and that it is a revolving fund over which Congress has no control, the tremendous power which the President proposes to place in Mr. Wallace's utterly inexperienced hands can be grasped.

ALMOST NO EXPERIENCE

In his whole career Mr. Wallace has had almost no experience in private business except that involved in his brief editorship of the farm journal inherited from his father and which lost its identity before Mr. Roosevelt became President.

Yet, it is now planned to oust one of the most capable businessmen in the country and put Mr. Wallace at the head of the department which deals exclusively with business and controls an almost incredible number of billions.

Opposition to his confirmation in the Senate is based, partly, on his total unfitness for such huge financial responsibilities; partly, on the undisguised use of this important post as a political reward; partly, on Mr. Wallace's own radical views as expressed in his writings and speeches.

But, mainly, the appointment is opposed because of the belief that with him as Secretary of Commerce the C. I. O. will be definitely in the governmental saddle with its professional lobbyists as the closest advisers to the man controlling the multibillions of the R. F. C. and allied agencies.

There is a feeling that the Wallace appointment will present an opportunity for the C. I. O. to dominate and operate the business of the country in a way heretofore undreamed, and that, despite his friendly words about "private enterprise," Mr. Wallace's whole heart would be set in this direction.

Some Senators believe that his appointment threatens the whole economic security of the country and regard the effort to give him this gigantic power fully as dangerous as the effort to pack the Supreme Court.

Not the least distressing feature of this whole business is the disclosure that in his fourth term Mr. Roosevelt still thinks it necessary to play politics and placate politicians at the expense of the national interest.

It is particularly amazing that he should do so right after his Friday speech in which he spoke of the "gravity of the hour" and indicated his desire to put aside partisan politics so that a united people might "get on with the war."

Eligibility of Filipinos for United States Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to invite the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to the following letter which is addressed to the House of Representatives and has been referred to me as the Representative of the Fourth California District:

THE FILIPINO FIGHTERS FOR FREEDOM,
San Francisco, Calif., January 23, 1945.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is with the profoundest sense of humility that we address this letter whereby we beseech you to vote for the bill that proposes to make Filipinos eligible for United States citizenship, which bill was not acted upon by the Seventy-eighth Congress despite the approval of its Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, but was therefore submitted subsequently to the Seventy-ninth Congress for consideration.

With your unflinching support and favorable vote, we look forward to the day when we can say unequivocally that there is theoretical as well as practical democracy in the United States.

Very respectfully,
THE FILIPINO FIGHTERS FOR FREEDOM,
JULIO S. ESPIRITU, *President.*

An American Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Union:

AN AMERICAN SPEAKS

(By Ruth Taylor)

I've been accused of using my friends for copy material, and told that no conversation is safe from my pencil. I admit the justice of the accusation—but, after all, the democracy of which I try to write is not the democracy of the lecture hall but just the plain, everyday life of each and every one of us. It is the "practical freedom of man" and the actual "sanctity of the individual," not the ideological basis that is of primary importance.

Therefore, I don't apologize for retailing another conversation. The other evening I was listening to a group of men talking about various things, when, across their theories came the words of the oldest of the group, who up to then had been silent.

"You talk about the problems of Europe being reflected here," he said. "I want to tell you this. I've read some of the vicious, scurrilous, smutty, un-American material that is going the rounds today. It's disgusting. I've read it only because I had to in my work. But I tell you this, no American who is worthy of the name (and I hold that most Americans care as much for democracy as I do), no decent American would give houseroom to it, let alone read the stuff some of which is anti-Semitic, some of which is anti-Catholic, and all of which is plain anti-Christian. Decent people don't read or believe that kind of thing. You can't live in America without knowing that it is all lies. Nobody is fooled by it—and only the vicious will lend an ear to it."

He went on to say, "I have lived in this town my entire lifetime. Many of those I knew as boys are dead. I've outlived my years—but those I used to know, those I've always known, have come from all sorts of

homes—their parents spoke English with different accents, we went to different churches—but rich or poor, first or sixth generations here, Protestant, Catholic or Jew—we were all Americans—and we were friends. We knew each other. We understood each other—and it's hard to dislike a man when you really know him.

"This country has given me many opportunities. Some I've used wisely; others not so well. I've had a chance to work at the work I enjoyed. I've prospered and been honored by my fellow citizens. But others with different backgrounds than mine have done the same or better. They are still my friends, my fellow Americans. And it is as Americans that I think of them! I do not narrow them down to any group either of class or creed. And I hold that what I do, any real American will do if he gives any real thought to the matter—as I have. Don't talk to me of any European problems being reflected over here! Such issues are plain un-American, and I, together with all Americans, will have no part in them."

The Monetary Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to receive a letter from a constituent which has words of well-merited praise for one of our colleagues in this House. I should like to include as part of my extension of remarks the following letter from Mr. John Morrill, of Gonzales, Calif., which makes some very pertinent and praiseworthy remarks about my fellow Californian, the Honorable JERRY VOORHIS. I might state that Congressman VOORHIS was kind enough to distribute copies of the book which Mr. Morrill mentions among his colleagues and I, for one, believe that he has done a real service to us by making available such a careful study of the monetary problems of this country.

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GEORGE: * * * I appreciate being on the mailing list, thanks to you, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which keeps me in close touch with what is going on in the national legislative halls. I cannot begin to read it all, but there are certain Members of the House whose speeches I watch for and always read. We have some brilliant men representing us in Washington, elected from both parties. Some of those speeches appearing in the RECORD are real classics. While I do not always agree, I respect their views and sincerity.

I have noticed in recent months, however, and that is what has prompted me to write you, expressions of pessimism concerning the future. The same sentiment is often expressed by people I contact here on the home front, among them, prominent businessmen. The pessimism is built about the fear of an inevitable period of depression following the change from a wartime to a peacetime economy. Some even anticipate that it will be worse than the disaster which struck during the Hoover administration and continued into the early thirties.

If the Congress does its full duty to cope with this menacing situation, can it not be avoided? Plans have been discussed on the floor of both Houses. All seem to be in full accord that full employment must be found for returning veterans of this war and for those thrown out of employment by the closing of war industries, as well as adequate subsidies for unemployables and disabled veterans. All very good, but where is the money coming from to pay for all of this, plus retiring outstanding bonds as they mature and interest on the colossal national debt? I have yet to read of any proposed plan by any Member of the House or the Senate, with one exception, to cope adequately with this situation. That one exception—and in him and his plan I see the one bright ray of hope for the future—is Congressman JERRY VOORHIS of California. If I remember correctly, Jerry was picked by the Washington press correspondents as being the outstanding Member of the House from the standpoint of intelligence, sincerity of purpose, and devotion, as well as hard work for the cause of the people. A fitting tribute, in my opinion.

I do not need to elaborate here upon the plan for monetary reform and for the setting up of a scientific and constitutional money system, to replace the present banker-dominated unconstitutional debt money system, which has been proposed by Congressman JERRY VOORHIS of California. It must be familiar to every Member of the present Congress, as he has discussed it fully at different times from the floor of the House.

However, I would like to refer specifically to his recent letter to the people of his district, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 21 last. In this letter he makes the statement that, had the principles contained in his monetary reform bill (H. R. 4931), introduced in 1939, been adopted, our national debt at the present time would be $80,000,000,000 less. Has any one in the House challenged that statement?

In my opinion JERRY is absolutely right when he says that what we need is "Not more debt, but more horse sense." We need to divorce the private banking system from the business of creating money. Let them confine themselves to the legitimate field of private banking, and on the other hand, put our Government into the business of creating money, as the Constitution provides, through a Government-owned Federal Reserve System. Then when new money is created to meet our expanding needs, let it be created debt and interest free, appearing on the books of the Treasury Department as a national credit (as JERRY proposes), not on the books of the private banks as a national debt.

It is squarely up to Congress to act in the impending crisis. Congress alone has the power. They are responsible to the people.

I challenge any Member of the House of Representatives to state one valid reason why the proposals contained in JERRY VOORHIS' bill (H. R. 4931) should not be adopted and made into law, or in lieu of that plan, to offer any substitute measure which will achieve the same ends.

As a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I urge that you do all possible to bring about the reforms mentioned above—reforms which have been urged by some of the Nation's outstanding economists as the only plan that will prevent those cycles of deflation such as we have experienced in the past and that will avoid the disaster which otherwise looms ahead. Also, in one of your news letters released to the press of your district, will you let us have your views on the Bretton Woods monetary agreements?

And now in closing may I compliment you on your splendid record of service to your district and to the Nation during your first term of office and express my full confidence in your handling of the difficult problems which will confront the new Congress starting in 1945.

With warm personal regards,
Cordially and sincerely yours,
JOHN A. MORRILL.

Delaware Assembly Ratified Bill of Rights 155 Years Ago Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilmington (Del.) Sunday Morning Star of January 28, 1945:

DELAWARE ASSEMBLY RATIFIED BILL OF RIGHTS 155 YEARS AGO TODAY—STATE COPY, NOW IN NATIONAL ARCHIVES, HELD MOST VALUABLE OF TEN KNOWN EXISTING COPIES

(By Maj. Elizur Yale Smith)

Delaware was the first State to ratify the Federal Constitution, on December 7, 1787, by unanimous consent of the popular convention held for that purpose, and Delaware was the sixth of the original 13 States to ratify the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, which amendments are known collectively as the Federal Bill of Rights. The necessary action in ratifying the Bill of Rights, by the general assembly of Delaware, took place in both the house and asembly and in the council on January 28, 1790, just 4 months and 3 days after the amendments had been passed by resolution of the First Congress of the United States under the Constitution. The ratification was signed by George Mitchell, speaker of the council, and by Jehu Davis, speaker of the house, and on February 19, President (Governor) Joshua Clayton forwarded the official notice of ratification to President Washington, who in turn transmitted the communication to Congress on March 8, 1790.

New Jersey was the first State to ratify the bill of rights, on November 20, 1789, and it was nearly 23 months after Delaware's ratification before the necessary three fourths of the States ratified our famous document of personal liberty, so that the bill of rights officially became part of the Constitution, just as much so as if it had been written into the original Constitution in 1787. The last necessary State to ratify was Virginia, on December 15, 1791.

NEW YORK THEN THE CAPITAL

When this memorable action took place in Delaware, the seat of Government of the United States was in Federal Hall, on the corner of Wall and Nassau Streets, in the City of New York. There the first Congress of the United States began its deliberations on March 4, 1789, and there, on April 30, following, Gen. George Washington was inaugurated the first President of the United States. In his first inaugural address, President Washington spoke of "a reverence for the characteristic rights of free men," and pointed to the advisability of framing a Bill of Rights. At that time Richard Bassett and George Reed were the Delaware Senators and John Vining was the sole Representative of the State in the House of Representatives.

The Declaration of Independence says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain in-

alienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed * * *." But not the Declaration of Independence, nor the Constitution of the United States, nor the Federal Bill of Rights, nor the early charters granted to the American Colonies, nor the early constitutions adopted by many of the States at the time of independence, nor any of the early declarations of rights, gave us our natural rights and freedoms. "We the people of the United States" have been entitled to our rights and liberties from a time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary—we were born with them—but it became necessary to guarantee us, "We the People," our inalienable right of all mankind. Various attempts have been made, here in America, to usurp our rights and freedoms, but on every occasion the people have risen in protest. Today, as never before, there are sinister forces at work to curb many of our rights and freedoms, and to overthrow our constitutional form of a republican democracy.

DOCUMENT WORTHY OF CELEBRATION

There is probably no one state document that could be more fittingly celebrated in this time of war than our Federal Bill of Rights. The personal liberties enumerated in this great document are unquestionably the basic principles at stake as the United Nations press forward to victory. The personal freedoms of "We the People of the United States," stand out in striking contrast to the regimented slavery of millions of people in foreign lands. Thomas Jefferson once remarked: "How little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of and which no other people on earth enjoy."

Fortunately the immortal document known as the Bill of Rights listing the first ten amendments to the Constitution, was enrolled on parchment and has been preserved so that this generation, and generations to come, may look upon the writing of the words on many of our founding fathers who fought for freedom that our personal liberties might be perpetuated. Yet, for many years past this priceless heritage has been forgotten, or taken for granted. People spoke the words of the Bill of Rights glibly, but recent researches by national organizations have proved that the average American citizen knows little about this famous state paper—the Bill of Rights—its wording, or its history.

Many of the States objected to the ratification of the Federal Constitution, as written, at Philadelphia, in 1787, because it contained no Bill of Rights. Many of the States were slow in their ratification of the Constitution for this reason, and many of them recommended that amendments in the form of a bill of rights should be brought "to the consideration of the Congress which shall first assemble under the said Constitution to be acted upon according to the mode prescribed in the fifth article thereof," which are the words adopted by the Virginia Convention. Had not many exponents of the Constitution agreed to propose such amendments it is doubtful if the great charter of our republican democracy would ever have been ratified by a sufficient number of States to put it into effect.

DELAWARE EAGER FOR NEW GOVERNMENT

Delaware, the first State to ratify the Constitution, was a small compact community, and its public men were intelligent and patriotic. In the Constitutional Convention, at Philadelphia, it had contended with great spirit for the interests of the smaller States, and its people now had the sagacity and good sense to perceive that they had gained every reasonable security for their peculiar rights. When the session of the convention for ratification commenced in Massachusetts, in January 1788, the people of the five States of Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut had successfully ratified the Constitution without proposing any amendments, yet, it is certain, that the subject of a Bill of Rights, and other amendments, was the ground of considerable anxiety on the part of the people of these five States. The people of Delaware were especially anxious for the new form of constitutional government, even though it had defects, to be put into effect in place of the decrepit Confederacy.

It fell to James Madison, a Representative in Congress, from Virginia, to bring up the subject of amendments in the First Congress. Five days after President Washington's inauguration, Madison, who had copies of the resolutions of several States calling for a total of 78 amendments, including a Bill of Rights, tucked away in his pocket, announced in Congress that he intended to bring up the subject of amendments on the fourth Monday of the month. The various resolutions of the States were debated in Congress throughout the summer, until finally, on August 25, 1789, when the number of amendments recommended had been boiled down to 17 articles, they were received in the Senate, from the House. After further debate in both branches of Congress, the 17 articles, by combination and elimination, were reduced to 12 articles. To these 12 the Senate concurred on September 25, so that this is the correct date of the passing of the resolution of Congress recommending the ratification of the Bill of Rights to the 11 States that had ratified the Constitution, and to North Carolina and Rhode Island, where ratification was pending.

COPIES SENT FOR RATIFICATION

The articles of amendment, as passed by Congress, were ordered to be enrolled on parchment and copies sent forth to the Governors of the several States for ratification, or rejection, by their Legislatures. Fourteen enrolled copies were accordingly inscribed on parchment between September 25 and 28, 1789, and from a careful examination of the 10 known extant copies 3 scribes did the engrossing. All copies were signed at Federal Hall, on September 28, by John Adams, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; Samuel A. Otis, Secretary of the Senate; Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and John Beckley, Clerk of the House. Joint resolutions proposing amendments to the Constitution do not require the signature of the President and are not, as a rule, submitted to him. In this case, however, a resolution of Congress desired the President to send the original enrolled copies of the proposed amendments forth to the Governors of the Original Thirteen States. The President's letter of transmittal is dated October 2, 1789. One of the fourteen enrolled copies was retained by the Department of State, and this copy is now in the National Archives, Washington, but there is no endorsement on it to show that it is the master copy. All the extant copies, including the Delaware copy, are similar, except for slight variations in lineation, punctuation, and inscribing. The existing copies are approximately 28 inches by 30 inches in size.

DELAWARE COPY MOST VALUABLE

The original copy sent by President Washington to President Joshua Clayton, of Delaware, is the most interesting, and undoubtedly the most valuable of the 10 known existing copies. Delaware is the only State that took the original document and on the bottom of it inscribed the resolution of its general assembly and then returned the document, bearing the Delaware ratification and the State seal, to President Washington, with the request that he notify the Congress. This Delaware copy, which is now in an excellent state of preservation, was therefore returned to Federal Hall, New York City, from whence it came, and the site of Federal Hall is now the headquarters of the Bill of Rights Commemorative Society. This Delaware copy of the Bill of Rights is now in the National Archives, Washington. Perhaps, someday, some Delaware statesman will introduce a bill in Congress to have it returned to Delaware and placed on exhibition in the statehouse. There are two other copies in Washington, one in the National Archives and one in the Library of Congress.

Some of the States have lost their copies, including Maryland, North Carolina, Georgia, and Pennsylvania. Through investigations started by the Bill of Rights Commemorative Society the States of New Jersey, South Carolina, and Rhode Island have recently found their original copies, which were thought to be lost. It is hoped that the other lost copies may eventually be found.

FIRST ARTICLE NOT O. K.'D BY DELAWARE

Delaware ratified all but the first article of amendment, as originally passed by Congress, but as a sufficient number of States did not ratify the first two articles, the Bill of Rights, as we know it today, consists of the original articles 3 to 12, inclusive. The two rejected articles referred to proportional representation in Congress, and prohibiting varying the compensation of Members of Congress until an election of Representatives should intervene. Both of these matters are very much in the thoughts of the Members of the present Congress.

Secretary of State Jefferson sent out the announcement of the ratification of the Bill of Rights, as part of the Constitution, on March 1, 1792, but the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that December 15, 1791, the day Virginia ratified them, as the eleventh necessary State, is the effective date. It took 11 States for ratification as Vermont was admitted to the Union on March 4, 1791.

Strange as it may seem, the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Georgia did not formally ratify the Bill of Rights until 6 years ago, the year of the sequicentennial of the writing of our great charter of rights and freedoms.

Letter From Mr. Paul Schoff, of St. Anthony, N. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a letter from Paul Schoff, St. Anthony, N. Dak.:

I hope the Congressmen and Senators of the United States would use their influence to stop and have come to an end this terrific war by working for a negotiated peace with the Axis Powers, one fair and reasonable to all nations, one that would compare with the laws of God, rather than to maintain the slogan that we will fight until unconditional surrender, regardless of the numbers of thousands or millions of young men that are going to be slaughtered on both sides, and which would be the surest way to spread the seeds for hatching up the next world war even a

little bit sooner than No. 2. The people in this section of the State are unalterably opposed to compulsory military training after the war other than in some form that could be given in the schools.

The Post-war Defense Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How to Solve Our Post-war Defense Problem," written by Brig. Gen. John McAuley Palmer, United States Army, and published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 27, 1945. I should like to have the article printed in full, including the remarks of the editors.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate of the probable cost of printing this article. The estimated cost is $114.40.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO SOLVE OUR POST-WAR DEFENSE PROBLEM

(By John McAuley Palmer, brigadier general, U. S. Army)

What kind of military establishment shall we have in this country after the war? Do we want a professional army or a citizen army rooted in universal military training? Should the Army and Navy be administered under a single Government department? Should we have a separate air force on equal footing with the Army and Navy? These and similar questions are all components of the post-war defense problem—a problem which will be hotly debated during the coming months.

In our issue of December 23, Brig. Gen. John McAuley Palmer presented one important phase of the question in an article titled "General Marshall Wants a Citizen Army." In an endorsement published with that article, Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, United States Army, identified General Palmer as "the Army's leading authority on the subject of American military policy."

General Palmer now turns to some other urgent phases of post-war defense and, in the article beginning on this page, makes a simple and logical suggestion as to how Congress and the American people might get at the real facts behind all the argument. His suggestion has such originality and such merit that we believe it will be interesting to every American.

THE EDITORS.

When Washington became President, there were two principal planks in the platform of his administration. He sought to establish a sound financial system and a sound military system. With the aid of Alexander Hamilton, his Secretary of the Treasury, he attained the first of these objectives before the end of his first administration. But it was not until after Hitler conquered France, 150 years later, that Congress adopted the first principle of Washington's military policy—compulsory military training in time of peace.

It is a high tribute to Hamilton's financial genius that his successors have, so far, been able to devise enough taxes and borrow enough money to pay for the vast wastes of public wealth that have flowed through that wide gap in our national structure. For unreadiness for war has been the principal cause of all our great national debts. If our fathers had accepted all of Washington's political system, instead of but half of it, our burden of taxation would be much lighter than it is today.

Since we have neglected the solution of this paramount national problem for more than a century and a half, it is obviously time to begin taking effective action. Our enormous national debt and our determination to join with other nations in the establishment of a peaceful world order both demand a scientific solution of the problem of post-war military organization. Fortunately, General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, has taken a long first step toward such a solution. He has simply directed his planners in the War Department to return to George Washington's guidance. The historical background of his directive is given in my article, General Marshall Wants a Citizen Army, which appeared in the December 23 issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

It is also fortunate that the House of Representatives has recently taken another essential step toward a scientific solution of the problem. Its Select Committee on Post-War Military Policy is the first competent agency ever created by the Congress to weigh and decide between conflicting ex parte views as to the relative missions, dimensions, and economies of the several elements of our national-defense system.

In the old days, the Congress appropriated for the Navy and the Army separately, without any prior scientific settlement as to the proper joint relations and missions of the land forces and sea forces. One committee in each House prepared legislation based more or less upon the Navy's view as to what these relations and missions should be. Another committee in each House prepared legislation based more or less upon the Army's view as to what these relations and missions should be. Congress then passed laws embodying incomplete fragments of both ex parte proposals, frequently splitting the same mission between the two services and sometimes giving to one service a mission that could be performed better and more economically by the other. These things happened because the members of the committees had access to only one-sided views. There was no means of bringing conflicting points of view together in an open court with the view of arriving at the truth.

This situation was bad enough when only the land forces and the sea forces were concerned. With the tremendous new importance of the air forces, all our accepted conceptions of world strategy must be reappraised. From the days of Themistocles to the days of Admiral Mahan, a nation could protect its overseas communications solely by means of ships. That long chapter in world history is now closed. It therefore becomes imperative to solve the problem of equilibrium between the ground forces, the air forces, and the sea forces. Before proposing a peace establishment for either, their mutual relations and relative economies should be determined in a scientific manner. The mission and role of one cannot be defined intelligently without also defining the missions and roles of the two others. This problem of equilibrium between the three military services cannot be solved by either the sea-force expert, the air-force expert, or the ground-force expert. Each of them will be a competent and highly eloquent witness as to what his branch of the service wants. But each of them will be a strictly ex parte witness as to what his branch of the service should get—which happens to be the real question at issue.

The truth will be arrived at only through a judicial determination of the issues joined between these three expert witnesses. Some such process of adjudication will be indispensable after the present war. With our enormous public debt, economy will demand that all unnecessary overlappings of military missions must be eliminated. Each of the three ex parte programs must therefore be rigorously whittled down and refitted into one coordinated national program. There must be one single plan for the whole structure of national defense. It will not do to have one architect for the foundation, another for the walls and another for the roof.

Now, how can these ex parte views be reconciled and the truth determined? The answer is very simple. It is only necessary to bring the three experts together in an open court, receive their pleadings and join their issues. A competent judicial mind, after a reasonable time for enlightenment and investigation, can weigh these issues and make a sound decision. The essential thing is to require each expert to present his case in the presence of the two others—subject to open rebuttal by either or both of them. This is the recognized method of reconciling conflicting expert views in our courts. And, by this method, issues just as complicated and technical as the issues between land, sea, and air experts are decided daily. It will not be necessary for the judge to master all the intricacies and technicalities of land, sea, and air warfare. The three experts will always be available to enlighten him sufficiently for him to intervene with common sense and practical wisdom whenever his expert advisers fail to agree. In fact, this process, through mutual education, will frequently have a salutary effect in narrowing the issues themselves. It can safely be predicted that the judgment of such a tribunal will be accepted by the American people as the real foundation of a sound military policy and an economical military budget.

Under the Constitution of the United States, the House of Representatives' Select Committe on Post-war Military Policy has full power to exercise this judicial function in all matters affecting the organization of the armed forces of the United States. But it will not be humanly possible for it to exercise it effectively unless it employs the aid of other judicial machinery of a kind well known to our courts.

All the members of the committee have other great obligations to the Nation. Most of them are members of other congressional committees, which frequently make great demands upon their time. They must also be prepared to be present on the floor of the House when important issues are under consideration. And they all have extensive correspondence with members of the constituencies which they represent in the Congress. Few, if any, of them can be present at all the meetings. How, in these circumstances, can they make a sound adjudication of all the issues between the many ex parte witnesses who must appear before them if our national defense problem—with its many political and economic as well as military complications—is to be solved?

A possible solution is suggested in the practice of our courts of equity. Such a court might frequently have a case that would absorb the judge's whole time for weeks, if he should attempt to act upon every phase of it in person. It might thus fill his docket for an indeterminable period, to the exclusion of other and, perhaps, more important cases.

The judge meets this situation by appointing a master in chancery. It is the duty of this officer of the court to inquire into and report upon all matters of fact referred to him and to perform such other acts as may be directed by the court. In this capacity, he is empowered to examine conflicting witnesses in the presence of counsel for all parties at

interest. After this process, he reports the essence of the case to the court, with his recommendations. His report is not binding upon the judge. But, as it gives the reaction of one intelligent mind on the whole case, his honor generally accepts it as the basis of his further action in full court.

In this way the judge is enabled in a short time to dispose of a case which might otherwise close the Temple of Themis to all other petitioners for weeks or even months.

There is a remarkable incident in the history of the Supreme Court of the United States in which the harmonizing influence of a master was revealed. In this case, under the custom of the Supreme Court, the official was known as a special master. But his function was in essence the same as that of the master in chancery in equity cases.

Suits had been brought against the Chicago Sanitary District, a creature of the State of Illinois, by all the States bordering on the Great Lakes, on account of alleged injuries threatened their harbors and navigable waters by the diversion of water at the lower end of Lake Michigan. As the flow of water from Lake Michigan tended to maintain a better low-water level in the Mississippi River. all the States of the lower Mississippi Valley found it to their interest to join the State of Illinois as codefendants in these cases.

In all these cases, under the Constitution of the United States, the Supreme Court of the United States was the court of original jurisdiction. It would obviously be impossible for the Court to exercise its normal functions if it undertook, at the same time, to take the evidence directly in these highly important cases—which, by the way, were quite as complicated and technical as the three-way controversies between the sea forces, the air forces, and the ground forces now pending before the House of Representative Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy.

The Supreme Court therefore decided to refer all these cases to a special master. And, as it realized that his success would depend largely upon his Nation-wide reputation for wisdom and integrity, the Court selected the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, a great lawyer, one-time Governor of the State of New York, one-time Justice of the Supreme Court, one who had missed election as President of the United States by a close vote in but one of the States, one who had recently served as Secretary of State, and one who was soon to become the Chief Justice of the United States.

After many months of patient labor, Special Master Hughes submitted his report to the Supreme Court, with the result that this enormously complicated and highly important litigation was finally argued and presented to the Court for decision in less than 2 days.

It is obvious that an able and disinterested mind, free to explore the problem as a whole, can do for the Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy what Special Master Hughes did for the Supreme Court. It is not even essential that the committee's special master should be a lawyer. Some distinguished layman recognized both as a scientist and a man of affairs, such as the president of Harvard or the president of Masachusetts Institute of Technology, would be eminently qualified for this task. Such a man would not be overawed by the intricacies of any application of science within the armed forces. Also, with his pedagogic experience, he would be able to appraise his witnesses by the quality of their thinking, without regard to any purely irrelevant criteria such as the number of stars on their shoulders or the amount of gold braid on their sleeves.

While high military rank has an indispensable place in the conduct of military operations, it has no such privileged position in scientific processes as the solution of a problem in geometry or the determination of a national policy. In fact, the history of our Army shows that high military rank may exert a baleful influence in the field of military policy. It was Winfield Scott, hero of a brilliant campaign from Vera Cruz to the city of Mexico, who later, as commanding general of the Army, influenced President Lincoln to adopt an unsound military policy which almost defeated his efforts to save the Union. It was William Tecumseh Sherman, hero of the decisive march through Georgia and the Carolinas, who later, as commanding general of the Army, submitted that same unwise policy to a joint congressional committee, thus thwarting the efforts of Congress to establish a sound military organization after the Civil War. If any Army officer, while either of these distinguished soldiers commanded the Army, had ventured to propose a modern adaptation of the Washingtonian military policy such as General Marshall has recently endorsed, he would have been dangerously close to military insubordination.

In fact, the mental processes of a successful leader in battle are essentially different from those of a scientific investigator. In the stress of combat, there is no time for a meticulous quest for the ideal plan. The successful commander is one who can adopt any one of several practicable plans quickly and then press it to swift and resolute execution. It is obvious that the problems submitted by the select committee to its special master will require essentially different treatment.

We may now dispose of one possible objection to the appointment of a special master. It may be urged that we alleged military experts have mysteries in our craniums that no intelligent layman can understand. This, of course, is unadulterated and not entirely disinterested bunkum. It will not be necessary for me to prove this statement because, under a well-known rule of evidence, it will be sufficient for me to admit it.

The select committee's special master would not be concerned with details of organization. He would simply investigate and report upon broad questions of policy referred to him by the select committee. Among these are the following:

Should we have a single Department of War in our post-war organization? What, in a general way, should be its relation to the three armed forces?

Whether we have a single Department of War or not, should the Joint Chiefs of Staff, created by the Commander in Chief for the effective prosecution of the present war, be perpetuated in permanent legislation? If so, how should this agency be related to the civilian head or heads of the armed forces?

Should we have a separate air force, coequal with the sea forces and the ground forces? If so, what proportion of the total number of airplanes should be set apart permanently as integral auxiliaries to the sea forces and the ground forces?

What are the relative missions and economies of carrier-based and land-based airplanes?

What is the true mission of the Marine Corps? What is the true line of demarcation between its amphibious missions and the amphibious missions of properly trained ground forces?

None of these, nor any other questions before the select committee, will be any more technical or complicated than the questions in engineering and sanitary science which came before Special Master Hughes in the Chicago Sanitary District cases. The select committee's special master would reach his conclusions by having all conflicting experts sit at the same table with him, where he would enlighten himself by questioning each of them in the presence of the others. After each special case, he would submit his recommendations to the select committee for its action in the premises.

The Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy has already held extensive hearings on the single Department of National Defense without reaching a final conclusion. The testimony shows that all the Army witnesses from the Secretary of War down favored such a single department. Most of the civilian witnesses before the committee, including the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and a former Secretary of the Navy, strongly endorsed it. One distinguished Navy officer favored it, but most of the Navy witnesses opposed it, and some who did not positively oppose it expressed the view that no action should be taken until Admiral Nimitz, Admiral Halsey, and other commanders in the Pacific theater of war should be free to appear before the select committee. There was merit in this position, although its effect would be to postpone action on an important public question for a long period of time.

This suggests a special advantage to the select committee in appointing a special master. After digesting the testimony of other witnesses, he would be able to take a swift plane to the Pacific. There within 3 or 4 weeks, he would be able to get the views of all the higher military and naval commanders without distracting them from their duties in connection with the prosecution of the war His final report, after his return to Washington, would greatly expedite the select committee's solution of a fundamentally important post-war problem.

The labors of the special master would be greatly expedited by a consideration of the Washingtonian military policy recently endorsed by General Marshall. In his logical mind, the master probably would soon reduce this policy to the following essential principles:

1. Every able-bodied American should be trained to defend his country.

2. During the training period, all natural leaders should be carefully screened out and encouraged to become reserve officers—eligible for eventual promotion to any rank for which they can qualify, under sound and equitable standards.

3. No professional officer or man should be maintained on the permanent establishments of the ground, sea, or air forces to perform a duty which can be performed effectively and in time by trained nonprofessional officers and men.

Further analysis of these principles would, I believe, convince the special master that they constitute an infallible formula for maximum economy in peacetime and maximum effectiveness in wartime.

A sound solution of our postwar military problem will demand the scientific determination of that effective combination of air forces, sea forces, and ground forces which will be most consistent with economy, military efficiency, and our purpose to join with other nations in the establishment of a peaceful world order. It is obvious that an uncoordinated summation of the separate estimates of the three armed forces will result in a much larger total peace establishment than will be consistent with the foregoing considerations. A quite natural esprit de corps in each of the three services will impel it to seek the greatest possible share in the defense of its country. But each will be influenced by a less disinterested motive. The larger its slice in the postwar military melon, the more promotion by act of Congress will there be for its professional officers. This suggests that Robert Burns was the supreme authority on national military organization when he wrote:

"If self the wavering balance shake
It's rarely right adjusted."

This interservice competition will greatly complicate the problem before the select committee. Under its influence, many witnesses will come before it as members of pressure groups rather than as scientific experts. With the testimony beclouded by

self-interest in this way, it may be questioned whether even the wisest special master will be able to straighten out the mess.

This leads to the conclusion that it will be impossible for the Congress to make a scientific solution of our post-war organizational problem unless it first removes the promotion perturbation from the minds of all officers in the three armed services.

Fortunately, a congressional precedent indicates that this will not be so difficult as it may seem at first glance. The Sixty-sixth Congress had to solve precisely this same problem as a first step toward establishing a sound organization of the Regular Army after World War No. 1.

The story of this great reform goes back many years. From the close of the Civil War until November 1919, interarm competition within the Army defeated every effort to determine a well-balanced Army organization. During those years, no Congressman was able to learn what the Army really needed because his correspondence with friends and constituents within the service indicated that those in the infantry, the cavalry, the artillery, and other branches of the service each wanted an increase of his own arm of the service and was little concerned with anything else. This difficulty reached a climax in 1919, when the Military Affairs Committee of both Houses of Congress took up the pressing question of post-war Army organization.

Both committees soon discovered that the wide differences of opinion between witnesses from the several branches of the Army were almost all due to the promotion perturbation. Therefore, during the month of November 1919 they eliminated the cause of this perturbation definitely and permanently by adopting a system through which the normal promotion of all officers below the grade of brigadier general should be placed on an equitable basis entirely independent of any immediate or future changes in organization. Thereafter, the normal promotion of any officer would not be overstimulated by a legislative increase of his arm of the service, nor would he suffer if the public interest should demand legislation for its decrease. From the day that the Military Affairs Committees wrote this provision into the proposed law, the allotment of commissioned personnel to the several branches of the Army, presented no further difficulty. Also from that day, the military correspondence of all Congressmen was enormously reduced. Thereafter, letters on Army organization came only from the small percentage of their correspondents who knew something about that subject. I will venture to say that since that momentous day in November 1919 no Army officer has ever written to any Congressman on the subject of Cavalry, Infantry, or Artillery increase.

The promotion-perturbation eliminator adopted by the Sixty-sixth Congress may not exactly meet the conditions existing after World War No. 2. But an able special master, after a reasonable time for investigation, should have no difficulty in rectifying the formula. In fact, if the members of the select committee should make this the first item on the special master's agenda, their subsequent labors would be enormously simplified.

A strictly scientific solution of our national-defense problem demands that the normal promotion rate for all officers should be the same, whether they serve on the ground, in the air, or on the sea. There should be no departure from this general rule except where the law authorizes accelerated promotion as a recognition of exceptional ability os as a reward for exceptional merit. But though such a rule is obviously fair to all, it will not be universally popular. As in 1919, there will be protests throughout the services. But, as the Sixty-sixth Congress decided then, this is a case where individual tastes, predilections, and pretensions must yield to a paramount public interest.

Do We Want National Health Insurance?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article entitled, "Do We Want National Health Insurance?" from Collier's magazine of January 27, 1945. As the title indicates, it discusses the problem of national health insurance. The article is by Amy Porter, and is a very valuable contribution to the discussion of this subject.

I am informed by the Public Printer that it will cost $173.40 to print the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO WE WANT NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE?

(By Amy Porter)

HOW WOULD YOU RECEIVE MEDICAL CARE UNDER THE PROPOSED LAW?

Senator MURRAY illustrates as follows:

Question. Will the medical care I receive depend upon how much I have paid into the insurance fund?

Answer. No; if you have paid the minimum amount so that you are insured, you are entitled to all the medical care you need.

Question. Will I be allowed to choose my own doctor?

Answer. Yes; you can choose from among all the doctors in the community who participate in the insurance system, or you may choose a group practice center. You may change doctors if you are not satisfied.

Question. Can I continue to go to my present doctor?

Answer. Yes; if he is participating in the insurance system. He will be paid for his services to you. A great majority of the medical profession presumably will participate, since practically our entire population will be insured. If you go to a nonparticipating doctor, you will have to pay him yourself.

Question. Will the doctor come to my home if I am too ill to go to his office?

Answer. Yes. The doctor will be available to you in his office, in your home, or at the hospital, according to your need.

Question. Will my dependents be taken care of without additional fees?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What if I should need an operation?

Answer. You will be entitled to the surgical, hospital, and laboratory services that you need.

Question. What if I already have a chronic or incurable disease?

Answer. You will be entitled to medical or surgical care and to hospital care up to 30 days, with possible extension to 120 days.

Question. Will it be possible for me to see specialists?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What kind of medical care would I receive?

Answer. It should be better than what you receive today, since your doctor could use all needed laboratory, specialist, and hospital services.

Question. How will my doctor be paid?

Answer. According to the method the local doctors choose—by salary (part time or whole time), fees, or so much per insured person who chooses him.

The state of health in the United States is nothing to brag about. Ours is not the healthiest country in the world, although we like to think it is. In the matter of life expectancy, often taken as an index of health, the United States does not make a very good showing. Prewar statistics, compiled by the National Resources Planning Board, reveal that we are outranked in life expectancy at various ages by Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Australia, New Zealand, Germany, Italy, and other countries. At age 60, we rank below 11 other countries.

We lose at least half a billion working days each year to illness, one-third of it considered preventable. Out of 13,000,000 men drafted, almost 4,000,000 were rejected as unfit. Of the unfit, at least one-sixth suffered from "easily remedied defects," and a larger proportion from defects that were preventable. Methods and treatment are steadily improving, yet it is estimated that from 30 to 50 percent more mothers die than would die if they all had good medical care. With proper treatment, probably 30,000 cancer victims could be saved each year. Syphilis could be wiped out with the knowledge we now have and do not fully apply, and tuberculosis, which claimed more than 56,000 lives in 1943, could be practically eliminated.

These statistics and estimates come from the United States Census Bureau, the United States Public Health Service, the Children's Bureau, and other governmental agencies, and from studies made by private agencies such as the Rockefeller Foundation. A survey by the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care showed that at the peak of prosperity in 1929, one-half the population was poorly provided with medical care. This result is borne out by the findings of the National Health Survey, made during the depression.

When people do not get adequate care, it generally is because they cannot afford it. Medicine is more effective and more widely applied today than it used to be, but full application is often more costly because it makes frequent use of expensive equipment, expensive laboratory procedures, and expensive consultations with specialists.

Dr. Ernst Boas, of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, says: "Medical knowledge has increased so much, it costs more to apply it. This is not the doctor's fault and it is not the people's fault. But we must find a remedy. Fifty years ago a man with a bellyache was content when his doctor gave him a few pills out of his little black bag. That was all there was to do for him, and it didn't cost too much.

"Now, the man who takes his bellyache to the doctor may get involved in X-rays and specialists and one thing or another until the first thing he knows he has run up a bill for $50 or $100 or $1,000. Or else, realizing he may run up such a bill, he stays away from the doctor, taking his chances on a ruptured appendix or stomach ulcers. And when you consider the cost of caring for long-drawn-out illness, such as rheumatism or heart trouble or cancer—well, we all know cases where such costs have brought a family to ruin."

Lack of money is the reason, again, for the scarcity of doctors in farm communities and in the poorer sections of the country, especially the South. This scarcity is not merely a wartime condition, but a settled trend which can be expected to continue after the war. Doctors in private practice must live by fees, so naturally most of them gravitate to cities and prosperous communities where more people have more money. In peacetime, New York—a center for specialists—had one doctor for every 487 inhabitants. But Alabama had 1 doctor for every 1,500 inhabitants (since the war, 1 for every 2,800).

The regions that are short of doctors usually have too few hospitals and inadequate supplies and facilities such as X-ray services and laboratories. This, in turn, keeps doc-

tors away, for a modern doctor prefers to practice with the aid of the equipment he learned to depend upon at medical school.

In general, the distribution of medical care in this country is spotty, with the well-to-do and sometimes the city poor getting good care, and the middle and lower income groups, especially in rural areas, often getting inadequate care, or no care at all. This spotty distribution is reflected in various statistics. Last year 200,000 women gave birth to babies without any medical help. Out of every 1,000 babies born in the United States, 40 die during their first year of life, but that is the rate for the country as a whole. In 10 States, only about 30 babies out of every 1,000 fail to live out their first year. At the same time, in 10 other States, the infant death rate was nearly double the average for the best States.

In the 10 States where the fewest babies died, over four-fifths of the births occurred in hospitals. Physicians attended nearly every birth. But in the 10 States where almost twice as many babies died, less than a third of the births were in hospitals, and only about three-fourths were attended by doctors. In the same way, the poorer areas of any city will fall behind the city as a whole in health.

We all know these things in a vague sort of way. We shudder when some especially pathetic case is brought to our attention through a newspaper story or through personal knowledge. We shudder and perhaps we send in a contribution to a health fund.

We Americans, who can boast of the finest doctors and hospitals in the world, do not like to think that our neighbors actually suffer and die because they do not have access to good medical care. Doctor Alan Gregg, medical director of the Rockefeller Foundation, says, "Because the doctor's services are purchaseable and yet almost beyond price, they are coming to be regarded like life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—a civic right, a public necessity."

It is generally agreed that something must be done—and nearly everyone concerned with the problem agrees that that something will have to be insurance of one kind or another, public or private. Individually, most people cannot budget the unpredictable costs of illness. Collectively, they can do it in the same way they budget fire or car insurance.

The most far-reaching insurance proposal so far is the Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security bill, a revised version of which is to be considered by the present Congress. In its medical provisions, the bill goes beyond all earlier ones and proposes to pay the cost of complete medical and hospital care for some 110,000,000 United States citizens, from birth to death, from measles to eyeglasses.

The measure proposes to pay for this and other health measures with the expenditure of approximately the same amount of money, or perhaps a little more, than we pay out now for private medical services—between two and three billion dollars. The money would come from insurance taxes instead of through fees paid privately to doctors and hospitals. All of us, sick and well, rich and poor, would pay according to our earnings to make up a great insurance fund out of which all of our medical needs would be met.

The medical provisions are the most controversial part of the bill, which is sponsored by Senators ROBERT F. WAGNER and JAMES E. MURRAY and Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, and is designed to extend social security all along the line. It provides for a single payroll deduction of 6 percent on incomes up to $3,000, with employers paying a like amount. Self-employed persons such as grocers, farmers, doctors, would pay 7 percent. One quarter of the total funds would be applied to medical care costs, the balance going to insurance against old age, unemployment, maternity, temporary illness, permanent disability.

Thus, if you are employed, complete medical care for yourself and your dependents would cost you 1½ percent of your income up to $3,000 or not more than $3.75 a month. An average, middle-income family now pays out 4 percent of income on medical bills alone, or about $120 annually on $3,000. Of course, most of us would not pay the maximum $3.75 monthly, or $45 annually, for medical and hospital care, because three-fourths of us make less than $3,000 a year.

The bill has passionate friends and violent foes. They have argued themselves hoarse since 1939 when the first compulsory health insurance proposals were put before Congress. The foes charge that the bill is communistic, un-American, a stab at free enterprise, and a scheme to provide an inferior kind of political medicine to the people.

Led by the American Medical Association, they include several large national drug chains, some private insurance companies, a group of patent-medicine and drug manufacturers, the American Bar Association, and the American Hospital Association. Prominent doctors opposed to the bill include Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the A. M. A. Journal; Dr. James C. McCann, president of the Massachusetts Medical Service; Dr. W. P. Morrill, research director, American Hospital Association; and many others.

The bill's friends argue that tax-supported medicine is no more un-American than tax-supported education.[1] They are led by the social-minded legislators who wrote it, and by a minority group of doctors within the American Medical Association. Friends include organized labor, both A. F. of L. and C. I. O., some farm groups, the National Lawyers' Guild, the Association of Interns and Medical Students, and the American Public Health Association. Prominent doctors and specialists who favor the bill include Dr. Hugh Cabot, of Boston, formerly of the Mayo Clinic; Dr. Ernest Boas, of Columbia University's college of physicians and surgeons; Dr. Miles Atkinson, eye, ear, nose, and throat specialist, of New York University; and many others.

The arguments of the opposition are (1) the bill would rob the patient of his right to choose his own doctor; (2) it would lower standards of medical care; (3) it would make doctors slaves to bureaucrats; (4) it would cut the doctor's income by ending the fee-for-service system; (5) the bill is unnecessary because anyone can get the medical care he needs right now, privately, or through voluntary insurance or through charity.

Those in favor of the bill reply that: (1) The bill does not limit free choice of physician, rather it extends the privilege to those who have not had much choice before. (2) Standards of care would be raised because a physician would be able to make free use of costly equipment specialists' service, and laboratory tests which now are often beyond the ability of his patient to pay for. (3) Doctors would be as independent as they are at present, practicing as they do now, except that they would be sure of getting paid. (4) Most doctors' incomes would be raised, and more who wished to keep on with private practice could do so. (5) Many persons do not now get adequate care, either because they can't afford it and don't like to ask for charity or because first-rate medical services aren't available in the communities where they live.

Public opinion on the issue is reflected by various polls. Dr. George Gallup reports that 59 percent of the people want an extension of social security laws to cover medical care. Seventy-five to eighty-five percent want an easier method of paying doctor bills.

A survey by the National Opinion Research Center (paid for by a group in favor of the bill) found that 68 percent favored a broadened social security law covering payments for doctor and hospital care, and 82 percent wanted an easier way of paying medical bills. Another survey by the Opinion Research Corporation (paid for by a group opposed to the bill) showed only 37 percent favoring a Federal Government plan for health security, although 63 percent wanted some easier way of paying medical costs. The National Opinion Research Center blames the apparent discrepancy in the two surveys on the way the Opinion Research Corporation worded its questions.

THE WISHES OF THE PEOPLE

Still another poll, made by Foote, Cone & Belding for the California Medical Association to determine how doctors could meet the threat of Federal medicine, found that 50 percent of California's citizens definitely favor Federal medicine, 34 percent are against it, and 16 percent are undecided.

The report commented: "Among upper-income groups, Federal medicine is desired because of the poor. Among the poor it is desired because they want proper care themselves. * * * If it were to come up on the ballot today * * * it seems abundantly clear that you (the California Medical Association) would lose the issue—perhaps by a landslide.

"And," the report continues, "if doctors ask 'Why is medicine singled out? Hasn't the doctor as much right to the advantages of free enterprise as anyone else?' the answer is simple, 'The public doesn't think so.' The public is applying to the profession a principle as old as this Nation: When something is desperately needed by all of the people, but only part of the people can obtain it because of the cost, then it must be socialized so that all may have it. The people quite evidently think that medicine should be a public utility under Government control and operation like the postal system."

To wean the public away from its desire for Federal medicine, this firm advised its doctor clients to concentrate on enlarging and improving the California Physicians' Service, a medical insurance plan for families with incomes under $3,000. The California Physicians' Service is one of the best-known medical society-sponsored plans in the country, headed by the distinguished Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, chancellor of Stanford University, who had the boldness to suggest 12 years ago, when he was chairman of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, that it was time the American Medical Association did something to extend better care to low-income families.

The American Medical Association is conducting its campaign against the bill in cooperation with the National Physicians' Committee, which has distributed more than 15,000,000 copies of a pamphlet denouncing compulsory health insurance.[2] This pam-

[1] Dr. Fishbein, of the American Medical Association, says: "Take a look at tax-supported education.

"We have in the United States 108,000 one-room schools—in Illinois 67 percent of educational facilities—where 1 teacher teaches all the subjects to pupils of all ages and acts at the same time as school nurse, physical educator, and supervisor of recreation. Among the medical profession there is a feeling that national compulsory sickness insurance would provide an equally low quality of medical care for most of the people served."

Advocates of the Wagner bill reply that because the bill is national in scope, it would tend to eliminate State inequalities in health facilities, pulling up low-standard areas to higher standards.

[2] Dr. Fishbein says the American Medical Association's house of delegates "has endorsed the work of this and other agencies," but that the American Medical Association does not support the National Physicians' Committee with funds. However, medical societies and individual doctors do support the N. P. C. with funds.

phlet, the committee states, "is the source and fountainhead of most of the propaganda against the Wagner bill, flooding the Nation today. It supplies the chief arguments drummed into the medical profession through editorials in hundreds of official medical journals, and pounded into the public ear from the lecture platform, the press, and the radio." Maybe you receive one of these pamphlets enclosed in your doctor's bill, or wrapped up with a package of pills at the drugstore.

The National Physicians' Committee also asks the personal physicians of Congressmen to present its arguments to legislators. The National Physicians' Committee likens the threat of the Wagner bill to a raging forest fire, and in one of its pamphlets says: "Human rights as opposed to state slavery is the issue. * * * The provisions (of the bill) are so sweeping that, if enacted into law, the entire system of American medical care would be destroyed."

The 1943 financial report of the committee noted that 6,227 individual physicians had sent in contributions "to preserve for the medical profession the independence and freedoms essential to its continued progress." The committee's funds for the fiscal year 1943–44 totaled $294,720.88.

Senator WAGNER says of the National Physicians' Committee's pamphlets: "Misrepresentations and half truths abound in this propaganda. It has roused unwarranted fears as to the purposes of our bill."

WAGNER recalls the opposition he encountered when the social security bill was introduced in 1935. "Yet today," he says, "no one questions the value of this act."

Leaders of the American Medical Association, Dr. Morris Fishbein and others, say they speak for a majority of the country's doctors. Members include 125,000 out of a total of 185,000 licensed physicians.

But a dissenting group within the American Medical Association—the Physicians' Forum, headed by Dr. Boas, of New York—is actively working for the Wagner bill. Another group of American Medical Association members—the Physicians' Committee for the Improvement of Medical Care, headed by Dr. John P. Peters, of Yale University's medical school—endorses the principles of the Wagner bill. The combined membership of these two groups is around a thousand.

Dr. Boas argues: "You cannot tell from American Medical Association utterances how the rank and file of physicians feel. Many of them are afraid to speak up, for the American Medical Association is powerful. It can cause a doctor to lose his hospital privileges and otherwise damage him in his practice.

"We cannot win this fight through the organized doctors," Dr. Boas continues. "They'll trail along after their patients—the public—demand action. They have always trailed along behind every progressive move in medicine. They opposed public-health vaccinations against diphtheria. They almost kicked me out of my county society because I ran a baby health station."

An opinion poll of doctors in the armed services shows, according to a report in the American Medical Association Journal, that 54 percent want to go into group practice after the war, 4 percent want to go into full-time salaried practice, and 5 percent want to go into Government service. Thus a total of 63 percent prefer some form of practice other than the American Medical Association's traditional solo practice on a fee-for-service basis.

FIGHTING FIRE WITH FIRE

As one method of opposing the Wagner bill, leaders of the American Medical Association now are working to develop more and more voluntary insurance plans, such as the California Physicians' Service and other medical society plans, the Blue Cross Hospitalization plans, and industrial plans run by private insurance companies, in the hope that the public will prefer those to a Government-sponsored Nation-wide plan.

Voluntary plans now promoted by organized medicine in the beginning were stoutly opposed by the American Medical Association. This century-old organization, which during its early history did so much to raise medical standards, promote research and stamp out quackery, thereby earning the gratitude and respect of the country, has always opposed any medical care plant that involved any change in the traditional way of practicing medicine. The traditional way is: The individual patient consults an individual doctor and pays a fee for each service rendered.

The American Medical Association disapproved of the first hospitalization plans, starting with the one that began in Dallas, Tex., in 1929, but later, after such plans were securely established in many places, it gave its approval. It opposed the country's three most famous voluntary medical insurance plans—Ross-Loos of Los Angeles (whose founders were expelled from their local American Medical Association); Group Health of Washington, D. C. (which won a conviction in the Supreme Court against the American Medical Association under antitrust laws), and Farmers Union Cooperative of Elk City, Okla. (whose founder almost lost his license to practice).

In the past it has opposed the formation of group practice centers where (as at the Mayo Clinic) a collection of doctors skilled in various branches of medicine work together to give appropriate care to each patient. It has usually protested when the Government extended free treatment to special groups—such as venereal-disease cases, veterans, or low-income mothers and children—on the ground that such treatment amounted to unfair competition with the private practitioners.

However, after national health proposals were introduced in Congress in 1939, the American Medical Association came to accept both group practice centers and voluntary insurance plans—although never a combination of the two. It also sanctions increased Federal grants-in-aid to States, to provide public health services and care for indigents—always under local control.

There are at present over 300 voluntary insurance plans in operation—hospital, medical society, industrial, and other types. Together they insure approximately 20,000,000 people against one or more items of medical expense. The most important numerically are the Blue Cross hospital plans with an enrollment of 15,000,000. These cover hospital bills only. About 7,000,000 people have some protection in addition to, or other than, hospitalization insurance. This protection, in about half the cases, is limited to surgical and obstetrical insurance, and, in many, there are other limitations.

So far, then, about 15 percent of the population has signed up under voluntary plans of one kind or another. American Medical Association representatives believe this percentage can be tremendously increased. Advocates of the Wagner bill argue that experience shows such plans usually stop growing after a few years of operation because the bulk of the people can't afford them.

The voluntary plans favored by medical societies and hospitals find most of their customers among people making over $2,000 a year, and even in the prosperous year 1942, 43 percent of the Nation's families earned less than $2,000. Then there is a ceiling on most plans, limiting membership to those with incomes of less than a specified amount. The ceiling is generally from $2,000 to $3,000. Most plans limit enrollments to group, many exclude dependents, almost all exclude persons over 60. For these and other self-limiting reasons, advocates of the Wagner bill believe voluntary schemes can never reach more than one-fourth of the population. Also, as Wagner bill proponents observe, insurance against surgical and obstetrical expenses does not help a person who has pneumonia, heart trouble, or cancer.

Those who administer voluntary plans are in general opposed to compulsory insurance. The Blue Cross administrators, closely affiliated with the American Hospital Association, which in turn is closely affiliated with the American Medical Association, are opposed. Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, is an exception. He says that the new voluntary plan about to start operating in New York is "only a stopgap until something like the Wagner bill passes, and when that happens I'll be very happy about it."

The Wagner bill designates the Surgeon General as the administrator of its health insurance features. Would this mean, as opponents fear, that the Surgeon General would be an autocrat over American medicine, with every doctor, every hospital, dependent on his whims?

Advocates say such fears are without foundation, since the bill provides suitable checks on the Surgeon General's power.

He could not hire doctors. Any doctor licensed to practice in any State would automatically have the right to participate in the national insurance plan if he wished to. And doctors would themselves decide which of several methods of payment they preferred.

On all matters of policy, the Surgeon General would be required to consult with a council on which the medical profession and other interested groups would be represented. He could not spend a penny without the consent of the Social Security Board, which, the bill's advocates argue, has made an excellent record for just, unbiased dealing during the 10 years of its existence.

Under the bill, payment to doctors and hospitals would be arranged on a national basis, but administration of medical practice would remain, as now, a local affair.

To the argument that "Government in medicine" would necessarily give us inefficient, low-quality care, Wagner bill advocates reply by citing the record of the many Government health activities which have been in operation for years. The Government now gives care to some 750,000 farmers through the Farm Security Administration. It gives whole or partial support in many States to public health departments, hospitals for veterans, and for tubercular and mental cases, to venereal clinics, maternity and child health clinics.

Maternity clinics, for instance, have had the use of social security funds for the past 7 years. From 1936 to 1942, the infant mortality rate was cut almost one-third; the maternal death rate more than half. This marked decline coincides with the extension of medical services by the States, made possible in part by social security funds. Katharine B. Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau, says, "This Federal aid was undoubtedly a factor in saving the lives of many babies and their mothers."

If the Wagner bill goes into effect, the voluntary plans will not necessarily be junked. Many probably will take over administration of the Federal plan within their areas. At least one American Medical Association leader in New Jersey is figuring on that.

Speaking at a medical society meeting, he said, "We don't feel these plans are going to answer the problem of medical care distribution. If we took in 50 percent of all the people in New Jersey, that wouldn't answer it. * * * But we can develop an agency * * * and its administrative methods can be extended to take over any Federal plan which comes into our State."

The health program conference of 29 prominent physicians and economists issued a report in December, proposing that voluntary plans of good standard should be allowed to continue under a health insurance law. The Wagner plan has greater scope than any other. It offers more than insurance against the cost of illness.

"Ultimately and by evolution," Senator MURRAY says, "it probably would bring about a vast reorganization of medical care. It would subsidize the building of hospitals, health centers, and laboratories in the places that need them most. By offering doctors financial security (it is estimated that on the average the general practitioner would make at least $5,000; complete specialists twice as much) it would tempt an adequate number of able men to settle in areas now desperately in need of them.

NEW ERA FOR RURAL DOCTORS

"It would encourage establishment of group practice centers, on the theory that group practice offers the most efficient as well as the least expensive kind of medical care. Rural diagnostic centers would radiate out from these centers into small towns and rural areas. Thus the country doctor who never could afford to pay out $10,000 for three standard items—X-ray, cardiograph, and metabolism devices—would have access to this equipment."

The Wagner plan emphasizes preventive medicine. Dr. Atkinson, of New York, praising this part of the program, said, "Any system of medical care which comes to life only in the face of illness is outmoded. If we are to give good care to all the people, we must prevent sickness, rather than simply treat sickness after it happens. This bill would encourage people to go to doctors for check-ups even when they feel well, thus making it possible for us, the doctors, to prevent illness and to detect serious disease while it is still in its early, curable stages."

The bill also would provide funds for medical education and for medical research, both essential to continued progress.

Contrary to the fears of some doctors, private practice would not be wiped out. No doctor would be required to join the plan. The Park Avenue specialist and the super de luxe hospital could continue as now, giving luxury service to those who wish to pay for it. Just as we have many fine private schools in a country where tax-supported schools are open to everybody, so we would continue to have private doctors and private hospitals, along with assured medical care for everyone.

Senator WAGNER says, "This is an American plan, geared to our own experience, form of government, and standard of living. Our people need protection against the costs of illness. They need ways to narrow the gap between the best that medical science has to offer and what many people receive. The medical provisions of our bill provide this program."

Whether or not this particular bill is passed, the trend is in the direction of medical security for all the people. No country which has tried compulsory insurance has ever abandoned it. The organized doctors of Great Britain strongly favor more, rather than less, compulsory insurance. Perhaps, like some European countries, we will go through a period of further experimentation with voluntary plans before we come to a final decision on national health insurance.

The Wallace Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Alexandria (La.) Daily Town Talk:

THE WALLACE APPOINTMENT

The spoils system took one of its most corrupt turns this week with the firing of Jesse Jones and the hiring of Henry Wallace. It was enough of a shock to the American people that a good man was being ousted so that a party worker could be rewarded. But it was more of a shock to learn that the party worker was Wallace.

To the South this move is one of distaste and distemper. Jones has represented the principles of the South—of its democracy and of its free enterprise. He has represented the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and subsidiary lending organizations which have provided many an impetus to American enterprise. He has done a good job.

What are the American people getting in this New Deal? They are getting Henry Wallace, whose party dropped him at the Democratic convention last June. They are getting a man whose reward is a position of high importance and significance at all times for which he is not fitted. They are getting a man who has called American businessmen and industrialists a group of Fascists.

Political personnel swaps can be swallowed, though not condoned, when they represent a change for the better or, at least, not for the worse. But it is a blow to the American people when the President in whom they have put their trust for a record-breaking number of history-making years, removes a qualified man in such an important post in order to reward a party worker.

The fundamental principle behind this move is as important as any political or economic significance. It has undermined the faith of a lot of people in their President at a time when faith is a mighty important thing.

Connecticut War Workers' Production Leading Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hartford Courant entitled "Connecticut War Workers' Production Leading Nation":

CONNECTICUT WAR WORKERS' PRODUCTION LEADING NATION

(By A. E. Magnell, financial editor)

Nowhere in the United States has the value of production of war materials and supplies equaled the total that stands to the credit of every man, woman, and child in Connecticut. First in the Nation in the per capita production value of material, Connecticut also ranks high in its ratio of manpower serving in the winning of the war. Connecticut individuals, institutions, and corporations have helped bear the cost of war, too, as is evidenced by purchases of a total of $3,300,000,000 in War bonds and stamps, which was 45 percent of the war contract awards placed here. Hartford's War bond purchases were almost 50 percent of the State totals and were also about 44 percent of the contracts placed in the city.

One of the smallest States of the Union in territorial area, and thirty-first when measured on a basis of population, the war effort and accomplishment of Connecticut's citizenry in World War No. 2 stands as an inspiration.

Connecticut has already given the sweat of its brow; its blood has stained the soil of foreign lands; and tears have been shed for those torn from its protecting arms.

More and more is being demanded of sons of the Nutmeg State on the war fronts and the home fronts. In meeting these demands Connecticut must not falter and must not fail.

SEVEN BILLION FOUR HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS IN WAR CONTRACTS

The cumulative total of war supply and facility contracts for the period from June 1940 through November 1944, compiled by the War Production Board, ran to $207,000,000,000 nationally, of which Connecticut's total was $7,442,096,000, or 3.59 percent. The civilian population of Connecticut was 1.32 percent of the Nation. In other words, residents of the State produced almost three times as much in value of materials as their ratio to the population of the country.

The total value of the war contracts placed in Connecticut was tenth highest in the Nation, but, on the basis of population, the production requirement was $4,360 per capita.

The State of Michigan obtained war contracts aggregating approximately $22,000,000,000, but, reduced to a basis of inhabitants, the average was $4,175.

In meeting demands made upon Connecticut industry $279,000,000 of Government funds were supplied in Connecticut; in Michigan the Federal funds aggregated $1,269,000,000.

At the same time men from Connecticut industries went into the armed forces. The ratio of these was 31.2 percent of the male labor force, while in Michigan this ratio was 27.1 percent. Only in Massachusetts, West Virginia, Arizona, and the District of Columbia was Connecticut's ratio exceeded, and in none of these was the demand for production of war material as high.

Connecticut's production of war material has been approximately 5^ percent of the total of the whole New England area. Hartford's share of the total war contracts has been $3,419,625,000 placing it thirteenth in the list of cities on a basis of volume while the city ranks fifty-first on the basis of population. Further reduced to the per capita basis, Hartford was found sixth with an average of $6,800 followed by Detroit with a per capita of $6,525. South Bend, Ind.; Wichita, Kan.; Flint, Mich.; San Diego, Calif.; and Bridgeport were leaders in that order.

AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION

Citizens of Connecticut have the distinction of having met aircraft production requirements of the highest per capita value in the country with an average of $2,175. The aggregate of aircraft contracts in the State was $3,718,820,000 to November 1944. This placed Connecticut sixth in total value of contracts of this classification, then aggregating $58,125,000,000. The per capita production of aircraft in this State of $2,175 compared with $1,432 in California, $1,391 in Kansas and $1,389 in Michigan. Aircraft production contracts placed in Hartford amounted to $2,671,800,000 and those in the Bridgeport area exceeded $804,000,000.

ORDNANCE CONTRACT

Ordnance requirements, including guns, ammunition, armor, and mechanized units is another important field in which Connecticut occupies a prominent place. The volume of these contracts is $2,044,187,000, or almost 5 percent of the total national needs. In this standing of States Connecticut is seventh. On the per capita basis the average, putting Connecticut second in the list, is $1,195.

The value of ordnance contracts in Connecticut cities are: New Haven and Waterbury combined, $849,000,000; Bridgeport,

$649,000,000; Hartford, $418,000,000. Bridgeport leads in per capita production.

SHIPBUILDING

Connecticut's importance in shipbuilding production rests almost 100 percent on submarines. The volume of these contracts is $289,000,000, while the national expenditures total nearly $27,000,000,000. In volume Connecticut stands eighteenth. Groton stood twenty-fourth in the listing of cities.

Other contract awards for the winning of the war are classified as "all other" contracts. The major requirement in this group is production machinery, without which airplanes, artillery, ammunition, tanks, and other mechanized units, ships, and other essentials cannot be built. As a machine-building area Connecticut figures prominently in the $1,110,851,000 of such awards.

Cream for the Few But Little Butter for the Many

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following letter and answer indicates a trend that is not in keeping with a desirable wartime food program:

JANUARY 2, 1945.

Mr. BENJAMIN H. BENNETT,
Bureau of Agricultural Economics,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: I note in your letter of December 19 that in 1943, 1,475,000,000 pounds of cream were sold in the United States, and in 1944, 1,672,000,000 pounds.

Was this cream sold for consumption as cream or was it diverted to manufactured products such as ice cream?

How much was sold and used as cream?

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Washington, D. C. January 6, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: The 1,475,000,000 pounds of cream sold in 1943 and the 1,672,000,000 pounds sold in 1944, as mentioned in our letter of December 19 referred to cream sold for fluid consumption only. Cream for use in the production of frozen dairy foods, such as ice cream, sherbets, etc., was excluded.

Very truly yours,

B. H. BENNETT,
In Charge, Dairy Section,
Division of Agricultural Statistics.

Mr. Speaker, cream is not even rationed and you will note that the consumption of cream increased from 1,475,000 pounds in 1943 to 1,672,000 pounds in 1944.

Can you find anyone that can give a valid reason for not rationing cream? Why not, when the products made from milk and even at times the product made from the skim milk have been rationed?

Do you know anyone that can give a reason for rationing evaporated milk with 7.9 percent butterfat content when cream containing 19 percent butterfat is not rationed?

Do you realize the millions of pounds of butter, for the average citizen, that could be made from the cream diverted to the few with the price?

The people should be willing to at least accept equal consideration in the consumption of dairy products that is accorded the men in service. We should not continue to see the cream for the few.

In a Washington grocery store a few days ago, a lady asked for some butter. The grocer said: "I haven't any butter, but I can sell you all the cream you want" "Won't you have some cream?"

I thought, how much longer are we to have a food program for the few at the expense of the many? How much longer are we to have a food program based on sectional favoritism, and political expediency, instead of a food program that gives all the people equal consideration?

WHY SO LITTLE BUTTER

Everyone realizes that butter is a necessity and not a luxury. Of course, there should be sacrifices—but they should be equal and apply to all and not for the few. As long as butterfat is frozen at some 52 cents per pound for one purpose such as when used in butter and allowed to sell for twice as much in other forms of dairy products there is not much fairness or economic sense involved. When a cheese spread with 28 percent fat and 45 percent moisture is allowed to sell for 70 cents per pound, when the producer has his normal cheese frozen at 23¼ cents per pound and where the normal cheese has 32 percent fat and 39 percent moisture, it would appear that the Price Control Act did not do much toward protecting the consumer.

If butter and powdered skim milk are produced all the nutritive value of milk is obtained. The butter and powdered skim have all the food value of the milk and there has not been any valid reason why an acceptable amount has not been made.

The reasons that butter—a protective food—has not been provided the armed forces is no doubt due to transportation problems in some sections. The reasons that butter the protective food has not been provided in acceptable amounts for domestic consumption are:

First. There has been no attempt to produce butter in acceptable amounts.

Second. The subsidy for butter production at 8 cents per pound fat in 100 pounds of 3½ percent milk is 28 cents per pound and the subsidy is 60 cents to 90 cents per hundredweight of milk when the milk is used for bottling or when converted into the other manufactured dairy products. However, there is nothing in 10 pounds of cheese made from 100 pounds of milk or in 50 pounds of evaporated milk that is not in the 5 pounds of butter and 13 pounds of powdered skim milk made from 100 pounds of milk.

Third. The low ceiling on powdered skim has retarded butter making. The price of powdered skim has been kept ridiculously low when its food value is taken into consideration. Powdered skim with 35 percent digestible animal protein has had a 14- to 15-cent per pound ceiling which is way out of line with the price of any other animal protein food or any food product.

Fourth. Some people have read into the dairy program evidence of a desire of the vegetable oil interests, which are so influential in the present administration, to promote vegetable oils at the expense of the animal fats. The fact that animal fats are being allocated for soap making, and vegetable oils are being subsidized is also apparent.

Fifth. One animal fat such as lard with a 13-cent-a-pound ceiling, has been allocated by the millions of pounds to these soap makers while the vegetable oil production has been subsidized up to 8 cents or 9 cents per pound, or a subsidy of nearly three-fourths the O. P. A. ceiling for oils and fats, which is 13 cents per pound.

Sixth. The war food program has been keyed to cotton and wheat, both of which have been surplus crops although of great importance in war as well as peace. Manpower, fertilizer, and effort have been expended in producing cotton and wheat. Ten cents to fifteen cents per bushel has been spent to subsidize wheat production and $10 to $15 per bale has been spent to subsidize cotton production, and then 33 cents per bushel is spent to get rid of the wheat and $20 per bale is spent to get rid of cotton even during wartime.

Seventh. The New Deal has always appeared allergic to butterfat when in the form of butter. The Department of Agriculture has used radio facilities of the Nation to promote vegetable oils at the expense of animal fats. These groups are more interested in profits than in human nutrition. Many people are being misled. Not only the producer but labor, business, and the people themselves will suffer if unwise food programs prevail.

Eighth. When the vegetable oil interests can enjoy a 13-cents-per-pound O. P. A. ceiling, add 15 percent water, inject one-half cent worth of a vitamin, and sell the product for 29 cents per pound and, in addition, obtain the cooperation of the administration, it is not surprising that the butter industry is faced with many difficulties.

Ninth. Under normal times over 40 percent of the Nation's milk was diverted to butter making, and when the butter business is injured the whole dairy business is injured.

Tenth. The W. F. A. and O. P. A. do not appear to read the law very carefully or they would not put so many obstacles into the butter-production business. If the powdered skim were allowed to sell somewhere near in accordance to its value this butter situation would not be difficult to meet. If the 1,672,000,000 pounds of 19 percent cream obtained in 1944 were converted into butter, the national butter production would be increased by some three hundred fifty to four hundred million pounds and all the people would be furnished an acceptable amount of this great food. The few get the cream—the many do not get the butter their children should be eating.

A Citizen Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "General Marshall Wants a Citizen Army", written by Brigadier General John McAuley Palmer, United States Army, and published in the Saturday Evening Post of December 23, 1944. I should like to have the article printed in full, including the endorsement of General Marshall, Chief of Staff.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate of the probable cost of printing this article. The estimated cost is $110.50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MARSHALL WANTS A CITIZEN ARMY—THE WAR DEPARTMENT STATES ITS POSITION ON OUR ARMY AFTER THE WAR

(By John McAuley Palmer, brigadier general, United States Army)

ENDORSEMENT BY THE CHIEF OF STAFF

The author of this article, Brig. Gen. John McAuley Palmer, is the Army's leading authority on the subject of American military policy. The conclusions at which he arrives are solidly founded on research and study extending over the past half century, and are worthy of the consideration of every thinking American.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff, United States Army.

Since the War of 1812, most of our military unpreparedness and most of our enormous military expenditures have been chargeable to two conflicting views as to the merits of two mutually antagonistic types of military organization One of these may be characterized as the citizen-army type, the other as the standing-army type. In the War Department's plans for a post-war military structure, which of these two styles of architecture should the planners follow? This is a highly important question, for, in the absence of a decision on this fundamental point, the planners are almost certain to give us an incongruous hodgepodge of both systems, as they have invariably done in the past.

Fortunately, this fundamental question has been answered by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army. In War Department Circular No. 347 dated August 25, 1944, he has directed the General Staff and all other planning agencies under his jurisdiction to adapt their plans to the citizen-army formula. It will help us to grasp the full significance of this important decision if we will consider the origins and places of these two military types in our past history.

General Marshall is not proposing anything new. He is simply directing his planners to make a modern adaptation of the plan which President Washington submitted to the First Congress in January 1790, as one of the essential foundations of the new American Republic. This 1790 plan was prepared by Maj. Gen. Henry Knox, our first Secretary of War, and was revised to meet the President's views before he transmitted it to the Congress. It was based upon the fundamental democratic principle that every citizen in a free state should be trained to defend his country. It contained simple and economical machinery for the orderly mobilization of all or any necessary part of the Nation's manpower in ample time to meet any military emergency.

Few of his countrymen realize that from the close of the Reveloution to end of his life, Washington gave continuous scientific study to the problem of military institutions suited to the needs of a self-governing free people. In 1783, shortly after the formal conclusion of peace with Great Britain, he transmitted his Sentiments on a Peace Establishment to the Continental Congress. This was a treatise on national military policy prepared after consultation with all the generals at his headquarters. Unfortunately, this important state paper remained in manuscript form for 147 years and was not printed until I found it among the Washington papers in the Library of Congress and published it in a book of mine in 1930.

In this 1783 treatise Washington had written: "It may be laid down as a primary position and the basis of our system that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free Government owes not only a portion of his property but even of his personal services to the defense of it."

After 7 years of further study and mature reflection, he made this "primary position" the "basis" of the plans which he transmitted, as President, to the first Congress in January, 1790.

In delivering his first inaugural address, 9 months earlier, Washington revealed that he was deeply conscious of the world significance of the new American republic. He was a lover of peace, but as the founder of the modern democratic state, he sought to make it always strong enough to maintain its just rights in its cruise toward an unknown future. Unfortunately, a great majority of his fellow countrymen preferred to make it impotent. Therein lies the fundamental cause of the present world cyclone: A high barometer of overmilitarization in the regions of lawless aggression; a low barometer of undermilitarization in the regions of law-abiding democracy. Hence the inevitable storm. In their calculation of world conquest, the general staffs of the Axis powers counted primarily upon the continued military impotence of world democracy. They are now finding that this was a most disastrous miscalculation.

The Washington-Knox plan was very simple and may be outlined briefly as follows:

For a few weeks in their nineteenth summer, again in their twentieth summer, and finally in their twenty-first summer, all young Americans were to be trained as citizen soldiers in what Knox called camps of discipline. During these 3 years all these citizen soldiers in each community were to be enrolled in local units of what Knox called the advance corps of the national citizen army and held in readiness for a call to arms, if necessary.

In addition to his citizen soldiers, Washington insisted that there must also be enough regular officers and soldiers to do those things that obviously cannot be done by citizen soldiers. In Washington's day this meant the national military overhead, teachers in his military schools, guards for the national arsenals, and troops to garrison the posts on the Indian frontier.

In the event of an Indian war or other emergency requiring a temporary reinforcement of the normal Regular Army, each community was to furnish its equitable quota of citizen-officers and soldiers. If any community should fail to fill its quota with volunteers, the shortage would be filled by what we would call a selective draft within that community.

In the event of a great national emergency all citizen soldiers under the age of 22 would be mobilized immediately in their local units of the advanced corps.

Washington attached great importance to trained leadership. In an address to the Congress, less than 4 months after his inauguration, he urged that war-experienced veterans of the Continental Army should form the original officer corps of his new citizen army. These war veterans were to be gradually replaced by the graduates of a system of military schools. In his treatise of 1783, he proposed the establishment of "one or more" military academies. A year later he endorsed General Steuben's proposal that there should be three such academies, one in New England, one in the middle States, and one south of the Potomac—and this when our total population was less than 4,000,000. Later, Knox incorporated this proposal of Steuben's in his own plan. It is obvious that these three military academies would train many more officers than would be needed for the little Regular Army of about 2,500 men with which Washington proposed to guard the Indian frontier. A great majority of their graduates would therefore return to their homes to become the trained leaders of his citizen army.

A MISHANDLED LEGACY

Washington believed as a fundamental political principle that, in a free state, military promotion should be open to able citizen soldiers as well as to professionals—but subject to the imperative condition that no officer—professional or nonprofessional—should be intrusted with the command of any body of American soldiers, small or great, until he had demonstrated definite and positive qualification for that great responsibility.

If the First Congress had adopted the Washingtonian plan, and if subsequent Congresses had gradually adapted its detailed organization, armament, and training requirements to meet gradual changes in population, modes of transportation, and scientific progress, we would have been prepared for all our subsequent wars. To use Washington's language, it would have made us so "respectable in the eyes of our friends" and so "formidable to those who would otherwise become our enemies" that most of these wars—including the present global holocaust—probably could not have occurred.

But this was not to be. After 2 years of debate and agitation, the Congress finally adopted Washington's scheme for a Nation-wide citizen army, but not until after it had carefully eliminated every provision for training its soldiers and for providing it with qualified officers. Washington had proposed a national citizen army in terms of gilt-edged bonds. Congress issued it in terms of watered stock. This is the origin of the notorious Militia Act of 1792, which got its inglorious try-out 20 years later in the War of 1812.

So Washington failed to secure the adoption of his most cherished plan for the future peace and welfare of the new American Nation. His plan was rejected, not because it was bad from a military standpoint, but because it was obviously too good. The majority in Congress was influenced by a curious antimilitary complex which most American politicians had inherited from their English forebears. Back in the seventeenth century, Parliament had given Oliver Cromwell an effective army. Since then, anything savoring of military efficiency was regarded by most Englishmen with suspicion. And so, at the beginning of our Revoluntionary War, their descendants in the Continental Congress were careful not to authorize an intelligent manpower policy for the Continental Army. If too easily victorious over King George, Washington might be tempted to follow Cromwell's example. This was the principal cause of an unduly prolonged war, with all its attendant economic and social distresses. On the whole, the Commander in Chief of the Continental Army encountered much more serious opposition from obstructionists

in the Continental Congress than he did from King George's army.

After the adoption of the Constitution, the traditional antipathy to military efficiency took on a new form. Suspicion was now directed not against Washington, but against the Government that he headed. Obviously, if the new Federal Union should be given effective military power in any form, it would be strong enough to nullify the divine right of secession. After the Constitutional Convention, a strong isolationist party had sprung up in each of the 13 States. The isolationists of that day regarded the proposed American Union much as their political descendants of the twentieth century regarded the League of Nations. They therefore did all they could to keep their respective States out of it. Failing in that, they entered the new Government with their fingers crossed. They feared that the interests of a majority of the States might become fatal to the interests of a minority. They believed that, in that event, the minority could and should secede from the Union.

While large numbers of men, North as well as South, believed in the divine right of secession, they were not disposed to give the new Federal Government any effective military power. It might be used to preserve the Union as well as for national defense. It thus appears that the establishment of an effective military system, in any form, was not politically feasible in the United States until after interstate isolationism was finally wiped out in the Civil War. But by that time, Washington's legacy of military wisdom had long been forgotten by his countrymen.

It was the untrained militia of the act of 1792 that failed in the War of 1812. It may therefore be interesting to consider what the issue might have been if Congress had accepted Washington's plan for a citizen army composed of trained citizen soldiers under trained leaders. By 1812, his organized advanced corps would have numbered about 117,000. All able-bodied American citizens under the age of 40—about 600,000 in all—would have been graduates of Washington's camps of discipline. Practically all the veterans of the Revolution would have passed the military age, but they would have been replaced by younger officers who had been tested for each step in the ladder of promotion. Every company and higher unit would have had a commander accustomed to lead it in field maneuvers. Every divisional commander would have been familiar with the team play of infantry supported by artillery and cavalry. Could a little British raiding force have burned the capital of a Nation organized like this? If Washington had had his way, Britannia might have hesitated before entering a second war against her wayward American daughter.

But if the untrained 1,792 milita failed completely in the War of 1812, our little Regular Army came out of it with the highest credit and prestige. Before the war, it had been little more than widely scattered constabulary on the Indian frontier. As war threatened, it was increased in 1808 and again in 1812. Under capable leaders like Brown and Ripley and Winfield Scott, the Regulars became highly disciplined soldiers. At Chippewa and Lundy's Lane, they proved themselves a match for the best British troops. It was the gallantry of this new Regular Army and the brilliant exploits of our Navy that redeemed some of the general disgrace of the war. The history of our modern Regular Army really begins with the War of 1812. Since then, it has never failed to give a good account of itself.

After the War of 1812, the War Department became the headquarters of this new Regular Army. Its leaders became the sole military advisers of the Secretary of War. They were neither military philosophers nor critical historians. They were hard-boiled, practical soldiers. To them, the lesson of the recent war was simple. The militia was utterly worthless. They had no knowledge of Washington's scientific plan to make it the source of an effective citizen army. In their minds there could be no effective military organization except with hired soldiers under professional officers.

When Monroe became President, in 1817, he made John C. Calhoun his Secretary of War. The new Secretary was fully indoctrinated by his generals. He therefore agreed with them that the existing militia was worthless. But instead of seeking to reform it, he proposed to replace it by what he called an expansible standing army. Here was a plan that Washington and his generals never heard of, and one that was the very antithesis of everything they ever advocated.

An expansible-standing-army bill was transmitted to the Congress by Secretary Calhoun in December 1820. It was based upon a radical conception entirely new in American history and foreign to American tradition. In time of emergency, instead of reinforcing the Regular Army by the mobilization of organized military units composed of citizen officers and soldiers trained in peacetime to defend their country, we should expand the Regular Army, as such, by drawing the national manpower into its lower ranks, there to serve under a permanent class or caste of professional officers.

Looking at the Calhoun plan after the lapse of 120 years, we are amazed that any group of intelligent men could have proposed an arrangement so utterly futile from a political standpoint. There was never a chance that it would be acceptable to the American people or their Congress. The trouble was that Calhoun's military planners—like many other distinguished practical soldiers since their time—were totally ignorant of the fact there is a political as well as a dynamic aspect of military institutions. They were proposing a type of military organization which later attained a high degree of efficiency in autocratic Germany and Japan. But they were unable to see that it was totally inapplicable to a democratic state such as the United States of America. Wise military statesmen like Washington are always inclined to improve or perfect existing institutions rather than to propose new or alien types. They appreciate that a national institution is a living organism, like a growing tree deeply rooted in the soil of national history and tradition. It can be pruned or guided or stimulated as it grows, but it cannot be replaced by a lifeless, artificial substitute such as a post driven in the ground. The trouble with the post is that, instead of taking root, it will rot where it enters the soil.

Notwithstanding its utter futility, the Scott-Brown-Calhoun conception of an expansible standing army became orthodox in the Regular Army for many years. It completely displaced the Washingtonian military policy. As late as 1876, General Sherman worked out a modern improvement of Calhoun's scheme. But he suggested a much greater coefficient of dilution. He proposed to expand a peacetime Regular Army of about 27,000 men into a wartime Regular Army of about 213,000. General Upton's coefficient of dilution was not quite so big. He proposed to stretch a peace establishment of about 23,000 into a war establishment of about 140,000. Under such a system, expansion for a great war would be impossible under the volunteer system, and none of the advocates of the expansible standing army ever dared to propose that its ranks should be filled by conscription.

While we officers of the old Army were never able to say just how we proposed to expand our expansible standing Army, we were all agreed that there was one infallible practical formula for national preparedness: Increase the Regular Army whenever you can. If Congress won't give you enough Regulars, get as many as you can. We submitted this panacea to our friends in Congress and made it the theme of learned books and magazine articles whenever we could find a publisher. As General Pershing once said of his early days in the Army: "Every Army officer carried an Army-organization bill in his vest pocket." I wrote one myself when I was a second lieutenant. I gave cogent reasons for a sufficient legislative increase to make me a captain of infantry. But while that highly commendable objective would have added $40,000,000 a year to the National Budget, I can see now that my scheme would not have added a pennyworth to the solution of our national-defense problem.

It will be seen that there was one marked difference between the old Army's military policy and Washington's. He wanted as many professional officers and soldiers as were needed for certain specific purposes, but no more. We disciples of Calhoun and Scott and Sherman wanted just as many as we could persuade Congress to give us. And we were perfectly sincere about it. We had been bred in the doctrine that citizen soldiers are worthless and that only professional soldiers are worth their salt.

This, of course, was due to a defect in our military education. There was a serious deficiency in the curriculum at West Point. We had more mathematics than we needed, and no instruction at all in the history of our national military institutions. How different our subsequent military history might have been if some old superintendent of the Military Academy about a century ago—when General Sherman was a cadet—had ordered one of his bright young instructors to prepare and deliver a course of lectures on that theme.

This increase-the-Regular-Army complex in the minds of many Regular Army officers tended to vitiate their thought on national military policy for many years. According to General Grant, the superiority of the Confederate armies at the beginning of the Civil War was due to the fact that the North did have and the South did not have a standing army. The true problem for each side was to develop its traditional citizen army as soon as possible. The Confederacy concentrated upon this policy from the start. Almost all the southern graduates of West Point and other trained officers who resigned from the old Army when their States seceded were absorbed as leaders and staff officers in the great citizen army of the Confederacy. As Grant said, "They leavened the whole loaf." There was little such yeast for the Federal citizen army, because the northern military authorities wasted valuable time in securing their orthodox increase of the Regular Army. Many trained and educated officers who should have gone to the northern citizen army as leaders and staff officers were, therefore, retained in new regular regiments, too few and too small in total strength to exert any material influence upon the progress of the war. It is well known that Calhoun's political disciples in the South were powerful advocates of secession, but it is not so well known that his military disciples in the North almost made it impossible for Lincoln to save the Union.

Thirteen years after the Civil War, for the first time in our history, the Congress made a constructive effort to establish a sound military system. Now that the secession heresy was finally extinguished, this had finally become feasible from a political standpoint. A joint congressional committee, popularly known as the Burnside Commission, comprising three Senators and four Representatives, was, therefore, appointed. All seven of its members had commanded citizen soldiers in the recent war, two in the

Confederate Army and five in the Union Army. Here was a jury of seven soldier statesmen, highly competent to take up the light that had failed in Washington's administration.

And but for an unfortunate accident, Washington's message might have come to their hands. In preparing his military policy of the United States, General Upton had just finished a study of Sparks' Writings of Washington. Unfortunately, he overlooked the highly significant footnote in volume 8, which should have directed him to Washington's correspondence with his generals and his Sentiments on a Peace Establishment, then among the voluminous unpublished Washington papers in the State Department. Lacking this essential key to Washington's constructive labors, he quoted most of Washington's denunciations of the untrained militia of the Revolutionary War, but failed to find any record of the scientific reforms that Washington, with the aid of his generals, had worked out after the war. In short, he found Washington's diagnosis of the national military disease without finding his sovereign cure.

Lacking Washington's own remedy, he then substituted his own, which was no less than a new version of Calhoun's expansible standing army. In this way, Washington was made the principal expert witness for a military policy which he never heard of and one which was the antithesis of everything he ever proposed. Strongly endorsed by General Sherman, then commanding general of the Army, this was the gist of the military policy that the War Department submitted to the Burnside commission.

But even with the support of Upton's pseudo-Washington, the War Department was unable to sell its expansible standing army to the soldier-statesmen of the Burnside commission. They had all seen American citizen soldiers doing pretty well in a great war. As to the Regulars being the whole show, the two Confederate veterans—Generals Butler and Dibrell—probably recalled that Lee and Stonewall Jackson had managed to do fairly well without any Regulars at all. And so another great opportunity passed with nothing done.

After the Spanish-American War, the War Department again had an opportunity to present a solution of our national military problem to a receptive Congress. The result was a material increase of the Regular Army, but no effective step toward the development of our traditional citizen army. In 1903, upon the recommendation of Secretary Root, Congress authorized a new planning agency known as the General Staff and a new educational system for the training of prospective General Staff officers. But unfortunately, just as he was launching his new planning agency, Mr. Root gave it a bad start by publishing Upton's Military Policy of the United States, in an official War Department document, as a critical and exhaustive study of our national military system since Washington's administration.

In a message to the Congress shortly after the outbreak of World War No. 1, President Wilson proclaimed that the traditional foundation of our military system was a "citizenry trained and accustomed to arms." This pregnant hint from its commander in chief made no perceptible impression upon the General Staff, for it immediately proceeded to make plans for an expansible standing Army on a large scale. As a result, when a great war Army of citizen soldiers was required a little later, it had to be extemporized, as in the past. Again, as at the beginning of the Civil War, many trained professional officers who should have become leaders and staff officers in the wartime citizen Army were tied up in new Regular Army regiments.

After World War No. 1, there was a widespread popular opinion that the citizen Army, developed at such enormous cost during the recent war, should be perpetuated as a permanent national institution through a system of universal military training. This policy was advocated by the citizen-Army veterans who were then establishing the American Legion, and was endorsed by many Regular Army officers, including General Pershing. Unfortunately, the War Department recommended another policy based upon a large standing Army, with no provision for the development of our traditional citizen Army. But for these divided counsels, the National Defense Act of 1920 might well have contained a complete legislative solution of our national military problem based upon universal military training.

Failure to establish a sound system after the last war found us in dire straits at the beginning of World War No. 2. Again it became necessary to extemporize the national citizen army with which we have fought all our great wars. In accomplishing this tremendous constructive task, General Marshall and his assistants are demonstrating on battlefields throughout the world that the American Army of the people is superior in sheer military might to the much-vaunted armies of the Axis Powers. In his recent War Department circular, he therefore directs all planning agencies under his jurisdiction to make that Army the basis of their plans for a future peace establishment. As Washington did before him, he bases his military policy upon the democratic principles that in a free state every able-bodied citizen should be trained to defend his country and that every citizen sholdier should be eligible for promotion to any rank for which he is able to qualify under sound and equitable standards.

The Army of the future envisaged in the War Department circular would comprise a relatively small Regular Army, subject to prompt reinforcement when necessary from a great citizen army reserve composed of trained citizen officers and soldiers. The officer corps of this national army, as a whole would comprise relatively few professional officers and a relatively great number of citizen officers. But the efficiency of the whole would depend primarily upon the efficiency and the disinterested devotion of these professionals. There can be no effective citizen army without them. It would be their indispensable task, as General Grant expressed it, to leaven the whole loaf. Within the limits of his true mission, as defined by Washington and Grant in the past and more recently by General Marshall, the highly trained professional officer would thus become one of the most invaluable servants of the modern democratic state. The plans now in preparation in the War Department contemplate that the National Guard shall continue to be an essential component of the Army of the United States. Under the provisions of section 5 of the National Defense Act, representative officers of the National Guard are now participating with Regular Army officers in the preparation of these plans.

The citizen army advocated by General Marshall would meet our military requirements, whatever the future world organization may be. It would not be provocative of war, as great standing armies are. It would be organized for the prompt reinforcement of a relatively small Regular Army in the formation of such expeditionary forces, great or small, as would enable us to do our part in suppressing lawless aggression. It would thus assure our friends and warn our potential foes that hereafter America will be not only willing but able and ready to do her part in maintaining a peaceful world order. On the other hand, if the organization of world peace should, unfortunately, break down, it would put us in a position to mobilize all, or any necessary part, of our total manpower in a minimum of time and with maximum effectiveness for war.

It would also form the basis for a military system of maximum economy. Under a system of universal military training, the money required to maintain one officer or man on the permanent establishments of our armed forces would maintain several trained Reserve officers or reservists. With such a Reserve system, our peace establishment would be capable of rapid expansion and, therefore, a relatively small and inexpensive permanent establishment would meet our needs. Without such trained Reserves, there would be no such power of rapid expansion, and a much larger and more expensive Regular Establishment would be necessary in order to give us a reasonable degree of security. It may therefore be laid down as a fundamental principle that whenever we maintain one officer or man on the permanent establishments of our ground, sea, or air forces to perform a duty that can be performed effectively and in time by trained Reserve officers or reservists, we increase the per capita cost of our national-defense system unduly and reduce its ultimate capacity to meet the Nation's requirements in war.

Mr. Biddle, the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve Contract and His Apparent Dereliction of Duty

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am incorporating herein a final excerpt from the memorandum submitted by Mr. Norman Littell, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, on January 8, 1945. This excerpt will supplement three other parts of the memorandum submitted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 22, 1945, pages 427–430 and again on January 24, 1945, pages A268–A270, and again on January 25, 1945, pages A295–A297.

Mr. Speaker, the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve contract matter has already been before this House, but no action was taken upon a resolution by the gentleman from California [Mr. JERRY VOORHIS]. In view of the record as now submitted herein, the time has come for this House to take action. This is a matter of vital interest to each Member of this body. Excerpt in question is submitted herewith:

FORENOTE; PERSONAL AND PUBLIC ISSUES DISTINGUISHED

Personal issues: Mr. Biddle's official release and his public testimony before the Senate Immigration Committee on December 9, 1944, answering my memorandum of November 27, to this committee, presents issues of two kinds: Personal and public. Only the latter should be of real concern because they involve a vital question as to whether a public official should de disciplined or discharged (as in my case) for testifying frankly before congressional committees, and also matters of integrity in the transaction of Government business. I have heretofore ignored

the personal issues, but I find that Mr. Biddle has widely disseminated critical personal comments. This was done through his paid public relations staff and through leaks to a columnist (as he now admits in his testimony before the Immigration Committee).

Grave problems of government and not of personalities are at issue.

I do not wish to lend even passing importance to such statements by replying to them. However, in case any member of the committee wishes an answer to Mr. Biddle's personal comments I have attached a brief reply as an appendix to this memorandum.

Public issues: In replying to the committee's present request for all available information which I may have in this matter, I am compelled to consider in its entirety Mr. Biddle's statement before the Immigration Committee and his public release of December 9, not only because these statements constitute his official reply to my charges of November 27, but because the public interest imperatively demands it. The basic question as to whether an official of the executive branch of the Government has been disciplined for destifying too frankly before congressional committees and whether or not there is also involved a fundamental question of integrity in the transaction of Government business vitally affects not only the war effort but the well-being and effectiveness of democratic Government.

These matters fall squarely within this committee's jurisdiction as follows:

I. MR. BIDDLE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD TESTIMONY GIVEN BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

A. The Elk Hills naval petroleum reserve contract

1. Hearings before Public Lands Committee in Congress regarding Navy Department contract, November 20, 1942, with Standard Oil Co. of California for development of the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve: The Attorney General's principal objection seems to be that I said "this was another Teapot Dome case" (p. 40)[1] and that I "read my entire memorandum (to the Public Lands Committee) which was to be the basis of" Mr. Biddle's "opinion to the President" (p. 42). The former statement is untrue and the latter completely misrepresents the order of events.

I said in my opinion that "in degree this agreement goes beyond the contracts involved in the Pan-American and Mammouth (Teapot Dome) cases and in principle there is no controlling distinction." I reaffirm that now. The instant case went beyond the Teapot Dome cases in that an actual interest in the oil content of the Government land, together with an interest in the Government improvements and equipment on that land, were vested in the Standard Oil Co. of California.

Any able lawyer will agree with that statement in my report. Contrary to Mr. Biddle's apocryphal account (p. 41), I have never in the slightest degree retracted, or apologized for, that statement, and I do not do so now.

Respecting the charge that I read my report to the Public Lands Committee before Mr. Biddle had time to write an opinion to the President based upon it, Mr. Biddle elliptically evades the fact that he had the report for an ample period of time and elected to go on vacation to Hot Springs when this matter was already a subject of public controversy. Note the following dates:

June 9, 1943: Completion of report discussed with Mr. Biddle.

June 11, 1943: Completed report handed to Mr. Biddle.

June 12, 1943: Copy of my report sent to Justice Byrnes at the White House pursuant to Justice Byrnes' request.

June 14, 1943: After having studied the report, Mr. Biddle reviewed it page by page with the writer and representatives of the Interior and Navy Departments in Mr. Biddle's office. The language above quoted that this contract went beyond the Teapot Dome leases in degree, was then in the report, and it still is. Mr. Biddle could have changed the language then if he so desired.

Mr. Biddle left that night for a vacation at Hot Springs, Va., with the contract in force and Standard Oil Co. pumping oil from the Elk Hills reserve.

June 17, 1943: The writer was requested to appear before the Public Lands Committee of the House, but was instructed not to submit a report. I stated merely my personal conclusion that the Standard Oil contract was "illegal and invalid."

June 19, 1943: Unknown to me, Mr. Biddle authorized delivery of my report to Standard Oil Co. attorneys.

June 21, 1943: Mr. Biddle telephoned me to direct that my testimony should not "go into any details regarding the contract" when I appeared again before the Public Lands Committee on June 22.

June 22, 1943: I again requested the Public Lands Committee to postpone the matter pursuant to Mr. Biddle's instructions, but postponement was refused. The committee consented, however, to consider only the bare legal aspects of the matter and not go into the practical aspects of the contract as analyzed, where the greatest embarrassment to the Navy and Standard lay. I testified accordingly. I withheld copies of my report as Biddle instructed, but I did not know that he had already authorized giving it to Standard Oil Co. lawyers.

Same day, June 22, 1943: Held conference with Biddle regarding problem of testifying under restrictions. He was highly irritated over my stated opinion that the contract was "illegal," and said, "I doubt whether the contract is illegal." Later, on my questioning, it was apparent he had not read the two controlling Supreme Court decisions—the Teapot Dome cases. On those only could any opinion be based.

June 24, 1943: After it had been pointed out to Mr. Biddle that it was highly improper to give Standard Oil Co. copies of the report when denying it to a committee of Congress, as a face-saving gesture he personally delivered copies the next morning to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee.

Same day: Instructions received over the telephone from Mr. Biddle to limit my testimony before the committee the next day. "There is no need * * * to do anything but submit a copy of your report."

Due to the complex character of the subject matter, voluminous technical exhibits, and language unfamiliar to the committee, involving statistics of production, encroaching water levels, fluctuating market values, production costs, etc., reading the report without explanations would have been largely meaningless—and how could one be so evasive before natural and inevitable questions of committee members? And why?

In an effort to have Biddle's instructions clarified before going back before the committee on June 25, I finally reached him on the telephone at 6:45 p. m. on June 24th, only to be again reproached for having testified that the case went beyond the Teapot Dome leases, even though I again stated that I had only read from my report in saying so. His instructions were again wholly confusing, for he concluded petulantly, "You will have to use your own discretion, but you know what I want you to do!" I, therefore, sent to Mr. Biddle a memorandum which I had drafted when unable to reach him on the telephone that day, which can be found in the Department files.

June 25, 1943: Testified fully and frankly in accordance with my memorandum of the preceding evening to Mr. Biddle.

From these facts it is readily apparent, (a) that Mr. Biddle had ample time in which to draft an opinion to the President if he desired to do so, but he chose to go on vacation instead; Congress could scarcely be asked to postpone hearings until after the return of Mr. Biddle when Standard Oil Company was drilling wells in the Naval Petroleum Reserve and pumping oil daily; (b) that when I read my report to the committee, it was only after two postponements at Biddle's request, and on Mr. Biddle's instructions to do so; (c) that Mr. Biddle had plenty of time to change the language of my report if he did not approve of it, and his disapproval came entirely as a result of press reports which hurt the feelings of Secretary Knox, who had signed the contract, and not as a result of any improper statement in my report; (d) that throughout, repeated efforts were made to restrict my testimony, which is in flat contradiction of Biddle's statement (p. 41, last line): "Nobody objected to his going down and testifying. He went down and testified. He wasn't asked not to at all. He testified at once when he was told to."

2. The Abe Fortas memorandum: In passing, let me note Mr. Biddle's attempt to detract from my exhaustive study of the Standard Oil-Navy contract of November 20, 1942, by saying that Under Secretary of the Interior Fortas "as a result of his study of the contract * * * wrote a careful memorandum" on the contract before I did. I am sure Mr. Biddle never saw the Fortas memorandum or he would not have been so expansive. It was all on one page. It contained three points, one of which was wholly wrong, and one of which questioned the general public policy which was, of course, what everyone was questioning at that moment. How any lawyer could have passed so superficially so challenging a contract, bristling with potentialities of future dispute and loaded with booby traps where certain and provable damages and injuries to the public's interest in this oil reserve were lurking, is difficult to understand. Mr. Fortas himself apologized for what Mr. Biddle describes as a "careful memorandum" when he testified before the Public Lands Committee, but later information that an assistant had prepared it and Mr. Fortas had merely signed it, permits Lawyer Fortas to escape from responsibility. Only Messrs. Biddle and Ickes are lavish in their praise of this "careful memorandum."

3. Exclusion from conferences and negotiations re new Elk Hills contract: Mr. Biddle's statement that I was included in all conferences and negotiations (p. 45) in the Department of Justice in respect to the writing of a new contract for the development of the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve, following the announced rescission of the illegal contract after my appearance before the Public Lands Committee on June 17, is untrue. The records and files of the Department of Justice will show conclusively that this matter was turned over to Mr. Charles Fahy, Solicitor General, and a lawyer from the Solicitor's office, by Mr. Biddle, and that I was excluded from all conferences on this matter from June 17, to the end of July. During all of that time the Navy and Standard attorneys, attending conferences at the Department of Justice, were trying hard to get the approval of the Department not of a temporary agreement, as Mr. Biddle testified (p. 44), but of a new permanent agreement.

The results of these conferences were submitted to me from time to time and I submitted written memoranda which appear in the files of the Department, renewing objections to some of the same factors which had appeared in the original contract and were restated in new form. It was only when I

[1] All references are to pages in the Attorney General's statement of November 9, 1944, before the Senate Immigration Committee.

finally refused, as far as I was personally concerned, to approve of a permanent agreement because the Government's interests could not be adequately protected in such hasty legal and technical work, that a temporary interim agreement was approved as a compromise. It was at the end of July that Mr. Fahy finally stated, after finding himself unfamiliar with certain factual matters, that henceforth he was not going to have any conference without me present. Very proper, but very late.

Mr. Biddle complacently states that (p. 45) "The Navy was not affectionately inclined toward Mr. Littell." By "Navy" whom does he mean? Certainly not the many officers who congratulated me privately on saving the Navy's oil reserve from Standard, nor the former Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, who, with President Roosevelt as Under Secretary of the Navy in the last war, had fought to preserve the Elk Hills Reserve from oil company exploitation, and who publicly commended me for the stand which I had taken. Rather, did he not mean Admiral Stuart, in charge of the Naval Petroleum Reserve, who had been taken in completely when he approved such a contract and who has since been removed, and honest but easy-going Secretary Knox, who admitted that he had "muffed it."

And what difference did any personal attitude make? Since when have we worked in the Department of Justice for love and affection?

4. Publicity regarding the Elk Hills expose: By innuendo in his testimony, before the Immigration Committee, and by direct statements made to press men from Biddle's rumor factory in his publicity office, Mr. Biddle has charged that I sought publicity in this matter. As usual, Mr. Biddle failed to recognize on the merits a vital public issue until too late; a major public controversy had to break over him before he saw it. No man could have prevented publicity in respect to Elk Hills, and the man who had mastered the problems imbedded in the contract was inevitably drawn into the discussion.

Had I been so minded, there were plenty of opportunities to let this story leak to the press any time after I went to Mr. Justice Byrnes on April 14, 1943, when Justice Byrnes had Secretary Knox withdraw the contract from the Appropriations Committee where $2,000,000 had been requested in support of certain obligations of the contract. The press was silent on the subject.

Many people knew of this contract, in spite of the secrecy which surrounded it, and there was much adverse discussion on the Hill when the contract was known to the Appropriations and Naval Affairs Committees. The first public attack was launched upon it by Senator LANGER in the Senate on June 12, 1943, 2 months after Mr. Justice Byrnes acted. I did not know Senator LANGER. I had not at any time communicated with him and have no idea where he got his information.

Upon being notified of Senator LANGER'S speech by long distance from my office on June 12, 1943, when I was in Asheville, N. C., attending a United States attorneys' conference, I telephoned to Mr. Biddle, in order to suggest a means of protecting the President from further attack and being unable to locate Biddle, reached Mr. Byrnes at the White House. I suggested that there be issued a public statement that the contract had already been withdrawn from the Appropriations Committee by orders from the White House. Mr. Byrnes concurred, and this action was taken later that day, after Mr. Byrnes had conferred with Mr. Biddle, and Mr. Biddle, himself, said in a public statement that he "had persuaded Secretary Knox" to withdraw the contract from the Appropriations Committee. (Justice Byrnes had done that on April 14.)

Attention from the press was not only inevitable—it was invaluable. While Mr. Ickes had made every effort to prevent my testifying before the Lands Committee in the first place, and Mr. Biddle had endeavored to limit my testimony after he could not postpone the hearings against the insistent demands of the Public Lands Committee, the congressional hearings proceeded step by step to turn the light of day down into the shadowy nooks and crannies of that predatory contract. Only because of publicity did the Government attain anything like an equality of bargaining power when Navy personnel were pitted against the skilled lawyers and technicians of the Standard Oil Co. of California. Sheer embarrassment made Standard reasonable in negotiations.

It is inevitable that memories of the "little black bag" in the Teapot Dome cases should have been revived in the press. One of the identical oil reserves was involved in another bad contract. The press rendered an invaluable service to the American people in fully illuminating the facts.

Mr. Biddle now says that he "supported me" in this Elk Hills fight. I was unaware of it. His confusion of mind was further confounded by pressures to which he was constantly subjected by a Secretary of the Navy who had committed the Government to the contract and was anxious to stop his public embarrassment over the matter, and the Secretary of the Interior, who, as Petroleum Coordinator for War, was closely associated with a former director and other representatives of the Standard Oil Co. of California in the Petroleum Administration for War.

The real trouble was that Mr. Biddle was simply in a twit trying to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds.

Daughters of the American Revolution Endorse Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a resolution of the Mississippi Delta Chapter, Daughters of The American Revolution, commending the creation of the permanent Committee on Un-American Activities.

The resolution follows:

As a patriotic society, interested in the welfare of our beloved country and the preservation of its ideals and traditions and its way of life, we hereby offer our sincere thanks to Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, for his stand in Congress to preserve the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities, and give praise to him for what we consider a great achievement.

We commend Mr. RANKIN for his speech on this subject over the Columbia Broadcasting System on January 16. It was a forthright, courageous statement, and clearly defined the object and purposes of the committee.

We appreciate the acknowledgment in this address of the support of the Daughters of the American Revolution, for the purpose of our society is to preserve the ideals and traditions, the principles of government upon which this great country was founded.

The National Society D. A. R., in session April 1943, commended the Dies committee for "its diligent research and persistent uncovering of un-American activities." We join with the national society in such commendation for work well done, and we urge the Members of Congress from Mississippi to lend their support to Mr. RANKIN and the committee in continuing investigation of un-American activities which threaten free government.

We request that this resolution be spread upon the minutes and a copy be sent to Mr. RANKIN and one to each of the Representatives of Mississippi.

MISSISSIPPI DELTA CHAPTER, D. A. R.,
Mrs. WALTER SILLERS, Sr., *Regent.*
Mrs. L. W. NUGENT, *Secretary.*

Maj. Thomas B. McGuire, Jr., Nation's Leading Active Air Hero, Killed in Action in Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the people of my congressional district, particularly those living in Paterson, were shocked recently to learn of the death of Maj. Thomas B. McGuire, Jr., the Nation's leading active air hero, who was killed in action in the Pacific.

Tom spent his early days in Paterson, and he was a member of one of that city's oldest families. His great-grandfather settled there in 1817. Ever since McGuires have played a prominent part in the business and civil history of this area.

The ace's father, Thomas B. McGuire, Sr., well-known automobile dealer, is a personal friend of mine, and with him I have held out the hope that Tom, who had destroyed 38 Jap planes, would be returned to the United States and learn of his countrymen's appreciation of his services.

The Paterson Morning Call, in a leading editorial, says, in part:

The news that Maj. Thomas B. McGuire, Jr., of Ridgewood and formerly of Paterson—who since joining the Army Air Force in July of 1941 had downed 38 Japanese planes in action, making him the leading American air hero still on the fighting front—had been killed in action while fighting enemy planes over the Philippines on January 7 will come as a tremendous shock not only to the members of his family but also to his many thousands of friends in this city, Ridgewood, and all over the country who appreciated the wonderful part he was playing in helping put the Japanese Air Force out of business, thus aiding in speeding up victory in the Pacific war area.

The report of his death came to his beloved widow, who has been living at San Antonio, Tex., yesterday in a letter from Lt. Gen. George C. Kenney, commanding the Allied Air Forces in the Pacific. He told Mrs. McGuire that the news of the death of her husband brought him the worst moment of the many he has had to face since the war began as he realized his importance to the Nation's war effort. He wrote: "Your husband was

one of the men the Air Forces can never forget, and we will find it more difficult to carry on without him."

Major McGuire's greatest desire was to help win the war as speedily as possible, and for this reason he had on two occasions refused furloughs that would give him an opportunity to rest and visit his family, a privilege which his 720 combat hours and more than 240 combat missions richly deserved. It was his determination to be a help to General MacArthur in his invasion of the Philippines that undoubtedly kept him on the fighting front and brought him into the final battle that resulted in his death after his plane had been crippled while he was engaged with a number of Jap planes.

The Paterson Evening News presents the following tribute:

Only 23 years old, Major McGuire, whose father and paternal grandparents have long been part of the Paterson scene, had packed more thrills and action into his brief life's span than the average 1,000 people experience in a long normal lifetime. For 2 years come March, he was in all the major battles in the Pacific, and intrepid flier that he was, had destroyed 38 Jap planes before the pruning knife of war cut him down. He was second only to Maj. Richard I. Bong, American ace who had knocked down 40 Japs. Before going to the Pacific, he was 6 months in the Aleutians in the grueling days when we didn't know where next the yellow terrors would be hitting us.

Death of a young hero like McGuire brings the fight right close to our doors. After all, he was just a plain American kid who loved life and the ordinary things we all like. When home, he was just a quiet youngster who loved to tinker with mechanical things, yet never went into the shop of the auto agency his father conducted in Ridgewood. There was never any indication that here in this young fellow were the makings of a fabulous hero whose exploits would thrill the world, galvanize the entire Air Corps with a new esprit de corps and bring panic to the hated Nips.

Yet when he swung into action, young McGuire was the epitome of fearlessness and daredeviltry. Maybe it wasn't daredeviltry at that, because his commanding officers and fellow fliers attested to the fact that he was a team player who worked with his squadron instead of trying to play a single-o, limelight-seeking game.

Allen W. Smith, writing for the Passaic Herald-News, says:

Tom was not a resident of Passaic. News dispatches of his heroics and daring in the South Pacific said he was from Paterson, or from Ridgewood, or from San Antonio, Tex. But he was as much a part of Passaic as he was of Painted Post, N. Y., or Rapid City, S. Dak. He was an American fighter who performed his job far beyond the call of duty.

It was the pleasure of this writer to have had dinner with Tom and his father, the Ridgewood automobile dealer, just before he left on his ill-fated trip to the Pacific. He had just returned from a 6 months' tour of battle duty in the Aleutian Islands, where his flying and daring made him outstanding. He was anxious to get in the big show in the South Pacific. But his was not talk of war or planes. He talked of music in which he had such a deep interest; he talked of home and his plans for after the war.

He knew he had a big task ahead, and he was ready for it.

Tom left for San Antonio for some advanced flying instruction, and there, too, he was married.

Then the South Pacific—

There were big names in that theatre, Boyington, Bong, and others. Soon his name appeared on the horizon.

Two for McGuire! Eight for McGuire! The D. F. C., the Air Medal, Presidential Citation, then a plunge into the ocean off New Guinea and wounds. The Purple Heart and the Distinguished Service Cross, a grateful Nation's second highest award to its brave. Tom could have come home, but he preferred to stay with his command and fight.

Col. Charles Lindbergh went to the New Guinea area on a secret mission, and for a month he lived in a hut with Major McGuire and daily they flew in combat formation * * * into enemy territory. Their studies of high altitude flying will result in the saving of many of our fliers.

In the meantime, young Tom's record grew. In the Christmas Eve period he downed 7 Jap planes, for a total of 38—two behind Major Bong, the leader. He wrote a thrilling saga across the blue Pacific skies.

Major Bong retired from combat, and returned to this country to be married.

"No finer fellow than McGuire could break my record if he has not already done it," said Bong.

Few days went by that Tom's father did not call this newspaper.

"Any news of Tom today?" he'd anxiously inquire.

The tragic news came at 2:56 yesterday afternoon.

Tom was dead, killed in action, the way he would have preferred it.

The American Air Forces will never forget Tom McGuire.

We Must Modernize Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by me, published in the Reader's Digest for February 1945:

WE MUST MODERNIZE CONGRESS

(By GEORGE E. OUTLAND, Member of the House of Representatives from California)

Criticism of Congress by the people is not new, but of late Congress has begun to criticize itself. Our National Legislature has become sharply aware of the need of bringing its machinery up to date. More than 50 resolutions calling for reform were introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress, which ended in December, and reorganization along modern lines will be one of the chief concerns of the new Congress. The public thinks of Congress largely in terms of what happens on the floors of the Senate and the House. The real work, however, is done in committees, and it is with the committee system that changes must start.

Frank Knox, late Secretary of the Navy, was an extremely busy man. Yet when Congress decided to investigate a Navy contract, Secretary Knox was haled up to Capitol Hill not once but four different times to tell exactly the same story to four different congressional committees. Jesse Jones is reported to have appeared 18 different times before 18 different congressional committees—to deliver the same 2-hour speech.

Today there are 47 standing committees in the House and 33 in the Senate; moreover, there are many temporary committees. No wonder the New York Times refers to "our hydra-headed Congress." Senator LA FOLLETTE told the Senate last year that "hardly a day has gone by during the present long and arduous session of the Congress when I have not had to decide which one of several very important committees I would attend."

The Maloney-Monroney resolution, adopted at the close of the latest session of Congress, creates a bipartisan committee composed of six Members from the Senate and si from the House to study the problems of reorganization and make definite recommendations at the end of 90 days.

There are several possible solutions to the committee problem. One that will appeal to the common sense of the American people calls for 10 or a dozen joint or parallel committees of both Houses. Much time now wasted could be saved and such an arrangement would enable the two chambers to work together with greater understanding.

However, reform will make little progress until the American people as a whole demand greater efficiency of their Congress. Reducing the number of committees would mean reducing the number of committee chairmanships. The prestige of a committee chairmanship is the climax in the career of a Congressman; there are few who will vote to reduce their own chances for such a position—and few chairmen who will vote to abolish the position already theirs. Moreover, each committee chairman is allowed extra clerical help; short-handed as each Congressman is, to become a committee chairman is to obtain a more adequate staff.

This problem of staff is becoming increasingly serious. One of the keenest students of Congress, Dr. George B. Galloway, chairman of the Committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association, contends that of the 80 standing committees not more than 6 have staffs sufficiently expert to cope with and to evaluate the testimony of either administrative officials or lobbyists. My own Committee on Banking and Currency must pass on all legislation concerning the Office of Price Administration, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal Reserve System, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, and the many aspects of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Yet our committee has no attorneys, no special consultants, no expert to whom we can turn for evaluation of testimony, preparation of material, or legal interpretation.

Congressman MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, points out that each of 145 Federal departments and bureaus employs more people than there are on the entire congressional staff. For example, the Office of Indian Affairs spends more than twice as much to supervise the Nation's Indians as it costs to operate Congress.

To meet requirements it would not be necessary for committees to create permanent staff additions. There is now provided by the Library of Congress a little-known Legislative Reference Service. This is composed of experts who are able to render research assistance on questions of importance that arise before various committees. Such a service could be greatly enlarged. Thus committees which from time to time needed greater staff help might turn to the Service, drawing from a pool of competent students of Government problems maintained under impartial auspices.

Likewise a Constituents Inquiry Service under the Library of Congress would immediately remove from individual Representatives and Senators the burden of handling endless trifling requests, and demands which overwhelm them in a mass of detail and prevent them from adequately performing the major duties.

One Representative hurried back to his office to find 96 letters awaiting him, among which were the following requests:

A chamber of commerce wanted him to get busy "right now to lift gasoline and tire rationing."

A determined young woman demanded that he instruct the Army to transfer her boy friend from Africa to a service post she named back home.

A clubwoman wanted "some information on world production."

A politician wanted a portrait of the President personally autographed "from Frank to Willie."

The principal speaker at a political meeting wanted to know how long the war would last and how much it would cost.

"Taxpayer" wanted him to put an end to "lend-lease gifts to foreigners and other immoral people."

"American mother" urged him not to vote for post-war cooperation "unless they do what we say."[1]

If you think this list is an exaggeration, I hasten to assure you that it is not. My own collection of strange requests already fills several folders, and is growing daily. Legitimate requests any Congressman is happy to attempt to meet. Those asking him to "please send me a rock from Chesapeake Bay to add to my rock garden" or demanding that he "see that sliced bread is restored to the American people or I shall vote for your opponent next time" are time consuming, to put it mildly. All requests for information or accommodations, including many that are reasonable, could well be referred to a Constituents Inquiry Service.

Other steps are needed, however, to reduce the demands now made upon a Congressman's time. Placing all post offices under Civil Service would save the worry and energy now spent on nominating postmasters. Further time could be saved by the transfer of all Annapolis and West Point appointments to Civil Service or to the academies themselves. The granting of self-government to the District of Columbia would remove a thorn from the side of many a harassed Congressman—and from the side of the city of Washington, too.

Under existing procedure the first and third Tuesdays of each month are reserved by the Claims Committees in both House and Senate to hear private claims against the Government. Persons who have been injured by an Army truck or have some other personal injury claim against the Government present their cases. In the opinion of many Congressmen, the Claims Committees might well be abolished and an administrative agency to do its work set up. This would take away, as Senator LA FOLLETTE points out, the burdensome task of investigating petty claims and invoking the cumbersome procedure of passing private bills through the House and Senate."

Among the criticisms of Congress heard most often is that there is too little cooperation between our National Legislature and the administration. Sometimes the blame is placed on the bureaucrats, sometimes on the New Deal; less often on a willful Congress itself. Here again Congress is aware of a problem to be solved within its own ranks, and the stirrings of solution are already noticeable.

Representative KEFAUVER of Tennessee suggests amending the rules of the House to provide for a question period at which heads of executive departments and independent agencies would be requested to appear and answer questions—somewhat like the question hour in the House of Commons.

One practical example of cooperation between the legislative and executive branches has already demonstrated its merit. The House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds supervises the vast public housing and Federal works program in war-congested areas. The first Tuesday of each month there appear before it John Blandford, Jr., N. H. A. Administrator; General Fleming, F. W. A. Administrator, and the key assistants on their respective staffs. A mutual give-and-take follows. Chairman LANHAM asks questions about particular complaints or problems that have arisen, and he gets frank answers. Such meetings have resulted in better understanding on the part of both Congressmen and Administrators; potential friction has been averted, and governmental efficiency has been increased. The example set by FRITZ LANHAM and his committee might well be followed by other committees in both Houses.

There are even plans afoot also by which Congress could improve its public appearance. Dr. Galloway suggests that more frank recognition be given of the fact that the important work of Congress is done in committees. Therefore, let the bulk of the calendar be given over to committee meetings, open to the public, and let Congress meet to vote only one night a week. Business could be cleared with dignity and decorum. Similarly congressional debate, in Dr. Galloway's opinion, could be telescoped into one or two evenings a week, with congressional leaders discussing legislative issues before their own visible audience and the radio audience as well.

Neither the problems facing Congress nor the solutions are limited to Congress; both are for the American people as a whole to face. We shall never see our national legislative body modernized until the demand has reached the point where Representatives and Senators can no longer afford to ignore it. To this end there is much that we as individual citizens can do.

We can familiarize ourselves with the problems and proposed solutions. There is more fresh material available in books and publications. Once you have posted yourself, do not hesitate to let your Representative know that you are aware of needed changes, and that you are concerned with his awareness to them. It is easy to sit back and damn "bureaucracy"; the essential thing is to help bring about changes which will prevent bureaucratic domination in the first place.

Our Congress is not composed of supermen, armed with extraordinary powers of vision. Nor is it composed of "political panhandlers and trimmers." It is made up of ordinary men who are sincerely interested in doing the job which you sent them there to do. They work hard at that job. Your encouragement and your suggestions will help them to remodel Congress and enable it to function more efficiently.

Totalitarianism starts with the decline and neglect of the legislative body. The sensitiveness of the people to their Congress is one of the surest guaranties against the failure of democracy.

[1] Associated Press article by Frank I. Weller in the Washington Post, March 19, 1944.

Democratic Steering Committee Commends Hon. Robert Crosser, of Ohio, for Outstanding Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I include the following resolution of the Democratic steering committee, commending the outstanding service rendered by the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER, as chairman of that committee:

Whereas Hon. ROBERT CROSSER, a Representative from the State of Ohio, is automatically retiring as chairman of the Democratic Steering Committee of the House of Representatives, at the beginning of the Seventy-ninth session of the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas said committee desires to express its deep and abiding appreciation of the service, fellowship, and wisdom of our retiring chairman: Be it

Resolved, That the Democratic Steering Committee of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States of America extend to our beloved colleague and fellow Democrat profound appreciation of the services which he has rendered this committee, the leadership of the House of Representatives, and the Democratic Party; and be it further

Resolved, That this committee and his fellow Democrats of the House of Representatives, where he has faithfully served for more than 30 years, experience immeasurable pride in the career of "BOB" CROSSER, as he is affectionately known. Few men have ever been so honored by their constituents as he has; he has the love and confidence of all those who know him, and his personal life and political record will adorn forever the history of this Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be recorded in the records of this committee, and a copy sent to our retiring chairman, Hon. ROBERT CROSSER.

JOHN H. KERR.
JED JOHNSON.
EDWARD J. HART.

Seaway for the Whole Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on January 21, 1945:

SEAWAY FOR THE WHOLE NATION

Again bills are before Congress to authorize construction of the long-delayed St. Lawrence seaway.

This great project long has been ureged and advocated by the lakes States and some others; it has been opposed by some Mississippi Valley States, especially Illinois, and by Atlantic seaboard communities that feared competition with their shipping and harbor operations.

It is time the American people realized that the St. Lawrence seaway would not be a regional facility. Its service would be to the whole Nation. The war alone should, by now, have made that crystal clear.

Seacoasts everywhere in the war areas have been attacked and many of their water-front facilities have been wrecked. In England, both the Dover coast and London itself have experienced the damange and horror of robot bombs.

The Nation, therefore, that provides lines of communication from its best protected or least vulnerable inner reaches to its coasts, best insures its security in wartimes.

These communication lines, to be most effective in war periods, must be used and thereby adequately tested in peacetimes. And, obviously, the peaceful flow of commercial traffic, not only to the seacoasts but also to a Nation's interior, will help to create industrial and other constructive endeavors at the core of such a Nation, with immeasurable benefits thereby conferred upon the whole of that Nation.

So the St. Lawrence seaway is not a regional project. It is national in concept and effect. It is intended to, or in any event inevitably will, make the whole Nation stronger.

It seems needless to repeat that bulk cargoes from or to far-away places can most economically be carried by ships. That America's shipping should and will continue to ply into and out of seaboard harbors is obvious. But that they also should ply into and out of the world's greatest and safest inland seas—in peacetime or wartime—is so evident that every American should be urging great works that would make it possible.

News of Casualties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are receiving letters in increasing numbers from worried parents asking for news of their boys fighting on foreign fronts, particularly those engaged in the action around Bastogne and the Belgian bulge.

In the hope that I could obtain information which might be of some comfort and reassurance to the anxious relatives and loved ones of these boys, I called at the Casualty Branch of the Adjutant General's Office a few days ago and spent 2 or 3 hours with the highly efficient, kindly, and sympathetic Chief of the Division, Col. George F. Herbert, and several of his officers.

I suppose more heartbreaking messages go out from that office than anywhere else in America. Secretary Stimson, Chief of Staff Marshall, Adjutant General Ulio, Colonel Herbert, and, I believe, his entire division, realize that grim fact, and I was greatly impressed with the care that is taken to see to it that the sad news passing through their hands is delivered promptly, accurately, and sympathetically.

The Casualty Branch is a large and well-trained organization consisting of 82 officers and 2,400 civilian employees who work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, in three shifts. Practically all of the civilian employees are women, about 45 percent of whom are colored. Incidentally, I saw no loafing in my tour of the office. Four thousand telegrams and 10,000 letters are dispatched every day, and all are carefully checked to avoid errors.

The files contain the record of every man and woman in the Army serving overseas as well as records of civilians serving with the Army. Before embarking, everyone is required to designate the name, address, and relationship of the person to be notified in case he or she becomes a casualty.

Many people feel that a direct message from the War Department is too cruel a shock and that the sad news should be broken gently by clergymen, or the Red Cross, or some fraternal or veterans' organization. A well-known news commentator advocated such a course a few months ago, and as a result of it a great many parents and wives of boys in the service wrote the Casualty Branch on the subject. Over 65 percent of them preferred the direct message from the War Department. And so would I.

Normally, reports of casualties go from company or unit commander through military channels to the theater headquarters where the different types of casualties are classified, individual card records of each case are made by those marvelous business machines, showing name, serial number, grade, arm or branch of the service, place, date and nature of casualty. Officer couriers bring them directly to the Casualty Division in Washington. They travel by air under the highest priority. This method has been found the most expeditious and accurate means of delivering the records and the card system enables the Casualty Branch to tabulate the totals in the different classifications quickly. There are so many similar names, so many difficult to spell and pronounce in our all-American Army, and the serial numbers have so many digits that errors often creep into cable and radio reports, although in some places the Army must rely on cable or radio because the equipment for the more modern method is not available.

Each individual report is carefully checked with the records of the Casualty Division to make sure of the identification of the casualty and to determine whether any previous and contradictory reports have been received.

A telegram to the designated relative reading typically as follows is sent:

> The Secretary of War regrets to inform you that your son, Pvt. John Doe, was wounded in action on November 5 in France. Letter follows.
>
> ULIO,
> *The Adjutant General.*

Very promptly thereafter a personal letter will be written by one of the many skilled writers in the Division giving all the information available and permissible regarding the circumstances and the nature of the injury. At the same time the addressee is invited to send a cheerful five-word message to the wounded boy by cable through the Casualty Branch and a form is enclosed for this purpose.

I was shown a number of the messages going overseas. All of them were tender and affectionate but some were cleverly and subtly so.

One girl cabled her soldier, "Wish I were this cablegram."

A young wife cabled this message to her wounded husband lying in some far-off hospital: "Baby busting diapers. Raising ——."

I imagine that second one got a friendly chuckle and perhaps a sentimental tear from every nurse, orderly, and wounded man in the ward.

When a soldier is hospitalized overseas, the commanding officer of the hospital is ordered to write, or designate some one on his staff to write, a letter to the person whose name is supplied by the patient, giving brief diagnosis, physical condition, and prognosis in simple language, expressing sympathy and describing the treatment being received. Similar letters will be written monthly as long as patients remain on the seriously ill list and progress reports will be sent at 15-day intervals. Copies of these letters and reports are sent to the Casualty Branch in Washington to be attached to the soldier's records so that they are always kept up to date.

In all cases, casualties and any news concerning them are reported to the persons designated by the soldiers themselves before any release is made to the press, the Red Cross, Members of Congress or anyone else. This is as it should be.

As a Member of Congress I can quickly obtain the latest reports that have reached the Casualty Branch but only after the emergency addressee has been notified. It is important that the serial numbers be given to expedite replies.

Parents and wives and sweethearts are often deeply worried because of long delays in receiving letters from their loved ones in the Army. This may be accounted for in various ways. Under battle conditions the opportunity and the facilities for letter writing are not available for weeks at a time. Sometimes there is a shortage of trucks, ships, or planes to carry the large shipments of mail that accumulate. Mail sometimes goes astray, and sometimes mail goes down with the ship or plane carrying it, and sometimes the boys are a little careless about writing, taking it for granted we will know they are all right so long as we do not hear to the contrary.

Please be assured that in nearly every case no news is good news. If you have not heard from your boy for several weeks or months, I suggest you write to his immediate commanding officer or his chaplain stating that you are worried about him because you have not heard from him in so long a time and asking for information regarding him. If his failure to write is due to neglect or the natural aversion so many young boys have toward letter writing, I predict you will get a prompt response from him. After all, there is so little they are allowed to tell about the things they are doing.

Probably more deep and prolonged anxiety and anguish is caused by the "missing in action" messages than any other. Right now thousands of Ameri-

can families are receiving telegrams like this:

Mrs. JOHN JONES:

The Secretary of War desires to express his deep regret that your husband, Corp. John. Jones, has been reported missing in action in Luxembourg since December 15. If further details or other information are received, you will be promptly notified.

ULIO,
The Adjutant General.

The first thing the stricken family notes is that more than a month has elapsed since young John has been reported missing. Why the delay? They want to know. In battles of such severity as are occurring today it frequently happens that a company or a regiment is broken up, scattered, their rosters lost. The division would then be the smallest unit having personnel records. While the battle rages at its full fury it is impossible to determine the losses with any accuracy. It is bound to take time to ascertain the names of the men killed, wounded, captured, or missing.

Let me say at once that there is a better than a 50–50 chance that the boy reported missing in action is alive. In the case of the men so reported in the recent fighting on the western front, Colonel Herbert thinks the chances are considerably better than that; that a very large proportion will eventually be reported as prisoners of war in Germany or will return to their outfits. There will be another agonizing delay before we can know definitely who are the prisoners. It takes from 6 weeks to 3 months to learn about that, and then we will receive our first and only news through the International Red Cross until the boys themselves are permitted to write highly censored letters.

When a soldier is taken prisoner he is moved from one place of detention to another, and it may be several weeks before he reaches his final concentration camp. There committees of the International Red Cross obtain his name, serial number, and other pertinent information and report it to International Red Cross headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, whence it is sent by cable to the Casualty Branch of the Adjutant General's Office and families are notified. They are also informed of the laws Congress has passed regarding allotments, family allowances, and other provisions for the welfare of wives, children, and parents.

The Red Cross is the finest humanitarian organization the world has ever seen. It renders services of incalculable value to prisoners of war and to their families. Let us remember that when the next campaign for funds is launched.

In this brief statement I have covered my subject very sketchily. I have not told you about the fine work of the Casualty Division of the Navy, and I have not told the full story about the Army.

It should be a comfort to all of us with boys in the service to know how painstakingly and how sympathetically our Army and Navy chiefs are trying to keep us informed about them.

Drafting Workers Into Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT K. HENRY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Dairyland News, of Lake Mills, Wis., December 11, 1944, and an editorial, Drafting Workers Into Unions, which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on January 25, 1945:

[From the Dairyland News, Lake Mills, Wis., of December 11, 1944]

THE POLITICAL PASTURE

(By Art Tiller)

Herewith are offered a few words in defense of farmers living in the vicinity of the Badger Ordnance Works in Sauk County, against whom certain radio broadcasts and newspaper articles appear to be directed because they do not rush in to fill 1,200 construction jobs.

It was not until November 1 that the War Manpower Commission changed its regulations to permit farmers to seek employment at the huge powder plant without invoking what could be considered a penalty, in that their draft status would be altered. Even now the farmers are permitted only 4 months of such employment.

In order to get to the work site and home again each day, most of the farmers would spend from 3 to 4 hours riding the busses, since farmer help is recruited within a radius of 65 miles from the plant. Thus, any 8-hour day at the plant would be stretched into 12 hours devoted to the job, and with chores on the farm still to be done.

The long hours, hardships, and inconveniences do not constitute a deterrent, however, to the enlistment of farmer labor. The real "bottleneck" is the exorbitant demands made by organized labor agents.

To qualify for a $1.25-an-hour job as a carpenter—which means anyone who can drive nails or saw lumber on rough construction—the farmers are compelled to pay $50 to a labor union agent in the form of initiation fees, plus $2 a month for a "permit" to work. As a result, any farmer willing to serve on the job for 2 months would earn $400 in eight 40-hour weeks but would have to pay 14 percent of it, or $54, to a union for the privilege of patriotically helping in the war effort. The situation prevails at a time when the Commander in Chief, General Eisenhower, and numerous other War and Navy Department officials are appealing for more ammunition—and when work on the new addition at Bow is 2 months behind schedule for lack of help.

Obviously, no blame can attach to the farmers who have done such a grand job in producing food, and who stand ready to aid in getting out more powder. But as long as the labor unions insist upon getting such heavy cuts of the farmers' wages there isn't anything that the purchase of an extra war bond will do to produce more ammunition.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, January 25, 1945]

DRAFTING WORKERS INTO UNIONS!

The House Military Affairs Committee, showing about as much courage as an angle worm, has cringingly reversed itself. It has struck from the work-or-fight bill a provision that men taking essential war jobs—at the direction of their draft boards—would not be required to join labor unions against their will.

This is just like drafting men into the Army and then forcing them to join a soldiers' union. It sounds ridiculous. The weak attitude of the House committee is ridiculous.

We are not here concerned with any normal right of labor unions. We are not concerned with the closed shop or maintenance of membership. We are concerned with the forcing of men into joining organizations whether they want to or not.

We are confronted with a war emergency, a manpower shortage which requires some legislation to facilitate the shifting of workers from nonessential to essential work. The May-Bailey bill is not as comprehensive as it might be, but it is at least part of the answer. It provides a method whereby draft boards may keep men between 18 and 45 in essential jobs and shift men from nonessential to essential jobs.

The seniority and other rights of men who are shifted would be protected under the bill. As another protection, it was proposed that such men would not be forced to join a labor union against their will. Obviously this is right. When a man is drafted into a war job he is in no normal relationship to the job or a union.

This protective clause brought loud complaints from Philip Murray and William Green and other union leaders. Hastily the House Military Affairs Committee beat a cowardly retreat.

This is unthinkable. There are fewer than 15,000,000 Americans in labor unions; there are 130,000,000 Americans. The overwhelming majority of Americans, whether they can get their ideas across to Congress or not, will be disgusted if the law is passed drafting workers into labor unions. This overreaching by union leadership to apply political pressure will in the end prove damaging to unionism.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, as factual information which may be pertinent to the debates of this week, I wish to insert in the RECORD the Social Security Board table appearing below, showing the average weekly unemployment claims being paid during the month of December 1944, in this country, a total of 74,269.

For unemployment compensation purposes it is considered that 4⅓ weeks constitutes a month, so on this basis it is evident that for the month of December there were approximately 325,000 man-weeks—13,000,000 man-hours—lost by persons who were unemployed due to no fault of their own, who could not find suitable employment and, hence, were eligible for benefits in their respective States.

The lowest month of record for the payment of unemployment benefits was November of 1943. The December figures show an increase of over 40 percent

in the year in benefit payments and a total payment in December of nearly five and one-half million dollars.

The table follows:

Average weekly number of beneficiaries, Social Security Board

Region I:	
Connecticut	1,648
Maine	865
Massachusetts	3,198
New Hampshire	267
Rhode Island	1,425
Vermont	115
Region II–III:	
Delaware	167
New Jersey	4,911
New York	10,980
Pennsylvania	2,925
Region IV:	
District of Columbia	364
Maryland	819
North Carolina	466
Virginia	333
West Virginia	486
Region V:	
Kentucky	1,311
Michigan	9,706
Ohio	1,076
Region VI:	
Illinois	7,274
Indiana	1,584
Wisconsin	941
Region VII:	
Alabama	1,192
Florida	804
Georgia	571
Mississippi	271
South Carolina	391
Tennessee	2,739
Region VIII:	
Iowa	316
Minnesota	424
Nebraska	39
North Dakota	9
South Dakota	22
Region IX:	
Arkansas	255
Kansas	426
Missouri	1,406
Oklahoma	306
Region X:	
Louisiana	761
New Mexico	15
Texas	828
Region XI:	
Colorado	81
Idaho	35
Montana	97
Utah	190
Wyoming	3
Region XII:	
Arizona	94
California	12,136
Nevada	43
Oregon	267
Washington	365
Territories:	
Alaska	20
Hawaii	2
Total	74,969

James F. O'Connor, Late Congressman From Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, JIM O'CONNOR is gone. I desire to add my humble tribute to my good friend from Montana who died January 15.

My former boss and predecessor, the Honorable R. T. Buckler, served on the Committee on Indian Affairs with Representative O'CONNOR. Because of this, I had quite a number of personal contacts with Mr. O'CONNOR, who, shortly after beginning service on the committee, became its chairman. He was ever ready to help me whenever I called on him for information or advice.

His office staff has lost a considerate and appreciative boss.

Members of the Committee on Indian Affairs have lost a fair-minded and helpful chairman.

The Indians of America have lost a sympathetic and understanding Congressman.

The people of Montana have lost a good neighbor, a conscientious public servant, and a Congressman of great integrity and character.

Congress and its membership have lost a good true friend.

The American people have lost a loyal and unselfish American and statesman.

May God bless and keep his soul.

The Tydings Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the milk and butter situation in the dairy sections of New York State, particularly western New York, is most serious. Prior to the second directive issued by General Hershey explaining that the II–C men still have their rights under the Tydings amendment, and that these rights should be granted, there have been taken from the farms large numbers of young men who are indispensable to the preservation of the dairy farms. There is no group of farmers who face a more serious problem than the dairymen, because inexperienced replacements are of no help in this highly specialized type of farming. Under leave to extend, I wish to insert resolutions passed at the seventh annual meeting of the Niagara Frontier Cooperative Milk Producers' Bargaining Agency, Inc., under date of January 16, 1945:

Whereas the Niagara Frontier Cooperative Milk Producers' Bargaining Agency, Inc., views with alarm the steady decrease in skilled dairy farm labor; the agency feels that migratory and transient labor are of great value in harvesting fruit, vegetable, and cash crops, but that this class of labor cannot be relied upon by the dairyman. His is a 365-day job requiring experienced skilled workers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the agency recommends to those in authority that every effort be made, consistent with the prosecution of the war, to leave on, and return to the dairy farm as many of its skilled workers as is possible; be it further

Resolved, That we place ourselves on record as favoring the Tydings amendment which provides for the deferment of farm workers whose induction would take a large portion of land out of production.

Whereas the Niagara Frontier Cooperative Milk Producers' Bargaining Agency, Inc., reiterates its stand as opposed in principle to the use of subsidy payments, believing that fair and comparable pricing is the better method. However, those in authority have definitely authorized and adopted the subsidy program, and have made it applicable to production of milk and milk products: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the agency believes that, pending withdrawal of the program and readjustment of market prices to cover the cost and true value of milk, the agency and the producers of milk should know, well in advance, of any change in the amounts of such subsidy payments. That producers and their organizations should be consulted as to what changes, if any, would be fair and equitable; that rates of payment should be continued at not less than their present levels and that adjustments made should be commensurate with current changes in production costs.

That this agency reaffirms its position taken in recent petitions to the Commissioner, that official order No. 127 should be so amended as to protect producer returns, and the public interest in the adequacy of supply, in the event of the total or partial withdrawal of subsidies.

Whereas butter has long been recognized and proven to be a healthful, nutritious food; it stands as one of the best of all milk products and cannot be honestly imitated. The agency feels that the price of butter is too low at this time in comparison with other milk products and discourages the production of milk for this product: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the agency is strongly opposed to any attempt by anyone to imitate this natural food by processing, packaging, flavoring, deceptive advertising, coloring, or any other deceptive methods; and be it further

Resolved, That the price of butter be raised to a point where its manufacture will be encouraged to the end that consumers be no longer deprived of this valuable food.

"I Took Refuge in American History"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hal W. Kennedy, assistant deputy, Los Angeles County counsel:

In this tragic hour in which we live, as we listen to the roar of history, our souls cry "sanctuary" and our minds grope for encouragement upon which to hang our faith and belief that the American way of life will continue. In common with millions of other average Americans, I want to continue to believe in democracy.

If possible I want to believe in democracy in the same trusting manner in which I believed in it as a boy. I want to capture back

that definiteness and certainty of belief that came with my own boyhood but which may be passing out in the manhood of my generation.

I want my little boy to live in a country where he can enjoy watching a Fourth of July parade and experience the same spiritual and emotional reactions that I did. I hope he will be able to go to a patriotic gathering and hear the orator of the day extol the virtues of our representative democracy and have the same deep-seated, ingrained trust that the America his dad knew is here to stay.

Perhaps this is wishful thinking, naive, entirely unrealistic, and not in keeping with the sweep of today's events, but I found the mental refuge I was seeking by rereading American history and by visiting the shrines and places which symbolize America's greatness. I am now ready to face the challenge of our responsibility.

REBIRTH OF PATRIOTISM

Hope, courage, and determination returned to me as I stood on the banks of the James River, at Jamestown, Va., and looked upon the site of the first American colony. As I thought about the suffering and the starvation of those early colonists and viewed with awe and reverence what now remains of the old brick church that housed the first Legislative Assembly in our country, I experienced a rebirth of patriotism and I wondered whether, along with the great need for physical things, national defense does not also demand some things which are spiritual.

Standing on the bleak New England coast, looking at the Plymouth Rock, feeling the icy blast that swept in from the Atlantic, I was confident that the American people today are ready to show the same devotion that motivated the Puritans in their search for freedom. The American people are not ready to entirely capitulate to the doubts and fear and hysteria sweeping the world today.

Visiting Boston Common, Bunker Hill, and Breed's Hill, and reading the scores of historical markers and commemorative plaques gave me confidence that today there must be new John Hancocks and Samuel Adams with ability to crystallize the courage and determination of a great people.

Retracing the routes taken by Paul Revere and the lesser known William Dawes, I felt sure that there must be modern riders "ready to rise up and spread the alarm" to warn us of new dangers that now beset our shores. Lexington Green and the Concord Bridge reminded me that every period in history has found its leaders. Fundamentally we are no different from our ancestors, only softened and lulled into security by too much ease.

In the midst of the low Pennsylvania hills, I stood at Valley Forge and thought studiously of the innate greatness of Washington. It marked the spot where he had been called upon to show the eminence of his character. While Washington was there, there centered the common hopes and the common interests of all the American people. A visit to that place imbued me with the greatness of Washington's sacrifice and the littleness of what I, as an average citizen, was really doing to preserve the product of his arduous labors. I knew then that his influence was the property of the world, the legacy of all those who love liberty.

I journeyed to Gettysburg and sensed the power of that place as a symbol of the present Union of the States, the tragedy of Civil War, and the emptiness of the future if the patriotic citizens of this country do not now reappraise the value of that struggle, in terms of its influence upon our country today.

ETERNAL VIGILANCE THE PRICE

We are a great people but the age-old law of compensation demands that we must be eternally vigilant to keep us great. In the history of the law there is an old maxim which has come down to us since the days of Justinian, which declares that "he who takes the benefit must also bear the burden." If America is to remain free, we must pay the price to keep it so.

A rereading of the history of the United States and an intimate visit to historical American shrines gave me a greater appreciation of the debt we owe our ancestors and a stronger resolve to hold on to the pattern of representative government, for the world of tomorrow will need it to build upon.

I found peace, comfort, and courage through my historical tour and returned home to read again and again of America's greatness. As history repeats itself, the present generation will produce new leaders, statesmen, heroes (if need be) who will save us in our crisis. We must have faith; we cannot let go. The pattern of American Democracy must be preserved. With boyish faith, I am ready to believe that God shall not let America be the last of its kind in the world.

Exportation of Tobacco Seeds and Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the many examples of the hypocrisy in high places in this administration is shown in legislation passed in 1940—the eighth year of the present administration:

[Public, No. 543, 76th Cong., ch. 232, 3d sess.]
S. 3530

An act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful to export any tobacco seed and/or live tobacco plants from the United States or any Territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof, to any foreign country, port, or place, unless such exportation and/or transportation is in pursuance of a written permit granted by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such permit shall be granted by the Secretary only upon application therefor and after proof satisfactory to him that such seed or plants are to be used for experimental purposes only.

SEC. 2. Any persons violating any of the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment.

Who was Secretary of Agriculture at this time? Who together with his assistants went from one end of the country to the other lauding the wonders of reciprocity? Who appeared on program after program of the free-traders? It was none other than the then Secretary of Agriculture, Henry Wallace.

Listen to this letter of explanation coming from the office of the present Secretary of Agriculture:

JANUARY 22, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of January 2, inquiring about the act of Congress prohibiting the exportation of tobacco seed and live plants. This law was enacted to protect the foreign market for American tobacco growers. It was felt that the large quantities of tobacco seed being exported annually to China and other countries which normally imported large quantities of tobacco from our flue-cured districts were contributing to the decrease in these tobacco exports.

The act forbids the exportation of tobacco seed except for experimental purposes, and the officials of the Department concerned with plant breeding stated that one-half ounce of seed is more than ample for planting a regulation-size experimental plot. This, therefore, was adopted as the maximum quantity of seed that could be exported for any one variety. However, under an approved application, a permit may be issued to cover several varieties. Permits are issued only for seed to be used in the course of scientific experiments as conducted by governmental agencies. During the past 4 years the total quantity of seed authorized to be exported has been slightly under 11 pounds. A copy of the regulations governing the administration of this act is enclosed.

Congressman KERR, of North Carolina, was instrumental in securing the enactment of this law, and you may wish to discuss it further with him.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Assistant Secretary.

Is this what the New Deal champions call good-neighbor policy? Do you think the American people can be deceived forever by a policy of talking one way and acting another. The first requisite for understanding between countries is to have the spoken word and the legislative acts religiously coincide. We have a near embargo on wheat imports, and we have a near embargo on tobacco exports set up by the present administration. Who, I ask, wishes to explain this situation and what is your answer?

Giant Foreign Cartels Controlling Industrial Diamonds Are the Target of the Department of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the Department of Justice has today filed another anti-trust case against the giant foreign cartels which operate in world markets and attempt to deprive this country of materials needed for war- and peace-time production. This time it is industrial diamonds. There is hardly any element more important for war production than industrial diamonds. Industrial diamonds are needed for turning out machine tools on which our whole war production depends. It is high time

that a cartel operating to restrict the supply of industrial diamonds to this country was struck down.

The complaint which has been filed by the Department in the United States District Court in New York, states that 5 British or South African companies, 3 Belgian companies, and 1 Portuguese company produce and sell 95 percent of the world's diamonds, and that the result of the conspiracy is to keep all the diamond producers of the world from selling directly to American consumers. Thus the Belgian producers have been kept from selling directly to the American market. They were forced instead to sell to the British combine. The complaint shows that it has been difficult to build up an adequate stockpile of industrial diamonds in this country because the cartel was afraid that might reduce the price.

The Appropriations Committee has long been familiar with the cartel problems facing the antitrust division. The diamond case is a good example of how these cartels interfere with war production. I call the attention of the Members of Congress to the operations of this cartel because if it should turn out that existing law is insufficient to break it down, and that something more is needed, consideration will have to be given, in my judgment, to measures which will put teeth into the antitrust laws and prevent their continued abuse.

Kiwanis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday it was my privilege to attend the meeting of the Kiwanis Club of Washington in celebration of the thirtieth anniversary of the establishment of Kiwanis. At this meeting I listened to an address by the Honorable Ben Dean, of Grand Rapids, Mich., president of Kiwanis International. I think it was a splendid address and believe it will be of interest to every Member of Congress. Under the unanimous consent granted me I am incorporating his address as a part of my remarks.

Kiwanis has become a great moral force in the United States and Canada. In the active prosecution of its motto, "We Build," it has contributed and is contributing to the building of greater men and a better world. It has helped immeasurably in cementing the cordial feeling of friendship which now exists between Americans and Canadians. It is in the forefront of every effort to bring this great world war to an early and victorious conclusion, and is taking an active part in the planning for the establishment of an international agreement among nations to bring an end to war and to secure the blessings of a lasting peace.

It has been my privilege to be a member of the Kiwanis Club of my home city, Americus, Ga., for about 20 years. This fellowship and the ideals and programs of Kiwanis have proven of great benefit to me and are the source of constant inspiration in my present work.

Mr. Dean's address is as follows:

Kiwanis this week is 30 years old. On January 21, 1915, the State of Michigan issued a charter to the first Kiwanis Club, located in Detroit. Today there are 2,250 Kiwanis Clubs in cities and towns throughout the United States and Canada, and the membership includes 138,000 leading business and professional men.

The name Kiwanis is a coined name of Indian derivation. Originally it had no meaning. Today, after 30 years of attention to community needs, Kiwanis is universally accepted as a symbol for service, and is held in public respect and esteem throughout the two nations.

In these three decades Kiwanians have spent millions of dollars on tens of thousands of underprivileged children. They have maintained hundreds of fresh-air camps and supported thousands of clinics. They have turned ugly city dumps into spacious parks and playgrounds. With their dynamic leadership they have revitalized communities which had gone to seed.

During these 30 years Kiwanis Clubs have trained more than 50,000 men for leadership in community affairs, and in the State and Nation. Each year Kiwanians spend seven and one-half million hours in fellowship around luncheon tables, in adult education, and in learning to understand and cooperate with fellow citizens of diverse racial backgrounds, political opinions, and religious beliefs.

Much of the manpower and the leadership for the war effort on the home front has been supplied by Kiwanis and other service clubs. For instance, last year Kiwanis Clubs bought and sold more than a billion dollars worth of War bonds. Kiwanians contributed more than 10,000 pints of blood, and induced more than 250,000 other men and women to donate to the blood banks. Kiwanians sent 10,000,000 packs of cigarettes overseas, and made more than 2,000,000 contacts through gifts and letters to men in the armed forces.

Kiwanis International has dedicated its manpower and its influence to two major objectives in 1945—the year of decision. They are embodied in the Kiwanis theme—six words—six words that hold the destiny of mankind—six words that sum up the hopes and prayers of every liberty-loving soul on the globe.

The six words are "Win the war—build for peace." Win the war—build for peace.

That is the Kiwanis theme. Listen now to the first great Kiwanis objective. Hasten total victory—accelerate club war services. Kiwanians will intensify their efforts to sell war bonds, to supply blood banks, to collect scrap, to fill war chests, to finance the Red Cross. They will do this as a practical means to speed the war effort. They will also do it to build morale.

Do you know what the war is costing the United States? Two hundred and fifty million dollars a day. Every 4 days, a billion dollars. Every 12 days, as much as we spend in a whole year on our public schools, our colleges and universities.

The second world war will cost the nations a trillion dollars. A trillion dollar bills laid end to end would stretch 3,800 times around the earth. For a trillion dollars, a modern 5-room house could be built for every family in the world. Or a million dollar hospital for every community of 2,000. A trillion dollars would give 500,000,000 young men and women a 4-year college education. Or build 25,000,000 miles of 4-lane highways.

The money cost, however, is unimportant compared with the blood that stains the snows of Europe and the sands of the South Pacific. Already more than 150,000 American boys have been killed. More than 600,000 casualties. Every day the losses mount. There is a desperate urgency to end this bloody business quickly.

Thus Kiwanians must throw the weight of their influence in their 2,250 communities against a let-down of the war effort—against the inevitable war-weariness which will follow victory in Europe—against those vicious subversive influences on the home front which seek to divide and sow doubt and distrust.

The second objective of Kiwanis is—use our influence to establish and maintain world peace.

It was just 25 years ago next March 19, in the United States Senate that the votes of 35 Senators—7 more than necessary—barred this Nation from joining the League of Nations, and changed the course of history. These 35 Senators believed they had public opinion behind them. People were disillusioned, embittered. They wanted to isolate themselves from European quarrels. They welcomed President Harding's normalcy.

But does any thinking American today believe there is security in isolationism? No spot on the globe, no matter how remote, is more than 60 hours from the local airport. The world has shrunk to the size of an oyster. Everybody is everybody's neighbor. What goes on anywhere on earth is a matter of concern to America.

A third world war might well be the annihilation of civilization. The V-3 bomb gives promise of the horrors to come. Given time, Germany may yet devise bombs that can travel far enough to destroy our coastal cities. Soon there will be monsters of destruction—jet-propulsion bombs capable of traveling 3,500 miles an hour, vaulting 70 miles above the earth, carrying tons of explosive to wipe out entire cities. As long as there is a single unpoliced spot on earth where men of evil design may marshal scientists without souls to devise colossal engines of human destruction, there can be no security or peace for America, or for the world.

This time, America dare not evade the responsibility of leadership. We have the largest navy on earth. The largest air force. The second largest army. The largest industrial plant. We have the most power—the most at stake. We must accept the obligations inherent in such superiority, and take the lead for peace. There can be no effective international force for peace unless America plays a leading role.

It is high time America used her power and her influence to insist on the proper terms and conditions for a lasting peace. It is time America served notice on her allies and the world that she is spending her manhood and her resources not to perpetuate old world empires, not to maintain buffer states and balances of power—but to fashion out of blood and agony for all time, a peace that will be just and durable. The voice of Senator VANDENBERG was a welcome voice of clarity and purpose in a fog of doubt and indecision. The instant favorable response to his brilliant speech shows the temper of the people.

I am amazed to find how many people—educated men and women—are pessimistic about peace. How many think another war in 20 years is inevitable. This is rank defeatism. This is not the faith that built America. There are 2,169,000,000 persons in the world. Never in history did so many want one single thing so passionately—a just and lasting peace. How the gods must look

down and laugh in derision at boastful, arrogant man, who can find no better purpose for the machines that he has built than to use them to destroy himself. How absurd, how utterly preposterous to say that man, who has conquered disease and mastered the forces of nature, who has tamed the tides and probed the secrets of the stars and released the energy of the atoms, how absurd to say that he cannot join hands with his fellow man and work out their common destinies in peace unvexed by violence.

This, then, is the task of all Kiwanians and like service groups, to build a strong and vocal public opinion that demands a lasting peace. We must use our Kiwanis Clubs as forums and platforms to mold in each community a public opinion that will be powerful and insistent. In a democracy it is the people on whom the peace depends. Let the people speak with a common voice from the towns and the country, from the hills and the plains, and Congress will hear. Across this broad land must be built a public opinion that cannot be ignored in Washington, that will be clear and unmistakable to our allies, that will be a sharp and insistent directive at the peace table. To this task Kiwanians and all like-minded Americans must dedicate their energies in this fateful year.

The tenth great objective of Kiwanis—I wish I had time to discuss the other seven—the tenth objective is, Stress spiritual values as vital to human progress." The Kiwanis ideals of fellowship and service are based on the primary of human and spiritual values. Democracy is a spiritual concept. It exalts the individual. It gives primacy to human personality. Man is the master, the state is the servant. America has strayed far down the pathway of materialism. She forgot the faith of her fathers. Now she does penance in an agony of blood and wasted treasure. Out of this fiery furnace America must emerge humble and chastened if she is to lead the world to liberty. She must turn back to the eternal values of the spirit.

I close with this story. In a little town in Scotland, a distinguished professor of speech of a great university spent the week end with a friend. On the Sabbath they attended the village kirk. In the midst of the service the host of the professor rose and said, "We have as our guest today a professor of speech of one of our universities. May we have him read the Twenty-third Psalm?" The pastor gladly invited the professor to the pulpit. With cultivated voice and practiced diction, the professor read the beautiful Psalm of the Shepherd, and when he had finished the audience was visibly moved. Then someone in the congregation rose and said, "And now, Pastor, will you also read the psalm." And the venerable pastor, who had spent his life among this people, who had shared their joys and sorrows, in his frail, hesitating voice, read also that matchless passage of the Psalmist. And when he had finished there was hardly a dry eye in the congregation. On the way home from church the host said to his guest, the professor, "Did you notice what a strange thing happened? When you recited the psalm the congregation was visibly moved, but when the pastor read it there was scarcely a dry eye. Why was that?" And the professor, who must have been a modest man and a very discerning one, replied, "That is easily explained. You see, I know the psalm, but the pastor knows the Shepherd."

That, my friends, is the difference between lip patriotism and a loyalty and love of country that wells from the heart. May we as Kiwanians, in this year for greatness, dedicate our manpower and our leadership to the safeguarding of our historic liberties and to bringing about a world of lasting peace and good will.

India's Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me at the India Independence Day meeting, National Press Building, Washington, D. C., January 29, 1945:

I want to begin with a warning. Let us not fall into the error of viewing India as an eternal problem which will defy solution into the ages; rather, it must be the purpose to focus our energies on the realization that it is a living problem requesting solution and possible of solution.

The talk about India revolves and revolves. It is a study in contrasts and disparities. It would almost appear that wherever you strike at the tumultuous canvas that is India you can reach forth and pull out an extreme of one kind or another. The truth is there exists in India such conflicting conditions, side by side, as to give each opposing study of India a semblance of truth. And because of this profusion of talk this everlasting marshalling of facts some semitrue, some true in what seems to be in everlasting parade before the world, we begin, out of inertia, to view India, not as eternal India, but as India, the eternal problem. I think it is extremely important that we in America, before all else clarify our approach to an awareness that the problem of freedom for India is immediate, is alive, and is soluble.

I have spoken to any number of our servicemen who have recently returned from India where they had been stationed. They tell me their first reaction is one of profound shock. They have seen on one hand the fabulous resources of the continent and on the other the specter of starvation and famine stalk the land. They are puzzled and distressed. They come away with a sense of the enduring moral dignity of the Indian people in the face of their rulers. They have asked themselves and asked me: Don't the principles of the Atlantic Charter apply to India? Aren't we fighting for the freedom of men and nations everywhere? And for a durable peace? It isn't right and it doesn't make sense. Can a peace endure when 400,000,000 inhabitants of a continent are held in thrall for the benefit of another country?

But the direct approach is undermined by the adroit and seemingly unanswerable propaganda of the British who smoothly point out:

1. There is a war going on and the question of India independence must wait until some day after the war.

2. The diversity of religious and political groups preclude unity in India and hence preclude independence until such unity is achieved.

3. The Cripps offer for India independence was made in good faith, offering independence. Why was the offer not accepted?

4. British rule in India prevents civil wars, protects minority peoples and defends the continent.

5. The illiteracy rate is so high and the training in self-government so underdeveloped that it would be injurious to India if independence were granted.

The British, however, take great pains not to point out:

1. That the war against Japan could be won more quickly if the Indians were given a specific date of independence. Then and only then would they enter into the battle in sufficient numbers to be of more than token aid. It is no secret that the Indians join the armies in order to eat. Mr. Phillips' report to President Roosevelt made on May 14, 1943, is very much to the point. He stated: "Assuming that India is known to be an important base for our future operations against Burma and Japan, it would seem to be of highest importance that we should have around us a sympathetic India rather than an indifferent and possibly a hostile India. Indians feel they have no voice in the Government and therefore no responsibility in the conduct of the war."

2. As to unity, the British are well aware, and so are we, that in every country which has sought its independence, unity was achieved after freedom. The history of our own country in its struggle for freedom is an exact case in point. England asks that all parties reconcile their differences first, a most difficult feat, you will admit, when the very visible efforts of the British are directed toward keeping the factions apart. To ask for complete unanimity of viewpoint among all the factions of a country actually is asking for the development of a totalitarian form of government. No unbridgeable chasm exists in India to keep the people divided and render them unfit for self-government. There are more minorities, more unrelated languages spoken in the United States, more variance in custom and belief in the United States than there is in India. Yet here out of the amalgam, a mighty nation has been forged.

Much has been made of the Hindu-Moslem intractability. Look, the British say, they won't get together and so how can we grant independence to the contesting parties. I think a very apt analysis has been made by Kumar Goshal in an article in the Voice of India. He states: "It is curious how the name of the Moslems crops up wherever it is profitable for a third party to utilize it. Britain says she has to remain in India because of the Hindu-Moslem antagonism. In Palestine, British power has to be maintained, we are told, because the Jews and Moslems cannot get along when left to themselves. General Giraud abrogated the Cremieux decree in French North Africa because, he said, voting rights for the Jews annoyed the Moslems. Since the Moslems are the common denominators in all these places, one might suspect that they can never live peaceably with the members of any other religion. Yet 50,000,000 Moslems in China get along quite well with Buddhists, Taoists, Confucians, and Christians; Moslems in the Philippines had no conflict with Christians; and in the Soviet Union Moslems live harmoniously with members of many other religious faiths. Can it be that the fault lies with imperialism, which is the other common denominator in the countries where religious antagonism takes an acute form?"

3. Now, how about the wonderful Cripps offer? Can there be any doubt that the Cripps offer was framed in such a manner as to insure rejection? It continued the supreme power of veto in the Viceroy. It offered independence in an indeterminate future. It continued complete sovereignty to 562 Indian princes in as many different states covering 90,000,000 people with power to lay and collect taxes and administer justice outside the national government. Individual provinces or Indian states (some of the latter are smaller than a small township in the United States) could elect to stay out of the Indian Federation. The results are easily forseeable; there would be states within a state, a sort of

Balkanized India, a paralyzed India economically and politically. It is little wonder then that all parties of India rejected the Cripps offer.

Can it be said that the Cripps offer was made in good faith? Certainly it is more in keeping with Churchill's pugnacious declaration: "I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire" than an actual offer of independence.

4. So Britain remains in India for India's good, does it? England may point to the illiteracy, the disease and squalor, the vast number of untouchables to justify her withholding freedom from India. She may say it would be dangerous to give freedom to those yearning to be free. But Britain's tight hold on India resulted in no program to wipe out the disease and squalor. Indeed, she encouraged an economy in India that permitted great wealth to exist alongside of the abject poverty. Her defense of her position in not granting India independence because she is not prepared for self-government is like the story of the man who killed his parents and then pleaded for clemency on the ground that he was an orphan. If England really were sincere in talking of eventual self-government for India, why has she superimposed upon India from outside a a civil service system and her own system of India's defense. Having withheld the apparati of self-government, she now reasons that India is unfit to govern itself. Let's be frank. Is it not true that a certain class of British aristocrats and industrialists fear loss of social position and economic power if India should be free? And was this not the same fear that England had when the American Colonies first demanded independence? And is it not likewise true that countries developing internally to a recognizable strength promote the economic welfare of the whole world? An outspoken member of Parliament recently said, "It is hypocritical to say that we hold India for the benefit of the Indians. We hold it as the finest outlet for British goods in general and for Lancashire goods in particular." That's it in a nutshell.

The real sabotage of the war effort in India is British encirclement of India. To attribute it to the leaders and thousands of members of the Indian National Congress now imprisoned by the British for over 2 years without a trial is a criminal denial of the truth. The imprisonment aside from its violation of judicial rights solves no problem. It intensifies the bitterness; it keeps the Hindus and Moslems from reaching any form of agreement. It casts a sorry reflection of Britain's integrity in colonial rule. When Sir Maurice Gwyer, the eminent English judge, ruled that the Indian nationalists had been arrested illegally under a statute that had no validity, the Viceroy of India autocratically issued a new ordinance in April 1943 validating the arrests made in August 1942. We cannot sit by and unprotesting, accept such denial of human rights and liberties.

I cannot leave off here without making reference to the article that appeared in the Reader's Digest of February 1945. In its book section appears a digest of Beverley Nichols' book, Verdict on India. It is so obviously the British point of view, so smug in its expression of British superiority, so superficial in its examination of the real India, so patently slanted that the mischief it can breed in the minds of the vast number of readers of the Digest is incalculable. I sincerely believe that the Reader's Digest should be prevailed upon to present the other side of the shield. Once again, the Reader's Digest finds itself on the side of power and once again it betrays a public trust inherent in a publication that purports to present a cross-section of opinion. In fairness not only to the people of India, but in fairness to its readers, I sincerely trust the Reader's Digest will publish in the near future a more honest survey of the problem of India.

I have so demanded of the Reader's Digest in a letter I sent its editor today.

I am glad I'm here tonight and to walk in step with Mrs. Pandit and those who have not given up the fundamental struggle for liberty and who have proved their devotion over and over again to those very things for which the embattled world fights today.

I cannot let the occasion go by without paying tribute to the guest of the evening, Mrs. Pandit, particularly on the day we celebrate India Independence Day, alas, an "independence day" without independence, but it will not be an unrealized dream. Mrs. Pandit symbolizes the glorious idea of freedom, the idea to which we in America must rededicate ourselves, for it is truly said that the world cannot exist half free and half slave. A bit of Mrs. Pandit's background: Her brother Nehru, a great Indian leader and servant has spent 21 years out of the 29 years of his political life in jail. Her father, her mother, her sister, and daughter have likewise been imprisoned. As Dr. Yu Tang has remarked, "Her family is strong in conviction."

Prayer at Inauguration of Gov. R. Gregg Cherry, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following prayer given at the inauguration of Gov. R. Gregg Cherry, Raleigh, N. C., by Dr. C. Excelle Rozzelle, pastor of Wesley Memorial Methodist Church, High Point, N. C.:

O Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations, before the mountains were brought forth or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world. Even from everlasting to everlasting Thou are God. We stand today far along the processions of the centuries and in the foremost files of time. To us Thou hast given a heritage, O God, and a faith, out of the lives of heroes and martyrs, deep from the souls of saints and seers, who by their long-ago courage and idealism, speak to us this hour. Across the wide seas have come to our shores the streaming lights of a hundred, yea, a thousand, torches of struggling men out of whose tragedies and whose sacrificial renunciation we have builded here a land and country which we call liberty enlightening the world. So today we rededicate ourselves to the tears and blood, the graves, and fond memories of our fathers and our mothers.

> Faith of our fathers, living still
> In spite of dungeon, fire, and sword,
> O how our hearts beat high with joy
> Whene'er we hear that glorious word,
> Faith of our fathers, holy faith,
> We will be true to thee till death.

This day we are in the city of our sires and our feet are on holy ground. Into an ancient forest here, more than a century and a half ago, the pioneers came. On this obscure spot they cleared a pathway, built a camp fire, erected a cabin, opened a school door, and rang a chapel bell, beginning a State that we proudly now call Carolina.

> "Carolina, Carolina, heavens blessing attend her,
> While we live, we will cherish,
> Protect, and defend her."

Through the long, hard years of poverty and adversity, the birth pains, and travail of human souls, we humbly hail our commonwealth and rededicate her again to service and freedom, to untarnished ideals, and goals that lie ahead. From a handful of pathfinders on the sandy stretches of Roanoke, we have come to a multitude—oh, what a multitude—of progressive and advancing people. From the mountains to the seas, citizens, friends, and brothers have come together praying, hoping, and trusting in one supreme God who is ruler of liberated men and free governments. What a story has been ours in Carolina! What a record of perilous labors! What a history of unfailing love!

In this hour we come to make our offering of renewed service and to consecrate anew our hearts and hands to an ever challenging task without fear and without retreat. This is an hour that must try our souls—both in war and in peace. We remember those heroes of ours in camp and on the seas, high in the air, and in battle lines of death; for them we pray. For our sons and our daughters, gone from us, out of our homes and places of toil, to carry the red flag of courage, the blue flag of freedom, and the white flag of righteousness, even to the ends of the earth. For those anxious and burdened at home and busily at work on farm and mill, we pray. For all on the needed fronts of the State's daily work who do not slack at the job nor idle time away in sloth, we pray. For every particular institution of our commonwealth, we make our petition now. For those in her prisons, O Lord, teach them now the way of law. For those in all her hospitals, give Thy healing and comfort. For those on the college campus be Thou the great teacher. For the tiniest child in her school, oh, guide those little feet. For the strong ones who man those industries, be Thou the Master Workman. For the men who run her presses, write her editorials, collect, and distribute the news, be Thou the publisher of good tidings of hope. For those who make her laws and interpret them, from the plainest magistrate up to the Supreme Court, be Thou impartial judgment for all. For those who build the roadways and patrol them, and every officer of peace, be Thou the strong arm. For this assembly before us now, representatives of, and by, and for the people, be Thou the Sinai of revelation and legislation. For all the people in our land, from the President of the Republic down to the simplest workman at the job, be Thou friend and fellow worker.

In this moment we pray for him who retires from leadership in this high office but never from service to his State. O God, bless and keep him as he goes into a quiet life, to his private home and family. His rule has been fair and just and beneficent and Thou wilt reward him for his good works. And now, O God, for this friend and servant of Thine who comes to assume the duties of our new leader, we pause for a more earnest petition. We ask Thee in this solemn moment, as Israel's ancient king asked for himself long, long ago, give Thy servant an understanding heart to judge Thy people that he may discern between good and bad, for who is able to judge this Thy so great a people? We rejoice together that in this state a youth may come up from the fields of toil, through the schools of country and town, by the open process of liberal education into learning and intelligent living, reaching out into places of leadership and

giving himself to his fellow men in law and political economy of a commonwealth. We are glad that when our liberties were threatened from abroad this man left the quiet office of his profession and volunteered to serve on foreign soil for the democratic idealism he has always practiced. Now in this hour his life and work are rewarded by the gift of a free and open franchise as he is inducted into Carolina's succession of noble Governors. God bless him now and God bless him during the coming 4 years and God bless him always in his life and task. With him let the benediction of heaven abide upon her who will help to bear the burdens of state and soothe the troubled heart of this man when days are hard and difficult. Yes, Father of us all, guide, direct, and empower these two into this administration with heaven's supreme life and light and love.

Forgive us all of the wrong that has past. Enlighten us all in the ways of danger ahead. Cleanse our hearts, ennoble our purposes and guide the ship of state and every passenger aboard on the voyage we now are undertaking toward that port yonder which is now a secret in Thine heart, O God, with Thy help and the piloting of Thy gracious hand, we will not fear nor fail Thee.

All these things we ask in His name who carried our sorrows and was broken for our sins and who rose for our hope and who lives for our victoy. His name is Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, and Prince of Peace. Amen.

Women and Democracy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in submitting for the RECORD a very interesting and informative address delivered Monday, January 29, at the Women's National Democratic Club, by Mme. Wei, brilliant and charming wife of the Chinese Ambassador.

The address is as follows:

It is an especial privilege for me to meet with the members of this distinguished club which, by its devotion to the highest principles and ideals have come to exercise so great an influence for progressive thought and action.

I am very happy to be at such a gathering and since this is a club for democratic women, it may not be out of place for me to say a few words about women and democracy in China.

It has sometimes been presumed that in the old days the Chinese woman did not enjoy as much freedom or equality as her western sisters. As a matter of fact, in cur long history, if women did not have many positive rights prescribed in so many words by law neither were there any legal restrictions specifically directed against her. She enjoyed a high position in our society and exercised great influence in the shaping of the destiny of her country. She often was active in public affairs as well as in its social and cultural life. We have had in our history many women scholars, public servants, and even women generals, who conducted victorious campaigns in the defense of their country.

But beginning with the early 19th century, when our contacts with the western world grew more intimate, we found that certain changes had to be made in order to meet the modern world trend. Among other things, the freedom and equality which the Chinese woman already enjoyed had to be expressed in more concrete terms if we are to arrive at a fuller democracy in form as well as in spirit.

Such were the purposes of the revolution which broke out in 1911. Many women took an active part in the people's uprising, sharing in its pains and dangers. I can tell you from my own experience that we had contributed our part to its success.

Since the establishment of the Republic, we have reached our goal of equal status with that of the men in every respect. The revolutionary struggle was hardly over when the Japanese invaded our country. Again we joined our men folk to put up total resistance in a total war against the enemy, not only in the defense of our homes, but for the consummation of the people's revolution.

Today, the women of China are working and fighting side by side with the men. They come from all ranks of the people—college presidents, wives and daughters of government officials, business women, farmers, laborers, and hard-working domestics.

It is with high spirit and with great determination that we work and fight. We engage in all forms of production. We have established centers for the improvement of sericulture, spinning and weaving, and are participating in cooperatives, which are helping so much in the economic life of wartime China. In the direct war effort, women are nursing the wounded soldiers and civilians, and caring for the refugees from war's destruction, the widows, and the orphans. We go into the war areas to rescue the children and put them in good hands. We are doing all those things which would help our soldiers in the front lines. Recently, among the 100,000 student volunteers for the Army, 10,000 of these are girls, anxious to join with their brothers in the fighting.

You might be interested to know that in all our armies, there is a regular women's corps in each regiment. Its members go through 3 months of intensive training which is every bit as thorough as that given the men. Although these women are taught how to use firearms and they use them whenever necessary, their main duty is liaison work between the Army and the civilian population in the war zones. When the troops approach a village, the women's corps is the first to arrive. They make known to the people the needs of the soldiers and help in preparing facilities for a brief period of rest and in setting up emergency hospitals for the seriously wounded.

But even today when all efforts had to be concentrated in our defense against the ruthless aggressors, we have not neglected for one moment to move forward in the methods of democracy where the position of Chinese women have grown daily in importance.

Let me go back for a moment to 1937, the first year of the war. In the fall of that year China was to have had a popular election of the National Congress which was to vote on the draft constitution.

The outbreak of war came in the middle of our national elections and we were unable to complete the lists of the people's representatives.

But in its place there was created the People's Political Council which is like a wartime congress.

The Council has worked remarkably well. On the one hand, the Government has received and carried out many wartime measures proposed by the Council. On the other hand, the people have found in the Council a vital channel through which their opinions and criticisms can be crystallized into constructive Government action.

The present council has 240 members. Two-thirds are elected by the provincial councils and 60 are elected by cultural and economic organizations. I might add that there are twice as many women in this body as there are in the Congress of the United States, and the body itself is just about half as large.

Among other wartime measures toward greater popular government are the provincial councils and the county councils.

These are popularly elected bodies and their powers correspond to those of the State assemblies and county councils of this country I point with pride to the fact that there is no one of them without women representation.

All these measures and many others have helped to preserve the democratic traditions of my country and have enabled us to move forward even under the most difficult conditions, in the democratic ways and methods. In his New Year's message to the people President Chiang Kai-shek called them to even greater efforts in this direction and announced that in the year 1945, as soon as there is a greater assurance of a successful counteroffensive, a national convention will be called. This is a momentous step forward in the fulfillment of our revolutionary aims.

In the post-war world a strong and democratic China with her inherent love for peace will constitute an essential bulwark in the guarding of security and freedoms. We are an old democracy, yet we are one of the youngest republics. We look to our sister Republic America for we know that our comradeship forged on the battlefields will be carried forward in terms of close cooperation in the peace to come. Together with all freedom-loving peoples, we shall work on to the end that not only will the Pacific be truly pacific, but the entire world will be brought as one family under one roof.

Amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter that is very much to the point and I am sure expresses the view of many members of the Railroad Brotherhood, with respect to legislation embodied in H. R. 1362, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. I join with the writer of this letter in urging the immediate consideration and passage of this bill.

HELPER, UTAH, *January 22, 1945.*

Hon. WALTER K. GRANGER,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALTER: I have been instructed by the members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers to get in touch with you and our Senators, concerning provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act. We consider it very valuable legislation and we are appreciative of it; but we also believe it needs some changes.

As an example I will outline the manner in which it applies to myself as we understand the provisions of the act.

I will be 54 years old on July 9, 1945. I have been employed by D. & R. G. railroad for 36 years exclusive of 15 months as a soldier in World War No. 1. If I meet with an accident or become mentally disqualified as a locomotive engineer, I would be 11 years under the age of 65.

If the retirement board, after reviewing my case and my medical examination believed me capable of performing any sort of labor or any other kind of employment, if I wanted to take the pension they would deduct one-fifteenth for each and every year I was under 65 or allow me approximately 26 percent of my pension after 36 years continuous service, thus for 11 years I would be forced to seek new employment, physically handicapped.

1. "Our thoughts," after 30 years of service if mentally or physically disqualified, should be allowed his pension.

2. If a pensioner or an employee qualified for pension passes away his widow, a bona-fide widow, should be allowed 75 percent of her husband's annuity so long as she does not remarry and an orphan or orphans under age should be given help while attending school until they become of age; without any deduction to his own pension if living.

3. After 30 years of service and upon reaching the age of 60, he should be eligible for pension without accepting any reduction.

Social security pay-roll tax is 1 percent up to and including $250 per month. Railroad retirement's pay-roll tax is 3¼ percent up to $300 per month.

An employee earning good wages and 30 years of service under social security, his benefits will be practically the same as ours, also his widow, under present law would be awarded 75 percent of her husband's annuity in case of his death.

Thus, under the Railroad Retirement Act we are taxed better than 300 percent of the social-security program and our benefits mentioned above are not included.

We are not complaining of our tax rate, it is all right.

When Congress passed the Railroad Retirement Act, it was new and revolutionary and perhaps had strong opposition. When it later passed old-age-social security the people of our Nation were also broader minded and Congress included in it some necessary changes in order to make old age more secure.

In the year 1943, I worked 523 days, in 1944, 500 days, we are giving our Nation at war the best that is in us, but it sure is making old men out of us and causes physical or mental infirmities earlier in life. Thus every railroad man in the State of Utah, when he understands it, will appreciate any and every effort you may put forth to bring about such changes in the law.

We are proud of all our national railroad laws and we never forget the Congressmen and Senators who fight and vote to get them over.

We will appreciate from the bottom of our hearts, anything you may be able to do in our behalf.

Sincerely yours,

G. F. SPRATLING,
Legislative Representative, Division 888,
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

Factual Data Relative to Federal Subsidy for Teachers' Salaries, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD a table of factual data relative to Federal subsidy for teachers' salaries, 1945.

This material should be of value to every Member of Congress and particularly at this time when legislation of which character is being given attention.

The table follows:

Factual data relative to Federal subsidy for teachers' salaries, 1945, indicating financial ability of States, State expenditures and financial inequalities in education, and the estimated amount each State would receive under Federal subsidy bill S. 181

States	Excess of income over expenditures 1943 [1]	Average salary of teachers [2]	Average salary [3]		Average annual cost per pupil A. D. A. [2] [3]	State expenditures for schools [3]	State expenditures for highways [1]	Per capita State collection [1]	Per capita Federal collection [4]	Amount would receive under S. 637 and/or S. 181 [5]
			Urban	Rural						
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Alabama	$8,661,000	$787	$1,037	$645	$40.58	$21,150,000	$23,374,000	$26.73	$87.53	$10,403,238
Arizona	3,885,000	1,653	1,635	1,479	108.72	8,659,000	5,608,000	48.33	138.27	1,414,408
Arkansas	6,346,000	678	827	509	41.09	12,556,000	9,358,000	26.70	47.36	6,855,138
California	109,085,000	2,300			174.67	107,629,000	65,905,000	66.77	488.16	9,119,400
Colorado	6,570,000	1,417	1,961	998	107.69	6,392,000	9,569,000	44.81	191.07	2,701,144
Connecticut	2,394,000	1,932	2,006	1,536	129.97	6,500,000	13,875,000	48.51	529.32	2,185,400
Delaware	1,781,000	1,741	1,862	1,501	115.39	5,650,000	1,913,000	47.72	1,570.24	341,800
Florida	1,261,000	1,130	1,012	1,012	75.24	18,882,000	17,639,000	29.24	181.31	4,789,172
Georgia	[6] 12,890,000	806	1,222	594	45.47	27,129,000	24,826,000	23.16	123.60	10,465,580
Idaho	62,000	1,115	1,324	918	89.88	4,302,000	5,770,000	37.17	111.93	1,489,110
Illinois	32,434,000	1,807	2,071	1,250	134.33	35,052,000	45,519,000	40.51	409.25	10,120,904
Indiana	13,651,000	1,505	1,749	1,129	98.42	30,075,000	31,967,000	36.34	242.64	7,529,576
Iowa	9,989,000	1,061	1,492	800	98.77	10,554,000	25,157,000	32.21	115.54	6,161,106
Kansas	12,004,000	1,021	1,466	829	91.70	9,459,000	12,390,000	34.62	197.56	4,784,818
Kentucky	5,472,000	936	1,401	643	53.30	17,621,000	17,992,000	23.74	194.11	9,104,706
Louisiana	7,578,000	1,086	1,598	784	69.55	27,395,000	11,633,000	43.33	130.87	7,179,574
Maine	4,443,000	1,000	1,264	708	70.72	4,358,000	6,512,000	38.32	174.63	2,153,442
Maryland	8,036,000	1,713	2,038	1,244	95.85	9,609,000	10,339,000	36.21	390.10	3,018,118
Massachusetts	14,762,000	2,049	2,053	1,898	131.92	15,510,000	20,786,000	41.51	347.35	5,978,204
Michigan	30,526,000	1,671	2,030	892	105.38	63,515,000	55,069,000	44.51	451.04	10,100,406
Minnesota	15,969,000	1,288	1,830	865	109.64	24,929,000	24,324,000	42.49	206.51	6,456,570
Mississippi	10,706,000	517	913	487	32.98	12,232,000	11,123,000	25.04	40.39	8,820,942
Missouri	5,806,000	1,223	1,816	765	90.67	28,928,000	13,195,000	29.07	256.59	8,042,234
Montana	3,474,000	1,224	1,627	1,016	126.61	3,480,000	3,863,000	36.69	101.67	1,271,934
Nebraska	3,846,000	854	1,402	649	87.90	4,425,000	9,833,000	23.24	169.87	3,568,126
Nevada	503,000	1,644	1,811	1,451	138.52	1,228,000	3,879,000	56.21	324.56	166,000
New Hampshire	697,000	1,293	1,519	1,014	102.61	2,790,000	4,127,000	34.25	150.99	931,810
New Jersey	9,003,000	2,157	2,257	1,416	169.99	29,897,000	27,318,000	38.52	347.77	5,983,868
New Mexico	[6] 2,325,000	1,190	1,386	1,036	86.39	8,856,000	3,319,000	41.36	69.98	1,890,314
New York	18,316,000	2,618	2,902	1,604	181.21	148,870,000	62,319,000	50.93	549.70	17,036,200
North Carolina	30,170,000	1,019	1,094	892	48.28	42.228,000	13,421,000	36.03	249.88	13,671,022
North Dakota	5,175,000	750	1,335	673	82.92	4,129,000	5,100,000	34.22	53.90	2,027,080
Ohio	36,379,000	1,747	1,979	1,044	112.29	68,453,000	74,220,000	40.62	427.17	12,325,582
Oklahoma	581,000	1,120	1,318	874	74.86	19,915,000	18,157,000	37.78	116.10	7,747,990
Oregon	12,604,000	1,430	1,648	1,068	110.84	7,736,000	14,627,000	47.30	290.04	1,891,478
Pennsylvania	[7] 73,593,000	1,724	1,939	1,164	118.09	69,226,000	64,035,000	43.22	341.10	20,525,074
Rhode Island	3,098,000	1,830	1,787		134.03	2,154,000	2,434,000	52.25	360.26	1,048,226
South Carolina	2,825,000	820	958	663	48.70	16,064,000	11,537,000	28.60	191.50	7,200,822
South Dakota	3,581,000	844	1,382	705	100.73	3,685,000	3,912,000	28.71	58.12	1,916,266
Tennessee	3,614,000	880	1,153	749	52.91	15,308,000	13,454,000	23.92	104.15	9,373,926
Texas	[6] 37,253,000	1,091	1,364	871	83.72	65,016,000	62,936,000	27.52	161.71	18,135,254
Utah	3,014,000	1,454	1,674	1,171	87.60	10,392,000	5,730,000	48.44	156.22	1,838,152
Vermont	1,488,000	1,001	1,395	843	94.89	1,808,000	3,128,000	37.49	145.41	852,316
Virginia	5,664,000	1,047	1,353	698	57.26	21,339,000	24,275,000	26.43	310.14	7,908,824
Washington	18,112,000	1,920	1,966	1,424	130.50	11,651,000	18,974,000	65.32	348.78	2,735,970
West Virginia	1,629,000	1,265	1,170	1,170	73.95	22,839,000	16,807,000	38.03	94.25	6,485,290
Wisconsin	11,188,000	1,428	1,861	971	110.52	21,627,000	29,665,000	46.88	262.09	6,822,720
Wyoming	761,000	1,145	1,472	1,056	126.61	2,069,000	4,840,000	38.51	115.32	592,306

[1] U. S. Census Reports, 1943.
[2] U. S. Office of Education, Statistics of State School Systems, 1941-42.
[3] Including current expense and interest.
[4] Computed from U. S. Census Reports, 1943.
[5] Report of hearing on S. 637, Apr. 6, 7, 8, 1943.
[6] Exclusive of capital outlay.
[7] Exclusive of debt service.

Manpower Muddle Laid to Army Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of January 29, 1945:

MANPOWER MUDDLE LAID TO ARMY ITSELF—OBSERVER PREDICTS CURE IF DRAFT-AGE CEILING IS LIFTED

(By David Lawrence)

The Congress is at last discovering the manpower muddle. Having sat idly by for 4 years and having failed to note how the armed services, as well as civilian industry, wasted manpower, the Senators and Representatives now are finding themselves confronted with requests for a coercive national service act, which, of course, is the nearest thing to totalitarianism this democracy has been asked to accept since the war began.

There is not only no need for a compulsory work law now but there never has been any need for it. There has been, however, need right along for efficiency and competence instead of inefficiency and incompetence in selecting men for the armed services and for industry, but Washington's way, especially in wartime, is to cover up blundering and then expect extreme measures to be taken to extricate the blunders from their dilemma.

Congress, in 1940, passed a selective-service law but did not insist that it be administered so that younger men would go first. Politics and pressure groups influenced the means of selection and so did the White House. Thus America did not have true selective service for a long while, but a hodgepodge of cumbersome regulations.

When the administrators of the Selective Service Act did finally emerge in 1944 from their strait jackets of pressure influence and ordered men to be taken by age groups, America took her first constructive step toward selecting a fighting army.

BUNGLED BY THE MILITARY

When some of the military men appeal now for a National Service Act, they are asking for a relief from a situation which they themselves have bungled. Why did they overestimate Air Force needs for instance and underestimate Infantry requirements?

They have wasted manpower to such an extent that behind the lines today in the noncombat areas are hundreds of thousands of men who are capable of fighting, while at home in America, also, are hundreds of thousands of men who can take those same military jobs immediately behind the lines.

The argument that because a man's eyes are bad or he has a bad ear drum, or because he once had a spot on his lung he is unable to serve in the so-called supply units repairing a truck or working a typewriter—jobs which absorb millions of men overseas—is just an alibi for the unwillingness of the armed services to face the truth about the use of manpower.

But the armed services need not take all those who have been disqualified for minor physical defects. The manpower shortage is supposed to be acute on the home front in industry. The simple way to get industrial manpower is to follow the scheme that has been already proved successful—namely, to draft for the armed services anybody who is not employed in an essential industry or business or who is not a keyman in a business establishment or in a labor union or on a farm or on a railroad or in other vital services.

It will be asked whether this isn't the present practice and whether the existing system hasn't failed nevertheless to provide the manpower. The question is answered by stating that the Army itself is responsible for a ruling which can be revoked overnight whereby men above the age of 38 are at present exempt from the draft for military service. Indeed, ever since it was announced that men as young as 30 wouldn't be called soon, the manpower shortage began to develop a crisis.

URGES CEILING REMOVAL

Strangely enough, in the last few days, under the threat of legislation, applications for jobs in war plants have been pouring in, and in many a plant the crisis has been solved. The plain answer then is to remove the ceiling on draft exemptions—it can be done without legislation—and make anybody up to the age of 45 subject to military service if he doesn't take or hold on to an essential job.

If the Army took a few here and there from that age group, or if it took enough men only to release the able-bodied young soldiers in the Supply Service behind the combat lines, the flow to the war plants of needed manpower at home would be continuous.

This isn't a plan involving the voluntary principle altogether, but as between this and coercion with jail penalties or with laws compelling men to work for somebody's private profit in so-called Army battalions, there is no comparison.

Congress could well insist that the President ask the manpower agencies and the selective service office and the armed forces to get together and remove the present ceiling on draft ages for military service and let legislation stay on the shelf for a while. The manpower shortage would be cured overnight and remain cured for months to come.

Manpower Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me on the program Congress Speaks over a coast-to-coast hook-up of the Columbia Broadcasting System on Tuesday, January 30, 1945, with reference to the pending manpower bill:

The manpower bill now being considered by the House of Representatives is designed to secure participation in the war effort of the men needed for the efficient and expeditious prosecution of the war. The press has referred to this bill by various titles, such as "IV–F Draft," "Work or Fight," and others. It is definitely not a IV–F draft, and there is no intention to reflect upon the patriotism of those whose physical condition, through no fault of their own, disqualifies them for active military service. Neither is it essentially a work or fight bill, as it merely defines the obligations of citizens in time of war and provides civil penalties in the courts of the land for those who violate the duties imposed. In truth, the bill is national-service legislation applying to men between the ages of 18 and 45.

The bill had its inception in the request of the President in his message on the state of the Union delivered at the beginning of the present Congress. The necessity for some such legislation is vouched for by the War Department; the Navy Department; the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Marshall; the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral King; the War Production Board; the War Manpower Commission; Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen, production wizard on duty with the Army; and others who bear the principal duty in equipping, maintaining, and commanding the Army and Navy.

Hearings before our Military Affairs Committee have proven that during the first 6 months of 1945 the war effort will require an additional 1,600,000 men. This expansion is made necessary because of casualties suffered by the armed forces and future military campaigns looking to a speedy termination of the war. Nine hundred thousand men are required by the armed forces during those 6 months. The military situation on all fronts has made necessary an expansion of our production effort to the extent of $6,000,000,000 over the program of $56,500,000,000 as of October 1, 1944, and requires an additional 700,000 men. This additional production will consist of airplanes, tanks, artillery, and new secret weapons.

Through registrations under the Selective Service Act of all men to the age of 65 years, an inventory of the available manpower is at hand. Applying the demands to the available supply, we can count on securing only 570,000 men for the armed forces, requiring that 330,000 must come from those now employed in necessary industry and agriculture. These must be replaced and 700,000 additional secured. Therefore, to fill present demands 1,030,000 must be taken from non-essential work and channeled into essential work. These must be secured from the seven million men between 33 and 45 years of age and those between 18 and 26, who are not physically qualified for active military service.

I have unqualified confidence in the patriotism and desire for service of a vast majority of the American people. All they want is to be told how they can help, where they are needed, and what they should do to back up our fighting men at the front. The bill under consideration is designed to give the people that information. Once told the necessities and how they can the best contribute, I have no doubt but that our needs will be met by the voluntary and patriotic response of that majority. On the other hand, this bill will furnish the power and compulsion needed in handling the recalcitrant few who fail to contribute their share while your sons are bleeding and dying on the battlefields throughout the world.

I am afraid that the provisions of the bill are not accurately understood by a large portion of our people. Unfortunately, this lack of information is due, in part at least, to misinformation and misconstruction supplied by those selfish organizations and individuals who seek to preserve their advantages at the expense of the war effort. The bill is thoroughly adequate to fill the purpose for which it is designed. Still it is reasonable and neither harsh nor oppressive in its provisions.

The bill first provides that any man between 18 and 45 years of age who is employed in necessary industry or agriculture shall not voluntarily discontinue that employment without the consent of his local draft board, subject to all of the rights of appeal available to one ordered for induction into the armed forces. Further, that should he voluntarily discontinue his position without such permission or a justified reason therefor, he shall be subject to the same penalties in the local Federal district court which a registrant who fails to report for induction must

face, and he remains liable for military service if within the age limits and physically qualified. The Selective Training and Service Act was so denominated advisedly, and particular stress must always be placed on the word "selective" in the title. It has always been the philosophy of the System that each individual shall do what he can do the best in support of the war effort. If one selected for military service is required to perform it under the penalty of fine and imprisonment, why should there be a less penalty for the one selected for war production? His service does not subject him to the dangers of battle. It allows him to work under much more comfortable conditions, generally at home with his family, and at a much higher rate of pay. This first portion of the bill freezes men in their necessary jobs and will insure a steady supply of men in airplane plants, shipyards, arsenals, and on the farm. It will terminate the turnover of employees in those plants, which has run as high as 100 percent and more a year in some plants.

The other function of the bill is to direct men not now engaged in necessary industry or agriculture into the character of work most urgently needed at the particular time. Let me here stress that the entire procedure under this bill is in the hands of civilians. The application of the bill to individuals and their assignment to work will be in the hands of the friends and neighbors of each registrant. The same patriotic Americans who are now serving, without pay, as members of local and appeal boards under the Selective Service System will administer and enforce the provisions of the bill.

The bill places in the hands of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Justice Byrnes, the duty of determining the type of plants, activities, and agricultural pursuits which are essential to the war effort. Thereafter, Justice Byrnes is required to consult with representatives of management, labor, agriculture, and government, and determine the number of men needed in various activities and the area where needed. This determination is to be followed by a voluntary recruiting campaign (to be conducted by management, labor, government, and agriculture), to secure the number and kind of men needed in the area for the industries. This voluntary recruiting campaign will give every registrant a full and free opportunity to choose between the various types of activities in which men are needed; choose the location of the plant, and choose the employer by whom he prefers to be employed. It is my firm conviction that this recruiting campaign will frequently produce all of the men needed. On the other hand, the recruiting campaign will be much more effective than the present unsystematized efforts. Under the proposed system, the types of work, the areas where needed, and the skills required will be determined by a responsible official of Government, and recruiting efforts will be coordinated. It will eliminate competition between employers and thus prevent the moving of large numbers of employees great distances from their homes, as under the present system. It will tend to prevent any hoarding of labor because the employer will know that an orderly system exists to fill any needs which may develop.

Should this first voluntary recruiting campaign fail to produce sufficient employees, the local selective service boards will request designated men registered with them, who are within the categories desired, to become employed in the necessary war work, and will designate the time within which they are requested to accept such employment. Again the registrant has a period of time within which to choose his type of work and employer within the various types required and the area in which needed. This gives the one needed in war production a second period of time within which the individual may volunteer for work where needed the most. I reiterate my absolute confidence in the patriotism of the American people, and that they need only be told where they are needed and what they should do. This second opportunity for orderly volunteering will almost inevitably produce the necessary workers. Only after these two opportunities for voluntary service does the bill make any provision for compulsion.

There may be instances in which an individual has not been able to secure such employment through his own efforts, and there will always be a small proportion who seek to shirk their duty. The bill provides for these and other contingencies by following the request of the local boards, and the period for voluntary employment, with a direction from the local board to the designated registrants to make application for employment in the endeavors needing workers, and to accept employment when tendered. This direction is also subject to appeal, as in the case of one ordered for induction. Anyone who fails to carry out such an order will be subject to the same penalties as any other violation of the Selective Training and Service Act, after trial in his local court. It is anticipated that such trials will be most rare, if they occur at all. The existence of the law and the orderly effort to secure all men required as volunteers will obviate the necessity for prosecution. No doubt the experience in this country will be comparable to that of England, where a similar law has been in effect for several years and the compulsory features rarely used.

I cannot agree with those labor leaders and others who state that labor will resent such a law and diminish its efforts in war production because of that resentment. Such statements constitute a most serious reflection upon the patriotism of American workingmen, tens of thousands of whose sons are fighting throughout the world. The most outspoken enemy of labor will find it hard to coin expressions to equal such an insult. American labor is patriotic. It will respond; it will serve the Nation.

Next we must consider the status of the workman who either volunteers for the designated work or accepts it after having been ordered to do so. In the first place, the bill provides for employment in the area of his residence, if possible, but that he shall be transported to his place of employment if it be not in that area, and transported back to his home when his services are no longer needed. If his employment be in a Government-operated plant he will have the protection of the United States employees' compensation laws for injuries or illness contracted as a result of his employment. If employed by a private employer, he will have the benefits of the workmen's compensation laws of the State in which he is employed. The bill provides that he shall have the right to his old job when the war work is terminated, with seniority and pension rights intact, just as he would have had he entered the armed forces. Should the employment which he accepts pay him less than his former employment, he will have the same right which a member of the armed forces has to suspend the payments on his home and other obligations to the extent that his ability to discharge is decreased by the change of employment. If his ability to pay his insurance payments is decreased the Government will guarantee those payments during the time he is employed and allow him 2 years thereafter in which to redeem them. In short, the bill protects him in all of his property rights until he returns to his normal pursuits and is again able to take up where he left off. This is basically just and protects every right of the persons affected.

This is emergency legislation designed to accelerate the war to a rapid and victorious conclusion. This is not the time, nor is this bill the place, to settle any social or racial questions; nor is it in the interest of the war to attempt to use this bill as a vehicle to prevent strikes or abrogate closed-shop agreements. Those questions should be settled at another time and in other legislation. I decry the efforts of all who attempt to import these highly controversial questions into war legislation denominated by the most responsible officials of Government charged with the actual prosecution of the war as necessary to the successful accomplishment of their efforts. At this very moment the Germany Army is pressed on the eastern and western fronts as never before. The Japanese face our troops at the gates of Manila, while our planes bomb his homeland. Let this consolation not come from the Halls of Congress, as surely it will, if we fail to adopt this bill, insuring the utilization of all our resources. I hope that all will sustain the position of those Members of Congress who support this bill, in the single purpose of aiding the war and hurrying the return of our loved ones from the battle fronts.

Drafting of Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, at present, the House Military Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, is holding extensive hearings on all aspects of the manpower shortage and related problems with a view to legislation. These hearings are covering a proposal for a Universal Service Act, more drastic controls of essential civilian employment, and the possible drafting of nurses.

I am most reluctant to support the latter measure but will not definitely make up my mind until the hearings are completed. Fundamentally it seems to me unjust and inequitable to single out one group for compulsory service, especially a group of women that has rendered such magnificent contributions to the war effort as our nurses.

Moreover, our civilian hospitals and institutions housing the sick, the mentally ill, expectant mothers, the aged, and other invalids must not be depleted of adequate nursing and medical personnel. If those seeking this legislation can demonstrate conclusively that we must draft nurses in order to provide adequate care for our wounded heroes then I suppose we may have to resort to compulsory measures. This alternative should never have faced us. I regret the fact that our armed services did not exhibit more vision in such a vital matter as providing nursing for our veterans, particularly at the time when they commenced the enlistment of approximately 150,000 women into various branches of the armed forces. In the first instance, if some of these women enlistees so eager to serve their country had been trained as nurses, there would not now be the present unfortunate situation which a reasonable degree of foresight, judgment, and planning on the part of policy making officials of the War and Navy Departments might well have averted.

Obviously we must and will provide at all costs every necessary and indeed the most solicitous care for the gallant band

of hundreds of thousands of young American heroes who have fallen and will fall in battle before the end of this tragic and most destructive war.

If it is shown to be necessary, therefore, I will support the nurses' draft measure, but, let me emphasize, I will do so most reluctantly and only when evidence is presented that to follow a different course would prove injurious, harmful, and detrimental to our boys. We do not propose to take chances that any of our wounded, or disabled in mind or body, should have to go without the best medical and nursing care and treatment possible.

There are other compulsory bills pending which will have far-reaching effects upon the national economy and the lives of very many of our citizens.

The whole question of universal service legislation which is polite language for a national civilian draft is bound up with additional regimentation of our whole economic system both as regards management, labor, small businessmen, farmers, and all other civilian classes. Rigid controls of this character are essentially totalitarian and alien to the spirit of American democracy for which we are fighting. Since such strait-jacket techniques involve a measure of human slavery and involuntary servitude contrary to our institutions and offensive to most of our citizens, they can be justified only by very desperate conditions. For these reasons, before I vote on any legislation which would subject our men and women to be drafted and transported far away from their homes and families to work in so-called more essential occupations, you may be sure that I will give careful consideration, not only to the validity of the urgent requirements behind such legislation but also to the undesirable effects and the probability of definite termination of such totalitarian programs when the war emergency is past.

A healthy, thriving, civilian economy, energetically and patriotically producing the weapons and materials of victory, as ours has been doing in recent years, is one of the prime requisites for our final success on the war fronts. Only the valor, heroism, and bloodshed of our own sons is paramount. Therefore, whatever other countries may do, or may be planning to do, we in America are of the conviction, based on the memorable, historic, and unparalleled experiences and accomplishments of over the past 160 years, that freemen can produce better than slaves, that untrammeled Americans are more effective than regimented minions. I have personally the greatest of doubt that compulsion could possibly bring better results than the stupendous and most exceptional achievements which our American economy, capital, labor, and every other one else included, has recorded under democratic voluntary cooperation.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 9, 1945.*

Hon. PHILIP PHILBIN,
Member of Congress:

Please advise return wire your stand on drafting women, particularly nurses.

C. EDWARD HOLLAND,
City Editor, Daily Record.

[From the Boston Record of January 15, 1945]

BLAMES BRASS HATS FOR NURSE SHORTAGE

Blame for the severe lack of nurses was placed in the lap of Army and Navy higher-ups yesterday by Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, who contended the need for drafting nurses "should never have faced us. I regret that our armer services did not exhibit more vision in such a vital matter as providing nursing for our veterans, particularly at the time when they commenced the enlistment of approximately 150,000 women into various branches of the armed forces.

"If some of these women enlistees so eager to serve their country had been trained as nurses, we would not have the present unfortunate situation which a reasonable degree of foresight, judgment, and planning on the part of policy-making officials of the War and Navy Departments might well have averted."

The Massachusetts Congressman, a member of the important House Military Affairs Committee, said he is most reluctant to support a nurse draft bill.

FLAYS SINGLING OUT

He flailed the unjustice of singling out "one group for compulsory service, especially a group of women that has rendered such magnificent contributions to the war effort as our nurses.

"Moreover, our civilian hospitals housing the sick, the mentally ill, expectant mothers, the aged and other invalids must not be depleted of adequate nursing and medical personnel.

"Obviously we must and will provide at all costs every necessary and indeed the most solicitous care for the gallant band of hundreds of thousands of young American heroes who have fallen and will fall in battle. If it is shown to be necessary, therefore, I will support the nurses draft measure, but, let me emphasize, I will do so most reluctantly."

CRITICIZES METHODS

At the same time, PHILBIN declared himself opposed to the strait-jacket techniques of national civilian draft legislation.

Rigid controls of this kind are "regimentation, essentially totalitarian, and alien to the spirit of American democracy for which we are fighting," PHILBIN asserted. Such laws would "involve a measure of human slavery and involuntary servitude contrary to our institutions and offensive to most of our citizenry," he said.

"Before I vote on legislation which would subject our men and women to be drafted and transported far away from their homes I will give careful consideration not only to the validity of the urgent requirements behind such legislation but also to the definite termination of such totalitarian programs when the war emergency is past."

Unity Essential for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the speech given by Henry J. Kaiser at the testimonial dinner to Henry A. Wallace in New York City last night. Mr. Kaiser's praise of Henry Wallace is significant in that it shows the economic thought of forward-looking industrialists of today and their belief that Henry Wallace typifies the liberal philosophy of this group of our society.

The speech follows:

I like to feel that the cause of liberalism brought us together tonight. We have come to honor a man who has gained and held the confidence of a very large majority of our people. In a definite sense Henry Wallace exemplifies the liberal tradition. It is not enough to say that he believes in it. He lives it.

One does not need to be a scholar, nor a philosopher, nor a historian to know that liberalism is a way of life. It has never been the portion of kings, dictators, or conquerors. It is the spiritual heritage of the people—all the people.

The kinship between liberalism and liberty is self-evident. The true liberal is consecrated to the cause of freedom; the unconquerable will of mankind to oppose power—whenever and wherever it is concentrated in the hands of an individual or of the few.

MISUSE OF POWER

Power, and its potential misuse has increased in direct proportion to the increase in material riches. Over and over throughout the course of history it has been often employed to exploit and enslave the majority for the benfit of the few. Yet so vast and so enduring is the surge of liberalism that no individual, group, or nation has ever succeeded in subduing man's will to be free.

Whatever else may be said of the momentary crises of war or diplomacy, this is the reason why both Nazi Germany and Imperialist Japan will fail. It is the reason why every dictator must fall. It is the reason why power politics have always failed. It is the reason why every power combination whether it be in industry, finance, labor, or government is doomed.

When money power was cornered by a handful of men, it went down before economic forces which it could not control. When industrial power achieved monopoly it invited regulation and control. This is at once the evil and tragedy of bureaucracy. This is the ancient evil against which the labor movement must contend.

It will be a pity if labor repeats the tragic mistakes committed by money power and monopoly power. As one who is deeply sympathetic with the aims and hopes of organized labor, I believe the labor movement now faces the greatest crisis in its history. With compulsory membership and ample treasuries, organized labor can try to force its will upon its membership and on society by the exercise of power. If it does so, it is doomed. All of its legitimate and constructive ideals will be lost if it yields to the temptation to place power above service.

POWER OF RIGHT

There is only one power which freemen dare to recognize. It is the power of right. Before the essential rightness of the liberal position, privilege, monopoly in all its forms, and fanatical ideologies must give way. There is no truth more self-evident, more inspired in its revelation, than man's right to be free. It is in itself a power which aggression has never understood.

It was with these thoughts in mind that I turned my attention to the topic on which you asked me to speak, namely, the future of industry. In my mind industry is and must be a part of the democratic process. We are living in and witnessing the ordeal of democracy. It was never more forcefully expressed than in an editorial which appeared in the New York Times in June 1940, the author of which is, unfortunately, unknown. It bore the caption "Dunkerque," and it reads as follows:

"So long as the English tongue survives, the word 'Dunkerque' will be spoken with reverence. For in that harbor, in such a hell as never blazed on earth before, at the end of a lost battle, the rags and blemishes that

have hidden the soul of democracy fell away. There, beaten but unconquered, in shining splendor, she faced the enemy.

"They send away the wounded first. Men died so that others could escape. It was not so simple a thing as courage, which the Nazis had in plenty. It was not so simple a thing as discipline, which can be hammered into men by a drill sergeant. It was not the result of careful planning, for there could have been little. It was the common man of the free countries, rising in all his glory out of mill, office, factory, mine, farm, and ship, applying to war the lessons learned when he went down the shaft to bring out trapped comrades, when he hurled a lifeboat through the surf, when he endured poverty and hard work for his children's sake.

"The shining thing in the souls of freemen Hitler cannot command, or attain, or conquer. He has crushed it, where he could, from German hearts.

"It is the great tradition of democracy. It is the future. It is victory."

Again in a time of terrifying crisis, not so much in war as in the search for peace, democracy needs that degree of unity which will make it work. Peace could likewise have its Dunkerque. It can come as tragically near to defeat. On the other hand, it can release all the exalted forces of democracy, in which men forgot themselves in the noble impulse to minister to others.

UNITY NEED

Shall essential employment in the future, also have its Dunkerque? Is not this our chief concern? Here again there is desperate need for unity of the great forces of finance, industry, agriculture, and government.

Such immense sources of employment as housing, transportation, and medical facilities for advanced health programs need no emphasis here tonight.

There is an essential unity between government, industry, and labor. They are not independent and isolated forces. The health and well-being of the commonwealth is their common objective, the core of which is service. The unity of democracy is based on a compromise of equals and mutual self-respect.

We need now to emphasize the harmonies rather than the differences. If government, labor, and industry will each forsake the search for power and will engage in a wholehearted effort to work together, liberal democracy can be achieved. It is my firm conviction that this can be done.

Physical, mental, and spiritual health cannot be the gift of government or of industry. They cannot be seized, or legislated, or compelled. They must spring from that unified effort of which democracy alone is capable if men are to live in freedom.

UNITY FOR PEACE

I know Henry Wallace believes that only from such unity can flow the maximum use of all the resources of men, materials, and technology so vital to the prosperity and security of a world at peace. The nation united in the spirit of liberalism to do this for war. The nation must unite in the same spirit to do it for peace.

I have no fear that these are theoretical ideals beyond the power of men to realize. We are witnessing the miracle of war production, the power of unity in purpose and command on the battle fronts, the first successful attempt of government to control prices and the distribution of goods in time of war. We have seen billions of dollars earned, accumulated, and offered to the Government to support an effort in which we all have a stake. We are witnessing the nobility of sacrifice on a scale heretofore unknown. We are in the presence of a majestic demonstration that humanity and charity can triumph over selfishness.

"This shining thing in the souls of freemen * * * is the great tradition of democracy. It is the future. It is victory."

The Manpower Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of January 30.

I agree with this editorial completely. Certainly there is no sense in sending our men all over the world to preserve American freedom and liberty and then let them find when they return we have destroyed their liberties here at home while they were so valiantly fighting. It follows:

THE MANPOWER ACT FACES THE CLOSED-SHOP HURDLE

The first big hurdle which the May manpower bill will have to pass is certain to be the closed-shop matter. Is the Congress going to require that men assigned to war jobs must, in addition, pay initiation fees and dues to private organizations free of public supervision? That is the question in essence. It is a sign of the extent and the tempo of our drift from older civil-liberties concepts that it could ever arise.

For those older concepts were still vigorous as recently as the autumn of 1941. In November of that year, President Roosevelt himself stated, "I tell you frankly that the Government of the United States will not order, nor will Congress pass legislation ordering, a so-called closed shop. * * * The Government will never compel (a minority of workers) to join the union by Government decree. That would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor."

In talking for the executive departments in this statement, the President, of course, was discussing agencies over which he had direct control. But he was on the firmest of ground when, in addition, he warned that Congress itself would not tolerate the compulsory closed shop. For Congress itself had formally taken that position on a number of occasions.

One of the most recent of these occasions was in 1932, in the preamble to the Federal Anti-Injunction Act. This act was sponsored in Congress by the late Senator Norris and the then Representative LaGuardia. Felix Frankfurter, as a professor in the Harvard Law School, had been one of its framers. In the Norris-LaGuardia Act Congress very forcefully stated as the "public policy of the United States" that "it is necessary that [the worker] have full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of his own choosing"; but it insisted just as forcefully that "he should be free to decline to associate with his fellows."

To be sure, the situation faced by the President in 1941 was not quite like the one now under consideration in Congress. In 1941 the President was discussing John L. Lewis' demand that as a condition of his followers' continued production of coal for the war effort, all coal miners be driven by the Government into the miners' union. The unions do not ask in the present controversy that all workers be driven into unions; they do demand that workers assigned to closed-shop plants be driven into the union involved.

But the principle expressed by the President is clearly broad enough to cover the present situation. The principle stated by Congress in the Norris-LaGuardia Act and elsewhere covers it completely. The question before Congress is whether the principle is now to be abandoned—where a bill gravely impairing personal rights, though in the public service, is to impair personal rights still further by compelling membership in and money payments to unregulated private organizations.

Old-Age Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a plan for old-age security forwarded by a constituent of the Ninth District of Ohio:

It should be to the interest of the Federal Government that all births, deaths, marriages, and divorces are correctedly recorded in counties and States as well as in a national bureau. With the object in view that a form of social security be adopted to which every person or citizen will contribute a just portion and receive like benefits.

The span of life should be divided into three periods: Educational, production, and retirement.

The educational period should be from birth until 21 years of age. At 1 year of age the child should receive a social-security number from a Federal security board. The county recording the birth should be interested in its education and the parents also in its future, so county and parents should each contribute an equal amount to a Federal or State security fund. This should continue until the child is 11 years of age. During the latter part of this period, the State being interested in the youth's future and education as well as the parents, should take the part heretofore taken by the county and should contribute an equal amount with the parents until the child is 21 years of age. There should be a limited insurance in case of death.

The production period should not be definite. It should begin with the youth's acquirement of sufficient education or when other conditions warrant. It should begin at about 21 years of age and should last as long as is necessary or the person is capable. During this period every earner, every person having any income from any source whatever, should pay his just proportion or percentage of income into the social-security fund. Every employer should contribute an amount equal to the amount now deducted from every employee. During this period the youth are the backbone of the Nation: its main defense in time of war, its servants and producers at all times. Therefore the Federal Government should take the part formerly taken by county and State and during the period from 21 to 46 or 51 should contribute an amount equal to that of em-

ployer and employee combined. There should be a limited insurance in case of death.

The retirement period should not be definitely limited. Some are aged at 40, others youthful at 70. Casualties in wartime are high; hazardous occupations take heavy toll and accidents happen when least expected. All disability claims whether in war or peace and all Federal and public pensions should be handled by the Federal or National Social Security Board through the State and county if necessary. With every person a willing contributor to social security there would be freedom from fear and want. Security in old age instead of poverty, decent unemployment compensation and no fear for the future as your neighbor as well as yourself are creating the national social security from the cradle to the grave.

Boards of experts should pass on the extent of any injury and the physical, mental, and financial status or condition of applicants for pension.

EDWARD J. LINDOW.

TOLEDO, OHIO.

The "Passaic Warrior"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Ted Malone, broadcasting from overseas last night, told us the story of the *Passaic Warrior*, a famous B–17 flying fortress which was christened by our colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] when he was in England early last July.

Meanwhile, the Eighth Air Force has released a complete account of the big bomber's career, pointing out that it has accumulated more than 670 combat-hours of flying time, has dropped 165 tons of bombs on enemy objectives, and was the command plane of Lt. Gen. Lewis H. Brereton when he took the First Allied Airborne Army into Holland. I present the story in full:

AN EIGHTH AIR FORCE BOMBER STATION, ENGLAND.—While the news spotlight plays on the ground battle in western Europe, American bombers continue to pound enemy objectives day after day, providing the interference to clear the way for victorious Allied forward movements. Passaic County and New Jersey have a direct share in the job being done from the air.

That share is represented by the hundreds of Passaic County boys who serve in and around the bombers, and also by a famous B–17 Flying Fortress bearing the name of *Passaic Warrior*.

The *Warrior* owes its name to Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of the Eighth New Jersey Congressional District, who christened the fortress last July 10, using a bottle of Coco-cola for the ceremony. CANFIELD, with a Philadelphia colleague, had worked his way to England as an ordinary seaman on a tanker, in order to learn about merchant-marine conditions at first hand. He visited the bombardment group's station only a few days after he arrived in England.

The big bomber had completed five missions (having begun its career July 4) prior to receiving its name. Under the expert care of Staff Sgt. C. D. DuBoss, of Burke, Tex., its crew chief, it is now credited with 65 combat operations. Throughout the course of the first 47 of these, the *Warrior* was never charged with an abortive, that is, it never turned back from an enemy target without completing its job.

The 6-month list of *Passaic Warrior's* targets resembles a Cook's tour of Germany, with just enough of France thrown in to remind you that the Nazi's still held most of that country when the bomber began to fly. The July 4 Eighth Air Force attack on Tours, France, was the *Warrior's* maiden mission. Since then the targets include Lyons, Munich, the main German V–2 experimental station at Feenemunde Dessau, the ball bearing factories of Schweinfurt, the German front lines at St. Lo (in support of the American ground force's break-through there), Leipzig, Kiel, Ludwigshafen, Munster, Frankfurt, and Brux, Czechoslovakia.

The *Warrior* has been a consistently reliable and exceptionally lucky aircraft. Although each of its original four engines has since been replaced, it was the cumulative wear and tear of long and steady combat flying, not enemy action, that necessitated the changes. The few fighters the Luftwaffe manages to put up these days have given the Passaic County Fortress a miss and the sheet-metal repairmen have never had to deal with more than a spatter of flak holes in the big bomber's aluminum skin.

The *Warrior* has never had a casualty aboard throughout her 65 combat trips and it has been over almost every important German target.

In the course of its career the Passaic County Fortress has dropped 165 tons of bombs on enemy objectives and has accumulated some 670 combat hours of flying time. Only once has it been forced to turn back from any enemy target without its full job done, and on that occasion engine failure necessitated the early return.

Her day of glamor occurred last September when air-borne Allied troops were pouring into Holland from the skies to open a new ground salient in the Eindhoven sector as the liberating American and British forces drew closer the ring of steel around the Germans. The *Passaic Warrior* was chosen to fly Lt. Gen. Louis H. Brereton, commanding the First Allied Airborne Army, on an observation mission in connection with the operation. Her selection was due to the fact that she was operationally in the pink on the appointed day and to the fact that it had compiled an excellent record for dependability.

Flying low between two lead wings of C–47 Dakotas, which carried the air-borne troops, the *Warrior* boomed her way through the clouds with First Lt. Frank Scurlock, of West Middletown, Ohio, at the controls to provide General Brereton with a front-line command post from which landing operations could be directed. With General Brereton in the *Warrior* was William Courtney, of Colliers, whose magazine article on the air-borne show featured Passaic County's bomber.

America, Italy, and the Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, millions of citizens of the United States of Italian birth or extraction are vitally interested in the political and economic outcome of the desolated people of Italy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the views of the Italian-American Labor Council adopted in resolution form at a general membership meeting of that organization held on Saturday, January 27, 1945:

On the eve of the coming historic meeting of the Big Three it is appropriate to place before the American people and the public opinion of the United Nations a grave situation which we must begin to remedy at once. This is imperative in order to hasten victory and secure an endurable and enduring peace.

The critical conditions in Italy, the possibilities of Italian political, social, and economic rehabilitation, and the entire question of the role of the new Italy in the world of tomorrow—all of these are issues which transcend in importance and scope the interests and boundaries of Italy itself. On the solution of these issues the fate of Europe and the future of mankind are, in no small measure, dependent.

In his address on the state of the Nation to the Seventy-ninth Congress, President Roosevelt declared: "It is true that the statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter does not provide rules of easy application to each and everyone of this war-torn world's tangled situations. But it is a good and useful thing—it is an essential thing—to have principles toward which we can aim."

The Italian-American Labor Council regretfully declares that in their treatment of Italy the Allied Powers have to date not been guided by the sound approach proposed by President Roosevelt.

The Atlantic Charter first of all pledges the United Nations to "seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other." In its second point, the United Nations—all of whom are signatories to the Atlantic Charter—specifically pledge themselves "that they desire no territorial changes that do not accord with the fully expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

All the world knows that the Allied Powers and other United Nations have in their treatment of Italy, paid little attention to these first two principles of the Atlantic Charter. In their relations with Italy, the Allied Powers have, to a dangerous degree, disregarded these basic points of the Atlantic Charter as principles toward which they can aim. The extremely harsh armistice terms imposed upon the Italian people after they overthrew Mussolini, and the campaign to take by force from Italy Trieste and Fiume are flagrant violations of the letter and spirit of these principles.

We appeal to our own Government and to all the Allied Powers to lose no time in making it clear to the Yugoslavian regime of Tito that the guiding principles of the Atlantic Charter rule out the proposal of the Yugoslavian Foreign Minister Josip Smodlaka to take away Fiume and Trieste from democratic Italy and annex it to Yugoslavia.

Point three of the Atlantic Charter provides that the adhering nations are to "respect the rights of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see the sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

The Italian people were the first ones to be forcibly deprived of their sovereign rights by a Fascist dictatorial regime; the first people in Europe to overthrow a Fascist dictatorship as the Italian people. Certainly, such a nation is entitled to every consideration in its efforts to rewin its sovereign rights and the restoration of self-government. But what do we find? It was painfully revealed

in the recent Sforza case that the government of the new Italy has been allowed to exercise authority more in name than in fact. To date its power has been more fiction than reality. The dominant Allied power in Italy has not allowed the Italian people even to choose its own Cabinet members without approval by outside governments.

The fourth point of the Atlantic Charter declares "the United Nations will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity." Furthermore, the Atlantic Charter expresses in its fifth point the desire of the United Nations "to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all, improved labor standards, economic adjustment, and social security."

We cannot emphasize too strongly that these have not been the guiding principles of all the Allied powers in their treatment of the reviving democracy of Italy. The Italian people are paying a dreadful price in suffering and destruction. Their country is a theater of bitterest warfare; they are subjected not merely to all the havoc of military devastation but also to the vengeful wrath of Hitler and his Mussolini quislings. Their wealthiest and most industrialized provinces are being ravaged and looted. They are making a gallant effort to contribute decisively to the common victory and to speed the reconstruction of their country. So far the United Nations have rendered only pitifully inadequate assistance to and on occasions even hampered Italian democracy in its efforts to secure the raw materials and the industrial equipment with which to lay a firm foundation for the return of their economic prosperity.

It is distressing to note the thoroughly insufficient collaboration with resurgent democratic Italy by the United Nations. Anti-Fascist Italy is not being permitted to do its full part in the destruction of Axis tyranny. Hundreds of thousands of her best sons, behind the Nazi lines as well as in the freed areas, are eager to fight against the German hordes but are not being given the proper equipment and are not allowed by the Allied powers to constitute themselves as an effective national democratic Italian Army. What is more, the thoroughly unfair and unsound rate of exchange imposed upon the Italian people has served to depress cruelly labor standards and to block seriously all efforts at economic readjustment in Italy. The military authorities, particularly the British group which is dominant, have imposed wage policies which paralyze all possibility for advancing the social security of the people of liberated Italy.

We hail the declaration made by President Roosevelt to the Seventy-ninth Congress that our country "shall not hesitate to use our influence—and to use it now—to secure so far as it is humanly possible the fulfillment of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We have not shrunk from the military responsibilities brought on by this war. We cannot and will not shrink from the political responsibilities which follow in the wake of battle."

The Italian-American Labor Council calls upon our Government and all its departments to act in the spirit and manner herewith emphasized by President Roosevelt and to pursue vigorously the above course in their relations with all the United Nations.

Our pleas for a forthright and energetic application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter to democratic Italy spring from our desire not only to assure a better life for the peace-loving industrious people of Italy, but, above all, from our devotion to America as the hope of the world in its aspirations and strivings for the triumph of democracy in war and peace and the organization of lasting world security and the enhancement of human progress.

Streamlining Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. HEDRICK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of the Charleston Gazette, of Charleston, W. Va., dated January 28, 1945:

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

The recommendations of the National Planning Association for making Congress an up-and-going concern are sensible in large part but have little chance of acceptance. Any attempt to shake Congress out of its ancient lethargy and antiquated way of doing and not doing things is not likely to get past the received and filed point.

But at least the report calls to the attention of the people a number of things that account for the fact that Congress, even during the greatest emergency that ever confronted this country, has frequently chosen to obstruct rather than aid. It shows that the body lives largely by precedent, and practices chiefly party politics.

The recommendation that has met with the most publicity is that the Senators and Representatives, who now get $10,000 a year, be upped to $25,000. The thought immediately occurs to one that the quality of representation would in no wise be increased two and a half times by the process. We seriously doubt if any one ever ran for Congress for the pay; a few seek an opportunity to do something for their country and most of the others seek prestige only. There are a lot of citizens who would take the job for less pay, and do it better.

The committee found a number of sources of weakness, among them incompetence and overworked. It is not clear why the two are mentioned as separate causes, for overwork is usually caused by incompetence. Lack of party responsibility is mentioned as another, yet everyone knows party politics has been the death of much worth-while legislation.

With the increase in salary, the Members would each get a "political assistant" who would look after the requests of constituents and save time for the Members to cultivate statesmanship. Imagine a constituent traveling all the way to Washington and being content to see only the political assistant. Of course the "assistants" would reply to all letters, but the secretaries do that anyway. Also they would act as buffers and have the job of helping keep up the political fences at home. About all the political assistants would have to do would be duplication of the work of the secretaries.

Everyone except the senior Congressmen and Senators is against the seniority rule because it holds back such able young Members as find their way to Washington. The excuse for the rule is that the fledglings must first learn the ropes by close observation, yet there are not a few Members who have been in Congress for years and never have learned anything. The rule is pernicious in the extreme and ought to have been thrown out long ago.

Another suggestion is the adoption by the Senate of a cloture rule which would do away with the filibuster. We know of no practice more open to criticism than that of talking a measure to death by a dissenter who is on the minority side. By use of the filibuster one Senator standing alone in his opinion can sometimes defeat a measure upon the passage of which may depend the fate of the Nation.

The committee could have gone further and done better by recommending some means whereby Senators and Congressmen could be actually selected by the people. Anyone who keeps an eye on politics knows that the candidates are selected by the party managers and in most cases the qualifications consist solely of ability to get votes or corral campaign funds. Once in a while a candidate appears who has sufficient popular strength to override the wishes of the party managers and get himself nominated, but they are few and far between. And once in a still longer while a man gets into Congress who has brains and force enough to grasp opportunities and override obstacles that stand in the way of true greatness.

In a number of particulars the National Planning Association has made some fine recommendations. What is really disheartening about the report is that it does not recommend how the reforms can be brought about.

The Wallace Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for January 25, 1945:

WALLACE'S WILD AND VISIONARY IDEAS

We have carefully read the wild and visionary 6,500-word statement which the radical and crackpot Henry Wallace made yesterday before the Senate Commerce Committee. Then we read it again to find out who was crazy, Wallace himself, or those who say that for him to replace Jesse Jones means the doom of our Republic.

Wallace thinks private enterprise—we repeat, private enterprise—can produce 60,000,000 jobs after the war.

He reasons this way: We are now producing goods worth 200 billions a year, or twice as much as we produced before the war. He thinks if we can produce guns, ships, and planes, we can also produce houses, cars, and clothing. How crazy is that?

This man has faith in America. He thinks that, since we led the world in establishing political democracy, we have also the stuff to lead it in establishing economic democracy. Well, haven't we?

However, Wallace does not think that the job of making 60,000,000 jobs can be tackled by 20,000 big enterprises alone; but that 3,000,000 small businesses must also produce jobs. If that's radical, Thomas Jefferson is revolving in his grave.

Wallace believes the future of the American worker lies in the well-being of private

enterprise, and vice versa, and that working as a team they are unbeatable. What, no socialism, no communism?

In order to provide jobs, Wallace says we must have great business expansion and this should be financed through private investment capital. However, in cases where special risks are involved, the Government should step in and guarantee the lender against loss.

This is exactly what the Government is now doing in the case of V loans, F. H. A. loans, and so forth. Maybe it should not guarantee against risks now and maybe it should not guarantee against risks after the war. So far as we could figure out, this part about guaranteeing private lenders against risk, in the interest of an expanding post-war economy, was the most radical thing in Wallace's speech.

Of course, America was built by risk-takers, people who fondly embraced the inalienable right to lose their shirts. If we had a few men around like "Bet-a-Million" Gates, maybe Henry Wallace wouldn't have brought up the subject at all.

But to go on with a sketch of the radical Henry's ideas. He thinks private investors can gainfully lend twenty billions a year after the war.

New construction and expansion should provide 5,000,000 more jobs a year in this field than we had before the war.

In a nutshell, he thinks that if we are going to have jobs for all, we must have expanded private industry. This industry will be privately owned, privately operated, and privately financed, with Government stepping in only to share with the private investor unusual and abnormal risks which may be involved in getting started.

Along with a bigger domestic market, we should have a bigger foreign market. Our heavy equipment industries will sell a lot of their production abroad. Our farmers will ship boatloads of cotton, tobacco, and wheat. And so on.

With reciprocal trade agreements and our already existent Export-Import Bank, along with new measures for international credit and currency stabilization, Wallace thinks American can play a big—and profitable—role in developing the economies of other nations. A lot of people who haven't been accused of crack-potism think so, too.

If private enterprise cannot produce 60,000,000, what then? Wallace thinks the Government should be on watch, and when employment begins to fall below 57,000,000, a reservoir of public works should be tapped.

But public works, he thinks, should not produce Government or "relief" or leaf-raking jobs. No, says Wallace, they should produce private jobs. Construction should be done by private firms under contract to the Government, private firms to employ private labor.

Other dangerous ideas of Wallace:

Wages should be kept high after the war to provide purchasing power for expanding economy.

Profits should be kept high, too.

Taxes should be lowered.

Farmers should have good incomes, enabling them to have better homes, indoor bathrooms and electric lights.

Monopolies and cartels should not be encouraged, as they stand in the way of free enterprise.

New businesses like aviation, television, frequency modulation, fibers, plastic, should let in the little fellow, as well as the big fellow.

Small new firms become great firms.

We should build through private enterprise 2,000,000 homes a year.

We should get rid of slums.

We should be a land of home owners, and new homes should have all the fine new gadgets.

We could use more hospitals, more clinics, more doctors.

We need a broader social-security program.

We need more schools and more teachers.

So goes the radical program of the crackpot Wallace. To his detractors, after outlining the program, he says:

"There are those who say that these goals are the dreams of a 'man willing to jeopardize the country's future with untried ideas and idealistic schemes.' These people think they are realists. Actually they are the persons of limited vision and stunted imagination. * * * These people think the same as those who said the President was dreaming when he declared in 1940 that the American people would produce 50,000 planes in 1 year."

Maybe Mr. Wallace is all wrong. Maybe he is a crackpot and a visionary. Maybe our private enterprise can't produce, as he thinks it can, 60,000,000 jobs a year. Maybe we can't have more cars, more homes, more bathtubs, more clothes, more gadgets. Maybe we can't be a healthy, prosperous, independent, happy people.

But if the time has come when Americans cannot share with Henry Wallace an optimistic view of their own future; if the time has come when America cannot flex its muscles and look to the future with high hope and the old covered-wagon determination, then God help us.

Polish Lublin Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a vivid and timely newspaper article written by Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance of America, and president of the Polish-American Congress, that appeared in the Chicago Herald-American, on January 21, 1945, on the Moscow-inspired Polish Lublin government:

If the Moscow-inspired Polish Lublin government is allowed to rule Poland, it is finis Poloniae.

Yes; the end of the great and free Republic of Poland.

And perhaps never in the world's history would there be a more shameful travesty on justice.

Poland, the first nation to fight the Nazi hordes unleashed by Hitler and the nation which suffered the most in this war and which witnessed most of her children, men, and women killed and massacred by the Nazis, will be a serf after this war—if the Russian sphere of influence is allowed to rule over the democracy-loving Poles.

Poland, the cradle of Slavic Catholicity; the home of Paderewski, Kosciuszko, and Pulaski and Sienkiewicz and Curie-Sklodowska, cannot and must not be allowed to be communized by Soviet Russia.

And Poland will be communized if the Stalin-Lublin government is allowed to continue in power.

Let us consider the plight of Poland.

Poland was vigorously anticommunistic and greatly in fear of Russia before the war.

Now Poland, although allied with Russia against Germany, is in greater fear of Russia than ever before. It will be Russia, not Germany, which will occupy Poland at the end of the war and decide the permanent fate of Poland.

Russia has started in taking over Poland with the Lublin government.

LONG-TIME REDS IN CONTROL

Examine the members of the Moscow-made Lublin government, who formerly acted as members of the Comintern.

The new so-called propaganda minister of the Lublin government is Stefan Matuszewski, a Communist agent even before the Soviet revolution of 1917.

Stefan Jedrychowski, member of the Supreme Soviet in Moscow for the Vilna district, has been sent as the Lublin government's representative to Paris.

Foreign Minister Osubka-Morawski and Vice Premier Gomolka are also well-known Communist leaders. They were trained in Soviet Russia.

The people of Poland will detest these leaders and the reforms they will bring.

First, they will institute all the elements of Soviet totalitarianism. Then the N. K. V. D., Russian secret police, will start harassing the Polish patriots, and hundreds of thousands of them will be deported to Siberia and other parts of Russia. Thousands of them will be executed by the Soviet police in reprisals.

Furthermore, Poland will be forced to face a hopeless economic situation—as offered by the Lublin Soviet team.

There will be a great shortage of food, medicaments and clothing, especially in view of the fact that the help of U. N. R. R. A. is barred in Poland by the Soviets.

The viewpoint of the Polish people was evidenced when Stanislaw Mikolajczyk's influential Polish Peasant Party recently denounced the Polish Lublin government as a threat to Allied unity and a "usurper of privileges and functions" belonging to a recognized authority.

APPEALS TO UNITED STATES FOR JUSTICE

The only and real solution of the Polish situation is the recognition of the constitutionally established Polish Government in exile and to give the people of Poland an opportunity to pick its ruler at a free election without the coercion of Soviet Russia and the Lublin team.

The controversies which have arisen between the Soviet Union and the people of Poland and the other democratic countries should not be settled by force, unilateral decisions, or political coercion.

One of the principal aims of this war is to establish an international organization before which just disputes can be settled according to international moral principles.

Americans, as the torchbearers of liberty, cannot support any policy which, in the Russian interpretation, would encourage the Soviet Union to seize land and men it does not need.

Even the flimsy pretext that Russia is forced to absorb her neighboring countries in order to insure herself against future German aggression does not hold in view of the fact that all the United Nations at the end of this war will make Germany impotent militarily.

FEARS LOSS OF LIBERTIES

As Americans we plead not only for the righteous cause of our devoted ally, Poland, but also for Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, the Balkan countries, and all the other small nations who are being deprived by a strong neighbor of the right to choose their own governments and fashion their own destinies.

The bogus governments imposed upon these nations by Russia is only a scheme to rob the people of their liberties and of their territories. If Russia refuses to grant basic liberties to her own people, how can she

be expected to carry the banner of freedom to the countries occupied by her on her march to Berlin?

We do not in any way belittle the Russian victories, but at the same time our American instinct for justice and equity cannot permit us to sanction the division of Europe into masters and slaves.

If we permit tyranny to triumph over justice in Europe we will prepare with our own hands the graves of our children. Any retreat from our war objectives outlined in the Atlantic Charter would be a death blow to the peace of the world.

For a free America here there must be a free Europe abroad.

What Henry Wallace Will Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit Free Press is an independent newspaper and has one of the largest circulations in the State of Michigan. The publisher is John S. Knight, who is president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Pursuant to permission granted to me, I am including in these remarks a logical editorial from the Free Press, which is as follows:

WHAT HENRY WALLACE WILL DESTROY—FAITH, HOPE, CONFIDENCE, FOUNDATIONS OF BUSINESS

Henry Wallace has been careening around this country for years denouncing American business as Fascist.

So President Roosevelt puts him in complete charge of American business.

Mr. Roosevelt in his last campaign said—again and again and again: "I believe in free enterprise, I believe in the profit system, I believe that private enterprise can give full employment to our people."

So he places in charge of American business a man who has missed no opportunity to express his hatred for American businessmen.

It would be difficult to imagine any man in all the United States who is as thoroughly distrusted and disliked by American business—big and little—as Henry Wallace.

From the very beginning of the New Deal he has never ceased to infuriate men in all classes of business activity by his highly emotional accusations.

Typical of his attitude was his charge, made in Cleveland last summer, that "American business had to be dragged into war production by the scruff of the neck."

Now, the most obvious fact in economics is that business only thrives when there is faith and confidence.

People do not put money into investments they do not believe in.

No businessman, whether he is running a corner peanut stand or a giant corporation, ever plans expansion unless he has confidence in the future.

Business can only grow on faith. Business can only thrive on confidence. Business can only exist on the hope of future profits.

Yet Mr. Roosevelt places in almost dictatorial charge of all commerce and industry a man in whom businessmen of all types have no faith and no confidence.

Far worse, they have for him a violent emotional hate which is a normal reaction from his own violent emotional antagonism toward them.

It is as simple as this: If the owner of a baseball club picked as the manager the man on the team thoroughly hated and trusted by the other players he could hardly expect a championship ball club.

Yet Mr. Roosevelt says that he will place Henry Wallace in complete charge of the planned production and employment Budget, to provide 60,000,000 jobs, now before Congress, and which is proclaimed by its sponsors as in keeping with "the free, competitive enterprise system."

American businessmen know—and it should be brought out into the light of this Senate investigation so that all Americans will understand—that Henry Wallace is a mystic who consults soothsayers, crystal gazers, and Yogis.

That is his own business in his private life. For all we know, or anybody else can tell, it may be a sound philosophy. But hard-headed American businessmen do not think so. To keep in business and to make a profit they have to stick to the simple arithmetic of earth-born knowledge.

Therefore they have no faith in Henry Wallace.

President Roosevelt could not have planned it better if he had deliberately sought to destroy the chances for American post-war recovery.

It was the free and uninhibited spirit of America which, when Pearl Harbor was attacked, made possible the miracle of production which saved the human race from the slavery of nazi-ism.

It is this free and uninhibited spirit, born of faith and confidence and hope, which alone can carry America to the heights of post-war production and bring back to this Nation a greater and cleaner prosperity.

To Henry Wallace this doctrine is anathema.

First he contends that it was not free enterprise at all which brought American management into the war. Patriotism had nothing to do with it. American business was dragged into production "by the scruff of the neck." Who did the dragging? Why, the Government! The miracle of production was brought about by coercion.

American engineers, American designers, American production wizards, had to be whipped to their tasks as slaves. It was not the majesty of their imaginations, their dreams of America, their hopes for mankind. They did not accept the challenge at all. Roosevelt did and dragged them "by the scruff of the neck" to give vent to their inventive genius.

On November 8, 1942, Henry Wallace addressed a gathering of the American-Soviet Friendship at Madison Square Garden.

He proclaimed there a new type of democracy far removed from that of Jefferson and Lincoln.

He proclaimed then that the American economic system would have to become more and more like that of the Russian Communist state, while the Russian Soviets would become politically more and more like the United States.

"These various kinds of democracy," he declared, "must be woven together into a harmonious whole. * * * We have overemphasized what might be called political or bill-of-rights democracy. * * * Russia, perceiving some of the abuses of excessive political democracy, has placed strong emphasis on economic democracy. * * * Somewhere there is a practical balance between economic and political democracy. Russia and the United States both have been working toward the practical middle ground."

Thus the mystically minded gentleman attempts to mix oil and water.

He thinks there can be a blend between totalitarianism and human freedom.

He contends that Soviet Russia has established "economic democracy."

No labor unions are allowed in Russia and any man who dares suggest such a thing is shot without further ado.

The state is absolute.

You work where you are told to work for any number of hours and for what pay the state determines.

That, Mr. Wallace declared on November 8, 1942, was "economic democracy."

Yet, for sake of argument, let us say he is right.

Let us say that he has learned truths deeper than it has been given mortal eye to see, through his Yogi contacts.

Let us say that he is preeminent and alone qualified to fit the tasks that lie ahead.

The point is that American business does not think so.

American business distrusts and hates him.

American business cannot carry to its tasks the faith and confidence and hope which alone can bring about prosperity and supply 60,000,000 jobs under a free enterprise system.

Mr. Wallace is proclaiming himself fit for the job says that he will be the champion of little business.

It is little business that distrusts him most.

Big business, the heads of giant corporations, can afford to be philosophical. They have so many millions they can weather any storms.

But little business cannot. It's the little fellow, just fighting his way up to his place in the sun, who is conservative and fearful. Big business can stand the loss of millions, the little fellow cannot stand the loss of dollars.

It is the little fellow who must have this faith and confidence and hope.

And upon him, collectively, depends the whole prosperity of the United States.

Collectively he is far bigger than any big business.

Our future depends upon his expansion.

But he will not risk expansion with the dead hand of bureaucracy upon his shoulder or the mad hand of mysticism leading him up dark alleys to see some Yogi.

The United States Senate has before it a grave and desperate responsibility.

The appointment of Henry Wallace should be rejected or his office should be shorn of its vast power to do great harm.

The Wallace Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Watertown Daily Times of Watertown, N. Y.:

DEFEAT FOR MR. WALLACE

The Senate Commerce Committee spoke out sharply yesterday on the Jones-Wallace case. In two separate votes the committee voted 14 to 5 against President Roosevelt's nomination of former Vice President Wallace as Secretary of Commerce. Shortly after the members approved by a 15 to 4 vote the George bill to separate from the Commerce Department the vast lending agencies which have been attached to it under Secretary Jesse Jones' administration.

The feeling of the committee and the feeling of Washington as a whole is strong in this matter. Senator JOSIAH BAILEY of North Carolina, chairman of the Commerce Committee, expressed it well when he said in a statement following the voting that the lending powers and the financial authority in this country today and after the war must be kept in experienced hands. His statement was far more accurate than that of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau who referred to Mr. Wallace as a "Yankee businessman with the horse sense to recognize that we are living in a world of change."

The people of the country have followed this debate over Secretary Jones and Mr. Wallace with deep interest. It is the old story of an informed people not being fooled. The Times has received a number of letters from readers and the rank and file praise Secretary Jones' broad experience and understanding. They have confidence in Jesse Jones. They are apprehensive about the spend-and-prosper philosophy of which Mr. Wallace is a leading exponent. They know that after the war we must return to jobs through industry and broadening business activity and not through the creation of a vast public-works program. Government spending may be necessary, but there is a broad desire on the part of our people to curb deficits and to build firmly and strongly for the future.

Washington writers are saying now that Mr. Wallace may not now receive confirmation as Secretary of Commerce when the Senate as a whole considers the matter next week. The refusal of the Commerce Committee to approve the nomination will be a powerful obstacle. It seems certain that the Senate is ready to separate the lending agencies from the Commerce Department. Mr. Wallace himself weakened his position and showed his hand plainly when he admitted to the committee in Thursday's hearings that he would accept the secretaryship without authority over the lending agencies.

In behalf of sound Government and economic stability in the post-war years, Mr. Wallace should be turned down by the Senate. Secretary Jesse Jones is too valuable an official to be cast aside at this important time to pay a political debt.

The IV-F and Nurse Draft Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Johnstown Tribune, Johnstown, Pa.:

THE IV-F AND NURSE DRAFT BILLS

In the House hearings on the May-Bailey bill the Army and Navy had to explain why they did not already enjoy the powers bestowed by the bill. Under the measure, draft registrants classified as IV-F or deferred because of essential occupation would be reclassified as I-A if they did not take essential war jobs or if they left such jobs without the consent of their draft boards. If these registrants still refused to take or to stick to war jobs, they would be formed into a kind of labor battalion under Army control but would not receive certain advantages, such as discharge pay and the benefits of the G. I. bill of rights.

Some Members of Congress want to know of the Army: "Can't you do all this, anyhow, without new legislation? Can't you already induct any draft registrant you want, even if he isn't adapted to combatant service? Haven't soldiers already been released from military duty to take emergency civilian tasks?"

It is true that last year some 7,000 soldiers were allowed to take jobs in tire, cotton-duck, and foundry and munitions plants. Some of these were released on temporary furloughs to meet a temporary emergency. The difficulty here, the Army points out, was that such men had to get not only the standard wages in the industries into which they went but also at the same time the regular Army pay and allowances, since they were only on furlough.

No question is raised as to the constitutionality of the May-Bailey bill. There is, however, doubt as to the constitutionality of the proposed measure to draft registered nurses, even though the Justice Department has given assurances on the constitutional angle. It holds that the obligation of military service is one which all citizens owe the State.

Others hold that this ruling applies to conscription applied universally to all of one sex and within age limits, with certain individuals released who do not qualify. It may be something else again to pick out one group of women in one calling as subject to conscription while women as a whole are not so subject. For example, joining of the WAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and other women's auxiliary organizations is on a voluntary basis, and if nurses are to be put under conscription, why not the others?

The bills referred to, it appears to us, are weak substitutes for universal service. The one advantage would be that they could be passed quickly to meet a pressing emergency, while universal service legislation in all probability will be held up in Congress by lengthy debate Emphasis just now is on speed in meeting the pressing needs confronting our armed services.

XCI—App.——23

Rent Control Before Columbus Discovered America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "Rent Control Before Columbus Discovered America—Stringent Regulation 500 Years Ago," which appeared in the November 1944 issue of the Rent Control Bulletin, Washington, D. C.:

That history repeats itself is again proven by the rent-control program. According to the October 28, 1944, issue of America, the national Catholic weekly, there seems to be nothing very new about our present rent regulations or the practices of landlords and tenants. Evictions for self-occupancy, holding accommodations vacant for higher rents, tenant complaints, refunds to the Treasury—all these have a precedent.

Following are excerpts from the article by Edward D. Kleinlerer, The Popes and Rent Control, to which several of our rent directors called attention:

"It will be of interest to recall, particularly at the present juncture of Rome's history, some of the many documents, edicts, and decrees issued by the Holy See for the protection of the citizens of Rome against rent speculation.

"An edict issued by Pope Paul II as far back as October 26, 1470, was aimed at preventing arbitrary removal of tenants by greedy landlords. 'No tenant can be removed from his lodging,' states the edict, 'unless the landlord wishes to occupy the same for himself; and then only after adequate assurance has been given that he will occupy it for 1 year at least; or in case the tenant be asked at the proper time, refuses to pay rent.'

"On October 11, 1510, Julius XII added further restrictions to the protective measures taken by his predecessor, and this, as he expressly stated, 'for the tenants' greater satisfaction and for the sake of avoiding controversies and disputes.'

"The Roman landlords and innkeepers were, however, most ingenious in finding means and devices to circumvent papal dispositions. This can be gaged from the fact that only 4 years after the edict of Pope Julius XIII, Leo X, on June 21, 1513, found it necessary to recall and confirm it. The Holy See was determined to prevent the disgraceful spectacle of Roman porticoes and church steps transformed into dormitories, crowded with homeless Romans and pilgrims.

"On April 29, 1549, Paul III issued a decree entitled 'In favorem inquillinorum et subinquillinorum Urbis' (in favor of tenants and subtenants in Rome), prohibiting increases of rent during the coming holy or jubilee year, or removal of tenants under the pretext of the necessity of putting the house to the landlords' own use. 'Now and in the future,' we read in that decree, whose title indicates the papal intention, 'landlords will not be permitted, during the anno santo (jubilee year) to increase the rent paid by a tenant or to modify the terms of its payment.' Referring to previous decrees, Paul III stipulated that, should a landlord remove a tenant using the false pretext of needing the house for his own use, he would be liable to a fine amounting to a year's rent. Half of the fine would go to the removed tenant, half to the Vatican's treasury. Gregory XIII, on February 20, 1573, added new measures against the practice of arbitrary removal of tenants. Evidently many of these measures must have fallen short of their goal, as Roman chroniclers tell us of incessant complaints of pilgrims and citizens against abuses of innkeepers and landlords. The complaints of Roman citizenry against landlords keeping apartments and lodgings vacant in the hope of getting higher rents induced Lorenzo Pizzatti, papal chamberlain to the Court of Alexander III, to present to the pontiff a series of suggestions aimed at checking this new form of speculation. He recommended, in fact, that those landlords who keep their apartments vacant over a period of 3 months should not be allowed to increase the rent.

"This constant care of the Vatican to curb speculation on housing, one of man's most elementary needs, continued till the last years of the temporal rule of the popes. It found its expression in the motu proprio of Pius VII of March 19, 1801; in the edict of Pope Leo XII, of September 20, 1824; in the orders given by Cardinal Della Somaglia, papal secretary of the state, on May 8, 1826, to extend for a period of 3 years all measures taken for the occasion of the anno santo, 1825. Moreover, Cardinal Della Somaglia made it known that whoever would, during that 3 years' period, build new houses, dwellings, stores (botteghe), or add new structures to the existing ones, would be exempted from taxes until the end of the nineteenth century. He went even further by promising that taxes already paid on materials used for new buildings would be reimbursed."

Aviation Research and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in order to call the attention of the Congress to the important subject of aviation research and development, I am including with my remarks the following statement which the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics recently prepared for presentation to the House Select Committee on Post-War Military Policy.

Many of the improvements now incorporated in our military airplanes are the direct results of the very fine type of research work that is done by the N. A. C. A. I am sure that Members of the House and Senate will be interested in reading the following statement:

AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH POLICY

PREAMBLE

1. Experience since the establishment of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics by the Congress in 1915 has shown that the value of the airplane for national defense and for commerce has directly followed the evolution of an advancing technology based on research. Research made rapid strides as more facilities were provided for the N. A. C. A. The Army and Navy developed military applications of N. A. C. A. research results with the aid of their increased facilities for testing and evaluation. The manufacturing industry, by the exercise of great initiative and technical competence, created superior airplanes of both military and civil types to meet ever-increasing performance requirements.

2. The effects of accelerated enemy research and development in preparation for war helped to create an opportunity for aggression which was promptly exploited. This lesson is the most expensive we ever had to learn. We must make certain that we do not forget it.

3. During the war, the N. A. C. A. has greatly expanded its research facilities at Langley Field, Moffett Field, and Cleveland, while the Army and Navy have correspondingly increased their facilities for experiment and evaluation. Furthermore, the airplane industry has been able to provide extensive development facilities of its own. As a result, American airplanes are today superior in most respects.

4. This lead may or may not be continued in the post-war period, depending on whether the present facilities in the country are used to full effect to advance the science and the technology of aeronautics. Results already obtained make it apparent that there are further opportunities for substantial improvement in the performance of aircraft and equipment which can be realized only by a vigorous research program.

NECESSITY FOR RESEARCH

5. It is possible to assume that the United Nations will, by repressive measures, eliminate hostile competition in the air. Nevertheless, it is essential so to continue research as to assure American leadership in military aviation development. It is moreover certain that between the United Nations vigorous commercial competition will take place. In fact, we already are informed of extremely ambitious plans to surpass present American research equipment, obviously in a desire to excel in the air.

6. The committee believes it to be in the public interest to foster a greatly increased civil use of the airplane, for domestic and international airlines and for private operation. A vigorous civil aviation can affect favorably our domestic and international relations, both economic and cultural. At the same time it will contribute to national security by the support of a reserve of airplanes, operating and manufacturing facilities, and civilians trained in the skills which are critical in time of war.

7. The rate of growth of civil aviation will depend on the rate at which improvements in safety, performance, reliability, utility, and economy can be realized. However, to realize such improvements, research must solve some difficult problems associated with operations over extended ranges of distance and altitude, aggravated by the extension of airlines over areas of unusual weather and terrain.

8. Some of the results of war research can be applied by the manufacturing industry directly to new designs of civil airplanes. In many cases, however, practical applications have yet to be discovered and require further research directed toward the solution of specific problems. Neither the airlines nor the manufacturers can be expected to solve these problems quickly without the assistance of intensive research and development.

9. The N. A. C. A. should, therefore, endeavor to direct an increasing proportion of its research effort to the technical problems of civil aviation with a view to their practical solution.

10. Experience clearly indicates that in time of peace the application of research results to military and naval objectives is extremely important. Possible military applications must be expored by continuous experiment and testing by professional soldiers and sailors as a life work, and the products of industry must be evaluated by the military users. Such exploration and evaluation requires the full use of the facilities now available to the Army and Navy.

11. The public interest requires that effective use be made of all existing facilities for research, development, and evaluation, and that they be kept modernized. The results of research conducted at public expense should be made available to manufacturers and operators in such a manner as to stimulate the growth of healthy competition in the supply of goods and services.

POLICY

12. It is recommended that the Army Air Forces, the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy Department, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Department of Commerce, and the N. A. C. A. follow, insofar as may be practicable, the following general policy considerations in the post-war utilization of research, development, and testing facilities of the Government.

A. Fundamental research in the areonautical sciences is the principal objective of the N. A. C. A. Such research is directed toward the solution of the problems of flight and results are promptly published. In exceptional cases research results of potential military importance may be withheld from publication.

B. Research of the N. A. C. A. is not considered completed until results are tested by sufficient practical application. In general, N. A. C. A. research will not include the development of specific aircraft or equipment.

C. Research programs of the N. A. C. A. are formulated in close collaboration with technical personnel from the Government agencies concerned and from industry, through membership on appropriate subcommittees. Members of all technical subcommittees of N. A. C. A. are appointed as individuals especially qualified in their particular fields.

D. The research facilities of the N. A. C. A. may be used to assist a Government agency in evaluation of specific aircraft and equipment, whenever facilities available to that agency are inadequate.

E. The research facilities of the N. A. C. A. may be used to assist private individuals and corporations whenever commercial facilities are not available; provided that, the investigation is considered by the N. A. C. A. to be in the public interest; and provided further, that the cost be met by the individual or corporation requesting assistance.

F. Application of research results to the design of improved aircraft and equipment, both civil and military, is the function of the industry, assisted as may be necessary by contracts for experimental articles, placed in a manner to stimulate competition for quality. It is recognized that the encouragement of competitive engineering organizations is essential.

G. The evaluation of military aircraft and equipment developed by the industry, and the exploration of possible military applications of research results are considered to be the function of the Army and Navy.

H. Expedition of the practical use in civil aeronautics of newly developed aircraft and equipment, insofar as Government assistance may be necessary, is considered to be the function of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

I. The N. A. C. A. normally will use its own research facilities, but will contract with university or other private research organizations for work in special fields where outside facilities and competence are to be found. Likewise, the facilities and competence of the National Bureau of Standards, Forest Products Laboratory, and other Government research centers will be used by the N. A. C. A. whenever practicable.

J. Unnecessary duplication of facilities and effort will be avoided by adherence to the principles stated above, but for important problems whose practical solution appears to be especially difficult, parallel attack by several independent research teams is necessary. In such case, N. A. C. A. laboratories, industry designers, Army, Navy, and commerce groups and individual scientists and inventors may work on various aspects of the same basic problem. Such parallel attack must be coordinated, and it is the policy of the N. A. C. A. to achieve such coordination through the medium of subcommittees of experts representing all concerned.

Analysis of May-Bailey Bill, H. R. 1752

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following analysis of H. R. 1752, the May-Bailey bill:

Section 1, paragraph 1: The Selective Service Training Act of 1940 was enacted to provide a democratic method of inducting men into the armed forces. The local Selective Service Boards are not equipped to deal with the recruitment of manpower for war production. Furthermore, the basic principle of granting to the Selective Service System the power

to draft men for work in war plants or on the farms is fundamentally opposed to the entire American tradition of freedom of contract. Whatever problems may exist with respect to war production or mobilization of manpower should be solved by the agencies created for such purpose and with experience in these fields.

No provision is made for appeal from decision by the Selective Service System to draft men for industrial or agricultural war work until the registrant is inducted. The present appeals machinery of the Selective Service System cannot possibly make a fair determination of whether or not local Selective Service boards have acted wisely in ordering an unqualified man to take a war job.

Section 1, paragraph 2: The registrant is forbidden to leave his war job unless his local selective service board has determined that "it is in the best interest of the war effort" for him to leave his job. The worker is thus frozen to a job under a private employer regardless of the wages, hours, working conditions and other terms of employment which may prevail under such employer. The local selective service board, because of reasons given above, cannot possibly determine whether or not it is in the best interest of the war effort for a worker to leave a farm or a war job. The War Manpower Commission with its local labor-management committees and farm committees now has the power to prevent workers from leaving essential war jobs. It may be necessary to strengthen the present powers of the War Manpower Commission, but there is no need to transfer this power to an agency completely unequipped for doing the job.

There is no provision whatsoever for appeal from arbitrary determination by a local selective-service board that a worker should not leave his present war job, in spite of adverse working conditions and terms of employment. Workers will not regard private employers, whom they are drafted to serve, as having any resemblance to Uncle Sam whom they have served willingly in the armed forces.

Section 1, paragraph 3: The Director of War Mobilization is given the power to certify to the Director of Selective Service plants, facilities, and farms which are in need of manpower and which have not been able to obtain sufficient manpower through voluntary recruiting. It is provided that the Director of War Mobilization shall "consult with the appropriate representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and government." Such consultation however is not mandatory and obviously would be entirely ineffective in providing a means of cooperation of labor, management, and agriculture with government.

Section 1, paragraph 4: The Director of Selective Service (which means, of course, local selective boards) is given the power to designate the categories of registrants whom he deems can transfer to war work with the least disruption to civilian economy. There has already been considerable confusion caused by the indecision of the Director of Selective Service with regard to occupational deferment. The above provision merely enlarges the present power of the Director of Selective Service to designate categories of workers whom he believes are not necessary to the functioning of the civilian economy.

Section 1, paragraph 5: The Director of War Mobilization is given discretionary power to assign to local selective-service boards in an advisory capacity representatives of other Government agencies. This provision clearly recognizes the inadequacy and lack of experience of local selective-service boards in war production and manpower problems. It is wholly ineffective, however, because it reduces the power of Government production and manpower agencies to a purely advisory role.

Section 2, paragraph (j): President Roosevelt in calling for national-service legislation stated that seniority rights and wage levels would be protected. Paragraph 2 of section 2 extends seniority right protection now accorded under the G. I. bill of rights but makes no provision whatsoever for protection of wage levels in the event of transfer to a war job. Furthermore, protection of seniority under the G. I. bill has not proven sufficiently strong.

There is no provision in the bill making it illegal for employers to refuse to accept assignments of manpower on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Although men between the ages of 18 and 45 are to be drafted to work under private employers without adequate protection of wages and working conditions, there is no provision whatsoever for the drafting of industrial facilities and capital. The bill is thus inequitable and ineffective. It is only through the proper coordination of the procurement agencies, W. P. B. and W. M. C. with their already existing labor-management-farm committees that we can get the right man in the right place at the right time.

The Task Remaining Before Us—As Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, Proclaimed to the American People on Last December 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the debate on the pending limited national service bill, it is interesting to reread a speech delivered December 11, 1944, by General Hershey, Director of Selective Service.

The text of that speech, marked "cleared and issued through the facilities of the Office of War Information," follows:

It is a real pleasure to visit the city of Cleveland again and to meet with you here tonight.

Last Friday, December 8, marked the third anniversary of our entrance into this world conflict. Many of you in this audience were at that time deeply involved in selective-service operations in one capacity or another. Others of you have volunteered your services since then. All of you who have served so faithfully have earned the Nation's gratitude.

As we enter the fourth year of the war the major task of manpower procurement is well along the way with nearly 12,000,000 men in the armed forces. Today much attention is being given to the plans and preparations for caring for the returning veteran. I am familiar with your plans in Ohio, and I am happy to learn of the progress that has been made in organizing your State and this very locality for the tremendous undertaking.

Your State director of selective service, Colonel Goble, has done an excellent job of organization. He in turn tells me that the success is due to the very able local leaders, who have quickly recognized the problem, and have coordinated all efforts in organizing a program that embodies the cooperation of all agencies and groups interested in the welfare of the returning veteran.

I am deeply interested in the success of this program. I am naturally interested in seeing that Selective Service assumes its full share of the responsibility, for I have every confidence in the ability of the Selective Service System to accomplish its part of the task.

This confidence is not wishful thinking. It is based upon past performance—a record that is worthy of recounting to you at this time.

September of this year 1944 brought the fourth anniversary of the passage by the Congress of the United States of the Selective Training and Service Act. America was at peace on September 16, 1940, when alert Members of Congress, conscious of a troubled world, passed the first peacetime conscription bill in the history of the Nation. This bill called for selecting not to exceed 900,000 men yearly for training and service in the armed forces. Time has proved the wisdom of this legislation, though, at the time, it faced strong opposition.

The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 provided great responsibilities for the Selective Service System. First was the basic responsibility of selecting the required manpower for the armed forces and making that manpower available for induction as called for by the Army and Navy. Physical, mental, and age standards were laid down by the armed forces. The law delegated to the President the power to issue regulations which would govern the granting of deferments. The task of selecting the men from the Nation's supply of manpower was placed primarily upon the shoulders of the local boards.

A second responsibility charged to the Selective Service System was that of accomplishing this selection of men for the armed forces with the least possible disruption to essential industry and agriculture.

Now, after more than 4 years of operation of the Selective Service System, of which over 3 years were while the Nation has been at war, it is well that we look at the record—that we appraise the work of the 6,443 selective service local boards and their two basic responsibilities.

The Army has reached its authorized strength, and the Navy is proceeding to its authorized strength on schedule. Manpower of the type, age, and qualifications required is available not only to complete the needs of the Navy but also to provide the replacements needed for both the Army and the Navy. Responsibility No. 1 has been accomplished with remarkable success by the local boards, aided by all other components of the Selective Service System.

For proof that responsibility No. 2 also has been accomplished one needs only to look

at production records. Essential industry and agriculture could not have accomplished their outstanding production records had selective service not understood their needs and cooperated in deferring necessary men. Labor and management in industry and the farmers in their fields are to be highly congratulated for their tireless efforts, their loyal endeavor. Millions of young men have been deferred by selective-service local boards and appeal boards in order that essential industry and agriculture might continue their operations unhampered. American war production of munitions and supplies has astounded the world. Agriculture has accomplished its fourth straight record-breaking year. Those are records that speak for themselves in certifying and substantiating the accomplishment of the second responsibility of selective service.

It would be ungrateful for me not to express at this time the appreciation we all have for the tireless efforts of the local and appeal board members and of all the other persons who are a part of the Selective Service System and who have given so generously and loyally of their time and energy. The Nation must never forget the patriotism of these persons and their magnificent contribution toward the winning of the war.

I should like to be able to promise some relaxation to the uncompensated members who have made selective service possible and have contributed so greatly toward its success. But there is yet a war to win and a peace to be made—there is yet remaining the great task of bringing the men now in service home again and fitting them back into their civilian pursuits. We in selective service have not only a responsibility but an obligation to see this job through to a successful completion.

We may say that selective service has passed a milestone with the accomplishment of these two directed responsibilities. Though mobilization has been decreasing in momentum and scope, there is at this time a gradual increasing of demobilization activity. Today we must describe our status as one of mobilization-demobilization—two distinct activities though closely related and simultaneously in operation. In each activity selective service has been given a tremendous responsibility.

Casualties in the armed forces are unfortunately occurring and men are being discharged from the services daily. They must be replaced. This requires that the normal procurement work of selective service continue. A constant supply of new manpower must be made available for the armed forces. Calls may increase or decrease as the needs vary. As the procurement agency, we must remain organized and ready to fill these monthly calls for men.

This mobilization-demobilization movement, which has in fact existed since the beginning of our operation is today in an almost balanced position. With the progress of the war toward victory we shall find the demobilization factor eventually reaching the major proportion.

Several months ago the Army announced its partial demobilization plan to be placed into effect following the defeat of Germany and prior to the defeat of Japan. The plan was well received, it was prepared with the cooperation and approval of the men in service. It contemplates the continued selection of men by selective service.

The demobilization occurring today, though not large in any sense, provides a sample of the task to come. Approximately 50,000 men are presently being separated to civil life from the armed forces each month. Over half of these are by reason of disability. Today the need for men in both industry and agriculture is great and job opportunities are plentiful. These conditions simplify the work for those engaged in returning the veteran to civilian livelihood. As time progresses, however, we may expect increased activity and the introduction of new complications.

It therefore becomes imperative that we in selective service turn our attention to this great job of demobilization and the part we must take in connection with the veteran who is homeward bound. In section 8 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act, Congress provided that the Director of Selective Service shall establish a division with adequate facilities to render aid in the replacement in their former positions of or in securing positions for those who return from our victorious armed forces. In compliance with this direction of Congress there has been established in the Selective Service National Headquarters a Veterans' Personnel Division.

The Congress, in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the G. I. bill of rights as it is more commonly referred to, created a Veterans Placement Service Board naming the Director of Selective Service as a member. Other members are the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who is the Chairman, and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. In this act, the Congress declared its intent that there should be an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans so as to provide them with a maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment.

Within the recently established Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion was placed the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, which was established to have general supervision and direction of the activities of all existing executive agencies (except the Veterans Administration) relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. This was done in an effort to coordinate these activities and avoid overlapping functions of such agencies. Selective service also has membership representation on the advisory council of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration.

Congress well recognized the magnitude of the problem when it legislated on the subject and it wisely named existing agencies to play an active part. Besides selective service, other governmental agencies concerned with the reemployment problem include the Veterans Administration, the United States Employment Service, the War Food Administration, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Civil Service Commission. This tremendous job will be great enough for the fullest use of all of these agencies. Through their coordinated efforts—and the assistance of each and every one of our citizens back home—there is every reason for confidence that our efforts will meet with success.

Congress recognized the employment problem as having two parts: (1) The veteran who wants his old job back, and (2) the veteran who never had a job, who does not want the one he did have, or whose job has disappeared since he went away.

The Selective Service System has been given a responsibility in both fields.

The initial responsibility, that of giving aid to restore veterans to their former positions, has been accepted in full by the Selective Service System. In carrying out the second part, that of obtaining new positions for the veterans, the services of the aforementioned agencies of Government are being utilized.

As for the veteran who wants his old job back, the law provided that he is entitled to reinstatement in his former position or in one of like seniority, status, and pay, provided (1) such a position was in the employ of a private employer, the United States Government, its territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia; (2) such position was not a temporary one; (3) he left the position subsequent to May 1, 1940, to enter upon active military or naval service in the land or naval forces of the United States; (4) he satisfactorily completed his period of training and service and received a certificate to that effect; (5) he is still qualified to perform the duties of such position; (6) he makes application for reemployment within 40 days after he is relieved from service; and (7) if such a position is in the employ of a private employer, the employer's circumstances have not so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to reinstate the veteran to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

Other measures are provided by law to protect the veteran after he has been restored to his old job. When he goes back onto the pay roll, the law provides that (1) he shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence during his period of service; (2) he shall be restored without loss of seniority; (3) he shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on leave of absence or furlough in effect with the employer at the time such person entered military or naval service; and (4) he shall not be discharged from such position without cause for 1 year after restoration.

To carry these provisions into effect the Selective Service System established in its national headquarters a veterans' personnel division, which will provide for the operation of the reemployment phase of the problem nationally.

In each state, the State director of selective service is organizing and supervising the program. The selective service local boards, 6,443 of them located throughout the Nation, of whose records we are so proud, are carrying it into effect in line with the decentralized operation of the entire Selective Service System.

To follow the case of an individual veteran who is being discharged, this is how the program works:

First, under the Army's demobilization program, the veteran is sent to an Army separation center geographically located near his home. He will be informed there of his rights and privileges as a veteran.

Before separation from the service, he will be instructed to report within 10 days to his selective service local board. If he had not registered with a local board before entering the service, he is required by law now to register. However, he may call upon any local board for aid in getting his old job back, or in finding a new one.

The reemployment committeemen attached to each local board will also assist the veteran in obtaining reinstatement in his former job or may refer him to the proper agency for aid in obtaining a new one. These public-spirited citizens who have knowledge of the veteran's abilities, an appreciation of the employment situation within their own local communities, and who are personally acquainted with many of the employers, understand employment problems and job possibilities. Both local board members and the reemployment committeemen will be available to aid the veteran. Both are peculiarly well fitted for the task.

It is not anticipated that every veteran will need assistance. It is to be hoped, and is confidently expected, that many of our returning servicemen will be accepted at once, and without question, back into their old jobs.

But we do appreciate that some misunderstandings may arise between the returned veteran and his former employer concerning reinstatement. The circumstances of both necessarily will have changed during the intervening years, and in some cases these changes will have been drastic. Whether such changes are sufficient to deprive a veteran of the rights which the Congress meant to confer must, of necessity, depend upon the facts in each case.

It is anticipated that employers will meet the problem in a spirit of fair play; that they will appreciate fully the sacrifices made by the veteran, and will not take advantage of a technicality in an attempt to evade responsibility to the veteran.

If a misunderstanding arises, the local board or its reemployment committeemen will make every effort, through personal contact, to reach an agreement mutually satisfactory to the employer and the veteran. This must be done without sacrificing any of the veteran's rights which Congress intended him to have. In endeavoring to avoid misunderstandings, local boards will have numerous agencies upon which to call for assistance, such as veterans' organizations, labor, civic, community, or post-war planning groups, veterans' service committees, and others, many of which are represented here tonight.

Certainly, everything will be done to reinstate the veterans by amicable means. If all of these are exhausted without success, then it obviously will be necessary to resort to legal procedure as provided in the law.

You who are cooperating in this work, both from selective service and from other agencies, can be counted upon, I know, to give your wholehearted and sympathetic consideration to each case and to use your best ability to properly relocate the veteran back again in the community.

While demobilization is today progressing at a relatively slow rate, it can be expected to increase in momentum with the end of the war in Europe and the inauguration of the Army demobilization plan. It may also be expected that at this same time the return of war workers to civilian production pursuits also will be greatly increased. It is therefore imperative that the machinery to foster the return of the veteran to his old job or to aid him in obtaining a new one be functioning at the best.

When victory comes, each and every citizen must be prepared to pay the tremendous debt owed these servicemen. We must not fail to realize the magnitude of this responsibility. In this work there will be adequate opportunity for the wholehearted cooperation of all who will assist.

Jobs must be created by the people who hire men—the employers. We can act only as a go-between to place the man in a job. It is the duty of all our 130,000,000 citizens to join wholeheartedly in supplying and making those jobs available.

Service clubs, churches, employment agencies, labor, and veterans' organizations, governmental agencies, chambers of commerce—all must lend a hand in this tremendous job of relocation. It is fine to learn of your plans and programs to avoid duplication of effort, and to avoid early disinterest, for it will not be an easy job. Through the coordinated efforts of all the agencies responsible and the assistance of each and every one of our citizens at home, there is every reason for confidence that the efforts will be successful.

Reports from the far-flung battle fronts are encouraging. The prospect of victory in Europe has brought much discussion concerning peacetime military training for our American youth. Congress already has had under consideration legislation for such training. The President has expressed his ideas on the subject. There is a concerted movement in this direction aimed to provide preparedness to insure a permanent peace.

I am definitely in favor of peacetime universal military training. The benefits to be derived from such a program are manifold, not the least of which is the future imperative requisite for preparedness. This Nation must never again allow itself to revert to the status of unpreparedness prevalent 10 years ago. Today's warfare has changed in a manner that the risk of unpreparedness is tantamount to courting disaster. Our wealth unprotected offers too great a temptation to aggressor nations. Not all nations in this world understand or follow the philosophies of ownership and fair play that are so basic with us. Our national security requires armament and manpower in adequate quantities and of the most currently scientific type to protect us from future aggression. America must never again take chances.

There are at the same time many other good results which will follow the institution of a system of universal military training. Selective service operation and manpower procurement has uncovered shocking facts concerning the physical condition of great numbers of our young manhood. Nearly one-fourth of the young men in this Nation have been found to be physically unfit for service in our armed forces. Much of this unfitness is unnecessary and a reflection upon the record of our Nation in other respects. Past and present physical training measures have been inadequate. Perhaps there have been too many cases of thousands of persons watching a few boys exercise—such as we have in today's sports arenas.

Peacetime military training should be designed to provide physical education and training for all in the age group. Many of the defects found among rejected registrants undoubtedly could have been avoided through training and education or could be easily remedied. Let it not be forgotten that the physical training and physical education of young men will in turn be passed on down to their children at a much earlier age and serve to build a healthier and stronger youth in America.

In addition, peacetime military training will provide a true lesson in Americanism by bringing together young men of like ages from all walks of life. They will live together, work together, train and play in the same atmosphere—a circumstance which will bring a true understanding of each other's problems and a mutual feeling of responsibility for the Nation's welfare.

After this war America is to be a greater world leader than ever before. America must remain strong and virile. It must set an example to all people. Through preparedness America must protect her position and possessions. She must also take a leading part in preserving peace throughout this world.

Duties and Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under consent heretofore granted, I am including two speeches I recently made in Vermont, one to the members of the Vermont House of Representatives on Thursday, the 25th, concerning which the journal of that house records:

Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Congressman-at-large from Vermont, was introduced by the speaker. Following the introductory remarks, Congressman PLUMLEY spoke briefly, as follows:

"Mr. Speaker, in order to get here for Friday night, I had to leave Washington yesterday afternoon. I am no dog and have no priority as a Member of Congress. They say in Washington that Office of Defense Transportation (O. D. T.) stands for 'Our Dog Travels,' while O. P. A. means 'Our Pup Aviates.'

"Seriously, Mr. Speaker, our duties are obvious.

"A lot of water has flowed under the bridge (but, incidentally, not over any dam on the West River) since last we met on a similar occasion. We are just getting into the toughest part of the fighting in the shooting and killing war. The toughest days for us on the home front are ahead of us. The days of readjustment to normal peacetime activities will be full of problems for which we can make no present plan because we do not know for what to plan or how long the war will last or to what extent our resources will be exhausted; nor can we appreciate the extent and magnitude of the demands that will be made upon us not only to police but to help to feed and clothe and rehabilitate the stricken nations as they crawl out from under the Hitler heel and back into the sunlight of their greatest opportunity.

"Yet we are in this fight for an unconditional surrender which means nothing less than a complete victory. There shall be no halfway business this time. We propose to establish and to maintain a perpetual peace. For this we fight—or else in vain.

"In this war even more is at stake than our existence as a nation. We are engaged in a struggle that challenges the fundamental values upon which our civilization is built. Its transmission to our sons and daughters, its preservation, depend upon our victory in this struggle.

"So all those things essential to that victory must come first. No effort we can contribute to that end should be considered a sacrifice. What must be done will be done, but unless we voluntarily cooperate we will have to submit to governmental regimentation and direction, which none of us like, many of us resent, and all of us protest. 'The more we police ourselves, the less we will be policed.'

"Whatever will assure and hasten victory must have first place in any statement of American policy.

"Without victory, our aims, and the underlying values upon which they are based, will be extinguished, blotted out by the opposing aims and values proclaimed by our enemies.

"The needs of our fighting men must be put first. For, unless we win the war, the national aims and policies of the United States will cease to have meaning in the world.

"Let us face the future with calm confidence—confidence in our ability and determination to accomplish the purpose to which we have dedicated ourselves. We must not be unmindful of the awful price we are paying in our effort to save civilization, for that is our responsibility.

"Out of the travail of these days of sweat and blood and tears will be born a better day for 'in Today already walks Tomorrow.' "

After the address, on motion of Mr. Ogden of Landgrove, the remarks of Mr. PLUMLEY were ordered printed in the journal of January 26, 1945.

On motion of Mr. Adams of Marlboro, the House adjourned.

The other was delivered at a banquet held by the Vermont Dairymen's Association at Burlington on the evening of Friday, January 26, as follows:

THE RIGHTS OF STATES

Members of the Vermont Dairymen's Association and guests, these are awe-full days (spelled a-w-e-f-u-l-l) in the history of the States, the Nation, and the world. To be able to play our part in deciding what shall be done to discharge our duty and to determine our destiny is an honor not to be lightly appreciated.

Representatives of the rugged individualists of Vermont should not forget that there is a group in this country determined to destroy ancient landmarks, to federalize and to centralize government even to the extent

of stripping the States of their sovereign powers.

It follows that if the representatives of the States in their legislatures assembled do not stop trading for privilege by wasting the powers and prerogatives of the States in deals for more Federal funds, and otherwise, they will further Federal control, depredation, and destruction, and encourage the complete confiscation of the rights reserved to the States, which are the people. It is important that we know our rights, and more important that, knowing them, we dare to maintain them.

This is a time when tyranny would destroy human rights everywhere and humanity has risen in arms to save those rights, to win them for itself and for posterity. We should not gain a thing to win a war or establish a peace at the cost and the loss of those very fundamentals for which we fight.

With these rights go obligations and the insistence that only when the rights of the States are respected are our own individual rights made secure.

The right to speak and to print, the right to assemble and petition, the right to worship as our conscience bids, the right to be secure against despotic invasion of person or property, the right to a fair trial under the law—these rights are so common that we scarcely stop to realize that they are the things, among others, for which we fight and to lose them is to lose all.

Eternal vigilance still is the price of liberty. The essence of authority lies in the consent of the governed. We cannot afford to trade liberty for license, or our rights for a mess of pottage.

The excessive encroachment of the power of centralized government under the guise of idealistic social planning is a threat to the States which they must resist or be a part of the all-inclusive State. The easiest way out found in surrender does not fit the idea or ideals of Vermont or Vermonters. The consummation of the plans of such a concentrated political power must be resisted at any price if we are to preserve, conserve, and save the sovereign States.

Vermont will never assent to the proposition that the Federal Government has the right to wipe out or drown one State by virtue of assumption of an authority acquired and exercised under duress of centralized government to save another.

Huge Government hand-outs are only the measure of the amount of money taken from the taxpayer and the magnitude of the debt made larger by this alleged generosity.

The average man and woman, the people, at plane plants, tank plants, factories, machine shops, on the farm, the office, the hospital, and at home have proved we Americans can out-dream, out-think, out-work, out-produce, out-invent, out-prosper, and out-fight any country in the world. We must not forget that the centralized government cannot give us a dime we did not earn and turn over to it as a tribute to ourselves.

If we continue to maintain our self-respect, individuality, and the rights for which we fight, we can enjoy and can assure to posterity such a life of abundance and real liberty as no people on earth has ever before enjoyed.

This war is far from won. Starry-eyed idealism, indifference, indecision, weakness in the face of veteran diplomacy cannot take the place of stern necessity. We have talked too much, too soon. We must work and fight, not talk, to be victorious.

To secure conditions which we hope may obtain following the defeat of our enemies we must overcome difficulties far greater than are generally recognized by an effort which must be gigantic, requiring the full pouring out of all our intelligence, our energies, our resources, our blood and treasure. This is no time to believe anything else.

Our first business is to win this war, and every law enacted by this assembly should be based on that concept—wisely—as should every bill which Congress seriously considers. The road we have yet to travel to peace is slick and slippery, rough and rugged, and bloody, and it will be hard going to reach the goal we have set before us.

When victory comes we will be confronted with the most serious situation which has ever confronted civilization. Oppressed by problems, irresolute, uncertain of our way, we shall stand at the crossroads, the turning point.

If history is to be our guide, we must have a definite policy. We should not (as of old) expect somebody representing us to sit down at the council table with representatives of other governments, skilled in diplomacy, to negotiate our terms of peace. The fate of the world will be at stake, and at such a table no final settlement leading to an enduring peace will or can be determined without our concurrence. The people must be heard. Their wishes must be the basis of all negotiations.

Of course, spoils will be equitably divided—or at least divided—and the power positions of the signatories to the Atlantic Charter will be decided, but in the fracas perpetual peace might fly out the window as the last delegate signs his name. That is what we must prepare to prevent, and it is for us, the greatest nation in the world, to fight for such a peace as we demand and shall have if it takes all we have to give, for not to insure a durable peace would be a wicked waste of all we have contributed to that end and would be to have fought the war in vain.

That is the problem which confronts Vermonters right here in the Vermont Legislature, at the base of the pyramid of the people's government, to the solution of which problem all of us are called upon to contribute our best thought and judgment.

Unless the people are to be heard, a precarious and insecure result will obtain in a lot of highly colored words leading only to World War No. 3. We must have the vision and the courage to strip the words to the bone, to throw into the discard the beautiful phrases and illusive hopes of idealism. We must be practical. Vermonters are.

If we are to go on as a democratic-republican government the rights of the States must be preserved. What we have done and accomplished due to the wisdom of the founders is based upon the preservation of the rights of the States, united, to make a strong federal government from whose tentacles the States are to be protected because of the rights they reserved to themselves for the preservation of which we are responsible.

As I have said before, I emphasize the fact that this is the country which has given the world its pattern for self-government, which has championed the rights of the individual, and has responded with its blood and treasure to the cries for help of distressed peoples.

It is in the spirit of these ideals that individual rights have been temporarily surrendered to hasten victory. But this sacrifice implies no willingness to change—no conversion to any creed of socialized control.

For the youth of America—the returning fighting man—deserving of the opportunities traditionally his, this must again be a country free of unnecessary restraints; where business is encouraged by government, and where a man can build, brick upon brick, the structure of his own well-being.

What do the youth who are fighting and dying for us expect of us and for themselves? Let me answer that question by reading you what they say:

"We'll be home again someday. Back home where not just us but everyone will understand how and why this war was fought and won. * * * Back home where all of us will know we bought and paid for peace with something more than bonds and tears and blood and long years of sacrifice. * * * Back home where everyone must know this war will have no meaning, this victory will be hollow, this peace will not endure unless the power that won the war, the power that made our country great, the power of men and women working together to destroy can become the power to create. Unless the power to rub cities out becomes the power to put new cities up. Unless the power to take life becomes the power to give life. Unless the power to liberate men in foreign lands becomes the power to free ourselves, to give to every man a boundless opportunity to dream, to work, to grow, to make his life, to make his America what he wants it to be.

"That's what this war is being fought for. That's what victory will mean to us. That's what we'll come home for."

All of us owe to those who have fought to preserve it, a strong, a vital, a growing America, where every man and every woman will have the freedom and the opportunity to make his or her dreams come true. That is the challenge which confronts us.

The initiative of men, their enterprise, the inspiration of thought, the determination to be free, flower in full only in the security of those fundamental rights for which we fight. Those rights that made our fathers freemen and have kept us so, "if they are not now the more carefully preserved," said John Elliot, "will render us to posterity less free, less worthy, than our fathers." All that is needed in order that Democracy shall survive," said Calvin Coolidge, "is for us to give all and to do all that we think America is worth."

"Tomorrow the world" was a Nazi boast which meant a world to rule under regimentation. We say "Tomorrow one world" and that a free world in which men can live and trade and prosper together.

"These things shall be—a loftier race
Than e'er the world hath known—shall rise
With flame of freedom in their souls,
And light of knowledge in their eyes."

The Ward Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein an editorial from the Washington Star of January 29, 1945, relating to the Ward decision.

I wish especially to call attention to the statement made by Chairman Davis, of the War Larbor Board, that the "whole plan of peaceful settlement of wartime labor disputes will collapse" if the decision of Judge Sullivan in the Montgomery Ward case is permitted to stand.

The average citizen will consider it more than an oversight or a mere incident that when one James C. Petrillo defied the War Labor Board and the President there was no outburst of fear from Chairman Davis that the "whole plan will collapse." In fact, the public has not even heard a whisper of complaint because of such defiance on the part of a labor leader, but the whole structure of peaceful settlement will collapse if a ruling which faces an employer is permitted to remain on the record.

That measure of justice and administration will ultimately destroy all free enterprise in this country.

The editorial follows:

THE WARD RULING

The thing that stands out in Judge Phillip L. Sullivan's ruling in the Montgomery Ward case is the unequivocal notice to Government officials that they may not take the law into their own hands and override the rights of citizens merely because, at the moment, it seems expedient or desirable to do so.

On this point Judge Sullivan, who was placed on the bench by President Roosevelt, declared: "The constitutional guaranties that protect the sacred rights, liberties, and property of American citizens, from the humblest to the most exalted, still remain inviolate. These rights may not be transgressed with impunity nor be disregarded because of expediency."

That is a reassertion of the concept that ours is a government of law, not of men. And it has an especial timeliness now because of the tendency of some administrative officials to distort the laws, or to stretch the statutory and constitutional powers of the President to cover the doing of whatever, in their judgment, needs to be done. This tendency is a dangerous one, and Judge Sullivan's ruling, whatever its fate on appeal, should have a thoroughly desirable restraining influence.

When that has been said, however, the fact remains that the decision may seriously undermine the none-too-stable machinery that has been set up to deal with wartime labor disputes. Chairman Davis, of the War Labor Board, says that, barring reversal of the decision or appropriate congressional action, the "whole plan of peaceful settlement of wartime labor disputes will collapse." It may be noted that Mr. Davis displayed no such alarm when James C. Petrillo, in a comparable situation, was permitted to defy the board and the President with impunity. The W. L. B. took that defiance in stride, and so did the President. But employer defiance, in their opinion, is another matter, and unfortunately there is at least some reason to believe that they are right.

If Montgomery Ward should remain immune to wartime controls, it seems reasonable to anticipate strikes that would spread into war plants. That ought not to be so if there were a proper respect for the law and the courts, but the probabilities are that the strikes would occur. There are irresponsible elements among labor, as there are among employers, who would exploit this ruling for their own selfish purposes, and at this juncture of the war we cannot afford to ignore that danger.

Judge Sullivan's ruling confirms, first, what was already established—that W. L. B. orders are merely informatory or at most advisory. There is no legal obligation on anyone to obey them. But beyond this he has also ruled that neither the War Labor Disputes Act nor the Constitution gives the President any power to seize the business properties of Montgomery Ward in the circumstances of this case.

The court's reasoning is persuasive, especially as to the invalidity of the steps taken under the disputes act. There remains, of course, the right of appeal and the Government undoubtedly will exhaust that remedy, being especially interested, presumably, in securing an authoritative ruling as to the extent of the President's wartime constitutional powers as Commander in Chief.

But so far as the Montgomery Ward matter is concerned, the more desirable remedy lies in an appeal to Congress. Throughout this proceeding the Government has stoutly maintained that Congress intended to grant power to seize an establishment like Montgomery Ward. If the Government was in earnest in that contention, the logical course, it would seem, would be to ask Congress to amend the law to remove all doubt as to the extent of the power granted.

Spain Is America's Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 22, 1945, I introduced House Resolution 100, expressing the will of Congress that this country should forthwith sever diplomatic relations with Franco Fascist Spain. Because I think it pertinent and pointed to explain the purposes underlying this resolution and the reasons justifying its introduction, I am inserting herein below, with the consent of my colleagues, a speech delivered by me on January 2, 1945, at Madison Square Garden, New York City.

This speech was given before an audience of 18,000 people. There is tremendous interest in the subject matter throughout the country. The Madison Square Garden mass meeting was sponsored by the Nation Associates, publishers of the weekly newspaper, the Nation, together with a group of civic, political, and labor organizations.

I am proud that I was invited to be the chief speaker at this notable gathering.

The speech is as follows:

The other night, late in the evening, I sat at the desk at my apartment in Washington, D. C., preparing my notes for this talk. My young son was home from his school in Virginia for the holidays. I thought, watching him, that he was fortunate to be well under military age, that at least he would not have to feel the brunt of this war as 11,000,000 other Americans are feeling it. I know that this is not supposed to be the way to think, but this is the way all fathers think of their sons these days.

And then, as I studied my notes, I wondered. Was my boy really fortunate? Could I truly tell him that this is, indeed, the last world war that will ever be waged? Could I tell him, in all honesty, that our generation was finally going to pass on to our sons what few other generations have ever left—a millennium of universal peace? Could I—with a possible third world war being generated in Spain today?

You know, the District of Columbia is not exactly the most cheerful place in which to be marooned for the holidays. It's every American's capital and no American's home. Believe it or not, that goes for Congressmen, too. I come from Tacoma, in the State of Washington, which is about as far away from New York as you can get and still be in the United States. It's an awfully long way from the District of Columbia, too. When you're away, you do things to try to recapture what you used to do at home. I picked up the old books my father used to read to us when I was a kid back in Tacoma. And a few minutes after my young son went off to sleep, I found something in one of these old books. I found myself reading the Old Testament, reading Jeremiah's Lamentations for another world which like ours today, had to pass through purgatory on earth.

And there I came to the nineteenth verse of the second chapter, and I read it again and again, and it was like a great voice from the past speaking to this world at war.

"Arise," pleaded Jeremiah, "Arise, cry out in the night! In the beginning of the watches pour out thine heart like water before the face of the Lord! Lift up thy hands toward Him for the life of thy young children, that cry out for hunger in the top of every street!"

Yes, this meeting tonight is a meeting of those Americans who can no longer be still. This is a meeting of those Americans who, seeing the world's great anguish and its grief, arise to cry out in the night. To cry out against the forces that made this war, against the forces who would bring upon our heads a Third World War.

Yours are the voices that must be heard in the halls of Congress, in the White House, in No. 10 Downing Street in London, in the Pardo Palace of Madrid, and in the guerrilla encampments in the hills that face Madrid. For the voices here tonight are the true voices of the American people, and these voices must be heard now, in a mighty cry—while there is still time to cry out into the night.

We meet tonight as allies of the democratic peoples of Spain, and we meet in a hall which echoed to the heroic words of the Spanish people during the years 1936 to 1939. Perhaps some of you still remember how, in 1936, the people of New York filled this very hall to greet the first delegation of spokesmen for the Popular Front Government of Spain. I remember only too clearly how these spokesmen, Mme. Isabella Palencia, Father Luis Sarasola, and Senor Marcelino Domingo, carried the message of the Spanish people to North America.

I recall how this pioneer delegation from embattled Spain pleaded for our aid; how for night after night they told new American audiences that the fighting in the streets of Madrid was the start of the Axis war against the free world; how they pledged that if we aided them then, the Spanish people would come to our side when we were attacked by their German and Italian invaders.

Later, to these Spanish voices, were added the voices of Americans who had gone to Spain to fight the Nazi monster, and who returned, wounded, to tell us of what they had seen. They, too, were voices crying in the night. The Spaniards and the Americans told us that if Madrid fell, Paris and London—and Pearl Harbor—were next. Here at Madison Square Garden, and at hundreds of similar meetings throughout the United States and Canada, the rafters rung with the cry of the Spanish Republic—the cry: "Make Madrid the Tomb of Fascism."

Perhaps our voices were not strong enough.

Before our eyes, we saw Madrid suffer another fate. As our friend, Allan Chase, wrote in one of his books on Spain, "Madrid, which was to have become the tomb of Fascism, became, instead, its womb."

I know that it is a hard thing to say, but these are hard times, when only cowards refuse to face facts. For the fate of Spain, we have no one to blame but ourselves.

We, who saw; we, who knew; we, who understood—did we really fight hard enough?

There is, of course, no honor high enough for those few thousand gallant American men and boys (they call them premature anti-Fascists in some nasty Washington circles today) who made their way to Spain and fought and suffered in the ranks of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. They more than did their best to stop the third world war before it hit their native land. Never in the history of our Nation has a group of Americans fought so heroically and received so little recognition from our own people as have the men of the Lincoln Brigade. I am

indeed moved tonight to know that among the organizations sponsoring this meeting is included the veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. They, of all Americans, did their share.

But what of the rest of us, the Americans who stayed home? We sometimes went to meetings for Spain on Friday, but we always went to the movies on Saturday and to the ball game on Sunday. Many of us even went through the motions of really doing our share; we signed petitions, we contributed a few dollars to the old North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, we bought a book or two, we even watched Gypsy Rose Lee strip for Spain at rallies run by the entertainment industry.

And then, when this proved to be not enough, we showered all of the blame for the Spanish tragedy on the appeasers. We blamed the Chamberlains and the Daladiers and the Hoares and the Bullits and the Dunns. What a convenient and easy way this was to absolve ourselves for our own sins.

The appeasers were—and are—all we claimed they were. Those who survive, at any rate. But our country happens to be a democracy, and because it is a real democracy, we have only ourselves to blame for the appeasement policies which led to this war, and for our present highly dangerous policies toward Axis Spain.

Our Congress is a pretty accurate barometer of what the people really want. Colonel McCormick found this out in Illinois recently, when nearly every one of his favorite candidates and incumbents were swamped by the people. Martin Dies found this out in Texas. Gerald Nye and Hamilton Fish felt the will of the people too. So did I. This year, running for the fifth time, I ran not only as one active in the liberal bloc in the House, but also as the leader of the congressional fight against Franco, and I am both proud and happy to tell you that I not only received one of the largest majorities of my political career, but also one of the largest majorities on the Pacific coast. One of my campaign issues was my promise to continue to fight for a break in relations with the Franco regime, and this is one promise the people of my district will not let me break, even if I should dream of weakening.

I have talked about Spain with many Congressmen, and believe me, they feel just the way you and I do about it. Let the people in their districts back home offer to back up their Congressmen, and you'll see how quickly even the most timid Representatives and Senators will stand up and aim a shaft at Hitler's weak Spanish underbelly. Let there be 100 meetings like this one all over the country during the next 6 weeks, and out of these meetings, let there come a flood of letters and post cards asking Members of Congress to fight for a break with Franco—and the appeasers will run for cover quicker than you can say "premature anti-Fascist."

The Congress is your servant. Through the Congress you can make your will felt. Through the Congress you can determine your own foreign policy. Don't just take my word for it. Try it, and see for yourself. If you don't try it, don't blame the State Department or the British Foreign Office or the Sultan of Sulu if the appeasement of Franco continues.

There is one thing you can do tonight, while this meeting is still fresh in your mind. You can write a letter to your own Congressman and ask him whether he intends to support the Coffee resolution for a break with Franco.

Last June in the seventy-eighth session of Congress, I introduced this resolution. And before this month is over, I give you my pledge that I will again put it before the brand new Seventy-ninth Congress. Some of you may have read the complete text of the resolution; if you haven't, drop me a line in Washington, and I'll send it to you. The resolution makes two proposals, and these I would like to read to you now. They read:

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the United States urge it upon the President of the United States that it is the will of the American people, expressed through their elected representatives, that the Government of the United States can speed our victory and guarantee a lasting peace by immediately breaking all diplomatic relations with the Nazi-Falangist Government of Spain; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the United States urge it upon the President of the United States that it is the will of the American people, expressed through their elected representatives, that the breaking of diplomatic relations with the Axis Government of Spain should be followed by the appointment of a military commission, which will be charged with the task of getting arms, ammunition, and medical supplies to the heroic republican guerrilla armies of Spain when their revolt, timed to weaken the Nazi armies in their moment of greatest crisis, creates in Spain one of the active and decisive battlefields of this global war."

Well, this resolution is now before your Congress. Does it express your sentiments? What are you going to do about backing it up?

I think that the program of this resolution is the minimum program on which all Americans can agree in relation to Spain. It is a program which, while it will aid the people of Spain, is primarily designed to aid and protect the people of the United States.

We have much more than an ordinary moral responsibility in Spain. Our military security, our political stability, and our economic well-being in the post-war world are all intimately tied up to the fate of Spain. Let Spain emerge from this war as a free, nonimperialistic, people's republic, and both our security and our markets to the South will not be threatened. Let Spain remain, in one guise or another, a government of the German cartels—and we face a third world war for the control of Latin America.

In the past 2 years, I have studied dozens of reports, prepared by Spaniards inside of Spain, and smuggled out via the Spanish republican underground. These reports, among other things, contain a detailed running account of how completely the German financiers and industrialists have taken over Spain.

The Germans control the coal and copper and mercury and iron and wolfram mines of Spain. The Germans control the shipbuilding industry in the Basque provinces. The Germans control the heavy industry of Catalonia. The Germans control the wine and olive industries of the southern provinces. The Germans have been building, without a let-up, chemical and pharmaceutical factories all over Spain since 1939. The Germans have built fish fertilizer factories in the Spanish Canaries, canning plants in Bilbao, and arms factories in dozens of Spanish towns and cities.

Until the liberation of France, Spanish industry and Spanish agriculture poured its wealth into the German war machine via trains that crossed France. Today German war factories on Spanish soil are sending arms and munitions via Spanish ships to those German garrisons still fighting us in French coastal areas under their control. What of tomorrow?

I'll tell you what will happen in that tomorrow, when the Germans are driven out of the French ports and when the armies of the United Nations finally crush the Nazi monster in Berlin itself. Tomorrow the German cartel masters, the men who inflicted Hitler and nazism upon the world, will find themselves back in business in Spain—unless we help the Spanish people throw them into the sea.

Spain is a rich country. Spain is an industrial Midas, whose lavish resources have never really been tapped. Spain has everything a nation needs with which to forge a powerful industrial bastion. Spain is rich in potential hydroelectric power, has plenty of sea water—and the combination of electric power and sea water equals magnesium, the key to the light-metals industry of the future.

A post-war Spain controlled by the German cartels would be a powerful industrial and political base of operations against one main target: The United States of America. Through Spain, the German cartels would strive to keep us out of the Latin-American markets by fostering the rise of fascism and the continuance of the economic status quo in South America.

The spread of fascism in Latin America means the rise of militarism. Also, since fascism is, when you get right down to it, the declaration of war against the common man at home, fascism in South America means the continuance of poverty. Great Americans like Henry Wallace and the late Wendell Willkie talked themselves hoarse in their campaigns to tell us all that depressions hit us when our poorer neighbors lack the money to buy what we have to sell. I don't think that I have to belabor this point for you. The whole purpose of our good-neighbor policy is to raise the standards of living in Latin America—and not for completely unselfish motives. There's nothing really wrong with enlightened selfishness, when it produces results like the good-neighbor policy, and Teheran, and Dumbarton Oaks, and, let's not forget it, lend-lease.

But the Fascists of Latin America can't afford to see democracy develop at home, can't afford to see the common man get a more just return for his labors. It is with the wealthy and powerful Fascists of Latin America that the German cartel masters, who control Spain, have been and are today cementing alliances.

The guiding genius of the battle for Spain, the man who planned and ran its military and political strategy, was Nazi Gen. Wilhelm von Faupel. He is today the real ruler of Spain, the man who hands the puppet Franco his orders from the Nazi high command. In 1938, during the Pan American Conference in Lima General von Faupel traveled from the Spanish front to Berlin, where he delivered a speech before the German Academy. And in this speech General von Faupel, of Hitler's Wehrmacht, minced no words. He said:

"A victory for Fascist Spain will cement our relations with Latin America and will be a rude shock to the good-neighbor policy of President Roosevelt."

General von Faupel knew what he was talking about. And so do the unfortunate people of Argentina and Bolivia and other Nazi-Falangist infested nations of Latin America.

We at home have made tremendous technological advances during the war years. An individual worker can now produce about 40 percent more goods than he could before the war. When the war ends we will need expanded foreign markets, and particularly expanded Latin-American markets, as desparately as we now need to see the end of fascism. Our only hope for increased markets in Latin America is the free and unhampered development of democracy below our borders.

This is the one thing which the Germans who control Spain today aim to prevent. This is one thing they will be able to prevent if they retain their control of Spain.

There are many ways open for the Germans to retain their control of Spain when the war ends. It is quite obvious by now that they will have to drop Franco. This traitor has served their purpose; today the name of Francisco Franco is repulsive, even to men of the stripe of the former Samuel

Hoare, now Lord Templewood, Lord knows why.

But there are other men who call themselves Spaniards who would suit the Germans quite as well as fronts for their Spanish enterprise. There is a young man named Juan de Bourbon, the scion of a notorious and profligate family. He can read and write, and, as proof that he can write, I call your attention to the fact that he signed his name to card No. 7 in the Falange Party when that Iberian branch of the Nazi Party was in its infancy.

This Mr. Bourbon, who has no visible means of income, was the son of an unemployed king. His late father used to be King of Spain, but in April 1931 the good people of Spain went to the ballot boxes and their collective decision went something like this: "Alfonso, until today you've been both a bum and a king, but from today on you're just a bum." If there are any historians here tonight I think they will back me up.

Well, so the Bourbons, what with Poppa losing his job, went on the town with the rest of the international unemployed royalty set. Every once in a while they'd meet in Biarritz, or Paris, and while none of them—the Hapsburgs and the Bourbons and the rest—toiled or spun or even tried to earn an honest dollar, they'd discuss the problems of the world. They'd say to each other, over their champagne and caviar, that this is one hell of a world, and that some day strong men like Hitler and Mussolini would put an end to the silly idea that the common peoples have the right to determine their own destinies. And on that day, the Bourbons and the rest of the international white-trash set would sigh, on that day they could go home and go on being kings again.

Well, I know something about the Spanish people. I know that if the Germans ever do bring young Bourbon to Spain and put him on the throne, Lloyds of London is going to take an awful shellacking if they issue any insurance on Mr. Bourbon's life.

There are safer ways for the Germans to hang on in Spain. We have seen two examples of what I mean in action recently—in Greece and in Belgium. There may be others.

The Germans are clever enough to know that if they create an ostensibly anti-Fascist government in Spain, then their control is most secure. Who will head this government? There are some traitors, men who deserted the Spanish Republic when the war started in 1936 for example, who might come forward as "neutrals" who will offer to prevent an "extremist" regime in Spain. And what do they really mean by an "extremist regime"? That's easy—a true and honest republic of the people, which will confiscate the holdings of the Germans and their Falangist collaborators inside of Spain.

The Germans fear the Spanish people; they will seek at all costs to avoid a free election of the people. The Spanish underground has given the Germans good cause for grave alarm.

The Spanish underground, with its guerrilla armies, its saboteurs, its newspapers, its radios, and its intelligence services, is a very real thing. Many a British flier, whose plane was shot down over Spanish ports while he was chasing a Nazi submarine into a Spanish base, owes his life and his freedom today to those units of the Spanish underground who found him and healed his wounds and smuggled him back to the British lines. The widow of many a German sentry, killed while guarding a Nazi radio station along the Spanish coast, knows that the Spanish underground is not the myth certain exiles have tried to say it was.

If this war has taught us anything, it is that the peoples' movements of resistance in all the occupied lands of Europe and Asia can neither be denied nor ignored. The Spanish resistance groups are no exception. They are bearing the brunt of the fighting against the Germans now; they will have to bear the bitterest part of the fighting and the dying in the battles once again to establish in Spain the Republic of the people's choice. It is for this reason that, in my resolution, I asked that we follow up our break in diplomatic relations with Axis Spain by sending arms and munitions to the fighting men and women of the Spanish underground.

During the Spanish phase of this World War, the armies of the Spanish Republic were fighting our battle. Instead of selling them arms, we weakened them by an arms embargo that denied them arms. One of the results of our mistake was the spread of the war to Pearl Harbor.

Today, the same armies of the Spanish Republic, formed as guerrilla units of the Spanish underground, are still fighting our battle. We must not repeat our former and fatal mistake. We must send them arms when they beseech our help. If we fail them again, one of the results of our new mistake will be a third world war fought primarily in the Western Hemisphere.

Can we shirk this responsibility? Can we sit still and let it happen again?

Friends, the job is in your hands. Arise and cry out into the night. This time you must make your voices heard, you must make them ring in the Halls of Congress until every Representative from every district, every Senator from every State, will know that we, the American people, are determined to erase the crime of Spain. And when they hear your voices, they will be eager, and able, to obey your mandate.

The New Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following brief editorial about the duties and responsibilities that face this present Congress is so concise and to the point that I include it as a part of my remarks for the serious consideration of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I agree fully with the sentiments expressed in this editorial and promise on my part to be guided, in my attitude toward public questions and in my vote upon the same, by the thought expressed in this editorial:

THE NEW CONGRESS

To the Members of the new Congress we should like to offer not good luck, but good wishes, and the hope that they will employ wisely the considerable accumulation of intelligence which they represent.

Certainly none of our preceding 78 Congresses has had greater need of wisdom, high ethics, and responsible statesmanship. No other Congress has had greater need to approach its tasks with the proud but humbling consciousness that it is an instrument of the whole people and an equal partner with the President in Government.

Too often in the past that partnership has been interpreted as complete subservience to White House wishes by one group, and opposition for opposition's sake by another. But the job facing the Seventy-ninth Congress calls for considerably higher motives.

The people have made their wishes reasonably clear as to what sort of a world and country they want after the war. The administration is likewise making clear what is required of the people in war if those wishes are to be attained. It is the duty of the new Congress to translate those mandates into laws and recommendations through thinking that is national and international rather than regional; and American rather than partisan.

Traffic in Marihuana Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Chief Coordinator of Enforcement of the Treasury Department, Elmer L. Irey, in a statement just issued shows marihuana peddlers are increasing. He further describes the activities of Treasury agents in apprehending offenders.

Under permission granted me, I include this release as part of my remarks:

Traffic in marihuana became an increasingly serious enforcement problem during 1944, Secretary Morgenthau reported today, with seizures of the weed by Treasury narcotics and customs officers larger than in the previous year, and the illicit traffic in some instances reaching the proportions of well-financed national and international conspiracies.

Reports to Elmer L. Irey, Coordinator of Enforcement, indicated that New York City was the focal point of this traffic, with Treasury agents breaking up four major gangs supplying the eastern metropolis. Numerous arrests were made in other population centers, some seizures being measured in terms of many pounds, rather than in ounces, as is ordinarily the case.

Captures of opium and its derivatives declined moderately, but a reappearance of heroin in moderate quantities was reported. This prepared drug has been practically nonexistent in underworld channels in recent years.

But while opium seizures were declining, the Treasury officers still were called upon to match wits against international gangsters operating against a back-drop of double-crossing and violence that accounted for at least two murders. One of the most spectacular incidents involved a Bureau of Narcotics undercover agent who at great personal danger infiltrated himself into a remnant of the old Black Toni Parmagini gang in California. The Treasury man found himself actually chosen as overnight custodian of a fortune in dope by gangsters who feared a double cross from fellow conspirators on the distribution end.

The officer ruefully saw the drugs turned over to the buyers the next morning, unable to act lest he expose the Government's hand and enable the mob leaders to escape. His feelings were mollified 2 days later, when he learned that fellow agents, following through, had quietly arrested the runner as he stepped from a train in Chicago, the drugs in a suitcase. With the evidence gathered by the undercover officer and other customs and narcotics agents, the leaders subsequently were rounded up. Two of the mobsters drew 10- and 20-year prison terms.

The dangers inherent in marihuana use were demonstrated dramatically during the

year with the sentencing of Carl Murphy, an Oklahoma City, Okla., bellhop, to 10 years in prison for the slaying, while under the influence of the weed, of a Federal building guard. The slaying culminated a series of brawls in which Murphy participated, and of which he professed to have no recollection after the effects of the weed wore off. Four others were sentenced in this case as the suppliers of marihuana.

H. J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, said this case is but one of many in the files of the Bureau that involve crimes of violence carried out by persons under the influence of the drug. He warned against complacency on the part of the public toward the marihuana problem. He pointed out that while not all persons always display violent reactions to marihuana, there are many instances of persons who, like Murphy, appear of mild and harmless temperament, displaying maniacal characteristics after using the weed.

Large quantities of the weed were seized in the four cases involving gangs supplying New York City. Sentences ranging from 15 months to 4 years in prison were given four persons convicted of selling marihuana to workmen in four different Detroit war plants.

The joint customs-narcotics investigation in which the undercover agent figured prominently had its origin some 2 years ago. In May 1942 narcotics agents started looking into activities of the so-called One Hundred and Seventh Street Mob, formerly headed by "Lucky" Luciano, and composed of some of the most notorious hoodlums in New York City. Several arrests were made in eastern States, and it was learned that certain members of this gang had gone to the Bahamas in an effort to obtain drugs. They were not particularly successful due to double-crossing proclivities of some of the group.

This phase of the investigation resulted in indictment in New York of 17 persons.

Since it appeared the major supply source of the gang was Mexican opium and heroin, and the New Yorkers were dealing with members of the old Black Toni Parmagini gang in California, the Treasury officers shifted their emphasis to the west coast. Willie Levin, former partner of Parmagini, and just released from a 17-year prison sentence, was the first big game snared and was given a new 10-year sentence for fresh narcotics trafficking. Several lesser lights were nabbed.

The seller in Mexico was identified as Enrique Diarte, a notorious smuggler. Two of his runners were arrested and 20 ounces of pure heroin seized, a rare catch of great value in illicit channels. Diarte kept to the Mexican side of the border; but in November 1944 was found near Tijuana, murdered. He had been shot through the heart, his throat cut, and his skull crushed. Mexican officers arrested Frank Drbe, one-time associate of Diarte, himself a notorious narcotics smuggler, and charged him with the slaying.

Previously, one of the principal California members of the gang apparently had been taken for a ride under bizarre circumstances. This hoodlum, known as "Big Nose" Charlie LaGaipa had been under intense surveillance by Treasury agents. However, during an interval of a few hours when this surveillance was incomplete due to the manpower shortage handicapping the enforcement agencies, Charlie disappeared. Police subsequently found his automobile, abandoned, with traces of human tissue plastered on the instrument panel. No further trace of him has been found.

In the meantime, the Italian-speaking Treasury agent and his fellow officers had been busy assembling evidence. The transaction witnessed by the undercover officer involved 622 ounces of smoking opium and 8 ounces of heroin. The runner taking it east, Joseph Tocco, alias "The Eye," was arrested in Chicago, and the dope seized, one of the largest such consignments taken in recent years. He was removed to California, tried, and sentenced to 10 years imprisonment, and Sam Maugeri, his supplier, was sentenced to 20 years in prison. One member of the ring still is at large.

Other joint narcotics-customs investigations broke up large-scale drug-smuggling gangs operating through Phoenix and Nogales, Ariz., and one channeling dope from El Paso to New Jersey. The Government of Mexico is cooperating with United States officers in combating this traffic, and made numerous arrests within its own borders.

Congressional Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer an editorial urging the wisdom of properly handled broadcasting of congressional and legislative proceedings.

Senator PEPPER and I have introduced identical bills in the Senate and House of Representatives, which would effectuate this objective.

Because sentiments contained in the editorial are of profound interest to the country, I am inserting herewith such editorial, which is as follows:

SOLONS ON THE AIR

For many years Ward Coley, of the Seattle Building Service Employees Union, has been an indefatigable worker for a pet project—the broadcasting of legislative proceedings.

Within recent weeks there have come two evidences that his campaign is beginning to bear fruit.

One is the introduction of resolutions in both Houses of Congress which propose, in brief, that each House shall set up the apparatus for recording all speeches and other proceedings, and make these recordings available, at cost, to any radio stations which desire to use them.

The more recent step is the introduction of a bill at Olympia, calling for the direct broadcasting of proceedings of the State legislature.

It is probable that most citizens will continue to get their information about what is happening in Congress and in State legislatures through newspapers. This fact should not interfere with the desire of any groups or individual citizens to hear exactly what happens when a measure in which they are particularly interested is under consideration. And daily attendance in the galleries, in both Washington and Olympia, is evidence that many persons are interested in getting first-hand views of the general course of legislation.

There are many technical and other difficulties to be surmounted before complete broadcasting of legislative proceedings can be arranged, either from Washington or Olympia. But undoubtedly there is much more than a germ of merit in the proposal. Whatever form the development may take (and there are many possibilities short of complete broadcasts) the tendency will be to interest more people in the details of legislation—and to make legislators more careful of what they do and say, and thus improve the quality of legislation.

Black-Market Traders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the various Treasury Department agencies have been most active in apprehending black-market traders.

Under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks a statement issued by Chief Coordinator of Enforcement, Elmer L. Irey. It follows:

Treasury agencies during 1944 struck at black-market traders in war-scarce commodities, effecting some 1,000 arrests of persons charged with violations in which the Department has an enforcement interest.

The now virtually smashed black market in liquor, the counterfeiting of ration stamps, the illegal diversion of sugar, and attempts to export controlled commodities illegally were particular targets of Treasury investigators working in close cooperation with the Office of Price Administration, the Foreign Economic Administration, and other wartime agencies.

Secretary Morgenthau, summarizing the year's activities of his investigative units, cited these highlights in the Department's drive against wartime chiselers:

The United States Secret Service, assisting the Office of Price Administration, developed evidence resulting in more than 200 arrests in ration-coupon-counterfeiting cases, chiefly gasoline and sugar, and seized printing plants and bogus coupons representing many millions of gallons of motor fuel. The Service made more than 1,800 arrests in Government check-forgery cases, and its effective work against money counterfeiters brought losses to the public from bogus money to a new low.

The Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, also working with O. P. A., made nearly 4,000 investigations of liquor price-ceiling violations, resulting in indictments against 650 persons and seizure of black-market liquor worth $340,000. The Unit in cooperation with O. P. A. also investigated diversion of sugar, running into millions of pounds, into illicit distilling, and seized nearly 8,000 stills, mostly small plants in the Southeastern States' moonshine area.

The Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue instituted investigations into income-tax evasion by black-market operators who neglected to report their illegal gains to the Government. In other tax investigations during the year, the unit turned up a record-breaking potential gain to the Government in the form of recommended additional assessments totaling $73,000,000 and reported conviction of 70 persons in criminal cases.

Customs officers at ports and borders made numerous arrests involving seizures of restricted goods, and smashed a large-scale attempt to drain badly needed used car stocks into the lucrative Mexican market.

Foreign Funds Control Investigative Section continued to ferret out assets of enemy and "black list" nationals concealed in this country. In one case freezing $280,000 sent into the country under evasive circumstances by a resident of Turkey; and in another case blocking further transactions in previously unreported assets totaling $500,000 belonging to a group residing in France.

Frank J. Wilson, Chief of the Secret Service, reported to Elmer L. Irey, Coordinator of Enforcement, that his agents participated in one bogus gasoline coupon case involving

a potential 20,000,000 gallons, and another in which coupons representing more than 15,000,000 gallons were seized.

The larger haul was made at Woodside, N. Y., when Secret Service officers and O. P. A. agents seized a complete plant for counterfeiting gasoline ration coupons, including a printing press, plates, 45,000 sheets of paper, and large quantities of partially completed stamps. Three persons were arrested.

The other case also resulted in capture, in New York City, of a printing press, plates, and equipment, including facilities for making shoe coupons as well as gasoline coupons. Two alleged operators of the plant were arrested. A similar enterprise broken up in Meriden, Conn., by the Secret Service, O. P. A. agents, and police involved a potential million-gallon diversion, and brought a year and a half in prison for the principal.

With the arrest of 11 persons in Buffalo, Rochester, and Syracuse, N. Y., the Service nipped in the bud a plot to flood the country with counterfeit $5 Internal Revenue automobile-use stamps and counterfeit gasoline coupons. This case featured effective use of undercover agents who worked their way into the gang. The counterfeiting plant and equipment were seized.

Stewart Berkshire, head of the Alcohol Tax Unit, reported that the courts had dealt out heavy fines and in some cases substantial prison terms in black-market liquor cases coming to trial during the year. Convictions already have been obtained in cases involving nearly 400 individuals. The Equitable Trading Corporation, New York City, and Hyman Karlin, owner, were fined $100,000, and Karlin sentenced to 30 days in jail. Distribution of large quantities of whisky in the South and in the State of Ohio at above-ceiling prices was alleged.

Fines totaling $55,000 were levied against the Connecticut Importing Co. and three individuals of Hartford, on charges of falsification of records in the disposition of liquor.

Isidore Fried, general sales manager of the Hercules Liquor Products Co., Brooklyn, received an 18-month sentence and was fined $56,000.

In Wilkes County, N. C., one of the most prolific moonshine counties in the country, O. P. A. and Alcohol Tax investigators traced 2,000,000 pounds of sugar that had been obtained illegally by merchants during a 15-month period and diverted to illicit distillers. Seven persons were convicted and fines were assessed totaling $14,200, with several suspended from trading in sugar for various periods.

Similar suspensions were invoked against 11 merchants in northern Georgia for diversions effected by counterfeit sugar stamps.

In Miami, Fla., in December, 8,000 pounds of sugar, 3 trucks, 2 trailers, and an automobile were seized and 7 persons were arrested for having obtained sugar on counterfeit stamps. This sugar was intended for illicit distilleries in northern Georgia.

In Anderson, S. C., 3 persons drew prison sentences of a year to a year and a half for handling counterfeit sugar stamps. In Hagerstown, Md., 3 persons were convicted on similar charges. In Cocke County, Tenn., moonshiners had paid 50 cents each for counterfeit sugar stamps, and had thus purchased 31,000 pounds of sugar. Sixteen persons, including several merchants, were convicted. A similar case in Cookeville, Tenn., involved 10,000 pounds of sugar and brought 3 arrests.

The Secret Service joined O. P. A. and alcohol tax agents in investigating sugar-stamp counterfeiting activities.

Culminating one of the largest illicit distilling conspiracies of recent years, Charles Tourine, alias "The Blade," and 25 codefendants were sentenced at Newark, N. J., to a total of 35 years in prison.

The volume of non-tax-paid liquor traffic, as measured by the amount of mash seized at stills, increased 57 percent over 1943, but was far less than the years prior to the effective date of sugar rationing.

Premium Price or Subsidy Plan for Copper, Lead, and Zinc Pays Nation Dividend of 1,000 Percent on Metal Subsidy Investment—Savings to Government and Taxpayers in 3 Years Amount to $2,000,000,000—Government Outlay Less Than $175,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when a Government agency invests its funds and gets them back with interest, that is good news. When an agency makes an investment upon which the return is tenfold or a dozenfold, that is either a miracle or signifies management and foresight of the highest type.

Such a happening has taken place, however, and it is of that investment that I wish to speak today. I point with pride at the results of the premium price or subsidy plan for nonferrous metals, specifically copper, lead, and zinc.

This premium price or subsidy plan of the administration's for metals was initiated in February 1942 as a joint action of three Government agencies—the Metals Reserve Company, the Office of Price Administration, and the predecessor agency of the War Production Board, the Office of Production Management. This program it is estimated has saved this Nation and its taxpayers the stupendous sum of approximately $2,000,000,000; and has done this in return for a cash investment by the Government of less than $175,000,000.

SUBSIDIES PAID NOT LOSSES BUT PROFITS

The other day, in perusing the last report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, I was struck by a statement which described the subsidy payments made by the Metals Reserve Company to mining companies as a loss suffered by the agency. I searched for the story behind this statement and soon came to the conclusion that it should have classified these payments, not as a loss, but as a partial profit to the Government on its investment in this direction. The conservative bookkeeping procedure of the R. F. C. would probably not permit it to set this item up on the books as an asset, but, in truth, these payments by that office, which aggregate nearly $175,000,000, are not a loss but a profit to the Government.

In order to satisfy my curiosity on this point and to secure sufficient data to justify my claim that this is a profit and not a loss, I have checked with officials of both the mining industry and the Government and have developed the following very gratifying information:

First. The premium price plan for nonferrous metals has saved the Government and the Nation a direct, probable recovery of $402,000,000 in the last 3 years in the cost of these raw materials alone. This is brought about by using these subsidy payments in lieu of an over-all price increase for these metals which would have otherwise been required.

Second. In addition, a further sum, variously estimated between $1,500,000,000 and $2,000,000,000, has been saved in the cost of the finished and civilian products manufactured from these three metals.

Third. In World War No. 1, the average price of copper in 1917, a peak year of production and use, was in excess of 29 cents per pound. Today, copper costs us 12 cents per pound despite the much greater demand for the metal in the gigantic war effort of today.

Fourth. Lead and zinc, though used in smaller quantities than copper, sell today at correspondingly lower prices than they did in World War No. 1.

Fifth. Our imports of copper and other non-ferrous metals cannot command higher prices than those permitted for our domestic production.

Sixth. Strikes, work stoppages and labor disputes in the mines and smelters which produce these three subsidized metals are a thing of the past—ample proof that labor, industry and Government can work hand in hand for the war effort whenever sensible formulas are devised and put into effect which protect the interest of all three parties.

I have it on the highest authority from leaders in the industry and in Government that this particular program has served to prevent which might have well been inflation of the most explosive type in the mining and smelting industry. Without this program, I am told, we would not have been able to avoid serious wage disputes, crippling production shortages and all of the uncertainty which accompanies a situation where adequate supplies of critical materials cannot be ascertained and counted on in advance of actual use.

CONSERVATIVE FIGURES SHOW ENORMOUS SAVINGS

At my request, the Office of Price Administration has prepared some charts on this subject. One of these tabulations shows the actual amount of premiums disbursed by the Government in connection with the production of each one of these three metals; the other tabulation shows the provable, computable savings to the Nation—on a conservative basis—in reference to the metals themselves before use for fabrication purposes. I feel that these charts are conservatively computed because, for example, 17 cents per pound is used as the possible comparative price which copper might have sold for in the absence of this premium plan whereas, during the last war, copper actually sold as high as 37 cents a pound during 1917 and averaged, as stated, more than 29 cents a pound during that year. If we had used the 1917 average figures the estimated savings of today

would run into many, many billions of dollars.

I endeavored also to have prepared tabulations which would show the savings to the Nation in the cost of finished products which are made from these three metals, but found that the preparation of that additional data would involve untold research, much time of valuable employees, and would impose too great a burden on industry at this time. However, from responsible sources in both industry and Government, I get information which convinces me that the savings to both governmental and civilian purchasers of these finished products is at least $1,500,000,000. Beyond this, there is the additional saving in scrap metal costs which follow the lower costs of the basic metals themselves.

METAL COST IN 45,000-TON BATTLESHIP

Perhaps the most graphic example I can give of the vast savings which accrue because of this program is shown in the case of the cost of the metal which goes into a 45,000-ton battleship. One of these fighting monsters, for example, contains 1,535,000 pounds of copper or copper products, 2,746,000 pounds of lead or lead products, and 210,200 pounds of zinc or zinc products. In addition, the steel or steel products used in the construction of the vessel require an investment of 63,000 tons of carbon steel, alloy steel, and heavy armor plates.

If we desire to compare the cost of these metals to us today with their cost during World War No. 1, we find the following:

Forty-five-thousand-ton-battleship example

	World War No. 1 cost	World War No. 2 cost
Copper (1,535,000 pounds)	$448,066.50	$184,200.00
Lead (2,746,200 pounds)	254,033.50	178,603.00
Zinc (210,200 pounds)	28,902.50	17,341.50
Steel (63,000 tons)	6,564,600.00	2,532,600.00
Total	7,295,602.50	2,912,744.50

Thus, because of this subsidy to copper, lead, and zinc producers and because of the lower cost of steel under present price-control regulations, the Government is able to buy these essential metals and metal products today at a cost of 40 percent of what they might cost if prices of World War No. 1 prevailed today.

COPPER SUBSIDY

When World War No. 2 commenced, copper was a very critical material. The three copper-producing companies that were producing practically all the copper could well afford to continue to produce copper for 12 cents per pound. There were a lot of copper mines, however, that could be opened up and more copper produced if 20 or 25 or 30 cents per pound could be paid instead of the 12 cents.

Therefore, the Government did not only what was good sense but good business when it adopted the policy of freezing the price of copper at 12 cents per pound to all companies that could produce it for that amount, and only allowed the increased price to those operating high-cost mines where it was absolutely necessary to get copper production. In this way the Government caused copper production to be increased about 10 percent, which was all that it was possible for it to be increased, by paying the high price in only those cases where there was a high cost of operation. The same thing was done in reference to lead and zinc.

Although the price of many commodities have increased during this war, the price of the principal things, like steel, aluminum, plate glass, cement, and other items, have not increased one cent a ton in 5 years up to the end of 1944. By reason of these prices being frozen, it has saved the American taxpayers tens of billions of dollars. In fact, if we had paid the same prices for things necessary for the Government to buy and to use in this war as were paid during World War No. 1, when we had no price controls, it would have cost the Government $80,000,000,000 more during this war up to the end of December 1944. In other words, if prices had not been frozen or held down, the national debt today would be $80,000,000,000 more than it is.

The interest on this $80,000,000,000 for 1 year at average Government rates is more than enough to pay the entire cost of the stabilization and price-control programs since war was declared. In addition to this, the consumers of America have saved more than $50,000,000,000.

Few of us have stopped to realize the magnificent job which has been done in the field of this single industry in the Government's drive to ward off inflation. If the Office of Price Administration had never done anything but confine its efforts to the devising of this premium price plan for metals, it has justified its existence many times over. The savings to the Government and to the Nation as a whole under the operations of this particular subsidy program have been sufficient to date to reimburse the Government for the operating costs and expenses of a score of O. P. A.'s.

In conclusion, I should like to submit the two tables prepared for me in this connection by the Office of Price Administration. These tables are self-explanatory and are as follows:

TABLE I.—*Savings from premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc (production, cost, and savings data)*

	Production (tons)	Cost at present ceiling prices	Premiums paid	Total cost	Total cost at premium price levels	Savings
1942:						
Copper	988,094	$237,142,560	$10,301,645	$247,444,205	$335,951,960	$88,507,755
Lead	452,533	58,829,290	4,381,293	63,210,583	83,718,605	20,508,022
Zinc	696,248	114,880,920	11,202,771	126,083,691	153,174,560	27,090,869
Total		410,852,770	25,885,709	436,738,479	572,845,125	136,106,646
1943:						
Copper	1,090,795	261,790,800	24,723,528	286,514,328	370,870,300	84,355,972
Lead	453,113	58,904,690	10,219,037	69,123,727	83,825,805	14,702,178
Zinc	744,196	122,792,340	33,255,812	156,048,152	204,653,900	48,605,748
Total		443,487,830	68,198,377	511,686,207	659,350,105	147,663,898
1944:						
Copper	972,000	233,280,000	24,800,964	258,080,964	330,480,000	72,399,036
Lead	409,953	53,293,890	13,547,147	66,841,037	75,841,305	9,000,268
Zinc	715,808	118,008,320	41,986,205	160,094,525	196,847,200	36,752,675
Total		404,682,210	80,334,316	485,016,526	603,168,505	118,151,979

NOTES

Production figures are from Bureau of Mines reports.

Cost at present ceiling prices is computed by multiplying production, converted to pounds, by ceiling prices of 12 cents for copper, 6½ cents for lead, 8¼ cents for zinc.

Premiums paid are computed on the basis of production data. The figures given are somewhat greater than Metals Reserve Company figures which are based on disbursements. The difference between the 2 sets of figures arises mainly because disbursements necessarily are made some time after the production for which they are paid. Furthermore, quota adjustments are made effective as of the first of the month in which application for adjustment is received, so that the "liability" for premium payments at any date is generally larger than the actual disbursements made up to that date. The figures given for premiums paid in 1944 include estimates made by us for the months of November and December.

Total cost is the sum of cost at present ceiling prices and premiums paid.

Total cost at premium price levels is computed by substituting premium prices at appropriate levels for present ceiling prices. The premium levels used are: For copper, 17 cents throughout; for lead, 9¼ cents throughout; for zinc, 11 cents in 1942, 13¾ cents in 1943 and 1944. These prices are believed to be more appropriate than those corresponding to the highest levels of premium payments.

Savings are computed by subtracting the figures for actual total cost from the figures for total cost at premium-price levels.

TABLE II.—*Summary of premiums paid and savings*

	Copper		Lead		Zinc		Total	
	Premiums paid	Savings	Premiums paid	Savings	Premiums paid	Savings	Premiums paid	Savings
1942	$10,301,600	$88,507,800	$4,381,300	$20,508,000	$11,202,800	$27,090,900	$25,885,700	$136,106,700
1943	24,723,500	84,356,000	10,219,000	14,702,200	33,255,800	48,605,700	68,198,300	147,663,900
1944	24,801,000	72,399,000	13,547,200	9,000,300	41,986,200	36,752,700	80,334,300	118,152,000
Total	59,826,100	245,262,800	28,147,500	44,210,500	86,477,800	112,449,300	174,418,300	401,922,600
Grand total in a round figure								402,000,000

The Day We Celebrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "The Day We Celebrate," before the New England Society of Charleston, S. C., Friday evening, December 22, 1944, by Alexander Guerry, D. C. L., vice chancelor and president of the University of the South:

"The central danger to the world today is that the barbarian will cut the web of history," wrote Herbert Agar in his last book, A Time for Greatness. At that time there was real danger that this would come about, for at that time it did seem that victory for Germany was more than a possibility as the armed might of the Nazis appeared to be almost invincible. And if the barbarian had won, certainly he would have cut the web of history.

What did Agar mean by this statement? The answer is clear and definite. The Nazis would cut the web of history by destroying all sense of values, all the great traditions and concepts of the human race, all the principles which have guided and governed the lives of men, and all the ideals for the realization of which man has struggled since the beginning of time.

Thus the Nazis would separate the present and the future from the past and would build a new civilization and a new order of things upon the abandonment and betrayal of truth and upon the destruction of the best and finest in human life. Without a doubt, if the Nazis had won or if they were to win, the world would live by a new code and our ideas of integrity, unselfishness, consideration for others, the dignity of life, liberty, justice, and right would be discredited and tossed aside. The world of today would be, therefore, different from the world of yesterday to a far greater degree morally than the world of the twentieth century is different from the world of the primitive man.

Agar does not suggest, of course, that the past binds or should bind the present and the future. This would be an unmitigated misfortune. But Mr. Agar knows, as all thoughtful men know, that the stream of history and the stream of truth and experience are the same and that out of his experience down through the ages and from the truth he has learned during the centuries, man may build the good life, a just, free, and enduring society. Certainly truth and experience give man the only opportunity, or to put it in different words, certainly without truth and experience man has no opportunity to achieve this goal.

There is, of course, little danger now that the barbarian, the Nazi, or the Fascist will cut the web of history. But there are other ways by which the web of history can be cut than by violent destruction on the part of victorious German armies and their defiance and hatred of the moral code, of all ideals and principles, and of truth itself. A people can cut the web of history by turning from the lessons of history, by forgetting or by being or remaining ignorant of the history and experience of men, by abandoning or forgetting the ideals and principles by which they have lived, by forsaking truth, and by attempting to build their social order on chance rather than on experience and the wisdom and faith and vision that come from experience and truth. This danger exists particularly in times of difficulty, uncertainty, and strife.

The day we celebrate is, of course, the day of the landing of the Pilgrims upon the shores of New England at Plymouth, Mass., on December 22, 1620. The event we celebrate is the daring journey of men, women, and children across the waters of the Atlantic Ocean, a fearful undertaking at that time. The significance of the day and event we acclaim is the realization that these Pilgrims on the Mayflower cared so deeply about the right to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience that they were willing to seek abodes in a new world across the sea in order to have for themselves the privilege of religious freedom. God was their creator, their father, their ruler, and their guide. It was of more concern to them to live in danger in America, according to the principles of life which were good and right in the eyes of God, than to remain in safety and comfort in England or Holland at a sacrifice of their convictions or their way of life.

If the people of this country ever cut the web of history to the extent that they forget or neglect the fundamental truths involved in the landing of the Pilgrims, we have brought upon ourselves the same sort of misfortune that Herbert Agar feared would befall mankind if Hitler won this war. We would be throwing away that which Mr. Agar thought might be taken away by force and terror. And any nation may do just that in the face of distress, perplexity, irritation, frustration, difficulty, or fear. It has happened before in the history of the countries of the world.

The fundamental truths in the story of the Pilgrims are the place of God in the life of man as his Creator and the importance of moral principle as the law by which men govern themselves and their affairs. These two ideas and ideals constitute actually the foundation and strength of a democracy and will constitute actually the foundation and strength of a free democracy and a free nation tomorrow and a thousand years from tomorrow, regardless of the changes that may take place.

The dignity of man, the dignity of life, is a concept which is the very essence of democracy. Freedom, justice, and the rights of man depend primarily upon the concept of the dignity of man and the dignity of life, the sacredness of individual human personality. As long as people believe in the inherent dignity of man and in the inviolability of man, they will preserve the rights of man. We may be sure of that.

As the rights of man rest upon the concept of the dignity of man, the concept of the dignity of man rests upon the conviction that men are the sons of God, that man is created by Almighty God in His image and is endowed by his Creator with a dignity and sacredness of life and, therefore, with certain inalienable rights. Take away the belief that man is of divine origin and that his life is linked with his divine Creator and gone is the lasting, permanent, and indestructible foundation of a sense of the dignity of man, gone is the security of the rights of man, such as freedom, justice, and opportunity, gone is the foundation of democracy.

The story of the Pilgrims, their journey to America, their life in the Colonies, their pioneering heroism and faith, their whole web of history should make us more aware and sure of a truth that ought to gleam with a brighter flame as the years go by.

In the novel, The Farm, by Louis Bromfield, one of the characters makes this statement: "There is the kingdom of God and the kingdom of man; and the latter in any form is a tyranny." And this is true because a nation must be ruled by spiritual ideals, by moral principle, by the moral law of God if it is to be free. The people of a country must seek to determine what they ought to do and what they will do out of their conscious knowledge and appreciation of moral principle.

The alternative to moral principle in the lives of men is might, force, the threat of force, expediency, or gain. Any of these results in tyranny. Right makes might, not might or power or influence or convenience and not the evil philosophy that the end justifies the means. A thing is never right because the state or a group or an individual does it or says it is right. A thing is never right solely because the end or objective appears good or worthy. An act is inherently right or wrong. When the measure of right ceases to be the ethical principle of right then freedom and all the ideals of democracy are in danger. Moral principle comes not from the state nor the group nor the individual but from God and is, therefore, above the state and the group and the individual and is never to be subordinated to them.

For this reason, a totalitarian state cannot be an ethical state, a state in which people try to determine out of their own conscience that which is right in principle and by principle, because the all-powerful state or the too powerful state considers that what the state does is the ultimate right and that the state should not yield or bend to principle if principle stands between the state and what it desires to do.

For this reason, an ethical state cannot be a totalitarian state. One is simply a contradiction of the other because people and nations are governed in the end by what is right as an ethical principle, by what is right as moral law, or by what is right as might or power or expediency or desire with regard both to internal affairs and international relations.

When the state of a group within the state grows so powerful or seemingly so powerful that whatever the state or group decides or decres or does becomes right in the eyes of the people, then the cause of democracy is lost and the cause of freedom is destroyed. Then the state becomes abruptly or gradually totalitarian or largely totalitarian and the government unlimited.

Government everywhere in the world is growing in the scope of its functions and activities. It is, therefore, increasingly difficult for government to be guided and restrained by moral principle or, for that matter, by political ideals that have their origin in moral principle as the great political ideals do. It is increasingly difficult for government to be guided and restrained by truth and experience because power and might in any and every sphere are impatient of any controls. All this applies to groups, parties, associations, blocs, organizations, and labor unions within the state, because with power and strength the group too often denies and defies any restraint. And this is happening too frequently in America today. Like the state, the group readily comes to believe that might is right, that the group has the right to do what it has the power to do and that the end justifies the means. And that, in the instance of the group as well as the state, is tyranny.

The guaranty of freedom, certainly one of the essential guaranties of freedom, in a democracy is moral principle, the ethical, moral ideal of right as the guiding influence by which men govern themselves and determine their affairs.

We are engaged in the greatest war in history to defeat aggressor nations, led by callous and cruel dictators, in order that we

might preserve freedom and justice in the world. We seem certain to win the war on the battlefields in spite of the present reverses. We want to make certain that as we win the war we shall preserve in the midst of the storm and stress of these days and the days to come a truly free America and a free world, the incentive and the reward of the battle itself for all of us and especially for our gallant, unselfish, and incredibly brave men and women on the firing line and in the combat zone.

One of the ways by which we can achieve this goal is to recall anew the story of the Pilgrims and to take our stand anew with the Pilgrims in the belief that man is the son of God and in the conviction that moral principle is and must be the governing influence for the citizen and the state. Thus the web of history gives us a stronger faith, a greater fortitude, and a clearer vision.

It is a great privilege for me to speak tonight to the New England Society of Charleston on the occasion of the society's one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary dinner. I thank Dr. Way, your distinguished president for the past 27 years, for the compliment of this invitation. Congratulations and felicitations to the New England Society of Charleston on the continuity of a comradeship for a century and a quarter which has preserved in a particular manner the common heritage of those of New England ancestry in this city and the great ideals and traditions of this heritage.

The man I loved and admired above all men was my father. It is an honor, therefore, for me to be in the city in which he lived for 21 years when he served the people of his church and the citizens of this State as bishop of South Carolina. And it is a source of infinite joy for me to see this evening so many of his devoted friends who meant so much to both my father and mother during the days they dwelt in your midst.

Booth Tarkington on Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present to the House and the country a very interesting and thoughtful article written by a distinguished constituent of mine, Booth Tarkington.

It deals with a question of grave importance which calls for careful consideration by every American citizen—the question of whether or not, after the war, we shall or shall not have military training of all of our youth.

The author's views on this subject were broadcast by Station WFBM at Indianapolis on January 28 under the auspices of the Indiana Committee for Victory.

Mr. Tarkington's article, entitled "Let's Look Before We Leap," is as follows:

LET'S LOOK BEFORE WE LEAP

(By Booth Tarkington)

The American people are now making a decision that will alter our lives after the war far more than most of us have yet realized. For that reason we all ought to think it over pretty carefully before we let our Congress take the final action for us in the belief that it is what we want.

Such action will change every American's life even more than the war itself has changed it, because the war is a temporary condition; but the decision before you is for a permanent condition—the annual peacetime conscription of all American boys.

No matter what we like to think, this will make the United States a permanently warlike country, with every male citizen a trained soldier ready for active duty so long as he is competently fit to bear arms. The Gallup and other polls show that over 60 percent of all our people favor this measure, and that about 80 percent of the women favor it. I believe that such majorities are the results of offhand judgments rather than of a cool examination of the subject. If, on the other hand, you have thought the subject over deliberately, the change it will make in all our old ways of living is so profound—yes, and so risky—that perhaps it would be better to think it over again.

We should understand that the measure for peacetime conscription is entirely separate from the National Service Act or the work-or-fight bill; in fact, is not concerned at all with the operations of this present war that we are fighting. Nor has it anything to do with our dealings with Germany and Japan after we have beaten them. The peacetime conscription proposal is to take effect after this war is over and peace has been enforced upon Germany and Japan. It is not proposed that the peacetime conscripts are to take part in the contemplated future disciplining of those two defeated nations.

No; the conscripts are to form what some of the proponents of the measure call a citizens' army trained to fight in future wars. All able-bodied American boys who have lived to reach the age of 18 are to be forced to take a year of thorough military training, either at that age or before they become 23 years old. For the training year they would be soldiers under professional officers and would undergo the same sort of training that our boys have now in wartime. This would apply to about a million American boys a year, more or less, though the number would increase as our population grows larger.

Of course, at the end of the year the trainee would not be through with his military obligation, or free to dispose of the whole of his next year as he might see fit, because, unless his first year of training is to be thrown away, he would of course be recalled during the second year for supplementary training or a refresher course which would have to last at least 6 weeks or 2 months to prevent the soldierly experience of the first year from being thrown away. The same would apply to the third, fourth, and fifth years after his first year's training.

Probably, to make the best military use of our youth in this manner the supplementary trainings will extend for 6 years. At the end of 6 years we should thus have a conscript army of 6,000,000 men under arms, including those in supplementary training, together with the many thousands of professional officers we should have to maintain continuously for the training and annual maneuvers.

As a large professional army, navy, and air force, the Marines and the National Guard are to be maintained in addition to the conscript armies, as well as all the factories needed to keep pace with the scientific changes in the manufacture of weapons to be used by a personnel of this immensity, only a mathematical expert could calculate precisely what insignificant fraction of every working citizen's earnings the total national debt would leave for him and his family to live upon.

This, however, is a minor consideration. We're all willing to let the Government take all of our earnings if it is necessary for the survival of our country. The question therefore is simply, Is peacetime conscription necessary for that survival?

Broadly speaking, two types of our citizens oppose each other on the question and both are sincere, earnest, and patriotic. Nearly all of our militarily minded people are for the measure. You can see how they would be, of course. I indeed mean no disrespect to anybody when I call your attention to the fact that every businessman thinks that everybody ought to learn more about business; every dancing teacher thinks everybody ought to learn to dance, and so forth. Similarly, nearly all college presidents and university and prep school and high-school faculties oppose the measure. The soldier believes in soldiering. The educator believes in education and doesn't want it interrupted to the damage of educational institutions. In making up our minds we can listen to both opposing parties; but I am neither a soldier nor a professor. I am only suggesting that we look, and think, before we leap.

Some people feel that peacetime conscription would increase the good health of all these able-bodied boys who are to be trained for war. Maybe it would; but let's go into that a little. I formerly lived in two conscript countries, France and Italy, and paid various visits to another conscript country, Germany. I can testify that in general the conscripts didn't look healthier than our free boys at home did, and I believe that our boys were the better athletes. I also remember how generally the French and Italians and Germans disliked conscription but thought they had to have it, firstly, to make other countries afraid to attack them, and, secondly, to make sure of winning the war when war did come. To avoid conscription many boys gave up their homes, left their homes, left their own countries and became free American citizens. Those a little older and at work worried a great deal about having to break into their careers with the annual supplementary trainings. When war came, of course, it didn't make them healthier; it killed a great many of them. The advocates of conscription think it will avoid war by scaring other countries; but suppose we scare some other country into being as warlike as we are. We should then be like two gunmen who say they don't want any trouble with each other but are ready for it. When that happens, the shooting happens, too. Fear makes hate; peaceful countries don't like to be scared; they hate warlike countries. Let's think about this: Who is it that we are going to scare so thoroughly with our peacetime military power? Not any South American countries; we're doing our best to make them like us. We know that the country we're to overawe couldn't be Britain or France or China or Italy or Germany or Japan. We are now engaged with our allies in making Germany and Japan militarily helpless for at least a generation; and that is to be done by means of forces now in existence and those already provided for by our selective service. Therefore, that leaves only Russia as the country to be scared—or fought, if we scare her too much.

The conscriptionists don't say they mean Russia, of course; but if we take a good look around we'll see that there isn't anybody else for us to become hugely militarized against. Russia doesn't want to fight us. Russia just wants to get back to work and be let alone; but, of course, Russia would know that she's the only country we could be doing all this preparedness against, and she can do a lot more of that than we can because she has a population 50,000,000 larger than ours and can be just as scientific and productive, too. We might carefully think over the usefulness of raising a conscript army for the really timid purpose of overawing our present ally, a tremendous

country that thus far would like to hope to keep the peace with everybody when this war is ended.

Further considering the matter, we might see that history gives us a hint about peacetime conscription. We have had two World Wars. In the First World War three great peacetime conscription countries—Germany, Austria, and Russia—were so defeated that they burst into revolution. In the Second World War three peacetime conscription countries have been or are being defeated—Germany, Japan, and Italy.

Of all the countries involved in the two tremendous wars only two nations—the United States and Britain—are twice victorious. That is, the only victors both times are the two nonconscript countries. This may not absolutely prove anything; but it is worth quite a little of thinking over.

Switzerland is sometimes mentioned as a country for which conscription avoided war. The Swiss military power was not comparable to that of France, and if it had been on the plains of Poland, would of course, have been destroyed as was that of Poland. Therefore not the Swiss conscripts, but the Alps, saved Switzerland, though probably the mountains would not have served except for the fact that a neutral Switzerland was a convenience for Germany.

A good many people are for peacetime conscription because, they say, we got caught unarmed. They forget that we were not unarmed at Pearl Harbor, but tremendously armed there. Other people say they are for conscription because they were wrong in opposing our increased armament to get ready for this war, so they don't want to be wrong again. This is the same as believing that because we got into this war with a little army we ought to get into the coming peace with the biggest army in the world. To some thoughtful minds that might look like making sure of being wrong both times.

As I have said, conscription would alter the lives of all of us; but let us think of those whose lives would be by far the most changed—the boys themselves. Necessarily a boy's life is changed in wartime when conscription certainly is necessary for the country's survival; but this new measure is for conscription henceforth in times of peace when our boys, up to now, have always been free to lead their own lives and plan their futures as they wished and needed.

You realize of course that henceforth, with this measure in effect, the boys who are now children or in their early teens will not have any choice or be allowed to say yes or no to what's going to happen to them. When every boy's turn comes, if Congress passes the bill, it won't matter what he wants to do—he'll be taken from his family or his school or his college or his job, and in time of peace he'll be made over into a soldier. It won't matter what he feels or thinks about it, himself; he will not have a say. We older people, his fathers and mothers and kinsfolk, are now making the decision for him without his consent.

In fact, of course, the boys whose lives will be altered by peacetime conscription are still too young to know what they'll want to do when they reach the conscript age, and our decision now isn't going to give them a chance to decide for themselves. The measure is compulsory and if any boy objects when he reaches conscript age and refuses his year of training and the supplementary trainings, he'll be arrested and subject to the penalties of the law. These boys are human beings, and it's quite a responsibility for even fathers and mothers to make such a decision for a compelled future for their sons. There won't be any way out of it except by repeal of the law, and, as we've learned, repeals are pretty slow and difficult.

No, if by this decision the boys whose freedom in peacetime is taken from them now shall later look at us reproachfully and ask, "Why did you do this to me?" we can only say, "We thought there was no alternative."

Are we right in this? Is there no alternative? Are we compelled to compel all our boys henceforth to learn how to meet in mortal combat similarly trained millions of boys from Russia? Russia or any other country?

During the last political campaign all our leaders were telling us that Dumbarton Oaks was a magnificent beginning, but only a beginning, for the structure of permanent peace to be maintained by force—that is, by small armaments in all countries to act in conjunction against any aggressor. We can have that lasting peace. Do you want to throw it away and instead make ourselves into such a warlike power as shall have the fear, and consequently the hate, of all the other countries? Is that the way for us who have always called ourselves a peace-loving Nation?

There are about 2,000,000,000 people in the world, and, when Germany and Japan are beaten into knowing that warlikeness does not pay, all—all of us—will want permanent peace. What can defeat that universal longing? Our fears and our excitement can defeat it. Let us not decide in haste—lest we do what we do not know.

The Coal Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, the daily newspapers are carrying announcements of shortage of coal in many areas of the country. From some of the news accounts one would gather that the shortage is due to the fact that we are not producing the coal at the mines.

In this connection, and on behalf of the mining industry, both labor and management, I should like to submit some statistics on the production of bituminous coal in 1944. The truth of the matter is that the bituminous coal industry, labor and management, have done a marvelous job of production in spite of the fact that over 40,000 coal miners have been taken from the mines into other essential industries or into the armed forces.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Star of January 30, 1945:

WHAT IS THE 1945 OUTLOOK FOR COAL?

In 1944, our third year of war, the bituminous coal industry produced the colossal output of 620,000,000 tons.

That's more coal than the record production mined in the previous year—which, in turn, topped all former records.

In fact, it's more coal than has ever been mined in any year in any country in history.

The story of how this vital wartime job was accomplished has a distinct bearing on the outlook for 1945.

It was done, first of all, with far fewer employees—because coal mining, essential as it is, has not been made a draft-exempt occupation, and many of the younger miners are with our country's fighting men.

It was done with a working force of patriotic men who put their backs into their jobs—who gladly gave up hard-earned vacations—who literally "dug in" and sweated to boost their production. Many of these miners were older men who gave up retirement and voluntarily went back into the mines.

It was done with the aid of mechanized production and safety equipment which the bituminous coal industry had previously provided at a cost of more than $400,000,000.

It was done with the industry's own money, without Government financial aid of any kind.

It was done finally, because of the very human, very enterprising, very American reason that it simply had to be done.

You'll want to know why so much coal was needed—and will be needed again this year:

In addition to heating 4 out of every 7 homes in the United States;

In addition to providing the source of nearly two-thirds of America's electrical energy for industrial and domestic power and light;

In addition to supplying the power for 94 percent of all America's locomotives;

In addition to all that—

Bituminous coal sinews the very arms and legs of America's war effort.

Into the making of every single ton of steel—for guns, ships, tanks, trucks, shells, bombs, and other vital war matériel—goes a ton and a half of bituminous coal. The wartime steel industry, alone, has to have 1,743,000 tons every week.

War chemicals and high explosives—for rockets, mines, and other ammunition—come from bituminous coal. It is also the base for 85 percent of all war plastics, and for hundreds of antiseptics, medicines, and drugs—including the life-saving sulfas.

And, without bituminous coal, the transportation of America's fighting forces and their supplies would well-nigh stop stock-still.

In fact, so very vital to the successful conduct of the war is the steady flow of bituminous coal that if it were to be interrupted even for only a few days, there's no telling where or how seriously it might cripple war production—or how long it might delay victory.

The industry pledges itself to do everything in its power to keep this steady flow uninterrupted. And we are confident that the miners, the public, and the Government will cooperate to make 1945 the record coal year which it "simply has got to be."

Letter From Chicago Negro Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CHICAGO NEGRO CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., January 16, 1945.

The Honorable WILLIAM R. ROWAN,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reaction in Washington from the serious set-backs suffered by our armed forces on the west wall have resulted in

numerous conflicting rumors, regulations, and directives. Among the various regulations proposed is one to draft all IV-F's if they refuse to take jobs in essential industry.

In view of the fact that industry has not accepted the principles involved in F. E. P. C. regulations, we realize that such regulations can be very dangerous to the welfare of a large section of our citizens. With this in mind the members of the Chicago Negro Chamber of Commerce, at its regular meeting January 9, unanimously adopted the following resolution: "That any and all legislation adopted, or regulation promulgated for the use of manpower, provide for equal opportunity for all citizens of the United States regardless of race, color, or creed; and that no person be inducted in the armed forces or otherwise as a result of or penalty for not taking jobs in essential industry, where such industry discriminates against prospective inductee or inductees on account of race, creed, or color, and the Chicago Negro Chamber of Commerce calls upon you to take such action as is necessary to bring about this protection for our citizens."

We urge you to take immediate action in this matter so that the lives and welfare of many of your constituents may not be jeopardized.

We await an early reply.

Respectfully yours,

EDGAR A. HAWLEY,
Secretary.

Move to Eradicate Water Hyacinths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I have become increasingly alarmed over a subject to which I previously called the attention of Members of Congress. I refer to the water hyacinth which is such a dangerous enemy to navigation, commerce, fish and wildlife, and health along the streams in Louisiana and some of the other Southern States.

Before resigning from the House last year in order to enter the military service, I urged that the permanent elimination of these hyacinths be made a post-war project. With my return to Congress I have resumed my efforts along this line. I intend to devote much time and energy to this purpose.

The fight against the hyacinth dates back many years, but during this period it has been confined to the clearing of streams for navigation. In this the United States engineers have carried on persistently and effectually. Their work has been vital, but because of the other factors involved in this problem, in addition to navigation, it is necessary that the fight be expanded. The greatest need exists for the eradication of this evil once and for all.

As far as I can ascertain no congressional report has been submitted on this subject since one in 1898 which recommended an appropriation for the use of crushing boats, log booms, and spraying. While the matter had been considered prior to 1897 the battle against the hyacinth appears to have had its real origin in that year when by congressional action a board of engineers was instructed to investigate the extent of the obstruction of navigable streams in Louisiana, Florida, and other South Atlantic and Gulf States by these plants and to determine means of removing them so far as they constituted a hindrance to interstate or foreign commerce. In a report the following year the board discussed various methods which had been employed with more or less success up to that time. Of the mechanical processes, that of crushing the plants by boat was considered the best. Mention was made of a successful experiment conducted by Assistant Engineer P. H. Thompson of Plaquemine, La. This called for the use of a saturated solution of salt with enough quicklime added to make a good spraying method. The cost of this plan was estimated at about 2 cents per square yard.

Down through the years, funds have been made available by the War Department for removal of hyacinths, the first such operations of the present authorized Federal project being carried out in 1900 by a mechanical crushing plant. In 1902 the use of chemicals was authorized and from then until 1936 the plants were controlled by spraying with a solution of arsenic and soda, by hand removal and by booms. The use of chemicals has since been abandoned and the process of removal by hand has been reduced to a minimum. In recent years the work has been carried on through utilization of the crushing plant, power-operated conveyors, and booms.

In an all-out war against this great plant menace, a systematic, far reaching and most carefully planned program is needed, based upon a study of the most practical method or methods of control. Primarily the growth must be combatted wherever it exists rather than confine the efforts at destruction to a relatively small area of infestation and then only insofar as navigation is concerned. Most important of all, the problem must be met at its very source.

Research indicates that until the seed fully matures in the flower, the hyacinth will not grow if transferred or planted. Therefore, attention should be centered on destroying the plant before it can blossom and deposit. This means carrying the fight into the smaller and feeder streams and into the swamps, a process which it is agreed will require considerable time and expense. The results, on the other hand, will be of such immense value that the trouble and cost will be more than justified. I know of no better investment and of no better post-war undertaking.

A study of the hyacinth problem also calls for consideration of other plant evils. I have particularly in mind the so-called alligator grass which has spread rapidly from waterways to invade much rich agricultural land along these streams. Where a combination of hyacinths and alligator grass exists, the situation is extremely bad. The expansion of the alligator grass is in itself a serious matter, but one I believe that can be solved satisfactorily along with the elimination of the hyacinth, under comprehensive planning.

It is interesting to note that the water hyacinth first found its way into this country when introduced as a rare and beautiful aquatic plant in the horticultural exhibit of the Cotton Exposition held in New Orleans in 1884. Little did those who viewed this delicate-covered flower realize that these bulbs, carried home as prized souvenirs to be planted in fish ponds, private lakes, and lagoons would in a comparatively short time become a scourge to the Southland.

Let us consider some of the most damaging effects of hyacinth infestation. Alone, or in a combination with alligator grass, it so completely blocks navigable streams that in numerous instances, equities in fishing camps and even permanent homes on lakes and bayous must be abandoned. To the fishing industry, which means so much to the Gulf section of Louisiana, the hyacinth is proving an immense handicap and a grave danger to further development. In many sections it prevents commercial fishing altogether. By blocking out the light it leads to destruction of fishing waters because underwater plants required for producing fish die without light and the fish, both commercial and game, starve or migrate. In a similar manner, food for valuable waterfowl is destroyed. Game and fish refuges and recreational facilities representing large investments of public and private funds are threatened with destruction unless the water hyacinth can be curbed. Agricultural welfare along waterways is also affected, and another concern is the danger to public health created by the obstruction and stagnation of these streams.

Feeling that my colleagues realize with me the seriousness of this condition and the urgent need for relief to protect the health and prosperity of the infested areas, I am pleased to report that a very definite and very important step is being taken in that direction. Working in collaboration with the Army engineers with whom I have recently conferred, I have presented through the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House a resolution providing for a survey to determine the possibilities and cost of an eradication project. This resolution asks the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors created under section 3 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 13, 1902, to review the reports on water hyacinth obstructions submitted in House Document No. 91, Fifty-fifth Congress, third session, with a view to determining (a) whether any expansion of the scope of operations, or any change in the method now employed, for exterminating and removing the hyacinth plants and other marine vegetable growths from the waters of Louisiana and other Gulf Coast States is advisable at this time; (b) the nature and extent of the various public benefits that would accrue from such extermination and removal,

and (c) the amount of local cooperation that may be warranted by reason of the local benefits.

This action would be taken with the view of determining the estimated cost of permanently eliminating the hyacinth plants and other marine vegetable growths from these streams; and since the obstruction of these streams affects the fishing industry, agriculture, and health conditions, the resolution provides that the cooperation of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior and of the Department of Agriculture and the United States Public Health Service be solicited.

I am confident that, with sufficient study, time, and funds, this menace to our national life and resources can be removed. We must keep in mind that aside from the benefits such a post-war project will bring to navigation, industry, and to the public in general, it will create a very large volume of employment, thus bringing immediate and substantial returns from the moment it is started. This is another very important angle to be considered.

I invite the support of Congress in bringing about and expediting this survey designed to provide the basis for something so urgently needed and so ideally adapted to the period following the war.

Lethargy of Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Florida Times-Union:

LOCAL VETERAN HITS LETHARGY OF HOME FRONT—LT. JIMMY KNIGHT, HOLDER OF COMBAT COMMISSION, WRITES FROM ITALY

A fighting man's reaction to civilian indifference and lack of understanding is graphically told in a letter from Second Lt. Jimmy Knight, a Jacksonville soldier who has served 30 months overseas and has won a combat commission with a field artillery unit which has been almost continuously in action since the beginning of the Tunisian campaign.

Knight, who was a popular organist at the Florida Theater here for several years before he entered the Army as a private on March 31, 1942, is now in action on the Fifth Army front in Italy with the headquarters of a field artillery group. He is serving as adjutant of his command.

Lieutenant Knight has seen action in Tunisia, at the crossing of the Volturno River, at Cassino, the break-through of the Gustave Line, the Hitler Line, the capture of Rome, the crossing of the Arno, and the cracking of the Gothic line.

His artillery group ranks near the top of the list of American units for actual days in combat, and it has been cited by the French.

Written to his mother, Mrs. Ada Wilson of 1676 Canterbury Street, Lieutenant Knight's letter condemning indifference on the home front, follows in part:

"That brings me to one point in your letter of December 5, which is also apropos of your yen for a 5-day week. Darling, that sort of thing is completely incomprehensible to me. I myself am on tap several days during the week for 20 hours a day, and have worked 7 days a week, quite as a matter of course since August 1942. That sort of thing is far from uncommon. If at least 10 percent of war workers at home had put in a corresponding amount of time, there'd be no shortage of materials on the western front.

"Yes, you say; but how can a civilian work like that and still have any time to devote to his private life and interests? May I point out that we in the Army have neither a private life nor private interests. When people at home are hollering for 5-day weeks at a time when shortages exist on battlefields which are actually and definitely prolonging the war (I know this to be a fact), it makes you feel that the lack of understanding of the situation at home is so hopeless as to make any bridging of the gulf between civilian and soldier impossible.

"Yes; you say, but I'm not doing war work. True—and millions of others are not. But if the ones who aren't doing war work spent more hours and more days on their jobs, it would release more people from these nonessential jobs for war work. If your job goes on during your absence, it means in the long run, somebody who could be doing something else is helping to hold up your end of things.

"If you'll refer to the date of this letter, you'll note it is being written during the period of the German's big counteroffensive on the First Army front. As I write, very little information has been divulged, but it's a highly serious matter, any way you look at it. I'll quote a remark from the Stars and Stripes. The article says that civilian production has been frozen and output of war goods is being stepped up, as well as drafting of men in the late twenties and thirties increased. I was disgusted to read in the body of the article the following: 'High W. P. B. (War Production Board) officials said that current civilian production was at a greater over-all volume than normal peacetime output and that the new policy isn't going to work a hardship on anybody.' Ye gods. What sublime indifference!

"I've been overseas for so long that I can endure a few more—or a good many more—months over here. Being in combat isn't pleasant; it isn't any fun to be scared, as you often are; it gets pretty damn dull, and there are lots of other little unpleasantnesses connected with it. However, I don't consider them important. The main point is that even when things are 'quiet' there are always a few hundred boys getting killed; a few thousand whose future lives are wrecked or made more difficult by losing an arm or a leg, or by being horribly disfigured. If those things mean nothing to you, I don't know how I can get through to you; they aren't just words in a book, or a headline in a newspaper; they're happening every minute, every day, every week, all over Europe.

"In view of the above, I cannot feel the importance of not working a hardship on anybody back home. It might restore some of the moral fiber and toughness of spirit which were responsible for founding our country if a little hardship was endured by the home front. Please don't write me anything more about people finding it difficult to go on with their working schedules. I find mine rather difficult at times, and can refer you to thousands of lads within a 5-mile radius of where I am at the moment who find it difficult to go on with theirs. Most of them manage to—those who don't get killed.

"Darling, I don't mean to make any personal reflections in delivering such a long sermon on the necessity for full cooperation on the home front. I know a good bit of it is due to lack of information. The American newspapers are in some ways the worst in the world. Their predeliction for using phrases like 'smashed through' to describe an advance of a few hundred yards, bloodily and tortuously won, isn't calculated to make you feel what's really happening.

"The American armies are good—I think they're the best in the world in some ways. If the high command was prepared to make more sacrifices of human life, they could make it look a lot more spectacular. But you must always think of the individual who is out there getting shot at, who is under enemy artillery fire, who has mortars bursting around him, and who, in spite of the publicity about the Luftwaffe being swept from the skies, still has to duck a Jerry plane every now and then, think of that guy, he's the Army, until he moves forward, (and Lord! how slowly he has to move); all the rest of it doesn't mean a thing. Keep that one, scared, dirty, muddy, tired lad in your mind, and see if your own contribution is excessive in comparison.

"You see, soldiers are no different from anybody else; there's nothing about military training that makes them supermen; they react to situations with the same emotions as anyone else. It's just that they can't quit when it gets unpleasant. And unfortunately, it doesn't 'get' unpleasant, it stays that way.

"This thing will never be over unless all of us give our best, the Germans are putting out their best, and it's still damned good!

"I hope you'll remember all the things I've said in here for a long time. There will always be things to be fought for and fought against in this world, because there will always be injustice, selfishness, intolerance, and greed. Personally, I'm prepared to fight indefinitely; how about you?"

Hospitalization and Medical Care of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me heretofore to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include statements by the vice commander, Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C. These were all furnished me by Joseph Leib, vice commander, and I am pleased to present them at this time:

This world of global war is not only taking lives of thousands upon thousands of our ablest-bodied young men forever from us, but it has already left thousands, and will leave countless thousands more, no doubt, crippled and maimed and handicapped mentally and physically for life. This Nation in its honest, sincere, right conviction to fight in this war for the preservation of democracy in this Nation and in our world

obligations can do nothing less for these gallant men who come to our hospitals needing hospitalization, and to give them a maximum of the most modern hospitalization possible under the most pleasant conditions and circumstances possible. No hospital condition which is not frankly and clearly conducive to the speediest possible recovery and rebuilding of morale and the reparticipation of the veterans in our normal community life should be tolerated. Whatever facilities or measures are necessary for the most adequate care of all of our veterans wherever they are in the world must be furnished. Cost compared with lives of men cannot be considered. We can reearn and replace the dollars, but we can never replace the men. I bespeak the utmost prompt and thoroughgoing sincere cooperation possible in this and all matters relating to our veterans and their hospitalization and care—not only at Washington, D. C., but wherever they are in such need. I am sure that great body of American nurses and doctors and assistants and all concerned will not knowingly have one son of a mother neglected nor uncared for in the finest possible manner. Anything less than this would be a shame and a disgrace to our Nation and an everlasting condemnation upon us all.

My distinguished son who recently gave his life as first lieutenant in the Army Air Corps in the performance of his duty, I observed in an Army base hospital during his 2 days of unconsciousness after the plane crash. Nothing was too good or too important or too necessary for him. He was my son. It makes a difference whose son we are talking about. From here on, more than ever before, I shall speak for and aid the sons of other mothers and fathers in hospitals and at the front, wherever they are. Therefore, more in a special manner, it is my pleasure to call these communications to the attention of Congress at this time.

The statement follows:

MOUNT ALTO, VOTELESS WASHINGTON, D. C., VETERANS' HOSPITAL, REFUSED ADDITIONAL BEDS—NOW DANGEROUSLY OVERCROWDED AND INADEQUATELY STAFFED—DISTRICT AMERICAN LEGION ORDERS INVESTIGATION

(By Joseph Leib, vice commander, Costello Post, the American Legion, Washington, D. C.)

There are merely 327 capacity beds at the veterans' hospital in Washington, D. C., known as Mount Alto. This number of beds is insufficient to care for World War No. 1 men, giving no consideration whatever to veterans of this war.

This disturbing fact is acknowledged by General Hines, Veterans' Administrator, in a letter to this post.

It is amusing to note that General Hines cunningly attempts to cover up this unfortunate situation by advising that a study is being made to set up a veterans' medical center in the National Capital. See how he endeavors to sidetrack the issue.

In this connection it must be pointed out, however, that General Hines has been talking about such a project for the past 12 years, yet nothing positive ever comes from his office outside of voluminous promises.

The fact remains that there are still only 327 capacity beds to care for the former soldiers of this vicinity. Many veteran leaders throughout the United States are voicing their disgust at the bureaucratic obstructionism, red tape, and simple inertia that emanates from the office of veterans affairs.

Under the policies of General Hines, many thousands of sick and disabled veterans have been deprived of urgent hospitalization and medical care.

It is a well-known fact that many veterans' hospitals are dangerously overcrowded and others have long waiting lists.

In line with these conditions needy and worthy veterans must wait months before obtaining admission to hospitalization.

Whom are they to turn to?

Our post recently addressed an inquiry to General Hines relative to the unfortunate condition at Mount Alto.

In the following correspondence the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs admits the amazing fact that no definite consideration or provision has been made for Mount Alto to accommodate the growing demand for hospitalization by veterans of both World Wars.

Think of it! With more than 1,167,000 servicemen of this war alone discharged as disability cases, and out of that total over 300,000 of them are drawing service-connected pensions, General Hines finds that there is no need to add additional beds at Mount Alto. All of these men are potential hospital cases. Many of them live in or near Washington.

The naked truth shows (the figures given by General Hines himself) that his administration has seen fit to add only 8,404 beds to its existing facilities throughout the United States since Pearl Harbor.

The mentioned communications and a resolution recently adopted by our post and unanimously endorsed by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, on January 25, 1945, attests to the deplorable predicament that exists at Mount Alto.

Is it not time for Congress to take proper action?

The correspondence follows:

JANUARY 4, 1945.

HON. FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HINES: I have been directed by the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, American Legion, to address an inquiry to you as to whether or not any funds are now allocated for the expansion of present or erection of new veteran hospital facilities in or near the District of Columbia.

Your early reply to the above will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

DAVID E. MILLER,
Adjutant, Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, American Legion.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, January 15, 1945.

MR. DAVID E. MILLER,
Adjutant, Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, The American Legion, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MILLER: I have received your letter dated January 4, 1945, which requests information regarding the hospital program of the Veterans' Administration.

There has recently been approved a program for additional construction covering our hospital requirements through June 30, 1946, and a request for an appropriation to accomplish these projects has recently been submitted.

While the expansion of veterans' hospital facilities in or near the District of Columbia is not provided, this program only represents the first increment of additional hospitals required for World War No. 2 cases, and consideration is being given to the establishment in this area of a modern medical center.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

The resolution:

Whereas members of this post have reported that the Veterans' Administration facility on Wisconsin Avenue, known as Mount Alto Hospital, Washington, D. C., is not able to provide care to which veterans in this vicinity are by law entitled; that the institution is understaffed and overcrowded; that veterans in need of hospital care cannot obtain such care; that the present buildings, besides being inadequate for the needs of this vicinity, are badly in need of repair; that the hospital has a general gloomy and poorhouse atmosphere not conducive to high morale or rapid recovery of patients; and

Whereas Mount Alto Hospital is the diagnostic center for the Veterans' Administration and therefore not strictly speaking a hospital for the care of veterans in this vicinity; and

Whereas we feel that it is a cardinal duty of the American Legion to see to it that adequate and competent hospital care under pleasant and comfortable conditions is made available to veterans in need of such care as provided by law: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia in regular meeting assembled this 2d day of January, 1945, That the executive committee of the department be urged to order a comprehensive survey to determine (a) the requirements of veterans in this vicinity for hospital care, including clinic facilities, (b) the extent to which and the manner in which such requirements are being met by existing Veterans' Administration facilities, and (c) what additional facilities or corrective measures are necessary to assure adequate care for all veterans; that a committee be appointed by the department commander to make this survey and that the committee be instructed to present its report to the department executive committee at the earliest practicable date, but in no case later than 1 month prior to the 1945 department convention.

Unanimously adopted, January 2, 1945.

THOMAS A. COSTELLO, *Commander.*

Unanimously approved, January 25, 1945, by the executive committee, American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia.

Latest Box Score on Twenty-second Amendment Shows No Change for Better—Arkansas Legislature Rescinds 1943 Action, but New Hampshire Joins Ranks of States Which Favor Amendment

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out in my remarks to the House, on January 24, the State Legislature of Arkansas rescinded its former action taken in 1943 wherein it endorsed the proposed twenty-second amendment to the Federal Constitution. However,

with the discovery that the New Hampshire State Legislature adopted a resolution in 1943 favoring this amendment, the box score of States on this matter remains unchanged today.

I have been requested to again submit to the House an up-to-date chart showing the status of all resolutions offered or adopted which call for the adoption of this proposed twenty-second amendment. Based upon the latest information available to me as of January 31, 1945, the Nation-wide picture is as follows:

	Adopted	Resolution offered	Passed House	Passed Senate
Alabama	July 8, 1943		Yes	Yes.
Arizona		None		
Arkansas	1943 (rescinded 1945).[1]	1943	Yes (unanimous)	Yes (unanimous).
California		June 7, 1944	No vote taken	No vote taken.
Colorado		1943	No	No.
Connecticut		None		
Delaware	Apr. 22, 1943		Unanimous	Yes, 10 to 6.
Florida		None		
Georgia		do		
Idaho		do		
Illinois	1943		May 5, 1943	May 26, 1943.
Indiana	1943		Yes	Yes.
Iowa	1941		do	Do.
Kansas		None		
Kentucky	Mar. 20, 1944		Yes [2]	Do.
Louisiana		1944	No, tabled 54 to 22	Do.
Maine	1941		Apr. 17, 1941	Apr. 15, 1941.
Maryland		None		
Massachusetts	1941		Apr. 29, 1941	Apr. 24, 1941.
Michigan	1941		May 16, 1941	Apr. 29, 1941.
Minnesota		None		
Mississippi	1940		Apr. 29, 1940	Apr. 29, 1940.
Missouri		None		
Montana		1941	Killed in committee	
Nebraska		None		
Nevada		do		
New Hampshire	1943	do	Yes, Apr. 13, 1943	Yes, Apr. 22, 1943.
New Jersey	1944		Apr. 4, 1944	Feb. 25, 1944.
New Mexico		None		
New York		1944	Lost on vote	No vote.
North Carolina		None		
North Dakota		do		
Ohio		1944	Killed in committee	Yes.
Oklahoma		None		
Oregon		do		
Pennsylvania	Vetoed [3]	Mar. 31, 1943	Yes	Do.
Rhode Island	Mar. 15, 1940		do	Do.
South Carolina		Feb. 3, 1944	No vote	Recommitted.
South Dakota		None		
Tennessee		do		
Texas		1943	No	Yes.
Utah		None		
Vermont		do		
Virginia		1944	Yes	No.
Washington		None		
West Virginia		do		
Wisconsin	1943	Apr. 14, 1943	Yes, 44 to 34	Yes, 17 to 9.
Wyoming	1939		Yes	Yes.

[1] Adopted 1943 but rescinded 1945. [2] Rescinded by House. [3] Vetoed by Governor, June 7, 1943.

I have also been asked to summarize once more the disastrous results which would befall this Nation if this amendment should pass. If this amendment should become a part of our Constitution, it will result in the following:

First. The principle of "ability to pay" in Federal taxation will be discarded.

Second. Small business will be wrecked because big business will be able to keep so much of the huge profits that they make that little business will be unable to compete and will be quickly and easily crushed and destroyed.

Third. The Government will be unable to collect sufficient money under the restriction to provide for more than the payment of the interest on the national debt when the war is over. It is estimated that our national debt will be around three hundred billion when the war is over. If the interest rate is kept down to 2½ percent, the carrying charges will be $7,500,000,000 per annum. Therefore, it is very doubtful that the Government can raise more than enough to carry this enormous carrying charge on the national debt with this 25-percent restriction.

Fourth. Dependents of those who gave their lives for their country in this and other wars will no longer be able to receive relief from the Federal Government.

Fifth. There will be nothing left for the Federal Government to provide for those who can no longer carry on due to injuries and wounds received in battle while protecting our country in this and other wars.

Sixth. The aid for old-age assistance will have to be discontinued and much of the social-security program generally will be wrecked.

Seventh. There can be no soil-conservation payments to farmers.

Eighth. There can be no help by the Federal Government for construction of highways and roads; nor for the improvement of our rivers and harbors.

These are just a few of the benefits that will have to be stopped immediately if this amendment becomes effective.

LITTLE TAXPAYERS WOULD BE HARMED

In practice the 49,200,000 taxpayers in the lower brackets will not only not have their taxes reduced under this amendment, but their taxes will actually have to be increased to make up for the savings that will be granted to the few who now own and control so much of the wealth of the country.

A Letter From the Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Jacksonville Journal of January 15, 1945:

By this time Mom, I know you've read about the ammunition shortage over here. They may be rationing gasoline and meat back home, but by God, they're rationing ammunition over here. The people back hor want this war to finish up in a hurry—and God knows, the guys who are fighting it want to see the end soon. But unless you and 130,000,000 other Americans do something about the ammunition shortage there will be a lot more little white crosses planted where there should be nothing but clover.

Ever round of ammunition—every shot that isn't fired over here is paid for in blood by somebody's son. There is only a pretty slim chance that you soon will have to shell out the price of a shot not fired but by God, somebody is paying that price and the payee is just as much an American as I am—maybe even a little more so because of the sacrifice he makes.

The guys over here are plenty sore about the situation, and it's high time that you folks back home start getting sore about it too.

The first time you hear somebody gripe about how the Allied armies have slowed down or eased up do me a favor Mom—just count to 10 very slowly and then knock hell out of him.

I don't want to scare you, Mom, but I do want to make you mad—and I hope that you make as many other people mad as possible. I guess I blew a little too much steam, Mom, but it is impossible to lay too much emphasis on the situation as it stands now.

ROBERT.

Missouri River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in no time since the beginning of statehood has a question of more far-reaching importance claimed the attention of its citizens than does the Missouri River project now before this Congress. By the utilization of the waters of the Missouri River in the semiarid areas of North Dakota, the State will have been made secure and henceforth this Congress will not be called upon in depressing drought periods for lavish appropriations for the people who live there.

Rather, by a program of well-organized irrigation, vast acres within the confines of this State may be watered by the

surplus waters of this river and on these lands can be grown various crops, conspicuous in them forage crops, feed for livestock, and Dakota is a livestock country. Never again after irrigation has been brought to the State will the Government have to move in and slaughter cattle in dry periods, because these areas watered by irrigation will serve as a bulwark against such conditions, and a permanent prosperity will come to the people of the State and the State will increase its contribution to the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to include herewith a statement made by Col. Lynn C. Barnes, district manager of the United States Corps of Engineers, in an address to the members of the Engineers' Club of Minneapolis:

MISSOURI PROJECT LARGEST SINGLE PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT ON RECORD

The plan of the Army engineers for Missouri River Valley flood control will be the largest single engineering project ever attempted by man, Col. Lynn C. Barnes, district engineer, United States Corps of Engineers, St. Paul, told members of the Engineers' Club of Minneapolis at a meeting held last month. Cost of the series of dams and reservoirs to be constructed would be $410,000,000, he said, while total storage capacity of the reservoirs would be 72,000,000 acre-feet of water.

Highways, railway tracks, bridges and farm homes will have to be moved under the long-term plan to gain control of one of the most perplexing flood-control problems in history, Colonel Barnes said. In addition to control over floods the water in reservoirs could be used for irrigation, sanitation, and recreation purposes, the speaker pointed out.

Address at Birthday Celebration of Doctor Chaim Weizmann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the birthday celebration of Doctor Chaim Weizmann, conducted under the auspices of American Friends of Palestine Histadrut, at the Biltmore Hotel, New York City, on January 23, 1945.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am glad of the opportunity to be here this evening and to join in the tribute which you, in common with millions in various parts of the world, are paying tonight to Dr. Weizmann.

It has been my privilege to read quite a few articles concerning his tremendous achievements against odds, and I am sure that of all the things he has been able to accomplish, nothing would give him greater satisfaction than to have a part in bringing about, during the seventieth year of his useful life, the relief of his fellow Jews in Europe, from the unbelievable sufferings and privations which they have undergone.

Under his leadership, and with his inspiring example, it should be possible to rally to the support of such an effort, every right-thinking and intelligent person who is made aware of the situation.

Too often, however, we assume that everyone knows what has happened and is happening to the European Jews. Yet, how many people have actually read even a small part of the report of the War Refugee Board established by the President of the United States on January 22, 1944, which report was issued in November of last year. I have read it through, but still do not seem able to grasp the terrible import of the figures given, nor even if I grasped the figures, would I be able to adequately comprehend the terrible anguish through which even the living have passed.

Who would believe that in this age of presumed enlightenment and civilization somewhere in the neighborhood of 5,000,000 members of an old race with glorious traditions would be systematically exterminated? Yet, that is what we are told has been accomplished in the dark years which lie immediately behind us. That figure, if correct, represents approximately one-third of all the Jews in the world. And the report from which that figure is taken is so documented and detailed that it seems impossible to doubt the accuracy of the estimates.

Whole commmunities have disappeared, never to return. Complete families have ceased to exist. Entire sections of great cities are tenantless, their former occupants having been vaporized, so to speak, at one or another of the infamous prison camps such as that in the Birkenwald.

Fortunately, it appears possible that the continuing successes of Allied arms have brought, at least, a temporary cessation of most of the actual murders, although we cannot be sure that such is the case, and we may at any moment find that our hopes in this respect are unjustified.

The temptation to remove forever witnesses who could testify to some of the unspeakable Nazi crimes must be strong and the realization on the part of the Nazi leaders that their defeat is only a matter of time may well lead them to further acts of desperation which will still further decimate the thinned ranks of Europe's Jews.

But what of those who remain, and who would theoretically be free to return to their former homes after the last shot has been fired? Will they have any homes to which they can return? Will they be welcomed by their neighbors? Will they be able to endure the thoughts which must daily assault their minds in these old familiar surroundings, when they note the absence of so many of their relatives, friends, and neighbors and are compelled to imagine their fate?

I do not have the answer to those questions, but certainly, under the most favorable conditions, there will be hundreds of thousands who would want to do almost anything except go back to their homes.

The problem with which you and I are going to soon be faced is what to do with these people.

Fortunately there exists a precedent. For the past several years efforts have been made by many organizations, including the one of which I am about to speak, to bring about the rescue of these beleaguered people, and in a pitifully few instances the efforts have been rewarded with success.

The rescued people have, in many cases, been brought to Palestine where they found waiting to serve them and to help them rehabilitate themselves that great and unique organization known as the Histadrut. Under the peculiar conditions which exist in Palestine it might be fairly said that this group carries on for the Palestine Jews all those government functions related to the welfare of the citizenry which ordinarily would be the activity of a full-fledged government.

It is nonpolitical and includes in its ranks, I am told, every one of the major political ideologies prevalent in Jewish Palestine. It is powerful in its influence because half the Jewish population is included in the group in one way or another and because it possesses tremendous economic strength as a result of its many and diverse activities.

It operates cooperative colonies, industrial transport, and purchasing and sales cooperatives, building companies, port, harbor and fishing companies, and even air lines. In other words, its policies determine the framework within which the economic life of the country will develop.

Naturally, the plight of their coreligionists in Europe made an immediate and stirring appeal to the leaders of Histadrut, as did, also, the call of the United Nations to take up arms against the Hitler menace.

The Histadrut has furnished, I understand, approximately 80 percent of the Jewish recruits from Palestine and it supplements governmental allotments made to the families of these boys. The organization, while carrying on its normal functions has also mobilized labor battalions for war jobs, cared for sick and wounded soldiers, conducted rehabilitation activities, and produced tremendous quantities of material for the United Nations armies based in the Middle East.

With this history, Histadrut was naturally equipped to tackle the new problem raised by the thin stream of generally destitute refugees which soon commenced to flow from Europe by every available route. The leaders of Histadrut at once set up training schools for the new citizens, acquainting them with new means of earning a living well adapted to the new country. They set up a cooperative medical system which went to work to build up the physical strength of the refugees in order to equip them for the difficult tasks which a pioneer civilization always faces.

All of the diverse services of which Histadrut is proud were made immediately available.

Having planned to take care of the thin trickle, Histadrut then set about trying to swell the trickle into what might be called a flood. Hundreds of representatives were sent into the occupied countries of Europe to organize the transport of groups of Jews to places of safety. Tribute has been paid to the work of these courageous agents by Mr. Ira Hirschmann, the Middle East representative of the War Refugee Board, in a public statement, and it must be evident to everyone that their work was fraught with constant danger and hardship.

I am informed that in the 4 months period ending December 31, 1943, they succeeded in rescuing 11,200 Jews and I hope that the number rescued in 1944, of which I do not have an account, will be far larger.

To equip and maintain these representatives costs money and the self-respecting Histadrut taxed itself severely to make their work possible. Every member contributes $24 a year and, if I am correctly informed that the average per capita income of these members is not over $500 a year, it will be seen that the annual contribution represents approximately 5 percent of each individual's income for this one special activity alone, not counting the many others to which reference has been made.

It will be seen then, that there exists in Palestine under energetic, far-seeing and intelligent leadership an organization which, so far as its limited resources permit, is making it possible for thousands upon thousands of broken, beaten, and dispirited people to start life anew. But, after all, it must be realized that all the efforts and con-

tributions of Histadrut fall far short of providing for the thousands who still hopefully wait for a refuge in Jewish Palestine. An appeal is, therefore, to be made to Americans for help.

The other day, in the space of a very few minutes the Congress of the United States appropriated $1,500,000,000 for the use of the Navy in carrying on the war. The completion of the program contemplated by this appropriation will give us, it has been estimated, a fleet twice as large as any other in the world, and should render us safe for an indefinite period against any conceivable attack coming over the surface of the seas. Yet, this huge sum will, in my judgment, eventually avail us nothing if we do not supplement expenditures of that sort with vigorous and determined efforts to establish our moral leadership all over the world.

My mind goes back to the early days of the century when a handful of Chinese who called themselves "the Boxers" staged an abortive revolt which caused the loss of some American lives and property. In punishment, China was compelled to pay our Government some millions of dollars and in one of those great moments of imagination and vision which national leaders occasionally have, this money, instead of being deposited in the Treasury for general Government purposes, was set aside as a fund for the education and training in this country of Chinese students. No one will ever be able to measure the return which that modest investment has brought in the shape of good will and genuine friendship on the part of most of today's Chinese leaders.

With that example to guide us how can we fail to see the importance of making a similar investment in Palestine—a land which is still regarded as the Holy Land by two great religions? How can we help but realize, too, that the great experiment in Palestine is comparable in many respects to our own early struggle for freedom and independence?

From the standpoint of the numbers of people involved and the distance from our shores of the scene of action the situation might not be considered acute by the great mass of our people. But, the Jewish people have a tremendous claim upon our interest and support which is all out of proportion to their numbers.

The contributions made to American life and progress by the many great Jews who have given us the benefit of their talents throughout our history, are always before us. We should never forget that a Jew played a leading role in financing our Revolutionary War and died a pauper as a result.

Here is a golden opportunity for Americans to demonstrate that the weak, the defenseless, and the oppressed can count upon our friendship and support. Here is a chance for us to invest some portion of the national prosperity which currently exists.

What we do now for the people of Palestine will be noted by other struggling peoples and will enhance the reputation for generosity and interest in the underdog which we have usually possessed and always coveted.

I am idealist enough to believe that in the long run the creation of such a reputation, the knowledge that America is not always actuated by self-interest and that we are as anxious to help those from whom we can expect little of substance in return, as we are to please the great and powerful, will bring to us greater real security than the most powerful Navy that we can construct. And I hope that as a result of this meeting tonight, and of others which are presumably in progress elsewhere, Dr. Weizmann's dream will be realized within a measurable period of time and that we Americans will have made a contribution to the terrible problem about which we have been talking commensurate with our ability to help.

North Dakota Is O. K.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it seems to us who come into this Congress to represent the States of smaller populations that all too often our States are lost in the great program in their relationship to the large States with large populations and large delegations.

Many of the States of the 48 have populations below a million. My State of North Dakota is one of that group, yet with our limitations so far as population is concerned, we are making a great contribution to the Nation's welfare, so completely so that it is recognized in many sections of the Nation; and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal, the most important metropolitan paper in close proximity to the State. It follows:

NORTH DAKOTA IS O. K.

For the second successive year, North Dakota farms have produced more than half a billion dollars in gross income, the alert Greater North Dakota Association reports in its review of 1944. That is an average of more than $7,250 for each of the 71,000 farms.

The State was first in the Nation in war-important flax production, first in barley, first in durum wheat, second in all wheat, third in potatoes.

North Dakota also produced 2,500,000 tons of lignite coal, has been developing its natural gas fields, and several companies are drilling for oil. The Federal Bureau of Mines is building a commercial-size pilot plant at Grand Forks to extract hydrogen gas and motor fuels from lignite.

The State is planning for peace in a practical way. County agents are developing community projects so farm boys, coming home from war, can get started on their own. In 67 business centers, definite post-war employment programs are progressing.

The Federal flood control bill, calling for large expenditures for the Missouri and Red Rivers, already has passed Congress, and there is prospect of much greater development of the Missouri in North Dakota with passage of the various plans now pending on Capitol Hill.

The State has contributed wonderfully to the war effort and the Greater North Dakota Association has more reason than ever to have faith in its slogan—North Dakota Is O. K.

Prayer of General Patton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a prayer of Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., which was distributed to his men at the height of the German break-through back in December.

We have all admired General Patton's brilliant military achievements, and it must be consoling to those of us here who have loved ones on the battle front to know that this great leader places so much confidence in the great Creator of the universe.

The prayer follows:

Almighty and most merciful Father, we humbly beseech Thee, of Thy great goodness, to restrain these immoderate rains with which we have had to contend. Grant us fair weather for battle. Graciously hearken to us as soldiers who call upon Thee that, armed with Thy power, we may advance from victory to victory, crush the oppression and wickedness of our enemies, and establish Thy justice among men and nations. Amen.

Why Congress Is Cautious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this editorial from the Humboldt Star, published at Winnemucca, Nev., rather clearly and fairly states the case on H. R. 1752, known as the work-or-fight bill and which is now under consideration by this body.

WHY CONGRESS IS CAUTIOUS

It isn't fair to call Congressmen cowards because they are reluctant to rush through a law to draft labor. They're in a soul-trying spot.

Give the President every power he and the military leaders think necessary to win the war quickly at minimum cost in lives—that's easy to say. And Congress has given vast powers to draft fighters, spend money, control materials, wages, and prices, hold down nonessential business, and seize industries that fail to contribute fully to the war.

But these, say the President and the military leaders, have proved too little. They ask now for power to tell workers where to work and to make them work there.

Many sincere people believe that in war the Government should draft everything—fighters, workers, capital, property—in a grand total mobilization. That would be drastic. We think it would be disastrous after, if not during, the war. But at least drafted workers, like drafted fighters now, would not be earning profits for private employers. There would be no private employers and no profits. However, Congress has not been asked to authorize total mobilization of that sort.

Congress is asked to authorize a partial mobilization of civilians—possibly all men and women, except the very old and very young, but more probably men in the 18–45 age group who are not wanted in the armed services—so that from among them workers can be drafted for war jobs in privately owned industries.

This would not be work or fight. People who refused to work where ordered wouldn't be sent to fight; the armed forces don't want them as fighters. More likely, they would be

subjected to fines or jail sentences. Those who are urging Congress to act believe it wouldn't be necessary to invoke the penalties in many cases—that the mere threat of them would be enough to cause most people to go and work where ordered.

Maybe so. In any event, it would be compulsory work for private employers. And that would be something so new in the United States, so hard to reconcile with our traditions of individual freedom, so certain to create a whole host of baffling problems, that we don't blame Congressmen for their cautious attitude.

We accept military judgment as to what this country must produce to win the war even though that judgment has shown itself fallible at times. But how best to get the production wanted is a different matter, on which the generals and admirals are not necessarily wiser authorities than industrialists and labor leaders. And so one thing seems to us certain: Despite the President's call for prompt action now and no worry about the perfecting of details, Congress is going to think hard before it acts on a draft of labor.

If, meanwhile, the executive branch of Government will make better, firmer, more effective use of the great powers already granted, it can do much to improve the manpower situation. And if further improvement is then needed, its requests for additional power will carry weight with Congress and the people.

Address Under Auspices of Brooklyn Council of American-Soviet Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at a rally conducted under the auspices of Brooklyn Council of American-Soviet Friendship at the Academy of Music, Brooklyn, N. Y., on January 24, 1945.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I feel a little reluctance in addressing this audience on the subject assigned to me, namely, the Fight Against Isolationism in Congress, because I am too new at the task of being a Representative in Congress to properly evaluate the situation which exists in Washington. And, in what I shall hereafter say, therefore, I would prefer to have you feel that I am speaking as an ordinary American citizen with such a citizen's reactions to the problem of American-Soviet relations.

The late Wendell Willkie once said something to the general effect that if a man did not feel right down in his belly that we Americans must and should have the friendliest possible relations with Russia, then such a man was not sincerely for international peace and good will.

I suppose that what he meant was that it is inevitable that Russia and the United States will emerge from this war immensely more powerful in relation to the rest of the world than we were before, and that in the foreseeable future we will be respectively the world's greatest military power and the possessor of the world's greatest navy. That being so, the two countries can be tremendous forces for good and can absolutely insure peace for an indefinite period if they work together, or, on the other hand, they can be responsible for another titanic struggle if they exert their tremendous powers and their overwhelming influence in opposite directions.

There seems to me every reason why the two countries should be able to work together. They have no common frontier; neither wants anything the other has except by way of exchange in the open market, and there is no history of past victories, defeats, or injustices, to embitter the peoples of the two countries against each other.

But international accord does not come by any process of logic. It comes through statesmanship, leadership, vision, and a realization on the part of the masses of the people that good relations are desirable and possible if each party does his part.

That is where the so-called isolationist doctrine comes in.

The word "isolationism" has been overworked and used to designate a great many different types of thinking, but in its most dangerous form, it means the belief, not only that we in America can exist under present conditions without friendly intercourse and some sort of working arrangement with other nations, but also that we possess some superior virtue, as a people, and should be suspicious of the character, trustworthiness, and motives of other nations.

Naturally, the fostering of such an attitude will not permit mutual good will and the teamwork which alone can create and maintain a peaceful world.

It is in the field of American-Soviet relations that isolationist thinking reaches its most dangerous depths. Our papers carry frequent utterances about the probability of war between the two countries, and opprobrious epithets are customarily employed by some of these people in connection with every reference to Russia, and its system of government. Naturally enough, an attitude of this sort on this side of the Pacific brings reaction in a like vein from some writers of the Soviet press who seem equally unaware of the necessity of temperate speech when discussing the inevitable points of difference between the customs, the people, and the Government of the two nations.

The task of those who believe as I do that we must make sacrifices, must adapt some of our thinking to new conditions and must, perhaps, depart from one or another of our traditional approaches to international relations if we are to have the cooperation of other sovereign peoples, is not made easier by reckless and ill-informed statements in the press of either country.

Every time one of these incidents occurs it gives ammunition to the large minority in this country whose views, though repudiated in the recent election, still hold sway over large segments of our population.

We who are in the forefront of the battle to insure a lasting peace cannot win unless the forces behind us are as fanatical in their zeal for a united effort to solve these problems which breed war, as are the forces which follow the leadership of those who think that peace can be preserved by keeping everyone at arms length.

Isolationism is not new. Those who preach that doctrine today are descendants of the agitators of 1787 who emphasized the differences of outlook, tradition, policy, and influence which existed among the 13 American Colonies seeking to "Form a more Perfect Union," rather than the urgent need for, at least, a try at united effort to solve the really vital problems of that day.

Fortunately, we had leaders then who were able to see the woods despite the trees. They knew that compromise was necessary. They possessed the energy and political skill to sell the idea to the people and the result was "The More Perfect Union," they had desired. The differences which the isolationists of those days stressed have been forgotten or eliminated.

One may well ask, what is the motive of those who try to set Russia, and, for that matter, Great Britain, against the United States and vice versa? Are they in any conceivable way helping the war effort? Are they improving the chances of bringing about the great series of compromises which any international agreement must naturally involve? Or, are they merely seeking to cater to what they suppose to be the temporary mood of the American voter, at the risk of destroying that same voter's hope of a lasting peace?

If they succeed in creating an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust which eventually defeats the effort to reap the only worthwhile fruit of victory, some form of international organization, it will be our fault. We will have failed to match the leadership, intelligence, political skill, and devotion to an ideal, which characterized the authors and supporters of the Constitution.

It should be the function of a group like this to use its influence to impress upon responsible leaders of both countries the need for educating the people of Russia and the United States in the history, traditions and culture of each other. And, a determined, well-directed and intelligent effort must also be made to bring about an understanding of the different systems of government under which the countries operate, the reasons why each has chosen its particular form, and the necessity for tolerance of the other fellow's viewpoint.

It is my hope that this organization has already dedicated itself to such a task and that before long we shall see a firm foundation laid for eternal friendship between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, two nations which, at the moment, hold the future prospects of the world for good or ill, in their grasp.

Russia and the Smaller European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely article by William Henry Chamberlin:

BY WHAT MORAL RIGHT?

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

A thick blanket of secrecy, censorship, and propaganda has obscured for most Americans the innumerable personal tragedies that have been the sequel to the Soviet overruning of large parts of eastern and southeastern Europe. The last despairing messages of Poland's underground patriots before they are shot or deported by the Lublin Quislings and their NKVD wardens do not sound very loud in the American consciousness. How much publicity has this message from General Mikhailovitch, whose Chetniks were fighting the Germans before Tito's Partisans were ever heard of, received in this country:

"The Serbs would rather perish than submit to Tito's command or accept communism. I appeal that I be permitted with my army to join any Allied army and fight the common enemy. Please appeal that an Anglo-American commission be sent immediately to Yugoslavia to see our suffering and our loyalty to the allied cause."

The prelude to this message was a record of attempted cooperation with the Red Army

and subsequent betrayal extremely similar to what has been happening in Poland. The Russian forces last autumn entered Yugoslavia from the east, in a Serb region where Marshal Tito had never won any political or military support.

Like the Polish underground forces, Mikhailovitch's men were eager to help the Red Army drive the Germans out of their country. The rewards of cooperation were the same. After utilizing the services of the Polish underground forces and of the Serb patriots the Soviet authorities disarmed their units, executed numbers of their officers, placed the soldiers in concentration camps. The details of this betrayal have been made known through Dr. Zivko Topalovich, veteran Yugoslav Socialist and president of the National Committee of Yugoslavia. No wonder American correspondents are not allowed to travel freely in that unhappy country.

Now and then a pure accident lifts a tiny corner of the blanket. During the last 2 years a group of young women has been taking training for relief and reconstruction work at Haverford College. As a preliminaiy job in this direction 2 of them, Fay Calkins and Laurie Page, went to Mexico to work in a relief camp for 1,400 Polish refugees. Strange as it must seem to our professional apoligists for every act of the N. K. V. D., they did not find this camp filled with aristocrats, reactionaries, Fascists, landlords. Because they went there on an entirely humanitarian mission, without any element of national feeling or political bias, their description of what happened to the refugees before they escaped from the Soviet Union and found a refuge in Mexico is worth quoting:

"Most of them, on September 1, 1939, were small peasant farmers along the Polish-Russian border. On October 1, they were exiles, herded into cattle cars on a terrible 2-week trip to Siberia. Many of the children were lost on the way—the train just went on without them—and the ones who survived are now in orphanages like the one at Santa Rosa, not knowing whether they are real orphans, but unlikely ever to find their parents again.

"Those who completed the trip were sent, with many Russian peasants, to compulsory labor in mines, forests, factories, and farms. The hours were 6 a. m. to 6 p. m., and the wages 500 grams of heavy bread per day (if they were strong enough to work). A Polish peasant is a sturdy breed, but too many were not sturdy enough for this."

When I read this account of a tragedy that must have been repeated innumerable times in Soviet-occupied territory in eastern Poland and the Baltic States, I became extremely impatient with the untenable and contradictory position which a former Russian democratic leader, Alexander Kerensky, takes in regard to Stalin's annexationist policies. Defending Soviet annexationist claims which are a patent violation both of the Atlantic Charter and of non-aggression treaties which the Soviet Union concluded, at its own initiative, with all its western neighbors, Kerensky made a curiously unreal attempt to divide Stalin into two persons:

"I make a distinction between Stalin, the national leader, and Stalin, the leader of international communism."

But no such sophistry can provide an answer to the question which Kerensky, and other Russians who live in this country or in other foreign lands because they would be shot or arrested if they set foot in Soviet territory, must face. By what moral right can they consign millions of Poles, Ukrainians, White Russians, Letts, Lithuanians, Estonians to live under a regime so tyrannical that they could not live under it themselves?

There is sometimes an attempt to justify this contradictory position by reference to immutable Russian "historical" or "ethnological" rights, which must be maintained, regardless of the regime in Moscow. This does not stand any serious examination. There are almost no Russians in the annexed territory. For almost two decades the Soviet Government never hinted that its economic well-being or its strategic security were impaired by the voluntary relinquishment, in line with Lenin's principle of national self-determination, of these non-Russian border areas of the former Russian Empire.

Far from being unimportant, the type of regime in Moscow should be all-important in determining the attitude of Russian and foreign liberals and democrats in this question. Had Kerensky realized his ideal of establishing a democratic federative Russian republic, without an N. K. V. D., without a huge system of espionage and terror and forced labor, the whole issue would have been on a different plane and the Baltic republics might well have become voluntary members of such a federation.

An analogy will make the point clearer So long as Germany was a republic, based on political democracy and respect for human rights, German democrats and liberals could quite properly have urged the inclusion of Austria, South Tyrol, the Saar, Danzig, and at least part of the Sudetenland in a German federation, assuming that the majority of the people in these regions desired union with Germany. From the moment when Hitler came into power the sole rational objective of every honest German liberal and democrat was to prevent the extension of that evil regime to any additional territory, German or non-German. Kerensky knows better than most Americans how formidably many points of similarity there are between Stalin's tyranny and Hitler's. The logical conclusion should not be obscured by an obsolete and misleading nationalism.

Address Under Auspices of Emergency Committee To Save the Jewish People of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Orchestra Hall, Chicago, Ill., on January 27, 1945, under the auspices of the Emergency Committee To Save the Jewish People of Europe.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is very flattering for a freshman Member of Congress from an Eastern State to be invited to make a trip to the Midwest for the purpose of addressing this great gathering of American citizens, and I am conscious of the fact that there are present tonight many people who know more than I do about the subject which I am to discuss, and who have contributed much more than I to the accomplishment of the purposes of the organization under whose sponsorship this meeting is held.

However, the New York branch of the committee invited me to address a similar gathering some time ago and did not have to recommend me to the Chicago branch if it did not wish to, so I suppose I can derive some assurance from the fact that I have been asked to come here tonight with full knowledge on the part of the committee of how much, or how little, I am likely to contribute.

The purpose of the committee which has invited me is, as I understand it, primarily to prove to the world that the Jewish people of occupied Europe can be saved.

Certainly no organization was needed to convince the American people that the Jewish people of occupied Europe ought to be saved and that there existed in Europe a situation unparalleled even in ancient and medieval times.

Yet, despite frequent newspaper and magazine articles on the subject, I doubt if anyone who has not actually read some of the reports prepared by the War Refugee Board can even begin to grasp what has happened.

Until one realizes that probably one-third of all the Jews in the world have been brutally and systematically exterminated by the Nazi regime, one cannot fully visualize the extent of this awful tragedy, and even then the bare figures showing the numbers put to death, or who have died of disease, malnutrition, and exposure, tell only a part of the story. They give no picture of the sufferings, both mental and physical, of those who remain and who must try to carry on.

We can only imagine what a task it will be to restore these persons, once they have been rescued from actual danger of persecution, to a position of usefulness in society.

I feel that it may be fairly said that this committee has succeeded in its primary objective, and that although a disappointingly small number have actually been siphoned out of occupied Europe, the publicity given those rescues, has convinced our people that the fight is far from hopeless, and that, in fact, it is partly won.

But after all, what does the word "saved" really mean? Does it mean merely kept alive, or does it have a greater significance encompassing actual restoration to health of mind and of body? If the latter, then this committee's objective is still far from attainment and there is every need for a continuance, and even an increase of the kind of work which this committee sponsors.

The job cannot be said to have been done until the beaten and discouraged remnants of Europe's Jews have been, not only removed from the shadow of the gas chamber and the gallows, but, in addition, have been located in a place or places where they are welcomed and enabled to become self-supporting and self-respecting. They must also be restored to a state of mind which will make them want to go ahead and fight for their futures and for the futures of their families.

If this is a proper and attainable objective, how can it be brought about?

To my mind, it can best be brought about by a Government-sponsored and probably Government-financed agency or board, similar in its general set-up to the War Refugee Board which was created in January 1944 and which is now, I understand, about to complete its labors.

I regard it as essential that such an agency should be Government sponsored and financed because in dealing with people like the Nazis who recognize only force, the prestige of the United States Government will be absolutely essential in compelling the Nazis to cooperate in any plan of emigration, or of resettlement, which may hereafter be agreed upon. Furthermore, sponsorship by the United States Government will be the best evidence of the fact, and I am sure it is a fact, that the rescue of the European Jews is an undertaking in which Americans of all races, creeds and colors are equally concerned, whereas, conduct of the rehabilitation operations by a privately financed agency, predominantly Jewish in its personnel and probably in its support, would lack such prestige.

Under such sponsorship the board could probably do, at least, the following:

(a) Ask for and secure the status of prisoners of war for those Jews still under Nazi control.

(b) Obtain the consent of the Nazis to the emigration of those Jews who wished to leave Germany and German-occupied territory.

(c) Arrange with neutral countries and other members of the United Nations for temporary asylum and support for the Jewish emigres without extending permanent citizenship in such countries.

(d) Provide for transportation of the emigres to such neutral or Allied countries and eventually to places of permanent abode, including Palestine.

(e) Collect data on atrocities already committed and make it abundantly clear to the Nazi rulers that the perpetrators of such atrocities and of any committed in the future will be relentlessly sought out and punished.

(f) Keep American public opinion fully informed so as to have continuous support for the Board's activities.

(g) Establish and maintain a rehabilitation program wherever refugees may be, with a view to acquainting them with new skills and new methods of earning a living suitable to the place which may be selected for their permanent abode.

(h) Provide for the reestablishment in their old homes of such Jews as wish to make a fresh start in the old lands, once the threat of persecution has been finally removed.

This may seem to be, and probably is, an ambitious program, but it is not beyond the abilities of groups like this, supported by the overwhelmingly favorable opinion of the American people. At any rate, I think it is a goal at which your efforts should be directed.

We in Congress have just appropriated $1,500,000,000 for the construction of additional ships and installations for our Navy which will result in giving us a Navy probably twice as powerful as any other now afloat, but in the long run our real security and hope for peace can come only through the creation in the minds of people everywhere of a realization that our country is not actuated by materialistic considerations, but that it is willing to stretch out its hands to help the most weak and defenseless of people from whom nothing substantial of a material nature can reasonably be expected in return.

Only in this way, through help to the surviving Jews and, of course, to other peoples in other parts of the world who have felt the oppressor's heel, can we establish and maintain that moral leadership, that reservoir of good will, which, in the last analysis, will be a more potent instrument of power than the fleets and armies which we can reasonably expect to assemble.

I congratulate this group upon the results already accomplished; I congratulate Senator Gillette on his outstanding humanitarian achievements, and I urge all within the sound of my voice, to press forward with undiminished, and even increased zeal, toward the eventual accomplishment of the objectives which I have mentioned.

Lest We Forget—Willkie Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am including in an extension of remarks a comment which appeared in Drew Pearson's Merry Go Round column in the Washington Post of date January 29 last, which runs as follows:

WILLKIE WINS AT INDIANAPOLIS

Sometimes a man who has fought all his life for certain goals and been defeated finally wins them in death. Many of the Republicans who attended the G. O. P. National Committee meeting in Indianapolis felt this about Wendell Willkie. What went on there in the closed-door sessions they considered a victory for him.

Two years ago, Willkie lost out at the 1942 national committee meeting when the Chicago Tribune isolationists elected Harrison Spangler, of Iowa. But this time, Willkie's old friends were stronger in death and won out in some significant backstage maneuvering.

Leader of the anti-isolationist group was Willkie's former campaign manager, shrewd Ralph Cake, of Oregon. Cake and Fred Baker, of Washington, discovered that the isolationists planned to put in their own secretary of the national committee. So they moved in with their own candidate, Mrs. Dudley F. Hay. Thereupon E. F. Colladay, national committeeman from the District of Columbia, went to Oregon's Baker, asked him to withdraw Mrs. Hay's nomination in the interests of party harmony. He tried to propose Mrs. Cooper B. Rhodes, of Washington, D. C., instead.

"I seem to remember a similar proposition 2 years ago," replied Baker, smilingly, "I won't go for it again." Result was Baker, Cake, and the Willkie forces won hands down.

LEST WE FORGET

And, Mr. Speaker, may I say that shortly after the death of Mr. Willkie I asked one of the recognized poets of the Nation, Mrs. Florence Alvord Dieterich, formerly of Vermont and now residing in the District, if she would write for me a tribute. She graciously responded by sending me the following sonnet, which, so far as I know, has never before appeared in print.

TRIBUTE TO WENDELL WILLKIE

Perhaps it is too soon to say how well
  This man has lived, how great, how wide his sphere
Of influence upon the world, so near
Are we to troubled times in which he fell.
And yet we know he cast his shining spell
  Around the earth and thousands will revere
  His kindliness of soul, his vision clear
Of things he gladly gave his life to tell.

The world he left will deeply mourn his loss,
  But all the things for which he stood will live;
His aims shall be our goal and we, across
  The years, will learn how much he had to give
  And freely gave. Then all the world shall say,
  With lowered heads: "A great man passed this way."

—*Florence Alvord Dieterich.*

War Emergency "Big Inch" and "Little Big Inch" Pipe Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the privilege of the House in granting me permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD is appreciated, and I wish to insert the statement of information and data just received from the management of the War Emergency Pipeline Director, through the Director of Supply and Transportation, Mr. George A. Wilson.

The construction of these 1,500-mile fuel-oil lines—24-inch pipe lines and 20-inch pipe-lines—will go down in this war effort as one of the outstanding major accomplishments, not only with reference to time building, but results. As things proved to be, it was most necessary to have these lines when they were completed and thus save thousands of lives of our boys on the battle fronts in Europe.

I here include the complete statement sent me by Mr. Wilson:

JANUARY 19, 1945.

Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SNYDER: In response to your recent request we are pleased to furnish the following statistical data with respect to the operation of the War Emergency Pipeline, Inc., and related information pertaining to the wartime domestic transportation of crude petroleum and petroleum products. The War Emergency Pipeline, Inc., comprises the 24-inch crude-oil pipe line known as the Big Inch and a 20-inch refined products pipe line known as the Little Big Inch.

The Big Inch crude-oil line originates at Longview, Tex., and extends to Phoenixville, Pa., at which point it branches into two 20-inch lines, one leading into the New York Harbor refining area and the other into the Philadelphia refining area. It has a rated annual carrying capacity of 315,000 barrels a day into Norris City, Ill., and 310,000 barrels a day from that point on to the east coast. Actual pumpings north from Longview during the past 3 months have been: October 320,654, November 315,814, December 316,652 barrels per day. Since this line originally began operation on December 31, 1942, it has pumped north from Longview in excess of 195,000,000 barrels of crude oil. Cost of construction of this line originally was estimated at $95,000,000, but actual cost was only approximately $78,000,000.

The Little Big Inch refined products line originates at Beaumont, Tex., at which point it is connected by a series of feeder lines with the principal refineries in the Texas-Louisiana Gulf coast area, and extends to New York harbor. It has an annual average throughput capacity of 225,000 barrels of gasoline a day. When operating on heating oil or similar heavier product, the throughput capacity is decreased to approximately 180,000 barrels a day. Actual pumpings north from Beaumont during the past 3 months have been—October 203,137, November 215,758, December 2[illegible],424 barrels per day. Since this line originally began operation on January 26, 1944, it has pumped north from Beaumont in excess of 63,000,000 barrels of refined petroleum products. Cost of construction of this line originally was estimated at $75,000,000, but actual cost probably will not exceed $66,000,000.

There are attached two detailed statements of construction and operating costs of the War Emergency Pipeline, Inc., as issued by Secretary of Commerce Jesse H. Jones on November 9, 1944. No more current detailed cost figures are available to this office at this time. If we assume that the total quantities of petroleum transported to date through the War Emergency Pipeline, Inc., had been shipped by tank car, we estimate that the additional cost to the Government because of the rail transportation would have been approximately $225,000,000 on the crude oil, plus approximately $100,000,000 on the re-

fined products. This estimate is based upon the differential between existing rail-freight rates and the direct gathering and operating costs by the War Emergency Pipelines as announced by Secretary Jones. At the same time, it must be borne in mind that during the present emergency and shortage of tanker transportation, the pipe lines have not displaced tank-car movement of equivalent quantities, as the total requirements for overland transportation of petroleum to the East coast continue to be so great as to fully occupy all available tank car, pipe line, inland waterway, and tanker capacity.

During the year 1944 deliveries of petroleum to the east coast by all modes of transportation averaged 1,712,129 barrels a day. Of this total, rail movement accounted for 646,113 barrels a day, pipe lines 662,599 barrels a day, inland waterways, barges, and Lake tankers 127,641 barrels a day, and ocean-going tankers 275,776 barrels a day. Particular mention should be made of the fact that, although inland waterways operations accounted for only a relatively small proportion of total deliveries of petroleum to the east coast from other areas, barges and other inland waterway equipment have been fully utilized in meeting other petroleum transportation requirements to which that equipment is better adapted. As evidence of this fact, according to data available in this office, the total volume of crude oil and petroleum products transported via inland waterway during 1944 averaged approximately 1,440,000 barrels a day. If more detailed data along these lines is desired, I suggest that it would be obtainable from the Office of Defense Transportation.

We trust that the foregoing provides you with the desired information.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. WILSON,
Director of Supply and Transportation.

Twenty-four-inch line (Big Inch)

CAPITAL COST

Cost of pipe line, right-of-way, and necessary buildings	$77,112,000

OPERATING COSTS

	Per barrel of oil transported
Gathering cost and cost of transporting the oil to Longview, Tex., has been approximately	$0.23
Operating cost for transporting the oil through the line—Longview to New York—approximately	.08
Depreciation and amortization of the investment in 20 years, including interest on working capital, approximately	.07
Total	.38

The foregoing can be compared with other methods of transportation as follows:

	Tank cars	*Tankers*
Gathering costs	$0.075	$0.176
Transportation	1.522	.430
Total	1.597	.606

The above is based on War Shipping Administration rates for tanker movements and current rail tariffs for rail movements.

Operating Statistics Through Sept. 30, 1944

	Barrels
Deliveries to Norris City and from there by rail, prior to completion of the eastern leg of the line	44,951,946
Deliveries to eastern seaboard via oil pipe line	110,726,371
Total	155,678,317

September 1944 Deliveries

	Barrels
Total	9,620,869
Daily average	320,695

Twenty-inch line (Little Big Inch)

CAPITAL COST

Cost of pipe line, right-of-way, and necessary buildings	$65,654,000

OPERATING COSTS

	Per barrel of products transported
Cost of delivering products to the line	$0.004
Operating cost of transporting products through the line—Gulf Coast to New York	.106
Depreciation and amortization of the investment in 20 years, including interest on working capital, approximately	.123
Total	.243

The above can be compared with other methods of transportation as follows:

	Tank cars	*Tankers*
Transportation	$1.74	$0.40

The foregoing is based on War Shipping Administration rates for tanker movements and current rail tariffs for rail movements.

Operating statistics through Sept. 30, 1944

	Barrels
Deliveries to Norris City, Ill., by pipe lines and then by rail, prior to completion of eastern leg of the line	183,189
Deliveries to eastern seaboard	37,217,756
Total	37,400,945

September 1944 deliveries

	Barrels
Total	6,228,256
Daily average	207,608

Paid for Holding the Pot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Ingham County News, published at Mason, Mich.:

PAID FOR HOLDING THE POT

Bootlicking has paid off for Henry A. Wallace. Double-crossed by President Roosevelt at the Democratic National Convention, Wallace at once began the greatest marathon bootlicking job in history. Up and down, back and forth across the country went Wallace, stopping almost everywhere except Mason to shower praise upon the man who doublecrossed him, stooping to the lowest form of villification of the political opposition in order to cling to a public job. His bootlicking paid off. He has been rewarded with the job of Secretary of Commerce, displacing one of the able men in the Cabinet.

The Greeks had another word for it. They called it holding the chamber pot. One of the pupils of Epictetus asked the master about holding a chamber pot for another.

Epictetus replied, "To one man it is consistent with reason to hold a chamber pot for another, and to look to this only, that if he does not hold it, he will receive stripes, and he will not receive his food; but if he shall hold the pot, he will not suffer anything hard or disagreeable. But to another man not only does the holding of a chamber pot appear intolerable to himself, but intolerable also for him to allow another to do this office, for him. If you then ask me whether you should hold the chamber pot or not, I shall say to you that the receiving of food is worth more than the not receiving of it; and the being scourged is a greater indignity than not being scourged; so that if you measure your interests by these things, go and hold the chamber pot. 'But this,' you say, 'is not worthy of me.' Well, then it is you who must introduce this consideration into the inquiry, not I; for it is you who know yourself, how much you are worth to yourself, and at what price you sell yourself; for men sell themselves at various prices."

There's the difference between Henry Wallace and Jesse Jones. Wallace has spent a lifetime holding the pot for President Roosevelt. It is not beneath his dignity. It is only consistent with the Wallace character. Having another hold a pot for him or holding a pot for President Roosevelt is not consistent with the character of Jesse Jones. That's why Jesse Jones refused an ambassadorship proffered as a reward for giving up his job to Wallace.

Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Unity," delivered by the Vice President, at the Democratic Victory Dinner in Philadelphia, Pa., January 29, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITY

It is a special pleasure to be here in Philadelphia, the cradle of American independence, to greet you and the Honorable FRANCIS J. MYERS, your distinguished new Senator, the outstanding result of Pennsylvania's most recent Declaration of Independence. Progressive statesmen of your great Commonwealth always have been among the leaders in the endless fight for freedom. I am sure that your junior Senator will become known as another champion of constructive liberalism from the Keystone State.

You industrious people of Pennsylvania have already accomplished a tremendous war task, thereby aiding the cause of liberty throughout the world. Your sons have fought valiantly to defeat powerful enemies on the battlefields. Your have produced the vital war materials which, by sheer weight, will ultimately crush the aggressors. Your farms, mines, and factories are providing America, and our fighting allies, with a substantial part of the modern supplies so essential for final victory. Today, in addition to your heroic men and valuable materials, America needs your moral and spiritual strength to help guide suffering humanity to a sound and lasting peace.

More than ever before, the world must have statesmen with vision—wise and tolerant men, who can rise above all local and petty prejudices, and serve mankind in the light of lasting interests. America needs statesmen like Benjamin Franklin, the kindly humanitarian from Philadelphia, whose deep understanding, wise philosophy, and practical diplomacy, helped create and preserve our national independence. It was Franklin, the elder statesman, whose sound advice and

extensive experience inspired confidence and harmony among the founding fathers, making possible political agreement, resulting in that keystone of democracy, our great Constitution, adopted here in Philadelphia at Independence Hall.

This world of ours has been seriously ill for many years. In desperation, a few nations have turned to political quacks, who promised prompt and painless cures for all chronic ailments—at the expense of unsuspecting neighbors. The first effects of the prescribed patent medicine seemed most agreeable to these patients. They experienced an exalted feeling of grandeur—the intoxicating stimulation of easy military victories.

As this drug wore off, and the inevitable reaction took place, the disease spread so rapidly that the epidemic became critical, world-wide, and almost beyond control. Fortunately, this plague has been confined recently to shrinking zones of infection. Furthermore, after this major operation, despite all pessimistic predictions civilization will survive and surely improve. However, the period of convalescence for the world may well be long and painful.

No ordinary doctor can adequately treat such a deadly disease. Today, the world truly requires practical physicians, who can administer to the mind and spirit, as well as to physical wants. we need righteous leaders, like Dr. Franklin, tolerant men, who have the sympathetic understanding, so essential in a world of tragic intolerance.

It may be well to recall that Franklin was the first distinguished internationalist born on American soil. He was the first to obtain international recognition, as a truly illustrious American. Franklin early acquired a deep appreciation of the lasting benefits, which may be derived from friends across the sea.

At one of the darkest hours of American history, the diplomat Franklin, despite his age, made another dangerous and difficult trip abroad. He finally induced France to extend lend-lease aid to poor, ill-equipped colonists, fighting for freedom against overwhelming odds. This assistance ultimately tipped the scales of fortune in favor of democratic Americans.

Today, America is again engaged in a desperate struggle for national existence. Again, the greatest danger to a conclusive victory lies in disunity. Hostile agents, operating throughout the world, know well that their only hope of averting a crushing defeat it to divide the forces of freedom. Unfortunately, certain unthinking people unconsciously play into the hands of the enemy, by stressing foreign and domestic disagreements, instead of concentrating on the one all-essential task—winning the war.

Various individuals still do not understand the seriousness of the world situation. In view of this, may I repeat Dr. Franklin's sage advice, given in another critical period of history:

"We must indeed all hang together, or, most assuredly, we shall all hang seperately."

It is hard to realize that, during this gigantic struggle for survival, a few Americans are actually asking why we fight. In the last 3 years, our fanatical opponents have killed and wounded hundreds of thousands of Americans—and yet people, living in safety and in relative comfort because of such sacrifices, have the effrontery to ask, "What are we fighting for?" As a veteran of the First World War, I am positive that our armed forces on all battle fronts know very definitely why they fight. Fortunately, the overwhelming majority of Americans also know that we fight for the fundamental right to continue our way of life, in fact, for life itself.

Even apart from basic American ideals, recent events in all Axis-occupied countries should be more than sufficient reason for our fighting, if merely to keep similar horrors from our own shores. Again history repeats itself, Americans must fight for freedom—or lose it.

It seems obvious that some people, who question our fighting ideals, are not really sincere. Certain critics merely hope to embarrass the administration in the delicate task of conducting our foreign relations. Others still dream about a return to isolation, even though the possibility of such an existence died with Pearl Harbor, and surely should have been buried with the first robot bomb that crossed the English Channel. Unfortunately, the former group deliberately place their interest above that of our country; the latter blindly yearn for a lost world which can never be revived.

Even more dangerous to our national morale, and to the war effort, are the enemy-sponsored whispers of dissension and defeatism. Such verbal saboteurs stress the differences between the Allies, magnify any disagreements and constantly strive to create lasting dissensions, which might result in a military deadlock. Consciously or unconsciously, people who cause or emphasize disagreements, at home or abroad, render real service to the Axis. Those who give rise to doubts if America should continue this costly and bloody struggle, act as agents of appeasement. In fact, a few newspapers and destructive critics should look to Dr. Goebbels for compensation. Their propaganda value to the enemy, especially in war-time, is priceless.

Freedom of speech and of the press are among the most cherished heritages of democracy for which we fight. Still, practically every virtue, if carried to excess, can become a vice. If free speech is used unwisely, creating disastrous disunity during this world-wide struggle, it might ultimately lead to international chaos and the death of all freedom.

As an ardent advocate of freedom of speech and of the press, I feel impelled to caution Americans, and to appeal for the most careful use of self-restraint. Common sense requires moderation in the exercise of our individual rights. As long as hostilities last no loyal American should speak or act in any way which would give aid or comfort to the enemy. This should be a duty for all of us.

Honest differences of opinion will always exist, among men and nations, as long as humanity moves along the hard road of progress. In fact, all progress grew out of disagreements relative to the existing practices. However, in wartime, unnecessary disagreements should be subordinated in the interest of national and international unity.

Let us, therefore, concentrate on the all-important task before us—defeat our deadly opponents on the field of battle. That is the first step, otherwise all plans for future progress become mere idle dreams. Even violent partisans must admit that it would be more than tragic to lose a war while fighting over details of a peace not yet achieved. First things must come first.

All Americans should support our fighting men to the utmost, which means also to stop wordy sniping at our allies. Even the worst blunders, made by any of the United Nations, fade into relative insignificance when compared with the conduct of our enemies.

The entire world is watching America these days. Upon our fateful decisions may depend the future peace and prosperity of all mankind. Our progressive statesmen will continue to lead America along the path of further social progress, complete military victory, and a lasting peace under the guidance of our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Although gratifying progress has been made, this global war is not yet won. In the final stretch, all remaining belligerents will exert themselves to the utmost. We must all brace ourselves for the hard ordeal ahead.

All Americans should realize that we must win the war decisively, otherwise everything is lost. Any appeasement, or compromise, before victory would be fatal. The world has become far too small for ruthless aggressors to exist among freedom-loving people. If America and democracy is to survive, Germany and Japan must be defeated in battle, and, thereby, taught to respect the rights of other nations.

After our troops march through the avenues of Berlin and the streets of Tokyo, there still remains the complicated task of social and moral rehabilitation of millions long taught a foreign and dangerous code of ethics. The reeducation of these oppressed people may be difficult indeed. Being raised on the vicious doctrine of world domination, they must gradually learn to appreciate the progressive ideals of international peace and order. Yet for the victors to rely upon force alone would be futile. Any order, which hopes to survive, must ultimately appeal to the minds of men. Enlightened world-wide education may be the lost key to lasting peace. However, such a program requires time, and tolerance.

During the heat of battle, Americans have shown their ability to make tremendous sacrifices for victory, both on the home front and the battle front. As complete triumph slowly appears on the horizon, the crucial struggles are yet to come. These may not be in some jungle swamp, or Alpine pass, but rather around the peace conference table, and in the countless subsequent meetings for adjustments, which peace and progress demand.

The tragic failures of Versailles, and all that followed, remain as beacon lights to warn us of the dangers ahead. The world has already paid far too high a price in blood on the battlefield to lose victory in the halls of diplomacy. The supreme sacrifice of our departed heroes demands that our statesmen and our people highly resolve that such conditions never again be permitted to develop. A few ambitious aggressors must not be allowed to cause chaos on earth and untold misery to millions of innocent people.

In this shrinking world no nation can live safely alone—no more than you or I can completely divorce ourselves from essential contact with society. Civilization, of necessity, means interdependence. For mutual protection, law-abiding citizens organized to suppress antisocial individuals. In similar fashion, peace-loving nations must band together in some acceptable form of organization for the preservation of human progress.

Wars have become far too devastating and destructive to accept them with any air of indifference. The entire world has already paid far too high a price to tolerate the view that wars just happen. Wars do not just happen. They are the result of deliberate acts of otherwise rational human beings, and they simply must be checked if long-suffering humanity is to survive.

As the world conflict grows in scope and intensity, we hear more and more about plans for the world of tomorrow. The tragic disillusionment following our high idealism during the First World War makes us Americans especially anxious to avoid another catastrophe at this time. We know that civilization simply cannot stand the destructive calamity of modern warfare every quarter of a century.

On the complicated problem of achieving a just and durable peace, too much thought cannot be spent. However, the pressing task still before us, which must not be delayed, is achieving military victory. That grim undertaking depends primarily upon deeds and not words.

By their heroic deeds the brave men of our armed forces, from the jungles of the Pacific to the banks of the Rhine, already are shaping the world of tomorrow. These strong arms and stout hearts defend more than our wealth and freedom, for our very national existence is at stake. Our debt to them increases steadily. Our gratitude will be eternal.

Thousands of our brave fighting men will never return. The least we can do in respect

to these heroes is to make sure that no selfish group will ever again be permitted to plunge the entire world into war. America's heroic dead would not want empty honors in bronze nor statues of marble. The only monument worthy of their great sacrifice is a much better world—a world blessed with just and lasting peace.

Address of George J. Chryssikos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by George J. Chryssikos, Esq., at the naturalization proceedings held in the Court of Common Pleas of Hudson County, Jersey City, N. J., January 22, 1945:

My new fellow citizens, a great many years ago I stood before the bench of the court in the same position as you are today. Several decades ago I took the oath of allegiance to the United States. I received my naturalization papers and became an American citizen. Like you, I was not privileged to be born in this country. Almost 40 years of enjoyment of the rights of American citizenship have reinforced my convictions that beyond doubt this is the best country in the whole world. I am proud to be an American citizen. Together with all other citizens I am grateful to the founders of this Republic because they made America a free country and placed the Constitution of the United States between me and all those who would deprive me of my rights. Whether in my home, or on the streets, or in a public conveyance, or at my place of work, or in this courtroom, I breathe the air of freedom.

This day is one of the most important in your life. You have crossed the bridge which separated you from the citizens of the greatest and safest democracy in the world. Today you have really entered the United States of America spiritually as well as physically.

From now on the Government of the United States is your Government—which means your servant and your protector. To many of you this is a novel experience, because not all governments are servants of the people. There are governments, we know, which consider the people as their servants and impose their arbitrary might on all except a chosen few. There are governments which, instead of protecting the people, subject them to all kinds of abuses.

As American citizens you are entitled and even expected to exercise control over the acts of the Government, to see that its three branches—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—live up to their obligations, which include the promotion of the common welfare of the people, the safeguarding and perpetuation of the Republic, the inviolability of its laws, and the protection of the rights of the individual.

At fixed intervals you will be called to the polls to express with your fellow citizens in a decisive way your opinion regarding the administration of national, State, county, or municipal affairs by those in power. Your votes will be a factor in the popular verdict which decides the fate of every administration in this free country.

America has adopted you, trusting that you will contribute to its welfare and to its strength with the loyal performance of your duties as well as the exercise of your rights as citizens. It is of the utmost importance to your new country and to you that the ideals of rights and duties are completely balanced in your conscience. This essential balance will be effected if you realize that your private welfare lies in the welfare of the country.

Your adopted country is now fighting for its very existence. It is fighting for its freeedom, for its rights and for its place in the world as a great Nation. Its enemies are your enemies. Their success in this war would mean that you, as American citizens, would have to submit to their dictates, to accept whatever fate their savage selfishness, their greediness, and their hatred of freedom would reduce you to. To defend your rights so threatened, you, your sons, and your daughters, your brothers and your sisters, must defend the country to the utmost of your power. You must be ready to do all that the safety of America and its future requires. You must accept cheerfully every sacrifice which is required of you for the complete and final defeat of the enemies of the United States. The war which this country, allied with the United Nations is waging against Germany and Japan is the supreme test of the loyalty which you have solemnly sworn to the American flag. Victory over our common enemies must be your most fervent wish. Its achievement must ever be the common aim of all those who take pride in calling themselves American citizens.

Millions of American men are now called upon to shed their blood, it may be to give their lives, in defense of our country. We on the home front must bear with courage and fortitude whatever our chosen representatives and public officers, in the exercise of their wisdom, ordain as necessary for the welfare and safety of our fighting men and women, whose particular needs must come first. Our individual interests must remain secondary to the general interests of our country. In this time of great emergency, every citizen is called upon to contribute his might to the prosecution of the war. When victory comes, each of us will then have the opportunity to receive his individual share of the great bounty of our glorious country; but let us remember, this share will, of course, be measured by the degree of the personal contribution that you and I have made to the welfare of our Nation.

Did the President Violate a Federal Statute?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, section 249 of chapter 8 entitled "Federal Corrupt Practices," of title 2 of the United States Code reads as follows:

SEC. 249. Promises or pledges by candidate.

It is unlawful for any candidate to directly or indirectly promise or pledge the appointment, or the use of his influence or support for the appointment of any person to any public or private position or employment, for the purpose of procuring support in his candidacy.

Section 61b of title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Criminal Code and Criminal Procedure," reads as follows:

SEC. 61b. Political activity—Promise of employment—Compensation or other benefit.

It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible in whole or in part by any act of Congress, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election.

In his letter to Jesse Jones, the then Secretary of Commerce, written on January 20, 1945, the President frankly stated that he was appointing Henry Wallace Secretary of Commerce in return for his political services during the last campaign; that as his reward for political service rendered Mr. Wallace could have almost any job he thought he was qualified to hold.

The only remaining question is, Had the President at any time prior to the election promised Mr. Wallace that he would give him a political job if Mr. Wallace supported the administration during the pending campaign?

Official and political as well as commercial business is transacted by agreement which may be either verbal, written, or implied, or by a combination of two or all three.

If the President promised a job with the administration in return for political support, then both sections were violated by him when he sent in the nomination of Mr. Wallace.

The President admits in his letter to Jones that he had promised Mr. Wallace a job as a reward for support during the campaign, but he says that the promise was made at the end of the campaign.

Let us look at the evidence which might indicate that prior to, or during, the campaign the President promised Mr. Wallace a job.

In 1940 Mr. Roosevelt refused to accept a Presidential nomination unless Wallace was made his running mate—Arthur Krock, New York Times, July 12, 1944. That is proof that at that time Mr. Roosevelt wanted Mr. Wallace's support.

When the Democratic National Convention was being held in Chicago in July of 1944, Mr. Roosevelt, in writing, stated that if he was a delegate he would vote to nominate Mr. Wallace as a Vice Presidential candidate of the party, but he added that he did not wish to appear in any way as dictating to the convention. At that convention, notwithstanding the backing of Sidney Hillman, Mr. Wallace was defeated.

Thereafter—quoting James B. Reston, New York Times, August 11—the President "reassured Vice President Henry A. Wallace that he wants him to have an important place in the Government if the Roosevelt administration is returned to office in November. Mr. Roosevelt is said to have sent a message to Mr. Wallace congratulating him on his fight for the Democratic Vice Presidential nomination and telling him that so long as the present administration remained in office an important post would be open to him."

That communication, if it meant anything, meant that if—and I emphasize the if—the Roosevelt administration won the election, that so long as it continued in office, a political job would be open to Mr. Wallace.

Now, does anyone doubt but that after the Chicago convention was over, after Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman had been nominated, the President desired the support of Mr. Wallace during the coming campaign? I think not.

Thereafter Mr. Wallace, who must have been disappointed because of the President's failure to go all-out for him at the Chicago convention, apparently was reassured and went out and campaigned vigorously for the fourth term. Was he then relying upon an express or an implied promise that if he campaigned for the administration he would get a job if it won the election?

The President won the election and on January 20, 1945, Mr. Roosevelt wrote the then Secretary of Commerce, Jesse Jones, these words:

> Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued.

That letter made it clear that the appointment was made as the result of a promise. Is not the only link needed to complete the chain of evidence supporting the theory that the appointment was the fulfillment of a promise made before the service was rendered rather than after, supplied by the President's statement as set forth in Mr. Reston's dispatch to the New York Times which was published on August 11, 1944, and which has been quoted?

If the President was correctly quoted, after the convention had been held, after Mr. Wallace had been refused the Vice Presidential nomination, and before the campaigning had fairly begun, and when he needed his support, the President not only told Mr. Wallace that he wanted him "to have an important place in the Government if the Roosevelt administration was returned to power" but for good measure and as a promise he added, "so long as the present administration remained in office an important post would be open to him."

Was not that an implied promise that if Mr. Wallace supported the fourth-term candidate and the fourth term candidate won, Wallace would get an appointment?

Does anyone think for one moment that if Mr. Wallace had sulked in his tent, or opposed the administration, he would have received an appointment?

Did not the President intend to tell and did he not give Mr. Wallace to understand that, if he was a good boy and worked hard during the campaign, he would get a job if the administration won and did not Mr. Wallace so understand it?

Let each individual judge for himself after considering the facts whether Mr. Wallace campaigned for the fourth term in reliance upon a promise, express or implied, that, if the administration won at the November election, he would be given an important political job.

Government by Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, now that those in high executive positions connive and scheme to circumvent the plain statutory mandates of Congress, there is little that remains of freedom under law.

The directive issued by General Hershey to the State directors on January 3, 1945, and by them transmitted to the draft boards of this country, was in its very inception a diabolical fraud and a deliberate swindle. It has already deprived thousands of their legal rights under the Tydings amendment. There were woven into this directive of January 3 statements purporting to be made by high officials, including the Chief Executive, calculated to misrepresent and deceive the draft boards of the Nation with respect to the Tydings amendment.

It is a clear case of the executive department seeking to do by indirection what could not legally be done under the terms of the law. The directive was so framed that the draft boards were led to believe that this directive was a Presidential order and, therefore, superior to existing law, and that this dictatorial edict carried with it power great enough to nullify all rights of registrants under the plain terms of the Tydings amendment, and an order of such force and effect as to deprive registrants of the right to appeal. Is it possible that the appointment to a Cabinet position in payment of a political debt can carry with it the assumption that the Executive could or would in like manner seek to punish the producers of food because the election returns from rural districts were not satisfactory to the Chief Executive? Just how far is this utter disregard of existing law to be carried? The reports coming in from the rural districts, and especially from the dairy sections of the country, indicate that even the second directive issued by General Hershey is being disregarded by some draft boards.

The food situation that is now developing is serious, but this raid upon the farm labor necessary to produce food during the coming year will present a ghastly situation. There seems to be a deliberate attempt to reduce the people to supplicants and serfs. The letters now coming to the desk present a deplorable condition with reference to abandoned farms, sale of large herds of dairy cattle, and the resultant lowering of morale among those who have worked with inadequate help, without the necessary machinery to replace help, and long hours of labor, often 15 hours a day, to meet the demand for more food.

There may be little that Congress can do to stem the tide of totalitarian tendencies, especially when its laws are overridden and treated with contempt; but it would seem as though the Congress could rise above partisan politics, assert its independence and self-respect, and throw the fear of God into those who are deliberately attempting to destroy the effectiveness of Congress.

What is the effect of a tyrannical government upon a citizen? Let one of the fathers of our Federal Constitution speak:

> A person of a very different description appears in view—pale, trembling, emaciated, faltering in his steps, not daring to look upward, but, with marked anxiety, rolling his eager eyes on every side. Who is he? He is the slave of * * * a tyrannical government. He is afraid to act, to speak, or look. He knows that his actions and his words, however guarded, may be construed to be criminal; he knows that even his looks and countenance may be considered as the signs and evidences of treacherous thoughts and treasonable conspiracies; and he knows that the suspicion of his masters, upon any of these points, may be fatal; for he knows that he is at the mercy of those who, upon the slightest suspicion, may seize or hang him—who may do whatever they please with him, and with all those who are dear to him. What effect must this man's situation produce upon his mind and temper? Can his views be great or exalted? No. Such views, instead of being encouraged, would give offence; and he is well aware what would follow. Can openness and candor beam from his soul? No. Such light would be hateful to his masters; it must be extinguished.

Letter From W. C. NeSmith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., *January 26, 1945.*

Hon. EMORY H. PRICE,

Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I have read something of the study now being made to determine what can be done to improve the operation of the Congress. It therefore seems an appropriate time to offer for your consideration an idea which I believe would be of great value to the Congress in its relations with the executive branch of the Government.

I would provide three coordinators for each department or major independent bureau of the Federal Government. These coordinators to have terms of office similar to the Comptroller General but staggered so that no two terms would expire at the same time.

In each department or bureau, one coordinator would be selected by the department or bureau head, one selected by the Senate committee dealing with affairs of that department or bureau, and the third selected

by the House committee on the affairs of that office.

For the purpose of studying the procedure and making recommendations for improvements, the coordinators would have access to all functions and all records of the department or bureau to which assigned.

Each would work independently of the other two and would use his own discretion as to the phase of the work he would study at any particular time.

Once per week, each would file a written report on his activities and include any recommendations he may have ready to offer.

The reports would be made in triplicate with the department or bureau head, the Senate committee, and the House committee each getting one.

At intervals of 3 or 6 months, the department or bureau head would be required to make a written report to the Senate and House committees stating what action had been taken on the various recommendations, and if no action, his reasons why not.

These reports to be made public unless a majority of the Senate committee and a majority of the House committee vote otherwise on specific reports.

The historian, Dr. Charles A. Beard, after years of studying our system of government, concludes that the founding fathers intended Congress to be the dominant branch of the Government. Whatever may be the individual opinion on that question, surely no one can deny that the Members of the Congress are entitled to full and complete information relative to the operations of the various branches of the Government. Otherwise, how can the Congress be expected to intelligently legislate for these governmental operations?

Perhaps my impression is incorrect, but it seems that the present system falls far short of supplying Congress with all the information which it needs. In the first place, does not most of the information come from the heads of the departments or bureaus, and, without casting any reflection on them, is it not natural for them to present information which will support their policies rather than to present information that would be detrimental to their policies? In the second place, with the departments and bureaus so large, can the head of the department or bureau know all that goes on in his part of the Government or know all the places where improvement might be made?

These coordinators would not have the power to change or interfere with any function of the department or bureau to which assigned, but would devote full time to research and reports thereon. They should therefore be of inestimable value in keeping a constant flow of information going to the proper congressional committees. These reports should be of value to the department heads, too, since this way they could learn about matters under their jurisdiction which might otherwise escape their notice and would have an opportunity to act before making their reports to the committees of Congress.

I would have the coordinators make written reports weekly, because it is human for the best of men to relax. They would be less likely to do so if they had to turn in a written record of their activities. This reasoning would also apply to the reports required from the department heads to the committees of Congress. Department heads would be more apt to act and less apt to procrastinate on matters requiring such a written report.

Objection might be raised to these coordinators having access to all the records of the department or bureau to which assigned because of such matters as military secrets and state secrets which involve the Nation's welfare. Is it logical to believe that these coordinators would be less patriotic and less concerned about the Nation's welfare than the heads of departments would be? Should a coordinator err in judgment about some matter, the report still need not go beyond the two congressional committees concerned. If it were a matter of grave importance, surely its suppression could be justified to a majority of each of the two committees concerned. Granting that the two committees could also make an error in judgment by not suppressing such a report, what are the chances of that as weighed against the chances of error in the other direction with perhaps one or two men making the decision?

Selection of the coordinators in the manner outlined seemed the most desirable because it would give each of the three parties to whom the reports would be made an opportunity to pick the kind of person believed to be best qualified for the job. If this should raise the question of appointive power, perhaps that could be met by making it mandatory that the President appoint those selected by the various parties.

Respectfully yours,

W. C. NESMITH.

Veterans' Discharge Insignia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, a situation has arisen which, I believe, deserves the widespread publicity it is receiving. I refer to the general attitude and public indifference toward the veterans' discharge insignia.

The lapel button given to the men and women who have been honorably discharged from the service is being criticized by both the public and the ex-servicemen themselves. The design is insignificant and has merited no recognition from the public. The veteran himself feels the emblem lacks distinction and in a majority of cases he fails even to apply for one.

Then, there is the recent case in Detroit where a veteran of Gaudalcanal was publicly ridiculed because outwardly he appeared physically fit and several factory workers thought he should be in the Army. When he showed them his button one of them sneered, "How'd he get that thing, for regular attendance at a race track?" Another remarked, "It's one of those production pins they give you for raising chickens." The veteran pocketed his emblem and has not worn it since.

It has been revealed that only a small percentage of the ex-service men and women have availed themselves of the right to wear the button. Out of several hundred thousand who have been returned to civilian life, only 14,182 have applied for the emblem. Many have expressed an open dislike for it, some stating that it should be bigger and more distinctive.

A reporter of the Detroit Free Press showed a card to scores of persons in Detroit on which was a discharge button between an ordinary patriotic pin that may be purchased in any jewelry store and another which had been bought in a Japanese novelty store. Only one recognized the insigne which marks the returned soldier. He should have. He had one himself.

On February 5 the Detroit district association of the American Legion will discuss the problem in a meeting. In the meantime, public officials, Legionnaires, and many others were united in the protest that a grateful Government owes these men at least a recognizable emblem symbolic of devotion and service.

Legislation Providing for Abolition of Pauper's Oath for Veterans—Medal of Honor for Billy Mitchell—Abolition of Age Limit for Railroad Employees Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing three bills today and would like to call their contents to the attention of the Members of this House. The first of these bills provides for amending the present veterans' legislation so as to abolish the so-called pauper's oath for all veterans applying for hospitalization, the contents of this bill being, and I quote:

SEC. 6. In addition to the pensions provided in this title the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized under such limitations as he may prescribe, and within the limits of existing Veterans Administration facilities, to furnish to men discharged from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard for disabilities incurred in line of duty or to those in receipt of pension for service-connected disability, and to veterans of any war, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, domiciliary care where they are suffering with permanent disabilities, tuberculosis, or neuropsychiatric ailments and medical and hospital treatment for diseases or injuries: *Provided*, That any veteran of any war who was not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, who is in need of hospitalization or domiciliary care, shall be furnished necessary hospitalization or domiciliary care (including transportation) in any Veterans Administration facility, wthin the limitations existing in such facilities, irrespective of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service.

SEC. 7. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not require any applicant for hospital treatment or domiciliary care to make any statement, written or oral, with respect to the value of the real or personal property owned by such applicant.

The second bill I am introducing provides for amending the present Railroad Retirement Act so as to give retirement

pay to any railroad employee who has completed 30 years of railroad service, regardless of age. The present law as it now stands provides that, in addition to 30 years' service, the employee must have also reached the age of 65 years. This bill would eliminate any age limitation.

There are other benefits concerning compensation for injury provided for in this bill, which I also quote, as follows:

ANNUITIES

SEC. 1 (a) The following-described individuals, if they shall have been employees on or after the enactment date, shall, subject to the conditions set forth in subsections (b), (c), and (d) be eligible for annuities after they shall have ceased to render compensated service to any person, whether or not an employer as defined in section 1 (a) (but with the right to engage in other employment to the extent not prohibited by subsection (d)):

1. Individuals, without regard to age, who on or after the enactment date shall have completed 30 years of service.

2. Individuals who on or after the enactment date shall be 50 years of age or over and either (a) have completed 20 years of service or (b) have become totally and permanently disabled for regular employment for hire, but the annuity of such individuals shall be reduced one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that they are under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue.

3. Individuals, without regard to age, who on or after the enactment date are totally and permanently disabled for regular employment for hire and shall have completed 20 years of service.

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall not be applicable with respect to annuities for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act.

The third bill provides for authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress the Medal of Honor to William Mitchell. This bill in the last session of Congress was passed by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and the Senate itself by unanimous vote. I feel sure that there is no man who ever served this Nation as a hero whose memory is more entitled to this honor than the late Billy Mitchell.

Birthday Message From the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a message from the President read by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt in a broadcast from the White House in connection with the observance of the President's birthday.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am sorry that wartime circumstances make it impossible for me to talk with you personally tonight on my birthday. I have asked Mrs. Roosevelt to read this brief message in my behalf to the many millions of Americans who contribute to the fight against infantile paralysis.

This year, if I had a birthday cake, there would be 63 candles on it. But the years they represent seem very few to me tonight because your great generosity has made this day a testament to youth—a promise to our children that the bright tomorrow for which we fight throughout the world will not be dimmed by the shadow of infantile paralysis at home.

The success of the 1945 March of Dimes in the campaign against infantile paralysis does not come as a surprise to me. We are a nation of free people, and free people know how to go over the top—whether it's a Nazi wall, a Japanese island fortress, a production goal, a bond drive, or a stream of silver dimes. The reason for these achievements is no military secret. It is the determination of the many to work as one for the common good. It is such unity which is the essence of our democracy.

Our national concern for the handicapped and the infirm is one of our national characteristics. Indeed, it caused our enemies to laugh at us as soft. "Decadent" was the word they used. But not any more. They are learning—and learning the hard way—that there are many things we are mighty tough about.

We will never tolerate a force that destroys the life, the happiness, the free future of our children, any more than we will tolerate the continuance on earth of the brutalities and barbarities of the Nazis or of the Japanese war lords.

We combat this evil enemy of disease at home just as unremittingly as we fight our evil enemies abroad.

Our work over the past decade in fighting infantile paralysis was put to its most rigorous test during this past year. The 1944 epidemic was the worst our country has experienced since 1916. But this time we were prepared with a Nation-wide network of defense that your dimes and dollars enabled us to build. Wherever and whenever an outbreak occurred, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and its community chapters, sprang into activity. Almost overnight afflicted areas were provided with trained personnel, supplies, and equipment.

Tonight we are able to report that because of your cooperation, the very best in medical care and treatment has been assured for everyone—for the boys and girls, for the men and women—stricken by this disease. All of them have greater hope and confidence today—because they know you are with them and giving them powerful support in their fight.

Yes, we can well be proud of the work of the National Foundation and its chapters. But as any fighting man will tell you, we cannot rest on defense alone. No matter how efficient and immediate the treatment is, it does not take the place of prevention and cure. We must continue to devote our attention ever more to attack. We must give our scientists and research workers the necessary equipment to find this invidious enemy, to corner and destroy him. The task is not an easy one. The mystery shrouding the infantile paralysis virus is not readily penetrated. But we will persist—and we will triumph.

There is no yardstick long enough to measure the happiness our children give us. Whatever we can contribute to promote our children's health is an investment in our country's future. It is an assertion of our American birthright to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Citations by the Kiwanis Club to Certain New York Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I made in New York City, on October 4, in behalf of the Kiwanis Club of New York, in presenting a citation from that club to the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, the Sun, and the World-Telegram.

I also ask consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD the address made by Mr. Nicholas Roosevelt, assistant to the publisher of the New York Times, in accepting the citation on behalf of the Times, the Herald Tribune, the Sun, and the World-Telegram.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES, OF NEW JERSEY

In presenting this citation on behalf of the Kiwanis Club of New York to the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, the Sun, and the World-Telegram, I wish to call attention to the magnificent work that has been done by these papers and the press in general during this greatest of all wars. The liberties of a people are almost directly in proportion to the real freedom of the press, and thank God, we still have real freedom of the press in the United States of America, and it will continue if the owners of the newspapers are courageous enough to accept the responsibilities and the attacks which may be made upon them from various sources because of the fact that they speak as free agents of a free people.

We all appreciate how great the casualties of war are on the battlefield and at the battle front, but few of us appreciate the terrific casualty which occurs off the battlefield.

The newspapers made their full contribution both on and off the battlefield. Nineteen correspondents of newspapers, press associations, radio networks, and syndicates have been killed during World War No. 2. More than 41,000 newspaper employees are serving in the armed forces.

Daily and weekly newspapers throughout the United States and Canada have served a threefold purpose in the Second World War.

1. They have kept the people informed with accentuations at the right time, which has helped materially to keep the morale of people high.

2. They have kept the Government vigilant and alert both in the account of war and the correction of errors. Open criticism fairly given for constructive purposes has helped to accomplish this.

3. Newspapers have stimulated the people themselves and kept them vigorous and alert, and all of the papers represented here today have worked to make the people cooperative with the Government's worthy war measures.

In my opinion the newspapers have done a remarkable job in placing upon themselves voluntary censorship regulations. They have reported bad news with the good news,

but have refused in most cases to report news that would give aid and comfort to the enemy.

I shall not take your time to mention all of the problems that have faced the newspapers by way of increased cost from many directions, coupled with inability to get the necessary operating materials on time for regular procedure. Nor will I deal at length with the fact that they have carried on despite decreased advertising revenues in many cases. They have had the same troubles that industry has had in doing its job and they have suffered from the loss of manpower through the draft of personnel. The newspapers have given freely millions of inches of editorial and display space valued at millions of dollars to help in the various campaigns for scrap collection, sale of war bonds, promotion drives, and the recruiting of men and women both for the services and for industry.

The newspapers are just as much a part of the free enterprise system as is any plant or business in the country.

The newspapers, coupled with radio, magazines, and other methods of free and uncontrolled communications, are really the lifeblood of a free people. Anything that attacks or destroys the freedom of the press and freedom of speech, as well as freedom of assembly for legitimate purposes in keeping with the Constitution of the United States—is inimical to the interests of our American freedoms. Too often people say, when one segment of our free life is attacked, let them take care of themselves. Many fail to realize that the destruction of freedom in one segment of our American life is a menace to the freedom in all other segments of our American life.

The newspapers can and should help mold individual character in such a way as to increase the national character which can be no higher than the composite of the individual character of our citizens.

The newspapers have a real personality and that is why we choose this or that paper for our regular reading of the news. We like the personality and character of a given newspaper, just as we like the character and personality of an individual. The very fact that these men here have worked for more than one of the papers, who receive this citation today, shows that newspapers cross the breed of thinking, just the same as human beings in the United States have crossed their breed and produced a sturdy race of people.

The newspapers, coupled with the radio, magazines, and other methods of freedom of expression, are the guardians of the liberty of the people. They protect the peoples' rights and free government, in my opinion, quite as much as the elected representatives of the people. They are the watchdogs of the representatives, and if they keep their character of news on a high standard, then I will guarantee the standard of the representatives of the people will be higher in any country which has a fine press than in a country which has a press and radio system which is conducted on a lower standard of national interest and welfare.

The Senators and Congressmen prove the great value of the work done by the newspapers, as is evidenced by the reading of many articles and editorials both in the House and the Senate and the insertions in the Appendix of the RECORD of these articles and editorials which are the results of the findings of a free press interested in good government.

No newspaper will always please all of its readers. Some will please all of them part of the time, and part of them all of the time, but none will please all of them all of the time. However, a good newspaper must please a substantial part of the people most of the time, and all of its readers a majority of the time if it is to keep up and increase its circulation. After all, the circulation of a newspaper is the verdict of the people on the performance of that newspaper.

I never forgot the statement of Charles Coburn, the actor, who is beloved by millions of people, when he said in answer to the charge that the producers of plays and the actors had let the stage sink to a low level. He said, "It is not the producers nor the actors who control the standard of the stage. The public at the box office determine the standard of the stage, and so long as they will pay four times as much to see a vulgar show as they are willing to pay to see a fine Shakespearean play, the standard will be just where the public keep it by their support at the box office." I leave this thought with you—the standard on which the newspapers function in delivering the news to the public is likewise determined by the support that the public gives to one method of the presentation of the news as compared with another method or presentation of the news. You gentlemen and the newspapers you represent are doing a fine job in setting a high standard for news presentation and I congratulate you. Let us all remember that you hold in your hands a very great part in the destiny of the United States of America, and through it as a leader in the world, you have a large responsibility in connection with the making of a fair, sound, and just peace which, God knows, all right thinking people have sought for hundreds of years, and today after this horrible war cherish above all other earthly accomplishments.

I now take pleasure in reading the citation which is presented by the New York Kiwanis Club to the newspapers represented by each of you four gentlemen, and I congratulate you on the conduct which merited this presentation.

ADDRESS OF NICHOLAS ROOSEVELT, ASSISTANT TO THE PUBLISHER, THE NEW YORK TIMES

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PRESS TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Stringfellow, president of the Kiwanis Club, and Senator HAWKES, in the name of the New York Times, I want to thank the Kiwanis Club for this fine citation. The Times is proud that the Kiwanis Club has felt that it deserves this honor. The Times has always striven, and will continue to strive, for the highest standards of accuracy and fair play in journalism. I think that I speak in the name of all four papers which are represented here when I say that we who are in newspaper work are keenly aware of the responsibility which we have to the public. It is something very real of which I am sure every principal editor and publisher is unceasingly conscious. A responsibility exists—and a very real one. But as I look back over the 20 years that I have spent on the staff of the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, I am of the opinion that this responsibility is rather different from what it is popularly supposed to be. I have often been asked why the press—or the New York Times or the Herald Tribune—does not do more to help a particularly worthy cause. I have been asked why certain newspapers devote so much space to the funnies instead of using their great influence to be educational. I have been told with complete positiveness that the newspapers of the country are merely the tools of the advertisers. In fact, on at least one occasion, the President of the United States deliberately charged that the policies of newspapers were formed in the counting room—the implication being that the news columns and the papers' policies were for sale.

Now I don't mean to pretend that never has a newspaper editor or publisher allowed himself to be led astray by greed or prejudice or pressure. But I do maintain that the leading papers in this country are run by men of character and principle and that these men look upon their work as in a sense a public service. Their constant preoccupation is to turn out newspapers that are accurate, fair, and honest.

Before going further into detail, let us stop to consider some of the functions of a newspaper.

The first and foremost function is to obtain and disseminate the news. This process should not be confused with the dissemination of opinion or interpretation of the news. That is why, in the best newspapers, the editorial page and the views and prejudices of the editor or publisher are rigidly separated from the work of gathering and writing of the news. I know, of course, that this is not always the case. You and I know at least two papers in this city which do not hesitate to color the news to further the prejudices of the publisher and a third which, though it calls itself a newspaper, makes no pretense to present the news and, instead, fills its pages from beginning to end with bitter expressions of prejudices and partisanship dressed up as if they represented news rather than views.

This separation of views from news is becoming basic in all good journalism. This does not mean that modern newspapers withhold expressing views—far from it. But these views, either in the form of editorials or of signed columns, are not allowed to influence the presentation of news in the news columns. In fact, very often you will find a conflict between the views of some of the columnists and of the editorial writers. I happen to like this myself—but I call your attention to the very important fact that the first and main function of a newspaper is to present the news. Expression of opinion, like articles which are designed to entertain, are only auxiliary functions of newspapers.

Too often the public fails to realize the nature of the task of obtaining news. News, as the word implies, is something new, something of interest to many persons, often something out of the ordinary. It implies events such as a fire or a train wreck or a wedding or a death or a hurricane or the opening of a new subway line. It includes important statements by officials, speeches by candidates for office, and a host of other things. The opening of a new and particularly good movie may be news. So is a world series baseball game. There is news of music and of art and of business events—many fields which have a special interest to special groups.

A good editor not only must balance the bill of fare so that readers with different interests find in their paper the kind of news which is of special interest to them, but he must also be editorially on guard against views, prejudices, or deliberate misinformation dressed up as news. The public does not realize how often efforts are made by interested persons to hold back important items of news or to attempt to have news stories colored to further their own interests. As a matter of fact, a whole profession has grown up which has as its principal objective to see that particular stories are so presented to the press that they are favorable to particular clients. It is no secret that good editors scrutinize particularly closely material sent them by press agents.

A good editor devotes much of his time to sifting the news from propaganda—to evaluating the accuracy of reports or stories or statements or "canned" copy. The good editor also takes all possible pains to verify and to check up. He instills in his reporters the importance of accuracy. He will not

tolerate prejudice or opinion injected into a news story by a reporter.

Again, I must insist I am talking about the best newspapers in this country. It is a subject close to me not only because I have worked on two of the greatest newspapers in this country, but because it was my good fortune during my earlier connection with the New York Times—from 1923 to 1930—to see a lot of the late Adolph S. Ochs, who made the Times what it is today, and of his great managing editor, Carr Van Anda. I don't think that the American people are aware of the debt which they owe to these two men. Their influence during more than a quarter of a century did more than anything else to turn American journalism away from the partisanship and prejudice that had characterized it in the nineteenth century.

Mr. Ochs, when he bought the New York Times, had a great idea—an ideal—to show that a paper which placed accuracy and fairness above all else could appeal to the American people and could be successful. Mr. Van Anda not only gave substance to Mr. Ochs' ideal but himself possessed an uncanny ability to detect sham, to see what lay under false fronts and to sense efforts of interested persons to distort or hide important aspects of news. Mr. Van Anda's mind was like a steel trap—without passion (but not without compassion), penetrating, searching, appraising, striking at roots and causes instead of being deceived by appearance. In addition, he had a genius for organizing the mechanical end of news coverage and seemed to be able to divine when and where an important news story would break. I am not detracting from the magnificent contribution of other members of the Times staff when I say that these two men were chiefly responsible for giving the New York Times its reputation for reliability, fairness, and accuracy. By its example, the Times strengthened the hands of many other editors and publishers throughout the country who knew in their hearts that accuracy and truthfulness are the keystones of good journalism.

I need hardly tell you, however, that eternal striving for accuracy and truth is not the only task which an editor faces. He has with him night and day the problem of the competition for space. Not only do his advertisers want more space, and his special feature sections, as well as his main news section, but he is faced with the problem of dividing up the available space between different stories. When something particularly important and spectacular occurs in the war, for instance, it is sure to take space that might otherwise have gone to an important local story. There are no hard and fast rules to govern an editor in allotting space. He has to use his judgment. Inevitably he makes mistakes. Often he is criticized for not having played up a particular story more prominently. But, if you read both the Herald Tribune and the Times—and, as one who has worked for and admires both papers, I can only say I hope you do—you have, I am sure, often been struck with the fact that time and again these two papers have at least insofar as their front pages are concerned played up the same news stories in about the same position. In other words, the editors of these two papers have very much the same evaluation of what constitutes important news.

I mentioned the advertisers as among those competing for space. In this connection, you may be interested to know that Mr. Ochs always took the position that an advertisement, if it is good, has news value—that is, it tells the reader something which he is interested to know. The better papers, as you know, have long fought for higher standards of accuracy, in advertising copy and have resisted the efforts of unscrupulous persons to attempt to sell goods by misrepresentation, exaggeration, or deception.

You have heard a lot in recent years about freedom of the press. You have doubtless heard it said that such-and-such a paper should not be permitted to print the kind of things it prints or that the papers should be compelled to print certain statements or official documents. Very probably, if you are a New Dealer, you have felt that the paper published under the eagle eye of my old friend and colleague, Wilbur Forrest, should not be allowed to criticize F. D. R. as severely as it sometimes has.

This desire to suppress news or views you don't like is probably only normal, but it shows a lack of understanding of the value as well as the significance of freedom of expression. The moment Government steps in and tells a newspaper editor or a broadcaster, "You may not say this, because we who speak for the Government do not think it is good for the people to hear it," the death of democracy is at hand. As that great apostle of liberty, the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, put it, "We should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death."

Freedom of the press is, as a matter of fact, inseparable from freedom of speech and freedom of the air. It includes the right to denounce evildoing even if it be in the seats of the mighty, and to criticize the acts and policies of those in office. It implies freedom to read and freedom to hear—freedoms, mark well, which the dictators have ruthlessly suppressed. Its very essence is freedom to think and freedom to hold and communicate an opinion. But these freedoms mean freedom from Government control and regulation and should not be confused with editorial policy or with the moral obligations of an editor to present facts accurately.

The right of freedom of expression belongs to all the people, and not merely to a single group, whether it be newspaper owners, the officers of the Government, or the spokesmen for a political party. Newspaper publishers and editors, of course, are vitally interested in freedom of the press, because this freedom directly affects their livelihood. But the press is only a channel through which people may be informed of what is happening in the world and in their particular community, and through which opinions about these things may be aired. If the people are deprived of a free press and are given, instead, a press which is controlled by the Government, they are denied one of the most important mediums of free expression and constructive criticism of public affairs. This is why freedom of the press has always been resented by wrong doers, feared by weaklings, and abolished by dictators.

I am sure that most of you in this room will agree with me when I say that the greatest potential enemy of freedom of all kinds is government. Americans have so long taken their freedoms for granted that they have lost sight of the fact that these freedoms were won only as the result of a long struggle against governments which only grudgingly and reluctantly admitted that people had a right to be free. We are too prone to look back only to the Revolution, the Constitution, and the founding of the Republic and to forget the long struggle during the preceding centuries which made possible the establishment on this continent of a free society of free men. One of the wisest remarks ever made by the late President Woodrow Wilson was, "The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it." Beginning as far back as the days of Henry VIII—as a matter of fact, going back even to the days of the revolt against King John—a succession of determined liberal-minded individuals fought to curtail the powers of the King of England and of his representatives on this continent to govern men arbitrarily. They fought for justice, not only as an ideal but as a very practical restraint on the arbitrary powers of the King and his henchmen. They fought to make it impossible for government to throw men into prison without due cause. They fought to make it impossible for those in authority to deprive men of life except after a fair trial and for due cause. They fought to prevent the King's henchmen from seizing their property.

Here on this side of the ocean the great struggle for freedom of conscience out of which grew not only freedom of expression but also the freedom of the human mind to explore new ideas without fear or prejudice began with the fight which a valiant young minister freshly arrived from England, Roger Williams, conducted against the theocracy which governed the little colony of Massachusetts Bay with an iron hand 300 years or more ago. Roger Williams not only was the first to proclaim publicly that the religious leaders had no right to use the civil government to enforce their personal wishes and prejudices, but he founded a new colony in Rhode Island which, from the very beginning, insisted on the separation of church and state. This, mind you, was done at a time when such separation was unthinkable. Out of Williams' assertion that the church had no right to compel men to worship in a particular way grew the idea that government itself had no right to coerce men and to control their lives and deal with them arbitrarily. In time we on this side of the water developed the idea of a government of laws—the idea that there were such things as laws which stood above rulers as well as the government. If you study the history of the Revolution and the Constitutional Convention, you will see that inherent in the thinking of the leaders of those days was the idea that rulers had to be held in restraint and that government was made for the people rather than that the people were the creatures of the state.

This idea became firmly entrenched in American and British political thought. Unfortunately, in the last few decades here and elsewhere throughout the world, the tendency to exalt the state has grown greatly. I noticed only last Monday that General De Gaulle has come out for a planned economy for France. This is another one of those reasonable-sounding phrases which advocates of state supremacy use in order to calm the fears of the descending numbers of liberals left in the world.

Make no mistake about it. When government plans and directs the economic activities of a people it must either have the power to enforce its plans or it will fail. Now, governments do not like to fail. The experience in other countries—including this one here—has been that as government imposes economic regulations—which is a form of economic planning—it has an apparently irresistible tendency to pile one regulation on another and to reach out for more and more power. Once government controls economic life, it is inevitable that it will seek to control opinion, because the more it controls, the more it will be criticized, and the more its powers will be resented and restricted.

The only protection we have against such control is a free press. And when I say free press, I mean also a free radio. Because editors and publishers are more keenly aware of the value of freedom of expression than is the average layman, they are more alert to smoke out any attempts to muzzle freedom of expression. In so doing, they are performing a public service.

I think I speak for the other three gentlemen of the press at this table when I say that we are deeply conscious of our responsibilities to the public. And I know that they will agree with me that, if we were not, we would soon be told about it. I know of no

occupation in the United States, even including politics, in which so much gratuitous advice is given and so many frank slams, as the newspaper business. Every one of my friends in other lines of work knows better than I do how a newspaper should be run, and he rarely hesitates to enlighten me fully about our shortcomings.

Even though from time to time we may feel that some of the slams are undeserved, and occasionally we may get a little hot under the collar, we know that they represent a keen interest in our work. Incidentally, very often our friends help us to retain our balance. An alert public demands an alert press. Whenever you find a newspaperman who is not alert or who doesn't care what his readers think or say, it is a safe bet that the newspaper which he represents or publishes or edits has ceased to be of real value to the community.

Textile Industries Under Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, much interest has been aroused among the textile and woolen industries by virtue of a combined order issued by the W. P. B. and the O. P. A. regarding civilian clothing. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Herald News of Passaic, N. J., on Friday, January 26, 1945, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL TEXTILE INDUSTRIES NOW UNDER NEW FEDERAL CONTROLS

Civilian clothing has been in short and irregular supply for several months, particularly those items of infants', children's, and women's apparel which normally move in the lower price range.

As the textile shortage has grown steadily more acute, the Government control agencies have tried increasingly drastic measures of priority and allocation to prevent real hardship in homes of the people.

Now these experimental measures have been abandoned in favor of a sweeping new order to be administered jointly by W. P. B. and O. P. A., which will control all textiles—cotton, wool, and rayon—from the spindle and loom through the retail stores.

How will this new plan work? First, the textile mills may employ only a limited number of workers—according to the "employment ceiling" fixed by the War Manpower Commission. This means that total production is limited for each mill.

Next, W. P. B. sets aside a certain percentage of each mill's production for military and lend-lease. The remaining percentage is available for the civilian markets.

But, under the new arrangement, this civilian allocation is not to move by the normal processes of free enterprise. Instead, W. P. B. will give priority certificates to certain selected garment makers, who agree in advance to use the fabrics only for the precise type and quality of garments specified by W. P. B. and O. P. A.

In return for these fabric priorities, the garment makers agree to sell their product at O. P. A. ceiling prices only to those wholesalers designated by W. P. B.'s Office of Civilian Requirements as being in greatest need for stocks of clothing.

But the wholesaler must agree, before winning his priority, to sell the garments only to those retailers designated by the Office of Civilian Requirements, so that the cities suffering the most acute need for clothing may have first call on the limited factory output set aside for civilians.

In return for his priorities, the retailer also agrees to sell his garments at O. P. A. ceiling prices.

The significance of this new program hardly could be overstated. These textile controls represent the first vertical application of Government controls in a basic industry, from raw materials to retail selling—through the mill, the converter, the wholesaler, jobber, and retailer.

This means that Washington now will tell the textile mill what type, grade, and quality of cloth it may produce; next it will tell the garment makers what type, grade, and quality of apparel they may produce; next it will tell the garment makers where to ship their goods; finally it will tell the wholesalers who is to get first call on the limited retail supply. All through these processes, the Government holds the whiphand of compulsion over every segment of the textile industry, for without priorities nothing may be shipped.

It is too early to tell how well this sweeping program of managed economy will work out. All we know at the moment is that the new textile orders represent the first complete application of national socialism in the United States, along lines perfected by the totalitarian governments of Italy, Germany, Japan, and Russia.

It will be interesting to see if the mechanics of compulsion and regimentation perfected by the dictatorships can be applied successfully to a nation founded and grown great in the inspirations and traditions of freedom.

If we may judge by history and experience in other fields, this new attempt to uproot the last lingering forms of free enterprise within the textile industry will result ultimately, not in more and better clothing, but in ever more distressing scarcities.

We venture the humble opinion that national socialism will not work well in America—in textiles, or in any other product.

Tributes to the Late Senator Francis Maloney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a resolution passed by the City Council of New Britain, Conn., concerning the death of Senator Francis Maloney.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert four editorials from Connecticut newspapers on the same subject.

There being no objection, the resolution and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To His Honor, the Mayor, and the Common Council of the City of New Britain:

The undersigned recommend that the following be accepted and adopted:

"Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of New Britain hereby records, on behalf of this body and of the citizens of New Britain, their deep sorrow upon the untimely death of Francis T. Maloney, senior Senator from Connecticut, and their recognition and appreciation of his long and unfaltering service for his fellow men, with a recognition that his passing leaves a loss in the State of Connecticut that will not easily be filled or forgotten; and

Resolved further, That the city clerk be and he is hereby authorized to send a copy of this resolution to Mrs. Francis T. Maloney, to the city of Meriden, and to the junior Senator from Connecticut for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Charles J. Prestia, Vincent Kotowski, John J. Valentine, Matthew J. Avitabile, Frank W. Chase, Henry L. Connor, John J. Storey, Arthur J. Kallberg, Robert H. Hausman, Adam P. Kwider, William E. Attwood, Jr., John A. Bednarz, Robert H. Stabert, William G. Gibney, Kenneth A. Larson.

Attest:

[SEAL] HARRY E. SCHEUY,
Town and City Clerk.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times of January 19, 1945]

DEATH DRAMATIZES NEED

It is a striking coincidence that the National Planning Association released its proposals for lightening the burdens and increasing the efficiency of the Congress on the very day that Senator Francis Maloney died, patently a victim of the overwork which the existing organization imposes.

The tragic death of the Senator who had assumed leadership in the upper House of the movement for reform may prove a more potent force for it than any living effort he could have made. Certainly his death is notice both to the House and to the Senate of the great need of that for which the Senator was preparing to fight as strenuously as he had for anything in his career.

The National Planning Association, which retained the services of Robert Heller, a business management consultant of Cleveland, has reduced its recommendations to 14 specific items. Some of these have directly to do with lightening the burdens on Congressmen and Senators, enabling them to work more efficiently and to give more attention to important matters through relieving them of need to attend to lesser ones.

Some of the recommendations go to the heart of the difficulty about Congress. It is proposed, for instance, to reduce the number of committees from 33 in the Senate and 47 in the House to about 15 in each case. With fewer committees, no Member need serve on so many or hold so many chairmanships.

It is proposed to give individual Members larger personal staffs, to establish a Congressional Service Bureau and expand the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. One of the staff additions for each Member would be a high-caliber assistant, paid at least $7,500 to $10,000 a year and thus be capable of relieving his chief of much detail. Congressional committees would be adequately staffed, including experts in various fields.

These are the particular recommendations which, if adopted, would improve the ability of Congress to function and which would put at their disposal services which would enable Members the better to deal with the subjects before them. It is significant that the Senator who was striving the hardest in this direction and who had been most articulate about the inability of a Member to spread himself over the activities of numerous committees should have fallen a victim to the very thing of which he was complaining.

The Washington Post commented upon this matter following Senator Maloney's death. It paid high tribute to him for his "freedom from narrow partisanship and political sectarianism" and for his "great talent for mediation." It called him "one of the chief proponents of an efficient Congress" and asserted that "his death is, in fact, proof of the need of such modernization." It called Senator Maloney "a conscientious statesman who took his committee assignments very seriously" and said the burden of presiding over one senatorial committee and serving on four others as well as two special committees, one joint committee and several commissions "undoubtedly helped to wear him down." "There are," it said, "too few men like him in our public life and his death is a very real loss to his State and to the Nation."

Even without such words, the death of Senator Maloney should cause the Senate, at least, if not also the House, to pay more attention to that for which he was striving both for the sake of efficiency and for the sake of Senators as individuals. The report of the National Planning Committee may or may not be the complete or even the best answer to the needs of the situation.

It is at least a starting point. It merits the early and serious consideration of both Houses.

[From the Norwalk (Conn.) Hour]

A WORK WELL DONE

Connecticut in general and his native Meriden in particular paid sorrowful tribute yesterday in last rites for Francis T. Maloney, United States Senator, whose death at a comparatively early age occurred early this week. The cosmopolitan gathering at the mass celebrated in his honor yesterday in Meriden was significant; honors were paid by all walks of life to the man who made a humble beginning—as counterman in a Meriden lunchwagon—and won a United States Senatorship at the climax of his career.

Much has been said of Frank Maloney, of his ability, his energy, his persistence. But probably his outstanding characteristic was his sincere concern for the well-being of his fellow men. Throughout his years at the National Capital, he was a true representative of the people who elected him to office. He appreciated the responsibility of that office and was true to his trust.

It has been said that overwork in execution of his responsibilities in high public office was a factor in the breakdown of his health. That may well have been, because he did not spare himself in the least in getting things done—the way folks back home wanted them done.

Frank Maloney's earthly career has ended. He has entered the greater field—the eternal realm—finding there the reward that comes of honest, helpful service to fellow men.

[From the Bridgeport Herald of January 21, 1945]

WAR CASUALTY

Those two words, highest tribute that can be paid to a private citizen or public official at a time like this, were the only ones that came to the minds of Governor Baldwin, a Republican, and Lieutenant Governor Snow, a Democrat, when they learned that United States Senator Francis T. Maloney had succumbed to a heart condition, and none can dispute the accuracy of that description.

The best editorials that could be written on the United States Senator from Meriden were composed extemporaneously on the floors of the house and senate in Hartford a short while after the final bulletin reached Capitol Hill.

There spoke men and women who, time and again, had disagreed with Senator Maloney's actions, but never had questioned his motives.

If ever it was truly said of a public official that "he wore no man's collar," it was said of Frank Maloney. He had opposed President Roosevelt on many important issues, notably that of the Supreme Court bill of 1937, but the President thought enough of Senator Maloney to offer him, even at a much later date, the national chairmanship of the Democratic Party.

That fact alone confirms the statement of the eloquent Representative Philip J. Sullivan, of Enfield, who said Senator Maloney's "outstanding characteristic was courage."

J. D.

[From the Hartford Courant of January 17, 1945]

FRANCIS MALONEY

Not in recent years has there been a United States Senator of more all-round usefulness than Francis Maloney, of Connecticut, whose untimely death near the close of his fiftieth year makes it hard to realize that his earthly tasks are done.

First elected to the Senate in 1934, after having served a single term in the House, and reelected in 1940, Mr. Maloney gave little evidence of any close affiliation with the Democratic Party. Aside from a brief interval at the beginning of his Senate service, when he went along with the general policies of the New Deal, he gave little consideration to the political aspects of public questions, voting about as often with the minority as with the Democratic majority.

He regarded himself as being first of all a representative not alone of the people of his own State but of the whole United States. In this he exemplified to a marked degree the sentiment once expressed by a distinguished Senator of Vermont, George F. Edmunds, who, when the Sherman Antitrust Act was under debate in 1890, said: "The citizens of the State of Vermont are no more my constituents than the citizens of the State of Colorado, for a Senator of the United States, although elected (as was then the case) by the legislature of the State from which he comes, becomes a Senator of the United States, and every human being within the broad boundaries of the Republic, from the shore of the stormy sea on the east to the tranquil one on the west, is my constituent." But like Edmunds, Senator Maloney was faithful to the needs and interests of his own State as the circumstances would permit.

To serve his constituency with complete fidelity and without distinction as to party was Senator Maloney's earnest endeavor, and none can say that he did not admirably succeed in so doing. He would have come up for reelection in November 1946, and no matter how worthy might be the Republican candidate opposing him, it would have been found no easy task to convince the voters that he should be displaced. Precious few Senators ever find themselves in such an enviable position.

Webster once described the Senate as composed of equals, "of men of individual honor and personal character, and of absolute independence." The Senate may have lost something of its independence as a result of the seventeenth amendment, which provides for the election of its Members by popular vote instead of by the State legislatures; but if so, Senator Maloney was not one to lose his. It was intended by the authors of the Constitution that the Senate should be the citadel of liberty, and as such this Senator from Connecticut strove to keep it by raising his voice whenever he thought the rightful liberties of the people were being assailed. And his could be a most eloquent and persuasive voice, whether it was heard in the Senate or at public gatherings.

One of Senator Maloney's last and most constructive acts was to introduce a measure looking to the reorganization of the Congress by reducing the number of its committees and preventing any overlapping of their activities. The project was one very close to his heart and his colleagues could pay no better tribute to him than by adopting the general program he had so patiently worked out.

For the State and the Nation to be deprived of "Frank" Maloney at the very height of his career is a loss that will be genuinely felt, not only by those who knew him as a friend but by those who had formed a just appreciation of his fine qualities as an unselfish public servant, never sparing himself in the discharge of his duties and responsibilities.

Nomination of Henry A. Wallace To Be Secretary of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from my home-town paper, the Beaver Press, a very small paper published in a very small town, Beaver City, Utah. The editorial is written in connection with the nomination of Mr. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, which indicates to me that the common, ordinary people are giving much time, thought, and attention to this subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHT NOW SHIFTS TO WASHINGTON

The age-old fight between the left and the right goes on, and for the time being has shifted to the Halls of Congress, where the disciples of Mammon are banding together and girding to prevent a friend of the common people—a man who, if given the opportunity, will make the 60,000,000 post-war jobs promised by the President more than idle talk. The supporters of big business and big profits for the few, and depression and want for the great majority of Americans, are determined to see that if the nomination of Henry A. Wallace for Secretary of Commerce is sustained, the office will be stripped of all financial powers which have been held by Jesse H. Jones during his tenure in office.

There is far more to this nomination than a political plum for a faithful worker. Its roots go much deeper than that. It is just one facet of the age-old fight between decency and deception; between special privilege and justice; between Christian concepts and the money changers. They charge that Wallace is incapable of handling important financial responsibilities because he is in the wrong gang, so to speak. He was not born with a silver or gold spoon in his mouth and might not channel Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds to the right people. You will recall the precedent that was established in early days of the Corporation when $90,000,000 was allocated to the banking chain of Vice President Charles Dawes while the farmers, workers, and other common people were left to shift for themselves in one of the worst depressions this country has ever endured. They fear he might do something to ease the labor situation by making post-war jobs;

that he might have too much interest in and consideration for the soldiers, farmers, and workers of the country, and not enough interest in bigger and better profits for the big boys who feel that they own these United States.

The President's nomination of Mr. Wallace was not primarily to reward Mr. Wallace for his political services, as they try to make it appear. If he receives the appointment, he will earn all he gets out of the position by the persecution and unjust criticism that will be heaped upon him by the interests and their hired stooges.

What the President probably had in mind was to do a good turn for the workers, farmers, and all of the common people of America, and perhaps in so doing he was discharging a political obligation at that, for certainly it was not the wealthy class nor their hired help that elected Mr. Roosevelt to a fourth term in office. It is a fact that the President on more than one occasion has made it plain that he aims to steer a course just a little to the left of center of the road. The left, you know, represents the common people; the right is the special privilege and wealthy class. And since this is supposed to be a democracy it is presumed that the greatest good for the greatest number should be the objective.

If the wealthy and ambitious elements of our society could get a true perspective of the future trends in this country, they might save themselves, as well as the country at large, a lot of misery; and they might be glad to adopt a more liberal policy. We shudder to think what will happen after this war if they try to squeeze the servicemen, workers, farmers, and common people of this country back into the sodden conditions of the past, now that we all have seen the productive capacity of this Nation. There is no longer any excuse for poverty and want in America. If it comes it will be because selfish and conniving persons bring it about, and the consequences will be upon their heads.

A man like Henry A. Wallace in a key position may quite possibly go a long way toward averting such a catastrophe. The common people of this country want Mr. Wallace in the position for which he has been nominated by the President.

Airplane Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD numerous communications I have received dealing with the matter of military airplane accidents in response to my remarks in the Senate on that subject last week.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *January 14, 1945.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: While not one one-hundredth the urgency for controlling plane safety, as the railroads, vessels, etc., for auto massacre reduction, yet your act for plane investigation is highly accreditable. The ever gross deficiency of plane massacre is lack of landing gear to allow safe landing on average open areas. Such would save 50 percent of all such landing carnage. Firestone's Wright Field proved tests of belt gears for 120 m. p. h. landings, of 1942, testings, outmoded enlarged auto wheels. Belt gears would have saved 10,000 crew lives and $1,000,000,000 of war planes to date. See file of 1940 No. 37-244-100 National Inventor's Council for another type. Will C. A. A., T. Wright, Administrator, longer delay safety gear improvements?

Truly yours,

EDWARD BANSCHBACH.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 15, 1945.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I read with deep interest that you called recently for an early report by the Senate War Investigating Committee on its inquiry into military plane accidents.

The record of Army plane crashes and casualties in the United States is appalling, and certainly something is wrong somewhere.

If through your efforts this serious situation can be corrected and crashes and casualties considerably reduced, you will have the everlasting gratitude of thousands of parents of boys in training in the air force.

From my own bit of observation I am led to think that one of the reasons for these crashes is that the training is rushed through too fast. The course is tough and I know that combat conditions will be even tougher, but as it is the boys are often tired and worn out when they go on their training missions. I know that flying for combat training requires the closest application, and therefore ample resting periods should be provided.

Of course this is only my own observation and reasoning, and I may be entirely wrong.

I do hope, however, for the good of the boys and the service, that you will follow this matter through to a successful conclusion.

Yours very respectfully,

SOL PELLMAN.

POLAR BEAR ASSOCIATION,
Rhinelander, Wis., January 29, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: My attention has just been called to your address before the Senate on January 11, 1945, in regard to the letter from Mr. Joe Leib.

I know Mr. Leib very well, and know that he is sincere in his effort to right some of the wrongs that have been a scandal in the Air Corps. I have worked with Mr. Leib on the matter of the war training service and the civilian pilot training program—a program where after we have spent some 273 millions of the taxpayers' money we still have some 7,303 former flying instructors now learning to fly at a further expense to the taxpayers. I know that you know something about this problem, for I have copies of letter that you have writen about W. T. S.

Keep the good work up, and then when some of the new bills come up in this Congress to right the scandal of W. T. S. and C. P. T. please give us your support. At the present time in the House there are bills coming through to help out some of the poor devils, who, after 3 years of some sort of service, are still no place. I call your attention to the article from the Tale Spinner—53,000 hours of flying time in one barracks—and the men are now going through ground school and preflight. The men are being washed out for reasons too numerous to mention, but a few are failure in math, color vision, when the positive orders of General Arnold was that no man could be certified to cadet schools unless he had passed his physical; now, when the boys are hooked new physicals are given them just in order to get rid of them.

It might interest you to know that on April 28 of 1944 I made arrangements for Mr. Joe Leib to tell his story to the aviation commission of the American Legion in Washington; in spite of my 25 years with the Legion, I never saw a person get a more rotten deal than Leib did from this so-called veterans' organization that is supposed to be interested in the war effort. Naturally nothing was done, for the two top rankers of the aviation commission owned and operated airports—these men were not going to stick their neck out when new C. P. T. programs might come through. Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn on October 20, 1943, also exposed this death rate in the Air Corps in training programs—84 men killed and 55 planes destroyed in 1 month in Florida alone. Yet before this Legion committee Leib was "kissed out" and nothing was done about his report. Keep your good work up and help on the W. T. S. legislation when it comes through; you have not seen any scandal until you dig into the W. T. S. program and its waste of the public funds.

Sincerely yours,

BRADLEY R. TAYLOR.

CHICAGO LODGE NO. 4, BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS,
Chicago, January 23, 1945.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable SIR: An article appeared in the Chicago Tribune last week quite clearly covering your activity in running down the causes of the many crack-ups in the air since the beginning of the World War.

If I can get to Washington in time, I can, no doubt, be of service to you. In brief, reliable information has come to me that many of these crack-ups are caused by hot box. The plane is buzzing along at 200 to 500 miles per hour, but before landing, the pilot slowly reduces the speed so as to land safely. During the high-speed trip from New York to San Francisco, the viscosity is ground out of the oil in the bearings in the propeller shaft, and the bearing metals have become a molten mass of hot metal. When the pilot slows down to a landing speed, this molten mass of hot metals freeze and the nose dive is inevitable.

Briefly, I have perfected a bearing—the King broken-contact, frictionless, oilless, air-cooled bearing which makes hot box impossible. I don't use oil, but I use air instead for lubrication and by this friction reduction, cut down power production cost 29 percent, adding at least one-fourth to present airplane radius.

As soon as I can get to Washington, I hope to get you and Senator KILGORE, of West Virginia, to join and work out the real solution.

Please send me what information you have and greatly oblige.

Yours truly,

J. FRANK KING.

NEW YORK, *January 22, 1945.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have noticed that you are interested in getting an early report on the facts of military airplane accidents. In this connection, I would suggest that the inquiry before it is completed look into the possibility of a large number of these accidents being due to the use of gasoline containing tetraethyl lead.

This chemical is the chief ingredient in high octane gasoline as made by present systems today, and tests have shown that it has a very corrosive and deleterious effect

on the motor. Not only that, it has a tendency to deposit metallic lead in the tubes leading from the tanks to the motor, clogging them up and thus preventing gasoline from getting into the engine and causing the engine to cease functioning, resulting in a crash.

Lead has been shown to be the cause of cracked cylinder heads, broken valves, burnt-out spark plugs, and many other causes of engine failure. Reports of partial investigation bear this out, and it would be interesting to know just what role the use of leaded gasoline has played in the destruction of over 17,000 planes on the home front.

I would be glad to place any information I may have at your disposal.

Very truly yours,

BERNARD ORMONT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 13, 1945.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have just concluded reading your remarks re airplane accidents in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 11.

As a professional safety engineer associated with the National Safety Council, American Society of Safety Engineers, and similar organizations, I very much appreciate your efforts to get the report out of the pigeonhole it seems to be buried in.

The Air Forces have a most thorough and comprehensive safety program for all personnel. What good is it all if the planes they assume to be safe are in poor condition before they have a chance to practice safety in flying? I wonder how many lives could have been saved if some selfishness and greed were not dominant?

You have my hearty endorsement to pursue the objective of seeing that the report is published so the people can see what transpires.

With best wishes, I remain

Sincerely,

MELVIN W. MORGAN,
A. S. S. E.

Industrial Conditions in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials commenting on a recent speech by Hon. James A. Farley in Birmingham, Ala., regarding industrial conditions in the South.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Willimantic (Conn.) Chronicle of December 7, 1944]

DON'T "BUY BUSINESS"

James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, recently spoke in Birmingham, Ala., advising the people of the South to balance their agriculture with industry and to make it possible for the people, through increased incomes, to satisfy their wants and their needs.

In addition, Mr. Farley urged that no effort be made to buy business, declaring that "I am not one who would advocate giving free sites to industries, years of tax exemption, special concessions and franchises, guarantee of roads and highways, waterworks, etc."

The New Yorker puts his finger on one of the rackets of modern industrial progress. Very often a community is faced with demands from a prospective industry that it provide, free of charge, certain essentials which are the legitimate expense of business. The people proposing the new enterprise are anxious to get as much as they can for nothing and are adept in playing one community against another. As localities bid against each other, the net result is the loss of considerable revenue and the donation of considerable public funds.

Mr. Farley asserts that real legitimate business does not ask, does not expect, and would not have these baubles hung in front of their faces. He adds that "the business that demands these is worth looking into—it savors too much of speculation and too little of permanency; it rings too much of theory and too little of practice; it's long on hope and short on know-how."

We thoroughly approve the sentiments expressed by Mr. Farley and give them publicity. Nevertheless, we have no illusions that what he says will persuade industry-hungry localities from attempting to "buy business." In the long run, however, we are convinced that there is no net gain.

[From America for December 23, 1944]

WASHINGTON FRONT

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 11 reprinted a number of editorials commenting on Mr. James A. Farley's recent address before the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce at Birmingham. It was a speech which caused wide repercussions in the South and is likely also to cause ripples in Washington.

Speaking as a businessman and not as a politician, Mr. Farley made several excellent points. His main one was that what the South as a region needs is a balanced economy of industry and agriculture, and therefore a great increase of industrial development. He warned, however, against the sad old policy of luring industries down South by specious promises of tax exemptions, free sites, special franchises, and lax labor laws.

He did, on the other hand, stress some of the South's natural advantages in a competitive economy: low production costs due to climate, involving cheaper housing and saving of fuel, abundant raw materials and water power close at hand, and a large potential home market with the increase of purchasing power. Mr. Farley's exhortations are likely to become prophecies after the war.

On the whole, Mr. Farley enjoyed a good press. But some of the editorials expressed the old fear of industrial slavery if the expansion is to be controlled by northern capital, and there was also a faint hint that wage slavery might follow in its wake.

What was surprising, and symptomatic, about the comment was its lack of political awareness. Mr. Farley spoke not as a politician, but he could not but be conscious of the political revolution which he was also advocating. This observer has remarked before that a large increase of industrial workers in the South, with the C. I. O. organizing them, is likely to change the whole face of the Democratic Party there. A semi-feudal agrarian civilization will largely disappear, and the workers' elected representatives will legislate quite differently.

This change will affect not only the Federal Congress, but also the State legislatures. Thus industrialization may prove a blessing for the southern workers, in the form of enlightened State legislation for wages, conditions, and union recognition.

Rev. WILFRID PARSONS.

Mobilization of Civilian Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD E. CAMPBELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer the following commentary on legislation we are now discussing:

In most of the discussion thus far it has been brought out at some point that what we all want is to win the war, win it quickly and with as little loss of life as possible. In that, I think we all agree.

Next, we do not want those in the armed forces overseas to feel that we are "letting them down." In that, we all agree, too.

What we do not agree on, however, is the solution. Shall it be the good old American way or shall it be the Old World method?

Now as to the armed forces overseas. Shall we say to them, yes, we are sorry, but we have let you down—the only way we can get your fathers, mothers, wives, sweethearts, brothers, and sisters to help you by producing war materials is to draft them under penalty of fine or imprisonment and then it will not be motivated by a desire to help you as much as for self-preservation. Would not that be a sorry message for them to receive and would not it be a bright and encouraging one for the enemy to use to build up morale and to stiffen their resistance with resultant additional loss of life and suffering by our armed forces. In the May bill, H. R. 1752, you can have that.

By contrast visualize, if you will, the effect of a voluntary, earnest, honest, and anxious desire to make the necessary war materials under the Barrett bill, H. R. 1803. In the first place the efficiency of a volunteer worker, would without question, far surpass that of the worker chained to a job by a must order—he will do more work and do it better because he wants to. Then, too, we would not be broadcasting to the world a most unfair and terrible indictment of American industry and labor, which has shown its superiority over forced labor and which is not responsible for the cut-backs which have caused such shortage as we may now have.

Up until last fall we were led to believe by those in authority who should know, that not only had industry and labor done a magnificent job in producing war materials, but also that war contracts at that time could be and, in fact, were being canceled because of surpluses, and, further, that sales and disposition of such material were being made.

Let us face this question squarely and fearlessly; let those in the armed forces overseas know that we are back of them 100 percent—let our enemies know we are back of the war effort 100 percent—that industry and labor are back of it 100 percent, not because we have to be for

fear of fine or imprisonment, but because we, as good Americans, want to be.

Under the Barrett bill, H. R. 1803, you would have done just that and in the American way.

I supported the Barrett bill, H. R. 1803, because it is our way of doing things and because it answers the pleas of all who have spoken thus far, to assure the boys on the far-flung fronts that we are back of them because we want to be, and that we will produce.

The True Facts About the Drafting of Farm Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America are now in a turmoil as a result of Director Byrnes' irresponsible directive taking farming out of the essential class and resulting in the further drain of farm help from what little remains. If this attempt to draft farm help continues, it means that in my district there will be a wholesale selling of farms and stock. This is true all over the Nation. If more farm help is drafted, in 6 months this Nation will regret that it happened.

Members of Congress are opposed to this new order by Director Byrnes. They feel it is a direct violation of the Tydings amendment passed years ago to protect production on farms. Members of Congress surmised that there would be trouble ahead, so they took no chances. They enacted into law the Tydings amendment, which reads as follows:

Every registrant found by a selective-service local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

This regulation is law. It is still on our lawbooks. Under this amendment every farm boy who is needed on the farm is deferrable. There should be no question about it. The words are plain, and there can be no misunderstanding about it whatever. Under this law, a farmer should be able to rest easy and know that his help is protected from the draft. No attempt has ever been made to change this law.

But there are those in high places in Washington who pay no attention to the law. Director Byrnes ignored the law when speaking for the President. He wrote a letter to General Hershey of the Selective Service as follows:

I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.

In other words, Director Byrnes told the draft boards that farming is no longer an essential industry and that all farm help should be drafted into service. For whom did Byrnes speak? Certainly not for Congress. He never once consulted Congress. He did this after a conference with the President. Congress was shocked that Director Byrnes ignored the Tydings amendment. In fact, he asked General Hershey to tell the draft boards to forget the Tydings amendment. This was done. Orders went to the State and local draft boards to draft farm help.

But Congress protested in no uncertain terms. They protested to the President, to Director Byrnes, and to General Hershey. These men were reminded that the Tydings amendment is still a law and that violation of the law was asked for in ordering local draft boards to draft more and all farm help.

As a result of the protest by Congress, General Hershey was forced to send a telegram to all State draft boards as follows:

Questions of interpretation of State directors advice No. 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

The directive of January 3, 1945, State directors advice 288, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State directors advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

Section 5K of the Selective Training and Service Act, known as the Tydings amendment, places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal in the case of the individual registrant, whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Notify all local boards immediately.

So that is how matters now stand. The buck has now been passed to the local draft boards. I urge all farmers in my district whose boys are about to be drafted to insist on the protection offered them by the Tydings amendment. Should your appeal fail there, go before the district appeal board. It is the spirit and will of Congress enacted into law that there be no further draining of farm help. It is unfortunate indeed that Director Byrnes stirred up this mess.

A Bell for Springfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, Springfield, Mass., the largest city in the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress, is noted for a great many things, not the least of which is that it is the home of the Springfield Armory, now daily turning out thousands of Garand rifles for our fighting men.

Always a leader in movements for civic betterment, Springfield has recently distinguished itself by originating the Springfield plan, a long-time program of education for democratic citizenship, which has attracted Nation-wide interest and admiration.

Now Springfield has again won the commendatory notice of the country and the plaudits of one of our leading magazines for the publication of a booklet, Our Home Town, which the Ladies Home Journal for February 1945 calls "a new and hopeful step in municipal reporting."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask permission to include the following editorial from the Ladies Home Journal commenting on the booklet:

A BELL FOR SPRINGFIELD

Most of us in America grew up in small towns where everybody knew almost everybody else. From that symbolic home town to the modern city of uprooted and indifferent millions is a far cry, a long jump in citizenship. But citizens must grow with their town; if we are going to have any part in shaping new growth, we must know at least in what direction we are heading and how far we have gone.

Our Home Town, a pocket-size booklet published by Springfield, Mass., is a new and hopeful step in municipal reporting, graphically revealing how the city is governed and what that government means to Springfield dwellers.

"Are you a registered voter?"—for instance—is a pointed paragraph on where and why the citizen should vote.

In each of the articles on city departments, expenditures for the past 3 years are given. Two full-page charts show where the money came from and how it was used, making the relation between taxation and services plain.

An outsider can hardly fail to be impressed by Springfield's up-and-coming virtue, but not because it is extolled in Our Home Town. Strictly reportorial, and minus glowing phrases, the booklet acquaints its readers admirably with the ins and outs of the city hall network. At Your Service, on the back cover, is a handy check list of often-used city services, with telephone numbers.

Springfield citizens have worked 2 years on the study that went into this report. Copies are given free to any citizen on request.

Community surveys have been made before, and in too many sad cases have collected dust into oblivion. But any town that really wants to know itself, and where it is going, can profit by Springfield's example.

Report of My Visit to the European Theater of Operations Against Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following report, written by

me under special arrangements with the Scripps-Howard newspapers, and published within recent days in the papers of that chain.

The report covers in a general way the impressions gained during the month in which I visited, in company with other members of the Committee on Military Affairs, the American armies waging war against Germany in the British Isles, Belgium, France, and the Mediterranean area:

With other members of the House Committee on Military Affairs, I spent a month with the men and women of our Armies waging war on Germany. I saw and talked with them in the British Isles, Belgium, France, Italy, and north Africa. I saw General Eisenhower and the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force, the general staff of allied operations in Europe, to us the now well-known symbol, SHAEF.

Our group visited with Generals Spaatz, Doolittle, and Eaker, who head our Air Forces in Europe and the Mediterranean; General Lee, commanding officer of Communications Zone, the supply service; General Vaughn, Supply Commander in Great Britain; General Bradley, and Generals Patton and Clark of our Third and Fifth Armies. I had the real personal thrill, too, of seeing Kepner, Saylor, Hawley, Thrasner, and Plank, all natives of my own State of Indiana, and all general officers who are doing big jobs in these operations.

I saw bomber and fighter groups in England, France, and Italy grimly whittling away the Luftwaffe and carrying destruction to the enemy. I witnessed the briefing of heavy bomber and fighter pilots; watched them take off long before daylight on their mission; and listened to these wonderful youngsters as they one by one contributed their bits to the final official story of the mission. I visited with infantry, artillery, and armored elements of our great combat teams right up in the lines where they are slugging it out with the Nazi armies.

Then behind all this, I saw, at least in outline, the amazing activities of the Army Service Forces, stretching from our own shores right to the combat units, which mounted these gigantic operations, transported them, and are now literally moving mountains of supplies which keep these operations rolling.

Thirty days' travel through an organization so complex, so diversified, and so widely spread is barely time to form the most general impressions. Furthermore, although I saw the raw edges of war in infantry trenches in 1917–18; and although my committee work has enabled me to keep in quite close touch with the Army throughout this war, I frankly do not pose as a military expert. What follows is intended as nothing more than personal observation and opinion gained during this trip.

We at home have been fortunate in the scope and thoroughness of the reporting which has so far come out of this war. Practically all of it has been skillful and courageous. No little of it, such as that by Ernie Pyle, has been epic. Still, I came home with the conviction that even the finest reporting cannot convey to us the awfulness and immensity of the war; the magnitude of the grim, dirty job our Army is doing; the magnificent spirit of our fighting men and women in the face of danger, grinding exertion, and heartbreaking hardship. The picture seemed too big for the imagination. It is even hard to believe and to understand when you see it.

As an example, we all knew that for more than 2 years before the invasion of the continent last June we were piling up troops, supplies, and equipment in the British Isles. Even so, I was not prepared for what I found there. That base, providentially provided by Britain's bulldog tenacity, is still an armed camp bulging with American troops; a vast supply dump, from water front clear to the remote interior, of everything fighting armies use, from shoe laces and buttons right on up to trucks, armored vehicles, and huge tanks. This despite the fact that we have been moving vast armies onto the continent and for more than 7 months pouring torrents of these accumulated supplies after them. There is ample evidence of the countless miracles of staff work plus back-breaking effort by the Army Service Forces.

Following the path of the invaders across the English Channel to the beaches, the military miracles become more incredible. Those beaches were heavily mined; and with diabolical cleverness the Nazis had placed piling, water mines, and barbed wire entanglements off every potential landing spot to prevent ship-borne troops from reaching shore. Behind all this was an elaborate system of almost indestructible pillboxes and gun emplacements, all placed to pour destruction upon any invaders. Looking over these defenses, even after they had been breached, an observer would almost be forced to say that Nazi propaganda erred on the side of conservatism in describing the slaughter which would certainly result if any force should attack Hitler's Atlantic wall.

But one of the most incredible phases of the invasion was still to follow. Nazi strategy accepted the possibility of an allied landing on the continent; and it displaced mobile forces to concentrate against such preliminary breaches and throw them back into the sea. But the German planners figured that the invaders could supply only the most limited forces over open beaches. They stuck to the old military formula which says an overwater invasion in force cannot be mounted without deep-water harbors and dock facilities to handle his ships. That is why they set up defenses in the Atlantic and English Channel ports of France which still hold out against us, but disposed their mobile reserves along the coast to deal with only a very limited allied invasion force over open beaches.

Allied commanders, estimating that the defenders would figure the defense problems exactly as they did, prepared to create harbor and docking facilities where none existed. To the confusion of the defenders, they painstakingly constructed the component parts of breakwaters and docks; and towed them piece-meal to French beaches. Within a matter of hours after we hit the beaches, deep-water ships were dumping cargoes and men on the French mainland. Before the Nazis fully realized what sustained force had hit Normandy, the allies were ripping across the peninsula; and our tactical air forces were blasting German lines of communications so effectively in every direction that there was just no way to contain the rampaging invaders.

How effective that single bit of allied planning and painstaking preparation has been, only the final history of this war will tell. But the story of the man-made harbors is by no means complete with the Normandy campaign. The strange fact is that our entire conquest of northern and central France, the entire disruption of Germany's defenses west of the Siegfried line, was mounted primarily through the Omaha and Utah beaches, two of those amazing man-made harbors which the Germans, with all of their perfection of detail, including estimates of the improbable, had not been able to imagine.

Earlier I spoke of Providence and British tenacity providing us the hopping-off spot for this European invasion. A little more should be said for our British allies. We Americans and the British people still seem to rub each other the wrong way.

But fighting personnel now in the islands, or previously stationed there, has a new slant on the British people. Our men and women who have lived and fought with them may not like them personally, but they have a new respect for British patience, steadfastness, and courage in the face of hardships and miseries which would sap the fighting spirit of any but the most dogged people. While there is no way to compare British production methods with those by which we achieve our own home-front miracles here, our forces abroad have come to appreciate the magnitude of the British war effort. Due credit is given also for Britain's scientific contribution to the war in such developments as the portable harbors, radar, and the Bailey bridge.

The Bailey bridge, as a single item of engineering achievement, is worth a volume of praise and credit. Over the many months before the invasion and during the battle for France the Allied air forces thoroughly devastated communication and transportation in northern France. Communication centers were wiped out. French railways became a mass of wreckage. Scarcely an important railway or highway bridge was left intact. But the destruction which immobilized Nazi defenses and helped trap Germans by the hundreds of thousands became a headache for our own supply services when our forces broke through and began the race across France. Here our American engineers found that the British-designed Bailey bridge was far better than anything in our manual.

The invasion, the conquest of Normandy, the break-through, and the subsequent envelopment of central and northern France will, I believe, stand out prominently among the most brilliant achievements in all military history. Going over it personally in detail, digging beneath the accounts of the amazing exploits of the tactical or combat units involved, the advance to the west wall shows up as the supreme achievement in planning and logistics. General Patton and other qualified officers on the spot told me that our eastward thrust toward Germany stopped not because of organized Nazi resistance but because our speeding combat teams simply had to wait for their supply lines to catch up. The main German forces were disposed along the coast line. We had destroyed and captured vast numbers of the enemy. We had shattered his defenses and outflanked him. And we apparently needed only to pierce his Siegfried line before he withdrew his shattered forces and reformed them there.

But we could not, apparently, quite keep the supply lines open for such a breakneck advance. It was a nice try which missed by inches, and which might have ended all Nazi resistance in the west months ago. What might have been had we had just one open port, or just one more artificial harbor, or even just a little hotter supply service, will always remain a matter of conjecture. As it was, the Nazis managed to pull the remnants of their defeated western forces behind the west wall, and to regroup and reinforce them for the fanatical stand which is now prolonging the European war.

Speaking entirely my own opinions, I believe the invasion, the liberation of France and Belgium, and the general assault on Germany have proceeded ahead of schedule. If this further disappoints those of us at home who 3 or 4 months ago had been encouraged to expect a German collapse in 1944, it should be remembered that errors in the timetable were political, rather than military. There was a presidential campaign in progress last fall, and some office seekers can be careless with their implications. My impressions, gained from discussions with many different responsible officers, are that these men all hoped more fervently than we here at home that the German collapse would come last fall. I think they did everything humanly possible with the means at their command to force that break. But after meeting them and seeing something of their problems, I am sure none of them will be rash enough now to make any predictions.

Moving south along the battle lines, we crossed from southern France into the Italian theater. For the past 7 months, incidentally, we have been inclined to forget the Italian operations because the larger struggle on the western front has absorbed our attention.

Lt. Gen. Mark Clark and his American Fifth Army are still accomplishing more than could be expected of them, although I came away from this theater, frankly, wondering just what we do expect of our armed forces there. Looking at the terrain over which these brave men have fought and scrabbled out gains northward, I wonder if there is any place on earth more perfectly suited for defense. If our soldiers are not swimming swollen rivers to get at the enemy, they are trying to scale mountains against positions where you feel sure a single Nazi could stand off an entire company.

This is indeed our forgotten Army, struggling doggedly on against impossible conditions, and manned with combat elements which fight on weeks and even months beyond any reasonable tour of front line service. Moving on south in Italy, however, I got a much brighter picture of the war during a visit with the Fifteenth Air Force.

These boys are daily topping the Alps to devastate southern Germany and her rapidly dwindling Balkan hegemony. In some respects their job is toughest of any of our European air forces. They are still flying extremely long missions over dangerous open water, more dangerous mountains, and the most concentrated antiaircraft defenses. Theirs is a routine of death in the air, sweat and toil at the bases. But at least in the matter of creature comforts on the ground, they have about the best deal I saw anywhere on the trip.

With typical American initiative and energy, the men of the Fifteenth have taken advantage of their surroundings. They have quarried much of the native chalk-soft white stone to build surprisingly comfortable quarters. They have appropriated a big dry cave formed where the natives of the area have quarried this same stone, and built into it an amazing recreation area bearing the proud title "Rockefeller Center."

As compared with the men of the Eighth Air Force in England, who are often quartered in tents, and who fight and work in chilling rain, fog, and mud, the Fifteenth is indeed fortunate. As compared with the ground and service forces in western Europe, or even of the Fifth Army farther up the peninsula, who slog through an everlasting sea of mud and freeze in one of the worst of all recorded European winters, these Fifteenth Air Force boys are enjoying a touch of paradise.

No army in history ever carried the same supply load that ours does. Our troops are the best equipped, best fed, best cared for. We spare nothing to keep our fighting men healthy, happy, and effective, to protect them against injury, and to restore them if disabled. If an extra ton of explosives or another 100 gallons of gas will prevent just one casualty, we gladly spend it. Our allies are often amazed at the scope and thoroughness of our services for our personnel, at our lavish expenditure of matériel, but we consider it the best possible investment.

Nothing better illustrates this than our medical service, which is nothing short of miraculous. The spirit of the Medical Corps is best typified by its corpsmen. Unarmed, and protected only by their insignia, they go wherever an American soldier goes. Among men to whom bravery is commonplace the corpsmen are deeply respected. Infantrymen, who get a small bonus for combat service, think so much of the men with the red cross arm bands that the combat pay in many units is pooled and shared equally with the medics, who so far have not been similarly rewarded.

The same spirit shows through our whole medical service. If a wounded man has a spark of life in him, the corpsmen will ignore their own safety to keep that spark alive and bring him back to a field station. Doctors and nurses at the station may be numb with fatigue, but they will fight to sustain that life and get the man on back to a general hospital, probably by plane. Our evacuation of casualties by air is an epic story in itself. All of this is a huge investment, probably not even approximated in any other army. But it pays rich dividends, as proved by the amazing percentages of wounded men who live and who return to active duty. I visited field and general hospitals all the way from England down into Italy and have nothing but praise and admiration for the inspired service the men and women of the medical corps are rendering.

Looking at our supply problems as they are influenced by our allies and the peoples in liberated territory, however, I came home wondering if American warmth and generosity are not costing us dearly in many ways. For instance, one air force burns up in an average day a million gallons of gasoline, every drop of which we laboriously produce, refine, and ship from American sources. Our allies, particularly Great Britain, have huge oil resources and largely idle refinery capacity just a few hundred miles away, at the eastern end of the Mediterranean.

Why drain our own resources and ship gas five times as far when it should take very little field development and technical improvement of refineries to get that gas right in the Mediterranean basin? Could not American armies in western Europe be supplied from the same sources? In fact, when you look at this problem as one of extended supply lines, you will find that these eastern oil fields are much nearer England, our farthest western operating base, than the American oil fields which are powering this war.

Much that I saw in the liberated countries also does not quite seem to make sense. Seeing how the British Isles are actually on bare subsistence rations, I was prepared to see real suffering on the continent. There is actual hardship in southern Italy, but probably because that area can scarcely produce its own foodstuff in normal times. But the French and Belgians seemed to be faring even better than the people of England. What shortages I noted were in the cities, where failure of transportation, rather than of production, seemed to be the trouble. Remember that Allied air war completely disrupted communications in western Europe prior to liberation. The demands of our armies upon the available transport also rank above requirements of the native population.

So as much as one-third of our supply energies are now being diverted from our fighting forces to supply specific areas, and our troops are limited accordingly. But why, after these several months, have we not found a way to take this responsibility off the Army's back?

We here at home have glowed with vicarious satisfaction at the reports of almost hysterical welcome accorded our forces by the people in liberated territory. The fact is that I found these people anything but enthusiastic about our arrival and presence in their midst. Particularly does this seem true in areas through which we have had to do hard fighting, because we have so often completely devastated these areas. Allied air forces started the destruction months ago, and what bombardments missed, our artillery and armored forces have since often destroyed.

The Nazis make fortresses of the towns and cities and we simply have to blast them out, building by building. I saw whole villages where hardly one stone stood on top of another when our bombardment ended.

These conquered people apparently had come to accept, or at least to tolerate, the Germans, who, contrary to reports, had done a fair job of selling the subjected people into passive acceptance of the German superstate. Even though the Nazis had exacted heavy tribute, they had not apparently stripped these areas to the degree we had been led to imagine. And when Germany took from these people, she apparently left a paper credit on the Reich which cleverly gave the subjects a neat stake in German victory. We take the blame for blasting whole cities out of existence, and for discomfiting people who had settled into a routine which we considered slavery, but which they had come to accept as at least endurable.

Native governments have not been helpful to our cause. At best, they have been unstable and unreliable. At worst, they deliberately create conditions for which we ultimately take all the blame. We ship in supplies to be distributed by responsible authorities. These authorities often release an absolute minimum for legal distribution through controlled channels. Then they actually divert these American supplies into personally controlled and promoted black markets. The rich and the political favorites prosper; the poor suffer, and America gets the blame. I understand that actual suffering among the people has frequently led to riots in Rome.

Native governments in the liberated areas have been unable or unwilling to give our Armies any real help in restoring order and civilian law. As a result, great quantities of supplies intended for our troops are stolen. Whole convoys have been hi-jacked, drivers murdered and trucks spirited away. And because the governments have been recognized, the Armies are helpless to take real punitive measures against the offenders.

A few months ago the arm-chair strategists and the political campaigners had the European war won. Lately, the story is that shortage of critical supplies actually threatens our war effort. That is true, particularly in certain categories. We are short in heavy ammunition, and you could readily understand why if you ever watched an American artillery battery in action burning up the stuff. We are short in heavy-duty tires, as you can also readily understand if you remember the repeated warnings over the past year or more that we still have not learned how to make good truck tires from synthetic rubber, and that our tire plants are short of manpower.

My over-all impression of supply, however, is that it is adequate. Adequate, however, is hardly good enough in a life-and-death war. If we are going to fix our production schedules in terms of certainty, we must provide for the worst conditions we can imagine befalling our Armies.

About the time we accepted the idea that our shortage of cigarettes at home was due to heavy deliveries for our troops, we began to hear that the fighting men also were going without smokes. Combat outfits have been low—as low as four packs per week. And when the front-line soldiers went under these restrictions, the authorities made similar cuts all through the service as a matter of equal justice. But the trouble was less with available stocks than with shortage of transport. Ammunition, medical supplies and absolute necessities went up the line ahead of cigarettes, so soldiers have sometimes been short on smokes.

There is, also, a meat black market angle to cigarette rationing in the Army. Our own Government helped shove our troops into the black market by paying men in the currency of the occupied country. Troops in France receive French francs on an exchange rate which makes their pay worth just about 20 cents on the dollar for anything they buy directly from French markets. The idea

definitely is not the Army's. It is our Government's arrangement with foreign governments, arrived at to help stabilize foreign currencies. There is little real need for an American soldier ever to go into a foreign market for anything, for the Army furnishes all his real needs, and sends the post exchanges along to provide the knick knacks.

But all that does not curb the American instinct for shopping. Soldiers soon found that in cash deals the exchange arrangement was costing them five for one. But when it came to barter, their American sources, including the PX, had many advantages to offer. Cigarettes, soap, candy, etc., were powerful swapping commodities on the local markets. Hence the urgent need for rationing among the troops. This also helps to explain the background of the ugly reports of wholesale thievery and blackmarketing by a few American soldiers in France.

Nowhere in our newspapers, however, have I ever seen a report of the way our Government has cooperated to rig foreign exchange, injurious in small ways to our troops. This is just one of dozens of ways, large and small, in which I found that censorship has screened out much of the real meat of the European war. For the same reason, I found that Americans abroad had no real conception of what was going on here at home. We have unequaled reporting facilities to channel the complete, uncolored news both ways, but I honestly believe that a too literal and too subjective censorship is largely at fault for the fact that we do not know more nearly what this war is really like.

Being an ex-infantryman myself, I simply must say a word for the doughboys of this war. We started out to try the experiment of bombing an enemy into submission or, at least, of softening him up to the point where ground forces merely had to parade in and take over. We really threw tremendous resources and effort into that experiment. I want to avoid carefully any reflection on our Air Forces in saying that we failed. But we have simply been forced to conclude that air power so far cannot reduce an enemy to submission.

Some glib airman said a mouthful when he remarked that the Infantry at least buries its own dead. Air power may devastate a country and soften it up tremendously, but ground forces still have to go in and occupy the territory. London itself ought to be the classic proof. Here is a city devastated beyond all description, yet functioning in a surprisingly normal way. To a much greater degree we certainly have devastated German cities and industrial areas by air and sapped the German ability and will to resist. But the ground forces must deliver the killing blow. The simple, unsung infantryman, wading in mud and snow to his belly, seeking cover wherever he can find it, freezing in open fox holes, will be the man who finally looks down the Nazi's throat and yanks the gun out of his hands.

He can't do it without the artillery and armored units which are indispensable parts of his combat team. He probably could not do it without the tactical air power which has taken the Luftwaffe off his back and tremendously eased his own advance. But this war is proving that the Infantry is still the "queen of battles."

This has been largely about the planning, the skill, and the technique of warfare. But actually the lump in my throat from this trip is for just the people in this Army. As I saw them in Europe, they are in fine physical condition on the average, in spite of the terrific hardships they are enduring. Whether I talked with veteran officers, nurses, and WAC's, or kids out on the line, everyone wanted to ask questions about home, rather than answer questions about the war. I saw no one who wasn't thinking about home and longing to get back to it. But that desire apparently in no way dampens the firm determination to finish off the Nazis so thoroughly there will be no lingering doubt about who is superman. This may be hard to believe, but my own impression is that very few of these men and women, given the opportunity to decide voluntarily, would walk off and leave their team mates to finish the job without them.

You get that feeling of team spirit from the cocky conviction, often expressed, that the particular soldier's outfit is the best so-and-so gang in any man's army. It's there in the obvious agony of ground crews sweating it out until their last plane is counted in on the return from a mission. It shows in the blanched faces of wounded men who are more concerned about their outfit than their own welfare; and in the attitude of doctors and nurses dizzy from fatigue and loss of sleep, but still driving themselves to perform miracles. It is the thing that keeps line outfits delivering fantastic performances long past the point of all reasonable estimates of human endurance.

Above everything else in this experience I brought back a fierce, choking pride in the men and women who are the heart, the muscle, and the guts of this war machine. I wish I could conclude this report with an editorial truly expressing their irrepressible and unquenchable spirit. If we could catch just a fraction of that spirit here on the home front, I think our toughest problem would be a push-over.

Letter of Hon. Robert L. Owen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from former United States Senator Robert L. Owen:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 31, 1945.*

Mr. FRANK J. BOUDINOT,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRANK: The World Language Foundation was organized by my friends in order to invite the cooperation of those who desired to participate in establishing the new world of mutual international understanding, a new world of benevolence, intelligence, peace, good will, and international cooperation.

You know, of course, that Sequoyah over a hundred years ago established the Cherokee phonetic, syllabic alphabet, which could be learned in a few days and which the Cherokees have used ever since to write and print the Cherokee language. It was Sequoyah who inspired me to devise an alphabet, making it strictly phonetic and stenographic. I have given it thousands of hours of study. It has been perfected. It has been submitted to hundreds of linguists. It has the approval of some of the ablest linguists in the world. It has been fully explained in Senate Documents 49, 133, and 250, of the Seventy-eighth Congress. In Senate Document 250 will be found quotations from some of these linguists, including Rev. Frank C. Laubach, Ph. D., who has established special phonetic alphabets in 84 nationalities covering the Dutch Archipelago, India, Africa, the Latin-American republics, southwestern Asia, and the islands of the Caribbean—Jamacia, Santo Domingo, Haiti, and Puerto Rico.

I have also quoted Prof. Mario A. Pei, professor of French and romance languages, Columbia University, New York City, whose modern works on teaching the languages of the world are unsurpassed. Professor Pei had 60 experts in many languages cooperating with him in these valuable publications teaching the world how to speak many languages.

In Senate Document 250, which I send you by separate mail, you will find these evidences of endorsements of experts in many languages, including Chinese, Japanese, and Russian. You will find also two pages written in Spanish and English. This Spanish-English book puts in four vertical columns, first, the Spanish word or phrase as printed, second, the Spanish word or phrase in the global alphabet, third, the English equivalent written in the global alphabet, fourth, the English as currently printed.

With the global alphabet, an American can correctly pronounce the Spanish and the Spanish correctly pronounced the English.

The reason why English is not already a world language is because it is impossible for a foreigner within any reasonable time to learn how to pronounce English as currently printed, because many English words are spelled with silent letters and the same letters have multiple meanings.

The global alphabet, which will be employed by the World Language Foundation, can be used to write any language in the world at high speed with the pen and can be pronounced at sight intelligibly by anyone who knows the global alphabet. The global alphabet can be learned in a day, and the trouble of spelling vanishes with the global alphabet, as it is strictly phonetic. The people of all languages can be taught to speak English through the printed word and make themselves understood within 90 days by learning 15 or 20 words a day. These words are in a book form where the memory can be constantly refreshed, at will, by using a little volume that fits in the pocket. These books can be sold at 25 cents apiece to cover cost and distribution or can be given away by those who wish to make English a world language.

So far, I have financed all expenses of this project out of my private funds.

It is my hope that my friends and the friends of world peace, based on world understanding and world good will, will support the World Language Foundation by contributions great enough to supply the world with these volumes, and make the World Language Foundation self-supporting at the same time. Dr. Laubach suggests that $5,000,000 would be sufficient to perform the miracle of abolishing illiteracy throughout the world. Ten millions will do it twice as fast.

The Moro method of "each one teach one" will be employed. This method is that any person who learns the global alphabet is in honor bound to teach it to one other person, at least. By this method, I am informed, the Moros speedily abolished illiteracy among several million people in the Philippines.

There are 30 or 40 leading languages in the world and several thousand dialects. Over 60 percent of the people of the world do not read or write any language. They are ignorant of the printed word and the vast knowledge contained in it. They suffer from poverty and exploitation because of their ignorance.

In my opinion, the human race is fundamentally good at heart, and gladly gives good will and service to those who are friendly to them. I believe in the doctrine expressed in the sentiment.

"Be noble, and the nobility that lies in other men, sleeping but never dead, will rise in majesty to meet your own."

In 3 days I enter my ninetieth year in perfect health and in possession of my faculties. For every single day of a long life I have been fed, clothed, and sheltered by God's little messengers. My gratitude to them for their friendship and affection is deep and sincere.

I know that men are fundamentally good. I know that the people of the United States have hundreds of thousands of churches from one end of this land to the other, which continually and hourly through the radio, teach the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. In addition to these organizations, there are hundreds of thousands of brotherhoods and fraternal orders teaching the same doctrines of brotherhood. I, myself, have been affiliated with many fraternal orders, beginning with the A. T. O.; life membership, Master Mason, Lodge No. 28, Muskogee, Okla.; life membership of the Elks; life membership of the Scottish Rite, thirty-second; member of the Woodmen of the World and the Moose. I know these men with whom I have been affiliated. I know they are good fundamentally. I reflect over the fidelity of the men engaged in our public service who administer the mails with hardly one error in a thousand. I know the fine service of those who conduct our railways and assure our people of safe transit. I refuse to think ill of the people of the world in spite of the blunders of leaders who lead brave men into war and mutual destruction.

The colossal tragedies of the present war have impressed the whole world with the importance of human brotherhood.

I rejoice that I have been permitted to give the world a mechanism in the global alphabet by which a world language can be established quickly and cheaply, a world language through which by the printed word knowledge of every human acivity can be conveyed.

When the world has a world language, the broadcasting stations of the whole world can instantaneously convey to them the knowledge necessary for multiplied production.

I believe my effort to serve mankind in this manner will be appreciated by the American people, and I hope to be invited to use the radio to explain this matter more fully and to have those who sympathize with me use the public press and radio as a means of instructing the people.

With the global alphabet, people can easily write phonetic English three or more times as fast with the pen as the current English script. This saving of time is important. They can read books three times as fast in global as in current English. That which is much more important, they can learn to write and read English phonetically in a few days or weeks, saving 5 or 10 years required to learn to spell current English.

Time is life, and saving time is of supreme importance. Books printed in global English require only half as much paper as current English books. Global books require only half the transportation and storage costs.

I have not forgotten that the last legislative assembly named you the principal chief of the Cherokee Nation, and I am glad to have your approval.

With kind regards,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

National Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address which I delivered over Station WHN on the program, Congressional Record of the Air:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful for this opportunity to discuss with you the proposed national service bill, which embraces a pressing question now facing our Nation. That question is, Should Congress pass legislation which would put every man in America between the ages of 18 and 45 at the mercy of some Government official he may never have seen before?

The proposal is innocently labeled "A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940." Actually, it is a bill to establish authoritative control over the individual citizen, to put every man in the age limit to which I have referred under bondage to a bureaucrat. It could properly be called a bill to conscript free labor. The next move might well be to conscript free capital. This would be only one move from totalitarianism, which we are sacrificing so much to avoid.

Under the terms of this bill, if you are between 18 and 45 years of age, you could be told that your present work was not essential, you could be uprooted from the city, town, or hamlet in which you now live, and commanded—not requested—you could be commanded to take a job in an industry far from your home and friends. And—mind you—in effect you could be told to join a union—not any union but a particular union. Is not this dangerous delegation of power? And—remember—power once delegated may not be easily regained.

In addition, under terms of this bill as it is now written drastic penalties could be applied against you if you refused to make the move which the authorities might demand of you, and, if your employer does not obey, sanctions can be applied against him.

It seems hardly necessary to point out that this harsh and far-reaching bill, with all its important ramifications, is not necessary today. The War Manpower Commission now has well-nigh airtight control over every man between 18 and 45 registered under selective service. It has ample power to induct men between 18 and 45 who do not move into essential industry. Actually, no additional legislation is required to immediately apply the work or fight principle—a principle which the administration failed to apply when given the power and also the duty to do so in the National Selective Service Act of 1940. And there lies the responsibility. Any work stoppages, strikes, or otherwise, any slow-down, any loafing, any idleness by those able to work, or any manpower hoarding could have been, and could now be, prevented by the application of the work-or-fight principle which the President has the power and the duty to apply and when the fighting men and women return they will hold this administration responsible for the failure to do so. Let's not now be deceived. This legislation has another purpose. The President and his administrators also have the power to penalize effectively any business in America that violates either the letter or the spirit of these Government regulations. Any existing difficulties are purely problems of administration and not want of power.

Congress in the past 4 years has given to the President and his administrators the greatest amount of power in the history of this Nation or any nation with representative government in the history of the world, yet they continue to ask for more power. They want the power to tell you whether or not you can move from town to town, where and when you can work at what pay, and for what purpose. Power feeds on itself and is never sated.

This legislation, I repeat, is unnecessary. Every announced purpose of this bill can be accomplished without granting any further authority. Senator MEAD, a Democratic Senator from New York, admitted as much just a week ago when he stood on the floor of the Senate and recited at length a story of manpower hoarding, waste, and inefficiency at the Norfolk Navy Yard. Every one of you listeners could tell other stories of wasted manpower. Every Congressman gets reports every day of new manpower wastes, hoarding, or misuse, both by private industries handling war contracts and by the Government itself. Senator WILLIS, Republican of Indiana, recently said that hoarding of manpower by the Government has reached scandalous proportions and there was not one person who challenged him. They did not challenge him because they could not. You know, and I know, that we have the most spendthrift administration—in money, men, and materials—in the history of our Nation.

This so-called work-or-fight legislation is not needed, I repeat again, and I can give you the highest authority to which many of you will listen. That authority is the President himself. As late as last October, after reciting the miracles of production which free labor and free industry had produced in this country, he pointed out that every gun and every tank and every bit of ammunition was being delivered on time, down to the last bullet. If this was true then, it is true now?

The last two Congresses gave the War Department and the Navy Department more money than they asked. We appropriated in these two Congresses the greatest amounts of money ever contemplated by the most liberal-minded economist in this Nation. Production records have been and are now at fantastic levels. The war production of this Nation has been one of the miracles of the ages. Although we have won every battle against the Japs and Germans for 3 years, the bureaucrats say we must give the President more power.

In the late political campaign, we were assured that everything was going fine and that all was being done that could be done. Nothing more was asked and nothing new was contemplated. Yet, within 2 weeks after Mr. Roosevelt's election to a fourth term, we were confronted with a propaganda campaign of unprecedented scope. We were told that men were dying because of a shortage of shells, that others would suffer for lack of equipment, and now we are told that our boys are freezing on the western front for lack of clothes.

If you will forgive a personal reference, I might say that I have been on that western front where our boys are fighting and dying today. I served all through World War No. 1 and I know both the climatic conditions of France and the tenacity and fighting spirit of the Germans. I would say no word, make no move, that would cause any man on that front to suffer, for I know what kind of enemy they are fighting against, what conditions they face.

Yet, this issue of labor conscription, no matter what the propaganda campaign surrounding it has developed, is not an issue affecting our men abroad. They will get their weapons and they will get their clothing, in the future as in the past, regardless of this legislation. Free American industry and free American labor will see to that. If this legislation were needed the administration should have requested it 3 years ago, not now after a miracle in production has been performed—and, yes, after the power of our enemies has begun to wane. Confidence in this proposal is not inspired by the statement made at the Lenin Memorial meeting at Madison Square Garden, January 13, by Mr. Earl Browder, that national-service legislation is "the way Lenin taught us to face and solve our problems."

This manpower conscription bill hidden under the euphonious title of "national manpower bill," is not to meet any exigency of this war. The plans for this act were laid prior to 1936. The plan was made and provided for in the 1936 revision of the national industrial mobilization plan. There you will find it if you wish. And the plan to continue these powers beyond the war was written into the 1939 revision of the industrial mobilization plan, and you will find it there under section F, of Post-war Adjustment title.

When freedom was an issue, the American people have never faltered, they have never failed. And freedom is an issue in this legislation. Already we are bound down by the greatest number of restrictions in our history. Shall we pass laws giving the same men who have misused the other powers more power? I say "No," and I think I speak for many besides myself, both in Congress and in the Nation.

This legislation is not needed, I repeat, and it is not needed because the manpower problem, as Paul V. McNutt, War Manpower Commissioner, has pointed out again and again, is not a national problem, but a local problem ever changing to reflect military strategy and requirements, and needs not a nation-wide regimentation such as provided in a national blanket law which reduces incentive and efficiency. It needs intensified, immediate action in the specific areas where the shortages exist by the War Manpower Commission under the authority which it now possesses. If you were to take a map of this country and dot the towns with critical industries that need manpower now, you would see quickly that only certain communities, certain cities, are hard hit. You would see what Mr. McNutt had in mind when he said that manpower problems are local problems. More people were employed in December and production was at a higher point than at any time since the war began. Any lags in production were principally in special lines where requirements had been changed to meet changes in military strategy or errors in estimates and planning. A W. P. B. release of last Monday shows that "in second half of 1944, output in every one of the critical programs showed a substantial gain, ranging upward from 20 percent for tires and trucks to over 150 percent for aircraft and mortars, and 200 percent for rockets."

Why, then, as Senator MEAD so forcefully asked the other day, enact blanket legislation that will touch 100,000,000 people just to get at a few? I say sincerely that I believe present powers already in the hands of this administration, if used properly and adequately, would pull us through with guns and tanks and bullets to spare. Thomas Jefferson once said: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." We here in America have given our best to the war—we will continue to give our best. But we do not want to give up unnecessarily more liberties to men who have shown what they have in mind. They want to make over America—make it over in such a way that our men will not recognize it when they return home. They must not succeed. We must not let them succeed.

Remember, that power once lodged in the hands of a bureau may be used against you.

If Congress Only Understood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from Beasley's Farm and Home Weekly of Charlotte, N. C.:

IF CONGRESS ONLY UNDERSTOOD—NOW HAS OPPORTUNITY TO BEGIN SOLVING GREATEST OF QUESTIONS

(By the Editor)

A subcommittee of the House of Representatives charged with investigation of the Government land holdings states that 24 percent of the land of continental United States is now under Government title.

This 24 percent of land area amounts to 455,171,125 acres. In addition to this, the committee states that if land now owned by the Government in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands be added it would show that 36 percent of all American possessions is Government owned. In North Carolina a million and three-quarters acres, or 5 percent of the whole, is held by Government title. This does not include land in possession of the States, which must in some cases be considerable.

While much of this land must have been in Government hands for some time as leftovers from settlement of the Western States, and much of it is in park reservations, a great deal of it has been acquired for war purposes. The House subcommittee, working on the matter for some time, is charged with making recommendations as to how all land not now needed by the Government is to be returned to private ownership.

Legislation already passed by the House provides that steps be taken to determine which lands are suitable for homestead entry, and that existing laws be amended to grant the same homestead preference rights to veterans of the present war as extended to veterans of other wars.

Of the many blind policies that our Government has pursued through the years none has been more blind and disastrous than that by which the public lands have been disposed of. And now, when unusual circumstances have placed so much land back in Government ownership, there is a chance to rectify the mistake to some degree. But the present Congress is as blind as all former Congresses have been. Not a foot of the land now owned by the Government should be returned to private ownership, but every foot of it not needed by the Government should be placed in private use.

If Congress could once fully understand the difference between private ownership and private use, it would see the rare opportunity which it now has of taking an immensely forward step in public policy. Countless millions of acres of public land were given to railroads and were given to private citizens under the homestead laws. Millions of these acres have passed out of the private ownership of recipients or their heirs and are held out of use for speculative purchases. Huge acreages have been monopolized by corporations and other owners upon a speculative market which keeps the price so high that it cannot be bought by actual users. Land capitalization is a fictitious value which operates to create tenants on farms, deserted farms, absentee ownership, and slums in the cities. We are now squalling about slums and lack of housing, about people not using the land, about absentee ownership, about the rise in land price, yet neither Congress nor anyone else will go to the root of the matter, which is that land held out of use for higher prices makes all usable land so high that small owners cannot obtain it, and that rent creates an economic burden which adds to the cost of living of every person that breathes. This burden is so great upon all that the benefits of the smaller number who profit by it are wiped out when the whole economic and social scale is considered.

And now while we are pondering the question we find that it is so little understood that the Mayor of New York proposes to tax rents in order to subsidize the transportation system of New York. This is not a proposition to tax the owners of real estate but to put a 2-percent tax upon the payer of rents, to be collected by the landlord and turned over to the city in the manner of a sales tax. This is insanity gone wilder. The rent payer has already paid to the landlord a profitable rate on values which the landlord never created, and yet a mayor of a great city, supposed to be wrestling with the housing problem, and a city filled with slums, comes forward with this scheme, which ought to be branded as a move to increase the slums.

But how could the Government return the land in question to private use without returning it to private ownership? That would be easy. The Government owns the land and it has been paid for. Let the Government retain the title and establish a system of ground rent by which anyone who wanted to actually use the land could be given indefinite possession merely by paying a small ground rent. He would himself make all the improvements which he would own just as securely and indefinitely as if he had title to the land. The Government would be under contract to let him use the land, either himself or his assigns forever, so long as it was actually used and the ground rent paid. If he chose to sell his improvements, including soil improvements, he could do so and the Government contract would go with the sale to the new owner. The only irrevocable condition would be that the man who held the ground rental contract would be compelled to use the land.

With the land the Government now owns and with additional purchases that might be necessary, every returning soldier could be given a home site, to be his for actual use as completely as if he had paid thousands of dollars for it. This system would take the place of the old homestead way of disposing of public lands but would be a vast improvement. The old homestead system did not guarantee use of land as the new system would. But keeping the land in use by those to whom it was rented would be but a small part of the general social benefit. The greatest benefit would be in keeping down the speculative value of land, a system under which land gravitates from small ownership to large or absentee ownership.

We once had great frontiers in this country, free land or nearly free land, to be taken up. Woodrow Wilson and others bemoaned the vanishing of the frontiers. Now the frontiers are here, right in every State in the Union. They consist of unused land. Land of every kind and location, farm land, forest land, vacant city lots. But all this land is so highly capitalized that men of moderate means cannot buy it and make the improvements.

There is enough vacant land in a short radius of every city or town in the country for every town or city worker to have a home and garden. But he can't buy the land and build the house. The Government is using all kinds of expediency to get people to own homes and farms; all expensive and in the long run futile efforts. By one sensible and logical and practical system it could reopen the frontiers in every State in the Union and give every man who desired it a chance to secure his own home site with no financial outlay, and secure it as certainly as if he had thousands to pay for it.

But Congress will not see this. They will piddle along with the old homestead system, appropriate money to build housing projects in cities which private parties would do profitably if they were freed from the cost of land, hire people to go back to the land where they would gladly go of their own accord if they had a chance. Congress looks upon the land question like it does upon tariff and oleomargarine. A tariff benefits some people; Congress will not see the great evil it does to all other people. A tax on oleomargarine benefits butter makers, so Congress will not see that it injures others. Land speculation benefits the speculators and Congress cannot or will not see that it injures the whole social and economic fabric.

International Cooperation for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the democratic, peace-loving nations of the world again face the problem of international cooperation in the interest of a just and an enduring peace. For the United States to refuse to make a fair and sincere contribution to international understanding and cooperation will be to break faith with those who have sacrificed so heavily to what we trust has been the cause of freedom. If we must again attempt to settle our international differences on the field of battle then World War No. 2, like World War No. 1, will have been another fruitless try at establishing enough order and peace in the world to permit the democratic concept of freedom to survive.

The military victories of the democratic alies in 1918 gave the victors the first real chance to make a concerted try for permanent peace. The military victories of 1918 also thrust upon the democracies the obligation of passing on to succeeding generations the gains so dearly bought by world-wide conflict. We had the chance but for what seemed perhaps to be good reasoning to some of the national leaders of that period the victors let the real victory slip so easily from their fingers and almost before the smoke of battle had cleared we were drinking only the bitter dregs of defeat. Again in the span of life in the same generation the free governments of the world are called upon to do again, and at a greater sacrifice, the same military job which was accomplished in World War No. 1. When the democracies again stand victorious on the far-flung battle fronts of the world they will hold in their hands the second chance for a try at enduring peace. Much will be at stake again this time. Will it be another fumble and World War No. 3, or may we expect an honest attempt to maintain order and peace?

Is it reasonable to expect enduring peace or must we always be looking for the next world conflict. Are there really any bases for international understanding and world order? If there are none then peace is of course an empty illusion.

In my humble opinion today the bases for international understanding and cooperation far outnumber the excuses for international disagreements. I earnestly recommend that the average citizens of the free groups turn their attention to emphasizing similarities with other free neighbors. Let us learn to appreciate and develop the habit of defending our likenesses, and resent being pointed out as being peculiarly different. If we are basically very different from other freedom-loving peoples we are peculiar indeed.

Man in that slow struggle up through the years has constantly planned and worked to overcome the countless limitations which surround him and which withheld from him that abundant life which he has known should be his. In the material or physical realm achievements have been phenomenal. In the realm of health, medicine, and surgery we have come from the days when pain, disease, and death were attributed to the vengeance of an angry god to a medical science which approaches the miraculous. In the realm of economics we have come the long road from the time when man had just what he could gather during the day with his own hands with no method of keeping any of what he had to enrich his life tomorrow to our complex economy of today. Would anyone argue that the more abundant life made possible by these gains is or should be restricted to certain racial or national groups? And would anyone insist that only certain racial and national groups are capable of taking enriched living from these advances? Happiness as a result of the abundance of peace, order, and justice knows no racial or national boundaries, and our responses to improve conditions in these realms are approaching similar patterns. This is as it should be, for civilization advances as we discover, accept, and share the better response patterns. In the realms of the material, health, economics, and other realms, we know and readily recognize that we have not attained ultimate goals. The future holds undreamed of progress and we confidently expect tomorrow to be better than today.

How about the realm of social controls or government? In this sphere we have also traversed a long road from the time when each individual was a supreme government unit to the nationalistic patterns of today. In my opinion, we are now at that place in the realm of government where some important dynamic choices must be made. Then, nationally, we should ask, Is government by a democratic unit which must continue to be one of a group of ever-conflicting democracies the best that we can expect in social control?

In all other areas of man's victorious conquest of his limitations we look ahead. We know that the steps taken today will enrich the world tomorrow and progress is not limited by national barriers. But in Government have we reached the ultimate goal? Is there no more progress? Is this it? In my opinion it will soon be necessary for us as a free nation to decide whether or not we will take the next step toward the perpetuation of the democratic ideal which fosters free and abundant living. This step is international cooperation and organization. Failure to take this step would leave us with only the very limited sphere of progress confined to internal refinement. Failure to take this step will also perpetuate that element of unrestricted conflict which may reasonably be expected, if continued, to wreck civilization itself. The chance for international planning will be the fruits of military victory and a fair and sincere trial at international understanding is the only payment the democracies can make for the sacrifices which this second chance has cost mankind.

In recent years needless national conflict for power and favored position has retarded desirable social controls and has piled high the junk heap of civilization with perfectly good tools of progress. Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations was thrown among the rubbish.

International organization must, of course, be the result of compromises with the knowledge that improvement is always the trend. No nation should expect everything it desires. Our own Constitution is strong because of its original compromises and it has gained strength through later changes. As our States retain their identities in a national union so may the free nations of the world retain their identities in an international pattern. Let us approach the task of helping to build a better world with an open mind and heart. Let us approach the task free from selfish reservations. Let us approach the task with a firm reliance on divine providence to guide us and the other free peoples of the world to an international understanding which will establish order and justice in a future peaceful world.

Poland, Russia, and Our Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has become necessary to remind ourselves that there are those in high places who are tempted to forsake the principles which brought us into this present war. If we in Congress permit those in high places to turn their backs upon these honorable principles, our sacrifice of a million boys will have been in vain. If we permit these principles to be lost, we might save for a time almost everything except our honor and our souls.

These principles were first crystal clear when we entered the Battle of Britain. By saving Britain we saved the principles for which we were fighting. Now with dramatic suddenness we see before us the Battle of Poland. It is not a military battle; it need never be so. It is but a diplomatic battle, but a battle that must be won, because in the Battle of Poland is interwoven all the principles for which we entered this global war. The Battle of Poland has become a test of the sincerity of the United Nations. The Battle of Poland is a test of the all-important question, Just what is it we are fighting for in this war?

The entire world today has its eyes on Poland. The conflict between Russia and Poland does not concern the Curzon line. Gentlemen of the House, do not be deceived so easily. The Battle of Poland does not concern the frontiers of Poland. The question is not, Shall Poland's eastern border be shifted westward? Nor is the question one of losing some territory in the East for a gain of some territory in the West. The question simply is, Shall Poland exist?

It is most important that should Poland lose this diplomatic battle with Russia all Europe, yes all the world, loses

just as heavily. Without a free Poland there can be no free Europe or a free world. That is why in 1939 England and France went to war. That is why in 1941 we went to war. The threat to Polish freedom is a threat to freedom all over the world. The world has been set afire as a result of Munich. It will again be set afire and freedom will die with Poland if she is permitted to die.

It is well to note that Poland today is a testing ground not only of our sincerity in this war but also a testing ground to find out if freedom is secure. The threat to Poland's freedom is the first step of a projected program to threaten freedom in every country all over the world. If communism has its way in Poland we are giving Russia a green light to proceed elsewhere. The freedom of all liberty-loving people all over the world is at stake in the Battle of Poland.

It is now time for America to speak out. It is now time to show our hand. It is now time to answer the question: Just for what purpose are our sons being killed? It is now time to prove our sincerity. Our honor is at stake in the Battle of Poland. Shall we sit idly by watching Poland crushed by the merciless monster of communism, knowing full well that some day soon all Europe too will be crushed the same way? What kind of peace will it be to live in constant dread of the spread of communism?

The fate of Poland will determine whether this war has been won or lost. Speak up America. Your conscience and your honor is at stake. Is America going to permit another Munich of appeasement? Is America going to rescue millions of Europeans from the beast of nazi-ism and embrace them in the arms of the beast of communism?

So that the true facts of the Battle of Poland can be made known, I am reciting a complete story with factual material. I urge fellow Members to study these facts and urge positive action by our leaders now before it becomes too late. Are we fighting for freedom? Well, Poland is freedom. If Poland is lost, freedom is lost. In the Battle of Poland our honor is at stake. Wake up America and act now before it is too late.

WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT?

What is the real issue in the Polish-Soviet controversy that has become paramount in importance for the United Nations?

The Soviet Union makes two principal demands on Poland: 1. That Poland cede to the Soviet Union all her eastern territories up to the so-called Curzon Line. 2. That Poland, once liberated from the German occupation, establish a government friendly to Soviet Russia.

Once these demands are satisfied, the friends of Moscow claim that unity among the Allies would be restored and the Polish-Soviet relations would achieve an edifying degree of friendliness.

Why, then, does the Polish Government oppose so vigorously these Russian demands?

TERRITORIAL DEMANDS OF THE SOVIET UNION

1. What Is Eastern Poland?

The Soviet Union claims for Russia the territory, delimited in the east by the Treaty of Riga, concluded between Poland, Russia, and the Ukraine on March 18, 1921. In the west the territory in question stretches as far as the so-called, erroneously, Curzon Line. As a matter of fact, this line does not deviate much from the line of Poland's fourth partition, concluded by the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement of September 28, 1939. At present this partition has been attributed to a more trustworthy authority, that of the British statesman, although Lord Curzon never intended to settle Poland's frontier along this line.

What is this territory that the Soviet Union demands?

Is it a small patch of land, insignificant in size? No. It is not, for it has an area of 70,000 square miles and constitutes 46.5 percent of the total area of Poland. It is larger in size than Illinois or Missouri, and four European countries put together—Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Latvia—would comfortably fit into this mileage.

Is it a depopulated, desolate land? By no means. In 1931 it was inhabited by 10,734,000 people, and in 1939 its population was nearly 12,000,000, or 33.1 percent of the total Polish population. More people live in eastern Poland than in Pennsylvania, second largest State of the Union, and more than in Australia and New Zealand put together.

Is this territory as poor and worthless as Mr. Churchill stated in his speech of December 15, 1944? Quite the contrary. The "most desolated region" of the Polesie marshes which Mr. Churchill matched against "the beauty of the ancient seaport of Danzig" constitutes no more than 20 percent of the whole territory coveted by the Soviet Union. The eastern territories gave to Poland much more than the Polesie marshes; it contributed 90 percent of Poland's natural gas, 63 percent of Poland's oil, one of Europe's richest potassium mines, Poland's sole deposits of phosphates and ozocerite, 50 percent of the Polish forests, 42 percent of Poland's water power, 40 percent of the total arable land, orchards, and gardens, 63 percent of Poland's meadows and pastures. It is also in the eastern part of the country that two wealthy cities of an ancient Polish culture, Wilno and Lwów, are located.

The eastern territories contribute to the agricultural production of Poland as follows:

	Percent
Wheat	45
Rye	28
Oats	38
Barley	36
Vegetables	45
Potatoes	33
Hemp	61
Flax	78
Maize	98
Tobacco	80

2. Historical considerations

Why should eastern Poland be given to Soviet Russia?

On the ground of historical considerations? But these do not speak for Russia.

(a) The southern part of Eastern Poland, the so-called Eastern Galicia, with an area of 23,583 square miles, has never belonged to Russia; only once in its history was it held by the Russians, during the period of Russia's friendship with Nazi Germany, between September 1939 and June 1941.

(b) The rest of the territory claimed by Russia today formed a part of the Tzarist Empire only during the times of partitions—1772–1918—when Poland, divided between Germany, Russia, and Austria, was erased from the map of Europe.

If these partitions were to form the basis for any territorial demands on historical grounds, Warsaw should also be included, for the Polish capital had suffered with the rest of the country 123 years of the Tzarist yoke. But the partitions were condemned by the world. Jefferson called the partitions of Poland a crime; President Wilson, "one of the greatest crimes of history." Even the Soviet Government had formally condemned and annulled the partitions by the decree of the People's Commissars signed by Lenin on August 28, 1919. This decree read:

"All agreements and acts concluded by the Government of the former Russian Empire with the Governments of the Kingdom of Prussia and the Austro-Hungarian Empire in connection with the partitions of Poland, are annulled forever by the present revolution, in view of the fact that they are contrary to the principle of the self-determination of peoples, and to revolutionary sense of law of the Russian nation, which recognizes the inalienable right of the Polish nation to independence and unity."

Any change in the Polish-Soviet frontier, if made, cannot be justified on historical grounds.

3. Ethnographic considera'ions

On the ground of ethnographic considerations? But these also do not speak for Russia. According to the census of 1931—the last Polish census—100,000 Russians or less than 1 percent of the population of Eastern Poland, lived in the territories claimed by Soviet Russia.

It is quite true that the populat.on of this territory, as in all the borderlands in Europe (Alsace and Lorraine, Schleswig, Macedonia, Fiume, Tyrol, Sudatenland, etc.) is ethnically mixed. But it is equally true that the Poles there form the largest single national group, and, together with the Jewish group, constitute over 45 percent of the population.

One should also remember that although many Ukrainians and White Ruthenians live in Eastern Poland, it is most doubtful—to say the least—whether they would want to be incorporated into the communist set-up of the Soviet Union. Before the war Communism made only very insignificant headway among the Ukrainians. The Ukrainian Quarterly asserts that "there was hardly another country in Europe where anti-Communist feelings were stronger."

The best proof that the union with Soviet Russia was not the heart's desire of these people may be found in the attitude of the Soviet Government toward the Ukrainians in Poland, and in the attitude of the Ukrainians in Poland toward the Soviet Union.

When eastern Poland was incorporated into Soviet Russia in 1939, mass deportations into the depths of Russia began almost immediately. Among those arrested and deported there was a large number of Ukrainians. It was at this time that the Ukrainian-American Institute in Pittsburgh wired to the Soviet Embassy in Washington as follows:

"The history of your government's cruel and bloody liquidation of the people of Soviet Ukrainian territory marks one of the blackest pages in modern history.

"Your government stands guilty of deliberately planning the starvation and annihilation of millions of innocent men, women, and children during the years of 1932 and 1933.

"The Ukrainian people throughout the world, as well as all civilized nations, will hold your government strictly responsible for your government's treatment of our brothers in eastern Galicia."

The leading organ of the Ukrainian National Alliance in the United States of America, Svoboda, wrote:

"Anyone familiar with the attitude of not only the Ukrainian but also the Polish and Jewish populations of that territory toward Russian communism, will agree with the author of these lines that in a free election the number of votes for the incorporation of that territory into Soviet Russia would not amount to more than 10 percent of the total votes, and most probably less."

While speaking of ethnographic considerations, it is pertinent to mention the composition of population in the two largest cities of Eastern Poland: Lwów and Wilno.

Lwów is the capital of southeastern Poland with a population of 312,200 inhabitants. The Poles constitute 63.5 percent of Lwów's

population, the Jews 24.1 percent, the Ukrainians 11.2 percent, and the Russians 0.2 percent.

Wilno—in the northeastern part of Poland—has a population of 195,100. Of these 65.9 percent are Poles, 28 percent Jews, 3.8 percent Russians, 0.9 percent White Ruthenians, and 0.8 Lithuanians.

It would be indeed a queer application of the principle of self-determination if we should overlook the wishes of the largest national groups in order to cater to the wishes of minorities who had not even been asked what their wishes were.

4. Cultural considerations

On the grounds of cultural considerations? Most emphatically—no! Despite over a century of Russian rule western civilization and Polish culture, so foreign to the culture and civilization of Russia, still permeates these areas.

The Poles in these territories exerted a far greater influence than their numbers would seem to warrant. How well-liked and trusted they were was made obvious in 1906, when the first only democratic elections to the Duma took place. Notwithstanding Russian domination, these elections returned only 3 Russian representatives out of the 17 who were to represent the province; the rest were Polish.

Eastern Poland produced such outstanding Poles as Kosciusko and Pulaski, who fought for America's independence; King John Sobieski, who in the seventeenth century rescued Vienna, and with it all of Europe from the Moslem invasion; Jozef Pilsudski, leader of the nation during and after World War No. 1; Ignacy Paderewski, famous pianist; Joseph Conrad—Konrad Korzeniowski—author of many brilliant novels written in English; Wroblewski and Olszewski, two scientists who were the first to liquefy air; Adam Mickiewicz and Juljusz Slowaeki, Poland's two greatest poets, and scores of others.

No cultural considerations can therefore speak in favor of incorporating eastern Poland into Soviet Russia.

5. Strategic reasons

Because of strategic necessity?

Strategic arguments are repeatedly advanced nowadays to speak together with the demands for Russia's security in favor of partitioning Poland and incorporating her eastern territories in the Soviet Union. Mr. Churchill, in his recent speech, has also been guilty of this misrepresentation:

"Twice in our lifetime Russia has been violently assaulted by Germany, many millions of Russians have been slain, and vast tracts of Russian soil have been devastated as a result of repeated German aggression. Russia has the right of reassurance against future attacks from the west."

One might conclude from this statement that it was Poland which had facilitated the German invasion of Russia. In reality it was quite the contrary; Russia was twice attacked by Germany in this century, but this occurred both times at a time when Poland did not exist on the map of Europe (1914 and 1941). While Poland did exist as an independent state in 1939, she took upon herself the whole brunt of the Nazi aggression, and would have defended herself much more efficiently were it not for the stab in the back the Red Armies dealt Poland on September 17, 1939.

So much for Russian security in the west. That the annexation of eastern Poland plays no role here was clearly shown in 1941, when Hitler's army pushed unimpeded across this territory in but a few days, without fighting any major engagements.

To avoid a new German attack in the future, Soviet Russia should aim not at partitioning Poland, but at disarming and controlling Germany and establishing close relations with the other United Nations, and among them, with Poland.

6. Moral considerations

Then, there are still—last but by no means least—moral considerations. They were also mentioned by Mr. Churchill, that eloquent pleader for a change in frontiers. The Soviet Army is liberating Poland from the Germans, and therefore Poland should repay Russia for their help with a half of Polish territory. "That is the great gift that they—the Poles—have to give to Russia," Prime Minister Churchill said.

This is a bill which but one party presents. Poland may present another bill, and a much more convincing one to those whose thinking is unbiased.

Poland did not passively wait for her liberation. Poland had fought valiantly for full 5 weeks in 1939, taking upon herself the whole German might at the very outset of the war; Poland's fall was indeed precipitated by Soviet aggression from the east.

Poland fought in the defense of Norway and France in 1940, at a time when oil and grain flowed from Russia to Germany.

Poland fought for England during the Battle of Britain, when every eighth German plane shot down over London was accounted for by the Polish airmen. Has this bill been paid in Mr. Churchill's speech?

Poland fought in the defense of Suez Canal and Egypt because the treaty between Poland and Great Britain—August 25, 1939—provided for the mutual assistance in case of an aggression. Poland has faithfully fulfilled her obligations resulting from the treaty.

Poland fought in Italy and after D-day—in France, in Belgium, and in Holland—for she believed that peace is indivisible and that fighting the Germans anywhere in the world was a battle for freedom and independence.

Poland, the land without a Quisling, had fought unceasingly at home ever since 1939, waging guerilla warfare, organizing sabotage and diversion. These activities increased in 1944 with the Soviet armies approaching Polish soil. The divisions of the Polish home army took part in liberating eastern Poland, in liberating Lwow and Wilno. Despite the lack of any assistance and help whatsoever they engaged the Germans in open fighting in the streets of Warsaw on August 1, 1944, and fought them for 63 days, long, hopeless days.

Poland's losses in this war amount to nearly 18 percent of her total population. No other country has had to bear such terrific losses, not even Soviet Russia. To whom should Poland present her bill and in what amount?

The reward that is being prepared for Poland today will rob her of half her territory, the very soil in whose defense Poland has suffered so much and fought so valiantly.

7. Pre-war Polish-Soviet frontier

The Polish-Soviet frontier as of 1939 was established by the Treaty of Riga—March 18, 1921—much further to the west than the line which had been suggested by the Russians themselves in Lenin's proposal of January 29, 1920, and in their answer to Lord Curzon's note of July 11, 1918. By the terms of the treaty Poland gave up 120,000 square miles of her prepartition territory, despite the fact that the Soviet Government had denounced formally the partitions of Poland. By the terms of the treaty 1,500,000 Poles were left in Russia, while only 150,000 Russians remained in Poland.

At the time of peace negotiations the Russian delegation opposed strongly Polish financial and reparational claims, while agreeing readily to the frontier line as proposed by the Polish delegation.

The Treaty of Riga was a compromise. It was not a solution thrust upon a weak Russia by a strong Poland as some would have it. Strong Poland? What nonsense! How could she be strong, regaining her independence after more than a century of nonexistence and foreign oppression? How could she be strong emerging from the turmoil of the war with an army of 4,000 men?

In the course of 18 years (1921–39) the frontier as established by the Treaty of Riga was never questioned, not even once, by the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the Treaty of Riga has been reaffirmed more than once by the Russians, notably in 1923, when the U. S. S. R. emerged from the original R. S. F. S. R.

Is Poland's title to her eastern territories debatable? It did not seem so when the conference of ambassadors representing the principal allied and associated powers—Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan—recognized the Polish-Soviet frontier on March 15, 1923, and when 3 weeks later, on April 5, 1923, the United States of America joined in extending its recognition also.

It did not seem debatable, either, at the time when none of the allied governments recognized the Soviet occupation of eastern Poland. The State Department and the British Foreign Office made it quite clear in their statements that their Governments stand by policy of nonrecognition of territory taken by conquest. Such a policy is in accordance with the principles formulated in the Atlantic Charter.

8. Territorial compensations

As a compensation for the territories east of Curzon line, the Soviet Government offers Poland the belt of land stretching along Poland's western frontier, carved out of Germany up to the River Oder and Neisse, and a part of East Prussia (without, however, the largest town and port of Koenigsberg).

Certain necessary corrections and alterations have to be made in the Polish-German frontier and undoubtedly will be decided upon by the peace conference. But to think of a country as of a wheelbarrow which may be pushed around at will, to the east or to the west—is to deal a blow to the deepest feelings and instincts of this country's people. No nation will ever understand or condone such an approach to the territorial questions. And it's even more true in case of the ancient Polish nation, proud of the thousand years of its national history.

The establishment of the proposed Polish-German frontier on the River Oder would, besides, burst wide open the grave problem of 7,000,000 people who would become an obnoxious German minority group. We do not propose here to discuss all the implications of this problem, but we cannot fail to mention it and to signal its gravity.

9. Conclusions

There can be no argument, whether advanced by the Soviet Union or by those who support Russian policy which would justify the partitioning of Poland. Should this partition be carried out by force of arms and maintained with Russian bayonets—a wrong will have been perpetrated, and—keenly felt as it will be by the Polish nation—it will provide the worst possible basis for the future relations between the neighbor countries and the seeds of new grave complications in that part of Europe.

The Polish-Soviet conflict, however, is not limited to the territorial dispute alone. Much greater issues are involved in this conflict, much greater problems are at stake.

SOVIET DEMANDS FOR A FRIENDLY POLISH GOVERNMENT

Soviet demands for the establishment in Poland of a friendly government would seem to imply that up to this time the Polish Government's attitude toward Russia have been hostile.

1. The attitude of the Polish Government toward Soviet Russia

Nothing is further from the truth. The three premiers who have headed the Polish Government from the moment of the outbreak of this war (Gen. W. Sikorski, S.

Mikolajczyk, and T. Arciszewski), on many occasions have stressed their readiness to cooperate with the Soviet Union, basing their relationship on a good-neighbor policy and on close collaboration in war as well as in peace.

This readiness was not limited alone to statements by the Polish premiers and those head Polish foreign policy. It also found expression in many acts of good will. All the more worthy notice, since they occurred after the Soviets had broken the Polish-Russian nonaggression pact, still in force, after the occupation of half of Poland's territory by the Soviet Army, after the partitioning of Poland by Germany and Russia, and after innumerable wrongs which the Soviets inflicted upon the population of the occupied provinces (over a million people deported deep into Russia, arrests, death sentences, compulsory deprivation of citizenship, etc.).

The good will of the Polish Government was clearly demonstrated in their acts of: The signing of the Polish-Russian Treaty of July 30, 1941, by which act the Polish Government proclaimed its readiness to let bygones be bygones and to forget the wrongs done by the Soviets; the signing of the declaration of friendly cooperation between Poland and Russia on December 4, 1941; the formation of military units of Poles deported to Russia.

After a year this army, when it became impossible to obtain supplies of food and ammunition from the Soviet authorities, was evacuated to territories remaining under the protection of the western Allies. For the past year this army has been fighting in Italy, where it has distinguished itself by its conquests of Monte Cassino and Ancona.

The Soviet Government did not deem it necessary to stand by their declarations or to fulfill the obligations arising from treaties they had signed. In April 1943 they broke of diplomatic relations with the Polish Government.

As a pretext for breaking relations, the Soviets took exception to the fact that the Polish Government applied to the International Red Cross to investigate the mysterious Katyn massacre of 10,000 Polish officers who had been Russian prisoners of war since 1939.

Even after the break of diplomatic relations the Polish Government continued its policy of good will and declared its readiness to discuss all outstanding questions with the Soviets for the sake of Allied unity and common victory. Their readiness was expressed not in official declarations only but through following acts:

1. The Polish Home Army received an order from the Polish Government to cooperate militarily with the approaching Red Army, and it actually did cooperate with the Russians in liberating Wilno and Lwow, and in fighting in the district of Kielce and in Warsaw.

2. The Polish Prime Minister, Mikolajczyk, twice went to Moscow hoping to end the dispute.

These visits did not bring about reconciliation for the simple reason that the Soviet Government, having other plans in mind, did not seek a true reconciliation. Most telling in this respect was the Soviet refusal to accept the United States offer of mediation in Polish-Russian dispute, January 26, 1944.

The story of the Polish Commander in Chief, Gen. Kazimierz Sosnkowski, illustrates well the fact that it is not this or that particular member of the Polish Government whom the Soviets object to, but the very thought of reconciliation with an independent Poland which is distasteful to the Soviet leaders.

Throughout 1944 the Soviet press carried violent attacks against General Sosnkowski. When finally the President of the Polish Republic relieved the general of his duties as Commander in Chief of the Polish Forces (in August 1944) and appointed to the post Gen. Tadeusz Komorowski (the heroic General "Bor" of the Warsaw Insurrection)—the campaign was immediately switched to the new Polish Commander. A personification of the Polish spirit of patriotism and resistance, General Bor of legendary fame, whose bravery was truly an inspiration for all freedom-loving peoples—was described by the Soviets and Soviet agents as a "traitor to his nation" and statements were made that should Bor fall into Soviet hands he would be brought to trial as a war criminal for causing the deaths of thousands of people in the Warsaw fighting.

From the above facts it should be quite clear that the Polish Government not only omitted nothing that could restore friendly relations between Poland and Russia, but yet did more than could be expected or demanded of Poland after the tragic years of 1939–41.

Unfortunately, two parties are needed for a harmonious relationship. The Soviet Union cannot boast of a single act of friendliness or cooperation on its part.

2. The legal status of the Polish Government

The status of the Polish Government is occasionally questioned by Soviet sources and their recipients abroad, and the issued raised of the legality of the Polish Government.

In connection with these charges, the following statements are in order:

Poland's present government is established in accordance with the Polish constitution. This constitution was binding before the outbreak of the war and could be amended or changed only by a parliament freely elected by the people of a free and independent Poland.

The continuity of government in the legal sense of the term, has been kept by Poland throughout the war. Prof. P. E. Oppenheim, prominent in the field of international law, declared that the Polish Prime Minister and the Ministers of his cabinet "were appointed by the new President of the republic, all in accordance with the constitution. Hence the continuity of the Polish Republic is preserved."

Due to the foreign occupation of Poland, neither the President nor the Government can carry on their work in their home country, and therefore London became the temporary seat of the Polish Government.

The Polish Government is recognized by all the United Nations (except Russia) and by all neutral governments. The attitude of the United States Government is typical in this respect. On October 2, 1939, Secretary of State Cordell Hull issued a statement to the effect that the United States continued to "regard the Government of Poland as in existence in accordance with the provisions of the constitution of Poland."

Many acts of the Soviets testify to the fact that even Soviet Russia herself regards the Polish Government in London as the only rightful Government of Poland. This has been affirmed by the fact that—

1. The Soviet Government had concluded several agreements with the Polish Government in exile during the period 1941–43.

2. Even after relations had been broken off, the Soviet Government endeavored to induce the Polish Government to give up the eastern Polish territories. Accepting the Polish Government in London as a party to these parleys, the Soviets revealed that they considered that Government the legitimate trustee of the interests of the Polish nation.

3. Representative character of the Polish Government

When attempts to undermine the legal status of the Polish Government in exile failed, the Soviets endeavored to question at least the representative character of the Government. In the communique of the Soviet news agency TASS of March 1, 1943, we find the following phrase:

"'The present Polish ruling circles do not reflect in this matter the genuine opinion of the Polish people,' and the statement of the Soviet Government of January 11, 1944, charges that 'the émigré Polish Government is cut off from its people.'"

This charge—as many others previously quoted—is not true. Among all the governments in exile, the Polish Government undoubtedly has the closest contact with the nation it represents. This exceptionally close contact is a result of the following facts:

1. The Polish Government in exile maintains constant touch with Poland by means of radio and couriers, going both to Poland and from Poland (the Poles have established undoubtedly the best system of communication of all the exiled governments).

2. All the important decisions of the Polish Government in London, as well as its political program, are forwarded to Poland for the consideration of the Polish underground parliament—the Council of National Unity.

3. The Deputy Premier of the Polish Government remains in Poland and acts as the Government's delegate inside the occupied country. Three more leaders of the underground movement hold ministerial portfolios and, while working in Poland, are members of the London Cabinet.

4. The present Prime Minister, Tomasz Arciszewski, remained in German-occupied Poland until July 1944 (almost 5 years) and was one of the leaders of the Polish underground; the Minister of Interior, Zygmunt Berezowski, also reached London only recently, having left Poland in the spring of 1944. All together six members of the present Polish Government represent the underground.

There can be no question but that the Polish Nation obeys the Polish Government in London. The Soviets frequently complain of the obedience which people in Poland display with regard to the orders from the distant London Government. By the word "frequently" we mean whenever those orders do not wholly agree with Soviet plans.

The Warsaw insurrection in 1944 provides a moving example of the London Government's influence in Poland. The Warsaw insurrection had been ordered by the Polish home army, cooperating with the Government in exile, and was supported by the entire population. The battle lasted for over 2 months despite the lack of aid, despite the fact that the Soviet Government and its agents inside Poland did their best to minimize and ridicule the Warsaw battle in the eyes of the world and to prevent any help from reaching the people locked in mortal combat with the Germans.

4. Conclusions

Thus the Polish Government—temporarily in London—(a) is the only legal and rightful Government of the Polish Republic; (b) is most representative of the Polish Nation—insofar as this is at all possible in time of war; (c) is a government friendly to the Soviet Union, and sincerely desirous of establishing good neighborly relations with Russia, provided that there is an equal manifestation of good will on the part of the Soviet Union.

What does the present Soviet policy mean, therefore, and what lurks behind these Soviet attacks on the Polish Government?

THE REAL ASPECT OF SOVIET POLICY TOWARD POLAND

Annexation of half of Poland's territory is only a part of the Soviet program as regards Poland. Under the pretext of establishing a friendly government, Russia plans to liquidate Poland as an independent state.

Let us consider facts which have taken place during the past year and a half.

1. In Russia a group of Polish Communists and fellow travelers was formed, which under different names (Association of Polish Patriots, National Council, and finally Commit-

tee of National Liberation in Lublin) tries to create an impression that it represents the will of the Polish people.

By its very existence this group was at first intended as a threat to the legal Polish Government and in this way it hoped to influence their decisions. After this blackmail failed, the group sought to seize the governmental authority in Poland.

As to the character of this group it suffices to mention that during its initial activities it was headed by Wanda Wasilewska, a colonel in the Red Army and a member of the Supreme Soviet, and wife of the Soviet Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs, A. Korneychuk.

At present Mrs. Wasilewska-Korneychuk has been succeeded by Mr. E. Bierut, who from 1921 has been a Soviet citizen and from the time of creation of the Comintern, an agent of that organization, whose duties were the survey of revolutionary movements in Eastern Europe (Poland, Austria, Czechoslovakia). On December 31, 1944, Mr. Bierut announced himself President of the Provisional Government in Lublin.

It goes without saying that the committee constitutes a puppet Soviet Government, whose aims run parallel with those the Germans have applied in forming governments of that type in Slovakia, Greece, Croatia, and Belgium.

2. While preoccupied with the formation of a Communist center in Poland, the Soviet authorities began to recruit the Poles remaining in Russia. They did not consent to the evacuation to the Middle East of several hundred thousands of Poles deported by them to Russia, and, under threat of starvation and imprisonment they forced these people to join the ranks of the Soviet-sponsored Polish Army.

After crossing the Polish frontier the Soviets supplemented these forces by a compulsory conscription of Polish citizens.

3. Having reached Polish territory, the Soviet Army was assisted by the Polish Home Army in liberating Wolyn, Wilno, Lwow, and several other Polish provinces.

Taking advantage of the fact that the commanders of the Polish Home Army, on orders, had reported and disclosed the strength of their units to the Red Army, the Soviet authorities began the liquidation of those units. Polish Home Army officers were arrested or shot (in June 1944 Premier Mikolajczyk disclosed that the Russians killed 23 leaders of the underground movement), the soldiers were disarmed and incorporated into units organized by the Soviets. In August 1944, 2,500 officers of the Polish Home Army were put in the ill-famed camp of Majdanek, near Lublin.

4. On August 1, 1944, the uprising in Warsaw began. The approach of the Soviet Army to the gates of Warsaw and the appeals of the Moscow radio stations determined the date of the uprising.

Having ascertained that the command of the uprising lay in the hands of the Polish home army, the Soviet authorities refused to help in any way the Poles in their fight against the Germans. This attitude was carried so far that during the first 6 weeks of the struggle the Soviet authorities denied landing rights on Russian shuttle bases to American bombers bringing help to Warsaw.

At the same time the Soviet Army halted their offensive on this sector of the front and the uprising died after 63 days of desperate struggle. Polish losses amounted to about 250,000 people.

5. The agrarian reform in Poland, now being so hastily carried out on territories occupied by the Soviet Army, is not only a proof of Soviet interference in Polish internal affairs, but also betrays the plan of introducing there the Communist system of land ownership.

Figures announced by the Lublin committee show that in eastern Poland land is being distributed among peasants in such small allotments that they do not allow the owner to organize his farm on a self-sufficiency basis (information bulletin of the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Washington, 1944, No. 130, speaks of holding of 3 hectares—7.4 acres). Besides, the impossibility of supplying the new farmers with indispensable farm machinery, tools, and livestock will necessitate common use of such tools and livestock belonging to the old landowners.

Therefore, instead of creating strong and self-sufficient farms, a new class of agrarian proletariat is being purposely created, one that is most easily influenced by any social revolutions.

A complete failure of the newly created farms will result from this division of land. Their difficulties will serve the Soviet authorities as the signal for the introduction of an "improved system" of farming, based on that existing in Russia. Common ownership of land, machinery, and livestock will replace private ownership.

This senseless division of land is therefore the first step toward the introduction in Poland of collective farming, similar to the kolchoz system in the Soviet Union.

It should be emphasized that the "agrarian reform" carried on in such a manner met with hostile attitude even of its beneficiaries. The Moscow and Lublin radios have often reported on "the sabotage of the reform."

As a result of his inability to win over the Polish peasants, the head of the Department of Agriculture and Agricultural Reforms of the Lublin Committee, Mr. Andrzej Witos was made to resign from his office at the beginning of August 1944.

CONCLUSION

It is the aim of these few remarks to warn American opinion against a misrepresentation of Polish issues.

This conflict is not an internal Polish squabble. Before the war only 2 percent of the people in Poland were Communists, and today also they constitute only an insignificant group of the Polish population. By abolishing all democratic rights this Communist group, backed by Soviet bayonets and the Soviet NKVD, aims at the liquidation of the Polish independent state.

The dispute over Poland's frontiers is not the essence of this conflict. The Soviet Government not only plans to take over half of Poland's territory, but also to place in Warsaw a Soviet puppet government.

It is, therefore, the very existence of Poland that is at stake, the very existence of a nation that first opposed German aggression and in whose defense this World War began.

There are other issues at stake: principles which we consider noble and worthy of defense even at the price of blood.

The division of Europe into spheres of influence, violation of the right of nations to independence, mockery of democratic ideals, means depreciation of war aims and a lowering of the morale, both at the front and at home.

If the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of democracy in national and international life are to be pushed aside in favor of the appeasement of a strong ally, and if we decide that might should dominate over right and, accordingly, accept the unilateral decisions of the great powers, the present war would lose all purpose and the final victory, all meaning.

It is time that the United States, who adhere to democratic principles, speak up in defense of these ideals, refusing to be dragged into the dangerous policy of expediency.

THE CURZON LINE

Up to the present moment the Curzon line was a purely academic question, of no importance from either legal or political point of view. The Soviet Government's declaration of January 11, 1944, brought the Curzon line to the fore and had given it a new importance, it maintained ever since.

In this connection it ought to be stressed that the Curzon line to which refers the Soviet declaration, had been suggested by the Supreme Allied Council on December 8, 1919, as a temporary eastern demarcation line of the area whose Polish character was absolutely unmistakable, and where the Polish Government was authorized to establish a permanent political administration.

The provisional character of this demarcation line should be borne in mind. Declaration of the supreme council emphasized it in following words:

"The rights that Poland may be able to establish over the territories situated to the east of the said line are expressly reserved."

The line of demarcation ran only through the territories which had belonged to the Russian Empire after the partitions of Poland. It ended at the frontier of Galacia, which had been a Province of Austria before the First World War.

On July 10, 1920, at the time of the victorious Bolshevik offensive, the Supreme Council exacted from Poland at Spa the consent for an armistice with Russia based on the line drawn on December 8, 1919:

"Accordingly, on July 11, Lloyd George and Curzon—and it is here that Lord Curzon's name became attached for the first time to the now famous Curzon line—dispatched a note to the Soviet government proposing that they reach an armistice with the Poles. The terms, said the note, should provide that the Polish Army immediately withdraw 'to the line provisionally laid down last year by the peace conference as the eastern boundary within which Poland was entitled to establish a Polish administration. This line runs approximately as follows. The note then traced briefly and very roughly a line coinciding with that of the Supreme Council declaration of December 8, from Grodno to the old Galician frontier, but then continuing down through Galicia west of Rawa Ruska, east of Przemysl to the Carpathians,' something about which the December 8 declaration had said nothing. Even worse, the note went on to say that the Russians should in return agree to stand 'at a distance of 50 kilometers to the east of this line. In eastern Galicia each army will stand on the line which they occupy at the date of the armistice.' * * *

"The part of this line running through Galicia (following the division between west Galicia and east Galicia and thus leaving Lemberg on the Russian side) had certainly not been 'provisionally laid down as the eastern boundary within which Poland was entitled to establish a Polish administration,' since the Supreme Council had already awarded Poland a mandate over the whole of east Galicia. Moreover, the note itself, having traced this line through Galicia, added immediately that in 'eastern Galicia each army will stand on the line which they occupy at the date of armistice' and in mid-July the Poles, though retreating, were still reported as far to the east as Rovno, far beyond Lwow. It was a flat contradiction in terms."

One more point need be made here. The offer of mediation extended by the Supreme Council of the Allied and Associated Powers had been rejected by the Soviet Union—note of July 17, 1920—and even were it accepted, it was in no way concerned with the frontier problems of territorial settlement between

ETHNOGRAPHIC DATA ON EASTERN POLAND

The provinces of eastern Poland enclosed between the Curzon line (prolonged through Galicia) and the Polish-Soviet frontier have a population of 10,734,000 (according to 1931 census).

This population was divided as follows:

	Number	Percent
Poles	4,040,000	37.6
Ukrainians	4,010,000	37.4
White Ruthenians	894,000	8.3
Jews	850,000	7.9
Natives of Polesie	710,000	6.6
Russians	100,000	1.0
Lithuanians, Czechs, Germans, and others	134,000	1.2
Total	10,734,000	100.0

It is estimated that 8 years later, i. e., on August 31, 1939, the number of Polish citizens on the same territory increased to 11,807,000.

DEPORTATIONS

Immediately after the entry of Soviet troops into Poland, extensive arrests were carried out, embracing Polish state functionaries, judges, members of the police force and of local, both urban and rural autonomous authorities, university professors and school teachers, officials and employees of the state forest administration. The charge was counter-revolutionary activities. Arrests were followed by deportations to the interior of Russia.

The aim of these systematical arrests carried out throughout the whole area seemed to be a twofold one: The elimination of all people who might become, sooner or later, a source of inconvenience to the Soviet regime, and the establishment of such an atmosphere of terror that any resistance to the new ruler would be strangled on the spot.

People were not imprisoned for any actual transgression of the Soviet law, but in order to prevent such transgressions they might possibly feel inclined to commit.

After the establishment of temporary town committees which replaced the former Polish administration, the action of clearing of territory of the enemies of the people was even intensified.

Many thousands of arrests were carried out on simple denunciations; the population was terrorized. Landowners, all active members of noncommunistic Polish, Ukrainian, Jewish, and other parties, including leftist labor parties, members of the Polish Parliament, the last as well as the preceding ones, were arrested, likewise officers of the Polish Army, industrialists, bank employees, merchants, and tradesmen. Mass arrests occurred up to the outbreak of Russo-German hostilities in 1941, embracing members of the same professions, such as lawyers, physicians, railroad men, active social workers, trade-union leaders, directors of educational and cultural organizations, religious brotherhoods and societies, even school children and students. The total figure of Polish citizens deported to Russia amounted to about one and a half million people.

Men, as well as women and children, were transferred to 2,800 places in Russian polar regions, Siberia or central Asia, and forced to hard work. As a result, large numbers died and continue to die of starvation, sickness, and exposure.

The conditions of the deportations in closed cattle wagons outraged every humanitarian feeling. No previous warning had been given, so that people had no opportunity to prepare anything. In many cases families were split up for the transport, men, women, and children traveling separately. Very often they never got in touch again.

While prisoners sent to labor camps got a minimum of food and some kind of barracks to sleep in, those who were sent to special settlements found there, in many cases, neither food nor shelter. They were not employed in industry but worked in the forests and mines, at the construction of railways, and so forth. Work was compulsory for all, irrespective of age, sex, and physical conditions.

In many places the deportees did not receive any money for their hard labor. In others they received a meagre pay in cash, not sufficient even to buy the bread they were entitled to.

Mortality among deportees was very high. The harsh climate, bad housing, insufficient clothing and appalling unsanitary conditions, hard labor and blank starvation was very efficient in this sense. During the period up to July 1941 it may well be said that 25 percent of all the Polish citizens died and 35 percent of children; among babies mortality reached even 50 percent.

"PLEBISCITE" IN EASTERN POLAND

On October 6, 1939 Soviet military authorities published their decision to hold elections for the "National Assemblies" on October 22d, and to summon these assemblies in Lwow and Bialystok a few days later. Simultaneously they issued by-laws, according to which the elections were to be carried out by special "Committees for the Organization of Elections," largely composed of Soviet citizens and U. S. S. R. officials.

The electoral campaign, which immediately began, was extremely intense and carried out by "election experts brigades" brought from the U. S. S. R. for this purpose. They had at their disposal an army of agitators and Soviet officials. Since the number of Soviet troops at that time in Poland was estimated at 700,000 men, there was on the average one Red Army agitator to every 17 inhabitants.

Various measures were applied to induce the local population to take part in the elections. Local residents were individually visited by agitators, mostly Red Army men or armed Workers' Guards who tried to persuade them that it was in their interest to vote.

Refugees from western Poland who fled from Germans and happened to find themselves under Soviet invasion, were also encouraged to vote.

An atmosphere of terror was created through arrests and other repressions. In particular, any person acting against the instructions issued by Soviet propaganda, was exposed to immediate arrest and sentence for counterrevolutionary activities.

All existing organizations—cultural, religious, economic, social, sport and trade-unions, both Polish and Ukrainian, as well as Jewish and of other nationalities—were dissolved and their property handed over to newly created Communist organizations. The entire press was stamped out.

On the other hand, attempts were made at winning over at least a part of the population. The distribution of land and livestock served that purpose among peasants.

Electoral statutes for western Ukraine and western White Ruthenia set up one-mandate electoral districts and only those bodies which were controlled by Soviet administration were allowed to nominate candidates to the national assemblies, namely: (1) Temporary town committees; (2) peasant committees; (3) workers' guards, a Soviet auxiliary militia; (4) assemblies of workers of enterprises; and (5) intelligentsia assemblies.

The first two of these institutions were in fact administrative bodies set up by Soviet authorities and directed exclusively by Red Army officers.

Candidates nominated by those organizations were liable to registration with the regional election committees which had the means of eliminating any eventual opposition candidates, thus insuring the nomination only of candidates approved by the Soviet authorities.

According to Pravda of October 19 and 22, 1939, Nos. 292 and 293, in the northern part of Poland only 921 candidates for 629 mandates were registered, in the southern part about 1,500 for 1,495 mandates. Thus in each of the 1 mandate electoral districts only 1 candidate was nominated, and several districts of the northern part registered none at all. Only persons previously chosen by the Soviet authorities could become representatives of the local population to national assemblies.

Polish citizenship was not regarded as a necessary condition for nomination, nor was permanent residence. Therefore, very frequently Soviet citizens were elected, as for instance Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs Molotov and Marshal Voroshilov.

The period of preparation for the elections was very short, lasting only 12 days. So short a time obviously could not permit setting up of electoral boards, compiling lists of electors, especially when nonresident population was to be granted the right to vote.

The elections took place on October 22, 1939. Both terror and the propaganda campaign attained their peak. Electors were rounded up in their workshops or dragged out of their homes in columns to the voting places. Each of them was given a card bearing the printed name of the only candidate of the district. Numerous Soviet police agents were present in all electoral premises.

Taking into account the systematic terrorizing of the electors by means of campaign conducted against enemies of the people, it must be realized that both absence at the elections and voting against by placing the paper with the candidate's name deleted, demanded extreme courage, even heroism. Those who wished to vote against knew that they thus exposed themselves, their families and friends to an inevitable imprisonment and deportation. No better off were those who decided not to take part in the elections at all.

The result of the elections as published by the Soviet press are obviously not based on any factual data. According to these reports in the western white Ruthenia 76.71 percent of the entitled electors took part in the voting, out of which 90.67 percent voted for official candidates. The respective figures for the western Ukraine were: 92.83 percent and 90.93 percent.

But even according to these figures the officially published numbers of those who declined to vote: in western white Ruthenia 90,911 persons, in western Ukraine, 342,278 persons, and of voters who declined to support official candidates in western White Ruthenia 262,177 and in western Ukraine 401,843. These figures are relatively very high. Thus even according to Soviet official statistics 1,097,209 people consciously decided not to submit to the invaders.

It must be added that no neutral observers, no neutral press correspondents were admitted. In the counting of votes took part only representatives of the organizations mentioned above and representatives of the Soviet press.

What took place in Polish territory invaded by the Soviets had not even a form of a plebiscite as the population was not asked to what country they wanted to belong. They were simply ordered to "elect" representatives to the National Assembly without being told that these representatives would eventually decide the incorporation into the U. S. S. R.

Five days after the "elections" the so-called representatives of the local population met in Lwow and Bialystok to attend the sessions of the National Assemblies. The resolution expressing "the unanimous will of the Ukrainian Nation for the establishment of the Soviet authority on the whole territory of western Ukraine" was carried out in an unusual way. After reading the motion the chairman asked who was "against" it. The answer was given by a thunder of voices: "No; and none will ever be and if anyone is, we will wipe him out." (Pravda, October 29, 1939.)

A similar show took place in Bialystok as the western white Ruthenia was concerned.

Both assemblies passed further resolutions to sanction "ex post" the expropriation of private owners, already carried out by the Soviet authorities, and the nationalization of banks and big industry.

The elected delegations submitted a "request" to the previously summoned extraordinary session of the Supreme Council of the U. S. S. R. in Moscow asking for the incorporation of eastern Poland into the Soviet Union.

On October 1 and 2, 1939, the Supreme Council decided to consent to that "request" and thus the incorporation was achieved.

TREATY OF RIGA

The peace treaty signed at Riga was the expression of Poland's sincere desire for a lasting agreement with Russia. It was not a dictated peace, imposed on the enemy by the victor, but a freely negotiated treaty aiming at finding a solution which would afford equal protection to the interests of both countries and liquidate their age-old conflict. The goal of final peace could be reached only through compromise, and the Treaty of Riga was such a compromise. By this treaty Poland abandoned some 120,000 square miles of her prepartition territory, and left 1,500,000 Poles in Russia.

It should be remembered here that abundant evidence exists in Soviet sources, testifying to the fact that Poland could have obtained a frontier farther to the east without any difficulties:

1. The statement of the Council of the People's Commissars of January 28, 1920, reads:

Maintaining the last peace proposal made to Poland by the Commissars for Foreign Affairs on December 22, 1919, the Council of People's Commissars which is foreign to all aggressive policy, declares that the Red forces will not pass beyond the present lines of the front of Byelorussia, running close to the following points: Drysa, Dzisna, Polock, Parycko, the station of Ptycz, Bialokorowicze.

In regard to the Ukranian front, the Council of People's Commissars declares in its own name and in the name of the Provisional Government of the Ukraine that the Soviet forces will not carry out military operations to the west of the occupied zones, close to the small towns of Cudnowa, Pilawa, Derazna, and the town of Bar.

Signed by Lenin, Chicherin, and Trotzky, this statement named a line which runs about 50 miles east of the Polish-Russian frontier as established by the Treaty of Riga.

2. The same point of view was expressed by the Russian spokesman, Julian Marchlewski, in his booklet published early in 1921.

3. Mr. Joffe, the head of the Russian delegation at the peace conference at Riga, declared that the territorial problems were not the greatest obstacle in the negotiations:

"The peace negotiations lasted several months and encountered considerable difficulties, especially in the settlement of economic and financial problems."

In his final speech, Mr. Joffe declared: "We have concluded a peace treaty giving full satisfaction to the vital, legitimate, and necessary interests of the Polish Nation."

4. The official Soviet historiography does not in the least consider the Riga Treaty as a defeat, but on the contrary a victory. In the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, an official publication of the Soviet Government, we find an article, Polish Soviet War in 1920 (p. 247, vol. 46; published in 1940). This article reads in part:

"On March 18, 1921, the peace treaty was signed. In accordance with its provisions, Poland kept Galicia and part of White Ruthenia. However, the new Polish-Soviet frontier meant for the White Poles much worse conditions in comparison to those which the Soviet Government suggested to Poland in order to maintain peace in April 1920. The frontier determined after the Polish-Soviet war runs 50 to 100 kilometers to the west of the line suggested at the beginning of the war. This means that Soviet Russia emerged victorious from this struggle against the forces of the counter-revolution."

The Treaty of Riga has not been questioned once in the course of the following years; on the contrary, it has been reaffirmed several times. In 1923, when Russia had adopted a new constitution, establishing the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, it declared:

"The Soviet Union takes on itself the guarantee of execution of the Riga Treaty within the territorial bounds of the Soviet Republics which in their time were at war with Poland."

In 1932, on the occasion of signing the nonaggression pact, the treaty was again reaffirmed:

"The treaty of peace of March 1921 constitutes now, as in the past, the basis of reciprocal relations and undertakings."

In 1934, when the nonaggression pact was promulgated for the next 10 years, it was again stated:

"Each of the high contracting parties having again examined all the provisions of the peace treaty concluded at Riga on March 18, 1921, which constituted the basis of their mutual relations, declares that it has no obligations and is not bound by any declarations inconsistent with the provisions of the said treaty."

In the period 1921–39 the Polish-Soviet relations developed satisfactorily. Among many agreements and pacts concluded in this period the most important were:

I. A protocol signed in 1929 in Moscow provided:

"The treaty for the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, signed at Paris on August 27, 1928, shall come into force between the contracting parties after the ratification of the said Treaty of Paris of 1928 by the competent legislative bodies of the respective contracting parties." (The Kellogg Pact.)

II. On July 25, 1932, a nonaggression pact between Poland and Russia was signed in Moscow. On May 5, 1934, this pact was extended for a period of 10 years, that is, until December 31, 1945. The first two articles are particularly worth notice because of their clear construction and meaning:

"ARTICLE I. The two contracting parties, recording the fact that they have renounced war as an instrument of national policy, reciprocally undertake to refrain from taking aggressive action against or invading the territory of the other party, either alone or in conjunction with other powers. Any act of violence attacking integrity and inviolability of the territory or the political independence of the other contracting party shall be regarded as contrary to the undertakings contained in this article, even if such acts are committed without declaration of war and avoid all possible warlike manifestations.

"ART. II. Should one of the contracting parties be attacked by a third state or by a group of other states, the other contracting party undertakes not to give aid or assistance, either directly or indirectly, to the aggressor state during the whole period of the conflict."

Technically speaking this pact is still in force, with all its provisions.

III. In connection with this pact it is necessary to mention the convention for the definition of aggression signed in London on July 3, 1933. Both Poland and Russia were among the signatories. Article 2 of the convention read as follows:

"The aggressor in an international conflict shall * * * be considered to be that state which is the first to commit any of the following actions: (1) Declaration of war upon another state; (2) invasion by its armed forces, with or without a declaration of war, of the territory of another state; (3) attack by its land, naval, or air forces, with or without a declaration of war, on the territory, vessels, or aircraft of another state; (4) naval blockade of the coasts or ports of another state; (5) provision of support to armed bands formed in its territory which have invaded the territory of another state, or refusal, notwithstanding the request of the invaded state, to take, in its own territory, all the measures in its power to deprive those bands of all assistance or protection."

The convention goes on to state in article 3, that "no political, military, economic, or other considerations may serve as an excuse for the aggression." A provision of paramount significance is the discussion of the Polish-Soviet relations.

IV. Polish-Soviet commercial agreement was signed on February 19, 1939. On this occasion again Mr. Molotov emphasized the good neighborly relations existing between Poland and the Soviet Union, and pointed out that the Soviet Union had endorsed the cause of peace and outlawed aggression.

As late as in June 1939, the newly appointed Soviet Ambassador to Poland, presenting his credentials, spoke of the close and fruitful cooperation of Poland and the Soviets as an important factor in the consolidation of universal peace, and emphasized that the aim of Soviets' foreign policy was to have peaceful and friendly relations with all countries and in the first place with Russia's neighbors.

Besides the above-mentioned important agreements and pacts, some 12 other agreements have been concluded in the period between 1921–1939, regulating the relations of the two neighbor countries.

In accordance with the spirit and the letter of all these agreements, Poland had persistently refused taking part in any anti-Soviet blocs or plans. In 1937, Mr. Beck, the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs, sent the following instruction to all Polish diplomatic missions abroad:

"So far no proposals to join the Italo-German-Japanese protocol (anti-Comintern pact) have been received by Poland. In any case, Poland could not be a party to that protocol in view of her special position as neighbor of the U. S. S. R., as well as her objection in principle to the formation of any bloc.

"If inquiries are made on this subject, please reply in the above sense."

In view of Poland's consistently friendly policy, the signing of the German-Russian non-aggression pact of August 23, 1939, came as a shock. This pact definitely slammed the door on peace and opened the new era in the history of the world, and particularly in the history of the Polish-Soviet relations. This new era began on September 17, 1939, with a military invasion of Poland by the Soviet Army.

UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN ON POLAND'S FRONTIERS

After annexation of the three Baltic republics, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, by the Soviet Union, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles declared:

"The policy of the Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of the state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"* * * The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice,

and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved." (Department of State Bulletin, July 27, 1940.)

After the Polish-Soviet agreement was signed on July 30, 1941, Mr. Sumner Welles was quoted to have commented in the following way at a press conference:

"The United States' position toward Poland, he pointed out, was made clear immediately after that country was invaded. It was one of not recognizing any change in her status as a free, sovereign, and independent nation. That position, he added, is maintained and continued.

"His understanding of the Russian-Polish agreement was that it was in line with the United States' policy of nonrecognition of territory taken by conquest."

On the same day the following exchange of notes took place between the British Foreign Secretary Mr. Anthony Eden and the Polish Prime Minister, Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski:

"On the occasion of the signature of the Polish-Soviet agreement of today, I desire to take this opportunity of informing you that in conformity with the provision of the agreement of mutual assistance between the United Kingdom and Poland of the 25th of August 1939, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have entered into no undertakings toward the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics which affect the relations between that country and Poland. I also desire to assure you that His Majesty's Government do not recognize any territorial changes which have been effected in Poland since August 1939."

General Sikorski handed to Mr. Eden the following reply:

"The Polish Government takes note of your letter dated July 30 and desire to express its sincerest satisfaction at the statement that His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom do not recognize any territorial changes which have been effected in Poland since August 1939. This corresponds with the view of the Polish Government which, as it has previously informed His Majesty's Government, has never recognized any territorial changes effected in Poland since the outbreak of the war."

DECLARATIONS OF POLISH PREMIERS ON POLISH-SOVIET RELATIONS

On July 30, 1941, the Polish Government signed an agreement with the Soviet Union. On this occasion the Polish Prime Minister Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski broadcast as follows:

"When today Russia, in mortal combat with the German avalanche, takes the path of reconciliation with Poland and seeks common action against our common enemy, we approach this action ready to forget the bloody wrongs we have suffered at her hands. The future of the agreement just concluded will depend on the good will of the other party."

On December 4, 1941, during his visit to Moscow, General Sikorski stated:

"Both sides have agreed to let bygones be bygones. We are confident that the Russian people will remember that we rallied to their side in their hour of trial, that they will appreciate the good will and friendship of Poland; mutual respect for national sovereignty will make these relations durable. Recognizing realities and taking advantage of them, we shall do our best to fulfill our agreements of July and August 1941. Thus we shall demonstrate to the world at large, that international problems can be settled peacefully in the name of common sense and for the good of all."

The New York Times, May 5, 1943, printed the following statement by General Sikorski:

"The Polish Nation wants, of course, to continue its friendly relations with Soviet Russia and to base them on an alliance directed against Germany.

"However, it is difficult for me not to be reserved, even in the face of such a favorable declaration as that of Premier Stalin, at the very moment when the Polish Ambassador is leaving Russia and masses of the Polish population in the U. S. S. R. are left without the assistance and care of their government.

"Yet in spite of this and many other facts, the Polish Government is ready to give a positive answer to any Soviet initiative which will coincide with the interest of the Polish Republic as defined in the common Polish-Soviet declaration of December 4, 1941, and in my speech in London yesterday."

After the tragic death of General Sikorski, Mr. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk was nominated his successor as Polish Prime Minister. In his first address to the Polish National Council on July 27, 1944, Mr. Mikolajczyk declared:

"Understanding between Poland and Russia is a historic necessity for both our countries, but it is also a historic necessity for Europe as a whole, for on it will depend the consolidation of Europe. Europe regards the Polish question as a test case which will show what is to become of the European continent as a whole. Therefore Polish-Russian understanding must be honest, just, and permanent. Poland is necessary to Europe, just as a consolidated Europe is necessary to Poland."

The present Polish Prime Minister, Mr. Tomasz Arciszewski, addressed the Polish National Council on December 13, 1944, in the same tone:

"My government sincerely adheres to the policy of an understanding with the Soviet Union and desires to do everything in its power—continuing the efforts of previous governments—in order to bring about such an understanding, which could become a guaranty of a really friendly and lasting settlement of relations between two neighboring states. This understanding must be based on respect for the rights and vital interests of both sides. It must also be an understanding which will not evoke a feeling of injury and injustice among the Polish people."

The above declarations prove that the Polish Government has been and still is animated by the spirit of cooperation with the Soviet Russia. Obviously, such a cooperation cannot be based on one-sided concessions.

POLISH-SOVIET AGREEMENTS OF 1941

On June 23, 1941, 24 hours after Germany's attack on the Soviet Union, Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, the Premier of the Polish Government in exile broadcast on the London BBC Station. General Sikorski welcomed the new ally in the struggle against Germany and proclaimed Polish Government's willingness to forget the evils wrought in Poland in 1939–41 by the Soviet occupation, provided that these many wrongs will be remedied wherever possible, at least in their most painful aspects.

This generous gesture of a wronged nation made it possible to open the Polish-Soviet negotiations in order to liquidate the effects of the Soviet policy toward Poland between 1939 and 1941.

The negotiations, in which participated also British Foreign Office, lasted 5 weeks, and took place in London. Finally the Polish-Soviet agreement was signed by Gen. W. Sikorski for Poland, and by the Ambassador of the U. S. S. R. to Great Britain, Mr. Ivan Maiski, for the Soviet Union.

The Polish-Soviet agreement of July 30, 1941, reads as follows:

"(1) The Government of the U. S. S. R. recognizes the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 as to territorial changes in Poland as having lost their validity. The Polish Government declares that Poland is not bound by any agreement with any third power which is directed against the U. S. S. R.

"(2) Diplomatic relations will be restored between the two governments upon the signature of this agreement and an immediate exchange of ambassadors will be arranged.

"(3) The two governments mutually agree to render one another aid and support of all kind in the present war against Hitlerite Germany.

"(4) The Government of the U. S. S. R. expresses its consent to the formation on the territory of the U. S. S. R. of a Polish Army under a commander appointed by the Polish Government, in agreement with the Soviet Government. The Polish Army on the territory of the U. S. S. R. being subordinated—in an operational sense—to the Supreme Command of the U. S. S. R., in which the Polish Army will be represented. All details as to command, organization, and employment of this force will be settled in a subsequent agreement.

"(5) This agreement will come into force immediately upon its signature and without ratification. The present agreement is drawn up in two copies, each of them in the Russian and Polish languages. Both texts have equal force."

The following protocol is attached to the agreement:

"The Soviet Government grants an amnesty to all Polish citizens now detained on Soviet territory either as prisoners of war or on other sufficient grounds as from the resumption of diplomatic relations."

The text of the agreement was quite unequivocal. It canceled the Ribbentrop-Molotoff Pact of September 28, 1939, which had partitioned Poland between the two powers, and it restored the legal status as of pre-war. Nothing but ill will could interpret the agreement in any other way.

The declarations issued by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, and by the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Anthony Eden, on July 30, 1941, bear witness to the fact that the agreement was thus interpreted not only by Poland and by the public opinion of the whole world, but also by the highest Allied authorities.

The Polish-Soviet agreement created a new political and military situation, and, once the diplomatic relations were reestablished between Poland and Russia, a number of other significant agreements followed. Among these should be mentioned: The Polish-Soviet military agreement of August 14, 1941, providing for the formation of an independent Polish Army on the Soviet soil, and the Polish-Soviet declaration of December 4, 1941, signed at Kremlin by General Sikorski and Marshal Stalin, and pledging the cooperation of both nations in their fight against Germany.

The text of this last declaration, animated by the spirit of good will, of friendly cooperation between Poland and U. S. S. R., is quoted below:

"(1) German Hitlerite imperialism is the worst enemy of mankind—no compromise with it is possible. Both states, jointly with Great Britain and other Allies, and with the support of the United States of America, will wage war until complete victory and final destruction of the German invaders.

"(2) Implementing the treaty concluded on July 30, 1941, both Governments will render each other during the war full military assistance, and troops of the Polish Republic located on the territory of the Soviet Union will wage war against the German bandits hand in hand with Soviet troops. In peacetime their relations will be based on good-neighborly collaboration, friendship, and mutual honest observance of the undertakings they have assumed.

"(3) After a victorious war and the appropriate punishment of the Hitlerite criminals it will be the task of the Allied states to insure a durable and just peace. This can be achieved only through a new organization of international relations on the basis of unification of the democratic countries in a durable alliance. Respect for international law, backed by the collective armed force of all the Allied states, must form the decisive factor in the creation of such an organization. Only under this condition can a Europe destroyed by the German bar-

barism be restored and a guaranty be created that the disaster caused by the Hitlerites will never be repeated."

The above agreements furnish sufficient evidence to prove the Polish Government's sincere desire to forget the tragic period of 1939–41, and to establish mutual relations based on good-neighbor policy.

FORMATION OF POLISH ARMY IN RUSSIA

Pursuant to the Polish-Russian agreement of July 30, 1941, a military agreement was signed on August 14, 1941, enabling the Polish authorities to organize a Polish Army on the Soviet territory. This army was to be formed of Poles deported from Poland to Russia after the signing of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact, giving Russia eastern half of Poland. This army's equipment and armament was to be supplied by the Soviet authorities and by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain under lend-lease. It was to be an independent army, set up under its own commanders and its own jurisdiction. The Soviet authorities were to be responsible for the feeding of this army.

It was impossible to determine the size of this army in advance, as Polish war prisoners and deportees were scattered throughout the vast areas of the U. S. S. R. and no statistical data concerning these people were available. It was estimated, however, that they numbered about a million and a half.

The headquarters of the Polish Army were set up at Buzuluk, a small town 100 miles east of Rubyshev. When a circular was sent by the People's Commissariat of the Interior (NKVD) to all settlements, prisons, and labor camps, announcing to the Poles their release and the formation of a Polish Army on the Soviet territory, only few of them could ascertain where the Polish headquarters were situated. Without any instructions they began their pilgrimage in the direction of the central part of European Russia. Thousands of patriots arrived every day to join the Polish forces. By October 1941, 46,000 men had been already enrolled and the Polish authorities estimated that their army will reach 200,000 men. However, news had been received already at that stage that the Soviet high command had restricted rations for the Polish Army to 30,000. The cooperation of the Soviet military authorities with the Polish command began to deteriorate. The enlisted men had been placed in overcrowded camps with insufficient food and medical supplies. That Soviet decision was to turn out 16,000 men to shift for themselves or hire out as agricultural labor.

As a result of the Polish Embassy's intervention, and later, of General Sikorski's conversation with Premier Stalin on December 4, 1941, which culminated in a declaration of friendship and cooperation signed on December 4, 1941, this restriction was canceled and adequate supplies of food, arms, uniforms, equipment were promised.

Yet difficulties multiplied. The Soviet authorities refused to release Polish citizens, soldiers, and reservists still remaining in prisons and camps who were in best physical condition. Great numbers of Polish citizens drafted into Red Army and the so-called labor battalions, were not allowed to join the Polish Army. Polish citizens of Ukrainian, White Ruthenian, and Jewish nationality were refused traveling permits (without which it is impossible to move in the U. S. S. R.) to join the Polish ranks.

On the other hand, training of the recruits met with unsurmountable handicaps—the greatest of these was lack of Polish officers. Out of 100,000 Polish officers in Russian prisoner-of-war camps, only 406 reported to places where Polish military units were formed. Polish instructors had to be sent from the Middle East and Great Britain.

No lesser difficulty was that of the lack of armament, uniforms, and equipment. Of the 7 divisions organized in Russia, only one was equipped with small arms. All matériel essential to modern warfare was denied to Poles by the Soviet authorities. Other divisions, counting 13,000 men each, received only 200 rifles for guard duty.

All these difficulties were to be removed after General Sikorski's intervention. According to the agreement reached between General Sikorski and Premier Stalin in December 1941, the size of the Polish Army was determined as follows:

Ninety-six thousand men (6 divisions plus replacements) to remain in Russia, including a certain number of units of the Polish Women's Auxiliary Corps.

Twenty-five thousand men to be evacuated to the Middle East.

Two thousand sailors and airmen for replacement of Polish units in England (to be transferred there).

All in all, 123,000 Poles were to be recruited.

By March 1942, 70,000 men were gathered at the recruiting points and many thousands more, delayed by traveling dicculties, were expected to join the Polish Army when suddenly a new decision of the Soviet authorities has been announced. It said that food supplies for the Polish Army have been limited to 44,000 rations. The remainder of enlisted men was to be distributed to work on the nearby kolchoz farms. General Anders, commander in chief of the Polish forces in Russia, endeavored to change Premier Stalin's attitude, but without avail. In order to save the men the Soviet Government was unable to feed, both interested parties decided to evacuate them from Russia to Iran, the nearest country under Allied military command.

Half starved, without essential clothing, constantly exposed to the raging epidemic of typhus and other diseases resulting from lack of soap and medical supplies, 30,000 Polish soldiers were moved in April 1942 to the Middle East.

In July 1942 the Soviet authorities forbade further recruiting and closed the supply centers of the Polish Army. By the Soviet unilateral decision, all Poles of Jewish, Ukranian, Lithuanian, and White Ruthenian nationality were considered citizens of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and were forbidden to join the ranks of the Polish Army. As recruiting was discontinued, Polish units in Russia could not develop into a great army which it would otherwise become. Needless to say, the loss was considerable not only to the Polish, but also to the United Nations' cause.

Finally, at the end of August 1942 the rest of the Polish Army, counting 40,000 men, was evacuated to Iran. At the same time 45,000 civilians, all of them relatives of the enlisted men, were moved to the Middle East. But most of their relatives remained in the Soviet Union. All interventions of the Polish Government for their release remained fruitless. Hundreds of thousands of Polish citizens are still in Russia.

It took a year for the Polish Army in the Middle East to regain military fitness and to undergo the necessary training. Since February 1944 this Army has been fighting in Italy. Its valor in capturing Monte Cassino and Ancona has brought it recognition and admiration of the whole world.

KATYN GRAVES

In the fall of 1939, when the resistance of Poland, fighting against hopeless odds, was broken, 181,000 soldiers were taken prisoners by the Red Army. Included were 12 generals, 69 colonels, 72 lieutenant colonels, 5,131 regular army officers, and 4,096 reserve officers.

Not all of these were taken in the field. The majority of the officers were seized after war operations had ceased. Soviet authorities simply ordered all Polish officers to report to a designated place; those who obeyed were arrested and deported.

After the Polish-Soviet agreement of July 30, 1941, was signed, the gates of camps and prisons were opened and Polish soldiers began reporting to the posts where detachments of Polish Army were forming. But within a few weeks a puzzling situation was apparent—among the arrivals were very few officers.

Inquiries set on foot immediately brought to light the following facts:

The circa 10,000 Polish officers captured by Russia in 1939 had been deported to 3 large military camps (Starobielsk, Kozielsk, and Ostaszkow), where they were confined till in the spring of 1940 these camps were liquidated. After that time they had, as far as could be learned, utterly vanished. From a total of 8,800 officers registered in the official records of these camps, only 406 reported to Polish recruiting centers.

For nearly 2 years the Polish Government and its officials in Russia carried on a series of conversations with Russian authorities, seeking to ascertain the fate of missing officers To all inquiries the Soviets invariably answered:

"We have released all officers and soldiers * * * if some of them have not reported, perhaps they went to German-occupied Poland or escaped to Manchuria."

On December 3, 1941, Polish Prime Minister, Gen. W. Sikorski, handed Stalin a list containing the names of 4,000 officers definitely known to have been held in the three camps and unaccounted for. Stalin, allegedly, was very much surprised.

On January 28, 1942, the Polish Government sent a long memorandum to Moscow, protesting that the Soviet Union had not carried out its pledged obligations, particularly with reference to the release of officers imprisoned at Starobielsk, Kozielsk, and Ostaszkow, who, it had been established with full certitude, were not now either in German-occupied Poland, or in German military camps.

Moscow delayed its reply to this note for 7 weeks. On March 15, 1942, came the reply assuring the Poles that the Soviet Union had strictly fulfilled the enactments of the agreement as to release of Polish prisoners of war.

All further Polish diplomatic interventions were fruitless.

So matters stood till on April 13, 1943, the Berlin radio made a startling announcement in Katyn forest near Smolensk a mass cemetery of Polish officers was found.

According to the German explanation, a group of Polish workers conscripted in 1942 for forced labor in the vicinity of Smolensk had learned from native peasants that on the ground where they were working there were mass graves of Polish war prisoners. The Poles had put up two wooden crosses on the spot indicated. This attracted the attention of the German officials, who ordered an investigation. The first opened grave contained bodies of 3,000 Polish officers. By April 16, a second grave had been discovered, which contained 1,500 more victims.

On April 17, 1943, the Polish Cabinet issued the following statement:

"There is not a single Pole anywhere who could fail to be deeply shocked by news received of the discovery near Smolensk in a common grave of the bodies of massacred Polish officers, news which is being given the widest publicity by German propaganda. The Polish Government has instructed its representatives at Geneva to request the International Red Cross to send a delegation to investigate on the spot the true state of affairs. It is to be desired that the findings of this organization to which is to be entrusted the task of clarifying the matter and of establishing the responsibility for it, should be issued without delay.

At the same time, however, the Polish Government, on behalf of the Polish nation, denies to the Germans the right to draw from a crime which they ascribe to others, arguments in their own defense. The profoundly hypocritical indignation of German

propaganda will not succeed in concealing from the world the many-repeated and still-continuing crimes committed against the Polish nation. It is not to enable the Germans to lay impudent claims or to appear in the light of defenders of Christianity and European civilization that Poland is fighting and enduring immeasurable sufferings. The Polish Government denies to whomever may be guilty of this crime the right to exploit it for political maneuvers."

The investigation of the International Red Cross was the only way to get at the truth. At this time the city of Smolensk was under German occupation, and neither the Polish nor any other United Nations Government could make an investigation there. The International Red Cross in Geneva is the official institution for the settlement of all matters connected with prisoners of war. The Board of the International Red Cross is composed of representatives of all civilized countries without regard to politics.

That is why it was not only the most suitable, but the only institution that could undertake the difficult task and perform it with complete impartiality.

Moreover, international precedents existed. In 1942 Great Britain had asked the International Red Cross to investigate cruelties committed by the Japanese in Shanghai and Hongkong.

The Polish request caused from the Moscow radio a blast against the Poles, accusing them to collaborating with Hitler.

On April 23, 1943, a reply from the Red Cross in Geneva was published, acceding in principle to the demands of Poland for the appointment of a commission of neutral experts to look into the circumstances of the Katyn massacre. The committee pointed out, however, that it could take this step only if so requested by all parties concerned, and then only under the terms of its memorandum to the belligerents of September 12, 1939.

Inasmuch as Russia refused her consent to the investigation, the Polish Government on May 1, 1943, withdrew its request.

It might seem as if this move on the part of the Poles for an impartial judgment would have been welcomed by Moscow as an opportunity to exonerate herself of guilt for the crime and to fix it elsewhere. Instead, alleging as her reason Poland's appeal to Geneva, on April 26, 1943, Russia broke off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government and took steps towards forming in Moscow the Union of Polish Patriots, a body made up of Polish Communists.

The medical commission convoked by the Germans and composed of representatives of neutral and German-occupied countries (Switzerland, Belgium, Denmark, Bulgaria, Finland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Slovakia, and Hungary) published a report to this effect that Polish officers have been murdered; they were shot in the head from the back at close range. The German-sponsored commission stated that shooting took place in the spring of 1940, that is at the time Smolensk was held by the Russians.

In September 1943, after the Katyn district was reoccupied by the Red Army, the Soviet Government appointed a special commission to conduct an investigation of the Katyn crime. No representatives of any allied institutions, not even of the Red Cross, were invited to participate in the investigation of the Soviet commission.

Upon the conclusion of this investigation Soviet authorities issued on January 22, 1944, a communiqué announcing that a commission established once and for all, that the Polish officers were killed by the Germans in August and September of 1941.

The only Polish report on the Katyn murder has been made by a Polish officer, a former Russian prisoner of war, who had been confined for a time, with the missing officers, but transferred elsewhere before the liquidation of the camps at Starobielsk, Kozielsk, and Ostaszkow.

This officer was ordered to carry on the search for the missing men. As mentioned before, the Polish inquiries brought no result. In his report the Polish officer wrote:

"Our anxiety was increased by a fact, the authenticity of which I, myself, have checked. Several months before the outbreak of the German-Soviet conflict, the Bolsheviks transferred a number of Polish staff officers, including Colonel Berling, to a new camp, and suggested to them that they organize a Polish army to fight against the Germans.

"Berling was willing, in principle, to accept the proposal. However, he set one condition: such an Army was to include all officers and men, irrespective of their political creed.

"A conference was held with Beria (Soviet Commissar of the N. K. V. D.) and Merkulov (the deputy chief of the N. K. V. D.). 'Of course,' they agreed. 'Poles of all political parties will be able to join the Army.' 'Well,' said Berling, 'we have excellent Army cadres in the camps of Starobielsk and Kozielsk.' Whereupon Merkulov replied with some constraint: 'No, not these men; we have made a great blunder in connection with them.' Three witnesses testified to hearing this remark of Merkulov."

The mystery of the Katyn murder has been presented on the evidence of these documents so far brought to light. It demands a definite explanation.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONTROVERSY

The Committee of National Liberation, formed by the Soviets in Lublin, took position that: (1) The Polish Constitution of 1935 was not legally binding, and that (2) in view of this, the previous constitution of 1921, should be brought back in force.

Before discussing the legal arguments supporting this assertion, it should be clearly realized what were the reasons prompting the Communists to take up the constitutional problem.

The Polish Government in London—subject today to vehement attacks of the Lublin puppets—was established in accordance with the provisions of the Polish Constitution, binding for the past decade. Since the legality of this government could not possibly be questioned, the Soviets resolved to attack the legality of the constitution itself. By attacking the way in which the constitution had been established, the Soviets and their agents tried to abolish the funtiamental law which governed Poland for years.

It is a primitive trick to invalidate a constitution and cross out the past of a country, in order to knock the legal government off its feet. It would be equally senseless to dig out a minor error of procedure in the establishment of the Constitution of the United States in order to demand the obliteration of the entire historical past of the country.

The Polish constitutional history is rooted deeply in the past:

Of all the newly established countries (after 1918), Poland alone possessed a rich and proud tradition of having developed parliamentary and constitutional institutions. Even as far back as the beginning of the fifteenth century, that is 150 years before the proclamation of the English Habeas Corpus Act, Poland had given to its citizens the guarantee of freedom from arrest without warrant (Neminem Captivabimus nise jure victum), and the origin of the Polish Parliament may be found in the Polish fundamental act of 1505, which took its name of "Nihil Novi" from the first words of its text.

The first Parliament (Seym) of reborn Poland met as early as February 10, 1919, and the constitution was adopted on March 17, 1921, by the House of Representatives.

No sooner, however, did this constitution become operative than people became aware of the fact that the newly adopted constitution turned the helm of government over to Parliament, which, split up into a number of parties, became the arena for sterile political squabbles. It became obvious that the constitution did not meet the requirements of the young state and impeded its political stabilization. The nations at large saw clearly that Poland could not survive unless a strong executive authority was set up and the power of Parliament curtailed in favor of a strong and yet democratic government.

In February 1931, the draft of a new constitution was submitted to the Parliament by one of the political groups. It was referred to the committee on matters of constitution. After 3 years of careful study and diligent research of opinion of all the outstanding experts on political law, the committee submitted to the Parliament the draft of the new constitution. Although strongly attacked by the opposition parties, this draft passed through both the House of Representatives and the Senate, and finally, in accordance with the pertinent provisions of the law, it was duly promulgated on April 31, 1935, as the new Constitution of the Republic of Poland.

The most important feature of the new constitution was that it strengthened the executive branch of the Government.

Article 24 of the constitution reads:

"In the event of war, the term of the President's office shall be prolonged until 3 months after the conclusion of peace; the President of the Republic shall then, by a special act promulgated in the Official Gazette, appoint his successor, in case the office falls vacant before the conclusion of peace. Should the President's successor assume office, the term of his office shall expire at the end of 3 months after the conclusion of peace."

In accordance with this provision the retiring President Moscicki appointed as his successor Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz, the present Polish President, who was thus in a position to legally appoint the members of the Cabinet of the Polish Government-in exile. Due to the provisions of the April constitution the continuity of the Polish Government was preserved intact, even though Poland was overrun by the enemy.

The Lublin committee charges that the constitution of 1935 is not democratic enough. If it were possible today to gather the Polish Parliament for a legal and free debate, undoubtedly some of the constitutional provisions would be changed. The Lublin committee, making its vehement charges neglects to reveal that President Raczkiewicz, immediately following the assumption of his Presidential duties, declared that he will not take advantage of all the powers which the constitution grants to the President of Poland. Of his decision President Raczkiewicz notified the people of Poland in November 1939, in a broadcast from France to Poland:

"In the framework of the April constitution I have decided to exert the authority, granted to me by its provisions, in collaboration with the Prime Minister and his full agreement."

Thus the execution of the constitutional provisions has been democratized quite a few years before the Lublin committee came into being, on the initiative of the Polish Government.

In connection with this, Prime Minister Mikolajczyk declared in his address to the Polish National Council (July 27, 1943):

"The legal basis of our government is the constitution of the Polish Republic. In the future we shall undoubtedly endeavor to change some of its provisions, but today it is the legal basis for the activities of the state authorities and, in view of the impossibility of changing it outside Poland's frontiers, it must and will be recognized as such.

"However, the most important thing is that its fundamental provisions, especially in con-

nection with the President's declaration of November 30, 1939, will permit decrees to be issued in a democratic spirit and, what is more important, will permit the enactment of democratic electoral laws on the basis of which the nation will freely elect its representatives who will ultimately decide on the form of government in Poland and on the details of the democratic structure of the state.

"Proceeding with determination towards the development of legal provisions in a democratic spirit, we desire to put the government in the hands of our country in a legal manner as soon as possible. The future structure of the Polish state will be decided by Poland herself, expressing her will freely."

The constitutional issue was further elucidated by Prime Minister Mikolajczyk after his visit to Moscow in August 1944:

"Though the constitution of 1935 is still formally in force it has been applied in a democratic spirit even since 1939. Indeed, when it became obvious that a number of States, which were neutral in 1939 (and one of them had been the United States), were willing to recognize as a lawful Polish Government the only government which would be based on the constitution of 1935, we decided to consider everything in it which was not democratic as a dead letter, and to reply it in a strictly democratic sense.

"The declaration of this Government of 1939 and 1942, and the declaration of the political parties in Poland in 1943 show clearly that Poland is now treading along the path of true democracy based on freedom and social justice. In a nutshell, the constitutional dispute is but a pretext for the Home National Council, which represents only a small part of our people, to obtain the right to appoint a government of the Polish Republic. Such claims lack every formal or factual foundation."

THE LUBLIN COMMITTEE

In the wake of the Russian armies, bands of organizers moved into Poland. Carefully coached and instructed in Russia, they were to prepare ground in Poland for the Soviet reforms.

Most of these men worked with one of the two major organizations.

1. Union of Polish Patriots was organized in Moscow in 1943. It was headed by Wanda Wasilewska, a Soviet citizen by preference, not need, a colonel in the Red Army, and wife of Mr. Alexander Korneychuk, Soviet Vice Commissar for Foreign Affairs.

2. Polish Workers Party was formed by the Comintern as late as winter of 1941–42, to replace the the Polish Communist Party, which the Comintern dissolved in 1937 for Trotzkyist tendencies. The Polish Workers Party operated on the Polish territory occupied by the Germans, without, however, admitting its Communist affiliations. Should there be any doubt as to these affiliations in anyone's mind, one of the party's acts makes their stand clear: The Polish Workers Party was among the signatories of the Communist Party's resolution which had brought about the dissolution of the Comintern (summer, 1943).

Both the Union of Polish Patriots and the Polish Workers Party were blessed with a large number of the professional Communist agents, for the most part not Polish citizens, who had been working for many years in other countries promoting the Communist revolution. Eugeniusz Bierut (real name: Krasidebski) is one of those agents. Ever since 1921 Bierut is a Soviet citizen. This did not prevent him from being elected now President of the Provisional Polish Government in Lublin.

To camouflage these Communist agents, a certain number of non-Communists were introduced. Some of these non-Communists were forced to do it and were recruited from among the Poles who had been deported into Russia and, after the break-off of Polish-Russian diplomatic relations, left without any protection whatsoever. Others were possessed of greater ambitions than abilities and had a shady past behind them. To those, for instance, belonged Gen. Michal Rola-Zymierski, who had been convicted of bribery and dishonorably discharged from the Polish Army in 1928, and Wicenty Rzymowski, expelled from the Polish Academy of Literature for plagiarism. Such men could not hope for any positions of importance in normal conditions; riding high on the wave of sovietization of Poland, they attained today the positions of, respectively, the Commander in Chief of the Polish Army and the Minister of Culture and Arts. These portfolios, of course, could be given to men of such a stamp only by the Lublin puppet government.

To assure the proper political line, the Soviets have assigned to each of the minister a counsellor, chosen usually from among the Russian officials. Thus a counsellor to the Commander in Chief is a colonel of the Russian NKVD (the Soviet counterpart of Gestapo), Alexander Zawadski; a counselor to the Ministry of Information is the collaborator of the Moscow Pravda, Bielayev.

In the Polish territories taken from the Germans there exists neither freedom of speech nor assembly today. The press, the radio, and all the political and social organizations allowed to exist are only instruments to further Soviet aims.

To obscure the real situation and confuse the public opinion in the free countries of the world, a number of fake organizations was called to life. It is well worth notice that in these organizations the same names and the same people appear over and over again. Among these stooge organizations are:

1. Committee of National Liberation—which on December 31, 1944, was pleased to call itself Provisional Polish Government.
2. Home National Council.
3. The Council of National Defense.
4. Citizens' Initiative Committee.
5. Group of Polish Leftist Syndicalists.
6. The Democrtic Party (headed by the Communist, Haneman).

The number of these organizations will most probably multiply with each day. But it is most doubtful whether the number of their members will multiply, because the population gave to the puppets moving on Moscow strings neither their enthusiastic support nor confidence.

The unfriendly to the new regime attitude of the population was reflected upon several occasions:

1. The Soviets sponsored a recruitment, on voluntary basis, to the Polish Army of General Rola-Zymierski. This recruitment fell flat. Only 10 to 15 percent of the expected numbers reported for the service, and the Soviets then introduced compulsory draft, staging regular man-hunts in villages and in the forests to which the people fled as they had been doing in years past, under the German occupation.

2. The Lublin Committee stirred much publicity around the agrarian reform they had introduced in Poland. Actually this reform was boycotted by the Poles.

From time to time some of these organizations go, much to the surprise of the organizers, against the policy of the Lublin puppets. The most conspicuous illustration of this fact was the Congress of the Peasant Party called in Lublin in September 1944. This congress passed a resolution paying hommage to the Prime Minister of the Polish Government in London, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk. The resolution was immediately hushed by the Soviet authorities, but it reached London through the underground channels.

Another Lublin activity which had received wide publicity was an agreement concerning the exchange of population between the territories administered by the Lublin stooges and the Russian territories, east of so-called Curzon line. Queer as this exchange may seem, in view of the military operations which accounted for unsettled conditions, the agreement had one more peculiar feature—the population was exchanged in a one-way fashion. People were shipped into the depths of Russia, just as they had been in the course of the two tragic years of deportations, in 1939–41.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the Lublin committee is an imposed regime, owing its pecarious existence only to the presence of the Soviet Army in Poland and to the terrifying efficiency of the Soviet secret police (NKVD) apparatus. The Lublin committee which had extended to themselves their own recognition as a Polish Government, could not find support among the people of Poland. The democratic freedoms, were they returned to the people, would sweep out of the Polish political life this small band of Soviet agents and stooges and career climbers of doubtful integrity.

The self-announced appointment of the Lublin committee as a Polish Government, met with a swift reply of the American Secretary of State, Edward J. Stettinius, who declared that the United States continues to recognize the Polish Government in London, as it had in the past, as the only rightful representative Government of Poland.

SOVIET ACTIVITIES IN POLAND (1943–44)

Soviet activities in Poland considerably preceded the entrance of the Red Army into Polish territory. As early as in 1942 Soviet planes dropped in eastern provinces of Poland detachments of parachutists whose task was to organize partisan units.

Partisan bands did not seek to engage the Germans. Quite the contrary. They raided and pillaged the homes of Polish country folk, whether manor house or cottage, the homes of the intellectual classes, and of the clergy. They robbed homes of everything useful, even compelling people to give up wearing apparel. They burned stores of grain and stacks of hay, although they knew—or because they knew—that this would increase the starvation of the population.

In eastern borderland, where the Germans have controlled the towns but never the countryside, partisan bands have boldly gone in and carried on recruiting. In cases where the inhabitants resisted compulsory induction into these bands, they were shot, sometimes in groups of 20 or 30 at a time. Another form of recruiting was to spread a report that the Polish Government has ordered an uprising but that the reactionary representatives in Poland refused to publish the order. Then they sent orders to young men to report at a given spot in a forest at a fixed time when they will be taken into the home army. On arrival the recruit heard a fine patriotic address, took the oath of allegiance, and then found himself listening to Communist political teachings.

The partisan units never coordinated their activities with the general plan of military operations carried on on a much wider scale by the Polish home army. Instead of bringing about major German losses, these operations evoked new and unnecessary repressions of the occupant directed against the helpless Polish population.

At the same time political agents were sent by the Soviet authorities to the German-occupied territories. They never disclosed their political character. Soviet political agents were instructed to creep into genuine Polish national organizations and gradually transform them into tools for the propaganda of Soviet doctrine.

The agents proceeded to set up groups of their own with names similar to those of the genuine Polish groups—names so similar that it is the easiest thing in the world to confuse one with the other. For example, long before the Comintern was dissolved by

order of the executive committee of that organization, the Polish Communist Party got orders to disband. One of the leading and most highly respected political parties in Poland, both of pre-war and present times, is that of the Socialists. In Polish it goes by the name of P. P. S. (Polish Socialist Party). What the political agents from Moscow did was to dissolve the Communist Party in Poland and to announce later the formation of a Polish Workers' Party (in Polish P. P. R.).

The intention here is perfectly clear. It was expected that, through confusion of P. P. S. and P. P. R., working people and peasants, who are utterly opposed to communism and the protection of the U. S. S. R., would be inveigled into the Bolshevik-sponsored party. For the P. P. R. is nothing but the Communist Party under another name.

The Soviet agents published some secret papers which were filed with articles denouncing the legal Polish Government in London and aimed at stirring up discord among Poles.

Help in the political field was given from the Soviet Union itself, where a Communist radio station, masking under the name of the Polish patriot Kosciusko, broadcast several times daily to Poland news that were exactly contrary to the broadcast in Polish from London.

The Soviet agents wasted no time to spread anti-American and anti-British propaganda. The Poles were told that they must beware of what the Americans and British tell them, that salvation will never come to Poland from the capitalist western countries, that there is no hope for Poland except from the Soviet Union.

In spite of all this and in accordance with their determination to subordinate every effort to the need of an all-out struggle with the German invaders, the Polish Government ordered their home army in Poland on October 25, 1943, and February 18, 1944, to disclose their identity to the advancing Soviet armies and to cooperate with them in the struggle against the Germans. Following these orders Polish units fought against the Germans and assisted the Red Army in liberating provinces of Volhynia, Tarnopol, Wilno, Nowogrodek, Polesie, Lwow, and Lublin.

It is to be regretted that this military cooperation was not met in the proper spirit by the Red Army.

As long as the battle against the Germans in Volhynia went on, the attitude of the Soviet commanders to the Polish forces was correct, and the Poles were even promised help in arms and ammunition. These promises were not kept. On the contrary, as the action in Volhynia was concluded, the attitude of the Soviet authorities underwent a radical change. The Polish officers were arrested, the soldiers disarmed and forced to join the Red Army. After a few days the reprisals became more severe. On March 9, 1944, the Soviet authorities executed the commander of the Polish home army in Luck and several Polish soldiers were hanged there on the same day. Six days later, the Commander of the home forces in the Kiwerce region—Volhynia—was shot. At the end of that month a number of other officers and men of the home army, who divulged their identity to the Soviet authorities on orders of the Polish Government in London and who fought side by side with the Soviet armies, were executed.

Three battalions of the Polish home army cooperated with a Soviet division in its battles along the river Wilja and in the Rudnicka Forest (south of Wilno). Four Polish brigades took part in the battle for the city of Wilno. Other Polish detachments were engaged in mopping up operations in the Provinces of Wilno and Nowogrodek. Everywhere Polish commanders of these units were praised by the Soviet officers who, as in Volhynia, promised them help, arms, and even artillery. But again, as soon as the battle was over, the Soviet attitude was radically changed. On July 19, 1944, the Soviet authorities arrested the staff of the Home Army in the districts of Wilno and Nowogrodek and the Polish forces were disarmed. These officers and most of their soldiers were deported to an unknown destination.

As a rule reprisals followed as soon as the battle was ended. This action was justified by the alleged anti-Soviet attitude of the Polish soldiers which found its expression in their service in the home army or in their participation in the activities in the Polish underground. The Soviet authorities considered every form of cooperation with the Polish Government in London as a crime.

In Majdanek, near Lublin, where ill-famed German concentration camp was situated, the Soviet authorities detained in August 1944 about 2,500 officers and soldiers of the home army. Further, 200 Polish officers and noncoms have been deported to Kiev. Mass arrests have been made in the districts of Radom, Brzesc on Bug, Zamosc, Biala Podlaska, Tomaszow Lubelski, Minsk, Mazowiecki, Rzeszow, and Bialystok. The behavior of the Soviet authorities is identical both east and west of the so-called Curzon line.

In the light of these facts the true meaning of the Soviet policy toward Poland is revealed. Good will exists only on the Polish side. The Soviets aim at premeditated annihilation of all organizational centers which fight for a free and independent Poland.

NOTE.—Facts and figures except introductory remarks were furnished by the Coordinating Committee of American-Polish Associations in the East, 103 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. Telephone Murray Hill 5-8851.

H. R. 1752

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have given this bill, and the arguments advanced in its behalf, the most earnest consideration of which I am capable. I approached it with the utmost sympathy. I strove to find in it one logical reason why I should vote for it.

I have not been able to find that reason. I shall therefore vote against it.

The arguments advanced for the bill hinge largely upon statements made by General Marshall and Admiral King. I can find no statement by either of these gentlemen in behalf of this particular bill. And I can find no statement by anyone which would show conclusively that the bill is necessary or even desirable from the standpoint of the prosecution of the war.

I can see many arguments which can be proven that the enactment of this bill would be harmful to our effort to win a speedy and complete victory against all of our enemies.

This measure as it stands seems to me to fit the description of Justice Frankfurter when he said that all laws do not mean what they say. There must be something behind this bill or it would not have been advanced. But what that something is has not been revealed.

I warn the Congress that if this bill is passed the hidden reason will be revealed and it will startle the Nation.

We are deluged with figures in behalf of this bill, but the figures do not make sense. It would be thought from these figures that unless this bill were passed the Selective Service System would cease to function. That is not so. The Selective Service System goes on daily providing men needed for the armed forces.

Furthermore, the Selective Service System now has, and for 4 years has had, complete control of the great bulk of our manpower. That System has the power and the authority now adequately to place men needed in industry as well as in the armed services.

There is no showing anywhere that there is a Nation-wide shortage of manpower on the war-production line. Yet we would set up a national system, duplicating systems already in existence and designed to meet a situation which does not exist.

The situation does exist of shortages in some localities. There is ample authority and certainly there are ample bureaus already existing to deal with those shortages. The fact is the bureaus are dealing with the shortages and are meeting the situation.

I am unwilling to allow the spotty local situation to induce me to lend my vote toward putting the neck of the American workingmen under a yoke from which they will never escape.

Smear—A Recent Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

SMEAR—A RECENT INCIDENT

(By John T. Flynn)

FOREWORD

In recent years the Marxists have had an epithet for all who oppose communism. They call them Fascists.

Mr. Flynn's article published herein may surprise some persons who have not sensed the real trend in communistic propaganda. But it gives an accurate picture of the un-American hate that these alien-minded gentry seek to cultivate in the United States.

We commend this pamphlet particularly to those comfortable and self-satisfied persons who still take no stock in the danger of communism.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC.

Those who are interested in what might be called the anatomy of calumny, will, I am sure, find food for instruction in the following description of a smear—a very

effective smear—in the act of being propagated. It is entirely possible that at some time or other you may have been told that Merwin K. Hart is a dangerous and notorious agent of anti-Semitic propaganda and a leader among American Fascists. Perhaps you have wondered why he has been thus labeled. What I shall relate here will help you to understand that and a good many other things as well.

On Thursday, July 27, 1944, a meeting was assembled in Swan Lake in the Catskill Mountains in New York State, to which a large number of men and women of Jewish faith, on vacation in the mountains, were invited. The meeting was sponsored by a religious monthly called the Protestant. The speaker was Mr. William Gailmor, a radio commentator then on Station WHN. What he said was certain to be received with sober consideration. Was not the Protestant a reputable magazine sponsored by more than a thousand American clergymen and recommended even by so eminent a person as the wife of the President? Was not Mr. Gailmor a man of education accepted by a reputable radio station as a competent interpreter of the news? And were not these favorable impressions strengthened later when he became a commentator on WJZ, key station of the great national radio Blue Network, sponsored by the Electronics Corporation of America?

Mr. Gailmor, while extolling the great work of the Protestant in fighting anti-Semitism, took a moment out to tell a little story. He said, in part:

"Let me tell you of a certain incident which occurred at the Republican convention (1944) at a meeting of the resolutions committee. This committee, consisting of 90 members, prescribed over by Senator TAFT, had before it a resolution to make racial bigotry, such as anti-Semitism, a crime. There were a number of people ready to talk in favor of the resolution. There were also people opposed to it. Their spokesman was the notorious Fascist Merwin K. Hart, who spoke for about an hour. He referred continuously to and attacked Lehman, Rosenman, Frankfurter, and President 'Rosenfeld.' His talk was full of anti-Semitism and bristling with invectives and when he was through he was vociferously applauded by the resolutions committee presided over by Senator TAFT. The spokesmen for the resolution were given very little opportunity to say anything. I am not saying that the Republican resolutions committee or its chairman, Mr. TAFT, are anti-Semitic. But definitely when people in high office applaud a speech of that type by this notorious man Hart, then we have before us a situation such as Germany had in 1932."

Can anyone blame our Jewish fellow citizens for their conviction that anti-Semitism is about to devour them in America when they hear from supposedly trustworthy sources reports like this? Now let us have a look at Mr. Gailmor's statements, at Mr. Gailmor himself, and at the Protestant magazine which sponsored him.

His statement contained several distinct allegations:

1. That Merwin K. Hart appeared before the Republican resolution committee to oppose a resolution to outlaw racial intolerance.

2. That his speech bristled with anti-Semitism and attacks upon Lehman, Frankfurter, Rosenman and "Rosenfeld."

3. That he was allowed to speak an hour while supporters of the resolution were scarcely heard.

4. That when he finished, his speech was vociferously applauded by the committee—of which there were 90 present.

Every one of these statements is a deliberate invention—a lie out of the whole cloth.

1. Hart did appear before the resolutions committee, but he did not speak on the racial intolerance resolution but on a seven-point program of his organization—the National Economic Council—relating wholly to political and economic problems, expressing views utterly unrelated to race or religion in any form.

2. Never once did he mention any of the names listed. Not one word did he utter which directly or indirectly touched the Jews or any other race or religion.

3. He did not speak for an hour, but for 10 minutes only, to which allotment he was rigidly held by the chairman, having barely time to read the statement of the seven-point economic program of his organization.

4. His speech was not vociferously applauded by the committee, and even if it had been, it could not possibly have implied an approval of anti-Semitism, since the subject was not even remotely referred to.

All this is attested by the most reputable witnesses. This vicious lie would never have come to light had there not been present at the Swan Lake assembly some persons, gentlemen of Jewish origin, who were shocked at the story and who deeply resented it. The people present would have carried away merely the impression of Hart as a purveyor of racial bigotry, as scores of other audiences have done where there was no one to call attention to the calumny.

Now, who is this gentleman, Mr. William Gailmor, well-known commentator for WHN and later for WJZ, whose poisonous messages are put on the radio regularly at a cost of many thousands of dollars to an American corporation? Well, first of all, he is a thief—a self-confessed thief, to put the matter bluntly. His name is Margolies. On March 29, 1939, only 5 years ago, he pleaded guilty in general sessions court of New York City to a charge of grand larcency in the first degree. He had stolen an automobile and he confessed that this was the sixth he had stolen. Mr. Westbrook Pegler has published these facts in his column in the New York Journal-America (December 22, 1944). And he records that "psychiatrists examined Margolies and, on the strength of their recommendations, he was placed on probation and went to an institution for treatment." He is still on probation as a convicted thief and will be until next May. He is also on the radio. After his conviction he changed his name to Gailmor, a mere rearrangement of the letters. This is the gentleman who was put on a platform by the Protestant to blacken the character of an honorable American citizen and the resolutions committee of the Republican Party with a set of vicious lies.

Now, what is the Protestant, the religious magazine which is carrying on the great fight against antisemitism?

This curious phenomenon in American journalism is an example of the manner in which subversive elements work under various masks and disguises. This magazine is one of those disguises. Its editor and inspiring spirit is a gentleman named Kenneth Leslie. Frederick Woltman, in the New York World-Telegram, February 9, 1944, thus described him:

"Mr. Leslie has had a somewhat interesting and varied career. A native of Nova Scotia, he at one time or another taught, lectured, farmed an apple orchard, bought and sold stock, led a dance orchestra, studied acting, wrote poetry, operated a buttermilk restaurant in Los Angeles, sang Hebridian songs over the radio, and published popular songs under the firm name of Leslie and Fitzgerald. At one time he was on the staff of the First Baptist Church, of Montclair, N. J. For a period, according to former associates, he went in strongly for Catholicism, studying the rituals and even carry a St. Theresa religious medal."

He has drifted far from these miscellaneous moorings now. The magazine which, on its face, seems to be a journal devoted to religious discussions is, in fact, devoted, so far as it deals in religion, to the most incessant denunciation of the Roman Catholic Church, to the most slavish exaltation of the Soviet Union, and to persistent efforts to inflame the Jewish and Negro citizens of America against their enemies with which, according to The Protestant, the nation seems to be swarming. Hewlett Johnson's book, Soviet Power, which was originally published by the Communist Party in this country, was put out in another edition by the Protestant and, under this allegedly religious imprint, got a far greater circulation than was possible to the Communist Party.

On November 7, 1943, Brother Leslie wrote in the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communists:

"If there is a heart of justice in the universe it is beating now in the Red Army. I believe in that heart. I call it God. * * * The religion that will be acknowledged in the Soviet Union will be based on the actual working out of community among individuals, economic units, and national groups. It will be beautiful. * * *"

Communist writers are among the most numerous contributors to The Protestant. In seven issues of the magazine I noted 26 articles in praise of the Soviet Union and its philosophy. There were almost as many articles bitterly criticising and attacking the Catholic Church in this country and Europe. The religious journal which weeps crocodile tears over anti-Semitism is itself the most virulent provocateur of anti-Catholicism.

Even Stalin does not seem to be Red enough for Leslie, for he criticized that amiable dictator when he dissolved the Comintern—the Communist agency for international propaganda and penetration. No man can read this magazine without perceiving that its chief purpose is to inflame Protestants against Catholics and both against the Jews by inflaming the Jews against them. One cannot refrain from asking why, when this country is at war and when the President of the United States is constantly asking for unity, this magazine should be so persistently engaged in the business of dividing the population upon such delicate and explosive issues as racial and religious antagonism.

Just as Stalin is not Red enough for the Protestant, so many Jewish leaders are not pro-Jewish enough. The magazine has made a favorite target of the American Jewish Committee which at times has seemed almost anti-semitic to Leslie. But this will be understandable if we remember that not only can Christians be arrayed against Jews, but that Jews can be aroused against Jews, just as Christians can be set at war with other Christians.

Jewish leaders of whatever faction have been able however to agree on one thing, and that is that they do not want Mr. Leslie and the Protestant as their defender. The four leading Jewish organizations—the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and the Jewish Labor Committee—have issued statements advising Jews not to support the so-called Protestant magazine. One of these statements says that the Protestant "belies its name by circulating largely among Jews and by seeking the major part of its support from Jewish organizations and individuals." The Jewish Labor Committee said: "For a sectarian Christian magazine to meddle in internal Jewish affairs and to foment factional strife among the Jews on purely Jewish issues is not only in bad taste but is postively immoral." There is a good deal more to the story of The Protestant but this will suffice for the time being.

So far as I am concerned, I have noticed this whole incident because I have been interested in the last few years in observing the guerrilla operations of these masked

gangsters of defamation and the profound effect they have been having on the state of public opinion in this country.

I am not interested in the political or economic opinions of Mr. Hart. He is entitled to hold them. I have made a diligent examination of many facets of this whole smear front and, as part of that examination, I have industriously inquired as to the charges made against numerous persons who have been the favorite targets of these professional calumniators.

Mr. Hart's views on political subjects would, I would say, square perfectly with those held by most Americans who subscribe to the traditional position of the Republican Party. He has supported the immigration laws, and for this he has been branded an anti-Semitic—an obvious and outrageous injustice. As to fascism, I should say he is as far from the school which preaches the planning and control of the national economy by the state and the assumption by it of dictatorial political powers as is the pole itself. It is possible for Americans of many schools of thought to disagree with Mr. Hart's political philosophy, but perhaps the last thing in the world he can be charged with is an affinity for the philosophy of fascism. He is vigorously and industriously anti-Communist.

The Communists have a new verbal trick by which they divide the world into Communists and anti-Communists. If you are anti-Communist, then you are pro-Fascist. By this piece of wordy legerdemain all who are most energetic in opposing the Communists are branded Fascists, and all who favor restricted immigration are called anti-Semitic. Starting from this base, the calumniators never lack for proof of their charges. Nothing more is needed than a lying tongue. The fantastic William Gailmor and his Swan Lake address on Hart are a perfect specimen of the means by which their charges can be implemented and documented.

The men who manage this arsenal of defamation are, generally speaking, nobodies. By what means, then, can they bring to bear in their aims so much power? Because they have mastered a technique in which they put behind their schemes the prestige and often the funds of people of wealth and importance. Thus Leslie and his colleagues and, in the instance related here, Gailmor, are of no consequence. As out-and-out Communists they could get neither support nor an audience. But under cover of a supposedly Protestant and religious journal devoted ostensibly to tolerance, they can get the sponsorship of more than a thousand reputable Protestant clergymen and they can get the endorsement of the most eminent persons. Here is one:

"MY DAY"

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

"HYDE PARK, Sunday.—For some time I have been wanting to tell you about various things I have been reading, and this fairly quiet day is a good opportunity.

"Perhaps you subscribe to the Protestant Digest (former name of The Protestant—Ed.). It is not just a Protestant magazine, but it does try to awaken those of us who happen to be Protestants to a realization of our responsibilities and interests in the world. I found it interesting. It is always stimulating to realize that if you belong to a certain religious faith there is a responsibility to make sure your thinking is constantly progressive and that you are a living force, not a static one."

Most decent men and women are for racial and religious tolerance. They are willing to lend their names to an enterprise that has this as its frontal aspect. They are foolish enough not to look behind the facade at the ugly real purpose which is concealed and which is not tolerance at all, but the exploitation of every kind of bigotry which the manipulators can locate in the community for the purpose of advancing political and social philosophies that the sponsors would not dare to support. And Gailmor, notwithstanding his unsavory past and his equally unsavory companions and sponsorship, can get the use of the microphone of a national radio network to indoctrinate the American people with the shockingly un-American principles which at the moment he is paid to propagate.

Now to return to Mr. Gailmor, the motor-car thief-philosopher. Had he made off with Hart's automobile, which he might well have done had he found it handy, thus adding a seventh theft to his string, a vigilant prosecuting attorney would have stepped in to defend Mr. Hart's property. But instead of an assault on Mr. Hart's automobile the miscreant commits an assault on his character; not just on his honesty, but on his loyalty, as an American citizen and his position as a civilized person. And though this is a gross violation of the law, far worse than stealing cars, no prosecutor seems to be in the smallest degree interested.

However, Mr. Hart and, for that matter, Mr. Gailmor, his traducer, are mere incidents in this little drama. It is no more than a small fraction of a social disturbance of the utmost gravity. What we have witnessed in the performance at Swan Lake just described is a function differing essentially no whit from that service which Mussolini attended to by beating his opponents over the head with a rubber hose. Thus, Mussolini taught his critics that it did not pay to stick those heads up too high. We are not yet at the stage where disputants feel free to bring out the rubber hose. But the groups represented by Gailmor have an instrument of compliance far more deadly and effective in this country. It is the organized smear.

There are at least four organizations in this country now, well-financed, with large offices and staffs and corps of under-cover agents, which operate as terror organizations through the use of the smear. They have busied themselves for the last 4 or 5 years blackening the names and, in many cases, assassinating the characters of numerous honorable and respected American citizens. The technique is to fasten on them the brand of "Fascist." "Nazi," and "anti-semitic." This is the penalty for disagreeing with the political objectives of these people in this country and abroad.

Hart is blackened, not to do him a personal injury merely, but to render him ineffective as an instrument of opposition and as an example to others. Having been smeared as a "pro-Nazi" and as an "anti-semitic," the assumption is that other citizens will not want to be associated with him in any kind of organized social movement. This would not be serious were it not for the fact that what has been done to Mr. Hart by this blackguard Gailmor has been done to hundreds of the most respectable men in America. Men who never dreamed of harboring a thought of intolerance against Jew or Catholic or any other religious groups, have been pilloried as violent Jew-haters.

The results have been magnificent from the point of view of the men who have been operating this racket. Not only have they brought hundreds of active and effective citizens under a cloud and thus diluted the consequences of their opposition, but they have succeeded in convincing hundreds of thousands of our Jewish citizens that these men are their sworn enemies.

This in turn has given these citizens a perfectly reasonable ground for joining in the criticism and attack. This in turn can be counted on to stimulate antisemitism in the bosoms of the victims and the thousands, indeed millions, of citizens who know them and respect them and resent the smear. A more diabolical device was never invented by the brain of man to brew hatreds and divisions among a free people who have a need at this moment to be united at least in their respect and tolerance for each other's spiritual freedom.

In describing this devilish technique and its victims I am not referring to those scores of wretched or disloyal persons whose names have figured in various news stories and who have been the active or compliant agents of truly Fascist or anti-Semitic groups. For the most part these creatures are unimportant, impecunious and, very often, stupid. But they, in their turn, have served a very useful purpose in the hands of the professional smear troopers. The names of hundreds of men and women, many of whom among our most distinguished citizens, have been stained by these brokers in calumny by mentioning their respectable names in company with the names of known or suspected persons. It is very easy, for instance, for one of these smearers, many of whom have access to radio, newspapers, magazines, to tell a yarn about the obvious disloyalty of some prosecuted and convicted offender and then mention, as a sort of side-swipe, that he is a "friend of Senator WHEELER." The constant repetition of this oblique calumny can do its work as thoroughly as if a long and implemented indictment had been presented and proved.

Take the incident I have described here. We see this professional character assassin Gailmor not only smearing Mr. Hart by picturing him as delivering a vicious anti-Semitic address, which he never delivered, but we see the traducer sweeping the tar-brush over the resolutions committee of the Republican Party by recording that they received Mr. Hart's attack with "vociferous applause," while giving Senator ROBERT TAFT a flick of the brush by naming him as the chairman who let Mr. Hart talk an hour while shutting out the proponents of the anti-Semitic resolution.

I repeat this is a solitary incident of this diabolical technique which is being practiced on a great scale against men and women in every community and against national leaders—religious, political, economic—who dare to oppose the schemes for remodeling the world of the men who operate the organizations to which I have referred.

The American people are being slugged over the head by a small handful of intellectual gangsters loose in the Nation. Some means must be found to deal with them and to bring their depredations to an end. No form of society can live with such a savage organism in its body any more than an animal can live with the deadly germs of physical disease eating at its vitals.

Obviously the only method which a civilized man who believes in the forms of our society can use is the exposure of the miscreants who use this weapon and, along with them, the foolish men and women, some of them well-meaning, who supply the funds and the prestige behind them.

If this does not succeed I shudder to think of the consequences. The task of dealing with the outrage will pass into the hands of angry and violent men.

Up to now the offenders have been almost completely immune from exposure. Let any man or woman who has suffered, or let any writer who has observed this dark phenomenon in eruption attempt to describe it—to expose it—and see how far he will get in finding the printed page, the radio, or any other medium of communication at his disposal.

The extent of the intimdation is beyond belief. The volume and violence of the revolt against this murderous device will be proportioned to the extent to which the victims and society itself have been deprived of the defenses which ordinarily free people use against such offenders.

I have written this mere incident illustrating the disease in the hope that people may be at least acquainted with its presence in our midst. That is the first step toward the cure.

What They Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, two boys from Sturgis, Mich., serving overseas, in the Sturgis Daily Journal published at Sturgis, Mich., express thoughts which are well worth repetition. One, who prefers to remain anonymous sends on a poem. The other writes to his mother.

I quote both:

NEW GUINEA

I'm full of damned malaria,
I shake the whole day long.
The quinine's ringing in my ears
I'm anything but strong.

Mosquitos bite all day long,
And you'd think I had the itch.
My ears are full of New Guinea mud,
My bunk's a dirty ditch.

I'm living in a jungle.
It's hot as merry hell.
C rations are my menu.
No cooking can I smell.

For this I get two bucks a day,
And a chance for a little ground,
That measures four by four by six,
And a grassy-covered mound.

My pals who came down here with me,
One lad was just eighteen,
He got a bed he'll never lose,
The coverlet is green.

Another one we'll see no more,
Another lost his arm;
And hundreds more I do not know,
Are now safe from all harm.

When I hear of a bunch of guys,
That are safe and far away,
Refuse to work because they want
Two dollars more a day,

I only wish we had them here,
For just a week or two,
To let them live in Guinea jungles
And see what we go through.

We'd give them all malaria,
Let the mosquitoes have a feast;
We'd make them bury many a lad
From north, south, west, and east.

We'd make them sleep in fox holes,
We'd feed them from a can;
We'd let the hot sun blister them,
'Twould be no Palm Beach tan.

We'd let them hear the wounded moan,
We'd let them see them die
With sniper bullets whizzing close,
With star shells in the sky.

Then we'd send them home again,
To their ten bucks a day,
To tell the others what they'd seen,
Way down New Guinea way.

I'll bet those guys would have enough,
At home they'd gladly stay,
They'd start no strikes right soon again.
For two more bucks a day.

Pvt. Leo Frohriep, who hasn't had a furlough in 40 months, is in the thick of the fighting in the Philippines. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Fred Frohriep, R. F. D. 3, have had two letters from him the past few days.

In the first one, written December 14, Leo says: "Am in the Philippines and it's plenty tough here. We have air raids every night, sometimes three or four; dead Japs lying everywhere, even floating in from the ocean. I've got a lot of Jap money. I'll send you some in my next letter. All I have for a bed is the ground and that's mud. All the time it rains here, and all the time I've been here I've been dry only 1 day. Am feeling fine, only lost a little weight, so don't worry about me. On the way here we stopped in the Marshalls and Carolines. I haven't got your box of candy yet. I got a letter from you the other day. My address is the same only the A. P. O. is 72 now."

The next letter, written 2 days after Christmas, follows: "Received your letter the other day and also the Christmas package. Came on Christmas Day, and was slow coming. Am still all right and feeling fine only don't get any too much sleep. The Japs are over every night bombing. They really kept me up Christmas night better than half the night. That's a Christmas I'll never forget. They come over every night about the same time. It's getting so if they come late we wonder what is wrong with them."

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered January 29, 1945, over Station WKOK, Sunbury, Pa., by Dr. Ruth Miller Steese, State membership chairman, American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Pennsylvania:

Abraham Lincoln. As we merely mention the name, we pause in wonder, in reverence, in honor to the man of the ages. As we think of Lincoln, we realize that he is the one human being whose honest, steadfast, and rugged perseverance as well as whose stanch and unswerving Americanism furnish us an example which we may all do well to emulate.

When we consider this great, strong homely man, this man of destiny, our thoughts go to his own words, spoken in his second annual message to Congress and I quote "We cannot escape history. Ne personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation."

When we consider the judgment of history, we are faced with the fact that the greatness of Lincoln has increased with the years. Unwanted by the intellectuals, Lincoln said of himself and I quote: "I hold myself without mock modesty the humblest of all the individuals who have been elected President of the United States." Horace Greeley opened a letter to him with this word of greeting: "You are not considered a great man." But the thoughts of the masses, of the great body of common people, were expressed by the enthusiastic westerner who at the White House reception for Lincoln said and again I quote: "Out our way, the people put their trust in God and in Abraham Lincoln."

Unwanted, despised, and rejected as he entered the White House and upon his duties as Chief Executive, when he died but a few years later, the first statement made concerning him and at his death bed, was made by the Honorable Edwin Stanton, Secretary of War, in the immortal phrase, "Now he belongs to the ages."

Emerson later said of Lincoln, and I quote: "By his courage, his justice, his even temper, his fertile counsel, his humanity, he stood a heroic figure in the center of a heroic epoch. He is the true history of the American people of his time—father of his country—the pulse of twenty million throbbing in his heart, the thought of their mind articulated by his tongue."

But Lincoln is considered great not only in America but throughout the world. At a time of the dedication of a statue to Lincoln in Westminster, Lloyd George made this pertinent comment, "In a few moments we shall see unveiled before our eyes a presentment in bronze of the best-known historical face in the Anglo-Saxon world, in fact one of the few best-known faces in the whole world. He is one of the giant figures, of whom there are very few in history, who lose their nationality in death, they belong to mankind."

When we mention the name of Abraham Lincoln, our thoughts naturally include that immortal address delivered by him here in our own Pennsylvania on the consecrated and dedicated soil of our national cemetery at Gettysburg. We think of it because it epitomizes the greatness of the character which is Lincoln.

Let us consider briefly the circumstances which led to the writing and to the rendition of this address.

The occasion was the dedication of the Soldiers' National Cemetery. Formal invitations were sent to the President of the United States, to his Cabinet, to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, to the diplomatic corps and to many other distinguished personages. Dr. Edward Everett, the most outstanding American orator of the day, was asked to deliver an appropriate address.

Six weeks after Dr. Everett was invited to speak, and just 17 days before the ceremony, it was decided by the board of commissioners of the cemetery to ask President Lincoln, and again I quote, "after the oration, as Chief Executive of the Nation, to set apart formally these grounds to their sacred use by a few appropriate remarks." May I repeat the statement of invitation "by a few appropriate remarks."

The day arrived—November 19, 1863. An estimated throng of 100,000 persons stood while Dr. Everett delivered his 2-hour oration. Then when the people were weary from the long ordeal of standing, the majestic Lincoln rose and uttered "his few appropriate words."

How few! Let us study them. This masterpiece of English composition contains but 10 sentences—268 words, of which 197 are words of one syllable.

And yet in those 10 sentences, what did Lincoln do? He carried out the request of the Commission "to set apart formally these grounds to their sacred use." But he went so much further. In the last 5 sentences he dedicated the living "to the unfinished work"—"to the great task remaining."

Fair indeed was the expression of the orator of the day, Dr. Everett, in his note to the President the next day, when he made this statement, "I should be glad if I could flatter myself that I came so near the central idea of the occasion in 2 hours as you did in 2 minutes."

No oration in history has ever expressed so much in so few words. No other address is so well known. Printed in books with the most expensive binding or on a scrap of the cheapest paper, its message remains the same. Today, more than ever before, it is being read and reread, studied and studied again.

The Lincoln Memorial in Washington contains only the statue of Abraham Lincoln and the words of his Gettysburg Address and his second inaugural speech. Bernard De Voto described his recent visit to this memorial in these words: "Impressive as the statue is, one presently ignores it; the texts count more. One sees them working an effect on the uniformed boys. On the approaches and

the steps there is a good deal of talk, laughter and horseplay. It becomes a whisper and presently dies out; the place is quiet. They stand reading those texts, they loiter for a while, and few of them say anything as they go away. There are those ribbons and stars—north Africa, the Solomons, the Aleutians, the sea frontiers, Sicily, the sky over France and Germany. Some of these boys have been there, the rest are on their way—and they might have spent this half hour with their friends, their wives, or their girls. They don't talk much as they go away, and as one becomes aware that they came here to be in touch for a moment with the highest expression ever made of what gives them meaning. A man is speaking to them out of an earlier testing, an earlier proof. They know what he is talking about."

Yes, the men in uniform know what Lincoln is talking about. They, too, have stood in countless cemeteries, the world over, dedicated as memorials to those who lost their lives that this Nation, yours and mine, might live. They have stood there and rededicated themselves "to the unfinished work"—"to the great task remaining," for they are in uniform today that "that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Yes, the men in uniform pause before Lincoln. The men in uniform honor and salute him.

Let us pause this evening and rededicate ourselves "to the great task remaining before us"—"that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they" in 1863–65, in 1917 and 1918, and in 1941–45 "gave the last full measure of devotion."

Let us pause in honor to the courage, fortitude, sacrifice, sympathy and love which are the price of greatness and which lay in the heart of the man of the ages, Abraham Lincoln.

Suppression of Vice in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Major Kelly and members of the Metropolitan Police Department for the splendid work they are doing to rid the District of vice.

In this connection, I would like to insert a letter addressed to Major Kelly by Mr. Ray H. Everett, executive secretary of the Social Hygiene Society, which is self-explanatory.

Metropolitan Police Department,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
January 26, 1945.

Major EDWARD J. KELLY,
Metropolitan Police Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MAJOR: Law enforcement in Washington against commercialized prostitution rates well in the report of a routine undercover study made last month. Here are a couple of excerpts:

"Those who knew the city in its palmy prostitution days and know it now cannot refrain from making a comparison. The essence of their remarks is: 'Money's plentiful * * * Possible customers never were more numerous * * * And hustlers never scarcer. Why? Only reason is that the law never was hotter.'"

"Methodical search for exploiters and prostitutes proved conclusively that flagrant activity has been eliminated, and that here and there where there may be some hustlers operating surreptitiously, their mode of action is so clandestine that a prospect has to offer gilt-edged documentary proof of identification before he can obtain an immoral offer."

These comments from trained and impartial investigators speak well for Washington's current status in this field. I expect a second report soon dealing with Negro prostitution specifically.

Cordially,

RAY H. EVERETT,
Executive Secretary.

More Stringent Antitrust Laws Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing a presentment which was submitted by the August 1944 grand jury to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York to Judge Vincent L. Leibell of that court. It was accepted, approved, and ordered filed by the court on November 13, 1944.

The presentment discloses a careful study of the facts and a proper appreciation by the grand jury of the dangers of hidden control or ownership of stock in American corporations by foreign nationals, especially enemy nationals.

I am thoroughly in accord with the presentment, which reads as follows:

To the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York:

Whereas the undersigned constitute all the present members of the Second August 1944 Grand Jury of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York; and

Whereas there was presented before this grand jury testimony and evidence with respect to dealings between certain American companies and individuals and certain foreign corporations and individuals, which resulted in a severe shortage in the United States of a vital raw material used in the manufacture of modern military radio equipment; and

Whereas this testimony and evidence have led this grand jury to certain conclusions deemed proper and imperative to be brought to the attention of Congress and the executive department of the Government for such action as may be necessary or appropriate.

Now, therefore, the undersigned members of this grand jury respectfully show and allege as follows:

1. Numerous agreements, in violation of the antitrust laws, between foreign and American corporations have resulted in restricting the production in the United States of many products of vital wartime necessity and great peacetime value.

2. American companies which are parties to these agreements are in some instances under foreign ownership or control as a result of stock ownership.

3. The registered foreign owners of the stock of American companies are in many cases not the real owners of such securities.

4. Foreign nominal owners of shares in American corporations are in a position, under the laws and business practices of certain foreign countries, particularly Switzerland, to refuse to disclose the names of the true or beneficial owners of such stock, so that it is often impossible to determine the identity or nationality of the foreign individuals, corporations or governments exercising control over American corporations.

5. In many instances, the penalties now provided by the antitrust laws are not commensurate with the gravity of the crime and with the extent of the injury to the public welfare, nor are they sufficiently severe effectively to deter enemies and prospective enemies of the United States from future attempts to inflict grave harm upon this country through the use of restrictive agreements and international cartels.

6. In view of the considerations herein set forth, the grand jury recommends that the Congress consider the desirability of providing greater maximum penalties for violations of the antitrust laws.

7. The grand jury also recommends that the Congress and the executive department of the Government take such action as may be necessary and appropriate to make it unlawful and impracticable for foreign nationals, particularly enemy nationals, secretly to own property in the United States through the instrumentality of foreign banks or holding companies or by any other means.

8. The grand jury, therefore, respectfully petitions the court to accept this presentment and order it filed, to authorize the Federal Grand Jury Association for the Southern District of New York to print and send copies of it to the Members of Congress and to the proper officers of the executive department of the Government and to permit such other use as may be properly made of this document.

(Signatures omitted.)

Bipartisan Responsibility for the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 30, 1945:

BI-PARTISAN RESPONSIBILITY

There's a very fine idea behind a 75-word resolution Representative BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, introduced in the House at the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress. It declares that:

"Whereas it is the sense of the Congress that measures involved in the establishment of a peace to follow the present hostilities should be considered without reference to partisanship: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That all legislation pertaining to the participation by the United States in international agreements and machinery to establish and to maintain peace shall be the joint responsibility of the majority and minority parties."

The Arkansas Congressman has been joined by Minnesota's WALTER JUDD, a Republican Member, in this effort to eliminate some of the political maneuvering that centers around the present discussion of the Dumbarton Oaks and the Vandenberg proposals.

It is obvious that they believe there is a national need for such a limited type of coalition government, and that even after it should be agreed on, there is still enough left on the domestic front for the two parties to argue about.

The recent visit of these two men to the European war theater increased their determination to diminish partisanship in the congressional consideration of the peace to come. "The simple fact of history," HAYS says, "is that partisanship was one of the determining factors in losing the hard-won peace of the last world war. By this step we Democrats would invite the minority to join us in perfecting the policies of peace and making it secure—and to share in the credit for it."

HAYS is quite right about it. There is a bipartisan responsibility for what the President has well termed a "just and honorable peace."

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Polish ancestry emphasize the sad plight of Poland in the following telegram:

POLISH DRAMATIC SOCIETY
OF KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
January 27, 1945.

Hon. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Americans all around us agree that Poland is being sold down the river. We appeal to you to raise your voice in defense of the rights of this unhappy land whose people were the first to brave Hitler's might.

STANDLEY SADECKI,
President.
BLASE MICHALAKI,
Secretary.

Deferment of Agricultural Workers

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called the attention of the Congress to the alarming condition in agricultural sections because of the interpretation being placed by local draft boards on General Hershey's directive of January 3, requiring the reclassification and induction of boys 18 through 25 years of age who were deferred because of agricultural occupation.

Over 200 Members of the House represent districts vitally affected by that order. As a result of the cooperation of these Members, General Hershey issued a clarifying directive on January 22, which directive states in clear, unequivocal language that boys are not to be taken from the farm under the draft except in accordance with the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

Together with many other Members of Congress, I was personally assured by General Hershey that this last directive would be strictly adhered to, and that the right of appeal under the law would guarantee those who were ordered inducted by the local boards ample opportunity to present the merits of their cases and receive just verdicts on the part of the authorities.

After this second directive was issued, the local draft board in my home county issued a clarifying statement which was given wide publicity in the county, and which seemed to be a fair appraisement of the situation. The statement is as follows:

[From the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of January 29, 1945]

THE FARM DRAFT CLARIFIED—YOUNG FARMERS NOT YET IN I–A

Because of confusion and misunderstanding over their draft status that has developed among some 328 Lenawee County farmers in class II–C in the 18 through 25 age group, the Lenawee draft board today issued a clarifying statement. The board has learned that some farmers in the group are selling livestock and preparing to leave for service, when actually they have not yet been classified in I–A and listed as subject to call. The board emphasizes that every deferred farmer in class II–C will be notified in writing when he is reclassified and will have an opportunity for a hearing and appeal. The board's statement, signed by Dr. F. S. Kellogg, H. D. Moran, and N. N. Raymond follows in full:

1. There is no reason for immediate alarm because farm registrants, ages 18 through 25, are being sent to Detroit for physical examinations. This does not mean that these registrants are now in I–A and subject to call. It is only to see if they are physically fit.

2. Your local board has been ordered to reopen and reclassify all registrants 18 through 25, in accordance with new farm directives received.

3. Your local board assures each farm worker, their families, or employers, in this age group, that when each registrant's case is reopened, it will receive the board's careful consideration, and that reclassification will be based on information in the file, and upon the registrant's necessity on the farm, in light of the Tydings amendment, and the new farm directive.

4. Each registrant will be advised of his new classification in writing after his case has been reopened, with full rights given to appear before the board or to appeal.

5. All farm workers, ages 18 through 25, are advised to visit the extension office at the courthouse, within the next 5 days, to file a new 1945 farm questionnaire, bringing with them income tax records and sales slips, showing their records of farm production sales. As continued deferment is based on production, not points or man days, as formerly, this is important.

6. Your local board wishes to suggest to our farmers that they recognize the agricultural importance of Lenawee County and that they realize the full importance of food in wartime. They assure every registrant in this younger age group that his reclassification will be based upon his own importance to agriculture.

7. The board also asks that our farmers sincerely consider the serious situation now at hand, as by our new directives the induction of young men under 26 years at this immediate time is considered more imperative and critical in the armed services than in their production of food. The board also asks that farmers realize that because of the manpower need of the armed services, that all II–A cases of our registrants in towns have been reopened, and we are calling to the servicemen up to 38 years of age who have families. Also, that men 18 through 25 years have already been called from industry, and that we are now calling up men in industry 26 through 29 years. We also wish to remind you of the deep obligation we owe to our nearly 4,000 men now in the armed services from Lenawee County who have served years of painful suffering and hardship in constant combat. The board sincerely feels that these men are worthy of replacement, and their sufferings should be considered, in its call for new men.

8. The local board asks your understanding in the task that now lies before it, and we hope, trust, and pray that in our decisions, based carefully upon your importance, that you will in return help us by understanding the serious task of decision ahead of us.

9. Your local board also firmly believes that even with the loss of a portion of the young farm registrants we will be forced to take, the older farm workers will continue, and even enlarge upon, their untiring efforts on the farms toward winning the war.

Mr. Speaker, it will be noted in subsection 3 of this statement that reclassification will be based on information in the file, and upon the registrant's necessity on the farm, in the light of the Tydings amendment, and the new farm directive.

This last sentence states the law exactly, as well as the attitude of the local board in its desire to comply with the law.

The above statement by the board was published on January 29, and in the evening of the same day Maj. Nick A. Luscombe, representing the Michigan State director of selective service, addressed a meeting in Lenawee County and made it clear that all farm registrants 18 through 25, who were physically qualified, were to be inducted into the military service, the Tydings amendment and the statutory law of the land to the contrary notwithstanding. The Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram in a front-page news article tells the story better than I can, and it is as follows:

THE ARMY NEEDS THEM—YOUNG FARMERS MUST GO, MAJOR SAYS

Young farmers in the 18 through 25 age group are destined for military service if they can pass physical requirements, Maj. Nick A. Luscombe of the operations section of the Michigan State selective service told a group of 100 businessmen, supervisors, draft board and country war board members at the courthouse last night.

"This meeting has been called to discuss the status of II–C farmers," said Major Luscombe. "In the last 4 weeks Selective Service has had to change its thinking and go back to the original purpose of furnishing men for the armed services. We believed we had reached a peak with some 12,000,000 men in service but the Germans threw a monkeywrench into things. Whereas our estimates were that 60,000 men a month from last July to next July would be sufficient it now appears this must be revised upward to some 160,000 to 180,000 men a month.

"Our casualties have been heavy, men are cracking in 15 days in the combat areas; the weather is a big factor and our replacements must come from the younger men. Failure to meet our quotas would prolong the war for 2 or 3 months, maybe a year.

"I wish to state right here that this decision is not that of your local draft board,

nor the State Selective Service nor the national office but higher up. The President of the United States after conferring with his aides advised General Hershey that further deferment of men 18 to 25 because of farm occupation is no longer needed and ordered a review of the men.

"The Tydings amendment is no more important than other sections of the Selective Service Act. We have been liberal for the last 6 months and now the needs of the moment mean more stringent application of the act. Local boards must order for induction all men in II–C. They will review and consider the evidence in the files and classify men accordingly."

Judge M. E. Tripp, Prosecutor L. B. Kuney, and Judge G. Arthur Rathbun as well as laymen pointed out that in their opinion the various sections of the Selective Service Act and the Tydings and other amendments were in conflict.

THE PRESIDENT'S POWER

"However you construe the act," said Major Luscombe, "the fact remains that Congress has empowered the President of the United States to issue the directive he has."

It was pointed out that while II–C's have the right to appeal their cases, the appeal in the final analysis must go to the Presidential board which issued the directive. This, it was claimed by farmers, would be like appealing to the judge who has just sentenced you.

While the II–C has the right of appeal, the State selective service board also has the right of appeal. Asked if they would appeal deferments made by the local draft board, Major Luscombe said, "I will say this, that they will consider an appeal in every case."

"In a nutshell, gentleman," said Major Luscombe, "the Presidential board has decided that the 18 to 25 age group is no longer as essential to food production as it is to the Army. In Lenawee County there are approximately 328 men affected and of these some will be rejected for failure to meet physical requirements. This would take a small percentage of the agricultural workers of the county and I do not believe that food production would be seriously affected.

ADVISES W. F. A. PROTEST

"If you gentlemen believe otherwise and can prove that this is the case I believe it is up to you to present your case to the War Food Administration and leave it to them to fight it out with the President."

A farmer in the rear of the room declared that by the time that could be accomplished the season would be fall, there would have been no crop, and the II–C might be a casualty.

"Drafting of some of these men is going to hurt and hurt a great deal," said Major Luscombe. "It may hurt food production to a certain extent but we need men in the Army more than in agriculture. It doesn't please us to know that in some individual cases there will be hardship, some cattle sold, some acres untilled, there may be the third or fourth boy of a family will be taken. There is a mission to be performed and if my taking the II–C's we can shorten the war a single day I believe the step well worth while."

To rate as a II–C, Major Luscombe said a farm worker must now be actively and fully engaged in essential agricultural endeavor; the farm operation must be essential to the war effort; if a man is inducted and a large section of land would remain untilled, and if no replacement is available, then deferment will be granted only until a replacement can be found.

In short, Major Luscombe, the official representative of the Michigan director of selective service, advised the Lenawee County Draft Board, the War Board, and interested citizens, that there was no discretion lodged in the local draft boards as to these farm registrants, that neither the State selective service nor the national office had any jurisdiction, but that the decision to take these boys, contrary to the Tydings amendment, was made by those "higher up." In short, he pointed out that the President of the United States, who is also the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, had determined that "further deferment of men 18 through 25 because of farm occupation is no longer needed."

Under date of January 30, the day following Major Luscombe's announcement, I received a letter from the secretary of Lenawee County Draft Board No. 1, which reads as follows:

DEAR MR. MICHENER: Last night at a meeting in the circuit court room at the Court House in Adrian before the supervisors, the War Board, heads of various farm groups, representatives of county banks and milk companies, Major Luscombe, of the State selective service at Lansing told us that we must draft every farm boy 18 through 25 who was physically qualified.

He quoted a section of the Selective Service Act of which the Tydings amendment is a part, which in my own words reads something as follows:

"The President has the right to defer any group or groups of registrants as he sees fit for the betterment of the war effort, and also he has the right to cancel the deferment of any group or groups as may be necessary in the best interests of the war effort."

He stated that the National Selective Service has ruled that they have the right to cancel farm deferments at the instruction of the President.

He further states that National Selective Service has definitely and explicitly ordered the State Selective Service to instruct all local draft boards to act accordingly and further that all local draft boards must carry out those orders and induct all physically fit men in that age group or the State Selective Service will remove such boards from office.

It is my understanding that Major Luscombe is now personally calling on all county draft boards, giving them these instructions and has already contacted many, including the appeal board.

Other letters and telegrams you will receive will tell you what a serious blow this will be to Lenawee County agriculture.

I need not point out to you that our only hope is for congressional action. We in Lenawee have no one to look to for aid except our Congressman.

Major Luscombe emphasized that the only way to change this order was for those in Washington to reverse their orders to the State selective service.

It appears plain, therefore, that your efforts must be to bring pressure on the Food Administrator and National Selective Service to reverse themselves, or to pass a law that the President cannot evade or bypass if we are to keep essential farm workers on the farms.

We believe that there are quite a number of farm workers who are not producing enough to warrant further deferment but we do believe also that there are many essential workers who should be deferred and a serious blow will be dealt our food-production program if the blanket order is allowed to stand.

May I emphasize that drastic action must be taken at once or it will be too late. These boys will have completed their physical examinations next week and are subject to immediate induction.

Yours truly,

HENRY N. RAYMOND,
Secretary, Lenawee County Draft Board No. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I am receiving many, many similar letters and telegrams, as well as letters stating the facts in many individual farm operations where deferred men are to be taken.

The attention of General Hershey and War Food Administrator Marvin Jones was immediately called to the pronouncement of Major Luscombe, and they both agreed that this statement, so far as it makes reference to the Tydings amendment, is wrong, and that the local boards still have and are expected to exercise all power given to them under the Tydings amendment.

I wired the Governor and the Michigan State director of selective service urging that statements like that attributed to Major Luscombe be discontinued, and that local boards be instructed to comply with the Tydings amendment. On yesterday, in response to one of these complaints made by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], Director Lewis B. Hershey signed the following statement:

The instructions issued pursuant to Justice Byrnes' letter did not direct local boards to induct all agricultural registrants under 26 years of age. We have, however, directed the review of the classifications of agriculturally deferred registrants, ages 18 to 25 inclusive, to make absolutely sure that they fully meet the requirements of the Tydings amendment, i. e., that they are necessary to an agricultural occupation or endeavor, that they are regularly engaged in it, that it is essential to the war effort, and that no replacement can be obtained.

This morning I am advised by General Hershey's office and by War Food Administrator Marvin Jones that the Governor of Michigan, in response to the telegrams which were sent to him, has interceded in behalf of absolutely necessary farm deferments, and that further action will be taken by General Hershey immediately to insure compliance by local boards with the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the young farmers of the country are not slackers. Proportionately there have been more farm boy volunteers than volunteers from any other group. In many instances it has been a real problem to persuade young farmers that they could serve best by producing food on the home front. Of course there are some young farmers, just the same as there are young men in other vocations, who possibly have avoided military service because of alleged farm essentiality. There can be no objection to a review of all farm deferments in order to eliminate any who are not needed on the farm. No one can complain about this and, so far as my district is concerned, no one is complaining. No one is asking that all farm boys be deferred. We are asking that the local boards, whose members live in the community and know the facts, be permitted and required to draft or defer under the provisions of the law provided by the Congress. The boards in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent are ready and willing to do their full duty. In these circumstances, such statements as Major Luscombe made are most disconcerting, and I can report to my constituents that I have the assurance of the Washington authorities

that the local boards in my district at least will be immediately directed to follow the law and not erroneous statements isued by those unfamiliar with the law or who exceed their authority.

A Letter From a War Plant Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I do not extend copies of my correspondence in the RECORD. I am today, however, including as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter from a personal friend whom I have known for a number of years. For obvious reasons I am not including the name of the author of this letter. He and his family are hard-working, upstanding citizens of my community. This man left an important job to work in a war plant. He and his wife are both employed. They have four boys—three in the armed forces, all overseas, and the fourth boy who will be 18 in the near future will be called before long. I feel the opinion of the writer of this letter is at least worth considering. It follows:

JANUARY 22, 1945.

Congressman E. H. REES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: Knowing you as we do and having had business dealings with you in the past, I know you do not believe in wasting time and money. Well, the Mrs. and I have each spent over 1 year each in airplane factories.

We have three sons in service, two overseas and one on a ship in the Atlantic, and we feel like we have a right to complain a little.

It is true we are short of help in many lines of business, but the set-up we have in small war factories is shameful. A person don't have to be in one of these factories one day to see that they are not run on a business basis. It is evident they are on a cost-plus basis or some other basis that means the same thing, for any individual or corporation would not waste money and manpower the way it is being wasted in some of these factories if they had to make a profit.

I personally believe any of these war plants could take 60 percent of the help they now have employed and let this 60 percent actually work which most of them would rather do (rather than stand around or act busy when foreman is around), we would be getting more war equipment for our money. Of course, there has been a big turn-over in employees in these factories and one of the big reasons for this is more employees like to work where they can see they are doing something for the war effort and after a few months they realize there are other things they could do to help the war effort more than wasting time at this job, so they become disgusted and terminate.

In these plants there are many young physically fit men being deferred because they are classed as essential, well, there is a few of these young fellows that are essential and hard to replace, but it is the ones that are really doing something with their hands, mechanical or technical. There is a great number of young men that are foremen, assistant foremen, and crew chiefs that have the seniority to hold these jobs that are nonessential, and the factory would be better off if it had older men in these jobs because the older man has more background and experience handling employees. These young men holding these foreman and crew chief jobs get the idea they are executives instead of an employee.

If Congress will send some special investigators to these plants and really go into this, they will find conditions like I have tried to picture them. The way to investigate these conditions is not to have a committee of Congressmen come to the plant and have the general manager take them through the plant. The proper way is to have some factory experts come and stay in the plants a week or 10 days and really get the facts.

Seeing these big ads in the newspapers and hearing the radio appeals for more help in these airplane plants, and seeing by the papers that the Government is planning to take farm boys that are really working many hours a day and you can see what they really do, while at the same time these young fellows in plants are working or I should say putting in their time. This makes us all think something is rotten somewhere.

Summing up our story we think stopping this cost-plus business would do a lot to solve the critical manpower problem, and I know it would cut the costs of the war equipment, and we taxpayers are going to pay for all this waste (or I should say we and our children and their children, etc).

The boys over there fighting and dying on the battlefields really believe we are running our war plants to furnish equipment instead of wasting money.

With best wishes, very truly yours.

Nurses at Walter Reed Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, some adverse criticism has been made of Walter Reed Hospital, and much publicity has been given this criticism. It has been said, for instance that many nurses, who are employed by patients at the hospital and are wives of Army officers, are not needed by these patients, and, at the same time, are badly needed by the armed services.

I have felt it my duty to make a check of conditions at this Army medical center and have obtained a report from Brig. Gen. Raymond W. Bliss, Acting Surgeon General of United States Army, which shows that 18 special nurses were on duty at Walter Reed Hospital January 28, 1945. Of this number, 12 were practical nurses and not graduates. Only six graduate nurses were employed in this group and of this number one is over age for military service and two have minor children. Only three of the number were eligible, if found fit, for military service.

These special nurses are employed only in very serious cases and only where prescribed by physicians as necessary.

So that the Congress may have a full insight into this situation, Mr. Speaker, I set forth the letter of General Bliss, as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROOKS: In compliance with your telephone request of Colonel Carpenter yesterday, the following information regarding the special nurses on duty at Walter Reed General Hospital is submitted.

Of the 18 special nurses presently on duty at that hospital, 12 are practical nurses and 6 are graduates. Of the 6 graduates, 1 is over age for military service and 2 have minor children. Three are eligible for military service if physically qualified. Of these 3, 2 are married.

These special nurses are employed in the care of patients hospitalized for the following conditions: Hypertension, cardiovascular disturbance, fractured hip and arteriosclerosis, fractured hip and uremia, carcinoma of breast (bilateral), ureteral lithotomy, hysterectomy.

Sincerely yours,
RAYMOND W. BLISS,
Brigadier General, United States Army,
Acting the Surgeon General.

Soldier Service Center at Fort Wayne, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members of the House the splendid program set up in the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., to provide advice and assistance to our returning servicemen. Under the Fort Wayne Municipal Veterans' Aid Commission, a soldier service center has been established in each of 11 fire department stations, and the fire department personnel in cooperation with the Veterans' Aid Commission counselors will provide service on the neighborhood level.

The following letter to the V. A. C. counselors from Mayor Harry W. Baals, director of Veterans' Aid Commission, gives details about the operation and purposes of these service centers:

Authorities now agree that soldier service must be at the community level. To make that formula other than a mere term, the leveling must continue to the neighborhood level, and reach its most efficient point at the zone level. There is an average of 6 blocks and 30 soldiers in each of the zones in the city. To organize the zones at the neighborhood level, the 11 fire stations have been made neighborhood information centers, for each of the 11 V. A. C. counseling districts. Through this type of leveling no soldier will be overlooked.

Most of our soldiers, of course, are still in the armed forces—11,282 at the present time. The V. A. C. program provides counseling service to them and to their families as well as to the discharged totaling 767 to date.

The V. A. C. counselors in charge of the neighborhood information and counseling centers recognize that there is nothing mysterious or intricate about the information to be dispensed. For, after all, the counsel to the veteran on jobs, education, loans, etc., is the same type that the same individual would have desired if there had been no war, and he had been given selective preference. He would have sought counsel then as he will now. The only difference being that the

preferred status is new and comes in a larger volume at one time.

Every V. A. C. counselor understands that each soldier, on his discharge, and upon leaving the separation center knows—

1. Report to draft board: That he must report to his draft board 6 days after his discharge. After this he is not required to report to any governmental agency or anyone else and may take any job of his choice that is available.

2. Mustering-out pay: That he must, if he has not already done so, apply for his mustering-out pay.

3. Old job: That if a veteran desires his old job, he can go directly to his old employer; that if any controversy occurs, which may exist only in extreme or rare cases, he is to contact his selective-service board.

4. New job: That if a veteran desires a new job, he can go directly to the employer of his choice or contact the United States Employment Service for counsel.

5. Educational benefits: That if the veteran wants educational benefits under the G. I. bill, he is to contact the local office representative of the Veterans Administration. However, he can previously receive counsel from the V. A. C. educational direction committee or other similar sources as to the type of study course or the educational institution to enter.

6. Loans: That for information on loans under the G. I. bill the veteran should be referred to the bank with which he has had connections or to the one he prefers to contact.

7. Other G. I. benefits: That for other benefits under the G. I. bill the veteran can directly contact the Veterans' Administration or solicit the aid of the Red Cross, V. A. C., American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, or such groups.

8. General aid: That if any other type of aid is desired, the same information is to be given the veteran as given other citizens, such as reference to family service bureau or other branches of the community chest, township trustees, Red Cross, and other appropriate social agencies. In an informed community the family head in many instances, will be the soundest soldier counselor. Often it is the intelligent or unintelligent attitude of the returning veteran's wife, sweetheart, family, or friends that spells the difference between successful and unsuccessful adjustment. It is a function of the V. A. C. counselor to impart to the head of the veterans' family the information that will aid the members of the family in intelligent counseling.

9. Family allowances: That with reference to soldiers in service, applications for family allowances can be referred to V. A. C. headquarters and contact will be made with the O. D. B., Newark, N. J., for Army allowances, and for Navy allowances with the Navy Family Allowance Division, Cleveland, Ohio.

10. Eleven centers clear through V. A. C. headquarters: That each center will be qualified to give information on the foregoing. Where requests are made either for information or for service to the center or the counselors in the field, reports of such preliminary or final applications will be made to V. A. C. headquarters on blanks furnished. Such reports will serve as a log book of service requests, both at the neighborhood center and at headquarters. Emergency requests, which make up a very small percentage can be phoned direct to V. A. C. headquarters, A-7403, 328 East Berry Street.

IMPLEMENTING THE GOOD NEIGHBOR

With the counselors and soldiers following the foregoing outline, with revisions adjusted by circumstances, much useful and helpful information can be furnished at the neighborhood level, eliminating in many instances the need for the applicant contacting downtown agencies. If the preliminary application indicates that the latter contact should be made, then the V. A. C. headquarters staff can, in advance, shape up the application from the facts transmitted to it by the neighborhood center, to be presented to any Federal or other agency.

COMMUNITY ATTITUDE

Finally, the value of any service depends upon the community attitude, reflected through the V. A. C. counselors and citizens generally. Such service should be leveled to the personal level of one neighbor serving another. The element of case work must be completely eliminated in the neighborhood approach. The veteran will "reject charity but welcome help; resent pity but welcome friendliness. He will want work and he will want to take his place in the community, but on equal term with all." In short, the V. A. C. counselor is simply performing as a good neighbor with a new title. To do so, no new rules or technique have to be learned or followed.

Labor-Management Committee of War Manpower Commission for Sixth Region, American Federation of Labor, and National Association of Manufacturers All Opposed H. R. 1752

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday this House passed H. R. 1752, a bill known as the work-or-fight bill. Its sponsors said it was designed to produce the weapons of war for our fighting men on all war fronts. It was supported chiefly by the military services and opposed by labor and management—by those who are responsible for the production of war material. It has been, and is, conceded that labor and management have done a superb job. On the other hand, it is freely admitted that H. R. 1752 was necessary because of certain shortages which resulted from overoptimism in the War Department as to the war's end.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1752 should have been defeated, if for no other reason because of the inclusion therein of section 6, which gives to those drafted for labor purposes the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940. This is an insult to our men and women in uniform and to the loyal worker who has been doing his patriotic duty on the production lines even before Pearl Harbor. It is to be hoped that the Senate will correct this grave injustice and delete it from the bill.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include herein a copy of a resolution, a statement by the American Federation of Labor, and a copy of a letter by the National Association of Manufacturers:

Whereas the War Manpower Commission has endeavored to perform the enormous task of mobilizing and allocating the labor force of this country for war; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission has effectively performed the task of training the labor force of this country to meet the needs of war production; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission has effectively performed the task of increasing the utilization of war workers by extending the minimum workweek and bringing about better personnel practices; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission is taking the steps necessary to meet current manpower problems; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission has accomplished all this by means of a voluntary program, with full cooperation of labor and management: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the management-labor committee of the War Manpower Commission for the sixth region, composed of L. H. Hill, vice president in charge of industrial relations, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.; J. L. Palmer, first vice president, Marshall Field & Co.; Lester N. Selig, president, General American Transportation Corporation; J. T. Gillick, chief operating officer, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad; H. S. Vance, chairman, Studebaker Corporation board; Joseph Germano, district director, District No. 31, United Steel Workers of America, C. I. O.; George A. Haberman, president, Wisconsin Federation of Labor; Paul Russo, international representative and assistant director, Region 4, United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; Reuben G. Soderstrom, president, Illinois State Federation of Labor; Thomas S. Roe, secretary-treasurer, Illinois State legislative committee, Order of Railway Conductors, hereby declares its opposition to any type of legislation providing for compulsory service by civilian workers; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the committee forward copies of this resolution to every Senator and Representative in the United States Congress representing the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin, and to the President of the United States.

Mr. Onarheim, alternate for Mr. L. H. Hill; Mr. G. Bergen, alternate for Mr. J. L. Palmer; Mr. Kramer, alternate for Mr. Lester N. Selig; Mr. J. P. Kiley, alternate for Mr. J. T. Gillick; Mr. Joseph Germano; Mr. Frank Ranney, alternate for Mr. George A. Haberman; Mr. Paul Russo; Mr. Thomas S. Roe.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the regional management-labor committee of the War Manpower Commission for the sixth region, this 17th day of January 1945.

PAUL RUSSO,
Acting Secretary, Management-Labor Committee, Region VI.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 17, 1945.*

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR SUPPORTS VOLUNTARY MANPOWER CONTROL

The American Federation of Labor opposes H. R. 1752 (the May bill) and supports H. R. 1803 for the following reasons:

1. A voluntary manpower system is more effective on the production front. Voluntary enterprise in America—free labor and free employers—has outproduced all other countries. Compulsory measures would not help but would break down this teamwork.

In Britain, compulsory labor is in effect. Contrasting results obtained by compulsory labor in Britain with free labor in United States we find:

Absenteeism: In Britain, 10 percent in 1943 and 1944. In United States of America, 6 to 7 percent in 1943 and 1944.

Strikes: In Britain in 1944, loss by strike was 16 percent greater than strike loss in United States of America (in man-days lost). (Source: British Ministry of Labor, W. P. B., Labor Department.)

Morale: British employers report: "Labor is unwilling because it is drafted. A minority of conscripts are satisfactory."

United States report: "We call our secret weapon the initiative, intelligence, and 'know how' of the free American workers." (Donald

Nelson.) Labor's "morale, their sense of participation * * * have been so heightened that they broke all records." (Joseph Keenan, W. P. B. Vice Chairman.)

The American way: Labor has voluntarily supplied thousands of men to jobs on time: At Twin Cities Ordnance, 15,000 men were supplied by unions as fast as they could be hired. (December to January.) At Knoxville, Tenn., 812 workers were supplied to du Pont in 12 days—all the company could take. Examples like these could be multiplied.

2. Waste of labor keeps thousands of men from jobs that need them. Our production record was achieved in spite of manpower waste in plants on a cost-plus basis, and waste in Government controlled plants, navy yards, etc. These wastes can no longer be tolerated.

A federation representative in Los Angeles reports: Skilled carpenters and other skilled workers in shipyards are being kept in enforced idleness. Management refuses to release them although shortage of skilled carpenters in nearby crating yards delays the crating of munitions of shipment to the Pacific war front. Airplane parts and equipment of all kinds are piling up, waiting to be crated, while skilled carpenters in shipyards are told by management to hide themselves and are not allowed to do the work they ask permission to do.

This condition exists in Navy yards and in many other plants working on a cost-plus basis as we know from our representatives. Their experience is confirmed by Senator MEAD's statement to the United States Senate. This bill gives the legal authority necessary to correct this condition.

3. Estimates of manpower needs are exaggerated. We have many examples of companies which overestimate their manpower needs: Crown Can Co. of Philadelphia reported as needing 250 workers, actually needed only 50; Consolidated Vultee Aircraft in San Diego, reported as needing 2,774 has been laying off its higher paid workers—is this company claiming a manpower shortage in order to replace high paid workers? Scores of such examples could be cited. Such figures have been the basis for demands for compulsory labor.

4. The manpower supply is adequate to meet the demand under a voluntary system. There is no need for compulsion. Even the exaggerated demands could be met.

The manpower demand, as stated by the War Manpower Commission, is:

From January through June 1945:

Critically needed in war plants	300,000
In war-supporting industries	400,000
To be drafted into armed services	900,000
Total	1,600,000

We note that only 300,000 are critically needed in war plants and that most of the 900,000 drafted will be taken from nonwar industries and agriculture. We note also that the supply of manpower is more than adequate to meet the demand.

Manpower supply, January through June 1945 (estimated from Government figures):

Veterans released, returning to industry	400,000
Young persons coming of age and new workers	550,000
Workers released by cut-backs and run-outs	350,000
Increasing productivity will release	100,000
Those unemployed and released from Government employment	100,000
From nonessential industries	100,000
Total	1,600,000

We note that many more than 100,000 could be taken from nonessential industries if necessary. There are 44,000,000 workers in nonmunitions industries and farms; the above estimate counts on 100,000 less than three-tenths of 1 percent. The supply is ample.

Lay-off due to cut-backs have released thousands. In September, 34,000; in October, 43,000; with lay-off of 350,000 expected for the first half of 1945. Increasing productivity is releasing thousands. In airplanes alone, 300,000 were released from November 1943 to September 1944, while production increased.

5. The War Manpower Commission, if strengthened, is competent to meet the need. The Manpower Commission has manned the plants which created the Nation's miracle of production for the last 3 years.

There is no over-all manpower shortage, no manpower crisis. There are hundreds of manpower problems in hundreds of individual plants. The task of supplying labor is fourfold:

(a) To find what men and what skills are needed.

(b) To recruit qualified workers in the community and outside.

(c) To find what plants can release men with the skills required.

(d) To arrange for the transfer with fairness to all concerned.

The Manpower Commission is equipped to do this work. Through its management-labor committees, it has the cooperation of management and labor. These two groups can use their organizations to find men who can be released without injury to industry or undue hardship, and to adjust the transfer.

Selective Service is not designed to select men for industry. Selecting workers for industrial jobs requires technical experience in placement. W. M. C. has 1,500 local offices with experienced personnel. Each office has information on the labor supply and demand throughout the country. Selective Service has no such information, nor has it management-labor committees through which employers and workers can cooperate.

Arbitrary removal of key workers from industrial plants could do immeasureable damage. This difficult task should be assigned to those who know industry and labor.

6. Transportation pay needed. Critical manpower needs will require transfer of workers from their homes to distant plants. The cost of transportation and of living away from home while on the job place such a burden on workers that they cannot afford to take distant jobs. Provision of pay for transportation and per diem allowance while living and working away from home will liberate thousands to go to war jobs.

7. Critical production problems are chiefly technical. In the 14 critical war industries listed by W. M. C. in January, manpower was not a major problem in 13 of the 14 industries. The chief bottlenecks were technical, growing out of the constantly changing needs of the battle front. Major bottlenecks were: Design change in aircraft, tanks, and airborne radar. Stepped-up program in naval ordnance, cotton duck, dry cell batteries, combat leaders, and field wire. Components in heavy-heavy trucks and naval ship repair. Facilities in heavy artillery, ammunition, tires. Manpower in foundries—because the low wages and bad labor conditions make recruitment of labor difficult. This list shows once more that there is no manpower crisis.

Technical problems arise constantly as battle experience shows the need for changes in equipment. With manpower control in the hands of the Manpower Commission, workers can be shifted to meet needs without disrupting industry.

8. Armed services do not plan contract awards so as to use facilities fully. In awarding their contracts, the armed services frequently permit a well equipped plant with skilled manpower to close down for lack of contracts, while work which the plant could do is awarded in a tight labor market creating a labor shortage. An example is the 9 shops releasing 70,000 men, thousands highly skilled, because the landing craft program is completed and the procurement services have not awarded new work to these plants. The plants are equipped to make fuses, casings, ordnance, and do a wide variety of war work requiring modern machine shops. Such work is now being awarded in tight labor markets. Plants are laying off men as follows:

Name of corporation and number of employees to be released	
Dravo Corporation, Neville Island, Pa.	12,500
Missouri Valley Bridge & Iron Co., Evansville, Ind. (and subcontractors)	26,000
Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., Seneca, Ill.	9,000
American Bridge Co., Ambridge, Pa.	6,500
Bethlehem Steel Co., near Boston, Mass.	7,000
Zenith Dredge Co., Duluth, Minn.	700
Jeffersonville Boat & Machine Co., Jefferson, Ind.	9,000
Island Dock Co. & Hildebrand Yards, Kingston, N. Y.	1,500

At the Kingston, N. Y. yards, well-equipped machine shops are being abandoned while an unused building 40 miles away in Poughkeepsie is being equipped to do the work which this plant could handle at least in part.

The Jacobs aircraft plant in Pittsburgh, Pa., was equipped and manned to make aircraft engines. Although plants are needed for aircraft engines, it is being stripped of its machinery and reequipped to make rubber tires. Its experienced work force, which has developed a high degree of teamwork, is being laid off, for few of the skills can be used to make rubber tires. A new work force must be recruited, trained, and developed into an efficient team.

Failure of the procurement services to work out a program for full use of facilities already in operation, creates unnecessary manpower problems. When skilled and disciplined work forces are broken up, much valuable time is lost before a new team of workers can be recruited, trained, and developed to efficiency in a new shop.

Labor insists that civilian workers be directed by civilian agencies.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MANUFACTURERS,
January 29, 1945.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This is in response to the invitation extended by your chairman to submit our views and comments on the bill H. R. 1752, reported to the House from its Committee on Military Affairs on January 24. We recognize that the bill is still in tentative form and may be substantially revised. Consequently, we would appreciate an opportunity to comment further on the legislation if and when it may be passed by the House.

American industry, as represented through the National Association of Manufacturers, has given careful study to various plans for a more complete utilization of civilian manpower to the end that the war may be brought to an early victory. The association has considered suggestions for national service legislation, as well as more limited proposals such as contained in H. R. 1752. We have viewed such plans with only one objective in mind—would such legislation contribute to winning the war by assisting American industry to produce the supplies and equipment needed by our military forces?

The National Association of Manufacturers has consistently emphasized that industrial management has a heavy responsibility for producing all the arms, ammunition, and supplies of war demanded by our armed forces, as quickly as procurement methods and productive resources will permit. It is

with this responsibility, and this responsibility alone, in mind that the association has approached the subject of manpower control.

Managers of American industry have been extremely reluctant to embrace any form of compulsory labor. This has been based on its long experience in dealing with American workers and because this experience has convinced management that compulsory labor does not produce as efficiently as freemen. The record of production since Pearl Harbor justifies this belief.

Nevertheless, management is acutely aware that serious local shortages in manpower are threatened; this is due not only to recent increases in production schedules, but also to rapid changes in schedules and in items needed by the Army and Navy. Industry has therefore proposed a program which it believes would supply the manpower without injury to war production.

INDUSTRY'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATION

The National Association of Manufacturers has proposed and, to the extent within its power to do so, has already launched a Nation-wide five-point program to meet current and anticipated manpower shortages. This program contemplates not only the fullest cooperation between labor and management but the enactment of supporting legislation. Our program is summarized as follows:

1. Legislative authority for War Manpower Commission: The association has recommended legislation to provide for the more effective enforcement of existing regulations and procedures of the War Manpower Commission by giving statutory authority for

(a) establishment of employment ceilings;

(b) use of controlled referrals to regulate hiring;

(c) authorizing compulsory release of employees in excess of the number permitted individual employers under manpower ceilings; and

(d) enforcement of such regulations—not against the employee, but against the employer—through court proceedings comparable to those used to enforce price ceilings under the Price Control Act.

Surveys conducted by the association throughout the country demonstrate that manpower shortages are purely local in character and change from week to week. The situation calls for flexibility and this can best be accomplished by local administration. It is recommended, therefore, that a large measure of responsibility and authority for administering statutory powers should be vested in local offices of the War Manpower Commission in full cooperation and consultation with industry and labor—on the local level—in those areas designated as critical.

2. Reemphasis by management on in-plant practices to increase production: In the judgment of management, a substantial improvement in the existing manpower situation can be accomplished by management itself through reanalysis of work methods, manpower scheduling, and the elimination of labor hoarding. In addition, the more accurate estimate of needed manpower would eliminate much of the confusion and aid materially in identifying and solving existing shortages. These recommendations have already been circulated by the N. A. M. to its some 12,500 individual member companies and, with the cooperation and support of 150 State and local industrial associations, to an additional 40,000 manufacturers.

3. Reemphasis by labor on increasing production with workers now available: Production can be materially increased by an active and organized effort by labor to reduce absenteeism, to eliminate artificial restrictions upon individual output and to promote strict adherence, in letter and spirit, to labor's no-strike pledges. While it is the firm conviction of management that labor and management working in cooperation can solve present and prospective manpower difficulties by voluntary methods, this can be done only if both management and labor will assume responsibility in their respective fields of activity and control.

4. Operation of work-or-fight principle: The association has emphatically endorsed application of the work-or-fight principle as now permitted under section 5 (k) of the Selective Service Act. This can be done within the framework of present laws, with the cooperation of the armed services and the Selective Service System. The enactment of special work-or-fight legislation, such as that contained in H. R. 1752, will add new complications, increase confusion and endanger war production.

5. Community publicity campaigns: In the firm belief that American workers will respond wholeheartedly to meet the requirements of war production, the N. A. M. has recommended, throughout its membership and through 150 State and local industrial associations, that strong community publicity and public relations campaign be instituted in critical areas to recruit needed manpower and to obtain the voluntary transfer of workers to more critically needed production.

This program was formulated early in January after consultation with many Government officials and after thorough discussion with representatives of some 150 industrial organizations. It subsequently received careful consideration by the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers at a meeting on January 25 and was approved without dissenting vote.

COMMENTS ON H. R. 1752

Since H. R. 1752 did not become available until January 25, time has not permitted adoption by the association of an official position with respect to the bill in its present form. As our suggested legislative program indicates, the N. A. M. is not opposed to manpower legislation as such, so long as such legislation will not be detrimental to maximum production. Our comments, therefore, relate to those features of the bill which have a direct bearing on plant personnel, efficiency, and war production.

H. R. 1752 undertakes to keep men between 18 and 45 in their present jobs in war work or war-supporting activity, it authorizes draft boards to order men of the same age group into war or essential work if not already so employed, and rewards men ordered into such jobs with travel allowances, veteran reemployment rights and benefits under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

It is our sincere and honest conviction that this legislation, as now drafted, will breed discord and confusion, will be inadequate as a solution to the manpower problem, and may seriously interfere with war production.

The bill will breed discord

In spite of shortages in a few specific items, industry is still performing a miracle of production. (See attached release of W. P. B., January 22, 1945, exhibit B.) Approximately 80 percent of war production is on or ahead of schedule. It would be a national tragedy to adopt any program which would endanger this present scale of output. Yet the bill H. R. 1752 could do precisely that.

As described in the attached exhibit C, the bill would discriminate seriously and unfairly against the most loyal, patriotic, and efficient workers who have contributed so much to our present production achievement.

For example, men ordered into war work under this bill will receive travel allowances, veteran reemployment rights and the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. Women, men over 45, and even men between 18 and 45 who have already been employed in war work, are eligible for none of these benefits. This and other forms of unfair discrimination can breed friction and discord, and even wreck the morale and efficiency of war plants. This legislation might well become a fight-at-work bill. In our judgment, such inducements will complicate—not aid—the recruitment of manpower needed to meet and maintain war production schedules.

The bill will confuse the manpower problem

The attached exhibit C discusses in greater detail those sections of H. R. 1752 which, by adding further uncertainty and confusion, will obstruct recruiting of workers for urgently needed war production and will jeopardize efficient operation of essential civilian production and service.

This bill covers only men between the ages of 18 and 45, and places regulation of their employment in the hands of the Selective Service System. All other workers would presumably remain subject to regulations and procedures of the War Manpower Commission. Coordination of this divided control will take valuable time of draft boards and other agencies of the Government. More important, recruiting of labor would be seriously impeded pending adoption of new policies and procedures.

For example, the bill requires draft board approval before men (18 to 45) can move from jobs in war production or war-supporting activities. Today such men can be and are being transferred from less essential to critical occupations by compliance with known W. M. C. procedures. Enactment of this legislation would end such emergency transfers. In addition, men between 18 and 45, wherever employed, would be under no immediate incentive to accept jobs in war production until requested or ordered to do so by their draft boards. To do otherwise would mean to give up the benefits provided them by H. R. 1752. Also the unfair award of benefits only to persons "drafted" for war work would not assist recruitment of prospective workers not eligible for such benefits.

Production could be seriously hampered by other aspects of the bill, as illustrated in the attached analysis (exhibit C). It should be emphasized, however, that the bill does not deal with absenteeism, restrictions of worker output, or with time lost because of strikes. Resort to compulsory control of individual workers, as proposed in H. R. 1752, with no attention whatever to such waste of manpower, will stimulate friction and reduce efficiency and production.

Conclusions

In considering this bill, and proposals for universal national service legislation, the problems of war production have been our chief concern. Management has no responsibility for the conduct of military operations. It does have a heavy responsibility for production.

Arguments have been advanced that compulsory service legislation is needed to boost the morale of our armed forces; or that it is needed to mobilize or punish a minority of Americans who may not be contributing their full share in the war. Our position is that such legislation will not help war production, whatever else it might do for national morale, either overseas or at home.

This association firmly believes that if the Nation has a manpower problem, it should be solved as such. On the other hand, if the country confronts morale difficulties, they too should be met, but not by endangering war production.

Responsibility, of course, rests upon the Congress to weigh and appraise these arguments and objectives. It is only with the desire to cooperate that we express our firm conviction that enactment of H. R. 1752, in its present form, will interfere with

industry's ability to produce the requirements of our armed forces.

The following documents are attached: (1) Outline of NAM–NIC manpower program (summarized on pp. 2, 3, and 4 herein); (2) W. P. B. release of January 22, 1945 (relating to December war production); (3) detailed comments on H. R. 1752 (summarized on pp. 4, 5, and 6 herein).

Respectfully yours,

IRA MOSHER, *President.*

WASHINGTON, January 30.—"The May-Bailey work or fight bill if fully enforced will cut—not increase—war production," according to Ira Mosher, president of N. A. M. "It would turn out to be a 'fight at work' measure by rewarding conscript workers and penalizing the free workers in our war plants. Instead of aiding war production, the bill could become the national slow-down bill," said Mr. Mosher.

The association sent a letter today on the legislation to the Senate Military Affairs Committee, at the invitation of the committee's chairman, Senator ELBERT THOMAS, of Utah. The Association at the same time suggested a course of congressional action which would enable the War Manpower Commission to control civilian employment in localities where manpower is needed most.

"The May work-or-fight bill," said Mr. Mosher, "would give almost foxhole standing to those last-minute men who chose to work rather than fight, for under this legislation they would, as work draftees, get such G. I. benefits as transportation allowances, reemployment rights, and moratorium on obligations. This would be rank discrimination against millions of loyal workers who have stood by their gunmaking for 3 years, as well as thousands of IV–F's already employed on war work.

"Imagine the serious morale and efficiency problem in plants in which people who have been loyally on the job for years are forced to work side by side with drafted labor who are rewarded with special benefits. Or picture the effect on the women, either those employed or who come back to help out the manpower situation. The bill would seriously discriminate against these women workers, who are excluded from any consideration.

"We realize that the mere phrase 'work or fight' has immense appeal to a public bent on victory. We recognize as well that to those with sons and daughters in the thick of battle it seems only just. Management also has sons and daughters at the front, and is as anxious for victory as any other group of citizens. However, our experience in the so-called miracle of war production causes us to point out that ill-considered pressure legislation to get 300,000 workers would backfire badly and could ruin the production efficiency of the hard-working millions in war production.

"The net of such legislation would be a gain of 1 to 5 percent more workers at the expense, in the considered judgment of management, of a 15- to 20-percent slump from current production—the exact reverse of what is sought, and is at a cost far too high for a psychological experiment. Instead of forcing labor through such legislation and creating strife among the good producers, the association has suggested legislation to Congress that would enable the Government to place a ceiling on civilian employment, the only big source of trained help. Workers thus released from civilian production would have a choice in war jobs without creating the compulsion complex in employees, which might generate a national slow-down of a dissatisfied worker.

"The public popularly hold to the belief that if you can conscript to fight, you should be able to conscript for work.

"Yes, you can conscript for work. But this is not the issue. The point is what will bring the most production. The letter sent to the Senate committee had this to say:

"'Managers of American industry have been extremely reluctant to embrace any form of compulsory labor. This has been based on its long experience in dealing with American workers and because this experience has convinced management that compulsory labor does not produce as efficiently as free men. The record of production since Pearl Harbor justifies this belief.

"'Arguments have been advanced that compulsory-service legislation is needed to boost the morale of our armed forces; or that it is needed to mobilize or punish a minority of Americans who may not be contributing their full share in the war. Our position is that such legislation will not help war production, whatever else it might do for national morale either overseas or at home.'"

The letter suggests that men presently employed in civilian industry can be made available by giving the W. M. C. statutory authority, with enforcement through existing courts with respect to the establishment of employment ceilings on all employers; use of controlled referrals; compulsory releases.

"The operation of this authority," the N. A. M. letter suggests, "should be determined through and administered by W. M. C. in full cooperation and consultation with industry and labor on the local level.

"The N. A. M. and its affiliates in the National Industrial Council recently developed a program for local action. Work is now going on to bring together management, labor, and the War Manpower Commission in the communities where shortages exist."

Mr. Mosher emphasized that the problem already was being met at the local level by just such activity.

"The N. A. M. has just completed a survey," said Mr. Mosher, "which confirms the W. M. C. figures on manpower shortages, but which shows definitely that the problem is being met at the local level, even in those communities in which shortages are most acute.

"In 22 cities in which the most serious shortages are reported replies show that the problem, almost without exception, is in the process of being met on a community-by-community and plant-by-plant basis.

"This is also confirmed by some 400 manufacturers in 90 additional war plant cities where local cooperation by management, labor, and W. M. C. is showing results.

"The N. A. M. survey also corroborates the War Production Board report of last week which showed that American industry was making progress in meeting the increased demands of the fighting forces. This W. P. B. report showed production in almost every category of arms and equipment is showing progressive monthly gains.

"On the 'must' list these gains in production have ranged from 20 percent for tires and trucks to more than 150 percent for aircraft and mortars, and more than 200 percent for rockets. Such critical items as have fallen behind schedule, the W. P. B. points out, have been because of changing requirements by the armed forces and alterations in designs and specifications.

"On the basis of these facts, it seems obvious to us that the manpower problem is being solved locally and that by the time national legislation could be made effective the problem will have ceased to exist.

"Management, being practical-minded and experienced in production, feels a responsibility to warn people of the danger of enacting legislation for psychological reasons which can badly impair our whole production program."

Transportation in School Busses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to request a modification of the rules and regulations of the Office of Defense Transportation barring the transportation in school busses of the classes of instrumental music, high school bands, and other recognized school activities

Whereas the Office of Defense Transportation, and the various agencies thereof, has ordered among other provisions that school busses cannot be used for the transportation of classes of instrumental music, high school bands, and other regular school activities; and

Whereas such action on the part of the Office of Defense Transportation tended to destroy the interest in instrumental music and other needed school activities on the part of students, and is detrimental to the best interests of the public school systems of the State: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring), That the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from Indiana earnestly urge and urgently request a modification of the rules and regulations of the Office of Defense Transportation barring the transportation in school busses of the classes of instrumental music, high school bands, and other recognized school activities, and that the Office of Defense Transportation survey such conditions existing in the State of Indiana to the end that the best interests of the public school systems of the State, with due regard to the interests of national defense, may be served in accordance with this resolution.

SEC. 2. That the principal clerk of the House is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Indiana.

William Penn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech at Mabel Smyth Auditorium Tercentenary, October 24, 1944, by J. G. Anthony:

Three hundreds years may not be a long time in the history of the race but it does represent a sizable segment of the history of western civilization. From such a vantage point we meet today in memory of that spiritual knight of the seventeenth century, William Penn. The fact that we are

gathered here is some evidence of the vitality and validity of the ideals for which he stood.

Fate has a habit every so often of producing an individual with certain qualities of universality who by his character and deeds leaves an indelible print on the web of time. Such a man was Penn.

I should like to consider tonight two aspects of Penn's versatile character, for they may be worthy of reexamination at the moment as we approach the time when we are thinking about what will happen at the end of the war and what kind of peace will follow. These are his religious tolerance and his statecraft.

Just as we must look for the roots of our American polity to the England of the Stuart kings and beyond, so I believe the key to an understanding of Penn is to be found in his steadfast struggle against the mores of that day.

Born to a life of high station, son of an admiral in the British Navy who had rendered distinguished service to his country and won the gratitude of the King, Penn might naturally have been expected to follow the life of a well-to-do member of the upper class—to have become a seventeenth century courtier. This, however, is a fruitless speculation, for Penn was what he was for the reason that he had within him the tough moral fiber that made him a man of conscience, an articulate and effective dissenter from the hypocrisy and tyranny of his day. It would be idle to think of him in the abstract apart from the stream ol life in which he moved as Oliver Wendell Holmes once said "a great man represents a strategic point in the campaign of history."

The young Penn entered Christ Church, Oxford, as a gentleman commoner. There he met John Owens, the Puritan head of the college, who had been recently removed with the restoration which had revived the strict statutory prohibitions against one holding public office who was not a member of the Anglican Church. Penn, along with other undergradutes, rebelled at the system that required the subordination of religious thoughts and beliefs to regimentation under the Anglican Church, and, accordingly, in his second year, was expelled for nonconformity. Samuel Pepys in his diary reported that his neighbor, Admiral Penn, was "much troubled" by the boy's opinions and considered removing the young man to Cambridge. However, a tour of the continent was to be the supplement of a curtailed college education. No doubt the admiral figured that a round of gaiety at the French Court would cure his son of his nonsense about Quakerism and he would be ready to settle down to a life fitting an English gentleman. Returning to his father's house, Pepys observed that the young man had "too much of the French garbe and affected manner of speech and gait."

Penn entered upon the study of law at Lincoln's Inn, where he continued until the outbreak of the plague. He acquired a basic knowledge of the common law of England, which was later to stand him in good stead in his memorable trial at Old Bailey. The admiral sent his son on a mission to manage his estates in Ireland, probably again with the view to purge the young man of his unorthodox notions about religion, but it was at Cork he made his final decision to join the Society of Friends.

The next few years were to be troublesome ones. Much of his time was spent in jail for no offense other than holding beliefs that did not conform with the Church of England. His trial at Old Bailey is one of the landmarks in the institution of trial by jury. He was indicted under the Conventicle Act for preaching to an "unlawful and seditious assembly which met in force of arms." The act actually prohibited meetings in churches or buildings but the British troops had closed the Graystreet Church where the meeting was to be held and it was in fact conducted in Graystreet. At the trial the judges endeavored to coerce the jury into bringing a verdict of guilty but the 12 men good and true stood their ground and returned a verdict of not guilty. For rendering a verdict contrary to the liking of the judges, the jury were imprisoned. The action of court was later reversed and that case established the province of the jury as exclusive judges of the facts in a criminal case.

I referred a moment ago to the England of the Stuart kings. Upon the restoration of Charles II both the Church of England and the King were restored. Existing legislation already pressed hard on the Roman Catholics but the new legislation was to bear down on all nonconformists. The Presbyterians could expect no mercy for they had shown none under the Commonwealth and as one Puritan divine put it toleration was nothing short of the "grand design of the devil." Holders of public office were obliged to take the sacrament according to the Church of England. The Book of Common Prayer was prescribed for all ministers. Heads of colleges were obliged to subscribe to the thirty-nine articles of faith. The Test Act was enacted to compel the acceptance of the Church of England. This last was no mere bit of governmental red tape like our own loyalty oath, the administration of which seems to accomplish nothing other than to consume paper and occupy filing space, it had real consequences—jail sentences and banishment from the realm were the penalties for its infraction. The Conventicle Act made assembly for the exercise of religion in a manner other than according to the practice of the Church of England likewise punishable by banishment for years. Special penalties were designed for preachers who came within 5 miles of their schools or churches without taking the prescribed oath. Penn along with several thousand other Quakers to say nothing of hundreds of other nonconformists and Catholics spent months in jail rather than surrender their beliefs. It was little wonder that Penn came to the conclusion that America was a land of promise for his "holy experiment"—the asylum for those holding unorthodox religious beliefs. There he would found a colony forever free of religious and political oppression.

Penn had already been active in connection with the colonies of west New Jersey and east New Jersey. Upon the death of the admiral his chance came. Among the assets of the admiral's estate was a claim of £16,000 against the King. Charles was glad to liquidate the debt by a royal grant in 1681 conveying to Penn a vast domain in the New World "bounded on the east by the Delaware River and on the west limited by Maryland and northward as far as plantable." This description in the grant, as might be expected, was to cause trouble later.

Before setting sail with his company on the ship *Welcome*, Penn was careful to publish a political constitution for the immigrants to know what manner of government they would live under in the New World.

Penn's government was not to be a Puritan commonwealth like Massachusetts, where witches were burned (or, as they claim in Salem, "squeezed") and Quakers were hung for their religious beliefs nor an Anglican aristocracy like Virginia, but a government which would be satisfactory to the British Crown and, at the same time, square with Quaker philosophy which encompassed the equality of man in the divine sight. This logically lent itself to a democratic form.

His frame of government stated:

"Any government is free to the people under it (whatever be the frame) where the laws rule and the people are a party to these laws, and more than this is tyranny, oligarchy, or confusion."

The germ of Jefferson's immortal words declaring that governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed" is discernible. Penn also discloses his firm grasp of the science of government by the statement:

"Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them. Let men be good, and the government cannot be bad; if it be ill, they will cure it."

His conclusion is also noteworthy:

"We have * * * composed the frame and laws of this government to the great end of all governments to support power in reverence with the people and to secure the people from the abuse of power."

Penn and his 100 followers, one-third of whom died of smallpox in passage, finally arrived at New Castle on the Delaware in 1682. From there they made their way up the river to the site of his future city which he had already named Philadelphia.

In his relations with the Indians, Penn exhibited statesmanship of the first order. He lost no time in meeting with the native chiefs and made plain to them what he had already said in a dispatch sent the year before his arrival, that he and his followers had come without hostile weapons and would deal justly with them. As Voltaire said, it was "the only treaty never ratified by an oath and never broken." Pennsylvania's relations with the Indians, under Penn, was unique among all of the American colonies, standing out in sharp contrast with the violence, injustice, and oppression the natives met with at the hands of the Spanish, French, and other English colonists.

The colony in Pennsylvania prospered. Philadelphia was laid out according to Penn's plan for a "green country town" with streets that intersected at right angles and parks for the public benefit. Within less than three-quarters of a century it was to become the second city in the British Empire.

As might be expected the vague description of the boundaries of the grant caused difficulty particularly with Lord Baltimore and Penn himself was obliged to return to England to adjust matters. The boundary itself was not finally settled until the famous Mason and Dixon's line was established and surveyed in 1767.

The government of Pennsylvania established by Penn continued a wise and successful administration for some 75 years. Penn himself was obliged to return to England where he spent his declining years with little or nothing to show by way of pecuniary gain from his domain in the New World.

The religious toleration of Penn was not limited to the Quakers for unlike the other American Colonies that were settled by those who had fled England to escape religious and political tyranny, Penn insisted for his government upon complete freedom of conscience and complete toleration of the religious views of others. The swing of the pendulum from the Puritan intolerance of the Commonwealth to the Anglican intolerance of the Restoration was too fresh in the minds of the Quakers to want theocratic government in Pennsylvania or regimentation of religious beliefs.

As late as 1776, Penn's original domain stood alone in affording complete toleration of all religious sects that professed belief in a divine being. No doubt it was out of a profound respect for what Penn had been able to accomplish and a vivid recollection of his own struggle for religious freedom in Virginia that led Thomas Jefferson to call Penn "the greatest law giver the world has produced."

Freedom of religion is apt to be looked upon by some as a museum piece in our

modern life, particularly among those who have no regular religious affiliation. However, in the last analysis religious liberty is essentially no different than civil or political liberty. Our constitutional guarantees of civil liberties are as the Chief Justice recently said "but guarantees of freedom of the human mind and spirit and of a reasonable freedom and opportunity to express them." As history amply demonstrates if one may be imprisoned or banished for his religious beliefs it is an easy step to extend this to political beliefs, freedom of speech, or freedom of the press or to thoughts generally. We, living under a constitutional democracy, have placed limitations upon the will of the majority, limitations beyond which the majority may not pass.

Some may take lightly the recent struggles of the Jehovah's Witnesses against saluting the flag. This sincere and loyal group would suffer jail rather than risk God's displeasure by violating the injunction of Exodus 20 against bowing down to any "graven image." Most of us believe that their fears are not well founded, but it is not for Government to compel expressions of loyalty contrary to the individual's sincere religious conviction. As a matter of substance, I suppose that no one would be so naive as to think that such an expression wrung from a person by compulsion would promote love of country any more than the infamous Test Acts of the seventeenth century instilled love of the British Crown in those dissenters who were willing to go through with that ritual. There is a very real danger in saying that tolerance should only extend to religious groups that have received general acceptance in society, for one has no assurance that it might not be his particular faith that will shortly meet the disapproval of the crowd.

The discipline which ascetic groups prescribe for themselves is frequently tragic and may appear to the uninitiated pointless. No group waged a more relentless warfare against the sham of ecclesiastical Christianity than did the early Quakers, but as William James once said, "The battle that cost them most wounds" was in defense of "thee-ing and thou-ing and in not doffing the hat." The resistance to symbols cannot always be brushed aside as a useless tilting with windmills, sometimes the acceptance of a symbol is not as superficial as it seems but involves the acceptance of a system for which it stands.

There have been those who would have us ape the dictators in the prosecution of this war; they would have us discard our faith in democratic processes as useless, which would have meant the surrender of our most powerful weapon and which, I have no doubt, would have greatly impaired the employment of our material strength.

I would not for a moment belittle the cultures of other lands. We entertain no delusions of the master race, but I believe we can say with reason that in the field of government the English-speaking people do excel. Anglo-American polity owes much to the bitter struggles for the liberty of the individual that have marked our history in the lives of such men as William Penn.

Our chief claim to greatness lies in our political institutions bottomed upon the rights of the individual and insistence upon the observance of the fundamentals of fair play; the Germans on the other hand with all their rich background in the arts and sciences are still politically immature. Perhaps this is the reason they have run amuck twice in our lifetime.

Why is William Penn of any importance to us in this year of our Lord 1944? The first thing that comes to mind is the finding of a rational solution of minority problems in America. As the late Mr. Willkie said, "The platforms of both major political parties are woefully inadequate on this subject." We in Hawaii with our diverse races are accustomed to a community in which race tolerance is a social norm. With our presently swollen population recruited from all parts of the country it would be remarkable if there were not inroads on this concept. The newcomers to our shores frequently are skeptical of Hawaii's matter-of-fact attitude to this subject but the patient processes of experience will not be denied.

I often think when I hear a recital of Hawaii's claims to admission in the American Union, the listing of our shipping tonnages, figures on the production of sugar and pineapple, population statistics, and taxes paid the Federal Government, that we press for a decision on a minor issue and thus obscure the true substance of our cause. Emphasis is laid on the wrong values. Hawaii has, I believe, a real contribution to American democracy, and that is its traditional race and religious tolerance.

One cannot witness the spread of the cancer of intolerance without genuine concern. It is the order of the day in the Fascist world, and we have not escaped some infection. We must either choose a solution in the spirit of William Penn or prepare for such excesses as apparently have the blessing of the Native Sons of the Golden West. It would seem that now is the time to repair the social damage, not to reopen the wounds.

Again, what is to be our role as a nation in the Pacific. What, for instance, do we propose as a government of the mandated islands wrested from Japan? Are we to embark on an imitation of the British imperialism of the nineteenth century? Are these places to become like prostrate Roman provinces under a permanent military or naval government, or are we prepared to extend to these peoples the kind of government which Penn founded and which was embodied in our own organic documents?

We should not forget that when the last shot is fired in the present conflict the ultimate peace will be made at a conference table. While the term "unconditional surrender" is an apt expression by a military commander in the field it is hardly helpful in the settlement of large international issues. Sheer force of arms never has and probably never will organize anything except on a temporary basis. One who should know from experience once said:

"There are only two powers in the world, the sword and the spirit. In the long run the sword will always be conquered by the spirit."

These were not the words of an impractical visionary; this was the considered judgment of the greatest military commander of his day—Napoleon Bonaparte.

We have traveled a hard road since 1919 when we turned a deaf ear to another spiritual and intellectual leader who would have had us assume our just moral responsibilities in international affairs. We are now paying the price of our default with the blood of our youth. The future is just what we make it; we must either approach it with a will to succeed in the making of a just peace enforced by a world organization or sow the seeds for a more terrible conflict.

We with our allies have built up the greatest concentration of power the world has ever seen, power which will reach its zenith with the victory over our enemies and the days that immediately follow. Once again there will rise in our midst those who would have us shirk our moral responsibilities and, like the ostrich, bury our heads in the sands of isolationism. Let us hope that such a day will never come, but that we go forward as faithful stewards of the trust which is ours to wield with all humility the vast power we have in the spirit of the man of conscience.

Eccentric Economics of the T. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Sun of January 27, 1945:

ECCENTRIC ECONOMICS OF THE T. V. A.—REVEALED IN ITS ANNUAL REPORT AS BASED ON USE OF THE NATION'S TAXPAYERS FOR FREE WHEELING

To the EDITOR OF THE SUN:

SIR: I have observed with growing interest the avalanche of governmental publicity about the T. V. A. at a time when the Federal Government is frantically, and very properly, urging the rest of us to forget everything else and to concentrate on winning the war. My suspicions have been aroused by the fact that most of this publicity comes from employees of the T. V. A., who, naturally, have a vested interest in it, and in extending the T. V. A. idea. All of it is couched in glitteringly general terms and its tone smacks strongly of the Alice-in-Wonderland school of literature. Nor were my suspicions allayed when, a few days ago, Mr. Ickes, of all people, branded the T. V. A. chairman as "the busiest propagandist the United States has ever produced."

All in all, this campaign seemed to have the earmarks of another one of those things wherein the Government itself violates all the rules of its Federal Trade Commission as to "truth in advertising," and of its Securities and Exchange Commission's "full disclosure" requirements, as they are so assiduously applied to all the rest of us.

Noting that the T. V. A. had recently issued its annual report, I was at some pains to secure a copy in the hope that it might provide some specific factual data that I could get my teeth into, as contrasted with the laudatory generalities of which I had seen so many and so much. The annual report contains 180 pages, and much of it is a rehash of, and written in the same Frank Merriwellian vein, as that which seems to pervade all T. V. A. publicity. Nevertheless, it is possible to extract many significant facts, of which only two or three can be considered here.

MANY FINGERS, MANY PIES

I suspect that most of us laymen think of T. V. A., primarily, as an electric-power operation and will be surprised, as I was, to learn the extent to which it has gradually branched out into a whole flock of other lines of business. Among others, it is in the business of producing and distributing ammonia, ammonium nitrate, calcium carbide, and cattle feed. It is mining more than half of the phosphate raw materials produced in the entire State of Tennessee. It is operating river freight terminals. It is licensing farmers to operate on its land and is otherwise engaged in the real-estate business in a large way, extending even to the operation of entire villages. It is in the park and recreational business. It has a long finger in the agricultural activities in the T. V. A. area, duplicating largely the functions which the Department of Agriculture was set up to perform. It is, of course, in the construction business in a very big way. And, believe it or not, it is even designing powerhouses for the Russian Government.

All of these extracurricular activities are mentioned only in passing, and to show again the sprawling functions into which the bureaucratic camel always extends himself once he has got his nose into the tent. All T. V. A. publicity is cleverly designed to make it appear that everything it does is in the way of cooperation with local citizens or local government or local industry. However, one cannot study its annual report without getting the very definite impression that T. V. A. provides most of the money for these experiments, and that since it pays the fiddler it calls the tune.

As one specific example, the report states that during the year T. V. A. approved reductions in electric power rates in 4 local communities, although these communities evidently own their own power systems and merely purchase their power at wholesale from T. V. A. I gather from T. V. A.'s report that, altogether, it sells electricity in bulk to 139 local communities, all of which own their own electric systems. Having paid for the electricity they buy from T. V. A., why should the citizens of these local communities then have to ask T. V. A. or any other Federal bureau what they shall charge themselves for the electricity they use from an electric system which they themselves own? In my book that isn't "cooperation," it is statism.

Our metropolitan press has recently carried a publicity release from T. V. A. concerning its tax payments, conveying the distinct impression that T. V. A. is a very prolific source of taxes. What are the facts? The facts are that T. V. A. does not pay a dollar of taxes, as you and I understand the word. What it does is to make a donation (which its own report says is "in lieu of taxes") to certain local areas in which it owns property. However, further investigation develops the fact that this payment is merely a handout; its size and the conditions surrounding it are fixed—not by the local tax assessor, as your taxes and mine are fixed, but by the Federal Government itself. The Federal Government can, therefore, withdraw part or all of this donation whenever it decides, for reasons of its own, political or otherwise. This is another example of how local communities are held in line, and again it isn't cooperation. As a practical matter this donation, in lieu of taxes, serves much the same purpose as the fish serves with the trained seal.

TAX-FREE COMMUNITY

But what about Federal taxes? After all, today it is Federal and not local taxes that are breaking our backs. Here we find that T. V. A. doesn't contribute so much as one thin ruble in taxes to finance the war effort—not even "in lieu of." The T. V. A. enjoys complete freedom from all Federal taxes, even to sales taxes on the gasoline it uses in its automobiles. It is one of the "freedoms" that haven't yet been proposed for you and me.

My last point has to do with the way T. V. A. handles—or fails to handle—the interest on the money that has been put up by the Federal Treasury.

The latest annual report of T. V. A. shows that, so far, $767,634,039 has been invested in it, including some $37,000,000 in property transferred to it when it was set up. This investment is steadily increasing, with no ceiling in sight. However, the report shows that T. V. A. pays interest on only $63,072,500, or one-twelfth of its total investment. Furthermore, as to $56,500,000 of this latter amount, *it pays interest* at an arbitrarily fixed rate of only 1 percent a year, although this particular part of its debt consists of serial bonds calling for interest payments of from 1¾ to 2½ percent a year. On 11 out of every 12 dollars of T. V. A.'s investment you and I pay the interest in our Federal tax bills.

UTOPIAN MORTGAGE

This sounds so fantastic that perhaps it should be simplified. So let's assume that your neighbor, Joe Doakes, owns a home with a $6,000 mortgage on it. Under the T. V. A. plan Joe would pay interest at 1 percent a year on about $500 of his mortgage. On the remaining $5,500 of Joe's mortgage you and the other neighbors would pay the interest for him.

There are many more variegated gentlemen in the T. V. A. woodpile, but this ought to be enough. Even a layman's investigation will show, among other things:

1. That T. V. A. has all the tools needed to control the economy of the area in which it operates, including an absolute, unregulated monopoly of the area's electric power supply.

2. That T. V. A. is not a business but a combination eleemosynary institution and a super-duper political fund with you and me as the contributors, but with no control whatever over the size of the contribution we shall make. It is a hidden item in the bill of every individual who pays a Federal income tax.

3. That Winston Churchill really had something when he said: "We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except a politician or an official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privileges."

4. That maybe Mr. Ickes has something, too.

ORSON BUGGY.

NEW YORK.

Resolutions of National Reclamation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House of Representatives to two resolutions adopted recently by the National Reclamation Association at its annual convention which are of tremendous importance to the 17 Western States that are concerned with the conservation of water for irrigation and other beneficial consumptive uses.

The first resolution, No. 7, recognizes the leadership of President Roosevelt and Secretary of the Interior Ickes in urging that the Congress recognize the prior rights of irrigation and other beneficial consumptive uses of waters in the area of the arid and semiarid regions west of the ninety-seventh meridian. This principle was written into the Flood Control Act passed by both Houses of the Congress and approved by the President on December 22, 1944. No legislation since the enactment of the Reclamation Law of 1902 has shown more emphatically that the Congress recognizes the importance of the conservation of western water resources for irrigation, and that the development of the West as an integral part of the Nation is dependent on the vigilance of Congress to support the President and Secretary Ickes in carrying out the policy that was enunciated in the so-called O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment written into the Flood Control Act.

The second resolution, No. 10, commends the leadership of Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore and Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, in bringing about the reconciliation of the differences in the reports of their respective agencies for the conservation and use of the waters of the Missouri River basin. Commissioner Bashore and General Reybold presented a coordinated plan for the development of the Missouri and its tributaries which was approved in section 9 of the Flood Control Act. The plan for the Missouri River which will serve as a precedent for the development of other western river basins gives full protection to the interests of irrigation and other beneficial consumptive uses of the waters of the Missouri and its tributaries. The resolutions are as follows:

Resolution 7

Whereas President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his letters to Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, and Representative JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, has proclaimed sound national policy in stressing the prior rights of irrigation and other beneficial consumptive uses to the waters of the arid and semiarid regions of the 17 Western States on the principle embodied in the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment; and

Whereas Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes has stanchly supported the President's position on the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment and has advocated before Senate committees that the differences between plans of the Bureau of Reclamation, of his own Department, and the Corps of Engineers, of the War Department, for the Missouri River Basin, be removed by joint action of the two agencies, which has resulted in a reconciliation of the two reports on the Missouri River, in keeping with the President's views for coordinated plans for river-basin development to protect the use of water for irrigation and other beneficial consumptive purposes; and

Whereas the Water Conference at Chicago on September 7 and 8, composed of representatives of 29 States, endorsed the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment as a means of assuring to the individual States a voice in the control of their waters for beneficial consumptive use and Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, from the West as well as other States with water problems, have taken the leadership in supporting this principle: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association commends the statesmanship of the President and the Secretary of the Interior, the forward-looking view of the Chicago Water Conference, and that of the Members of Congress who have taken the leadership for a solution of this vital problem; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association wholeheartedly endorses the action of the Chicago Water Conference and urges the adoption of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendments with any further changes consistent with their principles.

Resolution 10

Be it resolved, That the National Reclamation Association commends Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore and Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, for their

leadership in bringing about the reconciliation of the differences in the two reports for the conservation and use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin and for the presentation of a coordinated plan for the development of the stream and its tributaries with full protection for the interests of irrigation and other beneficial consumptive uses of their waters as set forth in their joint letter of October 25 to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior, and be it further

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association recommends that the pending flood control or rivers and harbors bills be amended to incorporate the authorizations for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers of the projests as set forth in the joint recommendations of Commissioner Bashore and General Reybold; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association urges that the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers proceed promptly to reconcile any conflicting reports on all other western river basins to the end that coordinated plans for the development and use of vital water resources may be presented to Congress in connection with postwar programs for employment and settlement opportunities on irrigated land in the West for returning servicemen and demobilized civilian war workers.

The Soldier Ballots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star:

THE SOLDIER BALLOTS

Secretary Stimson's report on the use of absentee ballots by service men and women, while expressing dissatisfaction with some complexities of the present law, indicates that the President was very wide of the mark when, a year ago, he told Congress that the soldier-vote bill was a fraud on our fighting men and on the American people.

Severely criticizing the State ballots and the voting procedure set up in 1942, Mr. Roosevelt said it would be no less difficult for soldiers to vote under the 1944 law. Perhaps he was right, but the fact is that, difficult or not, about 2,800,000 service ballots were cast in the 1944 Presidential race. In 1942 the service vote was negligible, some estimates placing it at less than one-half of 1 percent of those eligible to vote.

Mr. Stimson said that he had no "authentic" figures for the total number of State absentee ballots and Federal ballots cast last year. It is interesting to note his assertion, however, that in 10 States which approved the Federal ballot and reported to the Army, 28,136, or 2.2 percent, of the eligible persons used the Federal ballots, while 446,974, or 34.6 percent, used the State absentee ballots.

That would indicate that the State ballots were not as objectionable to the troops as some of the pre-election partisans would have had the country believe. No doubt these partisans were convinced that the service vote would be preponderantly for the President—it was about 3 to 2 in his favor—and feared that any difficulty in voting might prejudice his election. Now that the campaign is over and the verdict in, their more extreme complaints against the voting law can be dismissed. Some valid criticisms remain, however, as indicated by Mr. Stimson, and appropriate steps should be taken to meet them before 1946, in the unhappy event that we should still be at war when the elections of that year are held.

Setting the Pace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article by Grantland Rice titled "Setting the Pace," which was published in the New York Sun on January 17, 1945:

SETTING THE PACE

(By Grantland Rice)

NEED OF AN OVER-ALL SPORTS POLICY

What this country needs today, in addition to several other things, is an over-all sports policy at Washington. The Government at Washington admits it. And I'm not referring to unimportant leaders or to unimportant committees. In its job of handling sports, the Government has been a badly baffled and bewildered bunch, with only a vague knowledge of what it is all about. Yet in this country we happen to have over 90,000,000 persons deeply interested in some form of sport.

When some higher up or some committee is given a decision to make, the decision is promptly shuffled over to someone else. And from there the buck is passed again.

"There has been no over-all sports policy in Washington," one of the top leaders told me, "and there has been no sports coordinator named to handle or help out the situation. But we need this over-all policy first. Does the Government at Washington want baseball continued? Yes. But no one there knows what to do about it. Did the Government want racing stopped? No. Not outside of war-production centers, such as Hollywood. It was the Hollywood track that stopped racing, and everyone knows it. It won't be forgotten later. I can promise you that. Strube at Santa Anita was willing to do his share. Hollywood wasn't.

"We know that a lot of mistakes have been made. We also know that the Army and the Navy, especially the Army, have made more than their share of such mistakes in connection with manpower, the IV–F situation, and many other details.

"I can give you one specific example. Many of the IV–F's were put in a false position by Director Jimmy Byrnes and General Marshall. Both denounced IV–F athletes who could play baseball or football but who couldn't carry a gun. There are some 250 big-league ball players classified as IV–F's. Yet the Army has had more than 480 star athletes—such stars as Joe Louis, Billy Conn, Glenn Dobbs, Dippy Evans, and many great baseball players who have been relieved from duty on the fighting fronts for more than 2 years.

"These men are not IV–F's. They are the pick. The total comprises more athletes than baseball or professional football have been using. And these are the ones about whom the returning wounded, and others on furlough from many fighting fronts are complaining. Again I'd like to say it isn't their fault. The fault goes much higher. These men, or most of them, would like to carry guns, or fly planes, or get in some form of fighting action. But they must do what they are ordered to do. And a IV–F can't get into service when they won't take him in."

SITUATION IN WASHINGTON BADLY TANGLED

It is for all these reasons that I say that the country's main demand is an over-all policy as far as all professional sport is concerned. If Washington wants all professional sport stopped—baseball and football in particular—why not say so? But Washington doesn't want these sports stopped. England and Germany tried this system out, ran into a snag, and promptly reversed their positions.

Certainly anything that interferes with the progress of the war should be immediately curbed. Everyone understands that. But this has nothing to do with the badly tangled situation that now exists in all the overlapping boards and committees in Washington which haven't the faintest idea of something that is close to over 90,000,000 American citizens, including at least 10,000,000 servicemen.

Sport has made every possible effort to cooperate with the War Department, from which all orders come.

"And I would like to add," interjected my Washington adviser, "that it is no fault of Judge Patterson or Mr. Stimson. Certainly everyone knows that President Roosevelt is a strong believer in continuing all possible forms of sport. The queer part is that the Washington Government heads, including the Army and Navy departments, are strong for sport.

"For example, everyone knew that the Hollywood track, located in the midst of one of our leading war industry areas, should never have opened. A sane over-all sports policy, plus a coordinator or a head man, would clear up the matter very quickly. And I can tell you that both War and Navy Departments, plus the Manpower Commission and the rest of them in Washington, would like to see this happen. It should have been done at least a year ago. It is a little late now, but not too late."

The main trouble is that, due to the confusion prevailing in Washington today, there may be an even longer delay. This would be unfortunate. It remains to be seen, as someone has said before, just what Washington will do about it—in line with a winning war effort, of course. That part of it is beyond discussion.

I understand that many forms of professional sport don't want any such policy or any coordinator at Washington. Well, these had better wake up. Under such conditions, with the right policy and the right man on the job, racing, in the right places, would still be alive and professional baseball would know just what its place was, with a certainty of holding on. Along these lines Governor Dewey had the right idea when he named Eddie Eagan as the chairman of New York State boxing. Sport could use more Eddie Eagans—if sport could find them.

America, Italy, and the Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at the general membership meeting of the Italian-American Labor Council, held on January 27, 1945:

On the eve of the coming historic meeting of the Big Three, it is appropriate to place before the American people and the public opinion of the United Nations a grave situation which we must begin to remedy at once. This is imperative in order to hasten victory and secure an endurable and enduring peace.

The critical conditions in Italy, the possibilities of Italian political, social and economic rehabilitation and the entire question of the role of the new Italy in the world of tomorrow—all of these are issues which transcend in importance and scope the interests and boundaries of Italy itself. On the solution of these issues the fate of Europe and the future of mankind are, in no small measure, dependent.

In his address on the state of the Nation to the Seventy-ninth Congress, President Roosevelt declared: "It is true that the statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter does not provide rules of easy application to each and every one of this war-torn world's tangled situations. But it is a good and useful thing—it is an essential thing—to have principles toward which we can aim."

The Italian-American Labor Council regretfully declares that in their treatment of Italy, the Allied Powers have to date not been guided by the sound approach proposed by President Roosevelt.

The Atlantic Charter first of all pledges the United Nations to "seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other." In its second point, the United Nations—all of whom are signatories to the Atlantic Charter—specifically pledge themselves "that they desire no territorial changes that do not accord with the fully expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

All the world knows that the Allied Powers and other United Nations have in their treatment of Italy, paid little attention to these first two principles of the Atlantic Charter. In their relations with Italy, the Allied Powers have, to a dangerous degree, disregarded these basic points of the Atlantic Charter as principles towards which they can aim. The extremely harsh armistice terms imposed upon the Italian people after they overthrew Mussolini, and the campaign to take by force from Italy Trieste and Fiume are flagrant violations of the letter and spirit of these principles.

We appeal to our own Government and to all the Allied Powers to lose no time in making it clear to the Yugoslavian regime of Tito that the guiding principles of the Atlantic Charter rule out the proposal of the Yugoslavian Foreign Minister Josip Smodlaka to take away Fiume and Trieste from democratic Italy and annex it to Yugoslavia.

Point 3 of the Atlantic Charter provides that the adhering nations are to "respect the rights of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see the sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

The Italian people were the first ones to be forcibly deprived of their sovereign rights by a Fascist dictatorial regime; the first people in Europe to overthrow a Fascist dictatorship were the Italian people. Certainly, such a nation is entitled to every consideration in its efforts to rewin its sovereign rights and the restoration of self-government. But what do we find? It was painfully revealed in the recent Sforza case that the government of the new Italy has been allowed to exercise authority more in name than in fact. To date, its power has been more fiction than reality. The dominant Allied power in Italy has not allowed the Italian people even to choose its own cabinet members without approval by outside governments.

The fourth point of the Atlantic Charter declares "the United Nations will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity." Furthermore, the Atlantic Charter expresses in its fifth point the desire of the United Nations "to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labor standards, economic adjustment, and social security."

We cannot emphasize too strongly that these have not been the guiding principles of all the Allied Powers in their treatment of the reviving democracy of Italy. The Italian people are paying a dreadful price in suffering and destruction. Their country is a theater of bitterest warfare; they are subjected not merely to all the havoc of military devastation, but also to the vengeful wrath of Hitler and his Mussolini Quislings. Their wealthiest and most industrialized provinces are being ravaged and looted. They are making a gallant effort to contribute decisively to the common victory and to speed the reconstruction of their country. So far, the United Nations have rendered only pitifully inadequate assistance to, and, on occasions, even hampered Italian democracy in its efforts to secure the raw materials and the industrial equipment with which to lay a firm foundation for the return of their economic prosperity.

It is distressing to note the thoroughly insufficient collaboration with resurgent democratic Italy by the United Nations. Anti-Fascist Italy is not being permitted to do its full part in the destruction of Axis tyranny. Hundreds of thousands of her best sons, behind the Nazi lines as well as in the freed areas, are eager to fight against the German hordes but are not being given the proper equipment and are not allowed by the Allied Powers to constitute themselves as an effective national democratic Italian army. What is more, the thoroughly unfair and unsound rate of exchange imposed upon the Italian people has served to depress cruelly labor standards and to block seriously all efforts at economic readjustment in Italy. The military authorities, particularly the British group which is dominant, have imposed wage policies which paralyze all possibility for advancing the social security of the people of liberated Italy.

We hail the declaration made by President Roosevelt to the Seventy-ninth Congress that our country "shall not hesitate to use our influence—and to use it now—to secure so far as it is humanly possible the fulfillment of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We have not shrunk from the military responsibilities brought on by this war. We cannot and will not shrink from the political responsibilities which follow in the wake of battle."

The Italian-American Labor Council calls upon our Government and all its departments to act in the spirit and manner herewith emphasized by President Roosevelt and to pursue vigorously the above course in their relations with all the United Nations.

Our pleas for a forthright and energetic application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter to democratic Italy spring from our desire not only to assure a better life for the peace-loving industrious people of Italy, but, above all, from our devotion to America as the hope of the world in its aspirations and strivings for the triumph of democracy in war and peace and the organization of lasting world security and the enhancement of human progress.

ANNUAL REPORT (1944)

Within the last year, the Italian-American Labor Council has expanded and intensified its activities in behalf of the ideals inspiring America to victory and animating firm friendship between the American and Italian peoples as a cornerstone of lasting world peace.

In this spirit the Italian-American Labor Council has striven to have our country vigorously adhere to and consistently champion the principles of the Atlantic Charter so as to insure their application by the Allies in the treatment of the resurgent Italian nation. Similarly, we have spared no effort to secure adequate, speedy, material relief—Government as well as voluntary individual—to the needy in freed Italy.

Recent developments have only emphasized the value of our work and the urgency of redoubling our endeavors to strengthen the bona fide democratic forces in Italy and to restore the Italian people to their rightful place among the world's great democracies.

Toward attaining these objectives, the Italian-American Labor Council continuously worked for:

1. Just and honorable treatment of Italy, by our own country and the other United Nations, on a number of occasions critical in the regeneration of Italian national freedom and democracy.

2. Overcoming all barriers to prompt and sufficient shipment of food, clothing, and medicines from America to the ailing and hungry in liberated Italy.

3. Facilitating the reestablishment of genuine free trade-unions as the bulwark of reviving Italian democracy.

4. Establishing close relations and active cooperation between organized labor in America and the truly liberal forces and the democratic elements in the labor movement of Italy now being rebuilt.

5. Energetic and generous assistance to the heroic underground and democratic resistance forces in Nazi-occupied northern Italy.

1. Toward a virile, independent Italian democracy

The trials and tribulations of the reborn Italian democracy are too numerous and difficult to recount. Italy is a theater of desperate warfare. The country has suffered the heaviest hardships and most cruel losses as a result of two decades of Fascist dictatorship, a disastrous adventurist war brutally forced on the people, terrible devastation incurred through the clash of hostile armies, savage depredations and massacres at the hands of the Nazis and their Mussolini Quislings, the persistent danger of reactionary domination and Fascist revival, as well as the menace of totalitarian dictatorship of a different stripe constantly hovering over the land.

These tragic and trying circumstances have been further aggravated by the false policies of the United Nations—particularly those of Britain, the dominant Allied power in Italy.

The Italian-American Labor Council has been on the alert to mobilize American public opinion and the prestige and power of our country in support of the full sovereignty of the Italian people and in behalf of their uphill struggle to establish firm democratic institutions in their land.

A. Thus, in several instances the Italian-American Labor Council has written to and interceded with the President of the United States and the State Department, and has issued special statements to the press centering attention on the critical conditions in liberated Italy and on the best ways of overcoming them. We need only recall our letter of December 7, 1944, to President Roosevelt on the occasion of Britain's unwarranted veto on Count Sforza and the subsequent declaration by Secretary of State Stettinius dissociating the American Government from this high-handed British maneuver against Italian national sovereignty and self-government.

B. In this vein, our Columbus Day celebration and the "four freedoms" award were

utilized effectively and aroused splendid international response. With President Roosevelt accepting our award and addressing America and the world through the Italian-American Labor Council, with Premier Bonomi speaking to the American people through our Columbus Day celebration, and with Attorney General Biddle and a galaxy of other renowned personages addressing us on the occasion of the "four freedoms" award to the President of the United States, we were able to spotlight world-wide attention on the needs of the Italian people on the imperative necessity of Italo-American friendship and the urgency of according democratic Italy the status and rights of an ally, a full-fledged member of the United Nations.

C. On October 18, 1944, United States Attorney General Francis Biddle and President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, accompanied a delegation of the Italian-American Labor Council to the White House where President Roosevelt in person accepted the "four freedoms" award. This proved to be another occasion for arousing American public opinion to the faith and hope placed by the Italian people in our country and to the burning need of rushing relief to Italy and restoring her to an honorable place among the great nations.

D. As Americans we naturally were very active in the historic Presidential elections. In this moment of intense interest on the part of the American people in international affairs, we, as Americans of Italian descent, endeavored to arouse our country to the tremendous responsibility and opportunity it has—to do everything in its power to hasten victory and enduring peace by having the Allies apply in Italy and other liberated lands the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms."

E. Our participation in the national elections proved effective and helpful in bringing home to American labor in general and to Americans of Italian lineage in particular the vital necessity of reelecting President Roosevelt in order to avoid chaos and confusion at home and irreparable disaster abroad.

2. Relief for liberated Italy

A. The Italian-American Labor Council affiliated to the American Committee for Italian Relief and mobilized all its forces and resources for securing best results in helping the sick and famished in the land of our forebears. Posters, leaflets, and other literature were provided and circulated. The radio was used to the fullest extent.

B. There were set up more than 50 depots to receive the clothing and contributions. Thanks to the courtesy of the I. L. G. W. U., the building at 3 West Sixteenth Street was transformed into a general warehouse.

C. All constituent units of the Italian-American Labor Council cooperated actively with various Italo-American institutions and organizations throughout the country to put over a magnificent relief drive.

D. It is conservatively estimated that we have collected and consigned 308,694 pieces of wearing apparel of the approximate value of $1,500,000 to the American Relief for Italy, Inc.

E Besides this, we have raised $16,997 for food, medicines, and clothing to be purchased and shipped to Italy. Local 39, one of our affiliates, at its jubilee celebration raised and gave to the American Relief for Italy, Inc., $40,000.

F. Realizing the tremendous needs of Italian relief and recognizing that even the most generous private relief is insufficient, the Italian-American Labor Council has been doing everything in its power to secure U. N. R. R. A. and other official United Nations agencies and American Government assistance to freed Italy.

3. Helping Italy's democratic and free trade union forces

A. Behind the Nazi lines there is a magnificent Italian resistance movement rivaling in number and strength the best of other resistance movements on the European continent. Obviously, we cannot disclose details, but we have been rendering substantial material and other aid to the heroic democratic forces within this army of resistance battling ever-more effectively against the German armies and Nazi-Fascist terror in the northern provinces.

B. Our drive to aid the rebirth of genuine free trade unions in Italy has received considerable international attention.

C. To date the Italian-American Labor Council has raised $132,064.90 for helping the establishment of an Italian free trade union movement—free from all Government and political domination. An itemized statement of accounts is herewith attached.

D. As can be seen from the itemized report, the response of the I. L. G. W. U. and its locals has been particularly generous. They contributed with $99,905.10. Another outstanding donation of $10,000 was received from the Labor League for Human Rights. It is to be regretted that we are still far from our goal of one-quarter of a million dollars.

E. A most vital part of the drive to help restore bona fide Italian trade unionism was the trip by our president, Luigi Antonini, as A. F. of L. representative to liberated Italy. As a result of this trip, we have been able to render invaluable services to regenerated Italian labor and democracy and to the friendship between the two nations.

F. On the basis of full compliance with the Pact of Rome, we are confident Italian labor will be able to register real successes in building a mighty section of the world's free trade union movement.

4 Italo-American labor solidarity

A. A great forward step toward real cooperation between American and Italian labor was made, when the American Federation of Labor decided to select our President Luigi Antonini as its official representative to the emerging free trade union movement of Italy.

B. This trend was considerably strengthened through the energetic activities of Brother Antonini in Italy and through his written and oral report to the last convention of the American Federation of Labor held at New Orleans in November 1944. In confirmation of this friendly American Labor attitude to the rising Italian Free Trade Unions we herewith reproduce in part, from the report of Matthew Woll in behalf of the Committee on International Relations unanimously adopted by the American Federation of Labor Convention, the following:

"1. The American Federation of Labor should give its full support to the democratic elements in the Italian labor movement, to those elements which are opposed to totalitarian organization and domination.

"2. Italy is economically ruined and its economy is at a low ebb. The Italian people are hungry, ill-clothed, and despairing of the future. For months after the fall of fascism, the frantically anticipated relief from the Allied countries has been coming over only in dribblets. Lately, this help, especially from America, has increased. It is terribly urgent that this help be multiplied during the coming months. The splendid movement undertaken by the American Committee for Italian Relief, with the cooperation of the Italian-American Labor Council of New York, to collect clothing for the stricken Italian population, which has resulted in hundreds of thousands of garments already forwarded to Italy, deserves hearty commendation. Such help, however, meets only a small fraction of the vast needs. We call upon the agencies of our Government charged with distribution of relief abroad to consider the tragic situation in Italy and to redouble their efforts in that direction without delay and procrastination.

"3. We must not fail to realize that the Italian people are eagerly awaiting the hour of restoration of their national sovereignty and that such a restoration is incompatible with the thought of protracted military occupation. Moreover, our policy toward Italy must be such that would make it clear to the Italian population of every political belief and economic group that America will not support either dismemberment of their country or the imposition of a form of government to which they are irrevocably opposed.

"Such an open and declared policy will strengthen immensely the elements of democracy throughout Italy and infuse hope and confidence among the democratic contingents in the trade unions. For, as Brother Antonini has succinctly stated in concluding his report: 'Only in the atmosphere of a truly democratic country free of the perils of totalitarianism, is there hope for a truly democratic and free trade-union organization to develop and prosper.' "

This historic declaration will serve as a beacon light not only for the American labor movement but for the entire American people.

C. In collaboration with the British Trade Union Congress, the International Federation of Trade Unions, a representative of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the most authoritative spokesmen of Italian labor, Brother Antonini was able to survey conditions, prepare instructive material, and make valuable proposals for assuring the triumph of bona fide free unions in the new Italy. During his stay, Brother Antonini helped all deserving forces without any discrimination in behalf of the Italian-American Labor Council.

5. Social services

A. It is unnecessary for us at this point to go into the countless details of our efforts in behalf of many scores of Americans of Italian extraction in connection with the Red Cross, United States Immigration Department, United States Post Office Department, Office of War Information, Office of the Army Provost Marshal, and prisoners of war, etc.

B. In this connection, we can also refer to the considerable amount of work done by the Italian-American Labor Council to secure better treatment and justice for the sailors of the Italian Government ship *Saturnia*.

C. For some time, the Italian-American Labor Council has been aiding refugees from Italian fascism who had fled to countries like Switzerland and Mexico.

4. After the Italian people overthrew Mussolini and the German army of occupation swooped down upon the northern sections of the country, thousands of the finest fighters for democracy and labor had to flee the savage vengeance and terror of the Nazis and their Fascist quislings.

We responded to the urgent needs of this terrible emergency by rallying substantial support for these victims of Nazi tyranny. Through our recommendation and request and with the aid of the League for Human Rights, the National War Fund allocated the sum of $74,800 to be distributed by the Unitarian Service Committee among the political refugees in Switzerland.

E. During the past year, the Italian-American Labor Council has become more widely known in the ranks of organized labor in particular and the American public as a whole.

F. This is confirmed by the many inquiries we have been receiving from sundry Government institutions, by the mounting interest manifested in our work and reports by an ever-larger number of public libraries throughout the country.

CONCLUSION

The above outline report of our principal activities is in no way a full picture of the

fine efforts and help rendered by the various organizations constituting the Italian-American Labor Council. We are proud of their work. In this regard, we express our special appreciation to the various locals and joint boards of the I. L. G. W. U. for their timely support of our campaigns. We need but cite the exemplary solidarity manifested by the Dress Joint Board of New York in allocating $35,000 to help the underground labor and liberal movements of Italy. It is most inspiring to note that American workers of Italian and other origins worked side by side for 2 hours for funds earmarked to aid the democratic resistance and underground movement of all oppressed lands.

Today, the Italian-American Labor Council is the only organization in America that provides systematically moral and material assistance for the widespread activities of the underground forces courageously battling the Nazi barbarians. We devoted ourselves to this task in addition to continuous vigorous cooperation with other organizations in providing material help to the hungry and sick in liberated Italy.

In all our activities we come forward and serve not as an Italian organization in America. We function as an American organization interested above all in our own country pursuing shound domestic and foreign policies so that it should be able to fulfill its great world mission as a mighty force for international human decency, welfare, and progress.

At the moment, Italy is a crucible—the testing ground of American and United Nations policies in war and peace. In this light we have emphasized with special vigor the indispensibilty of the United States and other allied powers pursuing in Italy, and in all other liberated lands, a course based on the Atlantic Charter—the only road to speedy victory and a just and enduring peace.

Luigi Antonini, president; Arthur Esposito, vice president; Eduardo Molisani, vice president; John Gelo, treasurer; Joseph Procopio, secretary; Silvo Battini; Frank Bottaccini; Alex Di Brizzi; Alberto Campobasso; Philip Ciaccia, Anthony Cottone; Louis F. Donato; Umberto Gualtieri; Salvatore Ninfo, the executive committee.

JANUARY 27, 1945.

The Bretton Woods Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] before the annual convention of the Colorado State Mining Association in Denver on January 27, 1945, on the subject of the Bretton Woods agreement.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio has spent a great deal of time in the study of this proposal. His observations have attracted Nation-wide attention. In view of the importance of this subject, I include the full text of his Denver speech, which follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me to come to Denver and participate in the proceedings of your annual meeting of the Colorado Mining Association. I wish to express to you my gratitude for being afforded the opportunity to address you on the subject you have assigned me. Seeing that you have a full schedule, I shall immediately proceed with my discussion.

Before doing so, however, I should like to say that from all I can learn in Washington about the mining industries in Colorado and the other Western States, you are performing a wonderful job in aiding the war effort. For this, the whole Nation salutes you.

THE KEYNES-MORGENTHAU SCHEME OR THE BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT

For many years prior to the outbreak of war in 1914, the world maintained a free gold market internationally, as did also the more industrially advanced countries in their domestic economies.

The right of individual ownership of property was more secure, men in all walks of life were afforded a greater protection in the enjoyment of the fruits of their labor, and the distribution of wealth was more equitable than at any time in history.

Came the war, and all that was changed. Statesmanship broke down. Politics came into the saddle. The free gold market was completely destroyed in the domestic economies and largely internationally.

Along with this have gone competition, the sanctity of contract, monetary and financial integrity in government, and all the social protective forces for the preservation of liberty.

Financially distressed governments, true to their tradition, resorted to their old tricks—coin clipping, printing press money, and stabilization schemes of one kind or another, etc. And now comes the panacea for most, if not all, of our domestic and international ills, the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme, or so-called Bretton Woods proposal for an international monetary fund and bank for reconstruction and development.

THE SEVERAL DRAFT PROPOSALS FOR AN INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AUTHORITY

Simultaneously during the first week in April 1943 two proposals for an international monetary authority were made public in the United States. One came from London and was called International Clearing Union, the formulating of which was credited to Lord John Maynard Keynes, advisor to the British Exchequer and Governor of the Bank of England. The other originated in Washington and was credited to Mr. Harry D. White, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury.

In July 1943 Secretary Morgenthau released a revised draft of the so-called White plan, and in April 1944 a rerevised draft.

A study of the British and American proposals showed that our Treasury officials had done little else but copy from the Keynes' plan for an international clearing union, as outlined in the Whitish white paper.

Nor has the Bretton Woods fund proposal changed this situation. There is nothing of importance in it that does not stem from Lord Keynes' plan.

I shall confine my discussion to the fund proposal. This is so complicated and involved, and embraces so much territory, that it would require a goodly sized volume to fully discuss it. In the short time at my disposal, I can do not more than briefly touch upon a few of its more important provisions.

PURPOSES

The stated purposes of the Bretton Woods fund proposal are the promotion of international monetary cooperation, facilitation, expansion, and balanced growth of international trade, promotion of exchange stability, avoidance of exchange depreciation, establishment of a multilateral system in respect of current transactions between members and the elimination of foreign-exchange restrictions.

These are all praiseworthy objectives. They comprehend those principles of international intercourse to which all of us subscribe. The trouble is, however, that the proclaimed purposes of the scheme are not much in accord with its provisions nor with the approach taken to their attainment. Especially does the record of past and present performances of most of the governments concerned fail to check with these avowed high purposes.

MEMBERSHIP

Forty-five countries would become members of the fund. It would become operative when those countries having 65 percent of the total quotas had signed the agreement, but not before May 1, 1945. The United States, British Empire, Soviet Union, and China would be given 65 percent of the quotas. Therefore the fund would be established when these four powers had signed the agreement.

CAPITALIZATION AND QUOTAS

The fund would have a capitalization of $8,800,000,000. Each member country would be allotted a quota, or an amount of shares, to be subscribed to it. The projected quotas are not based on economic considerations—amount of foreign trade, gold holdings, etc.—but on military strength, power politics, and national self-interest.

ALTERATION OF QUOTAS

The fund could at intervals of 5 years raise or lower the quotas of members. Or it could at any other time at the request of a member change its quota. So that our quota could be changed at any time upon the request of the President through his representative on the fund.

This is an important provision, since it could be used to increase the quota or lending power of the United States, and will be mentioned again later.

COMPOSITION OF FUND

The capital subscription of each country would be composed of gold on the one hand and political promises to pay in the form of paper currency or government obligations of some sort on the other.

Each country would have the choice of paying in gold either 25 percent of its quota, or 10 percent of its net official holdings of gold and United States dollars, whichever of these two was the smaller.

No official figures are available to show the amount of gold each country would be required to pay into the fund. Even the Treasury does not know what the gold holding of the Soviet Union is, as Stalin keeps that secret. From my studies of such data as are available respecting the gold holdings of the prospective members of the scheme, I am convinced that the amounts of gold many of them would subscribe to the fund would be almost negligible.

CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTION OF UNITED STATES

The capital subscription of the United States to the fund would be $2,750,000,000. Since dollars are internationally convertible into gold on demand, our total subscription would be composed of gold and paper representing full gold value. This would not be true of most of the other subscriptions. The paper that would be subscribed by the other countries would vary in quality from full convertibility to almost complete inconvertibility. Yet the poorest quality paper in the fund would buy as much goods as the best. As has been pointed out by others, the poorer currencies would tend, internationally, to drive out the better ones.

FUND AS LENDING AGENCY

The fund would largely serve as a lending agency. The participating countries would be divided into two groups, lenders and borrowers. The United States would become

the principal, if not almost the sole lender. Most of the other nations would become borrowers.

Neither the amount of gold subscribed by a member nor its record in fulfilling its contractual obligations in the past would play any part in determining its credit worthiness. More than 20 of the prospective member countries have been in default on loans made to them by the United States.

A member could borrow just as much whether it paid its full subscription in gold or none at all. It seems the poorer its credit, the better off a country would be.

It should be noted that while the formula provides for the payment of gold in some amount, under another article this could be amended so as to eliminate any gold requirement.

Each debtor country would be allowed to borrow from the fund an amount equaling its quota, and only up to 25 percent of its quota in any 1 year. These limitations, however, could be set aside since it is further provided that the fund may, in its discretion, waive these limitations.

That there likely would be strong demand by debtor members for increasing their borrowing capacities has already been indicated by the dickering and scrambling for higher quotas in which they indulged at Bretton Woods.

PAR VALUES: BANCOR OR UNITAS?

The proposal provides that "The par value of the currency of each member shall be expressed in terms of gold as a common denominator or in terms of the United States dollar of the weight and fineness in effect July 1, 1944."

Here the way would be open to the fund for adopting an international bank money or unit of account and call it bancor, as Lord Keynes suggested in his proposal for an international clearing union, or unitas, as suggested by Mr. Morgenthau for an international stabilization fund, or any one of several other designations which have been mentioned.

As will be recalled, Morgenthau's unitas was severely criticized by some American writers.

It is easy to see why London should prefer unitas to the dollar, considering the international position of the pound sterling, but it is difficult to see why Washington should chime in with London, considering the international position of the dollar.

Why should we be asked to give up the great prestige in international trade and commerce which the dollar sign has so meritoriously earned for us? If conditions were reversed, would Lord Keynes be suggesting bancor?

PROMOTION OF EXCHANGE—STABILITY OR INSTABILITY?

One of the stated purposes of the fund is to promote exchange stability. However, it should be observed that the Bretton Woods proposal places much less emphasis on exchange stability than the Treasury did in its draft proposals, especially the first one.

Recall that Morgenthau's two first draft proposals were titled "Stabilization Fund." The very first item under "Purposes of the fund" in his first draft started with "to stabilize the foreign currencies."

In the Bretton Woods agreement, exchange stability is the third item listed under "Purposes of the fund," and reads: "To promote exchange stability."

Morgenthau's first draft also provided that the guiding principle in fixing the rates at which it (the fund) will buy and sell one member's currency for another, and the rates in local currencies at which it will buy and sell gold, shall be stability in exchange relationships.

In the Bretton Woods proposal nothing is said about any guiding principle, but only that "each member undertakes to collaborate with the fund to promote exchange stability."

Maybe Mr. Morgenthau and his experts became a little allergic to currency stabilization, since it raised a question as to their policy of pre- and post-war deficit financing. Historically speaking, Government deficit financing and stable exchange rates can hardly be said to be congenial bedfellows, and surely the gentlemen in the Treasury must know that the general public is possessed of some awareness of this fact.

At any rate, as will be mentioned in a moment, whereas exchange stability was in Mr. Morgenthau's first draft, one, if not the principal, objective to be sought, the Bretton Woods proposal provides so much leeway to countries for debasing their currencies that it is difficult to see how it can be claimed that stability in exchange rates is one of the objectives of the scheme.

The fund proposal would make legal provision giving to each member country the right to change, that is lower or debase its currency. A member could debase its currency 10 percent without consulting the fund. It could debase it an additional 10 percent with the concurrence of the fund.

Then it is specifically provided that "the fund shall concur in a proposed change * * * if it is satisfied that the change is necessary to correct a fundamental disequilibrium. In particular, provided it is so satisfied, it shall not object to a proposed change because of the domestic, social, or political policies of the member proposing the change."

What other grounds than those relating to domestic, social, or political policies could there be for objecting to a member's request for debasing its currency? The fact is that the fund proposal not only fails to provide any prohibition against members debasing their currencies, but actually provides an easy way for them to do this, and on top of it legalizes debasement to give it respectability.

The language dealing with exchange stability had to state in clear and reassuring terms to prospective members that the fund would not permit any country from debasing its currency, for otherwise not many could have been induced to interest themselves in the project.

Exchange stability is possible only when governments keep their budgets balanced and refrain from printing money.

How many governments are there in the world who would join anything which prohibited them from spending more than they collected in taxes, and which took away from them the power to manufacture money with a printing press? Surely not many.

How would our own Government stand on that kind of proposition? Judging from its pre-war record of spending, and its projected post-war spending, is it likely that it would fall over itself to become a charter member of an international fraternity that had the power to make it live within its income?

The fund proposal envisions a stimulation of production and trading by means of fiat credit, in accordance with Keynes' "expansionist" theory as outlined in the British white paper. Lord Keynes is perhaps the most effective apostle of phony money that has ever lived. I think he has John Law backed clear off the map.

This proposed scheme would extend the process of currency and credit inflation that has been so rampant in most of the domestic economies into the international domain, which could not help but intensify exchange instability throughout the world.

UNIFORM CHANGES IN PAR VALUES OF CURRENCIES

We now come to some most remarkable provisions in the Bretton Woods agreement. One of these provides that the fund could by a majority of the total voting power make uniform proportionate debasements in the currencies of all members, provided each such debasement was approved by every member which had 10 percent or more of the total of the quotas.

The United States, United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union would be the only countries having 10 percent or more of the total quotas. Therefore, these three powers could effectuate a uniform debasement of the currencies of member countries. They could lower the gold value or content of the dollar at will. The Congress could do nothing about it.

WORLD-WIDE REPUDIATION OF DEBTS

This provision for making uniform reductions in the par values of the currencies of member countries would provide the way for them to repudiate their international debts, and do so with the sanction of law. That is the purpose of this provision.

Do we as a nation want to defile our long record of faithful performance in meeting our international commitments by becoming part of a scheme, one of whose sinister purposes is universal welshing on international debts and giving to such deed respectability by legalizing it? I cannot believe it.

SURRENDER OF OUR SOVEREIGNTY

But the proponents of the scheme will tell us that our money could not be tinkered with except with our consent, that we would have the veto power over any attempt that might be made to do this. Who would have the veto power? The Congress? No. The President, as a member of an international body, would have the power to say whether our money should be debased or not. The Congress would be shorn of its power over our money.

There is no provision in the Constitution that is more believed in, or better known to the American people than the one which vests in the Congress sole power over our money. Time and again our courts have been called upon to consider this grant of power and without a single exception have ruled that Congress and Congress alone possesses all power over our money.

Yet, here we have this brazen Keynes' proposal, embodied in the form of a tentative international agreement, to which our President has subscribed, to make it possible for a group of self-seeking internationalists to usurp from the Congress of the United States the soverign power over our money, the very essence of the entirety of our sovereignty, which the Constitution vests in it. Has our Nation so completely lost its soul that it is willing to abjectly hand over to the neo-internationalists our sovereignty, the power over our money? I cannot believe it.

INTEREST CHARGES

In Morgenthau's draft proposals no provision was made for interest charges on loans made by the fund. The Bretton Woods agreement makes provision for interest charge on loans. However, through the amendments provision the interest charges provided for in the agreement could be altered or eliminated altogether.

CONTROL OF CAPITAL TRANSFERS

Capital transfers would be controlled. This means that all exports and imports would be under strict surveillance. For this provision to be effective it would be necessary to exercise a virtual dictatorship over all international dealings, including censorship of mails.

SCARCE CURRENCIES

One of the stated purposes of the fund is the elimination of foreign exchange restrictions. Yet, the proposal provides that in the event a member's currency became scarce, it would be rationed. Suppose the scarcity involved our currency. Let me here quote Dr. Benjamin M. Anderson on this point:

"Now this means that when dollars grow scarce in the fund all the countries needing dollars must ration out their supplies. It is by this method that the fund would prevent

the depreciation of the weaker currencies in terms of the dollar. This means price-fixing of dollars, and rationing of dollars as part of the price-fixing, in all the weaker countries. It destroys a free foreign exchange market in the dollar in those countries.

* * * * *

"With the free foreign exchange markets of 1919 and 1920 the exporter, selling in francs or lire, might find that the foreign exchange market had gone against him and that he got less dollars than he expected for his francs or lire or sterling, but, at all events, he could take his losses, sell them for what they would bring in the foreign exchange market, and liquidate his own debts. But with this new arrangement, designed to encourage exports and promising stabilized exchange rates, he might suddenly find that he had no market at all, that his foreign currencies were blocked, and that he himself, with his assets in the form of illiquid blocked foreign currencies, was a bankrupt unable to pay his own debts. There would be indeed a fixed exchange rate, but there would be no exchange market."

Provision is made for replenishing the fund's holdings of scarce currencies. This could be done in several ways, one of which would be for the fund to borrow currency from the affected country. Suppose the fund's holdings of dollars became scarce. Then the President, through his representative on the fund, could authorize the fund to borrow dollars from the United States. Resort would be had to the Federal Reserve banks for such borrowing.

No congressional action would be required for authorizing the Federal Reserve banks to extend the requested loans. This would virtually give the President the power to appropriate money which is now vested in the Congress by the Constitution.

Nor is there is any limit on the amount of dollars the fund could borrow. The funds so borrowed would represent further pyramiding of Federal Reserve bank credit and would be highly inflationary.

But as previously stated, the fund could increase our quota, that is, our lending power. This could be done by the President with the support of 53 percent of the voting power of other members, which should not be difficult to get, considering that most of the members would be borrowers. The Congress would then be legally obligated to vote the funds for the subscription necessary to meet the increase in our quota.

DISTRIBUTION OF VOTING POWER

The allocation in the fund proposal of voting power to the members is, like the size of the quotas, not predicated on economic considerations but on military strength, power politics, and nationalistic self-interest. The United States would be given about 27 percent of the total voting power and the British Empire 25 percent. Since most of the decisions would be made by a majority vote, these two countries would be in control of the fund.

The Soviet Union would be given 12 percent of the voting power.

To illustrate the disregard that was had for foreign trade in fixing the voting powers of members; Russia exported in 1938 about as much as Poland, yet, Russia was given seven times more voting power than Poland.

The borrowing countries would have a majority of the voting power. They would be in complete control of the fund and could formulate its lending policies.

It is conservatively estimated that the gold holdings of the fund, plus its holdings of those currencies that likely would be in greatest demand, approximately $4,000,000,000, and that the United States would supply about 70 percent of this amount. Yet, we would have only 27 percent of the votes.

Why should the United States allow itself to be inveigled into a crazy one-sided scheme like this?

INITIAL SUBSCRIPTION ONLY A STARTER

The initial amount of our subscription to the International Monetary Fund and Bank would be about $6,000,000,000, a sum of money which will again look large to us if we ever get sobered up from our drunken spending spree. But probably $6,000,000,000 would be only a starter.

Once this scheme was established we should be prepared to continue to pour more and more of our gold and goods into its bottomless pit.

MOTIVATION FOR SCHEME

The primary motivation for the creation of this scheme is the financial distress and weakened trade position in which Great Britain fears she may find herself after the war and her desire to restore London as the world's banker. We are for the moment concerned only with her blocked sterling balances, that is her foreign unfunded debts. Lord Keynes has given the figure of $12,000,000,000 as the total of Britain's external debt, four billion of which is accounted for by India's credit in blocked sterling. South American and other countries hold large sterling balances in London.

The first thing Lord Keynes listed under "Objects of the plan" in his proposal for a clearing union was the need for an instrument of international currency having general acceptability between nations, so that blocked balances are unnecessary. As stated he suggested "bancor" as the international currency, while Morgenthau suggested "unitas."

The Treasury's two first draft proposals for a stabilization fund contained a provision for dealing with these blocked balances which were of so much concern to Keynes. What this amounted to was an artful arrangement to induce the United States to underwrite and assume the British foreign debts which were involved in these blocked sterling balances.

The language used in drawing up this provision was extremely technical. It was a most remarkable device. Certainly nothing like it had ever been attempted before. It is one thing for us to give Britain financial aid, but it is quite another for her to try to secure such aid from us in the manner provided for in the blocked balances arrangement contained in Morgenthau's draft proposals.

Mr. Morgenthau dropped that proposal in his third draft, and, of course, it is not contained in the Bretton Woods proposal. But this is not saying that, should the Bretton Woods scheme go through, it would not provide a way whereby the United States could be made to assume these British debts. On the contrary, it appears to me that the fund could and would be so operated as to bring this about.

If the English pound sterling were unblocked and left to find its true value in a free market, its exchange rate would probably drop considerably.

One of the main objects of this scheme is to place the United States' gold stocks at the disposal of the British Government for the support of the pound sterling. It certainly should by now be no secret that London hopes, through this scheme, to help it regain its position as the world's banker and financial center.

Here I should like to quote Lord Keynes, the spearhead of this scheme. In presenting it to the House of Lords, he said:

"So far from an international plan endangering the long tradition, by which most empire countries, and many other countries, too, have centered their financial systems in London, the plan is, in my judgment, an indispensible means of maintaining this tradition."

I have been criticized for opposing this scheme; for not offering a substitute. Gentlemen, there just is no substitute for a monstrous proposal like this. If England needs our help she should come to us with her proposition face up, so that we can both see what we are signing. The greatest good we can do England right now is to refuse to have anything more to do with Lord John Maynard Keynes and all of his kind, because I believe he is as dangerous to his own country as he is to ours. But the question of real and lasting aid to England is a matter foreign to any discussion relating to the Bretton Woods proposal.

The Bretton Woods proposal is of much concern to India, Egypt, Latin-American, and Scandinavian countries because of their large holdings of blocked sterling balances in London. The gold and credit resources which the United States would make available through the fund to Great Britain would be of material help to her in funding, servicing, and paying off her debts to those countries. This is one reason why those countries are pressing so hard to have the United States effectuate this scheme. The making available to them loans by the United States through the fund is the other reason.

It must be realized that the money which the United States would lend to member countries could not be paid back to the United States except in goods. Furthermore, we would have to take the kind of goods they had to sell, whether we wanted them or not, or nothing.

We see here what so many of the foreign countries who are interested in promoting this scheme mean when they argue that unless the Bretton Woods proposal is adopted in its present form the opportunity for setting up an organization for international cooperation will be lost.

Plainly speaking, they want the United States to pay debts which Great Britain owes them and to lend them money. This is for many of the prospective members of the plan about all the meat contained in the Bretton Woods proposal. It should be easy to see why they don't want any substitute. For them there couldn't be any.

When we get somewhere near the heart of this scheme, we can also sense the reason for the great secrecy in which Mr. Morgenthau has shrouded his movements in promoting it, and also his anxiety to put it over just as quickly as possible. Time and darkness are to him the essence of success in having it approved by the Congress. Given sufficient light and time, the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme will be turned down by the Congress and the people in no uncertain terms.

CONTROL OF WORLD PRICE OF GOLD

The proposal would vest in the international monetary authority operating the scheme the power to control the world price of gold. This would constitute the ultima ratio of political power, and to the extent that the men in control of the scheme were capable of exercising it they would possess the power of life and death over each and every country in the world.

To presume that a group of men is endowed with sufficient intelligence that, if given the power, it could improve upon the control of the world price of gold, which power has been exercised by the social forces in process of evolution for 5,000 years, is to invest it with attributes superior to any possessed by God.

POSITION OF GOLD

What would be the position of gold should the Bretton Woods proposal be adopted? Would it have the effect of further demonitizing gold internationally? You gentlemen representing gold mining interest in the United States may be especially concerned in knowing the answer to this question.

We know what has been the position of our Treasury respecting the gold standard. Harry D. White, Mr. Morgenthau's expert, has severely criticized it and we know that the Treasury's entire fiscal and monetary policy has been to annihilate it, so far as our domestic economy is concerned.

Perhaps it would be better to quote again the father of this scheme. In the same speech from which I have just quoted and after explaining the manifold advantages that would accrue to his country by its adoption, he said:

"I hope your lordships will trust me not to have turned my back on all I have fought for. To establish those three principles which I have just stated has been my main task for the last 20 years. Sometimes almost alone, in popular articles in the press, in pamphlets, in dozens of letters to the Times, in textbooks, in enormous and obscure treatises I have spent my strength to persuade my countrymen and the world at large to change their traditional doctrines and, by taking better thought, to remove the curse of unemployment. Was it not I, when many of today's iconoclasts were still worshipers of the calf, who wrote that 'Gold is a barbarous relic'? Am I so faithless, so forgetful, so senile, that at the very moment of the triumph of these ideas when, with gathering momentum, governments, parliaments, banks, the press, the public, and even economists, have at last accepted the new doctrines, I go off to help forge new chains to hold us fast in the old dungeon? I trust, my lords, that you will not believe it."

Then further on in his speech, in order to remove all possible doubt as to his position on the gold standard, he said:

"If I have any authority to pronounce on what is and what is not the essence and meaning of a gold standard, I should say that this plan is the exact opposite of it."

ABANDONMENT OF GOLD STANDARD

Practically every nation in the world has already abandoned the gold standard in its domestic economy. Before the House Banking and Currency Committee, after I had put the direct question to Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, as to whether there was any relation between our gold reserves and bank and circulating currency, the following colloquy took place:

"Mr. ECCLES. I do deny that the amount of the gold reserve, the gold requirements have anything to do with the price level, which means it has nothing to do with the value of the currency.

"Mr. SMITH. Aren't you in effect saying there is no relation whatever between the gold in this country and our currency?

"Mr. ECCLES. That is right.

"Mr. SMITH. There is no relation whatever?

"Mr. ECCLES. That is right.

"Mr. SMITH. You then take the attitude we are completely off the gold standard?

"Mr. ECCLES. Yes; completely."

In this I think Mr. Eccles is correct. There is no doubt in my mind that we have abandoned completely the gold standard, so far as our domestic economy is concerned, and that we are just as completely on a political promise-to-pay standard.

Is this situation encouraging to the gold-mining interests? Why should our people be taxed to pay for digging gold out of the earth in one part of the country, only to be buried in the earth in another, where it remains as useless to our economic life as it was in its natural state?

WORLD-WIDE TRADE AND MONETARY CARTEL

The proposed international monetary fund has all the earmarks of a world-wide trade and monetary cartel. It would control trade, supply and demand of foreign exchange, rates of exchange, capital transfers, and the price of gold. Like all cartels, its main purpose is to annihilate competition—that is, liberty.

Two other world-wide movements are now in process which must be considered in connection with the Bretton Woods proposal to establish a world-wide trade and monetary cartel. These are the many commodity control schemes, such as the international tin agreement, international rubber agreement, the Chadbourne sugar plan, etc., and nationalistic monopoly of foreign trade as existent in the Soviet Union.

All of these schemes involve the basic principles of a cartel, and like all cartels, are moving in the direction of international barter arrangements. No one, of course, can tell how far this may go or the extent to which it will push gold out of the international economy. It appears to me, however, that these international schemes have the prospect of completely demonetizing gold internationally and setting up a world-wide political monopoly of ownership and control of gold on the order of the individual political monopolies of gold which now exist in the several countries. Should such an arrangement eventuate, is it not possible that this would have the effect of completely destroying the free market for gold in the international economy and make it useless to add more gold to the existing store the same as has taken place in the domestic economies?

The proponents of this scheme talk much about the need for international cooperation. They tell us this is wanting so much that it is causing all sorts of evils, even war itself. One would almost think from their protestations that the idea of international cooperation had never entered men's minds until they came on the scene.

Now they declare to high heaven that they have found something, which if they can only get people to adopt, will usher into the world this much-needed international cooperation and bring to us all everlasting peace and good will.

But I believe if these people cared to look into the matter a little they would find that we have had something in the nature of cooperation between nations. Indeed, if they did this they would probably find that there has been very much such cooperation.

The trouble is that these neo-internationalists are not talking about the kind of cooperation of which we have been in the past accustomed to think. Heretofore, the term cooperation meant a voluntary working together of private individuals. That is the kind of cooperation that made America the fine country it was—and which we hope it will be again—and which brought about the most equitable and greatest amount of international trading and good will the world had ever experienced.

But that is not the kind of cooperation the advocates of this international venture have in mind. They are thinking of an entirely different kind of cooperation. They do not want the sort of cooperation where men voluntarily work together to supply their mutual wants. They want politically forced cooperation in human endeavor.

The only voluntary cooperation that is involved in their scheme is in respect of the several governments interested in promoting it. Getting all these governments to join it must be done on a more or less voluntary basis.

But after the governments had combined they would destroy what is left of voluntary international cooperation and replace it with politically coerced international cooperation, just as they have severally been destroying voluntary cooperation and replacing it with politically forced cooperation in their respective domestic economies.

Gentlemen, I hope you will understand that it is not my intention to indulge in any special pleading. It is but natural that those of you who have interests in gold mining should have more immediate concern about the Bretton Woods proposal than some of the other interests. But I believe the problem involved here is so fundamental and vital to the very existence of our social organism that we should not approach its solution from any angle of special interest. I think it is just as much in the interest of silver, copper, oil, manufacture, agriculture, salary, and wage earner, and all other interests to defeat the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme to set up an international trade and monetary cartel as it is in that of gold mining.

It is primarily the political monopoly of ownership and control of our gold stocks, and the forcing upon us of inconvertible paper currency that is so rapidly destroying our free enterprise process and regimenting us into a totalitarian regime.

It is when we examine the Bretton Woods proposal in connection with this phase of the gold problem that we see looming before us the challenge to our common interests. Until we can break this monopoly and restore a free gold market we should expect nothing but a continuation, at an accelerating rate of speed, of the abolition of private property and its replacement by communism.

In closing I should like to quote a bit of rare monetary wisdom. This was spoken by Francis Horner in the House of Commons in 1811:

"With respect to the word coin, what is it? Does it make any difference as to the standard? The coin is the King's assurance to his subjects that their property shall be protected; that the coin shall be of that fineness and weight necessary to give to all in their dealings an equal security and an equal participation of justice."

How the People Feel Back Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent which is expressive of the sentiment of a great segment of the people of this country:

LACROSSE, WIS., *January 30, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM STEVENSON,
Wisconsin Congressman.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: Just a few lines to let you know how many people will be happy to have social security expanded.

The teachers do a very great work and should be included. Many of them are getting old, the pensions are small, and they would feel much more secure if they were sure of a little more income.

Would like to see many more occupations included in social security.

Hope you receive the proposed raise in salary.

Thank you.

Cordially,

A VERY GOOD FRIEND.

Peacetime Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement which was

adopted by the Milwaukee (Wis.) Federated Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, at its regular meeting of January 17, 1945, relative to peacetime military conscription:

The adoption of a system of permanent compulsory military service through conscription would effectuate a great fundamental change in historic concept of our Government. Such a fundamental change should not be made without the most careful and calm consideration of the necessity and the results of such change. Neither should such a change be undertaken without giving all of our people a chance to express their views under normal conditions.

If our hopes for the complete defeat and disarmament of the aggressor nations and for the setting up of an international organization to maintain peace and security are realized then there will be little necessity for peacetime military conscription in our Nation. To urge peacetime military conscription now means that we either doubt our ability to set up an international organization to maintain peace and security or that we doubt the ability of such an organization to achieve its purpose. Either doubt expresses a defeatist attitude.

It seems to us to be self-evident that in the midst of this global war with its consequently natural war psychology no calm and dispassionate consideration can be given to this proposal. To act on such a proposal now would be an effort to transpose the war psychology into the peacetime period.

Millions of our citizens are now serving in our armed forces. These citizens have no adequate means of expressing their opinions and wishes on this vital matter while they are in the service of their country. In our opinion it would be a breaking of faith with them to impose such a fundamental change in the historic concept of their Government on them during a time while they are voiceless and voteless, because they are in the service of their country.

For the reasons set out above the Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee and vicinity, representing 85,000 members of American Federation of Labor unions in the community emphatically goes on record against any congressional action on peacetime military conscription during the war period and until the results of peace treaties and international commitments are definitely known.

Broadening Absentee Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial published in the Daily Times of Mamaroneck, N. Y., on January 16, 1945, titled "Broadening Absentee Voting":

BROADENING ABSENTEE VOTING

It will be recalled that during the last political campaign every effort was made on the part of New York and other States to get ballots into the hands of our men in the armed services, wherever they might be. Scenting partisan advantage, the supporters of the New Deal sought to have the electorate of the Nation believe that the Republican candidate for the Presidency, Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, was loath to expedite these ballots, on the presumption which was never proven that a smaller vote would favor the Republican chances.

As a matter of fact, the record of New York State in getting applications for ballots to those in armed service, both in this country and abroad, was excellent. Further, these State ballots carried the names of candidates for State and local offices, whereas the Federal ballot, which was favored by the New Deal and exploited to the fullest as more advantageous, contained only the names of candidates for Federal offices.

With the election past and their Presidential candidate elected, little has been heard from the New Deal supporters to bolster their false claim that Governor Dewey was not cooperative in getting absentee ballots overseas. The record which this State made in that respect would now make such claims obviously untrue.

But along this same line it should be noted that there is now pending at Albany legislation which would broaden the ranks of those eligible to receive absentee ballots outside this country—and this legislation comes from a Westchester Republican, at that. The bill in question, from Senator Pliny W. Williamson, of Scarsdale, would give the same voting rights while away from home to members of the merchant marine and the Red Cross.

We believe the principles behind this legislation sound. A sailor of the merchant marine or a worker of the Red Cross is just as much entitled to an absentee ballot, when forced by national emergency to be away from his or her voting precinct, as are those actually in the armed services. We trust the amendment will become law.

At the same time, we suggest to other States which favored the Federal ballot that now is the time to alter their election laws along this same line, in order that absentee voting by those called away by the war may be done constitutionally, and not left as a forgotten item to be revived again in 1948 as an emotional appeal to prejudices.

Compulsory Military Training in Peacetime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the executive board of the Milwaukee Archdiocesan Holy Name Union with reference to proposed compulsory military training legislation:

Whereas there are now being put forward in several quarters and for many widely different reasons, certain plans for several kinds of universal, compulsory, peacetime, military training, or governmental service for all American youth or for boys only; and

Whereas present wartime legislation is capable of meeting every wartime emergency for military or civilian service until the declaration of peace; and

Whereas compulsory, universal, peacetime, nonmilitary, governmental service is unnecessary and hazardous to the youth of America and to the American way of thought and life under any plan; and

Whereas any system of compulsory, universal, peacetime, military conscription and training offers great hazard to the fundamental American institutions of the home, the church, and the school, as well as to the moral welfare of the youth themselves, and the democratic way of living and thinking; and

Whereas there will be no need for a heavily armed United States in the post-war world of a just and realistic peace is consummated; and

Whereas the security needs of the United States in the post-war world can be neither wisely nor definitely determined at this time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this executive board representing 40,000 men of the Milwaukee Archdiocesan Holy Name Union hereby and unequivocally protest against any type of compulsory, universal, peacetime, nonmilitary service for all youth, but especially for girls; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive board protest against the adoption of any plan of compulsory, universal, peacetime, military conscription and training that is not based on a clearly discerned and critical need for national security; and be it further

Resolved, That this executive board join with the bishops and archbishops of the United States in respectfully requesting that any consideration and vote on this matter be postponed until the war has been successfully concluded and the actual needs of national security are made manifest; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be addressed to the President of the United States, the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of both Houses, and to the Senators and Representatives of Wisconsin serving in the National Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to every branch president of the Holy Name Society in the archdiocese of Milwaukee.

Arkansas Legislature Rescinds Former Resolution on Limiting Taxing Power of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks contained on page A278 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, I mentioned I had been advised that the Legislature of the State of Arkansas had passed house concurrent resolutions Nos. 3 and 4, introduced by Hon. Emory Thompson, which totally rescinded the prior action of the 1943 Arkansas General Assembly favoring the passage of the so-called twenty-second amendment.

I believe that the members of the present assembly are to be commended for this action in removing the State of Arkansas from the group of States which have gone on record as favoring the passage of the twenty-second amendment. You will note that the Arkansas rescinding resolution contains reference to their former action having been taken because the purport of this resolution was misunderstood by various members of the house and senate. It is not surprising that many members have misunderstood the real intent of the proposed twenty-second amendment; the gentlemen at

the head of the movement to put over this amendment are masters at deceptive propaganda and the subtle manner in which they have waged their campaign is to be respected, if not to be admired, for its cleverness.

When the truth was brought to the attention of the members of the Arkansas assembly, it did not take them long to show their courage in correcting their former action.

I have had numerous requests from members of various State legislatures of other States which have passed an endorsing resolution as to how they might rescind their original action. I therefore reproduce below a copy of the rescinding resolutions—House Concurrent Resolutions 3 and 4—passed by the State of Arkansas so that other legislators who may wish to take similar action may consider its form:

House Concurrent Resolution 3

Whereas Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10 by Senator Abington was adopted by the Fifty-fourth General Assembly; and

Whereas the purport of this resolution was misunderstood by various members of the house and senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the adoption of the Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10 by the Fifty-fourth General Assembly be, and is hereby, rescinded by the Fifty-fifth General Assembly.

House Concurrent Resolution 4

A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and to amend said Constitution relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances by providing for a limitation of taxes thereon to 25 percent; and

Whereas the people of the State of Arkansas are opposed to such amendment to the Constitution of the United States being passed at this time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized and petitioned to defeat the efforts now being made to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and the effort to submit a proposed amendment which would limit the maximum rate of gift, income, and estate taxes to 25 percent; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Arkansas be, and he is hereby, directed to forward a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and to each Arkansas Member thereof.

Free Labor Has Made America the Greatest Industrial Nation in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, the mobilization of civilian manpower provided for by H. R. 1752 is, in my humble opinion, contrary to the traditional American concept of liberty and freedom. This young and growing Republic has the enviable record in the family of nations of being the greatest productive country in the world, while the genius of our industrial leaders and the skill of American labor are universally respected and fully recognized as models of efficiency and worthy of emulation.

This remarkable industrial growth of our Nation has been accomplished by the free labor of a liberty-loving people, and the astounding record of production in all phases of our industrial life is mute testimony of the fact that our system is infinitely more successful than the results achieved by nations where labor is conscripted and forced to work under the iron rule of a dictatorial form of government.

The shackling of free people by using coercive means to secure the fruits of their labor is apparent in the provisions of H. R. 1752, and despite my great respect and deep admiration for the military and naval spokesmen who favor its enactment, I find that I cannot in good conscience support this bill in its present form. It is the essence of discrimination and I seriously question the constitutionality of such a drastic proposal. It is directed solely to the male segment of our population within the age brackets of 18 to 45 years and affects specifically men in IV–F classifications of the selective-service law who, because of no fault of their own, find themselves in such a category.

Under section 6 of H. R. 1752 the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 as amended are extended to cover these labor draftees, thus placing them on a par with the servicemen in our armed forces who may be serving for as little as $50 a month as a private in the United States Army and subjected to the perils of front-line duty. In addition, from a civilian standpoint such a so-called labor draftee may find himself working at a machine in a defense plant alongside a fellow-workman who because he accepted his job prior to enactment of H. R. 1752 finds he has a different status than the labor draftee and that he is not eligible for benefits such as provided in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 which is to be extended to those drafted in industry. Such a condition will certainly not be helpful to improving the morale of employees and, as a result, production will be seriously impaired and definitely retarded.

So-called labor draftees under H. R. 1752 will be paid the prevailing wage rate of the industry to which they are assigned and given the distinction of being regarded in the same light as members of our armed forces, millions of whom are making heroic sacrifices by facing shellfire in the front lines on our far-flung battle fronts at a wage rate of $50 a month.

This bill was originally termed as a work-or-fight measure, but due to its inconsistencies and discriminatory provisions it is now before us as a compromise in that it has been changed to a work-or-jail proposal, thus giving the opportunity to a person affected by its provisions the right to go to jail rather than submit to its provisions.

There is no denying the fact that the inefficient manner in which the manpower situation has been handled accounts for the alleged shortage of manpower in certain sections of the country. It is freely admitted that the so-called manpower shortage is spotty and prevalent only in certain sections of the country, while in many communities there is surplus manpower available if the proper agency would cope with the situation by employing an intelligent approach to the problem through a detailed investigation which would reveal the true facts and then by proper administrative procedure seek to correct the situation without resorting to coercive legislation as exemplified by the provisions of H. R. 1752. Even the Federal Government is revealed as an archhoarder of manpower, with the result that a poor example is being furnished to private industry which is charged with the same sin.

It is doubtful in my mind whether men in the armed forces who are making untold sacrifices to preserve America as a free nation will find any sympathy in the efforts being exerted to conscript their fathers, relatives, and friends and force them into virtual labor battalions on the pretext that there is a grave manpower shortage.

I am opposing H. R. 1752 because I am convinced that a sincere effort has not been made to properly utilize existing manpower and that instead a drastic and totalitarian idea is being forced upon us under the guise of aiding the war effort. As an overseas veteran of World War No. 1, I yield to no man in loyalty to my country and its cherished ideals. I am opposed to the enactment of H. R. 1752 because I am not convinced that the patriotism of American workmen has sunk to such a low ebb that it is necessary to herd them into virtual labor battalions and force them to bow to the tactics of totalitarian countries, whose first step in bringing about their ultimate downfall was to shackle free labor, thus destroying its effectiveness and finally reducing it to a state of abject slavery.

National Cemeteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 29, 1945, on the subject of national cemeteries:

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Congress now has before it numerous bills calling for the creation or expansion of national cemeteries. They range from a proposal to return to this country and bury in Arlington Cemetery in a tomb identical with

the tomb of the Unknown Soldier of World War No. 1, the body of an unknown American warrior of this war, to the demands of individual States for the establishment of national cemeteries.

Although the maintenance of national cemeteries has been a national policy since shortly after the start of the Civil War, there has never been a well-defined program to distribute them equitably among the States. There are now 92 national cemeteries, of which 79 are under the jurisdiction of the War Department and 13 under the Department of the Interior. More than 50 of these cemeteries are located in 6 States, while there are no national cemeteries in 20 of the States. Many of the existing cemeteries are relatively inaccessible to railroads and highways.

Because of their inaccessibility and the limitations of expansion, the War Department has recommended that all but 9 of the existing cemeteries be inactivated and 72 new cemeteries be developed, of which 69 would be in the United States.

Missouri has three national cemeteries—at Jefferson Barracks, at Jefferson City, and at Springfield. There is, however, no provision in any of the bills before Congress to provide for the expansion or development of any national cemetery in this State. Certainly this State is entitled to consideration in the location and expansion of national cemeteries recommended by the War Department.

St. Louis is particularly interested in the cemetery at Jefferson Barracks. This is one of the historic military burial grounds of the Nation. It serves a large and populous area of the State.

If assurance is given by Congress that the national cemetery at Jefferson Barracks is to be expanded, citizens of St. Louis might well consider in planning their war memorials to the veterans of this war an appropriate memorial to be erected in the cemetery at the barracks. One form which such a memorial might take would be a chapel in which funeral services might be held for our soldier dead.

The first step, however, is to insure Missouri's participation in the national-cemetery program projected by the War Department. This is a matter which should receive the attention of the Missouri delegation in Congress.

The Altoona Plan Provides Careers for G. I. Joes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Miles Hollister, of Altoona, Pa., appearing in the March 1945 issue of the American magazine:

The article titled "Careers for G. I. Joes" describes in an interesting manner the initiative, patriotism, and unselfish devotion of 50 prominent citizens of Altoona, Pa., located in my congressional district, in their determined efforts to be of practical aid to returning service men and women through a well-organized and highly efficient Veterans' Counseling Committee.

Altoona, Pa., is the site of the largest railroad shops in the world, operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad, while the famous Horseshoe Curve, located on the outskirts of the city, has elicited keen interest as a model of efficient engineering skill.

The city of Altoona has a splendid record of enlistments in the armed forces, and it is authoritatively stated that one out of every four male citizens is wearing the uniform of some branch of our armed forces.

The splendid service rendered by the Veterans' Counseling Committee has focused national attention on the methods employed, and from the interest manifested the Altoona plan is certain to be adopted by countless other communities eager to render a real service to returning veterans.

The article referred to is as follows:

CAREERS FOR G. I. JOES

(By Miles Hollister)

One of the greatest economic losses and tragedies in American life has been the number of people who've spent their working time as square pegs in round holes. As a personnel counselor of several large corporations for 10 years I'd say that at least 60 percent of all Americans are misfits in their jobs! Many other personnel men have reached the same conclusion. That 60 percent adds up to a lot of misery when you thing that the average person spends at least 50,000 hours during a lifetime on his chosen job.

Ten years of trying to rescue these misfits from their plights convinced me that something should be done to prevent this appalling waste of human energy and talent in the future. And the post-war period seemed like a good time to make a start, for then there would be 10,000,000 returning servicemen and millions more war workers looking for new jobs.

So in Altoona, where I am now an employer, I set to work. I found that we had 12,500 men from our county in the armed forces. At least 4,000 of these were kids who had gone right from school into service. They had never had a job in their lives except carrying a gun. Another 2,500 of them had less than a year of civilian-job experience before induction, so they mostly were still in the groping stage. And, of the remainder; hundreds no doubt had been in jobs before the war that they had already found unsuitable.

I found as I talked to other businessmen that I was not alone in my worrying. The idea of getting these thousands of youngsters settled in careers they liked was intriguing, but the difficulties were somewhat frightening. What the returning veteran would need most, we agreed, was expert vocational guidance. But who could provide such guidance? Our first thought, of course, was the professional psychologists. That was obviously impracticable. There weren't enough of them in the county to make a dent in the problem.

The solution we finally achieved was a bit amusing, but hard-boiled. It is now widely known as the Altoona plan. We—a group of business and professional men in the county—decided that we would all go to school and train ourselves to be job counselors. We approached the department of psychology at Pennsylvania State College, 40 miles away, and asked them if they would give us a practical, down-to-earth course in vocational guidance. They agreed with enthusiasm, and there followed 7 weeks of intensive training—with one session each week.

In the class were 50 business and professional men and women making up what we called the Veterans' counseling committee. The members were selected from every business and profession in the county.

There were, for example, coal dealers, retail merchants, automobile men, factory managers, and eight executives from the Pennsylvania Railroad. The Pennsy was so well represented because almost half of the county's breadwinners work for the railroad. (Altoona's Pennsylvania Railroad shops are the largest in the world.) On the committee were also the principal of our high school, the head of our local undergraduate center, doctors, lawyers, psychiatrists, and members of the clergy—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish.

After we had taken the course, we realized our committee of 50 was in some respects better qualified to guide our young people into jobs than professional psychologists or vocational specialists would be. We have an intimate knowledge of the county and all its job opportunities. In short, we are the employers of the county. We have at least one man or woman with years of experience in any field of work a veteran might name. As a group, we know the skills and talents required in our respective industries, businesses, and professions. For this reason, we are in a unique position to analyze each veteran's aptitudes and interests and place him where they will be used to the best advantage for both the veteran and his employer.

Already more than 500 of Blair County's 12,500 servicemen have returned, and we've had an opportunity to counsel many of them. The results so far are good, indeed. We have our own headquarters with a full-time secretary. Our expenses, which are surprisingly low are met by funds raised by our chamber of commerce and other community organizations.

This group of ours is more than just a committee to counsel veterans. We expect to work with all young people in our community who are starting out in life. If the rush of returning veterans is not too great, we hope to counsel high-school seniors this coming spring. As we see it, the veteran problem is just the springboard for us to set up a permanent counseling agency which all young people in our community can consult if they wish.

In handling veterans we've already learned that we have a tough, human problem on our hands. A few of the boys are antagonistic to civilians. Others are high-strung or irritable.

Most of them are what I would call ill at ease. It is a terrific strain to move from a regimented life, ruled by bugles and superior officers, to a normal civilian life. In a mild sense, it is like coming out of jail.

When a boy comes to our headquarters he is met by a charming secretary who was selected primarily for her qualifications as a hostess. She puts him at his ease, obtains a brief record of his background, and introduces him to the counselor on duty who seems best qualified to counsel him. (Counselors rotate. At this time each serves a half-day every 6 weeks; when full demobilization comes, each will serve a half-day every 2 weeks.)

The counselor takes Joe into a private office which is not an office at all but really a cozy den. No desks. Just a couple of soft chairs and a soft light. First, the counselor makes Joe feel he is at home and with a friend. But definitely no glad-handing. They chat about old times and mutual friends. Our counselors are warned to lay off the boy's battle experiences unless the boy brings them up himself. Perhaps he's had a nightmarish experience he is trying to forget.

Gradually our counselor brings out the boy's ambitions, and then probes into his education, his hobbies, his record at any previous job, and his progress in the armed forces. The counselor must not make any decision himself about a career for the boy. His job is simply to guide the boy's thinking and supply him with facts which will make it possible for the boy to reach an intelligent decision for himself. The decision must be the boy's. If it isn't, he'll never be satisfied.

We had one boy who knew what he wanted: A job where he would be handling other people. However, his background showed no experience along this line. His school record gave no indication of leadership and in 2 years of Army service he had advanced only to private, first class. We asked him why he insisted upon supervising the work of others. His answer was surprising. He said, "Well, I've been ordered around for 2 years in the Army, and I swore to God that when I got out I wouldn't work anywhere unless I was the boss."

Obviously, his desire hardly qualified him for a supervisory position. Further probing revealed that in school he had done excellent work in manual training. With this as a starting point, we gradually uncovered the fact that he had a very unusual aptitude for mechanics, but had never done much about it. Today he is serving a machinist apprenticeship—and he likes it.

We had another case where the situation was exactly opposite. A 37-year-old chief petty officer came to us from the Navy. Stan Ruth, the secretary of our chamber of commerce, was his first counselor, and Stan did a swell job. A study of his pre-war record showed several years' experience in bookkeeping. He had some experience in selling, but on the face of his civilian record there was no indication of executive ability. It was his Navy record that definitely showed an aptitude for organization and leadership.

A closer study of his pre-war experience showed that while he was rated a bookkeeper, he had given excellent cooperation to other departments in the business and had always assumed work not required of an ordinary bookkeeper. Moreover, the particular type of bookkeeping work he had done gave him a close association with retail merchandising.

A neat job of putting two and two together added up to a man who had more ability than he knew anything about. A company operating a chain of hat stores wanted a local manager right away. But Stan wanted to be sure.

He called in Art Johnston, manager of J. C. Penney's. Art has been hiring people in the retail field for years. He had a long talk with our Navy man, and together they decided that he could handle the job. And he is handling it—in a way that very much pleases his district manager, and he is more enthused about his work than he has ever been before in his life.

This case illustrates one of the basic principles of our counseling system. We call it specialized counseling. When the counselor to whom a veteran first talks has reached the stage where the boy's aptitudes and interests point to a particular field of work, he is then turned over to a man with years of experience in that field. This specialized counselor turns his business inside out for the veteran. He tells him the good and the bad. He cites examples of the progress the average person makes in that field. In other words, he gives the veteran down-to-earth facts upon which to make his own decision.

Then there are the boys who have too many interests. One very intelligent lad came to us after a medical discharge from the Army. I happened to be the counselor assigned to him. He presented a regular patchwork of vocational desires. At various times he had wanted to be a salesman, a journalist, a teacher. Just before entering the Army he seriously thought about becoming—of all things—a male nurse. He had also been a salesman for a bakery and had spent one semester in college. He wanted to continue his education. But for what?

Here was a stickler. After a lengthy interview I decided to call in some help. The boy was given I. Q. and aptitude tests by the Penn State experts, and a compromise was worked out. This lad is now in college studying to become a teacher of history and English. He is majoring in these subjects because he feels they will help him in writing if he ever decides to switch from teaching. A new world has been opened to this boy.

The American Air Forces have provided us with some of the most ticklish of all cases. These are the 23-year-old captains and majors who are accustomed to lots of responsibility, high tension, and $5,000-a-year salaries. Some of them come back expecting a $5,000 job in civilian life. But doing what? We sit down and tell them something like this:

"Yes; you made $5,000 a year and you were more than worth it to America. You carried heavy responsibilities and you risked your life every day. But you were doing a highly specialized job that has no equivalent in civilian life. And unfortunately you have no civilian experience to fall back upon.

"However, your situation is not too difficult, because you acquired good tools to work with. You have had valuable training in the armed forces. You have learned the meaning of responsibility. You have gained experience in handling men and in organizing work. You should make rapid progress once you learn the ground work of your new job. And, besides, you are young, you have time on your side. That $5,000 will be more valuable to you 5 or 6 years from now than it would be at present. We can find you jobs that will have a promising future, but they will require a little patience." Usually they get the point, because they are intelligent lads.

Since our counselors are community men themselves, we know the prejudices and peculiarities of every employer in the county. Things a stranger couldn't know. We know bosses to whom we wouldn't send a high-strung kid, because they are too impatient. Unfortunately, we know two or three that we wouldn't send anyone to, because they are chronically unfair with their employees.

If a field is already overcrowded, we warn the boy about it. We suggest a very similar type of work where the chance of steady employment is better.

If a veteran wants to take advantage of the G. I. bill and buy a business or a farm, we guide him carefully and make sure that he doesn't become the victim of some overzealous salesman. We also have committees that try to make him feel that his home town is really home. If he acquired a wife in Georgia or Iceland, we see that she is introduced to all the neighbors.

We had some trouble trying to decide how to sell this program to the service men and women from Blair County. We wanted them to know about it before they got back—but they were scattered to all corners of the world. We finally decided to compile the names of all our service people from the induction records of our local newspapers. Then we sent letters to the whole 12,500. These letters were mailed to their homes to be forwarded. Each letter contained a booklet describing the plan and telling our fighting folks what we hoped to do for them when they got home.

The answers we have already received are very gratifying. We intend to write to our service people about every 90 days until they return

Of course, no one can predict tomorrow's economic conditions nor say with any degree of certainty how many jobs will be available. But we hope to place all our boys and girls who come back from the service. That doesn't mean we shall have to find 12,500 jobs because we have that many people in the service. Some of the boys aren't coming back—I'm not speaking of the casualties—and some who do come back will not be looking for jobs right away.

Probably 20 percent will stay in service for at least a couple of years after the close of the war. I think we're safe in assuming we'll have at least 2,000,000 men in our armed forces for some time to come. Many of these may be men who want to stay in the service.

Then there are a lot of boys who won't want to come back either to their old jobs or their old town. Some have been stationed in Oregon or Texas and like it there. A War Department survey revealed that perhaps 40 percent of all veterans now being discharged aren't going back to their old towns. Some estimates place the percentage even higher.

At present it's anybody's guess as to how many of our veterans will actually come back looking for jobs in our county, but it certainly won't be anywhere near the number who are in the service. At any rate, we in Altoona are resolved that we are not going to bungle the job of absorbing the boys into our community as it was bungled throughout America after the last war. Our treatment of veterans was disgraceful. I know. I was one of them. I finally got a job—after being pushed around by half a dozen agencies—by answering a newspaper ad.

We need not muff the veteran problem this time, not if we can get it into our heads that to the individual veteran the final aim in life is happiness, and if we can remember that no man can be happy unless he likes his job.

We in Altoona feel, frankly, that every community in America should take some sort of realistic action to get their returning veterans into jobs that will provide the satisfaction and happiness they deserve. By doing this, American business in the various communities will be taking advantage of the greatest opportunity it has ever had to win supporters for free enterprise.

And there are other important angles. Our scheme to give young people of our community this homespun vocational guidance is paying off in some intriguing ways we hadn't even thought of.

We have found that this counseling work has already aroused in the businessmen on our committee a new consciousness of responsibility toward their own employees. Some of them are already better employers than they ever were before. I know one in particular who has become much less interested in dollars and much more interested in people.

When the tumult and the shouting of World War No. 2 has died away, we hope to go on counseling our youth. As the years go by we hope, through our citizens' counseling group, to forge a real bond between our schools and the businesses and professions that employ their students. We hope that through this counseling service we can build a bridge of human understanding between the old and the new generation.

We hope, too, that our young people will no longer be poured from our schools into a cold and indifferent community—to roam our business streets looking for "anything."

Will it work? Only time can tell. It will work if human nature can become unselfish enough—if the average American on Main Street will forget his own selfish interests for a half day a month—and lose himself in the problems of a kid who needs his help.

It may be only a dream.

And still—we may have something.

America's Most Needed Superhighway to Northwest Pacific Via Gulfport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a

speech made by a constituent of mine, Dr. Frank O. Kreager, of Pateros, Wash. Dr. Kreager delivered this address for the Gulfport Rotary Club and it contains real food for thought for all those interested in post-war highways:

Highway construction is generally approved and supported as a post-war project for preventing unemployment during the period of industrial readjustment. Several highway construction bills are before Congress. One, the Snyder bill, calls for the expenditure of $12,000,000,000 (about $90 per capita) for six north-south and three east-west superhighways.

Post-war highways should be and can be built, not only to give employment but to give full value for cost to the people.

Of all possible transcontinental superhighways, the most needed, most useful is a northwest-southwest diagonal extending from the State of Washington through Oregon, Idaho, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, and Louisiana, thence along the Gulf coast of Mississippi and Alabama and diagonally across Florida to Miami and Key West and connecting:

1. At Oroville, Wash., with the Okanagan Valley Highway of British Columbia, which should be extended to become the real Alaska Highway. ("Alcan" is on the wrong side of the Rockies and unusable about 8 months of the year because of cold and snow.)

2. In Texas with the Mexican highway at Laredo extending to Mexico, D. F., and beyond—and ultimately to the Canal Zone and South America. From Bering Sea to the Straits of Magellan.

3. At Key West by ferry to Havana with the Cuban highways.

Why this northwest-southeast transcontinental superhighway?

1. Many north-south, east-west, and northeast-southwest Federal highways, but no northwest-southeast highway. One can go by car from Gulfport to Seattle if he doesn't get lost in the maze of the sections of 15 or 20 different highways over which he must travel. An airline superhighway would be several hundred miles shorter than the shortest present route.

2. Trade development: Refrigerator trucks on such an airline superhighway would carry fresh and quick-frozen seafoods, citrus fruits, figs, yams, strawberries, winter vegetables to the Pacific Northwest and intermediate points, and return with tree-ripened apples, apricots, peaches, prunes, cherries, pears, and berries—with increased profits to producers and lower costs to consumers all along the line.

3. Tourist exchange: Over the world's scenic highway, from Everglades to glaciers, from citrus groves to apple orchards, from sagebrush deserts to dense forests, snow-capped mountains, canyons, roaring rivers, and mirror lakes! No other highway in the world offers such a wealth of unique and varied attractions.

For Southerners a summer in the "Land of Snowy Peaks and Big Red Apples" is a lifetime experience.

And several millions of Northwesterners have never experienced the Teche Country, Natchez, the French Quarter, Mardi Gras, the Gulf Coast, Bellingrath Gardens, and the Florida beaches and citrus groves.

Before the war an increasing number of Northwesterners were making winter trips to Florida by rail because of northern snows and blizzards, through Chicago and Cincinnati, thus missing the Gulf Coast entirely. Over this northwest-southeast transcontinental highway many would make the Florida trip by car, thus through the Gulf Coast.

By taking delivery on a new car at the factory a Northwest buyer gets a reduction in price of about $170—which goes far toward meeting traveling costs. The big demand for new cars is from November to March, the time of low temperatures, snows, and blizzards in the northern Rockies and Plains. From Detroit to Cincinnati is 265 miles—and once across the Ohio the new car owner is out of the blizzard area and on his way for a tour of the Deep South and return to the Northwest over northwest-southeast superhighway.

4. Trade and tourists: Tourist consumption is big business. Michigan before the war had an annual tourist business of over $300,000,000—with no Gulf coast.

The quickest way to develop a yam market in Seattle is to feed Seattle tourists candied yams in Gulfport. The pleased tourist is the best of all advertisers. Trade follows the tourist.

5. National defense: The Nation's danger points are Alaska, the West Indies, and the Panama Canal. A superhighway connecting these with the military training zones of the Nation, over which large movements of troops, armament, and supplies may be quickly made is a national defense necessity.

6. The know your country highway: Social intelligence is the hope of democracy. Accurate thinking and sound conclusions are based on first-hand knowledge of facts, conditions, causes, and forces. Travel is the great civic educator. Americans must better know Americans.

7. The highway of international good will and fellowship: From Patagonia to Alaska and by ferry across the Bering Sea with China and Russia. Intelligent travel brings the realization that regions, countries, peoples all have more in common than in difference—more to unite for than to fight for:

Steps in making the northwest-southeast superhighway a reality:

1. Get the facts.

2. Formation of public opinion all along the way.

3. Obtain War Department cooperation for a military highway.

4. Realization of the opportunity to contribute in making America a nation worthy of sacrifices now being made in its defense.

One Big River Needs One Big Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been told on several occasions by Members who represent rural districts that the farmers and the farm organizations are not in favor of a Missouri Valley Authority.

The Missouri Farmers Association has been in existence for a long time. It issues a paper known as the Missouri Farmer. In the issue of January 15 I find an article on this subject and, under the permission granted me, I include it as part of my remarks. It follows:

ONE BIG RIVER NEEDS ONE BIG PLAN

President Roosevelt has just signed a flood-control bill that is of vital concern to every man, woman, and child in this State. But he did so with the understanding that the subject will be reconsidered by the new Congress, and very shortly new bills providing for a Missouri Valley Authority will be introduced. This is fortunate, because the new law has shortcomings and there will now be time for further consideration of the problem.

During past months the State legislative committee of the Missouri Farmers Association has studied the flood problem quite thoroughly, and we have come to certain conclusions. They include these:

1. Floods are caused by uncontrolled run-off.

2. The place to start dealing with floods, therefore, is on the uplands in the entire Missouri River Basin, where the run-off begins.

3. It is too late to control floods after the surplus waters have swept down into the valleys. To deal with them then by mechanical means (such as gigantic levees and the 36 high dams planned for Missouri) is to deal with effects rather than the cause.

4. Water is a valuable natural resource which should be utilized by all the people on its journey from the hilltop where it falls to its destination in the Gulf of Mexico, and should not simply be allowed to waste away, carrying with it the fertile soil which constitutes the State's and Nation's foundation.

5. Rivers, like all natural things, know no boundary lines, cannot be dealt with by States or other subdivisions of government; hence, flood control in the Missouri River Basin is a responsibility of the Federal Government.

Your legislative committee believes that the newly enacted flood-control bill is inadequate, does not meet the needs of the Missouri River Valley. We believe it is a patchwork compromise between those people interested in irrigation and river transportation, and a "shot-gun" compromise between the Reclamation Bureau, which is to deal with irrigation high upstream, and the Army engineers, who will construct the high dams and huge levees lower downstream. What little soil conservation that will be done under the law (as a seeming afterthought) will be done by the Department of Agriculture. Three different governmental agencies will be attacking the big problem in a piecemeal fashion, with the one hand scarcely knowing—or caring—what the other hand is doing. Can we expect good results from such a hodgepodge of authorities?

We strongly suspect that the new law pleases the big power interests, since only one of the 36 big dams that would be constructed in Missouri, and which will ruin numerous towns as well as a half dozen counties, provides for electric power. The one exception is at Osceola, where a local power plant will be inundated and is to be replaced with a new one. The irrigation people upstream were made happy, and so were those interested in cheap transportation. In order that too much water is not used upstream, which would reduce the Missouri River to a trickle below Kansas City so that barges could not operate, numerous huge dams in Missouri and Kansas will impound the surplus waters after they have run off our hills and slopes, to be released gradually so as to maintain a 9-foot channel for barges from Sioux City to St. Louis. Enormous levees, set back a half mile from the river banks, will keep the river between two walls.

Your legislative committee believes these big dams will, in a few years, prove to be a waste of money because of silting. Without extensive soil conservation measures in the watershed, silting will occur rapidly. * * * Army engineers told Congressman MAX SCHWABE at a hearing in Washington that the dams will be completely silted up within 50 years, and after that it is "somebody else's worry." If they will be fully silted up in 50 years and be made useless, they will be half gone in 25 years, which means they will be half as effective. After that, will other Army engineers build more dams elsewhere on our rivers?

And this is leaving out of account the 900,000 acres of Missouri's most fertile farm land that it is estimated will be permanently flooded, and its 20,000 citizens who will have

to move away from their old homes, and the towns and counties and business enterprises and property that will be ruined. The lakes made by the dams will be of enormous size when full and a mere frog pond after the waters are released during the dry seasons. The largest one of the dams, located at Osceola in St. Clair County, for example, will impound water covering 260,000 acres during the winter and spring seasons, and after the water is released, say in July and August when the dry season occurs, the lake will be about 60,000 acres in size. In the wet months there will be a lake of water; in the summer months there will be a sea of mud. And this will be true in corresponding degrees of all the 36 lakes planned for the State of Missouri.

We have no doubt that for several years after these dams are completed floods will be controlled downstream. But farmers living in the river bottoms will lose all their land between the levees and the river, a distance of a half-mile. And then a few years hence, when their children take over their farms, they'll find the floods recurring because the big lakes will be filled up with the top soil from our upland farms.

In view of the inadequacies of the new law, and after considering all of these things and more, your legislative committee believes Missouri farmers ought to urge their Congressmen and Senators to support a Missouri Valley Authority. Such an Authority would at least take all factors into account. If we should get an M. V. A., and it should be managed comparably to the Tennessee Valley Authority, attention would be given to flood prevention and water utilization. Water would be provided for irrigation out west; any large dams built would provide cheap electricity where it is needed; provision would be made for river transportation; and emphasis would be placed on soil conservation and all that it implies—such as contour farming, terraces, farm ponds, detention dams high up on our creeks, small lakes, reforestation, check dams, etc. While a few people in the valley might be discommoded, as will inevitably happen if the big stream is to be harnessed, millions of people in the region will benefit.

The millions spent for flood control and water utilization would then comprise an investment because we would eventually get our money back with interest, whereas under the Pick plan, which is embodied in the newly enacted law, our expenditures will be mostly an expense. Soil conservation would make our farms more productive and valuable; cheap power would make electricity available to thousands of farm families and to new industries; water would be available to thirsty farms upstream; low-cast transportation on our rivers would encourage the establishment of new industries along the big river, which would spell better markets for Missouri farm products.

All of this is assuming M. V. A. would be comparable to T. V. A., with allowances duly made for the differences in the two regions, and assuming we should get an Authority as competent as that of the Tennessee River region. No doubt the law will be modeled after that which established T. V. A., and no doubt T. V. A. will be used as a pattern throughout, so these assumptions, therefore, seem reasonable. In any case, we can have no such assumption if the Army engineers are to have charge * * * any thinking farmer living in the Missouri River bottoms can tell you that. Army engineers have spent millions on the river already, and about all that one can credit them with is that they have stabilized the river banks.

This is a big problem which deserves the serious thought of every farmer in Missouri, and in future issues we shall have more to say about the matter.

F. V. HEINKEL,
President, Missouri Farmers Association.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the President has indicated his desire for a compulsory military-training program and given publicity to the same, this question is now being debated throughout the Nation. In a desire to render as far as possible the views of the people of the State I represent, in order that in the sum total the people of the Nation will arrive at a common ground on this very important question by the time this legislation reaches the floor of this Congress for our attention, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD resolutions passed by the post-war planning committee of the State Teachers College of Dickinson, N. Dak., the same having reached me from its president, Mr. Charles E. Scott:

Whereas the proposed compulsory military training program will likely involve emphasis on physical fitness, mathematics, and the natural sciences; and

Whereas academic training is of special significance in modern warefare; and

Whereas the colleges are well adapted to provide this type of training; and

Whereas the administrative machinery and equipment is already at hand; and

Whereas the colleges have had signal success with Army and Navy training programs during the course of the war; and

Whereas a special 1-year program, including vocational and industrial training could easily be devised to meet the requirements of compulsory military training; and

Whereas it would be economy to use existing institutions: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Post-War Planning Committee of the State Teachers College at Dickinson, N. Dak., That any program for compulsory military training should make provision for the college student or prospective college student to get the major part of his training in a collegiate institution; and

Whereas permanent collegiate institutions are well distributed throughout the country; and

Whereas they could easily be staffed with the necessary military personnel; and

Whereas the college equipment and housing could be expanded to meet the needs of trainees more economically than to maintain separate institutions for military training; and

Whereas training at collegiate institutions would be more in keeping with American tradition: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That collegiate institutions should be considered as possible training grounds for all those who are required to complete a year of military training.

R. L. LOKKEN, *Chairman*,
E. S. HATCH,
L. G. PULVER,
A. C. SELKE,
I. I. GRINDSTUEN,
Post-War Planning Committee,
State Teachers College,
Dickinson, N. Dak.

The Great Salmon Experiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the great industries in the Pacific Northwest is fisheries. The Columbia River, which is one of the boundaries of my district, is not only the second largest river in the United States and the greatest potential source of hydroelectric energy but is also the greatest river in the production of salmon. Richard L. Neuberger has written an intriguing article on salmon, with particular reference to the program of our Government in preserving this important industry notwithstanding the development of our great waterways of the West for navigation, power, and reclamation. The article appears in the current issue of Harpers Magazine and is as follows:

THE GREAT SALMON EXPERIMENT
(By Richard L. Neuberger)

The first white men to journey down the Columbia River were a pair of American Army officers named Meriwether Lewis and William Clark. They were amazed by what they saw. From shore to shore the vast river was clogged with fish. The arching backs of these fish flecked the water like waves as they surged upstream in hordes which took 3 weeks to pass a point where the river had trenched a gorge a mile wide. Twenty-foot falls they surmounted in mighty leaps, and they turned the shallow creeks of the headwaters into a seething mass of fins, tails, and silvery flanks.

Lewis and Clark knew they had seen the greatest fish resource in the land. "Never," they reported, "have so many fish been collected together in one place before." They told President Jefferson that there were enough Chinook salmon in the Columbia River to feed Americans for infinite generations to come.

But the frontiersmen were unaware that in the swift water inhabited by the salmon there lurked, too, a mysterious force capable of transforming the face of the continent which they had explored. Lewis and Clark knew nothing about hydroelectricity. They did not know that the river they had followed through the mountains to the Pacific contained more latent water power than any other stream in North America. Nor could they possibly realize that full development of this unseen energy might bring about the unbelievable day when the last Chinook would flip its fins in the Columbia.

Two huge Federal dams now span the Columbia River—Bonneville, at tidewater 152 miles from the sea, and Grand Coulee, 400 miles upstream from Bonneville. These dams make possible 40 percent of the aluminum production for America's military aircraft. In the top priority post-war drawers of both the United States Army engineers and the Department of the Interior are plans to construct 8 more dams on the Columbia, notching the river into a giant staircase and generating 5 times the power produced in the whole T. V. A. If this proposal materializes—and many public works may be needed to cope with post-war unemployment—the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is ready with a corollary plan which calls for the most tremendous biological experiment in American history.

To save the principal fish runs in the Nation, a commercial resource capitalized at $250,000,000, the Fish and Wildlife Service may have to transplant downstream to rivers near tidewater all the salmon and trout that now spawn in the tributaries of the Columbia between Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

What does this involve? Why is it so unprecedented in magnitude? Why does a committee of ichthyologists and fishermen recently appointed by Secretary of the Interior Ickes regard it as "a very difficult and extremely hazardous undertaking"? How good are the chances of success?

To understand the reasons for the experiment, it is necessary to understand the life cycle of the most remarkable creature of this hemisphere—the great Chinook or king salmon of the Pacific seaboard. No other beast, bird, or fish has so incredible an existence.

The baby salmon emerge 4 or 5 months after the adult fish have deposited millions of eggs far back in one of the mountain ranges which drain into the Columbia River. This is generally at the bottom of a foaming, gravel-strewn creek. After a year in what biologists call "the parent stream" the fry have developed into fingerlings 5 or 6 inches long. They drift down the creek, down innumerable other tributaries, and finally into the main stem of the Columbia. So at last they reach the sea, and there they remain for the bulk of their life. Exactly where they go no one is sure. They may range off the Alaskan coast. Possibly they swim to the Kamchatka. Perhaps they do not stray far from the Columbia's stormy mouth. After 3 years in the Pacific the salmon—a fingerling no longer but a strong, fighting fish powerful enough to conquer rapids and tear a hook from an angler's line—heeds the call of the river, just as once it responded to the urge of the sea.

The salmon fights its way upstream, stemming freshets and dodging nets and traps. Beside it swim all the other salmon which drifted down the Columbia more than 3 years before and have survived the perils of river and ocean. They thrash through rapids, over falls, up the ladders at Bonneville Dam, and deep into the uplands. Each fish hunts a particular creek or lake. This is what makes the Pacific salmon unique among wild creatures. The migrating Chinook does not seek any creek or lake, although the Columbia is ribbed with 10,000 tributaries, but rather the one creek or lake where half a decade earlier it emerged from the egg.

Sometimes a salmon will swim for miles up some canyon tributary, only to discover that this is not the parent stream. In such a case, it retraces its course and pokes into another creek in search of its birthplace. Biologists have clipped the fins of fingerlings in the Kicking Horse River in the Canadian Rockies, the last glacial tributary of the Columbia. Five years later—in the British Columbia autumn—fish with these same marking have come back again, wanderers that found their home 1,500 weary miles from the ocean.

After it enters fresh water across the Columbia's bar a chinook never feeds again. It will strike at a lure, but will not take bait. The oily tissue beneath the salmon's scales must power it all the way to the parent stream. This oil is its fuel. Thus for countless epochs the strongest, stoutest-hearted, and biggest salmon specimens on earth have spawned in the final headwaters. Once the female fish has laid her eggs and the male has fertilized them, the life cycle of the chinooks is completed. They drift downstream, tail foremost, and die within 24 hours.

Only one factor ever varies the pattern of this strange existence. If the salmon cannot reach the parent stream, it perishes without spawning.

If a series of dams is strung across the Columbia the Fish and Wildlife Service believes the one solution may be "to transplant the salmon runs inhabiting the upper tributaries to the rivers of the lower Columbia." Can this be done? Extraordinary though the experiment sounds, a similar one on a smaller scale has been going on for the past 5 years, and has met with remarkable success.

II

When Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, first saw Grand Coulee Dam looming above the Columbia like a great crenelated fortress, he knew that no chinook ever would spawn again in the ultimate headwaters of the country's main salmon waterway. For as long as steel and concrete might endure, the 800 miles of river and the 100,000 square miles of watershed behind Grand Coulee were cut off as a spawning ground.

Bonneville Dam the fish could pass via wide, watery ladders. Bonneville, despite its 518,000-kilowatt capacity, is only 72 feet in height. Grand Coulee, largest edifice ever reared by man, towers 550 feet above the Columbia's granite bed. Water crashing over its parapet tumbles twice as far as Niagara Falls, with a roar heard for miles across the arid plateau of the Inland Empire. Not even the biggest salmon, which since time immemorial have spawned in the headwaters of the Columbia, could pass this battlement. In addition, the 151-mile lake formed back of the dam so raised the temperature of the river that most of the migrating salmon would be sure to die before they attained the spawning grounds. Chinooks en route to spawn are extremely susceptible to water variations.

Gabrielson and his associates answered this unique challenge with a unique solution. In 1939 they began trapping all the fish ascending the upper Columbia. The salmon were caught in specially designed cages at Rock Island Dam, a small structure a little below Grand Coulee built by the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. This dam was fitted with the best fish ladders ever constructed by a private-utility corporation, and the traps were wedged into the ladders.

From the Rock Island traps the salmon were poured into long, 1,000-gallon tank trucks. Oxygen pumps and ice chambers kept the water in the trucks at the same temperature as the Columbia River. Aluminum paint warded off the glare of the sun. At a speed of 45 miles an hour, the fleet of eight silvery vehicles rolled up into the Cascade Mountains to the little town of Leavenworth, Wash., where the Fish and Wildlife Service had built the biggest fish hatchery in the world. Here the salmon were artificially propagated. Each female fish was hit on the head and split open for the precious eggs, approximately 10,000 to the female Chinook, considerably fewer to the smaller species. The sperm from the male salmon then was squirted onto the eggs. In fields of troughs and pools, the fingerlings thus were hatched and reared. To keep the water in Leavenworth's array of ponds at low temperature, the Forest Service drove a long rock tunnel tapping Ice Lake on the divide of the Cascades.

Finally the baby fish made their own excursion in the oxygenated tank trucks. They were driven to the sources of the Methow, Entiat, Okanogan, and Wenatchee Rivers and there dumped into the water. These streams join the Columbia below Grand Coulee Dam—the essential fact of the whole experiment. It manifestly is impossible for salmon ever to spawn again above Grand Coulee. The naturalists of the Fish and Wildlife Service were attempting to school the offspring of the salmon that spawned above Grand Coulee to take as their own parent streams tributaries which flow into the main river below Grand Coulee.

Frank A. Banks, the white haired Bureau of Reclamation engineer who constructed Grand Coulee, once called this undertaking "Uncle Sam's Fish College."

Has Uncle Sam's fish college trained its pupils? This past spring and fall told the tale. Up the Columbia forged the salmon which 5 years before had been the first class in the fish college. They were the offspring of the fish originally trapped at Rock Island.

The weirs in the Rock Island traps were lifted for these voyagers. They were allowed to swim on through. The naturalists watched breathlessly. The critical question was whether the salmon would turn into the mouth of the Entiat, Okanogan, Methow, and Wenatchee Rivers or whether they would migrate on to Grand Coulee and perish in the man-made Niagara billowing over the crest of the dam.

Like well-drilled battalions, the fish swung up the rivers in which they had been liberated as fingerlings 4 years before. No stragglers swam on to Coulee's impassable barrier, answering the upland call that had had lured their ancestors. Chinooks marked for the Entiat and Methow swam unhesitatingly into those white-watered streams. Blueback salmon, a Columbia River version of the small but meaty Alaskan sockeye, spawn only in rivers with a lake at their source—rivers like the Okanogan and Wenatchee, into which the bluebacks turned as though they had been coached by a West Point drillmaster.

A few weeks ago Elmer Higgins, chief of the Division of Fishery Biology of the Wildlife Service, pronounced his verdict: "None of the salmon attempted to return to their ancestral spawning grounds above Grand Coulee Dam. The fish entered their appropriate streams, and it is expected that natural spawning now under way will be successful. We believe that the answer is conclusive—that the entire run of Columbia River salmon which formerly passed the site of Grand Coulee Dam has been transferred to the four major tributaries below the dam.

No longer will fish ascending the upper Columbia be trapped at Rock Island and artificially hatched at Leavenworth. The gates in the traps have been lifted permanently. The parent streams of these salmon are now rivers on the downstream side of Grand Coulee. After operation of Uncle Sam's Fish College from 1939 until 1944, five complete cycles of salmon have been put through the process. Yet Higgins interposes a few warnings:

"Present success does not mean, of course, that the races of salmon which through the ages have been adapted to conditions in the higher British Columbia tributaries of the Columbia River are equally adapted to conditions found in the streams to which they have been transplanted. It may well be that some of these races have suffered high mortality on being transplanted and may disappear from the Columbia River runs. We are hopeful, however, that most of the upriver fish have found conditions in their new parent streams sufficiently congenial to permit survival."

For the time being the experiment has succeeded—beyond their wildest dreams, some ichthyologists say. But this, after all, solves only part of the problem of saving the salmon runs.

In the past only about 10 percent of the Columbia's salmon have spawned back of Grand Coulee. They have been the largest fish in size but comparatively few in numbers. What about the others? Most of the salmon find their parent stream between Bonneville and Grand Coulee. These are the fish which must be transplanted if the other projected dams are built. Will artificial propagation and transplanting be successful when the number of salmon involved is multiplied many times? Hatchery fish seldom have the vitality and stamina of their wild brethren.

III

There are other obstacles to be overcome if the vast salmon industry is to be kept alive. The incursions of civilization on the miraculous life cycle of the salmon are not limited to cutting off the upland breeding grounds. Survival of the salmon depends on three conditions: (1) Enough fish must escape the commercial nets at sea and near the mouth of the Columbia to get upstream to spawn; (2) the upstream spawning grounds must be protected from pollution and diversion, as well as blockade; and (3) the fingerlings must be able to migrate safely to the ocean.

These conditions have not been met for many years. They are not being met now.

In 1885, when the first trains of the Northern Pacific were swaying through the Columbia Gorge, canneries scooped out of the Columbia's wide waters 31,493,000 pounds of Chinook salmon. The canneries are still hauling fish out of the river—though by 1940 their output had been reduced by almost half. And the salmon are subject to peril from other sources, too. Trollers take a deadly toll at sea. Cannery fishermen at Swiftsure Bank, off the entrance to Puget Sound, have caught nearly $10,000,000 worth of salmon every year for many decades. Swimming upstream, the fish must run another gauntlet of nets. Indian spearsmen at Celilo Falls have a treaty with the United States Government, negotiated in 1855, which allows them to fish in the Columbia River for "as long as grass shall grow on the hills and the sun shall set in the sky."

Will the salmon last that long?

"Civilization and salmon don't mix," I was told by Grady Miller, hawk-nosed forest ranger at Wallowa Lake in Oregon, as he stood below a dam constructed across the lake's outlet, a dam built by a private utility company that completely destroyed one of the most valuable runs of blueback salmon in the region.

In recent years the settlement and exploitation of the Pacific Northwest have been greatly accelerated. Developments which might logically have required several decades have been compressed into a dozen months. The war has brought about an intensive demand for food, raw materials, and manufactured products of all sorts. Factories and shipyards have sprung up where not so long ago heron waded and deer foraged. Trees marked by forest rangers for protection and preservation have been sawed into beams, crates, and deck planks. Water which once a tired hiker could drink now bears the chemical residue of paper mills and metal plants and the sewage of new mushrooming war communities. Cattle and sheep have grazed off the bunch grass anchoring the silt on a thousand hillsides. War demands minerals, too, and the slag from mines helps to fill up creeks and choke rivers. Neither salmon nor the insect and crustacean life which sustains them as fingerlings can compete with this pollution and waste.

Not so long ago a large salmon run surged up the Willamette River each fall, leaping the 19-foot cataract at Oregon City in spectacular flips. Now no autumn Chinooks invade this major tributary of the Columbia. The offal, chemicals, and junk poured into the water at Portland have killed them off. One afternoon the Oregon State Game Commission released a batch of fingerlings in the Willamette below the interurban bridge. A few minutes later they floated bellies up. There had not been enough oxygen in the river to sustain them.

Even the fingerlings that do not have to cope with hazards of this sort must take their chances with man-made obstructions on their way down to the sea. At Bonneville Dam, where the fish ladders have proved successful and the returning salmon traverse them quickly and easily, the little fish on their way to the sea are at the mercy of the river. They cannot pick out the ladders. They must take the course of least resistance. Often they do not find the fingerling bypasses provided especially for them—concrete flumes which honeycomb the powerhouse. Most of the fingerlings are swept over the spillway. In the maelstrom at the base of the dam some of the baby fish die.

When Bonneville first was completed, the Oregon State Fish Commission released batches of fingerlings both above and below the dam. There were 50,000 fingerlings in each batch. The fins of the fish were clipped in distinctive patterns so that the two groups could be distinguished. Awards were paid both commercial and sports fishermen for salmon with marked fins which they turned in. At the end of the fourth year they had turned in a considerably larger number of the salmon released below the dam than of those released above it. From this test biologists have come to the conclusion that perhaps 25 percent of the fingerlings going down the Columbia are killed by the stunning impact of the Bonneville spillway. How great an effect will this have on the future of the salmon runs? Here again, the certainties are not yet known.

The fish ladders at Bonneville have made possible for the first time in history an accurate count of the salmon ascending the upper Columbia. These are wide watery staircases which cost $7,022,000 and were built by the Army engineers with the constant advice of the Wildlife Service. Since the dam was completed in 1938, every salmon passing it on the way back upstream to the spawning grounds has been clocked by fish-counters who sit in doghouse-like structures, tapping a meter whenever a fish flips through the grating at the top of each ladder.

The fish count at Bonneville during the past 7 years has just been released by the Bonneville Power Administration. This is it:

Year	Chinook salmon	Blueback salmon	Silver salmon	Steelhead trout
1938	271,799	75,040	15,185	107,003
1939	286,216	73,382	14,382	121,922
1940	391,595	148,808	18,822	185,174
1941	461,713	65,741	17,011	118,087
1942	403,938	55,464	12,041	151,346
1943	313,123	39,845	2,547	92,131
1944 [1]	238,191	15,071	4,073	93,047

[1] Up to and including October. (By this month the main run has gone up the river.)

What do these figures mean? What story do they tell a biologist? Inasmuch as the Bonneville Dam first barricaded the river in 1938, the progeny of the first fish passing through the ladders came back upstream 5 years later. That was 1943, a year the count of Chinooks went tolerably high. Why has the count been so low for 1944? Did Bonneville in any way cause these discouraging figures? Why was the count comparatively low in 1938, long before the dam could have had any effect at all? Why has the number of bluebacks dropped so sharply? Why have silver salmon almost completely disappeared from the Columbia? Why did the Bonneville count in Chinooks soar from a low total in 1938 to its highest point in 1941 and then gradually descend to an even lower level for 1944?

"I wish I could answer these questions," declared Elmer Higgins, "but we are in the dark, too. This is the first time we ever had a salmon count on the Columbia. Considerable variations may be normal over a span of years. We have no previous standards to go by. But it is far more probable that the small 1944 count is due to the cumulative effect of uncontrolled commercial fishing for many seasons, as well as to the excessive exploitation of mineral, soil, and forest resources which guard the watershed."

But the naturalists do know several facts for a certainty so far as Bonneville Dam is concerned. First and foremost, the Bonneville fish ladders have been a success. Few fish on their way upstream collect in baffled schools at the base of the dam. Virtually all of them find the entrance to one of the big watery staircases. On a single September day in 1940 the ladders were spanned by 33,900 Chinooks, which turned the passages into a boiling melee of fins and backs. Even men who claimed the Government was going "dam crazy" now concede that the Bonneville ladders are by far the best fishways ever built.

IV

On the wall of Dr. Gabrielson's office hangs a map showing how man-made encroachments have gradually shrunk the spawning areas available to salmon in the Columbia Basin. An impassable dam here, unscreened irrigation ditches there, indiscriminate dumping of sewage and chemical wastes of a hundred towns, logged-off slopes, dredging for minerals—all this has blocked off nearly two-thirds of the lakes and creeks where fish originally spawned. Today only a few major tributaries still offer sanctuary to the fish which come home from the sea with the autumn equinox.

In December the Fish and Wildlife Service reported, "The piecemeal destruction of the Columbia River spawning grounds has proceeded to such a point that no more tributary streams can be sacrificed if the largest salmon river in the United States is to continue to contribute materially to the Nation's food supply."

To provide adequate spawning ground it may be necessary to move the entire salmon run downstream and to blow up the dams on the Clackamas, Sandy, and several other rivers near the tidewater. The plan contemplates trapping all migrating salmon in the Bonneville Dam ladders and propagating them in a series of immense hatcheries far larger than the facilities at Leavenworth. Then the resultant fingerlings would be released in the few available rivers near the sea.

The likelihood of successful transfer downstream is subject to many imponderables. Is there room in the lowland tributaries for the immense aquatic life of the Columbia? Will fish adapted to the high mountains spawn in rivers at tidewater? How many salmon will be lost in the elaborate transplanting process? Will the vitality of the species be irretrievably sapped by the intervening hatchery propagation? At what point does biology rebel against man's intrusion?

And at what point does the biologist rebel at the intrusion of the dam-builder? A vast new project imperils the salmon that survive. There exists the possibility that the construction of new dams is the wise course. The proposed structures would generate 5,894,300 kilowatts of power at the cheapest rates on earth. This hydroelectricity might rehabilitate countless other resources spent by the waste of war. It is claimed that the Grand Coulee Dam will turn arid sagebrush into 40,000 productive farms; that Umatilla Dam will cut down the cost of fuel shipped to the inland empire and reduce the price of wheat, fruit, and beef that are transported out of that spacious region.

With these benefits in mind, the Fish and Wildlife Service has admitted that "the economic importance of water for purposes other than the propagation of fish is such that it cannot and should not be used solely for the sake of maintaining salmon runs. If conservation is wise use, it is the part of true conservation to choose the more valuable use of a resource whenever two or more uses conflict in such a way as to be mutually exclusive."

If the dam project is undertaken the vast salmon experiment will go on. Millions of eggs will be fertilized, millions of fingerlings sent on their way down to the sea, their fins clipped for identification. Each year, as one class of Uncle Sam's Fish College is graduated, alumni of a previous class will return for their quinquennial reunion on the tidewater tributaries of the Columbia. Each year the faculty will be that much wiser.

Address by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida; at Bogota, Colombia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] made a notable address at Bogota, capital of the Republic of Colombia, on December 4, which I think would be of interest to Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, it is symbolic of the hospitality of Colombia that you have opened to Mrs. Pepper and me and to our friends accompanying us the gates of your country and city and the doors of your distinguished Senate and your hearts as well. I shall always cherish this honor you bestow upon me as one of the high lights of my life. Of course, I understand that this warm gesture of friendship which you have extended me in thus permitting me to come and to speak to you is an honor which you have selected me to receive on behalf of the United States Senate and my country, the United States, as well as my State of Florida. It is an honor for which the Senate of the United States and Florida will be grateful when they learn of it, as they soon shall. We will not consider that we have discharged our debt to you until all of you of the Colombian Senate shall visit the Senate of the State of Florida and the United States Senate in Washington. We shall hope that your visit to us will come in the very near future.

The State of Florida, which I have the honor to represent in the Senate of the United States, not only lies very close to you in Colombia geographically, our very name "Florida" came from the ever rich beauty of your language. We are very close to you in affection as well. You know the long history of Florida and of those who were its first settlers and how the Spanish tradition has lingered in the State. There are some of our people who hold even now Spanish grants of land. We have at St. Augustine the oldest city in the United States, and as you well remember, it was for so long a Spanish city. Even today, many of the descendants of those early Spanish citizens remain as distinguished citizens of our State and country. Many places in Florida proudly bear Spanish names and many of our people speak the music of the Spanish language.

Just as you are the gateway to South America, Florida is the gateway to the United States. Each of us therefore must keep close to the other, that we may not only be friends ourselves but may be the ties through which the two Americas may be held close together in interest and in esteem and friendship.

We have already seen at Barranquilla and in flying here and at Bogotá much of the rare beauty of your fair country, and already we have come to feel the pull which makes those who come to visit you so reluctant to depart. We have had the honor to visit your distinguished President and many of your eminent ministers. Now, I am privileged to see that part of your Government with which I feel so much at home because I am a part of the same branch of Government in my country, your Senate. I have had the honor to serve 8 years in the Senate and am happy to say that I have recently been reelected to a new term of 6 years.

I am sure I find you busily engaged with your heavy responsibilities, as we are in the United States. Both your country and mine, indeed almost all our hemisphere, are in one way or another at war—the worst war in the history of the world, a war against the most evil tyrants the world has ever produced. At last we have proved to the world the solidarity of the Americas, for the exception only proves the rule, as we have always heard. That dream of Simón Bolívar that there should be unity among the people of the Americas and that that unity should extend to the vast community of nations has come true. Indeed the United Nations established in the Western Hemisphere by George Washington and Simón Bolívar have grown into the United Nations of the world. The spirit of the Americas today has become the spirit of the real new order of the earth.

Now the world will know that the security of the Western Hemisphere will be defended and preserved against all who would attack or threaten our freedom and independence by peoples who, although they speak somewhat different languages and may live many miles apart, yet are one in unity and in determination that they shall be free and good neighbors.

Now enemies of the Americas who have designs upon us and our rich and fair lands will know that they cannot divide us and break up our friendship. Experience in this war has proved how little progress those nations have made who tried that policy.

And if there are those among us anywhere who have erred or sinned against the unity of the Americas, then let us remember that our religion teaches us two great virtues: one, to forgive those who repent and, two, faith that the sinner will reform. Let us hope therefore that any sinner amongst us in the Americas will repent and be baptized again into the old faith of American democracy.

When we have won this terrible war, with all that it has cost in life and treasure, we would dishonor the dead if we did not this time build a lasting peace. But we know from experience that such a peace can come only from our setting up an international organization which shall be strong enough to prevent war. Such an organization we are now building and we are all determined that we shall build it to completion even before the war itself shall end. That organization will be open to large states and to small states. In that organization all states will stand upon an equal status and each will be expected to discharge its burdens and its obligations according to its ability. There will be a chance for all to speak and to seek redress against wrong. In this organization there will be a judicial tribunal whose duty it shall be to decide disputes among nations by peaceful means, which is the civilized way of settling arguments.

This organization shall have force at its command, a part of which force shall be held available by each member state according to the ability of such member to provide such force. This force will be subject to instant use against any nation which may be an aggressor and threaten the world with war. At long last when the blood bath of this war is by the kindness of Providence ended, all of us together are going to make the world a lawful world where justice under law shall prevail, as it prevails in the courts of our countries.

This organization of nations of which I speak will have its struggles and its problems. It will need, therefore, faithful and stanch friends. The people of my country know that Colombia, where was set up the first republic in all of South America, the country of Simón Bolívar, can be depended upon to help to build and to defend against all enemies this new organization of united nations which noble men and women all over the world are now earning with their sacred lives.

The future will hold many problems for us, and one of those practical problems will be how we may all overcome the burdens of war and enjoy prosperity. That battle, too, we must win. We shall win it as we are winning the war, by working together, by understanding of one another's problems, by helping one another, by continued friendship, by continuing to be good neighbors.

You know what is in the heart of our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. You know how, with his great Secretary of State Cordell Hull, who has had to pass his mantle on to his distinguished successor, he launched the good-neighbor policy. You know he has in good faith endeavored to live by that policy. The results speak for themselves and they do not need words from me to bolster them up. If we have erred, we shall always try to do better. If we perchance have succeeded, we shall try to pursue the policies which have proved wise. The good-neighbor policy has worked. It has worked for the people of North America and of South America. You know that now for 4 more years you may count upon Franklin D. Roosevelt, who began that policy, to continue it. I am sure our unity shall grow more perfect as the days stretch out before us, for you may depend upon it that no United States Government will ever change the good-neighbor policy.

This future, while it will present problems, is bright with hope and promise. It offers us all safety, peace, prosperity, and happiness. We are indeed entering upon the promised land of the future, not only with hope but with faith. This victory, too, we shall gain.

Hasta luego.

Our Aged Folks Are "The Forgotten Man"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time someone who calls himself a humanitarian or friend of the common people, or a philanthropist, undertakes to tell us of the great humanitarian work of the Government bureaus and bureaucrats during the past several years. While advising our aged citizens—and this means the women as well as the men—that the administration leaders are doing so much for them, at the same time Government agencies and Government leaders are quick to make the claim that Congress is responsible for things that go wrong. This alibi, of course, is used in connection with every problem and among some folks who do not think the problem through it has a great appeal.

When the Social Security Act was passed several years ago, it was hailed by administration leaders as a great solution for all troubles of the underprivileged, the unfortunate, and those people who, by reason of old age were no longer able to earn a livelihood. Even assuming that these claims were sincere, condi-

tions very early indicated that payments to our aged citizens were wholly inadequate.

The Government records are devoid of any efforts made by the proper Government bureaus to change this situation. Just to keep the records straight, so far as I know, no administrative official has ever proposed legislation that would properly do justice to our aged citizens. Neither has the administration endorsed any proposed change in existing law. Without such endorsement such legislation cannot be considered or passed, because the administration has had and now has the majority of the votes in Congress. Those who know how the party system of Government operates will readily understand that responsibility for changes in existing law rests on the political party in power.

The bureaus and the bureaucrats are too busy writing new regulations, drawing their salaries, and otherwise following the highways of least resistance so that it has been convenient to neglect and overlook those men and women who have really had to live on a dole over a period of several years.

I am prompted to make these remarks because the Legislature of the State of Minnesota is now in session and a news item under date of January 30, 1945, states that the Federal Government has threatened to withdraw all funds for old-age assistance for Minnesota unless the Minnesota Legislature repeals a provision in existing State law permitting recipients of old-age help from the State to earn if possible not more than $100 a year, if they can find someone who can use their service to that extent. This notice was served by some head of the Federal bureaus stationed in Minnesota. Such an attitude on the part of the Federal bureau head and such a development is perfectly natural under our bureaucratic form of government. It disregards entirely the human element and the facts and everything else.

An editorial in the Duluth News-Tribune, of Duluth, Minn., on February 1, 1945, is very much in point in discussing these developments and in presenting the problem which confronts all of us not only as Government officials but as American citizens as well. This editorial reads:

OLD-AGE PENSION SQUABBLE

The regional director of the Federal Social Security Board in Minnesota says that unless the State legislature passes legislation barring "beneficiaries" of the old-age pension (the quotation marks are ours) from earning outside money, the Federal Government will refuse to pay its half of the sum devoted to the fund.

Members of the legislature best acquainted with the situation refuse to have anything to do with such restriction, and say, with much truth, that it does not matter enough in dollars and cents to either the State or the Federal Government if somebody who comes under the law earns a few dollars on the side or manages to eke out a living under the pension. How they manage to live on the pension allowed is a lesson in economics that should be the basis for study by some of our experts. It would be revealing and instructive. The average hand-out is $29.24 per month. Lavish, isn't it?

It seems to us that the Federal Government, instead of assuming such a squeamish and niggardly policy, should encourage the old-age beneficiaries to earn a few cents themselves if they can without injury to themselves. Is the Government determined to hold them down to the pittance given out? Perhaps the fact that the oldsters, because of age, will not long be with us and therefore cannot vote many more times, is one thing that counts.

Why should Uncle Sam kick about it? The State paid one-third and the counties one-sixth of the amount expended. And nobody besides Uncle Sam's employees and some officious employees on the cases investigated seem to worry about the amount paid out. We can better afford to pay heavily for assistance of people who have helped build up the Nation than to see them in want.

While the editorial does not say so, it approaches the problem from the standpoint of local government and amounts to condemnation of outside interference. Outside interference in this case happens to be the Federal Government.

One of my first contacts with this problem of bureaucratic interference with State and local subdivisions in social security came when regulations were promulgated from Washington requiring all employees of welfare agencies in the State of Minnesota to take examinations, the examination questions being prepared by high-powered college graduates employed by the high-powered bureaus in Washington. Many of the employees could not qualify in such an examination because they did not have two or three college degrees, although they may have had a lot of good horse sense which more than equalized the situation. Anyhow, authority to perform these acts of domination and tyranny was claimed under legislation passed by the Congress of the United States. The procedure was all a part of the program to streamline social security so that the Federal Government would tell the State agencies how to operate. In the end, the bureaucrats down here had their way about this matter.

Last summer I visited a courthouse in one of our Minnesota counties and one of the county officials unburdened himself. He pointed out that the encroachments of Federal Bureaus and Bureaucrats on local governmental problems and agencies have been so great that it is only a question of time until State lines disappear. As I recall it, he said in substance, that in his particular county $250,000 was being spent every year for social-security work, including old-age assistance, and that the whole matter was handled by high-powered, high-priced, and high-salaried employees who were imported from some other State, and who, of course, knew nothing about the background of the different families or their needs, or other factors involved in a relief program. This naturally resulted in too little money in some cases and probably more than was deserved in other cases. My friend who has been a county official for 35 or 40 years concluded his oration with the statement that the different local agencies were in much better position to determine these matters than were good folks who might come from South America or some State in this Republic of ours.

Our problem is how to prevent regimentation of the American people by Washington, bureaus, boards, and commissions. Congress through its Appropriation Committee would do well to check the number of employees in and the different kinds of activities carried on by these bureaus. We would do well to reverse the policy of giving unlimited authority and almost unlimited appropriations to these different agencies which operate to destroy America and our system of government.

We will never get rid of the existing confusion in government until some effort is made by congressional leaders to decentralize some of the functions and powers of our Federal administrative officials. Unless this is done the bureaus are going to continue to grow and prosper, and in corresponding degree the American people are going to suffer.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress I introduced legislation which would provide that a committee of the House and a committee of the Senate should be empowered to confer with particular administrative officials and make a study of their methods, why they wanted legislation enacted and just how much time they spend in trying to figure out enough ways in which they could spend the taxpayers' money.

When I talked with a newspaperman who is well known on Capitol Hill he laughed and made the comment that it took a lot of courage for any Member of Congress to suggest that a New Deal agency should permit Congress to have anything to do with a policy-making program of the agency. This man was correct, because my suggestion was never treated seriously by the people who control the governmental program.

However, to conclude this short discussion, let me say that the agency which controls the expenditure of Federal funds in our different States would be a very good agency on which to start the proper investigation by Congress.

The Compulsory Work Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I deem it is my duty to state to the people of the district I represent my attitude, not only on this compulsory work bill which we have before us today, but on similar bills that are expected to follow and which in my opinion would imperil the Constitution of the United States.

Never in my life, in peace or in war, will I cast a vote that would wreck the Constitution, or weaken its processes.

The Constitution of the United States, whether we realize it or not, is the cornerstone of our national welfare and the sheet anchor of our liberties. If we lose it we lose everything.

I have no criticism of the proponents of this measure, nor do I doubt their good faith. Those of us who do not agree

with them in respect to this bill also want to win the war in the briefest space of time, but what will we gain if in winning the war we destroy constitutional guaranties of liberty at home—the very thing our soldiers are fighting for?

The thirteenth amendment of the Constitution says:

> Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist in the United States or in any place subject to its jurisdiction.

If the pending bill is not a violation of that amendment, I am unable to sense the meaning of language. Certainly if the bill does not violate the expressed wording of the Constitution, it is a transgression of its meaning.

Our Constitution has a spirit as well as a letter. There have been altogether too many times when the letter of the Constitution has been observed but its spirit has been outraged in a thousand ways. In our American concept of government there is no room for a labor draft, which is another form of involuntary servitude, expressly prohibited by the thirteenth amendment. It would be in my opinion a gross violation of the spirit of the Constitution, a nullification of the objective for which our boys are giving their precious lives overseas, namely, that America shall forever remain a free country.

I believe it is entirely possible to achieve by voluntary cooperation what this work-or-fight bill proposes to accomplish by force and compulsion, and I have no doubt that the voluntary way is the better way. We must be extremely careful to see that no foreign ideologies take root in our free American soil. The boys in IV–F are not there because they are trying to dodge their obligations. They are there because they were put there by the operation of the Selective Service System. Many thousands of these men already are in defense work, and now that the need for more defense workers has been brought so forcefully to public attention I feel confident that as rapidly as possible more and more of those classified in IV–F will voluntarily change to defense employment. All they want is opportunity, and they will do their duty. Before we violate the thirteenth amendment of the Constitution let us try out the possibilities of the American way of doing things—the voluntary way. Give industry and labor the facts and they will give the Army and Navy materials in ever-increasing proportions.

I opposed the packing of the Supreme Court as being, in my opinion, violative of the spirit of the Constitution. The idea of enforced labor is certainly no less violative of the spirit of the Constitution than was the packing of the Supreme Court, and if Congress gives its sanction to this pending bill, I, for one, shall despair of the safety of the Constitution in the future.

On January 3, 1945, I took an oath for the ninth time to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. I am going to remain true to that oath. I am anxious that we shall have the same free country after the war that we had when we entered the war, and I want those who sent me to Washington to know that I shall do everything I can to preserve and safeguard the Constitution in all of its meaning and implications.

It is my considered opinion that the sooner we get back to the fundamentals of government as exemplified in our Constitution, and to the fundamentals of religion as exemplified in the teachings of Christ, the sooner we will usher in a better world.

Winning the War—First in Order of Importance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail I was favored by a copy of the resolution adopted by a national retail organization, at its recent convention held January 11, 1945. The members of this group are to be congratulated. At their meeting, held during the week of January 8, 1945 this was the only resolution which was prepared and adopted, declaring the war and the needs of the Nation to be paramount at this time.

In common with other patriotic Americans, the retailers of this country recognize the quicker the war ends just that much closer comes the day when men and women in our armed forces may call their job ended and return to civilian life in the United States of America.

This resolution adopted by the retailers reads as follows:

> We have come to the most critical hour in our history as a Nation when, in the balance of fate, no individual interest must be permitted to weight against the security and well-being of the Republic.
>
> American men, the flower of our youth, are suffering the stark horror of the world's most terrible war and are yeilding up their lives for those historic principles which are the dearest considerations of our people.
>
> Robbed of liberty and the dignity of freemen, life to Americans would be worthless.
>
> Therefore, waiving all controversial issues, the members of the National Retail Dry Goods Association call upon retailers everywhere, and all other forms of American business, to rededicate themselves, and all that they have and are, to the one supreme task of speeding the day of complete victory over the forces of brutality which have destroyed the peace of the world.
>
> The retailers of the Nation have thus far staunchly supported the war, contributing in numberless ways to the Nation's objective, but the time now has arrived which calls for even more generous sacrifice.
>
> We call upon the members of our trade to redouble their zeal in the loyal discharge of every obligation laid upon them by the national need, to the end that the great power and influence of the country's retailers shall be mobilized in all-out support of the war.
>
> In their important field of service to the civilian population, it is the obligation of retailers to take all steps possible, within the limits permitted by the concentration of facilities on the production of war supplies, to insure the equitable flow of necessities to the public.
>
> This service must be maintained to assure unswerving morale on the home front that the determination to support the war effort shall not falter through any fear of the spector of want.
>
> Retailers are urged to discharge this grave responsibility as a public trust. The knowledge of unselfish service is more satisfying than profits and no degree of individual success can be so important as the speedy ending of the war with complete victory at the lowest cost in the blood and lives of our fighting men.

Mr. Speaker, the sentiments expressed in the foregoing resolution should meet with full approval on the part of every citizen of the Republic. While we note that the retailers waive all controversial issues, we must not overlook the fact that right now they are circumscribed by numberless regulations and directives issued by numberless bureaus and bureaucrats operating under the administrative branch of our Government. The one agency of Government which can and should protect the small merchants and small business, as well as other public interests in America, is the Congress of the United States. We already have too many confusing and unnecessary orders issued by emergency war bureaus and very often by people who are not fitted to direct the different business enterprises over which they occupy governmental jurisdiction. It is our duty as Members of the legislative branch of our Government to keep a check on these numberless bureaus with their numberless regulations. Otherwise they may hinder instead of help the war effort.

In the economic life of America the retailers of the country play an important part. They are the ones who have to supply the economic needs of the average American family, and unless those needs are supplied there is an interference with the efficiency and American way of life which actually hinders the war effort.

I want to congratulate the retailers upon this resolution and pledge and assure them that their work is not a nonessential activity but that, in my opinion, it has to do with our war effort and with maintaining the morale of the war workers on the home front.

Do We Need Work-or-Fight Legislation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following round-table discussion on the American Forum of the Air, broadcast from the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D. C., on Tuesday evening, January 30, 1945:

Mr. MAY. Mr. Granik, we are now engaged in the prosecution of a world-wide or global war, and while the Constitution is effective even in wartime, I have no doubt whatsoever

of the constitutionality of the pending bill. In the first place, the Constitution expressly provides that Congress shall have power to declare war and to provide and support armies. I call special attention to the word "support."

The other question involving constitutional construction is hinged around the thirteenth amendment. That amendment provides that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been convicted, anywhere in the United States or any of its possessions.

Now, if the Congress can declare a war, it must necessarily have the power to maintain an army to carry on the war. In this war it is essential that we provide vast amounts of equipment and supplies never heretofore thought of in any war, and in order to provide those supplies we of necessity must utilize the facilities of private industry, and to do that it requires the services of men.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Granik, Judge MAY is a very able lawyer and I am no lawyer at all, but I have read the Constitution and I think there is a distinct difference between drafting men in the armed services whereby they serve the Government of the United States and drafting men to work in industries for private individuals or corporations for their profit. It is entirely different, and that fundamental distinction must not be lost sight of.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Granik, I don't fully agree with my friend Mr. SHORT. I think the act is constitutional. As a matter of fact, it has been tested out—not this particular act, but similar matters relating to the conduct of war have been tested in our Supreme Court in a number of cases, dating back to the earliest days of our country, certainly back to the Civil War times. There were a number of cases after the World War and during the World War. There have been cases in the present war relating particularly to the use of conscientious objectors, assigning them to work of national importance, and the Supreme Court has uniformly adhered to the rule that when the Constitution gave power to Congress to raise and maintain armies; that is, to wage war, it meant to wage war successfully and therefore to do whatever was necessary to make that waging of war successful.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, my good friend JOHN SPARKMAN, from Alabama, I am reluctant to mention the Constitution these days because it has been torn to shreds and thrown into the wastebasket so many times in recent years that no one knows what is constitutional or unconstitutional, but we do know this: That this particular bill before us is not a war measure; it is a peace measure. The men who are to be drafted are not placed in uniform; they are not employees of the Government; they are simply to be forced and coerced to enter private industries to work for other private American citizens for their individual profit, and because of that I think it is clearly unconstitutional.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The very fact that the constitutionality of this law is being questioned makes all of us stop and pause. Every constitutional government and provision of protection within constitutional government has been eliminated by the totalitarians under the guise of necessity. Of course, we should consider whether this is necessary or not. But I think that it is unconstitutional because it very clearly breaks the thirteenth amendment of the Constitution against involuntary servitude.

Mr. MAY. Mr. HOLIFIELD, may I interrupt to say this about your thirteenth amendment? I have repeated already the contents of that amendment, and it is undoubtedly admitted by everybody, at least lawyers throughout the country, that the States as sovereignties and members of the Union can impose criminal penalties upon men for penal offenses, and enforce them by imprisonment or by labor on public works. Now, if a man for the mere cause of infringing upon somebody's peace of the community or upon his property rights can be imprisoned and required to render public service as a worker on public works, why isn't it reasonable to conclude that when the life of the Nation and the liberty of all of its people are at stake the Congress can provide the means of maintaining an Army by employing the ability and the capacity of its people to perform labor?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. MAY, I would say on that point that it hasn't been proved yet that it is necessary, and I believe that the Constitution clearly says that in the conduct of war, as in the conduct of peace, we have to abide by the rules laid down by the Constitution. Of course, it is a difference of opinion as to what those rules are tonight.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Granik, Chairman MAY, and Mr. Sparkman have cited certain cases that have been ruled by the Supreme Court heretofore, but they must admit, and everyone knows, that never before in the history of the United States have we resorted to such a drastic measure as this, never before have we drafted civilians and coerced them to enter private industry for the profit of other private individuals. It is something entirely new.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Dewey, I think you will admit that never before in the history of our Nation have we been confronted with the difficulty with which we are confronted now, the danger.

Mr. SHORT. I certainly do agree to that, and it seems to me, Mr. Granik, we shouldn't waste too much time on the constitutionality, but simply ask ourselves whether or not this drastic legislation is necessary, be it constitutional or unconstitutional.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If it is necessary, you admit it would be constitutional?

Mr. SHORT. If I were convinced that it would absolutely achieve its purported objective, I would support it wholeheartedly. On the contrary, I have always believed, and I think history shows and experience has proved, that free labor is more efficient and productive than slave labor, and we have demonstrated to the world under our American system of free enterprise that we can out-produce and have out-produced the slave labor of Japan, Italy, and Germany combined.

Mr. MAY. Will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. SHORT. Gladly; always to my chairman.

Mr. MAY. I would like to answer that argument by saying this: That we are told by those who are the leaders and in charge of the campaign of this war and in the prosecution of it that we must have 900,000 men for the armed forces between now and next June 30 as replacements. We have more than 450,000 men in hospitals at this particular time. If we can authorize our leaders, our military chieftains, our Chief of Staff and the Navy and all the rest of them to maintain a fighting force and prosecute the war, we can certainly do the things that are essential to enable them to successfully prosecute it, and that means to win it.

Mr. SHORT. Chairman MAY or any other member of the House Military Affairs Committee or of the Congress has no higher regard or greater admiration than I have for General Marshall, Admiral King, and our other great military and naval leaders so long as they stay in their own respective fields; but when it comes to the matter of production, I'd rather take the advice and counsel of the workers and the employers of America who deal specifically and daily with that particular problem.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Dewey, I wonder what you would say in connection with that statement with reference to Under Secretary of War Patterson, who is charged with the job of getting out production so far as the Army is concerned, and what about Mr. Krug of the War Production Board, and various others who are charged by our Government with the responsibility of seeing that the production comes out?

Mr. SHORT. Robert Patterson was a judge of the United States circuit court of appeals before becoming Under Secretary of War, and I don't think he knows much more about production than I know myself, or you, and that is very little, but I do want to take the advice of the National Manufacturers' Association and other business organizations, of the C. I. O., of the American Federation of Labor, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; all labor, and all industry, are against this legislation, and I think they are better qualified to speak about the problem of production than any of our military leaders.

Mr. MAY. Does my colleague remember that in several of the instances when these representatives of labor and of manufacturers appeared before our committee, that even the president of the National Manufacturers' Association testified at length against the measure and at the end of his testimony in effect he was questioned by a member of the committee as to whether he had read the bill, and he said he had not even read it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. And as a matter of fact (pardon me for breaking in)——

Mr. MAY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, the whole line of his testimony was exactly what the bill sought to do. His recommendations were along that line.

Mr. MAY. He said in effect, and not only in effect but emphatically, that he was in favor of work or fight legislation.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; and right at this point, this bill is misnamed. It isn't a work or fight bill. The whole fight element has been taken out of it completely. It is a work or go to jail bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the gentleman object to taking out the fight part of the bill?

Mr. SHORT. No; I believe if we are going to have total mobilization we should adopt the American Legion bill to conscript wealth as well as labor and to take the profits out of war, and if we had had that bill presented immediately after Pearl Harbor it would have been passed overwhelmingly by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And yet the same people who are opposing this bill today opposed that bill when we reported it out in 1938.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; but this is a piecemeal and a discriminatory measure that applies only to male citizens between the ages of 18 and 45.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will go along with you——

Mr. SHORT (interposing). And I want to say there are many men between the ages of 45 and 50 who are mentally and physically better qualified to perform manual labor and other tasks for the war effort than a lot within the age group of 18 to 45.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Short, will you yield to me?

Mr. SHORT. Sure.

Mr. MAY. I would like to say this: That this legislation would have been enacted long ago had it not been for the opposition of the minority groups about which you speak. It is undoubtedly true that Congress would have enacted it shortly after the declaration of war on the 8th day of December 1941, and on the 11th day of December as to Germany, but since then there has been a campaign on and the only opposition expressed by the labor leaders, including Mr. Phil Murray, who is a high-class gentleman and an able labor leader, was that it was coercive in its effect, that it resorted to compulsion, when as a matter of fact compulsion doesn't enter into the picture at all until all reasonable efforts have been made to obtain the services of these men by voluntary methods.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, I will have to disagree with my chairman on that point. Coercion enters into the bill immediately upon passing of the bill, because it automatically

freezes every man into the job that he is in. That is where coercion starts. Now, he may mean criminal coercion, but coercion actually starts when the bill is passed. He cannot leave his job unless he gets permission from his local selective-service board, and then in order to overcome the ruling of his board he has to carry it through the United States Attorney General to the district court, he is indicted on a criminal complaint by the grand jury, and he is a criminal until his status is cleared by a trial.

Mr. SHORT. Subject to severe penalties, 5 years' imprisonment and a $10,000 fine.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. We would have to build jails all over the country to hold them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. HOLIFIELD, I wonder if I may ask you this question: You are in favor, are you not, of some kind of legislation to give statutory authority to the directives of the War Manpower Commission?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You would advocate that, would you not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes. I would qualify it in this way, that I am in favor if it is necessary to give the War Manpower Commission additional authority to enforce directives, but that doesn't include putting a man in jail because he doesn't obey a directive.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What would be the idea of giving statutory authority to enforce directives if you didn't attach some penalty to it? How are you going to enforce them?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is very easy. They are enforcing penalties at this time. If the W. P. B. will allocate materials away from nonessential, luxury-making industries and into essential industries, that will be penalty enough to drive, if it is necessary to drive—and I don't think it is—American workers into the defense plants.

Mr. SHORT. And if Mr. HOLIFIELD will yield for a second, if the War Manpower Commission were given statutory authority and would place a ceiling over the number of men who could be employed in a factory, that wouldn't throw a man in jail; that would simply keep him from finding employment there and force him to go somewhere else.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But suppose he didn't go somewhere else voluntarily. What would you do with him?

Mr. SHORT. The reason they haven't gone other places in the let-down of this production is due to many things. One is low wages, particularly in our foundries. They should be increased. Secondly, to bad housing, to insanitary surroundings, and to difficult transportation problems. Another is absenteeism caused by illness or accident or other factors which legislation cannot reach. Another is turn-over in plants caused by change in design and methods of production. Another thing that I think perhaps has contributed more than anything else to the let-down or the cut-back has been the termination and cancelation of contracts by the Government itself last year. The aluminum industry closed many of its factories, the Weldon Springs Ordnance Plant in St. Louis, the Small Arms Plant, the Ordnance Plant at Lowell, Mass., and many other of these munitions plants were closed, and thousands were forced out of work.

Mr. MAY. Now, will my colleague permit me to ask him this question: We have been told by our Army leaders and by the Navy leaders that they need 700,000 men between now and the 1st of June for industry.

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. MAY. That are not available.

Mr. SHORT. Your Army and Navy——

Mr. MAY. Just a moment. Let's say that the Constitution provides, just as I quoted it a while ago about the right of Congress to declare war, also that it shall provide for and maintain a navy. Now, if you are going to maintain a navy and you have provided a battleship, you certainly have got to have men to operate it. You can tie it up to an American shore in a harbor or on a dock and you can leave it there unless you have the manpower to operate it, and it is a dead duck. What are you going to do about the need for 700,000 more men that we haven't got in industry?

Mr. SHORT. Under Secretary of War Patterson says we need 700,000 more, and the Army and Navy men do, but the War Manpower Commission, on which is represented Government, industry, agriculture, and labor, who know this problem intimately, say that we need only 148,000. The truth is, no one knows exactly how many men we need because no census has been taken, no scientific, thorough, exhaustive survey has been made, and this whole legislation is built upon opinion rather than factual data.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now, Dewey, I think you have made a mistake there. I know you didn't do it willingly. I think you have misquoted a figure. The 148,000 that you refer to, as I recall, was a figure given by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as to the actual shortage in certain critical plants as of December 30, 1944. As a matter of fact, I hold a memorandum here from the War Manpower Commission and I am looking at the figures, and it shows demand from January to June 1945, 1,600,000, including 900,000 for the armed forces and 700,000 for the industrial production end of it.

Mr. SHORT. The testimony of Judge Hay, who appeared for Paul McNutt, who was in Europe at the time, was that for the next 6 months we need only 148,000. The figures have run anywhere from 90,000 to 700,000 men.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This recommendation is over the signature of Judge Hay and is dated January 9, 1945.

Mr. SHORT. It seems very strange to me, Mr. SPARKMAN, that we should have this bill before us now, when Congress has just set up a board comprised of former Senator Gillette, former Governor Hurley, and Lieutenant Heller, to dispose of $10,000,000,000 worth of Army equipment and goods which the Army and Navy themselves have declared surplus.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, no!

Mr. SHORT. Oh, yes! And when thousands of citizens in many of these States—and I have the figures here, 14,000 in New York, 13,000 in Michigan, 11,000 in Illinois, 5,000 in New Jersey——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Eighteen thousand and seventy-four in California are drawing unemployment compensation.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; unemployment compensation, and still we are crying about the shortage of manpower. I want to say that government itself and the armed forces have been guiltiest, are the biggest sinners when it comes to hoarding labor.

Mr. MAY. Listen, Mr. SHORT, there are two phases of this manpower need. One is for industry and one is for military purposes.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. MAY. And we are having today at least 30,000 men each month or 1,000 a day coming back from the ranks of our fighting forces, either wounded or killed or displaced in some other way. Now, we have got to keep up those stopgaps, and we have got to have 700,000 men between now and June 30. Therefore, I think that the legislation is necessary in view of the fact that it has been established that there is no other way of obtaining it.

And in reference to your manpower situation in the Manpower Commission, I would like you to answer this question. They have been dealing with the labor problem now for 3 years and we still have the troubles. Why haven't they solved it?

Mr. GRANIK. Did you want to answer that, Congressman HOLIFIELD, or did you want to comment?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I'll say this much: That the troubles we are now having are less than we have ever had before. We have at this present time more facilities, more trained personnel, a higher production per man, than we have ever had in the United States in the way of production for war; and, further, on the subject of possible sources to obtain this labor, let me say that 65,000 veterans per month are being discharged—that makes a total of 390,000 by June; we are getting 60,000 per month, or about 360,000 by June, of new boys in at the age of 18. We are having cut-backs in large-ship production. Calship in California, as you know, has recently turned off eight or ten thousand men, and we are not utilizing workers in many parts of the United States in defense-plant work because of their racial origin. Neither are we at the present time using women and people over 45 years of age that are in the nonessential industries who can be drawn into the work voluntarily if we will hold out to them the same protection in the way of seniority and pensions, transportation, and housing that we are now offering in this bill to the forces.

Mr. MAY. Mr. HOLIFIELD, will you permit me to interrupt you to ask you this question? In view of the fact that our supply lines leading to our battle fronts range all the way from 3,000 to 12,000 miles, and we have to have both replacements of men and replacements of vast quantities of materials that are necessarily destroyed in combat, we certainly have a dual or a double problem on our hands. Are you going to argue and do you contend here that we don't need additional men in order to provide the equipment and to transport it to our forces, and the men to take the place of replacements?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly do not argue that. I believe that, and I am willing to do anything that is necessary to provide those men, providing we follow the American pattern, and I believe we can follow the American pattern and get those men and put them into industry and put them into the Army, just like we have done the past 3 years when we have accomplished the greatest miracle of production of any nation in the world, including England, who has forced labor; and it was the testimony before our committee that we are all familiar with that the American workers, free workers, are producing five times the production of the English workers under a compulsory system.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, Chet, even though what you say may be true, you are bound to admit that in spite of that wonderful production—it it is something to be proud of—we are running far behind in many of the critical materials. I don't believe you question that, do you?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would say that we are not running so far behind as they would have you think. I have the figures the same as you have: 6 percent in some industries, 10 percent in others; but I want to call your attention to the fact that those figures include other factors besides manpower. Manpower is only 22 percent of that particular figure. The rest is facilities, the rest is materials, changes over to new weapons, and the further production of weapons which we are now needing badly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There has been no change-over. Let's get to some of the standard weapons. Heavy artillery ammmunition—there has been no change-over on that, and yet, according to Judge Patterson's statement, in all deference to the lack of confidence that my friend, Mr. SHORT——

Mr. SHORT. Oh, no; the gentleman now is putting words into my mouth that I didn't utter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, I certainly apologize, but I thought that is what you said. You said he knew nothing more about production——

Mr. SHORT. I said——

Mr. SPARKMAN. You said he knew nothing more about production than I do, and if you make that statement you are bound to say that he doesn't know very much about it.

Mr. SHORT. About production.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and that is what I am talking about. Judge Patterson said in connection with heavy artillery ammunition (and I submit to you that that is one of the most vital needs on our war fronts today, to save American lives) that we were 54 percent low on our stock pile.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is on the reserve.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is on the reserve. You can't get ammunition to the front unless you have got a reserve to draw from. And furthermore, he said that in order to meet our requirements during the first 6 months of 1945 we had to step production up 89 percent over what it was for the last half of 1944.

Mr. SHORT. I will admit there are shortages in certain industries and along certain requirements in particular places, while there are surpluses perhaps of certain other munitions or commodities in other places. I think if there are any shortages in anything it is due not to a shortage in manpower; it is due to miscalculation and to maldistribution. I think that the Government has made a mistake by letting these cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, because industry has hoarded labor. An employer who is guaranteed the wage of a man doesn't care how much it costs or how many he hires as long as he gets his 10-percent profit. So you find a lot of idle men in these plants all over this country.

Senator MEAD and Senator KILGORE, they are not Republicans like myself either, found the Paul Reveres down at Norfolk; they will find them in a munitions plant; and how the telephones will ring and give an advance warning that a congressional committee or an investigating committee is coming. I say if we had an efficient or full utilization of our present manpower there would be no shortage of anything.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me ask you this. How, without some kind of service legislation, are you going to prevent the hoarding of labor? How are you going to impose ceilings? How are you going to regulate the recruitment and placement of labor in any way?

Mr. SHORT. By giving the War Manpower Commission statutory authority.

Mr. SPARKMAN. By using coercion.

Mr. SHORT. No, sir; by going in there with industry and labor and the representatives of agriculture and Government to determine whether or not a certain plant is utilizing its manpower and is producing——

Mr. MAY (interposing). I come back to my question that the War Manpower Commission and those other groups downtown that are acting without statutory authority have been on the job for 3 years and we still have the shortage. I repeat, why haven't they brought a solution?

Mr. SHORT. The manpower problem is in a muddle; it is a man-made problem and has been created by the overlapping, conflicting, and duplicating agencies of this Government because the Commander in Chief has never appointed a single responsible head who can speak with final authority.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And this will add another agency to refer manpower and to take charge of the classification of manpower into industry, namely, the Selective Service Board, but I don't want to speak on that now. I want to address myself to this artillery shell program.

I called up the Smaller War Plants today and asked them if the small plants of America were being used fully in this shell program, because that is an article that can be made by small plants. I have some in my district, for instance. And they told me this, that 220 small plants in America offered their facilities; 104 of these plants were approved by the ordnance engineers as being capable of performing the duties. How many got contracts for these artillery shells and small munition shells that they are short of? Twenty-five got contracts. In other words, one out of eight got contracts that offered their services; one out of four that were approved got a contract. Let them use the small plants in the small towns of America and stop backlogging orders in the big plants in the critical labor areas and they will get their shells.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. HOLIFIELD, I don't know whether you have discussed this matter with Mr. Maury Maverick or not, who happens to be the head of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. I certainly think that he is in favor of smaller plants being utilized every way possible, and yet there is no more ardent supporter of this legislation in this country than Maury Maverick.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; and I'll tell you why. Maury Maverick wants to support this bill because the small plants all over the country are being closed and he thinks that if this bill is passed the small plants will be allowed to open and they can force workers into them, but I say that if you give the small plants the orders they will turn them out.

Mr. MAY. Mr. HOLIFIELD, May I intervene here to make this statement? The smaller plants are the producers of many of the articles we use in war, but the bulk of our production is in the vast plants of the big industries. Of course, we want to take care of the small war plant as much as possible. But it is a question of getting the equipment to our fighting forces on time and not too little too late. That has been the problem that we have had all the while, and with our vast distances that we must cover in the transportation of war materials and men and supplies, undoubtedly you will have to agree that with the break-down that we have had and the lack of supplies and the lack of manpower, there has got to be some form of legislation, and this legislation is not mandatory at any time and doesn't become effective until the War Mobilization Director in collaboration with labor, agriculture, and industry has failed to find a solution and has then certified——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is on new recruitment.

Mr. MAY. No; that is on the question of getting the available manpower.

Now, in answer to your assertion that we are going to set up a lot of Government agencies and duplicate them, this bill expressly provides that it shall be administered by the Selective Service Bureau so far as directing the men where they shall work, and we have more than 6,000 boards, local boards, throughout the country. We don't need to set up a single additional group of personnel anywhere to carry into effect the provisions of this bill when it does become effective, after it has run the gauntlet of getting by the Manpower Commission.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But my chairman will agree with me at the present time the War Food Administration refers workers, the U. S. E. S. refers workers, and now we are going to have the selective service refer workers. There are three conflicting units, and I will call your attention that in the last case there will be several boards in one large city that will be referring workers possibly to the same plant. It seems like to me this is heaping confusion on confusion.

Mr. MAY. You have an equal number of War Manpower boards in the same city, and it is a question——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But they work through U. S. E. S.

Mr. MAY. Regardless of their name, they are there just the same and the effort in this bill is to maintain the administration of this act in the Selective Service System that has the man's history, they are the neighbors of the man involved and concerned with the work job as well as the performance of his duty to his Government, and they, themselves, know whether he is an essential man or whether he has got hardships surrounding him with his family or whether there is some other good reason why he should not be called.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Granik, I asked Under Secretary Patterson if the break-through in the middle of December by von Rundstedt was due to our lack of manpower on the western front. He said, "No." I asked, "Was it due to our lack of munitions or equipment?" He said, "No." Last week, General Somervell in Paris issued a statement that "Ike" Eisenhower at this moment has sufficient supply to begin a major offensive. We know that warehouses in this country are bulging with war materials, that trainloads are lined up on our sidings, that they are stacked high at our ports of embarkation. We also know that if anyone would go to England and see all of the war materials we have accumulated there, he would wonder how the island keeps from sinking. It is not a matter of manpower or production. The problem is one of transportation. It is as difficult to get the material from the ports of Europe to the front line as it is to get the material from here to Europe.

Mr. MAY. May I ask my colleague from Missouri if he doesn't think or at least if he doesn't know that it requires manpower to provide transportation.

Mr. SHORT. Certainly I do.

Mr. MAY. And it requires manpower to transport equipment from the ports of entry to the battlefronts. Now, if you are going to handle all of these vast quantities that have gotten these warehouses crowded, as you say, you have got to have manpower to handle it.

Mr. SHORT. You have got to have a little intelligent management and direction, too.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to ask my friend, JOHN SPARKMAN, a question. Would you send Philip Murray and William Green and Fred Crawford over to the front line to handle our armies?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Why, no; I wouldn't send them over there to handle our armies.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to hear you say that, because they are not expert in military affairs. Neither would I bring in the military generals to tell us how to produce the guns and tanks and shells, because they know nothing about production.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Neither would I, but I certainly would bring in Judge Patterson, who is charged with that job. I would bring in the War Production Board officials who are charged with that job. I would bring in Mr. William S. Knudsen, one of the great production geniuses of all time, who is charged with that job, and they are the men who have been telling us as to what our needs were in industry. Generals have been telling us what they needed on the battle fronts to win. It is up to these back home who are charged with the job of producing that stuff to get the materials to them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I agree with you, my friend.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And all down the line they have told us that they needed these supplies on the battle fronts, and I believe them. Not only that, but I want to say this to you, regardless of what anybody may say about there being no shortage or its being simply a matter of transportation, or whatever it may be: I heard General Patton say that he needed ammunition and he said, "For God's sake, get us heavy caliber ammunition!" And I heard General Eisenhower say the same thing; and I heard General Bradley say the same thing; and I heard Gen. Mark Clark say the same thing; and I heard those G. I.'s right out in the front line who were firing those artillery pieces say the same thing; and I am not going to stand up in the face of experts who have told us that we need the manpower recruitment and placement in an orderly manner in order to produce the material, when General Eisenhower and General Patton and General Clark and General Bradley and those G. I.'s are calling for it.

Mr. SHORT. Wait just a minute. The time is about up.

Mr. MAY. Now, I am your chairman. Keep quiet here.

Mr. SHORT. Why did this Under Secretary of War in whom you have such implicit confidence tell us we have shortages of nothing, that the break-through was not caused by any lack of material or men? General Somervell only last week said they had a sufficient amount. I want to say this: That conscription is the quintessence of the Axis method, of the Nazi-Fascist philosophy of government, and when you take a drafted man and place him by the side of a voluntary worker on the production line in a factory you are going to weaken the morale of both. It is like putting a rotten apple in a barrel of sound apples.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now, with all due regard to my friend—and he is my good friend——

Mr. SHORT. Sure.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I heard him use exactly that same argument when the bill was up to draft men for the armed forces, and I heard him use it a year later when the bill was up to extend that draft, and you are using the same argument now.

Mr. MAY. May I ask a question?

Mr. SHORT. Just a minute. I say it is entirely different from drafting men into the armed services and drafting men in private industry.

Mr. MAY. Let me ask this general question. We have got men fighting and dying on every battle front in the world. We have got men at home earning wages unprecedented in the history of this country. Which side are you going to be with? Are you going to take care of the fellows on the other side just because somebody doesn't want to work in this country, or are you going to require the man that is not in a job (and that is all that this bill does, it affects only men who are not in some war production job) to work, or are you going to let them lay off the job?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to say to my chairman, that if the condition is as critical as he says it is, let's draft the men and the machines and the finances of this country and solve the problem; let's not go at it piecemeal and only take the men and let the factories and the profit-makers of war go unattended.

Mr. MAY. We don't need to draft industry in this country. You have already admitted that the wealth of this country has done its part of the job, and everybody admits that. They have done it in a great fashion; and labor has done a good job. But the men that we are trying to utilize in this legislation are the men that are not engaged in some war effort.

Mr. SHORT. You can't legislate patriotism, industry, or morality, and the minute you take a bowery bum or a pool-hall loafer and put him into a plant where honest and industrious Americans are working, you will have to spend twice the effort on him that you will get out of him.

Mr. MAY. Let me say that I think a $10,000 fine and a 5-year jail sentence will handle a good many bums, if you call them bums.

Mr. SHORT. You can force a man into the factory, but you can't force him to work.

Heroism of American Prisoners on Luzon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a statement by Rev. Father John Dugan, S. J., captain, United States Army Chaplain Corps, appearing in the Washington Post of February 5, 1945, revealing the heroism, fortitude, courage, and patriotism and fine spiritual outlook of members of our armed forces during the period of their captivity on the Island of Luzon. His dramatic statement is the best evidence of the love of the Filipinos for America; of the terrible conditions our boys underwent, and of their courage and fortitude. It also constitutes best evidence of the cruelty of the Japs, which we should not forget.

How dramatic and impressive is Father Dugan's utterance on freedom when he said:

You just cannot put into words what your heart feels when freedom—the last thing you have learned to expect after 3 years of prison—is suddenly yours.

The statement of Father Dugan, whom I last saw in Boston just prior to his leaving to enter the United States Army, should be read by every American. It follows:

ARMY CHAPLAIN REVEALS HEROISM OF YANKS DURING CAPTIVE PERIOD ON ISLAND OF LUZON

(By Capt. John Dugan, as told to Lee Van Atta)

A REST CAMP ON LUZON, February 4.—I can tell the whole story of my comrades during these past three terrible years in a few simple words.

Those words are these—they proved themselves real Americans; Americans with honesty, courage, Godliness, and fine common sense; Americans who never faltered and who may have feared, but were too proud to admit it.

Many of them found God in death; others found their God with me in the simple service we were allowed to hold in our rude little prison chapel.

LIVED HELLISH EXISTENCE

Yes, we lived a barbaric, cruel, and often bestial existence. But we lived a life which bound each unto the other and we shared the pain and suffering of imprisonment under our ruthless Japanese captors with the same community feeling with which we are now sharing our freedom under the Army officers and men who are almost too kind to be real.

I was one of those few fortunate men who missed the Death March—I was ill, too ill to walk, and even the Japanese apparently feared to infringe greatly on the church.

But everywhere around me I saw what they did to our men. First, they confiscated everything we had—our few precious remaining valuables and keepsakes, what little food we had saved aside, and, yes, even our medicines.

Not then, nor weeks later, nor months later, did they ever give us that medicine we needed so badly for our wounded and our dying.

They did everything they could to starve us, but they forgot one thing—the American spirit. Our boys had that from the start to the finish and they absolutely refused to let the Japanese crush that spirit.

Deliberately, in the first days, they did all they could to confuse us. They were frequent moves, disquieting reports which they circulated of what our leaders were doing, propaganda about how America was about to surrender.

It achieved them no good except to create an even deeper distrust and dislike.

Our death toll at first was staggering. In the early days at Camp Cabanatuan, second only to the terrible scenes at Camp O'Donnell for savage administration, our soldiers were dying at the rate of 50 a day.

Then, in late November of 1942, we were given our first Red Cross parcels—parcels with food, medicine, cigarettes, and even some reading matter which the enemy troops let pass.

JAPS TOOK THEIR MEDICINE

Nothing was received in all the time we were imprisoned that did so much to lift our morale, to increase our confidence and to cut our death rate.

That medicine meant the difference between life and death for many scores of our men.

All the officers, chaplains, and doctors had to do manual labor in the fields every day, working from dawn to dusk.

Our jobs ranged from cleaning latrines to farming and wood chopping. And those who failed to meet the schedule the Japanese had set were beaten and sometimes executed.

I've seen more than one American beaten to death because he lacked both the strength and the will to keep up the back-breaking physical labor our captors demanded.

Certain memorable highlights stand out in those 3 years we were in captivity, but not many. In time, often in a very short time, the sheer weight of living becomes so heavy you strive to let each day pass with as little notice as possible, except for a thankful prayer that you are still alive.

I could tell of tens and tens of thousands of terrible things we saw and heard, of little events which we magnified so much at the time, but which seems so small to us now, of more of that same type of camaraderie I mentioned before.

But fortunately, while the hardships of those years will always remain, somewhere deep within us it's the brighter things we like to remember.

FILIPINOS WERE KINDLY

For example, the wonderful kindness of all the Filipinos who willingly sacrificed their lives and freedom to bring us gifts of food or medicine.

I cannot find words to praise too highly their unselfishness, their loyalty, and their friendship for us when we were the representatives of what seemed to everyone but them and us, a great lost cause.

I can give the time right down to the minute when our captors knew that our cause was not a lost one. It was 10:30 a. m. on September 21 of last year. We were working in the fields when that hope flew past high above us in the form of at least 150 carrier-based planes.

We would have been beaten to death had we showed the least outward signs of happiness, but can you imagine what joyfulness seethed within?

That moment, I think, we all knew better than ever before that the Americans were on the way back to us for sure.

It was an unforgettable day in all our lives.

I like to recall Christmas Eve of 1942 also, an evening which will live in my mind as one of the great experiences of all my imprisonment.

We secured permission from the prison authorities to hold Christmas services in the fields near Cabanatuan. All the churches and all denominations were represented in that picturesque setting and 6,000 American soldiers came to that single service of belief.

I am sure God looked down on us that night, and today I'm equally sure that He answered our prayers.

Of course, Tuesday night, January 30, was our night of redemption and there'll never be another quite like it for any of us.

If all Americans are pouring into this war the same efforts those 120 Rangers gave, individually and collectively, to rescue us from almost certain death, then I know why we are winning this war.

They did an absolutely Herculean task with truly beautiful teamwork.

You just can't put into words what your heart feels when freedom—the last thing you have learned to expect after 3 years of prison—is suddenly yours.

What perhaps made it most realistic to me was that two friends—Lt. John Murphy, of Springfield, Mass., and Lieutenant O'Connell, of Boston—were among the first to recognize me and tell me it was not a dream, but reality.

Then I knew that even though there was a long march ahead of us, home lay at the end of the road.

Our Government cannot reward too highly Colonel Mucci and his rangers for what they did.

I want to say once again that the morale of our men the night we left Cabanatuan was the same strong, unflinching morale they'd showed throughout, and I want to say again how proud they make me feel to be an American.

How do I feel about this new freedom? It's like walking in a new and wonderful world.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Capt. John Dugan, 47-year-old Army chaplain from Milton, Mass., the author of this article, is one of the three Catholic chaplains who stayed with their men through most of the hardships after the fall of Bataan and Corregidor.)

A Citizen's Views on Current Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I submit for the RECORD a letter recently written me by a gentleman living in Minneapolis that I feel should be read by every man and woman in the country. The writer shows an unusual grasp and understanding of the problems that confront us and the evils that beset the country. The letter follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 20, 1945.*

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,

United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KNUTSON: Believing that each of us should take time out to express our opinions on matters of public policy, I am writing this letter to you to give you, not the opinion of a special pressure group, but the opinion of a person who attempts to study both sides of every issue and one who believes strongly in America, what it has done and what it can be.

It is my good fortune to travel often and meet many well-known, intelligent people with whom I have the opportunity of exchanging ideas and also get a fair cross-section of what people are thinking.

During the past few years I have noticed a definite trend in this country away from individual thinking, expression, and work, and toward a controlled, regimented way of life.

This just hasn't happened—this has been planned. You might say that people desire this trend to continue. The last election can be held up as justification for continuing this trend. But before this is accepted as a fact, let's look at a few factors. First, almost 50 percent of the people that voted didn't want the New Deal continued. Second, many voted for Roosevelt thinking the war was just about over and he should finish the job. Third, everything possible was done to create an air of freedom and to make people think that all the controls were wartime controls and would be dropped as soon as the end was in sight. For instance, before the election:

Most foods were taken off rationing;

There was much talk of reconversion.

Many critical items were going to be made again;

A beautiful job was talked about how well the production job was being done and how well our free enterprise system had worked;

The Montgomery Ward-War Labor Board case was dropped; it was a hot potato;

The New Deal's foreign-relation program was whitewashed, and everything possible done to hush up current events.

For the above reasons, many people reluctantly placed the New Deal in office again; they, like myself, with my tongue in my cheek, thought the cat had actually changed spots.

Now let's see what has happened.

Where is our foreign policy? Look at Italy and Greece.

Look at the power politics in Europe. What are we fighting for—the continuance in the world of empires and kings, or has it turned out that this is just another war being fought on the same basis as all past wars?

We are now being told that we have not done a good job in production—that it is necessary for a labor draft to get the job done.

There's a food shortage (not according to the War Food Administration, Kiplinger, or the farm leaders), and therefore rationing must be put on again.

We need more men in the armed forces, so all business, except direct war manufacturing businesses, must be stripped to get the manpower the Government says it needs.

Is all the above really necessary, or is it getting to be a crime in this country (as in Europe) to question the powers that be? Is Congress just a rubber stamp, a flock of sheep that like to follow the leader, or are they doing the job they've been given to do?

What's been wrong with our war effort that was so excellent up to the election?

Have any of you thought of what can be done about the following?

1. There's supposed to be a shortage of labor, but has anyone bothered to look into the actual labor situation; as a few examples:

One large Minneapolis plant just 2 weeks ago curtailed production from 70 hours per week to 48 hours per week.

At another, the employees have so little to do that time is spent making knives, rings, and other souvenirs. People that are disgusted can't quit, they wouldn't be allowed to get another job.

At another plant, this I personally observed at 9 a. m., 1 hour after starting time, at least half the office staff was having breakfast. In a so-called civilian plant, this wouldn't be tolerated, and I'm safe in saying one-third of the force could be dropped and not missed.

At one of our largest engine plants in the East, I was told last Thursday that at least 30 percent of the workers had very little to do, and many wanted to get into other work but couldn't.

What has been done about feather-bedding practices of unions to spread out manpower? This is serious, but everyone's eyes appear to be closed.

This, and many others, suggest to me that Washington is laying another smoke screen. We are not being told the real purposes of this push for more regimentation.

Is the debt going to be paid off to Sidney by having all labor told what to do, everyone told where to work and for how much, and what union to belong to?

We talk a lot about opportunities for the servicemen when they come back. If the Government goes through with its threat of drafting everyone to work where the powers that be say to work; if IV–F's which are the backbone of many large civilian enterprises are forced into semiidleness in a so-called war plant, isn't there a good chance that many of these businesses will fold up, leaving only W. P. A. for the servicemen to return to, or, and I believe this is the main objective, this is what the planners planned so they can step in and the people will all be under their thumb.

It is my opinion that you men in Congress must look into this crying of wolf before it's too late. Let's make sure drastic steps are necessary before they are taken.

People will put up with much now, due to the war, but there is going to be an accounting to the people, not only to two or three large pressure groups, after the war is over.

Have Washington go to work and stop kicking morale down in the basement. Unload your many Government agencies of excess manpower and you'll have an excess for production.

Also stop treating the American public like a bunch of school kids; from actions of the Government, one is led to believe that the Government's opinion is that no one knows what's best to do and that all the intelligence is in Washington. There's an overabundance of evidence that shows very little intelligence goes to Washington.

I would suggest that you talk to returning servicemen and get their side of the story, what they think and believe about what has been going on at home. These boys are going to be fed up with regimentation and expect to come back to an individual life with opportunities to work where and as they please.

This Congress could rise to the heights of greatness. All it needs is leadership; is it going to meet the challenge?

From here, and what has been happening, the sky looks black and the outlook is pessimistic. We need immediate action by Congress; we need men to measure up to the stature of Jefferson; we need an open, questioning mind, even if it means our political life or individual freedom.

Thank you for taking the time to read this. Every word of it is written with the greatest sincerity. I'm not worried about myself, I can take care of myself, but I am worried about what's going to be here for the youngsters who are just growing up.

As a last suggestion, I'd like to recommend a book to you that is going to be very much discussed in the near future. It outlines very capably what has and is happening to the western world. It is The Road to Serfdom by Friedrich A. Hayek.

Yours very truly,

Farm Labor Shortage Is Acute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the old adage, "An army travels on its stomach." We all know that the most urgent primitive instinct of all creatures, whether man or beast, is the quest of food. Food is indispensable to survival. Food is produced on the farms.

Whether it be wheat, corn, or other grains, fruits, or vegetables, milk, butter, eggs, poultry, beef, mutton, or pork,

whether it be carbohydrates, proteins, or animal or vegetable fats, all food originates on the farm. Food is essential. Food is essential to the Army, it is essential to the war worker, and it is essential to the civilian population. It is essential to the maintenance and preservation of the physical strength, health, and morale of the entire people engaged in the war effort. It is not only essential, but it is critical. If food is critical then the production of food is also critical.

Twice last month I called the attention of this Congress to the farm-labor situation. Twice I pointed out that farm labor was critically short. Twice I made reference to statements by Major General Hershey that farm labor was in a special category and had been specifically dealt with by this Congress when it passed the Tydings amendment. In spite of all this, certain powers put the pressure on the selective service and the local draft boards to take more men from the farms, which had already furnished 43 percent of the entire personnel of the armed forces, a matter of 40 percent more than the farm quota based on a pro rata computation.

It now appears that the Department of Agriculture has also become alarmed over the acute shortage of farm labor and the threat to the Nation's food supply. I quote herewith an article from the Washington Post of this morning:

FARMS FACE ACUTE LABOR SHORTAGE, OFFICIALS WARN

The Agriculture Department listed scores of critical farm-labor shortage areas yesterday as food officials warned that an early end of the war in Europe would not ease a tightening food-supply situation.

Farmers will need, the Department said, part-time help from at least 4,000,000 nonfarm workers in town and urban areas if they are to come anywhere near meeting production goals set up by the War Food Administration.

Contrary to expectations of many, a German surrender would not lessen demands on American food. Such an event would bring about increased demands for foreign relief feeding at a time when the armed forces were stepping up their purchases of reserves for the final campaign in the Pacific against Japan.

The Department is emphasizing that agriculture has its shortest labor supply in nearly 40 years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does all this mean? The most naive city slicker knows that food planted this spring will not be harvested until next fall. He knows that as prolific as even hogs are that the pigs farrowed now will barely be large enough for market by next winter. He knows that the work put in on the farm from now until the end of the season is necessary to the production of food. Surely if the city man knows this then our high and learned officials of government must also know it, too. So what does this order mean? Does it mean that someone in high office is deliberately trying to confuse the picture? Does it mean that through a food shortage they are planning chaos and the need for further regimentation? Does it mean that the United States is going the way the dictatorship-dominated nations of Europe trod? I certainly hope not, but I can't help but wonder.

However, Mr. Speaker, the above referred to high officials are without authority. There is a law on the statute books known as the Tydings amendment. This act provides as follows:

Every registrant found by a selective-service local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

Mind you, sir, I said this was the law of the land. It has not been changed, amended or repealed. The local draft boards are composed of honest law-abiding citizens who are laboring day and night, without pay, at the most thankless job any patriotic citizen can undertake for his country. I have absolute faith in their judgment and in their integrity. I think it very unfortunate and certainly un-American for any governmental official to attempt to confuse them. The war cannot be won without food. Food cannot be produced without farm labor. What can be more plain? Besides it is the law.

Rural Phase Inverters Cut Phone Induction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and joy that I call the attention of the House to just another piece of excellent work that has been done by a distinguished electrical engineer, Mr. Lee M. Moore, formerly of Selma, Ala., but now and for some time past a member of that small staff of technicians, known and respected in their profession, who constitute the Technical Standards Division of the R. E. A.

It is gratifying to note again an instance of achievement where a man in Government service has diligently applied his expert knowledge and skill to the solution of a problem to the end that improved service may be rendered the public.

Knowing how interested our constituents will be in this development, I beg to call your attention to an article that was published in Electrical World of January 6, 1945, entitled "Rural Phase Inverters Cut Phone Induction."

For your convenience, the article is set forth at length. I wish it were possible for the diagram and the chart appearing in the article to be reproduced in the RECORD.

The article was written by an electrical engineer for readers who know their electricity. So it is quite technical and means little to me, but as I understand it, it describes a new method of preventing disturbing noises in telephones and mistakes in telegraph messages which are brought about by interference with electrical communication due to the proximity of electric power lines. In the past it has frequently been necessary to provide and install complex corrective measures. This new invention is comparatively simple and inexpensive. It was conceived, perfected and placed in operation by the author of the quoted article. Mr. Moore should and will receive the grateful thanks of all rural telephone users whose service will be improved by this invention and by all others who benefit by improved electric service.

RURAL PHASE-INVERTERS CUT TELEPHONE INDUCTION—TWO 75 KILOVOLT-AMPERE TRANSFORMERS BALANCE INDUCTIONS AND REDUCE EFFECT ON THE PARALLEL COMMUNICATION CIRCUIT EXPOSED TO THE POWER LINES

(By Lee M. Moore, principal electrical engineer, Technical Standards Division, Rural Electrification Administration)

A combination of phase-inverting transformer and resonant shunt installations on a 12,450/7,200-volt rural line of the Black River Electric Cooperative in Missouri served to reduce the induction experienced by open wire communication circuits when a multigrounded single-phase extension was energized. Railroad signal and communication and Western Union Telegraph circuits are exposed to some 4 miles of 3-phase, 10 miles of V-line and 16 miles of single-phase; separations averaged less than 300 feet throughout the 60-cycle exposure. The Bell System lines are standard-transposition and some circuits are arranged for C and J carrier operation; the major toll line carries long-distance messages and wide-band programs. It parallels 5 miles in the three-phase section, 10 miles in the V section, and 8 miles in the single-phase section; average separation throughout is ⅛ mile; harmonic induction was the primary concern.

RESONANT SHUNTS

As a possible remedial measure for correcting the noise induction, 300-cycle resonant shunts were installed on phases "A" and "C" at the Pilot Knob substation. The shunts were effective in reducing the over-all TIF from 15 to 6.9, the 300-cycle component from 510 to 162 volts, and the 420-cycle component from 32 to 16 volts. The residual IT of phases "A" and "C" was reduced from 360 to 150, and the over-all IT of phase "A" from 360 to 160. The noise-to-ground on exposed telephone lines was reduced from 42 to 35.5 decibles (message weighting) with the tuned 300-cycle shunts connected during the heavy load period. A 10-decible reduction was obtained when the rural power lines were deenergized. The major reduction in noise-to-ground for both conditions was in the 300-cycle component. The use of 30 kilovolt-amperes capacitors instead of the resonant 300-cycle shunts produced no appreciable change in noise-to-ground on telephone lines.

In order to further reduce the induction on both communication systems, it was decided to transpose the multigrounded rural power line in the single-phase exposure by the use of phase-inverting transformers at a point in the single-phase line which would result in a minimum induction to the communication circuits, the principal component of induction being produced by phase "C," thus:

Component due to phase "C" = 25.61 + j0
Component due to phase "B" = −3.01 + j5.21
Component due to phase "A" = −5.06 − j8.75

Resultant (total induction) = 17.54 − j3.54 = 17.9 volts

Therefore, if the current in phase C could be shifted approximately 180 degrees at a point along the line so selected that the resultant component of voltage due to phase C would be equal to 8.07+j0, then the voltage induced in the communication wires would be a minimum.

SATISFACTORY RESULTS

Tests results with the 75-kilovolt-ampere phase-inverting transformers showed a reduction in noise-to-ground level of 6 to 10 decibels (50 percent—67 percent) while the metallic noise level was reduced 3 to 16 decibels thus indicating a substantial improvement in noise conditions on the telephone circuits. Measurements of the induced voltages of the telegraph wires between Arcadia and Piedmont indicated reduction in the induced voltages of 75 percent at 60 cycles and 84 percent at 300 cycles. The reduction of induced voltages by the phase-inverting transformers is variable due to the fluctuating loads on the rural power system, but sufficient reduction is obtained to warrant their continued use.

Development of International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, on January 27, at the Pan American Union, there was a meeting of members of the Inter-American Bar Association and the section on International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association. At that meeting a very scholarly address was delivered by Dr. Marcial Mora, Chilean Ambassador to the United States, dealing with the development of international law, and concluding with an invitation to the members, particularly of the American Bar Association, to participate in the forthcoming Inter-American meeting to be held in Chile, which is to be attended by lawyers from various countries of the Americas from October 20 to 29, 1945.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of Dr. Mora be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

In the history of human relations, a long and obscure period appears characterized by the axiom: "Dura lex, sed lex"—the law is hard, but it is the law.

The severity of this maxim did not emanate from a universal juridical conscience, but conformed to the false identification of the law with the will of a Caesar.

The precepts had, therefore, the narrow significance of a rigid mold which imperatively constrained the life of the peoples. History was nothing more than a succession of struggles between the princes, a continuous collision of authoritarian forces, whose conflict would scarcely permit even a silent and thin sediment of culture to slip through.

It has been necessary for many centuries to pass in order that this fecund sediment might settle itself upon the outer crust of the world. Innumerable conflicts have had to be resolved, and the blood of many generations spilled, before the princes might be superseded by the concept of the "Nation", which implies a moral category.

Only by this difficult and painful road has the law acquired meaning as the expressive norm for the existence of peoples, ceasing to be a rack of torment.

And the majesty of the juridical conscience only now brings up the ancient aphorism according to which the law is hard, since the legal precept now represents a safeguard of the people and a protection of their collective interest.

In past epochs, the law was hard for all who lacked the favor of Caesar; it was rigorous for the people or for the man of no particular caste.

At the present time, the law is hard for whomsoever wishes to leap the barrier of respect due to the collectivity, for whomsoever rises up against the national category, for whomsoever, ignoring human values, seeks a mandate which does not emanate from the will of the people, but endeavors to submit the people to the domination of his own will.

Thus, also there has had to occur an evolution in the concept that the law, being hard, is always the law; because in ancient times this meant the perpetuation of servilism, whilst at the present time it constitutes an admonition to the powerful that points out a social duty superior to their mere will and a force much superior to that available to their princely resources.

This conquest so transcendental for the destiny of humanity is due in great part to the patient work of the jurisconsults, to the tenacity with which the men of law have been defending, step by step, the prerogatives of human dignity.

Therefore, it is not strange that in our collectivities, which are the masters of their own destinies, and make their own determinations respecting the authority that is to govern them, the meeting of legal experts is appreciated and encouraged with increasing enthusiasm, in order that the law may reach greater perfection, to further tranquillity and the social good.

Our continent, which so many times has been selected as the stage of the future, and a builder of a new historical era, may take pride in its juridical tradition, of its republican institutions, of the meaning that the legal precept acquires among all its peoples.

And this is due to the exercise of democracy as well as to the cooperation that the legislators have received constantly from the forensic sectors.

Thus, it is that inter-American meetings of professional groups of lawyers, constitute in the political and diplomatic sense, a valuable contribution to the mutual knowledge, understanding, and friendship of nations; and at the same time have historical projections even more important, because they serve to agree upon actions, to deal with initiatives, and to make even more valuable the juridical heritage which we shall pass on to the new generations.

Should the building of a new historical epoch be the task of the Americas, there is the absolute assurance that such contribution must be carried out on the basis of the law, that will conform not only to national standards, but also will adjust itself to continental existence, to better serve civilization and the world.

The satisfaction with which the Government and the people of Chile will welcome the next Inter-American meeting of jurisconsults is justifiable, because they offer to Chileans the always pleasant opportunity to affectionately receive their brothers of the three Americas, and because at the same time it permits collaboration in the best possible measure in the success of this task of such noble and transcendental significance.

Because in my person there coincides the quality of ambassador with that of lawyer. I may enjoy the most singular satisfaction of assuring you that in my country our profession develops harmoniously, parallel with the sense of dignity and respect with which the authorities and all classes of the people attend upon the exercise and the perfecting of the law, and that the Order of Chilean Lawyers is a guaranty of the capacity and rectitude of its members in the defense of life and interests that are the essence of the exercise of this noble profession.

In greeting on this occasion the representatives who will gather at the forthcoming Inter-American meeting, and in wishing them a happy stay in my country, I desire to anticipate their trip in some degree, assuring them that they will find there, not only a friendly, hospitable and cordial country, but also, and above all, a country resolved and determined that her international life, as well as her own internal existence, shall be based on the majesty of the law, on the recognition of the law as the only source of happiness and justice for all men.

Foreign Policy of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by His Excellency Ezequiel Padilla, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, on January 7, 1945, on the subject of the foreign policy of Mexico.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I deem it an imperative duty for me to define the foreign policy of Mexico. International problems are now foremost among the interests of the people, and more than ever it is necessary to keep those problems before an enlightened public opinion.

Mexico is at war. It is natural that in these times our country should have as uncompromising critics of its foreign policy all those who are in heart and mind against the cause Mexico defends. I am not referring to wholesome criticism, to the just demand of information on issues vitally concerning all of us, but to that unmistakable poisoned kind that betrays the unconditional foe, and to perfidy at work. The purpose of this address is to defend our foreign policy against such destructive machinations.

President Avila Camacho, from the outset, was for the cause of the democracies. He did so with the determination that issues from an undeviating path of a conviction. Such was his invariable position throughout the various stages of our onward march; when relations were severed with the Axis Powers right after the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor, when Mexico defined its stand at the Rio de Janeiro conference, when the measures for collaboration and defense subscribed at that conference were swiftly carried out, when it was formally stated that a state of war existed in answer to the sinking of our ships. Every one of these decisions has involved a tremendous responsibility in the judgment of history, which the President of Mexico and his Secretary of Foreign Affairs have faced unhesitatingly. It is easy

to say all this now but, at the fateful hour, how many somber presages barred the way. Fifth columnism brought all its resources to bear, advocating neutrality, predicting an Axis victory, constantly stirring up historical resentments. With unutterable impudence, when our ships were sent to the bottom, it went so far as to assert that they had been attacked by submarines of the United States. Such rumors were spread, and continued to be spread, with wicked Nazi mastery. "This is not our war," they repeated everywhere, as if the designs of the aggressors for the subjugation of humanity were a threat foreign to our destinies and to those of all the Americas. They carried out this propaganda to such an extent that it may be asserted that the decisions taken by the Mexican Government in the early days of the war had the appearance of unpopularity.

There is nothing further from the truth than that stock phrase by which attempts are made to belittle the resolute action of Mexico—"that there was no other road open to us." There was. We had it; and took it in the First World War. There were other courses open to us and, among them, those suggested by the enemy, i. e., neutrality, isolation, wavering, misrepresentation, bargaining as advised by certain critics of our decisions, as if trafficking in the sacred principles and interests of the Nation were an honorable course to follow. But Mexico chose the path of honor, not for geographical reasons nor for mercenary opportunism. Had we dwelt six thousand miles away from this Continent, Mexico would have acted in the same manner in accordance with her tradition of defending resolutely the liberty and dignity of mankind.

True to its position of a nation at war, Mexico raised to the status of reciprocal agreement the duty of Mexicans residing in the United States to enroll in the latter's Army. This agreement is similar to those entered into with France, Great Britain, Holland, Canada and other nations at war, and is likewise similar to those concluded between other countries. Immediately that same poisonous propaganda was subtly and cleverly instilled into the channels of domestic opposition. But now the people know that the Mexican soldiers fighting under the banner of the United Nations, as the pilots of Squadron 201 who are soon to reach the battle front to share with their brothers-in-arms all hazards and the glory of a common cause defended against the would-be enslavers of mankind, are the pride of their native land, and their heroism shall be a contribution to protect the future of Mexico. A nation with a gallant tradition of courage, such as ours, could not have acted otherwise.

When it was decided to alleviate the manpower shortage, the old maneuver, concealed, objected thus: "We are going to impoverish our agriculture." As though war were merely an opportunity for profit. The international agreement subscribed by us, a pattern for the security of our workers, either was misunderstood by those who challenged it or else they pretended to do so; all they did was to spread rumors. Mexican workers understood it quite well; for them it was an opportunity to earn high wages, a gallant adventure for youth, and, above all, further evidence of cooperation toward victory.

In time of privation and hardships for all countries, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has concluded agreements that have safeguarded Mexico from the most terrible repercussions. Even when certain action was not taken directly by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who can doubt that it was this Department that created, and continues to create, the proper atmosphere of international cooperation to develop the constructive plans of the administration and of private individuals? And yet, in the meantime, what did the invisible enemies do? Acknowledge the truth? No; they grumbled, criticized, and spread falsehood.

Industrialization of the country has made remarkable progress, notwithstanding difficulties inherent to wartime. The Mexican-American Commission for Economic Cooperation has carried out its program satisfactorily. The press constantly announces how new industries spring up throughout the country.

And all this represents opportunities for new jobs, for economic expansion, for the development of Mexican private initiative, for material greatness. These incontrovertible results, however, mean nothing to the systematic objectors. Forgetting that we have been living through tragic days in which all peoples gallantly accept all sacrifices imposed by war, they have, demagogically and fully aware of the effect to be obtained, attempted to destroy the sentiments of international friendship.

While at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs we endeavored to obtain success beyond question in all activities required by the most pressing needs of the people, they spread their stories throughout. In the streets they flooded naive minds with their misleading propaganda; for this purpose the watchword was given out even at the public market. If there was no corn or wheat or lard or gasoline, they whispered the slanderous charge: "There is nothing because everything is shipped to the United States."

And this went on at the very time we were obtaining from the United States supplies needed for its soldiers at the front. In 1944 that country sent us, in addition to appreciable quantities of sugar, rice, and lard, 52,000 tons of flour, 134,000 tons of corn, 587,000 tons of wheat. And at that time the gasoline used in the North was imported mostly from the United States. We can assert that in these dark moments of the history of mankind the Mexican people, without the reciprocity of this friendly Nation, which was extended in an effective and cordial manner, would have gone through critical hours.

Our foreign policy, without impairing its universality, clearly advocated Pan-Americanism. What was it these ambushed babblers of mistrust did then? By underground means they disseminated vituperation upon that continental doctrine, alleging that a Latin American alliance was indispensable, a thesis coinciding with the reactionary defense of Hispanidad. When they speak of such union, they do not pretend to refer to a laudable sentiment of cohesion, of fraternity among those peoples of the same race, language, and religion in America. No indeed. With perverse intentions they only try to stir up ill-feelings, to weaken the solidarity of the peoples allied for the cause of liberty. Latin Americanism, understood as a negative doctrine of abstention and resentments, could have been justified in the face of excesses of United States imperialism; but it is out of date in the presence of the good neighbor policy. Furthermore, I am certain that were Mexico to promote such a Latin Americanism, no other American nation would follow.

They begin to spread confusion over the case of Argentina. And here I wish to state categorically that our foreign policy faithfully interprets the sentiments of the people when I say that our position and our actions toward the Argentine people are wholly based upon fraternity, admiration, and hope. The day when the authentic will of the Argentine people clears away the distrust aroused in the American nations by the failure of the Farrell government to identify itself with the destinies of our hemisphere, shall be a day of rejoicing for all the Americas.

It might have been expected that the victories of the United Nations would have given them sorrow but at the same time wisdom. However, it is not so. They are not stopped even by the consideration that the name and prestige of Mexico constitute a bulwark and a treasure for the uncertainties of the future. Mexico has occupied a place of honor in this war and is entitled to a place of honor in the peace. Its resolute attitude as well as its adherence to the noblest tenets of humanity, have won for our country such international standing as it never enjoyed. We must remember, besides, our enhanced fraternal friendship with the American peoples and with all other United Nations, the interviews of President Avila Camacho with various chiefs of State of this Continent, the expressions Churchill had toward Mexico at our Embassy in London, the cordial intercourse between Mexico and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and our excellent relations with the provisional government of France and with the Chinese Government. There is nothing more just than to endeavor to maintain Mexico in the peace at the height of its position recently reached of a nation endowed, if not with considerable military power, with such moral power that insures for it an important role in the world.

The policy advocated by adversaries of the Government would on the contrary, imply our sinking into a position of inferiority, in which resentment against powerful countries would not suffice to counteract the bitter realities of a new world to which we would not belong. In spite of all this, I know that the foes of the cause of Mexico and of the United Nations shall not rest. Their hopes of victory for Germany and Japan having vanished, they no longer can say that "this is not our war," but they can continue to promote dissension and distrust. The people must be aware of the existence of a constant and renewed onslaught against our foreign policy. That onslaught consists in designating the policy of Mexico as "entreguismo," i. e., turning one's country over to a foreign power. This word is tossed about throughout the country, financed by and under the sly impulsion of the disciples of Goebbels. But you cannot fool the people all the time. What is meant by that word? What is "entreguismo?" Have we turned a single slice of Mexican soil over to a foreign power? Our national flag gracefully waves everywhere. Even in these times when the United Nations, without impairing their sovereignty and honor, place their own geography at the service of the Allied cause, have we permitted that Mexican territory be occupied by foreign armed forces? Throughout the whole country only soldiers of the national Army, wearing the national insignia, uphold the honor and maintain the security of the Republic. Have we jopardized any of the principles of dignity and respect to the Nation? None. On behalf of the President and in my own behalf, I challenge the slanderers, authorize those still harboring the slightest suspicion of the conduct of the Government, to point out or denounce a single line, a single action not representing national honor and integrity. It is their duty to do it if they have cause; if they fail to do it they are responsible for guilty silence. But they know that they lie, and it is enough for them, with typically Nazi tactics, to circulate everywhere the word "entreguista."

They pretend not to know that I share the work of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with spirited and patriotic collaborators. The members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate, to whom I report on international matters from time to time, constantly extend to me their encouragement and valuable cooperation. There is not one single secret item in our foreign policy. And over us all there is the vigilant responsibility, the safeguard, of the President of Mexico. The people must realize it is a fifth-column machination when they consider that this undermining campaign is only carried out within the country. For in the outside

world Mexico receives nothing but honorable distinctions, confidence, and warm friendship. We have raised our missions in all the Americas to the rank of embassies and we have renewed or established relations with great peoples—Great Britain, Russia, China, Canada. Our policy has been significantly independent. Here I shall not enumerate irrefutable facts, but I wish to emphasize the attitude of Mexico in such cases as the establishment of relations with the De Gaulle government, effected before any other country; the attitude of Mexico in the case of Spain, by refusing recognition to the Franco regime when nearly all nations maintain relations with it; the cordial but independent opinions expressed in all consultations among our American nations and, more particularly, in the case of Bolivia, of Guatemala, of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The positive results achieved by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs through its decorous friendship with the United States are without precedent in our diplomatic history. Problems as difficult as the compensation for agrarian claims and the oil expropriation claims have been settled equitably and satisfactorily. We have secured credits, armament for our army, an invaluable collaboration, technical as well as economic, for the rehabilitation of our railways, for the construction of a network of first-class airports which, while of great strategic value in wartime, remain from now on for the benefit of Mexico without the slightest impairment of her sovereignty. We have concluded a trade agreement which has proved highly beneficial to the economic expansion of the Nation, and are about to conclude the treaty covering the waters of the Rio Grande and of the Colorado River, an equitable treaty for both countries which represents for Mexico splendid opportunities. We have received assistance to solve serious problems of sanitation throughout the Republic and the future is heavy with possibilities and good will.

All this transcendent work, to be recognized by history, rests on cordial and dignified reciprocity in which Mexico contributes with the utmost effort and collaboration. The people, therefore, must determine who are the "entreguistas." Mexico has boasted of being champion of the loftiest principles of mankind, sustaining an authentic Mexican doctrine, free from false alien ideologies; it has upheld in the highest forums of contemporary history, liberty, dignity, cooperation. It has struggled against imperialism, against the oppression of man. And this is what my slanderers call "entreguismo." To them our attitude would have been brave had we joined the Axis Powers—that is, had we turned Mexico over to the opprobrious dictatorships.

All this, however, the enemies of our foreign policy feign not to see; many of them are foreigners fulfilling their subversive mission, but unfortunately there are also Mexicans who, in their campaign to discredit the country, forget that they are Mexicans. One might properly ask of them what they want, what they are plotting, whither are they trying to lead the destinies of the nation. Is it Ezequiel Padilla whom they wish to assail? But then they are lacking in common sense and patriotism, for they have not attacked me in any way whatsoever. The work of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been carried out under the direct and constant inspiration of the President of Mexico. It is an honor and a source of pride for me to have my name linked in this historic march of immense consequence, of dignity and success, with the name of President Avila Camacho.

In the course of the past 4 years, the country has never been subjected to the slightest menace of having its sovereignty outraged. Had such menace arisen, the Government of the Republic would have repelled it with firmness. As to myself—and let my enemies have the blame if I speak thus in self-defense—in my duties as counselor and collaborator of the President I have acted with profound devotion for the destinies of my country and for the cause of liberty. My life, in these 4 years, has been one of concentration, of disinterestedness, of honesty without which no civic devotion is genuine, of constant work dedicated always to the ideal of serving the people, from whose ranks I come. Many friends and men of good will have come to tell me that the enemies of the Government, or my own personal enemies, spread false interpretations of our foreign policy. "This insidious propaganda is very effective—they tell me—because the people do not understand international matters." I do not believe so; on the contrary, I share in the same faith the President of the Republic has in the judgment of the common man. And should we want evidence, the firm support the President has felt in the Army, in the labor organizations, in both Houses of Congress, in organized farm labor, would suffice. But even if it were true that the work I carry out was to be paid with unpopularity, I should not care. I do not work for transitory rewards nor for lowly ambitions. If I did, I know how I could become a demagog, how to court unwholesome emotions. But then the benefits would be for myself, and the irreparable damage for my country.

International and local fifth columnism condemn the close friendship Mexico has achieved with the Government and the people of the United States. This friendship, based upon mutual respect, with a people whose defense of human liberties carried out with epic greatness deserves the gratitude of the whole world, is a consequence of our position in this war. When fighting for the same historical principles Mexico has always upheld, when encountering the same fate, when finding themselves on the same craft in the midst of the storm, men and nations fraternize and a common adherence to interests and responsibilities unites all souls. In the face of curses loosened by war, there are some compensations and, among them, few are as valuable as insuring the friendship of those nations fighting for the same cause. I am in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, not to surround my country by powerful enemies, but to secure for it the friendships needed for its grandeur. Thus Mexico comes forth in the certainty that the noblest peoples of the earth are its friends beyond doubt.

But all this infuriates those who attempt to defile the Government and its policies. And I ask, Is there any of them who advises a policy of aggression or hostility to the United States? Let them not reply that they want a policy of dignity, because Mexico has never enjoyed greater international respect. What they are engaged in is a demagogic campaign. They who, in the dark and uncertain hours muttered, incited, and advocated a policy that would have been most harmful to Mexico, now that they are confused by the imminence of a final victory for the United Nations and the victory of Mexico over their perfidious suggestions, now they try to revert to the events of the past.

All of us must bear in mind that international life is one of the most difficult struggles upon which the destinies of peoples depend. In the same manner that we have here individuals who advocate and practice hatred against the United States, we must not forget that there is in the United States a powerful sector with imperialistic tendencies. And those who for spite, for their unconfessed Nazi-fascism, or for envy, stir up animosity against our friends, the people of the United States, what they do is encourage that imperialistic sector and thus weaken, before the public opinion of that country, the good-neighbor policy so loyal and evident on the part of President Roosevelt and of the greater majority of the American people.

Let us keep constantly in mind that Mexico needs the reciprocal cooperation of the whole world. Without it, what hope can we nourish of redemption from the many iniquities in which we live? Let us face with fortitude and courage the realities that surround us. Mexico has demolished, through its revolution, enormous obstacles to fulfill the glorious destiny our country can reach; but the constructive task is yet to be developed in its entirety. The progress made on the farm and in the factory is not enough as yet to protect sufficiently the heads of our humble families. We need higher wages, more yield in production, more opportunities of work, and more social justice. Mexico continues to be an archipelago of privilege, large and small, in the ocean of misery and suffering of the people. There follow behind us, dazed, impatient, the youth of the Nation, the workers of the country, a tortured middle class, who find all doors shut. Deprived of new horizons where men may strive successfully for their own happiness and that of their families, the creative revolution will run the risk of degenerating into vested interests. And those new opportunities are being forged by international cooperation; for our country they shall come forth, fundamentally as an imminent and positive fact, from the coordination of energies and resources of all the American nations.

Now I wish to return to the press, to the other sectors of culture in our country, to our manufacturers, to our workers in the city and on the farm, to all forces forging our destinies. I address them to exhort all of them, in this decisive hour, together with the purest sentiments of true patriotism, to the most unyielding consciousness of human solidarity. Mexico must be a standard-bearer of the new ideals that inspire mankind. The whole world is devoted to the fervent hope of a new life, a life of collective security from which wholesale slaughter and recurrent immolations shall be barred, an existence of cooperation in a peaceful world. These hopes are based upon a new spirit the peoples and statesmen have. Hatred, rivalries, distrust, that have been the sources of war, are the negative values working against that overwhelming will of the world, bathed in tears. Let us proclaim the new gospel; let us reject those who would have us return to the dark forest wherein all hope is lost.

Plight of the White-Collar Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Edwin H. Cheever, one of my constituents, containing verses in which he discusses the plight of a citizen who comes within the category of what we often term white-collar worker. I was very much impressed with this letter. I believe it will be of interest to every Member of the Senate to have the privilege of reading what this citizen says. It calls to our attention again very forcefully the plight of the white-collar workers or salaried people, who, I think, in our efforts to hold the line and maintain stabilization, have possibly suffered greater injustice and discrimination than any other class of our people. It impressed me, as I think it will impress my colleagues, with

the fact that the Congress should give this question serious consideration and take appropriate action to bring to this class of our citizens the relief to which they are entitled, based on comparison with standards of wages and earnings in industry, in agriculture, and in all other aspects of our economy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *December 23, 1944.*

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: This is the plaint of a "Collar, once white, now frayed":

According to rulings of W. L. B.,
It's foolish, or must be a joke,
That I should expect a slight thought of me—
Unless it's to tighten my yoke.

I see people spend—
The crowds without end;
The money that each must be making!
But I cannot buy
At prices so high,
Yet buyers all records are breaking.

To grant me a raise
In these troublous days
Would be sowing the seed of inflation.
My judgment is such
That I'd spend too much—
Bringing dearth and ruin to the Nation.

I'd buy more to eat—
Fruit, groceries, meat,
In a wider and better selection;
I'd buy my wife hose,
And children some clothes—
Though their old ones still give some protection!

My sights are too high,
Yet I don't deny
I expect as a just compensation,
A check that will pay
At least a small way
Toward dispersing my fear—desperation.

I can't cook, drive a truck;
I'm all out of luck—
From pursuing the wrong education,
So my little check
Is merely a speck
In delaying my disintegration.

If the powers that be
Would look they would see
That I surely must be a magician
To live (yet I do),
On dollars so few,
But mere tricks cannot ease my hard mission.

What will W. L. B. gain by destroying us?

This isn't designed as a literary gem, but merely expresses my feelings. I wrote it just after a distribution of bonuses made by my company—in which I could not participate.

I hope I have not burdened you in my plea for some consideration for the truly forgotten man so inelegantly dubbed "white collars."

Respectfully submitted.

Yours very truly,

EDWIN H. CHEEVER.

United States Participation in Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain editorials relating to a letter addressed to the President of the United States by the 16 new Members of the United States Senate, on January 23, 1945, regarding the affirmative participation of our Government in foreign affairs, may be be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 25, 1945]

THE SENATE'S SERVICE

It is a good augury for the next meeting of the big three, and beyond that for the making of tomorrow's peace, that President Roosevelt is now in a position to say to Prime Minister Churchill and Premier-Marshal Stalin that the membership of the United States Senate, with very few exceptions, has made it abundantly clear that it favors the most affirmative and active kind of American participation in a world organization to check future aggression and maintain international order and security through the long years to come.

The latest evidence of this is the excellent and unequivocal letter just addressed to Mr. Roosevelt by the 16 freshmen Senators—10 Democrats and 6 Republicans. The letter places its signers on record as supporting, first, the prompt formation of a United Nations organization along the lines tentatively drafted at Dumbarton Oaks; second, the giving of assurances to our allies that we intend to share in the direction and responsibility of the next peace; third, the early negotiation of treaties among the major Allies—as originally advocated by Senator VANDENBERG—to demilitarize Germany and Japan, and fourth, the affirmative participation of America in all decisions affecting the establishment of law and order in liberated and enemy countries.

Coming on top of the far-reaching proposals made recently by Senator VANDENBERG, these views of the Senate's new Members should go far to impress other lands, particularly Britain and Russia, with this country's very genuine determination to continue to play a major role in the world. The "freshmen" in the Senate have rendered a real service.

[From the New York Times of January 26, 1945]

THE NEWCOMERS TAKE THE LEAD

To the 16 "freshmen" Members of the Senate who have sent a round-robin letter to the President on the subject of American foreign policy we offer our congratulations on a fine performance, excellently timed. Explaining that they have not previously had an opportunity to make their own position clear, these 16 newcomers have drafted a statement which is admirable for its clarity, its conciseness, and its understanding of the real American interest in the peace.

There are three major points on which these Senators concur. First, they favor the formation of a new league of the United Nations, along the general lines drafted at Dumbarton Oaks, "at the earliest possible moment." With this declaration they throw their support—rightly, we believe—to the view that the American interest requires our participation in the enforcement of the peace, whatever the terms of peace may be, because even an imperfect peace, adequately enforced, is better than the isolation and the irresponsibility and the anarchy that followed the last war. Second, they "suggest that treaties among the major allies be concluded as soon as possible, to demilitarize Germany and Japan and to keep them demilitarized." This is an endorsement of the sound proposal already made by Senator VANDENBERG. Third, they believe that our Government "should, as soon as possible, arrange to participate affirmatively in all decisions affecting the establishment of law and order in the liberated or enemy countries." This is a recommendation that we come out of our ivory tower, stop criticizing our allies when the results they achieve fall short of perfection, and share with them the making of day-to-day decisions in those difficult situations where compromise is necessary and responsibility should not be shirked.

This statement is signed by freshmen Senators of both parties representing every section of the country, two from New England, two from the Middle Atlantic, three from the South, six from the Middle West, and three from the Pacific coast. Its publication at this time ought to strengthen the President's hand in his forthcoming conference with Mr. Churchill and Marshal Stalin, and its candor, its realism, and its foresight give the rest of the Senate a mark at which to shoot.

[From the New Orleans States of January 26, 1945]

A HELPING HAND

The action of 16 freshmen Senators in assuring President Roosevelt that they will back formation of a United Nations organization to preserve world peace will strengthen the President's hand at the Big Three parley table.

A long-recognized soft spot in the armor of any American delegate to conferences involving decisions on affairs of world importance has been the inability of the delegate, right on up to the President himself, to commit the Nation to a line of action that might later be revoked by the Senate.

In taking the action the 16 Senators explained they thought it advantageous to prove that there is agreement about the substantial, fundamental things which must be done to end the war and write the peace, and to give other nations our assurance that we will definitely participate in post-war security organizations.

The President will need all the good wishes he can get to come out of this parley with American war ideals intact. Churchill and Stalin have announced agreements, of which the President was kept informed, which practically amount to a dividing up of Europe into spheres of influences despite their protestations to the contrary. If the American policy of free elections for all is to be even considered, the President has his work cut out for him.

Uncle Joe Stalin will go into the conference sitting in a very sweet position. His troops are away out in front in the race for Berlin. His new offensive has gone so well that he can easily afford to take a few days off—if only to point out to his conferees the validity of the old saw about possession being nine points of the law. With Red armies overrunning the Baltics, the Balkans, and Poland, Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill may not feel like pushing too vigorously any literal interpretation of the Atlantic Charter.

In matters regarding the form of the pattern to guarantee future military impotence of the Reich, Churchill and Roosevelt are liable to find the Boss of the Kremlin insistent upon strictness. They should have no trouble agreeing on a formula for the control of Germany on that basis.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 26, 1945]

SIXTEEN FOR SECURITY

Those convinced that the United States Senate rather than the American people repudiated the Wilsonian ideal after World War. No. 1 will note with special satisfaction the letter sent by the 16 freshmen Senators this week to President Roosevelt. The President of the United States, more than any

other world leader, needs such assurances of support for a progressive foreign policy as this letter provides—and particularly when he is preparing to discuss with the heads of other nations the terms on which American cooperation for world peace can be secured.

The American system of divided authority is a source of bewilderment to many European leaders. And the surprises it can produce in foreign relations are all too graphically illustrated in the history of the effort to construct a world security system from 1919 onward. Therefore, it is all to the good that Mr. Roosevelt will attend the coming three-power parley fortified not only with a clear popular mandate for American participation in a post-war security system, but with assurances the United States' tortuous technical process of formulating and ratifying treaties has been geared in advance to speed the production of a dependable weapon against future war.

Continuous adherence of the 16 new Senators to the ideal of collective security can make it all but certain that no Senate minority will be mobilized large enough (33 out of 96 Senators) to enable the sad history of Wilson's time to repeat itself. But their letter does more than offer support for the President. It urges him to assert the intention of the United States to take a share "in the direction" of the peace settlement as well as responsibility for its maintenance. This is in line with senatorial responsibility as defined by the Constitution, which provides for Senate advice on as well as consent to treaties.

Of course, it cannot guarantee, nor can any move in the Senate or elsewhere, that if much time should intervene between the end of hostilities and the launching of a world organization, the temper of the American people or the mood of Congress will remain so favorable. The Harding administration was able to interpret the landslide vote that placed it in power as evidence that the American people were no longer unitedly insistent on American participation in a world peace agency.

The Senate today can make a great contribution to international security because of public awareness of the national need for world organization. The Washington portents are good; their fulfillment remains not only a Senatorial but a public responsibility.

[From the Washington Post of January 27, 1945]

FRESHMAN SENATORS

Both in content and timing, the letter addressed to President Roosevelt by the 16 "freshman" Senators, Republican and Democratic alike, is a document of real significance. It proves that on major matters of foreign policy, particularly on the question of this country's role in the coming peace, partisan differences have disappeared in the United States. It might be said, of course, that this needed no further proof. The rival party platforms in the late Presidential campaign, the speeches of the two leading candidates, before that the Connally and Fulbright resolutions which were overwhelmingly approved by the Senate and the House—all these pointed in that direction. Yet the fear that after this war the United States might pursue a course similar to that pursued after World War No. 1 has by no means disappeared, and has undoubtedly been a factor both in the policies and in the activities of our allies.

The action of the "freshman" Senators shows that this fear lacks substance. These men have just taken their seats. They come straight from the electorate. Some have long been identified with the internationalist point of view, but others have been suspected, in the past, of isolationist leanings. Yet all of them have put their signature to a document favoring the establishment at the earliest possible moment of a United Nations organization along the lines of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement; urging this Nation "to assure our allies and the other nations of the world that we intend to share in the direction of and responsibility for the settlement of this war and the maintenance of peace"; favoring an alliance with our principal allies to demilitarize Germany and Japan; and supporting affirmative participation by the United States in "all decisions affecting the establishment of law and order in the liberated or enemy countries."

Designed to strengthen President Roosevelt's hand at his forthcoming meeting with Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin, it will do just that. For the greatest asset which the President will have at that meeting will be the certainty that the entire Nation is behind him. That is just what the letter of the 16 new Senators clearly underlines.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of January 27, 1945]

FRESHMAN SENATORS

For newcomers in the Upper House of Congress, the 16 new Senators who wrote President Roosevelt pledging their support to international collaboration designed to preserve the peace showed a wholesome maturity which should take them out of the freshman class immediately.

The fact that the 10 new Democratic senators and the 6 new Republican Senators could get together so quickly and so easily on a statement of objectives is added proof that last year's election was conclusive and decisive in at least one respect. However much they might disagree about other matters, the overwhelming majority of the American people want the United States to join with the other United Nations in bringing a durable peace out of this global war through a permanent international organization set up to maintain law and order, by force if necessary.

Because these new senators have received the freshest mandate from the people, this unequivocal statement of objectives which does not bog down into argument over controversial details is especially significant when it shows that the citizens of Pennsylvania and Oregon, Massachusetts and Missouri, North Carolina and Connecticut, Arkansas and New Jersey, Washington and Idaho, Indiana and Iowa, North Dakota and South Carolina are thinking alike on a question which is no longer an issue in this country.

Present Draft Confusion Inexcusable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the administration of any law, due to honest difference of opinion as to interpretation and administration, there are bound to be some inequities, some confusion. This is especially true when the welfare and the happiness of millions of our people depend upon the just and fair interpretation and administration of the Selective Service Act.

Experience has demonstrated that when Congress passed the present Conscription Act, it did not make proper provisions for the deferment of those upon whom falls the burden of producing the food for the Army, our allies, and our civilian population, hence the Tydings amendment. That amendment provided that:

> Every registrant found by a selective-service local board, to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

The interpretation of that amendment was by Congress left to the local boards, who know, or have means of knowing, the farms, the men, and what they are doing. Neither the President, General Hershey, nor any State director has any authority to tell the local board how the act should be interpreted or applied. The only authority with the power to change the local board's findings is the appeal board.

Now, I am not criticizing members of the local board nor their handling of individual cases. They serve without pay, do the best they can in almost every instance, and are, or should be, more familiar with the facts in each individual case than anyone else.

But, unfortunately, the President, General Hershey, the State director in Michigan, and his representative, Major Luscombe, each took it upon himself to interfere and complicate the difficulties confronting the local boards. The President, through Mr. Byrnes, in substance instructed General Hershey that men in the 18 through 25 age group were not as essential to the war effort as was the need of the Army and the Navy for young men, and that instruction was passed on to the local boards.

When the Agriculture Committee of the House and some 250 Congressmen called General Hershey's attention to the fact that his action had resulted in calling from the farms, through improper induction, thousands of men needed for the production of food, he sent to the State directors a modified interpretation of Directive 288, which was intended to liberalize the action of the local boards.

But when some of the local boards gave notice that those coming under the Tydings amendment would be deferred, Major Luscombe, on January 29, speaking for the Michigan State director of selective service, told representatives of local boards and others that the 18 through 25 age group must be classified I–A. The major's statement was not true. He had no authority to make it.

When General Hershey's attention was called to Major Luscombe's erroneous directive, he promised to correct it, and to issue a statement that those who met the requirements of the Tydings amendment would be deferred. Unfortunately, General Hershey, whether he intended it or not, made a bad matter worse. He made it more difficult for the board to defer farm workers. He wrote:

> We have, however, directed the review of the classifications of agriculturally deferred registrants, ages 18 to 25, inclusive, to make absolutely sure that they (the farm registrants) fully meet the requirements of the Tydings amendment.

Even a man accused of crime cannot be convicted until the Government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, that he is guilty. A registrant claiming deferment is not a criminal and he cannot be required to produce evidence sufficient to make the local board absolutely sure that he should be deferred.

Is General Hershey so dumb that he did not realize, when he told the local board to make absolutely sure that the registrant meet the requirements of the Tydings amendment, that he was imposing an additional restriction upon their deferment?

If General Hershey felt called upon to use the words "absolutely sure," and if he wanted the local boards to give effect to the Tydings amendment, then why did he not in his instructions to the State boards, advise that the registrants should be deferred unless the local board was asbolutely sure that the registrant was not necessary to an agricultural occupation or endeavor and so forth?

The truth is that if in the opinion of the board, the registrant falls within the Tydings amendment, it is the unqualified duty of the local board to defer him.

General Hershey has no right to add one word, one punctuation mark, to the Selective Service Act. Presumably, General Hershey is a good soldier and the first duty of a soldier is to obey orders. General Hershey gets his orders, by virtue of a law, from Congress and it is about time he begins to follow them.

Local boards are given sole authority, subject to an appeal, and subject, of course, to the action of any Federal court, to determine in accordance with the fact in each case, whether a man should be inducted, into what class he should be put, or whether he should be deferred and, if so, for how long.

Need of Constitutional Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared by Robert B. Dresser, an able lawyer of Providence, R. I., on the need of constitutional limitation on the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts. If a limitation be not set on this power in peacetime, business may be totally destroyed through confiscatory taxation. The power of the States may be rendered completely sterile if the Federal Government should exercise its unlimited powers in the direction of taxation. As the Honorable HATTON SUMNERS, Representative from the State of Texas, has so aptly stated:

By making the units of State government financially dependent on the Federal Government, that Government is acquiring the power to control the State governments. When this is fully consummated, the sovereignty of the States will be liquidated.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bulletin of the Tax Institute of December 1944]

NEED OF CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATION

(By Robert B. Dresser, trustee, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.)

The proposed twenty-second amendment, limiting maximum peacetime Federal income, inheritance, and gift tax rates to 25 percent, should be adopted.

1. It would provide needed assurance, which statutory law cannot, against recurring abuse of the Federal taxing power—the "power to destroy."

2. It would increase the national wealth and, over the years, the Federal revenue.

3. It would aid in saving our free-enterprise system.

4. It would free the States from Federal domination and aid in preserving our present form of government.

Legislatures of 17 States have passed resolutions requesting Congress to call a constitutional convention to propose such amendment for ratification by the States. This is one of the two ways for amendment provided by article V of the Constitution.

While 32 States can compel the calling of a convention, it is my hope that popular demand will induce Congress to propose the amendment and submit it to the States for ratification, which has been the method followed in all previous cases.

LOWER RATE PRODUCES GREATER REVENUE

In formulating a sound and effective tax policy, the all-important consideration is to promote an increase of the national income and an expansion of the country's wealth and productive capacity. Both reason and experience demonstrate that in peacetime a moderate rate of tax on income will, over the years, produce more revenue than a high rate.

The explanation of this seeming paradox is (1) that the lower rate leaves in the hands of the taxpayers more income which when invested and put to work produces more wealth, and (2) that the lower rate encourages investment and the production of wealth. This increase in wealth, when invested, produces additional income, which in turn when invested produces still more income, and so on. By thus increasing the national income, which is the base on which the tax is levied, more revenue is obtained and the wealth of the Nation is increased to the benefit of the people as a whole.

By way of illustration, let us take the case supposed by Dr. Irving Fisher and Mr. Herbert W. Fisher in chapter 9 of their book, Constructive Income Taxation. It is said that in 40 years the fortune of Henry Ford increased from a thousand to a billion dollars, which is at the average annual rate of 41.42 percent compounded. In the hypothetical case, using round figures for simplicity, it is supposed that an automobile business was started in 1900 with an investment of $1,000 and that, with no income tax, its net worth increased at the compound rate of 40 percent a year. This would give it a value at the end of 40 years of $700,500,000.

Then, by contrast, it is supposed that there was a 100-percent tax and that despite this the business continued to produce income before taxes of 40 percent a year, or $400. This is admittedly an impossible case, since no one would operate without a chance of profit. It is chosen merely for simplicity of exposition.

At the end of the 40 years, instead of having a net worth of $700,500,000, the business would have its original net worth of $1,000, and the Government would have collected in taxes $16,000, at the rate of $400 per year. Had the Government not collected these taxes, it would have had to obtain the money elsewhere. Assuming that it borrowed the money and paid as high a rate of interest as 5 percent, the $16,000 with compound interest at this rate would have amounted to but $48,320 at the end of 40 years. Compare this with the revenue which might have been obtained from an estate or inheritance tax of 20 or 25 percent on $700,500,000, the net worth of the business at the end of 40 years with no income tax.

With an 80-percent income tax, instead of a 100-percent tax, the net worth of the business at the end of 40 years would have been $21,700 and the Government would have collected $82,600 in taxes. With a 50-percent tax the net worth at the end of 40 years would have been $1,470,000, and the taxes collected $1,470,000. With a 20-percent tax the net worth at the end of 40 years would have been $66,500,000 and the taxes collected $16,600,000. In other words, as the tax rate decreases, both the revenue and the net worth of the business increase.[1]

In all of these cases, in addition to the revenue from the income tax, there would, of course, be the revenue from the estate or inheritance tax upon the death of the owner.

GENERAL BENEFIT FROM LOWER RATES

It should be noted that by increasing the national income the Federal Government, the States, the municipalities, and the taxpayers all benefit. For example, a Federal tax of 50 percent on an income base of $50,000,000,000 would produce $25,000,000,000, leaving $25,00,000,000 for division among all the other parties in interest. A Federal tax of 25 percent on an income base of $100,000,000,000 would produce exactly the same amount of revenue and would leave $75,000,000,000 for division among the others.

The principle here involved is the same as that governing the operation of a successful business, namely, that within certain limits the greatest profits come from charging a low rather than a high price for goods sold.

As high prices lessen the ability and incentive to buy, so high tax rates lessen the ability and incentive to produce.

IMPORTANCE OF CAPITAL

For a nation to be prosperous there must be an ever-increasing supply of new capital for investment in productive enterprise. With the capital invested in the industries of this country the American workman has been provided with improved machinery and equipment that have made it possible for him to produce an ever-increasing amount of wealth, to earn higher and higher wages, and to attain a standard of living surpassing that of the wage earners of any other country. Take, for example, the case of the railroad industry, which has an average capital investment of $25,000 per employee. By means of the improved machinery and equipment purchased with this capital, the American railroad worker is able to move freight so economically that he can be paid 50 to 100 times the wage of the Chinese coolie transport worker, who has no machinery or equipment other than a simple bamboo pole.

It is these high wages that provide a market for the farmer's products at good prices. Likewise it is the good prices received by the farmer that make possible an adequate market for the products of the factory. In fact, all groups are benefited.

The capital needed for these purposes can come only from the savings of corporations and individuals. Studies by Dr. Carl Snyder and by Dr. Willford I. King, of New York Uni-

[1] For the results at lower rates of growth than 40 percent, see table in Constructive Income Taxation by Fisher and Fisher, p. 74.

versity, indicate that the great bulk of the capital supplied by individuals comes from those having the larger incomes. Excessive taxation not only discourages the investment of capital in industry but it reduces these savings which constitute the source of supply.

It is the so-called venture or risk capital, of course, that is the most important—capital required by new and hazardous enterprises, such as the railroads, the automobile industry, the aircraft industry, and many others which have provided jobs and good wages for millions. According to 1939 reports, which are the most recent available, the number of jobs created directly and indirectly by the automobile industry was 6,105,000.[2] This is 10 percent of the total number of persons now employed in all classes of employment, including over 10,000,000 in the armed forces.[3]

Such enterprises, however, are risky. Many of them fail and the investor loses his investment. If high taxes take the great bulk of the profits where the enterprise is successful, all incentive to invest is destroyed.

Where the needed capital is not forthcoming, business stagnation and large-scale unemployment result, with a consequent lowering of the national income and a reduction in the revenue from taxation.

EXPERIENCE SUPPORTS THESE VIEWS

Our own experience supports the views herein expressed. For this purpose, the period to consider is that prior to the starting of the national defense program in the spring of 1940. Since then our economy has been subject to the artificial stimulus of war—a stimulus which will cease, of course, when the war is ended.

In 1924 President Coolidge, stating that experience shows that the lower rate produces the larger revenue, expressed the view that the point of diminishing returns is reached at 25 percent, if not sooner. This conclusion, he said, was based upon "the experience of the Treasury and the opinion of the best experts." That the 25-percent rate would produce more revenue than the higher rate was demonstrated by the experience under the tax act passed by Congress 2 years later in 1926, reducing the maximum individual income-tax rate from 46 percent to 25 percent.

For the 6 years, 1926 to 1931, inclusive, the maximum individual income-tax rate was 24 percent in one year and 25 percent in the remaining five. For the 6 succeeding years, 1932 to 1937, inclusive, the rate was 63 percent in the first 4 years and 79 percent in the last 2. Despite the much lower rates and the substantially smaller population during the earlier period, the national income and the revenue, as shown by the individual income-tax returns, were higher than in the later 6-year period with the higher rates and increased population.

From a study by Dr. Carl Snyder[4] it appears that every 10 years from 1790 to 1930 the national income showed an average rate of growth not differing greatly from one decade to the next. The rate of growth was about 4 percent per annum compounded. So for 140 years the national income doubled approximately every 18 years.

During the 11 years from 1930 to 1940, this astonishing growth was arrested for the first time in the Nation's history. In no year during that period did the national income reach even the level of the last part of the preceding decade. The principal cause of this was undoubtedly the great increase in tax rates. Had the growth of our national income continued at the rate prevailing during the 140 years prior to 1930, there would have been a national income of over $125,000,000,000 in 1940 instead of $77,000,000,000.

DEATH AND GIFT TAXES

The ill effect of high rates is not confined to the income tax. High death taxes and excessive gift taxes are extremely destructive of capital and will in the long run destroy the accumulations of capital that are so necessary for industrial activity and expansion and for the full employment of labor.

Furthermore, the heavy taxation of large estates compels the rich to seek comparatively safe, liquid investments in order to provide for the heavy taxes that will be imposed upon their estates at death, thus further reducing the capital available for hazardous business ventures which have done so much to improve the lot of the American people.

Moreover, the amount of the revenue from the estate and gift taxes, even at the present high levels, is but a trivial part of the total budget.

MUST INCREASE NATIONAL INCOME

If we are to solve the serious financial problems that will confront us in the post-war period and avert national disaster, we must restore the progressive increase in capital investment and national income that prevailed during the 140 years prior to 1930. The importance of this cannot be too strongly emphasized. It outweighs every other consideration.

By all odds the most important factor involved in accomplishing this objective is that of taxation. Tax rates must be kept within reasonable bounds, and the people must have confidence that this will be done. Otherwise, the needed venture capital will not be forthcoming.

WHY A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IS NEEDED

There can be no such public confidence, no such assurance against confiscatory taxation, without a constitutional amendment. Even if for a time it should be possible to get the rates reduced to a reasonable figure, there would be but little chance of holding them there when the next depression comes. Generally speaking, an advance in rates will increase the revenue for a short time. If past experience is a guide for the future, the temptation of our Government to take advantage of this in times of depression would be irresistible. The harm done to the economy, however, would far outweigh the temporary gain in revenue and would result ultimately in the production of less revenue.

The Constitution is filled with curbs on the power of Congress, which were placed there to protect the people's rights. There is no curb more important to the people than one on the taxing power. Congress should no more have unlimited power over one's property than over his person. Such a curb is the only way of giving assurance to business that it will not at some future time be subjected to excessive or confiscatory taxation. Such assurance would have the invaluable effect of attracting venture capital into new and hazardous enterprises to an extent possible of achievement in no other way.

HIGH FEDERAL TAXES WEAKEN STATES

A further effect of high Federal tax rates is to make the States dependent upon the Federal Government by draining the wealth of the people of the States into Washington and then doling part of it back to the States on conditions. If continued long enough, the inevitable result will be to deprive the States of all independence.

The proposed amendment would serve the double purpose of limiting the power of the Federal Government and at the same time restoring to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination.

[2] Automobile Facts and Figures, twenty-third edition, 1941, p. 76.

[3] National Industrial Conference Board, *Management Record*, July 1944, p. 196.

[4] Capitalism the Creator, p. 89.

When Democracy Breaks Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial by David Lawrence, which appears in the United States News of February 9, 1945:

WHEN DEMOCRACY BREAKS DOWN

(By David Lawrence)

The American people have been taught to believe that totalitarianism is bad and that democracy can wage war without adopting the Fascist formula of forced labor.

The American people have been taught to believe that involuntary servitude is bad. The Constitution explicitly forbids it.

Military service is not involuntary servitude because service for one's country is not service for anybody's individual profit.

But enforced service in a civilian plant, operated by civilians and in which civilians have a stock ownership and seek to make profits, is involuntary servitude.

The cry that in the midst of war the Constitution must be abrogated is the same cry of expediency that the totalitarians use when they abrogate human rights.

The House of Representatives has passed a manpower bill which calls for forced labor. It is a grave mistake in policy and marks a tragic chapter in the history of American democracy.

The truth is that our system of selecting manpower for war has not lived up to its name—a selective-service system. Congress must share some of the blame but, on the other hand, it is a fact that ample law to induct men by age groups has existed almost from the very beginning of the war emergency in 1940. Instead of applying the law, men were taken from nearly all ages up to 38, and hence many of the best troops—the younger men—were not inducted until recently. This was a waste of valuable time.

Delay in drafting youth: Thus the country finally got in 1944 a systematic plan for drafting younger men. After an inexcusable delay, all able-bodied persons from 18 through 29 are at last subject to immediate induction and only a few are deferred who are in essential positions in industry.

But what of those above 29?

Existing law gives the Military Establishment power to induct anyone up to the age of 45. The manpower shortage is directly traceable to the blunders of the military men, who announced first that men over 35 were not useful for the Army, and then last year agreed to an announcement that persons 30 and over would not be inducted until the supply of physically fit men under the age of 30 had been exhausted. The prospect of using that supply seemed remote.

This action, however, virtually promised exemption from military service to millions of persons in the age groups between 30 and 45, and it is small wonder that the exodus from essential jobs began, especially when military men abroad as well as on this side of the Atlantic were giving the American people last autumn stories of how the European war would soon be over.

Simple manpower plan available: There are no mysteries about manpower control. We went through a series of painful changes at the War Production Board before a plan to control materials was adopted. A similar

control of the flow of manpower could have been established long ago—and without forcing men to work for somebody's profit or face jail.

The plan available ever since the war began and still available today is simple. It does, of course, require the cooperation of the military men and it needs at least some degree of efficiency in allocating personnel in our armed services. But even at this late date and with the war against Japan likely to go on a couple of years longer, it is opportune for the Military Establishment to be required to introduce efficiency in the allocation and use of manpower. We learn now that too many men were allocated to ground forces of the Air Corps and not enough to infantry. Whose mistake was that? Stories of wasted manpower in the armed services are heard on every side.

The first step now, however, should be to revoke the arrangement whereby most men between 30 and 45 are virtually assured that they will not be inducted into military service. No new law is needed to withdraw such a regulation.

The second step is to begin to replace those able-bodied men in the supply units of our forces overseas and in the camps in this country with men from the 30 to 45 age groups. This automatically increases our supply of reserves and gives the front lines what they need—physically capable soldiers.

The system of deferments already in existence can continue to be used. If a man is not needed in an essential job or business or industry to help the war effort, he should be inducted into military service to fight or to replace some able-bodied man who can fight. The so-called Army standards, whereby boys with a broken ear drum or a spot on the lung acquired years ago are not inducted into some form of limited service in the Army, are ridiculous.

If the several million men between the ages of 30 and 45 knew tomorrow that they might be inducted into the armed forces to do limited service unless their civilian jobs were already in the essential groups, they would not need the threat of a jail sentence to find such jobs at once.

Why not accept limited service? One argument offered by the Army men in rebuttal is that too many such men would then gladly enter the armed forces, whereas the Army does not want them. But would a man who now earns $40 or $50 a week and has a family to support rush into the Army to earn $50 a month and separate himself from his home? If any considerable number did, couldn't they work a typewriter or cook meals or run a jeep or do any one of a number of countless tasks behind the lines so that able-bodied men now doing those same chores could be released for combat duty? If the Army agreed to accept only 500,000 of these men for limited service, spreading the selection process over the next 18 months, the manpower situation in the United States would be solved immediately. Already, with the threat of legislation, the movement last week into essential industries was like a panic. The mere possibility of induction at $50 a month would be equally persuasive.

To be asked to do limited service in the military forces is a proper use of manpower in a democracy. It is an understandable principle. But to be required to work in a particular war plant under penalty of going to jail is forced labor.

It is difficult to see how the Congress, if it enacts the pending manpower bill, can hesitate to remove all profit from any enterprise where there is forced labor. If forced labor is to be construed as service to one's country, let it be clearly for that purpose alone, and then, logically, management and ownership must be conscripted, too. It will be a surprise if the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., who are opposed to the "forced labor" bill, do not insist on such legislation to cover management and ownership. There would be a widespread sympathy with such a proposal, and then America would have the very chaos which the military minds never are able to foresee but which they themselves bring on because they do not understand how to get civilian production in a democracy.

EFFICIENT OPERATION NEEDED

It is to be hoped that the Senate will not be stampeded into action, but will adopt, instead of the forced labor bill, a resolution calling on the Army and Navy to utilize more effectively the manpower already available to it between the ages of 18 and 45. If those age limits are not wide enough to secure the indirect result in channeling manpower into essential industry, and it is necessary to include men above 45, then the law can readily be amended for that particular purpose.

We have an abundance of manpower for military use and for war production. But we have not insisted on the right mechanism of control or selection which can get the maximum utilization out of that manpower. Democracy prides itself that it can accomplish much by the power of public opinion. Billions of dollars flow out of the pockets of the citizens into War bonds—not by forced savings but by voluntary purchase. The press and radio and the leaders of public opinion gladly help to do that job. The same thing can be done with manpower needs and without a forced-labor bill.

Doubtless there were many men in the House of Representatives who were for the most part too new to the Washington situation to vote wisely on the bill which, with vague cries of military necessity, was urged upon them. The Senate has the duty of saving the House of Representatives from a major blunder in war policy. To adopt a forced labor bill is to break down democracy. We can still win the war without forced labor if the Congress will, by its power of exposure, insist that the executive agencies be efficiently manned and that policies within existing law be given a fair trial by competent administrators.

The Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a forward-looking address by Commissioner Harry W. Bashore of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, delivered before the Nebraska Reclamation Association at Lincoln, Nebr., on January 19, 1945. This association has been formed not only by men and women of Nebraska who are directly concerned with the conservation and use of the water resources of my State, but by many who live in the towns and cities whose future stability and prosperity are dependent on policies that look to the wise use of Nebraska's water resources for the development of the State.

Commissioner Bashore, having spent many years in the active development of the North Platte project which serves such important areas in western Nebraska and eastern Wyoming, is a recognized authority not only on water conservation but on the best means of putting water to work for the benefit of the people. An engineer of outstanding ability, his address shows that he believes that the measure of engineering results in water conservation is the extent to which constructed works can best serve the people.

I consider the outstanding achievement of Mr. Bashore's career to be the foresight and leadership he displayed in bringing about, in cooperation with Major General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, the coordination of the reclamation and Army plans for the unified development of the Missouri River system. This unified plan, which was given the approval of Congress in section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, has important significance not only for the people of Nebraska who are dependent on the Platte River Basin of the Missouri system but also to the people of every river basin in the arid and semiarid areas of the West where water is the most vital consideration.

I thoroughly agree with Commissioner Bashore's observation that all water-use problems were not solved by the recognition that Congress in the Flood Control Act gave to the priority in the use of water west of the ninety-eighth meridian for irrigation and other beneficial uses. Of equal importance is the further recognition in the act which declares it the policy of Congress "to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders" and "to facilitate the consideration of projects on the basis of comprehensive and coordinated development; and to limit the authorization and construction of navigation works to those in which a substantial benefit to navigation will be realized therefrom and which can be operated consistently with appropriate and economic use of the waters of such rivers by other users."

Eternal vigilance on the part of western water conservationists in cooperation with people of like minds throughout the country is essential to the effective translation of this policy into constructive and effective results of permanent benefit to the Nation as a whole.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When one places against the long perspective of history the short hundred years or so that this western country has been under development, one cannot help but realize that we have only just begun to build our civilization, to use our natural resources to best advantage, to say nothing of learning how to live with one another in peace and friendliness. The crude pioneering days of the West have passed, but the days of solid and intelligent growth and ripening are before us.

Within my lifetime modern science has placed in our hands miraculous tools with which we have unlocked a vast amount of new knowledge which has given us controls over our material surroundings such as man never before has held—scarcely dreamed of. There is not one of you here who does not know what I mean, who has not seen the tremendous development of air transportation at speeds and heights we hardly hoped to

attain. During the same period our knowledge of the structure of the atom has given us new skills in making metals which could withstand pressures and temperatures that have made possible new techniques in the construction of internal-combustion engines, the forging of weapons more deadly than man has ever before conceived, as well as new techniques in chemistry.

At the same time medical science has conquered diseases once regarded with abject fear, agricultural science has shown us how to increase crop production while reducing labor, and modern psychology has given an insight into the hidden resources of the human mind that eventually will teach us how to behave ourselves and lead happier lives.

In view of the short time this western country has been under development and in view of the great progress man has made in conquering his physical surroundings and making them serve his purposes, does it seem to you at all unlikely that along the banks of the Platte, the Loup, the Elkhorn, and the Niobrara beautiful modern cities will be built with all of the luxuries and conveniences that science can produce, peopled by intelligent men and women who have the leisure with which to develop the arts and sciences to a height they never before have reached?

This is the destiny that we could not escape if we would, just because we are human beings with brains and spirits that reach out for new and greater things to do. So when the means with which to bring these things about are at hand, as they are today, we cannot help but turn our hands and minds to the task. At least, we shall do so as soon as we have ceased to turn all of our energies in the direction of destruction.

In this State the resource which most requires development is water. There is enough water to bring nearly a million additional acres under intensive cultivation in Nebraska, but it rolls down the rivers and sometimes wreaks destruction along their banks. When we use the water that flows through Nebraska to full advantage, we shall avoid the destruction of floods, we shall assure additional electric power, and we shall make possible an agriculture that will increase the income of your people by hundreds of millions of dollars annually. It will enable Nebraska to combat drought such as wreaked havoc in your State in the thirties and drove thousands of families from the farms.

If we can learn to distribute these benefits so as virtually to end poverty, so as to give the greatest advantages to the individuals who contribute most to the welfare of all of us, we can certainly build for ourselves towns and cities that will be more convenient, sanitary, and beautiful than man has ever seen before.

One basis of every sound civilization lies in a healthy agriculture. The projects in the Bureau of Reclamation's plan for the comprehensive development of the Missouri River and its tributaries approved in the Flood Control Act of 1944 would irrigate 989,000 acres of rich Nebraska land, which lies in the valleys of the Platte, the Republican, and the Niobrara. And this land, which will assure ample moisture whether the rest of the area be suffering from drought or not, will be the basis for a greatly stabilized stock-raising industry, for on irrigated farms can be grown feed and winter forage for far larger herds than could be sustained if natural range lands were their chief source of feed. For that matter, the variety of products that could be grown upon newly irrigated land would add to the agricultural wealth of Nebraska through considerable diversification.

You may not be aware that today the Bureau of Reclamation systems in Nebraska are serving with a full water supply 2,436 farms, including about 170,000 irrigated acres, and that Reclamation developments under Warren Act contracts and other contracts are supplementing the water supply for about 100,000 acres. Moreover, the bureau is now building the Mirage Flats project in northwestern Nebraska, which is part of the war foods program, and has been making as much progress as possible considering the limitations on materials and manpower. Also, as part of the war food program, the Bureau recommended construction of the Cambridge project on the Republican River in southern Nebraska, but the urgent need of materials and manpower for other uses prevented approval. It is included in the initial stage of the Missouri Valley plan authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

But I shall not go into details regarding the program which the Bureau of Reclamation is proposing for Nebraska. Mr. E. B. Debler, director for the Bureau in region 7, of which this area is part, will tell you about these plans much more in detail tomorrow.

What we propose for Nebraska is a part of the plan for the development and coordination of the natural resources of the entire Missouri River Basin, a development which would include the construction of some 90 dams and cover territory equal to about one-sixth of the land area of continental United States. The cost in 1940 values would be something like one and one-third billion dollars.

This, in turn, is but part of a plan for the development of all 17 States that lie chiefly west of the ninety-seventh meridian—a plan which embraces more than 290 separate projects, and in 1940 dollars would cost about $3,000,000,000. Our economists have calculated that this great engineering proposal would result in doubling the population of the West and in increasing the national income by several billions of dollars annually. With increased prosperity in one section of the country every other section gains through the stimulation of trade, industry, and travel.

In the post-war days, when our productive machine will be put to full use for constructive purposes, it appears to me very probable that people will have to work fewer hours to produce the things they want. This may mean fewer hours per day or it may mean longer vacations—but it certainly will mean more leisure to enjoy the finer things of life—including fishing. And with this leisure is certain to come much greater expenditure upon the cultivation of the lively arts, which embrace many recreational activities. From the commercial angle this is becoming big business.

A factor in the post-war development of the Missouri River Basin will be a link between Nebraska's present power grid and the great hydroelectric developments authorized on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado. A transmission line from Fort Morgan, Colo., to North Platte, Nebr., will make available energy that can be produced at considerably less expense than in Nebraska, where rivers do not fall anything like the distances they drop down the slopes of the Colorado mountains. The existing Nebraska systems would be linked with the hydroelectric plants to be constructed on the main stem of the Missouri in South Dakota.

But the Missouri River Basin power projects themselves have a direct interest for Nebraska, especially. Most of the power plants proposed in the plan will generate electrical energy for use in pumping water for irrigation, and for domestic, commercial, and industrial uses. A few will be used almost exclusively for irrigation, however. In most cases, the operations of the power plants will be governed by the storing and releasing of water for purposes other than power generation, such as irrigation, flood control, and navigation, so that capacities and arrangements of the plants have been planned accordingly.

Considering all of the proposed power plants in the Missouri Basin plan of the Bureau of Reclamation as parts of one power generative unit, that unit would be able to turn out about 3,809,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy each year at a uniform rate of 434,500 kilowatts. That means that these power plants could serve consumers with a uniform demand at the rate of 434,500 kilowatts.

Now all of this generative capacity is not going to be built in a day. If it were, we should not know how to use it. It is anticipated, however, that while we are planning and building dams we shall look ahead to see what the needs of this region are going to be, and make wise provision for them. Statistical data show that in 1940 Nebraska used 78,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy, and estimates place the probable volume by 1950—which is only 5 years away—at 1,410,000,000 kilowatt-hours. By 1980, it is estimated, this State alone will require 3,900,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity—as much as power plants planned by the Bureau of Reclamation for the entire Missouri River Basin would produce. It does not appear as though we were planning too lavishly.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 to which I have referred is a great step forward. In this act the integrated plan of the Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers for the development of the Missouri River Basin was authorized, calling for the expenditure of $200,000,000 by the Bureau and an equal sum by the Army Corps of Engineers toward the partial accomplishment of the initial stage of the program. An appropriation with which to complete surveys and field studies and prepare designs for structures will be sought to clear the way for actual work on long-awaited projects on the Republican River in Nebraska and Kansas. Passage of such an appropriation will be the signal to make ready all plans, so that as soon as the wars with Hitler and Hirohito end we shall be ready to ask for bids on contracts and commence to shovel dirt.

Within the next few months the Bureau of Reclamation will have completed comprehensive plans for similar development of 14 other great river basins in the West. Among them will be plans for the Columbia River Basin in the Northwest, the Central Valley of California, and the basin of the great Colorado River.

These plans will be presented to the President and Congress. We hope that they will be studied by the people in the areas they cover with as great interest as you of the Missouri River Basin have studied the possibilities of the plan we prepared for your river basins.

Our first purpose which will be served by the construction of post-war projects of the Bureau of Reclamation will be to make jobs for demobilized servicemen and industrial workers after the fighting stops. Everyone knows that there will be a difficult period of transition. We estimate that within 2 years after the end of the wars our post-war program will mean employment for some 200,000 workers on the construction sites, and as many more in industrial centers making electrical equipment, machinery, semifabricated materials, and other things used in building dams, power plants, tunnels, and canals.

But the principal task will be to settle servicemen and war workers on new farms created for them by these projects. If all of the projects suggested in the Bureau of Reclamation plan are constructed, there should be some 135,000 new farms created. These will be family-type farms in conformity with the established land policy of the Bureau of Reclamation. Under the original Reclamation Act of 1902 the policy was first laid down that the Government would stimulate the development of family-type farms—a farm small enough for the members of one average farm family to handle.

The law provides that we can furnish irrigation water to not more than 160 acres

under one ownership. If water is to be supplied to more than this acreage, the excess land must be sold. While there may be areas in the West in which this rule has been modified for one reason or another, it is the policy of the Bureau to encourage family-type farming. Already the established pattern of irrigation in Nebraska is in farms of less than 160 acres. Data from the 1940 census and from Bureau of Reclamation records of more recent date indicate that the average size of an irrigation farm in Nebraska is close to 120 acres, of which 67 acres is actually irrigated. This compares, for instance, with an average size irrigated farm of 197 acres in Wyoming, of which 129 acres gets irrigation water. Compare also the average size of all farms in Nebraska of 391 acres—irrigated and dry farms taken together—with the average of 1,866 for Wyoming and 822 acres for Montana. It seems clear that the transition from dry farming to irrigation farming under the 160-acre limitation of the reclamation laws can be far more easily accomplished in this State than in most others.

One of the reasons that the family-type farm has prevailed in Nebraska is that it ranks high in percentage of farms operated by their owners. It follows that if Nebraska holds to this form of farming its communities will continue to be prosperous in comparison with the areas where tenant farming predominates.

We are now entering another phase of conservation in the West. The Flood Control Act, approved by President Roosevelt on December 22, 1944, marks what many westerners believe to be the most significant step for the conservation of the waters of the West since the passage of the Reclamation Act of 1902. Read carefully section 1 (b) which provides that:

"The use for navigation, in connection with the operation and maintenance of such works (authorized by the act) for construction, of waters arising in States lying wholly or in part west of the ninety-eighth meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes."

If the courts hold that paragraph means what I think it does, this paragraph is of especial significance when read in connection with the opening paragraph of the act, which declares it the policy of Congress "to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders" and "to facilitate the consideration of projects on the basis of comprehensive and coordinated development; and to limit the authorization and construction of navigation works to those in which a substantial benefit to navigation will be realized therefrom and which can be operated consistently with appropriate and economic use of the waters of such rivers by other users."

Effective implementation of this policy is given in section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 by approving as integrated and comprehensive plans the proposals of the Bureau of Reclamation and Army Corps of Engineers for the development of the waters of the Missouri River Basin. The Nebraska Senators and Representatives vigorously supported this policy together with all reclamation programs.

It would be assuming too much, however, to suppose that all water-use problems were solved by this bill. For example, it will require a good deal of thoughtful planning to avert the type of litigation which hampered development in the North Platte area for years.

I think a good many of you know of my connection as an active construction engineer on the North Platte project. It is a great satisfaction to see the effects of one's work bear good fruit—and I am not punning. Not only has agriculture along the North Platte been stabilized, but cities and towns which are dependent upon the irrigated farms of the North Platte have grown and flourished. In Scotts Bluff County, which includes the city of Scottsbluff, the population grew from 2,552 persons in 1900 to 33,875 in 1940, a thirteenfold increase. In the decade from 1930 to 1940 the Scotts Bluff County population gained 18 percent and the city of Scottsbluff gained 42 percent, although the population of Nebraska as a whole declined almost 5 percent. I feel grateful to have had something to do with the growth of this section because of the irrigating works which I helped to build.

I feel grateful also for the opportunity to take a part in even greater developments after the war. Today the Bureau of Reclamation, as an arm of the Department of the Interior, is preparing to build not only irrigation systems, great dams, power plants, and canals, but is preparing to make Federal investment in these works contribute to man's well-being to a greater extent than ever before.

We in the Bureau of Reclamation believe that we have a greater responsibility than ever before not only because we desire to help the water users repay their pro rata share of the Federal investment but because the Government is in a position to help the settler avail himself of many techniques and uses of modern science in farming and in living in a way that he is not able to avail himself of them as an individual. In this way the Bureau of Reclamation, with the cooperation of all of you, can make its greatest contribution to the development of western communities and States. You will hear much more of this in days to come.

I thank all of you for this opportunity to tell something about the plans of the agency of Government for which I am responsible. I know that you will feel a friendly, intimate connection with the Bureau of Reclamation through Mr. Debler, who is the director of our newly constituted region No. 7. Mr. Debler and I will work with you closely to increase the prosperity of your State and bring about the fullest possible development of its resources.

Family-Sized Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "All the People Have a Stake in Family-Sized Farms," published in the San Antonio (Tex.) Evening News of January 27, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL THE PEOPLE HAVE A STAKE IN THE FAMILY-SIZED FARMS

If agriculture is to prosper and expand as it must to feed the Nation, and if rural citizens are to exert an influence for decent politics and sound economics, the family-type farm—owned by the people who live on it and operate it—must be preserved.

Farmers of that type are almost invariably found to be "sturdy, independent citizens who cherish their liberties so much they will fight, as well as talk, to preserve them."

That assertion is by Senator ARTHUR CAPPER (Kansas), writing in Capper's Farmer. Preserving that traditional standard of farm life would be in everybody's interest—not the farmers' alone. As the Senator points out, industry has a stake in the family-size farm. Neither management nor worker can prosper except as the farmers prosper.

The buying power of rural America is the motive force that keeps factory wheels turning. Take that away, and many an industrial center would become a ghost town.

Bearing those principles in mind, everyone can concur in Senator CAPPER'S sensible, practical, middle-of-the-road program for keeping farmers out of "the red" after the war. He would (1) assure farmers parity prices; (2) provide equal educational opportunities for farm children, with emphasis on vocational agriculture; (3) encourage a higher living-standard for the farm family; (4) provide machinery and equipment adapted to the family size farm; (5) encourage farm-ownership through liberal credits; (6) promote the orderly marketing of farm products; (7) strengthen extension programs which will foster soil-conservation, sound crop planning, and livestock husbandry, and good management, so as to make the farm pay.

In that connection the consuming public—all patriotic citizens—may be reminded that the record-breaking food crops year by year since Pearl Harbor, supplying the sinews of war, have come mainly from family-size farms. Moreover, for the most part, those farms have been almost exclusively family tilled. Farm people have produced more foodstuff, more seed oil, and other war crops than ever before, though short-handed and needing plow tools and other implements.

Beyond that, youth from the farms have demonstrated the fighting qualities of which the Kansas Senator spoke, on many a battlefield. Surely the farmers have earned the "better break" which Senator CAPPER bespeaks for them.

Northeast Passage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem from the Milwaukee Journal of February 1, 1945:

NORTHEAST PASSAGE

(The St. Lawrence waterway)

I stood on the Bayfield hills
And looked out over the bay;
And far beyond the Apostles saw
The Sault, the Straits of Mackinaw,
The Michigan mitten's leather paw,
And Erie's skies of gray.

I saw Ontario's blue
Pouring its overflow
Into the river that leaps and smiles
Down through the emerald Thousand Isles,
For hundreds of old historic miles
Into the gulf below.

And I dreamed of a new bright time
When all this great domain,
Landlocked and languishing, would be
Opened to all the world, and free
To load the highways of the sea
With its iron, coal, and grain.

From the bluffs above Duluth
To Anticosti Isle,
From Milwaukee to Quebec,
Scorning Niagara's dam and check,
I saw a great sea highway deck
Itself in richest style;

With great new cities shining
Like jewels on its shore;
With all its thousand old ones grown
To magnitudes before unknown;
With all its fringing acres sown
And each year yielding more.

I saw some hundred thousands
At work constructing it;
Rivers at harness; channels hewed;
Huge dams reared; a multitude
Of new lives born; old lives renewed,
For new employments fit.

I saw the Northeast Passage
Carved out to meet the ocean,
And ships of every nation stand
In harbors of a once closed land,
And new winds blow on every hand
New life and fresh emotion.

I saw the minds once lulled
In isolationist sleep.
Through contact with the world awake
To wide horizons; and the brake
Of narrow judgment snap and shake
Under the salt wind's sweep.

I saw the inland cities
Opened to all the earth;
Chicago and London proudly stood
Arm in arm in the brotherhood
Of great world ports, and found it good,
And learned each other's worth.

The farmlands of Wisconsin;
The olive groves of Spain;
Detroit's great shops; Odessa's quays;
The mills of Cleveland; Norway's trees;
Ontario's surging industries;
All formed one single chain.

I saw great poets rising
To sing with majesty
The endless wonders of these places.
I saw great artists of all races
And nations come to paint their graces
For all mankind to see.

There on the Bayfield hills
That vision came to me.
But millions more have seen it, too.
What will you now, you millions, do?
Open the high road, grand and new,
From Ashland to the sea!

—*Fred B. Blair.*

Drafting of Farm Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on another occasion I addressed the Congress on this very important question of the drafting of farm boys.

On that occasion I presented the distressing factual conditions that prevail in my State of North Dakota, and I portrayed further the tragedy which would develop should the draft of farm boys continue.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter written by Thomas J. Heily, of Mohall, N. Dak., which is a fair symbol of literally hundreds that are coming to my desk:

MOHALL, N. DAK., *January 29, 1945.*

Hon. CHAS. R. ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you to see if you know whether the draft is going to take my last boy and leave me high and dry. My boy has received his induction papers and is to leave for Fort Snelling on February 6 for his physical examination. There is nothing in that order that leaves any doubt but what he is to be drafted. It states he will have 21 days if he passes and he will pass.

I talked to one of the draft board members and he told me they did not want to draft key men like him and that maybe he would not be taken right away. But if they got so their quota could not be filled any other way their orders were to take them. Being that there are not many left here now but boys in this class, the prospects don't look too bright.

I told him what you said about the law to defer key farmers was still in effect and he said them fellows are just trying to pass the buck to us. Our orders are to fill our quota. Now the time is right at hand when I should lay out about $2,500 in preparation for spring and I am up in the air and don't know whether to get ready or get ready to call a sale and wind up my operations.

This boy cannot be replaced. Here are the facts: He is farming in company with me. We operate seven quarter sections or 1,120 acres and figure to crop 750 acres. We have 4 milch cows, 20 stock cows, 21 head of young stock, 53 head of sheep, 1 brood sow, 100 chickens, 4 turkeys, and 2 horses. I am 62 years old and no longer able to do heavy work but can do a lot of work if he is here to take the heavy end. We are batching as my wife died in 1928. I have one boy an ensign in the Navy and one boy in the Army and this is my last boy.

If you can find out any information as to why these boards are not instructed to pay attention to the laws of Congress I would be glad to hear from you, as I do not like to lay out money for supplies that I will later have to sell.

Very truly yours,

THOS. J. HEILY.

Some Truths About Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, any day now the world may receive news of the decision of the Big Three with reference to some of the more difficult and troublesome problems that must be settled to assure an early victory and a lasting peace.

One of the most difficult ones will be involving the Russian claims to Poland. The prudent and just settlement of the Russo-Polish dispute is important, not because of Poland being the first to resist the totalitarian forces but because her problem came up first and the settlement made in her case undoubtedly will serve as a pattern in the settlement of the problems involving the Baltic states of Esthonia, Lithuania, and Latvia; the difficulties involved in the Russian domination of such countries as Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Italy, Belgium, France, and other liberated areas.

Thus the proper solution of the Polish-Russian dispute justly and equitably is important to the future of not only Poland but to the peace of the world.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith an article which appeared in the February 1945 issue of the American Mercury, by William Henry Chamberlin, entitled "Some Truths About Poland." Mr. Chamberlin is one of the foremost students of Russian history and politics and the author of several books on the subject. His discussion is not only interesting but likewise revealing and thought-provoking.

The article follows:

SOME TRUTHS ABOUT POLAND

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

It is unfortunate that American public opinion, never too well informed about the smaller European countries, has to some extent been forced to choose between two propagandist versions of Poland. One is the idealized legend of ardent Polish sympathizers, the other an excessively dark picture drawn by groups hostile to the Poles.

There are ugly spots in the Polish record. Liberal friends of the country are the first to acknowledge this. During most of its life as an independent state Poland was governed by semidictatorial methods. The Poles, long oppressed themselves, were often intolerant in their treatment of racial minorities. Polish administrative methods in eastern Galicia, where the Ukrainians are a majority of the population, were harsh and oppressive. Even now the Polish Government would strengthen its case if it included two or three Ukrainians in the cabinet and proclaimed some federative principle for the future, with local self-government for regions with non-Polish majorities.

There was anti-Semitism in Poland, as in Rumania and other east European countries. It grew out of the same unhealthy soil of poverty, economic depression, and urban overcrowding, and led to regrettable social and economic discrimination. Also, the seizure of Wilno and the taking of Teschen from Czechoslovakia after the Munich settlement were high-handed acts in the international field.

However, one need not accept an unreal picture of Poland as a Sir Galahad among nations in order to recognize the right of the Polish people, who have fought heroically and suffered unimaginable horrors to determine their own political fate.

Poland's past cannot be reasonably appraised in the abstract. Two considerations of time and place, in particular, should be noted:

First. Poland during the thirties was wedged in between two powerful and ruthless totalitarian states, Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia, which certainly did not contribute to the flourishing of democracy. Second, the Polish record, bad as it was in many respects, was strikingly better than that of the Soviet Union, if one takes such reasonable standards of comparison as the existence of opposition parties, executions for political reasons, and forced-labor camps. The attempt to justify absorption of Poles by Russia on democratic grounds is therefore illogical and absurd.

The arguments that are sometimes put forward for differential treatment of countries that willingly or otherwise joined the Axis certainly cannot apply to Poland, for Poland was the first nation that took up arms against Nazi Germany. And Poland's fight did not cease when the physical resistance of the country was beaten down by the Germans, abetted by a sudden Soviet blow in the rear

of the Polish armies. Poland's fight has gone on, through guerrilla warfare inside and through effective Polish units serving with the United Nations abroad. History will underline that Poland was the only conquered nation where Hitler was unable to find local Quislings.

But that is not all. Soviet Russia actually owes a debt of gratitude to Poland for its steadfast rejection of Nazi blandishments. According to the testimony of French diplomatic observers, contained in the French Yellow Book, Hitler made three proposals to the Polish Government looking toward combined action against Russia in 1938 and 1939. The basis of the German proposals was that formerly German regions be returned to the Reich and that Poland be compensated by additional territory from the U. S. S. R.—a proposal remarkably like Stalin's, except in reverse.

Poland refused these offers. How different the course of history might have been if Poland, like Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, had swung into the Nazi orbit and cooperated in an attack on the Soviet Union. In that case, Britain and France might never have been involved in the war and Russia would have been obliged to bear the whole weight of the German onslaught 2 years earlier. Certainly the Russians have reason to be thankful for Poland's refusal to accept a German orientation in its foreign policy.

Even after the ominous announcement of the German-Soviet Pact, in August 1939, Poland preferred an unequal war to surrender. Its reward was the revival of the old Russo-German technique of partition, with Stalin and Hitler repeating the roles of Catherine II and Frederick the Great. The Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, V. M. Molotov, pronounced a death sentence on Poland when he said, in a speech before the Soviet Parliament on October 31, 1939:

"One swift blow to Poland, first by the German Army and then by the Red Army, and nothing was left of this ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty, which had existed by oppressing non-Polish nationalities."

For almost 2 years, it should not be forgotten, Poland lived under a regime of joint German-Soviet occupation as cruel as any recorded by modern history. Both powers made every effort to decimate Polish leadership and stamp out Polish national consciousness. According to a diplomatic note of the Polish Government, 1,500,000 inhabitants of Eastern Poland were deported, most of them to Soviet forced-labor camps. The exact number of victims may be disputed, but the huge scale and brutality of the Soviet purge are beyond doubt.

II

When Hitler attacked Russia, the Poles did not seek revenge for the Russian horrors visited on their people. Though often accused of stiff-necked impossibilism, the Polish leaders showed both wisdom and magnanimity in joining the Soviet Union unreservedly as an ally. There was a disposition to "forgive and forget" in the interests of United Nations unity.

The Soviet Government signed an agreement with the Polish Government in exile, headed by Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, on July 30, 1941. In this agreement Moscow recognized "the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 as to territorial changes in Poland as having lost their validity." The two nations agreed to support each other in the struggle against Germany, and it was stipulated that a Polish Army, under Polish command, should be formed on Russian soil. The British Government, already pledged to uphold Poland's independence by the Anglo-Polish Treaty of August 25, 1939, declared that it did not recognize as valid any territorial changes in Poland. The United States, of course, had never recognized as legal the German and Soviet annexations of Polish soil.

The Polish Government, with headquarters in London, did everything in its power to aid the common cause. Some 140,000 Poles are fighting with the United Nations on land, on sea, and in the air. They look to the London regime as their legitimate Government. Indeed, it occurred to no one to doubt that legitimacy until the Soviet Government broke off diplomatic relations.

Systematic efforts have been made by Communists and near-Communist sources to discredit the representative character of the Polish Government. Even some ill-informed nonpartisan papers sometimes convey the impression that the Poles are deeply divided in allegiance, as between the Government in London and the so-called Polish National Council of Liberation, set up by Russia. This is a fantastic misapprehension of the Polish situation. It is as if one should describe the Norwegians as split 50-50 between their legitimate Government in London and the followers of Quisling.

The fact is that the Polish Government in London is the legal heir of the pre-war Polish Government. But it is far more representative of Polish public opinion than that regime could have claimed to be. The Polish Cabinet until recently has been composed of representatives of the four strongest parties in pre-war Poland. From the start it has worked in the most intimate cooperation with the active and heroic Polish underground movement The leadership of that movement has been in the hands of a deputy prime minister, and major policy decisions have been made, whenever physically possible, only after consulting the underground.

Thus the Polish fighting forces inside and outside the country alike acknowledge the authority of their Government in London. The recent change in the Polish Cabinet, with a three-party combination under the veteran Socialist, Tomasz Arciszewski, replacing the previous four-party combination, headed by the Peasant Party leader, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, reflects a difference in tactics, not in fundamental principles. It reflects the tragic dilemma in which the Government finds itself as a result of British (and to a lesser extent American) pressure for a settlement with Stalin at almost any price. It is in no sense a cleavage between progressives and reactionaries.

With absolutely no illusions as to the dark prospect of achieving a free democratic Poland under present conditions, Mikolajczyk was apparently willing to compromise on the frontier question in order to save the Polish people from the misgovernment of the puppet Liberation Committee. Arciszewski, on the other hand, takes the position that, if Poland is to be despoiled, the responsibility must rest with the despoilers, and that the Polish Government should stand on the moral ground represented by the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

By contrast with the exiled Government, the Council of National Liberation is a synthetic, made-in-Moscow puppet regime. It was never heard of until Soviet troops had entered what was, by Soviet admission, Polish territory. Formed on July 23, 1944, it was recognized as a provisional Polish administration by the Soviets, and only by the Soviets, on July 25. This was pretty quick work, even when it is a question of recognizing a régime of one's own making.

Most of the members of the Moscow-made council are completely unknown in Polish life. And those who are known hardly inspire confidence. They are broken, discredited adventurers, just the kind of men who might be expected to turn out as Quislings. Take, for example, the minister of war, Michal Rola-Zymierski. Under the Pilsudski regime he was convicted of taking bribes from French manufacturers in connection with the supply of gas masks and was sentenced to 5 years in prison and the loss of his military rank and honors. Jan Grubecki, minister of communications, is a former member of the ENDEK, a nationalist youth organization, and was identified with many anti-Semitic outrages. The now deposed minister of agriculture, Andrsej Witos, tried to blackmail the government into giving him a profitable export concession in 1923 by threatening to withdraw the parliamentary support of his political c ganization, the People's Party. Emil Sommerstein, a well-known Jewish lawyer, had been held for years in Soviet prisons and may well have joined the government to avoid indefinite detention. The chairman of the council, Boleslaw Berut, is a Communist who was unknown in pre-war Poland. The committee includes two men who were more or less well known as fellow travelers, Eduard Osubka-Morawski and Boleslaw Drobner, both expelled from the Polish Socialist Party for this reason.

The sole function of the phantom government which includes at least one criminal is to carry out orders from Moscow. It has obediently echoed Stalin's demand that Poland cede some 40 percent of its pre-war territory to the Soviet Union. It has laid claim to overwhelmingly German regions, such as East Prussia and lower Silesia, annexation of which would weaken rather than strengthen the future Poland.

A Soviet policy based on respect for Poland's independence and territorial integrity would have insured the Soviet Union a loyal and grateful ally in the event of any resumption of German aggression. Unfortunately the actual Soviet policy has been very different. Under pleasant-sounding phrases designed to soothe public opinion in England and the United States, Moscow became increasingly hostile to Poland as the tide of war turned in Russia's favor.

Long before the break in relations, Russia made life difficult for the Polish Embassy. Obstacles were placed in the way of relief to the masses of destitute Polish deportees in Russia. Thousands of Poles were arbitrarily declared Soviet citizens against their will. The organization and equipping of the new Polish Army, headed by Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, became so difficult that it had to be evacuated to Iran.

Meanwhile much uncertainty prevailed as to the fate of some 12,000 Polish officers who had been in Soviet captivity since 1939 but who, mysteriously, had not been released in accordance with the terms of the 1941 agreement. General Sikorski repeatedly pleaded with Stalin for information about these men. Such a mass of important prisoners cannot get lost or mislaid. Had they fallen into German hands, Stalin could have said so. There was no reason why he should accept responsibility for the fate of men captured by the enemy. It was only in the interests of unity, to avoid open controversy, that the Polish Government did not make public its demands for information about the missing officers.

In retrospect, that would seem to have been a serious tactical error. When the Germans in the spring of 1943 announced the discovery of thousands of corpses of Polish officers in the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, the world at large, unaware of the long Polish efforts to find those men, dismissed it as another Nazi invention.

Acting perhaps unwisely, but under strong emotional pressure of Polish public opinion, the Polish Government asked the International Red Cross for an impartial investigation of this affair. The Red Cross declined. But this incident was used as a pretext for the Soviet Government to break relations with the Polish Government, thus opening the way for the subsequent creation of a puppet regime.

When the Smolensk region was again in Russian hands, the Soviet authorities held an investigation and naturally reached the conclusion that the Germans had killed those officers. But Moscow has never explained why, if the prisoners had actually been aban-

doned to the Germans, this fact was not revealed in due time.

Stalin tried to soften the effect of his unilateral breach of relations by declaring that he favored a "strong independent Poland." But at no time was there any sincere attempt to resume relations with the only Polish group that could plausibly be regarded as representative of the Polish people.

III

One of the darkest chapters of the troubled story of Soviet-Polish relations—and a chapter shrouded in secrecy—has been the Soviet attitude toward the Polish Underground. Russia has made use of underground fighters where it needed them but has consistently dissolved their units, arresting and sometimes killing their leaders. For this tragedy the western powers, especially Great Britian, cannot escape moral responsibility.

When the Russian forces moved into Poland on a large scale in the summer of 1944, the insistent British advice to the Polish underground was to cooperate fully with the Red Army, revealing the number and location of its units, its hide-outs in swamps and forests, etc. The Poles loyally followed this advice. Their cooperation contributed appreciably to the rapid sweep of Soviet forces across eastern Poland in July.

How this cooperation was repaid—or rather, betrayed—by the Russians is one of the ugliest episodes of this war. There is a mass of material on this subject in Polish underground reports, some of which were broadcast from Warsaw when a part of the city was in the hands of underground insurgents. When the story is fully told it will shock the conscience of the United Nations' world. A few typical reports are herewith cited:

"July 13: In the Nowogrodek district the Russians 'pacified' seven villages where Polish units were quartered. Entire families were murdered, the men were deported, property destroyed.

"July 30: It appears, from events up to this moment, that all leaders of the Underground Army, together with their organizations, are being arrested by the Soviet forces after revealing themselves. It should be expected that a similar fate awaits all agencies, civilian as well as military. We must do all we can to protect these men and prevent their liquidation by the N. K. V. D. [Soviet Political Police] directly or through the intermediary of some Polish agents acting as Soviet tools.

"August 1: By radio from the Lvov District: On July 31 the officers of the Underground Army were called to a meeting. All who reported were arrested.

"August 17: In Tarnopol (Eastern Galicia) all men between the ages of 18 and 50 have been deported by the Soviet authorities.

"August 21: In Biala Podlaska (to the west of the so-called Curzon line) the Soviet authorities have arrested and deported the Commander of the thirty-fourth infantry regiment of the Underground Army * * * The Mayor of the town, Mr. Kowaleski, and the district commander of the Underground Army have also been arrested. All the orders of the 'Polish Committee of National Liberation' are executed by the N. K. V. D."

Shootings and hangings of officers and soldiers of the Underground Army were reported from Rozyszcze, in Volhynia; from Luck, in eastern Poland; from many other places. Mass deportations of Poles from Lvov and Tarnopol took place. The results of the attempt of the Polish Underground to cooperate with the Red Army could be summarized as follows: At the front there were friendly conversations, words of praise, promises of help with arms and ammunition. But behind the front lines the regular procedure included disarmament of the Polish patriot forces, arrests, deportations, shootings. The notorious Nazi death house at Majdanek, near Lublin, has been preserved as a concentration camp for Polish Underground workers.

Such a wide variety of reports, covering a fairly long period of time, indicates a settled policy, not individual misunderstandings. In a parliamentary debate that was not very fully reported in America, the Independent Labor member of Parliament, McGovern, on September 27, bluntly asked Foreign Secretary Eden:

"Is anything to be gained by covering up the fact that an ally of ours is both deporting and shooting Nationalists and Socialists in Poland?

He got no satisfactory answer. Acts of repression can be committed by a government without arousing international scandal if it is able to throw a thick blanket of silence over occupied territory. That is precisely what Russia has done in eastern Poland. Freedom of movement of correspondents has been nonexistent, except for a few conducted tours of German horror camps. Diplomats and military observers have been kept out.

IV

The climactic phase in the Polish national tragedy, however, occurred under sufficiently dramatic circumstances to attract world-wide attention. This was the 63-day uprising of Polish underground forces in Warsaw, led by Gen. Tadeusz Komorowski, also known as General Bor.

For months and even years the self-styled Union of Polish Patriots—a small group of emigrant Polish Communists in Moscow—and the Polish press had been criticizing the Polish Nationalists for not resorting to armed uprising. "Have no faith in those who urge you to be inactive and wait," declared Wanda Wassilevska, leading figure in that organization, on May 20, 1943. As Soviet troops penetrated into Poland this note was struck with ever-increasing urgency in broadcasts from Moscow which, it goes without saying, could not have been made without Soviet approval.

The appeals to start an uprising in Warsaw became more specific as the Soviet armies pressed forward to the line of the Vistula River and temporarily occupied Praga, the Warsaw suburb on the eastern bank of that river. One need only cite a single excerpt from Moscow appeals in broadcasts of July 29 and 30:

"People of Warsaw, take up your arms. Rally around the Home National Council, around the Warsaw underground army, and attack the Germans."

It was against this background of frantic appeals from Moscow, accompanied by assurances of speedy aid, that Warsaw's heroic and tragic uprising began on August 1. In its first stage it was amazingly successful and furnished a remarkable testimonial to the strength and discipline of the underground army. The old city area and many public buildings were taken. For about a week the initiative remained with the insurgents.

But the promised Soviet aid did not come. The Soviet front before Warsaw became passive. For a long time the Russians even forbade British and Polish airplanes, bringing aid to the insurgents, to use Soviet bases. Soviet propaganda suddenly began to accuse General Komorowski of having started a premature uprising. Even if this were true, it did not justify the crime of abandoning the underground heroes to extermination. The horrifying episode looks so much like a cynical design to enable the Germans to destroy underground forces which might oppose a puppet regime that the burden of proof is on the shoulders of the Kremlin and those who seek to alibi the Kremlin in this shocking affair.

V

Why should Americans concern themselves about the fate of Poland? This is an extremely curious question in the midst of a war that began in Poland and grew out of a big country's attempts to seize the territory of its smaller neighbors. Yet, it is a question one hears often in discussing this matter.

One answer is provided by a brilliant and far-sighted British publicist, F. A. Voigt, in the Nineteenth Century and After. Though he offered it in January 1944, it is even truer and more timely today. He wrote:

"The questions are not: Shall Poland's eastern border be shifted westward? Shall she lose her eastern territories or, losing them, acquire in their place western territories at the expense of Germany? The question is: Shall Poland exist?

"Beyond this there is another question: Shall Europe exist—the Europe we have known and hope to know again, the Europe for which the war is being fought, the Europe which alone gives the war any meaning, the Europe that is neither anarchy nor servitude, the Europe that is a balanced and integrated whole, the Europe of systems and states, balanced and yet related, the Europe of many sovereign states, big and small, the Europe that is so much more than a geographical expression, Europe, the stronghold of the Greco-Roman and Christian heritage? That is the question."

Whatever arguments of necessity are advanced, whatever the pressures to appease Stalin, public opinion in the United Nations cannot remain unaffected by the martyrdom of Poland. It is to be hoped that the peoples of America and Great Britain will consider seriously the moral and political implications of the policy of throwing Poland to the wolves. No step could be more isolationist in its effects, or more likely to chill the new readiness of the American people to assume international responsibilities.

Peril to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

PERIL TO EDUCATION

Many colleges and universities are faced by an extremely critical situation as a result of the war. Anyone who reads the carefully documented report of the advisory committee appointed by the House Committee on Education will be impressed by the bleakness of the financial outlook for institutions that have lost a large part of the income ordinarily derived from student fees. Even leaner times lie ahead, as the hoped-for early return of college-age veterans recedes into the dim distance. A heavy mortality has already occurred among junior colleges and other small colleges, while several score institutions are currently in dire straits. During the academic year 1945–46 the number of cases of acute financial distress is expected to mount rapidly, embracing large as well as small institutions.

The problems confronting our colleges and universities cannot be solved satisfactorily by merely cutting down operating costs and balancing budgets, although some retrenchment is imperative. Beyond a certain point economies can be achieved only at the sacrifice of present educational effectiveness and of institutional ability to render service to the community after the war, when the

country will have great need for university training.

Hence the advisory committee is agreed that the present crisis calls for some form of Federal aid to prevent the undermining of the "whole structure of higher education." It recommends the creation of a nonpartisan commission on emergency Federal aid to pass on applications for standby and other service contracts sought by institutions in a critical financial situation. A very ingenious method has been devised for extending aid under conditions that would not necessitate Federal control over utilization of funds. Briefly the assisted institutions would enter into a contract with the commission to maintain certain standby educational services, following the general principle embodied in legislation providing funds for land-grant colleges in 1862. To qualify for such assistance, the full-time resident enrollment of the applicant institution must have fallen 60 percent below the level of prewar years for three consecutive quarters or two consecutive semesters. Payments would be regulated in accordance with a formula outlined in the report. All contractual relations of this kind would cease to exist 6 months after the termination of the war, by which time a good many soldiers presumably would be back from the European war zone and in classrooms. By making assistance terminable at an early postwar date, fears that Federal emergency aid might become an entering wedge for establishment of Federal control over private institutions of learning would be allayed.

Among other important recommendations is one calling for creation of a Federal research agency empowered to contract for the use of the facilities of colleges and universities in carrying out specific approved programs. The resultant spreading of research work among larger numbers of institutions would discourage the present practice of concentrating research work for the Government in a limited number of large institutions. Other recommendations deal with such matters as early reestablishment of deferment of students majoring in essential fields, preferential discharge of former students preparing for work essential to the national welfare, priority in release of faculty members from military duty and Government positions.

The value of higher education has been brought home to the American people as never before by the crying need for trained minds to guide our great war undertaking. It would be criminally shortsighted to permit an educational structure that provides leadership for peace as well as war to be undermined by failing to take protective measures at this critical juncture. A very small sum judged by comparison with the huge outlays made for other purposes would suffice to keep our colleges and universities on a going basis and enable them to provide the kind of training after the war that insures a better, more civilized post-war society.

He Don't Like Nobody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, great men lose their effectiveness because of their prejudiced, biased, and partisan attitude. This is true of men in all professions whether it be Members of Congress or newspaper columnists. I admired Westbrook Pegler as a sports writer for many years, but since his abdication of the field of sports, I believe he has lost much of his sportsmanship. He has engendered such hatred for the New Deal that he dislikes everybody, and this is typified in a splendid editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette today entitled "He Don't Like Nobody," which I include in my remarks.

HE DON'T LIKE NOBODY

"We have in our craft," wrote Westbrook Pegler in a recent column, "a number of yearning essayists who are forever seeking another Lincoln, and in their quest overlook Lincoln's many faults, including his frequent contempt for law and his unmanly submission to the rule of a vixen in his home even to the extent of keeping his own son safe from war while he was rounding up by force the sons of other mothers to die horribly in battle."

Sometimes we have wondered how even a chronic grouch could find enough men to hate to supply a daily column, and we always had hopes that eventually Mr. Pegler would run out of his pet peeves and eventually be forced to write a good word about something or somebody. But no. When he starts turning back the pages of history to remind sentimental dupes in his own profession that even if they did dig up another Lincoln he wouldn't satisfy a Pegler, there is no hope for us mortals here below until he enters the pearly gates and starts exposing corruption on high.

Why, Mr. Lincoln surely wasn't a New Dealer, and he didn't even belong to a labor union.

Agricultural Deferments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of the Michigan Farm Bureau:

FEBRUARY 2, 1945.

Gen. LEROY R. PEARSON,
State Selective Service Director,
Capitol Savings & Loan Building,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR GENERAL PEARSON: At this critical time the board of directors of the Michigan Farm Bureau, in session January 29, 1945, recognizes the great necessity for every man, woman, and child to serve in the capacity in which each individual can render the greatest service to our country, whether in the armed forces or on the home front.

Food and fiber to sustain our men and women on the fighting front and those engaged in supplementary activities on the home front are just as essential to the support of our heroic men and women on the fighting front as arms and munitions. This is indicated by the fact that W. F. A. Administrator Marvin Jones is calling for 363,635,000 acres to be planted in crops, an increase of about 3 percent over last year, and for more meat, dairy, and poultry products.

In view of this unprecedented demand upon the farmers of the Nation, we urge the most careful and judicious interpretation of the intent and spirit of the Tydings amendment by the State selective-service office and the selective-service boards of the State.

Any further depletion of the essential farm workers at this time is bound to be attended by a reduction in farm production greatly exceeding the proportion of the men taken. This is particularly true of those in the age group of 18 to 26. In these young men is combined the vitality and the skilled experience to perform the heavier and more exacting tasks of farm production that are beyond the physical powers of older men and women or children. The trained judgment and experience possessed by these young men born and brought up on farms cannot be replaced by inexperienced urban labor, no matter how well-intentioned.

The demands of war industries and the selective service have already drained the supply of essential farm workers below the minimum required for wartime food production. Therefore, the board of directors of the Michigan Farm Bureau urges the most careful consideration of every individual agricultural registrant by the selective-service boards and your office. Any further draining of these men without due regard to the merit of their agricultural status is bound to be injurious to the war effort.

Members of local draft boards and county war boards over the State have expressed their concern over interpretations of the January directive ordering preinduction examination and reclassification of all deferred registrants, 18 through 25. Local officials indicate that these interpretations have had the effect of strong pressure upon them to induct into the Army every agricultural registrant who passes the physical examination. Other extreme ideas that have become current are that the registrant no longer has the right of appeal and that the local boards do not continue to have the authority previously exercised. Our contacts made directly with representatives of your office do not indicate such extreme treatment, but this seems to be at variance with reports on the effects of the direct contacts between your office and the local boards.

The extent to which agricultural workers have already joined the armed services either through volunteer or selective service channels is second to no other group in the Nation. It is not our purpose to make any plea for the deferment of any individual merely because he happens to be located on a farm.

We recognize that every agricultural deferment must be justified by facts sufficient to warrant the man's remaining on the farm. We view with the utmost concern, however, the general impression that seems to have become current among draft boards and selective-service officials that most or all of these young men who have passed their physical examination must be immediately inducted into the service regardless of their irreplaceability.

Therefore we urge that the utmost care be exercised to ascertain the facts through county war boards and other channels pertaining to agricultural deferment in accordance with the intent and spirit of the Tydings amendment.

Yours very truly,

MICHIGAN FARM BUREAU
BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
C. L. BRODY, *Executive Secretary.*

C. I. O.-New Deal Pact Sealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "C. I. O.-New Deal Pact Sealed," written by George Van Slyke and published in the New York Sun of January 23, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C. I. O.-NEW DEAL PACT SEALED—WALLACE APPOINTMENT SHOWS THAT NEW PARTY HAS BECOME A REALITY

(By George Van Slyke)

The alliance of the left-wing New Deal and the Sidney Hillman C. I. O. has been sealed and delivered with President Roosevelt's appointment of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce and forms the basis for the new political power which is to dominate the fourth-term administration.

The deal that was struck off last July in Chicago has been consummated in one of the swiftest and most startling political maneuvers of the entire Roosevelt regime in the White House. A new political party, which has been in the making for more than 4 years has now become a reality, as the politicians size up this latest development, with the old-line conservative Democratic wing crowded further out of the picture.

Mr. Hillman is being hailed here today by his political entourage as having accomplished his greatest triumph, and a political miracle. His place as a potential national leader, which has been in doubt, is now fixed in the belief of his supporters, who see him as a political power equal to any individual in the Democratic organization, excepting the President himself.

GAMBLED ON HILLMAN

Mr. Roosevelt and the New Dealers who manipulated the deal in the Chicago convention took a long gamble on Hillman and the C. I. O.-P. A. C., then coming to life in national politics, as a force which would throw the balance of power in the election.

The Hillman forces demonstrated in the election far greater voting strength than had been anticipated, even by the New Dealers. The P. A. C. came of age in the shortest period of time credited to any similar mushroom organization in political history. Having grabbed the veto power in one single campaign, the Hillman-C. I. O. group was so firmly entrenched that the President did not dare repudiate the Chicago bargain and was compelled, obviously against his wishes and better judgment, to throw out Jesse Jones and pay off the debt to Sidney Hillman. He did it in a big way and in so doing has cemented the Hillman-C. I. O. into the basic structure of the party alinement in the Nation.

The sensation which came out of the Chicago convention was the Hillman story. Enthroned in his penthouse apartment, Mr. Hillman held court for the New Dealers and big city bosses, who formed the combination seeking to put over the fourth-term nomination.

Mr. Hillman demanded the renomination of Mr. Wallace. The New Dealers feared it; the Southern Democratic leaders revolted against it and the city bosses insisted it would be too heavy a burden for the fourth-term candidacy. The series of events gave rise to the slogan "Clear everything through Sidney," which was Mr. Roosevelt's instructions to the bosses.

PROVED HIS POWER

Failing to put over Mr. Wallace, Mr. Hillman proved his power by blocking the nomination for Vice President of James F. Byrnes, director of the economic stabilization, and Senator Alben Barkley, majority leader of the Senate. They were, and are, two top leaders in the New Deal set-up. Both were bitterly disappointed and left the convention in disgust.

Then Mr. Hillman had the final word which led to the nomination of Senator Harry Truman for Vice President. And then it was that the report spread that Mr. Hillman had obtained an unconditional promise from the White House that if the C. I. O. went through for the fourth term, Mr. Wallace was to have a high ranking post in the new administration.

That story was circulated among the newspapermen and politicians during the closing hours of the convention and later through the campaign. We all heard it and many wrote it. The report never had official confirmation, but it bobbed up after Mr. Roosevelt's reelection in the frequent discussion of what Mr. Wallace was to get.

BARGAIN WAS INDICATED

Mr. Wallace's conduct throughout the campaign lent substantial credence to the convention reports of the bargain. The Vice President never wavered in his allegiance to Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal doctrines. There was never the slightest hint that he resented having been turned down by Mr. Roosevelt in person or that he had any misgivings about his political future. Evidently he had complete faith that the bargain with Mr. Hillman was binding, and the events of the last few days fully justify his confidence.

This complete surrender of the President to the Hillman-Wallace-C. I. O. defines the status of the old-line parties more clearly than ever. The conservative Democrats are now clearly the minority faction in the administration, unless they assert their position in the tests now pending.

Robert E. Hannegan indicated today in his announcement from Washington that he will carry on as Democratic National Chairman, that he will deal with the C. I. O.-P. A. C. as a controlling factor in the elections during the next 2 years as forerunners. He will make the chairmanship a full-time job with a $20,000 salary. He said:

"As we go into the congressional elections of 1946 I should think candidates would be happy to get P. A. C. support. The effectiveness of their help was evident in the November election."

Plan for World Cooperation and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a constructive and well-thought-out plan for world cooperation and world peace, the product of the mind and pen of John Pearson, of Hanover, N. H., distinguished alumnus of Dartmouth College.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD FEDERATION TO ENABLE MANKIND TO LIVE IN PEACE AND BE FREE

Some people conclude that while the establishment of international order through laws legislated by and administered by a world government authority may be a fine dream, it is not a practical solution because we can never achieve the goal. Let's run through history, however, and consider some hard facts.

1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAW AND ORDER

Man, in each stage of civilization, has finally found a way to put down anarchy through the development of new political methods and the better organization of mutual interests. Conflicts between feudal cities finally resulted in the organization of states. Then man suffered warfare between states until a system of national law and order was conceived, and broader principles of community interests were established.

The modern, scientific age, typified by sudden rocket bomb devastation of life and property of peaceful people, urgently calls for still another dimension of our political development; i. e., world government. Just as robber bands, pillaging the commerce between feudal cities, were eliminated by the organization of mutual interests on a state level, so international peace can only be had by the establishment of government authority on a global level. Airborne artillery has made the peoples of all lands and of diverse origins and interests members of one community in matters of international crime. Re: New political concepts for implementing the advance of civilization, skeptics have always said "the new idea won't work" or "it's not practical." Men had to die in battle and people become exhausted before the light was seen.

2. ELEMENTS OF LAW AND ORDER

History has revealed but one principle whereby crime (neighborhood, local, regional or national) has been eliminated. That principle is law.

Without law, there is no order in any jurisdiction, in any community. Law and order go together. You have either law or disorder and anarchy.

The weakness of treaties, pacts, and leagues

Treaties, or other substitutes for law, lack enforceability. Since there is no court on earth that can enforce a treaty, the only recourse left to an injured nation is the battlefield. The validity of treaties (contracts between nations), like the validity of contracts in private life, depends upon their enforceability in courts.

If international law and order can be built on treaties, what became of the 4,000 treaties in force among nations when World War No. 2 broke into Poland and Pearl Harbor?

If pacts are a basis of protecting us against international gangsters, what happened to the Kellogg Pact, signed by 48 nations in agreement no longer to resort to war as a settlement of international dispute? If leagues, or alliances, promise peaceful dealings among nations, what was wrong when Japan invaded Manchuria and Italy pounced upon Abyssinia?

What we call international law today is only a conventional term for referring to international understandings. No nation is compelled to submit its disagreement with a rival nation to the Hague Court.

Order, whether on a local or global scale, rests upon enforceable law. We cannot have world order without world law. We cannot have world law unless it is created and enforced by some form of world government.

What is the great American contribution to political science? As a people we inherited the system of legislative assembly. Through struggles of earlier generations we fell heir to trial by jury, habeas corpus and due process of law. But in establishing this Nation, a political principle was born that ranks with the earlier steps to endow the individual with certain fundamental rights. The organic life of the human race was raised to a greater capacity for political responsibility through the American discovery that an individual could be a citizen of more than one governmental unit.

In the 1780's, when the Confederation of States, made up of the Thirteen Colonies rebelling against England, was attempted as the means of organizing a new nation, the

basic weakness of nonenforceability of principles on which mutual interests existed, produced the same pattern of chaos and anarchy witnessed in world affairs in 1940. States debased their local currencies in seeking an economic advantage over a sister State. The Shay's Rebellion shed blood over another issue, and so on.

Despair faced our forefathers just as we today are confronted with seemingly hopeless prospects for world order. America was blessed in those days, however, with great minds and an intense interest in solving extraordinary political issues. At this time, the American version of federation of states, the formation of a new sovereign state, which we think of today as the National Government, was born in the minds of Washington and some of his associates.

The new concept was that the individual could be a citizen of State government and be a citizen of a Federal Government, at one and the same time. As is true of new ideas generally, many leaders said this was impossible. It had never been done before. Man can only be a citizen of one government, cried Mason. How can one person belong to more than one government?

Those who saw the light persisted courageously and finally through a vote of the members the only soverignty existing, i. e., State government, the Constitution of the United States was voted. Few of us realize by what narrow margin this favorable action was gained, a margin of 5 votes in one State and so on. As we look back, it seems as though the hand of God truly guided this Nation into this tremendous advance in political science.

The citizen voted for representatives of his State government and for representatives in the Federal Government on the same ballot. State courts administered the laws maintaining order in State jurisdictions (local burglary, murder, etc.) and State officials administered the laws financing the cost of local government, and operated the departments of the State. At the same time, neighbors had been voted into Federal Government responsibilities, Federal courts sat in the same town in which State courts functioned, and administered the laws created for the observance of national interests and the protection of the citizen of State against invasion by an enemy of the American colonies. Counterfeiters were tried in Federal courts because citizens of State government delegated to Federal Government the sole right to issue currency. Robbers of the mail were similarly punished for their crime through enforcement of Federal law conducted through action by a Federal jury. This jury was made up of citizens who a few months previous had sat on a State jury, dealing with a divorce case or a case of local embezzlement.

There is nothing, except attitudes of people, to prevent a world government based on the Federation principle, to which is delegated only the responsibility for maintaining international peace, from similarly dealing with an international gangster who starts to make 10-ton rocket bombs in his factory. Citizens elect their representatives in world government just as they do Representatives in Congress and their representatives in the State legislature and their representatives in city councils, and in school boards. World government courts sit in Cologne or Tokio or Chicago. Judges are chosen by the representatives we have elected. Judges, failing in their responsibility, are impeached just as Federal judges are. World government juries are drawn from the local regions just as Federal juries are drawn. The enforcing officer of the world government apprehends the criminal or criminals (in the light of law against international crime) just as the enforcing officer arrests the bootlegger breaking Federal liquor laws. The facts are heard, judgment given, and the criminal punished.

Capacity to organize for war, action leading toward an international crime, nipped in its incipient stage, not after airplanes have been built in secrecy and rocket bombs installed for a sudden destruction of peace-loving people living 500 miles away.

A. The foundation of peace: Man, the source of all political authority, is a manifold political being. He is a citizen of several communities—the city, the state, the nation, and the world.

Communities may exist for a time without being incorporated but, under the stress of adversity, they disintegrate unless legally organized. Government can only be established through the deliberate efforts of men.

The scientific and industrial developments have indissolubly unified the organic life of the human race wherever resident. Governments limited in their jurisdiction to limited geographical areas can no longer satisfy the needs of the human race.

History has revealed but one principle by which free peoples, inhabiting extensive territories, can unite under one government without impairing their local self-government. That principle is federation.

B. International order and world peace depend on the orderly process of laws backed up by judicial and enforcement procedures. Laws and their enforcement cannot exist unless created by a sovereign government. A world federation must be created to which peace-seeking nations shall delegate responsibility for maintaining world peace.

President Roosevelt told the American Society of International Law on April 30, 1944, "nations of the globe must unite in a definite body of law in order to preserve civilization and prevent a repetition of the present world disorder. Such a body of law must be capable of expansion to meet the needs of a rapidly changing world. The world cannot permit a recurrence of the present reign of lawlessness."

Common action on world federation: One method for expressing the will of the people is a State legislative memorial to Congress and the President.

Already eight States (Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia, Alabama, and Louisiana) have passed a resolution memorializing Congress on world federation as set forth in a declaration.

Identical resolutions, debated and passed, after public hearings by the legislatures of these eight States, declare:

1. That all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the Federation of the World;

2. Specify that the Members in Congress from the State support and vote for this resolution;

3. Requests the President of the United States to initiate procedure necessary to formulate a constitution for the Federation of the World;

4. Requests that the President submit such a constitution to each nation for its ratification.

Members of Congress have stated that this is a logical, a democratic, and orderly method for registering the will of the people in this matter.

Thus, already people of eight States have declared (a) here are principles on which peace may be built, (b) we want our representatives in Congress to work for these principles, and (c) we want the President to initiate action leading to the goal of world federation. No complete blueprint is drawn up; only the principle of federation is enunciated, but action on that is requested.

Such action is sought because the people of these States believe that whether the Dumbarton Oaks or other proposals come to light, any successful solution will have to be built on the above concepts.

Establishment of an Enduring World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the President of the United States from the newly elected Democratic Members of the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1945.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At a special meeting in Washington, D. C., on January 25, 1945, it was resolved unanimously that the following letter be addressed to you.

You are engaging in conferences with the leaders of certain of the United Nations on final plans to win the war as quickly as possible and to prepare the way for peace-loving nations to live in peace and security.

As newly elected Members of the House of Representatives from congressional districts all over the Nation, we want to report to you the universal desire for the establishment of the most effective means of safeguarding this Nation's and the world's future, the prevention of war.

The United States should take the lead among the United Nations in urging full cooperation toward a common plan for enduring world peace. This principle is the foremost resolve of the American people and we, as recently chosen Representatives, do hereby extend to you our assurances that we will cooperate to the fullest to see that it is effectuated.

Respectfully,

DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania: CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, West Virginia; E. H. HEDRICK, West Virginia; JOHN B. SULLIVAN, Missouri; FRANK T. STARKEY, Minnesota; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania; JAMES E. ROE, New York; HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN, Connecticut; WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Pennsylvania; HERBERT J. MCGLINCHEY, Pennsylvania; WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Pennsylvania; WILLIAM W. LINK, Illinois; ALEXANDER J. RESA, Illinois; JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina; MELVIN PRICE, Illinois; CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Connecticut; HAROLD H. EARTHMAN, Tennessee; JAMES P. GEELAN, Connecticut; EDWARD J. GARDNER, Ohio; EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, Illinois; EDWARD A. KELLY, Illinois; ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, Wisconsin; WILLIAM R. THOM, Ohio; A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Missouri; JOHN S. WOOD, Georgia; EARLE C. CLEMENTS, Kentucky; LEO F. RAYFIEL, New York; PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, Delaware; PETER A. QUINN, New York; HUGH DE LACY, Washington; CHARLES R. SAVAGE, Washington; CLYDE DOYLE, California; HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, California; ELLIS E. PATTERSON, California; DWIGHT L. ROGERS, Florida; NED R. HEALY, California; DUDLEY G. ROE, Maryland; JOSEPH F. RYTER, Connecticut; ADAM C. POWELL, JR., New York; GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland; BERKELEY L.

BUNKER, Nevada; E. L. BARTLETT, Alaska; JOSEPH W. ERVIN, North Carolina; WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, Minnesota; TOM PICKETT, Texas; J. M. COMBS, Texas; JOHN E. LYLE, Texas; FRANK R. HAVENNER, California; GEORGE P. MILLER, California; ALBERT RAINS, Alabama; JAMES J. DELANEY, New York; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania; WALTER B. HUBER, Ohio; JAMES W. TRIMBLE, Arkansas; MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia; BENJAMIN RABIN, New York; GEORGE F. ROGERS, New York.

The text of the letter to the President is the unanimous expression of the newly elected Democratic Members of the House of Representatives. The committee which acted upon this matter was composed of the following Members: DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania, chairman; J. M. COMBS, Texas; HUGH DE LACY, Washington; EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, Illinois; ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, Wisconsin.

The committee earnestly and sincerely invites our newly elected Republican colleagues to join in this symbol of unity and reaffirm America's nonpartisan spirit in dealing with the tremendous problem of this Nation's future.

Opposes War Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, a bill has been introduced into Nebraska Unicameral Legislature to repeal war time and go back to standard time.

Radio station WJAG, at Norfolk, Nebr., only station in northeast Nebraska, a rural section, asked their listeners to vote on the proposal.

In the first 48 hours they received 142 replies of which 137 wanted to go back to standard time and 5 wanted to stay on war time, at least until all States change back to standard time. The ratio was 27 to 1 against war time.

Some of the letters had as many as 66 signatures, but each letter or card was counted as 1 vote.

Here are sample arguments against war time:

A farm woman says old time gives them an extra hour to shop because they do their chores by sun time and sunset which now comes at 6:38 would come at 5:38 old time.

Another farm woman says she has to do her morning chores in the dark.

Another woman wants old time so children do not have to start for school in dark.

One family of four says:

War time makes forenoons too short and afternoons too long on both horses and men.

A minister wrote:

Our members simply cannot get farm work done in time to attend services that begin at 9:30 a. m., this early time being caused by most pastors having two and three churches to serve during this shortage of ministers.

A town couple wrote:

We have seen people go to work long before daylight on slippery streets, and are more likely to have accidents and I think they use more electricity than if they had been on old time.

Many farm organizations have voted unanimously or almost so in favor of the old time. Some call it God's time.

A farm woman says:

In summer we can't get started in fields until middle of forenoon on account of dew or rain. Hired men, if we can get them work grudgingly after 6 p. m. It is hard to get children to bed before dark. It is no fun to grope around in the dark during morning chores and working with animals you can't see.

One man says:

We are out of step with nature.

One man says:

If Nebraska goes ahead it might wake up the Nation to a good move.

Here are some samples of views of those who do not want to change:

I think as long as the majority of the United States uses war time so should Nebraska, but I never was in favor of war time.

Henry Deserves Any Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial appearing in February 15, 1945, issue of Aero Digest:

HENRY DESERVES ANY SERVICE

Send for Browder! Page Hillman! Call all followers of the Communist line! The crackpots dance with glee! Wallace is to be Secretary of Commerce; the country's industrial economy is to be a planned economy, and the Nation laid helpless under totalitarian feet!

It's a tragedy! Tragedies, to be sure, can be endured. But it is also a disgrace. We bow our heads in contrition. Shame and apprehension overwhelm us. For the first time in history a Chief Executive of the Republic stoops to smear the oath he had taken but an hour before—to pay a shameful political debt by throwing the Nation's business to its bitter and avowed enemies.

Left-wingers and nitwit ideologists lick their chops. The apostle of scarcity, the man who killed off the little pigs and plowed under the cotton and corn is in the place of power; the whole economic structure trembles. The man who was double-crossed at the Chicago convention has now been given what he wants.

What a travesty on "government by the people" was enacted in the letter that was so "difficult to write"—the letter in which our Chief Executive attempted to justify his wretched act by telling Jesse Jones: "It's not for lack of appreciation for all that you have done" * * * but "Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he thinks he can satisfactorily perform."

Why not—on that same cheap basis of barter of the people's rights—why not reorganize the Cabinet? Let Boss Kelly be Secretary of the Treasury and Boss Hague Secretary of State? How about Dan Tobin of the teamsters' union for Secretary of Agriculture? Surely he knows his oats! These gentlemen, too, worked hard to make the fourth term possible; they'd probably do as good a Cabinet job as Henry.

But while these hard-boiled guys were campaigning, Jesse Jones made the error of working hard at something also. He was trying to keep the home-fires burning, supplying money to build war plants, looking after the Nation's interests, running the biggest banking business in the world—a fourth department of the Government, Senator BYRD has called it. And he was doing these things with the temperament, political experience and business ability needed to swing the job.

How do you members of the aeronautical industry like the idea of having your whole destiny placed in the hands of a Secretary of Commerce who will stop at nothing to do what one of his fellow-travellers calls "Making America Over"? Did you, too, display the utmost devotion to our cause in the late campaign? Or are you what Wallace calls an "American Fascist"—too busy with war work and with your troubles with the C. I. O. to give politics much thought?

Your answer is important, for our troubles are deep-seated. The President of the United States has created a Frankenstein by his truckling to the irresponsible left-wingers from whose clutches he nevermore can escape.

For years we stamped our coins with the motto: "In God We Trust." Now we have a new slogan: "Henry Deserves Almost Any Service." As for the Nation, the deep, ugly scars which mark what the irritable, fast-failing, hand-tied Old Man of the White House has done to its integrity can never be removed.

An Excellent Poem by 1918 Doughboy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the May bill, which passed the House last week, I recited, as part of my argument for the approval of the bill, a poem entitled "Just Thinkin'." The author of this excellent poem was Hudson Hawley. I had never known or seen Mr. Hawley. He is now a member of the editorial staff of the Hartford Courant of Hartford, Conn. The poem, in my humble judgment, is the best one written about the First World War. It depicts the thoughts going through a doughboy's mind as he stands poised and ready to give the Hun battle. Little did Mr. Hawley think that his poem would be used to urge Congress pass needed legislation for increased production for boys in a later war. I respectfully request unanimous consent to publish an article in the Hartford Courant, which includes the poem.

This is the article:

WORLD WAR NO. 1 POEM READ IN CONGRESS—HUDSON HAWLEY'S VERSE ON SOLDIER RECITED IN PLEA FOR SERVICE ACT

A World War No. 1 poem by Hudson Hawley, now on the Courant staff but a private on the staff of the Stars and Stripes of World War No. 1 at the time he wrote it, was recited into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this week by Representative J. LEROY JOHNSON, Republican, of Stockton, Calif., as part of his plea for passage of the Limited Service Act voted by the House Thursday.

The poem, Just Thinkin', describes the doughboy of World War No. 1, standing on the trench firing-step "wond'rin' if the Hun's comin' over tonight" and reminiscing in his loneliness.

Representative JOHNSON, urging passage of the Limited Service Act, told fellow Representatives that Mr. Hawley's poem "represents the psychology of the doughboy of 1918, whose son is his counterpart today."

"We want to do something, no matter how feeble it may seem," said Representative JOHNSON, "to let the man at the front know that he is our main concern. We want to let him know that, to the capacity of our power, we are determined that he should get all he needs and more, so he can win and win at the least cost. We want him to know that we are his friends. He is thinking just like we are. He is wondering what we are doing and are we remembering and thinking of him. In the A. E. F. were some fine poets in 1918. They wrote some interesting poems. My favorite one is entitled 'Just Thinkin'.' It illustrates the psychology of the doughboy of 1918, whose son is his counterpart today. With your permission I want to recite it."

Representative JOHNSON then went on to recite Mr. Hawley's poem which is printed herewith:

JUST THINKIN'

Standin' up here on the fire-step,
Lookin' ahead in the mist,
With a tin hat over your ivory
And a rifle clutched in your fist;
Waitin' and watchin' and wonderin
If the Huns comin' over tonight—
Say, aren't the things you think of
Enough to give you a fright?

Things you ain't even thought of
For a couple o' months or more;
Things that'll set you laughin',
Things that will make you sore;
Things that you saw in the movies,
Things that you saw on the street,
Things you're not really proud of,
Things that are—not so sweet.

Debts that are past collectin',
Stories you hear and forget,
Ball games and birthday parties,
Hours of drill in the wet;
Headlines, recruitin' posters,
Sunsets 'way out to sea,
Evenings of pay day—Golly—
It's a queer thing, this memory!

Faces of pals in Homeburg,
Voices of womenfolk,
Verses you learned in schooldays
Pop up in the mist and the smoke
As you stand there grippin' that rifle,
A-starin' and chilled to the bone,
Wonderin' and wonderin' and wonderin'
Just thinkin' there—all alone!

When will the war be over?
When will the gang break through?
What will the U. S. look like?
What will there be to do?
Where will the Boches be then?
Who will have married Nell?
When's that relief a-comin' up?
Gosh; But this thinkin's hell!

Mr. Hawley was inspired to write Just Thinkin' after talking with buddies in the Twenty-sixth Yankee Division, who had just come off the firing line. Mr. Hawley himself had been a member of the One Hundred and First Machine Gun Battalion, but was transferred by order to The Stars and Stripes. He was the first enlisted man to be assigned to the soldier paper and last to leave it.

Radio Discussion With Bob Evans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening, I engaged in a discussion with Bob Evans, C. B. S. commentator, on the future of the G. I. bill of rights. This was broadcast over WFBL, Syracuse. Under unanimous consent, I include this colloquy in my remarks in the RECORD:

Each Friday night at this time, WFBL's special events department presents "Your Congressman Speaks." Each week, Bob Evans, WFBL's Washington correspondent will have as his guest, one of central New York's Congressmen. Here tonight in the Washington studios of CBS, is Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL of the Thirty-seventh Congressional District. Here is Bob Evans.

Mr. EVANS. Who will, in turn, introduce Mr. HALL. Perhaps it should be the other way around. In any event, Mr. HALL is well known to his Thirty-seventh District—his Binghamton, Norwich, and Madison County constituents. He has been in Washington since 1939. Has served successively in the 76th, 77th, and 78th Congresses, and now is well started on the 79th. Incidentally, it's beginning to look as if the 79th is going to be remembered even more than the 78th. Certainly it has started out with a bang, particularly with the hot fight which has been going on all week in the House, over the work-or-take-the-consequences bill.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes, the fight that reached a climax around 7 o'clock last night, when the House passed the May bill—the limited national-service legislation by a vote of 246 to 145. That legislation kept us going for 4 days. Now the Senate Military Affairs Committee has the bill, and they may report it out tomorrow. If they do, it may reach the Senate floor Monday. However, I understand that the Senate has its own version of this work-or-else legislation, and it looks as if there's going to be a battle there too, trying to compromise both bills.

Mr. EVANS. Yes; work-or-else legislation hasn't become a law as yet. However, tonight, your Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL is going to talk to you about the G. I. bill of rights, and the resolution he introduced in the House a few days ago to implement that bill.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to talk about veteran's benefits, Bob, but first, suppose you tell something of what has been going on in Washington in general this week.

Mr. EVANS. Yes, there were other exciting events in Washington this week aside from the passage of the "work or else" bill in the House. The sixty-third birthday celebration of President Roosevelt was observed, with literally millions of dimes being donated to the fight on infantile paralysis. New mileage records were turned in on the mile-of-dimes campaigns. Washington also is observing the national coal-saving "brownout" and, like many another American community, this capital looks peculiar with the bright lights all out, and the not-so-bright lights dimmed. Your first impression on seeing a darkened theater front is that no show is going on, and you wonder why. Then you realize that the show is going on as usual inside—it's the brownout. Washington also is intrigued by the fact that so many of our well-known people are missing from the Capitol scene. Secretary of State Stettinius and Harry Hopkins are overseas—last reported in Italy. War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes, and the President daughter, Mrs. Anna Boettiger, also are among the missing, but nobody knows where they may be for publication. However, former Vice President Henry Wallace is very much among those present. After much parliamentary maneuvering throughout the week, the Senate carried itself into a position yesterday in which it voted for the George bill first, and thus postponed a vote on Henry Wallace for Secretary of Commerce until about March 1. Throughout the week, opponents of Henry Wallace for the commerce post, had jockeyed for legislation which would cause the Senate to vote on his appointment first. They know that if they could force such a vote, the Wallace nomination would be turned down. But friends of Mr. Wallace, including Democratic leader Senator BARKLEY fought to get the George bill under consideration first. They won. The George bill was accepted. It is understood the President will give it his O. K.

And so, if Mr. Wallace is approved by the Senate for the Commerce Cabinet post, and there seems to be but little doubt he will, he takes over, in effect, the bare bones of the job. The George bill has separated the lending agencies from Commerce. That is, it will, if okayed by the House and the President signs. And, as evidence of how hotly contested all this legislation was, I can tell you that Senator BARKLEY left the hospital where he had been taking treatment for an infected eye, and showed up on the Senate floor yesterday, wearing a black patch. Said Mr. BARKLEY, admitting that the patch made him look more like Deadeye Dick than a United States Senator: "The doctor told me to wear this patch on my eye to protect it from the wind, so I thought I ought to wear it in the Senate." Well, that's something of what has been going on in Washington this week.

And now, Mr. HALL, let us talk about the G. I. bill of rights, and the resolution you have proposed in the House—that resolution which proposes that Congress be vigilant in seeing to it that the provisions of the bill be carried out to the letter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes. Everybody thought that when Congress passed the G. I. bill of rights last year we could forget about veterans' benefits and veterans' legislation. Everyone thought that we had uncovered all the solutions to the greatest problem that this country ever will face, that of taking care of the returning soldier.

Mr. EVANS. Is it your suggestion then, that those who have been called upon to administer the bill are not going about it properly?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Not at all. My point, my resolution is, that a good start be watched over to see that it is carried out to a better finish. With the facilities set up, and with the favorable legislation already approved by Congress, the veteran of World War No. 2 has much more assurance of a bright future, at this stage of the game, than did his compatriot of 25 years ago. In other words, a start has been made in the right direction. But, unfortunately, it is only a start. For, although a broad general basis for fair play for the soldier has been outlined, the whole picture still is rather hazy as to how this Magna Carta will be put into effect.

Mr. EVANS. Do we understand that the particulars of the G. I. bill of rights are not sufficiently specific?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In a number of respects they are not. To me it seems there are too many glittering generalities in the bill as it stands. The proposals are attractive, yet uncertain. There is much that Congress needs to do. There is much that the Veteran's Administration needs to do. So broad a field has to be covered. I think that when the bill was passed there was not complete comprehension concerning the vast number of men it would cover. Even now, as we enter our fourth year of the war, the number of veterans discharged so far, represents only a tiny part of the millions who will be mustered out after the war is over.

Mr. EVANS. You think then the G. I. bill of rights should be changed, or amended to make it more far-reaching?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think it is imperative, in order to get a comprehensive view of veterans' affairs, that we change our whole method of thinking about veterans and veterans' rights. In the first place, the United States has been transformed by this war from a Nation of peace to a great military power. Whether we can help it or not we have stepped forward upon the road which leads to militarism. Already, there is a hue and cry throughout the country, for permanent military conscription of this country's youth. Since this is the case, we must bring ourselves to accept policies in dealing with military personnel which would have seemed extraordinary before we acquired such an Army. For example, there is the question of rehabilitation of our wounded veterans. There are going to be unprecedented demands for veterans' hospitals in every corner of the land. We must be prepared to accept these demands, to face them. This Nation must be ready to start a program of building hospitals and veterans' facilities to take care of the staggering numbers of wounded men—of all casualities.

Mr. EVANS. But there are such provisions in the bill.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; but again I say they are not far-reaching enough. For example, the crippled soldier, the wounded man, will want to return home. It is inhuman to think that he would be expected to spend his lifetime, if he were disabled enough to need constant hospital care, in hospitals far from home, hundreds of miles away. So, special consideration must be given to the idea of bringing medical facilities, the hospitals, just as close to the individual soldier's home community as possible.

Mr. EVANS. In other words, you suggest that hospital facilities be provided, let us say, near Binghamton, or Norwich, or Oneida for wounded men whose homes are there or near there, and that the same be provided for those from, oh, Columbus, Ohio, or Phoenix, Ariz.; is that it?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes. It isn't a pretty subject to discuss, but it is one that must be faced, and I believe that the wounded soldier and his family be kept in as close proximity to one another as possible. It is only human. It is only just.

Mr. EVANS. This, of course, is going to call for a great number of hospitals and medical facilities, a greater number than ever before.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; and the number of disabled men right now is greater than ever before and will be greater. Certainly it will call for more doctors, more specialists, more nurses. But this will have its compensations, too. With more wounded men, there must be more competent doctors. With more serious cases, there must be greater concentration upon the effective practice of medicine for their sake. All this is bound to give rise to new research, and the certain advancement of surgery, physical rehabilitation, and the medical profession in general.

Mr. EVANS. Yes; surgery, medicine, rehabilitation have made great forward strides in this war.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. They have, and they will continue to go forward. But, now, I have a fear that this forward movement may be arrested. I am thinking of what may happen when the first call goes out for an appropriation by Congress—an appropriation of the tremendous funds that will be necessary to provide all these facilities. Reactionary forces, inside and outside Congress, will begin to raise their voices to defeat the possibility of proper rehabilitation and hospitalization for the veteran. That is, they will do this unless vigilant friends of the veterans in Congress remain awake to the dangers of reaction.

Mr. EVANS. I see—and it is for this reason that you introduced your resolution.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes. I have been concerned over the possibility of a tide of reaction setting in. In addition, the concern is not alone mine. I have had letters from people back home—letters which show that, in some instances, there has been a lack of interest in carrying out the provisions of the G. I. bill of rights. To ward off this lack of interest, a few days ago I introduced into the House of Representatives a resolution directing the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to conduct a continuous investigation—a continuous study—into the manner in which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is being administered. This resolution is to determine whether the G. I. bill is being carried out in accordance with the intention of Congress. It authorizes that reports be made to the House from time to time.

Mr. EVANS. In other words, the House by constantly keeping on top of what is going on in the administration of the bill, can advise, suggest, and even propose amendments, if developments suggest changes would be advisable.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes. And so far I have mentioned only rehabilitation of the veteran. I haven't touched on the broad field of education. Education which should present great opportunities later to every man now in uniform. Everybody agrees that the soldier should have a chance to recover the years he will have lost so far as his general education is concerned. This, of course, is outlined in the G. I. bill, but before us still lies the task of putting it into effect. We must see that the America of the future provides college education, vocational training for those of her sons who have borne the battle. We must see that the machinery is oiled and working to equip that veteran for the life's work he chooses to follow—whether it be mechanic, engineer, specialized farmer, lawyer, doctor. The sky must be the limit and it is the duty of Congress and the people to see that these opportunities are forthcoming.

Mr. EVANS. And so say we all of us.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes, and finally the soldier must be assured that, upon his return, he will be able to find a good job that will provide a good living under the only way of life worth living—the American way of life. Yes, to see that the G. I. bill is carried out will take vigilance—a constant watching over the veterans' rights. So Congress and the people must be constantly on the job. The Veterans' Administration and the educational authorities of this country should be preparing great plans for the glorious future we like to anticipate for ourselves and our returning sons and brothers. So far the American Legion, other veterans' organizations—with their experiences from the last war and its aftermath—have done much to see that present-day veterans get a square deal. But they will do more. So will Congress. So will the people of this land.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

The Challenge of the Second Hundred Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses delivered by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN and myself:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR GEORGE D. AIKEN OF VERMONT

The second century for cooperatives begins in a world torn by war and revolution, war involving nearly every nation on the globe and revolution involving the economic, scientific, social, and political future of our lives.

It is entirely possible that the period through which we are now passing and which began some 15 years ago may last for a long time to come. It is now obvious that it will not end with the signing of an armistice with Germany or even Japan.

The stories which come to us daily from Italy, from Greece, and Yugoslavia, and Poland, and India are indicative that certain phases of this changing process will continue for many years more.

Even as millions of years ago when this earth of ours was in process of reformation, with terrible earthquakes, followed by lesser disturbances, until at last a solid and enduring foundation was developed, so are we today experiencing earthquakes in our social and economic and political structure from which must eventually come the solid foundation on which the lives and future welfare of humanity will be built.

Whether we ask for it or not, we might as well face the fact that a new way of living is being established. We could not stop it even if we wanted to. The change can be for the better—it may be for the worse, but change itself is inevitable.

We can have some degree of opportunity and responsibility in determining what our future will be. We face this responsibility every day. The manner in which we meet it during the coming years will largely determine the degree to which happiness and security will accrue to generations far into the future.

The challenge, then, of the second hundred years is to assume our responsibility in determining what our future way of life will be.

As the late Justice Brandeis said, "Responsibility is the great developer." It is more than that, however. It is the yardstick of character. Men rise or fall as they assume responsibility. Not only do they rise or fall, but by the manner in which they meet responsibility they lift the status of others or drag it down to a lower level.

Vision alone is not a sufficient attribute to insure success. Vision without courage will not only fail to improve our social structure, but will bring unhappiness to its possessor.

This world of ours has largely become—in fact, has overwhelmingly become, a world dominated by economic issues. The governments of this world are largely economic governments. The wars we fight are largely economic wars.

The struggle is constantly one for power and more power; wealth and more wealth. There is inherent in the breast of everyone the urge for monopoly. To a few this urge

is translated into opportunity and realization, but to the multitudes nothing more than the urge itself is ever realized.

The world today has become the arena for this titanic struggle for monopoly and possession. Small groups of men obsessed with desire for wealth and power have organized monopolies and cartels, organizations which continually imperil the peace of the world and the safety of nations, even our own Nation.

These men respond only to this urge for possession and control. By their methods, they deprive teeming millions of the world's people of ownership, even the ownership of homes. When they deprive one of ownership or the hope of ownership, they destroy in him the final vestige of a sense of responsibility. Responsibility is intimately associated with ownership and in that very test, the test of ownership, we can find the cause for the social and economic and political failures of the past.

Even here in America, the world's great land of opportunity, we are to a great degree a Nation of tenants and mortgages. Over half the farms in some of our largest and richest Midwest agricultural States are owned by absentee landlords and are occupied by tenants. In some of the Southern States, the dgree of tenancy is much greater.

All through our great West, farms comprising thousands upon thousands of acres are owned by eastern capital but on which the labor is performed by men and women who have no hope of ownership in the land itself. The tendency toward corporation farming holds little hope of ownership for the actual tiller of the soil.

The ownership of homes in the cities has become a mirage to the millions employed in our industrial plants. Workers in many industries no longer own any part of the tools of production and have no voice in the management. Thousands of small industrial plants throughout the country have been absorbed by gigantic corporations and holding companies until their owners find that even they no longer have a voice in the management of the industry which they themselves or their forebears developed.

A system of absentee and impersonal ownership has come to rule in the United States with a resultant tendency toward loss of character on the part of industry and of groups employed by industries and even those in Government. The badge of irresponsibility is all too common today.

How often we see carelessness on the part of an employee because he does not own the tools. How often we see industry strive to get the highest figure on a contract, whether that figure is warranted or not. How often we see wastefulness on the part of Government employees because it is not their money that is being spent. How often we see whole communities and even States shifting the burden of their own responsibility to the Federal Government even while they cry out against usurpation of their authority. This condition is not irreparable; the tide can be turned back; but it can only be done through the assumption of responsibility by the individual.

The challenge of the second century to the cooperatives is to boldly assert that they are not only stemming this tide but are changing the system into which we have been drifting.

The cooperative method is the one organized economic force which has demonstrated that it has within itself the facilities for stemming the tide of our economic system from one of tenancy and dependency to one of ownership and responsibility.

Through cooperative effort, a thousand small farmers can pool their interests and thereby perform the services that might otherwise be done by a single corporation, while at the same time they preserve their sense of ownership and full responsibility upon which sound and stable government itself depends.

Through cooperative effort a thousand families in the city may enjoy a higher standard of living, which will result in improved health, better education, hope for home ownership, and a realization that these things have come to pass through the efforts that they themselves have made. They will stand a little straighter and they will hold their heads higher.

We have mastered the problems of production both on farm and in factory, but we have not mastered the problem of distribution.

Ten years ago we saw millions of tons of food destroyed on the farm because there was no market and millions of people in the cities went hungry for want of this very food. The specter of such a situation now haunts the minds of both farmers and consumers.

Both groups seek legislation to insure them against dependency. The long time solution does not lie in legislation. It will not be found in the halls of Congress. Congress may pass relief measures, may provide for subsidies, may furnish temporary expedients, but the problem of distribution cannot in the long run be met by legislation. It can be met by the people themselves working through their own organizations, working to wrest the control of processing and transportation and distribution from the hands of small monopolistic groups, working to provide homes and home ownership for more people who will realize full responsibility when ownership is realized.

When we have mastered the art of distribution, then, and only then, can we look forward to an era of peace with full employment. So long as overpopulated and underprivileged nations exist in a world where an excess of necessities of life constitute an embarrassment of riches to other nations, so long will we live under the shadow of the threat of war.

So long as millions in our own country are in want while others are unable to dispose of the fruits of their labor, so long will we have unemployment, racial and class discrimination, and all their attendant evils.

Cooperatives can show the way to a proper system of distribution. It is part of the challenge of the second century to do so.

Too long have cooperatives been apologetic about their purpose and even their existence. The second century challenges cooperatives and members of cooperatives to fly their flag high without apology and without any action which can be construed as defeatism.

Cooperatives are today the greatest single force for effectively regulating private industry. Their methods of operation, their insistence upon quality and price, their performance of service has a more far-reaching and beneficial effect on private industry than have all the laws and regulations that can be enacted or promulgated.

The cooperative system stands between the people of our country and Government ownership and control. The cooperative method offers the best solution for insuring costs of production to the producer who lives on the farm and a decent standard of living to the consumer who lives in the city. Through cooperatives we can bring both farmers and consumers to a sympathetic realization of the problems which affect the other.

Although cooperatives today have enjoyed an enviable expansion of the business which they do, they have not so far realized a corresponding increase in influence in legislative halls, particularly the Halls of Congress.

The cooperative business, including that done for producer and consumer, may be considered in terms of billions of dollars today, but the cooperative influence in Congress is almost negligible in comparison. It must find the way to express its opinions to Government.

Only last week we witnessed the defeat of the St. Lawrence seaway and and power project in the Senate because the powerful opposition to it was organized and asserted every influence at the command of its organization. The support for the development of greatest natural resource in the world and one which would contribute materially to the welfare of every person in the United States was desultory in nature and largely unorganized.

While the voice of the special interests opposing this measure was strong and influential, the voice of the cooperatives was scarcely heard. When such projects as the development of the St. Lawrence and the utilization of the tremendous resources of the Missouri River system, the expansion of transportation systems, which will result in a more adequate distribution and a higher scale of living for millions are proposed, the voice of the cooperatives should wield a powerful influence.

The second century challenges us to make that voice heard in the legislative halls of the States and the Nation. Cooperatives cannot afford not to be interested in the development of our great natural resources. They cannot afford to be unconcerned with any of the acts of State legislatures and the Congress. They must be zealously interested and zealously committed to a program of constructive action.

Not only should the conservation and utilization of water resources concern them, but conservation of forests, conservation of oil resources, conservation of minerals, and the use of these resources in the public benefit rather than in the interest of any financial group which desires to exploit them solely for itself is a matter which directly concerns every member of every cooperative.

When God placed man on earth, he imbued him with desire—desire for complete security and happiness and a perfect life. He also gave to man the means of achieving this desire, the only stipulation being that man himself, using the means which God placed at his command, should bring his desires to realization through his own efforts.

Through the ages, man has struggled upward toward the ultimate goal. He has evolved education as a foundation upon which other achievements rest; he has developed the art of medicine and healing so that life may reach its allotted span on earth; he has made the desert to bloom and he has curbed the floods and controlled the lightning; he has learned to fly through the air almost with the speed of sound itself, but he has not yet learned how to live at peace with his fellow man nor to dispel the feat of want in a world of plenty.

One hundred years ago the cooperative movement was born. Its progress has been difficult and slow. Adversity has dogged its way. Its enemies are powerful and ruthless. But because it was never stopped, because it came back after each adversity, millions of families in our own country and millions of others throughout the world are living better, happier lives today.

The first century built the foundation for a better way of life. The second century challenges us to build securely on that foundation.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JERRY VOORHIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman and friend in the cooperative movement, I understand that you have suggested that I speak to you on the subject "The First Hundred Years Were the Hardest." I am going to try to speak more or less on that subject in spite of the fact that I doubt very much whether the first 100 years will turn out to have been the hardest ones for the cooperative movement. It is true that there have been years of struggle and

heroic effort against tremendous odds. It is true that the pages of the history of the rise of the cooperative movement since it first beginnings 100 years ago this month are filled with a record of hardship and sacrifice for ideals and principles in which earnest men and women have believed. The 28 Pioneers of Rochdale did indeed light a light which has shined more and more brightly around the world as the years have passed. With the 28 pounds which these poor people managed to save through months of hardship they started on its way a form of business activity based more solidly upon truly sound economic, social, and spiritual principles than any other type of economic activity that the world has ever known. For they rediscovered the one basic principle upon which all human society must depend, namely, group loyalty. On that principle they built their cooperative and out of that principle has grown the most solid hope of human betterment that this distressed world knows today.

I think, if we were to select one factor which made the task of the Rochdale pioneers more difficult than any other one, that factor would be ridicule. When they opened their little store we are told that their fellow citizens laughed at them and the children threatened to stone their little place of business. I doubt that there is a single worth-while effort that human beings have ever made that did not start out in an atmosphere of ridicule. Ridicule is the cruelest weapon which those who benefit from an established order an use against those who seek its modification for the benefit of the masses of men.

Every great movement the world has ever known has passed through three stages. The first of these has been that of ridicule and indifference. Every great religious movement has passed through such a period. The Founder of the Christian religion Himself was no exception. The movement for free public education, the labor movement, the anti-child-labor crusade, above all perhaps the movement for world peace—all of these have been in their early stages regarded with indifference if not with ridicule by the majority of human beings. There are those, however, who prefer ridicule and indifference to the even greater difficulties which encounter a great movement when it passes into the second stage of its development. For that second stage is that of opposition and bitter attempts to destroy it. Christianity passed through this period during the persecution by Roman emperors and others and all the other movements for human betterment which I have mentioned have had to pass through the fire of this second period of their development. The cooperative movement will be no exception. And as we meet here tonight on this one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the first Rochdale cooperative, the one thought above all others which should be uppermost in our minds is this: Either this movement to which we are all so devoted must gird itself for the rigors of the second period of its development or it must give up the hope of making the worth-while contribution to the solution of the human problems of which it is undoubtedy capable.

The third stage in the development of any great movement is that of its successful establishment as an accepted part of the life of society. It may well be that in Scandanavia, in England, in Nova Scotia, and perhaps in one or two other places in the world the cooperatives have already passed into this third stage. In our own country I think we must frankly face the fact that this movement is just coming of age and is only just entering that second period of opposition and well-laid attempt at its destruction of which I have spoken. The great question before this meeting here tonight is whether or not you and I have the courage and the faith to seek with all our hearts to lift this movement out of a position where it is regarded with indifference by the bulk of the population of our country and to carry it forward with courage through the fire of misunderstanding and attack which, in all probability, will await it once its real potential strength is understood.

Only one example will be necessary to illustrate what I mean. Recently the president of a western railroad received a letter from the National Tax Equality Association informing him that in their opinion his proper contribution to the work of that misnamed organization was $25,000. It happens that this particular railroad official did not reply to that letter but instead turned it oyer to one of his best customers, a farm-marketing cooperative. I tell this little story only to show that the National Tax Equality Association is thinking in no small terms. There can be no shadow of doubt that this organization is out to destroy every cooperative in the United States. Its literature talks about tax exemption, an exemption accorded by an act of Congress to farm cooperatives only as a measure of attempting to bring about a greater equality of opportunity as between agriculture on the one hand and industry on the other in the United States. The exemption applies only to corporation income taxes and amounts, as a matter of fact, to considerably less than a small hill of beans from the standpoint of Federal revenue.

It is doubtful indeed if due to this tax exemption more than $10,000,000 of revenue is lost to the Federal Treasury per year. But under the cloak of trying to destroy this very minor tax exemption what the National Tax Equality Association with its well-filled treasury actually seeks to do is to induce Congress to attempt a violation of the American Constitution by passing a bill which would make taxable money held in trust by cooperatives which cooperatives are obligated to pay out to members. The National Tax Equality Association says that if a cooperative-marketing association receives money from the sale of farmers' crops and immediately passes that money onto the farmer who grew the crops, nonetheless all that money should be taxable as income to the cooperative. The National Tax Equality Association also says that money which remains for a short period of time in the hands of a consumer cooperative association and which that cooperative must pay out at the end of the fiscal year to its members in patronage dividends shall likewise be taxed as income to the cooperative. It is perfectly clear that this is no attempt to bring about tax equality, but rather a deliberate and well-calculated attempt to play upon the prejudices of the American people and thus to bring about the complete destruction of every cooperative within the borders of the United States. This is a challenge which I am confident we can successfully meet. I do not believe that any competent court in the United States would hold that funds held in trust by a cooperative for its members constitute income within the meaning of the sixteenth amendment. Neither do I believe when the facts are known that the American people will stand for any such attempt to destroy the one method for the solution of economic problems by the peoples' own effort and without intereference or help of the Government which has yet appeared upon an otherwise dark horizon. But this attack by the National Tax Equality Association is significant in the extreme for it indicates that the cooperative movement in the United States is coming of age, that in certain fields at least it is becoming a factor of sufficient importance to cause big business to be afraid and to make monopoly decide to attempt to do something which will bring about the destruction of this truly democratic form of economic organization of the people.

The attempt is being made to enlist the small businessman in opposition to cooperatives, an attempt that would be laughable if it were not so tragic. For I come now to a brief discussion of some of the accomplishments of the cooperatives which certainly should be mentioned at least on this memorable occasion. The first of those accomplishments is the fact that in instance after instance cooperatives have succeeded in meeting monopoly on its own ground and defeating it. They have succeeded where no other device, governmental or otherwise, has been able to succeed. Cooperatives have demonstrated that it is possible for people to own their own insurance companies and to purchase insurance at its true cost. Cooperatives have demonstrated that cut of the margin between the real cost of producing petroleum products and the market price including all of the profit mark-ups of the major oil companies, the entire capital cost of refineries and other huge installments can be liquidated in a few months' time. Cooperatives have removed from the minds of millions of farmers the fear they used to have of markets controlled by monopolistic speculators. Cooperatives have successfully manufactured fertilizer, produced feed, made farm equipment, and done a host of other things in the very teeth of monopoly control of the production of the commodity in question. In these instances cooperatives have broken the monopoly strangle hold. I could go on and on with instance after instance but the point is that cooperatives since they belong to the people and since they make it possible for the people to once again know what ownership really means, have over and over again broken the hold of monopoly power and have made it possible for small business to have hope of success which it could not possibly have in a market controlled by monopolistic power. Cooperatives therefore will one day be recognized as the best friends the small businessman has. For they are a force making for true economic freedom.

Consumer cooperative stores, wholesale and production units owned by consumer cooperators—enterprises conducting production and distribution for the purpose of promoting human welfare rather than for profit—have shown that the people as owners of their own economic enterprises can be outstandingly successful provided only they are careful to provide themselves with an adequate educational background for their undertaking, to secure the best and most competent management that it is possible for them to secure, and to understand from the beginning that without a solid and devoted loyalty they cannot hope for success.

By means of cooperation the farm homes of the United States have for the first time been lighted up. A few years ago only 10 percent of our farm homes had electricity. Today this figure is approaching 50 percent. Had we listened to the private power companies, we must have believed this accomplishment impossible. But cooperatives have done the job, and in doing it have taken the longest single step which has yet been taken by any agency in making the family farm home a more attractive, a somewhat easier, and a happier place to live. In so doing they have bolstered the position of the family-sized farm, the very backbone of American democracy.

By the application of the principle of cooperation over 4,000,000 American citizens have found out that they need not depend upon loan sharks or big financial institutions to secure the credit necessary to meet their everyday needs. These millions of people have found out that reservoirs of credit can be formed just as well by pooling the small savings of large numbers of fellow citizens as can be done by the organization of great profit-seeking financial institutions. People

have found out, in short, that they can borrow from themselves, pay interest to themselves, and thus take perhaps the longest single step toward their own economic emancipation. And in this connection I am hoping that the next great accomplishment of the cooperative movement can be the establishment of the principle of "co-op money for co-op needs." What that phrase means to me is the coming of the time when all the savings of every cooperative enterprise in the country will be deposited in banks belonging to cooperators, so that cooperative enterprises that find it necessary may secure funds from cooperative sources, pay interest to cooperative financing institutions, and thus render the cooperative movement independent of the necessity of any outside financing whatsoever.

Yes, these things and many more have been great accomplishments of the last 100 years. Nor have I even mentioned the things that have been done in other countries for I am talking tonight to the American cooperative movement as its leaders are so largely assembled here. But there are certain things which we have not yet done. The story of the wonderful work of American cooperatives has not been got across to the great bulk of the American people. Have we somewhat hesitated to emerge from the first stage in development of the cooperative movement, namely the stage of public indifference, into the second period of greater difficulty as well as greater challenge? It would be entirely understandable if this were the case but each of us should search our hearts to see if this is true and should make up our minds that if it is true we will have no more of such a point of view.

For the world is sick today and suffering terribly. It is in need as never before of the gospel of cooperation, a gospel as truly religious in the best sense of that word as any economic gospel which has ever been preached. And so in the concluding paragraphs of my speech here tonight I want to urge that at the very forefront of the future efforts of the cooperative movement in America should be put the task of effectively reaching the great rank and file of the American public with the true story of cooperation. Once they have heard it they will know that cooperatives are no threat to any single worthwhile institution in our whole country but that on the contrary they can give us the best guarantee for the continuance of constitutional government, economic liberty and genuine American hope for the common men that can be found from any source. Can we not take a lesson from the experience of those consumer cooperative stores which have failed? Has not the reason for such failure over and over again been the fact that the members of those cooperatives failed to see the outstanding necessity of securing the very best and most competent management that they could find? Some excellent publicity work has been done on behalf of our cooperative movement but it is my opinion that the time has come when we must reach out for at least a reasonable share of the very vest talent that exists in the field of public education in order that we may enlist that talent in a great drive to acquaint the American people with the truth about cooperatives and the hope they carry with them. The centennial year just passed has marked a great advance in this field and great progress has been made. But even that progress is no where near sufficient.

I have said repeatedly that one reason I believe in cooperatives is because I believe them to be the expression in the economic life of mankind of the basic principles of the Christian religion. I was most heartened a few weeks ago to be able to take part in a conference on cooperatives which took place at the great Catholic university at Notre Dame. But cooperators cannot and must not fail in these difficult years to preach not only with earnestness and devotion but with real effectiveness their message of economic hope and spiritual regeneration through economic activity devoted to the development of human personality which is the very heart of this movement. After all is said and done the greatest asset which we possess lies here. For the cooperative movement is the one answer which I know of to the problem of giving humanity both security and liberty at one and the same time and in the same nation. Cooperation is the one way by which economic problems can be solved by the efforts of men and women acting on their own behalf through their own initiative and guided by their own wisdom and loyalty without the aid of the state. This is the answer which men and women around the world are looking for. Let us not fail to see that they know about it.

A New Louisiana Purchase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, now and then the human imagination steps out boldly to encompass the future in a manner that stimulates enthusiasm and commands respect. A big plan is presented which thoughtful men recognize as practical because its roots go deeply into their own experience. People will say to themselves, "Now that is a big idea, but it is a good idea—one which I can go along with and work for." That is the way I felt when I read a speech made January 24, 1945, by William E. Warne, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, before the Associated Equipment Distributors at their meeting in Chicago. Mr. Warne has outlined a picture of development for western United States based upon the 43 years of experience of the Bureau of Reclamation which, although tremendous, is highly practical. I request permission to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I believe it is a document you will wish to read with care.

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM E. WARNE, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT DISTRIBUTORS AT CHICAGO, ILL., ON JANUARY 24, 1945

Members of the Associated Equipment Distributors, the Bureau of Reclamation proposes nothing less than the full development of the water and related natural resources of the West.

Unless you have done some pretty hard thinking about such a program, have a lively imagination and a good deal of faith in American ingenuity and initiative, it is difficult to realize fully what this means.

The most obvious first step is to more than double the irrigated area of the 17 Western States where rainfall is inadequate to sustain stable agriculture from 21,000,000 acres to 43,000,000. When you have irrigated 43,000,000, you will have found consumptive uses for nearly every available drop of moisture that falls in the United States west of the ninety-seventh meridian, except a portion of the run-off on a narrow strip along Pacific coast.

In doubling the irrigated area, you will have built dams from which electric power output for the West will have been vastly expanded. This will be the lowest cost hydro power produced in the United States and will bring to life tens of thousands of small industrial establishments and a good number of large ones.

In expanding the agricultural and industrial production, towns and villages will spring up—the population of the West will have been doubled—at least doubled. National income will have been increased by several billions of dollars a year. And in providing new employment on a very large scale, time will have been given to business and Government to discover adjustments to the most profoundly disturbing fact—the fact that we are learning to produce more and more goods with fewer and fewer people faster than at any time since the industrial revolution and science brought into being what we call the modern world. The pioneering period of the West will have been definitely extended almost as though the Nation had been able to effect another Louisiana Purchase.

Of course, the Bureau of Reclamation does not propose that all of this ground be covered in a single leap, although we have laid before Congress a very substantial post-war program which will cost well over $3,000,000,000 to complete.

But our proposals do call for irrigation of about 10,000,000 new acres of what is now dry soil, although fertile, on more than 300 separate projects, and would give supplemental water to some 10,000,000 additional acres now inadequately irrigated.

Coupled directly with irrigation expansion is the development of hydro power which assists in financing the construction of multiple-purpose projects and helps to balance industrial advancement with agricultural progress. Our post-war plans contemplate adding more than 4,000,000 kilowatts of firm power capacity through such projects. This will more than double the installed firm power capacity of the West.

To complete so vast a program calls for a new concept in the development of the West. In the early pioneering days, the winning of the West depended mainly upon individual courage and initiative. Quite true, fellow settlers cooperated in digging the ditches and building primitive dams that diverted water from streams onto land won from the desert, but this was done almost entirely as a private matter and on a relatively small scale.

Toward the turn of the century it became clear that there was an important job for the Federal Government in helping to construct dams and canals to supplement the efforts of private groups and individuals; and since the Reclamation Act of 1902, the Bureau of Reclamation has brought adequate water to some 4,000,000 acres of the 21,000,000 now served by irrigation in 15 Western States. Development has gone very nearly as far as it can under the methods of the past.

Now a bold new concept has broadened the outlook. We realize that, by thinking of the great river basins of this country as a whole, by planning the coordinated development of their water and other resources as one great unit, by building large, multiple-purpose projects, vastly greater benefits may be derived by every individual living within a river basin. In this way, the maximum use of water for irrigation can be obtained, along with a low-cost hydro-power development. Flood control can be achieved, navigation improved, and many related conservation ends served. At the same time, coordinated planning brings into the picture undeveloped mineral resources from which will grow new industries. This is the new concept which points to a greater future for the West than had previously seemed possible.

In approaching the tremendous problems involved in this development, the Bureau of Reclamation has made a series of 15 studies, each of which examines the natural and

human resources of a great river basin in the West. Most of these river basins include all or part of several States.

The first of these studies was that based on the Missouri River Basin, the results of which were printed as Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and which covers proposals for coordinating the use of resources in territory comprising one-sixth of the land area of the United States. Already Congress has authorized expenditure of $400,000,000 on this enterprise—$200,000,000 for initial work to be performed by the Bureau of Reclamation and a like sum for work by the Corps of Engineers. Altogether, the cost of work proposed by both Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri River Basin comes to about one and one-quarter billion dollars.

Within a short time, we expect to present another report based on a study of the Colorado River areas—both upper and lower basins.

Thirteen other river-basin reports will follow within the year, each calling for the construction of dams, canals, and hydroelectric power systems.

Now let us analyze briefly what this plan may mean to the Nation in post-war construction work, in related production of machinery, electrical equipment, and building materials, and the long-time effects which will flow from the continued expansion of the West.

First of all, accomplishment of a $3,000,000,000 program requires an approach which builds up volume of work as it proceeds. We could not put a full force to work at once. During the first year, our engineers figure that, if appropriations have been made by Congress, and we have a shelf of projects engineered to the point where bids can be let and dirt can fly, we would spend some $164,000,000. In the second year, this could be increased to something like $360,000,000; in the third year to $450,000,000; and in succeeding years we might spend some $500,000,000 each year until we tapered off near the conclusion of the program. This estimate is based upon 1940 prices.

We figure also that about 40 percent of this $3,000,000,000 program, or $1,200,000,000, would be spent for materials and equipment. The principal items of equipment would include $205,000,000 for electrical equipment and supplies; $145,000,000 for foundry and machine-shop products; and $74,000,000 for hydraulic and mechanical equipment. Construction machinery on a few individual projects may run as high as 30 percent of the cost, judging from past experience; but this is seldom the case. The remainder would be spent for iron and steel products, cement, lumber and timber products, gravel, and other materials.

A little arithmetic indicates that the labor cost probably will run in excess of $1,500,000,000. Our estimates figure that the work would provide jobs at peak production for more than 250,000 men working at the project sites and as many more in industrial establishments, chiefly in the East, producing machinery, equipment, and materials. This would provide work for a considerable number of demobilized servicemen and industrial war workers during the period of adjustment from war to peace, when jobs may be comparatively scarce.

Now it may surprise some of you to learn that the Bureau of Reclamation is far more than just a construction agency. It is operating a Federal investment of about $900,000,000 consisting of irrigation projects, power plants, dams which assist in flood control, and some recreational areas. It is an operating arm of the Government serving millions of acres of some of the most fertile land in the United States. It is also the largest single power-producing agency in the world, having under its jurisdiction hydroelectric plants with nearly two and one-half million kilowatt capacity. To administer these large investments and to carry on the tremendous construction program that it proposes, the bureau is divided into seven regions, each under a regional director, who is the personal administrative representative of the Commissioner of Reclamation in the unified territory under his jurisdiction.

Thus, the regional directors have a responsibility for the welfare of settlers who operate farms on the irrigation projects served by the Bureau of Reclamation, in order that, as water users, they may repay their pro rata share of the construction cost of the multiple-purpose projects built for them. It is clear that the increased purchasing power created by the construction and operation of these projects by the Bureau will be very great. Such purchasing power will provide wholesale and retail markets for manufacturers of all kinds, including construction equipment manufacturers.

Our studies show that on the completion of the irrigation developments contemplated by the program, the increased purchasing power of the West would amount to one and one-quarter billion dollars annually. Here are some of the items that make up this tremendous annual home market for the products of American industry outside of the West: Automotive supplies, $225,000,000 annually; autos and trucks $160,000,000; farm machinery, $70,000,000; tractors $40,000,000. The remainder would go for food supplies which are not produced on irrigated land, building materials, clothing, beverages, refrigerators, washing machines, and hundreds of other items which are produced in the factories of the Nation.

The initial capital investment of an irrigated farm has been estimated at $8,000. Of this, approximately 40 percent generally is invested in farm machinery, autos, trucks, and tractors. Since the irrigated land to be brought in under this program would provide for more than 200,000 newly irrigated farms, the total initial capital investment of the settlers would be more than one and one-half billion dollars.

Similarly, the concern of the Bureau of Reclamation extends beyond the basic job of constructing and operating irrigation projects, as well as related facilities such as hydroelectric power plants. In the 43 years since the Bureau of Reclamation was established its activities have created or sustained through supplemental water supplies nearly 100,000 successful irrigated farms in the West. These farms, with the cities and towns that are dependent on them, support directly a population of more than a million persons.

Through its power developments Reclamation now serves areas of a population of more than 3,500,000.

Under the post-war program which has been outlined, the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation through irrigation, power, municipal water supplies, and related activities would be extended to areas with a population of more than 12,000,000 people, not counting the increase which would result.

Right here I would like to point out that the Bureau of Reclamation is interested in your plans just as you, the Associated Equipment Distributors, are interested in what we propose. The design and production of efficient construction machinery and its sale at reasonable prices will have a considerable influence on the public works programs after the war. If we can keep our construction costs relatively low the reclamation program can be expected to absorb a considerable part of the expected employment slack by putting veterans and demobilized industrial workers on useful jobs of permanent value.

The Bureau of Reclamation operates under a law requiring that the cost of our projects allocated to irrigation, power, and municipal water supplies shall be reimbursable to the Government over a period of years chiefly through payments by farmers for irrigation water and through payments for electric current that we sell at wholesale from our dams and transmission lines. It is obvious that costs of operation in such a program are important in justifying that program before the Congress and the people. You are one of the most important factors affecting our costs. The greater ingenuity the equipment designers display, the more efficient the construction machinery becomes, the more work we can do at lower unit cost. So you see you have an actual part in determining the size of this program, the aim of which is to develop our western resources.

Now let us review in its entirety the proposal which the Bureau of Reclamation puts before you. We offer you a program for the future—a program which envisages a new approach to the problem of developing the West because it pictures coordinated use of the natural and human resources of great river basins, each basin taken as a whole.

This would be the third step in a great progression. The first step was the diversion of streams to irrigate pastures and dry benches bordering our western streams. The second was the control of great rivers through the magnificent multiple-purpose structures, such as Boulder, Grand Coulee, and Shasta Dams. The third is the application of the multiple-purpose principle to a whole watershed after first investigating and reviewing the unused or wasted resources and planning a unified program for their employment in the stabilization and development of the basin.

Through this concept, unit costs are reduced and greater engineering works than ever before are made possible. It is possible so to place and time the construction of the dams and water-control works so as to reach the most and the best of the arid lands with irrigation ditches; so as to get the maximum of hydroelectric power from the streams; so as to provide the optimum of flood protection; and so as to make all of the works serve the many useful and essential purposes for which God gave man water.

With the exception of the erection of the great $22,000,000,000 war-production plant built by this Nation to defeat the Axis, the Bureau of Reclamation's program is the greatest construction enterprise ever presented. It involves not only the construction of dams, canals, and power plants, but the construction which would result from building thousands of industrial enterprises, towns, villages, and farms that would arise in the West as an indirect result.

This program calls for the democratic cooperation of all of the people. With such cooperation, it points the way toward vigorous economic and social progress in the United States.

United States Foots Bill for Private Red-Hunt Files

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John T. Montoux from PM for February 4, 1945:

UNITED STATES FOOTS THE BILLS FOR PRIVATE RED-HUNT FILES—DIES AND MATTHEWS REPORTED PLANNING BUSINESS

(By John T. Moutoux)

WASHINGTON, February 3.—Just as the Seventy-eighth Congress was expiring, and

with it the Dies committee, Martin Dies and his staff gave themselves going-away presents in the form of seven thick volumes, six of them stuffed with hundreds of documents on alleged Communist organizations, the seventh containing over 20,000 names of alleged fellow-travelers, all carefully indexed.

The volumes were printed for use of the committee only, and the United States Government Printing Office will not sell them to others. Yet, when they were ordered, the majority of the committee, including Dies himself, were not in Washington, and the last one was ordered after Congress had adjourned and the committee no longer was in existence, except technically.

Dies himself, J. B. (Doc) Matthews, the ex-Communist who served as his research director, and several other members of the staff are reported planning to enter private industry, selling information and material on the victims of their witch hunts to reactionary employers.

VALUABLE MATERIAL

If and when they do, the seven volumes should prove invaluable. For not only are they rich in witch-hunt data; equally important, only 1,000 copies of each were ordered, just enough to supply Dies and the staff and their friends on the committee in the Red-hunt racket.

The volumes were printed at Government expense at the United States Government Printing Office. According to Frank Brodie, who supervises congressional printing, they were "confidential jobs, intended just for the committee."

The last volume, it was learned today from Russell Herrell, second in command of the Printing Office, was ordered 11 days after the Seventy-eighth Congress adjourned, December 19. It was delivered to Matthews on January 2, less than 24 hours before the Seventy-ninth Congress convened.

REPUDIATED

The voters, of course, had written the Dies committee's obituary as far back as May 12, when Dies, facing certain defeat, announced that he would not run for reelection.

The first volume was ordered October 23, the last, December 30. During this period, as PM reported on November 26, stenographers were busily at work in the committee offices, under Matthews' supervision, making copies of documents in the files, in preparation for Dies' and Matthews' projected business ventures. The files included Army and Navy intelligence reports and F. B. I. findings.

Whether the documents copied are those contained in the first six of the seven hush-hush volumes, or whether they are supplementary could not be learned authoritatively today.

The seven volumes are entitled "Appendix IX, Committee Print, Communist Front Organizations, With Special Reference to National Citizens Political Action Committee."

Actually, however, the N. C. P. A. C. is treated only incidentally. The material ranges from documents concerning the Workers Ex-Servicemen's League, which folded 10 years ago, to data concerning groups which have attacked the Dies committee. It contains the names of everyone who signed the Communist Party's election petitions in Wayne County, Mich., in 1940, and evidence of the Ohio Townsend movement's alleged Communist tie-ups in 1935.

ALL COMPLEXIONS

The more than 20,000 names of fellow-travelers in the index run from Rev. J. E. Aaeschabacher, of Hyannis, Nebr., to one John Zywoil, of Detroit. Aaeschabacher signed the call for the American People's meeting in New York, April 6, 1941; Zywoil, the Communist Party's county petition.

Some of the people cited are known Communists. The majority, however, are simply liberals, who at one time or another were connected with organizations which the witch-hunters dislike. Thus, Robert Morss Lovett, Virgin Islands Administrator; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; Sidney Hillman; Bruce Bliven, New Republic editor; Freda Kirchwey and Maxwell Stewart, editor and associate editor, respectively, of the Nation; and George S. Counts, vice chairman of the bitterly anti-communistic Liberal Party, all make the grade.

In addition, the index lists more than 1,500 so-called Communist-front organizations, ranging from the A. F. L. Rank and File Committee to Viveny, a slovak organization. Viveny was represented at the American Slav Congress in Detroit on December 7, 1941.

Several of the members of the late Dies committee's staff have been marking time, it was learned today, on their plans to enter private witch-hunt practice. They hoped to get jobs with the new Hart committee, established at the instigation of Representative JOHN E. RANKIN (Democrat, Mississippi), who intends to pick up where Dies left off. These hopes were dashed, however, when the Dies staff learned that Representative EDWARD HART (Democrat, New Jersey) will not rehire any of them.

So they are reported looking for clients, with the seven thick volumes of documents and names as their stock in trade.

This, of course, is exactly what Representative HERMAN EBERHARTER (Democrat, Pennsylvania) sought to avoid when he wrote Martin Dies last October:

"I sincerely trust that extreme care will be exercised so that no individual member of the Dies committee, or an employee of it, will find it possible to get possession of any of the material for his individual use at any time in the future. You know, and I know, to what use and abuse it could be put."

Representative EBERHARTER can stop trusting.

War Mothers' Part in a Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address delivered by Hon. Ed Rowe entitled "War Mothers' Part in a Permanent Peace":

The President of the United States recently said, "We must not let our differences divide us and blind us to our more important common and continuing interests in winning the war and building the peace." No thought more completely occupies the minds of our people, and I believe most of the peoples of the earth, than that expressed by our President.

It is important that each of us make our decision to cooperate in the fullest unstinted manner toward that objective. I believe that we can see the pale light beyond the termination of armed hostilities at this time. This will not come to pass, however, without further sacrifice of life and property. The measure of that loss will be determined solely on how well each and all of us meets this challenge of our President, to avoid all differences and give our utmost in cooperation.

Building the peace calls for an equal responsibility in cooperation and a marked degree of sacrifice. In our effort toward building the peace, the leading citizens and statesmen of our land are attempting to meet this problem by designing the nature of sacrifice we will make in exchange for the security of the peace. Public opinion is going to be a strong factor to lend courage and fortitude to our President and the Senate of the United States in building the peace.

What is the war mothers' part in a permanent peace? When I speak of war mothers, I intend that as a literal term. It should mean every mother of sons in this war, of past wars, and in wars that may again blight humanity in the years to come. I further intend it to mean the mothers of men over the entire face of this burning, uprooted earth.

The time has arrived for her, wherever she may be, to add her rich influence to the efforts of men so that human understanding shall overcome every cause for future costly wars.

It is within the elementary principles of motherhood where the earthly fundamentals of pure justice are born. She comes nearer to celestial wisdom in this phase of her life than all mortals. Here is where equality rises above the richness of life's deepest love. Self-denial in the interest of understanding and unity is native to her. In the highest moments of her sacrificial life, the one virtue she will not abandon is her true sense of justice or what she understands to be the right way. If there is to be a permanent peace, it can only come through the practice of such principles.

Senator VANDENBERG recently said in a speech in the Senate: "There are critical moments in the life of every nation which calls for the straightest, the plainest, the most courageous thinking of which we are capable. We confront such a moment now. It is desperately important to America. It is important to future generations if they shall live in peace."

On the 10th of May 1944, I said in Congress: "I am receiving an enormous amount of mail petitioning me to lend my efforts and influence to a movement that will bring about an everlasting peace."

I said further at that time: "We are not doing all that we can if we merely profess our desire for peace. I can almost hear and feel the vibrant fervor of earnest prayers from millions of mothers who are truly in the depths of suffering. Could there be a more sincere profession in the cause of peace than the plaintive petition of these mothers when the idols of their maternal beings are beyond any help that may come from their willingness to sacrifice. Their sons are in the lap of the God of War. It will take more than mere avowal to bring peace. We must learn that fear of war is not a true longing for peace. Peace can only grow, thrive, and live in the rich soil of justice."

An outstanding authority reports the efforts of the human family in its attempts for permanent peace has resulted in more than 8,000 peace treaties since 1500 B. C. All of these treaties were written with the avowed purpose of permanency. The facts show, however, the average life of these treaties to be only 2 years.

Shall we conclude from this poignant fact that permanent peace is impossible? I would rather believe that the failure of these past efforts can be placed directly on the ulterior motives of selfish men than accept the oft-repeated theory "there will always be wars." An examination of the agreements will disclose the avarice of the conquerors and the hostile submission of the vanquished. The absence of pure justice in such agreements was the spark for new wars at a later time.

The first task confronting the War Mothers in the peace arrangements to come is to use their concerted effort in insisting on pure justice instead of power politics. That raises the question, What is meant by pure justice? Pure justice has certain prime requisites. First, it must recognize the right of men in their quest to be governed by their own consent. This principle is enunciated in article 3 of the Atlantic Charter. This is, in my opinion, a most important element because

if an international organization accepts this principle, it places bounds upon the participating members or nations in its relations with other nations, yet this same nation is unbounded in its authority within the sphere of its own sovereign state.

Injustice can never suffer the light of truth. War mothers must further insist that a free press shall be recognized in all nations who wish to be participating members in an international organization for prevention of wars. The law must preserve liberty to the press throughout the world so that the press can preserve liberty to the people throughout the world. Let every son's mother insist on the truth and its telling then the dark breeding places of war will be filled with light.

Mothers must come to realize that while we are citizens of the United States, and selfishly so on matters that only concern us, that we are also members of the human family. It seems this family has done its best to destroy itself from time to time in these terrible wars, or at least go bounding back over the mounds of civilization to the most savage practices of all history.

These events come into being simply because the human family has not as yet established institutions for its government such as has been done by the different nations that make up the family. In the past and of the present the nation-state is the basic unit of the world community. It has not always been so, and it is probable that it may at sometime in the future, not be again. We are moving swiftly in these days. Our ancestors spent their whole life within a day's travel of the place where they were born. Communication was limited to the gossip of the little town store. Today we listen to the voice of our boys at the front and sometimes hear the crack of their rifles. In hours we move from one continent to another and overnight we visit another hemisphere. The speed of our means of travel is amazing.

The next responsibility of you war mothers is to unite in your effort to bring about a government for the human family to function under lawful procedure on matters concerning the whole family. Every nation should be bound by laws and should be entitled to its day in court to seek justice among the nations of the world when it is aggrieved. We must realize that law and order does two things for us. It forces us to recognize our responsibility and restrictions as moral agents in a world society and it affords us rights and privileges that otherwise could not be guaranteed.

I said in the Congress last May: "I believe that the time has come for the United States of America to take her place as a leader in world affairs." We cannot longer delay the organization of the human family to establish justice among the nations of the world. Another world war with its possibilities and civilization will be thrown backward to all the primitive evils of recorded and unknown history.

Need I call your attention to the technological progress of warfare? Contemplate if you will what a sneak or surprise attack could do to the largest of our world's cities. If technological progress of warfare continues for another quarter of a century, we of this generation can not comprehend the sudden death and devastation it may bring to humanity. There are strong possibilities that it will. President Compton of the great technical college, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, now tells that war operations are running three times the rate of the institute's normal peacetime budget and is continuing to increase. That training courses have increased over 50 percent in the past year because of special war training courses. The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, under Dr. Leonard Carmichael, of Tufts College, had by January of 1942, card cataloged 200,000 scientists of whom 31,000 were Ph. D.'s. There are present weapons not in use, only because of their unthinkable power to maim and destroy life and destroy property. Our largest cities in future wars could be wiped out overnight and no nation is immune from this destruction. The full truth of the Biblical prophecy, "He that lives by the sword, will die by the sword," is most emphasized in modern warfare. War mothers must take their part in seeing that law and order under an international organization, shall prevent future wars.

To abstractly fix our purpose on the prevention of wars alone is not enough. War is a product. It is the outgrowth of other elements that must be reckoned with if war is to be controlled.

In an article by the late Raymond Pearl, professor of biology of John Hopkins Institute, in the American Journal of Sociology, January 1941, he had the following to say:

"The major result of man's evolution since he first became established as a distinct species has been the unremitting, and in the last few centuries tremendously accelerating, control of natural forces and resources to his own purposes. The result is that today a species of mammals that is morally and spiritually at a low and primitive stage of evolution, finds itself in possession of colossal material powers and resources—such powers and resources as no other species ever had, either absolutely or relatively, nor for the most part did man himself possess until within the lifetime of persons now living. Furthermore the sociality of this mammalian species is so primitive, so ill-kept, so badly organized, and so lowly evolved generally that these enormous material powers can, and regularly do, fall completely under the control of single individuals, or small groups of individuals, who are selfish, greedy, vicious, dishonest, and hypocritical; whose souls know neither human decency, sympathetic and loving kindness for their fellowmen, nor social morality. Any sort of world-wide harmonious and sympathetic cooperation by which men may live decently together simply does not exist. The complexity of the world of today in respect of its sheerly aspects imperatively demands such cooperation if it is to continue to be a possible abode for human beings. Yet every single one of the protagonists of new social patterns, from Washington to Moscow and including assorted colleagues along the way, struggles to make his ideas prevail by the application of techniques of chicanery, demagogery, purges, and military force. * * * The standard pattern of national behavior, to which there are no exceptions, is to combat evil with evil. * * * But real and enduring peace will never be achieved by such techniques. * * * There must first evolve among men more decency and dignity, more tolerance and sympathy, more kindness and forbearance, and more capacity of cooperation for the common good in the conduct of human life."

As I have said, the small community a century ago was self-sufficient unto itself; today there is simultaneous cognizance of progressive social desires the world over and distance has been abolished. It is my profound conviction that there was never a greater demand for clearer vision and mental effort to adjust the human family's attitude to the new social forces and conditions of peaceful living.

My suggestions to war mothers can be encompassed by certain musts, if we are to find a way to build the peace.

First. The charter for an international organization must incorporate the fundamental principle of self-government for the nations of the world.

Second. There must be an international organization to prevent aggression, enforce the abstinence of the use of military force by any nation on earth, member or nonmember.

Third. Set up a tribunal to settle disputes between nations on the basis of justice.

Fourth. Cooperate fully with other nations on economic, social, and war prevention measures.

Fifth. Make membership to world organization available to all nations who will conform to the charter of purposes.

Sixth. Institute probation before granting voice in organization to any nation whose record for war making and aggression are unquestioned.

Seventh. Set up within the organization, such bodies as are necessary to study means for the improvement, suggest programs, extend credits and help all nations to bring about advancement in their social and economic life.

All of these things and more were considered at the Dumbarton Oaks meeting. Ninety percent of the program was agreed to. The sun of hope is high in the heavens. Public opinion will bring this hope into full fruition. In this you war mothers can be of help. Less than all you can do may mean its failure. All that you can do can mean its success. This is the war mothers part in a permanent peace. God grant that we may find the way.

Editorials From the Advertiser Review of Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials by J. L. Liggett, publisher and manager of the Advertiser Review of Los Angeles, Calif.:

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN SAID IT

On January 17 this Nation celebrated the birthday of the famed Benjamin Franklin. We use his own words, which were always so forceful, in reminding our readers of what he had to say about winning this war.

"When the Government finds it necessary for the common benefit, advantage, and safety of the Nation, for the security of our liberties, property, religion, and everything that is dear to us, that certain sums shall be yearly raised by taxes, duties, etc. (today the etc. are War bonds) * * * and paid into the Public Treasury, thence to be dispensed by government for those purposes; ought not every honest man freely and willingly to pay his just proportion of this necessary expense? Can he possibly preserve a right to that character, if, by any fraud, strategem, or contrivance, he avoids that payment in whole or in part?"

ALL OFFICIAL CIRCLES SWEPT BY MANIA TO GIVE AWAY INDIVIDUAL WEALTH AND MANPOWER

Throughout the whole ranks of all governmental agencies there appears to be a mania for giving away John Q. Citizen's money, time, and manpower.

Starting with the Dumbarton Oaks International Conference and down through our Federal State Department, State government, and city government we find this urge for generous dispensation of our public resources and individual time, energy, and money is being advocated by our elected or appointed officials.

We know Uncle Sam is the unanimous choice of all other nations to fill the post of "grand exalted fall guy" in the post-war economic reorganization and within reasonable limits we are resigned to acceptance of that position of doubtful honor, high expense, and certain ingratitude.

FEDERAL STATE DEPARTMENT WANTS TO GIVE AWAY COLORADO RIVER WATER

Our State Department is insisting that we shall give to Mexico an extra 750,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River just to show that we are a good neighbor. Among individuals no such custom has ever prevailed, nor can we find where the principle is taught in any historical document or scriptural command, unless it is implied as a part of the nebulous Atlantic Charter's "freedom from fear" assured to other peoples. But what about freedom from fear for future United States of America citizens who would like to make homes on desert lands that could be fertilized by that 750,000 acre-feet of water—and eventually provide markets for our future west coast industry employers of manpower?

CITY SALES TAX

Mayor Bowron climbs on the band wagon with the (more or less) clarion call for a city sales tax, for which all merchants and merchandise dispensers would naturally be called on to provide free collection service and reports, as we do with most all other taxes.

NATION IS SCRAPING MANPOWER BARREL

Right now our Nation is scraping the bottom of its barrel of manpower in the effort to successfully maintain the wide-sweeping naval and military campaigns now under way or immediately planned. Our Army and Navy are doing a magnificent job, but the chances are that they will have to enlarge their forces to win early success. Under such conditions it doesn't make sense to propose an increase of the number of men on the pay rolls of governmental civilian agencies; it would be more logical to look to them as a scurce for enlistment of additional servicemen.

Right now we've got a war to win—social reform and further social gains had better wait until that war is won.

Arms for Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Lindley from today's Washington Post:

ARMS FOR RUSSIA—TAKING OUR SHARE OF THE CREDIT

(By Ernest Lindley)

The official reports and statements on lend-lease have been prepared with scrupulous regard for the sensibilities of our allies. Almost invariably they have stressed that our aid, great as it may seem in total figures, was small in comparison with the total war production of Britain or the Soviet Union. The lend-lease authorities in Washington took the lead in publicizing the reverse lend-lease provided by the British, the Australians, and the New Zealanders.

This air of modesty about our own contribution through lend-lease, coupled with generous appreciation of the efforts and accomplishments of our allies has been very fine. It has helped to break down the notion that we are a nation of boasters, and it has helped to keep the American people reminded of the truly prodigious efforts which the Russians and the British and some of our other allies have made. Doubtless it has encouraged the spokesmen for some of our allies to speak generously to their own people about the extent of the American contribution. One recalls, for example, passages in several of Churchill's speeches.

But at times it has seemed as if our own spokesmen were leaning backward too far, especially when some of our allies have seemed reluctant to acknowledge, or to advertise to their own people, the true scope and importance of American lend-lease aid.

The statement on lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union released last Saturday therefore is of particular interest. Like its predecessors, it has a modest air, and gives full credit to an ally. The second sentence in the first paragraph reads: "Soviet officials have expressed to us their appreciation of the part these are playing in the success of the campaign." (It does not point out that the Soviet Government has not given its own people an intensive education in this matter.) The first sentence in the next paragraph says: "Our share in the equipping of the Soviet troops is small compared with their total needs."

But having registered prominently these acknowledgments, F. E. A. Administrator Crowley put down in black and white some pertinent and highly impressive facts. Up to December 1, 1944, we had supplied to the Russians under lend-lease a total of 331,000 motor vehicles. More than half of the Soviet armies' supplies on some fronts move on American trucks. In addition we have supplied 29,000 motorcycles.

The United States through lend-lease also has given large, and indispensable, aid to the maintenance and reconstruction of the Russian railroads: hundreds of thousands of tons of rails, wheels, and axles, more than 1,000 locomotives, and more than 8,000 cars. We have supplied large quantities of tools and raw materials for Soviet war plants. We helped to overcome the electric power shortage by portable power plants—60 power trains with generating capacities of from 1,000 to 5,000 kilowatts each, which can be moved from city to city and industry to industry.

We have sent to the Russians 12,000 planes, 6,000 tanks, 1,800 self-propelled guns, 3,300 armored scout cars and numerous other completely manufactured items of military equipment.

The Red Army not only travels in large part on American wheels. Part of it travels on American-made army boots. We have sent 11 million pairs of Army boots, and more than 200 million yards of cloth of various kind.

All of these supplies and equipment not only had to be obtained and manufactured. They had to be delivered to the Soviet Union. This meant building and manning cargo ships, building and manning the Navy and Air Forces to protect them, the construction of the great supply route up through Persia, and the development of the air transport route and of the supporting Alcan Highway across northwest Canada and Alaska. It meant a great effort and it cost many lives. A true account of our lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union would include all of these contributions.

But even this partial, inadequate account setting forth the total deliveries of a few of the more important types of equipment and supplies is enough to show that the great forward thrusts of the Red Armies are in no small part an American achievement also. This is something which the Russian people should realize and the Soviet Government should realize, that the American people know and do not undervalue.

American Shipping in the Post-war Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Frank J. Taylor, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., on the subject American Shipping in the Post-war World.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN SHIPPING IN THE POST-WAR WORLD

(By Frank J. Taylor, president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc.)

When America entered this war our merchant marine fleet totaled only 10,500,000 deadweight tons. By the end of 1944 we may have as much as 50,000,000 tons. Those two simple figures reveal the scope of the greatest shipbuilding and ship management and operation story in the history of the world.

If a rough transition is made, the United States may have five ships on the high seas where once we had only one. We will have a merchant fleet equal to or greater than the combined fleets of all other maritime nations.

No one would care to deny that this Nation has assumed a tremendous obligation to American taxpayers and to the world. Those vessels are tremendously vital, not only for the sake of our own economy; they are vital to all nations. They will help set aright the things so torn asunder by the misfortunes of war. They will serve as vehicles to carry the materials to be required desperately in all corners of the globe.

The immediate problem of foresighted and thinking men is, What will this country do with such a tremendous fleet? How will it be employed in the wisest manner?

One cannot offer an unimpeachable plan. I feel that it obliges everyone, directly or indirectly in shipping, to give mature thought to the subject. And in that category, I include Members of Congress, farmers, industrial management, labor, and, of course, steamship owners and management.

AMERICA IS A MARITIME NATION

It cannot be impressed too strongly that this is a maritime nation, and always has been. This is a country with 7,000 miles of coastline. It has at least 60 good-sized cities along those coasts. Its very economy has long been based upon trade—not trade just in the sense of exchanging goods—but in the broader sense that so many of our world relationships have long depended upon ships—American ships.

Thus, I say with some pride that this Nation's shipping is perhaps its most vital industry. It affects everyone in the United States, either directly or indirectly. It is in effect the morning coffee that you have on your table. It is most of the sugar that you consume. It is the wheat and the beef that we ship to other countries. It is the export of refrigerators, automobiles, cotton, and steel.

In addition to transporting these materials, the American merchant marine in its very operation is a great consumer of materials

and services produced in this country. Our vessels use fuel, food, and equipment of all sorts in tremendous quantities and require many different types of services for that continued operation and upkeep.

Those are some of the reasons why so many of us are deeply concerned about the employment of our vast fleet once the war has ended. They are the reasons why we are examining every post-war plan projected by other groups and other industries and from them we have learned much. We trust they will continue to help us with their studies.

In the meantime, the American Merchant Marine Institute has projected post-war recommendations of its own. It is not pretended that they are absolute in their conclusions. We only hope that they are sound in their overall structure while at the same time recognizing that many unpredictable factors must be considered.

It is evident that we don't know how long the war will last, nor do we know the terms of peace.

We have no idea how many merchant vessels of any nation will survive the conflict. We assume victory and that this Nation will have a merchant fleet which will surpass in tonnage all others in the world.

In reconstructing a war-torn world it is evident to everyone that it virtually means rebuilding a continental Europe, Russia, China and probably Japan. Those jobs will take ships—every available ship. The resumption of normal trade will occupy a good portion of our ships. No one knows how many ships will be needed for new trades that will develop as a result of the war.

OUR ALLIES AND FOREIGN TRADE

We do not propose to overwhelm any other maritime nation in course of such duties and such trade. We believe that there should be collaboration with our allies. The Institute clearly recognized in its program the claims of other maritime nations to which we are allied. We have no desire to dominate world trade but will insist that American ships carry a substantially increased share of American trade and be permitted a reasonable and justifiable entry into world shipping.

All the nations of the world are inescapably interdependent. The domestic economy and prosperity of the United States require substantial foreign trade, both for raw materials and as an outlet for our agricultural and industrial products. Foreign trade is a balance wheel against recurring periods of domestic depression. We must have a merchant fleet sufficient to serve our international requirements.

HOW AXIS USED THEIR MERCHANT FLEETS

We believe that there should be some checks made upon those vicious powers which provoked this war. We believe that the Axis Powers should not again be allowed to use their merchant fleets as spearheads of penetration into nations so that they could accumulate the means to provoke and carry on wars.

Of the Axis Powers—I should like to tell you how they accumulated much of the wealth and power sufficient to wage wars. They insisted on carrying the bulk of their foreign commerce. Japanese ships carried almost 70 percent of Japan's commerce. Germany, 58 percent; and Italy, 46 percent. The Axis Nations moreover made it virtually impossible for any other country to participate in the transportation of this trade.

Under totalitarian systems, German, Japanese, and Italian steamship lines were merged so that they could exercise the greatest competitive pressure on other maritime nations. They built vessels solely designed to seize a share of our water-borne commerce. How well they succeeded can be seen in the figures for 1938 when the Axis merchant marine had close to a 12-percent grip on United States foreign commerce while American ships, flying the flag of the country that produced this volume of business, carried only 25 percent.

I note that Germany carried 4,333,000 tons, or 4.9 percent, of America's foreign commerce in that single year. Japan did just about as well with 4,245,000 tons, or 4.8 percent. And Italy, which hasn't been considered a maritime power for many generations, took 1.9 percent, or 1,600,000 tons, of cargo which might have been carried by American-flag vessels. At the same time American-flag ships were carrying only 22,436,000 tons of our own water-borne foreign commerce. The total water-borne foreign commerce of the United States was 88,430,000 tons. The figures may not seem impressive, but they are virtually the difference between the survival and the eclipse of an American merchant marine.

Or I might say they are more than that. They are the difference between the survival of militaristic nations and the survival of a peaceful people.

CONTROL OF AXIS SHIPPING

We do not plan to quarantine those powers, for it is pure reason that they must survive as people. They must be permitted the eternal and civilized right of livelihood. They must be allowed to engage in trade, but at the same time they must remain within their own spheres and they should not be permitted to expand merely for the sake of imperialism, aggression, or whatever you may choose to call it.

The over-all plan is that their merchant fleets should be disarmed along with their armed forces. No longer should there be the spectacle of 18-knot ships loaded with scrap iron for shells. It is obvious that the Japanese merchant ships were designed with war motives well in mind and were placed in trades that did not warrant vessels of high speeds and expensive construction. Their merchant fleets should be placed under international guardianship to determine that they engage only in normal trade—a trade without purposes alien to our conception of peace or in violation of it.

OPPORTUNITY FOR AMERICAN SHIPPING

At this moment I should like to take into consideration the position that our merchant fleet must play in the post-war world. The problem which faces us is tremendous and no one realizes it better than those immediately engaged in ship management and operation.

In the year 1938, which we already have taken as a standard (because at that time no nation except China and Spain was directly affected by war), we were then carrying only 25 percent of our foreign commerce in a merchant fleet which totaled 12,000,000 deadweight tons. We were dealing with countries considered economically stable, no matter their political philosophies. We were enjoying the greatest freedom of the seas in the history of this world.

Now, we have reached a point when this country has the greatest opportunity for maritime development in its history. I sincerely hope that we do not lose that glorious opportunity to serve not only this country, but all countries, as we have done on many other occasions.

I mention this particularly because we have a profound duty to perform. We must not only distribute those goods of the peacetime world, but also those that are needed because of the emergency which has arisen. We must get the goods to the countries that need them most and to the points of consumption—with the greatest speed and effectiveness.

SHIPS AND WORLD REHABILITATION

The rehabilitation of the war-torn world should occupy our present merchant fleet, not only during the immediate emergency following the peace, but for many years thereafter.

We will send materials to almost every country, feed their people, clothe them, and reestablish them as nationals within their own countries. We will have to ship them steel, cotton, beef, machinery, and seeds to replant their fields.

The requests that these countries will make on the United States for food and other agricultural products will be staggering, and the problems of relief will exceed that of even the last war when 30,000,000 tons of goods were sent abroad. In this country, as elsewhere, industry will need to be furnished with raw materials to get peace time employment started again. The war will exhaust the stock piles of goods and materials that each country had in peacetime.

EXPANSION OF UNITED STATES INDUSTRY AND NATIONAL ECONOMY

To meet all these requirements there must of necessity be an expansion of our agricultural, manufacturing, and mining industries in the post-war period. Supported by these enlarged activities of our basic industries, our national economy in the post-war period will surpass anything we ever knew in peacetime. It will be, as it must be, at a level to meet our war indebtedness and other obligations. More important, it will furnish employment to men and women who have been engaged in activities related solely to war.

There will be a tremendous demand for automobiles, refrigerators, radios, agricultural machinery, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, and other products which have been cut off by war.

It should be evident that the production and distribution of these goods and others will require the services of our merchant marine. There must be ships to export these commodities to other countries—which will need them as much as ourselves.

MERCHANT MARINE TO SERVE COMMERCE AND DEFENSE

It is certain that our increased national economy which follows the war will benefit not only our transoceanic shipping, but also our coastwise and intercoastal trade because there will be many types of commodities to be moved along our coast lines.

The American agriculture, American manufacturing, and American industry in general, have been very helpful to the merchant marine of this country through the generations. We think this is an opportunity to reciprocate. We will have the ships for everything that the American farmer, manufacturer, and producer wants delivered. Behind the ships and at the service of America's industries will be skilled and experienced management—American-flag steamship companies which are demonstrating in this war their ability to handle a large merchant fleet under the most difficult operating conditions.

Just as vital to the country and to the whole world is our merchant marine as a factor in our national defense. This war has proven that the effectiveness of our Army and Navy is directly controlled by the size and efficiency of our merchant marine. No one connected with shipping has to be told that this is a global war, a war of distances, or a war of logistics. This war should certainly teach this country for all time that we must have a merchant marine commensurate with the size of our Army and Navy. America's foreign policy for the post-war period as expressed recently by the House of Representatives indicates that this country is going to take no small part in the continuous maintenance of peace. Our Navy has been trebled and will require auxiliaries in order to be efficient.

THE INSTITUTE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POST-WAR

The recommendations of the American Merchant Marine Institute assert that it is the inescapable necessity for the United States to assume a major role in post-war

affairs in order to promote peace and stabilize international conditions. They pointed out that:

We need an adequate American merchant marine for our national defense and economic security.

When war broke upon this country, we had very few auxiliaries and were forced to engage upon an emergency shipbuilding program—and our own commerce suffered severely because we lacked the ships to keep it alive.

The members of the institute recommend that post-war shipping plans should involve a strong American merchant marine under private ownership and that vessels now held by the Government for title or for use should be returned to private ownership as quickly as possible after the war. They believe that such a plan would tend to encourage the ownership, management, and operation of American-flag vessels.

There is also the general opinion within the steamship industry that the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 have been of invaluable assistance in continuing this country as a maritime nation. Hailed as the "Magna Carta" of American shipping, the act deems it necessary for the national defense and commerce of this country that we have a merchant marine privately owned and operated to carry a substantial portion of our foreign trade. It is believed that the war might have jeopardized the gains made under the act through the interruption of many trade routes and that one of the first steps in the shipping post-war program should be a progressive restoration of these routes as soon as possible.

It has been observed that less than one-third of pre-war commerce was carried by American lines engaged in foreign trade. There have been many people who set up a portion of the amount that our own vast fleet should carry. We definitely expect to carry an equitable proportion.

NEW ROUTES AND NEW SERVICES

The developments of war have obliged American steamship management, working under the direction of the War Shipping Administration, to udertake new routes and new services. It is a general opinion that such routes and such services that are of value to United States commerce should be continued in peacetime.

Although we are assured of a tremendous fleet for use in our domestic-trade routes when the war has ended, the post-war planning committee of the institute points out that the vessels in these trades not only must be replaced by modern ships, but that they should also be augmented with additional tonnage.

There is a decided opinion that American shipping should engage in indirect routes which for many generations has not been a strong point in our shipping program. It means in effect, that we have customarily sent our vessels only between domestic and foreign ports. For a long time we have taken no part in shipping between foreign ports without the necessity for returning to our home ports. In the same line of thinking, the committee has also encouraged the use of tramp shipping.

Perhaps one of the most striking of the proposals made in reference to our post-war merchant marine is the establishment of a reserve defense pool of at least 5,000,000 tons of shipping. Such a policy would alleviate the heavy and expensive shipbuilding program upon which we were forced to engage immediately upon entering the war to provide auxiliaries to our fleet.

Our merchant marine is not just a matter of ships—it is a human organization of men now engaged in the winning of the war. For many it may be a new occupation but they will want to stay at sea. The labor situation naturally is going to be serious if we at any time contemplate reduction of our merchant-marine fleet. We have spent a lot of time and money training a competent and able body of men to be officers and personnel for our ships. We do not plan to lose their experience and we think we have a great opportunity to employ those men in the post-war years for the benefit of our commerce.

FALSE NOTIONS ABOUT AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

We must be well on guard to disabuse any people who would spread the false notion that America is not a maritime country and that it is foolish to support and maintain an American merchant marine. We note that every time an effort is made to expand our merchant marine, this type of propaganda is projected. There are those who think that it is best for this Nation to let other countries attend to the carriage of our foreign trade.

These sophists would have us believe that a large American merchant marine would harm our foreign trade. They have long exaggerated the claim that the revenue derived from shipping enables foreign countries to buy American goods. Actually, freight revenue is but a small percentage of the value of the cargo involved and contributes relatively little toward purchases in this country. In normal times such great maritime countries as Norway and Sweden sold more goods to the United States than they bought here, thus clearly indicating that shipping revenue was not solely necessary to buy American goods.

Those who hail our liberal trade policy, our reciprocal trade agreements, and other steps toward a freer flow of trade, seem unwilling that such equality should apply to our merchant marine. That is, except in time of war when they think it is perfectly all right for us to have a merchant marine, built quickly and consequently at great expense to the American taxpayer. But in peacetime these people feel there is little place for the American flag on the seven seas.

THE PRICE OF SHORTSIGHTEDNESS

Such shortsightedness means that in event of an emergency that affects world shipping, our trade, dependent upon the transportation services of other nations suffers heavily; in the event we go to war, it means that we must again engage in a building program to make up for lost time.

This country was fortunate enough at the outbreak of both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 to have the time to build up merchant fleets to serve as auxiliaries to our armed forces and to keep other countries allied with us supplied with food, clothing, and materials of war. We cannot presume at any time that such favorable circumstances will attain again. We cannot trust to luck and rest on any assurance that we will always be able to fight off lightning blows and sneak attacks. The means and modes of modern warfare may develop to the point where an enemy could achieve victory so speedily—that the miracle of our wartime shipyards cannot be repeated. Preparedness remains our only assurance of peace.

SHIPS AND WAR SUPPLIES

Tanks, bombers, jeeps, trucks, cannons, and the other implements of war can be scrapped, stored, or otherwise disposed of. But our merchant ships, while being weapons of war, are also instruments of peace. In the ultimate disposition of our merchant fleet, we must make use of it to the best advantage of our country. Our merchant marine belongs to the Nation and we therefore must have the sanction and support of the American people to keep it maintained. We are confident that Americans, aware of the merchant marine's contribution in this war, will give it every encouragement in the days of peace to take our rightful place as a greater maritime nation.

The Turbulent Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the great rivers of the world is running amuck. With increasing frequency and with accelerated power and appalling devastation, the Missouri River has for the last 5 or 6 years poured raging floods from its watersheds to its confluence with the Mississippi, sweeping farms, villages, crops, livestock, highways, railroads, power lines, and human lives into vast and torrential seas of debris and destruction.

So vast and uncontrollable have these recurring avalanches down the great valley of the Missouri become that it is now apparent that it is a national problem and only the Federal Government has the authority and resources to cope with it. Numerous surveys have been made with a view to determining the method best adapted to the control and utilization of the waters of this unruly river and acres of newspaper space have been consumed in their exposition and discussion. None of them is entitled to more careful study than the considered statement just issued by the Missouri Farmers' Association, the membership of which includes thousands of farmers in the counties adjoining the Missouri River whose losses from flood damage over the last few years aggregate millions of dollars.

Following an extended and exhaustive investigation of the situation by its engineers, economists, and legislative committees, the Missouri Farmers' Association has just released the appended statement:

A STATEMENT ON FLOOD CONTROL BY F. V. HEINKEL, PRESIDENT, MISSOURI FARMERS' ASSOCIATION

The State legislative committee of the Missouri Farmers' Association has recommended that its 86,000 members in Missouri support a Missouri Valley Authority. This decision was made by the committee after several months' study of the flood-control problem.

In arriving at its conclusion that the interests of Missouri farmers would best be served by an M. V. A., the committee took into account these two points: One, that the present flood control law, signed recently by the President, does not meet the needs of the Missouri Valley; and, two, that a Missouri Valley Authority, patterned after the tried and proven Tennessee Valley Authority, would give the people in the valley a comprehensive, over-all plan which will not only control floods but conserve our natural resources and properly utilize the surplus waters at the same time, which will benefit all of the people in the region.

The newly enacted flood-control law is inadequate because it favors chiefly only two groups of people, those interested in irrigation upstream and those interested in low cost river transportation downstream. It is a patchwork compromise between the Reclamation Bureau which is to deal with irrigation upstream and the Army engineers who will construct the numerous high dams and

huge levees lower downstream. What little soil conservation that will be done under the law—and soil erosion over the years costs four times more than floods and is caused by the same thing, namely: Uncontrolled run-off—is a seeming afterthought and will be done by the Department of Agriculture, which means the Soil Conservation Service.

Under the new law just enacted three different governmental agencies will be attacking the big problem in a piecemeal fashion, with one scarcely knowing, or caring, what the other is doing. How can good results be expected from such a hodgepodge of authorities?

I strongly suspect that the new law pleases the big power interests, since only 1 of the 26 big dams that would be constructed in Missouri, and which will ruin numerous towns as well as a half-dozen counties, provides for electric power, although this is hard to understand since power profits have soared in the Tennessee Valley since T. V. A. reduced the wholesale rates. The one exception is at Osceola, in St. Clair County, where a local power plant site will be inundated and is to be replaced with a new one. The irrigation people upstream were made happy, and so were those interested in low-cost river transportation.

In order that too much water is not used upstream for irrigation and the Missouri River thereby reduced to a trickle below Kansas City during dry seasons so that barges could not operate, the new law provides that numerous high dams in Missouri and Kansas will impound the surplsu water after they have run off our hills and slopes carrying with them heavy loads of life-giving top soil, to be released gradually during the dry seasons so as to maintain a 9-foot channel for barges from Sioux City to St. Louis. Enormous levees, set back a half mile from the river banks, are to keep the river between two walls.

These big dams will, within a few years, prove to be a waste of taxpayers' money because of silting. Without extensive soil conservation measures in the watershed the artificial lakes will fill up with silt rapidly. Army engineers admitted at a hearing before the congressional Rivers and Harbors Committee in Washington not long ago that the artificial lakes created by the dams would be completely silted up within 50 years after their construction, and after that "it is somebody else's worry." If they will be fully silted up in 50 years and be made useless, they will be half gone in 25 years, which means they will be half as effective. After that will other Army engineers build more dams elsewhere on our rivers with taxpayers' money?

And this is leaving out of account the 900,000 acres of Missouri's most fertile farm land that it is estimated will be permanently flooded by the dams, and its 20,000 citizens who will be uprooted from their homes, and the towns and counties, business enterprises and property that will be ruined. The lakes made by the dams will be of enormous size when full of water and a sea of mud after the waters are released during the dry seasons. The largest one of the dams, located at Osceola, will impound water covering 260,000 acres during the winter and spring seasons, and after the water is released, say, in July and August when the dry season occurs, the lake will be about 60,000 acres in size. This same thing will be true in corresponding degrees of all the 26 lakes planned for the State of Missouri.

I have no doubt that for several years after these dams and the huge levees are completed floods will be controlled downstream, but only for a few years and at a tremendous cost. Farmers living in the river bottoms will lose all of their land between the levees and the river banks, a distance of a half mile on each side of the river from Sioux City to its confluence with the Mississippi. And then in a few years, when their children take over the operation of their farms they'll find the floods recurring, because the big lakes will be filled up with the topsoil from our upland farms. The river itself will finally silt up until it will eventually be flowing between two walls like the Yellow River in China.

The legislative committee of the Missouri Farmers' Association, after careful study, has arrived at these conclusions about floods:

First. That the Missouri River, like other natural things, knows no boundary lines, and that flood control is, therefore, a responsibility of the Federal Government.

Second. That floods are caused by the uncontrolled run-off of water. That the place to start dealing with floods is on the uplands where the run-off occurs—to deal with floods by mechanical means alone after the water has swept down into the valleys is to deal with effects rather than the cause of floods.

Third. That we should not merely seek to prevent floods, but to make all possible use of our water resource from the time it falls on our uplands to the time it merges with the Mississippi. We should seek to deal with the problem in a comprehensive, regional way, as an investment which will yield rich returns, rather than merely as a necessary expense.

I believe that a Missouri Valley Authority, patterned after T. V. A. with proper adjustments made to conform to the needs of the Missouri Valley, can make available to the people all of the possible benefits. We can have flood control, which is our foremost objective. There can be water for irrigation in the dry States. We can have extensive conservation of our soil, of wildlife, and other natural resources. Any high dams that may be necessary can and should generate cheap electric power. And there should be ample water left for river navigation.

Under proper management—and do we not always have to take chances on good management whether in private or public undertakings?—an M. V. A. can produce an environment here in the Missouri River Valley where cheap electricity and low-cost transportation will promote the development of a great industrial empire. Our farm lands will be conserved and improved through adequate soil-conservation measures, which spells a more prosperous State and Nation. Water for irrigation in the dry sections will take the gamble out of farming for thousands of good people. As new industries are developed in the region, more jobs will mean better markets for the products of midwest agriculture.

Such a plan as M. V. A. is an ambitious one, but the situation calls for it. And yet it is not a visionary plan, because it has been tried and proven in the Tennessee Valley.

America's Merchant Marine in the Post-war Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein an address given by me before the People's Lobby Conference, Washington, D. C., recently. The speech is as follows:

The title of my talk emphasizes the attitude of thinking Americans toward every aspect of this global war—that victory over the military machines of Germany and Japan, is vital—but that psychological and political aspects of the war are of equal importance with military, in winning that victory, and victory is never really won till lasting peace is insured.

Victory in an economic vacuum, with an orgy of ruthless competition, would be only a prelude to World War No. 3 and probably a short prelude.

All nations are watching America's economic policies and plans, enemy, neutral, and United Nations.

The British Labor Party is committed both to major social ownership at home and an association of nations, "the collective authority of which must transcend in the economic sphere, the rights of separate nations," to use its statement.

It is obvious that avoidance of dangerous commercial rivalries, and at least the possibility of war, requires measures in this direction.

The titles of two books by H. N. Brailsford, the British publicist, "The War of Steel and Gold," published in 1912, and "Property or Peace?" in 1934, and "We Fight For Oil" by an American publicist, Ludwell Denny, in 1928, are significant.

A merchant marine is a vital factor for war or for peace.

We must determine which ours is to be before fighting ends.

Hon. Emory S. Land, Chairman, the United States Maritime Commission, in the Commission's latest report to Congress, states the Commission in 1943, appointed a representative post-war planning commission, consisting of key officials in the Commission and the War Shipping Administration, to make a comprehensive study of the problems which would face the merchant marine industry when the war ends and full commercial operations are resumed.

The stake is enormous, even at our present rate of spending.

The Commission's report states:

"The over-all picture at the end of the fiscal year (June 30, 1944) was 6,765 vessels, constructed, under construction, or on contract, with a total estimated completed cost of $13,824,302,818, of which $8,947,946,299 had been disbursed as of June 30, 1944.

"The completed deadweight tonnage was 36,305,427 with 17,633,400 under construction, or a total of 53,938,827 deadweight tons."

Despite past and prospective losses, the Commission reports that the Government will own a fleet of ships aggregating more than 50,000,000 deadweight tons when the war ends.

This is about equal to the merchant fleets of the world, when the war started in 1939.

The Government's investment in shipping, which does not include battleships of all sorts, of about $14,000,000,000, is almost one-half more than its investment of about $9,000,000,000, through the Defense Plant Corporation, for construction of plants for war production.

The Commission holds no war-built cargo ships or tankers that are or can be put in first-class condition at reasonable costs should be scrapped, but placed in a sanctuary as a national defense reserve, so we won't have to spend so much time or money if and when another war is forced upon us, or to insure against another war.

In view of these facts, the following information was asked of the Commission:

"Tonnage and number of Government ships at end of war adapted for—

"(a) Transoceanic commerce.

"(b) Coast-wide and inland waterways.

"Anticipated demand for ships for world commerce and proportion America has and

other nations, particularly Britain, Norway, Sweden, France, and Russia, have.

"What plan, if any, has the Maritime Commission to allocate the world's ocean-borne commerce to the several maritime nations, and to regulate both freight and passenger rates, and to protect wage and working conditions of seamen?

"What plan, if any, has the Maritime Commission to correlate our local and ocean-borne shipping with railroads, canals, etc.?"

A reply, this month, from the Commission, states:

"The questions raised are impossible to answer at this time.

"They involve problems of post-war developments which no one can predict at this time. They are intimately involved in the prospective peace treaties and other international agreements, and I do not think anyone has anything like a definite idea as to what the future will bring in this connection."

Admittedly answers are not easy to give, and any program of an executive agency must be approved by the Congress, as long as democratic processes continue, while both the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress have committees on post-war planning.

Our experience after World War No. 1, however, convinces me, that as a famous jurist, Charles Evans Hughes, remarked about the law—"It is what the courts say it is," so the future of post-war international relations, of which the American merchant marine is a symbol, will be what the peoples of the world decide to have it.

This is very unwelcome doctrine in some quarters.

In sending me current data on the status of the merchant marine, the Commission writes:

"On the basis of this information, one should be able to speculate reasonably as to what would be desirable in the merchant fleet of the future, keeping in mind, of course, the basic policy set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936."

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 specifically states:

"It is necessary for the national defense and for the proper growth of its foreign and domestic commerce, that the United States shall have a merchant marine of the best equipped and most suitable type of vessels sufficient to carry the greater portion of its commerce, and serve as a naval or military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, ultimately to be owned and operated privately by citizens of the United States."

There is a clear contradiction in saying "the United States shall have a merchant marine" and in the same sentence it is "to be owned and operated privately by citizens of the United States," but the desire of some citizens to conduct their operations "privately" is quite understandable.

Similar issues have arisen in connection with certain appointments in the State Department.

The recent record is instructive.

In March last year, Hon. S. O. BLAND, Chairman of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, introduced a bill (H. R. 4486) authorizing the sale or charter of any vessel constructed by the Maritime Commission, or under contracts executed for it, from January 1, 1941, up to a year after the war ends, and any vessel transferred to or acquired by the Commission during this period if constructed in the continental United States—under conditions set forth.

The bill explicitly states—"notwithstanding any other provision of law."

In committee hearings over several weeks, Chairman Land, of the Maritime Commission, suggested amendments to protect the Treasury, that is the American people, incorporated in a redrafted bill introduced in this session, of which an important one prohibits the Commission from selling or leasing "a vessel which any other agency of the United States Government has the right to control, custody, or possession," as long as such agency needs it.

Another one vests in the Maritime Commission authority to determine prices and lease rates for our ships.

At this hearing, Mr. Almon E. Roth, president of the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., said:

"One of the greatest considerations of this industry (maritime) is the early restoration of our trade.

"If we do not get into it at an early date we will see our British cousins, and the Scandinavians going in."

This Federation is composed of five principal American shipowner associations, which include about 95 percent of the shipowners engaged in oceangoing traffic, when the war started.

On the other hand, Arthur Phillips, executive secretary of the Congress of Industrial Organizations Maritime Committee, told the House committee:

"Shipping is an international industry. Continued and enhanced United Nations collaboration is a prerequisite for profitable post-war maritime operations.

"The United States must take the lead in calling for an immediate open-table United Nations conference on shipping at which preliminary agreement on a fair distribution of the world's tonnage can be reached. The central theme of the conference must be organization of world shipping to fill the needs of an ever-expanding world economy.

"Agreement must be reached on a limiting of the spheres of economic conflict and a widening of the horizons of economic opportunity. Cooperation must be effected to prevent ruinous competition, rate wars, and restrictive and discriminatory practices.

"It cannot be said that such discussions are premature. Indeed, some surety of cooperation in the shipping field is a necessary win-the-war step. It will put an end to the uncertainty which had led to demands for the resumption of private operations at a time when every vessel is needed to bring victory closer.

"Subsidization to make up the operating differentials should be limited to true cost differences. Any use of subsidies for economic warfare will be disastrous.

"International agreement limiting subsidies and based on audits of actual records should be sought."

The executive secretary of the People's Lobby, Inc., urging international controls and allocation of ocean-borne shipping, told the committee:

"International controls of shipping are as vital as international controls of currency and of natural resources."

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, in an address to the Foreign Policy Association in New York, last June, very cogently stated:

"The lesson we must learn and remember and never forget, is that it is futile to wish for peace without providing the methods for keeping the peace."

The American Federation of Labor calls for "an international organization armed with power to deal promptly with aggression."

All the major general farm organizations are definitely on record for international organization.

Their action at last fall's annual meetings is significant.

The National Grange, oldest of the farm organizations, calls for:

"An effectively implemented organization of sovereign states * * * development of foreign trade on an equitable basis * * * rehabilitation of productive industry in devastated lands."

The American Farm Bureau Federation is equally explicit:

"International trade is basic to the well-being of this Nation and of the world.

"We must not repeat the mistakes made after World War No. 1, when the nations of the world resorted to extreme nationalism and isolationism to promote self-sufficiency and to secure selfish advantages through raising tariffs and trade barriers, through competitive manipulation of currencies and international exchange, through international cartels, and other restrictive trade practices. The present war will have been fought in vain if the nations of the world return to such nationalistic policies when this war ends."

The National Farmers Union with clarity visions the economic basis for an enduring peace in its promise:

"We pledge ourselves to work with men of good will everywhere for an international organization which, through political and economic cooperation, can bring about an era of enduring peace and universal brotherhood. This time we must not fail."

The committee on international policy of the National Planning Association, last fall, published a pamphlet America's New Opportunities in World Trade, which asserts:

"The policies affecting the overseas part of the Nation's economy have now become too important in their implications for national prosperity and world peace to permit tolerance of piecemeal and narrow-interest policymaking.

"From now on the foreign trade and investment decisions of the United States must be expressed and coordinated in terms of national long-term interest."

This study, assuming continuation of our general pre-war policies in trade, during the post-war years, estimates that by 1950 our international merchandise trade will amount to $7,000,000,000 of exports and $5,000,000,000 of imports—an annual total of $12,000,000,000.

This means a large ocean-borne commerce originating in or directed to the United States, and nearly all other major nations will seek to expand their foreign trade.

Britain feels she must increase hers, over pre-war, by about one-half.

Trade rivalries have in the past led to conferences and pools to fix and maintain passenger and freight rates.

Most maritime nations have subsidized their shipping in foreign trade.

American ship subsidies have often made an oceangoing pork barrel out of our merchant marine.

Congress must soon determine whether we shall repeat the inexcusable mistakes of the past, and facilitate the all too easy steps to another global conflict.

Over 40 years ago, Hon. David Lubin, of California, founder of the International Institute of Agriculture located in Rome, and till his death, our representative in that institute, foresaw the danger of rivalry in ocean-borne commerce.

He urged and worked incessantly for international control and allocation of freight shipping—but without success.

We can learn from the two World Wars in a quarter of a century—which we know were preventable—because all world statesmen tell us a third world war can be prevented.

America has a big head start in ships constructed, which summons us to leadership in a plan to use our merchant marine for peace.

During the war, the world's shipping has been pooled for the purposes of the United Nations—proving this can be done.

Experience shows any other course is a challenge, if not a threat, to peace.

During the war high profits have been made from war's emergencies in shipping.

Such profits cannot easily be carried as the world shifts back to peace pursuits.

Can we achieve this pooling under private ownership?

Certainly not under unrestrained competitive ownership.

The slogan "Don't give up the ship," applies in peace if surrender means "unconditional" and commercial rivalries and rate wars.

Possession is sometimes nine points of the economic law as it is in the legal textbooks.

Unless shipping interests of the world give better proof than ever in the past that they will cooperate continuously, to reduce charges, improve service, and protect labor's standards—America must not give up our merchant marine; it must not sell or lease ships to our own or to other nationals, without full guaranty it is to be used as an agency of peace to achieve this threefold peace objective of world commerce.

Work or What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Last week the House of Representatives in Congress had under consideration what is commonly known as the May bill. Some have erroneously referred to it as the work-or-fight bill. Others have referred to it as "work, fight, or go to jail or pay a fine." Still another name appearing in the press, in referring to this measure, was "work or else" bill.

These various names of and references to this measure show the confusion in the thinking of Members of Congress, Government officials, newspaper reporters, and commentators. This suggests the consideration of the history of this measure and the varying predictions as to its future form and passage or nonpassage.

Originally, this proposal was introduced as House bill 1119 and hearings were had and evidence was taken before the House Committee on Military Affairs, January 10 to 18, inclusive. Apparently, the substance and basic principles of H. R. 1119 were approved by the top military and naval authorities of the country. In the printed copy of the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee on page 3 thereof, Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, is quoted as having said:

> The War Department endorses bill H. R. 1119 as an immediate measure.

He further stated at the hearing:

> I want to make it clear that the War Department urges the prompt passage of national war service legislation of the broadest character affecting our entire adult population, capable of assisting in the prosecution of the war, as promptly as possible.
>
> The bill for discussion today, H. R. 1119, as I understand it, affects men from 18 to 45 years of age, and provides that as to those men, those who leave war activities that they are now engaged in, and those who decline, when requested by the local selective-service boards, to engage in war production, or in activities supporting the war effort, shall be subject to induction into the armed forces (p. 4).

At this hearing, Chairman MAY is quoted as having asked Secretary Patterson, "As I understand the meaning of H. R. 1119, it is that for a man who is even now engaged in war work, in an industry, or a man who is offered employment, or asked to take employment in war work, and refuses to do so, the penalty is immediate induction into the armed forces, as this bill provides?" Mr. Patterson answered, "I understand that." Then Chairman MAY asked the Secretary the following question: "So it is in the nature of what is known as a provision for 'work or fight' as it is commonly referred to?" Mr. Patterson answered, "Yes"—page 5.

The Secretary stated that the present manpower crisis "has been caused by maldistribution rather than by an actual shortage. There is no shortage in this country of anything to carry on a war"—page 11.

After stating that the war urgency is such that young able-bodied boys on the farms should be taken at this time, the Secretary said, "There is certainly no shortage of food in this country"—page 19. He further stated that the primary objective he advocated through this legislation was to get production—page 20—and that the purpose of the bill "is to put pressure on them"—referring to persons classified as IV-F or some other class that comes within the scope of this act, and so forth—"to obey the direction of the local selective-service board to go into war industry. That is the purpose, I take it"—page 23.

When the bill was printed and placed before the Members of the House of Representatives for consideration and debate, it appeared as House bill 1752. We were not shown and did not have before us H. R. 1119 considered by the committee and on which hearings were held, but the committee chairman introduced and presented for consideration H. R. 1752.

H. R. 1752, apparently, is a much different bill from H. R. 1119, according to the statements of many members of the House Committee on Military Affairs. Chairman MAY, in opening the discussion on H. R. 1752, stated:

> I want to get over to the membership of this committee the admission that I, myself, am not entirely satisfied with the bill. I wanted a work-or-fight bill. I wanted it so that when a man was reclassified, he would be made immediately available for induction in the armed forces if he refused to go to work. What this bill actually is, in my judgment, is a bill to provide a system by which a man must either work, fight, or go to jail or pay a fine. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1945, p. 567.)

Apparently, the administration of the bill as originally planned was to be under the supervision of the Office of War Mobilization, but, for some reason not disclosed, H. R. 1752 provides that the immediate administration of the provisions of the measure shall be placed in the hands of the Director of Selective Service. Many amendments were offered, but administration forces plead with the Members not to allow the bill to be amended in any respect whatever, regardless of how imperfect it was.

One amendment, the so-called Harness-Barrett substitute, was rejected by the small margin of 187 to 177. The Harness substitute would have thrown the administration of the provisions of the bill, with certain other important changes, into the hands of the War Manpower Commission. The Harness substitute contained several provisions similar to the provisions in the original H. R. 1119, which are omitted from H. R. 1752.

H. R. 1752, without amendment, passed the House by a vote of 246 to 165. Many Members voted for the passage of this act for the alleged reason that they wanted to support the measure because they understood it was recommended by the Commander in Chief and the heads of the military and naval departments. But, as above pointed out, it was not the measure upon which the hearings were held. It assumed a different form, omitted many salient provisions that were in H. R. 1119, and placed the administration of the act in different hands. Many Members expressed themselves as fearful of the criticism their vote might draw from the men in uniform and now on the battle fronts if they should vote against the measure. Several frankly confessed that they thought, regardless of the imperfections of the bill, the psychological effect would justify their voting in favor of the passage of the bill.

On the other hand, there were many of us who voted against the bill for the reason we did not consider it sound legislation.

First of all, many opposed to the bill considered it unconstitutional and in direct violation of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

The opponents did not believe the conditions justified the passage of the act and did not want to see what many considered slave labor, or forced labor, authorized by congressional enactment. On all hands it was agreed that labor and management have done a marvelous piece of work thus far and have not fallen down. The United States Chamber of Commerce, the various organizations of management, organized labor—both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., and the major farm organizations protested the passage of this act for the reason that they considered it a death blow to the system of American free labor. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, said H. R. 1752 "is highly objectionable to working men and women represented by the American Federation of Labor, all of whom cherish as a common heritage the principles of freedom, liberty, and democracy. H. R. 1752 embodies within it the principles of totalitarianism, the substitution of governmental compulsion for voluntary action on the part of those who serve in the army of production." He further stated, "There is no shortage of manpower." These statements were made over Mr. Green's signature under date of January 26, 1945.

Furthermore, statistical information and specific instances were cited showing that there has been a great hoarding of manpower in certain industries; that immediately prior to the election last November it was stated by those in authority that the war was about over, and many workers in war industries left their

jobs and went home, thinking that their services were no longer needed in the war effort. We were told in this country the supplies of materials, ammunition, munitions, and men were ample. Two months later, we were told this was a mistake and that the war was not as near to conclusion as had been prophesied.

The Harness substitute would have given the local draft boards the authority to go into the war industries and plants that are now being operated so extravagantly on a cost-plus-fee basis, where surplus labor is employed and production is lagging, with authority to take unnecessary men out of such plants and put them either in the armed forces or in places where their services are really needed. This would have corrected a lot of the bungling, mismanagement, and faulty allocation that is now so pronounced and so much in evidence. But, the provisions of H. R. 1752 will not correct the present ills along this line.

Management and labor alike agreed upon the all-convincing argument that if H. R. 1752 becomes a law, production will be slowed down instead of stepped up, for slave labor, or forced or involuntary labor, has never been as productive as voluntary or free labor. Commentators and those calculated to be the best judges of such matters predict freely that this act will never be passed by the Senate in its present form and that if any like measure is passed, after a conference, it will contain entirely different provisions from those in the bill passed by the House. Some even suggest that if our armed forces continue with those of our allies, as they are now so successfully advancing, the war with Germany may be concluded before this extreme and un-American measure is enacted into law—if ever it is enacted in its present or modified form.

If our American men in uniform could only be given a true picture of what H. R. 1752 provides and be told of the amendments that were offered to improve the same but rejected, no one would need fear their reactions.

Many Members voting against H. R. 1752 are fathers of sons in the armed forces of this country who have acquitted themselves nobly and gallantly in both of the major theaters of war. These opponents would not take the chance of depriving their own sons and those of their neighbors and friends of anything that the boys need to win the war as expeditiously as possible. It takes more fortitude and courage to stand forthright and patriotically for principles and love of country and its time-honored principles than to support measures which are calculated to appease or win temporary approval.

Members on each side, for the most part, are willing to vote their conscientious sentiments and allow patriotism to dictate their actions. This was not a partisan contest. Party lines were not attempted to be drawn. However, strong administration leaders championed the bill from beginning to end, admitting that it contained many imperfections.

Punishing War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the January 31, 1945, issue of the New York Times. The editorial is as follows:

PUNISHING WAR CRIMINALS

Axis war criminals ought to be punished. We are not aware of any important dissent from this statement in any Allied country. Some of us like to play with words. We may say that punishment is an old-fashioned idea and that what we propose is a sort of sanitary measure. We mean to abate the kind of crime Hitler and his colleagues and subordinates have committed by eliminating the cause. We mean to eliminate the cause in such a way that no new sources of contagion will be established. Whether we put the matter in this way or in some other way the conclusion is the same. Axis leaders must be removed from circulation, which means that they must be removed from this earth. They must be removed precisely because they are leaders and have led. They need not be convicted, unless we deliberately choose to make a drama of it, of the murder of any one specific person. Below a certain level of authority we come on a new category of crime—the designated offense against a designated victim or victims. In such cases we may find it desirable to hold court and bring in witnesses.

The question has been brought into the open by the resignation of Herbert Claiborne Pell as American representative on the War Crimes Commission in London. It has not been brought fully into the open, for all that the Acting Secretary of State, Joseph C. Grew, has to say is that "it is the policy of this Government that the Axis leaders and their henchmen who are guilty of war crimes shall be brought to the bar of justice." What crimes? Is the making of unprovoked and undeclared war a crime? Must we prove that Adolf Hitler had foreknowledge of what was done at Lidice and that he personally ordered the creation of the many Nazi murder camps? Shall we attempt to bring the Nazis to trial for all of the crimes they have committed in the Reich itself, as well as in the countries they once conquered? Or shall we settle account with them for their crimes against the United Nations and leave the punshment of crimes committed on German soil to the reckoning of the German people?

Dr. Sheldon Glueck has ably discussed the whole subject in a recently published book, War Criminals: Their Prosecution and Punishment. As he summarized his conclusions in a letter to this newspaper he holds that such criminals "must be tried by the military and civil courts, and under the laws, of each of the injured states with certain exceptional and large-scale cases to be prosecuted in an international criminal court to be set up by the United Nations and to apply the common (unwritten) as well as the conventional (written) law of nations." As an "injured state" Russia has already held trials and inflicted punishments—perhaps in more instances than she has yet made public. Whether anything would be gained by a full-dress trial of such creatures as Hitler, Goebbels, Goering, and Himmler may be questioned. Each one of these men has already made a full confession which would doom him in any court—and the fact that the confessions were otherwise labeled by those who made them is of no consequence. Moreover, these felons may die at the hands of their own countrymen before we can get at them.

When we come down to simple terms there seem to be but three necessities. One is to get rid of men whose continued life and freedom endanger our civilization. The second is to do this in such a way that present and future generations, including such Germans as have remained sane and such Germans as will, like members of other races, be born sane, will recognize that justice has been done. The third is to make it clear to the Germans that punishment will not be indiscriminate, and that those who have not shown themselves criminals will gain rather than lose by surrender.

The Allied heads of state have many important subjects to take up at their pending meeting. They would do well to make a clear statement on this one. It is not enough to say that a policy exists. A decent respect to the opinion of mankind requires that the policy and the reasons for it be stated.

War Crimes Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "War Crimes Problem" which appeared in the February 1, 1945, issue of the Washington Evening Star:

WAR CRIMES PROBLEM

The circumstances surrounding the end of Herbert C. Pell's service as American representative on the United Nations War Crimes Commission are disturbing, even though Acting Secretary of State Grew has just spoken reassuring words on the subject. Mr. Pell is convincing when he says that it is nonsense to ascribe his failure to return to London to the fact that Congress did not appropriate money to cover his work there; the real reason, he declares, is that certain American officials—presumably in the State Department—do not want to punish Nazi criminals as thoroughly as he advocates.

Mr. Pell's thesis is that the United Nations should try Germans not merely for the crimes they have committed against the nationals of other countries but also for crimes committed against the nationals of Germany itself, chiefly the Jewish minority. It is on the latter point apparently that there has been disagreement, some officials believing what a nation does to its own citizens is its own business. That a similar disagreement exists in Britain is indicated by the fact that Sir Cecil Hurst recently resigned from the commission when the British Foreign Office failed to go along with the ideas shared by himself and Mr. Pell.

If Mr. Pell and Sir Cecil had not been playing leading roles on the Commission, their departure from it would not now seem so significant. But in view of their importance,

and whether they are right or not, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that something fundamentally serious has upset the whole United Nations program to translate into action past inter-Allied declarations—notably the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin statement of November 1943—to bring Axis criminals to justice in the very countries where they have worked their crimes. Mr. Grew says that United States policy is "definite, forthright, and comprehensive," but Mr. Pell, who has been close to the subject, apparently does not think so, and if American authorities differ among themselves and if British authorities differ among themselves also, there is more than a little reason to wonder how America, Britain, Russia, and the other allies will be able to work out any joint approach to the problem.

The task of the War Crimes Commission, under the best of conditions, cannot be anything less than extremely difficult and complex, involving the grading of evidence and the working out of legal procedures against an army of individuals charged with abominable deeds on a vast scale. But as matters stand today, in face of the disagreements revealed by Mr. Pell and Sir Cecil, the task is probably more difficult and complex than ever, so much so that it is a question whether the Commission itself will be able to survive its inner divisions.

There thus seems to be a real danger that unless the situation receives prompt attention in the highest Allied councils, war criminals will escape again this time just as they did after 1918.

Pell Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the January 21 issue of the Washington Post. The editorial is as follows:

PELL AFFAIR

Acting Secretary Grew was somewhat disingenuous when, in his first comment on the Pell affair, he said that Mr. Herbert C. Pell would not be returned to the United Nations War Crimes Commission in London as the American member because Congress had refused to appropriate funds for his salary and expenses. Technically, that happened to be true, though it left out the fact that the Department did not try very hard to get Congress to appropriate the small $30,000 involved. One very likely reason why it did not try very hard was disagreement between Mr. Pell and certain of the Department's international-law experts regarding punishment of war criminals. Actually, moreover, the request for the necessary appropriations was supported before the House Appropriations Committee by a junior officer of the Department's Legal Division.

The real point at issue between Mr. Pell and the legal lights in the Department is whether the persecution and wholesale murder by the Nazis of German Jews and other racial minorities in Germany are crimes which the United Nations have a right to punish Mr. Pell took the position that they have such a right, and he persuaded the other members of the Commission to approve his stand. And his position is by no means unique. On March 24, 1944, President Roosevelt declared: "All who knowingly take part in the deportation of Jews to their death in Poland or Norwegians and French to their death in Germany are equally guilty with the executioner. All who share the guilt shall share the punishment." Again, in his message to Congress, June 12, 1944, the President said: "This Nation is appalled by the systematic persecution of helpless minority groups by the Nazis. * * * We have made clear our determination to punish all participants in these acts of savagery." But, apparently, the President did not make the point clear enough to certain well-entrenched functionaries in the State Department. Thumbing their books on international law, they found no precedent for the procedure which the War Crimes Commission advocates. They hold that crimes against humanity perpetrated on German soil are within Germany's domestic jurisdiction, that crimes perpetrated on United Nations territory are to be punished by the individual United Nations governments. But, lacking precedents, these experts favor delay, apparently, until more volumes can be thumbed.

It was the same legalism that was responsible for the fiasco that attended the execution of the clause in the Versailles Treaty regarding the perpetrators of atrocities in the last war. Surely we cannot permit that fiasco to happen again. In a second statement on the Pell affair Mr. Grew has declared that the Government has a definite program on war criminals which is "comprehensive and forthright." Those are mouth-filling words. They are not enough. The time has come for the Department to take the American people into its confidence on this matter.

Revolution—American Way—Wake Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include the following article from the pen of one of America's most distinguished small town editors, the Honorable Seymour S. Tibbals, which appeared in the Franklin Chronicle of Franklin, Ohio. These comments on public affairs by Mr. Tibbals, who has been a newspaperman for more than 50 years, are well worth the attention of every Member of Congress and every American:

REVOLUTION—AMERICAN WAY—WAKE UP

The fact is that we, and that means all of us in every part of the world, are going through a revolution. Some people call it a war, but it is a revolution, too. The trend is definitely to the left, to government control of all people. Make no mistake about it. President Roosevelt's promise of 60,000,000 post-war jobs, his nomination of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, the introduction last week by a relatively inconspicuous Senator of a job-budget program, various hints and comments in the recent Roosevelt annual address and Budget messages, all fit into a single pattern. Get set for the jolt that is coming. The New Deal roller coaster is again climbing the incline for another dash down the economic shoot-the-chutes. All at once, all over the world, simple, common, every day people have discovered the terrific production power of machines, if they can only be put continuously to work. Now the post-war problem comes down to this: We have had full employment in the war; can't we do the same thing in peace? It is as simple as that. Many of us believe that private enterprise could give full employment to the people if encouraged and given the chance. But those in control of Government, led by President Roosevelt, are outlining a dozen major fields of prospective Federal job-making—T. V. A.'s, highways, parkways, plus Federal-encouraged enterprises, like "a million homes a year for at least 10 years," all indicating that Government would play a big part in it. We all agree that we can't let the boys come home to apple-peddling on street corners. The New Dealers say we must have a break with the old established American way of life; the way that cleared the forests and made America the greatest country in all the world. We must adopt bold new policies, an approach equal to the magnitude of the subject. The so-called conservatives want employment all right, but for one reason or another they don't trust the New Deal to administer it, or don't agree with the proposed methods of getting it. The row over the appointment of Mr. Wallace is the first skirmish in this big fight. The court ruling against the President's seizure of the Montgomery Ward stores is another effort to stay the sweep of this revolution.

What was the good, old-fashioned American way when you were a boy? We'll tell you. You were flat broke when you finished high school. You started to work in a store or the local print shop for $3 a week. But you weren't discouraged. You had youth and health and a grim determination to get ahead. You worked hard for your employer, but you kept looking around for a chance at a better job. You saved a part of your earnings. You didn't make the high wages paid today, but what you received on Saturday night was all yours. There were no union dues and assessments taken out; there was no part deducted as withholding income tax and other levies for Government securities that supported an ever-increasing army of Federal appointees. When you had laid aside enough, you selected the girl of your choice and started a home and family. After a few years together, you were happy and contented, instead of paying a court fee and attorney for a divorce and being sued for alimony. In the American way a man who started as a peddler with a pack on his back could own a store of his own in time. A man who split rails could become President. Opportunity knocked at your door, and you were free to answer the summons. You could buy a little farm and look over your acres with pride in the thought they were yours and you could raise what you pleased. True, there were cases of injustice and unfair treatment. There were misers and overbearing landlords who extorted exorbitant rates of interest and took advantage of the ignorant, but there are hordes of indolent, unscrupulous politicians today who, like vampires, suck the blood from suffering humanity. There are dictators, rulers, and men in power who send millions of boys into the hell of war, killing them ruthlessly, maiming them frightfully, taking the best years of their lives, and sending them home, when they are through with them, shocked, nervous wrecks. It is all beyond us. But there is one thing we did and could comprehend and that was the American way under which we lived a happy boyhood and grew up.

Under the competitive, independent system we made great progress. We steadily improved the comforts of living. We developed the means of transportation, we built better

homes and better schools, we discovered electricity, the telephone, the radio, and the motion picture, but we also had time to walk in love under the moonlight. We had independence, the right to keep the rewards of our effort. Do you realize that men 33 years of age have known no President but Roosevelt since they became of voting age? Do you realize that the American way of life, of freedom of efforts, has never really been known in the last decade? Have we actually made progress during the period of encroaching socialism? We are, indeed, in the throes of a revolution and it is up to the great middle class to stand firm against the ideologists, the New Dealers, and those who lazily drift and say, "The Government will take care of me." It was rugged individualism that led the children of Israel out of the wilderness; it was individual effort and courage that blazed the trails through the American forests.

Our hope of staying this revolution lies in the American Congress. More and more in the Roosevelt administration has the executive branch of the Government taken to itself powers that rightfully belonged to the legislative. Congress, itself, when it was little more than a rubber-stamp body in the early days of the New Deal, carelessly allowed its powers to be plundered from it. But there are signs today that Congress has been revitalized. The hold-up of the Wallace nomination as Secretary of Commerce and Federal Judge Sullivan's decision that the President was without authority to seize the Montgomery Ward properties are hopeful signs that the American way is again on the march.

THE ROUNDER.

Justice for the Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely editorial which appeared in the January 30, 1945, issue of the New York Post. The editorial is as follows:

JUSTICE FOR THE LIVING

The failure of Clairborne Pell to get the $30,000 (less than one-thousandth of the total State Department appropriation) that is needed to maintain an American delegation to the United Nations War Crimes Commission is well worth a congressional investigation.

Mr. Pell believes that the Nazis who murdered their own nationals—Jews and anti-Nazi—are guilty of war crimes and should be tried. What's more, he joined the British delegate, Sir Cecil Hurst, in saying so.

A few weeks ago, Sir Cecil resigned under pressure. Then last week, veteran diplomat Pell was told that the House Appropriation Committee had somehow decided that we didn't need any war crimes delegate.

The United Nations War Crimes Commission can now return to the somnolence and profitless contemplation of legalisms that had, up to the time Hurst and Pell spoke up, characterized its existence.

The indignity this incident visits upon millions of dead and unavenged Hebrews is slight, compared to what these dead have already suffered. It is to ourselves, the living, that the greatest harm is being done.

For international justice is indivisible. If today, the Nazi can murder, say, a million and a half Jews, natives of Axis countries, and go unpunished, then some future Hitler will feel safe in building a Maidanek in London and cremating a million and a half conquered Britons.

If we overlook planned murder when it happens to Jews in Germany, Hungary, Rumania, then some day we will find planned murder on our own doorstep. X marks the next spot, and it turns out to be us.

L'Affaire Pell concerns justice for the murder of millions of Jews. It also concerns justice for all of us.

For it might have been us. It could be us in the future.

Drafting of Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, food is a weapon of war. Without food we could not survive. Today we stand on the threshold of victory; a nation well fed and from the abundance of our harvest we not only have been able to feed ourselves, our allies, but also those people who so recently were liberated from the yoke of the oppressor. This has been made possible by our tremendous production of food. The farmers of America deserve the thanks and gratitude of a hungry world. Their industry, their patriotism, their devotion to democracy, their willingness to work long hours have combined to make our Nation the food basket of the current world-wide conflict. To disrupt this program of production at this critical time by promiscuous drafting of essential farm labor would truly be unfortunate. This letter and resolution from the Nevada State Legislature, now in session in Carson City, forcibly states the case of our Nation's farmers and ranchers:

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER,
CARSON CITY, NEV., *January 29, 1945.*

Re Deferment of registrants engaged in agriculture.

Hon. BERKELEY L. BUNKER,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUNKER: We enclose herewith a copy of a joint resolution adopted by the forty-second Nevada legislative session, memorializing Congress and the National Selective Service Board to defer from induction those registrants engaged in agriculture and stock raising.

Until recently this had been the practice of the local selective service boards with the approval and approbation of the national board. These deferments were based on recommendations of the Department of Agriculture County War Boards, thus insuring a most careful scrutiny into the case of every registrant who claimed deferment on the basis of being engaged in the agricultural, dairying, or livestock industries.

As you are fully aware from your intimate knowledge of conditions in Nevada, these industries had even then been seriously crippled by reason of shortage of manpower with the requisite "know how" that takes years of experience to develop.

By reason of this condition, drastic cuts were made in sheep, cattle, and dairy herds. Most of the few remaining herds are being now entirely cared for and managed by the sons of ranchers who have been heretofore, and we feel properly so, deferred from military service.

An indiscriminate reclassification and induction of the young men heretofore deferred, by reason of being engaged in the agricultural and livestock industries, will create havoc in Nevada. For the past 2 years the level of livestock, dairy, and crop production has been maintained in most instances by the prodigious efforts of a father and son combination. If this combination is destroyed it will mean the end of many cattle and dairy herds and a greatly curtailed crop production.

We, in all sincerity, urge upon you the importance and gravity of the present situation.

We do not count the financial loss to the State, which will be great, as any part of the reasons which actuated the members of the legislature in adopting the enclosed resolution. It is the considered opinion of the legislature that if the national welfare, national economy, and the national war effort are to be maintained, those who produce the food of the Nation, the armies and the navies, must be permitted to have their sons stand shoulder to shoulder with them in facing the colossal task ahead.

As to the individual courage and patriotism of these lads whose continued deferments are requested, we point out that in most instances with these young men it takes more downright courage to stay on the farm and ranch than it does to enter actual military service.

Copies of the resolution will reach you in due course through the usual channels. In the meantime, we feel that this letter, signed by all the members of the joint committees on agriculture and livestock of the assembly and the committee on agriculture of the senate, will impress upon you, even more strongly than the resolution itself, the seriousness of the conditions now faced by the livestock, dairy, and agricultural industries in the State of Nevada.

Respectfully submitted.

Assembly Joint Committees on Agriculture and Livestock: Fred Strosnider, chairman; George J. Miller; Geo. Hussman; Alma Woods; James Ryan; Louis Scott; Paul W. Waner; Peter Henrichs; R. W. Ogden; Ellis J. Folsom; Senate Committee on Agriculture: Walter Cox, chairman; Charles H. Russell; A. V. Tallman; Press W. Duffin, Jr.; Nye W. Tagnoni.

Assembly Joint Resolution 3

Joint resolution memorializing Congress and the National Selective Service Board to delay the induction into the military forces of the United States of registrants actually engaged in the agricultural and livestock industries, and to declare these to be critical industries

Whereas it has heretofore been the policy of the National Selective Service Board to permit local selective service boards, upon the recommendation of the local United States Department of Agriculture County War Boards, to defer the induction of registrants actually engaged in agriculture and livestock raising; and

Whereas in answer to the need of the military forces and essential and critical industry for additional manpower the local selective service boards have been directed by the National Selective Service Board to reexamine and reclassify all deferred registrants to the end that all physically fit persons under 26 years of age be inducted into the military forces, and that all persons both

under and over the age of 26 years not physically fit for military service be forced into essential and critical industry; and

Whereas an indiscriminate reclassification of registrants will remove many thousands of men now engaged in agriculture and the raising of livestock from these industries; and

Whereas the growing and production of food is even more essential to military success than the production of armament, agriculture and livestock raising are not only essential industries but are critical industries, the impairment of which will be immediately reflected in the national war effort: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada, That the Congress of the United States, through proper legislation, and the National Selective Service Board of the United States, through proper rules, regulations, and directives, immediately take such steps as may be necessary to classify agriculture and livestock raising as critical industries ,and to reinstate and continue the policy, heretofore in force, of deferring the induction of registrants engaged therein, into the military forces and/or compelling them to enter into other so-called essential and critical industries; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the representatives of the State of Nevada in Congress, namely, Senator P. A. MCCARRAN, Senator JAMES G. SCRUGHAM, and Representative BERKELEY L. BUNKER.

Work or Fight Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, after listening very carefully to all the evidence presented before the House Military Affairs Committee, I am not convinced that a case has been made out for this bill. To the contrary, most of the factual evidence indicated that there was no present need for such drastic legislation. That was the testimony of representatives of labor and representatives of industry as well as some governmental officials and impartial, disinterested organizations.

Indeed, appraising the evidence fairly and impartially one would have to be possessed of a blind faith in the judgment and infallibility of our present military leaders as affecting the complex and highly organized and specialized field of American industry in all its intricate ramifications before one could reasonably conclude from a survey of our present industrial situation that this legislation was justified. Even from the proponents of the measure there was widely varying testimony as to the actual labor shortages that presently exist but the inference was inescapable from their expressed views that Congress was expected to act upon the assumption that the enactment of this legislation would have an anticipated psychological effect upon the morale of our own armed forces and the attitude and feelings of our enemies. The suggestion was apparent that entirely apart from any actual need that this legislation was sought, not so much because it was necessary but more to implement and strengthen ipso facto, in unstated and immeasurable ways the morale of our fighting forces and the spirit and diplomatic potentialities of our allies and enemies.

There is undoubtedly some dislocation of our productive forces in certain specialized lines due to various causes.

First. Technological changes, retooling, and the shift to new weapons and new types of instruments of war.

Second. Cut-backs of war production during the last 6 months or more of 1944 occasioned by the optimistic view in some governmental and business circles that the European phase of the war was rapidly approaching its end, which gave credence in the minds of many war workers to the belief that they could and should return to regular peacetime employment.

While it is an undoubted fact that absenteeism, turn-over, inadequate housing, faulty transportation, unsatisfactory living conditions, and the hoarding of labor were, and possibly are, factors in the lag of war production in certain limited specialized lines, there was no proof whatever that either strikes or letdowns of any kind attributable to labor had materially contributed to this situation. On the other hand, it is abundantly clear from all the testimony that American labor and American management, working together cooperatively, have achieved the greatest production miracle in history, which has literally flooded the country and the world with goods, materials, and weapons necessary to the war effort, and which have supplied not only our own armed forces but in prodigious quantities and amounts the armed forces of our allies.

Much stress was placed upon current shortages of ammunition, but no satisfactory reason was given why our boys should not be adequately supplied. It was suggested that difficulties of transportation existed. Why there should be any shortage whatever of anything necessary to carry on this war, transportation or anything else, is not comprehensible to me, nor has it been demonstrated that the shortages that existed—and I am willing to concede that they have existed and perhaps do exist—have in any way been attributable to the noncooperation of honest, industrious, and patriotic American labor or the leaders of industry. If people are seeking scapegoats to blame and stigmatize for the deplorable fact that in some cases our armed forces have been lacking in ammunition and other essential weapons of war, in my opinion, they cannot look in the direction of labor or management, and the Congress should not seek, even by innuendo or indirection, to convey to the country that the sporadic dislocations and shortages we are now suffering from are due to the failure of production forces on the home front. Our workingmen of all categories have shown a commendable willingness to go into essential war industry whenever they were requested or assigned. They have done so without force, coercion, or duress; they have done so because they are anxious to make their contribution to our cause, and they have done so voluntarily, willingly, and wholeheartedly in most cases, without compulsion of any kind.

On the other hand, if compulsion should be needed to induce the uncooperative or the unresponsive or the irresponsible to take their places in critical industry, existing Government agencies possess the broadest powers to require adequate performance within the provisions of existing controls. The local selective-service boards have full authorization to grant or revoke deferments and in that way require under threat of immediate induction any person subject to their jurisdiction to remain or continue in essential wartime work. The War Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Service have equally effective powers in that they may grant or withhold referral certificates for employment so that if an individual refuses to work in essential industry where he is assigned, he can be denied work altogether.

For these reasons, I do not believe that such drastic coercive legislation as this which would regiment American citizens and subject them to jail penalties for refusing to comply with directives of local selective-service boards and which would uproot them and their families from their home communities, and possibly send them into remote places to work. I do not believe that the local selective-service boards efficiently can or should be converted into employment agencies but the duty imposed upon them by this act would require them to exercise the functions of employment agencies. I do not believe that Congress ever contemplated that such heavy burdens and responsibilities should be placed upon these boards which exist to channel essential manpower into the Army and Navy and other military units because that is a special function so vital to the war effort that it ought not to be confused with any other.

Because of the high esteem and affection I have for the honorable chairman of the Military Affairs Committee who has demonstrated so much patience, great skill, and ability and laborious painstaking energy in connection with this measure, it is a source of considerable regret to me personally that I cannot support this bill. However, the dictates of conscience and my own conceptions of what I believe to be the best interests of my country and my district, together with my views of the wishes and desires of my constituents, compel an opposite course and I must follow it.

Perhaps a different question would be presented if broader national-service legislation requiring the drafting of labor, capital, and profits and everything else that might be needed to prosecute the war had been proposed to the Congress at the beginning of the war. At the present time, it is too late, in my opinion, after we have established and effectuated the voluntary principle with such sweeping character and effect, for

such legislation to be applied to our complex economic organization without utmost confusion and chaos. The experience of one of our allies which strove for almost 1½ years to acquire effective functioning of national-service legislation is some suggestion of the difficulties involved in such a radical departure from ordinary voluntary techniques that have been used by democratic governments since time immemorial.

I sincerely hope that somewhere along the line as this measure wends its legislative way throughout the Congress, that there will be still further deliberation, calm judgment, less sentimental and emotional feeling and sounder principles invoked which may result in the abridgment of the undemocratic methods prescribed by this bill.

It certainly is not sufficient that we should enact this measure simply because our military leaders have asked for it. They have their own specialized fields in which they have pursued a lifetime training and they are presently confronted with very serious problems of strategy, tactics, and diplomacy that surely require all their attention and ability. They are not, in my opinion, best qualified as experts or specialists to pass upon the very complicated problems of revising and adjusting our industrial techniques of manpower utilization and production during wartime. The persons who are best qualified, fitted, and capable to perform these vital tasks most efficiently and most skillfully are the persons who have lived and worked in industry during their entire lives and who have acquired proficiency, special knowledge, experience, and facility of industrial and labor techniques which suit and fit them best now to resolve and correct any madadjustments, inadequacies, insufficiencies, and dislocations of our American industrial and economic machinery, and thus promote maximum speediest production of critical weapons and supplies.

Summarizing my position on this matter, therefore, I would like to set forth the following objections to this measure.

First. That, on the whole, the evidence before the House Military Affairs Committee and available to Congress from all other sources does not indicate the existence of labor shortages or stoppages widespread or serious enough to warrant the imposition of the drastic revolutionary controls provided by this bill; in fact, to the contrary, labor surpluses due to cut-backs and lay-offs are observable in some localities and resultant manpower would be available for allegedly critical activities.

Second. Existing powers vested in local draft boards, the War Manpower Commission, the United States Employment Service, the War Food Administration, and other governmental agencies are adequate to channel employment from unessential to essential or critical war industry.

Third. To enact this bill now, instead of resolving whatever transient labor shortages exist by appropriate speedily applied voluntary methods, thus expediting needed war production, would result in delay, dislocation, confusion, and impairment of the whole manpower allocation and production process. That it would take at least several months to put this bill into effective working operation, no one has contradicted.

Fourth. The principle upon which this bill is based is entirely foreign to American institutions and is totalitarian, oppressive, and dictatorial and contrary to the spirit of the American Constitution and our accepted democratic way of life. It has been termed a work-or-fight bill. It would be more appropriate to call it a work-or-jail bill. It constitutes a dangerous, unwarranted, and most undesirable regimentation of the nineteen millions more or less of patriotic, hard-working American citizens which it would affect. The bill is a grotesque admixture of totalitarian techniques which certainly have no source or foundation in American life as we have known it, but which are more indigenous to the alien philosophies and arbitrary ideological conceptions of foreign lands.

Fifth. The bill is discriminatory in that it singles out so-called IV–F's and others within certain age brackets for compulsory enlistment in industry and at the same time leaves other equally useful groups outside those brackets free to choose their own employment, in the regular American tradition. It is further discriminatory in that it extends to these proposed industrial draftees, who are presumably being punished under the terms of the bill for noncooperation with the war effort, and who certainly constitute a very small, infinitesimal percentage of our working population, certain special privileges, rights, and benefits heretofore reserved for our veterans, which by the provisions of the bill would be denied to the remaining millions constituting, by and large, the overwhelming mass of faithful American workers whom no reasonable person would dare charge with dereliction of duty or disloyalty to the war effort.

Sixth. In operation the bill would produce division, discord, disagreement, and contention among vital and important groups of our people at a time when the greatest need of the hour is for absolute national unity both at home and abroad.

Seventh. The bill would effect a fundamental change of a revolutionary compulsory character in our American industry and economic patterns at a time when millions of our boys are away from home fighting for freedom, who therefore have absolutely no opportunity to express their views, and would result in reshaping and reconverting along totalitarian lines the very institutions of democracy and freedom which they are fighting and dying in many parts of the world to maintain and protect. These gallant sons expect us to maintain and protect these institutions while they are away.

If this bill is enacted it lays the precedent for legislation similar in principle but more sweeping in character which will change our entire American social order from a basis of freedom to a basis of compulsion, coercion, and force.

Before I can conscientiously vote for legislation such as this, which will unnecessarily and arbitrarily uproot honest, industrious, hard-working American men and their families from their own native soil where they were born and brought up and where they have undeniably worked with fervor, patriotism, and enthusiasm in our war effort and transport them as migrants and totalitarian puppets to distant and remote places, I will have to be shown that in no other way or by no other means of voluntary action and cooperative endeavor can the safety and security of our American Nation be preserved. For the foregoing reasons, I will vote against this bill.

Post-war Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of February 4, 1945:

WHICH PUBLIC OPINION?

The cloud over Congress as it approaches the question of post-war military training is, of course, the uncertainty of American public opinion. In many ways the American public's mass judgment has been surprisingly good, but its record on national defense is shocking. And yet the enduring opinion of the American people must be the basis for our national security and influence in the years ahead.

Within the last week 12 university presidents, including the presidents of the University of Missouri and the University of Kansas, have advanced the most potent argument against wartime action on a post-war military training plan. Instead of coming out in flat opposition to a citizen army, they say "Wait."

They point out that our own defense measures will be only a part of a complete post-war program for world peace as well as defense. We can't plan for part without knowing the whole. They stress the difficulties of planning a sound post-war program under the tensions of the war psychology and, they might have added, at a time the best military minds are occupied with the war. Why is it necessary to attempt to read the needs of the future, they ask, when you consider that this is strictly a peacetime bill with no bearing whatever on the pressing business of winning the war?

These reasons for waiting are too logical to be brushed aside, but many persons, both in and out of Congress, believe a long delay is tantamount to killing any plan for universal military training, no matter how much our national interest may require it.

The Army has another good reason for asking action now. Like civilian organizations, the Army should have information on its peacetime job at the same time it is conducting the war. Even plans that must spend some time on the shelf should be made in advance. The general staff should know whether it is headed toward a permanent civilian army, a large standing army, or virtual demobilization with the fate of the Nation trusted to brotherly love.

But, no doubt, it is also true that our responsible military leaders are afraid of the swinging pendulum of public opinion. At the price of terrible waste of lives and na-

tional resources they have been required to build one of the world's most powerful fighting machines is less than 5 years. They have stood at the brink of disaster, they have looked over the brink and seen what was below—at the very time the American public was blithely assuming our national good luck would see us through. These men would be negligent in their duty if they did not use any influence at their command to make sure that it doesn't happen again. In their minds no world order for a conceivable number of years can justify the United States in neglecting its own military strength.

Right now the majority of the American public, by the evidence of all public-opinion polls, is overwhelmingly in favor of universal military training. It would be quite natural for these men to want to strike while the iron is hot—get a good program established—then hope it will provide a peg for future public thinking, a peg to stop the pendulum before it swings too far back.

Considering that in peacetime civilians have always been suspicious of military leaders, General Marshall has taken a very constructive step. His plan for a trained civilian Army is geared more to the civilian type of mind than what usually passes for Army thinking. By proposing a substitute for a large standing Army he goes back to the methods advocated by George Washington and reverses all other military leaders since that day. Without exception they have been big standing Army men.

We all realize that in a democracy public opinion must rule. But on an issue of such wide fluctuations as this you might ask, "Which public opinion? The opinion generated by war or the equally unusual opinion likely to come with the reaction after the war?" As a practical matter, of course, both must be taken into account in drafting any permanent military training plan in times ruled by the war psychology. Neither the grim, sacrificial attitude of wartime nor the complete revulsion against guns after a war is entirely representative of the American people. In the past the military standards have been set at the time of the revulsion—with tragic results.

If the public could be counted on to see more clearly after the war than it does today, nearly everyone would agree with the 12 college presidents and many others who hold to the same view. No matter how a lack of permanent policy might handicap the military leaders in their long range plans, the arguments for delay would still stand.

Will the American people come out of this war clear-eyed and realistic? Most profoundly we hope so. Whether a military training bill passes or fails in this Congress, a steadfast public must be the foundation of our national strength. In the past we have indulged in the luxury of believing our hatred of war required us to throw away the means of war. We indulged in it behind the fancied security of ocean barriers that were blasted on Pearl Harbor day. Perhaps after 160 years we have learned our lesson.

Armed Forces Have a Priority on Beer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, we read during the past few days an article about the soldiers in the Thirty-seventh Division celebrating their entry into Manila by sampling the products of a large brewery. I can readily understand why a glass of beer is welcome in that climate.

Some well-meaning people feel that our armed forces should be deprived of beer during the period of the war. Regardless of our views on this subject, nothing could be more harmful than if an order were issued to deprive them of a bottle of beer. Even if they did not want it they would resent, and very properly so, any action that might be taken along this line.

St. Louis is one of the great beer-producing cities of the Nation. Fifteen percent of the beer brewed goes to the armed forces. Under the permission granted me, I include an article published in the St. Louis Star-Times:

ST. LOUIS BEER GOES TO WAR; 800,000 CASES EACH MONTH

Approximately 800,000 cases of St. Louis-made beer go to American servicemen overseas each month, figures from the Missouri Brewers' Association reveal.

Each of four major beer companies here ships 15 percent of its product to the overseas troops, and a fifth company is preparing an extensive shipment to be sent in March.

Figures also reveal that an additional 382,700 cases each month are purchased by the military for consumption by troops in this country, making a total of 1,182,700 cases a month earmarked for servicemen.

That means that, in the course of 1 year, 14,192,400 cases are sent to men either overseas or in military camps in this country. With each case containing 24 bottles, additional mathematics reveals that 340,617,600 bottles of beer a year are sent from St. Louis breweries to servicemen.

The following figures show how much St. Louis beer is going to the armed forces:

	Percent domestic	Percent overseas	Cases, domestic, monthly	Cases, overseas, monthly
Anheuser-Busch, Inc.	5	15	140,000	625,000
Griesedieck Bros. Brewery Co.	0	15	----------	75,000
Hyde Park Breweries Association, Inc.	1	15	1,700	55,000
Falstaff Brewing Corportation	17	0	237,000	(1)
Columbia Brewing Co.	2	15	4,000	45,000
Average	5	12	----------	----------
Total	------	------	382,700	800,000

[1] Falstaff now preparing extensive overseas shipment for March.

The George Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, many people have asked my position concerning the George bill, which, of course, involves the confirmation of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce. What the Senate may have done or may do in regard to Wallace is none of my business, legislatively. In the House of Representatives, however, I propose to support any and all measures such as I believe will effectually and absolutely divorce Mr. Wallace from the direct or indirect control of the expenditure of vast sums of the taxpayers' money. He has already wasted too many millions trying to make substance out of his pipe dreams to be entrusted with even a penny in order to advance his socialistic and radical plans to remake this Government fundamentally.

Anybody who reads what Mr. Wallace says must know he is opposed to the fundamental policy of thrift and to the present so-called capitalistic system of government under which we operate. The truth is, he is for about everything the ordinary man in this country is against. He is against those who have. He is for all those who have not, and he does not recognize the fact that in many instances the reason they have not is because they have not the intestinal fortitude to get in a country where what a man has is measured solely on the basis of what he is willing to pay in blood and sweat and tears to get. Wallace is a little of every "ism" and "ist" and their composite. We must see to it that he is not permitted to hold office where he can do us any further harm.

I am opposed to the confirmation of Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, with limited or unlimited powers. While he says he is for the small businessman, his actions over the years belie his words, for, as the slaughterer of little pigs and the plower-under of crops to create a scarcity of food for the common man, the small businessman and his family, he demonstrated his comprehension of the future and present and his incompetence as an administrator and, above all, his lack of interest in the very common people about whom he talks so much, impractically.

In the second place, I am against his confirmation because I am opposed ab initio to this astrologer, starry-eyed dreamer, socialistic, and radical, poor businessman, and to the theories he envisages and openly supports for a paternalistic state. The good old U. S. A. is good enough for me, on the old basis of live and let live, governed by the law of supply and demand.

In the third place, he should not be allowed to use the taxpayers' money in order to advance his selfish plan to make himself President. He has the misguided support of some of those who agree with his policies and visions, and that of others who hope to make his impractical dreams come true to serve their selfish ends. They must be their own juries and judges.

This man Wallace also is the sine qua non and the idol of those who hope to profit at his hands and at the taxpayers' expense, such as the Sidney Hillman C. I. O.-P. A. C. group which demands his confirmation, ill-advisedly.

However, there are those of us who feel that the common people—and that means the practical dirt and dairy farmers, the daily workers, management, labor, industry, and capital, and you and me—would survive Wallace's separation

from any administrative function of the Government. Why pay for a guinea pig and be one at the same time?

Henry Wallace is first, last, and all the time a dreamer of dreams which are impractical of fulfillment. He is the apostle de luxe of the New Deal. He can point to no real, practical, continuous benefit ever derived by the common man from any of his theories which have cost more to make work than they pay.

Very few Vermonters would agree with the policies of Henry Wallace if they were given an opportunity to know what those policies are or if they had been obliged to listen to him expound them as I have had to do over the years when he has appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture.

Personally, I do not consider him a real friend of the farmer, dirt, dairy, or other, and therefore and because I feel he is a threat to the continuation of the Government as I have known and love it I shall not vote to give him control over a dollar of any Vermont taxpayer's money.

Transportation Crisis in Grain Belt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter recently received from Mr. E. A. Kepley, chairman of the county agricultural adjustment agency committee for Grant County, Kans. In this letter Mr. Kepley points out the extremely serious car shortage now prevailing in western Kansas and adjacent areas. It is indicated that unless cars can be furnished immediately there will be serious losses of grain which is now piled on the ground subject to all the hazards of snow and winter weather.

I think the conditions mentioned in this letter are largely representative of those prevailing in the entire area and unless something can be done promptly, valuable and much needed livestock feed will be lost or seriously damaged.

I want to commend the Office of Defense Transportation for the efforts which it is making to meet this situation, efforts which have not as yet, however, resulted in much success due to the unprecedented weather situation in the Northeast which has resulted in immobilizing so many freight cars in Northeastern yards. The letter in question follows:

ULYSSES, GRANT COUNTY, KANS.,
January 29, 1945.

Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The grain car situation is critical in Grant County so the county A. C. P. committee called owners or operators of elevators in Grant County and prepared the most accurate and conservative information we could.

We find that it will take 153 cars to move the 305,000 bushels of milo that is still on the ground and exposed to snow and weather. In addition the elevators and farm bins have 2,010,000 bushels and will require 1,286 cars to move this. During the past 4 months the four shipping points in Grant County received only 434 cars; in order to move the milo the next 4 months we will need three times as many cars as we got the past 4 months.

In addition we find that the elevators and the C. C. C. has 238,000 bushels of wheat and various farmers have 101,000 bushels of wheat to ship. This will require 188 grain cars.

To get the milo and wheat cleaned up for what promises to be a better than average wheat crop we will need 1,474 grain cars the next 4 months, this is 368 per month or an average of 41 cars per elevator per month.

We understand that a larger than usual percent of grain cars are going to the stations along the main line and the stations in Stanton and Grant County are being neglected and that these two counties have the largest grain sorghum crop ever produced in the county.

We hope this information will be helpful to you in your efforts to get grain cars for western Kansas.

Yours truly,

E. A. KEPLEY,
Chairman, County Committee.

The Greek Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article which recently appeared in the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., which article follows:

MR. NICHOLSON DISCUSSES GREECE WITH HIS TONGUE IN HIS CHEEK

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

If I were to write the agenda of the proposed conference of Messrs. Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin, I would arrange the subjects to be discussed not in the order of their gravity but levity, placing the easiest at the top, the hardest at the bottom. According to this scheme, the problem of Germany would be the first, that of Greece the last to be handled, since the battle of Athens is the prelude of World War No. 3.

I would recommend the listing of the subjects in this manner for expediency as well as for psychological reasons. The conference would start in absolute agreement, which is of the essence. A bright morning is a good omen, heralding a lovely day ahead.

The Greek question is the biggest, hardest, most intricate, and thorny problem before Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin, because Greece is the crossroads of the Mediterranean where Russia and England decided to confront each other as potential enemies. The battle of Athens and the simmering civil war in Greece are neither accidents nor phenomena of local significance. They represent the ancient dreadful disease of humanity, which is now spreading all over Europe, but especially in Greece, exhibiting there its most sinister symptoms.

To simplify matters, the civil war in Greece today is a miniature of the "red" revolution in Russia in 1918. The Communist leaders of EAM (Greek front of liberation) are decided to wage war against Regent Damaskinos and Premier Plastiras to overthrow them and erect their own government.

OUTLINE OF OBJECTIVES

They seem to have the following objectives:

First, to Russianize Greece; second, to create a new state out of the three Macedonias—the Greek, the Serbian, and the Bulgarian; third, to organize a Balkan federation on the pattern of the U. S. S. R.; fourth, to establish an alliance of the Balkan federation with Russia for mutual assistance against any and all aggressors, and, fifth, to try in every possible way to induce Turkey to join the federation, using peaceful means. If these prove futile, to invade Turkey and deprive her of the Dardanelles and Bosporus.

The leaders of EAM, being Communists, take their orders from Moscow. Therefore, the revolution in Greece is sponsored by Russia against England, in spite of the agreement of Teheran in 1943.

When Churchill sits at the green table with Stalin, they will both know that they are enemies. Churchill will smile and ask Stalin his reactions to the fatal drama now being played in Greece. Stalin will say:

"I am not responsible in the least. The blood of the innocent men, women, and children who have been slaughtered in Athens and who will be slaughtered in Peloponnesus, Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia, and Thrace is on the hands of Siantos, Miantos, and Company. I have nothing to do with their nefarious schemes and crimes."

If the conference were being held in Jerusalem (as I believe it should be), Churchill will remember Pontius Pilate and remark:

"I know you are innocent, but innocence alone in this case does not seem to prevent a murder. Greece is being delivered into the hands of the partisans of Siantos and Miantos. Won't you be a trifle more than neutral in a Roman sense, which I admit is legal, and be a little more concerned in a Greek sense, which is moral and humanitarian? After all, Greece delayed Hitler in the spring of 1941."

THE DIALOGUE CONTINUES

Stalin will interrupt him and say in earnest:

"Please, I am open to suggestions. What is the use of forcing an open door? What would you like me to do?"

Churchill: "I would ask you to order those gangsters to stop shooting, disarm, go home, and shave * * *."

Stalin: "My good man, I have done this very same thing long ago. In fact, I did it in December. I sent a Christmas card to Siantos and Miantos, wishing them in Greek: Epi ghis erene, en anthropis evdokia (Peace on earth, good will among men). What else could I do?"

Churchill: "I am overpowered with gratitude for your tenderness, Comrade Stalin, for that inspiration of genius. And what, pray, was the answer to your most gracious message?"

Stalin: "Niet, rien, noffing. I was hoping for an answer until the end of December. Now, to tell you the truth, I am beginning to despair. I wash my hands from Siantos and Miantos." (He washes his hands.) "Here, I am innocent!"

Then President Roosevelt will hold his cigarette holder as a drummer holds his stick, iron his voice and say:

"My friends, allow me to remind you that the solutions of all the problems of the universe which we put down on paper are yet in nebulous condition, that they will take time, a long time, in fact, eternity, as far as we are concerned, to evolve into worlds innumerable, since we all must strive for perfectionism, no matter if we shall ever attain it or not. Oh, yes, I was speaking of eternity, wasn't I? * * * if you can follow the astronomical way of my thinking * * * Well, why, then, not be realists in practice, as we

are in theory? Why not be optimists, rather than pessimists? And why not leave a few questions unsolved, or at least one question? That one question will be an excuse adequate enough for us to meet in Jericho in the next crisis. After Germany's surrender, Japan will be with us—pardon me, I mean against us. So, let us promise solemnly to each other that we shall meet again, and again, and again, in order to plan together, work together, and fight together. I move we adjourn."

SOTERIOS NICHOLSON.

Farm Credit Administration Outshylocks Shylock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including two letters from Mrs. Mary Roberts, of Jetmore, Kans. These letters speak for themselves. It is almost unbelievable that a Federal agency should resort to the loan-shark collection methods which these letters reveal the Farm Credit Administration to be following.

A few weeks ago Congress passed legislation authorizing the Farm Credit Administration and other Government agencies to compromise and settle indebtedness owing the Government. It was the intent of Congress in passing this legislation to provide a way whereby people like Mr. and Mrs. Roberts could adjust their indebtedness and get it on a basis where they could pay it. It certainly was not the intent of Congress that any Government agency should go out and browbeat and harass elderly and sick people. It has been a long time since I have heard of anything so brutal and indecent. I may say that this is only one of numerous complaints which I have lately received regarding the collection policies of the Farm Credit Administration and I am today making a request of the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture to immediately investigate the administration of the recent act and the collection policies now being pursued by the Farm Credit Administration.

The letters follow:

JETMORE, KANS., *January 23, 1945.*

HON. CLIFFORD HOPE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to the resettlement and seed loans. During the dust storms we borrowed money to save the life of our cattle and to live on. For 10 years we never raised a crop; finally had to sell all our cattle and machinery and moved to town and found work to live for 3½ years. Federal land bank foreclosed on our home, our lifetime saving. Four years ago we moved to a farm and asked the F. S. A. to loan us money to get a new start, which they refused to do. We had nothing to live on but what our son in the Army would send us. He never asked for dependency benefits, but preferred to send home what he could. Some months more than $40. That's pretty good for a corporal overseas. He arranged to get a little farm, 160 acres, $2,000, paying $150 a year. Had arrangements made for it to go to me. But now since we have this little start the F. S. A. is trying to get what little we have saved. All the cattle we have probably a dozen with a $500 note against. It makes us pretty discouraged. We are both nearing 60 years and my husband ill with cancer, so most of the work falls on me. I would feel bad to see them get it with my only son fighting the past 2 years in France and never been home for 3 years. It's his money that has kept us alive and paid for what we have. I know you are very busy and I hate to bother you, but thought there might be some legislation you could put through to save what little the farmers have who have gone through this period. Many thousands of the older folk, like us, are in the same shape. But I would like to have a little left when the boy comes home. There are only 33 acres broke on this place. We rent 100 acres but give one-third rent and paid $5 an acre to have it cut and $128 to hire the grain hauled to market. How much have we to live on? We owe quite a hospital bill, as my husband was in the hospital most of the summer and fall. You've no idea what it's like to live in such a fear. I am afraid to get the mail for fear of the sheriff. I always thought growing old was to be pleasant, but not so in our case. Pardon me if I have taken up too much of your time, but what shall we do?

Sincerely,

MRS. MARY ROBERTS.

JETMORE, KANS., *January 31, 1945.*

MR. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: Your kind letter came today, and we really did appreciate getting it. The Feed and Seed Loan got so anxious for their money we couldn't wait for your letter, so we wrote them a check for $50, causing us a $12 overdraft at the bank. We have had two letters from them this week wanting more money by next Tuesday. Mr. Caldwell found out some way we owned four Government War bonds, the $25 type at maturity. He insists we cash them immediately and give them the money. We took them to the post office today. They wouldn't cash them, so we left them at the bank this afternoon to see if they would cash them. It was quite an effort getting enough money to get them. After Pearl Harbor I saved all my dimes to buy them, thinking I was patriotic. We owe the Crop and Feed Loan about $1,100, counting interest, and the Resettlement or Farm Security Administration $680. We have never borrowed anything from them for 8 or 9 years, but when they first started loaning money during the dust storms Mr. Kenneth Hall came out and told us in order to keep the farmers on their farms they would pay them a certain amount, I think, $12 a week. Anyway, this money must be used to build up the farm, thereby furnishing them work and their living. We were then living in a two-room shack. So they gave us 2 months' checks, and we bought the cement, doing our own work. When we got the foundation run for three rooms, Mr. Hall came out and told us they had quit giving the money and we would have to borrow to finish the building. So the $680 is what we borrowed to finish the building. We never would have started if we had known they were not going to keep their word. Of course, the dust kept blowing until we lost all our cattle. Many a day my husband and I spent all day digging out the soapweed, then taking and chopping them up fine with a corn knife until our hands were blistered and bleeding. The Federal land bank then foreclosed on our home. I wish I could find those papers and send you telling us to build, but we have had to move five times since then, and so much gets misplaced and destroyed when you move so much. I think we can borrow about $500 on this farm; but if we did, I want a guarantee that it will clear both Feed and Seed Loan and Resettlement or Farm Security Administration. This is all we have, and everything we have is what our son has sent us. He has earned his money the hard way, fighting and living in mud in France. I had hoped to have something for him when he gets home. We have not written him any of this worry, thinking it might not be best for him. We owe $75 hospital bill at Gleason Hospital at Larned, and I really do not know what the doctor's bill will be in Dodge City; probably $150. Have been afraid to ask, knowing we had nothing to pay with. My husband needs to go to the hospital now, as cancers are breaking out several places, but cannot do it until we have money to pay them. My son never asked dependency for us, thinking he'd rather pay us himself. If he had in the 3 years he's been gone, there would have been nearly enough to pay the seed and feed loan. I will send you our entire income for the month of January: Cream, $25.96; eggs, $15.87. Please tell us what would be the fair way to settle. But, really, we can't endure having them write us two or three times a week, calling us over the telephone (country line), and visiting us. I want some kind of a settlement so we can be at peace once more. Please give us your advice. How much do you think we should pay? Will take your advice. Thanking you again, I am,

Sincerely,

MRS. MARY ROBERTS.

The American Way Is Winning the War. Why Exchange It Now for Totalitarian Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I wish to amplify the statements made in my speech on Thursday, February 1, 1945, when the May bill, H. R. 1752, and the Harness-Barrett and the Voorhis substitutes were before the House for consideration.

In that speech I expressed opposition to the May bill and, in turn, supported the Harness-Barrett and the Voorhis substitutes. I voted to recommit the May bill and, on final passage, voted against it. The President has urged that we support the May bill, as General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, and Admiral King, Chief of Naval Operations, have stated that they will need by June 30, 1945, an additional 900,000 men and that they need additional war equipment. The President and the other proponents of this May bill, H. R. 1752, state that 700,000 additional men will be needed in industry and agriculture by June 30, 1945, to provide additional equipment.

I am a great admirer of General Marshall and Admiral King. They have been trained from early boyhood in the art and science of war. They and those associated with them and our millions of American boys have wrought heroically and gloriously on the seven seas,

the five continents, and the islands of the world. There is no brighter chapter in American history. General Marshall and Admiral King say they must have 900,000 additional men by June 30, 1945, and that they must have additional equipment. I accept these statements at their full face value. We should see to it that they have the 900,000 and as many more as needed and that our Army and Navy be supplied with all the munitions of war, food, and clothing, that our commanders say they need—and then some. There must not be any shortage of men, munitions, materials, supplies, and food at any time or anywhere in order to insure complete victory at the earliest moment possible.

As I pointed out in my speech the other day, the President and the Director of the Selective Service can place each and every one of the 18,000,000 men and boys between the ages of 18 and 45 covered by this bill into the armed forces, if they desire and after they are there, require them to perform any service they may be able to perform, either for full active duty or for limited service. They can draw from this pool of 18,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 45 except the joker in the Selective Service Act, which gives a privileged status to more than 300,000 able-bodied young men most of them single and who have been passed on as in good health and able to perform active duty. Most of these are clerks, performing nonessential jobs in the Government and they could be spared much more easily than to further strip the farms and industry of young men engaged in war production. It would be an easy matter if the administration were willing to have this provision stricken from the law and put these 300,000 young men on an equal footing with other able-bodied young men in the Nation.

Investigation has disclosed that by the end of 1943 there were 3,007,000 Federal jobholders. This was increased in 1944 by 302,000. Therefore, there are now 3,309,000 Federal officeholders and workers. It is generally agreed that the services of a million or more of these could be very well dispensed with and this would add to the efficiency of the service and save the taxpayers billions of dollars. But instead of cutting down this vicious waste of manpower, this conscription bill will add no one knows how many, but perhaps 100,000 or more Federal officeholders; and other bills are being pushed by the administration that will add many thousands more.

If young men under the age of 18 volunteer for the Navy as they have been and are doing, at least 150,000 will be inducted before June 30, 1945. More than 420,000 able-bodied young men will reach the age of 18 and be subject to the draft before June 30, 1945.

But there still remains this large pool of 18,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 45 within the draft age and subject to the draft who have not been inducted into any branch of the armed services.

There has been a wide discrimination against the colored men for the armed services, and there are thousands of young women who are willing and who could be inducted into the armed services to perform work that is being done by young men capable of combat duty. We can easily get an additional 1,000,000 men for service by June 30, 1945.

This conscription bill includes farmers. The farms have been hit harder than any other group. It is urged that with the farms stripped as they are of manpower, that 200,000 additional be taken from the farms. This would be a serious blow against our production of food, feed, and fiber that are so essential to winning the war. The facts disclose that there can be no doubt but that General Marshall and Admiral King will have all the men they say they need for our armed services.

IS IT NECESSARY TO CONSCRIPT AMERICAN LABOR?

In order to produce the equipment that General Marshall and Admiral King say is needed, the President and other proponents of this bill say that we must have 700,000 additional men and women for war production by June 30, 1945. The Federal Manpower Commission says that we need less than 160,000. They have been organizing our manpower resources during the war. They should know more about this question than any other person or agency of the Government. The President appointed them and if they are inefficient he should name a new manpower commission. They have been established and have a set-up in every community in the United States.

Whether it is one hundred and sixty thousand or seven hundred thousand, what are the prospects of securing this number of men and women over the period from now until June 30, 1945? We are told that a million and a half workers in industry left their jobs in the summer and fall of 1944. That may be true; but who is to blame for this condition?

ADMINISTRATION POLICY RESPONSIBLE FOR WORKERS LEAVING DEFENSE PLANTS

It was not due to any lack of patriotism on the part of the overwhelming majority of these workers. They heard President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and many leaders of this country and the Allied Nations say, and they read many magazine articles and editorials claiming, that the war in Europe would be over in 1944 and that many war plants would be eliminated and millions of workers would be released and would have to go back to peacetime production in industry and on the farms. They knew of hundreds of war plants being closed down and they knew of tens of thousands of men and women who were being released from work.

At the urgent request of the President and his administration for many weeks last fall Congress devoted a great deal of its time to working out a reconversion bill to provide for the reconversion from war industries to peacetime industries, and it was alleged there were $100,000,000,000 surplus war supplies and property to be disposed of. These overoptimistic statements and the closing of plants and people being let out from work led the great majority of these million and a half to feel that they had better get back to their homes and secure peacetime jobs.

We might say in passing that before the election the President told of the miraculous job that industry, management, agriculture, and labor had done in the field of production. When the American workers learned that the war would not be over in 1944, every day since early in November thousands have been flocking back to the war plants. The numbers who have returned run into the hundreds of thousands and the numbers are increasing every day. If nothing more was done I am sure that whether we need 160,000 as stated by the Manpower Commission, or 700,000 as claimed by the President and the backers of this bill, many more than that number will be back in the war plants long before June 30, 1945.

IS IT WISE TO CONSCRIPT AMERICAN LABOR?

Apparently many persons do not recognize the difference between being drafted to work for the Government and being drafted to work in civil life for private individuals and companies who are engaged in business for profit.

Great Britain and some of our other allies, as well as our enemies—Germany, Japan, and Italy—have been operating under a policy of controlled enterprise and conscripted labor.

Great Britain in 1943 and 1944 had an absenteeism of workers of 10 percent. In the United States our absenteeism for 1943 and 1944 was between 6 percent and 7 percent.

In Great Britain in 1944 loss of time by strikes was 16 percent greater than strike losses in the United States—in man-days lost. This statement is taken from reports of the British Ministry of Labour.

British employers report that labor is unwilling because it is drafted, and that only a minority of the conscripts are satisfactory laborers.

Donald Nelson, who made such a wonderful record as head of our War Production Board, declared, "We call our secret weapon the initiative, intelligence, and know-how of free American workers."

Hon. Joseph Keenan, vice president of the War Production Board, states that "labor's morale, her sense of participation * * * have been so heightened, that they have broken all records."

Notwithstanding that industry and management, agriculture and labor have been greatly handicapped by the mistakes and blunders of the administration, their record of production in every branch of industry, transportation, agriculture, and labor has been one of the miracles of recorded history. Labor and industry have also made some mistakes. Some men in industry have not cooperated. Some labor groups, against the advice and appeal of their national leaders, have engaged in work stoppages. Yet none of our allies and none of our enemies with conscript has approached American production in man for man, machine for machine, and unit for unit. There must be no halting or stoppage of industry or labor until victory is won.

A MARVELOUS RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

Industry and management, including chambers of commerce, the National Manufacturers Association, railroads, truck and bus lines, a great majority of the farmers, and labor—American Federation of Labor, the railroad brotherhoods, the United Mine Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, and other labor groups—in fact, all labor groups that we know anything about, except a small group of those with communistic front, have expressed strong opposition to the May bill, H. R. 1752.

We look to our generals and admirals to know our needs of men and materials. They are trained and experienced in their particular fields. On the other hand, we must look to industry, management, agriculture, and labor to advise us as to the best course to follow to provide the materials, equipment, and munitions for our war effort. These groups of producers are experienced and trained in their particular field. It seems to me that it would be unwise to follow any other course.

We started from scratch in 1940 and have built the greatest navy and merchant marine that the world has ever seen. It is generally said that we now have a greater tonnage of fighting and auxiliary vessels and cargo vessels than all of our allies and our enemies combined. We have supplied ourselves and billions and billions of dollars of war supplies for the Allied Nations. We have furnished Great Britain more than twenty-five billion of lend-lease. We have been thrilled over the wonderful progress made and being made by the Russian armies. I saw an article recently by Miss Christine Sadler in which she stated that the present Russian drive might be labeled, "Made in the United States of America." Our own Government F. E. A. lists the following that we have furnished the Russians: 11,000,000 pairs of Army boots, 97,000,000 yards of cotton cloth, 50,000,000 yards of woolen cloth, 58,000,000 yards of webbing, 294,000,000 tons of explosives, 331,000 motor vehicles, 1,045 railroad locomotives, 7,164 freight cars, 1,000 dump cars, 100 tank cars, 2,120,000 tons of steel, 478,000 tons of railroad rails, 110,000 tons of wheels and axles, 233,000 tons of aluminum, 314,000 tons of brass, 65,000 tons of copper products, 16,600 tons ferro-alloys to be used in the manufacture of steel in the Soviet mills, 733,000 tons of nonferrous metals, 12,200 airplanes, 1,300,000 tons of petroleum products, 638 tons of chemicals, and so forth. This does not include the billions of pounds of food, feed, clothing, powder, shells, and other war equipment.

This tremendous aid to Russia was made possible through production in our industries, plants, shops, mills, and mines, and on our farms and transported by American railroads, truck, bus, air lines, and ships, and this represents only a part of what we have delivered to our allies—Great Britain, France, Italy, China, India, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the South African Republic, Ethiopia, north Africa, Mexico, Cuba, and other Central and South American countries. These are the results of the genius and skill of patriotic Americans engaged in industry, management, agriculture and labor. Eighty-five or ninety percent of the 12,000,000 American boys in our armed forces come from the homes of those engaged in industry, management, agriculture, transportation, and labor.

Can it be truthfully said that they are not sincerely and deeply interested in winning this war and having their boys and my son to come back to their homes and loved ones?

Would it be the part of wisdom to ignore the advice of these persons engaged in production and enter upon an entirely new and untried policy at this stage of the war, that those engaged in production, say, will bring about confusion, lower the morale of our workers, and decrease production? The American people fought a war and adopted the thirteenth amendment to do away with involuntary servitude. We have fought all of our wars without conscription. We have won the battle of production and are winning this war without conscription. This has been the policy of our Government from its beginning. We are now called upon to abandon this well-tried American democratic policy and embark upon the policy of the totalitarian governments and the policy used by our ally, Great Britain, without success. Is it the purpose of this administration to secure greater production? If it is, let us appeal to those who have made this wonderful record of production, with their experience and achievements behind them, to go forward, as they can, to greater achievement, or is it the policy of this administration to further regiment and tighten their control on the American people, leading in the end to the regimentation and control of industry, management, agriculture, and labor. Why should our boys fight for liberty, freedom, and democracy in other lands and for other lands and other peoples, and come home to find that these great fundamentals have been destroyed here at home? The only group that has claimed to favor labor that is supporting this bill is Earl Browder, the leader of the Communists in the United States and the Daily Worker of New York, the newspaper and mouthpiece for the Communists in the United States. They favor this bill. It is very much in line with the totalitarian policies of communistic Russia. Do they indulge the hope that this will disrupt our country and bring about disunion and discord for which Communists throughout the world have striven for a quarter of a century? I have no objection to Russia having any form of government her people may desire but I do not want the Russian form of government imposed upon industry, management, agriculture, or labor or any part of the American life.

If the objection to the May conscript bill was confined solely to labor, the American people might hesitate to follow it but the objection to this bill represents every agency of production in this country, capital and labor, industry and management and workers, farmers and those engaged in transportation, chambers of commerce, manufacturers associations, and Federal Manpower Commission. They all warn the Congress and the country that this bill will hurt and not help production and threaten the liberties of the American people.

WHEN DEMOCRACY BREAKS DOWN

David Lawrence, the editor and publisher of the United States News, who cannot be charged as a spokesman for labor or any other group, but one of the very ablest commentators on public questions, sensed the danger in this measure and in an able editorial warns the Congress and the Nation against its adoption:

The American people have been taught to believe that totalitarianism is bad and that democracy can wage war without adopting the Fascist formula of forced labor.

The American people have been taught to believe that involuntary servitude is bad. The Constitution explicitly forbids it.

Military service is not involuntary servitude because service for one's country is not service for anybody's individual profit.

But enforced service in a civilian plant, operated by civilians and in which civilians have a stock ownership and seek to make profits, is involuntary servitude.

The cry that in the midst of war the Constitution must be abrogated is the same cry of expediency that the totalitarians use when they abrogate human rights.

The House of Representatives has passed a manpower bill which calls for forced labor. It is a grave mistake in policy and marks a tragic chapter in the history of American democracy.

* * * * *

It is difficult to see how the Congress, if it enacts the pending manpower bill, can hesitate to remove all profit from any enterprise where there is forced labor. If forced labor is to be construed as service to one's country, let it be clearly for that purpose alone, and then, logically, management and ownership must be conscripted, too. It will be a surprise if the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., who are opposed to the forced-labor bill, do not insist on such legislation to cover management and ownership.

Without pressure the House would have adopted H. R. 1803, the Harness-Barrett substitute to the May bill. With all the pressure the administration could bring to bear and with the appeal of the Speaker that we should adopt the May bill without any amendment, the Harness-Barrett substitute lost by only 10 votes. This substitute bill was backed by all of the groups that are opposed to the May bill. H. R. 1803 would have corrected the waste of manpower in the Government and in the Government shipyards and the cost-plus war plants. There are thousands of unnecessary men and women in these Government shipyards and these cost-plus war plants. That has been clearly demonstrated by the investigating committees of the House and Senate and by reports that all Members of the House and Senate have received from reliable persons working in these plants. There is nothing in the May bill to reach this hoarding and waste of manpower in the Government or in these Government-owned and controlled plants and the cost-plus plants. This waste of manpower has been denounced by industry, both management and labor. H. R. 1803 will carry out the policies of our Government and will

strengthen those policies by giving further aid to the War Manpower Commission. The Federal Manpower Commission was appointed by the President and can only recommend. The Harness-Barrett substitute gives the Manpower Commission the power to act and to cooperate with industry, management, agriculture, and labor in cutting out this waste and hoarding of manpower by the Government or anybody else and to distribute the manpower through this cooperation instead of by conscription. I know that we can accomplish more by cooperation of industry, management, agriculture, labor, and the Manpower Commission, acting with patriotic zeal, to increase our production and win the war as quickly as possible, than we can by conscripting 18,000,000 men when they say we only need 700,000, and set up a new far-reaching bureaucracy by placing this matter into the hands of the local draft boards of the Nation. Whatever shortage there is, it is more or less local. It does not exist throughout the country. They have an excess of manpower in most of the communities.

We have in this country nearly 53,000,000 workers employed in some capacity or other. Nearly one-half of this additional manpower asked for could be secured from the excess manpower in the Federal offices and all of it could be secured in the excess of manpower in the Government plants and the cost-plus plants.

The Government has been wrong in establishing and increasing many of the plants of production in populous and crowded centers of the Nation necessitating the expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars to provide homes, and so forth, for the workers. If these plants had been distributed throughout the country; for instance, in many parts of Kentucky where they have ample supplies of timber, coal, gas, water, highways, railroads, and over supply of men and women capable of doing war work there could have been no shortage of manpower, and the manpower would be distributed throughout the Nation. Under the May bill, men and women can be taken from their homes, farms, and small plants and sent to any part of the world and required to remain there until the war closes. That may be 1 or that may be 5 years. No one knows. They could be forced to leave their families and farms and go where a draft board may say and work for some other farmer if the draft board decides his farm is more productive, and a good machinist and mechanic might have a little business and produce war materials, but he might be forced to go to some larger plant and use machines and give up his own plant and his family, and the small number who have refused and still refuse to do useful war work when drafted would have all the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. This would put them on a much more favorable basis than tens of millions of patriotic men and women who have been and are doing their full share in helping to win the war. In other words, the faithful and patriotic are penalized and the indifferent and shiftless will be rewarded. That alone will create discord. They say this will reach folks in the pool rooms and other places, the idlers and shiftless. The British authorities say that only a small part of the conscripted workers perform satisfactory service. Why not take these persons who refuse to work or do their part in this war into the armed services? They can do that and compel them to do limited service, if not actually to fight.

Believing that this legislation will cut down production and not increase it; that it will be hurtful and not helpful, I have and shall continue to oppose legislation in the form of H. R. 1752, the May conscription bill.

Why the New Deal Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House on Friday, February 2, 1945, I insert an editorial titled "Why the New Deal Wins," which was published in the Herald-Statesman, of Yonkers, N. Y., on January 15, 1945:

WHY THE NEW DEAL WINS

The Dunn Survey of Greenwich which came closer in its preelection predictions last fall than did any other of the numerous poll takers and political prophets, has now furnished leaders of the Republican Party throughout the East with its analysis of the reasons why the New Deal continues to win.

Although the election is long past, the return of Congress, and the State Legislature at Albany has revived political interest and there may be timeliness in consideration of the review of past events.

"You must face squarely the fact that the Republican fight is to regain, not to preserve, free representative national elections," is the warning Rogers Dunn gives the G. O. P. chieftains.

"You did not 'almost' win the 1944 election," he writes. "Neither does the close vote justify optimism for 1948 any more than the close vote of 1940 justified optimism for 1944. Once again, New Deal methods worked with precision and returned the majorities planned more than a year before election day—majorities which experience showed could be maintained regardless of campaign issues and qualities of the Republican candidates."

What are these successful "New Deal methods"?

The Dunn Survey purports to show that they are based upon a "bought" vote, by which is meant the strategic placing of Federal employees in doubtful or pivotal States with large votes in the Electoral College. In July 1943 Mr. Dunn sent a questionnaire to Republican Governors, Congressmen, National and State committeemen, asking: "What is the average number of Democratic votes you would expect each Federal employee could influence?"

The answers ranged from 3 to 10 votes for each such employee.

Taking a low average of four to be conservative, the survey then shows that 2,800,000 Federal employees influence 11,200,000 votes and from this draws this conclusion:

"Forty-eight million votes were cast in 1944. If Roosevelt had only 40 percent of the normal or free vote, the Federal employee vote of 11,200,000 would give him 54 percent of the total vote. He won 53½ percent.

"You must recognize that you have never been fighting Franklin Roosevelt and his uncanny political touch," Mr. Dunn tells the G. O. P. leaders. "You have been fighting the new instrument of public power, a part of which, the bought vote, has been perfected as a high precision machine, unbeatable until directly engaged. You have had 8 years and five national elections in which to learn this, but you have failed."

Well, what can the Republican Party do about it?

Mr. Dunn suggests two courses, if the New Deal is to be defeated in 1948. One plan is to have the G. O. P. openly state the facts, admit incapability of defeating the bought vote, and thus afford at least 22,000,000 opponents of the New Deal an opportunity to know the truth and perhaps cooperate in the solution.

The second plan is for the G. O. P. to organize a small group of capable and independent thinking men and women who perceive the peril and who will seek and consider every conceivable solution before 1948. "Whenever men have created new offensive weapons," counsels Mr. Dunn, "others have always found successful counter measures."

Well, we don't know. But we hope somebody does something about it.

Only God and a Few Humans Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Industrial and Engineering Chemistry magazine:

ONLY GOD AND A FEW HUMANS KNOW

The head of one of the most highly rated departments of chemistry in this country tells us:

"Instead of a normal senior class of chemists and chemical engineers of about 100, I met my senior class on Monday consisting of 1 girl, 2 IV–F men, and 2 men in I–A who will almost certainly be called before they can graduate in February. This is the class which ordinarily would graduate in June. In other words, it is our normal class. At the present time, instead of having about 80 graduate students in chemistry and chemical engineering, we have 4 girls and 4 IV–F men. Of the girls, 1 is married to a staff member, and the other is an alien."

In all honesty, Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Stimson, Mr. Patterson, Mr. McNutt, and General Hershey, what can the post-war future of America be when conditions such as these are permitted to continue? You are the men who can change the present senseless interpretations of the selective-service law.

Pre-war Germany, we suspect, had more chemists in proportion to its total population than the United States and, for all we know to the contrary, still has them. Certain it is that such secret weapons as V–1's, V–2's, and probably V–3's are not the brain children of economists and statisticians. Our allies and our enemies alike are preparing the greatest number of chemists in their history for service, once the present conflict is over, but we—we are sending our future chemists into the armed forces to perform every sort of task except making America technologically strong in peace or in war.

The present conflict is no 2-week National Guard encampment. We have finished the third year, and the end is not yet in sight. Unless we do something constructive in the matter of returning the mental cream of the Nation's youth as bona fide students to its classrooms, we will see an entire generation of scientists lost to this country.

Today we have at least 15,000 trained chemists and chemical engineers in the armed forces. Are they serving as chemists and chemical engineers? No; not more than a mere corporal's guard.

Why? Simply because their services as chemists and chemical engineers are not required in the Army.

They are sorely needed in America's production army—the army that is producing explosives to make our guns vocal, the army that provides aviation gasoline for our boys to fly the planes, the army that makes sulfa drugs, penicillin, blood plasma, and DDT so that our boys may live instead of dying on the frozen fields of Germany or in the oozing mud of Leyte. Yes; it is also the army that can make worth-while jobs for our boys to come back to instead of raking leaves and selling apples.

Why is this challenge to America's technological strength and supremacy in the post-war era permitted to continue? Only God, Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Stimson, Mr. Patterson, Mr. McNutt, and General Hershey know, and it is hardly practical to ask God why.

Letter to Former Governor Gardner, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I was so impressed with the letter written by Mr. Drew Pearson to former Governor Gardner, of North Carolina, which was reproduced in the Washington Post under date of February 6, 1945, that I felt the Members of this body would be enlightened by reading the facts brought forth by Mr. Pearson.

At this time when there is so much misapprehension regarding the true facts, when so much propaganda is going the rounds in a campaign to crucify one of our greatest Americans, Hon. Henry A. Wallace, I want to commend Mr. Pearson for the convincing manner in which he has presented the real facts in connection with this Wallace appointment.

I am one who thinks Henry Wallace is a great American. I know that Wallace's pulse beats for the common people. I know that Wallace has not lost the common touch. The service rendered by Secretary Wallace as directing head of the Department of Agriculture, when he supervised and passed on loans totaling more than $6,000,000,000 to save the farmers of America, is too recent to be forgotten by me.

Mr. Wallace's record as an administrator has placed him among the forefront of those who did the most to bring us out of economic chaos in which we found ourselves during the early months of 1933. The enemies of Henry Wallace know he is honest and fair. It is to such men that our country must look in the future if we are to remain free.

Within 2 hours after the Senate passed the George bill friends of Henry Wallace in my home city of Hartford formed the first Wallace for President in 1948 Club in America. There will be other such clubs all over America—yes, hundreds of them.

We need a man who has the wisdom of Henry Wallace for our post-war economy.

I am grateful to Mr. Pearson for writing such a splendid letter in behalf of such an outstanding American.

Under leave given me, I wish to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD the letter of Drew Pearson above-mentioned:

WASHINGTON, *February 3, 1945.*

Gov. O. MAX GARDNER,
Shelby, N. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR: We were talking last week about Henry Wallace. And since you as an old friend have been so patient and generous in defending me in the past, I thought I owed you a further explanation of my ideas on Henry Wallace.

We were remarking that Wallace was politically inept. He has been presiding over the Senate for 4 long years. Usually when a Senator or anyone close to the Senate comes up for confirmation for an administrative appointment, he is confirmed by acclamation, regardless of his political views, regardless of committee hearings, and regardless of research into his past.

The Senate would have confirmed Jack Garner for the dual job of Loan Administrator and Secretary of Commerce without any hesitation whatsoever. Also Charlie Curtis—though neither was banker nor businessman. They were skilled, however, at poker and smoked-filled-room politics, and they would have been confirmed.

Henry Wallace, on the other hand, has hardly made more than half a dozen close friends in 4 years of presiding over the Senate. He has no private refrigerator. He does not even smoke. When Senators dropped in to see him he was timid and shy and talked about foreign affairs and preclusive buying or seed corn. He just lacked the aptitude for winning close friends and influencing Senators.

WOODROW WILSON AND WALLACE

But sometimes I wonder whether in the broader sense Wallace hasn't been a very smart politician. For while lacking friends in the Senate he has won millions throughout the Nation. As you remarked, his devotion to principle, his austerity, his inability to compromise is so much like another great man the Senate rebuffed—Woodrow Wilson.

As the world looks on Woodrow Wilson's fight over the League of Nations, it is generally recognized that that battle was the turning point toward a new war. And what I am afraid of is that the current Senate fight over Henry Wallace (in which he has already lost more than 50 percent of the battle) may be the turning point toward another different kind of war.

You know far better than I the danger of economic war which can follow military victory. As Governor of North Carolina, you told me how even your efficient State had difficulty meeting its financial obligations in the depression days of 1932. We all remember the threats to lynch judges in Iowa, and how the drawbridges across the Potomac were raised for the first time in history to prevent 20,000 angry, hungry war veterans from storming the Nation's Capitol.

And what I don't believe the Byrds or the Baileys, the Tafts or the McKellars have any conception of is how easily this may happen again.

MUST NOT HAPPEN AGAIN

In the European war theater today there are 8,000 American soldiers absent without leave. While many of these are technical A. W. O. L.'s, on the other hand we already know how the black market has prospered in France, and we know that some American troops, especially in Italy, have left the Army permanently, have married local women, and live by the black market or by raiding the vast stores of American supplies in France and Italy.

While these are in the vast minority, we cannot escape the fact that almost every American soldier will come back, trained to fight, but only too anxious to get back to work—if he can get work.

We also cannot escape the fact that one result of this war has been the tremendous enhancement of the prestige of Soviet Russia. Prestige always accrues to a nation winning great military victories. In addition, I remember an observation by Congresswoman CLARE LUCE last year that Russia had now usurped the place occupied by this country when for about 100 years after 1776 we were looked up to in Europe as the young, vigorous, revolutionary country which set the political pace for the rest of the world.

Mrs. LUCE is probably right that today in France, Italy, Greece, increasing numbers of people are looking toward Russia as the young revolutionary country now setting the political pace for the world.

UNITED STATES LABOR AND RUSSIA

How much American soldiers coming home from Europe will be influenced by the inspiration of Soviet Russia, I don't know. If they have jobs, the influence should be negligible. But the risk is there. The risk also exists here at home.

Labor, which carried the main load in reelecting Franklin Roosevelt, was not happy over the appointment of the new millionaire antilabor team in the State Department. However, labor figured that the Cabinet would be balanced by appointment of its own friend and chief champion, Henry Wallace.

Now, however, they see Wallace bearing the brunt of the bitterest political attack since the days of William Jennings Bryan. They see him getting, at the most, merely control over the Census, the Patent Office, the Weather Bureau, the Bureau of Standards, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and other routine functions of the Commerce Department, with absolutely no power to help provide jobs or influence the economic future of the Nation.

All of which is liable to leave a sour taste in the mouths of several million people.

Even assuming that Henry Wallace knew as little about administrative government as some of his refrigerator-frequenting predecessors in the Vice Presidency; even assuming he had never run the largest agency of the Government, the Department of Agriculture, for 8 years with an A–1 record; even forgetting that as Secretary of Agriculture he loaned more money than Jesse Jones to more people and with a higher percentage of collections; even so, the bitter fight against Wallace is likely to leave a sour taste in the mouths of many people.

CHAMPION OF COMMON MAN

For Henry Wallace to millions of people has become a symbol. He has become a symbol representing the things which Roosevelt once fought for when his administration was young and vigorous. He has become a symbol of 60,000,000 jobs, a champion of the common man.

And it doesn't make for good public reaction when he is opposed and sabotaged by the millionaire apple-grower of Virginia, the millionaire publisher from Ohio, and the representatives of the Duke power interests in North Carolina. I should think that if the Byrds and the Baileys, the Tafts and the

McKellars were smart they would take the initiative in letting a man like Henry Wallace bear the brunt of the terrific post-war headaches. Then the political repercussions in case of failure would not be so violent.

But if the men who have learned to shoot straight come back to a land where history repeats, and the same thing happens as after the last war, and if they see the same little group of obstructionists responsible, then I, for one, fear the consequences.

That is why I think the Senate fight over Henry Wallace and his plans for the common man may take its place in history alongside the historic fight over Woodrow Wilson and his plans for permanent peace.

I only wish that some of your friends in the Senate had your broad understanding of these problems, or at least your sympathetic desire to inquire into them.

Your friend,

DREW PEARSON.

Kansas Produces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, from my home city, Kansas City, Kans., comes news which is cause for just pride. In 23 January working days 315 Mitchell B–25's were delivered, and in addition to this output an equivalent of 20 more B–25's was produced, in spare parts, by the North American Aviation Co. of Kansas. Thus, January 1945 was the greatest production month in this company's history.

Not only that, but in our sister city of Wichita Boeing Airplane announces that January was its month of largest production of B–29's—a month in which accelerated schedules were exceeded.

All this was in spite of the most severe winter weather the State has experienced in many years.

Kansas workers and plants deserve our gratitude. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that Kansas sets the pace for others to follow.

The Army's New Correction Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday evening, January 10, 1945, I had the pleasure of hearing a most interesting address on the subject of the Army's new Correction Division by Col. Marion Rushton, A. G. O., before a joint meeting of the Committee on Military and Naval Law sponsored by the American Bar Association at the Army and Navy Club.

I have been very much interested in the kind of treatment which our soldiers receive when they infringe the military laws and I was truly amazed at the degree to which the Army is going in an effort to maintain the highest possible standards of military justice, particularly as it pertains to the rehabilitation of our own military prisoners.

Colonel Rushton in the course of his remarks outlined in clear and forthright terms the mission of the Correction Division which has been set up in the Adjutant General's Office of the Army Service Forces for the purpose of administering this vital program within the Army.

The remarks of Colonel Rushton are of such a nature as to be of profound to every Member of Congress and for that reason I am asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this most illuminating talk by the officer who heads up this all-important Correction Division.

The address follows:

The Army is now operating an extensive, complex, and far-flung correctional and penal system embracing institutions from simple stockades enclosed by a few strands of barbed wire to walled-in disciplinary barracks like Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and Green Haven, N. Y. In number, the Army's general prisoners alone exceed the inmates of Federal prisons or those of the State of New York. In addition there is an undetermined number of garrison prisoners confined in stockades and guardhouses in practically every part of the world. With the increase in the size of the Army its prisoner population is growing and experience in World War No. 1 indicates that the peak will not be reached until after the termination of hostilities.

The military prison has a difficult role to fulfill since it serves two masters—the Army and the public. It must be operated in such a way as to maintain discipline, morale, and efficiency and to exercise a deterrent effect on potential offenders and conserve manpower. On the other hand, its affairs must be so conducted that the public has confidence that military offenders are not being treated inhumanely or with undue severity and yet that men who have failed in their military duty and are safe in confinement, instead of at the battle front, are not pampered.

Many departments and practically every troop unit in the Army are concerned with the handling of military offenders. The Provost Marshal apprehends and arrests them, the Judge Advocate General tries and sentences them, the Surgeon General, through his neuropsychiatric service, helps to classify them, the Adjutant General exercises over-all staff supervision and recommends clemency for the most serious cases, while the service commands are responsible for the care, custody, training of all general prisoners within their boundaries, and the restoration to duty of those thought to be more readily salvageable. Every command unit from companies, batteries, or troops up has its stockade and garrison prisoners. Besides their own misdemeanants such institutions are frequently called upon to take custody of persons awaiting trial, or sentence, or transshipment to the place of ultimate confinement. This heterogeneous group is constantly changing and presents a focal point for trouble unless carefully watched.

The Correction Division has been organized to study and to meet these problems. It is charged with the development of standards, policies, and procedures to be applied by those having jurisdiction over military prisoners without interference with the proper functions of command. The Correction Division's mission is to devise plans and specifications for standard guardhouses and stockades of various types, for rehabilitation centers and branch disciplinary barracks; to indicate what minimum facilities are necessary to insure proper segregation of vicious inmates and meet the ordinary requirements of custody, housing, and sanitation. It recommends standard tables of organization for institutions of various types and personnel standards with respect to mentality, physique, personality, and aptitude, and assists in putting into effect programs and procedures that have been found to have constructive value for both short-term and long-term prisoners and to increase the likelihood that they will make good on restoration to duty or on release.

Army prisoners considered capable of restoration to duty are committed to rehabilitation centers; others for convenience of custody or training are kept in post guardhouses, disciplinary barracks, or Federal penitentiaries. On the 1st day of January 1945, there were a total of 24,348 general prisoners under Army custody or supervision throughout the world. That compares with approximately 18,000 Federal prisoners and 12,500 prisoners in the State of New York. As of the first of the year a total of 7,710 general prisoners were in rehabilitation centers of which there are 6 in this country located in the Second, Fourth, Fifth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Service Commands; 8,562 were in disciplinary barracks, of which there are also 6 located in the same service commands; 1,843 were in Federal penitentiaries, the younger ones in reformatories like Chillicothe and El Reno, the old offenders in penitentiaries like Atlanta and McNeil Island; 4,702 were in overseas installations; and 1,531 were in guardhouses awaiting transfer. No garrison prisoners are included in these figures—it is probable that they number an additional 20,000 around the globe.

Our gross intake of general prisoners has averaged 2,045 per month during the last 6 months and although we have restored an average of 747 per month to duty and released an average of 407, there has been a net gain over the last 6-month period of 891 prisoners per month. On the first day of last year, 1944, the total number in confinement was 11,701. In other words, we have grown more than 100 percent within the last year and we are still growing.

At the end of 3 years of this war, we have about the same proportion of general prisoners to over-all strength as prevailed at the end of 2 years in the last war, that is, thirty one-hundredths of 1 percent or 1 prisoner for every 330 soldiers. How long the war is going to last and how high the proportion is going to mount as we begin scraping the bottom of the personnel barrel is anybody's guess. At the end of the war, whenever it comes, it is foreseeable that there will be a widespread feeling that all prisoners who are charged solely with military offenses and of many who are charged with minor civil offenses should be released. Just what the effect of this feeling is going to be is difficult to foresee, but certainly the rate of decline from the peak at the end of the war will be very rapid in the rehabilitation centers and they in all probability will be quickly closed up. But in the disciplinary barracks the decline will be less rapid. It is contemplated under Article of War 42 that all prisoners of the nonrestorable criminal type be confined in Federal penitentiaries and it is to be hoped that by the end of the war all such prisoners will be confined in civil institutions rather than those operated by the Army. But for one reason or another there will be some prisoners left in the disciplinary barracks to constitute a permanent problem until their sentences run out.

Although exact figures cannot be known so long as the war lasts, it does seem clear that

the rapid expansion now indicated will not long continue, and this, of course, has an effect upon the type of buildings and equipment which the Army should install. The maximum-security prison at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., with a capacity of 2,000 must apparently be supplemented for quite a period after the war by two other maximum-security institutions, by choice one on the east and one on the west coast. The Eastern Branch Disciplinary Barracks, Green Haven, N. Y., which is a maximum-security institution having a capacity of 2,016, is under lease from the State of New York, but if the anticipated crime wave develops at the end of the war, New York may require it for its own needs. The Army is therefore in the market for another maximum-security institution on a permanent basis.

No change in plant or equipment is anticipated for rehabilitation centers in this country now that more than half of the strength of the Army is overseas. The prime purpose of imprisonment is discipline, and discipline is best served if the soldier can be straightened out in his thinking and conduct and restored to duty. Restoration when permanently accomplished more nearly answers the Army's prison problem than any other result. Consequently, the greatest emphasis has been placed upon it.

From the date of activation in December 1942 through December 31, 1944, the rehabilitation centers have received 25,841 general prisoners. Of this number 7,710 are still in the process of rehabilitation, most of them having been received at the rehabilitation centers within less than 6 months; 8,524 have been found unsalvageable and transferred to disciplinary barracks or otherwise disposed of; and 9,607, or 37 percent, have been restored to duty. How well this 37 percent has since behaved will not be definitely known until the end of the war. So far, 835 are known to have gotten into trouble again, and again were convicted by general courts martial and are back on our hands. No matter how well or how poorly these rehabilitees eventually turn out it is felt that the attempt at rehabilitation, the attempt to give the second chance must be continued so as always to provide the possibility of flow in the prisoner's status.

Absence without leave and desertion are by far the most frequent offenses, military or civil. The Army has devoted considerable thought to that annoying problem, and court martial is not always the disciplinary remedy used. Processing centers have been established at Fort Devens on the east coast and Camp McQuade on the west coast to deal with the special problems of men who have jumped ship on their first or subsequent scheduled trips abroad. Here their records are examined and if the excuse is pretty good, and the record justifies the conclusion that probably the soldier will make good after all, he is put on the next ship to rejoin his unit with or without charges preferred. Such procedure is often recommended when soldiers miss their return boat after sick, rotational, or battle-fatigue leave in this country.

It seems clear to me that there will never be any single optimum solution to the desertion problem and it is not difficult to foresee real trouble with it when the fighting ceases in Germany and troops in large numbers are ordered across the world to fight in Japan.

Murder and rape cases are pretty well disposed of by commitment to the Federal prisons (the exceptions are probably analyzed as manslaughter or attempts), but other felonies are largely sent to the military prisons. There is a general feeling among military men that there is less disgrace in being sentenced to a disciplinary barracks or rehabilitation center than to a Federal penitentiary. And certainly there will be less embarrassment for the soldier after the war is over to refer in conversation to the former than to the latter. But I submit that when a genuine criminal is identified he should be sent where he belongs; namely, to the penitentiary. There are many men now in the Army who in the natural course of things would have wound up in penitentiaries had there been no war. We have drafted many potential criminals along with sound men. It behooves us to identify the real criminal and tuck him away where he will cause the minimum of worry both to the Army and to society. In practice, however, there are frequently real obstacles to the classification of offenders in the early stages of investigation and trial. If such a man has a criminal record it is to his advantage to conceal it and it is rarely the case overseas, or even in this country, that police, F. B. I., or case work records are available to courts-martial or even to reviewing authorities. Usually there is a psychiatrist attached to each division, but he is not always a criminologist nor are his services always available. Maj. Gen. Myron T. Cramer, the Judge Advocate General is, of course, aware of all this. I have heard him and his staff preach on the subject to the Judge Advocate General's school at Ann Arbor, Mich., and to conferences in the field. But it is a matter as to which the Army must always be on the alert, for once a felon is sentenced to a military prison he may not thereafter, under the provisions of Article of War 42, be transferred to a penitentiary, no matter how criminal his real nature may prove to be.

The chief difficulty which arises in the handling of prisons is to find and train adequate guard and administrative personnel with sufficient age and experience to give expert handling under all circumstances. A fool armed with a little temporal authority and a club can do himself, his commanding officer, and the Army more harm in a guardhouse than he would ever get a chance to bring about anywhere else. The blind cannot be expected to lead the blind. Many inmates have become general prisoners in part, at least, because of lack of leadership or imagination on the part of their commanders. A little patient exercise of tact, a little defter handling might well have avoided court martial in several cases which come to mind. Such men are entitled to good leadership and a chance to prove what they can do under it. In prison work personnel—all personnel from commandant to cell-block keeper—is more important than plant or equipment or theory or philosophy of punishment. Guards are teachers, not only in courses of instruction, but by example. No matter how admirable the overall policy of the Army with reference to military prisoners may be, and no matter how well planned and integrated its proposed system may be, it is of no practical value unless the guards who come in daily contact with the prisoners are willing and able to enforce it.

Even if all the persons with prison experience now in the Army were made available there would be a shortage of guard and prison personnel. It has become necessary, therefore, to institute courses of instruction to properly indoctrinate, train, and inform them. A practical school for such instruction has been set up at Fort Leavenworth, and, as each new branch disciplinary barracks has been activated, its new personnel have attended that school. This however is only the beginning. Further instruction will be available within a few weeks in cell-block management, ju-jitsu, personal protection, etc., at Atlanta, and as the students finish these courses they will return to their respective stations and there teach what they have learned.

To insure expert professional guidance for the War Department the Under Secretary of War has appointed a board of civilian consultants which include some of the most brilliant names in the penological field. Members of the board are Warden Stanley P. Ashe, Western State Penitentiary, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Sanford Bates, Commissioner, New York State Board of Parole; James V. Bennett, Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons; E. R. Cass, General Secretary, American Prison Association; Reed Cozart, Associate Warden, United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans.; William J. Ellis, Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies; Dr. Garrett Heyns, Director, Michigan State Department of Corrections; Warden Walter A. Hunter, United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans.; Richard A. McGee, Director, California State Department of Corrections; Warden Joseph W. Sanford, United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga.; and Walter M. Wallack, Wallkill State Prison, Wallkill, N. Y. Austin H. MacCormick, Consultant to the Under Secretary of War and Executive Director of the Osborne Association, New York, is chairman of the board. This board attended a conference which was held at Fort Leavenworth, November 14–16, and at which all commandants of rehabilitation centers and disciplinary barracks, representatives of the staffs of the nine service commands, Army Air Forces, Army Ground Forces, Army Service Forces, the General Staff, the Adjutant General, the Judge Advocate General, and the Surgeon General were present. Practical down-to-earth problems of custody, clemency, and restoration were discussed in detail, as well as the practical effectiveness of the whole general program. It is felt that in the future the various services and commands which are concerned with this intricate and thorny problem will not work separately, but with a thorough understanding of appropriate functions, and the common result to be attained.

Vandenberg Peace Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme pleasure that I include herewith under consent of the House, the speech made in Detroit, February 5, by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of his forthright proposals. They constitute the most constructive and potent contribution to American thinking on foreign policy and to American statesmanship since World War No. 1. They give almost the first ray of real hope that we may prevent World War No. 3.

VANDENBERG PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, with deepest gratitude I thank you for your generosity to me upon this fine occasion. Under pressure of the times in Washington, I rarely have an opportunity to get back to home, sweet home, during these days and nights which try the souls of men and test the fate of nations. You may understand, therefore, why I so deeply appreciate your hospitality. I shall respond by gratefully taking advantage of the occasion to tell you what is in my heart regarding the dedications which must be closest to yours.

One. America must win this war as swiftly and conclusively as possible, and no interruptions to the supply lines which sustain

our intrepid soldier sons can be tolerated for a single, bloody instant.

Two. America must seek a peace which justifies this sacrifice and martyrdom, which searches for justice as a substitute for force, and which plans a free world for free men.

In the time at my disposal I concentrate upon this latter aim. We have relative unity in this fraternity of battle. We sometimes drift dangerously away from a kindred but equally indispensable fraternity for peace. It is our responsibility to see to it that if this unity for peace disintegrates, it is not our America which shall be held at fault when the books of history are balanced. In my view, we cannot serve this solemn function by further silence in respect to our attitudes. That silence confuses our allies. It often provides them with the reason which they plead to justify unilateral decisions which collide with our ideals. It may dangerously invite the conclusion that our silence gives our own consent by default. It even confuses our own people who frequently cry out in anguish for the definition of our aims. It is time for us to say what we will do. It is time for us to say what we will not do. And it is time for us to start the doing.

That is my theme tonight.

A FEW FUNDAMENTALS

As a basis for our thinking, let me lay down a few fundamentals. The first is the recognition of a physical fact. Since Pearl Harbor the ghastly countenance of war has become more sinister than ever before in the nightmares of the human race. The awful science of mass murder has made more progress—what a word—in 3 cruel years than in all the centuries since time began. And this new science is only in its lethal infancy. Contemplate the robot bomb in its maturity. Contemplate the refinements of jet propulsion when it still further reduces this foreshortened world to an intimate neighborhood. Contemplate a war of push buttons, in which human flesh and blood are at the mercy of mechanized disaster. I need not labor the point.

This war, God knows, is bad enough. But world war No. 3 will open new laboratories of death too horrible to contemplate. I propose to do everything within my power to keep those laboratories closed for keeps. I make this pledge in the name of humane common sense. But, more than that, I make it in the name of American self-interest. Times have changed. The oceans are no longer moats around our ramparts. Once upon a time Detroit could wait for the enemy to get to Windsor. In the next world war an enemy half way around the globe will be just as close. No nation hereafter can immunize itself by its own exclusive action. Only collective security can stop the next great war before it starts. Therefore, collective security is to our advantage—and we serve America if we can help to make it work.

But this brings me immediately to my second fundamental. We cannot make it work alone. Unshared idealism is not an asset; it is a liability. It takes something more than a paper league to keep the peace. An unjust peace will break out of any strait jacket the wit of man can devise. It ought to. Collective security will be no stronger than the merits of the cause it implements. Therefore it is to our own American self-interest also to keep this objective forever at our masthead—peace with justice. Not because we want to meddle in the problems of other continents but because there can be no peace without justice. Let me be specific. I am talking about the basic aspirations of the Atlantic Charter. It is not just a nautical collection of fragmentary notes. It is bone and sinew of our flaming forward march. I quote:

"No aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise."

"No territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned."

"The right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

"Sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

THERE WILL BE DIFFERENCES

There will be differences of opinion in the grand alliance about the meaning of these precious things. I do not pretend to say that we, by dictation, can have it all our own way. But I do presume to say that, by the same token, no other member of the grand alliance, by dictation, can have it all his own way either. I do not speak belligerently. I speak with deepest respect for the utterly mangnificent contribution which each of our major allies is making to the coming victory. But I speak with equal respect for our own fabulous American contribution. I speak with a profound prayer that the friendly, helpful unity among us shall never fall apart. But I speak also in the belief that candor now will do more for this priceless unity than will disillusionment tomorrow.

This brings me to my third fundamental. The President has correctly said: "The nearer we come to vanquishing our enemies the more we become inevitably conscious of differences among the victors." How do these dangerous differences disclose themselves? Usually by unilateral decisions in which one or another among the United Nations makes its own announcement—pronounces its own ultimatum—regarding its own present or post-war plans and purposes. It puts its own interpretation upon its own rights regardless of the fact that these rights, for all of us, all flow from our common effort. I assert that all vital decisions should also flow from the same sort of a common effort.

Let me illustrate what I mean. The army that gets to Berlin first does not win for its nation the right to settle Germany's future just because it got to Berlin first. No nation's army would have reached Berlin at all except for the herioc, common combat of all the other nations' armies. This is just another way of saying that unity—unity for an ultimate lasting peace—is a constant, day-to-day necessity which must be nourished by all of us through constant, coordinated consultation—in war and then in peace—and through a reasonable regard for mutual sensibilities.

Now let's put these three fundamentals together and—in the name of honest, helpful candor—see whether they do not plainly point an immediate plan of action. You will remember the fundamentals. First, the inexpressively vital need to prevent World War No. 3 through collective security; second, the paramount importance of a just peace if it is to be a permanent peace; third, the hazard to these objectives if each of the United Nations starts going its own way even before we have clinched our total victory. Let's frankly face our American responsibilities in this connection.

It seems to me that the logic of the situation is fairly straight and simple.

Why do our allies take these disunifying steps? What's the reason given for partitioning Poland? For planning satellite conquests? For the Anglo-Soviet agreement of 1942, the Soviet-Czechoslovak agreement of 1943, the Franco-Soviet treaty of 1944, and similar actions yet to come? What's the reason given for much of the resurgent movements toward alliances, and toward the old power politics which has been the world's prime curse? What's the reason?

IT'S PERFECTLY UNDERSTANDABLE

It's a perfectly understandable reason. It is a perfectly human reason. It is the frankly expressed fear of reborn Axis aggression in the years to come. Twice within one generation our continental allies have seen the German monster rise and overwhelm them. Twice within one generation they have been driven to the valley of the shadow by military aggression. They do not propose to be exposed again. Unless and until they know that they can depend upon America to join effectively in keeping Germany and Japan demilitarized, they will continue to go their own way. The truth of the matter is that it was the failure to keep Germany demilitarized after World War No. 1, which made possible World War No. 2.

In the face of these circumstances, my fellow citizens, I ask you whether our immediate duty—our tremendously great, immediate opportunity—is not clear? America has the same self-interest in keeping Germany and Japan permanently and effectively demilitarized as have her closer victims. America has the keenest sort of self-interest in preventing the threat of reborn Axis aggression from driving the rest of the world into another era of separate alliances because that, too, is the road to another war. In other words, here is one common danger—one common objective—in which we have a complete and basic common interest.

Why not face it now? Why not act now? Regardless of any other peace plans, and regardless of whether we agree or disagree among ourselves regarding them, here is one thing that must be done regardless of whether we do anything else at all. Here is one thing that must be done—namely, the permanent demilitarization of Germany and Japan—unless we are blinder than bats in respect to history, following World War No. 1, and unless we are to be guilty of the colossal sin of dissipating victory after World War No. 2.

It is in response to this irresistible logic of events that I have proposed and continue to propose that America shall sign up now with all her major allies, to join in a hard-and-fast treaty, solemnly ratified by the Senate of the United States, which pledges our constant armed cooperation, instantly and peremptorily available through the President of the United States without further reference to the Congress, to keep Germany and Japan out of piracy for keeps. I propose that we say—beyond misunderstanding—that this fiendish thing shall not rise again. I propose that we shall practice what we preach. I propose that no other nation shall have any further chance to use our silence as an alibi for ulterior designs, if such there be. I propose action instead of words. I propose action now—before it is too late. I propose it for the sake of a better world. But I say, "again and again and again," that I propose it for our own American self-interest.

Aside from the incalculable major advantage thus to be gained, there are at least two collateral advantages of scarcely secondary moment. I discuss them briefly.

SUBJECT TO REVIEW

When we have relieved our allies of any legitimate fear of reborn Axis aggression, we also have relieved them of any legitimate need, each on his own unchecked account, to make unilateral decisions, from time to time, in the name of self-defense. We shall have earned the right to demand that whatever such decisions may have been made in the process of war—and I concede that such decisions may sometimes be unavoidable—we shall have earned the right to demand that all such decisions shall be subject to review and correction in the post-war peace by whatever international organization we set up to perpetuate the solidarity of the United Nations. In other words, and in plain terms, we shall have earned the right to demand peace with justice—the only kind of peace which can survive. A spoilsman's peace will not survive. Therefore, peace itself is the

issue at this point. Furthermore, one of the greatest arguments against early action on the Dumbarton Oaks plan for a post-war league will have been substantially removed because, otherwise, it can be persuasively urged that America is asked to sign a warrant to help sustain an unknown future which may be too repugnant to us to deserve or to get any such fidelity from justice-loving America.

This brings me to the second collateral, but dreadfully important, dividend from this program. It brings me to Dumbarton Oaks. If we first deal with our enemies through unequivocal post-war restraints upon them, we have remaining only our friends to consider in charting the organization of our post-war peace league. This immensely simplifies our problem. The only real controversy inside America respecting Dumbarton Oaks is whether the President shall have the power, without reference to Congress, to join our armed forces with those of the peace league to stop renewed military aggression. After we have given him this unquestioned power in respect to our enemies, I think I can prove that the creation of such a power for use against our friends becomes almost an academic question from the standpoint of reality.

WOULD BE A FORMER ALLY

Remember, we are now arranging a peace formula with our friends. We have taken care of our enemies. Remember that we are now talking only about the future use of force against one of our present allies who subsequently becomes a military aggressor to threaten the peace of the world. Obviously it can be only one of our present major allies. It will have to be a present major ally who has broken a solemn pledge to abandon force as an instrumentality of foreign policy. It will have to be a major ally who has successfully defied all of the intervening machinery for the pacific settlement of disputes contemplated by Dumbarton Oaks. This means full investigation and report; then conciliation; then mediation, then arbitration; probably the intervention of international law through the medium of a new world court; perhaps even economic sanctions. The new crisis will not be a blitz. It will not come upon the world like a thief in the night. It will finally reach the last recourse—namely, armed force—only after the other United Nations (which is to say, the conscience of the world) has been put upon serial notice that one of our present major allies has turned brute beast and proposes to assault civilization.

Such a challenge would be of such gravity that no President in his right mind—whether he has the actual power or not—would think for an instant of committing America to such a war without knowing that he had his country and the Congress behind him. On the other hand, no Congress would hesitate for an instant to respond to such a challenge. We declared war on Japan in 13 minutes and on Germany in 5. That ought to be sufficiently expeditious. In other words, I repeat, it means nothing, in a practical sense, whether the President himself is given this final power or not, so far as the functioning of the peace league is concerned. But, in a practical sense, it may mean infinitely much in the decision of the American people as to whether they might reject the whole Dumbarton Oaks adventure, if they are asked to give the President this exclusive power against one of our present allies in the face of a plain constitutional injunction that only Congress can declare war.

Oh, but, you ask, if "only Congress can declare war," how can you give the President plenary power to use our armed forces to keep the Axis permanently demilitarized? The answer is that for 150 years the Constitution has permitted the President to use this plenary power for "the national defense"—short of war—and it repeatedly has thus been used without question. The permanent demilitarization of the Axis, when once authorized by Congress through the Senate's ratification of a treaty, would not involve a new declaration of war. It would only be the lengthened shadow of the present war. It would clearly fall within the Presidential authority under the Constitution.

GENIUS OF DUMBARTON OAKS

Now, you probably ask: "Should the peace league have no force available, except against our erstwhile foes?" My answer is that the peace league certainly should maintain constant staff work in planning the ultimate mobilization of military force; it certainly should have peremptorily available, so far as we are concerned, such military force as is traditionally granted under the Constitution to the President for national defense; but, remembering there is to be unlimited force for use against our present foes, it does not need the final war power which the Constitution of the United States commits exclusively to the Congress of the United States.

My further, and fundamental, answer is that the genius of Dumbarton Oaks, in correct perspective, is not the use of military force at all. The genius of Dumbarton Oaks, is the exact opposite. It is the substitution of justice for force. It is the substitution of international law for piracy. It is the substitution of peace for war. Its genius lies in the organization of these pacific mechanisms which shall stop future frictions short of the necessity for force. Its genius lies in the mobilization of the vigilant moral and spiritual power of enlightened civilization against the dark and evil forces of recurrent savagery. If this power has been dormant and impotent it is because it has lacked a vigorous world instrument for organized expression. In my deep conviction, Dumbarton Oaks, in proper form, can supply this tremendous instrument.

All of these benedictions become possible just as soon as we have permanently quarantined the Axis lusts. Oh yes, I have oversimplified the problem. I have no illusions that this tough old world will suddenly quit its sins because a formula is born. I promise no millenium. I am not so naive as to believe that the earth can suddenly rid itself of national rivalries. But I respectfuly submit that here lies a way of hope. It or something like it, will take us out of our foreign policy vacuum. It will untie our tongues and once more make us vocal in behalf of our ideals. It will save us from the dangerous misunderstandings which our continued silence might invite. It will certainly promise a better peace, and, therefore, a safer and a longer peace. And it is practical because it plainly conserves self-interest (unless "self-interest" involves ulterior and sinister designs) for all concerned in this great fraternity of allied war.

INSURANCE AGAINST WAR

I do not object, my fellow citizens, to the vigilance of any nation in behalf of its own self interest. That is what nations are for. I am frank to say that I want our intelligent, American self-interest just as vigorously protected by our spokesmen as British self-interest is always protected by Mr. Churchill and as the self-interest of the Soviets always are protected by Mr. Stalin. But I cannot escape the conviction that an insurance policy against World War No. 3 is basic in the self-interest of every civilized nation in this distraught world, America emphatically included.

Certainly that is an expression of American self-interest. We give up nothing except the inevitable curse of another involvement in another war if it ever comes. We do not sacrifice our independence. We join no world state. We do not desert the Constitution. We leave the Stars and Stripes in all their pride and glory on the domes of Washington. We simply join ourselves, in continued united fraternity with our battle comrades, in a great cooperative adventure for a better earth. We do it for the sake of free men in a free world. We do it in the name of justice. We do not do it if justice is denied. If we can start it now, our allied unity will have new vigor. The end of all our present wars will respond more quickly to our prayers. We shall vindicate our soldier-sons. We shall keep the word of promise to our hopes. We shall save our children's children. We shall have earned the right to beseech God's blessing on our dreams.

Senator Vandenberg Points the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Century of January 24, 1945:

SENATOR VANDENBERG POINTS THE WAY

To a country racked with anxiety over the fate of the Atlantic Charter and the prospects for a post-war international organization, to a public which had found little encouragement or leadership in the President's message to the new Congress, Senator VANDENBERG's speech in the Senate on January 10 brought the greatest lift of spirit in many months. For the Senator from Michigan pierced straight through the fog of mutual misunderstanding and recrimination which had begun to settle over the relations of Great Britain, Russia, and the United States. He showed what has caused the tensions which have threatened to divide them. And he pointed out an immediate practical type of action which the United States might lead in sweeping these irritations away and producing an understanding that would win the war on terms that would give some dignity to American sacrifices and open the road to a genuine post-war world cooperation. The Vandenberg speech may not have uttered the final word on peace-making. But it did offer the one thing the people of the United States have been most desperate to discover—leadership. It contained no empty generalities and no double-talk. It should be as welcome among forward-looking people in England and on the Continent as here. One strange fact about the speech, however, is that almost none of the comment, either in the press or over the air, seems to have recognized that at its vital point—Mr. VANDENBERG's proposal for an immediate treaty with our allies which would give the President a free hand to use the forces of the United States to help in completely disarming Germany and Japan and keeping them disarmed—the Senator was reaching straight back to the proposal made by Governor Dewey last August 16. At that time the Republican candidate, who was receiving as sound advice on international affairs as the Nation affards, declared that post-war control of Germany and Japan should be divorced from any permanent international organization, since handling these Axis nations in such a way as to see that they do not return to brigandage is "a specific responsibility of the victors" which "cannot immediately be delegated to a world-wide organization while such organization is yet new and untried." Section two of chapter 12 of the Dumbarton Oaks charter was so written as to permit such a separation of this immediate problem of dealing with Germany and Japan from the larger problem of building permanent peace.

WHAT SENATOR VANDENBERG WOULD DO NOW

The Vandenberg proposal is as simple as it is practicable. The United Nations, says the Michigan Senator, have reached a point at which they must make their final choice between a peace of joint or of individual action. They are drifting toward the latter, as recent events in Poland, Greece, and elsewhere show. The explanation always given is that Russia and Great Britain, which have to go on living in the same Europe with Germany, fear a German military revival and another attack, and they are not sure how far the United States would cooperate to stem such an attack. Hence they build blocs of buffer puppet states, or negotiate bilateral military alliances, all as a means of guarding against this German danger. Senator VANDENBERG might have added, though he did not, that some of the most glaring oversights and high-handed proposals in the Dumbarton Oaks document as it now stands grow out of this same urge to make the new league in reality a device for the repression of Germany. Let us, says Mr. VANDENBERG, clear away all confusion by placing the disarmament of Germany and Japan in a category by itself. Let the United States offer Russia and Great Britain reassurances by giving the President, by treaty, authority to use all necessary American forces to see that this is done and done in a way to be permanent. Then, having thus assuaged the fears of our allies and shown them how far the United States is from planning a post-war revision of isolation, let us ask our allies to place all their unilateral and bilateral agreements in a temporary category, subject to final revision by the new league, which would be given the right to pass on "protested injustices in the peace itself." Thus, at one stroke, the Axis would be rendered impotent, our allies given new confidence, the reasons for a return to power politics and balances of power wiped out, and a means provided by which eventually in the new league the principles of the Atlantic Charter might be translated into actual international practice.

WILL THE PRESIDENT RISE TO THIS OPPORTUNITY?

By his speech, as has been said, Senator VANDENBERG brought new hope to millions of Americans who had begun to ask, "What are we fighting for?" Now the question is, Will the administration seize the opportunity thus offered to change the whole outlook for the post-war future? This would not require that the Vandenberg proposal be adopted just as it stands, but it would involve endorsement of the principle of an immediate inter-Allied pledge to disarm and keep disarmed the Axis. The first indications have not been favorable. Senator CONNALLY, who acts as the administration spokesman by virtue of his position as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, at once denied that the task of dealing with the disarmament of Germany and Japan can be separated from that of forming a permanent world organization. When this failed to gain public applause the Senator from Texas came forward with an alternative to the Vandenberg proposal. This took the form of a suggestion for immediate formation of an "interim world council" to advise the Allies in handling questions regarding liberated territories. This Connally counter-proposal will seem as empty as it is to all who remember that in October 1943 the Big Three set up, in the course of the Moscow conference, a European Advisory Commission to do precisely what Senator CONNALLY talks about. This Commission has been in existence ever since, and has accomplished precisely nothing. It is possible, politics being what it is, that the administration may dislike to get behind the Vandenberg proposal because it originated with the recent Republican nominee for the Presidency (whose campaign would have been greatly strengthened if, after making it, he had kept hammering away at it) and because it has now been brought before the public by a Republican Senator. But this war, as the President has often admonished the Nation, is no partisan affair and is not to be fought on a partisan basis. The blunt truth is that Senator VANDENBERG has shown the general direction in which the United States can move immediately to exercise its leadership to get a decent peace. If the President chooses to ignore or turn down this proposal, he will lay himself open to the charge of placing party interests before the interests of the peace of mankind.

Congressman Wigglesworth, Republican, of Massachusetts, Demanded the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am extending my remarks in the RECORD and including therein an editorial appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., January 5, 1945, in which it discussed some of the acts of the Federal Communications Commission, headed by the Honorable James L. Fly.

For some 2 or 3 years many Members of the House and especially Republicans, have been insisting upon the investigation of the doings of this Commission and its Chairman, Mr. Fly.

This Commission and Mr. Fly, through a majority of the committee, have been able to postpone from time to time a thorough investigation, and finally have submitted a report which has been characterized as a "crude whitewash," and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman WIGGLESWORTH, a Republican, stated that this was achieved by "the full force of the administration." One of the matters attempted to be investigated was the complaint of Mr. Donald Flamm. Mr. Flamm charged that through administration pressure, including the Federal Communications Commission and Mr. Fly, he lost radio station WMCA in New York 4 years ago. It is charged that he did not desire to sell this station, but, through the administration and the Communications Commission and its Chairman, he was forced to sell it for $850,000, much less than its value, to one Edward J. Noble, a favorite of the administration. Mr. Flamm was offered a much higher price. He did not desire to sell but was forced to sell to Noble. Mr. Noble afterward sold the station for a profit of $405,000.

It also appears that Thomas G. Corcoran, who is regarded as one of the favorite lobbyists of the administration, figures in the transaction between Flamm and Noble.

Another station, WFTC, at Fort Lauderdale, changed hands under suspicious circumstances.

The Courier Journal, a stanch supporter of the administration, characterizes the Flamm-Noble case as a "sad story—an exceedingly painful and depressing one."

I wish to express my appreciation for its thanks to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman WIGGLESWORTH, a Republican, as the only member of the committee who has consistently demanded the truth. He is an able, honorable, courageous public official.

This editorial is as follows:

A GARBAGE CAN TOO FULL FOR A LID

The House committee which has been investigating the Federal Communications Commission has tried to put a lid on a garbage can, but the garbage, as is unfortunately the case in many a literal instance in Louisville this morning, still protrudes, very visibly and odorously. We have reference in particular to the deal whereby Donald Flamm, who is unknown to us but who has about as impressive a case as we have ever seen, lost radio station WMCA New York, 4 years ago. We are not pursuing a grudge against James L. Fly, under whose administration as chairman of F. C. C. the events which victimized Mr. Flamm occurred. Mr. Fly is no longer a member of the Commission and was by no means the only person concerned. We are simply pursuing a conviction that in the WMCA transaction there is garbage that needs to be incinerated in the fire of public opinion and that the House committee, instead of facilitating this, labored deliberately and crudely to prevent it.

Mr. Flamm's story, briefly, is this: He sold WMCA for $850,000 to Edward J. Noble, a favorite of the administration, who had been Under Secretary of Commerce when Harry Hopkins was Secretary. Mr. Flamm says that he did not want to sell and that, if he had wanted to, he had previously been offered a higher price. (The fact is that Mr. Noble afterward sold the station at $405,000 profit.) But how could a man be compelled to dispose of a property he wanted to keep? A radio station happens to be a property under the strict and detailed regulation of the F. C. C. Mr. Flamm says that he received intimations that, unless he sold, there might be trouble for WMCA from the regulatory authority. A careful man, he had certain soundings made in Washington to ascertain if this was the case and discovered, so he says, that the heat was on.

Now, if there were nothing whatever in all this—and incidentally the name of Thomas G. Corcoran, then close to the White House, now Washington's super-lobbyist, flitted in and out of the story—why was the House committee unwilling to subject Mr. Flamm's highly shocking contentions to the light of day? A curious thing happened. During the autumn, the committee had investigated at open hearings a transaction in which Station WFTL at Fort Lauderdale, Fla., changed hands. Some dubious circumstances were discovered, and the committee, criticizing Mr. Fly, has denounced these in the report it has just issued—the same report in which everything is said to have been lovely about the WMCA deal, no evidence of pressure, coercion, or duress, nothing amiss about what Mr. Corcoran did, and so on. But when the committee had reached the WMCA deal in November, it had suddenly decreed secret sessions, and the grounds for its conclusions are not known to the public as are those concerning WFTL. On its face, the committee's action appears to be exactly what Representative WIGGLESWORTH of Massachusetts, a minority member, and Mr.

Flamm say it is—a crude whitewash—Mr. WIGGLESWORTH adding that this was achieved by "the full force of the administration."

This is a sad story, and to the Courier-Journal, which is counted a supporter of the administration, an exceedingly painful and depressing one. It happens, however, that the story probably has not ended. Mr. Flamm, a persistent man, has instituted suit in New York for the recovery of WMCA, and the evidence which the committee either sought to suppress or was prevented from obtaining may yet be presented for a public judgment. For the present about all there seems to do is to thank Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, a Republican, and the only member of the committee who has consistently demanded the truth.

Retention of General Marietta as Superintendent of Walter Reed Is Fine Recognition of His Excellent Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a deserved tribute to ability and service of Maj. Gen. Shelley U. Marietta, Superintendent of Walter Reed Hospital, published in the latest issue of the Army and Navy Journal:

ARMY RETAINS GENERAL MARIETTA

A career studded with achievements is that of Maj. Gen. Shelley U. Marietta, Medical Corps, who reached the statutory retiring age January 31. While the policy of the War Department contemplates the replacement of retired with active officers, it makes exception in the case of those especially qualified, and such an exception is General Marietta. Therefore he will remain certainly for the period of the war as Superintendent of Walter Reed Hospital. In that position his talents as a physician and as an administrator will continue to be available to the thousands of wounded and sick officers and enlisted men admitted to the institution under his command. In spite of the lack of trained nurses and ordinary help, which necessarily has added to administration difficulties, it is generally agreed by patients and visitors that there is not a better hospital in the country. This is the judgment of the vast majority of the Senate and House and especially of their military committees. The man who above all others who is pleased that General Marietta will remain at the head of Walter Reed is General of the Armies John J. Pershing, whose devotion and esteem for this medical officer are based upon appreciation of the care he has received from him over the years and the close friendship which has developed from it.

General Marietta is an extraordinary combination of medical skill and administrative ability. Officially he is an authority on internal medicine, with tuberculosis as a specialty. However, due to his incessant study and wide experience, he is thoroughly familiar with all branches of medicine. His inclination for the profession he adopted came from his father, who was a physician and practiced in Des Moines, Iowa, where the family had moved from the South via Pennsylvania. He graduated in medicine from the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Illinois, after graduating from the School of Dentistry in Des Moines. Probably because his grandfather and father had seen service in the Mexican and Civil Wars, respectively, he became interested in a suggestion to join the Army. He received a reserve appointment in 1910. Two years later he was commissioned in the Regular Army and graduated from the Army Medical School at Washington, D. C. His duties carried him to various stations throughout the United States, Hawaii, and the Philippines, and in World War No. 1 he served with troops and at hospitals in France. Back in the United States he was stationed at the larger hospitals, including Letterman, Fitzsimons, Fort Sam Houston, Walter Reed, and others, either as assistant chief of the Medical Service or its chief. His final assignment was that to Walter Reed, where he has been in charge since 1939. It was when he was stationed at San Antonio that he was selected by the Surgeon General to proceed to Tucson to treat General of the Armies John J. Pershing, who had suffered a severe heart attack while vacationing in that community. General Pershing gives credit to General Marietta for his recovery, and his regard for him has continuously increased as their association over the years continued.

Besides the 22 years of strictly professional duty which General Marietta has had, he has been engaged in administrative and construction work of wide and varied character. He established the base hospital at Atlanta, Ga., and while there trained a medical unit made up of the students at Emory University, for service with the A. E. F. in France. He organized base hospital No. 43 and took it to France for service as the base hospital at Blois. Since his present assignment at Walter Reed began, besides the execution of 45 projects, which have greatly expanded and increased the usefulness of the hospital proper, he transformed college buildings at Forest Glen, Md., into a convalescent section and buildings at Beltsville, Md., into a reconditioning center. When he came to Walter Reed, there were available only 1,200 beds; now there are 3,502. His insistence on the latest modern equipment has made Walter Reed probably the best-equipped hospital in the United States if not in the world. There passed through the hospital last year 17,800 patients, who had come for treatment for wounds, illness, and rehabilitation. During the period of his service there, it is estimated that more than 50,000 persons have undergone treatment within its walls.

Besides his manifold duties at the hospital, General Marietta has served on numerous boards for the development of remedies for diseases. He is a member of the American College of Physicians, American College of Chest Physicians, Military Surgeons, and American Medical Association, and is diplomat of the board of internal medicine. Probably the greatest tribute that could have been paid to his ability as an administrator was that paid by an enlisted man who had been wounded in France. "I am going home on leave," he said, "and while I naturally am anxious to see my family, let me say that no one could have received greater attention or greater consideration than I at Walter Reed. It is an excellently run institution because the man at the top, General Marietta, knows his business and will have none but expert doctors and nurses under him. I was in bad shape when I reached the hospital. I had lost an arm and a leg, and the future looked pretty black to me. But I was treated like a human being and not like a cripple for whom everybody was sorry, and I shall face the world now with confidence. The hospital could not be what it is did it not have such a man in charge as General Marietta."

General Marietta was married in Des Moines, and his gracious wife has been a tower of strength to him throughout the years.

Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Endorses Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement of the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Honorable Jean A. Brunner, endorsing the Committee on Un-American Activities. The statement referred to follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N. Y., January 15, 1945.

Referring to the efforts of certain elements to scuttle the effectiveness of the House of Representatives committee investigating un-American activities, Jean A. Brunner, of Forest Hills, N. Y., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, said today:

"Anyone who would be guilty of interfering with the work, or who would put Trojan horses in, to interfere with the work of any congressional committee investigating un-American activities, is selling out the men in our armed forces, who are giving their lives to maintain our American way of life.

"Our fighting men are making sacrifices so that our Nation will remain free, and not that it will be controlled by any one person or group of persons. Those who interfere with the work of ridding our country of Nazis, Fascists, Communists, or any other vermin, will have to answer to our fighting men when they return.

"No loyal, patriotic American has anything to fear from such a committee, and real American Congressmen will not be intimidated.

"What are those who oppose this committee afraid of?" asked Commander in Chief Brunner. "Are they afraid that the spotlight of such investigations will reveal rodents in their houses?"

JERRY A. FREEMAN,
Public Relations Officer.

Coming Over the Blue, It May Be True

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Pegler seems to be just another victim of the smear. Here is one of the latest, as outlined by him on the 30th of January, last:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

Continuing my running commentary on the dangerous attitude of the Blue Network, one of our big national radio chains, toward miscalled news broadcasters specializing

in excitement and falsehood, here are chapter and verse on a specific incident.

On the Sunday evening after the recent election, Drew Pearson, in his program over the Blue, said that Frank Sinatra had called at my room at the Waldorf-Astoria on election night to take a punch at me for opposing his friend, Mr. Roosevelt, and, not finding me in, contented himself by mussing up the room.

This was an absolute fake.

Sinatra undoubtedly did get tight, as later inquiry showed, and returned from Sidney Hillman's P. A. C. headquarters to his own apartment in the same hotel where he caused large disorder and was subdued by a house detective. In all large and well-conducted hotels, of which the Waldorf is one, all unusual incidents are investigated promptly and reports are made in writing to the front office. Such reports were made in this case.

Being a Roosevelt fan, Sinatra, had a right to howl and did. But he never did come near my quarters either in my absence or after my return about 1 in the morning.

A few days after Pearson's broadcast, I began to detect the technique of the New Deal Communist smear which puts an opponent in an unfavorable light without libeling him. An item had appeared in one of the New Deal gents' room columns reporting that Sinatra had refused to work in the Waldorf's Wedgewood Room unless I checked out. There was no libel in that, either, but, like the Pearson broadcast, it was a smear.

So I inquired of Lucius Boomer, the managing director, who said that, of course, there was no truth in it and that any time anyone hired to sing, dance, or do card tricks in the saloon attempted to edit the guest list he would get rid of the performer.

It occurred to me that the Blue Network had some responsibility because, in the newspaper business, a reporter who brings in fakes is fired, the paper runs a "beg pardon" and that is that.

Instead of offering any redress, however, Mark Woods, one of the Blue's vice presidents, suggested that I write a piece about it. He said they could use the publicity, but he made no offer to right a wrong.

That made me curious as to how radio treats people who have been smeared with political or personal motivation, so I called on Chester La Roche, another vice president, whom I have known for years, and Ed Noble, a New Dealer, who had served in the Department of Commerce, and then acquired the Blue and became its president.

Both La Roche and Noble said Pearson was a headache to them because they thought he was malicious and unreliable, but couldn't get rid of him because, by the use of such methods and material, he had acquired a large popular following.

Noble said an apology might be arranged, but that if he gave one, Pearson would contrive it in such a manner as to make it worse than the original fake. He took a helpless attitude. La Roche cited an item which Pearson had broadcast about the automobile trip to Washington of John Foster Dulles, Tom Dewey's adviser on foreign relations during the campaign to confer with Cordell Hull on solemn state business.

He said Pearson had made it appear that Dulles had used the gas for this travel because he had a sore toe but that he, La Roche, knew that the trouble was much more serious, in fact, a bad infection. He thought Dulles had suffered a serious injustice but that was the end of that.

During this time I was investigating the pro-Communist thief and imposter calling himself William Gailmor who had been employed by the Blue as a news commentator on their key New York local station, and had several talks with officials of the Blue, incidentally, on the Sinatra-Pearson thing.

At no time did they offer an independent retraction or correction but, in the end, they said, that if I brought in affidavits from the Waldorf house detectives and the management, they would make one.

My point has been that the victim should not have to go to such extremes to disprove a fake. He might not know how to go about it. He might not have time. He might be away, even overseas.

Still, La Roche and Noble now insist that they are anxious to give fair and complete retractions when their commentators are proved unfair and that they review all their scripts for "appropriate news authority." In this case there was no news authority and, in answer to my own specific inquiry, Mr. Boomer says, in writing, "I have checked the files of the night manager, assistant managers, and floor clerks and can find no record of any unusual incident in the room you occupied on election night."

But quite as dangerous as motivated lies broadcast for smearing purposes over national chains, are half-truths and even wholly true statements and observations uttered with the dramatic voice. Noble, La Roche, and all radio men, and many other persons of intelligence, know that a harmless text may be an incitation to riot, delivered with certain inflections.

There was one broadcaster a few years ago whose text was absolutely faultless but whose sneering pronunciation of the phrase "this Jewish gentleman" or "Mr. Henry Morgenthau" was so full of hate that decent people thought of Goebbels and shuddered. It did no good to censor his copy.

It is up to radio to manage these problems. The newspapers, generally, weed out liars and fakers when they have revealed themselves and, fortunately, our type hasn't yet been wired for sound.

What I say, by way of comparison favorable to the newspapers, is that if this fake had been put across the desk of any paper as ethical as the Blue now pretends to be, the managing editor wouldn't ask the victim to bring in affidavits but would send out his own reporters to bring them in. He would then apologize and fire the faker, however great his circulation power.

Universal Peacetime Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following program entitled "Congressional Record of the Air," on universal peacetime military service in the United States broadcast over Station WHN, New York City, February 5, 1945:

Mr. REPAID. Around the Halls of Congress tonight there is a mounting storm of controversy, centered on the proposed universal military service for the United States. Although legislation on this subject has not as yet been introduced, many men in high places have expressed themselves both for and against the proposal. So tonight on this broadcast of "Congressional Record on the Air" we ask: "Is universal military service in the United States feasible? Is it needed? Is it democratic?" To present you with answers to these questions we have invited one of the country's outstanding Members of Congress, EMANUEL CELLER, from the Fifteenth District of New York City. Mr. CELLER has been a Member of Congress since 1922, and serves on the important Judiciary Committee of the House. I am very glad, indeed, to present Congressman EMANUEL CELLER.

Mr. CELLER. I view with alarm—with justified alarm—the proposals to introduce into the United States a system of universal military service in peacetime. I admit I am shocked by the loose thinking that has accompanied the proposals to date. We are told that it will be a blessing, an enrichment in education and in health. Nonsense. A year's military training is not education; it's indoctrination. No broad cultural base in education is provided; only that knowledge is stressed that will have a direct bearing on the brutal business of fighting. Very well, let the Army speak for itself. The War Department in a recently distributed circular states: "There will be no place in a sound universal military-training program for activities that are nonessential to the task of preparing our young men for combat." Thus it will be education for war.

Moreover—and the educators of our country know this—a year's interruption in the normal progress of study must result in a marked decrease in future attendance at higher institutions of learning. Take a lad away from his school for 1 year, and mark then his reluctance to return. What will he learn that a trade, vocational, professional, or general school cannot teach him outside of the usages attendant upon war? Do we need an army to educate our youth? What's wrong with our schools?

The talk about the increased health of our youth is just as hollow. Let's remember, firstly, that only the physically fit will be selected for the training. It has been ascertained that only 830,000 out of 1,250,000 who reach the age of 18 are mentally and physically fit for service. The unfit do not get into the Army and do not receive the innoculations and cures, and so forth, that those who are accepted get. Moreover, it's a pretty sad commentary on the state of the Nation when we choose the Army as the instrument to cure our social ills. Let's admit frankly that our public-health services need mending badly—and then let's do something about it for the whole Nation, children of 5 and adults of 50. Why only lads of 17–18?

That's what disturbs me, this shying away from essentials and giving us instead this gibberish about health and education.

If we as the most powerful country in the world want to start a race among the nations of the world for bigger and better armies, for feverish expansion in the instruments of war, then by all means let's have universal military peacetime training. If we want to cultivate an atmosphere of distrust among our weaker neighbors to the south of us, and inspire them to rivalries and jealousies among themselves, then by all means let's have this peacetime militarism. And if we want to make certain that all proposals for the establishment of international organization for peace fail, let's pass the military training bill now. Let's not wait until our boys return. What have they to say about the making of a durable peace?

The structure of a durable peace can only stand firm—and this is neither naivete nor wishful thinking—when the people believe and trust, it will stand firm. Encourage this tentative approach, this "maybe and maybe not," this "well, it's a good idea but will it work?" view of international practicable harmony, and upon the slightest disagreement—poof, down it goes. You cannot build a huge machinery of war, be it in men or machines, and then not search about for some way to use it. You jolly well know the temptation to use it.

You can either cultivate the attitude that a durable peace is possible, that the organization for peace is practicable or you can cultivate the dubious attitude, the distrustful, suspicious attitude. Then the game begins again all over the world. You don't trust me; I don't trust you.

Against whom are we arming? Peacetime conscription brings with it machine guns, tanks, and bombs. Do we aim at our allies? Does it mean we will shake hands with them but not without a bodyguard? Against Germany and Japan? Just why, pray tell, are we bothering with international organizations? Why have any Dumbarton Oaks conference?

Moreover, if that's the kind of mental set we are going to embrace (that war is inevitable and we must therefore bow to the inevitable), I can't see the effectiveness of universal peacetime training. In the rapidly changing techniques of war, you aren't going to use the boys who were trained 10 or 15 years ago, even 5 years ago. Those who have been previously trained will be either too old or will have to be retrained. Immediate use can only be made of the men then in training and they will only number those in the 17–18 year bracket, hardly enough for a fighting army. For the rest, the identical process of our present selective service will have to be instituted again. War implements are constantly changing; tanks used at the war's beginning are now obsolete. Men must be retrained to figure out the new weapons.

You will hear talk about "sneak attacks." Of all the misnomers in military history, that one stands supreme. The technique of modern war requires years of preparation; the conversion of peacetime manufacture and the diversion of raw materials for war purposes. Both Germany and Japan gave the powers that be ample notice of their intent. Hitler did not sneak up on France, Britain, and Russia; he gave full warning of the set-up in the Reich factories when they started to make Messerschmitts and Dorniers. The whole world knew about the ersatz rubber tire plants to be used for military purposes. We knew all about the conversion of automobiles to tanks and fertilizers to explosives.

Intelligent appraisals of exports and imports of a suspect nation and of the products of its manufacture will reveal any inimical purpose. A war can be stopped in the making, before the death on battlefields if we have the international peace structure dedicated to that purpose, alert and aware that in this era war does not come overnight. War is one coming event that casts its shadow. That is the one lesson we did learn.

If we must keep our lads in everlasting training, why not our farmers, our manufacturers, our shipbuilders, etc. All of which means that forever and a day, our economy must be geared to war.

And remember this, peacetime conscription can and does lead to the surrender of much of the liberty we have fought and sacrificed for. Our democracy rests on the principle that the state serves the people and is not founded on any concept that the people serve the state. Military peacetime training is a perversion of this basic principle of our Government. It insists upon the dedication of 1 year out of our youths' lives for—as far as I can see, and as I have tried to point out—no useful purpose. It places in constant stream the malleable minds of our youth under the tutelage and discipline of professional officers who necessarily bear the military cast of mind.

I ask those of you who are listening tonight to weigh the proposals and weigh them carefully. Ask yourself: What do we gain thereby, and how much do we lose?

Mr. REPAID. Thank you very much, Congressman CELLER. I think you have covered the question quite thoroughly. There is just a point or two I'd like to bring up at this time, and these are questions that have come to us as a result of our announcement last week that you were to speak on the program tonight. For instance, here's one: Would not a year or more of service in the Army develop a finer spirit of democracy?

Mr. CELLER. No, emphatically. I find nothing democratic about an obedience to an officer which the Army demands. I find nothing democratic about the Army forcefully inculcating in our youth the need for immediate and unquestioning obedience. In war, yes; we have no choice. In peace, no; we have a choice. Our democracy is, and should be, a pronounced individualism with a submission to an intense discipline, but only in time of war. Our democracy affords the right of the common man to be heard. Strict Army discipline smothers that right to be heard. Remember, peacetime military conscription is inconsistent with any intellectual freedom. It means complete submission to constituted authority. It precludes any criticism on the part of the conscript, and makes for a standardized conduct that destroys initiative.

Mr. REPAID. All right, sir; how about this one? If we are going to have universal military training at all, isn't this a good time to consider it? I mean the people are war conscious today, whereas they might not be 5 years after the war.

Mr. CELLER. No. The American Federation of Labor, the Federated Council of Churches in America, the National Farmer's Union, Catholic bishops and archbishops, and many others all agree that this problem should not be settled until after the end of the war. We will then know what our international situation will be. Those now serving in the Army and Navy will then be given an opportunity to express their views. Our military requirements until the end of the war can well be met by expansion of our present Selective Service Act.

Mr. REPAID. Now what about this angle? Military conscription is nothing new. It has been used by a number of countries. I wonder, sir, if you could give us a little bit of that history.

Mr. CELLER. Machiavelli first proposed universal military service in Europe—a rather suspicious origin. It was used by French revolutionists to preserve benefits of the French Revolution, but Napoleon seized upon it to forward his imperial dreams. He said: "I can afford to expend 30,000 men a month." Such an attitude toward humans is the very antithesis to democracy. Prussia with Bismarck, the Kaiser, and now Hitler used conscription for militarism and Lebensraum. The Czars used it for despotism. Hirohito uses it. Mussolini used it. Franco uses it. Farrell and Peron use it in Argentina for despotism. England and the United States, with no conscript army, were the victors in World War No. 1, and are destined for victory in World War No. 2. The Negroes fear the democracy of compulsory military service. They know it will spread Jim Crowism.

Mr. REPAID. That is indeed interesting, Mr. CELLER. Now, I think we have time for just one more question, and that's a pretty big one. I am sure you will agree we will have to have some sort of preparedness program. Now, just what plan would you suggest instead of universal military service?

Mr. CELLER. I am opposed to compulsory military training since it is duck soup for the hereditary military caste. It makes top dogs out of the professional soldier, career colonels, who demand blind obedience—not thoughtful acquiescence. I am for volunteers first, with suitable inducements for pay and quarters and rank, together with inducements of scholarships and bonuses. If Dumbarton Oaks succeeds, we will need an international army for police purposes, to which we would make adequate contribution of men. If, to fill our quota, volunteer methods fail, then we must conscript. We would have no choice. It would then be the price of domestic and international security. But, for goodness sake, let us not glamorize any idea of military conscription. Let us not combine such processes as education for democratic discipline with military training. Just as oil will not mix with water, they will not mix.

Mr. REPAID. Now our time's about up, and we thank you again, Congressman CELLER, of New York.

Deferring Essential Agricultural Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1945, the War Manpower Commission issued a release through the Office of War Information giving a list of essential and critical activities to be used by selective service for the induction of men in the 26 through 29 age group. This list contained 35 groups of services and covered about five and a half pages of mimeographed listings on letter-size paper. The entire listing of activities was represented as essential activities, and those activities that were considered critical were given in capital letters. To my surprise the fifth group which covered agriculture and agricultural services did not include any activity in that field as a critical activity so I wrote to Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, on January 20, 1945. Because of the importance of this matter I am setting out herewith my letter to Mr. McNutt together with his reply to me dated February 2, 1945.

In view of the opening statement in the release of January 16 that the list of essential and critical activities announced on that day was to be used by selective service as a guide in the induction of men, the War Manpower Commission has not helped to clarify the muddled situation that has existed in the field of agriculture. Issuing a list of essential and critical activities with their fingers crossed and without any explanation in their release such as given in Mr. McNutt's letter to me of February 2 has been confusing and misleading. A brief statement that the War Manpower Commission had made no attempt to appraise the relative importance of agriculture in their release of January 16 would have given me and all others interested in agriculture a far different impression than I gained from reading the release.

I hope the information given in Mr. McNutt's letter to me will be of some help in clarifying the situation for the Members of Congress from the agricultural areas:

JANUARY 20, 1945.

Hon. PAUL V. MCNUTT,
War Manpower Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCNUTT: War Manpower Commission release date Tuesday, January 16, 1945,

did not reach my desk until January 19 whereas you will probably recall we had War Food Administrator Marvin Jones before the Military Affairs Committee January 18. I had heard rumors of your release of January 16, however, in time to question Mr. Jones about it, but I am writing this letter to register with you directly my vigorous objection to your failure to list any agricultural activity as a critical activity.

What I fear most of all is that reduced manpower on the farms plus lack of adequate machinery supply plus a reduction of yields to even normal level this year may result in a real crisis in the food supply of our Nation at the most critical point in the war program. Unless you foresee the needs of agriculture for manpower the crisis will be upon the country when it is entirely too late to do anything about it. You know and I know that once the crop-planting season has passed, a full year must elapse before any shortages can be made up and then only with a good break in the way of weather and growing conditions.

Most fortunate for America, the past 3 crop years have been all-time record years for production and for good harvest seasons, but our experience 1 year ago with the abnormally late planting season in the commercial Corn Belt is a vivid reminder of lurking dangers and we cannot afford to take any undue chances in the matter of food production as we look ahead. While I sincerely hope that we may have the fourth year of record food production we cannot depend on good weather conditions to favor us indefinitely. For that reason, I look upon farm operations and all food production as critical when food is so essential to the success of our Nation and our allies. I hope, therefore, that your next list of essential and critical activities will take cognizance of the importance of agriculture and food production.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. MARTIN.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1945.

Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARTIN: I have your recent letter objecting to the War Manpower Commission's failure to list any agricultural activities as critical activities.

Since the list is used primarily as a guide in dealing with nonagricultural or off-the-farm activities, we made no attempt to appraise the relative importance of agriculture.

Agricultural recruitment and placement activities have been assigned to the War Food Administration, and the selection of agricultural workers for the armed services is made by the Selective Service System. In the former case the list is not used by the War Food Administration as a guide for its recruitment and placement activities. The Selective Service System's action is governed by the Tydings amendment.

I wish to thank you for your letter, and I hope my explanation will clear the matter up for you.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman.

Natural Gas Situation in Detroit Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD several short articles relative to the natural gas situation in the Detroit area. I also wish to refer to my speech on the floor of the House on Monday, February 5. I stated that there had been a "bungling" of orders issued by the W. P. B. to the gas company of Detroit, and that they had "slept on the orders all night." These statements have been borne out by articles appearing in the Detroit papers on Tuesday, February 6, and Wednesday, February 7, and particularly by the article in the Detroit Free Press on Wednesday, February 7, captioned "W. P. B. Officials Explain Industry Gas Shut-Down."

The recent bungling of W. P. B. orders and the attempt of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. to capitalize on this emergency to put over their $70,000,000 pipe-line plan is but another reason why the House Committee on Rules should approve my resolution, House Resolution No. 18, in order that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be authorized to investigate these giant utility corporations and recommend to the Congress remedial legislation in the form of amendments to the Public Utility Holding Act of 1935. It will also afford an opportunity to instruct the Federal Power Commission to investigate the exorbitant rates being paid by consumers of natural gas in the Detroit area. These rates are paid not only by consumers generally in the Detroit area, but also by over 100 war plants producing critical war materials. It is needless for me to point out that where excessive costs are burdened upon war plants for production of critical war materials, they are paid for by the taxpayers of America, which monies are derived principally from sale of War bonds to our citizens, including the members of our armed forces who have so generously subscribed to War bonds while they are fighting our country's battles on the far-flung battlefields of this global war.

The following are the articles to which I referred:

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 6, 1945]

GAS COMPANY HEAD DENIES DELAY ON CUT ORDER

A charge by Representative JOHN LESINSKI, Michigan Democrat, that the blame for Detroit's gas crisis last Friday should be placed on the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. drew a hot blast Monday night from John W. Batten, president of the company.

LESINSKI asserted on the floor of the House that the telegram curtailing the gas supply was sent at 5 p. m. Thursday. The company "slept on the order all night," he said.

"If the gas company had made the order public," he said, "the confusion could have been averted.

"If industrial users had known about it, they could have curtailed the use of gas and materially assisted in preventing the reduction of pressure."

When told of LESINSKI's charges, Batten replied:

"LESINSKI doesn't know what he's talking about. Nobody here slept on anything."

Batten said a telegram from the Panhandle Pipeline Co. was received at 9 p. m. Thursday.

He said the decision to curtail gas was held up to check with W. P. B.

Also, he said, there was no reason to shut off the gas at night because at that time there is enough for everyone.

He said that the telegram was ambiguous because it stipulated that the order must be carried out without damage to "service or production facilities."

As soon as the matter could be cleared with W. P. B. officials in Washington, Batten said, the order was complied with.

GAS SHORTAGE IN EAST SOMEWHAT RELIEVED

Eastern fuel gas shortages were relieved slightly Monday by rising temperatures.

In Pittsburgh utilities companies reported they had resumed operations at several war plants. A critical fuel gas shortage had shut down or curtailed the use of gas in 200 plants in the area.

A 3-day ban on the use of natural gas by amusement places was lifted Monday night in seven eastern States after temperatures rose. States affected by the W. P. B. restriction were New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, and Virginia.

[From the Detroit News of February 6, 1945]

BLAME DENIED IN GAS MIX-UP—COMPANY PRESIDENT ANSWERS LESINSKI

A denial that the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. was in any way responsible for the confusion which resulted in the Michigan gas crisis of February 2 was made today by John W. Batten, president of the company.

Batten answered charges made by Representative LESINSKI, Michigan Democrat, in Washington Monday. LESINSKI said that the company, by "sleeping on the order all night," was responsible. LESINSKI said the order curtailing the use of gas in war plants and night clubs came through at 5 p. m. February 1. It was not made public until next day, he said.

BATTEN VERSION DIFFERS

Batten said the order did not reach Detroit until 9 p. m. February 1. The telegram was from the Panhandle Pipeline Co., which supplies the Michigan company. The telegram was held up until the War Production Board was queried, Batten said.

Because of confusion over the application of the telegram to the local situation, Batten said, several factories shut off their gas supply and closed February 2. The order was withdrawn by the W. P. B. early February 2.

LESINSKI'S CHARGES

LESINSKI said that if gas users in the Detroit area had been told of the shortage arrangements could have been made for an adequate division of the available supply.

The Panhandle company diverted gas to Ohio, where a shortage existed. The Detroit supply was adequate, however.

LESINSKI said that the diversion of the gas supply was used by Michigan Consolidated officials to emphasize the importance of their plan to build an independent $70,000,000 pipe line to the oil fields of the Southwest.

[From the Detroit News of February 6, 1945]

UTILITIES TAX HELD INVALID—DETROIT FORBIDDEN TO COLLECT LEVY

Circuit Judge Joseph A. Moynihan today declared that the city ordinance which authorizes the collection on an excise tax on the Detroit Edison Co. and the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. is unconstitutional.

In conformity with his opinion, Judge Moynihan issued an order restraining the city from collecting the 20-percent excise tax.

The Michigan Public Service Commission last August 4 ordered the Detroit Edison Co. to pay $10,450,000 in rate reductions.

COMPANY TAKES APPEAL

The company appealed, contending it could not pay the rate reductions and at the same time pay Detroit's gross revenue tax.

The tax was set at 20 percent of the gross revenue, but was limited to the maximum the company would have to pay in Federal

excess-profits taxes. Paul W. McQillan, company attorney, argued the city tax would amount to $10,400,000. He contended that the tax plus the rate reduction would amount to confiscation.

TAX NOT COLLECTED

The city made no effort to collect its tax pending a court ruling on its constitutionality.

James H. Lee, of the corporation counsel's office, arguing for the city, insisted that the Detroit excise tax would be only $2,932,000 if the rate reduction were effected. This $2,932,000, Lee said, could be paid through a reduction in the company's post-war reserve.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 7, 1945]

W. P. B. OFFICIALS EXPLAIN INDUSTRY GAS SHUT-DOWN

The shutdown of industrial gas, which crippled a large portion of Detroit's war industries last Friday, was ordered for "humanitarian" reasons, according to two W. P. B. officials who flew here Tuesday from Washington to offer explanations.

Edward Falck, Director of the Office of War Utilties, W. P. B., denied categorically there had been any confusion so far as his agency was concerned in the issuance of the orders.

He said that last Thursday he had instructed the Panhandle-Eastern Co., which serves Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana, to deliver all extra gas to the Columbia and Consolidated Systems. That company supplies most of the larger cities throughout the Ohio Valley, including Pittsburgh.

He said the order was issued when it was found the lowered gas pressures in the Ohio Valley was imperiling hundreds of thousands of domestic users.

Falck said that no industrial considerations were involved.

He said the original order had gone out late Thursday to the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. At noon Friday Michigan Gas notified this area's prime users of industrial gas of the shutdown.

He said he understood that some confusion was caused because certain companies refused to take telephone orders from the gas company and demanded a written directive from Washington.

He said the cut-offs, which have been unknown to Michigan in any drastic sense, are common in all other areas and have been invoked frequently since the outset of war.

Falck emphasized that additional shut-offs might be ordered for this area during the winter.

Alex MacComber, director of the gas division of the W. P. B., who accompanied Falck here from Detroit, denied that the Detroit area had ever been on the list of areas where gas for amusement purposes would be curtailed.

He said that press dispatches which stated otherwise had misquoted him.

Freedom and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Women's National Republican Club on February 3, 1945, at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City:

I am happy to be with you here because, as you know, I am proud to be a Republican. When one takes the long view of our country's history from the noble years of Abraham Lincoln until now, it seems to me that our party has much to be proud of. It is still as in Lincoln's day, I believe, the party that most cherishes freedom. But the greatest domestic political issue of our times no longer seems to be freedom. It is security. Now neither of our two great political parties has a monopoly of either freedom or security as issues. Yet candor compels us to admit that since the advent of the New Deal, the Democratic Party seems to be the party that most cherishes security. In a democracy it is therefore reasonable that the party which seems most to cherish the more popular issue should be the party in power.

But why is security a more compelling issue in America today than freedom? Largely because our people have tended more and more since the turn of the century to take freedom for granted. Before Pearl Harbor millions of Americans had almost come to believe that their freedom was a natural manifestation of America itself—natural in the same sense that our weather is a manifestation of nature. And a natural manifestation, no matter how constantly discussed, could not be an issue of serious political dispute. Freedom, as political subject matter, became increasingly known as just Fourth of July oratory.

When we paused to reflect on our Revolution and Civil War, we knew that the climate of freedom was not fixed by nature over this Nation; that it did not spring from our native soil twixt the golden wheat and the green corn. We have shed too much blood in fraternal strife over the issue of freedom to forget altogether that it was wholly begotten in our forefathers' valiant hearts.

Pearl Harbor once again reminded us of these spiritual origins of freedom. Once again in the terrible light of war, we clearly see that only human wills—tirelessly and passionately dedicated human wills—can keep many men free from the lustful and ambitious few who stand ever ready, in every age, in every climate, on every soil, to dominate and enslave them.

We Americans know that we shall defeat all those who would dominate us from without and by force of outrageous arms strip us of our freedom.

Are we so sure that we shall in the years ahead resist those who would dominate us from within and by force of tempting words also strip us of our freedom?

The names of many powerful and persuasive domestic tyrants to come are not known to us now. They have not stepped upon the native scene for the times have not yet ripened for them. All we can predict is this: Before they can succeed in stripping us of our freedom they must first persuade us of a great untruth: They must first persuade us that security is freedom. For the intentional confusion of security with freedom is the stock in trade of all the great political racketeers of modern times.

Wise men who have studied the aspirations of the human soul and weighed the needs of the human body understand that political freedom and economic security are not identical or interchangeable concepts, even though they are closely interwoven and interrelated.

Consider Poland. Economic security for Poland was always to be had in the past from either Germany or Russia—but at the price of her political freedom. We know which she chose time and time again and at what terrible sacrifice.

What is true for nations is true for groups and for individuals within a nation.

Take an example from our own history—our Negroes. Our history books tell us today that before the Civil War the Negroes were far better fed, clothed, sheltered, and cared for, as a group, than the vast majority of New England millworkers. They were in fact economically secure from the cradle to the grave. But they were not free. Today they are free. And yet they are less secure than any other group within the Nation. Security is not freedom. And freedom is not security. Yet both are essential to the well-being and happiness of every individual. And the attainment of the largest possible measure of both—that is the American dream.

Can any political party today promise and give the individual citizen both freedom and security? Can any party expand the area of personal security without contracting the area of individual freedom? This is the all important question which will face our Nation when victory comes.

I was asked today to give you a report on my recent trip to the European combat zones. Perhaps you expected a colorful eyewitness account of what our men and women in the armed services are doing. But maybe you will agree that it is more important that we should know what they are thinking about their post-war world.

When they come marching home the vast majority of men and women in uniform overseas are going to demand more security and more freedom than their fathers ever dreamed of. They cherish both concepts equally. But if the leaders of our Nation fail to give them both—and to give them both fairly soon—then our Republic is doomed. For if our returned veterans are forced to choose between their political freedom and their economic security as they may well be if our party cannot give them both, they will choose economic security. They will do so with no immediate awareness of making any such hard choice because the great untruth that security is freedom has already made much progress in America.

Let us remember that millions of Europeans and Asiatics have been led during the last 25 years into totalitarian slavery by their gradual acceptance of this catastrophic fallacy.

Americans can no more remain isolated from the destructive ideas that sweep out of Europe and Asia than from Europe's and Asia's destructive armies. As we must conquer these great armies with greater ones, so we must conquer these false ideas with true ones or be conquered by them.

These battles still to be fought at home when peace comes are worthy of the noblest hearts and keenest minds in both our parties. For by the spirit of the Constitution, by the brothers' blood our fathers shed in Lincoln's time, by the blood our Democratic and Republican sons are spilling now, both parties are surely pledged to the proposition that free Americans can be made secure and secure Americans can be kept free.

Do we need to wait for peace to fight this battle? No. We can begin to fight it now on the home front and by fighting it now can help to win it even before our men start coming home. How? By testifying with all our minds, with all our hearts, with all our strength to our belief in freedom as a concept separate from security and a concept nobler than security. But how do we do that? How are all our men and women overseas doing it? How did the Poles do it? By the voluntary sacrifice of every personal comfort, every scrap of security that interfered with freedom's fight. By getting a war job. By buying War bonds. By giving blood. By enlisting if you are a woman, physically able and unburdened by family charges, in the Army or Navy Nurse Corps, the WAC's or WAVES, the MARINES, the SPARS, the Red Cross. Simply, you might say, by working

and fighting for freedom now instead of talking of freedom tomorrow.

There are millions of people in America—mostly very ordinary people you never read about in the papers, who are doing everything and more that has been asked of them in freedom's name. But there are millions of others who have done little or nothing to win the war. Most of these are women.

I am sorry to say today what has been said so often and so much better before: Too many American women have failed to match up to their men overseas. Too many American girls seem to feel that their only patriotic duty is to keep their skins lily white and soft for some G. I. to touch when he comes home. I hope their G. I.'s are lucky enough to come home with hands to touch with.

Their failure and the failure of many men on the home front to make voluntary personal sacrifices worthy of the terrible sacrifices our men make on the battlefields belittles the cause of freedom and casts it low.

Can there be any connection between the failure of many Americans to respond to the great and urgent calls for their services at home and abroad, and the fact that our Nation had fallen into the habit of taking domestic freedom too much for granted? Yes; there is surely is. But there is also a connection between this failure and the progress in America of the great untruth that security is freedom. For if you need only stay secure to stay free, then you don't have to fight to stay free.

Let us face the truth: Today every American physically able and free of domestic obligations who does not voluntarily put mind or hand to some sort of war work is either an unimaginative clod who does not see that freedom is again in danger and therefore the real issue, or a spiritual fat cat who does not care. And such men and women are set-ups for the post-war demo-Fascists or demo-Communists who will one day use them to rob us all of both freedom and security. Whatever their party affiliations today potentially they are the totalitarian mass men and women of tomorrow.

The lesson of the battle front for the home front is that freedom is still world without end the greatest issue for the valiant hearts and generous minds among mankind. It is still the supreme value. It cannot be caught in the scientists' test tube. It cannot be written on any economists' balance sheet.

Freedom is what we are really talking about when we say that the voice of the people is the voice of God.

When the Boys Come Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most impressive sights encountered in my recent trip to our out posts and battle areas in the Pacific was the wonderful accomplishments of the American engineers. From all accounts they are performing equally miraculous works wherever our troops are engaged. Someday when the whole story can be told the work of the Army engineers and the Navy Seabees will be cited as among the most important contributions to the winning of the war.

As an architect, I have always been closely connected with engineers, and as a public official and highway commissioner in Brooklyn, I was associated with many of the men who are now building roads, bridges, airfields, and fighting on the roads to victory.

While I was in the Pacific I met some of these men. Their first inquiry was aimed at getting news of the conditions at home. A question frequently asked me was how the company they worked for before entering the service was getting along and what the chances were of their getting back the jobs they left to enter the service of our country. Some of the younger men I met have grown in engineering and construction experience far beyond what they possessed when they put on Uncle Sam's uniform. They are going to present a problem when they return to civil life.

In this connection I was much impressed with what Col. E. W. Garbisch said recently, along the same line, at a meeting of the New York Highway Chapter, Associated General Contractors of America, at Albany, N. Y.

Colonel Garbisch, who is now district engineer of the Corps of Engineers in command of the New York district, won fame while at West Point as the outstanding football hero of his day, and is rendering valiant service to his country in the game of war.

At the Albany meeting he was asked by the contractors: "What can we do to help our boys on their return to civilian life?"

In answer to the question Colonel Garbisch said:

Naturally, you will have to be prepared for great changes in many of them. Those who have suffered injuries in body or mind will have to be treated with the same kind of consideration and understanding that you would want if you were in their place. As to those who return in good health you must bear in mind that they have, in most cases, been subjected to many hardships and have been through hell and back to make it possible for all of us to continue to live and maintain the American way of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

You must be prepared to keep your promises and give them back the jobs they left to enter the service of our country. In some cases this is not going to be as easily done as said, unless you have work on hand for them to do. This means that you have an added incentive to obtain contracts which will make it possible for you to put them back on the pay roll.

In most cases the older and more experienced men, those who left key positions, will not offer the same problems as will the younger men. The oldsters will be able, in great measure, to take care of their own destiny and more readily fit themselves into peacetime activities.

But the younger men are going to be much more difficult to place in positions which will match up with the added experience and the responsibilities they gained during the time they were in service. Most of them will be fitted for much better jobs than they had when they put on Uncle Sam's uniforms. The 3, 4, or more years' experience, especially of those who are engaged in engineering and construction work, which has taught them how to meet and accomplish the impossible, is going to make them dissatisfied with what they will consider petty jobs.

In many cases it is going to require patience and understanding on your part, as well as theirs, to refit them into your organization. They have no doubt learned the value and necessity of team work, and the records they have made show they play a winning game, but the game they are coming back to will be entirely different. They will need considerate and patient coaching to help them put aside the rules and regulations of the game of war and play a winning game on the civilian fields. Do not for one moment imagine I favor any mollycoddling. You should not attempt that and they would resent it, but I feel you should prepare yourselves to do your best for the boys who deserve the very most we can give for the sacrifices they have made.

Of course, we must keep one thing in mind: it is all right to do a bit of thinking and talking about post-war, but right now the main job is to win the war. Wishful thinking won't do that. We have the enemies on all fronts "advancing backward" at the moment, but we should keep going with everything we have until the ball is over the goal line. Then we can pick ourselves up, scrape off the mud accumulated during the battle, and select the clean clothes that will make us presentable again to face the problems of life and the pursuit of economic security in business and at home.

Many of your own boys are having experiences and rendering services which must fill you with pride. They are doing their very best for all of us here—let us do our best until the war is over to keep them supplied with everything they need, and let us prepare ourselves to do our best to help them to help themselves when they return. Pray God it may be even sooner than we dare to hope.

Hold on to the True Christmas Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a kind and good friend lamented that the true spirit of Christmas has, to a large degree, faded into the past and faces which a few short weeks ago were glowing with good will and friendliness are now set and resolute.

Because we are carrying on a grim and awful war, we should make a special effort to be cheerful and considerate of those around us. It will lighten their heavy burdens and make our own more easily endured.

Above all, we must reaffirm our belief in divine providence, so that we may not sink to the depths of the depravity engulfing the leaders of our enemies.

Following is my own Christmas message which was submitted by request to the Regular, the official publication of the Regular Veterans Association:

A MESSAGE FROM CONGRESSMAN HAGEN

The Christmas season of the year is traditionally celebrated by Christian peoples the world over as a time when we become conscious of our obligations to our fellowmen.

This year is no exception.

In spite of the fact that millions of our men and women are engaged in a struggle to the death with strong and resourceful enemies, we must not lose our perspective.

It becomes more important than ever that we retain and practice the Christian principles which are exemplified in the spirit of Christmas. It is this spirit which gives our fighting men the courage and stamina for victory over the enemy. Our fight is not against men—but against their evil and pagan and undemocratic philosophies.

During this Christmas season we all hope and pray for a speedy end of war and for a lasting peace based on Christian principles.

I also wish to insert a copy of a Christmas talk by the well-known commentator, Edwin C. Hill, delivered Tuesday, December 19, over the Columbia Broadcasting System network.

This talk made a lasting impression on me and my family. I feel others, who may not have heard it, should have an opportunity to read it.

It follows:

The only world we have while we draw the breath of life is in a state of such appalling confusion and violence that it requires the full strength of faith in the Savior of mankind to keep us going. It requires that we grip with all of our soul's strength the conviction that in the end good always triumphs over evil. Always. The seemingly useless slaughter and sacrifice of individuals suggests to the discouraged and doubting that God is not interested in the individual. That view is neither warranted nor intelligent—or else the life of Jesus Christ is utterly meaningless. For what else did the Christ come down upon the earth and give up His life than to help the individual?

No reading of the Gospels can lead to any such hopeless and daunting conclusion as that God and His Son are concerned solely with some vast plan of mass refinement. As we enter the season devoted to the Christ the thought occurs that there is only one dependable guide to life on earth, and that is in the sayings and doing of Jesus as the Gospel records them. After nearly 2,000 years the only sure authority on the Saviour is written in the four Gospels. And so it is immensely important, at the beginning of the Christmas season, that we attempt to picture not Jesus the God, but Jesus, the incomparable loving and tender human being. So again to the Gospels. The oldest of these was written many years after the event which is the very soul of the Christian religion. The others came even later. Before it became preserved in writing, the matter they all contain was handed down through the several centuries, from mouth to mouth, from father to son, from mother to daughter. And with much warmth of human association and reality. These do not derive from roving imagination.

How can one conclude, for example, as has been imaginatively written, that Pilate "listened with particular emotion," or was moved by any special consideration for one whom he, as a magistrate, could not possibly have cherished any reverence. No Roman pro-consul trying to steer a precarious course between two difficult and dangerous masters, Tiberius at Rome and the equally murderous Herod at Jerusalem, could have been in a more perilous case. So Pilate, on the authority of the Scriptures, took the middle course, conducted the briefest examination of Jesus—an official interrogation only—at the end of which he remarked, "I find no fault with this man." From the Roman procurator of Judea, this was great praise indeed. Fanciful interpretations of the unspoken thoughts of Jesus won't do. The farther we stray from the Gospels, the more bewildered we become.

As to his personal appearance, the French scholar, Renan, dwelling somewhat on the sweet and penetrating influence and amiable character of Jesus, remarks that these qualities appear to have been accompanied by a beautiful face. There can be no doubt at all that he possessed qualities which threw around Him a fascination from which no one of his countryside, of those simple and kindly populations, could ignore. Renan's supposition that the face of Jesus was lovely, brings to mind one of the most interesting questions of nearly 2,000 years: "What did Christ really look like?"

What evidence have we? If we may accept as authentic a letter which was written when Tiberius Caesar ruled the Roman world, more than 19 centuries ago, we have very positive evidence as to His personal appearance. In the reign of the Emperor Tiberius Caesar, there was a Roman law officer in Judea, whose official business it was to keep the Roman Senate informed of all occurrences of interest. It was his custom to send a letter every week or so, informing the Senators of what was going on in Jerusalem and in other parts of the Roman Province of Judea.

And this is what he wrote: This precise description of Christ: "A man of stature somewhat tall and most comely, with a very reverend countenance such as the beholder may both love and fear. His hair is of the color of chestnuts, full ripe, plain to the ears, whence, downward, it is more orient and curling, waving about his shoulders. In the midst of His head is a seam or partition of His hair, after the manner of the Nazarenes. His forehead very plain and delicate; His face without spot or wrinkle—beautiful, with a lovely red. His nose and mouth are formed as nothing can be represented; His beard is thickish, and in color like His hair, not very long-forked. His look innocent and moderate; His eyes clear and quick. In reproving He is terrible, in admonishing courteous and fair-spoken. It cannot be remembered that any have seen Him laugh, but many have seen Him weep. In proportion the body most excellent. His hands and arms most delicate to behold; in speaking, very temperate, modest, and wise. A man for His singular beauty surpassing the children of men."

There is the portrait in all its strength and beauty—something to contemplate with awe and with unshaken faith. On this Christmas, perhaps as never before, it is essential and paramount to believe that this man who came to save men, not only has steadily triumphed but will continue to triumph over all evil—however we fear, however we doubt, however we are shaken by the blasts of misfortune—until all things are made equal in the great day of reckoning.

Price of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed upon one thing, we want no more war. Everyone wants to win the peace. But just how are we going to win the peace? Public opinion will decide the course we will take. The decisions we make in the next few months may determine our national welfare for years to come. May we be given the courage, the human understanding, and the strength of character to solve this problem.

In planning for the future of America we are now perfecting and will have in operation the largest globe-girdling network of airways, as well as the largest fleet of planes in the world. On the sea we will have the greatest naval and maritime fleet in the history of mankind, and the invisible radio waves already dominated by Uncle Sam's vast communications network.

America will be willing to help feed the starving nations abroad and extend the hand of Christian fellowship as far and as fast as other nations will reach out to take it in a firm resolve to work together to preserve peace and eliminate the evils and inequalities which provides the seeds of resentment and of war, but above all, our security, our solvency, our system of self-government and sovereignty must be safeguarded.

Most Americans agree with the philosophy of the Atlantic Charter, which provides that we seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other; that we desire no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; that we respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; that we will endeavor to further the access by all to trade on equal terms; that we will try to bring full collaboration of all in the economic field; that we hope, after the destruction of Nazi tyranny, to see established a peace which will afford security to all within our national boundaries; that this peace should enable all to traverse the seas without hindrance; that we believe that all nations must ultimately abandon the use of force, but that pending such development the aggressor nations must be disarmed.

The minds of the American people are confused about the ways and means of implementing the Atlantic Charter. Many Americans favor the creation of machinery for international peace, yet oppose the implements necessary to carry out its objectives. Some are against compulsory military conscription and others are opposed to policing the world. Some have a friendly attitude toward the principles set forth in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Four things are called for in these proposals: First. A general assembly; second, a security council; third, an international court of justice; and, fourth, a secretariat.

If a group of nations are to bind themselves together under such a set of principles, giving the security council the range and power indicated, it appears to me the council will be ineffective unless it has at its command what might be termed an unlimited supply of: 1. The most modern fighting equipment in the world; 2. A trained and skilled personnel second to none; 3. Financial strength of unlimited proportions; and 4. Basic raw materials which can be converted into fighting equipment and general supplies as the needs of the day demand.

We may expect a total direct interest bearing Federal debt in this country of no less than $400,000,000,000 before the present conflict ends. In the event of the international agreements being consummated, it is reasonable to assume that the United States will take the lead in establishing international currency stabilization, and the necessary machinery for the expansion of the required credit with which to reconstruct the war-torn areas. If the United States is to do this, somebody will have to buy billions of dollars worth of new issues from the Federal Treasury in order to supply that agency with the necessary dollar exchange to extend to the other countries of the world. Such a program could easily involve an additional $100,000,000,000.

What the attitude of 12,000,000 fighting men and women will be when they return from the battlefronts to their homes, with respect to these great questions, I do not know. How far they will be willing to go on bearing the tax burdens incident to servicing the tremendous dollars debt, I do not know, to say nothing about the tax levies that will be required to pay the annual recurring expenses outside of the cost of servicing the debt.

Do you not believe the following questions should be answered before final approval is given the Dumbarton Oaks or similar proposals?

Should we do our part in policing the world?

If so, should it be compulsory or voluntary?

By maintaining an adequate air force and acquiring necessary air bases, do you believe American air power alone is sufficient to police the world?

How large a standing Army and Navy should we have in peacetime?

Do you believe in compulsory military training?

Do you believe the time has come to invest in physical education because it will prepare the youth of America to make his maximum contribution to society?

Should we dismantle our war plants and junk our ships which cost our taxpayers over $200,000,000,000?

Should we preserve our stockpiles of nonperishable materials, such as quinine, tin, and natural rubber, which were acquired at vast effort and expense?

Should we take our diplomatic service out of politics and establish diplomatic schools similar to West Point and Annapolis to train our future diplomats?

Will R. O. T. C. and Army summer school training be sufficient to prepare our youth in military tactics?

Will it be necessary to establish more R. O. T. C. units throughout our colleges and universities?

Do you believe in lowering the American standard of living to increase the *living standards* of other countries?

Yes, these and many more questions will have to be answered before a preponderant overwhelming public opinion will favor ways and means of implementing the Atlantic Charter. Every American will be called upon to help solve these perplexing problems.

Effort Made To Pass Proposed Twenty-second Amendment to United States Constitution in Georgia Legislature Condemned by Journal Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have made a number of talks on the floor of the House during the past year on the activities of the Committee for Constitutional Government in its effort to place about the neck of the American people a yoke in the form of the so-called twenty-second amendment, which, if adopted, would not only figuratively break the individual's back but would break the backbone of our democratic economic structure. I refer to the proposed amendment which would limit the power of the Federal Government to levy taxes on incomes, inheritances and gifts to 25 percent.

PLAN TO LIMIT INCOME TAXES ON RICH

The first obvious reaction by too many of our people who are the victims of the group's subtle propaganda is that "here is a chance to limit my income tax to a certain figure. The rate has been increased during the past few years and here is an opportunity to put a check on any further increase."

What that gullible person does not realize is that he is, by lending his support to such a movement, making it absolutely certain that his tax rates will increase to the 25-percent figure, which is considerably above the tax bracket in which the average workingman, white-collar worker, and the small businessman are now placed in paying individual tax returns.

The beneficiaries of such an amendment will be the individuals who now find themselves in the high tax brackets by virtue of a very high income and the corporations whose tax brackets are also high by virtue of high profits.

Should not the result be perfectly obvious to anyone who even gives a moment's reflection to the proponents' line of propaganda? It is so simple that it could well be illustrated by the grade-school teacher using the old loaf-of-bread type of explanation. If it takes three measures of wheat to make a loaf of bread, one of which has been furnished by the poor man and two by the rich, what happens when the law will no longer permit the rich man to contribute his two measures? The poor man is either going to have to increase his contribution or the loaf is going to be a mighty slim one. That loaf of bread, gentlemen, must keep the old people of our Nation in sustenance, must take care of our veterans, must keep alive our Government and our Nation. I dislike to bring such a childish story out on the floor of the House, but when a group such as the Committee for Constitutional Government can change the answer to exactly the same problem and do it so quietly and effectively that 17 of the State legislatures endorse their answer, I think it is about time that we do something about it.

PLOT SUBSTANTIALLY ACCOMPLISHED BEFORE DISCOVERY

I am casting no reflection upon the intelligence of our citizens. The group's activities have met with such phenomenal success only because the great majority of the people of our Nation have not been aware of what was going on until comparatively recent months. I myself was shocked last year when I discovered this diabolical plot and found that 14 States had already adopted endorsing resolutions. There was certainly no publicity connected with each of these alleged successes.

I am proud that I have been instrumental in changing this lack of publicity. I shall continue to act as an unwelcome press agent for the Committee for Constitutional Government, and I can assure you that the spotlight of publicity will be focused upon every move to get this insidious amendment passed.

I shall have plenty of help in giving these activities publicity, too. Members of State legislatures all over our Nation are keeping me posted on developments in their respective legislatures in this respect. National organizations are advising their officers and members to keep their eyes open and to do all they can to defeat the movement. Many of our papers are finding out what is going on and welcoming a chance to expose those who advocate the adoption of the twenty-second amendment.

EDITORIAL ON SUBJECT

A very fine example of an editorial which appeared recently on this subject is that in the Atlanta Journal, Atlanta, Ga., of February 4, 1945, and I believe the Members of Congress will be interested in it. I am therefore having it incorporated in my remarks, in full, as follows:

WELL, HERE IT IS

We have been expecting it for weeks and, lo and behold, here it is. On Friday Representative John W. Greer, of Lanier County, introduced in the general assembly a resolution asking Congress to call a convention to move for an amendment to the Constitution which would limit Federal income and inheritance taxes to 25 percent. This is a local manifestation of a national movement which has been denounced on the floor of the Congress by one of its ablest and most respected Members as "the most sinister lobby ever organized" and as "the millionaires' amendment to make the rich richer and the poor poorer." The Congressman who exposed the scheme is WRIGHT PATMAN, who has represented a Texas district since 1929.

The national movement is the scheme of an organization calling itself the Committee for Constitutional Government, sometimes functioning under the alias of the Committee to Uphold the Constitution. The leaders of this committee, whose name is so pretentious, have been identified to Congress by Mr. PATMAN as Frank Gannett, a New York publisher reputed to be a millionaire; Sam B. Pettingill, a former Congressman who has conducted an active propaganda campaign in recent years against all New Deal measures; Edward A. Rumley, a convicted German agent

during World War No. 1, and the reputed brain of the movement.

Resolutions similar to that which now has been presented to the Georgia General Assembly have been slipped through the legislatures of 16 States. We say "slipped" because there is record of declaration by many members of those legislatures that they were unaware of the action that was taken. Congressman PATMAN told the House "quiet but extremely effective lobbyists kept their hands covered until the right moment for unveiling their final attack." Fourteen States had acted before the scheme reached the attention of the Congress. The States which have passed such a resolution are Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. The Pennsylvania Legislature passed the resolution in June of 1943, but the Governor vetoed it.

The purpose of the scheme is obvious. Whereas a man with an income of $1,000,000 now pays income tax of about $800,000, the ceiling would be $250,000. The man with $2,000 income who now pays about $175, probably would have to pay up to the limit; that is, $500. Yet the Government would be unable to finance its operations without the levy of a national sales tax and other imposts which would bear with especial severity on those of low income.

If 32 States should pass such a resolution, a Constitutional Convention must be called to draft and submit a twenty-second amendment. One-half of the necessary number already have been gulled into action.

This move is an effort of special interests to revise the principles of taxation in such a way as to shift the burden of government from those best able to pay onto the shoulders of those less able to pay. It should never be permitted to reach the floor of the General Assembly of Georgia. If it reaches the floor, it should be defeated by overwhelming vote.

Personnel at Air Base Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, of February 7, 1945:

PERSONNEL AT AIR BASE COMMENDED—GROUP IS LAUDED FOR FLYING 11,000,000 MILES DURING YEAR WITHOUT ACCIDENT

Commendation of Lieut. Col. William B. Hooton, commanding officer of the Second Ferrying Group at the New Castle Army Air Base, and all base personnel was received yesterday from Maj. Gen. Harold George, commanding general of the Air Transport Command at Washington, for the successful completion of the first year of operations of the Crescent Caravan without a fatal accident.

General George's message follows:

"The hearty congratulations of the whole command are extended to you and the personnel of your organization on the outstandingly successful completion of the first year of operations of the Crescent Caravan Ferrying Division, Air Transport Command. You have accomplished the remarkable record of flying nearly 11,000,000 miles along the 12,000-mile-long crescent route and making 1,500 ocean crossings without a fatal accident.

"All this is due not only to the extraordinary skill and attention to duty of pilots and flight crews of the Crescent Caravan, but also to the careful supervision and exceptional efficiency of maintenance and servicing personnel.

"I, therefore, desire to express to all personnel of your command concerned in this operation, my thanks and appreciation for their consistent conscientious effort, and to officially commend them for their distinguished achievement."

Psychiatry for Vets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes, from today's Washington Daily News:

PSYCHIATRY FOR VETS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Congress has had its attention called—and very effectively—to one of the most serious problems of the war, the increasing number of veterans suffering from nervous and mental disorders, neuropsychiatric cases.

Representative PRIEST (Democrat, Tennessee), in a House speech, called it "one of our most pressing problems," and warned that until Congress provides facilities and trained personnel to meet it "we are leaving a tragically dangerous gap in our veterans' program unbridged."

It should be the immediate concern of Congress, he advised, "to find a way for specialized training of from 10,000 to 20,000 medical graduates in the field of neuropsychiatric treatment, and to provide reasonable assurances that an adequate number of men so trained shall go into veterans' hospitals for a definite and specified length of time."

He is preparing a bill for Government assistance in such a program.

The Tennessee Congressman, who has studied the problem, sketched its outlines to the House. Already between 130,000 and 140,000 men have been discharged from the service because of neurotic maladjustments, and the number is increasing daily. There are today less than 4,000 trained psychiatrists for the whole country and many of these are now in the service where they are needed badly.

Neither the Veterans' Administration nor any other agency of government today is able to cope with this growing problem, Mr. PRIEST said. He explained that the Veterans' Administration has its hands full with the tremendous amount of detail imposed upon it by the G. I. bill of rights, and at the present time is seriously handicapped by personnel problems. These, he added, will no doubt be cleared up in most lines of activity when the war is over.

"But," he said, "whether the Veterans' Administration shall be able to give the neuropsychiatric treatment that must be given as the number of such patients increases will depend primarily upon whether the Congress takes the necessary steps to augment facilities and to assure a sufficient number of skilled men in the medical service to do the job.

"I do not know nor does the Veterans' Administration or the Public Health Service know today how many men will be required. All who have looked into the matter at all know that many more will be required than are available today even if we were able to use all those now serving in the Army and Navy Medical Corps. I have received estimates that range from 10,000 to 18,000."

There is at the outset, too, he explained, a shortage of teachers qualified in the neuropsychiatric field, and it may be necessary first to train some teachers.

Representative PRIEST also emphasized the necessity of the community taking an active part in meeting this problem, for in the end it becomes a community problem. He pointed out that, even when enough psychiatrists are trained, there still will be need for a community program.

Statement by the American Labor Party on the Foreign Policy of the United States Government in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the statement of the American Labor Party on the foreign policy of the United States Government in Europe:

The approaching military victory of the Allies is the result of the most extraordinary coalition of nations in history. That coalition is making victory possible. Without it the forces of fascism and nazi-ism might have enslaved the world.

The success of that coalition is a tribute to the leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Joseph Stalin. In helping to cement that coalition, the President has fully represented and safeguarded the interests of the United States.

That coalition must be continued and extended in order to establish a just and durable peace for the people of this country and for the world. To achieve this end the Congress, and particularly the United States Senate, has a grave responsibility to provide the necessary cooperation. Otherwise the people of this country may be deprived of the fruits of our military victories and the benefits of the great coalition forged with the major United Nations.

I. UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER

We emphatically endorse the policy of unconditional surrender.

The peoples of this war-torn world must not be cheated of their victory by a soft or negotiated peace. This war will have been fought in vain unless the Allied Governments are free to take the sternest measures to exterminate the very roots of Fascist and Nazi aggression for all time.

We urge that the strongest possible measure be taken by the major Allies not merely to see that Germany and Japan are demilitarized but that they are kept demilitarized and that the industrial and political potentials of these nations to become future aggressors are destroyed. We urge that all necessary agreements to accomplish these objectives be concluded among the major Allies as soon as possible.

II. DUMBARTON OAKS

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals represent a historic advance in the establishment of international machinery for the preservation and enforcement of peace. There must be no reservations which will nullify these proposals. There must be no reservations which will hamper the new world organization in dealing with aggression promptly and effectively.

The last election was a decisive mandate to this effect.

We accordingly urge:

A. With respect to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals

1 That the new world organization proposed at Dumbarton Oaks be set up at the earliest possible moment.

2. That in accordance with the Dumbarton Oaks proposals this country undertake to make available to the new world security council a designated amount of our armed forces for use against aggressors.

3. That this country's representative on the security council be empowered to vote for the use of force by the council to restrain aggression, without being required to return to Congress for specific approval in each instance. In the words of President Roosevelt, "If the world organization is to have any reality at all, our American representative must be endowed in advance by Congress with authority to act."

B. With respect to voting on the security council

The enemies of the new world organization have attempted to magnify differences between the powers as to proposed voting procedures on the security council. Nothing must stand in the way of a prompt settlement of these differences.

For ourselves, we regard it as basic that another world war can be prevented only by the united action of the great powers who are primarily charged with the responsibility of maintaining the peace. If the great powers cannot agree to preserve the peace, then no organization can preserve the peace. Any attempt to preserve peace, except by the unanimous agreement of the great powers, cannot succeed. Any attempt to enforce peace against one of them must inevitably provoke another world war.

The maintenance of peace, therefore, demands that the great powers who stand charged with the responsibility for the maintenance of the peace be in continuous fundamental agreement. In view of the basic considerations, the most desirable voting mechanism in the Security Council is one that will best be calculated to produce unanimous action by these powers. We accordingly urge that voting procedure on the Security Council be so established as to require unanimity of action on the part of the great powers represented thereon.

C. With respect to bilateral agreements

We strongly approve the bilateral treaties of mutual assistance entered into by Czechoslovakia, England, France, and the Soviet Union. These treaties are essential steps to realize the objectives referred to above.

These treaties look toward the policing of Germany and the continuance of cooperative action between these allies of ours. The treaties are thoroughly consistent with the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and implement specific sections of those proposals. They seek to organize Europe so as to make Europe strong enough to check German aggression in the future through the united action of those countries as the primary policeman in Europe. These treaties are, therefore, necessary steps in the achievement of a basic goal of this war, namely, to render it impossible for Germany to attempt once again to conquer Europe and from Europe to threaten the peace of the world. These treaties are, accordingly, important and constructive contributions to the national security of the United States.

III. LIBERATED COUNTRIES

1. Democratic governments in the liberated countries are cornerstones on which a durable peace must be built.

Our aim should be to encourage the unity of all exiled governments with the liberation movement of their respective countries. Where, however, that is not possible, discredited and reactionary governments, however, temporary or provisional they are alleged to be, must not be superimposed by force on any peoples. Such governments do not prevent anarchy or maintain order. On the contrary, they provoke the most violent disorder and civil war. They retard economic recovery, create the basis for new Fascist movements, and jeopardize the interests of this country in world peace and post-war world trade.

Full encouragement and assistance should be given to the popular forces of resistance in each of the liberated countries. These forces stemming from the masses of the people have earned the right with their own life's blood to work out their own destiny. Moreover, these forces are vital instruments in the war against fascism. They constitute a firm foundation of future democracy.

2. In this connection, we must recognize that recent differences between the United States and England stem mainly from unresolved questions which will become acute in the post-war period. These questions relate to matters of post-war trade. They must be settled as quickly as possible in the interests of an enduring peace.

We favor agreements promoting the equitable participation by the peace-loving nations in an expanded world trade. The Bretton Woods proposals are vital steps in this direction.

Fair and mutually satisfactory agreements which give recognition to the interests and needs of the British people, as well as the United States, are necessary in order to check repressive measures in countries such as Greece, Belgium, and Italy, and remove obstacles to our own policies in the Far East and Latin America.

A. Greece and Belgium

In line with these fundamental principles, we condemn the policy which has thus far been followed in Greece and Belgium. We urge that the peoples of those countries be permitted to reconstitute their governments so that those governments will be truly representative of the popular forces of resistance and liberation.

B. Italy

We urge the more active encouragement and assistance be given to the democratic forces in Italy and that adequate relief be furnished to the people of that ravaged country, to the end that that country may be established on a self-governing, democratic basis as quickly as possible.

We support the demand of the Italian Government to be allowed to participate with armed forces in the fight against Nazi aggression.

We fully endorse the Marcantonio resolution providing for the admission of democratic Italy into the United Nations.

C. Poland

The people in Poland have suffered greatly and fought gallantly in their homeland against the Nazis.

We urge that the United States Government develop ways and means of sympathetic cooperation with the newly established Provisional Government of Poland in Warsaw.

IV. SPAIN

Franco Spain has clearly demonstrated that it is an outpost of nazi-ism and a springboard for the establishment of fascism in America. Under the guise of neutrality, Franco has been receiving American oil and other commodities, has placed Spanish waters at the disposal of Germany for Nazi submarine bases, has made Spanish land and factories available for Nazi plane bases, has made Spanish facilities available for Nazi radio stations, and has furnished Spanish soldiers for the Nazi war machine.

The whole of Spain has become a training ground for a Latin-American gestapo and a spearhead directed against our own immediate interests in the Americas. Franco Spain has become a conduit for the transfer to Latin America of billions of dollars of Nazi and Fascist loot.

In line with the principles expressed above, we urge the following:

1. The adoption of Congressman COFFEE'S resolution calling for severance of diplomatic relations with Franco Spain and the ending of all shipments of oil and other materials by our Government.

2. The extension of moral and financial assistance to the democratic Spanish elements within Spain and outside its borders, seeking to restore a republican form of government in that country.

3. The granting of freedom of movement and communication for Spanish republicans in exile, especially for political leaders and representatives of the last republican government.

V. CONCLUSION

The task of building a genuine and effective world organization is a challenge to our patience, our intelligence, our imagination, and our faith. That task is not facilitated by the irresponsible criticism of our allies by perfectionists or by the sniping of isolationists masquerading as superinternationalists.

In the words of President Roosevelt, "We are not fighting for and we shall not attain a utopia. Indeed, in our own land * * * we have yet to realize the full and equal enjoyment of our freedom."

Voices of the Present and Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this debate I had no intention of asking for time to express myself in support of this bill, as I am not a member of the Military Affairs Committee. And then, too, I am reluctant to violate the precedent set for new Members of this House, but as I have sat for the past 2 days and listened to arguments, both pro and con, trying to obtain a clear concept of this legislation, my mind unconsciously reverted back some 25 years ago during World War No. 1, when many of us here today had the privilege and honor of wearing the uniform of our country and leading men in action at Belleau Woods, or perhaps Chateau Thierry, St. Mihiel, Meuse-Argonne, and other famous names, all revered by the 4,800,000 men who served on the battle and home fronts of the last war.

During those days, Mr. Speaker, I never once thought it ever would be

my honor to express my thoughts in the Halls of Congress of the United States, and especially in support of a bill which, in my judgment, according to the way it is passed, will either shorten or prolong the war.

As I address you this afternoon I seem to hear voices from the sepulchers of the dead, voices of the past; yes, voices from the various cemeteries in France, where we see thousands of little white crosses, row on row and the red poppies grow. Voices from the Surennes Cemetery near Paris, voices from the largest cemetery at beautiful Romagne, France, where more than 30,000 of our heroic dead were buried. I seem to hear those voices, Mr. Speaker, asking the question this hour, Is Congress today considering an antilabor bill, a pro-labor bill, a bill in direct contravention to the thirteenth amendment of our Constitution, an un-American bill, a totalitarian bill, a slave-labor bill, or Fascist bill, as some have suggested, or a bill that our Commander in Chief, who should have the united support of all of us during war, our Secretary of War, our Secretary of Navy, our Chiefs of Staff of the Army and Navy have asked for? A bill which they say is necessary to win the war. As I listen to those voices, Mr. Speaker, the question suggests itself. Who am I to deny their request?

Moreover, I seem to hear the stilled voices of the past say "this is not a bill that would place a crown of thorns on the brow of labor, but one that is necessary on account of the exigencies of war—necessary if we have early victory—necessary if we want to save thousands of lives—yes, necessary if we want to save billions of dollars. Every hour you postpone action here you prolong V-day over there."

So far as I am concerned politically, I may be at the road of Armageddon. If I vote for this bill it may cause my defeat at the next election, but, Mr. Speaker, during these crucial days when the world is on flame I am not thinking of that. If that comes I shall at least have the courage of my convictions and the satisfaction of knowing I heeded the voice of my Commander in Chief, the Secretaries of War and Navy, and their respective Chiefs of Staff, and the countless voices of the past, voices inaudibile as they may be to some, but voices that have made this country what it is today—a land of freedom, a land of justice, yes, a land of democracy—a land where we have freedom from want or fear.

It is easy to say we are in favor of doing everything possible to help win the war, but, Mr. Speaker, it takes something more than lip service on the floor of Congress to win a war. Ask the dogface who ever occupied a funk or fox hole. This afternoon I am wondering whether we are going to follow the voices of the past, as well as the 40,000 World War No. 1 veterans who are still in the hospitals of our country paying, and paying with untold suffering, for the privilege of serving their country, and the some 11,000,000 men who, I am sure, if allowed to vote on this measure, an overwhelming majority would vote for it. Yes, I, too, am wondering if we are going to follow the voices of our Commander in Chief, Secretaries of the War and Navy, and their respective Chiefs of Staff.

In casting my vote for this bill, Mr. Speaker, I don't consider I am voting to slave labor, or violating my oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution, or voting for totalitarianism, fascism, or against organized labor, as has been said on the floor during this debate, but consider I am doing just the opposite and am only keeping faith with those voices of the past, the men and women in the service today, the fathers and mothers of our 650,420 combat casualties, and last but not least, with my Commander in Chief, Secretaries of War and Navy, and their respective Chiefs of Staff.

Drafting of Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from the Spencer (Mass.) Leader:

DRAFT NURSES?—NEVER

Ever and anon the toll of dead and wounded in this war increases at an appalling rate. The pressing demand for 10,000 trained nurses, with the threat that women will be drafted for this work, only serves to emphasize the fact that the methods of total modern warfare are producing casualties far in excess of previous wars. If nurses are drafted, it will be one of the greatest tragedies of this war. The services of nurses in connection with warfare, ever since the days of Florence Nightingale, have always been on a voluntary basis. Nurses become such, especially in wartime, because they wish to assist in healing the awful wounds left by the war. They volunteer because they love their work and their fellow men. No mere hirelings could minister to the needs of wounded men with that patience and kindly care which now distinguishes the work of our nurses. Nursing will lose its soul on the day that the volunteer system ceases to exist. Recently I met a cadet nurse whose father was one of New York's leading dentists, whose income was such that money ceased to be a consideration in their lives, and yet his little daughter, still in her teens, volunteered as a cadet nurse in a Boston hospital. One nurse of this type is worth 10,000 hirelings. More and more we tend toward regimentation by state edict. The drift seems always in that direction. Perhaps this move to draft and regiment the nursing profession may open our eyes sufficiently to awaken us to a full realization of how far we have left the basic ideals of our founding fathers as we supinely let the builders of a new tower of Babel confound our thinking if not our language. Already some of our institutions of learning are showing the Government the right way by instituting courses of preparatory training in the nursing profession. If the Government would get back of these moves to encourage voluntary training there would be no need for such drastic moves as proposed in the new draft legislation. Right here in Worcester County the Worcester Junior College is offering such a course, and young women who wish to enter this highly desirable profession will do well to investigate the advantages of such training.

Record of the F. B. I.

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, to take things for granted is a great American trait. To take things as they are has been the rule rather than the exception, until an emergency is upon us. Then with fanfare, we "view with alarm," and on the verge of hysteria we do a "Paul Revere" to save the day.

I recall, as do you, those soul-searching days following the disaster at Pearl Harbor when we expected an invasion on the east coast and on the west coast, with bombings in the Middle West. And from the lips of persons even high in the Government came the word that a wave of sabotage was soon to break out; that the enemy was getting set to strike. In fact, many accepted a wave of enemy sabotage for granted. That wave of sabotage has yet to come, and today, we generally are complacent and again we are taking it for granted that saboteurs and spies are a thing of the past.

During these perilous years we have all assumed that our home front would remain secure. There is justification for that view which will continue so long as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the able leadership of its Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, is on the job and has the backing of the citizenry of this Nation.

The record of the F. B. I. stands for all who desire to examine it—it is a record of achievement in which I take considerable pride. As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of the Department of Justice appropriations, I have for many years taken a personal interest in the development and accomplishments of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And the F. B. I. can stand on its record with justifiable pride, for it is the record of right-thinking Americans, in Congress and out. As Mr. J. Edgar Hoover said once in a speech, "The F. B. I. reflects the tempo of the times." It does. Over the years, by some means, it has been able to project itself into the uncharted paths of the future and lay a course of action which justifies our taking for granted the internal security of the land.

Let me refer to the record of this efficient agency of our Government. In 1938 and the early part of 1939, quietly and efficiently it was laying the ground work for events that now are history. Even before the Hitler military machine gave its horrifying exhibition of might in the

conquering of Poland, the F. B. I. was on a full wartime basis. It worked as we slept. Some persons, even here in Congress, thought that Director Hoover was somewhat of an alarmist and perhaps was needlessly expanding his organization. Others, subverters and heads of front organizations, were not long in publicly proclaiming that the F. B. I. was exceeding its authority. And as time went on they became more vociferous in their denunciations. But now we can understand. They knew what would happen to those who would sell America short. They knew that a program of sabotage would never materialize if the F. B. I. could get the jump on them. It is little wonder that more pressure was not exerted to restrain and hamper the F. B. I., particularly at the time when the Communists were alined with the Nazis.

Day and night, F. B. I. agents did their job of ferreting out persons potentially dangerous; investigating their backgrounds, alliances, and activities. When the Jap holocaust was visited on Pearl Harbor, the F. B. I. was ready. Even as the bombs were falling, the word was flashed to this organization's headquarters. A quiet Sunday afternoon and evening became a turmoil of activity. The G-men put their fingers on all dangerous aliens. Overnight the Axis fifth column in America became extinct. Since the outbreak of war, the F. B. I. has arrested over 16,000 alien enemies, many of whom were released upon giving a satisfactory explanation of their suspicious activities. Others were released by alien enemy hearing boards, while over 4,000 have been interned and nearly 6,000 paroled. In making these arrests the F. B. I. seized as contraband nearly 5,000 firearms; over 300,000 rounds of ammunition; 2,200 sticks of dynamite, enough if properly placed to cause untold damage to our war effort; over 4,000 cameras; 3,000 short-wave radio receivers; code books; and Jap and German uniforms, along with numerous other items.

There is always a fear that in time of war civil liberties will be infringed upon, and this was one of the favorite smoke screens that the subverters raised before the war in denouncing the F. B. I. So far as I have been able to learn, there has not been one single case of high-handed arbitrary action laid at the doorstep of the F. B. I.

Back of this miraculous job was planning and training. In 1935, for example, Director Hoover founded the F. B. I. National Academy for the purpose of training select representatives from various communities in America so that they in turn might train their brother officers in the application of scientific aids to law enforcement. Nearly a thousand men have graduated from this school. Many of the graduates are chiefs of police. Here was a nucleus around which progress could be made in each community. From my own State of Nebraska 14 officers have attended the academy. I have personal knowledge of the great value of this training to State and local law-enforcing officers.

More important, here was the backbone of the F. B. I. mobilization plan for law-enforcement officers which was placed in action in 1939. Director Hoover gives to American law enforcement its just praise and credit for their sterling performance of wartime duties. Standing shoulder to shoulder, local, county, and State authorities have worked with the F. B. I., proving once and for all time Mr. Hoover's claim over the years that this Nation needs no national police. I would venture to say that from the standpoint of efficiency and achievement our American authorities stood head and shoulder above the O. V. R. A. of Italy, the Gestapo of Germany, and the N. K. V. D. of Russia. And their work has been done in the American way. I would not insult our American authorities by making any further comparison. We want none of the Old World's corruption, oppression, brutality, and tyranny in the United States.

Seldom heard of was a vast mobilization program of war industries to safeguard against sabotage. In 1939 the F. B. I. launched a program of surveying the protective facilities of war plants, followed by recommendations as to how the protective facilities could enhance security. Some 2,300 key manufacturing establishments upon whom we had to depend for the bulk of our weapons of war were surveyed. Since the F. B. I. studiously avoided injecting itself into employer-employee relations, both management and labor enthusiastically aided in this furtherance of an antisabotage program. The result is that up to now there has not been one successful enemy-directed act of sabotage. To the shame of those enjoying the blessings of being Americans, the F. B. I. has found some 2,000 acts of technical sabotage committed by persons seeking to satisfy personal grievances, and by those who would rather engage in horseplay than to go all out to work for America. The records show 568 convictions for this type of crime.

While the enemy has not been successful, it has not been because they have not tried. The Nation was electrified by the news in the summer of 1942 of the landing of eight saboteurs from Nazi submarines and of their apprehension by the F. B. I. within 2 weeks after their arrival. Here was positive proof that the enemy was desperate. It is also their confession that the F. B. I. had done its work well, for you may rest assured that had the Germans a single vestige of an organization left in the United States they would never have gone to the expense, trouble, and risk of trying to build up a new organization in America.

The same observation may be made in the espionage field. Scores of spies have been arrested by the G-men; their plans thwarted. Here again the Germans, by sending their spies, Colepaugh and Gimpel, to the United States by submarine, admit that their spy organization in the United States was nonexistent. There is another lesson to be drawn from this most-recent landing. As the enemy finds the pressure of the Allied offensive mounting, in desperation they will become more brazen. Until the war is finally over and the shooting has stopped, both in the east and west, there can be no relaxing of our effort or curtailment of our protective forces.

In World War No. 1 the records show that there were 7 delinquents in every 1,000 men of draft age. Those of my generation remember with shame the disgraceful methods that were used in enforcing the draft laws. Slacker raids were the rule rather than the exception. There has been no such fanfare in this war. The job has been done without hysteria. Instead of 7 delinquents to 1,000, there is only 1. The emphasis has been placed on carrying out the intent of Congress in getting men in the Army rather than in jail. Thus, out of 445,000 cases there have been fewer than 12,000 convictions. The others either complied with the act or were made available to the armed services.

Prisoner of war camps are located in virtually all sections of the United States. In them are thousands of Germany's fanatical Nazis and some of Japan's vanquished but still defiant warriors. They are in our midst, but not by choice. Few have changed their minds about Hitler or Japan's destiny in the Orient. They despise America, look upon democracy with contempt, and are powerless and harmless only so long as they are kept safely in confinement.

It is inevitable that some prisoners will try to escape, and that many will succeed. Thus far there have been 1,249 escapes by prisoners of war in the United States, and all but 20 have been recaptured by the F. B. I. and local authorities. Most of the 20 still at large have been free for only a short period of time.

Military authorities have the responsibility of maintaining in confinement and controlling prisoners of war. But when a prisoner of war escapes, he becomes a threat to the internal security of the Nation and continues to be an active danger until he is placed back in confinement. Most prisoners who escape hope to make their way back home and rejoin the fight against the United Nations. En route are many opportunities to pick up valuable information, many places where carefully planned acts of sabotage would do great damage to this Nation's war effort.

The F. B. I. is charged with the responsibility of guarding the internal security of the United States, and for that reason it is the coordinating agency and the guiding force in the search for and the apprehension of escaped prisoners of war.

Prisoners have escaped by cutting wire, crawling through washouts, and going over fences. Generally they travel afoot, but some have ridden trains, traveled in crude boats on rivers, while others fled in stolen jeeps or even on bicycles.

With over 100 Federal criminal laws to enforce, aside from its wartime activities, the F. B. I. has had its hands full. Crime is on the upswing. Hijackings remind one of the old days of the roaring twenties when the beer barons were stealing each other's stock in trade. In this era of scarcity, racketeers and robbers find a ready sale in the black markets of rationed items, and the only way

to curb this menace is to make it so unprofitable that the criminals will think twice before attacking shipments in interstate commerce. Not only has the F. B. I. been able to clear up most of their hijacking cases, but they have been able to recover a high percentage of the stolen loot.

Protecting the uniforms of the United States has been another big job handled with distinction by the F. B. I. Those lecherous persons too yellow to fight have defamed our fighting men by buying uniforms, campaign ribbons, and even decorations, then being feted by those who would believe their lies and boasts, which were designed to gain the sympathies of their listeners.

There was a time when no home in America was free from fear of kidnaping. No bank was free from fear of robbery. Congress wisely enacted statutes giving the F. B. I. jurisdiction to investigate such cases, with the result that such crimes practically ceased. Before the outbreak of war, fears of kidnapings were almost forgotten; however, many responsible citizens and authorities again are fearful of a revival of crimes of this type.

The rise in juvenile arrests does not augur well for our future. They are the ones who may be our public enemies in the coming years. The disruption of home life and the failure of parents in the peacetime years is the fault. Americans have not always put first things first. And the home has suffered with the tragic result that arrests of girls under 21 have increased 130 percent since the outbreak of war. A boy 17 years old should be finishing his high school course and preparing for the future, yet the figures show that more boys aged 17 are arrested than in any other age group. What is the answer? It appears not to be a difficult one—return the American home to its rightful place, as the center of American life. Make it a place of learning as well as a place of living.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is an example of what can be accomplished in Government, and it should be duplicated in principle in all levels of Government, State, county, and municipal. Above all, let us support and stand back of this agency of security.

Observations Concerning Current Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following observations concerning current problems taken from my weekly news letters to the people of my district:

THE NEW BEVERIDGE PLAN

The Beveridge social-security plan of 2 years ago—used as a basis for the New Deal "cradle to grave" or "womb to tomb" security proposal—has now been superseded by the new Beveridge plan for full employment. Sir William Beveridge finally tumbled to the fact that his first plan provided insurance against losing a job, but it did not in itself make jobs; therefore, it was not a sound program. In order to provide the desired security, jobs to provide full employment must be created. Sir William has now brought forth his plan No. 2, a plan to guarantee full employment. Beveridge proposes to solve all economic problems—national idleness, trade slumps, depressions, overproduction, and underconsumption. In his new plan he would have the Government underwrite or guarantee consumption demand. He says the workers should be able to buy all the goods they can produce; but under our present economic system they haven't enough money, so the Government must step in and fill the deficiency of demand, which in plain English means furnish the extra money. The Government will get the money partly by borrowing and partly by a tax program designed to redistribute the wealth of the Nation. Since reading the Beveridge plan for full employment, I am wondering if this is where the President got his idea when he promised 60,000,000 jobs. Haven't we enough crackpots of our own without borrowing ideas from England's crackpots?

THE FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL

Senator MURRAY, of Montana, has introduced S. 380, which he calls the "Full Employment Act of 1945." The purpose of the bill, as glibly stated in the preamble, is: "To establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free, competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government." In substance, the bill says that all Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment; that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to guarantee that right; that whenever private industry fails to provide full employment—jobs for all—the Government must step in and provide the necessary jobs to assure continuing full employment. The bill is a very comprehensive one, full of high-sounding phrases, setting forth idealistic objectives; but when analyzed it simply offers the same old panacea for unemployment—Federal borrowing and spending to provide boondoggling jobs for all the unemployed. This is exactly what Wallace testified he intended to do if he were made Secretary of Commerce and had control of the Federal lending agency. It is the Hopkins' program of "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect" over again. It is Sir William Beveridge's plan No. 2 put into the form of a bill. What do you think of it?

THE PATTERN SHAPES UP

Straws in the wind flying around Washington show that we are in for an era of planned economy. In the President's recent Budget message he indicated that an era of planned economy under strict Federal control is in the offing. In that message he said, "The mistakes in debt management and tax policy after the last war must not be repeated." This suggests that he has a different plan for debt management and tax policy after this war from the one used by CARTER GLASS and Andy Mellon. He proposes to control the economy of the Nation through a program of taxation, Government spending, Government borrowing, and the manipulation of our debt load. A $300,000,000,000 debt load, with an annual interest payment of between six and seven billion dollars is a force to be reckoned with in the economic life of this Nation. The forced resignation of Jesse Jones, one of the biggest businessmen in the Nation, and the appointment of Henry Wallace, the greatest exponent of planned economy in the Nation, is a clear indication of what the President has in store for us.

A QUESTION OF FITNESS

What are Wallace's qualifications, views, experience, and background for the responsible job that Jesse Jones has filled so well?

1. The Secretary of Commerce has control over the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which deals with world aviation. Wallace says world aviation should be under the control of the United Nations peace organization. Do we want that?

2. The Secretary of Commerce has control of both foreign and domestic commerce, which deals with world trade. Wallace says he favors a United Nations investment corporation that would regulate world trade largely by using our cash and our credit. Do we want that?

3. The Secretary of Commerce has control over the $750,000,000 invested in American synthetic rubber plants. Wallace says we should scrap these synthetic rubber plants and get our raw rubber from Latin America and the Far East. This means doing away with several hundred thousand jobs, and again becoming dependent upon outside sources for our rubber. Do we want that?

4. The Secretary of Commerce has control over the Federal loan agency that has been given $35,000,000,000 to loan to the Defense Plant Corporation, the Rubber Reserve Corporation, the Foreign Economic Administration, the Petroleum Reserve Corporation, and so forth. Federal subsidies of all kinds are also covered by the Federal Loan Agency. Do we want Wallace in control of these billions so he may carry on his socialistic experiments? Jones testified that the R. F. C. could lend anything, at any time, at any rate of interest, to anybody."

Congressman DIRKSEN summed up Wallace's appointment very plainly when he asked: "If Tom Girdler had been appointed Secretary of Labor, what would our labor organizations say about his fitness for the position? If Jeannette Rankin of Montana, the lady pacifist—who voted in the House against World War No. 1 and against World War No. 2—were appointed Secretary of War, what would the American people say about her fitness for the position?" The question concerning Wallace's appointment to succeed Jones is a question solely of his fitness for the position.

Administration of the Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

G. A. PRESCOTT, JR., & SONS,
Tawas City, Mich., January 31, 1945.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: We enclose clipping from your local paper, the Bay City Times, under date of January 24, with a few remarks from one who knows after 3½ years as a member of the local selective-service board.

We are of the opinion some of the so-called parlor pinks placed in local State offices through political influences, to help General Hershey run the big selective-service show,

are not gifted as old Joseph, back in Egypt, when he interpreted King Pharaoh's dream about the seven fat and lean kine. If they were, they would not be making asinine statements which we hear about and read almost every day.

Did you know, in a recent meeting January 12, in Saginaw, before a joint group of selective-service boards, appeal boards, and appeal agents, one of these very brilliant young majors, when asked about the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, stated it did not mean a thing, or words to this effect; that the President, as Commander in Chief, had stated, "All men between the ages of 18, etc., should be in the armed forces."

Did you know after these meetings, when the heat went on, General Hershey told the press the Tydings amendment was still in force and would be strictly adhered to by all local boards; but the very next day, after all the news broadcasts had quoted him, the papers came out with a statement from our State headquarters that all men between the ages of 18 and 26 would be called from the farm to service as needed? We ask seriously which statement is true or false. Does General Hershey run the show or do some swivel-chair officers in the State headquarters? Who can the people of this great Nation believe, the head of the Selective Service System, who publicly calls it foolproof, or the misinformed and misguided heroes running the show from the various State headquarters offices?

Did you know in a recent meeting of the triple A, held in West Branch, a Mr. Doan, who is at the head of this organization in the State, told various members present the farm boys would be in service; there would be no chance in an appeal because the State office would request the appeal, and there would be nothing left for the appeal board to do but follow their wishes?

Did you know on March 29, 1944, Memorandum M-797 was sent from State office at Lansing to local boards, boards of appeal, and Government appeal agents; the subject: Current policy regarding classification of agricultural registrants?

Reference Tydings amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, section 5 (K), page 15-L.

Sections 622.25, 622.25-1, 622.31-2, 622.31-3, 623.61 (C), and 627.51, Selective Service Regulations.

Local Board Memorandum No. 164, as amended February 14, 1944.

The President's memorandum of February 26, 1944, to General Hershey.

General Hershey's letter dated March 13, 1944, to local boards and boards of appeal members and Government appeal agents.

State Memorandum (M-7180), (M-737), (M-778).

This Memorandum (M-797) has 12 paragraphs and is signed by LeRoy Pearson, State director.

Section 2 provides briefly that in "class II-C shall be placed any registrant who is found necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural endeavor essential to the war effort." (Please note carefully no age limit is here specified.)

Section 3 provides that class II-C deferments shall be for a period of 6 months or less. At the expiration of the registrant's deferment in class II-C, his classification shall be reopened. So long as the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and until a satisfactory replacement in such agricultural occupation or endeavor can be obtained, the registrant shall be continued in class II-C at the end of each successive period for which he has been deferred in such class.

Section 5 reads, and we quote: "The President, in his memorandum of February 26, 1944, states, 'It is time to strike a new balance' in manpower reserves between essential civilian activities, war production, and the armed forces; that agriculture and industry should release the younger men who are physically qualified for military service." (This seems to be the paragraph the State office majors and whozizs think overthrows the Tydings amendment, but we ask you, does it?)

Section 7 has a paragraph as follows:

"With the urgent need for manpower by the armed forces, it is not believed that new registrants (18-year-olds recently registered) can be currently deferred in class II-C unless there is an urgent need for their services on the home farm. Neither is it advisable to defer a registrant unless there is an established or preexisting need for the services of a skilled farm worker."

Section 9 says in part: "With the current need for younger age men by the armed forces, it is believed that the above provisions should be applied only to those men above the age of 25 years and more particularly to fathers 30 years of age and older." Here is where the blunder was made in the beginning—all these older skilled farmers and livestock men were put in the draft until the situation became so serious it brought about the Tydings amendment. With this older groups in service, the calls developed for the younger boys and each group of this desirable age has been drawn until the farms of this Nation are drained to their very grass roots.)

Section II says: "The practice of certain local boards classifying in I-A and ordering for induction physical examination farm registrants under 26 years of age, regardless of essentiality, is not in conformity with the Tydings amendment, selective-service regulations, or General Hershey's letter of March 13, 1944. Such action does not meet with the approval of this headquarters and coming at a time when spring planting is about to begin is causing farmers to question whether the administration actually desires their farms to be operated in 1944. If crops are to be planted, labor must be available. (Now, here we have all the arguments condensed into one. The above rule is being broken every day regardless of the Tydings amendment or any other directive and the only subterfuge has been the pulling of the farm boys to the induction centers while still classified in II-C and planning to drop them in I-A after they pass the physical examination.) Now, in all seriousness what is the score? On August 10, 1944, Col. Samuel D. Pepper, Chief Deputy State Director, wrote our board as follows:

"The Tydings amendment was never intended to and does not by its terms provide for exemption of registrants engaged in agriculture, and has not been construed by the President or by the Director of Selective Service as being an exemption law.

"This headquarters has been endeavoring to bring about a uniform compliance with the existing selective-service regulations and has felt obliged to appeal many cases in the past few months. Many of these appeals have been from agricultural deferments, especially as to registrants in the age group under 26.

"We believe your board should give greater consideration to the existing needs of the armed forces for younger men in classifying your registrants in this age group, and less concern for the food-production program which the President some months ago declared to be satisfactory enough to warrant the release of these younger-age-group men." (Just here we recall in the beginning of selective service one bright young lieutenant told a joint meeting in Bay City not to worry about the food and farm situation as the State of Iowa, Wallace's State, could grow enough to feed the United States, lend-lease, etc.)"

All over Michigan files have been combed recently by headquarters, all farm deferments in the age group 18 to 26 were ordered for physical examination, some 40 boys from our county, and those who passed will arbitrarily be inducted into the Army. State headquarters know how many there are and they will make the calls accordingly and insist on them being filled regardless of the Tydings amendment, if they can make this ruling stick.

It seems to us that at every turn all the State headquarters, and Washington too, has done is try and discredit the local boards. An order comes out in the press: "Every man in the 18 to 35 group must take a physical examination." The public heaves a sigh, tightens its belt, and says, "Let's go"; but the press release did not mean what it said. Five days later another release appears stating this does not apply to those deferred in agriculture under the terms of the Tydings amendment, and we ask you, Does this Tydings amendment mean anything under these new directives or is it an illusion to be played with by men too dumb to realize the seriousness of the farm situation? This country today has no big backlog in agriculture. In the past 100 years we have had seven major droughts. Today our country is about 25 percent short on hogs. This in itself is serious, but can be regained much quicker than in any other kind of livestock. Our stores of corn and other grains are such that one real bad drought or one real wet spring and summer to interfere with the planting and the food situation would be more than serious.

Butter stocks in the United States today are lower than anytime in the past 50 years—this is due largely to lack of help, selling whole milk, and the dairy cows wiped out by the Bang's test and sold as farms were closed. Just here we cite the dairy herds offered for sale in the Chicago milkshed area and in other areas when the selective-service law first went into affect. This and other things undoubtedly was the cause of the Tydings amendment.

The situation is so serious the county agents and triple-A men are alarmed and someone or some group down in Washington should think this thing through—not just the first part of the equation. Do you realize if all these farm-deferred boys are drawn into the Army there will be auction sales all over this country and a good dairy cow will be worth about 33⅓ percent of what she is worth today and even then who will absorb her other than for beef?

Our board will definitely battle the State office on deferments that have the war board recommendation, and we feel are justified according to production and we are supposed to have the final say, but the State office will ask for an appeal—the appeal board will be instructed what to do and by so doing will slowly strangle the food supply of a great nation.

Pardon me for drawing a personal mental picture. During the First World War my good father was food administrator of this State. He never faltered from his request for more and more food. The fall the armistice was signed we threshed 21,253 bushels of grain out on the ranch—we had 200 acres of corn for the silos, and ran over 1,000 head of cattle besides the sheep. We also cut 700 acres of hay and we paid two threshing crews more than $750 in money. We got this crop all in before the so-called third group were called to camp. The fourth group were married men with children. We drove the country for a radius of 100 miles nights and Sundays to get help. All we got were old men and school boys—the old men knew how to harvest but could not stand the gaff, and the young boys did not care to learn. Anyone with any intestinal fortitude hates to see a crop spoil and waste on the ground. We completed the harvest and we are willing to do our part again but we would not go through this experience again regardless of the cost, for we just could not take it.

Last fall was wonderful and a great crop was harvested but had the rains and floods

appeared as they sometimes do the summer efforts would have been in vain and the labor of the harvest wasted.

Today the Nation faces a shortage of farm labor. The local selective service boards who know and see these things are standing by with hands tied by tricky regulations.

According to Selective Service Statistical Digest of November 1, 1944, we have 22,098,000 registrants in the 18 to 37 age group. Of these 47.9 percent are inducted or enlisted, 19.3 percent have industrial deferments, 20.5 percent are in IV–F rejected and 6.9 percent have II–C deferments for agriculture. (These IV–F boys will not all stay on the farms.)

Here is the story, 6.9 percent of the 18 to 37 year old group are engaged in running the farms of the Nation along with a lot of old, tired men and women and yet we are told the food supply is ample, the President has spoken, agriculture must furnish this young group.

This is a serious matter—too serious for a lot of young, inexperienced Army officers to be interpreting the food supply of the Nation. We hope you and your colleagues will give this matter some very serious consideration in the near future.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

GEORGE A. PRESCOTT, Jr.

Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter published in the Journal-Gazette of February 4, 1945:

COMPROMISE

EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL-GAZETTE:

There is no settlement in a civilized world without compromise. No exceptions. Not one of us can ever be literally or absolutely (unlimited and unconditional) or uncompromisingly free. Each of us in this human world, is dependent upon others. There should be a "conditional surrender" to both Japan and Germany. And here is my thesis: Japan and Germany can never be totally destroyed. No large nation can be entirely stripped of its power. History shows this in too many instances for detail here. Suffice to say this is a historical fact. Now, a similar plan should be submitted to both Japan and Germany, to the Japanese and German people directly; to their respective military forces, indirectly. In the present unconditional surrender plan (the conditions of surrender) to both Japan and Germany that the present military cliques are to be eliminated and ringleaders tried before an Allied tribunal; all industrial or heavy production to be limited to peacetime production or dismantled; war indemnities for both Japan and Germany to be levied on long-term payments and reconstruction of destroyed Allied properties. For instance, Germany must restore Poland to her pre-war status as well as Russia's destroyed cities. And prisoners of war held by enemies and ourselves to be returned to their respective countries. An international Allied police force to police both Germany and Japan for 5 years to maintain this compromised peace. All enemy former military production centers to be under international police inspection during this term. The Japanese and German people to be reeducated into the humanities of civilization by an international educational college and helped economically to regain their foothold upon life. In short, give them the psychology (feeling) of a 5-year democracy in practice rather than theory. Show that religion of human relationships means kindness, sincerity, and cooperation to your fellow man. And as Confucius so wisely said, "Reciprocity will make the whole world kin." German and Japanese people will quickly observe that they have been lied to by their military groups and know what it means to feel free and not in fear of death at the least slip.

No legislation can reform a people—even by force. It may hold them in check for a while, but not for long. History of wars on end prove this apodictic fact. The Japanese and German peoples must "reform" themselves. But we must set the example—not as revengeful and hating victors, but as God's (not man's) worshippers of peace on earth good will toward all humankind. Not force reform (impossible) but help them to reform. The unconditional surrender psychology is not only unwise, impossible, but suicidal to an ultimate plan for permanent peace, for we will but continue hate (fear of insecurity) and wars of tomorrow. And this "compromised surrender" is what we would expect of our unconditional surrender. The erroneous psychology of an uncertain, unconditional surrender is its "indefiniteness." We must be definite, positive, and dynamic in our understanding what a peaceful world must be—and state these "surrender terms" in plain and simple terms—the simpler and laws involved will bring success. And I recommend to Congress and legislator war committee council that will attend the forthcoming Big Three meeting just this sort of an end-the-war and make-the-peace plan. If we persist in the unconditional-surrender plan thousands and more thousands of our boys and the allies' boys will be slaughtered and maimed for life, our economic supplies reduced to a basis of diminishing returns, for these peoples of our enemy countries will not understand our economic plan, and we will gain a victory, yes, but the world will (allies in particular), be economically bankrupted. That is the present World War determination of our enemies on this unconditional-surrender basis. A compromised peace or a stated peace policy to end war and bring dependable peace is the only sane and logical solution. No exceptions.

NORMAN SWEET.

Application of the Golden Rule in the Problem of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and accompanying statement:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. ARMSTRONG: I wish to thank you for your letter of February 1, enclosing a feasible application of the Golden Rule in the problem of peace.

I have read your memorandum carefully, and I am extending your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM T. BYRNE.

FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

A FEASIBLE APPLICATION OF THE GOLDEN RULE IN THE PROBLEM OF PEACE

All Christian people recognize the value of the Golden Rule as an ideal in human relationships. Occasionally some country actually applies it with surprising success. The rule is simple: "Do unto others as you would be done by."

When the United States turned the Boxer indemnity into a fund for supporting the education of the Chinese they applied the rule. The benefits to the United States of this policy have been great.

Does the present crisis offer the United States a similar opportunity? Undoubtedly, the Allies will demand some reparations from Germany and Japan. Such a penalty, as partial punishment, seems only just. The penalty, however, must not backfire, as reparations did after 1918. That is where the Golden Rule can save us.

The Bretton Woods Conference has shown the need for a large loan fund to be used in restoring the countries where war's destruction has been extensive. Much of this money must be advanced by the United States, but part could very well be from reparation payments. To have the reparations paid to the world government instead of national governments would add to the world governments' prestige and would lead to certain other possibilities that are the essence of this proposal.

Presumably, part of the loans would ultimately be repaid, but as we ruefully learned in 1930–32, there are many difficulties in repaying international loans. What one country wants to sell another may not want to buy. The reparations under the scheme proposed here are not to be returned to any particular country but to the world government. The peace terms should then provide that these funds should be repaid to the economic and social council to be used in research and education to raise the standard of living in all parts of the world, but with particular attention to those areas where the standard is low in comparison to the potential of the area. Research work could actually be carried on in the countries repaying the loans or in countries willing to accept sufficient imports to permit the transfer of the funds.

The scheme would do several desirable things: First, it would apply the Golden Rule by trying to raise the standard of living for all—which is certainly what we would want for ourselves. Second, it would give positive financial power to the economic and social council that would raise it from the level of futile discussion to the level of a super-Rockefeller Foundation for the improvement of the world. When one reviews what has been done by foundations of this type, the possibilities appear tremendous. Third, it would provide a revolving investment fund for transfer to countries with excess of imports over exports and could be used as an important part of the currency stabilization fund. It would have great advantages over the usual loan fund used for stabilization in that the transferred funds could be used to eliminate the basic causes of the depreciation of the currency, whereas the loan funds are not so readily directed into the needed education and research.

The plan is simple but goes directly to the fundamentals of world troubles: The hopelessness of people who see no way to offer a better chance to their sons and daughters than the meager opportunities they have had. It proposes to use the reparations as

a great humanitarian foundation for the improvement of the life of man wherever he may be—in Asia, Africa, Europe, or the Americas; yes, even in Germany and Japan.

Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post under date of January 24, 1945. The Federal Communications Commission recently issued an order which will directly affect the development of television broadcasting in the future. The Post editorial explains the problem with great simplicity and clarity. The editorial follows:

TELEVISION'S FUTURE

The Federal Communications Commission has issued what amounts to a caveat emptor warning in connection with its proposed allocation of spectrum space to television broadcasting. There has been a bitter controversy in the industry between those who wish to promote the sale of television receiving sets as soon as materials become available and those who would like to postpone commercial exploitation until a superior technique for broadcasting can be perfected. In its present place in the spectrum, television can operate in bands no more than six megacycles wide, permitting a picture of only 525 lines. In the ultra high frequencies, which the F. C. C. has designated for experimental television, much wider bands would be available to make possible pictures of far greater clarity, depth, and detail.

What the Commission's findings in its allocations report boil down to is a flat warning that better television is around the corner. Prospective buyers of television receivers should take note. Yet the Commission has authorized commercial television to go ahead on 12 six-megacycle channels assigned to it in the lower frequencies. The danger inherent in this policy was made evident at once in a talk delivered before the Washington Advertising Club last week by T. F. Joyce, of the Radio Corporation of America, a manufacturer of receivers. Mr. Joyce predicted the television industry would become a billion-and-a-half-dollar business in terms of retail pricing at the end of the fifth full television year. He must be planning to sell a great many receivers. But these receivers, keyed for reception in the frequencies now allocated to television, would be altogether worthless for reception of the improved television in the ultra high frequencies when this gets under way. If the public should be gullible enough to invest millions of dollars in such receivers, then the change-over to the superior system of television, when it becomes feasible, would be extremely painful, perhaps impossible. The F. C. C. might well have been more explicit on this score.

When it was talking about frequency modulation, the Commission declared that "Public interest requires that FM be established in a permanent place in the radio spectrum before a considerable investment is made by the listening public in receiving sets and by the broadcasters in transmitting equipment." We quite agree. And the doctrine is equally applicable to television. At least the public ought to be informed that the type of television which the F. C. C. now proposes to authorize is merely temporary and makeshift in character. It would be tragic if eagerness for immediate commercial gain were permitted to block technological progress.

Small Business and the Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I am including herein an editorial from the National Independent, published in January 1945, issued in the interests of the Independent Tire Dealers and Tire Rebuilders of America, in comment on the action taken by the House of Representatives in extending the life of the Small Business Committee:

REAL FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM IS NEEDED FOR REAL DEMOCRACY

The action of the House of Representatives on January 18, when unanimous approval was given by voice vote to House Resolution 64, which extends the life of the Small Business Committee, should be looked upon by all small-business interests of the United States as a big forward step by Congress indicating that small business assuredly must get the protection it deserves.

In the same vein of thought this action by the House would be a warning to all the peace-time agencies of our Government that they must adopt a more militant stand for small business, and act accordingly in protecting the many against the few who seek control of the industry of the Nation.

CANNOT AFFORD DELAYS

Nothing is more true than that small business cannot afford the time and money for delaying actions of the Government in bringing about prompt relief where the country's laws and regulations have been violated by big business.

In many instances in our industry insofar as the Robinson-Patman law is concerned, and as regards misleading advertising (in 1938 and 1939), we have witnessed the serious damage that has been done to all small-business interests, and while corrective measures have been taken, in the meantime the damage was most costly to the independents.

The amazing and unjustified price wars that beset the industry—right up to a few months before Pearl Harbor—would not have come about if we had the help and support of these Small Business Committees of Congress. If the committees had been in existence then we could have presented a truthful case which would have brought about immediate relief.

PROMPT ACTION SAVED INDEPENDENT

Without fear of contradiction it can be stated that it was the prompt and immediate actions of both the Senate and House Small Business Committees that figuratively saved the life of the independent tire dealer and the tire rebuilder, because certain Washington authorities—and even some leading rubber officials—shortly before Pearl Harbor remarked that it was too bad but the independent dealers were through for the war period.

Those making such statements did not want this to happen, but that was the actual way it looked to them at the time, due to the war emergency.

A few others thought differently, and they immediately appealed to Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, and their actions, with those of all members of the committee, always will stand as a monument in the Nation's business as the turning point for the small business interests of the country.

DEALERS SHOULD NOT FORGET

The independents of our industry never should forget this. We emphasize this as it is regretful to record that small business oftentimes does forget its sincere benefactors and those who seek to protect it.

Remarks on the floor of the House when this resolution came up for consideration were of major importance when one considers that they came from both sides of the House.

Outstanding was the statement of Hon. LEONARD W. HALL, New York, who said: "So, Mr. Speaker, I do hope this House will leave open to the small businessmen of America the only forum they have where they may be heard, and that only forum is the Small Business Committee of the House."

In our opinion the statement is of major importance to everyone in our industry, and a definite warning to any and all who attempt control of monopoly in the rubber-tire industry.

SUPPORT FOR OUR STAND

Previous to the national political campaigns in 1944—in the National Independent dated May 1944—we proposed to both parties that they incorporate in their platforms a plank recommending that the small business committees be made standing committees in the Congress. We now believe our thought was not in vain—due to the action on January 18—in the light of the support that was forthcoming from both major political parties.

We believe that we can state that a similar resolution, already introduced in the Senate by Senator MURRAY (Montana), and referred to the Commit on Audit, will be reported favorably, and that the Senate will take similar action to that of the House. And it is to be hoped also that Congress appropriates sufficient funds so that the small business committee will be able to function in a satisfactory and efficient manner so that all qualified small business in the country will have its rightful place in the economic structure of the Nation.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN has assured us that the tire bill will be reintroduced immediately, and we believe we will get similar cooperation from Senator MURRAY on the bill in the Senate.

GET OWN HOUSE IN ORDER

As time goes on it will be found that these small business committees will be found to be among the most important and powerful in Congress. Labor, agriculture, finance, and others all have powerful representation in Congress through committees, and now that small business is officially recognized it is up to small business itself to get its own house in order and prepare itself with factual information if and when it calls upon the Small Business committees for help.

Big business in our industry should immediately take note of its past actions in the retail field and set its house in order, or these forums will have to be used by the independents as the court of last resort.

Bethlehem Hingham Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the mayor of the city of Brockton, Mass.:

BROCKTON, MASS., *February 5, 1945.*
Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Hundreds of Brockton men and women who are employed at the Bethlehem Hingham Shipyard have asked me to appeal to you, the Navy officials, and Secretary Forrestal in their behalf.

This tremendous shipyard has been notified that some time in the very near future it is going to be closed down for lack of contracts, all of us are sure that the necessary contracts can be secured in order to keep this splendid, patriotic group who have worked and produced for the Government, those fine Navy ships that are winning this war.

Thanking you for your many favors in the past, I remain,

Very truly yours.
JOSEPH H. DOWNEY, *Mayor.*

Program for Rebuilding of Timber Resources in South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. GIBSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release:

PROGRAM FOR REBUILDING OF TIMBER RESOURCES IN SOUTH

(By Clair Johnson)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—A program designed to stimulate rebuilding of timber resources on 200,000,000 acres of southern forest lands was proposed today.

Twenty-five southern Congressmen pledged to work for the project, which calls for 20 experimental forests to serve as demonstration areas for each 10,000,000 acres of forest.

Representative GIBSON, Democrat, Georgia, chosen leader of the group at a meeting today, said an appropriation of $1,500,000 will be sought for next year and $1,000,000 annually thereafter.

The funds would go to the Agricultural Department, which would be charged with developing the research work.

Last year a similar congressional group, headed by GIBSON, was successful in obtaining an appropriation for development of the South's scrub oak into useful products.

The program was recommended by the Forest Farmers Association after 2 years of study. The association's secretary, Wayne G. Miller, of Valdosta, Ga., told Congressmen it was needed "to rehabilitate worn-out lands in the South and to provide cash incomes from the sale of wood pulp and other forestry products."

Miller said the Government already owns eight sites for the proposed experimental forests and cooperative arrangements with State and private landowners would make it unnecessary to buy others.

"The country will have to look increasingly to the South for a large share of its forest products in the future," GIBSON told a reporter. "The Federal Government, through a sound program of research, must lead the way in rebuilding and maintenance of our forest."

GIBSON, who was authorized to pick a committee to draft the necessary legislation and seek its passage, said the following either attended today's session or sent word they would back the effort:

Representatives HOBBS, MANASCO, GRANT, and BOYKIN, of Alabama; GATHINGS and HARRIS, of Arkansas; PRICE and SIKES, of Florida; PACE, BROWN, and COX, of Georgia; WHITTINGTON, ABERNETHY, and COLMER, of Mississippi; WEAVER and CLARK, of North Carolina; RIVERS, of South Carolina; BECKWORTH, COMBS, and LUTHER A. JOHNSON, of Texas; BLAND and SMITH, of Virginia; COOPER, of Tennessee; MALONEY, of Louisiana. All are Democrats.

Extension of the Lend-Lease Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted at a meeting of the United Lodge No. 889 of Lynn, Mass., Sons of Italy in America, requesting all possible aid under the lend-lease program be extended to the suffering civilian population of liberated Italy:

Whereas it is common knowledge that the civilian population of liberated Italy are suffering untold hardship and privation as the result of the ravages of war.

Whereas it is a moral obligation of the United Nations to devise ways and means to seek to ameliorate these conditions.

Whereas it is common knowledge that other liberated countries are being aided by large lend-lease shipments of food, clothing, and medical supplies.

Whereas the allocation of shipping facilities to transport a minimum amount of badly needed supplies would not affect the war effort.

Whereas the President of the United States has sufficient authority under the laws of the United States to extend lend-lease aid to the civilian population of liberated Italy: Be it hereby

Resolved, That by virtue and in pursuance of the action taken by the members of the United Lodge No. 889, of Lynn, Mass., Sons of Italy in America at a meeting duly called, it was voted to draft and forward proper resolutions to the President of the United States requesting that all possible aid under the lend-lease program be extended to the suffering civilian population of liberated Italy, and further that a copy of said resolution be forwarded to Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; Hon. DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts; and Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts, requesting that all possible assistance, encouragement, and aid be given the President in these premises, and further that Congress itself take cognizance of the situation by requesting immediate action in carrying out the general plan of this worthy program.

UNITED LODGE OF LYNN, MASS., No. 889,
SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA.
THEODORE REGNANTO, *Chairman,*
JOSEPH O. SPINA, *Secretary,*
JOSEPH H. SHIFCIONE,
CONSTANTINO D. GEROLAMO,
GAETANO IORIZZO,
Resolution Committee.

Work-or-Fight Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a letter concerning the recent so-called work-or-fight bill, written by a former Member of the Congress. The letter follows:

Hon. JOSEPH E. TALBOT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TALBOT: Action just taken by the House on the work-or-jail bill prompts me to give you some objective comment on the use that has been made of this newest "crisis" (the break-through in Belgium) to continue the trend toward a socialistic or a communistic state government.

With the administration forces, together with the Army and Navy, hammering away for immediate passage, the House fell for the propaganda, "We ought to give the armed forces whatever they ask." Meantime, during the Senate consideration, there is an opportunity for all citizens to scrutinize the proposals and consider what will be the final results if the May bill or similar legislation passes.

To sugar-coat the draft of labor with the excuse, "It is only for the duration" and "To stand by the military commanders" does not change the fact that this is nevertheless another direct step toward communal living and state control under military compulsion.

It is interesting to note that some of those who have professed great love and concern for organized labor, in their greater devotion to furthering the teachings of Trotsky and Marx, voted for this draft legislation.

We can utilize the IV-F's, include nurses in the draft, stop all strikes in war plants, enunciate by law the principle of "work or fight," and we may have peacetime compulsory military training for our youth—yes, we may have one or more or all of these. But it is important to realize that it is not necessary to adopt total civil draft or universal labor draft or even the May bill, under a supposed crisis that requires universal service, to achieve some of the components. Present laws will suffice or can be strengthened.

Of course, the Army and Navy want every man and woman included in a total civil draft. It would augment the present system that furnishes the uniformed forces by providing another simple process of drawing an official order to move civilian manpower at a certain moment to a given place.

It is fair to conclude, if the administration and shifting of civilian industrial forces was

to be done with the obvious waste of manpower and transportation that was practiced by the Army and Navy during the first 2 years of our recent training period, the war production manpower shortage would never improve. It was common practice for hordes of California recruits to be sent 3,000 miles to Florida for preliminary training, and New England men found themselves shipped to Pacific coast camps or getting their early workout on far-western terrain much like the home grounds.

Yet happily, under the voluntary system, the production forces promptly took up their posts in mine, mill, and factory with the minimum of travel and time lag. The President has called attention to what he called negligible loss of time by union strikes under our present methods. We need only remember the miracle of production performed by labor and management since our entrance into the war was done without compulsion.

To say the Army and Navy favor total civil draft only adds numbers to the proponents—not weight of argument. Their background and training for war sets them apart from the rest of us. They have no experience with nor tolerance of social and political opinion and results. They think only in terms of numbers of men and tons of matériel required for a given problem in warfare. To include full direction of all manpower from schoolroom to graveyard appears to them to be a simple broadening of the field of discipline. Unquestioned obedience to government on the home front may be a logical corollary to strict discipline required for the battle front, but it is a departure from the nonmilitary world and the democratic principles under which we Americans must compete, compromise, and compose the ideas and activities of each other if we are to live and work as free men. It is a departure from the American precept that the Government takes orders from the people and the belief that the least-governed country is the best-governed nation.

It seems imposing and unanswerable to say "unless we have total civil draft we shall prolong the war." This is a specious statement, and presumably used in the hope that if reiterated it will finally be believed. We ought to remember that, although both Germany and Italy were wholly regimented and England and France brought almost entirely to a similar state by what seemed necessity, yet neither singly nor as Allies were they able to attain success in this war. It needed the added weight of the United States with its voluntary production and citizen armies to turn the scales toward victory.

To state that total civil draft will speedily end the war is at best only a promise with a dangerous experimental short cut. Actually, can it be seriously contended that men and women ordered to dictated tasks, in which they may have no aptitude or liking, will work faster and more efficiently than those who work for the pleasure and pride of accomplishment, in jobs of their own choosing and for the pay that the individual's skill earns. Can dictated direction, planned and prefabricated homes, regimented recreation, and labor pools filled and emptied with mechanical precision be satisfactory substitutes for our right of freedom to work and to the pursuit of happiness in a state where ambition and voluntary effort often earn success?

Will a new horde of bureaucrats, the administrators to keep the records and the overseers to supervise our goings and comings, increase or decrease the number of productive hands engaged in the war plants? Will the party members or agents politically appointed wear black shirts or some less ominous color as they go about to make inspections or to collect the new taxes required to pay for the privilege of waging a speedy end to the war and of living under universal service or total civil draft?

Among the statements and arguments offered for total civil draft, the one the proponents regard as conclusive (you are supposed to slink off in a corner a slacker if you disagree) is the comparison with Selective Service. They state "if it is right for Government to induct our physically fit young men and women into military service, it must be equally right to induct every other man and woman into the production line." It may be added that the followers of Trotsky and a few in Congress advocate a further right of government—the requisition of all capital and private property for the use of the state.

Actually there is no logical comparison between the men who pursue the art of war and those engaged with the precise facts of matériel production. War strategy is practiced with elements of surprise, improvisation, quick movement, and withal with soldiers taugh "theirs not to reason why". In the fog of war with large numbers of men involved secrecy is important and only the commanders can know the reasons and hazzards of action. In such an enterprise complete regimentation is necessary and instant and implicit obedience is imperative if the manpower and matériel is to be used to the best advantage and with the least loss.

Conversely, the home front is a deliberate field, where tangible things may take on new shapes and purposes, but where men intensify rather than change their employment. True there must be unity of action and devotion to duty, but uppermost there is a sense of pride for and a loyalty to those who risk their lives in battle. All good citizens are warmed by patriotic zeal for service, but only 10 percent of the population are privileged to bear arms and become subject to military discipline. If the fires of patriotism have burned so low that men will no longer work and sacrifice at home to support those at the front, then the Nation holds no promise in the future for either soldier or civilian. Do those who demand total civil draft believe the fathers and the families of the men in the fox hole and jungle have ceased to love their country and will desert their defenders? For a century and a half this people has offered its sons, its labor, and its resources whenever the Nation was threatened. To stifle patriotic emotion and to extinguish honest pride in voluntary service for family, community, and country by complete or partial national regimented mobilization is to forsake our traditional past and to abandon the hope of a greater free democratic future.

The lately disclosed deficiencies of Army G–2 in the European theater, and the lack of comprehensive planning by those at home charged with military procurement for every contingency, makes an alibi and an opportunity of the present agitation. The technique of putting over self-defensive even though unpopular measures under the guise of war necessity has been common practice this past decade. This is the reason for the suspicions and fears of people today that new and added controls of the American economy and people will result if the May bill or civil draft is adopted. To attempt to place the blame for the honest mistakes and omissions made in high places by making a scapegoat of industry is despicable. The public will excuse bad judgment but not bold evasion. The war took a turn against us where we were not prepared, and that made shortages and new requirements. The labor and production front did not fall down, nor can it make up these shortages overnight. What failures there may be here at home are for want of information and because of ill-advised or insufficient information by the Government. It is lack of confidence in the news furnished to the Nation, news that is spoonfed by some all-wise ones, that is to blame for the letdown in the war effort. This news control is an adjunct of regimentation that is already in daily use—telling the public what is best for them and only what they can take. They (the O. W. I.) have a psychological warfare pattern for the home front and deliberately employ it. It is because of this manipulation of the bad news that the American people expected the war to end last October. Meantime, it is made to appear unpatriotic to question or criticize censorship.

With the experience of the past 2 years behind them, it hardly seems likely that the people are in a mood to accept the present arguments and harness themselves with new and broader restrictions that are basic in Universal Service and in the May bill. It cannot be that 2 years of directives has convinced the country that some Government agent or agency in Washington knows the possibilities and potentialities of Hank Hornyhand or George Grimyfist better than the farmer or the machinist himself. Both of these citizens grew up to choose his own vocation and his own boss—sometimes himself. Maybe he is ready for a change. It is doubtful if he has yet been convinced of the need for someone to compel him to work against his will, but he is still susceptible to reason and enlightened and inspired leadership.

Give him all the facts and sufficient time for consideration. Let him decide between compulsion and volition. He will not fail the Nation in this crisis—either with his hands or with his mind. Whatever Hank and George decide will be best for the future welfare of the country.

Very sincerely yours,

RANULF COMPTON,
MADISON, CONN.

Deferment of Agricultural Workers

REMARKS
OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, in the beginning, may I call the attention of the House to the very informative and factual remarks made yesterday by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]. These remarks appear on page 932 of the daily RECORD of February 7, and are well worth reading.

Since January 2 I have addressed the House on several occasions concerning the attitude of Director Hershey, the State directors, and the local draft boards, toward the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act. Particular attention is called to my remarks appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A411.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] makes it clear that the attitude of the Selective Service Director toward the Tydings amendment has caused much confusion and misunderstanding, not only on the part of State directors and local draft boards, but also on the part of Members of Congress. It would seem, however, that Director Hershey's last pronouncement clarifies the

situation so far as he is concerned. After quoting the testimony given by General Hershey before the Committee on Agriculture day before yesterday, the chairman succinctly says:

Let me draw the issue.

Simply stated, the issue is this: The Congress is of the opinion that the Tydings amendment is clear and unambiguous, and places upon the local draft boards only one determination, and that determination in the language of the amendment is to find out if the registrant is "necessary to or regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort." Selective Service has, in construing the Tydings amendment read into the amendment a new element, namely, comparative essentiality, and thus placed upon the local boards the duty to determine whether the registrant is more essential to the armed forces than he is to the farm, or whether the registrant is more essential to the farm than he is to the armed forces. This, in my opinion, is an unwarranted construction and a construction that the Congress never contemplated would be placed upon the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore pointed out the difficulties local draft boards in Michigan have been having in their desire to comply with the draft law. In this connection I include herein a front-page news story from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of February 5, 1945, which is as follows:

DRAFT BOARD MEMBER SUBMITS RESIGNATION IN II–C RULING PROTEST

H. D. Moran, a member of the Lenawee County draft board since April 29, 1943, has submitted his resignation to the local draft board and Gov. Harry F. Kelly. He first submitted his resignation to Governor Kelly January 31, but the Governor refused to accept it and urged Mr. Moran to continue with his duties on the local board. Mr. Moran submitted his resignation again Saturday.

In writing the Governor, Mr. Moran declared that he has "conscientiously carried out the responsibilities of the office to the best of my ability.

"However, as of today I respectfully ask that you accept my resignation, as it will be impossible for me to continue to fulfill my oath of office and to carry out the new instructions that have been given to me by the State selective service headquarters. I refer to new orders given our local board affecting all registrants new deferred in II–C, ages 18 through 25 years.

"We have been told that all II–C registrants must be ordered for induction regardless of their importance to agriculture.

"That if our local board places a registrant under 26 years of age in II–C that our State director will exercise his right of appeal to the appeal board.

"That if the appeal board upholds the local board's II–C decision, the State director will then exercise his right of appeal to the Presidential board, and we are further advised in that case this board will most certainly place the registrant in I–A.

"That if a local board insists upon placing registrants of this age group in II–C, that without doubt the State director would remove that board from office."

Mr. Moran pointed out to the Governor that memoranda from General Hershey and the State selective service headquarters do not jibe, particularly in relation to the Tydings amendment. He declared that in his opinion the Tydings amendment has not been modified.

"It therefore looks to me," wrote Mr. Moran, "that our memorandum in which the President has advised us of the critical need for young manpower is being used by Michigan as a State to increase her calls on younger men, disregarding the Tydings amendment and the seriousness of what it does to an agricultural county like Lenawee.

"Our board has always been willing to cooperate with every order, with any task, that has been required of it. We are proceeding in the selective service way of reopening all our farm cases. We were to furnish this young manpower by selection, we were also to consider the Tydings amendment, and that production of food was also important. I cannot follow the new instructions and therefore I must resign.

"When the people of Michigan realize the harm done to agriculture in our State and remember neighboring States have not interpreted State advice 288 as an order by our President to induct every farm boy 18 through 25 years then there are going to be some questions to be answered, and what, Governor Kelly, will those answers be?"

Mr. Speaker, I am personally acquainted with Mr. H. D. Moran and have no hesitancy in presenting this article as a correct statement of the facts.

After days of investigation on the part of over 200 Members of Congress representing agricultural districts, and by the Committee on Agriculture of the House, and personal interviews with General Hershey and Colonel Coatsworth, his chief assistant, I have reached the following conclusions:

First. The directive issued by General Hershey on January 3 might be susceptible of different interpretations.

Second. The so-called clarifying directive issued by General Hershey on January 22 is clear, concise, and understandable. I do not believe that anyone can read this "clarifying" directive and not understand that it was the purpose of the Director to require local draft boards to comply strictly with the Tydings amendment. How can any other interpretation be given to this directive which says in part:

The directive of January 3, 1945, State directors advice No. 288 did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment.

The House Committee on Agriculture assisted General Hershey in the drafting of this directive, and everybody present, unless it was General Hershey, thought that the purpose of this language was to require the local boards to comply with the Tydings amendment, and understood that State directors and local boards were to be given this information by General Hershey.

Third. The last statement made by General Hershey, on February 6, before the Committee on Agriculture is inconsistent with his two previous directives and raises a new issue which nullifies the force and effect of his so-called clarifying directive. His last pronouncement, which Chairman FLANNAGAN has summarized, absolutely destroys the Tydings amendment.

Mr. Speaker, no one wants to exclude from the draft all farm workers from 18 through 25. We do, however, want the law passed by Congress to prevail over a bureaucratic, evasive directive.

The Congress passes the laws which the President signs. The executive branch then executes the laws. In these circumstances the interpretation of any law by an administrative officer is vital. In short, if the administrative officers will not enforce the plain terms of a statute, it would seem that little good can come from additional legislation which might receive the same treatment. The several directives and statements of Director Hershey remind me of the old story, "Off again, on again, gone again, Finnegan."

Mr. Speaker, this whole matter is most unfortunate and regrettable from every standpoint. If Director Hershey had made his last pronouncement as his first directive, the State directors, the local draft boards, and the Congress would have at least understood what he meant. Together with many other Members of Congress, I cannot accept his final interpretation. However, he is in the saddle and the most that Congress can do is to attempt further to write a mandatory law in the form of an amendment to the May bill as suggested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

A number of years ago, out in the district I represent, there were two practicing attorneys. They finally pooled their interests and entered into a copartnership agreement. Later difficulties arose between them. In their agreement was found this language:

The respective parties to this agreement agree at all times to be candid and honest with each other.

Candor and frankness on the part of the Congress and administrative agencies and officers are necessary if our Government is to succeed. This was never more so than during these trying days when unity of effort is so essential. Plain language in the drafting of legislation or orders is of prime importance, and there must be but one interpretation of any law so far as the legislative and the executive branches of the Government are concerned. Therefore, if Director Hershey has finally concluded that he has authority to circumvent the Tydings amendment, it is high time that the Congress goes on record one way or the other as to the validity of his interpretation.

Mr. Speaker, what I have said above has been read to General Hershey, who was considerate enough to call at my office today, and we discussed this whole matter thoroughly. In view of that discussion I dislike very much to make this statement; however, in justice to our local boards, as well as to the Congress, I feel that there is a definite disagreement between a majority of the Congress and General Hershey as to his interpretation and effectiveness of the Tydings amendment. If the local boards are not to be permitted to use discretion in deferring absolutely essential farm workers, then the Tydings amendment should be repealed at once. I in no way impugn the motives of General Hershey in doing the job assigned to him. He has a disagreeable task. His job is to secure the men for military service required by the military authorities. If all physically fit men between the ages 18 through 25 are to be inducted, and if that is the law, then that should be done. I do not believe that is the law, and I am fully convinced that if the selective feature is eliminated in the administration of the law, then the entire system will fail because a battle front cannot be maintained without a home front.

A "Rubber Stamp" Congress

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of the farm census legislation the American people have the answer to the "$64 question": "What kind of a Congress will the new Congress be?" The answer is, "Rubber stamp."

On opening day the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi engineered a coup and put across the Un-American Activities Committee. Everyone was greatly encouraged. Here was a Congress that would assert itself. But I am afraid they will be disillusioned because it looks like the answer is to be, "Rubber stamp."

It is a well-known fact that when the executive branch of the Government swallows the legislative branch the Congress automatically becomes a "rubber stamp." That is how the term originated. That is what makes the American people uneasy.

Last week in the work-or-jail legislation we heard about the scarcity of manpower—900,000 men needed for the armed forces and 750,000 needed for industry. We who opposed the bill were blasted all over the lot for daring to offer opposition.

This week we had the farm census legislation to put some 28,000 to 30,000 men and women, now in productive enterprise, into nonproductive enterprise to gather and compile farm statistics at a cost of some $14,000,000. They will gather facts and figures, which when compiled, will be about as much use as the millions of dozens of eggs now rotting in storage. If these people were producing food instead of figures this census might be worth while.

So all I can visualize is that the boys over there now doing the fighting will come home and take off their coats and go to work to pay the taxes to meet this $14,000,000 bill to keep thousands on the public pay roll. Will they not be pleased about that.

The American people have been anxious to know what the trend of the new Congress would be. Well, they have it—"rubber stamp."

For 12 years up to 1942 we heard about the rubber-stamp Congress. The people tired of it and elected a Congress that reasserted itself and reclaimed its prerogatives and for 2 years, from 1942 to 1944, the American people were greatly encouraged. But it looks as though this Congress will return to the rubber-stamp days.

Now I ask the Members on the other side of the House after passing this farm census legislation, and it was passed by a majority on he other side of the House, to please discontinue talking about a manpower shortage and constantly telling us about the boys who are over there doing the fighting, because it is just a plain insult to their intelligence and to ours as well. It was simply this—the boys were shepherded together and the results speak for themselves.

I thought the new Congress would have the courage of their convictions, would do the right thing. But bureaucracy is again becoming fashionable, after a couple of off years, and bureaucracy must be maintained regardless of the cost and regardless of how much manpower and money it takes from the war effort.

I feel quite certain the boys who are doing the fighting will be concerned about matters of this kind when they return.

In conclusion, I might say that it looks to me as though the executive branch of the Government is about to swallow the legislative, and the old term rubber stamp is to be with us for the next 2 years.

Resolution of the Legislature of Oklahoma Commending the President, the General Staff, and the Congress in the Conduct of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am submitting herewith for the RECORD a resolution recently adopted by the Legislature of Oklahoma, now in session, strongly commending the Commander in Chief and the leaders of our armed forces in the present world conflict.

It will be noted that the resolution also commends those Members of Congress who have supported the war effort. The resolution follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 4

Concurrent resolution commending the policies and activities of President Roosevelt, as Commander in Chief, the General Staff, and the Congress of the United States, in the conduct of the war

Whereas under section 2 of article II of the Federal Constitution the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy; and

Whereas for more than 3 years Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in his capacity as Commander in Chief, has diligently and efficiently performed valuable services to the United States of America and to the Allied Nations in the prosecution of the war; and

Whereas the General Staff of the military has, by the application of skillful strategy and noble leadership, performed like services under the command of their chief; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by introducing and supporting beneficial war legislation, has made a great contribution to the success of the Allies in the winning of the war against the Axis Powers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, the honorable senate concurring herein, do commend the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the General Staff, and the Congress of the United States for their part in bringing to a speedy end the aggression of Axis Nations; be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma hereby urge the Congress of the United States to devote a portion of their time to consideration of world peace plans, to the end that the work of the Commander in Chief, the General Staff, and itself will not be for naught; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States, to each member of the General Staff, and to each of the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Oklahoma.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 5th day of January 1945.

JOHNSON D. HILL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate the 11th day of January 1945.

JAMES E. BERRY,
President of the Senate.

Dr. E. B. Fred Is University of Wisconsin's New President

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of Congress to the selection of Dr. E. B. Fred as the president of the University of Wisconsin. Dr. Fred has been with the Agricultural College, a department of the university for 32 years. He is one of the leading bacteriologists of the Nation. He has been dean of the Agricultural College. He was born at Middleburg, Va., and has a dairy farm in Virginia.

Beyond the personal satisfaction of serving a great university to secure a great president, I am impressed by other factors which may appear provincial to some people.

The factors include first—that this great State—noted for its liberal legislation—selects as its president one of the outstanding agricultural leaders of its agricultural college for its president. This in itself is very complimentary to the profession of agriculture.

Second, the important statement made by Dr. Fred when he accepted the post and I quote:

He pledged himself to the concept of scholarship and research outlined by the late Charles R. Van Hise, former president of the University of Wisconsin and emphasized that financially poor but industrious students must always be given equal footing at the university.

Let me repeat that at this institution the financially poor, but the industrious and the ambitious and the persons with the desire to equip themselves to best serve society in whatever field they choose will have equal footing with those with greater amounts of worldly goods.

This is real educational democracy; this is a program that all right thinking people will support; this is the formula that, when applied, makes for real progress of a people.

We congratulate the great State of Virginia for providing such an outstanding son. We thank the great State of Virginia for contributing such an outstanding leader. I am sure I represent the unanimous sentiments of every citizen of Wisconsin when I say that we all expect to see Dr. Fred carry on the traditional Wisconsin spirit, which, in short is, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

The following news article appeared in the February 1, issue of the Waupaca County Post:

REGENTS NAME DEAN E. B. FRED AS PRESIDENT—FRED REFERERD TO THE POLICY OF THE LATE CHARLES R. VAN HISE

MADISON, WIS., January 25.—Edwin B. Fred, dean of the college of agriculture since 1943 and former dean of the graduate school, was named president of the University of Wisconsin by the board of regents Thursday, January 25.

Dean Fred succeeds Clarence Dykstra, who assumes the provostship of the University of California at Los Angeles February 15. Fred is the twelfth chief executive of the university and will begin his new duties at once.

His appointment came a few minutes after a special committee headed by A. Matt Werner, of Sheboygan, had nominated him for the post.

A native of Virginia, Fred is 57 years of age. He attended the Virginia Polytechnic Institute before receiving his doctorate at the Universit yof Gottingen, Germany.

From 1907 to 1913 he was bacteriologist at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. He became assistant professor of bacteriology at Wisconsin in 1913, and was appointed dean of the university's graduate school in 1934, serving until he was named dean of the agricultural college 2 years ago.

In a short acceptance speech, Mr. Fred described the purpose of the university as that of accumulating and disseminating knowledge; stressing scholarship and research. He pledged himself to the concept of scholarship and research outlined by the late Charles R. Van Hise, former president of the University of Wisconsin and emphasized that financially poor but industrious students must always be given equal footing at the university.

The Agricultural Census Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of three or four Democratic Members who opposed the bill to take the agricultural census I was asked by a number of Members why I voted against the additional appropriation.

First let me say I voted against the appropriation in the last Congress. This matter has been before the House on several occasions and in the end some one made it a political issue. I do not approach matters of this kind from a political standpoint.

Just a few days ago I voted for a bill that provided for the conscription of manpower. I never thought I would live to see the day I would vote for legislation of that character, but when I was told by those in charge of the Army and Navy as well as the five-star generals on the eastern and western fronts, that they needed more ammunition and more men I supported the measure. I did not want it ever to be said in the event activities on the battle fronts had been stopped because of lack of supplies that I was in any way responsible for such a condition.

As part of my remarks, I include a letter written to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch by a private serving on the western front. It follows:

"GIVE US MORE AMMUNITION"

To the EDITOR OF THE POST-DISPATCH:

I've been bombed, shelled by artillery, strafed, and have run into a few booby traps, but so far haven't had it too bad. I've lived in foxholes full of mud and water, and now am in an old abandoned German home, in the cellar. I've sweated out many air raids and barrages laid down by enemy artillery, and I cannot see where I have any kick coming, because I'm only one of millions.

We do have a legal gripe, though, and I thought you back home, with all your hardships, like shortages of cigarettes, gas, tires, and whisky, would like to hear about it.

Why can't we, who are doing the job the best we know how, get all of the ammunition we need? If we had all we could use, instead of having it rationed, we could shorten this war.

That we capture two or three towns some days doesn't mean we just fire a few big guns and walk in. It means we fire our quota of artillery ammunition, and then the doughboy fights his way through a hail of death and destruction, inch by inch, to his objective.

With an unlimited supply of ammunition, we could put on a softening-up preparation that would cut down on death and make Jerry pull in his horns quicker. Therefore, you would be able to print news of 8 or 10 towns a day taken, instead of just a few which have cost a lot of American blood and life.

Each day we can't fire at every target we see adds that much time to this war and makes each fighting man wonder why in the hell he doesn't get ammunition. We all realize the people are doing a swell job for us over here, but now isn't the time to slack down. Now is when we really should put on pressure, and more each day, so the "supermen" won't have a chance ever to relax.

Pvt. (1st cl.) HARRY LIENHARD,
An Overland (Mo.) Soldier.
SOMEWHERE IN GERMANY.

It is such expressions as this that caused me to support that legislation.

I recall in the last session of Congress the appeals from those representing agricultural districts for an appropriation of millions of dollars to bring farm labor from Mexico, and the West Indies. In the last few weeks we have heard many Members on both sides of the aisle speak of the shortage of farm labor and assail the drafting of men who were working on the farms.

It seems to be admitted that 25,000 or more people will be required to take this agricultural census. Each and every one of them will require additional assignments of gasoline for their cars. Whenever a Government agency tells you that 25,000 or more men will be needed you can be assured that it will be more and not less than the figure submitted.

The chairman of the committee that handled this bill stated that every business—commercial, labor, industrial, and agricultural organizations—in the country favored its passage.

I come from a great industrial area where well over a million people reside. I might also say that included in that area is part of a county, the soil being used for agricultural purposes which is as rich as any soil in the United States. I receive a tremendous mail. It so happens that one of our Senators was nominated for Vice President and naturally he was active in connection with the campaign. The other Democratic Senator was defeated in the primary. Residents of this metropolitan area wrote me they were unable to contact the Senators so they contacted me, as many of them have over a long period of years who do not reside in my district.

I do not feel that my memory fails me when I say I have not received one letter from a businessman or from a laboring organization favoring the passage of this bill. I do recall one letter I received urging that a manufacturer's census be taken and I promptly advised the writer of that letter I was opposed to it at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I could absolutely see no benefits that would accrue as a result of taking an agricultural census now. One of our colleagues told me that just before he left home he was visited on his farm by a representative of the Census Bureau who presented him with a questionnaire and asked him to fill it out. He told me it took him over an hour to answer all the questions, and this man is an attorney.

In my opinion the best thing we can do at the present time is to leave the farmer alone and not require him to be filling out questionnaires.

Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to answer for my vote on this legislation. I might also say that I voted for the motion to recommit which read as follows:

No one shall be exempted or deferred under the Selective Service Act, or relieved from the assignment to essential industry or to agriculture under any law of Congress, by reason of being employed in preparing for, taking, compiling, or publishing the quinquennial census of agriculture in the United States.

I cannot understand how there could be any objection to provide that no one should be exempted or deferred under the Selective Service Act simply because they were engaged in taking this census. The motion failed but I express the hope that no selective-service board will exempt or defer any individual who is employed by the Census Bureau in this connection.

If what we were told is true, that there is a shortage of manpower, that production of munitions of war must increase,

and that legislation to draft the necessary workers was needed, then I can see absolutely no justification for taking an agricultural census at this time.

Commemoration of Eighty-ninth Birthday of Former Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, February 3, in the Speaker's dining room of the Nation's Capitol, the Oklahoma delegation in Congress had a luncheon in honor of one of the Nation's outstanding and most useful citizens, former Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma.

The occasion was in honor of Senator Owen's ninetieth birthday anniversary. Many other prominent Oklahomans were present on this historic occasion to pay tribute to one of the two first Senators from our State elected in 1907, when the great commonwealth of Oklahoma joined the Union. Among those who paid eloquent tributes to Senator Owen on the occasion mentioned was another well-known statesman who served also with distinction as one of Oklahoma's first Senators, Hon. T. P. Gore. His forceful and eloquent tribute to his colleage of many years in the United States Senate follows:

Mr. Chairman, I desire to say first that I have seldom found myself in agreement with George Bernard Shaw, the great Irish playwright, but with one of his epigrams I find myself in perfect accord. He said that youth is too precious a thing to be wasted on the young. Youth was not wasted on Senator Owen. He hoarded it. He had the foresight to go West earlier than the rest of us and there he discovered the fabled fountain of youth. The only trouble is that he monopolized it—although he had always professed to oppose monopoly.

We meet to commemorate the ninetieth birthday of Senator Owen. Since February 3, 1856, when the Senator first answered "present," 89 years have come and gone. Senator Owen's life has spanned nearly one-twentieth of all the time that has come and gone since the Star of the East stood still above the Manger at Bethlehem. His life spans more than one-half of all the years that have come and gone since our fathers brought forth this Republic on the glorious Fourth day of July 1776. In his time he has witnessed more material progress, mark, I say, material progress, than the human race had previously achieved since time began.

But after all neither seconds nor cycles are the best measure of time. The tick tock of the clock is not the best of all speedometers. As I have known him I have often thought that Senator Owen has acted upon the old adage that the west way to kill time is to use it. In that respect he reminds me of the great Napoleon who once said, "I may have lost a battle, but I never lost a minute."

It happens that Senator Owen and I were sworn into the Senate on the 16th day of December 1907—37 years ago. We had been elected by the legislature on December 10—which, incidentally, was my thirty-seventh birthday. Senator THOMAS, who sits at this table, and now honors a seat in the Senate, was then a member of the State senate and had the wisdom to cast his vote for Senator Owen and myself. Senator MOORE, who sits at this table, and who now shares with Senator THOMAS the honor of representing Oklahoma in the Senate, cast his vote for the men who elected Senator Owen and me to the Senate.

Of the 90 men who made up the Senate at the time Senator Owen and I were sworn in, not one is alive today. All of them have crossed the Great Divide. Senator Sutherland, afterwards Justice Sutherland, was the last to wrap the drapery of his couch about him—was the last to join the innumerable caravan.

Senator Owen was thrice elected to the Senate. He served more than 16 years in that body. He retired from choice. I retired for reasons too delicate and too numerous to mention Senator Owen's fingerprints will be found on all the great measures that were passed during his tenure in the Senate. They were years crowded with service. I remember in reading the autobiography of John Morley, the great English statesman, that he closed a summary of his career with this remark: "I said things that made a difference" That is about the highest claim he could have made. That is about the highest tribute that one man can pay to another. It means that such a man was a living force, that he was an effective force, that he exerted an influence, that to some extent he changed the course of human events, that to some extent he changed the current of history.

It is a still higher tribute to say that such changes improved the state of human affairs, accelerated the pace of progress, and contributed to the sum total of human well-being and human happiness. Owen as well as Morley said and did things that made a difference. No man as active as Senator Owen in the furtherance of his views could entirely escape opposition, but I believe that none of his opponents ever challenged either his sincerity or his ability. Ability is a gift, sincerity is a virtue. Owen has both.

It happened that Senator Owen and I were in public life during the First World War. We have survived to witness another world war. Hegel was wrong when he said that the only lesson we learn from history is that we learn no lesson from history. We learn that history repeats her tragedies. Today we see those of you upon whom our mantles have fallen wrestling with the problems of a second world war, a second world war in a single generation. We see you wrestling with problems some of which have defied solution in the past, wrestling with problems some of which may defy solution in the future. We see you trying to find ways and means to prevent war and to insure peace. You may fail again. But you cannot afford not to try. It may be that 8,000 treaties of peace have been made and broken during the last 3,500 years. But no matter how bloody the past and no matter how bloody the present you cannot afford not to try to find the answer. All will agree that it were better to have tried and failed than not to have tried at all. To try is the one duty that you will not default. The statesman always has this recourse: To take conditions as they are. To take the resources at his command and to make the best of the situation that confronts him, no matter how desperate.

In times like these when the present is as dark as the future you must, if I may say so, do a great deal of instrument flying. I wish that I could put you on a beam that could not but guide you aright. I cannot, but I do know that the best all-weather beam in these circumstances and in all circumstances is simple even-handed justice. Justice unto all. Justice means rendering unto each his due. The man and the nation that obtain justice may complain but they have no just complaint. The men and the nations that mete out justice to others may not escape all complaint, but they will escape just complaint. A Greek philosopher once said: "Nothing is unjust that is useful." America would reverse that judgment and say: "Nothing is useful that is unjust."

We all join in wishing for our distinguished guest continued good health and good fortune.

Another fitting and timely tribute in the form of a letter comes from another brilliant, eloquent statesman from Oklahoma, who also served with distinction and honor in the United States Senate, Hon. Josh Lee, at present a valuable member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, February 6, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT L. OWEN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Allow me to congratulate you and thank you for the inspiring address which you delivered on the occasion of the luncheon given in celebration of your eighty-ninth birthday.

Your address on the global alphabet was a masterpiece for the vigorous expression of noble ideals. You never lacked for a word nor used a surplus one. Your quotations from the Scripture and the classics were flawless. Your zeal for banishing illiteracy by means of a universal language was contagious. It was obvious that the audience hung on your words and shared your hope for the establishment of a better world through the medium of a common language.

There seems to be a direct connection between the future of aviation and a universal language. The airplane has made every man neighbor to every other man. Therefore, we need a language by which we can communicate with each other.

It is my sincere wish that you have many more birthdays and that you may continue, as in the past, to contribute to the betterment of mankind.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSH LEE, *Member.*

Those Oklahomans who heard Senator Owen on this occasion agree that he was never in better form or made a deeper impression on his hearers. For the most part he discussed his global alphabet that is the subject of so much discussion throughout America and the world. His address follows:

My dear friends, you must surely know how deeply I appreciate the presence, the good will, the commendation of those who have done me the honor of this luncheon on my eighty-ninth birthday, and the presence here of every Member of the Oklahoma delegation in the House and the United States Senate, as well as my "post graduate" friends, Hon. Thomas Pryor Gore and Hon. Josh Lee, who served many years in the United States Senate. Two finer orators than these "post graduates" cannot easily be found. I deeply appreciate the commendation of Senator Gore in his reference to my attempts to serve the American people. His inimitable wit is famous throughout the United States.

I am particularly pleased to see here Hon. ELMER THOMAS and Mrs. Thomas. The State of Oklahoma has had in Senator THOMAS a statesman and a public servant of the highest type, whose faithful and patriotic services could not be exceeded by any man. I rejoice to see his new honors as chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the United States Senate, a great committee whose chair-

man is a great American and worthy of all honor.

The presence here of so many ladies gives me special pleasure, for they know that I have been the champion of the rights of women during my entire life.

Within the few minutes that I may speak with propriety I shall confine myself to one or two vital points which I think deserve your attention.

All of you know my legislative career, the long and persistent efforts I have made to perfect the bulwarks of democracy through the political education of the people by such agencies as the National Popular Government League and the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I wish today to use the fleeting moments to call your attention to a matter which I deem of supreme importance to the people of the United States, to the people of the United Nations, and to the people of the whole world, including the Germans and the Japanese.

The weakness of government which leads to the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse—war, famine, pestilence, death—is the weakness of ignorance of great leaders who rely upon physical force, military power, fear, and economic monopoly to bring success and happiness to their own people.

It is ignorance and lack of vision in high places which has resulted in the wars of all the centuries past. But the twentieth century brings great promise of putting an end to the ignorance of leaders through the opportunity now of abolishing illiteracy and ignorance throughout the whole world, beginning with the least of the individuals.

Over 60 percent of the nationalities of the world or their people do not read and write any language, and of the remainder the percentage is not high of those who are sufficiently educated to guide the people in so governing their affairs as to bring peace, prosperity, abundance, and happiness instead of war and human agony.

When I came into this world I entered an atmosphere of friendship and loving kindness and for every day of a long life I have been fed, clothed, and sheltered by the unselfish work of God's little messengers. To them I have an unconquerable sense of gratitude and a passionate desire to reciprocate the kindnesses which I have received.

In the reading room of the Library of Congress on one of the pillars I recall this sentence:

"Be noble and the nobility that lies in other men, sleeping but never dead, will rise in majesty to meet your own."

My dear friend, MONRONEY, of this Oklahoma delegation, put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 8, 1943, a review of a book, The Silent Billion Speak, written by Rev. Frank C. Laubach, Ph. D., which demonstrated in a wonderful way the truth of this Christian doctrine. The Moros, who had been fierce enemies of the white race, became loving friends of the Government of the United States through the friendship of Frank C. Laubach and his missionary friends, who taught the Moros how to abolish illiteracy through a phonetic alphabet which they could learn in one day and with which they could write, print, and read the Moro language. This enabled them to have printed instruction in the care of babies and in the laws of health, cultivation of the soil, the principles of animal industry, and various occupations by which to increase their productions and mutual services.

It is my profound conviction that the work of the Committee on World Literacy, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, established by the representatives of 123 foreign mission societies, is now, through similar phonetic alphabets in other nationalities, abolishing the illiteracy of the whole world.

The Russian people, under Lenin and Stalin, adopted a phonetic alphabet of 33 letters and an intensive educational program for the common people, financed by the state, from the kindergarten, elementary schools, universities, and technological laboratories which within two decades has increased the national income and production of the Russian people, including 200 dialects, over 400 percent, and the end is not yet. They are electrifying all of Russia by harnessing water power, developing the coal and oil fields of Russia, and using the finest engineering skill in the world.

What it has done for Russia which 4 years ago was unprepared for war is now being realized by the unhappy leaders of the German people who thought of themselves as the "master race" and of other people as inferior and only fit for slavery. This heartbreaking blunder is bearing fruit which is bitter to the German people and to the distressed people of Japan.

During my life, and particularly in the twentieth century, the development of human intelligence and understanding in the United States has been profoundly significant, bringing about a transition from the ox wagon to the airplane, from the pony express to steel highways, electrified railways, universal use of electricity for light, heat and power, the radio which takes the human voice around the globe in a split second.

In the United States alone in December 1943, we had 57,000,000 radio receiving sets and 1,700 broadcasting stations, and the pictures taken at this luncheon by the Associated Press and other news agencies are being sent by wire to many subscribing papers throughout the United States.

Enormous has been the expansion of the marvelous American press and its newspapers and magazines. It is a miracle of modern knowledge and distribution of every form of human intelligence. Unspeakable are the great results in the United States, results which are establishing profound truths with regard to human relationships. It is my mature opinion and profound belief that nothing can possibly prevent the new world for which this war is being fought and a peace that shall be permanent, based on justice, mutual cooperation, human brotherhood, and human understanding.

In the United States there are hundreds of thousands of churches of many different denominations, and hundreds of thousands of fraternal and social organizations based upon mutual service and brotherhood, teaching the doctrines of charity, loving kindness and mercy. I understand there are over 60,000,000 members of the churches alone.

With many of the fraternal and social organizations I have been affiliated and I personally know their benevolence and good intentions. I am a life member of Master Masons, Elks, Scottish Rite (thirty-second degree), and a member of the Knights Templars, Shrine, Woodmen of the World, Loyal Order of the Moose, etc., and I have been a member of all the leading clubs of the city—the Cosmos, Chevy Chase, Columbia, University, Metropolitan, and I know by personal contact the fundamental goodness of the average human being in the United States. I reject the doctrine that the heart of man is desperately wicked. It is sufficient explanation to say that the ignorance of man leads to deplorable results through misunderstanding, through prejudices due to differences of languages, of race, of color, of religion. The antagonism can be and will be removed when men can understand each other and know the good that is in each other.

It is for this reason that during the last 8 years I have spent literally thousands of hours in perfecting the global alphabet presented to the United States Senate in Senate Documents Nos. 49, 133, and 250, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and in various letters explaining the matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The global alphabet is strictly a phonetic alphabet. The use of a phonetic alphabet is not new. Moses used one in writing Genesis 2,767 years ago. There are over 350 different phonetic alphabets in use in the world now. But in the United States the people have not realized the importance of a phonetic alphabet because they have made such wonderful progress in spite of the lack of it.

The phonetic alphabet which I am presenting to you and which I trust may meet your approval and support consists of 33 letters made in a mnemonic form. They are as simple in form as humanly possible, requiring only one stroke of the pen. The alphabet can be learned in 2 hours by a child 10 years of age. Every letter of the global alphabet begins and ends on the center line of the printed space. They are stenographic in quality. The English language can be written with the pen at least three times as fast with the global alphabet as with the Roman letters.

With the global alphabet, every language in the world can be printed, written and read, and can be composed on the monotype or linotype machine and printed on the rotary printing press.

Under my direction there is now ready for the compositor a book teaching the Spanish people to speak English and the English people in the same book to speak Spanish. Conversational Spanish and English can be taught with this book in 90 days using not exceeding 1,500 words.

The same pattern can be used to teach the Portuguese, the Russian, the Chinese, and I have these books in the process of preparation.

Within 30 days, the same pattern could be used to prepare bilingual books for the 30 leading languages of the world.

My objective is to print these books on the rotary press at a cost which will not directly exceed the cost of the paper itself, and to have them distributed so as to teach the whole world conversational English.

I assure you of my profound conviction that with the support of the Government of the United States, and with the support of the American people, English can be made the conversational language of the whole world within 2 or 3 years. The ignorance of the human race and illiteracy and poverty can be abolished by this mechanism. The radio can be used locally and internationally for the instruction of the whole world through the English language and I am appealing to you and to the friends of the human race everywhere to give their personal, political, and economic support to the global alphabet and to the World Language Foundation which has been organized by my friends as a means of financing this world movement through an educational, charitable organization that would safeguard the funds and have them properly applied for the purposes presented.

Before the Acting Librarian of the Congressional Library, who was invited to look into this matter by Assistant Secretary of State, Hon. Archibald MacLeish, I presented the evidence showing that the global alphabet had been endorsed by the greatest linguists in the world, some of whom I quoted in Senate Document 250, but a number of which I submitted in another memorandum.

I sent the Senate documents explaining this alphabet to over 200 linguists.

There has been no authority controverting the truth of what Dr. Laubach and Dr. Mario A. Pei, of Columbia University, have said in regard to the value of this alphabet for the purposes intended.

Time precludes my going into further detail but the record speaks for itself. I have delivered here to those who are present copies of the official organ of the railway brotherhoods, Labor, of February 3, edited by Hon. Ed. Keating, explaining the global alphabet, and giving a picture of it. The picture takes only about 4 inches square.

Please accept for the members of your committee my heartfelt thanks for the luncheon given by you in honor of my birthday and for so many good wishes expressed at this table. I shall cherish the memory of this meeting.

Pauper's Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the original resolution of the Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C., regarding the so-called pauper's oath and the second front-page editorial appearing in the Stars and Stripes National Tribune endorsing the resolution.

Surely there is no greater blot on our system of caring for our deserving veterans than the present requirement that boys who have fought and suffered for their country must sign a pauper's oath before being given needed and well-earned hospital treatment.

I am confident that my colleagues who have demonstrated their interest in our veterans' welfare by supporting legislation to assist them in their attempt to reestablish themselves in civilian life will be willing and eager to right this wrong as soon as they are fully aware of the humiliation and distress it causes our veterans. This practice is insulting and unjust to our war heroes and demands immediate correction.

The resolution follows:

MUST A VETERAN IN NEED OF HOSPITALIZATION SWEAR TO A PAUPER'S OATH?

Be it resolved, That the existing and written method of interrogation for admission to veteran hospitalization, as non-service-connected patients or as service-connected patients seeking treatment for ailment other than cause of discharge—either emergency or extensive cases—is un-American, degrading, and in addition clothed with the dubious but legal power of subjecting a veteran of the World Wars to the possibility of prosecution by arrogant or antagonistic governmental bureaucrats;

Whereas that the membership of this post respectfully suggests that Veterans Administration official be requested to authorize and institute a more democratic and more appropriate procedure of ascertaining and determining the financial status of an applicant or his/her eligibility for hospital treatment;

Whereas that these pleadings are not submitted for the intention of removing proper or necessary restrictions and safeguards for hospital admittance but to eliminate the apprehension of being stigmatized in official records by a so-called act of pauperism, and to remove the contingency of being coerced or threatened by overzealous public officials: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, is authorized and directed to recommend for the consideration by the delegates of the national convention of the American Legion to be assembled at Chicago, Ill., September 18–29, 1944, the deletion of questions Nos. 5 and 9, respectively, from Veterans Administration Form P–10, "Application for Hospital Treatment or Domiciliary Care," otherwise known as the pauper's oath.

Approved:

THOMAS COSTELLO,
Commander.
JOSEPH LEIB,
Vice Commander.

The editorial follows:

[From the Stars and Stripes of February 8, 1945]

MORE ABOUT PAUPERS

Late last September this newspaper took violent exception to and condemned vigorously the employment of the "pauper's oath" by the Veterans Administration. It is required from all war heroes who apply for hospital treatment. We had paid our respects to this offensive business many times during earlier months but our lawmakers had been so occupied with other matters that little attention had been accorded the many complaints from our comrades which we had aired through these pages, and, too, we suspect that representatives of the veterans' agency had used one means or another to quiet the fears of Congressmen who had inquired about it.

Now our legislators are awakening to the humiliation that faces men who have fought for this country's existence but who must swear they are indigent in order to be admitted to hospital treatment. Representative RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, World War No. 1 veteran, of Indiana, and Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, have bills pending before appropriate committees of both Houses of the Congress asking amendment of that infamously black statute of 1933, known as the Economy Act, so that neither law nor bureau-inspired regulation may require a showing of need for hospital admission purposes. Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON, of Louisiana, introduced a new bill last week seeking the same ends, and he advises that JOHN RANKIN, World War No. 1 chairman of the House committee handling such legislation, has assured him early hearings can be expected. There are numerous other bills pending before that and other committees asking that "needs clauses" and "income provisions" be deleted from laws particularly specified. On the whole, things appear a little brighter for veterans who must look forward to institutional care but who protest the practice of signing an oath that is both un-American and loathsome.

And to complete the recording of new events, it is noted that NOBLE J. JOHNSON and EARL WILSON, representing Indiana constituencies in the Congress, and several others of the solons have expressed themselves publicly in opposition to administration insistence on having a veteran declare himself a pauper or lie like a trooper in order to receive from the Government only what his service has led him to believe he has justly earned. The question on the application form, "Are you financially able to pay?" and the instruction to list "the total value of your property, both real and personal," have also aroused the ire of World War veteran, Congressman J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, who had it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD alongside a Canadian application to show that other countries are not so exacting as we. PETERSON has promised to help wipe out the vicious requisite.

Nor has the Veterans Administration been idle. On the best of information we have been told that this agency has finally seen the light and has been considering a modification of its form, and, on authority that is absolutely unimpeachable, we have learned that the Veterans' Administrator, General Hines, has had a trouble-shooter on Capitol Hill attempting to head off legislative action by trying to mollify Members who have thought first of veterans and secondly of men who are paid to administer laws enacted by the Congress.

These moves behind the scenes will not do. Men who have borne arms in defense of their country, whether on their home shores or in foreign lands, must not be subjected to this indignity. The law states, and the people demand, that no man of war shall be penalized for attempting to better his financial condition. The Constitution of our country provides against discrimination as between individuals. Whether that fiendishly conceived penalty clause applied to the Economy Act appears at the top of the hospital application blank where it is presently printed in bold, black letters, whether it be in the middle or at the bottom, or whether it is suggested to some applicants that it will not apply to them and pointed out to others that it does, makes not one iota of difference. It is as black in conception as it is in print, and legislation must wipe it out. It hits veterans smack in the eye and labels them paupers seeking something as mendicants that they have earned as a right. They are entitled to maintain their self-respect.

We have the highest regard for General Hines, whom we have praised here without stint. He has a tremendous job and, although he has erred as humans will, he has done a splendid work during his long tour as Veterans' Administrator. We have heard him defend "needs" clauses as a bar to further attempts at economy at the expense of veterans, and we know him to be sincere in his purpose. Nevertheless, no man, however competent, can possibly attend to all of the details of jobs as great as his. We are convinced that some of the general's advisers have sold him a bad bill of goods in this instance, and his fears that an overload of applications for treatment will prevail if the bars are let down are, in our opinion, without foundation. Even so, the care of veterans is as much a part of the cost of war as the guns they once carried, and that much the Congress recognizes without argument.

We cannot bring ourselves to believe that our affluent comrades will take undue advantage of free hospitalization. There should be no delay in according it to those who require it. To make veterans read that penalty provision is to make them debate their right to something to which they are normally entitled, or to make of them sneaking criminals. To require them to list their assets to be assayed by all who would snoop is to demand knowledge that is not the Government's business. To insist upon their subscribing their hands to an oath that they are not able financially to pay for a service that they should expect by virtue of fighting for their country in time of war is to humble and embarrass them and make of them unwitting paupers. The practice is positively indecent. It must be discontinued.

Is It To Be Law or a Military Dictatorship?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have this day received a letter from a sound and successful businessman in my district who accurately portrays conditions as they exist in the agricultural areas of three great counties in western New York. The reason for inserting this

letter under leave to extend is to emphasize the importance of prompt and favorable action by the House on House Concurrent Resolution 27, introduced by Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota, the purpose of which is to make plain in no uncertain terms that the time has not arrived when even military officers can with impunity ignore the plain mandate of law, as has been done in ignoring the Tydings amendment. Militarism in its most arrogant form could be no more ruthless in dealing with the civilian population than has been done in stripping men from the farms of the Nation contrary to law, thus endangering the food supply of this Nation and of those liberated peoples of Europe who look to the United States for food to save them from starvation:

I have just read your statement in regard to Major General Hershey's interpretation of the Tydings amendment in the deferring of the farmers from the armed service.

It does seem a thoughtless idea to empty the farms of essential workers, as many of these farms are really below the minimum for their successful operation, even under the most favorable circumstances.

Does General Hershey know the difficulties that this winter weather has placed in the path of the farmers who are trying their best to keep cattle from starving due to their inability to get food in for them and to get their milk out to the towns and cities?

One specific instance is that of Louis Kasbohm, on Chautauqua Road, who has been snowed in but has been able to travel cross country under the most adverse circumstances to secure food and make delivery of eggs from his flock of 7,000 New Hampshire Reds. An important feature of his work is the hatching and delivery of 6,000 chicks every week. He has to bring a big truck load of food from Buffalo each week. He has one son in foreign service, and one son and his wife to help him, while his daughter can be of some assistance when she is not in the hospital at Cassadaga.

There are doubtless thousands of similar cases throughout western New York, where country roads have not yet been opened and families are isolated, but these are things that General Hershey apparently does not take into consideration.

I certainly hope that you and others alined with you will be successful in correcting the situation.

The Alarming Air-Crash Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, day after day we read in the newspapers heartbreaking dispatches from every section of the Nation announcing an alarming number of service air crashes. I think it is about time for Congress to do something about this scandal. I think Congress has the right to know the unvarnished truth concerning this situation.

I am about to relate a most amazing incident in connection with these crashes. It is a striking example of how patriotic vigilance can help in our war effort.

On November 24, 1944, the Washington Star printed the following Associated Press dispatch. It reads:

FOUR PLANE WORKERS FIRED AFTER CRASH KILLING SIX

SAN DIEGO, CALIF, November 24.—Officials of Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft Corporation have disclosed that four employees were dismissed as the result of a bomber crash here Wednesday in which six civilian crew members were killed.

The company announcement was made after it had been reported there weren't enough bolts in a wing section of the giant Navy-type Liberator which plunged into a ravine and exploded, starting a brush fire.

The crash occurred soon after the left wing of the craft shook loose from the fuselage.

This story caught the attention of Joseph Leib, Washington free-lance writer. He immediately visualized the significance of the innocent-looking dispatch and air-mailed it to Governor Warren, of California. In an accompanying letter he urged the west coast chief executive to take immediate action, pointing out that if the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation saw fit to dismiss the mentioned workers, the cause must have been of a serious nature. And, if so, the public ought to know the facts, making sure that such a tragedy would not happen again.

Governor Warren acted promptly. He, in turn, referred the newspaper clipping and Leib's letter to the district attorney at San Diego with instructions to make a thorough investigation.

Action came swiftly. On December 14, 3 weeks later, the San Diego coroner and the district attorney undertook a methodical probe to determine the cause of the ill-fated plane crash.

On January 8 the coroner's jury rendered a verdict holding the Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft Corporation guilty of "gross negligence." The case now awaits grand jury action. The following dispatch appeared in the Washington Star on January 8, 1945. It reads:

GRAND JURY TO PROBE CRASH OF CONSOLIDATED BOMBER

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., January 8.—The county grand jury will confer today with the district attorney on a coroner's jury verdict which held Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft Corporation guilty of gross negligence in connection with the crash of a Navy-type Liberator bomber last November 22.

Six civilian flyers were killed in the crash, attributed by inquest witnesses to the absence of almost 100 bolts from the outer wing panel, which sheared away during the take-off and caused the plane to plunge out of control.

District Attorney Thomas Whelan said that, despite the verdict, he would seek involuntary manslaughter complaints against those believed responsible. The company denied its inspection methods were as described by the jury—lax and haphazard.

It should be emphasized that the coroner's jury found that the company's methods were at fault rather than individuals who worked on the fatal bomber. Fortunately, the wing was available as evidence. Investigation disclosed that because 96 rivet holes had never been filled in splicing the panel to the inner wing that tragedy overtook the plane soon after it took off.

Mr. Speaker, imagine, 96 bolt holes out of a total of 116 remained untouched as the plane took off. The chief inspector of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation testified that "undistributed paint over spray on the splice indicated few bolts had ever been installed in it."

The Assistant Chief of Flight took the stand to state that planes were tested on the assumption that they have been completely inspected before leaving the assembly lines.

In addition the assembly station work sheet was produced as evidence to show that the company's records stated that the splice had been inspected. It bore the plant inspection stamp "1025" and a naval stamp—"USN-162."

Although the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation produces these planes for the Navy Department it took the interest and the influence of the Governor of California to force a thorough investigation into the functioning of the Navy contractor's inspection system.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the Navy Department was so derelict in this case. What was the Navy stamp—"USN-162"—doing on the inspection records? What kind of inspectors do they have anyway? I think we have a right to know whether they are utterly incompetent or whether they are influenced by company officials as have been proven in other cases?

Company officials do everything in their power to hush up such tragedies. That is why few of them are brought to public view.

In this case word has just reached me that the San Diego district attorney has dropped further action against the aircraft corporation.

It must be recalled that the District Attorney opened the matter only after the Governor of California interceded and had urged an investigation.

This is not the first time Consolidated Aircraft was faced with such a tragedy.

On June 2, 1943, the Washington Star carried an Associated Press story from San Diego in which a $250,000 four-motored Consolidated bomber crashed killing the chief test pilot and his assistants. The story went on to say that a company spokesman said that there were "evidence of sabotage," adding that the plane had been "thoroughly tested, and things like that just don't happen."

I think that it is the solemn duty of Congress to find the answer.

I am wondering if every Member of Congress realizes the full significance of these revelations. I am wondering whether or not this Congress is satisfied and willing to ignore this scandal and wait until tragedy comes closer to their own homes or loved ones. I think we have waited long enough for an official explanation of these crashes. I think it is time for Congress to act.

The Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo., a Scripps-Howard newspaper, carried the following editorial on Saturday, October 2, 1943. It said:

ARMY OWES AN EXPLANATION

Four Army bombers have crashed in Colorado since last Sunday. Over 30 officers and men have been killed. What are the causes of these accidents? Up to this point the Army has offered no single word of explanation. Except for its four terse bulletins that so

many were killed on a "routine flying mission," the Army has maintained aloof silence. This, we feel, is a serious mistake. Let's have an explanation now.

Bombers are still crashing in Colorado and still the War Department is silent. That editorial appeared 15 months ago, but it was completely ignored. Why? Yes; why? What are the causes for these crashes? Is the War Department protecting someone?

I am angered at the calloused indifference to these alarming service air crashes by high officials of our Government.

Listen to this statement by General Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, made on October 2, 1944, and appearing in the Nation's newspapers under these headlines:

MORE PLANES LOST IN TRAINING THAN COMBAT, ARMY ADMITS

More Army airplanes have been lost in training pilots in this country than in combat. That is a startling disclosure by the War Department this week. * * *

Since Pearl Harbor, it said, 17,500 planes have been lost in continental United States, 11,000 in crashes and wrecks, and that is 3,000 more than have been lost by enemy action.

It was also disclosed that there have been 5,600 fatal flying accidents in training, involving about 11,000 deaths.

Verne T. Irons, of Irving, Tex., who was chief inspector at the North American Aviation Plant at Dallas, Tex., resigned last year in disgust after registering a vigorous protest because the company had relaxed its inspection standards in its attempt to produce service ships in a hurry. In a sworn affidavit, Mr. Irons charged that on one plane "thousands of rivets of the wrong type were used in the main center section of the airplane, through lack of competent inspection. This was not discovered until the center section was practically complete. These rivets were removed and replaced. In this operation, the center section was twisted several inches out of alinement. Every time this condition was mentioned to the top supervisory and management officials, they would immediately inform me to shut up and say nothing."

Mr. Speaker, such is the information coming to the attention of Congress.

Since early 1942, Joe Leib, who has made a comprehensive study of service crashes, has pleaded for a special congressional committee empowered to scrutinize and check company and service inspection methods and to review service crash reports and accidents. He has no quarrel with subcommittees or with the Senate War Investigating Committee.

But he rightfully believes that the investigation of service crashes is a big enough job for a full-time committee.

I believe that if such a committee were appointed with the power to act we might be able to do something about this tragic situation.

Otherwise, subcommittees of Congress will continue to issue alarming reports and then do nothing about it.

For instance, I hold in my hand a report from the Senate War Investigating Committee dated July 10, 1943, page 30, as follows:

AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS

In addition to the foregoing the committee has been engaged in a study of military plane crashes and at a subsequent date will report on this subject. The committee is concerned about the large number of such casualties, particularly in noncombat operational flights in this country.

Mind you, that was on July 10, 1943—17 months ago. Nothing since has been heard about it. Everyone remembers the Truman committee indictment of the Curtiss-Wright Corporation for the production of defective motors.

In this connection I wish to call attention to the fact that the secret of dive bombing which Hitler used to terrorize the people of Europe was given to the Germans by officials of the Curtiss-Wright Corporation.

How this secret fell into Hitler's hands is explained in a letter that appears in the famous munitions investigation reports. This letter was signed by the president of Curtiss-Wright and was addressed to his sales agents in foreign lands. Here is the amazing letter:

We have been nosing around the (Navy) bureau in Washington and find that they hold as most strictly confidential their dive-bombing tactics and procedure, and they frown upon our even mentioning dive bombing in connection with the Hawks or any other airplanes to any foreign powers.

It is also unwise and unethical at this time, and probably for some time to come, for us to indicate that we know anything about the technique and tactics of dive bombing. It may be all right to put on a dive-bombing show to show the strength of airplanes, but to refer in contracts to dive bombing or endeavor to teach dive bombing is what I am cautioning against doing.

Mr. Speaker, there you have it. Here was an American company willing to sell out vital military secrets to foreign powers. At this very time Curtiss-Wright was selling its planes to the Nazis, helping to arm Hitler for this war.

And, yet, the vice president of Curtiss-Wright, Mr. Theodore P. Wright, was made dictator of american aircraft production, by such appointments as Director of Aircraft Resources Control Board of the War Department and Director of Aircraft Production Board of the W. P. B.

This meant that he had full charge of all raw materials and priorities.

No wonder Curtiss-Wright received more war contracts than any other manufacturer in the Nation, with the single exception of General Motors. That fact comes from the Truman committee.

Here is another amazing story carried in the Washington Star on July 11, 1943, under this headline "Aircraft report accuses Wright of 'gross laxity.' "

The story, an Associated Press dispatch, went on to say:

In a report charging delivery of defective airplane engines to the Army and Navy, the Senate Truman committee yesterday called the Curtiss-Wright Corporation guilty of gross negligence about inspection practices designed for the safety of airmen.

Five days later, on July 15, Senator TRUMAN threatened Curtiss-Wright that he would make public his committee's secret testimony on which it based its startling charges. But that threat was never carried out.

I present another amazing story that appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on January 22, 1943. It was an Associated Press report from Kansas City, Mo., and read:

Practices at war plants in this area which "tolerate, encourage, or overlook" defective products or assembly in war materials were condemned by a Federal grand jury here. The report was made in the case of a foreman of the North American bomber plant, who was arrested by Government agents and charged with concealing a defect on an engine part with chewing gum, so it could pass inspection.

The grand jury further added that such "practices have been engaged in by both employees and supervising personnel" after making an investigation of the bomber assembly plant.

On February 1, 1944, a House Military subcommittee issued a startling report, No. 1052. That was 11 months ago.

On page 10, it reads:

FLYING TRAINING ACCIDENTS

An increase in the number of accidents is to be expected in the greatly expanded training program. However, we are sincerely alarmed to discover a recent rise in the rate of those accidents. We are particularly alarmed to learn that the rate continues to rise. An accumulation of experience, development of aircraft, and instruction methods should produce a reduction in the rate.

There is no braver man than the young American who volunteers to fight for his country, individually and in the air. It is regrettable that even one of these should die before he has a chance to face the enemy. We exhort the Air Forces to more strenuous effort in this regard.

I am appalled and sickened by these facts.

What is behind the hideous power that prevents a thorough investigation of these great American catastrophes? Maybe our Military and Naval Affairs Committees of the House should stay at home long enough to find out.

Medical Care Insurance—Portion of Ninth Annual Report of Social Security Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of the Ninth Annual Report of the Social Security Board—the portion that deals with medical care insurance. It is a succinct statement of the need for national health insurance. I hope every Senator will read it. I refer to pages 26 to 31 of the report.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL CARE INSURANCE

Health among a people depends on many factors other than medical care—among them, the amount and distribution of national income, the level of education and of sanitary safeguards, and climate and other environmental factors. Because the United States is the richest of the nations and is known throughout the world for its natural advantages and its progress in education, sanitary controls, and scientific achievement, it is often declared that Americans, as a people, stand first in health. It is argued that our present arrangements for making medical services available to individuals are fully justified by our health record.

SECURITY OF LIFE

Available statistics do not bear out the claim that the United States is the healthiest Nation. Probably the best single basis for international comparison is the death rate among babies in their first year of life. In the years preceding the war in Europe, according to statistics of the League of Nations, 7 countries had lower infant mortality rates than the United States. From 7 to 11 countries—the number differing for various age groups—had lower death rates among children and adolescents, and 20 or more countries had lower rates among persons aged 35 to 64.[1] Death rates among the Negro population in the United States are typically higher than those of white persons. Even if international comparison is restricted to the white population, however, our death rate is by no means the lowest. In the expectation of life for white boys at birth, the United States ranked fifth among the prewar nations; for white men at age 20, it ranked ninth; at age 40, twelfth; and at age 60, thirteenth.

Despite past progress in preventing sickness and prolonging life, the United States has not yet achieved for all its people—and in particular for those in the working ages—the level of security of life which has been attained in some other nations with much smaller economic resources.

PROGRESS IN PUBLIC HEALTH

Much of the spectacular progress in lowering the general death rate in this country has been in preventing deaths from the communicable diseases of childhood and from typhoid fever, tuberculosis, and pneumonia and influenza. Between 1900 and 1940 typhoid fever and diphtheria were all but wiped out, and death rates for other communicable diseases in this group were cut down by from 60 to 90 percent. For all other causes of death taken together, the decline was only 16 percent. The decline in the general death rate in recent decades has been due chiefly to the decline in certain infectious diseases, which have been controlled largely through public measures for sanitation and various other activities of public-health departments.

This progress is still spotty. If all States had had as low an infant mortality rate as 1 State had in 1942, some 35,000 babies could have been saved. If, in 1941, all States had had the tuberculosis rate of the lowest State, some 42,000 deaths could have been prevented, mostly deaths of men and women in the productive ages. This was about the number of the Nation's war fatalities at the end of nearly 2½ years of fighting.

It is not an accident that deaths which could have been prevented through accepted public-health measures and sanitary controls are relatively the most numerous in States which lack adequate facilities for controlling such diseases and spend inadequate amounts for public health. Hundreds of thousands of lives could be saved each year, and additional hundreds of thousands of families saved needless suffering and expense, if the time-tested public-health measures now actually in effect in some parts of the country were in full use everywhere.

PRESENT BURDENS OF SICKNESS

A much larger part of the existing burden of ill health, disability, and postponable death now comes from illness which cannot be prevented or controlled by methods which automatically protect the whole community. Full use of the resources of modern medicine to reduce suffering, prevent disability, and prolong vigor and life demands increasingly the services which doctors must give patients individually, one by one. Such care also demands increasing use of necessarily costly facilities and techniques.

With progress in saving lives of babies and children, a growing proportion of the population lives to middle age and old age, when the most important causes of disability and death are diseases of the heart and arteries, cancer, and other chronic ailments. Most of these kill slowly, after a long period of illness, and gradually increasing disability. Many of them attack in the years of life when responsibilities for family support are heavy. Disability insurance, as well as medical-care insurance, would be of particular importance in encouraging workers to seek medical advice at an early stage, when adequate care might prolong their usefulness and their lives. They would know that if the diagnosis was what they feared, some support would be at hand for them and their families. Most people will not go to doctors until they have to if they know that loss of earnings will mean catastrophe to the family or fear that they will not be able to pay for the care they need.

General morbidity rates and death rates are averages, made up of the experience of groups who have been able to benefit from all advances in scientific knowledge and skill, and of those who have had scant share in this progress. Sickness comes oftener and lasts longer, and death comes earlier, in the homes of the poor than of the well to do.

REASONS FOR LACK OF CARE

To some extent, the inadequacy of the medical care received by the American people as a whole is due to the fact that some places, especially rural areas, lack adequate medical and hospital facilities. These are areas where average income is low. Present resources for medical care are unevenly distributed, because hospitals tend to cluster in cities where large numbers of persons seek their services and financial resources are ample, and doctors also locate in cities and towns where they find hospitals and laboratories and a better chance to earn a living. Even when medical facilities are ample, however, a considerable part of the capacity of hospitals and the time of skilled practitioners goes unused in ordinary years, though in the same places there are sick people badly in need of services. Ignorance and inertia have some part in the failure of people to get medical services they need, especially early in illness when services are most valuable. By far the most important reason, however, for the lack of needed care and for the volume of charity required of doctors, hospitals, and the public is the present method of paying for medical care—when sickness is at hand and family income is likely to have been cut down or stopped.

METHODS OF PAYING MEDICAL COSTS

In an ordinary year the American people pay about $4,000,000,000 for all civilian health and medical services, including cost of hospital construction. Of this total, about four-fifths comes from private funds and one-fifth from public funds. The total expenditure, governmental and private, for all health and medical services is equivalent to about $30 a person a year. But in any year some families pay little or nothing to doctors and hospitals, while others pay hundreds or even thousands of dollars. The difficulty with medical costs is that no family can know how much or how costly medical care they will need or can limit their needs for care to what they can afford. If costs could be averaged for the types of medical services which are ordinarily bought individually, most self-supporting families could pay for adequate medical care without hardship.

Tax-supported care: For certain major forms of medical care or care of certain groups in the population, much or all of the cost has been "averaged" through payment from the tax funds to which the whole community contributes, not merely the sick person or his family. In 1943, for example, 97 percent of all beds in hospitals for mental and nervous diseases were in publicly owned and operated hospitals, and 85 percent of all beds for tuberculous patients were in tax-supported hospitals. These types of long-continued care obviously are too costly for any but the richest families to bear individually. These diseases, moreover, have long been recognized as endangering public health and safety and leading to public costs for broken and dependent families.

The Federal Government, again for obvious reasons, has always been responsible for medical care of the armed forces. In addition to care of service-connected injuries and illnesses, moreover by the end of the war some 16,000,000 veterans will be able to receive publicly supported medical care for non-service-connected conditions through veterans' facilities.

From colonial times, care of the sick poor has been considered a public responsibility, though often provided very inadequately if at all. It is estimated that total public expenditures for medical care of the indigent and low-income groups—including expenditures of the Federal Government, the States, and their localities—are at least $150,000,000 a year.

Most of the care given under the arrangements outlined above is "state medicine" in the sense that it is financed from public funds, is given through publicly owned facilities, and is given for the most part by physicians or others paid directly by Government agencies. It represents not only a method of financing costs but also a way of organizing medical and institutional practice. Since "state medicine" has ordinarily been used as a term of opprobrium, it should be pointed out that some of these areas of medical service, notably care of mental illness and prevention and care of tuberculosis and other communicable diseases, are those in which progress has been outstanding and for which the United States is known favorably throughout the world.

Insurance methods: Another group of arrangements has been developed in the United States through which costs of medical care are distributed among employers or the individuals directly concerned, or both, without recourse to tax funds.

Costs of medical care for work-connected injuries, and in some States also of occupational disease, are insured under State or Federal workmen's compensation laws; only one State lacks such legislation. These laws make costs of industrial accident and disease a part of the cost of production.

In recent years a large number of middle-class families have been able to average some of their medical costs through membership in voluntary prepayment plans. The membership of Blue Cross plans, which cover certain hospital bills, includes about 15,000,000 persons, or about 11 percent of the population. Voluntary prepayment plans for medical care, established by industry, medical societies, and community and other groups, probably cover about four or five million persons, about half of whom are counted in the number covered by Blue Cross plans. These families pay a regular fixed amount each

[1] From tables in Statistical Yearbook of the League of Nations, 1941–42, pp. 40–41, 62–67; and League of Nations, Annual Epidemiological Report for the year 1938, pp. 65–67.

month and know that, within limits fixed by the contract, their hospital or other medical bills will be paid if they become sick. Contracts are commonly restricted to surgical expenses or fix extra fees for some services. In addition, commercial insurance companies sell policies—usually to indemnify hospital or surgical expenses or both—on an individual and group basis. The scope of the protection is always limited and often is restricted to care of accidental injuries. All in all, possibly from thirty to thirty-five million persons have some protection against hospital and medical costs under the Blue Cross and other voluntary prepayment plans and commercial insurance. Comprehensive protection against medical and hospital costs is limited to a few million.

Workmen's compensation and the other arrangements mentioned above are forms of insurance. They are ways of distributing and paying costs, not forms of medical practice. In one way and another, they help to cut through the barrier of costs by distributing medical care expenses over the whole group of insured persons, the well and the sick, and by distributing the costs over periods of time—the years of earning as well as the weeks or months of sickness. In the usual voluntary prepayment plan, a patient picks his doctor or hospital from all participating in the plan; doctors and hospitals decide whether or not they wish to join such plans. These plans cause no change in the personal relationship between a doctor and his patient, except to wipe out misgivings of both about a bill and to lessen the other important failing in that relationship—that so many people have no relationship with any doctor.

All the voluntary forms of medical care insurance mentioned above are fulfilling valuable functions in their limited sphere. They are necessarily more costly than the arrangements which could be evolved with wider sharing of sickness risks and with the administrative economies feasible for larger units. Their great shortcoming is that they reach so small a part of the population and fail to reach those who have the greatest need of medical-care insurance. From the standpoint of both the public and the families concerned, the great majority of the population must have some better way to pay medical costs if American families are to achieve the level of health and economic independence which our national resources should assure.

Compulsory social insurance: Neither the course of present developments in this country nor experience in other countries which have tried voluntary health insurance gives any indication that comprehensive and adequate arrangements to insure medical costs can be made in any way except through a compulsory insurance system. In this aspect of health security the United States faces a situation not unlike that in old-age security a decade ago. At that time many employers had established sound retirement systems for their workers; some persons had banded together to provide for themselves as a group or had made adequate individual provisions through annuities or other forms of commercial insurance. It was clear then, however, as it is clear now for medical-care insurance, that these voluntary arrangements could not be expected to extend to even a majority of the population in need of insurance or to the groups whose needs were greatest.

Medical-care insurance would enable self-supporting families to pay for and get needed medical services without any important alteration because of the insurance system in present forms or organization of medical practice. Moreover, families dependent on public funds could be covered through payment of contributions on their behalf by the agencies administering assistance. They thus would receive care in the same way in which others receive it; the stigma and, typically, the inadequacy of poor-law medicine could be wiped out.

Contributions equivalent to about 3 percent of annual earnings would pay for adequate basic medical and hospital services for both workers and their dependents. A more comprehensive system would cost the equivalent of about 4 percent. These costs would be no more than now is spent by families on the average. They are less than the average expenditure by families in the low-income groups, since, contrary to the general impression, low-income families spend, on the average, a larger proportion of their incomes for medical care than families in better circumstances, though—because of their more frequent and severe illness—they receive much less in relation to what they need.

Public discussion has centered around three alternative methods of providing medical-care insurance. It has been suggested that it could be established on a State-by-State basis, without participation by the Federal Government. It could follow the pattern of unemployment compensation, in which Federal legislation gave inducement to States to enact laws and establish insurance systems. Or, following the analogy of old-age and survivors insurance, it could be established as a Federal system.

For reasons outlined in the following section of this report, the Board believes that it would be simplest, most economical, and most effective to establish comprehensive protection through Federal legislation, while providing authority to utilize State agencies and other facilities. In any event, administration of benefits should be so decentralized that all necessary arrangements with doctors, hospitals, and others would be worked out on a local basis. The general pattern of arrangements with hospitals and doctors should be developed with the collaboration of professional organizations and with careful regard for regional, State, and local circumstances. In each area of administration—local, State, and Federal—policies and operations should also be guided by advisory bodies representing those who pay the insurance contributions and those who provide the services.

The much-advertised fears of "socialized medicine," "regimentation" of doctors, hospitals, or patients, loss of the pattient's freedom to choose his doctor, and deterioration of quality of care can be made wholly groundless. A system of medical-care insurance can and should be so designed as to avoid these disadvantages. By making services readily available to those who need them, without fear of the costs, the quality and effectiveness of service may be improved, and the incomes of doctors and hospitals may be made better and more secure. If, at the same time, professional education, research, and the construction of needed facilities are financially aided, progress in medicine and improvement in national health can be greatly accelerated.

The American Dollar and the Bretton Woods Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an address by Dr. Edwin Walter Kemmerer on the subject of the American dollar and the Bretton Woods plan printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Dr. Kemmerer is professor emeritus of international finance, Princeton University, and president of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy. I believe every Member of Congress will find his discussion of this important subject most interesting.

I have checked with the Public Printer with reference to the cost, and I am advised that the address slightly exceeds the number of words permitted for insertion in the Appendix without reporting the cost, which the Public Printer now informs me will be $143. Regardless of this, I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN DOLLAR AND THE BRETTON WOODS PLAN

(By Edwin Walter Kemmerer, professor emeritus of international finance, Princeton University; president, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy)

(Professor Kemmerer asserting that monetary stability existed under the international gold standard before 1914, lays its failure thereafter to economic instability. Alleges that Bretton Woods plan, instead of fostering stability, does the opposite, by allowing flexible paper-money standards to many nations, while a few adhere to a rigid standard. Says plan threatens to debase the American dollar and, therefore, should be rejected. Outlines a nine-point program for an international gold standard and urges rehabilitation of our monetary system on a gold basis.)

My theme tonight is the American dollar. I shall first take a glance at its history. Then I shall try to forecast what would happen to it if the Bretton Woods stabilization plan should be adopted. Finally, I shall state in brief outline my judgment as to what our future American monetary policy should be.

Although my remarks will be from the standpoint of the American dollar, in the field of money I am a pronounced internationalist. Most of what is said, therefore, concerning the Bretton Woods plans and the future of the American dollar will apply in principle to the monetary units of other advanced countries.

THE AMERICAN DOLLAR PRIOR TO WORLD WAR NO. 1

The clause in our Constitution giving to Congress the exclusive power to coin money and regulate the value thereof clearly contemplated a metallic money standard. Aside from the period of the Civil War greenback-standard and from a few brief and slight lapses in times of great emergency, the standard American dollar both de facto and de jure has always been a full-weight gold or silver dollar. For two generations of American bimetallism the dollar was both a fixed weight of gold and a fixed weight of silver, while under the gold standard from 1879 to the First World War, it was a fixed weight of gold. During all the years of bimetallism the pure silver content of the standard silver dollar was never changed and the pure-gold content of the gold dollar was changed less than a total of 4 percent—covering two inconsequential alterations made to adjust a defective bimetallic ratio. The gold content of our dollar was never changed an iota during all the years of our gold-coin standard.

The American standard from 1879 to 1914 was a true gold standard, operating in a world in which most of the leading nations, and a large and continually increasing number of the lesser ones, were using successfully the same standard, "the international gold

standard." This was a highly automatic standard, in which the respective money units of the different countries carried their full money value in their gold content. A $10 gold piece contained $10 worth of gold under this standard; moreover, gold moved freely in both national and international trade, and gold bullion could be converted into coin at the mint under the free coinage privilege and gold coins could be readily melted down into gold bullion without appreciable expense. All other kinds of money, Government notes, bank notes, and token coins, were kept at par with gold, and were usually readily convertible into gold on demand. There was in those days almost no monetary management by governments and very little by central banks, except that of occasional small changes in central-bank discount rates. Our present much-used words "monetary authority" was unknown. There was a popular proverb: "We have gold because we cannot trust governments."

This international gold standard, though far from perfect, worked reasonably well. The few countries still on the silver standard were trying to get over to gold and the few that had lapsed from the gold standard to inconvertible managed-paper-money standards were striving to get back to gold. Everywhere it was taken for granted that the international gold standard would be the world's monetary standard for a long future, and that the real problem was not one of finding a substitute for the gold standard but one of improving that standard by international cooperation.

About the only criticism of the international gold standard one heard in those days was that gold was not as stable in value as an ideal standard should be. It had, however, been more stable than any other metal for many years, and had been much more stable than any of the many managed-paper-money units with which a number of countries had been recently struggling.

Concerning the stability of gold in those pre-war days, John Maynard Keynes, who is today the world's most vigorous critic of the gold standard, said, in 1923 referring to England's 88 years' experience with the gold standard ending in 1914, "* * * the remarkable feature of this long period was the relative stability of the price level." Then, after citing figures proving this stability, he added: "No wonder that we came to believe in the stability of money contracts over a long period. The metal gold might not possess all the theoretical advantages of an artificially regulated standard, but it could not be tampered with and had proved reliable in practice."

THE INTERNATIONAL GOLD STANDARD AFTER FIRST WORLD WAR

Then in 1914, the First World War struck us. At its outbreak there were 59 countries on the gold standard. Under the stress of the war, the gold standard was practically driven off the map within the brief period of 3 years. But, be it remembered, during these same years the silver standard also broke down in the few countries that still retained it, and all countries resorting to paper-money standards suffered serious inflation. In a few countries this inflation carried up prices only a few hundred percent but in some other countries it carried them to astronomical heights.

After the war there was everywhere a popular longing to get back to a solid monetary standard, to something in which the people had confidence; and in the distracted world of that time there was no other commodity in which they had so much confidence as gold. Then, as now, Charles Dickens' phrase "as good as gold," meant the best, the world over.

Accordingly in every part of the world plans were discussed and measures taken looking toward a return to the international gold standard. It was a striking fact that in those early post-war years there was almost no public agitation for any other kind of monetary standard than gold. The International Financial Conference held at Brussels in 1920, at which all the important nations of the world—39 in number—were represented, resolved unanimously: "It is highly desirable that the countries which have lapsed from an effective gold standard should return thereto * * *." Two years later, the International Economic Conference held at Genoa declared: "It is desirable that all European currencies should be based upon a common standard. * * * Gold is the only common standard which all European countries could at present agree to adopt."

With the removal of its gold-export embargo in June 1919, the United States became the first country to return to the gold standard. During the next 10 years most other countries of the world came back to gold.

The new gold-standard currencies, however, were required to function in a war-weakened world, whose finances were in bad shape and whose economic systems had been grossly distorted by the war.

Furthermore, the type of gold standard introduced was very different from that which had prevailed before the war. In most countries, although not in the United States at that time, a gold-bullion or gold-exchange standard superseded the old gold-coin standard, and there was no gold coin in circulation. The gold reserves of the new gold-standard systems were frequently inadaquate. And, most significant of all, the time-tested old type of international gold-coin standard, with its fundamentally automatic system of operation, was replaced by a new and highly managed nationalistic type. Government management of economic affairs which had reached new heights during the war persisted after the war was over. This was particularly true in the field of money. Directly and through central banks, which they increasingly controlled, governments managed their currencies on a large scale. Central banks no longer depended for their monetary and credit control chiefly upon the modest manipulation of discount rates and occasional minor operations in the open market, but resorted extensively to large open market operations, the exercise of foreign exchange controls, and the manipulation of reserve requirements. Some of this management was scientific and useful. Much was political and harmful. Natural checks and balances of economic forces were all too often interfered with by ignorant meddlers. Normal economic forces were side tracked before they were given a chance to correct evils. It was not so much a question of management or no management as one of too much management and too many incompetent, political managers.

Slowly then, during the latter twenties, most of the world struggled back to a gold standard, but it was a very different kind of gold standard than the one prevailing before the war.

England returned to gold in the summer of 1925 but did not complete her legislation for this return until July 1928. Very unwisely she deflated to her pre-war gold parity. Italy and Poland returned in 1927, France in 1928, and Sweden in 1930. The United States was the only important country having a gold standard throughout the twenties. Obviously, therefore, there was not very much international gold standard in the world during that decade. William Adams Brown, in the most intensive study of the twentieth century gold standard that has yet been made, says: "In the history of the international gold standard 1928–29 is a landmark because it was the only year during which that standard was almost universally in effect in countries not traditionally attached to silver." But, these were the years in which the world economic crisis began in Australia, Germany, and Belgium. It struck the United States in the stock market crash of October 1929, and soon led to the break-down of all the recently established gold-standard systems of the world, those of Argentina, Austria, and Uruguay breaking as early as December 1929.

The United States gave up its gold-coin standard early in 1933 and adopted in January 1934 a new, weak, hybrid type of inconvertible, gold-bullion standards, after a debasement of 41 percent in the century-old gold content of the American dollar. It still retains this standard. Since the world crisis of the early thirties no other important country has returned to gold, no other is today on the gold standard.

The world, therefore, has had very little experience with a true international gold standard since 1914, and that little experience has been in a very unstable period, between the two greatest wars of history. The failure of such a gold standard at such a time is not a fair test of the merits of a true international gold standard, a standard with a previous long record of successful operation in many countries. It is because, however, of such an alleged failure, that we have before us today the Bretton Woods stabilization plan.

THE BRETTON WOODS STABILIZATION PLAN

What would the adoption of that plan do to the American dollar, the dollar in which is payable all of our bonds, public and corporate, all mortgages, all life insurance, all pensions, all bank deposits and all wages?

The Bretton Woods plan provides for a collection of national managed-paper-money standards. While each country would have its own monetary unit, as in the past, these units would be tied together by mutual agreement, and be subject to controls administered by an international board of governors, one governor for each member state, with a committee of 12 or more executive directors and a managing director. Each member state is given 250 votes plus one additional vote for each $100,000 share of stock owned, an arrangement which is especially favorable to the smaller states. With a few exceptions, all decisions are to be made by a majority of the votes cast. For the 44 members of the Bretton Woods Conference the initial stabilization fund was fixed at $8,800,000,000. A member's required contribution is called its quota. The largest three quotas which combined constitute about 60 percent of the fund are those of the United States $2,750,000,000, the United Kingdom $1,300,000,000, and Russia $1,200,000,000. From these high figures quotas run as low as $500,000 for some of the smaller states. Only a very minor part of each quota is required to be paid in gold. The fund is essentially a loan fund. The great majority of the states represented at Bretton Woods are small states in terms of population and business. Twenty-one of the 44 were in default when the war broke out in 1939 on dollar loans made to them by the United States.

The par value of each member state's currency is to be expressed in gold, and official computations relating to the currencies of members are to be on the basis of par values. Limits are prescribed beyond which the price of gold and exchange rates are not normally permitted to go.

Before considering the provisions of the Bretton Woods plan as regards the values of the different national currencies, it should be noted that nearly every general provision is modified and whittled away by so many exceptions that it loses much of its force and most of its clarity in a maze of qualifications. It would be futile in a short after-dinner talk to cite and try to explain these exceptions. This is one of the reasons why there is so much difference of opinion in high places in the United States and abroad as to the meaning of the plan, a good illustration being the question to be considered

later, as to whether or not the plan is a gold-standard plan. Why, for example, Lord Keynes can say that it is "the exact opposite" of the gold standard, and Sir John Anderson, British Chancellor of the Exchequer can declare, "I believe there is in fact no foundation for the view that this scheme in any way involves a return to the gold standard," while the eminent British economist, Paul Enzig, can say the plan "is a most vicious form of gold standard, far worse than the one this country [England] was fortunate enough to abandon in 1931," and while our American coauthor of the plan, Harry D. White, while criticizing the gold standard in no uncertain terms, and expressing great doubt as to the possibility of maintaining a gold standard, can make the surprising statement: "Those countries which elect, as does the United States, to adhere to the gold standard can, of course, do so without in any way complicating the operations of the fund." With reference to this statement may I say by way of digression that it would be a strange sort of international monetary stabilization if a few countries should retain a rigid gold standard while all the other countries were on highly flexible paper-money standards.

At the proper time the fund is to request each member to communicate to it the par value it desires for its currency, based on the rate of exchange prevailing at a designated date. This is to become the real par value unless within a specified time the member desires a change, or unless the fund notifies the member that in its judgment the par value which the member has requested "cannot be maintained without causing recourse to the fund on the part of that member, or others on a scale prejudicial to the fund and to members." If any country persists in refusing to accept for its monetary unit the gold value which the fund wishes to prescribe for it, its only alternative is to get out.

The par values of member currencies when once adopted, though administratively flexible, are not expected to be permanent. In fact, frequent changes of par value seem to be contemplated as an important instrument of monetary policy. Such changes are divided into two classes: (1) Changes in the par value of the monetary unit of individual members and (2) uniform changes by all members. Let us consider these separately.

A member is permitted to change the par value of its currency only "after consultation with the fund" and in order "to correct a fundamental disequilibrium." It is provided, however, that, if the proposed change, together with all previous changes, does not exceed 10 percent of the initial par value, "the fund shall raise no objection." If it goes beyond 10 percent, but not in excess of 20 percent, the fund may either concur or object, but must declare its attitude within 72 hours, and if it goes beyond 20 percent, the fund may either concur or object, but is allowed more time to make its decision. The liberality of these provisions is insured by the requirement that the fund must agree to a proposed change without any stated limits if it is "satisfied that the change is necessary to correct a fundamental disequilibrium," and the fund cannot object to a proposed change on the ground that it disapproves of "the domestic, social, or political policies" for the carrying out of which the member is proposing the change.

The penalty for making an unauthorized change in the par value of one's currency is to render the guilty member ineligible to use the resources of the fund "unless the fund otherwise determines," and if the member persists in its noncompliance for an unreasonable period, it is required to withdraw from membership in the fund.

These provisions on their face would seem to open the door very wide to a member state wishing to debase its monetary unit. The variations readily permitted are large. The condition "necessary to correct a fundamental disequilibrium" can mean all things to all men. Can anyone conceive of a situation in which a nation desiring to change the par value of its monetary unit would not be doing so, or at least claiming to be doing so, largely by reason of its "domestic, social, or political policies"? Could the fund's authorities in making their own decisions help from being influenced by their judgment concerning the wisdom of those domestic policies? Nations do not ordinarily deliberately plan a policy of inflation and subsequent debasement. They slide into currency debasement down a political toboggan, and they usually receive their initial push, as well as other pushes on the way down, by unsound domestic, social, and political policies, involving the exploitation of their currency system for fiscal purposes.

In addition to the provisions permitting changes in the par values of the monetary unit of individual members, there is a provision to enable all members to make uniform changes at one and the same time. Specifically the provision is that the fund by a majority of the total voting power may make uniform proportionate changes in the par value of the currencies of all members, provided that each such change is approved by every member which has 10 percent or more of the total quota, and provided further that the par value of a member's currency shall not be changed if the member objects within 72 hours of the fund's action.

Since nearly all the members will be debtor nations, and since public opinion is usually strongly resistant to deflation, this provision, realistically speaking, is one to make possible by political action world-wide inflation. And, more than that, it will make such world-wide inflation dangerously easy. The action requires only a majority of the total voting power, if there is an affirmative vote of every member which has 10 percent or more of the total quotas. Only three members have that much, namely, the United States, the United Kingdom and Russia. Of these only the United States will be, for a long time to come, a creditor nation. Suppose, however, that we as a creditor should not want a world-wide monetary debasement at a time when most of the debtor nations should, including the United Kingdom and Russia, how long could we successfully oppose it? Moreover, would it not be likely, before any vote on this subject should be called for, that a large number of individual nations would have individually reduced the pars of their respective currencies, and by doing so would have placed those which had not done so in a strongly disadvantageous position as regards the payment of international debts and competition for export trade? Internationally the poorer currencies would drive out the better ones in a manner analagous to Gresham's law. It would be a case of the survival of the unfittest. Instead of giving the world international monetary stabilization which is the declared object of the plan it would give it precisely the opposite.

Do we in America want to make the value of our dollar so easy to alter? Even if we do, are we willing to place the power to alter it so largely in foreign hands, the hands of our debtors? If the gold standard seems too rigid—as some of its critics maintain—would not a plan of this kind give the world nationalistic monetary fluidity of flood proportions?

IS THE BRETTON WOODS PLAN A GOLD-STANDARD PLAN?

The stabilization plan of the experts submitted to the Bretton Woods Conference was at first frequently interpreted in the United States to be a gold-standard plan. The values of the respective monetary units were expressed in gold, so likewise were the quotas whose gold values were supposed to be maintained and a minor part of which were payable in gold. On the other hand, the respective monetary units were variable administratively, and frequent changes in their definitive gold pars were apparently contemplated as an important instrument of monetary policy. Such a concept is clearly contradictory to the principles and practices of the historic gold standard, under which a change in the gold content of the unit of value is looked upon as a break-down of the gold standard. Be it remembered that there was not a single change in the gold content of the pound sterling throughout nearly a century of Britain's gold-coin standard, and not one in that of our own American gold dollar, from the beginning of the gold-coin standard in 1879 to its demise 56 years later.

John Maynard Keynes, whose ideas largely prevailed in the development and final formulation of the Bretton Woods Stabilization Plan, said in a speech in the House of Lords, May 23, 1944: "If I have any authority to pronounce on what is and what is not the essence and meaning of the gold standard, I should say that the plan is the exact opposite of it." And then, after referring to his long-time opposition to the gold standard, Keynes said: "Was it not I, when many of today's iconoclasts were still worshippers of the calf, who wrote that 'Gold is a barbarous relic'?"

Yes, the Bretton Woods plan is, as Keynes says, the exact opposite of the gold standard. It is a collection of managed-paper-money standards which, in practice, would be largely controlled by a politically dominated international board. This board would be controlled by debtor nations who, most of the time, would believe their interests to be in the direction of monetary debasement and of extensive borrowing from the fund. The United States would provide the greater part of the gold funds available for borrowing, and would find itself under heavy international pressure, both political and economic, continually to debase the American dollar.

In my judgment the Bretton Woods stabilization plan, for this reason if for no others—and there are others—should be rejected by the American Congress.

BRETTON WOODS AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR WORLD PEACE

The administration of late has been saying that the Bretton Woods plan is an integral part of a comprehensive, unified, one-piece program for international reconstruction—a program planned by the United States and other peace-loving nations to improve economic conditions generally throughout the world. It covers Dumbarton Oaks proposals, lend-lease, tariff reduction, cartels, food, and agricultural organization, etc. To this effect, Secretary Morgenthau recently called the Bretton Woods plan "the historical pattern of international economic cooperation that world peace demands. * * * The fate of the Treaty of Versailles," he said, "adds to the significance of the course we adopt on the Bretton Woods proposals. * * * We must always keep in mind that other nations are anxiously asking whether the United States has the desire and ability to cooperate effectively in establishing world peace. If we fail to ratify the Bretton Woods agreements they will be convinced that the American people either do not desire to cooperate or that they do not know how to achieve cooperation." If we in the United States fail to approve this particular plan of world monetary and credit reform we will, we are told, pull down on the heads of all of us the whole recently visioned temple of international peace and comity.

This attitude on the part of the administration tends to make the opponents of the Bretton Woods plan appear to be selfish isolationists, which most of them are not. In fact, nearly all of these opponents desire fundamentally the same end as do the pro-

tagonists of Bretton Woods, namely, a sound and stable international monetary system, efficient production, freedom of trade, and peace and comity among nations. It is precisely because so many of us believe that the Bretton Woods plan would be in conflict with these worthy objects as that plan would actually work out in the kind of a world we shall be living in, that we oppose the plan.

There is an erroneous implication in the recent statement of Secretary Morgenthau that "* * * the Bretton Woods Conference had to succeed because there is no other method of dealing with international monetary and financial problems than through international cooperation." Of course, there is no other satisfactory method for dealing with these great international problems than by international cooperation, but there are many other methods of monetary and financial cooperation than the Bretton Woods plan.

Realistically speaking, and for the reasons previously stated, the trend of the Bretton Woods system would, in fact, be toward multiple paper-money standards and monetary nationalism. The only prospect today for a truly international standard is gold, and the only realistic monetary internationalists are the advocates of an international gold standard.

What then should be done?

AN INTERNATIONAL GOLD STANDARD PLAN RECOMMENDED

My recommendations, very briefly summarized, would be the ones I gave last April, in testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. They are:

1. The first requirement of any post-war monetary standard that can be wisely adopted internationally and maintained for any considerable time is that it shall have the confidence of the people. To this end it should be simple and be a development out of a long, common experience. This requirement alone should put the Bretton Woods stabilization plan out of the running. That plan is so complicated that even very few economists pretend to understand it, and among those few there is much disagreement. There is much wisdom in the old companion proverbs: "The greatest truths are the simplest" and "The people distrust what they do not understand."

2. My second point was well stated in the 1931 report of the MacMillan committee of 14 eminent British economists and financiers, including John Maynard Keynes. It said: "There is, perhaps, no more important object in the field of human technique than that the world as a whole should achieve a sound and scientific monetary system. But there can be little or no hope of progress at an early date for the monetary system of the world as a whole except as a result of a process of evolution, starting from the historic gold standard."

3. No sound currency can long exist anywhere unless it rests firmly upon the foundations of a balanced budget and otherwise sane fiscal policies. The financial structure must be built up from the bottom, not down from the top. The report of the Genoa International Economic Conference a quarter of a century ago well said:

"So long as there is a deficiency in the annual budget of the state which is met by the creation of fiduciary money or bank credits, no currency reform is possible. * * * The balancing of the budget will go far to remedy an adverse balance of external payment by reducing internal consumption. But it is recognized that in the case of some countries the adverse balance is such as to render the attainment of equilibrium in the budget difficult without the assistance in addition of an external loan."

4. The monetary unit should be established in each country after a conference with other countries, but without any compulsion from them whatever. The determination of the size of a nation's monetary unit is affected with such a great public interest and is so highly prized as a prerogative of sovereignty that it is impracticable to subject it to outside interference. If compulsory interference from outside is undertaken it is not likely to be effective.

5. While there should be some management of the gold standard, both international and national, this management should be kept as small as possible and should be superimposed upon a system that is fundamentally automatic in its operation.

6. There should be a high degree of freedom in the international movement of goods and services. The gold standard can function over high tariff barriers, as it has many times in the past, but high tariff barriers are obstacles to international trade and to the smooth and orderly functioning of any monetary standard.

7. The principal monetary authority in each country should be a central bank.

8. An international gold standard will call for an international bank with which the central banks of all gold-standard countries should be affiliated and to which they should contribute the necessary capital. The functions of this bank should be exclusively of a monetary and banking character. It should be a central bank of central banks. The bank should not make long-time loans to its member banks nor otherwise enter the field of fiscal operations.

9. The United States Government should promptly declare its intention to rehabilitate its own gold standard after the war, and should, in due time, call an international monetary conference of all other countries desiring to return to a gold basis, with the object of formulating plans for the restoration of the international gold standard and for international cooperation to make that standard a better standard.

I want to close this address with a question pertinent for a democracy. How would the American people vote if they were fairly presented with the question: What kind of an American dollar would you prefer, for the payment of your wages, your defense bonds, your life insurance and your bank deposits, and for the carrying on of your business, a gold-standard dollar or a managed-paper-money-standard dollar of the Bretton Woods type, largely under the control of a governmentally appointed international board of managers?

Destitution in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein three letters recently sent from Italy indicating the desperate plight of some Italian people:

DEAR BROTHER-IN-LAW: After a long time and after many years we can thank God, at least, that we are alive. My son and I are well. Your father, up to now, is in good health. You know that he is very old. I am happy that you are all well.

I suppose you know that in this war, you are considered the most fortunate, for you have experienced no days of fear and horror; isn't that so? But I need not tell you all we have been through. As you must already know by your radio and newspapers.

Everything has been taken away from us. All our sheep, cows, pigs, and donkey. We have undergone many hardships. Now, in order to start over again, it would take, at least, 20,000 lire. Where will I get this money? I don't know what to do. Best regards to you and your family.

Your sister-in-law.

DEAR UNCLE: I am writing this note to let you know that I am well, along with my mother and grandfather. How are you getting along?

In our town you can find nothing. If you can send a package, please send some clothes and shoes. Please send them as soon as possible.

Regards to all.

Your nephew.

NOVEMBER 26, 1944.

DEAR SON: After a long silence, I received your letter that I longed for very much. It finally reached me and you can imagine how happy I was. I am happy that you are all well and we are too.

Thank God we have been left alive, but I can tell you we suffered terribly, it was a year of torment. We pray to God that those sad days will not return again. We find ourselves in bad times. We have to do our best, especially when we can't find any clothes or shoes.

My dear son, if you will, please send me a pair of shoes and a suit, for at my death I have nothing to put on, because here, there is nothing. I have been left naked.

If you can, when you receive this letter, send me a package. I have heard that you can send packages now, so I think you will send me one.

Best regards to your wife and children. I regret that it hasn't been possible for me to know my grandchildren, but I send them my blessing, that's all I can do.

There is nothing else to say, except that I wish you a merry Christmas if this letter arrives on time.

Best regards.

Your loving father.

A. M. Ettesvold, Typical Midwestern Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, last year an interesting survey was made in the six States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Montana, Iowa, and Nebraska. This area is 82 percent rural. The survey conducted was nonpartisan, nonpolitical, and factual. It was conducted by Station WNAX at Yankton, S. Dak.

The survey, as conducted, is explained in the document presented herewith for printing in the RECORD. The purpose of the survey was to determine, through case histories, carefully examined and recorded, who was to be considered the most typical Midwest farmer in the area of the six States. I am proud to state

that the honor was awarded to an old neighbor and friend of mine, Mr. A. M. Ettesvold, and his family. I ask unanimous consent that the record of that survey, including the history of this family, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASE HISTORY OF MR. ANTON M. ETTESVOLD, MORRIS, MINN.

If there is such a title as an "All American Farmer," the title belongs to A. M. Ettesvold, who lives on a farm about 3 miles north of Cyrus. He was born in 1877 which makes him 67 years of age at the present time and still active and going strong. He bought his father's homestead in 1904 and added an extra eighty in 1911.

Mr. Ettesvold has always been active and progressive in community projects and held many offices. From 1905 to 1940 he served on the Town Board of Supervisors (chairman for several years). He served on the Cyrus Farmers' Elevator board of directors from 1903 to the present time. He served on the Cyrus Mutual Telephone board from 1910 to 1930. He has been a member of the Cyrus Consolidated School from 1926 to the present time, and is chairman of the board. Fourteen years he was on the Cyrus Shipping Association Board, and in 1932 he was a member of the Stevens County Welfare Board. He was relief certification officer in Stevens County from 1933 to 1937.

From 1940 and until the present time he continues on the Stevens County Board of Commissioners. From 1938 to 1941 he was chairman of the State farm tenancy program of the State of Minnesota. He is an ex officio board member of the Douglas R. E. A. since 1940. He was a trustee of the Skandia Free Church for several years, and sexton now. He was chairman of the Stevens County Civilian Defense at time of organization.

Mr. Ettesvold's farm consists of 333 acres. He raises small grain, corn, and alfalfa. He has overcome many obstacles—2 years of drought, 1 year of complete hail-out, 4 years partly hailed out, and he has had the average family sicknesses with heavy hospital and doctor bills to pay. His success today is due to his own initiative. He has raised a family of 11 children and has given them all a good education. He is a patriotic and public-minded citizen, has always been interested in better farming, and is a good religious citizen. He has taken an active part in all war drives, such as bond drives, salvage drives, and so forth.

He was married to Rosetha Lee December 31, 1905. They have added the following buildings and improvements to their farm home through the years: Chicken house, two silos, granary, garage, workshop, well, well house, and corncrib. They built a new house in 1926, put in electricity in 1941—R. E. A. project—installed sewage system in 1942, and running water to the buildings in 1944.

Eleven children were born to them, and all are living. They have a service flag in their home which has six stars on it, denoting six in the service of their country. Those not serving in that capacity are either engaged in agriculture or engaged as teachers or homemakers. Their children are as follows:

Maynard Oliver, born 1907, graduated from Cyrus High School in 1925—salutatorian; attended Concordia College, Moorhead, Minn.; graduated cum laude from St. Paul College of Law, 1935. He began practice of law in Elbow Lake, Minn.; became partner of Ruben Nelson at Breckenridge, Minn. In 1937 he served as city attorney and 2 years as county attorney of Wilkin County before being drafted. He is now serving in the Army in England, with the rank of corporal. His wife, Charlotte, is serving in the WAC.

Alvin Rudolph graduated from the Cyrus High School in 1926—valedictorian. He attended Concordia College, graduated with distinction from the University of Minnesota. In 1937 his major was agricultural economics. He was employed by the Federal Land bank until drafted. He served in Africa and Italy and now is in the United States. He has the rank of master sergeant.

Clarence graduated from the Cyrus High School in 1927. He farmed with his father until 1938, when he was married. He bought his own farm in 1943 in Framnas Township, not so far from his father's farm. He is a member of the Stevens County A. A. A. Board. He has one son.

Mildred graduated from the Cyrus High School in 1930, married Oscar Weers, and lives on a farm near Morris, Minn. They have three children.

Werdna graduated from the Cyrus High School in 1930, valedictorian; attended Glenwood Normal training department, and taught in Stevens County rural schools 6 years. She married Carl Weers and they live on a farm near Morris, Minn. They have two children.

Winfred graduated from the Cyrus High School in 1931, salutatorian. He was graduated from the University of Minnesota with distinction in 1937. He received his master's degree at Purdue University in 1939. He was assistant professor of agricultural economics at the North Dakota Agricultural College from 1938 to 1942. He was married in 1941. He is now first lieutenant in the Army Air Corps.

Earl graduated from the Cyrus High School, 1933, valedictorian. He farmed with his father until 1942 and is now serving in the Army as staff sergeant in antiaircraft.

Thelma graduated from the Cyrus High School in 1935, salutatorian. She attended Glenwood Normal; taught in Stevens County rural schools for 3 years. She attended the University of Minnesota; graduated from St. Cloud Teachers College in 1941. She taught in Santiago and Osakis, Minn. She enlisted in the SPARS in 1943 and now holds rank of ensign.

Nina graduated from the Cyrus High School in 1938. Graduated from St. Cloud State Teachers' College in 1941. She taught in the Stevens County rural schools 2 years and is now teaching fifth and sixth grades at Chokio, Minn.

Rose graduated from the Cyrus High School in 1940, salutatorian. She attended the St. Cloud State Teachers College for 1 year. At the present time she is a student at the university, where her major is journalism.

Kermit graduated from the Cyrus High School in 1943. At present he is helping his father run the farm. He is also adult leader of the Framnas 4-H Club.

All the children have been active 4-H members, winning prizes, trips and distinction in their projects.

Mrs. Ettesvold has been a very active P. T. A. member of the Cyrus school; served as its president. When the service flag was presented to the P. T. A., Mrs. Ettesvold received the honor to accept it as she had the most stars on it. She also took part in county home demonstration work; is one of the organizers of the Framnas Jolly Workers, is also active in Ladies Aid work in her church. Mrs. Ettesvold's brother, Alfred T. Lee, makes his home with them and is assisting in every way possible to keep the ball rolling till the boys come home when the war is won.

Mr. Ettesvold is the typical "all American" in all respects.

(NOTE.—Since this case history was written, their oldest son, Maynard Oliver, was killed in action in France on September 26, 1944.)

BRIEF RÉSUMÉ OF MIDWEST FARMER DAY

Midwest Farmer Day, sponsored by radio station WNAX, is to honor all farmers whose production of food has been so important in the eventual winning of the war and the peace. Soldiers on our fighting fronts have been given medals, and rightfully so; workers in war plants have received E awards, and in some cases medals, for their achievements.

To the best of our knowledge, WNAX is the only one thus far to pause and pay proper tribute to the farmers for their war efforts. We at WNAX are familiar with the tremendous job they are doing in the face of many obstacles—shortages such as that of farm machinery, manpower, etc. We could relate hundreds of stories of these "soldiers of the soil" and their individual efforts in increasing their production of beef, pork, and grains. We could tell of the long hours of hard work in the fields—hard hours put in, knowing that he must produce more food that this world might be fed; knowing that his job was one of the important ones in bringing back home that son who is now fighting on foreign soil.

The States of North and South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Montana stand out in the purchase of War bonds. The fact that this area is 82-percent rural is additional proof that the farmers are doing their share to help finance this war.

WNAX sensed the responsibility to tell America of the job being done by the Midwest farmer. This, we feel, has been accomplished through the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System with their coast-to-coast programs—Trans-Atlantic Call, Columbia Country Journal, and Vox Pop. These three radio programs originated in Yankton, and used as their themes the story of the Midwest farmer and the part he is playing in winning the war.

Months before Midwest Farmer Day, letters were sent to bankers, county extension agents, and newspapers in our five-State area, asking them to submit to us case histories on outstanding farmers in their particular area. In writing these case histories, they were asked to consider several points; such as, the success of the farmer due to his own ambition and initiative, his increased crop and livestock production, his community standing and community activities, the part he played in the various war drives—the scrap drives, War bond drives, etc.

Several hundred of these case histories were received from the five States. On the 23d of August, the five extension editors representing their respective States, came to Yankton; and from these case histories they selected their first and second choice. On Midwest Farmer Day, September 4, the winning family from each State was brought to Yankton. The entire day was set aside to pay tribute and thanks to the Midwest farmer for his part in the war effort.

The day's entertainment, which was all absolutely free, started with a chuck-wagon breakfast, put on by 55 modern cowboys from Winner, S. Dak. They brought over 50 head of horses to Yankton, along with the chuck wagon, to participate in Midwest Farmer Day.

This was followed by the inductions as chiefs into the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, Adjutant General of the United States Army; Maj. Gen. C. H. Danielson, commandant of the Seventh Corps Area; Hon. Chan Gurney, senior Senator from South Dakota; Brace Beemer, the Lone Ranger; and Parks Johnson and Warren Hull of the Columbia Broadcasting Co.'s coast-to-coast Vox Pop show.

At noon a banquet was held in honor of the five farm families. All the dignitaries present participated in the banquet paying tribute to the midwest farmer. This was the second banquet, the first being given in their honor by the chamber of commerce and local dignitaries in Yankton, upon their arrival the Sunday before September 4.

The afternoon performance before approximately 35,000 people was opened by Governor Sharpe, of South Dakota. Appearing on this program in addition to Governor Sharpe were Governor Thye, of Minnesota; Rufus Howard, secretary of agriculture, Nebraska; the Honorable Kenneth Simons, of North Dakota; Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio and Gardner Cowles, Jr. In addition to these dignitaries, there was entertainment featuring the Lone Ranger of radio fame, along with the WNAX radio artists, the WAC band from Fort Des Moines, Iowa, and the 70-piece Air Corps band from Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

At the close of the afternoon performance, the five farm families were introduced to the audience, the case history on each family read and turned over to the judges, Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, Maj. Gen. C. H. Danielson, Senator Chan Gurney, etc., at which time the selection of the outstanding typical farmer was made. A parade, made up of both bands mentioned above, horses, cowboys, Indians, and celebrities, and covering an area of better than eight blocks, was also a part of the afternoon performance.

The importance of the event was shown by the Columbia Broadcasting System, when it originated three coast-to-coast programs from here. Also one of Columbia's clients, who originated its program from Yankton, in order that it might be the first to announce to a national audience the name of the farmer to be given the title of typical Midwest farmer. As they put it, the citation was given to him, and through him the thanks and praise was carried to all farm people of the Midwest for their contribution to the war effort.

The Vox Pop program was followed by the speaker of the evening, Major General Danielson, who spoke on the farmer's part in the war effort. In connection with both Major General Danielson's and Major General Ulio's talks, two Army exhibits—one from the Ordnance Department and one from the Quartermaster Department—were on constant display, and were undoubtedly viewed by the 60,000 people gathered in Yankton throughout the day.

The second talk of the evening was given by Capt. Ralph W. Ilmanen, a Troop Carrier Command hero. Captain Ilmanen told of what food meant to the boys in the South Pacific. Captain Ilmanen has made in excess of 275 missions over "the hump."

As a part of the evening performance, J. Norman Lodge, commonly known as the Old Sarge—a veteran of both wars and now a war correspondent, brought a message from the battle theaters, again paying tribute to the farmer and what food means to the boys in the battle theaters. Also featured on the evening performance were the Army bands mentioned previously, Gray Gordon's Tic Toc Rhythm Band, and other entertainment.

The climax to the night performance was the presenting of 1943's Typical Midwest Farmer who in turn, turned the crown over to the 1944 winner, and the awarding of gifts of appreciation to the winner. The winning farm family received a certificate giving them a farm tractor as soon as production of farm tractors makes it possible. In addition, they are to receive a trip to Washington in January, to be the guests of their Congressmen, to participate in a banquet given in their honor, and to take part in the inauguration of the next President of the United States. The runner-up families were awarded a $100 War bond, plus $25 War bonds to each member of the family. In addition, they were given a farm wagon chassis and other gifts of use in the farm field. Each farm wife received an electric dehydrator for home use. The evening performance was closed with a fireworks display, carrying the slogan:

CARRY ON TILL VICTORY

This is a brief summary of our effort to pin a medal on the midwest farmers for their efforts in food production. All of us are very much aware of the importance of this food army and of their record of increased production in spite of the shortage of equipment and manpower.

Comments from Washington, New York, and across the United States have been so overwhelming that Midwest Farmer Day in Yankton, S. Dak., will undoubtedly continue to be an annual event and grow in importance.

Look magazine covered the entire day and pictured the event as the biggest farm picnic in the world. This further informed radio listeners from coast to coast of the importance of the farmers' work in winning the war and the peace.

As you know, in order to present such an outstanding day, considerable effort and time were needed from the employees of WNAX. An event this large takes months of preparation. We are already starting the ground work for next year's Midwest Farmer Day in Yankton, S. Dak.

The Red Mass at Catholic University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 4, 1945, at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception at the Catholic University of America here in the Nation's Capital, the Red Mass, the solemn votive Mass of the Holy Spirit, for the Courts and Congress of the United States of America was celebrated. In connection with this very impressive and important religious service the sermon was delivered by the Most Reverend Duane G. Hunt, bishop of Salt Lake City.

I have known Bishop Hunt for a great many years, having met him first as a member of the faculty of the University of Utah when I was studying law at that institution. I was at that time thoroughly impressed with his sincerity, his intelligence, and character. He has for many years been considered one of the great religious scholars, teachers and leaders of western United States. His selection to deliver the sermon in connection with the celebration of the Red Mass here in Washington indicates that his worth, sincerity and ability are recognized throughout our Nation.

I was fortunate enough to be able to attend the Red Mass and to listen to the sermon delivered by Bishop Hunt. In the audience I noticed many of my colleagues from the Senate and the House of Representatives. I was thoroughly impressed by the solemnity and the beauty of the Red Mass and also by the excellent and exceptional sermon delivered by Bishop Hunt.

I realize that many of my colleagues for causes beyond their control were unable to attend this religious function, and because of the timeliness and the importance of the sermon delivered by Bishop Hunt on that occasion I ask unanimous consent to have it included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sure that all my colleagues who heard this sermon will join me in commending it to the Members of the Senate and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have a brief description of the Red Mass, which has been prepared and delivered to me by the Catholic University, follow the sermon of Bishop Hunt in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon and description were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SANCTITY OF HUMAN RIGHTS

"For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities and the powers, against the world rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual forces of wickedness on high." Ephesians vi: 12.

In the present desperate crisis of civilization, we may well ask if the shadow of tyranny will eventually be lifted or if it will settle down over the world as a pall of darkness for centuries to come. The answer is to be sought not merely in the clash of arms on fields of battle; not merely in the deliberations of parliaments and diplomatic conferences. Over and above these, it is to be sought in the clash of opinions in the field of thought. It is to be sought in the age-old spiritual conflict between truth and error.

The subject of human rights may be approached from two opposite points of view. The one is that of principle and law; the other is that of physical force. The one is identified with religion; the other, with the cult of nationalism. The one exalts the authority of God; the other, the authority of the state. And, strangely enough, there is nothing else. Between these two extreme points of view there is no logical stopping place. Either we are climbing up toward the one or we are being pulled down toward the other.

The Christian point of view starts, where all logical reasoning must start, with the existence of God. It looks to Him as the First Cause, the one necessary and uncreated Being. It declares that He is the Creator of all things: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

Concerning man, Christianity understands that he is not the product of blind forces of nature. He is a creature, created according to the will and purpose of God. He is made to God's own image and likeness, being given immortality and being endowed with an intellect and a free will. There is set before him a noble and worthy end, which he is commanded to attain. In the words of the children's catechism: "Man is created to know God, to love and serve Him on earth, and to be happy with Him forever in heaven." This statement, so childlike in its implicity, nevertheless is most profound. It discloses the only secure foundation for justice among men.

For the fulfillment of any command God gives appropriate means. In order that man may attain the great purpose of his creation God endows him with certain rights. Among these, that of life itself is primary. This is more than a right, of course; the preservation of life is a duty. Similarly, there is the right to worship God and obey His commands; also, a duty. Then there are the freedoms. Man has the right to physical and spiritual security, free from interference and fear. He has the right to express himself freely, in speech, in press, in association, in art, in work and in play. There is the right to own property, with the corresponding right to choose property. There is the right to marry, and the right not to marry. There is the right of marital fidelity; and the right of parents to possess their children in unbroken homes.

These are men's natural rights. They are his moral possession, even though at times he may not be able physically to defend them. They belong to him, not because he is a subject of civil government or a citizen of a country or a member of society. They belong to man precisely because he is man. They are called natural rights because they are due to man's nature and because they come through the process of nature. Even so, they are supernatural in origin, tracing back to God, who is above nature.

Man is a special being, made so by his Creator. God intends that men shall live together, with each man respecting the rights of every other man. Inasmuch, however, as man has free agency and thus may choose to do evil, there is always present the possibility that some men will interfere with the rights of their fellowmen. The regulation of conduct, therefore, is necessary. Civil government, with physical power to enforce its laws, is necessary.

Let it be noted that government does not give authority to itself. The idea is self contradictory. Authority comes to government from above. It is indicated implicitly in man's social nature, through which it flows from Almighty God, the Author of man's nature. It follows, as a matter of course, that government is not absolute. It is bound, no less than the individual man, to submit to the divine and objective code of morals.

The principles by which governments live and act and rule should come from above, not below. They should reflect the purpose of God, not the selfishness of man; the perfection of God, not the weakness of man. They are not to be compromised in favor of popular demands or national ambitions. They are not to be interpreted as judges wish them to be. They are to be stated as they are. They are to be drawn from the unfailing deposit of God's truth, from the laws of nature and revelation, and, through the highest skill of legal genius, are to be applied to problems of government. Each new definition of law, therefore, should be a further unfolding of God's wisdom, a new enrichment for mankind.

Both man and government are thus expected to give glory to Almighty God; the one by honorably exercising his rights and the other by securely protecting those rights. This, my friends, is the Christian concept of justice and of the relationship between man and civil government. And I would have you note the order; God is first, man is second, and government is third.

This scheme of things has found one of its noblest expressions in the United States of America. Its statement in our Declaration of Independence has few equals in all the political documents of American history. "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

This has been our creed. It was the basis for our Federal Constitution, which we ordained to "establish justice" and to "secure the blessings of liberty." It became the guide for our State constitutions and for statutes and judicial decisions. It has been woven into the very fabric of our society. With liberty for ourselves at home and honorable dealings with our neighbors abroad, honorable for the most part, this creed, this religiously inspired creed, has given us a century and a half of glorious history.

Now consider, if you please, the opposite point of view, that of nationalism. It takes a variety of forms, depending upon circumstances, and expresses itself in varying degrees of frankness. In one country it may be identified with emperor worship; in another, with hero worship. In former centuries its defenders talked about the divine right of kings; today they talk about social utility or national destiny or racial supremacy. It may be called nazi-ism or atheistic communism, or merely totalitarianism. They are all similar. They all stem from the same root, the notion that civil government, as the spokesman of society, is above law.

I have said that in the correct order of things God is first, man second, and government third. It is highly significant that, whenever God is left out, the order of the other two beings sooner or later is reversed. Government sets itself up in the higher place, that of master, which it can do by its collective physical power, with man relegated to the lower place, that of servant. Precisely to the degree that government ignores God, it makes itself supreme, and then substitutes might for right.

The reason is as clear as the weakness of human nature. As in man, animal passions and appetities must at all times be held under control by the higher faculties, so it is also with civil governments and nations; selfish inclinations, greed for conquest, and lust for power, must be subdued by respect for law, by love for God, and for neighbor. Physical force at all times must be dominated by spiritual idealism. Once let a nation cease to look above itself for moral guidance, once let it regard itself as all-sufficient, and it is doomed eventually to surrender to the downward pull of lower nature.

This pressure of nationalism is one of the most powerful forces within the whole wide range of human experience. It is always present, even when only dormant; in every country it must be reckoned with. As is to be expected, it characterizes pagan countries. What is not to be expected, however, is that it should become dominant in Christian countries.

The experience of Germany warns of what may occur anywhere. The German Nation did not fall suddenly into its present madness. The groundwork had been laid over a period of many generations in the field of speculative thought by the writings of the anti-Christian philosophers, Trietschke, Nietsche, Marx, Hegel, Fichte, and others. Their doctrines, as a noxious leaven, had worked through German minds and had produced the superstate psychology. Under its spell, millions of Germans—the great majority, it would seem—became unbelievably apathetic about the preservation of their individual rights. They were victimized by the worst of slaveries, that of the soul.

The record of nationalism is its own condemnation. As the means to their ends, governments of modern nations have not hesitated to commit every kind of crime. They have suppressed freedom of speech and association; confiscated private property; banished citizens to foreign lands; punished alleged law violators without trial; proscribed religion; sterilized the socially unfit; snuffed out the lives of the insane, the aged, and the incurables; ruthlessly exterminated political opponents and racial groups. Against such crime, what plea could the injured victim make? His rights, he had been told, come from the state. The state had given, the state had taken away; blessed be the name of the state.

The curse of nationalism extends in both directions. If a government has no respect for the rights of its own people, it certainly feels none for the rights of other nations. It plots wars to acquire territory and power, with no question of morality raised, only that of opportunity. And in the prosecution of such wars, again, no human right is respected. It would seem that in the present-day massacre of civilians and the murder of helpless prisoners and hostages, civilization has sunk to an all-time low.

Against this monstrous thing freemen throughout the world have risen in righteous protest. Against it we of this country are fighting with all the resources at our command; against it our young men are now dying on distant battlefields. And yet, here at home, in our own speculating about human rights and government, we have begun to drift in the same evil direction.

For the most part, totalitarianism in our country is still in the academic stage, that of classrooms and textbooks. This is the stage of preparation, wherein currents of thought are generated. And here, we note regretfully, a considerable advance has been made. The truth is that the major premise of totalitarianism is now being widely taught to the youth of our country.

Of late years, to explain what I mean, the doctrines contained in the Declaration of Independence have been increasingly ignored. They are regarded as old-fashioned. The explicit avowal of God-given rights, for instance, is no longer generally rehearsed in the classrooms of secular colleges; it is repudiated in many standard textbooks of political science and law. In contrast, the social-origin theory is favored and is being taught. And this puts society, and thus the State, in place of God as the source of human rights and of law; and this is the major premise of totalitarianism.

So that it will not appear that I exaggerate, I quote from a textbook recently published by a professor of a well-known college, his statement being typical of the school of so-called liberal thought. "Viewed from the high point of twentieth century historical and ethnological research, the Declaration is not wholly convincing. Only in a limited sense, if at all, have men ever been created equal, nor are they endowed with any rights except those they can obtain and hold, nor were governments, in spite of certain American precedents, originated to secure these 'unalienable rights.'" And there is the story. That we have only such rights as we are able to obtain and hold, is pure totalitarianism.

Let there be no mistake, however, about the attractiveness of this doctrine. It is attractive, as a matter of course, to those who deny the existince of God. It is attractive, likewise, to those who look for novelty, and who identify progress with repudiation of the past. It is attractive, also, to the liberals among us; strangely so, because when carried to its ultimate limit it destroys all individual liberty, the very thing the liberals profess to demand. Being attractive, it is dangerous; and it is pointing us toward the very type of tyranny which now, by blood and tears, we are attempting to destroy.

In this conflict, this spiritual conflict, you, the representatives of the legal profession, are the front-line warriors. To you is entrusted a sublime duty, that of defining and defending God-ordained justice. You are to attack the heresies of the day and by the force of your scholarship to destroy them. You are to turn back the current of the times and direct it once more into channels of truth, back toward our Declaration of Independence, back toward the Christian concept of justice.

In this high endeavor you have a right to the clarifying influence of the Christian religion. In sanctuaries like this, dedicated to the worship of God, you are reminded of His superlative estimate of man's worth. Here you are taught that human souls are so precious that our divine Lord Himself died to save them. Here in this sacred place you catch a glimpse of the unique and exalted dignity of man.

You have the right, moreover, to the prayers of the church, such as the devotions of this morning. Here is being celebrated the greatest act of worship ever entrusted to God's representatives, the renewal of the sacrifice on Mount Calvary. It is being offered in honor of the Holy Ghost, the spirit of truth, and is offered to you.

If the apostolic successors need the help of the Holy Spirit to protect them against

error, it would seem that you, also, need supernatural help. And so the church prays for you, prays that God will enlighten your minds and strengthen your wills. She prays that you will cooperate with the grace of God and thus serve well and faithfully the cause of justice. May it be said of you, after the manner of the inspired text: "You have loved justice and hated iniquity; therefore, God has anointed you with the oil of gladness."

THE RED MASS

For centuries it has been the custom in France for judges and the legislators, to participate in the Red Mass. The tradition was initiated by the judges who, conscious of their human limitations, met at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass to invoke the aid of the divine source of wisdom and justice in their deliberations.

The unique term, "the Red Mass," was adopted because the particular petition of the mass sought the aid of the Holy Spirit, symbolized by the flaming fire of divine love and wisdom. The vestments of the priests were red, and the robes of the justices who attended were scarlet.

The solemn significance of this votive mass was evidenced by the fact that a special chapel was erected in Paris during the reign of Louis IX, St. Louis of France (1225–1270), as a proper setting for this beautiful ceremony. Le Sainte Chappelle, an architectural gem, was used but once during the year and then for this impressive ceremony.

The spirit of this particular mass for the Holy Spirit may be understood from one short passage in the sequence:

"O guide our minds with Thy blest light,
With love our hearts inflame,
And with Thy strength, which ne'er decays,
Confirm our mortal frame."

The custom was adopted later in England where for several centuries members of the judiciary and the bar have joined in the Red Mass, celebrated at the time of the opening of the courts.

In the United States the tradition was inaugurated in New York. Today the observance takes place in New York, Illinois, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, California, and Massachusetts.

The Catholic University of America Law School inaugurated the annual custom of the Red Mass in the Nation's Capital as a part of the celebration of the jubilee year of the university in 1939.

Certify Labor Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and instructive editorial entitled "Certify Labor Leaders," taken from the January-February 1945 issue of the Railroad Workers Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CERTIFY LABOR LEADERS!

To eliminate any trouble, it is wise to learn the cause of it. This fundamental principle is applicable to all trouble, including labor trouble. When one examines unionism, evidence is brought forth that labor trouble seldom starts at the bottom. It is generally promoted at the top and by individuals who are either incapable of coping with ordinary grievances which are bound to arise, or by those who promote grievances for the sole purpose of creating turmoil and for a very definite purpose.

Now do not get this writer wrong—that all labor leaders are either incapable or just plain agitators. I am not trying to create this impression because I firmly believe that most labor leaders are conscientious and capable people striving to bring about harmonious relationship between employers and their employees. Unfortunately this class is not in the public eye very much of the time.

I do, however, intend to bring your attention to certain individuals who are heading labor unions, that labor would do well without. Their hearts are not in unionism, never were, and never will be. To them, unionism is just a means of gaining their selfish objectives irrespective of the outcome to the union they control. It is because of these people that I say, we should certify labor leaders.

You may ask yourself, "What does he mean when he says 'certify labor leaders' "? Well, to start with, I believe union leadership is a profession, an occupation one should be well proud of. It is an important one, too. Union leaders, whether they be good or bad, are important members of human society. Their actions, good or bad, do affect industry and in fact, our entire economic and political structure as well. Therefore, it is important to every citizen of these United States, whether members of organized labor or not, to demand that the responsibilities of this profession, like all recognized professions, be placed in the hands of responsible people.

Every thinking person realizes that many labor leaders are not in keeping with this profession. Daily news items tell us of aliens, fugitives from justices, ex-bootleggers, etc., etc., heading labor unions. With this type of leadership the outcome can only be detrimental to the best interests of unionism and our country as a whole.

Before we can ever expect to have peace and harmony in unions we must place men at the helm who believe in peace and harmony. I do not believe we can expect a square deal from the type of representative just mentioned in the above paragraph. To my mind, unionism, when operated in accordance with the true principles as laid down by the founders of this system, is something every workingman; yes, and every businessman, will welcome because it can be beneficial directly or indirectly to all elements of society. When the union members themselves appreciate true unionism they will realize it is for the betterment of conditions of honest workingmen, industry, and our Nation as a whole. When they come to this realization they will rid themselves of those not worthy of this worth-while cause.

If unions are to be accepted as part of our American way of life, then they must operate accordingly. But how can they be part of our way of life when, in many instances, they are headed by aliens, people who accept the benefits of our American system and yet do not appreciate it enough to become part of it? Yes, we have, and I can prove it, union leaders who are not citizens of the United States although they have been in this country sufficient time to have availed themselves of this great privilege. But, no. Their hearts belong to some other system of government, and in some cases, a system hostile to ours.

Our unions should profit by the leadership of the greatest union of all times, the union of the United States of America. When you examine the by-laws of this union you find, and in no uncertain language, that office holders of this union must be citizens of the United States. Therefore, it would be wise for all labor unions to incorporate a similar bylaw in their constitution. Then every aspirant for office in a union would be required to produce a certificate of citizenship in order to be eligible to hold office, whether this office be elective or selective. Further to this suggestion, the unions would do well by having a committee whose duty it would be to examine all candidates and appointees to office, and report its findings to the organization as a whole, either in regular meeting or regular convention. I do not believe that persons unbecoming unions would be able to slip into office because such a committee, made up of rank-and-file members, would never certify aliens or people with backgrounds unbecoming good unionism.

When you dig into the alien situation you begin to ask yourself, "What's stopping an alien labor leader from being in collusion with the country of his allegiance against the United States, if his country is going to profit at our expense?" What would stop a labor leader, heading a key industry, from slowing down the industry through labor trouble? It can be very beneficial to his country and highly detrimental to ours, especially during times of war if we happen to be producing something not to the liking of his country. I say, let us not take a chance, and a good way to safeguard America and our unions from being jeopardized by the actions of aliens and other undesirables in unions is to certify labor leaders.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor.

Paying for Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an address which I delivered in the New York Times Forum on January 23 last, on the subject, Paying for Public Education.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The greatest security of any nation is the enlightened spirit of its citizens. If the individual is blessed with knowledge, the nation is girded with strength.

In the past, education in our Nation has been held to be a State function. The States have in large measure delegated their powers over education to local units of government and placed a large part of the responsibility of financial support of schools upon the resources of local communities.

The result of our dependence upon local resources for the support of education is the wide and grievous disparity of educational opportunity offered to the children in the various communities in all parts of the Nation. On the one hand we find the children in our wealthier communities being taught by well-paid and well-trained teachers, with good books, an ample supply of teaching materials and modern instructional equipment, and attending school in modern and well-equipped buildings. On the other hand we find several million children in the poorer communities being taught by poorly paid teachers who are not even graduates of high school and sometimes not even graduates of an elementary school, with a few worn-out textbooks, no modern tools of

learning, and attending school in mere shacks.

At the time of our entry into the present World War, more than 5,000,000 children aged 5 to 17 were not in any kind of school. In 1940 over 1,000,000 children were enrolled in classrooms that had less than $500 a year for their financial support. At the other extreme over 1,000,000 children were enrolled in classrooms that had over $4,000 a year for their support. Everything necessary to good education is found in classrooms upon which $4,000 or more per year is expended, while hardly anything necessary to good schooling is found in those upon which less than $500 a year is expended.

The penalties of educational neglect are heavy and inescapable. During the present war, by November 1944, Selective Service had rejected some 4,500,000 men because of educational, mental, and physical deficiencies, a large percentage of which deficiencies could have been prevented by good public schools. It is a startling fact that in the present war nearly as many men have been rejected as were drafted in the First World War. Instead of being a part of the Nation's human wealth, these men are a burden of debt which we must carry because of our shortsightedness. If the unmarried men who have been rejected could have been accepted, it is entirely possible that we might have avoided the drafting of married men, with all the social consequences incident to the breaking up of families.

The duty of the Federal Government to protect our lives and safeguard our liberties is universally recognized. Yet there are many who still refuse to admit that any duty rests upon our Federal Government to protect the citizen and the Nation against the dangers of ignorance. The States simply cannot meet the full responsibility of education as many of them do not have the wealth or financial resources.

The appalling differences in educational opportunity, both among the States and within the States, are due to the differences in economic conditions that lie largely beyond the control of the several States. These differences are differences in wealth, in income, in taxpaying ability, in the extent of absentee ownership of natural resources and industry, and differences in the number of educable children in proportion to adults. The poorer States and communities have the largest proportion of children. States least able to support schools have the most children to be educated.

With these differences there cannot be equality of educational opportunity throughout the Nation except through Federal aid. Even if we had a suitable uniform tax plan in all the States, there would be nine States which, if they used every penny from the plan for education without any expenditures whatever for other governmental functions, still would not have sufficient revenues for an adequate program of public education.

Much of the wealth of the richer States has been drawn from the poorer States, but these poorer States cannot tax this wealth. Alabama, primarily an agricultural State, sends millions of dollars each normal, peacetime year into other States for the purchase of automobiles, farm machinery, clothing, and manufactured goods and commodities of all kinds. Alabama cannot tax the profits derived from the millions of Alabama dollars sent out of her borders. The Federal Government can tax these profits.

The Federal Government takes the sons of the poorer States in this time of war and sends them into battle where many of them will die to save our Nation. Why should not the Federal Government aid in educating the sons of these poorer States to live and serve our Nation in time of peace? If the Federal Government can spend billions for war, it can afford to spend millions to give American children their birthright—health and education.

If the past be a guide to the future, fears that Federal aid might mean Federal control of our schools are without foundation. The long experience of the Federal Government has demonstrated again and again that there can be Federal aid to the States for education without Federal control. Land grant aids, beginning with grants to Ohio in 1803, and the two Morril acts of 1862 and 1890, providing for the land-grant colleges, large annual Federal appropriations for vocational education, and many other acts of Federal aid prove that Federal assistance without Federal encroachment can be given.

Federal grants should be made to the States for general elementary and secondary schools. Grants should be made according to an objective formula written into the law, so that the amount of money going to a State will be a matter of arithmetic and not subject to the discretion of any Federal official. The funds should be granted through the United States Office of Education and expended by the States through their respective State departments of education, according to the laws of the States. The Thomas-Hill-Ramspeck bill, now pending in Congress, will definitely establish such a policy and such a program for Federal aid to education.

The time is at hand when Federal aid must be provided. The national interest and the people's welfare demand it.

Ours is a government in which sovereignty resides in the people. The fundamental instrument of policy and control is the popular ballot. Such a government must depend upon the degree of enlightenment and the loyalty of the masses of the people.

Education is the strength that we possess. Public education is the means by which the citizens of the democratic nation are given the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and the will to serve effectively the ideals, aspirations, and institutions of our country. The public-school system is the agency through which the democratic state undertakes to perpetuate itself. If we fail to give to the children of our country, its future citizens, the opportunity to receive enlightenment, the opportunity to build and develop character, intelligence, and leadership, we deny democracy itself. We shut off the springs from which the democracy receives its life-giving waters. If we shut off those springs, the inevitable end must be the death of democracy.

Manpower in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two telegrams which I have received from the editor of the Portland Oregonian, Mr. Palmer Hoyt, one dated February 4, 1945, dealing with the problem of manpower in the great Pacific Northwest, setting forth evidence that there is a surplus of manpower in that area, in that thousands of workers are being laid off. We are really confronted with an unemployment problem, apparently, in that area. These telegrams bear upon the so-called work-or-fight measure.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Portland Oregonian of February 4, 1945, entitled "The Coercion Bill."

I submit this evidence because I think it has a bearing upon the burden of proof which rests on those who favor the work-or-fight bill, namely, to present evidence—not opinion, but evidence—showing that there is a need for it from the standpoint of the manpower problems of the country.

There being no objection, the telegrams and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1945.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

Washington, D. C.:

The following article appeared on page 1 of the Oregonian news section, Sunday, February 4:

"More than 3,000 members of the war-swollen boilermakers Local 72 have been laid off by Portland shipyards in the last week, Ralph Calhoun, union business agent, revealed Saturday.

"The disclosure came after Calhoun and a representative of the United States Employment Service had conferred most of the day with 20 women welders discharged at the end of the "graveyard shift" at Albania Engine & Machine Works Saturday morning. The women were offered other jobs, said United States Employment Service Representative James Bagan, but declined them.

"The welders stormed their union headquarters and demanded some sort of action, Calhoun stated, and most of them are puzzled that they were laid off while work-or-fight legislation is being debated in Congress.

" 'There wasn't anything I could tell them,' the business agent declared. 'The personnel agent at Albina told me when I called him that more people were going to be terminated every week. I called the United States Employment Service so the women could speak their piece to somebody who is supposed to know the answers.

" 'There is a manpower shortage in this area just the same as all over the country,' he continued, 'but there isn't any worker shortage. The women have been working in the shipyards for a long time, and if they were needed they could continue. Men are being fired, too.'

"Calhoun pointed out that this is the first time Portland has had more labor than it could absorb since the beginning of the war. His statement also highlighted the crisis the city might face when the war ends. 'These people haven't any money,' he asserted, 'I've given away more money than I've made in the last week just to help men with families get something to eat, they're out on a limb,' Calhoun continued. 'They haven't any place to sleep. A lot of them, and no money to rent a place. Several men slept in the railroad station last night.'

"L. C. Stoll, War Manpower Commission head in the Portland district, said that as far as he knew every person discharged from the shipyards up to noon Saturday had been offered a job in some other shipyard or 'another high-priority industry.' "

The January 28 issue of the Oregonian carried on page 1 an article telling of 2,000 employees of Swan Island shipyard laid off because of lack of materials and resulting changes in shipbuilding schedules.

L. C. Stoll, War Manpower Commission head here said at the time that the efficient workers among the 2,000 would find employment in other shipyards, while those with poor attendance records would have to talk over their troubles with the unions.

A. R. Nieman, assistant general manager of the Swan Island yard, reported that th

yard's new shipbuilding schedule had been reduced from six ships a month to a ship a week.

Stoll said Swan Island in about 60 days will be in need of some of the workers being laid off now.

Speaking of the cooperation that exists here between unions and shipbuilding management. Stoll said: "If unions and management in the rest of the United States would cooperate as well with the United States Employment Service as they do here, there would be no need of a national manpower conscription.

PALMER HOYT,
The Oregonian.

PORTLAND OREG., *February 7, 1945.*

Hon. Senator WAYNE L. MORSE;
Washington, D. C.:

Attached is report of speech made in Portland by Lee C. Stoll, head of war manpower in this State.

With little hope being given by the Army, Navy, or Maritime Commission of future war contracts in the Portland area, and the prospect that labor requirement here will be definitely eased within the next 30 days and drastically reduced by June, there seems no excuse for anyone talking at this time about work-or-fight legislation so far as Oregon is concerned," State War Manpower Commission Director Lee C. Stoll declared before the Rotary Club, Tuesday noon.

In what he termed a "fact finding" presentation of the 1945 manpower problem, Stoll said employers and labor alike must face the fact that Oregon is no longer a mecca for job seekers. Even after stopping all recruitment of workers from other States as of January 15, the W. M. C. can "meet any schedule the high command in Washington asks," he declared. We are not asking deferment for any men under 30 in the shipyards.

At present there are two or three jobs available for every lay-off, not always in the same classification, but with generally the same wages, Stoll said, and the need for workers in transportation, warehousing, teamster jobs, lumber and food processing will continue throughout the year.

He urged employers to "go along with the W. M. C. on the questions of priorities and distribution of labor, with my solemn pledge that our policies will always be for the best interests of everyone concerned."

As to the work-or-fight bill, Stoll declared there "could be no more muddled mess accomplished than for the draft boards in the State of Oregon to freeze men in war plants based on their own judgment." As to postwar public projects, Stoll asserted it mould be a very poor job of planning to rush these through so that workers let out of war industries could move from one to another, with the result that the projects would be dissipated by the time returning servicemen reach their home here.

E. P. HOYT,
Oregonian.

[From the Sunday Oregonian of February 4, 1945]

THE COERCION BILL

It should be called the "fight or join the union bill," though of course there will be the alternative of going to jail.

That, however, sums up the situation. Under the measure which the House of Representatives passed in response to Mr. Roosevelt's urging (246 to 165, with three out of four of Oregon's Congressmen conforming), male citizens between 18 and 45 must stand by for work in war industries, and the only leeway given is the provision that they shall have a reasonable choice of employers among the war industries. And since all or virtually all war industries are operated under the closed-shop system, the bill as it has gone to the Senate requires that the manpower of the country become unionized.

So far as this page is concerned, it believes the program belated and unnecessary. It believes the failure of the Congress to protect the individual citizen against involuntary unionization to be inexcusable.

Mr. Roosevelt's proposal for a universal draft was offensive to start with. Our people have been doing their job of production. The war is well along—at least the war against Germany. There is absolutely no likelihood that anything that might be done in the way of reorganizing America's manpower would have any effect upon the outcome of the German side of the war. And no one in his right mind would argue that when Germany is beaten there will be need for a labor draft in America for the purpose of finishing off the Japanese. And this being the situation, what possible excuse can there be for fastening upon America, at this late hour in the war, the principle of civilian coercion?

At the beginning of the war, as a matter of sheer national necessity, this page would have voted for a universal service bill. Today it believes that action toward that end is not a matter of national necessity at all, and that, indeed, the organization of such a draft will employ more manpower than will be saved, in the brief time remaining. Consequently one can only reach the conclusion that political and ideological purposes are playing a part—that coercion of our civilian population would not be resorted to when the Russians are at the approaches to Berlin unless those behind the movement were thinking of the future effect upon American policy and tradition. It just doesn't make sense at this hour.

Put it this way, and brutally: Mr. Roosevelt, as a master politician, is interested in the effect upon our 12,000,000 fighting men when he stands out as the champion of the idea that the home front should fight as hard as the battle front. His bright-eyed followers are interested in the general program of breaking down private industry in favor of government, and of forcing the people into unionism.

If there is such a thing as an emergency requiring the civilian population of the United States to be subjected to Government order as to where they shall work—which we deny—then the failure of the Congress to protect that population against being forced into the opposition's way of life is still a matter that cries to high heaven.

We are not proud of the fact that three of Oregon's Congressmen—MOTT, ANGELL, and STOCKMAN—supported the measure as it stood, and that only HARRIS ELLSWORTH said "Nay."

War Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made on my behalf before the Committee on Appropriations subcommittee which is now considering the request for a deficiency appropriation for war housing:

Gentlemen, I have asked that this statement be read to your committee in the interest of the war workers and war industry of this Nation—in the interest of victory in the war itself.

I humbly suggest to the gentlemen of this committee, who have in their great wisdom dealt with many similar problems and given true leadership in solving them, that they favorably report the request of the National Housing Agency for a deficiency appropriation of $90,000,000 for temporary war housing.

In fact, gentlemen, I believe that the $90,000,000 request by the National Housing Agency is a most modest one. I would venture to say that it is indeed quite inadequate.

If we in the Puget Sound area of Washington State, where virtually every able-bodied person is engaged in war production, are to meet the production goals set for us and supply the manpower which we so desperately need, then we alone need at least one-half of the $90,000,000 appropriation. We of the Pacific Northwest are not selfish when we say this. I have talked with representatives from Chicago, from Detroit, from California, and I discover that their needs are just as desperate as our own. I am told that all of this money could be expended in any one of these localities and still not solve the need for housing.

I would like to present you with some facts regarding my own district, which includes the great war producing centers of Seattle and Bremerton, Wash.

Under the proposed appropriation, the National Housing Agency has tentatively allocated for Seattle: 1,000 family units and 632 dormitory accommodations, and for Bremerton: 1,200 family units and 1,400 dormitory accommodations.

And this, gentlemen, is a section where the War Manpower Commission informs us we need 26,000 additional workers. These are workers needed desperately for the production of the great superfortresses by Boeings, for the tremendous shipyards in Seattle, Kirkland, and Bremerton—workers needed by the Navy itself at its naval air station in Seattle and its navy yard in Bremerton. This is an area where production has constantly risen, an area where no cut-backs are contemplated, and where, even if we look forward to the happy day when the war in Europe is won, we will have a still more intensified program of production for the much closer campaign in the Pacific and in Japan.

There are no housing facilities available today in Seattle or Bremerton for the workers who are already on the job. I was a worker in the naval construction yard, a machinist in shipbuilding, before I came here as the Representative of my district. I worked with men who were forced to sleep all night in their cars, while they worked all day. Some of them finally found a dismal shack or a trailer in which to crowd together with others, and some of them, unfortunately, went back to their farms or their far-away homes.

Today, we are informed by the War Manpower Commission that 26,000 more of such workers are needed. The House of Representatives, in its wisdom, heeded the call of our Commander in Chief and Chiefs of Staff and passed limited-service legislation to provide the manpower which is needed. But men cannot work where they cannot live. And no such legislation can bring 26,000 men to Seattle and Bremerton to sleep in their cars or in the now infamous "hot beds," kept warm as the workers sleep in shifts.

To provide accommodations for 26,000 workers, we would need approximately 20,000 units at least. At the estimated cost of $2,900 a unit for temporary family accommodations, that would mean that we need in this vital area alone nearly $58,000,000.

I am not now asking either an increase beyond the $90,000,000 requested or a greater allocation of that sum for my own district. I am well aware that the condition in my district simply reflects the problem found in

every war center of the Nation. I am detailing these facts to you, gentlemen, so that there will be no hesitancy in approving the full request.

Other pertinent facts regarding my district are these: Kitsap County, in which is located the great shipbuilding center of Bremerton, has increased its population by 118 percent from April 1, 1940, to June, 1944. Here was a community of less than 45,000 persons in 1940, and today the Bureau of the Census tells us, there are nearly 100,000 persons crowded together in this war center.

For this double population, we have so far provided 12,282 family units and dormitory accommodations for 3,542 through public housing, and 638 units through private housing. We are, therefore, asking 55,000 persons to crowd into accommodations we have built for no more than 43,942 persons at a maximum. Even when we add the 1,200 family units and 1,400 dormitory units now contemplated by this present appropriation, it means that workers will still live crowded together like ants, and some will still use tents and the most primitive shelter. And these are the workers we are asking to step up production, and who are stepping up production even under these outrageous circumstances.

In the Seattle area the situation is identical. Here the population has leaped 18.3 percent, or from 452,639 in April 1940 to 535,464 in June of 1944, demonstrating a need for quarters for at least (as of last June) 82,825 persons, and here is the housing we have provided: Public, 14,186 units, and private, 11,081 units including new construction, conversions, single-person units, and 3,000 units which have been scheduled but are either still under construction or haven't been started.

Here again we have provided for about half the actual housing needs.

Yet we face an ever-increasing need. Of the 26,000 needed workers, the War Manpower Commission reported late in 1944 that the Seattle area, excluding nearby Renton, was expected to hire 3,600 in-migrant workers in the early part of the year. The Boeing plants and Boeing subcontractors alone were to employ 3,400 of these in-migrants. Since this W. M. C. certification, the Navy Department has reported that the naval establishments in this area alone are to increase employment by 1,600 workers. The War Department reports, too, that the Boeing plant in Renton which employed 9,334 workers on December 1, 1944, is scheduled to employ 10,400 during the first half of this year.

Since the local labor supply is exhausted, these must be in-migrant workers, and they must be housed. Vacancies in the area are virtually nonexistent. Today, hundreds of employes of the Boeing Renton plant must be housed in projects in Kirkland, 20 miles away, and from where there is no regular transportation. Because of the shortage of dormitory units, many single workers have been housed in family units, thus aggravating the shortage of accommodations.

The Army Air Forces has strongly urged that additional housing be supplied for Boeing employes and the Navy Department is equally concerned in obtaining housing for the workers being brought to the area for the naval establishments.

The Seattle Chamber of Commerce telegraphed me on February 6 in part:

Manpower analysis, based on actual check with industries, indicates need for some 26,000 more workers in the greater Seattle area: Dock workers, transportation, port of embarkation, aircraft, shipbuilding, and repair. The Seattle Chamber of Commerce urgently recommends immediate allocation of funds for emergency temporary public housing. * * * These recommendations are submitted at the urgent request of Seattle's major war industries and have the unqualified support of their officials.

For these pressing reasons, gentlemen, may I urge upon you a speedy and favorable action on the request before you.

Heroic Polish Boy Scouts Keep Their Movement Alive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

HEROIC POLISH BOY SCOUTS KEEP THEIR MOVEMENT ALIVE

When in September 1939 Poland was invaded by her enemies, Boy Scouts and Girl Guides faithful to their promise, performed their duty to Poland to their utmost, adding a glorious page to the history of the Scout movement. The war service teams were formed in August and immediately after the treacherous attack in all places they undertook a large quantity of the auxiliary duties as messengers, guides, fire watchers, aircraft spotters. They also started canteens, auxiliary hospitals, rest centers, etc., for the armed forces and refugees.

In the famout defense of Warsaw, under the flow of bombs and shells, Scouts and Guides played an important part in performing all these auxiliary duties. Supplying food and munition to the first lines, they fought with soldiers and civilians of the capital. In some places Scouts took part in the actual fight armed with rifles. Gorki Wielkie, the center of Scout training, was defended by the spontaneously formed armed unit of Scouts from Silesia. Spontaneous armed Scout units were formed in Bielsko, Sosnowiec, and Lwow.

After 5 weeks of struggle the organized resistance was brought to and end. The incredible persecution, never before known in history, started. Scouts and Guides were among the first who suffered such as in Bydgoszcz and Krakow. In many places Scouts and Guides were shot immediately after occupation only for wearing uniforms. All Polish national life had to go underground.

The war did not stop Polish Scouting. In fact, one of the most remarkable features of Polish Scouting during this war is its vitality. All over the world, wherever Poles are scattered on their way to liberated Poland, Scouts and Guides everywhere carry on. Patrols, crews, and troops were formed in concentration camps and internment camps, in prisons, among deportees, in the forces rebuilt in France, then in Britain and in the East, among children in the schools, and among children evacuated safely from Russia to the British Empire.

In France, where the supreme council of the association was established, Polish Scouting contributed a great deal to the reconstruction of Polish forces. In the first units of this Army there were to be found many Scoutmasters and Scouts of the Polish Scout movement. Practically all those fit for service came in a voluntary body to the Polish Army. The same thing happened in other countries where Poles lived. Polish Scouts from Latvia, Rumania, United States, Argentina were first who volunteered for the Polish forces in France and then in Great Britain. It will be of interest to mention that Scouts in the Polish Army initiated a meeting of Allied Scouts in France. It took place in March 1940, in Rennes, the capital of Brittany, where a number of British, French, and Polish Scouts were present.

In Rumania, Polish Scouting developed widely. Over 20 troops with a total of 700 Scouts were organized. They had their own periodical magazine, We Shall Return. Their work was stopped by the evacuation of most of them after the fall of France in 1940.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND IN BRITAIN

Great Britain is now a strong center of Polish scouting. There the supreme council of the association and the headquarters are established. Altogether there are over 100,000 members of the movement in Britain. Most of them are Scouts and Rovers serving with the Polish Army, Air Force, and Navy in that country, the others belonging to troops or companies attached to Polish schools now operating in that country. Some meet only during holidays as many are in different English schools. A strong group was formed spontaneously in army units and air force stations soon after Polish forces arrived in Britain in 1940. Military authorities regard them favorably as they do much to keep up the men's spirits.

The main object for Polish Scouting in Britain is to prepare, as far as possible, the reconstruction of scouting in Poland and in other east-central European countries after the war.

The most numerous centers of Polish scouting in exile are now in the east and in Africa. There are now about 8,000 Polish Guides and Scouts in the following countries: India, Iran, Palestine, Egypt, Tanganyika, Uganda, Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia, and South Africa. (In Palestine and Rhodesia troops and companies were formed as early as 1940 among boys and girls evacuated from Rumania through Cyprus after the collapse of France.) Troops, companies, and packs have been organized spontaneously among the children evacuated to these countries in 1942 and 1943 from Russia.

NEED LITERATURE

As most of these children are orphans, scouting means much to their education and they stick to it, as it takes the place of a family for them. This also explains the high percentage of membership among young people in Polish settlements. All this accounts for the special part scouting performs among Polish communities in exile. There are heavy difficulties, and a great need to have important handbooks reprinted. The monthly magazine Scout gives much valuable help. In the Polish Army in the Middle East, there are about 1,000 Rovers and Scouts organized in the same way as in Britain in Army Rover Crews.

Recently, New Zealand has offered her hospitality to a group of Polish children so a new center of Polish scouting will be started.

Mexico is another place where Polish children found temporary homes. Scouting plays the same essential part there as in the east and in Africa.

All over the world goes the call "Czuwaj"—"Be Prepared." In the exotic countries and places, known before only from tales and stores, Polish camp fires are burning and Polish songs resound.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an item in the

Washington Daily News of February 6, 1945, a concrete example of what is happening to the youth of our country and probably contributing to the problem of juvenile delinquency.

I am proposing to reintroduce my bill to suspend the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war. I think it might be an effective method of solving these problems. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the article in question:

BOYS, 10 AND 12, DRUNK; WOMAN, 37, IS ACCUSED

As the result of a drunken spree by two boys, 10 and 12 years old, Mrs. Winnie Beckman, 37, of 630 M Street Southeast, today was arraigned in Police Court on charges that she "coerced and permitted minors to drink alcoholic beverages in her home until they became intoxicated." Bond was fixed at $1,000. The boys were removed from a streetcar at Eighth and H Streets Northeast at 10:40 p.m. Sunday, and taken to Casualty Hospital, suffering from alcohol poisoning. It was reported they did not stop vomiting until 5 a. m. They are still at the hospital.

Described as a friend of the boys' families, police said Mrs. Beckman told them the boys had been frequent visitors at her apartment, but she denied giving them wine or whisky. One boy lives with his grandmother; his father is in service. The second, son of separated parents, lives with his father and an older brother.

Resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution 5

Concurrent resolution memoralizing the Congress to enact suitable legislation providing that grazing lands, timber-growing lands, and agricultural lands now owned by the United States Government within the National forest areas in northern and western Arkansas be placed back on the market for sale, homestead, donation, or other methods of disposal to private ownership, with extended priorities given to World War veterans, and for other purposes

Whereas House Concurrent Resolution No. 10 was adopted by the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas and approved February 19, 1943; and

Whereas said resolution memoralized the Congress, the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, and the Forestry Commission, to provide funds by taxation or otherwise to assist in the operation of county government and for county debt service for the 25 counties in Arkansas where the Ozark and Ouachita National Forest maintains large forest areas; and

Whereas said resolution also asked that no additional grazing or agricultural lands be acquired for forestry purposes; and

Whereas many thousands of acres of United States Forestry-owned lands were purchased from timber companies desiring to go out of business, and from landowners who were in distressing financial circumstances during the early days of the depression, and many thousands of acres of such lands are lying along and adjacent to hard-surface Federal and State highways, or along high-class State and county highways, and were purchased in many instances for nominal sums and also in other instances, for fabulous sums; and

Whereas said resolution also asked that many thousands of acres now owned by the United States Government and used for forestry purposes, which lands are more suitable for grazing and agricultural uses than for forestry purposes, be placed back on the market for sale, homestead or otherwise, for ownership for grazing and agricultural purposes; and

Whereas since the adoption of said resolution of February 19, 1943, copies have been furnished to the Arkansas delegation in Congress, the President of the United States, the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, the Forestry Commission, the regional forestry offices, the supervisors of the Ozark and Ouachita National Forests, and also many Representatives and Senators in Congress from other States; and

Whereas on November 18, 1943, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, through its chairman, HARRY F. BYRD, United States Senator from the State of Virginia, filed its report, which report has also been referred to as the Byrd report on Federal ownership of real estate; and

Whereas said report disclosed the alarming fact that more than 20 percent of the lands in the United States was now owned by the Federal Government for essential or nonessential purposes; and

Whereas said report disclosed that the percentage of said ownership ranged from .02 percent in the State of Connecticut to 68 percent in the State of Utah; and

Whereas said report disclosed the fact that there have been 60 departments connected with the United States Government in the purchase, acquisition, and ownership of these lands, many of these departments overlapping in function with other similar departments; and

Whereas said report also disclosed the fact that many local county governments in many of the States other than Arkansas are in distressing financial circumstances due to the fact that many thousands of acres of taxable lands have been taken from the tax rolls; and

Whereas said report disclosed the additional fact that many thousands of acres of nonessential lands have been acquired by the United States Government through real-estate brokers on cost-plus or commission basis; and

Whereas many of the 25 counties in the State of Arkansas—within whose confines the Government has acquired grazing and agricultural lands for forestry purposes—are now in distressing financial circumstances; and

Whereas World War veterans are now returning and will continue to return, and veterans of other wars, and others, are now and will in the near future be entitled to, and will demand both small and large areas of lands for grazing, timber growing, and agricultural purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein):

SECTION 1. That the prayer of said Resolution No. 10 of 1943 be renewed.

SEC. 2. That some immediate action be taken by the Congress to reimburse the 25 counties in Arkansas, and allocate to them sufficient funds to assist in the operation of local county government, debt service, and other purposes.

SEC. 3. That no more grazing, timber growing, or agricultural lands be acquired for forestry purposes in any of the counties so financially distressed.

SEC. 4. That said lands now owned by the United States Government for forestry purposes which are more suitable for grazing, timber growing, and agricultural purposes, and all such lands along and adjacent to the leading hard surface Federal and State Highways, and along and adjacent to high-class State and county highways, be placed on the market either for purchase, homestead, donation or other means of acquisition and ownership, giving priority at all times to World War veterans.

SEC. 5. That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the Journals of the House and Senate, a copy transmitted to the President of the United States, a copy to each of the members of the President's Cabinet, including the Secretary of State, a copy to each of the Representatives and Senators in Congress; a copy to the Regional Forestry Office, and copies to the Supervisors of the Ozark and Ouachita National Forests.

South Dakota Boy Is Navy's Second Ranking Fighter Ace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a news story clipped from the Daily Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., issue of January 30, 1945. It reports the big home-coming celebration which the citizens of Cresbard, S. Dak., tendered to its distinguished hero, Lt. Cecil Elwood Harris, who holds the honor of being the second ranking fighter ace of the United States Navy.

Lieutenant Harris is the type of young man who has had a typical South Dakota background of experience and education. He grew to manhood in an area where freedom and liberty are as prevalent as the fresh, clean air which envelops South Dakota. He developed courage and self-reliance in a community where these characteristics were the dominant factors among the great pioneers who settled the West and developed its prevailing glorious opportunities. He has well earned the tributes which are now being extended him as one of South Dakota's outstanding sons.

Mr. Speaker, South Dakota although not the largest State in the Union, takes pride in its contributions to this global war. It was Joe Foss, another South Dakotan, who as a flier in the Marine Corps was the first in this war to equal Eddie Rickenbacker's famed record of downing 26 enemy planes in aerial combat. Many another South Dakotan has distinguished himself on the land, on the sea, or in the air in feats of valor and patriotism in this war.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the vast productive fields of South Dakota have contributed mightily to the world's food supply during these terrible years of war and its farmers, men and women alike, have worked hard and long to make this

possible. The mines and factories and shops of South Dakota have also operated without work stoppage or inflated profits to produce the implements of war. In this fifty-fifth year of its statehood, South Dakota works proudly and productively with its sister States, and its sons and daughters are in the vanguard of the Nation's embattled heroes as each day brings victory closer to our colors.

The news article follows:

CRESBARD ACE WELCOMED BY GREAT THRONG—FRIENDS, DIGNITARIES GATHER TO GREET SECOND RANKING NAVY FLIER

ABERDEEN, January 30.—Bearing the laurels of war that few other Navy fliers can boast—the Navy Cross, the Silver Star, two Distinguished Flying Crosses—Lt. Cecil Elwood Harris came home to Cresbard Monday night, and though subzero temperatures and a biting winter wind leveled the prairies, State dignitaries, hometown folks, and Handy County friends overflowed the local high-school auditorium to welcome back this young man who is now the Navy's second-ranking fighter ace.

Representatives of American walks of life, the state, education, and the military, the speakers honoring Lieutenant Harris included Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, Dr. N. E. Steele, president of NSTC, and Dr. Ray Stratton, of Huron, State commander of the American Legion.

GREAT OCCASION

For Mr. and Mrs. Howard Harris, the parents, the occasion was one of great moment, for on the platform, also, was another son, Capt. Gerald Harris, home on leave from Camp Swift, Tex., while regret must have surged through them that their third son could not have been with them: Corp. Calvin Harris, now somewhere on the Belgian front.

A gathering of the clan and intimate friends at the Harris home preceded the affair at the high school. An informal outline of his career showed that Lieutenant Harris was graduated from Cresbard High School, attended N. S. T. C. for a year, taught school for 3 years near Onaka, S. Dak., and then returned to N. S. T. C. for C. P. T.

WHOLE STATE PROUD

Harris joined the Navy in 1941, was at Jacksonville, Fla., for 3 weeks, then to Corpus Christi for flight training, where he won his wings in March of 1942.

Governor Sharpe eulogized Harris by stating that "The whole State is proud of him, for he is entirely a product of South Dakota." The Governor directed his remarks to the younger folks in the audience, maintaining "that you now know you can get an education right here in communities such as Cresbard, and then go out into the world and make good in a big way.

"But Lieutenant Harris probably wasn't out to set a record, as much as he was bent on showing the enemy what an American fighting machine is like," Sharpe declared.

IMPORTANCE STRESSED

"The real importance of this event," he emphasized, "is that it is the first time it has ever happened here. Cresbard, the county, State, and Nation has a right to be proud of Cecil Harris' accomplishments.

"For we are the first Nation ever to come out and fight for the idea that all men are created equal. It doesn't make any difference what race, religion, color, or creed you are, you are given an equal chance in this country."

Governor Sharpe also reminded his audience that equality of opportunity also means "equality of obligations, too. We must all of us consider the post-war world. We must be strong enough in a military and commercial way, that we can enforce the principles for which Americans, such as this young man, are fighting."

Labor's Views on the Pending Work-or-Jail Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of this House a writing which appeared in the recent issue of Labor. Every Member should read this timely article.

SENATORS, PLEASE READ THIS ARTICLE BEFORE YOU VOTE TO DRAFT AMERICAN LABOR FOR PRIVATE PROFIT

A powerful accumulation of evidence showing that there's no need for a law to draft labor for private profit was carried this week in the February issue of Labor's Monthly Survey, the research publication of the American Federation of Labor.

If every Member of the Senate were to read the Survey's carefully documented facts and figures and based his vote on the evidence contained therein, the May bill establishing forced labor wouldn't have a ghost of a chance of enactment.

At the very outset the Survey pointed out that the Federation can find no proof of a manpower crisis—"except a crisis in manpower waste."

"Careful examination of the facts has revealed no manpower shortage which could require national service legislation," the Survey declared. "In spite of newspaper headlines claiming a production crisis, December war production records show an outstanding achievement. Sharply increased schedules were exceeded, or met within 1 or 2 percent.

"Although the goals were exceptionally high, we came nearer reaching them than in almost any other month of our peak war production year.

"This was all done voluntarily by free American labor and employers in cooperation with the Government."

Actually, back in December 1943, the workers turned out more munitions than the peak monthly schedule laid down by the War Department for this year, the federation pointed out. Besides, labor productivity has zoomed since then and thus workers should easily be able to meet 1945 demands without the slightest compulsion, the A. F. of L. stressed.

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson recently sought to scare the Nation and Congress into support of a labor draft by brandishing figures of 1,600,000 workers to be needed by midyear—900,000 for the armed forces and 700,000 for industry.

However, the A. F. of L. survey charged that Patterson gave only one part of the picture.

"Patterson's figures for industry are misleading because they account only for workers to be added to pay rolls and do not show that workers laid off from other industries will be ready to fill many of these jobs," the federation asserted.

"He released only one side of the manpower balance sheet, withholding figures showing that the supply is more than adequate to meet the demand."

The A. F. of L. then presented the whole picture. On the supply side, it revealed the following sources: Released veterans, 400,000; young persons reaching working age and other new workers, 550,000; employees to be laid off through cut-backs, 350,000; available through increased productivity, 100,000; from present jobless and from released Government workers, 100,000; through transfers from nonessential industries, 100,000.

That adds up to the 1,600,000 cited as necessary by Patterson, but actually far more workers can be secured. Tens of thousands could be obtained from cost-plus plants that are hoarding labor, and several hundred thousand more from nonessential work, the A. F. of L. contended.

On the demand side, only 300,000 of Patterson's 700,000 have been rated as critically needed—150,000 as of last January 10 and the rest by June 30. In view of the record flow of workers back to war plants in the past month, the first 150,000 jobs have undoubtedly been filled, the federation declared.

As for the other 150,000 wanted during the first half of 1945, the survey said: "Needs such as these have always occurred and been filled throughout the war program. Certainly that is no manpower crisis."

Furthermore, unemployment has been skyrocketing because of cut-backs, and jobless insurance payments have mounted in the past year all the way from 152 percent in California to 502 percent in Michigan, the federation disclosed.

The survey listed a dozen big plants where lay-offs, ranging up to 12,500 per plant, are under way, with the armed services making no effort to place new contracts in such factories.

"Such waste of skilled manpower and machinery is hard to understand while the armed services proclaim a manpower crisis," the A. F. of L. emphasized.

In view of such conditions, if free labor is displaced by compulsory labor, war production is bound to suffer, the federation warned.

America's Place in the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech which I delivered in Detroit, Mich., at a civic dinner on the evening of Monday, February 5, which was also carried to the Nation on the radio networks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, with deepest gratitude I thank you for this generosity. Under the pressure of the times in Washington, I rarely get back to home, sweet home during these days which try the souls of men and test the fate of nations. You may understand, therefore, why I so deeply appreciate your hospitality. I shall respond by taking advantage of the occasion to tell you what is in my heart regarding the dedications which must be closest to yours.

If it is possible to have glorious days on bitter battle fronts, these are glorious days. America's intrepid soldier-sons, sustained by the invincible marines and by the greatest Navy in the world, are in Manila. MacArthur has kept his word. He has returned. Tokyo is next on the road to avenging justice and liberation. Meanwhile, the United Nations' climax in Europe what is probably the greatest campaign in the history of war. The core of Axis infamy faces numbered hours. Our great Russian allies may have already reached Berlin.

We have a right, upon our prayerful knees, to glorify these omens of the conclusive victory to come. But we also have the solemn obligation to remember that this is only the beginning of the end; and to accept these precious, hard-bought encouragements only as a spur to even more relentless efforts until the last pirate walks the plank. We are called now to supreme effort—and then we are challenged to the crowning task of building a successful peace which shall justify this sacrifice, vindicate justice, and protect free men in a free world.

God bless the United Nations. God bless America.

In the time at my disposal I concentrate tonight upon these peace aims. We have relative unity in the fraternity of battle. We sometimes drift dangerously away from equally indispensable fraternity for peace. It is our responsibility to see that if this unity-for-peace disintegrates, it is not our America which shall be held at fault when the books of history are balanced. We cannot serve this solemn function by further silence in respect to our attitudes. It confuses our allies. It often provides them the reason which they plead to justify decisions which collide with our ideals. It even confuses our own people who frequently cry out in anguish for the definition of our aims. It is time for us to say what we will do. It is time for us to say what we will not do. And it is time to start the doing.

As a basis for our thinking, let me lay down three fundamentals. The first is the recognition of a physical fact. Since Pearl Harbor, the ghastly countenance of war has become more sinister than ever before in the nightmares of the human race. The awful science of mass murder has made more progress in 3 cruel years than in all the centuries since time began. And this new science is only in its lethal infancy. Contemplate the robot bomb in its maturity. Contemplate the refinements of "jet propulsion" when it still further reduces this foreshortened world to an intimate neighborhood. Contemplate a war of push buttons in which human flesh and blood are at the mercy of mechanized disaster. I need not labor the point. This war, God knows, is bad enough. But World No. 3 will open new laboratories of death too horrible to contemplate. I propose to do everything within my power to keep those laboratories closed for keeps. I make this pledge in the name of humane common sense. But more, I make it in the name of American self-interest.

Times have changed. The oceans are no longer moats around our ramparts. Once upon a time Detroit could wait for an enemy to get to Windsor. In the next World War, an enemy halfway around the globe will be as close. No nation hereafter can immunize itself by its own exclusive action. Only collective security can stop the next great war before it starts. Therefore collective security is to our advantage. And we serve America if we can help to make it work.

This brings me to my second fundamental. We cannot make it work alone. Unshared idealism is not enough. It takes something more than a "paper league" to keep the peace. An unjust peace will break out of any strait jacket the wit of man can devise. Collective security will be no stronger than the merits of the cause it implements. Therefore it is to our own American self-interest also to keep this objective forever at our masthead—peace with justice. Not because we want to meddle in the problems of other continents. But because there can be no peace without justice.

I am talking, for example, about the basic aspirations of the Atlantic Charter. It is bone and sinew of our flaming forward march. I quote:

"No aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise."

"No territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned."

"The right of all peoples to chose the form of government under which they will live."

"Sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

There will be differences of opinion in the grand alliance about the meaning of these precious things. I do not say that we, by dictation, can have it all our own way. But I do say that, by the same token, no other member of the grand alliance, by dictation, can have it all his own way either. I do not speak belligerently. I speak with deepest respect for the utterly magnificent contribution which each of our major allies is making to the coming victory. But I speak with equal respect for our own fabulous American contribution. I speak with a profound prayer that the friendly, helpful unity among us shall never fall apart. But I speak also in the belief that candor now will do more for this priceless unity than will disillusionment tomorrow.

This brings me to my third fundamental. The President has correctly said: "The nearer we come to vanquishing our enemies the more we become inevitably conscious of differences among the victors." How do these dangerous differences disclose themselves? Usually by unilateral decisions in which one or another among the United Nations pronounces its own ultimatum regarding its own present or post-war plans and purposes. It puts its own interpretation upon its own rights regardless of the fact that these rights, for all of us, all flow from our common effort. I assert that all vital decisions should also flow from the same sort of a common effort. Let me illustrate what I mean. The army that gets to Berlin first—all honor to it—does not win for its nation the right to settle Germany's future just because it got to Berlin first. No nation's army would have reached Berlin at all except for the heroic, common combat of all the other nation's armies. This is just another way of saying that unity, unity for an ultimate lasting peace, is a constant necessity which must be nourished by all of us through constant, coordinated consultation in war and then in peace, and through a reasonable regard for mutual sensibilities.

Now, let's put these three fundamentals together and see whether they do not plainly point an immediate plan of action. You will remember the fundamentals. First, the inexpressibly vital need to prevent World War No. 3 through collective security. Second, the paramount importance of a just peace if it is to be a permanent peace. Third, the hazard to these objectives if each of the United Nations goes its own way even before we have clinched our total victory. Let's frankly face our American responsibilities in this connection.

Why do our allies take these disunifying steps? What's the major reason for Polish controversy? For planning satellite conquests? For the Anglo-Soviet agreement of 1942, the Soviet-Czechoslovak agreement of 1943, the Franco-Soviet Treaty of 1944, and similar actions yet to come? What's the reason given for the resurgent movements toward the old power politics which has been the world's prime curse?

It's a perfectly human and understandable reason. It is the frankly expressed fear of reborn Axis aggression in the years to come. Twice within one generation our continental allies have seen the German monster rise and overwhelm them. Twice within one generation they have been driven to the valley of the shadow by this military aggression. They do not propose to be exposed again. Unless and until they know that they can depend upon America to join effectively in keeping Germany and Japan demilitarized, they will continue to go their own way. The truth of the matter is that it was the failure to keep Germany demilitarized after World War No. 1 which made possible World War No. 2.

In the face of these circumstances I ask you whether our immediate duty—our tremendously great immediate opportunity—is not clear? America has the same self-interest in keeping Germany and Japan permanently and effectively demilitarized as have her closer victims. America also has the keenest self-interest in preventing the fear of reborn Axis aggression from driving the world into another era of separate alliances, because that, too, is the road to another war. Here is one common danger—one common objective—in which we have a complete and basic common interest.

Why not face it now? Why not act now? Regardless of any other peace plans, here is one thing that must be done—namely, the permanent demilitarization of Germany and Japan—unless we are blinder than bats in respect to history following World War No. 1, and unless we are to be guilty of the colossal sin of dissipating victory after World War No. 2.

It is in response to this irresistible logic of events that I propose America shall sign up now with all her major allies in a hard-and-fast treaty, ratified by the Senate of the United States, which pledges our constant armed cooperation, instantly available through the President of the United States without further reference to the Congress, to keep Germany and Japan out of piracy for keeps. I propose that we say—beyond misunderstanding—that this fiendish thing shall not rise again. I propose that we shall practice what we preach. I propose that no other nation shall have any chance to use our silence as an alibi for ulterior designs, if such there be. I propose action instead of words. I propose action now—before it is too late. I propose it for the sake of a better world. But I say again and again and again that I propose it for our own American self-interest.

Aside from the incalculable major advantage thus to be gained, there are two other advantages of scarcely lesser moment.

When we have relieved our allies of any legitimate fear of reborn Axis aggression, we also have relieved them of any legitimate need to make unilateral decisions in the name of self defense. We shall have earned the right to demand that whatever such decisions may have been unavoidably made in the process of war, all such decisions shall be subject to correction in the post-war peace by whatever international organization we set up to perpetuate the solidarity of the United Nations. In plain terms, we shall have earned the right to demand peace with justice—the only kind of peace which can survive. A spoilsman's peace will not survive. Therefore peace itself is the issue at this point. Furthermore, one of the greatest arguments against early action on the Dumbarton Oaks plan for a post-war league will have been substantially removed because, otherwise, it can be persuasively urged that America is asked to sign a warrant to help sustain an unknown future "status quo" which may be too repugnant to us to deserve any such fidelity from justice-loving America.

This brings me to the second dreadfully important dividend from this program. It brings me to Dumbarton Oaks. If we first deal with our enemies through unequivocal post-war restraints, we have left only our friends to consider in charting our post-war peace league. This immensely simplifies our problem. I hasten to add, lest there be misunderstanding, that this demilitarization treaty is no substitute for Dumbarton Oaks. The latter is the indispensable sequel to the former.

The only real controversy inside America respecting Dumbarton Oaks is whether the

President shall have the power, without reference to Congress, to join our armed forces with those of the peace league to stop renewed military aggression. After we have given him this unquestioned power in respect to our enemies, the creation of such a power for use against our friends becomes almost an academic question from the standpoint of reality.

Remember, we are now arranging a peace formula with our friends. We are now talking only about the future use of force against one of our present Allies who subsequently threatens the peace of the world. It will have to be a present major Ally who breaks a solemn pledge to abandon force as an instrumentality of foreign policy, and who has successively defied all of the intervening machinery for the pacific settlement of disputes, contemplated by Dumbarton Oaks. This means full investigation and report; then conciliation; then mediation; then arbitration; probably the intervention of international law through the medium of a new world court; perhaps even economic sanctions. The new crises will not be a blitz. It will finally reach the last recourse—namely armed force—only after the other United Nations (which is to say, the conscience of the world), have been put upon serial notice that one of our present, major Allies proposes to assault civilization. Such a final challenge would be of such gravity that no President—whether he has the actual power or not—would think of committing America to such a war without knowing that he had his country and the Congress behind him. On the other hand, no Congress would hesitate for an instant to respond to a just challenge. The Senate declared war on Japan in 13 minutes and on Germany in 5. That proves we can act when necessary. It means little, in a practical sense, whether the President himself is given this final power or not, so far as the functioning of the peace league among our present friends is concerned. But in a practical sense, it may mean much in the decision of the American people whether they might reject the whole Dumbarton Oaks adventure, if they are asked to give the President this exclusive final power against one of our present Allies in the face of a plain constitutional injunction that only Congress can declare war.

Oh, but you ask, if "only Congress can declare war," how can you give the President plenary power to use our armed forces to keep the Axis permanently demilitarized? The answer is that for 150 years the Constitution has permitted the President to use this plenary power, without reference to Congress, for "the national defense"—short of war—and it repeatedly has thus been used without question. The permanent demilitarization of the Axis, when once authorized by Congress through the Senate's ratification of a treaty, would not involve a new "declaration of war." It would only be the lengthened shadow of the present war. It would clearly fall within the Presidential authority under the Constitution.

Now you probably ask: "Should the Peace League have no force available, except against our erstwhile foes?" My answer is that the Peace League certainly should maintain constant staff work in planning the ultimate mobilization of military force; it certainly should have peremptorily available, so far as we are concerned, such military force as is traditionally granted under the Constitution to the President for national defense; but, remembering there is to be unlimited force against our present foes, it does not otherwise need the final war power which the Constitution of the United States commits exclusively to the Congress—and thus to the people—of the United States.

But my fundamental answer is that the genius of Dumbarton Oaks, in correct perspective, is not the use of military force at all. The genius of Dumbarton Oaks is the exact opposite. It is the substitution of justice for force. It is the substitution of international law for piracy. It is the substitution of peace for war. Its genius lies in the organization of these pacific mechanisms which shall stop future frictions short of the necessity for force. Its genius lies in the mobilization of the vigilant moral and spiritual power of enlightened civilization against the dark and evil forces of recurrent savagery. If this power has been dormant and impotent it is because it has lacked a vigorous world instrument for organized expression. In my deep conviction, Dumbarton Oaks, in proper form, can supply this tremendous instrument.

All of these benedictions become possible just as soon as we have permanently quarantined the Axis lusts. Oh, yes, I have oversimplified the problem. I have no illusions that this tough old world will suddenly quit its sins because a formula is born. I promise no Utopia. I am not so naive as to believe that the earth can suddenly rid itself of national rivalries. But I submit that here lies a way of hope. It will take us out of our foreign policy vacuum. It will untie our tongues and once more make us vocal in behalf of our ideals. It will save us from the dangerous misunderstandings which our continued silence might invite. It will certainly promise a better peace, and therefore a safer and a longer peace. And it is practical because it plainly conserves self-interest for all concerned in this great fraternity of Allied war (unless self-interest involves ulterior and sinister designs).

I do not object, my fellow citizens, to the vigilance of any nation in behalf of its own self-interest. That is what nations are for. I want our intelligent, American self-interest just as vigorously protected by our spokesmen as British self-interest is always protected by Mr. Churchill and as the self-interests of the Soviets always are protected by Mr. Stalin. But I cannot escape the conviction that an Insurance Policy against World War No. 3 is basic in the self-interest of every civilized nation in this distraught world, America emphatically included.

We give up nothing except the inevitable curse of another involvement in another war if it ever comes. We do not sacrifice our independence. We join no world state. We do not desert the Constitution. We leave the Stars and Stripes in all their pride and glory on the domes of Washington. We simply join ourselves, in continued united fraternity with our battle comrades, in a great, effective cooperative adventure for a better earth. We do it for the sake of free men in a free world. We do it in the name of justice. We will not do it if justice is denied. If we can start it now, our Allied unity will have new vigor. The end of all our present wars will respond more quickly to our prayers. We shall vindicate our soldier-sons. We shall keep the word of promise to our hopes. We shall save our children's children. We shall have earned the right to beseech God's blessing of our dreams.

Three Strikes and Out—Hillman to Roosevelt to Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the old days you had to be able to knock out a home run to get to first base against the Evers-to-Tinker-to-Chance trio. What an outfit! Yet they had nothing on the Hillman-to-Roosevelt-to-Wallace combination which has three strikes on the American people, now.

You do not believe it? Did you see in the Washington Post this morning what Reid Robinson, a C. I. O. vice president, speaking in the absence of Sidney Hillman, told the world trade-union conference in London yesterday? He told the conference of "our successful campaign in returning to the Presidency of the United States Franklin Delano Roosevelt." He stated further that the C. I. O. would not rest until Henry Wallace "fits securely in the office to which President Roosevelt has appointed him—and as Secretary of Commerce helps to realize the goal of 60,000,000 jobs in the United States and world-wide good neighborly relations."

Foul ball! Three strikes; you're out! Enough said.

Gross Misrepresentation of Hon. Fred M. Vinson in Houston Post Editorial—Are We Facing Runaway Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if people continue to denounce, criticize and censure the Government's stabilization and price-control program and those who administer these laws, it is possible that one of these days the people will lose confidence entirely in the program and permit inflation to take hold, which will very quickly destroy our country.

It is just as necessary that we hold the line against inflation on the domestic front as it is for our fine, brave fighting men to hold the line and push forward against our enemies on the fighting fronts.

GROSS MISREPRESENTATION

I have never known a time when there was so much misinformed and so many gross misrepresentations being made by certain newspapers and certain radio commentators in this country as are being made now.

At the same time I recognize that the owners and managers of these newspapers and radio stations must be patriotic people and I want to appeal to them in their own selfish interests to give consideration to the thought that they are helping our enemies by carrying on a campaign against the only tower of strength that protects our country on the home front—the stabilization and price control program.

IF CONTROLS OFF TOO QUICKLY, COUNTRY GONE

These criticisms of price control and stabilization during the war and those who administer these laws are calculated to cause so much disunity and lack of respect for the necessity for these laws that when the war in Europe is over it

is possible that a majority of the people will say, "Let us get rid of all controls of all kinds."

This will be fine if we have production sufficient to meet the demands for the goods that the enormous amounts of money are available to buy. But we know now that this will not be possible immediately after the European war is over. It will take time. All controls should be taken off just as quickly as possible, but not so soon that the way will be opened up for inflation.

REAL PERIOD OF DANGER

I am inserting herewith the following figures which are based on price indexes as collected by the League of Nations:

Country	January to June 1939=100			Indicated month
	1941	1943	1944	
United States of America.	106	125	127	August.
United Kingdom	129	129	131	July.
Japan (Tokyo)	122	133	146	May.
Sweden	134	150	149	July.
Switzerland	127	149	153	Do.
Brazil (Rio de Janeiro).	117	145	164	Do.
Costa Rica	101	157	166	August.
Peru	118	146	172	Do.
Spain	157	167	173	May.
Portugal	122	154	173	June.
Finland	143	190	201	July.
Mexico	106	159	210	Do.
France	150	237	256	April.
Bolivia (La Paz)	195	309	335	Do.
Turkey	138	233	442	May.
Iran	153	656	855	June.
China (Chungking)	958	6,074	21,000	July.

Nearly all countries, including both belligerents and neutrals, have price controls, but the systems vary greatly. It is interesting to note that there has been a greater price rise in some of the leading neutral countries than in the leading belligerent countries. This would seem to indicate that there is a direct relationship between effective control over prices and the attitudes within the country brought about by the pressures of war and a sense of national urgency.

This suggests that our real period of danger in this country will lie at the end of the European war when some of this feeling of national urgency may be inclined to diminish.

AN UNFAIR EDITORIAL ATTACK

As evidence of the kind of information that I am sorry to say is being published in some of the newspapers of our country, and I especially regret that one of our Texas newspapers has been guilty, I am inserting herewith an editorial that appeared in the Houston Post, Tuesday, January 30, 1945. It is as follows:

CHOICE OF EVILS

As an alternative to Henry Wallace as Federal loan administrator, Fred M. Vinson would be highly preferable.

As a successor to Jesse Jones and a filler of Mr. Jones' shoes, Vinson is just another lame duck bureaucrat.

Since the voters of Michigan decided, in 1942, that they didn't care to keep Mr. Vinson in the Senate any longer, he has been taken care of with Washington jobs. First he was appointed price administrator, to succeed Leon Henderson. That office proved a little too hot for Fred to handle, and he was kicked upstairs—made Director of Economic Stabilization. And now comes word from well-informed officials that Vinson is to be appointed Federal Loan Administrator if Congress passes the George bill divorcing the lending agencies from the Commerce Department.

This is a rather uncheering prospect. The American people would feel safer if a man of successful experience in business and financial affairs were handling the tens of billions of dollars that go through those agencies, especially in the critical times ahead, and that someone with first-hand knowledge of industry—someone who has met a pay roll—were handling the disposition of nearly a hundred billion dollars worth of war plants which Uncle Sam will have on hand when peace returns. Instead, it appears that those matters are to be administered by one who entered the bureaucratic business after losing his job as Senator, and who never before worked at much of anything but politics.

But at that, Mr. Vinson would be infinitely better than Henry Wallace.

I have replied to the editorial as follows:

The EDITOR, THE HOUSTON POST,
Houston, Tex.

SIR: Your editorial of January 30, 1945, entitled "Choice of Evils" is inaccurate and unjust to an outstanding and unselfish public servant.

You refer in most derogatory terms to the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, a man with whom I had the pleasure of serving many years in the House of Representatives and who possesses the complete confidence of the Congress and the people of the United States. Judge Vinson served as a Member of the House of Representatives from the Commonwealth of Kentucky from 1924 to 1938. In the latter year, he resigned from Congress to accept an appointment as Associate Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. In 1943, at the request of President Roosevelt, Judge Vinson resigned from this lifetime post in order to accept the difficult assignment as Director of Economic Stabilization. In this assignment, he has rendered outstanding and successful service in holding the line against inflation.

In my opinion, Judge Vinson deserves only the praise and gratitude of his countrymen for giving up a lifetime post in order to accept a thankless wartime task. Instead, he is in your editorial columns made the victim of a sneering and uninformed jibe.

Let me point out some of your errors. You state, "Vinson is just another lame-duck bureaucrat." This statement is untrue.

You state:

"Since the voters of Michigan decided, in 1942, that they didn't care to keep Mr. Vinson in the Senate any longer, he has been 'taken care of' with Washington jobs."

Mr. Vinson was never defeated for the Senate by the voters of Michigan either in 1942 or in any other year. He is neither a citizen nor a resident of Michigan. He was never defeated for the Senate, nor was he ever a candidate for the Senate in Michigan or anywhere else. He was neither defeated for nor was he a candidate for any office in 1942 in Michigan nor anywhere else. In 1938, after he had been reelected by a large majority in 1936, Mr. Vinson resigned from the House of Representatives to accept a judgeship.

You further state that Mr. Vinson "was appointed Price Administrator to succeed Leon Henderson." Mr. Vinson never served as Price Administrator, either as Mr. Henderson's successor or otherwise.

You further state, "That office proved a little too hot for Fred to handle, and he was kicked upstairs—made Director of Economic Stabilization." Since Judge Vinson was serving on the United States Court of Appeals at the time of his appointment to his present post, this statement is also untrue.

Any newspaper, of course, is entitled to express freely its opinions as to the capacity or record of any public official. But, if these opinions are to be taken seriously, they should be based upon facts and information rather than distortions and misinformation. Your attack upon Judge Vinson, based, as it is, upon misstatements of fact, can serve only to discredit those responsible for its publication.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress.

Contribution of Amarillo Region to War Effort Outlined by John Boyce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE WORLEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to bring to the attention of the House a speech recently made by Mr. John Boyce, of Amarillo, Tex., which reflects an outline of the contributions made to the war effort by the people of the Texas Panhandle.

No section has contributed more in manpower, food production, or all-out 100 percent war effort than these Texans.

CONTRIBUTION OF AMARILLO REGION TO WAR EFFORT OUTLINED BY BOYCE

A brief review of the contribution of Amarillo and the Panhandle to the war effort was given by John Boyce, president of the Amerillo Chamber of Commerce, at the noon luncheon Friday. Mr. Boyce said his survey was by no means complete but did give some idea of the vast amount of civilian war activity.

His talk in part follows:

The number of men and women from the Panhandle counties who are now serving in the armed forces runs into the thousands. No part of the country has made a greater per capita contribution. This is accounted for, partly, by the early voluntary enlistments and the many * * * from this area into Federal Service some 4 years ago, in November 1940. Although these people are undoubtedly our most important contribution, there is still a much larger number in the Amarillo area who are working in essential or semi-essential war industries. This number approximates 129,000 war workers.

These essential workers are located at Borger, Pampa, Dumas, Amarillo, the north Panhandle oil and gas field, and wherever else war plants are located in the Panhandle district.

A FEW CONCERNS

To give you some idea of the smaller concerns actually working on Government contracts, let me name just a few here in Amarillo, which, of course, can be duplicated in almost every other section of the Panhandle.

Amarillo Tent & Awning Co. has manufactured thousands of canvas articles under contract for the war effort.

Others are Amarillo Box Factory, Star Manufacturing Co., and Jack Ellis and associates.

All four of these companies are manufacturing wooden boxes which are used as crates for shipping artillery shells loaded by Pantex and other ordnance plants.

The Jewell Food Distributing Co. and the Mac-A-Lou Food Products Co. have completed contracts for the Government.

Star Machinery & Foundry Co., Superior Manufacturing Co., Johnson Bros., and Willborn Bros. Co. have completed many contracts for the War and Navy Departments.

Several local sash and door companies have Government contracts. The Amarillo Uniform Co. has completed a number of contracts.

METAL ARTICLES

Likewise, a number of welding and machine companies, making rivets, keys, and numerous other metal articles, have been awarded contracts.

These and many others will give you an idea of the scores of smaller war plants and firms in the Panhandle making their direct contribution to the war effort.

Now, to turn to the larger field, let's include:

The zinc smelter at Amarillo and the one at Dumas.

The two helium plants, one at Amarillo and the other 35 miles north at Exell.

The rubber plant at Borger.

The high octane gasoline plant at Phillips.

The Cactus Ordnance Works at Etter.

The Pantex Ordnance plant near Amarillo.

Power generating plants of the Southwestern Public Service Co., at Amarillo, Sunray, Borger, Mobeetie, Clovis, Tuco Switch, and Denver City. They have still other generating plants which, although outside of the Panhandle area, are nevertheless tied into this system.

Carbon black plants, oil refineries, gasoline plants, compressor stations are dotted all over the north Panhandle country. Then, too, there are hundreds of miles of pipe lines conveying gas to war industrial sections.

GRAND WAR JOB

Our railroads, the Santa Fe, Burlington, and Rock Island, with their thousands of workers in this territory, are doing a grand wartime job. This also applies to our air lines, bus, truck, and other forms of transportation, all of which employ hundreds of our citizens. They, too, are doing a fine job.

Our farming, livestock, packinghouses, elevators, all are essential industries; and each is doing its bit to win the war.

Then, to get into the military strictly. There are sizable military installations at Dalhart, Hereford, Childress, Lubbock, Pampa, McLean, Clovis, and Amarillo.

Now let's not overlook our hotels, apartment houses, and dwelling house owners. They, too, are making their contribution.

Automobiles, food, fiber, drugs, hardware, and machinery—manufacturers and distributors of every kind and variety, wholesale and retail, together with many of the professions and services, are all doing their bit and making their contribution to the war effort.

In Memoriam—Mrs. Ruth Hanna Simms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Ruth Hanna Simms, a former Member of Congress, died Sunday, December 31, 1944, at the Billings Hospital in Chicago, after a valiant fight for recovery following an emergency operation made necessary by a serious pancreatic ailment. Her death ended a career that was successful to a marked degree in business, in agriculture, in civil affairs, in the crusade for woman's rights, and in politics.

Many tributes expressing appreciation of her greatness, her leadership, and her sterling qualities were paid to her memory by leaders in all walks of life. The following statement from Gov. Tom Dewey is only one of many received:

The passing of Ruth Simms brings to Mrs. Dewey and me a feeling of deep personal loss. Her tremendous energy and the warmth of her friendship will leave bereft countless friends in every State in the Nation, who knew and loved her as one of the great women of our time.

A thumbnail sketch of her life, listing the many responsible positions she filled, taken from the Rockford Register-Republic of Rockford, Ill., reads as follows:

As the daughter of Marcus A. Hanna, Ohio "President maker," banker, industrialist, editor, and United States Senator, Mrs. Simms was born 64 years ago to a heritage of great wealth, political leadership, and business acumen. Throughout her life—first as secretarial aide to her famous father, then as wife and most trusted political adviser of the late Senator Medill McCormick, later as a Member of Congress and senatorial candidate in her own right, and finally as the wife of Albert G. Simms, New Mexico Congressman and businessman—she was deeply involved in politics nationally and in her three home States, Ohio, Illinois, and New Mexico. * * * As a Republican leader from New Mexico she played an important part in winning Gov. Thomas E. Dewey's nomination for president at the G. O. P. national convention this year. In 1940, she had served as national cochairman of Dewey's preconvention campaign.

Politically, Mrs. Simms was a liberal Republican. Throughout her life, she was identified with such reforms as woman's suffrage, child labor legislation, and betterment of the condition of wage earners in general. In 1912, she allied herself with Theodore Roosevelt's Bull Moose campaign and was active at national campaign headquarters of the Progressive Party.

Mrs. Simms was the owner and publisher of the Rockford Consolidated Newspapers, the most influential newspapers in northern Illinois, outside of Chicago. Her dauntless spirit and philosophy of life are so well epitomized in the following editorial, which appeared in the Rockford Register-Republic on Monday, January 1, 1945, that I feel it should be included in these remarks. It expresses the attitude of those who knew her well, who worked for her, and whose loyalty she so well deserved.

IN SPIRIT

There were two elements which commanded her entire life. One was her sense of loyalty; the other was her feeling that work is a privilege. Her loyalty, which came from a spirit both magnanimous and just, exacted loyalty, because she challenged us beyond loyalty to friendship.

Work to her was a privilege, and that conception shaped her life, shaped her associations, shaped her essential democracy. It was not by accident that her earliest public service was in the field of woman's suffrage and the Women's Trade Union League; for, endowed with wealth, with social place open to her at her bidding, she was seeking the privilege of work and usefulness. And not for herself only, but for women generally. And her final illness dated from a fall from a horse on her Trinchera ranch, where she had taken over management of production of thousands of head of cattle and sheep on the war food front, and was riding herd and keeping books and keeping things going in spite of shortage of manpower.

Work was a privilege which she had sought and, having won, held to be the most precious of possessions. Her democracy sprang from a feeling that what she had won should be the privilege of all. She was tender and generous in need, but her choice was to give others the opportunity to share in an experience of work which she found spiritually rewarding.

By religious upbringing, Ruth Simms was a Quaker, and the tenets of that faith touched her life in two ways. One was in a magnificent stamina in time of trouble or grief which bespoke deep spiritual roots. She never let us know how deep her hurt; she comforted the comforters. The other was in her attitude toward war, an antipathy which went very deep and which, in conjunction with her sharp realism, made it possible for her to see what some could not see: Beyond the quick glory, the lasting grief. Yet when war came, she threw her energies unflaggingly into patriotic activities and productive work.

Politically, Ruth Simms had intense convictions on the dignity and responsibility of Government. She was angered by the cynical or flippant, and this anger arose from her sense of democracy, which was wounded when public men seemed to talk down to a public which she met as an equal. In her political addresses, when she ran for House and Senate, there was acceptance of the integrity and understanding of listeners. This acceptance was no more beguiling compliment to voters; it sprang from an implicit faith in the people who had America in their keeping.

There was nothing of fear in her political philosophy. Clinging to her faith that there would always be a place in society for those to whom work was a privilege, she was not timorous of change, for she had preached forward-looking evangels as a young woman. But she wanted courses to be taken in full knowledge of the people, and not to be arrived at by means that impeached the people's dignity and betrayed their integrity. Political disappointments came to her, but she held to her faith.

To us in the News Tower, Ruth Simms was never far away. She laid no dictation upon us. For her newspaper she asked good faith and good will toward the public. She asked sincerity and good conscience from us in our tasks. She gave us loyalty and friendship and inspiration. In spirit, she is not far away.

The words of Ella Wheeler Wilcox are appropriate and fitting as a climax to this editorial tribute to Mrs. Simms. I close with these words:

There is no death!
What seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life Elysian,
Whose portal we call death.

Racial Theory at Bastogne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

RACIAL THEORY AT BASTOGNE

It was at Bastogne that a trapped American division stuck to its guns and blunted

the Nazi offensive and may have shortened the conflict in some of the fiercest fighting of the war. It was at Bastogne, too, that the theory of racial superiority on which the enemy holds no copyright took a beating.

With that One Hundred and First Air-Borne Division whose commander simply said "Nuts" when the Germans called on him to surrender was the Nine Hundred and Sixty-ninth Field Artillery Battalion, composed entirely of Negro enlisted men. Though they must have heard from time to time that Negro soldiers belong in labor battalions rather than combat divisions because they might not stand up under the strain of conflict, they were too busy on that occasion to pay much attention to that excuse for racial discrimination. Setting up their 155-millimeter howitzers, they poured out the fire which contributed as much as anything else to holding the enemy at bay.

How these Negro soldiers stood by their white comrades has now been revealed in a statement of the War Department paying deserved tribute to their courage. They not only remained as cool and calm as anyone else under that ordeal; they showed the same ingenuity when it became apparent that superhuman effort was needed to stem the German advance. Leaving only the actual cannoneers to man the guns, the rest of the men in the battalion picked up rifles on that bloody field and fought infantry fashion in the line with white soldiers who had been trained for that particular job.

The casualties were very heavy in that crucial engagement of the war, and the Negro battalion lost as many men proportionately as the white division. But some of them managed to stay on their feet until armored forces came up from the south to turn back Von Runstedt's drive which those heroic fighting men had checked. Some of them will be coming home some day. And will we then tell the Negro heroes of Bastogne who fought beside the white heroes of Bastogne that they must go back to living on the other side of the color line in the free America which they helped to save?

Air and Sea Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of January 23, 1945:

AIR AND SEA SERVICE—COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION VITAL TO MAINTAIN UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE LEADERSHIP

The American President Lines has withdrawn its application to the Civil Aeronautics Board for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to establish post-war air transportation service in conjunction with its steamship operations to the Far East.

The company's president, Henry F. Grady, explained that the withdrawal was made because of a belief the present Civil Aeronautics Board is opposed to steamship lines entering the field of international aviation.

"This is not to be construed as any change in the company's policy or program which is based upon a conviction that in order to meet the keen international competition in overseas Pacific trade," Mr. Grady said, "the premier American flag steamship service in that field must ultimately have a coordinated and integrated air and sea transportation service."

The policy of whether the shipping companies of this Nation should be permitted to engage in air traffic, as a supplementary and necessary service, should not be a matter for determination by the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is a matter for determination by the Congress. What the Nation's policy should be, and what it will be, must be established in law.

The authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board then, as now, will be to pass upon the merits of individual applications for providing such service, in accordance with governmental policy the Congress enacts.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has interpreted existing law as prohibiting steamship companies from engaging in traffic by air. If that interpretation is correct, then it is the duty of the Congress to amend the law, or to write a new law, if necessary, to provide that authority.

The steamship companies of other maritime nations already have such authority. If the American steamship companies don't have it, then the United States Merchant Marine will become a second-rate or a third-rate merchant marine because it will not be able to compete with foreign steamship lines.

As Mr. Grady points out:

"Such a service is not only of the greatest importance in developing sound American air operations in this area, but it also is vital in maintaining the position of the United States Merchant Marine in the Pacific."

It is vital, as well, to maintain the leadership of our merchant marine in the Atlantic. Without such leadership, American foreign trade will suffer, and that in turn will be reflected in our unemployment statistics.

Late Frances Sweeney Given Pope Leo XIII Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following reprint from the Boston Traveler, Friday, January 19, 1945, concerning a posthumous award of the Pope Leo XIII medal to the late Frances U. Sweeney, former executive secretary of the American-Irish Defense Association of Boston, and vice chairman of the Massachusetts Citizens' Committee for Racial Unity:

LATE FRANCES SWEENEY GIVEN POPE LEO XIII MEDAL—POSTHUMOUS AWARD TO BE MADE JANUARY 31 BY BISHOP SHEIL IN CHICAGO

CHICAGO, January 19.—A posthumous award of the Pope Leo XIII medal for outstanding work in social education will be made to the late Frances U. Sweeney, of Brighton, on January 31, the Sheil School of Social Studies here announced today.

In disclosing that the award will be made during the school's second anniversary celebration by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., senior auxiliary bishop of Chicago and founder-director of the Catholic Youth Organization, the school said:

"Founder and editor of the Boston City Reporter, Frances Sweeney fought unceasingly for social justice. Until her death at the age of 37 on June 18, 1944, Frances Sweeney continued to devote all her energy to combating prejudice and injustice.."

Irving Stone, author of Lust for Life, wrote after her death: "Fran Sweeney could not be discouraged, could not be beaten down, could not be frightened, could not be put in her place. She was a one-man crusade. She burned with some of the holiest and most unextinguishable passion for social justice that I have ever seen. I say unextinguishable, because the light that is Fran Sweeney is not put out by her death. She will remain a symbol, a heroic figure to those of us with less courage, less fortitude, less revulsion against intolerance."

Miss Sweeney was executive secretary of the American-Irish Defense Association of Boston, and vice chairman of the Massachusetts Citizens' Committee for Racial Unity.

Mrs. James Sweeney, mother of Frances, will accept the Leo XIII medal on her behalf from Bishop Sheil, at the annual dinner of the Sheil School faculty, to be held at the Hotel Continental (Chicago) on January 31.

The Leo XIII medal was presented for the first time in 1944 to Sister Vincent Ferrer, O. P., professor of economics and political science in Rosary College (River Forest, Ill.). The medal itself was designed by Graham Carey, and was struck by John Gove, of Boston. Of silver, 2 inches in diameter, it shows the hand of the Holy Father in the exercise of his role as teacher. The inscription is a quotation from the Gospel according to St. John (8:32): "The truth shall make you free."

Democracy Rescues Its Own

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people were thrilled and made happy when General MacArthur's forces in the Philippines recently liberated 513 survivors of the Bataan "death march" and a day or so later when there were liberated 3,700 civilians who had been held by the Japs in the Bilibid prison in the Philippines.

The New York Times of yesterday contained an editorial, entitled "Democracy Rescues Its Own," which describes the feelings of the American people concerning these episodes, and under leave granted I submit same herewith:

DEMOCRACY RESCUES ITS OWN

Perhaps we can write a new definition of democracy out of the American reaction to the news from the Philippines. A democracy is a system of society in which the natural warmth of the human heart has full play, and in which joy over the rescue of prisoners long in the hands of a brutal enemy makes people forget for a moment the pride of victory. Lieutenant Colonel Mucci and his Rangers set the pattern on January 29 when they liberated 513 survivors of the Bataan "death march" at Cabanatuan, in a thrillingly daring raid deep into enemy territory. Now there have returned from death as our troops charged into Manila 3,700 civilians held at the Santo Tomas prison camp and

800 prisoners of war and 550 civilians held in the Bilibid prison. In one of the strangest episodes of the war, 66 Japanese soldiers were allowed to march out of Santo Tomas and back to their own lines in order to save the lives of 221 civilian captives who might have been killed if Brigadier General Chase had chosen to shoot it out with Lieutenant Colonel Hayashi.

The freeing of these prisoners cannot change the course of the war. Any Nazi, any Japanese militarist, would have shrugged off any concern for them if the situation had been reversed. Why bother, they would have asked, about a few thousand individuals caught in the trap of war? They should be glad to die for Hitler or the Emperor. A democracy can't take that point of view. If saving these hapless captives, these starving men and women, these children crying for bread, these wives separated from husbands, these "angels of Bataan," every one of whom, thank God, survived—if doing this when it was done had threatened to delay victory a little or make it more costly, still it would have been done. This is the American, the democratic way. We fight bitterly against a savage foe, but the toughest fighting man cares tenderly for his own people, who were dead and now are alive again.

If these episodes hold our attention, if we find our thoughts returning to them again and again while the fate of the world is at stake, if our eyes moisten as we read our papers and a lump comes into the throat, let us not be ashamed. For our whole war, east and west, is a gigantic rescue operation. Our soldiers kill that men may live. We are unrelenting now in order that mercy and justice may rule in years to come.

The Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am in entire accord with the position taken by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], concerning this legislation. It is inconceivable that in the light of the statements recently made on the floor of the House about manpower shortages that legislation of this nature would receive even passing consideration. Under the provisions of this bill $15,000,000 over-all would be spent partially to employ an estimated 27,000 people to take an unneeded agricultural census. Most of the information that would be elucidated from such a census is now already known by the Department of Agriculture.

In my own county of Rensselaer, the county agent has performed a very excellent service to the farmers in that county. Thanks to his efforts, advance notices regarding feed, fertilizer, seed, and machinery shortages, and suggestions as to how to meet and supplement these shortages with substitutes, have reached every farmer in the community. His advice and help is now urgently needed if the farmers are to meet the emergencies which have arisen. Certainly his efforts, or the efforts of anyone else who could be used in the agricultural field, should not be channelled now in another direction. I believe that this agency now has enough statistical agricultural information to meet any present need for it, and new information on the subject cannot possibly be of any service.

Common sense dictates that in view of the evident shortages of farm labor, it becomes far more important to keep this labor on the farm-producing foodstuffs, than it is to send 27,000 census takers to the farmers of this country to find out that which the country, and particularly the farmers, already know. If there are 27,000 people now available whose services are to be used to take a census, then I venture to suggest that these same people be first used to plow the soil, plant, and reap the harvest, and then take the census, since it becomes relatively far more important to first produce the products of the farm, than to find out how little we have now, or will have in the future, to eat. In passing this bill we seem to be closing the barn door after the horse has left.

The expenditure of another $15,000,000 for the purpose of taking the census should not be passed over lightly. Some day we will have to tax back every dollar of this expenditure. Each of us would feel better physically, as well as mentally, if this $15,000,000 has to be spent, to have it used for the more constructive purpose of providing pools of farm machinery, fertilizers, feed, and other farming necessities to meet the present emergency. The census can wait, but a greater production of food is now imperative.

Bankers on Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

BANKERS ON BRETTON WOODS

After careful studies by several committees, the American Bankers Association has published a report in which it contends that Congress should not approve the proposed International Monetary Fund, but that it should approve, with modifications, the proposed International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The bankers recommend also an expansion of the American Government's Export-Import Bank, the repeal of the Johnson Act, the removal of hampering barriers to international trade, and the firm stabilization of the United States dollar in relation to gold."

The association's report is well reasoned, lucidly written, and conciliatory in tone. It is clear that the authors have made every compromise that they thought could safely be made so that the proposed program might be considered with a minimum of essential changes.

The rejection of the proposed fund is based on reasons that for the most part have already become familiar. The fund is too big, too elaborate, too complicated, too difficult for the public to understand. The language of the agreement is so vague as to be susceptible to widely different interpretations. It grants credit automatically, as a matter of right. It does not stipulate that the loans shall be good loans. It provides no real control over the policies of borrowers. It may tempt borrowing countries to continue on the easy political past, instead of making the maximum effort to put their economic affairs in order. It threatens a repetition on a large scale of the errors we made after World War No. 1, when we lent too much too carelessly.

It overlooks the fact that the outside world as a whole already has more gold and dollar exchange than ever before; that our own gold stock has been going down, and that we are about to be forced to lower our legal reserve requirements. It would force us to supply dollars even to countries with which we might be having serious political differences, or countries whose trade policies discriminated against us.

The bankers believe, however, that if the proposed International Bank for Reconstruction and Development were adopted by Congress, and authorized also to make loans for the purpose of aiding countries to stabilize their currencies, it would accomplish every good purpose that the fund would accomplish without its accompanying dangers. For the bank agreement provides that the loans made must be for specific purposes; that they must be examined by a special committee; that they must offer promise of repayment; that the country whose currency is lent will have a veto power, and that the bank will not make loans which can be reasonably made through private channels. If the bank were adopted, moreover, and the fund rejected, the world would avoid the danger of jurisdictional conflicts and potential confusion and rivalry between two separate institutions. Acceptance of the bank would also avert the psychological danger to world cooperation of a total rejection of the Bretton Woods proposals.

The American Bankers Association committees have brought in a constructive and statesmanlike report. It is to be hoped that not only Congress but the administration itself will study the report in the same spirit.

Resolutions Adopted by the Polish-American Congress, District of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

Whereas recent events on the military fronts in central Europe indicate that the present war in that sector of the world is fast approaching a climax; and

Whereas many of the countries, small and large, whose lands had been taken and whose people had been enslaved by the totalitarian bestial lust for conquest and power are now fast coming under the jurisdiction of the Allied forces and the people therein are being liberated; and

Whereas most of these countries have been at all times an integral part of the Allied cause whose people for centuries have stood for the principles of justice and liberty; and

Whereas among these nations is Poland, who first exposed the treachery of totalitarianism and which, even facing utter extinction, fought alone against the forces of the enemies of justice and freedom at a sac-

rifice unparalleled heretofore, being true to all of her promises to her allies and respecting every treaty and covenant made with them, never having at any time conducted a war of aggression; and

Whereas one of our allies, Russia, has indicated a desire to annex certain portions of Poland and other small countries and to impose her will and influence upon the Governments of Poland and these other little countries; and

Whereas this conduct on the part of our ally, Russia, does not comply with the original principles of the Allied cause when Poland was invaded and the countries of Great Britain and France found those acts of aggression cause for a declaration of war upon aggressor, Germany; and

Whereas the present attitude of our ally, Russia, does not square with the principles of the "four freedoms" and the enunciations set forth in the Atlantic Charter which served as an inspiration for the whole civilized world and which caused our own boys to most willingly undertake all hardships and make sacrifices for the fulfillment of the promises to the world made thereby; and

Whereas the fortunes of war have caused most of these little nations to be reoccupied by the military forces under the command of our ally, Russia, which participated in the original act of aggression upon Poland but which later was compelled to join the Allied cause for its own security but at present seeks legal approval of that portion of the original aggression that she undertook; and

Whereas certain groups and individuals acting in their own individual interests only are disseminating propaganda of misapprehension by various propaganda machines: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Polish American Congress for the District of Connecticut acting herein as a district member of the Polish American Congress of America, consisting of church societies and organizations, civic, welfare, social, veteran, educational, beneficial, political, fraternal, clubs, and societies of Americans of Polish descent, do hereby go on record urging that the coming peace be based on justice. That the principles of the "four freedoms" and the enunciations of the Atlantic Charter should be put into operation. We desire to go on record as commending the refusal of our Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, to place any approval for the surrender of any territory of Poland to Russia as urged recently by Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain. We further urge that our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, in the coming meeting which is to take place with Prime Minister Churchill of England and Marshall Stalin of Russia, to most forcefully insist and demand collaboration for the bringing about of a peace based on justice seeking to forever demilitarize those who have been guilty previously in causing wars creating bloodshed and to refuse to recognize any unilateral creation of boundaries originated since the beginning of the present conflict. We still further urge and request that if the present conflict is not over in Europe at the time of the said meeting that the matter of boundaries and questions of Government be postponed for deliberations after the military phase of the war is completed. We do further condemn any instrumentalities that seek to influence public opinion by sowing seeds of misapprehension thereby causing injustice to Poland and other freedom-loving nations by exposing them to the dangers of an imposed sphere of influence against their will; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, to our Senator and to our Members of Congress.

Attested to by:

JOSEPH KOZAKIEWICZ,
Secretary.
LUCIEN MACIORA,
President.

The Late Hon. James F. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD a memorial adopted by the Montana Legislature on January 18, 1945. It is a privilege for me to bring this token of high esteem to your attention because it shows how the people who knew Jim O'Connor best appreciated him.

Memorial by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-ninth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana consequent upon the death of Representative James F. O'Connor, Second Montana District

James F. O'Connor was born in California Junction, Iowa, May 7, 1878, and received his elementary education in the schools of Harrison County, that State. After being graduated from high school he entered the University of Nebraska Law School, completing a 3-year course in 1904. In the same year he came to Montana and located in Livingston, which remained his home until the time of his death.

Possessed of a magnetic personality, a deep student of his profession, and commendably ambitious, he quickly won a recognized place in the civic, political, and professional life of his community and the State. Early in his career he was chosen to the district judgeship of his judicial district, being at the time the youngest man to occupy that honored position. In 1916 he was elected as one of the representatives of Park County in the State house of representatives and, when he took his seat at the beginning of the session in 1917, was accorded the almost unprecedented honor of being chosen speaker of the house for his first term, which position he filled with dignity, ability, and impartiality.

Following the end of his legislative term, he served in several responsible public positions until 1936 when he was elected to the National House of Representatives from the Second Montana District and was reelected in 1938, 1940, 1942, and at the recent election in 1944, for his fifth consecutive term.

The same qualities which gave him eminence in the public affairs of his State enabled him to establish himself as an outstanding leader in the national assembly. His untiring energy, high talents as an orator and ready grasp of the larger affairs of state brought his rapid advancement to the chairmanship of one of the most important committees of the House and high positions on other major committees.

The successful political career of Congressman O'Connor was the result of his undeviating devotion to the varied interests of his district and State and effective work in behalf of these interests in committees and before the House. He was particularly diligent in answering the appeals of his constituents who requested him to represent them before the various departments, boards, and bureaus of the Federal Government.

Congressman O'Connor passed away in his sleep at his apartment in Washington, Monday, January 15, 1945.

Whereas it has pleased the Creator to remove from our midst, James F. O'Connor; and

Whereas James F. O'Connor served with distinction as a member and the speaker of the fifteenth Montana Assembly; and

Whereas he was an honored and valued official in many fields of public service in the State of Montana; and

Whereas his sudden passing robs the State of Montana of a most distinguished public servant; now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Twenty-ninth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, expressing the sentiments of all the people of Montana, hereby express to the members of the family of James F. O'Connor the sincere and heartfelt sympathy and condolences of all the members of this house in this time of their bereavement. May they be comforted in the knowledge that their loved one who has passed served worthily and with great distinction the people of his adopted State and his deeds will be rememberd with gratitude by all of the citizens of Montana; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to his family and spread upon the journal of this house.

TOM STOUT,
of Fergus County, Chairman.
DAVID F. JAMES,
of Liberty County.
RALPH C. BRICKER,
of Cascade County.
Dr. R. P. MINNICK,
of Treasure County.
FRANK W. HAZELBAKER,
of Missoula County.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the spirited debate and the controversy which has followed the action of the House in making the un-American activities a permanent committee has been well answered by the editorial so ably written by David Lawrence in the February 7 issue of the Washington Evening Star.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therewith this editorial:

HART UNIT HAMPERED BY ITS PREDECESSOR—WRITER SAYS NEW DIES COMMITTEE CAN DO "CONSTRUCTIVE SERVICE"

(By David Lawrence)

What is an "un-American" activity? Representative MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, has been endeavoring to elicit from all sides some definition for the guidance of the House committee which was recently formed as a permanent unit to succeed the Dies committee.

There can be no doubt there is a place for such a committee, but there is considerable doubt as to what constitutes a legitimate orbit for its inquiries.

One of the handicaps under which the new committee starts is that its predecessor unquestionably did injure the reputation of innocent parties while seeking to get at the persons really guilty of subversive activities.

There are unfortunately many misguided persons in America who think it is "un-American" to be radical or socialistic and who really want to define "un-American activities" as the articulation, either by individuals or groups, of all beliefs on social or economic questions that happen to be

contrary to their own, and perhaps even adverse to their pocketbook interest.

The new committee, of which Representative HART, Democrat, of New Jersey, is chairman, can do a constructive and a patriotic service by putting as much affirmative emphasis on what constitutes an American activity as has been placed on the negative or un-American activity side.

For one thing, it is American to study all forms of government and to examine all philosophies, whether left wing or right wing. It is American to assume toward any citizen a tolerant view by respecting his right to be left wing or right, radical or conservative, as well as his right to economic opportunity, irrespective of race, creed, or color.

FALLACIES NEED EXPOSURE

It would be American even to teach objectively what communism or fascism really is; provided, along with such courses, the fallacies of such systems were as sympathetically presented by the teachers.

But it is decidedly un-American for any organization or association to receive financial or moral support for any foreign government or interest and to pose as an American organization when it is, in reality, either openly or clandestinely dedicated to the furtherance of the objectives of a foreign government or group.

There have been in the past such un-American activities on the part of citizens of the United States who have acted in behalf of interests in Great Britain, Germany, France, and Japan, as well as Russia.

The ways of foreign propagandists are devious and subtle. Some governments bestow their rewards in the form of ribbons and decorations. Others bestow financial rewards, and still others employ at substantial fees American lawyers to do ordinary legal work, only to expect them to take an active part in the formation of societies and associations which at the bottom have for their purpose the furtherance of policies of certain foreign governments.

Some of these seemingly un-American activities may really prove to be legitimate but, if so, there can be provision by law for their periodic disclosure by the listing with the Department of State of all persons engaged in such activities.

Too often, however, only through the investigative power of Congress is it possible to get to the bottom of the intrigues that are employed by foreign interests to influence legislation or to exert an influence on our own domestic or foreign policies as applied by the executive branch of our Government.

LINE OF DEMARCATION

International friendship requires that citizens of all countries shall have access to Americans for the presentations of their respective points of view, but there is a line of demarcation between full disclosure or legitimate petition as distinguished from illegitimate influence and covert pressures.

It is un-American, moreover, for misguided citizens to distribute literature preaching hate against religions or races they don't happen to like. Too many American businessmen are sucked into contributing funds for these allegedly American activities which are, in fact, the very antithesis of true Americanism.

A committee of Congress can, by constant exposure, reveal to the American public and to well-meaning citizens the pitfalls to which they are so often subjected.

As for so-called subversive activities that seek to undermine our institutions of Government and which basically seek to overthrow by physical force or by economic violence our constitutional system of Government, this is a line of inquiry that may overflow occasionally into the activities of innocent groups, but corrective processes are always available when mistakes are made. There must be every assurance that truly subversive activities are not permitted to escape detection just because the line of inquiry sometimes enters a so-called twilight zone of investigation.

Nomination of Henry Wallace To Be Secretary of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials from the Philadelphia Record favoring the confirmation of the nomination of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, also Mrs. Roosevelt's article My Day, of recent date, entitled "Wallace Versus Jones—One Looks Forward, the Other Backward," and a telegram sent to me by Anita McCormick Blaine (Mrs. Emmons Blaine). I have an estimate from the Public Printer, which indicates that the cost of printing will be $121.40.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of February 1, 1945]

HENRY WALLACE, FIGHTING LIBERAL

We are for Henry Wallace.

We want him as Secretary of Commerce with all the trimmings.

We believe we voice the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the 25,610,946 citizens who voted for Roosevelt.

We are supporting Henry Wallace because he stands foursquare for those principles of New Deal economy which the Record has long championed.

We are supporting Henry Wallace because he is a fighting liberal—and fighting liberals are becoming as scarce as hen's teeth down in Washington. The only one we can think of in Henry's class is Harold Ickes. Both men happen to share many of the same faults and the same virtues. They both get fighting mad at reactionaries and call them mean names.

Of course, they should not do so, especially in wartime, but if the Record were too critical on that score, it would be a case of pot calling the kettle black, for the Record has occasionally handled the opposition without a velvet mitten.

So when Henry hauls off and labels his conservative opponents "Fascists" as he has on several inopportunities, we realize he is "misspeaking." We also know that such overstatements indicate that Henry really cares and is willing to fight for his principles.

All our great leaders misspeak themselves occasionally. President Roosevelt is a frequent offender. Nevertheless, he has held the confidence and respect of the majority of Americans for 12 years. The President misspoke himself on the Atlantic Charter when he said it had not been formally signed. He misspoke himself when he talked about Dr. Win-the-War taking the place of Mr. New Deal.

Mr. New Deal may have to stand aside for Dr. Win-the-War until V-day, but Mr. New Deal is far from dead. The same policies which brought such great benefits to so many millions since 1933 must be and will be reinstated for post-war reconstruction.

That is exactly what Henry Wallace proposed in his masterful statement before the Senate Commerce Committee. He took the eight points in the President's economic bill of rights, amplified them and applied them to post-war problems in such a clear and forthright style that everyone who reads that statement must be impressed with its logic and importance.

Unfortunately comparatively few citizens had the opportunity to read it. Because our daily newspapers are so largely conservative and because Henry, the fighting liberal, is anathema to most of them, the complete text was printed in only 4 newspapers, the combined circulations of which are less than 3 percent of the 45,000,000 daily circulation of all newspapers in the United States. That is the reason the Record is reprinting 1,000,000 copies of that statement and will print as many millions more as it can find means to distribute throughout the land.

There are many definitions of a liberal. According to the creed of the Record a liberal extends a helping hand to those below to come up to the new level.

Henry Wallace is that kind of a liberal—not one of those halfway liberals who stretches a condescending hand to help the other fellow only a little way up.

Right here and now let's issue a solemn warning that halfway liberalism won't go with G. I. Joe when he comes marching home. It has got to be all-the-way liberalism of the Henry Wallace type if we want to avoid a wave of discontent and radicalism. We have passed out of the era when the soup line and apple selling kept the unemployed from making too much noise about their misery.

Some conservatives have not awakened to that fact. They still live in those good old days of a soft labor market when a three-line want ad would bring to the factory a queue of willing workers a block long and the foreman could pick the huskiest lads.

That past-epoch thinking is the key to the fight on Wallace. The National Association of Manufacturers, dominated by the giant industrialists, is preaching: "Leave it to us industrialists and we will create the 60,000,000 jobs. We don't want Government help or interference."

If they were sincere, why would they want to assume this heavy responsibility alone? Why wouldn't they want Government cooperation, as outlined by Henry Wallace, with a backlog of Government work to take up the slack in employment in case private enterprise could not carry the whole load? Why wouldn't they welcome as head of Government lending an outstanding liberal who could go much further in aiding big business than a conservative without loss of public confidence?

The answer is obvious.

Keeping everybody at work means higher wages, shorter hours and more union demands. The half-way liberals would like to compromise this situation with just enough people unemployed to hold labor in hand. We think such a compromise would throw us into a tailspin with an aftermath of radicalism which would make Henry Wallace's political philosophy appear as ultra-conservative as Joe Grundy's does today.

Henry Wallace has proven himself one of the country's ablest administrators and clearest thinkers. He has had as much experience as any man in the Nation lending Government money during his 8 years as Secretary of Agriculture. We don't believe that anyone can sincerely question his eminent fitness for the combined job of Secretary of Commerce and Loan Administrator.

Henry Wallace is the Nation's leading champion of the New Deal's liberal principles and policies. That is the real objection to him.

Because President Roosevelt, as Commander in Chief, has had to give all his time and attention to fighting the Axis, he has neglected the reactionary enemies of the New Deal within the party—and these reactionaries have been gaining in strength and importance in their own opinion. Now they have the nerve to think they are going to make the Democratic Party over along conservative lines, which is just what happened to the Republican Party after the Civil War.

By pressing for a vote on confirmation of Wallace as Secretary of Commerce before a vote is taken on the George bill to divorce the loan administration from the Commerce Department, Senator BAILEY reveals this sinister purpose most clearly. There is no excuse for such a procedure. It is plainly the attempt of reactionaries to drive liberalism, as personified by Wallace, out of the Democratic Party.

Another straw in the wind is the defeatist attitude in this crisis of Robert E. Hannegan, National Democratic Chairman, and other party leaders.

Don't these gentlemen realize that the Democratic Party shorn of liberalism would be an empty shell of its former self? Don't they realize if the Democratic conservatives ride herd on the liberals, they will drive labor out of the party, split the party wide open and force a coalition of liberal Democrats with Willkie Republicans?

Unless the party leaders awaken to this danger, they will leave the Democratic Party, like Samson, shorn of his locks with strength left only to destroy the temple of liberalism, which it took 12 years to build and which should be our refuge from radicalism in post-war recovery.

[From the Philadelphia Record of January 27, 1945]

FIGHT FOR PROSPERITY AS WE FIGHT THE WAR

Fight for post-war prosperity as we are fighting the war.

That is the inspiring message which Henry Wallace gave his country Thursday in the form of a statement before the Senate Commerce Committee.

It reminds us of the Record's oft-repeated slogan during the Hoover depression: "Let's fight the depression as we fought the war."

Then we were referring to World War No. 1 when we spent some $40,000,000,000 and, according to the conservatives, had ruined the country by raising the national debt to $26,000,000,000, a stupendous sum for those days.

President Roosevelt had to defeat the penny-pinchers then to win the battle against the worst depression in the Nation's history. After V-Day we will have the same struggle to counteract a post-war depression, only on a much greater scale.

We will have to overcome the prejudices of those citizens described by Henry Wallace as "people who set their sights too low for war" and "are now asking the American people to set their sights too low for prosperity. They do not grasp the strength and the spirit of America."

Thus Henry Wallace throws down the gage of battle. In his masterful statement he charts the Nation's post-war course. This address and his subsequent testimony before the Commerce Committee leave no doubt in our minds that he is the Nation's outstanding leader to carry on where Roosevelt leaves off.

Anyone who reads Wallace's statement will realize instantly how false and foul have been the attempts to paint him as a crackpot and wild-eyed visionary.

He has given the Nation an American charter, a charter of the economic rights of man.

That charter will live on, remain a burning, unquenchable challenge, no matter what the outcome of this fight in the Senate.

Votes may reject the nomination of Wallace, but votes can no more destroy this American charter than short-sighted power politics can destroy the Atlantic Charter.

As to Wallace himself, for the Senate to slur this great national leader by depriving him of any of the administrative powers exercised by his predecessor would be as foolish as it would be futile.

The Senate Commerce Committee yesterday voted against Wallace and for separation of the R. F. C. from the Commerce Department.

The attempts by Senate pygmies to hobble this New Deal Gulliver will increase public enthusiasm for him and confidence in him. The less power Wallace is given, the more eager the overwhelming majority of his fellow citizen will be that he should have greater power and influence in shaping our post-war economy.

Wallace's address to the Commerce Committee is a most complete and clear chart of New Deal principles applied to post-war problems. We regret that of all the metropolitan morning newspapers in this country, only the New York Times, the Boston Globe, and the Philadelphia Record ran the complete text. The Washington Star, a Republican evening newspaper, printed the text yesterday. Apparently it was the only evening newspaper in America which recognized its importance.

As a public service the Record is printing 1,000,000 copies for distribution to those who may not have had the opportunity of reading the complete text.

[From the Philadelphia Record of January 31, 1945]

IF NOT WALLACE—WHAT? N. A. M. PLAN NO ANSWER

If not the program of Henry Wallace for post-war prosperity or one quite similar, then what?

If we do not exert every instrument and resource of business and Government to provide 60,000,000 jobs, then what?

The National Association of Manufacturers offers an alternative.

In effect, the N. A. M. urges us to tie one arm behind us. And try, thus handicapped, to lick the problem upon which the fate of free enterprise, of the Nation itself, hinges.

Big business, it argues, can handle the monumental task of employment alone. It can do the job all right, if Government will keep hands off.

That should be set to music—a dirge.

The N. A. M. is currently propagandizing Americans with its "process of prosperity" program.

Among material circulated is a booklet published by the N. A. M.'s National Industrial Information Committee. It contains laudable aims such as "increasing the opportunities of all to earn and buy."

But the accent is on increased production.

A factory can produce until it blows the roof off. But its products cannot be sold and the factory can't make profits, unless Americans have the money to buy. They won't have the money unless they have jobs.

The first step on the road to post-war prosperity must be jobs. They are the foundation. Without jobs for all who need them, anything else we do is building castles in the air.

The N. A. M. is also circulating an address made last December by Executive Vice President Walter B. Weisenburger. The N. A. M. program, he says, is not mealy mouthed:

"It goes into detail; how management intends to constantly improve the efficiency of production and distribution. How, by that course, the consumer is given better bargains, resulting in bigger markets, and in the end more jobs for all."

"* * * In the end." That's exactly where we would get it if industrialists who commune with the nineteenth century had their way and put jobs last.

Everybody agrees that the bulk of post-war jobs must be provided by private industry. If it can provide all, if it can provide 60,000,000 jobs, so much the better. But we cannot predicate our future on an "if."

Government through public works and generous credit terms to big and small business alike must take up unemployment slack—the reserves must be ready.

Americans, those at home and those who will return from battle, will rightfully demand it. A little unemployment is a dangerous thing. It feeds on fear, retrenchment, becomes big, disastrous unemployment. It must not get a start.

Wallace's program for a prosperous America does not stand or fall by whether or not he is confirmed as Secretary of Commerce. The Wallace program is bigger than Wallace.

But this is true: His confirmation would provide greater assurance that this plan for prosperity would be made the Government's official program and that it would succeed.

[From the Philadelphia Record]

DO THE SENATORS HATE 60,000,000 AMERICANS, TOO?

We suggest to our United States Senators a reading of history—

Before they vote on confirmation of Henry Wallace.

History shows it is much easier to get rid of men than to kill ideals.

Some Senators apparently believe that if they can only dispose of this felow Wallace now—once and for good—there will be an immediate end to all the crack-brained nonsense about 60,000,000 jobs after the war.

We suggest to the Senators that if they do reject Wallace, they are going to be bitterly disappointed. They will be no more secure in their reactionary victory than was Macbeth after he had murdered Banquo.

You might think from the attitude of some of our Senators that it was Henry Wallace who wanted 60,000,000 jobs, all for himself.

Wallace wants those 60,000,000 jobs for 60,000,000 American citizens. Whatever the Senate does about making Henry Wallace Secretary of Commerce—

It simply can't legislate those 60,000,000 American citizens out of existence.

To the contrary, rejection of Wallace will only intensify the real issue. It will make the demand for 60,000,000 post-war jobs more insistent, make these ideas which disturb the cozy reaction of certain Senators more annoying, not less.

We suggest to the Senators that if the jobs are not in sight when the need appears—this Nation may be faced with a crisis far more serious than that from which President Roosevelt rescued it in 1933.

The people may not be so patient next time. They know now that depressions are not supernatural phenomena but the fruit of human blundering.

As Thomas L. Stokes points out in his column on this page today, the most disheartening angle of the conservative fight upon Wallace is the attitude toward the whole post-war problem:

"It can't be done."

That's what they were saying in 1933. Then Roosevelt proved that where the will exists, the means can be found.

Senator BAILEY, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, leader of the committee fight against Wallace, ought to know better. BAILEY sat in Congress in the dark days of 1933 when the banks were closed, the Nation's business was prostrate, and the smoke from the burning shacks of the bonus marchers was still fragrant in Washington.

So should Senator VANDENBERG, another committee member who voted against Wallace. VANDENBERG was there in '33. So was PAT MCCARRAN. So was HIRAM JOHNSON, hating Hoover as lustily as he hates Roosevelt.

After 12 years they still cry "it can't be done."

They will have to learn better. All over again. And no matter what they do to Henry Wallace.

That's why it merely makes sense for the Senate to confirm Henry Wallace today.

Wallace can give the Department of Commerce a liberal leadership which will assure both big and little business a chance to go forward when the war ends. He can give the people confidence that their Government will be prepared to fight the problems of peace with the same determination that it has fought the war.

Senators may vent their fury against Wallace with votes. They may sneer and revile. They may even bind him with the chains that were on the White House gates when Hoover lived there.

But when the war is over, as surely as great Birnam Wood came to Dunsinane Hill, the voice will be heard again demanding jobs.

Not Wallace's voice, then. The voice of the American people.

[From the Philadelphia Record of February 2, 1945]

WALLACE AND LIBERALISM WIN FIRST ROUND IN SENATE

Backers of Henry Wallace yesterday won the first and apparently the decisive round of the epic Senate battle over his confirmation as Secretary of Commerce.

By the narrow margin of 43 to 41 the Senate voted to defer action on the Wallace nomination, and take up consideration of the George bill—a "bill of divorcement" which removes the R. F. C. and other lending agencies from the Commerce Department.

A few hours later the Senate passed the George bill, 74 to 12.

In political terms, this means Wallace is almost sure to be confirmed as Secretary.

Wallace's Senate foes sought action on his nomination first. They knew a number of Senators would refuse to vote to confirm Wallace if it meant giving him control of R. F. C. and the lending agencies, but would vote for confirmation if Wallace did not have such control.

So, by taking the R. F. C. out of the Commerce Department first, the objection of those Senators to Wallace is now removed.

We think it was a shabby objection. American liberals wanted to see Wallace made Secretary of Commerce on the same terms as Jesse Jones, with "all the trimmings."

But this much we know. Even with the George bill, the President is almost certain to name a liberal to head the R. F. C. and other lending agencies, a liberal who will try his best to create 60,000,000 jobs, which both the President and Henry Wallace stand for.

So, though this specific fight is compromised; the real issue, full employment as Federal policy, is not compromised at all.

There is no doubt that Wallace's enemies, well aware that yesterday's would be the crucial vote, had mobilized every last ounce of their strength for the show-down.

It wasn't enough.

True, the fight is not all over. But at least hate takes a holiday.

Deferment of action on Wallace's confirmation not only gives time for hotheads in the Senate to cool, it affords time also for some of the Democratic insurgent Senators to reappraise their position.

Democracy is a system of give-and-take, compromise, meeting halfway. Party organization in a democracy works the same way.

When the President named Stettinius and five conservatives to the State Department, the liberals protested. They recognized frankly that conservatism has a right to substantial representation in the Federal Government. But "five of a kind" was too much. However, when the show-down came, they voted to go along with the President.

Apparently the Democratic conservatives mistook that contribution to Democratic party unity as a sign of weakness. Ever since they have acted as if the liberal wing of the party—which contributed most to the victory last November—had no right to representation, almost no right to be heard.

Such an attitude offers little hope for the future of the Democratic Party.

If a majority of Republican Senators want to continue to appear before the public as rank obstructionists who just can't pass up a chance to embarrass the President, that is their affair. They have paid for that attitude in four successive defeats.

Today the conservative Republican hope for future victory over the Democratic Party is the same hope Hitler has for victory over the Allies—the hope that those on the other side will fight among themselves.

There was a time, in 1920's, when the Democratic Party did let disunity bring a succession of defeats. Those were the days when Frank Kent made his famous remark that "the Democratic Party has a genius for snatching defeat from the jaws of victory."

That genius has been safely buried for 12 years. It is up to the conservatives in the Democratic Party whether it stays buried, or whether they go on trying to remake the Democratc Party into a hating image of the G. O. P.

[From the Washington Daily News]

MY DAY—WALLACE VERSUS JONES: ONE LOOKS FORWARD, THE OTHER BACKWARD

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

FRIDAY.—In the past 2 days I spent a longer time on reading the newspapers than usual, and that is because I have done what I hope every other interested person is doing. I have read the full statements made by Jesse H. Jones and Henry Wallace, and as much of the questioning as was reported in the papers.

The reason I hope that other citizens throughout this Nation have taken the time to do this same thing is that I think they will find the two statements, with the questions and answers, a great help in clarifying their own thinking.

Mr. Jones has been for years a gentleman well known in business circles. Mr. Wallace was primarily a farmer, and the one business he was engaged in grew out of his scientific farming knowledge.

We are frequently told that farming is not an occupation where people accumulate vast incomes but that we are a Nation where a great many people still go in for farming because they like it as a way of life. Mr. Wallace has been, in his chosen field, successful; but much of his time has been given to Government work, and some of his most successful experience in business has come through Government work. Directing the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Farm Security Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Rural Electrification Administration, and making some $6,000,000,000 worth of loans is proof of vast experience, however.

What stands out, as you read—at least, for me—is that one man is looking backward and the other man is looking forward. We are at a period, it seems to me, where this attitude of mind is not something which you can judge by physical age. Some old men, like Albert Einstein, are always looking forward.

I do not think it is time wasted to read carefully what these two men have to say and to decide where one stands oneself, because it is a fundamental decision which is going to face many of us, and not just in any one field. Who is to be the Secretary of Commerce and who is to have the powers of the R. F. C. are perhaps the immediate questions before Congress, and the rest of the country is deeply interested; but the interest of the rest of the country is even deeper than this particular decision. We know, we people in the United States, that the world is facing new and unpredictable conditions. We know that to meet these conditions we will have to have realists leading us, who face what the conditions are. At the same time, we know that adherence to old and outmoded answers may lead to destruction.

I have always had complete faith in the power of the American people to make up their minds as to what they wanted, and to be wise in their decisions, if they had at hand the facts on which to base their judgments. In this particular moment of our history, I think the statements made by Mr. Jones and Mr. Wallace are essential facts which the American people need to have in making their decisions for the future.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 27, 1945.*

Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
The Senate Office or Residence,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I offer a serious thought concerning the question of the confirmation of the appointment of Mr. Wallace. If the people receive the idea that the Senate is trying to block the progress of all the people economically, the Senate will possibly be the one on trial. The Senate should recognize that that body was the force that blocked the cooperation of the United States with the world after the last war. Without assuming that the United States could have improved the actions of the League, it is true that the United States did not try to by joining it. It is easily understandable that had the United States taken a part in that effort it would have been better for the world. If the idea dawns on the people that a repetition of what was effected politically after the last war by a few blind Senators is now being attempted economically, the Senate may find itself in a dangerous place in its road. In the deep and vast problems that face us today Henry Wallace is an enlightened and honest guide—conservative—not radical. Conservative of the interests, the rights, the lives of all people and of the essential responsibilities of those who do the people's work.

He should be given more responsibility, not less. His influence must be conserved for the United States and for all people.

I am,

Sincerely yours,

ANITA MCCORMICK BLAINE.
(Mrs. Emmons Blaine.)

Corp. Michael Sapetti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, among the many young men from the Twenty-first Congressional District in Illinois now serving their country in the armed forces, is Corp. Michael Sapetti, of Kinsaid, Ill.

His splendid efforts have recently been described in the public press. The article follows:

CORP. M. SAPETTI KEYMAN IN SUPPLYING EQUIPMENT TO PLANES

AN AIR SERVICE COMMAND DEPOT IN ENGLAND.—Corp. Michael Sapetti, son of Mr. and

Mrs. Sapetti, of Tovey, is a keyman behind the scenes of the supply war in Europe.

Serving with a station complement squadron at an Air Service Command depot in England, he is working long hours wrestling with the thousands of complex problems that arise in keeping equipment moving to the men of the combat air forces.

A soldier since February 1, 1943, he has been overseas 14 months.

He attended the Kincaid high school.

Universities and Public Agencies Have Part in Developing Fundamental Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an address delivered by Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan, Vice Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, as reported in the Tennessee Alumnus, autumn, 1944.

The article is an interesting study of the methods universities can and should follow in helping develop our national resources in conjunction with public agencies, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Dr. Morgan had made an excellent record as a member of the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Prior to that time, he was president of the University of Tennessee. He was recognized as one of the foremost educators in the Nation.

The address is as follows:

We are here today in observance of a significant event. The University of Tennessee, established in 1794, now is in its 150th year of service to the people of the State and the Nation. We can look back upon a long and varied history of development and growth, and of accomplishment. We can look about our beautiful campus and admire the sturdy buildings which are outward reminders of the progress we have made. We can regard with deep satisfaction the increasing numbers of young, ambitious, and serious students who come to our lecture halls and classrooms to train their minds to cope with modern life. And we can congratulate ourselves on the forward looking members of the faculty who instruct in the intricacies of all the branches of knowledge and human concern.

These things, the fruits of a century and a half of endeavor, we look upon now and we find them good.

But this should be more than a period of self-congratulation. It also should be an occasion of stock taking. We may well take pride in the distance we have come and the heights we have achieved; but we must, if we are to be true to ourselves and to the institution which we have created, look into the future to see where we are going.

HOW MAY UNIVERSITY BEST SERVE

What course must we plot and toward what objectives must we strive? What is the place of a great university in the world of today, and especially in the years following a global war? How best may it fulfill its functions in the complex society in which we live? How best may it contribute to the peace and prosperity longed for by troubled people of the earth?

I have been asked to speak about the university and its relation to public agencies. It is a timely subject and one for deep and sober exploration, for throughout the land the functions of universities have been more and more integrated into the needs and keyed to the desires of the body politic. We have long ago left behind the days when universities were ivied retreats from the hurly-burly of the world, peopled by scholarly men immersed in the study of Greek and Latin, or higher mathematics, or metaphysical philosophy, or any of the other so-called cultural pursuits. Such studies are still to be found in the curricula, and they should remain there, but they have been pretty completely overshadowed by the more utilitarian aspects of education.

General knowledge of Greek is confined to enough of the Greek alphabet to identify the campus fraternities and sororities, and Greek and Latin linger chiefly in the nomenclature of the sciences, like biology and medicine; but commercially useful Spanish does a relatively booming business. Few students essay the heights of the higher mathematics, but many burn the midnight oil over scarcely less abstruse formulas of use to engineers, accountants, and statisticians who, by reducing life to digits and plotting mystic curves therefrom, tell us where we have been, where we are, and in what direction we are headed.

PREPARES FOR LEADERSHIP

Our students in the field of physical and natural sciences seek to prepare themselves for service in the modernly equipped research laboratories where their work will eventually result in practical benefit, in countless ways, to people generally.

The universities—the University of Tennessee as well as others—have been preparing themselves to be leaders in a modern world, and they are well fitted to adapt themselves to the new concept of leadership and cooperation. I am not complaining that this new approach to things as they are in this world came so late. I am satisfied that it has come at last. It is late, but not too late. Until recent years the agencies of the people pretty much had to go it alone. There was a sharp line separating national agencies whose concern was the development of the Nation's basic resources and the agencies of the people whose concern, in theory at least, was to prepare the youthful mind for the adult world. These two groups—the national agencies and the local agencies—were not able to work in close relationship, and this was through no fault of the local agencies. The national groups grew remote. Their headquarters were miles away geographically and many more miles away mentally and spiritually. And then something happened. It had been coming on gradually in the minds of men and it took form, at least in this valley, when Federal authority left the seat of government, rolled up its sleeves, and came to the agencies of the people, prepared to work jointly with them in a common cause. Both in the Nation at large and in the States as well there was a growing conviction that the business of resource development had a direct relationship to day-to-day living, and that the answer never would be found unless the national and local groups pooled their minds and abilities.

The University of Tennessee was ready for the job. Let me mention just one example. T. V. A. harnessed the destructive waters of the valley and from the controlled rivers created the energy to permit it to develop and improve concentrated plant nutrients, and the universities, as partners, tested and demonstrated their value to the soil. The Authority and the university jointly worked out programs and processes and machines of material benefit to the people. They have pooled their resources to develop better implements and machinery needed in an integrated program of the resources of the valley.

RESEARCH GETS PRACTICAL TEST

Along the same lines, the political scientists of the universities occupy themselves to a greater extent with the practical problems of government in the interests of better administration, and sociologists are called from their teaching to help deal with current development. The theories developed from cloistered study find their testing ground in practical everyday affairs.

Thus the university of today is a far cry from the pristine concept of university organizations in medieval times, which were concerned largely with theology, law, medicine, and philosophy. Today there is scarcely a phase of life which the university does not aim to touch in some fashion. In its own right, the university contributes to the furtherance of the common affairs of men. And, more important still, from its classrooms there go forth the men and women who do the practical work of the world, who operate factories, farms, and mines, who build dams and power plants and irrigation systems, who seek truth endlessly in laboratory and field research, who enter the field of government to provide there the countless services demanded by the people, who write in newspapers and magazines or speak over the radio to shape public opinion, and who are elected to office where they formulate and carry out policies of far-reaching effect on the lives of all of us.

What these men and women think as they leave the university, what grasp they have of the make-up of the world and man's place in it, shapes not only their lives but those of the rest of us.

IMPORTANCE LONG RECOGNIZED

The importance of the university in shaping social and political trends and events has long been recognized, and sometimes universities have been crammed, willy-nilly, into molds designed to further the ends of institutional prestige, overshadowing truth and science, becoming addicted to narrow ideologies.

The prostitution of the university as a means to an end reached the depths in Nazi Germany, amid the smoke from burning pyres of books. A few years ago, the University of Gottingen, Germany, celebrated its centenary, as today we observe a sacred milestone in the history of our own institution. How the true scientists and teachers, if any by that time remained at Gottingen, must have writhed to hear the following:

"We renounce international science. We renounce the international republic of learning. We renounce research for its own sake. We teach and learn medicine, not to decrease the number of microbes, but to keep the German people strong and healthy. We teach and learn history, not to say how things actually happened but to instruct the German people from the past. We teach and learn the sciences, not to discover abstract laws, but strengthen the implements of the German people in competition with other peoples."

AMERICANS HAVE DIFFERENT CONCEPT

We have another concept of what the role of a university should be. We believe that the university should be a place to continuously prepare seekers after truth and propounders of the discovered truths for the benefit of mankind. We do not seek only those truths which will benefit our own

small group, or our own Nation, but universal truth. It is the function of a university, as we see it, to seek after truth in order that we may better understand the world we live in and to reveal and translate those truths so that they may be applied to the problems of living and of perpetuating the human enterprise.

This is the ideal. But we well may ponder whether or not we are achieving it. There is no doubt but that in the past century education's contributions to general advancement have been greater than in all previous history. We have discovered more about the nature of man and the world in which he is a contributing partner during this period than ever was known before. When universities were first organized, little was known of the physical world; today we have identified some 90 elements and of these we have determined that some 20 are essential to all life processes. We have piled fact upon fact of the physical world until we have amassed knowledge which enables us to build a civilization based upon scientific truth and technology without parallel. Due to research and invention and the resultant development of technology based on the resources of elements, we have so vastly expanded man's powers that the possibilities are almost limitless.

HUMAN RACE WASTES RESOURCES

Yet at the same time, the human race has in countless ways used its powers to squander resources at a faster and faster rate. It has heedlessly decimated mines and forests and has wasted the resources of land and water. It has, time after time, gone contentiously to war and wasted resources which are essential to peacetime development. It has done this chiefly, I think, out of ignorance and as a direct result of the lack of a common understanding of basic resources which could underlie a common faith in the human enenterprise.

Universities and agencies of government and the people themselves will fail in their efforts to promote peace and practical democracy over the world unless they find the ways and means, equitably and with understanding, of learning to know what our fundamental resources are, developing them, utlizing them, and conserving them.

For the present and until the task is thoroughly completed, this, then, is the problem to which the university should devote itself.

I think that this will require a drastic change in our identifying and thinking as to what are the basic resources to which research and education should be applied. We have progressed so fast in the very late centuries in what we liked to call "the conquest of nature" that we have failed to keep pace—in common knowledge at least—with the facts of natural laws which must rigidly govern our use of the basic resources which nature has, in some cases prodigally and in others sparingly, given to us to work with. We have, if I may be permitted a trite saying, been unaware of the forest because of the trees.

MUST KNOW RELATIONSHIP

This is illustrated in our present educational system, where "subjects" are neatly tucked away in compartments and seldom related back, and only then remotely, to the resources and the elements by which men live. We have in our teaching generated specialists, which is all right if each specialized field knows and understands its relationship to the common problem of resource development in its application to the total economy of people. It is not all right for the university to create an engineer or a doctor who thinks his profession is an end in itself or merely a way to make a good living. The engineer must understand the contribution the dams he builds make to resource development, and the doctor should have as deep a desire for soil fertility maintenance as does the agriculturalist, if for no other reason than of the nutritional elements involved.

A few years ago one answer was given by Morris Llewellyn Cooke, in an article published while he was Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. In hiring its engineers, the R. E. A. drew upon the leading engineering colleges of the country and then, in initiating the new employees, gave an indoctrination course ending with an examination.

One of the questions in this examination was "Do you believe that the engineer has any social responsibility for his work?"

The answer, among a class of 10, Cooke reported, was a virtually unanimous "No."

RESULT OF "FRAGMENTATION"

Clearly the impression that these young men had carried away from college was the conviction that if they learned and practiced the technical side of their profession they had fulfilled their mission. If they were hired by either private industry or government to build a dam or erect a power line, their sole concern was to do a good technical job, whether or not their work was socially useful, whether or not it added to human enrichment, or whether, as in some cases it well might, it retarded mankind's advancement was the concern of others.

This is the result of what I have termed "fragmentation" of the educational program. We are in an age of specialization, in which members of society concern themselves with limited advanced fields to the practical exclusion of all others, and more important, to the exclusion of any over-all concept of the manner in which their immediate work fits into the whole of life. We have specialists in industrial production, specialists in government, specialists in minerals, agriculture, electrical, chemical, civil, and mechanical engineering, specialists in interstate commerce and international trade, and specialists in international political relations. To this compartmentalized specialization the universities have contributed. We must remove the partitions and give the specialists that elbow room they need to bring them in contact with other fields which have their common mooring of elements and energy.

The time has come—if, indeed, it is not long overdue—for the universities to take the lead in the new concept of education, fundamentally based on elements and energy. I am convinced that only by doing it will men come to understand one another and the age-old friction between men gradually disappear. The universities must knock the chips from men's shoulders.

MUST KNOW LIMITATIONS, POWERS

In short, on the basis of what we have learned in the past few centuries, we should reach back to explore the past, to learn both man's limitations and his powers in connection with the elements and energy he has to work with, and bring about a broad understanding of the facts, forces, and purposes of a total demonstration of these integrated resources.

It is essential to discern, to learn, and to make a matter of common knowledge, that the elements, the energy, and the mind and spirit of man are the basic resources and are the common heritage of all mankind. They are the only things, too, he has to work with for the present good and future development of the human race.

The carriers of elements and energy—the air, the water, and land, and sun—are likewise a common universal legacy. Arrayed in various combinations are found the elements by which plants, animals, and human beings live, each to contribute its part to the passing parade of Nature's and man's operations.

Most of man's scientific knowledge of the world about him is of relatively recent origin. It was not known during most of the long ages in which man fashioned his own civilization. Man began early to till the soil, but centuries passed before he understood the elements he was dealing with. To a considerable extent this knowledge of resources was likewise lacking when commerce and industry began to be developed. Political science and economics emerged under similar handicaps. Man was building his world out of these fundamental resources of elements and energy whose true relationship to life he did not understand.

TRADITION LIMITS SCOPE

In short, what has happened has been that most of our institutions and concepts developed and became set along traditional lines during periods when scientific guidance was in its infancy. As a result, we find our institutions and agencies handicapped by old cultures and traditions and economic and political alignments which often run counter to the modern interests of mankind when those interests are viewed in the light of the scientific facts. These traditional approaches limit man in the exercise of his full powers toward the present world objectives of peace and opportunity for every human being to make his own peculiar contribution. They act to limit mankind's full productiveness.

They will continue to do so as long as they stand in the way of common action based on common knowledge of the scientific facts about elements and energy and the laws which govern their use.

It is the dawning of this realization which perhaps accounts for the world-wide interest in the development of the Tennessee Valley. The whole world had become uneasily aware of something gone wrong with the complacent policy of noncooperation. Here the agencies and the universities of the Tennessee watershed have actually set a pattern of development, under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, for the development of basic resources along scientific lines. Here, for virtually the first time, we have set up objectives, based on what science has taught about the nature of elements and energy and their interrelationships, of making full use of our potential powers.

And beginning a few years ago, we have had an expression of almost world-wide interest in the trek of hundreds of representatives of foreign lands who have come to study our approach to problems which they face. And what these representatives approve is all that is implied in the program for capturing elements and energy of falling water and soil fertility and the harnessing of these returnable sources of wealth in order that the powers of people may be extended while at the same time the exhaustible sources of elements and energy may be conserved and judiciously used. This means that the nations of the world are becoming aware of the interrelationship of these basic resources.

MUST USE ALL RESOURCES

The capture of energy through modern vegetation is equally as important, if indeed not more important, to the welfare of present and future generations as the processes of capturing electric energy either by steam or hydro-electric plants.

Science has provided us with the knowledge of basic resources which greatly enhance our ability to obtain energy from the soil. We have within our grasp, as we have been demonstrating here in the Valley through the joint program of the T. V. A. and the universities and other agencies, a chance to vastly increase human well being through improved land practices.

The responsibility of the university and the agencies is clear, and I will cite only one illustration of many.

Together, the universities and the T. V. A. and other agencies have demonstrated that phosphate is one of the key elements basic to good soil management, yet most soils are deficient in it. The facts are known to soil scientists, to the chemical engineers and chemists, and to many farmers. We know, too, that phosphate is one of the limited elements with which man has to work, and that the deposits of this vital mineral occur in widely spaced areas and that under present conditions it is not being used generously enough to even begin to replace the phosphorus annually removed from the soil by crops and erosion. We know, too, that one of the reasons that phosphate is not more widely used is that the distribution of plant nutrient materials has been carried on in the commercial tradition, guided by a custom of supply and demand enunciated long before we found out through scientific research how vital this material is to all human life and to the full development of human powers. Viewed in this light, the use of this single element becomes not the concern of a few scientists, of the farmers, and farm organizations, and of the commercial interests, but a question of transcendent interest to everyone—whether he lives in country or city, works in a bank or factory, or teaches in a college of liberal arts. The same is true of all the other elements—only when the basic understanding of what they are, of their uses, of their relative abundance or scarcity is widely disseminated and taken into account by everyone will each generation make its potential contribution.

UNIVERSITY MUST PURSUE TRUTH

It is to this task of seeking truth through research and, by translation and wide dissemination, bring the results into cooperation along with a basic understanding of their implications, I believe to be one of the greatest contributions that a university can make. The elements which are necessary to all the units of life are fewer in number than the letters of the alphabet; I look forward to the day when everyone will be as familiar with the alphabet of the vital elements which underlie everyday existence as he is with the alphabet of letters.

That is the job for the university. It also is the job of the university to develop a common faith in these basic resources. A common faith must rest upon universal truth, and universal truth must be found in those creations of nature which apply to the life and activities of man, no matter what part of the globe he inhabits or what economic or governmental system he lives under, or what his span of life contributes to the culture of his generation.

The spirit and mind of man have made long strides forward in discovering the elements of life and the natural laws which govern them. And the search for truth goes on. We have, through science and technology, opened up the path toward a vast increase in the powers and capabilities of man. By promoting a broad understanding of what the findings of science mean, we can widen that path into a spacious avenue to the future.

After this meeting, we are, I understand, to break into small groups for forum discussions of the university's place in relation to agriculture, business administration, education, engineering and industry, health, home economics, law, the liberal arts, and the press.

I should like to urge upon you that in your discussions of these many subjects you keep in mind a full realization that our success in any and every one of these fields must inevitably be related back to the fundamental elements which underlie plant, animal, and human energy. Only when we attain a universal understanding of these facts will we open the way to full development of our powers.

Address of Vice Admiral Ben Moreell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Vice Admiral Ben Moreell (C. E. C.), United States Navy, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, United States Navy Department, Washington, D. C., delivered to the graduating class of Civil Engineer Corps officers, Camp Endicott, Davisville, R. I., January 6, 1945:

It is with mixed feelings of pride and trepidation that I address the members of the graduating class of civil-engineer officers this morning; pride because I have the honor of welcoming into the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy one more group of young officers who have been prepared to share the burden of our tasks; trepidation because custom has decreed that one addressing a graduating class should present rules of conduct which, if followed, will, presumably, lead to successful careers.

I believe it appropriate to bring to your attention, in brief form, some of the accomplishments of the great organization of which you are about to become a part. The war emergency is generally taken as having started on July 1, 1940, since that date is the beginning of a national fiscal year, and as it came as soon after the invasion of the Low Countries by the German forces on May 10, 1940. Since July 1, 1940, there has been confided to the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy what I believe to be the greatest sustained construction program in the history of the world. In money value the total authorized to date is, in round figures, $9,500,000,000. But this does not include the costs of pay, transportation, and subsistence of our officer and enlisted personnel by whom a large part of the construction work has been accomplished. If due allowances are made for these it is estimated that our construction effort from July 1, 1940, to date would represent in money value a total of approximately $12,000,000,000.

But the money value is not an adequate measure of our effort. The true measure is the importance of our work to the accomplishments of the fleet, the Air Forces, and the Ground Forces which we have supported.

It has been our good fortune to have assigned to us construction operations of the greatest diversity of character and the widest dispersion of location. We have built, in many places throughout the world, works ranging in size from the most insignificant and commonplace to those of the greatest magnitude and complexity. We have had projects for the construction of sidewalks at a cost of several hundred dollars, and we have had such projects as the construction of an underground, bombproof Diesel and fuel-oil storage, costing in the neighborhood of $75,000,000. We have had entrusted to our care the construction of shipbuilding and ship-repair plants, port and harbor works, aviation training and operating stations, ammunition depots and ordnance-production facilities, supply depots, training stations, artillery training ranges, radio stations, hospitals, fleet operating bases, fuel depots, housing projects, and floating and graving dry docks.

Prior to the organization of the Seabees in December 1941, these works were constructed by private contractors under the direction of Civil Engineer Corps officers at many localities throughout the world.

We have constructed, utilizing the services of private contractors, bases in the United Kingdom, in West Africa, in Iceland, in Newfoundland, Bermuda, at numerous places in the Caribbean area, in South America, Panama, Alaska, the Hawaiian group, Midway, Wake, Guam, the Philippines, and Samoa. All of these are in addition to the extensive program of construction which we have carried on within the continental limits. Our extra-continental work to date accounts for approximately $4,000,000,000 of the total of $9,500,000,000 previously cited.

One of our contracts for the construction of facilities to support the fleets in the Pacific Ocean areas is the greatest single construction contract in the history of the world in money value, in diversity of construction, and in dispersion of location. The final contract cost was about $300,000,000. The contract involved the construction of practically every type of naval and civilian facility. The operations were conducted from San Francisco as a logistics base westward to the Philippines. The contract extended from August 1939 until June 1944. At the peak, 50,000 men were employed on this work.

What is the significance of these tremendous operations? The work of the Civil Engineer Corps has only one reason for being. It is to support the operations of the fleets, of naval aviation, and of the Marines. Recent fleet operations in the Pacific have served to confirm the conclusion that every naval ship or aircraft of whatever type or size is dependent upon shore-based facilities for its maintenance and support. Roughly in proportion to size, a ship may be regarded as self-sustaining for longer or shorter periods of time. The capital ship, with its living accommodations for a large crew, its considerable resources in machine shops and other repair equipment, its storage spaces for repair and other materials and supplies, may be said to be self-sustaining as regards mechanical maintenance, except drydocking, for about 18 months. At the end of that period the accumulation of repair or alteration work which is beyond the capacity of the ship's forces or the resources of the fleet repair ship requires the facilities of a navy yard for general overhaul.

As the size of the vessel decreases it becomes more and more dependent upon its shore support. At the opposite end of the scale of combat vessels, for example, is the submarine, which is self-sustaining for relatively short periods of time. And even more dependent on shore facilities is the aircraft, which is self-sustaining only while it is actually in flight.

Involved in the consideration of this problem is the all-important one of providing ashore recreational and rehabilitation facilities for the crews of vessels which have been subjected to intensive service.

Behind the so-called first line or direct services to the fighting forces there is a vast establishment that is backing up the line, a great productive and service organization that must see to it that the fighting forces shall have in personnel and matériel what they need, when they need it. This means factories, shops, supply depots, training schools, hospitals, and other production and processing facilities.

In summary, it can be stated that while we of the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy must approach our tasks as a service force for the fleets with due humility, we should minimize neither their importance nor the vital part they are playing in bringing victory to our arms.

Our Civil Engineer Corps has expanded by leaps and bounds as the operations of the fighting forces have grown in magnitude and

dispersion. On July 1, 1940, the corps consisted of 267 officers and no enlisted personnels. As of December 31, 1944, we have actually on board 9,212 officers and 236,000 enlisted men, with an approved quota for June 30, 1945, of 10,650 officers and 272,000 men. With the organization of the Seabees in December 1941, the Civil Engineer Corps assumed added responsibilities and a vastly increased scope of function. Where previously our construction operations were conducted largely by utilizing the services of private contractors, our extra-continental work is now conducted almost in its entirety by our own officers and men. This means that all of the planning, procurement, and actual construction organization which had previously been accomplished by skilled private contractors now devolves upon our own shoulders. The order of magnitude of this burden can be gaged from the fact that our extra-continental construction operations are now being conducted at an expenditure rate of $2,000,000,000 per year.

In addition to construction work, the Corps has been called upon to demonstrate its versatility by undertaking special tasks of the greatest importance to the fleets, such, for example, as loading and unloading of ships, demolition and removal of obstacles for assault operations, pontoon fabrication, assembly and operation, camouflage, fog dispersal, and other highly specialized functions.

That we have accomplished our assignments to the satisfaction of those in authority is attested by the commendatory statements which we have received from the top command in every theater of war. Ours have been the duty and the privilege of participating in every major amphibious operation conducted by either the Army or Navy throughout the world. Our Seabees have taken a prominent part in every assault in the Pacific Ocean, in the operations in north Africa, in Sicily, in Italy, and in the Normandy invasion, and they have conducted themselves with honor and distinction.

I mention these brief statistical data not to impress upon you the great accomplishments of the Corps which you are about to join, but rather to emphasize the responsibility which rests upon your shoulders to perpetuate the history and the tradition of our organization, a history of accomplishment and a tradition of service to the fleets, a willing and eager service, a "service with a smile," if you please, coupled with a tradition which is perhaps best epitomized by the Seabee slogan, "Can Do," a slogan conferred upon us by a high-ranking officer of the line who, when asked in the course of an inspection of a lonely atoll in the far Pacific whether he had seen anything of the work of the Seabees, replied, "Oh, you mean the 'Can Do' boys."

I mentioned earlier my trepidation because of the custom of offering to graduation classes what might be called recipes for success. I cannot give you such recipes. All I would presume to do is to point out the lessons which can be learned from my own mistakes and from those of others. I have always felt that the greatest advantage can be garnered from a study of failures. I have had in mind for some years the preparation of a record which I propose to entitle, "An Anthology of Engineering Failures," in which I propose to discuss the failures of great engineering structures and the reasons therefor. I feel strongly that from such studies the profession can gain great benefits.

And so it is with our relationships and progress in the Navy. In retrospect, in my own case, I feel that my contribution to the efficiency of our naval forces would have been more effective and more durable had I recognized early in my career that most problems with which we are faced, even the most complex, can be solved by a resort to basic principles.

I know now that there are no substitutes for sound knowledge, experience, and hard work, and that these, together with the simple virtues of piety, sincerity, loyalty, humility, and tolerance, all of which go to make up that indefinite thing called character, are the foundation stones of engineering efficiency.

I have found, too, that my engineering education had a serious lack. Some time ago I was asked by the chancellor of the university which I attended to comment, in the light of my experiences, on the adequacy of the engineering courses. My comment was to the effect that there was one great deficiency, namely, that not only had the university failed to teach me anything about how to deal with human beings, how to handle men, if you please, but they had not even told me that it was an important thing to know.

To me this is the greatest knowledge which an engineer can have. We accomplish our works through the medium of human beings, and they are all different one from the other. You will find that each has his idiosyncrasies, his likes and dislikes, and even his prejudices. I have found that a deliberate study of how to deal with your superiors as well as with your subordinates is the most important task for an engineer to undertake and to master.

I have found, also, through hard experience, that just as we decide engineering questions by resort to basic engineering principles, so must we decide moral questions by resort to basic moral principles which our religious and lay teachers have expounded for us so well, and that, in many instances, the moral values involved in an engineering decision far transcend in importance the engineering values.

I have found, too, that engineering problems should be approached with humility but with boldness. The things we know are to the things that remain to be known as a drop of water is to the oceans. But this should not be an encouragement to futility; rather should it be a challenge to our determination to achieve.

Experience has taught me that engineers must plan ahead not only for the development of a specific engineering project but for the basic pattern of future operations. We must have vision, moral as well as material. A great engineer has given this advice:

"Make no little plans, they have no magic to stir men's blood and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans, aim high in hope and in work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will never die, but long after we are gone will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever-growing insistence. Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do things that would stagger us. Let your watchword be order and your beacon beauty."

I have found that to achieve success in any major operation it is necessary to have the unswerving loyalty of one's subordinates, and this loyalty can only be gained by showing a confidence in their ability and in their devotion by decentralizing to them the authority and the responsibility necessary for the accomplishment of their tasks. They will never learn to swim if they are not permitted to enter the deep water without artificial support.

I have found, also, that I could learn something from almost every man, no matter how humble his station. Many of the most valuable lessons of engineering and construction have been learned from contacts with the man who works with his hands. Those of you who have had experience on construction work know that there is a right way and a wrong way to dig a ditch. You can learn this from the ditch digger, as I have.

You are about to enter on your careers as commissioned officers of the Civil Engineer Corps of the United States Navy. You have a great responsibility. We are engaged in a war of extermination with cruel and ruthless enemies. You have had the training, both military and technical, which will enable you to discharge your duties, but you must supplement this training by unfailing devotion to those high moral principles which we are fighting to maintain.

There is still a tremendous work to be done. The news from the European area in the recent past would indicate the expenditure of personnel and matériel of war by our armies at a rate unprecedented in the history of warfare. The resistance of the enemy is increasing in intensity, and this presages the need for more and more power if we are to destroy him without expending large numbers of our own forces.

In the Pacific our recent landings in the Philippines mark a notable advance, but still leave us far from our ultimate goal. The fierce resistance of the Japanese in the face of annihilating fire is indicative of the intensity of the campaign which lies ahead. A recent calculation indicates that the Japanese Empire now has under its domination approximately 2,950,000 square miles of territory and approximately 456,000,000 people. In the continental United States we have an area of 3,000,000 square miles with 132,000,000 people. Certainly, no one would attempt to equate the productivity of the people and manufactories in the areas under Japanese control with our own. But it must be borne in mind that we are faced with the obligation of carrying the attack across vast oceans to distances varying from 7,000 to 9,000 miles, and that we must have great preponderance in quality and quantity of men and matériel if we are to achieve victory within a reasonable time and at minimum cost.

To achieve this victory, we must face our responsibilities squarely, with boldness, with determination to achieve, and with faith in our leadership. We must subordinate our personal predilections to the discipline of higher authority.

I feel it appropriate to defer here to custom by quoting the following from the great leader, Stonewall Jackson, who said:

"Men and officers must obey, no matter what cost to their feelings, for obedience to orders, instant and unhesitatingly is not only the lifeblood of armies, but the security of states and the doctrine, that under any conditions whatever, deliberate disobedience can be justified, is treason to the commonwealth."

I wish you Godspeed in the important tasks upon which you are about to enter.

Address of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following splendid address delivered by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, at the annual Lincoln Day dinner in the city of Washington on the evening of February 8, 1945. The address of Governor Dewey follows:

At this Lincoln Day dinner we Republicans traditionally take stock of ourselves. We ask ourselves how far we have strayed from

the fundamentals of our political faith. We rededicate ourselves to the eternal principles of human freedom for which the name of Lincoln stands.

It is particularly important that we reexamine our faith after a national election. It fell to us to conduct a campaign when our country was engaged in the greatest war of all history. That was a grave and difficult responsibility for an opposition party because any campaign has within it the dangers of divisions on our national purposes. Instead, the campaign made it clear to all the world that the united determination of the people of America to fight the war to total victory was greater than ever before. Moreover, our will to build a lasting peace was lifted by our party above partisanship and we made a lasting contribution toward the actual building of the structure for international peace.

At the same time we vigorously performed our duty as the party of the opposition in pointing out the defects in the policies of the present administration and the startling contradictions between its promises and its performances.

As Americans we accept with good grace the verdict of the majority. As members of the party of opposition we shall stanchly carry forward the banner of our political faith. There are 22,000,000 of us—nearly 46 percent of the voters—who believe today in that political faith.

We have no excuse for existence as a political party—we have no excuse for our service in public office, unless we are deeply conscious of the overwhelming tragedy which stalks the world today. The normal life of a majority of the people of the world has either been uprooted or its natural development set back. Tens of millions of young men have been giving their most productive years to warfare. An appalling number of them will come back to their homes with deep scars and many will never come home.

Over almost every home in our land there is a sense of brooding fear or of irreparable loss. At the same time, there is a gallant courage and determination in the heart and mind of every American to beat down the forces of evil, and this time to keep them down.

Certainly this is the time for reexamination and reaffirmation of the things we believe in. It is the time to cast aside those things that are not fundamental and to reaffirm those things that are true.

It is increasingly clear to everyone that neither justice nor freedom can long continue to exist in a world beset by periodic total wars. Modern warfare strikes down the youth of the world. It also strikes at the heart of freedom itself. By its very nature it forces even freedom-loving countries to regiment their people in order to fight total war.

Moreover, the terrifying developments of science have made war no longer a matter between next-door neighbors. We have learned to our sorrow that aggression anywhere in the world endangers all the rest of the world. We now know that in the future, aggression will be possible by air from bases thousands of miles away. If there is an aggressor anywhere in the world, all of us are his imperilled neighbors.

It is obvious that we cannot and must not risk another great war. It is equally obvious that aside from adequate military forces and bases for our defense in the future, our only hope of avoiding war lies in effective international cooperation for peace.

War is an evil which has scourged mankind from the beginning of time. It is not likely suddenly to disappear from the earth of its own accord. As I have said so often, peace must be waged with all the vigor and skill with which we wage war or we shall always be having to wage war.

We have nailed to our masthead one principle to which I believe we must everlastingly adhere; or principles will count no more in the face of force. That is that we, as a Nation, can, we will, and we must take a full, responsible part in the establishment of collective security among nations.

The opinion of our people has crystallized. They want the United States to accept its responsibilities for the vital decisions affecting the future of the world. Those who speak for our country need no longer hide behind fine phrases and glittering generalities. There need no longer be any doubt anywhere, that the American people are prepared to exercise their great power actively, continuously, and effectively in the interest of a just and a lasting peace.

There is now in progress a conference among the Three Great Powers among the United Nations. The results of that conference will go far to determine the course of the rest of the war and the nature of the peace to come. At that conference the President of the United States has, I am sure, the wholehearted support of both political parties and the prayers of the American people for his every effort in the interest of our country and of world peace.

Our people are prepared to uphold the hands of their own representatives. They ask in return that the decisions to be made shall be in harmony with our American ideals of liberty and justice. They ask that the actions to be taken shall not be concealed and shall not be devious. They ask that they shall not ignore the opinion of mankind. Our people insist that mighty decisions shall not be made in the cynical spirit of power politics. The structure of international peace must progress further and faster or it will be left behind in the swift movement of world events.

In the past 3 months, the liberation of peoples and nations has pressed forward with increasing speed. The governments of Bulgaria, Jugoslavia, Italy, and Greece, the government and boundaries of Poland have one after the other in rapid succession required action and decision. Yet, we learned, day after day, that events required action and our own Government was absent from the scene. We have seen the American people in the humiliating situation where they were compelled to learn of these tremendous events from the debates in the British House of Commons. Moreover, we learned from those debates that while the powder kegs of Europe were being dealt with once again the representatives of our own Government were uttering pleasant generalities and leaving our allies to decide the fate of the world.

During all of that critical 3-month period the clearest call for constructive action came from the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG.

In giving their wholehearted support to decisions to be made at the present conference and to action in the future, our people are perfectly aware that they cannot have everything just as they want it. Our allies have strong views of their own. We know that conflicting views must be reconciled. But we insist that decisions be made with us and not without us—with our representatives in the discussion, every day, on every subject, and not occasionally or part of the time. Our people cannot accept compromises without a new, firm knowledge that the American Government took its part and did its best in advancing the principles and faith for which Americans are dying all over the world. We shall accept neither isolationism nor abdication.

The time has come for the hard, painstaking labor of translating ideals and generalities into reality and action. The conference now in progress is, we hope, a great step to that end. From now on, these problems cannot hang in suspense for many months at a time. They cannot be left to the rare meetings between the heads of nations. Time and events move too fast. Ideals and great purposes are too easily lost by default. We are not content that our Government sit idly by and merely, as we have been told, be "kept informed." Millions of Americans are in the front lines of battle. Our Government must likewise be in the front line of decisions which flow from those victorious battles.

There have been these in other countries and some in our own, who choose to interpret the almost equal division of the American people between candidates and parties in the last election as proof of division in our fundamental purposes and intentions. The fact is that our differences concerned only who were the most effective individuals and what were the most effective methods of carrying out the ideals and purpose upon which we as a people are strongly united. Let that be understood by everyone, everywhere in the world. Let is be understood that the representatives of our Government have the wholehearted support of the American people in every step they take which advances the cause of a just and lasting peace.

So, as we give all-out support to action toward carrying out our ideals, we want to be sure that those ideals have been vigorously represented. We want to be sure of action guaranteeing the permanent disarmament of Germany and Japan. We want to be sure of action to transform the agreements reached at Dumbarton Oaks from pieces of paper into living reality. We want to know that the things left unfinished are moving toward solution.

As a nation we have strong views concerning the freedom of the peoples of Europe. We want to know that those views are represented in the decisions concerning the future of the people who have suffered so much through conquest and reconquest and final liberation. We want to know that it is liberation in truth—that we have in fact crushed out war-breeding totalitarianism wherever it infected those nations. We want to know that we have not fought this war in vain.

As, in the name of Lincoln, we take stock of our purposes in the world, we must also inquire whether we are upholding his ideals at home.

Our Nation was founded upon the classic liberal principle that government is the servant of its people and not their master. Hand in hand with this political idea of human freedom went the belief that men may be free politically only so long as they are free economically. These were the contagious, compelling, exciting truths out of which our country was established and became great.

These were not our ideas alone. They were in response to the clarion call to human freedom which swept over the western world in the eighteenth century. During that century the French Revolution and the American Revolution were fought to establish the right of people to rule themselves and the right of the individual to be free. By evolution the same principles were then also being established in Great Britain and elsewhere.

Today these liberal principles are under challenge. They are no longer self-evident to a large portion of the world. It is said that individual freedom can no longer exist in a modern industrial society; that government must be supreme, and the people must be its dependent servants.

The wheel has had a full turn between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries. The intrusive idea today is again that all wisdom is in government, and that it should exercise all power. Even as we fight a total war against that idea, it infects the minds of people everywhere.

We find people from all walks of life and of all shades of political thoughts right here in our own country who are afraid that we cannot have security and full employment and at the same time maintain the liberty and dignity of the individual. There are

others who joyously proclaim that the new road to Utopia is through government action alone, which leads inevitably to totalitarian control over our people. While professing their concern for the individual they would crush him, leaving only a soulless automaton who takes his orders from the state.

Adding together those who are afraid for human freedom and those who basically have no interest in it, we have a large body of opinion in our own country going down the primrose path toward totalitarianism.

How to achieve our objective, security, and full employment, and also preserve individual liberty: This is the crucial question of our time. It is the hard core of every political decision we make.

We have seen in our country a long, persistent effort to increase the power of Government over the individual. We have seen a cavalier willingness to saddle the people with unlimited debt in the peacetime behind us and in the plans for the peace ahead of us. We have seen a smooth willingness on the part of Government to find pleasant excuses in the name of false liberalism to bring the daily lives of our people under its increasing control.

There are those who want to take the easy way of spending the Nation into bankruptcy and chaos, while the Government takes over the control of the lives of every individual. They believe that to cure every ill you pass a law and appropriate a billion dollars. They would like to have the Government finance every business, from a gasoline station to a steel corporation, while it quietly takes over control of every aspect of our economy. It is by that process that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness would be stifled and liberalism would become a dead thing in history.

Here is the real battle of the years to come. Must the people of America deny their own heritage and surrender to an absolute state? Must we, too, when peace comes, join the march backward 200 years to individual subservience to the master state?

Let us on this occasion proclaim our faith in a better way. It is the way of progress not only toward ever-increasing security but also toward ever greater freedom of the individual. At times it may be the slower, harder road. But it is the only road for Americans to take.

It is perfectly obvious to the rest of the world and it ought to be to us, that America has staggeringly outproduced every other nation in the world. Our 130,000,000 people have produced many of the winning instruments of war for Great Britain, Russia, and China, as well as for ourselves. It is obvious to the rest of the world and it ought to be to us, that this is because of the enormous initiative and inventive genius which springs from the very heart of our system. Ours is a system which rewards achievement, in which men can create and build with the full knowledge that they and their families will benefit, as well as society as a whole. Ours has been a system whereby labor is free to work, to organize, and to share to the limit of its productive capacity in the good things of life which are produced by all.

The very heart of that system is the classic liberal concept that every man is his own master and that government exists to keep him free. It is in the natural development of that system that we assert that neither accumulations of great wealth nor monopoly—that neither government nor any individual—shall control the lives of other Americans. It is that system which guarantees and must make effective equal rights for all, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.

These are the principles for which Lincoln lived and died. If we are to justify the purpose for which we exist, we must follow in the path he set. It is of little importance whether the course is popular or unpopular at the moment.

What is important is that we follow unfalteringly the road of freedom on every issue. It is that road which 12,000,000 young Americans will want to take when they come home to enjoy the peace they have won. It is that road which opens to them unlimited vistas of achievement. To travel that road is their inalienable right. It is the right freely to produce to the maximum for their own enjoyment. It is the right to join a union free from the dictation of either government or employer. It is the right to become an employer without government dictation, whether on a farm or in a shop.

It is the right to use the initiative, the character, and skill these young Americans have developed in these dreadful years of warfare, for the advancement of their country and themselves and for the security of their families. It is the right to enjoy social security without any leader or party claiming a political debt for it.

It is the right of 12,000,000 young Americans to come home to a country where we have preserved and enlarged the area of human freedom while they fought and bled for it. It is the right to come home without finding the heavy hand of Government telling them where they shall work, at what and for how much. It is the right to have a government which knows that it is their servant and not their master.

If we who follow the faith of Abraham Lincoln will hold high the principles of that faith, liberal government under God shall not perish from the earth.

Automobile Use Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as an extension of my remarks, I enclose a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of South Carolina under date of February 7, in which I fully concur.

I sincerely trust the Congress will soon repeal the $5 automobile tax.

The resolution follows:

House resolution memorializing the National Congress to repeal the Federal motor-vehicle use tax

Whereas the National Congress imposed by Federal statute, section 3540 of the Internal Revenue Code, and it was enacted by the Congress as a part of the Revenue Act of 1941 (sec. 557), which places a tax of $5 annually on all cars; and

Whereas in the Treasury's report on H. R. 5143 (78th Cong.), a bill to repeal the automobile use tax, was investigated at the response of Chairman DOUGHTON of North Carolina, of the Ways and Means Committee, it was then considered that it should be among the first for repeal when the end of the war emergency permits any reduction in the level of Federal taxes; and

Whereas it appears that the automobile use tax is an undesirable method for raising Federal revenue, as it does not take into account the value of the vehicle, it duplicates automobile license taxes imposed by the State, is very difficult to collect the taxes under the procedure now taken, and is a very unfair tax: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of South Carolina, That the Representatives in Congress from South Carolina be urged to sponsor, if necessary, a bill to repeal the automobile use tax now in force and being collected by the Federal Government, and to support any bill pending for the repeal of the tax above referred to; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from South Carolina.

The Wallace Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following articles on Mr. Wallace that appeared in the Washington Post, February 4, 1945:

WALLACE'S NEW YORK SPEECH ON 1921 PANIC HELD IN ERROR

Testimony of Henry A. Wallace's late father arose last week to dispute an implication given by the former Vice President in his efforts to bring about confirmation of his nomination to head the Commerce Department and control the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government loan agencies.

Wallace, on January 29, at a testimonial dinner given for him in New York by the Union for Democratic Action and the New Republic, dwelt on the need for providing 60,000,000 jobs for Americans after the war, and the plans he would follow to attain that objective.

TELLS ABOUT CONDITIONS

In the course of his discussion he said:

"Our economic illiteracy after World War No. 1 gave us the smash of 1921, the crash of 1929, and economic conditions abroad which inevitably led to the rise of fascism and nazi-ism."

The implication that the smash to which Wallace referred had come in 1921, after the Republicans had taken over the Government following Wilson's 8 years in the White House, stirred numbers of Washingtonians who had watched at first hand the development of economic distress that followed the war's end.

Perusal of records of Senate hearings of that period brought official evidence that the smash was already a fact in 1920, months before the Republican Party replaced the Democratic administration, and that it was being felt severely in Wallace's home State of Iowa.

GROUP HELD HEARING

The Senate's Select Committee on Reconstruction and Production held a hearing at Des Moines, Iowa, on November 12, 1920, and among witnesses was Henry C. Wallace, editor of Wallace's Farmer and father of the man now awaiting Senate action on his second Cabinet appointment.

Senators Calder and Kenyon, and others of the committee, heard the distinguished farm editor testify.

"Our corn this year costs between 90 cents and 95 cents a bushel to produce. That is the actual cost on a cost-accounting basis, taking into consideration all of the factors included in it. It is selling now between 55 cents and 60 cents. Our oats costs around 75 cents to produce and it is selling at around 40 cents. Our wheat costs $1.88 to produce, and it is selling at about $1.40. These

figures I am giving you are the cost of production on the farm and the sale price on the farm. Now, when you remember that our production this year is 127,000,000 bushels above the 5-year average, and when you remember that only 20 percent of our corn goes off of the farms, crosses county lines, you will see that a slight increase in the cost of production has a terrific effect on the price."

It was not until 4 months after this testimony that the Republicans inaugurated Warren G. Harding as President.

COALITION IS SEEN

Southern Democrats were reported last night to be joining House Republicans in support of proposed George-bill amendments to curtail further the powers which Henry A. Wallace would exercise if he were confirmed as Secretary of Commerce.

Such a coalition would assure House approval of the Senate-passed bill in a drastically revised form. Senate concurrence in the revision, some observers believed, might move President Roosevelt to veto the bill. And if that happens, the Senate might reject Wallace's nomination when it comes up for action March 1.

WALLACE'S DEMEANOR AT HEARING LEFT SENATORS UNEASY

(By Bert Andrews)

In all that has been written about the Wallace-Jones fight one fact has been almost completely ignored and this is that the demeanor of Henry A. Wallace under fire played a large part in arousing Senate opposition to giving him the vast fiscal powers that were held by Jesse H. Jones.

The dictionary defines "demeanor" as: "Behavior, deportment, carriage, bearing, mien," and in Wallace's case the definition can be broadened to include the way he reads from a manuscript, the way he laughs, the way he combs his hair or leaves it tousled, depending upon the occasion; the way he talks when speaking extemporaneously, and the way he sits in a witness chair.

For the benefit of future historians who will want to know every last reason why a majority of the Senate felt uneasy about putting pursestrings in the Wallace fingers, it should be explained then, that not everything that happened at the Senate Commerce Committee's hearing shows up in the transcript of the session.

ACCORDING TO TRANSCRIPT

The transcript, at one point, reads as follows:

"Mr. WALLACE. Let me put it this way, to sum it up in a nutshell, that if during the last 10 years of this century the present type of financing and the present taxation had been in effect it would have been impossible to have anything like the present automobile, the present electrical industry, the present chemical industry, and if we want in 1970 to have the Henry Fords and Edisons of 1945 to 1950 coming into flower it will be necessary to make possible a type of financing for small business which does not exist today."

"Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine. That is rather a severe indictment of 12 years of this administration, isn't it?

"Mr. WALLACE. I feel it is a severe indictment of the past 30 years.

"Senator BREWSTER. We will take it all in." (He meant into consideration.)

Now, as this reporter saw it, the incident occurred like this:

Senator BREWSTER said: "That is rather a severe indictment of 12 years of this administration, isn't it?"

WALLACE LAUGHS 40 SECONDS

At BREWSTER'S last word, Wallace began to laugh, pro-Wallace onlookers might valiantly have defended the laugh as a warm-hearted chuckle. Strictly neutral observers would have described it as being, at best, a very nervous laugh. One anti-Wallace Senator said later, "Why, that man's got the damndest giggle I ever heard in my life. It gives me the shivers." After Wallace had been chuckling, laughing, or giggling for perhaps 10 seconds, this reporter's eyes dropped to the second hand of his watch. Wallace continued chuckling, laughing, or giggling for exactly 30 seconds more.

The record does not show, probably because the stenographer did not catch BREWSTER'S words, that it was not until BREWSTER insisted on an answer by saying, "Well, isn't it?" that Wallace gave his answer—that he regarded it as "a severe indictment of the past 30 years." Nor does the record show that the faces of some of the Senators as Wallace laughed were a strange study of men who just didn't understand Wallace, who regarded him as a strange man who did not measure up to, or down to, their standards of normalcy, who couldn't quite figure out why Wallace should have thought Senator BREWSTER'S question funny enough to evoke 30 or 40 seconds of mirth. Nor does the record show that Senator BREWSTER'S expression, as he said, "we will take it all in," seemed to imply, "Well, maybe this man's got something on the ball but what it is, is beyond me."

WALLACE FUMBLES CUES

The transcript, at another point, reveals that Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, Florida, very much a Wallace man, asked questions designed to give Wallace a chance to show that he had founded a profitable seed corn business and therefore had as good grounds as anyone else to say that he knew how to run a business. The transcript goes on:

"Mr. WALLACE. Last year this company sold more than $4,000,000 worth of seed corn. I resigned as president of the concern when I came to Washington, and shortly thereafter I got my brother into the business. Last night he called me up to wish me luck at the hearing this morning, and I asked just out of curiosity how much money the concern owed the banks at the present time and was told it was $800,000. Of course, if the sales of corn go well between now and next May, all of that money will be paid off. Last year, I believe, they borrowed something like one million dollars. They have always paid off the money they borrowed at the banks."

What the transcript does not show is that Mr. Wallace, in the minds of some of the Senators, did not make the very point he was trying to make—that the concern was a going one. Nor does it show that, because of lack of clarity on Wallace's part, the impact on some of the Senators was that reflected by one who said later, "Was he trying to show that the criterion of success is how much one can go into hock to the banks for?"

Here are some of the other things that the transcript does not show: That Wallace read his prepared statement, which was a thoroughly-lucid presentation of his economic and political philosophy, in a manner that seemed to some of the Senators to be, to say the least, uninspired; that he startled some of them by appearing with his hair slicked down for the first time within their memory; that he sometimes slouched in the witness' chair in a way that took him too far from the microphones.

And topping all of the things that the transcript does not show are these facts: That few of the Senators on either side of the aisle feel that they really know Wallace or understand what is going on in his mind.

That this feeling is so pronounced that some of them say, in private, that even if they subscribed completely to all the economic and political views of Wallace, they still would balk because of an indescribable feeling of uneasiness, at designating him as the instrument to carry out that program.

Report on Sentiment of German People in Aachen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of reports of three American educators attached to the psychological warfare branch of the Twelfth Army group. These men carried on extensive conversations in an informal manner with German residents of the city of Aachen in order to determine their attitudes. The reports of this group are most illuminating, and I feel justified in drawing them to the attention of the Members of the House:

I

LUXEMBOURG, January 8.—Some astonishing ideas about the state of mind of the German people have been brought out of the Aachen area by an intellectual task force composed of three American scholars. These men, surrounded by a material task force of tanks and armored cars, went into the area to do a job for the psychological warfare branch of the Twelfth Army group. In the course of their work they peeled off the armored escort, and talked as ordinary mortals to hundreds of German civilians.

What they found out changed some of their own basic conceptions of the Germany of today. The trio who conducted the brain penetration are Dr. Saul K. Padover, onetime assistant to the Secretary of the Interior and an authority on Austro-German history; Dr. Paul Sweet, professor of German history at Bates College, Lewiston, Maine, and Lewis F. Gitler, coeditor of German Psychological Warfare.

Dr. Padover stressed the point that the observations and conclusions of his colleagues and himself are personal, and in no way to be taken as official.

"To me the most astonishing thing that came out of our talks with these Germans," Dr. Padover said, "is their lack of nationalism. They don't want to govern themselves, and in a dozen different ways they expressed the same idea: They regard Germany's future as an Allied problem. One after another they expressed the hope that they will be treated as some sort of American colony. They declare that they are not at all ready for the burden of self-government. Instead of resisting the thought of being ruled, they welcome it with almost childlike relief."

Dr. Padover admitted that, like almost all of us, he had entertained the idea that the years of intense Nazi propaganda, combining nationalist themes with slogans of racial superiority, had created a fanatic German.

"But many Germans to whom we talked," Dr. Padover continued, "regarded nazi-ism as a kind of foreign rule. It was brought in by Hitler, himself a foreigner, and in the last years it was supported, in each locality, by SS troops and other forms of coercive police, from other regions."

Dr. Padover said he believed the weakness of German nationalism can be explained by the way the Nazis cut off the German people from their own history and cultural traditions. There was no German ideal, but a Nazi ideal; there were no German heroes, but only Nazi heroes, like Hitler and Horst Wessel.

He cited the case of a weaver's daughter who thought Bismarck was some kind of poet and Goethe a musician.

The father of an SS man, an old carpenter, told Dr. Padover he only wished the Rhineland could become some part of France or Belgium right away. An elderly school teacher voiced a common sentiment when she said: "Germany is kaput, and we would prefer our part of it to become an American colony."

An ex-soldier, who called himself a pacifist, declared, "I don't care what happens to Germany. I'm only looking out for myself."

A real-estate broker, a storekeeper, and a housewife all agreed that the Rhineland should become a separate territory, and this thought was advanced often enough, Dr. Padover said, to upset the common belief that the Germans want passionately to stick together.

Nor has racial indoctrination been a great success, he added. Young girls, when asked whether they would have any hesitation about marrying Frenchmen, Russians, or Americans, almost invariably responded that this would depend not upon race at all, but upon whether they were in love. When asked about marrying Jews, they expressed the same attitude.

The question of anti-Semitism, indeed, provoked some strange responses.

Many of these Germans had never known any Jews. Some said, "When the Jews were here they had stores, and you could buy things. Now you can buy nothing in the stores."

A factory worker and a girl, who had been in Hitler's Maiden League, expressed a common thought, "The attack on the Jews," they agreed, "was Hitler's greatest mistake."

On this point, Dr. Padover noted, "You invariably evoke signs of guilt. One woman told us she cried and cried when the Aachen Synagogue was burned because it was a place of God. Aside from the Jewish question, guilt and self-pity are the most common emotions. They pity themselves because they were forced into everything by the Nazis, and they feel guilty because they allowed this to happen."

II

LUXEMBOURG, January 9.—In my first dispatch I told how three members of an "intellectual task force," attached to the Psychological Warfare Branch of the Twelfth Army Group, had found German civilians in the Aachen area lacking any interest in the future of the Rhineland as a part of the German state, and lacking also in those traits of supernationalism which most of the world believes have been indoctrinated in the people by Hitler and the Nazi Party.

The three American educators who reported some of their astonishing findings to me are Dr. Saul K. Padover, one-time Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, and an authority on Austro-German history; Dr. Paul Sweet, professor of German history at Bates College, Lewiston, Maine, and Lewis F. Gitler, coeditor of German Psychological Warfare.

In the talks of his colleagues and himself with civilians, it was found that once again the military caste had escaped as blameless, Dr. Padover told me. The generals, in the view of Aachen residents, only acted as professional men, doing their best, and moving under the necessity of carrying out the commands of the Nazi higher-ups.

It is accordingly the Nazis who are the scapegoat, and who are now blamed for everything. As one girl put it, who talked with the three American scholars, "The fatherland means the aims of the Nazi Party. You cannot love a fatherland that starts and loses wars."

Most of the civilians, Dr. Padover found, blame Hitler only for losing the war, not for launching it. Nevertheless, Hitler is blamed. And the SS are offered up for punishment.

"Shooting is too quick a punishment for them," the civilians say. "They should be made to labor as slaves."

An old printer, the father of an SS man, said with equanimity, "If the SS men must be executed as war criminals, let them execute him, too."

The three educators tossed aside the traditional form-following methods of question-asking in their investigation of the German mind. Instead, they held long conversations in which they extracted complete histories of Germans of every type. Railroad workers, printers, bookkeepers, factory hands, housewives, grocers, policemen, Nazi Party members, Hitler Youth members, doctors, and actors were all got to talking freely. Their attitudes on a variety of subjects were, directly or indirectly, brought out. The past of Germany was in their lives, the future of Germany was in their fears, and in these long conversations they inevitably revealed their true sentiments about the Allies, about Russia, about democracy and socialism, about war.

Padover, Sweet, and Gitler were astonished to find that 12 years of propaganda and persecution had not changed the convictions of old-time Social Democrats, Socialists, and Communists. They talked to many persons who had been through terms in concentration camps, and had come out stronger than ever in their original beliefs. One woman who had been a Communist deputy in the Aachen City Council, though three times jailed, had continued her anti-Fascist stand till the day the Americans arrived.

While there seemed to be no organized underground movement, these people nevertheless clung to their ideologies, and waited in the belief that Hitlerism had to pass.

They could not fight it any more. The machine was too strong. Only two of the people who talked to the Americans said they wanted to continue to fight. The rest believed the German people were helpless, and had to wait for Allied guns to liberate them.

Most Germans simply claim to be "unpolitical." There was a playwright who had retreated to a tiny hamlet where he wrote about ancient Greece; and there was the one-time mayor of a small town who simply retired.

"They said they were waiting for us as liberators," Dr. Padover remarks. "And they were quite distressed by our nonfraternization policy. Many of their people had hoped we would pick the Nazis and punish them, instead of treating all Germans as equally guilty."

Another surprise the scholars received, in these conversations with Aachen civilians, came from the attitude of the young, the 'teen-agers, whom they had expected to find thoroughly indoctrinated and fanatical. The fact was most of them expressed anti-Nazi sentiments.

"They want some kind of freedom," Dr. Padover explained. "They want to have fun and do the things other young people do, instead of being regimented. They don't know a thing about democracy, can't define it, don't know what it is, but they will all tell you they want some kind of liberty. They admire Americans because we have such great resources, and we are winning the war. Instead of hating us for beating them, they admire us as victors almost as though their own people were not concerned. This was one of the most startling signs of a weak nationalism. One kid even said, quite unconsciously, 'We live under the yoke of the Germans,' and made it plain he regarded the Nazis as an outside or foreign kind of government."

Dr. Padover added that he believed this generation of German youth can be saved by being given a set of goals and a wholesale indoctrination in democratic ideas.

"It is the generation of young Nazi adults," he said, "that contains the real fanatics, and many of them are beyond change. But the 'teen-age youngsters have grown in the midst of war. They are not at all beyond redemption."

These three men probably know more about the inside of Germany today than any other Americans. They were not inside much of Germany, but the sliver we hold is quite a typical sample. As one old Social-Democrat said, there are still thousands of Germans in jails and concentration camps for their anti-nazi-ism, which should be evidence enough that all Germans are not alike.

It would seem that we might have a harder policy against the Nazis and the SS men, and differentiate between them and the Germans who are glad to be freed. In any event, it is clear from the personal reactions of the men in this intellectua' task force that at least one of our conceptions about Germany needs reexamination. We may be quite wrong about the intense nationalism of her people and about the fanaticism of her youth. We may save ourselves a great deal of labor and trouble and erase some fears if we investigate these suggestions fully and adapt our policy to what we find out to be the actual truth about the German mind, and the attitudes of the German people today.

Labor-Draft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit to the House a letter received from Mr. Joseph S. Clark, of my district. Mr. Clark is a laboring man, a patriotic American, and a good citizen. As his views represent the opinion expressed by thousands of laboring men and women in West Virginia, I place it in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues:

WILLIAMSTOWN, W. VA.

Hon. HUBERT ELLIS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: As a laboring man working at a local plant, I am pleased with your stand in regard to the labor-draft bill now before Congress. Not only myself but many of my fellow workers are of the opinion that this bill is but another way in which to bring American workmen to the status enjoyed by foreign masses—that of servitude and serfdom.

Already we are paying portions of our wages into so-called unions for which we receive no benefits; but only orders and reprimands. We are further compelled to meet W. M. C. requirements, pay the greater portion of American taxes, and give our brothers and sons as sacrifices on the altar of freedom.

We know that taxation finally is paid by the common people (hidden or otherwise) and we also know that practically all business dealing with Government orders are on a cost-plus basis.

We know, as do those now leading our Nation, that the average worker is a poor, misinformed creature, subject to all the propaganda and doctored truths given us by the glib tongue of the paid orator and through the press. Yet we know, too, that we of the silent masses have a greater power of reasoning than those in high places realize.

Yes, we workmen are, individually, bearing our burdens in silence—afraid and coerced by political and labor organizations. Still our mental status is as high as those front leaders who think we are but children

to be cared for by the hand of authority as it sees fit. Little do these leaders who would enslave us know the thoughts expressed in confidence by these children.

As men and as workers, we, the individual laborers of this Nation, ask only the right to work in a free atmosphere with as little regulation as possible. We are Americans, endowed with the love of freedom such as our fathers enjoyed.

Under the excuse of carrying the war to a successful conclusion, those in power would make us merely a part of the gigantic machine which they control.

Yes, Mr. ELLIS, may we thank you for your fight against the trend toward a nation composed of the ruled and the rulers.

Yours respectfully,

JOSEPH S. CLARKE.

Address of George J. Chryssikos, of New York, at the Naturalization Proceedings Held in the Court of Common Pleas of Hudson County, Jersey City, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by George J. Chryssikos:

My new fellow citizens, a great many years ago I stood before the bench of the court in the same position as you are today. Several decades ago I took the oath of allegiance to the United States. I received my naturalization papers and became an American citizen. Like you, I was not privileged to be born in this country. Almost 40 years of enjoyment of the rights of American citizenship have reinforced my convictions that beyond doubt this is the best country in the whole world. I am proud to be an American citizen. Together with all other citizens I am grateful to the founders of this Republic because they made America a free country and placed the Constitution of the United States between me and all those who would deprive me of my rights. Whether in my home, or on the streets, or in a public conveyance, or at my place of work, or in this courtroom, I breathe the air of freedom.

This day is one of the most important in your life. You have crossed the bridge which separated you from the citizens of the greatest and safest democracy in the world. Today you have really entered the United States of America spiritually as well as physically.

From now on the Government of the United States is your Government—which means your servant and your protector. To many of you this is a novel experience, because not all governments are servants of the people. There are governments, we know, which consider the people as their servants and impose their arbitrary might on all except a chosen few. There are governments which, instead of protecting the people, subject them to all kinds of abuses.

As American citizens you are entitled and even expected to exercise control over the acts of the Government, to see that its three branches—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—live up to their obligations, which include the promotion of the common welfare of the people, the safeguarding and perpetuation of the Republic, the inviolability of its laws, and the protection of the rights of the individual.

At fixed intervals you will be called to the polls to express with your fellow citizens in a decisive way your opinion regarding the administration of National, State, county, or municipal affairs by those in power. Your votes will be a factor in the popular verdict which decides the fate of every administration in this free country.

America has adopted you, trusting that you will contribute to its welfare and to its strength with the loyal performance of your duties as well as the exercise of your rights as citizens. It is of the utmost importance to your new country and to you that the ideals of rights and duties are completely balanced in your conscience. This essential balance will be effected if you realize that your private welfare lies in the welfare of the country.

Your adopted country is now fighting for its very existence. It is fighting for its freedom, for its rights, and for its place in the world as a great nation. Its enemies are your enemies. Their success in this war would mean that you, as American citizens, would have to submit to their dictates, to accept whatever fate their savage selfishness, their greediness, and their hatred of freedom would reduce you to. To defend your rights so threatened, you, your sons and your daughters, your brothers and your sisters, must defend the country to the utmost of your power. You must be ready to do all that the safety of America and its future requires You must accept cheerfully every sacrifice which is required of you for the complete and final defeat of the enemies of the United States. The war which this country, allied with the United Nations, is waging against Germany and Japan is the supreme test of the loyalty which you have solemnly sworn to the American flag. Victory over our common enemies must be your most fervent wish. Its achievement must ever be the common aim of all those who take pride in calling themselves American citizens.

Millions of American men are now called upon to shed their blood, it may be to give their lives, in defense of our country. We on the home front must bear with courage and fortitude whatever our chosen representatives and public officers, in the exercise of their wisdom, ordain as necessary for the welfare and safety of our fighting men and women, whose particular needs must come first. Our individual interests must remain secondary to the general interests of our country. In this time of great emergency, every citizen is called upon to contribute his mite to the prosecution of the war. When victory comes each of us will then have the opportunity to receive his individual share of the great bounty of our glorious country; but let us remember, this share will, of course, be measured by the degree of the personal contribution that you and I have made to the welfare of our Nation.

Tune In on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from This Month for March 1945:

TUNE IN ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Victor Riesel and Paul Sann)

Suppose, weary of such moth-eaten radio fare as John's Other Wife, Stella Dallas, or Life Can Be Beautiful, you flicked your dial one afternoon and heard:

"Ladies and gentlemen, we bring you now the Senate of the United States."

And for the next 3 or 4 hours your loudspeaker brought you a debate on the most controversial issue of the day.

Now, this isn't going to happen tomorrow, or the day after, but it is an intriguing postwar possibility. In the past session of Congress, one Representative introduced a resolution calling for the broadcasting of the deliberations of the House and Senate.

The resolution died, of course, because the suggestion is both impractical and premature as of this moment, but it does reflect the people's rapidly growing interest in the day-by-day proceedings of the councils which govern them.

The daily newspaper, crammed with global reports in place of lurid sex crimes and local trivia, best illustrates this hunger for firsthand information on the social, economic, political, and governmental currents affecting daily life—not only in the world capitals but even in the most remote crossroads hamlet.

In a sense, this is a projection of the old town hall sentiment onto the vast and limitless scale opened up by radio and the coming perfection of television and frequency modulation (FM).

Even now, almost unnoticed, this process is well under way. Witness the success of such radio programs as the Town Hall Meeting of the Air, the People's Platform, the Chicago Round Table of the Air, and the scores of radio forums on contemporary events. The key to the popularity of this type of broadcast lies in the unrehearsed spontaneity with which Government officials and other experts present their plain, uncensored opinions on big issues.

On another scale, this same increased interest in the economic and social phenomena of our time has accounted for the spread of broadcasts devoted to labor arbitration and the domestic problems of wage earners.

As far as municipal affairs are concerned, the New York City Council, airing all of its sessions over the city's own station, WNYC, built up a listening audience of 1,000,000 persons per broadcast. The council proceedings in those early days of its organization frequently were devoted largely to bombast and petty bickering.

Even at that, however, a Princeton University study of WNYC's mail showed that three of every four listeners reported increased civic knowledge, while half of them said they would use the information thus gained, in voting.

City Hall cynics used to refer to the broadcasts as the "funniest show in town," but for all the political word slinging, the real issues were aired. The study brought out that 49 percent of the listeners regarded the broadcasts as educational, 15 percent considered them entertaining, 32 percent viewed them as both educational and entertaining, and 3 percent saw them as propaganda for one side or the other.

All in all, "the relationship between the city government and the citizen is seen to be increased and strengthened by the broadcasts," the Princeton report concluded.

By the same token, the broadcasts provoked resentment against the ward-heeler type of politician who had not heretofore been exposed to large audiences. This man, schooled in the intimate and corrupt aldermanic sessions of the city's "tin box" era, found himself held up to a most unfavorable light in public debates with the new and progressive type of lawmaker elected to the council under proportional representation.

Indeed, the heavy WNYC mail provoked by the broadcasts showed a distinct anti-Tammany sentiment among the listeners. This, regrettably, killed the broadcasts after 2 years, for the Democrats had a majority in the council. Hardly satisfied with this

triumph, the Democrats since have tried to wipe out the station itself. But they have failed, and today Mayor LaGuardia's regular Sunday afternoon broadcasts, covering the whole broad range of municipal problems from the supply of meat to taxes and the subway fare, attest to the station's popularity.

Toledo and Buffalo also have broadcast official city government proceedings.

The only national experiment in this field is that of New Zealand, which started broadcasting the sessions of its house of representatives after its Labor Party came into power in 1935.

Labor Party officials initiated the broadcasts, first, because they felt that the press had been unfair to their cause, and, second, because they considered New Zealand an unusually politically conscious community. The physical set-up of the parliamentary broadcasts consisted of distributing microphones at intervals before the Government and opposition benches.

In the beginning, the full daily session was aired; later the broadcasts were limited, with the house going off the air at 11 p. m., although the sessions frequently lasted much longer. This necessitated some adjustment of normal parliamentary procedure—an equal number of speakers from both parties had to be given the floor in debates, and equal time had to be allotted to them during the more popular listening hours.

When the war broke out, the speaker of the house was vested with the authority to suspend the broadcasts when they tended to touch on military secrets.

For those who preferred music, or programs in a lighter vein, the Government thoughtfully provided a variety of broadcasts over its own local stations during the hours of the Parliament airings.

In this latter connection, it is interesting to note that Parliament had by far the biggest daily listening audience. Just as in New York City's venture in broadcasting, the New Zealand lawmakers had their moments of pointless debate on trivial, purely partisan issues, but the people listened. The tomfoolery was outweighed, in the people's mind, by the right that accrued to them to sit in on the sessions of government.

The use of the radio as a medium of education on public affairs has caught the imagination of the American labor movement. The Congress of Industrial Organization's Chicago Convention early this winter voted to enter the broadcasting field through the operation of commercial FM stations.

C. I. O. leaders view FM as the answer to the restrictions placed on labor by the big networks. The 5,000,000-member organization has instructed local union leaders to study their community problems in preparation for applying to the Federal Communications Commission for licenses to operate FM stations.

The United Automobile Workers, largest union in the world, already has filed application for six noncommercial, educational stations in Newark, Chicago, Detroit, Flint, Cleveland, and Los Angeles, where it has large memberships. The union hopes to broadcast its regular meetings.

These broadcasts of the future, aimed not only at the Nation's 15,000,000 organized workers but also at the man in the street, might well condition the American public to the point where it would demand the same privileges extended to the people of New Zealand—that is, the right to tune in on the men governing their lives.

What Our Men Overseas Are Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maj. William H. Burnham:

WHAT OUR MEN OVERSEAS ARE THINKING

(By Maj. William H. Burnham)

How the minds of the men in the armed forces are working; their attitude toward the future; and what they expect when they get home, should have a bearing on all plans being formulated for their future.

To get a background for the reactions of these men, let us briefly look at what happens to them if they land in the Pacific area. First, most of them are terribly young. The average age in our fighter squadrons, including the older officers, was just 22. These boys have been taken from life during their fun period when movies, whistling at the girls, leaning against the drug-store window, should have been their normal pastimes. They are plunged, after some training, into an environment of which they had never dreamed and onto an island of which they have previously never heard. They may be in the assault wave wading ashore; they may fly in; or they may follow on transports, but regardless of the method of arrival it is all new, strange, and trying.

KEEP THEIR HUMOR

They see their friends die; they subsist on rations full of vitamins but lacking beefsteak appeal; they sleep on the ground until the tents go up; they have no showers or latrines until they build them; everything in fact which they associate with home life disappears quickly and to them apparently finally—everything except their humor and wit—thank God.

Is it any wonder then that these youngsters with plenty of time to think balance the pros and cons of questions, estimate the real values of life (though they would never admit it) and have the outlook of mature men? They are dealing with life in the rough and raw. Sham, political trickery, and the self-inflated importance of others are quickly penetrated.

These boys are realistic, yet they are not hard. All we have to do is to watch them with the dogs, the chickens, the goats, the pigs (all of Japanese origin) or see them finding chocolates for the native kids, to realize that underneath they still have those instincts of kindness and the home touch which made them outstanding among all the other soldiers of the world. They are not tough, or hard but they are realistic and factual.

SEE WAR AS A DIRTY BUSINESS

How are they thinking? Let us first take their attitude toward the war. In it there is little or no glory for them. They see it as a dirty business that has to be done and their one object is to do it quickly and thoroughly. On the return from missions in which there has been a fight with the enemy the entire discussion between them and their pals may be a thumbs-up gesture—an O. K., a pretty tough, or have they heard from Jonesie yet? They are not talkers nor do they believe they are doing anything particularly outstanding. It's their job. After a mission when 14 Jap fighters were shot down by one of our squadrons—a banner day—the intelligence officer had difficulty in ascertaining who had shot down what until the bomber crews whom they were protecting arrived and talked, out of gratitude. Their modesty, if it can be called that, is refreshing and it is not false. There is nothing about these fighters of ours which is false. They are realistic, clear-thinking, hard-hitting men.

These men receive medals—the Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal as incidental to their business of winning and finishing the war. You will see most of them wearing them in the States—never in the combat zone—for as one squadron commander who had been on leave said to his pilots when he returned, "you better get some medals for when I walked down Market Street, San Francisco, with no ribbons on all the kids hollered, 'slacker.'" Incidentally he had the Distinguished Flying Cross.

These boys are creative, imaginative, and desire to be busy. The self-constructed showers not only showed initiative but imagination and a certain resourcefulness in acquiring pumps, both manual and gasoline, which had all the appearances of Government issue. They have built themselves tables and chairs and, due to the ever-pressing laundry question, have constructed hundreds of washing machines with the plunger made of old Spam cans, the tub wall of a Jap gasoline drum, and the propelling energy, not himself but the wind, harnessed by means of a windmill, and the discussion between the inventors as to the most efficient angle of the blade is endless. The shell necklaces and bracelets made by them would probably, if laid end to end, stretch to Tokyo, and will.

DREAM OF GOING HOME

These boys are homesick. Regardless of whether they come from Florida, Maine, California, Connecticut, Kansas, or Ohio, they dream of home constantly, of their return to their families, to their normal life, and to a job. What do they mean by a normal life? They think of a job with chance advancement. They dream of being with their wives and kids or of marrying and raising children. They have a great desire to return to their own place in a normal world and resume their contacts of social nature. These rights they have earned, and it is up to everyone at home to see they get them. Here in this State, the Connecticut Reemployment Commission, created by Governor Baldwin and headed by Carl A. Gray, and local reemployment and veterans' advisory committees are doing a tremendous job. But all of us must be vigilant. We are only beginning to tackle this problem.

WANT INDEPENDENCE

These boys do not want to be dependents. They are too proud. The word "bonus" was not heard in 2½ years of close association with these men. Even the wounded want only the right to earn their way in life. I still remember the look on the wounded Tarawa marine veteran's face when I stepped back to let him go ahead of me on the carrier coming from the Gilberts campaign.

Let us bend every effort then to see that they do not fall the prey of professional organizers eother through discouragement or believing themselves nonadapted to this world. Let us bend all our thinking and work to finding him a job—a proper job—and to helping him establish himself in the second new environment he has had to face in the past 2 years.

These men will be more tolerant than when they went away. When the bombers are overhead they are not thinking of whether it is a white or black, a Jew, an Irishman, a Czech, or a Chinaman who is

driving the enemy away either by manning the antiaircraft or piloting the fighter.

What do these men fear? Not the enemy, certainly; not that they will be killed, wounded, or maimed, but:

1. That there will be no job for them upon their return.

2. That the old-fashioned run-around from pillar to post will be their only reception.

3. That inertia, improper planning, and inactivity will find industry, education, the community, and their families unprepared to aid them in readjusting themselves to the peaceful world they have won for us and themselves.

That these fears do not become a reality is our responsibility—yours and mine. We cannot and must not fail.

Francisco Aguilera Joins the Hispanic Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article by Dr. Henry Grattan Doyle, dean of George Washington University, and president of the Cosmos Club, of Washington, which appeared in the December 1944 issue of Hispania. It is my information that the appointment of Senor Aguilera as Assistant Director of the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress marks the first time such a high rank has been given to a Latin American. The article is as follows:

FRANCISCO AGUILERA JOINS THE HISPANIC FOUNDATION

Dr. Archibald MacLeish, the Librarian of Congress, has announced the appointment of Sr. Francisco Aguilera, a citizen of Chile, as Assistant Director of the Hispanic Foundation, the Library of Congress, of which Dr. Lewis Hanke is Director. Sr. Aguilera brings to his new task wide experience as a writer, teacher, educational administrator, and lecturer, and demonstrated ability as an interpreter of Hispanic American civilization to English-speaking Americans and of Anglo-Saxon American civilization to Latin Americans. A poet of real inspiration, he has not only produced original verse but skillful Spanish verse translations of poetry originally written in English, notably MacLeish's Conquistador. He has a wide acquaintance with writers and artists throughout the hemisphere. His fluent command of English, both literary English and everyday American, combined with his exceptional skill as an architect of words in his native tongue, makes him an ideal choice for the position he has assumed.

Francisco Aguilera was born in Chile in 1899, and holds degrees from the University of Chile and from Indiana University. He also did graduate work at Yale University. He came to the United States in 1920, remaining until 1928, when he returned to Chile to become assistant professor in the Institute of Philology, University of Chile, and director general of secondary education in the schools of Chile. He also served as an editorial writer on La Nación. In 1930 he returned to the United States. His teaching career includes 2 years as instructor in Spanish at Williams College and 11 years as instructor in Spanish at Yale University under the late Frederick Bliss Luquiens. For the past 9 years he has been connected with the division of intellectual cooperation of the Pan American Union, and for the past 2 years has served as assistant director of the Washington Inter-American Center, holding this post concurrently with that of assistant director of the division of intellectual cooperation at the Pan American Union.

In addition to numerous original works in prose and verse and many translations, Sr. Aguilera has been since 1938 a contributing editor of the Handbook of Latin American Studies, published by the Harvard University Press. He has also collaborated in the preparation of a number of textbooks, among them the Whitman and Aguilera Course in Spanish Composition (Longmans, Green); Introducción a la Historia de la América Latina (D. Appleton-Century Co.), on which he collaborated with Prof. Ernest J. Hall, of Yale University; and a forthcoming record-and-textbook course, New World Spanish on Victor Records, prepared in collaboration with Henry Grattan Doyle. He has contributed many articles and reviews to learned and literary journals in Latin America, Spain, and the United States, among them some significant reviews published in Hispania. Among the principal duties of the new Assistant Director will be that of developing the collections and services of the Library in the field of Hispanic languages and literatures.

Dr. Robert C. Smith, the former Assistant Director of the Hispanic Foundation, has been transferred, along with the Archive of Hispanic Culture, which he directs, to the Division of Prints and Photographs of the Library of Congress, of which he has been appointed Assistant Chief. Dr. Smith will also serve as Exhibit Officer of the Library. Dr. Smith will contribute to these important assignments exceptional skill and wide knowledge.

Sr. Aguilera's appointment brings into the service of the Library of Congress, and therefore of American education and scholarship generally, a man who is almost unique for his possession of a variety of talents, aptitudes, and experience, all of which can contribute in sound and scholarly ways to the development of the Hispanic Foundation and, in the larger sense, of inter-American intellectual and cultural relations. Several years of close association, as friend and collaborator, have given me a deep respect—indeed, a tremendous admiration—for Francisco Aguilera. His contribution to the Hispanic Foundation will, I am sure, be noteworthy and lasting.

HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE.

Are We Children?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, are we children who must be kept in ignorance of the real purpose of the administration until it has attained its end? All too often from London or Moscow we first learn of the foreign policy of the administration, of the whereabouts of the President and his advisers. Many times news of what our fighting men are doing, of what is happening to them, comes to us first from foreign correspondents, our own American newspapermen having been smothered under a cloak of secrecy. That is not as it should be.

Not only is this true as to foreign policy, but here at home the Government moves by indirection, concealing its true purpose. Congress is told it must support a bill because it is a necessary war measure, when in truth it is nothing of the kind.

A recent illustration is the so-called work-or-fight bill, which was jammed through the House with speeches by the administration's leaders telling us that it was necessary for the successful prosecution of the war; that men and women must be conscripted to work in the factories in order to get munitions of war.

The bill is now stalled in the Senate because administrative agencies cannot agree as to how the power given should be used.

Just a few days later, the same administration forced through a rubber-stamp Congress a bill which will require 27,000 employees to take a farm census at the cost of $15,000,000, and at the same time refused to adopt an amendment which would make them subject to draft.

That is to say that, while, on January 2, the President issued a directive under which essential farm workers are being inducted into the service, on February 7 the administration refused to accept an amendment which would make the 27,000 Federal employees taking the farm census subject to the draft, as are agricultural workers.

If essential farm workers are to be drafted, is there any reason why Federal employees taking a census and who are eligible should not be drafted?

NAVY HOUSING

Recently the House gave the Navy $1,500,593,500 to carry on the war. But the Navy has never had authority to build housing for its civilian employees. Authority and money for that has been given to the F. H. A., but back came the Administration on the 7th and asked the House to permit the Navy—not the F. H. A.—to spend $41,265,000 for housing facilities.

For Federal employees the Government has built hundreds of homes which have never been occupied. So the House turned down the Navy's request to spend $41,265,000 for homes. Congress has never refused to give the Army and the Navy whatever it asked to further the war effort, but there are indications that it is not going to permit either to go into businesses which do not further the war effort.

DRAFTING OF NURSES

Next week Congress will be asked to vote on a bill to draft nurses into the armed service—this notwithstanding the report there are between seven and eight thousand registered, graduate male nurses available who the armed forces are not using.

In my judgment, there is no need to draft nurses. Women are just as patriotic, more willing to make sacrifices, kinder and more charitable, than are

the men and, if the Government will shorten the nursing course as it shortened every other line of training, give adequate pay and competent instruction, it will get all the nurses that it needs.

So long as New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, and Canada—integral parts of the British Empire—refuse to draft their men to carry on the war, I can see no reason why we should draft our women for foreign service.

ADMINISTRATION'S PURPOSE

Today, though we are engaged in two great wars, the administration, instead of devoting its whole attention to the wining of those wars, is still following its 1935–37 policy—a policy of strengthening its political fences; of spending; of the grabbing of power by the Federal Government; of centralization and regimentation, ignoring the fact that our history, prior to this war and our experience in this war, have demonstrated that a free people will voluntarily outproduce and outfight a regimented people, a totalitarian nation.

Let the administration tell us what it wants and, if its causes are just, there will be no slackers.

Lincoln's Ideals Must Be Ours Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., minority leader of the House of Representatives, at the Lincoln Day dinner, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., Thursday, February 8, 1945:

It is a happy privilege in behalf of this magnificent gathering of Republicans to extend a warm welcome to the able and distinguished Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey.

In 1944 he was selected to carry the standard of the Republican Party. He made a forceful, vigorous campaign, was only a scant distance back of victory. Twenty-two million Americans wanted him for President and so expressed themselves in a campaign conducted during a great world war. That was a remarkable tribute of confidence.

Governor Dewey, we are delighted to have you with us; we will enjoy your address and wish for you a most pleasant stay here.

We are assembled tonight to again pay homage to and reaffirm our faith in the character, the ideals, and the labors of a great man, a great American, the father of the Republican Party—the immortal Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln had the courage, the statesmanship, and the knowledge to preserve the Union; he mobilized democracy; he shattered the shackles which held the Negro in bondage. These were acts of a mighty leader. But Lincoln lives today in the hearts of liberty-loving people everywhere on the globe because he dedicated his life and his work not to a single country or a single race, but to all mankind and the whole world.

As equal justice, tolerance, individual freedom to all were the ideals of Lincoln for his own countrymen, so were they his ideals for mankind everywhere.

Lincoln placed duty to his country high above partisanship in his day; we, today, place duty to our country high above partisanship. But we must, at the same time, be alert that saboteurs do not secretly undermine the foundations of our free Constitutional Government, our free economy, and our free society while we are fighting to uphold our high ideals on battlefronts all over the world.

The present war is a war of all the people, irrespective of race, creed, or color. The issues of victory will vitally affect not only the present generation, but the liberty, the privileges, and the happiness of hundreds of millions who are to come after us.

We hope we are in the final phase of this terrible war. But victory—complete victory—must be our first consideration until it is assured.

Lincoln in his day fought to preserve the greatest experiment in free government ever attempted by the human race. We today must fight to preserve it. Democracy is not only the ideal of free souls; it is a system of enlightened production and distribution.

Ours is a biparty system of Government. Every problem of the Nation is the problem of the Republican Party which Abraham Lincoln founded. Just as our party had its birth to preserve the Nation, so today it is dedicated to the task of saving the Nation.

America faces many serious problems. Problems confront business, private enterprise, free agriculture, and constitutional government.

All citizens who firmly believe in the principles and the way of life which have made this country great and its people happy, have become gravely alarmed as they have witnessed the growing governmental controls, regulations, and restrictions, some of which, born of the necessities of war, now threaten to become a grave menace to our traditional freedom. Red tape and regimentation are falling over their own feet.

Lincoln did not fear to speak out plainly when he felt plain speaking was needed for the welfare of his countrymen. We must not fear to speak plainly today for the welfare of our country. We must expect to face violent criticism and abuse, but American ideals can be saved only by plain talking, and honest, forthright action.

We must not underestimate the cleverness and the perseverance of those who do not want our traditional American way of government, economy, industry, and society to exist in post-war America. The war has given a tremendous impetus to those who are joined, in effect, in a broad alliance of various shades of fascism, communism, socialism, leftism of one degree or another.

The schemers diligently spread their alien doctrines through the newspapers, over the radio, in book or pamphlet, from the public platform and in the colleges. They have the right, guaranteed by our Constitution, to propagandize. No one would deny that right. But we who do cherish our sacred heritage must fight back. We must not let them sabotage freedom in America.

These alien doctrinnaires smear characters, undermine accepted American institutions and practices, create doubt and suspicion, ridicule, lawful government of, by, and for the people. They endeavor to create public hostility against the Congress as an institution, belittle our concepts of free enterprise and equal opportunity. Their purpose is to tear down the Constitution and replace it with absolutism. Only through untiring vigilance can they be prevented from attaining these objectives. We must maintain our democracy as a mutual-benefit society.

Many of these advocates of totalitarianism have infiltrated into Government bureaus and departments. Their political theories may vary, but they are bound together in one common basic aim. That is to get control of sufficient governmental machinery and worker organizations to be able to restrict, regulate, and regiment all of America. Let's not let democracy be the greatest casualty of the war.

I have said a major part of the design of these schemers is to discredit the Congress. A typical example of this well-planned effort was in evidence last year during the consideration of a bill providing a means of voting for members of the armed forces. Most of the Republicans and a substantial number of Democrats advocated a law providing for observance of constitutional methods in the exercise of this most important right of the citizen. The administration and its faithful propagandists denounced the adherents of the Constitution as trying to deprive the soldiers of their ballots. Of course, the contrary was the fact. We desired to give the soldier a full ballot—one just as good as the civilians had and which could lawfully be counted.

The constitutional adherents won and the soldiers had their ballots.

Now comes the Secretary of War with a statement which fully justifies the fight we made for a full State ballot for service men and women. Of 7,800,000 eligible to vote, the privilege was exercised by 2,800,000. That is a pretty good proportion when we consider how widely scattered our service people were and how many of them were engaged in combat duties. But more significant is the Secretary's statement that in the 10 States which afforded the opportunity of a choice, 34 percent used the State ballot and only 2 percent the so-called bob-tailed ballot, advocated by the administration.

Thus we have complete justification for the attitude of the Congress. It is something to be borne in mind when next the propaganda pack gets busy.

A philosopher once said: "A democracy that goes to war, if beaten, loses its liberty at the hands of its adversary; if victorious, it loses its liberty at its own hands." You say that cannot happen here. Well, maybe not. I hope not, but I am not too sure, unless we exercise ceaseless vigilance.

"A house divided against itself cannot stand." America cannot remain free, half socialistic and half a representative republic. We must either be completely a democracy or entirely a socialistic autocracy. I am for a complete representative republic.

The war brought to the executive branch of the Government power and controls undreamed of in peacetime. It is a trait of bureaucrats always to try to stretch their powers beyond those limits intended by Congress. We have seen these powers many times expanded. It is historic that bureaucrats will cling tenaciously to power over the people even after the need for the exercise of such power has passed. Administration officials are already insisting these controls must continue after the war. Some even intimate they must remain over us for all time.

Thus there hovers over our Nation the threat of complete domination by a bloated bureaucracy. To a very great degree, the people must depend upon the Republican membership of the House and Senate to rescue them from such domination. Fears of primary reprisals, threats of purges, and loss of patronage cannot prevent us Republicans from discharging our responsibilities to the people. We intend to safeguard the people against bureaucratic abuses and excesses of power. We will be ready to fight for the return of these powers to Congress when the war emergency is over. We shall demand the correction of abuses of power whenever and wherever they appear. The Bill of Rights

is not a bill for bureaucratic extravagance and waste. It is irresponsible borrowing and spending which make wildcat dollars.

As Lincoln well said: "Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them."

And it is to the Republicans in Congress, and patriotic Democrats who may join with us, the people of this country are looking to save their liberty. We must not fail. We must not accustom the people to bondage through new-fangled political nostrums.

A problem fundamental to all freedom confronts us. Shall we continue to have virile private enterprise, functioning so as to give individual opportunity and jobs for all who want to work? No one can deny that under our system of economy, the people of America have made greater progress and have enjoyed more of the good things of life than under any other system yet devised by man. There is no substitute for liberty.

Yet danger signs are everywhere. The reasons motivating the substitution of Henry Wallace for Jesse Jones are deep and significant. One can readily visualize the difference such a change could make in our post-war economy. As director of the many functions of the R. F. C. and other loan agencies, besides being Secretary of Commerce, he could go far to impose on us state socialism or any other "ism."

That is why the people of this country are opposed to his confirmation as Secretary of Commerce. No more important vote will be cast in the next 2 years than the roll call on his confirmation.

The nomination of Aubrey Williams as Administrator of the R. E. A. further intensifies the threat of a regimented state, some form of bureaucratic state socialism. Williams' governmental record is not too inspiring. He was one of the happy spenders of the W. P. A. He scattered funds with reckless abandon as head of the National Youth Administration. His chief qualification appears to be his ability as a political organizer, and it is suspected that is the chief reason for his appointment. He can help his good friend Henry to gather in the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1948.

The policy revealed in the Wallace and Williams appointments is particularly alarming. They demonstrate utter disregard for fitness or ability to serve this country in the most critical hour of our national life. There is no pretense of efficiency. The form of government is important, but the spirit of government is vital to the people's liberty.

The President states the reason for such appointments bluntly and frankly in his letter to Mr. Jones. He says Henry has earned, because of his vigorous support of the New Deal fourth-term campaign, any place in the administration he might ask for.

There is the policy in words no one can misunderstand. High and vitally important posts go to individuals, not because of any qualifications for the job but as political pay-offs.

Think of it. In a great war crisis, with tremendous post-war problems ahead, with the fate of private enterprise in the balance, we see an able, experienced businessman like Jesse Jones removed to make way for the payment of a political debt. And then they accuse the opposition of playing politics. Surely this is not the way to bring about national unity.

There are lessons to this country in these recent appointments. One is the need of electing men and women to Congress who will stand up and fight for honesty and sanity in Government and for the preservation of the American way of life. Another lesson which should be clearly manifest now is that it is unwise to give any individual too much power. That is why in the George bill now pending in the House we should adopt satisfactory amendments which will be a further safeguard against too great a grant of power to any one man.

The indifference of the administration to the rapidly expanding Federal debt; the urging of vast expenditures after the war without consideration of how the necessary revenue shall be raised; the continuance of a tax system which stifles financial ventures and industrial expansion; these all would be the policies pursued if one wanted to precipitate a crisis which would bring about a radical change in our way of life.

Some day this war will end. Millions of men and women will be coming back home from the fighting fronts. They will be coming out of the shipyards and the war factories. They will want jobs, real American jobs at real American wages, under American working and living condition; they will want a future glowing with hope for a fuller, richer life.

These men and women will have done their full share in winning the war. They will deserve every chance to live happily, peacefully, and well, with their loved ones. Our task is to see that they have that opportunity. They certainly cannot get it under the system now being fashioned by the new dealers.

Congress must do its part through the adoption of sane, forward-looking post-war plans, which will operate to provide our service people and defense workers with good jobs.

We must, at the earliest possible moment, pass a practical tax bill which will give merited and necessary relief to individuals and business enterprises. A tax bill which will lower the tax taken from the individual, which will release additional purchasing power; will result in more jobs for all. A tax bill which will give business enterprise an opportunity to retain a fair share of its profits will encourage expansion and create new activities which will be needed if we are to secure full employment. We Republicans have a study committee working on that subject. We will be ready with a proposal when the time comes.

In the Central and South American countries will be opportunities for increased trade. Through a greater interchange of goods, more jobs will be created. China and Asia will need goods and services to an extent hitherto undreamed of. Europe must be rebuilt.

These are all potent reasons why we must take an active part in the reconstruction of the world. Our part can be just, helpful, humane, and philanthropic, without sacrificing the interests of America. A program fair to our own people, as well as to others, is the only policy that can endure and succeed over a long period of years.

Let's help the world, but let's do it in a way that will command the respect of the people we are helping. In that way, we can build for permanent peace and good will.

We Republicans have always recognized our obligations to the people of the world, as well as the people of America. We have always been ready for our country to assume her full share in keeping the peace of the world. At Mackinac, in the 1944 platform, and in the campaign of 1944, we forcibly and forthrightly demonstrated our position. Permanent peace, we have repeatedly declared, should be based upon the principle that all nations, small as well as large, have a right to expect a full measure of justice.

We can, if we wish, close our eyes to the danger signals which confront America. We can joy-ride today and console ourselves with the smug assumption that our country will somehow or other escape disaster. That would be the easy way. But it would certainly not be the right way; it would not be the honest way; it would not be the safe way. Nor would it be the American way.

Let us fearlessly face the facts. Let us deny ourselves some of the luxuries. Let's have the courage to fight to keep our free way of life so we can give the future generations of Americans some hope for a life free from regimentation and bright with the golden promise of equal opportunity for all.

A majority of the people are against the fumbling, bungling New Deal. It is our duty as Americans to unite this majority. Through aggressive leadership and through organization, it can be done. It must be done if the kind of America we love is to endure.

Address of George Maurice Morris, of Inter-American Bar Association, at the Inauguration of the Inter-American Academy of Comparative and International Law, Habana, Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I tender herewith to be printed in the RECORD copy of notable address delivered at Habana, Cuba, on January 8, by one of this country's most distinguished lawyers, Mr. George Maurice Morris, recently president of the American Bar Association.

The occasion for this address was the inauguration of the Inter-American Academy of Comparative and International Law. Mr. Morris and his associates in the American Bar Association, and members with similar high purpose of other bar associations of the Americas, in bringing together American lawyers in association and comradeship and in enterprises such as this in which all the peoples of the Americas are mutually interested, are doing a great constructive service for the peoples of the Americas and for the peace, justice, and good order of the world.

Following is the text of the address:

Something less than 4 years ago, the Inter-American Bar Association held its first meeting. That meeting was held here in this intellectually fruitful and brilliant city of Habana. It is doubtful if any action in even that historic conference has had a greater potential for lasting value than has been enjoyed by the vote of that gathering to create in this seat of learning and culture, Habana, the Academy of Comparative and International Law. Men of vision and courage proposed that resolution; [1] men of faith voted for it. There was then no certain indication that funds [2] would be forthcoming to support such a school or even that teachers or pupils could be found to people it. Nevertheless, we all realized the tremendous aid to mutual understanding and the international spirit which such an institution could contribute.

Great as we knew the potentialities of such an institution were, it must be confessed that

---

[1] See Proceedings of Havana Conference, vol. 1, pp. 167–168; 386–389.

[2] Decree No. 2249, issued July 31, 1943, Gaceta Oficial, August 5, 1943, p. 13443, and decree No. 2302, issued July 29, 1944, Gaceta Oficial, August 7, 1944, p. 12710.

many of us voted for the project with sensations of hopefulness predominating over those of expectancy. And here and now, in virtually no time at all, and to our happy surprise, we are about to see, in being, that which so short a time ago appeared to some persons as only a remote possibility—an academician's dream.

Little did the doubters know of the determination and energy of the men of Cuba, who were chosen to organize the academy. Tribute should be paid to those men on this occasion. In naming them one risks the accusation of incompleteness through leaving out others who should be named but certainly three men are in the group to whom high commendation is due. They are Dr. Manuel Fernandez Supervielle, the distinguished first president of the Inter-American Bar Association, Dr. Ernesto Dihigo, the indefatigable chairman of the organizing committee, and his colleague, the learned Dr. Juan Clemente Zamora. Upon behalf of the Inter-American Bar Association, we commend and thank these men and their associates for the interest, the time, and the personal sacrifices which they have contributed in the inauguration of a project so close to all our hearts. These men have given fact to what with us was only a hope.

One of the prominent members of the academy's first faculty, Dr. James Oliver Murdock, has said something born of his experience as a student, a teacher, a scholar, which at this moment it is appropriate to repeat. Professor Murdock states:

"International and comparative law can best be studied in an international atmosphere where students and faculty, sitting down together, are from diverse countries. An environment is afforded which is not possible when they are all from a single country. There is an exercise in the application of the tolerant spirit which evolves from oral discussions with persons of different nationalities. The restraints and capacity for understanding resulting from such exercise are priceless in conducting international relations. An academy, such as that instituted in Habana, inescapably will furnish this exercise to a degree which no quantity of reading and lecture attendance in one's own country alone will bring to him."

While the initial sessions of the academy may not furnish the diversity of attending pupils, which is desirable or optimum, certainly the faculty follows the principle of diversity and we probably have but to await a termination of the war and a broader knowledge of what is available here to see the desired diversity come to the student body.

In the intellectual intimacy which may be expected ultimately to develop in this school, the younger generation should get early something that their predecessors got later. Information, understanding, sympathy, humor, have been the payment we older men have begun to take from our investment of time and thought in the Inter-American Bar Association. These values are available, a generation earlier, to those who will invest their time and thought in the Inter-American Academy. The community stands to gain in the field of international cooperation as a result of the availability of such opportunities.

As session follows session and year follows year, the lectures offered and the round-table discussions scheduled at the academy should, when printed and circulated among the scholars, students, schools, and associations of lawyers, stimulate all recipients to a genuine interest in the constructive work of the academy.

We may have confidence, also, that the quality of the offerings of this superschool will add luster even to a community which has long known luster in its learning. One suspects that the problems of the future will not be the lack of appetite of the public for the wares here offered. "A good wine needs no bush." The problem will be to secure the financial support which will enable the hungry consumers of such wares to possess the time and the means to come and feast upon them. The Cuban Government has made the initial contribution. Let us hope that the demonstration which follows will induce other public and private donations to so worthy a cause.

Permit a conclusion which emphasizes that the world continues to need a concentration, or focusing of the thinking which men of these Americas have been doing with respect to the international and comparative law, which most relates to this region. Men of new countries with their new problems and new opportunities think new thoughts. They have a fresher approach. They are not too burdened by the crushing presence of past failures. Let us hope that some of this new world freshness will make its way into the thinking and the teaching of the men who will instruct here. Let us hope that men already able will talk and teach so well and so wisely, in this academy, that the pupils will progressively outshine the masters.

The world cries in agony for peace, for procedures through which men will resolve their conflicts without resort to force. May the work of this school advance the discovery and perfecting of those procedures.

May the blessing of our Lord rest upon this new House of Learning and upon all of those who strive within it.

American Farmers Cry Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it was, of course, inevitable that selective-service problems would prove to be among the most difficult personal issues our country has ever attempted to solve. When 12,000,000 men are removed from the pool of civilian life, hardships of varying degree are certain to occur. The question raised by the May-Bailey bill proposing to draft IV-F's as it applies to the thousands of American farms is being answered by the men and women who live on those farms in an ever-louder outcry against the results of the new effort to induct young farm workers.

In farm county after farm county the fathers and mothers of these young farmers are pointing out the gravity of the new situation. They are not protesting against the service of their sons in our armed forces, but they are justified in pointing to the inequity of a situation in which farm work is not recognized as the vital contribution to the war effort which it is.

Farm folks listening to their radios nightly and hearing the reports of professional boxing matches, professional basketball games, and the many other diversions in which the strongest, best-conditioned young men of the land participate cannot be blamed for comparing the plight of their essential farms to the spirit prevalent among those who permit these nonwar activities to flourish among able-bodied young men of induction age. Our selective-service officials are charged with a duty to weigh the relative contributions of our civilian population to the winning of the war. That is all our farm neighbors ask. They have a right to be heard and their voices heeded.

The American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, few organizations in the history of our country have contributed more to the common good or have followed a more constructive course with greater consistency than has the American Legion. There is hardly a patriotic or any related type of activity in which Legion posts have not made important contributions.

With more than 300,000 World War No. 2 veterans already members of the Legion, with roughly a third of the membership of the Congress composed of Legionnaires, and with 2,000,000 members in 21,000 Legion posts and auxiliary units in every section of the country, it is obvious that the American Legion is steadily gaining strength as a united force for victory, an enduring peace, and a strong Nation.

Recently Edward N. Scheiberling of Albany, N. Y., national commander of the American Legion, presented an impressive story of the Legion, its policies, purposes, and activities, before a distinguished group of leaders in the newspaper, magazine, radio, and motion-picture fields. The occasion was a dinner in his honor at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City.

I ask unanimous consent that Commander Scheiberling's address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of the Congress as an inspiring story of a truly American organization.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Foremost among the many revelations being made to the world during this tragic war, is the marvelous power of the American people when with common purpose they face a grave emergency.

The United States stands before the world today, not a nation which bungles through, weak with the inefficiencies so often attributed to popular government. We stand as a united people of high courage on the battle fronts. We have shown vast resourcefulness for unparalleled production of the tools of war. But we are not as united in protecting and strengthening our democratic institutions; in seeing that they function for the common good and as a symbol of hope for freemen everywhere.

There is one reason, above all others, why we have progressed so notably in this conflict. It is because the great body of the American people—with few exceptions—forgetting all differences of racial origin, of religious beliefs or political concepts, have made the winning of the war their first order of business.

SOLIDARITY AND TEAMWORK

To the prosecution of the war, the American people have given their young men and young women; their resources and their most concerted effort. Solidarity and teamwork explain both our great productivity and the advance of our armed forces on opposite sides of the world. Solidarity and teamwork have brought into bold characters the outline of victory that was so dim and shadowy after Pearl Harbor.

We know now that if we do not relax our efforts here at home, but rather, if we intensify them to meet the urgent call of our military leadership for more munitions and supplies, the splendid progress of our armed forces, stirring our deepest faith and admiration, will continue unchecked until the forces of aggression are completely routed.

We must now resolve, as a people, to keep alive and in full play this national solidarity and teamwork and apply it in solving the great problems growing out of this war. At no time in the history of our country has there been a greater call for unity of purpose and cooperative effort, unity in speeding victory; unity in facing the vital problems of peace; unity in preventing another of these world conflicts; unity in preserving and giving new life to our processes of democracy; and unity in safeguarding these processes against the visionary theories that seem to breed in emergencies.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGION

It is our purpose in the American Legion to stimulate this national solidarity and teamwork, this unity of action, on those measures imperative to orderly demobilization and adequate jobs and opportunities; to the maintenance of individual freedom and the American way of life; to the safeguarding of our Nation from attack from any quarter; and to the development of an effective formula for maintaining peace.

The American Legion is composed of more than 2,000,000 veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and auxiliary members. More than 300,000 veterans of this war are already Legionnaires and the number is steadily increasing. The Legion is national, State, and local. It functions through 59 departments, at home and abroad, and 21,000 Legion posts and auxiliary units.

The American Legion—veterans associated together for God and country—is the largest organization ever formed by the veterans of any nation's armies and navies. Chartered by act of Congress in 1919, the Legion lives and acts in accord with the preamble to its constitution, recited at the opening of every American Legion meeting.

LEGION'S CONSTITUTION

This preamble provides for what all Americans accept and none reject—preservation of our Constitution and all that it implies, nationally and locally.

To uphold and defend the Constitution—the first objective of every citizen—is to believe that it is worth fighting for and to be prepared to fight for it.

The American Legion wholeheartedly and consistently has supported a preparedness program knowing full well how greatly it is needed. The Legion regrets that our Government has not seen fit in years past to follow more closely some of our recommendations on national security and defense. The Legion has been particularly concerned over subversive and destructive movements within our borders which have necessitated costly action when war comes to make up for years of public indifference.

The American Legion prides itself on the programs it has advanced since its first national convention held in 1919. Through the years the American Legion has made studies, conducted research, and worked with the officials of the Federal Government on matters involving our national defense. The Legion has and will always advocate a sound, progressive, and intelligent program. Had it been followed our country would have been in a firm and respect-commanding position on Pearl Harbor Day.

PREVENTING AGGRESSION

World War No. 1 taught the American Legion that war-provoking acts of aggression are likely or unlikely in the ratio that the peaceful party is prepared to fight. That catastrophe also taught us that war's cost in blood and money is proportionate to the country's degree of preparedness. To make our Nation, its ideals, and its people secure from attack by provision for an adequate defense has ever been a principal objective of the American Legion.

The Legion also believes that the maintenance of a strong and adequately equipped Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, backed by trained Reserves, is imperative.

Military preparedness, however, is not enough. We must carry into the post-war period the unity in citizenship that has made it possible for us to be the arsenal of democracy. We must train youth for the responsibilities of citizenship.

The Legion seeks to promote peace and good will among the peoples of the United States and all the other nations. The Legion believes that our country should participate in an association of free and sovereign nations for the maintenance of peace. It should have authority to act with whatever force may be necessary to maintain world peace and prevent a recurrence of war.

As I interpret the Legion mandates of its last three conventions, our delegates to this international association of free nations must be clothed by Congress with the power to represent the United States instantly and effectively. They must be ready to move on any international incident that threatens to engulf the world in war.

CONCERN OVER PEACE AIMS

It is disturbing to find that almost on the very eve of victory there is serious concern over the position of the United States on world problems after victory comes. We believe that the peace aims of the United States should be clear cut and known to all so that there will be widespread sentiment behind American viewpoints to be expressed at the peace table.

We also believe that representatives at the peace table should include those on both the production and fighting fronts.

Our peace terms, while firm and clear, must recognize that an industrialized nation depends on world trade. If we are to have an enduring world peace, we must recognize that war hatreds will in time be erased and the people of the world will again live together.

The Legion does not believe that peace and good will among peoples requires that we permit "enemies within our gates." We believe strongly that immigration laws should be amended and treaties concluded to provide for the immediate deportation of naturalized citizens whose citizenship may be revoked for subversive activities.

When the glad note of final victory sounds, and the way is being paved for peace, our job on the home front really begins. It will be up to all Americans to make good every glowing promise we have made to our fighting forces. It will require the highest degree of united action we have ever known. It will mean some sacrifices, but none that even begin to compare with the horror and suffering of the battle fronts.

DEMOBILIZATION PERIOD

However, the impact of the demobilization period can be greatly eased if we recognize now two highly important principles. They are:

First. That the rehabilitation of veterans and their readjustment to civilian life are as much a cost of war, as much a part of the over-all cost of defending our country and our way of life as any phase of actual warfare. We cannot afford to spend billions upon billions in wartime and then quibble over those few millions needed for the rehabilitation and readjustment of our fighting forces when peace comes.

Second. That the men and women in our armed forces, by every rule of right and fairness, should be entitled upon their return to pick up a competitive position in civilian life. Obviously, they should not be expected to start all over again to win the place in life they held before war came. Any attempt on the part of any segment of our people to maintain wartime advantages gained solely because of the absence of millions of men and women in the service will create one of the most tremendous employment problems we have ever faced. I am confident that public opinion will be on the side of those who are now on the global fighting fronts.

The report of the Legion's commission on post-war America, headed by our toastmaster, Louis Johnson, and including any other distinguished men offers an 11-point program for post-war problems. It is the Legion's bill of rights for constructive action in the post-war period. I commend it to the attention of all concerned with preserving our competitive system of business and indusary based on private initiative and individual ability.

Consecration to mutual helpfulness and service to their country is another pledge in the preamble to our constitution. Outstanding among the services of the American Legion has been its work with young people—in sports, in recreational guidance, and in inculcating patriotism and inspiring devotion to flag and country.

Let us look back for a moment. It was not many years ago that observance of the patriotic forms, so meaningful to youth, was frowned upon by many well meaning citizens zealous in their efforts to make war less likely. The word "nationalism" came to carry a sinister connotation and by many was used with contempt. Simple ceremonies such as the salute to the flag or the pledge of allegiance in the schools were condemned as conducive to a militaristic attitude. Pacifist youth movements flourished. The last war, it was alleged, was promoted by munitions makers and fought for bankers' gains. Many questioned whether, if our country ever again became engulfed in a foreign war, large numbers of our younger citizens would respond. You who have been so closely identified with the trends of public thought, know that I do not overemphasize the frequency, extent, or depth of this pacifist teaching. War was to be prevented by closing our eyes to its possibility.

VALUES OF CITIZENSHIP

During this uncertain period, the American Legion did not forget the deeper values and responsibilities of American citizenship. It helped to keep alive and vital among the youth of our country the spark of patriotism and a true understanding of the citizen's obligation to respect the flag. I do not need to mention that it is these young men, subjected in immature years to the idealistic

preachment that to avoid war one must only scorn it, who now make up the finest Army and Navy in our history.

One of the principal activities of the American Legion with young people has been in the Boy Scouts. For the last two decades, the American Legion has sponsored each year around 2,500 and 3,000 Boy Scout troops, and through its individual members, has worked with numerous others. More than three and a half millions of boys, under 17 years, have played on teams in the American Legion junior baseball competition, started in 1926. Half a million boys were enrolled last year. Here again the returns have been abundant in the physical strength and courage, and the sportsmanship and teamplay, which the large number of these young men have shown in the service of their country. Anyone will be impressed with the long list of major league baseball players—including some who have reached the pinnacle of fame in this sport—who have come up from the teams sponsored by our Legion posts; but they will be even more impressed with what this competition has meant in health, vigor, and sportsmanship, in sturdy bodies and strong chacter. Our survey in 1943 showed that approximately 90 percent of those who have enjoyed the advantages of Legion junior baseball are serving in the Army or Navy. They have a high average of physical fitness, important when we consider that 30 percent of all 18 year old boys have been rejected by the services due to physical defects.

LEGION ACTIVITIES

Another important phase of our work with young people has been the national high school oratorical contest, in which more than 120,000 high-school students in 47 States participated last year. They learned the fundamentals of our Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and other bases of American freedom. I need not emphasize the great importance of these local district, regional, and national contests to a proper appreciation of the values of our Government by our young people. Numbers of our posts augment this work by conducting essay contests in the schools on subject of Americanism.

Still another phase of these activities has been the establishment and extension of the institution known as Boys' State. Begun in Springfield, Ill., with 200 boys in 1935, this program has been extended to most of the States, and in all instances it has proved its high educational value in training our young men in practical American citizenship. Its object is to offer youth a better perspective of the practical operation of Government. To that end, a miniature commonwealth is organized by the participating boys, who form their own political parties, plan campaigns, and set up and conduct their own state, county, and municipal governments by electing their own officers, who in turn fill the appointive jobs.

WORKING WITH F. B. I.

The Legion has taken a leading part in combatting, on both a local and national basis, juvenile delinquency, which has been an unfortunate outgrowth of this present war. We have worked closely with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and with State and local organizations to correct the conditions that breed and foster crime. A program of visual parent education in the wartime care of children was included. This broad activity is now an important phase of the work of our many posts. Emergency financial aid was extended last year to more than 490,000 needy children.

The American Legion distributes annually 2,000,000 Flag Codes to educate citizens in the proper usage and respect of the Flag. It cooperates with the National Education Association in the annual sponsorship of American Education Week, and it cooperates with public education in its fight to "hold the line" against federal control. Its opposition to text books that do not strengthen adherence to constitutional government is well known. It operates 2,000 citizenship schools for the foreign born. It presents annually 15,000 School Award medals to inspire scholarship and leadership among the elementary schools. It conducts orientation courses in pro-induction basic military training in the secondary schools. Its Americanism program is positive and militant.

CHILD WELFARE WORK

Let me mention just one more activity of the American Legion. Since the establishment of the Legion's Child Welfare Program in 1925—5,900,000 children have been rendered aid and service. Ninety per cent of these children aided were with their own mothers or in their family homes.

What has been accomplished in the field of our youth activities has been repeated along many other lines. Our work ranges through the full panorama of American community and national life. Our solicitous care has always been extended to those who were disabled in the last conflict, and this work has been enlarged and extended to include the greater number of wounded and disabled of the present war. We want no delay, red tape or run-arounds in handling the claims of the disabled veteran. Across the country our posts have set up local organizations to cooperate with other public-spirited groups and with the agencies of the Federal Government in the pressing responsibility of reemploying soldiers and sailors returning from this war, or assisting them in the establishment of their own businesses or the creation of independent services through which they can, themselves, create jobs and contribute to reemployment and the expansion of our trade and industry. That kind of aid is fully as necessary as finding jobs, because these men may be expected to assume positions of leadership in our economic and social, as well as our political life. What organization could be better fitted than the Legion, with its personal experiences after the last war, to take the leadership in the restoration of our returning veterans to constructive service in our peacetime economy?

VETERANS IN CIVILIAN LIFE

The American Legion believes that assistance in the restoration of these men to civilian life does not constitute the entire problem. They need guidance in giving the country the leadership they have every right to aspire to during the years ahead. To put it plainly, we do not want this leadership touched with resentment or tainted with bitterness. That will come if special advantages are wrested out of the war effort by any group of our citizens. It will come if we do not produce out of this war an enduring peace. It will come if these men are forced to believe that the home public, by laxity or omissions, has in any manner let them down. That is why we must intensify our war production now, and keep the supplies and equipment rolling from our plants and farms in the full volume required by our commanding officers. The American Legion believes that these men, on their return, will have the same concepts of service to the cause of free America, and of right over might, that actuated the returning veterans of 1917–18, who wrote the guiding principles of this organization. We want this fresh, vigorous leadership to devote itself, during the next 30 or 40 years, to the service of God and country.

In every part of this great war effort—in civilian defense, in the bond campaigns and salvage drives, in recruitment and in aid for the convalescent and disabled, in caring for the needs of inductees, in protecting their interests while they are away, and in seeking opportunity for them when they are discharged—in these and many other ways the American Legion has undertaken to provide help and guidance.

In conclusion, the aims of the American Legion may be summarily described in a few words—the preservation of the American home, the American system of private enterprise and competitive opportunity, as the foundation for a sound and strong America. As we are now the arsenal of democracy, let us become in the years ahead the citadel of world peace.

Sixth War Loan Drive in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is with real pride that I call the attention of the House to the record made by Montana in the Sixth War Loan drive. There is very little I can say at this time as the figures speak for themselves. Yes, Mr. Speaker, all of Montana can be proud of the results of the Sixth War Loan which are shown below:

MONTANA WAR FINANCE COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT—SALES TO DECEMBER 30, 1944

HELENA, *January 8, 1945.*

To Chairmen, Committeemen, and Workers of the Sixth War Loan:

All of Montana can well be proud of the results of the Sixth War Loan, which are shown in detail in the figures and analyses enclosed herewith. The maps and statistical tables make a graphic showing of results, and you will be interested in studying them.

The success of the Sixth War Loan throughout the Nation is shown by this drive-end message from Secretary Morgenthau to National Director Gamble:

"I am delighted to have the opportunity to congratulate you and those who work with you on the smashing success of another war loan * * * Your workers, especially the army of volunteers which is doing the big end of the job, deserve again not merely thanks but unstinted praise for their effectiveness. I salute them, the members of your full-time staff and you for another great and inspiring success."

Montana was the first State to achieve the E bond quota.

Montana was the first State to achieve all quotas.

Montana ranks third in E percentage, exceeded by Wyoming and North Dakota.

Montana's per capita sale of E bonds was $34.13, national average, $21.98.

Montana achieved 160.4 percent of E bond quota; national average, 114.7 percent.

Montana's per capita purchase of E bonds from the beginning of War Finance, May 1, 1941, to December 30, 1944, is $299.04, national average, $230.50.

Every county in Montana achieved and exceeded every quota—E bond, other securities to individuals, total individual, corporation, and total all investors.

Total sales, the largest of any of the six drives, exceeded the quota by $18,242,116.76, sufficient to sponsor 30 B–29's, an Avenger bomber and a Corsair fighter. Counties qualifying as sponsors are named on another page of this report.

Montana's total sales in the Sixth War Loan were:

	Quota	Sales	Percent
E bond	$10,000,000	$16,041,481.25	160.4
Other individual	7,000,000	10,102,174.00	144.3
Corporation	15,000,000	24,098,461.50	160.6
Total, all investors	32,000,000	50,242,116.75	157.0

Men and women from Montana serving in the armed forces, largely overseas, purchased through their military organizations for credit of Montana and their home counties $901,000 E bonds, included in our figures.

All honor to the good people of this great State who have shown their patriotism in supporting the war and their fighting men in this generous response in the Sixth War Loan and have shown their good judgment in purchasing the world's best investment.

Our special State chairmen—Mrs. J. H. Morrow, women's activities; J. A. English, theater activities; Oliver H. Campbell, 16-mm films; and P. W Singer, retail merchants—have done outstanding work in special promotion which has materially aided.

District, county and Sixth War Loan chairmen by diligent and consistent work and by exemplary leadership have carried all districts and counties over the top.

Committeemen, solicitors and bond salesmen have labored throughout the drive personally contacting, soliciting, and selling all Montana people. To all of these, the 15,000 fine people who make up the Montana war finance organization, we gratefully acknowledge our appreciation. We pay tribute also to the great army of others who have cooperated so fully in making this drive such a tremendous success—to the banks, postmasters, and other issuing agents, to the press and radio for their comprehensive and consistent support, to the merchants, service clubs, business, civic, agricultural, and labor organizations.

Only by cooperative effort of people, organizations, and business throughout the State could the results of the Sixth War Loan have been accomplished.

In these critical days of the war, when the cloud of its tragedies is heavy over our whole people, we may all take some pride, comfort, and satisfaction in having done our best in this vital war financing.

A. T. HIBBARD,
State Chairman.
FRED J. MARTIN,
Executive Director.
WM. H. BARTLEY,
Executive Vice Chairman.
ARTHUR NELSON,
Associate Director.
R. B. RICHARDSON,
Vice Chairman.
EUGENE SAVAGE,
Associate Director.

MIKE: Every once in a while we come out of the sagebrush—and when we do—

BILL BARTLEY.

Lanham Act Program in the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAL HOLMES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Mr. L. R. Durkee, Bureau of Community Facilities, Federal Works Agency, Seattle office, in which he presents an interesting picture of the splendid cooperation in the State of Washington in efforts to meet the situation created by the great influx of employees to carry on the very important war industries of my home State. Mr. Durkee's letter is as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES,
Seattle, Wash., February 7, 1944.

Hon. HAL HOLMES,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOLMES: I am enclosing two copies of a recapitulation taken from page 52 of the Fifth Annual Report of the Federal Works Agency, recently published. I call your attention to the record set by the State of Washington and its local subdivisions in cooperating financially with the Federal Government on Lanham Act projects.

Please note that Washington is fourth on the list as regards total project cost, being exceeded only by California, Texas, and Virginia. In terms of total cost, less than 22 percent of these projects were constructed on a strictly Federal basis, whereas contributions were received from applicants on more than 78 percent. Applicants' contributions are nearly double those of any other State.

It is true that the large Ross Dam project of the Seattle City Light, wherein we succeeded in securing more than an 80-percent contribution from the applicant, is largely responsible for this phenomenal showing. However, deducting the applicants' contribution of $8,300,000 and the Federal grant of $1,864,760 (and I don't see why we should) still leaves our applicants in the State of Washington contributing 38.5 percent to the cost of all non-Federal projects; the next highest State is Michigan, contributing 33.5 percent.

I know you will be proud, as I am, of the spirit of local cooperation which has always been extended my office throughout the Lanham Act program and which is so clearly demonstrated in the attached tabulation.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

L. R. DURKEE.

Lanham Act public works—Number of allotted projects and estimated total cost by source of funds and States, as of June 30, 1944

State	Number of projects	Estimated total cost	Federal construction	Non-Federal construction		
				Applicant's funds	Federal grants	Federal loans
Total:						
Number	3,394		1,602			
Amount		$396,439,741	$173,325,985	$70,665,027	$144,917,756	$7,530,973
Alabama	116	12,666,224	5,851,071	1,735,359	4,848,194	231,600
Arizona	38	1,994,948	1,539,797	77,026	378,125	
Arkansas	43	2,289,147	1,104,000	293,125	892,022	
California	324	38,510,589	26,239,979	2,565,757	9,605,035	100,000
Colorado	25	1,450,180	119,729	572,570	757,881	
Connecticut	62	8,384,698	950,197	2,923,723	4,510,778	
Delaware	9	431,913	117,449	166,922	147,542	
District of Columbia	54	6,822,964	1,906,248	81,652	3,691,283	1,143,781
Florida	128	9,415,334	3,968,659	1,984,100	3,377,575	85,000
Georgia	130	11,439,499	5,679,243	1,516,413	4,189,843	54,000
Idaho	6	236,054	185,769	4,000	46,285	
Illinois	118	9,997,913	1,799,596	2,510,859	5,241,752	445,709
Indiana	56	6,471,651	1,481,421	1,221,227	3,487,003	282,000
Iowa	20	1,651,019	356,087	365,886	929,046	
Kansas	42	4,205,068	2,352,476	512,449	1,340,143	
Kentucky	49	3,706,600	2,040,947	476,937	1,188,716	
Louisiana	80	6,293,835	1,563,039	823,944	3,431,852	475,000
Maine	37	3,796,398	2,233,044	162,017	1,401,337	
Maryland	83	10,858,873	5,383,530	1,875,030	3,229,827	370,480
Massachusetts	49	3,318,627	1,177,882	767,101	1,304,644	69,000
Michigan	153	24,988,090	7,147,855	5,683,490	11,256,745	900,000
Minnesota	20	1,472,442	72,945	478,525	824,972	96,000
Mississippi	59	5,197,792	2,556,745	815,134	1,605,913	220,000
Missouri	86	7,186,872	2,785,756	1,116,222	3,264,894	20,000
Montana	4	395,457	4,847	116,800	273,810	
Nebraska	20	1,090,517	339,466	207,020	544,031	
Nevada	21	2,121,107	1,850,126	86,092	184,889	
New Hampshire	9	820,639	325,748	117,555	377,336	
New Jersey	42	3,417,771	1,247,991	712,157	1,457,623	
New Mexico	9	293,558	98,626	16,692	153,240	25,000
New York	92	8,598,955	4,626,635	1,359,093	2,613,227	
North Carolina	113	12,118,219	3,664,717	2,216,725	5,954,777	282,000
North Dakota	3	410,000		116,200	239,000	54,800
Ohio	77	10,648,077	3,802,092	2,271,846	4,459,939	114,200
Oklahoma	54	4,617,432	1,531,683	1,288,793	1,796,956	
Oregon	46	2,513,319	1,412,656	396,471	652,692	51,500
Pennsylvania	82	5,422,348	2,709,666	627,588	1,782,094	303,000
Rhode Island	27	5,489,210	4,720,852	101,720	567,638	99,000
South Carolina	76	7,617,868	3,239,175	1,261,414	2,655,779	461,500
South Dakota	12	888,542	259,492	183,522	445,528	
Tennessee	68	6,245,629	1,819,414	959,473	3,345,742	121,000
Texas	311	35,114,781	12,332,839	7,030,738	15,234,204	517,000
Utah	44	5,876,146	2,629,580	1,068,272	2,178,294	
Vermont	5	206,167	112,873	37,092	56,202	
Virginia	208	42,616,323	23,929,163	5,581,695	12,955,465	150,000
Washington	145	31,541,449	6,856,895	13,653,098	10,451,456	580,000
West Virginia	24	1,582,914	387,364	46,830	869,320	279,400
Wisconsin	22	1,959,785	349,450	727,128	883,207	
Wyoming	9	274,155	245,004	8,505	20,646	
Various [1]		5,148,406	5,148,406			
Territories and bases	84	16,624,237	11,067,943	1,743,040	3,813,254	

[1] Completion of recreation centers, for salvage materials and engineering expense.

Study and Recommendations of the American Political Science Association on the Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the House to the press release announcing the recommendations of the American Political Science Association's study of Congress. These complete reports have been sent to each Member of Congress. The press release follows:

Ten recommendations, designed to mitigate congressional handicaps and remedy the defects in the internal organization and operation and in the external relationships of Congress are presented in a report just issued by the committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association.

Based on a 4-year study by 10 distinguished political scientists, under the chairmanship of George B. Galloway, this consensus report was submitted to the association's executive council at a meeting in Washington, D. C. "While this report reflects the unanimous views of the committee," Mr. Galloway explained, "it does not necessarily represent the opinion of the American Political Science Association, a professional organization traditionally neutral on questions of public policy."

In releasing the report, the chairman stated: "In our study the committee on Congress has been neither critic nor defender of our National Legislature. We undertook our inquiry with no secret ax to grind, no pet panacea to promote. Our role has been that of impartial and neutral observer proceeding in a nonpartisan and scientific spirit. Our sole aim has been to see how well Congress is organized and operates and to suggest ways of helping it to function more effectively."

Guided by these aims the committee finds that Congress as an institution is handicapped in the performance of its proper functions in eight ways:

SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL HANDICAPS

1. By being overburdened by many local and private matters which divert its attention from national policy making and which it ought not to have to consider.

2. By the lack of adequate, independent, technical advice necessary for wise lawmaking, and the lack of sufficient secretarial service to handle requests from constituents and routine chores.

3. By too many committees with overlapping jurisdictions and by the diffusion of responsibility for the development and coordination of legislative policy.

4. By inadequately developed channels of communication with the Executive, making teamwork between them difficult.

5. By the lack of adequate facilities for the continuous inspection and review of administrative action.

6. By the importunities of special-interest groups which tend to divert legislative emphasis from broad questions of public interest.

7. By the need of a redistribution of power, especially in the House of Representatives.

8. By the inadequate compensation of its personnel.

In order to mitigate these handicaps and remedy these defects, the committee makes 10 recommendations:

RECAPITULATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Congress divest itself, because of the heavy volume of legislative business, of such work and activities as it can appropriately delegate to other agencies, such as the government of the District of Columbia, the settlement of private claims and pensions, and other private and local legislation, eliminating the Private Calendar.

2. That the committees of Congress be adequately equipped with independent, qualified experts to aid them in making laws, such experts either to be attached to the committees themselves or drawn from a central pool or joint legislative staff service, or both.

3. That appropriations to the Legislative Reference Service and to the Office of Legislative Counsel be substantially increased so as to strengthen their research and legal facilities.

4. That the committee systems of both Chambers be simplified by (a) eliminating the inactive committees; (b) consolidating those with ovelapping jurisdictions; (c) creating twin committees in both Houses; and (d) correlating them with the major areas of public policy and administration.

5. That a Legislative Council be established, to be composed of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, the majority leaders in both Chambers, and the chairmen of the reorganized standing committees; and that it be the duty of this Legislative Council to plan and coordinate the legislative program of Congress and to promote more effective liaison and cooperation with the Executive.

6. That the reorganized standing committees also be utilized as vehicles of communication and collaboration between Congress and the corresponding administrative agencies within their respective jurisdictions; and that the heads of the major departments and administrative agencies appoint congressional secretaries who shall devote full time to liaison with their corresponding committees in Congress.

7. That the function of legislative oversight of administrative performance be entrusted by Congress primarily to the subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations which should be adequately staffed to permit continuing review and evaluation of the work of the executive agencies within their respective jurisdictions. Each executive agency should submit periodic reports, in sufficient detail to give an adequate picture of its actions and expenditures, to the House Appropriations Committee and to the legislative committees of both Chambers which have jurisdiction over it.

8. That all groups, representatives of which appear before congressional committees, should register and make full disclosure of their membership, finances, etc.

9. That an automatic time limit of, say, 6 years, be fixed upon service as chairman of a standing committee; or, alternatively, that standing committee chairmen be chosen at the beginning of each Congress by the committee on committees of the majority party, as they are in some of the States; and that committee chairmen be required by the standing rules to (a) call committee meetings when desired by a majority of the members; (b) report bills within 10 days after the committee has taken favorable action, failing which report any member of the committee could report the bill; and (c) keep a complete public record of all committee proceedings except executive sessions.

10. That the annual salaries of Senators and Representatives be increased to $15,000; that each Member's annual allowance for clerical hire be substantially increased; and that the Civil Service Retirement Act be amended so as to make Members of Congress eligible for retirement annuities on a contributory basis after long legislative service.

"It will be noted," said Mr. Galloway in releasing the A. P. S. A. committee report, "that our report and the Heller report, released by the National Planning Association on January 17, reach very similar conclusions. This is not surprising when it is recalled how heavily Mr. Heller, as he has acknowledged, leaned upon the writings of and interviews with numerous political scientists, including several members of my own committee. It is a significant and encouraging fact that engineers and political scientists alike recognize the key place of Congress in our scheme of democratic government, that both groups stress the vital importance of remedying the serious defects in its archaic machinery and methods, and that we agree in the main upon the steps that must be taken toward the restoration of Congress. I hope that our report and the N. P. A. report will inspire Congress to move in this direction."

"Our report," Galloway concluded, "is far from being the last word on this great subject. None of the members of my committee is so naive as to believe that the changes we propose would bring about a political millenium or provide a panacea for all the ills of our democratic institutions. Nevertheless, we think that our proposals are worthy of consideration by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress."

The report of the committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association, entitled "The Reorganization of Congress," has been published with the cooperation of the American Council on Public Affairs.

Remember the Loyal Mailman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Telegram:

REMEMBER THE LOYAL MAILMAN

No visitor is more welcomed, by those who live and work upon the land, than the * * * mail man. During these days, when almost every home has a boy, or one in whom it is interested, in the armed forces, this daily visit of the mail carrier is looked upon, more than ever before, as an important event.

There are no more faithful public servants anywhere than these workers for Uncle Sam. Daily they are at their tasks, regardless of storms or seasons. Many of them have spent their entire lives in the service. And at a salary that should make the old uncle blush with shame. Many of them have had no increase of pay since the old horse and buggy days—and some of them are reminded of this as they recently have had to resort to the use of their old faithful animal transportation.

Our Government, however, must be given much credit for its vast system of * * * home delivery. Anxiously these days do fathers and mothers and others, await the daily mail, to be kept informed, and to hear from those beloved, fighting on foreign soil. Nothing thrills more than a letter from such a one. And nothing thrills so at the other end, either. That boy prays for letters—and there can't be too many. A penny card, or a letter, that costs but a few cents, and a little

time, does more to lift morale than anything any of us can do for these brave lads.

There is not a farm or a hamlet in all this great country that does not have a contribution to the winning of this war. And no one can say that letters do not play a major part. So, to the loyal, faithful mail man we owe a debt of gratitude for the part that he plays. And it is about time that his services should be adequately rewarded. * * * There is a bill before Congress at the present time for this purpose. It should receive the support of every one of our law-makers. And I hope that it does.

One thing that the * * * mail man has in abundance is time to think. As he goes from place to place, he can both think of the past and speculate upon the future. He, too, has a family to care for, and he, too, has boys in the service. He appreciates the importance of letters. May none of us let our boys down at this crucial time. Keep the letters gladly flowing. And may we consider this great servant of ours, both rural and city—the mail man. Let's not let him down.

The Churches and World Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to extend in the RECORD a summary of the second national study conference of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, held in Cleveland, Ohio, on January 16 to 19, 1945, under the auspices of the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, which appeared in the Christian Century on February 7, 1945. I am certain this matter is of great interest to the people of our Nation at a time when we are looking for a cessation of hostilities and the coming of peace.

THE CHURCHES AND WORLD ORDER—A MESSAGE TO THE CHURCHES ADOPTED AT THE SECOND NATIONAL STUDY CONFERENCE, HELD AT CLEVELAND, OHIO, JANUARY 16–19, 1945, UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE COMMISSION ON A JUST AND DURABLE PEACE OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

I. CHRISTIAN FAITH AND WORLD ORDER

1. The Christian faith

We are living in a uniquely dangerous and promising time. It is dangerous because we are faced with widespread evidence of religious and moral disintegration as well as with effects of war in increasing suspicion, fear, and hatred. It is promising because a new spiritual vitality is manifesting itself under the providence of God and witnessing to that quality of the Christian faith which demonstrates its strength in adversity. In our effort to make decisions and to take action which shall help to guide the world from anarchy and chaos forward to a just and creative peace we are called to reaffirm our faith.

It is the Christian faith that God's righteous rule is over all men and nations; that in Christ he confronts us all alike in judgment and mercy; that men, though sinful, are made in His image and are not only the concern of His saving work but His agents as well, each of value in His sight, without distinction of class, race, or condition; that the church, the body of Christ and the fellowship of Christ's followers, is the creation of His spirit and the steward of His purpose; that His kingdom on earth is an unconquerable kingdom of justice and mercy and truth in which it is our responsibility to bring human laws and human institutions into increasing accord with His holy will.

In this Christian faith, the purposes which we seek to realize are fashioned. As we affirm the worth of man in God's sight, so we must act by the Christian principle of reverence for human personality. God sees his children united in one family whose individual and corporate life is the goal of redemption; we must be joined in the common effort to make effective in individual relations and in corporate acts the Christian principles which we affirm. God's way is the way of justice, love, and mercy; justice, love, and mercy must rule our life with our fellows. While compulsion and control are needed for the restraint of evil in a world of imperfection, the ultimate victory over evil must be by way of redemptive good will, by which alone can good be created. God's way with men is the way of freedom and responsibility; man's true life as man is achieved only when that way is freely chosen and freely wrought out. As we need humility and penitence in standing before God, so do we need humility and penitence in our dealings with men. Whenever human practice goes counter to these principles which root in our faith, the Christian must raise his voice in protest.

It is in this Christian faith that our confidence is grounded. For our confidence is in God, the establisher of the order within which men and nations work, and in the forces of the spirit which God employs. We believe in the might of truth as against falsehood and deceit and in the power of right to command the conscience and to overcome oppression and wrong. We believe in the power of good will as greater than selfishness and force; in the value of mutual trust as against distrust and suspicion; and in the might of faith as greater than cynicism, doubt, and despair. God's grace, made manifest in Christ, rescues men from despair, has power to remake them when they turn to him for healing and forgiveness, and redeems all their life. We see this power even now at work in the world in lives made new, in sins forgiven and conquered, in hopes rekindled.

We rejoice in the church of Christ as a world fellowship which today unites men in faith and love, transcending nation, race, and class. We rejoice that a growing number of men of good will outside the church, in recognition of the moral law, seek with us the creation of one world of justice and security for all men. Let the church purge itself of inner division, unite with all who work for these high ends, and so live out its principles of justice and love in the face of all dictates of selfishness and counsels of expediency as to create new faith, new conscience, and new hope.

2. The church's mission

Out of the continuous creative vitality of the Christian faith has grown the church of which we are a part. The church as bearer and sharer of the revelation of God in Christ stands under a divine compulsion to serve the world, with equal responsibility for all people. The misery, want, and sin of the world today bring to us a new sense of the urgency of the commission, "Go ye into all the world."

Home missions and foreign missions are aspects of the one world mission to which the church is called. Both are significant in the church's contribution to world order. The most effective assurance for justice in an abiding world order is in the expansion of allegiance by men and nations to the Christian faith. This is as greatly needed within America as elsewhere. The reconstruction of devastated lands, the rebirth of hope and determination for a world of justice, and the will to create instruments for the expression of that hope are central in the church's mission.

The world mission of the church has helped to create among our people concern about international affairs and has opened channels for the efforts of the churches toward a just and durable peace. Through missionary agencies relief is and can be administered, reconstruction can be furthered in many areas, and the long-range objectives of world order promoted. The immediate and practical necessities of mission work as well as the impulse to unite in Christ have promoted widespread interdenominational cooperation. This, in turn, has given impetus to that ecumenical movement which now brings promise that the energies of the churches will be utilized to face their overwhelming opportunities. This cooperation must be further developed. What is called for is a united Protestant missionary movement. The churches are therefore urged immediately to strengthen and unify their missionary enterprise both at home and abroad so that their unique contribution to world order may be equal to these opportunities.

3. Principle and action

Christians must act in situations as they exist and must decide what God's will demands of them there. At all times they must keep the ultimate goals clearly in view but they have equal responsibility to mark out attainable steps toward those goals, and support them. An idealism which does not accept the discipline of the achievable may lose its power for good and ultimately lend aid to forces with whose purpose it cannot agree.

If we accept, provisionally, situations which fall short of our ultimate objective, we cannot be morally bound to sustain and perpetuate them. That would be stultifying. It is the possibility of change which is the bridge from the immediate situation to the Christian ideal. That possibility is an imperative for Christians, who must constantly maintain tension with any secular order.

The churches through their leaders have the task of assisting people in situations of this kind. Specifically, in the realm of world order, the churches must declare their understanding of the will of God for life among the peoples of the world. They must do this while proposals are being framed. They must continue to to do it after governments have made their decisions. When a concrete proposal for world organization is presented, Christian leaders must help the people to decide whether it marks a presently obtainable step in the right direction and, if so, urge them to give it their support.

4. American attitudes and world peace

Whether America will be a help or a hindrance in building a peaceable world depends upon the attitudes of individuals and groups in our Nation. We call attention to the dangers which lurk in complacency toward existing injustices; the frequent contradictions we tolerate between our ultimate beliefs and our conscious aims; the false sense of national security which—in spite of the lessons of two tragic wars—holds that the United States can live apart from the rest of the world and its problems; intolerance and discrimination; selfishness which refuses to recognize that we are members one of another and is unwilling to run risks for the sake of the world community; blind devotion to national sovereignty; the syncism which believes there always must be wars and puts its reliance upon force alone; and the spirit of hatred and vengeance toward other peoples. It is our concern that such attitudes should not prevail, but rather

that in us and in our fellow citizens those attitudes should be developed which support the growth of world community.

5. Domestic order and world order

Over a century and a half ago it was given to the American people to determine by struggle and experiment whether government by the people could be established and maintained on earth. Upon the success of this adventure rested a great hope for mankind. In the intervening years the growth of the United States as a home for human freedom has been a notable fact and influence. It must now be demonstrated that human freedom is compatible with economic security. A new challenge is offered to the people of America to establish along with political democracy an opportunity through productive employment to earn an income sufficient for the basic needs of food, clothing, shelter, health, recreation and cultural pursuits, and assurance to every individual, of whatever race, of an equal and unsegregated opportunity for worship, protection in time of unemployment, illness, or need, and full political and civil rights.

The economic system which proved adequate in an earlier period has, in our day, revealed grave defects and inadequacies under the strain of modern industrial conditions. All elements in the economic system—consumer, employee, management, capital, and Government—should move from the strife and restrictions of our present situation to a full and free cooperation with the objective of greatly increased production and distribution to meet the expanded human needs in this and other countries. We recognize the need of experimentation with various forms of ownership and control, private, cooperative, and public.

A challenging effort in the United States in the solution of our domestic economic problem will be followed by favorable repercussions in the economic and spiritual life of the world, thus contributing to the establishment of a just and durable peace.

The right of private property is not an absolute right but a right qualified by the public interest. Likewise freedom of enterprise does not imply absolute freedom but operation of enterprise consonant with the interest of the public and the welfare of the Nation. In the use of property and in the operation of enterprise, therefore, the welfare of society should be given primary consideration; and it is the duty of the state to prescribe such regulation of industry and of the conditions under which it is carried on as will result in wholesome conditions of employment and fair treatment to those who are engaged in it and to the public at large.

The church must therefore condemn any failure of our economic system to meet the basic needs which have been indicated. We must ask our people to recognize that in order to supply these needs for all, many changes may be necessary in our economic practices. These changes will probably lie in the direction of a larger measure of social planning and control than characterized our pre-war system. They should be brought about by democratic processes and should be consistent with Christian principles with respect to the worth of personality and the value of freedom. We should not allow our devotion to any single system or method to deny anyone the basic requirements for the good life. Nor should we allow our preference for our economic or political system to prevent us from collaborating, for the achievement of world order and world peace, with peoples who have a different system.

In order to maintain our democracy at a high level it must continually be adjusted to meet the necessities of history and the demands of justice. Only if our domestic order is born again with fresh vision and determination to meet the needs of men can America fulfill her new mission and bring hope and encouragement to a broken world.

II. CHRISTIAN STANDARDS AND CURRENT INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

The decisions and actions of governments in the present international situation will have direct bearing upon the extent to which nations will collaborate in the post-war period. Tentative proposals for an international organization were agreed upon at Dumbarton Oaks by delegations of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, China, and the United States. They have been offered to the public for discussion.

In the light of the Guiding Principles and the Six Pillars of Peace,[1] we offer our appraisal of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and we call attention to certain related matters which we believe must be considered in connection with any international organization for world order and security.

1. The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals

We commend these proposals to the consideration of the churches.

The proposals are the only plan which governments have thus far evolved and therefore are the only available index to the extent of agreement which is now possible.

They set forth certain purposes and principles essential to world order and peace.

They provide for continuing collaboration of the United Nations, and in due course of other nations.

They provide, through an assembly, for the periodic consultation of all member nations and for promoting cooperation in the interest of the general welfare.

They provide an economic and social council for facilitating solutions of international economic, social, and other humanitarian problems and for coordinating international policies and agencies in this field.

They provide, through a security council, for continuing consultation of representatives of the greater powers and of selected lesser powers with a view to a peaceful settlement of disputes and the restraint of aggression.

The proposals now stand at a formative stage and the way has been opened for recommendations for improvement which will make them more acceptable to the Christian conscience.

Accordingly, we recommend that the churches support the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as an important step in the direction of world cooperation, but because we do not approve of them in their entirety as they now stand we urge the following measures for their improvement:

1. Preamble

A preamble should reaffirm those present and long-range purposes of justice and human welfare which are set forth in the Atlantic Charter and which reflect the aspirations of peoples everywhere.

2. Development of International Law

The charter should clearly anticipate the operation of the organization under international law and should provide for the development and codification of international law, to the end that there shall be a progressive subordination of force to law.

3. Voting Power

A nation, while having the right to discuss its own case, should not be permitted to vote when its case is being judged in accordance with predetermined international law.

4. Amendment

In order to permit such changes in the charter of the organization as may from time to time become necessary, the provision for amendments should be liberalized so as not to require concurrence by all the permanent members of the security council.

5. Colonial and Dependent Areas

A special commission should be established wherein the progress of colonial and dependent peoples to autonomy, and the interim problems related thereto, will become an international responsibility.

6. Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

A special commission on human rights and fundamental freedoms should be established.

7. Eventual Universal Membership

The charter should specify that all nations willing to accept the obligations of membership shall thereupon be made members of the organization.

8. Limitation of Armaments

More specific provision should be made for promptly initiating the limitations or reduction of national armaments.

9. Smaller Nations

There should be provisions designed more clearly to protect and defend the smaller nations from possible subjection to the arbitrary power of the great.

2. Political conduct required to promote further collaboration

There are four principles of conduct which are needed to bring collaboration out of the realm of theory and into that of reality:

1. We believe our Government should adopt and publicly proclaim its long-range goals. These should stem from our Christian tradition and be such as to inspire and unify us. Without such defined goals we will lack enthusiasm and sense of direction. We will not be able to measure our progress.

2. We believe our Government should not merely talk about its ideals. It must get down into the arena and fearlessly and skillfully battle for them. It must do so, not merely sporadically but steadily. It must do so even under conditions such that partial and temporary defeat is inevitable.

3. We believe our Government must, however, battle for its ideals under conditions such that no particular setback need be accepted as definitive. It must be made clear that collaboration implies not merely a spirit of compromise but equally a right, on the part of every nation, to persist in efforts to realize its ideals.

4. We believe our electorate, demanding the foregoing of its Government, must judge its Government accordingly. It should not judge it merely by the immediate results attained. It must rather judge it by its announced long-term objectives, by whether it works competently to achieve them, and by whether it brings into actual functioning procedures of peaceful change so that the world may evolve away from present harsh necessities. If our Government will meet those tests, the electorate should applaud such conduct irrespective of dissatisfaction with immediate results.

3. Economic cooperation

The economic aspect of human life concerns the church in two ways: Through the widespread fact of poverty and through those maladjustments, never the sole causes of war, which may predispose populations to war.

Poverty concerns the Christian conscience not alone because men hunger but also because their spirits tend to be stunted by it and their freedom limited. Low standards of living over large areas diminish the possibilities of trade and also of cultural intercourse. Morality and self-interest combine to show that in a world tending toward unity

[1] Thirteen Guiding Principles were adopted by the first national study conference held at Delaware, Ohio, March 3–5, 1942. The Six Pillars of Peace were subsequently issued by the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council of Churches.

by communication, the standard of living of men anywhere is a concern of men everywhere.

Poverty is not to be dealt with primarily by charity but by aiding undernourished populations to use their own resources, to develop agricultural techniques and industries suitable to their region, and to participate in world trade.

In order to prevent recurrent depression, the goal of full employment of labor and of economic resources on a world scale should be continuously pursued.

Because of the growing interdependence of peoples, the development of backward regions has become a common task of mankind, in which regard for one's neighbor joins a long-range self-interest. The immensity of the task, which is equally economic and educational, requires cooperative investment and effort on a world scale. Here some form of world organization, such as the Economic and Social Council proposed at Dumbarton Oaks, must be sought as a supplement to private undertaking. The international labor organization and the organized labor movement are also to be recognized as having an important role in raising the standards of living of the peoples.

Economically advanced nations constitute among themselves a community in which no one can prosper through the disadvantage of others. Their policies can no longer intelligently follow the line of economic nationalism. Barriers to world trade, whether in the nature of tariffs or of cartels, have become doubtful props of national welfare, and all of those acts, economic and political, in which one people affects the fortunes of another become subject to the judgment both of self-interest and of morality. A world point of view must be developed in economics, and the appropriate institutions developed. In such institutions our own Nation must actively participate both for its own welfare and for the common good.

Such intelligent supervision of world agriculture, resources, markets, currencies, and communications, and of world trade, may not imply in each case an authoritative regulating agency, but it does require an active self-regulation with a sense of responsibility and of stewardship for the just and constructive use of economic power.

The right of property is based, not upon man's animal need, but upon his personal nature as man. Private property is an essential aid to the maturing of human personality. It has been customary to set communism and capitalism over against each other on this point, the one denying private property, the other holding private property an absolute claim over against the state. Neither of these positions is now held in this extreme form; in both types of economy property is recognized as important for human character and is therefore the proper subject of public interest; so all economies today are mixed economies, showing a degree of private and a degree of common property. Neither is a fixed system, and to some extent in practice they tend to converge. To the extent that the sacredness of the human person, his liberty and responsibility to God are acknowledged by both systems, their cooperation in building a peaceable international order is facilitated. But in any case they can and must cooperate.

4. Human rights

We have recommended that, in connection with the world organization proposed at Dumbarton Oaks, there be established a special commission on human rights and fundamental freedoms. We believe that religious liberty is basic to all human rights and that it should be accompanied by equal and unsegregated opportunity for all races. The commission we have recommended should seek an international agreement on the rights and freedoms to be secured to all people; it should further formulate the procedures for their realization by action of the world organization and of the separate states. This is in harmony with our sixth pillar of peace which declares "that the peace must establish in principle, and seek to achieve in practice, the right of individuals everywhere to religious and intellectual liberty." It also follows a purpose set forth in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, "to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."

5. The peace settlement in Europe with special reference to Germany

In respect to the peace settlement in Europe, we share the following convictions:

The settlement following the war should be inspired by the desire to secure the maximum of collaboration among the peoples of Europe and encourage the economic development of Europe as a whole including Germany. The unilateral determination of boundaries would impair such collaboration. The settlement should insure to the smaller and weaker nations the fullest measure of autonomy consistent with European unity and world organization for peace.

The settlement should make possible the reconciliation of victors and vanquished. That implies that it should remove the power as well as the will of aggressive elements within Germany to make war. However, the necessary discipline of Germany because of the crimes committed in her name should not be vindictive. The participation of Germany into separate states should not be imposed upon the German people. The treatment of Germany should be calculated to strengthen the forces within that country committed to liberal civil policies and to international cooperation.

Among the constructive forces upon which a new Germany and a new European concord can be based, the churches are of primary importance. As they have been centers of resistance to tyranny and injustice within Germany and within the occupied countries, so they may become a medium through which reconciliation may be accomplished and through which the process of the reeducation and reconstruction of Germany may be carried out in the only way that gives any promise of success—voluntarily from within. The World Council of Churches will greatly aid in the process of reconciliation and reconstruction as the churches of the defeated, the liberated and the victorious nations are brought together into conference and collaboration.

6. The peace settlement in Asia with special reference to Japan

We are convinced that a just and durable peace in the Far East is possible only in the framework of world organization, supplemented by regional cooperation for security and welfare.

China desperately requires unrestrained opportunity for internal development. It is of urgent importance that China's voice in international affairs be given special heed, in order to cement new relationships between oriental and western peoples.

As in the case of Germany, so with Japan, the power and will to make war must be removed. However, Japan's basic economic problems, aggravated by the war and by the expected loss of her colonial possessions, must be met by "access, on equal terms, to the trade and raw materials of the world" as pledged by the Atlantic Charter "to all states, great or small, victor or vanquished." Treatment of Japan by the United Nations should be favorable to constructive forces within Japanese society, and should aim to bring Japan at an early date into normal relations with the world community.

We can enter into right relations with the vast and significant populations of China, Japan, and southeast Asia, none of them white, only upon the basis of the equality of races in justice and law. Indeed, a Christian outlook upon the Far East discerns that a world order is impossible if color discrimination is maintained. The churches recognize a special responsibility for reconciliation in such ways as may be possible after the war.

Addendum to 5 and 6. The Peace Settlement with Special Reference to Germany and Japan

We urge that the time is at hand when the governments of the Allied nations should make a more explicit statement as to the status of both Germany and Japan following the war. We believe such a statement is needed in order to satisfy Christian concern and to prevent needless sacrifice of life upon the battlefield.

7. Dependent peoples

Long and intimate relationships with the dependent peoples of Africa, southeast Asia, and other parts of the world place on the Christian churches a responsibility to champion their right to freedom and to develop their capacity for self-government.

We therefore call upon our Government and others: (1) to proclaim self-government as the goal for all dependent peoples; (2) where dependent peoples are ready for self-government, to give it now; (3) otherwise, to initiate progressive steps suitable for each area for achieving that goal; and (4) in the interim to provide that all such areas shall be administered under the supervision of world organization.

We cannot in good conscience be a party to the dismantling of the Japanese colonial possessions without at the same time insisting that the imperialism of the white man shall be brought to the speediest possible end. We cannot have a sound or stable world community so long as there is enforced submission of one people to the will of another whether in Korea, in India, in the Congo, in Puerto Rico, or anywhere else.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

The task now before us is to channel the spiritual power generated in this conference into deeds. Solemn pronouncements are not enough. Upon the minds and consciences of our people must be laid the duty and opportunity of using the world-wide resources of the church to bring about a world organized for justice and peace.

1. Church and federal unity

The present structure of denominational Protestantism is not adequate to deal with the issues of our time. The problems of war, of labor, of the chaplaincy, of the returning veteran, of the world-wide mission of the church, of our relations with the Christian churches of Europe and Asia and with other faiths, are all too vast and difficult for solution by our separate denominational units. While we are asking for cooperation and unity in the political and economic fields, Protestants themselves must take seriously to heart the duty of achieving a far higher degree of unity.

We have already come far on the road of cooperation. But we must achieve a more vital and visible federal unity than we now have—a unity that will preserve the freedom of various denominational groups and at the same time release the undeveloped and uncoordinated resources of Protestantism and focus them on the solution of these pressing problems. We therefore urge the denominations to consider earnestly the possibilities, in ways not now envisaged, of realizing more fully the ecumenical fellowship by implementing the principle of federal unity on local, state, and national levels.

2. Youth and the world order

If our purposes are to be achieved the new leadership of the churches must be world-minded and trained in the techniques of building a Christian world community.

In these efforts, youth itself must lead and the youth agencies be strengthened to provide more challenging programs resulting in life dedicated to Christ. Increased representation of youth in all the agencies of the churches should be speedily provided.

The churches are urged, in their total educational process but especially through the church-related colleges, the student Christian movements and the theological seminaries, to expand and adjust their programs in order to enlist and train world-minded churchmen who will take their place in the ecumenical movement.

3. Children and world peace

Parents and teachers in the home and in the churches are called upon to teach children the conditions of world peace. Particularly they should be helped to develop constructive attitudes, devoid of hate toward other peoples. Christian education for children must include study dealing with missions, race relations, and community life. Adults must help children develop attitudes and ways of behaving essential for Christian world citizenship.

4. Study and action for American participation in international cooperation

The Protestant churches must use all their facilities, denominational and interdenominational, to secure American participation in international cooperation. New methods of education and all legitimate means by which public opinion is formed must be utilized in this effort. We urge a concerted program of intensive study of the message of this conference, with the appropriate social and political action as an integral part. This program should include youth in churches and colleges, men and women in our military and civilian services, church members, and all men and women of good will in the community.

5. Relief and reconstruction

Assistance given to those in special need will be conducive to the mutual sympathy and trust which are essential to international cooperation. War-ravaged peoples in many lands will require help in their struggle to reestablish civic order. Basic welfare relief will need to be supplemented by assistance to the churches to reconstitute their services within their local communities in order to become effective centers of vital life and hope. The churches of America are urged to support to the fullest their agencies of relief and reconstruction already in operation in order to assist the churches of other lands in this period of reconstruction. The World Council of Churches and the national Christian councils in Asia will afford channels of immediate services, thus undergirding stable world order.

6. Race relations

Race prejudice is a primary obstacle to world brotherhood. It is strongly urged upon churches and church members that they wage a continuing campaign against race prejudice in all its forms. The churches should not only support all efforts to wipe out discriminations against minority groups, but they should also deliberately arrange cooperative programs in which racial barriers are broken down. We recommend active support by the churches of legislation providing for a permanent Federal Fair Employment Practice Commission; providing for the repeal of poll-tax and other discriminatory laws; providing for housing projects without discriminatory practices and other measures designed to advance the well-being and constitutional rights of Negroes and other underprivileged groups.

The church must counteract hate in all its forms and expressions. Anti-semitism represents a rising threat to brotherhood and must be wiped out. The Oriental Exclusion Act should be repealed and all Orientals be placed on the quota system. The churches should uphold the civil rights of Japanese-Americans as they return from relocation camps and wherever they may be.

7. New study conference proposals

A just and durable peace is conditioned by the ability of our own Nation to achieve economic stability and interracial justice in its domestic affairs. Therefore, it is recommended that national study conferences (1) on industrial relations and rural economics, and (2) on race relations, similar to this conference on a just and durable peace, be held under the auspices of the Federal Council.

8. Recommendations with regard to specific immediate action

(1) We urge a meeting of the United Nations, at the earliest possible moment, to consider the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

(2) We concur in the resolutions of the Federal Council of Churches and many other religious and educational bodies urging that congressional action on peacetime military conscription be deferred until after the war.

CONCLUSION

The unique contribution of the church is to bring to all these tasks the maximum of Christian faith and the full development of its power, its motivation and its resources. Before we can do Christ's work, we must appropriate more of His life. Basic to all else are greater depth of Christian faith, greater endurance in Christian fortitude and courage, more wholehearted devotion to Him and a more universal experience of His forgiving and creative grace.

As the Christian church faces its duties and the dangers of this hour, it must undergird its own life and the life of its people with prayer through which are made available to men the infinite resources of God. Without Him we can do nothing. With Him we can advance toward His kingdom of righteousness and brotherhood.

The Rural Mail Carrier, a Faithful Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Austin Daily Herald of Austin, Minn.:

THE RURAL MAIL CARRIER, A FAITHFUL PUBLIC SERVANT

Probably no service—rendered so many people—is less appreciated than rural mail delivery. Those who knew life on the farm before the advent of the R. F. D. can recall the isolation and loneliness of the residents of remote rural communities 45 years ago. To them rural free delivery was a godsend and the mail carrier an angel in disguise. He carried the news of the neighborhood from farm to farm. He gave advice on everything from colic to canning. He ran errands in town for the farmer's wife. He minded her baby while she hastily answered a letter he brought. He relayed information—important and trivial—the announcement of a basket social, the birth of a baby, or the death of a friend. Through the years he has been, and is today, as constant in his devotion to duty as the seasons that come and go. Patiently and uncomplainingly he makes his rounds three hundred and some odd days a year through the snowdrifts in winter and the mud of spring and fall. The mail carrier has become an integral part of rural life in America, his service an almost indispensable factor in its scheme of things. Yet this service, faithful if not distinguished, which he has rendered through the years is not altogether appreciated. He has not, for example, received an increase in salary for 20 years. This in spite of the fact that living costs have materially increased during this period. And his actual operating costs have kept pace with the increased costs of living. Should he, for instance, buy a new automobile today—were they available—it would cost at least one-third more than formerly. And the cost of gas, tires, and repairs have increased proportionately. Any garageman who services mail carrier's cars knows that an uncomfortable bit of his salary check goes for car maintenance. Yet the rural mail carrier still receives the same salary as he did 20 years ago. And there's nothing he can do about it. He can't strike against his Government and wouldn't if he could. He deserves a break. It's time Congress dispensed with technicalities—which in the past seem to have prevented the raise to which the mail carrier is entitled and which he has earned—and granted him a salary at least in some measure commensurate to the service he renders.

Lincoln and Agriculture

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, American agriculture owes more to Abraham Lincoln than is generally recognized. His contribution to the progress of agriculture was so completely overshadowed by the war that we find it difficult to appreciate the vast significance of measures inaugurated by him to advance our agricultural society. A Department of Agriculture headed by a Commissioner was authorized by an act of Congress approved by President Lincoln on May 15, 1862. Five days later he signed the famous Homestead Act under which 234,000,000 acres of the public domain went into private ownership. In the same the Land Grant College Act, often referred to as the Morrill Act, was passed and approved. Thus, 1862 was a year of tremendous significance for the American farmers, and Abraham Lincoln, by reason of the leadership which he devoted to these good causes, became one of agriculture's greatest benefactors.

His concern for the welfare of our farm population was a natural and unconscious reflection of his character. His intimate knowledge of pioneer life and his understanding of the problems of farm people was accompanied by a warm and sympathetic attitude toward those who struggled to conquer the wilderness.

He gave no evidence of being aware of any relationship between his political pursuits and this deep interest in farm life. In an address before the Wisconsin State Agricultural Society in Milwaukee in 1859, which is reproduced in an excel-

lent bulletin of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, he said:

I presume I am not expected to employ the time assigned me in mere flattery of the farmers as a class. My opinion of them is that in proportion to numbers they are neither better nor worse than other people.

This is sufficient proof of the fact that he disdained the arts of the demagog.

It must have been apparent to his audiences, however, that here was one who had fully entered into their experiences and who had the capacity to become an effective advocate of their claims upon the Nation. This fact led Everett E. Edwards to say that—

He came slowly but surely to represent the frontier, the farmer, and the small-town democracy * * * as few other men ever represented a people.

While he had been denied the advantages of scientific instruction in agriculture he displayed a remarkable knowledge of the problems of production and of the economic interrelationships resulting from our expanding civilization. He predicted the mechanical plow, and although he thought it would be steam propelled he evidenced an uncanny insight into the revolutionary developments which were ahead.

He was just as interested in the moral and social aspects of the new influences and told his Milwaukee audience that—

By the best cultivation of the physical world, beneath and around us, and the intellectual and moral world within us, we shall secure an individual, social, and political prosperity and happiness, whose course shall be onward and upward, and which, while the earth endures, shall not pass away.

It is apparent, not only from the content of Federal statutes with which he is identified, but from his whole career that his emphasis was upon social and moral values rather than material gain, even for the farm group which he loved and for whom he had expended so much of his energy.

The part that education should play in the improvement of agriculture had a great interest for Lincoln. It is reflected in his statement that—

Nothing is so pleasant to the mind as the discovery of anything that is at once new and valuable—nothing that so lightens and sweetens toil, as the hopeful pursuit of such discovery. And how vast, and how varied a field is agriculture, for such discovery. The mind, already trained to thought, in the country school, or higher school, cannot fail to find there an exhaustless source of enjoyment. Every blade of grass is a study; and to produce two, where there was but one, is both a profit and a pleasure. And not grass alone; but soils, seeds, and seasons—hedges, ditches, and fences, draining, droughts, and irrigation—plowing, hoeing, and harrowing—reaping, mowing, and threshing—saving crops, pests of crops, diseases of crops, and what will prevent or cure them—implements, utensils, and machines, their relative merits, and to improve them—hogs, horses, and cattle—sheep, goats, and poultry—trees, shrubs, fruits, plants, and flowers—the thousand things of which these are specimens—each a world of study within itself.

Many great monuments to the memory of Abraham Lincoln have been built but no memorial will be more enduring than the legislative foundation for an agricultural policy which he himself devised in 1862.

Underlying that program is the concept of farm ownership, the identification of the farmer with some of the earth which is his to tend and to conserve. He saw this factor in its true relationship to the total problem of democracy and that is the reason that he, like Jefferson, cherished those institutions that are associated with agrarian life. Every aid should be given to improved farming skills with the ideal of independence as the goal. The thought was expressed in this language of Lincoln's:

No community whose every member possesses this art, can ever be the victim of oppression in any of its forms. Such community will be alike independent of crowned kings, money kings, and land kings.

We could honor the memory of Lincoln in no better way than to perfect our homestead policies and to preserve for farm youth, particularly the returning veterans, the land resources of this Nation that they might have the same hopes for useful and happy careers afforded those of Lincoln's time.

Address by Brig. Gen. R. C. Crawford at Meeting of Nebraska State Reclamation Association

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Brig. Gen. R. C. Crawford, United States of America, division engineer, Missouri River division, at the Nebraska State Reclamation Association meeting, held at Lincoln, Nebr., January 20, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congress derives its power for enacting legislation affecting navigable waters of the United States from section 2 of article III of the Constitution, vesting admiralty and maritime jurisdiction in the Federal Government; and from the third clause of section 8, article I, of the Constitution, known as the commerce clause. This clause reads: "The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes."

This legislative power under the commerce clause as it relates to navigable waters was definitely established by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1824.

Public navigable water was defined by the Supreme Court of the United States in December 1870 as follows: "A river is navigable in law when it is navigable in fact, and it is navigable in fact when it is used, or is susceptible of being used in its ordinary condition as a highway for commerce over which trade and travel may be conducted in the customary modes of trade and travel on water. * * * A river or other waterway constitutes a navigable water of the United States, within the meaning of the aforesaid acts of Congress, when it forms by itself or by uniting with other waters a continuous highway over which trade and travel is or may be conducted between the States themselves or between the States and foreign countries."

A congressional act of February 1932 provides that the term "commerce" shall include the use of waterways by seasonal passenger craft, yachts, houseboats, fishing boats, motorboats, and other similar water craft, whether or not operated for hire.

The first settlers arriving from the Old World found natural harbors and safe anchorage which presented few problems for the navigation of their small craft. However, our very first Congress enacted provision for the future support and maintenance at Federal expense of lighthouses, buoys, beacons, and public piers, and for rendering safe the navigation of bays, harbors, and ports.

The early settlers also found the country largely an unbroken forest, and for the first two centuries of our history our rivers were the principal highways.

The National Government in those earlier days drew a distinction between marking a waterway obstacle and removing it. The question of whether improvement of rivers and harbors was a matter of national concern, subject to appropriation under the Constitution, remained unresolved until 1824, when the first definite river and harbor act was passed. In May of that year Congress adopted a measure entitled "An act to improve the navigation of the Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers." This act provided appropriation "for removing sandbars from the Ohio, and planters, sawyers, and snags from the Mississippi."

Almost each succeeding Congress has passed one or more acts providing for work of maintenance and improvement of rivers and harbors. These acts comprise two phases—one authorizing specified works in accordance with reports previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers, the other authorizing and directing preliminary examinations and surveys at designated localities.

Prior to 1922 the river and harbor acts not only approved projects but also appropriated the money for their execution. Beginning with the act of September 22, 1922, the river and harbor acts have been authorizations of projects only and funds have been provided in separate War Department Civil Appropriation Acts. Certain of these acts have also contained specific instructions which have been the basis for procedure of the Engineer Department in the study of projects and the execution of works of improvement.

By an act of October 11, 1888, Congress authorized the Secretary of War to cause practical and sufficient fishways to be constructed to facilitate passage of fish upstream to spawning grounds in the upper reaches of streams in which river and harbor improvements were found to operate as obstructions.

By the act of February 21, 1891, and subsequent enactments, Congress provided for the collection of statistics to determine the amount of commerce using navigable waters. Other provisions for the compilation, publication, and distribution of waterway statistics were made in the Transportation Act of February 28, 1920. This Transportation Act also declared the policy of Congress to be "to promote, encourage, and develop water transportation, services, and facilities in connection with the commerce of the United States, and to foster, and preserve in full vigor both rail and water transportation."

In the act of March 3, 1899, Congress provided for the protection of navigation by prohibiting the discharge of dumping of refuse matter, other than that flowing from streets and sewers, into any navigable water or tributary thereto.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors was created by the act of June 13, 1902. This act provided that all reports on preliminary examination and survey provided for by Congress, and all projects, or changes in projects, for works of river and harbor improvement are to be referred to this board of senior engineer officers, for consideration and recommendation prior to their transmission to Congress.

An act of March 4, 1913, established procedure to be followed to determine which of the proposed river and harbor projects are worthy of improvement at Federal expense. The act provides that reports submitted to Congress shall indicate the present and prospective commercial importance of the project, the benefit to commerce likely to result, and other information necessary to indicate the need for the improvement.

By the act of June 5, 1920, Congress directed that each report, on a preliminary examination or survey, shall contain a statement of special or local benefit to accrue to localities affected by such improvement; also a statement of general or national benefit, and recommendation as to what local cooperation shall be required, if necessary, on account of such special or local benefit.

For more than a century, Congress has entrusted to the Corps of Engineers of the Army the responsibility of planning for the Nation's waterways, investigating proposed works, and carrying on authorized projects. From the first modest beginnings designed to meet immediate needs, we have progressed to a point where channels of navigable depths have been provided and are maintained in our principal rivers. These river systems have been supplemented by a network of canals, including the interior canal system along much of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts for intracoastal commerce. Invaluable to our peacetime trade and commerce, these waterways have been a vital factor in the prosecution of our war effort.

In the course of executing navigation works in the Mississippi River, the floodwaters of the lower river created a serious problem in maintaining navigability, as well as causing serious loss to the increasing number of settlers. National interest in the improvement of this river for the control of floods was indicated as early as 1850. In that year Congress appropriated $50,000 for starting the survey of the river, made by Humphreys and Abbott, two Army engineers, and in an act of 1871 Congress authorized and directed that certain water gages be established and daily observations made of the rise and fall of the Lower Mississippi River and its chief tributaries.

The Mississippi River Commission was created by the act of June 28, 1879, to consist of seven members. The act provided that three of the members shall be officers of the Corps of Engineers, one of whom is to be designated president of the commission. The duties of the commission are to direct and complete surveys of the Mississippi River, to consider and mature plans to permanently locate and deepen the channels for the improvement and safety of navigation, to promote and facilitate commerce, trade, and postal service, and to prevent destructive floods.

The first major national legislation for flood control was enacted on March 1, 1917. This act authorized appropriation of $45,000,000 for the control of Mississippi River floods, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War as approved by the Chief of Engineers. It also authorized appropriation of $5,600,000 for Sacramento River flood control, and it further provided that examinations and surveys for flood control be made in the same manner as those for navigation improvements.

Multiple-purpose surveys came into the picture with the River and Harbor Act of January 21, 1927. In this act Congress assigned to the Secretary of War and to the Chief of Engineers, the duty of making surveys in accordance with House Document No. 308, with a view to the formulation of general plans for the most effective improvement of the navigable streams of the United States and their tributaries for the purpose of navigation, the development of waterpower, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation. The reports of these extensive investigations and surveys have been published, and these documents are commonly known as the 308 Reports. They cover virtually every major stream in the entire United States. The data contained in these reports were used as the basis in formulating the War Department's comprehensive plans for flood control and other purposes in the numerous river basins throughout the country. These data have been used also by other agencies in their studies and improvements of river basins.

It might be stated that one of the many 308 Reports compiled by the War Department was that for the Tennessee River, which is printed as House Document No. 328, Seventy-first Congress, second session. As the Corps of Engineers had made the first detailed investigation of that stream, the duty of constructing the first major improvement thereon was assigned to the corps. Later, the improvement of the water resources in that basin were taken over by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the data compiled by the Army Engineers on the proposed improvements have since served as the basis for the comprehensive development of the basin.

It was not until the Flood Control Act approved by the President on June 22, 1936, that a definite policy was established by Congress for Federal participation in the construction of economically justified flood-control projects throughout the United States, in cooperation with the States, political subdivisions thereof, or other local agencies.

The declaration of policy embodied in this act is in part as follows:

"Section 1. It is hereby recognized that destructive floods upon the rivers of the United States, upsetting orderly processes and causing loss of life and property, including the erosion of lands and impairing the obstructing of navigation, highways, railroads, and other channels of commerce between the States, constitute a menace to national welfare; that it is the sense of Congress that flood control on navigable waters or their tributaries is a proper activity of the Federal Government in cooperation with States, their political subdivisions, and localities thereof; that investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways, including watersheds thereof, for flood-control purposes are in the interest of the general welfare; that the Federal Government should improve or participate in the improvement of navigable waters of their tributaries, including watersheds thereof, for flood-control purposes if the benefits to whomsoever they may accrue are in excess of the estimated costs, and if the lives and social security of peope are otherwise adversely affected.

"Section 2. That, hereafter Federal investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways for flood control and allied purposes shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the War Department under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers * * *.

"Section 3. That, hereafter, no money appropriated under authority of this act shall be expended on the construction of any project until States, political subdivisions thereof, or other responsible local agencies have given assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will (a) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the projects, except as otherwise provided herein; (b) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; (c) maintain and operate all works after completion in accordance with regulation prescribed by the Secretary of War."

The Flood Control Act of 1936 specifically authorized some 270 flood-control projects with an estimated construction cost of about $300,000,000, located in 31 States and affecting nearly every State in the Union. Preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control were also authorized for some 220 localities and streams throughout the entire country.

In the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, Congress materially expanded Federal participation in flood-control projects. The act provided that all land easements and rights-of-way for dam and reservoir projects or channel improvement or channel rectification projects shall be acquired by the United States and be a part of the Federal cost of the project. Local interests were also relieved of the responsibility of maintaining and operating projects falling within this classification.

The Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, modified certain conditions of local cooperation prescribed in previous flood-control legislation. Under this policy, dam and reservoir projects because of their general benefits over large areas, are usually built entirely at Federal expense and are maintained and operated by the Federal Government. As the benefits provided by other types of flood-protection projects are more local in character, contributions by the communities protected are usually required. The amount of this local cooperation or contribution depends upon the circumstances of each case, but generally the minimum requirements are that the local interests provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way needed for the project, hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works, and maintain and operate the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War. The act of 1941 authorized the construction of projects at about 90 localities and also modified several projects which had been approved in the previous flood control acts.

The Seventy-eighth Congress, which adjourned a month ago, enacted the omnibus flood control bill known as H. R. 4485, which was signed by the President in the closing days of 1944. This act, with which most of you are familiar, declares it to be the policy of Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining development of watersheds within their borders and in water utilization and control. The act also provides for review of reports of the Chief of Engineers and of the Secretary of the Interior by the State or States affected by the report, and the comments of such affected States will become a part of the report when transmitted to Congress.

Other important sections of the 1944 act provide (1) for the development and administration of public park and recreational facilities in reservoir areas under the control of the War Department; (2) that electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior for sale in accordance with rate schedules to be approved by the Federal Power Commission; (3) that the Secretary of War may make contracts for domestic and industrial uses of surplus water at War Department reservoirs; (4) that the Secretary of War prescribe regulations for the use of storage allocated for flood control or navigation at all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds on the basis of such purposes; (5) for the use under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior and in accordance with reclamation laws, of storage available for irrigation in War Department reservoirs.

The act includes also, as you know, the authorization of the coordinated plans of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of the Missouri River Basin, as well as a number of other projects for flood control throughout the Nation in accordance with reports of the Chief of Engineers. It also authorizes a number of projects to be undertaken by the Department of Agriculture in accordance with reports submitted by that Department. The act authorizes the appropriation of $950,000,000 for projects to be carried out by the War Department, $200,000,000 for work authorized to be carried out by the Department of the Interior, $10,000,000 for examinations and surveys by the War Department and the Department of Agriculture, and $500,000 as an emergency fund to be used by the War Department for emergency bank protection work to prevent flood damage to highways, bridge approaches, and public works.

In accordance with general flood-control authorizations since the Federal Participation Policy Act of 1936, the War Department, through the Corps of Engineers by June 30, 1943, had placed in operation 44 reservoirs and 101 local protection projects.

The flood-control program as well as navigation improvements, has been affected to a large extent by the war emergency. In accordance with present Federal policies, those projects not directly affecting the war effort have been suspended. However, the Engineer Department has carried on surveys, investigations, and the preparation of plans and specifications for dams and flood-protection projects at numerous localities throughout the United States. These activities will provide a reservoir of useful public works to be available for immediate initiation when the present wartime restrictions on the construction of public works are removed.

I have attempted to outline for you the legislative policies which have guided the Corps of Engineers in their practices and procedures for the development of navigation and flood control. Like our Nation's growth itself, they are based on the Constitution and have progressed step by step in the light of experience and accumulated wisdom. In the course of that progress, several other agencies of the Federal Government have been charged by Congress with different responsibilities toward the full development of the water resources of the Nation's river basins.

For example, the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, has been charged with irrigation improvements. The Department of Agriculture is responsible for investigations and measures for the reduction of run-offs from land areas for the prevention of soil erosion. The Federal Power Commission must approve plans for power developments.

To assure that all national programs for water-resource utilization are completely integrated, there has been adopted a definite procedure for cooperation among permanent Federal agencies having special interests in such works. The chiefs of the principal bureaus directly responsible for the preparation of water-development plans and administration, have an agreement to insure cooperation on multiple-purpose projects. Under that agreement conferences are held in Washington at least once each calendar month for the purpose of discussing the results of studies and investigations, adjusting differences of opinions, and promoting ways and means for implementing agreements.

In conclusion, I can do no better that to quote from a recent statement of General Reybold, Chief of Engineers: "When the challenge of war is succeeded by the responsibilities of peace, the Army engineers will be ready to resume at full speed the mission they have performed for more than a hundred years—the river and harbor and flood-control programs for the Nation. We will not have to build a new organization. We have our organization—and it will be ready for its peacetime missions just as it has been ready for its wartime missions. It is this assurance that I am proud to leave with you as we look forward to the future of a great America."

I am sure that this applies equally to the other Federal water-use agencies, whose records of achievement in the interest of our people speak for themselves.

The Need for a Spiritual Revival

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Need for a Spiritual Revival," delivered by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., on February 9, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, if we are to have the post-war peace both at home and abroad which we all so deeply desire, we must admit the crying need for a new attitude toward the problems which now face us. That attitude must be based on a true spiritual revival.

If we expect to build a world security league the easy way, by the signing of a few documents of alliance or by some easy statement of principle like that embodied in the unfortunate Atlantic Charter, we are destined to a disappointment more bitter than that we tasted after the last war.

Good will toward men, both at home and abroad, is not something that can be won by mouthing phrases. It requires that we face our problems with realism as well as idealism.

Tonight I have elected to talk about the spiritual side of the case, of those living moral ingredients which are absolutely necessary if we are to prevent World War III and reorganize the world along decent lines, so that the ordinary, God-fearing men and women of all nations can go about in peace; and so that the bulk of the products of men's labor is not forced into nonproductive and useless armaments.

Before we can undertake any part of this, we must have a revival of the great ideals on which this Nation was founded, and of those human tolerances and sober religious attitudes which were the cornerstone of that foundation. Such a revival, if it is to succeed, must begin by discarding a number of the false conceptions which have been growing in this country as well as abroad.

I have quoted in a recent Senate speech from a brilliant book written by the famous author and thinker, William B. Ziff. It is called The Gentlemen Talk of Peace and is, I believe, today one of the country's best sellers. This great work has impressed many of us in the Congress. Mr. Ziff points to the gross dangers of dividing Americans along racial lines. He also points out the terrible danger of a vast racial war sometime in the future with the billion or more resentful people in India and China and other countries of the Orient unless a world is built in which they can live, too, as decent equal human beings.

Frankly, I ask you how America in the world conference can really take the dominant lead to make the world safe for democracy unless there is first a spiritual revival here.

In some parts of the country Mexican and Japanese citizens are barred from schools. In some parts soldiers who are partly Negro who are in uniform cannot even buy a cup of coffee in certain restaurants. In some parts of the country our neighbors from India cannot own real estate. The quota allowing 107 immigrants from China is a joke.

We see "Jim Crow" sections on trains and busses, and in parts of this country signs are displayed saying that certain minorities are unwelcome guests. Only when all of these evils have been eliminated from our American form of government, only then can we call ourselves fit and clean to take the lead in shaping the post-war world which will not permit these evils.

Society is built on faith as much as on power, on mutual acceptances, on the willingness of the son to take care of his aging father, on the willingness of each man to accord his neighbors dignity and the right to life.

The other side of this view is the harsh intolerant racism which now threatens to engulf the world and to rob our children of a secure peaceful future. The same terrible sickness which afflicted Nazi Germany will affect us if we do not secure for ourselves that spiritual cleansing which distinguishes the free and democratic man from the Fascist and potential Nazi. May God help us if we fail in this, our national task. Unless we can gain this victory also, military victory alone will not be enough.

All of this must have a direct bearing on our attitude toward a world-security organization. Can the present discussions by any stretch of the imagination be considered either spiritual in their objectives or a revival in the sense that they rededicate this Nation to its basic principles?

I regret to report that the actions of the nations at this moment are based instead on greed, on unilateral actions, and on the familiar cynicism and contempt for the rights of man, which caused the old League of Nations to fail and to become a cover for aggression. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals, regardless of the sincerity of the men who framed them, are inevitably leading to the cynical and unspiritual conclusions which were spawned by the Treaty of Versailles and the old League of Nations. We see this plainly in the actions of the nations today, which bespeak the deadly fear of still other and more terrible wars, not a faith in the ultimate peace. Let us consider, for example, the truly remarkable words of Harry Hopkins, the President's right-hand man, as given in the last issue of the American magazine. Mr. Hopkins says:

"We must accept a new and tough concept in world affairs. The world is not civilized enough to make world-wide disarmament practical for peace-loving nations. We wasted no time at Dumbarton Oaks, and we shall take our place in an international organization to attempt to keep the peace and to make secure the essential freedoms throughout the world. America's heart and mind will work intensively day and night to keep the world in peace. But that isn't enough. We can't take a chance. When this war ends, we must immediately prepare to defend ourselves, particularly to make sure that our enemies realize that if they dare to strike again they'll lose again."

What is this latest admission if not a declaration of lack of faith in the present peace league we are attempting to set up? Just think of it—we are going to set up a so-called Peace League, in the very midst of which we, and presumably the other nations, are to be armed right up to our eyebrows.

Is not this, with different trappings, the same old dangerous, outworn type of international attitude? Is it not authored in a cynical anticipation of international lawlessness in the future? If Dumbarton Oaks is to be the foundation for peace, why must we conscript our boys and spend the greater part of our wealth in preparing for still new wars? Is this the philosophy and are these the ideals of Christian belief on which the future of our nation is to be founded?

I, for one, would feel that I had betrayed my duty if I did not cry out against this settlement, against these almost psycopathic fears of the future, by which the affairs of men are all to be settled by brute force, by the terrible argument of shot, shell, tanks, cannon, rocket bombs, and deathdealing airplanes.

All these questions, I feel, can be answered. The truth is that Dumbarton Oaks, because its proposals lack both idealism and practicality, cannot succeed in their alleged goal—a permanent peace. A permanent peace can be achieved only if we face the facts of the modern world, put ourselves in the other fellow's boots, and make it possible for him to live in comfort and prosperity as well as ourselves—in truth approach the problem with a revival of the spiritual and practical values which made our forefathers great.

I shall outline briefly how this may be brought about, but first, I should like to tell you what my proposals do not by any stretch of the imagination represent.

They do not, as some of my opponents would have you believe, represent isolationism. Indeed, and on the contrary, it is the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, pursued to their logical conclusion, which will, if anything ever does, lead this Nation back to isolation—to an armed truce in which every other nation on the globe will have to be regarded as a potential enemy. My proposals are the very opposite to isolationism, though those impassioned advocates blinded by the worldly glitter of Dumbarton Oaks, have so tried to dub them.

Again, my proposals are not—as Dumbarton Oaks so patently is—an invitation to commit this Nation to the hilt on a world police force. I believe that if such a commitment is made, the power that controls such a force will control the world.

No, ladies and gentlemen, I do not speak to you here tonight advocating either isolationism or force. I beg rather, that we face the post-war world and its problems with logic, realism, and with a revival of the tried and true practical and spiritual ideals for which this Nation has long been so famous the world over.

I propose that we federate the world into a half-dozen great regional areas along lines of the natural interests of the nations. We would thus set up a system of regionalism which would be sane, rational, and genuinely international in character. None of the nations would lose their identity or cultural self-rule. They would simply move toward unity in their economic and other relations and would eliminate the existing currency, trade, tariff, and other barriers which now make some nations poor, weak, and impotent, in relation to their neighbors.

The present system does not guarantee the freedom and independence of small peoples as anyone can see in an instant by glancing at what is now taking place in Europe.

We are living in the midst not only of war, but of a tremendous international revolution which is completely changing the conditions of life on this earth. Yesterday, small states could exist in political isolation. Today small peoples in order to achieve security and prosperity must federate with their neighbors. Yesterday, the small state could manufacture muskets or cast cannon almost as well as anyone, though on a minor scale. Today this is not true and the small state is utterly helpless if in the path of invasion by a large, modern state.

Federation along regional lines would give the citizens of the small State an additional citizenship in a larger political grouping. This is not as unprecedented as it sounds. My very able colleague Senator ELBERT THOMAS, of Utah, has pointed out that the citizens of the Swiss cantons possess a dual citizenship. So do the citizens of the various republics of the Soviet Union. For that matter, the French Canadians possess a triple citizenship. They are citizens of the Province of Quebec, of the Free Dominion of Canada, and of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

It is the soundest of good logic that the world be consolidated into large, economically sound units in which people may live in peace and prosperity, without need of conquest to supply their wants in either raw materials or markets. The highroad for permanent security for the United States leads inevitably toward unity with our North and South American neighbors.

Only thus, and not in the present inquality between the Nations, can the world look forward to permanent peace.

[We must find some way to bring to bear our ideas and ideals in the settlement of the problems of this war and of the problems of the peace to follow. For the first time in history, we confront a situation in which the wrong of the past will be replaced by the horrors of the present, unless we can assume the moral leadership of the world. We must find some way by which, for the good of Russia, Britain, America, and the world, we can do this.]

Intolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Eric A. Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, delivered an able address before the Writers' War Board, New York City, on January 11, 1945. His subject was Intolerance. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I like to look on my presence here as a sign that the Hatfields of business and the McCoys of the writing world have ended their old-time feud. Maybe business is beginning to see more clearly that art has its practical aspects; and maybe the artist is beginning to realize that industry has its artistic values. More importantly, maybe both are beginning to understand that each is part of America and that neither has a right to pluck the mote out of the other's eye until he has first extracted the beam from his own.

Your subject tonight is The Myth That Threatens America. Surely, the businessman and the artist share responsibility in eradicating the myth of group or class superiority.

Those who pretend that it does not exist are kidding themselves.

Of all the social problems that face our great country in this area of crisis that of national unity seems to me the most challenging. Most other problems will not be solved if the American people are divided into mutually hostile and suspicious groups, sections, and classes. More than that: Even if solutions were possible under such conditions, they would hardly be worth achieving. They would be empty victories, utterly meaningless, if the character of our American civilization were changed in the process.

And the core of that civilization, it seems to me, is in the sacred dignity of the human being, regardless of race or class or place of birth. Individual freedom—liberty within a framework of law—are essential to the America we know and love. Without these elements it would no longer be our America, except in the geographical sense. In the deeper moral sense it would be an alien country, where those of us who cherish ideals of freedom would be exiles in our own homes.

We are all of us, in our several ways, seeking to preserve America. Millions of our sons are doing it on battlefields with bombs and bayonets. You who write and inspire and propagandize do it with the weapon of words. Those of us who build and manufacture do it with machines and goods. But what all of us have in mind is not simply the physical preservation of our country. It is the preservation of those human values which are implicit in the word America—the freedom, the opportunities, the equalities, the democratic ideals celebrated in our national songs and poety and books and holiday speeches.

I know these are the cliches of American patriotism and after-dinner oratory. But we dot not discount them for that reason. On the contrary, we accept them and cherish them as proof positive that the American dream is a dream of free men living together in a spirit of harmony and trust.

I regard as profoundly significant the fact that the average American, whether he be a blasé businessman or a cynical writer, looks on these so-called cliches as desirable even when he doesn't live up to them. Equally significant is the fact that even the salesmen of dissension must disguise their sales talks in the phraseology of American freedom.

Race hatreds and group intolerance simply do not jibe with any of the formulas of freedom so dear to the American heart. To the extent they are allowed to flourish, they threatened to change the American Dream into another European nightmare.

Let's not underestimate the threat. There is a tendency to soft-pedal the spread of alien doctrines of intolerance. The theory, I suppose, is that the best way to treat a disease is to pretend that it doesn't exist. That is a cowardly theory and worse, a futile one. It seems to me that honest diagnosis is the first and indispensable measure in meeting the challenge of propagandas and whispering campaigns directed against foreigners, against Jews, against Catholics, against Negroes.

Equally dangerous, but not so dramatic, and therefore not so well understood, are the campaigns of intolerance and vilification that are directed against economic groups such as business, labor and agriculture—sometimes by one another, and sometimes by the enemies of one or all. To the extent that business has been guilty of such intolerance in any direction I deplore it. I have set my face against it, and I shall continue to denounce it. To the extent that you, as writers have been guilty of this same type of intolerance with respect to any of these groups, including business, I invite you to have another look to see if the beam in your eye has gotten you off the beam of tolerance.

I have been privileged to travel widely in our country, and I do not hesitate to offer my personal testimony that the tremendous tension of race and group animosities are warping the very foundations of American democratic life. Men and women who should know better—who do know better—allow

themselves to mouth the catch phrases of anti-Semitism and antiforeignism, of anti-business, or antilabor, antifarm. Most of them are not themselves aware that they have been infected by the virus of intolerance which already has the whole world writhing in the fatal fever of war.

When there's a riot in Detroit or Harlem, when racial antagonisms break into the open in Boston or Brooklyn, it's more comfortable to shrug them off as local incidents. But the truth must be faced. These episodes of violence are symptoms of pressures and emotions and maladjustments which are Nation-wide.

The first thing we must do, it seems to me, is to confront the reality. Obviously the most violent and deep-seated of our antipathies are racial and religious. Widespread though these expressions of group hatred are, it is a hopeful fact that they still afflict only a small minority of the American population. That minority can be curbed and reeducated if conscious and organized efforts are undertaken.

At the very worst that minority can be frightened into desisting. Not by legal threats—you can't legislate the golden rule as you can the gold standard. I mean that Americans can be made sharply aware that intolerance endangers not merely the small groups against whom it is directed but the country as a whole. The obstreperous hate-mongers and their foolish or frivolous fellow-travelers who think it is smart to rock the American boat may drown with the other passengers.

If they achieve the calamity of race persecutions, they will drag our beloved America down to the barbarian level of Nazi Germany and we will pay for it in death and suffering and national degeneration, precisely as the Germans are doing today. We need to emphasize, day in and day out, that the spread of intolerance is not primarily a threat to the intended victims but to the whole country. Once the poison enters a nation's bloodstream, the entire population is doomed. Only 600,000 German Jews suffered through the triumph of Nazi barbarism—but the non-Jews who suffered from it include the more than 80,000,000 Germans.

If the day ever comes in this country when tolerance gives way to internal enmities and persecutions and discriminations, it will be the end of American civilization. Remember this: The dictates of intolerance cannot be enforced finally without the connivance of government. Should intolerance triumph, it will mean, as a matter of course, that free government is stamped out. Racial persecutions—whether in the old Russia or the present-day Germany—have always been conducted under the protection of a tyrannical governmental regime.

Viewed from the narrowest vantage point of the Nation's well-being, quite aside from human and moral considerations, the growth of doctrines of race and group hatreds represents a major economic threat. America has prospered because it has provided avenues of economic expression to all men who had the urge and the capacity to advance themselves. Wherever we erect barriers on the grounds of race or religion, or of occupational or professional status, we hamper the fullest expansion of our economic society. Intolerance is destructive. Prejudice produces no wealth. Discrimination is a fool's economy.

Freedom of the individual is the most vital condition for creative life in economy as in every other department of human existence. Such freedom is impossible where men are restricted by reason of race or origin, on the one hand, or on the other, paralyzed by fears and hatreds of their neighbors.

There are some in our country—industrialists, white-collar workers, laboring people—who hold to the myth that economic progress can be attained on the principle of an unbalanced see-saw. They think that if some groups can be forever held down the others will forever enjoy economic privileges and prosperity at the end which is up.

Fortunately it does not work that way. Any advantage thus gained must be paid for out of the fruits of the productive plant. The withholding of jobs and business opportunities from some people does not make more jobs and business opportunities for others. Such a policy merely tends to drag down the whole economic level. You can't sell an electric refrigerator to a family that can't afford electricity. Perpetuating poverty for some merely guarantees stagnation for all. True economic progress demands that the whole Nation move forward at the same time. It demands that all artificial barriers erected by ignorance and intolerance be removed. To put it in the simplest terms, we are all in business together. Intolerance is a species of boycott and any business or job boycott is a cancer in the economic body of the Nation. I repeat: Intolerance is destructive. Prejudice produces no wealth. Discrimination is a fool's economy.

These are things that should be made manifest to the American people if we are to counteract the pestiferous labors or race and group hate-mongers. The job lies to a large extent in the hands of you writers, in your colleagues in the movies, the theater, radio, the press. You are the people with direct access to the mind—and what is more important, to the heart and emotions—of the American people.

You must somehow take words like freedom and democracy and unity and lift them to the level of religious fervor. We require more than a broad acceptance of these American concepts. We need an eager enthusiasm. And you, in particular, have the power to arouse it and to keep it alive. I want to emphasize that.

If eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, the writer and the artist generally have a prime duty in keeping the vigil. It is for them to dramatize the strength and beauty that resides in America's multiplicity of races, religious, national origins and social backgrounds. The totalitarians who looked on us as mongrels, as a chaos of clashing cultures, have learned their mistake. We always must remember that America is a Nation made up of the peoples of all lands.

Any metallurgist will tell you that the toughest, most resistant metals are not pure cres but alloys that blend the most valuable qualities of many ores. It is thus with the American, who fuses in his blood and his spirit the virtues and vitalities of many races, creeds, and cultures—giving us an amalgam that is new, unique, and immeasurably strong.

That is why tolerance is necessarily and rightly a supreme American characteristic. In truth, we must continue to cultivate our native American tolerance for everything except intolerance.

Our enemies have learned in this war the toughness of our fiber. It now remains for the American people, likewise, to absorb that lesson. It was Walt Whitman who celebrated the diversity that is America's strength. "This is not a Nation," he proclaimed, "but a teaming of nations." In some measure every poet sensitive to the nature of our still young American experiment has felt and expressed that diversity. Russell Davenport has just done it in "My Country." Perhaps the poet, more than the economist or historian, senses the absurdity in attempts to hammer all Americans into a single national type and discriminate against the minorities who do not conform to an arbitrary creation.

Let's not apologize for the amazing variety of our human material here in America. Let us rather glory in it as the source of our robust spirit and opulent achievements. Let's not deny that there are differences in race and that our country has all the 57 varieties of God's humanity. Let us merely make clear that these differences cannot be measured on any scale of good, better, and best. They are all equally valid and all must continue to contribute to the magnificent mosaic of American life.

Subtract from the grand total of America the contributions of our racial and religious and economic minorities—and what remains? Subtract foreign-born Andrew Carnegie from our metallurgical industry, or David Sarnoff from American radio, or George Gershwin and the Negro composers from our native music, or Norwegian-born Knute Rockne from our football, or Dutch-born Edward William Bok from publishing, or Danish-born William S. Knudsen from the automotive industry, or Russian-born Major de Seversky from American aviation, or Belgian-born Leo H. Baekeland from American chemical achievements, or slave-born Dr. George Washington Carver from biological developments. The temptation is to list hundreds and thousands who have thrown their particular genius into the American melting pot.

And behind those whose names we know are the nameless legions of immigrants, generation after generation, whose labor and lives went into every bridge and tunnel, every mine and factory in these United States.

Too many Americans—indeed, too many of the immigrants themselves, whatever their race or land of birth—behave as if America only gave things to newcomers. We need to be reminded that America received more than it gave. After all, our country let the strangers in because it needed their muscle power, their purchasing power, their fecundity and their brains.

It is this vision of a society wonderfully rounded by reason of its many racial contributions, of an internation within the borders of a vast nation, that should be brought home to every American child and adult. The cooperation of these multiple elements, the unity of a powerful amalgam, has given a peculiar destiny and genius to our country. In pointing out our achievements to our preachers of division and distrust we are protecting that part of our history that still lies in the future.

But it seems to me that all of us who fight against intolerance can hurt our own cause by expecting too much too soon. The simple human fact is that prejudice is latent in all of us. The average Protestant, Catholic, Jew is normally prejudiced in favor of his own kind and against the others. The underprivileged are prejudiced against the well-to-do. The strong are prejudiced against the weak and vice versa. Men are prejudiced against women and women, alas, are even more prejudiced against men. The saintly soul who goes through life devoid of all prejudices is rare indeed.

These attitudes cannot be washed away or talked away or smothered with fine phrases. They are the products of centuries of history which must be taken into account in any functioning society. Those who would eliminate such things overnight may deserve good marks for their intentions, but they do not rate high in common sense. Let me say frankly that the bigotry and impatience of the right-minded can do as much harm as good. There is always the danger that their unrestrained zeal may sharpen animosities and stimulate unrealistic demands. I for one would caution such people that in clamoring for what is impossible they are sacrificing what is possible. A counter-propaganda that is divorced from living usually creates more tensions than it cures.

On the whole, America, through the generations, has shown itself capable of preventing natural prejudices from spilling over into unnatural intolerance. On the whole the trend has been toward greater equality. Even the worst manifestations of prejudice have been gradually tempered.

The danger today comes because the normal prejudices are being stimulated by deliberate propaganda. Watered by hate they flourish in more and more places as outright intolerance and discrimination. What is a mild and natural disaffection is being turned into a malignant disease. It is that which we are called upon to combat with all the skills, with all the energies that we possess.

Ill abused and unjustly treated are the victims of intolerant hate, but the dupes who follow the intolerant leader are unmercifully betrayed. Look at Nazi Germany. Intolerance is a hideous beast with an insatiable appetite. When it has devoured its unhappy victims, it turns upon its guilty followers. The strong Nazis liquidated the weak Nazis.

The inevitable cycle of organized intolerance is that it destroys the individual, the family, the community, and finally the state. In contrast, tolerance is constructive. It creates, builds, unifies. It gives strength and nobility to the individual, to the family, the community, the state. The fight against intolerance is not merely our duty as decent human beings. It is the indispensable condition of our survival as free individuals and as a prosperous Nation.

More than all this, it is a condition of happiness and a guaranty of spiritual enlargement. The very word tolerance itself derives from the same Latin stem as the words to lift up and to bear.

"Bear ye one another's burdens," said a clear voice long ago. This counsel should have been remembered by us during the past generation.

We all recognize that the two decades before the two world wars was a period of cynicism and little faith. In the enslaved and dictated countries, this cynicism found its most complete and ugliest expression.

But this degradation was not confined within the borders of totalitarian countries alone. Even among us in America there were symptoms of moral decay. During these two decades it was smart to question moral values to debunk traditional virtues, to rationalize brutalities, to make excuses for moral indignities. During this period we heard men sneer at freedom and make light of democracy. A lot of us forgot that our code of morals, respect for truth and fair dealing are not arbitrary laws imposed upon us from without. They are the products of thousands of years of human experience—the quintessence of the wisdom of the ages. To violate these codes brings disaster as surely as the violation of physical laws of nature bring disease and death.

To the extent that we yielded to this wave of cynicism, we have contributed to the greatest crisis of our epoch which came to a head in the most destructive war of all time. It has not been merely a political or economic crisis. It has been a spiritual and moral crisis. An evil wind has swept throughout the world and its havoc is all about us.

But in spite of this destruction, I know that the physical ingredients for a better, a happier, and a nobler America are at our disposal. Raw materials, machinery, skills, manpower in abundance. Can we match these with intelligence, good will, social idealism, and tolerance?

In the perspective of history, it will appear that ours is the tragic privilege—the tragic privilege of living in the greatest military crisis since Napoleon, the greatest economic crisis since Adam Smith, the greatest moral crisis since the fall of the Roman empire. But if ours is the tragic privilege, history will also show that ours is the magnificent opportunity—the magnificent opportunity to understand that in unity there is strength; in good will there is prosperity; in tolerance there is progress—progress toward a better, a healthier, and a happier America. In fact, this is the only way we may have peace at home or abroad in our lifetime.

Address by Ben Dean, President of Kiwanis International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, Mr. Ben Dean, the president of Kiwanis International, is from my home city of Grand Rapids, Mich., and we are very proud of him. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address which he delivered recently before the Kiwanis Club of New York, together with the introduction made by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

There being no objection, the address and introduction were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HOMER FERGUSON'S INTRODUCTION OF BEN DEAN, KIWANIS CLUB OF NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 15, 1944

Mr. Stringfellow, honored guests, it is a real privilege for me to be able to be here with you tonight, that I may introduce to you the next speaker, and I know that you will enjoy the wisdom which he brings you.

The Kiwanis Clubs of America have a great slogan. They have a great ideal. They have a great motto in the words, "We build." Nothing could be better for America or in American life than those two words. I think you start to build at the right source. In Kiwanis you start with the youth, not only with those who have adavantages, but also with those who don't have advantages.

Today you find that building with youth is not sufficient, because we are in a great war, and it is necessary that we win that war, and that is your ideal today. That is the principle upon which you stand and upon which your willingness to go forward depends. You are not satisfied with the winning of that war alone, but you have an ideal that this civilization of ours must not only win the peace, but must also keep the peace.

You start back in your neighborhoods and communities, and you teach cooperation among the people there. I say to you that if we don't understand and practice cooperation in America back in our own communities, this Nation will never be able to cooperate with other nations that we might keep the peace. You start back there, and you say that you believe that we should live under law, and you know that you all hope for the day that we will have international law, that we will have an international court which will be able to settle the disputes of the world, and that we may, if necessary, enforce that peace through the international court.

You have today a man who believes in the fundamentals of America, the fundamentals of your ideals. He has dedicated his life to work among his fellow men, that he may have cooperation and a better America. I know that when America dedicates itself to the task of cooperation in the winning of this war and the peace of the future, we will have a better chance for a peace which will be lasting.

It is a privilege for me to be able to introduce this man from Michigan. He was born out in Grand Rapids. He came up from the school system of Michigan. He became city editor of a Grand Rapids newspaper, and after a few years of newspaper work he decided he would go into advertising in order that he might help to sell the products not only of Michigan but also of the United States as a whole. He has done well in that and now he is international president of Kiwanis, where he is going to sell the ideals for which you stand.

Yes, he and his good wife have a son in Italy. They know exactly what war is. They, too, watch for news from the front as you watch for news from the front. This man comes to you as no stranger because you have known him many, many years to elect him as your international president. It is a privilege, for Kiwanis was born in Detroit, my home city, for me to come here to you tonight just to tell you that the next speaker will be your international president, a great Michiganite, Ben Dean.

ADDRESS BY BEN DEAN, PRESIDENT OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL, TO THE KIWANIS CLUB OF NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 15, 1945

May I acknowledge on behalf of Kiwanis International, Senator FERGUSON, our very deep appreciation for this fine introduction and the very gracious things you have said here this evening about our organization, and also which you said this afternoon on the program over the Columbia Broadcasting System, in which it was my pleasure to participate. I feel that I should like to say this to our New York audience: We are very proud of Senator FERGUSON in Michigan. That is why we voted for him and sent him to Washington. We admire very much the courage with which he fought boss rule in our home State and with which he prosecuted some public officers who were guilty of misuse of public funds. We followed his career with a great deal of interest in Washington, as we have seen him take a courageous stand for Government economy against bureaucracy. It is a real pleasure to me as a fellow citizen of Michigan to have had the pleasure of being introduced by him this evening.

I wish to congratulate this club and President Stringfellow on the very fine leadership and standing which this club has, and to say that Kiwanis International is extremely proud of this club and watches its progress, feeling that it is setting a pattern for the metropolitan clubs.

Now, just briefly, may I say a few things. I want to refer to an advertisement which was written 30 years ago and which is still considered in advertising circles—and the Senator has said that my business is advertising—as a classic. It was written by an advertising man in Detroit whom the Senator may recall, Theodore F. McManus. It was published in leading magazines in 1914. The space was bought and paid for by the Cadillac Motor Co., but unless you watched very closely and read a line of very fine type at the bottom, you would not have known who was buying the advertisement, because there was nothing in it about automobiles. It was entitled "The Penalty of Leadership" and went on to say in very eloquent phraseology that in every line of human endeavor leaders stand out, are subjected to the white light of publicity, and the penalty of leadership is that, while they enjoy the plaudits of the crowd, they are also subjected to the criticism of the multitude, and upon them lies the responsibility of constantly keeping ahead of the crowd and being entitled to the rank of leadership by their progressive ideas.

I should like to have you consider that with me for just a moment. First, I want to apply it to our country, the United States, which now, because of the strength of its armed forces, because of its great wealth and position, is necessarily subjected to the penalty of leadership. Whether we will or not, we must accept leadership in world affairs and must take this leadership, working out and welding together a peace which will be permanent.

I want to apply the penalty of leadership to the individual Kiwanian and remind you

gentlemen that when any of us accepts Kiwanis membership and places upon his lapel the Kiwanis button, we serve notice with that act upon our community that we have accepted a higher standard of citizenship and that we are available in our communities for leadership in community affairs.

Now, I want to apply that to this New York club. Kiwanis International is very proud of the New York club, proud of the leadership which President Stringfellow has given it, proud of the standing which it has in this community, proud of the fine relationship which has been developed between this club and the sister Rotary club in this metropolis, and that is one of the reasons I was very happy to accept this invitation, because I wanted to lay down three challenges to this New York club.

The first is that I believe Kiwanis International—and I speak for the board of trustees of Kiwanis International—has the right to expect of this club, the largest club, if you please, in the entire International set-up, in by far the largest city in the United States and Canada where Kiwanis operates, outstanding leadership in patterns of public service, and we look to you to give it to us in the days to come, so that it will be an inspiration for the other clubs of Kiwanis International.

The second challenge which I lay down to you is that your membership is composed of men of great influence, men of affairs and wide interests and wide acquaintanceships. Kiwanis International has a right to expect of this club that you devote some of that leadership and some of that ability and influence to the administrative affairs, not only to the New York district, but of Kiwanis International. The whole rank and file of Kiwanis International looks to this club for fine leadership because of the power and influence which you men have in this membership, and we want it in the future.

The third challenge which I lay down is that we believe there are literally thousands of potential Kiwanians in this congested area, who are not now members of the Kiwanis. The International Board believes that this club, this great club of the metropolitan area, should be the mother club in sponsoring a dozen or more clubs in this area, in communities within this great city, because of the possibilities of Kiwanis service which can be given by the motivating power of the leadership and manpower of this club.

Kiwanis International will be 30 years old next January. Today, our membership is 136,000. We have more clubs than ever before—2,243 was the last count—and this despite the pressure and anxiety of the war years. Kiwanis, along with other service clubs, has proved its usefulness and indispensability in these war years by its war services in various communities.

You may have seen the fascinating book which was published recently, Your World Tomorrow. It paints a fascinating picture of what science can do in adding new comforts and conveniences to America and to all civilization, once the last bomb is dropped and the last gun is fired and we can return to peacetime pursuits. It tells of homes which will be lighted by stored-up sun rays, meals that will be cooked by pressing buttons, newspapers which will be printed over night in our living rooms, and whatever we are lacking in raw materials will be made up for with synthetic materials. A great, new, promising future is opened up to the human race.

However, the other side of the picture is ominous, indeed, and within the last few days, intelligence in the newspapers has told us the horrifying story of the V-2 bomb, with unlimited potentialities. As I was coming over on the plane from Grand Rapids, I read the comments made by the engineering staff of the Ford Motor Co., which said that America was ahead of Germany in jet propulsion. We could have bombs in the future so destructive that they could travel 3,500 miles per hour and pack a ton of explosives.

Ladies and gentlemen, of what use is it to progress in the physical sciences, in the material comforts and conveniences of life, as long as science and scientists without souls, uncurbed in moral responsibilities by outlaw nations, are permitted to contrive their devilish inventions which may well destroy the human race? We shall never have security, no matter what the advance of science, until we develop, along with these physical sciences, these material comforts, the science which has been woefully neglected, and that is the science of human relationships.

I mention that because for 30 years Kiwanians, throughout the length and breadth of this land, have been practicing human relationships, the ability of men to meet with each other, men of different racial backgrounds and religious creeds and political opinions, working together and learning the spirit of cooperation.

One of the great contributions of Kiwanis clubs and other service clubs is their emphasis on community welfare and on community life. The heart of Kiwanis International is the individual club in the individual community. Our clubs are devoted not to their own progress and advancement, but to community service. We place the emphasis on the community. We have been running to Washington too much, as these distinguished gentlemen from the Senate know. We have had a dangerous trend toward centralized Government, and one of the great contributions of service clubs is that counter action against the centralized trend, putting the emphasis on community responsibility, on groups of business and professional men in their communities who will emphasize the needs of their own towns and cities and solve their own problems.

I wish I had time to tell you of the 10 great objectives which Kiwanis International has adopted for this coming year. I leave with you the administrative theme, which is: Win the war—build for peace. We recognize that after victory in Germany, whenever it comes, there will, inevitably, be a let-down, and Kiwanis clubs and other service clubs in their communities can help build the morale. We must help carry the energies of the American people through this war, lest we betray our fighting sons in the Pacific.

Reference has been made here tonight to how Kiwanis clubs and other service clubs can help to hasten a peace and help to build a permanent peace. We are going to ask our 2,243 clubs to establish, in the coming year, through forums and panels and public discussions, clear-cut debates on what a durable peace should involve, in order that we may clarify our own thinking and bring our influence to bear, and our suggestions as help to those in the legislative halls who will be confronted with the problem of building an international peace.

Many of you read a book last year with the intriguing title "A Time For Greatness" by Herbert Agar. Ladies and gentlemen, I submit to you that next year is a year for greatness, for greatness of faith, for greatness of resolution, for greatness of belief. Somehow, despite all these problems, these grave issues which confront us, if we believe in the fundamentals of American life, and if we use our influence as individual Kiwanians and through our clubs, somehow, through faith we shall be able to come through.

The last of our 10 great objectives is to stress spiritual values as basic to human problems and progress. We have come a long way along the road of materialism. America can never be saved, and this world, so grievously wounded and stricken with sorrow, can never be saved, and a new day can never be born until we get back upon the road of human values as superior to material values. I recall reading a story by Donald McKensie, a newspaper correspondent of one of the New York papers, who visited London in the fall of 1940 after London had gone through that bombing, when Hitler had all but defeated the British people. He had almost destroyed their city, but could not destroy their courage. Driving down one of the streets one day he came to where the fragments of a church were still standing, and he noticed a homemade placard on the wall of this church. He halted his taxi and walked over. This is what the poster on the fragment of the wall still standing said: "If your knees are knocking, kneel on them."

Is there a man or woman in the whole world tonight whose knees are not knocking for the fear of the future? Ladies and gentlemen, there is only one way out, and that is to find the way back through reverence and humility and penitence for this whole world. We must get on our knees and find our way back through spiritual and human values.

I close with this story and, if you will recall nothing else I have said this evening, will you please remember this. It sums up what all the previous speakers have said. It is a story of a professor of speech in a Scottish university, who, one Sabbath day, visited a friend in a small Scottish community, and they went to the village kirk or church to the service. During the service, the host arose from his place in the congregation and said to the venerable old pastor, a man past 70 who had spent his whole life in that community and knew the families intimately in their hours of joy and sorrow, "Pastor, we have a distinguished guest in our church, a professor of speech in a great Scottish university. I wonder if you and the congregation might not like to hear him repeat the Psalm of the Shepherd, the beautiful twenty-third Psalm."

The professor of speech came to the platform and recited, with all the beauty of cadence and diction and enunciation which he possessed, that glorious psalm, the Psalm of the Shepherd. The audience was visibly moved, and after the recitation when the professor of speech had taken his seat, someone in the congregation said: "Pastor, will you now repeat the twenty-third Psalm." And the pastor modestly and reluctantly said, "Yes," and without any affectation, in his simple way the old pastor repeated the twenty-third Psalm, and when he had concluded there was hardly a dry eye in the house.

As they walked home afterward, the man who was entertaining the professor of speech for dinner said: "Did you notice the strange thing which happened? When you repeated the twenty-third Psalm, the congregation was visibly moved, but when the pastor gave the Psalm of the Shepherd, there was hardly a dry eye in the congregation. How do you explain that?" And the professor of speech, who must have been a very wise man and modest withal, said: "That is very simple. I know the Psalm, but he knows the Shepherd."

That is the difference between lip patriotism and patriotism which wells from the heart. That is the difference between the casual Kiwanian and the Kiwanian whose soul and loyalties are stirred by the ideals of our organization. And, in facing these critical days to come, may we have a loyalty of the heart and a seriousness of purpose as we dedicate the great energies and power of our organization to play a part in the reconstruction of our world.

Thank you.

Address by Lt. Col. S. G. Neff at Nebraska State Reclamation Association Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Lt. Col. S. G. Neff, Corps of Engineers district engineer, Kansas City district, at the Nebraska State Reclamation Association meeting held in Lincoln, Nebr., on January 20, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER VALLEY

It is a pleasure and a privilege for me to be here with you today, and I want you to know that I appreciate this opportunity of meeting you and talking to you. Although I am not a Nebraskan, I feel at home with you, for I have always been a resident of the Missouri River Valley. There is hardly a tributary of any tributary of the Missouri River that I have not been the length of, and when I think of this great territory I an conscious of its present wealth and the wealth of the resources within the valley that have yet to be developed. Nebraska should certainly be interested in this development, for it lies wholly within the Missouri River Valley and is the only one of the nine States of the valley of which this can be said. South Dakota almost falls into this category, but not quite. My most pleasant memories are of the fishing and hunting in the headwaters of the Missouri River. I was raised at Cody, Wyo., where one of the first Federal reclamation projects was undertaken. It was there, while watching construction of the Shoshone Dam, that I decided to be an engineer. I wanted to learn how to drive a tunnel from both ends and make it meet in the center of a mountain. There has been such great development since those days, and one feels proud to know he has been a part of it.

It might appear that I am giving a life history of myself, but my knowledge of the river basin has been gained by close asscciation with its development since 1928, when, as a civilian engineer, I went to work for the Corps of Engineers at Kansas City. At that time the Corps of Engineers was starting the comprehensive survey of the water resources of the Missouri River and its tributaries.

The report, as a result of that survey, is referred to as the "308 Report." If you have never traveled the length and breadth of the Missouri River Basin you cannot comprehend the magnitude and unlimited resources of the river. In the course of 5 years we surveyed and reported on some four or five hundred dams, reservoirs, and various other projects connected with the development of the water resources of the Missouri River. Several of those projects have been built by Federal, State, or private agencies since the survey started. There are the Pathfinder and Alcova Dams built by the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of power and irrigation of land in Wyoming; the power development of the Loup River and the unusual tri-county project, both of which were constructed by agencies of the State of Nebraska. Let me here give credit to Professor Mickey, of the University of Nebraska, for the foresight and engineering courage he displayed in making the tri-county project a reality. He had the vision that was necessary to see the end results of such an undertaking. I remember going to his office at the University of Nebraska where he explained the proposed plan to Lieutenant Young, now deceased, and myself. I was 15 years younger then, and not much impressed with what appeared to be such a fantastic scheme. However, we made a survey of the entire plan, and the more we got into the details of the project the more feasible it appeared. A great part of that project is now constructed, and not long ago I went over it from end to end. I got a thrill out of seeing Johnson Reservoir, Sutherland Reservoir, the miles and miles of canals, and the powerhouses there on the ground in front of men. Years before they were on sheets of paper. The engineer never gets rich, but he gets some big moments out of life.

I must not neglect to mention Fort Peck, the next to the largest reservoir in the world. Mr. F. E. Fahlquist, of Boston, and I made the first investigation of the site in 1932. The valley was so wide that one could hardly call it a dam site, but it was a good site where a large amount of storage could be had at low cost. An amusing incident occurred at the site shortly before construction started. General Moore, the division engineer, Colonel Wyman, his assistant, and Mr. Coleman, mayor of Glasgow, Mont., were out from Glasgow to look over the dam site. They stopped their car on the west abutment, got out, and stood looking across the valley. The mayor asked where the dam was to be built, and when he discovered that he was looking at the site he remarked: "Why, it would cost a million dollars to build a dam across here." After 8 years of work it had cost about $130,000,000.

There are also extensive river improvements between Sioux City and St. Louis that many people do not know much about. Here are 760 miles of tamed river that at one time ran wild, cutting banks away, destroying farm land and property, and in general making a nuisance of itself. Floods still occur along this stretch, as we all know, but your land is not being washed and cut away, and in the not too distant future we hope that the valley will be protected from such floods as you have experienced the past 3 years. For one who has seen the shipping on the Mississippi River and some of its tributaries, it is easy to visualize heavy river traffic on the Missouri River when the 9-foot channel is a reality, and I am sure it will be a reality.

So much for what has been accomplished in the valley. Now let us look to the future and see what is yet to be accomplished here in Nebraska. A great start has been made, and it is our job to go on with this development. There are so many things to be done, and we should be at it as soon as possible. The State of Nebraska has a big stake in this. You have land to be irrigated, power to be developed, floods to be controlled, land to be saved from erosion, reforestation, preservation of wildlife, and many other problems that will call on everyone of us to put forth our best effort. I can name one problem that will give all of us something to think about. How are you going to control a flood on the Elkhorn River such as the one experienced last summer? There must be some way to do it, but it won't be easy. The thing for me to do is let Colonel Freeman help you figure it out. I have some problems of my own in Kansas City.

There is a great deal of land in Nebraska that needs irrigation, and it is not going to be easy to get water to all of it. It can be done; however, it will take a concentrated effort on your part, along with engineering skill in planning for it. Nebraska's need for irrigation reminds me of a plea for irrigation made by a Nebraskan years ago. He stated that the farmers in a particular area sowed in hope, cultivated in doubt, and harvested in despair. Not a very cheerful outlook, but we all know how often parts of your State have experienced such discouragement. Few things ever happen just right by mere accident. If it is a success or a triumph, you may be sure that someone or many have spent much time or effort to perfect it. There has been planning and teamwork, trial and failure, and trial again, with no giving up. There must be a definite objective with a desire and willingness to see it through. Such a spirit is essential in carrying out the development of this Missouri River Valley. We must make sure in our planning that we do not allow selfish interests to influence the development or destruction of our resources to the extent that valuable resources are lost to us forever. Thousands of good acres should not be inundated by a reservoir so that hundreds of acres of marginal land can be protected against infrequent flood. A low dam should not be constructed which would preclude the construction of a higher dam later on, provided a higher dam is economical and necessary for the full development of the water and land resources. Regardless of whether you favor private or public power development, no dam should be built without the necessary provision for the future generation of power if it is at all likely that the generation of electric power would be economical and desirable at some future date. Politics and trends of thought change from time to time, but we have only so much in natural resources, and they should be developed sanely and unselfishly. There must be a well-thought-out plan and a willingness to cooperate among yourselves and the agency delegated to carry on the work. There must be a trusting understanding and a willingness and a desire to work together for the greatest benefit to the greatest number. Without such cooperation, there will be many delays and set-backs in this development that we are all so interested in.

I know that you are all interested in the projects that have to do with the development of the resources of your State. Colonel Freeman has outlined the activities of the Corps of Engineers of the Omaha district affecting the State of Nebraska. I shall endeavor to cover briefly the activities of the Kansas City district office with regard to the projects on streams within the State of Nebraska. The principal streams of Nebraska within the Kansas City district are, in their order of importance, the Republican River, the Big and Little Blue Rivers, and the Nemaha River. The most important, of course, is the Republican, which presents problems in flood control, irrigation, and possibly the development of some power. The Big and Little Blue Rivers and the Nemaha have flood-control problems to be soved. It is unikely that much irrigation or power development will be undertaken on these relatively small streams within the near future. A review of the survey report of the Kansas River Basin, which includes the Republican River and the Big and Little Blue Rivers, is in the last stage of completion. It is quite likely that this report will be in shape for this session of Congress. The 1944 Flood Control Act, in addition to the authorized Harlan County Reservoir, includes the following reservoirs: Bonny Reservoir on the South Fork of the Republican River; Pioneer Reservoir, on the Arikaree River; Enders Reservoir, on Frenchman Creek; Culbertson Reservoir, on the Republican River; Red Willow Reservoir, on Red Willow Creek; Medicine Creek Reservoir, on Medicine Creek.

These reservoirs have been agreed on by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers and, as I have previously stated, are a part of the present flood-control bill. It is quite likely that each of these, when constructed, will contribute to the storage of water for flood control on the Republican River and the irrigation of land within the State of Nebraska. To my knowledge, it has not been determined which of the two Government agencies will be responsible for the development of these projects on the headwaters of the Republican River.

The Harlan County Reservoir and irrigation project on the main stem of the Republican River is one of the major flood-control and irrigation projects yet to be developed in the State of Nebraska. The project was authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1941. The district office at Kansas City has completed the definite project report on the dam and reservoir and is now engaged in the preparation of final plans and specifications. Actual construction of this project of course cannot be undertaken until the war is won and the present restrictions on civil construction are lifted. The present plans call for a 105-foot earth dam to be constructed across the main valley of the Republican River near Republican City, Nebr., and just a few miles below the mouth of Prairie Dog Creek. At full pool elevation, the reservoir will extend up the main stem of the Republican River a distance of 15 miles and store approximately 850,000 acre-feet of water. This amount of storage will provide 200,000 acre-feet for silting allowance, 150,000 acre-feet for irrigation, and 500,000 acre-feet for flood control, which is equivalent to a run-off of 0.7 of an inch from the total drainage area of 13,300 square miles above the dam site and below the tributary reservoirs. This 500,000 acre-feet of flood-control storage will more than store the flood of May and June of 1935, which has been computed to be 480,000 acre-feet. The peak flow for this flood in the vicinity of the dam site was 260,000 second-feet. Fortunately, this rate of flow lasted only a short time. Agricultural lands subject to flood hazards between the dam site and the mouth of the Republican River comprise 154,000 acres. Of course, there are many thousands of additional acres along the Kansas River and Missouri River that will be benefited. It is estimated that a total of 86,700 acres of land in Nebraska and Kansas can be irrigated from the water stored in the reservoir. The development of the irrigation will be undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation. It is undecided at this time as to whether power will be a part of the initial development. However, it is quite likely that in any case provision will be made for the future deevlopment of hydroelectric power by including penstocks in the initial construction.

There are two flood-control projects in the Republican River Valley in Nebraska that are not associated with the construction of reservoirs. The proposed basin-wide plan includes local flood protection for Bartley, Nebr., from floods on Dry Creek, and local flood protection for Indianola from floods arising in the Coon Creek Basin. Similar protection is planned for both towns which includes the construction of levees, bridge alterations, and channel rectification.

The Big and Little Blue Rivers do not offer much opportunity for the construction of large reservoirs for either flood control, power, or irrigation. However, local flood-control projects are included in our plan of development. They are, for the most part, small undertakings for the protection of communities located along the streams which have experienced considerable damage from past floods. The work generally embraces the construction of walls or levees and channel rectification. The present review report of the Kansas River and its tributaries includes in the recommended plan local flood protection for Beatrice and Hubbell on the Big Blue River.

As for the Nemaha River, very little has been done up to this time with regard to the survey that was recently authorized by Congress. A hearing was held at Falls City on September 8, 1944, for the purpose of determining the attitude of the local people regarding their flood problems, and at the same time to get as much information as possible which might assist in the study and preparation of a plan of development for the watershed.

These projects that I have discussed briefly, give you some idea as to the part the Kansas City office of the Corps of Engineers has in the development of your water resources here in Nebraska. I assure you that we have the greatest desire to work with you and for you in this great undertaking that lies before us. There is much work to be done, and it is going to stretch over a long period, but by working together we shall certainly make progress in the right direction with a minimum of mistakes and regrets.

It has been a pleasure to be with you, to meet new and old friends, and I wish to express my appreciation for being included on this program.

Surplus Property Disposal Through the Wholesaler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Surplus Property Disposal Through the Wholesaler," expressing the views of L. J. Carleton of Manchester, N. H., a distinguished businessman of that city.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Underwear and Hosiery Review of January 1945]

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL THROUGH THE WHOLESALER—PROGRAM WILL BENEFIT MANY SMALL MERCHANTS SAYS HOSIERY AND UNDERWEAR DISTRIBUTOR AT SENATE COMMITTEE HEARING IN WASHINGTON

The case of the wholesaler as a logical channel for the distribution of surplus Government goods, with special reference to hosiery, underwear, and other related textiles, was forcefully brought to the attention of the Senate Committee on Small Business at a hearing held in Washington December 12. It is rather significant that among those invited to the hearing to present his views on the subject was L. J. Carleton, a practical wholesaler of dry goods, who offered constructive suggestions for a program of distribution that will result in "freedom of purchase of surplus goods for some 1,647,150 independent merchants located throughout the United States, each doing a business of less than $100,000 a year."

The program outlined by Mr. Carleton, who is the head of L. J. Carleton Co., Inc., wholesalers of hosiery, underwear and other dry goods, at Manchester, N. H., was received with much interest by the committee which is now giving it serious consideration.

Mr. Carleton, who is a member of the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute and is actively identified with the National Association of Small Businessmen, urged the adoption of a program which would utilize the facilities of established wholesale firms for the most equitable distribution of textile and other consumer surplus goods and thus avoid the speculative practices and unfair competition that prevailed after the First World War.

The views expressed by Mr. Carleton at the Senate committee hearing, as here reproduced in full detail, are of particularly timely interest, as the subject will come up for discussion at the eighteenth annual convention of the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute, Inc., to be held at the Hotel New Yorker in New York on January 17, 18, 19. Lee R. Fleming, manager of the Zion Mills, Marshall-Field & Co., who was selected by the Secretary of the Treasury to serve as Director of the Textile Division, Office of Surplus Property, will speak on The Story of Surplus Property at the January 18 session of the convention.

"Please do not assume or gather from my remarks that my study on the matter of the disposal of consumer goods is totally in the interest of wholesalers," Mr. Carleton declared at the Senate hearing. "Frankly I am more definitely concerned about the interest of small business enterprise and in the welfare of returning servicemen. My remarks have a significant bearing on the act known as the Surplus Property Act of 1944, relative to objectives as outlined in section 2, also Disposition to Veterans covered by section 16 and Small Business covered by section 18.

"I strenuously oppose any proposed legislation that may be set up to work to any special degree for the definite interest of big business, speculative interests, or monopolistic practices which would result to the detriment of small business enterprise.

"In the March 3 issue of United States News the statement was made that 'sealed bids are the rule, in most cases, with all bids above ceilings to be rejected.' In my estimation, sales by method of sealed bids will have a detrimental effect on fair and equitable distribution and fair competition. Purchase of surplus consumer goods through the sealed-bid program could possibly lead toward monopolistic practices. The opportunity might exist whereby large operators or speculative interests could connive some method of purchase in order to obtain the total amount of a certain item that would be offered in the various zones.

NEW ITEMS SHOULD CARRY FIXED QUOTATIONS

"It must be considered that the small merchant in filing a bid for his requirements through a Government agency would doubtless be in a position to bid on (for example) a few dozen hosiery, shirts, pants, sheets, etc., or whatever the item might be. I see the picture, with no definite program having been formulated to take care of this condition.

"Another important point to be considered is that only through the service of some wholesaler or wholesalers can a returning serviceman collect the supplies needed to engage in any line of retail business. For his opening stock he could only go to a wholesale house to economically get together the goods he will need to embark in business. Only through a wholesaler can he secure his small part of the consumer surplus property.

"The wholesaler, from an economic standpoint, carries out the highly important function of serving department stores as well as the so-called small businessman with civilian goods from the sources of supply and in quantities to meet their requirements. The reputable wholesaler serves the small businessman in the capacity of warehousing—equitable distribution—banker in the extension of credit and business adviser.

"I advocate a program whereby new items in surplus consumer goods should carry a

fixed quotation and have equitable distribution throughout our Nation. Distribution should be made on an impartial basis throughout established regional territories. Surplus goods in the used or salvage brackets are not covered by the above suggestion. However, the sales of used and salvage material are in need of a definite and well-supervised program."

SHOULD RECEIVE ADVANCE NOTICE OF SALE

Mr. Carleton quoted from an article giving his views on the surplus-goods problem in relation to hosiery, underwear, and other textiles, which appeared in the February 1944 issue of the Underwear and Hosiery Review and reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 90, part 9, page A1644. He then recommended that boards or commissions to cover sales of consumer surplus goods should be appointed in various regional territories and that these should be composed of businessmen who are familiar with local market conditions.

A wholesaler, he then stated, must be classified as an establishment presently engaged in the business of selling hosiery, underwear, or goods of a textile nature to retailers generally, with at least 50 percent volume of sales from out-of-stock merchandise (not considering drop shipments).

"Furthermore, it should be definitely understood that every wholesaler in each zone should have advance notice from his board, stating the date, also item of surplus goods that are to be released for sale—this procedure in order that merchandise may be offered in a fair and impartial manner."

EXPERIENCE AFTER FIRST WORLD WAR

He quoted from another part of the article in which he suggested that in the case of surplus goods not acceptable from the standpoint of styles and colors for civilian use, or so-called victory merchandise that the domestic public may not be interested in when they can doubtless get a supply of up-to-date goods, these should be disposed of through lend-lease.

"It is recalled that after the First World War," Mr. Carleton informed the members of the Senate committee, "the distribution of governmental surplus goods was handled principally by special types of stores that mushroomed during that period. Will our Government sanction a repetition of this condition?

"I am informed that in 1944 a national trade association composed of interests concerned principally with the distribution of surplus goods had already been incorporated. L. J. Carleton Co received through the mails the association's application blank covering annual membership fee of $25 for the small retail trade, and association membership fee of $100 covering publishers, manufacturers, and wholesalers.

"In my estimation no wholesaler or retailer participating in the distribution of surplus Government goods should be obligated in any way to the payment of fees in order to have the privilege of buying his rightful share of such merchandise."

Mr. Carleton quoted from an article in the September 1944 issue of Fortune magazine as to the unsolved question of how the small businessman is to obtain a share of the surplus property inventory when it is sold. The part quoted by him read as follows:

"There are already many complaints. The lots, it is said, are too big for the smaller dealer; he hears about the sales too late and doesn't hear about some of the offerings at all; the descriptions of the merchandise are vague and, unlike his larger competitors or the professionals, he can't afford a trip to a distant depot or warehouse in order to see samples of the actual merchandise. If everyone is to have a chance to buy, it will take smart merchandising—good catalogs, small lots, frequent sales, widely dispersed selling points, and credit terms. The plans, except for credit, which will require legislation, are not yet visible.

"If people are to believe that all are sharing alike, far more information on sales will be needed than is now available. There will have to be a regular accounting of the kinds of merchandise being sold, the volume of sales, the Government's realization, and the kind of buyers participating. At present this information is either unavailable or exceedingly difficult to find."

"These points above mentioned are quite well covered by my suggested program of distribution through the wholesaler," Mr. Carleton said. "Through the wholesale channel the items of good catalogs, small lots, frequent sales, widely dispersed selling contacts, and credit terms, in my estimation, will be well taken care of by the wholesaler and thereby result in a real saving by our Government."

ADVANTAGES OF DISTRIBUTION BY WHOLESALERS

"The wholesaler, from an economic standpoint, carries the highly important function of serving department stores as well as the so-called small businesman with consumer goods indirectly from the source of supply and in quantities to meet his requirements. The manufacturer, or any source of supply from a quantity standpoint (be it textile goods, food products, hardware, footwear, etc.), find it economically sound to distribute their wares through designated distributors throughout our Nation.

"This procedure eliminates for the manufacturer cumbersome bookkeeping records, simplifies and concentrates credit matters, as well as eliminates the work involved in making small shipments of possible a few items to individual accounts. In connection with this thought could not the Government well be considered as a manufacturing unit insofar as sales and merchandising of surplus goods are concerned?"

CITES DISADVANTAGES OF DIRECT SALES

"Sales of surplus goods direct to retail trade outlets only would tend somewhat to centralize sales primarily to metropolitan areas, inasmuch as department stores (with group buying facilities), also various numbers of large city retailers and chain stores are set up from a buying standpoint to be more definite and consistent contact with sources of supply. The small businessman located in urban territory or within the vast expanse of our country finds it inconvenient to contact the manufacturer or sources of supply located at distant points.

"Please do not assume that the wholesaler is interested to any degree in monopolistic practices with respect to purchase and sale of surplus consumer goods. The large metropolitan department stores in cities in excess of 250,000 population and operating prior to 1940 with annual sales volume of an amount to be determined, also group chain stores operating prior to 1940 with Nation-wide distribution, are customarily or commercially entitled to their share of surplus goods on a direct basis.

"However, the wholesaler and our Government as well, should be vitally interested in making it easy and convenient for the small retailer to buy his share of such goods, and our servicemen, many with limited capital and with a desire to enter the retail mercantile business, should also have an equal opportunity to purchase their share of surplus goods in lots to suit their convenience.

"As I see the picture, the bona fide wholesaler on his purchase basis of list cost, less trade discount of 16⅔ percent, is the logical outlet for sales to small business enterprises.

"The L. J. Carleton Co. recently received from a New York concern, Merchandise of Surplus Goods, an illustrated circular offering for sale a combination hood and cap made for the United States Coast Guard. This well-made cap is constructed of specially tested cloth with an all-wool siding. The cap is water-repellent and warm enough for subzero weather—perfect for hunting, camping, or any outdoor work. Price depends upon quantities ordered in various sized lots, namely in 5-dozen lots at $10 per dozen, up to 1,000 dozen at $7.20 per dozen.

"Bear in mind that the sales circular on this cap carries the notation;—'Similar caps are now offered for $2 each, at retail, in top-ranking national weekly magazines.' Can you imagine what the father of some serviceman, located in rural territory would have to pay for this cap when the small businessman, (if interested) must base his cost price on his purchase in lots of 5 dozen at $10 per dozen (83⅓ cents each)? The operator who could purchase 1,000 dozen would pay $7.20 per dozen (60 cents each) and I wonder what his price to the consumer would be?

"I herewith offer for your consideration the following sales analysis basing the cap as having a $1.50 retail value.

"Consumer ceiling cost price $1.50 each ($18 dozen).

"Retailer's ceiling cost price $18 a dozen less trade discount 33⅓ percent or net cost $12.

"Department stores, chain and mail-order houses previously referred to 33⅓ percent and 5 percent or net cost $11.40.

"Wholesaler's ceiling cost price $18 dozen less trade discount 33⅓ percent and 16⅔ percent or net cost $10 per dozen.

"This chart in checking from a profit standpoint shows retailers' profit 33⅓ percent on their selling price of $18, department stores, chains and mail-order concerns profit 33⅓ percent and 5 percent on their selling price of $18, and wholesalers' profit 16⅔ percent on their selling price of $12.

"It could be possible to establish a program on surplus Consumer Goods Disposal that would harmonize with the O. P. A. program. In order to reconcile the above statement to the O. P. A. schedule (as I understand it), the following schedule is possible: The Government establishes a fixed selling price on the above item of $10 per dozen cost to the wholesale trade. The wholesaler's selling price must not exceed a profit of 16⅔ percent on his sale price of $12 which should be O. P. A. wholesalers ceiling. Chains and mail-order concerns must not exceed a profit of 33⅓ percent and 5 percent on their sale price of $1.50 which should be O. P. A. ceiling for this group. Other retailers' prices must not exceed a profit of 33⅓ percent on their selling price of $1.50 which should be O. P. A. retailers' ceiling.

"It is imperative that you gentlemen bear in mind that no wholesaler could continue to exist if he were to merchandise all of his wares on a profit basis of 16⅔ percent. It just can't be done. Furthermore, it is a well-known fact that a majority of retailers must realize a profit percentage in excess of 33⅓ percent in order to operate successfully.

"To summarize, I am convinced that the wholesalers throughout the Nation are vitally interested in the sale of surplus consumer goods, not so much from a profit standpoint, but are conscientiously interested in the welfare and in the service they can render to their customers—the small businessmen of our Nation. They are willing to sacrifice a margin of profit on the sale of surplus goods for the welfare of small-business enterprise.

"I am confident that wholesalers and retailers alike will aid and cooperate fully with a fair and favorable governmental program in order to be of help in disposing of surplus consumer goods based on a small margin of profit for them. They recognize the benefits to be derived through the establishment of a program that will call for distribution of surplus goods through regular established channels and out of the hands of speculators—and away from the unjust competition that existed after World War No. 1."

The Rape of Europa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Rape of Europa," which appeared in the Atlantic Monthly for January 1945.

Mr. Francis Henry Taylor, the author of this article, is director of the Metropolitan Museum in New York, and visited England and France last summer as a member of the American Commission for the Salvage and Protection of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas.

I have checked with the Public Printer with reference to the cost, and am advised that the article slightly exceeds the number of words permitted for insertion in the Appendix without reporting the cost, which the Public Printer now informs me will be $104. Regardless of this, I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAPE OF EUROPA

(By Francis Henry Taylor)

I

When Hitler triumphantly entered Paris in 1940, he went immediately to the tomb of Napoleon at the Invalides. As he stood there in the great rotunda, what were the emotions of this neurotic Austrian paperhanger who had cast himself in the role of the Corsican corporal? Was Paris the ultimate of Hitler's wish fulfillment? Was his reckless desire to sit upon the imperial throne of his great idol the madness which inhibited him from plucking the ripe fruits of Britain as they lay within his grasp beyond the sands of Dunkerque? Was it his hope that this later Pius would place the crown of Lombardy upon his brow in St. Peter's and thus seal with a concordat of illegitimacy the fate of 2,000 years of Christian civilization? In which case, would Paris have remained the cultural capital of Europe?

These were the questions which raced through the mind of the visitor to Paris immediately after the liberation. For Paris appeared virtually unscathed, more beautiful, more radiant than ever. From the long and wonderfully empty avenues leading into the heart of the city one felt the elation which comes only to those emerging after deep sleep from illness. The will to live had conquered. Paris as a supreme creation of the mind of man had paralyzed the hand that tried to seize her. And possibly it was the ghost of Napoleon himself that broke the mold into which this little Nazi upstart was so busily pouring his grotesque ambitions. Even the sniggering theft of two thousand Napoleonic items from the Musée de l'Armée upon Hitler's personal order to the Kommandant of Paris could not delay the deflation of this completely unauthentic Caesar.

Paris was the symbol of the unattainable. To Hitler she was a spiritual vision. One can imagine the visionary of Berchtesgaden standing at the great plate-glass windows of his eyrie overlooking the hills and valleys of a Wagnerian dream world, and conjuring up not merely the glories of Africa and Italy but the rewards of the Tuileries and Fontainebleau. To the other Nazis with grosser appetites, Paris was to be overcome by force if necessary, but much rather to be seduced by the irresistible virility of a master race. London was to be destroyed as the symbol of a power which would be forever inimical to the greater destiny of Europe.

Rome, on the other hand, had always troubled the Nazi conscience. And, since the ecclesiastical sanctions of the Pope might still be useful in attaining at least the episcopal trappings of imperial authority, it might be better to leave well enough alone. The ancient city republics of Italy would have to pay the price instead. Destruction, vengeance, terrorism would be the foundations of a new aesthetic, and on the rubble of the towns of northern Europe would arise a new culture of which Paris would remain the gay and prostituted capital.

The pattern of looting was long established. In November 1942, Soviet armies captured a German officer, Obersturmführer Normann Foerster of the Fourth Company of the Special Service Battalion of the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "The battalion," he stated in his deposition, "had been formed on the initiative of von Ribbentrop, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and acted under his direction. The commander of this battalion is Maj. von Kuensberg of the SS troops. The Special Service Battalion is charged with the task of seizing, immediately after the fall of large cities, the cultural and historical treasures and the libraries of scientific institutions, to select valuable books, first editions, and films and to send all of this to Germany."

This deposition, which was published in the bulletin of the Embassy of the U. S. S. R., Washington (No. 138, November 19, 1942), continues: "The Special Service Battalion consists of four companies. The First Company is attached to the German Expeditionary Corps in Africa, the Second to the Northern Army Group, the Third to the Central Army Group. The First Company is now in Naples, Italy, where it awaits a chance to be transferred to Africa. The battalion headquarters is located in Berlin at house No. 6, Hermann Göringstrasse. Confiscated material is stored on the premises of the shop of the Adler Trading Firm in Gardenbergstrasse."

A year later General von Mannstein in an order taken from a German prisoner captured in Italy confirmed the policy of the high command:

"Our pillage must be organized and methodical. We must take as many lightweight valuable objects as possible, such as jewels, precious metals and stones, works of art, religious treasures, books, linen, stamps, etc., so that they can be sold as easily as possible and transferred into cash deposits in safe and inviolable places. * * * This looting together with the destruction of factories and machinery and the terrors of deportation and scientific famine imposed on children and civilians should insure a speedy revenge."

Obviously such a military program could not have been undertaken without many years of preparation. The looting of Poland was so thorough and complete that the official figures of the Polish Government in London put the plunder and destruction of museums at 95 percent; libraries, from 60 to 70 percent; archives, 40 percent; and churches, over 30 percent. The cultural heritage of Poland has been destroyed, all private property confiscated. Moreover, when the Nazis plundered and stole, they took pains to burn all records, catalogs, and inventories which might later be used in evidence against them by courts of claims. The looting was systematically carried on under the direction of German art historians, notably Dagobert Frey of Breslau, Clasen of Königsberg, and Pinder of Berlin, whose students for years had been making inventories of art treasures in Poland and Czechoslovakia under the guise of historical researches.

Russia, next to the countries of central Europe, felt most severely the scourging hand upon the cities which fell to the enemy. The palace of Catherine the Great at Tsarskoye Selo was stripped, Chinese silks and tapestries torn off the walls, antique furniture and paneling shipped to Berlin. Even the inlaid floods were packed and sent away. The celebrated library of French and Russian books and manuscrips were pillaged. Peterhof was looted before it was burned, and the suburbs of Leningrad were sacked. Kiev, the religious and scientific center of old Russia, was emptied of its treasures, particularly the great collections and libraries of the university and the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The churches, the pride of Russian orthodoxy, and museums were likewise stripped before they were set on fire. What is true of Kiev is equally true of Kharkov and Krasnodar, of Lvov and Odessa, of Vinnitsa, Chernigov, and Poltava. In these latter cities the destruction and theft of scientific and especially medical equipment indirectly revealed the German's intention of destroying the population.

II

In August 1943, when President Roosevelt appointed, under the chairmanship of Associate Justice Owen J. Roberts of the Supreme Court, the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, no one dared hope that the art of Europe would get off so easily as it has. The Nazis had repeatedly made clear their intentions, and we knew too well what they had done in Poland and in Russia. Italy was still an ally, feeble as she may have been, and France and the Low Countries were prizes too rich to destroy while they could still be exploited. Discretion and calculation, therefore, rather than humanitarian or intellectual considerations, stayed the hand of the plunderer.

The national collections in France had been put away to safety in 1939 in the cellars of châteaus in the south. Here the objects of the museums were being properly cared for by competent experts acting under the direction of the Nazi military authorities. And as the Germans, flushed with conquest, could not bring themselves to believe in the possibility of a successful invasion, they thought it best to leave these depositories undisturbed.

Not all the State treasures of France, however, escaped from German hands. Looting was carried on in high places, as is evidenced by the birthday gift to Hermann Goering by Abel Bonnard, the Vichy Minister of Education, of the Ghent altarpiece by the brothers van Eyck which had been entrusted to the Louvre for safekeeping by the Belgian Government. Bonnard signed an order for its removal from a depository at Aix-en-Provence over the head of Jacques Jaujard, director of the Musées Nationaux de France, who did not discover the theft until a month later.

Jaujard's violent protests to Vichy and the German authorities resulted in his dismissal from the Louvre. Thereupon the entire staffs of the museums of France resigned in a body. The scandal was more than even the Germans could explain. Since they sought to placate public opinion wherever possible, they insisted that Jaujard be immediately reinstated. Thus the prestige which he derived personally from this courageous act and the unity which it produced among his colleagues went far to protect the national collections from further pillaging during the occupation.

But the private collections of France no longer exist. The pattern of Poland and Russia was ruthlessly followed, although the Germans tried assiduously to cloak their thievery with some form of legal fiction.

Rigged auction sales of private property were paid for with worthless occupation marks. Prices soared; even where sales were not forced, nearly everyone was obliged to turn in family heirlooms in order to buy food in the black market. The slightest infractions of the ceaseless police regulations which were making life miserable for every citizen were punished with fantastic fines for which the money had to be raised by selling personal property. Nazi officers and Vichy officials accepted gladly "gifts in kind" from persons whose passports and identity papers were otherwise held up. Many a splendid apartment remained intact, however, by a simple little arrangement with the lady of the house. In fact, Mrs. Warren's professional solicitude for the arts has been one of the minor blessings for which we should be naively grateful.

As the veneer of correctness wore thinner during the 4 years of occupation, the true nature of German culture became more and more apparent. Increased pressure was put upon museum officials to release important works of art for cultural exchanges with Germany. The Bayeux Tapestry was among those items which a few weeks prior to the liberation had been requisitioned by the high command. Removed from the deposit in the Chateau de Sourches near Rennes because of Patton's break through the German lines, it was brought to the Louvre for transshipment to Germany. Less than 10 days after its arrival Paris was freed and the Nazi plan was never carried out. Nothing can show more clearly how little thought the Germans had given to the possibility of evacuation.

By 1942 the gloves were off and outright confiscation was in progress. The Vichy laws depriving Jews of all civil rights and property were enforced and the great collections of the Rothschilds and others were sent to the small gallery of the Jeu de Paume in the Tuileries which became the collecting center for confiscated property as well as the headquarters for that benevolent organization known as the Administration des Biens Juifs. To this gallery came periodically the agents of the party leaders, art historians, museum directors, and archaeologists employed personally by Hitler, Goering, Himmler, and those of lesser rank. These experts divided the booty among themselves and superintended the expedition of shipments to Berlin, to Berchtesgaden, to Karinhalle (Goering's palace in East Prussia), and to the museum at Linz which Hitler has built as a memorial to his mother. What was not wanted by these learned connoisseurs was sold preferentially to art dealers who had won special consideration by their collaboration.

III

So many stories have been written by war correspondents concerning the destruction of European art and architecture by military action, in dispatches containing both sense and sentimental nonsense, that before adding up the dreadful account and discussing the philosophy and principles of restitution, it may be well to examine briefly the facts as they are revealed in the official reports. For while a great deal, to be sure, has been destroyed, it is nothing less than a miracle that with an entire continent in flames it has been possible to save so much.

It must be borne in mind, above all things, that this has been from the beginning a total war. It was the proudest boast of Germany that it should be so, and Hitler proclaimed it to the world in Mein Kampf. No thoughtful person expected anything other than the Götterdämmerung. But war is waged, not by a single force alone, but by two opposing armies. To preserve what lies in the pathway of battle becomes the joint responsibility of the generals on both sides. Unilateral action is at best an improvisation; and in view of Germany's frank lust for destruction, the efforts of our armies were very often quixotic and in vain. But General Eisenhower was nonetheless insistent on what our policy should be. On December 29, 1943, he sent the following letter to all allied commanders in Italy—a letter which was repeated again in almost identical terms for the northern theater shortly after D-day:

"Today we are fighting in a country which has contributed a great deal to our cultural inheritance, a country rich in monuments which by their creation helped, and now in their old age illustrate, the growth of the civilization which is ours. We are bound to respect those monuments so far as war allows.

"If we have to choose between destroying a famous building and sacrificing our own men, then our men's lives count infinitely more and the buildings must go. But the choice is not always so clear cut as that. In many cases the monuments can be spared without any detriment to operational needs. Nothing can stand against the argument of military necessity. That is an accepted principle. But the phrase 'military necessity' is sometimes used where it would be more truthful to speak of military convenience or even of personal convenience. I do not want it to cloak slackness or indifference.

"It is a responsibility of higher commanders to determine through A. M. G. officers the locations of historical monuments whether they be immediately ahead of our front lines or in areas occupied by us. This information passed to lower echelons through normal channels places the responsibility on all commanders of complying with the spirit of this letter."

Remarkable as this letter is, what is even more remarkable is the astonishing cooperation which the Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives officers attached to the various armies have received from their field commanders. Old-line Regulars who have devoted their lives to the study of firepower know the meaning and possibilities of destruction far better than men appointed from civil life, and it is possibly their inside knowledge of these things that makes them pay such particular attention to the protection of monuments. Whatever it is, posterity will be able to thank the Montgomerys and the Bradleys, the Alexanders and the Pattons, of this war for having preserved intact the vast majority of the artistic resources of France and Italy. And what is true of field commanders and artillery officers is even more true of the bomber commands and their gallant crews who take the most desperate risks in pinpoint bombing in order to spare a cathedral or famous palace.

Briefed in advance with maps supplied by committees of scholars in America and Britain, the Civil Affairs officers are further fortified with instructions regarding the emergency care of monuments which come under the jurisdiction of the armies to which they are attached. They are also given lists of local museum authorities, experts, and architects upon whom they can call for assistance. If damage through military action has endangered a famous historic shrine and, for example, has left it exposed to the elements, they call upon the military government to shore up walls or close in roofs to prevent further deterioration. In Italy they have gone even further, and it is interesting to note that the porch and roof of San Lorenzo, the only historic building damaged by our Air Force in the raid on Rome, has now been restored under the joint supervision of the Allied Control Commission and the Vatican. Costs for such emergency operations will be charged to reparations accounts.

In the early days of the Italian campaign, and before the American Commission was established, there was relatively greater damage reported, particularly at Palermo and at Naples. But Sicily came through with all the great Norman monuments of Monreale, Cefalù, and the Capella Palatina unscathed. It was the later Baroque churches which fared the worst.

In Naples too the Baroque churches, because of the conspicuousness of their high domes, were badly used in the early days of the bombardment. Much damage is reported around the harbor. The great library of the university was burned by German soldiers who, on the order of the kommandant, poured kerosene on the shelves and exploded hand grenades in the alcoves, but the museum, the greater part of whose contents had been moved first to Monte Cassino and then to the Vatican, was unhurt. The heavy sculpture had been sandbagged and protected and was undisturbed. Serious damage occurred in Pompeii in the new excavations, although to the average tourist this city of ancient ruins will not appear to have greatly changed. Only the archaeologist will be deeply concerned, and he may find his consolation in the fact that Herculaneum, Pozzuoli, Cumae, and Minturno escaped entirely. He can also look forward eagerly to a constant flow of doctoral dissertations on the new objects unearthed by bomb and shell in Magna Graecia.

IV

On the path to Rome many towns, particularly Benevento, suffered dreadful losses. The Abbey of Monte Cassino has already become the subject of historic controversy. The lives and heroism of thousands of brave men were sacrificed in vain to prevent this historic and religious shrine from becoming a major military target.

Rome, save for the accident at San Lorenzo, remains in all her pristine grandeur. That Rome would be spared was fully counted on by the Italian authorities, who poured into the safety of the Vatican countless treasures from the museums of Italy. Quite recently the subcommission on Fine Arts of the Allied Control Commission, with the aid of members of the Apostolic Household and of the Italian Government, opened an exhibition of these pictures such as Rome has not seen since the Renaissance. Here are united for the first time in the Palazzo Venezia many of the greatest masterpieces not only of Rome and Naples but also of the Brera in Milan, the academy in Venice, and the gallery at Urbino.

Following the armies north to the gothic line, the story becomes more complicated and distressing until it reaches a climax in the senseless fury of German vandalism in Florence. Certain of the hill towns escaped miraculously; at Assisi no damage was done at all. In Perugia the renaissance bridges were blown up by the Germans and many houses in the suburbs were destroyed, but the old town with all its monuments and treasures escaped any serious hurt. In Orvieto a single bomb fell and destroyed one house; everything else is intact. In Spoleto the damage was confined to broken windows, loosened roof tiles, and fallen ceilings. While Arezzo suffered some bomb damage, the famous frescoes of Piero della Francesca are reported safe. Siena lost only two churches of relatively little artistic merit, thanks to the promptness of her citizens, who found the plan for demolition and deactivated the mines with which the Germans had sown the city, and to the French general who spared it from artillery fire.

San Gimignano was wantonly shelled by the Germans after their withdrawal, but the early reports of devastation were exaggerated and 49 of her 56 famous towers are said to be standing. One of the frescoes by Barna in the Collegiata was hit. Viterbo was in great part destroyed, and other towns in the pathway of the fighting suffered to a greater or

lesser degree. At Pienza, for example, there was much damage, but its great glories, the Renaissance piazzas of the Duomo and of Pius II, are intact. Fortunately, too, the large bulk of works of art from these cities which had been removed to country places was recovered, although one irreparable loss to the art world is the destruction of the Triumph of Death fresco in the Campo Santo at Pisa, a town whose cathedral and tiresome leaning tower escaped injury.

Florence, however, is another story. A third of the old city of Dante and Petrarch along the banks of the Arno has gone forever. In the words of Herbert Matthews' dispatch to the New York Times, "it is the culmination of German vandalism to date. * * * The Nazis blew up the bridges in the early morning hours of August 4 after a thorough preparation lasting several days. During that time they evacuated 50,000 persons from a 200-meter zone on both sides of the Arno River. They then set explosive charges, tranquilly looted houses at their leisure, and finally set the fuses with very little more than verbal protests of the Florentines. They did not blow up the Ponte Vecchio, and that was their greatest crime because they destroyed many medieval palaces at both ends, changing the whole aspect of old Florence. What little credit they previously got for sparing the Ponte Vecchio with its old shops must now be withdrawn."

Fortunately, the Duomo, the Baptistry, the Bargello, and the Palazzo Vecchio and most of the principal churches escaped with only minor injury. The patience and the solicitude of Gen. Sir Harold Alexander, commander in chief of the Allied forces, in gradually forcing his way into the city and across the river with infantry rather than taking it by large-scale artillery action are responsible for saving for posterity the Medicean capital. The fact remains, however—and may posterity eternally remember it—that more American and British lives were lost than Italian in preserving for mankind this most perfect unit of European civilization.

The great collections of the Medici, accumulated from the museums and palaces, had been scattered in the Tuscan countryside by the Italian authorities in convents, castles, and wine cellars. One of the dramatic incidents of the artistic history of the war was the finding by Allied troops and correspondents of Botticelli's Primavera and a host of other paintings from the Uffizi in the cellars and outbuildings of Sir Osbert Sitwell's villa. By mid-August all the depositories had been recovered. Although much casual and haphazard looting has been reported, there is evidence to conclude that, because of the diligence of the Italian museum authorities, the greater part of the public collections were respected. But this, as in the case of France, is probably more by good luck and convenience to the Germans, who were otherwise busily engaged, than by good management or high morality. What the fate of Italian art beyond the Gothic line will be, only the gods can tell.

V

The war damage in France presents a picture which differs widely from that of Italy. A section of Normandy, the triangle from Calais to Cherbourg to Rouen, has been more or less obliterated because of the intensity of the fighting following the invasion. But even there precision bombing and accuracy of artillery direction contributed to the preservation of the greatest monuments. Bayeux Cathedral and much of the city are intact. At Caen, although the town was badly shattered, the two splendid abbeys of William the Conqueror and the cathedral are standing, having suffered relatively minor injuries.

Mont St. Michel, despite the heavy fighting at St. Malo, was untouched except for certain reconstructions and fortifications which the Germans built upon its ramparts. Chartres Cathedral, only a few hundred meters from one of the principal airfields of France, escaped 4 years of bombardment without a scratch. On the day of liberation three small caliber German shells hit the south tower. But the damage was slight and can easily be repaired. At Coutances, while the the lovely market place is gone, the cathedral still stands above the town.

Lisieux, St. Lô, and many other charming Norman sites have passed into the limbo of history. Rouen will never again be the same, for it first felt the impact of a German tank division in 1940, and then suffered from German and Allied bombing, and finally from the decisive battle for the Seine in August 1944. Five bays of the cathedral are reported to have been demolished. St. Maclou was hit, the Palais de Justice destroyed by fire. St. Ouen and other monuments are badly damaged.

But, on the whole, aside from this section of Normandy, it must be admitted that the art of France has paid a relatively small price for liberation. The late Henri Focillon cried from his deathbed, "Périssent les pierres pour que vive la liberté." If certain of these stones have perished the greatness of French art has nonetheless preserved its integrity for future generations. Thanks to the rapidity of the advance of Patton and Bradley, and of the British Armies toward Calais, famous towns were liberated before they could become military objectives. Like cavalry battles of the ancients, tank engagements brought decisions at their outskirts before the towns themselves had to be invested.

Normandy, to be sure, has borne the brunt, but the rest of France has come through practically unchanged. The capital is untouched, as are Burgundy, the valley of the Rhone, and the Île de France. The great monuments and churches in the west and southwest have hardly felt the breath of war. The Midi, except for some minor damage at the Mediterranean landings of the French divisions that marched north so rapidly, has only the starvation and indignities of Nazi rule to wipe from its memory. The soul of France, and what she has meant intellectually and artistically to the world, are happily hers as well as ours as long as peace can be maintained.

Would that it were possible to say as much for the Low Countries at this time. What trials lie ahead for Bruges and Ghent in the next weeks no one can predict. In Holland the added threat of inundation from the blowing up of the dikes gives little hope for Amsterdam, The Hague, and Delft. Consolation can be found in the fact that the greater part of the national collections of Holland were found unharmed in an air-conditioned cave near Maastricht. In Brussels, too, the state collections appear to be for the most part intact, as well as the city itself. Only the Palais de Justice was burned by the retreating Germans, an artistic blessing which unfortunately they did not visit on the Victor Emmanuel Monument in Rome.

VI

In reviewing the fate of Europe's art, the great surprise is the extent of British casualties from enemy action. Partly because of the Briton's phlegmatic reticence and partly because of security reasons, the American reader has been totally unaware that in the aggregate Britain has sustained greater artistic losses than either Italy or France. While the Vatican authorities were quick to tell us about the slightest loss to ecclesiastical property as the Germans were hurled back to the Gothic line, the English with characteristic stoicism have remained silent concerning the 4,000 churches, most of them Protestant, which have been damaged in the British Isles—some 2,800 hurt beyond repair.

It is well to remember also that the heaviest destruction by German bombers was made in the fall of 1940 and the following spring when the air raids on Germany by the R. A. F. had hardly got under way. The severity of these attacks and of the devastation they produced was not confined to London, where the greatest losses were received, but were widespread in England and even Scotland. The ports were ravaged: Bristol, Plymouth, Southampton, Liverpool were natural and obvious military targets. Along with their harbor installations, their palaces, museums, libraries, university buildings, and public monuments were wiped out. In contrast to these, however, were the famous "Baedeker raids" which took their toll in the cathedrals of Canterbury, Exeter, and Wells. These raids were nothing but spite, and what was not then imperiled or demolished was left to the mercy of the flying bombs in 1944.

London, with the possible exception of Berlin and Warsaw, has withstood more constant battering than any other European capital. Rome and Paris, as we have seen, are practically untouched. Brussels, The Hague, and Athens appear to be safe. Vienna has been affected, if at all, only in the industrial suburbs. But London has had the core of its historic life pocked and pitted and dismembered for more than 4 years. Behind St. Paul's Cathedral more than a thousand acres of the city are laid waste. The churches of Sir Christopher Wren, rebuilt by him after the Great Fire of 1666, are gone and will in all probability never be replaced. In the attacks of November and December 1940, on the city, not only were the churches and business districts the chief victims, but many historic shrines as well.

Repeatedly during the last 3 years the hallowed spots of London which were always haunted by American tourists have been picked off one by one. The Debating Chamber of the House of Commons, the Henry VII Chapel of Westminster Abbey, the Temple, Dr. Johnson's house in Gough Square, the Guildhall, Greenwich Observatory, Hampton Court, and the Dulwich Gallery—all these buildings have been seriously hurt along with hundreds more of equal importance and associations. Every museum building in London has undergone some change by bomb or fire or by concussion from blast in the immediate vicinity. The flying bombs moreover continued the devastation of London's lovely squares of the eighteenth century in Chelsea, Mayfair, and Regent's Park, and here the loss has been not so much in buildings fallen to the ground as of houses stripped of their former graciousness through scorched woodwork and frittered plaster.

That any part of the historic London that we know and admire is standing is due to guts alone. The fire wardens and the watchers, the men and women who loved their city as apparently the Florentines did not love theirs, by acts of heroism unparalleled in history, saved the Empire and, lest we forget, for America too, the heart of the English-speaking world. Curiously enough, despite the scars and wounds, the city's face remains unchanged. It is a determined and resolute face quite ready to meet the future on its own terms and without flinching.

VII

As we approach the final settlement with the filthy beasts who have done their utmost to destroy the European civilization which we cherish, there must necessarily be a period of soul-searching and calm reflection before justice can be dispensed and retribution made. Two wrongs cannot make a right; and, while justice demands that the Nazis be forced to give back what they have stolen and make restitution in kind for what they

have destroyed by deliberate acts of vandalism, it must be remembered that the cultural heritage of the German people has been subjected to equal catastrophe. Even in the siege of Aachen, efforts were made to spare the cathedral. Nevertheless the gross tonnage of bombs dropped on German cities has meted out a punishment which, however richly deserved, has left little upon which future generations may build.

If one recognizes that the Teutonic disease may lie dormant for half a century and suddenly break out with virulence because of social, economic, and political circumstances, one sees immediately the danger of reducing Germany to the same kind of cultural desert that she has made of Poland. For in the arid soil of such a desert the germs of future wars may breed. With this in mind the committees which have been meeting in London, composed of representatives of the United Nations governments, many of whom have had a tragic personal stake in the discussions, have tried to arrive at an intelligent and just program for settling the artistic problems of the peace, rather than a vindictive one.

General Eisenhower has already made public the policy of military government in Germany and has issued orders and directives to his officers in regard to property control in general. All forms of property, including cultural material, works of art, books, scientific specimens, will be subject to the same general seizure and "freezing" restrictions. Stolen or looted objects recovered will be held for disposition by the proper international bodies appointed under the terms of the peace settlement. It is interesting to note that the Dumbarton Oaks agreement provides for the establishment of economic and social agencies to deal with such matters.

The very vastness of the task facing the peace negotiators is terrifying to the lay mind. The British Board of Economic Warfare has announced that the Nazis have looted Europe to the tune of some $36,000,000,000. On top of this add the twenty-six billions which they have extorted as occupation costs from the countries which they overran. They stole, as they said they would, every imaginable category of property—bullion, jewels, works of art, securities and equities in corporations, rolling stock, inland water transport and ships, factory equipment and machinery, books and periodicals, and archives. It is difficult to think of any normal economic activity of man in which the Nazi hand had not been rifling. Various competent estimators have placed the value of works of art stolen or destroyed at some two and a half billion dollars in this larger total.

The problem of identification of stolen works of art alone will require a mobilization of all the available experts in practically every field. This cannot be done except by the most carefully integrated international cooperation. The implications of these operations will spread throughout the world and into countries that escaped the war but have given refuge to property concealed by Nazis or their agents. These who have illicitly profited by the distress of Germany's victims will have no title to their stolen goods, for the Declaration of Saint James', signed by the United Nations in London on January 6, 1943, invalidates all transactions made under duress in occupied territory. And more recently at Bretton Woods further steps were taken to this end.

War crimes must be punished and those who have been pillaged compensated, for Germany must learn that the rape of Europe, however scientifically and ruthlessly carried out, did not pay. German scholarship and Germany's claims to intellectual equality can never again be entertained by civilized men until the slate is clean.

Converted to War, a Great Corporation Lends Its Brains and Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, some of the more important products of General Motors Corporation are here announced from a list of more than 3,600 items manufactured for the fighting forces of the United States and her Allies. Since the beginning of the defense program in 1940 General Motors has produced:

More than 140,000,000 shells and shell casings.

More than 180,000 cannon.

More than 1,000,000 30- and 50-caliber machine guns.

More than 2,400,000 carbines.

More than 180,000 airplane engines.

More than 9,000 complete bombers and fighter planes.

More than 31,000 tanks, tank destroyers and armored cars.

More than 740,000 trucks, including amphibious "ducks."

A major part of all the Diesel engines produced for the United States on land and sea.

Truly a great work of brain and brawn devoted to the preservation of the ideals of humanity.

Address by Lt. Col. Delbert B. Freeman at Nebraska State Reclamation Association Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Lt. Col. Delbert B. Freeman at the first annual meeting of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, held at Lincoln, Nebr., Saturday, January 20, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIVITIES OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS OF THE OMAHA DISTRICT AFFECTING THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Mr. President, members of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, ladies, and gentlemen, I am pleased to have been invited to speak to this group today. I propose to talk to you briefly of some of the activities of the Corps of Engineers affecting the State of Nebraska.

In my present capacity as district engineer of the Omaha district and in connection with my previous duties in the Corps of Engineers, I have had the pleasure of meeting many of you, and discussing with you matters of mutual interest. I feel that I can speak to you today with a sympathetic understanding of the objectives of your association.

I was born and reared and received my university education in the irrigated Mesilla Valley on the Rio Grande project in New Mexico. I have lived on an irrigated farm. My early engineering experience was gained as an employee of the Bureau of Reclamation on irrigation and drainage work of the Rio Grande project. Following my graduation from college, I was employed for 2 years on irrigation and drainage work in the Imperial irrigation district in California, which, as many of you know, is the largest irrigation district in the United States. I left the Imperial irrigation district to accept employment in the Corps of Engineers to assist in the preparation of the so-called "308" report for the Missouri River Basin, to which General Crawford has referred in his address. So I feel justified in pointing out to you that neither the Corps of Engineers nor myself are strangers to the water problems of the State of Nebraska.

In this connection I believe it is appropriate to point out something that General Crawford has mentioned in his address, that although river improvement for navigation has been considered a Federal responsibility for over 100 years and money has been appropriated for navigation improvements since 1824, it was not until 1936 that the Congress of the United States recognized by a declaration of policy that flood control by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States is a proper Federal activity. It was not until 1902 that the Federal Government assumed responsibility for participation in reclamation projects.

It is apparent then why large scale federally sponsored irrigation and flood-control projects are, relatively speaking, recent developments.

The 308 studies carried out by the Corps of Engineers as mentioned to you by General Crawford included consideration of the development of the water resources of your State of Nebraska as well as the other States of the Missouri River region for irrigation, flood control, power, navigation, and other purposes. However, it was not until 1936 that the Congress authorized for construction any of the projects considered in these 308 studies pertaining to the Missouri River and tributaries. However, you people of Nebraska at that time were not strangers to the need for irrigation and flood control. At the very time the 308 studies were being completed in 1932 you had under irrigation in Nebraska more than one-half million acres of land, and between then and the Flood Control Act of 1936, you had a disastrous flood on the Republican River in which 105 people lost their lives and damages estimated to be about $9,000,000 were suffered. A newspaper account of that flood relates that two million acres of land were out of production 5 years later as a result of this flood.

The geographical boundaries of the Omaha district include only that portion of Nebraska which drains into the Missouri above Rulo, Nebr., and consequently does not include the Republican River Basin. I say the geographical boundaries do not include the Republican River Basin but in keeping with the close coordination which is maintained by all units of the Corps of Engineers in times of crisis, the Omaha district lent its full resources of men and matériel and worked shoulder to shoulder with the Kansas City district and local authorities in rescue and flood-fighting activities during this disastrous flood on the Republican River in 1935.

As you may know, the Corps of Engineers is not authorized to make any investigation for any purpose or to construct any project

for any purpose except upon specific directive from Congress, and it has only been recently that we were directed to make any investigations for flood control and allied purposes within that portion of the State of Nebraska lying within the Omaha district. As a matter of fact, following the 308 studies, the State of Nebraska was fortunate in that it did not have any major floods until 1943 and 1944 (with the exception of course of the Republican River flood of 1935).

In the meantime, those assassins Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini plunged us into the war in which we are now engaged and the winning of which must come above everything else.

In 1940, in addition to its duties on civil works functions, the Corps of Engineers was entrusted with the largest construction program ever heard of in the world. Today the Army Service Forces, of which the Corps of Engineers is a part, is the largest single business in the world, and the Chief of Engineers is responsible for all construction for the United States Army. In this military construction program, the Missouri River division and the Omaha district have played an important part.

Since July 1940 the Corps of Engineers has completed over one and one-half billion dollars worth of construction in the Missouri River division, $200,000,000 of which was placed under the supervision of the Omaha district in the State of Nebraska alone. This includes 13 facilities for the Air Forces, an aircraft assembly plant, an aircraft modification center, 3 ordnance facilities, a number of internment camps, a remount station, a dog training center, and numerous additions to existing facilities. At the present time, the Omaha district is busily engaged in modifying and expanding ordnance facilities both in Nebraska and Iowa.

The major portion of the military construction program was completed during 1943, and it was during the very peak of the program that we were visited by the three disastrous floods of 1943. Those floods caused damages for the entire Missouri River Basin of approximately $65,000,000 and cost the lives of 17 people. Nebraska suffered along with the other States, particularly along the main stem of the river, where every levee between Sioux City and Rulo, with the exception of the Updike levee near Herman, Nebr., was either breached, overtopped, or rendered ineffective by flanking.

It was during these trying times that the Corps of Engineers received a directive from Congress to restudy the flood situation on the main stem from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River. This directive from Congress was dated May 13, 1943. The division engineer of the Missouri River Division, at that time Col. Lewis A. Pick (now General Pick, building the Ledo Road in Burma), immediately set to work in preparation of the report called for. Based on the wealth of data which had been accumulated over the years by the Corps of Engineers in their numerous investigations, he was able to complete his report and submit it to the Chief of Engineers on August 10 of that same year.

The report was submitted to other interested Federal agencies including the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Power Commission and the Department of Agriculture whose soil-erosion program has a very direct relation to the development of the basin. By December 31 of 1943, after all the interested Federal agencies had been given an opportunity to comment on this report, it was submitted by the Chief of Engineers to the Congress, through the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of War.

This plan, commonly known as the Pick plan, was designed to be a flexible framework into which the plans of all other agencies, Federal, State, and local, could be fitted and it was recommended that it be subject to modification from time to time as unforeseeable circumstances and events warranted.

After the Pick plan had been submitted, the Bureau of Reclamation, which had been making extensive studies within the Missouri River Basin, also submitted a plan. This plan has been commonly referred to as the "Sloan plan." Whereas the "Pick plan" was fundamentally a flood-control plan in keeping with the directive from Congress, the Sloan plan was fundamentally an irrigation plan in keeping with the responsibilities of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Pick plan proposed a series of levees along the main stem of the Missouri River from Sioux City to the mouth, a number of reservoirs on the main stem above Sioux City and several reservoirs on the tributaries, including five on the tributaries of the Republican River in Nebraska.

The Sloan plan included some 90 reservoirs on the tributaries throughout the basin and, as you know, contemplates the irrigation of another million acres of land in the State of Nebraska.

These two plans have now been coordinated, and the omnibus flood control bill approved by the President on December 22, 1944, authorized a total of $400,000,000 to be appropriated for the execution of the first phase of the development proposed under each of these two plans. Two hundred million dollars is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of the Interior for the accomplishment of the work which will be done by the Bureau of Reclamation and $200,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of War to be accomplished by the Corps of Engineers.

I am pleased to say that I attended the conference in Omaha on October 16 and 17 between representatives of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of coordinating these two plans. Also, I am pleased to tell you that in less than 24 hours all the alleged engineering controversies and differences in these plans had been mutually agreed upon. This agreement was submitted to the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Bashore, and to the Chief of Engineers, General Reybold, on October 17, 1944, and a joint agreement signed by Mr. Bashore and General Reybold submitted to the respective heads of their Departments on October 25, 1944. Since that time I have sat in on another conference in Washington between representatives of the Bureau and the Corps of Engineers in continuation of this policy of cooperation and coordination.

At the present time the Omaha district is doing everything possible—consistent with the first duty of winning the war—to complete the necessary detailed planning for preparation of plans and specification prior to construction of the projects.

In addition to this, as a result of the damage caused by the floods during 1943–44, the Omaha district placed more than 2,000,000 cubic yards of earth in repairing and restoring to their original condition, levees in 15 counties in the States of Nebraska and Iowa, alone.

Obviously, these levees were inadequate but under the direction of Congress, repairs accomplished by the Corps of Engineers are limited to the restoration of damaged levees to their original condition.

And in speaking of the floods of these 2 years, it was my responsibility as district engineer in 1944 to lend every possible aid and assistance within my authority to you people of Nebraska when your crops were being destroyed, your homes ruined, cities damaged, and your lives threatened. The Omaha District, in cooperation with the local officials, assisted in the rescue of people and livestock, ferried food and medical supplies, furnished emergency equipment for maintaining safe water supply at various cities, assisted in cooperation with the local people in sandbagging levees, and performed various other emergency activities required during flood disasters.

The floods of 1944 have caused damages estimated at the present time to be around $50,000,000 within the Missouri River Basin and to have caused the loss of 13 lives, 4 of which were in the Elkhorn River Basin. The damages to the Elkhorn River Basin alone for 1944 approximate $10,000,000, and to the highways and bridges of the State of Nebraska, according to figures furnished to me by our State engineer, Mr. Scott, the damages amounted to about $550,000. Many of you right here in Lincoln today are personally familiar with the high water on Salt Creek which occurred this year.

I am not in a position to give you final figures today on the total damages to the State of Nebraska during the floods of 1944; however, they were sufficient in at least two localities to result in directives from the Congress to the Corps of Engineers to study these localities for the purpose of determining whether any flood-control measures are justified at this time. I am pleased to tell you that as a result of the directive dated June 21, 1944, to study the Elkhorn River Basin and the Salt Creek Basin, we have made continuous progress. Most of the preliminary office studies and some preliminary field work on the Elkhorn River and its tributaries, have been completed; and we are well on the way toward initial selection of projects to be considered and initiation of the necessary detailed field surveys for these projects.

Field and office studies of the Salt Creek Basin are in the preliminary stage; however, a field reconnaissance of the entire basin has been completed. We propose to continue both of these studies as expeditiously as is consistent with the primary need for concentrating on the war effort and as availability of funds will permit.

Gentlemen, I will not take up any more of your time today, but I assure you of the continued interest of the Corps of Engineers in you and your problems and I assure you that we stand ready to carry out our share of the coordinated program as fast as the necessary authorities and funds are given to us to accomplish the work.

Morality of Public Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, on October 19, 1944, before the Rotary Club of New York City, George E. Stringfellow, vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., delivered an address entitled "Morality of Public Servants." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Because a large body of our citizens seems to feel that the moral and ethical laws, which apply to business and professional men and women, do not apply to politicians, the character of our public servants is lower than it otherwise would be.

Politics have been defined in the positive sense as "the science and art of government;

the science of dealing with the organization, regulation, and administration of the business of a state, in both its internal and external affairs"; in the negative sense, "dishonest management, to secure the success of political candidates or parties." It is in the latter category that the public places a large percentage of our public officials.

When our public servants deliberately misstate a case, it is often justified by calling it "politics." When they run out on their promises—public or private—they are apparently forgiven when it is identified with politics. When the politician accepts bribes, this, too, is countenanced when identified with politics.

A common pleas judge, who was appointed by a Democratic governor and recently elevated by a Republican governor to the high office of attorney general, recommended that the governor appoint the attorney general's former law partner to succeed him on the bench. Before doing so, the brazenly remarked to an acquaintance, "I admit he's pretty dumb" (meaning his former law partner) "but we've got to find a job for him."

In nominating his attorney general's law partner for the high judgeship, the governor gave as his reason the county leader wanted this man on the bench.

Is there any significance in the fact that the county leader, or boss, is a lawyer and he and his clique practice before this court?

There was so much political patronage behind this appointment the senate confirmed the governor's nominee as quickly as greased lightning. Today, the attorney general, the governor, and the county leader are posing as symbols of civic virtue.

This word "politics" has come to denote an excuse, or justification, by our public servants, for almost every conceivable impropriety.

Negative politicians are often so brilliant, yet so corrupt—like rotten mackerel in the moonlight, they both shine and stink. The negative politician thinks only of the next election; while the statesman thinks of the next generation. The negative politician works and schemes for the success of his party; the statesman for that of his country.

As election day approaches, these negative politicians proclaim their virtues, make promises which they never intend to keep, and which they hope the public will soon forget. They invent high-sounding catch phrases, designed to mislead and deceive the voters.

Members of Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs do not have to be reminded that business or professional men who conduct their affairs like the negative politicians soon find themselves without friends; without associates; without customers, clients, or patients; without credit; and finally without hope. They are rightly shunned by society.

We should demand of our public servants a moral and ethical standard as high as that which we exact of our business and professional men and women.

What is so important to us is that politics affect every phase of our lives, every minute of our lives.

Our standards of living, our taxes, our wages and salaries, the condition of our cities, every condition of life is affected by politics. Yet we often accept, without protest, moral and ethical standards in public officials which we reject in others.

In this country, where our citizens are still free to choose for themselves the kind of officials who make and enforce the rules by which we live, there can be no excuse for our selecting second-raters. The only explanation I can think of for this laxity is that we have lost our sense of values and direction—that we have grown unmindful of our civic responsibilities. When a nation willingly accepts a low moral and ethical standard for its public servants, its people soon become soft and degenerate.

I have presented a very ugly picture, but it is a true one—wholly unexaggerated. It is true in every part of the country—in all political parties. It is true, only because the people permit it to exist. The fault is not primarily in the cheap and conniving politicians who gain control of our civic machinery. The fault, and the responsibility, lie with that great body of our citizens—like those who comprise the membership of service clubs—who, knowing what they face, do nothing to correct it.

We should regard a person who takes no interest or part in public affairs, not as harmless, but as a useless character.

I speak to you in this Rotary and Kiwanian fellowship in utter frankness, because I am convinced that we can admirably serve the whole people of the United States if we—of our farflung and highly respected organizations—reject the double standard in our public servants as we have in our personal, family, and business life.

We can make of ourselves a nucleus for its elimination by communities throughout the land, if we refuse to be dominated by political bosses, and recognize that we can never elect better candidates than we nominate.

Good government begins in the primaries, where candidates are nominated. If we nominate the right kind of candidates, without regard to party label, and elect them in the subsequent election, positive, capable public servants will invariably be the result.

Our organization can aid in setting a standard for public servants and the youth of our country which will be acceptable to all who are desirous of decent and efficient government.

It must be clear to every thinking person that our Government will never be any better than you, and millions of others like you, help to make it. It will be as bad, as inefficient and as corrupt as you, and millions of others like you, permit it to be.

Those who have the welfare of the Nation at heart cannot afford to be apathetic or cynical. They must come out of their cellars of silent submission into the open space of free political discussion. This is where they belong, and where they can best serve, and save, the greatest system of government ever conceived by man.

"Our Government," said Calvin Coolidge, "is a Government of political parties under the guiding influence of public opinion."

Let us consider these figures: Only 15 percent of the registered voters, on the average, take part in primary elections, when we select candidates for the general election.

Approximately 10 percent of the registered voters of the Nation are controlled by political machines—these machine-controlled voters always vote. In addition, they see to it that their relatives and friends vote for the machine candidates. What is still more important is that the voters who follow the dictates of their own consciences, outnumber the machine-controlled vote by ten to one, when they take part in the primary elections.

Mr. William Feather, writing recently in The Atlantic Monthy, said: "Believe it or not, there are only 250,000 in the whole United States whose opinions are important in the matters of grave concern. As these people go, so go the others. The thinking of these people starts the ball rolling—it never rolls until they start it."

As you know, there are more than 300,000 Rotarians and Kiwanians in the United States—all men of influence in their respective communities. By arithmetic, the solution seems simple.

Members of Rotary and Kiwanis, I believe this is a great challenge to our organizations. In the discharge of our civic responsibilities, let us use this power to influence public opinion to nominate and elect to public office honest and efficient statesmen regardless of party label—then, and only then—will we have, and will we be entitled to have, honest and efficient Government.

Importance of Railroads to the German War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Washington Times-Herald of February 3, 1945, carried an article by Frank C. Waldrop on the importance of Germany's railroads to her war effort. Inasmuch as American railroads are equally vital to our own effort, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The railroad industry in the United States is beyond question our foremost war industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN BERLIN FALLS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Don't let anybody kid you. When Berlin falls, Germany won't be far behind, for one reason beyond all others. Railroads. Modern war doesn't take to the backwoods and fields successfully, no matter what the romantic guerrilla tales may lead you to think. Modern war is made of steel and has to move on rails.

Berlin is the heart of the German railroad system, and therefore is the heart of Germany. To appreciate this, consider what Berlin was before railroads came into being.

London is ancient and has long been huge, because geographically it is the point of departure for British business.

Along the Thames embankment there stand today foundations and walls of buildings in which Londoners used to trade with the agents of imperious Caesars in the days of the Roman occupation of Britain 2,000 years ago.

And Britains are still trading there.

But Berlin is a comparatively new city, and curiously enough, no really good history of it has ever been written. The first mention of it is as of A. D. 1230, and then it was only a collection of mud huts along the east bank of the Oder River.

It had no natural use, nor any natural charm, being relatively cold, rainy and in a countryside that is celebrated principally as good for growing cabbages and pines.

Germany's chief cities of old lay along the Baltic Sea to Berlin's north, or in the west along the Rhine. Berlin was a mere inland trading post that grew up secondary in power to the coastal cities in a trading combine called The Hanseatic League.

Today all the businessmen of the Hanseatic League would be indicted as violators of the Sherman Act if they and their system were in the United States—but they were the greatest productive force in the German states of the medieval era.

Berlin began to grow important in politics after 1415, when the Hohenzollern princes took it over and set up their rule of the Mark (province) of Brandenburg, from there. It was a good spot for holding up river traffic on the Elbe, Spree, and other smaller nearby waterways, for tax money with which to fight other princes for more tax money extorted from businessmen trying to get merchandise up and down other waterways.

But even so, Berlin was still a jerk town with about 10,000 population, counting in the suburb of Kolln, which claimed for awhile it was another and separate city.

The Thirty Years' War (1618–48) nearly wrecked Berlin entirely, and some historians claim it was really saved only by the persecutions of the French Huguenots by Louis XIV. Some 5,000 of these thrifty, inventive, commerce-minded Frenchmen fled to Berlin in the seventeenth century and began to build up a trade contact with the world. Now their descendants are Nazis.

The dirty, crooked, narrow little Dark Age streets of Berlin began to be wiped away under the Frenchifying influence of the Huguenots and air and light were let into the closed German bedrooms. Canals ran out to connect the Spree and Oder Rivers.

Frederick III, Brandenburg elector, called himself Frederick I, first King of Prussia, in 1701, and set up in Berlin to be a real heavyweight among German princes.

In 1713 he was succeeded by his son, Frederick William I, a military and governing genius who organized a standing army of 83,000 men—unprecedented in those days—introduced systematic education and training of citizens for the use of the Prussian state, and in 1740 was succeeded to the throne by a son who was an even greater war-making and governing genius.

That was Frederick II (the Great) and from his day Berlin really began to amount to something.

Frederick the Great used his father's armies to break down Poland, to scare the Austrians and the French, and to make Berlin the headquarters of politics in Central Europe.

The population rose from 70,000 when he took over, to 172,000 by the end of the eighteenth century. Napoleon's wars at the beginning of the nineteenth century scarred and scared Berlin, but didn't destroy it. And the city lay there waiting—until Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor, came to power and decided to organize the loose confederation of German states into one nation, built on iron, coal, canals and railroads.

The Borsig machinery factories, Germany's first, were built at Berlin. The railroads began to thread out from them. Population trends tell the whole tale in brief: In 1815, Berlin had 198,000 population. In 1910, the population was 2,529,000.

When this war began, Berlin's population was around 4,330,000. It was the terminal point of Germany's 12 main railroad lines and of the nation's principal highways and canal system.

It manufactured electrical equipment, machine tools, chemicals, precision instruments of all kinds, textiles, and of course a lot of steel for the railroads and heavy industries, though Germany's principal iron and steel works are in the Ruhr, which our armies are trying to capture.

But, above all, Germany's traffic control point is Berlin. Germany's armies have to get their supplies via Berlin, if they are to live—and Berlin itself is now virtually under Russian siege.

When Berlin goes, make no mistake, Germany will go with it. Hitler can bellow all he likes, jump off the cliff at Berchtesgarden, or hide in a cave, but he can't build railroads this late in the day.

Board of Veterans Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in the issue of February 1, 1945, of Stars and Stripes, I find a very illuminating editorial upon the subject of the Board of Veterans Appeals. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

Back in 1933 there was enacted by the Congress what is unpopularly known as the Economy Act. Written in secret, heard by congressional committees behind closed doors and passed in an atmosphere of hysteria "to maintain the credit of the United States Government," the measure was applied to few others than the veterans of this country and their needy dependents. It was one of the most wickedly conceived pieces of legislation ever to be placed before an American Congress. Its application to veterans and their loved ones was so vicious that it sent many to poorhouses, to mental institutions, and to premature graves. Despite numerous modifications, it will ever remain a black spot on the record of our lawmakers who voted in its favor.

Out of that act there came directly a change in the administration of affairs of veterans. From a system by which the Congress wrote legislation for their benefit, to be managed by the Veterans Administration, there developed a bureaucracy that writes the laws, and interprets and administers them, oftimes contrary to the expressed will of the people's representatives. Within that huge and fast expanding agency is a powerful group which literally vitiates the very purpose for which it was created. That is the Board of Veterans Appeals.

Down through the years, since the creation of a bureau to serve the needs of the Nation's disabled and their unfortunate widows and orphans, there has always been a means of appeal from decisions of original boards of jurisdiction that seemed to be contrary to the evidence presented. By congressional direction, any claimant was to have all doubts resolved in his or her favor. That system does not generally apply in cases presented to this appeals group. Instead, veterans are considered to be wrong in their every contention and must bear the burden of proving that they are right. In fact, the Board of Veterans Appeals acts contrary to every established practice usually accepted in judicial appeal. It is both judge and jury and, in most instances, makes its findings arbitrarily, frequently with little or no regard for the evidence.

More than that, the constituent sections of the Board, after hearing the evidence, do not actually write the decisions. These are determined by medical and legal consultants who do not listen to the evidence at all and who come to their conclusions from a study of the history of each case and from transcriptions of stenographic notes taken down at actual hearings. These "backroom boys" prepare the findings and, with few exceptions, the Board adopts their decisions. That is the shameful procedure followed by men who have been appointed to listen openmindedly and fairly to evidence presented by or on behalf of men who have served their country in time of war and of women who have been left by deceased warriors as a charge upon the country they served. We recognize that this is a serious indictment, but if we can believe what we see and hear, it can be substantiated by case after case of disabled men who have not received just treatment.

The Board of Appeals was put into being by regulations issued under authority of the Economy Act. Its principal purpose was to review judicially such claims as were presented, and a probable function was to prevent interminable reviews and hearings on cases with too little substance. Before the Economy Act became fully effective, lesser boards were redirected by law, "to resolve all reasonable doubts in favor of the veterans, the burden of proof in such cases being on the Government." It certainly can be concluded that an appellate group must be bound by the same rules, but it apparently is not. Although it is empowered to correct obvious errors, it is bound by precedents, its own rules and solicitor's opinions and cannot reopen a case, no matter what the finding, except upon submission of new and material evidence. How new or how material, it decides for itself. It is said the Board denies generally accepted evidence and indulges in speculative theories.

When first established, this appeals set-up was headed by an ex-Governor of Virginia who did not know a veteran from a horned toad. It was a purely political appointment, as have been those of several of the present 15 associate members. Governor Pollard was succeeded by a career man, who was his vice chairman, a veteran who seems to be more interested in saving money for the administration than in seeing justice done. We are advised that he is domineering, that he abuses his powers, and violates his own rules, quite carefully, of course. Our experience with him shows him to be personable but adamant, hardly the type to give veterans "the benefit of the doubt." His associates seem generally to be good fellows. Some play an excellent game of golf while the back-room boys decide their cases for them; others doubtless indulge in recreation less arduous if more entertaining and equally innocent while the men in the back room reach conclusions that are approved regardless of the individual liking of Board members. Although many cases presented probably have little merit, the record shows only 1.55 percent of allowals on appeal, during the past fiscal year, out of 13,618 decisions in 8,823 claims. Some were remanded, a few modified, and several reversed, but the vast majority were turned down cold.

At convention insistence, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in 1942, named a committee to study the appeals regulations and to call upon the Administrator to correct abuses. The resolution voiced "universal and profound dissatisfaction with present functioning * * * and a settled conviction that it fails in many cases to properly apply the law and evaluate the evidence." The investigating committee received the well-known brush-off, but it did obtain several reversals. Where there is that much smoke present there must be fire. While the House veterans' committee is marking time on legislation, it should constitute itself into an investigative group and determine what, if anything, should be done to correct the evils complained of.

Nobody constituted to assure justice to veterans should act both as judge and jury, no matter what the basis of a claim. A presiding judge guides a court and advises on the law. The jury decides the case on evidence adduced, observes the conduct of witnesses, ponders their sincerity and their contentions. Here, the sub-board as a jury sees that the evidence is taken down, aids some in its development, and then the boys in the back room determine guilt or innocence without knowledge of the pleader. If the chairman of the whole board as judge does not like a favorable decision, he upsets it arbitrarily and calls in as many underlings as necessary to make a finding satisfactory to him. He does it without hearing one shred of testimony. The only appeal is to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who is obviously too busy to handle cases personally, a procedure that has been demonstrated to be palpably farcical.

The whole linen needs washing. If these claims can be substantiated, there is being committed a travesty on justice. They should be thoroughly aired.

Germany's Place in a Post-war World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Germany's Place in a Post-war World." This is a very scholarly and well-written article by Eugene A. Cox, a prominent and well known attorney of Lewiston, Idaho.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANY'S PLACE IN A POST-WAR WORLD

(By Eugene A. Cox)

After the war Germany must be completely disarmed and demilitarized and must be prohibited from producing munitions of any kind and prevented from ever again accumulating the materials for launching another war. Upon that point all commentators seem to agree. But when it comes to discussion of means to that end, there is not only much disagreement but some ill-considered and unwise solutions have been put forward such as Lord Vansittart's vengeance plan and Secretary Morgenthau's proposal to reduce Germany to the status of an agricultural country.

One factor involved in the problem, which must be taken into account if a wise solution is to be reached, is the fact that German economy is closely interlocked with the economy of all European countries and to a lesser extent with world economy. Decisions with respect to German production will have repercussions in many other lands.

Before the war Austria, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, which are mainly producers of foodstuffs and raw materials, and to a lesser extent Czechoslovakia, found a market for about half of their exports in Germany and received in exchange manufactured goods produced by Germany. The exports of these countries are of such a character that it would be difficult for them to find another market in the capitalist world, since the world market is already glutted with goods of that kind. If they are denied the German market, they must needs turn to Russia.

To a smaller extent the economy of Turkey, Greece, Italy, France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Poland, Finland, and Britain was also linked with and dependent upon German economy. The destruction or serious limitation of German industrial production would have disastrous consequences in all of these lands.

Germany does not have sufficient resources to set up a self-contained economy, as Russia might do. The German people cannot feed themselves. They must trade abroad in order to live. If they are to exist, they have to be allowed to maintain sufficient civilian industry to provide for their needs. That conclusion is not based solely upon consideration of the interests of the German people but also upon consideration of interests of neighboring peoples and of the whole world.

REGULATE—NOT DESTROY

The destruction of German industry would measurably reduce the total productive capacity of the world, and it would at the same time and in like measure reduce the total capacity of the world to purchase and consume goods. For production and consumption are two different aspects of the same process. The reduction of effective consumer demand resulting directly and indirectly from the destruction of German industry would impose a strain upon capitalism at a time when the system is under greater pressure than it has ever before endured.

Probably the only solution of the problem is the regulation and control of all German industrial production by an Allied commission under a system of rationing similar to that in use in our country in wartime. By rationing power and raw materials to producers and requiring and checking accounts of their products Germany could be prevented from producing war materials of any kind without the needless crippling of her useful production. Factory inspectors appointed by the control commission could see to it that allotted materials were not diverted into the production of forbidden goods.

Production of aircraft of any kind, poison gas and other munitions could be absolutely prohibited without seriously impairing German economy, since those goods never figured largely in German exports. The prohibition would merely release energies of production for more useful employment.

CIVILIAN GOODS

But except for the absolute prohibition against the production of any kind of war materials, the German people should be left to decide for themselves what kinds and quantities of civilian goods they want to produce. If decisions of such matters were left to the Allied commission, the members would be under considerable pressure to base their rulings not upon considerations of the safety of the world, but rather upon apprehension as to the effect of German competition upon industry in their own lands.

In order to get rid of the Junkers finally it might be wise to expropriate the large landed estates and distribute the lands, not to individual peasants, whose small-scale farming would necessarily be inefficient, but to cooperatives operating upon a large enough scale to employ scientific methods and management. Such an arrangement would strengthen German economy at a point where it needs to be strengthened. It would probably meet the approval of most Germans, and it might build up a bulwark against communism. Members of successful cooperatives usually develop a pride in their organizations, and they do not willingly surrender their property and its management to anybody else. But such a proposal would probably be resisted by the capitalists in Germany and the Allied capitalists countries from fear of communism, the bogy which has so often frightened the capitalists into resisting changes which were necessary and which on the whole tended to strengthen and prolong the life of their system.

Germany must be compelled to surrender the territory which she has seized and part of her own land, if that is necessary either to prevent further aggression or for the establishment of acceptable and enduring frontiers in Europe and she must also be required to surrender the loot which she has stolen. Germans guilty of plotting and preparing this war and those who have committed crimes during the war must be punished. Punitive measures should be swift, certain, and rigorous. But the punitive process should be a cleansing rather than a vengeance.

MUST REGENERATE PEOPLE

After the war the most serious and pressing problem confronting the world will be the regeneration of the German people, without which there can be no lasting peace. To that end control of the educational system will be necessary. The whole system will have to be reorganized and purged of every trace of Nazi influence. The press, the radio, the movies, and all means of communication will have to be controlled, at least to the extent of prohibiting Nazi propaganda and all propaganda inciting the German people to preparation for future wars.

In the task of liberating the German mind and reeducating the German people, the churches, the labor unions, and all liberal and progressive forces will have to be enlisted and given a wide measure of freedom to act. The Allies can help by eliminating certain evil influences and providing the German people with opportunities and facilities for acting, but the responsibility for building a new and sane and democratic Germany rests upon the shoulders of the German people. With wisdom, the Allies can help. But only Germany can redeem her own soul.

Recent Russian history and recent German history have one point in common. Both have shown how plastic human nature is and how quickly people can be conditioned for a new way of life, whether for good or for evil. That fact permits the hope, at least, that by firm and wise handling the German people may be prepared within a reasonable time to take their place in the world as a peaceful and democratic nation. But that end, which all the world desires, cannot be attained if conditions are imposed which deprive the Germans of hope and make life intolerable for them. If the Germans are to adopt a peaceful, democratic way of life, that way of life must be made economically possible for them—the alternative is communism.

RUSSIA NEEDS PEACE

When this war ends the world will be in desperate need of a period of peace and tranquillity. That applies particularly to Russia, where so many of her people have been slain, so much of her land devastated, so many of her industries ruined. For her, world stability will be of far greater immediate importance than the spreading of communism. Russia's interests dictate that the issue of world socialism or world capitalism be left to abide the test of time and be peacefully decided by each people for themselves upon the basis of experience, comparison, and reason; and, as always, Russia will be guided by her own interests. She will gladly welcome the organization of the peoples of Europe as free capitalist democracies, if that will assure peace and save her from the peril to which she would be exposed by a period of revolution and turbulence in the neighboring countries. For the sake of her own safety Russia will strive for a just and lasting peace upon any terms that will assure her own security.

In order to determine what course Russia will follow it is only necessary to ascertain what Russia's interests are, and those interests are manifest. Above everything else, Russia needs peace and stability in the world. She has no other need that she herself cannot supply in peaceful collaboration with the rest of the world. Russia's purpose has been clearly stated by Stalin in these words:

"We have not and cannot have such war aims as imposing our will and our regime on the Slavs and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are awaiting our aid. Our aid consists in assisting these people in their liberation struggles against Hitler tyranny and then setting them free to rule on their own land as they desire. No intervention whatever in the internal affairs of other people."

But there can be no lasting peace if the capitalist powers impose their will upon the peoples of Europe, or if they permanently deny to any people the means of livelihood or the right to freely organize their own democratic government under leaders of their own choosing. There can be no lasting peace, unless the capitalist powers exercise greater moderation and restraint than they have ever displayed or are displaying now. In order to build a durable peace, which will enable the Germans and all other peoples to live as peaceful democracies, it is not Russia that we have to fear. It is ourselves.

Manpower, Compulsion, Optimism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of February 10, 1945:

MANPOWER, COMPULSION, OPTIMISM

One of the most fascinating stories of the manpower crisis appeared some weeks ago in the Daily Sentinel, of Fairmont, Minn. According to a front-page story in that journal, a representative of the War Manpower Commission came to Fairmont to persuade people to take jobs at the Gopher ordnance works at Rosemount, Minn. The W. M. C. man put an advertisement in the local newspaper and awaited results. One of same was that Walter Bray, a workman possessing some of the skills mentioned in the advertisement, went to Rosemount to apply for a job. He has a son in the Navy and wanted to help the war effort. The rest of the story is on the Daily Sentinel:

"Do you have a union card?"

"No."

"Sorry, but you'll have to have one before your application can be considered."

"What will it cost me to join the union?"

"It will cost you $150, with dues thereafter at $3 a month."

"Will I have to pay it all at once?"

"If the union will accept you, arrangements can probably be made to pay by installments."

"How long will the job last?"

"Anywhere from 2 to 7 months."

Mr. Bray, eager to help the war effort, was not interested beyond that point.

Respectfully, before hollering our head off in favor of a universal service law, we should like to ask two questions?

1. To what extent is the present shortage of war workers due to episodes like this, plus the effect of union restrictions on the men already working, plus wasteful use of manpower by employers who have cost-plus contracts with the Government?

2. If the Government drafts Mr. Bray and half a million others like him to work in war plants, will he still be required to pay $150 for the privilege of helping his country?

It is also proposed that, to get 20,000 additional nurses into the armed services, we should draft them in. Nurses protest that this implies that their profession has not responded to appeals from the Army and Navy. They declare that almost a third of the active nurses in the United States have volunteered and that more than a quarter of them are now in the services. Others have been rejected because they are more than 45, an age limit they regard as too low, at any rate for service in hospitals in this country. They also declare that the physical standards are arbitrary and too high. It would seem that there are some hundreds of facets to this problem that ought to have been looked into before the yell went up to draft nurses.

The fascination for compulsions is a phenomenon which can be relied on to increase rather than diminish. The prevailing excuse for it in these fields is that the man in the street, that big yawp, has become overconfident about the war and has run out on the war effort. Too many cartoonists and editorial writers chime in which this propaganda without even asking themselves who made the home front so optimistic. A few weeks ago the St. Louis Post-Ditpatch took the trouble to look into this, and came up with a list of optimistic prophecies by President Roosevelt, General Eisenhower, Gen. Hap Arnold, General Montgomery, Winston Churchill, Admiral King, Gen. Mark Clark, and General Chennault. Every one of them expected the European part of the war to end in 1944, or so they said. If the people at home, who have nothing to go on but the word of their betters, became a little hopeful, whose fault was that?" Mr. Roosevelt has asked the boys to turn on the pessimism. An earlier application of gloom might have forestalled this talk of compulsion.

But it would not have disappeared, because we live in a period when the voice of the "planner" is loud and insistent, come war or peace. His case is best presented during emergencies, but we shall have to deal with it when the emergency is no more. In the meantime, it is entirely possible that we shall have to adopt one or all of the compulsions advocated by the administration, plus some others that we haven't thought of yet. As a soldier of our acquaintance put it, "They've been riding the gravy train for 3 years and the least they can do is stay on board." We agree. But before accepting the assumption that the methods which have raised the working force from nothing to 50,000,000 or so cannot produce another half million, Congress does well to examine all the angles, including those suggested above.

Address at Quartermaster Corps Officers Candidate School, Camp Lee, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the Quartermaster Corps Officers Candidate School at Camp Lee, Va., on Friday morning, February 9, 1945.

I was accompanied on the visit to Camp Lee, where I was stationed as an enlisted man at the time of my election to the House of Representatives last November, by the Honorable William Green, of Pennsylvania, who was also an enlisted man stationed at Camp Lee at the time of his election to Congress, Col. James D. McIntyre, General Staff Corps, and Lt. Col. James V. Hunt, Quartermaster Corps, War Department, Washington, D. C.

All were impressed with the appearance of Camp Lee and with the high military standards we found in various inspection tours through areas of the camp and the Quartermaster School. The military men in our party expressed their belief that Camp Lee is outstanding among all of the temporary camps in the Nation.

The training which the officer candidates received through their difficult course has fitted previous graduates so well for the tasks that were later assigned to them in their military careers that from approximately 25,000 officers produced by the school, less than 15 have failed to measure up to commission standards. This is a remarkable record and attests to the leadership of men like Brig. Gen. George Horkan, commanding officer of Camp Lee and former commandant of the Quartermaster Corps Officer Candidate School, and Col. L. L. Cobb, present commandant of the school.

The address follows:

General Horkan, Colonel Cobb, ladies and gentlemen, and members of the graduating class, it is rather odd that I am here before you. Only a short time ago I was an enlisted man stationed at Camp Lee. Today finds me a fledgling Congressman and you will soon be a fledgling officer of the Army of the United States.

I do not come before you to tell you how to solve the problems that you will encounter because I cannot, but being a former enlisted man, and knowing something about your school, I would like to tell your family and friends what you have been through to attain this position, and as a friend of the Quartermaster Corps I would like to tell you of some of the exploits of the Quartermaster Corps that you as Quartermaster officers are proud of and as Quartermaster officers you must attempt to live up to.

Back in 1942 Time magazine reported: "Most successful of the innovations of World War No. 2 are the officer-candidate schools. More than half of the officers of the most democratic of armies are now men up from the ranks, chosen solely for ability and leadership."

In January of 1941, when officer candidate schools were authorized none were authorized for any of the supply services including the Quartermaster Corps. The Quartermaster General immediately recommended that a quota be allowed for each supply arm and service. In March of 1941 the personnel of all arms and services were included in the officer-candidate program. And in April of 1941 an officer-candidate school for the Quartermaster Corps was authorized. The first Quartermaster Corps officer candidate class, numbering 150, was graduated at Schuylkill Arsenal in Philadelphia on the 1st of October 1941.

Realizing the need for field training, the Quartermaster School was moved from Philadelphia to Camp Lee, Va., on the 5th of October 1941. Since that time, approximately 25,000 Quartermaster Corps officer candidates have been graduated. The high regard of the Officer Candidate School held by the Quartermaster Corps is shown by the fact that of the over 111,000 Officer Candidate School graduates of the services, 25,000 of them were quartermasters. That the course is a hard one to pass is clearly shown by the fact that in the services approximately 150,000 men started the course and a little over 111,000 were graduated.

Your families and friends should be justly proud of you. You have completed a difficult course. You have studied over 28 subjects. You have been taught the actual operation of quartermaster equipment by observing and using it. You have been shown the over-all supply picture by the use of the miniature theater of operations, by motion pictures and lectures. You have lived in the field and participated in training exercises at A. P. Hill Military Reservation. You have practiced amphibious operations at Jordan's Lake. You have been taught methods of supply and how to defend those supplies. You have been prepared to do the job that is the most important job to America today; that is—to win the war.

The importance of your role in winning the war can best be told to you by your Quartermaster General, Maj. Gen. E. B. Gregory. He said, "Never before has an American Army been so closely supported on its offensive operations by such complete quartermaster supply and services. So far, the conflict has taken the American soldier to nearly every latitude of the globe but no matter what new

problems and conditions the future may bring, we know we can meet and overcome them with the confidence born of experience."

You men have a great deal to live up to. Quartermaster operations in this war have been noted for efficiency, ingenuity, and effectiveness.

We will never forget the quartermasters at Bataan who fished at night and gathered rice to feed the troops who were trying to stem the tide of the onrushing Japanese.

The north African invasion was the first big test of the quartermasters' ability to perform its assigned function. Over 700,000 items were necessary in this invasion, many of them quartermaster. This test was successfully met. The computations for requirements had been successful and the operations were ingenious to say the least. In one section even stables and barns were converted to warehouses. The transportation of supplies over the long supply lines in north Africa was accomplished in the main by the use of quartermaster truck companies.

The mountain fighting in Italy presented a problem in transportation of supplies. This problem was successfully met by the quartermaster through the acquisition of mules and by the use of packboards.

Quartermasters with the Fifth Army in Italy devised a clothing and bath exchange unit. Here tired and dirty soldiers could return their worn and dirty clothing, take a bath and receive a clean outfit of clothing. This is a great health and morale builder.

Dry-cleaning facilities were lacking in Italy so ingenious quartermasters converted laundry equipment to do dry cleaning.

Quartermaster operations during the assaults on Biak Island and Hollandia, New Guinea, were mostly a matter of blood and sweat. A lieutenant colonel who observed the action stated: "To stand on a beach and watch these service companies sweat in the tropic heat to move the prodigious piles of supplies and equipment, or to see those drivers coax and wheedle their big vehicles over unbelievably bad terrain; or to witness the growth from chaos to orderliness in the supply dumps is to marvel at the individual back-breaking efforts and the collective units' accomplishment."

Quartermasters with the American division operating in the Pacific needed refrigeration so they manufactured an ice plant out of salvaged materials. Many warehouses in the Pacific have been improvised from native materials.

For the assault on Kwajalein, quartermasters devised and constructed over 4,000 cargo sleds. Supplies were palletized on these sleds for rapid movement from landing craft to shore dumps.

In Burma, quartermasters did the initial development of dropping supplies to ground units from airplanes.

Fresh meat is provided jungle fighters in Burma by a Quartmaster Butchery Platoon.

On the continent of Europe a major supply battle was waged and won by Quartermaster gasoline supply units of the First Army which furnished gasoline to troops, tanks, and trucks during their 400-mile dash across northern France and Belgium.

Mobile dumps were operated by the quartermasters with the Thirty-sixth Division in the invasion of southern France.

Quartermasters in the Persian Gulf have been transporting American supplies to the Russians for over 2 years. The round trip is 1,400 miles. The importance of this work is shown today by the drive that the Russians are making against the Germans.

You will soon take your place as junior officers in the Quartermaster Corps to continue the great work that has been and is being accomplished. The importance of the position that you are about to assume can best be told to you by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower who said, "In the hands of junior officers lies the fate of the Army. You are in direct, immediate command of the troops. You are their inspiration and leaders. All of you are fighting for the right to live as you please so long as you don't get unjustly in other people's hair. You are fighting against dictation and dictators. Only discipline will win a war. Victories come from discipline and discipline comes from the everlasting efforts of the junior officer."

Again, as a former enlisted man and as a Member of your Congress, I want to congratulate you upon the successful completion of this course, and may God grant that you discharge faithfully this trust that is about to be placed upon you.

Lend-Lease and Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, February 11, 1945, entitled "Lend-Lease and Victory":

LEND-LEASE AND VICTORY

Lend-lease is one of the primary instruments for the victory of the United Nations in this war. Never before have allies in battle worked out so harmonious and so successful a plan for mutual aid on so vast a scale. If this truth had not already been demonstrated we would be entitled to deduce it from the facts furnished last week by Administrator Leo T. Crowley, of the Foreign Economic Administration, in his testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. If there are still honest skeptics about Lend-Lease they are so because they do not know these facts.

The ill-informed or wrongly informed, with help from enemy propaganda sources, have spread certain "fictions" about the operation of the Lend-Lease system. Mr. Crowley lists 20 of these with the answers. It is not true that Lend-Lease has helped Britain to keep up her export trade at our expense; that she has charged us for the use of airfields in Britain; that she buys gasolins from us and resells to us at a large profit; that she is overcharging us for goods used by our forces or for freight on her railways, or charging us at all except as these items appear in the reverse lend-lease accounting; that the figures used in such accounting are excessive; that she won't let us have planes badly needed by our Army. And so on.

It is not true that exports are responsible for the cigarette shortage—Lend-Lease shipments took 1¼ percent of our production in 1944. It is not true that American scarcities of butter, beef, veal, shoes, or munitions have been cause by Lend-Lease. It is not true that we are sending goods to Latin America for civilian use under Lend-Lease. It is not true that the Russians are trading American Lend-Lease planes to the Japanese in return for rubber. And so on, again. Enemy propagandists will have to think up other lies to take the places of those now disposed of. And they will have to be better lies. What Lend-Lease actually is doing is splendid enough to drive any enemy propagandists to despair. The dazzling mobility of the Soviet armies is in part due to the 362,000 motor vehicles we furnished down to December 1, 1944, the 1,045 locomotives, the 7,160 flat cars, the 478,000 tons of railroad rails, the 110,000 tons of railroad wheels and axles, the 333,000 field telephones, and more than 1,000,000 miles of field telephone cable. Their industrial recovery after the destruction of the Dnieprostroy Dam was aided by 60 American "power trains," each carrying a steam-driven electric generator system. We sent them 12,000 planes, 295,000 tons of explosives, 135,000 submachine guns, 6,000 tanks, 1,800 self-propelled guns, 1,200 half-tracks, 3,300 armored scout cars, 5,500 artillery prime movers, 1,700 ordnance service vehicles. We helped give motion and power to their superb courage and generalship.

Lend-lease works in two directions. Most of the 5,000 ships used in the Normandy landings were British-built and British-manned, but some of the ships and some of the steel for building others had come from the United States. Some British-built planes contained American lend-lease engines. Some American planes were powered with British-designed engines. The French troops on the western front have received equipment from both Britain and the United States. French and Belgian factories are producing vital supplies for the United Nations armies. American and British supplies have gone to maintain French, Polish, Yugoslav, Brazilian, Czechoslovakian, South African, and East Indian troops now engaged in Italy. French warships, overhauled and refitted in American shipyards under lend-lease, are now patrolling the Mediterranean. In Burma, Chinese, British, and American soldiers have received American arms and ammunition, British uniforms, and Indian food. Fifteen thousand American-built trucks are to be poured into China over the Ledo-Burma Road to reinforce Free China's worn-out 6,000 trucks. Nearly all the tires and tubes required by our forces in the Southwest Pacific in 1944 were produced in Australian factories with the aid of some American lend-lease materials.

The complete picture of lend-lease could not be presented on this whole page or on many pages. But this much can be truly said: Its effect is to shorten the war and to save lives; we receive as well as hand out; and if in the end the money balance runs against us, if we have paid out more in cash values than any other nation, we are still the gainers. For lend-lease, even when we have extended it to other peoples who are fighting our battles, has eased our burden even as it has eased theirs.

Presentation of Medal to Maj. Gen. Merritte W. Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted me, I wish to place in the RECORD the remarks of Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, of the American Social Hygiene Association, in presenting the William Freeman Snow Medal for 1945 to Maj. Gen. Merritte W. Ireland, retired, together with an extract from the report of the committee on awards.

Dr. Wilbur quotes a message from Gen. John J. Pershing, chairman of the committee on awards, who was unable to be present.

DR. WILBUR'S PRESENTATION OF MEDAL

At this meeting it is my privilege to act for Gen. John J. Pershing, chairman of the Awards Committee of the American Social Hygiene Association, in presenting to Maj. Gen. Merritte W. Ireland this medal for distinguished service to humanity.

In asking me to represent him, General Pershing said:

"I regret that I cannot be in Chicago on this occasion to honor by friend, General Ireland. I have followed with the greatest satisfaction his long and distinguished career of public service in behalf of both military and civilian health and welfare.

"In 1929, I had occasion to write a summary of General Ireland's career for the History of the Medical Department in the First World War and, in conclusion I said, 'He is abounding in vitality, mental and physical, quick and accurate in decision, and prompt in action once the decision is made. He understands men and knows how to work with them for the common end. He has a thorough knowledge of the organization of the Army and of the Medical Department's place in it. He is far-sighted in making plans, and unusually able in administration. He is loyal always, but courageous in promoting sound views and avoiding error. He has an attractive personality and a diplomatic turn of mind, through which he has been able, among other things, to promote in the War Department and in Congress the goal of his ambition, which is to make his department more useful not only to the Army but to the profession in eneral.'

"Now, in 1945, Dr. Wilbur, I would like to have you say that I can see no reason to change that statement except by adding that in these years since his retirement General Ireland has served civilian as well as military health and welfare with unabated zeal and statesmanship. Among the most valuable of his distinguished services to humanity has been his promotion of the social-hygiene movement.

"I have always had a profound sense of the importance of the control of the venereal diseases. It is my fixed opinion that our people can be educated up to such a state of mind on this question that these diseases can be wholly eradicated in this country. We have been most fortunate in having General Ireland's leadership in this field."

In these words General Pershing has summed up for us the thoughts we all have for General and Mrs. Ireland whom we honor today. They exemplify for the people of our Nation all that social hygiene stands for in its promotion of successful family life and living.

Through many years of association in official and public service I have found General Ireland one of those rare men who stands up for facts, pleasant or unpleasant, and uses them along with a large element of good will and faith in making decisions or developing policy. His constant efforts to improve medical standards, to better the care of soldiers, and to use science in the service of man make him a natural to receive the William Freeman Snow Medal for distinguished service to humanity. It is a rare pleasure to me to hand General Ireland this beautiful medal and to thank Mrs. Ireland for all the help that she has given to him and to us.

RAY LYMAN WILBUR.

EXTRACT FROM THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON AWARDS

The committee on awards decided this year to select for the award of the William Freeman Snow Medal for Distinguished Service to Humanity, Maj. Gen. Merritte W. Ireland, one of the great leaders in this movement, who exercised such vital and constructive influence on the successful programs for control of the venereal diseases, repression of prostitution, and promotion of social hygiene education during and following World War No. 1. During the post-war period General Ireland continued this influence as Surgeon General of the United States Army, and in many capacities of leadership as an officer in civilian agencies, such as the American Medical Association, National Medical Examining Board, and the American Social Hygiene Association.

The committee felt that as we approach the post-war period of the present world conflict, we are most fortunate in continuing to have the vigorous, experienced participation and counsel of this wise and understanding leader; and that awarding of the medal at this time to General Ireland would be an appropriate token of our affection and appreciation of his great services.

The Soldier Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask permission to include therein an editorial from the Creston News Advertiser, Creston, Iowa, of February 7, 1945. It is a timely commentary on Secretary Stimson's recent report disclosing the ineffectiveness of the Federal ballot that received so much ballyhoo before the election.

As a member of the minority group of the Committee on Election of the President, Vice President and Members of Congress, I decried the "bobtail" ballot because it was probably unconstitutional, and also because it failed to give our men and women in the service an opportunity to vote a full ticket. The Creston editorial points out that the percentage of Federal ballots cast was very small in comparison with the State ballots cast and did not justify the complexities involved in handling them. Clearly the disproportionate results do not recommend a continuance or enlarged use of the Federal ballots and the editorial urges the Congress that in future legislation of this kind provision should be made for supplying the Federal ballot, at most, only to the men in such States as do not make provision for their absentee voters by supplying ballots of their own.

Following is the editorial from the Creston paper:

STIMSON MAKES REPORT ON THE SOLDIER BALLOT

Naturally—and necessarily—all American voters have become accustomed to the political lies which have developed as a part of every campaign in this Nation, and the misrepresentations are confined to no single party.

Last summer and fall one of the chief items employed by the fourth-term campaigners was a denouncement of the State ballots which were to be supplied to the men in service. Secretary Stimson, of the War Department, has just published a very educational statement on this soldier-ballot issue. His report fully sustains the law enacted by Congress which gave soldiers the right to use the State or "complete" ballots, and also a provision for the use of the Federal or "bobtail" ballot where the full ballot was not obtainable.

When this measure was passed, in spite of the opposition of the radical New Deal Congressmen, it was denounced by the fourth-term speakers and writers as an attempt to prevent the soldiers from voting. "It is a vicious effort to disfranchise them," one of the chief campaigners said, and Roosevelt himself stated that: "I denounce this measure as a fraud on the servicemen and the American people." Well, of course, there was nothing to any of that complaint except the usual petty politics, and the report of the War Secretary shows how utterly foundationless it was.

It is now made evident that the men preferred and largely used the State ballots. This is shown by Secretary Stimson, who is simply reporting the facts. His statement is that "most servicemen who desired to vote were able to obtain, and then vote, and then return their State absentee ballots, leaving very few who needed (or legally could) use the Federal ballots."

What actually happened is clearly shown by the official figures covering 10 States which gave the servicemen a choice of ballots. These 10 States supplied the absentee voters with their own State ballots and also the "bobtail" Federal ballots. The soldiers, under the State regulations, were permitted to use whichever ballot appealed to them, and their choice is the best proof of the regard of the soldiers for the two blanks.

In those 10 States, but 2.2 percent of the soldiers used the Federal ballot. There were just 28,136 of the eligible voters who filled out and returned those ballots, while in those same States, 34.6 percent of the men returned the State or "complete" ballots. That means that where the ballots were given equal opportunity, 446,947 men voted the State ballots to 28,136 who used the Federal blank. Stimson calls this "an insignificant use" of the "bobtail" ballot.

In the Secretary's report to Congress he states: "In addition to the insignificant use of the Federal "bobtail" ballot, the administration of this ballot was excessively complex and entailed burdens which appear disproportionate to any resulting utility."

The Stimson report makes the further showing—that in the 20 States which approved the Federal ballot, only 5.3 percent of the soldiers who were supplied with them, filled them out and returned them.

As a matter of course, the voting is all over—it is water that has gone under the bridge and the whole subject would be of no value except for two reasons. The actual results, when compared with the President's denouncement and charge of "fraud" and all the rest of the fourth-term campaign propaganda, show that there was nothing whatever to the complaint and further show that the Federal ballot and the opposition to complete State ballots was not for the purpose of protecting the rights of the servicemen, but was for merely selfish political purposes.

Now, the other thing that is indicated by the Stimson report, and is of importance for it is still an issue, is the continued use of that "bobtail" Federal ballot if the war should continue through another election, or if the war is ended before that, its application to the many thousands of American servicemen who may still be abroad, serving in armies of occupation.

If the Washington Government is to be prevented from election meddling in the future, then it still remains for Congress to enact a further measure: A measure which at most would only provide for supplying the Federal ballot to the men in such States—if any—as do not make provision for their absentee voters by supplying ballots of their own. This is a matter Congress should attend to because the less the centralized Government has to do with our elections, the further we are from acts of dictatorship.

Opposition of Railroads to Water Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Hon. Wendell Philips Dodge, editor of the Marine News, of New York City, bearing on the arguments of the railroads against water transportation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MARINE NEWS,
New York, N. Y., January 11, 1945.

The Honorable THEODORE G. BILBO,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Having in mind what happened to the river and harbor legislative bill, H. R. 3961, during the last few days of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, what we saw in an article in the April 29 issue of the Traffic World, Chicago, comes to mind:

"Senator BILBO wanted to know what waterway development there had been that had cut down the revenue of railroads. Mr. Fort, general counsel of the Association of American Railroads, said he knew from past association with the Illinois Central that diversion of traffic to river carriers had cost that railroad a large sum annually. He said there was no doubt but that traffic on the Ohio River had hurt the railroads in that territory.

"He said that a philosophy that would support such a project as the Tennessee-Tombigbee would tend to weaken the railroads, over a period of time, so that their defense value, upheld by War Department spokesmen and many other high officials of the Government, would be reduced to a far greater extent than the national defense would be promoted by the waterway construction."

It is certainly unfortunate that there are not more broad-gage railway executives today with the outlook and interest in the general welfare as former President Markham, of the Illinois Central Railroad Co. At the time the Federal Barge Line was established down in your country, President Markham said:

"The Illinois Central, of course, recognizes that the barge line offers competition paralleling it on the Mississippi River, but our interests are clearly identified with the interests of the people of the Mississippi Valley * * * if it is a good thing for the people of the Mississippi Valley, it in some way will probably operate as a good thing for the Illinois Central System. If it supplies additional transportation that is needed and may be needed in the future that we cannot supply, or if it supplies a cheaper transportation than we can supply and makes for the prosperity of the people in that section of the country where our own interests are bound up, it in some way may work back to our own selfish interests. Perhaps it will increase the population, increase the amount of business everybody does down in that territory. If it does operate in that way we are going to reap some benefit too."

Who can reckon the benefits to the Nation from a waterway connecting the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers? These navigable waterways flow through the industrial heart of the South, a region overflowing with vital natural resources: Iron ore, coal, limestone, all in juxtaposition and near to the Nation's great oil and gas producing regions of Louisiana and Texas. No other area in America is so blessed by nature.

When almost all waterborne commerce is either prehandled or rehandled by railroads, their never-ending opposition to waterway improvements is utterly bewildering. Railroads have some $150,000,000 invested in floating equipment operating on Federal waterways. Some railroads simply would not exist but for the fact that almost all their tonnage is transhipped via Federally improved waterways: The Chesapeake & Ohio, Norfolk & Western, Virginian, Baltimore & Ohio, Western Maryland are notable examples. It is a fact that the Louisville and Nashville and the Illinois Central on the east, and the Missouri Pacific on the west bank of the Mississippi, would suffer tremendous losses almost every year, with traffic frightfully disrupted, but for the Mississippi levees built by the Federal Government, from Memphis to New Orleans. We cannot recall hearing the railroads call this expenditure from the Federal Treasury a blank check, or inroads on the Treasury, or tendency toward socialism.

When self the wavering balance holds, 'tis rarely well adjusted.

It might be helpful to the railroad boys to reread Aesop's fable, "The Dog in the Manger."

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

WENDELL PHILLIPS DODGE, *Editor.*

More Forest Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Times:

MORE FOREST PRODUCTION

Twenty-five southern Congressmen last week pledged that they will work for a program designed to stimulate rebuilding of timber resources on 200,000,000 acres of southern forest lands. They propose to establish 20 experimental forests, to serve as demonstration areas.

Representative GIBSON, of Georgia, chosen leader of the group, said an appropriation of $1,500,000 will be sought for next year and $1,000,000 annually thereafter to finance the program, which would be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

This project deserves applause and support, as does every other plan which has the purpose of increasing the productiveness of southern forest soil.

The only mistake which might be made, as we see it, is the error of assuming that because such a program is under consideration, and may be launched, satisfactory progress is being made toward the development of southern forest production.

Actually, of course, several areas of the South, including Louisiana, have had experimental forests of this kind for years. They have encouraged better handling of forest lands, especially in the areas immediately adjacent to the experimental tracts.

Also, several Southern States, including Louisiana, have gained much from the operations of pulp and paper mills which, to their own advantage, as well as to the advantage of landowners, have taught better timber-growing practices. It was not until the pulp and paper mills began operation that timber was widely regarded as a crop, to be harvested with the same foresight and care as any other crop coming from the soil.

In addition to these influences, a great deal of intelligent work has been done in the past by the forestry agencies of several States, by university extension departments and parish or county agents. The effectiveness of this work has varied, but it has contributed to a broad forward movement in forestry practices.

We say, therefore, that the worthy project which has been launched in Washington should not be magnified beyond its true importance. If the plan is carried through successfully, and the money is obtained for the experimental and research activity, that will be just one more force helping to promote maximum use of the South's timber-growing capacity.

Our guess is that the effects of all of these influences will be fully felt only in those rural communities and rural parishes or counties where local interest in proper forestry practices has been aroused by local people.

The distant Government in Washington will not be able to do the job alone. Neither will State agencies or local agencies. The main power for the forward drive must come from the southern farmers who own timberland. It is where they are actively pushing the program that the most gratifying gains in forest-land production are now being attained.

The Wallace Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NEW YORK CITY, *February 10, 1945.*

SIR: I am a 52-year-old, Texas-born, Southern Democrat, of Houston, Tex., not a member of the P. A. C. I have been in every State of the Union except Maine (my apology to the gentlemen from Maine) and have traveled literally around and about the world. Was in Japan, across Siberia to Tomsko, China, Guam, and Hawaii, among other places, in the last war. I have sailed the North and South Pacific, around Australia, across the Indian Ocean, the Arabian Sea, Gulf of Gaman, Persian Gulf, Red Sea, Suez and Panama Canals, Mediterranean, around the Cape, the South and North Atlantic, the Caribbean, crossing the equator six times (and almost forgot) the Gulf of Mexico. I have visited England, Scotland, Australia, and all the continents in various places, in my wandering lifetime—and will continue to "ship out" until this war is over, destination unknown.

I alone have written and will continue to write every word which appears above my signature; and am paying for the stamps and all expenses preparing same. I have no ax to grind, just a man in dungarees doing his job.

Here's what I want to say, please listen:

Life for some of us unfolds such a peculiar pattern, we are never sure that we understand it; while others pursue the even tenor of their ways, their success and happiness circumscribed only by their narrow orbit. So I was thinking, wandering along the banks

of the Euphrates River—thinking of the seventeenth chapter of Isaiah: "What is man that Thou are mindful of him." A civilization 14,000 years ago with virgin fields, and a people wise for that early time; now, a morass of creeping sand, the graveyard of known cities as recent as 20 generations past; and, there before my eyes, barefoot men in dresses, hungrily fighting among themselves for our wasted garbage as it was being dumped out on those same imperishable sands. May God forbid that it could happen to America.

Yes; life is a bit tough at times for all of mankind. Out of the hopeless sand dunes of past mistakes, and their endless paths of destructive greed, two nations, the two strongest—the United States and Russia—will lead, either together in peace or apart, but in cooperation with all nations, I hope. Although we dress, talk, and look differently on first appearance, and at the world's distance, it would seem we have nothing in common. As I come to know different peoples in their own environment, I am impressed more by the striking similarity of each individual's desires, thoughts, and efforts, than by the visible differences of languages, customs, governments, opportunity, and resources.

Returning last week after many months from the silence of the seas, like Rip Van Winkle, I am amazed at what I read, see, and hear.

The first thing that struck me was the very bitterness of this ignominious fight on Mr. Wallace.

Somebody down in Congress said it was his lack of qualifications, and yet nobody named a businessman, bank, or individual he has robbed. They don't want to try him (they closed the committee without taking the testimony of businessmen). They want to lynch him. This man whose personal life and every act has been in the public spotlight for more than 12 years.

What is he charged with? Being starry-eyed? Where are the witnesses? One prejudiced, old millionaire—and the case is closed.

We appeal. Americans are testifying all over the land for him. We must make Congress listen to the voice of the people. Who is behind this maligning persecution? The same group of rugged individuals that brought on the last depression, or, to say the least, were not capable of preventing it in their unwarranted freedom to prey upon their fellow men, but in the quaking fear of their greed, hoarded their ill-gotten gains and left too many of the citizens to starve.

Yes, this opposition is the same established order of special privilege from Texas to New York that the Roosevelt revolution at the polls has overthrown so repeatedly the past 12 years. The depth of their hate is because they rightly see in Mr. Wallace the continuing leadership of that fight.

Starry-eyed! Dreamy! Idealistic! Thank God, in this dark hour for America, Henry Wallace is looking forward. The truth is his philosophy is too realistic for them. He, like the immortal Abe Lincoln and our noble Commander in Chief, believes in governing for the benefit of the majority, with unfairness to none.

Henry Wallace has handled $6,000,000,000 worth of the people's money with sagacious credit to himself and prosperity to all. Why, folks, there wasn't that much money in Texas when my old friend Jesse left my home town, Houston, Tex., for Washington, D. C.

His personal character, undisputed by his worst enemy, his vast business experience, a matter of record; and now his realistic and most farsighted approach to the dangerous problems of peace are sufficient reasons why millions upon millions in America today believe unquestionably that Mr. Wallace is not only the best qualified citizen for Secretary of Commerce ever to have been nominated by a President, but amply capable in the not too dim future of a greater service to the Nation.

"One-Eyed Chips Soundings" on "That man, Wallace!"

The ship's carpenter is called Chips. The rest is obvious. He takes soundings twice daily at sea to find out if there is any bilge water or leakage in the cargo holds at ship's bottom, which might lead to damage and disaster. Let's pump out the bilges and see what we find in the "rose boxes."

It takes no discernment to see the issue is not Mr. Wallace's lack of qualifications, no more than it could be Mr. Jones bumbling of war preparedness in failing to provide, with all the billions at his disposal, rubber and other essential war materials when he had the early opportunity. Sometimes squeezing money is more fatal to the nation than spending even at a high cost. Better investigate the R. F. C.

This clash of opinion is bigger than the office, Secretary of Commerce, at stake, and the personalities of either man. In the head-on collision of the liberal Mr. Wallace and the arch-conservatice Mr. Jones, the importance of the conflict is emphasized.

Neither is it wholly Democratic or Republican; it cuts sharply through and is an issue in different forms in each State in the Union. This same cleavage is apparent, or will come up on every important measure to be considered in Congress in both Houses, with continued and increasing bitterness as pressing peace problems are debated.

The voting public will look for the line of division, not in the major parties, but individually study the outspoken stand of each representative. The fate of each officeholder will be determined as he comes up for reelection on whether he was a liberal or conservative (in this broad sense) in considering most important legislation. Personal friendship of long standing is not sufficient when the majority of the citizenship's welfare is being adversely affected.

It slightly confuses this plain distinction of position, when either side points alarmingly at the other, shouting "Fascist" to one and "Communist" to the other. The first implying that the Fascist is a dictator who would enslave his fellow citizens for his own gain. While the Communist is branded as one who advocates the overthrow of the government by armed force. I must confess I have not been able to find either a Fascist or Communist (even Joe Stalin) that advocates either of these un-American concepts, so equally dangerous to the American way of life.

But I do know that vested interests of accumulated fortunes and established power, who are trying to escape their proper share of the cost of the war and shift more taxation upon the burdened backs of the people; those who want deflation to enhance the value of their multiple securities; longer hours and less pay for the working man or woman; lower prices for the farmer, the stockman, and producer; those who are blind to the needs of the great middle classes, and professional men and women, those who seek to crush the competition of the small businessman and especially the prejudicial class of whatever nature, those who wish to continue "white man supremacy," "Jim Crowism," and the poll tax, all of which are most pernicious forms of archaic slavery and can find no justification that is not selfish, unChristian, and undemocratic, and violates the constitutional, moral, and economic rights of the helpless minority; those who want continued discrimination in employment, education, and opportunity; those who would hark back to uncontrolled rugged individualism of preying private capital that precipitated the despairing depression after the last war; the isolationists and pacificists who would not maintain world peace by force, but wait, too late, for another, doubtless, more destructive Pearl Harbor; and any and all reactionary interests of any form of undeserved special privilege—all of these, I say, have huddled together to plan Mr. Wallace's defeat. And I didn't even mention the big interests, newspapers with their daily foul and untruthful camouflage attacks.

But, sir, if you really believe in governing for the utmost benefit of the greatest majority, with unjust discrimination toward no citizen; and that the future peace of America can only be maintained by cooperating with the peace-loving nations, on a world-wide plan that will justly consider the rights of all nations as well as ours and theirs individually and reach a realistic compromise and help to maintain that peace by force if necessary; if your acts are sincerely motivated by such inner belief in this realistic world, no longer separated by geographical distances of the near future, where no nation can live alone and so conduct its national affairs, as to harm any of its world neighbors unjustly—if you so believe, you belong on Mr. Wallace's side.

Clean out the rose boxes, Mr. Mate—I gotta ship out.

Thank you, sir.

"ONE-EYED CHIPS,"
Rating, Ship Carpenter.

Mail address: Neil C. Erwin, 346 West Seventeenth Street, New York City.

The World of the Future—My Ideal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an essay by the late Pvt. Robert Kenneth Osterberg, 19 years old, of Chicago, who died in action in Germany last November 27, and who understood what he died for:

THE WORLD OF THE FUTURE—MY IDEAL

(By Robert Osterberg)

Not an America of the future, not an England of the future, not a Germany of the future, but a more perfect world of the future is what I anticipate. When we say world of the future we mean it in its direct and literal sense. There can be no portion of the world isolated from any other portion, nor can there be any isolationist philosophy. It is by no means a stretch of the imagination that we try to visualize a future world in which we would like to live. In reality, it would be no different from that for which previous generations have striven.

First and most important of all we should have a free and friendly commercial intercourse of nations. This is necessary for a strong economic status in all nations. Also, there must be a fair and equal distribution of all the world's natural resources.

There must be an equal opportunity for all in the field of education, which must be compulsory, and in which a common universal ideal is taught. This ideal ought to be respect for all human personality, because, in the eyes of the Creator, all men are created equal. It was the great American patriot and President, Thomas Jefferson, who first said, "Equal and exact justice to all men." These words apply now as well as they did then.

Each nation will have the right to choose its own form of government. It will be regulated, however, so that this Government remains within the limits of its own boundaries and does not attempt to impose itself upon other nations.

There must be a great reduction in armaments, and an international police force established, composed of all nations. This police force will act as a body, to see that the terms of the peace are preserved, and will prevent the breaking of these terms by any nation or group of nations.

A world court shall be formed which will settle all disputes justly and peaceably. Its authority shall be absolute.

There must be tolerance; tolerance of all nations, creeds, races, colors, faiths, and ideals.

A group of the most brilliant doctors and scientists will work together, in a body, for the betterment of world health and sanitation and for constructive inventions rather than for implements of war.

We of the younger generation realize that much of this work must be begun by the great leaders of the present generation, but that more will be left for us to do, and still more for our children to complete. If we can accomplish these beginnings, our future world will be one of which we can well be proud. It will be one of construction and not one of destruction; of tolerance and not intolerance. Our future world will eulogize less the feats of war and more the arts of peace. The future of the world rests largely in the hands of young America. We cannot afford to fail.

Lincoln Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by my colleague from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], on February 9, 1945, before the MuSoLit Club of Washington, D. C.:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations." In these closing phrases of the second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln set the keynote for the future of America and also gave us a pattern for our conduct in the present war and in the post-war years. Remember that when the second inaugural address was given, the Civil War, which up to that time had been the most fearful and destructive of human conflicts, was drawing to a close. Within a few weeks, the armies of the South were surrendered, their men scattered, and the organized Confederate resistance ceased.

There must have been great bitterness in the hearts and minds of many, many people when Lincoln uttered that immortal phrase. Thousands upon thousands of families had lost sons and husbands. There had been incomparable waste of men and the material resources of life. The internal economy of the country, cspecially in the South, was completely chaotic. The country faced a tragic and dreadful situation.

Yet the man whom we honor tonight on this anniversary of his birth, was able to give a pattern of conduct which is valid, not only for his own time but for the times in which we live. Just as the United States was torn by disorder with many homes broken on account of the war and with chaotic conditions existing in the country, so the world in which we live today has lost, not thousands, but millions of lives to the god of war, and the whole economic basis of human relationships is completely upset. During the Civil War, hatreds and animosities were aroused which even today find some faint echoes in our political life so the world in which we live is riven and torn by hatreds and animosities which will take generations to heal. Think, for instance, of the Polish and Russian homes and cities that have been wantonly destroyed! Think of the horrible massacres in cold blood!

What was Lincoln's pattern for meeting and solving these difficulties and problems? He said, first, "with malice toward none." How magnificent an ideal this is for us to attempt to achieve in this present day. How difficult it is to try to secure an attitude of charity and kindness toward those who are our enemies. Indeed, there are many who will say it is impossible; that it is inconceivable for us or any warring people to avoid malice and hatred. Perhaps it is. Nevertheless, most of us will admit that ultimately the only solution of the problems of this war-torn world will come through the application of the principle set forth, "with malice toward none, with charity for all." Obviously it cannot come at once. That would be expecting angelic action from humans. But, as surely as there is a moral law in the universe, so the ideals set forth by Lincoln will at long last come into fruition.

Lincoln was a great believer in the right. When someone expressed the hope that God was on our side in the Civil War, he gave the rejoinder that he was much more interested that we were on God's side. Throughout all his public utterances and his private life, there is the constant reminder that this man was a man of deep moral conviction. This is again expressed in his second inaugural. Lincoln then proceeds to the task at hand. "Let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds." And indeed, gentlemen, that is now the task that we have before us, "to finish the work we are in," and "to bind up" not only the "Nation's wounds" but the wounds of the world.

This war is not yet finished. We must go forward with it to its final victorious conclusion. Whatever may be its cost in money or sacrifice the American people are determined that we shall go forward to glorious victory. While we become dissatisfied and cynical at times with the progress that has been made, while we deplore and regret the many obvious mistakes and blunders that have been made, nevertheless, we must finish the work we are in; we must accomplish a complete and total victory over our enemies, and this must be done at whatever sacrifice and at whatever cost it requires.

Whatever differences of opinion there may be, politically, in America, whatever diverse opinons may be held as to who was responsible for this holocaust of blood and who brought our country into this world madness, the fact remains that we are in it, we have become engulfed and we must see it through to the end. Let no one doubt that it will be accomplished and we will achieve a glorious victory, and when that is done we shall have the task of binding up the wounds left by war. By reason of the gigantic resources and power of America we shall be shouldered with heavy responsibilities in bringing about a healing of the wounds of war. It will have to come not only through government election, but through the voluntary assistance rendered by voluntary groups of people in the United States of America. Leadership in world affairs has come to our country whether we have sought it or not. It is here and whether we accept or reject it will have tremendous repercussions on the future.

Incidental to healing these wounds, but a very important part of it, will be "to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan." No one realized better than Lincoln or appreciated more fully that the men who really make sacrifices in war are those who are actually at the battle front under arms, bearing the heat and toil, the blood and sweat of armed conflict.

Surely, there is no one who would deny to them the care that a grateful nation can give. For the most part, they had no responsibility in bringing about this war. Most of them would rather have stayed in their comfortable homes doing their work in civilian life; but they were called upon to enter the armed services and had been compelled by the exigencies of war to fight the battles of their country on all the battle fronts of the globe. Let us see to it that after this war we do not forget the sacrifices that they have made and that we give to them the kind of care that Lincoln talked about.

Some splendid strides have been made in this direction already. The G. I. bill of rights passed by the last Congress, certainly was a comprehensive act helping the returning serviceman.

Not only must we care for him, but also for his widow and orphan, and the legislation of the Congress of the United States has undertaken to do this, likewise. Lincoln's injunction "to care for him who has borne the battle and for his widow and orphan" has not gone unheeded.

Finally, Lincoln said that we must "do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations." This is a beautiful phrase, embodying one of the most difficult accomplishments confronting us. It is difficult enough to achieve a lasting peace among ourselves, with all the conflicting interests that exist in America today, to solidify ourselves, to make ourselves into one people; to achieve a lasting peace among ourselves is no small accomplishment. Our task shall be to seek an ordered freedom in America, to continue that opportunity which is the heritage of all Americans. Freedom under the law should be our watchword.

How much more difficult it will be to achieve a lasting peace among all nations, with the world disordered and in chaos, with the normal governments tottering and torn down, with Europe and the Far East in a state of flux. We shall have a gigantic task to maintain the peace of the world. But surely, Mr. Lincoln in his second inaugural, spoke not only for the days in the immediate future following March 4, 1865, but he also spoke to the generation in which we live. He gave a wise and noble standard to which all of us may repair, an ideal to which all of us may cling.

In honoring him on this anniversary, we honor ourselves. In considering seriously for a few moments, the ideals which motivated him, we shall lift ourselves a little closer to the accomplishment of a peaceful, a free and ordered world.

Troop Rotation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter from Mrs. Mildred Brownlee Dorman, of West Monroe, La. It so ably and eloquently expresses the thoughts and emotions

troubling the hearts and minds of the wives and mothers of men overseas that I present it here.

MONROE, LA., *January 30, 1945.*

Hon. C. E. MCKENZIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCKENZIE: A number of things bother me with a nagging persistency. I sometimes think it would be better if I were one of those passive individuals who can settle back and accept without question whatever the day brings. I have even tried to tell myself that it is not for me to suggest, analyze, or even question; that I should simply mind my own business and that Washington will take care of the affairs of the world. This only brings forth the question of where do my affairs end and the affairs of the world begin. Where, indeed? I believe I have a right to ask questions, and though they are endless, I will limit this letter to the matter uppermost in my mind at present.

Although Congress has an enormous task on its hands already, surely it might take on one more problem, that is, rotation of troops, and endeavor to work out some plan to relieve our men who have served overseas for such a long time. Even after the war ends, which will be a long time yet, it may be years before all the men get home. But meanwhile, can't something be done to relieve the men after perhaps 18 months of overseas duty?

The one plan outlined was contingent on the end of the European war, and this plan did not seem to take into consideration the resources in the home front army, but rather proposed to move excess troops in the European theater to the Pacific, and afford relief for men in that area who rated highest under the point system. This plan would be rather tough on the men who have been fighting the Germans. Wouldn't it be fairer to carry on the Pacific war with fresh troops, made up of men who have never been outside the United States? What is wrong with these physically fit men who have been in the Army for 3 or 4 years, stationed at one post for some 2 years or longer, and many of whom have never left their home towns? Why can't they have a turn in the foxholes and jungles for a change, permitting the weary men who have had this experience to enjoy stateside duty for a while?

I have tried to see some logic in the system which camps out one group on battlefields, and sets another up to comfortable living, but I cannot get away from the idea of "turn about, fair play." I realize a general shifting of troops would involve a problem of transportation and cause enough confusion to delay the end of the war. However, I fail to see where transportation is a problem in rotation on a small scale, when men who have lived through some 18 months of overseas duty are offered furloughs in the United States for 30 days—and transportation is always provided to return them to the hell from which they have been given a 30-day reprieve. Why can't this transportation take a new man into combat, and let the veteran take up the duties of the stateside hero?

Speaking of furloughs, whereas the men stationed in the States get a 15- or 20-day furlough every 6 months, it would seem that the men who do the dirty work of the war are deserving of even more. Instead, after a much needed rest of 30 days in the States, the combat men are returned to active duty. Why? When so many thousands have never been overseas at all, why must these men go back?

Too often, the men overseas do not even get a furlough. My brother joined the Navy in July 1942. He has been in four major campaigns, but has never had a leave long enough to come home. My husband has been in the Army over 2 years, overseas 18 months, and during the entire 2 years he has not had 48 consecutive hours off duty. Recently he was promised a rest leave in Australia—a 7-day leave after 2 years. But now he writes: "The hopes of getting a rest leave seem to be getting dimmer every day. Again! I haven't given up hope altogether, but it won't surprise me if I don't get one. It's been a long time since I wanted anything so badly (except to come back to you). Even so, I suppose there are a lot of guys who have been over longer than I that haven't had one." How many more men there must be who have not had a furlough in over 2 years? And even worse, these men can hold little hope, if any, of coming home for years yet, under the present plan. Don't you agree that it is time to do something to relieve these men—now?

If anything is done, it will most probably be up to Congress to do it. While the commanding officers are anxious to give their men a break, they are too busy with the actual fighting of the war to do much about it. Congress has already gone a long way in passing the G. I. bill of rights. But isn't this matter urgent, too?

Now, I will apologize for taking so much of your time. But I have felt it was necessary to register some protest, and to ask questions where there may be answers forthcoming. Ralph and I both have the utmost faith in your conscientiousness, and I can assure you it is most encouraging to know that we have a representative in Washington who has the interests of the people at heart.

With all good wishes, and best regards, I am

Sincerely,

MILDRED DORMAN.

You Can't Blame the Dog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Enid (Okla.) Daily News. It is timely and to the point:

YOU CAN'T BLAME THE DOG

There he sat, scared, uncomfortable, crated, a giant mastiff riding the skyways of America in an Army transport plane, and occupying four seats supposedly reserved for service personnel or for critical war-needed cargo. He didn't like this high flying so well, but there he was, crated, tagged, billed through to Hollywood. He hadn't stowed away; he hadn't gotten on the Army plane by choice. He wasn't critically needed war cargo. He was put there by orders, just as he had been shipped from England by orders, in Army airplane space supposedly reserved for the most urgent purpose of the war; for service or civilian personnel traveling on the highest priorities, in the interest of the war effort, or for foot sloggers or others, tired out with the battle, coming home for a few days of respite from the front line horrors.

The dog didn't know, of course, that alongside him in the plane were riding three servicemen—one a Navy tanker gunner, called home by the death of his father; another a veteran of the India-Burma jungle battles, hurrying to the sickbed of a wife critically ill; still another, a Navy Seabee, returning to duty from a hurried visit to his four children, who were ill. Nor did he know, or could he help it that these three were forced from the Army plane at Memphis in order that he could ride on. The dog hadn't asked an "A" priority rating, while the servicemen had only C and D ratings. He didn't know they were on tragic errands. It wasn't within his knowledge or of his desire that he was occupying precious air cargo space while three servicemen were put aground in order that he might continue his involuntary trip, as his mistress said, "to start a breed."

You couldn't blame the dog, because his master, Col. Elliott Roosevelt, had sent him from England by Army air transport. You couldn't blame him if he was continuing on to Hollywood by air while war veterans were grounded. He was only a dog; and he couldn't have known of the warship that turned back in the Pacific a few months ago in order to pick up another dog, a Presidential dog, a famous dog named Fala; or he couldn't have known how last week a President's wife took up the time of her "press conference" and cluttered the news wires with the astounding, world-shaking information that Fala was "honeymooning in the country"; that Fala was "about to become a father."

Nope! You can't blame the dog, or dogs, either of them.

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the War Food Administration has established increased food production goals for 1945. The farmers of our Nation have patriotically cooperated in the past and they are going to do their utmost to secure these increased production goals in 1945. They are going to do this despite the fact that many farm boys who were deferred for agricultural reasons have been inducted into the service, farm machinery is becoming obsolete and badly worn and new farm machinery production is being curtailed. Many farmers have written me that despite the fact they are 60 or 70 years of age they are going to do their best to carry on for another year. Farmers' wives and farm boys and girls are assuming burdens that should not be placed on them except during a period of national emergency or war.

I would like to urge that the War Production Board give serious consideration to increased priorities for labor and material for the production of additional farm machinery. We not only need new farm machinery, we must have a greatly increased supply of repair parts as the farm equipment is badly in need of replacement parts.

Several of the county agricultural conservation associations in my district have written me regarding the problem facing the farmers in their counties.

I am including in these remarks a letter which is typical of others I have received. It is submitted by Jess A. Connor, chairman of the Trego County United States Department of Agriculture War Board in Kansas:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Wakeeney, Kans., January 20, 1945.

The Trego County U. S. D. A. War Board in session to consider 1945 food-production

goals for Trego County, find that with weather conditions being normal, goals can be met except for the growing scarcity of experienced farm help. We need tractor operators, truck drivers, combine men, skilled operators of machines, and experienced livestock men.

Trego County is willing to furnish her share and more than her share of the armed forces, as long as it does not jeopardize food production. The only industry in our county is food production. Every farmer is engaged in essential work.

We are not in position to know just what would be a reasonable number of servicemen to be drawn from Trego County as compared with other counties and other States but Trego County has furnished about 12 percent of its population. The result is that farm labor is becoming so scarce as to be critical. Inasmuch as it is our responsibility to foster the production of food in this county, we believe that it is well to call attention to the shortage of farm labor and the impossibility of carrying on normal farm operations if more men are drafted off our farms.

Not being in capacity to give advice, we would like to call to your attention the real seriousness of the labor problem. There is a small amount of land showing up already in idle classification. The milk cow numbers are beginning to drop. There is quite a lot of corn in the field that has not been husked, and so on down the line.

We believe the local draft board has done a good job and we commend them for their faithful work, but we believe they are being called upon to furnish more than Trego County's share of the armed forces. In order that food production may not be jeopardized, we suggest that a way be found to leave more of our active young farmers on the land.

JESS A. CONNOR,
Chairman, Trego County
U. S. D. A. War Board, Kans.

Streamlining the Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD an article which appeared in the February 10, 1945, issue of the Christian Science Monitor. Mr. Neal Stanford, the author, has done a good job in compressing into a few words some of the needs of the State Department. It is my feeling that the efficient work being performed by the Department has not been recognized on the many occasions when it has laid the groundwork, cooperated in nursing a necessary policy, and worked quietly and unobtrusively to bring it to fruition. While I cannot speak for its personnel in all parts of the globe, I can say, from personal experience, that in China it has done a grand job. Not only have our representatives there done extremely well in attending to their own duties but, in addition, they have cooperated with the Army in that theater and helped it tremendously. The members of the diplomatic staff in China—many of them old hands out there—have hid their contributions under too many bushels for too long. They are a credit to our country and we should feel grateful that we have such people doing the work they are doing for us at this time. As a Member of the House I want to thank them for their efforts and to wish for all of them good luck and God speed.

STREAMLINING THE FOREIGN SERVICE

(By Neal Stanford)

In war America stands out a global power. In peace will it accept global responsibilities?

President Roosevelt in his state-of-the-Union message to Congress promised it would. Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius is going on the assumption that it will. He is asking Congress for roughly an extra $24,000,000 to expand American Foreign Service this coming fiscal year.

The United States has 800 Foreign Service officers at present. It wants 1,400 after the war. The entire Foreign Service personnel (including clerks, stenographers, couriers, and other employees) totals 6,000. Before the war it was 3,000. After-the-war plans call for expansion to 9,000. Those figures give some idea of how this Government is preparing for peace.

The Service is taking on a dozen new activities. For it is not only the Foreign Service for the State Department, but for every department of the Government. The Commerce and Agriculture Departments will not have foreign services of their own as in the past. Instead of the State Department's Foreign Service will be the eyes and ears and voice for all American governmental interests. Beside watching and reporting on diplomatic, political, commercial, agricultural, and financial developments in foreign countries, it will have specialists in mining, in the petroleum industry, in civil aviation, in labor problems, in cultural relations, stationed in offices abroad.

The United States already has the largest Foreign Service corps in the world. Britain's may be only 60 percent as large. Russia's is an unknown quantity but certainly smaller. That of France has to be entirely rebuilt. Though all will undoubtedly expand after the war, America's plans are the most formidable. It aims to know its United Nations neighbors better than ever before.

How will the United States go about almost doubling its Foreign Service in the next 2 years? There are three ways.

First by expanding the corps by the regular method of examinations. No examinations for commissions in the Foreign Service have been held since 1941. So that actually the regular corps has shrunk in that time rather than expanded.

The Service met the stepped-up demands due to the war by creating an auxiliary. It includes about 600 men. They have been drafted, or they volunteered for these temporary assignments. They are men not eligible for duty in the armed services. Admittedly a temporary expedient, the auxiliary has filled a need.

Some Service Corps officers, however, have watched their infiltration into the Foreign Service and become alarmed. Surprisingly frank letters to the editors of the monthly American Foreign Service journal express this concern. Why pull in outsiders when Foreign Service men by right should be advanced to those posts?

The answer is that most of the jobs are of a technical nature and call for specialists. "Stop squawking about the auxiliary and thank heaven we have in it a group of loyal and devoted public servants without whom the Foreign Service could not have fulfilled its obligations in so magnificent a manner," bluntly replied one Foreign Service officer.

This auxiliary may provide a few new men for the regular corps after the war. Those between the ages of 21 and 35 (the eligibility limits for entering by way of examinations) will go in that way. Those over 35 would need legislation (in preparation) to permit them to stay on after the war. Of the 600 auxiliaries only about 120 say they would like to stay.

The third way of expansion is through the creation of a foreign-service reserve—an idea winning official approval. With the specialized kind of activities the Foreign Service is planning to deal with after the war—from civil aviation to mining—it might not be possible within 5 or 10 years for the Service to train its own specialists. And then most such specialists could get $10 from private business for every $1 the Government could pay them.

The proposal has been made that a panel of foreign-service reserves be drawn up including economists, professors, engineers, experts in innumerable fields who could be tapped for temporary assignments in the Foreign Service. No reserve officer would be called to duty if a regular officer was qualified. But many businesses, colleges, concerns, even newspapers, would be glad, it is believed, to have one or more of their personnel spend a sabbatical year or more abroad in foreign service, gaining in experience as well as aiding the Government.

There's an impression that American Foreign Service officers are inadequately paid. Except for heads of missions, however, their income is generally comparable with that of similar posts in the foreign service of other nations. It is the heads of America's missions abroad that are invariably worse off than representatives of less powerful nations. Not in salary, however. American ambassadors get higher salaries than most other ambassadors, but their allowances for entertainment are considerably smaller. And because taxes eat into salaries but not into allowances, ambassadors of other countries are even better off.

In one world capital, Brazil's chief of mission gets a salary of only about $3,000, but with allowances—on which there is no tax—it becomes $20,000. In the same capital the British chief of mission gets a salary of about $8,000, with some $13,000 for expenses. But the American ambassador with a salary of about $15,000 (taxable) gets only $5,000 for expenses. Much of his official entertainment had to come out of his income after taxes.

Back in the thirties Cuba's Ambassador in Washington got the equivalent (salary, plus allowances) of about $45,000. But America's Ambassador in Cuba got the total equivalent of $23,000. Britain's Ambassador to Washington, all told, is provided with about $87,000. America's representative at the Court of St. James's gets only $23,000.

Except, however, for these top diplomatic posts the American Foreign Service is not the domain of the privately wealthy. And efforts are being made to correct this anachronism.

Even a college education is not necessary. Only about three-fourths of the Foreign Service officers are college graduates. About 1 out of 12 has had no college training at all.

But intelligence is necessary as any perusal of the examinations one has to take to get into the Foreign Service proves. Back when "exams" were still being given, only about 10 percent made the grade. Out of say 400 who might try the 4-day written exam, only 150 would get above the required 70. These were then orally screened. Possibly 40 pulled through.

The exams cover a wide field: all kinds of law, economics, trade, languages, geography, history, government, English.

Officials in the Foreign Service office believe that in the long run the United States gets about the kind of foreign service it wants. The State Department has presumed to ask for almost a doubling of appropriations and personnel because it believes the country today wants global representation equivalent to global responsibilities. It believes that it's just as true in diplomacy that you shouldn't ask a boy to do a man's job

as it is in industry—nor should you try to pay the man a boy's wages.

The $24,000,000 increase Mr. Stettinius is asking for is pin money in today's figures. The $54,000,000 total he is asking for to meet Foreign Service expenses is only what this country is spending every 5 minutes for the war.

Treaty Ratification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, last week the House Judiciary Committee unanimously reported the Sumners resolution proposing to amend the Constitution in the matter of treaty ratification. A more vital piece of legislation will not be presented to this Congress. If the Congress and the American people are to have any real voice in treaty making that provision requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify treaties must be changed. For all practical purposes, the greatest Nation in the world is now impotent and helpless in the matter of treaty making. At no place in American jurisprudence does the dead hand of the past lie so heavily across the path of the future.

Because of the current importance of this matter, I wish to insert two items on this subject which have been in my files several months: First, an editorial appearing in the New York Times on September 5, 1944, and, second, an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on October 21, 1944:

[From the New York Times of September 5, 1944]

THE SENATE'S TREATY POWER

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, as president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, has added his voice to those who are advocating an amendment to the Federal Constitution to provide for ratification of treaties by a majority vote in each of the two Houses of Congress instead of by a two-thirds vote of the Senate alone. The present requirement, as Dr. Butler points out, "might easily lead to almost irreparable damage to the prosperity and happiness of the American people as well as to the great movement of international cooperation to establish and maintain world peace."

There can be little doubt that, if the Senate itself took the initiative in proposing such an amendment, it would be immediately endorsed in the House and endorsed overwhelmingly by the country. The Senate alone has stood in the way of this change. It is understandable that when a small body of men holds the great power that a Senate minority now does, it should be reluctant to give it up or to share it. Many Senators doubtless quite sincerely feel that retention of the present system is in the best interests of the country, even though a majority of their fellow citizens do not share this feeling. But the Senators would do well to ask themselves seriously whether, even from the narrow standpoint of the interest of the Senate alone, it is wise for that body to try to retain its present treaty power in its present form.

Let us suppose that a treaty or a group of treaties is submitted that two-thirds or even a majority of the Senate feels that it cannot conscientiously accept. If such a treaty were submitted to the full Congress and rejected by a majority in both Houses, the country would no doubt accept this result as a reflection of its own majority opinion. But a much different situation would exist if the Senate alone, by failure to obtain a two-thirds vote, rejected such a treaty. Especially if a majority vote of the Senate favored the treaty, it would be pointed out that once more a minority had prevented the majority of the country from making the kind of peace it wanted. There would certainly follow proposals, with a great measure of public opinion behind them, to bypass the Senate and hence Congress altogether, in future treaties. However unwise that public opinion might be, if the Senate had public opinion strongly enough against it, it would be sure to find itself effectively bypassed altogether by one method or another.

The Senate will be following its own self-interest as well as the interest of the whole country if it takes the initiative in removing the two-thirds requirement and in sharing its great treaty responsibility with the House.

[From the Washington Post of October 21, 1944]

TWO-THIRDS RULE

Governor Dewey's speech in New York came close to cementing an agreement between the two major parties to keep the United Nations charter out of politics. Both President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey are now on record also as favoring prompt approval of a peace system before the war ends. The outlook for early completion and ratification of a treaty setting up a new peace system is thus most promising.

We cannot overlook the fact, however, that a shadow continues to hang over our entire relationship to this peace system. The shadow is the two-thirds rule for approval of treaties in the Senate. Probably the basic United Nations Treaty, with endorsement from the leaders of both parties, will slip through the Senate without too much trouble. In any event it will have to go to the Senate before there is any chance of amending the Constitution to eliminate the two-thirds rule. But no one should be deceived by a favorable outlook for a single treaty. International dealings will probably be more numerous in the post-war era than ever before. A major oil treaty is already before the Senate. Others designating armed forces to be at the disposal of the Security Council and dealing with such basic subjects as food, finance, and aviation will doubtless be negotiated. It would be self-defeating to leave in our Constitution a provision which permits a minority of one-third plus one of the Senate to sabotage international collaboration in these fields.

We think it is unmistakably clear, therefore, that the two-thirds rule must go. A Gallup poll a few months ago indicated that 69 percent of the people are of the same mind. Yet the machinery for removal of this obsolete appendix from the Constitution has not been set in motion. We hoped for a long time that the Senate would see the light and initiate action of its own accord. That hope now appears to be futile. Other means will have to be found to force the Senate's hand.

Attention may now well be concentrated on the House. The House has good reason to demand a voice in treaty-making. Only a misconception of how the Senate would function led to denial of House participation in this process in the first place. The House is apparently eager now to correct this error of the founding fathers. We think that a whopping vote in that chamber for a constitutional amendment providing for ratification of treaties with the advice and consent of simple majorities in both houses would give a proper start to the repeal movement.

To undermine any recalcitrant action on the part of the Senate the State legislatures should also be brought into the fight. Two-thirds of the State legislatures can call a constitutional convention for the proposal of amendments and an amendment set in motion by this method could be ratified by the States without ever going to the Senate. Use of this complicated procedure is not likely to be necessary, however, if concerted movements in the States demonstrate to the Senate that there is an overwhelming national demand for democratization of the treaty-making process.

Fortunately, some organizations are already campaigning for this reform. The League of Women Voters has prepared an excellent memorandum for its workers throughout the Nation and is beginning to strike hard for a show of action. If many other national organizations will join hands, they can convert this movement into a truly national campaign. In our opinion it is worthy also of the earnest cooperation of the American Bar Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., the American Bankers Association, the American Legion, and dozens of other national and local agencies through which public opinion is influenced.

The Post has suggested on more than one occasion a national committee to head up this movement and draw all the groups that are interested in a lasting peace into it. It is high time that such an organization be set up. We shall be cruelly fooling ourselves if we assume that world peace can be achieved without prodigious effort and without democratic (majority) control over our own participations in it.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HENRYETTA, OKLA., *February 5, 1945.*

To the Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

The mothers and fathers that have sons in this war, also the wives of the men in the war, they want the Congress of the United States to stop fussing over this post-war system and do something to bring this war to an end as quickly as they can. They say that you Congressmen have had 2 years on this post-war system and have done nothing about it yet. They say all the Congress has done is to fuss over this post-war system. They want to know what you are going to do about it. Can you expect the mothers and fathers to have any confidence in the Congress? Now there is another thing I would like to ask about, that is letting the Japs come back in the United States. If all reports are true that comes over the radio about the cruel Jap treatment of our boys over there in the Philippines, and which our soldiers are fighting and dying for, we, the people of the United States, want to know of the Congress and this Government, are they going to suffer the Japs to come back here even if they are native-born. I myself, being a United States citizen, and the people of the United States, weren't loyal to our Government we would be prosecuted by the laws of the United States. Once a Jap always a Jap.

We the people want to know what you are going to do about this. Please read this in the Congress.

G. W. SELVIDGE.

Full Employment Program Based on Economic Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Scoville, economist for Chrysler Corporation, is exceedingly well known as one who presents his views in a dramatic fashion. In the following article he fully measures up to the fine reputation he established years ago. I am sure the Members of this House will derive both pleasure and profit in reading this highly interesting contribution which appeared in the January 29, 1945, issue of Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly:

FULL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM BASED ON ECONOMIC FALLACIES—LAWS TO BRING PROSPERITY HAVE LOWERED NATIONAL LIVING STANDARDS

(By John W. Scoville)

Take several well-grown economic fallacies, mix thoroughly with a dozen undefined words, season to taste with economic ignorance and pressure group avarice, and bake for 2 years in the ovens of popular discussion—the result is an unpalatable, indigestible piece of hardtack known as the post-war employment problem.

This problem cannot be solved until someone states what it is. Apparently, it is merely a vague, mystical yearning which compels certain people to cry out that after the war someone must provide 60,000,000 jobs—that after the war we must have full employment and a national income of X million dollars—that we must never go back to conditions which existed in the Twenties—that we must have as much employment in peace as in war—that returning veterans must not sell apples on the street—that if industry cannot provide jobs the Government must take over—that we must have a 30-hour week to give everybody a job—that exports must be trebled to provide employment—that we must have full employment to enable the Government to collect necessary taxes—that we must have full employment to prevent a revolution.

We have become a Nation of hypochondriacs, and merely to list the diseases which threaten the body politic—as well as the proposed cures—would require a big book.

ECONOMIC TERMINOLOGY HAS CHANGED

In past decades, when we were more rational, we spoke of good times and hard times, of business being slow, active, or depressed. We realized that when times were hard everyone was less prosperous. The modern theme song promulgates the idea that that when times are hard the only class which suffers is made up of those who work for wages. Now, instead of hard times, we say unemployment, and instead of good times we say full employment.

Suppose that, by some miracle, the amount of labor required to produce goods was reduced by 80 percent. Ten million people could then produce all the goods formerly produced by 50,000,000. I suppose the advocates of full employment would consider this a great catastrophe, and believe that 40,000,000 would be unemployed and starving. They hold to the theory that the easier it is to obtain food, clothing, and shelter, the larger the number who will die of cold and starvation.

Now what would happen in this hypothetical case? Some people would work for 5 years and retire. Some would work for 10 weeks and then take a 40 weeks' vacation. Some would work 2 hours every day in the year. Most people would work to secure additional satisfactions—finer homes, finer furniture, better clothes. Many more families would hire domestic servants. There would be a great increase in travel, recreation, and amusements. More people would go to school. There would be a greater demand for barbers, beauticians, painters, sculptors, lecturers, gardeners, etc. In short, we would have more leisure and a higher standard of living.

Actually, we need not rely on a hypothetical situation. For a century the productivity of human labor has been increasing. What was the result? Less employment. Children, instead of working, went to school. More young people went to college. A larger proportion of old people retired. Those who labored worked fewer hours. People had better houses, better clothing, better food. Per capita production and consumption increased enormously in variety, quality, and quantity. Another result was a shift in occupations. There was a relative decline in employment in agriculture, mining, and manufacture and a gain in the professions, in clerical work, and in trade and distribution. Population increased, as did the average length of life.

As we gained mastery over the forces of nature we took part of the dividends in better living and part in more leisure or less employment. As technology advances, it is reasonable to suppose that these trends will continue. Let us be done with this scatterbrain doctrine that the end all and be all of life is work, toil, or employment.

The apostles of full employment do not consider it necessary to define the phrase. What is meant by employment? Is it the total hours of labor of all, is it the number who do some work, is it the number who work for wages, is it the proportion of those who want to work who are working? If all adults worked 3 hours a day, would that be full employment? Is the kind of work done important? Is a gambler employed? Is a dope peddler employed? Is a lawyer waiting in his office for clients employed? Is a wheat farmer employed in the winter? Is a boy who peddles papers employed? Is a housewife employed? If she hires a maid, is she employed? Is grandma employed when she knits? Manufacturers who introduce labor-saving machines are sometimes accused of reducing employment. They should admit the charge without any apologies. Instead, they frequently make the foolish defense that labor-saving devices create jobs and increase employment.

NO UNIVERSAL RIGHT TO A JOB

One of the most absurd of the current fallacies is the idea that everyone has the right to a job. President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress, said: "Of these rights, the most fundamental, and one on which the fulfillment of the others in a large degree depends, is a right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation." Does this alleged right to a job refer to the right to be self-employed? Has the citizen a right to buy a farm and operate it? Has he the right to buy and operate a grocery store, a barber shop, or a bakery? If qualified, has he the right to practice law, or medicine or dentistry? Obviously a citizen can do these things, but it would be foolish to say the citizen has the right to do these things, for the exercise of rights involves the interests of other people.

This right to a job does not apply to those who are self-employed. It must then apply exclusively to those who wish to be employed by someone. This right to a job is of no value to millions who have jobs. By elimination, we see this right to a job has value only to those unemployed who are seeking employment.

Since all rights are reciprocal relations, if the unemployed have the right to a job, some persons have the duty to employ them. But it does not help John Doe that someone has the duty to employ him. He has applied for work at several factories and farms without success. If the right to a job is to mean anything to John Doe, then someone must designate the person or firm who is to be compelled to employ him. I say compelled, because John Doe has been unable to find a voluntary employer.

President Roosevelt and Senator MURRAY have indicated that the responsibility for compelling someone to hire John Doe rests with the Federal Government. President Roosevelt and the full-employment bill specify that everyone has a right to a job in the industries, shops, offices, farms, or mines of the Nation, which are privately operated enterprises.

A Government official comes to John Doe's assistance. He tells him the Government has selected Farmer Brown as his employer. The official and John go to Brown to complete the arrangements.

Brown notices that John Doe is undersized and rather old. But he meets the official standards—he is able and willing to work. Farmer Brown asks if John would work for $30 a month. That will not be enough, says the official. The President has said—"Americans do not regard jobs that pay substandard wages as productive jobs." The full-employment bill specifies: "at locally prevailing wages." I find that average farm wages here are $60 a month. We demand that this man work for you at $60 a month.

Look here, says Brown. I make about $600 a year after paying my expenses. I have one hired man now, and I do not need two. If I hire this man, he will not earn his wages. If I pay him $60 a month, it will reduce my income to only $240 a year. Why should I be selected as the goat to hire this man? Let Smith hire him; his farm is bigger than mine. The official replied, "Brown, you did not sign up for the crop-restriction program. Our President has declared that everyone has the right to a job. In order to give these rights to the unemployed we must compel someone to hire them. We selected you in this case. You seem to be a reactionary who puts private interest above the interests of society. Furthermore, you are not to fire John Doe on the grounds of incompetence. He meets Government standards; he is willing and able to work." Farmer Brown then said: "I can't fight the Government. I am quitting this farm right now, and looking for work. Find me a job. I demand the right to a job." The official then took both John Doe and Brown to list them in the unemployment office.

This picture is not exaggerated. It illustrates exactly what the Government would be compelled to do to guarantee a job to every applicant in private industry. Of course, if the Government guarantees jobs to all, industry will no longer be private.

If the Federal Government guarantees to everyone the right to a job in private industry at remunerative wages, then employers are denied the right to determine the number employed, the wages paid, and the qualifications of employees. Most laws protecting rights of citizens are for the purpose of protecting citizens from injury by other citizens. But a full employment or right to work law enables job seekers to injure employers. This is a perversion of the function of law.

JOB GUARANTY WOULD MEAN COMMUNISM

The guaranteed right to a job in private industry is a promise the Government cannot meet—a right the Government cannot grant—without replacing freedom with communism.

We read in the full employment bill that "the rate of Federal expenditure may be varied to whatever extent the President may determine to be necessary for the purpose of assuring continuing full employment." And the President said in his recent message to Congress: "Our full-employment program

requires the extensive development of our national resources and other useful public works." So these jobs are not to be in the factories, farms, and mines. They are to be public jobs like the W. P. A. jobs, and the public projects are not to be undertaken because the people want them, or because they will be worth the cost. They are to be undertaken to provide jobs. The injury is to be inflicted, not on private employers who may be compelled to hire people they do not want, but on the Federal taxpayers, who will be compelled to pay for public works they may not want.

Since these Government projects will not be worth what they cost, they will not provide useful and productive jobs. While these jobs will not be substandard in wages, they will be substandard in utility. Which means that although the jobholders will not be cheated, the taxpayers will be. The real purpose of a full-employment law is to protect arbitrary wage scales established by labor monopolies by relieving the employed of the competition of the unemployed.

The President seeks to create more jobs by "an increase in our export trade above the pre-war level." But the purpose of foreign trade—like domestic trade—is to secure goods with less labor. A gain in foreign trade would not increase employment unless we gave our exported goods to foreigners. We could hide the gift element by giving money to foreigners (or making unsound loans) and then accepting our own money for the goods exported.

I will pass over the purchasing power fallacy, the fallacy that we need 60,000,000 jobs, the fallacy that we must work as hard in peace as in war, the fallacy that it is a responsibility of government to provide jobs—all fallacies incorporated in the President's recent message to Congress.

FREEDOM TO EXCHANGE IMPAIRED BY LAWS

What is the reason so many people have difficulty making exchanges of labor or goods? Why are we less prosperous than we might be? I believe the great impediment to progress is the intervention of Government in our economic affairs. Freedom to exchange has been impaired by laws on wages and hours, by minimum wage laws, by innumerable laws relating to agriculture, industry, and trade, by the rules of trade unions, cartels, and trade associations, by unfair tax laws, by fixed customs, etc.

Practically all laws passed ostensibly to make the people more prosperous act in reverse. Most regulatory laws seek to reduce output. Federal farm laws seek to restrict the acreage and output of farms; labor laws seek to restrict the amount of work done by shortening hours and by making labor more expensive; old-age pensions will not be paid unless the recipient agree to quit working in covered employment; unemployment insurance makes it easier to live without working; tax laws are framed to interfere with the accumulation of capital and to penalize efficient firms and efficient individuals; customs duties interfere with our making profitable exchanges with foreigners; fair-trade laws prevent merchants from selling goods more cheaply; laws to keep profits and interest rates low restrict the accumulation of capital; frequent changes in the laws destroy confidence; laws to debase the currency destroy the public confidence in our money—and so on with no end in sight.

Nearly every law to regulate our economic affairs lowers our standards of living and creates more poverty. These ill effects of legislation have been masked by our great gains in technology. But our scientists cannot forever overcome the evils done by the lawmakers.

OUR REGULATIONS ENCOURAGE MONOPOLY

Just as tariffs are enacted to protect us from foreign competition, so we have domestic tariffs to protect us from domestic competition. Thus we have laws to promote labor unions, so that the worker getting high wages may be protected from the competition of those who would work for less; we have fair-trade laws to protect the merchant who sells for high prices from the competition of the merchants who would sell for less; farm subsidies and acreage restrictions to protect farmers who wish to secure higher prices by producing less; unemployment compensation to protect employed workers from the competition of unemployed workers; old-age pensions and youth assistance programs to protect workers from the competition of the old and the young; taxes on chain stores to relieve independent grocers of chain store competition; regulation of motortrucks to relieve the railroads of some of the competition from trucks; taxes on oleo so it will compete less with butter; profits taxes on efficient firms to protect inefficient firms; maintenance of membership clauses to protect the income of labor unions; minimum wage laws to protect arbitrary high wage rates; public works projects to protect employed workers from the competition of the unemployed.

These laws, which make it possible for sellers to ask higher prices, cannot compel consumers to buy at the higher prices. The result of these restrictions and interventions is a reduction in output, a distribution of total output according to governmental favors, a curtailment of competition, and encouragement to monopolies.

Can the Government create greater prosperity and help the people to product and exchange? Yes. By repealing every law to regulate trade, wages, prices, and employment, and by restoring economic freedom.

A full employment law would be an attempt by Government to cure the unemployment largely caused by the laws passed to regulate business. Can the Government help us? Yes. It can help by leaving us alone.

The fraudulent theories of the economic medicine men reduce to this: "Everyone is to get more for what he sells and pay less for what he buys." While all of us may attempt to apply this rule, and some may succeed, it is obvious we cannot all succeed in getting the best of the bargain. These flimsy economic fallacies are advanced by pressure groups who claim their schemes for advancing their own interests will promote the general welfare.

For society as a whole, production and consumption are equally important. But the individual, who get his income from one source and spends this income in a thousand channels, feels it is easier and more important to increase his income than to reduce his expenditures. A factory worker is more interested in getting a wage increase than he is in reducing the price of toothpaste, bread, gasoline, or shoes. The pressure on Congress comes from producers. But any law which helps producers will injure the consumers. Congress is therefore unable, by economic regulations, to increase the general welfare.

H. R. 381

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas in support of H. R. 381 on February 6, 1945, under the sponsorship of Hon. C. H. Herndon, of Montgomery County, Ark., as follows:

Whereas a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives in Congress on January 3, 1945, same being House bill 381, by Mr. FADJO CRAVENS, of Arkansas, which bill has for its purposes and intent, the assessment and taxation of real estate owned by the United States of America for local purposes; and

Whereas many of the local units of government in many of the States are in distressing financial circumstances; and

Whereas the enactment of said House bill 381 by Mr. CRAVENS would afford much needed relief: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fifth General Assembly of Arkansas:

SECTION. 1. That the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas go on record as favoring the passage of said bill.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. CRAVENS.

Taxes and Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the dinner meeting of the Controllers Institute, Thursday, February 8, at Hotel New Yorker:

It is a privilege to appear before this group of distinguished and practical experts.

More properly, you should be addressing me. For you gentlemen, keenly attuned to the problems of business and employment arising from taxation, can speak with the authority that only painful experience brings.

Further than that, the Congress and the Nation should thank you collectively and individually for your assistance in putting into operation the system of withholding taxes. Without this practical addition to our tax structure, very likely it would have fallen of its own weight.

I have not heard one substantial complaint about your self-imposed tax-collection job. I wish I could say that there were no complaints about our tax framing job.

BACKGROUND OF REVENUE PROBLEMS

We have come a long way in the past 5 years in the devising of the heaviest tax collections ever conceived by man. Our gigantic program of war spending makes this tax collection necessary. The Congress has used every reasonable means, and I am afraid some not-so-reasonable means, to tap the earnings of individuals and business on behalf of the Federal Treasury. Federal yearly revenues are now about $47,000,000,000, and with $10,000,000,000 added for State and local levies, taxes amount to over 35 percent of national income.

Our Ways and Means Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, came to the conclusion last year that income taxes had reached the point of discouragement.

What is this point of discouragement?

Well, out in my big State of Kansas a farmer says a cow needs 3 acres of grass. The grass will grow just enough to keep ahead of her appetite. A hundred cows on 300 acres of pasture would be safe. Put 150 cows in there, and you'll soon get a bovine rendition of Don't Fence Me In, and a bunch of broken gates. When the grass disappears a cow gets discouraged. You lose both grass and cows.

If Government overloads business with taxes, it will lose both business and revenues. The millions that want jobs in useful private enterprise will be forced to look to a paternalistic Government.

Our committee stood pat against increasing individual income rates for 1945, and with success. The 1944 Revenue Act did increase corporate excess profits taxes from 90 to 95 percent, but the corporate normal and surtaxes were held at the 40 percent rate, and the 80 percent over-all limit was also maintained.

There have been many complaints about the complexity of the tax system and a lot more complaints about the way taxes are collected under interpretations of the law by the administrators. The present tax structure is involved and confusing; simplification and clarification can save many millions of dollars of both the taxpayers and the Government's dollars.

EFFORTS TOWARD SIMPLIFICATION

The Tax Simplification Act of 1944 is our start toward tax reform. It gave 30,000,000 taxpayers the privilege of using the withholding receipt for a tax return; it gave 10,000,000 others the privilege of rapid calculation through the short form.

Corporate and other business taxes deserve a similar simplification. Of course there are people who thrive professionally on these complexities, but by nature business executives have a yen for efficiency. The "make work" theory has never been accepted as sound economic practice.

The degree of simplification we achieve will be in ratio to your demand and public understanding and I urge you to use your creative talents for this high purpose. I am not nearly so concerned about your concealing complaints from Congress as I am about your being timid with suggestions.

On the Republican side—at least—we have a very stubborn attitude on taxation. In the face of all these brilliant new theories by tea-cup economists and long-haired leftists we cling to the idea that taxes should be adjusted to sound business practices, and not that business should have continually to adjust to new taxes.

We don't want government by "taxocrats" continually meddling with the competitive practices that brought this Nation the highest living standard on earth and the capacity to outfight and outproduce all regimented peoples.

SOME FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

For that reason, we so-called conservatives have some weird experiences in trying to frame a tax law with the so-called liberals, who are especially liberal with the dollars of 50,000,000 taxpayers. It's like approaching fatherhood. You try to work, try to study, pace the floor, you begin to get scared. Finally, you get a law. Then come the screams. Your tax baby looks strange, maybe deformed. You say, "Did I help produce this thing?" So we look for someone to share the blame. We call in the tax doctors.

One thoughtful suggestion which came out of this group, I believe, proposes that information returns for income-tax purposes and the employers return for Social Security taxes be combined. To me, this double reporting, looks unnecesary and I hope you can suggest practical methods of relief.

Some of you report difficulty over an interpretation by the Bureau of Internal Revenue which requires tax withholdings to be reported as of the date of actual payment, rather than determining the withholdings on the basis of established pay-roll periods. I am sure a solution to this problem can be worked out with your assistance, so that you will not be required to abandon sound and established practices.

I mention these two problems because they illustrate how you can give us guidance from your own personal experience.

THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

We still have a complication with regard to individual income taxes which is bothersome. Exemptions for normal and surtaxes are not the same. We allow $500 exemption per taxpayer for the 3 percent normal tax, and for surtaxes we give a $500 exemption respectively to taxpayer, spouse and dependents.

This procedure is necessary to obtain as many tax contributors to the war effort as possible, since the burden is so great that all must share the load. Had the many surtax exemptions been allowed for normal taxes, about 12,000,000 would have escaped income taxes.

The great simplification feature of the present income tax is the option granted to some 30,000,000 taxpayers to use their withholding receipts as a tax return. Thus, we have shifted at least part of the cost and trouble of tax computation to the government. It does not hit the heart of the problem since the law itself is still cumbersome and unwieldy.

I believe we can produce a clearly written tax law which the average taxpayer can understand and follow. A man can dream, can't he?

THE TAXES ON CORPORATIONS

So far, nothing has been accomplished toward simplication of corporate taxes. There are five corporate taxes.

1. Normal tax, top rate, 24 percent.
2. Surtax, top rate, 16 percent.
3. Capital stock tax, $1.25 per thousand of declared value.
4. Declared value excess-profits tax, 6⅔ to 13⅓ percent.
5. Excess-profits tax, 95 percent.

The last tax is clearly a war measure and certainly has no place in peacetime economy. It should be eliminated immediately with victory. And it is only proper to call a spade a spade and refer to the recapture of profits through renegotiation a sixth tax and one which only war can justify.

The capital-stock tax and declared value excess-profits tax were adopted back in the early days of the Roosevelt administration.

The Budget estimates a yield from these taxes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, at about $500,000,000. This is not all revenue by any means, because both taxes are allowed as deductions in computing income and excess profits taxes. Hence, the government realizes only about $150,000,000 revenue from these sources.

Aside from the comparatively small revenue involved, these taxes have caused more headaches to business than any tax which has ever been written into the Federal code. It is admitted to be a guessing game. The one guessing closest to the future income of his corporation is the prize-winner because he pays less taxes. This is a particularly difficult and often costly sport, especially in these times of uncertain incomes. The declared value excess-profits tax and the related capital-stock tax should be eliminated.

I believe our tax system should telescope corporation normal and turtaxes into one flat rate and give a lower rate to small business through credits or exemptions. The complicated structure of normal and surtaxes were enacted to collect income tax on the interest from partially exempt Federal bonds. They are still exempt from normal tax, but the surtax catches them.

Now, since the interest from all Government bonds issued after March 1941, is subject both to normal and surtaxes, the problem has all but disappeared, and could be solved if the Treasury would call in the partially exempt bonds, which are callable and allow a tax credit on the balance.

A SOUND TAX STRUCTURE

I am a great believer in having one tax for corporations in order to eliminate the waste and expense of keeping the many records which are now required to compute taxes on so many different bases. The Government would save the countless man-hours now devoted to checking taxpayers' returns; business would be relieved of many millions of dollars of needless cost of compliance.

Frequent changes in our tax laws play havoc with business policies. It has been impossible for most taxpayers to plan ahead. Not only that—but they must maintain idle funds against unsettled taxes, new claims and new decisions by the collector. Business cannot plan employment and operating policies upon such an indefinite tax policy and shifting interpretations. Certainty in taxes can contribute greatly to our future progress.

The tax policies of Great Britain and Canada in this respect provide quite a contrast to our own. While these nations, like ours, have been faced with extreme war conditions and have made frequent changes in rates and exemptions, the great body of their substantive tax law has not been changed in the last 10 or 15 years. They change the rates—not the tax structure.

Our post-war taxes should be so soundly conceived that we can emulate our British and Canadian cousins in their constancy.

PRESENT FISCAL PICTURE

What's ahead in taxes? Well, before discussing that, let us look at our present fiscal picture. During the current year the Budget anticipates a total outgo of $99,000,000,000. Estimated receipts, after the appropriation for the old-age fund, is set at $46,000,000,000.

Now, where are these collections coming from?

Individual income taxes, about $19,000,000,000.

Corporation income taxes and excess profits taxes, about $17,000,000,000.

This total of $36,000,000,000 of income taxes will furnish almost 80 percent of our total revenue. In addition, somewhat under $2,000,000,000 is expected to go into the Treasury through renegotiation.

We will collect $5,500,000,000 from excise taxes and one-half billion net from employment taxes. The balance—about two and one-half billion—will come from estate and gift taxes, customs, and miscellaneous receipts.

A COMPARISON OF NATIONS

No other country derives so much of its total revenue from income taxes. In many nations, more than one-half of the revenues come from excises. Great Britain gets a fourth of her total revenues from excises, even though she is a firm believer in the income tax. In one of his recent budget messages, the British Chancelor expressed hope for the return to the system of more reliance on excises. Canada gets about one-third of her revenues from excises.

Therefore, any consideration of post-war tax programs must determine what percentages of the burden shall be borne by excises, personal and corporate income. Men have been eternally seeking the proper balance. It is in the scales of economic justice.

TAX PLANS—GOOD AND BAD

Some of our post-war tax plans go so far as to advocate a complete repeal of the corporation income taxes. Some tax economists advocate an eventual repeal of most excises.

Other groups favor a high corporate tax and advocate low personal income taxes. There can be and is an honest difference of opinion as to which method merits approval. On one premise we must agree—that is,

as long as the Government spends, we've got to meet expenditures by taxes.

No; we cannot approach this bright new peace by reducing taxes simply to ease the tax burden, or by suggestions that the other fellow pay instead of you.

THE FEDERAL FINANCIAL SYSTEM

Our Ways and Means Committee of the House is the source of the tax law. Likewise, the Appropriations Committee is the source of authority to withdraw money from the Treasury. Of course both are subject to the vote of the whole Congress, but the House committees do the original planning and spadework.

As now organized, Ways and Means plans the taxing without so much as a conference with the Appropriations group on the spending. We in Ways and Means must impose all the taxes we think the economy can bear, yet revenues have lagged far behind expenditures. The result is deficit and debt, and while deficits are unquestionably necessary during war, as a peacetime policy they promise only national catastrophe.

The so-called streamlining of Congress is the subject of various plans, and some of them seek better correlation between the spending and taxing functions. Congress needs well-paid and expert help to handle these billions in budgeting. Also, professionally, you should be interested, for men of your methods and talents are just the type who can save us billions in both spending and tax planning.

We are just pouring sand down a rathole in our tax planning unless it is related to control of spending. Spending is taxing. The tax burden is compounded when that spending competes with business and destroys taxpayers.

THE TAX PLANNING

There have been several comprehensive studies on the post-war tax system. Two or three are being made by Government bodies; others come from unofficial, but nonetheless, authoritative, groups. They are all helpful and hopeful and will receive careful consideration. Perhaps they take too much for granted in spending economies and balanced budgets, but the fact that 62 proposals (at the last count) have been produced in prime evidence of aroused taxpayers.

Post-war taxes are getting more attention than any other proposed legislation in our history. All tax groups, whether they be Republicans, Democrats, right or left, labor, business, or agriculture, agree that expanded business activity and high employment are the twin goals of our post-war economy.

But let's not say that taxes in themselves will bring about either. The chief contribution our tax system can make is to give employment and business activity the best tax climate we can reasonably afford.

All of us concerned with taxation may well ask of each tax that is now on the books: "Does it injure the chance of full employment?"

The excess-profits tax is marked for early slaughter on my list as a tax which seriously discourages investment in new enterprise or in the expansion of business.

This tax tends to discourage the very type of business—that is going to make jobs—the enterprise that involves considerable risk. Surely there still is a place in America to make an honest gain by risking a shoestring on an idea, a patent or by hard work—an idea that will make jobs.

What other taxes should be reduced and to what degree is a round-robin argument. Surtaxes on personal income are too high and will discourage investment; the same is true of corporation taxes.

The double taxation of dividends as individual income after they have been taxed as corporation income is an inequity and needs serious study.

Small business needs special considerations. The big ideas of today, the core of our progress, came out of the little tinker shops of yesterday. More than any antitrust legislation, the promotion of the welfare of small business is a guard against monopolies and social stagnation. We must, therefore, be certain that tax relief applies to the lower brackets and small enterprises for the sake of employment as well as progress.

I speak particularly of taxes on business largely because I believe it is your professional interest and also because corporation taxes are my particular assignment in the Republican Post-war Tax Study Committee. This committee is composed of 25 members of the minority who are versed in tax matters, and under the able leadership of Mr. REED, of New York. However, I must for the record say that income taxes are just as burdensome upon the individual. Any reduction of corporate income taxes must have a compensating reduction in individual taxes.

TAXES AND BUDGET

By the lowest estimates, our post-war budgets are going to run $17,000,000,000 to $30,000,000,000, depending on how much we spend for war veterans, foreign relief, defense, debt, and public works. These are the items above those we used to consider a normal $4,000,000,000 Government.

We are collecting about $46,000,000,000 in wartime taxes. If we spend $23,000,000,000 we could reduce our tax collections 50 percent and still balance the budget on our present basis of national income. Actually, it is not as easy as that. Taxation, budgeting, and spending by the Federal Government have an effect on our national income. Now, please don't anyone say that we plan to cut post-war taxes in half. It might be good politics to say it, but it would be dishonest and a disservice. I hope we can do it. The only honest way is through economy in Government spending and prosperity shared by labor, agriculture, and industry.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

The Joint Committee on Taxation, representing the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, is giving the entire tax structure and our post-war problems a careful and close study. It has assigned its staff, directed by the very able and overworked Colin F. Stam, to the details of this tremendous task.

The joint committee, by a resolution, requested the Treasury to devote their full energy to this problem. Their tax economists and experts are cooperating wholeheartedly. Every possible effort is being made to gather in the ideas of tax-minded persons and groups.

Probable post-war budgets are being set up and from this long study, which started back in June and July of last year, the Congress will be furnished the basic facts, data, and information on which to proceed and write the changes in our tax laws.

You men who know the general thinking of our committee in the House under Hon. ROBERT DOUGHTON'S leadership, and the Finance Committee of the Senate under Senator GEORGE, will understand the good common sense that will be basic in the task. Perhaps that is the greatest word of encouragement and optimism I can bring you.

A FEDERAL TAX COMMISSION

The one thing I dread is a repetition of past experiences. Our committee will be petitioned by and hear the testimony of labor, agriculture, and business. Each group will ably and honestly present their suggestions.

In case of conflict, who are we to believe? Or shall we just follow the rule of votes and constituency? Will this old-fashioned, time-worn routine give us a sound tax structure? No; it will not.

I have consistently advocated a Federal tax commission, a commission composed of representatives of agriculture, labor, business, and industry, individual taxpayers and consumers, tax accountants, tax lawyers and tax economists, this committee to cooperate as a fact finding and advisory committee to the Congress.

Congress can write a tax bill but it must be acceptable to our people. We need the wide experience and broad views of every group. We must have the whole-hearted cooperation of labor, agriculture, and industry.

My anxiety is that the best tax plan bears the widest approval of the Nation, because it is the plan of most general approval that is going to be your tax law, perhaps the tax basis for generations to come.

Don't personalize your tax complaints. Fit them in with the tax problems of others. Judge them in terms of national welfare.

BUILDING THE POST-WAR TAX STRUCTURE

Having this in mind I think we can all agree on five basic points which must be the very foundation of our post-war tax structure.

1. As to its source, it must be developed by a representative, patriotic group, not one suspect of privilege.

2. As to its effect, the primary motive must be maximum employment and business activity.

3. As to its scope, it must give more than casual attention to the balancing of spending by revenues.

4. As to its benefits, it must equitably spread tax relief.

5. As to its soundness, it must bear approval by the most expert and practical opinion available.

Your taxation committees—the whole of Congress for that matter—are only the sounding board of the Nation. Before we are lawmakers, we are selectors and arbiters between the segments of our economy.

The justice of your Government depends upon the interest in government by the just. And the summary expression of government is its taxes, for in their collection the government manifests its character—constructive or destructive.

Let's not patch our tax structure with politics, privilege, and provincialism.

Let's leave enough grass for the cows.

Iowa General Assembly Asks for Repeal of Daylight-Saving Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following senate concurrent resolution recently adopted by the General Assembly of Iowa:

Whereas the return to standard time will help increase food production and help win the war and mean more daylight working hours for agriculture; and

Whereas daylight-saving time has proven a burden; and

Whereas daylight-saving time has failed to save daylight or accomplish its purpose: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to immediately take the necessary steps to return the United States to standard time and abolish daylight-saving time by terminating the War Act of January 20, 1942 (ch. 7, 56 Stat. 9), said act providing that Congress had power by concurrent resolution to terminate said act.

That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, President of United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress.

The Fifth Army in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I made over the radio on February 9, 1945:

January 18, after my return from the European combat zones, I made a report on the floor of the House, on our Fifth Army in Italy, as I had seen it. I tried to outline the history of that heroic army, since the time when it was formed by Gen. Mark Clark in Africa, shortly after the landings there in 1942, down to today, when it is attacking again south of Bologna. Since then, many requests have come to my office on the Hill to repeat that story. Now, in the 12 or so minutes allowed tonight, I cannot cover all the points made in that hour-long recital. Moreover, even that report was necessarily inadequate. Although I talked with literally hundreds of G. I.'s in Italy, it was impossible, during the few weeks I visited them, to get any complete picture of that vital front.

For example, it is impossible comprehensively to report on the Italian front, without understanding the job that our British allies are doing there. For the American Fifth Army, under Lt. Gen. Lucian Truscott, is holding only one-half of the line. The other half is being held by the British Eighth under Lt. Gen. Sir Robert McCreary. Both armies are grouped under the command of America's Clark. And he, in turn, is under the command of British Field Marshal Harold Alexander, who guides Allied military destinies in the whole Mediterranean theater. Time necessarily limited the scope of our committee's activities. I particularly regretted this circumstance in Italy because, since my return to America, I have been asked many questions concerning British efforts in Italy; I have heard a number of sharp criticisms of it, and I have been unable to answer them. Worse, I have discovered that there are many people in America who hardly know that a large British Army is today fighting beside our own, in the sleet-lashed mountains above the Po Valley, and are jointly with us forming policy in the liberated areas. I am particularly sorry that I have not been able to report to those who are interested in the character and efforts, aims and objectives of the British in Italy, for the part that our Allied armies play there today, and the diplomacy they practice there today and tomorrow, will largely determine the shape of things to come, politically, in central Europe. As Italy goes, you might say, so will go the whole Mediterranean. There, above all other places except Germany, it is of the utmost importance that American and British diplomatic and military efforts be well synchronized, if peace is to be harmonious and fruitful. Indeed, the troubles in Greece are only a forerunner of what may yet face American and British armies in Italy, if we can't get our joint war efforts and peace aims straight.

But now let me come to the main points that I tried to cover in the House about the American military effort in Italy. First, that effort has, unhappily, not received the popular appreciation on the homefront that the long and bloody battles of the Fifth from Salerno to Bologna have deserved. There has been a comparative blackout of news since the fall of Rome on June 4, 1944. This was natural enough since the Cross Channel Invasion began two days later, and the subsequent gigantic battles of Eisenhower's armies were vastly more decisive in character. But the fact remains that the scant news coverage the Italian theater has received since June 4 has not had an exhilarating effect on the Fifth Army's magnificent veterans, who are just as human as you and I are in liking their best efforts noted.

I pled in the House, I plead again tonight, with everybody who has a son or husband or relative in the Fifth Army, not to underestimate how terribly difficult their job still is, and how great the hardships they still endure. I urge them in their V-mail—the mail from home which is the backbone of an army's morale—to tell our men out there that they have not been forgotten, nor the importance of their front underestimated, simply because the newspapers are finding it difficult to give this front much coverage.

But why, you ask, doesn't it get more coverage, since there are plainly hundreds of thousands of our men there?

Well, let me give you the reasons as they have been given to me by professional newsmen themselves.

Said Lloyd Stratton, of the Associated Press: "We have a large staff assigned to Italy; coverage has been as constant as new developments have justified."

Harrison Salisbury, foreign-news editor of the United Press, said: "The Italian front hasn't gotten a play because the action is slow. * * * There's more action elsewhere, and action makes the news."

Now, I certainly don't want to argue what news should be published with these two well-known and able newsmen, who have played so great a part in informing Americans about the tremendous and rapid series of catastrophic events which have transpired around the globe since Pearl Harbor. But I must take issue with the definition that "action makes the news."

The truth is, and always has been, that "news makes the action." Let me make a very solemn reflection for a single minute on the subject of what is and what is not news. All news begins, of course, with words. Two thousand years ago a quiet sermon was preached on a mount. We know that it was not considered news by anyone in Rome at the time. But those words, and the effect they had upon people and the subsequent actions they took as a result of those words, including an incident on Golgotha, also unreported in Rome at the time, were the real news that finally overthrew the whole Roman Empire. Those words are still news today, which is making action. The men who believe the words, that is, the news, out of Jerusalem, will never be able to compose their differences with nazi-ism and communism, and this is still going to make plenty of world action. Again, a series of speeches in a Munich beer hall, delivered 20 years ago, although badly reported at the time, have resulted in all the military action on the western front today. Today the greatest piece of real political news in the world is what Mr. Stalin is saying to Mr. Roosevelt about Poland, Germany, and, of course, air bases in Siberia. These words—this news, if we ever get it straight, is going to generate most of the political and military action in the world for the next quarter of a century. In short, the real news—what men are saying, thinking, feeling, contemplating, as well as what they are enduring and suffering will inevitably result in a series of actions tomorrow. News makes the action.

Now by this definition, the real news in Italy today is the way that hundreds of thousands of American boys—and probably British boys, too—are feeling and thinking about the war that they are fighting, and the peace they are fighting it for. And those feelings and emotions, whether the press covers them today or not, are going to result in political action of a very determined sort when they get home.

Let me give you one example of what I mean. Many of our men in Italy and elsewhere, too, have been overseas 2½ years without a furlough. It is foolish to believe that their long exile in foreign lands and their experiences there, have not affected their thinking profoundly. This change in the thought processes of millions of Americans may not be action, but it is news. For what they think today will have serious repercussions in American political life for a decade.

For example, if they return home with no sense of grievance and injustice against the Government and the way it has run the war, everything will be all right. If they don't, everything may be all wrong. Now men who have been overseas and often under fire for more than 2 years do begin to feel they have such a grievance. They call it the failure of the rotation plan.

When I came home, I pleaded, as many others have done, for some policy of fixed tours of combat duty for troops and units. Now these words were not action, either. And yet it seems they were news—because they produced actions. Hundreds of letters came into my office, and those of other Congressmen, pleading that some such policy be adopted if possible.

Let me read you one editorial (among many) which was printed as a result of that by no means original observation made in an "unworthy" theatre. It is from the Army and Navy Journal of January 27. I quote:

"The present system of leaving ground combat units in the front lines indefinitely, replacing only those men who are battle casualties, must be revised to provide rest and relief for officers and enlisted men. * * * The conditions in the Fifth Army, as described in the House of Representatives by Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, will be paralleled on a larger scale in other theaters unless measures are taken to correct the system. In World War No. 1 entire divisions were withdrawn from the front lines and replaced by fresh divisions to keep the personnel from suffering too greatly from battle exhaustion. Now divisions are retained in their combat positions, their strength being maintained by replacement of individuals. The result is that the men who are not yet casualties feel that they have no hope, that the law of averages is against them. The War Department frankly states that it has no plan for limiting the front-line service of ground-force men similar to the limited missions set up for Air Force men. Such relief cannot be afforded, the War Department says, because of the 'lack of personnel for replacements.' This, then, adds another cogent reason for the adoption of a stronger manpower policy (on the home front). The present rotation system, which is limited in its application and cannot be counted upon by the men to provide them relief in any given period, is the only means now available for the relief of front-line men. The new regulations on rotation, published in last week's Army and Navy Journal, will not result in any increase in the actual numbers of men returned to the United States, and hence does not constitute any liberalization of policy. * * * If manpower is the stumbling block then there is even more reason for putting universal service into effect so that the utmost

use may be made of men in production and at the war fronts."

On February 4 we read that certain selected troops of the Fifth Division serving with General Patton's Third Army in France have received top priorities for 30-day furloughs in the United States. The Fifth Division landed in Iceland on September 5, 1941, moved to England in August 1943 for 2 months, spent 8 months in Ireland, and landed in Normandy in July 1944. The overseas time of many men in that division probably ranks highest in our armies. But there are many men in Italy—and in France and in the Pacific—who have spent, perhaps, less time overseas, but more time exposed to shellfire and bombing, than many of the men of the Fifth Division. In any case, the First, Third, Fifth, Ninth, Thirty-fourth, Forty-fifth, Forty-first, and First Armored are all divisions which have been held overseas more than 2 years.

I know that General Marshall is doing everything in his power to formulate such a priority furlough policy, based on length and character of service in divisions. I think I understand (having witnessed them) the terrible difficulties of shipping shortages, and trained combat shortages that face him in this effort.

Still I do not agree with the Vice President, Mr. TRUMAN, who said recently of me when I urged that haste be made in this direction, that the matter was "none of her business." It is the business of every legislator to point out danger spots in the war effort. Incidentally, the Vice President knew that very well himself when he was just a simple Senator, heading the Truman Committee Investigating War Production, an effort which often led him to criticize occasional Army policies, and most intelligently.

Now it may be a very hard truth for all of us to bear; it may even be a problem to which there is no immediate and happy solution. But I shall stand on my private right as a citizen of this country and my public duty as one of its citizens to tell my listeners that our men in Italy—whether they are "active" in a headline sense or not—have been fighting a very long, very hard war, that this is currently not appreciated, and that either appreciation or relief and preferably both, are certainly due them. And that the "news" from the Italian theater is that our men know it, too, and don't like it. And I don't blame them. But make no mistake, whether they like it or not, they're going to finish the job, as they began it in Italy—superbly.

In closing, let me return to his strange definition that "action makes the news." I think that the greatest piece of news that could possibly be printed would be the news that all action has stopped—and that the war was over victoriously.

Your Congressman at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMMET O'NEAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by the gentleman from Connecticut, Hon. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN, Sunday, February 11, 1945, over WDRC, Hartford, Conn., entitled "Your Congressman at Work":

A constituent said to me, when he learned that I was appointed to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives here in Washington, "You know, Herman, the one who holds the purse strings is the master." Today I want to discuss with you the work of this congressional committee which holds the purse strings of our Government and of which I am honored to be a member.

The Constitution provides that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in conequence of appropriations made by law. Appropriation bills, with few exceptions, originate in the House, rather than in the Senate—just as all revenue-raising measures must originate in the House, because the Constitution so provides.

The percentage of Republicans and Democrats who sit on this committee is approximately the same percentage as prevails in the House. At the present time, it consists of 43 members, 25 of whom are Democrats and 18 are Republicans.

Our committee has a multitude of objectives. The first and most important of these is economy. Because of our present public debt and in view of its increase, we must, of necessity, economize wherever economy can be had.

It is the responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations to check the growth of the public debt in every way posisble with the general welfare. We cannot and should not deny a penny that is requested of us by responsible military and naval leaders as essential to the vigorous prosecution of the war, but, as to so-called nondefense money demands, we must weigh carefully every dollar we are asked to appropriate, having ever in mind the peacetime economy when our enemies shall have surrendered.

For the fiscal year 1940, which is the last fiscal year preceding the period which has been used in financial statements as the "war spending period," the total appropriations for all purposes was $12,827,000,000. We thought that was a tremendous amount. I still think so. However, the cost of fighting a war is expensive and the next estimated budget calls for eighty-three billions.

As we look ahead to the forthcoming peace era, what do we see? The annual interest charge on the public debt alone may be six billion or more. It has been estimated that veterans' aid and care alone will run between three and five billions. Our post-war defense establishments may occasion an annual charge of well over five billions. Therefore, you have an annual bill of around fifteen billions with no allowance at all for the other expenses of Government.

In this effort to reduce expenditures, there must be no politics in our committee. It is essential that we plan all appropriations with a thoroughness that gives to our deliberations a unanimity which could not be had if politics were permitted to enter into our decisions.

The Committee on Appropriations is exceptional and differs from the other House committees. Numerically, it is the largest committee in the House. It is also the only committee of the Congress that may initiate an appropriations bill. It has a powerful veto over all executive departments, agencies, and bureaus. It can deny money not only to any department or bureau, but it can also deny money for the purposes of administering any legislation enacted by the Congress which requires funds for its operation. Of course, the Congress, in its wisdom, may override anything recommended by the Appropriations Committee, but in only rare instances has the Congress acted in opposition to the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee.

The control of the purse strings has been the ladder on which nations have risen to become democratic governments. The old dynasties, the absolute monarchies of the world, especially France and England, could not have been disturbed if it had not been eventually necessary for them to secure the consent of the people as to the limit of the amount of taxes placed upon them. They could have ruled indefinitely through the divine right of kings had it not been that they could get money only by the consent of the people. When they failed to secure and spend money by arbitrary undemocratic whims, both the English and French dynasties went down and our democratic form of government developed.

Since appropriations must be met out of taxes, the foundation of our financial system and its success depends upon careful and wise appropriations for the conduct of our Government.

The committee's tremendous responsibility and vast scope of work is perhaps best visualized when we take a glance at some of the Government bureaus, departments, and agencies to which it appropriates money. Every branch of the Federal Government, Executive, legislative and judicial, comes before us with their budget—the War Department, the Navy, State, Post Office, Justice, Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, Interior, Civil Service, Communications, Social Security, Public Health, Food and Drug, Federal Trade, Federal Works, are but a few of the departments which lay before us their claims for moneys to carry out their functions as provided for by congressional legislation.

It would be a physical impossibility for each member of the Appropriations Committee to enter into the job of handling the details of all departments. Therefore, each member is appointed to a sub-committee which is designated to handle the detailed appropriations of some departments.

I have been assigned to a subcommittee for the Treasury and Post Office Departments. The Treasury has under it a number of bureaus which have a multitude of activities. Here are some of them: Foreign Funds Control, Control of Currency, Bureau of Customs, Division of Research, Bureau of Narcotics, Secret Service, Procurement Division (which purchases supplies for the Government), all lend-lease materials for all our allies, Fiscal Service, Bureau of Engraving and Printing (where our money and bonds are printed), Bureau of the Mint (which makes all the coins for our own country and, as a public service, for many other countries in the Western Hemisphere). In addition to these and many others, there is the all important Bureau of Internal Revenue. This Bureau, as you probably know, is charged with the responsibility for the collection of all taxes, including income taxes. The size of this one Bureau alone and the details of scrutinizing its appropriation requests can best be understood when I tell you that they employ close to 50,000 persons.

When examining the Post Office Department's requests for appropriations we must consider and approve the Department's activities in many fields: the erection and maintenance of post-office buildings, salaries for carriers and clerks, and railway and airmail service. We recommend the budget for printing postage stamps, money orders, and all the other important activities of the post office.

From these few duties in connection with only two divisions of our Government you can understand that we are, in truth, the watchdogs of the Treasury.

Our subcommittee, as well as all subcommittees, is compelled to conduct exhaustive hearings. We have before us not only the heads of the departments but also their assistants and the experts of the Government to aid us in understanding the need for a suggested appropriation. We examine them from day to day over a period of from 3 to 6 weeks to justify their requests. And in the event of a request for a deficiency appropriation (which is need for more funds than was appropriated in the first place), time must be devoted again.

When a subcommittee concludes its deliberations the bill it has agreed upon and

an explanatory report is presented to the entire membership of the Committee on Appropriations, which reviews the action of the subcommittee and must give its approval before the bill can be reported to the House for its consideration and passage.

The work is most exacting, and on a major subcommittee (such as the Treasury and Post Office, to which I have been appointed) one will devote the better part of 2 months in advance preparation, sitting at the hearings, reaching conclusions, attending a review by the whole committee participating in the consideration by the House. From the moment an appropriation bill comes to us we have on each subcommittee, as well as the whole committee, the services of career men, who sit with the committee through all its deliberations, giving us the benefit of their many years of experience and knowledge. To these clerks who help us must be given much credit for making our job a bit easier.

The committee has an investigative agency which it employs to investigate, verify, and report upon any matters upon which it may desire information either in Washington or elsewhere.

Since coming to this session of Congress, our subcommittee, for many days, has been sitting from morning to night. If there are any among you who have written or telegraphed me and have not received an immediate reply, you will now understand the reason for the delay. My work of necessity compels long hours in order to meet the demands of the people of my district.

Members of the Appropriation Committee have home work. It is not uncommon to see members of my committee leave for their hotels with heavy books and reports which must be read and studied so as to be prepared for the next day's hearings.

The necessity for studying is called forth by the desire to keep from making appropriations that are unnecessary or wasteful. Each member of the Appropriations Committee vies with every other member in his effort to save a dollar here or there because this committee appropriates your tax dollars and that concerns every citizen.

Hardly a day passes but that I must also give attention to questions of legislation in which persons from within and without my district are interested and who write, telephone, or call upon me.

There are many men and women in Washington who want to talk with a Congressman upon matters before his particular committee and on subjects of general legislation. In order that a Congressman may be adequately informed, he should listen to those who want to discuss legislation with him.

This country is fortunate in having a man of such broad vision as the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, as the chairman of the committee. He is a man who believes in fair play and honesty in all his dealings with the committee, the Congress, and the Nation. It has been my good fortune to serve in previous Congresses with him but I consider myself especially fortunate that I am now able to serve with him as a member of his committee as well. Through my membership on Appropriations, I feel that I can better serve my district and the Nation than has heretofore been my privilege.

He is the author of Cannon's Precedents, which is the guide book to the transaction of legislative business. He occupies the seat in Congress filled for so many years with great distinction by the late Speaker, Champ Clark. The previous chairmen of this committee have been such national figures as Thaddeus Stevens, President Garfield, and "Uncle Joe" Cannon.

The late Edward T. Taylor, of Colorado, a former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations once said: "The solemn obligation upon every member of our committee to constantly and courageously protect the Federal Treasury against thousands of appeals and imperative demands for unnecessary, unwise, and excessive appropriations makes the Appropriations Committee of the House and its 11 subcommittees the hardest-worked, most powerful, and, in my opinion, the most important committee in Congress."

In conclusion, I want to say to you that the Committee on Appropriations is alive to the many problems of the Nation and the eager desire of all to keep the expenses of operating our Government at a minimum. Its job is difficult. Its membership is made up of men who, in my judgment, may be relied upon to discharge their responsibilities well, with the aim ever foremost to do that which, in the end, will prove to be best for this great country of ours.

Fight Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the well-known firm of Johnson & Johnson, of New Brunswick, N. J., is doing an excellent job fighting inflation.

I have just received a letter from the vice president of the organization in which he states:

JOHNSON & JOHNSON,
New Brunswick, N. J., February 9, 1945.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are certain that you are sympathetic to the tremendous job ahead in safeguarding the consumer against dangerous price increases. In our opinion it is second in importance to the winning of the war. Through the Office of Price Administration our Government has and is doing a most commendable job in price control. Johnson & Johnson is supporting this program wholeheartedly by carrying the "No inflation" message to the public through the medium of 300 newspapers, national magazines, farm, professional, and trade journals.

We submitted this promotional material to Mr. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, and I quote here an excerpt from his reply:

"I think you and your people have done a grand job on the advertisements and window posters which compare the prices of Johnson & Johnson commodities with the prices of the same items during the last war.

"Actually, since May 1943 the cost of living has increased only about 1 and a half percent according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. We have a tough job ahead of us if we're going to hold that line, but I think it is important to the whole stabilization program that the public have a true picture of where we stand. Misconception about the trend in the cost of living could only lead to increased inflationary pressures."

We thought you would be interested in the actual results of our long established policy of the lowest possible price consistent with the highest quality products. The attached sample advertisement is evidence of our accomplishment.

We feel that this is an opportune time for this publicity since the fight against inflation is most important to the economic future of our country.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR B. HILL,
Vice President.

The newspaper article that will appear is headed "No inflation here." It compares today's prices with prices during World War No. 1. For instance, Red Cross bandage, 2 inches x 10 yards, during World War No. 1, 1918, cost 20 cents; now it is 10 cents. Red Cross adhesive tape, ½ inch x 5 yards, was 35 cents; now it is 10 cents. Johnson's baby powder then was 25 cents; now it is 21 cents. Red Cross cotton, 1 pound, then $1.25; now 98 cents. Johnson's—Lister—dental floss, then 25 cents; now 10 cents. Red Cross gauze, 36 inches x 5 yards, then $1.25; now 59 cents. Johnson's baby soap, then 25 cents each cake; now 25 cents for two cakes.

In addition, the following statement appears in the advertisement:

These are "medicine-chest" items used daily in millions of American homes. Their lower prices spotlight the Johnson & Johnson philosophy of making the highest quality products available to you at the lowest possible costs.

The Late Honorable Francis J. Seiberling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Akron Beacon-Journal on the death of the Honorable Francis J. Seiberling, who died in Akron, Ohio, on February 1, 1945.

The Honorable Francis J. Seiberling was a former Member of this House, serving in the Seventy-first and Seventy-second Congresses as a Member of the Fourteenth Ohio District, which I now represent. He was a gentleman of character and integrity who made a worth-while contribution to the Congress and to the community in which he lived.

The editorial follows:

FRANCIS SEIBERLING

Always constructive without being spectacular, Francis Seiberling was one of the men who helped build Akron into the great industrial city it is today.

His ability to analyze financial problems and his keen perception of opportunities made his advice invaluable to both big and little businessmen alike.

He was a foremost member of the Akron bar, but it had been years since he had tried a case in court. His work was as a business counselor in the conference room.

Mr. Seiberling gave generously of his time and wisdom to community projects and to his church. His interest in good government was evidenced by the fact that he put aside a lucrative law practice to serve as Congressman from this district for 4 years. Too many of our truly able and successful professional men are too busy to serve their city, State, or Nation in public office.

With it all, Mr. Seiberling was a very human sort of person, who enjoyed good companionship and lively conversation.

He was completely devoted to his family.

His death at the age of 74 closes a fruitful life, which leaves lasting benefits to the community as a whole and to his many friends.

A Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include herewith the radio address of February 4 on the subject of World Peace, by that distinguished lawyer and former Ambassador to Great Britain, Hon. John W. Davis, of New York.

In furnishing to me, at my request, a copy of that address which has not yet been printed by the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, in whose behalf it was delivered, Mr. Davis said:

Undoubtedly there is going to be a hard fight over the final terms of any international organization. If we let too much cooling time elapse after the war is over we may find ourselves in the old familiar ditch.

I hope every Member of the Congress will carefully read Mr. Davis' speech. We must strike while the iron is hot.

I hold in my hand a paper signed by 150 distinguished Americans. The names of the signers are known throughout the country, and had I time to read the list you would realize that almost no field of activity is unrepresented. It is their message that I am asked to deliver this afternoon. I will let them speak in the words of the document they have signed:

"At Dumbarton Oaks the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China took a momentous step in the age-long struggle for liberty by proposing to give international sanction to human rights. They proclaimed that in order to create 'conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations' there must be international action to 'promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.' Thus they recognized that the violation of human rights anywhere may be a threat to world peace everywhere. To safeguard these rights they open the way for a permanent agency within the coming world organization.

"For this action at Dumbarton Oaks the long march of history has blazed the path. Freedom-loving men won Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, and the constitutions of many of the United Nations—this gives us faith.

"In recent times these historic acts by nations have led to the beginning of international recognition of human rights as in treaties, in the Covenant of the League of Nations, and in the charter of the International Labor Organization.

"Then in our generation the forces of oppression and militarism defiantly sought to reverse the process. The flagrant violation of human rights by Nazi and Fascist states, revolting to the conscience of mankind, stands as a symbol of an ever-present threat to peace and freedom. First discriminating against, next persecuting, then butchering helpless men, women, and children they later enslaved small unoffending nations and ruthlessly set out to conquer the world. Not only was this an attack on the inherent rights of individuals but it was a direct attack on the moral and religious foundations of our society. At each dreadful step civilized men and nations were horrified. Too long we forgot that to defend man's freedom is man's endless battle; that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty for all nations, great as well as small, and for their citizens.

"In face of dangers now so evident, the United Nations have once more stressed the essential place of human rights. President Roosevelt rallied the world to the Four Freedoms as the common goal. In approving the Atlantic Charter the United Nations called for complete victory 'to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands as well as other lands.'

"A major objective of our foreign policy, as stated by Secretary of State Stettinius, is the encouragement of all those conditions of international life favorable to the development by men and women everywhere of the institutions of a free and democratic way of life, in accordance with their own customs and desires.

"Dumbarton Oaks is both a promise and a challenge—a challenge to us to see that the promise is fulfilled.

"For the maintenance of human rights we seek the support of all peace-loving nations and all men of good will. Let us make sure that those who shall have died in this war to overcome the gravest of all threats to men's freedom shall not have died in vain and that the coming generations shall live in a peaceful world in which human rights and fundamental freedoms are honored.

"To this end we urge the United Nations to create in the coming world organization a commission on human rights and fundamental freedoms."

That is what they wish me to say on their behalf; and for these views they ask the approval and support of public opinion in the United States. Not many, I believe, will dissent. Let us think about it for a moment. Some day, we hope, believe and are sure that this war will end in the complete defeat of our enemies. Their mad dream of world conquest will be over and the vast crimes they have committed will be avenged. Once more we shall have proved by force of arms that man is both too weak to wield unlimited power and, thank God, too noble to submit to it.

Then will come the slow, laborious, and painful task of setting the world to rights, and of building a world system under which decent men, honest men, men who respect themselves and respect others, can live with security in freedom, and in peace. Who thinks that this will be easy? We can and we will drive maruding nations back to their rightful boundaries. We can and we will strike the weapons from their murderous hands. We can and we will punish those who brought all the present misery on the world; and to the limit of our resources, we can bind up the wounds they have made and succor the multitudes whom they have tried to starve. Thereafter, building for the long future, while no less imperative, may prove to be hardly less difficult.

The Dumbarton Oaks plan is a good beginning, but we must frankly recognize that it is only a beginning. Out of it we hope there will come an organization where in Whittier's words "the nations lift their right hand up and swear their oath of freedom." We have high hope that this organization will advance the rule of law among nations as among men and that it will have sufficient force to bridle the restless, curb the ambitious, and punish the evildoer. We hope also that in the language of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals it will be able to "promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."

The proposal I have just read to you urges the setting up of a commission on human rights and fundamental freedoms directed to this end. It is a necessary part of permanent peace for there can be no such thing as a lasting peace that is not founded on the decent treatment of human beings.

Nations can be considered free and independent only when they have shaken off the shackles of outside power and become masters of their own destiny. Individuals are free only when others cannot force them into action against their will. The chief duty of all governments, as we Americans conceive, it is to preserve, both for the nation itself and for its individual citizens, the freedoms they have the right to enjoy. It has been well said, however, that "he only is free who lives among free men," and this can only come about when every human being throughout the world, of whatever nationality, or creed, or race, or color, east or west, may, under just and equal laws, live out his life as he best chooses so long as he does no injury to his neighbor.

Truly this is a high goal and certainly a long, long road. Our grandchildren and their grandchildren may never see its end. The teachings of history warn us that the advance can only be slow and that success will require patience rivaling the infinite. Human nature cannot be changed by act of parliament or congress. Bigotry cannot be eradicated by a stroke of the pen or by mere creation of a commission. But all this is no reason why men of today should not set their feet on the path. They must set their feet on this path if civilization is to be justified by its works.

One often hears the statement that if this or that result does not follow our victory, the war will have been fought in vain. I do not care for this expression. To put down the lawless outrage of the Germans and the Japanese is worth all and everything it costs, and when that has been achieved no man will have the right to say the struggle was in vain. Victory over evil is never vain. But if after this war there shall come to the world a deeper love of liberty and a new birth of freedom, countless generations of men will kneel and bless our soldiers, sailors, and air men for their sacrifices on the blood-stained fields of battle.

Drafting of Farm Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to again address Congress on the question of drafting farm boys between the ages of 18 and 25. It is exceedingly unfortunate when a Government agency such as the Selective Service sees fit to put its own interpretation on a law passed by the Congress, and in this particular case I have reference to the now famous Tydings amendment.

It is an exceedingly unfortunate situation when farmers who took this law at its face value and proceeded accordingly now find that an agency of the Government can ignore in principle the provisions of the law, and under orders from Mr. Byrnes, chart a new course in the selection of these men. At the time the Tydings Amendment was passed, it would seem to me that it should have been the policy of the governmental agencies to read into the meaning of that amendment certain fundamental things, things

that will concern the lives of farm youth in the years to come.

By the action of General Hershey and his selective-service organization, they are today placing upon the lives of young men engaged in farm effort a stigma from which they can never recover. If it is legitimate and wise that trained minds in technical fields of industry are deferred on the principle that they are more needed in our great industrial plants, than at the war front, then the same should be said of the boys on the farm. The passage of the Tydings amendment was a complete recognition of the essential requirements of farm work in conjunction with the war. By this act then, all honor should be accorded to the boys who remain on the farm. This is not the case. They are being made to feel that they are slackers, that they are hiding behind the advantages of the Tydings amendment to avoid entering the Service.

Boys who dedicate themselves to the task of growing food in this hour of global war should have every honor placed upon them for their work. It must never be said of them in the years to come that they have failed in their task. It is the duty of this Government, and of the people, to impress upon the boys who dedicate themselves to farm effort that they are just as essential to the war effort as those on the battle front, and are entitled to every honor it is possible to give them.

Should we fail to do this, then these thousands of young men, whose parents seek deferment for them under the Tydings amendment, will have the feeling in the years to come that they failed in a great hour of test. If we are going to give honor to technical minds in industrial plants, then like honor should go to the boys on the farm. The policies that now are being followed, changing of plans, and new interpretations are bringing down upon the farm boys a disgrace from which they will suffer down through the years. There should be a way found to designate farm work and the production of food for the armed forces as an honorable profession, and one in every respect comparable with the work in the armed forces. Unless this Government can so bring honor to these young men, their lives in the future will of necessity be unhappy because their Government has failed to dignify and to make the effort of farm work in the time of war one of great patriotism.

The drafting of farm youth goes on even in the face of the Tydings amendment because the interpretations lack candor and understanding on the part of the selective service.

My able colleague from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] made an excellent analysis of the situation in his remarks of February 8.

I am glad to note that the distinguished Senator from Maryland, author of the Tydings amendment, as well as others have seen fit to introduce a resolution to investigate the misuse of power and misinterpretation of the amendment. The trouble is it is too late, but it is a step in the right direction.

Sale of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I include a recent article appearing in a local newspaper, showing a list of items offered for sale as surplus property.

This list of surplus products presents a situation that not many of us believed to exist. It will be noted that it includes 1,200 50-gallon drums of lard oil and 700 50-gallon drums of extra winter strained lard.

It has been my understanding and I am sure the understanding of most people throughout the country that there was an acute shortage of fats and oils. Under the administration's program, they have been and are now subsidizing some vegetable oils as much as 100 percent of the O. P. A. ceiling. This is true, while at the same time millions of pounds of lard have been allocated to the soap makers unrationed; and yet the housewife is rationed for lard to feed her family.

Now we find that lard is being sold as a surplus product, and while we continue to tax the Public Treasury to pay consumer subsidies to aid those who purchase canned vegetables, we now find huge amounts of these canned goods sold as surplus war materials.

The article follows:

FORTY RATIONED FOOD ITEMS SOLD BY GOVERNMENT AS SURPLUS—TONS OF LARD, CHEESE, CANNED GOODS OFFERED FOR SALE BY UNITED STATES AT LOSS

(By Walter Trohan)

As the Office of Price Administration resumed rationing of major foods late last December, the Surplus Property Board was arranging for the sale of millions of dollars' worth of foodstuffs, it was learned yesterday.

Among items for which American housewives would have had to turn over millions upon millions of red and blue food stamps were millions of pounds of lard, almost a half million pounds of cheese, and cases upon cases of canned goods requiring food points.

STAMPS INVALIDATED

At the time housewives' red and blue stamps were invalidated because civilian supplies of major food were short as war demands increased, according to Administration spokesmen, more than 40 food items were offered for sale as surplus commodities.

The largest single item was one of 20,216,817 pounds of lard, according to the Industrial Advisory and Research Service, which gathers data for clients on surplus commodities listed by Government agencies. The lard was described as Prime steam lard in storage tanks.

LARD BECOMES RANCID

It was learned yesterday that the Government had planned early in December to sell the lard back to processors so that it could be put in cartons for overseas shipment. It was acknowledged under this plan the Government would have sold at a loss on the original purchase price.

While negotiations were under way, the Army stepped in and halted the sale through the supply forces, headed by Lieutenant General Somervell, on the ground that the lard was needed for the Army. Later the Army found that the lard was not needed.

Meantime, according to the surplus organization, the lard became rancid so that it now cannot be used for food. It is offered for sale to soap manufacturers. It was said that the Government will take a substantial loss on the sale.

Another item with a high red point rationing total is one of 450,000 pounds of cheddar cheese. There is also 1,200 50-gallon drums of lard oil, which would take a heavy total of red points.

VALUE NOT DIMINISHED

There are hundreds of thousands of cases of peas, beans, and catsup, which require blue points at grocery counters throughout the Nation. It was explained at the surplus headquarters that these are being offered for sale to make room for new packs of these items.

It was acknowledged that the food value of these has not diminished in any way. These will probably be purchased by packers and eventually find their way to food shelves, but meantime the Government will probably suffer a loss, a spokesman said.

FRUIT JUICES INCLUDED

Other items on the lists include over a hundred thousand cases of eggs in shell, barrels of dry skim milk, flour, dried beans, rice, concentrated fruit juices and cans of vegetables not on the ration lists.

The list of items offered for sale recently follows:

One hundred and nineteen thousand seven hundred and forty-eight cases peas, No. 2 cans (24 to case).

Eleven thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven cases peas, No. 10 cans (6 to case).

Sixty-seven thousand one hundred and fifty-six 25- and 30-pound boxes seeded and seedless raisins.

Six thousand three hundred and twenty-eight 25-pound boxes Thompson seedless raisins.

Sixteen thousand 25-pound boxes Thompson seedless raisins.

Six thousand four hundred 25-pound boxes Thompson seedless raisins.

Five thousand six hundred and seventy-eight cases green olives.

Three thousand six hundred and fourteen cases green olives.

Sixty bags dry beans (all beans and peas in 100-pound bags).

Two thousand three hundred and ninety-eight bags pinto and pea beans.

Three thousand one hundred and ninety-seven bags pea beans.

Eight hundred bags Great Northern beans.

One hundred and four bags yellow split peas.

Eight hundred and ninety three bags garbanzos (50 kilos per bag).

Three hundred bags rice.

Seven 200-pound barrels dry skim milk.

Nine thousand seven hundred and twenty-two bags pea beans.

Three hundred and fifteen bags rye flour.

Three thousand two hundred and ninety-one bags cracked wheat.

One thousand bags white flour.

Twenty-five thousand three hundred and thirty-four cases canned snap beans, No. 2 can (24 to case).

Twenty-six thousand six hundred and fifty-nine cases canned snap beans, No. 10 (six to case).

Five hundred gallons lard oil in 50-gallon drums.

Seven hundred gallons extra winter strained lard oil, 50-gallon drums.

Seven thousand five hundred and eighty-two 24 14-ounce bottles tomato catsup.

Eight thousand two hundred and thirty-one cases tomato catsup (six No. 10 cans to case).

Five thousand three hundred and seventeen cases of (24 No. 2 cans) canned tomatoes.

Nine hundred and ninety-seven cases canned tomatoes, six No. 10 cans.

Twenty-three thousand five hundred and ninety, six No. 10 cans canned snap beans.

Three thousand four hundred and ninety-seven 24 No. 2½ cans canned snap beans.

Forty thousand one hundred and fifty-seven cases No. 2 canned snap beans (24 to case).

One hundred and twenty-one thousand seven hundred and fifty-six gallons concentrated orange juice (packed six 1-gallon cans to a case).

Twenty-four thousand eight hundred and fifty gallons concentrated lemon juice in 50-gallon barrels.

Twenty-two thousand one hundred and sixteen cases canned tomatoes (24 No. 2 cans to case).

Three hundred and six thousand three hundred and ninety-five cases canned peas.

Four hundred and fifty thousand pounds Cheddar cheese.

Forty-one thousand two hundred and seventy-four cases canned tomatoes (24 No. 2 cans to case).

Thirty-five thousand eight hundred and fifty-one cases canned tomatoes.

Twenty million two hundred and sixteen thousand three hundred and seventeen pounds of prime steam lard.

One hundred and ten thousand cases shell eggs.

O. D. T. Order No. 47

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein communications to and from the O. D. T. and Director Byrnes relative to O. D. T. Order 47:

FEBRUARY 3, 1945.

Mr. VINCENT CORBITT,
Assistant Director, Passenger Section,
Railroad Transportation Division,
Office of Defense Transportation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CORBITT: Attached please find a resolution dated at Springfield, Ill., January 31, 1945, and signed by the following: Edward F. Carter, legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; Clint Bush, chairman, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; Richard Abram, legislative representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; T. S. Roe, legislative representative, Order of Railway Conductors of America.

In paragraph two these gentlemen state in their resolution that reliable information has reached them that the Chicago & Illinois Midland Railway Co. contemplates the discontinuance of its passenger trains that operate between Springfield and Pekin on February 28, 1945. The reason for such discontinuance is O. D. T. Order No. 47.

I have not seen or read Order No. 47. Upon calling your office this morning your secretary read it to me over the phone and said she would mail me a copy. From the phone conversation it would appear this order was issued to discontinue trains handling resort traffic, etc. I am not personally familiar with the patronage of the Chicago & Illinois Midland Railway Co. I doubt very much if they are handing any transportation to or from any resort.

I would appreciate it very much if O. D. T. would send a representative in the Illinois area to investigate the matter, and if conditions are found to be as outlined by the four gentlemen signing the attached resolution, that the Chicago & Illinois Midland Railway Co. not be allowed to discontinue this service.

If there is no O. D. T. representative from that area, may I suggest one be sent from Washington.

Yours truly,

SID SIMPSON,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 9, 1945.

Col. J. MONROE JOHNSON,
Director, Office of Defense Transportation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLONEL JOHNSON: With further reference to my letter of February 3 and phone conversation with Mr. Corbitt relative to the discontinuance of the passenger train service of the Chicago & Illinois Midland Railway Co. between Springfield and Pekin under O. D. T. Order No. 47, I would like to submit the following as additional evidence of protesting.

There are 29 towns and communities affected if this discontinuance is allowed to go through. You may be aware of the fact and you may not, but the farmers along this right-of-way some years ago gave additional land for this road. I think it amounted to some 100 feet of good Illinois farming land.

According to the 1942 report of the Interstate Commerce Commission statistics of the railroads in the United States this road had a gross revenue of $6,106,000. They had operating expenses of $3,561,000, leaving a net railroad operating income of $2,545,000; they paid the Federal Government a tax of $1,319,000. Their average surplus or excess profits were 25 percent where the average is only 7 percent on other railroads in the United States. They had a $650,000 net profit on their capital stock of $5,000,000, which is around 13 percent or 14 percent, and not bad. Their book value is $13,745,000. The percent of excess profits tax paid by the Chicago & Illinois Midland Railway Co. is among the highest of any railroad in the United States.

The fact that they show in 1942 a $90,000 deficit on passenger service is also considered, but may I call your attention to the fact that the same year the B. & O. Railroad showed a deficit as far as passenger service is concerned of $3,604,000. On this same basis what is to keep the B. & O. from discontinuing all of their passenger service?

If you will look at item 489, on page 386 of this 1942 report, you will find a deficit in practically every railroad in the United States on passenger service.

Taking everything into consideration and from an over-all picture, this is probably one of the best paying railroads in the United States. These figures that I have quoted are as of 1942. If we can possibly believe what we read in the newspapers, certainly the profits in 1943 and 1944 were even better than these figures.

It is my understanding that it requires six railroad men to operate this service which they contemplate discontinuing March 1. A reliable railroad man informed me that to operate the new schedule, which is a mixed train, will take more railroad men. The new schedule, to be exact, will require 10 men, according to the information I have.

I can appreciate the O. D. T. Order No. 47 in that it was hopeful to preserve manpower and fuel, but the railroads apparently are taking advantage of this O. D. T. order. Please permit to cite what a schoolboy would consider extravagant waste by this same road. This railroad takes freight from Kincaid and Taylorville to Springfield, gives it to the Wabash, which takes it to Decatur and then to Chicago. This is an additional and unnecessary 40-mile haul. This especially is true when they could give this same freight to the Wabash at Taylorville, to the Alton at Auburn, to the Illinois Central at Pawnee Junction, or to the C. & N. W. at Compro. Any one of these stations would save the additional 40 miles, which makes the discontinuance of the service between Springfield and Pekin look ridiculous and inconsistent.

Please do not overlook the fact that the farmers and citizens gave the bulk of this right-of-way with the understanding that they would always be provided with service.

The following is another instance of waste of manpower, coal, and the wearing out of material and equipment. It is my understanding that the New York office and probably 12 other offices of this railroad solicit through freight from New York to St. Louis. This freight is routed over the Nickel Plate from the east to Peoria, then on the C. & I. M. from Peoria to Taylorville and then to St. Louis on the Wabash which is apparently an unnecessary 150-mile haul.

If a saving of railroad equipment, manpower, and coal is mainly the purpose of Justice Byrnes' directive which caused the O. D. T. to issue order No. 47, why not do it in such a manner that the consuming public would save on freight rates as well as the saving on equipment, manpower, etc. I think we have cited you where trains run an unnecessary 40 miles in one instance, 90 miles in another, and 150 miles in another; so why let the Chicago & Illinois Midland Ry. Co. discontinue this much needed service that employs 6 railroad men.

Finally, if this service between Springfield and Pekin is discontinued, the locomotives used thereon will simply remain idle, because of the fact that they are of small type and will not even serve as switch engines.

Yours truly,

SID SIMPSON,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1945.

The Honorable SID SIMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SIMPSON: Your letter of February 9, reference the Chicago & Illinois Midland Railroad case.

Mr. Roe called on me and I arranged a conference with Colonel Johnson. Mr. Roe stated he would relay to you Colonel Johnson's decision in the matter. In this connection, Colonel Johnson told Mr. Roe that as soon as the present crisis is passed General Order ODT 47 will be rescinded.

Yours very truly,

V. T. CORBETT,
Assistant Director, Passenger Section,
Railway Transport Department.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 10, 1945.*

Hon. GEORGE BARRETT,
Attorney General,
Springfield, Ill.:

Because of General Order ODT 47 the Chicago & Illinois Midland Railway Co. has announced new schedule effective March 1 eliminating four passenger trains between Springfield and Pekin. Twenty-one of the 29 towns affected are in the Twentieth Illinois District. This is the only passenger service available. My information is 3,400 passengers used this service during November 1944. Present schedule handles fish, poultry, eggs, mail, express milk and cream. Because of 300 citizens in Twentieth District have sent me petitions protesting this office has made subsequent protest with O. D. T. but to no avail. May this office suggest that as Chicago & Illinois Midland service affects Illinois only that your office investigate same. If found as represented here that injunction proceedings be started at once. This is suggested because of your office's valuable service in the Illinois terminal case because of W. P. B. order at that time.

SID SIMPSON,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 13, 1945.

The Honorable JAMES F. BYRNES,
Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRNES: The above O. D. T. General Order No. 47 from the standpoint of principle was, no doubt, issued with the best of intentions. I can certainly subscribe to the theory of discontinuing resort trains, etc.

However, under O. D. T. Order No. 47 I believe certain railroads can take an unfair advantage of it. In other words, in my opinion, and I have arrived at it after investigating the matter, the railroads should not be allowed to make communities suffer in the discontinuance of established freight and passenger trains. Attached please find what I consider an example of the situation where the Chicago & Illinois Midland Railway Co. is taking advantage for their benefit under O. D. T. Order No. 47 and to the detriment of the Central Illinois communities affected.

We have received petitions signed by some 600 citizens protesting the discontinuance of this service.

The attached communication to Colonel Johnson, of the O. D. T., will explain it in detail. Because most of the towns affected by the action of this railroad and effective March 1 are in the Twentieth Illinois District, this office has asked the attorney general of Illinois to start injunction proceedings.

My reason for calling this to your attention is because there will no doubt be similar instances by other railroads over the United States. As previously stated, the general purpose of the O. D. T. Order No. 47 was all right if it accomplishes the purpose for which it was issued. I do believe that since the same has started functioning some clarifying directives should be issued, especially in view of the attached.

Yours truly,

SID SIMPSON,
Member of Congress.

Monopolizing Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, are the multimillionaires—the economic royalists—in the Department of State attempting to monopolize and control the thinking of America? Are they trying to perpetuate their foreign ideologies through a university of their own? Are they trying to shape a permanent foreign policy favorable to American Steel—favorable to international bankers and manufacturers? It would seem so.

Following the reorganization of the State Department there was published in Time magazine, February 5, 1945, on page 78, a statement implying that anyone who wanted a job in the Department of State would from now on have to attend a school of which Joseph Grew, Acting Secretary of State, is a trustee. This ought to be interesting to every real American.

We are now informed that behind the scenes in the State Department young men and women will be trained by economic royalists—Stettinius and company. Their plastic minds will be filled with ideologies that represent not America but a little multimillionaire clique in the Department of State.

We are informed that Mr. Grew, Mr. Clayton, Ambassador Bliss, and others have started this school for the Department of State. Those who now wish to get a job in that Department will have to attend and be graduates from this school.

If the Department of State can have a school, why not the Department of Treasury? Why not the Under Secretary of the Treasury open a school across from the Treasury Department and educate the future heads and employees of that Department in foreign ideologies, or at least in the ideology of the powers that be?

Is this not a new form of Balkan diplomacy being introduced in Washington? Everybody knows that the heads in the Department of State belong to the economic royalists. They are, as it were, a multimillionaire club. Mr. Grew is a relative of J. P. Morgan, and uncle-in-law of his colleague, Nelson Rockefeller.

These gentlemen, of course, do not need the tuition fees of the poor applicants for jobs in the State Department. Neither does Mr. Will Clayton, the billionaire cotton speculator who squeezes tens of thousands of poor cotton farmers not only in the United States, but also in Brazil, Egypt, India, and elsewhere. In regard to Mr. Clayton someone please page Henry Wallace.

This small group of multimillionaires do not need the money; but they do desire to indoctrinate applicants for jobs in the Department of State with their foreign ideologies and international steel and trade philosophy. They want to make sure that in the future their foreign investments are policed by the sons of American unborn generations.

The philosophy of the school and its trustees might somewhat be compared to that of the Herren Club of Berlin where East Silesian noblemen, Rhineland industrial barons, and bureaucrats met to eat, drink, and discuss high policy. The school also aspires to be a modern Haileybury, which in its heyday controlled all jobs for the East India Co. You could not get a job in India unless you had a diploma from Haileybury.

Nearly a century ago the English ended Haileybury's monopoly. America had better nip this nonsense in the bud. If Mr. Grew and his trustees wish to create a "back door" to jobs in the Department of State, it is time for Congress to investigate the problem of misuse of official position. Mr. Grew already has his division heads and chiefs of offices teaching in his new institution—a most glaring example of misuse of one's official position.

This new Herren Club for Washington, or modern Haileybury, was incorporated in the law office of Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson, with the Acting Secretary Grew and Assistant Secretary of State Clayton on the board. Special adviser to the Secretary of State Robert Wood Bliss is also on the board, and the teachers are largely drawn from Mr. Grew's employees or former employees.

Many of these trustees sit on the personnel board which admits candidates to the Foreign Service. Lurking in the background is Hugh Wilson, former Ambassador to Nazi Germany, who undoubtedly knows all about the Herren Club.

Every section of the country is interested in this question. At the present time all of the leading universities of the country have foreign-service courses. The colleges which have been giving A. S. T. P. training courses are planning foreign-service courses for the post-war period. It has come to my attention that many of these institutions have become concerned with the monopoly attempts of Mr. Grew's Herren Club in Washington.

There is no need for a school of indoctrination of foreign-service candidates. There are already almost as many foreign-service schools as there are candidates, when you consider the curricula of our better colleges, especially such as Stanford, Pennsylvania, Yale, Michigan, Georgetown, George Washington, University of Washington, University of California, and Princeton.

If we need another foreign-service school, then it should be a Government institution, like West Point or Annapolis. There should be no back door to the Department of State run on the side by a group of inside officials.

America, watch your step. This new school is not for the best health of the Nation. Its purpose is too obvious. I am confident that its promoters are misjudging the temper of the American people. This thing is going just a little too far. If these people want to conduct a private school, let them get out of the State Department. They should not use their official position to sell America permanently to their line of thinking. Even if we would concede that they were the all-wise ones, yet they may be fallible. This school is incompatible with our system of government.

What Is a Fair Hourly Return for Farm Labor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following letter of transmittal and tables are the result of many years' study of the hourly labor return of Wisconsin farmers in different sections of the State and on farms of various land types:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Washington, D. C., December 8, 1944.

Hon. REID MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: I refer to our telephone conversation of November 24 in which you

asked for estimates of hourly cash and noncash returns to all labor on dairy and cotton farms.

Prof. Walter W. Wilcox, of the University of Wisconsin, has written me that his staff is preparing for your use such estimates for dairy farms in all major type of farming areas in Wisconsin. Professor Wilcox has charge of our cooperative project with the University of Wisconsin for study of dairy farms in that State.

Mr. Ronald W. Jones, of this office, is at present preparing typical farm indices for two additional areas in Texas and some minor revisions of indices of Mississippi and Georgia.

We expect, therefore, to be able to send you labor returns for typical dairy farms in at least six Wisconsin areas and one in central New York, as well as for five typical cotton farms in Texas, Mississippi, and Georgia.

Yours very truly,

RUSSELL W. BIERMAN,
Agricultural Economist, Division of Farm Management and Costs.

Estimated returns per hour of man labor on typical farms in different sections of Wisconsin

Item	Unit	East Central area				Southeast area				Southwest area			
		1936	1939	1942	1943	1936	1939	1942	1943	1936	1939	1942	1943
Land in farm	Acres	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	140	140	140	140
Land in crops	Acres	60	60	58	60	63	60	60	61	67	63	65	67
Total man labor	Hours	4,420	4,270	4,550	4,720	4,380	4,380	4,750	4,940	5,080	5,080	5,650	5,950
Investment in land	Dollars	9,100	9,282	9,555	9,919	8,600	8,772	9,030	9,374	7,280	7,426	7,644	7,935
Investment in working capital	Dollars	3,666	3,670	4,764	5,423	4,045	4,130	5,501	6,120	5,012	4,143	5,940	7,124
Total farm income [1]	Dollars	2,447	2,191	3,937	4,354	2,612	2,331	4,267	5,347	2,595	2,314	4,734	5,801
Total farm expense	Dollars	1,252	1,213	1,704	1,813	1,278	1,226	1,692	1,769	1,325	1,201	1,875	2,079
Net farm income [2]	Dollars	1,195	978	2,233	2,541	1,334	1,105	2,575	3,578	1,270	1,113	2,859	3,722
Return on investment [3]	Dollars	292	314	469	425	233	304	346	354	317	359	422	419
Net cash and noncash return to family labor [4]	Dollars	903	664	1,764	2,116	1,101	801	2,229	3,224	953	754	2,437	3,303
Net cash return to family labor	Dollars	395	230	1,174	1,451	578	328	1,603	2,522	485	340	1,855	2,639
Net cash and noncash return per hour to family labor	Dollars	0.20	0.16	0.39	0.45	0.25	0.18	0.47	0.65	0.19	0.15	0.43	0.56
Net cash return per hour family labor	Dollars	.09	.06	.26	.31	.13	.07	.34	.41	.10	.07	.32	.44

Item	Unit	Western area				Northwest area				Central sandy area			
		1936	1939	1942	1943	1936	1939	1942	1943	1936	1939	1942	1943
Land in farm	Acres	140	140	140	140	100	100	100	100	145	145	145	145
Land in crops	Acres	61	58	58	60	50	47	47	47	58	56	57	59
Total man labor	Hours	4,630	4,370	4,870	5,270	3,380	3,490	3,730	3,920	4,250	4,070	4,280	4,550
Investment in land	Dollars	5,320	5,426	5,586	5,799	3,600	3,672	3,780	3,924	4,640	4,733	4,872	5,058
Investment in working capital	Dollars	3,456	3,458	4,728	5,527	2,314	2,520	3,476	3,985	2,560	2,548	3,421	4,047
Total farm income [1]	Dollars	2,101	1,749	3,556	4,461	1,604	1,417	2,761	3,358	1,894	1,505	2,904	3,766
Total farm expense	Dollars	1,154	1,010	1,501	1,696	830	775	1,127	1,233	824	744	1,058	1,110
Net farm income [2]	Dollars	947	739	2,055	2,765	774	642	1,634	2,125	1,070	761	1,746	2,650
Return on investment [3]	Dollars	213	290	323	327	150	178	118	272	206	280	322	269
Net cash and noncash return to family labor [4]	Dollars	734	449	1,732	2,438	624	464	1,516	1,853	864	481	1,424	2,387
Net cash return to family labor	Dollars	293	65	1,172	1,791	228	117	1,018	1,281	479	143	940	1,832
Net cash and noncash return per hour to family labor	Dollars	0.16	0.10	0.36	0.46	0.18	0.13	0.41	0.47	0.20	0.17	0.33	0.52
Net cash return per hour family labor	Dollars	.07	.01	.25	.34	.06	.03	.27	.33	.11	.07	.22	.40

Item	Unit	Heavy loam area				Northern area				Weighted State average			
		1936	1939	1942	1943	1936	1939	1942	1943	1936	1939	1942	1943
Land in farm	Acres	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	114	114	114	114
Land in crops	Acres	45	44	43	44	35	35	34	36	58	55	56	56
Total man labor	Hours	3,640	3,740	3,960	4,030	2,770	2,820	3,010	3,170	4,280	4,200	4,560	4,790
Investment in land	Dollars	3,800	3,876	3,990	4,142	2,470	2,519	2,594	2,692	6,569	6,700	6,891	7,160
Investment in working capital	Dollars	2,301	2,505	3,478	3,837	1,887	1,975	2,609	2,937	3,463	3,448	4,537	5,317
Total farm income [1]	Dollars	1,582	1,384	2,678	3,192	1,310	1,092	2,119	2,744	2,206	1,922	3,654	4,474
Total farm expense	Dollars	769	753	1,122	1,224	625	598	876	969	1,115	1,041	1,498	1,618
Net farm income [2]	Dollars	813	631	1,556	1,968	685	494	1,243	1,775	1,091	881	2,156	2,856
Return on investment [3]	Dollars	165	216	211	232	124	149	144	164	227	282	331	335
Net cash and noncash return to family labor [4]	Dollars	648	415	1,345	1,736	561	345	1,099	1,611	864	599	1,825	2,521
Net cash return to family labor	Dollars	275	87	879	1,202	261	86	713	1,162	408	197	1,267	1,886
Net cash and noncash return per hour to family labor	Dollars	0.18	0.11	0.34	0.43	0.20	0.12	0.37	0.51	0.20	0.14	0.40	0.53
Net cash return per hour family labor	Dollars	.08	.02	.22	.30	.09	.03	.24	.37	.09	.04	.28	.40

[1] Receipts from sales of crops and livestock plus Government payments, credit for food and fuel used for human consumption on farms where grown and nominal allowance for rental on farm dwelling.

[2] Total cash and noncash income less contributions to family living on the farm.

[3] Interest on livestock and machinery and equipment at 5 percent plus net rental on land and buildings.

[4] Amount of labor hired was insignificant.

There are a few comments I wish to make in connection with these tables.

First. The farm labor return as shown in these tables indicates hourly labor returns on typical farm, which may show a higher return than the average hourly return.

Second. The hourly labor returns were from 10 cents per hour to 17 cents per hour in 1939, which was the seventh year of the present administration. In fact, these low hourly returns existed after Mr. Henry Wallace had spent billions in the name of agriculture.

Third. The returns in northern Wisconsin compare very favorably with the hourly returns in the older sections of the State. This is all the more apparent when one realizes that the A. A. A. program provided more funds in southern Wisconsin than in northern Wisconsin, because southern Wisconsin raised corn, a crop that was favored in the program.

Fourth. The returns for 1944 when compiled will no doubt show larger hourly returns because the whole year's milk subsidy will be included in addition to the Government payments already taken into account.

Fifth. These hourly returns being as low as they were in 1939 prompts everyone to look forward to exerting every energy to postpone such low hourly returns after the war.

Sixth. The 10 years from 1930 to 1940 provided such low hourly farm labor incomes that evidently were not increased except by the influence of the war.

The Mexican Water Treaty—How It Will Affect the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in the congressional act which in 1928 authorized construction of Boulder Dam it is specifically provided that Colorado River water salvaged and stored by the dam be used exclusively within the United States.

California communities are obligated to pay $575,000,000 to the Federal Government in fulfillment of their contracts.

If ratified, the pending treaty would give to Mexican landowners water salvaged by these works and thus take from American communities paying for these works water they need and in good faith have contracted to take and pay for.

The proposed treaty would take hydroelectric power revenues from the United States farmers and give this money to Mexico for the benefit of Mexican landowners.

It would set up an arbitrary, dictatorial, two-man commission, with unlimited powers over the economic welfare of millions of American people, each commissioner being responsible only to the Department of State and not to Congress or the courts.

It would give the two commissioners power to enter into, carry out, and enforce further agreements, with the approval of the Secretary of State and the Minister of Foreign Relations of Mexico without the consent of Congress.

If ratified the pending treaty will set up in perpetuity and beyond recall or control of Congress a two-man International Boundary and Water Commission, with one man from the United States and one from Mexico, who is accountable only to the Secretary of State and the President, and once the treaty is ratified Congress will be shorn of all power to review or reject the policies, projects and expenditures of the Commissioner. Congress must either appropriate the funds demanded or breach the treaty. This is a violation of our Constitution.

If ratified, the pending treaty will set up a one-man administration with practically unlimited power and with authority to impose on the United States the spending of vast sums of money in line with whatever philosophy of government or foreign policy may be dictated by any Secretary of State in all the years to come.

The American Commissioner will be able to dictate what works are to be constructed, operated, and maintained, and have complete control over the entire works.

If we are to have national socialism with respect to water ways, it should be done in the open through proper legislation, so that the people may know what is taking place, and not secretly through granting unchecked authority, hidden away in a treaty. This treaty abridges and amends the Constitution of the United States without the consent of the people.

This treaty would require the building by Mexico within 5 years of a main diversion structure or dam across the Colorado River, which structure is not now necessary and which would create a flood and drainage menace to communities in the United States. Such a construction is now forbidden under an existing treaty.

If ratified, the treaty would give to Mexico water salvaged by these dams and take from American communities paying for them, water they need and in good faith have contracted to pay for.

Acting in reliance on the express words of Congress—"exclusively within the United States"—these California communities changed their position to their detriment by giving up certain of their rights and pledging themselves to repay the entire cost of Boulder Dam and the All American Canal.

The water delivery pledge is violated by the pending Mexican treaty in its guarantee of 1,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water to Mexican land owners—an amount of water that is greater than the entire consumption of water by the cities of New York and Philadelphia combined, and twice as great as the largest amount of water that has ever flowed into Mexico before the construction of these works.

Any gift of the waters of the Colorado River will curtail the development of the communities of this region. There are need and opportunities for use, within the United States of all of the waters of the river. Of the 244,000 square miles that comprise its basin, only 2,000 are in Mexico.

Un-American Activities as Viewed by American Labor Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a news story released yesterday from Washington by the Federated Press.

Federated Press is a nonprofit cooperative membership organization of more than 200 labor papers throughout this Nation and is controlled and operated by its member labor publications, A. F. of L., C. I. O., and independent. It is the only daily news service of the labor movement and has been long accredited to the congressional press galleries and the White House.

Learning that the gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. KARL E. MUNDT, had sought the views of 100 persons on the question of what is considered un-American activities and, therefore, what might properly be investigated by the Committee on Un-American Activities of this House, Federated Press polled its own labor editors on the subject. Since this is the first time that we have had the views of these representatives and editorial leaders of millions of American workers, I believe it an important contribution to the thinking on the subject. I have made some minor deletions in the text of the story to eliminate references to Members of this House and of the Senate. Otherwise, the story follows:

LABOR EDITORS GIVE REPRESENTATIVE MUNDT SOME THINGS TO THINK ABOUT

WASHINGTON.—Editors of labor papers from coast to coast have some original ideas of what is un-American and what the new House Committee on un-American Activities should investigate.

Taking a cue from Representative KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, who is polling 100 "friends and enemies" of the old Dies committee on the issue, Federated Press circulated a questionnaire among some 366 labor papers; A. F. of L., C. I. O., and Independent.

The replies, still coming in February 12, showed that the top choice for a Federal investigation of thorough proportions is the Christian American Association, an organization headed by Vance Muse, of Houston, Tex. The Christian American Association is sponsoring antilabor laws in various State legislatures.

Only one point below, according to the Federated Press returns, the editors were tied on the question of international cartels and the Hearst-Patterson-McCormick axis. In separating the choices, the Chicago Tribune was ranked as the first menace by the labor editors.

As a third most popular topic for investigation, the labor editors thought the House committee might look into race-hating groups and American fascists. Most mentioned in this latter field was the Constitution Educational League, one of whose officials is publisher Frank Gannett.

Indicating what is probably a turn from straight labor union concerns, the editors ranked antilabor activities in the same ratio with columnist Westbrook Pegler, the National Association of Manufacturers, Sewell Avery, of Montgomery Ward, and Father Charles Coughlin, of Detroit.

Bringing up in the rear were such subjects as the work of the old Dies committee, the Scripps-Howard chain, the use of war prisoners on civilian jobs, United States seizure of civilian industries, publication of news stories deliberately designed to split national unity, the work of "lying columnists and commentators" and the record of Martin Dies.

As summarized by Federated Press, here are some of the replies:

Editor Leslie R. Hurt, the Unionist, Austin, Minn.: "Any activities which deprive our people of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are un-American. * * * The committee should concentrate its attention on bringing to justice Fascist elements, alien and native-born, who would destroy freedom in the United States."

Editor John O. Kykyri, Minnesota Labor, Minneapolis: "Activities which tend to break down or destroy national unity are definitely un-American. Individuals and organizations carrying on campaigns to promote religious and racial hatreds fall into this category and merit investigation."

Editor Morris Watson, the Dispatcher, San Francisco: "The constant belittling of our war effort and slandering of our allies by Hearst, McCormick, Patterson, and Roy Howard."

Labor Advocate, El Paso, Tex.: "If the new committee proposes to follow in the footsteps of the old Dies committee, we would suggest that it begin by investigating itself."

Editor Harvey O'Connor, International Oil Worker, Fort Worth, Tex.: "Activities of Upton Close and his reputed connections with Japanese Government."

Voice of Labor, Scottsbluff, Nebr.: "The forces that make it possible for scores of venomous publications still to exist, spreading racial and religious hatred, spouting the Goebbels line and doing their straight-from-Berlin jobs."

Editor H. F. Petty, Kentucky Labor News, Louisville: "Hoarding of labor in cost-plus plants. Military taking over operation of civilian plants."

Editor Raymond Hofses, Reading (Pa.) Labor Advocate: "Let them orient their in-

vestigations toward the sincerity of any movement or individual. Let them brand as 'un-American' whoever practices subterfuge by advocating one thing in order to accomplish another."

Beach Erosion in Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SHORELINE PLANNING ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 10, 1945.

Congressman GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GORDON: Just as we are in the midst of preparing a beach protection-erosion committee meeting on a State-wide basis as far as California is concerned, an article in last night's Santa Monica Evening Outlook reported that you had announced in Washington that "The House Rivers and Harbors subcommittee will begin a study of ways to prevent erosion of California beaches. The study will be made in cooperation with the Shoreline Planning Association of California, an organization for development and protection of beaches for public use."

We certainly congratulate you upon being appointed to such an important committee, and we are confident that with your aggressiveness and adroitness that you will become one of the leading members in this great national program of shore and beach erosion.

I spent last Thursday in San Diego County, and, in addition to the acquisition program, the erosion problems in that area were discussed. Up at Oceanside, in Orange County, they told me that they were somewhat fearful that the jetty constructed by the Navy in the Seal Beach-Sunset Beach area might prove disastrous to their beaches in that city in due course of time. The great structures at Seal Beach were put in by the Navy without any recognition of the dangers to local conditions which might arise, and which could have been taken care of without any additional cost as far as the Navy is concerned, if they had conferred with the local officials.

Then there is Newport Harbor in that area, which has suffered considerably from erosion, and the problems there have been considered somewhat by the Federal Beach Erosion Board. I understand that some studies are being made at this time. Up at Long Beach, their erosion problems have been quite enormous, and some protective works are now being constructed by the Navy and also by the city of Long Beach and the county of Los Angeles.

When we get out to Redondo Beach the situation is terrific. The houses and other structures have been washed out during the past few years and are now right up against the foundation of the Fox West Coast Theater. The cause of their troubles is the breakwater which they constructed some years ago, according to competent engineers. Then when we get up to Santa Monica where another breakwater was constructed, the sand filled in behind it, and therefore they do not have a successful yacht harbor.

Furthermore, it caused the denudation of the beach area southerly to Venice as far as sand is concerned. In addition, the breakwater is going to pieces and they are wondering what to do about it. That is the reason why it was decided that our committee and engineers who have been invited would assemble at the Santa Monica pier and hold a consultation on the ground.

Up at Port Hueneme a breakwater was constructed at that point and the Navy built a yard, and it has become one of the largest shipping points as far as the war is concerned, but it has raised havoc with the property. If the erosion continues for another 50 to 70 feet (so it has been reported), the town will be flooded, thus causing considerable loss. Then as we go up the coast, there are other places where erosion conditions are becoming troublesome, and as we reach Santa Cruz County there is found a very serious condition. Experimental groins will soon be constructed in order to determine upon the probable remedy for the protection of that area.

When we recently corresponded with San Francisco in connection with the State-wide acquisition program, we were informed that there was no land available as far as recreation is concerned, but that their problems were entirely that of erosion. Therefore, they threw their support for everything that could be done for San Mateo and Marin Counties, both of which have an acquisition program and have adopted master plans and met other requirements of the State. As we progress still further to the more northerly part of California, mention is made of erosion in one way or another, but they do not seem to have the same concern, which may perhaps be caused by a much smaller population for the whole area.

Certainly that condition is national in character. There should be a very definite program between the Federal Government, State, and counties, but it seems to us that the proposals made by the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, copies of which are enclosed herewith, should receive favorable action by Congress. We believe that this will be done now that we find that you are in a position to make it one of your special jobs as a Congressman.

* * * * *

We appreciate your announcement mentioning this association, and whenever you require additional information we shall be happy to furnish it either directly or indirectly.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. P. LARSEN,
Executive Secretary.

Let San Francisco Review Yalta!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News for today:

LET SAN FRANCISCO REVIEW YALTA!

The Big Three agreement at Yalta was an attempted post-war settlement without consulting the other allies. It was a compromise in which Stalin dictated most of the terms, and the Atlantic Charter pledges, other than German disarmament, came off a bad second. This Big Three political agreement, including its secret provisions, should be examined by the full United Nations meeting at San Francisco in April.

In justice to the President, it should be recognized that he has much less bargaining power than Stalin in any Big Three meeting now. At Yalta, Stalin had three aces and Roosevelt only one—which he could not play.

Stalin's first ace was actual possession of part of eastern Germany and all of eastern Europe, except Greece, and the strongest military force on the continent. His second ace was Churchill's prior acceptance of Russian claims and sphere of influence, and agreement that these decisions should be made by the Big Three (or Four) instead of the United Nations. Stalin's third ace was the power to help us, or not help us, lick Japan later.

Roosevelt's only ace was the power to withdraw from the war unless Stalin agreed to a fairer compromise. Actually, however, neither Roosevelt nor the American people would stop fighting before Germany's defeat—even if we had not pledged to stick to the end. Everybody knows that, including Stalin.

As a result, Stalin got what he wanted at Yalta with few exceptions.

The most important exception was Stalin's agreement that the entire German military system, as well as nazi-ism, must be eliminated permanently. Earlier he had publicly favored a post-war German army.

Since most of the other terms to be imposed on Germany were kept secret pending unconditional surrender, they cannot be evaluated now. Though war criminals would be punished, no specific reference was made to the Junker generals on Stalin's Free Germany Committee. Whether Germans are to be used as slave labor, as they have used others, was not mentioned. Germany must pay reparations in kind—Stalin wanted that, while other allies have been undecided or divided at home. This apparently eliminates, or modifies, the Morgenthau plan for de-industrializing Germany.

Roosevelt obtained a reaffirmation of the Atlantic Charter pledge of self-government for liberated peoples; first by broadening the representative base of the Russian puppet provisional regimes of Poland and Yugoslavia, and by promising later free elections. But, of course, the territories taken by Russia will have no such elections. Whether there can be really free voting elsewhere in eastern Europe, after a period of rule by Red-dominated regimes, is questionable.

Nominally, the President won a point in getting a United Nations conference called for April in San Francisco. But whether Stalin will have veto power over any league action relating to Russia, as he insisted at Dumbarton, is still a secret. Anyway, according to the Yalta plan, the San Francisco conference will not consider the peace settlement but only the machinery for a later security league. It is supposed "to prepare the charter of such an organization along the lines proposed * * * at Dumbarton Oaks," which sounds rather rubber-stampish.

The Polish settlement was the pay-off. Roosevelt agreed to Russia taking eastern Poland up to a slightly modified Curzon line; whether to include additional southern Polish cities and oil fields, as previously agreed to by Churchill, was not stated. Poland is to get substantial territory in the north and west—the original Stalin plan to load her with large slices of Germany, making Poland a perpetual Russian puppet for defense of a larger "Alsace-Lorraine." Since Stalin always has refused to discuss his seizure of the Baltic states and other territorial grabs, they were not mentioned.

The chief fault of the Yalta settlement, good or bad, is that the Big Three try to dictate decisions which only the United Nations as a whole can make—either in justice or with any chance of stability. The only Yalta reference to a peace conference concerns the German eastern frontier.

France is granted an undefined Germany occupation zone, and there is a vague promise to consult other nations on matters of their direct interest—as though the whole European settlement does not concern them.

Thus to shut out the other United Nations, who have suffered occupation, is fantastically unworkable. The peace will depend largely on the continental nations, none of which was at Yalta. If they are ignored now, they will be wooed by some future Hitler. They cannot be bound by agreements to which they are not a party, and some have said so. The full United Nations conference at San Francisco should review the Big Three political settlement.

Address Before Women's Republican Club, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me in New York on January 25, 1944:

Last Saturday several thousand of us stood outdoors in the snow to hear the newly elected President announce his aspiration for his new term of office. "In the days and in the years that are to come," he said, "We shall work for a just and honorable peace, a durable peace. * * * We can and we will achieve such a peace."

To some of his listeners must have come the thought as it did to me that the time to work for a just and honorable peace is not 'the days and years to come," but now. Still one must not be too captious about the President's use of words. The President would probably admit readily enough that it is none too early to work for peace. All of us hope that it is not too late. Few of us certainly would say that the cause of world peace had been advanced in the last 3 months.

Let me quote a few sentences from one of our new Senators. In New York last week he said: "Profoundly disturbing to all peace-loving citizens are the events of the past 6 weeks." * * * Our apprehension "springs from the hesitation and timidity, the lack of forthrightness in the managements of foreign affairs by our own Government * * * In spite of the 16 months in which to proceed, our Government has presented us with nothing more than an incomplete blueprint. We still lack the machinery for arriving at decisions, decisions based upon the give and take of mutual consultation. Conferences have been held, broad principles have been stated, but decisions by mutual agreement, with joint responsibility for specific action, have been largely avoided."

These are the words not of a querulous Republican or of a pettifogging opponent of the Roosevelt administration, but of the new Senator from Arkansas, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT. The 16-month period to which he refers is the 16-month period since September 1943, when the House of Representatives passed his resolution calling for the "creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world and * * * participation of the United States therein."

It was 2 months after that, on November 18, 1943, that Secretary Hull came before the House fresh from his diplomatic triumphs at Moscow, and said, "As the provisions of the four-nation declaration are carried into effect, there will no longer be need for spheres of influence, for alliances, for balance of power, or any other of the special arrangements through which, in the unhappy past, the nations strove to safeguard their security or promote their interests."

In the light of all that has happened since these words were spoken, they sound fairly hollow. It is putting it rather mildly to say that the Baltic and Balkan countries have become, at least de facto, spheres of Russian influence. Whatever you may think of Mr. Churchill's policy in Greece, the British have certainly been using more influence of a certain type in that unhappy country than anybody else. General de Gaulle is prudently making some alliances for France.

If the United States is actively doing anything to arrest these deteriorative processes, these steps backward from peace, then its citizens are not advised of them. On the other hand, Mr. Churchill, in discussing the Polish question before the House of Commons on December 15, complains, "I find great difficulty in discussing these matters because the attitude of the United States has not been defined with the precision which the British Government have thought it wise to use." This is a polite way of saying that we had been hopelessly noncommittal.

Three days later, prodded, perhaps, by the Prime Minister's speech, Secretary Stettinius said that the United States favored "a strong, free, and independent Polish state." He repeated, however, that "questions relating to boundaries should be left in abeyance until the termination of hostilities." This is in effect saying, "Yes, my darling Poland, swim, by all means; hang your clothes on the Curzon line; but until after the war don't go near the water." How can a nation be strong and free and independent without the frontiers to make her so? Would the United States be strong and free and, in our eyes, independent if New York and New England were ceded to Germany or California and Oregon to Japan?

Not content with this contradictory utterance, Secretary Stettinius goes on to say that, "if a mutual agreement is reached by the United Nations directly concerned" about the future frontiers of Poland "this Government would have no objection to such an agreement which could make an essential contribution to the prosecution of the war against the common enemy." Who are the United Nations directly concerned? If, as the Secretary admits, an agreement on Polish frontiers would make an essential contribution to the prosecution of the war, are not we, the United States, directly concerned? If we aren't directly concerned, who is? What the Secretary of State, as the spokesman of our Nation says, is that the question of the Polish frontier is a difficult one which essentially affects the prosecution of the war and we wash our hands of it, releasing our interests to any United Nation which may be deemed directly concerned. Many happy returns to Poland so long as we don't have to bother with making any of the birthday cake.

If Mr. Churchill complained on December 15, of our noncommittal attitude about Poland, I don't think he can have been entirely satisfied when a few days later he read Secretary Stettinius' statement of the 18th.

It is no wonder that Sumner Welles, certainly not an unfriendly critic of the present administration, complained on December 27, "There has become evident a wide, and growing rift in the basic political understanding between the three major allies. Unless that rift is repaired, unless unity of policy and unity of purpose between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union can be restored, not only can no valid international organization be established, but no lasting peace settlements can be concluded."

The United Nations Council has never been set up and our failure to insist on setting it up, again to quote Mr. Welles, "is now bearing its bitter fruit." The plain fact of the matter is that there never was a time either in 1919 or at any time in the Harding-Coolidge epoch when we shirked our responsibilities more flagrantly than we have shirked them in the last 4 months.

At Dumbarton Oaks, as at Moscow, we made progress toward the formation of an international collective security organization. I personally welcomed the proposals at Dumbarton Oaks—"Proposals" is what they were officially called—as a long step toward the goal of peace. But Dumbarton Oaks, like the four nations declaration at Moscow, is a mere landmark on the path of peace. And it seems doubtful whether these landmarks are going to be kept in any better repair than the Atlantic Charter which after all, is only 4 years old and is now almost as depreciated as the Wilsonian League of Nations.

Under chapter XII of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal it was agreed that the states parties to the declaration should consult with one another and, as occasion arises, with other members of the organization with a view to such joint action on behalf of the organization as may be necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Yet we have not consulted. All the consulting that has been done, so far as I know, since October 8, 1944, has been between Churchill and Stalin and various representatives of Poland. It is apparent from the Prime Minister's great speech of January 18, that he settles things with Stalin and not with us. Note this language: "In practice I exchange telegrams on behalf of the British Government personally with Marshal Stalin about difficulties which arise and what is the best thing to do. We keep President Roosevelt constantly informed." In other words, to use an old expression, that isn't asking the President, it's telling him.

We are now promised that a meeting of the Big Three is shortly to be held somewhere. It would probably have been held before this but for the November election and the inauguration. The Big Three, if they will, can doubtless do a great deal to repair the mischief that has already been done. But let us hope that they will not proceed as at Teheran through secret covenants secretly arrived at. "The conference held at Teheran," says F. A. Voigt, editor of the British Nineteenth Century and After, "was the signal for a great military advance * * * and for a great political retreat."

No matter when the Big Three meet or what they do, such relatively infrequent meetings as those held furtively by chiefs of state afford no adequate machinery for the steady consultation which is needed if we are to achieve the just and lasting peace desired by President Roosevelt and by all our people. What we need is a group of humbler people endowed with appropriate powers in steady contact and consultation at some particular safe place reasonably accessible to all.

What are we to do about this situation? On January 10 Senator VANDENBERG made a speech in the Senate which achieved the dignity of a national event. It was a piece of bold, constructive, logical thinking. It advanced the solution of our international problems. But in some quarters of the administration it was churlishly received, and there was an intimation that all thinking on international questions should either be suspended altogether or else cleared through the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which sat like a Delphic priestess on a tripod, saying nothing intelligible.

I am satisfied that unless there is Congressional leadership for the lasting peace which

is now the highest appetite of mankind, we shall flounder hopelessly about, reading in our newspapers of bloodshed and disorder that could have been avoided by a united attitude of the United Nations. If there is no such united attitude, the United States are mostly to blame.

Despite the Double Talk, It's the Army for Skilled Farm Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion Congress is being given the run-around in connection with recent orders pertaining to the draft of young men on the farms. We are told in one breath that the administrators had no idea of circumventing the Tydings amendment, but while they say this their underlings are out in the field putting the pressure on local boards to induct these skilled farmers because the President has said "agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and the Navy for more young men."

As a Presidential candidate, Mr. Roosevelt boasted at Shibe Park, Philadelphia, October 27, while seeking votes, that he and his administrators "had planned far in advance precisely how many men would be needed." But he did not reveal then any plans to take the best trained and most able-bodied men from the farms.

Despite their talk even the Washington Selective Service administrators are ignoring appeals sent here by farmers. Typical is a letter I have received from Mr. Walter Nobis, a farmer in Clinton County, Mich. Some days ago he wrote me as follows:

FOWLER, MICH., *January 31, 1945.*
Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Several days ago we contracted 19 acres of sugar beets; last year we had in 12½ acres. Sugar Beet Agent Raymond Bradley was here today and said we should write or wire you immediately, that you would help us out of our crisis. Am sending on separate paper our farm set-up. Have sent one to Hershey, but no answer. According to the Tydings amendment, these boys should be left on the farm. We have done everything we can in appealing our case, but to no avail. The one boy is called to leave for camp February 9; the hired man is in I-A; and the other boy will be next, as he has already had his phvsical test. The local board has told us that we have met all requirements in production and more, but still they are taking these farm boys. We have a complete line of tools—$14,000 invested in farm machinery. If they take one we will be at a loss as how to continue, for no man but an experienced man can step in here and operate this machinery, which is so hard to repair or impossible to get new.

The boy being called next week is Walter Garhard Nobis, and is being called by the local draft board of Clinton County, at St. Johns, Mich.

Respectfully yours,
WALTER NOBIS & SONS.

The hired man is Charlie Boak, and the other farm partner is Paul William Michael Nobis.

Mr. Speaker, please note that this man could not even get an acknowledgment from the office of General Hershey. After he had received my letter he wrote me again on February 9, as follows:

FOWLER, MICH., *February 9, 1945.*
Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD,

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I received your letter several days ago in regards to the drafting of our farm boys. My son Walter G. Nobis went to induction camp today; our draft board disregarded all his qualifications. Tomorrow, February 10, I have a hearing with our local board in regards to our hired man, who has farmed it all his life, and has worked for us (Walter Nobis & Sons) for the past 4 years. We will soon be all washed up as farmers and producers. We haven't sold any livestock yet. We are just holding on to see if we can't get help from Washington on this situation.

Our neighbor had two sons in the Army and the draft board put his last son in I-A. He has now enlisted and they are selling their livestock. The father is not well. His land will all lay idle, as many more acres will if this isn't stopped.

If this is what our Government wants, I guess they are going to get it. We are not intending to quit if we can get this boy back out of the Army—back on the farm, where he should be according to the Tydings amendment. I am not a quitter. I will fight for the right. God help me.

WALTER NOBIS.

Mr. Speaker, the story is pretty well summed up in Mr. Nobis' statement that "we will soon be all washed up as farmers and producers."

The point is that these boys are not backyard farmers. They have grown up on the farm. They have learned about farming from the time they were old enough to lift a hoe. They belong to the family type farming group the Secretary of Agriculture talks about. They are in the same category as the skilled chemist, the designer, the engineer or the aeronautical expert. They are specialists.

Liberated countries will be busy enough feeding their own people without us planning on any food from them. It is time we put a stop to robbing our farms of their best producers that is if we expect to produce the food for our military forces, our civilians and for liberated nations to whom we are promising everything under the sun.

International Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the C. I. O. News of February 12, 1945, entitled "International Security":

By one of those rare historical coincidences, the World Labor Congress in London is taking place at the same time as the Big Three meeting of Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill, which is mapping the final end of the Axis and the new world of peace and security.

The London meeting also takes place as the armies of the great alliance—the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Britain—sweep toward the climax of the war in the destruction of the Nazi military machine. The great victories over Japan in the Philippines further mark the final end of the Axis threat to world freedom.

The workers of the United States, represented by the C. I. O. under the leadership of Philip Murray, of our allies in the Soviet Union, in Britain, and our brothers in Latin America and the other countries at the London meeting have worked long and hard for this meeting.

They have worked for international labor unity because they know that it is the key to complete destruction of fascism and to a world of security after the victory is won. These are the objectives of the war against German and Japanese aggression. These are the reasons why labor in all the anti-Axis countries supports this war with the blood of sons in the front lines and the sweat of its people on the production lines.

The World Labor Congress in London is mapping future world security and freedom just as the meeting of Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill is mapping it somewhere in the Black Sea area.

The achievements of the London Labor Congress will place an additional responsibility on us here at home. Within the next few weeks Congress will be called on to ratify the United Nations agreements worked out at Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks.

The creation of a new world labor federation at the London meeting will provide a powerful backing for world security plans being outlined now and previously agreed upon.

Our job at home is to back up the work being done in London and in the meeting of the three great political leaders now going on.

Bipartisan Responsibility for the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and I introduced identical resolutions—House Concurrent Resolutions 3 and 11—providing that the majority and the minority parties shall share joint and equal responsibility for the peace. About the time these resolutions were introduced we discussed their purpose in radio addresses in the studio of the National Broadcasting Co.

We have received letters from practically every part of the United States endorsing our plan and the response to our explanation of this measure indicates that the people would applaud this demonstration that Congress is prepared to lay down the weapons of party warfare when our men are enabled

through victory to lay their weapons aside.

The response comes from members of both parties. For example, Mr. Eugene Underwood, New York City attorney and nephew of Oscar W. Underwood, writes:

I wish to compliment you on the splendid idea advanced by you and your Republican associate. I sincerely hope you can put it across.

And Mr. Walter T. Fisher, Chicago attorney and the son of President Taft's Secretary of the Interior, says:

I am heartily in favor of the position taken by you and Mr. JUDD.

I also quote the following from other messages:

Maj. C. L. Gardner, Medical Corps:

Because it meets so heartily with my approval I want to thank you for taking such a step. Keep up the fight there and we will do our best here overseas.

Mrs. C. Lynn Peterson, Salt Lake City:

My husband and I heard you and Representative JUDD speak over N. B. C. on bipartisan cooperation in world affairs. Your discussions gave us new hope and courage. May your efforts prove successful. We are for you 100 percent.

W. W. Alexander, Chapel Hill, N. C.:

I congratulate you and send my best wishes.

Arthur Clarendon Smith, Smith Transfer & Storage Co., Washington, D. C.:

You are on the right track. We of America and Congress must follow your advice.

Eli W. Collins, insurance executive, Little Rock, Ark.:

I hasten to congratulate you upon the solid position you take in the matter.

J. R. Grant, president, Ouachita College, Arkadelphia, Ark.:

You and Congressman JUDD have started something that should help guide statesmen in their plans to settle such questions as lasting peace.

T. M. Bragg, Albuquerque, N. Mex.:

I heartily approve of your efforts.

Gus Daniel, labor union official, North Little Rock, Ark.:

I am highly in favor of your explanation.

C. E. Crossland, banker, Little Rock, Ark.:

Good luck to you in this effort.

Ellis D. English, sales manager, Kansas City, Mo.:

Keep the good work going.

Robert J. Fischer, Belvidere, Ill.:

It is timely that such action take place.

E. J. Bodman, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

I am glad to see that you are broad enough to join hands with the Republicans in trying to bring about a peace that will be an enduring one.

Rev. W. B. Zimmerman, western Nebraska:

You are both to be congratulated on your stand.

Mrs. Helen Vail, Windham, N. Y.:

More power to you, and sincere thanks from one serviceman's wife.

E. H. Wendland, Deer Lodge, Mont.:

May I say, in those brief statements and the joint resolution you read, there was a ray of hope for a decent world.

Nurse Draft Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which indicates clearly that the nurse shortage in the armed forces may not be all that it is said to be. The letter from Miss Axelson follows:

PASADENA, CALIF., *February 7, 1945.*

Representative CARL HINSHAW,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I, as a graduate registered nurse, am asking you to vote "no" on any bill proposing to draft nurses. Since there are continuous appeals in papers and over the radio for women to join the WAC's, WAVES, and SPARS, why not draft all women and then all needs in all branches of the service could be filled?

Do you know, Mr. HINSHAW, that the nursing abilities of many nurses both in the Army and in the Navy are not being utilized? Are you aware of the fact that nurses are acting as dietitians, that nurses are working in linen rooms where they never see a patient, that nurses are used for clean-up detail? Do you know that nurses are overseas for many months before their nursing services are put in use? I hear from many nurses (both directly and indirectly) and most all of them complain that they are not working. Most of these nurses have gone over since D-day and if units of 12 to 75 nurses do not engage in nursing for 2 to 4 months after their arrival it seems to me that many nursing hours are wasted. The nurses who arrive overseas feel that they are ready to do nursing shortly after their arrival. Nurses have had their training days and know their work and duties long before they ever enter the Army or the Navy, and it seems to me that their services should be utilized instead of spending weeks and months drilling and marching awaiting actual nursing. The following is from a clipping sent to me by a nurse in England:

"(From the B-Bag, vol. 5, No. 57, January 9, 1945)

"NURSING POWER

"JANUARY 3, 1945.

"To the B-Bag:

"Nursing power is definitely wasted in the European Theater of Operations. Hundreds of nurses are sitting around in replacement pools, camps, etc.

"It seems to us strange that nurses who have spent some time in Army hospitals at home, and are familiar with Army routine and procedure, must wait about for many weeks in muddy camps before doing nursing.

"The previous letter did not mention the resultant drop in morale due to useless waiting, illness contracted because of mode of living, lack of proper nursing care for these ill nurses, continual prohibitions and restrictions so that one felt as though one were an infant and not a mature woman who is credited with a sense of responsibility as well as some common sense.

"We know that nurses are needed. We also know that they are already on hand. Our suggestion is that nurses be kept at home at work until installations are provided, and then sent to the United Kingdom and put immediately on detached service so that they would be working. Our personal experience proves that we have enough in our hand luggage for our work. Our bed rolls, etc., could follow us.

"TWO NURSES IN REPLACEMENT POOL."

"JANUARY 4, 1945.

"To the B-Bag:

"We are a general hospital and we heartily second the 'common sense in hospitals' letter. May we add that in some cases patients are neglected. Nurses can only do so much, as the human body can only generate so much energy.

"On arrival in this slap-happy European Theater of Operations we were told by the orientation officer—a doctor and a lieutenant colonel—'We are not interested in the nursing care you can give; that is taken for granted; we are primarily interested in how clean you can keep the wards.'"

"INSPECTION-CRAZY NURSES IN THE EUROPEAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS."

"JANUARY 2, 1945.

"To the B-Bag:

"I would like to give a vote for the nurses who recently mentioned the extra things like standing retreat. I just returned from a general hospital and saw those things happen, even though the girls came on at 7 a. m. and seldom left us until 8:30 p. m.

"We do not have to drill them. They work because they have an inborn feeling of responsibility to help any of us back to health, regardless of the cost to them.

"Capt. BURDEAN WALKER, A. C."

Therefore, Mr HINSHAW if the nursing services of the majority of nurses I know in the Army and in the Navy show such a great waste, and other of my friends hear of the same waste from their nurse friends in the two branches of the service, is it not reasonable to expect that much nursing service already available in the Army and in the Navy is wasted? If nurses are actually needed, then draft all womanpower and utilize that womanpower as needed. Why couldn't anyone with a small degree of intelligence have charge of a linen room? Why couldn't dietitians be drafted to fill the positions of nurses acting as dietitians and relieve that nurse to do nursing? Why not fill nonnursing services by women who could be drafted for the job that does not require nursing intelligence?

In the Los Angeles Times of February 2, 1945, I noted the results of a poll taken on the drafting of nurses. The poll was 73 percent in favor of drafting nurses, but the general public does not know the existing conditions in the Army and Navy Nurse Corps because such information is not publicized.

If women are needed, then I favor the drafting of all women and not single out one group of women; therefore, Mr. HINSHAW, I am again asking you to vote "No" on any proposal to draft nurses.

Respectfully yours,

MILDRED O. AXELSON, R. N.,
Pasadena, Calif.

Address of Maj. Gen. J. G. Ord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMMET O'NEAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Maj.

Gen. J. G. Ord to the nineteenth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, January 12, 1945, Washington, D. C.:

Mme. Chairman, distinguished guests, and delegates to the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense: I realize that the 750 ladies assembled here represent 2,500,000 organized women who are performing a great patriotic service by their active support of the war effort of our country. It is, therefore, an honor as well as a personal pleasure to speak to you today as a representative of the War Department, and to bring you some facts and impressions about this war and the part which our Latin-American allies and neighbors are playing in it. This is a war of bold and spectacular developments, a war which we at home are sometimes apt to picture primarily in terms of today's headlines. Yet in the complete picture, behind the immediate pattern of combat, are a great many fine details which give the picture its background and perspective. I am going to ask you for a few minutes to forget the headlines and to think that at this very moment, perhaps as I speak these words, Brazilian soldiers are pushing through the snow and mud of Italy beside our own men, Brazilian flight nurses are flying the Atlantic to look after their wounded, Mexican aviators are training for combat in Texas, Chilean sailors are patrolling our shipping lanes, and Bolivian explorers are working through the jungle looking for quinine to send us.

Why are they doing all this? Well, primarily they are doing it because they have realized that one of the things at stake in this war is the freedom and the future of the American Republics—all 21 of them. They knew that Pearl Harbor was only one step in an offensive which, if it had been allowed to succeed, would eventually have overrun all of them. This knowledge is nothing new. The American Republics helped each other gain independence, and, in spite of a few family quarrels, they have generally stood together against outside interference ever since. The people of the American nations, especially in recent years, have realized that geography, interlocking national economies and common ideals have made them natural partners. I think that most of them now realize that they must pull together for their common progress and security.

So it isn't surprising that the Latin-American nations lined up on our side when we were attacked. Many people in the United States do not appreciate the degree of assistance we have received from our sister republics to the south. This help has been considerable, and has included moral support, material assistance, political and military cooperation.

By moral support I mean that the people of Latin America have been cheering for us from the start, and that the feelings of the people have been translated into political action which has been of great practical assistance to us—in fact, this moral support probably has been the greatest of all Latin-American contributions to our united cause. Even if the Latin-American nations were making no further contributions to the war, it would be more than reassuring to know that today all of them have broken relations with both Germany and Japan, that 13 of them are at war with Germany, and that 11 are at war with Japan. Even in the early days of the war, when some of them still maintained relations with the Axis, they all opened their ports to United States warships by giving us nonbelligerent status. That meant that United States warships could call at any port in this hemisphere and stay as long as necessary for repairs. You'll understand the importance of this arrangement if you remember that a couple of years ago the German pocket battleship *Graf Spee*, damaged but still dangerous, was scuttled off Uruguay because that nation refused to let it stay in Montevideo harbor to make repairs. Latin-American nations have given us data and have cooperated in the suppression of sabotage, espionage, and Axis smuggling; they have helped stamp out the Nazi press, Nazi organizations and societies, and Axis-controlled air lines; and they have shipped thousands of Axis workers to the United States of America for internment. The moral support of the Latin-American nations has been shown also in scores of inter-American organizations which have been set up to help plan our cooperation in the war and in the peace that will follow. Among these is the important Inter-American Defense Board, a purely military group of army, navy, and air force representatives from all 21 of the American republics. This board is charged with making recommendations for the defense of our hemisphere and is the only continuing military body of its kind in the world today.

Raw materials have been coming to the United States in ever-increasing quantities, and their delivery has been speeded by the fact that Latin-American nations with merchant marines voluntarily putting their ships under our War Shipping Administration quota system to assure the best possible use of every cubic foot of cargo space. Because of this flow of raw materials, a United States bomber flying over Germany today may have been built with tin from Bolivia; chrome from Cuba, Guatemala, or the Dominican Republic; manganese from Cuba or Brazil; copper from Chile; vanadium from Peru; platinum from Colombia, and zinc from Mexico. It may be powered by petroleum from Venezuela or Mexico, and its radio equipment and bomb sights probably have quartz crystal from Brazil. The rubber in its tires and the oils used to make its explosives may have come from Brazil, Haiti, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras, or Panama.

These are only a few of the raw materials which we obtain from Latin America. I could not begin to give you the complete list, for it includes thousands of items ranging from rope fibers and canned food to strategic materials like tantalite, a rare mineral used in secret military devices. Although some processed goods are imported from Latin America, by far the greater part of our imports has been in raw materials. Latin-American nations are not highly industrialized, and they have to keep the products of their factories to help meet their own minimum civilian requirements. As it is, most of them are suffering greater civilian shortages than we are. In Rio de Janeiro, for example, supplies of meat often are so short that it can be sold only twice a week. But Latin America has supplied us generously with the things she has to spare, and this has paid dividends not only in the increased supplies available to us, but also in the amounts denied to the Axis. For example, Brazilian and Venezuelan industrial diamonds, which are used in cutting and grinding the hardest steel, have been denied to Germany. This has cut German production of guns and tanks, and saved the lives of American soldiers on the battlefields.

Of course, I don't mean to imply that Latin-American nations have presented their raw materials to us as gifts. Latin-Americans are good businessmen, and they are just as interested in profits as we are. I do believe, however, that in selling their raw materials to us they have gone beyond ordinary commercial cooperation. They have welcomed the experts we have sent down to tell them how to increase their production, and they have been just as pleasant and patient with our experts when they were wrong as when they were right.

Latin-American military cooperation has been greater than is generally known, and began early in the war when our sister republics permitted us to build naval and air bases from which to defend our shores and our shipping routes. Gradually the Latin-American nations have begun active military operations; Brazil already has troops at the front, and Mexico is taking steps in that direction. Many Latin-American countries maintain sea and air patrols to protect our joint shipping routes. United States Coast Artillery guns in Latin America, which at first were manned by United States crews, have been taken over by Latin-American soldiers, and our own men have been freed for duty elsewhere.

Because of my work with the Joint Brazil-United States Defense Commission, I have had a close-up view of the Brazilian war effort. I can assure you that the Brazilian Expeditionary Force now fighting beside our troops in Italy is not just a token force—it is a large and well-trained force, with both ground and air elements. Brazilian units are right up in the front lines, and they have taken ground from the Germans. The Brazilians are good fighters, their staff work is excellent, and they have mastered our modern mechanical weapons.

The Brazilians get along very well with the Italian partisans, and because of this their information on enemy positions and movements is exceptionally good. Of course, they have some special problems. Because they come from a tropical climate, they hate the winter weather in Italy. They are not accustomed to what we in the United States consider a balanced diet, so they are now getting extra beans and rice to add to our standard Army food. Incidentally, I know of one Brazilian unit in Italy that still won't eat our C rations. This unit started out by making a long jump by sea in small landing craft, and all its food was in C rations. After their first meal, the Brazilians all got seasick in a storm, and they still shudder at the sight of a can of C rations.

In the past Latin Americans generally have considered that a woman's place was in the home, and because of this feeling the women of Latin America have not taken as active a part in the war as have the women of the United States. However, this old idea of a woman's place is beginning to change, and in many countries women are making important public contributions to the war effort. In Brazil, for example, the Central Railway is training women as machinists and electricians, and thousands have taken Red Cross courses in first aid and nursing. Brazilian flight nurses are regularly taking care of wounded soldiers on hospital planes flying between Africa and Brazil. Senhora Vargas, the wife of the President of Brazil, was influential in organizing the Brazilian Assistance Legion, which supplies clothing, food, and money to needy families of soldiers and arranges recreation for the troops themselves. She also helped start a service which sends packages at regular intervals to Brazilian soldiers overseas. The Red Cross of Brazil is well organized and is now starting a blood-plasma program. During practice black-outs in Rio de Janeiro uniformed women air-raid wardens help patrol the city. Women are taking some part in civilian defense in almost all of the Latin-American nations.

The different customs under which Latin Americans live have led to some amusing situations. Soon after the United States built bases in northeastern Brazil our U. S. O. planned a dance for the boys and sent out invitations to most of the attractive young ladies in town. A couple of days later the whole town was in an uproar. It seems that no one had remembered that when Latin-American girls go out they are always accompanied by an individual chaperon, usually their mothers. No one had thought of inviting the mothers, and it took a lot of explaining to convince the Brazilians that in the United States it would be perfectly proper

for a girl to go to a dance without taking along her own special chaperon. Of course once we found out our mistake we invited all the mothers, and when the first dance was held most of the fathers showed up too, just to make sure that everything was all right.

There is much more I would like to tell you about the Latin-American contribution to our war effort, but before I leave tonight I would like to speak briefly about some of the aspects of the war in the Pacific. Many people attempt to judge our war against Japan on the basis of our experiences against Germany. This cannot be done, for Japan is in an entirely different strategic position.

Great Britain was available to us as a base for our attacks on Germany, and, as a result, distances in this theater of war were measured in scores of miles. Distances in the Pacific, on the other hand, are measured in thousands of miles. Flying Fortresses based in Britain can bomb the farthest points in Germany, but in the vast Pacific, Japan is still out of range of our B–17's and B–24's. Japan's main industries are thousands of miles from our closest base, and they can be attacked only by the new B–29 Super-Fortresses until the Allies can establish bases within 500 or 600 miles of Japan. For the present at least, Japan can continue to supply her troops with a steady flow of guns, tanks, planes, and all the other necessities of a bitter and difficult war.

Take shipping: We have no base in the Pacific right now that could begin to offer the ports, the roads, and the accessibility of England, and the bases which we do have are so far away that it takes a ship 5 months to make a round trip. Let us suppose that a ship is being loaded tonight in a United States port. Many months from now this ship will deliver gasoline to a bomber squadron in the Philippines. Some of the planes in that squadron may still be on the production lines today, and some of the crews are still in training. Three months from now these planes and crews will fly to the Philippines, but the gasoline that they will need at the bases there has to leave tonight.

Pearl Harbor, our best Pacific base, is so far from Tokyo that a million large trucks lined up bumper-to-bumper would just reach from one to the other. The end of the European war will release some shipping, but it will be a matter of many months before this can be transferred to the Pacific. The speed with which we can defeat Japan is based on the speed of our supply system. The bullet that killed a Jap on Luzon today took more than 3 months to reach him.

That is what we mean when we say: "Geography fights on the side of the Japanese."

One objective of Allied strategy has been the opening of safe ocean routes to China. Our own fighting ships have done a masterful job of reducing the threat of the Japanese Navy, but even with our eventual domination of the sea lanes it is a tremendous operation to land successfully on the Chinese coast. To land and maintain a force of only 250,000 men on a hostile shore for a 30-day period, more than 300 Liberty ships would have to deliver an initial 2,000,000 tons of supplies. All the ports of China are not now capable of handling such a eet at one time. Should we eventually land troops on the Chinese coast, it will be necessary for us to deliver not only men and guns, but also the port facilities necessary to unload the ships. However, as the Allies proved in Normandy, this can be done.

Hirohito and his subjects control the second largest empire in the world, with 400,000,000 people and much of the world's natural wealth. Japan has all of the things she needs for a long war—tin, rubber, oil, iron, coal—and she has them in sufficient quantity to wage this war. Take rubber, for instance; while we must ration it carefully, Japan is reported to have so much rubber that she is paving some of her streets with rubber.

Of course these vast resources must be processed, but according to the Foreign Economic Administration, Japan in all probability has not yet reached the peak of her industrial production. Her industry has been converted almost entirely for war, at the expense of even her low peacetime standard of living. A dish of ice cream for dessert is quite normal in an ordinary American home today, but in Japan only the Emperor or some high official could hope to enjoy such a scarce delicacy.

This empire of Japan's did not happen by chance. We are dealing with no amateurs at aggression. Japan's history over the last 50 years is one of thievery, rape, and murder relentlessly pursued throughout the whole of Asia. Wherever opportunity offered, the fanatic Japanese extended their strength and influence.

Japan's manpower situation is one of her strongest points. A million and a half Japanese men of military age, between 20 and 39, still have not been called into service because they are not needed. In addition, they have about 1,400,000 men between 17 and 20 who recently became subject to conscription. Each year about half a million more young men become available for service. Although it is hard to say exactly how many men Japan has lost in this war, she probably has been able to replace her losses from this supply of younger men alone.

Although Japanese leaders must realize that the best they can now hope for is a negotiated peace, the common Japanese people, and especially the soldiers, are confident of victory. These ordinary Japanese believe that the United Nations have already been defeated and that it is just a question of time until our weaknesses become so acute that we will have to ask for an armistice. Consequently, before we can hope for victory in the Pacific we will first have to defeat 4,000,000 fanatical Japanese soldiers who look on their Emperor as a god and who would rather die for him than surrender. We will have to defeat them with bullets, bombs, flame throwers, and the cold steel of our bayonets. Their fanatic morale will not crack. I have shown you some of the difficulties we face in the Pacific, but I know we can overcome them because our leaders have devised a system of combat which makes maximum use of our superior quantity and quality of fighting men and combat matériel. We will win our victory with a minimum of casualties—the ratio of Japanese to American casualties is more than 10 to 1 at present. You may rest assured that our leaders will continue to use American skill and American matériel in such a way as to achieve maximum results with the lowest possible loss of American lives.

But our coming victory must be based on what we call the will to win.

This will to win is not a creation of the armed forces. The spirit of the soldier is a direct reflection of the spirit of the country and the roots of our country are in the home. We all know that the tone of the home is set by the wives and mothers. They can preserve our will to win better than any other group.

Our ultimate victory over both Germany and Japan depends in large measure on the active and continued support of our military effort by the women of the United States. You ladies assembled here can take this message back to your influential clubs and societies, and personally advance among the women of America an unfaltering determination to resist all efforts to weaken our spirit. You can do a great part in making the homes of America an unfailing reservoir of spiritual support. The men who are carrying the force of arms against our enemies will be immeasurably strengthened by the knowledge that here at home the will to win will never falter.

Letter From J. W. Burch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from J. W. Burch, director, University of Missouri College of Agriculture, Agricultural Extension Service, Columbia, Mo.:

UNIVERSITY MISSOURI,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Columbia, Mo., February 9, 1945.

Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CARNAHAN: The farm people of this State, particularly those unselfish men and women who are always thinking and working for the betterment of their communities, are very much interested in S. 383, introduced by Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama, and the companion bill, H. R. 1690, introduced by Representative FLANNAGAN, of Virginia. These bills were referred to the respective Agricultural Committees. I would personally appreciate it very much if you would study this bill and let me have your opinion as to the best way to get early and effective action with respect to it.

I am convinced that in the years ahead, education for all people in all walks of life is of paramount importance. As you know, the Agricultural Extension Service carries the findings of the State experiment station and the United States Department of Agriculture to farm families, men, women, and the children. It is, without question, the most effective adult education organization in the world. It is a teaching agency that uses real life situations in its teaching process. It teaches the farmer how to build terraces and how to apply soil treatments when he wants to know those things on his own farm.

The great problem is the teaching load in the counties. The average Missouri county has something over 2,000 farm families. They will average 4 people to the family. This means a class of 2,000 men for the county agent, 2,000 women for the home demonstration agent, and 4,000 young people for the two of them, who should have the advantages of the great character-building work done through 4–H Clubs and the older youth groups.

Last September farm people in this State elected an extension service advisory committee of 20 people, at sectional meetings over the State, in which every county was represented. This advisory committee met in Columbia and instructed the State Extension Service to work upon four major problems throughout the year 1945. These problems are as follows:

1. Development of a complete farm and home plan upon as many farms in each county as possible. This is known as the balanced-farming program, and combines the best soil conservation practices and the best methods of handling crops and livestock into a program that will give the greatest net income for the farm family.

2. Work with rural youth in 4–H Club work and with the older, out-of-school youth between the ages of 16 and 26. This latter group is not now being effectively reached by Agricultural Extension or any other agency. It is the group which will be joined by the returning veterans. They have great promise for good, if wise leadership can be afforded them.

3. Guidance in improving farm homes and other buildings. Only 11 percent of the farm homes in Missouri have water in them. Eighty-nine percent of the farm women of the State of Missouri still carry water from the well or from the spring into the house. We think this is a disgrace, and we pledge ourselves to give the leadership to do something about it in the post-war years, when farmers have money, and business needs additional activity, as would be afforded by the many things that the improvement of farm homes would require.

4. An explanation to farm people of the economic problems facing agriculture, so that those closest to these problems could meet community by community, discuss them, and offer their suggestions as to the solution.

You will note that the bill mentioned sets forth certain special purposes for which these funds may be used, and that the very problems that our farm people in Missouri want help upon are those for which this bill provides funds.

It is obvious that the need for these funds is to hire additional workers for the counties. We expect to spend this money in the counties in this State. The bill provides that we should. It will give us money enough to make home demonstration agents available for every county in the State. It will also give us money enough to provide an assistant agent for all counties. Some counties are not ready for an assistant, but others of the more populous counties badly need two assistant agents.

I am convinced that this is one of the most constructive and conservative things that could be done to put farm people in position to help themselves to withstand the depression years that may be ahead and to build the type of citizenry our Nation needs.

I would appreciate very much your suggestions with respect to this bill.

Very truly yours,

J. W. BURCH, *Director.*

McCarran-Sumners Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the Legislature of Arizona:

Senate Joint Memorial 3

Joint memorial requesting Congress to pass the McCarran-Sumners bill

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

In view of the numerous regulatory and administrative agencies, possessing quasi-judicial functions, which have in recent years been added to the administrative branch of the Federal Government, and because of the many rights of citizens affected by the regulations and decisions of these agencies, it is deemed of the highest importance that legislation be enacted prescribing fair and impartial procedure by which these agencies shall be governed in the discharge of their functions, and providing for adequate judicial review of their rulings.

Such legislation is proposed in the McCarran-Sumners bill (S. 7, H. R. 1203), pending before the Congress.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

1. That the Congress enact the McCarran-Sumners bill.

Adopted by the senate January 19, 1945.
Adopted by the house January 31, 1945.
Approved by the Governor February 3, 1945.

The Wallace Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein two separate articles on the important subject of the fitness or ability of Mr. Henry A. Wallace. One of these articles is a very able analysis by the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann. This article from the Washington Post of February 13, clearly shows that in their antagonism to Mr. Wallace, certain Members of Congress are going far beyond the prerogative of the legislative body and are transgressing on the Executive function; that is, the naming of the members of the President's Cabinet.

Mr. Lippmann's article follows:

UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN PORPOSE

(By Walter Lippmann)

An issue affecting the fundamental structure of the American Government is now being agitated by men like Mr. TAFT in the Senate. It is whether the head of an executive department, in this instance the Secretary of Commerce, is to continue to be what he has always been, an assistant of the President, or whether he is to become—through control of the appointment—an agent of the legislature.

Mr. TAFT, and those who think as he does, wish to reject Mr. Wallace on the ground that he does not have the confidence of a majority of the Senate. This is, I submit, a radical departure from the American constitutional system, wholly unworkable, and profoundly dangerous. It is no wonder that the true conservatives like Senator GEORGE will have none of it.

If the Senate asserts the power to reject Mr. Wallace on the ground that it does not agree with him, then it is claiming the power to appoint the Secretary of Commerce. If it says to the President: "You cannot have Henry Wallace in your Cabinet because we do not like him," then it can say the same thing to the next man and the next man after that whom the President nominates. It can say to the President: "The only man we are willing to confirm is a man that we, not you, have named."

No such power is vested in Congress. The Senate's power to confirm has never been regarded as meaning the power to control the selection of the President's Cabinet. The limits of the power of Congress are clearly indicated by the fact that it has no power to remove a Cabinet officer except by impeaching him and convicting him of "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors." If Congress cannot remove a Cabinet official because it does not agree with him, then it has no constitutional ground for refusing to confirm him because it does not agree with him.

The attempt to reject Mr. Wallace is, to put it bluntly, a usurpation of power which, if it succeeded, would establish the right of Congress, by rejecting anyone it had not chosen, to appoint the executive officers of the Government. The American system would be unworkable if Congress assumed the power to appoint the officials through whom the President performs his duties. For under our system Cabinet officers are merely his assistants, and their acts are the President's acts.

If Congress has the power to control the selection of the President's Cabinet, then what is to happen if the President wants Henry Wallace and Congress refuses to confirm him? How is the deadlock to be broken, and the business of governing carried on? Under the British parliamentary system, if the legislature votes no confidence in a member of the Cabinet, the Prime Minister has the right to dissolve Parliament, hold an election, and let the country resolve the conflict. But the President does not have that power. Unless he does have it, the Cabinet cannot be made the creature of Congress without paralyzing the Government.

As long as we have a Government based on the separation of powers, we must, as Madison said when the question was debated in the Philadelphia Convention, insist that the executive and the legislature "be independent of each other." This independence would disappear if the Senate asserted the right of controlling the appointment of Cabinet officers.

It was an error of principle on the part of the President not to divorce the lending power from the Department of Commerce before he nominated Mr. Wallace. For Mr. Wallace is the exponent of a new policy, and the lending power was vested in Mr. Jesse Jones for purposes which are different from those which Mr. Wallace proposes. Congress has a right and a duty to pass on the new policy, and it would in some measure have lost that right if Mr. Wallace had inherited all of Mr. Jones' powers.

The George bill cures this error. But those who want to go beyond the George bill and reject Mr. Wallace because they disagree with his policies, have fallen into an error which is at least as great as the President's original error. They should reconsider their position. For they are, in the heat of partisanship, proposing to defend conservative principles by resorting to acts that are radically alien to the American system, and would if they succeeded, mark a deep revision of the Constitution.

As Mr. Lippmann's article expresses the viewpoint of a nationally known columnist on one phase of the Wallace issue, I wish also to append to my remarks an article which appeared in one of the neighborhood newspapers in my district. While the writer of this article is less well known than Mr. Lippmann, I submit that she is equally sincere. Margaret Wildrick, the columnist who wrote this article in the Bell Gardens Herald has expressed, I believe, many of the thoughts which are running through the minds of the common people of the United States.

The common people need a champion and they have their eyes on Henry A. Wallace. Let those who are blinded by their hatred of the former Vice President beware of their intemperate opposition. The American people usually stand for fair play and if they once get the idea that a person is being persecuted, they are prone to come to his rescue. The unjust treatment of a great American in this instance will, I am confident, boomerang on its mistaken and short-sighted authors.

The article by Margaret Wildrick follows:

IF

(By Margaret Wildrick)

If Henry Agard Wallace were in charge of administering the huge sums of money now found in the hands of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, there is a strong indication that a great part of these funds would go to the aid of small business rather than to the aid of the enormous financial powers.

Thereby we find the substance of the dividing issue on the confirmation of his appointment as Secretary of Commerce. Is the Senate of these United States interested in helping provide the necessary 60,000,000 jobs required in the post-war era, or are their objectives the means of encouraging the financial interests of the country to flourish more rapidly than at present?

Those who are opposing his appointment state that they are doing so because they doubt his ability to properly administer the spending of some $14,000,000,000. They say, in effect, "We may decide to confirm the appointment of Henry A. Wallace, but only if we are allowed to strip the Commerce office of a great part of its present powers." Which, from here, seems a little like saying to a soldier, "Go out and fight the forces of evil in the world but leave your rifle and machine gun with us."

It just doesn't add up. Wallace has demonstrated by his successful administration of the duties as Secretary of Agriculture that he is fully capable of doing the very things that his opponents attempt to question his ability to do as Secretary of Commerce. A far greater percentage of money has been loaned to small farmers by the Department of Agriculture than the R. F. C. has loaned to small business. And, incidentally, the percentage of collected returns, on such investments run higher than the collected returns by the R. F. C., under Jesse Jones. It is also interesting to note, in connection with aid to small business, that only 1.7 percent of the total loans by the R. F. C., under Jones, have been for less than $10,000 each and that the biggest proportion of loans have been for more than $1,000,000 each. These figures would seem to indicate that the money has not been going to aid the small businessman.

It seems then the same old question of whether the people of America are going to have anything to say relative to the spending of government money or whether, as far too often in the past, Wall Street financiers will set the pace. If such is the case it will mean that the President's aim at establishing an eight-point economic bill of rights will very likely be stymied before it gets a chance to be put into effect. It may also mean that we will have nothing more to look forward to in the post-war period than we had in the last days of the Hoover administration.

We do not claim that Mr. Wallace could solve all the post-war problems by himself. There is no individual capable of such an undertaking but it does seem that he is on the right track and doing the right kind of thinking about such things.

The opportunity of meeting Henry A. Wallace, at the Chicago convention, was one of the most outstanding experiences that the writer has had. No one fortunate enough to listen to Mr. Wallace could fail to be impressed with his sincerity or determination of purpose. In his quiet, modest sort of way he seems to be able to express the thoughts of the common man. It is my opinion that the American people, not Henry Wallace, will lose a great opportunity if his appointment is not confirmed. The people have a champion they have long needed, and will continue to need, in Henry Wallace. A statement made at the Democratic convention in Chicago could also be used very appropriately in this case. During a caucus of the California delegation on the selection of a candidate for the office of Vice President the question was raised as to the amount of support behind Wallace. Whereupon Helen Gahagan Douglas, then national committeewoman from California, replied in unforgettable tones: "Poor Henry Wallace—he has no one behind him except the President of the United States and the people."

Why Join the Farm Bureau?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. L. Dean, of Jonesboro, Ark.:

WHY JOIN THE FARM BUREAU FEDERATION?

(By E. L. Dean)

As the time of year approaches for the Farm Bureau to make its annual membership drive, the above question will be in the minds of many. Not only is it an important question confronting "dirt farmers" but it is equally important to every American citizen who likes the American way of life and wants this country to live long and keep healthy. This article attempts to point out why.

The greatest strength comes only with internal soundness and complete equality and coordination of all parts.

Though America has offered magnificent opportunity for individual enterprise and development we have not given sufficient thought to national soundness and planning for the future. America's strength today is due more to the strength of youth than to wise, unselfish, national planning. We have done a poor job of national planning. As America grows older her health must be better guarded. The history of other countries, in this ever-changing world, is that as they grow old they grow weak. Does that thought frighten you? Is it inevitable that America should grow weak in years to come? The Farm Bureau Federation answers "No." It believes that, with wise and unselfish planning greater and ever-increasing strength can and will come with age.

Whether we like it or not, American interests and American activities are divided into groups. Prominent among them are: Industrial group, commercial group, labor group, professional group, salaried group, and agricultural group.

For the best interests of America it is essential, in fact it is imperative, that equality always be maintained between groups; equality of opportunity, which affords equality of income, of education, of luxury, of recreation, of leisure, etc. In brief, there must be equality of American standards of living for all groups.

Group equality would not detract from our rugged individualism. On the contrary, it would strengthen it. It offers a more perfect field for our much-cherished free enterprise. It in no way lessens the reward for individual merit. It merely demands respect and regard for the rights of others, without which no country can grow strong and be happy.

Granting that all agree to this philosophy, in a democracy, it can be carried out only by get-together meetings; by representatives from all groups pleading their cases and threshing out their difficulties around the council tables. Other groups are well represented. It is the particular business of the Farm Bureau to get the very best possible representation for agriculture in our national planning.

IS THERE URGENT NEED FOR STRONGER REPRESENTATION FOR AGRICULTURE?

Let us analyze past and present conditions.

In the early days of America, when there were always more and fertile acres to cultivate, agriculture fared well by taking up more acres and robbing them of fertility. Such a policy could not always continue. In those days, industry, then young and weak, organized and through its representatives in Washington sought special favors to get it started. Agriculture faring well at the time, did not oppose such favors. Thus while agriculture looked on industry succeeding in getting many and important laws and rulings that gave to it many tremendous advantages. Most conspicuous among these advantages were the high protective tariff laws, favorable freight rates, franchises, Government grants, guaranteed profits, trusts, monopolies, trade agreements, labor and trade union, etc. All were used effectively to increase industrial profits. But those very advantages to industry diverted an ever growing portion of the national income away from agriculture. Agriculture suffered. For each dollar's worth of goods agriculture bought it paid an added subsidy to industry of approximately 50 cents as a result of these advantages. In a few years this heavy drain caused the farmer's portion to decrease from 50 percent to 10 percent of the national income. The average individual farmer's income decreased from 100 percent of the American average to 20 percent of that average. A hundred years ago 50 percent of the population were engaged in agriculture and received 50 percent of the national income. Today the 30 percent engaged in agriculture get 9 percent of the national income.

The situation got so bad that with few exceptions farmers found themselves entirely unable to live according to American standards set by other groups. Their debts increased. Worst of all, in their dilemma they lived by rapidly depleting the fertility of their soil and by consuming their capital investment.

Owing to the isolation of the individual it was difficult for farmers to organize. But, finally much too late and in spite of these difficulties, farm leaders got together approximately 35 years ago and formed the Farm Bureau Federation. They were determined that agriculture should share equality with other groups.

They believed that: Any country to successfully live must maintain a fertile soil and a contented rural population: That on the extent of that fertile soil and the number and prosperity of the rural population depend the strength and future of the nation.

Since the Nation depends on it, it follows that maintaining a fertile soil becomes a national must rather than merely a farmer's prerogative.

Soil fertility being a national problem, it could best be solved by fixing conditions so that it would be to the farmer's interest to maintain fertility, a requirement that must be met by national planning.

Not only was agriculture suffering from legislative favoritism bu a study of conditions revealed that it also suffered a fundamental handicap that made it an exception to an important economic law. The law of supply and demand did not work for farmers.

It was known that efficiency on the farm was at a much lower stage than efficiency in industry. There was a reason for it other than incompetence. As proof it was pointed out by farm leaders that fluctuations of the prices of farm commodities was so wide that efficiency was lost sight of and farming was a gamble rather than an efficient, well organized, business. Comparison showed that the fluctuation of the price of manufactured goods, the wage of labor or of commerce was rarely during a years' time more than 5 per-

cent. Yet farm commodity prices almost every year fluctuated as much as 100 percent of the low. Cotton, for example, that was frequently 20 cents per pound at planting time dropped to 12 cents or 10 cents or even 5 cents per pound at selling time. It was plain that there could be no efficiency with such an unstable selling price. What could be done about it to put it on a par with industry?

Economists had taught that the law of supply and demand stabilized prices. For industry it did. How it worked was simple. For example, a man wanted to be a manufacturer. The procedure was first: Determine what it would cost to make the article selected. Then determine what it could be sold for. That being done he must decide whether the margin between cost and selling price was sufficient to be an acceptable reward for his services. If he decided it was he started the wheels turning.

But, as he proceeded he constantly kept his eyes on cost and selling price. If for any reason either the cost or the selling price changed so that his margin was too small, he, with all other manufacturers of that article, slowed down the machinery. This slowing down created a scarcity sufficient to boost the price back to normal. The buying public was also well protected by the same law. If the selling price got too high, to reap their reward, the manufacturer speeded up the machinery. The increased supply resulting brought the price back to normal again.

For industry the law worked perfectly when let alone. Economists especially, and the public in general, were slow to believe that the law would not do the same for agriculture. But the Farm Bureau leaders said "No." They pointed out that for industry the law worked only because the operator was free to start, stop, slow down, or speed up at will and could thereby control the price which was all important by controlling the supply. They further pointed out that because of the nature of their business farmers could not slow down or speed up at will. They planted once a year and gathered months later.

Since they could not control the supply they could not control the price. They had no bargaining power which power is essential to business efficiency.

Instead of loss and failure driving farmers away from the farm and into industry, the lure of gambling involved by the wide fluctuations kept it overcrowded. The gambling instinct kept many farming at a loss hoping to hit a high price later.

To be on a par with industry a control must be set up that would remove the gamble, stabilize the prices, and release the supply to the consumer only when there was a margin of profit between costs and selling price for the producer.

Since the law of supply and demand did not work for agriculture the leaders urged that the Government take steps to remove this disadvantage. They recommended a "crop reserve and a floor under prices." That has been done with great help both to farmers and consumers.

It was not easy sailing. The farm leaders met great obstacles in their efforts. Not only did they have the tasks of working out solutions for the many problems confronting agriculture but they found it to be a far greater task to get their ideas put over to the public and to the Nation. Senators and Representatives in Washington were not prone to listen. Even those from strictly agricultural districts were many times the last to give aid. The leader's insistence that their efforts were only attempts to equalize opportunity and remove handicaps fell on deaf ears. Economists, public speakers, journalists, industrial leaders, even Presidents of the United States, ridiculed the idea that soil conservation or price stabilization were problems for national legislation.

The great difficulty was to get enough numbers in the organizations to command attention. It was an up-hill drive. Sound logic, an unselfish approach, and an everlasting persistence has won support. From the small beginning 30 years ago the membership has increased so that it now approaches the million-member mark. This is approximately 10 times as many members as claimed by any other farm organization that speaks for agriculture. Its membership includes tenant farmers, small and large landowners, and businessmen, having the interest of America at heart.

THINGS THE FARM BUREAU HAS ACCOMPLISHED

The ten following are some of the more important things the Farm Bureau Federation has accomplished in the past 12 years and what they have meant to folks on the farm:

1. Secured the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (A. A. A.) of 1933, providing for acreage adjustment of basic crops and commodity loans and a big factor in raising the farm income $1,000,000,000 a year for the next 4 years.

2. In 1933 sponsored the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act which virtually stopped farm foreclosures and reduced the rate of interest so that borrowers from the Federal land banks had a saving of $400,000,000.

3. Sponsored the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 authorizing Federal appropriations for State experiment station and extension service and for the establishment of Federal research laboratories.

4. In 1936 sponsored the Soil Conservation Act creating a long-time soil conservation program. That has already resulted in increasing the average per acre yield of cotton from 156 to 272 pounds.

5. In 1937 secured passage of the Marketing Agreement Act to promote orderly marketing of nonbasic agricultural commodities.

6. 1938 improved the Agricultural Adjustment Act giving a better program than provided by the A. A. A.

7. 1939 secured passage of a bill that required truthful labeling of seed.

8. In 1941 pushed through Congress the Bankhead bill that raised the commodity loan rate from 52 to 85 percent of parity. This bill raised farm income of that year at least $1,000,000,000 and the price of cotton $25 per bale.

9. In 1941 obtained enactment of the Steagall bill which provides that support prices on farm commodities shall be continued at least 2 years after the war ends.

10. In 1944 amended control bill directing the President to use every power of Government to insure that farmers receive parity.

Though the Farm Bureau Federation has accomplished much the big tasks are still ahead. Compared with organized labor and organized industry, organized agriculture is still very weak, weak in numbers and weaker in finance. Yet, there never was a time greater strength was needed.

It is important that, in post-war planning and in the peace conferences, agriculture should not only have delegates sitting at the conference tables but those delegates should be backed by sufficient strength to command equality of attention with other groups. Every trade agreement that is proposed with other countries should be made only after those in authority to speak for agriculture have been heard.

COTTON AT THE CROSSROADS AN EXAMPLE OF THINGS IMPORTANT

King Cotton, which has been the largest source of income for the Nation of any exported crop and the main income for the South, is at the crossroads. Many predict that it is doomed, that its doom will mean wreck and ruin for the South. Some contend that cotton growers should be subsidized, as industry has been subsidized. Others contend that by equipping farms with modern machinery cotton can be produced cheap enough to hold its own. Others answer there is no way that farmers can produce cheap enough to meet new competition without a loss and that they are not financially able to take the loss. All agree that unless cotton can be put on the market for approximately one-half of the present price it is doomed to obsoletism. Foreign produced cotton has already taken 80 percent of the foreign market, and rayon and other substitutes produced now at 11 cents per pound are even a greater threat to the home market. Farmers have been criticized for wanting a floor under cotton that holds it above the world market. But let those critics be reminded that farmers do not want a market if it has to be supplied at a loss to hold it. Let those critics also remember that it is high tariff, unfavorable freight rates, and other special legislation favoring industry that has made those costs high and not profit to the cotton grower.

It is plain that what to do to save a national asset is a national problem. The whole attitude of Congress and the administration is yet to be decided. On those decisions hangs the future of the cotton South.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is working day and night on these problems. They are hoping and praying for a solution that will lead to a better and stronger America; an America that offers a still better place in which to live; an America in which every citizen and every group of citizens takes first pride in seeing that every other citizen and every other group of citizens has equal opportunity and is equally happy and equally free from fear of want. But the American Farm Bureau needs more strength. It needs more ammunition; in short, it needs more manpower; it needs members who will give it a backing; it needs numbers who will give it authority; its problems are many and vital.

So, Mr. Farmer, when you consider joining the Farm Bureau Federation, do not look upon it as just another organization, but think of it as an organization that believes in a better and stronger America, and that to make it better and stronger there must be a better agriculture enjoying equality with other groups.

Mr. Businessman, this is no less your problem. Get in the boat with those who are trying to guide the ship of state to safer and happier shores. Help row with your membership. It will mean a better distribution of wealth and happiness—greater prosperity in your business. Those of you who prize and love America and are friends of agriculture join the Farm Bureau Federation. It is the logical and best equipped organization or force to speak for agriculture. Agriculture needs a stronger champion.

Coke and Coal Top Priorities in War-Winning Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a brief statement from Walter P. Schenck, secretary of the Uniontown, Fayette County (Pa.), Chamber of Commerce, relative to the coal and coke production of Fayette County. You will observe that more than 23,000 men in this county, during the year 1944,

brought to the surface more than 20,000,000 tons of the finest bituminous coal—much of it coking coal—and at the same time we produced in Fayette County about three-fourths of all the bee-hive coke produced in the entire coke area.

When we consider that it is absolutely essential to have coke to make steel, and that we must have coal to make the wheels of industry go, in this big global war effort, we will have to place the men who dig this coal and make this coke among the top notch group of our civilian war heroes.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, my county has more than 14,000 girls, men, and boys in uniform in this war effort. More than one-third of them are sons and daughters of these civilian heroes who daily go down into the mines and furnish this all important material—coal and coke—to make essential equipment to put in the hands of our armed forces. Again I want to say that the wages of these miners and coke makers should be raised so that their pay envelope would be commensurate with the war workers in the steel mills and other war-producing establishments. Mr. Schenck's statement follows:

UNIONTOWN, PA., *February 9, 1945.*

Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your letter of February 8, requesting information relative to coal and coke production in Fayette County in 1944.

Coal production for Fayette County in 1944 was silghtly in excess of 20,000,000 tons. * * *

Relative to bee-hive coke production, we produced in Fayette County * * * about three-fourths of all bee-hive coke from this area last year.

* * * * *

Following is a list of coal mines in operation in Fayette County and the Monongahela River area in Greene and Washington Counties.

Name of coal mine	Operator and address	Approximate number employed
Alicia	Pittsburgh Steel Co., Alicia.	300
Allison: No. 1	W. J. Rainey trustees, Allison.	300
No. 2	do	350
Banning	Pittsburgh Coal Co., Pittsburgh.	400
Buffington	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Fairbanks.	500
Brownsville Junction.	Republic Steel Corporation, Lynn Station.	400
Canyon	Canyon Coal & Coke Co., Lake Lynn.	425
Colonial 1, 2, 3	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Smock-Grindstone.	2,800
Collier	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Collier.	350
Continental No. 1	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Continental No. 1.	500
Crawford: No. 3	Faywest Coal Co., Connellsville.	25
No. 4	do	50
No. 5	Vanderbilt Coal & Coke Co., Connellsville.	400
Crossland	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Uniontown.	150
Crystal	Hecla Coal & Coke Co., Gans.	175
Daugherty	Bortz Coal Co., Uniontown.	150
Dearth	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Uniontown.	300
Donald	Whyel Coke Co., Uniontown.	350
Eagle	Fancy Hill Coal Co., Lake Lynn.	275
Edenborn	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Edenborn.	400
Emery	Leckrone Coal & Coke Co., Uniontown.	40
Filbert	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Fairbanks.	500
Footdale	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Footdale.	25
Fredrick, No. 1	Davidson-Carville Coal & Coke Co., Nilan.	175
Gates	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Gates.	500
Geneva	Barton Run Coal Co., Uniontown.	75
Gilmore	Gilmore Coke Co., Uniontown.	100
Griffin, No. 2	Hecla Coal & Coke Co., Masontown.	200
Harding	Diamond Coal Co., Point Marion.	100
Helen	Leo Duncan, Uniontown.	50
Isabella	Weirton Coal Co., Isabella.	1,200
Kyle	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Fairchance.	800
Lambert	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Lambert.	350
Leckrone	H. C. Frick Coke Co., McClellandtown.	100
Leisenring 1, 2, 3	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Leisenring.	1,000
Lemont No. 2	Lemont Coal & Coke Co., Darent.	200
Bridgeport	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Brownsville.	700
Maxwell	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Maxwell.	500
Melcroft	Koppers Coal Co., Melcroft.	400
Mount Braddock	Mount Braddock Coal & Coke, Mount Braddock.	80
Old Home	Eberly Coal & Coke Co., Footedale.	40
Oliver: No. 1	Oliver Coke Co., Oliver.	35
No. 2	Eberly Coal & Coke Co., Oliver.	150
Palmer	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Palmer.	750
Phillips	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Phillips.	500
Pike	Hillman Coal & Coke Co., Brownsville.	100
Poland	Poland Coal Co., Pittsburgh.	150
Puritan: No. 1	Leckrone Coal & Coke Co., McClellandtown.	65
No. 6 and No. 7.	Pennsylvania Coal Co., Pittsburgh.	100
Redstone	Fayette Fuel Co., Brownfield.	200
Ronco-Robena	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Ronco.	1,000
Sapper	Bortz Coal Co., High House.	75
Shoaf	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Shoaf.	500
Tower Hill, No. 2	Hillman Coal & Coke Co., Ralph.	500
Walnut Hill	W. Point Marion Coal Co., Point Marion.	150
Washington Run	Blaney Coal Co., Star Junction.	100
Wynn	Embassy Fuel Co., Fairchance.	275
Youngstown	Bortz Coal Co., Stambaugh.	250
Total		31,610

Following is a list of beehive-coke ovens now in blast in Fayette and Westmoreland Counties:

Name of ovens	Name of operator and post office	Active ovens
Allison: No. 1	Hillman Coal & Coke Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	200
No. 2	do	195
Tower Hill, No. 2	do	254
Alicia	do	400
Poland, No. 3	do	102
Griffin, No. 2	Hecla Coal & Coke Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	152
Crystal	Hecla Coal & Coke Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	76
Oliver, No. 2	Eberly Coal & Coke Co., Uniontown, Pa.	127
Old Home	Old Home Fuel Co., Uniontown, Pa.	35
Puritan, No. 1, No. 2.	Leckrone Coal & Coke Co., McClellandtown, Pa.	40
Emery	do	32
Puritan, No. 6, No. 7.	Pennsylvania Coal Co., Uniontown, Pa.	60
Donald: No. 1	Virginia Coke Co., Uniontown, Pa.	32
No. 2	Whyel Coke Co., Uniontown, Pa.	160
Isabella	Weirton Coal Co., Isabella, Pa.	136
Geneva	Barton Run Coal Co, Uniontown, Pa.	80
Rich Hill	Rich Hill Coke Co., Uniontown, Pa.	16
Lemont, No. 2	Lemont Coal Co., Uniontown, Pa.	108
Carpentertown	Carpentertown Coal & Coke Co., Uniontown, Pa.	285
Crawford No. 5	Galiard Coal & Coke Co. Connellsville, Pa.	140
Gilmore	Gilmore Coke Co., Uniontown, Pa.	48
Oliver, No. 1	Oliver Coke Co., Oliver, Pa.	24
Daugherty	Bortz Coa Co., Uniontown, Pa.	70
Sapper	do	26
Youngstown	do	210
Central	do	104
Collier	H. C. Frick Coke Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	400
Crossland	do	120
Sheaf, No. 1	do	202
Phillips	do	400
Kyle	do	247
Leisenring: No. 1	do	300
No. 2	do	500
Continental, No. 1	do	400
Dearth	do	250
Myers	Geo. K. Brennan, Scottdale, Pa.	38
Marguerite	King Bros. Coal & Coke Co., Scottdale, Pa.	210
Wynn	Embassy Fuel Co., Fairchance, Pa.	220
Redstone	Fayette Fuel Co. Uniontown Pa.	143
Calumet	C. W Dillon, Mount Pleasant, Pa.	106
United	W. H Glasgow Scottdale, Pa.	41
Beatty	Unity Coke Co., Scottdale, Pa.	124
Jane	J. W. Byars, Scottsale, Pa;	20
Humphreys	Anjo Coal & Coke Co., Kecksburg, Pa.	46
Washington Run	Blaney Coal Co., Star Junction, Pa.	79
Total in blast		7,253

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
W. P. SCHENCK,
Secretary,
Uniontown Chamber of Commerce.

Memorial 50-Cent Piece in Honor of the Late Will Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to authority granted by unanimous consent, I incorporate as a part of my remarks a resolution recently unanimously passed by the Oklahoma House of Rep-

resentatives memorializing Congress to issue a memorial 50-cent piece in honor of the late Will Rogers.

Each succeeding year, since the untimely passing of this great Oklahoman, we are more and more reminded of the great loss sustained not only by our own country but all the other countries of the world. Never at any time in the history of this country have we so sorely needed the benefit of his humor, philosophy, and understanding. Certainly no one contributed more, during the years of his activity, toward establishing friendship and good will between this country and the other countries of the world.

The resolution follows:

Enrolled House Resolution 17

Resolution memorializing Congress to issue a memorial 50-cent piece in honor of Will Rogers, great Oklahoma humorist, philosopher, and world citizen

Whereas Oklahoma is the birthplace and final resting place of the beloved philosopher, humorist, and cowboy statesman, Will Rogers, who walked with kings and did not lose the common touch; and

Whereas we desire to keep alive his memory as the outstanding example of Oklahoma and world citizenship, and to perpetuate those virtues of humility and good will which he expressed in his life; and

Whereas a proposal has been advanced in the National Congress that a memorial 50-cent piece be coined in honor of Will Rogers, and this project has been endorsed by Members of the National Congress, the Will Rogers Memorial Commission, and others interested in preserving the name of Will Rogers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That we memorialize Congress to speedily pass legislation authorizing the coinage of a 50-cent Will Rogers memorial piece, and that we urge the Oklahoma Members in the National Congress to use their best efforts to push this legislation to a successful conclusion; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be printed in the Journal and that the clerk of the house be directed to send by registered mail a copy of this resolution to the honorable members of the Oklahoma delegation in Washington, D. C.

Adopted by the House of Representatives the 7th day of February 1945.

JOHNSON D. HILL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Unity Is Greatest Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great interest an address made by the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Eric A. Johnston, in which he states clearly and decisively that hate and intolerance are the worst enemies today to American progress and the peace of the world.

I share with this distinguished gentleman this philosophy and I am concerned as I look back over the past 12 years as to what has brought about this particular disturbing situation. Surely much of it can be charged to the policies of the New Deal administration.

There are many who may disagree on the objectives of the national administration. There are many things with which I have found myself in agreement. There has been great debate upon the policy of economics employed, but the one outstanding among all the others that has been bad, it seems to me, is the sinister effort to produce a class consciousness, and that effort has been expanded for political ends.

Yes; we have heard about economic royalists and tories and similar things. We have seen the maneuvering of the machinery of this mighty force directed in the interests of minorities, solidifying, if you please, their interests first within themselves and then welding them into a common unit, results of which produced the desired number of votes on election day. And so it can be rightfully said, I believe, that no greater force in the land has contributed to this class distress than the political efforts of the New Deal.

Much as I may disagree with many things they have done, all passed into insignificance in my personal judgment as compared with the insidious attempt to drive a wedge between the different peoples. In full realization of the fact that the vast number of voters are in the low-income brackets, great political effort has been expanded to allege that these people are underprivileged, and all too often they are underprivileged—we do not deny that—and I have no occasion to refuse to assist them to advance themselves, but it can be done without producing a class consciousness from which springs immediately the feeling of hate and distrust toward others.

It should be the policy of our Nation to legislate against those who appropriate conditions for their special interests. But we should never at any time remove from the man the opportunity to climb higher and higher on the wall of personal achievement if he is willing to pay the price for that climb. Some men in this world are so constituted that they will attain wealth even though located under conditions most unfavorable. There are millions of others, given every conceivable advantage, who spend more than they earn. This is a part of human nature, and laws passed by this Congress or laws promoted by this Government will never change human nature.

Pressure groups have taken their cue from this administration, and in their desire to add numbers to their membership dwell at great length in their tirades against those who may have accomplished something in life. And so like the chickens that come home to roost, in this day when our representatives meet in far away places to lay the foundations for a lasting peace with the other nations of the world, we find ourselves confronted at home with this distressing aspect of class consciousness. All of this had its beginning and received its stimulus from this administration as it moved forward to reelect itself again and again and again.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include herewith the remarks so ably expressed by Mr. Eric A. Johnston:

UNITY IS GREATEST NEED

(By Eric A. Johnston, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States)

Of all the social problems that face our country in this era of crisis, that of national unity seems to me the most challenging. Most other problems will not be solved if the American people are divided into mutually hostile and suspicious groups, sections, and classes. More than that: Even if solutions were possible under such conditions, they would hardly be worth achieving. They would be empty victories, utterly meaningless, if the character of our American civilization were changed in the process.

And the core of that civilization, it seems to me, is in the sacred dignity of the human being, regardless of race or class or place of birth. Individual freedom and liberty within a framework of law are essential to the America we know and love. Without these elements it would no longer be our America, except in the geographical sense. In the deeper moral sense it would be an alien country, where those of us who cherish ideals of freedom would be exiles in our own homes.

MUST FACE REALITY

We are all of us, in our several ways, seeking to preserve America. Millions of our sons are doing it on battlefields with bombs and bayonets. Those of us who build and manufacture do it with machines and goods. But what all of us have in mind is not simply the physical preservation of our country. It is the preservation of those human values which are implicit in the word "America"—the freedom, the opportunities, the equalities, the democratic ideals celebrated in our national songs and poetry and books and holiday speeches.

I have been privileged to travel widely in our country, and I do not hesitate to offer any personal testimony that race and group tensions are increasing to an alarming degree. Men and women who should know better—who do know better—allow themselves to mouth the catch phrases of anti-Semitism and antiforeignism, of antibusiness, or antilabor, antifarm. Most of them are not themselves aware that they have been infected by the virus of intolerance which already has the whole world writhing in the fever of war.

When there's a riot in Detroit or Harlem, when racial antagonisms break into the open in Boston or Brooklyn, it's more comfortable to shrug them off as local incidents. But the truth must be faced. These episodes of violence are symptoms of pressures and emotions and maladjustments which are Nation-wide.

The first thing we must do is to confront the reality. Obviously the most violent and deep-seated of our antipathies are racial and religious. Widespread though these expressions of group hatred are, it is a hopeful fact that they still afflict only a small minority of the American population. That minority can be curbed and reeducated if conscious and organized efforts are undertaken.

DESTRUCTIVE POLICY

At the very worst, that minority can be frightened into desisting. Not by legal or physical threats—you can't legislate love of one' neighbor. Americans can be made sharply aware that intolerance endangers not merely the small groups against whom it is directed but the country as a whole. The obstreperous hate-mongers and their stupid or frivolous fellow-travelers can be made to understand that it simply isn't smart to rock the American boat in which they, too, are passengers.

America has prospered because it has opened avenues of economic expression to all men who had the urge and the capacity to advance themselves. Wherever we erect barriers on the grounds of race or religion, or of occupational or professional status, we hamper the fullest expansion of our economic society. Intolerance is poor economy. Prejudice doesn't pay. Discrimination is destructive.

There are some in our country—industrialists, white-collar workers, laboring people—who hold to the myth that economic progress can be attained on the principle of an unbalanced see-saw. They think that if some groups can be forever held down, the others will forever enjoy economic privileges and prosperity at the end which is up.

Fortunately, it does not work that way. Any advantage thus gained must be paid for out of the fruits of the productive plant. The withholding of jobs and business opportunities from some people does not make more jobs and opportunities for others.

Perpetuating poverty for some merely guarantees stagnation for all. True economic progress demands that all artificial barriers erected by ignorance and intolerance be removed. To put it in the simplest terms, we are all in business together. Intolerance is a species of boycott and any business of job boycott is a cancer in the economic body of the Nation.

Let's not apologize for the amazing variety of our human material here in America. Let us rather glory in it as the source of our robust spirit and opulent achievement. Let's not deny that there are differences in race and that our country has all the 57 varieties of God's humanity. Let us merely make clear that these differences cannot be measured on any scale of good, better, and best. They are all equally valid and all must continue to contribute to the magnificent mosaic of American life.

ALL HAVE CONTRIBUTED

Subtract from the grand total of America the contributions of our racial and religious and economic minorities, and what remains? Subtract foreign-born Andrew Carnegie from our metallurgical industry or David Sarnoff from American radio; or George Gershwin and the Negro composers from our native music; or Norwegian-born Knute Rockne from our football or Danish-born William S. Knudsen from the automotive industry; or Russian-born Major de Seversky from American aviation or Belgian-born Lee H. Baekeland from American chemical achievements; or slave-born Dr. George Washington Carver from biological developments. The temptation is to list hundreds and thousands who have thrown their particular genius into the American melting pot.

Too many Americans, indeed, too many of the immigrants themselves, whatever their race or land of bith, behave as if America only gave things to newcomers. We need to be reminded that America received more than it gave. After all, our country let the strangers in because it needed their music power, their purchasing power, their fecundity, and their brains.

On the whole, America, through the generations, has shown itself capable of preventing natural prejudices from spilling over into unnatural intolerance. On the whole, the trend has been toward greater equality. Even the worst manifestations of prejudice have been gradually tempered.

The danger today comes because the normal prejudices are being stimulated by deliberate propaganda. Watered by hate they flourish in more and more places as outright intolerance and discrimination.

Yank, the Army Weekly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that many civilians will be interested in the following fine description of a magazine that is edited by soldiers for millions of their soldier sons. It appeared in Dutton News on January 25:

YANK, THE ARMY WEEKLY

(By Sgt. Al Hine)

Yank in its almost 3 years of existence has built up an enviable reputation for the accuracy and quality of its reporting. It has also built up a somewhat confused picture in the minds of the millions of civilians who know it by reputation. They want to know it better because their sons, brothers, husbands, and sweethearts in the service tell them about it, but few have had a chance to examine the magazine itself.

INTRODUCING YANK TO CIVILIANS

Yank, by War Department order, remains the property of the enlisted man, the only official publication for the whole Army. * * * The appeal of Yank, the Army Weekly, from the day in May 1942, when its first skeleton staff assembled in a bare room on Forty-second Street to the present, has been, in one sense at least, esoteric. Yank was and is written exclusively for soldiers exclusively by soldiers. It has been, until now, a closed book for the civilian reader—unless the civilian reader can pick up a copy from a friend in the service or read, at a later date, some of the Yank material which has been reprinted in magazines and newspapers of general circulation.

Civilians who haven't ever seen a copy of Yank are prone to wildly false impressions of what the book is. Some think of it as a glorified version of a high-school students' paper.

Yank is salty and gutty and sometimes profane. It isn't any of these all the time because the average soldier isn't any of these all the time. Yank's contents are balanced, not according to a golden means of what would be good for the soldier, but according to what the soldier, who writes Yank as well as reads it, likes. Yank is what the soldier is.

That is the story of what goes into Yank, the stories and the cartoons, the articles and the poems and the photographs. Now a word about the people who put it there.

The most important phrase in the Yank credo is by the men, for the men in the service, Yank's writing, drawing, photographing and production personnel is 100 percent enlisted men. No officers are assigned to Yank in an editorial capacity. There are Yank officers, both in the New York headquarters and in the various overseas branches, but they deal with administrative problems and act as liaison between the enlisted editorial staff and their War Department superiors. Yank men write their stories from the enlisted man's point of view and pass them through the same channels of security censorship that applies to all other correspondents.

WHO ARE THE WRITERS, ARTISTS, CAMERAMEN?

These enlisted writers, artists, and cameramen are an Army cross-section. Running down the editorial masthead you can check off almost every branch of the service. There are ex-infantrymen and air force soldiers, engineers and ex-medical men. There are signalmen and artillerymen and Sergeant Hargrove, the most famous of Army cooks. Yank has a sailor on its staff, for ships' stores are as regular an outlet for the magazine as the Army's PXs. Yank goes to all the armed services, not merely to the Army.

Sgt. John A. Bushemi came to Yank from the Field Artillery at Fort Bragg, N. C.; before the Army he had been a photographer on the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune. In the early, harried days of Yank organization, he worked in the New York office, shooting the picture stories of training programs and camp news which necessarily made up a good part of early issues of Yank.

John, or "One-Shot" as he was nicknamed, didn't stick long around New York. By the end of 1942, he was in the Pacific. He went along on the early island hopping that chewed away the perimeter of Jap domination. He sent back to Yank some of the finest combat photographs of the Pacific war.

John went along on the landings at Eniwetok in the Marshalls. He had already covered combat operations in New Georgia, Makin, Tarawa, and Kwajalein. Moving up on the beach with the invading Yanks, Bushemi was fatally wounded by fire from a Jap knee mortar. His last worry, before he died, was about transmissions of his photographs to Yank.

Sgt. Pete Paris had been with the Engineers at Fort Belvoir. He came to Yank as a photographer and artist. Pete joined the military migration to north Africa. He covered the invasion with his camera and moved on up into Sicily with the advancing British and American troops. Home for a brief spell after Sicily, he went next to England where he waited, with thousands of other Yanks, for the invasion of the continent.

D-day was Pete's biggest assignment and on D-day he was killed. He was wounded severely on the Normandy beachhead. The ship carrying him back to a hospital in England was strafed and sunk. Later, when it washed up on shore, another Yank artist-photographer, Cpl. Joe Cunningham, saw it. "It was blasted apart," he said. "Three big holes blown through it."

YANK STAFFERS IN ACTION ON EVERY FRONT

Yank staffers have won seven Purple Hearts in four different theaters of the war. They have three Bronze Stars, three Legions of Merit, and two Air Medals.

In England Reporters Sgt. Walter Peters and Pvt. Ben Frazier went to aerial gunnery school to qualify as combat personnel on the bombers softening up Hitler's war machine in 1943 and early 1944. Each of them made five or more missions. Walt Peters went along on the famous raid on the ball-bearing works at Schweinfurt, the raid from which 60 flying fortresses never came back.

There have been few big stories in this war that have not seen a Yank correspondent in the middle of the action. Sgt. Burgess Scott, writer, and Sgt. George Aarons, photographer, were with Montgomery's Eighth Army when it chased Rommel out of Africa. Sgt. Ed Cunningham was with Wingate's Raiders and Col. Phil Cochran when they launched the air-borne invasion of Burma.

Sgt. Walter Bernstein hiked over the hills of Yugoslavia with a band of Partisans to be the first English-speaking correspondent to interview Marshal Tito. Sgt. Mack Morriss was in on the early bloody days of Guadalcanal. Now he's in Germany with the First Army. Sgt. George Meyers, of the Alaska beat, was with the United States forces in the Aleutians.

Sgt. Bill Reed hitched a ride on one of the first B-29 raids in the Pacific. Sgt. Dave Richardson, long before that, had been with Lieutenant Commander Bulkley's famed PT-

boat squadron. Sgt. Merle Miller covered Pacific warfare with Bushemi; now he edits the Paris edition of Yank.

Sgt. Barrett McGurn and other Yank men were in on MacArthur's return to the Philippines. Corp. George Barrett, bumming a ride on a reconnaissance flight out of Italy, saw his plane's motor's shot up and made a forced landing in the Mediterranean.

Add to these all the Yank men in less active theaters, reporting the Army job of supply troops in Australia, of weather station G. I.'s in the north Atlantic, of soldier longshoremen in the Persian Gulf, of transport fliers in India and WAC's in Ceylon. Add the tremendous amount of unsolicited material from correspondents in the field who turn to Yank when they find the germ of a story in their outfit. Add up all of these and you find the down-to-earth Army reasons why Yank is the enlisted man's reflection as well as his weekly magazine.

YANK, PIONEER IN GLOBAL PUBLISHING

There is a "how" to be added, too, to the "what" and "who" of Yank. The how has to do with Yank's production, with its 15 different editions printed weekly in 11 plants scattered all over the world. For Yank has been a pioneer in global publishing.

Yank had to go global when the war scattered Army readers to the four corners of the world. The first foreign printing of Yank was set up in London in 1942. Now Yank is printed in India, Egypt, France, Hawaii, Iran, Italy, Australia, Panama, and Puerto Rico. The Honolulu office prints three different Pacific editions, including a pony-size job for air mail. New York prints a domestic edition, an Alaska edition, and an over-all overseas edition for those overseas installations not serviced by a printing center of their own.

Yank's publishing problems have been as varied as it foreign offices. The Middle East edition, now printed offset in Cairo, was originally a letterpress job, run on a machine in Palestine that had previously been used for printing grapefruit wrappers. The Persian Gulf edition is printed by Iranian pressmen on French paper with German presses; extra plates are made by an Armenian photoengraver who dealt with Yank personnel through a Turkish-Russian interpreter.

The master edition of Yank, naturally, is made up in New York from the contributions of correspondents in the various theaters of war. This master edition is then matted for letterpress; extra positives and negatives are made for offset and rotogravure. The mats, positives and negatives, are shipped by air to the overseas printing plants. There, with changes to run material of tropical interest to the particular command, they are put together to form the Pan-American Yank (Panama) or Yank Far East (Australia) or Yank European Edition (Italy), or whatever.

Thus Yank, substantially the same magazine wherever it goes, reaches sailors on the run to Murmansk and marines on Saipan, medical corpsmen in Assam and combat infantrymen on the soil of Hitler's Reich. And to all of them, wherever it goes, it tells the same story, the true story of themselves and their part in the war.

Work or Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the recent debates in Congress on the May work or fight bill left the American people confused and bewildered over the necessity of such drastic compulsory legislation. The genial and able Patrick T. Fagan, area director for the War Manpower Commission, Pittsburgh, Pa., wrote me on the subject and submitted pertinent free verse by S. Quagmier McGill. I am happy to include in my remarks the poem by Mr. McGill I received in a letter from Mr. Fagan.

WORK OR FIGHT

(Condensed)

The work was nice in our organization
'Til, in an effort to aid the Nation,
Some crackpot with hallucination,
Conceived of manpower utilization, compliance, and stabilization.

The plan was fine and without hesitation,
War Manpower Commission commenced to ration.
Employers were accused of malutilization
And darned near succumbed to nervous prostration,
And in the form of communication,
Periodically register indignation.

Then comes Government reorganization
And each plant is requested for compilation
Of records that led to complete frustration
And in an attempt at retaliation,
Industries howled, "It's discrimination,
We've done our best at integration
And leaned over backward with cooperation.
The workers are victims of bad transportation
And we seek solace in expectation.

So we suggest an experimentation of comprehensive adaptation
Of a program which, by demonstration,
Is bound to help the situation;
We're on the verge of realization
They'll have to pick an occupation
And choose with all acceleration
Or else it's military indoctrination."
"Termination."

—*By S. Quagmier McGill.*

What Do the Veterans Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, Congress talks a great deal about what should be done for the veterans when they come home from this World War. I sometimes think that what we should do is to ask the veterans themselves what sort of help they want or what they think Congress should do. This thought was emphasized a few days ago in a letter I received from a lieutenant in the Seabees from my own home town. Boiling down what he says, it is that "most of the veterans are interested in a chance to get ahead in their own businesses."

He sent with his letter a clipping from the Seabee Coverall, which is printed at the United States Naval Base at Port Hueneme, Calif. The item is clipped from a column called Port Hole Peerings, and makes an interesting suggestion regarding post-war rehabilitation, all over the world, and the possibilities of absorbing men who have had tremendously fine experience for such rehabilitation jobs. This proposal would give them a chance to do a better job than could be done otherwise.

PORTHOLE PEERINGS

(By Burns)

How about it? Why not give the G. I.'s (a broad term used here to include officers and men) first call in applying for post-war civilian reconstruction jobs overseas? Here's why: Hundreds of thousands of man-hours (to use current nomenclature) are being spent these days in planning post-war jobs for the millions of G. I.'s now in the armed forces. And this is a good deal. But I wonder—as plans shape up for the Allied control of Germany, and eventually Japan—if the planners have thought of devising some system whereby the education, administrative experience, and all-around ability of many G. I.'s could be intelligently used in the post-war civil, economic, and political control of Germany and Japan.

Specifically, the Allied post-war civilian reconstruction set-up overseas, is bound to include many well-paying jobs, and I seriously doubt if there would be any serious objections to making these overseas jobs first available to the G. I.'s. The G. I.'s were thought competent enough to invade the countries, and this writer has not a single doubt as to their ability in helping to run them. But let someone think that this is a proposal for the G. I.'s to take over the functions of the State Department, let me hastily add that this is not what I have in mind. Rather, it's my idea to give the G. I.'s first crack at accepting such post-war overseas civilian jobs as will be necessary to convert the Germans and Japs from their "master race" complex. And such jobs will most certainly include a place for school teachers, newspaper editors, censors, and the like. And the armed forces today have men with these qualifications. However, all the post-war overseas civilian jobs for the victorious Allies will not fall into the so-called white-collar class.

Construction jobs, probably, will be the largest single undertaking of the Allies, immediately after Germany and Japan are defeated. And it's certain that the Allies are not going to hand over millions of dollars' worth of construction material to our former enemies, and, in effect say: "Go to it and rebuild your country." Surely, the Allies will hold a careful watch over the Germans and Japs as to what they rebuild, for a blank check on millions of dollars' worth of construction materials with nobody around to watch how these materials were being used could well result in some kind of a Siegfried line being built behind our backs. Germany did it before, but surely, we won't let her do it again. So the question arises as to how the Allied supervision will be carried out.

Will the armies of occupation carry on all the supervisory functions? Presumably not, for only last week the newspapers revealed that the former O. P. A. head, genial, able, cigar-smoking Leon Henderson, a civilian, was sent to London (and I quote the reliable Associated Press) "to handle economic affairs in the American-controlled portion of defeated Germany." Doesn't this sound as if civilians (and most G. I.'s have a burning desire to join 'em) were to play a part in the post-war reconstruction of Germany? It does from where I sit, and chances are that a similar set-up will be devised for Japan—in due time.

Now, remember this: Not all of us are going to consider the war won just as soon as the guns stop firing. There's more to this war than combat fighting. Call it winning the peace, if you choose. But whatever combination of words pleases you, the fact remains that not all of us will be willing to retire to the thousands of "Podunks"

from which we came and "forget it all." Sure, sure, right now we think we will, and we'd be crazy if we didn't think so. However, once we're united with our families, thousands of us will realize that the job which no longer requires bloodshed is, nevertheless, not done.

And to finish it, thousands of us will experience a continued determination to play an active role overseas, this time in the front lines of post-war reconstruction, though not in fox holes. For again the sane elements of civilization (to wit, the Allies) are again going to stage an effort—but this time a successful all-out effort we hope—to make this next post-war world really safe for democracy. And many a G. I. will wish to continue playing an active role, though no longer with shot and shell.

Speaking personally, it would give me a tremendous amount of satisfaction to hold a post-war reconstruction job overseas, and in holding the job to know that my ability and past experiences were being intelligently used in this war's ultimate goal of seeing the job through—of actually being on hand and actually taking part in helping to create, at long last, a safe and sane world.

So I ask, Why not give the G. I.'s—and the term is meant to include all officers and men in the armed forces—first call in applying for civilian post-war reconstruction jobs overseas?

Congress Can if It Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Telegram, Superior, Wis., for February 1, 1945:

CONGRESS CAN IF IT WILL

Members of Congress are indulging in considerable conversation concerning proposals to reorganize that body's method of doing business.

This is all to the good, provided that too much time is not spent talking about it. For many years the need has been apparent to citizens having dealings with Congress or knowledge of the way its machinery functions. The Constitution contemplated that the ultimate source of power, next to the people themselves, should be their duly elected representatives. The executive department has definite prerogatives and the judicial has negative powers as relating to both the others. But the greatest single source of power, the purse strings, the founders placed in congressional control.

Yet, with all its potential power Congress too often finds itself the victim of circumstances that it should control but does so only inadequately. To those familiar with the development of machinery of State government, especially as observed in Wisconsin, the curing of the situation at Washington does not seem so difficult to accomplish. In this State, through leadership both in the executive and the legislative branches during the past 50 years there has been a marked increase in the scope of governmental activity and in the machinery to handle it. At no time through this long process has there been evidenced on the part of the people of the State any great fear that the Executive would overshadow the legislators to the extent that the people's hold on Government be weakened.

One outstanding reason for this is the fact that in enacting the legislation to cope with modern conditions the Wisconsin Legislature has had the benefit of expert counsel whose objective was to serve the people's instead of special interests. Wisconsin was the first State to develop a legislative reference bureau and clothe it with ample authority and funds to produce full information relating to subjects under consideration. Thus have grown such able departments as the public service commission, the industrial commission, the State tax commission, and various other boards that are now an integral part of the State government.

The personnel of such boards is named by the Governor, but in actual practice the executive's function stops there. He can remove for cause and he can recommend reduced or enlarged appropriations, but the general Wisconsin experience has been that these agencies function independently and stay within the limits contemplated by the legislature.

Two vital things are lacking at Washington, the need for which has prevented Congress from working out any such efficient sysetm for the National Government. First, Congress has no adequate fact-finding organization on which it can depend for unbiased analysis of the problems presented; second, it has no machinery for following through on departments to hold them to the task prescribed and prevent them from branching out into other fields. A lone Congressman or even a congressional committee has small chance to follow the ramifications and evaluate the consequences. A smaller unit such as a State, does not meet this latter difficulty in such degree. Being closer to the scene of operations legislators have a better chance to know how far public servants may be transgressing.

There are efforts being made to streamline its methods of operation, but unless Congress makes up its mind to first inform itself as to the needs involved and second to check up on the agencies that it sets in motion the lawmakers have small chance of holding up that end against executive departments and bureaus of their own making. Congressman VOORHIS of California is pressing a bill to accomplish this. The general idea should be written into law with the least possible delay. Congress has too long permitted bureaus and interested department heads to be the main source of information as to the merits of their own operation.

Activities of Secret Service and Other Enforcement Agencies of the Treasury Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks some interesting releases from the enforcement agencies of the Treasury Department. They follow:

Frank J. Wilson, Chief of the United States Secret Service, said today that carelessness on the part of persons receiving Government checks and merchants and others who cash them is contributing to an increase in juvenile delinquency.

Chief Wilson said that nearly half of some 1,800 persons arrested by his agents during 1944 for stealing and forging Government checks were 18 years old or younger. Many of these youngsters, he believed, might have been saved from making a start toward a life of crime had the opportunity for apparent easy money been removed. He called upon persons who receive such checks to guard them as they would money, and on persons who cash them to use extraordinary care in obtaining proper identification of persons who present checks for payment.

An additional social aspect of the problem is presented by the fact that many such checks stolen are allowance and allotment checks urgently needed by dependents of our servicemen. Their families or dependents often suffer hardships because issuance of new checks is delayed by the necessary investigations.

Chief Wilson said the courts are paying increasing attention to the juvenile problem arising from this racket. Several jurists have called merchants who cashed checks for juveniles under obviously doubtful circumstances into court and warned them of possible charges of contributing to delinquency.

At Omaha, Nebr., Judge Herbert Rhoades, of the Douglas County Juvenile Court, placed parents of 9-year-old and 11-year-old brothers on probation for a year after the children were arrested on check stealing charges.

The tragic aftermath of crime was demonstrated dramatically in one case. A San Antonio, Tex., man identified as the forger of six Treasury checks, stabbed himself to death before his wife and baby as city detectives closed in on him after a 10-mile automobile chase.

The Secret Service is intensifying its educational campaign designed to remove opportunities for stealing and forging checks.

Narcotic addicts, pinched by steadily diminishing supplies in the underworld trade, are resorting to frantic efforts to obtain drugs through fraud and theft, H. J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, reported today in reviewing the work of his agents during 1944. He cited as examples:

Three Dallas, Tex., men were given prison sentences in connection with theft and sale of morphine syrettes from first aid kits installed in Army planes and parachutes, thefts that might cost the lives of United States fliers.

A Sioux Falls, S. Dak., couple to satisfy their addiction, invented a cancer stricken father and false documents to obtain quantities of morphine from a sympathetic country doctor.

A woman addict in Kentucky hired ailing old men whom she paraded from physician to physician as her father to obtain prescription drugs.

Two Medford, Oreg., physicians were given long prison terms for supplying addicts; a prominent St. Petersburg, Fla., doctor drew a record $10,000 fine and a suspended prison term; and a Chicago physician is awaiting trial on similar charges.

E. J. Shamhart, Deputy Commissioner of Customs, reported continued numerous seizures from vessels arriving in United States ports especially those from India and Iran, mostly in small caches in every conceivable hiding place aboard ship. However, several sizeable lots of opium seized appeared intended for the illicit United States traffic.

Combined narcotics seizures by customs at the ports and borders and by Narcotics agents in the interior traffic totaled 7,160 ounces, compared with 8,549 ounces in 1943. Total seizures of marihuana were 12,117 ounces, against 11,961 ounces in 1943. Total arrests for violations of the drug laws were 2,410 in 1944 and 2,672 in 1943.

Seizures and arrests continue below levels of pre-war years.

The days when mountaineer folk considered "revenooers" fair targets for a rifle ball have passed largely, but enforcing Uncle Sam's tax laws relating to liquor still has its hazards.

Dwight E. Avis, Assistant Deputy Commissioner, in charge of the enforcement section of the Alcohol Tax Unit, culled from his agents' reports on 1944 activities a case in point.

Two Treasury investigators, J. B. Reed and W. W. Frost, were wounded by buckshot near Biloxi, Miss., when their car was ambushed after they had destroyed two moonshine stills. Three prisoners in the rear of their car were unhurt. Lovender Ladner and Ramsey Cameron were given 20-year prison terms on charges of assault with a deadly weapon in connection with the shooting.

There are new tricks to this old trade also, Mr. Avis revealed. One gang of illicit liquor distributors in North Carolina employed attractive 16-year-old girls to accompany their drivers as "blinds."

The American soldier's penchant for souvenirs is proving something of a headache to United States Customs officers, who, although sympathetic, have to follow the laws and regulations.

E. J. Shamhart, Deputy Commissioner of Customs, in charge of enforcement, reported numerous seizures during 1944 of automatic weapons, explosives, explosive devices, and ammunition obtained in battle areas and being brought back by returning servicemen.

Importation of military souvenirs is permitted where the members of the armed forces have certificates of permission signed by their commanding officers. Unauthorized articles are confiscated and turned over to military authorities. Customs officers point out that many such items are dangerous and that there is danger of weapons and explosives falling ultimately into irresponsible or criminal hands unless they are rendered inoperative.

Attempts of servicemen to inform their relatives of their whereabouts and experiences in communications outside the mails, and consequently not cleared by other censorship, also add to the Customs job. Diaries and other such communications when seized are preserved carefully and may be released to the addressees after the war.

Mr. Shamhart reported that the scarcity of liquor produced an increase of small-scale smuggling operations during the year, with 6,650 such seizures, an increase of 1,100 over 1943. There were no signs of a revival of liquor smuggling on the scale of prohibition days rum running, however, with such activities being confined to individual cases on the Mexican border and from Cuba. Other types of seizures declined, but several cases involving war-scarce commodities were noted. Mexican silver cigarette lighters worth $8,000 were seized, along with some jewelry in one case. Two persons were arrested in a case involving smuggling of watches, silks, and woolens worth $24,000 from Canada.

A case of attempted smuggling in reverse involved $11,000 worth of piece goods headed out of the country in violation of orders of the Foreign Economic Administration and intended for Cuban consignees. Remnants, which could be exported legally under license, were packed around the outside of bales containing actual bolts of materials. The goods were seized.

W. H. Woolf, head of the Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, has a long-standing conviction that persons who cheat Uncle Sam on their taxes are pretty likely to "take" their fellow citizens as well.

For example:

An Alliance, Ohio, scrap-steel supervisor for a big steel company charged 25 cents to $4 a ton for bestowing to dealers wishing to sell scrap to his firm his personal stamp of approval. His employer was in ignorance of his methods. The Intelligence Unit found the man had reported only $4,200 income while garnering $25,000, and he went to prison for tax evasion.

An Oskaloosa, Iowa, gasoline dealer made false claims for tax exemption on sales allegedly made to the county government. He claimed that 50,000 gallons were sold to the tax-free agency, whereas investigation showed that actually only a small part went to the county, the rest being disposed of to other customers, quite profitably, of course.

In another case, Mr. Woolf reported, a gambler made $125,000 betting on races and failed to share with the Government. He's doing 5 years.

Wallace and Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Washington Evening Star of February 12, 1945:

WALLACE AND WILLIAMS—COMMON MAN

(By Ernest Lindley in the Washington Post)

A contest of sorts seems to be developing between a majority of the Republicans and the right-wing Democrats in Congress to see which group can put itself more emphatically on the record as opposed to any man who has lifted his voice in behalf of the common people or the underdog. Henry Wallace has become the symbol of the aspirations of the common man—more so probably than any other man in American public life except Roosevelt. Aubrey Williams, less well known than Wallace but very far from unknown, is identified more particularly with the underdog.

Williams was Hopkins' right-hand man as Federal relief and W. P. A. Administrator. He organized the National Youth Administration in 1935 and was its Administrator until it was liquidated. Through N. Y. A., hundreds of thousands of young men and women earned enough money to enable them to stay in high school and college. Hundreds of thousands of others got part-time work experience which helped them to qualify for jobs. As the national defense program and the war came on, Williams was quick to correlate this work training of young people to the needs of war industries.

Williams put his heart into the N. Y. A. program, perhaps all the more because he had had to quit school in the fourth or fifth grade, to start earning his living. Later he went back to school and worked his way through college. In the First World War he served with the Y. M. C. A., the French Foreign Legion, and the United States Army. Three of his four sons are in the armed forces now.

What has Williams' early life got to do with his qualifications to be Rural Electrification Administrator? Not much, perhaps, except to indicate that he has energy and a strong will—in short, that he is a good example of individual initiative. Not all our self-made men are to be found in private business. Many of the ablest go into the professions and the public services, often because they have a sense of social obligation. Williams comes out of the South, from early American stock—judging by his long lank frame, predominantly Scotch-Irish. He has come a long way under his own steam. He is the kind of man who would rather be an effective public official than president of the largest corporation or a millionaire. He is simply an old-fashioned American with a Presbyterian conscience, who believes that equal opportunity is a fundamental American aspiration, and that the high-water mark of American economic and social progress was not reached in the twenties.

As to his specific qualifications to be R. E. A. Administrator, these observations may be pertinent: He is an experienced public administrator who has dealt with large affairs. He is enterprising. One of the gravest charges leveled against him as N. Y. A. Administrator was that he corralled machine tools which could have been put to better use elsewhere. The charge probably was correct, but it was a tribute to Williams' foresight and initiative. He has shown ability to find and direct competent men. One of the important national farm organizations, the Farmers Union, thought him qualified to be one of its chief organizers.

Williams' opposition does not appear to be as large or as firm as Wallace's. But the political significance of the fights against them both lies in the fact that they are champions and symbols of the aspirations of the common man and the underdog. Their opponents may be smart politicians; they have succeeded in getting themselves elected. But they have not won a national election since 1928, and they are advertising a general viewpoint on which Roosevelt repeatedly has been able to capitalize. That is the viewpoint which the progressive Democrats have labeled "Hooverism."

Presented as a public service by:

INTERNATIONAL LATEX CORPORATION,
Playtex Park, Dover, Del.

Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the February 12, 1945, issue of the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Tribune:

LINCOLN

There were not many men 84 years ago, especially in the distraught city of Washington, who believed that the Union of States could be saved. Bull Run, which statesmen and society people went out to see in their carriages, was but the beginning of a succession of disasters, and for a time it seemed as if the Union could not produce soldiers who would stand and fight and generals competent to lead. Everywhere there were treachery, disloyalty, fear, acquisitiveness, and inefficiency.

Meanwhile, the thunder of the guns drew closer to the capital and the city was overrun with fugitive slaves, soldiers who had fled from battle, and mercenaries of one sort or another who were determined to capitalize the Nation's crisis.

Lincoln witnessed the disheartening spectacle. He saw the defeat of his armies, the failure of his chosen generals, the perfidy of many in high places, the rising tide of fear that surged through the city. For long months it appeared as if the forces of the Union could not match in fighting qualities those who followed the banner of Lee and

that a great nation must disintegrate. He had reason, not once but a thousand times, to fear that all was lost, that the overwhelming storm could not be weathered. But he never lost either his faith or his courage. He knew that a cause which was infinitely just would triumph, that the American people had within them those qualities which are vital to victory.

There is never a time when the life of Lincoln is not a source of inspiration to the American people. In this troubled year of 1945, the sublime faith of Lincoln in the enduring character of this Nation is a heartening example and a font of spiritual sustenance.

The American people need this faith today and will need it still more in the days that lie ahead. At a time when defeat was everywhere and passion ran high, Lincoln found it in his heart to speak without malice and to urge charity for all "and firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right." Let each American do his best to find in his own heart something of his courage, his tolerance, and his faith.

Where New Jobs Are Waiting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of February 11, 1945:

WHERE NEW JOBS ARE WAITING

The American people have become acutely conscious of the need of planning for full employment after the war Henry Wallace is only one of many who are stressing this necessity. And whether the number of jobs is to be 57,000,000, as Mr. Wallace asserts, or several million less than this figure, as estimated by others, the task of maintaining full employment is one to challenge all our resources.

While the great bulk of these jobs must be geared to the home market, many industries are set up on the basis of supplying the peacetime requirements of other countries. We are prepared to produce automobiles, typewriters, agricultural machinery, machine tools, and mass production goods in general on a scale far in excess of domestic needs. Evidently the expansion of our export industries might be counted on to furnish an important quota of jobs toward full employment.

In his Chicago speech last October the President said he was convinced that with congressional approval our foreign trade could be trebled after the war, "providing millions of more jobs." Dean Acheson, an assistant secretary of state, told the National Association of Manufacturers that the United States must find markets abroad "in the neighborhood of $10,000,000,000," and thus provide 3,000,000 jobs in industry and 1,000,000 in agriculture.

We shall not realize the importance of these figures unless we bear in mind that the 1940 census, showing an aggregate employment of 45,000,000 persons, reported that only ten and one-half million of these were engaged in manufacturing. The rest were in construction, mining, farming, trade, and various services. The 3,000,000 jobs proposed in export industries would thus constitute nearly 30 percent of all employed in normal peacetime manufacturing.

What are the chances of expanding our export industries and thus contributing millions of new jobs toward the full employment program? The Department of Commerce, in a survey of foreign trade after the war, points out that the chief barrier to the expansion of American imports has been, not lack of demand on the part of foreigners, but the inability of foreign purchasers to get the dollars they needed to pay for our goods. They may have enough of their own currency for the purchases they would like to make, but unless they can exchange their currency into dollars the American dealers aren't interested. And the supply of dollars available depends in the long run on sales of foreign goods to the United States.

In other words, foreign trade is essentially a swapping of goods. Foreigners pay for the American goods they buy with the goods they sell in America. (To be accurate we must include here the American money spent abroad by travelers, or sent back to the old country by immigrants, or spent on foreign freight and insurance.)

Evidently we can't build up our export industries unless we are willing to accept imports in payment. We can't sell more abroad unless we are willing to buy more abroad.

We all recognize this broad fact theoretically. But to apply the principle practically—that is another matter. After the last war we found ourselves abruptly transformed from a debtor to a creditor nation. This meant that whereas we had been accustomed to pay the interest on our debts with exports of farm products and manufactured goods, now we no longer could send out exports in payment of interest. The only way foreigners could continue to buy our products was by inducing us to accept goods in exchange.

But we didn't want to do this, or at least our protected industries didn't want us to. They sent up screams that resulted in our raising tariffs that already were high, and a few years later in raising them again. Our export trade was in danger of being shot to pieces because of the inability of foreigners to pay for the American goods they wanted. The only reason this didn't happen was that we began to make foreign loans on a huge scale. We thought we could eat our cake and have it too. What we were doing was lending the foreigners the money to buy American goods and postponing the day of reckoning. That day finally came in the crash of the depression.

In view of the stress that is now being put on export industries to help create postwar jobs, the question is whether we have learned the lesson of the improvident 1920's. Are we ready to build our exports in the only sound way by swapping exports for imports? Or will we shut our eyes and plunge ahead as we did after the last war?

Two writers in Harper's magazine put the case bluntly in an article, That Export Boom May Cost Us Another War. They point out that though people recognize in principle that tariffs should be lowered in order to promote both national and international prosperity, apparently no group has ever been willing to give up any advantage that it thought a high tariff brought it.

The experience under the Hull trade agreements was discouraging. The greatest care was taken to make reductions in duties so slight as to admit only an additional trickle of foreign goods. But the admittance of such goods to the extent of only 2 percent of the American production was enough to evoke violent protests from the interests affected. The salmon packers of the Pacific coast were going to be ruined by imports of a few thousand cans against an American production of 300,000,000, just as the livestock men of the West grew pale when an unusual rush of Canadian cattle one day in the spring of 1936 broke the Minneapolis market for the day.

The writers in Harper's conclude that if America makes a ruthless drive to capture foreign markets without a sound give-and-take program on foreign trade, this Nation will force other countries into a series of protective measures in the course of which world trade may be strangled, peoples impoverished, and the way left open for new dictatorships and new wars.

It cannot be denied that such a danger exists. It need not eventuate if the American people act on the information now available and insist on a reasonable foreign trade policy. Such a policy would be of vast advantage not only to the United States, but to the world. The Nation cannot allow an enlightened policy to be wrecked by pressure groups, eager for short-run advantage.

Price Control and the War Effort in Australia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, our experience in this country with price control has demonstrated the effectiveness of a national price-control program in time of war. While some mistakes have been made the over-all picture has contrasted wonderfully with the picture of the last war.

I believe that it would be of interest to the American people to know something about the price-control efforts of our allies in this war. Consequently, I am including here as part of my extension of remarks an address broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System on January 20 by the Honorable D. B. Copland, Commonwealth Prices Commissioner of Australia, entitled "Price Control and the War Effort in Australia":

I am very glad, during a brief official visit to the United States, to have the opportunity of speaking to you about price control in its relation to the war effort in Australia. This is the right way to approach the problem of price control. It should not be considered merely as a repressive agency designed to hold prices at a particular level during the war, though that is the major job price control has to tackle. But in the broader sense price control is one of a group of measures which all democratic governments have to take to mobilize their resources for war and to maintain stability in the economy under the disturbed conditions of war.

Australia commenced price control in the first week of the European war in September 1939 and it has been my principal responsibility to the Commonwealth Government to control prices ever since. The first step taken by the Government was to insue a "stay" order pegging the prices of the principal commodities at the levels ruling on August 31, 1939. This gave us time to work out a system of control which would permit price adjustments to unavoidable increases in costs. In the Australian economy costs rose immediately on the outbreak of war because Australia imports essential goods and the landed costs of these imports went up on account of increases in freight rates and war-risk insurance and rises in prices overseas. Australian exports also rose and these goods enter into consumption or into the

production of other goods. These increases in the prices of imports and exports had to be absorbed into the whole price structure and some increases in prices were therefore unavoidable. Australia has an interesting system of wage control under which a large proportion of wage rates are automatically adjusted each quarter to the cost of living. Thus, the rise in prices brought about by higher prices of imports and exports also brought about a rise in wages. This in turn caused other costs to go up and other prices. It looked like a vicious spiral of rising prices, rising wages, rising costs and still further rises in prices.

This is rather too simple an explanation of the method of control and might give the impression that there was no real firm control at all. It would, however, be a great mistake to jump to such a conclusion. Traders and producers were not allowed to add the whole of their increased costs of production if they were already making high profits. They were not permitted to make a greater profit margin on sales of any commodity than their pre-war margin unless they got permission. In some cases where profits were low, or where losses were actually being made, traders were allowed to adjust their profit margins by raising their prices. Against that, however, was the principle adopted that the Prices Commissioner could also reduce profit margins where they were high. As turn-over was increasing, profits tended also to rise rapidly and traders were expected to absorb some of the increases in costs. This is what people call the squeezing of profit margins, and what others call profit control instead of price control, but what's in a name? The fact was that from the very beginning of the war profit control was an integral part of price control, so that prices did not rise by the full amount of the increases in costs. In a few instances, prices were even reduced below the pre-war level, and in many cases, as for example, in steel and iron, large increases in costs were absorbed before any rise in price was permitted. Australian iron and steel is now the cheapest in the world, and the main company producing iron and steel in Australia has readily accepted a lower profit margin for the duration of the war. The squeezing of margins was not confined to manufacturers, but was extended to both wholesale and retail distribution.

From the very outset price control was designed to prevent profiteering. In wartime supplies are disorganized and demand leaps up rapidly. Thus there is created a profiteer's paradise, and he would have most certainly entered into that paradise had it not been for price control. The rule was laid down from the outset that mere shortage of supply in the face of increased demand did not entitle a trader to raise his price.

This system of price control worked fairly satisfactorily for the first 2¼ years of the war. At the outbreak of the Pacific war in December 1941, the Australian price level had risen by only 12½ percent despite the big increases in imported goods and in exports and the general upward movement of wages and incomes. The pressure on the price level was greatly increased by the impact of the Pacific war on Australia. We had then to divert men and resources from civilian production to war production and the shortages of goods became more acute. So did the pressure of demand, and it was a stiff battle to hold prices at reasonable levels. The landed costs of imported goods went up again because we were partially isolated from the rest of the world and had to pay very heavy insurance rates on cargoes. After a year and a quarter of the Japanese war, the price level had risen by another 10 percent, making 22½ percent in the first 3½ years of war.

The increase would have been greater had it not been for other measures of control designed to strengthen the economic front. We have to remember that in this war the home front is more important than in any war in history. That is because more than ever before this is a war of equipment and ships and planes, as well as of the armed forces. The drain on normal supplies of goods and transport is much greater than in any other war, and Australia has had to impose rigid controls on her economy in order to build up the home front for the increasing burdens it has had to bear.

These controls are as follows:

(a) Control of supplies of essential materials so that they will be reserved for war needs.

(b) Control of transport so that priority will be given to materials and men required for war. We even have a rationing of railway travel in Australia.

(c) Control of consumption through general rationing so that the productive effort of the community will not be absorbed in meeting nonessential civilian demand. In addition to petrol, tea, butter, sugar, and meat, there is a severe rationing of all clothing, household linen, boots, and shoes. Without this rationing it would be impossible to supply our own forces and the forces of our allies in the Pacific and the people of Britain with essential food and clothing.

(d) Control of manpower so that men and women are undertaking what is regarded as essential work if they are not in the armed forces.

(e) Control of incomes, including wages and salaries, and incomes derived from rent and interest. There is thus a maximum level of incomes so that costs will not be continuously rising because of increased incomes resulting from shortages of labor.

In this background of general control, price control was further intensified and a price stabilization policy was put into operation in April 1943. This policy has been successful in holding the general level of prices, including the prices of all goods and services at, or about, the level prevailing on April 12, 1943. No goods or services are exempt from the price ceiling. Thus it covers not merely the prices of potatoes and butter, or essential clothing, but also the prices of amusements of all kinds, haircuts, charges in beauty parlors, medical and dental fees. The view Australia has taken is that there can be no compromise with the evils of inflation and profiteering. The controls of supply, consumption, labor, and transport, all contribute not only to the mobilization of resources for war, but also to the success of price stability. Price control in turn plays a very important part in enabling these other controls to operate equitably and smoothly. They all hang together like the blocks in an arch and they can bear the burden while they are in position. Price control enables resources to be diverted at equitable levels of rewards and it prevents the less noble-minded sections of the community from being able to use resources to obtain special rewards higher than those available to people working for the war, whether they are soldiers, sailors, airmen, munition workers, transport workers, and so on.

Thus we see that price control has a great constructive part to play in the war effort. It is a central feature of the attack on the home front. Not only does it help in mobilizing resources for the war, but it imparts confidence to the people that inflation will not swallow up all their energies, their incomes and their savings. It gives stability to wage earners, investors, and employers alike, in a world which otherwise would be most unstable. It sweeps away opportunities for profiteering, which is most damaging to any war effort. Thus it builds up morale, but its advantages will not be confined to the war.

The greater the economic stability attained during the war and the lower level which costs and prices can be stabilized, the easier will it be to make adjustments to peace conditions, and to move in an orderly way through the difficulties of the transition period from war to peace. This is important. We all owe it to the hundreds of thousands of men and women who are fighting on the real front that we shall hold the economic front in reasonable shape for them when they return. We cannot do this unless we maintain stability of prices. If we fail we will damage ourselves in the long run, but much more reprehensible will be the damage we do to the brave men and women who are giving the most valuable years of their lives to enable us all to live in a free society. Each section can see the case for special concessions, but if all the concessions are granted, we are back where we were before in the same relative position, except that prices and incomes are higher and we have suffered a blow to our pride that we were not able to hold the position. For this reason a price controller's job is a most unenviable one. His watchword should be: "No compromise," and people in a democracy normally dislike a man who is uncompromising. But in price control we have to be uncompromising, because we are dealing with an enemy. At all events, that is what we have tried to do in Australia and our measure of success is partly due to an uncompromising attitude against allowing any price increases under a price stabilization plan. So, if I can presume to say one word of advice after my 5 years' experience in the small community of Australia, it is this, support your price controller and sustain him. You will get greater rewards in the long run than any inconvenience you may suffer from his decisions.

Stability is so important that it must be held even against increases in costs such as the higher prices of imports or the necessity for improving the position of some producers to bring them up to common levels of incomes in the community.

To meet these costs it is better for the Government to pay subsidies rather than to allow prices to rise still further. The Australian Government in common with the other democracies that are operating a price-stabilization plan is paying subsidies. These subsidies are not looked upon as aids to distressed producers, but as constructive payments designed to maintain economic stability. They amount in Australia to approximately £17,000,000 per annum, or about 1½ percent of the total national income.

Views of Civil Aeronautics Board as to the Proposed Uniform State Air Commerce Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to request granted by the House, I place in the RECORD a statement by the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board in reference to the proposed uniform State air commerce act.

There is a proper field for the States by legislation and administration to cooperate with the Federal Government in the regulation of air navigation. The prospect, however, of 48 States attempting by legislation and regulations to cover the board field of aviation must be looked upon with apprehension by all

true friends of air commerce. A multiplicity of regulations, conflicting laws, and inconsistent regulations will almost inevitably follow a widespread scale of State legislation.

However, well intended may be the aggressive effort to secure State legislation of air navigation in the alleged interest of our commerce, it carries the probabilities of many varied and great handicaps to the progress of aviation. All such efforts should be measured by the probable results that would follow as the result of such proposed legislation.

The views of the Civil Aeronautics Board are expressed in the following letter:

JANUARY 19, 1945.

MR. FREDERICK G. HAMLEY,
National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAMLEY: Following the meeting with some of the Association's committee on legislation on December 6, 1944, the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board have given careful consideration to the committee's proposed uniform State air commerce bill. In response to the committee's request, the Board submits its views with respect to that proposed legislation.

We believe you will agree that the question of state economic regulation should be considered from the standpoint of the interest of all the people in the realization of the full potentialities of air transportation to serve the people and in the development of a national air transportation system adequate to the needs of the entire country.

We are of the opinion that no urgent necessity exists for the proposed economic regulation of air commerce by the States. Air transportation has been, and is, essentially interstate in character, and it is our belief that it will continue to be predominantly interstate for some years. Thus, a comparison of the relative volume of passenger movements by types of carriers shows that in 1933 45 percent of the railway passengers and 54 percent of the highway passengers moved in intrastate commerce (Federal Coordinator of Transportation, passenger traffic report), whereas in September 1940 (the last month for which the Civil Aeronautics Board has a country-wide traffic survey) less than 16 percent of the air carriers' passengers moved in intrastate commerce, and they accounted for less than 8 percent of the total passenger-miles. In the past intrastate services have developed in close relation to the long-distance or interstate services. The Board looks forward to a considerable growth of local air services, but even these services will be largely interstate in character, operating across State lines and carrying chiefly interstate traffic. Of the approximately 600 applications for domestic service on file on January 5, 1945, only 47 applications were for service within a single State. Air transportation is still in its development stage, and no public interest will suffer from postponing the inauguration of State economic regulation. On the contrary the development of air transportation could be seriously prejudiced by the regulatory program you propose. We recommend, therefore, that no action be taken during the 1945 sessions of the State legislatures.

If the States, nevertheless, undertake active economic regulation of air transportation, the Board agrees with your committee that uniformity in legislation and regulation is desirable. However, the Board must point out that seldom have uniform State statutes been uniformly interpreted and administered, and it entertains grave misgivings lest the development of air commerce be prejudiced by a multiplicity of regulation and by a lack of uniformity in regulation.

The members of the Association's committee on legislation rested the case for immediate State economic regulation largely on what they assume to be an essential similarity between air transportation and other forms of transport. In response to your queries, we outlined what appeared to us to be significant differences between air and surface transportation, differences which support the conclusion that a different public policy from that designed for the regulation of surface carriers must continue to be applied to air commerce. We would again direct your attention to these salient and distinguishing characteristics: (1) air transportation is predominantly long-distance, and hence, interstate, transportation; (2) the air carriers do a relatively small volume of business (the industry's aggregate operating revenue being approximately equivalent to that of one medium-size railroad for the prewar years) and operate with relatively narrow profit margins, and hence are unable to bear the burdens of multiple regulation; and (3) the air transportation industry is still in its developmental stage when every opportunity to effect low costs must be safeguarded if the industry is to achieve the volume operations which the public interest requires. No evidence has been advanced that intrastate air transportation has suffered from the absence of State economic regulation or that the level of charges for intrastate transportation has been such as to require State regulation. Indeed, passenger fares have moved in harmony with reductions in operating costs. Furthermore, the studies which we have made into intrastate operations on the west coast (where conditions would be expected to be more favorable to intrastate operations) indicate that the local services have been financially dependent upon the long-distance, interstate operations. Thus, there exists no basis for any misgivings that the interests of the intrastate traveler have been neglected or made subservient to those of the interstate traveler or shipper. Nor is there any basis for a fear that the development of local services has been, or will be, retarded by the absence of State regulation.

If your association should, nonetheless, sponsor a program of State economic regulation of air commerce, we believe that every effort should be made to avoid conflicts between State and Federal regulations, and particularly that duplicate regulation of the same air line by both Federal and State authorities should be avoided. To insure this result each air line should be responsible to only one regulatory agency rather than to many regulatory bodies. Therefore, the proposed uniform bill should, in our opinion, be modified to redefine the jurisdiction of the State authority, limiting State economic control to those air carriers which are not subject to Federal regulation. It is our considered judgment that the air transportation industry cannot properly develop and give maximum service to the public under a system of multiple regulation. The industry's large potential contribution to the growth of the country's commerce and the welfare of every community, as well as its vital relation to national security and defense, warns against any governmental action, State or Federal, that might handicap or forestall its imminent expansion.

We should seriously consider the precise nature of the public's interest in air transportation. In the absence of artificially imposed obstacles, it is certain that every important community in the country will be linked by reasonably direct services to every other important community. Air transportation can make all regions of the Nation as accessible as the different parts of the State now are in terms of surface transportation. The vast majority of the people who will use air transportation for travel or for fast shipments will be primarily interested in long-distance carriage. If multiple economic regulation keeps cost at high levels or hampers the growth of volume operations, the air carriers will be unable to make those rate reductions which are prerequisite to the maximum development of economical air transportation. The net result of State economic regulation may thus be gravely detrimental to the interests of the people of the State, diminishing the amount of service offered to its communities and increasing the costs to the taxpayers.

Furthermore, the Board sees no justification for some of the duplicating regulations which are contemplated by the proposed uniform State air commerce bill. We refer specifically to requiring interstate carriers already certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board to obtain certificates of convenience and necessity from the States. Similarly, the requirement that interstate air carriers keep accounts according to any system differing from that prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Board would impose a heavy burden on interstate commerce; and even if that system is followed, the requirement that the interstate air carriers report specifically on their intrastate operations, segregating their accounts accordingly, would involve difficulties and expenses quite disproportionate to any resulting benefits.

This response to the request of your committee for a frank statement of our judgment as to the wisdom of the uniform State air commerce bill in its present form and at the present time rests upon our estimate of the consequences for air transportation which would follow the attempt of the 48 States to regulate the interstate air carriers that constitute our national air network.

Sincerely yours,

L. WELCH POGUE,
Chairman.

Medical Care in Maryland

REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. I want to call your attention very briefly to a very important legislative enactment just adopted by the Maryland Legislature.

I am proud of Maryland's traditions and I think justly so, and so I am happy to see that my State, in cooperation with the doctors and nurses, our splendid and efficient State department of health, and our progressive Governor has worked out a program to give adequate medical care for those who cannot afford to pay for it themselves, and have provided in the present State budget an appropriation of $200,000 for this worthy worth-while achievement. I trust other States will follow Maryland's lead.

I will be pleased to get a copy of the Maryland act for any of my colleagues who might be interested in same. The editorial follows:

AN IMPORTANT STEP FORWARD IN MEDICAL CARE

Passage by the legislature of the State medical aid bill brings nearer the elimination of a serious weakness in the existing medical system. This is the inadequacy of medical care for those who cannot afford to pay for it themselves.

The bill makes provision for payment by the State of doctors and nurses engaged in

this service and also for improving the equipment and facilities of county health bureaus. Administration is placed in the hands of a newly created bureau of medical services in the State department of health, and this bureau is also to operate the two chronic disease hospitals, for which provision has been made, and the third which is contemplated. Expenses are covered by an annual appropriation of approximately $200,000 which is included in the budget.

The bill was framed with the advice and cooperation of the medical profession, and the virtue of the proposal lies in the fact that it endeavors to improve the existing system, which has accomplished so much, rather than to destroy the whole structure and attempt to erect something completely new and untried. The favorable action of the legislature keeps Maryland in the forefront in the important matter of improving and extending medical care to all who need it.

There Ought To Be a Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Journal of February 16, 1945:

THERE OUGHT TO BE A LAW

It was reported last week from Michigan that disorders in a camp for conscientious objectors at Germfask are being investigated by the Government, with a view to finding some way of enforcing discipline among the 74 men confined at Citizens Public Service Camp No. 135, located there. The charges against persons interned at this particular place include refusal to work, frequent absences without leave, bringing liquor into the camp in violation of rules, breaking into food lockers, and destroying large quantities of Government property—and, on one occasion threatening camp officials with bodily harm.

The troubles at No. 135, we are informed, have been of long standing. State courts have insisted they are without jurisdiction, and the Federal tribunal in that district has taken the position that, except in cases of desertion, the violations were too trivial to take up the court's time. There have been proceedings against 10 deserters during the last 5 months, it was claimed by the prosecuting attorney.

In our view there has been entirely too much coddling of these so-called conscientious objectors from the very beginning, this claim being used as a cloak to hide, too often, a nonconscientious coward's fear of enemy bullets. The line drawn between the classes of American youths—those anxious to serve and those unwilling to answer their country's call—is entirely too wide. Camps for conscientious objectors are entirely too numerous, for everything else being in order, the eligible male citizen should either be ordered to fight or go to prison. (There are, of course, some exceptions.)

What is needed, however, is a law giving the commandant of a citizens public service camp full authority to punish minor infractions of discipline following proper trial by military court. It is high time to put an end to such nonsense as has been reported from Germfask, No. 135.

Chicago's War Labor Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, regarding the legislation recently passed by the House of Representatives, known as the work-or-fight bill, I include an article from the Washington Daily News of February 13, 1945, which outlines a plan that is used in Chicago to solve the war-labor situation.

I have known Dean Spencer for quite a while and know him to be a very capable and apt man, who meets these problems with a breadth of vision, as the article herein describes.

He has been fortified with men in the War Manpower Commission such as Charles Casey and Leonard Brown, who are a credit to that agency, and this article proves what can be done by cooperation of employer and employee, without drastic legislation.

The article follows:

CHICAGO'S WAR LABOR PLAN

(By Peter Edson)

Chicago area's War Manpower Commission office thinks it has a plan for solving the labor-shortage problem in critical war industries.

This Chicago plan has been in operation for over a month and William H. Spencer, dean of the Chicago University School of Business, now regional W. M. C. director, cites figures to show it works. The Chicago plan is attracting attention at W. M. C. headquarters in Washington as something other areas can copy.

To begin with, Chicago is one of the tightest labor areas in the country. It was slow starting on war work but has picked up steadily. The Chicago area consisting of Cook and DuPage Counties—not to be confused with the Chicago Region of Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin—has a labor force estimated at 1,833,000, of whom over a million are in war production. Every procurement agency has contracts in Chicago—Army, Navy, aircraft, Maritime Commission, and 50 percent of the Quartermaster Corps processed foods are from Chicago packing plants.

Many of these Chicago area contracts are without ceiling, meaning that the Government will take all of the items that can be produced, without limit. Chicago can therefore use all the labor it can get for war industries. The question has been where to get it.

Toward the end of last year, Chicago area manpower officials through the 18 area offices of the United States Employment Service, were crying for 60,000 more workers in essential industries. That figure has been successively cut down to 40,000, to 20,000, and to 10,000 today through a very simple and apparently workable plan which has been found acceptable to employers, labor union officials, and the working people themselves.

Point of attack on this problem was the 650,000 people employed in the trade and service industries.

First step was to put all women workers under priority referral, meaning that women could no longer switch from one job to another unless they had U. S. E. S. release.

Next step was an order to cut 10 percent from the labor force of all nonessential industries employing more than 10 people, the 10-percent cut to be paid off in male workers. Thus if an employer had 200 workers, half of them women, he would have to release 20 men.

These employers could not be given credit for the men they released, however, unless they were men who could be placed by U. S. E. S., unless they were accepted by the essential industry employer to whom they were referred and unless they had a written guarantee they'd get their old job back from their original employer and that all their seniority and other union rights would be protected during their temporary employment in essential war industries. These three conditions, particularly the last, sold the idea to the labor organizations and, furthermore, they prevented the nonessential industry employers from dumping their least efficient workers.

Deadline for release of the first 5 percent was set at February 15, the second 5 percent to be released by March 15 for the tristate region, though this was moved up to March 1 for the two-county Chicago area.

The results, as announced by Dean Spencer, show how Chicago has been able to shift its work force to meet war needs. What this all means is that Chicago has found tens of thousands of workers it didn't know it had and that it will get many more millions of dollars worth of war contracts as a result.

Address of Hon. Ivy W. Duggan, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ivy W. Duggan, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, before the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, December 12, 1944:

Farmers are in the best financial position for the moment that they have ever known. They have experienced 5 years of record production. There has been no other time in the history of agriculture in this country when we have had 5 consecutive years of as high production, either in the aggregate or per farm worker. During the same period there has been an almost unlimited market for the vast majority of commodities which farmers have produced. In spite of greatly expanded production, they have been unable to fill the demand at all times for many commodities, such as wheat, tobacco, livestock, livestock products, etc. There are only a few commodities, such as cotton, wool, and eggs, of which at times we have had a surplus supply on hand. Farmers truly have done a magnificent job in the face of shortages of labor, materials, equipment, fertilizer, and other supplies in producing for the war effort not only the commodities most needed but when and where they were needed. Too little and too late has not been said of farmers in any instance in this war.

In fact, since 1940, farmers have experienced a situation that does not usually come once in a lifetime. In addition to having a favorable growing season, record production, and almost unlimited markets, they have received good prices for what they produced. While prices of agricultural commodities on the whole have not been as high in this war as they were in the last war, income has been higher because of the record volume of production.

Farmers have had demonstrated again that it is price times volume that determines their income. The gross income from agriculture for each year since 1941 has set a new all-time record. Each year since 1941, the net return to agriculture has also set a new record. The average annual farm income per worker has nearly doubled since 1941 and is now $1,456. Of course, the annual income per worker is nothing like as high in agriculture as it is in industry where it now amounts to $2,360. But still, I state again that as a result of this combination of factors, farmers are for the moment in the best financial position in the history of American agriculture.

There has been a marked change in the financial structure of agriculture since 1940. The high gross income and the high net return to labor and investment in agriculture have had a big effect on agriculture's balance sheet. We find the total equities in agriculture have increased almost $30,000,000,000 between January 1, 1940, and January 1, 1944. This increased equity is accounted for by increased prices in the case of real estate, by increases in both volume and price in the case of crops and livestock, and by increased savings from net income in the case of currency and deposits and United States Government bonds; and finally by a reduction in the farm debt since 1940.

Possibly the most significant item in farm assets is the large amount of cash, bank deposits, and United States Government bonds which farmers now hold. On January 1, 1944, this amounted to about $12,000,000,000, or an increase of more than $7,500,000,000 since January 1, 1940. This increase in cash assets and bonds alone amounts to more than the total outstanding farm mortgage debt. If distributed in proportion to debtor this could wipe out the total mortgage indebtedness of farmers together with all of their short-term indebtedness on January 1 of this year and still leave several billion dollars of cash on hand.

Farm real estate values account for the greatest part of the rise in farm assets from $54,000,000,000 in 1940 to $83,000,000,000 in 1944. There has been little change in the amount of farm real estate, so all of this increase of $12,000,000,000 in the value of farm real estate is due to price changes. Then the rise in prices of livestock, machinery, and crops on hand amounts to over $7,000,000,000. So it is estimated that the rise in prices accounts for $19,700,000,000 of the $21,100,000,000 increase in the value of tangible farm assets. How secure is this increase of $19,000,000,000 in value of assets which is based on price increases? How much of this is paper profit and how much of it is real? How much of it will last? Let's look for a minute.

It is true that Congress has guaranteed to beginning January after the end of the war. support prices of many agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity for 2 years But that doesn't mean today's prices because prices of agricultural commodities on the whole are 114 percent of parity. Ninety percent of parity would mean a decline of one-fifth in prices received. Then with cost of production still on the upward trend, the net profit could be reduced without a 24 parity point decline. With a 24-point decline to 90 percent of parity the net profit could be greatly reduced or wiped out. Furthermore, Congress has not made a public commitment on the volume of agricultural commodities on which it would support the price, and farmers must never forget that it's not volume alone that determines income but that it is volume times price that determines the gross income. And to determine the net income, the cost must be subtracted from the gross income.

Real estate prices, which accounted for a $12,000,000,000 increase in farm assets the first of this year as compared with the first of 1940, have been going up since the war started at just about the same rate, if not a little faster, than during World War No. 1. For 2 years now this rate has been remarkably steady at 1 percent a month. Land prices for the whole country have gone up about 44 percent above the 1935–39 average. While the rate has been greater in some parts of the country than in others, there is no part of the country in which there hasn't been a material increase in the price of land. How much of this is paper profit? Frankly, if land prices continue to go up and there is continued speculation on the part of farmers and others in farm real estate, all of the increased assets may turn out to be merely paper profit. Let's see what happened in the last war.

Cash income and gross income were up then just they have been in this war, although not quite so high, and farm real estate values rose from $39,500,000,000 in 1944 to $50,000,000,000 in 1918. They didn't stop there, however, but went on up to $66,000,000,000 in 1920. In the 10 years from 1910 to 1920, the total value of farm real estate increased $32,000,000,000, or almost doubled. If we should continue to follow the same pattern, we could expect real estate values to reach a peak about 2 years after this war. You are all familiar with what happened after 1920. In 13 years' time the total real estate value shrunk to $30,500,000,000. Farmers had lost on real estate alone $36,000,000,000 of paper assets, and remember that the increase in the assets from 1940 to 1944 of $30,000,000,000 is $6,000,000,000 less than farmers lost on real-estate assets alone in the 13-year period following 1920. Whether the present increased assets turn out to be paper profits is going to be determined to a very high degree by farmers and others who bid for farm real estate. In addition to the actual loss in valuable assets, we should not forget the 2,000,000 farm foreclosures between wars when farmers who were foreclosed lost all their savings and equities.

The following factors are operating to further increase real estate values:

First, there are more people, both farmers and nonfarmers, wanting to buy farms. Tenants and sharecroppers are trying to become owners, active farmers are adding to the size of their places, war workers are buying expecting to become either part-time or full-time farmers, and servicemen, often with the help of their folks, are purchasing land to operate when they are discharged.

Many city people are looking for a place to invest surplus cash earnings as a hedge against further inflation. I would warn city investors, though, to remember that they didn't have any hedge in farm real estate in the 13 years following 1920. For them it was sort of like hedging on a horse race by betting on two other horses.

To supply this demand, the farms for sale are decreasing. Credit institutions, estates, and other unwilling holders of farms have sold nearly all their land. The higher rental incomes also have made retiring farmers and widows want to hold on to land they would otherwise wish to sell.

Not only are more people wanting to buy the fewer farms offered, but they can easily finance the purchase. Those $12,000,000,000 of quick assets give many farmers the money to pay cash or large down payments on land they want, and city buyers have even more cash they can use. The balance is easily borrowed.

Life insurance companies, banks, and other investment institutions which largely pulled out of the mortgage lending field in the depression are reentering it on a large scale. Many banks now find themselves with a very large proportion of their funds invested in Government securities and are seeking more diversified outlets for their funds.

Private capital is also aiding in the financing of sales. For example, individuals this year are making nearly 40 percent of all mortgage loans to farmers. Such loans are almost never based upon land appraisals by experienced appraisers or on the normal value of a property. They are not made under a long-time amortization repayment plan. Usually loans made by individuals are the first to get in trouble.

Added to these economic factors tending to further increase real-estate values are the psychological forces. In almost any area you go into today, you can hear farmers relating how someone in a community paid for a farm with one or two crops and how someone sold a farm for twice what he was offered for it or paid for it only a few years ago. Some farmers and real estate operators are beginning to feel the urge to do a little speculating, such as buying a farm for resale at a profit. Of course, no one knows how far this will go if not curbed. The full effects on real-estate values of the high production in 1944 and the large net income to agriculture have not yet been fully felt.

Over on the other side we have certain factors which are operating and which we hope will continue to operate to hold down further inflation of real-estate values.

Many farmers will remember what happened during and following the last war and will not repeat the mistake they made then.

The investment in Government bonds is at least delaying the full effect of the increased income on land prices.

One other factor is the uncertainty of post-war markets for agricultural commodities, especially some of the important ones such as wheat, wool, and cotton, causing many farmers to hesitate before obligating themselves for farms at increased prices. The advancing cost of production and difficulty in securing adequate and efficient farm labor has tended to put a brake on land purchases.

I think that the policy of the Farm Credit Administration is possibly one of the strongest influences in checking uncontrolled inflation of land. As you know, it has for a long number of years followed the policy and practice of lending on the normal value based upon the long-time earning power of the farm.

It took considerable courage on the part of the Farm Credit Administration and the cooperating borrowers, who took a portion of the risk, to lend on normal values during the depression of the thirties when most of the other lending agencies were withdrawing from the field or had withdrawn. Normal value during the depression is the same as normal value during inflation, but normal value during the depression was relatively high and in some cases higher than market value. By staying with the farmer and normal value during the depression, the Farm Credit Administration refinanced hundreds of thousands of farms which were on the brink of foreclosure and assisted the farmers to remain farm owners, hold their properties, thus affording them an opportunity to work out of the situation in which they found themselves, and to remain farm and home owners. Sticking to normal value during these present times when in so many instances the normal value is far below the present market price perhaps takes more courage than during the depression. However, when prices are at the bottom, they cannot go any lower, and history has proved that loans made at the bottom are much safer, both for the borrower and the lender.

The production credit associations, the intermediate credit banks, and the banks for cooperatives, as well as the emergency crop and feed loans, and the regional agricultural credit corporations were all of measurable benefit to the farmers of this country when

it was equally as hard to get production and marketing credit as it was to get mortgage credit.

I wish I had time today to review the history of each of these lending institutions and the part they have played in helping the farmer to achieve the very favorable balance sheet he has today, for each has a record in which it can take great pride.

However, getting back to the question of land prices, farmers themselves will determine just how much pressure their present cash bank deposits and Government bonds, in the amount of some $12,000,000,000, will exert on further inflation of land values. If they will use these liquid assets to further reduce their debts or invest them in more Government bonds to hold until after the war when materials and supplies are available, then they can use their cash assets to improve their farm buildings, build new buildings, make necessary repairs to equipment and fences, buy new machinery and equipment, improve their livestock, terrace and improve their land, and as operating capital. If so used, these funds will have very little effect in further increasing land values. After the war, farmers very likely will need a rather large reserve of ready cash and operating capital to convert from a wartime to a peacetime basis. I would like to point out right here that agriculture has a more difficult conversion problem than industry. Agriculture does not have any backlog of unfilled demand to be met when the war is over.

In the conversion period from a wartime to a peacetime basis and in the post-war period, farmers may have a greater need for sound agricultural credit agencies than they have ever had before. They will desire credit designed to meet their specialized needs. In some areas we may need a different type of credit with an intermediate period of maturity from the kind they have been accustomed to in the past; one designed to assist farmers in converting to a different type of agriculture due to the shifting of markets and production over a period of years. I would urge the American Farm Bureau and the other farm organizations to study carefully private, cooperative, and direct lending institutions, to thoroughly familiarize themselves with the history of these institutions, with their strength and weaknesses, and determine how well-fitted each is to meet the probable needs of the future.

If history repeats itself and we have declining prices following this war as we have had following all previous wars, we may have a rather heavy strain on the agricultural credit institutions of the country. I would seriously question the advisability of dispensing with any sound institution or program which has rendered a real service in the past, without carefully evaluating the future needs for such institutions, program, or service.

Other subjects to which we should give consideration are:

1. A Government licensed and supervised appraisal system where, for a reasonable fee, either a borrower or a lender could obtain a normal value appraisal based on the long-time earning power of a farm.

2. The taxing of profits made from land speculation. This could be a variable tax on farm resales, the amount of the tax depending upon the number of years between the time of purchase and time of resale.

3. A study of the Government lending agencies to determine the degree of corporation, coordination, and consolidation that should be brought about to see how much the cost of providing credit can be reduced and the efficiency of services increased, to determine the degree of competition, duplication, and overlapping existing between and within Government lending agencies; to see that there is available to all farmers types of credit to meet their individual needs.

4. State and national farm organizations also should look into the cost of transferring titles and recording deeds and chattel mortgages. In many cases, these costs and fees are out of line with the service rendered but probably can be corrected only through State legislation. The Farm Credit Administration would be glad to cooperate with the farm organizations in a study of this type.

The farm organizations and all the farm groups should give careful consideration to programs for veterans. Credit to veterans for purchase of farms and for operating capital must be such that there is a reasonable assurance of success. In our haste to be of assistance to veterans, I am sometimes afraid of what we might do to them instead of for them. Improper credit or untimely credit to veterans, and to others, for that matter, would probably cost the Government more in the long run and at the same time do the veteran immeasurable damage.

Our agricultural income will be greatly influenced by the amount of employment and our national income. However, even with full employment we may not have a prosperous agriculture. Also, full employment in industry is going to depend upon the purchasing power of agriculture. Thus, we should not ignore the importance of industry to agriculture and conversely, industry should not ignore the importance of agriculture.

Post-war problems will be difficult but not impossible to solve. I have the utmost confidence in the ability and will of the American people, and especially of the American farmer because I know him best, to meet and deal with whatever problems develop. The farm organizations have an opportunity and a responsibility in assisting in a solution of the post-war problems of agriculture. Farm organizations, individually, and as a group, must oppose with all of their power and their might unsound policies, plans, and programs. Yet, they cannot be content and must not be content with a policy of opposition. Farm organizations must take a stand and blaze the way for courses of action which are sound. They must lead the way in the forward march of agriculture. The best defense against the problems of the future is a strong courageous offense.

Consolidated comparative balance sheet of farms of the United States, 1940–44 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Item	Jan. 1, 1940	Jan. 1, 1941	Jan. 1, 1942	Jan. 1, 1943	Jan. 1, 1944	Net change, 1940–44	
Asset items:							
Tangibles:						*Percent*	
Real estate	33,642	34,026	36,611	39,905	45,592	+36	+11,950
Nonreal estate:							
Livestock	5,132	5,320	7,042	9,541	9,526	+86	+4,394
Machinery and equipment	3,135	3,319	3,959	4,157	4,198	+34	+1,063
Crops [2]	2,339	2,493	3,409	4,576	5,595	+139	+3,256
Household equipment	4,275	4,338	4,513	4,620	4,699	+10	+424
Intangibles:							
Currency and deposits	4,030	4,478	5,462	7,362	9,663	+140	+5,633
United States savings bonds	230	331	486	1,143	2,390	+939	+2,160
Warehouse receipts	323	470	394	490	513	+59	+190
Other (in co-ops) [3]	660	660	660	660	660		
Total assets	53,766	55,435	62,536	72,454	82,836	+54	+29,070
Equity items:							
Liabilities:							
Real-estate mortgages	6,586	6,534	6,484	6,117	5,635	−14	[4] −951
Non-real-estate debt:							
To principal institutions [5]	1,940	2,233	2,331	2,512	2,359	+22	+419
To others [6]	1,455	1,675	1,748	1,464	1,180	−19	−275
Proprietors' equity:							
Farmers' equity in nonreal estate [7]	16,729	17,501	21,846	28,515	33,705	+101	+16,976
Landowners' equity in real estate	27,056	27,492	30,127	33,846	39,957	+48	+12,901
Total equities	53,766	55,435	62,536	72,454	82,836	+54	+29,070

[1] All figures are estimated, the margin of error varying with the items.
[2] Crops stored in unbonded warehouses escape inclusion either in inventory or in warehouse receipts. Likewise commodities in bonded warehouses which are not covered by a Commodity Credit Corporation loan agreement escape the estimate.
[3] Data for 1936–38.
[4] Because of rounding of figures this difference is $1,000,000 less than a figure which appears in the text.
[5] Gross; includes debt underwritten by Commodity Credit Corporation.
[6] These figures are believed to be reasonable but they lack supporting evidence.
[7] Including intangibles.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Gross farm income and net income of farm operators, 1914–44

Year	Gross farm income [1]	Net income of farm operators
1914	$7,638,000,000	$3,518,000,000
1915	7,968,000,000	3,745,000,000
1916	9,532,000,000	4,687,000,000
1917	13,147,000,000	7,011,000,000
1918	16,232,000,000	8,674,000,000
1919	17,710,000,000	9,249,000,000
1920	15,908,000,000	6,778,000,000
1921	10,478,000,000	3,603,000,000
1922	10,883,000,000	4,057,000,000
1923	11,967,000,000	4,842,000,000
1924	12,823,000,000	5,128,000,000
1925	13,567,000,000	6,103,000,000
1926	13,204,000,000	5,699,000,000
1927	13,251,000,000	5,706,000,000
1928	13,550,000,000	5,695,000,000
1929	13,824,000,000	6,044,000,000
1930	11,388,000,000	4,329,000,000
1931	$8,378,000,000	$2,744,000,000
1932	6,406,000,000	1,832,000,000
1933	7,055,000,000	2,681,000,000
1934	8,486,000,000	3,759,000,000
1935	9,595,000,000	4,484,000,000
1936	10,643,000,000	5,062,000,000
1937	11,265,000,000	5,139,000,000
1938	10,071,000,000	4,327,000,000
1939	10,547,000,000	4,459,000,000
1940	10,962,000,000	4,617,000,000
1941	13,779,000,000	6,395,000,000
1942	18,474,000,000	9,254,000,000
1943	22,738,000,000	12,046,000,000
1944 [2]	23,500,000,000	12,400,000,000

[1] Not adjusted for inventory charges; beginning with 1933, including Government payments.
[2] Tentative estimates.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Farm real estate. Index numbers of estimated value per acre, by geographic divisions, selected years, 1912–44 [1] *(1912–14 = 100)*

	New England	Middle Atlantic	East North Central	West North Central	South Atlantic	East South Central	West South Central	Mountain	Pacific	United States
1912	99	98	97	97	98	97	96	98	94	97
1920	140	136	161	184	198	199	177	151	156	170
1925	127	114	116	126	148	141	144	105	146	127
1930	127	106	96	109	128	128	136	102	142	115
1933	105	82	62	64	80	79	82	69	96	73
1934	104	83	65	67	87	85	88	69	97	76
1935	104	85	68	68	93	93	91	70	101	79
1936	105	88	72	71	97	96	94	73	105	82
1937	107	89	76	71	104	102	96	75	110	85
1938	106	90	78	70	106	107	99	75	109	85
1939	105	89	77	67	106	109	97	75	107	84
1940	106	90	78	65	107	112	99	76	108	84
1941	107	91	80	65	110	115	99	78	109	85
1942:										
Mar. 1	109	94	89	69	117	126	105	84	115	91
July 1	109	94	87	68	117	126	104	86	119	91
Nov. 1	109	95	90	70	121	128	105	89	120	93
1943:										
Mar. 1	112	103	96	76	127	141	112	92	126	99
July 1	114	105	97	77	128	142	114	94	134	102
Nov. 1	116	106	100	79	133	147	116	99	141	105
1944:										
Mar. 1	122	109	110	88	145	159	125	107	150	114
July 1 [2]	124	110	113	90	148	162	130	111	158	117
Nov. 1 [2]	125	111	113	91	150	163	131	115	165	120

[1] All farm land with improvements, as of Mar. 1 unless otherwise specified.
[2] Preliminary.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Farm-mortgage debt outstanding, value of farm real estate, and debt as a percentage of value, United States, Jan. 1, 1910–44

Year	Total outstanding farm-debt	Total value of farm real estate	Debt as a percentage of value
			Percent
1910	$3,208,000,000	$34,801,000,000	9.2
1911	3,522,000,000	36,050,000,000	9.8
1912	3,930,000,000	37,306,000,000	10.5
1913	4,348,000,000	38,463,000,000	11.3
1914	4,707,000,000	39,586,000,000	11.9
1915	4,991,000,000	39,597,000,000	12.6
1916	5,256,000,000	42,271,000,000	12.4
1917	5,826,000,000	45,495,000,000	12.8
1918	6,537,000,000	49,987,000,000	13.1
1919	7,137,000,000	54,539,000,000	13.1
1920	8,449,000,000	66,316,000,000	12.7
1921	10,221,000,000	61,476,000,000	16.6
1922	10,702,000,000	54,017,000,000	19.8
1923	10,786,000,000	52,710,000,000	20.5
1924	10,665,000,000	50,468,000,000	21.1
1925	9,913,000,000	49,468,000,000	20.0
1926	9,713,000,000	49,052,000,000	19.8
1927	9,658,000,000	47,634,000,000	20.3
1928	9,757,000,000	47,495,000,000	20.5
1929	9,757,000,000	47,880,000,000	20.4
1930	9,631,000,000	47,880,000,000	20.1
1931	9,398,000,000	43,993,000,000	21.4
1932	9,094,000,000	37,236,000,000	24.4
1933	8,466,000,000	30,724,000,000	27.6
1934	7,685,000,000	31,933,000,000	24.1
1935	7,584,000,000	32,859,000,000	23.1
1936	7,423,000,000	33,910,000,000	21.9
1937	7,154,000,000	34,757,000,000	20.6
1938	6,955,000,000	34,747,000,000	20.0
1939	6,779,000,000	33,931,000,000	20.0
1940	6,586,000,000	33,642,000,000	19.6
1941	6,534,000,000	34,026,000,000	19.2
1942	6,484,000,000	36,611,000,000	17.7
1943	6,117,000,000	39,963,000,000	15.3
1944	5,635,000,000	45,592,000,000	12.4

Retirement Pensions of Railroad Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from the John Fritz Chapter, No. 6, East St. Louis, Ill., of the International Association of Railroad Employees:

JANUARY 5, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At a meeting of our organization held this day, we the officers were directed to write you a New Year's greeting, and solicit your support of our pension plan. Considering all the sadness and sorrow throughout the world, it is indeed difficult for us to say "Happy New Year." Everywhere there are vacancies left by our beloved members who have passed into the great beyond. During 1944 the grim reaper took 29 members of our group, their presence is sadly missed in our meetings.

The John Fritz Chapter filed a petition with Congress about a year ago asking for a pension increase, but nothing came of it. We now respectfully request the new Congress to consider our case. Our pension plan is predicated on length of service and earnings. The pension now scales between $6 per month minimum and $120 per month maximum. The increases we ask are as follows: Those who now receive $100 to $120, a 5-percent increase; for those who now receive between $75 and $100, an increase of 10 percent is requested. For those receiving $50 to $75 monthly we ask an increase of 15 percent; those who receive between $25 and $50 request an increase of 20 percent; and for those receiving between $6 and $25 we ask an increase of 25 percent. We feel that these allowances can be made without increases being necessary in the present tax rate for pensions on railroads and employees thereof. The rate now in force is 3¼ percent from employees and a like amount from the railroad companies.

In its annual report for the year ending June 30, 1943, it is stated that more money is being paid into than is being expended by the Railroad Retirement Board. Many millions are invested in Treasury 3-percent notes. We feel that the income of the retirement program is meant for retired employees and should not be frozen in investments beyond a reasonable surplus fund. Railroad workers are buying War bonds separately from their payments toward retirement.

In our local chapter we have a membership of approximately 400 people, all over 65 years of age. Some of our people are 70, some 75, and a few over 80. It should not be difficult to understand the hardship now being undergone by these people because of the tremendous increase in living costs. In most of these homes there are one or more dependents. In a majority of these homes there are loved ones in the armed forces, doing their bit in the war effort.

We are hoping that you and others will bring these matters before the attention of the House.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. DUNCAN.
H. A. SNEDEKER.
H. W. BRUNKHORST.
V. C. POWELL.
ERNEST COOMES.
FRANK C. SMITH.

Ship Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter on the subject of ship construction from Admiral Land and a summary from the Maritime Commission, showing tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program through January 31, 1945:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, February 13, 1945.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Believing it may be of interest to you, I am enclosing a tabulation showing monthly deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program through January 31, 1945.

Last month United States merchant shipyards completed 120 ships, totaling 1,429,296 tons, dead weight. During January for the first time, the number of Victory cargo ships placed in service exceeded the deliveries of Liberty ships, 33 of the former being completed as compared with 32 of the latter, not counting Victories converted to combat-loaded transports. Liberty ships now comprise a relatively small proportion of the merchant shipyards' output, and at the end of January only 116 more such vessels (including colliers and aircraft transports based upon the Liberty design) remain to be delivered. Naturally, deliveries of long-range type cargo ships, military conversions, and tankers continue at a high level.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND, *Chairman.*

Dead-weight tonnage of ships delivered under the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program

Month	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
January		30,330	47,200	197,628	1,007,680	1,204,730	1,229,296
February	31,230	31,628	40,500	289,549	1,236,481	1,372,864	
March	18,230	44,627	108,700	291,473	1,513,244	1,538,357	
April	25,042	64,219	131,200	401,632	1,603,307	1,593,691	
May	34,340	44,457	98,600	619,779	1,782,836	1,537,915	
June	31,594	32,399	81,700	749,654	1,670,442	1,379,994	
July	18,440	105,121	127,441	791,667	1,669,341	1,274,453	
August	33,796	31,514	112,042	752,774	1,690,411	1,157,602	
September	37,459	40,738	86,185	1,016,112	1,652,571	1,185,997	
October	17,840	59,658	75,296	889,737	1,675,311	1,310,295	
November	37,524	90,245	138,254	892,536	1,692,763	1,430,660	
December	55,724	62,924	92,175	1,197,191	2,044,239	1,361,908	
Total dead-weight tons	341,219	637,860	1,139,293	8,089,732	19,238,626	16,348,446	
Number of ships	28	54	103	746	1,896	1,677	

District Schools Physical Training—Since Pearl Harbor 27,000 Students Have Profited by It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the membership of this House knows of my interest in and activity with legislation dealing with the physical-fitness and health activities in the schools of the District of Columbia. The time has now arrived when I can report to you that the appropriations which you approved for this program have been justified and that the program is being successfully conducted by the able officials and their staffs in the public schools of the district. The Congress has wisely continued these appropriations and has also approved funds for an accelerated program. You may be interested to know that more than 27,000 students of the District schools have benefited by the program since Pearl Harbor. Many heroes of this war are numbered among those who have participated. So successful has been this program that many schools in other communities have adopted it in whole or in part. Educators in many States who look to Washington for leadership are making inquiries into this excellent type of youth training.

The gratitude of those who believe in this program goes to this Congress for the approval of the funds for its continuance; to the Superintendent of the District Schools and his able staff; to the business and professional people of the District for their sympathetic assistance, and to Mr. Ben McKelway, associate editor of the Washington Star, who was one of the foremost in the District in the promotion of this and other programs which have as their objective the building of better citizens through health and physical activities among the boys and girls of the District of Columbia.

Because of the great interest in this program in all parts of the country, I requested a full report on the program and its relationship to service in the armed services. Mr. Robert L. Haycock, Superintendent of the District Schools, who has taken a lead in these activities, has prepared such a report. This report is so informative and so encouraging that I include it with my remarks for the information of the Congress and the country:

STATEMENT PREPARED BY ROBERT L. HAYCOCK, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Nation-wide interest is centered at this time in proposed legislation providing for a year of military training. Many leaders in public life have expressed the opinion that compulsory military training after the war can be made most effective through proper coordination of high-school training with that offered in the military camps. Since Pearl Harbor the American people have been passing through a cauldron of experience due to unpreparedness for the great conflict. A never again declaration is heard throughout the land, and our leading military men affirm that compulsory universal military training is essential to maintain a lasting peace and to preserve order among recalcitrant nations. In all our planning the part that our high schools have already played in preparing inductees for military service must not be overlooked. Also, we must give due credit to the vocational high schools for their part in training men to adapt themselves readily to motorized warfare and to specialized tasks in war industries and production centers.

Preparation, therefore, is a matter of national importance especially in its relation to post-war security. Compulsory military training as proposed will affect especially our young men just above high school age. The war has shown us that adequate training for the kind of warfare now taking place on the battle front requires months of well-planned preparation.

SPECIALIZED HIGH SCHOOL TRAINING

The kind of warfare in which we are engaged makes such rigorous demands upon the physical stamina, fighting spirit, and independent thinking of our men that it became necessary at our induction centers to enlist only those men who would be able to measure up to the service requirements of the armed forces. Physical fitness had to be a first consideration as well as other potential abilities and characteristics.

Most of the young men reporting at the induction centers are products of our public schools. Many have completed their high-school training and some have entered colleges. It is evident that the kind of training given in our high schools before the young men come to the induction centers is a matter of great importance in its relation to military training.

Unfortunately many of our drafted men did not have the advantage of high-school training. The census of 1942 revealed that only 41 percent of these men had received training in the high schools of this country. To improve the situation many States are now stepping up compulsory school attendance requirements.

Present-day warfare is very complex in its demands upon our fighting men serving in the air, under the sea, with the signal corps, manning our ships, and operating the tanks. Training our men in the fundamentals that will make them more efficient in all arms of the service requires that our regular high schools and our vocational high schools be provided with laboratories, shops, and equipment so that appropriate courses may be introduced and competent teachers employed.

ADAPTATION IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The high schools of the District of Columbia have been cooperating with the selective-service procedures by preparing for each graduate before he reaches the induction center a personality card which sets forth in considerable detail his high-school record including scholarship, special skills and achievements, personal characteristics and interests, and a general background of his ability and educational attainments. Thus high-school training and background becomes an important factor as the counselors at the induction centers channel these young men into their niche in the armed forces. How important it is, therefore, that the high schools adapt their training and preparation so that the inductee may serve his country efficiently.

In many communities high schools have been adjusting their courses to the war needs insofar as school funds will permit. A striking example of rapid adjustment is found here in the District of Columbia where marked improvements have been made in the high schools to prepare students for greater efficiency in the war effort after graduation. Wartime adjustments have been made in physical training, in science courses, in aviation, in radio, and in automotive mechanics. Undoubtedly physical fitness is the first fundamental in the life of the soldier.

CONGRESS SUPPORTS THE WASHINGTON PHYSICAL EDUCATION EXPANSION

During the war period marked improvement and expansion of the physical education program of the senior high schools of the District of Columbia was accomplished by increasing the number of hours of instruction from 3 hours to 5 hours per week.

This expansion was made possible by increased appropriations allowed by the House Committee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia under the sponsorship of Representative KARL STEFAN, member of that committee from Nebraska. Provision was made for the employment of additional qualified instructors. The main purpose of this accelerated program of instruction was not only to improve the general health and vigor of high-school pupils, but to prepare inductees for the rigorous physical demands of military life.

Every boy and girl now benefits by physical training every day. Since Pearl Harbor 27,192 students have profited by this accelerated program. This figure represents 12,454 boys and 14,738 girls. The following table indicates the participation by our high schools:

	Boys	Girls	Total
White schools:			
Anacostia	700	830	1,530
Central	991	998	1,989
Coolidge	1,031	1,045	2,076
Eastern	1,517	1,893	3,410
McKinley	1,792	1,530	3,322
Roosevelt	892	1,086	1,978
Western	920	986	1,906
Wilson	1,447	1,497	2,944
Total	9,290	9,865	19,155
Colored schools:			
Armstrong	1,907	1,192	3,099
Cardozo	643	2,244	2,887
Dunbar	614	1,437	2,051
Total	3,164	4,873	8,037
Grand total	12,454	14,738	27,192

PURPOSES UNDERLYING PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING

Most of the senior pupils now enrolled in the high schools will be inducted into service in the armed forces or will be employed in wartime industry in the immediate future. The general purpose of the physical training program is to make secondary school students physically fit to undertake the heavy manual tasks that will face them in the camp or the wartime community. Other purposes may be stated as follows:

1. To develop an appreciation of the value of physical fitness for effective service of one's country for efficiency in industry, and for general success in life.

2. To put into practice training procedures recommended by Army and Navy officers to develop physical characteristics needed by soldiers, sailors, and airmen.

3. To provide a daily period of systematic training in a program of muscle buildings and strenuous physical activities.

4. To develop strength, stamina, endurance, agility, and bodily coordination.

5. To train in teamwork through field athletics and group activities in the gymnasium, thus developing leadership as well as cooperation.

6. To develop courage, self-confidence, and physical prowess through combat activities involving bodily defensive and offensive techniques.

7. To instruct the prospective inductee in health habits and standards of healthy living as related to nutrition, personal hygiene, and sanitary living conditions.

The inductee who is physically fit for the rigorous life of the soldier, the sailor, or the airman must have speed, agility, and flexibility in movement; must be hardened to endure protracted periods involving strain and exertion; must climb down ropes, scale walls, and carry heavy loads; must take hard falls and punishment without apparent injury; must engage in combative activities and take blows without flinching; must be able to swim through rough water when clothed and bearing a burden; must acquire the power to march or run long distances; must learn to buffet, to wrestle, to tumble, and perform acrobatic feats.

SOME RESULTS OF THE NEW PHYSICAL-FITNESS PROGRAM

The new program in the Washington high schools has been eminently successful despite some problems caused by the manpower shortage. With a view to evaluating the extent of gains in physical fitness especially of high-school boys a system of tests was developed by a committee of instructors in the white high schools.

The over-all aim in these tests was to make possible at all times a knowledge of the physical progress or retrogression of each student as a result of his participation in the physical education program of our senior high schools.

In order to attain that aim it was proposed that certain objectives in the testing program be set up. This included a comprehensive battery of tests to be given three times in each school year so as to keep students on the alert to improve themselves physically, the explaining of the purpose and mechanics of each activity in such a manner as to create in each student the desire to accomplish physical growth and development; the maintaining of an accurate record of the scores of each student from the time he enters our high schools until he graduates, giving a clear picture of his progress; and finally the ultimate establishment of norms or standards of performance in each event for the high-school students.

Four activities were proposed by a committee of male teachers of health and physical education, as follows: (1) push-ups, (2) set-ups, (3) jump and reach, (4) the 440-yard dash. All of these events are simple of execution, practical of application, and require a wide range of movement. In addition they show very clearly whether the student shows improvement in performance.

Attached with this statement is a complete report indicating the marked improvement shown by the large number of boys who took part in the four types of tests—push-ups, sit-ups, jump and reach, and the 440-yard dash. It was particularly noticeable that there was a definite improvement in the performance of the younger and less-developed boys.

The committee will continue its study of the progress of the boys during the current school year and it will hope to develop acceptable norms after enough tests have been given to enable the committee to establish satisfactory standards of performance for different levels.

INSTRUCTION IN SWIMMING IN THE WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOLS

Ability to swim well is considered essential in the training preparation of the inductee. In the high schools of this city it is the aim to train every boy and girl to swim. Last spring and summer as soon as the weather permitted much progress was made with this program. In the Central, Coolidge, Dunbar, McKinley, and Anacostia High Schools practically every boy and girl enrolled acquired the art of swimming. In the other high schools a similar program is in progress.

HIGH SCHOOL CADET TRAINING

Especially valuable as preparation for military service is the training given in the high-school cadet organization of the Washington public schools. For more than 60 years the cadet training has been an outstanding feature of the high schools. Cadet training began in the white schools in 1882; in the schools for colored students in 1888. The Cadet Corps, composed of a brigade of five regiments and three battalions of white cadets and a regiment of colored cadets has become an outstanding student organization in the community. These military groups have been for many years a notable feature in the school life of the Capital of the Nation. Many young men with aspirations for military careers have received valuable training before entering West Point or Annapolis.

CADET TRAINING SINCE PEARL HARBOR

After Japan's treachery had drawn us into a global war requiring our Navy and Army to cross the Pacific as well as the Atlantic, all high-school preinduction training took on greater significance. The anticipation of actual induction gave the cadets a more real and serious attitude toward the physical training essential for meeting the rigorous demands of military service. Cadet training was entered upon with greater purpose and enthusiasm.

In all of the high schools for white and colored, there are 44 companies in which a total of 2,525 privates and officers are enrolled. Membership in the cadets is voluntary. Trained by men of Army experience, the program of drill and tactics gives to the boys the training best adapted to Army procedure and practice. Supplemented by the stepped-up physical training given in the gymnasium and on the play field, the cadet goes into the camp better prepared to meet the demands of soldier life. Undoubtedly he becomes a soldier better equipped, better able to master all the arts of war, ready to be adjusted into the many differing units of the armed forces.

VALUE OF HIGH SCHOOL CADET TRAINING

The high-school cadet benefits from far more than just the drill which occurs twice every week. Cadet life is a challenge to a boy's manly school spirit, because it offers membership in the largest competitive organization of the high schools of the city. Cadet activities offer far-reaching physical and social advantages to every enlisted student.

These are some of the outstanding benefits to the cadet:

He becomes identified with the oldest and most popular high-school-student organization which for more than 60 years has been the pride of the Washington schools.

He enters into comradeship with upstanding, self-respecting fellow cadets with whom lasting friendships develop.

He contributes to the welfare of his school through loyalty to his cadet group and its efforts for achievement and success.

He participates in many celebrations and events of a military nature that bring pleasure and satisfaction.

He receives training and experience that develops physical stamina, fortitude, and manly attitudes.

He understands more fully the true meaning of service and sacrifice for one's country through a worthy unselfish citizenship.

He learns the value of cooperation, teamwork, self-control, and personal responsibility within the group.

He acquires the habit of adjusting himself to law and order, and gains a wholesome understanding of proper relations with his superior officers and associates.

He appreciates the true values that make men manly, genuine, honorable, and free from that which cheapens one's life.

He becomes informed concerning the necessity and the purpose of our National Military Establishment, and through company battalion, and regimental drill comes to understand something of its organization and operation.

He learns how to assume the responsibilities of leadership if he becomes an officer, and thus has experiences of great value to him in life situations involving human relations and executive ability.

EVALUATION OF CADET TRAINING BY AN EXPERIENCED ARMY OFFICER

Impressed with the favorable results of the cadet training of high-school youth, Lt. Col. H. O. Atwood, professor of military science and tactics, in charge of the cadets in the colored high schools of this city, has listed the following as the benefits derived from such training:

1. A cadet is taught the duty and obligations of a citizen to his country, his community, his associates, and himself.

2. He is taught the meaning of and the value of loyalty to one's country, one's associates, and one's high principles.

3. He is taught what discipline is; its value to him in whatever walk of life he may be; its part in causing one to have self-respect and self-confidence; that self-discipline is necessary to success.

4. The value of and necessity for punctuality.

5. He is taught the value of and necessity for physical fitness and is given a course in physical training and personal hygiene which fits him physically for his work now and in after life.

6. He is taught map reading; care and mechanics of the rifle and how to shoot; the value of teamwork; the value of careful grooming; the value of and use of a fine, forceful personality; is given exercises in command and other things which develop leadership; is shown the value of self-respect and self-confidence, initiative, and ambition.

Dr. Sao-Ke Alfred Sze, formerly Ambassador to the United States from China, was educated in America and attended the Central High School of this city. As a cadet, he attained the rank of lieutenant. Referring to his cadet experience, Dr. Sze says: "I have always regarded the cadet training which I received at the Washington high school as valuable to me as a matter of physical development and as a matter of discipline."

HIGH-SCHOOL CADETS COMMISSIONED SINCE PEARL HARBOR

Officers must be trained as well as privates. Both must be well prepared to be integrated into the numerous branches of the service and to function efficiently wherever assigned.

Principals of the Washington high schools were requested to follow up the records of graduates since Pearl Harbor to determine, if possible, whether or not cadet training brought rapid advancement in the ranks. This study shows that 92 of our high-school graduates have already advanced to the rank of commissioned officers. They have been commissioned as follows: 1 lieutenant colonel, 1 captain, 72 lieutenants, 18 ensigns. Young men who have had the experience of leadership in our high-school cadet organization should be prepared to demonstrate after the basic training of the camp has been completed a readiness to enter upon officer training.

GIRL CADETS A GROWING ORGANIZATION

Since Pearl Harbor the girl cadet companies in the Washington high schools have had a notable development. This is another phase of the Nation-wide participation of women in war activities. The organization of WAC's and WAVES has been a great incentive to high school girls to do their part toward victory.

Since 1941 the girl cadet groups in schools for white students have increased in enrollment from 294 to 414. Companies are now organized in all eleven of our high schools. Undoubtedly the training received by girl cadets contributes beneficially to physical fitness, to willingness to serve wholeheartedly in the war effort, and to general school spirit and morale. At this time when delinquency has loomed ominously in the social life of our young people we cannot overestimate the wholesome effect of cadet experience for both boys and girls.

In the high schools for Negro students the girl cadet activity aroused enthusiasm from the beginning and the interest has been sustained. In 1942 the enrollment was 650. This year 682 have enlisted despite the increasing opportunities for after-school employment.

MORE PHYSICAL TRAINING URGED FOR HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS

In a bulletin recently issued by the Committee on Physical Fitness, Federal Security Agency, a study of replies from more than 900 school systems showed that only about 46 percent of the girls in the last 2 years of the high schools were receiving regular physical training. The study showed that more illness is found among girls than boys. Officers of the WAC's and WAVES state that women admitted to the service have poor posture, are low in endurance and are lacking in strength. Out of 1,680 examined in 1 recruiting area of the WAC's, 500 were rejected for physical defects.

A survey by the American Youth Council of girls between the ages of 16 and 24 years found that 62 percent of the single girls had no physical recreation.

STEPPED-UP PHYSICAL TRAINING FOR HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS

With increased funds made available by the House Committee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia physical training for girls has been increased from 3 days to 5 days per week. Additional teachers have been employed and the training in gymnasiums, on the play fields, and in the cadet drill has been greatly improved. In the high schools for white students 9,865 girls have benefited by this stepped-up program of physical training. The improved program has given training to 4,873 girls in the high schools for colored students.

Among graduates from the schools for Negroes who have entered the WAC's or WAVES six girls have been commissioned as first lieutenants.

Among the white graduates in the WAC's or WAVES one is a lieutenant colonel, eight are first lieutenants, 4 are second lieutenants, and 7 are ensigns.

HIGH SCHOOL CADET BANDS

An interesting feature of the Washington High School Cadet organization is the large number of bands. Instrumental instruction given to cadets having musical ability is an important phase of cadet training. There are eight bands in the high schools for white students, one at each school, and one interhigh band in the colored high schools. Two hundred seventy-three cadets play in the nine bands. When the entire brigade is on parade the numerous bands add enthusiasm and spirit to the marching units. At each school also there is a well-trained orchestra. Thus, music has a large place in our high-school training. Many boys and girls specialize in instrumental music with a view to preparing for a career in music. School credit is given for proficiency in music along with other regular credits for academic courses. Many inductees who have had training in these bands have been assigned to the Army, Navy, and Marine music schools.

DISTINGUISHED MILITARY MEN TRAINED IN THE WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOLS

During its long history the high-school cadet organization of this city has had a wholesome influence upon the early training of many men who have attained high rank in the affairs of our Nation. Large numbers of graduates entered West Point and Annapolis and later won distinction in our military forces.

The following is a partial list of high-ranking graduates. The great war has brought such rapid changes that it has been difficult to keep pace with the attainments of all of our high-school alumni:

Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, Chief of Supply, United States Army.

Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb.

Maj. Gen. William Rupertus, United States Marine Corps.

Maj. Gen. Robert C. Macon, United States Army.

Maj. Gen. Richard Elwood Quesada, United States Army.

Maj. Gen. Donald Stroh.

Maj. Gen. Levin Campbell.

Brig. Gen. William E. R. Covell, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. B. O. Davis.

Brig. Gen. Anthony McAuliffe.

Brig. Gen. W. Richard Dear, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Roy Heflebower.

Brig. Gen. David S. Brewster, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Robert Nicholas Young, United States Army.

Dr. Sao-ke Alfred Sze, former Ambassador from China, as a high-schol student was commissioned lieutenant in his company at the Central High School.

Admiral George Fort.

Vice Admiral Russell Willson, United States Navy, former superintendent, United States Naval Academy.

Vice Admiral Joseph K. Taussig, United States Navy.

Rear Admiral Charles A. Young, United States Navy.

Rear Admiral Oscar Badger, United States Navy.

Rear Admiral Lawrence DuBose, United States Navy.

Rear Admiral Dallas Sutton, United States Navy.

Many high-ranking military men have received cadet training in the Washington high schools for colored pupils. The following have rendered distinguished service in the military forces: Brig. Gen. B. O. Davis, Col. West A. Hamilton, Col. Campbell C. Johnson, and Col. Howard D. Queen. In addition to the above, there are 12 lieutenant colonels, 26 majors, 60 captains, 245 lieutenants and 4 ensigns who were cadets in the colored high schools.

Former cadets in the white high schools who have advanced to high rank as officers in the Army, the Navy, and the marines are listed as follows:

U. S. Army:	
Colonels	22
Lieutenant colonels	19
Majors	29
Captains	59
First lieutenants	204
U. S. Navy:	
Captain	1
Commanders	24
Lieutenant commanders	21
Lieutenants (junior grade)	17
Ensigns	19
U. S. Marine Corps:	
Major	1
Captain	1
First lieutenants	3

ANNUAL CADET DRILLS

Notable events each year in the high schools of this city are the two competitive drills and reviews of the cadets, one for the white cadets and one for the colored cadets. Griffith Stadium is crowded with enthusiastic parents and friends on these occasions when the companies meet in competition. Battalions also meet each year in competition. On the basis of outstanding performance the most meritorious band is also chosen.

CONCLUSION

It is evident that the high school period is an area in the educational progress of our American youth when enriched training is of vital importance to our boys and girls as they face the responsibilities of a worthy citizenship in the life of the Nation. Out of the exploratory experiences that come to the student as he pursues his high-school courses, he finds satisfaction in personal achievements in certain fields of learning and culture and in abilities and skill that prepare him for a livelihood in his community.

He is ready to choose his career whether it be a profession, a vocation, or a scientific or commercial pursuit. At the same time he will have received basic training that makes him physically fit and intelligently prepared to be more readily trained should his country call him for a period of military training.

FEBRUARY 8, 1945.

Memorial Services for Mr. Justice Sutherland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial address of William Cattron Rigby:

Mr. Chairman, it was while he was on this Court that I came to know Mr. Justice Sutherland. He was a kindly judge; always keenly interested; able to cut to the heart of a matter with a quiet question or two.

He had come to his place here with an established reputation as a constitutional lawyer. In the Senate, and as president of the American Bar Association, and in lectures, magazine articles, and public addresses, he had expressed his views of the Constitution and our Government.

He loved the Constitution, and revered it. He had said of it, in his first lecture at Columbia University, in December 1918:

"It is the most democratic thing we possess, for it is the one thing above all other things that makes articulate and clear the claim that all political power comes from the people, * * * those whose will it speaks today, and whose will it must continue to speak until they in the exercise of their sovereign authority see fit to put something else in its place." [1]

He did not take a narrow view. In this same lecture he said (ibid., p. 16):

"But though the Constitution stabilizes the principles of government it does not fix or define these principles minutely or in detail. * * * The authority of the several departments of government is, therefore, of great flexibility. The Constitution was intended to be perpetual and hence to cover the changing needs of the people and the country, the extent of which changes were within the contemplation but not within the knowledge of the framers. Within the broad limits of the enumerated subjects it was intended that power should keep pace with need and that the Constitution should be the source of this power as a spring is the source of an ever-flowing stream and not as a cistern is the source of a precisely measured and rigidly limited supply."

In another lecture in that series at Columbia University, the next month after the armistice in the former World War (ibid, p. 27):

"By reason of our participation in the war we have formed alliances and assumed responsibilities which we cannot wholly lay aside now that the war is ended. * * *

"In this new and extended relationship, we shall probably be obliged to extend the scope and application of the familiar meanings of the Constitution, and it may be to find—though not to make—new meanings." [2]

He called himself conservative, but not reactionary. In his great Senate speech July 11, 1911, opposing the initiative, referendum, and recall in the then proposed Arizona Constitution, he had said: [3]

"Somebody has defined a stand-patter as a man who has stopped and cannot start, and a progressive as one who has started and cannot stop. If these definitions are * * * accurate, sensible people will avoid both schools. * * *

"I am no stand-patter. I am not in favor of standing still. No one who takes the slightest thought desires that we shall do that. Of course, we must advance, but we must at our peril distinguish between real progress and what amounts to a mere manifestation of the speed mania. * * *

"The forward march of democracy will be of little avail if in the end it rescues us from the absolutism of the King only to hand us over to the absolutism of the majority. * * *

"I am not one of those who have become impatient at the restraints and checks and safeguards of the representative form of government and the written Constitution * * * (ibid., p. 2802).

In the main and in the long run, changes which come by the gradual and orderly processes of evolution are better and far more enduring than those brought about by the spasmodic methods of revolution. Experience is a safer guide than prediction. A tree is known by its fruits rather than by its blossoms, for sometimes the fairest blossoms, like the fairest promises, produce no fruit at all" (ibid., p. 2803). [4]

And eight years later, in his Columbia University lectures, speaking of the importance of the Preamble's statement of the ends for which the Constitution is "ordained and established":

"The substantive powers conferred * * * are the means to these ends, but it is the ends which are essential; the means are only important insofar as they contribute to the ends. Hence the wisdom of the rule * * * that the Constitution must be construed with reference to these ends and so as to subserve them." (Constitutional Power and World Affairs, supra, p. 42.)

And in his Columbia University lecture on The External Powers—Extent and Limitations, he had said (ibid., pp. 48–49):

"It is time we realized not in phrases merely, but in fact, that the Constitution is not a petrification nor the charter of a petrification. This is a progressive Nation in a progressive world. As the Nation goes forward the Government which has been organized to put the will of the Nation into operation must go forward with it and in aid of it; * * *. This does not mean that the powers of the Government are not fixed, but it does mean that they are not fixed within any narrow or rigid bounds. * * * The Constitution does not change * * * but the things which fall within the scope of the Constitution constantly change. * * * The Constitution was not made alone for those who framed it and adopted it. It was made for us who followed them, and for those who will follow us in the centuries to come. * * * Without this capacity for indefinite extension" (ibid., p. 50) "the written Constitution long since would have become a tradition, and the Union itself, perhaps, have fallen apart from its own weakness."

Of the war powers (ibid., pp. 94–97) he had said:

"The sword and the purse are the two indispensable requisites of war. In time of war when the life of the Nation is at stake the power of the general Government to sharpen and strengthen the one, and fill the other, and utilize them both, by any means and in any way the authorized agencies of that Government may determine, cannot admit of question; and in my judgment the power exists without any restrictions whatsoever, save those which are imposed by such express prohibitions of the Constitution and such fundamental restraints upon governmental action as are obviously and clearly intended to apply at all times and under all conditions.

"The Constitution looks to an enduring Republic, and a perpetual union made more perfect. This, the framers intended, and for this many thousands of brave men have perished. * * * This does not result in the suspension of the Constitution, * * * but it may result in a suspension of the constitutional rights of the individual, because they conflict with the paramount powers of war. * * * In time of peace, an attempt to interfere with the least of these would be, and ought to be, resisted to the utmost. In time of war, when the Nation is in deadly peril, every freeman who prizes the boon of enduring liberty will lay them all freely and ungrudgingly upon the sacrificial alter of his country."

He had emphasized the independent powers of the individual States in their own sphere, as against those of the Federal Government; that the Constitution creates "an indestructible union of indestructible States"; and likewise—notably in his 1921 address before the New York State Bar Association—the basic and vital character of the distribution of the governmental powers among the three great departments.

He had supported the woman-suffrage movement, and the nineteenth amendment, in the Senate and afterwards.

He had shown deep respect for this Court. He had on one occasion in the Senate [5] quoted Lord Bryce's saying that [6] "The Supreme Court is the living voice of the Constitution;" and that of Chief Justice Marshall [7] that:

"The judicial department comes home in its effects, to every man's fireside; it passes on his property, his reputation, his life, his all. Is it not to the last degree important that [the judge] shall be rendered perfectly and completely independent, with nothing to influence or control him but God and his conscience?"

He had defended in the Senate the independent power of this Court even to reconsider and to overrule its own former decisions. In the debates on the income tax, championing this Court's decision in the Pollock case he said on May 17, 1909 (44 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2096):

"Stare decisis is an adviser, not a dictator. Stare decisis operates by way of persuasion, not of compulsion. I submit that there is as much virtue in setting aside the wrong precedent as there is in following a right precedent.

"The Supreme Court of the United States is the greatest Court the world has ever seen. In the year 1895 when the Pollock case was decided its members were as magnificently equipped in learning and ability as any who have sat in that august tribunal before or since. * * * If the effect of their decisions is to set aside the prior decisions of the Court for a hundred years, we may be sure those judges did not do that for light or trivial reasons."

With such matured fundamental beliefs Mr. Justice Sutherland came to his place in this Court in the autumn of 1922. He applied them here. His opinions sometimes reflect the identical phraseology he had used some years before. For a variety of problems experience had further especially prepared him. The Federal Criminal Code and the Judicial Code, as well as the workmens' compensation law, were largely his own handiwork; and, to a degree, the woman suffrage amendment. For problems of the outlying territorial governments, and of mining and irrigation, water rights, the desert land law, Government land patents, and the like, his memory harked back to his early days in Utah, under its territorial form of government, when its problems and those of the miner and of irrigated lands and of Government land patents were all about him. He took his share of the work of this Court in these fields, as in others.

But it fell to him, too, to write the Court's opinions in some cases of grave constitutional importance, and in some to be constrained to dissent.

I shall not attempt a catalog; a collection of his opinions runs to five volumes, but a few may indicate the trend of his thought.

---

[1] "Constitutional Power and World Affairs," pp. 10–12.

[2] Nearly 9 years earlier he had said in the Senate on March 2, 1910, in support of the bill for postal savings depositories (45 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2616):

"While it is true that the Constitution continues to speak through its original words and meaning, their scope and application continuously broaden so as to include new conditions, instrumentalities, and activities."

[3] 47 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2793 et seq., at p. 2795.

[4] And earlier in the same speech (ibid., p. 2794):

"A written constitution means nothing unless it means stability and permanence. It is the fundamental law, the foundation upon which rests the whole superstructure of the state; and like the foundation of a great building the continual tearing out of a stone here and the insertion of another there will threaten the integrity of the whole structure."

[5] Speech of July 11, 1911, supra, 47 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2802.

[6] American Commonwealth, vol. I, p. 273.

[7] Debates, Virginia State Convention of 1829–30, pp. 616, 619; quoted again by Mr. Justice Sutherland, 22 years later, in writing the opinion of this Court, in *O'Donoghue* v. *United States* (289 U. S. 516, 532).

In *Cudahy Co.* v. *Parramore,* December 10, 1923, upholding the Supreme Court of Utah, in its liberal construction of the Workmen's Compensation Act of that State, as covering an employee injured while on his way to work, Mr. Justice Sutherland said (263 U. S. 418, 423–424):

"The modern development and growth of industry, with the consequent changes in the relation of employer and employee, have been so profound in character and degree as to take away, in large measure, the applicability of the doctrines upon which rest the common-law liability of the master for personal injuries to the servant, leaving of necessity a field of debatable ground where a good deal must be conceded in favor of forms of legislation calculated to establish new bases of liability, more in harmony with the changed conditions. Workmen's compensation legislation rests upon the idea of status, not upon that of implied contract; * * * upon the existence of the relationship * * * the fact that the accident happened upon a public road or at a public crossing * * * is not conclusive against the existence of such causal relationship, if the danger be one to which the employee, by reason of and in connection with his employment, is subjected peculiarly or to an abnormal degree." (Followed afterward in his opinion in *Bountiful Brick Co.* v. *Giles* (276 U. S. 156, 158–159); February 20, 1928.)

In the field of territorial law he upheld the Governor General as against the Legislature in the Philippine Board of Control cases involving the voting control of the Philippine National Bank and other Philippine Government-owned corporations, considering its exercise to be an executive function rather than a legislative one, saying (*Springer* v. *Philippine Islands* (277 U. S. 189, 201), that separation of the Government powers into the three great departments is implicit in the Organic Act and, in almost the same identical words which he had used 7 years previously in his 1921 address before the New York State Bar Association:

"And this separation and the consequent exclusive character of the powers conferred upon each of the three departments is basic and vital—not merely a matter of governmental mechanism."

He cited this again 5 years later, in *O'Donoghue* v. *United States* (289 U. S. 516, 530), and in *Williams* v. *United States* (289 U. S. 553, 580), in holding that the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and the Court of Appeals for the District (as they then were, now the United States District Court and the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia) are constitutional courts of the United States under article III of the Constitution, the compensation of whose judges may not be diminished during their continuance in office, but that the Court of Claims is simply a legislative court analogous to Territorial courts established by the Congress.

And in *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602) he held the President without power peremptorily to remove a member of the Federal Trade Commission appointed for a fixed term of office under the act of Congress creating the Commission to discharge quasi legislative and quasi judicial duties, instead of purely executive duties, thus limiting to this extent the earlier decision in *Myers* v. *United States,* 272 U. S. 52, which had held the President vested with unrestricted power to remove purely executive officers.

In *Posadas Collector* v. *The National City Bank of New York* (296 U. S. 497) he held that the national banking laws extend to the Philippine Islands, and in *Bengzon* v. *The Secretary of Justice of the Philippine Islands* (299 U. S. 410) held that the Governor General was without power under the organic act to veto a particular section of a bill as it was passed by the legislature.

In *People of Puerto Rico* v. *Shell Company* (302 U. S. 253), he upheld the power of the insular legislature to enact its own local antitrust act for the island, despite the existence of the Federal antitrust acts, the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, holding that although Puerto Rico is to be considered as a Territory of the United States to which the Federal antitrust acts extend, nevertheless, the local legislature may legislate on the same subject, and that its legislation is valid insofar as it does not conflict with any act of Congress, saying (302 U. S. 253, 258–259), quoting from *Kopel* v. *Bingham* (211 U. S. 468, 474, 475, 476), that:

"'It may be justly asserted that Puerto Rico is a completely organized Territory, although not a Territory incorporated into the United States * * *.'

"With equal force, it may be said here that there is no reason why Puerto Rico should not be held to be a Territory within the meaning of section 3 of the Sherman Act.

"The grant of legislative power [to the insular legislature] in respect of local matters, contained in * * * the organic act of 1917 is as broad and comprehensive as language can make it. * * * It requires no argument to demonstrate that a conspiracy in restraint of trade within the borders of Puerto Rico is clearly a local matter, * * *. The power being given without express limitation, a conclusion that the present exercise of the power is precluded by the existence of section 3 of the Sherman Act must rest upon the assumption that a congressional statute penalizing specific local behavior and a statute of Puerto Rico to the same effect cannot coexist. With due regard to the status of the Territory, the character of its established government, the positive terms of the congressional grant of power, and the lack of conflict between the two acts, that assumption must be rejected.

His first opinion, the Ozawa case, held that a Japanese was not a "white person" within the naturalization laws;[8] followed later by his like ruling in the Thind case, as to a high cast Hindu.[9]

In desert-land law and water-rights decisions he held[10] that:

"By the Desert Land Act of 1877 (ch. 107, 19 Stat. 377), if not before, Congress had severed the land and waters constituting the public domain and established the rule that for the future the lands should be patented separately. Acquisition of the Government title to a parcel of land was not to carry with it a water right; but all nonnavigable waters were reserved for the use of the public under the laws of the various arid-land States," thus settling a long-standing controversy in the Western States.

In interstate commerce cases he upheld State taxes in some cases, but not in others. For example he held that the Kentucky wholesale gasoline sales tax could not be levied on fuel for interstate ferries on the Ohio River between Kentucky and Illinois,[11] but in *Atlantic Lumber Company* v. *Commissioner* (298 U. S. 553, 554, 557), he upheld the Massachusetts excise tax for the privilege of doing business in Massachusetts, on a Delaware corporation, having its principal office and actual headquarters in Massachusetts, with properties and subsidiaries and bank accounts scattered through several States and Canada, against the contention that it was unconstitutional as imposing a burden on interstate commerce; since the burden, if any "is not immediate and direct but remote and incidental, a distinction which * * * marks the line between a tax", in such cases, "which is valid and one which is not"; although in *Ozark Pipe Line* v. *Monier,* 266 U. S. 555, 560, 562 et seq., he had stricken down as a direct burden on interstate commerce a Missouri franchise tax on a Maryland corporation operating through Missouri a portion of its pipe line from Oklahoma to Illinois.

In the fields of the war powers, and of the external powers of the Federal Government, he had occasion, in several cases, to tread the same ground he had trodden in his speeches and lectures.

In the Omnia Co. case,[12] where the Government, during the last war, had requisitioned the Allegheny Steel Company's entire production of steel plate for a year, and had thereby made it impossible for that company to comply with its earlier contract to deliver a quantity to the Omnia Co., he upheld the Court of Claims in denying relief to the Omnia Co., although admittedly its contract (p. 508) was property within the meaning of the fifth amendment * * * "and if taken for public use the Government would be liable"; because there was no direct "taking" of the contract, but only consequential damage to the Omnia Co. as the result of lawful governmental action in requisitioning the product of the Allegheny Co., saying (p. 513):

"The Government took over during the war, railroads, steel mills, ship yards, telephone and telegraph lines, the capacity output of factories and other producing activities. If appellant's contention is sound, the Government thereby took and became liable to pay for an appalling number of existing contracts for future service or delivery, the performance of which its action made impossible. This is inadmissible. Frustration and appropriation are essentially different things."

In another opinion the same day, April 9, 1923,[13] he had occasion to consider in interpreting a statute the effect of the circumstance that the country had been at war when it was enacted. In deciding that the Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 15, 1917, in its clause (40 Stat. 182) empowering the President "to modify, suspend, cancel or requisition any existing or future contracts for the building, protection, or purchase of ships or material," authorized cancelation of the Government's own contracts, he said (261 U. S. at p. 521):

"When the act was passed we were in the midst of a great war which called for the utilization of all our resources. The necessities were great, beyond the power of statement. The Government was confronted with the vital necessity not only of producing ships and supplies in unprecedented quantities, but of producing them with the utmost haste. Hence it was necessary that everything which stood in the way of or hindred such production be put aside. But this was a necessity which Congress of course realized must sooner or later come to an end, suddenly and completely. With the termination of the war the continued production of war supplies would become not only unnecessary but wasteful. Not to provide, therefore, for the cessation of this production when the need for it had passed would have been a distinct neglect of the public interest."

Thirteen years later, in 1936, in the Curtiss-Wright Corporation case,[14] in upholding the joint resolution of Congress of May 28, 1934

[8] *Ozawa* v. *United States* (260 U. S. 178).

[9] *United States* v. *Thind* (261 U. S. 204).

[10] *Idaho Irrigation Co.* v. *Gooding* (265 U. S. 518, 520, 525); *California-Oregon Power Co.* v. *Beaver Portland Cement Co.* (295 U. S. 142, 150, 153–165); *Ickes, Secretary* v. *Fox,* 300 U. S. 82, 87, 95–97.

[11] *Helson & Randolph* v. *Kentucky* (279 U. S. 245, 247, 248–252).

[12] *Omnia Commercial Co., Inc.* v. *United States* (261 U. S. 502, 507, 508 et seq.).

[13] *Russell Motor Car Co.* v. *United States* (261 U. S. 514, 521).

[14] *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation* (299 U. S. 304, 311, 315 et seq.).

(ch. 365, 48 Stat. 11), authorizing the President if he should find that the prohibition of the sale of arms and munitions to the countries then engaged in armed conflict in the Chaco might contribute to the reestablishment of peace, to issue a proclamation making such sales unlawful, Mr. Justice Sutherland called attention to the difference existing between the powers of the Federal Government in relation to external affairs, on the one hand, and in relation to internal affairs, on the other; and that in relation to external affairs the President as the Executive head of the Federal Government is the sole organ through which the Nation speaks to other nations.

He applied the same reasoning again the following year in *United States* v. *Belmont* (300 U. S. 324, 325 et seq.), upholding, after the recognition by the United States of the Soviet Union, a claim of the United States, under an assignment to it by the Soviet Government, to a sum of money deposited in New York, the Soviet Government's title to which, however, had come through an earlier act of confiscation by that Government, back in 1918. He says (pp. 330, 332):

"That the negotiations [with the Soviet Government] * * * were within the competence of the President may not be doubted. Governmental power over internal affairs is distributed between the National Government and the several States. Governmental power over external affairs is not distributed, but is vested exclusively in the National Government. And in respect to what was done here, the Executive had authority to speak as the sole organ of that Government. * * *

"What another country has done in the way of taking over property of its nationals, and especially of its corporations, is not a matter for judicial consideration here."

In a series of forward looking decisions he upheld State statutes and ordinances based upon the changing conditions of modern life; such as the zoning ordinances of the Village of Euclid, a suburb of Cleveland; [15] and of Los Angeles; [16] the statute of New York [17] regulating the use of city streets and highways by private motor carriers of passengers and freight; the New York statute [18] prohibiting women from working in restaurants after 10 o'clock at night in cities of the first and second classes; and that [19] regulating the sale of kosher meat; and the Fair Trade Act of Illinois.[20]

The general trend of his reasoning in cases of that type is reflected by what he said in upholding the Euclid ordinance (*Euclid* v. *Ambler Co.*, 272 U. S. 386–387):

"Building zone laws are of modern origin. They began in this country about 25 years ago. Until recent years urban life was comparatively simple; but with the great increase and concentration of population problems have developed, and constantly are developing, which require, and will continue to require, additional restrictions in respect to the use and occupation of private lands in urban communities. Regulations, the wisdom, necessity and validity of which, as applied to existing conditions, are so apparent that they are now uniformly sustained, a century ago, or even half a century ago, probably would have been rejected as arbitrary and oppressive. * * * And in this there is no inconsistency for while the meaning of constitutional guaranties never varies, the scope of their application must expand or contract to meet the new and different conditions which are constantly coming within the field of their operation. In a changing world, it is impossible that it should be otherwise. But although a degree of elasticity is thus imparted, not to the meaning but to the application of constitutional principles, statutes and ordinances which, after giving due weight to the new conditions are found clearly not to conform to the Constitution, of course, must fall."

In *Brush* v. *The Commissioner of Internal Revenue* (300 U. S. 352, 361, 374) reasoning as in the *Ambler* v. *Euclid* zoning case, and the New York motor car license and womens' working hours cases, *Packard* v. *Banton*, and *Radice* v. *New York*, supra, as to the effect of changing conditions, he held that (p. 370):

"We conclude that the asquisition and distribution of a supply of water for the needs of a modern city involve the exercise of essential governmental functions."

And accordingly that the chief engineer of the New York City water supply bureau was engaged in the exercise of a governmental function of the city; and thereupon concluded, as a matter of course, that such official's salary was exempt from Federal income taxation, in accordance with the long established rule of this court as it had stood ever since *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316) and *Dobbins* v. *Commissioners of Erie County* (16 Pet. 435, 448–449) followed in *Collector* v. *Day* (11 Wall. 113), and then recently recognized in *New York ex rel Rogers* v. *Graves* (299 U. S. 401, 408).[21]

But in any case where he considered that fundamental constitutional rights were being invaded, he was adamant. He set his face against any chipping away of the foundations of ordered liberty. Thus, in the first Scottsboro cases, *Powell* v. *Alabama* (287 U. S. 45), he held that the right of a defendant in a criminal case to have counsel for his defense is fundamental, and includes reasonable opportunity for consultation with his counsel in preparation for trial; and, accordingly, the convictions in those cases were reversed.

In *Byars* v. *United States* (273 U. S. 28, 32–34), he emphasized the right to protection against unlawful search and seizure, in reversing the judgment below because counterfeit internal revenue stamps seized in an unlawful search had been used in evidence for the prosecution, holding that the rights guaranteed by the fourth amendment are "not to be impaired by judicial sanction of equivocal methods."

And in *Grosjean* v. *American Press Co.* (297 U. S. 233), he struck down a Louisiana statute levying a discriminatory tax on advertising in newspapers and periodicals with a circulation of more than 20,000 copies, or in moving pictures, as in violation both of the first amendment guaranteeing the freedom of the press, and also of the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment.

And so also, as violating the Bills of Rights, a New York statute attempting to fix the profit to be made on the resale of theater tickets; [22] one of New Jersey limiting the fees of employment agencies; [23] of Oklahoma requiring contractors with the State to pay wages not less than the "current rate per diem in the locality"; [24] of California, regulating the fees of private motor carriers; [25] one of Tennessee, regulating the price of gasoline; [26] one of Oklahoma, requiring a license for manufacturing and selling ice; [27] and, in a greatly debated case, Vermont's "Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1931," insofar as it levied heavier taxes on income from money invested outside of the State.[28]

In *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Company* (298 U. S. 238, 278 et seq.), his opinion for the court struck down the Federal Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935, considering the 15 percent tax levied by it as "clearly not a tax, but a penalty," and following former decisions that the Constitution "made no grant of authority to Congress to legislate substantively for the general welfare" (p. 292), "and no such authority exists, save as the general welfare may be promoted by the exercise of the powers which are granted."

In his later years on the Court he found himself constrained to dissent in a number of Bill of Rights cases. Notably, in the Blaisdell case [29] in which the majority opinion upheld the Minnesota Mortgage Moratorium Act enacted in the depth of the financial depression, he found himself constrained to say, in his dissenting opinion (pp. 448–449):

"Few questions of greater moment than that just decided have been submitted for judicial inquiry during this generation. He simply closes his eyes to the necessary implications of the decision who fails to see in it the potentiality of future gradual but ever-advancing encroachments upon the sanctity of private and public contracts. The effect of the Minnesota legislation, though serious enough in itself, is of trivial significance compared with the far more serious and dangerous inroads upon the limitations of the Constitution which are almost certain to ensue as a consequence naturally following any step beyond the boundaries fixed by that instrument And those of us who are thus apprehensive of the effect of this decision would, in a matter so important, be neglectful

---

[15] *Euclid* v. *Ambler Co.* (272 U. S. 365, 379, 386–387), Nov. 22, 1926.

[16] *Zahn* v. *Board of Public Works* (274 U. S. 325, 326, 327–328).

[17] *Packard* v. *Banton* (264 U. S. 140, 141, 144).

[18] *Radice* v. *New York* (264 U. S. 292, 293 et seq.).

[19] *Hygrade Products Co.* v. *Sherman* (266 U. S. 497, 499).

[20] *Old Dearborn Co.* v. *Seagram Co.* (299 U. S. 183, 185).

[21] Despite the rising dissent which swept that whole rule into the discard the next year after Mr. Justice Sutherland had left this Court, in the decisions in *Helvering* v. *Gerhardt* (304 U. S. 405, 408, 411–424), and *Graves* v. *New York ex rel O'Keefe* (306 U. S. 466, 475–487). But sweeping away that old rule of the immunity of State officials from Federal taxation, and vice versa, did not affect that part of the decision in the Brush case, holding that the operation of a water system by a modern city is the exercise of an essential governmental function.

[22] *Tyson* v. *Banton* (273 U. S. 418, 426 et seq.).

[22] *Ribnik* v. *McBride* (297 U. S. 350, 355, 357); overruled April 28, 1941, 3 years after Mr. Justice Sutherland had left the bench, in *Olsen* v. *Nebraska* (313 U. S. 236, 244), where the Court said:

"The drift away from *Ribnik* v. *McBride*, *supra*, has been so great that it can no longer be deemed a controlling authority. It was decided in 1928. In the following year this Court held that Tennessee had no power to fix prices at which gasoline might be sold in the State. *Williams* v. *Standard Oil Co.* (278 U. S. 235). Save for that decision and *Morehead* v. *Tipaldo* (298 U. S. 587), holding unconstitutional a New York statute authorizing the fixing of women's wages, the subsequent cases in this Court have given increasingly wider scope to the price-fixing powers of the States and of Congress."

[24] *Connally* v. *General Construction Co.* (269 U. S. 385, 388, 393–395; primarily for uncertainty).

[25] *Frost Trucking Co.* v. *The Railroad Commission* (271 U. S. 583, 589, 592).

[26] *Williams* v. *Standard Oil Co.* (278 U. S. 235, 238 et seq.).

[27] *New State Ice Co.* v. *Liebmann* (285 U. S. 262, 271–280).

[28] *Colgate* v. *Harvey* (296 U. S. 404, 416, 424, 431, 433–436); Justices Stone, Brandeis, and Cardozo dissenting (pp. 436–450). This case of *Colgate* v. *Harvey* was, on January 29, 1940, expressly overruled in *Madden* v. *Kentucky* (309 U. S. 83, 93), with Justices Roberts and McReynolds dissenting.

[29] *Home Building & Loan Association* v. *Blaisdell* (290 U. S. 398, 448–483).

of our duty should we fail to spread upon the permanent records of the court the reasons which move us to the opposite view." [30]

And in concluding his powerful dissent from the majority opinion subjecting the Associated Press to regulation by the National Labor Relations Board, he said: [31]

"Do the people of this land—in the providence of God, favored, as they sometimes boast, above all others in the plenitude of their liberties—desire to preserve those so carefully protected by the first amendment; liberty of religious worship, freedom of speech and of the press, and the right as freemen peaceably to assemble and petition their Government for a redress of grievances? If so, let them withstand all beginnings of encroachment. For the saddest epitaph which can be carved in memory of a vanished liberty is that it was lost because its possessors failed to stretch forth a saving hand while yet there was time."

Early in his service here the act of Congress empowering a board to fix minimum wages for women (or children) employed in the District of Columbia came before the Court in *Adkins* v. *The Children's Hospital* (261 U. S. 525), decided April 9, 1923. To him the discrimination between men and women involved in that statute prescribing minimum wages for women, without imposing any corresponding limitation on those for men, was a violation of the fundamental liberty of an adult woman to contract as she chose, and was a reversal of the modern trend toward equality of women with men before the law. Pointing out that this was not a statute relating to the hours of labor for women, or to their working conditions, in relation to which the physical differences between the two sexes may justify different provisions for them,[32] he says (pp. 553–554):

"In view of the great—not to say revolutionary—changes which have taken place * * * in the contractual, political, and civil status of women culminating in the nineteenth amendment, it is not unreasonable to say that these differences have now come almost, if not quite, to the vanishing point. In this aspect of the matter, while the physical differences must be recognized in appropriate cases, and legislation fixing hours or conditions of work may properly take them into account, we cannot accept the doctrine that women of mature age, *sui juris*, require or may be subjected to restrictions upon their liberty of contract which could not lawfully be imposed in the case of men under similar circumstances. To do so would be to ignore all the implications to be drawn from the present-day trend of legislation, as well as that of common thought and usage, by which woman is accorded emancipation from the old doctrine that she must be given special protection or be subjected to special restraint in her contractual and civil relationships."

Emphasizing the distinction between such a statute and one merely regulating hours of labor or working conditions, he adds (p. 554): "This court has been careful in every case where the question has been raised, to place its decisions" (sustaining a statute) "upon this limited authority of the legislature to regulate hours of labor, and to disclaim any purpose to uphold the legislation as fixing wages, thus recognizing an essential difference between the two." [33]

His opinion in the Adkins case was plainly influenced by his belief that the "modern trend" of legislation and thought is toward the perfect equality of women with men before the law, and that the District of Columbia statute and other State statutes of that type were really reactionary in refusing recognition of women's equal rights and equal liberty of contract with men. However, during the following decade, and particularly after the financial depression, State statutes began to multiply along lines similar to that of the District of Columbia stricken down in the Adkins case; but Mr. Justice Sutherland's own earnest belief remained unchanged with respect to them; and this Court adhered to that decision as late as the Tipaldo case (*Morehead* v. *New York ex rel Tipaldo* (293 U. S. 587, 603, 614; June 1, 1936), despite rising dissent.

But on March 29, 1937, the Adkins case was overruled in *West Coast Hotel Co.* v. *Parrish* (300 U. S. 379, 386), upholding a statute of the State of Washington, where this Court repudiated the idea of there being any substantial difference between a "minimum wage" and a "maximum of hours" statute in limiting liberty of contract. The opinion of the Chief Justice adverted among other things to the history during the intervening decade since the Adkins decision, and said (pp. 399–400):

"The adoption of similar requirements by many States evidences a deep-seated conviction both as to the presence of the evil and as to the means adapted to check it."

And added:

"There is an additional and compelling consideration which recent economic experience has brought into strong light. The exploitation of a class of workers who are in an unequal position with respect to bargaining power and are thus relatively defenseless against the denial of a living wage is not only detrimental to their health and well-being but casts a direct burden for their support upon the community. What these workers lose in wages the taxpayers are called upon to pay. The bare cost of living must be met. We may take judicial notice of the unparalleled demands for relief which arose during the recent period of depression and still continue to an alarming extent despite the degree of economic recovery which has been achieved. * * * The community is not bound to provide what is in effect a subsidy for unconscionable employers."

Mr. Justice Sutherland, however, remained unconvinced. To him the majority opinion was a change made by the Court in the meaning of the Constitution. He felt constrained to dissent, and in his dissenting opinion [34] he stated in forceful words what he conceived to be the duty of a Justice of this Court in such a case. He said (ibid., pp. 401–402):

"Undoubtedly it is the duty of a member of the court, in the process of reaching a right conclusion, to give due weight to the opposing views of his associates, but in the end the question which we must answer is not whether such views seem sound to those who entertain them, but whether they convince him that the statute is constitutional or engender in his mind a rational doubt upon that issue. The oath which he takes as a judge is not a composite oath, but an individual one. And in passing upon the validity of a statute, he discharges a duty imposed upon him, which cannot be consummated justly by an automatic acceptance of the views of others which have neither convinced nor created a reasonable doubt in his mind. If upon a question so important he thus surrender his deliberate judgment, he stands forsworn. He cannot subordinate his convictions to that extent and keep faith with his oath or retain his judicial and moral independence.

"This court acts as a unit. It cannot act in any other way; and the majority (whether a bare majority or a majority of all but one of its members), therefore, establishes the controlling rule as the decision of the court, binding, so long as it remains unchanged, equally upon those who disagree and upon those who subscribe to it. Otherwise, orderly administration of justice would cease. But it is the right of those in the minority to disagree, and sometimes, in matters of grave importance, their imperative duty to voice their disagreement at such length as the occasion demands—always, of course, in terms which, however forceful, do not offend the proprieties or impugn the good faith of those who think otherwise." [35]

Early the following year, on January 3, 1938, only a few days before his retirement from this bench, Mr. Justice Sutherland handed down the opinion of this Court in *Alabama Power Co.* v. *Ickes, Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works* (302 U. S. 464, 475), holding that a competing power company had no standing in equity to maintain a bill to enjoin performance of "loan-and-grant agreements" between the Administrator and various municipalities contemplating the construction of municipal electricity-distribution systems, which might result in destructive competition with the existing power company. The bill was based on the alleged ground that the agreements were unlawful, but his opinion for this Court held that, since (pp. 478–479) "the interest of a taxpayer in the moneys of the Federal Treasury furnishes no basis for an appeal to the preventive powers of a court of equity"; [36] and since the complaint did not allege conspiracy or fraud or malice or coercion, that it showed no invasion of any "enforceable legal right of petitioner" (pp. 479 et seq.).

In considering constitutional questions of grave importance concerning which there was widespread division of thought throughout the country, that came before the Court during the period of Mr. Justice Sutherland's service on the bench, it was inevitable that men of strong convictions and different points of view should develop conflicting opinions, and should hold them firmly. Upon these matters it is too early to appraise his work or his opinions. It is enough to say, as his colleagues did in their letter to him, January 6, 1938, upon his retirement from the bench:

"Not only have you brought to our deliberations learning and dialectical skill, a wide

[30] Justices Van Devanter, McReynolds, and Butler concurring with him (290 U. S. 483).

[31] *Associated Press* v. *Labor Board* (301 U. S. 103, 141).

[32] He distinguished for example the case of *Muller* v. *Oregon* (208 U. S. 412), dealing with the number of hours in which any woman may be employed in certain industries and similar cases; *Riley* v. *Massachusetts* (232 U. S. 671); *Miller* v. *Wilson* (236 U. S. 373); and *Bosley* v. *McLaughin* (236 U. S. 385); cases where the reasoning was along the same lines as Justice Sutherland's own reasoning in the above mentioned case of *Radice* v. *New York* (264 U. S. 292, 293 et seq.), decided the next year.

[33] Chief Justice Taft and Justices Sanford and Holmes dissented; Justice Brandeis took no part in this case (ibid., pp. 562–571).

[34] Justices Van Devanter, McReynolds, and Butler joined him in thinking that "the judgment of the court below should be reversed."

[35] He said further, stating his own position on the case:

"It is urged that the question involved should now receive fresh consideration, among other reasons, because of 'the economic conditions which have supervened;' but the meaning of the Constitution does not change with the ebb and flow of economic events. We frequently are told in more general words that the Constitution must be construed in the light of the present. If by that it is meant that the Constitution is made up of living words that apply to every new condition which they include, the statement is quite true. But to say, if that be intended, that the words of the Constitution mean today what they did not mean when written—that is, that they do not apply to a situation now to which they would have applied then—is to rob that instrument of the essential element which continues it in force as the people have made it until they, and not their official agents, have made it otherwise." (Ibid., pp. 402–403).

[36] Citing his own former opinion in *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 447, 486 et seq.),

knowledge of affairs enriched by varied and eminent public service, and a habit of thoroughness and precision, but you have matched tenacity of purpose with an unvarying kindliness and have mellowed our deliberations with unfailing humor" (303 U. S. vi).

He was a great judge and a great American.

The Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley before the Advertising Club of New York at the luncheon meeting commemorating the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America:

Mr. Chairman and guests, Dr. Fretwell's introduction makes me feel very humble, for it seems to me that all of us here, who have the privilege of taking part in the anniversary observance of this great organization, are honored by the opportunity.

A short time ago, Dr. Fretwell showed me a copy of a message which had just been received from Gen. Mark W. Clark, commanding general of the Fifteenth Army Group in the European area. I would like to read you his message just as it was handed to me:

"In sending the Boy Scouts of America my hearty congratulations on the thirty-fifth anniversary of their movement, I feel a personal pride in the record of achievement and inspiration manifested by that organization.

"My son, Bill, now in his final year at West Point, was himself an Eagle Scout. Scores of enlisted men and officers under my command are former members and, being true Scouts, have never lessened the ideals of world brotherhood. They join me in congratulating all Scouts for the great service they are rendering on the home front. We, in turn, are looking to them for inspiration and leadership in our post-war life when brothers together becomes more than a theme for the Boy Scouts—when it becomes the keynote for every race and creed of this battle-torn world.

"With best wishes, I am,

"Sincerely,

"MARK W. CLARK,
"Lieutenant General,
"United States Army,
"Commanding."

Now when a man like General Clark takes time out of his many duties to send a message from his headquarters to the Boy Scouts of America, I think we on the home front should realize that the growing boys are most certainly our responsibility, but as the citizens of tomorrow, are the bright promise of the Nation. I think that we should feel that we are privileged to have a share in the work that is being done to strengthen them for the great task that lies ahead.

I believe this is typical of the feeling throughout the country today. We are all of us very much more aware of our responsibility to youth than we were a generation ago. When I was a boy, growing up in a small town, there were no such organizations as the Boy Scouts. We had no neighborhood clubs for boys. We went fishing, swimming, skating, coasting down hill, played baseball and now and then got together for a little social diversion. Nobody directed us; nobody assumed any responsibility for us; we just went along on our own power. But we were lucky at that. In the cities, the boys fared much worse. There were no playgrounds for children. There were very few parks. When cities did have parks they were usually removed from centers of population. The only places for recreation were the city streets, and the only recreation direction was the corner cop. Only of course neither he nor the kids thought of it exactly that way.

Today the picture has changed. We realize that youth ought to have a number one priority on our devoted attention. Our young men are needed to fly our planes, to drive our tanks, to absorb the shock of battle. We need our young men desperately today, and we realize that when we ask them to take the brunt of battle, we have no moral right to accept their sacrifices unless we do everything under heaven not only to help them to get readjusted when they come back, but to educate, to train and provide the right sort of experiences for their younger brothers.

Now the Boy Scout Movement invests in the future and it is one of the great tokens of the fact that America is awake to her obligations to youth. Under God and the fitness of things, I believe that we ought to strengthen the oncoming generations to youth to repay the sacrifices which their older brothers are now making for them and for us, and we ought to highly resolve that our young people will be properly equipped to take the leadership that they will have to assume in years to come.

Well, what have our boys and girls a right to expect of us? Are we, you and I, really fulfilling our obligation to them? We pick up our newspaper and we read that juvenile delinquency is up 40 percent, 50 percent, and in some places I have seen it estimated as high as 60 percent. Why? Everyone has an answer. The war, the war conditions, overcrowding, this thing, that thing, the other thing. There is nothing the matter with our boys and girls today except the same thing that has always been the matter. The problem is not juvenile delinquency, but adult indifference. Boys want adventure. Of course, they do. They always have. The thing to do is to give them the right sort of adventure. The time to stop juvenile delinquency is before the boy becomes delinquent.

There are four things to my way of thinking that play a very important part in the life of a boy, that have everything to do with fixing the way his future life will be. First is the home. In 9 times out of 10 if a boy gets into trouble, you will be able to trace the cause of it to bad conditions at home, bad example, indifference, neglect.

The second great influence on a boy is the church. It is impossible to overestimate that influence. Religion should be a real and compelling thing in the life of a boy. The time was when the atheist was just one in a mob who cried out, "There is no God." But today in Nazi Germany atheism is organized and for the first time in the history of the world a new generation was educated on an anti-Christian and anti-God basis. We have seen the results in the lives of the young people in Nazi Germany, who were taught that the state is above God.

How much better off the whole world would be if all observed the twelfth Scout law. Let me read it to you. "A Scout is reverent. He is reverent toward God. He is faithful in his religious duties, and respects the conviction of others in matters of custom and religion." If that had been the law for boyhood all over the world there would have been no racial persecution in Germany, and the world would not now be embroiled in the bloodiest war in history.

The third important influence on youth is the school. There is no need to elaborate on that. We all know how necessary a good education and vocational training are for the future of a boy. What the home and the church do for the heart and soul, the school does for the mind.

But in our complex modern life when the home, and the church, and the school have done their part, there still is need for something more in the lifetime of a boy. He is a social being. He naturally looks for companionship, and he looks for adventure, something to do in his spare time. That is where the Boy Scouts of America comes into his life, and does a job which, in my judgment, no other organization can do more effectively. What are some of the things that this Scout program gives the boy to round out his equipment for life?

In the first place, the Scout program gives him wholesome recreation. Boys become Scouts for the fun that they get out of it. You and I may know that a lot of other things are important, but to the boy today, just as to us, when we were boys, the great thing is adventure and fun. Now, there are all sorts of commercial amusements available on ever street corner—many more than when you and I were in our 'teens. There is the motion picture—a great institution and a powerful educational source for good, in its better phases, but there are also unfortunately, cheap motion pictures that pander to the boy's love of excitement, without doing anything constructive for him. There are the poolroom and the dance hall, harmless enough in themselves perhaps, but not constructive influences in the life of a growing boy. In contrast to these and other commercial amusements, the Scout movement gives the boy the whole world of the out-of-doors—camping, a chance to sleep out in the open and to fill his lungs full of fresh air; a chance to cook his dinner over a fire; a chance to go swimming, to learn how to handle a boat, and maybe to save a person's life.

That brings up the second thing that I think is valuable in the Scout program. It gives the boy things to do that appeal to him as worth while—that appeal to the man already beginning to take shape in him. He learns to take care of himself and he learns to help other people.

Not so long ago there was an item in one of our New York papers. The headline read, "Boy Scout Rescues Pair Felled by Gas." The article told about how his knowledge of artificial respiration enabled a 14-year-old boy to save the life of an elderly couple who had been overcome by fumes from a gas heater. When this boy came home from school in the afternoon he smelled gas as he entered the hallway of the apartment building where he lived. He traced the odor to an apartment on the fourth floor, and got no response. But he did not give up for this boy was a Scout. He knocked for one of the other tenants, climbed through the window of this apartment on to the fire escape and looking through the window next door saw the couple lying on the floor. With help from the neighbor he broke the window. He took the pulse of the unconscious man and woman and started to work on the man because his pulse was weaker. At the same time he directed the neighbor how to revive the woman and yelled down the fire escape to someone else to send for help. By the time the police and ambulance got there both those old people had been saved, because a 14-year-old boy knew what to do and how to do it.

Now this is a common enough story. I dare say something like it appears many times in our newspapers here in this city and elsewhere all over the country. But think of the satisfaction that that Boy Scout and all the other Boy Scouts in his Scout Troop, and in other Scout Troops, get out of the knowledge that they have learned something worthwhile that enables them actually to save a person's life.

Right now in the city of New York, and in every other community, large and small, all

over the country, young boys are having a chance to help our country win the war in ways that would never under the sun have been possible if it were not for the Boy Scouts of America. This is not only a very well worthwhile service for our country, but is an Waste paper drives, bond selling, planting crops, helping the Red Cross; you see these important thing in the lives of these boys. Boy Scouts all over doing a man-sized job at a time when we have a serious manpower shortage.

Then another important thing that the boy gets in his scout troop is companionship. The right sort of companionship, the right sort of impressions, are of critical importance to a boy. I ask you here to look back upon your own youth and consider honestly how much of what you are now has been affected by the friends and companions you had when you were in your 'teens. How important it is for every boy to have a wholesome recreation, and worthwhile things to do, with the right sort of companionship. And I think you will agree that boys are tremendously susceptible not only to the influence of companions of their own age, but also to the influence of adults. Boyhood is perhaps the most important period in a man's life, then his ideals are acquired, his character formed. He needs to have the right kind of man to supply his ideals and to become his hero. Every boy is a hero worshipper, and he tries, albeit unconsciously, to make himself like his hero. If the men with whom he associates are cheap, and crooks, are gunmen or gangsters, that is the sort of hero the boy wants to resemble. It is up to us to see that he has the right sort of companionship and the right sort of leader to follow.

At this period boys are having a hard time. Their older brothers are away, their fathers in most cases are keeping longer business hours than ever before, and crowding in a lot of wartime activities also. Many of the wholesome things that the family used to do together are not possible now, because of war work or restricted travel conditions or gasoline shortage or other reasons. Boys have time on their hands. Tens of thousands of boys are nightly on our streets looking for amusement, seeking adventure, yearning for companionship. This situation is a challenge to us on the home front. Is it not up to us to provide places where these boys can meet and play, be entertained and instructed and at the same time be under the influence of men of the right kind?

This is a practical thing to do. It can be done. It has been done, thank God, all over America. But why are we not, in every community, undertaking it in a big way? All of you men here today are interested in boys and want to work for them. That is why you are taking part in this occasion, but are you interested enough and do you care enough? If each one of you would lead a one-man crusade to provide more opportunities for boys to get the benefits of this Scout program, your city could be an immeasurably better place when your sons come back home than it was when they left.

This job is up to us. It depends upon us whether these boys will have the opportunity to learn how to be good and worthwhile citizens, or whether they will be woefully neglected during these important formative years. We cannot turn our backs and ignore existing conditions. It is up to us to accept the challenge and lend ourselves for the task. It is a man's job and it needs men of mettle who will put something of themselves into the undertaking.

For 35 years the Boy Scouts of America has been helping to train and direct American boys. This year the Scouts are taking a wider view. Their theme for the year is, "Scouts of the World—Brothers Together." Scout organizations exist in practically every country in the civilized world. In 1939 there were 3,000,000 Boy Scouts. Travelers told us that everywhere they went they would find these smiling boys in their distinctive uniforms, eager to do a good turn and devoting themselves to the ideals of democracy and friendliness and respect for the rights of the other fellow, which the Scout code teaches. No, not in Germany. Hitler would have none of Scouting; neither would Mussolini. And as fast as the Nazis invaded a helpless country, one of the first things they did was to abolish the Scout movement.

Nonetheless, boys in these countries did not give up their Scouting, and now as fast as the countries are liberated, the Boy Scouts are coming into the open again. These Boy Scouts all over the world have a lot of things in common and they deliberately cultivate friendliness and good will with each other by correspondence, by world camps, by exchange of books, and by swapping things with each other as boys have done since the world began. I think we have a tremendously important force in building world friendship and international good will here. Certainly, if we are to have a world peace it will have to be preserved by these boys of Scout age throughout the world. To me it is very encouraging that so many millions of them are Boy Scouts and are dedicated to democratic principles, to high ideals, and to the Scout promise.

It is my profound conviction that the boy who subscribes to your Scout promise, who has a chance to learn the things that Scouting teaches him, and to associate with the right kind of man as leader, will go a long way to make an honest, upstanding, straight-forward citizen of this country, and that in the tomorrows which are coming he will be found in the very front line of the citizens who will maintain the cherished and sacred traditions which the democratic nations of the world are defending today.

Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War No. 2 and Their Dependents, Including Rights and Benefits of Veterans of World War No. 1 and Other Wars and Their Dependents

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, since 1934 I have prepared each year a booklet on veterans' rights and benefits. The last one that was printed as a House Document was in February 1944, House Document No. 394, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. It contained 314 questions and answers and often referred to as the "veterans bible."

With the assistance of others, who will be given proper credit when the booklet is printed, I have prepared another handbook which brings this particular one up to date and includes all recent legislation, especially the so-called G. I. bill of rights. It will contain 391 questions and answers.

The table of contents will include:

Part I: Benefits and Privileges Available During Period of Service in Armed Forces.

Part II: Benefits Administered by the Veterans Administration for Veterans of World War No. 1, World War No. 2, and of the Intervening Period, and Their Dependents.

Part III: Benefits and Privileges Available Through Other Government Agencies for Veterans and Their Dependents.

The booklet will be fully indexed and practically every question that has arisen so far is answered in this booklet.

For instance, the following subjects are especially included:

Mail and railway fares.

Pay and allowances.

A table showing the rates of pay and allowances for officers of the armed forces which indicates how the rank of one in the Army compares with the rank of one in the Navy, both officers and enlisted men.

Servicemen's dependents' Allowance Act of 1942.

Allotments of pay.

Monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for dependents.

Missing men and women and their dependents.

The Women's Army Corps.

Women's Reserve of the Navy.

Women's Reserve of the Marine Corps.

Women's Reserve of the United States Coast Guard.

Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940.

Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944.

Six months' death gratuity.

Headstones and national cemeteries.

Organization of the Veterans Administration.

United States Government life—converted—insurance, World War No. 1.

National service life insurance, World War No. 2.

Protection of life insurance issued by private companies.

Pensions payable where there was service in the armed forces in World War No. 1, World War No. 2, or in the intervening period.

Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—so-called G. I. bill of rights.

Educational training under Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Vocational training to provide for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans and their employment—act of March 24, 1943.

Guaranty of loans.

Readjustment allowances.

Hospital care, domiciliary care, and medical treatment of veterans.

Burial of veterans.

Appeals.

Employment and veterans' benefits in Federal employment.

Income tax.

Homestead and other land laws.

Naturalization of persons who have served in the armed forces.

DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS

The Committee on Printing will give me a hearing soon on the question of printing a supply of these booklets for distribution to the Members of the House and Senate as heretofore, and for the purpose of making them available for sale at the Government Printing Office.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

The Veterans Administration has just issued Pamphlet No. 44 of December 15, 1944 which contains information concerning monetary and other benefits available to persons who have served in the armed forces of the United States, and to the dependents of such persons. This pamphlet gives a history of the Veterans Administration and the location of the various offices and hospitals of the Veterans Administration and contains information in the form, in most instances, of exact reproductions of laws concerning veterans and their dependents.

This booklet brings up to date a booklet that I prepared with the help of the Veterans Administration in 1941, which was House Document No. 300, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

Prior to that time another booklet was prepared by me on veterans' benefits, House Document No. 666, in 1940, and House Document No. 701 in 1938 was of the same kind.

The first booklet of this kind was prepared by me May 15, 1934, which was brought up to date in 1936.

BOOKLETS SERVE DIFFERENT PURPOSES

Although the booklet prepared by the Veterans Administration is a very valuable booklet and I commend the Veterans Administration for doing an excellent job on the revision, yet it does not serve the purpose that the handbook containing questions and answers serves. Any booklet prepared by the Veterans Administration or any other official governmental agency must necessarily be very strict as to the exact wording of a law, and therefore, many questions arise which are difficult to answer by reading the actual text of the law.

The question and answer form presents questions that are daily asked and the answers are in plain language that anyone can understand.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION BOOKLET RECOMMENDED

Since the booklet on Veterans' Benefits, Pamphlet No. 44 of December 15, 1944, by the Veterans Administration is available at the Government Printing Office now at 15 cents per copy, I do not now propose to ask for another resolution, as I have in the past, to provide for its printing and distribution to the Members. However, I recommend this booklet to anyone interested in veterans' affairs. It contains 98 pages with 8 pages of index. It is a very comprehensive booklet and should be in the hands of every person who is dealing with the veterans or their dependents.

PRINTING OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWER HANDBOOK WILL BE REQUESTED

It is my hope that the Committee on Printing will ask for the passage of a resolution that will permit the printing and distribution of the question and answer handbook which has just recently been finished, and that the House will pass the same and that the printing and distribution can be made by March 15, 1945.

Mandalay '45

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was thrilled a few nights ago when Mr. Dorr Stuart sang a song entitled "Mandalay '45." It was a fighting song and typifies the spirit of the British and American soldiers fighting in that far-off land. As he sang that song, we who heard him were impressed with the words describing the ultimate fate which is in store for Tojo and Hirohito.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith the words of that song:

MANDALAY '45

(By Dorr Stuart)

By the old Moulmein Pagoda, lookin' eastward to the sea,
Is that Burma girl still settin', as of old she used to be?
Is the wind in peaceful palm trees? Do the temple bells still say—
"Come back, you British soldier," as they did just yesterday,
"Come you back to Mandalay"?
No, there's guns by those pagodas, and there's death upon those seas
And those Burma girls aren't settin', they've been beaten to their knees.
If there's wind among the palm trees, it's the wind from bombing planes;
And the temple bells aren't ringin', Burma's silent in her chains.
Can you 'ear the paddles chunkin'? No, the bombs make too much roar,
And the shells and bullets splatter round the Great Gawd Budd's front door.
But the Japs have had their innin', and the time has come to say
That there'll soon be hell a-blazin', out of China 'crost the bay.
Like our boys did at Midway.
And those fires will keep on spreadin' growin' hotter as they go,
'Till they reach one grand explosion in the heart of Tokyo.
Listen, Tojo, Hirohito, and your little gods of clay,
While the bombs rain down like thunder "out of China 'crost the bay."

Extending the Three-Mile Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article by Mr. Edward W. Allen, of Seattle, which was recently printed in the Commercial Fishermen's Weekly. This article deals with the 3-mile rule, an antiquated piece of international law, which was originated nearly 400 years ago and is based upon the distance that cannon in those days could fire out to sea.

Today with rocket bombs hurtling hundreds of miles through the air, it is time that we took a look at the 3-mile rule. This article indicates some of the certain needs for its revision:

THREE-MILE RULE IS DECLARED OBSOLETE, ANTIQUATED—POLICY HAS NEVER BEEN STRICTLY ADHERED TO. AS A MENACE TO FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT, THE RULE PRESENTS A PRACTICAL PROBLEM WHICH CALLS FOR PROMPT ACTION. FISHERY DISPUTE WITH JAPANESE COULD HAVE LED TO BLOODSHED

(By Edward W. Allen)

Senator WALLGREN'S bill raises a question not only important to Alaska but to everyone interested in this Nation's food supply and in its international relations.

Before the war the world's annual catch of fish was said to be 30,000,000,000 pounds, of which the United States took almost 4½ billion pounds. Such a food resource certainly is worth perpetuating.

Formerly ocean fisheries were thought to be inexhaustible. Modern high power, long range, efficiently equipped fishing boats have proved this is not true. More effective regulation is therefore necessary, and the greatest obstacle to such regulation is the so-called 3-mile rule, that a nation can protect its coastal fisheries to a distance of only 3 miles offshore.

RULE SUITED SEA POWERS

However, it was only at the beginning of the last century, at the time when England's Navy became powerful and England wished to hold all other nations down to the smallest sea rights, that the principle gained real recognition. Our own New England fishermen who wished to frequent other people's coasts were largely responsible for this country's taking the same position. Although later on, when Germany and Japan also became strong at sea they, too, adopted the idea, it cannot properly be said that it ever became a rule of international law for the very good reason that probably a majority of nations, such as Russia, Mexico, Norway, Sweden, Portugal, as well as others, have consistently opposed it.

The rule is really only one of policy. Furthermore, it has never been strictly adhered to even by its advocates. It is inconsistent with some of our own recent positions, such as those indicated by the antismuggling laws and the Declaration of Panama. We already have a diplomatic precedent as to Bristol Bay, to which I will later refer. Whatever value the rule may have had in the past, it is now a menace to the protection and development of the great coastal fisheries.

JAPAN SENT FISH BOATS

There is perhaps no more valuable single local fishery than that of Bristol Bay, Alaska, where in a normal year, with only a 30-day fishing season, up to a million and a half cases of red salmon are canned. A case consists of 48 one-pound cans. These salmon spawn in fresh-water streams, usually go to sea their second year, and 3 years later seek the very stream where they were born, there to spawn and die. In making this return they pass through the Aleutian Islands and swing northeasterly for more than 3 miles off shore.

Commencing about 1930, Japan sent fish boats into Bristol Bay. Gradually she increased her operations until in 1936 and 1937 it was demonstrated that Japanese vessels operating more than 20 miles off shore could, if their attempts persisted, practically destroy this fishery.

Fishery unions, salmon canners, members of the Pacific coast public, rose up and demanded that these Japanese marauders be put out. Their effrontery was not only shown by claiming the right to do as they pleased even though it would destroy a valuable American food resource, but one Japanese article went so far as to call Bering Sea just an extension of the Bay of Tokyo.

Our State Department averted a dispute which might well have resulted in bloodshed by getting the Japanese to agree to withdraw their salmon fishing vessels until the problem could be worked out more conclusively, but a permanent solution is essential either through diplomatic channels, which is the most desirable procedure, or through legislative action if the other should fail.

COULD WIPE OUT FISHERY

I should like to give one other illustration. Halibut are found only on ocean banks having the right range and relation of depth and water temperature. Now it happens that almost 90 percent of the Pacific coast halibut fishery is more than 3 miles off shore. Canada and the United States have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars bringing back this fishery to its present high state of production. Are they, when this war is over, to permit foreigners who have not contributed 1 cent to this result and whose fishermen have not suffered any of the restrictions which have been imposed to our own fishermen, to come over to our side of the ocean, reap the harvest, and deliberately wipe out all the constructive work this Commission has done?

The Senate of the United States in 1937 ratified a salmon treaty with Canada. The Commission created by that treaty is confident that if its recommendations are followed, an enormous industry can be rehabilitated. This fishery has fallen to about 15 percent of its former maximum. It can be brought back. But what will it profit these two countries which are thus cooperating in such a constructive manner and affording such a world-inspiring example of practical friendship, if they let outsiders frustrate all their efforts?

OPENLY CONDEMNED

The 3-mile rule as applied to fisheries, if it ever had any reason, has lost it. It is openly condemned by many nations. It is not a binding principle of international law. It is obsolete and unsound. It should be repudiated along with other antiquated conceptions.

Not only have the fishery interests of the Pacific coast pleaded for immediate action in this regard; but the two international commissions to which I have referred have submitted resolutions on the subject to both governments. Labor unions, commercial organizations and operators have all supported this position. Even the lawyers of the United States have taken up the same.

This is not a matter of theory. It is an extremely practical problem which calls for prompt action. We hope that it will be solved through diplomatic channels, but that you gentlemen will not hesitate to resort to legislation if other methods fail to obtain the result which is so important, in fact, essential.

Thoughts for Peace Planners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ferdinand A. Hermens of the Department of Political Science, University of Notre Dame, has written a powerful and challenging appeal to all who work toward a just and lasting peace.

Dr. Hermens' letter appears in the current issue of Our Sunday Visitor and is as follows:

THOUGHTS FOR PEACE PLANNERS—OF INTEREST TO MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By Prof. F. A. Hermens, University of Notre Dame)

No peace could be better than one based upon the teachings of the founders of the American Republic, and upon the lessons of our own national development. No peace could be worse than one inspired by the kind of writing based upon a mixture of passion, half-truths, and plain fiction, which apparently is an inevitable byproduct of wartime psychology.

The founding fathers had a high opinion of the dignity of the people's representatives and expected them to exercise real leadership. Madison, in No. 10 of the Federalist papers, said that their task was "to refine and enlarge the public views." Hamilton, in No. 71 of the Federalist papers, reminded us that there is a difference between "the deliberate sense of the community" and "an unqualified complaisance to every sudden breeze of passion, or to every transient impulse which the people may receive from the acts of men who flatter their prejudices to betray their interests." He called upon our leaders to crystallize the former, and to shun the latter.

The polls taken on the subject of peace by the National Public Opinion Research Center at Denver are a powerful reminder that the thinking of the average American is even now a great deal sounder than the literary products of certain intellectuals. Furthermore, the public reaction to "the Pattern for peace" issued by the religious bodies of this country, to the recent statement of the Catholic bishops on peace and power politics, and to Pope Pius' latest Christmas address, shows that our people respond gladly to far-sighted leadership whenever it is offered. Therefore, we do not have to delay in mobilizing the "deliberate sense of the community"; it is possible to bring it into action here and now.

Leadership in the interests of a just and durable peace presupposes, in the first place, the renunciation of power politics. Most of us are aware of the reality of, and the need for, power. But we reject what has long been a practice in other lands and what now in this country threatens to develop into an influential theory. The late Prof. Nicholas John Spykman, the founder of this school of thought, at one time said:

"The statesman who conducts foreign policy can concern himself with values of justice, fairness, and tolerance only to the extent that they contribute to or do not interfere with the power objective. They can be used instrumentally as moral justification of the power quest, but they must be discarded the moment their application brings weakness. The search for power is not made for the achievement of moral values; moral values are used to facilitate the attainment of power."

Such realism is not only immoral but it is deeply unreal. A nondemocratic power may, for a long time at least, follow the policy recommended; a democratic country cannot. Our consciences are as much a reality as are our guns, and in a democracy the consciences will, in the end, control the guns. Wartime passion may drown out the voice of the conscience; if this happens, post-war disillusionment will produce a guilt complex bound to paralyze the use of force when force is necessary to protect the right.

Let us then, first of all, lay down the basis of a foriegn policy which we can respect. At times we may fail to attain the ideals embodied in such a policy, but that is no reason not to have the ideals. If circumstances drive us off our road, the star of our principles should guide us back to it. And when accepting a policy of the lesser evil, we should bear in mind that as Christians we are not permitted to do evil. We may tolerate what is wrong because in trying to remedy it immediately we might be led into even greater evils. But we should make it clear that we fight for as much good as we can attain, and when we do not reach the goal we should resist the temptation to call right and just what in fact is but submission to superior force. Any lesser evil to which we submit should not make us slacken in driving for the good which alone can be our real goal.

THE CASE OF POLAND AN EXAMPLE

We should bear such lessons in mind in the present struggle over Poland. Perhaps there is a limit to what we can do to defend her true integrity and independence. But we should not call right what in fact is nothing but a decision based upon sheer military might. Besides, there is no need to have such things as the present dishonorable press campaign, which portrays the Lublin committee as a true emanation of democracy.

Justice acknowledges no limits. It has to be observed toward the vanquished as well as toward our allies. In the case of Germany our responsibility is all the greater because our own military power will have much to do with the ultimate defeat of that country and the decision of its fate afterward. To be sure, in the countries overrun by Hitler's armies the demand for sheer vengence is great. But it is by no means universal. Some of the leaders of the underground movements in the countries have, in fact, come out for farsightedness and moderation, and so have influential papers in much-bombed Britain. It would have been natural for us to throw our weight on their side, if, instead, we do the opposite, there is real danger that we might find ourselves lined up with the forces of vengeance and destruction.

In dealing with Germany, we might well heed the counsels of the founders of our Republic. The problem of militarism was most lucidly dealt with in Nos. 6 and 8 of the Federalist papers. The authors, Jay and Hamilton, were concerned with the possibility that instead of the union proposed, the 13 States might resume their independence, or that regional federations might be effected. They objected that this would create a feeling of insecurity all over the continent. One State, or one regional federation, would be in danger of being attacked by another. A standing army would be required to guard against this danger. In being so vital to the security of their section, the Army leaders would make themselves superior to the civilian powers and establish militarism; wars would follow upon some pretext or other. The proposed Union, however, would dispense with the need for an overlarge and overbearing army, and preserve peace alongside democracy.

PRESCRIPTION FOR THE GERMAN PROBLEM

What Hamilton said contains the diagnosis of, and the prescription for, what we call the German problem: In the Thirty Years' War which reduced Germany's population from 16,000,000 to less than 8,000,000, Germany was the anvil of the power politics of Europe. At the end of that war, Brandenburg—Prussia's standing army came into being, through which Germany in the end was to become the hammer, although the intervening period of Napoleonic tyranny should not be forgotten.

Under such conditions, the solution is obvious. Let the states of Europe federate as did those of the North American continent. It will not be easy to do so, but then, neither

was a permanent union finally established in this country without difficulties. Federation of Europe means cooperation, and out of cooperation alone can there arise reconciliation—without which there will never be a peace worthy of the name.

To be sure, in their opposition to a federated Europe, Lord Vansittart and Stalin, believing in different varieties of power politics, have joined hands. Agencies working for a real peace, such as the Catholic Association for International Peace, have endorsed such a solution. As long as we are willing to apply the lessons of our own national development, we should do whatever is in our power to promote this goal. Above all, we should shun any of those political monstrosities propagated by our own hatemongers and calculated to make perpetual the abyss now separating victors and vanquished.

Let us remind those in the liberated countries who oppose cooperation with the "upright souls" (to use a term of Pope Pius) in the Axis Nations of what the younger Pitt said when his great opponent, Fox, taunted him with his failure to bear in mind his father's belief that France was the natural foe of England. Pitt wisely answered that "to suppose any nation can be unalterably the enemy of another is weak and childish."

American political development contains other elemental lessons which we should ponder. The founding fathers' analysis of the reasons of, and the remedy for, tyranny is as sound and as modern as their analysis of militarism. It is impossible to bring these points out in detail in this letter. Yet, the fog of propaganda which hangs over our discussion of the peace should not be allowed to obscure the true meaning of American political philosophy and American political experience. The Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees might well hold hearings in order to sift the true from the false in the current controversy about the reorganization of the world. In that way alone can we satisfy ourselves that we shall base our contribution to the peace, and our foreign policy after the peace, upon the Christian and democratic traditions of this country, rather than upon the quicksand of that "sudden breeze of passion" against which Hamilton and Madison warned us so eloquently.

Confidence, the Basis for Full Employment—Full Employment Bill Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are two subjects upon which the people of this Nation are united and speak in a single voice. First, and most important for the immediate present, we are united in our programs leading to a solid and long peace. Second, and of equal national importance, we are united in our desire to devise ways and means to bring to an end for all time the recurring cycles of depression and major unemployment which this Nation has been forced to endure during various stages of its past history.

Depressions are bred by fear and thrive in a climate of lost confidence. Depressions and unemployment go hand in hand. To banish unemployment would be to banish depression.

The real question before us in this connection is not "Can we have full employment?" but "How do we go about maintaining full employment?"

When we face squarely this question and attempt to devise its answer, we quickly recognize that jobs are made because investments are made and because credit is not contracted and our citizens have funds they can and will spend.

Investments are made under three conditions:

(a) When idle capital exists;

(b) Markets appear assured; and

(c) When confidence exists.

Credit remains uncontracted—

(a) When debtors' employment or sources of revenue seem assured;

(b) When signs of continuing reinvestment are visible; and

(c) When employment opportunities for the able and willing exist.

Our citizens have funds they can and will spend—

(a) When employment opportunities are plentiful;

(b) When present employment remains insured; and

(c) When general confidence exists.

Idle capital now exists in greater quantities than ever before in this Nation's history. Recent reports of the Securities and Exchange Commission give overwhelming testimony on this point. Markets, however, are not assured when we can see into the post-war period only so far as we can visualize the resumption of certain types of civilian buying of now scarce items when those items are once again in plentiful supply.

Markets will not appear assured unless and until the customers know that their own personal jobs are assured and that employment opportunities will always exist for the able and willing.

The catalyst is confidence. Without it the gears will not mesh and the economic future is uncertain and full of gamble.

Confidence, however, is not bred by idle words, fancy phrases, or even by a campaign of national advertising to that end. It stems from actions taken, not from actions promised at some future date. Only through affirmative action is confidence inspired and guaranteed.

To begin at the beginning, we must devise ways and means to assure the Nation, its industries, and its industries' customers that a full and steady flow of investment capital will be poured back into our industries each year in a sufficient amount to insure maximum employment and thus assure a maximum customer market. To have confidence, we need a guaranty that this will be done. From whom will we get this guaranty?

If we assign this task to private industry, and to private industry alone, we take a grave step. Offhand, to assign private industry the entire responsibility might seem a logical step. Reflection, however, will show that this is not possible nor is it practical under our political and economic system.

By definition, private enterprise in our country means competitive enterprise. This means that the more competitors there are, the healthier is our economic system. For private industry to do the full job of guaranteeing a sufficient and continuing flow of investment capital at all times in amounts enough to assure maximum employment would mean that businessmen would have to foregather and agree in advance on what they would spend for investment and construction each year. In order for such a program to be effective, and workable, it would be necessary for a relatively small number of men and groups to meet and agree in order to exercise such control over the economy as to make their decisions effective.

The power which this small group would wield would mean the power of economic life and death. Whoever made these decisions would control the country. The people of this country will never stand for the vesting of such power in a few persons or groups which are not directly accountable to the people. The fundamental power of our people must never be transferred from public hands to private. Any other road would lead to fascism.

If it is not possible to vest this power in the hands of large business and industrial interests, there remains but one place to vest it. That is in the Government.

It is for this reason that I have today introduced in the House H. R. 2202, described as the Full Employment Act of 1945.

The purpose of that bill, as I see it, is to induce and help maintain an economic climate of confidence in the United States. It proposes the following:

First. It would offer every possible inducement to private enterprise to operate at a high level of activity.

Second. It directs the President to propose annually a wide variety of measures to assist private business in offering jobs to all.

Third. It provides for estimating the number of jobs this activity will produce.

Fourth. Lastly, it directs the executive branch of the Government to embark upon a works program that will supply whatever jobs remain to be supplied in order to assure employment opportunities for all the able and willing.

This is a vastly different thing from just a public works bill. The essential difference in one respect is that this works program will be carried out by private industry under contract with the Government. More important, however, is the guaranty itself that the required investment to maintain this full employment will always be forthcoming.

Imagine the difference in risk-taking and the attitude of private business in this respect if it knew in advance that this primary cause of depressions and panics had been removed. Imagine the degree of confidence that a businessman could feel in making his own plans if he knew in advance that a high level of general business activity would not of necessity be followed by a downswing such as has often happened in the past.

Take a case in point where the future looks dark. I refer to the case of the cotton farmer, who typifies the post-war period's most serious agricultural crisis.

This cotton farmer, faced with foreign competition of cotton raised by laborers

working for a pittance, and faced with competition at home from the larger agricultural units which are bound to equip themselves with these latest mechanical picking and other devices, knows that he and his helpers are likely to need other fields of employment for themselves after the war. They cannot remain exclusively raisers of cotton and hope to make a decent living. They know that other jobs must be made available to them or at least the opportunities for other kinds of employment must be open to them. My bill offers this particular group that kind of hope. It offers many other marginal groups the same type of guaranty.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I can visualize where legislation of this type would be a tremendous boon to small business. Its effect upon agriculture is obvious because when agriculture's customers are employed, farm products command good prices and sell in large quantities.

Full employment, high wages, a prosperous agriculture, all help small business, and large business gets its quota of the benefit also.

I am not one who thinks utopia comes with a stroke of the pen or the passage of a law. This bill would not solve the problem. It would, however, provide the mechanism within Government for a long step forward toward solving the problem and there is nothing in the bill, in my opinion, to which business, large or small, can object. I have protected business from divulging trade secrets and have a clause at the end of the bill which forbids the disclosure of information the publication of which would be harmful to the firm or person submitting it.

We have made a splendid approach toward the solution of the problems of the peace table and have done this because we showed political unity and a singleness of purpose. In approaching this problem of full employment only one spirit can bring us through to an early and successful conclusion—the spirit of good-humored and tolerant cooperation, with industry, large and small, agriculture, labor, and Government pulling together.

Rights of Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

RIGHTS OF WITNESSES

Congressional investigating committees obviously need greater flexibility in their procedures than courts of justice. But they need also a resolute respect for the rights and reputations of the citizens hailed before them. To this end, Representative FRANK HOOK, of Michigan, has urged enactment of what he terms a bill of rights for men being investigated by congressional committees. He would assure such persons legal counsel at private hearings, access to stenographic records of any testimony cited by a committee, a full opportunity to reply to accusations and to file a formal statement at the conclusion of testimony. These are such elementary principles of fair play that it is shocking to realize how flagrantly they have been disregarded in the past.

The whole system of congressional investigation, a vital adjunct of the legislative process, has been brought into disrepute by the excesses of committees such as those headed by Representative Cox and former Representative Dies. Some of them have become organized atrocities. Congress as a whole, for the sake of its own prestige, ought to put a checkrein of the sort proposed by Mr. HOOK on the activities of Members whom it vests with investigatory powers. Committee members ought to keep careful check upon any chairman disposed to make individual pronouncements for the committee as a whole. Of course, the most effective control Congress can exercise over investigating groups is care, in the first instance, in establishing them. In this regard, it is worth recalling that Mr. HOOK is also the author of a resolution calling for repeal of the amendment creating a permanent Committee on Un-American Activities. Adoption of this would be the best evidence Congress could give that it wants the rights of witnesses respected.

Labor's Amazing Production Record—Now Let's Repeal the Smith-Connally Law

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 9, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that in all America there is any person among our 130,000,000 people who is more capable of giving an accurate opinion on labor's part in winning the war than J. A. Krug.

Mr. Krug is Chairman of the War Production Board, and in that capacity has over-all responsibility for the production of the implements required to win this global war.

Writing to Mr. Krug, I said:

I will be much obliged if you will give me your opinion on labor's contribution toward winning the war in respect to the production of the implements of war.

Chairman Krug's answer has just been received. It should be read by everybody in the country.

During the 3 years ending last December, monthly production increased 11 times in size.

"Quite remarkable" are the words used by Chairman Krug in describing labor's strike record since Pearl Harbor. Pointing out that the enormous increase in industrial activity normally would have been accompanied by an increase in the number of strikes, the War Production Board Chairman says:

Instead of increasing, however, the number of man-days lost due to strikes has declined over the period 1942, 1943, and 1944. A preliminary estimate through November 1944, shows that 0.1 percent of available working days were lost because of strikes. Furthermore such strikes as have occurred have been of shorter duration and have involved fewer workers.

The Chairman reports that enormous increases have occurred in labor productivity and that the output per worker as of April 1944 was 30 to 35 percent over December 1942.

In view of the plain, unmistakable facts set forth in Mr. Krug's letter in regard to labor's magnificent contribution toward winning the war I have referred the letter to the House Committee on Military Affairs, which has before it H. R. 499, the bill I introduced on the opening day of this Congress for the repeal of the Smith-Connally law.

That law is a cruel, stinging indictment of labor based on utterly false premises.

Chairman Krug's letter gives us the facts about what labor has really done and it is a record of almost unbelievable accomplishment.

I appeal to Congress to right the wrong it did to labor when it passed this iniquitous law.

The full text of Chairman Krug's letter is as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: In reply to your letter requesting my opinion on labor's contribution toward winning the war with reference to producing the materials and equipment of war, I am very happy to forward to you the following comments:

Labor's contribution to the war effort may be measured by the degree to which labor has mobilized for war work, the extent to which labor's voluntary effort has kept strikes, labor turn-over, and absenteeism to a minimum, and the way in which labor has rallied to help solve production problems, manpower shortages, and other situations affecting critical war production, through local labor-management committees, and similar groups.

Growth in production: Labor's mobilization for war together with the development of technological and managerial improvements and increased labor productivity have brought about an enormous growth in munitions production which just about quadrupled over the period January 1942 to December 1943. Employment in munitions increased roughly 70 percent over the same period. Monthly production during the 3 years ending December 1944 has grown from one-half billion dollars to five and one-half billion, or 11 times its former size.

Mobilization: The manpower of the country has been mobilized through measures which were basically voluntary in character. Between 1940 and 1944, 15,500,000 people were brought into employment and the armed forces who had not been employed in 1940. During the same period millions of workers moved from less essential employment to war work, as was evidenced by decreases in employment in trades and services and an accompanying rise in employment in all types of war work. Between July 1941 and July 1943, employment in retail trade was reduced approximately from 6,700,000 to 5,900,000. Self-employed and domestics were reduced from 7,500,000 to 5,700,000. On the other hand, over the same period, employment in the munitions industries rose from 5,900,000 to 9,600,000, and employment in Federal war agencies rose sharply likewise.

Expansion of the total labor force, including the Armed Forces, in the 12 months ending in September 1944, was half a million more than the normally expected increase of about 600,000 annually. As of December 1944, the total labor force was 6,700,000 greater than the labor force would normally be expected to be.

Large numbers of workers have migrated from their homes to centers of war production. Areas in which war production has been concentrated have experienced tremendous population increases. San Diego, Calif., for instance, has experienced a population increase of 111 percent between 1940 and 1944, while its population increase for the entire decade 1930 to 1940 was 38 percent. San Francisco has experienced a 40-percent increase over the past 4 years, as compared with 8 percent in the previous decade. This concentration of war workers in war production centers has led to the development of serious community problems such as shortages of housing and transportation, difficult shopping, etc., which have made living and working conditions much harder for the workers and are in part responsible for turn-over, absenteeism, etc.

An idea of the size of the occupational adjustments which have been made may be gathered from the fact that millions of new entrants to the labor market and former workers in less essential industries were being put to work on war jobs who had not had the previous industrial training needed. Workers who had had previous industrial training in peacetime factories likewise needed training for their new jobs. According to the Bureau of Training of the War Manpower Commission more than 10,000,000 persons have been trained in the various types of public vocational training courses between 1940 and 1944.

Labor productivity: Enormous increases have occurred in labor productivity. A rough analysis of munitions output and employment based on W. P. B. and B. L. S. data indicates that output per worker has risen steadily. Output per worker as of April 1944, on this basis, is from 30 to 35 percent over December 1942.

No-strike pledge: After Pearl Harbor labor took its no-strike pledge. Labor's strike record since Pearl Harbor, when properly evaluated, is quite remarkable. Since that date, the enormous increases in industrial activity and in employment which have occurred would mean, under normal conditions, a corresponding increase in the number of strikes and in the number of man-days lost due to strikes. Historically, except under unusual circumstances, strike activity has increased with growth in industrial activity.

Instead of increasing, however, the number of man-days lost due to strikes has declined over the period 1942, 1943, and 1944. A preliminary estimate through November 1944 shows that 0.1 percent of available working days were lost because of strikes. The loss of 2 days' time in a plant has a minimum effect on production, since so short a period would not deplete the stock piles the plant has on hand with which to carry on production other than that immediately affected by the strike. Furthermore, such strikes as have occurred have been of shorter duration and have involved fewer workers.

It must be recognized that accumulated fatigue and strain springing from wartime living conditions are bound to have their effects in strikes, absenteeism, and labor turn-over.

Labor-management cooperation: Over 5,000 labor-management committees have been established throughout the United States, their purpose to provide a mechanism whereby representatives of labor and of management can sit down together to work out production problems. Under the suggestion-box system set up by these committees to receive workers' suggestions on how to expedite or improve production, nearly 10,000 awards have been made, and about 100,000 suggesters have submitted usable ideas. Several hundred million man-hours have been saved through these suggestions. Not only have labor-management groups made recommendations on the best utilization of machinery, the adaptation of old machinery to new uses, and the breaking of production bottlenecks, but they have been instrumental in promoting increased care of tools and machines to prevent break-downs, in eliminating the waste of materials, and in minimizing rejects. Labor-management committees have established subcommittees with a wide range of functions from controlling absenteeism and turn-over, improving measures and devices around the plant to protect health and safety, to morale work among the plant's employees.

Local community groups in which local labor groups, or collective bargaining representatives of the particular plant concerned, as well as the labor representative of the regional war production board, have worked together in many cases to help overcome problems holding up production of critical items. These problems are worked out on a plant-to-plant basis, in terms of the individual problem concerned. One or two instances will illustrate this approach.

One of the War Production Board regional labor representatives handled a foundry problem in up-State New York in which the local U. S. E. S. office was unable to make referrals because of a low starting wage and high-cost transportation facilities. Investigation showed that under a recent War Labor Board award the company was in a position to employ new personnel at a higher rate but feared that doing this would create unrest by setting up intraplant inequalities. However, the W. P. B. labor representative was able to show the company how they could make adjustments under general order 31 which would offset the inequality factor. So far as transportation was concerned, the company was willing to engage a carrier and absorb the costs but was not permitted to do so since the War Labor Board interpreted this as a salary increase. Furthermore, no Utica transportation company would contract to transport people to and from the plant because of disagreement over transportation rates. This problem was overcome by securing a decision from the W. L. B. permitting the company to pay all transportation above rates normally charged on the route, and by engaging a taxicab company to supply the necessary service. As a result, in a short period of time, the company had secured the additional people needed.

Group action on a community basis was employed in Philadelphia also, where the W. P. B. labor representatives for that region called together a group of union officials to explore the possibilities of lending men to critical establishments. Under this program firms whose needs were less essential would agree to lend especially skilled workers to "must" plants for a specified period of time—30, 60, 90 days. At the same time these firms would guarantee to give these workers full reemployment rights and their previous status.

This same flying squadron device was used by several Minnesota shipyards in lending pipefitters to the Gopher Ordnance Works, in that area. Use of such a device requires cooperation from everyone concerned. Management has to guarantee reemployment to the workers being lent. Unions must agree to the crossing of union jurisdictional lines when necessary. Government procurement services must cooperate along with other Government agencies and community services.

Another type of cooperative action was used in the rubber industry when heavy-duty tire production fell behind schedule. In this instance management was placing the blame for the situation on the organized rubber workers, particularly in the Akron area. Unfavorable newspaper stories brought the crisis to a head. In July and August, General Knudsen, and Mr. Keenan and Mr. Golden, Labor Vice Chairmen in the Board, held conferences with the local rubber union officials in Akron and other parts of Ohio, in Michigan and also New England. These conferences brought forth the fact that in large part the answer to the recruitment problem in the rubber industry lay in improving relations between labor and management.

The Office of Labor Production was uniquely suited to deal with this problem since its representatives were drawn from labor and had the confidence of the local unions involved. Furthermore, as an agency of the War Production Board it was able to assist in procuring materials and machinery where that proved necessary. Therefore, teams of representatives were assigned to the trouble spots to work jointly with the local unions, management, and Government agencies on a recruiting program. Subsequent area conferences made it very plain that causes and solutions varied from area to area and from plant to plant within the industry. The success of this method of dealing with production lags by plant-by-plant discussions led by Government officials thoroughly familiar with labor problems indicates the readiness of labor to cooperate in any steps that can be shown to be necessary and reasonable in order to increase military production.

I hope you will find this information useful.

Sincerely,

J. A. KRUG, *Chairman.*

Drive Opened Before State Legislatures To Obtain Endorsement of Vicious Proposal To Limit Federal Taxes on the Rich

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the closely knit faction in our Nation which is sponsoring the proposed amendment to reduce the taxes on millionaires' incomes, gifts, and inheritances is at the present time making a desperate bid for endorsement by additional State legislatures.

As pointed out in some of the recent literature put out by the Committee for Constitutional Government, a number of State legislatures now in session will adjourn for 2 years, and therefore the plea from the committee is for immediate and renewed activity to induce these legislatures to endorse their clever scheme before they adjourn.

Only too well do they realize that many of these legislatures, if not sold on the idea during the present session, will certainly never be open for consideration of such a plot again after the legislators have had an opportunity to give thorough study and thought to the implications which would result from the adoption of such an amendment. These implications have only begun to be brought

to the attention of the legislators and to the public with any degree of effectiveness. I believe I can say that I was one of the first to bring this nefarious conspiracy out in the open. I must admit that I am amazed and completely baffled at the success with which the Committee for Constitutional Government, under the direction of Pettengill, Rumley, Gannett, and McClure, operated before the treacherous scheme was brought to light.

In this connection, I find one of the committee's spokesmen, with typical audacity, making such a statement as the following: "At this stage, all that is asked is that Congress submit the proposal to the people so that they may decide whether to accept or reject it. So far, Congress has failed to submit it to the fair judgment of the entire Nation. The immediate issue, therefore, is whether Congress shall continue to suppress the proposal or shall submit it to the Nation for discussion and action on its merits."

In the name of common decency, has the underhanded, unpublicized campaign waged by the Committee for Constitutional Government been any indication that they would have been willing to "submit it to the fair judgment of the entire Nation"? This is what I have tried to do and what I am now doing—let us bring this diabolical scheme out in the open and let us have less of bewilderment and surprise by our public, and even our legislators, when it is discovered that endorsing resolutions have been passed by our legislatures. Let us bring it out in the cold light of public scrutiny and we will soon see what reception it is given by the "fair judgment of the entire Nation."

According to another propaganda pamphlet put out by the committee, the following 17 States are listed as having passed an endorsing resolution in both houses: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. What the committee is not publicizing, however, is the fact that the Governor of Pennsylvania vetoed the endorsing resolution and the fact that the State of Arkansas passed a resolution reversing its endorsement—bringing the score down to 15 States instead of 17. Neither are they publicizing the fact that some of the other States listed above have before their legislatures at the present time rescinding resolutions such as passed by Arkansas.

The pamphlet lists 29 States as being in session this year and making the comment "If one of the 29 States listed, having biennial sessions, fails to pass the resolution this year, action in that State will be delayed for 2 years." We can, therefore, expect a concerted drive by the Committee for Constitutional Government for passage of an endorsing resolution in the 29 States. For the information of the Members, and for the information of those who are anxious to see that the propaganda of the Committee for Constitutional Government is not the only material used in discussion and consideration of the proposed millionaires' amendment, I list these States below:

Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida—April—Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia.

It is also noted that six States have passed the endorsing resolution in but one house. They are: California House, Louisiana Senate, Nevada Senate, New York Senate, Ohio Senate, Virginia House.

Unfortunately for the Gannett-Pettingill-Rumely-McClure syndicate, they will no longer be able to spread their gospel and continue their activities with the complete lack of general public knowledge with which their activities have been heretofore blessed. A fine example of this is the effort now being made to obtain the endorsement of the New York Legislature, and the article which immediately appeared in PM on Sunday, February 11, exposing this new drive. The article follows:

GANNETT OUTFIT GETS BEHIND DRIVE FOR INCOME-TAX GRAB—COMMITTEE REVIVES CAMPAIGN TO LIMIT LEVIES

(By Karl Pretshold)

ALBANY, FEBRUARY 10.—The campaign has been revived to have the New York Legislature join the movement for an amendment to the Federal Constitution limiting Federal taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances to a maximum of 25 percent, during peacetime. The campaign is part of a national effort by Frank Gannett, millionaire reactionary Republican publisher, and his Committee for Constitutional Government.

Seventeen State legislatures already have passed resolutions asking Congress to call a constitutional convention to repeal the sixteenth amendment which gives the Federal Government power to levy taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances. The resolutions all call for a twenty-second amendment fixing a 25-percent income-tax ceiling.

If adopted, says the United States Treasury Department, the tax-grab amendment would almost certainly shift the burden of the Nation's war debt to the small taxpayers and bring about a Federal sales tax.

The Constitution requires action by two-thirds of the States to obtain a constitutional convention. Thus resolutions by 15 more States are required to get Federal action on the tax-grab amendment. If a constitutional convention is obtained and initiates an amendment, that amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the States.

SINISTER LOBBYING

Lobbying efforts of the Gannett committee on behalf of the amendment were called sinister, sordid, by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN (Democrat), Texas, during the debate in Congress last year.

Assemblyman Justin Morgan (Republican), Erie, has again introduced the Gannett resolution here. He introduced it last year, but it was defeated in the assembly. In 1943 a similar resolution carried in the State senate and died in the assembly rules committee. To be effective, the Morgan resolution would have to carry in the assembly and at the present session of the senate.

Irwin Steingut (Democrat), Brooklyn, assembly minority leader, said he opposed passage of the resolution.

"I am for lower taxes," he said, "when and if they can be lowered. We must recognize facts and this proposal would put hardship on the small taxpayer and relieve the big fellows."

Irving M. Ives (Republican), Chenango, assembly majority leader, voted against the tax-grab resolution last year. He will oppose its adoption this year if it comes to a vote.

Labor is wholeheartedly against it. Legislative representatives of various unions say they would urge defeat of the Gannet resolution.

MAJOR VICTORY

The amendment giving Congress the right to levy income taxes was adopted in 1913 after decades of agitation. Its adoption was considered one of the major victories of progressive forces.

"The spirit of our Constitution was breached when the sixteenth amendment was passed," the committee declares in a recent letter seeking contributions toward a $15,000 fund to finance its tax-grab campaign. Defenders of the present income-tax system are denounced as collective-minded radicals out to misuse Federal taxing powers, and thus undermining private enterprise.

"Powerful forces," runs the alarmist warning, "some of them favoring State socialism, are mobilizing" in defense of the sixteenth amendment. Therefore, says the Gannet committee, an immediate special fund of $15,000 is needed for quick action on behalf of the tax grab.

DIFFERENCE

The difference between those who back the idea that taxes should be levied on those with the ability to pay and the committee, it is said in a recent leaflet, is "in the final analysis a difference as to the philosophy of government—national socialism as opposed to a representative form of government based on free enterprise."

The State legislatures adopting the Gannet-sponsored resolution are Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

They Are Making News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Post of February 12, 1945:

THEY ARE MAKING NEWS

Representative CLARE LUCE in her broadcast Saturday night again repeated her criticism that our fighting men on the Italian front have been relatively neglected by press, radio, magazines and all other sources of public information, and that they are conscious of this and correspondingly resentful.

Their bitterness is intensified because so many of them have been so long under fire, without adequate leaves or replacements, under the most miserable conditions of physical discomfort.

Mrs. LUCE discussed this situation with the manager of one wire-service bureau, and found her criticism taken lightly. "We have plenty of correspondents covering the Fifth Army front," said this man, "but there isn't

enough action there. After all, news is action."

But is that a good definition? Mrs. LUCE evidently thought not, for she dissected it in her broadcast. Some 19 centuries ago, she pointed out, there was a sequence of events, beginning at Bethlehem and ending at Calvary, which attracted but little attention at the time.

The great, the mighty, and the powerful in the Rome of that day thought these events too insignificant to mention, but in truth they had more bearing upon the fate of Rome than the rise and fall of all the emperors put together.

And in our own time, Mrs. LUCE remarked, the rise to power of an obscure German beerhall orator failed to be news to most of us until he had become such an obvious menace that we have since had to call the four corners of the earth to arms to stop him. A sad error of judgment on our part in not recognizing news when we saw it.

The definition, "News in action," will do for tabloid journalism but not for any service of information that intends seriously to inform and enlighten the people. The late Carr Van Anda, managing editor of the New York Times during the period when that newspaper rose from relative obscurity to recognized leadership as a journal of information, illustrated the point repeatedly.

There is no subject duller than archeology, for instance, but a touch of insight and imagination on Van Anda's part made the opening of Tut-Ankh-Amen's tomb a page 1 news story for weeks on end, in every daily newspaper in the world.

It was an interesting story and important too—for it is important for us humans to know how our remote predecessors thought, felt, and acted, unless we wish to repeat their errors and share their fate.

Just now it is infinitely more important for us to know how hundreds of thousands of our fighting men in Italy and elsewhere are suffering and sacrificing and perhaps dying, and what their survivors will be thinking when they return to take control of this Nation, as they most certainly will.

It would be much smarter for news service managers, newspaper editors, broadcasters, and war correspondents to act on Mrs. LUCE'S tip than to try to brush it aside. For she has been to these fronts, she has seen and talked with these men, she knows what they are thinking—and she knows news.

Who's Going to Be Free?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the Gardner Advertising Co., of St. Louis, Mo., frequently publishes a letter entitled "It Seems to Us."

Their most recent one, on the subject of What Is Free Enterprise? is worthy of the attention of every American, and I extend it, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 1945.*

DEAR SIR: Who's going to be free?

Right now, in this nightmare of war, no one is free. We're all in the same boat. We all work for the Government. We all work or fight for America.

That's good for all of us. It's good for our souls. It's good for America—until this war ends. Then * * * what price freedom?

If we are to be free, we must recapture free enterprise. It's our only hope if we are to provide enough jobs, produce enough goods, earn enough profit to pay off this war, pay our way in peace—and put an end to American crises.

Well, what is free enterprise? Freedom from what? How much freedom? Who gets it? Can you answer these questions? Can we? Let's try.

Free enterprise is a way of life. It's strictly American. It's a voluntary system, a merit system, an honor system. It's the most individualistic, most reliable, most productive system on earth. It's the only system conceived in the spirit of its people, raised to world dominance by the genius and elbow grease of its people, paying top rewards to a majority of its people. It works.

Free enterprise is a hypersensitive economic triangle. It's a three-man team. Worker, employer, investor, perform interrelated, interdependent, indispensable roles. Each must have his job, his dignity, his just rewards. Each is inescapably dependent upon the other two. Working in harmony, all three prosper. Playing one against the others leads to ruin—for all three. Until these facts are faced by worker, employer, and investor there can be no free enterprise in America. Only the shell remains.

Free enterprise flourishes when government functions as servant—and not as master—of all three members of the team. Freedom from excessive power—in all its sinister forms—is the No. 1 requirement if we are to recapture our three-man job-making, prosperity-making, peace-making team, free enterprise.

How much freedom? Every ounce that can be heaped upon the scales of justice—and still keep them in balance. Freedom rooted in the fact that those scales are held aloft by the strongest arm in all the land. Freedom to plan and build to one's own standards. Freedom to succeed or fail—with all America as the jury. Freedom to expand in all directions—short of exploitation. Freedom to prosper with honor.

Who gets it? First, the worker. In free enterprise, he gets more, rises higher, faster, than he can under any other system on earth. He's free to think more, produce more, earn more than his fellow workers. He's free to compete for authority, prestige, social and financial independence. He's free to win and hold all four—as countless others have before him. Yes, he's free to climb. And his ladder is as strong as his own abilities and desires.

The employer finds his freedom in incentives to prosper. Incentives to build better products, render better services, win and hold more customers. Incentives to produce and distribute more efficiently and thus outstrip his competitors. Incentives to expand and employ more workers. Incentives to climb—and lift his workers with him.

Of all the freedoms, the investor's is the most restricted, most hazardous, most misunderstood. His money is the lifeline of industry and trade, the energy which puts life into job-making machinery. Without his money, industry bogs down, workers find no work, depression reigns. And yet, his is the freedom to risk his all and take his share of profit or lose his shirt—and no tears shed.

And be it noted that investors include millions of workers with a few dollars invested—as well as the few with many.

Free enterprise is not a lopsided system in which one member of the three-man team gets all the glory—or the gravy. It's not an economic grab bag. It's not a system which condones sharp practice in any form—any more than it condones arson, murder, rape. It's not a cloak for crooks. It is not for one group and against another. Free enterprise is a system in which all groups prosper when they pull together.

Why must we recapture it? There's one alternative to prosperity and peace via the three-man team of free enterprise. It's collectivism or some alluring facsimile thereof. Collectivism is modern slavery—net. We are not fighting this war to set up a collectivist America—or to make the world a set-up for its creators!

Very truly yours,

GARDNER ADVERTISING CO.

Provisional Polish Government in Lublin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, no doubt the Members of this House will be interested to know just who the people are who have been chosen by Russia to head the so-called new Polish Government in Lublin. The names and records of these so-called leaders of the Polish Nation read like a Communist's who's who. These so-called leaders are about as representative of the Polish Nation as the draft dodger of World War No. 1, Earl Browder and his gang are representative of the American people. Earl Browder represents just about as much a percentage Americans as the representatives of the Lublin government represent the Poles. In order that the Members of the House might know just who the so-called Polish leaders are I ask unanimous consent to insert their names and records at this point in the RECORD:

MEMBERS OF THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT IN LUBLIN, AS BROADCAST FROM LUBLIN ON DECEMBER 31, 1944.

Acting President: Boleslaw Bierut.

Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs: Edward Osóbka-Morawski.

First Deputy Prime Minister: Wladyslao Gomolka.

Second Deputy Prime Minister: Stanislaw Janusz.

Minister of National Defense: Gen. Michal Rola Zymierski.

First Deputy Minister of National Defense: Gen. Alexander Zawadzki.

Second Deputy Minister of National Defense: General Konczyc.

Public Administration: Józef Maslanka.

Public Security: Stanislaw Radkiewicz.

Finance: Konstanty Dabrowski.

Public Education: Stanislaw Skrzeszewski.

Social Welfare and Health: Wiktor Trojanowski.

Agriculture and Agrarian Reform: Eduard Bertold.

Communications: Jan Rabanowski.

Industry: Henryk Mino.

Supplies and Commerce: Piotrowski.

Posts, Telegraph, and Telephone: Tadeusz Kaplinski.

Justice: Edmund Zalewski.

Culture and Arts: Wincenty Rzymowski.

Information and Propaganda: Stefan Matuszewski.

WHO'S WHO IN THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT IN LUBLIN

M. Boleslaw Bierut, born in 1891 at Laczna, near Lublin. His real name is Krasnodebski, and the name "Bierut" is a nom de plume composed of the two first syllables of the other two names, which were used by him during his political activities: Bienkowski and Rutkowski. During the First World War he

served in the Russian Army and had already begun Communist activity. In 1921 he was admitted to the Comintern and granted Soviet citizenship.

In December 1923 he was sent for the first time to Poland and soon established himself as one of the leaders of the Polish Communist Party. In 1925 he planned the escape of the famous Comintern member Leszczynski, and himself escaped to Moscow. Later he was entrusted with the Polish section of the Comintern Office for Central and Eastern Europe, which had its headquarters in Vienna. In 1930 the office was transferred to Prague, where he continued to head the Polish section. He cooperated closely with a certain Jurewicz, cashier to the Comintern for that part of Europe.

In 1932 he was again sent to Poland as leader of the underground Communist organization. This time he was caught and sentenced to 7 years of hard labor. But before many months passed he was exchanged as a Soviet citizen for a Polish citizen in Russia. In 1933 he was sent to a special school organized by the Comintern in Leningrad and the next 2 years were spent in Moscow on special political studies. In 1936, under the name of Rutkowski, he was in charge of the Polish Section of the Foreign Office of the O. G. P. U.

He entered eastern Poland in 1939, on the heels of the Soviet troops, and organized a widespread political sweep of all Polish, Ukrainian, and Jewish elements opposing communism. Mass deportations to Russia, arrests, and executions were carefully prepared by him. After the German armies occupied eastern Poland, Bierut escaped to Moscow, but in the winter of 1941–42 he was dropped by parachute from a Soviet plane onto Polish territory. His task was to organize Communist activities in Poland, acting against the underground movement and the underground state directed from London and to set up a new Polish administration in opposition to the existing one.

He organized the Polish Communist Party under the innocent name of the Polish Workers' Party. (One of the leading and most highly respected political parties in Poland, both of prewar and present times, is that of the Socialists. In Polish it goes by the name of P. P. S. What the political agents from Moscow did—acting, as always, on instructions—was to dissolve the Communist Party in Poland and announce the formation of a Polish Workers' Party, the P. P. R. The intention here is perfectly clear. It was expected that through confusion of P. P. S. and P. P. R. working people and peasants, who are utterly opposed to communism and the protection of the U. S. S. R., would be inveigled into the Bolshevik-sponsored party. For the P. P. R. is nothing but the Communist Party under another name.) His next step was to form a council which was supposed to represent the Polish people and a committee, later known as the committee of national liberation. Neither the council nor the committee, however, represented anyone but a few Communists. In March 1944 Bierut, with four others, including Osóbka-Morawski, reached Moscow and there the whole group appeared publicly as leaders of the Polish National Council.

M. Edward Osóbka-Morawski is about 40 years old and a member of the Polish Socialist Party. Before the war was instructor in cooperative movement in Wielun, later worked with the Warsaw Building Cooperative. During the war went over to the Workers' Party of Polish Socialists. After the failure of his efforts to bring this party under the control of the Polish Workers' Party (P. P. R.), a haven for the Polish Communists, he became a member of that latter party in December 1943 and published a fake copy of Robotnik to create impression that the Workers' Party of Polish Socialists merged with the Communist Party. He was sent to Moscow as chairman of the national council elected by the P. P. R.

M. Gomolka, Prime Minister, now a member of the P. P. R., was secretary-general of the Polish Communist Party. He is a new addition to the Lublin group. His career goes back to 1920 when, as an 18-year-old youth, he organized a Communist cell in the Thirty-sixth Infantry Regiment of the Polish Army and promoted desertion to the Red Army. He was arrested and put in prison. He was later trained in Russia for the work of communizing Poland and in practical revolutionary knowledge.

M. Janusz (Agrarian Party) belonged before the war to the Central Board of the Polish Peasant Party and was not known to be an extremist.

Gen. Michal Rola Zymierski. Real name Lyzwinski. In 1927 as chief of the Armament Department of the Ministry of War he was accused of bribery, arrested and sentenced to 5 years of prison and demotion. After serving his jail sentence he went to Paris and traded in arms for Republican Spain. It was then that he contacted Communist elements. Under the name of General Rola he was appointed to the Berling Army. His claim to have no party affiliation is not true, as he too belongs to the P. P. R. under membership card No. 21.

M. Alexander Zawadzki, a Pole by origin but a Red Army officer since 1920 and later for several years Colonel of N. K. W. D. on the Manchuria frontier. Later imprisoned, he was released during the war, promoted to the rank of general and made assistant to Gen. Berling, and the real head of the Army.

Gen. Konczyc, Soviet officer, member of P. P. R., frankly communist.

M. Jozef Maslanka, Minister of Public Administration, former member of the Polish Diet from the conservative and ultra-Catholic district of Grodno-Bialystok, during his term in the Diet a typical back bencher with no initiative or followers.

M. Stanislaw Radkiewicz, member P. P. R., active member of the Union of Polish Patriots in Moscow.

M. Konstanty Dombrowski, member P. P. R.

M. Stanislaw Skrzeszewski, member P. P. R., Communist of many years standing, member of the Union of Polish Patriots, formerly teacher of mathematics in Cracow.

M. Wincenty Rzymowski, Minister of Culture and Art, has often changed his political credo. Became member of the Union of Polish Patriots in Moscow in 1944 when the Red Army occupied Polish eastern borderlands. He was expelled from the Polish Academy of Literature in 1938 for plagiarizing from Bertrand Russell's works. A fervent defender of the 1935 constitution and of the Brzesc process.

M. Stefan Matuszewski, a Communist agent even before the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, became later a valuable agent for the Comintern. He was detached to the Polish Socialist Party and has always disclaimed his Communist affiliation. At the Congress of the Polish military men within the Russian Army, called to Petrograd in the spring of 1917, he opposed violently the motion of organizing separate Polish units of the Poles serving with the Russian Army, which units were to fight side by side with the Russian Army. As a result of this stand he had to leave the congress with the group he was heading. At that time he was a lieutenant in the Russian Army. At the close of the same year, soon after the outbreak of the Bolshevik Revolution, he was one of the group of Polish Communists who tried to set up a Polish red brigade, a unit which was later used against Poland in the war of 1920–21. In the fall of 1944 he was elected treasurer of the reorganized Socialist Party by the fake Congress of that party called to and held in Lublin under the Red Army supervision. His loyalty to Moscow in his role of the head of the Lublin propaganda center cannot be questioned.

Pontifical Mass for the Victims of Warsaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. LANE POWERS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered by the Right Reverend Monsignor James H. Griffiths, S. T. D., chancelor of the military ordinariate, St. Hedwig's Church, Trenton, N. J., January 28, 1945:

"My glory shall always be renewed, and my bow in my hand shall always be renewed. * * * When I sat as a king, with his army standing about him, yet I was a comforter of them that mourned." (Job XXIX.)

On this day the Church of God in its liturgical office makes commemoration of the octave of the feast of St. Agnes, a Roman virgin and martyr who died in the fourth century. Until recent years when the Sacred Congregation of Rites adjusted the calendar, this day was dedicated to a renewal of the memory of St. Agnes. However, when the late Sovereign Pontiff, Pius XI, desired to dedicate the 31st of January to that glorious apostle of modern youth, St. John Bosco, the feast of St. Peter Nolasco was transferred to January 28. And yet the Roman Church could not bear the thought of totally eliminating all reference to Agnes, the glorious exemplar of Christian youth, Christian purity, and Christian fortitude.

Hence, it is today that we make commemoration of this unusual child, Agnes, whose feast the church celebrated a week ago on the 21st of January. It is as though Christianity could not forget this singular type of the Church of Christ standing in her innocence and simplicity before the formidable array of the totalitarian empire of the Romans. Agnes, a girl of 13 or 14 years, was able to vanquish the power and astuteness of a political organization which had conquered the whole known world because she had faith in Christ her Savior, because she was convinced that all the power politics, all the refined tortures, all the assaults on her Christian virtue could not avail against the power of God.

She had been subjected to flattery, to the offer of riches and prestige. She had been threatened with the punishments prescribed by Roman law for those who would not betray her Creator—and still she remained adamant. When the executioner raised his sword and finally and haltingly swung it down upon her lily-white throat, the world of power politics, the totalitarian government, concluded that they had definitely disposed of a delinquent child who had not the practical common sense to sprinkle a few grains of incense on the burning coals in the brazier which stood before the images of the deities which symbolized a totalitarian state that believed not in the divinities except as they typified its tyranny over the souls of men.

The Christians spirited away the broken, bleeding body of this child saint and laid it in the soft, moist earth beneath the cobbles of the Via Nomentana outside the imperial city of Rome. There she lay as an inspiration to other men, weak and feeble as the world reckons strength. But she remained in her humble "columbarium" as a source of power for others who would meet the armed might of tyranny, urging them on to fight the good fight in spite of persecution and

confiscation, in spite of all the brutal tortures which hatred and cruelty could devise. Those bones were not the relics of a great general, or of an astute statesman. They were the bones of a young girl who had vanquished an empire and the builders of empire knew it.

It is the old, old story of Christianity. It is the old, old story of the weak who confound the strong; of the simple who confound the wise. With this inspiring figure of Agnes before our eyes, it seems to me providential that this day should have been chosen on which to intercede for Poland and to pay prayerful tribute to her martyrs who have poured forth their blood for their country and for their faith. Agnes becomes the counterpart of Poland, weak as the world reckons, but strong before God; standing bravely before the wisdom of the world, resisting its blandishments, its flatteries, and its debasing compromises because she has principles and ideals which surpass the cheap expediency of diplomacy.

Poland could match the glorious legions of martyrs of Rome itself. She can produce national heroines such as St. Hedwig—the Jadwiga who bravely saw her husband fall in battle for Poland; who beheld unflinchingly the slaughter of her son, as he resisted the barbarous invasion of his country by the pagan Mongol Tartars from the east.

It would be a simple matter to embroider over with sparkling gems the golden tissue of the glories, the victories, the joys of Poland. We might readily compose a Paradiso of Casimir and Stanislaus and Andrew Bobola, of Sobieski and Kosciusko and Pulaski; of Maria Theresa Ledockowska, Prince Augustus Czartoryski, and Mother Frances Siedleska. But, no, this morning we are assembled for a more painful purpose but for a purpose which is no less glorious. This morning we have come to mourn with Poland and to plead for Poland.

We have come this morning to offer sacrifice not for one man, for a prince—but for a whole city—for the city of Warsaw, the capital of one of the most distressful people modern civilization has ever known. We have come to pray for Warsaw by the Vistula, which has died a dozen deaths from the conquest of Napoleon to its double martyrdom under Hitler; for Warsaw, whose very ashes have become by a divine paradox the burning source of life and the unquenchable spark of liberty. We have not come to mourn the death of one man. No, for before us there lie symbolically the broken, blasted bodies of 300,000 men and women, who spattered with their blood and brains the streets and cellars of their beloved Warszawa in the most recent, most ill-fated, and most betrayed struggle of the Polish people—a struggle undertaken not merely to defeat the enslaving enemy but to achieve and establish their God-given right to national independence and national sovereignty.

The whole world stood aghast on September 27, 1939, when Warsaw first surrendered to the Nazis. It seemed incredible that a well-organized military establishment should have crumbled in 27 days. That was before western Europe had experienced the lightning thrusts of blitzkreig. They later learned its diabolical tactics at Sedan and at Abbeville and at Dunkerque. Then they began to appreciate the courageous resistance of the Poles, who had been the first to confront this new type of mechanistic, terroristic warfare.

Yet Warsaw was not to be crucified once, but twice. Although she had been beaten to the earth in 1939, the flame of liberty burned in her breast and again in August 1944 the Polish underground rose from the cellars and back alleys of the city—at the signal from its supposed Allies—to throw off the yoke of slavery, hoping that the leadership of Gen. Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski would be supplemented by its friends with whom he was fighting to destroy nazi-ism. The story is well known to you all: An insufficient supply of food and arms flown clear across the continent of Europe and dropped from the skies; a host of excuses and oversimplifications by an army which until then had been allegedly rolling forward across the plains, invincible and indestructible and victorious.

It all came to a finish on October third of last year. After superhuman efforts, without appreciable help from outside, starving and naked, and pest-ridden, the Poles of Warsaw gave up to the Germans. And in the very hour when the arms of the United Nations were marching to victory across France, in the Baltic States, in the far-flung theater of the Pacific, the bleeding patriots of Warsaw were capitulating to the Germans while the invincible armies of Russia stood in the very suburbs of the city, across the River Vistula in the outlying districts of Praga. Only yesterday morning in the newspapers all this sordid story of betrayal was confirmed by Lt. Jan Novak in his statement in London.

Now that this undying exploit of the dying Poles has passed into history, statesmen and generals held the Sixty-three Days of Glory. Why 63 days of glory? Why not 1,825 days of glory? Why not 5 years and more of glory, since September 1, 1939, when the panzer divisions first rolled into Poland? Though they were beaten on the Western Front and betrayed on the Eastern Front, the indomitable Slavic spirit of the Poles has never acknowledged defeat. It has trusted in the promises made to it in the dark days when it was engulfed in the Nazi miasma.

It was this trust in the given word of the United Nations which drove them on across the face of the earth to keep their plighted word with the rest of the world in the crusade to crush nazi-ism.

While civilians were deported to frozen Siberia and languished in the blistering heat of Persia and picked their way across the submarine-infested seas to a savage refuge in the highlands of Africa, their fighting men carried on. No race or people has been more loyal, more sacrificing to the cause of the United Nations than the Poles. When the fiendish reality of the blitz broke over Britain, it was the Polish aviators who organized themselves into fearless squadrons which defended the United Kingdom at a time when western civilization trembled in the balance. It is a matter of record that one out of every eight German planes destroyed in the Battle of London was shot down by the Polish Legion, of which more than one-half gave their lives to defend the British Isles. Those exiled Poles, yearning for liberty, have fought in Norway, in north Africa, in Italy, in Holland, and in Normandy. It is now admitted that were it not for the Poles and the French the Battle of Cassino would not have been won and the road to Rome and northern Italy opened.

Poland and the Poles have unquestionably vindicated themselves as invaluable, loyal Allies and they have vindicated their rights to their lawful aspirations for nationhood. It is for this reason that all men who believe in God, who love Poland, who have even a rudimentary regard for natural justice are today appalled as they witness the travesty on international justice which is being enacted as Poland is pounded between the diplomatic anvil and the imperialistic hammer, in the name of realism. It is all so redolent of the period of the partitions when Maria Theresa wept for Poland but with each tear drop took another mile.

Poland has time and again been called the bastian of western civilization. Today she is something infinitely more—she is the litmus test of our war aims. If she must of necessity turn red regardless of the wishes of her people; if she must sacrifice her national sovereignty, her national aspirations, her national honor and independence to gratify and satisfy and appease the imperialistic greed; the nationalistic security policy of a bordering nation, then has our preaching been in vain, and all the blood and sweat and tears shed not only at Warsaw, but at Dunkerque, at El-Alamein, at Guadalcanal will have been expended in vain—and Poland and western civilization will stand exactly where they were on September 1, 1939. If this should ever happen, the Atlantic Charter must go down in history as a pact made not merely geographically but ideologically as well—at sea!

In the middle of the last century when the springs of thought and the springs of hope had dried up in a Poland suffering another Crucifixion, her poet Zygmunt Krasinski smuggled into the country his inspiring poem "Dawn—Przedswit" which reenkindled the dying embers of the national will to live. He consoled the mourning Poles as he wrote:

"And I heard
A voice that called in the eternal sky:
As to the world I gave a Son,
So to it, Poland, thee I give.
But in Thee my purpose for Him lives.
Be thou then the truth, as He is, everywhere.
Thee I make my daughter!
When thou didst descend into the grave
Thou wert, like Him, a part of humankind.
But now, this day of victory,
Thy name is: All Humanity!"

In this day, when the eagles of victory have settled on the standards of the United Nations, the cause of Poland is the cause of all humanity. If the white eagle of Poland is now torn asunder, all humanity is torn apart. And if the United Nations now betray Poland, they betray not truth, the unbetrayable, nor even all humanity, but themselves, and with their diplomatic kiss' traitor craft, they purchase for themselves not peace but a grave, a plot of days, wherein to consummate their Judasry with Judas' compensation of despair.

Selling of Surplus War Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the Western States Council, at Salt Lake City, Utah, on February 13, 1945, concerning the policy of selling surplus war plants. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD rather than to weary the Senate with a repetition of the speech. It addresses itself to the great problem before the Congress of the disposition of the $200,000,000 steel plant near Salt Lake City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen of the Western States Council, this gathering is a gratifying revelation of the proper functioning of a great republic such as that in which we live. You are meeting to consider how the now iron and steel producing facilities at Geneva and Fontana can best be fitted into the permanent economy of the West. Exactly as your grandfathers planned the opening of the West, you meet here today to plan its further growth.

As we all know, the great plant here at Geneva was built with governmental money

and title to the plant still rests with the Government. It has been managed during the war by a subsidiary of United States Steel without profit. The facilities at Fontana were built with money borrowed from the Government by Henry Kaiser. The Government still holds a mortgage on these facilities. The problem is to establish as soon as possible the fairest conditions under which these plants can be run and owned by private industry after the war.

One is in doubt whether to congratulate you upon the importance of these plants to the future growth of the West or to commiserate with you because of the inevitable problems which will arise when these war-born plants are put into peacetime production. Perhaps I should do both—with emphasis upon the fact that the headaches of the reconversion era will be a small price to pay for the revolutionary effects of a growing iron and steel industry in this part of America. This industry in this area can be a real asset to the entire Nation if we are successful in building an expanding economy in the post-war period.

The just and wise disposal of the plants at Geneva and Fontana will present complex problems but I think we should begin by seeing those problems against their true background. Tough as will be the business of selling one of these plants and facing up to the fair financial adjustments which may be necessary on the other, their disposal is but a very small part of the total surplus-plant disposal problem.

The sale of all surplus property, to go further, is only one segment of the entire reconversion problem here at home. It, in turn, must be handled with an intelligent regard for other factors such as our future tax policies, a stable price level after the shooting stops, and employment opportunities for millions of displaced war workers and millions of returning service men—to name but a few of the policy decisions still ahead of us.

Furthermore, in a world now as compact as New England was in colonial days, no wholly domestic solutions, even if they are integrated into a sensible national program, can work unless we also solve our basic international problems. I am thinking of such matters as the building of an international organization to assure a durable peace, of the world-wide problems of shipping, of air transportation, of the flow of petroleum between the continents, of the marketing of worldwide agricultural surpluses, and of the building of an integrated system of international communications for this country as we go into the post-war years.

All these things are part and parcel of a single picture. Any major change in any particular part of that picture may make it necessary for us to make other changes in our approaches to other parts of the total problem. I know the job ahead is not an easy one. I do, however, want to say in all temperance that this administration is no more ready to meet these problems of the peace than it was ready to meet the problems of total war at the time of Pearl Harbor. The day may yet come when we shall have to pay dearly for our economic unpreparedness. It will come if we do not move swiftly to make up for lost time.

A meeting such as this, however, can make a constructive contribution to reconversion policy on a national scale. Of necessity, this meeting must be a beginning. Some of the information we need is now available. Other relevant facts will not be known for some time to come.

There is the question of your ultimate markets for end products both on the West Coast and abroad. This is the $64 marketing question for every potential fabricator of steel products in these Western States. Once you feel that your estimates of post-war markets and post-war costs of production are reasonably accurate, you will have to face the problems of peace-time expansion. Tens of millions of dollars worth of additional capital investment in fixed assets will have to be made before you can switch over to the production of peace-time products. That will present the further problem of the best ways to secure your needed financing. It will be a tremendous undertaking under the best of conditions.

Meanwhile, you will be continuing your engineering surveys on your costs of production. These are likely to be more like a motion picture than a single print, however, since you are still in the shake-down period of production so far as your ultimate costs are concerned. New technological advances may have to be made before you can fully utilize the raw materials available to you in the most efficient ways possible.

Your freight rate structure post-war will be vitally important. I am thinking not only of the freight rates from your present plants to your probable markets, but of the rates on your raw materials from their points of origin to all of your west-coast plants as well. And I am also thinking of the freight rates both by rail and by water from the pre-war steel centers of the country to the west coast.

The pricing policies followed by the older steel centers of the country on their west coast sales post-war will be a determining factor in the growth of your steel industry out here. The problem, as you know, is not one which you will be able to settle wholly upon a regional basis. Basing points are essential but Pittsburgh plus must not mean west coast minus. There are headaches ahead to be sure, but the kind of internal pioneering in which you are now engaged is also tremendously stimulating. You are carrying forward the old pioneering tradition of this part of the country—1945 will have as interesting a place in the history books of a century from now as 1845 has today.

Now, as to the part of Government in this complex situation. No serious and responsible voice is heard these days which advocates Government ownership and operation of such establishments as these steel plants. Everyone seems agreed that our surplus plants must be sold to private industry as rapidly after the war as possible. This does not mean, however, that the Government problem is as simple as it would be if all the Government had to do was to sell its surplus plants to the highest bidder. Unfortunately, it is much more complicated than that.

If, for example, the Government sets its sights too high as to price, in order to protect the taxpayers, there may not be any buyers of our war-built plants. Idle plants will mean idle men. If, on the other hand, the Government sets its sights too low as to price, in order to get out in an ill-advised hurry, a grave injustice might be done to both business and labor in the pre-war steel centers of the country. Too low a price would subsidize the new purchaser unfairly with respect to his older competitors.

Justice must also be done in this case as between the Geneva plant which the Government owns outright and the Fontana plant upon which the Government holds a mortgage. The necessity for consideration of both plants as the two sides of a single coin is obvious.

The price at which the Government sells any surplus plant will have an unavoidable and a profound effect upon competitive conditions within any industry. There is no dodging the unpleasant fact that government will have to weigh all the relevant factors before coming to its final decisions. Any other approach would be irresponsible and certain to bring about grave repercussions. Government cannot possibly escape its role as umpire among sincerely conflicting interests in the difficult transition period.

It should reach its decisions as speedily as possible, however, both with respect to price and with regard to the conditions of sale. It must consider minority interests as well as the public interest before its ultimate decisions are made. The whole point I am making is this, that any decision by government with regard to the price of our war-financed plants will have a profound effect upon competitive conditions. The decision, unfortunately, cannot be reached upon so simple a basis as that of a price tag alone.

Under existing legislation, the Congress has reserved the responsibility of passing upon major sales of surplus plants concluded tentatively by the executive branch of the Government. The Attorney General has the additional responsibility of examining any antitrust angles involved in such sales.

This complex set-up must not result in frustration of business initiative through governmental indecision.

The Defense Plant Corporation should take the initiative in providing a mechanism through which all the various interests can be considered with dispatch. Government must not give business a run-around by batting it from one agency to another unless it is desired and designed to paralyze recovery. What we need is a single table around which we may achieve a meeting of minds. The chairman at the head of that table probably should be an outstanding man from the Defense Plant Corporation. The Attorney General should have his representative at the same table. Otherwise, the Department of Justice will be in a position to upset arrangements which have taken many weeks or months to work out without having made itself heard throughout the early discussions.

A steel man from the War Production Board obviously should be sitting around the same table. There must also be consideration of the views of segments of the industry and of communities and labor interests that will be vitally concerned. Personally, I feel very strongly that appropriate representatives from the Congress also should be present to avoid so far as possible endless review. This approach may provide us with an informal forum where every affected business interest and every affected labor group and every affected Government group will have its chance to be heard.

This is an obvious democratic approach but it cannot work effectively without vigorous leadership from the executive branch of our Government. That is where the initiative must come from under our form of government. We have not had that leadership in the past. We cannot do without it in the future.

Some such procedure should be followed not only with regard to these western steel plants but with regard to each of the major surplus plant disposal problems as well. The time to have begun was many days before yesterday. Every day we put it off only increases the probability of unemployment when the war is over. There is no excuse for further delay, nor for continuing to bite at these problems piecemeal.

The Defense Committee of the Senate will turn the same searchlight upon industrial reconversion for peace that proved so useful in stimulating our industrial mobilization for war.

The swift and equitable solution of these matters requires much more than teamwork within Government so that you businessmen can have a central spot for the discussion of your proposed programs. It also requires teamwork between Government and industry. As sincere differences of opinion arise within Government or industry or labor, we must all avoid the easy demagoguery of letting epithets fall too loosely from our tongues. Nothing will be solved by calling each other naughty names.

Rather, we must begin as you are beginning by getting all the facts out into the light. Those facts must then be judged with

as little bias as possible by each of the affected groups. Our final decisions must be composite decisions based upon our analysis of all the facts. That will require a good deal of give and take on all sides. The need for this unity and understanding cannot be over-emphasized. We shall not remain a first-rate power in world affairs if we are torn and weakened by disunity here at home.

These new iron and steel facilities in the West are an asset not only of this region but of the whole Nation. They must be used with imagination post-war as a vital part of an expanding economy for the whole country. Properly used, they can bring about an enormous growth of other industries out here which depend upon reasonably priced steel products for their own success.

When a region like this becomes more highly industrialized, the benefits of that growth are felt throughout the entire Nation. Trade will increase within this region to be sure, but it will also increase as between this region and other sections of the country.

In coming to grips with this problem of surplus plant disposal, we must beware of those who tell us that there are very simple answers to very complicated problems. There are none. We must also beware of the perfectionists who will oppose compromise solutions because their own particular brands of Utopia are not being established overnight. There are no such panaceas.

Rather, we have a razor-edge path to walk. The road will be more than half traveled, however, if we recognize that fact from the beginning. Our ultimate goal is easy to define although it will be difficult to reach. That goal is the full use of our human and material resources. More and more people right around the world must each year have a little more chance to earn the decent kind of living made possible by science. This is the road to peace.

The greatest single challenge to the private enterprise system is this broadening of markets, world-wide. Too many people are still dependent upon human muscle power rather than upon mechanical horsepower for their standards of living. Industrial engineering, coupled with economic statesmanship, can turn the energy of men from the mad rivalries of war to the glad rivalries of peace.

Let America show the world the joy of making more use of our resources as an example for the good of all mankind. Let us help men to live fuller lives instead of preparing the ground in bitter disillusionment for more and more tragic graves.

Actually, this broadening of markets is more than our greatest challenge; it is also our greatest hope. The way to realize this hope is to keep our eyes ever riveted on our ultimate goal. Only then will our day-to-day decisions enable us to move toward it as rapidly as possible. There is no other way along which we can travel and be sure that we shall finally arrive.

The Republican Party Looks Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Republican Party Looks Forward," delivered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], at Niles, Ohio, on McKinley Day, February 9, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to meet with you tonight to celebrate, a few days late, but not too late, the one hundred and second anniversary of the birth of William McKinley. I hope that you will feel, as I speak, that we are thinking together, and that I am speaking with you, rather than to you. It is my hope that I may say something that will be of benefit to you, to our Republican Party, and to this great America which we all love so dearly.

We of Indiana, your neighboring State, are proud of William McKinley, the twenty-fifth President of the United States, just as we are proud of that long list of distinguished citizens who have sprung from your soil and have won national fame for the great State of Ohio, and for the great Middle West as well. Two of my distinguished colleagues, Senator TAFT and Senator BURTON, are carrying on today this tradition in a magnificent manner. No State is more ably served in the Senate than is Ohio.

Citizens of both Indiana and Ohio have a high regard for your great former Governor, our Republican Vice Presidential candidate in the recent election. He waged a valiant campaign, and although he did not win enough votes, he won a place in the hearts of millions of people in this Nation—and time will not soon erase the high mark of political statesmanship set by that sterling American Hon. John W. Bricker.

We of Indiana and you of Ohio have many other common ties that bind us. Some of these ties were knitted in our common history when we were part of the great Northwest Territory, struggling together to develop this vast empire. I can never forget one stirring example of our mutual will to fight aggression. Back in 1813, when the British were advancing on Detroit and threatening at the back door the very existence of this new Nation, the Secretary of War wrote a letter to William Henry Harrison, Governor of the Northwest Territory with headquarters at Vincennes, Ind., calling on him to assemble the fighting men in Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky and to march to Detroit to repel the invaders. The response was immediate, and in the historic battle of Thames, the British were decisively defeated. That was the last time until these present bitter years that any foe ever dared to raise a foreign flag on American soil or fire a shot at American homes. The aggressors who struck at Pearl Harbor and Manila, and at Guam and Kiska, might well have read the history of the Northwest Territory and have learned that the descendants of the men who whipped aggressors in 1813, would prove as worthy in battle today.

And, of course, there is a community of interest in both our economy and our outlook on national and international affairs today. There are some who would say that I should be ashamed to be from Indiana and you should be ashamed to be from Ohio, for there is definitely an effete clique in this country who believe that every idea emanating from the Middle West necessarily is a reactionary or hide-bound idea.

Horace Greeley said, "Go west, young man," and grow up with the country, and in those days he meant to go to what we now know as the Middle West.

Now, many could say: "Go east and go down with the cities." I say that in jest, but actually it seems that the majority of the people of the great East, animated by fear, by emotionalism, or by selfish gains, are determined to accept lock, stock, and barrel the economic and social fallacies of the Old World, from which their ancestors once escaped and fought a great war so that they might be free from the shackles that bound down the peoples of Europe.

We in the Middle West no doubt have made mistakes and errors of judgment in the past, and, being human, may make other errors. But there is one thing you can say for us here in Ohio and over in Indiana and out in Illinois and across to Nebraska: We are Americans. We believe in America. We love America. We think of America and we think for America. And we think American.

And, thank God, we shall always hold it our duty—yes, our duty, and not a sin—to think of America first in solving our problems at home and abroad.

I cherish this opportunity to speak here tonight for another reason. I have always—and I say it humbly—felt a kinship to the man whose memory we honor. Like William McKinley, I was one of nine children. So I know how much he had to struggle in his early life. And I know how he achieved the ability to live in harmony and cooperation with those closely associated with him in life.

My father and William McKinley fought in some of the same campaigns of the Civil War. My first vote was cast for the election of William McKinley for President. And I feel our political beliefs and actions have been watered by the same middle western wellsprings of wholesome Americanism. The man in whose honor we meet is my idea of the type of American we must develop in our national political life if we are to meet successfully the challenges that face us today.

The story of William McKinley shows us how much life in America has changed and is changing. It is recorded of him that he "studied beyond his strength" and had to return home to rest. I just wonder how many school students today are studying beyond their strength and need to go home to prevent a nervous breakdown? But there still remains today only one way to success, and that is through the homely virtues of initiative, thrift, and character under a free government.

When the Civil War broke out in 1861 William McKinley enlisted as a private. He did not have the advantage of being a President's son, so, having no training, he could not enlist as a captain. So far as the record shows, he was not even known to President Lincoln at that time, and even if he had been it would have availed him nothing, for Lincoln never mixed the Army up with his personal political favorites. McKinley proved to be a good soldier in his own name. He was promoted to second lieutenant in 1862, to captain in 1864, and in 1865 was breveted major of volunteers for gallant and meritorious services.

The comparison is only a contrast to all who are familiar with the lives of the two men.

After the war, McKinley bent all his energy to the study of law and he was admitted to the bar at Warren, Ohio, in March 1867, beginning practice in Canton, Ohio, where he made his permanent home. He immediately associated himself with the Republican Party, taking part in his first political campaign on behalf of Ulysses S. Grant for President. In 1876 he was elected to the House of Representatives of the National Congress, and there he remained for 14 years, broken by only one defeat in 1882. In December 1880 he was appointed a member of the Ways and Means Committee succeeding James A. Garfield, who had been elected President the preceding month, and to whose friendship, as to that of Rutherford B. Hayes, McKinley owed much in his early years in Congress.

It was on April 16, 1890, that he introduced the tariff measure known commonly as the McKinley bill, which became law. The bill became as famous as its author in the campaign of 1896 when one of the slogans was,

"Bill McKinley and the McKinley bill." Under provisions of this bill reciprocal trade agreements were provided and reciprocal treaties later were made with Germany, Italy, France, and Belgium.

When McKinley campaigned for the presidency in 1896, he and his asscciates were called the advance agents of prosperity. They promised to the laboring man of America the "full dinner pail," which slogan has since become part of our political lore. It is interesting to note that the Democrats, who in those days sneered at the full dinner pail of McKinley, have adopted it and gone far beyond it today in their promises of jobs for everybody. There is a vast difference between McKinley's full dinner pail and Wallace's employment for all. He made his promise good without introducing a new ism in America and without destroying the solvency of the Treasury of the United States. The full dinner pail that McKinley's policy brought was filled by the honest and worthy toil of American laboring men and women through jobs in private industry made possible because those jobs were protected from the competition of cheap foreign labor. The Republicans in those days, as they would today, if given the opportunity, under a sound fiscal policy, made possible the expansion of private industry so that employment and pay rolls could rise.

The great industrial empire of the Calumet region of Indiana, and no doubt the industrial development of this northeastern Ohio area, had their inception in the policies advocated and established by William McKinley, and out of these policies developed the two most prosperous decades in American life—years of unprecedented comfort and peace at home.

The New Dealers today promise full employment for everybody at higher wages sustained by Government jobs. The dinner pail they offer is made with glittering promises and Government jobs if necessary. Their so-called gains are based on an ever mounting debt and ever spiraling prices. The New Dealers fail to tell you that they are only thinning the soup, that they will not give us more goods and services but will hamper opportunities and will do nothing more than divide up a diminishing production if their policies are followed.

They tried it for 8 years and still had 10,000,000 of unemployed in this land of promise. They promise you a fully rationed dinner pail. They promise jobs, but are not certain these jobs will be in private industry, where men can advance according to their abilities. They promise us the right to employment, but they fail to promise the right to work where we please, when we please, and at what we please.

William White, son of the great liberal of Emporia, who recently returned from Russia, got a look at the freedom of state controls in a land of full employment in peace or war. He points out that Russian workers are no more or less free than the inmates of the prison at Chillicothe. The prisoners, you know, have very little to worry about. True, they can't talk against the warden and his assistants. True, they have very few civil rights. But they are well fed and well clothed for the climate they are in. Russia, he maintains, is one vast prison, where a man cannot move unless he reports to a commissar—another word meaning bureaucrat—or cannot change jobs unless he gets state permission. The prisoners, at home and abroad, should serve as a sample of what the New Dealers have in mind for us. Sure, they will let us all have a minimum of good things, sometime in the future, if we will but give up all our freedoms to them now.

Of course these great forward-lookers who style themselves liberals, deny that they have any desire to sovietize America. As near as one can ascertain, all they propose is that free American citizens give over unto Government power to plan business, to control materials, to designate markets, to allocate labor, to regulate working conditions—all to be brought about by the huge spending power of the Government. Is that liberalism? Is that freedom? The plain truth is that they are liberals only in spending other people's money.

The people who preach these beautiful aims should be challenged at every opportunity to tell how they are going to accomplish these things within the framework of our Constitution and in view of the inherent wickedness of man. We know our rights under our Constitution as it is written today. We might have more freedom under other bills of right that have been discussed by flighty high officials, but before we take off into the stratosphere with no haven in sight, the politicians who promise us these things must show, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that we will not lose our present rights while trying to attain more liberties and more of life's goods. The promiser must prove to us that he will bring real freedom and not tyranny disguised under a new name.

On the day before he was fatally wounded by an assassin's bullet, shortly after he had been reelected President for the second time, William McKinley spoke at the Pan American Exposition in Buffalo, N. Y. He declared that henceforth the progress of nations must be through harmony and cooperation, and he maintained that the time had come for wide-reaching modifications in the tariff policy of the United States through commercial reciprocal agreements with other nations.

Like a great many other words and phrases, the term "reciprocal trade agreements" has been picked up by shrewd manipulators, used, or rather misused, repeatedly, and then made a cloak for practices that have not the slightest resemblance to the original.

The trade agreements which McKinley favored called for mutual agreements based on satisfactory exchanges of surplus manufactured goods or raw materials. They were businesslike agreements in which both parties to the contract benefited. The so-called reciprocal trade agreements of former Secretary Cordell Hull have been and are now nothing in the world but multilateral low tariff devices by means of which this administration has frittered away American wealth in a vain and foolhardy attempt to lift the other nations up to our economic level. We have not succeeded in lifting the other nations. We have succeeded in depleting our own resources to an alarming degree. They did not increase foreign trade; they did not prevent war. They did destroy thousands of jobs for American workingmen.

President McKinley supported the "good neighbor" policies which were inaugurated by his friend and coworker, Secretary of State James G. Blaine. Blaine believed in a real "good neighbor" policy, and put into effect practical measures designed to strengthen our ties with our neighbors to the south. He certainly never hinted he would agree with the present so-called good neighbor program in Latin America by means of which we have spent billions of dollars in the past several years and are spending hundreds of millions more in the vain effort to purchase good will. The American taxpayer still has a right to protest such waste of public funds, but protests seem to be in vain in this day when bills are still pushed through Congress with the battering ram of administration influence.

President McKinley sincerely believed that the peace and progress of Nations must come through harmony and cooperation in worthwhile objectives. That, too, was a major theme of his last public address at Buffalo. During his administration the United States entered into membership in the permanent court of arbitration known as The Hague Tribunal. The tyranny of Spain was driven from the Western Hemisphere. United States soldiers joined with the troops of other nations and invaded China to defend American lives and property during the Boxer uprising. Stable government was maintained in the Philippines and a colonial policy was established through which those down-trodden and exploited peoples advanced to a state which in twoscore years has brought them ready for independence. This policy established a new pattern for colonial administration under which lasting good will must be achieved.

True international cooperation has never been opposed by the Republican Party. Republicans for the most part have opposed, now oppose, and forever will oppose American participation in any agreements or cooperation with other nations on terms dictated by other nations without full consent and approval of the United States Congress.

William McKinley was thinking when he urged increased international cooperation—as you and I are thinking—of cooperation by mutual agreements, embracing liberty and justice for peoples of all nations, great and small, not on arbitrary decisions by any two or three powerful nations.

Finally, my fellow citizens, we cannot understand completely the greatness of William McKinley unless we pay reverent tribute to his true personal character. He had a deep and abiding faith in the guidance and wisdom of divine providence in the affairs of men and nations. He believed in the homely personal virtues—temperance, honesty, simple justice, the sanctity of the home and family—the virtues that made this Nation great and will make us great again. He took into the White House a high and noble attitude that increased the respect of the Nation for that house and that high office. He was never spiteful and vindictive with either political friend or foe. He did not know how to harbor a grudge. His administration was noted for the harmony among those charged with responsibility; harmony between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. When he died, the people had high faith in the spoken and written word of the White House, faith born of confidence in the personal and official integrity of the President.

Now, my fellow citizens, I have not come here tonight wholly for the fellowship that one gets in meeting with Republicans, alluring as that was. I have come primarily because I believe that the life of William McKinley is significant for us today. Therefore, my purpose in coming will not be fulfilled until I have expressed some clear, tangible and definite conclusions.

1. The Republican Party was born in the Middle West. Here it was nurtured and here it grew to its greatest strength. From out of these States came Lincoln, Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Harrison, McKinley, Taft, and Harding. Only one successful Republican candidate for the Presidency, Herbert Hoover, was originally elected from outside these States. The three other Republican Presidents from other States first came to the office as Vice Presidents to Midwestern Presidents (incidentally Ohio Presidents). In the recent election the Republican party polled new high records of votes for the past 16 years in the Middle West. We can well look here for successful leadership.

2. The American people need the pure Americanism of the Middle West. We must give to them the right to choose whether we shall continue under the philosophy which made America great, or shall accept the ideologies of theorists too often borrowed from foreign lands. The Republican Party cannot succeed by compromising with the philosophy of the New Dealers. We have been rebuked twice for doing that. We won our greatest majorities in the recent election in the States in which a clear-cut campaign was waged against the New Deal. We are not reactionary. It is the New Deal that would take us back to state control—back

to the tyrannies of the Old World that our fathers fought to be free from, back to the poverty of other nations that have failed to catch the spirit of America. You will understand, I hope, that I speak of real progress when I urge and pray that we in America go forward. We must set up the outlines for sound financing of the tremendous financial burden our people face. We must establish an economically sound and progressive program of continuing security for the aged, the infirm, and industrous. We must offer a program which defends the right of free enterprise and the unshackling of the business and industrial structure of the Nation; a program which will enable the individual to attain for himself a competence and to keep it. Upon these and many other principles which we already know we shall go forward. If we are to recover the virtues that made our great men and our great Nation, we must not look back.

3. We must begin this campaign at once, and every hour in the day, every day in the week and every week for the next 4 years we must labor unceasingly to arouse the American people to the danger that confronts them. Through glittering promises and vague generalities the people have been misled. We are in definite danger of losing our civil freedom, as so many unwittingly have lost their economic freedom, by depending upon the state and the state alone. A fourth term has put a tremendous strain upon our representative republican government and we must unceasingly warn the people of the danger confronting them, if huge selfish groups, big bureaucratic bunds, and mercenary machine bosses continue to storm the ramparts of free government. The people have been soothed with seductive promises that there is an easy way to liberty and security. Someone has said that "it is much easier to bamboozle people than it is to unbamboozle them." The older ones here tonight will recall the confusion that was in the minds of the people in the early days of the first McKinley campaign. There was Coin's financial school—a very appealing thesis that the way to prosperity was through an inflated currency, and every forum had its exponents of fantastic philosophies. However, the people were unbamboozled by the strenuous, persistent, and patriotic effort of loyal Americans in 1896, and they can be unbamboozled again if we make the issue plain and take our stand squarely upon it. Shall we go forward upon the American way, or shall we turn from this way to the path that leads to socialism, communism, and chaos?

LINCOLN AND COMMON PEOPLE

4. We must have faith in the American people. McKinley's greatness like that of Lincoln grew out of his confidence in the integrity and judgment of the common people. I believe that they will again respond when the truth is made known to them. Sons of Washington, of Jefferson, of Lincoln, of McKinley, and of Wilson will not for always permit their Constitution to be sabotaged by Executive decree, nor for long permit an administration to continue in power by the vote of selfish groups. I refuse to believe that America is going down that glittering road that promises so much, but ends in the same totalitarianism that came to the men who wanted full employment through economic control in Russia, Germany, and Italy. How terribly they were misled and what a price they paid. Americans are not like that!

And finally, when I think of the brave men who are fighting for us tonight, on the battle fronts from the forests of Germany to the streets of Manila, I know that America is not doomed—is not finished and will never be finished. They went out, mere boys, to do a job for us. And what a man's job it is they are doing! Only a little while ago they were riding bicycles down the streets or taking their best girls out for sodas, or playing on the high-school football team. Tonight they may be driving a Flying Fortress, costing a quarter of a million dollars, high in the stratosphere, carrying a message of doom to those who would enslave the souls of freemen. Tonight they are on the battle fronts of the world, serving notice that America is unbeaten and unbeatable. Let us rally to their cry for tomorrow: Keep America free!

Development of North Pacific Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, some time ago the then Vice President of the United States, Henry A. Wallace, was asked by the President to proceed to China and the Orient and parts of Soviet Asia for the purpose of making a general political and economic survey of the international situation in both areas and such facts as may pertain to the possibility of our international collaboration in the post-war world with these two great Asiatic powers.

Upon his return to this country, he made a report to the Nation in the form of a radio speech from Seattle on July 9, 1944.

The contents of that speech and the views expressed therein are of such importance to us of the Pacific coast that they should not go unheralded, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the speech may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. Wallace's broad and intelligent interpretation of our Pacific problems after that trip is of such nature as to justify any representative from the Pacific area to place the utmost confidence in his views and suggestions for the post-war economic cooperation and development of the area. Development of the Pacific rim requires vision and political courage.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since I left the skies above America 7 weeks ago I have visited two great countries—Soviet Asia and China. I have not stood upon the threshold of these countries like a stranger. I have been honored with the confidence of those who are working to shape their countries' destinies. I have been privileged to look behind the scenes.

Today I want to tell you something of my experiences of the past weeks.

In the first place, I am today more than ever an American. The more I examine other countries, the more convinced I am that the American way of life is the best way for us. In the second place, we can and should fit our own way of life to cooperation with other nations and other peoples whose way of life is different from ours but who need our cooperation quite as much as we need theirs, and are not only willing but eager to cooperate with us.

In the third place, I am convinced that a main area of new development after this war—new enterprise, new investment, new trade, new accomplishments—will be in the new world of the North Pacific and Eastern Asia.

This will give to our Pacific coast an importance greater than it has ever had before, and I am glad, returning from Soviet Asia and China, that Seattle is my port of entry. No city is more American in spirit and action than Seattle. But no city has shown itself more alive to the importance of our relations with other areas of the North Pacific. This spirit is well exemplified, not only in your active peace-time trade with Asia, but also in the University of Washington, where for several years you have worked on integrating the study of the languages, cultures, history, politics, and economics of the Pacific.

We shall need all our resources of knowledge and all our American readiness to think out new ways of tackling new problems when we have won the war in the Pacific.

The day will come when the Pacific will be cleared of Japs, and our boys, coming home from Tokyo, will land at Seattle, Portland, San Francisco and Los Angeles. Then we shall think more and more of our West as a link with the East of Asia. Those who say that East is East and West is West and that the two shall never meet are wrong. The East of Asia, both Chinese and Russian, is on the move in a way which is easy for any American to understand who sees these great areas at first-hand for himself. The rapid agricultural and industrial development of this great area means so much to the peace and prosperity of the post-war world that I am glad on my return to America to give my impressions of the manifest destiny of the West of America and the East of Asia.

Here in Northwest United States we were long held back by unfair freight rates and by failure to develop the power inherent in the great rivers. But more and more we are perceiving the importance of strengthening our West and especially our Northwest. Thanks to men like Norris, McNary, Bone and Roosevelt, the Northwest during the past 10 years has rapidly expanded. This expansion must continue to the limit of its agricultural, industrial and commercial potentialities. This includes Alaska, which has not yet begun to measure up to its possibilities. Our growth must be not merely in terms of ourselves, but also in terms of Asia. Vigorous two-way trade with Soviet Asia and China will greatly increase the population and prosperity of our Northwest.

All of this I knew in a theoretical way before going to Asia. After having seen as much of the industry and agriculture of east Asia as any American has seen in such a short time, I am more than ever convinced that we are entering upon what might be called the era of the Pacific. One characteristic of the Pacific era will be the building of great airports in parts of the world now very thinly inhabited. The extent to which the Russians have already developed runways and servicing for airplanes in east Asia amazed me. We landed at perhaps a dozen airports in Soviet Asia, the names of which not one in a thousand Americans ever heard. It is quite possible that for 15 or 20 years after this war the air route to Asia via Fairbanks, Alaska, will not be a money-making one. But it is also certain that our national future requires that we, in cooperation with Russia and the Chinese, maintain such a route.

Soviet Asia, during the past 15 years, has more than doubled in population. It is quite possible that the next 50 years will see a further increase of more than 30,000,000 people. I am convinced from what I saw of the Amur River region that in the southern part of that area there will be a great increase in population. Russia, as a result of her experience with this war, will certainly shift much of her industry east of the Urals. Most of the people who moved to Siberia with their factories will stay there.

Everywhere, from Magoden on the Pacific Ocean to Tashkent in central Asia, I found the Russian people producing to the limit

in the factory and on the farm. About two-thirds of the work on farms and one-third of the work in the factories is being done by women. In the factories everywhere I found American machinery, some purchased before the war but most of it obtained under lend-lease.

The way in which American industry through lend-lease has helped Russia to expand production in Soviet Asia has given me an increased admiration for both the United States and Russia.

I found American flour in the Soviet far east, American aluminum in Soviet airplane factories, American steel in truck and railway repair shops, American machine tools in shipbuilding yards, American compressors and electrical equipment on Soviet naval vessels, American electric shovels in open-cut coal mines, American core drills in copper mines of central Asia, and American trucks and planes performing strategic transportation functions in supplying remote bases. I found the people both in positions of management and at the work benches appreciative of the aid rendered by the United States and other Allies. While it is misleading to make any comparison between the huge Soviet industrial effort and the amount of lend-lease aid we have been able to give the U. S. S. R., I am convinced from what I saw in Siberia and central Asia that lend-lease has helped the Russians in many difficult and even critical situations on the industrial front, as well as on the military front.

On the rich irrigated land of Central Asia a strong cotton industry is being rapidly developed. At Tashkent, a city of a million people, I found experimental work in cotton which for its originality and practical effectiveness compares most favorably with the best in the United States. Modern industry was also flourishing at this ancient seat of Eastern culture.

From Tashkent, my farthest point west, we turned east to Alma Ata, my last stop before entering China. There I found not only excellent scientific work with apples, but also the beginnings of a moving picture industry which may make Alma Ata the Hollywood of Central Asia. Located at the foot of the Tien Shan—Heavenly Mountains—the city is blessed with a superb climate, almost as good as that of southern California.

China is totally different from Soviet Asia. While she is eager and anxious to enter the machine age, she has not yet been able to turn out, in either modern war materials or heavy goods, more than a small fraction of her needs. This situation should not long continue. China, with her 450,000,000 people and her great resources, should sooner or later produce a large portion of her requirements in the way of heavy and light industrial goods and also consumer goods. But to modernize her industry and train her people, China needs help. We have thousands of technical and businessmen in the United States who are able to furnish that help. But the businessmen in particular want to be sure of one thing. They want to be certain, before they lay the foundations and make the necessary outlay, that there is no foreseeable likelihood of conflict within China or between China and the U. S. S. R.

I am glad to say that I found among those with whom I talked an outspoken desire for good understanding; and personally I am convinced that China and the U. S. S. R. will take the necessary steps to insure continuing peace and to promote cultural and commercial exchanges among the nations of the Pacific to the benefit of all.

Asia is the center of the greatest land and population masses of the world. It is our business to be friends with both Russia and China and exchange with both Russia and China the goods and information which will raise the standard of living of all our peoples. I found the leaders in both Soviet Asia and China anxious for the most friendly relationship with the United States and expressing the utmost confidence in the leadership of President Roosevelt. Living standards can be raised. Causes of war can be removed. Failure to concern ourselves with problems of this sort after World War No. 1 is costing us today hundreds of billions of dollars and a terrible toll of human life.

To avoid a recurrence of the scourge of war, it is essential insofar as the Pacific Basin is concerned, that relations among the four principal powers in the Pacific—China, the Soviet Union, the British Commonwealth, and the United States—be cordial and collaborative.

Post-war stability in China is dependent upon economic reconstruction—agricultural as well as industrial—and reconstruction in China is dependent upon trade. It became clear to me during my visit to China that reconstruction is going to depend in large measure on imports from abroad. It will require technical and material assistance from us given on a businesslike basis.

We hear much about industrial reconstruction in China. I found the Chinese anxious for industrialization. China should be industrialized. But any industrialization of China must be based upon agricultural reconstruction—agrarian reform—because China is predominantly a nation of farmers. They are good farmers, as I observed during my stay there, but they need a break—a new deal.

China should make the necessary reform, but we can help by furnishing technicians and scientific information and, on the trade level, by selling the Chinese agricultural implements, fertilizers, and insecticides. Ultimately, of course, China should make these products for herself.

China should be self-sufficient in foods, but I can foresee that for many years the Chinese will continue to import food products from our West—wheat, flour, and fruits, for instance. In fact, it is not unreasonable to anticipate that, with an increase in the standard of living of China's consumers, a healthy exchange of food products peculiar to China and our West will develop and endure.

Northwest lumber should play an important part in the China of the future, as it has in the China of the past.

The industrialization of China will require machines and the materials of which machines are made. During recent years our West has been developing facilities for the production of steel and machinery. These will be in demand in China to produce the consumer goods which will be needed by the masses of east Asia.

Machines for land, sea, and air transportation will also be needed. Our West is in a particularly strategic position to produce for the east of Asia airships and sea ships, and the timber, steel, and aluminum of which they are made.

Trade is not a one-way affair; it is a swap, sometimes direct and sometimes complicated. It seems evident that credits will have to be employed to finance economic development in east Asia. But those credits must be repaid, and the most satisfactory way to repay is with goods. So, speaking particularly of China, we should plan to buy as well as to sell. Such typical commodities as wood oil, silks, tea, hides, and metals, which formed the bulk of China's exports to us before the war should form the basis of an expanding Chinese export to the United States after the war.

There is a great future for trade between east Asia and ourselves. To bring this to pass will take only a sympathetic understanding of each other's conditions and a far-sighted determination to make trade what it should be—a mutually beneficial transaction.

Day after tomorrow I hope to report to President Roosevelt certain definite facts which I am not at liberty to discuss here. But I can say that everywhere I went in eastern Asia I found rapid changes. Even in Mongolia, one of the most remote regions of the world, I found that the changes of the past 20 years had been very great. The United States, together with Russia and Great Britain, has a profound interest in the rapid, peaceful change of eastern Asia to the more fruitful use of her vast natural and human resources.

Here is a great new frontier to which Seattle can furnish much in the way of leadership. Our scientists must cooperate with Russian and Canadian scientists in learning how to lick the problem of the permanently frozen ground of Alaska, Canada, and the north of Siberia. We must exchange agricultural and weather information. I have found a splendid disposition on the part of Russian scientists to cooperate in agricultural matters and a frank readiness on the part of Chinese administrators to consider America's position as well as China's in discussing future economic cooperation. This gives me great hope for the long future.

The American businessman of tomorrow should have a broad world outlook. I have faith that American economic leadership will confer on the Pacific region a great material benefit and on the world a great blessing. The new frontier extends from Minneapolis via the coast States and Alaska through Siberia and China all the way to central Asia. Here are vast resources of minerals and manpower to be developed by democratic, peaceful methods—the methods not of exploitation, but on the contrary the more profitable method of creating higher living standards for hundreds of millions of people.

It was a wonderful trip. I am grateful to the President for giving me an opportunity to talk with people in every walk of life in Asia who are aiding us in winning this war. With victory we can continue to work together in peace. We want a higher standard of living in America. We want full production, jobs for our boys who come home, and peacetime jobs for those who are now employed. Trade with Russia and China will help keep the factories of America busy in the days that lie ahead. We are on our way.

Hebrew Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Peter H. Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, at Carnegie Hall, New York, on Monday evening, December 4, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The liberation of certain parts of Europe has resulted in a virtual abandonment of the clamor in this country for the rescue of the Hebrew people of Europe. The fact that parts of Europe are no longer under German occupation has overshadowed, in the minds of too many people, the fact that there are probably one million and a half Hebrews still in constant danger of horrible and useless German death.

I believe that it is our duty, and it is furthermore, feasible and possible at this stage of the war, to take necessary official steps which are sure to result in the slowing down of Germany's campaign of extermination and might very well result in a complete halt of that campaign.

After all, the Germans are not going to murder Hebrews in Europe right up to the very minute of the armistice. They are going to stop some time before that, and I believe that the time when they will stop, the military situation being what it is today, is entirely in the hands of the United Nations. I believe that steps could have been taken to bring this about yesterday. Steps can still be taken to bring it about in a couple of weeks. And once it is done the extermination of the Hebrews will cease.

It is not a question of speculation, it is a question of facts and logic. The Germans are still at war with the United Nations, but they have clearly declared they are not fighting now to crush and conquer the United Nations, they are fighting to be able to bargain for a settlement. Because of that, they have refrained, for quite some time now, from doing anything against the will of the United Nations which is not prescribed by the most conservative and accepted dictates of warfare.

The representatives of the International Red Cross in Washington told me that Germany's treatment of prisoners of war has improved to a degree where they are now given even very scarce and expensive medical supplies. What is necessary, therefore, is that the Germans are really convinced that the United Nations care about, and seriously oppose, their campaign of extermination.

In order to achieve that, some concrete things must be done. First of all, the Germans know well that while a United Nations War Commission is working in London, establishing procedure and gathering evidence for the punishment of war criminals, this commission officially refuses to regard the murder of Hebrews as a war crime. It is claimed that this is so because Germany is a sovereign State, as are its satellites, and sovereign states have the right to execute any of their nationals. Therefore, the murder of German or Hungarian Jews is not contrary to international law. It is a shocking situation. Most people are not aware of it and do not know it; nevertheless, it is there. But the Germans are aware of it; they know it very well. How can you expect them to stop their murderous activities against the Hebrews when they know this to be the official and practical situation and not the one so often expressed in meaningless speeches and statements?

Secondly, the Germans know too that the United Nations have issued repeated warnings that the use of poison gas against any member of the United Nations would result in retaliation by all. It has now been officially and repeatedly established that the Germans have used and are using poison gas in their campaign of extermination against the Hebrew people. Leading powers of the United Nations have officially confirmed such reports, and the fact that a warning and a threat have not been simultaneously issued to Germany that the Hebrews are one of the United Nations, again to the criminal German mind serves as an encouragement to continue with the murder.

The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation has repeatedly urged in official communications to the leading powers of the United Nations that an appropriate warning be given to Germany in connection with the use of poison gas. Such a warning is sure to bear results because the Germans cannot afford to ignore it. They have yielded in cases where the United Nations' position was not nearly so strong. General Bor, commander of the Polish underground, captured in Warsaw, and the underground forces in Czechoslovakia, are being treated by Germany as war prisoners, although they are by no means part of a regular army, nor do they wear uniforms. They are being treated as such because the United Nations demanded such treatment for them. Should the United Nations demand, in the same terms, that Hebrews in German-occupied territory be treated as prisoners of war, for that is what they are, the murders will cease.

What is specifically necessary is that the United Nations issue a joint declaration proclaiming that crimes committed against Hebrews in Europe, irrespective of the territory on which the crime was committed or the citizenship or lack of citizenship of the victim, be considered a war crime and punished as such, and that the governments of the United Nations instruct their representatives on the War Crimes Commission to see to it that this declaration is immediately put into effect.

The very core of the situation which bridges the question of the rescue of those still in German territory, and the salvation of those in liberated territories of Europe, is the realization that it is foul and evil to consider the loss of some 50 percent of an entire population as an episode, as a temporary occurrence which ought to be soon forgotten, and which does not dictate, does not compel, a fundamental change in the entire structure which brought it about.

And here I speak, first of all, to the so-called leaders of American Jews. For it is they who are making every effort to hold on to the present, to stick to the status quo at any price. The fact that the various and numerous Jewish factions and committees are continuing today, after all that has happened, to advocate, virtually in the same phraseology, the same proposals which they made 5 and 10 and 20 and 50 years ago, is the most shocking evidence of the depths and the dangers to which inertia and confusion lead.

Except for the proposals of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, there has been no new approach, no new formula, no new solution. There is only a feverish effort to preserve the status quo. Everything that the Jews did after the last war is being quoted again and held up as an example of what should be done after this war. Overlooked or forgotten is the horrible fact that under this system, and under these policies, and under these leaders, we have lost more lives than did the British Empire—to be more exact, about 40 times as many.

Should these Jewish leaders win, and should the murder of 3,000,000 Hebrews pass as an episode which did not merit the punishment of the perpetrators or bring forth a change in the life of the survivors, a pattern would be set for the solution of the problem of the Jewish people the world over. The moral would have been provided for all who care to watch and copy, for a perfect, speedy, and cheap way permanently to solve the problem.

That is why something new must come out, something positive, to the consternation of the perpetrators of the crime. This something is the emergence of a sovereign Hebrew nation. And there is no time to postpone this development until after the war. It may be too late. That is why we insist that the Hebrew nation is today, and of right ought to be, a member of the United Nations. That is why we insist today that all Hebrews in Europe be considered prisoners of war, and all crimes committed against them be considered war crimes.

That is why we demand that we, the nation against whom more war crimes have been committed than against all the other United Nations combined, should be given a seat on the War Crimes Commission to order and supervise the punishment of Germany for its crimes against Hebrews. That is why we demand that the Hebrew nation receive all the benefits and all the assistance of U. N. R. R. A. due it as a nation ravaged by war, and that is why we demand that our delegates sit as members of U. N. R. R. A. and as members of the International Committee on Refugees and participate in all United Nations councils and conferences in which the interests of our nationals are involved.

These are the demands of a people who have learned a lesson, who refuse to die, and who refuse to remain in a position which has led to death in the past and is sure to lead to it in the future. These are the demands for which the Hebrew committee stands and fights. These are the demands for which we are being persecuted, not by external enemies but by the dead hand of yesterday, which is the symbol of the misguided leadership of the Jews in this country.

What do they propose? Status quo ante? Pious hopes and wishful thinking. They are meeting now in Pittsburgh to select a delegation of American Jews to the peace conference. What peace conference? The one that took place yesterday or is taking place every day all over the world? What Jews? The American doughboy from Brooklyn fighting today for the liberation of Europe? Isn't he going to be represented by his American Government? And if they mean not to represent American Jews, who are Americans and do not need two representations, whom do they want to represent?

If they mean to represent us, the mutilated, wounded Hebrews of Europe, we appeal to them in the name of friendship and common sense to stop and think. Who are they, Americans with the security of the American Constitution, to attempt the impossible—to be the political spokesmen of a foreign nation—the Hebrew nation? For an American will never and can never be accepted by American statesmen as the political representative of a foreign entity. Rather, should not we Hebrews with no other state, no other government, no other representatives, survivors of Warsaw and Lublin, Bucharest and Budapest, united as one nation with the Hebrews of Palestine, come before the conscience of the United Nations, as indeed we are doing now, and say:

"Here we are, the Hebrews who refused to die. Here we are molded through the fires of German hell; here we are, people whose souls have never been enslaved and whose bodies too are now free. Are you going to treat us as equal human beings, accept us into your councils, recognize our statesmen? Or are you going to persist in treating us as second-rate human beings, unable to speak for themselves and unworthy of the right of self-determination? Are you going to do that and speak at the same time of the "four freedoms?" Are you going to be guilty of that and shatter the hopes of your children for a free and decent world, even as you and your fathers had it shattered once before? Here we are, 3,000,000 strong. Here we are in Palestine and on the roads leading to it, and we refuse to go back to ghetto Europe."

We, therefore, appeal tonight particularly to the leaders of the Jewish community in this country, to the men who had the tragic misfortune of being in leadership when the disaster overcame us, but whose consequences they cannot overlook. We say to them:

"You are Americans. You have a country and a flag and a government, and all the things we lack. You therefore should not, for your good and for ours, keep confusing yourselves with us and placing yourselves in our position, as our leaders, which you are not and which you cannot be. But you and we share not only a common faith and civilization, we share ancestry and heritage. And this should make you our true friends. But you must let us speak for ourselves and act for ourselves, and be called in our own name, and you befriend us, and help us, and champion us. But do not become our protectors and spokesmen, for then you humiliate and insult us, even as does the enemy; for then you proclaim us 'schutzjuden', even

as did the enemy. For you, too, view us as a passive object to be murdered at will by Hitler, to be ignored and sometimes pitied by Churchill and to be sincerely pitied and spoken for by Stephen Wise. In this lies the tragedy. This is the clue to the entire solution. The Hebrew is not an object. He is a human being whose only chance for survival lies in his ability to speak and act for himself. We are not protected Jews, nor are we stateless Jews, nor are we refugee Jews, nor German Jews, for we hate Germany. We merit being referred to by our own name—our own nationality—as all humans are referred to.

We are Hebrews, members of a Hebrew nation, whose territory is Palestine. And we, the Hebrew nation, must sit in the councils of nations. We must have recognition, or we can receive no consideration. And you, Stephen Wise, the American, and you, Chaim Weizmann, the Englishman, should be first to give us this recognition, to demand it for us. Unless we attain it our dead have died in vain, our survivors have survived in vain, only to face continued privation and torture, and to remain the chosen people—chosen for discrimination and abuse.

It is for this that we of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, with humility and reference, have undertaken the initiative and responsibility of proclaiming to the whole world that we are still here, that Germany's solution did not work, that to the contrary it has speeded the renascence of our nation.

We consider ourselves one of the United Nations. From our headquarters in Washington waves the Hebrew flag, as the flags of all other nations wave over roofs of their representatives in this leading world capital. To the various governments go constantly our communications concerning all problems involving Hebrew nationals. We Hebrews have thus taken the initiative without which no nation has ever been liberated. The rest is now up to the others. It lies now with the governments of the United Nations which, through fulfillment of our just demands, can bring to an end this, the greatest scandal of history.

I am happy to say that in the time that has elapsed since first we raised the Hebrew flag in Washington, experience and considerable progress have proven not only the justice but the eminent practicability of our solution.

We rely upon the understanding and support of the magnificent American people. The time is now at hand for the full and dignified restoration of the ancient Hebrew nation as a full-fledged member amongst the republics of the world.

With your help it shall be done.

Pending Water-Disposal Treaty With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Inter-American Unity," written by Sumner Welles and dealing with the pending Mexican treaty.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTER-AMERICAN UNITY

(By Sumner Wells)

PENDING MEXICAN TREATY

The dramatic progress in our march toward victory in Europe and in the Far East, the meeting of the heads of the three major powers, and the series of political crises in Europe have all engrossed public thought in this country to the exclusion of problems which have to do with the course of events in the New World.

It is singularly unfortunate that that should be the fact at this moment. The existence of a solid inter-American front was never more important to the United States than it is at this time, and inter-American unity has not for many years been more gravely threatened. The number of vital questions in the field of inter-American relations which are coming up for immediate decision is very large. Few Americans seem to appreciate realistically how greatly United States interests are going to be affected in the future by the way in which these questions are now determined.

Outstanding among such questions is the pending treaty between the United States and Mexico, providing for the distribution between the two countries of the waters of the Rio Grande and Colorado Rivers, now under consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee of our Senate.

If the present treaty as negotiated is ratified by both Governments future relations between Mexicans and Americans will be free from one of the greatest causes for friction and bad feeling which can exist between peoples whose very existence depends upon irrigation and where the water supply is severely limited. For in this case unless the distribution of water for irrigation purposes is based upon equity, and regulated by an intergovernmental authority rather than by local authorities, international controversies will become inevitable. Under existing conditions the grounds for such controversies between Mexico and the United States will constantly increase because of the growing demands for additional water for irrigation on both sides of the international boundary as a consequence of the rapid development of those agricultural regions.

The treaty was negotiated while there was still time to find an agreement based on fair treatment to all existing interests for the purpose of preventing an insuperable obstacle to good relations between Mexico and the United States in the years to come.

The provisions of the treaty which provide for the distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande between the citizens of Texas and those of Mexico are welcomed by both sides.

It is only with regard to the articles in the treaty which cover the distribution of the Colorado River waters that trouble has developed. The opposition comes solely from the State of California.

For the first time in history, so far as I can learn, a State has appropriated funds to block the ratification of a treaty negotiated by the Federal Government. The California legislature has appropriated $75,000 for this purpose.

California alleges that no chance was given interested persons in that State to make known their views before the treaty was negotiated.

That charge is patently absurd.

The Committee of Fourteen—composed of two representatives of each one of the seven States forming the Colorado River Compact—was consulted by the Department of State before any decision was even reached by the Department that a treaty could be negotiated. The committee at that time agreed to cooperate fully with the State Department in formulating acceptable bases for the treaty to be negotiated with Mexico. Representatives of California were present at every one of a series of meetings which took place over a period of more than 2 years at which these bases were discussed. Finally, a formula for the water treaty was approved by Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah. Nevada abstained from approval or disapproval. Only California opposed the formula. But her representatives had taken every opportunity throughout that long discussion of making the views of the California interests fully known.

The California representatives are charging that an excessive amount of water will be guaranteed to Mexico by the treaty.

It should be emphasized that under the terms of the seven-State Colorado River Compact, California receives annually 4,400,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River. The water required by the Imperial irrigation district in California is included within this amount. But California interests have already entered into contracts for almost a million acre-feet beyond the total allotted to California by the compact.

The 1,500,000 acre-feet of water allocated to Mexico by the treaty are less than Mexico's use of water in 1943 and in 1944 by some 300,000 acre-feet.

If the treaty is not ratified, Mexico can, of course, continue to increase her use of water, particularly in the rich Mexicali Valley, which is a continuation, on the Mexican side, of the Imperial Valley. At the present time there is an annual excess of some 8,000,000 acre-feet of water flowing into Mexico from the Colorado River. Mexico has every right to put this water to beneficial use. Under international law, the beneficial uses of water which a downstream country has built up cannot be cut down by new uses created at a later date by the upstream country. Should California interests later attempt to divert the amount of water required by such beneficial use within Mexico, and should Mexico then demand arbitration of this question, the United States is pledged by the Pan American Arbitration Treaty of 1929 to accede to such a demand. In that event, the weight of established law would be wholly on the side of Mexico.

It can readily be foreseen what bitterness of feeling will be aroused in both Mexico and the United States if the treaty is rejected and a condition of affairs is allowed to develop where Mexico legitimately puts to beneficial use the present overflow, while California interests continue to enter into contracts for additional water.

The pending treaty is an example of constructive and preventive statesmanship on the part of both governments involved.

Its ratification will not only remove a constantly increasing threat to friendly relations between Mexico and the United States but it will provide assurance as to the permanence of their water rights to the hundreds of thousands of farmers on both sides of the boundary. It will also have a profoundly helpful effect in strengthening confidence throughout the other Americas—at a moment when it is much needed—in the consistency of the policy of the Government of the United States to deal fairly and justly with all of its American neighbors.

Lincoln Day Dinner Address by Joseph H. Kaszubowski, President of the Coordinating Committee of the American-Polish Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD an extremely thought-provoking address delivered by Joseph H. Kaszubowski, president of the Coordinating Committee of the American-Polish Associations in the East, at the Lincoln Day dinner, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on February 12, 1945. On that occasion I was privileged to be a guest with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We meet tonight to celebrate the birthdays of two immortal heroes in the age-old fight for freedom—Abraham Lincoln and Thaddeus Kosciusko. We meet at a time when the fate of Poland and America, the future of freedom everywhere, is still in the balance. A great conference is taking place where diplomatic decisions are being made, as fateful as any of the great batlefields of this war. At that conference our political leaders must stand as firmly and steadfastly as our soldiers. This is a time when we must renew our faith in the ideals which united Lincoln and Kosciusko and which still unite the two countries, Poland and America, which they loved.

Unlike Lincoln, Kosciusko had to fight slavery not merely within his own country. His country itself was enslaved. So he fought in Poland when he could, and when he could not, he fought abroad. When other freedom-loving countries would not or could not help to free Poland, Poles like Kosciusko fought to help them.

In doing this Kosciusko and Pulaski were the forerunners of the Polish Army of today which fought first in Poland, then in France, and later still in the Battle of Britain. It has kept fighting ever since, inside Poland and out, on most of the bloodiest battlefields of this war. Many of those who escaped abroad had to travel halfway around the world before they could begin to fight their way back to Poland. But in this great odyssey their single aim remains, like that of Ulysses, to return to their homeland. And yet today, despite all the heroism they showed and the blood they shed from Tobruk, to Cassino, to Breda, the day of their return seems as far away as ever. When we remember the services of Kosciusko in bygone days, let us remember also the services of those Poles today who followed his example.

The aim of Kosciusko like others who followed in his footsteps was to return to Poland, but only to a Poland that was truly free. In the meantime they served humanity and especially America. Poland's martyrdom gave them an understanding and a love for the universal principle of liberty not only in Poland but elsewhere.

Because of this Kosciusko realized long ahead of his time that the institution of slavery was a deadly enemy of America's freedom. Like Lincoln, he knew that the slavery of some threatened the liberty of all. That is the lesson we must remember today.

Lincoln said that a nation cannot exist half slave and half free. We who live in an age of rocket bombs and rocket planes know that what Lincoln said of America is now true of the world. We have learned that peace is indivisible, that justice is indivisible, and Kosciusko, with his prophetic soul, knew these truths 150 years ago which we are painfully learning today.

Thomas Jefferson called Kosciusko the "purest son of liberty." When he left America for the last time to fight, and eventually to die, for Poland, Kosciusko left all his property to free slaves in America. His letter to Jefferson read:

"I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, being just on my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson, to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own or any others, and giving them liberty in my name; in giving them an education in trade or otherwise; in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality, which may make them good neighbors, good fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, in their duty as citizens; teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country, of the good order of society, and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful.

"FIFTH DAY OF MAY 1798.

"T. KOSCIUSKO."

The millions of Poles who followed Kosciusko to America have been inspired by his example.

There was never any conflict between our love for the land of our forefathers and our love for America, the land of our own opportunity and of our children's future. American Poles paid their debt to America not only by their sweat but by their blood, in the front ranks in two world wars. The fact that in both wars Polish freedom was linked with the triumph of America's cause gave us a double motive to fight for America's victory, not only in war but in peace.

Today American Poles with millions of other Americans are deeply concerned. Our victories mount, but there is increasing fear that the true victory for which America fights is being lost. America has no selfish ambitions. Like Poland, we were forced into this war by aggression. Our war aim has been not only to repulse this particular attack of Germany and Japan but to end the danger of aggression for all time. We know the world has grown too small for America to isolate herself from future wars. An international organization must be set up, but it can only be established on the basis of justice, for America cannot promise to defend frontiers which sow the seeds of future wars. That is why the Atlantic Charter was more than expression of noble ideals, more than a promise by Britain and America to the enslaved peoples. It is the only kind of peace which offers safety to ourselves.

That is why not only our honor but our security is involved in the fulfillment of the Atlantic Charter. The President has said that the aims of the Charter are as valid today as on the day it was written, and America, herself, is living up to its principles. For where we are the liberating power, as in the Philippines, all goes well. There our triumph means what America and the world believed it would mean everywhere. Although the Philippines were not fully independent before the war, America is now not only liberating them from the Japanese; we are giving them a greater independence than they had ever known.

But when we turn to Poland, the situation is tragically different. Poland was independent before the war. Poland was the first to refuse to compromise with Hitler. Poland suffered under the Nazi yoke longer and more terribly than any other nation. And yet the "liberation of Poland" now brings not only the loss of nearly half the country which it set out to defend, but the loss of its true independence under the guise of a foreign puppet government.

When this proposal was first presented to Premier Mikolajczyk, he would have said, if he were an American—"This is where we came in." Because this is precisely the same proposition which was presented in 1938 and 1939 to Poland by Hitler. The only difference is that Hitler's offer was more generous to Poland. According to testimony of French diplomatic observers contained in the official French Yellow Book, Hitler made three proposals to the Polish Government, looking toward combined action against Russia both in 1938 and 1939. The basis of the German proposal was that former German regions be returned to the Reich and that Poland be compensated by additional territory from the Soviet Union—a proposal exactly like Stalin's, but in reverse. As the French Yellow Book shows, Poland refused these offers. If Poland had accepted, the whole course of the war would have been different. Russia would have been attacked 2 years earlier and she would have succumbed.

Exactly the same parallel applies to Britain. Here is what a British Labor Member of Parliament, Richard Stokes, said on January 31:

"I remember that in June 1939 we sent a mission to Russia to arrive at a treaty with Russia against Germany. My belief is this * * * that, in effect, the Russians said to us 'let us have Poland to the Curzon line, and the Baltic provinces, and we will have an alliance with you.' We said 'no,' and I personally think we were quite right. There was no alliance and what happens next? Off go the Germans to Moscow and Von Ribbentrop is asked the same question. He says 'yes, not only may you have the Baltic provinces but as much as you want of Poland on the east.' * * * Now, where do we find ourselves? We find ourselves fighting to give Russia precisely those territories which, had we allowed her to have them in 1939, would have prevented the outbreak of war at all. Is there an answer to that?"

This tragic irony is underlined in a statement this week in the newspaper of the Polish Army, published in London, which corresponds to the Stars and Stripes in the American Army. This is the paper which speaks for 150,000 Poles now fighting in the front rank of the Allied armies. Many of them started to fight in Poland. They escaped to fight in Britain, Africa, and the Continent of Europe. And today they speak of what this Russian liberation means to Poland. They speak with restraint, but their words should go to the heart of every American:

"We are enjoying, of course, the defeat of the Germans and the German flight from Poland. But we don't feel the same joy which overwhelmed crowds of people in Belgium, France, and Holland, after the liberation of their countries by the British and Americans. They have regained their freedom—we have not. We don't mean that the Red Army is not acting according to the laws of war. We realize that no one else but the Red Army has chased the Germans from Poland. But we mean by that the fact that a complete foreign body has been established in our country and given power to execute its will.

"What is the gain for us if Governor Frank is replaced by another gentleman who is a strange figure in Polish political life, who lived and worked in a foreign country and for a foreign country who treated Poland as his enemy No. 1? What is in it for us if the German authorities are replaced by a new form of government which does not allow us to express our opinions, which does not recognize a freedom of speech and does not protect the population from freedom from fear by giving orders to liquidate anyone who opposes the new regime by words or deeds?"

So speaks the Polish Army abroad, and the most remarkable thing about these words is their moderation. What more they might have said is conveyed by an editorial from the British magazine Time and Tide, which reported on January 27:

"There is one cause for the acute anxiety of the Poles, which must be a matter of immediate and general concern—the fate of the Polish home army after its 5 years of resolute fighting against German occupation. These men, who are recognized by the British and American Governments as an allied belligerent force with full combatant status, are being terrorized and hounded as traitors throughout liberated Poland. The commission set up last August in Lublin to investigate anti-Soviet activities in Poland has accepted the mere fact of membership in the home army (or service in the Polish under-

ground state) as proof of anti-Soviet activities.

"Reports of home army units being arrested and disarmed and their members shot or deported have grown too numerous and too detailed to be discounted. One of the most callous cases was the incarceration of 200 officers and noncommissioned officers (subsequently deported to Russia) and over 2,000 men of the Polish home army in the infamous former German concentration camp at Majdanek. Even in September, in an area under the administration of the Lublin Committee, there were five concentration camps for Poles. Since the committee took upon itself the status of a provisional government, statements from Lublin have made it painfully clear that a policy of extermination of the home army is to be relentlessly pursued."

Nor is this all. On December 5 the United Press reported from Moscow: "Exchange of population between the Soviet Union and Poland is proceeding satisfactorily and according to plan."

This is no temporary war measure, for the effect of these deportations may never be undone. They must be stopped now or never. The exiled Poles must be returned now or they never will return. With heavy hearts we recall that of the million and a half Poles deported by Russia during the Hitler-Stalin pact, only one-tenth were ever recovered, even when Russia had friendly relations with the Polish Government. Hundreds of thousands of them died of hardship.

What this amounts to is this: In Kosciusko's day Poles were openly exiled to Siberia. Today it is called "exchange of population."

Is it possible that America has not enough influence with her allies to end such open violations of the Atlant Charter as this? That is the question which the world is waiting to hear answered by the conference of the Allied leaders.

So far our Government has not even made an open protest. Worse still, Ralph Parker reported in the New York Times 3 weeks ago that the Lublin soldiers who carry out these very acts are armed with American lend-lease equipment.

We have financed and supplied our Russian allies on the most lavish scale in history, while at the same time they have pursued policies which we were pledged in honor to oppose. We have heard much about the necessity for compromise to preserve Allied unity, but so far the compromise has all been on our side. Allied unity is our goal. But there can be no unity without equality of reciprocity.

We are told that it spreads disunity if we criticize our allies when they violate the Charter. But we reply that it is not the criticism but the violations of the Charter which destroy unity. Unity cannot be preserved by pretense or by censorship. It can only be based on common principles, and those principles have already been expressed and pledged in the Atlantic Charter.

The Atlantic Charter is more than a statement of vague and remote objectives. It is a statement of rules or principles, an expression of moral law like the Ten Commandments. We cannot tacitly approve a gross violation of these rules and still claim to be faithful to the objectives of the Charter

The Charter promises all people "the right to a government of their own choosing," and if any people on earth has earned that right, it is the Polish people. The Charter further promises that all peoples should be immune from territorial changes "that do not accord with the freely expressed opinions of the people concerned," and if any people on earth should be so immune, it is the Polish people.

In his time Kosciusko also was advised to compromise by the realists, the people who believe that peace can only be preserved by power politics. The Congress of Vienna set up the political power and spheres of influence of his day. They called it the Holy Alliance. Kosciusko was invited to Vienna, offered the post of viceroy of Poland by Czar Paul of Russia. The Czar promised to make liberal reforms if Kosciusko would consent to surrender his demand for full Polish freedom. But Kosciusko refused to be the Bierut of his day. The Polish people who survived a living death for 150 years will never compromise. The Polish people will return the same answer today.

In his last message to Congress the President promised to use every ounce of America's power to fulfill the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which embody America's war aims. The American people hope with all their hearts that the President will be successful. But he will not succeed if any of the fundamental issues of principle are abandoned. There must be no more glossing over, no more secret diplomacy, no more pretense of allied unity where it does not exist. We must know where we stand. Either the promises to Poland are to be kept or Poland is to be sacrified on the altar of power politics.

The Polish Government has called for a joint Allied occupation and supervision of liberated Poland until free elections can be held, but it must not be the kind of joint action we have seen in Bulgaria and Rumania. It must be real Allied supervision throughout the whole of Poland. There must be as many British and Americans in Poland as there are Russians, or joir t action would be a mockery. Moreover, any election would be a mockery unless the millions of Poles deported both to Germany and Russia are returned before such an election is held.

As for the proposal to compensate Poland by moving the whole nation hundreds of miles to the west, we may say that Poland is not a nation of nomads but a people rooted in the soil they love, the soil they have defended with their blood.

When General Pershing landed in France during the last war to save her from the invader, he uttered these immortal words: "Lafayette we are here." Thus we repaid our debt to France. But the debt to Poland and Kosciusko is still unpaid. We pay him eloquent tributes, it is true, but he would rather have us do something for his country. As our Under Secretary of State, Joseph Grew, has said:

"His deeds of valor in fighting for a cause which he was great enough to take as his own are written deep in the annals of history; but the true character of the man who a century and a half ago fought for the ideals which have inspired and will ever inspire the progress of Poland and the United States, is enshrined in the hearts of all of us. And it is from our hearts that the call goes forth in salutation from our people to the people of Poland—Kosciusko lives."

Yes, Kosciusko's spirit does live. It was present in the first battle of Warsaw, in the immortal struggle in the Jewish ghetto, and in the legendary exploits of General Bor's home army, when they fought for 2 months against the might of the Nazi Army, abandoned and alone. Kosciusko's spirit lives and it says to us Americans: "Where are you? We are waiting."

Why Does Hitler Hang On?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why Does Hitler Hang On?" by H. V. Kaltenborn, published in the February 1945, issue of The Rotarian.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DOES HITLER HANG ON?—THE BLITZKRIEG IS NOW IN REVERSE AND ALLIED ARMIES ARE CONVERGING ON THE REICH, BUT NAZIS BATTLE ON—WHY?—WHEN WILL THE CRACK-UP COME?—A DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN RADIO COMMENTATOR OFFERS HIS ANSWERS TO THOSE QUESTIONS

(By H. V. Kaltenborn)

Why does Hitler continue the struggle in the face of certain defeat? What persuades the Nazi hierarchy and the highly competent leaders of the German army to sacrifice what little remains of German manpower and German resources to a lost cause? If they are, as we say, already planning the next war, why do they persist in wasting effort on a war that is already lost?

The answer is simple. German leaders are not at all sure that the war is irrevocably lost. They count on dissension among the Allies. They exaggerate the power of their new weapons. Moreover, they hope that if they can even prolong the war well into 1945, they will get better terms than unconditional surrender.

During the closing weeks of 1944, I visited the most important military fronts in Italy, France, Germany, Belgium, and Holland. I talked with many Government officials, diplomats, and military leaders in Rome, Paris, Brussels, and London. I interviewed German prisoners and civilians. Above all, I talked with the men who are fighting the war in the front lines. My dominant impression is that Germany is still stronger than seems possible when the war is viewed from the American side of the Atlantic.

The Nazi war machine may collapse. The failure of the German offensive in December produced strains which may shorten the war. But this major effort also taught us that we underestimated what remains of German air power, tank power, and supply power. We continue to destroy Germany's war industry, but she always seems to have enough left to put up a good fight on three fronts.

Are Hitler's hopes altogether vain? What about his new V-bombs and his jet-propelled airplanes? Can they help him get better terms than unconditional surrender? Is there any chance that he can capitalize on the developing differences between the United States, on the one hand, and Britain and Russia, on the other? An examination of these questions should tell us why Hitler fights on.

The V-bombs are a terrible war weapon. With unlimited opportunity to make them and launch them, Hitler could both terrorize and weaken his enemies. I had a chance to study the effectiveness of the V-2, for which there is yet no answer. It gives no warning of its approach and destroys an enormous area. The V-1 or buzz bomb is equally deadly, but it cannot travel so far because it flies more slowly at a lower altitude, it can be intercepted. The proportion that reaches intended targets is steadily declining. German jet fighters are faster than any Allied planes, but they need more time to reach maximum speed.

During the first weeks the jet fighters were used, they accomplished little. The German pilots were still experimenting and had not worked out the best way to utilize the extraordinary speed of which these planes are capable. They were also unable to remain in the air for any length of time. But Allied aviators are convinced that the jet plane will play a highly important role in aviation. They hope, before long, to surprise the enemy with a better jet plane than the Germans have produced.

No new weapon, no matter how effective, is likely to win a war. It can prolong a war or make war more destructive, but neither the V-bombs nor the jet planes have given Hitler the illusion that he is going to win. They have boosted home morale by giving Dr. Goebbels a good talking point. Thus they have made it easier to persuade the German people to go on fighting.

Hitler's hope that Russia, Britain, and the United States might begin to pursue their separate interests if the war continued into 1945 has been justified by events. Despite continued calls from Britain and the United States for a post-election meeting of Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill, no such meeting had been announced at the turn of the year. Much has been lost by this postponement.

At Dumbarton Oaks, Russia reserved the right to veto joint action against an aggressor. Yet how can there be collective security unless each nation agrees in advance to abide by the collective decision of all other nations? The whole principle of international cooperation depends upon the willingness of every nation to surrender the right to wage aggressive war. In the prewar period the Soviet Union made substantial contributions to the League of Nations and its principles. But since Russian military power has swept the Germans out of Russia, the Balkans, and the Baltic States, the Soviet Union has pursued an independent policy with regard to all her neighbor countries. This policy is one of power politics without the slightest regard for the rights of weaker peoples.

In an effort to protect her own position as a world power, Great Britain has revived imperial ambitions. Winston Churchill still thinks of the Mediterranean route to the Far East as the life line of British Empire. His sense of history and his conservative background combine to remind him that the British have always opposed Russia's entry into the Mediterranean. In Afghanistan, in Persia, in Turkey, and in the Balkans, Russian and British interests have long fought one another. They are at war today even though the first interest of both countries is the defeat of Germany. The Churchill government seems to want monarchy for Spain, Italy, Greece, and Yugoslavia, probably because the monarchy is a convenient rallying point for the conservative forces of law and order. It is a symbol which has powerful appeal to a distracted people seeking an escape from communism.

Generally speaking, I found United States diplomatic and military leaders abroad on the side of the British. They have worked closely with British leaders in crisis situations. They share their dislike of a Communist solution. Most of them doubt that Greece or Italy will be ready for democratic government at the end of the war. The choice, they feel, lies between a Communistic Europe dominated by Russia and a much more conservative Europe in which Great Britain, France, the Vatican, the United States, and other powers will continue to exercise a moderating influence. They would welcome Russian cooperation. They fear Russian domination. All these things Hitler knows. They help to explain his belief that, given time, they might affect the conduct of the war. They make the men around Hitler feel that on the diplomatic and political war fronts time is now on their side.

"Unconditional surrender" is, in the opinion of most military leaders, the Allies' greatest propaganda mistake of the war. Whatever it did to fortify Allied home morale, it did much more to stiffen German morale. It also pointed up the separate policies of the Big Three, since the Russians never approved the Casablanca dictum and have never used it. Their propaganda has always distinguished between Nazis and other Germans and has never threatened to destroy Germany. The Russians talk soft, but there is every prospect that they will act hard. Americans talk hard, but there is every prospect that they will act soft.

In essence, there is no such thing as unconditional surrender. No leader and no group of leaders will be in a position at the end of this war to guarantee the unconditional surrender of 70,000,000 Germans. That surrender cannot be guaranteed by Allied military government. Unless and until voluntary cooperation is secured from a German Government which has the obedience of the German people, the Allies must enforce the terms of surrender on 70,000,000 Germans by the use of military power.

What we really mean by "unconditional surrender" refers only to the Nazi hierarchy and to the military power they have created. We are quite willing to work with the German people insofar as they are willing to work with us. I saw that for myself in Aachen, the first big German city which the Allies took over. Military administrators did little more than supervise. Germans operated the stores, the banks, the municipal services, even the police department. They did it willingly and efficiently. They will run the rest of Germany for the Allies in the same way.

In order to offset the foolish talk of unconditional surrender, a German newspaper in German, published under General Eisenhower's supervision, tells Germans what the Allies expect to do for them. This newspaper features the promise to treat Germans fairly, to pay them going wages, to see that they are fed, to re-create their labor unions. It counters these promises with what continues to happen to them under the Nazi regime. The purpose of this newspaper is not to coddle the Germans, but to save lives by shortening the war.

Hitler hangs on, but not for long. I returned from Europe convinced that there is little chance to end the war before another summer is under way. This year will certainly see the end of war in Europe. But it will not see true peace begin. Unless we realize that military victory is a beginning and not an end, we shall repeat our failures of the twenties. We can frown on both fascism and communism; by the judicious use of food and fuel, of gold and goods, we can help defeat the extremist and advance the cause of the middle way. But it will take infinite patience and tolerance. Those who shout from a safe distance against admitted evils will be less helpful than those who applaud each hesitant step in the right direction. Perfectionists can be the curse of post-war Europe.

Germany continues to fight now because she sees growing differences among the Allies. Unless these differences are healed, even a defeated Germany can regain the balance of power.

Mexican Water-Disposal Treaty Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Treaty Dispute," published in the Washington Post of February 13, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREATY DISPUTE

Governor Warren's objection, in California's name, to senatorial ratification of the waterway treaty with Mexico already has had some unpleasant repercussions. A movement has been started in Mexico to deny California the migrant Mexican workers who help to harvest California's crops. A cloud has been cast over the American Foreign Ministers' Conference which opens in Mexico City on February 21. This treaty, in Latin-American estimation, is the key to the realities of our professions as a good neighbor.

Of course, California's opposition to the treaty, which is now under consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is not a new thing. This opposition should likewise be understandable in a country like Mexico, which is equally thirsty for water. At the same time California's attitude is alone among all the seven Colorado Basin States. Solitary among them California voted against the formula upon which the treaty is based, even though California produces not a single drop of the Colorado. In the circumstances California's opposition could not hold up the diplomatic negotiations with Mexico. For international reasons a treaty was overdue, since the issue has plagued Mexican-American relations for years. For national reasons, also, the Mexican right needed definition. Further development of Colorado River water, with the determination of the Mexican claim, can proceed without let or hindrance from Mexico.

The Californians do not challenge either the need of defining Mexico's claim or the desirability of a treaty. It is this treaty, as Governor Warren said, that the Californians oppose. Under it the Mexicans are pledged to have delivered to their country 1,500,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River, the delta of which is situated in Mexican territory. The Californians say that this is double the sum of water that Mexico is entitled to. The figure is the amount that Mexico got by normal flow prior to the building of Boulder Dam, which, by regulating the Colorado, benefited Mexico as well as the United States, in that Mexico was saved from floods and got its water desilted. Since the construction of the dams Mexican usage of Colorado water has increased. In 1943 Mexico was using well over a million acre-feet of Colorado water. In this, as in most other aspects of the dispute, engineering testimony differs: antitreaty experts say 1.1 million acre-feet, protreaty experts, 1.8. But a compromise figure would show that Mexica is now using about the same quantity of Colorado water as is guaranteed—subject, however, to a sliding scale in case of drought—in the disputed treaty. Moreover, half or more of the promised 1.5 would be return flow. This is water that has already been put to use within California and has seeped back into the river or the canals on the way to Mexico. It is estimated, therefore, that the allocation to Mexico would be 3 or 4 percent of the primary flow of the Colorado River.

It would seem to be this figure that any arbitration tribunal would have to take into account in case of a rejection of a treaty. For international law, which in this matter is based on treaty precedents, requires the protection of existing uses. That in the event of nonratification Mexico would submit the case to arbitration is undeniable, since there is not the slightest prospect of getting a better treaty out of Mexico. Mexico happens to be every whit as thirsty for water as California. The Imperial Valley, the flowering of which is California's main concern in this treaty dispute, becomes the Mexicali Valley on the other side of the frontier, and Mexico intends to exploit it. Nor could this country back out of arbitration. We would be committed to acceptance of arbitration by our signature of the Pan-American Arbitration Treaty of 1929.

In the meantime Mexican usage of Colorado water in anticipation of arbitration

would continue to increase. There is reason to believe that last year the figure was a little less, but very little less, than it was in 1943, say, around the 1.5 million acre-feet guaranteed under this treaty. Much more is available for Mexican use. For, as the downstream country, the waste flowing into the Gulf of California passes through Mexican territory, and this is between 8 and 9 million acre-feet. It is thus difficult to see how the United States could get a better deal at arbitration than is written into the new treaty. On the contrary, the prospect is that the deal would be worse. For the Colorado division in this treaty is tied up with a division of the Rio Grande waters which decidedly inures to United States advantage.

We find nothing in the record to sustain the charge that the treaty sells California down the river. Nor can we find that California's legitimate hopes for the future are in danger. With these, of course, the entire Nation is in sympathy. Californian development is American development, and the post-war years will pose a problem in furnishing employment for all our population which calls for the maximum use of all our resources. However, California already gets one-third of the waters of the Colorado and is not now using more than a half of that third. That is an indication that this treaty will not stifle the development of Southern California in the conceivable future. Indeed, it has been shown that California itself doesn't consider itself in danger. The evidence has been furnished to the State Department and presented in evidence before the Senate committee. Actually California offered itself to supply Mexican needs out of its own facilities, but, of course, at a price. The offer was made by the Imperial irrigation district of California.

It is in the material no less than in the moral interests of the country that the treaty be ratified with minimum delay. The State Department appears to have gone the limit in consulting all the interests concerned in the hope that at this delicate stage of our continental relations there would be the minimum of argument.

A White Cross and a Dog Tag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the Brigham Young University, at Provo, Utah, is one of the outstanding universities of the West. The university newspaper is known as the Y News. In its issue of January 11, 1945, I find a letter, under the heading "A White Cross and a Dog Tag," written by Sgt. Claron L. Oakley, who is now somewhere on the western front in France, and who is a former student of this great university. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Sergeant Oakley be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WHITE CROSS AND A DOG TAG

On the windswept shores of Normandy, stretched far over the green flat lands, lies a field of white crosses and single dog tags that are the mute evidence of the enormous price paid to free France. In the center of the field flies Old Glory, fluttering gently in the wind, representing the ideal for which these boys died. These staring white, inanimate crosses represent the bill paid to lift the black cloak of oppression from a nearly smothered France; but, in the deepening shadows, the crosses take on the form of the men over whom they stand, and you realize that these soldiers, now lying in soil far from the land they died for, lived, breathed, and laughed like you. They, too, loved the feel of warm sun on their flesh; the thrill that comes in smelling the fresh,clean, air of spring; the exuberance that lingers in the crisp, cool breezes of autumn; the happiness that comes with getting something new, the sorrow that comes in parting with something old. They're all standing before you, and in the soft symphony of the night winds, their voices reverberate in one loud question: "Why?"

Why must there be wars? Why was I chosen to be a martyr for freedom? Why must I bear the cross for a world too blind, too selfish, too lazy to keep from seeking to destroy itself every quarter century?

Why? Why!

But only dead silence is his answer—for I can't give them the answer. The evening shadows lengthen, and the moon throws a lonely beam across the row on row of white crosses that have now become a group of martyred soldiers.

Can I tell them why? Why their blood soaks the sand of foreign beaches? Why their lives were snapped short by a terrible pattern called war? I could say we were forced into the fight by a stab in the back from a grasping, treacherous Japan; that we had to resort to war to keep from ignoring the constant prodding of a power-starved Germany. I could answer these quizzical dead in that way—but I must also tell them that the winds of France play over their graves today because big-hearted America, territory-hungry Britain, and security-bent France were not willing to pay the price to keep the peace for which they so fiercely fought in 1918. Too anxious to settle back to the normalcy she had known in pre-war years, the United States reverted to civilian luxuries once more and left a peace-loving Woodrow Wilson to fight on alone for his dreams and visions of living on an earth free from war, with peace for all time. In the meantime, a bitter Germany was locked behind the walls of defeat to lick the wounds that not even then would heal. In those years that she was ignored, blockaded, and shunned, Germany built its foundation for the Third Reich that turned the whole of Europe into a flaming mass and threatened to turn the whole face of the globe into a titantic battlefield—just 21 years after they had been pounded into submission.

Will 1965 see the same thing happen again?

These men long for and demand the reasons why they lie dead on the same soil their fathers bled and died on just 26 years ago. If we can't tell them why, we must at least promise them that it will never, ever, happen again. We can either resign ourselves to the fact that wars are a necessary evil that must forever be.

There is a stir of dissatisfaction among the crosses.

Or we may search our hearts, our minds, and our conscience for the elusive solution to the formula for a permanent world peace. Scientific patterns for peace may come from the mouths and pens of Sumner Welles, Cordell Hull, or Walter Lippmann, but the real solution lies with us in realizing our responsibilities as individual citizens—indispensable pillars supporting the structure of peace—not for a decade, generation, or a century, but for all time. If we become so eager to settle back to pre-war normalcy after this armistice is signed, the marine at Tarawa, the Russian at Stalingrad, the Chinese and British at Hong Kong, will all have sacrified in vain.

As the last telephone book has been ripped to shreds and dropped on the cheering streets; as the last V-sign has been given and the last victory whistle blown, the job of having a lasting peace will have just begun. The peace terms lie in the hands of a handful of men, but the keeping of that peace lies in the initiative and ambitions of the freedom-loving millions. Without their help, the peace to come will only be a pause between a more bloody, more gigantic struggle than the one in which we are now engaged.

A ray of moonlight stabs the darkness. A bird, startled into flight, screeches its defiance at a fleet of bombers passing overhead. Then there is silence. The row on row of men blur in the moonglow and become once more a field of crosses. Their bodies lie silent in the foreign soil of France, but their valiant spirits—far away in a world that must be far better than the one we know—watch and wait for the day of lasting peace they tried so hard to bring on earth. They wait for that day, and Paul Smith, Dale Lewis, Norman Harris, Que Jones, and the many other Y boys who have died, been wounded, or are missing in action in this great conflict wait with them.

You and those of us who remain must justify their lonely vigil.

Sgt. CLARON L. OAKLEY.

SOMEWHERE IN FRANCE.

Address of Hon. Clarence J. Brown of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN of Ohio, at Chattanooga, Tenn., on February 12, 1945:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a great privilege to break bread with my fellow Republicans in the historic city of Chattanooga, on the one hundred and thirty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the founder of our party.

It is a real pleasure to come to Tennessee—the Volunteer State, which has given so many strong sons and daughters to the Nation. It is good to get away from the hectic turmoil, the uncertainties and the inconsistencies, the political and international intrigue, which have become almost the normal life in Washington, and to come to this beautiful community where one can breathe the free and pure air of true Americanism as it flows down from your ageless hills and mountains. It is in places such as this that the heart of America beats the strongest. In your veins flows the blood of those who fought and died to create this Nation. Your forefathers carved this magnificent State from the wilderness. Men of courage and vision, they fought tyrants for their freedom and Nature for their living.

Tennesee has long held a prominent place in the affairs of our party and Nation. You have given to the Congress of the United States two of your outstanding Republican sons, both of whom I am proud to call my warm personal friends. I speak of JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., who represents your Second Congressional District in the House of Representatives, and B. CARROLL REECE, of the First Tennessee District.

Judge JENNINGS is one of the most powerful and influential Members of the Congress. An able, astute, and sound lawyer, he occupies a place of leadership on the important Judiciary Committee which passes upon most of the grave legal problems which come before our national legislature. His counsel and advice are sought and followed by his colleagues. JOHN JENNINGS always has his feet on the ground, his mind on the alert, and his heart in the right place.

Within a few days after I first entered the House I was fortunate enough to be assigned to the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where CARROLL REECE had already given several years of able service. I soon came to admire his keen analytical mind and to trust and follow his sound judgment. We worked in even closer relationship as members of several important subcommittees, and I say to you that because of the tireless energy and the unusual ability of Representative REECE of Tennessee the people of America are today enjoying the benefits of much progressive legislation.

In recent years CARROLL REECE and I have served together on the Republican National Committee, and on the national executive committee of our party. Through him, as well as from other sources, I have learned of the splendid work you have done in this State. I hope I shall not be accused of taking advantage of this occasion if I digress for a moment to express to the sound American citizens of this community my personal gratitude, and the appreciation of the Republican National Committee, for the exceptionally generous financial support you gave to our cause during the recent campaign. The sinews of war which you provided helped greatly. We made the good fight in 1944. We lost—yes—but we went down fighting for the principles in which we believed.

These are dark and discouraging days to many of us who have always believed, and still believe, in constitutional government and the American way of life. So I feel it only fitting and proper that those of us who still cling to the beliefs of Lincoln should gather here, and in numerous other cities of the land, on this, his natal day, to draw from his life and deeds renewed courage and added strength to carry on the good work he began.

In the city of Washington, in a direct westward line from the Capitol and the Washington Monument, near the east bank of the Potomac, stands the national memorial to Abraham Lincoln. I can best describe it in the words of an unknown poet:

"Yesterday I saw Lincoln
I stood reverently before him
Within the lighted walls in Washington.
There he sat, like one who would speak to the Nation.
With deep, all-seeing eyes, soft and friendly,
Full of the warmth of human kindness.
His spirit of tolerance, of liberation,
Of love of the Republic,
Filled that shrine
And reached out, calling all of us
To unity, to sacrifice, and brotherhood.
Surely his life defines the American way—
The ways of freedom, liberty of conscience,
Press, and speech."

I usually pass the Lincoln Memorial each day on my way to and from the Capitol. In recent years as the pressure of the times brought longer hours of work and more troublesome problems, more and more often I have found myself stopping for a moment in front of that beautiful memorial to gaze at the huge stone figure of Lincoln sitting there in the shrine a grateful Republic has erected to his memory. Usually it is at night that I stop—at night when the flood lights play upon his figure and cause it to stand out of the darkness in all the glorious detail which a world-renowned sculptor has given it. He sits looking to the eastward toward the Capitol. In his face is all the pathos and the understanding, the pain and the suffering; the plainness and the humility; the character and grandeur of soul, which have made it both an inspiration and an enigma to all who look upon it. Often I go there disheartened and low in spirits. I leave with a renewed faith in the Nation which produced and gave to the world Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln proved himself to be a true man of destiny, given to the Republic in one of its darkest hours when its very survival was in grave question. Today, our Nation faces another such crisis. We need a Lincoln now as badly as we needed a Lincoln in the sixties, for the future of our glorious Republic is at stake. It must soon be decided whether it can and will survive in the form in which it was created, and under which it became great.

During the past 12 years many changes have taken place in our governmental structure. Strange doctrines and preachments have been heard from high places. We have seen the depression, which came as the inevitable aftermath of the First World War, lengthened by governmental bungling until it lasted for more than 9 years—until it became almost a normal condition to have ten or twelve million Americans unable to obtain employment—a depression which was not cured, but only suspended, by the coming of war and the calling of 12,000,000 young Americans to arms. Class has been set against class. Industry and free enterprise became the whipping boys of the New Deal administration. Everything possible was done to discourage private initiative, thrift, and progress. Yet when war came, and our sons marched forth to fight and die on half a hundred far-flung battle fronts throughout the world, it was these same whipping boys—American industry and our American free-enterprise system—supported by the strong sinews of free American labor—that out-produced all the world and furnished the implements of war so necessary to assure the great victories which have been won.

A few short years ago there were many who were critical of modern youth. There was much talk about the jitterbug age, and that young America had become soft and decadent. Time has proven how wrong that appraisal was, for within the veins of the young manhood and womanhood of America still courses the blood of those who founded and made great this Nation of ours. On land and sea and in the air, American youth have met in deadly combat the best our enemies could pit against them, and have proven themselves the better. Just as our youth have demonstrated their worth in the terrible crucible of war, so, too, has industry, private enterprise, and free labor here in America proven beyond question their worth, their abilities, their strength, their capacities, their loyalty, and their patriotism. American free enterprise and free labor have alone outproduced the state-controlled industries and the slave labor of all the dictator nations of the world combined, four times over.

We are winning on the battle fronts in both Europe and the Pacific. There is every indication victory may soon come to our arms across the Atlantic and, while final triumph may be longer delayed in the Pacific, it is nevertheless just as certain.

No longer are we in danger, here in America, from our enemies from without. No foreign foe now threatens us with destruction through military might. Yet history teaches us that more nations have been destroyed from within than from without. More nations have fallen as a result of internal weaknesses than have ever been despoiled and crushed by invading armies.

Today we have within our borders those who do not believe in our American way of life. They do not believe in representative government or free enterprise, or the Constitution as we have known it. They want to change this Nation into some sort of a socialized state, for they believe in the philosophy the state should be supreme, and the individual should bow to the will and the desire of the state. The men and women who believe in such a philosophy are neither Republicans nor Democrats. They believe in and owe allegiance to no party. For the time being, at least, they have affixed themselves to the Democratic Party and gnaw from within the Roosevelt administration. Many call themselves New Dealers.

Of course, Mr. Roosevelt and other of the top spokesmen of his administration, have long told us the New Deal is a liberal movement. I can agree with such a theory in only one particular. I admit the New Deal is, and always has been, liberal with other people's money. They have been so liberal that today we have a national debt of nearly $250,000,000,000, and a Federal tax rate that starts at 23 percent of any income above $500 and goes so high as to actually total more than 100 percent, this year, on incomes of $500,000 or more.

Yes, the New Deal is so liberal that everything we eat and wear is taxed to the limit, with the Government taking more than one-fourth of our entire national income as taxes. So liberal that at every family table of three there is a fourth unseen guest present—the tax collector—eating more than one-fourth that family's substance.

Yes, the Roosevelt administration has been a liberal one—so liberal that we have given to others of our finances and our natural resources so lavishly as to almost bankrupt ourselves. Since entering the war we have consistently spent more money than all the rest of the nations of the world combined—friend and foe alike. We have been so liberal with our natural resources as to practically exhaust many of them, and to make it impossible for us to ever wage another war such as this, without being dependent upon foreign sources of supply for necessary raw materials. With less than 25 percent of the oil reserves of the world, we have been furnishing 80 percent of the gasoline and oil used in the war. The oil reserves of the United States and the British Empire are approximately the same; yet we have furnished 80 percent of the war's oil and gasoline needs, while the British Empire has furnished only 8 percent.

Today, on the Western Front in Europe, we are supplying slightly more than 70 percent of the military manpower engaged in that gigantic struggle. In the Pacific we are furnishing practically every fighting man in combat against the Japanese, outside of China. We have conquered island after island in the struggle, all of strategic importance to our national defense, only to raise the flag of some foreign power once the fighting was ended.

We have done all of these things without promise or obligation on behalf of the recipients of our largess. We have promised, so I understand, to do much more for the rest of the world in the post-war years ahead, although neither the Congress nor the American people have been informed as to any of the provisions of these promises.

Woodrow Wilson's policy of "open covenants, openly arrived at," has had no place in Mr. Roosevelt's scheme of things. The Atlantic Charter was announced and given to the world as an authentic document approved and signed by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and held forth as an inspiration and a promise of better things to the war-torn and prostrate people and nations of the world. Yet, when many of the pledges contained in that pronouncement were disregarded and forgotten, it was blandly announced by the President, at a press conference in the White House, that the Atlantic Charter actually never existed as a document, and, of course, was never signed.

A great conference—the first between the leaders of the Three Great Powers—the United States, Great Britain, and Russia—was held at Teheran a little more than a year ago. It was surrounded by secrecy, but soon after the return of the President the American people were assured no secret agreements or commitments had been made. Then, a year later, or just a few months ago, when certain actions were taken by one of our allies in the Balkans and in Poland, and by another of our allies in Greece, it was openly announced on the floor of the British Parliament such actions had been taken in conformance with agreements made at Teheran, and with the full knowledge and consent of the President of the United States.

We are now hearing rumors from abroad that certain agreements are either in process of formation, or have already been made, whereby the United States will furnish huge sums of money, mounting into many billions, and great quantities of machinery, materials, and supplies of every type and description, for the rebuilding of Europe and the reestablishment of European industries and world trade, not only for the liberated countries, but for our present allies and enemies as well.

If the Roosevelt administration has any fixed foreign policy today, neither the Congress nor the people know about it. Is there any person in this room who can tell us what American foreign policy is tonight? Or where we stand, as a nation, on any foreign question other than military ones? Has the Democratic Party enunciated any foreign-policy program half as broad or half as detailed as the one laid down by the Republican Party at the famous Mackinac Conference? Has the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, or any responsible leader of this administration given to the American people any program or foreign policy to compare with that which was set forth in the Senate of the United States by the ranking Republican member of its Foreign Relations Committee—the Honorable ARTHUR VANDENBERG, the senior Senator from Michigan?

Yes, the great liberal New Deal—the New Deal which has brought to the people of the United States no increased liberty, but only regimentation, regulation and restrictive control undreamed of just a few short years ago. Regimentation, regulation, and control which touch every activity of every citizen in every corner of America. Tell me, if you can, one single human activity over which the Federal Government does not exercise some control, either directly or indirectly.

Three and one-half million civilian workers are on the pay roll of the Government of the United States tonight. More than three and one-half times as many as were found necessary at the very height of World War No. 1. Today 1 person out of every 11, exclusive of those in the military forces, obtains his livelihood from public funds—from the taxes paid by the other 10.

In the last 4 years the capital city of Washington and its environs have doubled in size, despite the moving of many Government bureaus to other cities. Great governmental agencies have sprung up everywhere. Thousands of bureaucrats rush madly here and there busily engaged in devising new ways and means to control, regiment, and direct the lives of 135,000,000 Americans. Tens of thousands of them spend their time writing new regulations, directives, and Executive orders, having the force and effect of law on business and industry and agriculture, as well as almost every other human endeavor. They are ground out in such volume and with such rapidity no one knows what they contain or what they mean. Even the bureaucrats in Washington cannot agree among themselves as to the meaning of their own regulations and orders. They are constantly quarreling and fighting among themselves.

Believe it or not, in the old days, under our representative form of government and our Constitution, the Congress of the United States passed the laws of the land. But today that no longer is true. Last year there were 10 times more Executive orders, departmental regulations, and administrative directives, all having the force and effect of law and carrying penalties of one kind or another, issued in Washington, than there were public laws enacted by the Congress.

Why bless your souls! The Office of Price Administration alone has issued more than 55,000 pages of fine-print regulations and orders affecting the business enterprises of the country. Many times an amendment to an order is issued before the original order appears in print. The same holds good for the War Production Board and its limitation orders on the producers, processors, and manufacturers of the Nation.

Then, of course, the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration have huge staffs continually grinding out regulations and directives to control the farmers of the country. And, I have not even mentioned the War Manpower Commission, the Selective Service System, the War Labor Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Social Security Board, the Bureau of the Census, the Treasury Department, the Federal Trade Commission; the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Reserve bank, the Public Health Service, the Department of Justice, or any of the other scores of Government agencies which are also forever pointing a finger at some American citizen and saying: "You can't do this and you must do that;" and "You are damn'd if you do, and damn'd if you don't."

What a long way we have come in the last few years, ladies and gentlemen, along the road that leads to state socialism.

I say to you there is nothing liberal about the New Deal. How can there be anything liberal about an administration which buys the people's support with their own money? Is it liberal to fasten upon each American family the burden of a gigantic public debt, the carrying of which will alone cost at least $20 a month for every month they may live? Can there be anything liberal about an administration or a government which takes one-fourth of the people's earnings for its own use? Can there be anything liberal in wanton waste and extravagance? The spendthrift may be happy while his funds last, but the day of disillusionment always comes, and his sufferings and his miseries are the greater for the unearned ease and luxuries he has enjoyed. For 12 long years the only answer the New Dealers have ever had for any problem has been the spending of more and more money.

Tonight Harry Hopkins, the superspender of them all, is abroad helping to set up an international W. P. A.—at our expense, of course—for the post-war years. Here at home Henry Wallace nervously studies the stars, feverishly fingers his numerology books, and constantly consults his favorite fortune teller, in the hope he may learn when—if ever—he will become Secretary of Commerce, and whether the fates will favor his gaining power over $40,000,000,000, and more, of R. F. C. funds and loans. Harry had such a glamorous time with his leaf-raking and his "Chick Sales" building programs here in the United States that he just knows he will be a success as an international W. P. A.-er, while Henry, having failed in his own publishing business and having almost wrecked American agriculture by his theory of scarcity, which called for the killing of millions of innocent little pigs and the plowing under of thousands of acres of cotton, is firmly convinced he can make a great success of pushing American business and industry around, and still have time left to make his regular morning milk deliveries to the Hottentots and the Fiji islanders.

Yes. It is a great liberal movement—this New Deal—with great plans for the future. A year ago they were trying to disinfranchise our fighting forces through the obnoxious bob-tailed ballot bill, which would have prevented our soldiers and sailors from voting for any State or local official; but only for the President, Senator, and Representative. Because of the courageous fight made by the Republican Members of Congress, including your own two stalwart Tennesseeans in the House, the right to vote the same ballot as given civilians at home was saved for most of our fighting men and women. In 10 States use of the short Federal ballot was made optional. At the time this legislation was before the Congress those of us who fought for a legal and constitutional ballot were accused of endeavoring to disinfranchise the soldiers. Yet last week an official report, filed with the Congress by the Secretary of War, showed that in the 10 States where our soldiers were given the option of using either ballot, only 2 percent chose the bob-tailed Federal ballot, while all the rest used the regular State and local ballot.

And now—1 year later—the New Deal is attempting to force through the Congress a bill to conscript all American workmen between the ages of 18 and 45; compelling them to work when and where, and at the kind of a job, some bureaucrat may decide. This bill, which is erroneously known as the May limited national service bill, would not require a man to either fight or work for his country, but only to work when and where he may be directed for the benefit and profit of some private employer selected for him. Discharged veterans are covered by the act, and even those who have been honorably released from military service because of wounds suffered in battle could be ordered into the mines or the mills at the discretion of some governmental agent. Men who refuse to accept the jobs assigned to them, or voluntarily quit their work, could be heavily fined or sent to prison for many years. The section prohibiting voluntary quitting of work could easily be interpreted as applying to any employee going out on strike. In fact, support for the bill was sought in some quarters by administration spokesmen who whispered the real purpose of the bill was to prevent strikes.

Leaders of business and industry, as well as leaders of labor, insist the passage of this measure would not increase production of war goods, but would actually reduce it. While manpower shortages may exist in a few isolated spots, there is no general manpower shortage in America. Instead, there is and has been a scandalous waste of available manpower. Congressional investigations and testimony of men of integrity have disclosed so much hoarding of labor and so many inexcusable failures to properly use the labor available that only the most loyal and ardent new dealers in the Congress are any longer attempting to justify the labor-draft bill on the basis an actual manpower shortage exists. Even Paul McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, admitted before the Senate Military Affairs Committee that the records of his agency disclose the manpower situation in essential war industries, as of January 1 last, was better than at any time since the war began. And Secretary of War Stimson could justify his request for enactment of the legislation on only two grounds. First, that it would help morale among our soldiers on the fighting fronts, and, second, that it could be used to freeze and hold workmen in war jobs after the war is over. He admitted it would not increase the production of war goods. By inference, at least,

he also admits his desire to mislead our fighting forces overseas and to make them think we are doing something to help them, when actually we will be hurting them by interfering with war production. And just why it is so necessary to retain workmen against their will in war industries after victory is won is hard for most Americans to understand.

There are only two real reasons for the hue and cry over the supposed manpower shortage and for the introduction of the May labor-draft bill.

The first is to cover up the mistakes made by the Commander in Chief and his aides in estimating the length of the war in Europe and our war needs. All of you remember that about a year ago numerous war plants were shut down, or had their production cut, by orders from Washington; and how further reductions in war production were ordered later in the spring and summer. You will also remember how, in the last week of October, speaking from Boston, I believe, the President as Commander in Chief—oh, yes, he was Commander in Chief then, although little use of the title was made during the dark days of the Belgium break-through—how he told the American people in a broadcast to the Nation that every soldier had a gun, with a plentiful supply of bullets to fit it, right at hand. Perhaps you will also recall how on November 30, in his written report to the Military Affairs Committees of the House and Senate, Lieutenant General Somervell, Chief of the Services of Supply, boasted that every possible need of our armed forces had been met, and that all future needs had been fully anticipated.

Yes! Some one made a mistake, and that mistake was made up toward the top, although it must never be admitted the Commander in Chief or his aides ever make mistakes. So American industry and American labor, having met every demand placed upon them by force of war, must be blamed for something for which they are in no way responsible. That is their reward. That is their pay-off for out-producing all the other nations of the world—for doing the grandest production job in the history of mankind.

But the second reason for attempting to enact this legislation is a more sinister and far-reaching one. It is the desire for power and more power that permeates this administration. Put 12,000,000 men in the armed forces, and 18,000,000 in the straight jacket of the May bill in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States, and the affairs and lives of every human in America can be fully controlled by a few individuals. The final transformation will have taken place—we will have become a totalitarian Nation.

What must the Republican Party do about it all? Ladies and gentlemen, our duty and our responsibility are plain. The one real job we have before us is to protect, here at home, the liberty and the freedom for which our men are fighting and dying overseas. There is no division among our people in seeking to bring this war to an early and victorious conclusion. Boys from every walk of life, from every corner of America—boys from Democratic families and boys from Republican families—are fighting and dying side by side. Here at home their families, regardless of race, creed, color, or political faith, join in supporting the war effort. We all want a just and lasting peace. The United States has always met its every obligation to the other nations of the world. It will continue to do so in the future. Regardless of politics, we will support every honest and forthright effort toward building an enduring peace for those who follow us. But we want peace at home as well as abroad.

We, as a party, must direct our efforts toward bringing to an end the misunderstandings, the bickering, and the quarreling, which spring from the New Deal's dangerous practice of pitting class against class and group against group for the purpose of political advantage. We must fight to maintain free enterprise against the attacks of those who are attempting to destroy it; for it is only under the free-enterprise system that we can long maintain a free economy and free labor. We must see to it that America is truly once more the land of opportunity; that those who fought and won our Nation's battles are given a real freedom of choice, and the full right to build their own lives, and to carve out their own careers, as they, and they alone, may wish.

We must make certain those young men who will return from the wars, and their children, too, will receive a full and fair reward for their intelligence and their toil. We must guarantee to them the enjoyment of fair and reasonable benefits from their successful achievements. We must strike from them the shackles of bureaucratic regimentation. Instead of the Government regimenting and regulating our citizens, our citizenship must regiment and regulate the Government. We must see to it those in high places understand fully they are the servants of the people—not their masters. We must teach our people to depend upon themselves, rather than upon their Government.

Respecting the rights of all nations, we must also learn to respect and to protect the rights of America as a Nation. We must keep ourselves strong. Strong nations, like strong men, need not take advantage of the weak. Strong nations, like strong men, protect their own hearthstones, yet meet their obligations to their neighbors.

Above all else we must restore honesty and decency in Government. The people must learn once again to depend upon the word and pledge of high officials. The high and the mighty must once more obey the law and the proprieties, as well as the lowly. There must not be any favored class or royal family in America. We must return to the Constitution, under which the rights of the few are secure against the greed of the many. We must return the lawmaking powers to the Congress, and reestablish an impartial Judiciary, thus restoring the balance between the three branches of our Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—as given us by our forefathers in that great Magna Carta of American liberty—the Constitution.

These things we must do, if we are long to maintain here on this continent "a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Warsaw, a Symbol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. LANE POWERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Most Reverend William A. Griffin, bishop of Trenton, at the Pontifical Mass honoring the heroes of Warsaw, Sunday, January 28, 1945, St. Hedwig's Church, Trenton, N. J.:

We are drawn together from all sections of the diocese at this pontifical mass this morning, not in any spirit of narrow partisanship or of exaggerated nationalism, but in a genuine spirit of universal admiration, love, and gratitude for the heroic men of Warsaw, and therefore of Poland, who suffered and died to keep aflame the torch of human liberty in the darkness of a war that still envelopes Europe and the world. These are the men of individually unpraised deeds, the men who are never cited by name to receive the Purple Heart or the Distinguished Service Cross, and who "leave no memorial but a world made a little better by their lives." Yet, like the heroes of our own Bunker Hill and Gettysburg, and like the martyrs of the Catacombs, the heroes of Warsaw shall remain immortal; for the ineffaceable prerogative of human liberty was engrained by their Creator in the very substance of their souls; and neither bayonet nor machine gun nor the refined torture of inhuman tyrants can subdue, much less destroy, the soul.

Warsaw is a symbol, as Bunker Hill is a symbol, as Gettysburg is a symbol, as the ancient Catacombs outside Rome are a symbol—a symbol of right against might, a symbol of justice against injustice, a symbol of the immortal spirit of liberty against the cruel absolutism of the despot. And, like Bunker Hill and Gettysburg and the ancient Catacombs, Warsaw, now in ruins, will live on centuries after its oppressors from the east and from the west either turn from the wickedness of their ways or are buried in oblivion. Because the spirit of liberty and of justice, breathed by God in the souls of men, cannot be destroyed, because in fact that spirit thrives and spreads even under the strongest opposition, the Catacombs inevitably changed pagan Rome into Christian Rome and her temples of false gods into houses of worship of the one true God.

For the same reason, 50 years after Bunker Hill, in all truth it could be said by the great American spokesman immortalizing that glorious event: "If the true spark of civil and religious liberty be kindled, it will burn. Human agency cannot extinguish it. Like the earth's central fire it may be smothered for a time. The ocean may overwhelm it; mountains may press it down. But its inherent and unconquerable force will heave both the ocean and the land. And at some time or other, in some place or other, the volcano will break out and flame up to Heaven."

Because the spirit of liberty is God-given, 5 months after Gettysburg the President of the United States could pay rightful honor to Gettysburg heroes in these immortal words: "The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it (this ground) far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us * * * that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause to which they gave the last full measure of devotion * * * that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Some day in the not far distant future, when Warsaw, now consecrated anew by the blood of her heroes, fondly gathers her surviving children to her bosom, she will select a spokesman whose voice will be heard around the world, as from the Catacombs and Bunker Hill and Gettysburg, triumphantly repeating and reemphasizing the inevitable supremacy of right over might, of justice over injustice; loudly proclaiming the unchangeable truth that the flame of civil and religious liberty, kindled by God Himself in the hearts of men, cannot be extinguished by any human agency no matter how powerful; and calling for rededication and new resolution that these heroes "shall not have died in vain, that this nation (Poland) under

God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

So today we sing no requiem for Poland; for Poland is not dead. Rather do we chant joyful hymns of praise and thanksgiving to the God of nations; for Poland lives; and the soul of Poland is not, and cannot be, conquered.

H. R. 2121

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the editorial in the New York Times of February 14, on H. R. 2121. I introduced this bill this week, hoping that by its passage many of the monopolistic practices of labor unions which are antisocial and actually antilabor can be curbed.

The bill makes every possible effort to protect the legitimate objectives of labor and labor unions, but strikes at nonlabor activities which are in restraint of trade and are actually a hindrance to a full employment program and to full production.

It seeks to restrain abuses which have grown up in many places throughout the Nation, abuses which injure the public, workers and industry, without benefiting the laboring man in any way. These abuses most generally are used to build up monopolistic power of the heads of some unions to control business activity, fix prices or encourage monopolistic practices to the general detriment and interference with normal trade and full employment.

The New York Times editorial follows:

TO CURB MAKE-WORK

Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, has had the courage and clearsightedness to introduce a bill that seeks not merely to curb Mr. Petrillo personally but to curb some of the antisocial practices in which the latter has been one of the chief offenders. Mr. Monroney's bill would first of all make it illegal for any union to try to force an employer to hire its own members for a task when another union had already been designated by the National Labor Relations Board as the exclusive bargaining agent for that task. This would curb the present effort of Mr. Petrillo to take over the "platter turners" on the radio. Its general effect would be to uphold the authority of the N. L. R. B.

More important than this, Mr. Monroney's bill would make it illegal for any union to force an employer to hire or to pay wages to any person when such person is in fact in excess of the number of persons reasonably required to perform the work in which the employer is engaged. This would not only end the forced hiring of stand-by musicians but a great many make-work practices outside of the musical field. The bill would also prohibit unreasonable restrictions on the use of material, machines or equipment. This provision is amply safeguarded, from the standpoint of labor, to permit restrictions related to health, safety, or working conditions. It even permits the retardation of technological advance to provide for an orderly change in the methods of production. Finally, the bill outlaws combinations of unions and employers to monopolize any part of trade.

Here at last is a measure that would strike at the evil of make-work practices, practices which are still tolerated in spite of a national labor shortage, and at a time when every misuse or waste of labor postpones the day of victory in war.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Harold Knutson, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an address delivered by Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, in the Ford Theater, at the Lincoln anniversary program under the auspices of the National Park Service and the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, as well as before the Washington Executives' Association at their luncheon meeting on Monday, February 12, 1945, at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

It is to me a very great honor to be privileged to speak to you this afternoon on the life and accomplishments of Abraham Lincoln, and especially so in this historic place. I can think of no more appropriate place in which we can gather to pay homage to the memory of that great man. It was here that the foul blow was struck that laid low one of the greatest souls of all time.

Of Lincoln, the rail splitter, who later clerked in a store at Salem and sold grog over the counter, the world has heard much but it is the towering Lincoln who stepped into the breach in the tragic days of '61, and saved the Union, that I should like to address myself this afternoon. That is the Lincoln that we should know better.

As the procession of mankind passes in review, we observe at long intervals, and only in time of some great crisis, a figure that towers high above his fellow man, who steps to the front and by common consent assumes leadership. In times gone by the human family has been served by a number of such leaders, and in the comparatively small number George Washington and Abraham Lincoln—one the Father of his Country, the other its savior—stand out as shining and illustrious lights. Each contributed his all to the country we love, and their places in history are so firmly established, so well known, and so generally conceded, that there is little that we can say or do that will add to the luster that is so justly theirs.

As the unbelievers said of Christ, "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" so there were those who undoubtedly asked of themselves, and of others, "Can it be possible that a man born in a log cabin in Kentucky, rough and uncouth, with few if any of those social attainments which we are accustomed to associate with greatness, can it be that such a man is fitted by tradition and training to occupy the greatest elective office in all the world—the Presidency of the United States?" It was but natural that they should thus inquire of Christ, and of Lincoln, for although one was born in a lowly manger in Bethlehem, the other in a log cabin, open on one side and without windows, doors, or floor, both stand out today as the two greatest individuals of all time, and their names are written in letters of eternal light that the mutations of time can neither tarnish nor dim.

We have assembled this afternoon to commemorate the one hundred and thirty-sixth anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth. We are here, not as partisans, but as pilgrims to worship at the shrine of the man whom God gave to the American people as their deliverer in their darkest hour of despair. In this gathering we will renew our devotion to that great leader, and our loyalty to the precious heritage that he has left us.

The rugged pioneer stock from which Lincoln sprang was nurtured amidst privation and hardship, such as are today unknown. They braved the lurking dangers of the forest wilderness with all the assurance and confidence that has ever characterized your real American. While on their irresistible march, they constantly pushed back the frontiers and hostile forces, built roads, established homes, schools, and churches, carved out farms and cities in an untamed empire that was destined to become the bread-and-butter basket of the world.

The only music that he knew as a boy and young man was the sweet song of birds, the low murmur of brooks, and the gentle rustle of the trees. Truly, if any man ever grew up in close communion with his Maker, it was Abraham Lincoln, the man of sorrows, whose sympathetic heart embraced all humanity.

His early reading was confined to six books: The Bible, Pilgrim's Progress, A History of the United States, Aesop's Fables, Weem's Life of Washington, and Robinson Crusoe, which he read by the flickering light of a smoldering fire. Holland has truly said: "The poverty of Lincoln's library was the wealth of his mind." With such a foundation for learning, one could hardly expect the development of a mind that has given to posterity the oration at Gettysburg and the Second Inaugural Address, two of the most polished gems in all literature.

To secure a true appraisal of Abraham Lincoln, we must check through a maze of evidence and material, some of it false, some mythical. In doing so, we need have no apprehension that the stature of the man will become diminished or obscured; indeed, stripped of all nonessentials, falsehoods, and myths, Lincoln attains new stature, enshrouded by a halo of light that burns with ever-increasing brilliance with the passing of time.

Contemporaries, who should have known better, underrated his characteristics of love for humanity and inflexibility of purpose. As late as 1862, Wendell Phillips is quoted as having said that the lawyers who knew Lincoln best appraised him as "the one man in Illinois least capable of saying 'No'."

The real Lincoln was as gentle as the spring breezes that warm the cold earth and bring forth the sleeping grass and flowering plants that charm and delight us, as witness his letter to Mrs. Bixby:

"DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the Adjutant General of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be

yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

"Yours very sincerely and respectfully,
"ABRAHAM LINCOLN."

When occasion required, Lincoln could be as firm as granite, as witness the grim and dogged fight that he waged for 4 long years to preserve the Union. Most other men would have succumbed to the early defeats, to the jealousies, to the intrigues, and to the disloyalties which surrounded him. Fortunately for us, and for all mankind, Lincoln was made of such unyielding stuff.

Where, I ask you, can we find another example of such a perfect blending of gentleness, humility, forgiveness, sternness, ruggedness, honesty, and singleness of purpose? Truly, Edwin M. Stanton, his great Secretary of War, spoke more prophetically than he perhaps realized when he stood at the deathbed in that modest little brick home across the street and said, "He now belongs to the ages."

Yes; Abraham Lincoln belongs to the ages, and wherever men are struggling to become free his name and his great soul are the beacon lights that give them hope and inspiration. When the cowardly assassin's bullet struck him down in this room the shot was heard around the world and evoked a wave of sorrow and indignation, the repercussions of which we yet feel.

Under the divinely inspired leadership of Abraham Lincoln was fought a long, bloody, and costly war which was to cement the several States into a more perfect and endurable Union, where all men, regardless of race, creed, or color, were to be free and equal before the law. Under his administration and guidance America became for the first time an indissoluble union. We then crossed the threshold of an era of national expansion and development that has become the marvel, if not the envy, of all the world.

Whenever I think of what the founding fathers of our beloved country endured in order to bring forth this new Republic in the Western Hemisphere, those who suffered the chilling blasts and the pangs of hunger at Valley Forge; the fever and heat of the tropics; those who fought, bled, and died at Bloody Angle that our country might be preserved; those who lowered the flag of tyranny at Manila Bay; who, on the flowering fields of Flanders snatched victory from defeat; of those heroes who with their blood consecrated the soil of Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Saipan, and Normandy—when we think of what all those heroes fought, bled, and died to achieve and perpetuate, we cannot but realize that a sacred trust, handed down from the distant past, rests upon us.

In my humble opinion, Lincoln's election to the Presidency was providential. In the light of the stirring events that followed his election to the position of Chief Executive, and the masterful genius displayed by him in meeting every great emergency, including intrigue and disloyalty on all sides, it becomes more and more apparent that Abraham Lincoln, and he alone, could have successfully prosecuted the great war for the preservation of the Union.

The war opened inauspiciously. The first battle resulted in the rout of the Union forces, and for more than 2 years the secessionists had the better of it. It was only when the grim and silent Grant carried the day at Shiloh and Pittsburgh Landing that the first rays of hope broke through the dark and war-clouded sky. Those were days that tried his soul, and Lincoln's great heart was often torn by the suffering and misery that grew out of that titanic struggle. Had he not possessed the love, confidence, and affection of the people of the North, and more especially of those who left their firesides to fight for the preservation of the Union, the cause might not have triumphed. To one and to all he was Father Abraham, the man whose heart encompassed all humanity, and it was to him that the downtrodden and the oppressed looked for help.

In passing upon the case of a lad condemned to death for falling asleep at his post, Lincoln said: "I could not think of going into eternity with the blood of that poor young man on my skirts. It is not to be wondered at that a boy raised on a farm, probably in the habit of going to bed at dark, should, when required to watch, fall asleep; I cannot consent to shoot him for any such act."

The impressive sequel to this act of mercy was brought to light when the dead body of this soldier boy was found on the battlefield of Fredericksburg and next to his heart a photograph of the President, across which he had written, "God bless Abraham Lincoln."

His untimely death, just as he had reached the pinnacle of usefulness and fame, was the greatest tragedy since the crucifixion, and, by a peculiar coincidence, the end came on Good Friday, the anniversary of the death of our Saviour.

It was only when the great Lincoln lay cold in death that his real greatness and nobility of character were appreciated and understood. He left behind him a monument as enduring as the ages, a united country, firmly established on the eternal principles of justice, welded together in the strong bonds of fraternity, and sealed by the sacred blood of the countless thousands who died that liberty might live.

Today, fourscore years after his death, Abraham Lincoln is yet a living, breathing inspiration to all the people of the world, and so he will continue to be in all the centuries yet to come.

"We tell thy doom without a sigh
For thou art freedom's now, and fame's,
One of the few, the immortal names
That were not born to die."

In these days of stress and strife it would be well if we were to take from the life of Lincoln some of the precepts with which it is so generously interspersed. Abraham Lincoln is frequently quoted by the demagog as a proponent of the dangerous panaceas that are being proposed as cures for the ills of our body politic. He is frequently quoted in support of doctrines that seek to array class against class, and which ultimately would break down the very cornerstone upon which the Republic is based. Fellow Americans, we have never had a President who gave more meticulous and scrupulous consideration to the rights of all men. We have never had a Chief Magistrate who observed the Federal Constitution with greater reverence and respect. Indeed, his great love for our country and its institutions was his outstanding characteristic. Abraham Lincoln believed in constitutional government, of the people, by the people, and for the people. He stood for sound money, for the protection of the American wage earner and producer, for adequate preparedness, and for an economic program that would bring the greatest good to the greatest number. He believed in the common man, and it is plainly discernible that one of his motivating reasons for opposing the institution of slavery was that he did not subscribe to the doctrine that free labor should be compelled to compete with slave or forced labor. At any time during the war he could very easily have set up a dictatorship under the plea of an emergency, but I am sure that the idea never once entered his honest and guileless mind, because it was foreign to his philosophy of life.

From earliest boyhood to the tragic end he believed in and fought for those principles of government that are essentially American; and so, my friends, let us not be deceived by what theorists and sophists would have us believe regarding the things that Abraham Lincoln stood for in the way of government.

An impartial study of his inspiring life furnishes convincing proof that he was sound to the core, ever devoted to the best American ideals and traditions, holding steadfast to the Constitution, veering neither to the right nor to the left, always adhering to a course of action dictated by a conscience responsive to a deep and abiding sense of righteousness.

Let us then, on this anniversary of the birth of the savior of the Republic, dedicate ourselves anew to the immortal principles for which he lived and died. Let us drink deep and often at those wellsprings of human thought and action that inspired the founders of the Republic, which stimulated and nurtured Lincoln's undying faith in his fellow man, of those heroic souls who stood with him shoulder to shoulder during the darkest hours of the Republic and made this glorious country of ours free, one and indivisible.

Their memory will ever remain one of the brightest chapters in our history. My countrymen, let us cleave to the ideals for which they fought, suffered, and died, ever keeping before us those principles of sound government which have made our country the brighest star in the grand galaxy of nations.

Not for G. O. P. Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chattanooga News-Free Press for February 13, 1945:

NOT FOR G. O. P. ALONE

Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio Republican, in his Lincoln Day address at the Read House last night, delivered a blistering indictment of the New Deal—of its incessant war on free enterprise and representative government; of its fantastic waste of the Nation's wealth and resources; of its dreamers and star-gazers, like Henry Wallace; of its greed for power and constant progress toward a socialized, totalitarian state.

But more important was the sound, patriotic program which he outlined as the path of duty for his minority party.

"The one real job we have before us is to protect, here at home, the liberty and the freedom for which our men are fighting and dying overseas," he said. "There is no division among our people in seeking to bring this war to an early and victorious conclusion. * * * Regardless of politics we will support every honest and forthright effort toward building an enduring peace for those who follow us. But we want peace at home as well as abroad.

"We must fight to maintain free enterprise against the attacks of those who are attempting to destroy it. We must see to it that America is truly once more the land of opportunity; that those who fought and won our Nation's battles are given a real freedom of choice, and the full right to build their own lives, and to carve out their own careers, as they, and they alone, may wish.

"Instead of the Government regimenting and regulating our citizens, our citizenship must regiment and regulate the Government. We must see to it those in high places understand fully they are the servants of the people—not their masters. We must teach our people to depend upon themselves, rather than upon their Government.

"Respecting the rights of all nations, we must also learn to respect and to protect the rights of America as a nation. * * *

"There must not be any favored class or royal family in America. We must return to the Constitution, under which the rights of the few are secured against the greed of the many. We must return the law-making powers to Congress and reestablish an impartial judiciary, thus restoring the balance between the three branches of our Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—as given us by our forefathers in that great Magna Carta of American liberty—the Constitution.

"These things we must do, if we are long to maintain here on this continent 'a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.'"

This is too vital a program to be that of the Republican Party alone. If the freedom won for us by our forebears is to survive to bless our descendants, this must be the program of enlightened American patriotism, regardless of political affiliation or preference.

Tieing Up the United States Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will soon start hearings on a bill authorizing the sale of ships now in the American merchant marine to American and foreign purchasers. Ships purchased by aliens will then enter into unfair competition with American flag ships by reason of the added advantage they will have of the right to operate in conjunction with overseas air transportation of their respective nations. At the same time the American merchant marine continues to be hamstrung by the action of the Civil Aeronautics Authority in interpreting the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the operation of transoceanic air lines by American shipping companies.

Britain, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and other maritime nations have no civil aeronautics authority to prevent operation of their ships in foreign trade in conjunction with air service. I have repeatedly called the attention of Congress to the action already taken by some of these forward-looking foreign shipping companies to provide for overseas air transport.

The latest to join this group has been neutral Sweden which has already constructed over a million tons of modern merchant ships for its post-war trade. At the same time it is taking steps to coordinate overseas air transport with the operation of these new ships. A forceful editorial dealing with this condition, which should be read by every friend of the American merchant marine, recently appeared in the San Francisco Call Bulletin.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to that convincing editorial, as follows:

TIEING UP UNITED STATES MARINE—FOREIGN SHIPPING ALREADY TAKING ADVANTAGE OF AMERICAN LACK OF AUXILIARY AIR SERVICE

Seemingly convinced that the American Government will strangle its own peacetime merchant marine by prohibiting steamship companies from providing international auxiliary service by air, foreign operators continue to rush their own preparations for cornering freight and passenger transportation to world ports.

Latest to announce its plans is a Swedish steamship syndicate which has acquired control of an aviation company, as indicated in the following from the weekly publication, International Aviation:

"A syndicate headed by the Rederi A. B. Svenska Lloyd, of Gothenburg, has acquired a majority of the shares of Skandinaviska Aero A. B., which has increased its capital from 150,000 krona to 500,000 krona." The article adds that the air line "plans to extend its taxi and tourist business after the war."

This items indicates that Swedish steamship companies, like those of other foreign nations, already have authority to provide auxiliary service by air. American companies which hope to have such authority, and which must have it if they are to be able to compete in international trade channels, continue to cool their heels, waiting to learn what the Congress intends to do about this matter.

Meanwhile, the American merchant marine can make absolutely no plans for its peacetime operations because it doesn't know what it will be permitted to do. The financial and other arrangements that must be made for the extensive activities these companies want to promote cannot, of course, be made in a matter of weeks.

These plans should be well along in the formative stage now, but the Civil Aeronautics Board has indicated there is no purpose in making any such arrangements when existing law, as interpreted by that Board, prohibits our steamship companies from providing auxiliary service by air.

The American people, as well as the American steamship companies, are entitled to know now, and they should know now, what sort of a peacetime merchant marine this Nation is going to have. Are we going to maintain the commanding position essential for an adequate national defense and for transportation of our manufactured and grown products to ports throughout the world, or are we going to scrap or otherwise dispose of most of our merchant fleet?

We won't be able to maintain a strong merchant marine unless the private operating companies have the authority to provide auxiliary air service. It is the duty of the Congress to establish that authority in law—now.

Lincoln's Question: Can This Nation Long Endure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an address delivered by me at the annual banquet of the Lincoln Club of Denver, Colo., on February 12, 1945:

Today, all over the land, the American people are standing at salute, while Abraham Lincoln and all his deeds and scenes of sacrifice go passing in review. Eighty years have gone since he left this world, but he still lives and stands alone; no ancestors and no successors. Had Jesus of Nazareth walked this earth in the flesh, when Lincoln lived, those two men would have been the best of friends, for they would have had much in common.

As long as men live, they need the Lowly Carpenter; as long as men desire liberty, they will find Abraham Lincoln an inspiration. Among the heroes, he is a hero; and among the martyrs, he is a martyr. Among our statesmen, he was the statesman; and among our Presidents, he was the President. He was the first Republican President, although not the first Republican candidate for the Presidency, and he imbedded the party to which we belong, and its principles, so deep in the hearts and minds of the people that only three times in 80 years has any other party challenged its position.

It is in memory of such a man that we honor ourselves by gathering here tonight to commemorate his natal day.

As we wage a Second World War, it is well for us to contemplate Lincoln. Here at home we face problems of a magnitude which he knew, and from him draw strength to solve those problems as he solved his. It should profit our present leaders, and it should curb any reckless ambitions they may entertain, to remember that Lincoln's greatness came in retrospect and, therefore, is enduring. He was not thought of as a man of stature in his day, and neither was he a man who though he could, or who sought, to set the world agog. He neither sought nor expected the acclaim of the multitudes while he lived. It never occurred to him that he was the only one capable of holding the high office which was his. Instead, his was a deep sense of obligation to a people who so honored him.

It was his genuineness that has stood the test of time. His strength lay in the knowledge of his limitations, humility before his God. He searched not after false prophets for wisdom; he drew it from the people whom he served.

In this tragic day, in this national crisis now facing us, we need men of his homely virtues, his simple philosophy, and his innate honesty.

He has been frequently quoted by demagogs in recent years as a proponent of dangerous panaceas which have been proposed as cures for the ills of our body politic. He has been quoted in support of doctrines that seek to array class against class and which would ultimately destroy the very foundation on which our Government stands.

My fellow citizens of Colorado, we have never had a President who gave more meticulous care and consideration to the rights of all men. We have never had a President who upheld the Federal Constitution with greater reverence and respect. His unyielding devotion to our country and its institutions was his outstanding characteristic. His immortal address at Gettysburg was a prayer to the Almighty that free constitutional government would not perish from the earth. He stood for sound money, protection for the wage earner and the producer, and an economic program that would bring the greatest good to the greatest number. He believed in human rights and property rights, because they were guaranteed by law, but he also knew that one was dependent upon the other. Certainly no man understood better the problems of the common people than he did, because he was one of them.

During the Civil War Lincoln might have set up a dictatorship almost at anytime, under the plea of national emergency. History presents no instance when such an idea ever entered his honest and guileless mind. It was inconsistent with his philosophy of life. He was ever steadfast to a course of

action which sprang solely from nobleness of purpose.

Let none of us be deceived or led astray by star-gazing theorists regarding the principles Lincoln stood for in government. He not only believed in economy in government; he practiced it. He was even unwilling that the Government should pay for the horse his own son rode as a soldier in the Civil War. His check for $125, in payment of the horse, is still in existence.

His record stands out when compared with present-day ideas of national economy and stability. This Government can be destroyed from within, unless the people themselves repudiate the philosophy that it makes no difference how much we owe, because we owe it to ourselves, and that a nation can make itself poor by paying its public debt.

We have been moving away from the time-tested principles on which the Government was founded, and which have lifted the weights from the shoulders of men and given promise and hope to the downtrodden and oppressed of the earth. We have been moving at accelerated speed toward totalitarian government.

When Benjamin Franklin stepped out of old Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, on a day in September 1787, the day on which he signed the new Constitution which he helped to formulate, a friend asked him, "What kind of government have you given us?" He promptly replied, "A republic, if we can keep it."

Three-quarters of a century later, we find Lincoln at Gettysburg, asking the same question, "Can a government conceived in liberty long endure?" Now, 80 years later, we are asking the same question.

When Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg, the Civil War was at its height. He must have had in mind the danger of our destruction from within, for we were not being attacked from without.

He foresaw then what we fear now, when he pointed out, with the wisdom of a prophet: "At what point is the danger to be expected? If it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

Tonight our heroic and courageous fighting men and women are on every battle front in the world. Now and then I think of that editorial which appeared in Life magazine on New Years Day 1944, in which the author caught some of the bitter spirit of today when he wrote, "This is the last year on earth for many young men." The very thought is disturbing as one watches the young of the Nation march off to foreign battlefields to give their all at the battle stations of freedom.

A generation ago, a poet wrote of those who sleep in Flanders field, they "lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow, loved and were loved, and now they lie in Flanders field."

The grimness of war reaches into every household and touches every human heart in the land.

There is the anxious vigil of God-fearing fathers and mothers who, night after night, murmur their devotions and utter their resurgent hopes for a son who is far afield. But this is not all. Only recently, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs appeared before Congress to advise them that already 873,000 young Americans are being carried on the service-connected wounded rolls, and it is expected it will reach 993,000 by June 30, 1946. Here we see the progressive stamp of war upon the minds and bodies of young men.

Millions of war workers who have gone forth from their homes to find work in plants which produce the sinews of war, are disturbed over the future and what change may unfold by way of jobs and contented living. Not a class or segment of our entire population but what has felt the impact of conflict and wonders what the future may have in store.

Today, it is common knowledge that already we have expended $45,000,000,000 for the prosecution of conflict, and the national debt at the end of the next fiscal year will be just short of $300,000,000,000. People everywhere are wondering whether we can preserve the fiscal integrity of the Nation.

These fears today are assailing the hearts and minds of the common man—the forgotten man about whom we heard so much in other days.

DEEPER ANXIETY

The discerning person today can observe a deeper anxiety in the land. It stems in part from our growing familiarity with the advance of total government in other parts of the world. On every hand one hears the question whether or not, in a world where the philosophy of total government has moved so far, we can still sustain the tradition, the incentive, and the basic freedoms which are the wellspring of American greatness.

THE INSTINCT FOR COMFORT

We are like so many children; when the way is hard and tortuous, and bewilderment is everywhere, we seek comfort and assurance. We are like plants in a dark cellar in the wintertime, which send their dainty tendrils in the direction of any stray sunbeam which may come through a soiled basement window. It is a quality which is inherent in all mankind.

It was Wordsworth, the lyrical English poet, who as he surveyed the perplexities of his own generation was impelled to cry out, "Milton, thou shouldst be living at this hour."

In the same fashion, we Americans who worship not at the shrine of Milton, great as he was, but at the shrine of the humble Lincoln, are impelled in this anniversary period to cry out in the same throbbing tone of Wordsworth, "Lincoln, thou shouldst be living at this hour."

Is it not interesting that in 1940 the custodians of the Lincoln Memorial, who keep accurate count, reported that in a single year 1,639,000 persons visited that sacred shrine? They came with a kind of humility to the shrine of one whom they knew could understand if he were still alive.

Could we do better on this one hundred and thirty-sixth anniversary of his birth than to stand within the aura of his influence and seek direction and guidance which will carry us through the anxious days which lie ahead?

Can it be doubted that he still lives, that his influence can reach into every known heart? In the words of the Apostle Paul, "being dead, yet speaketh", might be said of Lincoln, and I can think of no greater fount of assurance in this anxious hour than to give ear to the whisperings from his shrine, wherewith to find comfort and refuge.

THE CHALLENGE

Let us go back, then, to Gettysburg for our test. Let us reexamine our own souls and consciences and reecho that imperishable challenge "whether a nation conceived in liberty can long endure". Can it? No longer can it be lightly dismissed, because already the challenge has struck fear into the hearts of men everywhere.

This challenge confronts not only us, but the people of other nations who have hewed out, by blood and tears, the foundation and the processes of a democratic structure, only to find them tumbling in an age when values are being so rapidly destroyed.

What provided so much interest in the Dies committee, if it were not the concern of people in all walks of life who wonder whether our form of government may be destroyed from within rather than from without?

That very thought persists today, as Congress and the country consider the subversive forces that seek to modify the form and substance of the government under which we have grown so great.

Why should there be such widespread interest, for instance, in the salvage of Poland, if it is not the same old question of nourishing the philosophy of freedom, not only in our own land but other lands as well?

Why are we at war today and why has the casualty list expanded to include 800,000 of our finest youth, if it is not to repeal the philosophy of total government before its deadly virus too vigorously besets us upon our own shores?

Why is our country so deeply interested in the affairs of the Argentine, 9,000 miles from the seat of our own Government, if it is not the fact that the virus of totalitarianism has already struck deep root and may one day overwhelm us, since we are a part of the same hemisphere?

We do not consciously phrase our anxiety, and yet it is at the very root of the turbulence of mind which we experience today. We are afraid of the menacing forces which imperil the very life of this Republic.

Let us echo and reecho, then, the challenge from Gettysburg, whether a nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.

THE MENACING FORCES—WAR

How amazing it is that, for 4,000 years, the nations of the world have resorted to war as a form of political action for the adjustment of their difficulties.

The yellowing pages of history tell us that 4,000 years ago the Greeks besieged and destroyed many of the finest values of antiquity in a war that lasted for 9 years with Troy and which began over the kidnaping of an ancient glamour girl named Helen. Even before that time man was using the arbitration of force, and since that time war has been the steady diet of mankind. It has ever disseminated nations and will continue to do so until the formula for lasting peace has been found.

Consider the dislocations in our own land. Nearly 300,000 business enterprises have gone out of business under the impact of war. The whole resource of the Nation has had to be marshaled, burdensome restrictions have had to be imposed, taxes have gone to unbelievable levels, and in the fiscal year 1945 the Federal Government alone will collect in excess of forty-seven billion in revenues of all kinds.

CENTRALIZED POWER

Consider the power by which government has become so thoroughly centralized already in this Nation. In 1933, with the depression and the despair as a springboard, powers were freely delegated to the executive branch by the Congress, with the general sanction of the country. Administrative agencies were created, and rules and regulations issued, which govern the very life of our people. Scarcely an activity of the citizen is left untouched. They carried their own penalties and had the force of administrative law. To make them effective, not thousands but hundreds of thousands of people were placed upon the civilian rolls of government. A host of experts—nearly 34,000—were employed to make these regulations palatable.

Control, by means of regulations, is becoming more rigid. Government is becoming the master and manager of the people's interest. The sovereignty of the States is gradually being impaired by grants and assistance of all kinds.

From 1941 to 1946, with the latter year estimated, the number of administrative rules and regulations for that 6-year period will exceed 182,000. There you have a staggering picture of government by administrative fiat, which is another name for centralized national government. As it moves on to larger proportions, and the comings and goings of the people are regulated by orders

from Washington, what shall we then say to the question of whether a nation conceived in liberty can long endure?

COURTS

For many years, there has been a growing concern about the impaired integrity of the court system of the Nation. How much blood was spilled for centuries, before we reached the degree of perfection in our court system, whereby the humble citizen may go before an impartial tribunal and there have determined any controversy which may arise between him and his neighbor, or between him and his government. However, in the original O. P. A. Act, Congress specifically stated that a citizen could not raise the question of the validity of any order, rule, or regulations issued by the O. P. A., except in a special court which had its situs in Washington.

Here, then, was the spectacle of an administrative agency, which could punish people by means of administrative fiat and then have him prevented by law from securing a redress of his grievance before a fair and impartial court which was close to home and easily accessible.

If this impairment of the judiciary continues, and more and more power is lodged in a single branch of the Government, what shall we then say of the essential freedoms? What shall we say of liberty as we knew it in the early days of our Nation? What shall we say of the freedom for which young men fight and die? What shall we say of the preservation of the democratic process and, again, what shall we say about the challenge which came rolling down from Gettysburg 82 years ago, from the humble Lincoln, whose sense of fundamental values was derived from the soil, from communion with nature, and his fellowship with the common man of that day? With him, we query the question whether a nation conceived in liberty can long endure?

What is the collectivist idea? It is the thesis that the collective welfare is important and that, if necessary, the rights, the privileges, and the welfare of the individual citizen must be subordinated entirely to it. It is but another way of saying that the common man must be kept common.

If that theory is embraced, we are on the road to the destruction of individual liberty and the very foundation of the greatness of this country. Liberty has provided the initiative for man to go forward and create benefactions for himself, his country, and the world. It is why, in all ages, millions have died for that precious thing. Yet, collectivism sweeps over the country and is expressed in Government agencies. It is so easily sold to many people and, when it gets the whip-hand, liberty dies. The challenge of Lincoln from Gettysburg again rings in our ears.

What confronts us in our own country today is, after all, a moral problem. Liberty is a moral thing. It will be defended only when there is a regenerative sweep through the land that touches every heart and stirs a new sense of values.

In Spite of the Law, Selective Service Still Takes the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Selective Service System continues its reckless and unauthorized draft of essential and irreplaceable farmers. This is in plain violation of the intent of the Tydings amendment as passed by the Congress and signed by the President. And during all this time, the newspapers and the corner fence posts along our countryside are filled with notices of auction sales of entire herds of cattle and of farm machinery. In today's mail, I have a collection of some of these notices taken from the newspapers in a midwestern community within the district which I have the honor to represent.

One of these reads: "26 head of cattle, 19 head of hogs, 5 head of horses, farm machinery," and so forth.

Another begins, "Having decided to quit farming," it announces the sale of 7 head of horses, 51 head of cattle, 21 head of hogs, farm implements, and so forth.

Another states, "As I am quitting farming," it offers for sale 16 head of cattle, 600 chickens, farm implements, and household goods.

Another reads, "As I have been called for service, I will sell at public auction," 20 head of cattle, 6 head of horses, farm implements, and so forth.

And another one: "A herd of 32 cows and heifers in good production." This herd has been producing milk for the Chicago market for 10 years.

And another one: "On account of the shortage of help, I will sell at public auction 24 head of high-grade Holstein cows."

And still another: "Due to my son having to leave for the armed forces, I am forced to offer at public auction 40 head of cattle," and the notice goes on, "this is one of the best dairy herds in the county and has produced an average of 10 cans of milk daily for the past year." It also offers for sale 2 head of horses, farm implements, and everything down to the family car.

Many herds of fine cattle have already gone to the slaughterhouses and others are on the way.

If the Washington planners, who are nullifying the expressed intent of the Congress, do not stop these violations and stop them very quickly, America is going to see some mighty lean days ahead and it is already very, very late in the day.

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Small Business" which appeared in the February 10, 1945, issue of the Lynn, Mass., Telegram-News:

SMALL BUSINESS

Everybody pays lip service to small business, and a good deal of the adulation is sentimental if not hypocritical. The time has come to recognize that small business is important to the Nation's future not because it is small or necessarily therefore lovable, but because it has an essential economic role to play. Henry Wallace talked about that role in his testimony before the Senate commerce committee, and a report this week by Senator MURRAY'S small business committee buttresses his evidence.

Smallness alone may have nothing to recommend it, as bigness alone has not. The reason government must actively protect and encourage small business in that it serves as a fruitful source of new ideas, new economic growth, and competitive progress. If monopolistic practices, tax policies, or limited access to credit and technical information tend to concentrate more and more enterprise in the established big units, as in the past, then we are headed for a static economy, encrusted with caution and dedicated to stability instead of expansion.

The concentration of economic power is a direct and logical result of free enterprise. Enterprise that is free, in the sense of being immune from government attention or guidance, tends to become progressively less free, in the sense of equal opportunity. Government's responsibility is not to break up the big units—no use trying to turn back the clock—but to keep the door open for new initiative, to preserve opportunities for new business to grow big.

And this implies more than the enforcement, on the umpire theory, of a set of rules. The Murray committee, for example, explodes the notion that mere tax revision, necessary as that may be, will of itself open up capital sources to small business. Government must take an active part in guaranteeing or supplying credit, making available technological research that has too long been the monopoly of big corporations, and otherwise promoting fair competition.

Small enterprise in both manufacturing and distribution took a hard knock in the shift to a war economy—one-sixth of all firms have closed their doors in the past 4 years—and it can take an even harder one in demobilization. Safeguards have been written into reconversion legislation, but they must be enforced by sympathetic administrative policies carried out by men who clearly grasp the function of small enterprise in an expending economy.

Senator MURRAY'S committee finds that to achieve post-war full employment "small business and new business must enter the field, assured in their opportunity to compete." But if small business is essential to full employment, full employment is also essential to small business. The opportunity for economic growth depends upon a steadily rising standard of living; the incentive for new enterprise upon sustained purchasing power. It is Government's job to establish the conditions under which all business, big and small, can prosper as the people prosper.

The Case of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the only criticism that I have

heard growing out of the recent conference at Yalta has been with reference to the Polish question.

An editorial appearing in the New York Times of yesterday entitled, "The Case of Poland," states the case so well and sums up the facts in such a convincing manner that under leave granted I am submitting herewith this editorial:

THE CASE OF POLAND

Until the spokesmen of the Big Three powers met at Yalta the outlook was bleak for any satisfactory, or even acceptable, settlement of the controversy over Poland. The Russians, who had twice within one generation been invaded by the Germans across the Polish plains, insisted upon a new strategic frontier farther west, along the so-called Curzon line. Their claim for such a frontier was buttressed by the fact that east of the Curzon line there are fewer Poles than non-Poles, and by the further fact that the old frontier had been established at the end of the last war by force of Polish arms. Meanwhile, in opposition to this view, the Polish Government in exile, functioning in London, insisted that it had no mandate from the Polish people to surrender any part of Polish territory and that Russia was attempting to force a settlement of the whole question by unilateral action.

That was true before the Yalta conference met. It is now no longer true. The solution proposed at Yalta is a three-power plan, supported not only by Russia but by Britain and the United States. To be sure, the Polish Government in exile had had no hand in this decision. But the fact remains that the decision was made in the name of the three powers which alone are capable of defending the integrity of Poland against a renewal of German aggression, and by the three powers which will once more have to bear the brunt of the fighting in case such a threat develops.

Moreover, the solution has much to commend it on other grounds than this vital one that it represents a decision which the great powers are prepared to defend in Poland's interest. For, while Russia's claim to the Curzon line is recognized, with certain minor digressions in Poland's favor, Poland is assured of "substantial accessions of territory in the north and west." Meanwhile, the present puppet government set up in Warsaw by Russian unilateral action is to be reorganized "on a broader democratic basis" under the aegis of an international commission of three members, in which Russia will have a minority of one, and the new provisional government thus formed is to be "pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible, on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot." In these elections "all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates."

Because we believe that this plan offers the Polish people west of the Curzon line an opportunity to choose their own government by democratic methods; because we believe that the Curzon line itself, judged historically, is not unfair or unreasonable; because we believe that, with the accession of some new territory in the west and north, there will be ample living space in which a sturdy Poland can prosper, and because we believe that the guaranty of Polish integrity implied in this three-power decision is of great importance from the point of view of the long future, we regret the action of the Polish Government in London yesterday in flatly rejecting the Yalta plan. We think that history will say that it missed an opportunity.

Crop Loans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of S. P. Lindsey, Jr., Director, Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Division, Farm Credit Administration, before the House Committee on Agriculture, February 15, 1945:

All the early crop loan or seed and feed loan acts as well as the act of Congress, approved January 29, 1937, under which we have operated since that date, state that any such loan shall be secured by a first lien or an agreement to give a first lien upon all crops of which the production or harvesting or both is to be financed. If, however, the loan is for the purchase of feed for livestock to be sold, a first lien on the livestock is required. The loan regulations which have been adopted embody exactly the same requirement as to security. With a congressional mandate to take such security, it becomes our administrative responsibility to see that the crop or stock so pledged is preserved, and, that upon its sale, an accounting is received. Therefore, with respect to current secured loans, it is our policy to require that all sales of security be for the account of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, and that the proceeds thereof be applied in liquidation of the debt until the loan is paid in full or all security has been accounted for.

It is our practice to consider that the requirements of the foregoing policy have been met when the security, such as growing crops, was not produced and marketed because of crop failure attributable to reasons beyond the borrower's control or, when the proceeds of authorized sales of security were insufficient to repay the loan in full because of poor markets and other such reasons. In those cases when the security is no longer in existence or has all been accounted for, collected effort on unpaid balances naturally must be governed by a policy that gives due regard to the entirely different circumstances which then prevail.

Accordingly, the policy which has been established to govern collection effort on these old loans is to request payment in accordance with the debtor's ability to pay without undue hardship. If a borrower has acted in good faith and cannot pay because of circumstances beyond his control, such facts receive sympathetic consideration. On the other hand, if there is evidence of the debtor's ability to pay, either in whole or in part, he will be expected to pay in accordance with his means.

No policy, no matter how conceived, can be applied automatically to the many different sets of individual circumstances represented by the thousands of persons who owe old emergency crop or feed loans. It is our custom and practice, therefore, to determine these individual circumstances either by personal calls on the debtor or by letters of inquiry. In many cases the letters of inquiry or personal calls include or take the form of a request for voluntary payment. It is quite natural that some borrowers may construe such a request for information or voluntary payment as undue collection effort. Nevertheless, it is our administrative responsibility, flowing from Federal law and the regulations of Federal agencies having charge of accountability of Government funds and property, to maintain collection effort on unpaid seed and feed loans within the framework of the foregoing policy.

The integrity of Federal funds, that is, payments which have been made on emergency crop and feed loans, must be preserved. We must be certain that all payments which farmers have made on these loans have not been either misappropriated or erroneously credited. To meet this objective, audit letters of confirmation are sent to all debtors at periodic intervals. These letters contain information as to amount of the original loans and the dates and application of all payments which have been received. In addition, they request the debtor to inform the regional office immediately if proper credit for all payments are not reflected. Such letters of confirmation of accounts may likewise be considered as undue or inconsiderate collection effort, but with other safeguards they are instrumental in preserving the integrity of Federal funds.

I feel that we are on sound ground when it is stated that preliminary requests for voluntary payments, requests for information as to a borrower's circumstances, and periodic letters to confirm accounts are not inconsistent with either the foregoing collection policy or the administrative responsibility imposed on us in the handling of Government business.

Until the passage of Pubic Law No. 518, during the closing days of the last Congress, we had no means of clearing our records of accounts owed by borrowers who had no ability to make payment, and until the passage of that act we had no authority to make reasonable settlements, by compromise or adjustment, with those borrowers who were unable to pay in full but could pay a lesser amount than that due the Government. Previously, there was no action that could be taken if such information was developed about debtors, or when field men came in contact with and learned the circumstances of individual borrowers. In administering the compromise and adjustment of accounts, we clearly have in mind the cancelation of debt when there is no ability to pay in whole or part, and the compromise and adjustment of debt by directly negotiated settlement with the borrower in accordance with his ability to pay without undue hardship. It is our interpretation of the wishes of Congress, as indicated in section 1 of Public Law No. 518, that such settlements shall be made whenever it is definitely established that (1) the indebtedness has been due and payable for 5 years or more, (2) the debtor is unable to pay in full and has no reasonable prospect of being able to do so, (3) the debtor has acted in good faith in an effort to meet his obligation, and (4) the principal amount of the debt is not in excess of $1,000.

Our experience in the last few years of good yields and satisfactory prices justifies the action of Congress in providing that these old seed loans shall be compromised, adjusted, or canceled after giving consideration to the ability of the debtor to repay. Thousands of farmers in the High Plains States, where the greatest amount of debt is outstanding, have sent in remittances covering numerous loans on which nothing had been repaid during the first few years following the granting of the loan.

Now these unpaid loans, in many cases, are being paid in full. In numerous cases farmers have stated that such payments on their old seed and feed loans leave them free of debt for the first time in many years, and in a substantial number of cases it has been stated that they have considerable assets after making such payments.

While Public Law 518 permits the disposition of accounts which cannot be collected and authorizes the final settlement, either by compromise or adjustment, of debt for an amount less than that due the Government, we must remember that there are many hundred thousands of accounts which are subject to this treatment at the present time, and that we are unable to increase our field force or office force during wartime. It may not be possible, therefore, to remove these accounts from our records in anything like the time that such action could be taken under ordinary circumstances. However, as these accounts are disposed of and settled by agreement with the borrowers, it will no longer be necessary to contact the debtor in order to determine his ability to meet an obligation to the Government. Further, once an account is removed from our records, it will be no longer necessary to write him with the view of auditing the manner in which Federal funds have been accounted for. The operation of Public Law 518 will remove this source of irritation. On the other hand the accounts, more than 5 years old, which may not be removed from our records in the orderly and sympathetic administration of this act, will consist almost entirely of debts due the Government from borrowers who are obviously able to pay.

A Few Remarks by a New Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, since recently becoming a Member of this distinguished legislative body, many Members thereof, on both sides of the aisle, have told me that the time to first speak as a new Member was when I felt impelled that I simply must speak out. Also they have urged that precedent in this House did not dictate that a new Member should always be seen and not heard.

I have studied the bill most carefully. There is no mention of Henry Wallace or Jesse Jones therein; yet, having listened to the full debate and discussion on this bill, rule, and motion to recommit, I venture that most of the time has been taken on the floor in speaking against Henry Wallace. I also have heard many of the gentlemen of this House who have spoken against him as an idealist, frankly state that there was nothing against his honesty, integrity, or character.

Admitting that I have not been here long enough to be familiar with the history and background of the Department of Commerce, or of the Federal Loan Agency, or of the First War Powers Act, 1941, or of the General Accounting Office, or of the Comptroller General, all of which Departments of Government or officials are referred to in S. 375, nevertheless, it appears to me that the major debate and discussion of these two afternoons have been about a person instead of about governmental policies, procedures and programs. As I read the Constitution and law, it is a fact appointments to a Cabinet position by the President of this great Nation are only confirmed by the United States Senate. Yet, it appears to me, that Members of this House who have no jurisdiction, authority, or responsibility in the premises for or against confirmation of the Cabinet members are in fact, indirectly at least, undertaking by their stated positions on this measure to determine whether or not Henry Wallace shall be confirmed as a Cabinet member. Some of the many who have spoken have strongly said they were opposed to the confirmation. This then appears to be a determining factor in the attitude and speech of some Members, rather than the exclusive merits of the bill.

Every Member of this House who has spoken to me about it, on both sides, has told me that Members of Congress must clearly and always listen to the voice of their constituents on important matters in which their constituents express great interest. This being true, I will say of the many expressions I have received from the Eighteenth District in California on this bill, all but two have been favorable to Mr. Wallace. I have received literally dozens of communications from individuals, as well as groups asking support for Mr. Wallace—endorsing his policies, experience, and political philosophy. Furthermore, during the political campaign as a result of which I came to the halls of this great legislative body, a decided majority of expressions to me as a candidate to this office by my district were strongly for Henry Wallace.

I have no fear of the decision of the American people when they know all the facts. One of the greatest dangers to democracy in this Nation is the lack of information to the majority of people. Truth hurts no person or program for progress. Full debate and discussion based upon facts rather than personalities—decisions on major matters in light of merit of the measure, rather than ill will toward any individual or political animosity or rivalry—must determine our destiny if our democracy is to endure.

The strongly expressed wish, as made to me from my district in California, is for the George bill—they are not afraid of Henry Wallace, his idealism, philosophy, and sympathetic understanding and friendship for the rank and file of the American people.

I shall vote for the rule and for the bill, and against the motion to recommit.

Surplus Medical Supplies

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Surplus Reporter of February 3, 1945, lists some 344 articles of a medical and surgical nature which will go on sale on and after February 19, 1945.

In checking over the Surplus Property Reporter, I find a few of the 344 items listed as follows: 53,657 surgical knives, 36,881 surgical forceps, 27,004 sterilizing instruments, 19,995 pairs of surgical scissors, 1,536,000 tablets of procaine—these are used for local anesthetics—51,150,000 tablets of laxatives of various types, 1,200,000 tablets of strychnine sulfate, 95,954 pints of aromatic spirits of ammonia, 28,687 pounds of zinc oxide, 28,300,000 first-aid surgical dressings, 50,000 tubes of surgical catgut, 7,292 surgical masks, 44,875 pounds of ichthyol.

Most of these articles are new and unused and offered at informal bid.

It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time that a better coordination is had between the several branches of Government when it comes to buying the materials they need.

In order to have articles ordered, it is necessary for someone to estimate the needs and then for the order to be placed. It seems to me that the chiefs of the several staffs ought to pay closer attention to the placing of all orders. Does it not follow that when there is a surplus of property that someone has over-ordered? Does it not follow that there is a waste of money, manpower, and materials? The same factories that are selling this property as surplus are still working 24 hours a day to turn out the same articles for the military.

I can understand that there will be implements of a military nature that become obsolete and must be changed but the items that I have cited are standard, have been for 10 years, and will probably be standard 10 years from today. The Surplus Reporter carries thousands of items from screws and bolts to airplanes and brassieres.

Unless there is a more careful coordination in the buying and the selling of surplus property, this country will be rocked by a scandal it will not soon forget. A few days ago, Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, testified before the Committee on Executive Expenditures that perhaps $50,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money had been wasted in the construction of war plants through war contracts and the cost-plus method being followed by the military service. This wanton waste of money, manpower, and American resources must stop. It can be done by more careful planning. The merciless spotlight of public scrutiny must be in continual focus on this segment of Government activity or nasty scandals are sure to occur.

Taylor Grazing Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, the unwarranted attempt of the Grazing Service to raise the fees of western livestock

producers has thoroughly aroused and provoked the people of my State. The Legislature of Nevada is now in session at Carson City. It is almost certain to adopt a resolution in the next few days dealing with the subject of grazing management and fees. Should this happen, it will be a serious indictment on the operation of this Government agency in my State. The following quotations taken from a letter are cogent statements representing the views of both large and small producers in Nevada. The resolution which follows the quotations presents a strong case against the present management of the Grazing Service and the proposed increase in fees as announced by them. In my opinion, Congress must take action in this matter.

Quotations and resolution follow:

Those of us who are taking the lead for the Nevada State grazing boards and their central committee in opposing the proposed increase in grazing-service fees consider it of particular importance that those in Congress, before whom the Grazing Service officials appear in connection with its annual appropriations be advised at the earliest possible moment of the wish on the part of the stock-raising settlers concerned that no further grazing-supervision service on the part of the Grazing Service is wanted until the matter of a proper basis of fees can be settled.

The record shows that the Grazing Service, year after year, has been urging upon congressional committees the need for continual increases in appropriations for rendering additional service and that these committees have responded with the general idea that this additional service was being demanded by the users and that, generally, they would not object to compensatory increases in fees. This has gone on until the service costs are beginning to exceed the collections possible on the basis of present fee standards.

The National Advisory Board Council, in its answer to the recent proposal of the Grazing Service for increased fees is on record to the effect that the service rendered should be limited to the extent possible with such collections as the present fee scales produce and we believe that this stand represents the general attitude of the stock-raising settlers concerned.

Steps have been taken urging the various States representatives on the National Advisory Board Council to advise their congressional delegations to urge upon the members of the congressional committees concerned the importance of granting no further appropriation increases for grazing-supervision increases until a proper basis of fees within the provisions and intent of the Taylor Act can be determined.

It may be that the Grazing Service appropriation already is before either the Budget Bureau or the House Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations. We are rushing this letter and enclosure to you, therefore, in the hope that you can see fit to contact either or both the Budget Bureau and the said committe econcerning this matter at your earliest possible convenience. In our efforts to require the Grazing Service to carry out the intent of Congress when it enacted the Taylor Act in the matter of a proper fee basis, we regard it as of material importance that the record show, as soon as possible, that it is not the wish of the stock-raising settlers concerned that further increases in appropriations be granted as matters stand.

Assembly Joint Resolution 8

Whereas the Taylor Grazing Act specifies that the grazing fees required to be paid under its provisions are to be reasonable; and

Whereas when the said act was before the Congress in 1934 the matter of the reasonableness of the said fees, as to their economic effect upon the enterprises of the stock-raising settlers and the business and tax structures of the local communities concerned, was brought up by members of the Senate Public Lands Committee with officials of the Interior Department, and, to secure support of the Senate committee in enactment of the said act, assurances were given the said committee by the Interior Department officials that—

Their intention under the act was that of maintaining and upbuilding the public ranges for the benefit of the local interests consisting of the stock-raising settlers and States concerned.

They had no intention at all of depriving the settlers of rights derived either under State laws or by customary usage or of using the said act to exploit the grazing values of the ranges for revenue-producing purposes, and instead intended only that the fees to be charged should pay for the costs of administering these values, and nothing more; and

Whereas in 1941 a grazing-fee study made by the Grazing Service and contemplating an increase in the existing fees of some 300 percent, was set aside after a series of hearings, at the request of the representatives of the stock-raising settlers, with a definite promise by the Grazing Service to defer any steps looking to increased fees pending the end of the war when opportunity could be had to determine what post-war economic readjustments might then have to be undergone by the range stock-raising industry; and

Whereas despite both the said assurances by the Department of the Interior officials that only a cost of administration fee was intended and the promise of the Grazing Service officials that the matter of increased fees would be deferred for the duration, the Grazing Service recently has announced its intention of increasing the fees, effective for 1945, by approximately 300 percent, attempting to justify such increase, not on the cost of grazing administration but instead upon the value of the range, and without any consideration whatever of the economic effect upon either the enterprises of the stock-raising settlers or the business and tax structures of the local communities concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That unless the officials of the Department of the Interior and the Grazing Service speedily and forthwith show a proper disposition to conform with and carry out the said assurances and promises in connection with their administration of the Taylor Grazing Act, the said act should be repealed, at least insofar as its application to the public lands in Nevada is concerned, and that until the question of how much the stock-raising settlers are to be required and how much they can afford to pay for range administration is decided that no further increases in Grazing Service appropriations be granted, and we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and its committees concerned to take the steps necessary to these ends; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to each of the Members of the Nevada congressional delegation, to the governors of each public-land State, to the chairman of the Senate Public Lands Committee, to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Director, United States Grazing Service.

Perpetual War Declared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the statement issued by the Big Three after their Crimean Conference means that there will be no peace in our time, if the provisions of the agreements reached are carried out. To carry out the provisions it is clear that the United States will be called upon to maintain in Europe an expeditionary force in perpetuity.

Under the commitments we become the guarantor of boundary lines which I do not believe can be preserved in peace. They can be maintained only at the cost of perpetual fighting, and it is quite clear that we are to do the fighting.

There will be wars piled upon wars because of the manner in which the loot of Europe is to be divided under the proposals. No international organization working under the Crimean agreements can save Europe from these wars. All that such an international organization can do will be to compel us to participate in those wars.

It is also clear that if the United States is to maintain a European expeditionary force, we will have a perpetual emergency in America. This means that all of the emergency war powers that have been granted to Mr. Roosevelt will continue indefinitely. There will never be an end to the emergency we are now in.

In a nutshell, that means an end to our constitutional form of government which 12,000,000 of our sons and daughters were told they went forth to defend. It means that the people of America will have nothing to look forward to but bureaucratic regimentation and control and Government compulsion.

Simultaneously with the distribution of the statements of the Crimean Conference agreements there arose in the United States, according to many news commentators, a chorus of approval. The New Deal propaganda machine was working in high gear. It sought to give the impression that every one was in agreement with the decisions which were announced.

I have found no such unanimous approval as was indicated over the radio and in the press. I, for one, and I know I am not alone in Congress, am unwilling that we should be called upon to maintain a standing Army on both sides of Poland to preserve the territorial distribution which this conference has made. Likewise, I do not see why there should be three military spheres of influence in France, if the international supergovernment which we are talking about has any chance of being effective.

Perpetual war is no method for preserving peace.

It might be well to ask, Where would we have been in Greece 2 months ago

had this agreement been in effect at that time? Would the United States have been fighting for Great Britain or would we have been fighting for the E. L. A. S. who are said to have had the blessing of Stalin's government?

The Crimean agreements indicate that all Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill had to do at the conference was to agree with Mr. Stalin. This is well indicated by the fact that they made a right-about-face when they agreed to recognize the Lublin government of Poland after having recognized the Polish Government in exile only a few short weeks ago.

It is amazing that the three leaders of the world could meet and issue a statement of the results of their conference without mentioning another war in which the United States is bitterly engaged. Yet that is what has happened. No mention whatever was made in the conference statement of the terrific struggle now being fought in the Pacific area. No mention was made of what, if any, aid will be given the United States in our war with Japan. It must be admitted that the statement announced at Yalta shows an utter disregard for our problems in the Pacific.

When we entered the European conflict we were hailed as great participators in the movement for the betterment of humanity. It would give the people of America great pleasure to hail Russia and Great Britain in a similar manner in regard to our war with Japan.

"Debunking" the Poll-Tax "Bunk"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled " 'Debunking' the Poll-Tax 'Bunk' " which appeared in the February 1945 issue of the Southern Planter. This is the oldest agricultural journal in America and has its headquarters at Richmond, Va. The editor of the Southern Planter is Mr. Paul D. Sanders.

The editorial follows:

"DEBUNKING" THE POLL-TAX "BUNK"

Self-preservation is the first attribute of a politician. That is why the "machine" politicians in Virginia are fanatically fighting repeal of the poll tax as a voting requirement. They have found in the poll tax their most useful tool for perpetuating their term of office. By disfranchising the vast majority of people and permitting only a pitiful minority to vote, a handful of officeholders in every county, through the influence of "their sisters, their cousins, and their aunts," can swing almost any election. This is a vicious sort of thing in a democratic society.

The very fact that politicians are fighting poll-tax repeal is ample evidence that they are afraid to face an unhampered electorate. None of them will admit this, however. Instead, they give as their excuse for opposing poll-tax repeal, such bunk as "revenue from the poll tax goes to support the public schools;" "the poll tax keeps the riff-raff from voting;" "it disfranchises the Negro and guarantees white supremacy;" "it insures a sound fiscal policy for Virginia." Anyone remotely familiar with the problem knows that all of these arguments are bogus.

Divorce the poll tax from the right to vote, universally assess and collect it, and the tax will yield three times its present revenue for the schools. The so-called riff-raff if they be defined as those who permit the poll taxes to be paid in a block by politicians and voted accordingly, can only vote under the present system; while many of our best citizens are being disqualified. The racial issue is pure demagogery. Of the 10,000,000 Americans who are unable to vote because of the poll taxes, at least 6,000,000 are white citizens. Less than a fourth of Virginia's total population is colored. North Carolina, with a much larger Negro population than Virginia, abolished the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting 25 years ago and that State is a shining example in the South of everything good in government for the common man, of both colors. And, as far as sound fiscal policy is concerned, is their anyone who surely believes that Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Texas, the poll-tax States that polled a total of 3,113,082 votes in the Presidential election last fall, are operating under a sounder financial policy than the other 40 States of the Union that polled 44,856,706 votes, or 94 percent of the total? The question is as ridiculous as the arguments that promote it.

The whole argument in favor of the poll tax is a foil, a smoke screen to hide the ugly fact that the politicians, now in power, want a small electorate that can be controlled by the officeholders. The poll tax as a voting requirement in Virginia is doomed just as surely as day follows darkness. And the quicker it passes, the better it will be for all the people.

Nonresidents Buy More Vermont Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Brattleboro (Vt.) Reformer of February 13, 1945:

NONRESIDENTS BUY MORE VERMONT PROPETRY—SALES IN 1944 SECOND HIGHEST ACCORDING TO REPORT BROKERS

MONTPELIER.—Licensed real-estate brokers in 1944 sold 303 Vermont properties, involving $1,362,550, to out-of-State buyers, who spent, it was estimated, $143,460 for repairs. These figures, compiled by the publicity service, department of natural resources, do not include sales not handled by brokers and do not include reports from all of the license brokers in the State.

This report includes data supplied by 67 out of a total of 288 real-estate men licensed by the secretary of state as of November 20, 1944. There were a number who reported no sales to out-of-State people and about half of those licensed made no report at all.

A total of 17,700 inquiries about Vermont property were received by those who reported. Of these 1,272 resulted from State advertising and the brokers say the State ads helped in making 69 of the sales. There may have been some indirect help in the other sales as it is difficult sometimes to trace out what interested customers in Vermont.

Since the beginning of the record in 1931, only once before has the recorded number of sales gone over 300, but the amount of money involved was exceeded in 2 years. There may be significance in the figures recorded since the war began. The following is the record:

Year	Sales	Amount	Repairs (estimated)
1931	106	$437,100	(1)
1932	90	278,875	$29,520
1933	114	335,425	47,400
1934	125	365,459	100,000
1935	173	542,750	165,385
1936	157	680,800	206,600
1937	239	731,105	499,900
1938	164	501,710	186,800
1939	200	840,825	297,500
1940	244	780,010	318,300
1941	380	1,559,270	801,620
1942	198	880,225	219,750
1943	269	1,478,460	138,750
1944	303	1,362,550	143,460

[1] No report.

Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, George Washington once said:

In proportion as the structure of government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion be enlightened.

It is important that sovereign citizens in a free government should be fully informed of all commitments, agreements, and alliances made or entered into by their President in the field of foreign affairs.

There is nothing more dangerous to free government than a rigid censorship applied to matters which relate to the vital interests of a free people. It is only where a sovereign people are permitted to know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth that they can pass accurate judgment upon the wisdom of the public acts of those whom they have entrusted with power to negotiate for them with foreign countries.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article by Arthur Krock from the New York Times of February 9, 1945:

THE ISSUES OF CENSORSHIP AND SILENCE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—In his Lincoln Day speech here tonight Governor Dewey joined the ranks of those who lately have renewed criticism of the censorship policies and the official silences of the administration. Asserting that American public opinion is ready for responsibility for "the vital decisions affecting the rest of the world * * * decisions which flow from victorious battles" in which this Nation has played so great a part, Mr. Dewey demanded that "the actions to be taken (at the Big Three conference and elsewhere) shall not be concealed and shall not be devious."

This is another voice, and a powerful one, raised for the purpose of ending the system that has prevailed since the war began, and before, whereby the American people have had to await speeches in Commons by Prime Minister Churchill and Moscow announcements ordered by Marshal Stalin to learn what happened in plenary Allied councils at which the President was a participant. On utterances and publications abroad, and not on their own government, the American people, under this system, have been forced to depend for the most important news of our wartime political policy. It was through Mr. Churchill, for instance, they discovered that the United States had assigned to Great Britain full control of Greek national problems following liberation. From the same source they were informed that the President was fully advised at Teheran of Russian-British comity on the Polish boundary question. And now through the Foreign Minister of Italy comes the first news of the terms of the Allied-Italian armistice signed nearly 2 years ago.

Recently it has been increasingly stated in the press that two fundamental changes in our foreign policy have been made by the President: one, we have abandoned the position that decisions on all the political problems of the war must await the end of it; two, this Government will take an active part in the detailed settlements of the European sections of these problems. But Mr. Roosevelt himself has made no such explicit statement at any time.

On almost every occasion when the chiefs of the great Allied states have met the first news of the meeting has come from abroad and not from Washington. Washington has eventually confirmed these reports, but nearly always there has been pointless delay. The system reached the height of absurdity several days ago when official permission was not obtainable here to announce in a Washington dispatch that Harry L. Hopkins and Secretary Stettinius were in Rome, although foreign dispatches and wirelessed photographs were proclaiming the fact at that very time.

It may be that the growing protest, in which Governor Dewey has joined, will break down the system by producing sufficient pressure of public opinion. But if this happens the order will have to be given by the President. He is the author and guardian of this type of censorship. He is personally responsible for the exaggerated concept of security which forbids the press to announce even that he has gone to Hyde Park or Warm Springs, or to reveal how much he has been absent from Washington on such journeys since the war began. Protected, as Mr. Churchill is not, from a requirement to account for his stewardship to the people through their elected legislators, he faces for question only his press conferences, and these are conducted on his own terms.

Therefore, unless the President has decided he is ready to modify this policy, or a combination of congressional and public opinion induces him to do so, Mr. Dewey and other critics will be shouting into the wind. All lesser officials are subject to his orders, and wherever congressional groups are told anything of importance—which is not often—they are put on honor to keep it secret. All concealments, all evasions, all half-truths, all black-outs of the movements of nonmilitary persons are justified either on the argument that military and individual security requires it, or on the argument that wise and constructive solutions of war-created political problems will be jeopardized or frustrated by any other policy.

Certain movements of nonmilitary persons, especially the President, must be shielded. The time and method of Mr. Roosevelt's departure for the conference in the Black Sea area were known to many persons here, and not a few knew his destination. It was also known that Mr. Hopkins had left in advance for Great Britain, France, and Italy to explain the President's foreign policy views to Allied officials, and that he, instead of the Secretary to State, had been chosen for that duty. Many were aware that James F. Byrnes, Director of the O. W. M. R., had been assigned to foreign errands at a time when domestic issues close to his responsibilities were becoming acute. But this correspondent has seen no criticism of the concealment of all such details until the interests of security are satisfied.

It is quite a different matter, however, to carry policy to the point described by Mr. Dewey, and to oblige the American people to rely on spokesmen of other nations and the press and radio of other lands for the news they have a right to hear first from their own Government and through their own channels of public information. But that is how it has been and will be so long as Mr. Roosevelt holds to his concept of personal government, and interprets his elections as mandates to proceed on the parental theory of administration.

The Dairy Farmer Needs a Better Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, about 150 United States Senators and Representatives in Congress gathered at the Mayflower Hotel, Wednesday evening, February 14, to hear Mr. John Brandt, president of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, discuss the increasingly serious problems confronting the dairy farmer. He was introduced by our colleague, Representative AUGUST ANDRESEN, of Red Wing, Minn. Representative ANDRESEN is looked upon as an agricultural authority in Congress.

Mr. Brandt, in his usual graphic style, told his listeners of the increased production by the dairy farmers in spite of adverse labor and price conditions, and he made an eloquent plea for a better break for the farmer and his family.

Washingtonians may have read the full-page advertisements sponsored by the Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., of Minneapolis, and published February 16 in most of the Washington, D. C., newspapers, which gave some interesting information on the part the dairy farmer is playing in the war effort. Others may be interested in reading it also.

The advertisement follows:

AMERICA'S NO. 1 WAR PRODUCER

There are millions of him.

The top producer in this war is the American dairy farmer.

With the manpower shortage and less equipment, this man has produced 13 percent more milk. This man has kept right on producing 50, 60, 70, 80 hours per week—actually 50 percent more output per man.

The farmer has kept right on producing by himself because American needs milk and butter and cheese. Because he knows 39 percent of the total food consumed by the armed forces comes from the cow. Milk and butter are vital.

Yet, America today is failing to recognize the dairy industry as a No. 1 vital war plant—in manpower or prices.

Actually, the dairy farmer loses money today when he produces butter.

We need a new parity formula for the dairy farmer. Our present parity formula is antique. It does not even include the cost of labor—the biggest cost item to a dairy farmer.

Cows need milking twice a day. No Sundays off. No holidays. Who says labor isn't important?

Who says labor doesn't cost money?

Labor is the biggest cost item of our war effort, and rightly so. Why leave labor out of the formula that governs production?

The dairy farmer is the No. 1 war producer. He has proved it. But his efforts, his labor, need recognition now.

This is a balancing problem. Government must decide where to direct men and money. If America wants to keep dairy production high, the dairy industry needs a higher priority.

JOHN BRANDT,
President, Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.

Deferment of Farm Laborers Under Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to grant and to extend deferment to farm laborers under the Selective Service Act:

Whereas Minnesota farmers, desiring to render the fullest measure of patriotic service to the Nation, have worked unselfishly for long hours, bearing unprecedented hardships, to meet the increased demands for food that have been placed on them by the war; and

Whereas in addition to the thousands of men they have furnished to the armed forces, our farmers have seen great numbers of farm laborers upon whom they normally depend drawn into the defense plants by the high wages offered there; and

Whereas the growing shortage of farm labor is making it increasingly difficult for farmers to meet the food quotas prescribed by the War Food Administrator; and

Whereas successful prosecution of the war to final victory will require not merely continued reliance on bigger than normal food supplies but in all probability even greater quantities of food, and

Whereas Congress, appreciating the gravity of the problem facing our farmers and the importance of keeping up our vital food production, has declared in adopting the Tydings amendment: "Every registrant found by a selective service board * * * to be necessary to and properly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces as long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained," and the national director of selective service in a statement on January 23 has reaffirmed his adherence to this policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, in regular session assembled, That we ask the President, Congress and our Federal officials to follow and uphold the spirit of the Tydings amendment in dealing with matters affecting farm labor and that we memorialize the President and Congress to take all further steps and to prescribe all further regulations that may be necessary to insure to agriculture an adequate farm labor supply; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of State of Minnesota is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to each of the Members in the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

LAWRENCE M. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. ELMER ANDERSON.
President of the Senate.

Passed the House of Representatives, the 7th day of February 1945.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Passed the Senate, the 8th day of February 1945.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved February 9, 1945.

EDWARD J. THYE,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Resolution of Boston Chapter, No. 10, Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was adopted by unanimous vote of Boston Chapter, No. 10, Disabled American Veterans, Boston, Mass., at regular meeting of November 20, 1944.

Whereas certain members of the armed forces of the United States, whose names were on eligible registers for appointment to positions in the Post Office Department, were not available when considered for such appointments by reason of their absence in military or naval service; and

Whereas other eligibles, junior to them on said civil-service registers and who have not been in military or naval service in the present war, have received during the war permanent appointments to such positions in preference to and with seniority rights over said members of our armed forces and returned war veterans; and

Whereas such appointments constitute grossly unfair discrimination against said members of the military or naval service and said discharged veterans and impose on them a severe penalty because of nonavailability for appointment due to patriotic service to our Nation in time of war: Be it

Resolved, That Boston Chapter No. 10, Disabled American Veterans, hereby protests against said injustice and discrimination and respectfully petitions the President of the United States by Executive order or Congress by suitable legislation to restore these members of our armed forces or discharged veterans to their original relative standing on the civil-service registers by voiding said permanent appointments made during the war which are prejudicial to the civil-service rights of said members of our armed forces or discharged veterans and cause permanent appointments to be deferred and made in exact order from the civil-service registers after the termination of the war; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Hon. David I. Walsh, Hon. Sinclair Weeks, and Hon. John W. McCormack.

HENRY B. PARK,
Commander.
JOHN W. MCAULIFFE,
Adjutant.

The foregoing resolution was approved by unanimous vote of the executive committee, Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, at regular meeting of November 25, 1944, statehouse, Boston, Mass.

FRANCIS J. ROCHE,
Senior Vice Commander and Acting Commander.
LEON CHASE WAITE,
Adjutant.

Decisions of the Crimean Conference Regarding Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I incorporate statements made by the Polish-American Congress of Chicago, Ill., and the Polish Telegraph Agency, of New York, N. Y.

The recent decision of the Big Three has deeply saddened and further wounded the hearts of Americans of Polish descent, by the slicing and cutting up the land of their ancestors for the fifth time. The decision giving all the land east of the Curzon line is a tremendous loss and a staggering blow to the cause of freedom, especially to the heroic Polish Nation, and is in violation and a direct contradiction of the provisions and principles of the Atlantic Charter.

The Joe Stalin recommended Lublin Government that was wished and forced on the Poles is made up of hand-picked Communists, and it is said, they are not even citizens of Poland, for they were formed to incorporate Poland into the Soviet Union.

The forcing of a Government without the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned, will wipe out and void freedom and bring serfdom to the people of Poland.

The statements follow:

On February 12, at 7:30 p. m., the British Foreign Office handed the Polish Ambassador in London a text of resolutions concerning Poland, adopted by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin at the Yalta Conference between the 4th and 11th of February.

Before the conference began, the Polish Government handed a memorandum to the Governments of Great Britain and the United States, in which hope was expressed that these governments should not be a party to any decision regarding the Allied Polish State without previous consultation and consent of the Polish Government. At the same time, the Polish Government declared itself willing to seek solution of the dispute initiated by Soviet Russia through the normal international procedure and with due respect for the rights of the two parties concerned.

In spite of this, the decisions of the Three-Power Conference were prepared and taken, not only without participation and authorization of the Polish Government, but also without their knowledge. The method adopted in the case of Poland is a contradiction of elementary binding principles and constitutes violation of the letter and spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the right of every nation to defend its own interests. The Polish Government declares that decisions of the Three-Power Conference, concerning Poland, cannot be recognized by the Polish Government and cannot bind the Polish Nation. The Polish Government will consider severance of the eastern half of the Polish territory through imposition of the Polish-Soviet frontier following along the so-called Curzon Line as a fifth partition of Poland, now accomplished by her allies.

The intention of the three powers to create a "Provisional Polish Government of National Unity" by enlarging the foreign-appointed Lublin Committee with persons vaguely described as democratic leaders from Poland itself and Poles abroad can only legalize Soviet interference in Polish internal affairs. As long as the territory of Poland will remain under sole occupation of Soviet troops, a government of that kind will not safeguard to the Polish Nation, even in the presence of the British and American diplomats, unfettered right of free expression.

The Polish Government, which is the sole legal and generally recognized Government of Poland, and which for 5½ years has directed the struggle of the Polish state and nation against the Axis countries, both through the underground movement in the homeland and through the Polish armed forces in all theaters of war, have expressed their readiness—in a memorandum presented to the Governments of Great Britain and the United States—to cooperate in the creation of a government in Poland which will be truly representative of the will of the Polish Nation. The Polish Government maintains its offer.

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., February 13, 1945.

A VOICE OF PROTEST AGAINST DECISION TO GIVE RUSSIA HALF OF POLAND

Following is the statement issued to the press wire services Tuesday night, February 12, 1945, by Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress, upon the appearance in the newspapers of the report of the Big Three Conference, held at Yalta, in the Crimea:

It is with sorrow, dismay, and protest that we greet the decision of the Big Three to give all land east of the so-called Curzon line to Russia in direct contradiction to all sacred pledges of the Atlantic Charter. This tragic revelation is a staggering blow to the cause of freedom.

The docile submission to Russia's demand for all the lands seized during the partitions of Poland as Germany's collaborator and even Lwow, which, prior to the war, was never at any time under Russian rule, even illegally, is a distortion of our war aims. It means reaffirmation of the Molotov-Ribbentrop line of 1939, which gave one-half of Poland and all of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to Russia.

When the Germans were at the gates of Moscow and Stalin was making frantic pleas for help, Stalin renounced his claims to all the territories he had seized as Germany's partner. As soon as Russia, thanks to American lend-lease aid, began pushing the Germans back, Stalin reaffirmed the Molotov-Ribbentrop boundary line and abruptly broke off relations with the London Polish

Government, which he had always recognized as the only legitimate Government of Poland.

It is also shocking to learn that the members of the Stalin hand-picked Lublin government, composed of professional Communists, who are working for the incorporation of Poland into the Soviet Union, are to continue in power in a newly reorganized government, in violation of the Constitution of Poland. The imposition of a government "without the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned" would mean the end of freedom and the beginning of serfdom for the people of Poland. America would never tolerate within its borders any government that would owe its allegiance to a foreign power.

America cannot aline herself with forces seeking the destruction of democracies. By permitting the advocates of slavery to have their way in all things, we will reap the backwash of our spiritual and political weakness as the world did after the shame of Munich.

The spectacle of an avaricious ally, already devouring 10 of her neighbors in whole or in part and of instigating civil strife in the countries not yet under the Russian sphere of influence, unless checked in time, will mean not only the downfall of Christianity but of civilization itself.

Republican Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest K. Lindley:

REPUBLICAN STATESMANSHIP

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

Governor Dewey, as nominal leader of his party, has again joined his voice with those of other influential Republicans in notifying the world that the American people are overwhelmingly united in their international objectives.

No President engaged in critical international negotiations could ask much more of the opposing political party at home than Roosevelt has received from the Republican Party during the last few weeks. Senator VANDENBERG'S speeches, the letter from the freshmen Senators to the President, in which the Republicans joined their Democratic colleagues, Senator FERGUSON'S resolution, John Foster Dulles' speeches, and Dewey's Lincoln Day address—all have strengthened the President's hand. The shrunken group of dissenters, with the notable exception of Senator WHEELER, a Democrat, have remained silent. As a rule these declarations have not only endorsed the President's declared objectives, they have urged him to pursue them with the utmost vigor. Thus, instead of acting as a brake as the Republican leadership in the great majority did during the period leading up to the present war, it is acting as a spur. It is urging the President to make far-reaching commitments and to obtain them from our allies.

This would be dangerous only if it were to whip up exaggerated expectations of what can be accomplished immediately. There is a note of perfectionism running through some of the recent Republican utterances—although no stronger than in those of the President and former Secretary Hull. If the failure to achieve in every respect what we regard as a just peace should cause a swing back to cynicism and isolationism under Republican leadership, the sincerity of some of the recent Republican utterances would become suspect. However, like the President, Dewey and VANDENBERG have both warned or acknowledged that we cannot expect to win every argument with our allies. Dewey said explicitly: "Our people are perfectly aware that they can not have everything just as they want it. Our allies have strong views of their own.

"We know that conflicting views must be reconciled. But we insist that decisions be made with us and not without us—with our representatives in the discussion every day on every subject and not occasionally or part of the time."

These Republican spokesmen have been emphasizing furthermore, that if we don't like what our allies do we are not going to pick up our marbles and come home—that on the contrary, we will continue to work for a peace that is both secure and just. VANDENBERG'S proposal of treaties pledging the demilitarization of Germany and Japan is unconditional. He says, in effect, that it is vital to the interest of this country that when these wars have been won they shall be kept won. But, he also says, we are not going to underwrite other features of the peace settlement if they seem to us flagrantly unjust. This does not mean that we will not take part in a world security organization. It means rather that we will use our influence to try to correct arrangements which we do not like.

Dewey said: "We shall accept in the future neither isolationism nor abdication." This is a succinct warning that our reaction to disappointments at the series of peacemaking conferences will not be withdrawal. The worth of these declarations, as an expression of firm opinion within the Republican Party, and within the Nation as a whole, will be tested by the reaction to the specific international agreements reached at the Black Sea and ensuing international conferences. But it is hard to conceive how Dewey, VANDENBERG, and the other Republican leaders who have spoken on foreign policy during the last few weeks could have done more, by words alone, to convince the world that the President, in international affairs, acts for a united Nation. They have attained a high level of statesmanship.

Minnesota Veterans' Hospital Facilities Are Praised by Patient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have known for a long time that the Veterans' Administration hospital facilities in Minneapolis, Minn., rank high among the Nation's hospitals for veterans.

Therefore, I was pleased to recently receive the following letter from a veteran friend who had just spent 8 months in the veterans' hospital in Minneapolis:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 17, 1945.*

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
United States Representative
in Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HAROLD: I was discharged from the veterans hospital January 1 and am getting along very well. Of course, I still use a cane but will be able to dispense with it shortly.

At this time I want to tell you, as I have told everybody with whom I have come in contact, about the wonderful treatment I received there. Everyone from the ward surgeon, who took care of me, down to the most menial of the staff, gave me every consideration. In all the 8 months I was there I never heard a cross word spoken to one of the patients.

Money could not buy the care that we had. If ever you can do anything that will be of assistance to the staff, Harold, I hope you will do so. You can take my word for it, they deserve everything that they can get.

It is so seldom that anyone takes the time to tell them that their work is appreciated that I with you would write me a letter that I can show to my doctor, the head nurse, and a few others, showing that I, for one, feel as I do about that institution. I will appreciate it.

I will be at this address until sometime late in February, when I will go back to Bemidji.

Sincerely,

DAN.

P. S.—Think you should plan on visiting the hospital sometime when you are going through. There are always patients from your district there.

D. J. MOORE.

Italy's Appeal for Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the appeal made by Premier Bonomi to President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshall Stalin:

On the even of decisive military events the Italian Government venture to request that the heads of the United Nations who are now discussing the fate of the new Europe reexamine the very severe conditions imposed upon Italy in September 1943.

At the moment, when earnest exhortation is being addressed to all classes of the Italian nation toward a supreme effort of cooperation with the Allies on the front line, in the rear, and in the patriots' warfare, the Italian Government feel it their duty to emphasize once again that the ambiguous situation of cobelligerency thwarts their efforts to raise and maintain throughout the country that intensity of purpose and determination which can only result from the consciousness of a sacrifice achieved in freedom and dignity.

It is therefore also in the interest of the common cause that the Italian Government asks for a new settlement based on a confident and full association with the Allied Powers in the place of the present one-sided formulas of control and guardianship set up by the armistice.

For the same reason the Italian Government hereby directs to the United Nations their earnest appeal—

1. To see that the Italian people who are still undergoing almost unendurable hardship be granted, particularly in the matter of food and transportation, the possibility of satisfying at least their most elementary needs.

2. To suppress the financial burdens which, by an extensive interpretation of the armistice, has been weighing for 15 months upon

the exhausted resources of an already devastated country and has been hindering any reconstruction and monetary rehabilitation.

3. To afford to one-half million Italian soldiers in Allied hands the possibility of giving their whole contribution, not as prisoners of war but as free men, both in the field and in the factories, to the struggle for a new world to which the whole Italian people devote their will and hope.

The people and Government of Italy are striving for the establishment of a free, orderly, and stable democracy. The Government feels, however, that should the liberation of the most populated and industrious regions of Italy find the country still under the incumbent menace of inflation and hunger and its Government in a humiliating position, for which they are in no way responsible, it would be extremly difficult to allay the causes of unrest, disorder, and discouragement, and to foster in these long-suffering regions the energy indispensable for the reconstruction of a new Italy within a world of free democratic institutions and effective cooperation The Italian Government submit these considerations to the generous understanding of the heads of the United Nations in the full confidence that their appeal will be repaid with the same spirit and loyalty and friendship by which it was inspired and in order that the gallant effort of the Allied armies may bear their full results and that the hopes of the Italian people fighting against the German and Fascist oppression be not frustrated.

We Must Keep Our Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address I delivered at the twentieth annual Lincoln Day dinner of the Lucas County Republican Club in the Commodore Perry Hotel, Toledo, Ohio, February 12, 1945, entitled "We Must Keep Our Sovereignty":

Fellow Republicans, I greatly appreciate the invitation to address you on this occasion. The annual custom of honoring the birth of the great man and statesman, Abraham Lincoln, has always been an important event, but peculiar circumstances attend the present state of our Nation which give it greatly added significance.

Lincoln's great task, as we know, was to preserve the Union. However, we are too apt to think of the service he rendered to his country as having had to do exclusively with an issue between the North and the South. We seem to forget the trouble he had with foreign countries. The record indicates that certain foreign powers were greatly concerned in seeing the Union dissolved. The early covert recognition by England of the belligerency of the Confederacy together with other historical data leads one to conclude that foreign influence must have played an important part in inducing the South to start the war and perhaps also in agitating the slavery question.

In his Twenty Years of Congress, James G. Blaine, who certainly is an authority on the causes of the Civil War, left these lines:

"In Europe, the general opinion, founded in many influential quarters on the wish, was that the Union would be dissolved; that with the success of the South there would be still further division between the East and the West; and that the only compact power would be the Confederacy founded on slavery, with the world's greatest staples as the basis of its wealth and its assured development. We had but recently narrowly escaped war with England on account of the Trent affair, and in the crafty and adventurous Emperor of France we had a secret enemy who saw in our downfall the possible extension of his power and the strengthening of his throne. * * * Confederate bonds were more popular in England than the bonds of the United States. The world's treasuries were closed against us. The bankers of Europe * * * would not touch our securities. Their united clientage included the investors of Great Britain and the Continent, and a popular loan could not be effected without their aid and cooperation. We were engaged, therefore, in a threefold contest—a military one with the Confederacy, a diplomatic and moral one with the Governments of England and France, a financial one with the money powers of Europe."

By intrigue and sharp diplomacy, certain European powers have too often been successful in insinuating themselves into our Government and exercising baneful influence over it. The Revolutionary War was fought to relieve our people of the fetters of foreign exploitation. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, in speaking of the danger of the spirit of party, solemnly warned his countrymen of the ever present danger of foreign schemery when he said:

"It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the Government itself through the channels of party passion. Thus the policy and will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another."

However, the troublesome influence which was wielded in the United States by foreign powers met more than its match in Abraham Lincoln. He subdued it and in doing so once more restored to our people their national sovereignty, the power to be master of their own house.

Now once more we see intervening in the affairs of our country the same baneful foreign influence with which Lincoln had to contend, but on a much greater scale, and it is this about which I wash to speak to you tonight.

We are hearing much these days about the need for world government. We are told that this becomes necessary because of the great havoc wrought upon civilization by modern implements of war, and that unless super-government is established and given sufficient police power to prevent wars, civilization is in danger of being annihilated.

Those who further the cause of world government invest their creation with grandeur and the most laudable objectives. It would bring about better relations between nations, greater cooperative spirit, abolish war, and bring everlasting peace and goodwill to mankind. And they warn us that, if their plan is not adopted in toto, more terrible wars will follow and the world will be plunged into chaos and night.

The terms internationalism and isolationism are being used by the proponents of the new world order as representing two opposing schools of thought dealing with this proposed scheme. It is presumed by them that internationalism favors the plan while isolationism opposes it.

Judging from the attitude taken by the powers that be in Washington, and some other quarters, internationalism is something entirely new in the world and is of a highly, magnanimous and benevolent nature, which if adopted will bring to all the nations so much mutual goodwill and affection for each other that the causes of international strife will disappear.

On the other hand, isolationism, so these forces tell us, is a wicked thing and by its very nature just the opposite of internationalism, greedy and malevolent in the extreme, and if allowed to have its way will further muddy the waters of international relations, add to the strife among nations and lead the world into greater tribulation.

Now it is not my purpose this evening to indulge in any subjective examination of the position which the administration takes on this subject. I propose to present to you some objective observations respecting this proposed plan for a world government which are based upon ascertainable facts.

However, before proceeding with my discussion, I must pause to object to the monopoly which the administration seems to feel it possesses of being the sole judge as to what really constitutes so-called internationalism as well as so-called isolationism. Though we have perhaps lost much of the foundation of our liberty, we still have enough freedom left to express at least a modicum of independent judgment.

I further object to the administration's calling every one who does not agree with its foreign policy an isolationist, and its presumptuousness in defining this term as being obstructive and inimical to human progress.

As you know, blueprints have already been made for constructing some of the main parts of the political machinery which is to constitute the proposed world government. By examining these blueprints we ought to get some idea as to the true nature of its parts, what the finished product might look like, and how it would be likely to work. Of course, in the brief time at my disposal it is impossible for me to do more than touch upon a few high points. It would require many hours to explain in detail the plans which have been drawn up for creating this proposed scheme.

Two units of the international political machinery are now in process of being assembled. They are the Dumbarton Oaks proposal "for the establishment of a general world organization," and the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme or the so-called Bretton Woods proposal for an "international monetary fund and bank for reconstruction and development."

The Dumbarton Oaks proposal provides for establishing a world general assembly. Forty-five countries would become members and each country would be entitled to one representative.

The general assembly would have the right to consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principle governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, etc. Each member of the general assembly would have one vote. The United States would have one vote, Iceland one, Haiti one, and so on.

In addition to the general assembly there would be established the security council. This would consist of 11 members, 5 of whom would be permanent and 6 nonpermanent. The United States, United Kingdom, Soviet Union, China, and France would be entitled to permanent seats in the body.

The security council would "be empowered to take such action by air, naval, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain, or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the organization."

This means that, should this proposal be adopted, the Congress of the United States would lose the power to declare war which the Constitution vests in it.

Under the Constitution the Congress has no authority to give away its power to declare war. It would be the grossest violation of the Constitution for the Congress to divest itself of the power to declare war without the Constitution having first been amended.

I am against Congress surrendering to any foreign nation or group of nations any of its power to declare war, with or without an amendment to the Constitution, and so are you.

We would lose our national sovereignty should Congress pass this provision.

Let us now examine a few of the more important provisions contained in the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme, or what is called the Bretton Woods proposal for an international monetary fund and bank. I shall discuss only that part of the scheme relating to the international monetary fund.

I refer to this proposal as the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme, because it was concocted by Lord John Maynard Keynes, who is an adviser to the British exchequer and Governor of the Bank of England, and because it is being promoted in this country by Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury.

At about the same time in 1943 London made public the Keynes' plan for an international clearing union, and Morgenthau's proposal for an international stabilization fund. Mr. Morgenthau later released two revised drafts of his plan.

A reading of the two proposals showed that Mr. Morgenthau's monetary experts had done little else but set up in legislative draft form the essential provisions contained in the Keynes' scheme. Nor has the Bretton Woods proposal for an international monetary fund changed this situation.

All of its important provisions stem directly from the Keynes' plan.

The primary motivation for the creation of this scheme is the financial distress and weakened trade position in which Great Britain fears she may find herself after the war, and her desire to restore London to its former position as the world's banker.

One of its main objects is to place United States gold stocks and other resources at the disposal of the British Government for the support of the pound sterling. It is no secret that London hopes, through this scheme, to help it regain its position as the world's financial center.

Let me quote here Lord Keynes himself on this point. In presenting his scheme to the House of Lords, he said:

"So far from an international plan endangering the long tradition, by which most empire countries, and many other countries, too, have centered their financial systems in London, the plan is, in my judgment, an indispensable means of maintaining this tradition."

At Keynes' suggestion, Morgenthau's two first draft proposals contained a provision which would have required the United States to underwrite and assume debts, which then amounted to four or five billion dollars, which Great Britain owed to India, Egypt, South American, Scandinavian and other countries.

The language used in writing this provision was complicated, even weird. It seemed to resemble hieroglyphics more than English.

Anyway, it was unraveled and its hidden purpose revealed, whereupon Mr. Morgenthau got out another draft in which he omitted the provision to finagle the United States into assuming Britain's foreign debts. That provision is also not contained in the Bretton Woods proposal. But this does not mean that the United States would not pay those debts should this proposal be adopted. On the contrary, the Breton Woods proposal could and would be so operated as to make us pay Britain's foreign debts.

Now just who it is that would pay those debts, and how would they be paid? You people right here in this room would help pay them out of your hard-won earnings. You would have to give up some of the fruits of your own labor to pay them. That should be plain to you.

Do you know any reason why we should pay Great Britain's foreign debts?

It is, of course, all right if you want to do that. But in any event you would probably like to have the Administration lay its cards on the table face up so that you might see just what is being dealt out to you, instead of having it secretly reach into your pockets and relieve you of their contents.

Do you see what can happen to you when we lose our national sovereignty, how this makes possible foreign intrigue in our Government to take by sly and subtle means the bread from your mouths?

The Keynes-Morgenthau scheme provides for a capitalization of $8,800,000,000. Of this amount the United States would furnish $2,750,000,000, or about one-third of the total. Each country would pay in a certain amount of gold on the one hand, and paper money on the other.

However, since our dollars are internationally convertible into gold at their face value on demand and is, therefore, the same as gold, our entire subscription would be in gold.

This would not be true of most of the currencies paid in by the other countries. A goodly portion of the money they paid in would not be worth its face value and some of it would be almost worthless.

But the arrangement which this scheme sets up makes it possible for the weakest currencies to buy just as much goods as the strongest. I cannot go into the technicalities of this arrangement, but suffice it to say that the reason why the poorest quality money in the scheme would buy just as much as the best is because of the gold and dollars the United States would put into it.

One of the main objects of the plan is to strengthen the weak currencies of other countries with United States gold and dollars.

Now the point here is that, by as much as the resources of the United States gave purchasing power to the currencies of other countries, we would be giving away our goods. In other words, the arrangement would have the effect of lifting up the standard of living of foreign countries and pulling down our standard of living. Do you want your earnings taken away from you in that manner? Do you want the United States to become part of a scheme which will make you give away some of your goods and which will have the effect of lowering your standard of living to the level of that in foreign countries? I do not want that to happen, and neither do you.

We must keep our sovereignty and make it impossible for foreigners to persuade our Government to secretly permit them to take advantage of us in this way.

The scheme would serve largely as a lending agency. The countries belonging to it would be divided into two groups, lenders and borrowers. The United States would become the principal, if not the sole, lender. One country's credit would be no better than that of any other. Credit worthiness of a member country would not be considered by the scheme in making loans to it.

About 20 of the countries that would belong to the scheme have defaulted on their international debts. But that would not affect their credit standing. In fact, it would appear that the poorer its credit the better off a country would be. Again let me remind you that it would be some of your dollars that the scheme would lend to foreign countries.

It is conservatively estimated that the United States would furnish approximately 70 percent of all the lendable funds in the scheme, yet, we would have only 27 percent of the voting power. The borrowing countries would have the majority of stock and would control the lending policies. Why should we allow ourselves to be duped into a crazy thing like this?

We tried a so-called foreign lending scheme something like this once before. During the armistice after World War No. 1 and the twenties you people, along with the rest of us, loaned or, to speak truthfully, gave away, and without knowing we did it, many billions of dollars to European countries.

Those countries used the dollars they got from us to buy our goods. Our factories boomed, stocks zoomed, speculators went crazy, and everybody felt himself getting rich. Then when the well went dry along about 1928 or 1929 the balloon bursted and we were caught in the crash. The foolish idea we had that we were getting rich was completely deflated and a lot of us found ourselves in the poorhouse.

Now it was the making of those phony loans to foreign countries that was largely responsible for the boom in the twenties, the crash in 1929, and the depression which followed. And the depression provided those conditions out of which the Roosevelt administration concocted its synthetic emergencies with which it destroyed our honest money, gold, undermined the Constitution, put us on the road to regimentation, and opened wide the portal of our Government to foreign influence.

One of the most sinister provisions in the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme is that which would take from the Congress of the United States the control of our money and give that control into the hands of the international crowd which has contrived this scheme. Our Constitution vests control of our money in the Congress of the United States.

Under the scheme, any control over our money remaining to the United States would be vested in the President. However, some of the control over our money which would be taken from Congress would go to Stalin, some to England, and so on.

There is no provision in the Constitution that is more valued or better known to the American people than the one which vests in the Congress the power over our money. Time and again our courts have been called upon to consider this grant of power and without a single exception they have ruled that Congress and Congress alone possesses all power over our money.

Yet, here we have this brazen Keynes proposal, embodied in the form of a tentative international agreement, which Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, is vigorously promoting, and to which our President has subscribed, to make it possible for a group of international schemers to take from the Congress of the United States the sovereign power over our money, the very essence of the entirety of our sovereignty. Has our Nation so completely lost its soul that the perpetration of this can be possible? I do not believe it has and neither do you.

Then there is a provision in the scheme which would give Stalin, Roosevelt, and the British Government the power to lower or debase the gold value of the money of all the countries belonging to it. This would make possible universal repudiation of debts among all the member countries, which is the purpose of this provision.

Do we as a nation want to defile our long and faithful record of performance in always meeting our international commitments by becoming part of a scheme, one of whose sinister purposes is universal welshing on international debts and giving to such deed respectability by legalizing it? I do not believe we do, and neither do you.

It is hard to believe that any responsible citizen of the United States could even seriously suggest that the Congress should surrender to this international crowd its power over our money, and to have the United States engage in a program whose purpose is to make it legal for governments to cheat each other out of paying their debts. But I assure you that this shall not pass with my vote. However, this proposal would not stand the least chance of passing if our people were properly informed as to its true significance.

It must not be thought that the $2,750,000,000 which the United States would put into the scheme would be all of its contribution. That would be only a starter. After it was set up the President would be empowered to put any additional amount into it he cared to.

Should Congress pass this proposal, you people assembled in this room must expect to pour more and more of the fruits of your labor into the bottomless pit of this scheme.

Some of you may recall my having attended the International Food Conference at Hot Springs, Va., in the summer of 1943. You may also remember how unwelcome was my presence there. Nevertheless, I did get in and I saw much. I learned that the delegates gathered there had comparatively little real concern about food, that this term was used largely as a cloak to hide their real designs. The principal interest of most of the foreign delegates seemed to be in establishing a world government and bank financed by the United States, where they could go and borrow money. International cooperation meant to them getting something from Uncle Sam for nothing.

But I want to relate something I saw there which I am sure will interest you. The Soviet delegation played a very prominent role at that meeting. It consisted of 12 members. Alexy Krutikov was its chairman. Alexy Krutikov was second vice president of the Conference. Alexy Krutikov was a member of the executive committee. Alexy Krutikov was a member of the steering committee. Alexy Krutikov, according to press reports, was chairman of the drafting committee. Alexy Krutikov was chairman of section 2, which was given such subjects as the following for consideration and to make recommendations relating thereto:

(a) Credit or capital developments.
(b) Cooperative services.
(c) Land tenure.
(d) Other similar activities and education.

What kind of consideration would it be expected Stalin's agent would give to these questions as they relate to the United States? Is it thought he would consider our system of private ownership of land and other property, good or bad, according to American standards or Russian standards?

Are we to believe Stalin sent his delegates to Hot Springs to persuade him to institute in his own country a system of private ownership of farms, as we have in the United States, or that he sent them over here to persuade us to adopt his system which prohibits the ownership by any person of even a single foot of land.

Was not the answer to this question given when, according to a news dispatch from Hot Springs, Russian influence was detectable in a proposal that was made advocating community farming?

Then came the final session, the grand climax of the whole affair. Alexy Krutikov was accorded the high honor of moving the adoption of the recommendations made by the conference. The delegates went wild with excitement apparently intoxicated with their own achievements; Judge Marvin Jones, chairman of the conference, rushed over to Alexy Krutikov, head of the Soviet delegation, embraced him in a bearlike hug and thumped him on the back, which was heralded as symbolizing the conference's great success. (Washington Times-Herald, June 4, 1943.)

If this administration is not planning to sovietize the United States, why did it invite Stalin to send his emissaries over here to tell us that we ought to have the same kind of economy and government as he has?

Now put to yourselves this question: With this examination of the blueprints for some of the main parts of this proposed political machinery, how does it look to you? Do you see in it the hope of the world as painted by its designers? Does it appear to you that the finished structure would be so constituted as to make for everlasting peace and good will among all men? Or do you feel as did Lord Keynes, whose ingenious brain contrived this scheme, and who therefore, ought to know, when in a speech before the House of Lords, during a slight mental lapse, let the cat out of the bag by saying:

"There is one important respect in which the British proposals seem to be gravely misunderstood in some quarters in the United States. There is no foundation whatever for the idea that the object of the proposals is to make the United States the milch cow of the world in general and of this country (England) in particular."

Honest and square dealing never needs defense.

I have been criticized for opposing this scheme without offering a substitute for it. Fellow Americans, there is no substitute for this propsal, and can't be any. One does not think of substituting something else for dishonesty and crime, or in any way compromising with it. One thinks only of avoiding or destroying it.

If England or any other country wants our help, let it come to us with its proposition face up so that both of us can see what we are signing.

The most good we can do England right now is to refuse to have anything more to do with Lord John Maynard Keynes, because I believe he is as dangerous to his own country as he is to ours. Lord Keynes is perhaps the most effective apostle of phony money that ever lived, and has John Law backed clear off the map.

We will win the war against Germany and Japan. There is no question about that. But we face a foe which may test our souls as much as has the war.

That enemy is "the insidious wiles of foreign influence," as Washington called it, and which he warned us "is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

Should any of you doubt my appraisal of the seriousness of this situation, pause for a moment and reflect upon the following statement which was made by our Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius. When he was asked by news reporters to explain the various failures in Poland, Greece, Italy, and way stations, Mr. Stettinius replied:

"Gentlemen, don't you see, we are to some extent at least the prisoners of our allies in these matters?"

It is the foreign influence and intrigue that is primarily responsible for undermining the Constitution and destroying our liberty. There is no hope of our being able to stop the everincreasing drift toward communism until we rid our Government of this evil.

Now, when this scourge is frustrating our hard-earned and God-given right to be masters of our own destiny and to enjoy the infinite blessings of a truly sovereign nation, we must invoke the true spirit of nationalism of the immortal Lincoln who in his time vanquished and thrust from our midst this baneful foe of the Republic.

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union; one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

Lifting of Racing Ban Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter and memorandum from David A. Buckley, Esq., of New York and Virginia, a distinguished member of the bar and a well-known breeder and owner of horses, analyzing the situation resulting from the racing ban issued by Justice James Byrnes on December 26, 1944.

If Mr. Buckley's facts and contentions are true, I cannot see how a continuance of this ban can be justified. I have today forwarded the originals of Mr. Buckley's statements to Justice Byrnes for comment. It follows:

NEW YORK, *February 16, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM B. BARRY,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Inasmuch as you are the representative from Queens in which most of the important race tracks of New York State are located, I call your attention to the statements issued by Mr. Justice Byrnes on December 26, 1944, which virtually stopped racing in America.

The various racing authorities and all concerned with racing have since then expressed their desire to cooperate and, indeed, the record of racing groups during the past year, by their donations and accrual of large funds for charitable purposes and for purposes in connection with the war, have demonstrated this.

However this advice was issued without much discussion, if any, and the facts which are gradually developing show that it may cause unnecesary hardship and loss without serving any substantial purpose.

The ones who really suffer on account of the stoppage of racing are the small horse owners and trainers, employees, and the small breeders throughout the country. I would estimate that at least 75 percent of the race horse and breeding interests in the country are represented by small owners and small breeders.

The large owners and large breeding interests can continue without much trouble until racing is resumed.

However the small breeding groups will have to curtail their operations and the small horse owners will virtually be pushed out of business. Of course many of them probably have already sold out because the numbers which could be shipped out of the country are comparatively small.

It will be found, I believe, upon examination, that the employees of the tracks or in other parts of the racing picture were pretty well located either in the armed forces or in war work before this order was issued. Comparatively few were available at the tracks, at least from my personal observation. I saw very few who would be much in use in the war effort. The remaining grooms and others were men chiefly along in years who had been working all their lives in this one occupation.

In addition, in the New York area, according to the official records of the War Production Board, there is no labor shortage as this is known as No. 4 area, that is an area in which there is plenty of labor.

This is further shown by the fact there have been huge lay-offs and by the fact that there are more than 1500 factories in this metropolitan area which are vacant or are not being operated.

Amongst the others who suffer from this order are the States which are deprived of taxes in a very substantial manner.

Practically the only object, if the manpower is eliminated, is the so-called absenteeism.

The figures which have been released in the newspapers show that in the Hollywood area, the absenteeism the month before racing was commenced was greater than it was during the racing period.

There are sufficient facts concerning absenteeism throughout the country to demonstrate that one amusement extra in an area does not make any difference in war work.

I know from plenty of experience which I have had in plants that I have run in various sections of the country that absenteeism is something which arises from excess moneys, the fishing season, the hunting season, and other reasons, separate and distinct from any particular amusement.

In many families where there are three or four people working, it is necessary at times for a certain amount of absenteeism to occur because the people in the family have no chance to be with each other and even to do such small things as shopping. The result is that they take a day off now and then for these purposes.

Diverting from the subject for the moment, the reservoir of manpower in this country is in the efficiency or in the use of manpower now available.

For instance, in one plant in which the Navy took an active part the total number of employees was reduced from 12,000 to 7,000, a saving of 5,000 employees and yet the plant had a greater production than it had before.

I imagine that if all the bin of racing was scraped to the bottom, there would not be 5,000 war employees secured throughout the entire country.

The racing associations are not likely to suffer very much, even if racing is not resumed for some time, because whatever profits they made were pretty well taken in taxes as very few of them have a tax base sufficient to offset excess-profits taxes.

The result thereof is that the breeding interests in this country, if racing is not resumed, at least in part, will seriously suffer and the breeding of horses which has occupied the time and money both of individuals and the Government for a long time, will be considerably lessened. The possible export markets for breeding in this country will be turned over to the British and the United States for all of these sacrifices will have to look to racing continuing under certain conditions in England, France, Egypt, India, Australia, and various South American countries, while it is stopped here.

Under the circumstances I think that as a breeder and an owner of horses, I am entirely warranted in asking you to inquire into this situation not only on behalf of small breeders and small horse owners in this country but also on behalf of your constituents and the interests of New York State resulting from taxes created within the boundaries of your own district.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID A. BUCKLEY.

Supplementing my letter of February 16, 1945, I give you herewith information as to many details:

1. Racing in New York is held at the Jamaica, Aqueduct, and Belmont tracks. The first two are in Queens, in the city of New York, and Belmont is just over the New York City and Queens line at Elmont. It is next to Queens Village. Each of these tracks is served by the Long Island Railroad, and by subways and busses. The remainder of flat racing in New York State is negligible. Trotting races exist throughout the State at county fairs principally and serve large crowds—fairs like Syracuse and Mineola and the main trotting meets at Westbury, Saratoga, and many other places.

2. The tax income of the State from racing amounts to approximately $30,000,000, and is mostly from the three tracks mentioned above.

3. Horses at the tracks are cared for by grooms, exercised by riders, and ridden in races by jockeys. The grooms now left at the tracks are mostly old men who have been in that line all their lives. There are about 12,000 race horses in the United States and 1 man can take care of 3 or 4 horses. The total in this service is therefore about 4,000. One exercise rider takes care of from 6 to 12 horses. Therefore there are about 1,000 to 2,000 riders at tops. As to jockeys, I have seen figures of 500. Of course, many of the jockeys also exercise the horses in the morning, so that there are only about 100 jockeys outside of the exercise boys. The grand total of all above at maximum is therefore about 6,000. If racing is abolished, about one-half of this force will still be necessary, unless the horses are all shot and buried now. The saving in manpower or the use of more men is therefore negligible.

Horses at the farms include stallions, mares, weanlings, yearlings, pensioners, and injured horses. There are about 6,000 foals registered each year, which would indicate that there are between nine and ten thousand mares. Weanlings and yearlings at the farms would equal that figure, so that we have about 20,000 on the farms. This makes 2,000 now in that work. At the present on the farms children are helping after hours, as in most places the younger men are gone. I doubt whether a total of 2,000 men are in this work. On Virginia records it would show a total for the country of 1,200.

The above are all the labor involved if the thoroughbred horses are allowed to continue alive.

If they are all shot, the feed will be saved and the few farmers engaged in this eliminated. Their business will also, of course, be eliminated and the values of their farms destroyed. The international trade in thoroughbred horses will then go as a monopoly to England.

4. If racing is operating, there will be in the period from April to November one track always operating in New York, one track operating in the Middle West, and one track operating in New England. During part of this period one track will be running in New Jersey, Maryland, Kentucky, Florida, and California. Some small racing goes on at half-mile tracks during this period in Rhode Island, Maryland, and Ohio. There is hardly ever more than one track operating at any one time, and dates are awarded to the different tracks so that their meets do not conflict. During the rest of the year—that is, December to April—so-called winter racing exists in Florida, New Orleans, Hot Springs, Ark., and California.

It is entirely possible to do all the racing in the New York area at one track, all the racing in Chicago at one track, divide New England into three divisions, use only one track in Maryland, New Jersey, Florida, California, and Kentucky. If all winter racing were abolished, it would not be badly missed, except by the State of Florida. Horsemen got along without winter racing for a long time.

Since racing normally operates in any vicinity in one track at a time, the number of help involved is limited, as they move from one track to another. Restaurant help, mutuel employees, etc., are the same at each track. In other words, all the employees who have to serve the crowds are the same at each track. There are about 500 in each locality and in this respect some localities take the same men as others. For instance, Stevens Catering serves Maryland, Florida, and New York. The mutuel employees also move to the winter tracks. For all practical purposes, therefore, the total crews necessary include 1 for New England, 1 for New York, 1 for the Middle West, and 1 for the coast. This would make a total of about 2,000. These consist of middle-aged clerk types, waiters, etc. A good many of these could get other positions as waiters. Many are located in labor areas, such as New York, where there is unemployment at present, and most of them are over 45 years of age. Anyone who has seen the waiters and mutuel clerks will tell you they look more like an average of 60 years at present.

5. The above is the story of racing. It is not a big story, as the facts show. It is highly publicized, of course, as all matters of public entertainment are. The engaging element of chance lends it romance. Its history and tradition and the superb beauty of the thoroughbred horse make it a universal attraction.

6. Racing in other countries is continuing—England, Ireland, France, Egypt, India, Australia, Canada, Mexico, and various South American countries are all operating.

7. Our country as a breeding center was badly smashed in the early part of this century through the action of Governor Hughes in New York. Our horses were shipped out to France and England. During recent years we have been reestablishing our breeding, and our American lines are being accepted throughout the world. England is constantly trying to block us because this is an important agricultural industry. However, we have American lines of breeding which do not exist in England, and we are well on our way to compete successfully in this field, which will make us friendly relations in many parts of the world.

The history of breeding shows that it is important to all lines of agricultural activity to encourage the study and practice of breeding. The concepts developed for the breeding of horses bring forth minds thinking for perfection. The breeding of other animals is greatly affected and helped. England with its Guernseys and Aberdeen Angus and supremacy in many breeding lines is a perfect example.

So you see the story of racing is the story of breeding of the land, the farm, and the thoughts of people.

If it touches the romance of chance, the thrill of a great victory, it is all in balance, a harmony of people on the land and in the cities.

DAVID A. BUCKLEY.

The Job Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Moley from Newsweek of February 19, 1945:

THE JOB BUDGET

(By Raymond Moley)

Whether March comes in like a lion or a lamb for the proposed new Secretary of Com-

merce, the country is indebted to Mr. Wallace for a revealing lesson in political economy. For that candidate for the Commerce job has presented the first detailed plan for spelling out the promise of 60,000,000 jobs. Since his plan was created through the collaboration of several members of the administration, it bears the stamp of an authority transcending in importance his own fortunes. It richly deserves analysis.

The proposed "job budget" involves the source of the 15,000,000 jobs between the 45,000,000 of 1939 and the 60,000,000 promised.

First, it is proposed that 5,000,000 new jobs, which is half the size of our entire industrial employment for 1939, be used in building new plants and factories. This would mean that in 2 years we would add to existing facilities a brand new industrial plant twice as large as the whole pre-war British industry. The money for such expansion could hardly be expected to come from private creditors, since no banker in his right mind would fail to note that we were not fully using our plant capacity in 1939 and that we have since built a new war industry at a cost of twenty-two to twenty-five billion dollars.

Mr. Wallace said that "the Government should recognize its responsibility for sharing part of any special or abnormal risk of loss attached" to such financing. Mr. Wallace's statement on this point concluded with the sentence: "And this does not include the workers who would be needed to operate these plants after they are built." I add this because, at this point, the reader must believe that I am misrepresenting Mr. Wallace's proposal. I confess that I returned to the text of his Senate testimony again and again to be sure that my eyes had not deceived me.

In describing the way in which government should finance the new construction, Mr. Wallace made a comparison with the F. H. A. guarantee of new mortgages on homes and was immediately confronted with the crucial difference between financing a new business and financing a home. It is the difference between a loan and equity financing. When pressed on this point, Wallace said he would like to present "details" later.

When the Government guarantees a loan on a home and the owner loses the home, another owner moves in. In most such cases the F. H. A. doesn't lose. If the house cannot be sold for enough to cover the mortgage, the F. H. A. loses a small percent of its guaranty, but even this is covered by the insurance premium of one-half of 1 percent paid annually by all F. H. A. home owners.

But if a grocery business or a small manufacturing plant fails, the business practically disappears. And even in piping times, only 30 percent of new groceries live to be 2 years old. In such failures, the Government which provides equity capital loses most of its investment. If the Government is willing, the proprietor may even get money to try again. It should be said further that when a new manufacturing business is opened with new machinery, some older plant will probably lose out. It will, that is, if the new plant succeeds. No measure is provided in the job budget for this consequent loss of employment.

The next item in the job budget is 3,000,000 jobs created by increasing foreign trade threefold. This is a commendable ideal. British expectations are more modest, for the British seek an increase of only 50 percent in foreign trade. When Senators pressed Mr. Wallace about "what the people abroad have to sell us," he answered: "They have tourist service." The amount of new foreign trade which could be covered by tourist service could hardly be expected to employ even a small fraction of the 3,000,000.

Another figure on the list is 2,000,000 jobs in home construction.

The final item in the job budget was unemployment doles and increased social-security payments to 5,000,000 persons. These payments more properly belong in a leisure budget. They do not involve jobs. Perhaps this is why Mr. Wallace reduced the 60,000,000 total to a "floor" of 57,000,000. Maybe that floor is not too delicate to sustain Mr. Wallace, but his heft is apparently buoyed up by celestial wings.

Crimea Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of February 14, 1945:

CRIMEA COMPACT

Day after day, night after night, whether skies smile or snow falls on the home front, young men, fighting to defend their Nation and restore freedom to the world, are being wounded, become prisoners, or die in action.

Day after day, night after night, by wire from Washington, the news that these young men have been injured, have been imprisoned behind barbed wire, or have died the deaths of heroes, comes to the homes of the high and the low throughout our land.

Day after day, night after night, exactly 27 years ago, on the same terrain, against the same foe, and under the same conditions, other young men whose sons fight now were being wounded and imprisoned, and some were dying.

To those who fight so bravely now, and to those who so bravely wait at home for the doorbell to ring; to those to whom the war is not a headline but a heartbeat; to those who have not only an altruistic stake in it, but a very human one—a human life, the compact of Crimea will be especially appealing in its major aspects.

It had a ring of action to it in its pledge to shorten the war with blows at Germany from all points of the compass. It had a ring of tough determination in its pledge to cut out the German canker which for decades has been the sore spot of the world. And it had the ring of confidence in its pledge that this time the peace to be made would keep for more than a generation.

It bears out the very thing we hoped for and which our foemen hope against, that the proceedings would be carried out in a harmonious atmosphere and that the three great powers who must preserve the peace would be drawn closer together. Considering each leader naturally thought of his own land first, such unity was miraculous.

It is not a perfect compact because it will not please everyone. But it would be hard to find any compact, worked out by men with finite minds and signed with human hands, that was perfect. Many times that magnificent document, our Constitution, has been amended to meet, not in an idealistic way alone, but in a realistic way, the changing world in which we live.

But it is progressive. It is better than anything the combined freemen of the world ever had before in the way of agreements. It aims in a more definite, concrete way to bring to pass the ultimate thing for which young men bear wounds, suffer imprisonment, and offer up their lives—peace.

What abrasive points and unsettled problems remain, we can hope, in the light of what has been accomplished, may be ironed out more satisfactorily at future meetings. That is not impossible. We traveled a long way from Teheran to Yalta.

But in all considerations of the compact, there is one which cannot be ignored. The Nazis, for home consumption, called it a hate program. It was a clever designation. It was far-sighted. It held out a tiny ray of hope for them and a warning for us.

They did not expect any love program as far as they were concerned. They called it a hate program because they were sowing a seed, the seed of the Third World War in German hearts against the day, if the day ever comes, when the Big Three bicker and fall apart, and the purpose of the Crimea Compact is forgotten—peace, lasting peace.

Mr. Wallace's Pay-Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Christian Century:

MR. WALLACE'S PAY-OFF

(By Oswald Garrison Villard)

The President put himself so thoroughly in the wrong in his ousting of Jesse Jones that it is impossible to withhold some sympathy from the ex-Secretary of Commerce even if one has heretofore not been enthusiastic about him. Franklin Roosevelt has the reputation of being one of the cleverest of politicians. Yet every now and then he makes a blunder so crass as to seem inexplicable. This is one of them. Whether he expected that Mr. Jones would not publish the letter of dismissal, or whether he just failed to appreciate how it would appear in the public prints, he signalized the beginning of his fourth term with an act of what would have been called pure stupidity if done by one of his immediate predecessors in the White House. After exalting Mr. Jones and his work without any reservation, he put on paper cold-bloodedly the reason why he was being ousted, telling him that he was being dismissed because the man he probably dislikes more than any other in Washington wanted his job.

ATTITUDE TOWARD OFFICE

This revelation of President Roosevelt's attitude toward high office, this fresh proof of how lightly he takes the Cabinet of the United States, is astounding in a veteran of 12 years in the Presidency—to put it as politely as one can. Even a tyro, one would think, would have written a graceful, quiet note expressing his sorrow that the present relationship must terminate and the hope of further cooperation in the service of the country. But no. Something drove the President to let the daylight in on the whole transaction. There for everyone to see is the usual Rooseveltian performance—the "Dear Jesse," the familiar tears of oh, such profound regret, and such moving thanks for the superb public service rendered, and then the offer of a nice ambassadorship to salve the wound, just as in the case of Adolf Berle, who has been shipped off to Brazil—without mercy for the Brazilians. Add to this the President's frank confession that Henry wanted Jesse's job and would not take any other, with the reminder to Jesse that after all Henry really did the best service of anybody in helping to re-elect the donor of all

these good things, and you have a perfect picture of the way public office is bandied about by the President. There is no pretense that the public interests were respected or that Henry Wallace was fitted for the new job. He wanted it, he had earned it, and so Jesse must go.

THE "SPOILS" PHILOSOPHY

This is the sort of thing we used to believe was restricted chiefly to the bosses of petty and crooked political machines, who regarded public office as private spoils. It was the fundamental philosophy of Tammany Hall that the fellow who worked hardest for the success of the ticket got the best job. It constituted one of the greatest difficulties before the civil-service reformer. The one thing that does not enter the picture in the Wallace case is whether this move will in any way facilitate the reorganization of this country's economy and commerce when the war is over. Mr. Wallace has many valuable qualities, including courage and determination to carry on the historic fight to free the political life of this country from the domination of big business. Without question he has been more loyal to the New Deal than many of the avowed New Dealers. He was badly treated at the last convention, Vice Presidency being taken away from him only because the President betrayed him, yet he took that betrayal with Christian charity and forgiveness. He not only showed no ill will or anger, but, as the President says, spoke for his reelection with greater zeal and devotion than any other of the leading Democratic politicians. Even that, however, does not entitle a man to a Cabinet seat which, whatever may have been the past practice, ought certainly to be awarded for something else than campaign services. But the President told the newspapermen only a couple of weeks ago that "Henry won't starve" in the next 4 years, and so a job had to be produced, and Henry was so unkind as to refuse anything but Jesse's.

WALLACE SHOULD HAVE REFUSED

I submit that if Henry Wallace were as fine a man as he was before he took public office and got into the political game he would have scorned an appointment obtained and bestowed in this fashion. However much he may hate Mr. Jones, it would seem as if he should have—if the President has not—a greater respect for public office, and especially for the Cabinet, than to insist upon forcing himself into a post for which he is not qualified either by his experience in life or by his relationship to the business community. Surely the President might have prevailed upon him to take the office of Secretary of Labor. The ex-Vice President is extremely popular with labor, and the office of Secretary of Labor is now so completely stripped of important functions that Mr. Wallace would have had the opportunity to play a really useful role as a sort of "minister without portfolio," with permission to give time and attention to developing some of the innumerable policies for our postwar reorganization about which Mr. Roosevelt has no time to think. But no, he had to be Secretary of Commerce.

This has naturally recalled the open break between Mr. Wallace and Mr. Jones, and their public attacks upon each other in 1943, which led the President to remove Mr. Wallace from the additional job he was then holding as head of the Board of Economic Warfare. The suspicion that Mr. Wallace saw his chance to get even with Secretary Jones will forever persist. Should the Senate reject the nomination or restrict the secretaryship to its original purposes, without the tremendous additional powers bestowed upon it since the war began, it would at least let the world know that there are some Americans ready to protest against this method of dealing with the Cabinet when the United States is in the greatest crisis in its history. Unfortunately the case will hardly be decided on its merits. Too many of the judges are themselves deeply immersed in the game of dealing in offices, and tied down by party affiliations. There will be much less concern with the injury done the public service by President Roosevelt's letter than desire on the part of the reactionary Democrats, especially those from the South, to vent their personal grievances.

REHABILITATION OF CABINET NEEDED

What the hour called for was obviously a complete rehabilitation of the Cabinet. But the truth is that the President has never respected the Cabinet, has never regarded it as a body of men to counsel with him in regard to national policies and literally to share with him the responsibility for those policies. He has wanted yes-men, as did Woodrow Wilson. It will be recalled that the situation got so bad under Wilson that Mr. Lane and other Cabinet members consulted as to whether they could move the President to tell them what he was planning to do; for example, during the Lusitania crisis. But never has the Cabinet reached so low an ebb in this respect as under Mr. Roosevelt. Of late years there have not even been regular Cabinet meetings, and there can be no question but that its members have often known no more about what was taking place, what national and international policies were being formed and put into execution, than any intelligent newspaper reader. I have heard it stated unqualifiedly by persons in a position to know, that no dispatch came through to the State Department during the conferences at Cairo and Teheran to tell Mr. Hull or anybody else what was going on.

Need anyone look further to ascertain why it is that the President is such a bad administrator? He will not cooperate with others, however much he may expect them to cooperate with him. As has been pointed out in the case of the State Department, he has deliberately worked against subordination by dealing directly with lesser officials—for instance, with Consul General Murphy in the North African matter, and constantly with Sumner Welles—until Mr. Hull's patience wore out. Insubordination has been an outstanding feature of the Roosevelt administration, yet it is certainly impossible to blame cabinet members when one of them assured me that for months and months he had not been able to present his needs and desires to the President. Even that is by no means as bad as the revelation in the President's letter to Mr. Jones that the work Mr. Wallace did for the success of the ticket is the only reason "that I am asking you to relinquish this present post for Henry."

ANOTHER BLOW TO DEMOCRACY

The seriousness of this Wallace episode lies in the fact that it is another blow at our democratic machinery and its standing in the eyes of the world. But the President does not see that he is endangering our democratic processes and giving the totalitarians among us another opportunity to indict our republican form of government. He sees nothing whatever wrong in Miss Perkins' drawing her salary at her empty desk when the most important functions of her department are divided between 10 or 11 different bureaus, boards and commissions. It does not occur to him that, especially in wartime, waste, duplication of effort, inefficiency and working at cross purposes by consent of the Chief Executive are far more dangerous to the Nation than any strike or outright treason of that American boy who has just been captured in his effort to play the spy upon his own country.

The President has never shown an understanding of how far the influence of a bad example in the highest office carries, and how deeply it affects multitudes who think that the man in the White House sets the proper civic and ethical standards for his fellow citizens to emulate. If he has no hesitation in making a football of a Cabinet office, ought we to be surprised that dozens of Americans are being sentenced to long terms in Italy and France for having disposed of Army supplies almost in sight of the enemy in order to enrich their own pockets?

United States Future Depends on Avoiding World War No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Worcester Telegram:

UNITED STATES FUTURE DEPENDS ON AVOIDING WORLD WAR NO. 3

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

Self-preservation is the first law of Nature. Self-preservation is the first consideration which we Americans must have in mind as we plan our policy for the post-war years. Let's not make any mistake about it, for, if we do, it is likely to be our last mistake. Before Pearl Harbor there was a great deal of dissension in this country as to whether we should get into the war or stay out of the war.

After Pearl Harbor there was no dissension because we had been attacked, and nobody questioned the necessity of defending ourselves. Next time we will not have any choice about getting in or staying out. Next time the whole of the United States will be just as exposed to sudden attack as was Pearl Harbor, 2,000 miles out in the Pacific Ocean.

MISSILES OF FUTURE

After all, a bombing plane is just an instrument for delivering high-explosive missiles against a chosen target. Now the progress of scientific discovery is about to provide us—and others—with means for delivering such missiles which are far superior to the bombing plane in range, in accuracy, and in economy of power. A few more years of experiment and research will bring these means to even higher stages of efficiency.

No spot on the face of the earth will be safe from sudden and overwhelming attack.

BASIC PRINCIPLE

That is what I mean when I say that self-preservation is the basic principle which should guide our future policy. Every American should keep this fact in mind. Every American should be properly aware of the grim truth, for realization of that truth and intelligent action based upon such realization is essential to the individual safety of every one of us, and to our collective security as a nation.

I recently listened to a distinguished Englishman describe what he saw as he came into an area of London where a German rocket had just fallen. "There were two blocks of smashed houses. The streets were blocked with debris.

WHAT ROCKET DID

"Broken glass was scattered over a considerable area. Atop a crumbling bit of brick wall, I saw all that was left of a baby. A couple, dazed and staggering came down the street.

"The man was leading a little child by the hand. The woman was carrying a baby from

which blood dripped on her feet as she walked. A little farther on four American soldiers lay dead on a heap of rubble. The rescue squads were at work, but it would take them many hours to reach some of the shattered bodies, which lay beneath the ruins * * *."

Remember, the people of Britain once believed that they were secure from such horrors because of their insular position, ringed round by the sea which the British Navy ruled. It was hard for them to abandon that instinctive feeling of security even after the lessons of World War No. 1, even after repeated warnings by many of their public men.

SOOTHED THEIR FEARS

They elected and kept in office those leaders who told them comfortable fictions and soothed their fears, rather than those who sternly warned them of the certainty of peril and demanded sacrifice and action to avert it. We Americans are inclined to do the same sort of thing.

But we must not. We dare not. For the next time may be too late.

I have seen some of the experiments which our own military scientists are conducting. I have seen some of the foreign matériel which they are examining and analyzing. I have talked with military and scientific people who have been in Britain and France and who have seen what the effect of some of the Germans' weapons is, even under the present conditions of great difficulty and strain for Germany. And frankly, it scares me stiff.

MUST ORGANIZE

It would be a good thing if we were all sufficiently scared, if we could all understand just what we are up against if we do not now so organize this shrinking planet of ours that no future Hitler or Tojo can suddenly hurl the bolts of World War No. 3 against an unsuspecting America, comfortably proceeding about its lawful occasions and comfortably believing that there will be plenty of time.

It isn't a question of doing something for the British, or the Russians, or the Chinese. It isn't a question of mixing ourselves up in the European mess. It isn't a question of getting into war or staying out of war.

It is just a stark, grim question of self-preservation—do we want to live or do we want to perish? Either we use our immense power and our immense influence in the post-war world to organize and police the world community so that nobody can again build up the machinery of a new war of aggression, or we might as well start digging the holes into the which we shall have to bury ourselves and our families in order to survive when the rockets begin to fall in Pittsburgh and Chicago and Oklahoma City.

FACE UNDERGROUND

Either we have an organized, enforced and vigilantly maintained peace all over the world, a peace supported by the peoples of the world because that is the only way that they and their children can continue to live in the sunlight and grow food and bring up families and have any hope at all for the future, or we go underground and exist—those of us who exist at all—like moles in the dark, burrowing into the earth in order to prolong by a few weeks our miserable lives.

That is where we stand today. We live or die by the measure of our wisdom, our courage, and our willingness to face the hard facts of a future from which we cannot escape. We can mold that future if we will only realize what it holds for us—its threat as well as its golden promise.

If we fail, we stand on the threshold of a new dark age compared to which the Dark Age that followed the collapse of Graeco-Roman civilization will seem in retrospect but a passing hour of twilight.

Montana and the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1945, I appeared before the Civil Aeronautics Board urging it to give serious consideration to the application of Western Air Lines to establish direct air-line service between Great Falls, Mont., and Alaska and the Orient.

The most direct and the most feasible route to these important areas of trade is from Great Falls, which has more clear flying days—in excess of 300 every year—than any other terminal in this country. It offers a shorter route than New York, Chicago, or Minneapolis in the East and certainly is more ideally situated than Seattle or any other center in the West.

Furthermore, Great Falls has the necessary fields, hangars, and equipment to start operations on this route at the earliest practicable moment. The Army Transport Command has used the port of Great Falls for the transportation of planes and needed supplies to Russia. This was done only after other ports in the United States had been used and found wanting. The only place where the planes and material needed by Russia to carry on her fight against Germany could be sent from in the shortest period of time and by the safest route was from Great Falls. Over 6,000 planes and millions of pounds of war material have, since the port was first used, been sent by air from Great Falls, Mont. No time has been lost and no inconveniences have been encountered in transporting war material and passengers during the war, and no time will be lost or inconveniences suffered if Great Falls is designated as the American port to Alaska and Asia in the post-war period.

This is a tremendously important matter, and I want to compliment the Board for the time and study it is giving this hearing, and the fairness and impartiality with which it is considering all applications.

Great Falls, Mont., not only has the facilities; not only is it the route now being used by the Army Transport Command; but, in addition, it will cut the flying time and lessen the cost of transporting material and passengers to Alaska and the Orient. It has everything worth while to offer in its behalf, and I sincerely urge the Civil Aeronautics Board to take all these factors into consideration before arriving at its final decision.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD an article by Ben H. Pearse, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 15, 1945, showing how this route will function when Russia enters the war against Japan:

ALASKA-SIBERIA ROUTE ALL READY FOR USE IF RUSSIA WARS ON JAPS

(By Ben H. Pearse)

If and when American hopes are realized for Russian participation in the Japanese war after the defeat of Germany, an air route linking the United States and Siberia by way of Alaska is ready for instant use ferrying planes and flying supplies to air bases within easy range of Japan and the Manchurian border.

While no break-down has been given of lease-lend planes delivered to Russia in official reports, it is known that the Alaska-Siberia route has been favored in recent months because of the time element. While the Persian Gulf Command has delivered millions of tons of equipment through Iran, airplane shipments find a shorter and less congested route through Alaska. Pursuit planes, which do not have enough range for the long overwater hops across the Atlantic and have to be crated and shipped by boat, can be flown straight from the factory here to the Russo-German front in a matter of days.

Since the recapture of Attu and the evacuation of Kiska by the Japs, little attention has been paid to development along the Alaska route largely because attention shifted to other theaters. Nevertheless curtailed operations continue there with air and naval raids on the northern Kurile Island bases of Paramishiru and Shimishu appearing in Navy communiques from time to time. Of the Alaska-Siberia route, almost nothing has been said since last August when the Russians permitted disclosure that lease-lend planes were being turned over to a Soviet military mission in Fairbanks, Alaska.

There are indications, however, that this route has not been left out of consideration by the Army despite the shift of attention to other theaters. Air travelers landing at commercial airports in Canada from Edmonton north of White Horse, have noted construction going on during the past year, although Kiska was evacuated 18 months ago. While nothing has been said about its extent, it is known that a $10,000,000 airport was planned for Edmonton, solely for the use of military aircraft, which would be considerably beyond the necessities of present traffic.

Deferment of Farm Laborers Under Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Minnesota on February 9 passed the following joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to grant and to extend deferment to farm laborers under the Selective Service Act:

Whereas Minnesota farmers, desiring to render the fullest measure of patriotic service to the Nation, have worked unselfishly for long hours, bearing unprecedented hardships, to meet the increased demands for food that have been placed on them by the war; and

Whereas in addition to the thousands of men they have furnished to the armed forces, our farmers have seen great numbers of farm laborers upon whom they normally depend

drawn into the defense plants by the high wages offered there; and

Whereas the growing shortage of farm labor is making it increasingly difficult for farmers to meet the food quotas prescribed by the War Food Administrator; and

Whereas successful prosecution of the war to final victory will require not merely continued reliance on bigger than normal food supplies but in all probability even greater quantities of food; and

Whereas Congress, appreciating the gravity of the problem facing our farmers and the importance of keeping up our vital food production, has declared in adopting the Tydings amendment: "Every registrant found by a selective-service board * * * to be necessary to and properly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces as long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained," and the National Director of Selective Service in a statement on January 23 has reaffirmed his adherence to this policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, in regular session assembled, That we ask the President, Congress, and our Federal officials to follow and uphold the spirit of the Tydings amendment in dealing with matters affecting farm labor, and that we memorialize the President and Congress to take all further steps and to prescribe all further regulations that may be necessary to insure to agriculture an adequate farm-labor supply; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Minnesota is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each of the Members in the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, the production of food will decline sharply this year unless some steps are taken immediately by the Congress to see to it that the selective service obeys the spirit and intent of the law as embodied in the Tydings amendment.

The fact that the Legislature of the State of Minnesota has passed this joint resolution is evidence in itself that a very serious situation confronts the Nation as far as the production of food is concerned.

Action To Avert Lend-Lease Losses Urged by Senator Tunnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, now that the Congress is soon to be asked to authorize an increase in the debt limit from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000, it is important to keep the spending record straight. The Bureau of the Budget could, if it would, disclose the arrogance with which foreign government officials have refused point-blank to give any accurate accounting for funds advanced to them. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article from the Washington Times-Herald under date of February 16, 1945:

ACTION TO AVERT LEND-LEASE LOSSES URGED BY SENATOR TUNNELL—UNITED STATES DENIED RIGHTS TO AIRPORTS BUILT WITH OWN MONEY, VISITOR TO FRONT SAYS

(By William Moore)

The story of the billions of taxpayers' money that have been poured into north Africa and the Middle East was told to the Senate yesterday by Senator TUNNELL (Democrat) of Delaware.

It was an eyewitness story, but it was not complete.

There were incredible gaps, some of which the white-haired Senator blamed upon inadequate accounting, some upon no accounting at all.

ACCOUNTING INADEQUATE

The British, he said, had failed—declined in fact—to make an accounting of reverse lend-lease. The War Department accounting of its expenditures he found wholly inadequate as he told of a million-dollar American airfield in French Morocco listed by the Army as costing $52,000.

TUNNELL warned the Nation that it has no commercial rights to the great airports it has built and is dependent upon the British, in some cases, for permission to use them at all.

STIFLING AMERICAN TRADE

Moreover, TUNNELL said, the British are stifling American trade in north Africa and the Middle East by limiting the number of dollars that nations can acquire to buy American goods. And those goods, from which he said American taxpayers should be getting a fair return, include such surplus war property as camps, hospitals, air bases, radio stations, port facilities, prison camps, assembly factories for airplanes and trucks, and warehouses.

TOURED NORTH AFRICA

TUNNELL'S story was his report on his recent tour of north Africa and the Middle East with Senator BURTON (Republican), of Ohio, for the Senate War Investigating Committee.

In the report, TUNNELL pleaded for immediate establishment of an American policy to protect American interests. He said other nations are not delaying decisions on such matters despite the war, and warned that delay will be extremely costly to American taxpayers.

Before telling of conditions on the other side of the Atlantic, he told of visiting Bermuda on the first leg of his airplane trip.

UNITED STATES HAS NO RIGHTS

There he found the airport on which the United States has spent $42,000,000 and is still spending—without obtaining any airplane or other commercial rights.

"No matter how much we spend on the airport," he said, "it cannot be used by our Government or our people for commercial purposes after the war."

Turning to the British refusal to account for reverse lend-lease, TUNNELL said on one occasion when the British did make an accounting, they credited themselves with 17½ times the amount for which the Navy credited them—$175,000,000 instead of ten million.

BALANCES IN DOUBT

"Lend-lease and reverse lend-lease accounts," TUNNELL said, "are in such condition that it is impossible to tell with certainty the exact status of balances for intra-theater transactions. There are two serious discrepancies between methods used by our forces and those of the British.

"The first is the refusal of the British to price invoices on materials and services lend-leased to us. The second is the policy of the British to charge 42 percent on their cost for transportation, insurance, and handling charges on material and equipment, whereas the American charges have been 25 percent.

"Both the Army and Navy have been seeking to persuade the British to price their invoices. The British have consistently refused to do so on the basis that they did not have sufficient bookkeeping manpower.

DISCREPANCY SEEN

"Warehouses full of unpriced invoices will be accumulated which, if ever priced, will have to be priced by persons not familiar with the original transaction. Apparently the British maintain prices for their own records and unquestionably there will be a discrepancy between our estimate of British reciprocal aid and the estimate the British will have.

"As an example, the British presented a report of some $175,000,000 worth of material transferred to us on lend-lease, which was appraised by our Navy at only ten million."

TUNNELL offered no estimates on the cost of American military installations in the Azores, second stop of the trip, but commented that we use facilities there by permission of the British, although the islands are owned by Portugal.

Discussing the American airport at Casablanca and the other 15 airfields visited, TUNNELL told the Senate that American representatives are firmly opposed to giving up any American establishments unless the nation benefiting pays, and pays a fair price. But there are no agreements or treaties, he said, to protect American rights.

One airport now being secretly built, TUNNELL said, is being established without even any discernible title acquired by the United States.

The Casablanca airport of Sale, TUNNELL said, was improved by the Americans at a cost of $1,000,000. But the French have turned it over to the British, who are using it commercially.

NO HELP FOR UNITED STATES

"Neither the United States nor any American air lines," TUNNELL explained, "have obtained any franchise to operate in North Africa." On the other hand, the British Overseas Airways Corporation is running regularly scheduled commercial flights.

TUNNELL said the costs of North African and Mediterranean airports were not accurately kept by the War Department. He said that, while it is known the Casablanca airport cost $1,000,000, the Army books showed an "out-of-pocket" cost of only $52,000.

Of 25 airports for which he and BURTON asked the Army for costs, TUNNELL said, the Army was unable to give estimated totals on 8, and reported that information was not available at all as to the cost of 5 of these. On 2 other airports listed by the Army, TUNNELL said, the Army reported:

"No record is available of a United States Army Air Forces installation."

Since TUNNELL did not elaborate on his prepared report, Senators were left wondering as to whether or not these airports should be counted as lost or missing.

Discussing the British interference with American trade, TUNNELL said:

"At the end of this war, we shall have airports which can be made beacons of commercial activity to an extent never before dreamed of. Notwithstanding, our commerce may be limited by lack of commercial treaties, by an entire absence of the right to trade with many of the nations of the world.

"In addition, there is what is known as the sterling bloc, which together with local conditions make it practically impossible for Americans to trade in these lands. The natives have no way of paying for American goods with American dollars.

DOLLARS ARE SCARCE

"There is an acute scarcity of dollars in most of these areas, notably Egypt, Palestine, and Iraq. These countries and others are in what is known as the 'sterling area,' which means that dollars received in these

countries are required to be pooled in London.

"These countries are then permitted to acquire dollars for the purchase of imports from the United States only to the extent permitted by the British. * * * The sterling bloc is an impediment to free trade with this area."

Recalling complaints of Senator CHANDLER, Democrat, of Kentucky, that Americans always "sit at the foot of the table" in dealings with the British, TUNNELL said of a visit to Italy:

"We found that although our representative, Admiral Stone, is the chief commissioner of the Allied commission administering the armistice, there are two British officials who are superior to him."

The Crimean Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the press of America has by no means unanimously proclaimed the results of the Crimean Conference a victory for American ideals. Much of the criticism of the Crimean Conference, however, particularly by the columnists has been partisan. But Mr. David Lawrence is a man whose true desire for international cooperation has never been questioned. Therefore, the following two columns are of particular interest in this moment, for they seem to express much of the spiritual uneasiness with the Crimean Conference aroused in many men of good will and generous impulses:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 14, 1945]

AMERICAN IDEALISM DEFEATED AT PARLEY—REICH'S ECONOMIC EXTINCTION IS FEARED AS RESULT BY WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

American idealism has been defeated as conspicuously at the Crimean conference as it was at Paris 26 years ago. The late President Wilson, caught in a cycle of expediency, made concession after concession to European statesmen who were grabbing territory and spoils of war, pinning his hopes on the League of Nations to correct the inequities of the Versailles Treaty. Then America refused to enter the League.

Today all that President Roosevelt can hope for is that the United Nations organization some day may save something out of the wreckage of American ideals and hopes. For America will enter the new league.

The wreckage of ideals is confirmed in the Crimean communique. On August 14, 1941, and again in January 1942, the Atlantic Charter was exhibited to the world as a solemn pledge that the signatory countries "seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other."

Yet Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have apparently been annexed by Russia since those dates and a Polish puppet state under Russian domination has been set up and now its title and authority is confirmed.

RUSSIA TO DOMINATE GROUP

Russia, moreover, is to dominate the Reparations Commission which is to sit in Moscow and extract for an indefinite time from Germany whatever labor, raw materials or other compensation can be extracted.

It was the reparation demand to be paid for "in kind" that stripped Germany of her coal and rolling stock in the early 20's and prevented the German republic from recuperating and forced her, instead, into bankruptcy in 1923, on the heels of which a few years later Hitler got his chance to whip up his political strength among the unemployed and distraught German people.

American idealism, which cried out in the twenties against the kind of punitive peace that ultimately eats like a cancer into the conquerors as well as the conquered, has been forced into silence today by the louder cries of revenge.

As the Pope so eloquently said in recent months, a peace based on revenge gets nowhere. For it means large standing armies, compulsory military training for our youth, huge burdens of taxation, and a recalcitrant spirit among the vanquished peoples. It means undergrounds, sniping, and a reign of terror in central Europe. And many millions of Americans will have to stay in uniform to enforce such a truce and prepare for a third world war.

But the world doesn't learn. Each age apparently is swept by its own hysteria and its own emotional slogans. And each generation passes on to the next the task of paying in the blood of millions of unborn children for the sins and mistakes of its predecessor generation.

The mind of Josef Stalin, who gives no democracy or freedom of worship to his own people, can realistically enough throw a crumb to Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt by promising to assist in free elections in the liberated areas and by lip service to the Atlantic Charter, but any one familiar with continental elections in disputed areas knows what happens to such so-called elections when military controls are present.

Only a government submissive to the dictates of Moscow can live hereafter in Poland, Yugoslavia, or the other satellite States. Russia now has her sphere of influence, and America and Britain find themselves compelled to recognize it.

The same high-sounding phrases have been given to the world again this week as were issued at the Moscow and Tehran conferences in November and December of 1943. The same promises of military coordination and of a desire to work together in a peace as well as war were promulgated then.

The same European Advisory Commission was pointed to in 1943 as a pious body to examine questions arising day by day out of the liberated countries, and joint action was pledged. But that pledge was broken by Britain through her single-handed action in Greece and in Italy and by Russia in her encouragement of and setting up of the Lublin Government in Poland.

GERMAN GANGSTERISM FEARED

Just as in the communiques from Moscow and Teheran, so another vision of a future world at peace has been painted with dramatic words in the Crimean communique. But behind those words stands stark realism. In the decision to destroy Germany's economic life and make it impossible for her for many years to come to live as a peaceful partner in the European family, the Crimean Conference has condemned Germany to a life of underground gangsterism and outlawry.

The Nazis will certainly be able to step-up German resistance now and, after organized resistance has finally been crushed at high cost in human life, the adherents to the underground probably will be larger proportionately than they were in France.

When Hitler tried to crush the spirit of the French people, he found himself checkmated. The decision at the Crimean Conference will arouse the same desperate resentment and martyrdom in Germany. The world might as well prepare for perennial bloodshed in Europe and economic chaos.

It is a sad day for civilization when all that the three most powerful statesmen of the world apparently can do in an international conference is to consign a whole people to economic extinction by a system of punitive reparations that really condemns all of Europe to an era of economic anarchy.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 15, 1945]

CANDID EXPLANATION ADVISED ON PARLEY—WRITER SAYS VALIDITY OF STEPS MUST AWAIT SENATE APPROVAL

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are entitled to some candid answers to specific questions when President Roosevelt returns here from the Big Three conference. Among them are these:

1. What were the "hard bargains" driven by the President, as the phrase is publicly used by one of his spokesmen? In exchange for an American willingness to participate in policing the affairs of Europe, what did the United States get?

2. Did the President sign a commitment in behalf of the United States defining the future boundaries of Poland and if so, do the other governments understand that this does not come within the President's war powers but must be submitted in the form of a treaty to the United States Senate where it is subject to approval or rejection by a two-thirds vote?

3. Does the United States acquiesce in the annexation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, which were grabbed by Stalin when he was Hitler's partner in 1939 and 1940, and is not this annexation, plus the change in Poland's boundary, a violation of the Atlantic Charter, which pledges Russia not to seek any "territorial aggrandizement"?

WILL UNITED STATES SHARE IN REPARATIONS?

4. Did the President agree on any formula for the allocation of reparations arising from war damage done by Germany and is the United States to have any share of the reparations, and, if so, is the American representative to be provided for by treaty or by statute as was proposed after the World War?

5. Was Stalin's price for possible aid against Japan and for agreeing to the Roosevelt formula of voting procedure in the United Nations Security Council, the giving of American consent to the partition of Poland and the annexation of the Baltic states?

6. Will the Russian and other Allied armies withdraw and exercise no military control while free elections are held in liberated states?

7. Has any limit been placed on the extent to which the new commission on reparations, which is to sit in Moscow, can extract materials or payment in kind from the German people? Also has forced labor been included as one of the payments in kind that will be required? Will any maximum be placed on the payments and will Germany be told of this maximum so she can adjust her internal economy to meet the payments?

These are pertinent questions to which the American people have a right to get answers either directly or through Congress. For while the provisions of our Constitution may be annoying to some of the totalitarian minds of today both in this country and abroad, it is nevertheless a requirement that conditions fixing the terms of peace must be submitted in treaty form to the Senate.

SENATE APPROVAL NEEDED

The decisions of the Big Three, therefore, are not decisions so far as the United States is concerned until the Senate approves, especially if such decisions relate to the conduct of affairs or policies or pledges of the United States affecting matters arising after a state of war shall have ended.

Mr. Roosevelt does not require congressional approval for any agreements relating to the

conduct of military operations during the war, but peace conditions and the underwriting of the peace of Europe do require action by the Senate.

The biggest unanswered question is what promise or secret commitment was made that has led to such rejoicing in Russia and such widespread approval in the British press, where it is vaguely hinted that the President agreed to American participation in the enforcement of certain policies with respect to the peace of Europe.

What were these pledges and what is the extent of America's responsibility in a military way for post-war duties in keeping Germany disarmed and enforcing the program outlined at the Crimea Conference?

Certainly the official communique issued this week doesn't tell us much of the story or give us a hint as to the sequels that lie ahead for the United States.

Foreign Affairs Committee Member Questions Foreign Economic Administration on Accuracy of Reports Concerning Certain Operations of Lend-Lease and Lend-Lease in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, to the end that the country and the Congress may be as fully informed as possible concerning the methods, operations, and records of lend-lease, I am inserting in the RECORD at this pcint a copy of a letter which I today sent to Mr. Oscar Cox, adviser to the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration.

The letter is self-explanatory. If the F. E. A. grants me permission, I shall be glad to insert its reply in a forthcoming issue of the RECORD so that a complete report will be available on the matters under review in this letter.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1945.

Mr. OSCAR COX,
Foreign Economics Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COX: This morning, during our Foreign Affairs Committee hearings, I asked you some questions concerning the authenticity of certain newspaper stories reporting on the findings made by Senator JAMES M. TUNNELL, of Delaware, and Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, of Ohio, in connection with lend-lease operations abroad. You replied that some of these matters were beyond the exclusive purview of lend-lease and that on others it would require some time to gather accurate information upon which to base your replies. It was suggested you appear before our committee next Monday, together with any other Government representatives necessary to bring our committee the complete picture in response to my questions based on the Tunnell-Burton report.

Since the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee has asked that the meeting on Monday be an executive session, and since I believe it in the public interest for the public and the Congress to know the true facts on the matter discussed in the Tunnell-Burton report, and since a discussion in secret session of problems poised in the public press can be of little value to the Congress and the country as a whole, I am writing you this letter, listing the specific questions on which I should like to have accurate and additional information, and I am placing the letter in the Appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As my letter is being made public, and as the public has a legitimate interest in knowing the true facts in connection with the problems raised by Senators TUNNELL and BURTON, I hope you will decide to make public your reply to this communication and to join me in the request that your appearance before the committee on Monday be at a regular public hearing.

In all events, here are the questions on which I should like additional information and I want to call attention to the fact that these questions do not grow out of unsupported rumors or out of facts finding their way into general circulation without foundation; they are based on public statements made in writing by two responsible Members of the legislative branch of this Government. Your complete and candid replies will therefore be appreciated.

1. Have lend-lease funds, directly or indirectly, been used in the acquisition, improvement, and/or expansion of any air bases located on soil outside of the United States? If so, is it correct that no commercial rights to the use of these great airports have been specifically reserved to the United States and must we seek in the future permission of some foreign power to use these bases commercially? If it is not a military secret, what future protection has the United States as to our use of these bases by our military forces?

2. Is it correct as stated by Senators TUNNELL and BURTON in their report as I find the statement on page 43 that it is "the policy of the British to charge 42 percent on their cost for transportation, insurance, and handling charges on material and equipment turned over to us under reciprocal aid in the theater, whereas the charges of the American forces for such items have been 25 percent?" If correct, what is the reason for this discrepancy? What has been its approximate extra cost to the taxpayers of the United States?

3. Is it correct as stated by the two Senators on page 44 of their report that "Both the Army and Navy have been seeking to persuade the British to price their invoices. The British have consistently refused to do so on the basis that they did not have sufficient bookkeeping manpower." The Senators go on to say that, "After extended negotiations the Navy secured from the British Admiralty an understanding which became operative on January 1, 1945, that they would price invoices on all transactions subsequent to that date," and that, "The Army has as yet been unable to secure a similar commitment from the British." If these statements are correct does it follow that information given our committee on lend-lease in reverse is substantially simply an approximation or a conjecture because actual values cannot be determined without a consideration of invoice prices? It would appear that the two Senators must have had this in mind when they report, "The seriousness of the foregoing can readily be appreciated when it is realized that warehouses full of unpriced invoices will be accumulated which, if ever priced, will undoubtedly have to be priced by persons not familiar with the original transaction, who possibly will not have the proper catalogs or other reference sources to determine accurately the value of such lend-lease transfers." This doubt on the part of the Senators is further indicated when they say, "As an example, the British presented in their official documents a report of some $175,000,000 worth of material transferred to us on lend-lease, which was appraised by our Navy at a value of only $10,000,000."

4. The Tunnell-Burton report to the Senate also states that the airport at Sale, north Africa, was constructed largely at the expense of the United States and was abandoned by it in 1943. I now quote from page 7 of the Tunnell-Burton report, "Great Britain is now using this airport. It seems that either on the day that it was abandoned by the United States or shortly thereafter the French transferred it to Great Britain. An inquiry into the cost of this airport to the United States disclosed the fact that the military had not kept a very accurate record of the costs.

"We were told that the airport cost something over a million dollars. Later, from the books kept for this purpose, we were told that the actual out-of-pocket cost was about $52,000. This is mentioned only for the purpose of showing that in the haste of war, tremendous expenditures are made which are entirely justified. However, if the airports are not to be kept by the United States, they should be paid for at a reasonable price by those who do keep them." On page 7a of this report I find the statement, "In some of our new airports, we are informed our rights will end 6 months after the termination of the war." This and similar transactions may or may not have a connection with lend-lease. Please give me the facts in this connection.

I feel confident that you agree with me that lend-lease can best serve the interests of the United Nations and the United States by making available to the general public complete information on all its transactions, save those having some military significance and it seems obvious that none of the questions set forth above can have any conceivable military significance.

With best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
Member of Congress.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent to the President of the United States by 14 college presidents:

FEBRUARY 8, 1945.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT: All American citizens are united in a common determination that never again shall this country be found lacking in the military strength to insure its security. Educators from every State in the Union have declared themselves in favor of an adequate program of national defense. Incident to such a program is the proposal for compulsory military training. We whose signatures are appended to this letter believe that this proposition should be thought through now while we are conscious of the realities of a world at war. As a nation we are better able at this time to reach a wise decision on this important matter than we shall be after the war is over, when again we shall be lulled by a false sense of security. Contrary to the opinion expressed by some, we believe that the judgment of the people of the Nation is now more sound on this issue than it will be after peace is declared. We know too well the reaction which occurs after

a conflict is over—the general desire to forget it.

If adopted now, we believe that a sound plan for universal military training will enable the United States to speak with greater authority at the peace table in favor of an international organization to enforce peace.

Its adoption now will reassure the other peace-loving nations of the world that the United States proposes to cooperate with them in outlawing war and will not again retreat into isolationism.

We believe that it is more fitting in our form of government to insure national security through a democratic plan of military training rather than through the maintenance of a large professional standing army. These are the only alternatives. We believe that the maintenance of a large standing army is contrary to the traditions of our people and opposed to the best interests of the Nation.

The adoption now of a proper plan of universal military training involves no perpetual commitment. If out of the coming discussions among the nations an effective international plan to insure peace should emerge and the unrighteous ambitions of aggressor nations permanently blocked, the Congress would always have the authority to modify or abrogate the military training system.

For these reasons it is our firm belief that the proposal for a system of universal military training should be considered now; its advantages and disadvantages carefully weighed and appropriate action taken without subjecting the Nation to those hazards which are involved in postponement and delay.

Sincerely yours,

John G. Bowman, chancelor, the University of Pittsburgh; Edwin S. Burdell, director, Cooper Union; Robert C. Clothier, president, Rutgers University; Karl T. Compton, president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Thomas S. Gates, chairman of the board, University of Pennsylvania; Ernest M. Hopkins, president, Dartmouth College; Robert L. Johnson, president, Temple University; Stanley King, president, Amherst College; William Mather Lewis, president, Lafayette College; Charles Seymour, president, Yale University; Franklin B. Snyder, president, Northwestern University; John J. Tigert, president, University of Florida; Levering Tyson, president, Muhlenberg College; Blake R. Van Leer, president, Georgia School of Technology.

The Wallace Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. STARKEY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we hear and read so many intemperate and extravagant statements used to back up argument in the various controversial matters before the Congress, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Paul Dispatch of my home district. It concerns the appointment of Henry Wallace to the post of Secretary of Commerce and is, I believe, a splendid example of good sense and restraint in dealing with such controversial matters.

Although the St. Paul Dispatch is listed as an independent newspaper, it invariably supports Republican candidates and Republican policies in national issues. I do not know, but I can guess that it probably opposes Mr. Wallace's appointment. Nevertheless, it does not subscribe to the campaign of vilification against a man who even the most reactionary among us, on sober reflection, will admit has most of the qualities of an outstanding American.

I quote the Dispatch editorial:

THE WALLACE RESOLUTION

The Minnesota House is to be complimented for returning to committee the ridiculous resolution against confirmation of Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, stating among other things that the former Vice President "has indicated a greater interest in the welfare of citizens of foreign countries than he has in the citizens of America."

Henry Wallace, in the course of this fight, has been accused of intending to fold up the R. F. C. supported war industries as soon as the war is over and of intending to keep them going; of being an advocate of scarcity economics and a champion of a philosophy of abundance; of having acted short-sightedly in the depression and of having a too-distant view of the future now; of being a "religious mystic" and of consorting with communistic enemies of religion. The proposers of the resolution brought before the house, however, were sufficiently ingenious to introduce an entirely original allegation. He has a greater interest in the welfare of the citizens of foreign countries, they say, than in that of Americans.

Henry Wallace has no greater interest in the world than the welfare of American citizens. There is room for a difference of opinion on the particular measures through which he may, from time to time, seek to advance that interest. But to suggest that he is less interested in his own country than in some other country is the sheerest nonsense.

The house is well rid of this resolution. There is enough name calling and motive questioning in public life without having Minnesota's Legislature join in this undignified slur upon a man whose motives are not open to reproach whatever his methods may merit of praise or criticism.

The Battle Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is always an inspiration to see America at work and it is thrilling to see America at work during a national emergency. Labor and management, urged on by the common desire to win the victory, have wrought wonders in production and in providing for the needs of our fighting men and women. All Americans are proud of this record and hope and pray that management and labor, working together in the days after the peace, will continue this spirit of cooperation.

One of the great industries in the district I represent is engaged in the manufacture of many kinds of bandages and medical supplies for both the Government and the civilian population as well. Johnson & Johnson, Inc., has not only kept up a continual stream of supplies abroad but they have also fought the battle on the home front by holding the line against inflation. Let me quote a few of their prices today in comparison with the prices in 1918, and remember that the dollar does not purchase as much today as it did then:

	1918	1945
Red Cross bandage 2 inches by 10 yards	$0.20	$0.10
Red Cross cotton, 1 pound	1.25	.98
Johnson's baby soap, per cake	.25	[1].25
Red Cross adhesive tape, ½ inch by 5 yards	.35	.10
Johnson's dental floss	.25	.10
Johnson's baby powder	.25	.21
Red Cross gauze, 36 inches by 5 yards	1.25	.59

[1] 2 cakes.

Johnson & Johnson typifies the spirit and patriotism of the American businessmen by doing everything they can through their long years of experience, to keep prices down and cooperate with the Government and its fellow citizens in the battle against inflation. As the Representative of Johnson & Johnson in the Congress, I am proud of their record and I am glad to testify to their loyal cooperation in playing fair with the American people. I include herewith a letter I have received from Mr. Arthur B. Hill, vice president of Johnson & Johnson, which explains their policy in this important matter:

JOHNSON & JOHNSON,
New Brunswick, N. J., February 8, 1945.

The Honorable JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are certain that you are sympathetic to the tremendous job ahead in safeguarding the consumer against dangerous price increases. In our opinion it is second in importance to the winning of the war. Through the Office of Price Administration our Government has and is doing a most commendable job in price control. Johnson & Johnson is supporting this program wholeheartedly by carrying the "no inflation" message to the public through the medium of 300 newspapers, national magazines, farm, professional, and trade journals.

We submitted this promotional material to Mr. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, and I quote here an excerpt from his reply.

"I think you and your people have done a grand job on the advertisements and window posters which compare the prices of Johnson & Johnson commodities with the prices of the same items during the last war.

"Actually, since May 1943 the cost of living has increased only about 1½ percent according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. We have a tough job ahead of us if we're going to hold that line, but I think it is important to the whole stabilization program that the public have a true picture of where we stand. Misconception about the trend in the cost of living could only lead to increased inflationary pressures."

We thought you would be interested in the actual results of our long established policy of the lowest possible price consistent with the highest quality products. The attached

sample advertisement is evidence of our accomplishment.

We feel that this is an opportune time for this publicity since the fight against inflation is most important to the economic future of our country.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR B. HILL,
Vice President.

An Undercover Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

AN UNDERCOVER DRIVE

One way of selling an attack on progressive democracy is to disguise it as a campaign against high taxes, and that's exactly what Frank Gannett's Committee for Constitutional Government and the American Taxpayers' Association are doing. Their method is as underhanded as their intent.

These groups are lobbying extravagantly with State legislatures while the people's attention is elsewhere. Seventeen legislatures have approved a proposal for a twenty-second amendment to the Constitution. This measure is called the millionaires' amendment because it would prevent Congress from taxing incomes and estates more than 25 percent.

Congressmen themselves were vastly surprised when Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, disclosed nearly a year ago that the secret lobbies had had so much success. The public has had ample time to become surprised, too, yet the twenty-second amendment crowd works quietly along.

The undercover method is not new. It was tried once before, and the eighteenth amendment was the result. Legislatures bowed to the prohibition lobby while the people's back was turned and millions of young men were gone to war. Prohibition endured for more than a decade to shake confidence in democratic processes.

Under a 25-percent limit on income taxation, there would be little difference in the rate of taxes paid by millionaires and those paid by persons with the lowest taxable income. Federal revenue would be reduced in time of a costly war, and low-income groups would face higher taxes to pay off the national debt. A Federal sales tax would be one almost inevitable result.

In any case, the purchasing and investment power of most of the people would be restricted. This could turn the Nation's economic problems into an economic crisis.

The last time the people's purchasing power was depressed, the millionaire population fell off considerably. Therefore, it is unlikely that the proposed millionaires' amendment would help the millionaires.

If unwise for its supporters, the twenty-second amendment would be ruinous for most of the people. Little business would suffer before big business, and if the wealthy found it hard to pay taxes on their incomes, the less wealthy would find it hard to get an income. Would anyone profit by this reactionary scheme?

Seventeen legislatures ought to rescind approval of the twenty-second amendment. Thirty-one more should be on the alert against it. Congress should investigate the whole business unless it wishes to be bypassed helplessly. And the people must realize what this under-the-counter offer amounts to before it is too late to say "No sale."

Genius Still Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, countless Americans have rendered extraordinary service to our Republic in this great war. I think that it is well that the people of America should know about some of these individuals. I have in mind Sgt. Alfred G. Dannull, A. S. N. 38008048, and whose address is Atlanta, Nebr. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. F. A. Dannull. Sergeant Dannull is now assigned to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics at Langley Field in the Enlisted Reserve Corps. He has served 2½ years overseas.

Sergeant Dannull's unique contribution in this war has been his various inventions that have made our equipment more effective and in turn saved time and lives. Sergeant Dannull graduated from the West Denver High School in 1933, studied 4 years at the Emily Griffith Opportunity School, 2 years of which was in mechanical engineering and 2 years in electrical engineering. He entered the service in March 1941 and prior to being returned to this country he was assistant foreman and tool designer at the Second Strategic Air Depot.

Sergeant Dannull's inventions comprise a long list. He is one of those unusual inventive geniuses that rarely appear on the scene. Some of his inventions are of such a confidential nature that they cannot be disclosed. A partial list of his inventions are as follows:

First. A dynamometer or proney brake, used to check dynamic tension of the slip clutch in landing gear retracting motors, tail wheel and bomb-bay-door retracting motors and aircraft-engine starters. This unit has saved many crack landings and a lot of gear trains in aircraft engines, and this brake has now been in use in the European theater of operations for the past 2 years. In the December 1944 issue of the Air Force magazine, an article said of this invention:

Through use of Dannull's invention mechanics determine before installation in aircraft the efficiency of small electrical motors, thus preventing mechanical failure in flight. The device, constructed from salvage jeep and Fortress parts, has prevented many crash landings caused from inability to lower landing wheels.

Second. A blind rivet gun, used to head Cherry, Goodrich, Cholbert, and pop blind rivets, which are used to rivet patches over bullet and flak holes. With the use of this gun, patches could be installed from the outside. Prior to its manufacture, it was necessary to do this work from the inside, necessitating the removal of large sections of sheet metal in order to turn or buck the rivets. At one station alone, approximately 200 to 500 man-hours a day were saved by using this gun on sheet-metal work and, as no gun of this sort had heretofore been available in his theater of operations, Sergeant Dannull manufactured several of them and distributed them to all the depots that were doing repairs on battle-damaged aircraft. This most useful invention was also mentioned in the Air Force magazine for November 1944 which said:

Rosie the Riveter would become grass-stained with envy if she were to hop over to an Eighth Air Force Service Command station in England and see the blind rivet gun designed by Sgt. Alfred G. Dannull.

A boon to sheetmetal men who formerly had to peel off large sections of sheet metal or skin in order to get to the inside or under-surface to turn rivets when patching flak holes, the gun now makes shooting rivets into inaccessible sections of skin on heavy bombers as easy as money from home.

Using tapered rivets with the large end inserted into the opening and encased by a closely fitted jacket, a hand-operated bellows-type lever pulls the rivet from inside to out, forcing its greater diameter against the jacket, thus expanding it into a washer which holds the rivet securely.

Third. A universal platinum-point dressing tool, used for reclaiming magneto points and other circuit-breaking points. This unit saved many sets of points at a time when they could not have been replaced in this theater of operations.

Fourth. A frequency modulator, used for changing cycles of electric current from 60 cycles to 400 cycles for the testing of radar equipment.

Fifth. Sealed bearing packing unit, used to pack sealed rollers and ball bearings with grease, enabling them to reclaim any type of sealed bearings, many of which were not carried in their replacement stock.

Sixth. A gear case for checking turbo superchargers, regulating control units, and so forth, that were used in the theater of operations.

Seventh. A glyco boiler core extractor, used to extract the cores of glyco boilers, which are located in the exhaust manifold on B–17's, and so forth. Prior to the use of this extractor the boilers had to be salvaged due to the fact that they could not be dismantled and thus repaired. Commenting further on the above-mentioned inventions of Sergeant Dannull, the Air Force Magazine in an item from the Eighth A. A. F. service command station in England, in December 1944 said:

Other inventions of Sergeant Dannull, a machinist at a strategic air depot bomber repair base, are a universal platinum point dressing tool for reclaiming magneto points; a frequency modulator for testing radar equipment; a unit for packing with grease sealed roller and ball bearings; a multiple gear case for dual tachometer for testing superchargers used on Fortresses; a puller for removing the core from the glyco boiler, located in the exhaust manifold, which prior to Dannull's invention often had to be salvaged.

Eighth. An armature shaft puller, used to pull flexible drive shafts from generator armatures without damaging them, an important precaution as no more shafts were available at that time in this theater of operations.

Ninth. An armature undercutter, used to undercut the mica between the commutator bars on generator armatures. No machine of this type was available in this theater and was necessary in generator overhaul.

Tenth. An electronic static and dynamic balancing unit, used to check the balance of wheels, turbo superchargers, and any other part that needed to be balanced.

Eleventh. An electric rivet gun that could be used in the field, where air pressure was not available.

Twelfth. A large number of gear, bearing, and race pullers, as well as other special tools too numerous to itemize, that were essential in the maintenance of aircraft.

There are also a number of items of his own design on the secret list in the European theater of operations which are produced in large quantities.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Sergeant Dannull is interesting and thrilling. It is good news to the brave flyers and their families and the other members of our armed forces who use Sergeant Dannull's equipment. In addition to that, it is living proof that genius still lives and that there is still a great field for inventive minds. We owe much to Sgt. Alfred G. Dannull.

Donovan's Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a timely and well-written editorial in today's Washington Post on the subject of a coordinated and effective United States information service. One of our great weaknesses in diplomatic and in military activities, has been the lack of adequate information about the other fellow. This editorial discusses rationally a sound solution to the problem. I earnestly recommend its careful reading:

DONOVAN'S PLAN

A good deal of whatever unfavorable reaction there was on Capitol Hill to the plan for a central intelligence service may be traced to headline reading. The plan should be read as a whole. It should be reviewed in the light of what in this war intelligence has actually accomplished. It should be pondered with the aid of a little exercise of the imagination on what a better intelligence service might have accomplished. This is important. For the basic assurance of our national security in time to come is the absorption of the lessons of the last 4 years. And the greatest lesson is that national security depends upon knowledge of what is going on in the world, not appraised merely as a fact-finding or informational job, but synthesized by brains at the elbow of the policy makers.

At to the plan itself, it is said to be the product of General Donovan, head of the Office of Strategic Services. Donovan is one of the trail blazers in our war organization. Before the war, in studies on the spot of 'tween war campaigns, he was impressed by the lamentable showing of intelligence services. Only the German had a rating on a par with the advancement in new war techniques. Accordingly, when this war broke out, he organized the group now known as the O. S. S., which functions under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is a kind of brain trust for the men charged with making decisions based upon exact knowledge of all the detailed elements in hitherto unknown situations.

The proposed Central Intelligence service does not call for the absorption of existing intelligence agencies, either civilian, like the Federal Bureau of investigation, or military, like G2 of the Army and the Office of Naval Intelligence. It would simply use their product, and evaluate it. It would be put in position to call for the interchange of the data they possess and collect. It would be responsible for policy directives. It would channel the "dope" to the Executive for the formulation of national and international policy. More than the saving of the present system from a post-war break-up is envisaged, more than transfer of authority over the military side of it from the Joint Chiefs to the executive office. There would be the addition of the priceless ingredient of coordination and over-all control which is still lacking in intelligence work as in so many other phases of our administration.

Examples galore could be given of faulty intelligence which has produced disaster and worse to modern nations. Russia got a bloody nose in Finland in 1939, because of a failure to appreciate the Finnish situation. For the same reason Britain tripped up recently in Greece. The same deficiency led to our own discomfiture when Rundstedt lunged through the Ardennes. In these cases what is called strategic intelligence was at fault. An excellent example of strategic intelligence was the job done in Normandy before the liberation of France. But there are all kinds of intelligence work. There is, for example, technical intelligence, which remits to the factories the lessons learned on the battlefield on weapons. We cannot pretend that in this war it has been either first class or expeditions. Then there is such a thing as clandestine intelligence. Mr. Sumner Welles was using it when he forewarned the Russians 6 months prior to the event that the Germans intended to invade Russia in mid-1941. Perhaps the greatest coup in clandestine intelligence in this war was the report of the robot bomb factories in the Baltic, which were subsequently destroyed by the R. A. F. The man who got this news through saved Britain.

Brains make intelligence, not snooping. No correct "estimate of the situation," which precedes all military planning, is possible without this kind of intelligence service. Intelligence should equally be the eyes and ears of the Nation in time of peace. After the war the Government should not be left to frame policy on the basis of blind guesses. Statesmen in peace as well as generals in war require "estimates of the situation."

The German radio, picking up the details of the Donovan proposal, makes great play of the plan, which is called an evil design to control the post-war world. Most of the headlines are faithfully repeated, except, of course, the charge that the new plan is a super-Gestapo. That would not do in a country which is at the mercy of secret police. It so happens that no police or law enforcement function would be vested in the proposed over-all intelligence service, either at home or abroad. It would simply save policy-making from being done in the dark. If, for instance, the President is asking for appropriations for the armed forces, those appropriations must be for the purpose of meeting situations which, as we have learned from experience 'tween wars, are not known to ordinary observers, but are discoverable only by trained intelligence officers.

The Donovan proposal deserves consideration on its merits as a contribution to our national security. It is an effort to make a sum out of the parts of our intelligence services. Some of those parts have done well, some have done ill. Working together they could do an economical, efficient, and fundamental service which hitherto has been neglected on the ground that intelligence work is somehow tainted. For our part we have not yet gone beyond the stage of wanting to see the military intelligence branches strengthened and unified as a basic preliminary to the merger of the armed forces.

The World Day of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, this is the World Day of Prayer.

Today millions upon millions of people in our own and Allied countries are praying that this cruel war with its ravaging waste of life and treasure may be brought to a victorious conclusion as speedily as possible and that and a just and permanent peace may be established throughout the world.

After all of the suffering and travail humanity has gone through, no peace will be acceptable except a peace of the ages and in my opinion there can be no peace of the ages that is not founded on principles of Christian faith.

So I think it is entirely proper that those who believe in the saving grace and power of Christian influence should today be sending up their prayers to the throne of God, and to my mind it seems one of the dramatic incidents of the war that millions upon millions of people in our country are joining in these supplications with millions on six other continents.

In this connection, I present for printing in the RECORD, a letter I have received from a splendid Christian woman, Mrs. Ralph L. Holland, president of the Indianapolis Council of Church Women, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS COUNCIL OF
CHURCH WOMEN,
Indianapolis, Ind., February 2, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Last year you spoke of the World Day of Prayer in the House of Representatives. This year the Indianapolis Council of Church Women feels that the World Day of Prayer is more important than ever for its members are convinced with each passing year that the united prayers of millions of Christian women around the globe avail much and offer a beacon of light in this chaotic world.

Ten million women in 10,000 communities in the United States will join women of six continents to pray on Friday, February 16, the first Friday in Lent which is the World Day of Prayer, that Christians everywhere may be reeducated spiritually and strengthened to take up the task of helping to build a Christian world order, and to produce a just and lasting peace.

We believe that the world is upside down in an abyss of chaos and destruction because Christians have not practiced the teachings of brotherhood and good will. It can only be righted as Christians everywhere rededicate themselves to a policy of goodwill and justice for all nations.

The women of the United States will give an offering to further this conviction. It will be used to provide religious and humanitarian services for the migrant workers and sharecroppers who harvest our crops; to employ religious directors in seven United States Government schools for Indians; to bring Christian literature to the women of China, India, Africa, Iran, and South America, and further to help support seven Christian colleges for women in Asia—three in China, and four in India.

In such expressions of fellowship, reconciliation and Christian love lie the hope for the peace of the world.

With sincere appreciation of your services as our Representative in the Congress, and with every good wish. I am,

Very sincerely,

MRS. RALPH L. HOLLAND.

Henrietta Szold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Henrietta Szold has passed on. A gentle soul has gone. Her memory is, however, engraved on the hearts of multitudes and will live on. She died in Palestine where she wished to die, and in the hospital which stands as a monument to her tireless energy and her devotion to Palestine. She ever was solicitous of the poor and oppressed members of the race of Abraham. She was a firm adherent of Zionism and labored ceaselessly for that worthy cause. She founded Hadassah and solidified the ranks of women and girlhood in support of Zionism. She was loved by all who came under her benign influence. Her tolerance, her love of mankind endeared her to all—Jew, Gentile, and Moslem. I herewith submit a news item from the New York Times. It is a worthy tribute to her:

HENRIETTA SZOLD DIES IN JERUSALEM—HADASSAH FOUNDER, KNOWN AS OUTSTANDING WOMAN ZIONIST, STRICKEN AT AGE OF 84—LIFE'S WORK FOR JEWRY—BEGAN CAREER AS AN EDITORIAL SECRETARY IN 1892—RESCUED YOUNG VICTIMS OF NAZIS

JERUSALEM, February 13.—Henrietta Szold, American-Jewish women's leader and the founder of Hadassah, who had been seriously ill in Hadassah University Hospital on Mount Scopus since December, died today at the age of 84. She will be buried in the Jewish Cemetery on Mount of Olives tomorrow.

SAW HEAVY TRACHOMA TOLL

Miss Henrietta Szold was inspired to establish Hadassah, which originally was the sponsor of the American Zionist Medical Unit, but subsequently developed into the women's Zionist organization in this country, by the appalling prevalence of trachoma, an eye disease leading to blindness, and other maladies which she observed on a visit to Jerusalem in 1909.

In the course of that trip Miss Szold—already nearly 50 years old, and with a long career in Americanization work among Jewish immigrants to this country—conceived the idea of district nursing in the Holy Land, to which she devoted the remainder of her life and which made her world famous.

She was born in Baltimore on December 21, 1860. She was a daughter of Rabbi Benjamin Sophia Schaar Szold. After studying in the Baltimore schools she became a teacher in private institutions there. Her career in organized Jewry began in 1892 when she became editorial secretary of the Jewish Publication Society.

She served in that capacity almost a quarter of a century, editing the American Jewish Yearbook from 1904 to 1908. With the organization of Hadassah—the name came from the Biblical designation of Queen Esther, one of the greatest of Jewish heroines—she became known as the outstanding woman Zionist and as one of the outstanding American and world Zionists.

Within a few months of the beginning of Hadassah, Nathan Straus became interested in its work. He financed the sending of the first two district nurses to Jerusalem—the first of a long series of benefactions to Palestine, many of them granted through the women's organizations.

During the First World War the work was handicapped by the drafting of doctors and nurses. In 1916 Palestine appealed to the Zionist Organization of America for doctors, nurses, and medical necessities; the need remained great. The response to the appeal was entrusted to the 4-year-old group. In 1918, 44 physicians, dentists, nurses, sanitation experts and administrators were sent to the Holy Land. They constituted the first formal Hadassah medical organization.

The vast project has never lost momentum. Figures showing the decrease in blindness and in infant mortality are dramatically conclusive. In a part of the world where trachoma, malaria, and skin diseases were normally prevalent, Hadassah built up clinics to combat those enemies of humanity by combating the ignorance that fostered them. The preventive aspect of its work was stressed from the beginning by its leaders, among whom Miss Szold remained conspicuous. Infant welfare stations—the first in the Near East—sprang up under Hadassah sponsorship, and school hygiene was introduced in 1918.

ACTIVE ZIONIST IN GENERAL

It is difficult to separate the story of Henrietta Szold from the story of the organization she founded. But her work for Hadassah did not prevent her participation in general Zionist activities, both in Palestine, in Europe and here. She was in Pittsburgh for the assembly of the old Federation of American Zionists in 1918 and her report was widely discussed. About 2 years later, when the federation had become the Zionist Organization of America, she left for Palestine to direct the medical work there.

Returning in the spring of 1923, she was greeted by more than 3,000 persons at a meeting at the Hotel Pennsylvania. She outlined the wide range of problems facing Zionism in Palestine and hailed the rugged pioneering spirit of the early Jewish settlers there. She was optimistic about the future of the Jewish national home, but she pointed out that patience was essential. She did not underestimate the task that faced the movement to rebuild.

In the fall of 1924 she was guest of honor as Hadassah—which had started with a handful of members—opened a drive for 5,000 others. In 1925, presiding over the Hadassah convention in Washington, she urged American Jewish women to assume all responsibility for financing medical work in Palestine.

Within a few days the organization decided to construct a series of hospitals in the Holy Land. Miss Szold announced that the Zionist Organization of America had formally recognized Hadassah as the sole women's Zionist body in the country, and the organization entered the modern phase of its existence.

Miss Szold presided at a memorial meeting to Theodor Harzi, generally regarded as the father of modern Zionism, in July 1925. She sailed for Palestine again in 1926 to take charge of the construction of the Nathan and Lina Straus Health Center in Jerusalem, which had been made possible by a large gift from the philanthropist. Forwarding her annual report from Jerusalem, Miss Szold stressed the immediate need for improved hospital facilities.

She was back in New York in December 1926, furthering the Hadassah organization in many ways. When, in March 1927, the cornerstone of the $250,000 health center was laid in Jerusalem, she presided over the large gathering of foreign consuls, government officials, church dignitaries, and representatives of Christian, Jewish, and Moslem organizations.

Miss Szold was a vice chairman of the stormy Zionist convention in Atlantic City in June 1927. At its close she was unanimously chosen vice president. Louis Lipsky was elected president and headed the delegation to the fifteenth World Zionist Congress in Basle that August. Miss Szold was one of the delegates and served as a vice president of the international gathering.

Her election as a member of the world Zionist executive committee in Palestine followed. It was the occasion for a large testimonial dinner in November. Miss Szold was now honorary president of Hadassah.

At the Zurich convention in 1929 Miss Szold warned of the possibility of the development of a theocratic state in Palestine. "I am religious and Jewish myself," she declared at this time, "but I do not believe in the rule of priests. School children must not be drawn into religious and political strife." She was again elected to the executive committee as the convention closed.

In May 1930 she received an honorary degree of doctor of Hebrew letters from the Jewish Institute of Religion, headed by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise. She was in Jerusalem at the time, returning to America in October.

A few months after her seventieth birthday the New York chapter of Hadassah planted a tree in her honor in Central Park. She frequently was honored by Zionist groups, and mention of her name at meetings invariably brought prolonged applause. In recent years, despite her advanced years, she remained in close touch with the latest developments in American Zionism, although staying at the scene of the actual Zionist progress. On October 16, 1934, she laid the cornerstone for the new building of Hadassah-Rothschild Hospital on Mount Scopus, site of the Hebrew University. The hospital was expected to serve as an important medical center for research and post-graduate work and as a haven for scholars exiled from Germany.

Five and one-half years later, on May 9, 1939, the hospital was formally opened without fanfare or pomp. The crowning achievement of the American women's Zionist or-

ganization and the American Jewish physicians committee had been interrupted by disturbed conditions in Palestine. Miss Szold delivered a spirited address on Hadassah's accomplishments in Palestine, culminating in the erection of the medical center.

AIDED VICTIMS OF NAZIS

In 1935 German Jewish children had to be rescued from Nazi persecution, and Miss Szold, then 75, became the director of the movement which brought them from Germany to Palestine. She supervised every aspect, met the boats at Haifa and welcomed the children in the new land, placed them in cooperative agricultural settlements and stayed with them in their new environments.

When a Nation-wide movement in this country was launched to celebrate Miss Szold's seventy-fifth birthday, the foremost Jewish woman of contemporary time was on the high seas from Palestine to America. The celebration under the auspices of Hadassah lasted 30 days and coincided with Chanukah, the Feast of Lights. For her social work she was made a honorary citizen of Tel Aviv, and the New York Times said editorially that the occasion should not pass without mention of her translation from the German manuscript of the first two volumes of The Legends of the Jews, by Lewis Ginsberg, and continued:

"Miss Szold deserves the thanks of the English-speaking peoples for bringing out of Germany this work before it was burned, if, indeed, it was on the list."

The eightieth birthday of the prophetess in Israel was marked by celebrations in Palestine and throughout the United States. President and Mrs. Roosevelt signed their names in a huge birthday book which contained 94,000 signatures, and 500 birthday gatherings took place in 46 States. A birthday gift of $25,000 for the protection of the welfare of the people of Palestine during the war was cabled to Miss Szold as a tribute to the veteran Zionist leader. In an editorial, "A pioneer at 80," the Times again praised her outstanding qualities as a social worker:

"Her beautiful spirit has known no religious, racial, or political frontiers. She has earned an untold wealth in love and admiration. May she long enjoy it."

Personally Miss Szold was a woman of quiet charm. Her hair was abundant and gray, her eyes dark and expressive. She was always characterized by poise, sincerity, and efficiency and had been described as the "most brilliant Jewish woman in America." She engaged in considerable literary and translating work and was exceptionally proficient with Hebrew. Quietly, and over a long period of years, she wove her name inextricably into the pattern of Jewish progress in Palestine.

In March 1944 Miss Szold was given the degree of doctor of humanities in absentia by Boston University, during a two-way broadcast between Boston and Jerusalem.

Miss Szold was stricken with pneumonia in August 1944, and although she recovered she was too weak, at her advanced age, to return to her home. Her office was accordingly moved into the Henrietta Szold School of Nursing, adjacent to the Hadassah-Rothschild Hospital, from which she continued to carry on her work until she was again stricken ill on December 13.

On December 18, 1944, Hadassah cabled her $105,000, of which $5,000 was an outright gift in anticipation of her eighty-fourth birthday 3 days later, for use for any emergency project she deemed important, and the balance was the first remittance against a quota of $650,000 which Hadassah had pledged itself to raise by September 1945 for the maintenance and education of Jewish refugee children in Palestine.

Edison the Great Liberator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, this House passed House Joint Resolution No. 76 on February 8, 1945, designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day, and requesting the President of the United States to issue annually a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will do likewise in order that we may honor this great American.

An address by George E. Stringfellow, a long-time business associate of Thomas A. Edison, before the Kiwanis Club of New York City on February 14, 1945, pays tribute to Mr. Edison:

Ninety-eight years ago last Sunday, Thomas Alva Edison was born in the little town of Milan, Ohio. Before this truth-seeking lad was 10 years old, he set up a chemical laboratory in his home.

Today, the name "Edison" symbolizes electricity, good will, and progress. Thought flashed over continents; cities garlanded in light, silent smokeless motors turning wheels in factories, transporting goods economically, and human beings in safety and comfort, are all associated with the magic name of Edison.

When this symbol of good will and world progress passed on to his rich reward 13 years ago, one of his closest associates remarked, "Every incandescent light is his remembrance, every power house his monument; wherever there is a phonograph or radio, wherever there is a moving picture, sound or silent, Edison lives."

Edison not only gave us these wonders of modern life, he multiplied the services of the telegraph and the telephone. He gave us the nickel-iron-alkaline storage battery, the Ediphone dictating machine, the thermionic tube—which was the forerunner of our modern radio tube—and the microphone transmitter whch has played such an important part in the development of radio broadcasting. The list of his accomplishments is staggering and their ramifications are overwhelming.

Perhaps no man ever lived who was more industrious than Edison. His days were long in hours but so filled with inquisitive and creative activity that his labors were all leisure and his leisure was all labor.

Edison believed in the goodness of human nature and in the evolution of a better society. He once said, "We are groping on the verge of another great epoch in the world's history. * * * The invitation to constructive thought is becoming irresistible to every branch of human effort. Creative thought," he continued, "will raise the human race to higher and higher standards."

It was this ethical idealism which motivated him from the early days of his youth to the end of his long and productive life. Fame and wealth came to him, but he treated money as an incident.

Had he not possessed this passionate desire to serve the human race, Edison could have retired early in life to a quiet research laboratory, free from the hub-bub of the hurly-burly business world.

When he was 82 years old, the world celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of his invention of the incandescent lamp. President Hoover and other notables came to do him honor. The next day he was back at work. Indeed the day that the fatal illness overtook him, the 84-year-old genius was busily engaged in the problem of extracting rubber from goldenrod.

Edison waged no wars of human destruction; he fought no bloody battles; he stirred no fires of raging hatred; nor pandered to the baser passions of the race. Yet, the world recognizes Edison today as one of the mightiest conquerors of history. He conquered the elements and gave to humanity the greatest ascendancy over the forces of nature the world has ever known. He brought the dawn of a new civilization to a race of men emerging from the darkness of superstition and drudgery. His contributions to science helped to make the United States the greatest industrial nation on the face of the earth.

Light and understanding—these were Edison's great gifts to humanity. He made light a social force. The luxuries of kings became the household necessities of millions of the poorest. The phonograph, which he invented, has been characterized as one of the most original inventions in the annals of technology. The phonograph has brought the world's greatest artists into the homes of the humblest. His inventions made the moving-picture industry, the telephone, the telegraph, and the radio possible or practicable. He did much to make the United States a nation of humanity and brotherhood.

Edison stands in history today among the leaders of the men of genius of all times. Perhaps he did more than any other man in history to bring the peoples of the remote parts of the earth closer together.

Someone has said that "They are truly great who, as the centuries slowly pass, are found by each succeeding race nearer to the heart of human love."

Such a man was Thomas Alva Edison. During the first World War someone asked him, "Could you invent something more deadly than poison gas?"

"Yes," answered Edison, "I could * * * but I don't want to destroy life; I want to make the world a better place in which to live." He concluded, "The dove is my emblem."

By the force of his matchless genius, tireless energy, and idealism he struck the shackles of drudgery from untold millions of human beings and lifted the world into the light of a new civilization.

Thomas Alva Edison was one of the greatest liberators of mankind the world has ever known.

Dairying and Tydings Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me heretofore to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include in this statement a letter dated January 11, 1945 from the Protected Milk Producers Association of Hynes, Calif., signed by Ned M. Clinton, manager, and C. L. Smith, manager of Central Milk Sales Agency, Downey, Calif. Also, a

letter dated December 1, 1944 to me and signed by M. Oliveria, manager of Superior Milk Producers Association, Bellflower, Calif.; Ned M. Clinton, manager of Protected Milk Producers Association, Hynes, Calif.; C. L. Smith, manager of Central Milk Sales Agency, Downey, Calif.; M. Toste, manager of Los Angeles Mutual Dairymen, Los Angeles, Calif.; Gail McDowell, manager of Western Consumers Feed Mo., Hynes, Calif.; L. C. Kenworthy, manager of Producers Distributors, Pasadena, Calif., and Frank S. Glass, manager of Natural Milk Producers Association, San Gabriel, Calif., and also a letter dated January 16 and one dated January 29 by me to Mr. Ned Clinton, manager of Protected Milk Producers Association, Hynes, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, I have been honored to be elected Representative to this great legislative body from the Eighteenth District of my native State of California. This Eighteenth District is all located outside the great metropolis of Los Angeles city, but all within Los Angeles County, from the important city of South Gate on the north to the fourth largest city in California, to wit: Long Beach, on the shores of the Pacific Ocean—a distance of about 17 miles north and south; and from the important towns of Artesia and Norwalk on the east, to Compton, Dominguez, Willowbrook on the west, or a distance of about 13 miles east and west. This Eighteenth District is surrounded on the west by the Seventeenth Congressional District, represented by my colleague, CECIL KING; on the north by the Nineteenth Congressional District, represented by my colleague, CHET HOLIFIELD; on the northeast by the Twelfth Congressional District, represented by my colleague, JERRY VOORHIS; and on the east by the Twenty-second Congressional District, represented by my colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS.

In this Eighteenth District there are not only the great naval installations at Long Beach and Terminal Island in Long Beach, and the great shipyards of Consolidated and Craig together with the aircraft plants of Douglas and Consolidated Vultee, but also literally dozens upon dozens of smaller, but possibly not too much less important in this war, plants producing necessities of the war with which to win this global conflict and upon which winning, must be set up a global and enduring peace.

But, as food is also an absolute necessity of peace and war, so my great Eighteenth Congressional District of California is unique in that it not only contains industrial plants of world renown and naval installations of history-making importance, but it raises and nurtures most valuable herds of dairy cows. Certainly fresh wholesome milk is not less important than any food content known to man for daily use. Generally speaking, the great fluid-milk-producing section of the Eighteenth Congressional District is termed as being no small portion thereof. The herds are not only of the best of stock; the milk is not only rated highest by all known tests; but the men and women owning and operating these dairy herds in this time of war are of the finest and most patriotic of our citizenship.

As we discuss the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, and its bearing on the agriculture and dairying of this great Nation of ours, I must speak of the service subject as it applies to my constituents in my native State of California. Having lived in the great city of Long Beach, Calif., for about 35 years before being elected to this House, I generally knew of the great herds of milk cows and the nationally famous hay markets situated a few miles from Long Beach in the Eighteenth District; but, not until the last Presidential campaign did I personally and intimately learn the great strategic importance and value of this great dairy occupation to the war effort. And, at this time when there is so great a need for men from 18 to 45 years of age, I consider it appropriate and imperative that I call to your attention some pertinent facts with reference to this important dairy industry in this district, for it not only applies to my district, but to all agricultural districts wherein the production and marketing and distribution of fluid milk is a chief occupation.

Hundreds of my constituents are rightly concerned lest through misunderstanding or lack of information the Tydings amendment is no longer given its proper interpretation and emphasis as applied to dairy workers. These dairy workers are not seeking any special privilege nor asking any special treatment, and the operators of these great dairies producing so much of the fluid milk used in the Los Angeles metropolitan area are only asking that the Tydings amendment continue to be applied.

Most of the great bulk of the fluid milk supplying Los Angeles metropolitan area comes from dairies within less than 50 miles of the Los Angeles city hall, and a good portion of that daily and essential supply of food comes from herds in the Eighteenth Congressional District. It may surprise you that the average dairy herd in the Eighteenth Congressional District is 100 cows, and that production per animal in my district is more than twice the national average. Thus to handle such herds and essential food, particularly the milking of these important thousands, requires an unusual technical skill. In my district dairymen must needs depend upon hired help, and some of the milkers are naturally within the draft age. Already the serious manpower shortages have resulted in a marked shortage of skilled, technically trained milkers, and there is a shortage of such milkers now for a period of the last 2 years. Formerly, one man could be expected to milk 25 cows at each milking. Now, however, he must average almost twice as many, and some of the men skilled handle as many as 75 cows.

Needless to say, such technically expert young men are a vital link in the food production chain. I am informed in all of Los Angeles County that there are 330 milkers between the ages of 18 and 26 and that they are milking between eighteen and twenty thousand cows morning and night, resulting in approximately 400,000 quarts of milk a day; and that this total by these 330 young men is about 20 per cent of the total milk production in Los Angeles County, of which the Eighteenth Congressional District herds contribute a very substantial part. All of these 330 men have been called by their selective service boards for physical examinations. Mr. C. V. Castle, farm adviser in Los Angeles County, says:

> What will happen if they go into the Army? There is absolutely no replacements for them. We of the U. S. D. A. war board are doing everything in our power to help dairymen keep these essential milkers. If more than a mere handful are taken away the milk supply of this area will be seriously reduced.

Recently, at a committee hearing with General Hershey, I heard him declare substantially that it was his opinion that the young men milking these dairy herds, if called by their selective boards, should exercise their right of appeal, so that it might be clearly defined in each case as to what the status was of each registrant under the Tydings amendment with reference to their present occupation and the present manpower shortage. I have so advised my constituents in the dairy industry. I am informed that it will probably develop that almost without exception none of these expertly, technically trained young men heretofore deferred in a II–B classification as essential to agriculture can be replaced. They are now undergoing examination by reason of call of their selective-service boards in Long Beach and Los Angeles. The operators of these great dairying herds and industries are not asking for special consideration or any favors. They only ask that the Tydings amendment be fairly and fully construed with reference to the irreplaceability of these technically trained men, upon whom so much of the daily life for fluid milk hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children, both able and ill, daily depend. Many of them, months ago, could have left their lesser wages and gone to war industries, where hours would have been shorter and the pay greater, but they have loyally stood by, worked for less and worked longer, in the production of one of the absolute necessities of life, to wit, fluid milk. The production of this necessity of life, therefore, in great quantities is one of the great products of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California.

At a later hearing before the Agriculture Committee in this Congress, which I had the privilege of attending and at which General Hershey was present, it appeared as possible that the second and clarifying directive which he sent January 22, 1945, to all of the State directors of selective service, had not been promptly sent by the State directors to all of the local boards of selective service at their respective areas. But, I am pleased to say that in response to my wire to him of February 5, 1945, the Director of Selective Service of the State of California replied that he had sent notice of such clarifying directive by General Hershey to all the local selective boards in California promptly on Janu-

ary 23, 1945. At the hearing, General Hershey urged that the discretion remaining with selective service boards under the Tydings amendment was believed to be sufficiently inclusive and broad, to make it possible that every farm worker could be drafted at the discretion of the local board acting in the premises, if in fact they are men needed in the Army. This as I understand it, is the interpretation of the situation. He is now quoted as having said at the hearing:

If I didn't believe the Tydings amendment broad enough to make it possible to take everybody, I would ask Congress for a new law.

And at the same hearing, Representative PACE, of Georgia, informed General Hershey that he believed that draft boards are evading and avoiding the Tydings amendment. This was reported in this morning's papers.

I am sure that the local selective boards which have been doing such a magnificent piece of voluntary service in this terrible war, will continue to fully appreciate the heavy responsibility upon their shoulders; and that they will not act in haste or ill-consideration of each and every case coming before them; even though there has been misunderstanding and confusion regarding the interpretation of this Tydings amendment in farming, dairying and agricultural districts over the Nation. I am confident that there will be utmost consideration and intelligent, diligent cooperation in the Eighteenth Congressional District in California to the necessary end, that in the production of food in the form of fluid milk, there will be no undue haste; that every case will be most carefully considered in relation to the facts as they exist, and the Tydings amendment still applying in each case. I repeat again, I have not heard of a single case in the Eighteenth Congressional District in which even one lad is seeking special favors or consideration; nor, have I heard of a single case in which selective-service boards in that great district have yet acted hastily or unjustly. I compliment both the boards and draftees in this great dairying population.

The time will come in the not-too-distant future, I hope, when the munitions of war will not be known as necessities in the life of man. This war must cease and this world which now lives so close together in terms of distances, time, and transportation must either learn to live together or it will fall apart. This world has shrunk into a neighborhood. It must learn to live in terms of world brotherhood or it will not live as a civilized world at all.

The conference of the United Nations at San Francisco, called by the three great world leaders of the United Nations, on April 25, 1945, will shape the destiny of all the living peoples of the world and of the near-born and of the unborn for generations yet to come. Let us work and pray, each in our sincere and humble way, that peace on earth and good will toward all men shall triumph. Nothing else counts as much in the victory of mankind all over the world.

The following letters are the ones previously referred to in these remarks:

PROTECTED MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Hynes, Calif., January 11, 1945.
Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the outset of the war in Europe there was established in the San Pedro Harbor area a number of shipyards and, more recently, plane factories. There were a large number of milkers who left their milking jobs at that time because of the inducement of higer wages. The dairymen met this situation by changing from hand milkers to machines, and in so doing were able to meet wage conditions because machine milkers milked twice as many cows. This job requires younger and quite active men, as they milk 60 cows twice daily and turn out approximately 1,080 quarts of milk each 24 hours. To maintain this production, it is necessary to have skilled men, just as any other job requires.

One important fact is that the dairy industry here has not been able to increase production to meet the greater demands, both for increased military and civilian defense workers, but just hold even with pre-war production. More milk has been made available by discontinuing the sale of cream and other dairy products; also some production on a temporary permit basis from the San Joaquin Valley. This production amounts to about 15 percent of the total milk received in this market.

At the present time there is being shipped out of Los Angeles milk supplies direct to military establishments in the following amounts:

Texas, 6,000 quarts daily.
Nevada, 8,000 quarts per week.
Arizona, 2,500 quarts daily.
San Diego (military), 40,000 quarts daily.
Los Angeles (military), 102,000 quarts daily.

In addition, fleet and all other warships shipping out of the ports of San Diego, Long Beach, Wilmington, San Pedro, and Huenema (in Ventura County) are also supplied with milk produced in this area.

There is in effect the War Food Administration quotas regulating the civilian supply, and there is no doubt but that much more milk could be sold if it were available.

There are approximately 105,000 dairy cows in this county most of which are in the Eighteenth Congressional District. The average dairy farm has 100 head of milking cows and is operated on a small plot of land on a high-production basis.

More than 80 percent of the entire Los Angeles metropolitan area milk supply is produced in the area comprising the Eighteenth District.

There are only approximately 330 men in the age group of 18 to 26 now deferred in Los Angeles County and the removal of any of these men would result in decreasing the milk supply.

Six hundred and eighty-five dairy farmers in this district produce and market 32,400,000 quarts of milk monthly to the Los Angeles metropolitan population of 3,280,000. This production is the largest of any single county in the United States.

Figures quoted herein were obtained from the offices of the Market Milk Administrator, War Food Administration, Bureau of Market Enforcement, State Department of Agriculture, and Los Angeles County Livestock Department.

Very truly yours,
PROTECTED MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
NED M. CLINTON, *Manager.*
CENTRAL MILK SALES AGENCY,
C. L. SMITH, *Manager.*

HYNES, CALIF., *December 1, 1944.*
Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR SIR: About 54 percent of all the fluid milk sold in the State of California is produced and consumed south of Kern and Santa Barbara Counties. In the southeast area of Los Angeles County, which is in your district, dairy farming is a major business and supports many of the small communities with businesses such as: supply houses, banks, hay dealers, cow dealers, truckers, milk transport companies and all the kindred businesses associated with the personnel requirements of all the various types of labor used in carrying on their business. It is estimated that there is disbursed to the dairymen in this territory approximately $3,000,000, monthly.

Before the war the milk industry, both producers and distributors, operated under chapter 10 of Agricultural Code, which dealt with the stabilization and marketing of fluid milk and fluid cream.

The procedure under this act was for the bureau of market enforcement of the State department of agriculture to obtain facts relative to the production costs for producing both fluid and manufacturing milk. Upon procuring these facts, public hearings were held, after which prices were established which distributors must pay producers for milk fat in a particular marketing area.

Like surveys were made of distribution operations and, after hearings, resale prices for both wholesale and retail sales were established under which no sales were permitted.

At the beginning of the war, when Congress passed the price-control bill under which the O. P. A. was established, the first move was to freeze resale prices, leaving all production costs uncontrolled. It was pointed out to various Federal officials and Members of Congress by members of our producer groups at the time, that this was an impossible condition. Shortly, production costs, especially of feed and labor, increased to where under the State law, it was necessary to raise producer prices in order to maintain the local milk supply. This raise when granted cut the distributor's margin as the O. P. A. ceiling took precedence over the State law. To correct this situation, the O. P. A. raised the resale price one-half cent per quart of milk and later froze the producer price; stopping any further increase to producers while still leaving the producer cost of production items uncontrolled.

In time, these uncontrolled prices led to producers again being placed in a position where they must either receive more for their milk or discontinue production at a time when the Government was asking for greater production of this very necessary food. The producer groups met and sent representatives to Washington. These men met with the California delegation and were supported very strongly by the entire delegation.

A subcommittee of three was appointed, consisting of Congressmen CLARENCE LEA, JERRY VOORHIS, and JOHN PHILLIPS. This subcommittee, after attempting to get the price adjusted, finally secured the present subsidy plan, under which the price received by the producer remained the same as set under the O. P. A. regulation. The difference necessary to maintain production was being supplied by payments direct to the producers by the Federal Government. These subsidy payments, while taking care of the immediate problem of returning sufficient to the producer to keep him in production, left a good deal of uncertainty in the minds of many producers. The extension or renewal of payments are at the decision of men in the various Federal bureaus. If payments are either discontinued or materially reduced without a like drop in production cost, it would be disastrous to local dairy farmers

who purchase almost their entire supply of feed and must compete with metropolitan and war industries for labor.

This procedure is in contrast with the operation under State control wherein our returns were based on actual cost and under which the consumers of Los Angeles and Long Beach purchased milk at the lowest cost of any of the large cities in America.

As long as parity price of grain is maintained and the high wages paid labor as established by wage stabilization order, War Food Administration, it will be necessary for the dairyman to continue to receive his present returns, either through subsidy payments or price increase.

Los Angeles County is the largest dairy county in the United States and has over 103,000 dairy cows which supply the metropolitan area. Our average herd in this area is about 100 cows per herd, as compared to New York State of 16.68 cows per herd.

Our dairies are operated on a feed-lot basis on small tracts of land and are fed by purchases of all their grains, hay, and purchase-cow replacements from other sections of California and bordering States. Due to the requirement of efficient production and in order to be competitive and to stay in the production of milk, under our local conditions we must have highly skilled milkers who are trained to maintain production and milk more cows per man and produce more fat per cow than any other section of this country. It takes several years of training to produce such men and at the present time sufficient labor is our most serious problem. Many of our men have been called for military duty and others have sought easier work in war industries.

This memorandum is submitted for your information with the hope that it will be helpful in bringing about some understanding of our problems and also bring about a mutual relationship between yourself and our organizations in dealing with the many problems confronting us.

Sincerely yours,

Superior Milk Producers Association, Bellflower, Calif., M. Oliveria, Manager; Protected Milk Producers Association, Hynes, Calif., Ned M. Clinton, Manager; Central Milk Sales Agency, Downey, Calif., C. L. Smith, Manager; Los Angeles Mutual Dairymen, Los Angeles, Calif., M. F. Toste, Manager; Western Consumers Feed Co., Hynes, Calif., Gail M. McDowell, Manager; Producers Distributors, Pasadena, Calif., L. C. Kenworthy, Manager; Natural Milk Producers Association, San Gabriel, Calif., Frank S. Glass, Manager.

NOTE.—These men form the Los Angeles Producers (milk control), appointed by the director of agriculture of California.

JANUARY 16, 1945.

Mr. NED CLINTON,
Manager, Protected Milk Producers Association, Hynes, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. CLINTON: Following up my wire to you of January 10 and receipt from you of splendid letter, I immediately and briefly communicate to you further, as follows:

This morning I attended a committee meeting and conference of approximately 75 Congressmen with General Hershey of Selective Service. I made notes of some of the testimony and facts brought out before the committee, and, while I do not claim that this hurried report to you is verbatim of what was said, it is substantially what was brought out in relation to the important subject of the Tydings amendment and deferment of agricultural workers under the recent directive concerning same. General Hershey in part stated substantially as follows: 1. That the Tydings amendment could be best illustrated by a table with four important legs, to wit: First, the applicant must be a bona fide farmer. Second, he must be necessary. Third, his work must be necessary to the war effort as a farmer. Fourth, he must be irreplaceable. If anyone of these four legs is not present, then it would appear that under the Tydings amendment an agricultural worker applicant could not be qualified for continued deferment.

General Hershey stated directly: "I do not destroy the Tydings amendment; I have not ordered it destroyed." The Tydings amendment is not an exception; it made his conditions as absolutely essential before a deferment was justified. Before the enactment of the Tydings amendment, probably some of the farmers were too much stripped of farm labor. Because of the Tydings amendment, however, we probably now have 364,000 more deferred. The initial determination as to whether or not the Tydings amendment is applicable must be made by the local draft boards. They are in a position to determine all the facts in each case better than anyone else. They have done a grand work all over the Nation and without ever receiving a cent of compensation.

If any State director of Selective Service or anyone else is telling local boards to destroy the Tydings amendment, that person is not doing it with the authority of the national director of selective service. I have never authorized any such action. The Tydings amendment is the law. I believe the Tydings amendment has been liberally interpreted. But, in the last 3 months, it has been necessary to strictly interpret it. The local boards must make their decision in view of the Tydings amendment. No one can destroy it and it is not the intention to do so. You can't take any young farmer under this directive from his work in agriculture unless the local board first initially indicates it and is in possession of all the facts, first determines that the selectee does not come under the Tydings amendment in one or more of its essential provisions.

The meeting was called, my friend, Ned Clinton, to discuss the question of whether or not agriculture is to be considered as an essential industry. It appears that the matter will not stop with this important meeting.

General Hershey made it very clear that the needs of the war demanded that every possible selectee between the ages of 18 and 26 be now called into the service and that there was no time for delay. I emphasized time and again that the local boards were initially the determining factor as to what selectees were now called and those who were not. He also stated that he felt it was proper for any and every person who differed with any local board ruling to exercise his right of appal to the limit so as to avoid the largest possible number of mistakes. He also stated that he did not intend this directive referring to agricultural workers to be taken as an order or indication to any local board to go contrary to the provisions of the Tydings amendment or of any law or regulation applicable to the situation.

I am mailing a copy of this communication also to Messrs. Smith, Toste, McDowell, Kenworthy, and Glass, for their immediate information. I hope the same may be helpful until there is some further more definite development. Let me know if you have any suggestion or idea how I can be more helpful to you on your important problem than I am now.

Sincerely,

CLYDE DOYLE.

JANUARY 29, 1945.

Mr. NED CLINTON,
Manager, Protected Milk Producers Association, Hynes, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. CLINTON: You will be pleased to know that here is a copy of General Hershey's clarification directive to State directors and draft boards:

"Questions of interpretation of State directors advice No. 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

"The directive of January 3, 1945, State Directors Advice No. 288, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State Directors Advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

"Section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act, known as the Tydings amendment, places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section. Notify all local boards immediately.

"Dated January 22, 1945."

I think this directive should make it clear to local draft boards that they are the authority, subject to appeal, in the determination whether or not a registrant does meet the terms and conditions of the Tydings amendment so as to be qualified as an essential agricultural worker. It should make it clear therefore that nothing which preceeded this clarification directive was intended to nullify the Tydings amendment. The Tydings amendment is found in section 4 (k), Public Law No. 772, Seventy-seventh Congress which amends section 5 of the Selective Service Training Act of 1940 and provides as follows:

"(k) Every registrant found by a selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work."

I will appreciate it if you will see that the papers in your dairying district give this publicity so that the apparent misunderstanding will be corrected.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE.

Appreciation Expressed for Sympathies Extended on Death of First Lt. Clyde Doyle, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the sincere and spontaneous expressions of sympathy and understanding made to me as a Member of this House upon the tragic occurrence of the death of my distin-

guished son, First Lt. Clyde Doyle, Jr., of the United States Army Air Corps, were so inspiring and strengthening to me that I appreciate your courtesy in allowing me to make this expression of my appreciation therefor. I do it not only in my own behalf, but in behalf of Clyde's mother, his two sisters, his widow, and his other relatives.

From the time the news reached me of the fatal airplane crash, I had extended me, from dozens of Members of this House, regardless of political party, words and evidences of sympathy, understanding, and good will. For instance, without my asking it, my California colleagues requested that I be granted a few days' leave of absence to go to his bedside with his mother as he lay unconscious for over 2 days. Then, also without my knowing it, my distinguished colleague, JERRY VOORHIS, of California, with the consent of this House, worded a beautiful but unsought tribute to my son. Then my California colleagues again, unsought by me, arranged that the House would grant me leave of absence to accompany his mother, his widow, and the honor guard to the memorial services for my son in Long Beach, Calif. I did not go because I knew my dead son would, if alive, speak and tell me to stay here on the job, for he was well cared for, and the job here was the most important thing in his estimation for me to do. Then the floral tributes sent by the California delegation to the services at Long Beach, Calif., the extended hand of sympathy with brief words; or with no words at all; the many letters I have received from Members of this House, regardless of party, the allowances made; the many calls at my office by House Members and their wives and secretaries. And these expressions of human sympathy and understanding still continue to come. This, my colleagues, is an intimate proof to me that death knows no party lines.

I am informed that over 20 other Members of this distinguished House have also given their only sons in the performance of war duties during this world holocaust. Yet my son and their sons are but few of the thousands upon thousands of forthright, life-loving American lads who have already made the supreme sacrifice in honorable performance of their highest duty to this Nation and to the world. They and each of them have done this, in order that we who live on might be better able with increased vigor and devotion and sacrifice and good will—every minute we live—to so conduct ourselves as Members of this great legislative body that they shall not have died in vain, and that coming out of this global war there shall be a triumphant and enduring peace.

My son and every son of every Member of this House, having made the supreme sacrifice, have soared into higher and greater responsibilities and privileges of service to mankind. No doubt these other fathers who are Members of this House feel as I do, which is that they are now of necessity working not only to do a job for themselves as citizens, but that they must work also for their sons who have given their lives. My son and I would have been law partners, some day, probably. Now we are partners in working for an enduring world peace.

While flying Army airplanes on the fighting fronts in the frigid north of the Alaskan-Aleutian area, my son wrote and challenged me to actively participate in politics on the home front for an enduring peace. That is the main reason why I am a Member of this Congress.

In closing, may I respectfully venture this thought, to wit, that if every other Member of this House who has also lost his son in this war could join with me in voicing his sentiments at this time, with one accord, we would speak out and say to you, our colleagues, that nothing concerns us so much nowadays as does our increasing, constant dedication to the proposition that a way must be found whereby wars must cease.

Letter Urging Immediate Adoption of Recent Three-Power Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following letter sent me by Mr. Frank Siegel, New England regional director, United Office and Professional Workers of America, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass., in support of the recent Three-Power proposals, and urging immediate adoption of same by the Congress:

UNITED OFFICE AND PROFESSIONAL WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Boston, Mass, February 14, 1945.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Liberty-loving people everywhere enthusiastically greet the Three Power decisions at Yalta that guarantee a speedy victory in the war and promise total destruction to fascism in all its forms.

Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill have assured the conquered millions of Europe that liberation is at hand for them and that a terrible but just punishment awaits those who have promoted international mass murder, misery, and starvation.

Japanese Fascists will also understand the meaning of these declarations which give renewed courage to our boys plugging away in the Pacific and to the people of Asia.

The people of the occupied and newly liberated nations also know from these decisions that the people and Governments of the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain will work together to help these countries destroy every last remnant of fascism and will help them set up wherever necessary self-governing, fully representative, democratic governments.

Above all, the Three Power decisions help assure a future of hope and promise for all the people in the world for which millions, including tens of thousands of Americans, have already paid the full price.

In the world security organization patterned along Dumbarton Oaks which will arise as a result of this historic conference and from the unity of purpose and unity of will amply demonstrated by America, Russia, and Britain during the course of the war, we Americans can surely feel that together with our allies we are taking great strides toward preventing the repetition of future world strife. Together with our allies and all freedom-loving people we can now move into a bright, new world of future and promise—a world flourishing with trade, industry, science, and the arts—a world of hope and opportunity with expanding living, health, and educational standards for all people.

The Federal Congress can and must implement these decisions at once by voicing the Nation's emphatic support and by immediately enacting legislation to adopt the Bretton Woods proposals, "the cornerstone of international economic cooperation and the guide to post-war prosperity."

Our thousands of members in New England eagerly await an expression of sentiment on your part and would like to hear directly from you.

Very truly yours,

FRANK SIEGEL,
New England Regional Director.

Leading Artists, Writers, Actors, Composers Endorse Coffee Resolution, House Resolution 100, Asking for Severance of Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Franco Fascist Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1945, I introduced House Resolution 100, asking to have an expression from the United States House of Representatives to the effect that diplomatic relations between the United States and Franco Fascist Spain should forthwith be severed. This resolution was in response to feeling entertained by millions of Americans, that our appeasement of fascism anywhere should no longer be tolerated.

In the October 1944 issue of Coronet magazine appears an article of mine entitled, "Why Not a West Point for Diplomats?" in which I suggested that the State Department should be purged of those elements which continue to favor appeasement of Fascism, and I offered a remedy. As a result of this article, I have received thousands of communications from all over America and more thousands from men and women in the armed services located in every section of the world in which can be found American citizens in uniform, warmly praising the article and its objectives and expressing hearty endorsement of the plan therein outlined.

The American Committee for Spanish Freedom was organized last fall for the purpose of coordinating, developing, and clarifying sentiment in the United States

with respect to the present government in Fascist Spain. At the head of its artists' and scientists' division is Mr. Olin Downes. Recently a number of these artists and scientists assembled and drew up a statement of endorsement of the Coffee resolution (H. Res. 100), which is self-explanatory.

Scrutiny of the eminent names attached to this resolution will be enlightening. They include some of the outstanding creative minds of America.

I have, on frequent occasions, urged Congress to consider this idea and to take steps seeking to induce our Government to stop appeasing Spain. My colleagues will recall that I introduced the first resolution in Congress specifically providing for an embargo on the export of essential or raw matériel of war to Japan, and I continued crusading for such objective until Pearl Harbor. We are paying the price for having built up that Frankenstein and supplying Japan with matériel now coming back to us in the form of bullets. Let us not repeat the mistakes of the past.

I attach hereinbelow a statement of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom, incorporating the document numerously signed by artists, writers, and thinkers. I commend its reading to my colleagues and to the country.

Here it is:

Now that Winston Churchill has relieved Generalissimo Franco of any faith he may have had in the support of the British Government, the statement by a hundred of the most prominent leaders in the fields of art and science against Franco's present position and American recognition of it becomes increasingly important. These leaders have organized as the Artists and Scientists Division of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom under the chairmanship of Olin Downes to work for severance of diplomatic relations with Spain.

As their first activity they have signed an open letter to Congress which says: "We, the undersigned, desire the severance by the United States of all diplomatic relations with Franco Spain. The great war in which we are now engaged will have been in vain if German fascism is permitted to exist anywhere in the world when this war ends. The present government of Spain was created by the governments of Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini, and became a formal signatory to the Axis pact in 1939. Francisco Franco, the head of the Spanish Government, has always supported and worked for a German victory under the guise of a specious, hypocritical neutrality.

Spain, under Franco, has become in effect a colony of the Third Reich, her factories and her soil devoted to producing cloth, guns, and food for the Nazis; her merchant marine devoted to carrying Nazi spies to the New World, and oil, wheat, cotton, and arms from the Americans to the German Wehrmacht; her wolfram, copper, iron, and coal mines devoted to producing the raw materials for the German weapons which kill American and all other United Nations' soldiers; her shipyards devoted to repairing German warships damaged in engagements with American and British forces. The controlled press and radio of Fascist Spain are overwhelmingly devoted to spreading the propaganda of the Axis and painting a false, derogatory picture of the United Nations and their leaders.

The continuation of this Fascist Government or any version of it in the post-war world endangers the whole good neighbor policy, which it constantly undermines in Latin America, and can easily provide the breeding place for a third world war.

American recognition of the Franco-Fascist regime is at the present time one of the controlling factors in keeping it in power against the constantly expressed will of the people of that country.

We therefore urge that you, the Congressmen of the United States, pass the resolution introduced in the House of Congressman JOHN M. COFFEE (Democrat, Washington) asking for severance of diplomatic relations with Franco Spain and assistance to the republican forces in that country. This statement is signed by Olin Downes, chairman, and Louis Adamic, Stella Adler, Claudio Arrau, S. N. Behrman, Albert Bein, Wm. Rose Benet, Leonard Bernstein, Alvah Bessie, Anita Block, Dr. Ernest P. Boas, Van Wyck Brooks, Prof. Edwin Berry Burgum, Bennett Cerf, Stewart Chaney, Aaron Copland, Norman Corwin, Marc Connelly, Russell Crouse, Dr. Leo Davidoff, Jo Davidson, Hallie Flanagan Davis, Howard Dietz, Dean Dixon, Guy Pene DuBois, Anton Dolin, Vernon Duke, Clifford Evans, Howard Fast, Wm. Feinberg, Betty Field, Charles Friedman, Wanda Gag. Wm. Gailmor, Hugo Gellert, Ira Gershwin, H. Glintenkamp, Wm. Gropper, Chaim Gross, Oscar Hammerstein, Dr. I. W. Held, Lillian Hellman, Oscar Homolka, Miriam Hopkins, Leo Huberman, Burl Ives, Crockett Johnson, Jan Kiepura, Otto Klemperer, Arthur Kober, Beatrice Kaufman, George S. Kaufman, Dr. Foster B. Kennedy, Rockwell Kent, Alexander Kipnis, Julian E. Levi, Paula Laurence, Louis Lozowich, Pierre Luboshutz, Leonide Massine, Fritz Mahler, Albert Maltz, Alicia Markova, John T. McManus, Helen Clare Nelson, Isamu Noguchi, Sono Osato, Yella Pessl, Mishel Piastro, Gregor Piatigorsky, Anton Refregier, Elmer Rice, Dr. Bela Schick, Wm. L. Shirer, Arthur Schnabel, Lisa Sergio, Herman Shumlin, Edgar Snow, Moses Soyer, Dr. Sigmund Spaeth, Johannes Steel, Donald Ogden Stewart, Estelle M. Sternberger, Hazel Scott, Martha Scott, Genevieve Taggard, Mark Van Doren, Pierre Van Paasen, Nym Wales, Max Weber, Margaret Webster, J. Raymond Walsh, Kurt Weil, Dr. Gregory Zilboorg.

Shall the War Department Equipment in Europe Be Used in the Pacific War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press on January 31, 1945, carried an article to the effect that the War Department had decided to abandon all equipment in Europe and rearm European troops sent to the Pacific theater anew. I am inserting in the RECORD today the Associated Press article referred to, together with a letter I wrote to the Secretary of War which is self-explanatory:

WILL ARM TROOPS ANEW FOR JAPAN—UNITED STATES WILL LEAVE BULK OF EQUIPMENT IN EUROPE

WASHINGTON, January 31.—American troops shifted from Europe to the Pacific after Germany's defeat will leave the bulk of their equipment behind, under present plans, and will be armed anew for Japan.

Purpose of this military decision, it was learned tonight, is to hasten the final outcome by bringing substantial forces to bear against the Japanese months and months ahead of the time otherwise possible.

LARGE-SCALE PRODUCTION

The sending of new arms and supplies from the American production arsenal, however, will require continued large-scale war production and slower reconversion to civilian industry after V-day in Europe.

This strategic decision was said to stem from these military considerations:

First. That the giant strides already made across the Pacific Ocean will make it possible to employ large bodies of troops—presumably in operations on the Asiatic mainland—much earlier than was anticipated 6 months ago.

MORE EXPEDIENT

Second. That it would be more expedient, in view of transport problems, to let soldiers from Europe and munitions from America converge for the show-down assault against Japan, than to undertake the slower task of shipping both from Europe.

Otherwise months of effort would be required, the plan's proponents held, in reassembling the weapons, vehicles, and supplies from depots and bases spread over the map of Europe, in preparing them for reshipment, and in hauling them over Europe's battered transportation system to ports congested with troop movements.

HEAVIER COSTS

It held further that the heavier costs incurred in producing new equipment would be far outweighed by the resultant quicker ending of the war and the saving in lives which this would represent.

Presumably the property abandoned in Europe would be forwarded ultimately to the new theater, returned to this country, or sold as surplus on the spot. Disposal plans from the outset have envisaged the sale of the bulk of war surpulses in the country where peace overtakes them, since salvage value would hardly cover the cost of handling and shipment home.

The reported decision sheds additional light on recent official warnings that VE-day will not mean the wholesale demobilization of domestic industry previously planned.

Production schedules for 1945 have been boosted $500,000,000 higher than in 1944, despite the prospect of Nazi collapse this year, and the Army service forces have given notice that their war contract curtailments, instead of running about 45 percent after VE-day, will be about half as deep. W. P. B. recently asked the Army and Navy to place contracts at once for the full year ahead.

W. P. B. also has withdrawn its announcement of last fall that industry would be granted virtually a free hand when the war narrows to a single front, and that some 350 of the existing 500 industrial controls would be dropped automatically.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1945.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have before me an Associated Press report dated January 31, 1945, which reads in part as follows:

"American troops shifted from Europe to the Pacific after Germany's defeat will leave the bulk of their equipment behind, under present plans, and will be armed anew for Japan."

The report then proceeds to give certain reasons why this is being done stating that the property in Europe would be ultimately forwarded to the new theatre or sold as surplus on the spot. The report reads further in part as follows:

"The reported decision shed additional light on recent official warnings that V–E Day will not mean the wholesale demobilization of domestic industry planned."

"Production schedules for 1945 have been boosted $500,000,000 higher than in 1944, despite the prospect of Nazi collapse this year, and the Army Service Forces have given notice that their war contract curtailments, instead of running about 45 percent after VE-day, will be about half as deep. W. P. B. recently asked the Army and Navy to place contracts at once for the full year ahead.

"W. P. B. also has withdrawn its announcement of last fall that industry would be granted virtually a free hand when the war narrows to a single front, and that some 350 of the existing 500 industrial controls would be dropped automatically."

I would like to have you furnish me the following information:

1. A complete copy of the War Department release upon which the Associated Press based this statement, if it was based on the War Department release.

2. Any explanation and reasons why this policy has been adopted, if it has been adopted.

3. The hearings on the War Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, were postponed at the request of the War Department. The committee was informed at that time that this was done so that the War Department might increase its requirements. Was this requested increase asked for based upon the above policy?

4. Is the War Department shipping any new equipment to the Pacific under this policy now, that is, equipment which is to be used by European troops which will be sent to the Pacific at the conclusion of the European war?

5. To what extent was the War Department's support of the War Manpower bill based upon the requirements of military matériel and equipment made necessary by this new policy?

6. In view of the fact this policy, if adopted, will involve the expenditure of hundreds of millions and perhaps billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money and in view of the fact that all appropriations under the Constitution must originate in the House of Representatives, I feel that the policy is one in which Congress and particularly the House of Representatives and our subcommittee should have a voice.

7. In order that Congress may have an opportunity of voting on this policy, I respectfully request that you instruct your budget officer to submit to Congress:

(a) A statement showing how much of the moneys appropriated thus far for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, has been and is being expended under this policy.

(b) That he segregate and show separately in the War Department budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, any items and the cost thereof of matériel and equipment which the War Department proposes to purchase under this policy.

I am asking for this information in order that I may frame an intelligent motion should I desire to do so, either in committee or on the floor of the House, striking such items from the bill, thus giving Congress an opportunity to express itself on this so-called policy.

I am frank to state that the extent to which I shall support the next War Department appropriation bill will depend in a large measure upon the question of whether or not you have adopted this policy and the adequacy of your reasons for adopting it, if you have.

In view of the fact that this is a question in which every Member of Congress and the public is interested and in view of the publicity given to the original Associated Press report, I am taking the liberty of inserting the report together with a copy of this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall, of course, be glad to insert in the RECORD your reply.

Very truly yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

Commissioning Communists in the United States Army in Violation of Law

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's paper it is stated that "the War Department has issued a directive to all commanding officers at home, behind the lines, and at battle fronts, stating that there shall no longer be any distinction between Communists and Americans in the United States Army"; in other words, providing for the commissioning of Trotskyite Communists who are dedicated to the overthrow of this Government, as officers in the United States Army, in violation of a law passed by Congress and signed by the President.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Is that reciprocal. Are we to be taken into the Russian Army?

Mr. RANKIN. This has nothing to do with the Russian Army. I doubt if these Trotskyite Communists could get into the Russian Army. Stalin would probably send them to Siberia. Remember that, while they were plotting the overthrow of this Government, they were also plotting to get rid of Stalin and put Trotsky in his place.

It is a known fact that every Trotskyite Communist in America is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government by force and violence. Of course, he will tell any kind of a lie to get a commission in the Army of the very Government he wants to overthrow.

This is the most dangerous step I have ever known the War Department to take, and I am calling upon the Committee on Military Affairs to investigate it at once.

The article to which I refer reads as follows:

The War Department has issued a directive to all commanding officers at home, behind the lines, and at battle fronts, stating that there shall no longer be any distinction between Communists and Americans in the United States Army.

Under the directive previous confidential instructions, barring Communists from officer training and some 19 various assignments involving military secrecy, were countermanded.

MUST BE LOYAL TO UNITED STATES

The directive states that no prejudicial action shall be taken on the basis of membership in the Communist Party or allegiance to the Communist Party unless it can be proved such loyalty supersedes loyalty to the United States.

It also states that no individual shall suffer because his views on social questions shall be the same as the views the Communist Party has advanced.

The directive, which is being construed throughout the Army as giving Communists the green light for all Army jobs, is at direct variance with Federal law and Department of Justice opinions that Communists preach overthrow of the American Government.

SIGNED BY GENERAL DUNLOP

The directive was issued under date of December 30, 1944. It was signed at the direction of the Secretary of War by Brigadier General Dunlop at that date acting Adjutant General of the Army.

It was reported that the issuance of the directive had been forced because Army commanders had been referring all applications for commissions from Communists to the War Department. From last October 30 to the date of the issuance of the directive the Department had approved 200 communist commission applications without rejecting one.

The War Department's directive was sent to the commanding generals of the air, ground, and service forces, the commanding officers of ports of embarkation, base commands, and all posts, camps, and stations; the commanding generals of theaters of operations, defense commands, departments, service commands, and military district of Washington, and the commander in chief, Southwest Pacific area.

BASIC CONSIDERATION

The directive, referring to the submission of the question of Communist commission applications to the War Department, said that questions have arisen as to the "significance of membership in and sympathy with the views of the Communist Party."

"The basic consideration is not the propriety of the individual's opinion, but his loyalty to the United States," the directive said. "Membership in, or strict adherence to the doctrines of the Communist Party organization is subject to influences that may tend to divide his loyalty.

"However, many good soldiers are subject to conflicting influences that may tend to divide his loyalty. Such influences must be appraised in the light of the individual's entire record."

CAN BE MEMBER OF PARTY

"No action will be taken under the reference letter that is predicated on membership in or adherence to the doctrines of the Communist Party unless there is a specific finding that the individual involved has a loyalty to the Communist Party as an organization which overrides his loyalty to the United States."

The letter referred to is a confidential communication sent to the same officers under date of January 31, 1944, outlining procedure for "the disposition of subversive and disaffected military personnel," which letter is set aside by the latest directive.

"No such finding should be based on the mere fact that the individual's views on various social questions have been the same as the views which the Communist Party may have advanced."

HATCH ACT QUOTED

"Except in clear cases, no action shall be taken against persons who are being trained for combat assignments and have demonstrated a high degree of ability to serve the United States in that manner, including a willingness to accept combat duty."

This directive stands in sharp contrast to the Hatch Act, which states: "It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any capacity by any agency of the Federal Government, whose compensation or any part thereof is paid from funds authorized or approved by any act of Congress, to have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States."

The law provides that any such person discovered in Government employ shall be removed immediately.

On May 22, 1942, Attorney General Biddle declared in deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges, west coast labor leader:

"The Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception in 1919 to the present time, is an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence the Government of the United States."

In 1942 Biddle attempted to denaturalize a foreign-born citizen, because he was a member of the Communist Party and allegedly attempting to overthrow the Government. The citizen was William Schneiderman, Russian-born, head of the Communist Party in California. The Supreme Court upheld his naturalization.

RED CLAIMS SCOUTED

Since the dissolution of the comintern by Stalin and the dissolution of the Communist Party and the substitution by Earl Browder, of the Communist Political Association, the Communists claim to have shed their aim to overthrow the Government.

However, this claim was scouted by Members of Congress, who emphasized that the Communist Political Association is advocating establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat, which cannot be done in the United States without overthrow of the Constitution.

The new Communist line was announced by Robert Miner, party leader, as "we know that all of the great founders of scientific socialism affirmed the Marxist view of the dictatorship of the proletariat which is the very 'core' of that science. * * * So we see the correctness of Lenin's saying, 'A Marxist is one who extends the acceptance of the class struggle to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat.'"

OPEN TO COMMUNISTS

Under the directive the following highly confidential posts are now opened to Communists:

1. Officer candidate schools, as candidate.
2. Aviation cadet training.
3. Security and intelligence duties.
4. Duties in connection with secret and confidential cryptographic systems of equipment.
5. Duties in connection with radar.
6. Duties in connection with the information, education, and orientation of troops or the educational recondition of troops. (To include training for such duties.)
7. Headquarters units of companies (similar units) and higher organizations.

OTHER POSTS FOR REDS

8. Clerical duties.
9. G–3 and S–3 duties.
10. Duty as an operator of means of signal communication.
11. Instructor or administrative personnel of replacement depots.
12. Duties requiring maintenance and repair of confidential or secret equipment.
13. Duties affording habitual opportunities to observe confidential or secret equipment closely.
14. Duties allowing knowledge of the tactical dispositions of submarine mine fields.
15. Signal corps units providing communication, signal intelligence, photographic, repair, or depot supply services.
16. Ordnance units providing ammunition or depot supply services.
17. Quartermaster units providing gasoline or depot supply services.
18. Chemical units providing chemical munitions or depot supply services.
19. Engineer units providing depot supply services.
20. Duties affording frequent access to secret and confidential matter or opportunity seriously to injure the war effort.

This opens the gates of the most technical and secret branches of the Army to Communists.

Story of Our Patent Office

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, when I envision the economic crisis that is certain to follow this war, and when I contemplate the various means and methods we must adopt to assure our industrial and commercial stamina in the future, I am always convinced that one of our chief reliances must be inventions. And inventions connote our patent system and the agency which administers it.

In conflict in which we are now engaged with totalitarianism our Army and our Navy have been aided by inventors in the achievement of our own victories and those of our allies. Not yet can we reveal the number and kinds of mechanisms and methods that have contributed to the defeat of our enemies and the preservation of our liberties, but I know that these have been among our most powerful weapons and defenses. Not all of these inventions are of purely military nature, and not every one of them has been evolved since the beginning of our battle with the Axis. Many of them are, however, of vital importance of our forces on land, at sea, and in the air, and were the products of peacetime.

Since the outset of hostilities the inventions patented and those in process of patenting have been appraised—and in many cases—adopted by the Army and the Navy. A special division of the Patent Office was established to examine the many thousands of pending applications to determine the military usefulness of the mechanisms and compositions they disclosed. A large number of these are of such importance to the prosecution of the war that they have been withheld from patenting under authority of an act of Congress—Public, No. 700—and have been subjected to secrecy because their publication would be of assistance to the enemy.

LINCOLN WAS INVENTOR

Had we been without a patent system that has for 155 years spurred invention we might have been deprived of the armament that is now vanquishing our foes in Europe and in the Orient and Hitler might now be the master of all the peoples of Europe and a menace to us.

In the First World War the mightiest influences were the submarine, the airplane and the tank—all of American creation. Even the iron-clad warship of today had its beginning in John Ericsson's *Monitor*, and that, in turn, was encouraged by Abraham Lincoln, himself the inventor of a devise for buoying vessels over shoals patented in May 1849. Richard Gatling achieved in 1862 a very notable improvement in machine guns. These mere glances into the history and accomplishments of our patent system inspire me to record that invention is the act either of making known and usable that which was previously unknown, or of enhancing the usefulness of that which, though already known and used, is susceptible of larger utility. And by rewarding the first inventor with a patent for his product we spur the inventiveness of others. That is precisely the influence our patent system has exerted on genius so that this Nation and the whole world have benefited by its fruitfulness.

PATENT OFFICE 155 YEARS OLD

The framers of our Constitution have left the most eloquent proof that they appreciated the need and the value of inventions even then and at the dawn of the industrial age. By the adoption of section 8 of article I of our Constitution they empowered Congress—

> To promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times * * * to inventors the exclusive rights to their * * * discoveries.

Though many other provisions of the Constitution were opposed at the convention of 1787 and afterward, that authorization was accepted without question. Its ratification antedates by some years that of our Bill of Rights. On January 8, 1790, President Washington, in his address to the second session of the First Congress, urged that there be given "effectual encouragement to the exertion of skill and genius at home." Within 3 months President Washington approved the act of Congress establishing the patent system of the United States.

The authority to grant patents under that law was lodged in a board consisting of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Attorney General. The subject matter of a patent was required to be "any useful art, manufacture, engine, machine or device, or any improvement thereon not before known or used." The members of that board—the first administrators of our patent system—were impressive figures even in that era of great patriotism and statesmanship. They were Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence; Henry Knox, a general in the Revolutionary War; and Edmund Randolph, one of the most able and illustrious members of the constitutional convention. Jefferson's experience as a member of that board seems to have altered his views as to monopolize insofar as the exclusiveness of rights represented in patent is concerned. After serving for 8 years as an administrator of the patent system he wrote:

> Certainly an inventor ought to be allowed a right to the benefit of his invention for some certain time. Nobody wishes more than I do that ingenuity should receive liberal encouragement.

To this he added, years afterward, the statement that "many ingenious improvements are made in consequence of the patent right giving exclusive use of them for 14 years."

Jefferson himself was an inventor, but his inventions antedated the patent system. Until 1861 the term of a patent was 14 years.

THE FIRST PATENT

The first patent issued under the Initial Act of Congress was that to Sam-

uel Hopkins, of Vermont, for a Method of Making Pot and Pearl Ashes. That could hardly be regarded as a significant addition to the arts, but less than 4 years later there was granted a patent for an invention that, with the refinements added to it by subsequent inventors, has long been a boon to important sections of our agriculture and manufacture. That was Eli Whitney's cotton gin, which aided the production of textiles then and ever since.

THORNTON SAVED PATENT OFFICE

In 1802 President Jefferson appointed Dr. William Thornton to have charge of the issuance of patents. The bureau which Dr. Thornton headed was a section of the State Department. James Madison, afterward President for 8 years, was Secretary of State. Dr. Thornton was born in one of the Virgin Islands. He studied medicine at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland, and after receiving his degree came to the United States and acquired citizenship here. He became more prominent as an architect and as director of the Patent Bureau than as a physician. It was he who designed the Capitol, his reward for that service being $500 and a plot of land. By a freak of fate he was superintendent of the Patent Office when the British burned the Capitol and other buildings in Washington in 1814. He successfully pleaded with the British commander to spare the office and save from destruction "what would be useful to all mankind." He died on March 27, 1828, after 26 years of service.

RAPID INCREASE OF PATENTS

By reason of normal propagation, immigration, and the addition of new territory the population of the United States had increased from 3,929,214 in 1790 to approximately 17,000,000 in 1836. In the same 5 decades our country's trade and industry had made great progress. In 1790 one patent was granted. The total in the following 46 years was 9,956. Among these were patents awarded to Cyrus H. McCormick for his reaper and to Samuel Colt for his revolving gun—popularly known as the 6-shooter—and destined to become a potent factor in the winning of the West, and both in the prosecution of war and in the preservation of peace.

But the patent system was not functioning as effectively as its great creators would have wished. Accordingly, in 1836, through the initiative of Senator John Ruggles, of Maine, Congress revised and improved the requirements and procedures so as to assure greater novelty and utility in the inventions protected. There was reestablished the examination that was provided in the Act of 1790 and later waived. This requisite of originality and usefulness has continued down to the present. In fact, the Ruggles Act of 1836 is the basis of our patent system today. Senator Ruggles received the first patent granted under the act of Congress he sponsored. It was issued on July 13, 1836, and covered a locomotive steam-engine for rail and other roads, its purpose being to increase the tractive power and prevent the sliding of the wheels. This device anticipated if it did not actually inspire the cog-railroads that came to us in later years.

FIRST COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

The law of 1836 constituted the Patent Office as a separate bureau of the Department of State and gave to its administrator the title of Commissioner of Patents and required his appointment by the President. His salary was $3,000 a year. In the period from 1802 to 1836 there were but five chiefs of the bureau of patents—Dr. Thornton, Dr. Thomas P. Jones, Dr. John D. Craig, J. C. Pickett, and Henry L. Ellsworth. After the enactment of the statutes in 1836, Ellsworth was appointed by President Jackson as the first Commissioner of Patents. He continued his service until 1845. Very often a statement he made in his report to Congress in 1844 is quoted as an example of the chimerical. He declared that—

> The advancements of the arts, from year to year, taxes our credulity and seems to presage the arrival of that period when human improvement must end.

It may be that Commissioner Ellsworth's optimism—or pessimism—was begotten by a great invention that had been tested that very year—that is, Samuel Morse's telegraph. Morse received his patent on June 20, 1840, but the first telegraphic message was transmitted from Washington to Baltimore in 1844, and prompted Nation-wide enthusiasm. Ellsworth was deeply interested in Morse's discovery and aided him in obtaining from Congress an appropriation of $30,000 to determine the operativeness of the new invention. In the same year that Ellsworth made his often-quoted statement there was issued to Charles Goodyear a patent for the vulcanization of rubber. To this day and in the crisis of our defeat of despotism we are immeasurably indebted to that discovery. Within 2 years Elias Howe patented his sewing machine, which, with the betterments it has undergone, has become a big factor in our industry. Since Ellsworth's misvision there have been granted more than 2,360,000 patents—among them those for the rotary printing press, the elevator, block signals for railways, the mower, the refrigerator, the typewriter, the air brake, celluloid, the telephone, the phonograph, the incandescent lamp, the automobile, the electric trolley car, the adding machine, the motion-picture machine, the airplane, various plastics, and television. How many myriads of our people are employed in the manufacture, sale, and use of these mechanisms and compositions?

Would these benefits have come to us without the inducement of patents? Perhaps history can supply the answer to that question. It informs us that in all the ages that preceded the establishment of our patent system there were not evolved as many and as momentous inventions as have come to us in the last 150 years. We are deeply indebted to the genius of the Hebrews, the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans, but their inventiveness was less fruitful than our own. Our patent system, then, is one of the best proofs and one of the richest recompenses of our ingenuity.

The agency which administers and effectuates our patent system is in many respects unique among our Federal departments and bureaus. The Patent Office is almost coequal with our Government. In the period from 1802 until the present the Office has been administered by 36 superintendents or Commissioners. One of these, by the way,—Benjamin Butterworth of Ohio—after serving from 1883 to 1885, became a member of Congress. He was again appointed Commissioner by President McKinley in 1897. In 1849 the Office was transferred from the State Department to the Department of the Interior, created the same year. The first Secretary of the Interior was Thomas Ewing, whose grandson, of that same name was Commissioner of Patents from 1913 to 1917, and from 1888 to 1890 an examiner in the Patent Office.

Our present Commissioner is Conway P. Coe, who was appointed by the President in June 1933.

PATENT OFFICE SELF-SUSTAINING

Now I shall instance what I believe to be another singularity of the Patent Office. In the last 109 years it has not only earned its way but has returned profits. Its receipts in that long period have exceeded its expenditures by more than $2,000,000. That is a fine record of service plus surplus and, I believe, one without parallel among the other Federal agencies.

There is now, and for some time has been, deprecation of patents as monopolies. I shall close this statement with a brief commentary on that viewpoint. Like any other right bestowed and buttressed by our Constitution and our laws, that of the patent may be misused and abused to the public detriment. That is true also of every provision of our Bill of Rights, but violations of that sacred charter are not penalized by its revocation; they are vindicated and preserved by the punishment of the guilty individual. Accordingly, wrongful exploitation of patents is corrigible by the remedies and recourses our laws now afford. My conclusion and conviction, therefore, is that we must perpetuate our patent system as a powerful propellant of our progress, both industrial and social.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter

REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, the behind-closed doors maneuvering, planning, and under-cover work of one man connected with this administration, after 12 years, has been revealed to us through the press. I have wondered many times why the press long ago had not divulged to the public, if they knew it, the efforts of this man who has for this period of time been trying to change the whole

set-up and structure of this great Government of ours, which it has so prospered under for 150 years.

The papers on yesterday revealed that Frankfurter, a member of our Supreme Court, has now launched out on a program of controlling this country and probably the world, by and through the henchmen who are endowed with the same philosophy that he is.

It has been known for quite a while his tactics in securing the appointment of men in key positions of this Government and how he connived with others of his faith and belief behind closed doors. Each of them, one at a time, because they were close to our President, make separate appointments with the President and each urge him to place a certain man in a position, each taking one phase of the would-be appointee's ability to administer the special position, but never recommending one except that he was of the same ideologies as he and his ilk and clan. This has been done to the extent that practically every department of our Government is now infested with those who see eye to eye with Frankfurter. His intent and purpose is that eventually he can change the form of this Government in accordance with his ideas.

I am wondering what he is going to do with the Montgomery Ward case when it comes before the court. Any primary student throughout this land knows that the seizure was illegal. Justice Sullivan, who rendered the decision, should be given a congressional medal of honor for following the dictates of his own judicial training and not taking orders.

I want to say to you, in my opinion, which is also the opinion of thousands of good patriotic American citizens, that this man Frankfurter, together with a few others, are the Rasputins of this administration. I am suggesting to the Dies committee that they go immediately into and delve into the actions of Frankfurter, with a view of bringing impeachment proceedings against him and relegating him back to private life and, if possible, send him back to the land from whence he came and let him teach his un-American doctrines there rather than try to contaminate a patriotic American citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, this article charged that Frankfurter has the New Deal administration and the Supreme Court under his thumb and that he now cherishes the ambition to be chief justice of an international court of justice to be set up under the Dumbarton Oaks program. The article further charges that Frankfurter has confided to his friends that he is certain he can have the President nominate him for the post and that Churchill will favor him and he believes Marshal Stalin will also. I am of the opinion that Stalin will favor him, but I am loath to believe that our President and Churchill would. I say Marshal Stalin will no doubt favor him because of his championship of the causes of Sacco and Vanzetti, the Reds who went to the chair for murder in Massachusetts and his work in behalf of the I. W. W. deportation cases.

This article says that Theodore Roosevelt said this of him:

He has taken an attitude which seems to me to be fundamentally that of Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders in Russia, an attitude which may be fraught with mischief to this country.

Also, according to this newspaper report, Frankfurter will shuffle Cabinet posts and Supreme Court seats at a furious pace.

Mr. Speaker, when, oh when, except when the monk Rasputin handled the Czar in this manner, has any nation experienced such influence over the entire national set-up as it is alleged that this un-American is influencing the higher officials of our country. Members of Congress, let me admonish you, let me beg of you, let me plead with you, that as Representatives of the greatest citizenship in the world, wake up, take action and throw out of the key positions they are now holding and wielding an influence that is changing the very form of our Government, those of the ilk and clan of Frankfurter. If you do not, what chance have your boys and girls who are coming along today, going to have in life?

Michigan Farmers Are Not Magicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, Michigan farmers are as far advanced in the science of farming as any farmers anywhere. But they are not magicians. Any belief of Washington bureaucrats to the contrary, Michigan farmers cannot wave the branch of an apple tree over the soil and produce great quantities of sugar beets, onions, peppermint oil, potatoes, navy beans, grains, fruits, and other crops for which our State is noted.

It takes back-breaking work to produce record-breaking crops. It takes mechanical skill and experience, too, and for the most part Michigan farms are operated by farm families. Our children start learning the science of the soil in childhood.

War Food Administrator Jones is calling for something like 312,000 additional acres of sugar beets, 49,000 additional acres of beans, 127,000 additional acres of potatoes and also great increases in milk and dairy products as well as slaughter animals.

How will it be produced when farms are being stripped of their young men? That is what is happening in Michigan and I have pending before the Rules Committee a bill to provide for the investigation of the drafting of these skilled farmers contrary to the Tydings amendment. I hope the committee will see fit to authorize some sort of an investigation into this matter. The situation is serious.

Anyone who says that the older people can produce the food required for our armies and navies and our allies and conquered peoples just do not know anything about farming. Even from far away Australia that country's Minister of External Affairs is predicting starvation greater than that which followed the previous World War.

The people of Michigan who know what is involved in food production—and we are producing a tremendous amount of food for our Army, Navy, and our allies—are alarmed. Our State legislature has called upon Congress to act in this farm-labor crisis.

Its plea to Congress follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 8

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort

Whereas farm labor has not been placed on the critical list in the war effort; and

Whereas local draft boards apparently do not have sufficient power to classify physically fit producing farmers between the ages of 18 and 26 as critical in the war effort, and to defer the drafting of men critically essential to the production of the food supply of the Nation and armed forces, but are obliged to meet their draft quotas; and

Whereas with rationing and shortage of food supplies, it is vitally important that farm production be kept at the maximum, and it is short sighted to imperil production of crops and livestock: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is urged by the Michigan Legislature to enact legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort, which action should be taken immediately to forestall a possible emergency, due to the recent ruling of selective service; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

Adopted by the house January 25, 1945.

Adopted by the senate January 31, 1945.

NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.

The extent to which confusion has swept the farm areas of Michigan as the result of the "let the old men do the farming" policy is set forth in an editorial in the Michigan Farmer, our State's 102-year-old farm journal, for February 7. It follows:

TOO MUCH CONFUSION

Comments we have received, through the mails and otherwise, since our January 20 issue containing the editorial on drafting young farmers reached our subscribers would indicate a state of confusion exists in many places. Several have argued that the picture was not just as we presented it. Some declared information coming to their attention indicated that all farm boys between the ages of 18 to 25, if found physically fit, would be drafted, regardless of how important they might be considered locally in the land army. It was intimated that the county war board and local draft board had no alternative but to put the farm boy in I–A if he met the physical requirements.

We are not placing the responsibility for this confusion upon the shoulders of any person, persons, or group. No doubt several things contributed to it. But we do want to clear the air by pointing out that the facts in our editorial still stand. A telegram from

General Hershey to all State directors of the Selective Service System on January 22 called attention to the Tydings amendment which "places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section."

A second conference with Lt. Col. P. V. Engstrom, used as the authority in our earlier editorial, assures us once again that this Tydings amendment is to be observed. That county war boards continue to make their recommendations. And local draft boards decide which farm boys within this age group shall go into the armed services and which shall remain on the farm to produce the greatly needed food. Any evidence of cases to the contrary should be brought to our attention.

Washington's double talk has done little to untangle the mess into which it has thrown farm States, and as late as last Saturday, February 17, the Michigan Farmer again sets forth the situation in an editorial entitled "Still Confused."

The editor of the Michigan Farmer hits the nail on the head when he says, "Only Congress can force a change in what is admittedly an erroneous and dangerous policy." Selective Service officials have not shown any inclination to step into the mess and straighten it out. It will take some legislation similar to House Resolution 122, which I introduced on February 7, or some similar bill introduced since then, to keep these essential crop producers on the farms.

The editorial follows:

STILL CONFUSED

Confusion still reigns along the farm front in regards to the drafting of farm boys within the 18-to-25-year-old group. We are told that there is urgent need for at least as much foodstuffs in 1945 as we produced last year. We are told that there is a shortage of some 4,000,000 workers on American farms. We are told that new farm machinery will not be as plentiful as last year. We are told that our armed forces need 150,000 men a month for replacements. We are told that every able-bodied man within the 18-to-25 group will be needed to fill these quotas. We are told that the Tydings amendment is still in effect and must be considered when drafting farm youth. We are told that it is the responsibility of the local draft board to determine which boys go into the armed services and which continue to serve on the home front. All of these statements are credited to men or agencies of authority, mostly located in Washington.

Letters and comments coming from out in the State would indicate this confusion extends into the local draft boards, for there seems little uniformity in the way they operate. Some are liberal, others are hardboiled. Evidence of military pressure is frequently reported. Here and there a member resigns because he resents any trespassing upon the authority of the local groups.

PLANNING DAYS ARE HERE

It is most regrettable that this fog of confusion seems to grow more dense with the passing of time because these are the days when plans are laid for the year's production on the farm. If we are to lose our young able-bodied farmers it just naturally follows that the older folks left to carry on will of necessity reduce their plans to fit their manpower and equipment. Selective Service officials point out that production should not be disturbed greatly because these boys represent only a small percent of the farm labor group. Measured in units we can agree but when it comes to production ability we fail to appreciate their viewpoint. A general is only one person, just as is a private, but we can understand that one is much more valuable than the other in the carrying on of a war. Many of these farm boys are officers in the food front army. Too many people, including some high Government officials, look upon farming as a job for the unskilled, rather than a business requiring a great variety of knowledge if it is to be a success.

And none of these arguments takes into consideration the possibility of unfavorable weather that might seriously hamper and curtail our farm production program, even with ample manpower and equipment.

WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN

The farms of Michigan should not harbor youths who are only trying to avoid serving in the armed forces. But they should not be robbed of the important help needed to produce the food so necessary in the winning of this war and the writing of a just peace. We owe this protection to our boys on the fighting fronts of the world.

Farmers who feel they are not being treated fairly, in accordance with the Tydings Amendment, should file appeals at once and then immediately write their Congressman in Washington, giving a true picture of the local situation. Only Congress can force a change in what is admittedly an erroneous and dangerous policy. Your editor would appreciate hearing from all who do write their Congressmen so that he can keep fully informed on the situation, and lend assistance wherever and whenever possible.

Capt. Marcel Graux

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, during the last war I commanded a battalion of artillery in France. A French officer was attached to my battalion.

I heard from him several times, the last time being in 1921. On Saturday last I received a letter from him. He was a fine officer and a great artilleryman. I thought probably the Members of the House would like to read it. May I not call briefly to your attention the following letter:

NEUILLY (SEINE), *January 10, 1945.*

MY DEAR MAJOR BULWINKLE: Permit me, please, to call you by this title again. The Lieutenant Graux sends you his best remembrances and his wishes for a Happy New Year. I am trusting that you and your family are well, and I should be much pleased to know it.

Here in Paris we are just getting out from an awful period. I was taken again by mobilization in September 1939 and was entrusted with the command of a battery "guns 75 and horses." We were on the Meuse in Belgium near Fumay from May 10 till May 15, 1940. On this day German units had already crossed the Meuse at Sedan and crushed liaisons and commands 60 kilometers behind us. I tried to go through the German troops with three batteries of the regiment, but finally after traveling and fighting during the whole night, we were surrounded and massacred by tanks. I succeeded to escape with a few men, after a long walk.

A new unit was reformed in Normandy with 75 guns and motorcars, and was driven back to the south of France. I was demobilized in August 1940, and then I lived in Paris with my wife, my daughter, and my son. During 4 horrible years, humiliations of the defeat, of the armistice, of the occupation; privations of every kind in the large towns, with the right of abundance for enemies and collaborators using the marché noir (black market).

I worked for the intelligence service in 1941–42, but about 20 of my friends were arrested in February 1943. I escaped once more, being at the hospital when the gestapo came into our house. I was engaged with the F. F. I. for Paris liberation. These days will remain the most beautiful and enthusiastic in my life.

Now I have put on again my military dress; first in our security service and then having succeeded to be engaged by the French liaison section-headquarters communicatory zone. I am in Paris at this time. I am much pleased to assist once more your dear and beautiful Army of which we admire here the courage, organization, armament, and successes.

Here in Paris our life remains very hard, but we have to be patient until our transportation will be rebuilt and given back to civil affairs after our complete victory, which I think we can expect for 1945.

Such is the short recapitulation of these years. I hope my letter will reach you shortly through being posted by the Army, and that I shall get back good news from yourself and your country.

Now, if any friend or relation of yours, officer or private, would be pleased, being long since absent from his country, to know something of a French home, we should be very happy to welcome him. I should myself be very glad, being introduced to the friends of yours fighting now on our own frontiers.

Please also let me know, if possible, of the officers of the One Hundred and Thirteenth Regiment, in particular of Captain Morrison, Vairin, Crayton.

Ever remembering your kindness to me, I am, with my best wishes,

Sincerely yours.

GRAUX.

Let San Francisco Review Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, records show that from the year 1500 B. C. to A. D. 1860 more than 8,000 treaties of peace meant to remain in force forever were concluded. The average time they remained in force was 2 years. These broken treaties were not made by the people themselves nor by their representatives, but by rulers with the power of life and death over their people and with power to make and break treaties and to make war. The result of such vast powers usurped by ambitious rulers has left a record of only 227 years of peace during a period of 3,357 years. It is estimated by one eminent authority that more than 15,000,000,000 persons have sacrificed their lives in the wars of historic times. I

agree with David Lawrence that it is high time every phase of the commitment made in Yalta be examined. Under permission granted to extend my remarks and to include an editorial, I insert Let San Francisco Review Yalta, by David Lawrence, published in the United States News under date of February 23, 1945:

LET SAN FRANCISCO REVIEW YALTA

(By David Lawrence)

Did not the American people envision an organization of nations with democratically chosen representatives which would sit like a court of judges and develop an equitable formula for handling the major problems growing out of this horrible war—adjustments of boundaries and territorial changes, vital questions of self-government of peoples, and the humane treatment of millions of men, women, and children forced to move from one country to another?

Did we not envision a tribunal of justice which could sit sternly in judgment on the sins of the enemy but at the same time would see to it that the innocent peoples of all European countries had a chance for economic sustenance? Was not that the kind of peace conference which we have thought would be held at the end of this war?

Instead we have three men already making commitments in secret and pledges that will bind the so-called peace conference which at best can now be only a perfunctory mechanism of ratification.

The meeting at Yalta, in the Crimea, was the most important international parley since the peace conference at Paris in 1919. And history has repeated itself. President Roosevelt has been out-traded and outmaneuvered by the pragmatic-minded statesmen of Europe, just as was President Wilson.

Mr. Roosevelt pins his hopes on the curative potentiality of the United Nations organization as Mr. Wilson did with his League of Nations. Europe, which at the Paris peace conference sold out idealism and principle for territorial greed and aggrandizement and a punitive peace, finally produced an embittered Germany that accepted Hitler as a better alternative than the misery and chaos of economic ruin forced upon her by excessive reparations. The League proved powerless to correct the mistakes of the Versailles Treaty.

Is the same thing in evolution now?

A reparations commission has been ordered. It will sit in Moscow, of all places. Germany's economic mechanism is to be destroyed and she is to make payments in kind, which means she is to be deprived of the sinews of economic recovery or rehabilitation. It is easy for the Allies to announce that they have no intention of destroying the German people but realistically their program of reparations means exactly that ultimate result.

After the last war, the Allies for years extracted locomotives, coal, machinery, and other payments in kind and the struggling Weimar Republic in Germany finally went bankrupt. Economic chaos ensued and unemployment multiplied until Hitler came along with a dictatorship to which millions of Germans in their desperation acceded.

Then the dictators of Europe began to trade with each other. Mussolini made a deal with Hitler and afterward Hitler and Mussolini made a deal with Franco. Soon Hitler made a deal in 1939 with Stalin and let loose the Nazi bombers on Warsaw. Presently Stalin made a deal with the totalitarian government at Tokyo. The objective was always supposed to be peace.

Yes, it was this same Stalin who insured Hitler's armies against attack from the east in 1939, so that an opportunity was afforded Russia to grab the Baltic States and administer a death blow to Poland.

It was the same Stalin who formally subscribed to the Atlantic Charter in January 1942 and, joining us, demanded a second front in Europe while he retained his friendship and trade with Japan in the Far East.

Now our President is making a deal with Stalin, and Churchill is standing by. Let us see what each gets out of this extraordinary performance wherein the United States is committed to post-war agreements on territory and other understandings of a far-reaching nature without so much as a representative of the United States Senate present, to say nothing of the absence of a treaty for submission to the Senate—by which method alone, our Constitution says, the authority of the United States can be lawfully pledged.

We are told hard bargains were driven at the Crimea Conference.

WHAT DID STALIN GET?

Acquiescence in his grab of the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Annexation of territory that previously belonged to Poland. Acquiescence in the sphere of influence set-up which will mean Stalin-controlled governments in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and in the Baltic areas. Reparations from Germany that could include forced labor. More lend-lease dollars and goods from America.

WHAT DID CHURCHILL GET?

Acquiescence in the sphere of influence idea, which assures British domination of the Mediterranean and north Africa. A promise of continued American military power to enforce whatever settlements have been privately agreed upon.

WHAT DID ROOSEVELT GET?

The widely heralded honor of being "chairman" of a conference consisting of three men. The doubtful privilege of sponsoring a new voting procedure in the soon-to-be-erected organization known as the United Nations Security Council, whose academic scope is already foreclosed by the practical process of Big Three conferences from which all the other nations, large and small, are excluded. A promise of a formula of "free elections" in liberated areas, which, of course, is meaningless while military controls are present. Russian aid in the Far East—perhaps of doubtful value in the long run because of the consequent need of dividing the energies of our Navy in opening up new supply lines in the foggy and weather-bound north Pacific.

WHAT DID THE AMERICAN PEOPLE GET?

A promise of continued war with heavier and heavier casualties against a stiffened and perhaps fanatical resistance by the German people, who have everything to gain now and little to lose by adopting desperate measures. A promise of a big standing army and compulsory military training for American youth as we furnish men and materials to keep Germany's underground forces permanently disarmed and to suppress rebellions in the liberated countries, while American boys are killed by snipers and guerrilla fighters for years to come.

This isn't promise of peace for anybody. This is a promise of more war, because economic anarchy breeds gangsterism and dictatorship and incessant strife. The high-sounding phrases of the Crimea communiqué can be found almost verbatim in the communiqués issued after the Moscow and Teheran Conferences in 1943. A European Advisory Commission was set up then by Russia, Britain, and the United States to deal with all problems arising out of the liberated countries. Joint and not individual action was pledged then, too. But Stalin ignored the pledge and so did Churchill, and now we resolve again with more phrases about Allied solidarity and unified action.

Many of us will still believe that the President's position at the Crimea Conference should have been that which we took earlier in this war, namely, that peace settlements must await the day of victory and that the peace conference must be free from any previous commitments or pledges on territorial questions made in secret or otherwise.

Russia could not quit the war against Germany if decision on her territorial demands were deferred any more than we could turn from the fight against Hitler because we failed to persuade Russia to wait for the awards of a peace conference, at which all interests, including the people of Poland, would have had a chance to be heard through a government of their own choosing, as specifically provided for in the Atlantic Charter, which says:

"They (Russia, Britain, the United States, etc.) desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

We cannot concede that Russia is winning this war alone against Germany and so deserves everything she asks for. If American lives had not been sacrificed on the western front and if we had not supplied airplanes and other materials under lend-lease, Russia could not have mounted her offensives. The American viewpoint has back of it moral right as well as sacrifices of our manpower thousands of miles away from continental United States.

For American idealism was defeated at Yalta. American constitutionalism was scorned at Yalta, and the pledges given in the Atlantic Charter that no nation—neither Russia, nor Britain nor any other country—will seek "territorial aggrandizement" were flagrantly violated at Yalta.

The covenant of the League of Nations provided a machinery for periodic revision of the peace treaty itself. The United Nations Charter must also provide a means of review of the agreements reached at the conference of the Big Three at Yalta. Unless this is done, it is not likely that the United States Senate will ratify the treaty or furnish the other guaranties that are expected to supply American military power to enforce the settlements made at the close of this war.

"Let San Francisco Review Yalta" was the title over an editorial in the Scripps-Howard papers last week. It is an excellent slogan for the American people. For it points the way to a means of correcting the mistakes at Yalta and of really fulfilling the promises explicitly written in the Atlantic Charter.

Continuation of Premium Price Plan for Copper, Lead, and Zinc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona:

Senate Memorial 1

Memorial requesting continuation of the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc

To the Congress of the United States and the War Production Board:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

In the interest of the prosecution of the war, the Congress enacted and the War Pro-

duction Board carried into effect what is known as the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc.

The premium price plan was designed, not to afford a profit to producers, but to bring out more of these essential metals than the low ceiling prices could provide—to encourage overquota production involving careful planning, capital investment, and increased production costs which can only be liquidated over a long period.

Hundreds of producers, large and small, have done and are doing their part to carry out the program.

Announcement has been made that the premium price plan will be closed as of July 31, 1945, and as to certain classes of premiums prior to that date, on 30 days' notice.

This action, if carried out, will work a very great and unjustified hardship upon a large number of producers, and especially small-mine operators, who have made investments and incurred obligations in compliance with the Government's wishes, which have by no means been liquidated, and which were assumed and undertaken with the understanding that the duration of premium prices was guaranteed until the national emergency ends.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

1. That the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc, including all classes of premiums, be continued to June 30, 1946, and that no provision be made for the cancelation of any class of premiums during the intervening period except in cases necessitating individual operating corrections.

2. That the Congress appropriate sufficient funds for carrying out the existing plan until such date.

Adopted by the senate February 5, 1945.

Approved by the Governor February 7, 1945.

Memorial Exercises for Frances E. Willard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at the memorial exercises for Frances E. Willard in Statuary Hall, Saturday, February 17, 1945, Washington D. C.:

Officers and members of the District Woman's Christian Temperance Union, my friends, and fellow citizens, it is most appropriate that we thus annually observe the passing of Frances E. Willard and remember her great deeds.

As evidence of her outstanding character and accomplishments Miss Willard alone represents her sex in Statuary Hall. Women have attained greatness in every phase of life equal to that attained by men, but, thus far, only one woman has been honored by having her statue here—Frances E. Willard.

On this eventful occasion, during these war days to which our women are making such valuable contributions, as we think of Miss Willard it is also proper to think of womanhood in general.

Someone has said that God could not be everywhere all the time therefore he gave us our mothers. This same week we have observed the birthday of Abraham Lincoln who said, as many of us could truthfully say, "Whatever I am I owe to my mother."

Of all the crusaders for temperance, decency, and right living no one ever surpassed Frances Willard. She initiated the fight for the extensions of all the privileges of life to women in like proportions as they had been extended to men.

Born on September 28, 1839, in the State of New York, later moving to Ohio, still later to Wisconsin, and then to Illinois, the rather frail little girl to whom had been given the name Frances Elizabeth, grew into young womanhood.

During a serious illness, about the time of her graduation from college, she resolved to devote her life to Christian work; to which pledge she rigidly adhered.

In the field of education Miss Willard made great contributions but her natural theater of operations was as a reformer. Although considered an impractical dreamer by many, Miss Willard fought for the political franchisement for equal opportunities and responsibilities in homes, in professions, in industry, and in affairs of state.

She insisted on provision for vocational guidance being provided for girls; upon education for citizenship; upon physical education and sports; she advocated the 8-hour day, a minimum-wage law, union churches, and many other ideas which in her day were considered the ravings of an impractical dreamer. In 1896 Frances E Willard, speaking in England declared: "We cannot help looking forward to a time when the universal church shall come into a larger understanding of the unities that so vastly outweigh its diversities—until, like the sun in the heavens, they shall render the stars of the present twilight invisible."

When she was a little child, Frances Willard signed a total abstinence pledge in the family Bible. This pledge read:

"A pledge we make, no wine to take
Nor brandy red that turns the head,
Nor fiery rum that ruins home,
Nor whisky hot that makes the sot,
Nor brewer's beer, for that we fear,
And cider, too, will never do:
To quench our thirst, we'll always bring
Cold water from the well or spring.
So here we pledge perpetual hate
To all that can intoxicate."

When she had grown to womanhood, she heard reports of the Women's Temperance Crusade in Ohio, and her first temperance speech was made in support of that movement. As a young schoolteacher, she was an ardent supporter of temperance, and assigned themes on the evils of intemperance and the value of abstinence to her pupils. Especially at Northwestern University was this subject stressed.

After leaving Northwestern, she went east and studied the temperance situation in cities of the East; she visited the slums of New York and saw there the dire poverty and the intolerable suffering caused by intemperance. So impressed was she by the need of service in this field that she refused the offer of an educational position and returned to Chicago, where she accepted the presidency of newly organized Christian Temperance Union of Chicago.

Miss Willard had a genius for organization and she threw herself whole-souled into the task of organizing the women of Chicago for temperance. She conducted gospel meetings for the intemperate in Farwell Hall, Chicago, every day, and through this work many drunkards were reformed. She became corresponding secretary for the Illinois W. C. T. U. in 1874, and was a delegate to the convention at which the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union was organized in the fall of 1874. It was she who prepared the famous Declaration of Principles which have guided the body through the years.

At that time her name was proposed as president of the national organization, but she felt that those older in the work than she should hold that responsibility, and she became corresponding secretary.

In 1877 Dwight L. Moody had her conduct daily meetings with women in connection with his revival meeting in Boston.

During those days her labor was a work of love for humanity, for she served without salary. Many times she walked to her meetings because of her lack of funds. She even endured hunger in her sacrifice for the worthy cause. Finally when these privations brought on illness, she was compelled to accept a small salary.

In 1879, Miss Willard was elected president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which position she held (being reelected each year) until her death in 1898. In this capacity, she traveled up and down the country lecturing, guiding, stimulating, organizing, agitating. For 12 years she averaged a meeting a day and during 1 year she lectured in the capital cities of all the States and Territories of the United States, save two.

This guiding genius of the national temperance cause early recognized the importance of the printed page. She wrote six books, and edited the Union Signal. She believed in temperance education and promoted this cause for schools, colleges, and churches. She agitated for legislation, and participated in securing constitutional prohibition amendments in various States. This phase of the work was one of the most fruitful services she rendered.

Not only was Miss Willard interested in her own country, her community was world wide. She went into Canada and visited every province in that country, organizing for temperance. She agitated the question of a World-Wide Woman's Christian Temperance Union. In 1883, she was in San Francisco and learned there of the opium traffic, especially among Chinese girls, and the resultant vice conditions. With her, to see a need was to take some step to meet that need. And so definite plans for the organization of a World's W. C. T. U. took shape. Miss Willard wrote what is called the Polyglot Petition against the liquor and the opium trade and addressed it to the governments of the world. This was presented to the International Anti-Alcohol Congress in Belgium in 1885. Miss Willard was the first vice president of the World's W. C. T. U. and really acting president. In 1888 she lectured in England and Scotland.

As a result of her organizing and administrative genius, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union became a most broadly comprehensive organization, functioning through numerous departments, among them: Scientific temperance instruction, Christian citizenship, child welfare, legislation, evangelism, anti-narcotic, medical temperance. So numerous were the activities carried on that it was declared that she maintained a "do everything" policy.

Many beautiful tributes have been paid to the marvelous achievements of this noble woman, who early in life learned from the hymnal:

"A charge to keep I have,
A god to glorify,
A never dying soul to save
And fit it for the skies."

Throughout the world are many memorials to her name. There are hospitals bearing her name, notable among them being the Frances Willard Temperance Hospital in Chicago. There are educational institutions which honor her memory. Northwestern University has its Willard Hall. To this hall, Lady Henry Somerset presented a marble bust of Miss Willard, on which were inscribed the lines of Whittier:

"She knew the power of banded ill,
But felt that love was stronger still,
And organized for doing good
The world's united womanhood."

In 1905 the State of Illinois voted to place this marble statue of Miss Willard in the Hall of Fame in our national capital. It was accepted by Congress February 17, 1905, at which time both House and Senate paused to pay tribute to her. Addresses of eulogy were delivered. On the pedestal of the statue are Miss Willard's words:

"Ah! it is our women who have given the costliest hostages to fortune! Out into the battle of life they have sent their best beloved with fearful odds against them. Oh, by the dangers they have dared; by the hours of patient watching over beds where helpless children lay; by the incense of 10,000 prayers wafted from their gentle lips to heaven, I charge you give them power to protect along life's treacherous highway those whom they have loved."

The Frances E. Willard Settlement in Boston is a successful venture in carrying out some of her most cherished ideals. More than 300 schools, libraries, and hospital wards bear her name, not only in America, but in many other lands as well.

Miss Katherine Lent Stevenson wrote of her:

"How great she stands!
A mountain peak, her soul!
An ocean wide, a river sweeping on with full free tide;
A sacred shrine where holiest things abide;
How great she stands!
Stand, radiant soul!
Here in the center of our Nation's heart;
Forever of its best life thou'rt a part;
Here thou shalt draw thy land to what thou art;
Stand, radiant soul!"

A nation, a church, a people do well to remember the life and service of so noble, so self-giving, so loving a soul.

As a reformer, Miss Willard has not been surpassed. No woman or man of her time has accomplished more for the protection and upbuilding of her fellow men and the cause of temperance.

She was a brave, true soldier, a great commander and finally and best of all a kind and gentle woman who loved her fellow beings with such an unstinted devotion that she has been christened the "mother of all mothers."

When called by that Master with whom she walked so closely all through life, she answered with tones of utmost content: "How beautiful it is to be with God."

Negro Squadron Donates Gift To Promote Interracial Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the Washington Star recently, stating that the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron of Negro flyers returned a gift of $1,000 to Ford Local, No. 600, Detroit, Mich., to be used for interracial good will. This shows a true American spirit and expresses their desire that the sorry spectacle of religious bigotry and racial hatreds be eliminated when the war is over.

We must have trust in one another, and we must be prepared not to allow our great Republic and Nation to be exploited during the confusion and uncertainty in the period of transition from war to peace economy.

NEGRO SQUADRON DONATES GIFT TO FIGHT PREJUDICE

DETROIT, February 10.—A War Department spokesman reported today that the Nation's first all-Negro fighter squadron, now in action in Italy, has returned a $1,000 gift from a Detroit union local with the request that it be used to better interracial good will.

Truman K. Gibson, Jr., civilian aide to Secretary of War Stimson, said Ford Local 600, United Auto Workers, C. I. O., has agreed to contribute the money to a national fund which will provide an annual award for "the person or group contributing the most toward racial good will."

Mr. Gibson said Maj. George S. Roberts, former commander of the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron, told him his flyers made their decision because of their desire for understanding and advancement of the Negro.

Address of Hon. Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania, at Roosevelt Victory Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] at a Roosevelt victory dinner at Erie, Pa., February 17, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are gathered here this evening to dine and fraternize, and celebrate the reelection of Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Presidency of the United States. I want to congratulate the liberal voters of Erie County for the excellent job you all did in Erie County last fall. While you did not carry the county for the Prresident, you did reduce considerably the number of votes by which the county was lost in the Presidential election of 1940. That is a job of which you of Erie County may be proud.

Last fall's election is over and we must now plan for the future. It is incumbent that we, as liberals, shall not declare a political holiday. Our opponents are not doing so. Already we see signs of a terrific battle between the liberals and the conservatives. Such a battle is personified by the actions of the conservatives in Congress who are doing everything within their power to prevent the confirmation of the nomination of Henry A. Wallace for the position of Secretary of Commerce.

Senator ROBERT TAFT said during the course of debate recently that Mr. Henry Wallace was not qualified to hold an important position in the Government. Since Henry Wallace asked the voters of Ohio to defeat Senator TAFT last fall, his statement was not altogether unexpected.

Let us look at the record and see how bad Wallace really is. What is there about him to cause some Senators to fight him with such venom? Mr. Wallace's sin is that he has never knuckled under to special interests. He has been more than fair to them when their interest coincided with the public good, but merciless in his fight against them when they were pushing some measure against the general welfare. Take the story of how Mr. Wallace saved $874,000,000 to the United States Treasury, which otherwise would have gone unjustly to enrich certain processors who had done nothing whatever to earn the money.

When the A. A. A. was declared unconstitutional and with it the processing tax which financed the cost of the agricultural program, many of the processors thought that inasmuch as the tax had been declared unconstitutional, the tax money belonged to them. Mr. Wallace called this a legalized steal and immediately asked the solicitor of the Department of Agriculture to work with the appropriate committees in Congress to draw up "unjust enrichment tax" legislation to see that the money already collected from the farmer or consumer was not returned to the processor who had done nothing whatever to earn it. The legislation was passed. Mr. Wallace's men in the Department of Agriculture worked with the Treasury to carry it out. In justice to the processing trades, it should be said that the majority of them recognized the justice of the action taken by the Government under Mr. Wallace's leadership. The courts sustained the Government in 92 percent of the cases contested. The overwhelming majority of the cases were settled out of court because the justice of the Government's position was so apparent. Of course, there were some individuals who thought they had their hands on windfall gains amounting to millions of dollars and who had a strong feeling of resentment against Mr. Wallace for the strong leadership which he furnished.

Take the ever-normal granary which Mr. Wallace fathered. Some of the grain interests did not like this. But it was an essential step to take on behalf of the farmer and the consumer. The American people are thankful for the extra 100,000,000 bushels of wheat and 450,000,000 bushels of corn which Mr. Wallace had stored up in the ever normal granary when the war came on. This huge stock of extra grain made the difference between crippling hunger and efficient working and fighting for many millions in England and Russia.

In the ever-normal granary were also huge stocks of cotton, and in April of 1939 Mr. Wallace was responsible for initiating the trade of 600,000 bales of cotton for 90,500 long tons of rubber. The rubber cartelists in the East Indies were holding production down at that time to 50 percent. Naturally they and their business friends didn't like what Mr. Wallace started. Ninety thousand five hundred tons of rubber is a lot of rubber—enough to make 18,000,000 average automobile tires. Both the automobile user and the war effort were served by this war visioned action by Henry Wallace.

The Wallace farm program in the thirties almost doubled the farm gross income and almost trebled the farmers' net income. There was nothing incompetent about the way Wallace got the cooperation of the farmers, the Congress, and the administrators in the executive branch of the Government to do a difficult job which had been precipitated by the scarcity policies of industry. Mr. Bernard Baruch has repeatedly said that Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Agriculture did a superb job of administration.

Let's look briefly at this administrative job. Under the Triple A, which became law in May of 1933, Mr. Wallace had to pick the men who would build an organization which would contact county by county and State by State the majority of the six million

farmers of the United States. The chief responsibility was placed on the county committees elected by the farmers themselves. This annoyed a few politicians, but it was sound administration to decentralize what otherwise would have been an impossible task. These county committeemen trained in local responsibility have been invaluable in the war, serving on the county war boards to ration scarce materials and machines in the best way to promote the maximum war effort. To these men as much as to anyone goes the credit for the phenomenal job of all-out agricultural war production.

Mr. Wallace, as Secretary of Agriculture, was responsible for the food-stamp plan. He told Mr. Milo Perkins to work out the most friendly relationship possible with the wholesale and retail distributive trades. It was almost as difficult an administrative job to come into effective touch with several hundred thousand distributive outlets as it had been to work out the Triple A in cooperation with several million farmers. But the job was done and it was done efficiently and effectively. One of he men who worked with Mr. Wallace at that time was J. Frank Grimes, President of the Independent Grocers' Alliance. Mr. Grimes recently wired Senators "I strongly urge full complete support of Henry Wallace's appointment as Secretary of Commerce. My experience with him, when chairman of the important food and grocery conference committee, has earned my deep respect for his ability and integrity, I believe he is ideally suited to be Secretary of Commerce and urge you to support him unwaveringly."

When Wallace saw the war coming on in 1939 he appointed a special advisory committee composed of representatives of business, agriculture, and labor to advise the Department of Agriculture on the problems which would inevitably arise in case war should materialize. Mr. Wallace gained the wholehearted esteem of both the businessmen and the representatives of labor on this committee.

Nine billion dollars were lent to farmers while Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture, while Jesse Jones in R. F. C. was lending $6,000,000,000—and the percent repayments on the agricultural loans ran higher than on the R. F. C. loans. Wallace loaned money to over a third of the American farmers while Mr. Jones through the R. F. C. helped only one-half of 1 percent of the American businessmen. Wallace it was who used Presidential backing to force Mr. Jones to give the farmers 4-percent instead of 5-percent money. He it was who insisted on safe storage facilities at reasonable rates. He it was who insisted that the Commodity Credit Corporation be transferred to the Department of Agriculture so that the products could be stored more economically. More than $15,000,000 in storage charges were saved after complete control came into the hands of the Department of Agriculture. This was done merely by enforcing ordinary, sound business procedure. The purpose of the Commodity Credit Corporation was not the making of money, but it is interesting to note that in spite of the fact that the loans made were nonrecourse loans resulting in large accumulations by the Government of farm products, nevertheless the final collection and liquidation experience of the loans made prior to 1941 was remarkably good.

The only Vice President who ever did any work in the executive branch of the Government was Mr. Wallace. No President would ever have asked a Vice President to engage in Executive work except in time of war. Certain coordination jobs necessary to the war effort could only be done by the President or by someone who outranked the Cabinet officers. The various Cabinet officers had to be coordinated with respect to economic warfare and war production. Mr. Wallace, at the request of the White House, stepped into both situations only a few months prior to Pearl Harbor. He was serving as chairman of both the Board of Economic Warfare and S. P. A. B.—later the War Production Board—when Pearl Harbor was struck, and he broke bottlenecks which nobody else could have broken except the President.

And so I say to Senator TAFT, "Yes; Wallace is a bad man for the enemies of the general welfare. He is a bad man for those who do not believe in justice for agriculture. He is a bad man for the cartelists. He is a bad man for those who want 10,000,000 unemployed."

Wallace's multitudinous business contacts, made on behalf of the general welfare, make him an ideal man for Secretary of Commerce. If he only shows one-half the ability as Secretary of Commerce that he showed as Secretary of Agriculture, the businessmen of the United States will soon come to feel that he is the best Secretary of Commerce they have ever had. I believe and I think Mr. Wallace believes that the vast majority of businessmen are sound, forward-looking, and eager to cooperate with Government in doing a first-class job of furnishing the maximum number of positions for willing workers in the production of peacetime goods for a peacetime market.

How bad is Mr. Wallace in the eyes of the Allied and neutral nations? What will Mr. Wallace's rejection by the Senate mean to our harmonious relations with the peoples of other nations? The answers to these questions are put most briefly by saying that Mr. Wallace has a standing abroad second only to that of President Roosevelt. The British know that his full-employment ideas are less radical than those of Sir William Beveridge, to which even the British Tories are giving the most respectful consideration. The British are unable to understand why the Tories of the United States fight both President Roosevelt and Henry Wallace with such viciousness.

Mr. Wallace has long taken a deep interest in the peoples of Latin America. This was recognized by the President when he appointed Mr. Wallace as Ambassador Plenipotentiary to Mexico in December 1940, on the occasion of the inauguration of President Avila Camacho.

Mr. Wallace's trip to Mexico was such a success that the President asked him in the spring of 1943 to visit the west coast of South America. The western Latin-American countries felt that they had been neglected by high ranking United States officials. Mr. Wallace, by that time, had learned to speak in Spanish and everywhere he was tumultuously received. At the huge outdoor stadium in Santiago, he spoke in Spanish to more than 80,000 people on behalf of the Allied cause.

When the situation in China became unusually difficult in the spring of 1944, the President asked Mr. Wallace to carry a message to the Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. His mission was undoubtedly a contribution toward that understanding between China and Russia which is essential if the war against Japan is to be terminated with the minimum loss of American lives and peace in the Far East is to be established on the firmest possible basis. On his trip to China, Mr. Wallace visited many agricultural experimental stations and factories in Soviet Asia. In so doing he established friendly relations with the technical people of Soviet Asia.

In all these trips, Mr. Wallace worked with the closest possible relationship with the State Department. Everyone cooperated with him in the best possible way and a magnificent job was done of creating the maximum of good will on the part of millions of people toward the United States. Mr. Wallace has painstakingly created good will capital for the United States which an international advertising man might value at hundreds of millions of dollars. The United States Senate can destroy all of this in a twinking of an eye and in so doing start the American people on a path which will be beset with unimaginable difficulties.

On May 8, 1942, Mr. Wallace made before the Free World Association his famous century of the common man speech. This speech was translated into more than 20 languages and broadcast far and wide among the neutral nations and among the Axis nationals. Millions of copies were distributed. In this speech Mr. Wallace said:

"Some have spoken of the 'American century.' I say that the century on which we are entering—the century which will come out of this war—can be and must be the century of the common man. Perhaps it will be America's opportunity to suggest the freedoms and duties by which the common man must live. Everywhere the common man must learn to build his own industries with his own hands in a practical fashion. Everywhere the common man must learn to increase his productivity so that he and his children can eventually pay to the world community all that they have received. No nation will have the God-given right to exploit other nations. Older nations will have the privilege to help younger nations get started on the path to industrialization, but there must be neither military nor economic imperialism. The methods of the nineteenth century will not work in the people's century which is now about to begin. India, China, and Latin America have a tremendous stake in the people's century. As their masses learn to read and write, and as they become productive mechanics, their standard of living will double and treble. Modern science, when devoted wholeheartedly to the general welfare, has in its potentialities of which we do not yet dream.

"And modern science must be released from German slavery. International cartels that serve American greed and the German will to power must go. Cartels in the peace to come must be subjected to international control for the common man, as well as being under adequate control by the respective home governments. In this way we can prevent the Germans from again building a war machine while we sleep. With international monopoly pools under control, it will be possible for inventions to serve all the people instead of only the few.

"Yes, and when the time of peace comes, the citizens will against have a duty, the supreme duty of sacrificing the lesser interest for the greater interest of the general welfare. Those who write the peace must think of the whole world. There can be no privileged peoples. We ourselves in the United States are no more a master race than the Nazis. And we cannot perpetuate economic warfare without planting the seeds of military warfare. We must use our power at the peace table to build an economic peace that is just, charitable, and enduring.

"If we really believe that we are fighting for a people's peace, all the rest becomes easy."

No wonder the forward looking people of the United States, and the common people of the world, believe in Mr. Wallace. It is not Mr. Wallace's competence which is on trial before the Congress. It is the Congress which is on trial before the people of the world.

That is the record with respect to Mr. Wallace. If the farmers, the white-collar workers, the businessmen, and the laboring men, and women of this country are to improve their position in life, they, you and I, will have to be on our guard continuously, fight these Conservatives, and prevent a return of the days of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. I feel sure that the Liberals and Progressives of this county, and the Nation ,as a whole, will recognize and meet the issue.

Franklin D. Roosevelt is to us the symbol of a unified liberal Democratic Party. The hope of realizing liberal ideals on a national scale depends on the continuance of a unified liberal Democratic Party. A conservative

Democratic Party can never win the Nation. It can never win in Pennsylvania.

The whole world recognizes today that the liberalism for which Roosevelt stands is on trial, not only before the people of the United States, but before the whole world.

Some of the leaders of the Democratic Party do not as yet realize how dangerous is the reactionary bipartisan bloc. It has been acting for a long time. But now for the first time it is unmasked for the whole world to see. The confirmation of Henry Wallace is one of the greatest tests the Democratic Party has ever faced. I know because I read my telegrams and letters. The people are stirred as they have rarely been stirred by any domestic issue. The Democratic Party is on trial. The rejection of Henry Wallace will give him a greater standing in the eyes of the people than he has ever had. His rejection will not hurt him, but it will hurt the Democratic Party and the people of the United States.

This is what the reactionary Republicans led by TAFT are trying to bring to pass. VANDENBERG is trying to make the vote on Wallace a test of Party regularity. The shrewd Republican leadership through the help of some conservative Democrats is out to destroy the Democratic Party as a united progressive force. If a Republican-Conservative Democratic Alliance brings about the rejection of Henry Wallace, the people will know exactly what it means. In their own good time they will act. They will never again be deceived by a reactionary bi-partisan bloc. The issues will be clear. We are either going to kill the conservative bi-partisan bloc or the conservative bipartisan bloc is going to kill the Democratic Party. The conservative bipartisan bloc has picked the battle ground. We welcome the fight. If the Democratic leaders do their duty, there is no question about the outcome.

Child-Care Program—Equal-Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a letter from Mr. R. J. Thomas, international president, U. A. W.-C. I. O., together with resolutions, in support of the child-care program and in opposition to the equal-rights amendment:

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (U. A. W.-C. I. O.),
Detroit, Mich., February 7, 1945.

To All Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress:

Recently representatives of our 300,000 women members in the U. A. W.-C. I. O., all war workers, met in Detroit to discuss problems affecting their lives, both as workers and as citizens.

The delegates in unanimously approving a child care and equal rights amendment resolution instructed my office to send copies of the resolutions to you so that you might have an expression of our 300,000 women members on these two important subjects, which very likely, will be on the legislative calendar in this session of Congress.

Our women in the international union are vitally concerned that the child-care program, under the Lanham Act, not only be continued but greatly expanded. We constantly receive reports from our local unions showing that production of war equipment is suffering because of the failure of local communities to set up adequate facilities for the care of working mothers' children. You will also note that the resolution heartily endorses the proposal of the Senate subcommittee on wartime health and education that a commission for children and young people be established in the Office of War Mobilization.

Our union has long been a strong opponent of the so-called equal-rights amendment and the conference delegates expressed themselves clearly and forcefully against this vicious piece of legislation.

We trust that you will give both of these resolutions your most serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

R. J. THOMAS,
International President, U. A. W.-C. I. O.,
Director, War Policy Division.

CHILD-CARE RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE NATIONAL U. A. W.-C. I. O. WOMEN'S CONFERENCE, DETROIT, MICH., DECEMBER 8–9, 1944

Since the early days of the defense period the U. A. W.-C. I. O. has carried on an increasing campaign to have adequate child-care facilities and services provided for children of working mothers. The union has supported the Lanham Act program and has consistently asked for expansion and improvement of existing services and extension of facilities where the program is not meeting needs of war-worker families. Our interest in the wartime child-care program is twofold: (a) That of giving assurance to women, while they are producing tanks and planes and guns to defeat our enemies, that their children be protected and secure; (b) during a period of wartime tensions and postwar adjustments, that children be given maximum opportunity for growth and development.

As a result of the federally supported program during the war period thousands of C. I. O. members and their families know from first-hand experience that nursery school and extended school programs provide good care which helps the mental, emotional, and physical development of children. During a period of great national crisis the program has brought positive value not only in helping women stay on the job but in strengthening family life and parent education. The program has also increased community interest and understanding of the needs of children: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference urges:

1. That the Lanham Act child-care program be continued with Federal assistance under the Federal Works Agency until the end of the emergency and that funds be made available not only for the continued operation of projects now in existence, but for expansion of projects which are seriously needed in some communities. That the program be strengthened so as to provide—

(a) More adequate night-care centers.

(b) Group care for the child under 2 years.

(c) Care for the sick child.

(d) An expansion of the child-care program for school-age children.

(e) Community recreation programs for school-age children.

(f) More flexible opening and closing hours.

(g) Better buildings and equipment.

(h) Improved teaching methods and health supervision.

2. That the program be extended in those communities in which services are failing to meet the needs of the working mothers.

3. That the Federal Works Agency make its program sufficiently flexible so that the following groups of families can have child care:

(a) Children whose parents have been laid off and who are shifting from one job to another or from one area to another.

(b) Mothers whose husbands are in the services or whose husbands are war casualties. This group of families which has suffered so much are particularly entitled to help in readjustment to a home without a father or a father who is disabled.

(c) Families who are victims of acute housing shortage and who are forced to live in dilapidated, overcrowded, unhealthful slums.

4. That the school-lunch program be expanded and extended to the many communities in which there is no adequate provisions for school lunches for children.

5. That we thoroughly endorse and urge upon Members of Congress the proposal of the Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education that a Commission for Children and Young People be established in the Office of War Mobilization. This Commission would, as stated in the Pepper report, "effect through existing agencies a coordinated program to provide for the basic need of all children."

6. That the National Political Action Committee, C. I. O., be urged to conduct a vigorous campaign to rally public and congressional support for continuation of a wartime child-care program and for a comprehensive and adequate program for all children in the post-war period.

7. That copies of this resolution be forwarded by Members of Congress and appropriate Federal agencies.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE NATIONAL U. A. W.-C. I. O. WOMEN'S CONFERENCE, DETROIT, MICH., DECEMBER 8–9, 1944

A so-called equal rights amendment has been before the Senate and House of Representatives for over 20 years. It has been and still is opposed by the National C. I. O. and the International Union as well as most of the large women's organizations.

Under the guise of establishing "equal rights for men and women," passage of the amendment would actually rob women of many rights and protection which they have won.

Since 1874, when the New Hampshire women's hour law was passed, organized labor has supported the passage of State laws regulating the hours, conditions of work, wages of women workers, maternity aid, widows' pensions, and aid for dependent children. Such legislation has been particularly needed for women working in restaurants, hotels, laundries, beauty shops, and retail stores, and other intrastate industries not covered by Federal law and frequently not well organized in labor unions.

The proposed "equal rights amendment" would wipe out the gain of nearly a century of progress for women: Therefore be it

Resolved—

1. That this conference goes on record as opposing the "equal rights amendment."

2. That we call upon Members of Congress to oppose and vote against the "equal rights amendment."

3. That we urge the National P. A. C.–C. I. O. to conduct a campaign to rally public and congressional support of a real "equal opportunities" bill.

4. That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress.

Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan:

House Concurrent Resolution 8

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort

Whereas farm labor has not been placed on the critical list in the war effort; and

Whereas local draft boards apparently do not have sufficient power to classify physically fit producing farmers between the ages of 18 and 26 as critical in the war effort, and to defer the drafting of men critically essential to the production of the food supply of the Nation and armed forces, but are obliged to meet their draft quotas; and

Whereas, with rationing and shortage of food supplies, it is vitally important that farm production be kept at the maximum, and it is short sighted to imperil production of crops and livestock: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is urged by the Michigan Legislature to enact legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort, which action should be taken immediately to forestall a possible emergency, due to the recent ruling of selective service; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

Adopted by the house January 25, 1945.

Adopted by the senate January 31, 1945.

NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Proposed National Service Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland, Oreg., of February 13, entitled "Drop the Work-Fight-or-Jail Bill," and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial from the Oregonian dated Thursday, February 8, 1945, entitled "Becoming the Judges." I think there are two or three paragraphs in the editorial last referred to which are particularly apropos to the public discussion this morning, and I should like to read them. They are as follows:

In other words, the War Department is not primarily concerned with any lag in production. There are—so far as we know—no shortage or threatened shortages which make it mandatory for the Congress to lay aside its right of judgment, because of extreme necessity, and accept without question the military judgment. On the contrary, the War Department itself admits that its primary purpose is to reform the civilian population and force it to conduct itself more in accordance with what the military may desire.

* * * * *

One can agree that no one deserves a free ride and yet not agree with the right of the military to pass judgment upon the people of the United States. That is not their job. Their job is to ask for what they need for the fighting and object only if they do not receive it. Under the democratic theory, the Army and Navy are our defense in emergency, and every contribution must be made to them in accordance with the danger that confronts us. But woe to the democracy in which the army and navy become the judges of the nation which they started out to protect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the editorials will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Oregon Daily Journal, Portland, Oreg., of February 13, 1945]

DROP THE WORK-FIGHT-OR-JAIL BILL

The work-fight-or-jail legislation before the Congress ought to be dropped. It isn't too little, but it is too late. Discussion of the bill has created endless confusion; to pass it would be confusion worse confounded.

Moreover, evidence accumulates that American workers on a voluntary basis will complete and exceed the quota in the most extraordinary war production job in history. A work-fight-or-jail law thrown in among them would reduce initiative, the most valuable quality in meeting emergency. It would be a slap at every worker who has done his best, not to escape jail, but for his country.

Already, there is immense difficulty in deciding which Government agency would administer—whether War Manpower or Selective Service. A real question has been raised, whether the Army and Navy are not drawing perilously near military government of civilians when they become principal promoters of such legislation. There is the further question whether the draft should be adopted to control workers who work for private employers.

This does not mean that slackers in war work should escape, any more than slackers in military service. But they can be laid hold of by a strengthened manpower administration without placing the willing, patriotic worker in the same bonds and under the same shadow. Public opinion supports stern measures for work slackers. The patriotism that has invested $268,000,000,000 in this war, 40 percent from current revenues, according to the latest statement by Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, can, however, be relied upon for the requisite investment in toil to produce.

There is a local situation that further challenges the need for drastic work-fight-or-jail legislation. We are informed by L. C. Stoll, war manpower director for Oregon, that by the end of June the employment demands of war industry in this area will rapidly reduce. The issue then will be guidance of workers who want to remain here and work.

The Congress can spend its energy to greater value in behalf of the war program than to wrestle further with the work-fight-or-jail bill. For example, disposal of war surplus without breaking down the market or setting a field day for speculators. For example, organization to enforce peace. For example, the streamlining of the Congress itself. For example, unifying and tightening of all policies related to the winning of the war.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of February 8, 1945]

BECOMING THE JUDGES

Those who have supported the so-called work-or-fight bill in Congress against their own better judgment, and on the plea that they simply could not go against the judgment of the War and Navy Departments, now have an excuse—and, in our opinion, a compulsion—to reverse themselves.

Secretary of War Stimson and Under Secretary Patterson, appearing Tuesday before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, are officially reported by Senator THOMAS of Utah, committee chairman and spokesman, to have declared that "the legislation is needed primarily for morale and secondary for military purposes." Under Secretary Patterson is said to have carried the thought further by declaring that in this war no one is entitled to a free ride.

In other words, the War Department is not primarily concerned with any lag in production. There are—so far as we know—no shortages or threatened shortages which make it mandatory for the Congress to lay aside its right of judgment, because of extreme necessity, and accept without question the military judgment. On the contrary, the War Department itself admits that its primary purpose is to reform the civilian population and force it to conduct itself more in accordance with what the military may desire.

So far as this page is concerned, it believes the War Department has gone entirely outside of its proper field of activity, and we hope that the Senate will defeat even the modified bill passed by the House. It further believes that the War Department was led to this extravagance by the White House, which in turn wished to impress the men on the fighting front with its response—even though it did not seriously expect or push action—to the gripe of the soldiers and sailors concerning those at home who are not fully doing their duty.

Actually, the overwhelming majority of those at home really are doing their duty. They are performing the most amazing feat of production in the history of the world. If the White House and the War and Navy Departments had emphasized this side of the picture, they would have reassured the men who are out in the fox holes. As matters have turned out, they have only stirred further doubts and intensified the problem which they have said they wanted to solve.

And if the White House was serious about this matter, why didn't it make a real issue of the matter 3 years ago—in that crucial winter of 1942, immediately after Pearl Harbor? Why didn't it fight through in 1943 or 1944? At the most, until now, there has never been more than a token recommendation. The compulsory mobilization of the country was an entirely logical program when affairs were so desperate in 1942. As we have said before, it is silly now, when the Russians are almost within rifle range of Berlin and the big push on the western front is a matter of hourly expectation. The office

workers needed for the paper work of civilian conscription could not expect to get their typewriters oiled before there was a decision of one kind or another in the European war. It would only add a lot of confusion and set a precedent for civilian conscription that no American wants if it can be avoided—not, certainly, when free labor has produced so magnificently.

One can agree that no one deserves a free ride and yet not agree with the right of the military to pass judgment upon the people of the United States. That is not their job. Their job is to ask for what they need for the fighting and object only if they do not receive it. Under the democratic theory, the Army and the Navy are our defense in emergency, and every contribution must be made to them in accordance with the danger that confronts us. But woe to the democracy in which the army and navy become the judges of the nation which they started out to protect.

The Head of the Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, inspired by a fervent hope that God will have a place at the head of the peace table, a constituent of mine, Mrs. Hobart M. Trotter, of 2020 East Forty-sixth Street, Indianapolis, Ind., wrote this beautiful and meaningful poem:

THE HEAD OF THE TABLE

We'll never have peace eternal
The din of war will never cease,
'Til God is asked to guide the hands
That write the plans for peace.

Should not the One who made the world
Be asked to share the plan
To decide the fate of nations
And the destiny of man?

Who has a better right than God,
Who rules our future fate,
To make another paradise
And save this world from hate?

The links in the chain of friendship
Will be strong as a steel cable
If the men who make the peace plans
Ask God to sit at the table.

There will be peace for all the nations
If men are willing and able
To reserve for our Heavenly Father
The seat at the head of the table.

—*Mrs. Hobart M. Trotter.*

The Federal Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert an editorial discussing the Federal ballot, which recently appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, of St. Louis, Mo.:

THE FEDERAL BALLOT

Supporters of the administration-sponsored Green-Lucas bill providing for absentee soldier voting, claimed that servicemen were stabbed in the back when Congress rejected the bob-tailed Federal ballot and placed the responsibility for the vote on the respective States where it belonged legally. The outcry was terrific. The States, it was shouted, couldn't do the job and men overseas might as well be formally disfranchised if they had to depend on a State ballot. Let's see what actually happened.

The War Ballot Commission which was set up to handle the Federal ballot—to be used when the States could not or did not function—has just disclosed that 109,479 voters from the Army, Navy and Merchant Marine preferred the Federal ballot, as against 2,800,000 who used State absentee ballots, according to an estimate by State election officials. Twenty States authorized use of the Federal ballot, but only 5.3 percent of the soldiers from these States used the Federal form. (The Federal ballot carried the names of candidates for President, Vice President and Members of Congress only, whereas the State ballot permitted voting for State, county and even city officials).

Secretary of War Stimson, reporting on the meager use of the Federal ballot last November, said it raised the question of whether it is "of sufficient utility to justify its continuance of a voting procedure in time of war." He declared that "most servicemen who desired to vote were able to obtain, then vote and return, their State absentee ballots, leaving relatively few who needed to, or legally could use, Federal ballots." Further, the Federal ballot wasn't as simple as it appeared to be, because 9 percent of those cast were invalid.

Supplementing Secretary Stimson's observations was a criticism by General Eisenhower, who pointed out that the Army was given the job of handling the Federal ballot just at the time when it was busiest with the occupation of Europe. He said in some instances it had been necessary for officers handling the ballot" to crawl from foxhole to foxhole under enemy artillery, mortar, and small arms fire while distributing official war ballots to personnel engaged in combat."

It is everybody's hope that before another Presidential election is held in 1948, the war will be ended and the calls for absentee ballots will be comparatively negligible. But if such is necessary the Federal War Ballot Commission makes the reasonable suggestion that the names of all candidates be made available for ballot printing not later than August 1. In the last election the names of 22 Federal candidates were not determined until after August 10, and their names were sent to absentee servicemen by radio. The commission would also require States which do not recognize the Federal ballot to make that date known before May 1. The date now is July 15 and several thousand servicemen cast worthless ballots because they did not know their States would not count their votes.

In view of Secretary Stimson's disclosures it is unlikely another Green-Lucas bill will be presented to Congress. It was politically inspired legislation, designed to limit the absentee voters to a select list of candidates, including the President, who was, incidentally, their Commander in Chief. Moreover, the Green-Lucas bill was unconstitutional, as it was a clear invasion of the right of each State to control its elections.

Its proponents were certainly in error when they said the State laws were ineffective and that the absentees preferred the Federal ballot. They are referred to Secretary Stimson for details of how far they were wrong.

The House Acts Wisely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 17, 1945:

THE HOUSE ACTS WISELY

By passing the George bill, however narrow the margin, the House has avoided a position which would have been both politically unwise and inconsistent with good government.

The Members of the House were not opposed to the George bill as such. This is shown by the fact that only 2 votes were cast against it on the final ballot. On the earlier motion, to recommit, however, which would have killed the bill, the vote was 204 against and 196 in favor of recommital.

From this it is clear that the opposition was not hostile to the bill—the only matter properly before the House—but was trying to maneuver the Senate into a position where that body would refuse to confirm Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce. In other words, the House minority was trying indirectly to exercise a veto power over a Presidential nomination, although under the Constitution that is the exclusive function of the Senate.

As matters stand, the prospect is that Mr. Wallace will be confirmed when the vote is taken on March 1. The President has stated that he will sign the George bill, which strips from the Commerce Department the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, and, on this condition, the Senate is expected somewhat reluctantly to acquiesce in the Wallace nomination to the trimmed down Cabinet post.

If the House had killed the George bill, however, the Senate would have been forced into voting on the nomination without any assurance that the Federal loan agencies would be kept from the control of Mr. Wallace, and in that situation the chances are that the nomination would have been rejected. This would have meant, in practical effect, that the House had vetoed a nomination by the President which the Senate was willing to accept—a result which could not be justified on any ground and which could have been explained only on the basis of very narrow politics.

It is much better that the matter has been worked out so that Mr. Wallace can take over the Commerce Department. There may be some surprise that he should want the post, in view of the lack of confidence in him, which is reflected in the votes of both brances of Congress, but if he does want it, and if the President wants him, the House has no right to stand in the way.

Smith-Connally Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star:

NOT A BAD LAW

The National Labor Relations Board has just made public a report of its experience in the first year of operation under the strike vote section of the Smith-Connally law. The report should make interesting reading for those who professed to fear the worst when the law was passed.

This is not to say that the N. L. R. B. is wholly pleased with the operation of the law. The report finds indications that labor organizations are using the strike ballot machinery to "dramatize and focus public opinion on their demands" and to "bring pressure in the form of a strike threat to bear upon governmental agencies dealing with labor disputes, either in the hope of obtaining more favorable decisions or more rapid ones."

It is the statistical phases of the report, however, which seem most significant. During the fiscal year 1943–44 a total of 1,089 strike notices were filed with the Board. Of this total, 688 were withdrawn, 232 led to strike votes, and 115 were otherwise closed. Out of the whole business only 64 strikes resulted. When that is compared to the total of more than 4,000 strikes that occurred throughout the country during the period covered by the report, most of which were staged in defiance of the strike ballot provision of the law, it gives a very convincing answer to those who opposed the statute on the claim that it would encourage rather than discourage strikes.

This view was taken by the President when he vetoed the bill, only to have it passed over his veto. On the record, however, it seems clear that passage of the law has not tended to "stimulate labor unrest" and has not been construed as "giving Government sanction to strike agitations."

What is needed now is not abandonment of the law, which some still advocate, but a strengthening of its penalty provisions so that all phases of enforcement can be handled with the effectiveness which has characterized the work of the N. L. R. B. in carrying out the strike ballot provisions.

Medal for Congressmen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following editorial from the Fort Smith Times-Record, of Fort Smith, Ark., under date of February 12, 1945:

MEDAL FOR CONGRESSMEN?

Fort Smithians who heard William A. Lydgate speak here the other night spontaneously applauded when the editor of the Gallup poll proposed that a medal be established for any Member of Congress "who shows bravery and devotion to duty over and above the call of politics."

That applause was more than appreciation of a bit of humor aimed at an American institution which has been the butt of countless jokes. It was expressive of consciousness of a hard fact in American democracy—the persistent gap between the people and the Government with the people consistently ahead in readiness for action to meet problems that arise.

Lydgate cited specific instances of this in his lecture: That 91 percent of the people favored a greatly increased air force in September 1939, despite which Congress 6 months later granted money for 59 planes instead of the 1,200 asked; that the public was 4 months ahead of Congress in regard to selective service and 1 year ahead on price-wage control; and that it has long had its mind made up about world-peace organization.

The lecturer, whose business it is to learn what people are thinking, touched upon the key to democracy's success when he said that individually citizens may be grossly wrong but that collectively their opinions constitute "a salty, earthy judgment which frequently adds up to better judgment than that of so-called political experts." Democracy, he said, requires only that the average judgment add up to common sense—and this is true of the American public if it has the facts. The problem, he suggested, is how to pipe some of this common sense to Washington.

The chronic lag between public readiness and congressional action is one which occasions serious effects at times but it is not likely to be eliminated. It is a weakness which grows out of one of our strengths: The fact that in the long run our policies are likely to be firmly grounded in public opinion. The gap between public acceptance and Government action is a period in which popular opinion gathers cumulative force which makes final action more truly representative of the will of the people.

This is not to say that congressional delay is in itself an admirable thing. Certainly it is desirable that the lag be reduced, within the limits of safety. Too often, delay has been occasioned by fights touched off by Congressmen or other public officials who are ignorant, misled, or prejudiced or who are more concerned with their own political welfare than with major problems of public welfare. In this connection Lydgate's proposal of an award of honor for the Congressman who rises above political considerations is quite justified.

But let this be said in defense of Congressmen: They are elected as being representative of the people. While their average ability is greater than that of the general public, among themselves they share the weaknesses of the public they represent. Individually they may have their blind spots and may be grossly wrong, but collectively their judgment usually adds up to pretty good sense when they finally get around to action. And when they make mistakes the people must share the blame. Congress could improve itself a lot, and we wish it would—but we're not ready to trade it off.

Another Big Three

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune of January 27, 1945:

ANOTHER BIG THREE

One of the most constructive legislators in the National Government is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. Senator BYRD has included the views of James A. Farley, with his endorsement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. BYRD and Farley have one similarity which is a burning desire in the hearts of both men to serve America first, regardless of political consequences to themselves. So naturally, BYRD agrees with Farley's statement that it is up to the people of the United States "to balance their agriculture with industry and to make it possible for the people, through increased incomes, to satisfy their wants and their needs." Farley urged that no effort be made to "buy business." He said, "I am not one who would advocate giving free sites to industries, years of tax exemption, special concessions, and franchises, guaranties of roads and highways, waterworks, etc."

Senator BYRD agreed that "the New Yorker puts his finger on one of the rackets of modern industrial progress," and he cited instances in which communities have attempted to "buy business" by freedom from local taxation, plus bonuses out of the local public funds.

BYRD and Farley agree that "real legitimate business does not ask, does not expect, and would not have these baubles hung in front of their faces."

American industry and business will be literally breaking their backs and unloosening all of their energies—when the Government gives them the green light—to reestablish enterprises that are necssary to sustain our Nation. The Government took over, for war production, and that made it possible to save the world.

Wise citizen and Top Counselor Bernard Baruch was praised by Senator BYRD, and quoted as having said, "The system of individual effort, which we call the capitalistic system, is the best in the world. It has proved itself in peace and in war. I believe in trying to better that system, instead of tearing it down. * * * The protection of the essentials leads to certain social and economic levels, which promise progress."

Lincoln Birthday Dinner Address by James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "With Malice Toward None," delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at the Lincoln Birthday dinner of the Catholic Club of Norwalk, Conn., on February 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the address as ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH MALICE TOWARD NONE

To any American, the opportunity to talk to his fellow-citizens about Lincoln is an honor, and also an exercise in humility. I am not going to presume on the opportunity. Many men have spent their whole lives studying and writing about Lincoln. I know very well that I could not add to their efforts. So I hope instead you will let me talk for a few minutes about a very great man, who for years has been a guiding star in many of the problems with which I have been confronted.

One of the proofs of Lincoln's greatness is that he does have something to say to everyone, high and low, rich and poor, no matter

what his occupation. Most of us who have briefly emerged in national affairs will swiftly pass. Great men do not pass; and Lincoln was one of these.

I, myself, am very glad that his old associate and friend, William Henry Herndon, who was angry at seeing Lincoln made into a legend, decided to try to collect the material which would paint a picture of the man. Herndon, you remember, had known him as a country lawyer, a neighbor, a politician, a district worker, a job seeker, and a friend. It was his simple faith that the more people knew about the real Lincoln, the greater he would be.

For this reason, Herndon spent the latter years of his life in bringing together everything he could find about Lincoln, good or bad, big or little. As a result, we have not a picture of an angel in a church window but a knowledge of the man, great enough to give inspiration to every American; a Lincoln so human that everyone of us feels he has had him for a friend. Not many men in history could pass that test.

A famous New York newspaperman, Don Seitz, used to spend much of his time outside his job in studying Lincoln. At the close of many years' work of this kind, he made this statement "I would have Lincoln freed from all the sentimentality that has enmeshed him, from the embraces of the sob sisters of fiction and those who try to tie him to romance and religion, to stand forth coldly and clearly in his highest form as an American politician of the first rank."

I do not know that Lincoln's principal significance is as a politician, but that was certainly one of his great contributions, and it is worth thinking about a little in these times.

There is a striking contrast between the view which was held about Lincoln while he was alive, and the personality which has emerged since his death. It is not easy for us today to believe that Lincoln was pictured in his lifetime as a weak man. It was said that he did not follow a clear line of policy: that he wavered; and that he was dominated by stronger men around him. It has taken a good many years for the history books to make us realize that none of these judgments, which were freely passed by his contemporaries, was even remotely true.

Being a first-class political leader, Lincoln had the wisdom to call in and consult all sorts and kinds of men. Again with fine political instinct, he frequently allowed his visitors to believe that they were really initiating the policy of the country. More than one man of the period published his diary or papers, and showed that he was laboring under the delusion that he, and not Lincoln, carried off many of Mr. Lincoln's best strokes. Only later, as the whole truth comes out, have we discovered that it was Mr. Lincoln who made the policy, though he was humble enough and adroit enough, to allow lesser men to believe that they were running the Government.

Somewhat the same thing was true of his alleged indecision. We know today that he was constantly calculating the political support needed to bring the Union together. He was constantly trying to bridge the wide gaps between all sorts of groups. Each one of these groups thought they had the only method of saving the country; yet Mr. Lincoln knew that if the country was to be saved he needed to get them all working together.

This, I think, explains a good deal of the misunderstanding of the time. What seemed like hesitation then, we now know was really a long and carefully thought out campaign to bring grgoup after group nearer to common ground, and on that common ground to build the political structure which enables a democratic government to function. It was politics, if you please. It was cruel to the President; but it saved the country.

And today, 80 years after his death, we honor the man who was great enough to think out that political structure, humble enough to permit other men to take the credit for it, and brave enough to stand, without complaint, the endless amount of criticism and abuse which it aroused.

This is a model worth following; and it is worth remembering when loose tongues are raised against the people on whom falls the burden of carrying the country through difficult times.

Mr. Lincoln is frequently thought of as a war President. Yet the policy which has made him great in American history was his persistent use of political methods. He was convinced that wherever political measures could be used, force might be avoided. He stuck to this both before, and in the middle, and at the end of the Civil War.

Politics, as he practiced it, was a means by which people are brought to agree on a line of action; brought to agree in numbers great enough so that the policy can be carried out. He was no stranger to all of the means that were used at the time. They were, in fact, much the same means as those which are used today. Politics has not changed in the past 80 years except that, I really believe, it is cleaner and less devious today than it was then.

So we find Lincoln endeavoring to make political compromises, rather than to force the issue which led to the Civil War. He differed on the point from many of his colleagues and rivals. Seward, capable New York politician, had taken a position which represented the opinion of New York, but did not give enough common ground on which the entire country could stand.

Lincoln's antislavery sympathies were certainly as strong as Seward's. But when he made his famous campaign in 1860, he was careful to emphasize those elements which would hold the country together, rather than those which would split it in two. Let me be bold enough to risk a theory of my own as to the history of that period.

It seems to me at least possible that if Lincoln had taken office immediately upon his election in November 1860, instead of having to wait until March of 1861, the Civil War might possibly have been avoided. The reason I think so is this.

Passions were running high in 1860, and the only chance of avoiding the Civil War lay in bringing together, by political methods, the moderates, both of the North and of the South.

But during the months between election and inauguration, a President-elect cannot do very much to guide political movements. He is obliged to leave the hold-over President as free as he can, and President Buchanan seemed obviously unable to handle the situation.

Lincoln was doing his best to see that the extremists in the North did not force matters to an impossible point, and he was trying, so far as he could, to establish contact with the more thoughtful southerners, who realized the dangers which would come from forcible uprising. Actually, the moderates in both the North and the South probably were a majority.

Yet the people who were making the most noise were the extremists. On both sides of the Mason and Dixon line they were building up hatred, at a time when Lincoln's policy was to build up understanding. Until he actually reached the White House there was not a great deal he could do, and during that fatal period emotions were being aroused all along the line. If ever we needed Lincoln, the politician, it was then.

No one can prove an historical "might have been," but having had some contact with politics, I really wonder whether Lincoln's very great gifts in handling politics and politicians might not have been able to bring about a solution by political methods instead of by war.

There is a lesson to be learned from this. Today we can go over the history of that period and we can see that the extremists on both sides were probably wrong. We know that Lincoln was not the uncouth and brutal figure which some southern hotheads made him out. The southern group who felt so bitterly obviously were sincere, and thought they knew what they were talking about, and yet they were dead wrong, and history proves it.

Those northern extremists who thought Lincoln was a floundering weakling were equally mistaken. Because he did not press for immediate reform they believed him a failure. On one occasion the New York Times actually proposed to replace him with a dictator. Today history has shown that they were as wrong as their southern counterparts.

Perhaps we—all of us—will be a little more humble and a little better advised if we take the lesson to ourselves. Bitter feelings are not unknown in politics today. We do not have to go back to the Civil War to find people who feel strongly about national affairs, indulge in personalities, and very sincerely believe evil of men, without reason.

Intolerance, as a political weapon, has been used in connection with issues other than that of slavery. If we remember the lesson of the Civil War—a lesson which is better taught by the life of Lincoln than in any other way—all of us may be protected a little against our natural inclination to feel violently and talk violently.

All of us may realize that we do not always know the whole truth, and that sometimes it is wise to suspend judgment. All of us, in time, may even learn to feel that the men who are trying for a common agreement are usually safer guides than the men who are trying to make divisions or stir up hostility.

As a man, I think the use of hatred, and of intolerance, and of evil stories, is plain wrong. As a man who has been active in politics, I had an added dislike of that kind of tactics. The reason is simple. These weapons make it impossible for men ultimately to agree; while it was my job in politics to try to find ways by which they could agree.

Lincoln's doctrine was that democracy would be impossible if nobody ever agreed, and particularly if a minority felt that it could break ranks and go its own way when political decisions had been reached. This is as true now as it was in his time.

Consequently, I know that if issues are not discussed on their merits, but on personality; if any political group tries to stir up hatred, and of course thereby provokes hatred on the other side, or if resort is had to the tactics of abuse, it becomes extremely difficult for these groups ever to agree again.

Men tend to repay hatred with hatred, or insult with insult, and if that process is allowed to go on, it becomes impossible for them finally to cooperate in carrying out any course of action. And yet, in a democracy like our own, our entire national life is a vast cooperative scheme. To the technical politician, extremism is not only a crime, it is a blunder.

I think Lincoln taught us this, and though from time to time some may forget, the country as a whole has learned its lesson. It cost us the life of our ablest and noblest statesman. But I think that if he were to come back today, he would say that the sacrifice was not in vain.

In this year of 1945, we see a world writhing in agony as group fights group, doctrine clashes with doctrine, and nations war upon nations. Nevertheless, even in this mad disdisorder and strife, the United States has steadily preserved the ideal of good will, of

moderation, of justice. Even in our wildest internal political conflicts today, we do usually remember that there is something to be said for the other fellow's point of view. Even in the terrible rage of war we do have the tradition of justice to opponents, as we demand it for ourselves, our allies, and the victims of aggression.

We are able to attack social problems which are often bitter in the extreme, and still find the way of moderate common sense toward an ultimate goal of progress.

Without trying to usurp the place of the historian, I think I may say that we owe this in great measure to Abraham Lincoln. Indeed, I think it is not impossible that Lincoln himself hoped that this might be one result of his life's work. His second inaugural address, which contains, as you remember, the famous words, "With malice toward none; with charity for all," was itself a plea for greater understanding.

Thurlow Weed, a politician of the time, wrote him a note of praise. Mr. Lincoln's answer is not as well known as is the second inaugural address, but what he said was this:

"Thank you for yours on the notification speech and on the recent inaugural address. I expect the latter to wear as well as—perhaps better—than anything I have produced; but I believe it is not immediately popular. Men are not flattered by being shown that there has been a difference of purpose between the Almighty and them. To deny it, however, in this case is to deny that there is a God governing the world. It is a truth which I thought needed to be told, and, as whatever of humiliation there is in it falls most directly on myself, I thought others might afford me to tell it."

This was Lincoln anticipating the coming peace, and trying to bring back the state of mind and the political attitude which would make real peace possible. He was engaged in his last and greatest attempt to bring this about, and to reunite the country, almost to the hour of its death.

Time after time, since then, this country has had its problems and its troubles. Time after time wild tongues have again been loosed. Yet the lesson of a great spirit and a great man has remained with us to make of this country a union so firm that even the forces of today which are tearing Europe and Asia apart beat harmlessly against our coasts.

The Union was saved, with God's help, for all time. But the real authors of its salvation were the great spirits, North and South, who followed Lincoln's plan, who cast hatreds aside, and in Lincoln's sympathetic spirit attempted to make the Government a means by which this Republic binds all Americans in common brotherhood.

The bond was forged faithfully and well. In its time it has overcome the peril from within, and now we see that it is no less stanch and true against the peril from abroad. That is our legacy from Lincoln and our blessing from God.

Yalta Conference Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a discussion of the Crimean Conference agreements by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and myself over the N. B. C. network at 10:45 p. m., Friday, February 16.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator BALL. The decisions announced at Yalta cover four major subjects. First is the coordination of military efforts of the Big Three to hasten the end of the war. A very important paragraph reads: "Our combined military plans will be made known only as we execute them, but we believe that the very close working partnership among the three staffs attained at this conference will result in shortening of the war. Meetings of the three staffs will be continued in the future whenever the need arises." I think that means that all the propaganda efforts of both Germany and Japan to divide the Allies in the prosecution of the war have failed completely. Do you agree, Senator HATCH?

Senator HATCH. I do, Senator BALL. The agreement will allay fears expressed here of disunity. It is bound to shorten the war and hasten ultimate victory. It is tremendously significant that Russia has now joined the Joint Chiefs of Staffs. The Big Three are getting closer together instead of drifting apart as victory nears. I believe the second subject covered relates to the surrender terms and control of Germany following victory. We have heard much about the term "unconditional surrender."

Senator BALL. Senator HATCH, I think unconditional surrender has always meant unconditional surrender of all German armed forces and that only. I believe the Big Three were wise in not making the terms of surrender which they agreed upon at Yalta public at this time, because Goebbels would simply twist and use them to stiffen German resistance. It is a great advance that we have agreed on those surrender terms.

Senator HATCH. Some agreements on Germany were announced, like the decision to completely demilitarize Germany and to destroy nazi-ism.

Senator BALL. That carries out the proposal Senator VANDENBERG made last month that the United States should now commit herself to help demilitarize Germany. I was impressed also by two words in the paragraph on reparations, the words "in kind." I agree that Germany should repair as much as possible of the damage she has caused, and I believe it is more practical to do so in kind instead of in cash.

Senator HATCH. Senator BALL, the statement by the Big Three summed up my convictions on Germany in this paragraph, I quote: "It is not our purpose to destroy the people of Germany, but only when nazi-ism and militarism have been extirpated will there be hope for a decent life for Germans, and a place for them in the comity of nations." End quote. The agreement also sets up a central control commission for Germany. It has been rumored that Russia was going to dominate Germany through the Free Germany Committee which she had set up. I believe the agreement finishes those rumors. What do you think, Senator BALL?

Senator BALL. I think the agreement is very clear on two points: First, that the Big Three agreed on surrender terms. Russia is not going to impose one set of terms in eastern Germany and the United States and Britain another set in western Germany. Second, each nation, including France, will occupy a separate zone in post-war Germany. A central control commission on which all four nations will be represented by their supreme commanders will be set up in Berlin to determine policies which will apply in all zones.

Senator HATCH. I have no objection whatever to the occupation by the different countries of different zones in Germany. We would encounter tremendous administrative difficulties if we attempted to amalgamate the civil and military personnel of four nations into a single organization. The zone system is much simpler. The necessary overall coordination of policies in all the zones would be achieved through the central control commission. The third subject covered by the agreement, Senator BALL, is one in which you and I have been intensely interested for some time. That is the establishment of an international organization to maintain peace in the future. Do you get any encouragement from the agreement?

Senator BALL. I think we and our allies made a rapid progress at Yalta in that direction as we could hope for, Senator HATCH. First, a full dress conference of the United Nations to draft the charter of an organization along the lines of the agreement reached at Dumbarton Oaks was called for April 25 at San Francisco. The American delegation to that conference has already been named. Second, the big three reached a tentative agreement on voting procedure in the security council which was left unsettled at Dumbarton Oaks. The treaty establishing this organization should reach the Senate within the next 3 or 4 months.

Senator HATCH. May I interrupt to say that I found encouragement in the very last paragraph of the statement, which definitely ties victory in this war and the establishment of the proposed international organization together as means of keeping the peace. Clearly all the leaders involved in this conference recognized that military victory alone would not suffice for the future, that victory must be tied to a permanent international organization if there is to be any hope for peace. I think that was a very realistic approach to the problem of future peace in the world.

Senator BALL. Victory merely gives us and the world another chance to solve the age-old problem of preventing major wars. The voting procedure in the Security Council is likely to provoke some debate. The council will have 11 members, 5 of them permanent because of their great power and major responsibility—the United States, Russia, Britain, China, and probably France. The other 6 seats will rotate among smaller nations. The dispute at Dumbarton Oaks was whether unanimity of the great powers should be required in all actions by the council, which in effect would give each of the 5 permanent members a veto over any action, even in a dispute to which it was a party. It is reported that the compromise agreed on would permit the council to investigate and make findings and recommendations in any dispute without unanimity, but that unanimous approval of the permanent members would be required for the use of military force. I imagine there will be opposition to this sort of solution because it does to a degree violate our common law that a party to a dispute cannot sit in judgment on that dispute. However, to me it is realistic and workable. We are establishing this organization to prevent major wars. If the organization attempts to coerce by force any one of the great powers, we have a major war and it has failed. Futhermore, the quota forces at the command of the council would be insufficient for such a task. It would not be an international policing job, but all-out war, and in the United States, that would require a declaration by Congress.

Senator HATCH. Here, of course, we are speculating as the voting procedure solution has not been announced. Theoretically I cannot approve of any nation sitting in judgment on its own case. In circumstances such as you outlined, the objection would be academic. If any situation reached the point where force was to be applied to any one of

the great powers, then, as you have said, the machinery has broken down and we are already in a major war. I hope we won't quibble too much over possibilities which may never come to pass.

Senator BALL. It would be unfortunate if we did, Senator HATCH. Now we come to the fourth and perhaps the hottest subject covered by the agreements reached by the Big Three, the interim political decisions in liberated Europe. What do you think is the most significant decision reached there, Senator HATCH?

Senator HATCH. To me it is that Great Britain, Russia, and the United States have agreed that there shall be no more unilateral decisions in Europe but that the three great nations will act in concert. What do you think of that?

Senator BALL. I agree with you. I think the unilateral decisions that were made in Greece and Poland were a real threat to the harmony of the Big Three. This decision for joint action and responsibility and the speeding up of international organization were the two major achievements hoped for from the conference.

Senator HATCH. The agreement also provides for joint action to supply emergency relief to liberated countries, for free elections with secret ballot and universal suffrage at the earliest possible date. The Big Three reaffirmed the principles of the Atlantic Charter and also agreed on the procedures by which in concert they would apply those principles. They also provided that the Foreign Secretaries would meet every 3 or 4 months regularly to discuss problems which are bound to arise. I think it is the first major step we have made toward actually applying the Atlantic Charter, and I am for it 100 percent.

Senator BALL. There has been one criticism of these decisions about Europe, namely, that they will involve the United States in all of Europe's quarrels. My own reaction is that twice in 25 years we have had upward of 2,000,000 fighting men in Europe. To me that demonstrates that we have a tremendous and vital stake in the fair and just settlements of quarrels that do arise in Europe without letting them explode in war. I believe that our participation in these decisions is the best way to prevent another war.

Senator HATCH. I would rather try our influence in times of peace to prevent war than to send our men to the battlefields to win wars after they have already started. The Polish settlement announced is one which probably doesn't meet the approval of all of us. Personally, it doesn't meet with my entire approval. I think there is much to the contention of the Polish government in exile. The eastern boundary seems to be settled at the Curzon line with slight variations. What do you think of that, Senator BALL?

Senator BALL. The western boundary of Poland is left up in the air to be settled at the peace conference. Presumably Poland will be compensated for territory lost. It is unfortunate that the clearly Polish cities of Llow and Vilna were not included within the new Poland. This is the one major decision reached which does any real violence to American principles of international justice. Russia did agree that the Lublin Committee which she has recognized shall be revised to include representatives of the government in exile and then will be recognized by all the Big Three as the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity. Even that includes a pledge for a free election in Poland as soon as possible, so that the Polish people will have a chance to choose their own government. I believe the decision on Yugoslavia was much better.

Senator HATCH. I agree, Senator BALL. Finally, may I say that while the agreement in all of its parts does not meet with my complete endorsement and approval, I see in it a spirit of give and take on the part of all. After all, that is the only way in which agreements can be reached. I am very hopeful that this, to me, very progressive step will be but a forerunner of better things and better understanding to come.

Senator BALL. My own view, Senator HATCH, is very similar to yours. I don't think everything was perfect or to our liking. We did not dictate the Yalta decisions, but it is very obvious that neither did Britain nor Russia. The decisions convinced me that the peoples and governments of these three great powers are together on the great fundamental objective of winning the war and thereafter maintaining peace, stability, and justice in the world. We must continue to travel that road because it is the only road that holds any hope for humanity.

Definition of a Good Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Definition of a Good Citizen," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, chairman of the citizenship committee, New York District of Kiwanis International, at the presidents' conference, Albany, N. Y., January 28, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been requested to speak for a few minutes on citizenship.

It seems to me that in order to discuss this subject with some degree of understanding a definition of citizenship is necessary.

The word "citizen" has a venerable history. It meant, in ancient times, the freemen of a city. That lover of democracy, Aristotle, defined a "good citizen" as one who shares the civic life of a city.

I like that definition for two reasons:

First, by changing it to "one who shares the civic life of the Nation," we have a definition of a citizen of the United States that could not easily be improved; and

Second, I like the idea "shares the civic life," which, of course, means that a citizen shares the rights and privileges as well as the responsibilities. It is easy enough to share the rights and privileges. They are protected by Federal and State constitutions, courts of law, and the agencies of law enforcement. But to share the responsibilities means work.

On that subject that great American, Theodore Roosevelt, said, "The first requisite of a good citizen is that he shall be willing to row his own weight."

To enjoy the rights and privileges of citizenship we must discharge certain responsibilities or lose those rights and privileges even though they are protected by constitutions. In fact, the need of safeguarding our liberties was never greater than today. We who are privileged to remain at home—while millions of our citizens are in the armed forces—must realize that we are trustees for them, that we owe them an obligation to preserve American institutions and American freedoms so that when they return, they will not find their substance wasted and their country materially and spiritually impoverished. We owe them the responsibility of protecting their liberties at home while they are protecting ours on the battle fronts of the world.

Too often that segment of our human family represented by service clubs, leaves the discharge of the responsibilities of citizenship and the control of government to the political machines who are made up, too often, of men and women, whom we would not employ in our own businesses, whom we would not retain as lawyers and for whose knowledge, ability and experience we have no respect and in whose character we have no confidence.

A large number of our citizens, including some Kiwanians, take the position that politics are dirty and, therefore, they want nothing to do with politics. They seem to overlook the fact that politics affect every phase of our lives, every minute of our lives, and that politics will be as clean or as dirty as our decent citizens demand.

In this country, where citizens are still free to choose public servants who make and enforce the rules by which we live, there is no justification for our electing second-raters. The explanation is that too many of our citizens are unmindful of or unwilling to discharge their civic responsibilities. If we don't stand for something, we'll likely fall for anything.

The real clash these days is not so much between right and left as between right and wrong.

We should consider a person who takes no interest or part in public affairs not as a harmless citizen but as a useless character. It is just as impossible to have good government without working for it as it is to have a top without a bottom.

Good government, when we have it in the United States, begins in the primary election, where we nominate candidates to run in the subsequent election. When high grade candidates are nominated and supported in the general election, regardless of party label, positive, capable public servants will invariably result.

We can and should, as individuals and as an organization, aid in setting a standard for public servants and the youth of our country, which will be acceptable to all who are desirous of decent and efficient government.

To attain this desirable end, we need men in public office who possess:

"Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor, men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue, and damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking."

It must be clear to every thinking person that our Government will never be any better than you and millions of others like you help to make it and that it will be as bad and corrupt as you and millions of others like you permit it to be.

To be characterized as a good citizen is one of the highest recognitions that can be bestowed upon any person in our Republic.

If we Kiwanians, by our example, encourage other citizens to scrutinize public issues, the character and ability of candidates for public office, and speak out boldly and courageously against that which is not in the public interest and fight tenaciously for that which is decent and honorable, then, and only then, will we be worthy to be characterized as good citizens.

Statement of Chairman of National Labor Relations Board on Submission of Ninth Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by H. A. Millis, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, consisting of a summary of the Ninth Report of the Board to Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The one outstanding characteristic of our agency's activities during the past fiscal year may be summarized in this fashion: The National Labor Relations Board with continuing and increasing frequency is being called upon to act the judge rather than the prosecutor. That is, the overwhelming number of cases filed with us ask the resolution of questions concerning union representation; a declining number of cases call upon us to police unfair labor practices by employers. Thus:

During the past year, as in the preceding 12 months, more election cases were filed with the Board than in any single year of the Board's history.

The number of election cases filed represented an increase of more than 3,000 percent over the number received in the first year of the Board's operation.

On the other hand, fewer unfair labor practice cases were filed than in any of the 7 preceding years.

For the sixth consecutive year the proportion of unfair labor practices cases to election cases before the Board continued to fall. The ration of unfair labor practice cases to election cases, in fact, has been completely reversed. Whereas in 1937 the unfair labor practice cases comprised 71 percent of the cases before the Board; in 1944 the election cases accounted for 72 percent of all cases presented to us.

Viewing these election cases on the level of our daily tasks at the Board, we find:

Every working day of the year, throughout the Nation, an average of 15 collective-bargaining elections are conducted.

Daily, wherever prosecution of the war effort is the mission, an average of 3,400 American workers vote in Board elections to determine their collective-bargaining representatives—indeed, including the votes cast by members of the merchant marine in far-off and infested waters.

More than 80 percent of the total number of workers eligible to vote cast valid ballots, a far greater percentage of participation than is common in political elections.

I am gratified with the record of the Board's work during the past year. The Board's record reflects increasing use of the procedures of collective bargaining and wider acceptance of the principles underlying the National Labor Relations Act. Each of these two significant developments is borne out by what is rapidly becoming an industrial habit in American labor relations: While labor organizations consistently turn to the Board's democratic election process to adjust representation disputes, the illegal practices of employers have continued to diminish.

This acceptance of the principles underlying the act is no accident. For, employees and employers alike have come to know their rights and duties under the law with an exactitude borne out of close observation of 9 years of administration by the Board, with ultimate review of orders by the Federal courts. Labor, employers, the American bar, the judiciary, and the Board, itself, through thousands of Board decisions and nearly 600 court decisions have acquired an awareness and precise knowledge of industrial labor relations. As a result the parties to the collective bargaining relationship have become experienced in determining what line of conduct each must follow to comply with the provisions of the law and to receive its benefits. In essence, we have today a body of law which is understandable and which is becoming increasingly precise.

What the Board's administration of this body of law signifies in wartime is readily ascertained when we look at the requirements and consequences of our wartime economy. With employment at a new high American workers have speeded output of vital material and have worked long hours to smash production quotas. The full exertion of this manpower was not always made under the most ideal conditions. Tensions developed. Incidents which might have gone by unnoticed in peacetime very easily become sources of friction in time of war which might flare into serious interruptions of vital production. It was in this area of labor relations that the Board performed yeoman service. For, in disposing unsettled questions of majority representation and allegations of unfair labor practices the Board was removing the fuze caps from high-potential explosives which might have shattered both production and morale.

That the Board is overwhelmingly preoccupied with vital war operations is demonstrated by the frequency with which the Board's services were invoked in certain industries. During the past fiscal year more than half of the cases filed with the Board originated in eight major industries engaged in producing basic war equipment and supplies—iron and steel (which includes the production of ordnance), machinery, aircraft, chemicals, textiles, food, and electrical equipment. In terms of the number of employees involved, more than 50 percent was concentrated in only four of these industries. Aircraft alone, for instance, had 399 election cases, as compared with 121 in 1942; approximately 237,000 employees voted in elections conducted in this essential industry, representing an increase of 300 percent over the votes cast by aircraft workers in 1942.

To observe that discharges for union activity, refusals to bargain and other illegal activities are relatively giving way to the more constructive issues of representation is not to close our eyes to that segment of American industry which still, for one reason or another, violates the law. During the past year a total of nearly 3,000 workers were reinstated to remedy discriminatory discharges, while 350 in addition were reinstated after strikes caused by unfair labor practices. Back pay amounting to almost $2,000,000 was paid to a total of 3,700 workers who had been the victims of unlawful practices. Company-dominated unions were disestablished in 100 cases. Collective bargaining negotiations were ordered in 136 cases.

During the past year, a total of 9,176 unfair labor practice and representation cases was filed. Of these, 6,603 were representation cases. The unprecedented number of elections conducted in the past year, 4,712, brought to 19,031 the total number conducted in 9 years; the 1,072,594 valid votes cast during the past year brought to 5,220,983 the total number of votes cast since the inception of the Board.

The number of elections involving only 1 union, 3,645, comprised 77 percent of all elections held. Independent unions participated, either alone or opposing another labor organization on the ballot, in 969 elections, or 21 percent of the elections conducted. Affiliates of the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. opposed each other in only 575 elections, or 12 percent of all the polls. Of these the C. I. O. won 286, A. F. of L. 244, with 36 resulting in a no-union vote.

For several years the Board has followed the practice of holding elections in order to ascertain the desires of employees as to representation by unions. While the election device is now commonly accepted, it is not required by statute; the law expressly provides that the Board "may take a secret ballot of employees or utilize any other suitable method" to ascertain the exclusive representative. However, it has been our experience that the secret ballot is the most acceptable method of resolving representation disputes. A necessary condition to the continued use of this practice is that the atmosphere of a collective bargaining election be free of any coercive tactics or undue influence directed at the employees, whether attributable to the employer, a contesting union, or any other source. The Board stresses the atmosphere of a collective bargaining election because it is deeply concerned that employees shall be protected in their statutory right to select representatives of their own free choice.

A regrettable tendency to make elections the occasion for the exertion of pressure on employees by means of propaganda campaigns, subtle threats, and other devices has been observed in recent months. In one case these manifestations reached such proportions that they required the Board to take the unusual step of protecting the integrity of its election machinery by resort to the courts. The Board was successful in the one instance in which this procedure was adopted and obtained an order from the circuit court of appeals restraining the employer from in any manner interfering with the conduct of the election as well as from "interfering with its employees in their selection of bargaining representatives at said election by statements, either oral or written, by using methods having the effect of requiring employees to vote or not to vote, and by aiding and abetting in the circulation and distribution of election campaign material, or otherwise participating in any campaign with respect to the election."

The Board is desirous of continuing to utilize the election method to determine bargaining representatives. To that end it will use its powers to the fullest extent in order to insure that elections conducted by the N. L. R. B. result in the uncoerced and free choice of the employees.

Court litigation for enforcement or review of the Board's orders during 1944 was the most successful in the Board's history. Five Board orders reached the Supreme Court, and each one was enforced in full. The circuit courts of appeals reviewed 88 Board orders and enforced 74, or 84 percent, in full; eight orders were enforced with modifications and six were set aside.

The fiscal year 1944 coincided with the first year's operation of the strike-vote provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act. Under this statute we were assigned the task of conducting strike ballots, after 30 days' notice, and to certify the results to the President. During the year a total of 1,089 strike notices were filed. Before the expiration of the 30-day period 688, or 63 percent were withdrawn, many of them on the eve of polls for which all preparations had been completed. Strike votes were conducted in 232 cases, involving 381 separate voting units. In each poll the employees were asked to vote "yes" or "no" on this question: "Do you wish to permit an interruption of war production in wartime as a result of this

dispute?" In 323 of the 381 polls at least a majority of employees voted in favor of interruption of work. Only 34 polls showed majorities voting against a strike, there being 12 polls in which no votes were cast and 2 others resulting in a tie vote.

The Yalta Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Power Politics Given a Blow," published in the February 17, 1945, issue of the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, one of the leading newspapers of the South. The editorial deals with the recent Yalta Conference.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER POLITICS GIVEN A BLOW

Those who are complaining that the United States did not get everything it wanted at the Yalta Conference have forgotten that this is a world of compromise, that life is a game of give and take in which nobody ever gets everything he wants.

Likewise, a nation that goes into an international conference with the determination to have its own way in all respects and to make no concessions will quickly break up the meeting.

On one of the most important issues before the Yalta meeting, however, President Roosevelt carried his point in a way that will have a profound influence in maintaining the future peace of the world.

In his inaugural address, the President promised that he would attempt to get Russia and England to accede to a system of international commissions to administer the governments of liberated or occupied countries until the people of those States are able to choose their own governments by peaceful means.

This would be a substitute for the old method of puppet governments and spheres of influence that have always led to international bickerings and finally to wars.

It now develops that Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden were in hearty accord with this plan from the beginning, because they were alarmed by American resentment against the unilateral methods that were being used by Russia in the Balkans and by England in the Mediterranean. They succeeded in making Stalin see that persistence in such methods might eventually drive the United States back into isolation.

It was agreed, therefore, that in the future an international commission consisting of representatives from the three great powers and France will administer the affairs of each liberated or occupied country until the people are able to choose their government peaceably.

That will eliminate such situations as arose in Greece when all factions at once grabbed for power as soon as the Germans were out and brought on a civil war that England had to stop.

It means also that there will be no unilateral or puppet government set up by the first army that reaches Berlin, but a provisional government administered by a commission on which each of the four powers will have equal representations.

Unification of Small Nations in Confederations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Small Nations May Unite in Three Big Confederations," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Sunday Star of February 18, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL NATIONS MAY UNITE IN THREE BIG CONFEDERATIONS—PAN-ISLAMIC, PAN-SLAV, AND CENTRAL EUROPEAN GROUPS FORECAST WITH ALL HAVING CLOSE TIES TO SOVIET

(By Constantine Brown)

Three big confederations are in the making at the confines of the U. S. S. R.—the Pan-Islamic, the Pan-Slav, and the Central European. The principal characteristics of these new creations are that while they are far from each other, they are being encouraged and sponsored by the brilliant Politbureau in Moscow, which functions independently of the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs. While the latter serves only as the contact agency with foreign powers, the actual political plans are being framed and put into effect by the Politbureau, whose members are anonymous as far as the general public is concerned.

The Pan-Islamic Confederation is closer to becoming a reality than most observers have suspected. The most powerful Arab ruler, King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia and Hejaz, has finally approved the protocol of the Pan-Arab Conference held last October at Alexandria, Egypt. The shrewd Arab monarch had not endorsed the agreement signed by all the other Arab nations in the Middle and Near East and by the Egyptians because he was not certain who would become the foremost power in Europe and Asia.

The Arabs are great believers in outward signs. When Ibn Saud heard that President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill had decided to meet Premier Stalin on his own territory, he knew he could join the Arab states without much risk. The fact that the King of Saudi Arabia and Hejaz has now joined the other Arab states leads observers to believe that the Pan-Islamic Confederation already is in existence and will require only a mere formality before it becomes officially known as such.

RECOGNIZE NATIONAL SPIRIT

Russian diplomacy has worked hard to bring the confederation into being. Moscow dispatched diplomatic missions to Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt, Trans-Jordan and Iraq. All these countries formerly were regarded as being within Britain's exclusive zone of political and economic influence. The Russian diplomats were not the usual type. The heads of the missions and many of the attachés were Russian moslems who made a point of being seen regularly in mosques just like the rest of the officials of the countries to which they were accredited. They spoke Arabic fluently and all were "believers"—a vitally important point in the dealings with the Mussulmanic countries.

The Russians were fully aware that the national spirit had made much progress throughout the Middle East in the last two decades. They encouraged it and were able to prove conclusively that Russia, unlike the Western powers, was not seeking to exploit the natural resources and people of the Arabic states. The Russians are believed to have been able to convince the Arabs of the sincerity of their intentions. They have fought the British influence in the Middle East, sometimes militantly, at other times through passive resistance.

Up until 1943 the Arabic states had been propagandized by the Germans and the Italians who had promised them complete liberation from the British sphere of influence. When the Nazi armies advanced close to Alexandria and the Suez Canal some of the less cautious Arab leaders, such as the Premier of Iraq, staged a short-lived rebellion against the British. It failed because Field Marshal Erwin Rommel never reached Alexandria.

But now when the Russian Armies are rolling back the Germans, the leaders of the Arab States believe that by getting together in a vast confederation which would have close ties to them may become a reality.

The Russians have played their cards very intelligently. For instance, they have discouraged the Zionist movement in their own territory where zionism is illegal and its leaders have been sent to Siberia. They also are reported to have refused exit visas to about 35,000 Rumanian Jews who wish to go to Palestine after having been kept in concentration camps for several years by the Nazis and their satellite government. Whatever else may have prompted the Russian leaders in Bucharest to refuse these exit visas, it is certain that the Arabs' opposition to having Jewish immigrants come into Palestine has played an important role in the decision.

From what is known here it appears that this Pan-Arab Confederation eventually will include the entire Moslem world from Afghanistan, on the borders of India, to the Eastern Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and the Persian Gulf.

The Pan-Slav Confederation already has been formed but has not yet assumed its official name. It extends from the western borders of the Black Sea to the Adriatic and will comprise Bulgaria, the newly Tito-created Macedonian republic, Albania, and the Federated Yugoslav States, namely Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Dalmatia, Croatia, and Slovenia.

TURKEY'S PLACE UNCERTAIN

The place of Turkey in either of these confederations is, for the time being, unknown because Moscow has not yet decided where to put that country. Turkey will be invited to enter either the Pan-Islamic Confederation to which she belongs racially and religiously or the Pan-Slav Confederation to which she belongs geographically. So far as Rumania is concerned, the consensus of observers acquainted with the situation in that country is that she will likely become a Soviet republic by a plebiscite which may be held in the near future while the Russian Armies still occupy the country.

The Central European Confederation, it is believed in Washington, will comprise the following states: Hungary, Austria, Czecho-

slovakia, and Poland. The consent of the newly created and Moscow sponsored governments of Hungary and Poland is assured beforehand. Austria has not yet been liberated, but as soon as the Nazi forces are crushed it is expected that Austria also will be given a government hand picked by the Moscow Politbureau. President Edouard Benes' advocacy of a close alliance between Czechoslovakia and the U. S. S. R. are well known and he probably has already enthusiastically accepted whatever ideas Moscow may have for the reconstruction of his country in a federation closely linked with and dominated by the U. S. S. R.

Whether the peoples in the Balkans and in Central Europe want to lose their national individuality and place themselves under the protectorate of the Russians is now a matter of little consequence. Most of the governments which have been established in all the countries which are to form the Balkan and Central European Confederations have been hand picked by the Kremlin. They have at their disposal the police forces necessary to discourage opposition from any quarter. Execution squads and concentration camps have been established and those suspected of sentiments which do not dovetail with the views of the puppet governments are either being purged or given time to think the matter over behind barbed wire.

USE STRONG-HAND METHODS

The Russians, like the Germans, realize that dramatic changes are not likely to succeed with kid-glove methods or even with the bribery of a few top men. The most drastic treatment is considered necessary to bring people into submission. And the stories reported by reliable individuals as to what is happening today in Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Rumania proves that the strong-hand method already is being fully enforced.

The three great confederations, which are not likely to be even mentioned in any international agreements such as the Dumbarton Oaks Agreement will increase the power of Russia in the areas where she considers herself predestined to play an important historical role. From the military and economic point of view, these confederations are the key to Europe and eastern Asia. There has been a centuries old rivalry between Russia and Great Britain about the domination of some sections of this enormous expanse of territory. When, under Emperor Wilhelm II, Germany desired to become a world power, she began to expand in the direction of Turkey and Iraq. Hitler had dreams of implanting the swastika in Egypt and in the Middle East.

Mussolini some 8 years ago attempted to become the leader of the Moslem world when he appeared on a white charger before a gathering of Arab chieftains in Tripoli and promised them he would draw his sword for defense of Islam. These attempts of the Germans and the Italians were short-lived. Hitler and Mussolini lacked what it takes to bring the Arabs to their fold—real and unmistakable power. Stalin has it, and it is for this reason that he is likely to succeed where the others have failed.

The three confederations will give the Russian Premier more power and strength than any other ruler has ever possessed. At the end of the war close to 200,000,000 persons and territories boasting untold riches will be added, directly or indirectly, to 190,000,000 Russians who live between the Vistula and the Pacific. There is no question that when the resistance of our enemies in Europe and Asia ceases, Russia will be the greatest power the world has ever seen. She will control more men and raw materials than any other empire in modern or ancient history.

Wiregrass Award to Alabama's Tom Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely and well-written article published in the February 2 issue of the magazine Alabama concerning the recognition accorded to one of Alabama's most outstanding citizens, Thomas Wesley Martin, president of the Alabama Power Co., for his unselfish and untiring efforts on behalf of the people of his State:

WIREGRASS AWARD

The climax came as a complete surprise to powerman Thomas Wesley Martin. The smallish, sixtyish president of Alabama Power Co., longtime promoter of new Alabama industries (including Dothan's hosiery mill) and extender of rural electrification lines, thought he was in the Wiregrass merely to address the assembled chambers of commerce of several southeast Alabama municipalities.[1] When, his homily concluded, Dothan's (First National) banker Wallace D. Malone rose, produced a slim silver cup inscribed "Alabama's most useful citizen" and presented it with a strongly personal as well as public tribute, he was almost overcome. Said Wallace Malone:

"I have the honor of being selected to express to you the sentiment of the people of this section in respect to the useful work you have done for your State. We admire you, and what is more, we love you."

He noted the thousands of A. P. C. dollars spent to bring new industries to Alabama; cited Tom Martin's State chairmanship of the committee for economic development and its survey of post-war employment problems, his vision and original thinking [as] prime mover in the foundation of the Southern Research Institute—which will mean so much to the people of the South for generations. But these, boomed banker Malone, were not the reasons for the unprecedented Wiregrass honor.

INTEGRITY, UNDERSTANDING

He continued: "Mr. Martin, our motive here is not even the honor that you brought to the State of Alabama when you made your historical research relative to the French settlements in this State * * * recognized by the Government of France [which] made you an officer of the French Institute. It is not even because you, in your public relations and otherwise, have always put the interest of your State ahead of anything else, nor because, during that era—the callow 1920's—when most of the utility-baiting was done in States instead of at Washington, you did not then lose faith. * * *

"This cup—and indeed it is a loving cup—is presented to you, sir, to show you that we love you best for your high Christian character and for the example that you have shown to all generations of Alabamans, for integrity, understanding, and love for your fellow man, * * * and it is in this respect that you will longest be remembered by the people of this State."

NO MIRACLES

Tom Martin found the words to say nothing like that had happened to him before in all his thirty-odd A. P. C. years (general counsel since 1912, president since 1920). His address already had keynoted the faith which the Wiregrass tribute payers admired: "We know our assets, we know our liabilities; we can cure our shortcomings in education and health. We can extend a sound governmental welcome to business; we can create and manage industries in our own communities. We can be the authors of our own future progress. * * *

"We need not wait for miracles to happen, and expect large industries to be located in every Alabama community at once," he warned; but declared: "I have faith that all of us pulling together can do many things never done in the past."

He discussed three coordinating and pioneering agencies of prime importance now and post-war; C. E. D., S. R. I., and the State Planning Board. He revealed that C. E. D.'s post-war job survey will be completed within 2 months—noted that effectuating its findings will be largely the task of chambers of commerce. He said the planning board's work "rests upon the underlying philosophy of faith in the people of Alabama and the resources of Alabama."

SELLING STORY

Pointing out that sound planning should take place within the fourfold framework of national interest, Christianity, democracy, and private enterprise, he emphasized that no economic activity should be undertaken by Government if private enterprise can do the job well.

For the program of S. R. I., of which he is chairman, he bore down heavily, noting that economic progress is conditioned on scientific development of resources, and that 63 percent of the wage earners and 65 percent of the country's entire manufactured production is in the North where industrial research also has been centered.

Today, said powerman Martin, the entire South stands at the portals of opportunity. The people of Alabama must build a selling story like a staircase and carry that story to the industrial centers of the Nation. For only by such a crusade will the full potentialities of the South be realized.

Advancing to the speaker's table as Mr. Malone made the cup presentation were the Enterprise Chamber's secretary, Miss L. L. Farrish; R. C. Joiner representing the Ozark Chamber; Yank Dean, of the Eufaula Club. Next to toastmaster Harry Hall, business manager of the Dothan Eagle, sat the Dothan Chamber's retiring president, Charles Adams, who made a satisfying report on Dothan's business year 1944. New president is J. H. Bryson.

[1] The Dothan, Ozark, and Enterprise Chambers of Commerce, Eufaula's Commercial Club, at their annual dinner (205 present) at Dothan's Houston Hotel.

Development of the Arkansas River and Its Tributaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including

an article by Mr. C. F. Byrns, of Fort Smith, Ark., appearing under date of February 12, 1945, in the Fort Smith Times-Record and dealing with a question which is rapidly becoming a matter of increasing interest in many sections of the United States. The article is as follows:

A serious effort is being made in eastern Oklahoma to build support for an Arkansas Valley Authority to take over from the Corps of Engineers the development of the Arkansas River and its region. An organization has been formed at Muskogee, and doubtless others are planned.

Our people need to look this matter squarely in the face and decide what they want to do about it after considering carefully the full situation.

Readers of this column know that I am enthusiastic about the results the Tennessee Valley Authority has been able to achieve in its 11 years of existence in the 7-State area under its control. I have visited the valley, talked with officials of the T. V. A. and with people in the area, and seen at first-hand some of the excellent results that have been obtained.

I want to do with the problems and the possibilities of the Arkansas Valley all that has been done in the Tennessee Valley, and more. I believe we can do it. But I do not believe we should approach the job through creation of an Arkansas Valley Authority. Rather I believe the intelligent course for us is full and enthusiastic support of the plans of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for flood control, navigation, and power development on the Arkansas and its tributaries. I believe we should give equally full support to the newly created Arkansas Resources and Development Commission and the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board for a unified development of the resources of these two States.

There is a basic difference in the two methods of developing the resources of an area.

The only authority the country has is T. V. A. It is the pattern on which the President wants to establish a number of others, including one in the Arkansas valley. T. V. A. has almost unlimited powers over the waters and the resources of its area. Those powers are exercised by a board of three appointed by the President. If they exercise those powers for the benefit of the folks, following approved democratic practices, that is fine. If they choose to exercise those powers in dictatorial fashion, imposing programs which people did not want, I know of nothing anybody could do about it. In its power development program, T. V. A. was pretty rough. Maybe it had to be. I don't know. But it was. Competition was eliminated and a public ownership system was established. In its varied program of conserving and developing the resources of its area, I think it has followed a wise course, stimulating demand from the people for needed reforms and then helping to carry out those reforms. But it could have been just as dictatorial in all these other fields as it was in the field of power. It all depends on the attitudes of the board of three.

The approach of the Corps of Engineers to a river problem is the opposite. The Corps of Engineers is one of the oldest governmental agencies, in existence for much more than a hundred years. It is strictly nonpolitical. It is realistic. It is concerned fundamentally with flood control and navigation, not with public power, while the authority is primarily concerned with power. Every project of the Corps of Engineers is first investigated on orders of Congress—certainly a democratic beginning—then carefully checked by its own engineering experts, subjected to public hearings to determine public sentiment, and carried out only when Congress, responding to public demand, approves the project and appropriates the money to build it.

The funds come from the same source—the Federal Treasury. The difference lies in the emphasis of authorities on power and the emphasis of the engineers on flood control and navigation, and upon the centralized power in a small board of appointive officials under the authority plan, as compared with the democratic expression of public opinion, under the Corps of Engineers plan, through actions of Congress at every step of the way.

For our river problems, here in the Arkansas Valley, it seems clear to me the engineers are far preferable to an authority. We are far advanced toward final river control under the engineers—20 reservoirs now approved, five of them built, four under construction, others waiting for the end of the war; a $12,175,000 levee program ready for construction when materials are available; a comprehensive program of navigation, added flood control and power in its final stages of approval by the engineers before going to Congress. I do not want to sacrifice that and start over, or turn the plans of the engineers over to a new agency whose political and economic philosophy is at best a vast uncertainty. We have almost made the grade after many years of effort. I do not want to turn back and start over along a different and questionable route.

Congressional Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following article on the subject of congressional salaries, which appeared in the February 12, 1945, issue of the publication entitled "What's Happening in Washington":

CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Congressmen, even more than the white-collar class generally, have suffered drastic cuts in income since pre-war years. In 1936 a Member of Congress paid $260 in taxes, leaving spendable income of $9,740 out of his $10,000 salary. Today he pays $1,915 in taxes, has only $8,085 with which to meet his expenses. (Assumptions: married, two children, $1,000 in deductions, no other income.)

A Member of Congress has to maintain two homes, one in his district, the other in the most expensive city in America, neither expense deductible for taxes. Constituents expect each to be appropriate to his position. Rent on his Washington home averaged about $75 in 1936, $100 in 1941, and $150 to $250 today—when he can find one.

Entertainment of congressional constituents—a large item—unlike entertainment of business customers, is not deductible.

Campaign expenses are not deductible. With increasing ideological warfare, he often has a bitter fight both in the primary and in the final election. Moreover, every district unmercifully and unfairly taps its Congressman for charities and benefits.

We may soon approach a condition where only a man of means can afford to run for Congress.

Food Shortage Imminent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, administration inefficiency, constant bungling of the farm problem, and stripping the farms of necessary labor has now brought the country to the first definite realization of a food shortage.

The American Meat Institute, in its report today, states that the American public will have to get along on 38 percent less meat during the first quarter of this year and predicts a further sharp drop in meat supplies for the second quarter. It states that the Government and the Government's weekly requirements for the Army, lend-lease, and the liberated countries will require one-half of the country's total meat production complying with Government specifications. It also hangs up the bad news that storage stocks of meat cannot be relied upon to furnish relief as they are lower than anytime in recent history.

Almost 2 years ago many Members of Congress interested in agriculture, warned Government officials that the withholding of farm machinery needed for production on the farms and the stripping of too much farm help from the farms, taking them into the military service and forcing them into war plants, would bring about a situation that might well produce a food shortage that would slow down the winning of the war. We hope it yet may not become that serious, but there can be no denying the fact that the disregard of these warnings is fast bringing about a very serious condition.

This morning I talked with a high official of the War Food Administration who said "the present run of hogs to the market was way down as compared with last year." He agreed that this was partly brought about by the lack of farm machinery and, particularly, through taking too many men out of agricultural production. When I asked him if he thought we were going to be able to divert much food and meat to the liberated countries as we drive the enemy out, in order to partially feed the people and prevent chaos behind our lines, he said, "I do not think we can give them very much. I do not know where we can get the food. There is a limit to how far we can safely restrict and ration the American people."

It appears that the Army and Navy and the administration, who, through General Hershey, has just recently attempted to lay such a heavy draft on farm manpower, further depleting the production of food, do not learn by the lessons of the past. They seem to see only a part of our entire national picture.

Their lack of such conception is emphasized by the fact that they now insist on passing the May bill, which would take another million men under

the threat of fines and jail penalties, largely out of farm production, and civilian distribution, and drive them into the war plants that the War Manpower Commission says, under its own signature, has approximately 800,000 men already in these plants, drawing high wages, who are not fully employed and whose labor is hoarded and wasted, and is not used in production.

The Chief Executive and the heads of the Army and Navy had better desist from the desire to further regiment the people, had better turn away from the May bill, and endorse the principles of the Barrett substitute which, by an investigation of war plants, will stop this labor hoarding and get 800,000 into production who are already being paid by the Government in these plants.

Apparently everyone in the Nation knows this condition exists except the President and our military leaders. It is time they consent to a house cleaning in these war plants which will increase production morale and save the taxpayers billions of dollars, instead of insisting on the passage of the May bill that will further deplete the farms and the thin line of distribution, bringing about a dangerous food famine which is absolutely unnecessary, if efficiency and sound business principles in government are substituted for bungling and regimentation.

Free Men Produce More Than Slaves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, those who would conscript men and women under the so-called work-or-fight bill on the specious plea of necessity might well pause and reflect that true statesmanship has long recognized that "necessity is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves." Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting a letter published in the Farm Journal of February 12, 1945:

FREE MEN PRODUCE MORE THAN SLAVES

FEBRUARY 12, 1945.

MR. GRAHAM PATTERSON,
Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR GRAHAM: On this, the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, you asked me for my thoughts on the manpower draft. I have never tried to influence your editorial policy against your judgment, and do not wish to do so now. You and your editorial staff have fought a magnificent battle for the freedoms of rural America, and I am very proud to be a stockholder in your publications.

All my life I have been a stanch Republican, and especially since the N. R. A. days have I done everything I could to promote the cause of a free people. I felt that this was best served through the Republican Party because I come from an abolitionist family with a deep and abiding faith in Abraham Lincoln and the things for which he stood. I have in my lifetime seen the productivity of our people in industry and agriculture grow to 3 times that of any other nation on earth, and 10 to 20 times that of Asia, where the great masses of population in this world live. I am deeply convinced that this added productivity is simply the manifestation of the resourcefulness of a free people which can continue to grow without limit if individual freedom is preserved.

The living standards of our people have fully kept pace with this increase of productivity, and even during the worst of the depression America was able to support its unemployed, the ill-clothed, the ill-housed, on a higher living standard than that enjoyed by skilled mechanics in the Old World.

This is the history of a free representative republic in a nutshell, and should not be lightly tampered with. We are in the midst of a great war, with 12,000,000 of our sons and brothers fighting for their country in all parts of the globe. The issues are deep and the tempers uncertain, and regardless of our magnificent victories in one spot or another it will necessarily be a great many years before complete peace can be restored on this earth. We must not resort to any expediency which sacrifices the principles of a free people under the illusion that it is only temporary. "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." This is just as true today as it was when Benjamin Franklin wrote it many years ago.

The manpower draft bill, which has already passed the House of Representatives and is before the Senate, is in no sense a partisan measure. Its proponents say that it is necessary in order to improve the morale of the soldiers and, more significantly, they testify that it is more important after V-day in Europe than it is today. And so they want to have the power to enslave 18,000,000 of their fellow men, including the soldiers as they return, for an indefinite period which may last for a generation in the twilight zone between war and peace.

Of course, we are all tremendously worried by the obvious lack of interest in the war effort on the part of many people, and disturbed by their unwillingness to take war jobs, but should we not look into the cause of these things and cure them at the source rather than put despair in the hearts of men by selling them down the river into bondage? We must remember that it is the invisible chains that clank the loudest in the hearts and souls of men.

Today one can travel from one end of America to the other and hardly see a flag flying from any home. In the last war, to the contrary, there were few homes that did not respectfully raise their flag in the morning and take it down reverently at night. This in turn was coupled with enthusiastic and patriotic cooperation in the conservation of wheat, gasless Sundays, meatless days, restrictions in the operation of saloons, and a hundred and one other helpful and cooperative activities. The oil industry and many others set up voluntary cooperative groups that did a magnificent job in supplying our war needs. So outstanding was this particular performance that Clemenceau remarked that we had floated to victory on the sea of oil. But in those days we were told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and more than two million American soldiers were landed in France. True, they lacked training and in some cases arms, but one never heard of sagging morale.

What has made this difference? It seems to me that it is lack of candor and frankness to the people, the application of heat in the form of threats, intimidation and coercion, and sometimes downright falsehood regarding the progress of and conduct of the war, coupled with outrageously optimistic statements such as the pretense for over 3 years that the end of the war is just around the corner. This, no informed person believed, but the veil of secrecy is so thick that few men can penetrate it.

I am chairman of the Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., which has, I think, generally been conceded to be America's most efficient shipyard, and has been so for many years. Nevertheless, within the last 15 months the men there, working as freemen in a close spirit of cooperation, have increased their productivity per man 50 percent. They are allowed incentive pay which has increased their earnings about 30 percent, and the cost of the ships to the Government is considerably reduced. Among the men working with tools we find over 7,000 men whose earnings in the aggregate average over $400 a month, and they are earning every penny of it. They are producing ships with fewer man-hours than ever before in the world's history.

In the oil industry we find the same thing. With a slight decrease in employment the oil industry has increased its output of products nearly 40 percent, and the quality of the products is tremendously improved to meet the exacting war demands. This is true not only of one oil company but the entire cross-section of the industry. Some places we find the C. I. O., some places the A. F. of L., and some places independent unions, but all with cooperative urge of men working together as freemen for the common purpose.

Why then do we find the arguments for conscription of 18,000,000 men? America has not failed. It is absolutely futile for the Government to attempt to cover up its own shortcomings in leadership by piling threat upon threat, intimidation upon intimidation, and coercion upon coercion.

Freemen produce best, and we have a host of witnesses to this back through thousands of years. Four thousand years ago Homer wrote, "Whatever day makes man a slave takes half his worth away." But it wasn't until Abraham Lincoln came along that a whole Nation became free, with citizenship for all and involuntary servitude outlawed by the Constitution, we thought forever. It was Lincoln that first brought home that the chain which is fastened to the slave was also fastened to his master, and that all men had to be free before any man could be free. Civilization failed in the old world because the "master races" wanted to be free themselves, and still maintain colonial empires which were in truth nothing but vassal states. Lincoln in his second inaugural address brought out that in giving freedom to the slave you assure freedom to the free. Are we then going to "meanly lose the last best hope of earth?"

The farmers and agricultural leaders of America have solidly taken their stand against this bill. Industry is unanimously opposed to it, because management knows that slave labor is not only worthless labor, but poisons everything it touches and undermines the productivity of freemen.

The heads of our great labor unions have taken a strong stand against the bill, although we have heard nothing from Mr. Browder and Mr. Hillman, who apparently sit chuckling in their tent because they know full well that such legislation will reduce American productivity to that of the Old World, cut our standards of living, and make us ripe for their Old World philosophies.

No, we must recognize that our war effort must be divided into two distinct parts. The art of production and the art of destruction are as far apart as the poles. Let every man therefore stick to his trade. Give us honest, truthful and inspiring leadership on the home front, and American production will give to the armed forces everything they can conceivably use. The manpower draft bill takes us back to the antebellum days, and

it is just as true now as it was in Lincoln's time that this Nation cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. Let us hope and pray that our fathers did not die in vain at Antietam, in the Wilderness and at Gettysburg. I would not like to be in the shoes of any Member of Congress who succeeded in voting his fellow men into slavery for something which means nothing more or less than post-war controls of the bodies and souls of men.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH N. PEW, Jr.

The 1945 Reclamation Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have had several requests for information regarding the national reclamation program. Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, has provided me data which I now present for the information of the whole Congress under the heading of 1945 Reclamation Outlook.

All of those of us who are from the West are proud of the work that the United States has done through the Interior Department and the Bureau of Reclamation to roll back the deserts through irrigation and multiple-purpose projects. We are looking forward to even greater things, as the following statement will disclose:

1945 RECLAMATION OUTLOOK

With a record of 43 years of achievement behind it, including the construction of irrigation and multiple-purpose projects representing an investment of $922,000,000, the United States Bureau of Reclamation in 1945 faces a greatly increased construction program for the post-war years—a program for which it is now preparing.

This program can be summed up as follows:

1. Reclamation projects have been approved by Congress which, when completed, would cost approximately $2,200,000,000 at 1940 prices.

2. A post-war construction program has been proposed amounting to more than $3,000,000,000, which would give employment to about 250,000 workers on the site of construction when work was at its peak, and at least as many more making machinery, electrical equipment, and fabricating building materials in industrial plants throughout the country.

3. Publication in 1945 of reports calling for the unified and coordinated development under the reclamation program of the resources of 14 great river basins in the West is planned.

4. Post-war plans call for increasing present installed power capacity of 2,500,000 kilowatts to about 4,300,000 kilowatts in existing plants, and building new plants with about 1,765,000 kilowatts of firm capacity.

Last year the Bureau of Reclamation issued a report relating to the development of the Missouri River Basin. Together with flood-control works planned by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and approved by the passage of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (Public Law 538), this calls for construction of dams, power plants, and irrigation projects at an estimated cost of $1,327,000,000 at pre-war prices. Twenty-nine units and seven power plants with a potential installed capacity of 475,000 kilowatts constitute the Bureau's initial part of the program for which appropriations of $200,000,000 have been authorized.

Reports on the upper and lower Colorado River Basin, Central Valley Basin, California, and the Columbia River Basin are expected to follow in early months of 1945.

Following these will be reports on unified development of resources of the Nothern Pacific Basin, Central Pacific Basin, Southern Pacific Basin, Lahonta Basin, Bonneville Basin, Platte Basin, Arkansas, Kansas Basin, Red River Basin, Gulf Basin, and Rio Grande Basin.

These basin reports, including the Missouri River plan, already approved, will envisage the construction of more than 300 projects, which would bring irrigation water to about 10,000,000 acres of hitherto unirrigated land, and supplemental water to some 10,000,000 acres now inadequately irrigated.

Manpower Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of February 10, 1945:

MANPOWER PROBLEM—1. LESSONS FROM CLEVELAND

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

Such manpower shortages as exist throughout the country are due to two things. First, by cutting orders sharply in 1944, the Army broke the terrific tempo of production, and the war workers left the factories in droves. Our complicated industrial machinery cannot be thrown back into high gear overnight, though it is all set to go except in a few big pockets. Secondly, the key shortages were created by the failure of various Federal agencies to coordinate their programs.

I chose Cleveland to dig into the manpower chaos because that city's numerous and diversified industries, its critical labor shortage and its reputation for cooperative action on all civic affairs, make it one of the country's best test tubes. The members of the labor-management committees of the local War Manpower Commission have never disagreed on a single controversial issue. Like all other cities, Cleveland has bad managements and bad labor leaders, but these elements are kept under control by a group of the ablest industrial and labor union executives to be found anywhere in the country. Therefore, the facts in the battle for production in this city may be considered a fair, though somewhat optimistic, picture of what is going on in general.

LACK OF COORDINATION

The manpower situation in Cleveland did not become critical until the drive started in France and a flood of new contracts suddenly changed the picture, demanding increased production from a majority of the factories that ranged from 65 percent to 200 percent. In January the War Manpower Commission stated that the area had a shortage of 8700 workers. The 38 plants that have a pricrity right to do gate-hiring are not seriously handicapped, but the city has some 4,800 firms ranging in size from seven or eight employees to seven or eight thousand. The smaller firms, most of them important subcontractors, feel the pinch. The only acute manpower bottleneck in Cleveland in the field of heavy industry is not a local but a nation-wide problem.

The development of this Nation-wide manpower crisis is a perfect example of the penalties we pay for lack of a coordinated war production program—specifically for the fact that the War Labor Board and the War Manpower Commission from top to bottom never know what the other is doing.

When the War Labor Board froze wages, there was an immediate country-wide exodus from the heavy industries making the forgings and castings that are the foundation of the whole war production program.

The foundries not only have the hardest, dirtiest work, but this industry has preserved the most antiquated methods and the most backward installations. For these disagreeable jobs an increased wage rate of 77½ cents per hour was established in Cleveland in 1944, whereas unskilled lighter labor can get 90 cents an hour sweeping the floor in clean, sunny factories. Steel and construction workers get well over a dollar an hour.

USE OF JAMAICANS

It is useless to make a patriotic appeal to workers to man these factories as long as they can be equally patriotic at a higher rate per hour under pleasanter working conditions. As a result, the industry has pressed down on the local war manpower committees to meet its needs, but the men go in one day and out the next. As the situation has become insoluble the Cleveland War Manpower Commision has resorted to the importation of Jamaicans. Some of them arrived in a blizzard and a near-zero temperature in white clothes and straw hats. It is comical to see how carefully these men are being housed and fed, in the hope that this desperate attempt to escape from our own national stupidity won't end in failure.

As the resort to a few Jamaicans for one of our most essential industries is a purely artificial solution that cannot solve this crucial problem, the War Labor Board will sooner or later be forced to revise its wage policies in relation to manpower needs for the foundries and forge shops.

If this is not done, what are the alternatives?

The only supply of labor still left in Cleveland is in nonessential industries. If we except a few brewery and trucking employees, these people cannot do the inordinately hard work in the foundries. Enough suitable workers are scattered about the war plants, notably the Negro workers who used to be a main source of supply for heavy industry before they had an opportunity to be upgraded in other war plants.

Can we force American citizens to accept this arduous and unpleasant work at a notoriously inequitable wage rate as long as lighter jobs are obtainable at a much higher rate of pay?

EXODUS OF WORKERS

Another result of the same lack of coordination between manpower and the W. L. B. directives has been the exodus of tool and die makers from Cleveland. This most skilled of all work has always been paid more highly in Detroit than Cleveland, the difference running as high as 50 cents an hour for gagemakers. No sooner were wages frozen than the Cleveland workers moved en masse to Detroit, and Cleveland industrialists were left to hold the bag, as it takes from 5 years upward to train people in these specialized skills.

This brings us to another fundamental weakness in the Federal controls of manpower: neither the United States Employment Service (under the War Manpower

Commission) nor the draft boards, as they are now constituted, could be trusted with the delicate and difficult task of transferring great masses of unskilled workers into the war plants.

So far the War Manpower Commission has gone from crisis to crisis and piled directives upon directives, all of which have failed of their objectives. It would be like sending an army across a bridge with defective supports to give it more power unless it is reconstituted.

The U. S. E. S. has never had a staff capable of handling the people who now make use of it. Blown up suddenly, it is full of ordinary folks who are trying hard to do an extremely difficult job as best they can. The clients, mostly unskilled people, after standing in line for hours, are shunted off to assignments for which they are frequently not suited, or to one that does not even exist. The records of the U. S. E. S. are swollen with statistics that mean nothing, as many of the placements are repeaters. But the most brilliant person would be lost in the U. S. E. S. and the Manpower offices because all of the employees are so harassed with endless reports, telephone messages, and a deluge of other chores that they have no time for the careful placement of workers. In both offices several officials said to me: "We don't know whether we are here to make out reports or further the war effort. We must have these useless reports taken off our necks."

ADMINISTRATIVE FAILURE

Yet, an intelligent War Manpower set-up and an efficient U. S. E. S. are essential not only to handle problems that now confront us but the much more difficult situation when the veterans come back in large numbers. It is a general conviction that the Federal office of the War Manpower Commission is hopelessly incompetent. It issues restrictive orders that cannot be enforced, tells of wonderful results, announces 2 months later that conditions are worse, and follows failure with worse failures.

It has just handed down another five-point program concerning which Washington consulted none of its local officials.

1. To bear down on ceilings. The 4,500 firms of widely varying size in Cleveland cannot possibly be checked as to ceilings unless the local War Manpower Commission have a huge staff of expert engineers.

2. To eliminate gate-hiring. Gate hiring is the only thing that keeps the big plants in Cleveland going. Without this priority for some 38 industries, the U. S. E. S. would be completely snowed under.

3. To clear all people through U. S. E. S. The U. S. E. S. is having a hard time—through no fault of its own—placing the comparatively few unskilled people it now handles.

4. To enforce transfer from less essential to critical industry. Nothing has been done about it so far by the W. M. C. for lack of methods and personnel.

5. To investigate violations or suspected violations of labor hoarding. The Cleveland War Manpower Commission has 10 to 12 pay-roll auditors. It would take a gestapo to cover the job plus technical knowledge which the W. M. C. auditors do not possess.

The local war manpower officials, under Stuart Smith, an able and respected chairman, could do a good cooperative job if they and other local boards had any freedom of judgment and more stuff to do the work. At present they are tied in bowknots with red tape. One humorist remarked "It's like Durante's gag: 'Everybody wants to get into the act.'" The result is chaos.

DRAFT BOARDS

But the results achieved by the draft boards are even worse. Having been empowered by Mr. Byrnes to transfer people from nonessential to essential work, they have tried their hands at it with disastrous results. They have no experience that fits them to distinguish between critical, essential, and nonessential work. Anything to do with metals seems to them critical. So they transfer the most skilled worker in a clothing factory making uniforms to a factory making airplane parts. Result: the Army uniforms are delayed, the man is useless in the new job, and he is mad as a hatter because his salary is cut in two. The two A's or war supporting industries, are "getting the devil," said one official, as the result of the draft board's activities. The police force and the depleted public school teaching corps are also being harassed. The country must be in a turmoil if all the draft boards are behaving like those in Cleveland.

These boards have drafted and still are drafting men with irreplaceable skills into the Army to fill their quotas, thus working against the Army's own interests. But even if they have, on the whole, done a good selective job of military recruitment, this is no preparation for the most technical responsibility of industrial recruitment.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Never has the Federal Government worked out clear-cut policies or an integrated program. Labor and management are not discouraged, but they want to eliminate unnecessary handicaps as a preliminary step to a more orderly war manpower control. As local leaders of management, labor and agriculture know the problem better than Washington, they insist that order can be established if representatives of these groups and the public are called together for a national conference to think through a sound national policy and find the tools for its implementation and simplification.

They maintain that an intelligent reorganization of the whole manpower muddle and the cooperative action in this field between labor, management, and government are essential not only to the war production program but to the handling of even more difficult situations during the conversion and post-war period.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is food for thought in a letter that reached my desk from a constituent in Idaho this morning.

The letter follows:

WEISER, IDAHO, *February 14, 1945.*

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the late 1800's my maternal great grandfather came to America from Germany just before his boys were old enough to be caught up by the hated universal compulsory military training of Germany. I predict thousands of families will flee America in the same manner if this thing becomes a part of American life.

It will be a paradox if, while our boys are fighting to destroy the effects of peacetime conscription in Europe, they come home and find the same thing was "put over" here during their absence.

In a democracy a worthy bill does not have to be put over during a period of national hysteria. Are our leaders afraid to have this idea receive the cool consideration of peacetime?

I pray you will use your vote and influence against peacetime conscription.

Yours sincerely,

RALPH TURNIDGE.

Our Political Immorality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by Mr. R. H. Markham, which appeared in the January 31, 1945, issue of the Christian Century. This very informative article was forwarded to me by Dr. Carlton F. Wells, of the department of english, University of Michigan:

OUR POLITICAL IMMORALITY

(By R. H. Markham[1])

It seems to me that America is letting itself be carried away on a wave of immorality. I am not referring to Hollywood, juvenile delinquency, or sexual looseness, deplorable as these are, but to prevailing political attitudes.

I have spent most of my adult life in central and southeast Europe and have recently returned from a long sojourn in that vicinity as an employee of an American war agency. For many months I was in close contact with events in eastern Europe and could not fail to see that something ominous is taking place. Developments there may radically affect the future of America and of all other peoples. They may determine to what extent the nations of the world will retain freedom, self-government, and self-respect. Yet many Americans try to escape recognition of this unpleasant prospect and of responsibility for overcoming it, preferring to ride along on a current of euphonious self-deceit.

The most striking demonstration of this irresponsibility is a prevalent American attitude toward Poland. Here are some indisputable facts in the situation:

It was partially on the insistence of Great Britain that Poland took the stand which led to Hitler's attack on her. Poland faced the full power of the Nazi war machine alone and without military help. She fought well and since defeat has remained faithful to the Allies. She has an excellent record of loyalty and bravery.

POLAND AS A TEST

When Poland made her stand against Germany, Russia was siding with Germany and helping the Nazis. All Russia's admirers in all lands, including the United States, were then on the side of Germany. They were extremely active in working aganist Great Britain and its allies. Russia and Germany partitioned Poland, both for imperial reasons. Russia's spokesman callously said that

[1] R. H. Markham has for the past 2 years been employed by the Office of War Information, most of that time as Deputy Director, but has recently resigned. He spent most of 1944 in the Mediterranean area for the O. W. I. In addition to the Balkans—where he has lived over a period of many years—he has traveled in north Russia, Poland, the Middle East. In the United States he has been deeply concerned with reform measures for the southern sharecroppers. He is a native of Kansas, of pioneer American stock, a graduate of Columbia University.

Poland was liquidated and advised Great Britain against trying to help her.

We should keep in mind that there are 25,000,000 Poles in a fairly compact mass and only 48,000,000 Britishers. We should also recall that for the sake of the security and well-being of those 48,000,000 Britishers the British Government intends to preserve its whole empire intact, thus continuing domination, control, or ascendancy over 400,000,000 non-Britishers. This means that the security of 48,000,000 Britishers is considered of supreme importance, while the security of 25,000,000 Allies is treated as a bagatelle.

It should also be added that Russia partitioned Poland at about the time of our Revolutionary War and later seized most of the country, as Germany took the rest. The Poles were held in a terrible bondage until 1918. Perhaps it is not strange that the Poles cannot forget that a partitioning was the prelude to Poland's complete enslavement.

These are plain facts. It is also a fact that the Russians, after being attacked, have fought magnificently; along with the Americans, other United Nations, and Britain itself, they have saved Great Britain. Having done this, Russia again insists on partitioning Poland and on setting up its own Polish Government. The second policy is far more vital than the first, though both seem to be part of a single plan. Poland, after more than a century of complete subjugation, followed by barely 21 years of liberty, again finds itself on the point of being controlled by a puppet government.

REMEMBRANCE OF THE PAST

London backs Moscow in this plan and many Americans applaud. Russia and hard-pressed Britain are completely subordinating Poland's interests to their own. Thinking of this, one cannot but recall that Germany, for its security, threatened to take part of Poland, that Mussolini, as Mr. Churchill is now doing, urged Poland to accept, and that Japan applauded, as many Americans are now doing. And, recalling this, one cannot but ask: What did the heathen Axis do more than we freedom-loving nations? Do we not even the same?

The main issue is not boundaries. I think that at an international conference Poland's boundary might well be changed. The vital thing is that we rob an ally of independence and pretend that this is right, "liberal," and "progressive." Would it not be just as right for us Americans to impose a government on Canada that would give us all territory west of Winnipeg and would promise to do anything else Washington demanded? Would it not be just as right for us Americans to impose a government on Canberra that would take Australia out of the British Commonwealth of Nations and bring it into our sphere of control and security? Is it not interesting that Britain does not expect to relinquish one island or piece of the mainland in the Americas, but tries to impose upon Poland a government that would presto-change give away Lwow and other areas which Poles consider just as vital as Britain does North Ireland or Wales? And is it moral for Americans to applaud such an attempt in the name of "liberalism"?

AMERICAN NAME CALLING

Because 25,000,000 Poles refuse summarily to accept vassalage, many Americans call their government reactionary and fascistic. Many Americans call the Poles undemocratic because they hesitate to accept a government imposed upon them by a dictatorial neighbor. It is true that Poland needs land reform, even though a far larger proportion of our own American land is in great private holdings than that of Poland. It is also true that Poland has had reactionary ministers. But it is likewise reported that America has had some pretty bad ministers, or rather secretaries. I heard of one who accepted bribes in connection with oil lands; and it has been rumored that Chicago, Albany, and Philadelphia are not perfectly governed, that Mississippi is not quite a utopia, that Boston's school system has slight defects and that Texas' university is not utterly free from the control of slightly conservative men. However, I haven't heard responsible Americans seriously say that America should be made a vassal of a foreign dictator because of these "fascistic" practices.

A DISSERVICE TO THE WORLD

Many Americans in their attitude toward Poland are adding two insults to an injury. Not only are they giving up an ally to partitioning and subjugation but they are calling that act moral and are trying to salve their consciences by calling Poland immoral. It is as though Jezebel had called the little peasant immoral because he wouldn't give his field to King Ahab. When Americans call wrong right to salve their consciences and to bring peace to their souls they perform a disservice to America and to the world.

Let us look at another aspect of the political situation. Our press and broadcasters constantly praise the Balkan partisans as democrats and bearers of freedom. I have just spent months in direct contact with them and though I have the warmest admiration for their courage and energy I saw that they are by no means democratic.

They are among the world's most fanatical autocrats. We should praise them for being as brave as Nazis, as devoted to their cause as the Japanese to their Emperor, as firm in their faith as Moslems. Bravery, devotion, and faith are admirable qualities, but they do not constitute democracy. The partisans are terribly intolerant. They have divided humanity into Fascists and anti-Fascists and are determined to liquidate, dominate, or exploit the Fascists. Anyone whom they dislike they may call a Fascist and thus place him beyond the pale. This attitude makes democracy impossible. It cannot serve as the basis for a good new world.

The prevalent talk of a world revolution for little people is a sad delusion which we fondly nourish to make us feel good. We resemble desperate Christians who have given up the long, hard struggle for the Kingdom of God on earth and sit around, self-hypnotized, singing of the second coming. The people's world revolution is apocalyptic politics of the most regrettable sort.

REVOLUTION FOR LITTLE PEOPLE

Where is the world revolution of little men? What I have seen on the spot is that little men are furiously killing little men. Little Serbs kill little Serbs; little Croatians kill little Croatians; little Slovenes kill little Slovenes; little Greeks kill little Greeks; little Germans kill little Americans; little Hungarians kill little Russians. In Albania, young girls and boys are busy in the killing.

Of course, since the time of Amos little men and women have yearned for a better world. How beautifully and poignantly the Hebrew psalmists sang about it. What an inspiring Messiah they envisioned. The early Christians ardently expected a millennium. So did the French revolutionists and so did the Nazis. All of us little men have been longing for a better world for millenniums. But there are no indications that it will arrive through a second coming of any sort. When we stake all on an apocalypse, we destroy what has already been created. We go backward and not forward. We become defeatists.

So let us quit fooling ourselves about a good world revolution as little people butcher one another. Let us face facts, pray God for strength, consecrate ourselves to love and service, prepare to rebuild ruins and resolve to help the little men gradually get back as much freedom as they had 50 years ago.

And take the sad case of Greece. All good men deplore what is going on there. But it is easy for us to deceive ourselves about it. The liberals have cried for intervention every place. They have constantly agitated for us to interfere in order to make people do right—in Italy, Spain, the Balkans, everywhere. Well, here is intervention. American guns are killing Greeks. That's what intervention in other people's affairs means. Napoleon did it; Maria Theresa did it; Hitler did it; Mussolini did it. Now our allies are doing it.

It must be pointed out that this is a sample of Big Three cooperation. That is how the regional set-up works. Britishers shoot Greeks in the British region; Moscow kills Poles in the Russian region—and incidentally a hundred times more than the British. This is a foretaste of a world arranged by deals, with each empire getting its shooting preserves. Never in history has it been good for the common man when two or three conquerors divided the nations among themselves. We have no excuse for fooling ourselves about that.

STOP FOOLING OURSELVES

If we in America, who know what right and freedom are, approve of such a plan, instead of beginning of real collective security it will mean that we have allowed ourselves to be led into immorality. We live in a very tense time and are in danger of giving way to mass emotions. We tend to become political holy rollers. As we shout happly slogans about big power domination, democracy, one world, people's revolution, we deceive ourselves and debase truth. Let's leave such incantations and return to integrity, honesty, and intellectual decency.

We should not be foolish perfectionists, and we shall have to accept practical arrangements which we don't like, but let us quit humiliating ourselves by calling wrong right, slavery freedom, and the subjugation of an ally the basis of international justice. Let's get clear in mind. If we still have to keep some of our neighbors in slums, let us not call those slums beautiful architecture or a paradise for little people. Let's recognize them as slums, and with all our might keep on trying to clean them up.

Combined Sea-Air Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to call the attention of Members of Congress to a splendid editorial which recently appeared in the San Francisco Examiner with reference to the proposed hearings before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on the ship disposal bill and post-war international sea-air service.

The first consideration of Congress in this matter should be the future welfare of the American merchant marine as one of the four important arms of our national defense, along with the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps. The American merchant marine is also of major importance to our post-war peacetime economic well-being due to the fact that it has always been a principal agency for finding foreign markets for American

products. Prior to the war we produced fully 10 percent more than we consumed. With the technological advances made in production under the stress of war the importance of this service will be much greater following the war.

Our American merchant marine has always had to meet a highly unfair but competitive field in foreign trade. That competition has not only been unduly increased, but the American merchant marine has been strait-jacketed by the action of the Civil Aeronautics Authority in interpreting the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit American shipping companies from operating overseas air service even along routes paralleling their surface ship lines.

The estimated value of our American merchant marine at the present time is in excess of $16,000,000,000. On March 1 next the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will take up for consideration legislating proposing to sell these ships to American and foreign purchasers. Unless Congress takes steps to remove the straight jacket into which the Civil Aeronautics Authority has forced the American Merchant Marine, the sale of these ships to foreign purchasers will not only increase this unfair competitive advantage, but it will also be definitely reflected in the prices to be received from American buyers in the sale of these billions of dollars' worth of ships.

Information already available indicates that every other maritime Nation is following a policy diametrically opposite to that created by our Civil Aeronautics Authority and is encouraging its shipping companies to operate air service as an integral part of their overall activities. This editorial invites attention to the application of an Australian shipping company to our Civil Aeronautics Authority for permission to establish air service with the United States. The editorial follows:

COMBINED SEA-AIR SERVICE

The recent reports from Washington that Congress is moving promptly to prevent a repetition of the costly blunder that permitted an administrative agency after World War No. 1 to squander most of the American merchant fleet built during that conflict are encouraging.

The most substantial basis for these encouraging reports is probably in the fact that the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has scheduled early hearings designed, as Representative WELCH, of California, ranking minority leader of the committee, says, 'to give full opportunity for west coast shipping interests to be heard."

If the west coast shipping interests are fully and sympathetically heard they will bring out some interesting and vital facts about the future of the American merchant marine, especially in the vast and rich Pacific.

These competent and resourceful American shipping interests have an opportunity to be and are ambitious and anxious to be most advantageous and beneficial to the entire Nation as a vigorous post-war enterprise.

But in order to do so they are going to have to meet some extremely vigorous competition.

An inkling of the nature of this competition comes from the recent announcement that the Oceanic Steamship Co. of Australia is seeking permission from the United States Civil Aeronautics Authority to establish air service between San Francisco and Sidney.

The company further proposes to establish air service between San Francisco and Los Angeles in the United States with Sydney in Australia, via Honolulu, Palmyra, Samoa, Fiji, and Auckland.

In disclosing these plans, representatives of the Oceanic Steamship Co. reveal that not they alone, but the Cunard, White Star, Bank, and Pando steamship lines as well, are preparing for combination air and sea service over their international routes.

The point in all this that American shipping interests will emphasize in the course of the forthcoming congressional hearings is that existing American maritime law does not permit them to meet this kind of competition, and that if they do not meet it they will be licked before they start.

American steamship lines are prohibited by law from supplementing their surface facilities with commercial aircraft.

If this prohibition continues to prevail, how can they successfully compete with the combination sea and air fleets of Oceanic, Cunard, White Star, Bank, and Pando?

It will not only be in the Pacific that this obstruction to the post-war American merchant marine will exist as long as present law prevails.

It will exist on all the international trade routes of the world, in which American facilities are adequate for successful and profitable operation, but from which they will be inexorably driven if they are not allowed to combine sea and air services on the same basis their foreign competitors will adopt.

The most important service Congress can perform to assure the future of the American merchant marine is to remedy the obvious and fatal defects of American maritime law.

If this service is not performed, the old blunders which destroyed the American merchant marine after the First World War will not only be repeated but pyramided.

The danger in this situation is not in the resourceful and vigorous and modern competition foreign competitors are capable of offering but in the indifference and stupidity of our own policy.

Congress is to be commended for a prompt hearing of these facts.

It can only earn further commendation with a prompt remedy of the obstructive and destructive maritime policy to which such facts bear abundant and trustworthy witness.

Alice in Blunderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I offer a brief bit of entertaining literature which appears to have been inspired by recent events that attracted national interest. The item comes from the editorial page of the Washington Evening Star for February 12, 1945:

ALICE IN BLUNDERLAND

"Now that a congressional investigation has shown that Colonel Roosevelt got the A priority for the dog Blaze, while a Senator can get only a C priority, they should promote him. Colonel Roosevelt, I mean," said Alice.

"Mixed up as usual," snarled the White Rabbit. "It was definitely established that Colonel Roosevelt had nothing whatsoever to do with getting the A priority. A Pentagon colonel got the A priority for Blaze. Yes; I suppose they will promote him."

"Promote the Pentagon colonel?" asked Alice.

"No, stupid," said the White Rabbit. "The Pentagon colonel is now in the doghouse for getting the A priority for Colonel Roosevelt's dog. As Colonel Roosevelt did not get the A priority for the dog, he will be made a brigadier general. Is that clear?"

"Almost," said Alice. "I know many nice colonels who also did not get an A priority for Blaze. Will they be promoted, too?"

"You are hopeless!" screamed the White Rabbit. "Now get this straight. Colonel Roosevelt brought two dogs back from England in a bomber——"

"Oh," cried Alice, "I think it is so kind of the Army to let the soldiers bring their dogs back in airplanes. If a colonel rates two big dogs, how many teensy-weensie little dogs does a private rate?"

"Now you've got me so confused with your eternal interruptions," growled the White Rabbit, "I forget where I was. Where was I? Oh, yes. There were two dogs. I don't know what happened to the other one."

"Didn't he go to Walter Reed Hospital?" asked Alice. "Or maybe that was some other dog. There are so many people at the White House always going places and so many dogs."

"Doggone," said the Queen, who at that moment entered the room on the arm of the Mad Hatter. "That's treason. Off with her head."

Farm Manpower Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the letter which follows tells exactly what is taking place in Nebraska. The men are being drafted from the farms in spite of the Tydings amendment. This is in direct violation of the law passed by Congress. It is not the fault of the local draft boards. The directives issued by Selective Service from Washington led them to believe that the Tydings amendment did not apply. The result has been a further stripping of manpower from the farms and the retirement of farms from the production of food. My only hope is that the people of this country will be so thoroughly disgusted with bureaucratic planning and interference they will have no more of it when this war is over.

BOELUS, NEBR., *February 13, 1945.*

Representative A. L. MILLER,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Thank you so much for your recent letter in answer to my request that you do all in your power to help us farmers in our struggle with the present critical manpower shortage. Things are going from bad to worse. Farmers all around us are selling out and going into industry because they find it impossible to carry on farm operations.

I will give you an example of conditions by listing the farms in our school district. There are 12 farms in the district and only 5 farmers left and 1 of these farmers is disabled, 2 are between 65 and 70 years of age. That means less than one-third of the acreage in the district will be farmed. There are absolutely no replacements to be gotten as everyone who is physically able, both men and women, are

working in war plants where the wages are good and hours are shorter. Besides, farmers want experienced and skilled help and will let their land lie idle rather than hire someone who would ruin his machinery and neglect his livestock.

For the next 2½ weeks there is a farm sale scheduled for every day in our county. Our local board has no regard for the Tydings amendment as every young man between the ages of 18 and 26 is inducted if he passes the physical. One young farmer who was farming over 300 acres in this community, has a wife and baby, and who still has 20 acres of corn to pick, was given his induction notice for next week. He has been trying desperately to get someone to operate his farm but has been unsuccessful. Two young men, farmers, of this community who were the sole support of their widowed mothers are also called for next week and are getting ready to dispose of their livestock and machinery.

I could keep on and on relating conditions which will most certainly lead to a very serious situation in food production in a very short time. Farmers everywhere are getting so confused and desperate they don't know which way to turn and, as a solution, they sell out and leave their farms to the care of nature. Something radical should be done, and immediately, to bring the men at the head of the manpower situation to the realization of the terrible and far-reaching mistakes they are making by their ignorance of what it takes to produce food and not expect farmers to do the impossible. They are only human and cannot perform miracles.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. FRED WEISS.

Destroying the God They Worship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Union, published at Smethport, Pa.:

DESTROYING THE GOD THEY WORSHIP

If the United States does not go Communist it won't be the fault of the editors of the New York Times. They are doing a much better job along that line than the editors of the Daily Worker.

Whenever the Times prints an editorial which had to do with the interests of the American workers, it isn't necessary for anyone to read it. It's safe to take it for granted that it is viciously opposed to anything the workers may desire.

For example: Everyone knows that the textile industry, particularly in the South, pays wretched wages. Recognizing this, a southern Senator, Black from Alabama, now a Justice of the Supreme Court, helped put over the Wages and Hours Act, which eventually set up a minimum of 40 cents an hour. During the war the War Labor Board has boosted the minimum to 50 cents.

Labor members of the Board contend the minimum should be 72 cents. Chairman Davis suggests a compromise of 55 cents an hour.

Even if we forget the tremendous increase in the cost of living and the urgent need for increased buying power to take care of our fabulous productive capacity, Davis' figure certainly seems small enough.

But not to the editorial writers of the Times. They fairly tear their hair over the proposition. They say it means "poorly paid workers would not only make no economic sacrifice but would be awarded by a considerable increase in their living standards." Horrors! These poor people might get more to eat!

Of course, we are not surprised. It's exactly what we would expect from the editors of the Times. In their innocence, they imagine they are safeguarding "free enterprise." As a matter of fact, they are opening the way for the destruction of the institution they worship.

GREAT RESPONSIBILITY ON LABOR

We of labor have an immense responsibility at this critical time. Our responsibility is the greater because compulsory manpower controls have been repudiated and the task of helping to supply workers to jobs by voluntary methods has been left squarely on our shoulders.

Our immediate duty is twofold: (1) For those of us who have essential war jobs our responsibility is to stay on the job and give our best work. Even if this means a sacrifice, the cost is small compared to what the boys are giving in battle. (2) For those of us whose skills are not being used to the utmost in war work, our duty is to get from our international unions and the Employment Service or Manpower offices information on where workers are needed in war work and move to these war-vital jobs if we possibly can. The union has a duty as well as individual workers.

Retroactive Choice of Settlements in National Service Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have had several people ask me why certain benefits of the act of September 30, 1944, were not made retroactive for veterans or their dependents. The matter was presented concretely by a resolution of the Harold Mason Post, No. 15 of the American Legion, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., which, because of its general interest, I submitted to the Veterans' Administration for comment.

The question is one of national interest. For that reason, I have asked permission to place both the resolution and the reply in the RECORD. It will be noted:

First. That the Veterans' Administration makes a distinction between "optional settlements" on National Service Life Insurance and "other benefits."

Second. That the "other benefits" are held to be retroactive.

Third. That "optional settlements" are held to be retroactive so far as policies are concerned on which no settlement had begun prior to the date of the act, but not as to those policies on which a choice of settlement had been made and actual settlement commenced.

The question is of considerable importance to beneficiaries of policies where entitlement began prior to September 30, 1944, and a clear understanding of the situation should be had by every agency of veterans' aid. For this reason, under permission granted by the House, I offer the resolution and the reply for the RECORD at this time.

The resolution:

Whereas the Congress of the United States by the act of September 30, 1944, amended the National Service Life Insurance Act providing for more liberal and fairer settlement options and conditions with reference to waiver of premiums, but further providing that such liberalized options and conditions should not be available in any case in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of the amendatory act; and

Whereas such amendments to the National Service Life Insurance Act are unfair and result in unjust discrimination against service men and women and their beneficiaries in those cases where payments of insurance installments have been made prior to the date of such amendatory act: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Harold Mason Post, No. 15 of the American Legion of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., That we do hereby urge the Congress to further amend the National Service Life Insurance Act to provide that the option settlements and other benefits set out in the act of September 30, 1944, be made available to those cases in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of such amendatory act.

Dated this 30th day of December 1944.

HAROLD MASON POST NO. 15,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.,
J. A. CLOUD, *Adjutant.*

The reply:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 7, 1945.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: Reference is made to your letter dated January 26, 1945, enclosing draft of a resolution passed by the Harold Mason Post, No. 15, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., concerning National Service Life Insurance and requesting comment of the Veterans' Administration in regard thereto.

The purpose of the resolution is to procure further amendment of the act to the end "that the option settlements and other benefits set out in the act of September 30, 1944, be made available to those cases in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of such amendatory act."

It would appear that further amendment of the act insofar as other benefits are concerned is unnecessary because the provisions of Public Law 452, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved September 30, 1944, except as to optional settlements, are retroactively effective.

With reference to optional settlements, the amendment of September 30, 1944, in express terms, is restricted to those cases in which payment of insurance benefits commenced on or subsequent to the date of passage of such amendatory act.

The Veterans' Administration does not believe it would be sound or feasible to extend the right of election in those cases in which settlement had commenced prior to September 30, 1944. An amendment to that effect would not only cause many administrative complications but would also produce results contrary to insurance and actuarial principles.

In this connection it will be appreciated that many thousands of claims are being paid under settlement effected pursuant to the provisions of the original law. Some principal beneficiaries have died and settlements are now in process with contingent beneficiaries, or in the absence of such bene-

ficiaries, payment is being made to those entitled under the devolution clause. Even were such cases excluded from the operation of the proposed amendment, the resulting necessity of notifying all beneficiaries of the right of election and making necessary changes in the mode of payment would very likely seriously impair the service in respect of current claims.

Moreover, in every case wherein the beneficiary elects to have payment under a refund life income, as provided in the amendment of September 30, 1944, an overpayment would result, necessitating recovery probably from future installments. The situation would be most difficult of adjustment, and it is not unreasonable to expect that the process of adjustment would produce unwarranted ramifications and perhaps considerable dissatisfaction.

Moreover, other distortions and inequities in regard to basic insurance principles would also occur. Where optional settlements are available to a beneficiary it is assumed that the method of payment selected would govern throughout and would not be subject to change. Were changes allowed, it must be apparent that the factors governing the particular choice of the beneficiary in the first instance might indeed have undergone such a change as to indicate the desirability of varying the mode of payment. However, such a practice if too far extended would produce intolerable results. It would invite a species of adverse selection which would not only impair the equities of policyholders but might also affect the solvency of the insurance fund.

It is appreciated, of course, that the method of payment in the cases under consideration were fixed by law and that therefore a change in the mode of payment would not be a change of an election. However, since it would produce the same results, the same reasons which prohibit such changes would apply whether the original settlement was effected by operation of law or by selection.

Accordingly, the Veterans' Administration must advise that the proposal to allow changes in mode of settlement in the cases described would not accord with sound insurance principles.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD W. BREINING,
Assistant Administrator.

Lend-Lease Shipments of Butter and Lard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the lack of judgment in economic matters shown by Government agencies is well illustrated by the facts brought out in an editorial appearing in the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman, on February 13, 1945, which follows. Since fats can be furnished to our allies in the form of substitutes as well as it can in lard and butter, one would naturally think that it would be done in that way and thus interfere as little as possible with normal practices. That, unfortunately, is not the way bureaucracy thinks and works. The editorial reads:

GREAT TIME FOR THESE SUBSTITUTES

The practice of lend-lease buyers in taking lard in preference to lard substitutes, and butter in place of butter substitutes does not bode any lasting good for the man on the farm, because this buying now has reached a point where the housewife can find the substitutes for lard and butter in butcher shops, but she cannot find the butter or the lard. If she does find it, the points on the butter, at least, are so high she will still buy the substitutes.

The point is this: While lend-lease is sending large quantities of butter and lard to Europe, an outlet that can be only temporary, producers of the substitutes are capturing the only lard and butter customers to whom these products can be sold after the war, the American housewives.

During last year Lend-Lease bought 43 percent more butter than substitutes, and more than 100 times more lard than substitutes for this product. Lard, except the last couple of years, has been a major problem of packers and farmers for many years, and some progress was made "selling" this product to the public. The product was made more uniform. Some packers even developed a lard that backed all substitutes off the map in cooking tests. The appeal of the substitutes to consumers has always been that they are more uniform in quality than lard. The lard industry was well on its way to overcoming this obstacle.

If Europeans were going to be steady customers, all well and good, give them lard and butter. But if they are going to buy elsewhere when they have to pay cash, as they will, then American producers should be left enough of the original products to keep their customers.

Seven Brothers Serving Uncle Sam in United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Eastern Colorado Plainsman of February 16, 1945, carried a headline story of the Roy Berry family of Limon, Colo., having seven sons in the United States Navy. I include the article as part of the permanent record of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Every American appreciates deeply the patriotism of this family.

SEVEN BROTHERS SERVING UNCLE SAM IN UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. and Mrs. Roy Berry of Limon have seven boys who have answered the call to the colors for World War II and all are in the United States Navy. We believe this record beats the previous record printed last week. These boys all joined the Navy from Denver.

Lt. Robert Berry is on an aircraft carrier somewhere in the Atlantic. He joined the Navy in 1930.

Ensign Oliver C. Berry is on the U. S. S. * * * somewhere in the Pacific. He joined the Navy in 1934.

Chief Petty Officer Claude L. Berry is in Hawaii. He and Robert were both there when the Japs attacked Pearl Harbor. He joined in 1939.

Chester Berry, baker (2d cl.), joined in February 1942. He is in Hawaii at the present.

Joseph S. Berry, radio technician (2d cl.), joined in 1943 and is somewhere in the Pacific.

Keith W. Berry, seaman (1st cl.), joined in 1944 and just left Shoemaker, Calif., for further training.

Edwin Berry was given an honorable discharge from the Navy and he is now working in the shipyards in Seattle, Wash.

Excellent Work Done by Army Surgeons in Amputation Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter from Capt. M. Marshall Kissane, United States Army Medical Corps, a close friend of mine from my home town, Malone, N. Y., who has performed hundreds of amputations at the Lawson General Hospital in Atlanta, Ga., and who is thoroughly familiar with this work of the Army Medical Corps. This letter is his reply to a recent column of Drew Pearson:

ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
LAWSON GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Atlanta, Ga., February 12, 1945.

Hon. CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KILBURN: I was interested to get your clipping, Washington Merry-go-Round, by Drew Pearson. Needless to say, it has probably created in the minds of many people a false impression of what is being done for our amputation cases in the Army. I am writing this letter to you only because I know you so well and because I am merely a captain in the Army and have no authority or basis for any statements. Nevertheless, I am a physician, first and foremost, and for this reason I have decided to state my views in the present situation.

For the past 3 years I have been intimately associated with our amputation cases and have devoted my entire time to their care and well-being, which begins the moment they are admitted to the hospital and ceases only on their discharge. My interest in the particular cases goes beyond that point and I regularly hear from a large number of boys that I have taken care of. As you know, our Surgeon General started the program now in use in the Army to care for our amputation cases. It was not the brainchild of one man, but the sum total of the efforts of all the men who could contribute valuable information and time to a problem of such magnitude. Lawson General is but one of the centers selected to care for such cases, all centers being primarily the same in every manner. I naturally am prejudiced in feeling that Lawson General is the best of centers. However, if I were an amputation case myself, I believe there would be little choice as to which center I would select.

Our patients are seen immediately on admission, regardless of the time of day or night they arrive, and their treatment begins immediately. They are in the hands of surgeons who have been especially trained and who devote their entire time to the problem of the amputee. Much has been learned in the manner of surgery and the goal at which the Army surgeon aims is to discharge the soldier from the Army hospital with an amputation stump that is the best possible and one which will not give him further trouble, necessitating hospitalization after his discharge. This goal, I can honestly tell you, has been achieved and the type of surgery rendered these boys, as well as their care, has never been matched in medical history.

With this advancement, rather than discharging the patient to the veterans' facility to be later fitted with a limb, the Army decided to fit the patient while in an Army hospital and rehabilitate the man during the most important phase of his treatment.

After consultations and adequate trials with various types of limbs, a limb of a special fiber was made because it could be made to fit the soldier and it could be made in sufficient quantity to meet our needs. There has been no effort made to get a cheap or temporary limb; quite the contrary, every effort has been bent to making our soldier amputee the finest limb possible. For 3 years we have devoted every effort in our limb shop to improving the limb and in turning out better technicians for their fitting and maintenance. As soon as the man's stump is sufficiently conditioned a limb is made for him. This is a specialized process and a limb made for one man could never be used for another. It must be individually custom built from beginning to end. When this limb is completed, our patients have had a sufficient trial period before their discharge. I can honestly say that I don't think there is a limb on the market today made by any concern which is better, and if I were an amputation case myself I believe I would prefer to be fitted with the present type of Army limb such as made here at Lawson General Hospital than any I have ever seen. Fitting of the limb is not the last word in the care of the patient. His fitting is carefully supervised by his surgeon in cooperation with the limb makers and fitters and each patient is urged to call to our attention any defect, or any other fact about the limb which he does not like. We then make every effort to completely satisfy the patient. He is given a prolonged and carefully supervised course of instruction in the use and care of this new limb and only upon completion of such a course of instruction is he granted a furlough home, where we urge him to give his new limb every known test and hardship that he can so that any defect will become evident. Then upon his return, his limb is carefully checked at the limb shop for any sign of wear or breakage. He then has another complete examination with particular emphasis placed on the condition of his stump, the fit of his leg, the quality of workmanship in the leg itself, and the patient's ability to use his limb. Only when the surgeon, the limb makers, the instructors in physiotherapy, and most important, the patient himself, are completely satisfied with the results obtained is the patient ready for discharge. The same type of limb is made for all patients and the same care goes into its construction and fitting regardless of what the disposition of the patient will be.

I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that there has never been as comprehensive or as complete a program designed entirely for the benefit of the patient as is our present method of care for our amputation cases. Undoubtedly, the primary credit for such a program must go to our Surgeon General, who, for many years, has been vitally interested in the care of the amputation case. I know that if you could get to Atlanta and visit our amputation patients that you would leave with no question in your mind that the program now under way is a tremendous success. I hear regularly from many of the boys that we have cared for, yet I have never received a complaint, or even a hint of a complaint concerning the limb which was constructed for them at Lawson General. I don't think there is anything more that I could say. It is too bad that such things as the recent article you sent me must be brought to the attention of the public. It is also a shame that the public itself cannot talk with our boys and learn the true facts of the care they are receiving. If, in the near future, you have any business in the vicinity of Atlanta, or if any of your associates who are from around this section could pay me a visit, I am sure that they could see for themselves the splendid work which has been done.

Sincerely,

M. M. KISSANE,
Captain, Medical Corps.

Future of the World Is Brought Into Focus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial which appeared in the Toledo Times on February 16, 1945, by the great journalist, Harold Hartley:

FUTURE OF THE WORLD IS BROUGHT INTO FOCUS

The peace for which most of the world is fighting will survive only so long as international candor, frankness, and confidence prevail.

Until the architects of the "new world" met at Yalta there was a disturbing drift away from those preeminent virtues. Confidence had given way to distrust; first, because of developments in Italy and then successively in Greece and Poland.

A rush to establish spheres of influence in the old continent appeared to be gathering momentum. The British were concerned about their lifeline in the Mediterranean. Russia was concerned about establishing western frontiers from the warm waters of the south to the Arctic, along which only friendly neighbors would live in productive peace.

The United States was concerned only with the soothing of Europe's age-old rivalries in a fervent hope that it would never again be necessary to send American boys to war, let alone to die on foreign soil.

Thus, President Roosevelt, and his advisers at Yalta, coveted and asked nothing except peace, and demanded nothing except confidence—in each other and in a modern application of the Golden Rule as a guide to individual and community living.

A broad and promising step toward that goal was achieved at Yalta. There was a rebirth of confidence. Churchill, the imperialist, Stalin, the revolutionist, and Roosevelt, the democratist, achieved mutual understanding and respect for each others problems and out of their confidence came a new spirit of confidence that thrills the war-fatigued world.

Yalta was only a milestone toward the kind of a world we all want—just as Casablanca and Teheran were milestones. The pledge that Nazi Germany will be totally defeated and forever disarmed is a major premise upon which peace will be built, but in itself it is only a reaffirmation of previous commitments. More important, because defeat of Germany was a foregone conclusion, is the spirit of trust evident in the agreement for the post-war occupation of a crushed Reich.

Criticism of the preliminary steps taken toward solving Europe's tangled politics is not entirely fair at this early date. Conditions in Europe have been building up for thousands of years, and a solution cannot be pulled out of a silk hat like a magician's rabbit. Frankly, it is too early to judge right or wrong the decisions involving Poland, for instance, any more than it is right to criticize the Big Three for sitting without France.

There is no question but that the Big Three approached their problems realistically. It took stanchness for President Roosevelt to cast this Nation in the role of referee. He ended a beautiful and outmoded theory of American isolation and with definiteness committed the United States to a position of responsibility for world peace.

The Big Three agreement contains many generalities, but it is couched in less bewildering diplomatic language than previcus conference reports. This in itself can be taken as evidence that the future is being brought into focus for all to see.

The architects of peace have erected signposts for all peoples to follow.

Tennessee's New Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, and particularly Members of the Committee on Agriculture, have keenly missed our former colleague Jim McCord, who left us to become Governor of Tennessee. Those of us who were privileged to work closely with him realize that the good State of Tennessee has put its future in the hands of a wise and capable chief executive, and we wish him well as he takes over his new assignment.

I know that Members will enjoy reading the following item about Jim McCord which appeared in the Breeder's Gazette:

LIVESTOCK AUCTIONEER TENNESSEE'S NEW GOVERNOR

From the sale ring to the executive mansion goes Jim Nance McCord, livestock auctioneer extraordinary in days gone by, and now to be inaugurated as the new Governor of Tennessee.

As an auctioneer Colonel McCord was unique, as you who have heard him cry a sale will testify. He went to a regular auctioneer's school and learned how to do it right, but he always added highly colorful personal touches of his own. Poetic phrases from Wordsworth, Keats, Shakespeare, Shelley, gleaned from his continual browsing in the bookstore he and his brother owned together, graced his chant over the heads of Jerseys put up for auction. It is said that on one occasion his moving and eloquent peroration on an aged dam, with sentimental bits of Shakespeare thrown in for good measure, was so heart-rending that the consignor of the old matron, with tears streaming down his careworn face, bought his own cow back for $95! And the story goes that the buyers, ringmen, and consignors oftentimes became so entranced with Jim McCord's exquisite word pictures that the animals going thrcugh the ring were only cursorily examined. So one time they sold among a lot of surplus bulls a Gold Medal sire for $40 to a butcher.

Governor McCord has a genius for salesmanship along other lines, too. His persuasiveness was responsible for a million-dollar milk plant locating in Lewisburg, Tenn., to say nothing of a stove factory and a shoe factory. Besides being a very successful livestock auctioneer, he organized and served as head of the Tennessee Walking Horse Association and the Jersey Cattle Club. He has published a weekly newspaper, the Marshall

Gazette, since 1910. He was mayor of Lewisburg for 26 years, and quit that office only when he was elected to Congress in 1942. He served 27 years as a member of the Marshall County Court. He has been a director of the chamber of commerce, the Marshall County Farm Bureau, and the First National Bank of Lewisburg.

As an after-dinner speaker, his reputation is unequaled. Such fervor, such eloquence, such sincerity, such pungent humor have perhaps not been heard since Zeb Taylor's day. The stockman Governor advocates an industrial development in his State that will balance its agricultural advancement, and he declares that agriculture and industry will cooperate to see that labor enjoys the fruits of its labor. Fair enough.

The Compulsory State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, for some time there has been a great deal of publicity given, through Government committees and bureaus, to ways and means of rendering aid to the small businessman.

Well, I happen to be one of them, and from my observation this talk is mostly "noise," and if you will read between the lines, these department heads who are so much concerned about the small businessman are more interested in their lucrative jobs. They never speak of economy or the reduction of wasteful spending of Government funds in nondefense projects, and are forever asking Congress to increase their appropriations so they can do something for the small businessman, when it seems that what they really do is to take away his initiative and independence, and get him to rely more and more on his Government. This situation is clearly set forth in the following article taken from the February 13 issue of the Wall Street Journal:

THE COMPULSORY STATE

THE MEN OF BUSINESS WHO BUILD BOOBY TRAPS FOR THEMSELVES

No people ever entered the compulsory state through a door on which the price of admission was plainly posted. Not even the Germans, who seem to like regimentation more than they value freedom, did that.

There are other entrances well camouflaged, sometimes with one pretty theory and sometimes with another. But underneath the glitter of slogan and economic scroll work they are the same. Those who pass through them have a sense of carefree well-being, of having deposited their burdens outside. They seem to be traveling a smooth and sunlit road and they proceed under a peculiar enchantment for, while they can see where the road has taken others, they are blind as to their own destination.

The road we look at now is paved with things labeled "subsidies," "Government guarantees," "floors under this," "ceilings over that," "Government patnership." Traveling the road are three caravans: Agriculture, labor, and business.

Agriculture has been on the way for a long time. Many of the caravan already see the smooth highway leading into the jagged rocks of compulsion. Some would like to turn back, but when they look the pleasant road seems to have closed in behind them.

In the labor caravan there are fewer misgivings. Mostly its members are bedazzled with some pretty new baubles of power. Perhaps, they think, there are more of these ahead and they want to push on.

The business caravan lectures its fellow travelers. It tells them about free enterprise and it warns them gravely that their yearnings for security will bring them to a bad end. But the other two look puzzled and say, "Then what are you doing here?"

Well, as a cold, practical matter, business has less reason to be there than either labor or agriculture. Those two constitute numerous and comparatively cohesive groups, which control votes and so have political power. At least in the compulsory state, they might be represented on the committee.

Business is not cohesive. By its very nature it is as diverse as the American landscape. Its political power is represented by no more than zero and it is probably a minus quantity.

So what is it doing there?

And the question becomes more puzzling when we recollect that business once before started down this road, but was turned back by wholly fortuitous circumstances.

That original excursion was the N. R. A., conceived and proposed by business groups. Under Government sponsorship business was to draw up codes, agreements to do or not to do certain things. Competition was not to be lessened, of course, but just the same there were provisions covering expansion, installation of new machinery, and like subjects. What we saw was a budding experiment in cartelization.

The experiment failed because it was put in charge of a sincere and honest man. Believing in what he was doing, failing to see the result, General Hugh Johnson went ahead at breakneck speed and he had not gone far before a pants presser was brought to court for working too cheap. Had General Johnson been a crafty man, able to bide his time, that grisly set-up that appeared in the early New Deal days might well have taken a hold that not even the Supreme Court would have broken. And if it had, the production machine that is winning this war would have been rusty and antiquated.

Now what is the evidence that a good many businessmen again want to crawl under the Government umbrella?

Here is a quotation from Charles P. Taft, son of an ex-President, brother of a leading Senator, and himself director of the Office of Wartime Economic Affairs in the State Department:

"It seems to me high time that private business got away from its liking, perhaps unadmitted, for the security of Government distribution of business under a quota system and begin to justify the descriptive term 'enterprise.' The only reason I mention that is that, within the past few months, we in the State Department who have been pushing with all our ability for the reduction of trade controls have been startled on at least two occasions to have delegations from the trade coming in to insist with us on the continuance of public purchase or other Government intervention, because they were not prepared to take the kind of chances which I have always assumed were part of normal business risks."

Within the past few days we have seen the head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the president of the American Bankers Association, and the former president of that body battling against Government guaranties of loans. They know that many bankers want such guarantees and are so telling their Congressmen. Such men are afraid of risks. They don't want to be bankers. They want to handle Government funds on a commission basis. How long do they suppose the Government will pay them for such of parasitical performance?

It was not long ago that there was a drive on Congress to get a huge appropriation for Government advertising in newspapers, which fortunately was defeated. But in a country which should prize its free press, some of the custodians were looking for a Government subsidy.

There has recently been an unusual amount of literature setting forth the benefits of cartels—and those booklets don't just happen. Someone pays to print and distribute them. Now one simple fact about cartels is that there must be some power to enforce the agreements that bind them. Either directly or indirectly, that hand is a government. There probably never has been a cartel of any pretensions or prestige which did not involve government power openly or secretly.

Talk to some of our so-called bureaucrats about free enterprise and see the smug look. If they will unloosen their tongues, they can tell a great deal about how this business group thinks perhaps one government control is permanently good and how that group likes another. So there it is again, the flight from risk.

How much good do solemn lectures on the illusion of security do when the wage earners to whom they are addressed can read the financial pages and see how some executives are being given annuities and pensions on top of sizable salaries? Stockholders read of these and complain with just cause. Some propose action, but not always the action that lies within their power as stockholders and investors. Some suggest that this or that government agency take a hand. Could it be that they are under the delusion that government will manage their affairs and still allow them dividends?

The vast majority of those in business and finance in this country do not, we believe, desire the Government in their affairs. They want the situation which put the Government there ended as soon as possible. But there are far too many who want the Government to build them shelters from the risks without which free enterprise is not free.

A good many German industrialists and financiers thought that Adolf Hitler was not so bad. They gave him money. He came to power and for a time they had pleasant sailing with the Government the main partner in their cartels.

But there came a day when they went to Herr Hitler and he was no longer so agreeable. He is reputed to have remarked that he "hoped these gentlemen were under no delusion that he had built this structure for their benefit."

Those German businessmen must have left that conference with the sickly feeling of a man who is the victim of his own booby trap.

What a tragedy if history recorded that business in America was as stupid!

Will the Basketball Scandal Affect Sports?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked beyond words when the recent exposé of the bribery scandal involving several young basketball players at Brooklyn City College came to light, and I have attempted to analyze its effects on

collegiate sports generally. One of the finest approaches to this situation was made by Lt. Col. J. Howard Berry in his Nation-wide radio address delivered Saturday evening, February 17, 1945.

Lieutenant Colonel Berry, of the National Selective Service Headquarters, Washington, D. C., is one of the Nation's greatest all-around athletes. He has the distinction of being the only athlete in intercollegiate competition to win the decathlon championship in 1914, 1915, and 1916. While a student at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., he was selected as fullback on the All-American football teams of 1916 and 1917 by Walter Camp. Many sports writers in the Nation consider him one of the greatest all-around athletes of all-time, second only to the inimitable Jim Thorpe.

I am happy to include in my remarks the above-mentioned radio address by Colonel Berry:

The recent exposé of the bribery of several young athletes of an eastern college basketball team came as a profound shock to all who are interested in the development of American youth. It brought sharply to the front the entire question of the value of intercollegiate athletics as an educational force. It raised the problem of athletics as a business or as a part of the educational program. It raised the moral issue on outside interference, and even on the wider question of the effect on moral character of athletics and physical education. The immediate reaction is somewhat too violent but let us first understand how venal what happened is, and then let us look at the larger problem.

I do not concede that the incident of a few young and misguided athletes deduced by moral outcasts should be held to condemn, or even seriously retard, competitive sports as an aid to physical training in our schools. But it does bring to light, and emphasize, a too prevalent weakness in the manner or method of their conduct. It cries out to athletic instructors, coaches, trainers, of the fundamental need for stressing those benefits of physical education which far transcend the elation of victory in competition—its possibilities for the development of high morals and morale as well as for upbuilding of the body. And it cries most loudly to those who have charge of youthful sports, both in and out of school. It warns them that they have supervision over the competitive sports in which their charges engage and, therefore, the responsibility for their conduct.

The gambler we will always have with us, for it is human nature to wager. But there is no place for the so-called professional gambler in clean sports, for he represents nothing but temptation to dishonesty.

Even more abhorrent and menacing to the cause of physical training is the insidious encroachment of the swindler who poses as a gambler into the field of school sports. There is no language strong enough to describe his turpitude or reveal his rapacity. He does not gamble, because it is not in his vile psychology to take a chance. He wants a sure thing, and no means are too dastardly to insure it.

A bandit avows his deed, does it openly. A swindler sneaks to the same thievery. There is a frank way and a mean way of doing even the dirtiest deed. The swindling gambler takes the meanest way of doing the dirtiest deed. In competitive sports, his method is to suborn participants and he sees a fertile field in college sports because of the immaturity of his prospective victims. As far as possible he stays in the clear and works through his jackals—underlings in the underworld, petty criminals and moronic gangsters whose aborted lives compel them to take the chances of detection he thus avoids.

This is the type of gambler who recently tried to debauch the sport of basketball here in the East. He is the same type that, some years ago, ruined bicycle racing which then attracted hundreds of thousands of fans and which today is seen no more. He is the type of gambler who is cowardly, sleek, stealthy, mousing and mean. He is a blood-sucker and he will suck the lifeblood from any sport to which his tentacles become fastened.

His tools, the little gamblers, search out his victims that they may pick the bones he leaves for them. Inexperienced youth are their quarry. They flatter them, inflame their passions, pander to their appetites, debauch, cheat, and destroy them. Youth caught by their wiles, and firmly entangled in the swindling gamblers tentacles, revolve but briefly in his orbit of spurious affluence or in the arenas of sport—the brothel, the doctor's ship detection, disgrace, and disappearance from the realms of respectability and the field in which lasting fame might have been attained, is the usual course.

Following the exposé of bribe-taking by several basketball players of an eastern school, many well-intentioned men offered many hopeful suggestions. Most of these recommendations, however, were simply surface remedies—not cures.

Some saw in it a result of the stopping of horse racing that steered touts and professional gamblers toward basketball as a substitute field for their activities. Yet observers who know the facts have been worried about gambling in basketball for at least a decade. Increased wartime incomes undoubtedly have increased the desire to gamble and furnishes the means as well. The swindler's opportunities have been enlarged, but that is not the reason for his existence.

Others would take basketball away from the public arenas and put it back on the campus. That is going to be helpful but as a solution it is oversimplified. There was gambling on the game before it left the campus and college players were approached by fixers.

From all we can learn, these approaches failed. But the fact that they were made is proof enough that the campus is not absolutely safe territory.

Nor can you say that limiting attendance to alumni and other presumably safe spectators is the answer. It is a known fact that thousands of dollars are bet every week on college football games by men who never travel to the games—indeed they live hundreds of miles from the colleges involved. Barring gambling at the games simply clears the atmosphere around the court. The heavy betting isn't done at the games, just as the "fixing" in the Brooklyn case wasn't done on the campus.

If the games are taken back to the campus, as they probably will be after the war when colleges will build arenas adequate for playing and spectator accommodations, then obviously the colleges will have the sole responsibility for the honesty of their players. It will be an awesome responsibility. Definitely college sports, now in most cases are public sports since tickets are sold to any and all comers, have moved a long way from the old, casual days. And yet who can say that they haven't done a lot of good?

College sports crowds have come to sense college loyalties and college ideals. Boys who otherwise might not have gone to college are attracted by the glamor of sports. If, after this war, colleges refrain from subsidizing and pampering of athletes who can't keep up with their classes, a sad scandal that followed the last war, they will be off on the right foot.

A boy isn't easily fooled. If he knows he can lag in classwork and get fixed up by his coach, he won't study. And what is his attitude when he knows some wires have been pulled to get him into college with inadequate credits?

Laws against bribing athletes, professional or amateur, could help. But laws against murder and stealing have not eliminated those crimes. It all gets back to the integrity of the college, the integrity of the coach, and the integrity of the players. In peacetime, a coach has a chance to study his boys as freshmen and as up-coming varsity candidates. Today, youngsters whip into college and out again. They have no chance to learn college loyalty; many are going to war. Unfortunately, they see around them evidences of black markets and other home-front vice. They cannot help becoming somewhat cynical, even in their teens. Older Americans are not setting them any perfect example by any means.

The Brooklyn incident is pathological. It is exceptional. It was news, and the revulsion that the news brought shows that the body of public opinion is sound, and colleges want to do the right things. We must not forget the thousands upon thousands of young men who are giving their all in effort and spirit on athletic fields of all kinds, finding satisfaction in the game itself and in their loyalty to their alma mater.

Colleges and universities ought to clean their own houses. There ought to be no subsidies of athletics and no winking at their own violations of recruiting for athletes. On the educational side there ought to be a strict admission policy, no winking at lack of preparation by athletes, no soft courses nor soft curricula. All sports and athletics should be justified by their recreative and educational values. Too large an investment in a stadium, or an effort to make football or basketball help finance dormitories or help college finances, should not tempt colleges to wink at bad practices, for the promise of financial gain is for the overwhelming number of colleges illusory.

American sports are fundamentally sound. They have rich values for the morale of our community life. They have been factors in building up the young men who are winning the wars in Europe and in Asia. Let us be jealous of the reputation of our sports. Let the game be its own reward. Let us keep the spirit of play. Let us make them a factor in the training of the young. Let us keep them clean—as clean as a hound's tooth.

Nor let us forget that sports and athletics are primarily, if not solely, in the interest of the boys' welfare taking part in them. When the center of interest shifts we are on the wrong track and disaster and wrecks follow. Let us keep on the main track whose destination is the welfare of youth. That is the best interest of all, the sport, the community, and the Nation.

Mr. Ted Steele, of Pearl River, Rockland County, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story of a man who lives in my home district and who has, in my opinion, made an unusual contribution to the war effort. I am proud of the war record of the people of my

community and I cite the record of the home-front work accomplished by Mr. Ted Steele as but one instance.

A well-known orchestra leader, he is the owner and operator of a large fur-rabbitry farm in Pearl River, Rockland County, N. Y. Since 1940, he has been raising rabbits which are bought by Army and Navy agencies for medical purposes. The serum obtained from these animals has saved many lives in the service. Last week he was informed that there was an emergency shortage of Webster mice now urgently needed for the treatment of a most serious disease which has hit a number of boys overseas. At his own expense, he combed the country from coast to coast, discovered a source, had some breeders shipped by air express, and is now devoting himself, in addition, to this important project.

The following is from the pages of the next issue of a national magazine, This Month, of which I have seen the advance proofs:

There is a very personable, and popular orchestra leader in New York who is never seen by his musicians, or business associates or friends excepting when he is actually needed on the scene for rehearsal or performance.

His name is Ted Steele and he devotes the bulk of his time and has done so, since 1941, to the raising of rabbits. He is frequently late for his radio auditions because of his interest in rabbits and other laboratory animals such as guinea pigs and white mice.

He will tell you frankly that while he thinks the entertainment world is wonderful, he considers his real job in life the care and breeding of these animals and as a matter of statistical fact is one of the world's largest suppliers.

His farm at Pearl River, near Nyack, N. Y., produces some 12,000 rabbits a year as well as thousands of pigs, etc. All of the animals are utilized for medical experimental, preventive, or curative purposes. Serums extracted from rabbits, for example, are widely used in pneumonia cases. Among Steele's regular customers are 130 Government and civilian hospitals, the Army Medical Corps, the Chemical Warfare Division, and the Brooklyn Navy Hospital.

Without getting too technically involved, the value of rabbits to medical science lies in the fact that rabbit blood in composition and structure is nearer to that of the human being than any other animal with the exception of monkeys.

The other day Steele, who is heard on the N. B. C. Chesterfield supper-club program, was informed by Government officials that there was a terrible shortage of Webster mice which are a source of a serum used to treat a very serious disease affecting men in the armed forces stationed in tropical climes. He took time out from his rabbits and music and family for 2 days, getting on the long-distance phone and combing the country until he found a west coast source of breeders. He convinced the California farmer only after long discussion that he could help the situation, the critical shortage, by virtue of his experience in related fields, and a number of the mice were shipped air express to LaGuardia Field where Steele and his charming wife met same and drove up to his farm in the middle of the night so that they could get going on development by morning.

It isn't money which causes Steele to do all this and it is partly because he has loved working with animals of this type ever since his boyhood on a farm. But it is mostly his desire to help his country in time of great need. A point which emerges like a sore thumb from analysis of the facts is that civilians can very often help their Government's war effort in a private way because Government officials can't always find the right answer or have the time or opportunity to do so even if they could.

This Month magazine salutes Ted Steele.

An International Bill of Rights Will Prevent Another War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, at a time like this it is hard to look upon events and say: "The human race is making progress." Within the short span of one generation we have seen two wars, conflicts of such dimensions that all the great battles of past history shrink by comparison. The death tolls of the great war were high enough to frighten us into a solemn resolve that we would never again permit such destruction of human lives. But here we are engaged by the millions in warfare, and this time on a scale so gigantic that the full realization of it is beyond the ability of the human mind to grasp.

Last time, as now, we knew what we were fighting against: Militarism and aggression and the world-domination complex of the German Nation. We knew, too, then as now, that we were fighting for certain principles: The right of nations to live in security and peace, the right of peoples to live in freedom. We fought a war for democracy. But, in 1918, when the guns were stilled, and the dead were buried, we dried our tears and promptly withdrew into our little corner. Like everyone else, we were tired; we thought we had done enough. Se we did not bother to finish the job and win the peace.

Well, we are finishing the job today.

Because, last time, we talked about international cooperation, but thought it might be safer to protect our own narrow interests; because we talked about the rights of man, but failed to see what had to be done to protect them; because we talked about the long view, but acted with fatal short-sightedness, our enemies, the enemies of freedom and mankind, were able to stage a come-back and make another lunge for conquest. And the battle today is more gruesome and more devastating than the most terrible nightmare.

Historically, therefore, it is correct to call this war a continuation of the great war. Yet because World War No. 2 differs so greatly from the first war in degree, it is also different in kind. Soldiers of this war are not always men and women in uniform; the battlefronts are directly connected, through production lines and bombing routes, with the folks back home. The people of Europe and Asia know this; our armed forces, serving in every far-flung theater of war, know it too. And so do we in America.

For purposes of war, the world has become one sphere of operations, one closely knit field of action. And there is not the slightest likelihood that the situation will change in peace. It will not. The interrelationship of the human race will grow stronger. Steps taken by one group will inevitably react to the welfare or the detriment of others. There is nothing original or new in this conclusion. I am only repeating what everyone has said in urging international organization for peace. Some far-sighted men had a dim inkling of this truth 30 years ago, in the early stages of our twentieth century war. But today it has been driven home to millions. There is a realization abroad, across the earth, reaching into every land, that international cooperation is a crying need. It is no longer a phrase for diplomats to play with.

The record of man's attempts to build a peaceful world is neither long nor impressive in comparison with the record of human warfare. But the people of the earth have seen enough of battle; they have felt the sting of bullets and borne the agony of death. They know, at last, why international cooperation must be made to work, and what is needed to make it work. And therein lies the difference between the first and second stages of twentieth century war.

For in this stage we have learned, beyond the possibility of doubt, that the suppression of one man's liberty can lead to the oppression of a nation—that the denial of human rights to one group spells the downfall of liberty for all. From the insecurity and homelessness of a few may spring the chaos which brings insecurity and homelessness to millions. This is the age-old lesson of religion, "I am my brother's keeper," but now we know that it is the only practical foundation on which to build a real, a lasting, a meaningful peace for ourselves and the world.

Humanity, which has always revered its religious prophets, has also been pretty consistent in ignoring them when it came to concrete application of their principles. We paid lip service to the God of our fathers, but we were careful to keep our dealings with men on what we chose to consider a much more practical, realistic plane. "Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceedingly small." It has taken many long centuries, but the day has at least dawned when we, all of us, must take the word of God literally and let it speak in our transactions in the market place. We must do it, if we would survive as human beings. The peoples of the earth demand it; the American people demand it.

Evidence of this comes from many quarters, from every corner of our country. Long ago, civilized people in every nation recognized the Fascist aggressors as anti-Christian. Moreover, the war from its very inception was understood, and rightly so, as a war against the moral code of all countries—against the dignity of man. In the United States, where every religion finds its followers, this

awareness of the true issues behind the war has been given strong and frequent expression. The result is a demand, growing clearer by the hour, that the protection of basic human rights, as defined in all religious teachings, be made an integral part of the peace, in deed as in word.

In October of 1943 the Declaration on World Peace brought this demand forcibly before the American public. One hundred and forty-four individuals, prominent members of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths, signed this seven-point declaration, of which the first sentence reads:

The moral law must govern world order.

But it is in point 2 of the declaration that the principles of which I speak were most sharply outlined. I quote:

The rights of the individual must be assured. The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights, and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

This declaration shows the complete agreement reached by representative Americans on the fundamental issues confronting us today.

Several months earlier the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, representing 25 Protestant and orthodox denominations, issued a program known as the Six Pillars of Peace, through the Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace. After dealing with the political and economic measures necessary, the program concludes:

The peace must establish in principle, and seek to achieve in practice, the right of individuals everywhere to religious and intellectual liberty.

Part of the comment on this sixth pillar is worth quoting:

Wars are not due only to economic causes. They have their origin also in false ideologies and in ignorance. Peace, furthermore, cannot be preserved merely by documentary acts that create political bodies and define their powers and duties. Such bodies can function effectively only as they can count upon a public opinion to understand and support them. It is, therefore, indispensable that there exist the opportunity to bring the people of all the world to a fuller knowledge of the facts and a greater acceptance of common moral standards.

In the spring of 1944, 1,250 leading Protestants who had subscribed to the Six Pillars of Peace appealed to President Roosevelt, Congress, and the people of the United States, to take practical steps immediately to form the nucleus of a general world organization. There can be no question, this time, of the people's determination to see their ideals made a living reality.

This same determination prompted the statement issued by the Catholic bishops of the United States last November. In unequivocal language, in clear and ringing tones, the statement voiced the convictions of our Catholic Americans, both on the ideologies involved in this war and on the realistic steps necessary to build a just and lasting peace. Here, as in the other statements, there was no evading of realities, but rather a sharp admonition of what facing them involves. Said this statement, signed by the 10 archbishops and bishops who compose the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference:

If we are to have a just and lasting peace, it must be the creation of a sane realism, which has a clear vision of the moral law, a reverent acknowledgment of God its Author, and a recognition of the oneness of the human race underlying all national distinctions.

Furthermore, and I continue to quote:

A nation which refuses to accord to its own people the full enjoyment of innate human rights cannot be relied upon to cooperate in the international community for the maintenance of a peace which is based on the recognition of national freedom.

Surely this is a far cry from the notion held not so long ago that as long as people mind their own business behind their own national frontiers the world will go merrily on, bringing peace and prosperity and security to all.

To emphasize the deepening conviction that this notion is all wrong, 1,325 leading Americans recently signed a declaration of human rights issued by the American Jewish Committee. The signatories are persons of every creed and color, of every shade of political opinion; people prominent in government, religion, business, the professions, the arts and sciences. The President, although he did not sign the document, gave it personal endorsement in a letter from his secretary, William D. Hassett. Among the signers are Supreme Court Justice Frank Murphy; the late Alfred E. Smith; Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York; former Postmaster General James A. Farley; Henry Wallace; Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; Langston Hughes, Negro poet and author.

Like the Protestant and Catholic pronouncements, which it parallels, the declaration of human rights asks for a recognition, in the peace to come, of those fundamental moral claims which arise from the God-given attributes of every man, woman, and child. I quote from the preamble:

With the inevitable end of Hitler, the struggle begins, not of tank and plane but of heart and soul and brain, to forge a world in which humanity may live in peace. This new world must be based on the recognition that the individual human being is the cornerstone of our culture and our civilization. All that we cherish must rest on the dignity and inviolability of the person, of his sacred right to live and to develop under God, in whose image he was created.

I could go on, quote further and say more, but I think you have heard enough to realize how wide and how deep is the longing of our fellow Americans for a world of peace, for a world that promises human beings some measure of security and happiness.

The Mexican Government is the first government formally to recognize this yearning of all peoples for these elementary principles. Only a few days ago it proposed that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals be supplemented with a provision for an international bill of rights which would guarantee the fundamental human rights. I am told that at the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, which is to be held in Mexico City, beginning February 21, this proposal will be on the agenda.

Like the peoples of other nations, the American people want to be heard at the peace table. Is it so much that they ask? Is it so much we all ask? There is no one of us who has not given and is not giving to the fight against tyranny. There is no one of us who would not give more if he could. God knows, the millions who have spilled their blood have a right to be heard. The mothers and fathers, the widows and orphans of those who have died have a right to be heard.

We must act this time. We must look the monster of war in the face, and finish the job of finishing him. Else we shall inherit the curse of the dying and the dead; else we shall condemn future generations to die in more terrible wars to come. We must act, and now. Even at this moment, those who fought and sacrificed in the battles of this war are asking us, the lawmakers, what we are going to do about it. In the words of Edna St. Vincent Millay, they speak:

This was a war for Freedom; so we thought it;
And so we fought it.
You knew this, all of you.
You promised us a new
World—a decent one this time, a world a man might live in without shame.
How is it going forward, this great enterprise, this plot
To outwit Evil?—Are the blueprints done?
And may we see them?

A New Turn for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 18, 1945:

A NEW TURN FOR AMERICA

As is right and proper, the Crimea Charter proclaimed last week at Yalta is now being subjected to the analysis and criticism of world opinion. The charter covers a wide area and every detail is important. But taking the document as a whole, its principal significance lies not in its individual provisions but in the fact that it represents an earnest effort by the three most powerful nations in the world to find common ground for collaboration in war and peace, and by doing so to reverse the previous dangerous trend of events.

The charter represents an effort to replace the loose military understandings regarding

the scope and timing of actions on the various fronts—which did not always work out in practice—with closer coordination of efforts planned in detail and jointly by the three military staffs. It marks an agreement to replace the hitherto divergent policies toward Germany with a joint policy executed by the combined forces of the Allies under a central Allied control commission. It proposes a settlement of the most difficult remaining issues by the creation of an international organization for the maintenance of peace. It proclaims, finally, the mutual agreement of the three powers to concert their policies in assisting the liberated peoples of Europe not only to throw off the last vestiges of nazi-ism and fascism, but also to solve their pressing political and economic problems through democratic means. In all these points the charter represents a move to end the drift toward independent policies and unilateral actions, toward spheres of influence, exclusive alliances, and other expedients, and to replace these methods with broader international agreements and more universal organizations in which ultimately all peace-loving nations can join. If the charter can accomplish this, it will come to be regarded as a turning point in the world's history. Certainly, those who would reject it because of imperfections in detail will do well to contemplate the alternative.

But if the charter is a turning point for the world, it is also a turning point for the United States. For under this agreement the American Government, irrespective of any future peace treaty, has abandoned the hands-off policy which it pursued ever since the last war, and which found its most recent expression in Secretary Stettinius' hands-off declarations regarding Italy and Greece. The United States now joins in the control of a defeated Germany; it participates in the establishment of new borders of immense consequence to Europe; it undertakes to cooperate in the creation of free and independent governments in Poland and throughout liberated Europe; and it pledges itself to see to it, together with the other powers, that these governments are created by free elections under conditions of internal peace. We have thereby assumed grave duties and grave responsibilities, and it is not too much to say that the manner in which we discharge these duties and responsibilities will go far to determine the extent to which the charter will be carried out.

In these tasks the United States has an unusual opportunity. While every move of every European power is suspected of ulterior purposes, thereby producing countermoves, the United States—for one reason because of its geographical position—is above such suspicions. Its intervention in European affairs is therefore a new factor of immense importance and in striking contrast to the situation which prevailed after the last war. It was the absence of such intervention then that was as much responsible for the breakdown of the League of Nations as any of the League's own imperfections. This will be equally true if we fail to help carry out the provisions of the Crimea Charter and of the new international organization for which this charter prepares the ground. But because this is so, the ideals of the Atlantic Charter, proclaimed anew at Yalta, acquire a new significance. For the power of America's intervention will be in direct proportion to the popular support behind it, and that support will in turn be in direct proportion to the extent to which these ideals are realized.

Never before has America been more willing to abandon a foreign policy that had become a tradition with it, and to embark on a new policy looking toward active collaboration with all the world. Good faith on our part, and on the part of the European nations which will share responsibility with us, can make that collaboration a success.

Secretary of War Stimson Urges Action on Manpower Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, delivered a radio address on a national hook-up yesterday on the manpower problem and the pending legislation in the Congress which is worthy of careful consideration by all of us, as well as the American public. The following is the text of the address:

We have reached a crisis in this war. At such a time I feel it is my duty to speak out to you. I shall not speak long, but my words will be blunt and plain. I speak to all Americans, but primarily to those who have sons or husbands or other dear ones at the front.

As Secretary of War my single purpose has been to strive for the quickest possible victory of American arms—a victory which will save every possible life which might be sacrificed in a needlessly prolonged war. Today we are in danger of a delay—an unnecessary delay—which may cost thousands of unnecessary casualties.

At this moment our armed forces are at the very peak of combat and the time of the conclusion of the war hangs in the balance. The great masses of our armies are deployed and locked in struggle with the enemy throughout the entire world; in cruel depths of snow and freezing rain along the German border, astride the ice-clad Apennines in Italy, in the broiling heat of Luzon, and swarming over the seas and through the vast reaches of the winter sky. The sun never sets upon their battle. The world has not seen such a fight before.

It is a desperate struggle against desperate enemies. Without exception and in every theater our men are rendering a notable account of American fortitude and American valor. But the cost is growing as the climax mounts; and as more and more troops become engaged our casualties rise higher week by week.

In every war, particularly in every desperate war like this, every month of the struggle brings out new problems in the race for victory—unforeseeable problems until the test of battle has produced them; problems of the production of new weapons, new types of planes and guns, of new appliances of science; problems of new types of ships and numbers of carriers; and finally problems of new types of soldiers and sailors, and the uses to which they must be put, and the numbers of them which will be necessary. Modern war is a great and grim evolution, and he who recognizes that and meets it is the one who wins the war. Prompt meeting of the new needs will save lives.

To wage such a war we cannot depend upon the old methods of peacetime industry. The enemy does not wait. We must have a ready, efficient means of putting workers into the new jobs immediately. Today in America there is no such means. While we have long since recognized that our Government must have the means of scientifically selecting and training our soldiers and putting them where they can best work and fight for the country's welfare, we have never given our Government the adequate machinery to produce the equipment and weapons for those soldiers to fight with.

While we have by law organized our young fighters and compelled them to sacrifice their lives if need be in that service, we have never by law organized our workers who are to equip those soldiers and have them ready and able to fight at the proper moment. In this we are alone among our allies. While we have no service law, Britain and Russia have been working under such laws since the very beginning of the war. And of course our enemies have all been so organized from the very beginning. We alone are depending upon voluntary, and therefore ineffective, methods of organization among the workers who are producing the arms and equipment of our soldiers and furnishing them with their ships and all the other necessities of war.

As a result, ever since the beginning of this war, there has been in America a constant and alarming turn-over of workers in industries which are essential to the conduct of the war. In some important war industries this turn-over has actually amounted to 90 percent per year. By every means of public exhortation the Nation's leaders have stressed the importance of having the workers stay on essential jobs. They have been only partially successful. Literally hundreds of thousands of workers, trained for jobs, work at them for a brief time and then quit for something else. Ask any plant manager if he can get efficient production when he must constantly slow down to train new workers for his idle machines. Every possible expedient has been suggested and tried by our patriotic industry and it has failed. There is only one remedy to this situation—that of adopting national service legislation to keep men at their war jobs.

The inevitable result of this failure of American democracy is now becoming apparent at this crisis of the war. Shortages, deadly shortages, are now looming up before us at a moment when every ounce of our power should be thrown into the combat. I mean both shortages of weapons and shortages of manpower caused by the misplacement of our men. Our infantry will run short of its necessary replacements if the places of young men of military age and fitness now working in essential war jobs cannot be promptly filled by available men who are older or not physically capable of fighting. There is now no legal means of effecting the necessary transportation.

On January 6 the President of the United States called the attention of the Congress to this situation and asked for the prompt enactment of a national service law. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the War Production Board, General Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and Admiral King, the Chief of Naval operations, have all united in pointing out the character of the approaching danger and the necessity for the remedy. They have pointed out that during the first 6 months of this year there will be 900,000 more men needed for the armed forces, and another 700,000 needed for war production now scheduled at its all-time peak. Every responsible leader of the military and naval forces of this country and those responsible for war production are thus united in asking for national action to meet these shortages which would delay our onward sweep to victory.

This call has been heeded by the House of Representatives. With much care a bill has been drafted which all of the military and naval leaders agree would put into effect principles of law and organization and be effective for meeting the coming danger. The House of Representatives in its finest tradition rose to the occasion. Its Speaker even descended from the rostrum and speak in favor of the bill. After 4 days of searching debate the House passed the measure on February 1.

Since that date the bill has been pending in the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate for nearly 3 weeks. According to the press, the committee has been listening to

many voices—voices which object to placing upon our men at home the same compulsory responsibility for national duty that has rested upon our men in uniform since 1940; voices which call it "slavery" to serve one's country at a bench or turning a lathe; voices which, flying in the face of demonstrated experience, loudly assert that manpower shortages in industries can be met in this fourth year of the war by a mere invitation to work; voices which, ignoring the long struggle which lies ahead of us to reduce Japan, express pious hopes of the early fall of Berlin as the end of military and naval needs; so many voices speaking for special and, by comparison, trivial interests, that they seem to have stifled the voice of national interest and suffocated the bill. Enemies of the bill are beginning to boast today in the streets of Washington that they have killed it.

Amid this confusion of voices, what has become of the call of the President and the judgment and reasoned pleas of General Marshall and Admiral King? Will those who have trusted to these men the lives of 12,000,000 citizens in uniform, at the eleventh critical hour deny to them the strength they say they need to bring this conflict to a close, with the saving of as many lives as possible?

I have read that some are troubled lest, under the bill passed by the House, civilian workers may be sent too far from their homes to work in munition plants. Does this seem a very weighty objection to you fathers and mothers; you wives and sweethearts of our fighting men, whose loved ones have been bravely and willingly fighting in the torrid jungles of New Guinea or the frozen hillsides of the Rhine?

Your men are risking their lives at the direction of their country many thousands of miles from home, which some of them have not seen for 30 months. The word of their leaders has been enough for them to offer the full measure of their devotion. Prolonged consideration of comparatively trivial details of this legislation should not be allowed to jeopardize the giving to our fighting men of the full support of our own strength and power.

We dare not delay longer. The fighting on every front grows more savage as our brutal enemies are pressed back into their citadels. In millions of American homes there is anxiety for loved ones in the midst of battle while we debate whether workmen may not be sent too far from their homes in order to make the munitions which these men must have to save their lives and to win the war. I say to you, as the pledge of my official duty, that the passage of this measure by the Senate is needed by the Army and the Navy to supply critical shortages in our essential civilian plants and to help fill the places of young vigorous workers who may then be sent as replacements for battle-weary troops.

But even more than this, I believe that the passage of the bill will be a signal to the men on the battle front that there is to be no longer discrimination against them on the home front. It will be a sign to our soldiers and sailors that all of America is behind them. Action by the Congress will sustain and strengthen their spirit in the thick of battles—yes, and the spirit of their families waiting at home for the victory that will bring their men back, as well as the spirit of those good men and women of all ages who have been laboring at war jobs since the calls first went out and have stuck to those jobs through the long hard years of record production.

That is the crisis with which we are confronted. I say again to you fathers and mothers, wives and friends of the soldiers, for whose welfare I have a great responsibility that every day this war is prolonged is inexpressibly costly in precious lives. Let us stand together. Let us speed the victory by treating this crisis of the war in the true spirit of American democracy, with justice between man and man, between soldier and civilian. When the facts are understood, I believe that the voice of American conscience will be heard.

Returning War Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from Mr. J. W. Winterbottom and Mr. Arthur Connor of Nashua, N. H., concerning the status of the returning war veteran and his possible acceptance as an apprentice in the various skilled trades.

NASHUA, N. H., *February 9, 1945.*

The Honorable CHESTER MERROW,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At a recent meeting of the New Hampshire State apprenticeship council, at which Mr. James J. Doyle, manager of the Veterans' Administration, was made an advisory member, a discussion arose concerning the status of the returning war veteran and his possible acceptance as an apprentice in the various skilled trades.

The members of the Veterans' Administration who were present indicated that they were unable to place any returning veteran in an apprenticeship which required more than 4 years' training because of the present restrictions of the current G. I. bill.

As a result of this, the council voted to write to you, Congressman ADAMS, and the Senators from New Hampshire to express its opinion that the veteran's bill should be altered so that any veteran who has the proper qualifications may be allowed to enter an apprenticeship of more than 4 years' duration, if the standards of the particular skilled trade demand it.

The unfortunate situation created by the present bill limits the action of the Veterans' Administration in that it forces them to place the veteran wherever they may, in any sort of apprenticeship, for a duration of 4 years or less. It seems to the apprenticeship council that this is an unfair limitation to place upon the Veterans' Administration, and it is also a very undesirable practice which will do returning veterans great harm. In our opinion, it is very unwise to place a returning veteran in a 2- or 3-year apprenticeship for a skilled trade when the minimum acceptable standard for such trade may be 4 or 5, or even 6 years. Thus, a veteran who might finish a 3-year apprenticeship and apply for a job as a journeyman in a shop which is unionized will probably not be accepted by the union, because he has not met the proper standard qualifications necessary to become a journeyman.

While the apprenticeship council feels that the returning veteran should be given every possible opportunity to readjust himself to society and to make a living, it must insist that the standards of the apprenticeship courses for the various plants throughout the State be maintained at a level acceptable to both labor and management. In fairness to the veteran, we must be sure that he is qualified to become an apprentice in the trade which he desires, and also that he not be deceived relative to the years of service and standards required of him for its completion. We can appreciate the disillusionment that a returning veteran may experience after several years at an apprentice's pay only to find at the completion that he is still not a recognized journeyman, as he has been led to believe.

It is the council's sincere wish that you give this matter your immediate attention, so that the injustices which exist may be corrected before the situation gets too complicated. If the change can be made, it will give the Veterans' Bureau a sensible and practical method of placing returning veterans in apprenticeships and it will remove the Apprenticeship Council from the unpleasant task, a few years hence, of informing veterans, who believe that they have completed an acceptable apprenticeship course, that they have not met the standards required to become journeymen.

Very truly yours,

J. W. WINTERBOTTOM, *Chairman.*
ARTHUR CONNOR, *Vice chairman.*

Resolutions Relating to Future Aviation Policy of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following resolutions relating to the future aviation policy of the United States, which were passed at a meeting of the Boston, Mass., Chamber of Commerce, and forwarded to me under date of February 15, 1945:

In order to provide for national defense, promote the general welfare and secure liberty for ourselves and our posterity, and in order to insure that the airplane which America created shall be used to maintain peace and secure the blessings of peace to mankind, the Boston Chamber of Commerce unanimously recommends the early formulation of a United States aviation policy based on the following principles:

1. An air force sufficiently powerful, in conjunction with forces of our allies, to win this war and also to keep the peace. Leagues and covenants without an adequate striking force have proven useless. The cost of maintenance of the most completely modern air force should be divided proportionally among the victorious nations and contribution of advanced war equipment designs to this striking force should be mandatory.

2. An adequate post-war air force of superior aircraft and competent personnel at such strength and in such state of readiness as to preclude a successful assault upon our country or its possessions. It should be emphasized in Congress that military aviation appropriations should not fluctuate with the prosperity of the country, but be based on a realistic appraisal of air strength elsewhere in the world.

3. Orderly and economic expansion of domestic and international air transportation and encouragement of private flying.

Domestic air expansion should be based on actual public convenience and necessity. Development of feeder local and paralleling air routes, on the one hand, should not result in unreasonable subsidies with the eventual weakening of the major air lines,

and on the other hand, should not be restricted to a point where the major air lines are strengthened and expanded at the expense of public convenience and necessity.

We recommend a policy of freedom of the air in international air transportation and look with disfavor on the chosen-instrument policy. We believe in freedom of transit and freedom of technical landing, but recommend the regular reciprocal landing and schedule agreements with foreign countries should be granted only in proportion to respective volume origination.

Private flying should be encouraged by simplifying, within the bounds of safety, the present ground and flight tests. Every assistance should be granted to the development of flight strips, ground markers, and radio aids.

4. A career in commercial aviation, both from the flying and engineering angle, should be kept so attractive that the youth of America will seek out this field of endeavor as a life work.

Training of youth to fly and service military airplanes should be first attempted on an attractive voluntary basis. Failing to get the required number of applicants, compulsory aviation training commencing at a suitable age is recommended.

5. Maintenance of a strong aircraft manufacturing industry with continuing world leadership in research and development is of paramount importance. Military orders for post-war production should now be allocated to the essential companies in sufficient volume to guarantee reasonable profits. Research should be stimulated by allowing both research cost and an amount identical with the research expenditures to be deducted from taxable earnings.

6. We recommend the establishment of separate Aeronautic Committees in both the National and State House and Senate.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, while every ounce of our American resources and all of our American ingenuity is now engaged in the fighting of this great war, it will scarcely come to an end until we shall find ourselves involved with a problem almost as great—that in dealing with the post-war period. It is true that the tragedy of death will be removed, but it will call upon American ingenuity to measure up to a new test of strength. We will find ourselves confronted with the task of making America produce, of making America think and act in a capacity in peacetime comparable with that in war. This will be a new day in the lives of most Americans.

Not only will the profit motive be threatened, but more particularly, the general American system will be threatened. The test of accomplishment that will rest upon the shoulders of American citizens, and particularly American business, will be that of providing jobs for American workers in the post-war period, plus adequate prices for farm products. To provide these things will require the most superlative of American qualities because there will be no war stimulus. There will be no Government purchasing agency to keep production at a high point. We shall have to settle down to the job of serving the American people with the things they want at the price they have to pay.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; well may we think in terms of the post-war period as we go forward with our great war endeavor. We are being tried, and sorely tried, in the great contest for war, but the contest that will come to us in the peace to follow will call for hitherto undiscovered qualities of humanity.

Mr. Kenneth W. Simons, editor of the Bismarck Tribune, Bismarck, N. Dak., has written brilliantly on this important question, reflecting deep thought and an intellectual study. I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks his excellent editorial dealing with the great question of the post-war period:

KENNETH W. SIMONS SPEAKS AT MEETING

America can provide a good, well-paying job for everyone if it will give its capitalistic system a chance to work as the capitalistic theory intends it to work. That doesn't mean monopoly, the protection of vested interests against the inroads of progress or business combinations in restraint of trade, which too many people think of as capitalism.

This was the opinion expressed to members of the Bismarck Business and Professional Women's Clubs Tuesday night at a dinner in the Prince Hotel by Kenneth W. Simons, editor of the Bismarck Tribune.

Many persons who claim to be supporting the capitalistic system of production, trade and commerce are, in reality, moving to destroy it by refusing to let it operate as it was intended to operate, the speaker said.

He explained that the capitalistic system stimulates progress by encouraging new ideas and new capital to destroy old ideas and old capital. When the old is forced out, it represents a loss, he said, but the new is more valuable than the old and so humanity scores a net gain. Anything which interferes with this system, he said, is a blow at capitalism.

For illustration the speaker pointed to the widespread use of bridges to replace ferries. When a bridge goes in, he said, the value of the ferry is destroyed, but humanity benefits because the bridge is better and more convenient and encourages trade and commerce.

Whether or not the American capitalistic system can be made to work to the satisfaction of the American people, he said, depends upon their interest and intelligence as citizens. He predicted that, unless it is made to work in a satisfactory manner, "the tendency of the last 50 years will be extended and intensified and we shall pass from the system of state capitalism [which he defined as investment by government] into a system which is clearly akin to socialism or communism."

This will develop, he said, because the Government stands ready to meet the demands of the people and will do so, regardless of the party in power, when the demand becomes strong enough.

The demand for a higher standard of living, with comforts and security for all, is certain to come as a result of our experience in this war, he said.

With only 40 percent of our productive facilities devoted to peace and 60 percent to the destruction through war, the Nation still has the highest average standard of living in its history, he pointed out. In view of this fact it will be impossible to tell the American peoples after the war that they cannot have the things they want and need merely because the established way of doing things will not permit it.

If this happens, he said, the people will demand and get a change, using their votes—the most powerful instrument in America today—to bring it about.

Simons said the principal hope that capitalism will function in the way it was intended to do and for the best interests of the country lies in adoption of the plans and principles now being advocated by the Committee for Economic Development, a group of businessmen who are acting intelligently to prevent the destruction of our present way of doing things.

In charge of the program were Miss Clara Lewis, chairman; Mrs. Florence Scott, and Mrs. John Delzer. Valentine favors were used. Happy Birthday was sung in honor of the birthday of Dr. Fannie Dunn Quain.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on January 13, 1945:

In general, it may be said that a system of universal military training should provide that every young man will receive military or naval training—this on the sound and democratic principle that every man owes it to his country to undergo training which will enable him to defend it in a major emergency. Normally the training should commence at age 18, although it might take place at any time between the ages of 17 and 21, depending upon educational status. The training period should be for 1 year and every youngster, regardless of antecedents, should take it. They should be mobilized in special training units and it should be understood that during the period of training they shall not be liable for military service in the accepted meaning of the term. In other words, they may not be employed in combat service or any other active service with the Army or Navy in the field or at sea, except in training vessels. While subject to military discipline, they shall be in the status of trainees, not the status of active soldiers or sailors. After completion of the training, they shall not be subject to active military service except in the event of a national emergency proclaimed by the Congress. Concurrently with such a proclamation, the Congress will determine the number of young men to be called to active duty and under what conditions. It is highly probable, almost certain, that in such a situation the Congress will, by appropriate enactment, set in motion the process of selection, closely paralleling our present wartime processes. In time of peace, graduates of the year of training will be encouraged to volunteer for refresher training or training along advanced lines; also, voluntary enrollment will be encouraged in the National Guard of the United States and the Naval Militia, to the end that those important reserve components may be maintained and strengthened in their present constitutional status. To sum up, all peacetime military service by graduate trainees should be on a voluntary basis. The ranks of the Army and Navy

should be maintained only through a system of voluntary enlistment as heretofore. Only in the event of a national emergency shall the element of compulsion appear.

The great military advantage gained under such a system will lie in the fact that whether as volunteers in time of peace or as selectees in time of war, every recruit for the Army or Navy will have had 1 year of training, an advantage we have never enjoyed in our history.

It is obvious that to meet the demands of a major emergency we must train in time of peace a large number of reserve officers, Army and Navy. Without well-trained officers any military effort, large or small, falls down lamentably. No one will deny this. How to get them? If we are to be faithful to our traditions we must open the door of opportunity to every ambitious youngster, no matter what his antecedents. He must be given a chance to prove his worth as to character and his qualifications, mental and physical. The commanding officers in the training camps must watch these youngsters as the training goes along and take note of their intelligence, their aptitudes, and their potential qualities of leadership. And it may be stated at this point that an overwhelming majority, perhaps 80 or 90 percent, of the officers in charge of the training will be reserve officers—trained citizen officers on active duty and especially competent to understand and evaluate the feelings and potentialities of the citizen soldier. If a youngster makes good in his training and shows himself possessed of those inherent qualities which a good officer must have, then the authorities in charge of the camp should certify to that effect and give to the young man, if he wants it, a certificate establishing his eligibility for officer training. If the young eligible goes on to college and desires to work for a reserve commission, then he should be admitted to the R. O. T. C., which organization, of course, should be maintained and perfected as a vitally important mechanism for producing reserve officers for the military services. If the young candidate makes good he will, upon graduation from the R. O. T. C. course, be commissioned as a reserve officer in an appropriate branch of the service. If a young trainee deemed eligible for officer training does not, for one reason or another, go on to college but is still ambitious for advancement, then, in my judgment, either the War Department or the Navy Department, as the case may be, should admit him to an appropriate officer candidate school, upon graduation from which he will get his commission. Thus every young man will have his chance. And, finally, it should be a part of our fundamental policy to keep open the door of opportunity to the young reserve officer to earn his way to higher rank without limitation. Only thus can we inculcate in our citizens a constant, energetic interest in the security of the country.

We are all hoping that the United States will take a leading part in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization designed to preserve the peace of the world. Our country can do this, perhaps, better than any other. We do not hunger for additional territory. We have no wish to subdue other peoples to our will. There is none of the aggressor in us. The whole world knows this and will have confidence in our motives. We want to lead the world along decent paths and we will appeal for decency and contribute everything we can toward its achievement. Unfortunately it does not suffice merely to be decent. We cannot achieve world peace simply by hanging a motto on the wall reading, "Let us have peace." If we are to be effective in the cause of peace we must at the same time be strong—strong in support of righteousness, if you please. Otherwise the greedy aggressor, nothing our weakness and despising our ideals, will be tempted to strike. This very thing has happened and accounts for both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. And so I contend that a strong America will go far toward securing the peace of the world.

Universal military training is founded upon the sound democratic principle that every competent man owes it as a duty to his country to undergo training which will enable him to defend it. George Washington, our first President, recommended this very thing to our first Congress. Unfortunately, his advice was not followed. Had our forefathers listened to him we might well have saved many thousands of lives and billions of treasure. Universal military training will bring together young men from every walk of life and of all conceivable antecedents. The son of the rich man and the son of the laborer will be brought into intimate daily contact. All will be treated alike. They will come to understand each other, to recognize the things they have in common and to sympathize one with the other. They will emerge from the training better citizens and our democratic institutions will be strengthened.

The records of the Selective Service System now in operation show a deplorably large percentage of young men afflicted with physical disabilities. In time of war these men must be rejected for active service for the simple reason that we cannot afford to spend much time in correcting their defects. In time of peace, however, quite a number of these men (not all of them, by any means) could be admitted to the training and much could be accomplished in the way of improving their health. I am speaking now of those afflicted with what are called comparatively minor defects. By no means can it be contended that all the physical disabilities originating in childhood or early youth can be cured in a year of military training. It is conceded that those youngsters with serious defects would have to be rejected for the training. But here is a most important thing to remember. Every youngster in the land would be called up and put through a physical examination. As a result of that we would get an over-all, accurate census or inventory of the health of our youth. From this we would be able to identify the sore spots. Our public-health authorities, national and State, and the school systems of the various States would then be equipped with information which would enable them to take better care of children in the schools and instruct parents along the same lines. We possess no such inventory today. The establishment of military training would give it to us automatically.

It should be emphasized that a year of military training will not be a lost year in the educational process. An absolutely necessary element in military training is teaching a man how to use a large variety of instruments. Not only must he know how to use the weapons, but he must acquire considerable skill in maintaining and repairing them. He must know all about gasoline engines, as well as a large number of mechanical gadgets used in mechanical equipment. He may learn about the telegraph, the telephone, radio communication, photography, meteorology. In some instances he will be admitted to the mysteries of radar. In others he will learn about first aid to the injured, the importance of personal hygiene, sanitary measures to protect health. This is but a partial list. The point is that military training these days includes a very important element of vocational training which would be useful to the man after he had returned to civil life. So it will not be a year lost by any means.

Prisoner of War Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a copy of a letter which I have this date addressed to Col. Clifford S. Urwiller, Assistant Director, Prisoner of War Operations Division, Provost Marshal General's Office of the War Department, at Washington, D. C.

Mr. Speaker, the letter speaks for itself:

FEBRUARY 19, 1945.

Col. CLIFFORD S. URWILLER,
Assistant Director, Prisoner of War Operations Division, Provost Marshal General's Office, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLONEL URWILLER: Hon. J. G. Lee, Jr., secretary of the Louisiana Farm Council of the College of Agriculture, Louisiana State University, and A. & M. College, at Baton Rouge, La., has forwarded to the writer a copy of his letter addressed to you, dated February 14, 1945, to which was attached also copies of letters dated January 29, 1945, addressed to Mr. R. D. Reeves, State director of the War Manpower Commission, Baton Rouge, La., and the copy of the reply of Mr. Reeves, dated February 7, 1945, all in protest of, and in connection with your announcement at Chicago that there was a probability that the prisoners of war would be moved out of the State of Louisiana into other sections, and I respectfully refer you to the correspondence above mentioned, and ask that you review all of the statements made therein, all of which I am in a position to substantiate.

Representing the largest and most important agricultural district in the State of Louisiana whose principal products are rice, cotton, cane, sweetpotatoes, soybeans, legumes, oil, cattle, lumber, and other industries contributing to the war effort, I desire to join the agricultural leaders of my State, and on behalf of my constituents, in protesting the proposal of withdrawing prisoners of war from Louisiana and the Seventh Congressional District (the largest rice and sweetpotato producing district in the United States. Sixty percent of our rice has been ceded to the Government, and more than 50 percent of all of the sweetpotatoes used by the armed forces throughout the world are furnished by my district.

Not only do I protest against the proposed withdrawal of the prisoners of war allocated to my district and the State of Louisiana, but I respectfully request that consideration be given to granting an increase over the number previously allocated to my district and the State of Louisiana.

My further reason for this request, in addition to the facts presented by those herein above named, and others is—that had it not been for unusual and extraordinarily favorable planting and harvesting weather in my district and in Louisiana, and if we had not been able to secure the prisoner-of-war labor during that time, we would not have been able to save and harvest our important food and other crops.

Much of our farm labor has migrated to the war industries, and in addition, I am advised that overzealous and pressured

draft boards have cleared many of the farms of experienced farm and dairy workers, and under recent directives from the Director of Selective Service, the boards are now in the process of inducting practically all of the balance of the farm labor, in defiance of, and in contravention of, the law and intent of the Congress as expressed in and under the terms of the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act.

I respectfully reiterate that this important matter be reviewed, and that favorable consideration be given to this, as well as other requests; otherwise there will be a tremendous and critical reduction in the production of important and necessary foodstuffs in my district and State, as well as a great financial loss to those who are striving so patriotically to produce the food and supplies for those in our armed forces.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Seventh Louisiana District.

Allocation of Prisoners of War for Farm Labor

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, what is the Provost Marshal General going to do about the allocation of prisoners of war for farm labor? It is plowing time in Louisiana. The farmers are trying to make their plans for the 1945 crop. They are short of labor, as you all know. The farms have been stripped of every available man of military age. Many thousands of acres of fine fertile land was not cultivated last year and many thousand more acres cannot be cultivated this year unless the farmer can get labor and machinery to replace the farm hands who have been drafted. Old men, many of them sick or physically incapacitated, cannot do the work of the younger men who have gone into the armed forces, but these older men do have the "know how" and can direct the work if a sufficient number of prisoners of war are made available to them.

For the past 2 weeks farmers from all over my district have been inquiring of me and of the Provost Marshal concerning the availability of prisoners of war. I have contacted the Provost Marshal's office here, the Provost Marshal of the Eighth Service Command at Dallas, Tex., and the commanding officer of the prisoner-of-war camp at Ruston, La., trying to get some definite data. They all advise me that no definite allocations have yet been made, but that it is expected—expected, mind you—that an ample number of prisoners will be made available. But I can get nothing definite. Neither can the farmers. Yet, the farmers have to make their plans now, right now. They have to plan ahead for the whole year, the entire crop from planting to harvest. To do this adequately and economically they must know, not guess, what labor they will have. Further they are required to build and have available camps for these prisoners. To prepare these camps they must have the approval of the Eighth Service Command. When they sought the approval of the Eighth Service Command they were told "The Eighth Service Command, Dallas, Tex., is unable to approve construction of the prisoner-of-war camps because the Provost Marshal General's office has not made allocation of prisoners of war to this command." Now what does all this mean? Obviously this is a case of the right hand not knowing what the left hand does. It is all up to the Provost Marshal.

The farmers are required to furnish the camps. They are told to be ready. To be ready they have to get the approval of the Provost Marshal to build the camps. The Provost Marshal who approves the camp says he can not because he, the same Provost Marshal, has not yet allocated the prisoners of war. The Provost Marshal is holding the deal up now, but when he does finally get around to making up his mind on the allocation of prisoners of war, which will probably be at the last minute they can be used, he will tell the farmers that they do not have their camps ready so they cannot have the prisoners. It is the same old merry-go-round of confusion, indecision, and incompetence with the farmer and the food-consuming public as the goats. What I want to know is why?

I want to know why the Provost Marshal General cannot make at least tentative allocations of prisoners of war based on the number now known to be available and the needs of the farmers now certified to by their applications for this type of labor. There may not be enough prisoners of war to meet the full requirements of all the farmers, but some prisoners of war are available and a reasonable pro rata allocation can be made now and the farmer can be so advised in order that he may prepare his camps. There is absolutely no sane or sensible reason why the Provost Marshal cannot make some estimate now. According to reports from the front the supply of prisoners of war can be expected to increase, not decrease, so there should be more shortly.

The military services are supposed to be the champion long range planners. To mount an attack or an invasion of some enemy position thousands of miles from our shores takes months and months, sometimes even a year or more, of minute planning and they have done, done it efficiently. Why then cannot the military plan ahead with the farmer on this 1945 crop? They can. Somebody is deliberately playing the part of a slacker, laying down on a most important job. I charge that the responsibility lies with the Provost Marshal General and his subordinates. He should be made to deliver or he should be removed. If this situation is not remedied I intend to make every effort to see that he is relieved of his command and a competent man put in. His incompetence or indecision, whichever it may be, can easily cause a food shortage in this country, with disastrous results to the war effort and to the peoples of the world, many of whom are looking to us for food this coming year. This martinet-like incompetence has already cost hard-working, hard-pressed farmers many millions of dollars in lost crops. It can cost many millions more. There must be immediate action.

I repeat, either the Provost Marshal must supply the prisoners of war that are now available and inform the farmers what to expect or he should be relieved of his command and a competent man put in his place.

I do not propose to let this matter drop here and I sincerely urge every Member of Congress from the farm areas to join me in smoking out this incompetent military bureaucracy.

Gulf and Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to an editorial on the subject of southern representation on the United States Maritime Commission. This is a matter of much interest and much importance to the South. The editorial is from the gifted pen of Ralph Nicholson, publisher of the New Orleans Item, and it appeared on February 16, 1945:

GULF AND MERCHANT MARINE

The term of one member of the United States Maritime Commission will expire next September, and another term will end next year. For obvious reasons the great maritime area of the Gulf coast should be represented on the Federal agency that makes policies and regulations for the Nation's deep-sea transportation. But Louisiana's paramount concern in this field has never but once been recognized—President Wilson named our talented friend, Theodore Brent, a member of the first United States Shipping Board.

Not one of the present Maritime Commission came from the Gulf coast, not one from the South. One is a Washingtonian; two hail from Pennsylvania; two are Navy career men, one coming originally from Ohio; the other, we believe, from Wyoming.

This Commission now directs the building, maintenance, and operation of the vastest fleet of cargo and passenger ships ever assembled in this world. Its duties for years after the war will be far more complicated than they are today because of vexatious difficulties and problems arising from the necessity of readjusting its enormous properties and operations to peacetime uses. This natural complex will be aggravated by countless conflicts of interest between our own maritime enterprises and those of all the other seafaring nations.

Thus will arise situation in which the Commission's judgment and action will most vitally concern every seaport in the United States. The ways in which any or all of them

may be affected are obviously beyond counting. Hence it is vitally important to all of us that at least one member of this agency should be a man especially familiar by personal contact with the relationship of this great maritime area, between and including Texas and Florida, to the deep-sea transportation of our country and the world at large. National welfare and good business in general require this, as well as fairness in the allocation of the Commission's responsibilities between the maritime regions most affected.

We should, of course, like to see some qualified Orleanian on this commission. But that preference is secondary to New Orleans' concern in seeing the Gulf area as a whole properly represented there. In this spirit, we suggest that the importers and exporters, the ship operators, and all other maritime interests of the Gulf pool their efforts and influence, with all the added southern influence that they can enlist, to bring that about.

This idea was incubating in "Ike" Thornton's head before he left the direction of our city's interests in traffic matters to return to Galveston. It was a good idea. We bring it forward for that reason. The five maritime States of the Gulf, putting aside rivalry between their ports, can wield a great influence at Washington, of themselves. If they organize intelligently and work energetically they can bring to their support not only other southern influences but certain northern interests as well.

There is plenty of time between now and fall to press the point—but none to waste. For the object to be sought will call for a real campaign.

We don't suggest this because we feel that the present commission has discriminated against our great port or the Gulf coast as a whole, or by reason of dissatisfaction arising from any other cause. We do so simply in the feeling that every port will be more concerned than ever before in the agency regulating the Nation's maritime affairs, and that the Gulf therefore needs, more than ever before, the proper degree of recognition therein which it has never received.

There Is Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there just is not enough to do all of the things everyone wants done. Henry Wallace wants 60,000,000 post-war jobs, with higher wages for every worker. He and those who believe with him insist that every worker and some others should have comfortable homes, better clothing, an automobile, an education and recreation for the family, and, in addition, all the other good things of life.

With it, he insists, should go fewer hours of work and lower taxes; also higher prices for the farmers; rural electrification throughout the country, a telephone in every farm home, and every farm home equipped not only with lavatory and toilet, but with electrical refrigerator, washing machine, mangle and, incidentally, electric egg beaters, slicers, and perhaps dishwashers and driers.

Now, no one finds any fault with those objectives. Many will be attained, but not all immediately. In my judgment, they will come more quickly and in greater volume through free individual effort than through Federal control and regimentation.

Wallace also insists that, at the same time, we should furnish the people of Europe with the food, clothing, shelter, and fuel they may need to keep them in comfort, the money to rebuild their cities, factories, docks, wharves, warehouses and airfields. In short, that we should rehabilitate the war-torn countries and place and maintain their inhabitants on a standard of living equal to that enjoyed by ourselves.

All of the foregoing are very worthy objectives and there is no charitable Christian individual who does not hope that all can some day be accomplished.

Wallace's objectives were again brought to my attention this week when into the office came the president of a C. I. O. local from my district. He was a young man of good character, well educated, courteous, and persuasive in his talk. He was here to secure my aid in obtaining an increase in the wages of industrial workers in the Fourth Congressional District. His argument was that the wage scale in the district was lower than that in other districts for similar work, while the cost of living was as great as in those districts paying a much higher wage scale. His facts were accurate and his argument was sound and, if justice is done, the wage scale for that district will be revised. I shall do my part to assist.

But then came his argument that Wallace should be supported in his demands, placed in a position of power with billions to spend. To that I cannot and will not agree, for, in my judgment, Wallace is a spender and a wrecker, not a constructive builder. I fear that all the facts cited did not convince the young man that everyone cannot now have all he wants without someone assuming an excessive burden. The fact is that there is not in this country enough food, clothing, machinery, to properly supply and equip our own people, to say nothing of caring for the people of all the world.

This gentleman complained of the high cost of food, clothing, and fuel. He admitted that that was due in part to the scarcity of those items, which, in large volume, had been shipped abroad, but yet he seemed to feel there was some magic way out of the dilemma without in any way curtailing our expenditures, without imposing undue burdens upon our own people.

To date the war has cost our taxpayers two hundred fifty thousand million dollars. Recently, the Comptroller General, a lifelong Democrat, told the committee of which I am a member that, in war contracts alone, the administration had wasted $50,000,000. What is the answer? Harder work, more careful spending.

My theory is that, when this war is over, we should bring our boys home; that we should first care for our own—not only the returning veterans, but industrial workers, farmers, and white-collar workers; that we should—in fact, that we must—do it, not by attempting to lift ourselves by our own bootstraps through inflation and increased taxation, but by, for a while, doing without some of the things which we call necessities, but which are in fact luxuries; increasing, as we always have increased, our production by improving machinery, inventing new processes, making new products, creating new jobs.

We did it for 150 years and we can do it again, if we will repudiate men like Wallace, Government interference with management of business; return to free and fair competition; give individuals—and that includes workers—a fair share in the profits created by their own efforts.

Why trade our proven successful system of government for that of nations we have been forced, at almost overwhelming cost, to save from defeat and disaster?

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech which I delivered February 18, 1945, at St. Francis Roman Catholic Church, Bradford Street, Lawrence, Mass., in commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day:

It seems fitting and proper that we gather here, in the Church of St. Francis, to observe the Independence Day of Lithuania. For years I have watched this small band of devoted Christians working patiently to build this church and parish. In a fine spirit of brotherhood you have achieved from small beginnings a religious center of which you have every reason to be proud. With your own hands and hearts and faith—asking little of others—you have done this. To me that is symbolic of the sturdy independence which you and your forebears have brought to this country from your native Lithuania.

Your fellow Americans have watched the sons and daughters of Lithuanian immigrants adjust themselves quickly and naturally to our way of life and make their contributions to it. Why? Because there must be elements in the Lithuanian character that are in harmony with the environment of America. The first generation among you did not come to this country for material opportunity alone. You did not come here to take—as some have done—paying only lip service to democracy as they went. Your people came to stay and work for home and family, so that you and your children would be proud to call yourselves Americans. For the little nation on the shores of the Baltic and this great democracy of the New World have this in common—the faith that only freemen, under Divine guidance, can have any self-respect and respect for others.

In reading the history of Lithuania, I was impressed by one act of Christian statesmanship that was so far ahead of its time that it should be held up as an example for the troubled world of today. As early as 1380, when the Jews were burned in Spain and tortured to death in Germany, Vytautas, king of Lithuania, attracted a number of perse-

cuted Jews to his country by promising them religious freedom and security. And he was as good as his word, enacting laws that punished by death anyone who attacked a Jew, injured, or murdered him. Such Christian justice was outstanding then. It deserves mentioning now. For nowhere did the Jews enjoy as much religious freedom as they did in Lithuania. As a result there were and there are many Jews active in the fight for Lithuanian independence.

At the third conference of nationalists which was held in Lausanne in June 1916, the Lithuanian delegate proposed and carried through resolutions guaranteeing to each individual his language, his religion, and political and civil equality. Free association and traditions were recognized as rights. Such was the fair and forthright spirit which animated the founders of the Lithuanian Republic. To them their religion was a living faith, kind and just to all men * * * in startling contrast to the dark and deadly intolerance that has swept other nations in our time.

Many people are apt to think of the Lithuanians as a new culture in world history, not knowing that their roots reach far back to the beginnings of time. They speak one of the oldest of languages, resembling the ancient Sanskrit. In richness, the Lithuanian is only equaled by the English language (75,000 words, according to the authorities). Scientists have found that agriculture was developed to a high degree more than a thousand years before the birth of Christ. Between 100 and 400 years before Christ Lithuanian culture was astonishing. Weapons were manufactured from metal; ornaments from amber and other substances. Already the spinning and weaving of clothes were in progress.

Through the centuries constant attacks by enemies forced the Lithuanians to form closer and closer ties among themselves. Through this unity in the face of common danger, the nation became strong. Finally, in 1386, the Lithuanians embraced Christianity.

At this critical point in world history it was the privilege of Lithuania to render one of the greatest services to western civilization. It was Vytautas the Great, who, in 1399, withstood the invasion of the Tartars into Europe and saved Christianity. Lithuania stood as an impassable barrier, holding back the Asiatic hordes. For this deed alone, Vytautas and his followers have earned the undying gratitude of all ages.

During his reign, Lithuania attained the summit of her power. Her frontiers extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea. This leader was as brave as he was clever. Historians have compared his genius with that of Charlemagne and Washington.

Then came the fatal union with Poland which led to the subsequent weakening of both countries. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, larger and more powerful neighbors joined forces to partition Lithuania and she lost her sovereignty. For more than a century, the Lithuanians plodded along under a foreign yoke, holding fast to their faith and national culture in spite of every form of persecution. The renaissance of their tenacious spirit began with the year 1904–5, coincident with the Russo-Japanese War and the first Russian Revolution. Freedom of the press was once more restored to the people and certain liberties were enjoyed again. The ecclesiastics, intelligentsia, and a large majority of the nobility returned to the Lithuanian language. The work of culture and the education of the people started anew with an energy and enthusiasm that was astonishing to witness.

Before this turn of events, however, a century of persecution had forced hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians to emigrate to other lands. Utter lack of political and economic freedom, exclusion from schools, everlastingly hindered in developing commercially, and barred from holding public office or industrial positions, or even from the ownership of land in their own country. These are the causes which left to Lithuanian youth no other choice but to seek more congenial conditions in foreign countries.

The largest emigration was to the United States. The first arrivals settled in the anthracite coal region of Pennsylvania. Many went to the larger cities, including Boston. In the cities the Lithuanians are chiefly progressive workers in factories of all sorts; many are skilled workers, tailoring claiming a great many. There is a large number of merchants and more recently, numerous professional men have made their appearance.

No one appreciates American freedom as much as the Lithuanian. Unwanted in the land of their birth, a land where they had been oppressed and constrained in every phase of the national and individual existence by a vengeful alien rule, they found a welcome haven in America. Here they enjoyed the benefits of education and culture freely and unhindered; they organized study classes and meetings; they attended lectures, theatricals, and concerts; they published, disseminated and read books and newspapers in their own tongue; they founded parishes and societies. How vastly different was everything in America from the drastic prohibitions and the crushing ukase back home. Moreover, books and newspapers published in America were smuggled into Lithuania and, like a religious token, passed from hand to hand; those who returned from America became the living apostles of freedom. Lithuanians soon began to argue that if freedom was possible elsewhere, why was it not possible in their native land.

By having, in addition to the parochial schools, access to the public schools, and to the night schools in particular, the immigrant was able to supplement and so broaden the training and education he received from daily experience in the workshop and from a study of publications in Lithuania.

The children of immigrants, born in this country, have inherited their parents' passion for liberty, and even at this moment are giving it generously in defense of our America. The honor roll on the Lawrence Common bears testimony to what I say. Their allegiance to our democracy is complete and uncompromising.

Today we observe the twenty-seventh anniversary of the signing of the declaration of Lithuania's independence. Those were tragic days in 1918 when the 20 heroes of Vilnius proclaimed that henceforth she would be free. The darkness gave way to light and she became her sovereign self again. For 22 years the citizens of Lithuania worked with a will to restore their ravaged land. Knowing that political democracy cannot exist without economic democracy they worked long and hard to provide opportunities for all. Agricultural reforms were instituted. Stock-breeding and dairying were increased. The peat bogs were tapped for fuel and power. Manufacturing was encouraged. The whole country was astir with the enterprise born of the new freedom. Religion and culture, unfettered by tyranny, stimulated the souls and minds of men again. It was good to be free. All that Lithuania asked was the opportunity to work out her own destiny in peace with her neighbors.

But the peace following the last war was an imperfect and uncertain one. The larger nations were faced with economic problems for which they had no immediate solution. Minorities, under the banner of false promises, captured power from the disillusioned majorities. Beggars on horseback rode into power in many countries and the problem of unemployment was temporarily solved by preparing for war—war in which to loot and pillage peace-loving neighbors. And the democracies, praying for peace at any price made concession after concession until there could be no more humiliation short of national suicide. Such was the cynicism, the expediency, the international spiritual bankruptcy of the 1920's and 1930's.

Then came the holocaust of 1939. In the years that followed, the armies of rival neighbors swept back and forth across the helpless countryside and paralyzed cities of Lithuania. Her cherished independence and individual culture were engulfed in the war among the powers. But Lithuania was not alone the victim of resurgent tyranny. In Europe, Africa, and Asia, many other nations went down before the onslaught of bombs and tanks. They went down but they did not die, for the decent aspirations of men are a spiritual truth which all the material force in the world cannot crush. As long as men and nations believe, they live. It is only when they abandon themselves, that they die.

Kosciusko was the first Lithuanian to come to America and advertise his country. This he did in a practical fashion, by rolling up his sleeves and helping the American colonists in their battle for independence. He was passionately interested in our cause for he had learned in his own country what misery and hardship an oppressed nation can suffer. Lithuania had long been the battle ground for major powers. Because of her geographical position she has suffered intolerably. Kosciusko, then, was a logical defender of the rights of small and weak peoples, and his championship of the American cause was the first tie that bound the interests of Americans and Lithuanians.

Since his day, however, immigration from Lithuania to America has been steady and consistent and the friendship between the two peoples has increased with the years. It is only natural that Lithuania should ask help of the same America that Kosciusko aided in 1777. She wants to be a free and independent nation, to take up her national life where she left off a few years ago and to establish herself once more as a national entity in reconstructed Europe.

There never was a more determined nation than Lithuania, and she is not so little either. It has a population of 3,500,000 of whom 87 percent embraced the Catholic faith.

Overrun by both German and Russian armies not only in World War No. 1, but also in the present war, Lithuania has been devastated to a degree that cannot be imagined by Americans whose homes have escaped the torch of invasion. In spite of the primitive conditions under which he is forced to live, the spirit of the Lithuanian carries on, making the best of hardships until the day when he can be himself again.

As leather became scarce during military occupation, the farmer turned back to his old way of making sandals of wooden soles with little straps of leather over the soles. Like the early pioneers of America, the enterprising character of the Lithuanians found ways and means of overcoming shortages through home industry. Petroleum disappeared from civilian use, as did candles. In this predicament, the people turned to sheep's lard. But lard, too, was requisitioned by the invaders for the fats essential to military needs, so down from the attic came the quaint old taper holders, and they made again the tall pinewood tapers as they had been taught by their grandparents.

The grain supplies and even the windmills were taken over by foreign armies. Then it was that the Lithuanian had recourse to his grinding millstones and began to make flour by hand in an effort to feed his family.

The farm implements that were taken from them could be replaced, in part by handmade ones. Small tools such as rakes and threshing devices they had long known how to make from wood.

As recently as 75 years ago the Lithuanian farmer was able to make everything he needed in the way of cloth, linen, leather, cloth and skin shoes, and on his land he grew what was necessary for the nourishment of his body when well, and the cure of it when ill. This knowledge of arts and crafts stood him in good stead and enabled him to survive, where others might perish. The farmer had even devised a kind of soap for personal use, and medicinal baths using herbs and roots came into vogue again.

One of the most charming of the old Lithuanian customs was the use of the resinous pine taper, which served not only for lighting purposes, but also as a timepiece. These tall tapers were cut to a definite length which provided the Lithuanian girls with a fairly accurate measure of time. They would invariably burn 15 minutes. When four long tapers had expired, the little spinner or weaver would know that she had worked an hour and would leave her loom and reset four other pine tapers in a special frame to mark the passage of another hour.

The Lithuanian farmer still relies on linen and wool with which to clothe himself. White linen in summer is everybody's Sunday best and in winter the hard woven wool is reinforced outdoors by sheepskin coats closely resembling aviator's jackets. With the nylon shortage, stockings are made of hand-knitted wool.

In a country where these simple and natural industries prevailed for so many centuries, song and legend grew up around the daily chores. Songs of harvest time, of growing grain, spinning songs, festival and wedding songs have survived the self-consciousness of the modern exhibitionist music craze, and are still part of the pleasure of life to them.

Lithuania has in her veins the same blood that gave to the world the works of the greatest Greek sculptors. This sister race of northeast Europe, whose democracy is older than the Greek, preserved not only her ancient flair for the plastic arts. She has kept alive through centuries of oppression the same inflexible aspiration for political freedom. It is this national hope and love of the soil of their motherland that has made modern Lithuanian sculpture what it is. The French have called Lithuanian sculpture the threshold of art and many of their own artists have gone to Lithuania for inspiration. Rimsa, perhaps the greatest of Lithuanian sculptors, gave to the world The Lithuanian School, a group which symbolizes the subject and cause of Lithuanian art. The old woman sitting by her spinning wheel, and teaching a child to spin, is a national symbol. For the suppressed language of the Lithuanians was preserved only in secret like the old woman at the spinning wheel, handing down the tradition of a culture that will not die.

Lithuanian girls are taught almost in babyhood to weave textiles which are made from thread spun and dyed by themselves. Their tiny fingers copy patterns their mothers made, the beautiful mosaic-like girdles, the linen tablecloths, the towels of satiny linen that last through years of use, and the exquisite tapestries that they never use but "keep in the families" for heirlooms. In the hand-woven carfs and the love bonds that encircle a Lithuanian girl's waist—this country shows her spiritual aloofness and the clear identity of her personality. These are the signs that demonstrate the continuity of her sturdy nationalism.

What the future holds for Lithuanian independence we cannot definitely predict. There are hopeful signs, however, the most recent of which was indicated in point 8 of the communique issued after the recent Crimea Conference. It reads: "It was agreed that the Big Three Powers should join in assisting any of the liberated or former Axis states of Europe in carrying out measures designed to guarantee the peoples' right to choose their own government. This is one of the most far-reaching decisions for it means that from now on the United States may have a direct hand in every European settlement pending the proposed creation role in world affairs."

This insistence on the right of people to vote regardless of political affiliation so long as it is not pro-Nazi was threaded through the communique and evidently represented the views of President Roosevelt, who was determined to seek agreement on the practical application of such Atlantic Charter principles.

As we meet in this church hall to observe the twenty-seventh anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, we sincerely hope and pray that she may be reconstituted as a democratic republic, to assume her rightful place as a member of the family of nations.

The way to that goal may not be short, and it may not be easy. But from her past we nourish confidence for her future. No nation which has suffered so through the centuries without losing her will to freedom can ever fail in her mission.

The strength of her Christian faith which has supported her through every trial will not be denied. It is this moral and spiritual character which have outlived all oppression. Even now it shames the restless conscience of mankind.

Lithuania lives in the hearts of her people. With unyielding belief in the justice of her cause, they do honor to her this day and look forward to the better day when she achieves her freedom for the rest of human time.

I join with you on this occasion to salute the spirit of Lithuania. May its vindication, through freedom, be near at hand. May God bless Lithuania.

Sometimes We Drive Too Fast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the article printed herewith David Lawrence asks, "Is American public opinion fickle or is it that the people have short memories?"

The people are not fickle and their memories are far longer than some folks believe. Sometimes, those of us who assume to speak for the people do not know what we are talking about and sometimes those who have assumed to speak for the people forget what they have said.

All too many—and this includes editorial writers and columnists who, sitting in their offices, mistakenly think they know what the people want—instead of stating facts, think that what they think is true when, in truth, it is nothing but an opinion.

One from abroad, reading the papers, might get the opinion that all of America enthusiastically wanted war; that now the people not only are determined to win the war, but that after the victory has been won, they want their flesh and blood to stay in Europe, in Africa, in Asia, in all the South Sea islands, and forever aid first one nation, then another, in whatever wars may be instigated, and that, in addition, our people are just crying for the privilege of feeding and clothing the people of all the world, even though they themselves go sockless and shirtless; that our people are going to be bitterly disappointed if we are not given the so-called privilege of rebuilding and equipping, for future competition with us, the towns, cities, harbors, industries destroyed or damaged during the war.

If anyone wishes to know what the people are thinking and what they want, the way is not to listen to the statements of Senators, Congressmen, editors, columnists, paid propagandists, but to get out into the highways and the byways and talk with the folks who have calluses on their hands and feet.

Lawrence's article is as follows:

CRIMEAN SETTLEMENT REQUIRES REVISION—CONFERENCE AT SAN FRANCISCO MUST ACT, WRITER BELIEVES

(By David Lawrence)

Is American public opinion fickle, or is it that the people have short memories?

Five weeks ago—January 10, to be exact—Senator VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan, made a speech decrying the partition of Poland as it had been proposed by Prime Minister Churchill, and urging, instead, that Germany be demilitarized by Britain, the United States, and Russia, thus making unnecessary the buffer-state security idea of Moscow.

Republicans and Democrats in the Senate applauded. The Nation applauded.

This last week it was announced that President Roosevelt had agreed at the Yalta Conference in the Crimea to do the exact opposite of that which the Michigan Senator had urged. Again the Nation, through the majority of the press, applauded.

Now to cap the climax, President Roosevelt has asked Senator VANDENBERG to serve as a member of the delegation to the coming conference of the United Nations at San Francisco, where a peace organization is to be set up, presumably to underwrite the very kind of thing against which Mr. VANDENBERG inveighed in his speech.

MUST VANDENBERG SOMERSAULT?

Where does this leave the Michigan Senator? Must he turn a somersault, too, reversing himself within 5 weeks and submitting himself to the rubber-stamp process of approving something which he already has disapproved?

Can Mr. VANDENBERG accept, unless he is free to advocate at San Francisco, the correction of the mistaken course which was insisted on by Churchill and Stalin at Yalta?

After discussing the speech of Prime Minister Churchill on December 15, last, in which the Curzon line settlement was first revealed to have been made secretly by the Prime Minister and Marshal Stalin, Senator VANDENBERG told the Senate that the desire for a buffer state by Russia was really based on a fear of the resurgence of German aggression.

He argued that a tripartite treaty adopted now would overcome that difficulty. Then, significantly urging a revision of any interim agreements, he added:

"I think we have the duty and the right to demand that whatever immediate unilateral decisions have to be made in consequence of military need—and there will be such even in civil affairs—they shall all be temporary and subject to final revision in the objective light of the post-war world and the post-war peace league."

Mr. VANDENBERG thereupon quoted from President Roosevelt's state of the Union

message earlier this year in which he had said that "during the interim period, until conditions permit a genuine expression of the people's will, we and our allies have a duty, which we cannot ignore, to use our influence to the end that no temporary or provisional authorities in the liberated countries block the eventual exercise of the people's right to choose the government and institutions under which, as free men, they are to live."

Since the Atlantic Charter was supposedly reaffirmed at Yalta, there can therefore be no final settlement now of the Polish boundary question—eastern or western—by the Russian-created Lublin government or by the exiled government in London because the charter specifically says there shall be "no territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

REVISION SEEN NECESSARY

It is obvious from the foregoing that the San Francisco conference must revise the so-called settlement at Yalta if the new charter of the United Nations is to be ratified by the American Senate.

Otherwise, as Mr. VANDENBERG himself said in his recent address, the American people would be asked to put a blank check warrant behind a future status quo which is unknown to us and which we might be unwilling to defend.

The Michigan Senator made two other statements which it is not likely he will abandon. He said:

"We are standing by our guns with epic heroism. I know of no reason why we should not stand by our ideals. * * *

"I am not prepared to guarantee permanently the spoils of an unjust peace. It will not work."

The Polish settlement has already been called the Alsace-Lorraine of World War No. 3. It can breed dissention and sow the seeds of another war not just because of the few miles of territory involved but because of the lack of principle in the whole procedure—the high-handed method by which the territory was arbitrarily taken from an ally in this war.

It was to protect the territorial integrity of Poland that Britain entered the war in 1939 and it was the defense of Britain which ultimately involved America. Wars grow out of seemingly unimportant bits of territorial aggrandizement and the indifference of peoples to issues, capable of becoming festering sores.

Full Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter on full surrender from the New York Times of January 24, 1945:

FULL SURRENDER DEMANDED—BUT THIS, IT IS HELD, IS NOT FOR THE GERMAN CIVILIAN POPULATION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Some radio commentators, a few publicists and some so-called statesmen, both here and abroad, are bombarding the people of the United Nations with what to me seems a false and altogether unwarranted barrage of propaganda.

The Observer of London and other publications in Great Britain and elsewhere, commentators on our radio, politicians in and out of Congress, in concert, are crying for an abandonment of the principle laid down by the United Nations of unconditional surrender by the Nazis and the Japanese.

Like Goebbels they assert that the demand for unconditional surrender means unconditional surrender by the German people as well as their armed forces. Indeed, they argue that to insist upon that demand bolsters the morale of the Nazis and Nazi-controlled Germans—if there are any Nazi-uncontrolled Germans. Goebbels, if he is wise—and he is wise, with the wisdom of the serpent—must use this propaganda to his own purpose. And the purpose of nazi-ism at this time is a negotiated peace. To abandon the agreed basis for the end of the war by the United Nations can only help the Nazis to bolster the rapidly sinking morale of the German people. For that would hold out hope of a negotiated peace.

ARMY MUST SURRENDER

It is axiomatic that in war surrender, conditional or otherwise, is surrender by the armed forces. The army surrenders. With such surrender the enemy government may acquiesce or fall. Surely our boys are not dying on the wide-flung battle fronts to destroy only the German Army or the Japanese armed forces. That, of course, is a prerequisite to the ultimate aim for which we are fighting. Beyond and above military victory our war is to erase from humankind the ideology for which the armed forces of our enemies are fighting—nazi-ism and shinto-ism.

In the natural course of events the German civilian population cannot surrender, nor would we accept a surrender from them. We would not treat with the present spokesman of the German civilian population, the Nazi Government. There can be no one to surrender the German people. It is their armed forces from which we demand and will exact unconditional surrender. That must be insisted upon if naziism is to be destroyed. Nazi-ism and junkerism are twin brothers.

On all sides I am asked, What does this propaganda mean; what is this business of abandoning the basis upon which the United Nations have agreed for ending the war?

And then I am asked, as territory occupied by the Nazis is liberated and the unspeakable and unimaginable bestiality practiced upon civilians by the Nazis is revealed. Does this propaganda mean a concerted effort to conclude a soft peace with the beasts responsible for the extinction of millions of lives in gas chambers? Yes; and I ask myself a question Why this propaganda? Does it mean that the criminals are to go scot-free? Does it mean that isolationists and concealed haters of democracy are preparing the ground for a soft peace?

NOT FOR GERMAN PEOPLE

Those who shout—and they do shout—against unconditional surrender know full well that it is the German Army, the Junkers, the SS., the Brownshirts, the Nazis, and their brute functionaries whom we will compel to surrender unconditionally—not the German people, if there is a German people that can be distinguished from the Nazis.

I am afraid of this propaganda. It is pregnant with danger to the morale of our boys and girls on the battle fronts and to our people on the home front. Our soldiers and the nurses who see their buddies when taken prisoners lined up and then mowed down by machine guns, and the uniform of the dead, the uniform of our country, desecrated when it clothes a Nazi, when they see the identification tags of our heroes used by Nazis to treacherously attack, they react with astonishment at this new type of propaganda.

Our people must bear in mind that unconditional surrender is surrender of the armed Nazi hordes, surrender of Nazi ideology, complete surrender of nazi-ism, for erasure and destruction. Moreover, we must all remember our dead, our wounded, our fighting men. Bear in mind what they are fighting for, and shun this vicious and specious propaganda.

JACOB PANKEN,
Justice, Domestic Relations Court of the City of New York.
BROOKLYN, *January 23, 1945.*

Manpower Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of February 12, 1945:

MANPOWER PROBLEM—II. LESSONS FROM CLEVELAND

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

Both labor and management agree that the manpower problem is not wholly a question of numbers but also a question of proper utilitization of manpower already in the factories.

The most efficient, fixed-price factories in Cleveland, such as Warner & Swazey Co. and the Graphite Bronze Co., are getting a per capita production rate of 75 percent, whereas it ought to be 90 percent. The national average is supposed to be about 65 percent. These figures indicate a staggering wastage of production and capital. In other words, there is no all-out war effort, yet the worker is probably the least to blame for this poor showing.

The feeling generated among our troops against the home front as slackers is as dangerous as it is unjust. Now that this split in our national morale has taken place, we suddenly feel the need to mend it with such measures as the May "work or jail" bill. But the only real stimulus to morale lies in the recovery of our former magnificent production record. It is dangerous to confuse moral and material issues. Our prime objective must remain that of supplying our boys at the front with all the weapons they need. To do this we must first understand why the home-front army is not making its maximum effort.

Here are some of the cogent explanations:

In Cleveland the local bureaus of the Federal Government are a bad example. Everyone knows they are overstaffed. Army, Navy, Air Force, and W. P. B. A clerk in the W. P. B. said to me: "We have nothing to do in our department, but today they hired three more girls." In the military staffs, great numbers of young men in uniform are holding jobs that older men or women could do equally well.

An appalling waste of manpower is in the cost-plus-fixed-fee factories, where the Government pays the bill. The turn-over in these establishments is such that, as one labor union man said: "Putting manpower into these factories is just like throwing mud against the wall in the hope that some of it will stick." Of one notorious plant, the Cleveland people say that the workers play bridge on the assembly line.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR LOST PRODUCTION

Labor declares that inefficient management, poor labor relations, and bad working conditions are responsible for a part of the lost production. Management points out that labor union committeemen are deliberately restricting production in many of the best-run plants where the labor relations and working conditions are ideal. The union leaders do not deny this when talking off the record. They are thinking of the post-war situation when work will have to be spread out again. For that matter, the W. P. B. has made a goodly contribution to restriction of output through failure to release materials promptly.

The loss of highly skilled workers in vast numbers to the armed forces has also had its effect on production. The quota system of recruiting is partially to blame for this. There are 51 draft boards in Cleveland. Good mechanics were taken in one Cleveland area, when across the street in another area there were young men under 26 who had not been called up.

Governor Lausche is holding a conference soon to work out and submit to the Army a plan for a more proportionate distribution and a less rigid interpretation of Ohio's quotas because this whole question has such an immediate bearing on the manpower problem. We are reaching the bottom of the manpower barrel. It now takes three new people to replace any skilled worker taken into the Army, and much production is lost while the substitutes are being trained.

Nor has the constant migration of workers between cities and States been checked. A statement of availability entitling the worker to seek a new job can still be obtained from the W. M. C. by anybody who leaves a war plant and goes into unessential industry or just loafs for 60 days. This leaves the W. M. C.'s control system wide open and encourages floating from place to place or from factory to factory.

Management will tell you that strikes are always condoned by our labor government, whereas management has been humiliated to a point where it has no control over its workers. "Under the Wagner Act," said one of the best Cleveland managers, "no company has the right to enforce discipline. Political considerations have dominated the manpower field. There has been great emphasis on labor's rights but none on labor's duty to do a good day's work for a good day's pay."

Labor replies that in the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee plants there has likewise been no emphasis on the duties of management, since these contracts are an invitation to management not to concern itself with costs.

FEDERAL POLICIES TO BLAME

It is impossible for the most objective observer to measure whether bad labor policies or bad management have created the greater amount of restriction in production. But it is clear that both are an outgrowth of Federal policies, if they can be called policies. Moreover, uncertainty as to the Government's post-war plans, leads both management and labor to jockey for position in the post-war world.

This slant on the whole situation foments increasing friction, cuts production, and makes the worker a helpless pawn in the struggle for power. With any assurance of a sane post-war program, the best elements both in management and the unions would work harmoniously as both factions know and say that the survival of private industry depends on their mutual understanding and cooperation.

But the psychological battering which the workers have endured has had perhaps the most depleting influence upon production. The enthusiasm which I found everywhere in the war-production centers 2 years ago has disappeared. Campaigns to break down worker complacency cannot counteract the influence of stern facts. Uncertainty and lowered morale among workers began when in 1944 there was a sharp cut-back in orders and the headlines supported the conviction that the war was over. Thousands of men and women were dismissed. Workers without seniority streamed out of the factories and took nonessential jobs. Many went home, never to return.

As I talked to all types of workers, they complained that accurate information concerning the war's progress has been withheld; they get nervous now that orders in the factories have increased from 65 to 200 percent, because the war headlines are favorable to a speedy victory and they don't know what to think. The disrepute into which Washington has fallen with these intelligent people, through the bungling, contradictory orders to which they have been subjected, is a serious matter. Over and over again groups of them ended such discussions by saying: "The truth is, the home front has no leadership."

The effects upon the morale of the workers—the emotional confusion, cynicism, the widespread feeling that the Federal Government is inefficient and insincere—can be seen in the mounting number of people who break down from fatigue, strain, and war psychosis, not only physically but mentally.

Nor are the mental cases only women or new industrial recruits. Some of them are mature, capable, steady men with long employment records in the same factory. What the war worker needs to steady his morale is order on the home front and the feeling that the plans for post-war employment are being made by people whom he can trust. That would eliminate the fears that now beset many of them and boost production from 15 to 25 percent in a short space of time.

JACK & HEINTZ

There can be no complete picture of the manpower situation in Cleveland without reference to the firm of Jack & Heintz.

Bill Jack, at a time of Nation-wide shortages, still has more than 150 workers at his gate asking for jobs every day. He obtained permission to raise his ceiling by 1,500 employees to meet his new orders and found them at once. "The manpower shortage is rot" said Bill Jack. "My wages are no higher than other people's. I can get all the labor I need and, in spite of the hard winter, my turn-over and unauthorized absenteeism is zero."

His products are acknowledged to be tops, whereas his prices are the lowest in the field. "I am still reducing prices," he volunteered, "after refunding last year a $75,000,000 voluntary cash reduction."

Among these workers there is no fear, no strain nor restlessness. The Jack & Heintz workrooms had the same happy relaxed atmosphere that made such a deep impression on me 2 years ago when I first discovered and described this industrial phenomenon.

Since then his associates have built or purchased 728 charming little houses near the plant, and contractors put up 27 apartment houses especially for them. The associates have also invested fifteen millions in the business, to the dismay of the local A. F. of L. labor leader, Mathew De More, for unions are necessarily weakened when the worker has a stake in the company. They own 75 percent of the business—all in Class A stock—and they would have bought Bill out if he hadn't insisted on keeping a 25-percent interest for himself and his son. Last week the associates tossed $101,000 worth of dimes into the infantile paralysis drive, but they reserved half of it for Dr. Toomey of Western Reserve University Medical School to do general research work on childhood diseases.

Concerning the post-war world, Bill overflows with enthusiasm. He sees the country rebuilding houses, trucks, automobiles, tractors, and a thousand other restricted materials.

RECONVERSION PLANS

What will he do? Bill pointed to a beautiful transparent plastex clock on a handsome stand. In any jewelry store, it would look like $50 worth. Jack & Heintz will roll them off the assembly line for $6.

What else?

After a short hesitation, a mischievous grin lit up his features. "I've got some things that will knock their eyes out. And I'm going to tell you one of the secrets—just one. I have a vacuum cleaner that works on the gyroscope principle. Figure that out if you can. You don't have to plug it into a switch. It works under its own power and does as good a job as the best vacuum cleaner ever made, at half the price. I invent these new things with a few of my engineers as a side issue instead of groaning about the future.

"The Federal Government ought to stop scaring the daylights out of business. Of course they won't risk their capital if they can make more by just buying Government bonds. The Government must lower taxes enough to bring capital into the market and make it worth while for businessmen to take a risk.

"I am all set for reconversion and it won't be costly. We will give the 'associates' 2 weeks off, or maybe 30 days, with pay. During that time, 100 toolmakers and millwrights will take the machines we now have and make them over. When they are finished, these men will take their month off, the 'associates' will come back, rested, and we'll start rolling.

"As for labor, you can't overpay it. Our annual take-home per worker last year was $5,800 at going rates. That was for an 80-hour week. Now it is my job to find out how they can make as much in the future in a 40-hour week. That's the way to face the post-war problem. Keep wages high and raise 'em as fast as you can. Big wages make for prosperity."

Bill Jack, it seemed to me, has found the best solution of the manpower problem—security for his workers.

Bretton Woods Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 President Roosevelt sent a message to the Congress asking for immediate passage of legislation to implement the agreements arrived at by the representatives of 44 nations at the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference held last July. Briefly, these agreements covered the establishment of an International Bank for World Reconstruction and Development, and an International Monetary Fund. These two institutions were to have a combined capital of $18,000,000,000, one-third of which the United States would be expected to furnish, but the United States would be expected to provide more than one-half of the gold or gold currency in the fund. In other words, our gold and sound currency would be put in to match the depreciated currencies of the busted nations. The gentleman from New York, Congressman REED, described the Bretton Woods agreement as follows:

Boiled down to the lowest common denominator the Bretton Woods agreements proposed the establishment of an international bank, Uncle Sam to furnish most of the money, but the borrowers to control the bank.

The guiding spirit of the Bretton Woods Conference was Lord Keynes, a British economist. The agreements arrived at were for the most part his proposals. This is the same Lord Keynes who persuaded President Roosevelt early in 1933 to discard his economy program and embark upon the spend and spend and spend program of the New Deal. The Bretton Woods agreements, if accepted by Congress and implemented by law, would start us off on a world-wide spending spree to rebuild a war-torn world in the face of our $300,000,000,000 debt. Why should Uncle Sam follow the lead of a discredited English economist, one whom the English themselves refuse to follow?

ADVICE FROM ANOTHER ENGLISHMAN

Sir Walter Citrine, a titled Englishman, in a speech at the recent London World Trade Union Conference, proposed an international T. V. A., which would include a Rhine Valley Authority and a Danube Valley Authority to develop electric power for European use. Sir Walter did not say so, but the inference was plain that this international T. V. A. should be set up, established, and paid for, by the taxpayers of the United States. If the Bretton Woods agreements are implemented by law they will provide convenient machinery for financing this international T. V. A.

The post-war monetary scheme of Lord Keynes and the international T. V. A. scheme of Sir Walter Citrine are very closely related. Significantly, the President's message to the Congress urging the passage of legislation to implement the Bretton Woods agreements came immediately after Sir Walter's speech at the London conference. Can it be possible that the proposals of these two titled Englishmen add up to the fact that John Bull again wants Uncle Sam to pull England's financial chestnuts out of the fire and once again get our fingers burned while doing it?

The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Wednesday, February 14, 1945, pertaining to the President's message requesting the passage of legislation to implement the Bretton Woods agreements throws light upon the problem that is now before this Congress. It should be of interest to the membership of this House. I therefore include it as a part of my remarks:

BRETTON WOODS

The President in his message Monday called upon Congress to approve the proposals formulated at the international monetary and financial conference held last summer at Bretton Woods, N. H. He can hardly expect that his request will be granted.

The whole idea of the conference came from John Maynard Keynes, the world's most celebrated advocate of inflation. That the plans which were agreed upon did not disappoint Mr. Keynes was shown by his statement that if adopted they would oil the wheels of trade by a great addition to the world's stock of monetary reserves, distributed in a reasonable way.

Keynes has been trying to get his inflationary schemes adopted for years, but never made any progress in England, altho he made quite an impression on Mr. Roosevelt and was the one who got the President to embark on deficit spending to prime the pump early in the New Deal. Failure by Mr. Roosevelt's British adviser to get his own government to accept his theories was due to the fact that it was a creditor nation, and it would have been lunacy to let the other countries pay their British debts in depreciated money.

During this war Britain changed from a creditor to a debtor country. As Keynes put it in a speech in the House of Lords, "We have burdened ourselves with a weight of deferred indebtedness to other countries beneath which we shall stagger."

The debt would be nothing at all if world-wide inflation could be brought about. Keynes came here to put that idea over, and with the aid of his disciples high in the New Deal, was able to do so. There was advance agreement by Roosevelt with Keynes before a meeting was called.

To guard against any slip-up, the delegates to the conference had to be people who would not upset the apple cart. None of the Nation's celebrated experts went to Bretton Woods. Even so consistent a supporter of the Roosevelt administration, especially on international collaboration, as the New York Times was moved to say that the list of delegates, "in all candor is not encouraging."

After the conference made its report virtually every expert of standing denounced it. Repeated efforts were made to get delegates to engage in joint discussions of the proposals with men of broad experience in international money and financial matters. So far as we know the delegates always sidestepped. It was never possible to get Morgenthau, White, and the others cornered in full view of the public.

One leading banker after another told of his grave alarm about the Bretton Woods proposals. By the time that the bankers' association met in Chicago opposition to the plans had swept the country. It was only after the promise of the association officials that a committee would be appointed to study the subject and report upon it that the bankers were persuaded not to issue a strong statement denouncing the schemes.

The bankers' association committee completed its work recently and published a report urging Congress to refuse to approve the international currency stabilization fund. It approved the creation of a bank to make loans to foreign governments, but under an arrangement far different from that planned at Bretton Woods. The schemes the President calls upon Congress to approve have no support in any informed quarter.

Religious Tolerance of Washington Cited at Anniversary Rites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE OF WASHINGTON CITED AT ANNIVERSARY RITES

George Washington was described as "more of a Christian than a churchman" and "ahead of his day in his tolerance of the religious views of others" in an address yesterday featuring a joint celebration of the two hundred and thirteenth anniversary of his birth by four patriotic organizations.

Capt. William N. Thomas, Naval Academy chaplain, discussed The Religion of George Washington in the program held at Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church.'

From the mass of material available, Capt. Thomas declared, George Washington's creed can be summarized broadly as follows: Belief in a wise and benevolent Supreme Being; a high moral standard, charity, and faith in the ultimate supremacy of the good.

"He was not so much interested in abstract religion as in its practical application," Capt. Thomas declared. "The results of this practical faith are too well known today to be disputed."

Three resolutions which Washington drew up at 13 for the conduct of his life were quoted by the speaker: "When you speak of God or His attributes, let it be seriously, in reverence. Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of fire called conscience. Honor and obey your parents, whatever may be their condition."

With this beginning, Captain Thomas continued, it is not surprising that Washington wrote as a mature man: "I shall always strive to be a faithful and impartial patron of genuine religion" and "it is impossible to reason without arriving at a Supreme Being."

Rear Admiral Frederick G. Pyne, United States Navy, retired, president of the District Society, Sons of the Revolution, was chairman of the joint committee on arrangements. Greetings were extended by the following representatives of participating organizations: John B. Gordon, General Society, Sons of the Revolution; Mrs. Goeffrey Creyke, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; Mrs. Louise Mosely Heaton, National Society, Children of the American Revolution, and Frank B. Steele, National Society, Sons of the American Revolution.

The Reverend John W. Rustin, minister of Mt. Vernon Place Methodist Church, gave the invocation and the benediction was pronounced by the Reverend G. Freeland Peter, former canon and chancellor of Washington Cathedral.

Howard Hosmer, Jr., and Barbara A. Milburn of the C. A. R. led the pledge of allegiance to the flag and the American's Creed. Music was provided by the United States Marine Band Orchestra and the Arlington Male Chorus.

After the service a wreath was placed at the base of the Washington Monument.

Poland Betrayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News of February 19, 1945:

POLAND BETRAYED, BISHOP DECLARES—MOST REV. E. J. FITZMAURICE HITS IMMORAL PHASE OF BIG THREE YALTA PARLEY

"We weep today for Poland betrayed by her own allies; forsaken by fair-weather friends; given over to an implacable enemy bent on Poland's destruction," declared the Most Reverend Dr. Edmond J. FitzMaurice, bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Wilmington, at a

memorial mass meeting honoring Washington, Lincoln, and Thaddeus Kosciusko attended by nearly 700 persons in Modjeska hall yesterday afternoon.

"Once again," continued Bishop FitzMaurice, "we saw might triumph over right. I am sorry our President and representative at the Yalta Conference apparently meekly acquiesced in this tragedy; this shameful and scurvy treatment accorded gallant Poland, first to resist Nazi tyranny with arms." Paying tribute to Poland's great sacrifices and sufferings in this war, Bishop FitzMaurice said "her reward and fate now appears to be the imposition of chains and a slavery worse than any she has known in the past."

Remarking that "as one American I believe we should protest; and until justice is done Poland that we should deem it an honor to share in the grief and sorrow of her distraught sons and daughters," Bishop FitzMaurice expressed the hope that Americans "will rise in their wrath against this immoral phase of the Yalta Conference which strips Poland of nearly half its land without it having even a voice in the proceedings; and would take by force the land of another country to recompense Poland. I hope the American people will protest. Even if they do, it may not avail, but if the protest is made we shall at least stand absolved before the bar of history as refusing to call wrong right." The bishop also scored the Yalta Conference decision on Poland as a "repudiation by cynical men of the Atlantic Charter principles. Hitler must have rejoiced as he saw approval and ratification of his doctrine of conquest by force," he said.

Bishop FitzMaurice said that over and above protest in this matter, "we can pray for Poland. I believe that God in His mercy and justice and in His good time will come to the aid of a great people, long an honored member of Christendom, a defender of Christendom's faith and culture through the ages."

Tributes were paid by the bishop to Washington as "a name which will ever stand as a challenge to tyranny and as a symbol of high character and noble purposes; the father of our Republic"; to Lincoln, "rugged, strong preserver of the Republic; devoid of malice and vindictiveness in victory," and to Kosciusko, "whose military genius and burning love of liberty contributed in no small measure to the victory of American arms. For them we utter the ancient Catholic prayer: 'Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon them.' * * *"

The Rev. Joseph F. Delikat, an assistant rector of St. Hedwig's Catholic Church, presided. Register in Chancery Adam J. Rosiak, secretary of the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs of Delaware, which sponsored the memorial mass meeting, and Vincent J. Kowalewski, president of the council, both denounced the Yalta Conference decision concerning Poland's future.

Others on the platform were: the Rev. John S. Gulcz, rector of St. Hedwig's Church; the Rev. Stanley W. Delikat, an assistant rector; Anthony J. Emory, former register in chancery; and Charles L. Paruszewski, another local attorney.

A group of boys and girls of St. Hedwig's Parochial School and Boy Scouts of Troop 7, affiliated with the Pulaski Legion, presented a program of recitations and songs honoring Washington, Lincoln, and Kosciusko. Taps was played over a catafalque of Kosciusko on the stage. Felician Sisters of the school directed the program. The Pulaski Legion Junior Band, conducted by Carl T. Elmer, played selections including the national anthems of the United States and Poland.

Baseball and the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting and pertinent statement issued by Mr. Sam Breadon, owner of the St. Louis National League Baseball Club.

There has been much discussion in recent weeks concerning the duration future of the major sports, and in particular baseball. In my opinion baseball plays an important part in the war effort. It not only lifts morale on the home front, providing relaxation for workers in our war industries, but it lifts morale of our men in the armed forces in all parts of the world.

Best testimony as to the importance of baseball on the home front comes from the endorsement given the game as a wartime morale builder by high executives of the steel industry, who have publicly expressed their fear that discontinuance of the sport would promptly be felt in decreased efficiency of workers. Workers must have their days of relaxation. It is best that they find it in clean sports.

Newspapermen who had the privilege of touring the battle fronts with the several groups of baseball stars this past winter have told me they were astounded at the uplift the presence of the ball players brought to the fighting men. It was apparent, the newsmen stated, that the men had continued their interest in baseball and that just through following daily scores of their favorite teams they had an interest that helped their morale.

Mr. Breadon's statement covers only his Cardinals' contribution to the war effort. Multiply this by 16 and you have an idea of the tremendous amount of good done by major-league baseball through our war years. Add to this the contribution from minor-league baseball and then who can say, in the face of such figures, that baseball has not helped in the war effort. What nonwar industry can cite a better record?

Baseball may not be absolutely essential to winning the war—but it will help.

Mr. Breadon's statement follows:

I think it is about time that someone connected with baseball tell something about what baseball has done as its contribution to the war effort. I speak only for the St. Louis Cardinals. I know what we have done.

We are one of the few businesses that has made no money through the war, but we have cooperated with every request made by any Government agency.

The Cardinals have admitted free to Sportsmans Park during the past 3 years a total of 160,417 servicemen.

The Cardinals have played three games in St. Louis and three games on the road each year for the past 3 years, the total receipts of which went to Army and Navy relief. These averaged over $20,000 for each game in St. Louis. In addition, we played at least 5 games a year at service camps, foregoing the opportunity to play exhibition games which would have netted us a minimum of $2,000 a game.

The Cardinals were fortunate in being in the world series the last 3 years. And the amount deducted from the Cardinals' share of world series receipts and donated to the War Relief and Service Club amounted to over $225,000 for the 3 years.

In the last 3 years the Cardinals paid in dividends to its stockholders the total sum of $80,000.

I think these figures speak for themselves. The Cardinals are only one of 16 major league clubs. The other clubs have done as well, or possibly better, with the exception of the donation from the world series, the Cardinals being the only club that has been in three world series during the war.

I'm not saying anything about the three all-star games, the total of which went to war relief, nor about the money donated by the commissioner, the two leagues, and the other clubs in the world series. I'm only mentioning the Cardinals' share.

There were over 450 men joined the colors from the Cardinal organization during the war. A number of these men have been killed, wounded, and missing. And I know of no club official or ballplayer who asked for any favors from his draft board or his examining board.

I think when thought is given to what baseball has done, instead of criticism, we merit praise.

SAM BREADON.

The Infantry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday, February 18, the press branch of the Bureau of Public Relations of the War Department issued a release entitled "The Infantry," which was prefaced by a note to the editor. The author of this letter, Maj. Flake L. McHaney, comes from my home town and from one of the leading families in my home county, Dunklin.

Major McHaney is a graduate of the University of Missouri and a product of the R. O. T. C. program at that institution. He volunteered for service at the outbreak of the war and has engaged in some of the major campaigns in Italy where he is now stationed. It would be well if our chronic grumblers, critics, and kickers who daily bemoan the hardships they are forced to endure under wartime conditions would read this letter and find out what our doughboys are going through for them.

Under leave granted, I insert this letter, which is as follows:

THE INFANTRY

(NOTE TO EDITOR.—The following appreciation of the American infantryman was written in a letter by Maj. Flake L. McHaney, of Kennett, Mo., a Field Artillery officer of

the Ninety-first Division, after watching an Infantry battalion file past his command post to the front in northern Italy.)

A mind burns on a subject until it cannot remain silent longer. In every man's life there is some injustice he feels and sometime he must voice that feeling—so it is with me.

Tonight I watched the American doughboy moving up a dirty mud trail in the heart of a mountainous section of Italy. These doughboys have been in reserve and are now going up to replace another battalion. To be in reserve has meant that they were several hundred yards behind the front lines; that they lived in a puptent rather than not having any shelter; that they had two blankets rather than one; that they did not have to march through the rain, just live in it; that they were not constantly subjected to small arms fire but just artillery and mortar.

It has been raining for many days. They have not been dry, not only their feet, but their entire bodies, during all of this time. The rain is not a warm tropical rain but that b—— cold type that is too warm to snow, which would bring comfort to aching bodies, but cold enough to keep the body numb, the nose running, the skin purple—not just today but for several days past. Despite their discomforts, they have been in reserve, in rest, compared to their fellow soldiers in the assault battalions.

I watch their faces as they pass. One catches my attention. He is a tall, thin man about 40—probably a father participating in a youth's game. He is walking in the hard rain with his weapon, ammunition, grenades, entrenching tool. He has one blanket rolled into a shelter-half. His feet are wet and have been wet for days; there is no possible way to keep them dry. Even though he has been in "rest" the expression on his face is one of a tired, fatigued, miserable man. Now he is going back into battle to relieve tired troops.

His life for the next few days will not be so glamorous. He will be shot at with everything from a pistol to a 280-mm. artillery piece. He will rush into foxholes in which everything but his head will be under water and sometimes his head will go under, too—but he will gladly seek the foxhole because the water makes no difference—he cannot be wetter than he is now. At night, while he is not on the outpost line, he will unroll his one blanket, dip the water out of a foxhole and prop his shelter-half above him to keep the water out, or part of it.

Of course, he is cold and wet and one small blanket is not sufficient to keep him warm or allow him to sleep but it will allow him to lie down and he appreciates that opportunity. He will get up early in the morning before daylight, still wet, colder than before and will have a nice cold C or K ration; however, to him it will be better than fried eggs are to some of the other arms this same morning.

Upon finishing his breakfast, he will prepare himself to "jump off" at the first crack of dawn. However, the term "jump off" is a little strenuous for his condition and "crawl out" would be more appropriate. As soon as daylight comes the same shells which kept him awake all night begin to fall in greater quantities, mortars crack all around him and "rat or burp" guns (a German automatic weapon) announce their nearness. He will again endure a million deaths.

Since first entering combat, I have learned much about the American soldier, particularly about the infantryman since we are light, direct support Artillery—that closest to the Infantry.

There are times when all infantrymen become mad; when something is done by the enemy which to them appears to be unfair or not humane. At that time they become cold, relentless killers but do not remain so for long. I believe that if the American soldier should remain mad he would be the most ruthless killer in the world.

The doughboy does not feel that he is underpaid, he feels that there are a lot of people overpaid. He envies the unjust glory and glamor that is heaped upon other arms while people look upon him as being an infantryman, that thing that people are because they can't do anything else. To him, the war does not represent parties in London, Paris, and Rome; the living in luxurious hotels, the seeing of traveling U. S. O. shows. To the doughboy the war represents mud, dirt, slime, cold, heat, hunger, blood.

The American people will never know what the doughboy experiences, regardless of the number of Ernie Pyles, because the average American has not experienced these things. If there were enough doughboys in the world, there would never be another war.

The Infantry always has been and always will be the queen of battles—the unsung heroes of the war.

Punishment of War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a radio address which I delivered on the program Congressional Record on the Air, broadcast over Station WHN, New York City, Monday, February 19, 1945:

The cancer of Fascism—which feeds on and destroys the good cells of the body politic—can be cured only by an operation to eliminate the roots of this modern plague.

Those roots are the power-mad men who scorn all concepts of civilized conduct, who revert to the beast in order to rob, beat, and murder their fellow men and fellow nations.

It is barbarism in modern dress and using modern techniques and as such it has fooled many well-meaning men who do not yet see its calculated plan to destroy all who stand in its way.

This present war is not a contest between military forces alone. It is an assault on civilization by those who scientifically plan to destroy the mind and spirit of man. Our enemies war on unarmed civilians as surely as they fight our soldiers. The Jews and the Poles in particular have been singled out for slow but certain extermination. This is biological warfare, where the enemy, in another generation, hopes to turn defeat into victory. To the Nazis, this war is but one phase of a permanent plan for eventual conquest. Even though they lose on the field of battle, they plan to conquer in other ways. The deliberate undernourishment of children in the countries they have occupied; the separation of husbands from wives—these are methodical steps to weaken the people of neighboring countries so that they will be unable to resist future aggression.

This is the long-term policy. At times the Gestapo, impatient for results, staged carnivals of mass murder. The world knows of Lublin and Lidice. It does not know of the millions of people, not soldiers, who have been systematically slaughtered.

The American people, far removed from the scenes of these wholesale crimes, find it hard to believe them. Therein lies the danger that the easy-going American people may let these crimes go unpunished. It is upon this complacency that our enemies rely, hoping to escape the indictment by an outraged humanity—hoping for a breathing spell during which they may prepare to strike again.

You want evidence? Pay attention then to the statement made by Gen. Otto von Stuelpnagel, the military governor of Paris, as quoted in the New York Times, March 12, 1944:

"What does a provisional defeat matter to us if we have been able to destroy so much manpower and material in neighboring countries that we have obtained an economic and numerical superiority greater than before 1939? The conquest of the world will require numerous stages, but the essential is that the end of each stage brings us an economic and industrial potential greater than that of our enemies. With the war booty we have accumulated, the enfeebling of two generations of the manpower of our neighbors, and the destruction of their industry, we shall be better placed to conquer 25 years from now than we were in 1939."

Consider further the instructions issued to the War Academy in Berlin by Marshal von Rundstedt, currently commanding the German troops who are fighting our men in the Siegfried line;

"The destruction of neighboring peoples and their riches is indispensable to our victory. One of the great mistakes of 1918 was to spare the civil life of the enemy countries, for it is necessary for us Germans to be at least double the number of peoples in contiguous countries. We are therefore obliged to destroy at least a third of their inhabitants. The only means is organized underfeeding, which in this case is better than machine guns."

This is the enemy we must deal with; the implacable foe of every human decency who will continue in his crimes until we bring him to justice and make him realize once and for all that crime does not pay.

It is not that we charge the Axis war criminals with personal responsibility for the 20,000,000 casualties caused by their cruelty and greed. We cannot hope for restitution of the billions which they have stolen or expect them to rebuild the vast areas they have destroyed. As in past times these are apt to be charged off to the general crime of war in itself, for which mankind has found no solution.

We hold them responsible however for the millions of men, women, and children guilty of no offense except that they were not wanted, who have been deliberately murdered in death factories. We recoil in horror to think that fellowmen could be capable of such atrocities. We carry the heavy burden of shame until justice has been done. If we permit them to escape we shall become accessories after the fact. Our common dignity as men must be redeemed by the punishment of these evil-doers.

I could bring to your attention the well-documented evidence of the terrible persecution of the Polish Jews, but the record is too shocking to reveal over the radio. Never in the history of mankind, even in the days before religion and reason, has anything occurred to match the brutality that was inflicted on the Jewish population of Poland. Even with the evidence at hand, it is impossible for the human mind and spirit to realize and feel the full meaning of this crime. It is too vast, too cruel, for contemplation.

Even those men of good will who saw it happen cannot fully understand it. For they are alive, but the victims suffered and died.

All this happened to other people in other lands, but recently we saw it happen on a small scale to our own relatives and friends. The German armies on the western front, under the command of the same cynical Von Rundstedt, who counseled the scientific extermination of innocent civilians, tried a last, desperate counter-offensive. In the course of that drive some of our American soldiers were captured. One hundred and fifty of them, being herded back to the German rear, were stopped in an open field and told to raise their hands. German armored units ringed the defenseless prisoners and gleefully mowed them down with machine-gun fire.

Even war has a few rules, but the enemy could not even abide by them. He did not attempt to hide his crime or to minimize it. A few days later a German spokesman asserted boldly that they had a right to do anything and everything to gain their ends. To the perverted mentality of the enemy, a criminal can do no wrong. This is but a sample of the enemy we are fighting. This is the leadership that must answer for its crimes.

The hour of retribution is near. When the enemy is defeated in the field, the Allies will set up a temporary military government. One of the first steps must be the quick round-up, trial, and punishment of war criminals. Our Government has been compiling an atrocity list of gestapo men, SS troops, and other German agents charged with perpetrating crimes against the peoples of the conquered countries. Russia and Great Britain are compiling their own lists. Swift and pitiless action against the war criminals is necessary to convince the German people that their leaders can no longer escape the responsibility, not only for starting wars but for making murder of civilians an instrument of national policy. The German people have proved themselves incapable of assuming this responsibility. In fact, by their tacit consent to, and their active support of this criminal leadership, they too are morally responsible. There is no underground, no active minority in Germany which can be depended upon to clean house. The Allies must do the job without compromise or delay. Every German official responsible for the torture and slaughter of civilians, ranging from Hitler, Goebbels, Goering, Himmler, and all down the line of executioners, must be brought to immediate trial. Even German Army generals who permitted war crimes in occupied territories under their command must answer before the bar of world justice.

In our society, when one man unlawfully, and with malice aforethought, takes another human life, he is punished by death or long imprisonment. He pays a forfeit for the wrong he has done to another. He becomes an example, a warning to others who might be tempted to break the laws of God and violate the sacredness of human personality.

That same divine law applies to nations as well as individuals. That nation which, unlawfully, and with malice aforethought, takes the lives of its own or neighboring peoples, or tortures them, must be held responsible, through its leaders, for these crimes. The defendants, Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Imperialist Japan are indicted by the community of nations not for one crime but for millions. The evidence already in is overwhelming, and there is much more to follow.

The peace and safety of this world cannot and will not endure the ravaging hands of outlaw nations. There is no place in modern society for the law of the jungle. Those spiritually bankrupt men and nations who revert to brutality must answer to their fellow men. The battered bodies and broken minds of the victims of Fascist terror—modern martyrs to the dignity of the human spirit—must ever remind us that we are their only hope of vindication. Through us, the wrong that has been done to them must be righted.

There is no forgiveness except through repentance. It is idle, however, to expect repentance from Fascist bullies who, in murdering so many millions of human beings, have brutalized their own minds and hearts beyond any possible redemption.

There is one law and only one law that they can possibly understand—that they shall pay, in person, for the outrages they have inflicted upon so many. Whatever price they pay will fall so far short of the fearful debt they owe to a shocked humanity. Inadequate though it is, the price must be paid. So that our own conscience may be satisfied, we must be unrelenting in the punishment of Axis war criminals. It is our solemn responsibility to write this page of justice for history so that generations to come, reading it, will be ever vigilant against the beast of tyranny that cloaks itself in the likeness of a man. And knowing it they will protect themselves from it before it can torture them, as it did to so many men, women, and children of our time.

As we read the lengthening casualty lists of the many young men on the threshold of life who are daily sacrificing their lives to beat down the Fascist menace, we must realize that it is up to us to finish the job they started.

The security of our American way of life must and will be preserved. With other men of good will we must work to establish a world system to preserve the peace. At the same time we cannot forget the lawless tyrants who brought mass misery to mankind in an outburst of sadism unequaled in history. Though defeated in war, these men and the vicious creed they foster will remain a constant source of infection unless we act soon, and swiftly, to eliminate it.

Plain justice sanctions the punishment of Axis war criminals. Our own safety and that of the whole civilized world demands it. Let not the ghost of appeasement rise up to mock the victims of Fascist brutality.

Together with our allies let us hold steadfast to our determination that: "He who lives by the sword shall die by the sword."

Radio Address of Lothrop Stoddard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has already been announced that the most powerful propaganda battery in the world will soon swing into action in support of every secret commitment made at the three-man conference at Yalta. This attempt to use such a propaganda agency at the expense of the taxpayer to blot from the minds of the citizens of this great Nation any attempt on their part to give careful and thoughtful consideration of the defective features of a new Crimean Charter surrounded by an emotional halo is to foster a most dangerous program of deception.

This so-called campaign of education to be financed by funds taken from the pockets of citizens through taxation is in and of itself a piece of totalitarian technique. It is not alone the use of the radio and moving picture that is to be used in an effort to magnify virtues in the so-called Crimean Charter, which do not exist, but these funds from lend-lease and other sources will be drawn upon to send a hoard of speakers to present only one side of the question at clubs and organizations throughout the country; prominent of course among those speakers will be those who have been indoctrinated with the philosophy, not of our country, but by all those countries which seek to drain from our resources and our taxpayers the last drop of blood and the pound of flesh before our own people can escape from the spell and delusion of this great propaganda drive.

There are some persons who are sufficiently objective and discriminating enough not to be caught in this whirlpool of foreign propaganda. I am glad to know that one commentator, Lothrop Stoddard, has had the courage to point out the dangers inherent in secret agreements, secretly arrived at by three men who have usurped the function of committing their people to things that must of necessity breed another war. Pursuant to a unanimous consent request obtained on Monday, February 19, 1945, I am extending a radio address delivered by Mr. Lothrop Stoddard on February 18, 1945:

The hectic tension which we have recently experienced, due to the sense of great events impending, has given place to keen realization of what has happened this week in the fields of both war and diplomacy. Last Monday a waiting world devoured the joint communiqué on the momentous conference at Yalta in the Crimea between Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin, while hardly had the text of that document been diligently scanned than our Navy announced the mass air bombing of Tokyo and coincident attacks on the island ladder leading to the very heart of Japan. I should greatly prefer to devote this broadcast to a discussion of those heartening events in the Pacific, with all that they may imply. However, I feel impelled to the less agreeable task of analyzing the Yalta communiqué, which strikes me much less favorably than it has most of my colleagues on the radio and in the press. I realize that I form part of a small dissenting minority to the chorus of praise which widely hails the Yalta pronouncement as the "Crimean Charter," the firm foundation for a new and better world. I sincerely wish I could see it that way, but the more I peruse the text, the more I am reminded of the biblical adage against expecting to gather grapes from thorns and figs from thistles. Since I realize that my attitude may disappoint many of my listeners, I will preface my own remarks by quoting the remarks of another dissenter who comes nearest to expressing my particular feelings on the subject. In his syndicated column in the Evening Star, David Lawrence has repeatedly discussed the Yalta Conference from several angles. His first reaction, published on Wednesday, the day after the announcement, reads: "Another 'Big Three' conference has been held and, again with a fanfare of publicity and with a new set of swashbuckling phrases, the same things that were said in Teheran are said over again. It remains to be seen if the members of the Big Three will again discard pledges and operate singly or whether this time a pledge of joint action means what it says."

In his column next day, Mr. Lawrence was still more forthright when he roundly stated: "American idealism has been defeated as conspicuously at the Crimea Conference as it was at Paris 26 years ago. The late President Wilson caught in a cycle of expedience,

made concession after concession to European statesmen who were grabbing territory and spoils of war, pinning his hopes on the League of Nations to correct the inequities of the Versailles Treaty. Then America refused to enter the League. Today all that President Roosevelt can hope for is that the United Nations organization may some day save something out of the wreckage of American ideals and hopes." And in his column on Thursday Mr. Lawrence enumerates a bill of particulars to which the American people are clearly entitled, reminding the President that the so-called "decisions" of the Big Three "are not decisions so far as the United States is concerned until the Senate approves. Certainly the official communiqué issued this week doesn't tell us much of the story or give us a hint as to the sequels that lie ahead for the United States."

The communiqué does, however, tell us enough to make it clear that the conference was effectively dominated by Joseph Stalin, who gets about everything he really wants in Europe, plus a veto right in the projected international organization which will render it impotent to oppose aggressive action of the major powers. So far as I can make out, the chief "concessions" made by the Russian dictator consist in the reiteration of certain slogans like "Atlantic Charter," "democracy," and "freedom," which may mean different things to different people—to be specific, whether you look up those terms in Webster's Unabridged or in a Russian dictionary.

Until more of the inside story of the Yalta Conference has been revealed we must remain uncertain as to its larger implications for America and the Orient. But we do have specific information as to what is meditated regarding Europe; and, on balance it is not reassuring. Yet, one thing stands out as of much more fundamental significance than specific items regarding Germany, Poland, or Yugoslavia. This is the striking fact that the post-war settlement of the European continent, in its historic sense of the region lying between the English Channel and the Rusisan border, is being shaped by three great powers none of which is European in the traditional meaning of the word. This is especially true of the United States and the Soviet Union, but it is likewise essentially true of Britain, the seat of a world-wide empire which, though situated within sight of the continent, has habitually held aloof from the continent, intervening chiefly as regulator and arbiter for its own particular ends.

Now this arrogation of extracontinental authority may be theoretically justified by the present condition of the Continent itself, which the Nazi madness has reduced to ruins and incipient chaos. Nevertheless, this virtual dictatorship of an alien triumvirate is already arousing resentment and apprehension in varying degrees among practically all the continental peoples who, it should be remembered, number in the aggregate more than 300,000,000. That is an immense human mass which, weakened and divided thought it momentarily is, cannot be long disregarded. Furthermore, its very sufferings and misfortunes tend to give it an almost abnormal sensitiveness to even fancied slights and affronts. Certainly, each item of a program of reconstruction decreed from without which does not square with strongly held principles and ideals is bound to produce deep repercussions, not only among the peoples immediately concerned, but also among continental Europeans as a whole. The upshot might well be the engendering of widespread revolutionary explosions even sooner than those which shattered the European settlement imposed by the concert of powers at the Congress of Vienna after the Napoleonic wars. And it should not be forgotten that we Americans will be pledged to uphold whatever European settlement we now endorse and partially guarantee by accepting the decisions of the Yalta Conference and becoming part of the international organization sketched out last summer at Dumbarton Oaks and slated for further elaboration shortly at San Francisco.

That is why we Americans should so closely scrutinize whatever has been agreed upon by the Big Three regarding Europe. The best publicized, though by no means the only item, is that of Poland. And the agreement on Poland is certainly an ominous portent, because it is a decision imposed against the passionate protest of those who undoubtedly represent the majority of the Polish people, to say nothing of the fact that it clearly violates the principles and ideals embodied in the Atlantic Charter. I am not going to discuss at this time the circumstances which may have impelled Roosevelt and Churchill to defer to Stalin's inflexible determination. It may well be that they were faced with the alternative either of acquiescence or splitting the camp of the United Nations wide open before the war against Germany has been won. This would constitute logical justification from the strictly American or British viewpoint. But that should not cause us to ignore the Polish viewpoint nor to minimize the ultimate price which may have to be paid in terms of international unrest and insecurity. Let us seek dispassionately to examine the Polish attitude and the logical consequences which flow therefrom.

First and foremost, we should understand that Poland's very existence depends upon the resolute upholding of certain ideals. Geographically, there is no reason for Poland. It occurs as an undifferentiated part of the vast plain which extends from the Urals to the North Sea, most of which is occupied by either the Russians or the Germans. To both those more numerous and powerful peoples the Poles are a standing irritant. Though christianized and civilized from the west, the Poles are refractory to Germanism by their widely different Slavic temperament and culture. But, though fellow Slavs, they are also refractory to Russianism with its Greek Orthodox background and its semi-Asiatic spirit and outlook. A century and a half ago, Germanism and Russianism combined to wipe Poland politically off the map, and did their best to destroy it as a nation. That effort was foiled by the indomitable obstinacy of the Poles, who rejected all compromise and insisted that historic Poland must be restored. At Versailles it was restored—by the western powers and in despite of both Germany and Russia. The Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement which immediately preceded the present war was designed to undo the Versailles restoration and to destroy Poland once more. Indeed, Mr. Molotov, who is still Stalin's Commisar for Foreign Affairs, frankly admitted this at the time.

Now what Stalin is aiming at, and what Churchill and Roosevelt tacitly agreed to at Yalta, is not merely the redrawing of the Russo-Polish boundary or even the setting up of a regime at Warsaw subservient to Moscow but, in the last analysis, a renunciation by the Poles themselves of the very principles on which the continued existence of their national life depends. As already indicated, the ultimate sanction for a nation without natural frontiers is the inviolability of its soil. If the Poles first consent to a lopping off of nearly half their territory and then cynically indemnify themselves by taking other territory to which they have no moral right, they logically reduce themselves to the status of a nomad folk which can be shoved hither and yon at the arbitrary desires of more powerful neighbors. As Mr. Mikolajczyk, himself, recently protested: "Poland is not a nation that can be trundled westward in a wheelbarrow."

Bearing all this in mind, we can understand why the leaders of the Polish Government-in-exile at London have refused to bow to the decision of the Yalta Conference. No matter how hopeless the present situation may be, and how grievous the personal consequences for themselves and their supporters, they are upholding the principle which has historically preserved their national life. If the Yalta formula is imposed, we may anticipate a resurgence of that irrepressible Polish question which, for 150 years before the Versailles restoration, gave European diplomacy a chronic headache. And that will not be the only migraine from which Europe may suffer. There is much in the Yugoslav decision announced at Yalta which suggests future trouble. Then there is the total silence concerning the Baltic States—Esthonia, Lithuania, and Latvia. That silence probably indicates that those little nations, to borrow the brutal German U-boat formula of the last war, are diplomatically spurlos versenkt—"sunk without trace." Yet the violation of principle involved in that sinking will haunt the peace settlement like a restless ghost and will tend to engender unrest and uncertainty in most unexpected quarters.

Those are only a few of the troublesome problems which should be weighed and studied by us Americans before we commit ourselves to the underwriting and perpetuation of a post-war European settlement wherein we must participate as an integral and major part of the new international order we have in mind.

U. S. O. Camp Shows Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include excerpts from a very informative address on the work of the U. S. O. Camp Shows, which was given by the vice president of that organization, Mr. Lawrence Phillips, in Chicago on February 5, 1945:

This is the story of a hundred million men; of your sons, your brothers, your husbands, your sweethearts; of men who have lost for a brief hour that deadly oppression of homesickness in the first strange weeks in a training camp; of men on the beaches of Normandy; under shell fire from Aachen; in the sandy wastes of Africa; in the hills of China; in the heat and pestilence of the islands in the Pacific; in the bitter cold of the tundra of Alaska; of men who have paused, for a brief time, to turn their thoughts backward to the things they have left behind and the things they hope to come back to. It is a story, ladies and gentlemen, of men made happy as they went into battle.

But it is a story, too, of those loyal Americans at home who have given their extra bit so that through their contributions the work of U. S. O.-Camp Shows might be carried to every corner of our far-flung battle fronts. And it is the story of the American actor, the little name and the big, from stage and screen and concert field. It is a story of which all may be proud, but let us remember with deep humility that whatever of time, of money, or of effort has been put forth to yield this record pales into insignificance beside the day-to-day sacrifice of the men who stand between us and the enemy across the world:

It is my purpose to lay before you three matters: first, what does U. S. O.-Camp Shows do overseas? secondly, what does it mean to the men overseas, in terms of what they have told us? and, third, brief comment on some of the problems which confront us.

As a background for what I am to say, you should know that since its organization on October 22, 1941, to December 31, 1944, USO-Camp Shows has given in the United States and overseas a grand total of 177,473 performances, to 99,748,843 men of the armed forces of the United States. The total today is more than 104,000,000. In the year that ended on December 31, last, it entertained a total of 53,166,000 servicemen—more than a million men a week—and of these 28,625,000 men were overseas and attended 57,250 performances given at every overseas base at which Americans were stationed.

In the United States, entertainment was given by means of four separate circuits: First, the Victory Circuit, visiting Army posts and camps and naval stations with a troop population of 1,500 or over at intervals of 4 weeks, and by means of units numbering up to 20 players. This entertainment has consisted of vaudeville shows, concerts, legitimate plays, and band concerts. Second, the Blue Circuit, reaching activities numbering less than 1,500 men and consisting uniformly of small units of 5 people, playing at intervals of 3 weeks and capable of putting on a show indoors or out, on any kind of stage or none at all, before 15 men or 1,500. The Victory Circuit has been operated with 23 units, and the Blue Circuit from a high point of 47 units has been reduced, at the present time, to 32 units in line with the reduction in number of activities to be served.

The third circuit, the Hospital Circuit, appearing at Army and Navy general hospitals only during the year 1944, was serviced by 12 units of up to 18 people, which played at 79 general hospitals at intervals of 2 weeks. Instituted on March 13, the Hospital Circuit by the end of the year had given 5,444 performances in hospital auditoriums and wards to a total recorded number of 350,537 patients. In addition, Victory Circuit units have given 1,341 matinee performances in post or station hospitals to 351,000 patients. On January 15 of this year, the units on the Hospital Circuit were increased to 20 and the service extended to include regional hospitals, so that at the present time this circuit is reaching 164 Army and Navy hospitals throughout the country every 2 weeks.

The fourth circuit, namely, the Hospital Sketching Circuit, provides the service of skilled artists to sketch portraits of wounded servicemen in hospitals. The original of the portrait, with a negative and a positive photostat is sent, entirely without charge, to whomsoever the patient designates. Through the volunteer services of artists, who are paid only their actual living expenses while on tour, U. S. O. Camp Shows provided—between April 17 when the program was started and the end of the year—277 weeks of sketching service in Army and Navy general hospitals in this country. Eleven thousand nine hundred and fifty-three portrait sketches have been mailed to parents, friends, and relatives of wounded men during the period, and what this service has meant I can best convey to you by a letter which I will read to you later on in connection with the same service which was extended during the year to hospitals overseas.

In additional to these four circuits, delivering entertainment at regular intervals at designated points from coast to coast, 449 major screen, stage and radio personalities made personal appearances during the year in hospitals in the course of 192 independent tours under the sponsorship of the U. S. O. Camp Shows. These volunteer stars reached an audience in excess of 2,000,000 men.

Finally, 2,268 volunteer performances were provided at camps and stations, and on shipboard, by name bands, concert artists, and by special variety shows, to a recorded audience of 2,940,000 men. These volunteer shows are organized in the New York, Chicago, and Hollywood offices of U. S. O. Camp Shows, and I am glad of this opportunity to pay glowing tribute to what has been done by the Chicago committee of U. S. O. Camp Shows under the leadership of Mr. Hal Halperin. * * *

So effective has been the work carried on by the Chicago committee that it permits U. S. O. Camp Shows to eliminate visits by units of the hospital circuit to Chicago hospitals and to devote the days thus saved to further service to hospitals in remote areas * * *.

Let me turn, now, to what U. S. O. Camp Shows does overseas. * * *

Overseas, U. S. O. Camp Shows furnishes entertainment to the American soldier and sailor, wherever he may be, in accordance with the orders of the commanding general of the base to which its overseas units may be assigned. Overseas, U. S. O. Camp Shows performances have been given on air strips in China, on PT boats lashed together 10 miles off the shore of a Pacific Island, on a captured Japanese truck on Guadalcanal, in a Neissen hut in the Aleutians, in a ruined building within artillery fire of the German lines, and in the theaters of London, of Paris, of Rome, and of Naples.

In a directive issued from the Adjutant General's office under date of March 15, 1943, U. S. O. Camp Shows is designated, and I quote, "the sole agency for the procurement of professional theatrical talent in the United States for showing to troops overseas." Once the units have left the United States, the Army—and when the units are playing to men of the Navy, the Navy—exercises complete control over where the units will play and how often they will play. It is important to remember that U. S. O. Camp Shows does not, and cannot, designate where or how often its units play overseas.

During the year 1944, 1,390 entertainers, including stars of screen, stage, radio, and the concert stage, were sent overseas on 268 separate trips, lasting from 3 weeks to more than 6 months; 172 of these units, composed of 848 entertainers, were overseas at the close of the year. The Army has asked that we make available, during the year 1945, 1,500 entertainers to be at overseas bases at all times. Of the 268 units that were sent overseas during the period, 179 were variety or vaudeville units, 21 were concert units, 38 were legitimate play or musical-comedy units, 6 were all-Negro units, 11 were sports units, 2 were bands, and 11 were sketching artist units. * * *

No area in which American military or naval personnel is stationed was neglected.

I wish that I had the time to go over with you more of the letters we have received from enlisted men, from officers, and from chaplains overseas—from mothers and fathers, wives and sweethearts here at home. Like the letter from a father, who says, "I am writing in most grateful appreciation of the sketch of our son done on November 27 in England. Surely I can testify to the value of this project. The sketch was the last thing we ever received from our son. He died in a United States Army hospital in England on December 5, 1944. From the bottom of our hearts we thank the U. S. O. for the portrait—it will be a source of great comfort to us in the years that lie ahead." I would like to tell you more about the letter from the mother who heard from her son that he had seen a U. S. O. Camp Show and who asks us to help her in finding out what happened to him, writing, "If you cannot do this, at any rate I want to thank you for giving this boy a happy hour before he went to his post of duty on to his death." * * *

Here is a letter, written under a date line of October 31, 1944, in northern Burma to Dear Mom: "Last night for the first time in a long time the men here in northern Burma were satisfied. Satisfied to the extent that they 'hit the hay'—practically normal humans once more. * * * What caused this magic? The answer is found in just three letters—U. S. O.

"Through the medium of a traveling camp show—5 girls put laughter, memories, not to mention frustration, into the hearts of nearly 500 lonely G. I.'s—G. I.'s who haven't seen a beautiful American girl in 2 years, some cases longer. * * *

"The girls sang, danced, teased the boys—and made them like it. * * * It wasn't a Broadway musical; no famous names appeared on the marquee—and the orchestra was just a bunch of fellows who had gotten together for the occasion. But to these men who had suffered tortures from Mother Nature and the Japs—it was a miracle, a temporary Shangri La, where their cares and worries could be dispersed. No greater play or musical ever received such an ovation. A half hour after the performance the men were still sitting in the rain, still applauding. * * *"

From a far different part of the world, the Aleutian Islands, a letter dated January 5 of this year says: "Christmas Eve as we sat in church waiting for the services to begin the Chaplain stood before the congregation and said, 'Men we are waiting for a group of five girls from U. S. O. Unit, No. 368, and I'm sure that they will indeed add enjoyment to our services for this evening.'

"Indeed they did, too, for when the girls came on the stage and began to play, it seemed that a tenseness went out of the air and each man relaxed within himself, for here indeed was truly beautiful, smooth, restful music. As Miss MacNeill sang Ave Marie, accompanied by Miss Mitchell on the electric organ and Mrs. Chapman on the violin, every heart and mind was flooded with the warmth and tenderness of her soft, clear voice. * * *

"A personal word about the ladies. I had the opportunity to meet them myself and they were more than happy to talk to the enlisted men. Their friendly, wholesome personalities, their enthusiastic answers to questions, and their questions too, all added up to the typical American girl and, by gosh, Mister, that means a lot to us." * * *

And now, from Germany. Here is what a corporal in the infantry of the Ninety-fifth Division thought: "Your U. S. O. Troupe 23 put on a marvelous show under very adverse conditions in an ice-cold auditorium, and really came through with a bang-up job. Their show will not soon be forgotten here." * * *

Let there be no mistake about it, the men overseas want U. S. O. Camp Shows entertainment. Not every man likes every show, not every man wants vaudeville, or concert, or legitimate play; not every show that we send overseas is as good as we should like it to be, but every show that we send overseas is just as good as we can possibly make it, and in every show that goes overseas there is something that appeals to some men, and to the millions of men who we have served so far these shows, and I repeat, have brought with every hour of laughter and forgetfulness of hardships and danger and suffering, a memory of the things they have left behind and of the things they hope to come back to.

Now, let me turn to some of the problems that confront us, and that confront you * * * This is what I refer to—"We've been overseas for 6 months and we haven't seen a camp show yet." "Why aren't the shows bigger?" "Why aren't the shows better?" "Why don't U. S. O. Camp Shows entertainers act like soldiers, both the men and the girls?" "Your shows are indecent."

There are two reasons why the man may not have seen the show yet. The first is there are 6,000,000 Americans overseas and we have 840 American entertainers overseas. That's about one entertainer to every 7,000 men. * * * We hope shortly to have almost twice as many entertainers overseas as we have now, but it will never be possible to guarantee that any individual soldier will see U. S. O. Camp Shows' entertainment overseas at a given interval.

"Why aren't the shows bigger?" This is largely a matter of transportation but also one of money. Even if transportation for fighting units did not have to have priority over transportation for entertainment units, and even if large stages were everywhere available, the job even then of reaching as many men as possible would have to be done by small units both for financial reasons and because of a real lack of entertainers. * * *

"Why aren't the shows better?" U. S. O. Camp shows has in its employ at the present time approximately 1,400 entertainers. Within the limits of its budget it has employed the best entertainers available and willing to go overseas, or to work its one-night stands in this country. The problem is a difficult one, but carefully considered. That the quality of the shows is acceptable to the men overseas is attested by the fact that we are asked to double the number of entertainers now serving.

"Why don't U. S. O. Camp Shows' entertainers act like soldiers overseas? Well, let us keep in mind that no entertainer who has gone overseas has been drafted. Every one has chosen the hazards and the discomforts of overseas' service instead of security, the comfort and the greater pay here at home * * * They have done this without the physical training we give the soldier, and in all but one or two cases did it cheerfully, courageously, and well. Seven of them have died in this service to their country. The record of over 2,000 entertainers who have gone overseas since our overseas program began, is one of which the American actor may be proud.

Nevertheless, he is a civilian; not trained in Army discipline and by virtue of the qualities that make him an entertainer, an individualist. The record of the American girl of the theater who has gone overseas is second to none. We have every confidence that this group of over 1,000 young women has conducted itself as well as any other group of 1,000 American girls that might be chosen from any field of activity for overseas service. * * *

And now the question, which from time to time has been in the public press, of indecency. There have recently appeared articles implying that U. S. O. Camp Shows has knowingly and with intent produced and sent out indecent shows; that such has been done with the approval of a so-called Washington; and that the Army overseas cannot refuse to present these shows as delivered.

Ladies and gentlemen, in this there is no word of truth. * * *

Every entertainment unit of U. S. O. Camp Shows that moves overseas provides entertainment from a written script. This script is approved in the U. S. O. Camp Shows office and the entertainer to whom it applies is required to take an oath before a notary public that he or she will adhere to the script as written. We have in our files duplicate copies of the script of every overseas entertainer, which we will be glad to make available to anyone concerned for review as to the adequacy of our judgment in authorizing spoken material. * * *

Furthermore, every entertainer who goes overseas does so under Army orders and is at all times subject to the orders of the commanding general of the base to which he is assigned. The commanding general, either direct or through his deputies, is at all times in complete authority with respect to all or any part of the show as given within his jurisdiction. Entertainers have already been returned to the United States for violation of script without first reference to U. S. O. Camp Shows.

Perfection is not of this world, however, and we know that despite their oath entertainers have, from time to time, interpolated material or business not only unauthorized by directly contrary to their solemn undertaking. We know of no means of preventing an entertainer, in advance, from saying or doing something on the stage in violation of his oath. We do know that remedial action can be taken after he or she has done so, and this we have done and will do. * * *

A statistical analysis of complaints received shows that no complaints whatsoever had been received with respect to more than 98 percent of all the units sent on the road. U. S. O. Camp Shows has sponsored in excess of 177,000 performances during the past 3¼ years. The number of complaints in relation to number of performances is far less than one half of 1 percent. * * *

Many of our staff—Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, alike—have sons overseas and take pride in the high principles of service and moral conduct that are set forth in the Guide to the Foxhole Circuit which is used to instruct each of our entertainers. * * *

And that is the story, ladies and gentlemen—the story of 100,000,000 men—of the kid who laughed before he went into battle and to die; of the kid listening reverently to the songs of home; of the kid who smiled away the pain so that mom could have the sketch of him, cheerful forever; and of the entertainer to whom we say as he or she leaves:

"This is your duty and your heritage. For this work ask no plaudits—no eulogies. You are a soldier in grease paint, serving a free country and freedom-loving men. This service is the actors' imperishable memorial."

Win, Lose, or Draw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Grantland Rice:

WIN, LOSE, OR DRAW

(By Grantland Rice)

FIGHTERS WONDER WHY STAR ATHLETES DON'T FIGHT

He had just got back from 18 months in the South Pacific, where he had been decorated by Admiral Nimitz and had more medals across his chest than John Philip Sousa ever wore. He was a young sailor with a keen, intelligent face, and seemed to know what it was all about. He had mixed with both the Army and the Marines and knew what they were thinking and talking about.

"I'll tell you our greatest kick," he said. "We understand about the IV-F's. That's all up to the Army and Navy medical boards—not up to those turned back. We like football and baseball especially and hope both games can be carried on. But what we don't like is the way they are using star athletes to win games or to give exhibitions. I can tell you that doesn't help our morale. I mean all these fighters, star football and baseball players held back from active war service. Understand, we know it isn't the players' fault.

"I'm talking about men who have been in the service for 2 years or longer, who still are playing on service football or service baseball teams or giving boxing exhibitions. We think that after they have finished their training they belong with us, carrying a rifle or using a machine gun. We need them with us when action starts.

"Most of these I hear about want to be with us. But they have to be where they are ordered to be."

NO INTEREST IN WHAT HAPPENS TO SERVICE TEAMS

"The fault goes higher up, and we all know it. We think this should be stopped. We haven't any interest in what happens to one of these service teams. They can win or lose and we don't care. We know it's all right for the various training centers to use the best talent available for their teams. But the time these star players remain on the team should be confined strictly to the length of their training period. But not beyond that spot. Maybe one season. We resent the discrimination they draw when they are held over just to win a few games. We know it isn't fair, either to them or to us. We need them with us, where it really counts.

"We also resent," the decorated sailor said, "such men as Joe Louis and Billy Conn and others being used for exhibitions back of the lines. We are not blaming Louis or Conn or anyone else. We are blaming those who take them away from the fighting front where they are needed.

"We get a big laugh in hearing about the morale on the home front. We can use a little morale, too, those who are fighting and dying. I'd like to have Joe Louis or Billy Conn alongside me in a tough fighting battle, where it's kill or get killed, live or die.

"Don't let anyone tell you Louis or Conn or the rest of them are helping the fighting man at the front in any way. I have an idea that Louis and Conn would like to be with us, doing their full share where it counts."

COULD USE TWO GOOD HEAVYWEIGHT FIGHTERS

"We sit around at times and talk about our two best heavyweight fighters, two men who would make great soldiers, giving exhibition boxing matches out of gunfire range. Why shouldn't they take the same chances we do, up in battle formation, up in the front lines, where it's live or die any second?

"Why should these and other fighting men and football stars be held in reserve month after month and even year after year, when clerks, country kids, filling station boys, young farmers and other non-athletes are up there with a gun, a grenade or a bayonet, or in an airplane giving their blood? We don't like this a bit and we know that after the war it will become a national scandal unless there is a quick change.

"A lot of us unathletic kids want these famous fighters and star athletes with us, not punching a bag or running for touchdowns 3,000 miles away. Or even 20 miles away. I'm just telling you how most of us feel about it. And we know it isn't the athletes' fault. It's the fault of their commanders or others higher up who apparently know nothing about true war morale, for many of these also haven't been shot at. Give these men rifles, machine guns and planes—and move them in with us. Up front where it counts."

This young decorated sailor happens to be one of the most intelligent combat men I've talked to. I agree with him 100 percent. I still feel that up to the last few weeks we have been fighting a 60 percent war against 100 percent for Germany and Japan. It has taken us over 2 years to wake up from a pleasant dream.

George Ephraim Sokolsky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on George Sokolsky from the National Catholic magazine the Sign for December 1944.

WHY I LIKE SOKOLSKY

(By James M. Gillis, C. S. P.)

I hope the editor will not accuse me of violating a confidence if I reveal the fact that he asked me to do an article for this series on a columnist whose pomps and works I renounced when I made my baptismal vows. Like the innocent maiden of old-fashioned melodrama, I cried, "Not that! Not that! Anything but that!" The editor being also a gentleman (rare combination but not unique) said, "Well then, take someone you like." So I said, "I'll take Sokolsky." Hence the title of this paper: "Why I Like Sokolsky.

I like him, first of all, because he seems to me so consistently and so remarkably right. Right and forthright. The two go together. Any newspaperman, competent enough to write for a national syndicate, has means of getting at the truth. The question is, Will he tell the truth when he has found it? He will, unless he has an ax to grind, a thesis to maintain at all costs, or an overlord to serve. As far as I can make out from some years of reading Sokolsky, he suffers no restraint from criticism and he is independent of external control.

In one of his columns he inveighs—vigorously as usual—against men who insult the intelligence of the American people by wantonly speaking what they do not know to be true, and, what is worse, what they do not believe; who say in public what they denounce in private; who mouth sentences with the object of gaining a following, who hurl phrases and speak slogans which upon analysis develop no greater thought than that contained in current popular songs. These tricks of the trade would obviously fail if the general public were shrewd and critical. But as Sokolsky says, "The people" [not all the people all the time, but too many people too much of the time], "prefer slogans to analysis of ideas, movements, and purposes. They will fight for a stereotyped phrase which defies definition. The moment one of these slogans meets a definition it collapses." What we should demand, therefore, he says, are "clear-cut statements, not headline material, captions, punch lines."

Such a demand for honesty in journalism and, I may add, in politics and diplomacy, is right down my alley. I have for years been crying aloud that the world might be saved by truth-telling. My favorite text of late, as far as national and international affairs are concerned is, "You shall know the truth, and the truth will make you free," or that of St. Ambrose, borrowed by Pope Leo XIII, "Tell the truth; God has no need of a lie." "We cannot build the Church upon the ruins of charity," said Pope Leo's successor, Pius X. Neither can we build the state—especially the world state—upon the ruins of honesty. Yet some politicians, high and low, try to do just that. Not that they have a grudge against the truth or a predelection for falsehood. They are broadminded enough to look with equal favor upon the one and the other. If truth will do the job better than a lie, they use the truth; if a lie will achieve the objective more quickly or more easily, they use the lie.

It is part of the job of a journalist to detect and to expose this pragmatism (some call it "realism"). Sokolsky seems to agree, because he devotes a fair proportion of his space to debunking and deflating. Such a job is not unworthy of any man. A supreme genius in the journalistic profession, Hilaire Belloc, did it consistently, explaining that in journalism as elsewhere we must tear down before we can begin to build. Belloc's running mate, G. K. Chesterton, also did a beautiful job of demolition, sometimes with delicate wit, sometimes with slashing humor and loud laughter. As a demolition and construction expert, Sokolsky is in the same category, if not in the same class, as the redoubtable Chester-belloc.

He works largely with two weapons—one Aristotelian, the other Socratic. Like the most rigorous Scholastic he demands definitions. Like Socrates, he punctures solemn pretense with pointed questions.

For example: He is discussing a phrase, "the middle way"—made familiar and popular by Marquis Childs' book on Sweden. "Middle," says Sokolsky, "implies two extremes." Before you can know the middle, you must know from what extremes the measurements are to be taken. If the extremes are indeterminate you might as well measure with a rubber band. So he asks, "Is it the middle between capitalism and communism? Shall capitalism go half way to meet communism? Is a reconciliation between the two possible, or advisable?" Karl Marx insisted that the world is not big enough to contain both capitalism and communism. Orthodox communism, except when it goes pragmatic, still holds that view. But since communism showed that it can fight (with arms, ammunition, food, and clothing provided by capitalism) it has become the fashion to say that capitalism and communism can arrange a modus vivendi together on this planet. Sokolsky has not fallen for that dangerous and treacherous notion. His intelligence will not let him, nor will his honesty.

If the middle way is not between communism and capitalism but between communism and the New Deal, Mr. Sokolsky asks, "Which New Deal?" He recalls the fact that Gen. Hugh Johnson always insisted that we specify New Deal 1, 2, or 3. "Were he alive today," says Sokolsky, "I wonder how many numbers he would have reached from Raymond Moley to Sidney Hillman." There is even a distinction, as Sokolsky reminds us, between the Hoover new deal and the Roosevelt new deal. "Hoover initiated the R. F. C. and the New Deal developed it." The Federal Reserve System, inaugurated by capitalists and originally operated by Wall Street bankers, has now become "a center of state power and its philosophy is clearly socialistic." So if one speaks of New Deal or R. F. C., Sokolsky asks, "Which New Deal? Which R. F. C.?"

I confess I like that sort of mental discipline. Unless we can persuade the people to analyze phrases and slogans, we shall perish of phrases and slogans. The continuance or the discontinuance of the essential character of the American Republic depends upon the answer to the questions: How far must democracy go to meet communism, and how far will communism come to meet democracy? Must we go most of the way, or all the way, while communism refuses to budge? Is it symbolic that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill went to Moscow and to Teheran, while Stalin was too busy to come to Washington or to Quebec?

To take up another problem—winning the war. "Which war," Sokolsky asks, "have you in mind?" The war now in progress, or the war which will commence when this war is over? If we win this one and lose the other, shall we not lose this one? The big war still to come is between dictatorship and democracy. Fascism is gone. Nazi-ism is doomed. There will remain only one dictatorship. The war between democracy and that dictatorship may be ideological, or economic, or social, or military. But it will be tremendous. Those who don't see that fact, or who see it and don't say it, will in later years be known as appeasers or even as collaborators. when that occurs, Sokolsky will be in the clear.

This demand upon his part that the people give over their preference for phrases, slogans, catchwords, and other such tripe (he calls it cabbage) and develop a taste for precise thinking takes me back to my first year in the seminary when the professor of logic used to try to compel us to think. Sokolsky might be that professor with a larger class. The fact that millions of readers remain with him and welcome the logical discipline to which he submits them is reason for satisfaction and for hope. Sometimes when we are in a despondent mood, what with swooning and crooning in place of singing, jitterbugging in place of dancing, the "funnies" in place of the classics, peephole gents'-room journalism in place of Dana and Greeley, Godkin and Cobb, we are tempted to think that the people just don't want to think. But the fact that large numbers of them stand by Sokolsky helps to restore our confidence in the wisdom of the people and hence in the first principle of democracy.

Another reason I like Sokolsky is because I sympathize with him. As we have seen, he is fond of asking questions. But the painful fact is that he gets no answers. It reminds me of my own efforts. As far back as 25 years ago I made many attempts in public and in private to induce advocates and exponents of the League of Nations and the Covenant to answer just one question. I used to buttonhole them, poke my finger into their ribs—metaphorically at least—and say, "Tell me, what is the meaning of those words in article X: 'Undertake to guarantee as against external aggression the territorial integrity of members of the League'?" That phrase to me was a mass of words, a perfect example of the sort of thing of which Sokolsky habitually complains; long words in place of short, abstract terms in place of concrete examples, round-aboutness in place of forthrightness. Here in New York City and perhaps elsewhere, when the war started and the black-out ordered, a sign appeared in shop windows, "Illumination is required to be extinguished before occupants depart from these premises." Why didn't they say, "Put out the lights before you go home"? Similarly, why didn't the author of article X say simply, "If one member of the League invades the territory of another member, all other members shall make war upon the invader"?

As it turned out, uncertainty or dishonesty about the meaning of article X was responsible for our present tragic predicament in Asia. Now, in 1944 I find Mr. Sokolsky asking questions as we did in 1920, and with apparently no better luck in getting answers. So, as I say, I sympathize with him.

In the business of putting public men on the spot by asking questions, Mr. Sokolsky shows commendable impartiality. He was a Dewey man, yet he demanded of his candidate a definition of a phrase which Dewey had appropriated—"military alliance." Sokolsky could have excused himself from that unwelcome duty on the ground that the Democrats also favored a continuing military alliance after the war, and that the scales of popularity were before the election heavily tipped against Dewey and toward Roosevelt. But in his habitual demand for clarity of utterance, he played no favorites. "'A political agreement," he explains, "may be good; its purpose is to prevent war. But

a military alliance is a design for making war and has always been a precursor of war. So, Mr. Dewey, why do you advocate a military alliance?" Of course, he got no answer. You never do. He concluded, therefore, that Mr. Dewey, like so many others who snap up a popular phrase, had not seen its implications and couldn't have meant what he said.

Neither can we get an answer to our question as to the meaning of "aggressor nation," or "international cooperation," or "policing Europe," or that weasel phrase in the Atlantic Charter, "The signatories seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other." "Do not seek"? Why not say "will not accept"? In this instance, however, loose thinking is not the explanation. That phrase, like the other, "with due respect for their existing obligations," was inserted with malice prepense, as Mr. Churchill admitted in the House of Commons. Since we have in our governmental system no such instrumentality for extracting answers to legitimate questions from reluctant authorities, it may seem foolish of Sokolsky to keep on asking. But to ask a question and get no answer is often a means of imparting knowledge. Socrates used that method. And so does Sokolsky.

While the common run of columnists were mouthing pious platitudes or composing minor rhapsodies about the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, Mr. Sokolsky, with characteristic frankness, called it "an amazing spectacle." He said: "Here is the amazing spectacle at Dumbarton Oaks of the powers organizing a League of Nations to maintain the status quo, but nobody knows what the status quo is or even what it is going to be. * * * After World War No. 1, when the American people knew what trickeries had been perpetrated, they threw the whole treaty out and would have nothing to do with the League of Nations. The high strategy of Dumbarton Oaks is to get the United States into the League of Nations before it is possible to tell the American people what their obligations will be. Then when the people cry out loud against the shameful new boundaries of Europe or the suppression of national aspirations in Asia, they will be placed in the position of breaching a covenant, of breaking a treaty." Furthermore, "the Russians have to move out before the Chinese can move in because never the twain may be under the same roof. The Chinese are to confer de novo about something that has already been settled. Only Lewis Carroll could describe this wonderland adequately, Yes, Lewis Carroll or Niccolo Macchiavelli.

One more reason I like Sokolsky is that he continues to demand fair play for Poland. In the midst of a world that has run out on Poland, he stands by his guns and keeps firing away: "The Poles believe that at Teheran they were sold down the river. They are convinced that their national existence is not to be liberated but stifled. There may be some kind of a show-window independent Poland, but it will be forced to become a vassal state of Russia. Most Poles believe there is no hope left—not after Teheran."

Mr. Sokolsky also refuses to be blinded or bamboozled about Russia's intentions and actions in regard to Poland. Many columnists and others go around about Robin Hood's barn in search of reasons for believing that "after all," "in the circumstances," "things being now as they are," "in view of the danger of attack from the west," and so on and so forth, Russia's attitude may be justified. Those who talk that way either deceive or are being deceived. In a hundred years, or it may be in 20, or even in 10 or 5, the cowardice and treachery of the big democracies toward their small brothers will be recognized as ruinous to permanent peace. But at the moment the pack of columnists and commentators are running and yelping with politicians and world planners who tell us we must be realistic. Because Sokolsky, in a dozen or a score of columns on Russia and Poland, expresses his disgust for that sort of realism, I admire him.

Finally, I like Sokolsky because he is on our side in the matter of domestic and personal morality. In answer to a woman correspondent who charges him with being harsh toward unmarried mothers, he says: "Not the least ugly social manifestation of this generation is the condoning of breaches of family ties. We seem to have grown accustomed to all sorts of social horrors and, what is more, even the clergy, whose business is faith and morals, say nothing these days in condemnation of the lack of family responsibility. Yet, the family is the prime social unit of our society. Destroy the family and our civilization sinks into a swinishness beyond the imagination of the most depraved."

With the exception of the reference to clergymen who are renegade to their duty, and with a little toning down of the phraseology, Sokolsky's little sermon might have been lifted from a papal encyclical.

Just one more matter of morality, this time civic as well as sexual. He has a column headed "Sodom." In it he refers to an abomination that has been tolerated—as what has not?—in the theater. He says: "One of the most successful plays on Broadway at this very moment has, as its most funny sequence, a homosexual theme designed to wow the audience until it rolls in the aisles, as the saying goes. * * * And the audience roars with laughter. There is no resentment, no disgust, no retching. It is all taken for granted."

And he continues: "Every ancient civilization decayed and collapsed because of this particular rot. It is always the end of the greatness of national existence. It is evidence that national masculinity is being replaced by the substitution of the vulgarities of the brothel in place of the pristine virtues of the family. Foul becomes fair in such a climate, not only in morals but also in politics and economics. The world becomes bisexual; madmen master the day. Caligula is emperor and Nero fiddles while Rome burns."

I should not care to close this paper on Sokolsky with that unpleasant note. So let's borrow by way of conclusion this sentence of his on religion: "No fanaticism of any sect at any time in history is as foully fearful as the paganism which has become the stench of Europe and even assails our nostrils here in this country. It is a struggle between the God of Love and the gods of hate. It is a struggle between the shrewd materialism that the confusions of science without philosophy, of knowledge without truth, of facts without thought, have employed in the corruption of our manhood and womanhood—it is a struggle between that and the essential need for men to walk again in the image of God unafraid and without shame. It is curious perhaps that I, a layman, hard in the intricacies of life, engaged in the dissection of politics and economics and the motives of men, should be speaking of this. * * * But the peril is that our western civilization, the civilization of torah and crucifix, will be shattered because men have forgotten and have lost faith."

Obviously, this man, George Sokolsky, born 51 years ago, Jewish by race and religion, and I know not of what upbringing in philosophy, has an instinct for truth and right. If there were others in sufficient numbers who would speak out as boldly as he and with as holy a recklessness of personal consequences, we might still save all worth saving in America and in the world.

International Monetary Conference at Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement made jointly by the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER and myself reporting that we have received information that more than 200 leading United States economists had joined in endorsing the proposals of the International Monetary and Financial Conference at Bretton Woods:

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and Representative BRENT SPENCE, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, reported they have received information that more than 200 leading United States economists had joined in endorsing the international financial agreements reached at the Bretton Woods Conference and in urging their ratification by the Congress.

Senator WAGNER and Congressman SPENCE, both of whom were members of the United States delegation to the conference, said that support for the proposed international monetary fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is being mobilized by a voluntary committee of 33 prominent members of the American Economic Association. The legislators said that they had been informed that the committee has received widespread support from authorities on international trade and 3 related fields. Of the approximately 250 replies to the economists' statement on Bretton Woods, 90 percent approve the statement. A poll of former presidents of the American Economic Association shows that 16 favor the economists' statement in support of the Bretton Woods program and 2 oppose it.

In a statement of its position the committee says:

"If the present proposals are not ratified by the leading countries of the world, the outlook for genuine international collaboration in the economic field and even for world peace would be indeed gloomy. It is therefore a matter of urgent necessity that full support be given to the agreements by all United Nations."

The major arguments set forth by the economists in urging approval of the Bretton Woods agreements are:

Although the monetary fund and the international bank do not provide a complete solution to the international economic problems, they will contribute substantially toward solving the exchange and investment problems, which are necessary if expanding international trade is to make its much needed contribution to the prosperity of the United States and of the world.

The experience of the inter-war period has demonstrated that neither the operation of the international gold standard nor the independent action of national governments will achieve workable exchange arrangements.

Conditions of foreign lending must be substantially improved if international investment is again to make its indispensable contribution to the prosperity of the world

economy on which, to a large degree, our own welfare depends.

The proposed monetary fund provides a program for avoiding competitive currency depreciation and related forms of economic warfare.

The proposed Bank for Reconstruction and Development aims at increasing security of international lending, not only through the bank's guaranty, but also by making the government of the borrowing country directly responsible to the bank.

Under the monetary fund, barring outright repudiation of debts by some debtor government, the risk of financial loss is very small.

The good will acquired by accepting the agreements, supported by the influence which the United States can legitimately exert through its large voting power in the fund and the bank, will be of great advantage in the settlement of other international issues.

Bretton Woods represents the first attempt of the United Nations to reach agreement on vital economic issues, and in view of the fact that over 40 governments are involved, and in view of the complexity of the problem the extensive concessions made by others to the United States at Bretton Woods, and the ill will we would incur by insisting on reservations, it is very doubtful whether another agreement could be reached.

Members of the economists' committee sponsoring the movement to enlist support for ratification of the agreements, and the institutions with which they are connected, are as follows:

Prof. James W. Angell (Columbia), Prof. John D. Black (Harvard), Prof. J. M. Clark (Columbia), Prof. J. B. Condliffe (California), Prof. J. Anton de Haas (Harvard), Prof. Howard S. Ellis (California), Prof. Paul T. Ellsworth (Wisconsin), Dr. J. K. Galbraith (Fortune magazine), President Harry D. Gidenose (Brooklyn), Prof. Frank D. Graham (Princeton), Dean Clare E. Griffin (Michigan), Prof. William Haber (Michigan), Prof. G. Haberler (Harvard), Prof. Seymour E. Harris (Harvard), Dr. Albert G. Hart (Committee on Economic Development), Dean Calvin B. Hoover (Duke), Prof. Frank H. Knight (Chicago), Prof. Wassily Leontief (Harvard), Prof. Fritz Machlup (Buffalo), Prof. Edward S. Mason (Harvard), Prof. Wesley C. Mitchell (Columbia), Prof. Mabel Newcomer (Vassar), Prof. Paul M. O'Leary (Cornell), Dean Howard H. Preston (Washington), Prof. Winfield Reifler (Princeton), Prof. Henry C. Simons (Chicago), Prof. Arthur Smithies (Michigan), Prof. Tipton R. Snavely (Virginia), Prof. Oliver M. W. Sprague (Harvard), Prof. Jacob Viner (Chicago), Prof. Charles R. Whittlesey (Pennsylvania), Prof. Clair Wilcox (Swarthmore), and Prof. John B. Woosley (North Carolina).

The texts of the letters and the recommendations sent to Senator WAGNER and to Congressman SPENCE by the Economists' Committee are as follows:

ECONOMISTS' COMMITTEE ON THE BRETTON WOODS PROGRAM,
Cambridge, Mass., February 12, 1945.

DEAR SIR: I submit herewith a statement of 224 economists in support of the Bretton Woods program. This statement is sponsored by 33 economists listed on the attached sheet and is signed by those whose names will be sent to you later. This statement was also submitted to all living ex-presidents of the American Economic Association, nearly all of whom replied. Of the 18 who replied, 16 approved the statement and only two disapproved.

It may interest you to know that substantially more than one-half of the economists who were polled—all economists listed by the American Association as primarily interested in international economic relations and three related fields—replied to this poll. Approximately 90 percent of those who replied approved and 10 percent disapproved.

This shows a remarkable degree of unanimity among economists. Economists of all kinds—liberal and conservative, Democrats and Republicans, new dealers and anti-new dealers, young and old—seem to agree that revival of world trade is imperative and that the Bretton Woods program is the road to take toward more trade and a higher standard of living.

Sincerely yours,

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS,
Chairman.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ECONOMISTS FOR UNITED STATES APPROVAL OF THE BRETTON WOODS MONETARY AGREEMENTS

We, the undersigned economists, urge the Congress to accept the Bretton Woods agreements providing for an International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Our main reasons follow:

1. If expanding international trade is to make its much needed contribution to the prosperity of the United States and of the world, exchange relations between currencies must be established on a stable and orderly basis and there must be a steady flow of international investment to increase the productive efficiency of the countries of the world. Action is, of course, required in other no less important fields such as trade barriers and commodities in world surplus. Although the monetary fund and the international bank do not furnish a complete solution to the international economic problems, they will contribute substantially toward solving the exchange and investment problems.

2. The experience of the interwar period has demonstrated that neither the operation of the international gold standard nor the independent action of national governments will achieve workable exchange arrangements. The nineteenth century gold standard is too inflexible to allow countries the independence of domestic action which they now demand; and the policy, so widely followed in the thirties, of disregarding international considerations in order to achieve freedom of action in the domestic sphere only served to contract international trade and, in the end, to make every country poorer.

3. In the field of investment, the last 25 years have shown the need for international action. While international investment did reach a substantial volume during the twenties, the investment was in many cases ill-advised; rates of interest were high and many countries resorted to borrowing in order to balance their international accounts without increasing their productive capacity. The collapse of the thirties brought repudiation, deflation or depreciation; and many borrowers and lenders resolved to eschew the dubious benefits of international investment in the future. Conditions of foreign lending must be substantially improved if international investment is again to make its indispensable contribution to the prosperity of the world economy on which, to a large degree, our own welfare depends.

4. The proposed monetary fund provides a program for avoiding competitive currency depreciation, the arbitrary and discriminatory control of foreign exchange available to pay for current imports, the freezing of funds due for current transactions, and related forms of economic warfare. This is in line with the fundamental United States trade policy of free enterprise with a minimum of administrative interference, discrimination, bilateralism, and international barter. The Bretton Woods agreements are essential to keep the door open for later application of this fundamental policy through international negotiations dealing with tariff discriminations, administrative protection, import quotas, cartels, raw material controls, and so forth. The clauses in the Bretton Woods agreements which permit limited devaluation, continued control of capital movements, rationing in emergencies of particular currencies officially declared to be scarce, and a gradual removal rather than abrupt termination of wartime currency and exchange controls are necessary modifications for reaching the fundamental objectives.

5. The proposed Bank for Reconstruction and Development aims at increasing security of international lending, not merely through the bank's guaranty, but by making the government of the borrowing country directly responsible to the bank. Since the bank rather than any particular government is made the direct representative of creditors, the debtor country's government can be called upon to take responsibility without loss of dignity or risk of conflict.

6. Under the monetary fund, barring outright repudiation of debts by some debtor government, the risk of financial loss is very small. Under the bank agreement, loans are to be safeguarded not only by the scrutiny of the bank but by authorizing each government to prevent its currency from being lent if it thinks the transaction dangerous; and under the guaranty, all losses are to be shared among all member countries in proportion to their subscriptions. The advantages of the agreements far outweigh the financial risk incurred by the United States.

7. The good will acquired by accepting the agreements, supported by the influence which the United States can legitimately exert through its large voting power in the fund and the bank, will be of great advantage in the settlement of other international issues.

8. Bretton Woods represents the first attempt of the United Nations to reach agreement on vital economic issues. The present drafts could undoubtedly be improved as regards details. But in view of the fact that over 40 governments are involved, and in view of the complexity of the problem, the extensive concessions made by others to the United States at Bretton Woods, and the ill will we would incur by insisting on reservations, it is very doubtful whether another agreement could be reached at all, or, if reached, whether in the end it would be a better one. If the present proposals were not ratified by the leading countries of the world, the outlook for genuine international collaboration in the economic field, and even for world peace, would be indeed gloomy. It is, therefore, a matter of urgent necessity that full support be given to the agreements by all United Nations.

Lt. Dennis Chavez, Jr.

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, in the press of legislative debate during the past few days, I have refrained from taking the time of the House to mention a matter in which all the people of New Mexico take pride and which should be of interest to the Members of this House. It is the award to First Lt. Dennis Chavez, Jr., of the United States Marine Corps Reserve, of the Bronze Star medal. The citation reads as follows:

By cool and capable direction and personal leadership, Lieutenant Chavez and his platoon completely annihilated an attacking

enemy force three times superior in manpower and weapons.

His conduct, leadership, and courage throughout were outstanding and in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service.

Lieutenant Chavez is the son of the junior United States Senator from New Mexico, the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ. Senator CHAVEZ was himself a member of this House for two terms, retiring from it voluntarily to become a candidate for the United States Senate. The son, Lieutenant Chavez, was born in my home city of Albuquerque on December 8, 1912; was reared in Albuquerque and was graduated from Albuquerque High School; received his A. B. and his LL. B. degrees from Georgetown University; was secretary to his father from 1938 to 1941; practiced law in Washington from 1941 to October 1942, when he enlisted with the marines as a private. He was sent to officers' candidate school at Quantico, Va., where he received his commission as a second lieutenant in January 1943. He then received advanced training at Camp Lejeune, New River, N. C., and was sent to the Southwest Pacific in July 1943 where he has been ever since.

The story of the exploits of the marines on Guam in those days of July 1944 when that island was recaptured has been reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, August 8, 1944, in an extension of the remarks of the Honorable CARL A. HATCH, senior Senator from our State. It tells in thrilling terms the experiences of this New Mexico boy who had charge of a party of 25 marines that destroyed 68 Japanese soldiers who sought to attack their position. The story took on additional interest due to the fact that the group commanded by Lieutenant Chavez, while a part of the headquarters and supply company, not ordinarily trained for the rough-and-tumble fighting of the Pacific Islands, had been in the thick of combat for months.

Members of the Senate had called to their attention the honor of the award of the Bronze Star Medal to Lieutenant Chavez through the medium of a statement made by a distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. CHANDLER. I feel that the matter should not only come to the attention of the Members of the Senate, where this young man's father is serving, but to the House as well, because it was in the House of Representatives that Senator CHAVEZ started his public service as a Representative of the State of New Mexico in the National Congress.

Those of us who have seen Dennis, Junior, grow into manhood are delighted by this continuing evidence of his devotion to his country and his desire to serve in whatever field of opportunity there may lie before him. In behalf of New Mexicans, we are pleased by his heroism, and I extend to him our congratulations, our good wishes, and our prayers that when the conflict is over and the conquest of Japan has been completed, he may return to his family circle in good health and with still greater achievements to his credit.

Cactus Ordnance Works

REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 30, on page 605, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] made the statement that "they built one plant at Amarillo, Tex., which cost more than $30,000,000 and it never produced one single thing; and other plants costing millions of dollars have even been dismantled." I fully realize that it is humanly impossible for any one Congressman to be fully informed of the multiplied billions of dollars invested in war plants all over the country producing the sinews of war, and in this instance Mr. SHORT was grossly misinformed.

In the first place, there is no such plant at Amarillo. He later stated he meant the Cactus Ordnance Works in Moore County, which is nearly a hundred miles from Amarillo.

The War Department officially advises me that the Cactus Ordnance plant was built when the ammunition program was very high and it was built to manufacture ammonia for high explosives. Just before it went into operation the demands for this particular product were not as pressing as were the requirements for a certain type of high octane gasoline needed by the Army Air Corps. This necessitated a change in the plant and after its operation for approximately 1 year the Air Corps indicated that it no longer needed this particular type of gasoline ingredient. Since that time the demand for heavy artillery ammunition and other high explosives has increased, therefore the plant is now being reconverted for the manufacture of ammonia.

I am also in receipt of a copy of a letter to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] from Mr. Rex B. Baxter, executive vice president and general manager of the Amarillo Chamber of Commerce which follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1945.

HON. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHORT: In the Congressional Record dated January 30, on page 605, I read a statement made by you which is most revealing to those of us who live in Amarillo. In a statement to Congressman ENGEL you said: "They built one plant at Amarillo, Tex., which cost more than $30,000,000, and it never produced one single thing, and other plants costing millions of dollars have even been dismantled."

In order to keep the records straight I would like to point out that there never has been a plant built at Amarillo that cost as much as $30,000,000, and there has never been a plant built at Amarillo nor anywhere in the Panhandle area that has not produced war materials in abundance. In order to give you a detailed picture of the war plants in this area, may I list them for you, together with what they produce.

1. Pantex ordnance plant is located at Amarillo and has the finest record in loading bombs of any ordnance plant in the United States. The actual dollar cost and man-hours required at this plant are less than at any plant in the Nation. Also, they have the lowest absentee record of any plant, and, finally, the plant has been cited for its safety record by the National Safety Council. I might add that this plant has received the Army-Navy E award.

2. The Cactus ordnance plant, located a few miles north of Amarillo, was originally constructed to manufacture ammonia nitrate. About the time the plant was to go into production it was decided that the ammonia nitrate was not needed at that time. Immediately the Shell Petroleum Co. negotiated a contract with the ordnance and the plant was converted to manufacture a gasoline additive. I might point out that this has been one of the most valuable of all war products.

3. The Goodrich Rubber Co. has a synthetic-rubber plant at Borger, Tex., which has been in full production since the day of its completion and is now producing synthetic rubber at the rate of 60,000 tons per year—a very splendid contribution to the war effort.

4. The Phillips Petroleum Co. located at Borger increased the capacity of its plant in order to produce high-octane gasoline—one of the finest plants in the Nation and possibly the first to produce 100-octane aviation gasoline. The output of this plant alone has kept many of the vital air bases of the Southwest supplied with gasoline.

5. The second helium plant was located at Amarillo, just north of the Canadian River, and has been in full operation since the day of its completion. This plant, along with the original one located just west of Amarillo, supplies a large percent of all the helium produced in the world.

6. In this area the air forces have built plants at Dalhart, Pampa, Childress, and Amarillo, all of which have operated at near capacity since they were completed in 1942.

7. Finally, we have two prisoner-of-war camps located in the Panhandle, one at Hereford, Tex., and one at McLean, Tex.; and, Congressman, I judge from what I have read in the papers that we have had less prisoners to escape from these camps than in any other section. I really think that this record is due to the fine weather here in the Panhandle, and these prisoners just refuse to leave.

I realize that you are a tremendously busy man and that possibly the statement made by you is no direct indictment against Amarillo, but we are rather proud of our record in this war, and I felt sure that you would appreciate receiving this correct information from the chamber of commerce.

Very truly yours,

REX B. BAXTER,
Executive Vice President
and General Manager.

While I know the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] intended no harm, it is my hope that future criticisms will first be checked for accuracy because much damage can be done by remarks, even though made in good faith, which are not backed up by facts.

We Need More Democracy, Not Less

REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam is having family troubles. His

family has become so large, and the affairs of the family have become so complicated and messed up, that some of his children—the new dealers—believe the cure for his troubles is to centralize all power in the Government at Washington. Many of his children, however, still believe in private initiative, our democratic form of government, and our American way of life. The latter group believe that most of our troubles have been caused because too much power already has been centralized in Washington under the New Deal. These would have the Congress recapture most of the powers that have been delegated, temporarily, to the President. They even place a check upon the powers of the Congress, or at least place some restrictions upon those powers.

I have sought to accomplish these objectives by introducing the following bills:

(a) A bill (H. R. 2276) to require the names of all Cabinet officers and department heads, whose appointment must now be approved by the Senate, to be submitted to the Senate for re-approval every 2 years. This would give the Senate a definite check upon, or veto power over, the actions and attitudes of the various heads of the executive departments. Under present law, when once confirmed by the Senate, only the President can remove them. Madame Perkins is an example.

(b) House Joint Resolution 88, proposing a constitutional amendment that would limit the power of Congress to tax, during peacetimes, by placing a ceiling of 25 percent upon Federal tax rates levied upon incomes, inheritances, and gift transfers.

The question facing Congress today is, Do we need more democracy or less democracy as a cure for our troubles?

The following article by David Lawrence gives his answer to this question and suggests a practical method for placing a check upon the executive department of our Federal Government:

[From the United States News of February 16, 1945]

HOW TO MAKE THE CABINET RESPONSIBLE TO THE PEOPLE

(By David Lawrence)

The trend toward autocratic government in the last decade or more has become unmistakable.

The executive branch, with its billions of dollars to spend or lend, has been operating virtually without check by the legislative branch.

Executive agencies, commissions, and boards have been granted wide powers to be used at their discretion with only vague phrases to describe the limits of authority.

The judiciary has cautioned in vain that legislative standards must be clearly prescribed and adhered to when power is delegated.

President Roosevelt himself, in an address in 1937, conceded that the powers granted the executive agencies under his administration were unprecedented and far-reaching and confessed that in the hands of a people's government these powers were safe, but some day in the hands of a reactionary administration these same powers could become shackles and chains.

The problem is not partisan. It is not particularly new. There is talk of streamlining Congress to do away with so many of its committees. There is a greater and more acute need. It is to make our whole system of government responsive to the will of the people—to give us in this age of mechanical miracles and invention a means of maintaining an efficient system of representative government in the midst of economic circumstances that have changed materially since the Constitution was written. Commerce is now national by judgment of the Supreme Court. Government is centralized.

CHECK ON EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

In other democracies the principle of a constant—in fact, overnight—check on the behavior of the executive and his appointees is well-established and works effectively.

But to accomplish such a reform would require an amendment to the Constitution—an admittedly difficult process.

There is a simpler and yet just as lawful a way to approximate this particular end-result—making representative government in America effective and asserting once more the system of checks and balances as between the three branches of government that our forefathers ordained.

It would require only a brief act of Congress. This should provide for a fixed tenure for Cabinet officers and executives of all other agencies that have been or may be created by Congress.

The term could be 1 year or 2, as Congress might prescribe. But there is much to be said in favor of a 1-year term for all those executive appointees who must now be confirmed by the Senate.

LET THE PEOPLE RULE

Such a law would provide us with a check at least once a year. This is not likely to be as effective as the check which the people have in Britain, Canada, Ireland, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand, where a whole cabinet can be removed from office overnight by a majority vote of the legislative body or a new election held. But it is at least a start in the direction of what has come to be characterized as responsible government because the responsibility for government action can be fixed where it belongs by the people.

The essence of democracy is that the people shall rule, that no instrument of government shall be the master of the people but its servant. There has been no more decisive slogan in all the history of politics in a democracy than "Let the people rule."

At present the people have no recourse against the arbitrary or wasteful action of a Cabinet officer or executive agency chairman except to vote every 4 years against the President or party seeking continuance in office. This is not adequate. In a Presidential campaign of 4 months, the issue of administrative efficiency can be lost in a maze of other issues. Other democracies which use the parliamentary form of government can make a single issue the basis for the ousting of a Cabinet or the holding of a general election. Under our system there is no way to get at single issues and separate them from each other.

But, it will be contended, the Congress still has the purse strings and can specify how its appropriations shall be used. It can repeal laws with their vague grants of authority and make such grants specific.

This is a good answer in theory, but in practice it is at best indirect and involves the withholding of funds for desirable purposes just to restrain an incompetent official. Actually the administrative side of government has become far more complex than ever before and will continue to grow even more complex in future years. It is impossible for a legislature of 531 Members to act as a board of operating executives. Delegated authority is an essential of modern government.

For a long while Congress thought to retain control of the new boards and commissions, because of their quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial character, by fixing the tenure and also by specifying the grounds of removal and by requiring representation from both political parties. These limitations proved futile.

Gradually our Presidents, Republican as well as Democratic, began to appoint men who were in sympathy with their policies irrespective of how they might have voted in previous elections. Party discipline has not been carried to such a point in America that the appointment of a Republican or Democrat to a bipartisan commission carries with it any subsequent responsibility to a political party or organization once the appointee is confirmed.

Nor is there any method today whereby the Senate which confirms an Executive appointee can be sure that after it holds hearings and obtains the views of the official, he will stick to such views in administering his post. Once he is confirmed, he is safe from a congressional check except through the doubtful process of impeachment, which involves malfeasance in office. There is no way for Congress to impeach an official for what it believes is stupidity, ineptitude, or inefficiency.

SENATE CANNOT REMOVE OFFICIALS

For while the Senate must advise and consent to a nomination, it has absolutely no powers of removal if the appointee fails to live up to the specifications given when confirmation was voted.

The only remedy now, therefore, is to specify a fixed tenure for every appointee and also to make that tenure brief so that the confirmation process will be frequent. Cabinet officers have served under President Roosevelt for 12 years and some will serve 16 years. Would each of these have won four terms if they had been required to submit their respective records to the people at the polls?

The last election showed that 22,000,000 voters did not approve of the Roosevelt administration. A majority of about 3,500,000 votes out of 49,000,000 kept the present administration in power. Actually it was a basic desire to maintain continuity in foreign policy and leadership in time of war that swung millions of Republican and Democratic votes to Mr. Roosevelt's side. But among those millions of Republicans, Democrats, and independents were many who did not approve of the domestic policies of Mr. Roosevelt and who today are disturbed by the platform Henry Wallace has proclaimed.

DOMESTIC POLICY PROTESTS

How can that protest on domestic issues be expressed by the people or their representatives? The Senate, by the power of confirmation, can reflect the will of the people. If Mr. Wallace is confirmed and does not continue to retain public confidence, he could be subjected to confirmation by the Senate a year hence and once a year thereafter. The people are asked to take a chance on Mr. Wallace. Why should not Mr. Wallace be asked to take a chance on the people's representatives in Congress? Being a liberal, he should welcome the opportunity, and he should also insist, as he has every logical reason to insist, that all other Cabinet officers and executive appointees who by law require the confirmation of the Senate, shall be treated likewise.

An amendment to any current appropriation bill or to the George bill can provide in less than 100 words that all Cabinet officers and heads of agencies created by Congress or the President shall be appointed to serve for 1 year only and be subject, if reappointed, to confirmation by the Senate.

This is a means of encouraging the people to exercise their constitutional prerogatives and a means also of insuring our democracy against the abuses of autocratic government which, if unchecked, can lead to misery for the people.

Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN J. RABIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which I have written to the editor of the New York Times and the editorial to which it refers:

FEBRUARY 21, 1945.
EDITOR, NEW YORK TIMES,
New York City.

DEAR SIR: I read with a great deal of interest and pleasure your editorial entitled "Admiral Peary's Vision." With reference to his accomplishment—having been the first man to get to the North Pole—you say:

"He got there because he was at once a dreamer and a far-sighted planner."

At the end of the editorial you further properly say:

"In the peace to come the goals ahead must be explored by other men like Peary, dreamers who are also hard-headed planners, if we are to reach them with the least loss of time."

In the peace to come there will be many goals—goals we all seek to reach. We need men like Peary to lead the way so that we may reach those goals—men who are dreamers, who are hard-headed planners.

How appropriate this editorial is in the case of Henry A. Wallace. The chief objection to Mr. Wallace's appointment is that he is a dreamer. Isn't he the type of dreamer we need to lead us to those goals ahead? Yes; he may be a dreamer but also a far-sighted planner.

Let us not reject him because he is a dreamer. We need this kind of dreamer.

Very truly yours,
BENJAMIN J. RABIN.

[From the New York Times of February 20, 1945]

ADMIRAL PEARY'S VISION

Admiral Peary died 25 years ago today. Every schoolboy knows that he discovered the North Pole. But why he was the first man to get there is not so well remembered. He got there because he was at once a dreamer and a far-sighted planner.

In a sense the North Pole is only a geographical assumption, a combination of figures which add up to 90 degrees of latitude north. But for centuries men of imagination regarded it as the roof of the world, the end of the rainbow, the unattainable. All his life Robert Peary desired to stand on that spot. His plans developed only after years of self-training and exploratory testing. He finally reached his goal. When his team of dogs dragged his sled across the ice around the Pole it was the emptiest spot on earth. By the strange metamorphosis of the new world of international flight it may be among the busiest crossroads of traffic.

Admiral Peary lived to enter his new world and became one of its enthusiasts. Had the airplane been sufficiently perfected in 1909 he undoubtedly would have used it. He was one of the earliest leaders of the Aero Club and clearly foresaw the importance of aviation both in peace and war. During the First World War, as chairman of the Aerial Coast Patrol Commission, he worked out the basic plans of coast protection from the air which have been applied so effectively in the present conflict. In the peace to come the goals ahead must be explored by other men like Peary, dreamers who are also hard-headed planners, if we are to reach them with the least loss of time.

Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson's Statement on the Question of Shall War Equipment Be Abandoned in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for some months past a report has been circulated that the War Department was considering or had adopted a policy that the bulk of the equipment of the American troops would be left in Europe at the conclusion of the European war and the European troops sent to the Pacific armed anew. On January 31, 1945, an Associated Press report appeared in the newspapers to the effect that the War Department had made such a decision. On February 15, 1945, I wrote the Secretary of War a letter asking him certain questions which concluded in part as follows:

I am frank to state that the extent to which I shall support the next War Department appropriation bill will depend in a large measure upon the question of whether or not you have adopted this policy and the adequacy of your reasons for adopting it, if you have.

I also stated in my letter that I expected to insert my letter to the Secretary of War in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that I would be glad to insert his reply in the RECORD when received.

On February 16, 1945, I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the Associated Press article referred to together with my letter to Mr. Stimson.

On February 19, 1945, a representative of the War Department brought to my office a letter from Mr. Stimson denying that the War Department had adopted such a policy or had issued any release upon which it could have been based. His letter is self-explanatory and I am inserting it at the conclusion of my remarks.

In discussing this matter with the representative of the War Department, I asked him where the Associated Press reporter could have received a report such as that which was published and the facts upon which it was based. He replied, "He probably picked it up in some barbershop." Before I finished talking with him however, he stated that the language of the Associated Press report followed in part almost word for word the language contained in some secret statement or report that the War Department had, the description of which was rather indefinite. He stated, however, that this report taken in its entirety could in no way be construed to justify the statement made by the Associated Press reporter. All of which makes me wonder whether perchance the Associated Press reporter found that secret document in some barbershop among old copies of La Vie Parisienne, The Police Gazette or among other similar literature usually found in the country barbershops. I was, of course, not permitted to see the so-called secret statement or report. The important thing however is that the Secretary of War states in his letter that the War Department has adopted no such policy and that the War Department expects to transfer to the Pacific theater from Europe and from all inactive theaters the maximum equipment that can be utilized effectively in the war against Japan.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Henry L. Stimson:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1945.
Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ENGEL: Your letter of February 15, 1945, is before me, and I can readily understand your concern over the press report to which you refer. However, investigation reveals no War Department release upon which it could have been based.

Further, I wish to assure you that the War Department contemplates making maximum use of all equipment which can be utilized effectively in the war against Japan, regardless of where the equipment is located. The expressed goal of present War Department policy is maximum transfer of equipment to the Pacific from Europe and from all inactive theaters. There is no War Department policy which contemplates a duplication of procurement.

The end of the European war will of course, find us with certain equipment and supplies on hand in Europe which, because of wear and tear or the very nature of the item, it would be ill-advised to ship to the Pacific and uneconomical to return to the United States. Such supplies must be disposed of as good judgment and common sense dictate.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

The Crimean Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., February 14, 1945:

THE CRIMEAN AGREEMENT

The conference of Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill that has just been concluded in Crimea calls for a sharp distinction between the military and political plans. The agreement on military plans is reassuring and forecasts the early doom of German resistance. The agreement on certain political matters like the case of Poland comes as a shocking revelation whose effects are hidden by the emphasis on the war itself.

The Crimean agreement just negotiated by the Big Three calls for a repudiation of what has been the basic foreign policy of our country, a policy that has compelled us to go to war in both the Atlantic and the Pacific.

The repudiation of American foreign policy in the Crimean agreement is contained in the article that calls for the recognition

of the Curzon line as the eastern boundary of Poland. This line deprives Poland of a considerable area in the eastern part of her country and turns it over to Russia. Thus, against her will, Poland is called upon to sacrifice territory to a neighbor. It is in that act, not the mere amount of territory, where American foreign policy is torn to shreds before our eyes.

If the American people recognize that act, they recognize territorial seizure by force of arms. The very heart of American foreign policy has been its unrelenting opposition to seizure of territory by force of arms. We could have avoided war, for a while at least, in both the Atlantic and the Pacific by giving up that policy. Instead, we chose to stand by it and fight a great global war. Now on the verge of victory we welsh on it.

Worst of all, we do it in the case of the first country that dared to resist aggression from Hitler. And then to compound a felony, we agree to the mutilation of this country along a general line close to that set forth by Hitler in his agreement with Stalin in 1939.

Are we American people going to approve that act of President Roosevelt?

That question might be answered by asking ourselves if we are going to mark our entry into the area of world politics by committing a dishonorable act, by using American might and power to deny the very basis of the policy that has compelled us to go to war.

It is up to the Senate to let President Roosevelt know now, not a year later, that it will not permit the American name to be so dishonored.

Attack on Mikolajczyk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of February 20, 1945:

ATTACK ON MIKOLAJCZYK

Pravda's attack on Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Premier in the Polish Government-in-exile, does nothing to reinforce the hope that the forthcoming political reorganization of Poland will follow truly democratic lines.

The Yalta declaration called for the recasting of the present Lublin regime on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad. This was taken as a hopeful indication that Poland, although forced to yield one-third of her territory to Russia, would retain a substantial measure of political independence. It is that assumption which suffers as a result of the Pravda article, assuming that the Communist publication was speaking in this instance for the Kremlin.

Of all the Poles abroad, Mikolajczyk, leader of the important Peasant Party, has been considered one of the most genuinely democratic. He accepted the decisions reached at Yalta as inevitable, but made what seems to have been the mistake of openly expressing his disappointment at the loss of Polish territory. For that Pravda blacklists him as an assumed adherent of Polish reactionaries who have placed themselves outside the ranks of the United States.

This seems to mean that Pravda at least will tolerate no one in the new Polish Government who is not wholly subservient to the Russian point of view. If that is also the position of the Soviet Government there is no reason to suppose that the new Poland will enjoy anything approaching political independence.

United States Rebuffed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a column by Mr. Ernest Lindley in this morning's Washington Post, which to my mind is a clear statement of present relations between France and the United States:

UNITED STATES REBUFFED—DE GAULLE'S GESTURE QUESTIONABLE

(By Ernest Lindley)

Several hundred thousand of America's best have died or been wounded in liberating France. Thousands more will be added to our casualty lists before France's enemy, Germany, has been finally beaten.

The United States is preparing to pledge itself to see that Germany is kept demilitarized. Such commitments already have been made by the President and, unless there is a sudden change in American opinion, they will be ratified overwhelmingly by Congress. This will mean that France will be rid of the German menace with which she is incapable of dealing alone. Within 70 years, Germany has defeated France once, nearly defeated her again in spite of the help given to her by Britain and Russia (and would have defeated her but for the United States) and, the third time, overran her and, without tremendous exertions by the United States, would have kept France permanently enslaved.

At present France is in serious economic straits. Her internal transport is in bad shape, her industries are grinding to a stop for lack of raw materials. France has sought and has been offered by the United States credits for internal reconstruction—credits in large amounts and on generous terms. The American proposals were handed to the French Government only 3 weeks ago. They involved $2,300,000 in credits. There could have been no more concrete manifestations of the desire of the United States Government to see France restored to full economic health—in fact, to attain a level of well-being beyond any in her previous history.

At Dumbarton Oaks, the United States joined with Britain, Russia, and China in providing that the Big Four should become the Big Five, by the inclusion of France as a permanent member of the proposed world security council.

At Yalta, the United States, Russia, and Britain made further specific arrangements for welcoming France as an equal partner. France cannot become an important power again without the aid of her more powerful friends. And, when fully restored, her strength will be, inevitably, less than that of the United States, of Russia, and probably of Britain.

The French Army is being rebuilt with American lend-lease weapons.

These are all proofs that France has friends and that, among them, the United States is second to none in the desire to see France restored.

Yet General De Gaulle rebuffs the President of the United States by declining an invitation to talk with him at Algiers. Various overlapping explanations appear in the reports from American correspondents in Paris: De Gaulle felt that France was slighted in not being asked to the Yalta Conference. He felt that if the President of the United States wished to see De Gaulle he should come to Paris. De Gaulle had not had time to digest the meaning of the provisions concerning the future role of France made at Yalta. He was tired of being "whistled up" on short notice. And with this appeared an astonishing intimation that the behavior of the United States toward De Gaulle was like Hitler's toward the governmental heads of Germany's small neighbors and satellites a few years ago.

This is what is described as a policy of prestige abroad. Within limits it may be useful in cementing De Gaulle's hold on the French people. But, significantly, his rebuff to the President of the United States was concealed from the French people and, at this writing, members of the provisional French Government were reported to be irritated and dismayed at the leak to the American press.

But whatever effect these tactics may have within France, someone should tell De Gaulle that they do not add to France's prestige abroad; that on the contrary, they are the surest way to throw away the good will which France needs and now has.

Violations of Money Provisions of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, Page L. Hawthorne, of Creston, Iowa, a former State president of the Iowa Farmers Union, is a strong advocate of a sound money system and in a letter to the Iowa Union Farmer he contends that the violations of the money provisions of the Constitution are the cause of our economic distress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include Mr. Hawthorne's letter, which was printed in the Union Farmer issue of February 10, 1945:

VIOLATIONS OF MONEY PROVISIONS OF CONSTITUTION CAUSE OF ECONOMIC DISTRESS

(By Page L. Hawthorne)

Honest sound money was provided for by the founders of this Nation. The Constitution is complete in placement of money-creating powers. The violations of the money provisions of the Constitution are the cause of our economic distress.

If this administration had set for the world a good example in the inauguration of a really sound money system, the people of the world would become so activated in constructive work as to abhor the interruptions of war. Many a war has been precipitated in order to divert the people's minds from the money question.

By taking the power and the unearned interest out of the money master's hands, the prime incentive to war is eliminated; we can then have peace on earth and the good will that springs from the cooperation toward a

common purpose, the ennoblement of the races.

Under the dishonest system we have today, we allow the Federal Reserve banks to issue their puny promise to pay for which the Government exchanges with them the taxpayers promise to pay and the people are charged interest on the bonds and also on the currency. Is it any wonder that the bankers who enjoy the power to create money spend millions of dollars upon false teaching and propaganda to prevent the American people from learning the gross dishonesty in the system now operated?

Under our present system, when the United States Government needs a million dollars, it issues bonds for that amount to the Federal Reserve bank. The Federal Reserve banks buy the million dollars in bonds. They can deposit these same bonds with the Government and receive a million dollars in new currency printed at a Bureau of Engraving and Printing owned and operated by the United States Government, while these banks use and loan this currency, they will also get interest on the bonds which they have deposited.

The interest on our national debt from 1932 to 1936 amounted to $3,615,600,000. This was paid to the international bankers for loaning the United States Government money to the United States Government; perhaps this is where Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Dealers got the idea that we owe this to ourselves; someone is either dumb or dishonest—why don't they tell us the truth—that the United States Government owes this to the invisible United States Government?

It is an established fact that in 1934 Franklin D. Roosevelt and Morgenthau were given complete control of $2,000,000,000 in gold for 3 years and in 1937 a bill was rushed through Congress extending their authority 2 more years, there being no provision for any accounting; in fact the act stated "not subject to review by any officer of the United States."

Guess what became of this fund? It was called the stabilization fund at the request of our Executive; it was set aside to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to gamble in foreign securities, bonds, and money; we know that he flirted with the franc in France and the pound in England and got short-changed in both cases. Are entanglements of that kind likely to draw us into a foreign war?

Our Civil War was planned by bankers in London in 1857, one group of British bankers agreed to help finance the North and a bunch of Paris bankers agreed to finance the South. Their money paid for propaganda on both sides of the slavery question to inflame public opinion to a white heat. Their plan was to so weaken both North and South so they could plunder and exploit the whole country with a private central bank, patterned after the banks of Europe, and would have done so had it not been for the timely interference of Alexander II, of Russia, who knew and hated their ultimate objective.

London and Paris bankers had five European countries send troops into Mexico to worm into this country and assist the South. Alexander notified those five countries they could consider themselves at war with Russia the moment they landed troops on United States soil. His action enabled the North to win the war, and this became a united country again; this not only should be food for thought for every American citizen but should be an object lesson for every member of the Iowa Farmers Union, when a desperate effort is being made to divide and conquer or destroy their organization so they will become political puppets with a backbone like a banana.

This can't happen in Iowa if our State board will do the honorable thing and assist our State president in carrying out the mandate from the membership that was given at our State convention and the membership will awaken to their responsibility.

Let me quote the words of the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, from page 399 of the hearing on Banking Act of 1935 of the Seventy-fourth Congress. "In purchasing offerings of Government bonds, the banking system as a whole creates new money or bank deposits. When the banks buy a billion dollars' worth of bonds as they are offered and you have to consider the banking system as a whole, as a unit the banks credit the deposit account of the Treasury with a billion dollars. They debit their Government bond account a billion dollars or they actually create by a bookkeeping entry a billion dollars."

This process can be repeated every time our bonded indebtedness increases. I wonder if anyone thinks that isn't inflation. Thank God there are some who are not content to be deceived with the hypodermic needle of doles and subsidies instead of removing the causes which create farm poverty. This system must be destroyed or a democratic form of government will give way to an autocracy ruled by a bureaucracy. Oh, if people could only realize that liberty, justice, and truth are the only things worth while, and if there be a reward beyond the grave only those who fight for this blessed trinity will be crowned with immortality.

Prior to our entering the foreign war the money changers were loading up on foreign stocks and bonds; one firm admitting it sold foreign securities in America amounting to $1,136,000,000; another firm sold $1,071,000,000, making a profit of $25,000,000 on the deal. Another sold $1,805,000,000, the total making over one-half of all the money in existence in the United States which had gone to foreign countries, mostly to Germany. One of the excuses made by one of the money changers before the Senate committee was that Germany should have it because of her inability to pay. If this policy is good for foreigners, why was it not good for farmers and American businessmen?

I wonder if it isn't time we were studying our lesson instead of depending on those at the top telling us what to do or think.

FEBRUARY 5, 1945.

But the President Cannot Do This Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a timely editorial recently appearing in the Long Beach Argus, Long Beach, Calif. Long Beach is the largest city in the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent in this distinguished legislative body. Mr. George Rochester, owner and publisher of this paper and the writer of this appropriate and powerful editorial, is also a member of the Long Beach Harbor Commission.

As this timely editorial speaks for itself in every word and phrase thereof, I only desire to call attention of this House to its general outline and import to wit:

First. It points to the probable fact of a definite victory for the Allies over Germany.

Second. It points to the conquering of Japan, as well as Germany.

Third. It stresses the fact that Franklin Delano Roosevelt as President of the United States has challenged great responsibilities on his shoulders, and that he, as President of this great democracy, will be confronted with great trials, duties, and obligations in representing this great Nation.

Fourth. The editorial reminds us that our President will have the challenge of standing out as a guiding light to bring about a cooperative understanding world for enduring world peace.

Fifth. Finally, Mr. Speaker, he urges this is no time for criticism or political bickering. How true this is.

This timely written editorial reminds us that the President cannot do this alone, that he must have the support, cooperation, and prayers of every American, in facing this tremendous job. The last paragraph is indicative of heartthrobs and humility of every thinking American, and Mr. Rochester, the editor, rightfully utters a prayer on bended knee for the homes and families of America, that God in his infinite way guide Mr. Roosevelt in this tremendous job.

Every conference of Messrs. Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill heretofore, fades into relative insignificance in the presence of the epochal, destiny-making conference of the Allied Nations now set for San Francisco, April 25. Mr. Speaker, certainly it will not be considered remiss for me, a native born of the great State of California and being a Member of the House from that great Eighteenth Congressional District of California, to remark that not only all people of California, but of the west coast, should be especially conscious and aware of the fact that this great conference of the Allied Nations on April 25 is being held on their shores and that there may come as a result of this conference an enduring peace for the world.

This fervent hope of every thinking heart and prayerful soul is expressed in Mr. Rochester's editorial when he reverently utters hope that God will guide our President:

A BIG JOB FOR OUR PRESIDENT

(By George Rochester)

Reports from every front these days seem to point to a victory for the Allies. That Germany will be conquered within a very short time now seems to be a fact agreed to by most all of us. That Japan is suffering tremendous losses would indicate that the war with that Nation will not last very many months.

But the winning of the war, the conquering of Japan and Germany, is not the big problem that confronts the world today. What after the war? What kind of a peace will we have? What kind of a settlement will we be able to make with those countries that will insure a permanent peace—a lasting peace? What will be done to give freedom to those countries which have lived all these years in almost what might be termed slavery? Will those countries continue to be governed by some larger and more powerful nation? Will they, too, be included when the settlement to make all peoples free is agreed upon? These are some of the questions that should be in the minds of every American today.

As President of these United States, it is going to fall upon the shoulders of Mr. Roosevelt to see to it that the terms of the four

freedoms are agreed to and made a part of this post-war settlement. Will he insist that these little countries are given their freedom—freedom to govern themselves as they desire? Will he insist that India be given her freedom? Will he insist that democracy in the true sense of the word—democracy as practiced in America—be a part of the settlement? We do not mean by this last statement that we should dictate the form of government or that these nations should adopt the same form of government as we have in America, but we do mean that these nations, so long under the dictatorship of some other country, be allowed to choose their own form of government, just so long as it is chosen by the majority of the people of these countries.

Immediately following World War No. 1 there appeared a statement by one Romani Rolland, addressed to the then President Woodrow Wilson, as follows:

"You alone, monsieur le president, among all those whose dreadful duty it is to guide the policy of the nations, you alone enjoy world-wide moral authority. You inspire universal confidence, answer the appeal of these passionate hopes. Take the hands which are stretched forth, help them to clasp one another. * * * Should this mediator fail to appear, the human masses, disarrayed and unbalanced, will almost inevitably break forth the excesses. The common people will welter in bloody chaos, while the parties of traditional order will fly to bloody reaction. * * * Heir of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, take up the cause, not of a party, not of a single people, but of all! Summon the representatives of the peoples to the Congress of Mankind. Preside over it with the full authority you hold in virtue of your lofty moral consciousness and in virtue of the great future of America. Speak, speak to all! The world hungers for a voice which will overleap the frontiers of nations and classes. Be the arbiter of the free peoples! Thus may the future hail you by the name of reconciler!"

Will President Roosevelt be able to carry out such a program as outlined above? Will he be able to cope with the diplomats and the rulers of the other nations? Will he be able to stand out as the guiding light to bring about such a program as is outlined above? Should he be able to bring about such a program and see to it that it is carried out, then he will go down in history as the greatest man of all times.

But the President cannot do this alone. He must have the support, the cooperation, the prayers of every American to make this dream of a perfect world come true. This is no time for criticism; this is no time for political bickering; this is no time for taking territorial rights from the weaker nations for the stronger ones.

May God in his infinite way guide Mr. Roosevelt in this tremendous job that he will face within a short time, is our wish.

To Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted I am including as an extension of my remarks a wonderfully well written sonnet dedicated to Wendell Willkie by Dr. Glen Levin Swiggett and never before printed or published.

As you know, Dr. Swiggett is one of the most able and distinguished men of the times in which we live. An eminent educator, Dr. Swiggett is widely known as a writer and lecturer in the field of comparative literature and on international topics.

His sonnet to Wendell Willkie follows:

TO WENDELL WILLKIE

(By Glen Levin Swiggett)

Brave rugged spirit! Marked by fate as old
As that of man! To have the vision, then
To die, alas, ere it comes true. But men
Like you have always sought to have and hold
A vision—Lincoln did; and of their mold,
Brave heart, all men shall recognize you when
You rightly are acclaimed first citizen
Of the one world whose coming you foretold.

Not yours, therefore, such death as in men's eyes
So often seems to close some futile life
Of vain presumptions, all so profitless;
But yours shall always serve to symbolize
The birth of a new world, with end to strife:
The vision you so bravely did profess.

About-Face on Polish Border

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Chicago Daily News of February 19, 1945:

ABOUT-FACE ON POLISH BORDER

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Is American public opinion fickle or is it that the people have short memories?

Five weeks ago—January 10 to be exact—Senator VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan, made a speech decrying the partition of Poland as it had been proposed by Prime Minister Churchill and urging instead that Germany be demilitarized by Britain, the United States and Russia, thus making unnecessary the buffer state security idea of Moscow.

Republicans and Democrats in the Senate applauded. The Nation applauded.

This past week it was announced that President Roosevelt had agreed at the Yalta conference to do the exact opposite of that which the Michigan Senator had urged. Again the Nation through the majority of the press applauded.

Now to cap the climax, President Roosevelt has asked Senator VANDENBERG to serve as a member of the delegation to the coming conference of the United Nations at San Francisco, where a peace organization is to be set up presumably to underwrite the very kind of thing against which Mr. VANDENBERG inveighed in his speech.

Where does this leave the Michigan Senator? Must he turn a somersault, too, reversing himself within 5 weeks and submitting himself to the rubber-stamp process of approving something which he already has disapproved?

Can Mr. VANDENBERG accept unless he is free to advocate at San Francisco the correction of the mistaken course which was insisted upon by Churchill and Stalin at Yalta?

Since the Atlantic Charter was supposed to have been reaffirmed at Yalta, there can therefore be no final settlement now of the Polish boundary question—eastern or western—by the Russian-created Lublin government or by the exiled government in London because the charter specifically says there shall be "no territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned."

It is obvious from the foregoing that the San Francisco conference must revise the so-called settlement at Yalta if the new charter of the United Nations is to be ratified by the American Senate. Otherwise, as VANDENBERG himself said in his recent address, the American people would be asked "to put a blank check warrant behind a future status quo which is unknown to us and which we might be unwilling to defend."

The Michigan Senator made two other statements which it is not likely he will abandon. He said:

"We are standing by our guns with epic heroism. I know of no reason why we should not stand by our ideals * * *.

"I am not prepared to guarantee permanently the spoils of an unjust peace. It will not work."

It was to protect the territorial integrity of Poland that Britain entered the war in 1939 and it was the defense of Britain which ultimately involved America. Wars grow out of seemingly unimportant bits of territorial aggrandizement and the indifference of peoples to issues, capable of becoming festering sores.

Yalta Agreements Will Result in Third World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following English translation of a Polish language news release issued by me on February 19, 1945, to certain Polish language newspapers in the United States:

YALTA AGREEMENTS WILL RESULT IN THIRD WORLD WAR

The Crimea Conference certainly will not contribute to world peace—in fact, it will have the opposite effect. This present conflict was brought about by the invasion of the Republic of Poland on September 1, 1939, by Germany. At that time Hitler and Stalin were pals and Stalin came to Hitler's assistance to deliver the death blow on September 19, 1939. Stalin and Hitler celebrated the fall of Poland by dividing her territory in accordance with their respective spheres of influence. The Molotov-Ribbentrop boundary line of 1939 gave one-half of Poland and all of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to Russia. Hitler, having received all the assistance he required of his puppet, Stalin, turned on him and invaded Russia. When the Germans were at the gates of Moscow and Stalin was making frantic pleas for help, he renounced his claims on all the territory he had seized as Hitler's partner. With the aid of American lend-lease Russia was able to push the Germans back, and just as soon as Stalin had firmly established himself on the offensive he reaffirmed the Molo-

tov-Ribbentrop boundary line and broke off relations with the London Polish Government.

The freedom-loving Poles have continued their resistance and have perfected an "underground" which has been the model for all smaller nations. Free people have never submitted to government by force, and the people of Poland and the other smaller nations of Europe are no exception. The "underground" of all these nations will continue to function as long as they are enslaved by governments by force. If the agreements of the Big Three at Teheran and Yalta are to be the yardstick by which we are to measure world peace, then I say there can be no peace because the enslavement of freedom-loving people will have its reaction and the world will suddenly awake to the fact that at Yalta the seeds were sown for a third world war, and the fathers and mothers of today will learn to their sorrow that the sacrifices of our valiant fighting men and women and the blood they have spilled on every battle front of the world has not brought us peace. Roosevelt and Churchill collaborated with Stalin in 1944 at Teheran and just recently at Yalta on the division of Poland as consummated by Stalin and Hitler in 1939. President Roosevelt has strayed a long ways from the American policy of nonrecognition of territorial aggrandizement by force and the four-nation declaration of November 1, 1943, which pledged our Government to liberation of all oppressed peoples and the establishment of international peace and security based on the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states.

We Need Henry Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, many of our constituents will have difficulty in understanding just what issues were involved in the passage last Friday of the bill S. 375, which had as its declared objective the withdrawal from the Commerce Department of all lending functions.

Under the Constitution the Senate of the United States must confirm appointments made by the President. Even in the choice of the members of his own Cabinet the President does not have a free hand. So when Mr. Wallace was named to the secretaryship of Commerce, it was necessary that the Senate either confirm the appointment or reject him. Apparently a counting of noses showed that a majority of the Members of the Senate would vote to confirm Mr. Wallace only if he were first shorn of the power to loan money; hence, the bill we disposed of Friday.

Now many of us voted for the bill because we know the worth of Henry Wallace, the good he has done, and we want him to continue to be identified with this administration. As long as men of honor and integrity such as Henry Wallace are associated together directing the energies of the New Deal for the good of the average man and woman, this Government is entitled to and will receive the support of its citizens. Mr. Wallace has endeared himself to the great rank and file of Americans not only because of his understanding of and sympathy with their aims, but because in his years of public service he has shown himself an able administrator whose chief characteristics are honesty and loyalty. And if I am any judge of human nature, the people love him because of the enemies he has made.

But I for one do not intend that my vote for this bill shall indicate that I am unwilling to have Henry Wallace handle the lending agencies of our Government. Far from it! It means simply that I am unwilling to have his energies lost to the people of our country. I feel he belongs in this administration and I feel safe in saying that the vast majority of the people of California feel as I do. Were it in our power, Henry Wallace would be given not only the Secretaryship of Commerce but the administration of the lending agencies as well. And our concern is not only for the success of the Roosevelt administration, but for the good of our country and the whole world. We recognize the critical period through which all nations are soon to pass in the transition from war to peace. And we want an honest man to deal with the problems affecting the men and women, the small businesses and the little enterprises on which the very stability of our country depends.

In a word, in voting for this bill we did so because it seemed to be the only way we could guarantee the continuance in public office of one of the great Americans of our day, Henry A. Wallace.

Is There a Fertilizer Trust?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1945, I introduced H. R. 1823, a bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce.

The object of this bill is not to take away or interfere with State laws, but to assist in their enforcement. The purpose is to compel those who sell fertilizer in interstate commerce to let the public know just what they are selling.

It is not the object of this bill to interfere with legitimate interstate trade, but it is the object to protect the farmers of the various States from buying a pig in a poke.

That there has been abuse and that there is necessity for this legislation appears clearly in an article by William G. Holman, which reads:

When a Federal grand jury charges that collusion has existed between the fertilizer interests and State law-making and law-enforcement officials, the public will naturally be interested and want to know more about it.

Let the public know that the exploitation of the farmers has a direct bearing on the success of our war effort and on the rebuilding of a war-torn world, and the public will want to do something about it.

Prior to 1923, only one-third of the nitrogen in commercial fertilizers was derived from water-soluble sources and two-thirds from organic sources.

In 1924, the source tags on North Carolina fertilizer bags told the farmers that the methods of fertilizer manufacture had undergone a radical change. Two-thirds of the nitrogen was obtained from water-soluble sources, and only one-third from organic sources.

The bitter opposition of the farmers to this radical formula change inclined the manufacturers to put their heads together and secure the enactment of new fertilizer laws in the various States that would give the manufacturers greater latitude of choice, and the farmers less information as to the character, source, and proportions of the materials used in making the fertilizers.

A Federal grand jury in the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of North Carolina took note of this undue influence and indicted 102 fertilizer firms and individuals for having been in collusion with State legislatures and State law-enforcement officials. The defendants admitted their guilt and paid fines amounting to more than a quarter million dollars.

The new fertilizer laws enacted in several States give the farmers the following information:

1. The percentage of nitrate nitrogen and of water-insoluble nitrogen but not the source.

2. The source tags were removed from the fertilizer bags.

3. The nitrogen content of the fertilizer was increased 21 percent by law by cutting out the fractional units of nitrogen.

4. The manufacturers were not required to disclose the water-soluble nitrogen content of the fertilizer, an omission which permitted them to increase the water-soluble nitrogen content at will, without the knowledge of the farmers and to their great hurt and injury.

This radical formula change was profitable to the fertilizer manufacturers because one unit or 1 percent of water-soluble nitrogen costs them only one-third as much as they had to pay for 1 percent of organic nitrogen.

It lowered the cost of fertilizers to the manufacturers at least $3 per ton, but no reduction in price was made to the farmers; in other words, they had to pay $24,000,000 a year more for 8,000,000 tons of fertilizer than they should have paid.

The greatly reduced proportions of organic nitrogen forced the farmers to use at least 20 percent more fertilizer per acre in order to get the proper proportions of organic nitrogen to sustain and feed the crop to maturity.

Since the farmers' annual fertilizer bill amounts to not less than $200,000,000, this unnecessary 20-percent increase in the cost of fertilizers amounts to not less than $40,000,000 a year.

To prove the above statement, I quote from the Fertilizer Review (1944), published by the National Fertilizer Association. It says that during the period between 1930 and 1943, "The consumption of fertilizers increased 29 percent, and the farmers' fertilizer bill increased 19 percent, in spite of an acreage reduction of 8,500,000 acres."

The 21-percent increase in the nitrogen content of the fertilizer, and the disproportionate increase in the water-soluble nitrogen content, resulted in the growth of less profitable crops and in an extensive spread of destructive plant diseases: unheard of before this radical formula change was made.

Two eminent authorities have spoken of the harmful effects of too much nitrogen: particularly soluble nitrogen.

Lyon and Buckman, Cornell University, said that: "Of the three common fertilizer

elements, soluble nitrogen is the only one which, added in excess, will result in harmful effects on the crop." "It will," said they, "decrease resistance to disease."

Sir A. D. Hall, M. A., F. R. S., said that: "The association of high nitrogenous manuring with susceptibility to disease may be seen in all plants."

Thus we see the costly effects of this radical formula change. It forced the farmers to pay twenty-four plus forty or $64,000,000 a year more for fertilizer than was necessary. It resulted in the growth of less profitable crops, and in an extensive spread of destructive plant diseases—which caused the farmers to sustain losses far in excess of the $64,000,000 increase in the cost of crop production.

Another item of expense to the farmers is the unnecessary use of sand as a makeweight or filler. This costs them ten or twelve million dollars annually and should not be permitted.

The destruction of tobacco plants by blue mold and black shank is costing the farmers millions of dollars each year and is proving to be a serious threat to the tobacco growing industry.

My experiments with a special fertilizer mixture over a period of years have resulted in finding a way to give the tobacco plant such a healthy growth as to make it resistant to the attacks of plant diseases. Twenty-six of these experiments were successfully conducted in 1 year.

Dr. F. A. Wolf, Department of Botany, Duke University, said this in a recent letter to me: "Your idea that fertilizer is the key to the solution of the downy mildew (blue mold) problem is capable of resolution by experiment. Your evidence or proof indicates you are correct."

Dr. Earl H. Hall, Department of Biology, The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, said that my theory "was physiologically as well as logically sound."

Dr. Ivey F. Lewis, Miller professor of biology, and dean of the University of Virginia, said this: "It is undoubtedly true that susceptibility to disease in plants is influenced by the physiological condition of the plants, and that this depends to a large extent on soil and fertilizer."

Fertilizer is the key to the solution of the downy mildew or blue mold problem which is costing the farmers millions of dollars annually, and Federal Government regulation of the manufacture and sale of commercial fertilizers is undoubtedly needed: (1) to protect the farmers from exploitation, (2) to reduce the cost of crop production $75,000,000 annually, and (3) to enable the farmers to grow better and more profitable crops.

Written reports sent to me by a Tennessee farmer, by Georgia's commissioner of agriculture, by North Carolina and Virginia county agents, and by Dr. F. A. Wolf, of Duke University, show that:

1. Blue mold destroyed tobacco plants at the rate of 50 percent in at least 200 beds entailing an estimated loss of $21,000 in this Greer's Chapel community. (Tennessee, July 3, 1943.)

2. Extreme cold and blue mold combined have destroyed most of the tobacco plants in the tobacco belt of Georgia. March 3, 1943.

3. "Blue mold is causing a shortage of plants in some sections and is delaying the planting of the crop in most cases from a week to 10 days." (Caswell County, N. C., May 26, 1943.)

4. "Blue mold has effected practically every plant bed in this section. It has delayed the planting of the crop 2 or 3 weeks." (Rockingham County, N. C., May 26, 1943.)

5. "Blue mold has done considerable damage and has delayed the planting of the crop around 10 days." (Halifax County, Va., May 27, 1943.)

6. "Downy mildew was quite destructive in North Carolina this season. Farmers in this area have just finished planting. The crop is at least 2 weeks late. How much reduction in yield this lateness will cause is a question, but it could easily amount to 50 to 100 dollars per acre." (Dr. F. A. Wolf, Duke University, July 5, 1944.)

Fifty dollars per acre reduction in yield would mean a loss to North Carolina farmers of approximately $25,000,000.

I have been informed that North Carolina planted 511,000 acres in tobacco in 1941. If the farmers prepared 25 square yards of plant beds for each acre of tobacco, which was the usual practice before blue mold put in its appearance, 12,775,000 square yards of plant beds were required for planting that crop. The cost of spraying this plant-bed yardage would have been $383,250, and the cost of fumigating it $766,500. These are the figures for only one State, and there are 12 or more of them that grow tobacco.

Federal court records show that collusion has existed between the fertilizer interests and State legislatures and State law-enforcement officials.

Does the evidence offered herein leave any room for doubt as to whether the fertilizer interests are exerting a sinister influence on the United States Department of Agriculture?

This is a matter that not only affects the welfare of millions of our citizens, it involves the honor and dignity of government itself.

It is, therefore, high time, in fact, long past time for a thorough investigation of a matter that means so much to so many of our citizens.

WILLIAM G. HOLMAN.

Summary of Our Present Economic Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, my friend and neighbor, Mr. O. F. Bledsoe, of Greenwood, Miss., is one of the most successful cotton planters in the South and has devoted his time and talents not only to cotton production but to cotton marketing and to all other cotton problems. He is now and has been from its organization some 25 years ago president of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association. This association is not only one of the oldest but is the most efficiently managed of all of the cotton cooperative associations.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by Mr. Bledsoe before the Lions Club of Greenwood, Miss., Friday, February 16, 1945, to wit:

The dictionary says that "economics is the science that treats of the development of material resources, or of the production, preservation, and distribution of wealth, and of the means and methods of living well, for the state, and of the family, and the individual." Therefore, you see that all of us are interested in the economic welfare of our country, whether we are producers of wealth, or processors, or transporters, or distributors, or render civic services.

Why are the Americas? Our forefathers came from the densely populated nations of the Old World. They were seeking land on which they could produce agricultural wealth. The Western Hemisphere provided the land, and it has always been and is still the greatest agricultural surplus producing area of this world. Its outlets for this agricultural surplus are the densely populated nations, and the process is the exchange of this surplus for manufactured goods.

When our Constitution was written, the United States was 90 percent agriculture and 10 percent industry, and now only 20 percent of our population is in agriculture, and we still are producing a great export surplus.

Domestic trade is the exchange of goods for the monetary units of the political subdivision, while export trade is the exchange of products both manufactured as well as raw materials. The cause of all wars is the disruption of this world trade as "armies move where trade ceases to flow."

What is the future of our surplus agricultural production? If our cotton crop is cut to domestic consumption would you prefer 5,000,000 bales at $100 per bale, or 10,000,000 bales at $50 per bale?

Competition in rayon is here to stay, based on whether rayon or cotton is best suited for the particular job. High grade rayon has proven that it is doing the best job in tires based on the mileage records. The equivalent of over 1,000,000 bales of wood rayons are now in production, and they have their place in our economy. Our domestic market for cotton has always been less than half of our production, notwithstanding that our per capita consumption is far the greatest in the world. The answer is foreign trade or cut our production of cotton to less than half. As to the cost of production of cotton, technological advancement will do the job by reducing the number of human labor-hours involved.

What will be the result if we cut our agricultural production to domestic consumption? An analysis of the economic system in the United States shows that our national income has continually been practically seven times what the farmers received for their crops. In the depression when our farm income went down to $5,000,000,000, our national income declined to $35,000,000,000, and last year when our farm income was $20,000,000,000 our national income went up to $140,000,000,000. Why is this? All of our wealth comes from the surface of the earth. Our inherent wealth in our mines, forests, and oil supply are being continually diminished. We obtain some wealth from our fisheries and a small amount comes from the mechanical fixation of nitrogen from the air. The great continuing supply of our wealth comes from agriculture. It is continuously used up and replaced. This great supply of agricultural wealth is practically two-thirds of all the natural wealth produced here in the United States. Therefore, it is the controlling factor in the amount of our national income. As our national income multiplies seven times the amount of natural wealth produced on the farm, it is interesting to note that in the case of cotton, our national income increases 14 times as the cotton farmer receives one-fourteenth for his share of the retail price.

With our war debt of over $300,000,000,000, it is necessary to have a large national income to service and retire this debt. Then I ask you the simple question, Should we reduce our agricultural production of wealth, or any other production of consumable wealth, if we hope to retire our national debt? With 52,000,000 workers now employed out of our population of about 137,000,000, can we hope to increase this employment to the proposed fifty-five to sixty million workers? Our Government has spent over $15,000,000,000 on new industrial plants for war production, and industry itself has

increased its plants by over $5,000,000,000. It would seem from this situation that both industry and agriculture are now geared up for surplus production. What is the answer to this surplus production when our domestic price structure is practically 100 percent above world prices and our tremendous war debt was contracted at this price level? If we cut our price structure in half, it will take twice as many units of wealth to service our war debt and twice as many to pay it off.

The only answer I can see is the Bankhead-Eastland bill, which provides for the rebate of import duties if the dollar exchange is used to purchase surplus agricultural products. Under this arrangement, all of our surplus agricultural products could be disposed of in foreign trade amounting to 1 to 2 percent of our national income, which is seven times our agricultural income. In this way we can maintain our agricultural production, on which our national income is dependent.

O. P. A. in the Territories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio talk by Hon. Chester Bowles:

Mr. BOWLES. Hello everybody, many of you have received letters from men overseas. They often tell about the fantastic prices charged in some countries for the simplest food, the simplest articles of clothing. It's always kind of a shock to read about prices doubling, tripling, rising as much as 500 percent, as they have in some countries. Here at home where prices and rents are under control many of us tend to forget that everyone must constantly help keep them under control. Perhaps one of the reasons is that we never have had to cope with the grim problems of living close to the fighting fronts.

But there are about two and three-quarter million American civilians who have had to cope with those problems. They are the people of all United States Territories—Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. In those 4 Territories live 37 different races—all loyal Americans, living under the American flag.

So Congress asked O. P. A. to control prices and rents for the people in these United States Territories, as well as for Americans here.

In all the Territories O. P. A. encountered problems that were both unusual and unusually hard to solve. I've asked two guests to tell you about some of them. The first is our O. P. A. Administrator for the Territories, Mr. James P. Davis. He has to cover a lot of ground, and is about to leave again for Puerto Rico. The other is Miss Mary Gresham, who has charge of getting O. P. A. information on price and rent control and rationing to the people in the Territories. Mr. Davis, let's start with Alaska. What were O. P. A.'s big problems in controlling inflation up there?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, as you know, Mr. Bowles, Alaska was an actual war zone. When Japan started coming after us across the Aleutian Islands, Alaska was practically our front line. And it still is a vital war base. Even before Pearl Harbor things were booming.

Mr. BOWLES. The population jumped fast, didn't it?

Mr. DAVIS. It certainly did. Towns like Juneau, Anchorage, and Fairbanks doubled and tripled in population. Practically everything had to be shipped in from the States. Transportation costs were high. And the transportation problem in Alaska itself was even tougher. Some areas have to depend on plane or dog sled or river boat for their supplies.

Miss GRESHAM. Mr. Bowles, most people don't realize what huge areas there are in Alaska. Our O. P. A. office in Fairbanks alone covers an area the size of Texas. One of our men had to make an 800-mile trip by dog sled to check prices in isolated towns.

Mr. BOWLES. There must have been a lot of spending money around with all the defense workers and servicemen in military bases there. Did that make it hard to keep prices in line up in Alaska, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. I'd say we've done pretty well, Mr. Bowles. Of course, prices in Alaska have always been high because of transportation difficulties. O. P. A. was esatblished there in May 1942. We have no comparative cost of living figures by which to measure our progress exactly. But we do know prices have been held down since we took over. Price control in Alaska now covers 2,000 items—practically everything except fresh vegetables, restaurants, recreation, and haircuts. It even includes reindeer steaks. Rent control is operating reasonably well for the protection of Alaskan tenants. Three hundred and sixty hotels and 6,037 houses are registered.

Mr. BOWLES. Miss Gresham, both you and Mr. Davis were up in Alaska recently. Do the people of Alaska support O. P. A.?

Miss GRESHAM. They certainly do. Everyone is anxious to do even more than his share. I think it's because they were so much closer to the actual fighting front. And many communities are so isolated they know that the whole success of price control depends almost entirely on themselves. And they pitch in to do a fine job of price and rent control. A Yukon River tribal chief said to one O. P. A. man. "Just tell us what Uncle Sam wants us to do for him." I'd say that's the attitude of practically everyone in Alaska.

Mr. BOWLES. Now how about price control out in our other Pacific Territory—Hawaii?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, out in Hawaii, Mr. Bowles, there was very much the same kind of inflationary situation as in Alaska—a huge military base, thousands of defense workers and military personnel crowding in—and a general shortage of supplies.

Mr. BOWLES. That's true. Skyrocketing prices at such a strategic base as Hawaii could mean real hardship and resentment for defense workers and service personnel as well as for the civilians.

Mr. DAVIS. As you know, Mr. Bowles, when the military government set up price control right after Pearl Harbor, O. P. A. advisers worked very closely with them. Then O. P. A. finally took over entirely just about 2 years ago. Rent control is in the hands of the local government, however. You know O. P. A. here in the United States has set quite a record of price and rent control for the Territories to live up to. We work hard to do as good a job.

Mr. BOWLES. In most respects we have done a good job here. Of course clothing prices did get away from us. The new clothing program O. P. A. has worked out with the War Production Board, however, is going to bring clothing prices down and get more low-priced clothing in the stores. But in spite of clothing price rises, reports from the Bureau of Labor show that the general level of all retail prices and rents has been held to a rise of little more than 1 percent in the past 19 months.

Our record of price control out in Hawaii has been about the same, hasn't it?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, it has. Of course, most prices have always been relatively higher on Hawaii than in the United States. And they, like us here, experienced price rises in the early part of the war. In the past year and a half, however, the general level of all prices has held pretty stable under O. P. A. controls—just as it has here in the United States. Most prices on basic essentials out there have even gone down a little.

Mr. BOWLES. And that's in spite of really tough continuing pressures toward higher prices?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. It's easy to see how stiff those pressures still are by looking at the prices of items not under O. P. A. controls. For example, recreation costs have shot up. Medical and personal care, like hair cuts and shaves, have also gone up quite a bit in this past year and a half.

Mr. GRESHAM. Some of the things on which we have had to set prices out in Hawaii would seem pretty strange to people here in the States. But they're things that are basic to the people out there.

Mr. BOWLES. What kind of things, for instances?

Mr. GRESHAM. Well, taro root is one of them. That is a potato-like root. They grind it into a paste called poi. Poi goes with almost every Hawaiian dish. We have ceiling prices on both the poi and the taro root itself.

Mr. DAVIS. You know, Mr. Bowles, on the last trip I made out there in Hawaii, what impressed me most was the tremendous enthusiasm and cooperation of local merchants and people in putting across O. P. A. price control. In Hawaii there is probably the biggest mixture of races and religions under the American flag. There are Chinese, Melanesians, Koreans, Filipinos, Portuguese, Japanese, as well as native Hawaiians. Many can't speak English. But they are some of the most active volunteers we have in O. P. A. Why, one O. P. A. price panel out in one of the islands has 35 volunteer price-panel assistants, who check prices in retail stores once every week. As a result, price compliance is extraordinarily good.

Miss GRESHAM. Just to bear that out, Mr. Bowles, the volunteers in the territories rank third of all the volunteers in any region in this country on the number of hours they give to working for price control and protecting their neighbors.

Mr. BOWLES. That's certainly a splendid record and a very real example of democracy in action!

Miss GRESHAM. You see the same kind of democratic action in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, Mr. Bowles. I found it really inspiring. Many of the people of those islands are very low income farmers, with little opportunity for education. But in Puerto Rico alone there are some 5,000 O. P. A. volunteers, all local people. They give an enormous amount of time and enthusiasm to telling their own people what O. P. A. price control is and how it should be carried out.

Mr. BOWLES. What kind of problem with rising prices did you have down there in Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, it was a pretty dangerous situation. Military bases were being built there. And the islands are almost totally dependent on foods shipped from the mainland here. A little over 2 years ago, when German submarines were sinking ship after ship in those Caribbean waters, even essential food supplies were threatened. Prices started to soar.

Miss GRESHAM. To make matters worse, the rural people down there spend almost 65 percent of their income for food. A price rise of a few cents often means the difference between starving and living.

Mr. DAVIS. We had to act pretty fast to hold down food prices. With the help of the War Food Administration and the Department of the Interior, we set fixed prices on rice, beans, codfish, lard, and so on. Those are the basic items in the diet of the people down there.

Miss GRESHAM. Here's just an example of what was happening. Rice had gone up in some black markets in Puerto Rico to 40 cents a pound. Now the O. P. A. has brought the price down to the ceiling of 8 cents.

Mr. BOWLES. What kind of record have we had in holding down all prices of living essentials in Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, in the 2 years that O. P. A. controls have been in effect in Puerto Rico, the general level of prices has been held fairly steady. They've gone up less than 5 percent compared with a rise of 30 percent in the year and a half before O. P. A. came in.

Miss GRESHAM. Most of that increase has been due to higher costs of foods from here on the mainland, Mr. Bowles. Clothing and rent have actually dropped.

Mr. BOWLES. Do the stores and storekeepers down there comply with price ceilings pretty well?

Mr. DAVIS. Amazingly well. Price regulations are printed in Spanish as well as English so that everyone can understand. We don't have recent cost-of-living figures for the Virgin Islands. But the latest report showed prices have dropped under O. P. A. controls. And there has been almost 100 percent compliance there. In Puerto Rico, too, price compliance is generally good.

Miss GRESHAM. You see, Mr. Bowles, the people down there are just about 100 percent behind O. P. A. I've been to many of their outdoor O. P. A. meetings. Very few of the people there have radios, you know. So they come and bring benches and hurricane lamps to hear about O. P. A. in outdoor meetings. Once they even sat through a heavy tropical shower and made me sit through it, too, just to hear what the right O. P. A. ceiling prices are for the things they buy, and how they could help keep prices down.

Mr. BOWLES. There isn't any food rationing in any of the Territories, is there?

Mr. DAVIS. No. So little of our scarce foods is used that rationing hasn't been necessary. Occasionally in the Virgin Islands cornmeal is rationed. That's a very basic, important food down there, and when the boats don't come in we have to ration it temporarily until shipments arrive. We've been using the old war ration book No. 1.

Miss GRESHAM. There's rationing of gasoline, automobiles, and tires, of course, in most of the Territories. Bicycles, stoves, refrigerators, and even typewriters are rationed in Hawaii. Naturally all of the rationing is handled by the local O. P. A. boards, just as it is here.

Mr. BOWLES. I certainly want to thank you, Miss Gresham and Mr. Davis, for coming here.

I believe the story of what's been done by Americans in our outlying Territories is an outstanding example of how efficiently prices can be controlled when everybody pitches in.

Our country has been spared the suffering and the hardships of uncontrolled prices and uncontrolled scarcities. That has been true only because everyone here, too, regardless of race or religion, or color, or walk of life has pitched in to help the O. P. A. to do that big job.

But keeping prices and rents down is a constant battle for the O. P. A. and for all of us. Everyone must help all the time. I know that you will continue to help, to work together for your protection, for the protection of us all.

Good-bye to you all until next week.

How Free Is Our Press?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on Sunday, February 11, 1945:

HOW FREE IS OUR PRESS?

A frequent question is, Has the Federal Government in any way encroached on the constitutional guaranties of freedom of the press? Many things have been done by the New Deal to regiment and restrict the people and industry. Has Government control reached in any degree to the newspapers, upon which the people depend for information?

The membership of the American Society of Newspaper Editors was recently polled on this question. Replies were received from 154 members in 34 States. "No," answered 118; "Yes," answered 36.

An analysis of the vote, which came from editors representing various degrees of approval and disapproval of the New Deal, was interesting in that it disclosed a healthy fear that if actual encroachment has not yet been achieved by the administration, there is a dangerous trend in that direction. Many of those who voted an emphatic "No," appended the qualifying observation, "No, but—" or "Not yet."

The necessity for censorship during the war was admitted by all, and there has been unanimous compliance with its restrictions by the newspapers. Byron Price, chief of the censorship, bureau, has frequently complimented the fraternity on doing a good job under difficulties. The necessity for the successive cuts in newsprint is also taken for granted by the newspapers.

But many editors are not so certain that the administration does not look beyond this wartime structure, and wonder whether it has a program in mind for further restraints. The Government's monopoly suit against the Associated Press is generally regarded as an assault on freedom of the press. It is recalled that the N. R. A. in its early days sought to license the newspapers. It is also recalled that Attorney General Biddle once attempted to force a bill through Congress which would make it criminal to divulge anything on a departmental paper marked "confidential." The insidiousness of this bill was in the fact that it could have been possible for so much Government information to be marked "confidential" that there would be little left to publish.

Several editors described as a direct encroachment the ordering of union maintenance into contracts between publishers and the Newspaper Guild. This is enforced membership which, as stated by Frank R. Ahlgren, of the Memphis Commercial Appeal, had this result: "Freedom of the individual is restricted and stultified, managerial prerogatives usurped, and the median of performance driven to a common denominator which will be that of the least efficient."

Then, there is the growing practice of Government departments issuing their own hand-outs, slanted entirely for their benefit, and refusing other comment. This obviously stifles news at its source. A glaring instance of news stifling was in connection with the Pearl Harbor attack. Long after military needs required secrecy, newsmen were unable to obtain any factual information beyond the cryptic communiques issued by department heads who scrupulously said little. In fact, the full story of Pearl Harbor has never been told.

One editor made the pungent observation that although there is no visible encroachment on press freedom, the administration has consistently sought to undermine public confidence in the press. Freedom of expression has not been curtailed, but the President's persistent belittlement of the newspapers—except those which toady to him—has an erosive quality which cannot be ignored. At the same time the administration does not hesitate to use the press to advance its own programs. This it does by setting up its own public relations bureaus which are outright propaganda organizations. The war provides many excuses for the proselyting effort.

The questionnaire provokes another question. What is the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press? Is the suppression of news for political or other reasons a violation of this guarantee? The war places limitations on publication which are technically a clear violation of press freedom but such restraints are willingly accepted by the editors as their patriotic duty. But there is a twilight area between what should be printed within the bounds of military secrecy and what is withheld from publication by department zealots who use the war as the excuse for withholding legitimate news, or color the news to fit their own interests.

It all adds up to a feeling among editors generally that although the Government has not yet encroached on sacred soil in an appreciable degree, there is no assurance that, given the opportunity, it will not do so. There are symptoms which cannot be ignored.

Vigilance must be the watchword, and the American Society of Newspaper Editors' poll indicates that the press is alerted to danger. The press is still free and must remain in that status. The hope of permanent peace rests in no small measure on a free press around the world.

Wanted: A United Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech prepared for the fiftieth annual Lincoln Day dinner of the Republican Party of the State of Illinois at Chicago, Saturday, February 10, 1945:

It has long been our custom to assemble as Americans who follow the tradition of Abraham Lincoln, on the anniversary of the birth of that great leader. We do so to draw inspiration from his life and from his incalculable service to our Nation.

It is our custom further to extol his life, to review his beliefs, to rededicate ourselves to the theories of government which he expounded and exemplified.

It is our pleasure on these annual occasions to review and to admire the personal life of the man who met tragic death that a mighty Nation should go forward under one flag to a national and international glory unexcelled in the history of the world.

These tributes are the just due of a man who brought a sundered Nation to unity.

I do not believe we come here tonight as Republicans or partisans. I cannot believe that with the shadow which hangs over our Nation and the world we assemble here mere-

ly to make a verbal parade of the unique glories of Lincoln, and the subsequent services which we, under our party banner, have rendered to our Government.

I come to you tonight, therefore, not to talk party politics, but to discuss the more fundamental, the more enduring, the immensely more important problems of government.

Lincoln was plagued with political problems. He brushed them all aside to deal with the great and overpowering problem of the continuity of our constitutional government and the preservation of the unity of our people.

Now the time has come for us to brush aside the relatively minor political problem that confronts us—the problem which was set forth by one of our New Deal friends recently of who gets what and how and when.

We, as Americans, Republicans and Democrats alike, must get away, too, from that pervasive and insidious theory of political conduct which another New Dealer recently described as being to "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect"; and another recent New Deal exposition of the theory of politics that of "keeping our friends in power."

These seem to be the political theories, schemes, and questions which are bothering many of our political minds today. They are the theories, schemes, and questions which Lincoln would not allow to distract him from the task of preserving the Government which our ancestors had built.

These are the political theories, schemes, and questions which have brought in their wake great distress in peacetime, which have compounded the inevitable suffering of wartime, and which threaten the total disruption of our American form of government when peace shall come again.

You will note that I have not mentioned the specific steps which our administration in recent years has taken to carry out the political practices which I have described in their own words. I shall do so, but first I want to place before you, so that it will run through your minds as I go on, the program of government set forth by Abraham Lincoln a few short weeks before his tragic death.

It was a program of government, not a program of politics. In every word, in every detail, both domestic and foreign, it is this program of government that the United States must follow.

Frequently heard in part, and ignored almost in toto, I give you the full paragraph of quotation:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphans and do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

This was the program of government laid down by Lincoln at his second inauguration. It is a program which encompasses a united Nation—a united people. It envisages those people carrying on their own affairs in a forthright and friendly fashion, with justice for all under the law. It is a program which foresees our Nation conducting itself with fairness and justice toward all other nations, and emerging afterward with those nations in a cooperative and peaceful spirit.

Here was a program of unity wrought out of the great disunity which had existed when Lincoln first took office. It must be remembered that secession had already taken place before Lincoln went from Illinois to Washington to take the oath of office. His task was to deal with a disunity already a fact—a disunity stirred up by radicals and crackpots and by those who sought war and who brought on war.

After that internecine war had been fought for years with bloodshed and terror, there were advanced proposals for a peace between the sections. Lincoln laid down in the conference at Hampton Roads only one overshadowing demand and that was a demand for a united Nation. With that denied, the war went on until its final conclusion which brought the unity which Lincoln knew was essential to our national existence.

Now we are engaged, and we have been engaged for years, and probably shall be for several more years, in a mighty war—the mightiest conflict of arms the world has ever witnessed.

Your sons and daughters, fighting on all the lands and on all the seas, and in the skies over the lands and seas will bring us victory in that war. I have been with them on the fighting fronts. I have seen the carnage of the slaughter through which they have fought. I have sought among them the means of improving their lot, a lot not subject to any great improvement until the would-be destroyers of government as Lincoln knew it and as we have know it, shall have been conquered.

Now that the light of victory burns ever more brightly upon our fighting sons in all parts of the world, now as we stand here in the lengthened shadow of the great apostle of a united people under a just government, let us examine what has for years been happening to our Government. Let us test the foundation upon which that Government will rest when our armies come home. Let us likewise test the application to the coming years of Lincoln's great urge "to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all other nations."

Recently in Washington we reinaugurated a President who had already served three terms as the Chief Magistrate of our Nation. By his words and deeds over the last 12 years we must test the course of our Government. We must judge by those words and deeds the adherence of our present administration to the aims and objectives of Lincoln.

Shortly after his fourth inauguration President Roosevelt was asked what would be the course of his administration during the next 4 years. Not for him was the homey program of Abraham Lincoln on his second inauguration; no mention of binding the Nation's wounds; no mention of going forward together in a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with other nations.

No; Mr. Roosevelt declared that his program of government is to be "a little left of the center."

Our fourth-term President could not find in the American idiom the words which would describe his program to our people. He went into the parliamentary verbiage of the corrupt stewpot of Europe to find the words to tell us that the ideals of government laid down in our Constitution and preserved by Lincoln's determination for unity were off his course. He didn't want them. He doesn't want them.

We have always had a few leftists in our country. We have always had the "wobblies" with us. We have had the Molly Maguires. We have had a scattering of anarchists and a few bomb throwers, but never before have we had our Government headed by a man who declared that his aims were along with theirs—"to the left of the center." Never before have we had a Chief Executive who plainly and publicly declared his determination to accomplish those aims.

The leftists have their own idea of government. That idea is plain and it is simple. It is that they should be the government, and the next step in their thinking is equally simple. It is that government is all-powerful.

These were on the beliefs of those leftists in Russia when they set up the dictatorship of the proletariat, which has become the dictatorship of Stalin. These were the beliefs of the leftists Black Shirts in Italy when they set up the dictatorship of Mussolini. They were the beliefs of the leftist Brown Shirts in Germany when they set up Hitler.

They were the beliefs of those who were the controlling factors in France when outside forces toppled over the whole French Government on top of the leftists and everyone else. The leftists had eaten out the great heart of the French Republic for their own selfish purposes and when the Germans came there was nothing to withstand them.

The pattern of all of these leftists emerges as always the same.

Groups of malcontents meet up with the seekers for power. The seekers for power make the same promises in all cases. They promise to give to the malcontents something that someone else has, providing the malcontents will give power to the seekers for power. The basic cynicism of it all is that the malcontents are deserving of everything they want and if giving it to them necessitates taking it away from those who have earned it, that is a simple hurdle for the seeker for power to jump.

If an individual comes up to you in a dark alley and at the point of a gun relieves you of your purse, we refer to it as robbery.

If the political malcontents, under their power seekers, rob you of all you have earned throughout your life, including your purse, your liberty, your good name, your business, and split these virtues of yours among themselves, we refer to it politically as leftism and the time in which it occurs as the century of the common man.

So it is clear where we are going when our President tells us that our Government is to be "to the left of the center." He means that by changes in our Government, the malcontents are going to be satisfied; that by taxation and other measures those who have justly and honestly earned their little bit of security are to have it taken from them and, of course, those to whom that which is taken away shall be given, will, in turn, give more and more power to their benefactors.

It is the old story of robbing Peter to pay Paul. Taking from the haves and giving to the have-nots.

It is this philosophy which enables our ex-Vice President, and nominee for Secretary of Commerce, to tell the wife of the Soviet Ambassador that our sons are fighting and dying so that everyone will have a quart of milk a day—whether they want it or not. The concept of government which the leftists are trying to instill in the American mind—which they are successfully instilling in some minds—is that government can do all, can be all, and can know all.

We are told by those gentlemen—and their equally vocal ladies—that the Government will give everybody a job, that the Government will keep everybody healthy, that the Government will give everybody a home, that the Government will tell you how many children you should have, and that it will tell you how they should be educated. They tell you that the Government will, can, and must do all of these things.

The fact of the matter is that the Government cannot do them for you, and that if the Government could do them your lives would be ruined.

The Government cannot give anybody a job, yet your Government attacks those who can make jobs possible. Government can make you all slaves. That has been proven by the leftist governments of Europe.

We are told that Russia solved the unemployment problem a long time ago. It did, in a way, but it did not do it by creating honest jobs for freemen. Germany and Italy did the same thing.

Americans do not want the unemployment problem—if it recurs after the war—solved on the European plan. They want it solved on the American plan. That means that their Government must help, not hinder, in creating and making available sound jobs at

good wages for workers operating in a free labor market.

In recent weeks in Washington we have been treated to a disgusting spectacle of political fenagling in the most serious aspects of government. I refer to the nomination of Henry A. Wallace, repudiated Vice President, to be Secretary of Commerce because Mr. Roosevelt thought he should be paid for supporting the New Deal ticket. The hidden reason for Mr. Wallace's appointment was that he would control the entire tremendous lending agency which the New Dealers have set up. Mr. Wallace, in accordance with his announced plan, would lend this money to create jobs in a manner that he and other left-of-the-center philosophers feel they should be created.

The United States Senate, controlled by the New Deal though it is, was so horrified at the thought that it has had to rush in and put a padlock on the money before it would even consider Mr. Wallace's appointment.

Imagine the spectacle of appointing to the Cabinet post which has to do with all our commerce and business, a man whom the Congress immediately declared it could not trust with the Government's money. Not because Mr. Wallace might not be personally honest, but because his left-of-the-center control of funds would in itself endanger our whole governmental and economic structure.

This is the type of man who, during the last 12 years, has been infiltrated into high positions throughout the Government. All of them carrying out, or intent upon carrying out, the policy of a "little to the left of the center." And all of these men combined have made their attacks to carry out their philosophies.

Let us refresh our recollection on some of the specific instances. There was the scandal of the subversion of the United States Supreme Court. Back in 1937 the leftists found that the Supreme Court wanted to maintain our Government of laws and refused to accept government of men which was being foisted upon us.

So the most vicious proposal in our whole constitutional life was launched. The Court's robes were dragged in the mud. The Congress stood adamant against the court packing plan, but time has given to Mr. Roosevelt the changes he desired. The result is that the Court, with its new members voting their political and economic beliefs, has thrown our whole system of jurisprudence into chaos. They have created a condition in which no reputable lawyer will attempt to tell you today what tomorrow's law will be.

The leftists program calls for subduing any element that opposes them. They did that here in Illinois. And whether you think Montgomery Ward treats its employees properly or not, you have a right to be proud that here in Chicago is found one justice who would recite the law as he found it and not as some one in Washington demanded that he find it.

Consider the vicious and continuing attacks which the left-of-the-center program has brought on the freedom of the press. Because a pampered journalistic pet of the leftists could not obtain an Associated Press membership for his publication, Government agents were sent throughout the land in an effort to destroy the Associated Press.

Newspapers of honor and integrity have been attacked and smeared. Reporters, correspondents and columnists who report the truth have been ridiculed. Their news sources have been closed and their reputations assailed.

Literally thousands of men and women have been employed by the leftists in Government to spread the glories of the day when Government controls everything. Every Government agency, no matter how small—and not many of them remain small long—has its official feeder of pap and propaganda to the public.

The intelligence and courage of the American people are insulted daily by deception and lies of omission and commission, spewed out in an attempt to bolster the clique which has determined to lead us from the things which have made America the envy of the world.

This campaign of falsehood—subsidized by your own tax dollars—extends far beyond our domestic affairs. It goes into the battle fronts with your sons, and reverts back from your sons to you.

Last October, and up to the first few days of last November, we were told by the New Dealers and by the President himself that your sons on the firing line had everything they could possibly want to fight with. That they were being kept the healthiest Army in the world. That their supplies were inexhaustible and in the right spot at the right time. That American workingmen and workingwomen had done everything possible to produce the necessities of war. In fact, everything was hunky-dory.

Within a few days after election, which the leftists won with their admittedly appealing line of argument—appealing if true—I personally visited the battlefields of Europe and found conditions appalling. The drive through France was stopped because of the shortage of supplies. The Belgian front gave way because of the shortage of supplies. The health of our men was being jeopardized because of improper shoes and clothing.

And the basic supplies of war, guns and ammunition, were so short that the fighting units had to be rationed. Ammunition was rationed to units. When general after general had complained personally of the shortages that existed, I could not help but recall the economy of scarcity days of the New Deal when little pigs were slaughtered and crops were plowed under.

These were actual shortages that existed. They were revealed to us with a feeling of horror by the generals, who were in command; generals who admitted that the lives of your sons were being needlessly lost because of shortages. But that was after November 7.

Since then we are told that labor must be enslaved to produce the supplies now found necessary. We are told America fell down on the job of producing for its sons, and that now American workingmen and workingwomen must be whipped to the task with threats of jail.

Is this the conduct of the honest, honorable type of American Government as we have known it through the years?

Let us look at this same Government operating in the field of international affairs.

As near as it is possible to detect the foreign policy of our left-of-the-center operators, it is as follows:

That while our omniscient Government is making puppets of Americans it will spread such light and joy throughout the world by its gifts and beneficences that all peoples will turn to America as to a savior. They will forsake their own national allegiances and those who have gained control in America will then control the world.

Well, let me tell you about that. The people of the world will take what we give them—they will ask and even demand more—but they are going on being just the same people of just the same nations they have always been.

We have for years been fighting a war in coalition with the British Empire and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of China. You would think that in the face of a life and death struggle some kind of unity would have been achieved among these nations.

We were led to believe, up until a few short months ago that that was the actual condition. But then came November and we awoke to find ourselves and our allies in total ignorance of each other's aims and objectives.

We found that the famous Atlantic Charter had dwindled from where it was placed by Mr. Roosevelt alongside the Ten Commandments and the Magna Carta to a mere press agent's handout distributed to cover up the meeting of a couple of boys somewhere in the Atlantic Ocean.

We found, and we still find, that the nations of Europe are going right on their merry way of dividing Europe among themselves just as they have always done after all of their wars. And the United States will be found to be holding the bag throughout the settlement.

Mr. Churchill announced that he did not become the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. Mr. Stalin just goes on sawing wood and taking big gulps of territory as it comes under his saw. Mr. Roosevelt, still traveling a little left of the center, sends social workers abroad to sweeten up the boys with a little more of the lady bountiful act.

It seems to me that it is apparent that there will be no real peace in Europe for many years to come. The nations like France and Italy, which have been upset, cannot be stabilized for a long, long time.

Most of the nations which we, in the language of the left-of-the-center crowd, are liberating are developing an intense hatred for America. In France and in Italy this is especially true.

Our so-called good-neighbor policy in South America, despite the millions of dollars we have spent on it and the musicians we have sent to carry out our culture, the motion pictures we have made, and so on, has increased the always latent suspicion with which most of the Pan-American countries have always regarded the colossus of the north.

If we want to get our sons back after this war we had better get to work now establishing a definite and forthright agreement showing the unity of the nations which are on our side in this war.

And then if we want to bring our country to a speedy recovery from the war's disasters and disruptions, let us bring about a unity among our own people.

Let us bring to our Nation and among all other peoples a feeling of self-respect and a feeling of mutual self-respect. Let us free our people from the grasping tentacles of Government seeking totalitarianism of power and degradation of individuals.

Let us restore our Americanism.

Let us, in all walks and ranks of life, turn back and find the solid basis for our future in our history. Let us, in simplicity and in honor, say with Abraham Lincoln:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphans; and do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

The Motion Picture Theater Essential to the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I represent the Hollywood district of Cali-

fornia, the motion-picture capital of the world. Contrary to the opinion of many, Hollywood is a substantial community made up of thousands of reliable and loyal citizens of this Nation.

Here is located the Hollywood Bowl, where the symphonies under the stars are directed by the great music masters of the world. Here is located Radio City, where the massive studios of the national broadcasting companies originate many of the great radio shows. Paramount studio, R. K. O., the original Warner Bros. studio, United Artists, and the original William Fox studio are located in Hollywood, employing thousands of men and women.

This vast store of artists, technicians, culture, and art has been sincerely devoted to helping win the war. All of the talents of these artists and technicians have been at the disposal of the Federal Government.

Although not recognized as an essential industry, the motion picture theater is the channel which carries the story of the war to 88,000,000 people in this Nation each week, thus keeping up the morale of the folks at home and the men at the front.

I urge the Members of the House to give more serious attention to the motion-picture theater as an essential industry in winning the war.

Its service to the public cannot be overlooked. Under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks the following editorial from Boxoffice, the national film weekly:

CONSIDERATION DUE

The news on the front pages of the Nation's newspapers on New Year's morning had a sobering effect on those who needed it. The announcement of the tightening of regulations on the manpower situation was enough. But the recall of reconversion orders to industries that had been given the green light several months ago added a touch that struck right down to the roots.

The upsetting war news of the last few weeks has now taken on a brighter hue. But that has not changed the planning, nor is it likely to, for some months to come. War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes, whose plans are supported by the President, has made himself quite clear on that. The all-out war effort, that slackened when the prospects for an early conclusion of the European war seemed imminent, not only is to be resumed but it is to be accelerated to the very extreme. Paradoxically, as the pendulum swings backward, it is hoped that it will throw the machinery of war into high gear, pushing forward the arrival of VE-Day.

While the motion-picture industry has not slackened in its war role—in fact it increased its efforts even when the optimistic talk of war's early end was at the highest pitch—it will continue to do better than its best. But it must not be hampered in its efforts by deliberate or indiscriminate "raids" on its already heavily reduced manpower.

With the closing down of the race tracks and the imminent shuttering of night clubs (although we anticipate their well-organized strength will again be evidenced as it was in the tax case), there has come an unfortunate slurring inclusion of motion-picture theaters. Unfair charges that many motion-picture actors have been unwarrantedly discharged from military service have been hurled about carelessly in the lay press and in radio news reports.

It doesn't seem possible that there are so many "who have eyes, yet do not see" when the motion picture and its institutions are concerned. But, unfortunately, old-time prejudices still linger. And, despite the knowledge of Senators and Congressmen of the fine work this industry in its every branch has done toward and for the war effort, there are too many among them who include motion pictures in the general classification of "amusements" and thus fail to give this industry the recognition and consideration it properly deserves.

It is time, again, to remind that this industry has not asked special favors. But, with all of the many acknowledgments—from every quarter—as to the essentiality of morale maintenance and morale building, on the home front as well as on the battle fronts, and the very potent evidences of the extraordinary part motion pictures have played therein, it seems strange that there should ever be any question as to whether the motion-picture theater is essential.

Exhibitors have willingly and at great cost and sacrifice done their part in pushing every bond drive over the top. Is that essential? They have worked as never before to keep their theaters open, thus making their screens available for the showing of war information films—many made by the Government—for the dissemination of information that the Government deems vital to the public weal, for the future as well as for now. Is that essential? Motion-picture theaters are actively and constantly engaged in more war work than any other industry except those that actually produce weapons of war. And every branch of this business is likewise doing its part—and more.

Motion-picture exhibition does not expect and, perhaps, does not even want a special ruling as to its essentiality. But it is entitled to the proper consideration for those efforts that are deemed essential. It seeks no favors, but it deserves to be rated far above that general classification of "amusements," into which horse racing, dog running, and juke-box joints are lumped.

Poland, the First to Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the reaction of many of my constituents to the Yalta Pact is well illustrated in the letter written to the editor of the Milwaukee Journal by Mr. J. A. Kapmarski, the editor of the Kuryer Polski, a Polish language newspaper published in Milwaukee for more than 50 years.

The agreement reached by the Big Three with respect to our war aims, military strategy, and ultimate treatment of the Nazis meets with unanimous approval. However, in respect to the disposition of the rights of the small nations of eastern Europe, keen disappointment is expressed because of its failure to have been carried out pursuant to the tenets of the Atlantic Charter and our old American philosophy regarding the self-determination of nations. There is still hope these wrongs my be righted.

Mr. Kapmarski's letter reads as follows:

POLAND THE FIRST TO FIGHT

To the Journal:

No sensible person will try to belittle Russia's contribution to the Allies' ultimate victory in Europe. The Journal's editorial, the Price That Russia Has Paid, was a well deserved tribute.

However, the fact remains that Russia gave the green light to Hitler in August 1939 to start this war and was Germany's silent partner against the Allies up to the time when Hitler betrayed Stalin, starting the invasion of Russia in June 1941.

Russia did not enter the war for any lofty ideals, democratic, humanitarian, altruistic, or what have you. Russia was simply forced to fight in self-defense.

The Journal says, "Let us never forget the millions of Russian dead who, by their contribution, made possible the victory we shall win over the Axis aggressor." Very true.

But shall we forget the contribution of Poland, the first nation to oppose Hitler in armed conflict, and her losses in dead, wounded, and deported inflicted upon her by Germany, the enemy, and Russia, the "ally"? Shall we forget the sacrifices of Poland which were proportionately greater than those of any other Allied Nation, Russia included?

Shall we forget that the Polish airmen constituted the only Allied fighting force in action on England's side in the Battle of Britain in 1940, helping to turn the tide in those dark days? What about the 5-year battle of the Polish underground, which has won the unstinted admiration of the world? What about the Polish Navy and Army which fought together with her Allies from the north to the Aegean Sea, from Narvik to Tobruk, from Cassino and Ancona to Breda and Arnhem?

Without saying it in so many words, the Journal obviously feels that irrespective of all human rights, international laws, treaties, the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," and what not, regardless of Poland's contributions and sacrifices, Russia should have her own way, and the right to dispose of the Polish problem as Stalin sees fit.

Poland is meeting a worse fate than any of the former enemy nations, Italy and Rumania, for instance. One begins to wonder if Poland would not have been better off by yielding to Germany in the first place, instead of being the first to fight.

J. A. KAPMARSKI.

MILWAUKEE.

Pattern of the Fourth New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, on Sunday, February 4, 1945, published an important editorial entitled "Pattern of the Fourth New Deal." It follows:

PATTERN OF THE FOURTH NEW DEAL

When President Roosevelt made his famed pledge of 60,000,000 post-war jobs, it looked like just another pre-election rabbit pulled out of the political hat—a rabbit of doubtful legitimacy, but nonetheless impressive to most voters. It aroused little comment that he failed to analyze the need or quote authority for the figure.

In view of subsequent events, that avowed goal, however, now takes on the appearance of a vital part of the Fourth New Deal.

By his pledge the President arbitrarily set a goal which he indicated the Nation's business structure must meet—apparently without consulting business or any other experienced source on either its need or its feasibility. Yet his prestige gave the figure wide

acceptance at face value. For this reason if private enterprise fails to attain that level of employment, it will be private enterprise which is blamed, even though it had no part in the pledge.

So let's examine the validity of that figure and the possibility of meeting it.

The Census Bureau estimates our post-war population (1946-47) will be about 140,000,000 persons. In order to arrive at the size of the actual post-war labor force, we must subtract certain classes, including those individuals who have taken jobs only under pressure of the war emergency.

These classes are the 33,300,000 youngsters under 14 years of age, the 11,200,000 others who will be in school, the 30,400,000 housewives and former women workers who will have no desire to work after the war, the planned standing army of 2,380,000 troops, the 8,800,000 persons 65 years of age or over, the 2,500,000 undesirable characters on the economic border line, such as racketeers, confidence men, and plain bums, the 1,800,000 (between ages 14 and 65) inmates of penal institutions and hospitals for the mentally defective and the permanently disabled or chronically ill, the 800,000 who may be expected to take up residence abroad, and the 80,000 who will voluntarily retire at age 60. With these deductions we arrive at a probable post-war labor force of 48,740,000, or nearly 5,000,000 more persons than were employed in 1940.

It follows that if 48,740,000 post-war jobs are provided, there will be one for everyone in the United States who wants to work. Hence, if the President's 60,000,000 jobs are to be filled, it will mean taking 11,260,000 youngsters out of school or women out of homes by almost as drastic a labor recruiting campaign as was necessary to achieve our war production record. The alternative is to persuade the over-age, the bums, the ill, the mentally defective to take the balance of the jobs Mr. Roosevelt says business must provide.

It is ridiculous to suggest President Roosevelt didn't and doesn't know this. Clearly then the goal was set for one purpose: To provide the New Deal with a club with which it can drive private business into the post-war dog house, however creditable its performance.

With this device assured to induce at any time a public clamor for government pump-priming, the next step was to get the Reconstruction Finance Corporation out of the conservative hands of Jesse Jones and into more liberal ones. Obviously the R. F. C., a $32,000,000,000 structure of lending and operating agencies, with its loans and ownership of competitive plants giving it the power to coerce or even destroy virtually any segment of the Nation's industry, would be an invaluable blackjack toward a socialized economy.

Jones had made an excellent and profitable showing as head of both the R. F. C. and Commerce Department, but there was no chance he would tolerate the desired lavish scale of handouts. Mr. Roosevelt also had Mr. Wallace and Mr. Hillman to take care of.

Hence the brazen "Dear Jesse" ouster letter and Wallace nomination, which presumably simultaneously cleared Roosevelt with both Sidney and Henry. There were hints the notorious missive was not intended for publication, but the ensuing silence of the White House indicated the President had been aware a congressional explosion would follow and was indifferent whether Wallace was confirmed to either or neither post. If the starry-eyed Iowan was not allowed to take control of the R. F. C., there were plenty more moonbeam boys Mr. Roosevelt could nominate until one was finally confirmed.

Thus the major parts of post-war fiscal fantasy were in readiness—the "proof" that business could not supply all the jobs needed and a free-handed gentleman in charge of the agency which could ladle out funds in a volume to make New Deal I benevolence look miserly.

As Jones himself testified, the R. F. C. "can make loans in any amount, for any length of time, at any rate of interest, to anybody." And the probable application of that power was revealed by Wallace's statement supplementing the President's earlier liberal views, that "an adequate program must provide America with 60,000,000 productive jobs," with the Government starting the pump priming when the level drops below 57,000,000. This plan, meantime, was implemented by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY'S resolution providing that full-scale Federal spending shall begin any time national employment goes under an arbitrary figure, probably Mr. Wallace's 57,000,000.

All of which adds up to a Government guaranty that more persons shall have post-war jobs than want them.

However, even the cosmic planners admit this will cost money. If New Deal IV is to police our social and economic lives, the Government must underwrite the expense, even though it has a public debt costing $4,500,000,000 a year in interest alone.

To plug this loophole a new term is dragged out—the horrendous evil of "over-saving"—a word by which individual thrift for a rainy day is branded as antisocial if not downright economic sabotage. To discourage this reprehensible hangover from Benjamin Franklin's tenets, the Government must tax these savings into the Treasury, from which they will be shoveled into a sort of state socialism to provide the jobs the omniscient state thinks are needed.

Naturally it would be unthinkable for business to be so encouraged and freed from restraints that these same savings would be attracted directly into it as investment funds, with better employment results.

The Senate has just passed the George bill which divorces the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries from the Department of Commerce, with prospects rather bright for Wallace's confirmation for the secretaryship. However, the George bill relates merely to the R. F. C. and its allied agencies. There are some 34 other lending-spending bureaus which the President, if he chooses, could transfer to Wallace and their authority extends to funds almost as large as those commanded by the R. F. C.

Congress' duty, then, is only part done with the R. F. C. divorcement. It must make certain that the new Director of the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries is not just another Wallace, and it should apply the same scalpel to the Government borrowing agencies which are still within the President's gift to the Secretary of Commerce. House debate on the George bill indicates something of the kind may be done.

Whether Congress will have the courage to act under pressure of inspired public fears of widespread unemployment, will determine if all of us are to have an uncontrolled joyride to complete management by government.

Report on Ship Construction Contracts

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on September 13, 1944, I addressed a letter to the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, in which I asked that he furnish me a report on ship-construction contracts entered into with each of the companies with which Henry Kaiser is associated. I referred to such contracts as had been renegotiated as of July 1, 1944.

I received a very comprehensive report on this matter from the Comptroller General covering such cases as had been renegotiated up to that time and which is as complete, I believe, as could be furnished under the circumstances. However, Mr. Speaker, I hope to have later reports on the companies not covered in this report.

Mr. Kaiser, without a doubt, has done a magnificent job in contributing to the success of our armed forces. He has displayed a capacity for organization and production that amazes everyone familiar with his record. However, his efforts have not gone entirely unrewarded. As is shown by this report, it will be noted that the original investment of the Kaiser group was $100,000. It is shown also that the Government has spent the sum of $216,647,734 in providing facilities for the companies included in this report. The stockholders in the Kaiser companies are limited in number and appear to be a closed corporation.

The net profits, after renegotiation on the two companies reported upon in detail, were $27,374,487.24. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that when the reports on the other companies are finally in, it will be found that the original $100,000 investment was a decidedly profitable one.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1944.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,

Comptroller General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I will greatly appreciate it if you will furnish me a report on ship construction contracts, entered into with each of the companies with which Henry Kaiser is associated. I refer to such contracts as have been renegotiated as of July 1, 1944.

In compiling this report please indicate—

(1) The name of the company and the principal stockholders therein.

(2) The amount of the initial capital investment (a) in cash: (b) other than cash, when the first contract was awarded.

(3) The subsequent cash investment of private funds. Also, if other than cash, the amount and the form of such investment.

(4) The amount of government funds invested in such plants. Please indicate the amount of further funds, if any, advanced to such plants by Governmental agencies. Also indicate amounts advanced by each agency if more than one has participated in such loans.

(5) The value of such Government investment, in the interest received, and whether such interest paid has been added to the cost of operating such plants.

(6) The actual profit, prior to the payment of taxes, and, prior to renegotiation of each of these companies, and, the period covered. Also, the percentage of profit to each company on the actual stockholder cash investment for the period covered.

(7) The profit to each company, after payment of taxes, for the period covered. Also, the percentage of profit retained, after the payment of taxes, on the actual cash investment.

(8) The profit to each company, after payment of taxes, and, after renegotiation for the period covered. Also, the percentage of profit retained on the actual stockholder cash investment of each company.

(9) Were the profits of these companies approved by your office, and, the Maritime

Commission after your staff had made a detailed and final audit of such companies?

(10) Did your staff have complete data and, were all of the items covered in section 405 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law 235 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, considered in determining the profits retained by each of these companies?

(11) Has your staff reported to your office any evidence of fraud or willful misrepresentation of material facts in connection with the renegotiation of these contracts, or, other ship-construction contracts?

I am assuming that some of this information, herein requested, is at present available, and some of it will have to be obtained from the auditors of the Maritime Commission and other agencies which your office is privileged to obtain without unnecessary delay and without much additional cost.

Trusting that this request will receive prompt consideration, I am,

Very truly yours.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, September 20, 1944.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: I have your letter of September 13, 1944, requesting a report on certain matters pertaining to the renegotiation of ship-construction contracts entered into with companies with which Henry Kaiser is associated.

Your letter will be given prompt attention, and you will be advised further with reference thereto as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, October 16, 1944.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House of Representatives,

MY DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: Further reference is made to your letter of September 13, 1944, acknowledged September 20, requesting a report on ship-construction contracts entered into with companies with which Henry Kaiser is associated. There is transmitted herewith a report containing much of the data requested. However, I should like to comment briefly on certain phases of the matter and to explain such deficiencies as there may be in the factual information contained in the report.

In general, the data which you have requested pertains to matters involving the renegotiation of ship-construction contracts. Under section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended by the Revenue Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 982), it was made the duty and responsibility of certain administrative agencies of the Government to renegotiate contracts entered into by such agencies where it appeared that excessive profits had been made thereunder. By section 701 of the Revenue Act of 1943, effective February 25, 1944, Public Law No. 235, said section 403 was further amended and there was established a War Contracts Price Adjustment Board consisting of six members—an officer or employee appointed from each of six different departments or establishments designated therein—which Board now has the function of determining whether excessive profits have been paid or have accrued under war contracts. It is provided that an agreement made by such Board with a contractor or subcontractor for the elimination of excessive profits and for the discharge of liability for excessive profits shall be conclusive according to its terms and that, in the absence of fraud, malfeasance, or a willful misrepresentation of a material fact, any such agreement shall not be modified by any officer, employee, or agent of the United States.

From the provisions of law above referred to you will note that it is not a function of this office either to approve or disapprove the amount of profit made by the companies here involved in the construction of vessels for the account of the United States Maritime Commission. As indicated in the report herewith, no evidence of fraud, malfeasance, or a willful misrepresentation of a material fact has been reported by representatives of this office as a result of investigations made of these companies.

Moreover, such inspections and audits as are made prior to renegotiation and upon which the determination that excessive profits are involved are not performed by the General Accounting Office. While it is the function of this office to determine that payments under such war contracts have been made in accordance with the terms thereof and do not contravene any law, and while, in the performance of such functions, this office does audit the accounts of the disbursing officers who make the payments under such contracts, such audit necessarily is undertaken along different lines than an audit made solely with a view to a determination of excessive profits. For example, in the audit of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract, a determination of the contractor's costs for the purpose of ascertaining the amount of profit realized or to be realized under the contract would not necessarily coincide with the determination of this office as to whether various items of cost properly were reimbursable by the Government to the contractor. Accordingly, since the action taken by this office in the audit of ship-construction contracts is entirely independent of the audit made of such contracts for renegotiation purposes, some of the information requested by you is not available here.

Such of the information requested as is not contained in the enclosed report probably could be obtained by you from the Maritime Commission or the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

SPECIAL REPORT ON KAISER SHIPBUILDING COMPANIES, CALIFORNIA SHIPBUILDING CORPORATION

(Incorporated under laws of Delaware Jan. 6, 1941)

Capital structure (items 2, 3, 4, 5)

Capital stock authorized 10,000 shares:	
Capital stock issued, 1,000 shares	$100,000
Capital stock increased Feb. 19, 1942, to 6,000 shares by stock dividend	600,000
Capital employed by corporation Nov. 30, 1943:	
Capital stock	600,000
Loans from stockholders	2,700,000
Bank loans	3,750,000
Government funds invested as of Oct. 1, 1944:	
Payments by Government for facilities	24,334,247
Government allotment for cafeteria	104,000

No information relative to any return to Government representing interest on facilities investment.

Profits (items 6, 7, and 8)

Renegotiation contract No. MCc-29119 indicates renegotiation of ship contracts Nos. MCc-7785 Mar. 14, 1941, 7786 May 1, 1941, 2128 Jan. 17, 1942, and 7834 June 16, 1942, and indicates profits before Federal income and excess-profits taxes on total contract sales of $255,878,346.57 of—	
Before renegotiation	$27,257,524.00
Deemed excessive	10,706,199.76
Profits allowed	16,551,324.24
The corporation's Nov. 30, 1943 statement of earned surplus indicates balance as of Nov. 30, 1942 (adjusted)	459,076.18
Net income before Federal Income taxes and contingencies (year ended Nov. 30, 1943)	19,704,127.35
Provision for Federal income taxes and contingencies	15,447,000.00
Net income	4,256,527.35
Less dividend paid [1]	2,000,000.00
	2,256,527.35
Balance Nov. 30, 1943	2,715,603.53

[1] $1,000,000 of dividends was loaned company by stockholders to increase loans to $2,700,000.

Approval of profits by the General Accounting Office (items 9, 10, and 11)

This Office has not approved any profits or settlement and is not authorized to question any settlement under the renegotiation statute in the absence of a showing of fraud or malfeasance or a willful misrepresentation of a material fact. A report of field investigation by representatives of this Office was made under date of March 4, 1944, covering the operations of the corporation for the period ending November 30, 1943. The report did not indicate any evidence of fraud, and so forth.

KAISER CARGO, INC.

Capital structure (items 2, 3, 4, and 5)

(Incorporated under laws of California, November 17, 1942)

Capital stock authorized, 1,000 shares.
Capital stock issued, 500 shares, $50,000.

Profits (items 6, 7, and 8)

There is no information available relative to any contract of renegotiation of excessive profits, nor has there been received any data on profits of this corporation.

Approval by General Accounting Office (items 9, 10, and 11)

This office has not approved any profits or settlements of contracts with this corporation.

There has been received no report of field investigation of this company by representatives of this Office.

KAISER CO., INC.

(Incorporated under laws of Nevada, December 1, 1941)

Capital structure (items 2, 3, 4, and 5)

Capital stock authorized, 25,000 shares.

Capital stock issued, 1,000 shares, par value $100, $100,000.

All other working funds are borrowings from banks on assignments of contracts.

Government funds invested as of September 1, 1944: Payments by Government for facilities (for all 3 yards), $103,473,665.

No information relative to any return to Government representing interest on facilities investment.

Copy of corporation's June 30, 1942, balance sheet indicates:	
Notes payable, banks	$9,500,000
Notes payable, Reconstruction Finance Corporation	6,071,000
Capital stock	100,000

Profits (items 6, 7, and 8)

There is no information available relative to any contract of renegotiation of excessive profits for this corporation, nor has there been received any data on profits of the corporation.

Approval by General Accounting Office (items 9, 10, and 11)

This Office has not approved any profits or settlements on contracts with this corporation. A report of field investigation by representatives of this Office, made under date of September 2, 1942, covering the operations of the Richmond, Calif., yard for the period December 1941 to November 1942, did not indicate any evidences of fraud, etc.

MARINSHIP CORPORATION

Capital structure (items 2, 3, 4, and 5)

(Incorporated under laws of Nevada, September 2, 1942)

Capital stock authorized, 5,000 shares.
Capital stock issued, 3,750 shares, $375,000.

Capital employed by corporation, November 30, 1942:

Capital stock sales	$375,000
Capital loans	125,000
Capital contributions by joint venture	100,000
Bank loans	1,500,000

Bank loans secured by assignment of contracts and interest thereon considered as allowable cost.

Government funds invested as of September 1, 1944:

Payments by Government facilities	$16,157,134
Other Government allotments:	
Cafeteria	49,178
Ferry	110,000

No information relative to any return to Government representing interest on facilities investment.

Profits (items 6, 7, and 8)

There is no information available relative to any contract of renegotiation of excessive profits, nor has there been received any data on profits of the Corporation.

Approval by General Accounting Office (items 9, 10, and 11)

This office has not approved any profits or settlements on contracts with this Corporation.

A report of field investigation by representatives of this office, made under date of February 13, 1943, covering the operations of the Corporation for the period ending November 30, 1942, did not indicate any evidence of fraud, etc.

OREGON SHIPBUILDING CORPORATION

Capital structure (items 2, 3, 4, and 5)

(Incorporated under laws of Delaware, January 6, 1941)

Capital stock authorized, 10,000 shares.
Capital stock issued, 5,500 shares, $550,000.

Government funds invested as of September 1, 1944:

Payment by Government for facilities	$21,196,171
Other Government allotments:	
Cafeteria	$103,650
Housing	1,961,178

No information relative to any return to Government representing interest on facilities investment.

Profits (items 6, 7, and 8)

Renegotiation contract No. 26699–331W indicates renegotiation of ship contracts Nos. MCc–ESP–11, 595 and 596 and MCc 7950, and indicates profits before Federal income and excess-profits taxes on total contract sales of $177,461,650 of—

Before renegotiation	$17,631,650
Deemed excessive	6,908,487
Profits allowed	10,723,163

Approval of profits by General Accounting Office (items 9, 10, and 11)

This office has not approved any profits or settlement and is not authorized to question any settlement under the renegotiation statute in the absence of a showing of fraud, etc.

There has been no report by representatives of this office of field investigation of this Corporation.

PERMANENTE METALS CORPORATION

Capital structure (items 2, 3, 4, and 5)

(Incorporated under laws of Delaware, December 9, 1940)

Capital stock authorized, 4,600 shares.
Capital stock issued, 4,600 shares, $460,000; includes 3,600 shares exchanged for stock of Richmond Shipbuilding Corporation.
Bank loans as of December 31, 1942, $4,000,000.

Government funds invested as of Sept. 1, 1944:

Payment by Government for facilities	$34,455,401
Other Government allotments:	
Cafeteria	65,147
Housing	35,000

No information relative to any return to Government representing interest on facilities investment.

Profits (items 6, 7, and 8)

There is no information available relative to any contract of renegotiation of excessive profits, nor has there been received any accurate data on profits of the corporation.

Approval by General Accounting Office (items 9, 10, and 11)

This Office has not approved any profits or settlements on contracts with this corporation.

A report of field investigation by representatives of this Office, made under date of April 14, 1943, covering the operations of the corporation for the period ending November 30, 1942, did not indicate any evidence of fraud, etc.

RICHMOND SHIPBUILDING CORPORATION

Capital structure (items 2, 3, 4, and 5)

(Incorporated under laws of Delaware, April 1, 1941)

Capital stock authorized, 3,600 shares.
Capital stock issued, 3,600 shares, $360,000.
Bank loans at June 30, 1942, $1,750,000.
Government funds invested as of June 30, 1942: Payment for facilities, $14,279,561.76.

This yard was consolidated with the Permanente Metals Corporation and the completion of contracts in force along with others were completed by that corporation.

Profits (items 6, 7, and 8)

There is no information available relative to any contract of renegotiation of excessive profits nor has there been received any data on profits of this corporation of the Permanente Metals Corporation.

The profit and loss statement as of June 30, 1942, prior to consolidation indicated profit before taxes of $2,879,946.18 and distributed as follows:

Federal income tax and surtax	$414,252.78
Federal excess profits tax	1,571,693.62
Earned surplus	893,996.78

Approval by General Accounting Office (items 9, 10, and 11)

This office has not approved any profits or settlements of contracts with this corporation. A report of field investigations by representatives of this Office, made under date of November 28, 1942, covering the operations of the corporations for the period ending June 30, 1942—which was prior to consolidation—did not indicate any evidence of fraud, etc.

WALSH-KAISER CO., INC.

Capital structure (items 2, 3, 4, and 5)

(Incorporated under laws of Delaware February 19, 1943)

Capital stock authorized, 3,000 shares.
Capital stock issued, 3,000 shares, $300,000.
Government funds invested: Payment by Government for facilities, $24,761,649.

No information relative to any return to Government representing interest on facilities investment.

Profits (items 6, 7, and 8)

There is no information available relative to any contract of renegotiation of excessive profits, nor has there been received any data on profits of this corporation.

Approval by General Accounting Office (items 9, 10, and 11)

This office has not approved any profits or settlements of contracts with this corporation. There has been no field investigation by representatives of this office of this corporation.

Intercompany stock ownership (shares)—Kaiser affiliates

Name of stock owner	California Shipbuilding Corporation, Terminal Island, Calif.	Kaiser Cargo, Inc., Richmond, Calif.	Kaiser Co., Inc., Richmond, Calif., Portland, Oreg., Vancouver, Wash.	Marinship Corporation (Bechtel Co.) Sausalito, Calif.	Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg.	Permanente Metals Corporation, Richmond, Calif.	Richmond Shipbuilding Corporation, Richmond, Calif.	Walsh-Kaiser Co., Inc., Providence, R. I.
Henry J. Kaiser Co	473	500	1,000	----------	XXX	543	XX	X
The Kaiser Co	473	----------	----------	----------	XXX	543	XX	X
W. A. Bechtel Co	900	----------	----------	1,250	XXX	453	XX	----------
Bechtel-McCone-Parsons Corporation	900	----------	----------	1,250	XXX	453	XX	----------
General Construction Co	276	----------	----------	----------	XXX	516	XX	----------
J. F. O'Shea Co., Inc	723.5	----------	----------	----------	XXX	476	XX	----------
Pacific Bridge Co	286.5	----------	----------	----------	XXX	248	XX	----------
McDonald & Kahn, Inc	583.5	----------	----------	375	XXX	456	XX	----------
Morrison Knudson Co., Inc	692.5	----------	----------	375	XXX	456	XX	X
The Utah Construction Co	692	----------	----------	----------	XXX	456	XX	----------
J. H. Pomeroy & Co., Inc	----------	----------	----------	250	----------	----------	----------	----------
Raymond Concrete Pile Co	----------	----------	----------	250	----------	----------	----------	----------
Consolidated Builders, Inc	----------	----------	----------	----------	[1] 5,500	----------	----------	----------
Permanente Metals Corporation	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	[2] 3,600	----------
Associated Contractors, Inc	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	[3] 3,000
Total shares	6,000	500	1,000	3,750	5,500	4,600	3,600	3,000

[1] Owned by companies designated "XXX".
[2] Owned by companies designated "XX".
[3] Partially owned by companies designated "X".

Intercompany stock ownership (shares)—Kaiser affiliates—Continued

CAPITAL STOCK

Name of stock owner	California Shipbuilding Corporation, Terminal Island, Calif.	Kaiser Cargo, Inc., Richmond, Calif.	Kaiser Co., Inc., Richmond, Calif., Portland, Oreg., Vancouver, Wash.	Marinship Corporation (Bechtel Co.) Sausalito, Calif.	Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg.	Permanente Metals Corporation, Richmond, Calif.	Richmond Shipbuilding Corporation, Richmond, Calif.	Walsh-Kaiser Co., Inc., Providence, R. I.
Authorized	10,000	1,000	25,000	5,000	10,000	4,600	3,600	3,000
Original issue	1,000	500	1,000	3,750	5,500	4,600	3,600	3,000
Stock dividends	5,000							
Value per share	(1)	$100	$100	$100	(1)	$100	$100	$100
Incorporation:								
State	Delaware	California	Nevada	Nevada	Delaware	Delaware	Delaware	Delaware
Date	Jan. 6, 1941	Nov. 17, 1942	Dec. 1, 1941	Sept. 2, 1942	Jan. 6, 1941	Dec. 9, 1940	Apr. 1, 1941	Feb. 19, 1942

1 No par value.

Principal officers and directors (d) in interlocking companies—Kaiser affiliates

Name	California Shipbuilding Corporation	Kaiser Cargo, Inc.	Kaiser Co. Inc.	Marinship Corporation (Bechtel Co.)	Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation	Permanente Metals Corporation	Richmond Shipbuilding Corporation	Walsh-Kaiser Co., Inc.
Henry J. Kaiser	Vice president (D).	President	President		(D)	President	President	Vice president.
E. F. Kaiser	(D)	Vice president (D).	Vice president (D).		Vice president (D).	Vice president	Vice president	Do.
J. A. McCone	President			Vice president (D).	(D)			
S. D. Bechtel	Chairman of board			Vice president	(D)	Vice president (D).	Vice president (D).	
K. K. Bechtel	Vice president			President				
J. K. Doolan	Vice president and general manager.							
J. A. McFachern	Vice president (D).				President			
C. P. Bedford		Vice president.	Assistant secretary.			Assistant secretary and general manager.	Assistant secretary and general manager (D).	
E. E. Trefethen, Jr.		do	Vice president		Assistant secretary-treasurer.	Vice president, secretary (D).	Vice president, secretary (D).	
P. S. Marrin	Assistant secretary (D).	Vice president (D).	Assistant secretary (D).		Assistant secretary (D).	Assistant secretary (D).	Assistant secretary (D).	
R. L. Bridges	Secretary	do	(D)	Treasurer				
F. Kahn	Treasurer (D)			(D)	(D)			
T. J. Walsh								President.
W. A. Durkin								Vice president and assistant secretary.
J. F. Reis			Assistant secretary.		Secretary	Vice president, assistant secretary and treasurer (D).	Assistant secretary and treasurer.	Assistant secretary.
J. S. MacDonald								Vice president.
H. W. Morrison	(D)				(D)			Do.
F. B. Smith								Secretary and treasurer.
G. G. Sherwood	Assistant secretary and assistant treasurer.	Secretary-treasurer.	Treasurer, assistant secretary.		Treasurer, assistant secretary (D).	Treasurer, assistant secretary.	Treasurer	Assistant secretary and assistant treasurer.

Importance of Development of Power Resources of St. Lawrence River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

VALUE OF RIVER POWER IS CITED

MASSENA, February 16.—The effect of the critical coal shortage on steam-developed electric power should make clearly apparent the value and importance of the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project with its great resource of hydroelectric power, pointed out Mayor R. A. Newton, Massena, president of the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce, today.

The mayor's statement follows:

"The critical coal shortage which has confronted not only all of northern New York but central New York, including Syracuse, Utica, Albany, even New York City, should bring home to all the people of the State the importance of the St. Lawrence seaway development. I have been reliably informed that the power generated by steam at the Oswego plant of the Niagara Hudson costs approximately 4½ mills per kilowatt-hour in comparison with the power developed by the St. Lawrence which is estimated to cost from one-half to 1 mill per kilowatt-hour.

"The recurrent threats of the coal miners to strike at various intervals has resulted in keeping people worried about fuel for our northern winters.

"The following information in regard to the amount of coal which would be required to reproduce the electric energy which would be produced by the St. Lawrence power development is very interesting, especially at this time when we cannot get sufficient coal to burn in our homes. Long lines of cars are hauling coal from the mines to plants where our electricity is manufactured by its use.

"It is estimated that in order to produce 2,200,000 horsepower which the St. Lawrence at Massena is capable of producing, it will require, each year, 5,280,000 tons of coal to produce the same amount at a cost of more than $22,000,000. To transport such coal would require more than 165,000 cars yearly.

"It is rather an appalling thought to realize the enormous economic loss which is suffered yearly on account of our failure both to open and harness the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River."

Foreign Economic Administration Makes Public Its Version of Statement by Senators Tunnell and Burton, With Regard to Lend-Lease Activities and Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Senators TUNNELL and BURTON are rendering a great public service in bringing to the attention of the Congress and the country

a report of their investigations and studies in connection with the handling of the money and materials of American taxpayers by the Army, Navy, and lend-lease officials in the European theater of war operations. Eternal vigilance is the price of solvency as well as of liberty in this Republic.

On February 16, Senator TUNNELL made public some of the findings made by Senator BURTON and him on their recent trip overseas. Some of these conclusions were critical of lend-lease operations, and since our Committee on Foreign Affairs is presently engaged in studying lend-lease records preparatory to considering a resolution to extend the act another 12 months, I brought these statements to the attention of the committee at our hearings last Friday.

Following our hearings, I addressed a letter to Mr. Oscar Cox, of the Foreign Economics Administration, inquiring into the accuracy and cogency of some of the printed criticisms of lend-lease, and my letter was inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A680. I made my letter public because it is my sustained conviction that lend-lease expenditures can render the maximum good only when the public is fully informed concerning all of their details and implications. Facts can effectively supplant rumors only when complete facts are available to all who crave the truth.

At this point in the RECORD I am inserting the reply which I have just received from Mr. Cox to my letter of February 19. I am gratified that the Foreign Economic Administration has granted permission to make public this reply, and that in so doing it indicates a continuing desire to supply the Congress and the country with a factual report of what is being done with that portion of the peoples' money which is being appropriated for the use of lend-lease operations.

No comment at this time is required on the following communication. A study of the Tunnell-Burton report, a reading of my letter of inquiry, and an analysis of the reply printed herewith will supply information from which Members and others interested can draw their own conclusions.

Reply to my letter of February 16, 1945:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
February 19, 1945.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MUNDT: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 16 in which you ask certain questions raised by the report filed by Senator JAMES M. TUNNELL and Senator HAROLD H. BURTON. I shall try to answer those questions in the order in which they were presented.

1. None of the airports referred to in the report in question were, according to the best of our knowledge and according to the Senators' report, constructed with lend-lease funds; they were constructed with War and Navy Department funds as a part of the military operations of the armed forces. Those Departments are therefore the best ones to advise you with respect to any agreements for the present and future use of those fields.

Lend-lease funds have, however, been used in the construction and expansion of some airfields located outside of the United States, its territories, and possessions. Prior to Pearl Harbor, the Army had no funds which it could use for such purposes, and the President therefore allocated approximately $175,000,000 of lend-lease funds to the War Department for use in establishing the Air Transport Command and for constructing certain airfields. A major portion of these funds has been used to expand airfields on the trans-African ferry route and to construct airfield installations in Canada and Labrador on the North Atlantic ferry route, but these latter amounts have been repaid. Since Pearl Harbor, however, the War and Navy Departments have had funds appropriated directly to them for such purposes and for the construction of other air bases for military operations.

These airfields have been built on sites chosen for reasons of military strategy. Many will therefore be of no post-war commercial or strategic value to us. An interdepartmental committee under the leadership of the State Department has for some time been studying the much broader problem of American interests with respect to the use of airfields outside the United States. As a result of their recommendations, a United States position with respect to post-war commercial use has evolved and was made public last November at the Chicago Air Conference. The question of post-war landing rights for United States military aircraft is one for the consideration of the United States military authorities.

2. You have asked whether it is true that it is the policy of the British to charge 42 percent of their cost for transportation, insurance, and handling charges on material and equipment turned over to us under reverse lend-lease in the Middle East, whereas the charges of the American forces for such items have been 25 percent.

We do not presently have information in Washington with respect to the amount entered in the reverse lend-lease account to cover transportation, insurance, and handling charges on articles furnished to United States forces in the Middle East. The information is, however, being gathered and will be furnished to you shortly. In the meantime, I can state that the charges for such services will vary, depending on whether the goods are procured in the Middle East or in Britain. For in the case of this and all other reverse lend-lease charges, the British report their actual or estimated out-of-pocket expenditures which in the case of transportation necessarily vary with the place of procurement. Moreover, as I have indicated in my testimony, the present entry in the British reverse lend-lease account for transportation, insurance, and handling charges, as well as all other entries, has not been accepted by the United States as the proper value to be entered in that account or used in any final settlement.

3. You also ask whether it is true that the British have consistently refused to price reverse lend-lease invoices.

Shortly after the British began to furnish us with reverse lend-lease, the United States armed forces were asked to keep quantity records only and to refrain from making a dollar evaluation of these quantities. At the same time, the British Government was advised by the United States that detailed records showing the amount of money they expended for reverse lend-lease aid need not be furnished to the United States. About a year later the British were asked by the United States to modify this procedure to the extent of furnishing quarterly reports showing their best estimate of their expenditures for reverse lend-lease aid by major categories. This the British have done for every quarter beginning on or after July 1, 1943, and in addition the British have prepared an estimate by major category of the value of reverse lend-lease aid furnished prior to July 1, 1943.

Late in 1944 a mission of representatives from the War Department, the Navy Department and the Foreign Economic Administration went to London to reconsider the whole matter with the British and the United States Ambassador. At that time the British were asked to provide even more detailed data and to supply us with as much information concerning unit prices of reverse lend-lease as could be furnished without increasing the number of persons performing reverse lend-lease accounting functions. This the British have agreed to do. The types of information that will be made available differ with various types of issue. In many cases both the United States Army and the United States Navy will receive a priced invoice with each article and each service they receive as reverse lend-lease. In other cases, where the issuing officer does not know the cost of the article he is furnishing as reverse lend-lease, the United States Army and the United States Navy will each receive unpriced invoices at the time they receive the article, but each will receive subsequently a price invoice or a price list from which the invoice originally received may be priced.

In addition the United States Army and the United States Navy may each station in the various British Ministries furnishing reverse lend-lease liaison officers who may examine all original reverse lend-lease invoices, vouchers, and records, and observe the manner in which the reverse lend-lease account is prepared. With this information both the United States Army and the United States Navy will be able to maintain records showing the unit cost to the British of each article and service that has been or will be furnished to them as reverse lend-lease. Both the State Department and the Foreign Economic Administration consider that the amount of information now available on the cost to the British of the reverse lend-lease program is adequate.

The report in question further states that the British presented in their official documents a report of some $175,000,000 of materials transferred to us on reverse lend-lease which was appraised by our Navy at a value of only $10,000,000. I do not know the specific transaction to which this statement refers, but I can state that the value of reverse lend-lease rendered to the United States Navy by the British Admiralty, up to September 30, 1944, as officially reported to the United States Government by the British, totaled only $28,250,030. It is possible, however, that this reference involves a report of transfers subsequent to September 30, 1944. In this event the discrepancy may be explained by the fact that in the past the Navy, for lack of information, did not know the cost to the British of certain goods and services received as reverse lend-lease and that those whose cost they did know, totaled only $10,000,000. In view of the fact that the Navy will now have complete pricing information, they can no doubt eliminate this discrepancy between theirs and the British records.

4. With reference to your question concerning the airport at Salé, north Africa, I am advised that no lend-lease funds have been used in its construction. I therefore believe that you should address your inquiry on this matter to the War Department.

In conclusion, I should like to state that it has always been a basic lend-lease policy to make as full and as frank a disclosure of all information concerning lend-lease operation as can be made without endangering our military security. Therefore, while I understand from subsequent conversations with you that a public hearing on these problems is no longer necessary, it is agreeable to the Foreign Economic Administration to have this letter published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where your letter appeared.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR COX,
Deputy Administrator.

Elimination of the Pauper Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to have inserted in the RECORD an article that appeared in PM newspaper concerning the pauper's oath required of veterans before they are granted hospitalization.

On February 1, 1945, I introduced H. R. 1923 which asks for the elimination of this objectionable oath.

This article clearly presents the issues involved, in a fair and comprehensive manner, and I am pleased to call it to the attention of my colleagues for further study and consideration:

VETS RESENT "PAUPER'S OATH" REQUIRED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

(By Albert Deutsch)

Among the welter of congressional bills dealing with veterans are three which seek to eliminate the degrading "pauper's oath" or "needs clause" that many sick and disabled vets must sign in applying for admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital. This clause has been a constant source of justified griping by vets in need of hospital care.

As noted in a previous article, two types of patients are eligible for treatment in Veterans' Administration hospitals:

Veterans with service-connected disease or disability incurred in the line of military duty.

Veterans with non-service-connected disease or disability. According to law, these are eligible for Veterans' Administration hospital admission only if they can't afford private medical care and if beds are available—service-connected cases always being given priority.

Service-connected cases are treated regardless of financial status. But the others, who comprise about two-thirds the total patient population in Veterans' Administration hospitals, must sign the so-called pauper's oath before admission. Then, too, vets who have service-connected disabilies but seek treatment for non-service-connected ailments must also attest to financial need.

EXHAUSTIVE DETAIL

Until last Saturday the application blank for admission to Veterans' Administration hospitals, officially known as Form P10, was an exhaustive four-page document going into minute details of the applicant's medical, military, social, and economic record. The new blank, just introduced, is a streamlined affair of one and one-half pages, drafted in response to repeated complaints of vets bewildered by the numerous questions they had to answer, some of a very personal nature. One of the two offending questions pertaining to the applicant's financial status has been eliminated. But the pauper's oath—the clause in which the vet has to swear he can't afford private hospital care—remains intact.

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, says he can't eliminate the needs clause without a special act of Congress. Representative RAYMOND S. SPRINGER (Republican, Indiana) and Representative JAMES H. MORRISON (Democrat, Louisiana) have introduced bills in the House calling for its deletion. Senator WILLIAM L. LANGER (Republican, North Dakota) has introduced a similar measure in the United States Senate.

MANY WON'T SIGN

The mainspring of the present movement to abolish the pauper's oath is Joseph Lieb, a 33-year-old veteran of World War No. 2 and a vice commander of the Vincent B. Costello Post, American Legion, in the District of Columbia. Lieb is a free-lance ghost writer, professionally, who concentrates on writing speeches for Congressmen.

"I got interested in this cause," he says, "because many members of my post, and others that I know, told me they had refused Veterans' Administration hospital care because they didn't want to sign the degrading pauper's oath.

"Every war veteran deserves hospital care when he falls ill or is disabled. He deserves it as a right, not as a privilege. How can the Government pretend that it gives veterans special benefits when it compels a poverty-stricken statement sworn under oath and flanked by penal provisions before granting them medical attention?

"A veteran can go to a private or charitable hospital and obtain needed care if he says he cannot afford to pay for it and if beds are available, in the same manner as he gets care in a Veterans' Administration hospital. There have been many occasions where vets have secured medical benefits from charitable or local public institutions in a more gracious and humane spirit than has been accorded many former soldiers at veterans' hospitals. What's more, they are not obliged to swear to a pauper's oath."

WHAT IT SAYS

The pauper's oath in form P10 reads:

"Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care?"

There has never been a clear-cut definition of what constitutes ability to pay and the Veterans' Administration does interpret this clause liberally, but the bewildered veteran who applies often must virtually declare himself a medical pauper or make a deliberate liar of himself.

The Vincent B. Costello Post, American Legion, recently adopted a resolution branding the pauper's oath as humiliating, "and in addition clothed with the dubious but legal power of subjecting a veteran of world wars to the possibility of prosecution by arrogant or antagonistic Government bureaucrats."

BLAME ORGANIZED MEDICINE

Representative GEORGE W. GILLIE (Republican, Indiana), citing an exchange of heated correspondence with Dr. Olin West, secretary of the American Medical Association, backed up charges made by Vice Commander Lieb that organized medicine was blocking efforts to abolish the pauper's oath.

"One of the basic reasons for this oath," GILLIE stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, "is to discourage veterans from applying for veterans' hospitalization and to encourage them to give their business to private hospitals and civilian doctors. When a veteran reaches a point where he must go to a hospital, there should be no conditional admission.

"To force a veteran to swear under oath that he is poverty-stricken is degrading and un-American."

I would like to see the pauper's oath abolished. Such a step need not result in an expansion of Veterans' Administration hospitals. Non-service-connected cases could be treated in civilian hospitals with the Veterans' Administration footing the bill. A far better solution of the over-all medical problem would be a national health insurance bill, guaranteeing good hospital and medical care for all the people, vets and nonvets, without distinctions that divide.

Discard Pauper's Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I introduce this letter from the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, the American Legion, Department of District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., at the request of Joseph Leib, third vice commander of that post:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REVISES HOSPITAL APPLICATION—BUT ONLY CONGRESS CAN REMOVE THE PAUPER'S OATH

(By Joseph Leib)

On September 5, 1944, the Costello Post of the American Legion, Washington, D. C., passed a resolution recommending the deletion of questions Nos. 5 and 9 of the Veterans' Administration, Form P10, application for hospital treatment or domiciliary care, otherwise known as the "pauper's oath. In various letters to General Hines we have suggested a number of additional changes.

Costello Post has contended that the existing form or interrogation for admission to veteran hospitalization was un-American and degrading.

During this controversy the writer has been critical of the Veterans' Administration both in the public press and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

However, I am delighted to call attention to the fact that General Hines in a letter dated February 14, 1945, furnished me with a copy of the new veteran hospital application form. This document is a revolutionary change over the old form.

For instance, two pages have been entirely eliminated. Whereas the old form was 4 pages long, it is now only 1½ pages short.

General Hines has revised the form to include what he considers to be a minimum of information necessary to comply with present statutes.

Now, it is up to Congress to eliminate the one question—No. 6—on the new form which asks:

"Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care?"

No veteran would answer that question in the affirmative if he was seeking hospitalization, for if he did he would not be admitted to a bed. This question is asked under penal threat and must be certified by a notary public.

The Stars and Stripes, National Tribune, the voice of all veteran organizations, stated editorially on September 28, 1944:

"To be admitted for treatment he (veteran) must be stigmatized in official records by an act of pauperism and an act of bureaucracy of the rankest sort. * * * A man to be admitted to a bed must declare himself a pauper or make of himself a deliberate liar. * * * To humiliate people who come to the country's aid in time of great need is indeed un-American. To force the Nation's warriors to swear they are poverty-stricken is degrading."

In a second editorial on February 8, 1945, the Stars and Stripes added:

"To insist upon their subscribing their hands to an oath that they are not able financially to pay for service that they should expect by virtue of fighting for their country in time of war is to humble and embarrass them and make of them unwitting paupers. This practice is positively indecent. It must be discontinued."

Those who are opposed to the elimination of this oath fear that an overload of applications for veteran treatment will prevail if the bars are let down and the pauper oath is removed.

Deep mystery beclouds this issue.

What is the unvarnished truth behind this refusal to remove the pauper oath? Thousands of veterans would like to know the real facts behind the retention of this oath.

In 1933 during the Economy Act debate the American Medical Association went on record as opposed to the construction of additional veteran hospital beds. In no uncertain terms, the A. M. A. vocied its fear of losing veteran business if the Government built more hospital beds.

Today these same forces appear active again in an attempt to prevent needy veterans from securing hospital or medical treatment unless they submit to a pauper's oath.

If this statement is not true, then what are the facts? What other conclusion can be drawn from the insistence to retain this obnoxious pauper's oath?

If the scheme to retain the pauper oath is not intended to scare and humiliate veterans in the hope that they will take their business to private doctors, then why in the name of logic does this humiliating question appear on the form?

If there is a logical reason for this oath, other than it represents the wish of selfish pressure groups, then I would like to hear what it is. I have searched for another answer in vain. This is the only conclusion that comes to the surface when all facts are carefully considered.

Since Pearl Harbor there have been added merely 8,404 beds to existing veterans hospitals throughout the United States. More than 1,167,000 servicemen of this war alone have been discharged as disability cases, and out of that total over 300,000 of them are drawing service-connected pensions. All of these men are potential hospital cases.

No sane person wants to see a hospital bed made available for every discharged soldier, but certainly there should be a reasonable number of facilities for worthy and needy veterans.

I hope and believe that General Hines is attempting to correct this unfortunate situation, but I have heard all kinds of conflicting alibis for this deplorable condition. I don't know the answer to this riddle. I submit that the American people have a right to know what is behind this unfortunate misunderstanding.

Costello Post members also objected to the fact that the penalty clause appeared at the top of the old hospital application blank in bold black letters.

It has been contended that this clause is as black in conception as it is in print, and must be eliminated. It hits veterans smack in the eye and labels them paupers seeking something as mendicants that they have earned as a right. They are entitled to maintain their self-respect.

Therefore, it was shocking to note that the Veterans Administration removed the penal provisions from the front of the hospital form and placed it at the rear.

Certainly, the Veterans Administration wasn't so sure of the justification of this clause when it lifted it from the front of the application form and had it inserted in the rear. Otherwise it would not have taken this unusual step.

The letter and all of its contents and facts therein set forth were prepared and handed me by this officer of this post.

Every American home has reason to be vitally concerned for the permanent health welfare of the veterans of every war. Proper, prompt, and thorough hospitalization means health for the individual and national health; it means the saving of human life in many cases, and as the millions and millions of American soldiers return from this global holocaust, it will mean more millions of American veterans will be concerned with methods and procedures of obtaining hospitalization and health care and assistance than ever before in our Nation's history. No one ever dreams that the Nation does not owe the maximum of such hospitalization and care to every veteran, regardless of race, creed, or color. Therefore, whatever these veterans have to sign, whatever procedure they have to take to obtain prompt, thorough-going hospitalization, is of vital concern to every home. Not only for one occasion; not only for 1 year, but throughout the entire lifetime of the veterans that are now home and of the more than 12,000,000 veterans who will come home.

The American Legion post objects to question 6 in the application for hospital treatment or domiciliary care as released in December 6, 1944. It appears manifest that this one-page revised Form P–10, application for hospital treatment or domiciliary care, is a marked improvement over the four-page application as issued August 1943. In that application, question 9 therein was exactly the same as question 6 in the revision of December 1944.

It reads as follows: "Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care? (Yes or no)."

Question 9 had to be answered under oath and before a notary public in the old form, with penal provisions applicable thereto staring the veteran in large type as he signed it. As question 6 in the revised form, the answer also has to be sworn to under oath, even though the penal provisions applicable thereto in which the veteran is reminded that he shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than a year or both is on the reverse side. The content of this question is a relic of an era to which we will never return. It is the horrible pauper's oath. The history of it is that it not only breeds deceit, but it destroys dignity, confidence, and morale. If the time ever was that it was the fault of any individual veteran that he could not pay for necessary hospitalization, then the social and economic evolutions of this generation have eradicated such conceptions of a Nation's obligation and responsibility to a veteran, who has offered his life and who needs hospitalization largely or partly as a result of such service to his Nation.

Furthermore, the very form and content of this pauper's oath as question 6 calls for a matter by way of answer, of opinion and interpretation of the veteran's ability. It asks for his opinion of whether or not he is financially able to pay. Now, then, if he honestly answers that question as "No," he may be giving a frank, honest opinion of his financial ability and for which honest, frank answer he later may be fined under the penalty clause, section 15, to have knowingly made a false statement or affidavit in order to get the relief. If he answers "yes" to question 6, he, of course, will not receive the hospital treatment. So, what is the veteran to do? What constructive and governmental need is furnished by this pauper's oath requirement. After a veteran signs "no" to this pauper's oath, is there going to be an investigation of the veteran's veracity as to whether or not he speaks the truth before he is furnished the hospital treatment or care? And who is finally to be judge as to whether or not his answer "no" shall forfeit him all rights, claims, and benefits as provided in the claim under section 15?

Let Congress give the Veterans' Administration, if they do not already have it, authority to delete this pauper's oath, question 6, which read as follows: "Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care? (yes or no)." Let us authorize the Veterans' Administration, if they do not already have that authority, to see to it that every veteran needing hospital treatment or domiciliary care receives it with the maximum of dispatch and promptness and with a minimum of form and procedure which causes delay and heartaches and increasing physical or mental sickness or fears, or unnecessary family stresses or strains. And let us always leave the Veterans' Administration, if it is not now there, in a position where it can administer the gratitude and appreciation of a grateful Nation to every veteran in these matters, so that the veteran has cause and ability to retain his dignity and a sense of worthwhileness, and of need and use and of value to the community. Let us eradicate the need of any veteran declaring he is a pauper in order to receive hospital treatment or domiciliary care.

Reds' Berlin Drive in Land Once Peopled by the Slav

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Sunday Independent of February 18, 1945:

RED'S BERLIN DRIVE IN LAND ONCE PEOPLED BY THE SLAV—NAMES FOUND ALONG ODER CAME FROM THEIR OLD HOLDINGS

(By Attorney Peter P. Jurchak)

The Russian overrunning eastern Germany, including the capital of Berlin, are merely returning to territory once peopled by Slav ancestors. The historical fact is that even considerable additional territory west and northwest of Berlin once belonged to the Slavs. This forms an interesting chapter in the history of the Germans and the Slavs in this region.

If you will take a map of eastern Germany, any of the maps currently seen in the newspapers will do, you will see towns and cities other than Berlin which once were peopled by Slavs. Run your eye down the Oder River from its mouth on the Baltic Sea to its source in Czechoslovakia. All the territory

along its 560 miles was for hundreds of years peopled by Slavs who were later driven out by the Germans. In fact, the Oder gets its name from its former Slavonic name of Djodr.

The territory east and west of the mouth of the Oder was part of the original Pomerania, which extended along the Baltic Sea to East Prussia. This land was called by its original name, the Pomorze, meaning the land along the sea. Originally it denoted the coast district between the Oder and the Vistula Rivers. Afterward it extended much farther west, while it was shortened on its eastern end. Modern Pomerania was then known as Slavinia and the then province of Pomerania late became West Prussia, which was under Polish rule until 1309, when it was divided between the German province of Brandenburg and the Teutonic Order, which played so large a part in the conquest of the eastern portion of Germany from the Slavs.

ONCE PEOPLED BY CELTS

This region was primitively peopled by Celts, but about the fourth or fifth century A. D. Slavonic tribes settled there, built towns and occupied all of this country to the exclusion of any other race for roughly a thousand years. It was not until the twelfth century that the Germans, under Albert the Bear, finally drove the indigenous Slavs out of Berlin and the surrounding country, which became the Saxon "North Mark."

If you will look at your map again, you see near the mouth of the Oder, in the Baltic Sea, the island of Rugen. Prussia acquired it in 1815, but it was for centuries occupied by Slavs. Most of its place names are of Slavonic origin, and the island was, until the spread of Christianity, the abode of the principal Slav pagan deity. In fact, only recently has the important temple built by the pagan Slavs to this deity been discovered. Of course, the name of the Baltic is of Slav origin, the Teutonic name being Ostsee.

ORIGINAL HOME OF SLAVS

To the south of the original Pomerania, the territory between Leipzig westward to the present border of Poland, was all at one time part of the original home of the Slavs. The Slav name for Leipzig was Lipski, meaning "the city of the lipa (lime) tree." It was not until about A. D. 1000 that it was first occupied by the Germans. Dresden was Dresga, meaning "the town of the forest"; it remained Slav until A. D. 1260. Breslau is a corruption of Vratislava, which belonged to the Czechs as late as 1526, when it was finally given to the Hapsburgs. The story of this region presents an intensely interesting tale in the German "drang nach osten" (drive to the east).

Before the Slavs were driven out of these territories they had spread westward as far as the North Sea. The River Elbe likewise rises in Czechoslovakia and empties into the North Sea. Fifteen hundred years ago the valley of the Elbe was peopled by Slavs, who named this river the Laba (from which the present name is derived) and became known as the Polabians, meaning "the people living along the Laba."

NAMED THE COUNTRIES

It should be noted that all of the Slavs originally spoke somewhat the same basic language and were not divided into nations or nationalities. In fact, in most instances, the names of the Slav countries of today were named after some particular Slav tribe. Poland was named after the Polans, a large but definitely not the only tribe inhabiting Poland. The Czechs were one of the tribes inhabiting Bohemia. Russia was populated by many Slav peoples corresponding somewhat to the present western republics of the Soviet Union. It was named after the Russ tribe.

The first federation of these Russian Slav tribes appeared in the third or fourth century and were referred to by the Roman writers as the Antae, living between the Dnieper and Dniester. Prior to this time is the accepted belief that no Slavs lived south of the Carpathian Mountains, leastwise in the Balkan Peninsula. About this time, in the great migration of nations, the Slavs, probably because of the natural increase in population, moved over the mountain range which fringes roughly northern Czechoslovakia. Later they moved south into the Danube Valley and into what is now Yugoslavia and Greece. The province of Macedonia became populated by Slavs in the fifth and sixth centuries, with the exception of a few Greek spots.

NEVER UNITED

But the Slav tribes, or later the various Slav nations, never united like the Germans. And thereby hangs an historical tale. The former were individualists and attached to their own separate cultures, languages, and traditions. Taking advantage of the differences among the various Slav nations in central Europe the Germans, as they grew stronger militarily and nationally, pushed eastward and took from the Slavs all of what is now eastern Germany and east Prussia. So that at the beginning of World War No. 1 there remained but Bulgaria and Russia as Slav nations in all the vast territory of central and eastern Europe that still remained Slav. The Germans, either by direct conquest, as in Pomerania, or indirectly as in the establishment of Austria-Hungary, governed Slav territories and populations which far exceeded the original Germany or the original German people.

World Peace Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a resolution asking the House of Representatives, the Senate of the United States concurring to empower the President of the United States to appoint from each of our 48 States and Territories a wounded or disabled war veteran of World War No. 2 to be a delegate from the United States to the coming World Peace Conference. The resolution also urges the President of the United States to ask all the nations who will have representation at the World Peace Conference to appoint from their respective nations an equal number of wounded or disabled war veterans of World War No. 2 to represent their respective countries.

Mr. Speaker, this war has cost the lives of over 8,000,000 youth of the world, young men who had every right to live in peace and security except for the madness of certain political and military leaders.

Capital and labor undoubtedly will be present at the forthcoming peace conference. Is it too much to ask that those who bear the scars of battle and who have sacrificed their all for a better world take part in the deliberation for a just and lasting peace? The presence of wounded and disabled war veterans at the peace conference would, in my opinion, be a salutory influence and do more to destroy the insanity of war as a settlement of international disputes than any other factor. I respectfully ask support of this resolution.

Punishment of War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we all rejoice in the accomplishments of the Big Three at the Crimean Conference. The hopes of the common people throughout the world seem brighter. However, all the problems facing the United Nations were not solved, nor will they be solved by many future conferences. It is not amiss to point out one failure somewhat accentuated, because of its platitudinous mention. I speak of the punishment of war criminals.

Prime Minister Churchill, President Roosevelt, and Marshal Stalin did declare it "their inflexible purpose to—bring all war criminals to just and swift punishment and exact reparation in kind for the destruction wrought by the Germans." The irony of this declaration of a joint purpose, namely, punishment of war criminals and reparation for property damage is that a definite step was taken to implement the reparation part of the declaration. An Allied Commission on Reparations was authorized to sit in Moscow and determine the "damage (property) caused by Germany to the Allied countries."

No such implementing commission was established to pursue the equally, if not more important first part of the declaration, namely punishment of war criminals. Why the timidity in approaching this subject fraught with so much importance to the future peace of the world? Does not the blood of slaughtered millions, Jews, Poles, resistance heroes of every minor group cry out for punishment against their murderers? Are the Nazi and Fascist murderers to go unpunished? Are they to be allowed the asylum of neutral countries, to which they are already fleeing? After World War No. 1 the Kaiser escaped by taking refuge in Holland where he lived in immunity from his accusers. His henchmen by farcial trials were freed to build another war machine for World War No. 2.

This failure to implement a United Nations commission to deal with this problem casts grave doubt on the "inflexible purpose" of the conferees. The United Nations War Crimes Commission in London should have been strengthened. Russia should have joined with the United States and Britain in making effective this or a similar organization.

The resignation recently of Sir Cecil Hurst in London and the dropping of Herbert Pell—our representative—by the State Department in Washington from

this Commission, casts a grave doubt on the desire and capacity of Britain and America to take effective action in the field of war crimes. A recent article in the New York Post of February 2, inserted by the American League for a Free Palestine, challenges our attention on this vital subject:

OF COURSE YOU ARE FOR MR. PELL—THEN ASK YOUR GOVERNMENT TO TAKE AN UNEQUIVOCAL STAND ON WAR CRIMINALS NOW—DON'T LET LEGAL QUIBBLING SAVE THE MURDERERS FROM THE GALLOWS

In our confused times we have become used to many strange and inexplicable occurrences. Yet, what is happening now in the councils of the United Nations War Crimes Commission is something so amazing that it surpasses the imagination of even the greatest of skeptics and cynics. The situation may be summarized as follows: Two decent, courageous, farsighted and outstanding statesmen of the United Nations—Sir Cecil Hurst of Britain, and Herbert C. Pell, an American—were squeezed out of the War Crimes Commission because they demanded three things:

1. That all war criminals of the Axis powers, regardless of rank and position, be brought to trial for the unspeakable atrocities that were committed against human beings.

2. That these war criminals should be tried and punished even if they committed crimes against Jews of their own countries.

3. That in order to translate the Moscow declaration on atrocities into concrete action, an international conference be convoked for the purpose of setting up a United Nations War Crimes Court.

These two courageous champions of humanity were pressing their governments for a solution for almost a year, but the British Foreign Office did not even offer a reply to the courtesy of the presentations of Sir Cecil Hurst. In disgust and embitterment he resigned, making his protest universally known. Some weeks later, Mr. Herbert C. Pell found himself dismissed as the American representative on the Commission. The official reasons for the "purge" of these two champion statesmen—Sir Cecil Hurst for "ill health" and Mr. Pell for the lack of an appropriation of $30,000 for himself and his staff—as well as the legalistic hair splitting brought forward against bringing to trial Axis criminals for having tortured and killed Jews, are senseless and inhuman.

There is no use indulging in any legalistic discussions. It is enough to say two things:

By virtue of the Nuremberg laws, the Jews in Axis countries have long ceased to be nationals of those countries. They have been excommunicated, denationalized, and transformed into stateless people; in fact, a new ethno-political entity which the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation so rightly designates as the renascent Hebrew nation.

Should international law fail to acknowledge this fact, to justify the crimes committed against those people, then there is only one conclusion to be drawn; something is wrong with international law and therefore it must be changed or abandoned in the interest of historic justice. The world must not permit the establishment of an axiom that red tape supersedes justice.

If legalistic excuses will remain the basis of the United Nations attitude to the worst crimes history has ever witnessed, there is no hope for humanity and civilization to survive. Leaving crimes of this kind unpunished on the pretext that they were committed only against Hebrews, would mean to allow the continued existence of a lawless zone for crime and extermination. Within this zone the philosophy of barbarism would continue to feed on its own cruelty and make the coming peace less than an armistice, a situation that would lead to another war, just as surely as the present war followed the last because of an incomplete peace.

Mr. Pell, in his recent statements, expressed this certitude in the most convincing and prophetic, though dispassionate manner:

"The conviction and punishment of those responsible for the suffering of this war is not a matter of revenge, but of justice. The persecution of minorities is an easy and, from ancient times, regularly used means of establishing tyrannical governments which inevitably become belligerent sooner or later. Every such government must canalize discontent and transmute the hostility provoked by its own methods at home into hatred of foreign countries.

"The persecution of a minority will tend at first to consolidate the gang and will cow the opposition of all citizens, even those not belonging to the persecuted minority. Let us suppose a shopkeeper in Berlin sees a Jewish shop next to him raided and wrecked. It is manifest that such a man will hesitate before opposing the Nazi organization.

"I am thinking of our unborn children and I see myself damned, in the most literal and theological sense of the word, before I will leave a stone unturned that might save them from a third world war."

But it is not only a question of the future. What makes this a very grave and urgent problem is that most of the estimated million or more Hebrews still alive in German-occupied Europe are former Axis citizens, and while being in constant danger of death, which hundreds of them meet daily, the Germans are being informed that crimes committed against Hebrews are not considered war crimes. In their criminal way of thinking the German murderers might very well look upon the present policy of the War Crimes Commission as tacit consent to their incessant mass murder of Hebrew men, women, and children.

But Mr. Pell and Sir Cecil Hurst are not dreamers. They are realists who foresee what is going to happen tomorrow. To uphold them, public opinion in this country, as well as in England, must stand up and join their voices to those of Mr. Pell and Sir Cecil.

The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation made the following requests of the governments of the United Nations:

1. That they issue a joint declaration proclaiming that crimes committed against Hebrews in Europe, irrespective of the territory on which the crime was committed or the citizenship or lack of citizenship of the victim at the time of death, be considered as a war crime and punished as such.

2. That the governments of the United Nations concerned instruct their representatives on the War Crimes Commission to see to it that the above-mentioned declaration is put into effect.

3. That representatives of the Hebrew people be given membership on the War Crimes Commission and that temporarily, until such time as a Hebrew national sovereignty be reestablished, the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation be authorized to constitute the Hebrew representation on the War Crimes Commission.

In backing these requests, we appeal to every man and woman in this country to demand that Mr. Pell be immediately restored to his function on the United Nations War Crimes Commission and given authority to act on behalf of the United States Government for the punishment of war criminals.

The American people, heirs to a glorious tradition, keepers of a sacred flame of justice, must take a firm stand on these demands. We must not nullify the ideals for which our sons and brothers are dying in Italy, on the borders of the Reich, in the Pacific islands, and on the seven seas.

Preference for Veterans on Government-Insured Housing Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by me yesterday:

As part of the Government's program for returning servicemen to normal life as expeditiously as possible, provision should be made whereby veterans would be given preference in public housing projects, Representative FRANK E. HOOK said today in introducing a House bill calling for such preference.

"The homes of very many of the men and women in the armed services have been disestablished as a consequence of their service to the country. By placing all returned members of the armed forces and their dependents at the head of all lists for Government housing projects, I believe we will be taking a concrete step toward establishing normal home life for our veterans."

The text of the bill introduced by Representative HOOK follows:

"A bill to give World War No. 2 veterans preference on lists on Government housing and Government-insured housing projects

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That veterans of World War No. 2 and dependents of such deceased veterans be given preference on all lists for Government housing and Government-insured housing projects."

A National Problem of the First Magnitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, many thoughtful people in this country are turning their attention to the national debt and wondering how it will be paid.

I hope some of our eminent economists can give an answer to the problem submitted by Mr. Smelser as stated in his letter printed herewith:

OKEANA, OHIO, *January 15, 1945.*

Mr. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regularly and read all your articles, both in the debates and the Appendix. I like your views on most subjects discussed. I am very much interested in how this national debt can be paid. About the smallest estimate is three hundred billion. That is three hundred thousand million and there are about 30,000,000 families in America. At 3 percent, the carrying charges will be nine billion a year, nine thousand million, an average of $300 a year per family. Totally impossible at present incomes. As we are under private enterprise, it means that private enterprise will have to pay out that much before the

Government can collect it. Private enterprise pays out money only for production and has to recapture that money by the sale of goods. If a billion dollars is paid out for production, the goods must carry that amount as part of production costs. If the Government takes my $300 for tax (which they are, and more) that is $300 of goods unsold or in the warehouse. If the nine billion was paid out as interest on bonds held by workers, it would still be active purchasing power, but the workers' bonds are of the 10-year variety, not due for sometime and during that 10 years the interest goes to banks and other big holders who are very small buyers of consumer goods.

What is going to become of the surplus which we in this country cannot buy? Production costs carrying this heavy interest charge cannot compete in foreign markets. Or is it the lend-lease or give-away plan to be followed as at present? If that is the idea, why cannot we lend-lease it to our own people, or perhaps put a lot of it into decent homes and home furnishings for our citizens. Or is it to be sent abroad on 30 years time, Bretton Woods or Export-Import Bank style, mostly a bookkeeping operation. Why not just cancel the whole national debt in all nations and not make the workers fight the war and then go into world-wide slaving to pay the bill?

R. L. SMELSER.

Urge Legislation Protecting Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a resolution passed by the Michigan State Legislature urging the enactment by Congress of legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort. The resolution follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 8

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort

Whereas farm labor has not been placed on the critical list in the war effort; and

Whereas local draft boards apparently do not have sufficient power to classify physically fit producing farmers between the ages of 18 and 26 as critical in the war effort, and to defer the drafting of men critically essential to the production of the food supply of the Nation and armed forces, but are obliged to meet their draft quotas; and

Whereas with rationing and shortage of food supplies, it is vitally important that farm production be kept at the maximum, and it is short-sighted to imperil production of crops and livestock: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is urged by the Michigan Legislature to enact legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort, which action should be taken immediately to forestall a possible emergency, due to the recent ruling of Selective Service; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

Adopted by the house January 25, 1945.

Adopted by the senate January 31, 1945.

FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.
NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The District of Columbia-Virginia Boundary Line

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, within a stone's throw of this Capitol lies the beautiful Potomac River, granted by the King of England to Maryland in 1632 and to Virginia in 1687. Out of those original grants there existed a conflict between Virginia and Maryland until the compact between the States in 1785.

Six years later by proclamation of President George Washington the site of the District of Columbia was finally located, partly in Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties in the State of Maryland and partly in Fairfax County, Va., which then extended to the high-water line of the Potomac River. This was an area 10 miles square.

Nine years later Congress held its first session in the city of Washington when the total population of the District of Columbia, including Alexandria City, was 14,093. Pursuant to an act of Congress July 9, 1846, when the population had arisen to nearly 50,000 individuals, and with the assent of the people of the town of Alexandria—then total population approximately 8,500—at an election on the 1st of September 1846 by a viva voce vote of 763 for retrocession and 222 against it, President Polk, by proclamation of September 7, 1846, gave notice that the portion derived from the State of Virginia was receded to that State. Including water and land, there remains out of the 10 miles square area originally ceded approximately 69¼ square miles. It has been estimated that the present land area, excluding the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers, is approximately 61 square miles. Thus was consummated a tragic error. Almost one-third of the District of Columbia so carefully planned and created by the fathers under the magnetic influence of Washington by an assent vote of 763 was receded to Virginia. The lost area constitutes what is now known as Arlington County, including a part of Alexandria City.

The committee reporting on H. R. 259, House Report No. 325, Twenty-ninth Congress, first session, in part, said:

Within the portion of the District on the north side of the Potomac River there is much more than space enough for all the public groups and buildings ever likely to be necessary for the seat of government. Beyond this quantity every addition of territory to be embraced within the exclusive legislation of the Congress is not only unnecessary but makes a useless diversion of its time and attention from the great objects of general legislation to the discharge of the duties of a petty local legislation, for which it is unfitted. In the District itself this union of the counties of Washington and Alexandria has been the source of much mischief.

Even in those early days all was not quiet along the Potomac. There was an abundance of land and a very limited but very vocal population. However, as the population grew and land value increased, the beautiful Potomac became more and more the source of agitation and controversy.

Where was the exact line between the Federal city and the sovereign State of Virginia and what about the constitutionality of the retrocession? In 1875 it was claimed that the act of 1846 was unconstitutional and void—*Philip* v. *Payne* (92 U. S. 133).

Throughout the years there have been distinguished jurists and others learned in the law who consistently maintained that the act of retrocession was unconstitutional upon the following grounds:

After the power to select the seat of Government had been once exercised by Congress, after the cessions had been made for that purpose by particular States, after the area so ceded had been accepted by Congress under the act of July 16, 1790, declaring "the same is hereby accepted for the permanent seat of the Government of the United States," the power of Congress over the subject matter was exhausted. Or, if it was not exhausted, it could not again be exercised, because no power remained to transfer the District as originally created and accepted or any portion of it to any state.

Year in and year out the controversy has raged. The White House, the Capitol, the Department of Justice, the Governor's Mansion and the District Building have all joined in the chorus.

Then one day there came a sad awakening. It was generally conceded that the Maryland charter authoritatively and conclusively bounded the State of Maryland by the high water line on the Virginia shore. The Supreme Court of the United States in several decisions had held that to be a fact so firmly established as to be no longer the subject of discussion.

Where was the line? No human being could be produced as a witness to testify as to the location of the 1791 line. Its location was to be established as a question of fact from highly controversial evidence. By the use of old maps the District of Columbia government and some Federal agencies have attempted from time to time to establish the relationship of the high watermarks of 1791 and the high watermark at the time the studies and investigations were made. It is important to accurately determine this line. It has been discussed for years and years. At our doorstep there is a "No Man's Land" which has given rise to bitter controversy and interminable lawsuits. It's time for action.

AN INTOLERABLE SITUATION

Why should a condition as intolerable as this continue to exist at the very doors of the Capitol? So far as I am advised there is no existing controversy between

the Commonwealth of Virginia and the United States as to the boundary between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth. I am not aware that the Commonwealth of Virginia has ever claimed that the boundary is other than that as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States. So far as I know the only parties setting up any dispute with respect to the boundary are certain private individuals and corporations asserting ownership of lands made out of the Potomac River below the high water line as it existed at the creation of the District of Columbia. The uncertainty arose because of the long-lost line.

What could the authorities of Arlington County be expected to do in view of the uncertainties of the situation? What could the local municipal authorities be expected to do? Apparently nothing was expected, for we actually had and have had for a great number of years a "no man's land" on the other side of the river.

In years past this "no man's land" was the zone of safety for criminals of all types. Bootleggers infested the riverfront and the gambler conducted his establishment unafraid and unmolested. Many little houseboats lay just off shore and there the shooting cases and other felonies occurred bringing disgrace to the administration of justice in the section. Virginia could take no action and neither could the District by reason of the uncertainty of the jurisdictional line. To give you an idea of the extent of this lawlessness, let me quote from a witness appearing before a House committee in 1932:

> I own some land along there, and may I say that during recent times the question has been brought up by bootleggers and other lawless individuals, particularly in houseboats, and there were a lot of shacks that they had built upon this area and the sheriff of Arlington County said their jurisdiction was doubtful, so that we resorted to lawless methods ourselves on our land bordering the Potomac River, between Alexandria and Washington. The only way we could get those people off was for the sheriff of Arlington County to go down there and hold the gun while we burned up the houses and set fire to them in this disputed area between the high and low water mark where these shacks were all built opposite the Mount Vernon Boulevard.

It is interesting to observe that there seemed to be no doubt in the minds of Virginians when it came to collecting taxes. The record shows that since the birth of the county, taxes, license fees, and so forth, have been collected by the State and county down to the low-water line. The question of jurisdiction did not worry our friends when it came to collecting taxes.

It is regarded as important by some individuals that license taxes and other forms of taxes in this disputed territory have been paid in Virginia. It is likewise regarded as important that the District of Columbia has not policed or attempted to police the territory, or to tax the property in question. I do not feel that the public rights in and to this area should be lost merely because years of unassertion of right have elapsed. It looks like the time has arrived for an accounting.

The Federal Government and the local municipal government have a very vital interest in this area.

The Department of Justice, with full knowledge of all the facts, has not been aggressive enough in the protection of the public interest.

The District government with knowledge of the fact that much of this territory was within the boundary of the District has not been aggressive enough in protecting its rights. The fact that revenues derived from taxation across the river would not be sufficient to pay for police and fire protection is absolutely no justification for failure to assess and tax.

THE FEDERAL INTEREST

For 150 years the question of jurisdiction has been discussed. Suit after suit has been filed to clear titles and the end is not in sight.

The Federal Government is becoming more and more interested in this small country. Here is located Fort Myer Military Reservation, the Arlington Cemetery, great housing projects, the Pentagon, the Navy Annex, Public Roads Administration Buildings, the Naval Radio Station, and the Washington National Airport. Virginia wants to have the boundary line and titles definitely established, yet in doing so Virginia does not want to give away an inch of property or any jurisdiction. Perhaps it is not so much Virginia as it is the local interests which have interfered with the solution of this problem throughout the years.

COST OF NATIONAL AIRPORT

The Washington National Airport is property of the United States almost wholly created out of the Potomac River covering 729 acres of land. This is a National Airport which should be part of the Nation's Capital solely under the control of the Congress.

The cost of construction of the Washington National Airport including hydraulic fill, excavation and grading, drainage, paving of runways, taxiways and aprons, terminal building, six hangars, access roads and structures, utilities, landscaping and park areas, and other appurtenances was $16,954,417. Additional improvements currently being made under the development of landing areas program, will cost approximately $571,000 additional. These amounts do not take into consideration the buildings and grounds of the Public Roads Administration, which buildings were at the site prior to the construction of the airport. It is understood that the Public Roads Administration was allowed by the Public Works Administration the sum of approximately $2,000,000 as reimbursement for the land and buildings which the former relinquished. Since the beginning of the war additional buildings have been constructed on the airport from funds appropriated to the War Department. Their costs approximate $4,000,000.

The following shows cost of operation of the National Airport for 1944, and estimated costs for 1945 and 1946:

	1944	1945	1946
Cost of Civil Aeronautics Administration	$540,746	$559,000	$611,321
Cost of other Government operations reimbursable to Civil Aeronautics Administration and not included in revenues	39,718	40,000	40,000
Total	580,464	599,000	651,321

Annual receipts from operation of the National Airport approximate $516,470.

The exclusive jurisdiction of Congress is lost unless this airport becomes in its entirety a part of the District of Columbia. If transferred to Virginia, the Federal Government will only have concurrent jurisdiction. The entire operation may in all probability be subject to the license laws of the State. This is a serious question now and will become increasingly more serious in the days which lie ahead.

THE PENTAGON

On a lovely site with a commanding vista stands the Pentagon, housing some 40,000 employees.

As the name implies, it is a five-sided structure. The building, including a 6-acre court in the center, covers 42 acres. Each of its five sides is 986 feet long, and the building is approximately a mile in circumference. I am advised that there are 143 acres of gross office space in the building of which 83 acres is net office space. The other 60 acres are devoted to the following purposes: 5 acres for storage; 1.8 acres for garage; 1.9 acres for bus terminal; 2 acres for concourse; 6 acres for kitchen, cafeteria, and beverage bars; 20 acres for corridors, ramps, entrances, and stairs; 10 acres to furnish housing for mechanical equipment; 8 acres for walls; 3 acres for toilets and janitor's closets.

Observe the great new highways, the wonderful overpasses and underpasses serving the Pentagon, the Arlington Cemetery, Fort Myer, Navy Office Building No. 2, the Army Signal Corps Station at Arlington Hall, the Naval Radio Station at Arlington, the women's dormitories, and the people of Arlington County, Fairfax County, and all of Virginia. Count the investment, and you will run over $150,000,000.

The census reports show increases in Arlington of 30,000 and in Fairfax of 15,000 between 1930 and 1940; think how that population has increased since the start of this war. I am advised that in 1940 the total privately owned real-estate assessment for the entire county of Arlington amounted to $39,348,740, plus $2,729,181 for Public Utility Service's holdings, which includes personal property as well as real estate. Its full value could hardly have exceeded $100,000,000. Arlington County and the State are now reaping a rich harvest, but the county and the State must play fair with the Federal Government and the city of Washington.

The National Capital Airport lies almost entirely riverward of the line of 1791 and a good portion of the Pentagon

Building lies riverward of the line of 1791.

Since 1846 Virginia has been collecting taxes and fees which rightfully belong to the District of Columbia.

Even at this very hour Virginians have a way of getting into the local charitable hospital. For the first 10 months of 1944, 94 individuals from across the Potomac were admitted to Gallinger Municipal Hospital. Surely you do not expect the taxpayers of this city to continue to assume your burdens now that you are becoming so prosperous.

Many of your citizens earn their livelihood in Washington but contribute little or nothing toward its maintenance and upkeep. Perhaps you know that 645 of your sons and daughters are receiving free education in Washington.

When Washington signed his proclamation of 1791 he must have felt great pride in his beloved State, which solemnly offered to turn over for the Nation's Capital the entire 10-mile-square area. He would have no pride, I am confident, in the act of retrocession and in the controversy which has raged since then on a simple question of boundary. How can we hope to engage in the settlement of vital boundary disputes between the great nations of the world when we are unable to settle one so simple as this between the National Government, Virginia, and the local municipality?

Our War Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered in New York on February 17 entitled "Our War Aims."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No sacrifice is too great for freedom; but any sacrifice is too great if we wage this war merely to perpetuate the injustices and inequalities which would make another war inevitable. While our energies are expended these days in increasing our scale of production and in putting the tools which we produce to the best possible use on the various battle fronts of liberty, we must give some thought and contemplation to the ends for which we fight. We must make certain that these tools of war and the victory they are bringing will not be wasted. We must redeem the sacrifices our fighting forces are called upon to make by striving to perfect in the world communities, a procedure that will prevent the inevitability of war.

Naturally, our primary aim is to defeat our enemies. While we are not out to eradicate entire peoples, even those who have succumbed to the wiles of the dictators, we are determined to free them from their oppressors, and to make sure that they will not again be brutalized or cajoled in desperation into accepting tyranny. Our first objective, therefore, is to win the war and then to crush out aggression wherever it is to be found.

That is not all, however, for we cannot stop at that. Need I remind you of the mistakes of the last war? Is it sufficient to remind you that, while we won the military decision in that great struggle, we lost the peace that followed. We were not willing to assume the obligations of that peace. We turned our backs upon our rightful responsibility of seeing to it that a just, equitable, and lasting peace resulted from the deliberations at the peace table. Some believed that the horror of the war would prove an object lesson strong enough to prevent any new uprising of tyranny. It was not enough. The seeds of conflict had not been destroyed, and as a result another and more horrible conflict resulted.

This time, let us hope, we shall have the spiritual ideals, the moral strength, and the political wisdom to see the thing through; to win the war and then to win the peace as well. We know that as a nation we cannot live apart from the rest of the world. If, as individuals, we were merely to follow our own inclinations, good or bad, and completely ignore our neighbors, the result would be a lawless community with nothing accomplished, because no one would work with anyone else. That is why we have laws; that is why we have community planning in government, in the factory, on the farm, in the school, and the home. The world, just like the local community, needs an orderly system, a system in which the several nations may work together in an orderly manner. No nation, any more than any individual, should be permitted to go haywire and injure the others. This is one of the basic fundamentals of democracy. We in America have always held to such a policy in our own affairs. Today we know that it is just as vital on a world-wide scale as it is at home.

So let us clear our minds and set about wholeheartedly to help build a more cooperative world. Lack of international cooperation, while not the only cause of the world's ills today, has certainly given the Hitlers a chance to seize power. Preying upon self-interest, upon greed, and upon inertia, Hitler encouraged our disunity and lulled us to sleep. The French were doubtful; the British were unprepared; we ourselves were unconcerned. We were blinded to the plain fact that unless we all banded together, we would eventually all be attacked, one by one. The strategy of dividing in order to conquer was employed in every democratic country in the world. It is still employed, but, fortunately, the world understands its use and its effectiveness, for the time being, is at a very low degree.

Today the United Nations are united and determined upon complete victory over the forces of fascism. They are determined to build an international order that will make impossible the recurrence of war. They are determined that when this war is over we shall declare another war—a war against unjustice, a war against poverty, a war against exploitation, a war against prejudice, a war against inequality. They are determined that we shall win that war just as we are winning this war.

We fight for a world in which freedom may live everywhere. We fight for the chance to work together, to plan together, and to live together in peace and in security. We fight to prevent a world in which honest people go hungry in one country and grow fat in another; where prosperity abounds in one area and famine and poverty destroys life in another. Call it what you will, unless we retain a common bond with our fellow human beings, in peace as well as in war, we shall have lost the battle. We fight for the freedom embodied in the Declaration of Independence. We fight for a world order which recognizes the natural law and which subscribes to the inalienable rights of man.

These are vast jobs ahead of us—staggering jobs. We must finish the war; speedily we must build an enduring alliance of nations to keep the peace. We mus' bring our millions of fighting men back and make real for them the hopes they have cherished. We must give to all of our people the just rewards, the rising standards of living, security, and the culture obtainable in our Nation. We must make the fullest use of all of our resources and energies for the enrichment of all our people.

Our mission thus becomes clear; to abolish aggression and replace it with a well-planned peace that will unite the nations of the world and grant to their peoples the "four freedoms" essential to life. This time we must shoulder our part of the task. America will gain, rather than lose, glory in the eyes of the world, if we stand in the forefront of this fight for a better future.

To attain our objectives we must give to the peoples of the world the example of leadership they need so earnestly. This, then, is the supreme test of our generation.

We shall not fail this time. The future of mankind—the future of our children—lies with us. Ours is a precious opportunity to will a legacy of justice, freedom, and peace to the future. For this, our sons are in action on all the flaming battle fronts around the world.

Tribute to Yugoslavia by Hon. James E. Murray, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Tribute to Yugoslavia" by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] delivered at the Yugoslavia dinner in New York, February 7, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Montana is thousands of miles from Yugoslavia, yet we, in that far Western State, have deep feelings of friendship and admiration for the people of Yugoslavia in their great fight for freedom. Montana is no different in this respect than other parts of the country. In nearly every section of America we have welcomed to citizenship thousands of sturdy immigrants from Yugoslavia. They have come here in search of new homes and new opportunities of life. They have brought to our shores the ideals and traditions of a virile, industrious, and peace-loving people. We have learned to admire and respect them. We like their clear-cut traits of character, their untiring industry and, above all, their devotion to our ideals of liberty and democracy.

We have come here tonight to pay a tribute of respect and admiration to this little nation whose hardy, fearless men and women are making such an outstanding contribution to victory in the war. The stirring fight of Yugoslavia will be recorded as one of the

great epics of this period. Many of the tragic details are still to be revealed, but we who are gathered here tonight and are privileged to know of the great suffering they have endured and the sacrifices they have made, are moved by deep feelings of pride in our association with the courageous Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, collectively known as Yugoslavs.

Tonight, let us for a moment try to recapture some of the atmosphere of 4 years ago. The conquering Axis armies were thundering across Europe in the full flush of their initial success. Years of extensive planning and preparation had rendered them the most powerful and destructive armed forces ever organized in history. Country after country, unprepared to meet the treacherous onslaught of the German hordes, quickly fell before their onward rush. The British evacuation at Dunkerque had occurred some 10 months earlier, and a death-like chill of apprehension shivered through most of the non-Axis world. Russia was soon to be attacked. Its defeat and enslavement was an essential step in the Nazi plans. The future and freedom of the whole world hung in the balance.

Suddenly, in Yugoslavia, an undeveloped peasant country of 16,000,000, a great leader appeared. In fact, a whole host of fearless men and women stood forth to arouse the people of Yugoslavia to make a stand against an enemy threatening to enslave the world. They possessed no armaments, they had no air forces, they were equipped literally with slingshots and clubs, but they had the courage to stand forth against the most powerfully equipped military organization the earth had ever seen. Soon the dramatic reports of Yugoslavia's resistance inspired the outside world. The news ran like a blaze of light through the dark clouds of despair hanging over Europe. It stirred the hopes of liberty-loving people everywhere. Can anyone wonder that we in America have such strong feelings of respect and admiration for the Yugoslavs. The courage and daring of these people, their complete disregard for personal safety, their fierce determination to defy and ultimately defeat the enemy or die in the effort gave the world renewed hope and rekindled faith in the cause of democracy and human freedom.

It was a tremendous inspiration, revolutionizing the thoughts and hopes of men everywhere like an invigorating current of pure air. Here was a people who absolutely refused to accept defeat either through vastly superior armed forces of a brutal enemy or the deadly drain of hunger and frost. They set aside all doubts and fears. No matter what might be in store for them, they determined that they would never give up. Almost from the very day of invasion by the enemy on April 6, 1941, the Yugoslavs have been tossing a series of monkey wrenches into the Axis plans to conquer the world. Their unexpected and unorthodox resistance was one of the factors which upset Hitler's timetable and delayed his invasion of Russia, a delay that is recognized as a decisive factor in the approaching wreck of the German military machine. For over 2 years the Yugoslavs engaged some 20 Axis divisions, keeping them away from other fronts, away from Russia, Italy, and Tunisia. Nobody can tell how many American soldiers fighting in Africa, and later in Italy, owe their lives to the Yugoslav guerrillas, who have since been welded into a national army. Marshal Tito built up his forces from scratch, arming his men by killing the enemy and taking his arms away. Someone would kill a German or Italian and seize his gun; then a few more of the enemy would be disposed of in like manner and more arms would be collected. Thus, step by step, Tito's forces grew.

During the fall of 1943 and early in 1944 the Yugoslavs were fighting more enemy troops than the combined British-American-French forces in Italy, and this without a war industry or a supply system, as we understand those terms. By their great courage and sacrifice they, themselves, have freed well over half of their country. The heroic resistance of that little nation was the forerunner of the great crusade which the people of Russia were soon to undertake to rid the world of German militarism. The Yugoslavs have effected a junction with the Russian armies, and thus constitute a vital element in the military strategy which is soon to crush Hitler forever. How much the undefeatable Yugoslavs have contributed to the final victory over the Axis armies cannot yet be measured, but I am certain it will be found to be conspicuous and considerable, and that they will be given the full credit they deserve for their part in the ultimate destruction of Hitler's so-called invincible armies.

These outstanding achievements are still more incredible when we look at another element in the picture. Yugoslavia's fight against the Axis is a people's fight. It was the people of Yugoslavia who rose against the invaders in the face of their government's official capitulation. They had the vision and the courage to stand out against the enemy even when their own government deserted them. It was the people of Yugoslavia who stood together. It was the people who suffered and fought and died together so that their land might be free. We Americans can understand that. We cherish memories of our own Valley Forge, of bitter winter and near-starvation, and of rag-wrapped, frozen bleeding feet of our own early armies fighting for our freedom and independence. Let us always remember that this is a people's war. As President Roosevelt has said: "Ours is an association not of governments but of peoples." The Yugoslav people have built up a national liberation army of 300,000 men and women, led by one of this war's great heroes, an army that has already liberated more than half of the country, and will undoubtedly soon free the rest.

Surely the debt we owe Marshal Tito and the Yugoslav Liberation Movement in this war is vast. They have given us food for the spirit. They have given us critically important military aid. They promptly carried out sabotage operations requested by the allied commanders, and, in carrying them out, they destroyed their bridges, railways, and other installations. It is estimated that the destruction caused to their transportation system alone represented a loss of hundreds of millions of dollars.

These people have proven their ability to run their own affairs. I am reliably informed that the Yugoslavs have definite post-war plans, as well as dreams, for transforming their country into a truly successful democracy. They wish to see their country's resources developed for the benefit of their people. They wish to raise their standards of living. They wish to improve and expand their educational opportunities. They wish to see their country grow and their people prosper under democratic principles. They want to make the land of the Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Montenegrins and Macedonians a place where a free people, regardless of religion or historic background may be united under a democratic government—where the people rule and where all men may have a fair and equal opportunity for life, liberty and happiness.

It is indeed a privilege for us to honor such a people. They must have our sincere cooperation and encouragement. It must not be by words only. We must help them heal their wounds by rushing to them food, clothing, medicines and surgical instruments. We must assist them in reestablishing their economy. Their human rights and fundamental freedoms must be respected in the readjustment of Europe. The shackles of outside power must be broken and they must have the right to be masters of their own destiny.

Let us hope that America, subscribing to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, will so act in the ordering of the new world of peace as to retain the confidence and friendship of the brave people of Yugoslavia.

The Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Crimean Agreement One of Mankind's Great Documents," which was published in the Salt Lake Tribune, of Salt Lake City, Utah, on February 14, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRIMEAN AGREEMENT ONE OF MANKIND'S GREAT DOCUMENTS

The Crimean agreement reached after 8 days of deliberation and discussion, a momentous period of give and take in which the three military powers that have liberated France, Greece, Hungary, and Poland from the clutches of the Nazi monster joined hands for victory and peace, will be regarded henceforth as one of the most important historical documents ever formulated and signed in an era of war.

It has been acclaimed already by a former President of this Republic as "a strong foundation upon which to rebuild the world." It has found favor in Great Britain, although many of Churchill's expectations may have been ignored. It has been unanimously approved in the Soviet Union, notwithstanding Stalin's acceptance of the terms of the Atlantic Charter with reference to the formation of governments by popular consent of the Poles and other liberated nationalities.

It will be criticized by isolationists and uncompromising nationalists in this country, where agitators and obstructionists may be counted upon to oppose measures they do not originate. Some eloquent and aggressive politicians in all party organizations would have criticized the Lord's Prayer, had it been uttered first by a member of the opposition.

The Crimean charter, as it may become known to future generations, pledges the Allies force the foe to an unconditional surrender; to destroy militarism in Germany and regulate internal affairs of that unhappy land so that another frenzied fuehrer will not be tempted to organize and equip for wholesale murder and vandalism; to apprehend and punish the arch criminals who have covered continents with corpses and ruins; to perfect a permanent organization to promote and enforce peaceful settlements of all international disputes; to stand upon the principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter.

It is a document of such importance to present and future generations of mankind in every part of the world that only the diehards and habitual howlers may be expected to find fault with its terms.

It will be remembered that this covenant is an agreement between leading powers of two hemispheres—between three governments that have different systems, backgrounds, and traditions—different ideals, objectives, and boundary problems—yet they

have indorsed the Atlantic Charter and accepted American proposals for the free and untrammeled expression of rehabilitated people in selecting the form of administration and the kind of administrators thereof which the majorities may prefer.

Palestine and the "Four Freedoms"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Palestine and the "Four Freedoms," delivered by me at the annual dinner of the Zionist Organization of Philadelphia, Pa., in that city on February 20, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a privilege to appear before you tonight to discuss a subject which is dear not only to the hearts of each of you, but upon which I have the deepest convictions. Your views concerning Palestine, like mine, must have been forged out of the bitter experience of our fellow men, suffered in this age, when many of us had come to believe that perhaps the world had achieved some measure of civilization.

As we sit here tonight our sons, our brothers, and the husbands of some here present are fighting through the muck and mire of bloody Europe and Asia and the distant waters of the Pacific to make possible a world in which we will have a chance to gain a true civilization.

Victory alone will not release us from our bondage. Victory will merely make possible the greater fight for freedom.

Freedom is no lightly won gift. It is not something to be inherited painlessly from hardier generations. Each age must rewin its birthright. Some indeed are destined to fight and die for it. But it is the duty of freemen in all places and at all times to strive for the freedom of all human beings. To borrow the words of a great American educator, Horace Mann: "We want no more of those patriots who exhaust their patriotism in lauding the past; but we want patriots who will do for the future what the past has done for us."

Today no one can doubt the ideals for which we are fighting. The revelations of the war-torn world from Lidice to Lublin from Pearl Harbor to Bataan clearly paint the true picture of the forces of destruction which have been loosed upon our generation.

We now know the true intentions of Hitler's Europa. We now have seen the systematic program of destruction, slavery, and mass murder, upon which was to be built a baser system than ever defied the Dark Ages.

To defeat this sinister purpose there arose almost spontaneously out of the hearts of a freedom-loving people the United Nations. Founded in justice, dedicated to liberty and nurtured in battle, the United Nations will fight to give back to each liberty-loving people their birthright.

First, there is much to be done. The war is by no means yet won. We have learned through sad experience and over many generations that a love of liberty alone will not prevail over brute force.

Our great Nation has been able to gird itself for this fight with less pain and sacrifice than any nation in the world. Our strong economy, our vast resources, our energetic people, our far-sighted leadership, all have made it possible for us to build and arm the greatest military force in the entire world—indeed in the history of the entire world—without giving up the basic elements of our American way of life which has made this production possible. We alone have been able to have guns and butter. But even we, now that the battle is becoming tenser, must draw in our belts, work harder, fight harder, and devote our every waking moment to victory.

The liberty we want to buy is costly. Its cost to some cannot be told. They will never return to tell us. The cost to others will be scarred on them as long as they live when they return from the battlefields. Its cost to those of us at home will be merely temporary. We are merely called upon to get into war work and to apply ourselves to it efficiently.

We must buy bonds, visit the blood bank, respond generously to war drives, shun the black market, and otherwise assume our individual responsibilities as citizens of this great Nation in its hour of need. But most important—we must give up our peacetime pursuits, where they do not contribute to victory. We must devote ourselves to producing the weapons which will beat the Axis. Victory is within our grasp, but we must reach out for it.

Even this is not enough. We must all, each of us, look beyond victory and work for that which must be our ultimate goal. Our leaders have set up the United Nations, looking forward to the problem of the postwar world and fully aware of the necessity for ministering to the material needs of innocent victims of greed and of lust for power. The United Nations have already embarked upon a systematic program of providing at least the very minimum of shelter, food, and clothing.

Under the able leadership of Gov. Herbert Lehman, this program is already proceeding.

But just as concerted governmental activity alone will not win the war, neither can mere governmental plans assure us the peace we desire. Such complete victory requires the pulsating throb that can only come with flesh and blood. The individual personalized and willing participation of each of us in the common effort will achieve the common goal. The officers and the active workers in your organization are especially to be congratulated for their share in the furtherance of this noble undertaking. You are doing your part and each of you must and will continue to do so.

When this war is over there will be three or four million Jews left alive in war-torn Europe. They will desperately require even the basic necessities for sustenance. They will urgently require food and clothing and medical care and shelter. Plans have been made to provide these, but more important, they will require new homes, new opportunities, new hopes. Most of them, we fear, will never breathe deeply of freedom or of happiness in the land where they have suffered. For them there will be no rebuilding. Too much has been torn down. Their souls have been too deeply scarred. They cannot be expected to look forward to a life among those who persecuted them and permitted others to persecute them.

Most of them, we hope, will be able to go to Palestine, there to build a new life for themselves and a homeland for their fellow Jews. And the United Nations, in decency and in justice must spare no effort to make that possible.

Great portions of Hitler's victims will have no alternative but to remain on the soil of Europe. There they will be dispersed in many lands, uprooted from their homes, full of the fear and uncertainty of the ghettos and concentration camps from which they have newly been released.

They may have been freed from the yoke of Nazi barbarism, but they will still stand on the soil which symbolizes their slavery. They will still be ground under the crushing tyranny of poverty, of disease, of homelessness, and of hopelessness. To these Jews, the United Nations shall have to bring immediate and extensive assistance.

But there has been too much of a tendency, I believe, to think of rehabilitation in too narrow terms. When we speak of rehabilitation, we generally think only of food and shelter, of clothing and medical supplies. Certainly, those items are of fundamental and overwhelming importance. But they by no means exhaust our tasks—and we shall forget that fact only at grave peril.

Rehabilitation, if it is to be effective, must include a major offensive against the legacy of hatred and prejudice that years of intensive anti-Semitic propaganda are certain to leave throughout Europe. And rehabilitation must include as well as a program to restore, to those who have been ground into the dust, the self-respect and the human dignity of which they have been so cruelly robbed. Failing these things, our efforts may serve for a time to relieve hunger. But they will not achieve success. When this war is over the idealism and the sense of justice of the United States must find opportunity for expression in world unity of nations.

What are the prospects for success in this vast undertaking? Are there any straws in the wind by which we can foretell the future?

One need only to turn to the only wartime monument to reconstruction which now exists in the entire world to see the answer to the question. I challenge anyone to deny the progress which I saw in Palestine just 1 year ago. During the past few years, the world saw painfully a few examples of creative statesmanship, but I doubt if many examples of constructive effort in all history exceed that of the Jewish people in Palestine. There I saw a blossoming land of milk and honey. There I saw Tel-Aviv, a sparkling tribute to modern engineering and creative energy.

While aggressor nations were ravishing whole countries, there I saw the Jews transforming a wasteland. Where others brought death, the Jewish national homeland brought life. Where others allowed deserts to creep upon fertile soil, Jewish pioneers rehabilitated arid land.

One need but set foot in Palestine to feel the depths of its dedication to the democratic ideal, to social progress, to economic opportunity and to human freedom.

Then why do we of the United Nations persist in our tendency to liquidate the Jewish homeland? Why do we continue to thwart one of history's noblest and most inspiring adventures? Why do we make Palestine the scene of one of the most tragic injustices of this generation?

The Jewish peoples of Europe were the first victims of the monstrous Nazi machine that has devastated and destroyed a greater part of Europe. It was they who first bore the demands of Hitler in Germany. It was they who first felt the pangs of Nazi torture. It was they who paid in blood their full share of the Nazis sad blow to civilization.

The Jewish people throughout the world have cried for arms to share in the fight for democracy. The Jewish people of this country have contributed their full share and more to the Army and Navy which are now forging ahead to victory wherever the enemy can be found. The Jewish people in this war as in each of our Nation's great struggles for democracy have been in the forefront of our fighting ranks. The Jewish people have paid the price in blood, in tears, in sweat, and in toil.

It is but right that the Jewish people of the world shall enjoy the benefits all of us are determined to forge out of victory. To those Jews now trapped in Central Europe, to those whom even victory will not mean relief from suffering and oppression, to all those, we must give words of encouragement. They are to be once more equals in a world of equals.

To the Jewish people of Europe, therefore, we must say: "The 'four freedoms' are meant for you as well as for all other peoples. We are determined that you shall, as individuals, wherever you are, enjoy equal rights with all other individuals."

We shall stand united in support of our great President in his historic message to the Congress on January 6, 1941, proclaiming the ideals of the "four freedoms," not for a privileged few, not for any particular country, but for everyone, everywhere, in these immortal words:

"In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

"The first is freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world.

"The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world.

"The third is freedom from want, which translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants everywhere in the world.

"The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world."

These are our ideals. We shall back them with the full strength of our moral and political force to open the gates of Palestine to the homeless and stateless Jews of Europe.

At the termination of the last war, under the Balfour Declaration and the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, it was the intent and underliying purpose, based on the historical association of the Jewish people with Palestine to reconstitute Palestine as the Jewish Commonwealth. This action was wholeheartedly approved by a majority of our people as indicated by the unanimous approval of Congress in 1922.

The program held a great promise, as an international covenant with the Jewish people, founded as it was in justice and in charity. The continuing labor and sacrifices of the Jewish people in rebuilding their homeland fully justified the dreams of the sponsors of this democratic ideal. In the short space of 20 years the community flourished from a tiny settlement of some tens of thousands so that a year ago when I visited there it was a thriving and modern community of more than half a million. While other nations were bent on destruction, the citizens of the Jewish homeland made the waste lands fertile and brought to that hitherto backward territory the miracles of modern civilization. They provided a place where over 500,000 Jews enjoyed the "four freedoms." Palestine became a haven of safety for all Jews deprived of any of the freedoms in their native lands. They knew that they could find sympathy, shelter and understanding in this historic center from which sprang our modern civilization.

The gates of immigration to Palestine are now closing against the millions of Jews throughout Europe; Jews who have been driven from their homes and uprooted from their occupations; Jews who will have to be resettled. Palestine, alone, will have the will, the capacity, and the eagerness to absorb many of them. These people have a moral, a historical, and a legal claim to the lands now being denied them.

In building the peace, it is a major concern of ours that the "four freedoms" and the principles of democracy be applied everywhere, to all peoples. Over 20 years ago we expressed our support of the Jewish National Homeland as an act of justice and as an act of faith. Today that support must be renewed as an act of national honor; as an act of common decency.

This war of ideals will be won by nations of idealists. Such a Nation is the United States of America. Founded by men of lofty motives and great moral force, it has ever stood as the defender of liberty. Such a nation also is Palestine and it, too, shall endure. When we have disarmed the last oppressor, when we have freed the last slave, when we have regained the peace which is so dear to our hearts; even then, we will not stop. We shall go on to build for the United Nations an enduring peace, a fuller life; a better world than man has ever known. For these things, we are willing to fight. When our sons and brothers have won their war, we shall fight ours. We will make United Nations succeed. We will cooperate with other peace-loving nations. We will support each other in the never-ending fight against oppression. We will leave a legacy of peace for future generations to enjoy.

Curfew on Entertainment Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by William L. Shirer over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Monday night last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last month, 8,000 of our finest youth were slaughtered on the battlefields of western Germany. Today, 2 of our finest American marine divisions landed on Iwo Jima, just 750 miles from Tokyo. Their going was not easy. The war correspondents on the spot said the Japanese on the island were putting up a terrific fight. All of them made it plain that our losses in American lives would be considerable. We know what that means. And, yet, from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast of this great land, whose sons were dying on the distant battlefields, there was a considerable hullabaloo tonight. Why? Not because either coast was attacked by the enemy. No, because War Mobilizer Byrnes clamped a midnight curfew on the Nation's entertainment spots—the night clubs and bars—that meant, will have to close early. I'm no expert on such matters but let us see how some of our citizens took this terrible hardship on the homestretch of this deperate war, say, in New York and Hollywood.

The Associated Press said that Broadway reacted to the request of War Mobilizer Byrnes as if a blockbuster had landed on Manhattan. The A. P. must have been exaggerating, you would think, because to those of us who have fairly recently experienced the real blockbuster, blowing up whole blocks in London, certainly nothing that has hit Broadway, just because people have to finish their drinking by midnight. (Sic.) There really is a difference.

As for movieland, the United Press tells us that indignant owners of swanky Hollywood night clubs tonight grumbled right out loud against Mr. Byrnes' midnight curfew on night spots. One can hope that the words of one night-club operator will not be cabled to our men inching ahead against deadly Japanese fire on Iwo Jima tonight. He said: "Golly, when I think of the dough we will lose." The G. I.'s I recently spent a little time with at the front were not particularly pleased at the dough the fellows back home were making while they were hourly risking their lives and certainly not making any dough. It's only fair to say, of course, that the majority of the night-club operators seem to react to the alleged blockbuster as patriotic citizens. Their feeling was summed up by one who said: "If it will end the war 1 hour sooner, I'm for it 100 percent."

This correspondent can clear up one error made by a Congressman tonight. He said: "No such curfew has sounded in London and Paris and I don't think it's necessary here." Unless London has changed its regulations since I was there some 2 months ago, the night clubs in London close at midnight. As for Paris, all night clubs have been closed for several weeks. And what is more, civilian life in this blessed land of America can scarcely be compared to that of the other countries in the war. The difference resembles, so far as my experience goes, the difference between night and day.

Take France, where I happened to spend a couple of months this past fall and winter. There, the people are continually hungry, to begin with. There's just not enough to eat. How many Americans at home have known hunger during this war, or cold? Perhaps in the next few weeks a few of us will know cold because of the coal shortage, but few of us, if any, will ever experience what the people of Paris have gone through this freezing winter. They had no coal at all, no heat at all in their homes or shops or offices or factories, or even in their hospitals, and when you have a half-empty stomach the cold seems doubly cold somehow.

Probably a safe prediction that one can make tonight is that the American people fighting this war at home will survive the ordeal of the midnight closing of their night clubs and bars.

Liberation of Prisoners on Luzon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter appearing in a recent issue of the Parowan Times, of Parowan, Utah, written by Sgt. Milo Mortensen, describing the delivery of prisoners on the Island of Luzon.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORTENSEN HELPS LIBERATE JAP-HELD UNITED STATES PRISONERS

In a letter received by Mr. and Mrs. S. C. Mortensen from their son Sgt. Milo Mortensen he tells them that he was in the Ranger outfit that liberated the more than 500 American prisoners on Luzon just after the invasion of that Island began. Mr. and Mrs. Mortensen have let us have the letter for publication and as it is very interesting we are taking the liberty to publish it in its entirety, which is as follows:

Dear Mother and all:

I wrote you a short V-mail a couple of days ago, I couldn't say much at that time, but

now I can tell you that I participated in the rescue of the American prisoners of war. I was very much in hopes that Austin would be among them. Unfortunately he was not. However, I found one man who had known him, but the information I received from him was vague. I think it better that his folks keep hopes he will yet be rescued.

I never have seen such a happy, or more grateful group of men as they were upon their release. Some could hardly believe they were free. They were treated badly in the prison and told many tales of Jap brutality.

The Philippine Guerillas were of great value and assistance. They fed us, hid us, spied for us and fought for us.

It was a sight to see the procession of caribou-drawn carts loaded 4 and 5 each with prisoners who were unable to walk. The number of carts eventually reached 50 before we were safely within our lines. Yet it was amazing the number who reached safety under their own power even though some were without shoes and few had more than just underwear for clothes.

As we proceeded along, it seemed each barrio among the never-ending rice paddies knew of our approach and greeted us silently with baskets of rice fresh from the ovens, along with eggs, cane, or anything else they might possess. They would walk alongside the caravan as it passed and whisper to each individual with their offerings lest they should betray our presence by their voices. They were masters of the art of keeping our route back in strict secrecy.

The night before we released the prisoners we entered a village and were greeted warmly. The girls presented us with leis as a token of welcome. They asked permission to sing. We gathered around and eight young girls sang softly and beautifully the Star-Spanged Banner, God Bless America, and God Bless the Philippines. It was quite touching.

Well, mother, guess I had better talk about something else; anyway, from what I hear the papers back there will carry the full account. Give my sincere regards to the Halterman family and tell Butella how sorry I was to find that Austin was not among those rescued.

I hope this finds everyone well there. Personally I am fine. I am taking it easy at present. I received a package tonight from Pearl. It was quite the worse for wear, but the fruit cake was delicious. Well, guess I'd better ring off for tonight. Will try to write Pearl and those at home soon.

With lots of love,

MIKE.

Burial Caskets

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I called the attention of the Members of the House to an order issued by the War Production Board limiting the size of caskets. That order, due to the situation which developed in the House at that time, was subsequently revised so as to permit the construction of caskets that would accommodate men of the size of the gentleman who is now speaking to you.

A new critical situation has now developed in the casket industry. This situation arises because of the failure of the Office of Civilian Requirements to allocate fabrics to the casket manufacturers of this country. I am advised by two of the large casket manufacturers of this country who are located in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, that within 60 days the cheaper grades of caskets will largely be off the market. These manufacturers have been denied an allocation of fabric which is used to cover the cheaper grades of lumber that are used in the construction of the cheaper grades of caskets. As a result, unless some action is taken by the Office of Civilian Requirements and the W. P. B., there will be a complete shut-down of the production of the grades of burial receptacles that have been used by those of modest means in the United States.

I think this is a matter that ought to challenge the attention not only of this Congress but of the War Production Board and the Office of Civilian Requirements, so that this custom in America of burying the dead in caskets will not be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter:

THE BUCKSTAFF CO.,
Oshkosh, Wis., February 13, 1945.

Dr. WILLIAM Y. ELLIOTT,
Vice Chairman, Office of Civilian Requirements, Social Security Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of my own firm and the casket industry as a whole I want to take exception to treatment the casket manufacturer is receiving in not being able to obtain sufficient cloth for casket manufacture from the material being set aside for civilian use. On a number of occasions the war service committee of the funeral supply industry has been in contact with the War Production Board and the O. C. R. and have placed before them the actual requirements and very definite needs of this industry. It appears that the elimination of the casket industry from the list of essential users of fabrics is a direct discrimination. This industry is not asking for material that is needed by the armed forces of this country but is simply asking for their proportionate share of the amount for civilian purposes.

Cloth-covered caskets are naturally made of cheaper grades of lumber and this quality of lumber will not lend itself to painted or varnished finishes. The lumber requirements for war purposes will not permit the use of better grades to enable cloth-covered caskets to be furnished in a painted or varnished finish. At the present time those casket manufacturers making hardwood caskets are faced with a serious difficulty in continued production because of present Government restrictions on the better grades of lumber. We are informed that applications for grades suitable for hardwood-casket construction have been denied.

We know in our own case that our application has not yet been acted upon. Cloth-covered caskets represent approximately 60 percent of the caskets produced for public use at the present time, and it is imperative, therefore, that this industry be allotted sufficient material to enable further production. Cloth caskets are in the lower-priced end of casket production and any change necessitated as a result of insufficient materials being allotted will add to the cost burden and become inflationary.

The bulk of all casket factories would be compelled to install new equipment to make varnished or painted burial cases, but this they will be unable to do because of War Production Board restrictions.

Most casket factories are local and serve the nearby localities. There are no abnormal inventories of finished caskets on hand either in the possession of manufacturers or funeral directors. If other factories have been experiencing the same situation as we have they find themselves with unfilled orders, which are immediate replacements of sold merchandise from the funeral directors stock. Inventories of cloth coverings at the present time will allow most factories to run not more than 5 weeks. Our position is like other factories in this respect. Thus the supply of caskets for the proper care and burial of the dead is in jeopardy as a result of your failure to recognize the needs of this industry. We do not believe the people of this country would want to bury their dead without caskets, and we doubt that the health laws of the States would permit it. We doubt also that religious customs and sentiments would tolerate a condition like this.

The present quarter in each year usually creates the greatest need for burial caskets and so it is imperative that the necessary material to continue to furnish the public with a suitable burial casket be allotted. This industry should be allowed at least 9,800,000 yards of domets and muslins for counterlining and interior backings for the year 1945. It also requires 14,816,000 yards of covering material for the outside of caskets.

We certainly feel that regardless of conditions the casket industry is most important and should be given sufficient materials from those allotted to civilian use to properly carry on. We honestly feel that if an abnormal increase of the number of deaths occurred in this country that a very definte shortage of burial caskets would occur almost overnight. We feel it is sufficiently important for you to give your consideration and we earnestly request your immediate action.

Sincerely yours,

THE BUCKSTAFF CO.,
By R. N. BUCKSTAFF,
President.

Law and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a poem entitled "Law and Peace," written by Mr. James P. McGovern. The poem as presented is a reprint from the Journal of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW AND PEACE

(By James P. McGovern)

What is the brotherhood of him who knows
no brother?
What is the faith of him whose creed respects
no other?
What is the kin of him who wrongs dust, all
men's mother?
What is the peace of him who sets it for
another?

Solon made laws for Greece, Aurelius for
Rome;
Moses wrote rules for Hebrews, Christ taught
all Christendom;
Hammurabi's code graced a Babylonian
dome;
All Europe has justice stored in many an
ancient tome.

The law is always dead in parchment, marble, stone,
Unless each generation relives it as its own;
"A scrap of paper," adorned with names, tempts power on its throne
As fuel for worldwide flames by all the four winds blown.

When the spirit transcends the law, men see beyond the letter,
When justice frames the law, revenge has no abettor,
When mercy guides the law, virtue holds vice its debtor,
When hearts enshrine the law, peace stands free from fetter.

The Murray Dictatorship Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil, written by A. M. Piper, editor:

THE MURRAY DICTATORSHIP BILL

Senator MURRAY, of Montana, has introduced a new Missouri Valley Authority bill. He calls it an improved version of the measure he offered last session, but which Congress never acted upon. Here are some of the so-called improvements.

1. The new legislation would create an advisory committee consisting of the heads of eight leading Federal agencies and nine members from the Missouri Valley, three each representing agriculture, commerce and labor. The committee would act in a consultative capacity on matters of broad policy referred to it by the board, and also would receive the annual report from the authority and transmit it to the President.

2. Family-type farms served by the M. V. A.'s irrigation system would be limited to 160 acres of irrigable land. Farmers owning more would receive needed irrigation only on the condition that they sell the excess land in 5 years.

The advisory committee would be just so much window dressing. Its 17 members couldn't possibly get together very often or exert much influence when they did meet. Practically all power would reside in the commission, appointed by the President.

Every business firm, every farmer in the Missouri Valley would be at the mercy of the President's appointees, some, of course, to a greater degree than others. The Commission might be only mildly despotic but the hand of steel would be there, even though concealed in a silken glove.

The second change, the proposed limitation of all irrigated farms to 160 acres, is one of the most brazen New Deal moves in the direction of dictatorship that has ever come to our attention. It not only limits purchases of Government-owned lands to a quarter section, but where irrigation water is made available to privately owned land, the owner must agree to sell all irrigable land in excess of 160 acres before he can get any water. Moreover he must sell it at a price fixed by Government appraisers.

If this isn't confiscation of private property, it comes mighty close to it. In explanation of this amazing provision of his bill, Senator MURRAY said:

"It is my firm conviction that just as we must avoid concentration of industrial and financial control in a few hands, we must likewise safeguard against the concentration of land in the hands of a few landowners. Monopolistic control of either is bound to bring about disaster to our citizens and undermine the very foundations of our democracy."

To avert such a disaster (?) MURRAY proposes what amounts to a Government monopoly. It resembles the Russian system which permits residents of collective farms to have an acre or two of their own to raise a few vegetables and keep a cow.

Other features of Senator MURRAY's bill lean in the direction of socialism. States, counties, municipalities, and cooperatives would be given preference in the sale of electric power generated at M. V. A. hydroelectric plants. The authority would also be empowered to extend credit to States, municipalities, and nonprofit organizations desiring to acquire or construct distribution facilities and interconnecting lines.

The Murray bill defines the area to be included in the proposed M. V. A. as "the entire Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, and such adjoining territory as may be related to or materially affected by the development." This could easily be interpreted to include all of western Iowa and possibly the whole State.

Iowa will surely be under the thumb of the Federal Government if the Murray bill passes.

Mr. Farley on Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of February 16, 1945:

MR. FARLEY ON POLITICIANS

In a thoughtful Lincoln Day speech to the Catholic Club of Norwalk, James A. Farley, on the theme of Lincoln as a politician, brought forward a concept of politics well worthy of consideration.

He believed it possible that if Lincoln had taken office immediately upon his election he might, by his political genius, have averted the Civil War. Basing his supposition on Lincoln's tendency to compromise, which so frequently caused him to be charged with indecision, Mr. Farley sees the possibility that Lincoln might have brought the moderates of the North and the South together, and overcome the insistence of the extremists of both sides who were trying to force the situation to an irreconcilable point.

From there, after pointing out that extremists on both sides hated Lincoln, those of the South looking on him as some sort of a monster and those of the North looking on him as a failure, Mr. Farley develops the theory of politics as the art of reasonableness, the overcoming of ill-will, and of compromise. For that reason he utterly condemns the political activity that bases itself on personalities, on group interests, and, thus, upon irreconcilable hatreds. Speaking of his own experience in politics, he continued:

"Consequently, I know that if issues are not discussed on their merits, but on personality; if any political group tries to stir up hatred, and of course thereby provokes hatred on the other side; or if resort is had to the tactics of abuse; it becomes extremely difficult for these groups ever to agree again.

"Men tend to repay hatred with hatred, or insult with insult; and if that progress is allowed to go on, it becomes impossible for them finally to cooperate in carrying out any course of action. And yet, in a democracy like ours, our entire national life is a vast cooperative scheme. To the technical politician, extremism is not only a crime; it is a blunder."

Unfortunately, politics has come to stand for a great deal other than the able men of all parties getting together to resolve and reconcile the differences of opinion through a common course of action for the benefit of all. Indeed, it has come to mean all kinds of maneuverings which too often completely submerge that objective. It has come to mean—more insistently than any idea of the common good—patronage, favoritism without regard to competence, and the juggling of minority groups by trading here and there to make an artificial majority by ignoring fundamental problems and putting localized and passionate ones into the foreground.

Mr. Farley found that the seemingly harmless system of patronage, of which he himself was one of the most expert wielders, was made a key to these other evils, and a hindrance to those ideals of cooperation which he so eloquently asserts to be the foundation of democracy. Divided between two loyalties—his principles and party regularity—he chose to separate himself from politics, avoiding allegiance to both. Yet his Lincoln Day speech shows that one of those loyalties is fundamental, and cannot, in good conscience, be avoided.

Fortunately, we still find active examples of these political ideals of cooperation for the good of all. Senator BALL, misguided though his emphasis may have been, must be credited with that sincere ideal. Senator VANDENBERG's brilliant act of lifting foreign policy and world peace above party issues is another instance. We can find many such examples, in State and National politics.

Mr. Farley has clarified the ideal, and there is good hope that throughout our Nation, in spite of present confusions, the ideal is a living and vigorous impulse. As it becomes increasingly articulate politics moves more and more toward its true function of service.

Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown, from the Washington Times-Herald of February 21, 1945:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

Never has there been a time since the New Deal first rolled up its sleeves to make us over into a better but poorer America, when the gentlemen of Congress were so worried about money as they are now.

The thing is piling up on them, until they feel overwhelmed. At the same time, it must be admitted that the administration has plenty of nerve to be putting all this emphasis upon the state of the national finances at one crack.

The signs of the times are disquieting. The bill to increase the debt limit to $300,000,000,000 has been introduced.

The Export-Import Bank is about to ask for an increase in its capital stock of $1,300,000,000.

The Senate has given the Commodity Credit Corporation an additional $1,500,000,000, while the House has raised the ante, and proposes a general boost to $2,000,000,000, which is a more even number.

On top of all these things the President fires Jesse Jones from the Secretaryship of Commerce, which carries with it the fabulous Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and nominates as his successor one of the greatest and most freehanded spenders of all time, Henry A. Wallace.

Scarcely had the Senate decided that this was going too far, and had separated Henry from the money bags of the Houston pooh bah—a decision now concurred in by the House—when along came the Treasury's Bretton Woods bill to set up an international monetary fund and an international bank.

The identic bills offered in Senate and House, as bills, and not as a treaty, and therefore requiring only a majority vote in the two Houses, instead of a two-thirds vote in the Senate, propose to finance the fund and the bank by a species of financial legerdermain that has left the gentlemen on Capitol Hill goggle-eyed.

Some years ago a vacancy occurred in the office of the Comptroller General of the United States, through the expiration of the term of the incumbent, which is 15 years without the right of reappointment.

It is one of the most vitally important posts in the Government. The Comptroller General is in reality the watchdog of the United States Treasury.

The Democrats of the House were able to obtain this position for one of their own number, Representative Lindsay C. Warren, of North Carolina.

The appointment was universally approved and applauded, nor has there been any regret. Warren has been an eagle-eyed, tight-fisted guardian of the public purse. He has stopped rannygazoo spending right and left. He has been popular on Capitol Hill, less so in the spending branches of the far-flung bureaucracy.

Now comes the disquieting report that Lindsay Warren is to be appointed to the Federal bench in North Carolina.

It is disquieting, for there was never a time when a man of his high standing, and so completely enjoying the confidence of Congress, was more needed than right now. Are they trying to get rid of him? That is what's being asked.

The Bretton Woods bill should be completely rewritten by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

It should be changed to require, if enacted at all, that not a dollar of Government money may be used to finance the fund or the bank, until it has been appropriated by the Congress of the United States.

As it stands, this bill would permit the administration to become an international banker by the simple process of juggling money from the pants pocket, into the vest pocket, and thence into the hip pocket.

The Export-Import Bank, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, both in need of more funds, should be given a thorough dusting off. They have cobwebs on them. Their control has completely passed from Congress.

That control should be taken back, now that America appears to be poised on the brink of a spending spree, in which the sky is to be the limit, conducted by a theoretical banker from an invisible office.

Tribute to Finnish People of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, in the part of the country I come from, the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, there are what I believe to be some of the unsung heroes of American war industry. In this lovely but rugged country, in weather now well below zero, men are engaged in four most hazardous occupations essential to our successful conduct of the war: Logging, copper and iron mining, and fishing on the bleak and dangerous waters of the Great Lakes.

These people have done an outstanding job during the war period, have made a great contribution to our war production and war food programs. Largely their work has gone unrecognized, both in terms of public knowledge of the job they are doing and in terms of monetary return for their labors.

Recently, I came across an article in a national weekly magazine—Colliers—paying splendid tribute to one of the groups of war workers in my district, the Finnish fishermen who are supplying thousands of tons of fish for both civilian and armed forces. These rugged fishermen do a heroic job, rivaling very often in danger the job being done by our merchant marine and Navy. Because I was so pleased to see this tribute to them, I ask leave to have the article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

One comment I would like to make on the article, and it is no reflection on the author. I have lived among the Finnish people of the Upper Peninsula all my life. I know them as a proud, resourceful, and intelligent people. They are very proud of their language. It is not an easy language, and that, I suppose, is why in printing the article, a slight error in spelling was made so that the Finnish word "paivaa" came out "paava," which means nothing in Finnish or any language that I am aware of.

The article is mostly concerned with the herring fishermen of Keweenaw Peninsula on Lake Superior. The tales told of their adventures and of their production records could be duplicated in every one of the lake counties in the area.

HERRING ARE SILLI

(By Clay Perry)

When America thinks of commercial food fishing, it thinks of its seacoasts. Yet freshwater commercial fishing in the United States, under the impetus of war, has become big business. It has grown up swiftly from haphazard operations out of Great Lakes ports to a coordinated industry that furnishes thousands of tons of fine food for both armed forces and civilians.

Most important of the inland fishing States is Michigan, with 1,600 miles of shore line (more than any seaboard State) on three vast Great Lakes. An investment of $3,000,000 in more than 1,100 boats and gear keeps 3,000 fishermen at work gathering an annual harvest of herring, lake trout, and whitefish, that averages 30,000,000 pounds a year and nets the hard-working fishermen more than $4,000,000.

Prize food fish of the Great Lakes is the Lake Superior herring, the firm, succulent variety that commands a premium price anywhere in the world. Even in normal times, Lake Superior herring, along with whitefish and the huge lake trout, command a wide market, even in the seacoast States.

Ideal fishing grounds for herring are in the lee of northern Michigan's Keweenaw Peninsula, which juts its rugged 45-mile length straight out into the cold blue waters of Superior, the world's biggest—and roughest—lake. This peninsula shelters a large bay from the fierce nor'westers—although not from the equally severe nor'easters. Here, within sight of a land of lakes, forests, and mountains that is a vacation paradise in summer and a fishermen's hell in winter, is one of the most important sources of food fish for the Army.

While lake trout and whitefish are year-round staples for Upper Peninsula fishermen, herring provide the most hectic and hazardous action. The midwinter season is short and severe—three or four hard-bitten weeks of lashing gales, blizzards, bitter cold, and sometimes sudden death and disaster, as hardy fishermen gather millions of herring from the huge schools that gather to spawn on the reefs and shoals off Keweenaw's southeastern shores.

Keweenaw fishermen are a tough and colorful lot. They are mostly second and third generation Finns who have managed to retain their nationalistic identity, customs, and language since their ancestors came to this land years ago, to fish, farm, and work in the forests and the deep copper mines.

They need to be hardy and brave.

The 1943 herring season got off to a heartbreaking start with the worst storm in 30 years, just as the run was beginning. A 3-day howler, sweeping across 200 miles of icy lake, washed so much sand into harbors and ports that huge dredges had to be hired in a hurry to clear the way for the boats, while docks and other equipment were badly damaged and some ports were made useless.

When the run was at its height, a lashing 55-mile gale stopped it almost entirely, forcing most of the fishermen to pull their nets and run for their lives.

BIGGER AND BETTER HERRING IN SEASON'S FIRST CATCH

The 1944 season on herring opened a week late due to the warmer weather. However, the fishermen were pleased when their first netting showed that the herring were running larger in size. The Michigan Conservation Department's figures for the total catch of herring in all three lakes—Huron, Michigan, and Superior—are 7,249,190 pounds.

But the price went even below the 1943 ceiling of 3 cents per pound, despite the fact that O. P. A. regulations were lifted, and no ceiling price was imposed for "herring in the round." The reason for this is believed to be the fact that big city packers, a month before the 1944 run started, had a carry-over of 2,500,000 pounds of lake herring. Nevertheless packing went on full blast, with the Army taking about the same amount as the year before, and three filleting plants operating to provide frozen fillets.

A midwinter trip to the Big Lake with Capt. Henry Tormala, out of Portage Entry, is an unforgettable experience. His boat, the *Superior*, is a 35-footer, with broad beam, enclosed against the weather from stem to stern, metal-sheathed to combat ice. It is owned by Captain Henry and his brother, Aldrick, manned by a Finnish crew of five.

The *Superior* leaves port before dawn in the teeth of a knifing gale, with snow driving before it. The boat carries several gangs of

40 nets, each 250 feet long, 35 to 40 inches wide, fitted with buoys and anchors. Thrust out from a hatch near the bow is the bristle-toothed lifter—motor-powered—that drags up the loaded nets. A barrel of water has been heated, it will be thrown on the lifter to keep it from freezing. Amidships is a roaring fire in a tiny stove, on which always simmers a pot of kaffii, the superb Finnish coffee.

Captain Tormala heads into the hammering, pounding waves and screaming wind which toss the boat badly, holding his course for his chosen reef. Inside, the crew hug the stove and hang on. An hour or more of this, and a rear hatch is opened—and the icy blast roars in.

Out go the buoys, as tall as a man, anchors, and then the nets, unfolding from their trough. Down they go, 10 fathoms, the legal limit of depth. Nets are of Sea Island cotton and cost $500 to $600 per gang for materials alone. The fishermen weave them and they handle them with great care.

"Paava!" growls a veteran crewman, which is a Finnish "hello" to the cold and tumultuous winds. "We got plenty silli (herring) maybe. Plenty raha (money)—maybe."

It takes several hours to set the 4 long miles of gangs—some big boats set twice as many—and we head back to port for a big meal of fresh herring—or as a special treat, lake trout baked in a pit of hot stones, or whitefish, fresh or smoked.

Next morning, we head out for our reef again. There is a heavy swell from the previous blow, and the wind is rising with the sun. Sharp snow pellets hammer at the hatches and glass windows as we plow out to see how many tons will be lifted that day.

Over the nets, a hatch is opened, and the first net is hooked to the curved teeth on the lifter cylinder. The motor is started, and the net begins to rise with its load of herring caught by the gills—a flopping, squirming, shimmering bouquet of fish. They roll in over the cylinder, and the crewmen grab them hand over hand and "choke" them free, tossing them into wooden boxes. They work at mad speed, barehanded in the icy gale.

These Finns, among the best fishermen in the world, will handle 20,000 to 30,000 fish, one by one, in a day's haula (haul).

On this particular day our 5-man crew took in 4 tons of herring. One day last winter, 32 tons were delivered at the Great Lakes Fisheries packing plant. We also karistaa—that is, set the nets for tomorrow—and paying out these miles of web from a pitching boat in a blizzard, near dark, is something to give a Gloucesterman pause.

At the home dock, trucks are waiting, and the catch is hurried off to the packing plant at Houghton or Hancock or one of the smaller ports, to be cleaned, boned, filleted, day or night, and then quick-frozen for shipment to the Army Quartermaster Department. A byproduct of packing is delicious herring roe—as good as Russian caviar.

Michigan's big lake trout are taken in nets, by trolling, and by bobbing through holes in the ice. The ice angler is a human polar bear, scorning the huts and stoves used elsewhere. His only shelter—if any—is a tiny triangle of canvas set up to the wind.

Many an ice angler—sometimes whole squads of them—is carried out on drifting floes. Some drown and thrilling rescues are common, the fishing boats crashing through the ice to get to the marooned men, with the Coast Guard racing to help.

Lake trout caught through the ice run up to 25 or 30 pounds, but the biggest are taken by deep trolling in summer. Many 50-pounders have been taken by sports fishermen, and a commercial fisherman once brought in a 56-pounder.

Deep lake trolling for trout has become a national sport, and Keweenaw held the first national trout derby in 1941, with 1,200 entries, a colorful 2-week fiesta that will be resumed after the war.

Lake Superior leads all the lakes in big trout. It yielded the first 7 of 10 prize winners in the Field and Stream contest for 1941 and 1942. The biggest lake trout entered in the 1944 contest, 53 pounds, came from Lake Superior, and an even larger one, 54½ pounds, was caught but not entered. Commercial catches of trout in Keweenaw waters have jumped from 45,323 pounds in 1940 to over half a million pounds annually in the past 4 years.

"All very fine," says the Finnish fisherman. "I'll take herring."

Order of the President Creating the Jackson Hole National Monument Upheld by the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1945, Judge Kennedy of the United States District Court of Wyoming rendered an opinion sustaining the order of President Roosevelt whereby he created the Jackson Hole National Monument.

While the case which resulted in this ruling was pending, the House and the Senate, by substantial majorities, voted to rescind the President's order. I was one of those who voted against the bill to set aside this order. At the time I stated my views briefly, and I also ventured the conviction that the order was legal.

I was sorry to see so many of my Republican colleagues vote to set aside the order creating this monument. To me this act by the President was a step in favor of conservation. The Republican Party contributed that policy to our national life. President Theodore Roosevelt dramatized the need for conservation of natural resources and places of exceptional or unique scenic attraction. Through his initiative in setting aside the Grand Canyon of the Colorado as a national monument, we later got the Grand Canyon National Park. I am one of those who hope that some day the Jackson Hole Monument will be Jackson Hole National Park. It provides the setting for the most gorgeous group of mountains in this country.

For the information of the members I am including herewith the opinion of Judge Kennedy, which is as follows:

[In the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming. The State of Wyoming, plaintiff, vs. Paul R. Franke, defendant. No. 2875 Civil]

JUDGE'S MEMORANDUM

Dated: February 10, 1945.

Kennedy, Judge.

This case involves the Jackson Hole National Monument, located in Teton County, Wyo. The suit is brought by the State of Wyoming in part under the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, seeking a construction of the Antiquities Act of June 8, 1906, and the proclamation of the President made thereunder by which it prays a judicial declaration voiding the effects of such proclamation and also in equity for an injunction restraining the defendant, as an appointed official of the Interior Department, from asserting management and control of the area embraced in the proclamation. The cause purports to be under 28 U. S. C. A. 41 (1), covering suits arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States where the matter in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs exceeds the sum or value of $3,000. In its complaint the plaintiff asserts that the proclamation of the President is not authorized under the provisions of law upon which it purports to be based and is without legal authority; that the defendant, as an appointed official of the Interior Department, has asserted a right to the control and jurisdiction over the area involved to the exclusion of the State and has threatened to exclude officials of the State from the boundaries of such designated area; that such asserted control, if carried into effect, will interfere with the rights of the plaintiff in its jurisdiction over fish and wild game, from which it receives a large and lucrative revenue; that such asserted control will interfere with the rights of the State in operating and maintaining many miles of highway constructed by the State within the area, in that it is threatened that gates and guards will be placed at such boundaries in such a way as to interfere with the rights of the plaintiff; that such asserted management and control by the defendant will interfere with a large income from grazing fees, from which a substantial revenue is derived by the State; that the Secretary of the Interior, with the assistance of the defendant, threatens to acquire by donation, purchase, or condemnation privately owned lands within the area, thereby depriving the plaintiff of the benefits of taxation and the right of jurisdiction over the same; that the segregated area, by virtue of the proclamation over which the defendant threatens management and control, is outside the scope and purpose of the Antiquities Act under which the proclamation was issued, in that such area contains no objects of an historic or scientific interest required by the act; that the proclamation is void and of no effect, in that it is not confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of a national monument; that by said proclamation an attempt has been made to substitute through the Antiquities Act a national monument for a national park, the creation of which is within the sole province of the Congress, thereby becoming an evasion of the law governing the segregation of such areas; and that the plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law and will suffer irreparable damage unless accorded the relief prayed for in the complaint. The court has attempted merely to summarize the more important claims of the plaintiff.

The defendant in its answer disputes the jurisdiction of the court upon various grounds and alleges that the action of the President in issuing the proclamation is not open to judicial review and in effect that the proclamation is in fact well within the scope and purpose of the National Monument Act.

Some time after the action was commenced, the Interior Department made a change in officials in charge of the monument area by which the defendant, Franke, was substituted for the former defendant, Charles J. Smith, and the plaintiff thereupon sought a substitution in defendants to conform to the facts, which was made upon stipulation of the parties. Prior to the trial a hearing was had by the court upon the various legal defenses set forth in the amended answer in the nature of a motion to dismiss, and upon motion by defendant for summary judgment, upon which argument was heard and said defenses and motions were overruled without prejudice to the defendant to assert

them upon the trial or final argument in the case. Trial was had and trial briefs have been submitted.

The defendant now asserts that the plaintiff has not brought itself within the scope of the act giving the court jurisdiction of controveries arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States where the matter in controversy exceeds the value of $3,000. A decision on this point in the first instance is necessary for the court to determine its jurisdiction. The evidence in the case, in the opinion of the court, leads to the conclusion that the statutory value as required is satisfied. The alleged interference with the use, maintenance, and control of the State highways, together with the loss in taxation which would occur to the State, and the loss of revenue from game and fish licenses in the event the defendant should exercise the control and management threatened would far exceed the statutory limitation.

It also seems to this court the suit arises under the laws of the United States in that it substantially involves a controversy respecting the validity or construction of an act of Congress. Here the question presented is as to whether or not the proclamation is valid under the Antiquities Act, the answer to which question requires a construction of that act. In *First National Bank* v. *Williams* (252 U. S. 504), at page 512, the Court says:

"What constitutes a cause arising 'under' the laws of the United States has been often pointed out by this court. One does so arise where an appropriate statement by the plaintiff, unaided by any anticipation or avoidance of defenses, discloses that it really and substantially involves a dispute or controversy respecting the validity, construction, or effect of an act of Congress. If the plaintiff thus asserts a right which will be sustained by one construction of the law, or defeated by another, the case is one arising under that law. (Citing cases.)"

In *Gully* v. *First National Bank* (299 U. S. 109), at page 112, the expression of the Court is as follows:

"How and when a case arises 'under the Constitution or laws of the United States' has been much considered in the books. Some tests are well established. To bring a case within the statute, a right or immunity created by the Constitution or laws of the United States must be an element, and an essential one, of the plaintiff's cause of action. (Citing cases.) The right or immunity must be such that it will be supported if the Constitution or laws of the United States are given one construction or effect, and defeated if they receive another."

Clearly in the case at bar, the right of the plaintiff may be sustained or defeated in a construction by the court of the law under which the proclamation was issued.

Again, it is contended by the defendant that the proofs do not support the allegations of the complaint in that the threats of the management and control of the area on the part of the defendant do not encroach upon the rights of the plaintiff. The proofs tend to show that under regulations by the Interior Department, the original defendant was directed to take charge of the management and control of the segregated area and the present defendant is only on account of a rescission by the Secretary of the Interior of that direction partially refraining from exercising such management and control on account of Congress having failed to provide an appropriation to cover such services, but the defendant reasserts that he will again, upon receiving similar direction from the Secretary of the Interior, proceed to carry said direction into effect. It appears to this Court that such previous action, coupled with the continuing threatened action on the part of this defendant, is sufficient to justify the plaintiff in seeking to invoke the jurisdiction of the court for the restraint of a threatened act alleged to be illegal.

As to the assertion by defendant that the suit is not legally laid against the defendant as an officer acting in excess of his authority, we think that in view of the allegations of the complaint and the proofs offered by the plaintiff, this suit is one in which it is claimed that the authority exercised and threatened to be exercised by him is not validly conferred by statute. In *Yearsley* v. *Ross Construction Co.* (309 U. S. 18, pp. 20 and 21), the Court says:

"In that view, it is clear that if this authority to carry out the project was validly conferred, that is, if what was done was within the constitutional power of Congress, there is no liability on the part of the contractor for executing its will. (Citing cases.) Where an agent or officer of the Government purporting to act on its behalf has been held to be liable for his conduct causing injury to another, the ground of liability has been found to be either that he exceeded his authority or that it was not validly conferred. (Citing cases.)"

In the circumstances of the present case, the suit is not one against the United States. In *Philadelphia Co.* v. *Stimson* (223 U. S. 605) at pages 619–620, it is said:

"If the conduct of the defendant constitutes an unwarrantable interference with property of the complainant, its resort to equity for protection is not to be defeated upon the ground that the suit is one against the United States. The exemption of the United States from suit does not protect its officers from personal liability to persons whose rights of property they have wrongfully invaded. (Citing cases.) And in case of an injury threatened by his illegal action, the officer cannot claim immunity from injunction process. The principle has frequently been applied with respect to State officers seeking to enforce unconstitutional enactments. (Citing cases.) And it is equally applicable to a Federal officer acting in excess of his authority or under an authority not validly conferred. (Citing cases.)

"The complainant did not ask the court to interfere with the official discretion of the Secretary of War, but challenged his authority to do the things of which complaint was made. The suit rests upon the charge of abuse of power, and its merits must be determined accordingly; it is not a suit against the United States."

Neither is it necessary to join the defendant's superior officers. In *Colorado* v. *Toll* (268 U. S. 228) at page 230, the language of the court is as follows:

"The object of the bill is to restrain an individual from doing acts that it is alleged that he has no authority to do and that derogate from the quasi-sovereign authority of the State. There is no question that a bill in equity is a proper remedy and that it may be pursued against the defendant without joining either his superior officers or the United States. (Citing cases.)"

The foregoing discussion would seem to dispose of the more vital of defendant's objections that the Court is without jurisdiction to determine the issues presented by the pleadings upon the merits. In this respect, this Court feels that it has a limited jurisdiction to investigate and determine whether or not the proclamation is an arbitrary and capricious exercise of power under the Antiquities Act so as to be outside of the scope and purpose of that act by which the President in the exercise of its provisions has exceeded or violated a discretion thereby conferred.

In this connection, it will be pertinent to set out the Antiquities Act (16 U. S. C. A. 431):

"The President of the United States is authorized, in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments, and may reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected. When such objects are situated upon a tract covered by a bona fide unperfected claim or held in private ownership, the tract, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the proper care and management of the object, may be relinquished to the Government, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept the relinquishment of such tracts in behalf of the Government of the United States."

The proclamation, known as No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, omitting the metes and bounds description, which admittedly includes 221,610 acres, is as follows:

"Whereas the area in the State of Wyoming known as the Jackson Hole country, including that portion thereof which is located in the Teton National Forest, contains historic landmarks and other objects of historic and scientific interest that are situated upon lands owned or controlled by the United States; and

"Whereas it appears that the public interest would be promoted by establishing the aforesaid area as a national monument to be known as the Jackson Hole National Monument: Now, therefore,

"I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11, 36; U. S. C., title 16, sec. 473), and the act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; U. S. C., title 16, sec. 431), do proclaim that the Teton National Forest lands within the aforesaid area are hereby excluded from the said national forest and that, subject to all valid existing rights, the lands excluded from the said national forest together with all other lands within the following described area are reserved from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws and set apart as a national monument, which shall hereafter be known as the Jackson Hole National Monument:

* * * * *

"The reservation made by this proclamation supersedes, as to any of the above-described lands affected thereby, the withdrawals made for classification and other purposes by Executive Order No. 3394 of January 28, 1921; No. 4685 of July 7, 1927; No. 4857 of April 16, 1928; No. 5040 of February 4, 1929; No. 5436 of September 2, 1930; No. 5480 of November 13, 1930; and No. 7680 of July 30, 1937.

"Warning is hereby expressly given to all unauthorized persons not to appropriate, injure, destroy, or remove any feature of this monument and not to locate or settle upon any of the lands thereof.

"The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of the monument as provided in the act of Congress entitled 'An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes', approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535, U. S. C., title 16, secs. 1 and 2), and acts supplementary thereto or amendatory thereof, except that the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal heretofore made under the authority of the act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388."

The Antiquities Act, it will be seen, provides that the President may in his discretion declare by proclamation, historic landmarks, historic or prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest. It is the plaintiff's contention that the area included within the monument is barren of any of these features while the defendant contends to the contrary. Upon these divergent contentions an issue of fact was presented and evidence offered at the trial. The plaintiff's evidence was of a negative

character that there were no historic landmarks, historic or prehistoric structures or objects of historic or scientific interest included in the area established by the proclamation. While this line of evidence was quite elaborate, in the view the court takes of the matter, nothing could be accomplished by a detailed discussion of it in this memorandum. On the other hand, the defendant's evidence was to the effect that there were trails and historic spots in connection with the early trapping and hunting of animals formulating the early fur industry of the West, structures of glacial formation and peculiar mineral deposits and plant life indigenous to the particular area, a biological field for research of wildlife in its particular habitat within the area, involving a study of the origin, life, habits, and perpetuation of the different species of wild animals, all of which it is claimed constitute matters of scientific interest within the scope and contemplation of the Antiquities Act. It would likewise serve no useful purpose to elaborate upon the defendant's testimony in detail as the foregoing outline as to the trends of evidence illustrate the sharp conflict in regard to the facts. By this analysis in an ordinary suit the court would be confronted with the task of determining where the preponderance of evidence rests and render a decision based thereon. This, in substance, amounts to no more in the end than the court's opinion of what the evidence in the case purports to show and itself implies an exercise of the court's discretion. If there be evidence in the case of a substantial character upon which the President may have acted in declaring that there were objects of historic or scientific interest included within the area, it is sufficient upon which he may have based a discretion. For example, if a monument were to be created on a bare stretch of sagebrush prairie in regard to which there was no substantial evidence that it contained objects of historic or scientific interest, the action in attempting to establish it by proclamation as a monument, would undoubtedly be arbitrary and capricious and clearly outside the scope and purpose of the Monument Act. In the proofs in this case we have evidence of experts and others as to what the area contains in regard to objects of historic and scientific interest and by that testimony this court is bound although it may not agree that the testimony of the witnesses by the preponderance rule sufficiently supports the claim of the defendant. This is the limited scope which it seemed to the court were issues in the case within its jurisdiction to determine.

The law governing such a situation has been expressed in regard to the President exercising a power through proclamation based upon a resolution of Congress in *Dakota Central Telephone Co.* v. *South Dakota* (250 U. S. 163, at p. 184) in the following language:

"The proposition that the President in exercising the power exceeded the authority given him is based upon two considerations. First, because there was nothing in the conditions at the time the power was exercised which justified the calling into play of the authority; indeed, the contention goes further and assails the motives which it is asserted induced the exercise of the power. But as the contention at best concerns not a want of power, but a mere excess or abuse of discretion in exerting a power given, it is clear that it involves considerations which are beyond the reach of judicial power. This must be since, as this court has often pointed out, the judicial may not invade the legislative or executive departments so as to correct alleged mistakes or wrongs arising from asserted abuse of discretion."

A more recent expression is found in *U. S.* v. *Bush & Co.* (310 U. S. 371), where at page 380 it is said:

"It has long been held that where Congress has authorized a public officer to take some specified legislative action when in his judgment that action is necessary or appropriate to carry out the policy of Congress, the judgment of the officer as to the existence of the facts calling for that action is not subject to review. (Citing cases.) As stated by Mr. Justice Story in *Martin* v. *Mott*, supra, pages 31–32: 'Whenever a statute gives a discretionary power to any person, to be exercised by him upon his own opinion of certain facts, it is a sound rule of construction, that the statute constitutes him the sole and exclusive judge of the existence of those facts.'

"For the judiciary to probe the reasoning which underlies this proclamation would amount to a clear invasion of the legislative and executive domains. Under the Constitution it is exclusively for Congress, or those to whom it delegates authority, to determine what tariffs shall be imposed. Here the President acted in full conformity with the statute. No question of law is raised when the exercise of his discretion is challenged."

In short, this seems to be a controversy between the legislative and executive branches of the Government in which, under the evidence presented here, the court cannot interfere. Undoubtedly great hardship and a substantial amount of injustice will be done to the State and her citizens if the executive department carries out its threatened program, but if the Congress presumes to delegate its inherent authority to executive departments which exercise acquisitive proclivities not actually intended, the burden is on the Congress to pass such remedial legislation as may obviate any injustice brought about as the power and control over and disposition of Government lands inherently rests in its legislative branch. What has been said with reference to the objects of historic and scientific interest applies equally to the discretion of the executive in defining the area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

The court is not impressed with the technical argument of counsel for plaintiff that the designated area is not consistent with the preface to the proclamation in referring to the Jackson Hole country. The area over which control is threatened is in any event limited to that defined in the proclamation. Neither can the court take any judicial interest in the motives which may have inspired the proclamation described as an attempt to circumvent the congressional intent and authority in connection with such lands. The argument and propaganda which have been circulated in forums and through the press of the Nation, and even volunteered for the use of the court, largely concern a policy of segregating the area for its natural scenery and inherent beauty as a national playground or in the alternative, a policy representing in effect an encroachment upon the State's sovereignty over lands within its boundaries by adding to the already large acreage of public lands over which the Federal Government exercises authority, more lands and more restrictive measures, thereby retarding the State's growth and development. Such discussions are of public interest but are only applicable as an appeal for congressional action.

The case has been considered primarily under the prayer for injunctive relief, but if considered under the Declaratory Judgment Act the result must be the same. Where an injunction will not lie a declaratory judgment cannot be substituted for it. *Great Lakes Company* v. *Huffman* (319 U. S. 393).

It follows that the court will find generally for the defendant and counsel for defendant will prepare and submit findings of fact and conclusions of law in harmony with this memorandum but including such basic facts as are fundamental, together with an appropriate judgment dismissing plaintiff's cause of action, all in collaboration with counsel for plaintiff, on or before March 10, 1945. The findings and conclusions may carry such exceptions to be allowed as counsel elect.

Resolution of St. Anthony's Parish, Toledo, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

TOLEDO, OHIO, *February 18, 1945.*

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: I am forwarding to you this protest which was unanimously approved by the members of St. Anthony's Parish, Toledo, Ohio, February 16, 1945.

St. Anthony's Parish was established over 60 years ago. It comprises about 5,000 souls. We have over 630 boys in the uniform of the United States Army. Many of them have died upon all the far-flung battlefields of this war.

I need not tell you of the quality of our citizenship. You know there is none more ardently patriotic in the State of Ohio. We ask you to make our sentiments and beliefs known to the entire Nation.

Most respectfully yours,

F. S. LEGOWSKI, *Pastor.*

This war was entered into by the United Nations for two primary purposes. The first, destruction of totalitarianism, and the second, the preservation of the territorial integrity of Poland.

Totalitarianism became a menace to the freedom of the democratic governments and the peoples of the world. Its avowed purpose was to dominate the world and subjugate all peoples to its rule. Hitler chose the slogan of security of his eastern borders as the reason for unleashing a world war by striking at Poland. England and France recognized this security slogan as a specious pretext to attain world domination. They declared war on Hitler, proclaiming that no nation's alleged security outweighs the existence of a free people.

Britain and France recognized the validity of this truth and went to war to guarantee the territorial integrity of Poland against the totalitarian aggression of Hitler.

Recognizing the menace to world freedom, even before we entered the war, we promulgated the Atlantic Charter. Every nation, large or small, has a right to freedom and self-determination.

When Stalin wantonly attacked Finland, we condemned him as an unjust aggressor. We extended to Finland our sympathy and credit. Stalin was then a tyrant and dictator, devouring an innocent people. We stood upon the principles of democracy and morality. We were true to our heritage.

When Hitler sent his sadistic murderers into Poland, we took the side of freedom and democracy. Short of war, we aided with credits and munitions the Allies; we stood by while we witnessed the great totalitarians, Hitler and Stalin, join hands in the commission of an international murder. "One swift blow to Poland, first by the German Army and then by the Red Army, and nothing was left of this ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty."—Molotov, 1939. Stalin stabbed Poland in the back while she was preoccupied in fighting Hitler and his hoardes. Being buddies under the skin, they united in annihilating the only democracy between their boundaries.

After Pearl Harbor, with the United Nations, we repromulgated the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We assumed the role of

the champion of morality, human dignity, and freedom.

We called upon millions of our boys to fight to the death for these high-minded and lofty principles of moral right.

But, in the meanwhile, our President looked into the eyes of the totalitarian Stalin and became fascinated and hypnotized. He abandons our ideals, our principles, and the blood of our youth and pays worship to the monster of international immorality and evil. It can only be because the idolators of power pay worship to the evil one. It is simply not human.

Bad company corrupts good morals is an old adage. Personal contact and face-to-face talks may be conducive to understanding only when the righteous are firm and steadfast in the right. But it is unfortunate when one rotten apple in the barrel corrupts the whole mess.

Now, the buddy of Hitler raises the question of security of his western boundaries, exactly as Hitler raised the question of his eastern boundaries. Stalin's security to the west demands the death of the Polish nation, and sows the seeds of a third world war. He demands the fifth partition of Poland. Churchill and Roosevelt agree to treat Poland, not as the first of the United Nations, but as an enemy. Poland is treated even worse than Rumania, which was an enemy country.

When Catherine the Great of Russia perpetrated the same evil deed we officially named it as "the greatest international crime in history." Today Stalin, not the Russian people, hacks off even more of the body of Poland than did Catherine and our President condones, approves, and cooperates in the crime.

When Hitler demanded security we condemned him as an aggressor and usurper, but when Stalin does the same thing we are asked to close our eyes to the injustice and immorality of his act and hope for the best.

As heirs of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, as believers in the principles of the Atlantic Charter we cannot sit idly by without a protest. We do not approve international injustice. Our years of sacrifice and labor were not spent to support Stalinist imperialism. The blood of our boys is surely not being shed to condone international immorality. What we condemned in Hitler we equally condemn in Stalin. We cannot build a world of peace upon the ruins of injustice.

We bring these things to your attention that you in turn may bring them to the attention of the people of the United States.

Trustees of St. Anthony's Parish, Toledo, Ohio: Anthony Pawlowski, Stephen Czolgosz, Max Grzegorzewski, Frank Chlebowski, Stan. Stygowski Jr., Vincent Donnelly, Michael Holewinski, Joseph Lechlak, Martin Szymczak, John Zajac; Rt. Rev. F. S. Legowski, Pastor.

Future International Air Trade and Travel Routes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an important and informative address on the subject of international air trade and travel routes of the future, delivered by Mr. L. Welch Pogue, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I have received from the Public Printer a statement that it will cost $124.80 to print the address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRADE AND TRAVEL ROUTES OF THE FUTURE

(By L. Welch Pogue, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, delivered at the first International Civil Aviation luncheon sponsored by the aviation section, New York Board of Trade, in New York, N. Y., on January 24, 1945)

I deeply appreciate the privilege of speaking to the New York Board of Trade. Your membership represents the active and vigorous business leadership of the very great city of New York. I prize the opportunity of discussing with so distinguished a group some plans and ideas relating to the future.

Sometime in the latter half of the twenties some men, fired with the courage of their convictions and willing to risk their money and careers in the establishment of commercial air services—a daring venture then, started in the Caribbean area our first small international air operation. From that nucleus grew, during the thirties, the very extensive system of American flag international air lines known as Pan American Airways. If we include the Pan American-Grace Airways, 50 percent of which is owned by Pan American and 50 percent by W. R. Grace & Co., the Pan American Airways System operated more route miles by far than the next largest international operator before the war. In 1940, American Export Airlines was authorized to operate a temporary service across the Atlantic, although its operations did not actually start until after the entry of the United States into the war.

Modern war called for air transport operations to serve theaters of war all over the world. The Air Transport Command was created in the War Department and grew to fill this need. It started with a small nucleus of personnel, many of whom were key officers and technical experts taken from the domestic air lines. And it had only a small number of transport aircraft, most of which were likewise taken from the domestic air lines. It wisely utilized, under contract, the "know-how" and the services of the air-line organizations themselves. Intelligently directed, the Air Transport Command has expanded until it is operating approximately 125,000 miles of routes every day, carrying enormous numbers of passengers and millions upon millions of pounds of cargo annually. As of a recent date, the Air Transport Command was operating across the North Atlantic alone approximately 65 trips daily.

In addition, the Naval Air Transport Service has likewise built up a very extensive operation serving naval establishments throughout the world.

These two services, plus the limited amount of commercial transoceanic international services which could be continued during the war, have, in one of history's twinklings, transferred the prospect of transoceanic passenger travel very substantially from the surface to the air. There will, of course, be many pleasant sea voyages hereafter as heretofore; but for the man whose object is to get there, the war has proved the safety of the air and the superiority of air travel in time saved. And speaking of safety, have any of you stopped to think recently of how crazy you would have thought your neighbor had he, 10 years ago, prophesied that it would be safe within a decade to cross the Atlantic by air? While submarines stalked the sea lanes, they drove their human prey into the air lanes. This war experience does not represent theorizing; it is the practical laboratory test which proves the case.

Alert to the very great possibilities of expansion and growth in international air trade and travel, the Civil Aeronautics Board, in 1943, consulted extensively all aeronautical interests, twice soliciting their views, as to the international air transportation routes which the United States should seek to operate in the future. After further consultation with all interested governmental agencies, and with the approval of the President, the Board made our proposed world routes public last June. If existing United States air routes established before the war are included, there are 20 world routes in all which were so announced. They do not include any routes, existing or prospective, between the United States and the contiguous territories of Canada and Mexico. These routes reach every continent and important region of the world. Europe with approximately 25 percent of the world's population and the important areas of east Asia, south Asia, and southeast Asia, including approximately 47 percent of the world's population, are reached by these new routes. Generally speaking, these routes are based upon commercial considerations. They represent the Board's judgment as to the best routes for airborne trade and travel prospects from and to the United States. With minor exceptions they constitute reasonably direct routes out from and back to our homeland.

About 100 applications were filed by American citizens to operate international routes. The Board has divided the world into four areas for the purpose of conducting hearings on these applications and reaching decisions in the cases. All applications in each area have been consolidated in a single proceeding. The areas are (1) the Latin-American, (2) the North Atlantic (reaching eastward as far at Calcutta, India), (3) the South Atlantic, and (4) the Pacific, including Alaska (and reaching westward as far as Calcutta, India), and Australia. Hearings have been held in the Latin-American, North Atlantic, and South Atlantic proceedings. Under the law, when the Board has reached its decision after a hearing in these international cases, that decision is submitted to the President. The issuance or denial of each certificate is subject to his approval.

The Board realized, of course, that many of the applications, and most of the additional proposed routes which were not in operation before the war involved air transportation to and through the air space of nations with which the United States currently has no operating air arrangements. But in setting these cases down for hearing and decision in a timely manner, the Board was following the necessary statutory requirement that findings of public convenience and necessity should be made as a result of hearings. This action by the Board was designed to permit the prompt inauguration of additional air carrier services abroad when time and conditions are appropriate. Obviously no services can be inaugurated on any of the new routes unless and until suitable arrangements have been concluded with the foreign nations concerned.

It is, of course, clear that after as well as before the war there will be many foreign air carriers operating in the international field. Under existing law, no foreign air carrier can operate to a United States point without a permit issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board after a public hearing and after approval by the President. Although there may be exceptions to this general rule, these hearings upon applications for permits by foreign air carriers would normally take place following the negotiation of suitable air transportation arrangements with the country whose air line seeks such a permit.

We are approaching, therefore, a period of great importance to this country in that the decision period is now almost upon us with respect to the applications of American

flag carriers. These applications will require the determination of many important issues such as the question of whether there should be more than one American flag carrier in the international field; if so, whether they should operate as much as possible in different world areas or whether there should be competition between American flag carriers; whether, if there is to be more than one, there should be any prohibition against a domestic carrier proposing to operate beyond the borders of the United States; and many related questions of an economic and political nature.

Although, as I have indicated, the United States has had a very considerable volume of international operations in the past—it led the world in this respect—the volume of operations in peace times was insignicant compared to what is in store in the future. We expect that international trade and travel routes can be opened up widely and rapidly after this war is over. These routes will give access directly to commercial objectives, unimpeded by shore lines, barriers, and bottlenecks which have plagued other forms of transportation in the past. The impact of air commerce of the future upon our economic, social, cultural, and political life will be enormous. We are riding the crest of a wave of discovery and invention which got under way a hundred or so years ago and which, we hope, is still accumulating force for a much greater future. Someone has said that transportation is civilization. In any event, civilization and this wave of discovery thrive and develop best when it is possible for the people everywhere to profit from the best that is thought and developed by every people elsewhere in the world. High speed, time arresting, world-wide travel, and the resulting acceleration in the exchange of ideas can be a powerful agent in stimulating the creative developments which are possible in the future.

It was under these promising prospects that the Chicago International Civil Aviation Conference was held last November and December. That conference achieved some of the greatest and most progressive steps ever taken in the field of aviation. Before this conference there had been two major attempts to organize the world, or portions of it, in the safety and technical fields of aviation. Neither of them had achieved the widespread acceptance necessary to meet the world-wide requirements of civil aviation for the future.

The first and most important of these attempts was the Paris Convention of 1919. Although an original signatory to this convention, the United States did not ratify it. It was not placed in effect in many important regions of the world. The other major attempt was the Habana Convention of 1928. This convention was expected to apply only in the Western Hemisphere but it has not been ratified by many important countries in this hemisphere. Each of these conventions related to safety and technical matters and neither of them undertook to provide in any way for the establishment of commercial air routes. Although each convention purported to grant so-called "innocent passage" to private aircraft, there was, in many cases, a good deal of red tape involved even in that limited class of international travel.

The Chicago conference produced, among others, five documents of chief importance which were drafted and opened for signature at the conference. The first of these was a new international air navigation convention. It represents one of the most outstanding contributions in the field of civil aviation ever achieved by an aviation conference and reflects the experience gained under the Paris and Habana Conventions. It represents a strictly modern, up-to-date attempt to provide for order and regulation in the safety and technical fields for all types of civil airplane international operations and, if accepted by the nations, will, for the first time, have organized the whole world with respect to the regulation of these very important matters. It provides for a world organization consisting of an assembly and a council. In the assembly each country is to have one vote. Twenty-one nations are to be represented on the council, eight of them nations constituting those of chief importance in air transport, five constituting those not otherwise included which make the largest contribution to the provision of facilities for international civil air navigation, and eight not otherwise included whose election will insure that all major geographical areas of the world are represented. In addition to the jurisdiction of the council over safety and technical matters, it has certain powers of investigation and reporting in other fields as well. It is also to be the repository for the recording of a good deal of statistical information regarding the operation of international air lines and of international agreements relating to air transportation between nations and between any nation and air lines of other nations.

A second document drafted and opened for signature at Chicago is known as the interim agreement. It provides, during the period (not to exceed 3 years) from now until the time when the international convention can be properly ratified by the countries of the world, for a temporary or interim world organization similar in structure to that provided for in the permanent convention. The seat of the interim council is to be in Canada.

The third is the so-called two freedoms document. The first of these freedoms is the privilege accorded by each signing nation to the aircraft operated in civil air transportation by each other signing nation to fly in transit through its air space without any additional special authorization. The second of these freedoms is the privilege accorded by each signing nation to the aircraft operated in civil air transportation of each other signing nation to make nontraffic stops within its territory. The purpose of a nontraffic stop is to take on gasoline and oil, to make repairs, to take refuge from storm, or to meet an emergency. I do not have the time here to appraise accurately the great value of these two so-called freedoms. They are really privileges mutually exchanged in order to promote the cause of international air transportation. Suffice it to say that they are, in my opinion, very great steps forward in connection with the establishment of international air routes; and that is true generally and not only with respect to a particular nation's operations. The second privilege, that of nontraffic stop, in effect throws open those important and much discussed air bases built during this war which will be needed for international civil air transportation so far as they do not have to be used exclusively for military purposes.

The important fourth paper produced at Chicago is the so-called five freedoms document. In addition to including the abovementioned two freedoms, this document also includes the right to carry traffic embarked in the home state to any other state in the world (the third freedom), the right to pick up traffic anywhere in the world destined to the home state (the fourth freedom), and the right to pick up traffic along the route in a foreign state and carry it to another foreign state (the fifth freedom). In the exercise of the so-called five freedoms, routes operated thereunder must be reasonably direct out from and back to the homeland.

The fifth document produced by the Chicago Conference is the so-called standard form of bilateral agreement. Realizing that, of course, not all countries will adhere to the "five freedoms" document and that even with respect to those that do so there may well be an interim period during which international air lines must be operated, some standard clauses for bilateral agreements providing for air routes were developed at Chicago and unanimously recommended by the Conference to all nations for use in any bilateral agreements authorizing such routes. The most important provisions of these standard clauses are: First, that discrimination against any country or its air lines is forbidden; second, the building up of air blocs providing for the exclusive use of air space by any nation in any part of the world it outlawed; and third, the making of international air-transport agreements whether between countries or between a country and an air line is required to be filed with the international body and made public. The conference thus unanimously voted to eliminate the era of secret agreements in the field of international air transportation.

It is too early to prophesy as to the extent to which these agreements will be accepted by the nations of the world. It is not too early, however, to express the very earnest hope and confident expectation that the interim agreement will come into force at a very early date. It will do that when 26 nations have confirmed their signatures to the United States.

As we contemplate the establishment of these important international air trade and travel routes of the future, whether pursuant to bilateral air-transport agreements between nations or eventually under the "five-freedoms agreement" or under some other international arrangement, it is appropriate to inquire about the effect of these routes on trade and travel by sea.

Mark well the point that in the long run the largest portion of international air transport business will be new business which has never before existed. The railroads had developed yearly average per capita railroad passenger miles in the United States to 114 by 1880; to 350 by 1915. But in a very short time the automobile created a whole new volume of traffic; before the war the average yearly per capita motor vehicle passenger-miles were around 1,500. Better and faster ships increased foreign travel by United States citizens from around 1 person annually out of 5,000 to about 1 out of 350 before the war. We do not know the limit of our capacity to trade and travel as the transportation medium improves and the rates go down. Thus a tremendous growth of entirely new business in international air trade and travel is sure to develop when the enlarged opportunity to use the service comes. And as fast travel becomes available to the businessman, his markets and his business expand. Bulk shipments following his business trips will, in all probability, as I shall explain later, go by ship and not by plane, thus enlarging, not diminishing, the business of our merchant marine.

I want to make it unmistakably clear that, as I have just indicated, I do not believe that the air trade and travel routes will be the only trade routes of the future over which the commerce of the world will move. Every new form of transportation, as well as creating new traffic, has diverted some traffic from older forms of transportation. To the extent that air transportation diverts traffic from surface vessels, it will initially consist principally of passenger traffic. When a greatly expanded network of world-wide airways is available, persons interested in speed who might otherwise travel abroad as first- or cabin-class passengers on steamships will have strong motives to go by air. The cost of traveling by air will be competitive with that of first- and cabin-class travel by sea; the time saved by air will range from days to weeks; the inducement to travel by air will be compelling; but the first- and cabin-class

sea travel which is destined to go to the air will, in the long run, be but a minor fraction of the total of international passenger air travel. New air passenger business will constitute the major fraction.

Some limited diversion of ocean cargo to the air will also take place, but it will not constitute more than a very small fraction of the sea total, so far as we can now see. Until international air cargo rates can compete economically with ocean shipping rates the percentage of diversion will be small. Of the 7,225,124 tons of exports from the United States to the United Kingdom in 1938, only 260.4 tons, or 0.004 percent, bore rates of more than 5 cents a ton-mile; over one-third of the total tons exported was shipped at less than half a cent a ton-mile. Air cargo rates up to now have been many times higher. It will be a long time, if ever, before air cargo rates will be able even to approach most of the ocean rates. Ocean transport, so long as it remains the cheapest means of freight movement in the world, must be counted upon to continue to transport bulk cargo. Air transportation will be obliged to be content with only a small amount of diverted cargo where time, competitive considerations, or unusual circumstances control the medium of shipment.

Thus, the diversion of passenger traffic, and the limited diversion of cargo traffic, to the air most decidedly does not mean a destruction of the United States merchant marine. Ships will still carry the bulk of the exports and imports of the United States.

In 1938 the United States merchant marine consisted of 27,155 vessels having a gross tonnage of 14,651,000. Of this total, however, only 1,575 vessels, having a gross tonnage of 3,550,815, were registered and engaged in the foreign trade. Sixty percent of the vessels engaged in the foreign trade, representing 54 percent of the gross tonnage, were in the freight services; 5 percent of the vessels, representing 14 percent of the tonnage, were tankers; and 22 percent of the vessels, representing 3 percent of the tonnage, had their services classified as dredging, ferry, fishing, oystering, pile driving, towing, wrecking, pilot boat, patrol boat, refrigerator, whaling, and miscellaneous. Thus, a total of 87 percent of the number of vessels, representing 71 percent of the gross tonnage engaged in the foreign trade are in services which stand to benefit from an increase in exports and imports brought about by increased world trade which, as I have already indicated, I am certain will be stimulated by the quickened movement by air of business mail and the swift transportation of businessmen throughout the world. I would like to stress here that, in my opinion, the new business which will be developed cannot be measured accurately by any formula applied to past business. As I have shown, this acceleration of business activity resulted from railroad operations. It was the same again when the automobile arrived. I prophesy with confidence that history will repeat itself in this respect when the airplane blazes the way for new kinds and volumes of trade.

Two hundred and five, or 13 percent, of the 1,575 vessels of the United States merchant marine engaged in the foreign trade carried passengers; these vessels had a gross tonnage of 1,047,632, or 29 percent of the 3,550,815 gross tonnage of vessels engaged in the foreign trade. Those 1,575 out of the total 27,155 vessels constitute the group which stands to have its first- and cabin-class passenger traffic subject to diversion to the air. That may appear to some of you as a large, and to others of you as a small number of vessels and amount of tonnage to be so affected. Of more interest to me at the moment, however, is the fact that to the extent that this diversion to the air is captured by American-flag air lines, it will be captured primarily from operators of foreign ships. So far as I know, the facts relating to this and certain related matters were for the first time placed in air transportation perspective in a recent study made by F. H. Crozier of the Civil Aeronautics Board.[1]

In the first place, first- and cabin-class sea travel constitutes only a portion of the total sea travel. In 1938, there were a total of 1,057,516 overseas sea passengers between the United States and other countries. Four hundred and ninety-five thousand five hundred and seven, or 46.9 percent, were second-, third-, or tourist-class; 562,009 were first and cabin class. We are dealing, therefore, with the effects of diversion upon roughly 53.1 percent of the total sea passenger traffic between the United States and other countries. The important fact in this possible diversion, however, is, as I have indicated, that it would not all come from our merchant marine.

In 1938 only about 25 percent of the gross revenue received for transporting passengers between the United States and overseas destinations was received by vessels of United States registry; foreign vessels received approximately 75 percent of such revenue. This was despite the fact that United States residents were contributing about 70 percent of the gross passenger revenue in overseas travel between this and other countries. These are general averages. Different areas vary widely. For example, in the trans-Atlantic region, vessels of United States registry secured only 9 percent of the passenger revenue although United States residents contributed 72 percent of the total passenger revenue for travel in this area; vessels of foreign registry secured 91 percent of the passenger revenue at the same time that foreign residents were contributing only 28 percent of the total passenger revenue for travel in the trans-Atlantic area.

A diversion then of even all first- and cabin-class passenger traffic to the air would have its principal effect upon foreign surface carriers rather than upon ou own merchant marine. If, as first- and cabin-class traffic is diverted to the air, United States air carriers step in and capture only one-half of the diverted traffic, there will be a net gain to United States interests. The initiative and resourcefulness of our air carriers should enable us to establish a merchant air fleet in keeping with the importance of the contribution which we make to world passenger travel.

Another important consideration in the penetration of sea by air travel is the probability that the revenues of ships serving United States overseas traffic which is normally attributable to first- and cabin-class travel are approximately 8 percent of the aggregate operating revenues of these carriers. The area of competition between air and sea in terms of total steamship revenues promises, therefore, to be relatively small in the immediate future.

Air transportation will not destroy ocean shipping or our merchant marine. It is not at all improbable that these limited adverse effects upon ocean shipping will never be noticed for the reason that the increased business activity which will be stimulated by air transportation will produce other new traffic in such abundance that the losses will be more than compensated for. Ocean shipping and air transportation are both destined to remain and both destined to grow.

[1] Overseas Air Service Patterns; Travel Distribution and Composition—All Areas: Report by F. H. Crozier, Chief, Research and Analysis Division, Economic Bureau, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C., December 1944. The material in the next four paragraphs is drawn in large part from this report.

Final Decision on Iwo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maj. George Fielding Eliot:

FINAL DECISION ON IWO IS SEEN UP TO THE INFANTRY, AS ALWAYS—BITTER FIGHTING PROVES AGAIN THAT PREPONDERANCE OF WEAPONS IS NOT ENOUGH—AND THE SUPERIORITY OF UNITED STATES GROUND FORCES IS THE GUARANTY OF VICTORY

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

As inevitably happens, when the guns and the bombs have done all that they can do of their own power, the final decision on Iwo Island is being sought by the ground fighting team—the infantry, with artillery, air, and armored support.

The marines of the Fourth and Fifth Marine Divisions must kill the intrenched Japanese defenders, rooting them out of holes and caves, or slaughtering them in the open when opportunity offers. Rifles, grenade, bayonet, automatic weapons, and the supporting arms must work together in a great symphony of death—rising to the final crescendo when the last of Iwo's defenders are herded together in a final stand somewhere in the northern hills, or come out to meet their end in a last suicide charge after the Japanese fashion.

MAN ON THE GROUND DECIDES

On a large scale or a small, this is the end of all campaigns. The decision must be gained by the man on the ground. He needs the help of other arms; indeed, he cannot succeed without it. One of the great Japanese weaknesses in this war lies in their second-rate artillery, armor, and air-ground cooperation. Yet wherever their infantry has fought it has made us pay a bitter price to overcome it, even with the faulty and sometimes nonexistent support that it has had. That fact in itself should be sufficient testimony to the value of good infantry even in this war of machines.

The truth is that man is neither a marine animal nor a flying animal. He can travel on the surface of the sea, or he can fly in the air, but his ability to remain there is subject to the limitations of the machines by which he translates himself from his native earth to the unnatural element. It is on the surface of the earth that man lives, and has his being; there are his hopes, there his future. From the earth he draws his sustenance, and in it he will at last come to rest. It is on the surface of the earth that his great decisions of war and of peace are taken. This has always been so, and insofar as human prescience may judge, it always will be so.

Despite all the claims of all the magicians and soothsayers, this war is ending where every war in human history has ended—in final battles on the surface of the earth, fought by men on foot. These men bear and are accompanied by weapons that would appear strange and terrible indeed to the phalangite of Alexander, to the legionary of Scipio or Caesar, to the English archer who won the day at Crecy and Agincourt, or to the Swiss pikeman who humbled the armored chivalry of Charles the Bold. Yet the heir

of all these generations of sturdy and invincible infantry is the doughboy of today; the Marine on Iwo, the Highlander rooting the Huns out of the ruins of Goch, the Russian guardsman storming through the streets of Breslau. Sarissa and pilum, longbow and halberd have given place to the automatic rifle, the bazooka, the machine gun, and the mortar; but the bayonet still reminds us that even in the mechanized warfare of today, men still must have a weapon with which they can kill each other in hand-to-hand fighting.

The taking of Iwo will be complete when the enemy's infantry has been defeated or—as is more likely—destroyed. "Iowa Jima," said Vice Admiral Richmond Kelly Turner to a correspondent, "is as well defended a fixed position as exists in the world today. It is small, but better defended and better organized for defense than any island with which I am acquainted." And the admiral has made the acquaintance of quite a number of defended islands.

THE PRICE OF VICTORY

So once again we must pay the price of victory—in the blood of our bravest and best. Once again we relearn the grim lesson that war cannot be won merely by a preponderance of machines and material weapons. Such a preponderance is invaluable, and we are lucky, indeed, that we are able to provide it in so lavish a measure to our fighting men on their far-flung battle fronts. But it is not enough. It gives us victory at less cost, but not at no cost. It is precisely because the Germans no longer have enough men left to man their mechanical armament and still to provide an adequate force of good infantry that they are suffering defeat after defeat. It is precisely because the Russians not only have plenty of mechanical armament but also outnumber the Germans two or three to one in solid infantry formations that they are rolling on toward Berlin. It is precisely because our British Allies and ourselves are at last able to build up our infantry formations to a strength decisively superior to the Germans' in the west that we are beginning to gain ground, and will gain a great deal more ground in the immediate future.

And it is because, in the last grim analysis, the final test of the flaming crucible of war, the American infantry man—Army or marine—is a better fighting man than his Japanese opponent, that we are winning Iwo as we have won every other position which we have attacked since the first marines set foot on the shores of Guadalcanal back in the summer of 1942. We have a better Navy than the Japanese, we have more and better air power, we have better all-around armament, we have a better staff and better coordination of the several arms—but if we did not have better infantry, these things would not bring us victory.

Lincoln and Our Foreign Policy Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, in these days of overwhelming responsibilities and of swift changes in world affairs, in governments, in the very objectives of our citizens for their Government, it affords a refreshing bit of reorientation to pick up a speech lately delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. The Senator from Michigan reviews for us the concepts of our predecessors in Government, whose minds were less troubled by the complexity of individual and governmental affairs with which we are confronted today, and who, it seems to me, were more likely, if not actually much more able, to see clearly many implications which appear but dimly to us. For this reason I have welcomed the opportunity to read the distinguished Senator's words, prepared for delivery near the tomb of Abraham Lincoln, in his city of Springfield, Ill., on his birth-date anniversary, February 12, 1945. I cherish for all my colleagues the same opportunity, and therefore ask unanimous consent that the address by the Senator from Michigan be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a privilege and honor for me to talk to you tonight in Abraham Lincoln's memory. It is indeed fitting for us to pay tribute to this great man here in the city of Springfield, where he lived for almost a quarter of a century. As he practiced law here and rode out over the old eighth circuit with the lawyers and judges of his day, and as he lived the life of an active citizen participating in the civic and social activities of the community, he formed a great many strong and loyal friendships which clung to him through life and had a vital and indispensable part in his elevation to the high office of the Presidency. Springfield will continue to be rich throughout all time because of its historic association with him.

In Lincoln's day Springfield was a busy frontier city, the capital of a frontier State, deep in the heart of the middle valley of America. This middle valley played a great part in the fostering and development of our American democracy. The hardy pioneers who peopled its sweeping plains were devoted disciples of those principles of freedom, justice, and democracy which Lincoln championed with unceasing devotion. And it was from the lips of your most illustrious citizen, at the high tide of war, that the message went out to all the world that a government was determined to endure, based upon the immortal truth that under the laws of nature and of God all men were created equal and endowed with the sacred right of liberty.

Lincoln came to the Presidency in a tragic era. Under him the Nation was engulfed in civil war over issues which threatened our national existence. He had seen these issues unfolding and growing more and more critical long before he became President. He discerned more clearly than most of his contemporaries what a real threat to the integrity of the American union was contained in the problem of slavery and the fundamental question of State rights, which had become the paramount issue as the bitter antagonism between the North and South came to a grave crisis.

In 1858, right here in Springfield, he stated the problem in these words:

"A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved, I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other."

As he waited here in Springfield after his election and before his inauguration, he saw the threat of secession become an accomplished fact; he saw the Union broken asunder by the withdrawal of one State after another, and he was not able to lift a finger to stem the tragic tide. Then almost immediately following his inauguration the Nation was swept into civil war.

There are many evidences to show that periodically, from generation to generation and from century to century, mankind meets with the same great problems. This leads people to conclude that history repeats itself. And today American history is repeating itself, although not in precisely the same outward forms and events.

True, we are not engaged in a great civil war, testing whether this Nation or any nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal can long endure. But we are at war again, the second time in 25 years. We are fighting today for a new application of the great truths for which Lincoln and the people of his time made immeasurable sacrifices.

All through history men have sought for the road to peace between nations and brotherhood between men.

Long before the time of Christ, statesmen talked of organizations, and they established leagues to preserve peace among states and to foster good will among men. The Chinese, the Greeks, the Romans all labored over the problem of securing peace by disarmament, by agreement, by the application of force to prevent and repress aggression. Christ was the supreme advocate of peace and brotherhood. The Peace Palace at the Hague, Woodrow Wilson's fourteen points, the League of Nations are modern evidences of this age-long quest of humanity for peace and brotherhood.

Back of every true interpretation of history must lie these two great purposes—to accomplish peace between nations and the brotherhood among men. Call these ideals if you will. Criticize them as fantastic and impractical. But they are the embodiment of the Sermon on the Mount, the real justification of Christianity, the ideals of the great world religions. They are the stars to which men must forever harness their destiny, if mankind is to be lifted above the savagery of incessant war.

The great modern attempt to organize the world to maintain peace and to work toward freedom and justice for all mankind began, of course, when Woodrow Wilson set forth for fourteen points, along with the technical points for ending World World No. 1. Wilson laid down the principles for a just and honorable peace for victor and vanquished alike, just as Lincoln sought a peace between the North and South, without revenge or bitterness:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us * * * do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace * * *."

And even as Lincoln saw the significance of his acts in wider service to mankind, seeking to achieve "a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations," so Wilson called for "a general association of nations," which he hoped would become the basis of peace and justice in the same way that Lincoln and the fathers of our country regarded the Union as the prime condition of peace between the States.

Thus it was in the fiery furnace of World War No. 1 that this modern practical plan for world peace was forged—the League of Nations. It proved inadequate for many reasons, but no doubt largely because the world at heart was not yet ready for it.

In 20 years men failed to perfect the machinery which might have saved the world; today we are paying the price of this failure, in the form of a second world war.

But now we believe that a new spirit is abroad, the firm conviction that if we do not find and follow the road toward an effective world organization, then mankind is doomed to a third world war. And that war, on a scale which modern science and air warfare will make possible, will level our vaunted civilization to the shambles and ruins which

mark the path of modern armies and air armadas.

So as we contemplate the grave emergency which our Nation faces today, engaged in a world-wide struggle for the very life of our Nation and the preservation of freedom and democracy, it seems to me that history is repeating itself; that there is a striking parallel between the situation in which we now find ourselves and the critical situation which faced the Nation in Lincoln's day. He prayed that the Nation might have a new birth of freedom. We fight today to give freedom to all men everywhere. The Atlantic Charter expresses the hope that a peace may be established under which all nations may dwell in safety and all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom.

Lincoln exhorted the Nation to be dedicated to the proposition that "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." Today we battle to preserve popular government and to secure for all the nations of the earth, great and small, as the Atlantic Charter declares, the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. And the Dumbarton Oaks Conference laid down the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states.

As is true of our Nation today, when Lincoln came to the Presidency he was faced with grave domestic difficulties and critical foreign relations. The South took up arms to justify its claimed right to a separate national existence; foreign nations had to decide whether they should recognize the Confederacy as a separate government. One of the severest tests Lincoln had to meet was to so handle our Nation's foreign relations as to influence or persuade the nations to refrain from recognizing the Confederacy as a separate government.

He felt himself, at the outset, totally unprepared to cope with the problems of foreign policy. He was appalled by the prospect of having to deal with foreign nations. To William H. Seward, his Secretary of State, he declared shortly before his inauguration: "There is one part of my work that I shall have to leave largely to you. I shall have to depend upon you for taking care of these matters of foreign affairs, of which I know so little, and with which I reckon you are familiar."

On another occasion he said: "I don't know anything about diplomacy. I will be very apt to make blunders."

Less than a month after the inauguration, Seward wrote that very unusual letter to Lincoln in which he stated that the administration was without a policy, either domestic or foreign, and urged that a policy should be adopted and then energetically prosecuted. There are people today in Washington and throughout the country who feel that right now there should be a clear and specific statement of our foreign policy. On January 10 of this year, I declared on the floor of the Senate, that "the time has come for the Senate to clarify its views in the interest of national unity on a strong effective foreign policy," and that "the Senate should pass a resolution embodying a clear minimum statement of principles to which every Member can subscribe who believes enduring peace depends on teamwork." Then I proposed such a resolution, to which I will later refer.

As in our own day, foreign relations during Lincoln's administration involved many purely technical problems. The North had to combat the sympathetic attitude of other nations toward the Southern Confederacy in its attempts to run the Union blockade; it saw the South receive substantial assistance from England, in permitting fast-running cruisers to be built in British ports, later to overhaul and destroy on the high seas unarmed steamers and freighters flying the United States flag. There was the continual struggle to prevent recognition of the Southern Confederacy by other nations. Lincoln and Seward strove to establish the fact that the rebellion was a purely domestic matter which was not subject to the laws of war. But the creation of the blockade involved the right to search foreign vessels on the high seas, and this could not be done except in time of war. Hence the Government abandoned the fiction of insurrection, recognized the fact of war, and proceeded to apply the rules of international law in order to define the rights and obligations of neutral nations.

There was the famous Trent affair, when Captain Wilkes of the United States Steamship *San Jacinto*, intercepted the British packet *Trent*, boarded it, and arrested and removed James Mason and John Slidell, Confederate agents, who were on their way to Europe to solicit aid for the Confederacy.

There were potential difficulties with France, England, and Russia over the situation in Mexico. The dwindling supply of southern cotton upon which the mills of England depended for their raw material, created wide-spread distress, unemployment, and unrest among the English working classes, and raised other difficult questions between Britain and the United States. Seward even went so far as to suggest that by fomenting a foreign war the North and the South might be united in a common cause, but this suggestion, of course, received no serious consideration.

As Isac N. Arnold observed, however, Lincoln at length impressed the leading traits of his character upon our foreign policy. Arnold, as you know, was a Member of Congress during the Civil War and one of Lincoln's closest friends and confidants. Of the development of American policy under Lincoln, he stated that frankness, straightforward integrity, patient forebearance, and unbroken faith in the triumph of the Union and liberty, based upon his trust and confidence in the Almighty and the American people, characterized his foreign policy, which was simple and thoroughly American; that our representatives were instructed to ask nothing but was clearly right, to avoid difficulty, and to maintain peace, if it could be done consistently with our national honor; that the record of the diplomatic correspondence of the United States during the critical years of this administration is one of which Americans may justly be proud.

Lincoln looked beyond the technical issues of foreign policy to the broader questions of human relations and associations. His paramount purposes to preserve the Union of the States was the deep underlying motive which enabled him to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion. Only in the preservation of the Union was it possible, as he saw it, to perpetuate our form of popular government in the world. He expressed his deep yearning for the preservation of the Union in his letter to Horace Greeley, in 1862, when he asserted that he would save the Union the shortest way under the Constitution; that his paramount object in the war was to save the Union, and was not either to save or destroy slavery; he even declared that if he could save the Union without freeing a single slave he would do it, but that, on the other hand, if he could save it by freeing all the slaves, he would that. "What I do about slavery," he said, "I do because I believe it helps to save this Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union."

Lincoln was not the first American statesman to recognize that the preservation of the American Union was indispensable to the maintenance and perpetuation of government based upon the principles of freedom and democracy. Washington in his Farewell Address urged that the efficacy and permanency of the Union should be maintained, and that the Constitution in existence was sacredly obligatory upon all. Henry Clay in 1850 declared that the American Union was a sacred connection of the States, "which no human authority can dissolve or divorce the parties from." And Webster's words have a familiar ring to all of us, "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

All joined in the one noble sentiment that only by the preservation and perpetuation of the American Union could government based upon the principles of freedom, justice, and democracy be preserved not only for our own people but for all the nations of the earth.

Lincoln went far beyond his predecessors, however, in his ardent devotion to these principles as the foundation of human association.

Thomas Jefferson was not thinking merely of the American people when he wrote in the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Lincoln was thinking in terms of all humanity when, in 1859, he declared that the principles enunciated by Jefferson in that immortal document "are definitions and axioms of free society, abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times." These principles, these self-evident truths, were to him the very breath of life.

He was thinking in terms of all humanity when, at Philadelphia on February 22, 1861, he stood on the very spot where these sentiments originated and were given to the world, and declared that he had never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. There he said that he had often pondered over the dangers incurred by the men who assembled there and framed and adopted that Declaration; that he had often inquired of himself what great principle or idea it was that kept this Confederacy so long together; he felt that it was not the mere matter of separation of the Colonies from the motherland, but that it was that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance. He wondered whether the country could be saved on that basis. If it could, he said that he would be the happiest of men in the world if he could so help to save it. "If it cannot be saved upon that principle," he asserted, "it will be truly awful. But if this country cannot be saved without giving up that principle, I was about to say I would rather be assassinated on this spot than surrender it."

So Lincoln's problem of the preservation of the Union and the perpetuation of the principles of freedom, justice, and equality led him to look beyond the domestic situation, beyond questions of technical diplomacy, to the very foundations of civilization. He saw union and democracy as the only real hope all men. America could be a pattern for all men. America could bea pattern for others. And, I am sure, if he were here to face the problems of our time, he would agree that the thing with which we must deal constructively and immediately is the formation of an enduring association of peoples capable of maintaining world peace and capable of extending the principles of freedom, justice, and equality—democracy—throughout the world.

The problem now is the same as that which he faced, but on a world-wide scale. The solution of our problem may require the application of the principles enunciated at the

Dumbarton Oaks Conference, just as Lincoln's problem could be solved only by the preservation of the American Union. But if the present-day problem is actually to be solved, it will require the application of those principles for which Lincoln struggled and literally gave his life.

These American historic principles, broadened so as to apply to the nations of the world, are embodied in different forms in the Atlantic Charter, the Senate document known as the Connally resolution, and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. It is my earnest hope that as we study and endeavor to apply the principles laid down in these various documents we may in the end find the solution to the problem of world peace; that as Lincoln found the solution to his problem in the preservation of this Union, so we may find the solution to our problem in the actual formation and functioning of a union of the peace-loving nations of the world.

The Atlantic Charter is a declaration of the historic principles of liberty, justice, and equality to be applied to all the nations, great and small alike.

In January 1942, 26 nations subscribed to the common program of purposes and principles embodied in this joint declaration; and each of the 26 pledged itself to cooperate with the others that signed the declaration for complete victory over their enemies, in order to defend life, liberty, independence, and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands.

The Atlantic Charter announced eight common principles in the national policies of the two countries, on which the President and Mr. Churchill declared their nations based their hopes for a better future for the world. These declarations provided that they would seek no territorial or other aggrandizement; that they desire no territorial changes except in accordance with the wishes of the peoples concerned; that all peoples should have the right to choose their form of government and that there should be the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government; that all states should have free access to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity; that there should be economic collaboration between all nations to secure for all improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security; that there should be an established peace affording all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their boundaries, assuring that all men in all lands may live a freedom; a peace which will enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance; and that all nations, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force.

In the third and fourth paragraphs of the resolution which I proposed on January 10, I called upon the United States Senate to declare that "the United States stands unreservedly on its historic American principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter, and intends to do its utmost to bring about the application of such principles throughout the world; "and that the United States will formuulate its post-war policies along diplomatic and economic lines which will exert its full influence toward universal application of these principles."

On that occasion I urged that, in order to bring about the application of these principles throughout the world, we should serve notice on other nations that those who are to receive the full post-war economic collaboration of the United States must live up to those principles in a reasonable degree.

By securing the world-wide application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, I believe that Lincoln's dream for world-wide peace among all nations can and will be made to come true. The people of all nations must dedicate themselves to such principles to accomplish this.

When the Connally resolution was before the Senate, I was one of the sponsors of the amendment which called for the establishment, at the earliest practicable date, of a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States, and open to membership by all such States, large and smal, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

As that resolution was finally approved it declared the sense of the Senate to be that the war be waged to complete victory; that the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace; that the United States join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world; and that there be established at the earliest practicable date the international organization to which I have already referred.

In my resolution of January 10 I urged not only the formation at the earliest possible moment of a United Nations organization, but that there should be formed immediately a United Nations council to supervise, when necessary, the life of liberated territories until stable governments can be set up by the free choice of the people involved, and to deal with other diplomatic and political issues that may arise and cannot wait until a permanent United Nations organization can be formally ratified.

I further urged the Senate to declare that the permanent United Nations organization should be formed along the lines tentatively drafted at Dumbarton Oaks, and that the United States is prepared to accept its share of responsibility, even to the use of force, if necessary, to act within the framework of such an organization to keep the peace and prevent aggression.

I felt then and feel now that enduring peace depends upon the formation of such international organization, as a channel through which the people of peace-loving nations can merge their desires and their efforts to prevent future wars, and that such an organization must be rooted deeply in the very principles to which Lincoln was so ardently devoted, the principles of justice, freedom, and equality that have always motivated men of good will everywhere.

American must take the lead if we are to prevent a third world war. To do that we must have a foreign policy so strong, clear, and unified that no one in this country and no one in any other country can misunderstand it, and that has for its aim, the winning of the war, and second, the setting up of an enduring peace.

And, as I have said, these objectives can best be accomplished by the formation of an international organization along the lines suggested by the Dumbarton Oaks Conference.

The purposes of the organization proposed by that conference include the maintenance of international peace and security by taking effective measures for the prevention and removal of aggression or other breaches of the peace that would likely cause another world war; the development of friendly relations among nations and other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace; the achievement of international cooperation in the solution of international problems; and the creating of a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the achievement of these common ends.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals define the principles upon which this international organization could be formed and outline the framework of such organization in considerable detail. Of course the proposals are tentative and incomplete, but they furnish a basis upon which we can work.

As we contemplate the part that the United States will have to assume in the formation of such an organization and the carrying out of its provisions and purposes, we see many difficult and complex problems which will have to be solved. But we can accept the axiom that there is no problem on earth which canont be solved if the proper willingness and skill are applied to it. Courage, tolerance, and insight are needed in the approach to any such problem.

In connection with the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, questions arise as to the treaty-making powers of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; the power to declare war and the authority to recognize a state of war; and the new question of the use of force, if necessary, to preserve peace and prevent aggression.

The charter of the proposed organization would empower the security council, which it creates, to determine what diplomatic, economc, or other measures not involving the use of armed force should be employed to give effect to its decisions, and to call upon members of the organization to apply such measures, which may include complete or partial interruption of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication and the severance of diplomatic and economic relations. It would further provide that should the security council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security, and that such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the organization. It also provides that the members of the organization for this purpose should make available to the security council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements concluded among themselves, armed forces, facilities, and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security; that such agreements should govern the members and types of forces and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided, and should be negotiated as soon as possible, and should be subject to approval by the security council and to the ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

My view is that the charter of the proposed peace organization containing these and other provisions should be submitted by the President to the Senate of the United States for ratification as a treaty, under clause 2 of section 2, article II, of the Constitution, which provides:

"He [the President] shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

My reason for saying this charter should be ratified as a treaty is that I believe it constitutes not merely an Executive agreement or compact that could be made by the President alone, but that it actually is a treaty. The Supreme Court of the United States has said that treaties require ratification when they are made between two or more independent nations with a view to the public welfare. Certainly under this definition the charter proposed by the Dumbarton Oaks Conference would be a treaty and require ratification by the Senate.

One of my purposes in drafting and proposing the resolution of January 10 was to provide that the Senate should exercise its full responsibility in relation to the negotiating and ratifying of treaties. The Senate, of course, cannot approve a treaty before it is presented in writing. And without the advice of the Senate the President cannot give assurances that the treaty he is negotiating will be acceptable to the Senate. Is our constitutional division of power in respect to the making of treaties to be an excuse for other nations to say they are forced to return to the old power politics, spheres-of-influence way of doing business, which has

always in the end led to war, and which if it leads to another great war may lead to the end of freedom and even civilization itself?

I do not think this need happen. But if we are to make certain that it will not happen through any fault of ours, the Senate should exercise its full responsibility under the Constitution, and advise the President, in broad but specific terms, what the Senate believes our foreign policy should be, and what kind of an association of nations to keep the peace we Americans believe in. We should discharge our responsibility under the Constitution, clarify our position beyond doubt as specifically and plainly as is possible, and count on the President to discharge his.

The acts to be performed under the proposed charter of the international organization in regard to the severance of diplomatic relations, the application of sanctions, the use of force, are political questions. They are questions of policy and therefore must be authorized by congressional acts, to be binding upon the American people. Congress alone has the power to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces and to provide for calling for the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasion. Congress may provide for the extraterritorial use of force in future contingencies under its power to punish piracy and offenses against the law of nations. Congress has power to make all laws necessary and proper for executing treaties. Congress must decide whether the American people want any of our naval or military forces to be used by an international organization or to do any other act which will be binding on us as a people or a nation. These acts are beyond our treaty-making power or the power of the President. Both Houses of Congress and the President must exercise them, and they should be determined before a treaty ratifes an international organization.

We have had no means of enforcing international law. International law lacked effectiveness because there was no sure and certain sanction or remedy against those who broke it.

The international gangsters of aggression had a license from all nations except his helpless victim. It was only after other peace-loving nations arose in their righteous indignation, to save the overrun nation, that a world war was started.

The Security Council of Dumbarton Oaks Charter distinguishes between the force to be used by the international command and the regular armed forces to be used by a nation after a declaration of war by that nation.

The Security Council will have no power to declare war for the United States. The charter contemplates that the United States would have to declare war in the regular way, by act of Congress. Only a regular declaration of war would permit the President to use our armed forces to the full extent permitted by international law and to use the war powers permitted by our Constitution.

If this is to be our policy, then Congress should pass a law making available to the Security Council armed forces, facilities, and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. This law should specifically provide and govern the number and type of forces and the nature of the facilities and the assistance to be provided for the Security Council. And since Congress alone has the power to declare war, the law would have to further provide that such forces may be used by the Security Council when, under the vote as provided for in the charter, the Security Council found such armed forces should be used, with those of other nations, to maintain and keep international peace and security.

Before the United States could be a party to such an international agreement Congress would be compelled to pass a law giving our delegate or representative in the Security Council the same power as possessed by the delegates of the other major nations as members of the organization.

Our delegate, under the Dumbarton Oaks Charter, would be somewhat like an ambassador whose duty it is to learn the facts and to keep in touch with the President. The foreign policy of our country, up to the point of making treaties or breaching them, is in the hands of the President, and our ambassadors and ministers are his representatives. The delegate to such an organization would be a representative of the United States authorized by law to act for us. Congress could reserve the right to instruct our delegate and, of course, to remove him at will.

It would be only in those cases which arose like a hurricane that no instructions could be given, but certainly past history shows that the necessity for action does not come with such speed but only from situations which have continued over months or even years. However, we must be prepared for and provide for situations requiring the use of force to maintain or restore international peace and security following the happening of an event that will come like a hurricane, for it is such an event that worries some of our citizens and such contingencies must be met. Certainly such an occasion would be rare, if ever. Normally our delegate would be sitting with the other representatives in the Security Council in almost continuous session and there would be a staff of sufficient size to follow international developments and gather facts so as to be able to keep the President advised of current situations, and he in turn would keep Congress advised.

Prior to using force, we should be willing to use embargoes, cut off diplomatic relations, withdraw ambassadors and ministers, and freeze credits and moneys, if such acts are necessary to keep international peace and security. We have not found difficulty in doing this in the past, and I anticipate none in the future. But it will be the right of the organization to use military force when necessary that will make the organization an effective weapon to prevent aggression and world wars. Supporting justice there must be authority and force. It is the force the unjust fear, and the justice the just desire.

We must remember that we are going to form this international organization not only for the immediate future, but for many years to come. We do not anticipate any big wars immediately after we have won this one, but we must look ahead, 25 or 50 years hence.

Important questions have been left undecided by the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, such as the voting procedure in the security council, details regarding the organization and functions of an international court, and the size and type of the so-called trigger force, which is to be held immediately available to make possible the taking of urgent military measures by the organization. We hope the present conference has considered these and other questions which were left undecided. A further conference of the associated nations will have to be held in order to ratify the charter and the agreement provided for and to give the smaller nations their proper place. This is very vital, and I assume that the smaller nations will ask that they share in efforts that will be exerted in connection with the keeping of the peace.

There are other elements in our foreign policy which we might with much profit consider. There are many details in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals to which I have not even made reference, all of which are important to the proper understanding of the plan laid down and to its effective functioning. But we have made a fair start, we have exerted a noble effort, toward the formation of such an international organization as will insure, we fondly hope, the establishment and the maintenance of a just and permanent peace in the post-war world. It is the machinery of an organization and not merely men that will be needed. The people, however, as a whole must be back of such a plan to make it work.

I believe that the spirit of Lincoln lives and works today in the hearts of all Americans who are laboring together to solve this problem of international peace and security, and for the application of the principles of liberty, justice, and equality to all mankind. Our brief study of Lincoln's philosophy and ideals leads to the conclusion that the Atlantic Charter, the Connally resolution and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals all contain declarations in accord with his own convictions and to which he would have subscribed fully.

Let us, as Americans, here and throughout this broad land, now highly resolve that our dead on the battlefields of the world shall not have died in vain, that everywhere there shall be a new birth of freedom, and that the principles of liberty, justice, and equality shall not perish from the earth. Let us strive on to finish the work we are in and "to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace * * * with all nations."

Collaboration of Chinese With Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, recently I had the honor to have a statement broadcast by the O. W. I. to the people of China. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the Chinese theater of war is growing in importance in the over-all picture of this global war, there is a statement of special significance from China's general, Ho Ying-Chin. General Ho is speaking in his dual capacity as China's Chief of Staff and chief of the newly established supply depot at Junming. General Ho said that the Japanese were deploying up to 50 vital divisions on the Chinese mainland in a bid to stem a possible American landing on the coast. And he added the following cheering promise: "We are making a new disposition of troops and planning an effective offensive to collaborate with Allied movements toward victory."

It is certainly most gratifying to hear this resolve of our Chinese allies. Let us hope that General Ho's promise will soon be complemented by efficient and organized action. If we learn of such action, it will, in turn, stimulate us to try and help our Chinese allies even more. If the Chinese from the west and the Americans from the east actively cooperate in driving out the Japanese invaders, the fate of Japan will ultimately be the same as the fate of Germany. Germany's fate is sealed, because Allies from two sides are crushing the enemy. Let us hope that the promised offensive of General Ho will complement our own offensive in the same way.

Treatment of Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I append hereto the following resolution recently passed by Somerville Post, No. 19, of the American Legion located in Somerville, Mass., with reference to the treatment of prisoners of war.

FEBRUARY 15, 1945.

Somerville Post, No. 19, the American Legion, in compliance with motion adopted at the regular meeting of February 1, 1945, your committee on resolutions submits the following:

"Whereas the military authorities in this vicinity have in their custody certain alien prisoners of war; and

"Whereas upon occasions groups of the prisoners, with the consent of said military authorities, have been transported at Government expense to attend parties and banquets conducted in their honor and for their enjoyment by organizations bearing hyphenated names and apparently of hyphenated allegiance; and

"Whereas such treatment of prisoners of war goes far beyond any provision of international law or treaty dealing with the subject and is in sharp contrast to the reported treatment accorded members of our armed forces who have become prisoners of our enemies; and

"Whereas one such group was recently entertained in such manner within our city in defiance of the expressed opposition of a large number of the citizens of this city and of our organization: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Somerville Post, No. 19, the American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, Incorporated, in regular meeting assembled, in Somerville, on February 1, 1945, express its indignation at this continued pampering and coddling of those who so recently were actually engaged in killing our sons and brothers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the War Department instruct the military authorities in this area to discontinue such treatment of prisoners of war at once; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the War Department, to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to the local press."

Respectfully submitted.

ALBERT J. GOGUEN,
Chairman.

De Gaulle Incident

REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, there has been called to my attention an Associated Press article dated Jacksonville, Fla., February 21, 1945, quoting in part a statement by my colleague and friend, Representative PRICE, of Florida, stating that he and a delegation of Members of Congress were snubbed by General de Gaulle, at an airfield near Paris, by the refusal of General de Gaulle to meet the delegation, and further, that I, speaking French, had carried on the negotiations, without success. Representative PRICE is quite correct in his statement except for the fact that the reason given and the circumstances are not mentioned.

In all fairness to General de Gaulle, I think it proper that I should explain to the House the circumstances surrounding this incident.

Our party was on its way to visit a hospital in Cherbourg and arrived at the D'Orsy Airport to board a plane, and noted a large military and official assembly on the field, and, upon inquiry, we were informed that General de Gaulle was expected to land at the field momentarily.

The members of the party having included in their itinerary a visit to General de Gaulle, decided that to save time, they would be glad to meet the general at that time.

I was delegated to make the arrangements for the meeting, and I contacted the officer in charge of the troops, and he advised that it would be quite agreeable for us to meet the general upon his arrival.

However, a few minutes later, prior to the arrival of General de Gaulle, the officer I had contacted returned with a superior officer, who, we were told, looked after "protocol" in the general's cabinet, and he explained to us that he was very much disappointed but that, according to protocol, it would not be proper for the general to receive us at the airport; however, that immediately upon the arrival of the general he would be delighted to arrange for a reception of our committee by General de Gaulle at his headquarters at Paris.

The majority of the delegation decided that since our plane was ready to depart, we would forego the invitation to return to Paris for the reception at that time. About that time the plane of General de Gaulle landed and he alighted and made a beeline to salute his troops, after which he entered a waiting automobile and was whisked away.

It is true that he passed within approximately 15 feet of where we were standing, but I know it to be certain that he was not apprised of our presence, as the officer with whom I had first spoken and his protocol aide did not contact the general.

Upon our return, having left my card with the protocol aide, I received a warm letter from General de Gaulle expressing his great disappointment at not having met the delegation, and expressing his warm friendship for our country and its citizens, recalling the ties which had bound the two countries together for so many years.

I conveyed the regrets to all of the Members who made up our delegation at that time, and I am of the opinion that General de Gaulle was not aware of our presence, and therefore, certainly no slight could have been intended by General de Gaulle to the delegation.

Threatened Strikes in Meat Packing Industry

REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the National War Labor Board Tuesday narrowly averted a major catastrophe in the meat-packing industry—a catastrophe which would have affected packing houses and consumers all over the Nation, as well as our fighting forces abroad. In my district, the Armour plant, represented by the C. I. O. United Packinghouse Workers, and the Swift plant, represented by the A. F. L. Amalgamated Meat Cutters, would have been directly concerned. The crisis was avoided, Mr. Speaker, by the War Labor Board releasing its decision on the national packinghouse labor dispute—a decision which Judge Vinson had held up for approximately one month after the Board had completed its deliberations.

I called public attention to this situation on February 7 when I released to the press a letter dispatched by me the preceding day to the Director of Economic Stabilization, suggesting my doubt, as to the necessity or wisdom of his intervention in War Labor Board procedures. On February 12 the Director replied by transmitting a copy of a press release he had issued on that day. I ask that these letters be annexed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Although the W. L. B. released the meat-packing decision last night, it was compelled to stay those portions dealing with money until the dispute as to procedure, between the Board and Director Vinson, is resolved. The crisis is thus averted only temporarily and may plague us again in a few weeks. It deserves the attention of the Members of Congress, including those Members in both parties.

The situation is this, Mr. Speaker. On May 12, 1943, Mr. Justice James F. Byrnes, then Director of Economic Stabilization, issued a policy directive clarifying the procedure and basis for the War Labor Board's handling of wage adjustments. That basis and procedure worked with reasonable satisfaction thereafter, the Board conforming its directives to the orders then outstanding. Later, Judge Vinson became the Director of Economic Stabilization, and the Board continued to issue its directives in the same manner. A year and a half passed. Suddenly, on last December 12, Judge Vinson decided that the procedure, which had worked so long and so well, was wrong, and would have to be changed. He wrote the War Labor Board accordingly.

Judge Vinson informs me, and has informed other Members of the House, that he has not changed anything at all. But this seems to me to be inaccurate. He has asked the W. L. B. to change its procedure and the form of its order which it had been using since May 1943. That

change is so vital that the W. L. B. maintains it cannot function under the new requirements. Hence, the problem which confronts us.

Mr. Speaker, the War Labor Board has settled hundreds, perhaps thousands, of labor disputes since May 1943. The threat to its orderly handling of cases is a threat to war production, a threat to organized labor, to employers, to our constituents abroad on the war fronts and to those in this country on the home front. The Congress must not and, I am sure, will not let these people down. It will, I am sure, guarantee the efficient operation of government and remedy any defects that may have recently come to the fore.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the House Committee on Banking and Currency will commence hearings next Tuesday on the proposed extension of the Stabilization Act. That subject covers the problem of the War Labor Board versus Judge Vinson. It will be beneficial to the people in my district and, I believe, to the people of the entire Nation, if the honorable members of that committee would consider this problem at the earliest possible moment in their hearings. Let us hope that they may guide the Congress and the administrative agencies involved to a restoration of efficient all-out production to win the war and a prosperous peace.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., Febrpary 8, 1945.

Hon. FRED M. VINSON,
Director of Economic Stabilization,
Federal Reserve Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE VINSON: Within my district, at East St. Louis, Ill., are two large meat-packing plants, each of which employs more than 2,000 persons. One is a Swift plant organized by the A. F. of L.; the other plant is an Armour plant, organized by the C. I. O. Both of these plants, together with practically all the other slaughtering plants of the five largest meat-packing companies, are involved in a dispute case now pending before the National Labor Board. After 18 months of litigation, this case has apparently become lost in the doldrums created largely, I understand, by a letter which you sent the N. W. L. B. in December. The unrest in East St. Louis, with its loss of employee efficiency and threats to continuous production, has become so serious as to impel me to write you. If East St. Louis is typical of other meat-packing centers, I feel a national food crisis is upon us.

As I understand the situation, Congress by the Price Control Act of 1942, authorized and directed the President to stabilize prices and wages and provided that he might make adjustments to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities. Congress authorized the President to carry out these provisions through such agency or officer as he should direct. The President thereupon, by E. O. 9250, established the Office of Economic Stabilization with a director instructed to develop a national economic policy and authorized to issue directives on policy to the Federal departments and agencies. The Executive order provided that any proposed increase approved by the N. W. L. B. and requiring a change in the price ceiling should become effective only if also approved by the Director. E. O. 9328 limited somewhat the type of wage increases to be allowed, specifically permitted promotions, reclassifications, etc., which would not furnish the basis for a price increase, and again authorized the Director of Economic Stabilization to issue directives to stabilize the national economy, to maintain and increase production and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

I understand that on May 12, 1943, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, then Director of Economic Stabilization, issued a policy directive noting the power of the N. W. L. B. to make noninflationary wage adjustments to aid in the prosecution of the war and to correct gross inequities, and specifically authorizing the establishment of wage-rate brackets. The directive, like E. O. 9250, specifically stated that wage adjustments affecting price ceilings would become effective only if also approved by the Economic Stabilization Director. The War Labor Board apparently operated under that directive successfully for the following 18 months, settling several hundred disputes with reasonable satisfaction. This period of successful operation was interrupted only by your alleged letter of December 12, 1944, in which I understand you request the N. W. L. B. to state in unequivocal language that proposed wage adjustments for promotions, reclassifications, etc., are not effective if they appreciably increase prices or the cost to the United States of war purchases.

Your letter appears to me to violate the provisions of E. O. 9250 and of your predecessor's May 12, 1943, directive, both of which state that wage adjustments affecting price ceilings shall be effective only if approved by you. Apparently you wish to shed this responsibility and give the O. P. A. veto power over the N. W. L. B., without review by yourself. Whether you intend to give the O. P. A. veto power on only promotions, reclassifications, etc., or whether you expect that veto power to cover other wage adjustments, such as those to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, to correct gross inequities, and to remove substandard conditions, is not clear. This doubt has filled the struggle between the agencies with confusion. I might also ask if your letter of last December, regardless of its meaning, was necessary or wise under present circumstances. It seems to have stopped the N. W. L. B. from processing major cases and has created more labor unrest than I have seen for many years.

We are on the verge of a great military victory in Europe. It is important that all the resources of our country be mobilized for victory abroad. The labor unrest which you seem to have created may have serious consequences and certainly tends to replace harmony with confusion and anger. I would therefore appreciate receiving, at your earliest convenience, your statement concerning the above, any interpretation which you care to make clarifying your December letter, and any suggestions which you have for removing the present confusion, restoring the N. W. L. B. to its usual power, and allowing the workers in my District and in other Congressional Districts to resume harmonious all-out production to win the war.

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1945.

The Honorable MELVIN PRICE,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of February 8, 1945, regarding the packing-house workers' wage case. I am glad to have your views in this matter.

In connection with the general subject matter involved in this and other cases, I have today issued a press release, a copy of which I enclose.

Sincerely yours,

FRED M. VINSON,
Director.

Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, today issued the following statement:

"In view of recent comments with reference to wage adjustments of the so-called fringe variety and with reference to an alleged change of policy by this office, I want to clear up any misunderstanding regarding the national wage stabilization policy.

"In this connection, I wish to call attention to certain language in the President's hold-the-line order. This order has been in effect since April 8, 1943. It provides that the National War Labor Board may authorize "reasonable adjustments of wages and salaries in cases of promotions, reclassifications, merit increases, incentive wages, or the like, provided that such adjustments do not increase the level of production cost appreciably, or furnish the basis either to increase prices or to resist otherwise justifiable reductions in prices." My statement to the National War Labor Board was a restatement of, not a change in, this standard and a suggestion for a better procedure to effectuate the Executive order.

"Except for wage increases permitted under the Little Steel formula, increases designed to correct substandard living conditions, increases to the minimum bracket of sound and tested going rates, or rare and unusual increases in critical war production cases, all wage adjustments must be brought within the language of this clause. Otherwise, wage increases are prohibited by the President's order.

"In practice, adjustments under this clause have, for the most part, been confined to vacations with pay, shift differentials, severance pay, holiday pay, merit increases, automatic progression plans, and the reclassification of wage scales within a particular plant. These are the so-called fringe adjustments.

"Such fringe adjustments can be made only if they will not affect adversely our price stabilization program. This policy is not a new one. It has been a part of our wage-stabilization policy ever since the President issued his hold-the-line order on April 8, 1943. In my opinion, this policy is a sound one—the correction of wage inequities within the general level of existing prices.

"I realize, however, that in many individual cases such a standard may prove difficult to administer. Indeed, all wage standards are difficult to administer, and the practicability of each standard must be judged by balancing administrative difficulties against the importance of the object to be accomplished, the stabilization of wage and price level.

"I am sympathetic to any proposal which will ameliorate the administrative difficulties of our present fringe policy without impairing the objective established by the President's order. At present this office and the National War Labor Board, are attempting to fashion a better means to carry out this objective."

Thank God for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article

by Gen. G. M. Johnson, from his book entitled "But General Johnson":

The American legislative assembly is the least understood part of government. Everyone is clear as to what goes on at an election—even the more nefarious aspects of the ballot are known to the rank and file of the voters. A few days in a civil or criminal court will give a fair idea of what the judicial process is like, though the refinements of legal procedure will forever escape the layman. The job of the public administrator is understood in its essentials—he is at least a visible and articulate symbol of what he tries to do. But the Congress of the United State is a great enigma. No outsider can participate in it, no citizen can watch it in any realistic way, and no man or group of men can snub it with impunity.

The popular idea of Congress is, therefore, an erratic mingling of wisecrack and fantasy. This is developed from a variety of sources, most of them hostile and most of them wrong. First, in the American press—habitually critical, unfriendly, sometimes defamatory, and rarely constructive. This attitude is, indeed, required of it. Editorial columns are sustained by criticism and readers are attracted by controversy. Such public evils as we have are laid on the congressional doorstep. The good that Congress does dies with it. Did anyone ever read headlines announcing, "Congress rises to new heights of statesmanship," "Congress leaves an excellent record," or "Congress is to be commended on public law"? Whether or not the framers of the Constitution realized it, they established a governing body that was at once the savior and the scapegoat of the country, and so fitted it to the American political scene that, in spite of tremendous accomplishments, Congress can never expect anything but brickbats.

Congress lives, moreover, in an aura of controversy. It could not be otherwise because Congress is first and always a controversial body. It is in constant and violent disagreement with itself and with all other agencies of government. It can speak on policy only in two ways—by law or resolution. Its official history ends with the cold record of its journals. Beyond these Congress has no voice of its own. It therefore suffers badly in debate, because the vigorous personalities of its opponents—from the President down—can tell the country of its iniquities with no fear of cross-examination and little fear of backfires except an occasional veto, a jimmied appropriation, or a "ripper" bill.

Congress rarely turns out a perfect product in the sense that everyone affected by its work is satisfied. Inasmuch as it turns out an amazing number of products and every product tends to offend a different group, it builds up an enormous backlog of critics who constantly tell the world how badly we are governed. For the job of Congress is this: To do what every citizen wants done but what few groups of citizens want done. It is amazing how little interest there is in the sponsorship of public policy outside of Congress, itself. Innumerable groups are established for special purposes, but their secretaries are paid for intensive service in the interests of their memberships. There was no better example of this than the sponsorship of Public Law No. 603, as an executive from my staff emphasized before a congressional hearing:

"You understand, Mr. Chairman, that no one wanted this law except the people. That is the reason why you enacted it.

"The War Production Board didn't want it; the Army didn't want it; the Navy didn't want it. No one wanted it."

He might have added that not even small business wanted it—it wanted contracts and was far too frequently led by men of the Coxey's Army type.

And finally, the bands of the congressional spectrum are composed of a small nucleus of statesmen, a few constructive critics, a large and predominant bloc of watchful followers, and a scattering of "dead-end kids." There is, indeed, probably a higher proportion of leadership in the upper bands of the spectrum than is to be found in any private group of equal size. I doubt if there is another place where a large group of men assemble for a common purpose—either in public or private life—where there is an abler, more honest, and more distinguished group of men than in the Congress of the United States.

It is, nevertheless, the terminal bands of the spectrum that give Congress its place in public thinking and the lower end makes the best headlines, and therefore reaches the largest audience. But, more than anything else, Congress represents the difference between our way of life and that of our enemies. Congress is the American way. This must never be forgotten.

The lights that play upon the congressional picture determine the mood and action of Congress. Personal contacts with constituents is a powerful influence. I used to think that anyone who wrote or wired his Congressman on a public question was just a naive little fellow who had a sort of Alice in Wonderland idea of government. I was in error. The attention a Congressman gives to his mail and the influence of a timely batch of telegrams from the home folks are facts to be reckoned with in the legislative process. When a Member announces on the floor that he has 500 letters of protest against a bill, it is more convincing than any argument on the merits.

A Congressman is, moreover, most sensitive to his local political coloring. A representative himself, he wants to be represented at home. This is the crux of the Congressman's interest in appointments. It is more than the rewards of patronage that so frequently surround a change in administration. It is an effort to secure the best for his district and an environment that will keep him in office. It is not a mere plot to perpetuate himself but a measure of his success as a producer for his constituents and a matter of pride to himself. The people who elected him must be satisfied—that is what representative government is all about.

Treatment of German Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent:

SPARTA, WIS., *February 20, 1945.*

Hon. W. L. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

FRIEND BILL: The daily papers report that Senator MCFARLAND, of Arizona, has demanded an investigation of the escape of the German war prisoners from the Arizona prison camp. The account, which I read under an Associated Press February 12 Washington date line, stated that an Arizona resolution branded "as fantastic and highly improbable" an explanation that the prisoners had escaped through a 200-foot tunnel.

The camp commander of the Papago Park Camp was Col. William A. Holden, formerly of Sparta. Colonel Holden left Sparta some years ago and for years had charge of the veterans home at Waupaca, Wis. He was hand picked for that job by General Immell, who knew his capabilities as an officer.

I had the pleasure of serving for 17 consecutive years with Holden in the Wisconsin National Guard. I know him to be a man of integrity as an individual and exceptionally capable as an Army officer. Holden served with distinction in World War No. 1. He was decorated with the Croix de Guerre, the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart in World War No. 1. He was commander of the One Hundred and Twenty-eighth Regiment of the Thirty-second Division during its training in the South just prior to the declaration of war on Germany of World War No. 2.

I understand that Holden was detached from the command of this regiment and given the difficult assignment as commander of the prison camp solely because of his military record. Knowing Holden's background and the splendid service which he has rendered to this Nation, I think it is a crime that some unfounded and unsubstantiated rumors should step in to ruin a military career.

The article I read stated that war prisoners were being pampered. I believe that article. It happens that we have a prison camp within 12 miles of our home. I had occasion some months ago to talk to a brigadier general from the War Department who was inspecting this camp and who made the statement that the War Department itself was going out of its way to observe every last detail of the Geneva Convention Code. I don't doubt but that Holden's instructions were that he was to give these prisoners every consideration to avoid any criticism that Americans were mistreating prisoners of war. On the other hand, I know Holden's intense hatred for the Germans based on his own personal World War No. 1 experiences as a member of the First Division. To say that a man with that background would pamper the Germans is too ridiculous to necessitate comment. I mention it, however, because this matter is now involved in politics and I, for one, would not like to see a man of Holden's distinguished service thrown to the wolves.

I served for 12 years as a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department. I know that incidents of this kind are immediately investigated by the War Department. I assume that that was done in this case. The fact that Holden remained as camp commander convinces me that after the investigation the War Department exonerated Holden. If that is the fact, and it should be a very simple matter to subpena the War Department records or to compel the attendants of the officer in charge to testify to the facts, it should be an easy matter of proof.

Since dictating the foregoing letter I read an Associated Press dispatch under February 19, Washington date line, quoting Representatve HARLESS, of Arizona, to the effect that he had learned that only one of every four guard towers surrounding the camp was manned. He said "as a result of this inefficiency the escaping prisoners of war were able to dig a tunnel for some 200 feet under the very eyes of the guards." My comment to this is that the Arizona Congressman and Senator should get together on their stories. The one denies that there was a tunnel and the other says that there were no guards and that as a result of that, there was a tunnel. It is

true that these distinguished gentlemen are making the headlines, but what is more regrettable is that a man that has given distinguished service to his country is being crucified. I, for one, demand a fair deal.

What worries me about this situation is that with prejudices running high, it is such a simple matter to exaggerate and twist the facts. I am personally convinced that if the true facts are known the officer in charge will be completely vindicated. His splendid record of service demands, I believe, that the investigation be without prejudice and thorough. I am confident of the outcome. I will, personally, appreciate any action which you may take to insure that the investigation be conducted in a fair and impartial manner.

Sincerely yours,

LAMBERT.

Report Showing Progress and Statistical Facts Relative to the Administration of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, so many inquiries are being received by Members of the House relative to the loan title of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, Seventy-eighth Congress—commonly referred to as the G. I. Act—that, as chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, I have asked the Veterans' Administration to furnish me with a report of what has been done to date concerning the application of that particular title of the law.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter which I have received this morning from Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator, Veterans' Administration, together with the report to which he refers.

The matter referred to follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1945.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANKIN: In accordance with the statement I made to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation on January 22, 1945, there is transmitted herewith part I of Report Showing the Progress and Statistical Facts Relative to the Administration of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944, Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

The portion of the report transmitted herewith relates to title III of the act. Title III contains the provisions relating to loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property. Other parts of the report will be forwarded to the committee as the survey now in process is completed.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

REPORT SHOWING THE PROGRESS AND STATISTICAL FACTS RELATIVE TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LAW 346, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, JUNE 22, 1944, SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT, MADE BY THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, BRIG. GEN. FRANK T. HINES, TO THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PART I

Title III. Loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, Public No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, was approved June 22, 1944. Since many of the provisions of the law affected the field operations of the Veterans' Administration as a whole, instructions were issued to all field offices on July 1, 1944, following the transmittal of copies of the act, announcing, among other things, that the operations incident to the provisions of title III concerning the guaranty of loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property would be under the Director of Finance. It was emphasized that in making effective the provisions of title III, a program of collaboration and close cooperation with other Federal and State agencies and nongovernmental organizations would be followed.

Steps were taken promptly to establish units within the Veterans' Administration to administer the provisions of the act. A Loan Guarantee Division under the Director of Finance with subdivisions for home loan, farm loan, and business loan guaranties was officially established on July 1, 1944. Loan guaranty units were authorized at selected locations in field areas by instructions released October 19, 1944, to regional field offices.

To further facilitate administration of the act, loan guaranty agents are being assigned to each regional office or facility having regional office activities as promptly as appointments can be accomplished pending the establishment of Loan Guaranty Divisions in all offices.

The drafting of regulations to accomplish the intent of Congress was promptly undertaken. Since the regulations would be the basis of contracts affecting many individuals and business organizations, it was realized that they must be based upon sound principles of construction. This required an extensive study of many legal points, and the rendering of decisions thereon. It will be of interest to the committee to know that 14 Administrator's Decisions have been required to date on questions arising under Title III, copies attached.

In carrying out the intent of sec. 505 (a) of title III of the act providing that the administrator shall designate such agency or agencies, if any, as he finds equipped to determine whether the guaranty of a loan should be approved, it was necessary to coordinate the regulations with certain governmental agencies cooperating in the approval and servicing of loans. However, there has been retained in the Veterans' Administration the policy-making, the over-all control and the general supervisory functions, but every endeavor has been made to utilize the services available through other agencies to the greatest practicable extent.

After extensive consultation with officials of other Government agencies, representatives of lending groups and service organizations, regulations covering the guaranty of home loans were issued October 19, 1944. Regulations concerning the guaranty of loans for the purchase of farms and farm equipment were released on December 8, 1944. Regulations for the guaranty of loans for the purchase of businesses, etc., were issued December 20, 1944.

Copies of the regulations and the forms required for processing the loans were concurrently distributed to members of the Federal Reserve System, member banks of the American Bankers Association, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, Mortgage Bankers Association and numerous other agencies primarily interested in the home loan program through the distribution facilities of their respective parent organizations.

The Department of Agriculture has been designated as the cooperating agency to aid in processing the guaranty of farm loans. In setting up the committees to assist with the farm loan guaranty, the Veterans' Administration utilized machinery of the Department of Agriculture rather than duplicating it by organizing new machinery in the Veterans' Administration. A Veterans' Advisory Committee will function in conjunction with the county agent's office. The membership of this committee will be the same as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Committee which has been in operation under the Farm Security Administration, with the addition of one member who must be a veteran and, if possible, a businessman.

Every effort has been made through the press to acquaint veterans with the procedure in procuring a loan. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs announced to the press on October 19, 1944, the issuance of regulations concerning the guaranty of home loans with an explanation as to the procedure a veteran should follow in procuring a loan. Subsequent releases were issued explaining the procedure for procuring farm and business loans, and reports indicate the press has cooperated fully in using these releases.

The loan regulations and forms required for processing loans are made a part of this report, as also the Instructional Letter to Veterans' Administration field offices.

The following forms are for use in connection with the three types of loans:

All Types of Loans

1800: Certification of Eligibility.

Home Loan

1801: Loan Guaranty Certificate.
1802: Application for Home Loan Guaranty (combined form).
1802: Application for Home Loan Guaranty (duplicate).
1803c: Application for Approval as Appraiser.
1804: Explanation of Home Loan Guaranty.
1806: Loan Closing Statement.

Farm Loan

1821: Loan Guaranty Certificate.
1822: Application for Farm Loan Guaranty (combined form).
1822a: Application for Farm Loan Guaranty (duplicate).
1824: Explanation of Farm Loan Guaranty.

Business Loan

1841: Loan Guaranty Certificate.
1842: Application for Business Loan Guaranty (combined form).
1842a: Application for Business Loan Guaranty (duplicate).
1842b: Supplement to Application for Business or Business Realty Loan Guaranty (Ex. A).
1842c: Supplement to Application for Business or Business Realty Loan Guaranty (Executive B).
1844: Explanation of Business Loan and Business Realty Loan.
1845: Appraiser's Check Sheet.

General Use

1861: Loan Closing Statement.

Copies of the regulations and the forms may be had upon application to the nearest office of the Veterans' Administration.

Regulations covering the guaranty of home loans provide in effect that a veteran who desires to buy or build a home or to improve an existing dwelling will proceed in the usual manner of a person seeking a loan for such a purpose. The veterans will go to his bank, building and loan company, or other lending agency, or an individual lender. Either before or after the veteran and the lender reach a tentative accord, a request may be made of the nearest Veterans' Administration office for a certification of eligibility of the veteran and information as to the amount available for guaranty. The Veterans' Administration will issue in eligible cases the certification of eligibility and statement of the amount for guaranty. The Veterans' Administration will also name an appraiser from the list of appraisers who are qualified and reputable, and the agency to process the loan. Perhaps it is well at this point to again emphasize that the total amount that can be guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration is limited to a maximum of $2,000. This $2,000 guaranty can be made available to the veteran in one or more transactions so long as the aggregate of the transactions does not exceed the $2,000 maximum.

In any case wherein a principal loan for such purposes is approved by a Federal agency to be made or guaranteed or insured by it, and the veteran is in need of a second loan to cover the remainder of the purchase price or cost, or a part thereof, the Administrator may guarantee the full amount of the second loan, subject to the $2,000 limitation, provided such second loan does not exceed 20 percent of the purchase price or cost and the rate of interest is not more than 1 percent greater than that charged on the principal loan, and is not more than 4 percent.

Section 501 of the law requires that before the Administrator may approve a guaranty of a loan for the purpose of purchasing or constructing a home he must find (1) that the proceeds of such loan will be used for payment for such property to be purchased or constructed by the veteran; (2) that the contemplated terms of payment required in any mortgage to be given in part payment of the purchase price or the construction cost bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses and that the nature and condition of the property is such as to be suitable for dwelling purposes; and (3) that the purchase price paid or to be by the veteran for such property or the construction cost, including the value of the unimproved lot, does not exceed the reasonable, normal value thereof as determined by proper appraisal.

The Treasury Department (Comptroller of the Currency) has modified its regulations to permit certain banking institutions to participate in this program and the Federal Reserve has relaxed Regulation W (relating to consumer credit) to liberalize the terms on which loans may be made for repairs and improvements on a home. The National Housing Agency, through the Federal Housing Administration, is cooperating in the program. Several of the States and the District of Columbia have in process plans for amending local laws if necessary so that insurance and other corporations may make loans guaranteed in whole or in part under the act.

It should be stated at this point that when the application is approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the veteran and the lending agency are notified. The Loan Guaranty Certificate and copy of the application are returned to the lender with instructions as to closing the loan in a manner to make the guaranty effective. The lender then proceeds to close the loan by securing a certificate of title, obtaining signatures and acknowledgments, disbursing the funds as set forth on the loan closing statement and recording all proper instruments.

A Handbook for Lenders, Home Loans, has been issued by the Veterans' Administration for the information of persons and institutions making loans. The pamphlet covers matters of policy and procedure to be followed in connection with loans to veterans subject to guaranty pursuant to the provisions of the act. Also, a pamphlet entitled "Questions and Answers About Title III—Loan Guaranty for Homes, Farms, Business Under the G. I. Bill" is available for distribution to veterans who contemplate making a loan.

Regulations covering the guaranty of loans for the purchase of farms and farm equipment are, insofar as the real estate provisions are concerned, very similar to those issued in connection with the home-loan provisions of the act. In addition to real estate the law provides for loans to purchase, repair, improve or alter equipment, or to purchase livestock and other supplies necessary to the farming operation. In addition to the loans for the purchase or improvement of property, guaranty of a loan may be made for the purpose of paying off delinquent indebtedness or assessments if the place is to be used as a home. The total amount that can be guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration is limited to a maximum of $2,000 as in the case of all loan guaranties. Two or more veterans may join in a farming operation and effect a joint loan for that purpose. Under these conditions each veteran would be charged individually with his proportionate part of the guaranty. The total amount guaranteed may not be more than 50 percent of the loan, or in any event not more than $2,000 for each veteran. In cases of default under this type of loan, the veterans will be adjudged as if they were several debtors rather than one joint debtor.

Section 502 of the law requires that before the Administrator may approve a guaranty of a loan for the purchase of farms and farm equipment he must find (1) that the proceeds of such loan will be used in payment for real or personal property purchased or to be purchased by the veteran, or for repairing, altering, or improving any buildings or equipment, to be used in bona fide farming operations conducted by him; (2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for efficiently conducting such operations; (3) that the ability and experience of the veteran and the nature of the proposed farming operations to be conducted by him are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that such operations will be successful; and (4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed the reasonable normal value thereof as determined by proper appraisal.

The Department of Agriculture has an advisory committee in each county whose functions will include advice and guidance to veterans with reference to such matters as where and how to get additional training if the veteran lacks the training and experience requisite to success in farming operations; the availability and cost of farms in the various counties; what are satisfactory and customary partnership and leasing agreements; what kind of farming set-ups are required for success in various localities of the country; approximate investments required for such set-ups; what are safe margins of indebtedness; the kind of credit needed and where and how to get such credit, etc.

The participation of the Department of Agriculture in the operation of farm-loan guarantees will require almost no change in the Nation-wide organization now in operation through the Agricultural Extension Service, Farm Security Administration, and the Farm Credit Administration.

Regulations governing guaranty of business loans are basically very much the same as those for home and farm loans and are circumscribed by the same limitations which provide that the maximum amount of guaranty for any one person is $2,000, and the interest charged on the loan may not exceed 4 percent. Business loans may be guaranteed not only for the purchase of buildings or real property but also to buy supplies, equipment, machinery, and tools normally used in connection with such occupation as the veteran plans to enter. Loans for inventory, stock, or working capital are not covered. In general, business loans must be secured by first liens unless a first lien is held by a Federal agency, in which case a second lien may be accepted so long as it amounts to not more than 20 percent of the purchase price and if the amount of the loan is under $500, the guaranty may be issued on an unsecured loan. Where a loan is made for the purchase of real property a standard real estate first mortgage will be taken as security. An appraisal by a qualified and designated appraiser will be required just as they are in connection with guaranty of loans for the purchase of homes and farms.

Where equipment is to be purchased the loan will be secured either by chattel mortgage or a conditional sales agreement. If two or more eligible veterans plan to enter business together, they may apply for guaranty of the same loan. In such cases the obligation shall be treated as separate and not as joint responsibilities. The guaranty under these conditions may not exceed the maximum of $2,000 for each borrower.

Section 503 of the law requires that before the Administrator may approve a guaranty of a loan for the purchase of a business he must find (1) that the proceeds of such loan will be used for payment for real or personal property purchased or to be purchased by the veteran and used by him in the bona fide pursuit of such gainful occupation; (2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for the efficient and successful pursuit of such occupaton; (3) that the ability and experience of the veteran, and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such occupation, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful in the pursuit of such occupation; and (4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed the reasonable normal normal value thereof as determined by proper appraisal. The procedure in applying for loans under this title is the same as that outlined for loans for homes.

The Veterans' Administration has consummated agreements for the utilization of the services of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Smaller War Plants Corporation in the processing of business loans.

The following is an accumulative statement of operations as of February 3, 1945:

1. (a) Number of applications for guaranty received, 983.

(b) Number of applications for guaranty executed, 555.

(c) Number of applications for guaranty rejected, 132.

(d) Number of applications for guaranty on hand, 296.

2. Number of certifications of eligibility received, 6,614.

3. Amount of guaranty commitment, $993,470.93.

It has been the purpose of the Veterans' Administration to establish an organization capable of handling a heavy volume of applications and it is believed that the organization now set up will be able to do this. If need arises for change in the organization and in the regulations, such changes will be made promptly. It should be noted, however, that among the persons discharged from the armed services subsequent to September 16, 1940, there are many who are not yet established in permanent business or employment and who consequently are not in the market for the purchase of property. It should also be remembered that economic conditions are

not favorable for construction or purchase of homes or farm property on a large scale. While it is incumbent upon the Veterans' Administration to make every reasonable effort to advise veterans of their right to apply for guaranty of loans in proper cases, nevertheless there is a further obligation, in my opinion, upon the Veterans' Administration and public officials generally to see that veterans are not unduly pressed to undertake financial contracts which it is not to their best interests to assume. The Veterans' Administration has been pleased to note that private financial organizations are recognizing this responsibility.

Goodhue County, Minn., Draft Board Interprets Tydings Amendment According to the Intent of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the confusion which has existed in agricultural sections of the country during the past 6 weeks, over the proper interpretation of the Tydings amendment, I am pleased to publish, as a part of these remarks, the clear cut and definite decision of the Selective Service Local Board No. 1, for Goodhue County, Minn., on the issues involved. The decision of the Goodhue County board to follow the law and the intent of Congress in determining the classification of essential agricultural workers, who cannot be replaced, merits the commendation of every American who believes in the theory that our Government is one of law and not of men. The Goodhue County board states that it will make its determinations in accordance with the law, but suggests that if the law is faulty in securing manpower for all war purposes, changes in policy should be made by Congress rather than by officials. The decision of the Goodhue County draft board follows in a letter to me from its clerk, Mr. H. E. Rardin. The other members of the board are, Mr. Anton Johnson of Zumbrota, and Mr. Elmer S. Burggren of Cannon Falls:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
LOCAL BOARD, NO. 1, GOODHUE COUNTY,
Red Wing, Minn., February 19, 1945.
Congressman AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: After closely studying your letters and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the local board together with the local appeal agents, who have concurred with us on our decision, have decided that we have been in error in the interpretation of the law. It was not so much the misinformation received but the lack of information that has led to the confusion. It appears very plain now that under the Tydings amendment the local board classifies a registrant in his relation to the farm and does not classify him as other registrants are classified—in relation to their industry compared to the need for men in the armed forces. After having decided that a man is necessary to agriculture the local board's work is completed. It then remains the duty of Congress either to keep that man in agriculture or change the law for him to enter the service.

The fact that the board agrees or disagrees with the Tydings amendment does not enter into the case at all. Until the law is changed an essential farm worker shall be exempt from service. Back in 1942, this board told State selective service that all men who were then left on the farms were essential and we could not take any more of them consistent with the agricultural policy at that time. Agriculture was then on the critical list, and furthermore there were sufficient men in industry to fill calls. With the war continuing and having drained all men in the ages 18 to 26 from industry it seemed the only logical thing to do, when the armed forces demanded more men from the 18–26 group, was to take men from that age group wherever we could find them. While the board was never directly instructed to take any certain man, we were instructed to "consider taking agricultural workers in the light of the President's findings."

Our decision has had the following immediate effect on the draft situation here. We recalled all induction notices of farm workers in the call for the 24th of February. We reopened all cases of the appeal board where the classification had been upheld in I–A and reclassified them back to II–C. All pending I–A registrants in agriculture were reclassified back to II–C. The total number affected by this action was approximately 300. The number of men now in I–A in this board is less than 100 and they are the group in industry in the age group 26–30.

* * * * *

The further induction of the agricultural worker in Goodhue County is now in the hands of Congress as the local board declared all agriculture workers essential to agriculture back in August of 1942 and they all come under the Tydings amendment.

Kindest personal regards,

H. E. RARDIN,
Secretary, Goodhue County Local Board.

Mr. Speaker, to further clarify the intent of Congress with reference to the Tydings amendment, I invite a reading of the Senate debate on the deferment of essential farm workers on pages 917, 918, and 919 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 8, 1945. Senator TYDINGS and others took part in the discussion. These debates should leave no room for doubt as to the intent of Congress in passing the Tydings amendment. The Goodhue County board has followed the law, and I am hopeful that other boards in agricultural sections will promptly reach the same decision.

General Medical Hospital for Veterans in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, has recently prepared a memorandum on the need of a general medical hospital—United States Veterans' Administration facility—to be located in New Jersey. The case, which is a strong one, will be supported by additional facts and figures now being correlated. The Legion's memorandum, prepared by Mr. William G. McKinley, chairman of its rehabilitation committee, follows:

New Jersey veterans of both World Wars, the Spanish-American War, and miscellaneous campaigns eligible for hospitalization under all existing Federal laws will require a general medical hospital of at least 1,000 beds within the next 5 years.

At the close of 1944 there were in Federal hospitals—all outside of New Jersey—543 New Jersey men receiving general medical care. Estimates indicate that with the close of the present war, the increase in World War No. 2 patients will become rapidly manifest. The American Legion of New Jersey estimates that in 1952 the minimum general medical requirement for New Jersey veterans will be 750 beds and projecting the need to 1972, the requirement will be 1,700 beds.

There is now located at Lyons, N. J., a United States veterans facility, but this is a neuropsychiatric institution which does not provide other than extreme emergency hospital care to other types of physical disorders. Such treatment must be found at other institutions, principally at the United States Veterans' facility at Bronx (New York City), N. Y., or at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa., these being closest to New Jersey.

It has been the experience of the New Jersey American Legion that (1) arranging for hospitalization of general medical cases has been difficult, and (2) in many instances, veterans have declined the needed care because of a reluctance to go far from their homes. The difficulty in obtaining admittance to hospitals has greatly increased since the advent of the present war because of the increase in the number of World War No. 2 veterans now applying for treatment. Many veterans who have refused hospitalization because of reluctance to go far from home have aggravated their condition deferring proper treatment. In some instances death has resulted because of this neglect; particularly in cardiac and tumor cases.

Up to the present time, the American Legion of New Jersey has reluctantly withheld a militant advocacy of the need for a general medical hospital in New Jersey because the fact was not convincingly established that the number of New Jersey general medical cases were sufficient to prove in such construction. While it was undesirable to have New Jersey veterans sent out of the State for treatment, it has been the disposition of the New Jersey American Legion to cooperate with the United States Veterans' Administration and to join with other States in continuing their respective needs in obtaining new construction within reasonable communication limits.

Experience in this regard has proven unsatisfactory. In the last instance, New Jersey joined with Pennsylvania in urging the building of a general medical hospital which was to have been located in the Philadelphia area and within travel facility to South Jersey. The project was also intended to relieve the load in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital by releasing the contract beds of the United States Veterans' Administration. After securing the allocation of the hospital to Pennsylvania, the actual site was selected in Altoona; quite remote from New Jersey and without relieving the Philadelphia Naval Hospital load.

Studies of the hospital requirements for New Jersey veterans develop two positive conclusions; first, that the new load, which is now developing from World War No. 2 will be at least three to four times that of World War No. 1 for the same age groups and, second that the present upward trend of World War No. 1 cases will continue for at least 5 years before assuming a downward characteristic.

The present ratio of hospital cases for World War No. 1 veterans by general classification is: neuropsychiatric, 63 percent, general medical, 27 percent, and tubercular, 10 percent, and for World War No. 2 (applying World War No. 1 experience for 1923, the earliest available data) neuropsychiatric, 39 percent; general medical, 20 percent, and tubercular, 41 percent. (Note: Opinion of Army medical officers, so far as they will commit themselves, is that these percentages will be less as to tuberculosis and greater as to neuropsychiatric and general medical cases.)

Patient bed days per patient at present experience is: neuropsychiatric (nonmental), 63 days; neuropsychiatric (mental), 396 days; tubercular, 177 days; and general medical, 42 days.

At the close of 1944 there were 1,396 New Jersey World War No. 1 veterans, 432 New Jersey World War No. 2 veterans, and 183 New Jersey veterans of the Spanish War and miscellaneous campaigns in all hospitals both in and out of New Jersey, or a total of 2,011 New Jersey patients. These cases were classified as: neuropsychiatric (nonmental), 803; neuropsychiatric (mental), 473; tubercular, 195; and general medical, 543.

This indicates an annual turn-over of the present load as follows:

(a) General medical, 4,344 patients per year; (b) tubercular, 468 patients per year; (c) tubercular, 2,818 patients per year; (d) neuropsychiatric (nonmental), 2,818 patients per year; (mental), 437 patients per year.

Projecting this to the year 1952, the turnover can be estimated as follows:

	Patients per year, World War No 1	World War No 1	Total
A. General medical	3,024	3,040	6,064
B. Tubercular	336	1,869	2,205
C. Neuropsychiatric:			
Nonmental	3,450	2,807	6,257
Mental	464	253	717
Total	7,274	7,969	15,243

If an estimate of 6,100 New Jersey general medical patients is reasonable for the year 1952, it appears that to serve such a load, a minimum of 750 beds will be required. If estimates of requirements are extended to the year 1972, it appears that about 13,640 New Jersey veterans will require general medical service in that year and require about 1,700 general medical beds for this purpose. A request, therefore, for a 1,000 bed general medical hospital at this time seems entirely reasonable; with a prospective load of at least 75 percent of the patients coming from New Jersey.

The basic statistical data from which this memorandum was developed was obtained from annual reports of the Director, United States Veterans' Administration. Vital statistics—Special Reports, Bureau of the Census, United States Department of Commerce, and other sources researched for the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, by the division of veterans services, department of economic delevopment and the department of institutions and agencies, both State of New Jersey agencies. In addition recouse has been made to the national rehabilitation committee of the American Legion, to reports of the department service officer, American Legion, department of New Jersey, reports of the department rehabilitation committee of the American Legion, department of New Jersey, and to the experience of many individual post and county service officers in New Jersey.

WILLIAM G. MCKINLEY,
Chairman, Rehabilitation Committee, the American Legion, Department of New Jersey.
JERSEY CITY, N. J.

Commenting on New Jersey's need of a new veterans' hospital, the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call says, editorially, in part:

If ever a State had an unchallenged right to a modern war veterans hospital for World War No. 2 veterans, it is this our own New Jersey. If ever a State was being given a run around by the administration at Washington in consistently side-tracking that right, it is this same original State of New Jersey, which from our American Revolutionary days of 1776 has played a leading role in the birth and preservation of our Nation.

The part, which our State has played through all the years since that great day of our Nation's birth, glorifies the pages of every American history. The same spirit of our New Jersey ancestors, who crossed the Delaware with George Washington, and drove the Hessians out of our State capitol in the most daring exploit of that first war for freedom, rides with their fighting Jersey sons today, now 500,000 strong, in this World War of liberation; and with our daughters, too, serving on every front with the valor of America's immortal patriot Molly Pitcher.

Yes, already half a million of our soldiers, sailors, and marines are sons and daughters of New Jersey. Thousands of them have already been wounded, many still hospitalized far away from their homes. Thousands more will return, their bodies broken, their minds shattered by the hell fire of modern battle. Every week they keep coming back to the land of their fondest dreams, only to discover if they are still under hospital care that they are shuttled off to some distant base hospital far from home, because New Jersey, once the hallowed seat of our Continental Congress, has no veterans base hospital to welcome them in.

The New Jersey congressional delegation is lending its support to the veterans' movement to obtain this needed hospital in our State and all agree the project should not be too little and too late.

Address of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at the Veterans of Foreign Wars commander in chief's biennial dinner to Members of the Congress who have served in the armed forces, Congressional Room, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 20, 1945:

Commander-in-Chief Brunner, Members of the Congress in the armed forces, distinguished guests, my comrades of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is a very great honor, Mr. Commander in Chief, which you have conferred upon me tonight in inviting me to address this distinguished gathering of Members of Congress who have served in our armed forces, and the other distinguished guests here assembled.

I consider it an excellent idea for the V. F. W. to have this dinner of the Commander in Chief's every two years at the beginning of a Congress, so that your officials may become acquainted with Members who are also veterans. This acquaintance can only lead to a better understanding of each other's problems, and closer cooperation in furthering the objectives in which all of you have such a profound and unselfish interest.

Although the age group of the Senators and Representatives here tonight would indicate that the overwhelming majority saw service in the First World War, yet there are a few Spanish-American War veterans present, and I am happy to note, some who have seen service with the armed forces in the present global conflict. Thus in point of service rendered in uniform, a period of close to half a century is spanned.

But of greater importance to veterans than this time element, is the fact that all of you bring first-hand experience of your own to aid in the solution of veterans' problems. I do not doubt that this fact alone has done much to provide the veterans of the present war with the most diversified and adequate benefits which have ever been made available to returning war veterans and their dependents, at any time in our history.

I want to take this occasion to congratulate the Veterans of Foreign Wars upon your unprecedented membership growth, which I understand, has now reached about 800,000.

I am told that about one-half million have become eligible to membership because of service in the present war, and that most of these new members are still in the armed forces overseas. Many are doubtless sons of your older members. I consider this affiliation a very fine thing. These new members will bring with them a vigor and enthusiasm which should add greatly to the effectiveness of an already strong and well-established organization.

Your greatly augmented and diversified membership should increase materially your ability to assist returning veterans in making necessary adjustments.

You know how valuable your cooperation in the past has been to the Veterans' Administration. I am confident you realize fully that such cooperation will be even more important in the future, inasmuch as the problems to be overcome are much greater than we have ever encountered before, both in the potential number of veterans to be served and the broad scope of the many benefits to be administered.

I have just had a comparison made between some of our major activities up to the end of last December with those up to the end of February 2 years ago. These comparisons reveal the extent of many of our problems, if it will be remembered that between these two dates our total personnel has increased only 14 percent—from about 46,500 in February 1943, to about 53,000 at the present time. Our activities in the meantime have increased manyfold. Some of the more important of these are as follows:

At the end of February 1943 we had had only 32,435 World War No. 2 disability claims filed. By last December 31 we had 612,745 such claims filed, an increase of nineteenfold.

By February 1943, we had only 8,050 death claims filed on account of service in the present war. By last December we had 87,687 such claims filed, an increase of more than tenfold.

By February 1943, we had only 18,588 National Service Life death claims filed. By last December we had 180,558 such claims filed, an increase of more than ninefold.

As of February 1943, we had adjudicated 21,619 disability and death claims of all types concerned with World War No. 2. Last December we had adjudicated 617,421 such claims, a twenty-eight-fold increase.

It should be kept in mind also that at the end of February 2 years ago we had no nonservice-connected hospitalization for veterans of the present war; no vocational rehabilitation to teach the disabled new ways of earning their living; and no G. I. bill of rights with its partial guaranty of home, farm, and busi-

ness loans, educational benefits and readjustment allowances as the unemployment benefits are called.

These activities as you are aware, have been superimposed upon the many which were already in existence, and, as I have just indicated, some of these latter have now been enlarged a great many times.

I think all of us realize that Veterans' Administration expansion is still in its initial stages, and that by far the greater part of it is yet to come, considering only the administration of laws now on the books.

Our most pressing problems at present are involved with womanpower rather than with manpower, as our most serious shortages and greatest future needs are in the fields of nursing, stenography, and clerical help rather than in administrative positions. An example of an expedient we have been forced to adopt, is that we are dictating thousands of letters in Washington which are sent hundreds of miles away to be transcribed.

Ways and means must be devised which will enable us to overcome present deficiencies in personnel, and to augument our staffs to meet our steadily increasing responsibilities. We earnestly solicit the assistance of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other patriotic groups in the solution of these pressing problems.

Personnel shortages have been particularly acute in the nurses who care for disabled veterans in our hospitals, and unless something drastic can be accomplished in obtaining many additional nurses very promptly, this will present a real acute problem.

At the present moment, we need 1,000 additional nurses in order to fill existing vacancies in our hospitals. We have a number of thousands of hospital beds which will be completed by July 1 next, and we estimate that to staff these new beds adequately on that date, we will need 2,000 more nurses, or 3,000 altogether considering the existing vacancies.

We realize that the Army and the Navy are each endeavoring to recruit nurses for overseas service, and we earnestly hope they will fill their requirements. I would call to your attention that in this connection the Veterans' Administration is not in competition with these programs, because we are able to accept nurses which the armed forces may not. Our nurses do not have to meet the requirements in either age or physical condition which the armed forces specify.

Our nurses are obtained through Civil Service, but in order to meet the present emergency I have authorized the managers of our veterans' hospitals to accept nurses who make application to them. The employment will be steady for these nurses and of a character which should satisfy their desires to play a part in the war effort.

The young men who are now returning from war service and being transferred to our hospitals are the cause for our increased hospital load and our accelerated hospital-construction program. It should be kept in mind that these disabled veterans are the same young men who have been cared for in Army and Navy hospitals prior to their discharge from the service, and that they are entitled to the best care which it is possible for their Government to provide, in order that they may obtain the maximum of improvement.

We have lost many of our male hospital attendants to war plants and the armed forces. The Army has accordingly detailed to us about 5,500 limited servicemen, whom we are using on the level of attendants in our hospitals. But it should be kept in mind that these servicemen cannot take the place of nurses, that they can only assist the nurses, and that they work under the supervision of nurses.

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks have volunteered to assist us in a recruitment campaign for nurses through the activities of their local lodges, and I would welcome such assistance from the Veterans of Foreign Wars through the cooperation of your local posts. The efforts of the Elks have already brought us a considerable number of nurses, but our net gains have not been great, due to the continued loss of our younger nurses who volunteer for service in the armed forces.

I believe that if the Congress finds it necessary to enact legislation providing for the drafting of nurses, that provision should be made also to supply the requirements of Veterans' Administration hospitals in this same manner. I am confident that the Congress and the American people want their war veterans to receive the best possible treatment and care, of whatever type that may be adequate to their developing needs.

Our hospital and hospital-bed situation is as follows in round numbers: We have 89,000 beds of all types in 94 veterans' hospitals and homes, plus the use of 4,000 additional beds in the facilities of other Government agencies. We have 11,000 beds under construction, with funds available for 12,000 additional beds.

The independent offices appropriation bill for 1946, now under consideration, carries funds for 14,100 more beds, while the President has approved action by the Federal Board of Hospitalization authorizing us in principle another 8,000 beds. When these various programs are completed we will have the use of 138,000 beds of all types, which should meet our needs for the immediate future.

As of December 31, 1944, there were 74,881 of our beds occupied, of which total patient load 16,050 were veterans of the present war. It will be seen from these figures that we have considerable leeway at present in overall bed occupancy, although some of our hospitals in certain localities are full, while others could take many more patients if we had the hospital personnel to care for them.

The membership of our special medical advisory group of 15 eminent surgeons, physicians and medical specialists has now been completed, and it will hold its first meeting next week here in Washington. This group supplements the work of our several hundred eminent medical consultants in various parts of the country and our resident hospitals' staffs.

We have several hundred of our medical staff with the armed forces, but thanks to the generous attitude of the Army and Navy, these losses have been helped by their detail to us of a number of their own medical officers, many of whom had prior service with us.

For the most part, the young veterans of the present war require relatively short periods of treatment in our hospitals. This applies to all types, the average period of hospitalization to date among those discharged being 35 days. Of the 128,000 World War No. 2 veterans admitted for hospital treatment, but 16,050 remained under treatment as of December 31, 1944.

We have been receiving only a relatively few veterans of the present war suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis, running about 10 percent of the total World War No. 2 admissions, but we have been having difficulties with many of these patients who have been leaving our hospitals to return to their homes without consent of our medical officers. In these cases we notify the county health authorities so that precautions may be taken against the infection of the boys' families and neighbors. We do our best to persuade these boys not to go home, but under the law we are unable to prevent them from doing so if this is their desire.

We have not begun as yet to receive direct battle casualties in relatively great numbers, as it is the policy of the Army and the Navy to provide the wounded men with the maximum of care prior to discharging them from their own hospitals.

A study has been made of the men receiving service-connected disability pension as of November 15, 1944, at which time we had 321,300 cases on the rolls, and of this number 25,550, or 8 percent, had received their disabilities as a direct result of combat, although many of the others have seen service in combat zones.

I think you will agree that regardless of the cause of disability all of us want our disabled veterans to receive the highest possible type of care that we can give them, and I wish to assure you that we are doing everything within our power to attain this desirable end.

Incidentally, the number of World War No. 2 veterans receiving service-connected disability pension on December 31, 1944, was 350,062, as compared with 334,893 veterans of World War No. 1 receiving service-connected disability compensation on that date. It will be seen, therefore, that we are now making service-connected disability payments to a greater number of World War No. 2 veterans than we are to the veterans of World War No. 1.

High wages and manpower shortages are still holding down the number of disabled veterans of the present war who are applying for vocational rehabilitation in order to overcome the handicap of disability and have lost employability restored.

As of December 31, last, we had 9,359 disabled veterans of the present war taking training courses, of which 6,804 were in institutional training and 2,555 were being trained on the job.

When demobilization begins we expect that the number of disabled veterans entering vocational rehabilitation courses will increase very greatly. While taking such courses a man's pension is increased to $92 a month if single, with additional sums for dependents. This is not enough of an increase to induce many disabled men to leave jobs which may pay them several hundred dollars a month, as many are now making in war plants.

A graphic illustration of this situation is that we have sent out more than 150,000 applications to disabled men presumably eligible to receive training who have not even signed and returned the applications to us. However, many of them may enter training later, as the courses may run until 6 years after the end of the war.

Inasmuch as most of you participated actively in the formulation and enactment of the G. I. bill of rights, you recall that it provides three new types of benefits for World War No. 2 veterans, which are: Educational advantages; partial guaranty of loans for homes, farms, and business purposes; and readjustment allowances for unemployed veterans. Basic requirements for eligibility are 90 days' active service after September 16, 1940, and a discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.

As of December 31, 1944, 12,864 veterans were taking training or refresher courses provided, of which 12,589 were in institutional training and 275 were training on the job. As you are aware, we may pay up to $500 for tuition and other expenses at educational institutions, and the veteran receives a $50 a month maintenance allowance, or if he has a dependent, $75 a month.

Under this training program an eligible veteran is entitled to 1 year of training of his own choice, and if his education has been interrupted by his war service he is entitled to additional training for a period equivalent to the length of his service. If under 25 at the time of enlistment, his education is deemed to have been interrupted. We are not required to counsel and advise these veterans as to their courses—as we do under vocational rehabilitation—but we will gladly advise any veteran who desires this service from us.

The guaranty of loans by the Veterans' Administration under the G. I. bill of rights has been progressing more rapidly than heretofore, the chief emphasis still being upon

home loans. We had received up to February 17, 1,470 applications for loan guaranty, a break-down of which shows that 1,465 applications were for homes, 1 for a farm, and 4 for business purposes.

Up to February 17 we had issued guaranties on 884 loans, of which 880 were for homes, 1 for a farm, and 3 for business purposes, the guaranty commitments having been for homes $1,553,000, for farms $1,000, and for business purposes $4,700.

We have declined so far to guarantee 191 applications for home loans on the grounds that the price asked for the property was too high, and therefore did not meet the provision of the law which requires the purchase price shall not exceed the reasonable normal value as determined by proper appraisal.

The number of veterans who have been receiving readjustment allowances (unemployment benefits) provided under the G. I. bill is not considered excessive in view of the turn-over of workers and local employment conditions throughout the United States and in Puerto Rico.

During the month of September 1944 the largest number of veterans paid such allowances for any week was 5,464, and the increase has been gradual during the intervening weeks until the week of February 3, 1945, when 25,693 veterans were paid a total of $602,025. During the time the program has been in operation $7,157,621 has been paid including the self-employed, as well as those wholly or partially unemployed.

I have cautioned veterans not to apply for these allowances unless it is absolutely necessary. They are like one-way bank accounts—the money drawn out will not be replaced. When exhausted, that is the end.

In addition, veterans should keep in mind that benefits received under the G. I. bill shall be charged against any future adjusted compensation which may be provided for veterans of the present war.

You remember that an important provision of the G. I. bill was designed to provide a maximum of job opportunities for veterans, creating for this purpose a Veterans' Placement Service Board—of which I am chairman—to determine matters of policy relating to the administration of the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service.

The Veterans' Employment Service is now functioning with a World War No. 1 veteran as chief, and we are hopeful that it will render the best possible service to unemployed veterans and to their prospective employers.

You are also doubtless aware that as Administrator of Retraining and Reemployment—which is concerned with policy in the post-war employment of both veterans and war workers—that I and my associates have been endeavoring to visualize this most vital problem of our post-war economy from an over-all long-range viewpoint.

Our conclusions boil down to this: Maximum or full employment for all workers is necessary in order that the returning veterans may be fully employed.

Under the auspices of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, State committees have been established consisting of representatives of the United States Employment Service, Selective Service System, and Veterans' Administration to coordinate efforts of local communities in the establishment of veterans' information service centers in such communities which justify the establishment of such a center in addition to the offices of the United States Employment Service, Selective Service System and Veterans' Administration.

The primary function of these centers will be that of referral and dispensing of precise information providing one point of contact in a community so that the individual can go to the agency concerned to procure the services desired.

There are over 8,000 information service centers in the offices of the United States Employment Service, Selective Service System, and the Veterans' Administration as well as numerous community centers in the larger centers of population. It is expected that by this method it will prevent a veteran from being shunted from one agency to another as a referral center will know exactly where to send the individual for precise service.

I think all of us realize that veterans prefer jobs to pensions or unemployment payments. All of us—management, labor, and Government—will do our best as a team to provide the necessary jobs.

In conclusion I would like to say this: The war is unquestionably going our way, and there is no doubt about the ultimate victory of the United Nations. But as realistic war veterans we know that the war is far from over and that much hard fighting still lies ahead.

Let all of us then so conduct ourselves that when complete victory is finally won that each and every one of us will feel that he or she has played his or her full part, according to his or her abilities.

Mr. Commander in Chief, I want to thank you for the privilege of addressing your guests at this unusual dinner.

Sugar and Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House and the interested public, consisting of the women and others who are responsible for the maintenance of our home life insofar as foodstuffs are concerned and as related to sugar, and also the commercial users of sugar of the United States, I submit for the RECORD additional information pertaining to the outrageous conditions which prevail in Puerto Rico in connection with the harvesting and processing of the present 1945 sugar crop of that island.

This editorial has been taken from the Puerto Rico World Journal. The editor of this paper and the news reporters who serve the paper are, to my certain knowledge, quite well informed on the conditions which prevail in Puerto Rico with respect to the sugar industry, sugarcane growing, and sugar processing, and their statements are worthy of consideration by all who are interested in this subject and in this commodity.

I specifically direct attention to what the World Journal has to say about Governor Tugwell and the Popular Party. We are now reaping what we have previously been sowing in Puerto Rico. This is a matter which in my opinion should have the attention of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Congress in general. It is now time for us to act.

The editorial follows

SUGAR AND UNCLE SAM

After nearly 5 years of constant advice to fight for their rights against employers bent only on exploitation of the masses, workers in Puerto Rico heard twice in recent days that they also have responsibilities. Señor Francisco Susoni last week issued a statement saying that "the worker must be made to realize what he must give in exchange for what he gets."

Last Saturday Governor Tugwell praised Susoni's words and added this unveiled warning to government and labor:

"Like many others, I am sure, I was regretful that after the victory in November there should spread throughout the ranks of workers a spirit of withdrawal and a feeling that now the government would support them.

"Puerto Rican leaders, I feel, now must combat this and show the way to ever greater efficiency in production."

Few close observers of the local political scene in the past 5 years will question the fact that the above statements come close to being revolutionary so far as the government's relationship with labor has been concerned during that period.

Meanwhile, sugar urgently needed to meet a critical shortage in the States and at fighting fronts remains unprocessed in Puerto Rico because the workers' demands have not been met by the Sugar Producers Association. We don't know how justified are the demands of labor in this strike, and we have no way of knowing whether the sugar people can or cannot meet those demands and stay in business. They say they can't unless Uncle Sam pays a big enough subsidy to offset their losses.

We do know, however, that both sides feel Uncle Sam should step into the picture with enough cold cash to make everything agreeable to all concerned. The unions say they will help the sugar producers to fight for a bigger subsidy.

Isn't it about time that Government leaders here told themselves that they also have responsibilities? For 5 years labor has listened to a one-sided story of how it has been exploited. Belatedly, high authorities issue a warning, praiseworthy to be sure, but obviously not destined to overcome 5 long years of propaganda aimed at securing labor's vote.

The past 5 years have seen labor here make great strides under the tutelage and assistance of the Government. That, too, is laudable and justified. Labor had far to go, and perhaps should go much farther. But it is ironic that all that progress should be sacrificed by the same persons who have worked so devotedly in labor's cause.

Government, aside from the merits of present issues involved in the sugar strike, has molded the worker's frame of mind to accept all and give as little as possible. Now, apparently, an attempt is being made to recover ground—to stave off widespread economic disaster.

And how do spokesmen for both sides hope to save the situation? Fight for a bigger subsidy. As spokesmen for both sides have said recently: "Uncle Sam won't let the people starve." That comes pretty close to being right. Uncle Sam won't let the people starve. It's wrong, however, if Uncle Sam is mentioned without taking into account that Mr. and Mrs. John Doe are being taxed heavily from their weekly pay envelopes to meet such demands as the present situation has created.

Since Pearl Harbor the war has cost the American taxpayer $238,000,000,000, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau announced yesterday. Also, since Pearl Harbor, the war has put about $100,000,000 into the Insular Treasury. Some day Uncle Sam's bottomless barrel of cash is going to find a bottom. Let's hope that before then government officials here are going to realize their own responsibilities to their own people.

Government, through two highly competent spokesmen, has admitted its failure to educate the workers on their obligations to

the community. Government, through its various leaders—in political campaigns and out—has encouraged the feeling among the masses that the people would be cared for, that their interests came first at all times. That is proper and right, we believe, but while it sought to improve labor's standards government's lack of foresight or reluctance to face the facts of Puerto Rico's economic structure fostered this attitude of dependency among the workers.

We sincerely urge government here to make a strong effort—late as it is—to teach the people, after it learns itself, that the dole makes a perilous foundation upon which to build for progress and security.

Poll of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report of a study made by Surveys, Inc., of New York, for Look magazine, a poll of congressional opinion on 21 questions of current interest.

It is not maintained that the results of this poll are conclusive. However, I believe the report will be of genuine interest to the Members of Congress and others, because of the indications of its findings of congressional opinion. It follows:

I. Do you believe the President's objective of 60,000,000 peacetime jobs is attainable?

	Percent
Yes	55.4
No	42.2
No opinion	2.4

II. Do you favor a guaranteed minimum annual wage for American workers?

	Percent
Yes	47.0
No	43.4
No opinion	9.6

III. A recent poll found that nearly half of the 17,000,000 wage-earners in American manufacturing industries look primarily to the Government to solve the post-war job problem. Another recent poll learned that Americans in all walks of life are overwhelmingly in favor of "taking the Government out of business after the war." Do you believe post-war full employment requires Government expenditures for direct work?

	Percent
Yes	48.2
No	45.8
No opinion	6.0

IV. Should Congress pass legislation providing controls of labor unions similar to the controls of business firms and organizations?

	Percent
Yes	77.1
No	18.1
No opinion	4.8

V. Should unemployment insurance coverage be extended to the employees of all business establishments?

	Percent
Yes	69.9
No	19.3
No opinion	10.8

VI. Should old age benefits start at 60 instead of 65?

	Percent
Yes	48.2
No	47.0
No opinion	4.8

VII. Do you favor socialized medicine?

	Percent
Yes	14.5
No	81.9
No opinion	3.6

VIII. After the defeat of Japan, do you favor reduction of personal income taxes in the lower brackets? In all brackets?

In the lower brackets:	Percent
Yes	59.0
No	12.1
No opinion	28.9

In all brackets:	Percent
Yes	55.4
No	26.5
No opinion	18.1

IX. Do you favor repeal of the excess-profits tax, after the defeat of Japan?

	Percent
Yes	55.4
No	28.9
No opinion	15.7

X. Do you favor requiring all young men to devote 1 year to military service in peacetime?

	Percent
Yes	49.4
No	36.1
No opinion	14.5

XI. Do you favor a 1 year's compulsory Government service for all young women?

	Percent
Yes	3.6
No	90.4
No opinion	6.0

XII. Do you favor our maintaining, after the defeat of Japan, a large navy, air force, and army?

	Percent
Yes	82.0
No	7.2
Large air force and navy	[1] 3.6
No opinion	7.2

[1] This 3.6 percent did not answer either "Yes" or "No" to the question; it receives this separate tabulation (rather than being included in "No opinion") because of its clear indication of a definite stand for which the phrasing of the question made no allowance.

XIII. Should the United States insist upon naval and aeronautical bases at strategic locations in the Pacific and Atlantic?

	Percent
Yes	96.4
No	1.2
No opinion	2.4

XIV. Should America's representative on the world security organization be authorized to vote with other nations in resisting aggression without first referring issues to Congress?

	Percent
Yes	44.6
No	45.8
No opinion	9.6

XV. Do you favor a constitutional amendment providing for treaty ratification by majority votes of the Senate and the House?

	Percent
Yes	61.5
No	34.9
No opinion	3.6

XVI. Do you favor governmental price guaranties and crop insurance to farmers?

	Percent
Yes	67.5
No	24.1
No opinion	8.4

XVII. Should the O. P. A. be continued for a temporary period after the defeat of Japan?

	Percent
Yes	61.5
No	30.1
No opinion	8.4

XVIII. Do you believe the Roosevelt administration is in favor of private enterprise?

	Percent
Yes	39.8
No	50.6
No opinion	9.6

XIX. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and to provide for election of the President by popular vote?

	Percent
Yes	49.4
No	42.2
No opinion	8.4

XX. Do you favor a constitutional amendment limiting future Presidents to two terms of 4 years each?

	Percent
Yes	66.3
No	30.1
No opinion	3.6

XXI. After the defeat of Japan, should the war plants now owned by the Government be leased to private industry? Sold to private industry?

Results: Seventy-three and five-tenths percent believe that the war plants now owned by the Government should be sold to private industry. An additional 7.2 percent believe that they should either be sold or leased to private industry; 2.4 percent are opposed; 16.9 percent have no present opinion on it.

On the question of leasing the plants to private industry, in addition to the 7.2 percent who believe that they should either be leased or sold to private industry, 37.4 percent believe they should be leased to private industry; 8.4 percent are opposed; 47 percent have no present opinion on leasing them to private industry.

FEBRUARY 6, 1945.

Henry Clay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMMET O'NEAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address, with accompanying letter, by the Honorable South Trimble on Henry Clay. Mr. Trimble, Clerk of the House, and formerly a Member of the House and a distinguished Kentuckian, is deeply interested in history as related to the Congress. His address was presented in the folklore hour of the Kentucky Society of Washington at the Willard on Friday evening, January 26, 1945, before the large audience present at the annual congressional reception tendered by the

society to the members of the Kentucky delegation. As one of them, I feel Mr. Trimble has made a real contribution both to our national and State histories.

The letter and address follow:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1945.

Mr. CAMDEN R. MCATEE,
President, Kentucky Society of Washington, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MCATEE: When I received the invitation to address the Kentucky Society on January 26, I was a little surprised as I have not gone out at night since my serious illness of 4 years ago. Twenty years ago I would have been delighted to have accepted the invitation, but that day has gone forever.

I am not a historian in any sense of the word. However, within the last 2 or 3 years I discovered some historical mistakes of alleged historians made public by the press, two of which related to Henry Clay and Aaron Burr. I endeavored to correct both historical errors by diligent research, and I feel sure that I did correct both. Mr. Paul Brannon wrote a very interesting article about Frankfort, which is one of the most historic towns in the country, and in his article referred to Lafayette, the great French statesman, and to other noted men who had visited Frankfort. But in one paragraph he made the following statement: "Here the swashbuckling Burr strode the streets to answer the charge of treason with Henry Clay, the great pacificator, at his side to defend him."

This article was published in the magazine Kentucky and circulated in every State in the Union. I knew it was a slanderous statement and I immediately wrote to the State Journal, which reproduced his article, stating that there was not a scintilla of truth in this statement and that it slandered the name of Henry Clay. This started a raging controversy through the columns of the State Journal, and many attacked me and defended Mr. Brannon's statement, with the result that after a lapse of 6 months I compiled a history of this episode which was published in the State Journal and covered an entire page. This article was subsequently published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and those who are interested enough may find this copy in the files of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 2, 1943, page 10352, on file in the Congressional Library.

I will not be able to appear in person and deliver an address on Henry Clay, but am sending you a brief history of outstanding events in his life and, if you think proper, you may read it to the society.

Sincerely,

SOUTH TRIMBLE.

HENRY CLAY

Henry Clay was born in a district, known as The Slashes, in Hanover County, Va., April 12, 1777. He attended the public school for a short time, acquiring a knowledge of spelling and arithmetic, which was the basis of his education since he never had any college training. He studied law in a prominent lawyer's office in Richmond, Va. When he was 20 years of age he obtained his license to practice law, and then chose to go to Lexington, Ky., to make his future home, and to practice law.

Clay was a wealthy man of his day, and when he arrived in Lexington, which was then a town of about 1,800 people, he bought a farm immediately adjoining the town and built a beautiful home, calling it Ashland. His great-great-granddaughter owns and lives in this residence today. The remainder of his farm has been developed into the residential portion of Lexington.

Henry Clay was the pioneer fine stock breeder in Kentucky, being the first man who ever imported purebred horses, cattle, and sheep to the blue grass regions. At the age of 29 he was elected to the State House of Representatives in Frankfort. While serving in that legislature, a vacancy occurred in the United States Senate because of the resignation of Senator John Adair, and Clay came to the Senate and served the unexpired term of approximately 4 months. He then returned to Kentucky and was again a candidate for the State legislature, something almost unprecedented for a United States Senator. He was elected, and was also elected Speaker of the Kentucky House of Representatives. It was not very long before United States Senator Buckner Thurston resigned, and the legislature again elected Clay to serve out the unexpired term of approximately 3 months. When he arrived in Washington the first time as a Senator, he was not of the constitutional age of 30 years, but his reputation had preceded him and no Senator had the temerity to question his age. Therefore, he took his seat, the only Senator on record who was ever sworn in before he was 30 years of age.

On his return to Kentucky, after serving out his last term in the United States Senate, Clay was a candidate and was elected to the Twelfth Congress. The most remarkable thing about Clay's entire career was that he was elected Speaker the first day he entered the United States House of Representatives, something that never had happened before and will never happen again. He was elected to the Thirteenth Congress, and again was elected Speaker. He resigned from the Thirteenth Congress while he was Speaker, because he was appointed by the President as one of the commissioners to negotiate the Treaty of Peace with Great Britain after the War of 1812, and Langdon Cheves, of South Carolina, was elected Speaker. Clay was elected to the Fourteenth Congress and was elected Speaker again. He was elected to the Fifteenth Congress and elected Speaker. He was elected to the Sixteenth Congress and again elected Speaker. He resigned from the Sixteenth Congress, for what reason I have never discovered, and John W. Taylor, of New York, was elected Speaker in his place. Clay was out of the Seventeenth Congress, during which Philip P. Barbour, of Virginia, was the Speaker, but Clay was elected to the Eighteenth Congress and was elected Speaker again, a circumstance which would not happen in this day and time.

Clay was elected to the Nineteenth Congress and his term began on the 4th of March 1825, the same day that John Quincy Adams was inaugurated. He did not qualify as a Congressman because Adams appointed him Secretary of State.

In the Presidential election of 1824 Henry Clay, of Kentucky, Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, William Crawford, of Georgia, and John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts, were candidates. When they counted the electoral vote in a joint session of the House and Senate no one candidate received a majority of electoral votes. In such event the Constitution provides that the House elect one of the three candidates receiving the largest number of electoral votes. As Henry Clay was the fourth man, receiving 37 electoral votes, he was eliminated in the election. The Constitution also provides that in a situation of this kind each State has but one vote and the dominant party in the delegation controls that vote and the successful candidate must get a majority of all the States.

Under normal political conditions, with Adams living in Massachusetts in the far east and with Crawford, Jackson, and Clay in the South and West, Jackson would be elected. However, Clay at that time was Speaker of the House and the most powerful man in the Nation next to the President, as he appointed all the committees and chairmen of those committees, and could make changes at will. He and Jackson were viciously antagonistic toward each other and were not on speaking terms. Clay did not want to see Jackson elected, so he threw all of his powerful influence into the contest, with the result that Adams was elected. Adams was elected on the first ballot, and it is absolutely certain that Henry Clay was responsible for his election. It was at this time that Adams appointed Clay Secretary of State, which position Clay held for 4 years. Clay's political enemies charged him with trading his influence in the election of Adams for the job of Secretary of State, but such was not the case. He was more powerful as Speaker of the House than he was as Secretary of State, and his successful efforts in electing Adams were the result of his bitter antagonism toward Jackson.

When his time expired Clay returned to Kentucky. Subsequently another vacancy occurred in the United States Senate, and Clay was again elected to the Senate. He was a candidate to succeed himself and he was reelected and reelected until at the age of 75 he died in office on June 29, 1852.

In the Presidential election of 1828 Jackson defeated John Quincy Adams, who was a candidate for reelection, and, in 1832, Clay was a candidate against Jackson's reelection but was defeated. In 1844 Clay was again a candidate for President and was defeated by James K. Polk.

Clay was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives six times, or more than any other man. There have been but three other Speakers elected four times—Stevenson, of Virginia; Clark, of Missouri, and Cannon, of Illinois.

Incidentally, Kentuckians have been elected Speaker in more Congresses than have Members from any other State. However, Massachusetts has elected more Congressmen Speakers than any other State. The Members from Kentucky who served as Speakers and the number of terms follow: Clay, 6; White, 1; Boyd, 2; Carlisle, 3.

CLAY-MARSHALL DUEL

During the troubled years in pioneer days of Kentucky when Clay and Marshall met on the dueling grounds, two of the most famous men in Kentucky met in mortal combat. The events that led up to the duel began when Henry Clay introduced in the Kentucky Legislature a resolution "That Thomas Jefferson is entitled to the thanks of his country for the ability, uprightness and intelligence which he has displayed in the management of both our foreign relations and domestic concern."

The hostility between Clay and Marshall was of long standing. Their debates on the floor of the House were exceedingly abusive and vitriolic. Marshall was a Federalist but was branded a Tory and he opposed the Jefferson resolution. In the discussion both employed their matchless power of vituperation and invective. Ultimately Marshall lost his head and bluntly called Clay a liar. Clay, then 10 or 12 feet away, darted forward with arms uplifted, beside himself with anger. Members interposed. Clay struggled to get free. They were separated by General Riffe, a giant of a man of German extraction, who entreated, then threatened, "Come, poys," he said, holding them off, "no fighting here. I vips you both." Turning to the House, Clay apologized. He would not have taken the liberty, he said, had his opponent been a man of honor.

This was too much for Marshall, who rose and yelled, "It is the apology of a poltroon." That night Clay sent Marshall a written challenge, which was accepted with a prompt and tart reply. Clay asked his friend, Colonel Moore, to be his second and to secure for him a brace of pistols on which he could rely; also to procure some of the best powder adapted to such an occasion.

At last came the fatal day. On Thursday, January 19, 1809, in the cold early morning the principals with their surgeons, seconds and a few friends, crossed the Ohio River at Louisville, and selected an eligible spot of

ground just below Silver Creek in Indiana, as there was a law prohibiting dueling in Kentucky. The surgeons stood by with cases open; the seconds consulted together gravely; pistols were examined, 10 paces measured off, and amid awesome silence slender, fair-haired Henry Clay faced in mortal combat tall and swarthy Humphrey Marshall. A moment of suspense, a tightening of the trigger finger, then shots came quickly upon the words "Attention! Fire!"

Clay remained steady, but Marshall staggered. Clay's ball had grazed his abdomen, and given him a slight wound. On the second round Clay's pistol snapped; there was only one shot, but Marshall fired without effect. On the third, Clay staggered—and his shot went wild. Marshall had given him a flesh wound in the thigh.

"Mr. Clay insisted on another fire very ardently," said the seconds, "but his situation, resulting from the wound, placing him on unequal grounds, his importunate request was not complied with."

The affair was over. Colonel Moore and Major Campbell, the respective seconds, reported, "We deem it justice to both gentlemen to pronounce their conduct on the occasion, cool, determined, and brave in the highest degree."

Henry Clay exclaimed, "Thank God, Humphrey is only slightly wounded!"

So ended the Clay-Marshall famous duel.

CLAY-RANDOLPH DUEL

One hundred and eighteen years ago—April 8, 1826—Henry Clay, Secretary of State, and John Randolph, United States Senator from Virginia, fought a duel on the Virginia side of the Potomac River, a few miles above the National Capital. Senator Randolph had the reputation of being one of the best pistol shots in the country. His friends claimed he usually hit whatever he shot at. It is also said that Secretary Clay had similar skill.

The duel was the result of rough language used on the floor of the Senate by Randolph. He referred to Clay's alliance with President John Quincy Adams as a union of the "blackleg and the Puritan"—the "Blifil and Black George."

Gen. James Hamilton, of South Carolina, one of Randolph's seconds, gives this interesting description of the bloodless duel between the two distinguished gentlemen:

"The night before Mr. Randolph sent for me, I found him calm, but in a singularly kind and confiding mood. He told me that he had something on his mind to tell me. He then remarked: 'Hamilton, I have determined to receive, without returning, Clay's fire; nothing shall induce me to harm a hair of his head; I will not make his wife a widow, nor his children orphans. Their tears would be shed over his grave; but when the sod of Virginia rests on my bosom there is not one in this wide world, not one individual, to pay this tribute upon mine.' His eyes filled; and, resting his head upon his hand, we remained some moments silent. I replied: 'My dear friend, I deeply regret that you have mentioned the subject to me; for you call upon me to go to the field and see you shot down, or to assume the responsibility, in regard to your own life, in sustaining your determination to throw it away. But on this subject a man's own conscience and his own bosom are his best monitors. I will not advise; but, under the enormous and unprovoked personal insult you have offered Mr. Clay, I cannot dissuade. I feel bound, however, to communicate to Colonel Tatnall your decision.'

"He begged me not to do so, and said he was very much afraid that Tatnall would take the studs and refuse to go out with him. I, however, sought Colonel Tatnall, and we repaired about midnight to Mr. Randolph's lodgings, whom we found reading Milton's great poem. For some moments he did not permit us to say one word in relation to the approaching duel; and he at once commenced one of those delightful criticisms on a passage of this poet, in which he was wont so enthusiastically to indulge. After a pause, Colonel Tatnall remarked: 'Mr. Randolph, I am told you have determined not to return Mr. Clay's fire; I must say to you, my dear sir, if I am only to go out to see you shot down, you must find some other friend.' Mr. Randolph remarked that such was his determination. After much conversation on the subject, I induced Colonel Tatnall to allow Mr. Randolph to take his own course, as his withdrawal as one of his friends might lead to very injurious misconstructions. At length, Mr. Randolph, smiling, said: 'Well, Tatnall, I promise you one thing: if I see the devil in Clay's eyes, and that, with malice prepense, he means to take my life, I may change my mind'—a remark I knew he made merely to propitiate the anxieties of his friend.

"Mr. Clay and himself met at 4 o'clock the succeeding evening on the banks of the Potomac. But he saw no 'devil in Clay's eye,' but a man fearless and expressing the mingled sensibility, and firmness which belonged to the occasion.

"I shall never forget this scene as long as I live. It has been my misfortune to witness several duels, but I never saw one, at least in its sequel, so deeply affecting. The sun was just setting behind the blue hills of Randolph's own Virginia. Here were two of the most extraordinary men our country in its prodigality had produced, about to meet in mortal combat. Whilst Tatnall was loading Randolph's pistol, I approached my friend, I believed, for the last time. I took his hand; there was not in its touch the quivering of one pulsation. He turned to me and said: 'Clay is calm, but not vindictive; I hold my purpose, Hamilton, in any event; remember this.'

"On handing him his pistol, Colonel Tatnall sprung the hair-trigger. Mr. Randolph said, 'Tatnall, although I am one of the best shots in Virginia with either pistol or gun, yet I never fire with a hair-trigger; besides, I have a thick buckskin glove on, which will destroy the delicacy of my touch and the trigger may fly before I know where I am.' But, from his great solicitude for his friend, Tatnall insisted upon hairing the trigger. On taking their positions, the fact turned out as Mr. Randolph anticipated: his pistol went off before the word, with the muzzle down.

"The moment this event took place General Jessup, Mr. Clay's friend, called out that he would instantly leave the ground with his friend if that occurred again. Mr. Clay at once exclaimed that it was an accident and begged that the gentleman might be allowed to go on. On word being given, Mr. Clay fired without effect, Mr. Randolph discharged his pistol in the air.

"The moment Mr. Clay saw that Mr. Randolph had thrown away his fire, with a gush of sensibility he instantly approached Mr. Randolph and said, with an emotion I never can forget: 'I trust in God, my dear sir, you are untouched. After what has occurred, I would not have harmed you for a thousand worlds.'"

Grasping the other in a fervent handclasp, Randolph, in happy good humor, said: "You owe me a coat, Mr. Clay. You will observe that your bullet went through the tail of my coat in the vicinity of my hip." Whereupon the Secretary of State pleasantly replied, "I am glad the debt is no greater."

In the meantime all Washington was excited over the possible outcome of the duel between these two famous men. Mrs. Clay, with heart half broken, was wondering whether she was going to be a widow and her children fatherless. President Adams was speculating about the probable loss of a mighty good Secretary of State. But the most worried man seems to have been William Henry Harrison, then a Member of the Senate from Ohio, and subsequently President of the United States. He and Clay were great cronies, and both lived on F Street not far from where the National Press Club now stands. These two men were real neighbors and thought the world and all of each other. For little more than an hour, Harrison had paced up and down his parlor floor, eargerly awaiting some word about the duel. Glancing out of the window he observed Clement Dorsey, a Maryland Congressman, passing down the street. Hoisting the window, he yelled for Dorsey to come into his house. "Mr. Clay is dead," sadly remarked Harrison. "He was to have returned by 4 o'clock, and here it is 5 and no signs of him. Yes, yes, he must be dead. Poor Henry Clay." But at that very moment Clay appeared on horseback, turning the corner of F Street at Fifteenth, Harrison rushed out of the front door, and with the tails of his dressing gown flying in the wind, he raced up the street to meet Clay, and warmly embraced him when he dismounted from his sweating horse.

According to Ogle Tayloe, one of Clay's close friends, Mr. Clay, sometime after Randolph's death told him that years before the duel he had been warned by close friends to be on the look-out for trouble with Randolph. They claimed that Randolph was determined to fight a duel with him, asserting that he had made the statement that he "preferred to be killed by Mr. Clay to any other death."

The story goes that more than 100 years ago when Washington was a country town, a small creek ran down Constitution Avenue; there were no paved streets, just plank sidewalks, and in the winter time when rains washed out the sidewalks foot logs had to be put in so that only one person could cross at a time. Henry Clay was going down to his hotel, and John Randolph was going to the Capitol when coincidentally they met on either end of the foot log. Randolph threw up his hands, exclaiming, "Clay, this is John Randolph and I have the right-of-way; I never get out of the way of a damn rascal!" Clay backed off, bowed very suavely and politely and said, "Mr. Randolph, this is Henry Clay and I always get out of the way of a damn rascal, and you have the right-of-way."

After the bloodless duel on the Potomac, Randolph and Clay became bosom friends. Randolph, in failing health and on his way to a hospital in Philadelphia, stopped off in Washington to hear Henry Clay make his farewell speech in the Senate. At Randolph's request, he was brought to the Senate from his hotel on a cot to hear the speech.

Fellow citizens of Kentucky, I regret more than I can tell you that conditions were such that I could not be present in person and deliver to you an extemporaneous address on Henry Clay. While for the last 30 years I have resided in Washington, my heart is in Kentucky and I always look forward with pleasure to my visits to Frankfort three or four times a year. In conclusion I want to add an excerpt from James H. Mulligan's beautiful poem, In Kentucky, which expresses my sentiments.

The moonlight falls the softest in Kentucky;
The summer days come oftest in Kentucky;
Friendship is the strongest,
Love's light glows the longest,
Yet, wrong is always wrongest in Kentucky.

Life's burdens bear the lightest in Kentucky;
The home fires burn the brightest in Kentucky;
The sun shines ever brightest in Kentucky;
The breezes whisper lightest in Kentucky;
Plain girls are the fewest,
Their little hearts are truest.
Maidens' eyes the bluest in Kentucky.

Rents—Public Versus Private

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Joseph H. Deckman entitled "Rents—Public Versus Private," which appeared in the February 1945 issue of the Home Builders Monthly:

RENTS—PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE

(By Joseph H. Deckman)

Public housing exponents continually misuse, as their strongest argument, the fact that private enterprise cannot rent a four-room housing unit for $12 per month.

By clever mixing of this truth with the myth that public housers can produce such housing, the general public has been led to accept the biggest financial hocus-pocus of this century. Actually, only a mere handful of public housing units are rented for $12 per month for public exhibition and consumption. In fact, it is a stated policy that not more than 25 percent of the units in any one project shall be rented at graded rents.

For every one of these units there are hundreds of public housing units renting at more than $30 per month, and all of them are made possible through staggering public subsidies.

When confronted with the $12 per month rent for a four-room dwelling, private enterprise always truthfully states that it cannot rent at this figure and pay all expenses plus a normal business profit.

In like manner, it holds true that public housers cannot rent a four-room dwelling for $12 per month without the aid of enormous subsidies furnished them by the taxpayer through the Public Treasury.

To show how enormous these subsidies are and how unfair it is to condemn private enterprise on the basis of comparing rents the way public housers do it, the following comparative table of rents is given.

Charges which go to make up private rents will be shown in one column and compared to them will be the subsidized items of public housing rents which are necessary to reduce the rent of a four-room unit to $12 per month.

In the case of private rents the items will be subtracted to arrive at a fair comparison to the $12 rent, while in the case of public rents the subsidized items will be added for a comparative full rent.

Rents will be based on an average cost of construction by both private and public operations. A 25 percent lesser cost for private housing than public will be used. This differential is based on factual testimony presented to the Burton Senate subcommittee, which proved that private enterprise can build from 25 percent to 40 percent less than public housers.

It is pointed out that the housing units in this example are entirely comparable to the minimum standard housing constructed in the majority of cases by public housing.

Space heaters for heating, untiled baths, and minimum equipment in kitchens are specified. Under the usual conditions of comparison, the cost of this minimum standard type public housing unit would be compared to a private unit with a central heating plant, tile bath, and more expensive kitchen equipment. Even with these former handicaps of comparison, private housing has been repeatedly proven to be constructed at a considerably less cost than public.

The rent for private housing is taken at a figure which is high enough to make a good investment for such a property.

A rent of $12 for the public unit is taken as the minimum rent which is boasted about.

The public housing considered in this example is permanent public housing built under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as constructed in this city of Washington.

From the accompanying rent analysis it is clearly shown that public housers are resorting to the worst type of fabricated falsehoods, when they maintain that public housing is the least costly method to the taxpayer for housing the low income groups. The same can be said of their unfair methods of comparing public subsidized rents to full private rents.

The comparison as made here is not entirely a true one, as many other subsidies enjoyed by public housing are not stated in given amounts of monthly rent.

The largest and most important unstated subsidy is the outright gift to public housing of the cost of land and construction. This subsidy is normally covered up by the scheme of using the annual subsidy of interest and amortization as a book transaction which pays off the original cost. This subsidy is annually taken from the taxpayer after the original project cost has already been spent so it does not pay off anything. The subsidy is actually used to write down rents for the purpose of producing low rental housing. The whole transaction is similar to taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another and by so doing deluding oneself into thinking a debt is paid off by this manipulation.

Another cost to the taxpayer is the progressive annual interest which has to be paid on moneys borrowed through deficit financing to make the annual subsidy payments.

Other indirect subsidies to public housing and costs to private enterprise are the franking privileges of the mail, governmental printing rates, legal services for Congressional hearings and other business, and the cost of information and propaganda departments.

By present public housing methods huge sums of public money are being expended at a higher cost than is necessary and without achieving adequate housing for the indigent.

Thus this immense distortion of the truth and financial chicanery is being perpetrated at both the expense of the taxpayer and the indigent citizens.

A COMPARATIVE RENT ANALYSIS

Public rent

Based on a four-room unit at a cost of $4,000 per unit:

Subsidized rent (assumed to include overhead, repairs, and maintenance), $12 a month.

Subsidized items:

Taxes, real estate ($1.75/cw. on 85-percent of cost), $5 a month.

Sixty-year financing (3-percent interest and amortization), $13 a month.

Management cost (13 percent of rent collected), $1.56 a month.

Insurance (80 percent of cost), 42 cents a month.

Cost of debt service on total cost of $4,000 at 2 percent per annum, average interest compounded for a sound life of 35 years for the structure, $9.86 a month.

(This is necessary due to deficit financing of the Federal Government. The figure is arrived at by taking the first year monthly charge of $6.67 and averaging it with the thirty-fifth year monthly charge of $13.06. It is to be noted that a 59-year life is not used even though a substantially higher monthly cost would be shown. This has been done to eliminate any criticism of showing partiality to private enterprise, despite the fact that public housing is amortized on a 59-year basis to obtain its low rents and in order to justify its existence.)

Total additions, $29.84.

Total comparable rent to full private rent, $41.84 a month.

Private rent

Based on a four-room unit at a cost of $3,000 per unit, or 25 percent less than the public cost.

Full rent (includes all finance charges, repairs, maintenance, taxes, and profit), $35 a month.

Items to be deducted:

Taxes, real estate ($1.75/cw. on 85 percent of cost), $3.70 a month.

Twenty-year financing (5½ percent interest and amortization and insurance at $7 per month per $1,000), $21 a month.

Management cost (5 percent of rent collected), $1.50 a month.

Total deductions, $26.20 a month.

Total comparable rent, $8.80 a month.

Eight dollars and eighty cents a month is the private rent which should be used when a comparison is made to the $12 a month subsidized public housing rent. This rent includes profit, repairs, maintenance, social security, and other Federal taxes.

It is significant to note that the $8.80 rent of private housing is approximately 26 percent less than the subsidized $12 rent of public housing. In like manner the $41.84 public housing rent is approximately 19 percent greater than the $35 private rent. This is true even though all subsidies are not reflected and the public housing rent has the decided advantage of being based on the low interest rate of 3 percent with 59-year financing.

If private builders had low interest rates and longer financing, their full rents would unquestionably be less than the so-called economic rents of public housing.

On the basis of a true comparison of private and public rents it can be seen that the least costly and most efficient method to clear slums and house the low-income groups is to set up machinery whereby private enterprise finances and constructs all housing and pays all taxes without any public subsidy.

This can be accomplished through a public agency clearing slums and selling them to private enterprise at a fair value based on a maximum rent that can be charged. Any write down in land is not a subsidy to the builder but is a subsidy to the owner of slum property and a cost chargeable to the general public for slum elimination as is now the case with public housing.

The subsidy needed for rent relief is the function of public welfare and is given to the low income or indigent tenant for rent purposes and can in no way be termed a subsidy to the builder.

It is admitted by the National Association of Housing Officials, that it is the function of public welfare to provide rent assistance for the indigent. On page 19 of the pamphlet, Housing for the United States After the War, the statement is made concerning rents in public housing, "it is the responsibility of public welfare agencies to assure that families needing general assistance will be able to pay such rents."

By this it is meant that public welfare shall pay the tenant's economic rent if necessary, even though private enterprise can meet this rent for comparable housing.

If private enterprise can build for less and manage for less than public housing and public welfare is to render rent relief for the needy, the paramount question is, Why is there any need for public housing?

It should be quite obvious to anyone confronted with the facts that private housing coupled with public welfare is the only solution to housing low income groups.

Through this method all land and housing will remain on the tax rolls, and income

taxes from private enterprise profits will aid in caring for the unfortunate. Only the needy will be subsidized by rent relief and only one cost, that of rent relief, will be borne by the taxpayer. Furthermore, the public debt will be decreased, as deficit financing will not be needed. Also, greater tax revenues will aid in balancing the budget, which is a necessity to avert ultimate financial chaos.

A sound economy will provide jobs and prosperity which will raise wages and the standard of living of the working classes and in turn will result in less need of rent relief to a shrinking number of indigent citizens.

Last but not least the threat of State socialism through Government ownership of the homes of the citizens will be dispelled by a true American approach to a problem which has stumped every other nation of the world.

The Truth About Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. J. Pope Dyer, head of the department of government, Central High School, at Chattanooga, has spent years studying the problem of juvenile delinquency and is one of the Nation's foremost authorities on criminology and juvenile delinquency.

Since all of us are interested in this problem, I am pleased to include herein an address delivered by him on February 9, 1945:

A friend of mine tells about going into a restaurant recently which was located near a railroad depot. It was early in the morning, about 4 or 5 o'clock. My friend sat down at one of the tables and near him sat a group of girls. A newsboy came in and yelled, "Paper! Paper!" One of the girls said, "We can't read and we don't enjoy the pictures." To which the newsboy replied, "Well, then, smell it. It's about half baloney anyway." I realize that when we start talking about the subject of juvenile delinquency that so much has been said and so much has been written that the average listener says that I am not interested because a very high percentage of it is all baloney.

If we should go back into the early history of our Nation and study the criminal careers of the notorious criminals we would find that the outstanding examples of adult crime started in acts of juvenile delinquency. John A. Murrell is quoted to have said, in the book In Outlaw Years by Coates, that his mother taught him to steal and rob at the tender age of 8. It is of interest to recall that the most dangerous and desperate criminals of the past decade—"Pretty Boy" Floyd, Alvin Karpis, "Baby Face" Nelson, John Dillinger, and the Barker brothers—all started their careers of crime as juvenile delinquents. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover makes the statement in his book, Persons in Hiding, that the most cunning and cruel criminal with whom he has had to deal was "Ma" Barker. It does not take a finished criminologist to recall that she was the mother of four sons, and that from almost their infancy she taught them to steal, to rob, to kill, to plan a getaway, to case a job, and to kidnap. All of you will remember that these sons, one by one, were killed by law-enforcement officers, and she paid the supreme penalty while shooting it out with the agents of the F. B. I. in Ocala, Fla.

I should like to relate a story which I believe would serve as a typical example to explain most cases of juvenile delinquency. A few years ago in New York City, a ruthless young killer named "Two Gun" Crowley was parked in a New York City park. A policeman came up and asked to see his driver's license. He pulled his gun and killed the policeman. Later he was surrounded in his apartment by a great number of police who were exchanging shots with him. He paused long enough to write this statement, "In my bosom is a heart that would do no person any wrong." He was caught, tried, and sentenced to be electrocuted. In Sing Sing Prison he said, "This is what I get for defending myself." In his book, Meet the Murderer, Lewis E. Lawes says that Crowley was the only man that ever ate his last meal during his time as warden of Sing Sing Prison. Crowley is quoted to have said: "Warden, when I was a child we were too poor to have turkey; when I became a youth I was too busy dodging policemen to eat a decent meal, and now when I have the chance I am going to eat one decent meal before I die."

From the statistics of the F. B. I. we learn that juvenile delinquency is on the increase. It is said that the increase is some 50 or 60 percent among girls and some 8 or 10 percent among boys. The chief offenses among girls seem to be ungovernability and sex offenses. For boys it seems to be in the field of larceny and particularly the stealing of automobiles. It is agreed by sociologists and criminologists that most of the delinquency occurs near military camps and in towns that have had mushroom growth—in other words, communities that have had an abnormally high growth in population without adequate means to deal with this increasing population from the point of view of education, recreation, or law.

Experts tell us that these juvenile delinquents are about the same size physically as their companions of like age. They furthermore tell us that from the standpoint of intelligence that the delinquents are not exceptionally low but that educationally they rank about 2 or 3 grades lower than the normal student. Experts also tell us that they have had very little religious or moral training. To be specific Judge Tatum of Nashville, Tenn., recently stated that of the approximately 5,000 cases of juvenile delinquency that had come before him in his court, in the past 5 years, that fewer than a dozen of these delinquents were regular attenders of Sunday school and church and that only about 5 of their parents regularly attended Sunday school and church. We might be a little premature in stating that regular attendance at Sunday school and church is almost an immunity against juvenile delinquency. However, this statement would not be greatly exaggerated.

The chief causes of juvenile delinquency can broadly be classified as economic, educational, emotional, and those growing out of faulty home training. In practically all cases of juvenile delinquency we find that the offenders come from homes where poverty prevails. We find the youthful offenders, in most instances often play truant, are openly opposed to attending school, antagonistic to their teachers and notorious violators of the rules of the school which they seldom attend and are retarded to such a degree that they are obviously, radically maladjusted. These same juvenile delinquents come from homes where both parents are irresponsible, incompetent to successfully rear children and do not possess either the ability or the desire to give their children the benefits that are necessary to make good citizens. In many instances the parents are too eager to make money, to have a good time in riotous living, or have such a selfish point of view that they are not willing to pay the price of being proper parents. Most experts in the field of juvenile delinquency are stating that the big problem is the problem of adult delinquency rather than juvenile delinquency.

It might be appropriate that I give some of the possible solutions. We need more youth centers to take care of the spare time of the unregulated and unguided youth of our communities. This is one of the means of bettering our community recreational opportunities. Many cities such as Moline, Ill., and even our own city have these centers. The one chief indictment is that they have been inclined to become meccas for jitter-buggers rather than offer a program enough to meet the recreational needs of a differentiated mass. In the beginning of this war, every community had air-raid wardens. Every community now needs the services of these same men to play with the needy children.

The second solution seems to lie in the field of improved educational offerings. Every child is entitled to the fullest education that he is capable of assimilating, taught by a competent, sympathetic teacher and learning under a curriculum that is broad and flexible enough to meet the emotional, scholastic, and vocational needs of every student.

Every child is entitled to be born in a home where there is sufficient income to give him the needs of a decent living. A great criminologist recently said that the juvenile delinquent was underfed, underclothed, and under-understood by parents, teachers, and law enforcement officers. We need above everything else parents who are willing to give daily careful instruction, moral and religious, to their children. The most difficult task in the world is to be a competent parent. In many communities there must be established schools for spoiled parents such as the one that San Francisco has.

Juvenile delinquency is a challenge to every parent and community. It cannot be eliminated, it can be reduced by all the forces in the community working together. It is a national problem. Miss Crowell has challenged us in her few lines:

"So long as there are homes to which men turn
At close of day,
So long as there are homes where children are,
Where mothers stay.
Where love and loyalty and faith are found
Above the sills,
A stricken nation can recover
From its greatest ills."

North Dakota Topped United States in 1944 Series E Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, to many Members of this House and many people in this Nation the name North Dakota suggests nothing but a frigid cold country famous for blizzards and low on production. There can be no denying the fact that there are days of extreme low temperatures in North Dakota. Yet when measured over

a span of 12 months, it is possessed of one of the most inspiring and pleasing climatic conditions of any of the Northern States.

There have been times in the past when this Congress was asked to come to its rescue in those periods of excessive drought in North Dakota and in most portions of the Middle West, and the people of the State of North Dakota will remain eternally grateful to the Congress of the United States and its benevolent help in those drastic periods.

The people of North Dakota are deeply concerned today with the development of the Missouri River and its tributaries. This Congress will be called upon to pass an appropriation bill in due time which involves the development of the Missouri River Valley. By the passage of this appropriation, no State in the great empire of the Northwest will be a greater beneficiary than will North Dakota, because by bringing to the State irrigation and reclamation, now so long overdue, never again thereafter will the Congress probably be called upon to assist in another drastic drought period. The people of North Dakota will take care of themselves from there on.

With a population of only 700,000 people and no war industries of any character, North Dakota tops all other States in the Union in series E bond sales in the year 1944. Under the privilege of unanimous consent, I here attach a record of percentages covering several States in the Union on their records of E bond percentage sales:

NORTH DAKOTA TOPPED UNITED STATES IN 1944 SERIES E SALES

WASHINGTON.—North Dakota led all States in percentage-of-income sales of War bonds, series E, in 1944. Its sales of $66,100,000 (issue price) represented 11.12 percent of income.

Iowa ranked second with a percentage of 10.91 in sales of $281,700,000, Nebraska third with a percentage of 10.68 (sales of $138,600,000) and Montana fourth with 10.48 percent (sales of $59,000,000).

The figures made public Monday were given in testimony of Treasury Department officials before the House Appropriations Committee in connection with the Treasury Department's appropriations bill.

Other States ranged in this order:

South Dakota 10.39 percent on sales of $56,800,000; Oregon 9.92 percent, $170,000,000; Minnesota 9.81 percent, $262,400,000; Wyoming 9.67 percent, $25,700,000; Michigan 9.34 percent, $705,800,000.

The percentages were based on national income statistics of the Commerce Department.

Resolution of North Central Dairy Cooperative, Mansfield, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at annual meeting of North Central Dairy Sales Cooperative at Mansfield, Ohio, February 9, 1945, and at the annual meeting of the Richland County Farm Bureau Cooperative Association at Mansfield, February 15, 1945:

Whereas farmers are asked to keep 1945 production up to 1944 levels; and

Whereas 1944 record production was obtained largely because of unusually favorable weather and by whole families working 70 to 100 hours per week to compensate for shortages of machinery and manpower; and

Whereas machinery shortage and transportation difficulties are more serious than in 1944; and

Whereas many older men who worked up to or beyond their limit in 1944 will not be able to continue that expenditure of effort; and

Whereas since the 1944 season many essential young farmers have been taken from the farms for military service; and

Whereas herds of dairy cattle are being sold because of the loss of nonreplaceable labor necessary to keep them; and

Whereas there is evidence of intention to continue removing essential men from farms, thus forcing still further liquidation of livestock and increasing the acreage of land which will be idle in 1945 for lack of custom machine work ordinarily performed by these skilled young farmers; and

Whereas this induction of nonreplaceable essential farmers has taken place without regard for the provisions of the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act; and

Whereas, in spite of the best efforts of those farmers remaining, and the most favorable weather possible, it is certain that production in Richland County in 1945 cannot be maintained at the 1944 level: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this situation be called to the attention of national and State selective service officials and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That it be emphasized that no special dispensation is asked for farm boys because they live on farms, but only because of their essential status as nonreplaceable skilled men in the highly complex business of modern food production; and finally be it

Resolved, That this resolution is submitted for the purpose of presenting the facts facing farmers in Richland County, Ohio, who are producing to the limit of their ability but who cannot maintain production without a certain minimum of skilled labor which is rapidly being lost as a result of present policy.

Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State of the United States of America and Delegate of the United States of America, delivered at the plenary session of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, in the Chamber of Deputies, Mexico City, Thursday, February 22, 1945:

Mr. President and fellow delegates:

I

It is an honor and a privilege for me to address on behalf of the Government of the United States this conference of American Republics on the problems of war and peace. I bring to you the most cordial greetings of the President of the United States and of my great predecessor, Cordell Hull.

We have met here in beautiful and historic Mexico City because we—the peoples of the new world—are at an historic juncture in our own affairs and in our relationship to the rest of the world.

The vital interests of the American Republics are equally involved in winning the war and in making the peace.

The United States Government looks upon this conference in Mexico City as a meeting of decisive importance. Our unity has been greatly strengthened by our wartime collaboration. Now it is our task to advance this unity still further both for the war and in our political, economic, and social collaboration in the tasks of peace.

I wish to reaffirm to the representatives of all the governments assembled here that the United States Government regards the good-neighbor policy and the further development of inter-American cooperation as indispensable to the building, after victory, of a peaceful and democratic world order. I wish also to reaffirm the belief of the United States that this democratic order must be built by all nations, large and small, acting together as sovereign equals.

II

I have just had an extraordinary experience that has driven home to me more sharply than ever before the significance of the fact that the world is now truly united in time and space.

A week ago I was in Moscow where I paid a brief visit after we had completed our work at the Crimea conference. Moscow is over 15,000 miles away by the route I came. In the short time since I left Washington I have traveled 24,000 miles on the business of war and peace. I have flown over the North and South Atlantic Oceans and over points on five of the world's six continents—Europe, Asia, Africa, and North America and South America. I have come from a conference about war and peace conducted on the shore of the Black Sea to another conference about war and peace meeting 10 days later in Mexico City.

Both are concerned with essentially the same problem. For they are no longer purely European problems of war and peace, or American problems of war and peace, or African, or Asian problems of this character. War anywhere in the world today threatens war throughout the world. Peace anywhere in the world today requires a whole world at peace. The prosperity and well-being and security of the peoples of the American continents is bound up with the proseprity and well-being and security of the other continents and islands of the earth.

For a long time we relied for protection upon the oceans which surround these continents. Now we know that there are no barriers of sea or air or land that can separate us from the rest of the world. We have learned our lesson in two successive world-wide conflagrations which have destroyed our sons, consumed our wealth, and interrupted our peaceful and creative purpose as disastrously almost as though their battles had been fought upon our prairies or in our cities.

And we are sure now what it is that must be done. It is not enough to stop war at our coasts—nor on the oceans that lie beyond

our coasts. War must be stopped at the point, whatever point it may be on the surface of the earth, where war begins.

III

Toward that end we worked at the Crimea Conference. Toward that end we are assembled here. May I, before I address myself directly to the tasks of this conference, say a few words about the meeting in the Crimea.

You have all read the communiqué of the Crimea Conference. You know that the unity of the three powers represented there was greatly strengthened, both for the war and for the peace.

A full measure of credit for this result belongs to the President of the United States, whose vision, courage, understanding, and creative purpose were never displayed to better advantage. I want also to pay tribute to the other two heads of government, Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill, and to the Soviet and British Foreign Secretaries, Mr. Molotov and Mr. Eden, with whom I worked in such close, friendly, and effective collaboration at the conference. They have rendered distinguished service to the United Nations cause.

I reviewed the achievements of the Crimea Conference with the President of the United States when I met him again 3 days after we had left the Crimea. It is the President's firm conviction that the results of the Crimea Conference have greatly advanced the basic objectives of United States foreign policy.

My purpose tonight is to speak to you of our hopes of what may be accomplished here in Mexico City and of these basic objectives of our foreign policy.

IV

The earliest possible final defeat of the aggressors who plunged the world into war and so gravely threatened the security of this hemisphere is, I am sure, the first objective of the other American republics, as it is of the United States.

Military matters are, of course, not in my field, but it was generally agreed at the Crimea Conference that the military plans completed there in the closest cooperation by the Chiefs of Staff of the three powers—and the continuing three-power staff meetings there provided for—will shorten the war and thus save the lives of tens of thousands of United Nations fighting men.

Here at Mexico City the American republics have met to consider what further steps we can take together to that same end—helping to shorten the war.

The solid foundations of the wartime collaboration of the American republics were laid at the conferences of Montevideo and Buenos Aires in 1933 and 1936 and at Lima in 1938. In meetings at Panama, Habana, and Rio de Janeiro after the outbreak of this war the intention and the capacity of our countries to implement our solidarity was fully demonstrated. We have acted together in accordance with the Declaration of Habana that an act of aggression against any American state is an act of aggression against all of us.

The American republics since 1940 have succeeded together in building up the defenses of this hemisphere to an extent never before dreamed of. Their military forces have cooperated in the war. They have increased greatly the military might of United States and other United Nations armed forces through their production of strategic materials that were transformed in our factories into the fleets of planes and tanks and ships which are carrying the war to the enemy.

The only hope that remains to the Nazi and the Japanese is that the United Nations might now relax their efforts in the belief that the war is as good as over. It is thus more important than ever before that we maintain and strengthen this active wartime collaboration of the American republics.

I have high confidence that our discussions here will result in cooperative action that will hasten the day of final victory.

V

The second major point I wish to make is this: I am certain that all of our countries will support as absolutely necessary to the future of the world and of this hemisphere the strong and sweeping policies toward Germany agreed upon at the Crimea Conference. This is what was agreed upon: "We are determined to disarm and disband all German armed forces; break up for all time the German General Staff that has repeatedly contrived the resurgence of German militarism; remove or destroy all German military equipment; eliminate or control all German industry that could be used for military production; bring all war criminals to just and swift punishment and exact reparation in kind for the destruction wrought by the Germans; wipe out the Nazi Party, Nazi laws, organizations, and institutions; remove all Nazi and militarist influences from public office and from the cultural and economic life of the German people; and take in harmony such other measures in Germany as may be necessary to the future peace and safety of the world. It is not our purpose to destroy the people of Germany, but only when nazism and militarism have been extirpated will there be hope for a decent life for Germans and a place for them in the comity of nations."

So far as the United States is concerned, this is a fundamental of our foreign policy. The world may rest assured that the United States, in full agreement with our allies, is inflexibly resolved upon whatever steps may be necessary to insure that neither Germany nor Japan will ever again have the military or industrial capacity to make war.

We of the Americas have another responsibility to fulfill in the destruction of nazi-fascism—a responsibility common to all of us. During the war we have through close cooperation achieved encouraging success in combating Axis economic and political penetration and in preventing Nazi and Fascist sabotage. But we have much yet to do. We still face the danger of secret-Nazi-Fascist infiltration into the political and economic life of this hemisphere.

The Axis leaders will, of course, attempt to escape the consequences of their crimes. We must be constantly on the alert for the flight to this hemisphere of Nazi funds and Nazi underground leaders who will seek to find a refuge here that can serve as a base for an ultimate comeback.

The people of the United States are confident that the American republics will join in whatever cooperative measures may be necessary to stamp out utterly every vestige of Nazi influence in this hemisphere. That must be our unalterable purpose.

VI

At the Crimea Conference the Soviet Union and Great Britain joined the United States in a declaration on liberated Europe. This declaration provides for joint action by the three governments to assist the liberated peoples during the temporary period of instability in Europe to destroy the last vestiges of nazi-ism and fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice.

The Three Powers thus pledged joint action to uphold the right proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations.

This is a third fundamental purpose of United States foreign policy. We intend to make our full contribution toward the building of a world in which the right of every nation to develop free institutions according to its own desires will be upheld. We look upon this purpose as part of the American faith which we have sought to practice in our relations with other peoples.

The United States will not shirk its responsibilities in seeing to it, so far as it is within our power, that this purpose is achieved.

The declaration on liberated Europe adopted at the Crimea Conference is animated by much the same spirit and purpose as the good-neighbor policy. We recognize that all nations are interdependent and that no nation can achieve peace and prosperity alone. We believe that all nations are equal before the law and that the equal rights of all nations, large and small, must be upheld.

VII

We are assembled here to discuss the creation at the earliest possible moment—and before the end of the war—of an international organization to insure the peace of the world, by force if necessary. This is a fourth major objective of United States foreign policy, as I am sure it is of the other American republics.

Largely because of the vision and leadership of Cordell Hull, we were able to lay the foundations last fall at Dumbarton Oaks. These proposals setting forth a plan for such an organization were agreed upon by the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and China. Since then these proposals have been studied and discussed throughout the world.

At the Crimea Conference the last obstacle to calling a United Nations conference to adopt the charter for such a world organization was removed. The Soviet Union and Great Britain there agreed to the proposals presented by the President of the United States for voting procedure in the Security Council.

The United Nations Conference, toward which we have been constantly striving, has therefore been called to meet at San Francisco, Calif., on April 25, 1945, just 9 weeks from now. Invitations will be issued as soon as we have completed our consultations with China and France, who have been invited to join in sponsoring the conference.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals recognize that the world organization has two tasks: First, to prevent aggression; and second, to reduce and remove the causes of war through close political, economic and social collaboration among all peace-loving peoples.

The proposals are designed to prevent lawless power politics and to use the power of the great nations in the interests of the peace and freedom of all nations. They are based squarely upon the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the United Nations declaration, and they draw heavily upon the ideals and practices of the inter-American system, to which the statesmen of the American Republics here present have contributed so much.

The agreement reached on voting procedure at the Crimea Conference recognizes the two essential elements of a successful world organization—unity of action by the great powers who alone have the military and industrial strength to prevent aggression; and the equal sovereignty of all nations, large and small, who must act together to create the essential conditions of lasting peace.

We have met here in order to carry further our discussions of the world organization before the United Nations conference at San Francisco. We will not, of course, in this inter-American meeting take decisions on questions of policy that will be explored by

all the United Nations together at San Francisco.

However, we should, I believe, examine what steps need to be taken to strengthen the inter-American system for the major role which it should play in the world of the future.

Let me remind you that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals recognize the value, within the framework of a general organization, of regional arrangements for promoting peace and security.

The United States Government believes that the stronger we can make the inter-American system in its own sphere of activity the stronger the world organization will be.

VIII

There is another statement of purpose in the Atlantic Charter which was reaffirmed at the Crimea Conference—the purpose to build a peace which will afford assurance that all men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

I can assure you that the United States does not regard this as a rhetorical assertion of vague intentions. We regard it as a necessity if the United Nations are to build a peace that will endure.

We cannot, of course, accomplish this purpose overnight. We can accomplish it only by establishing the world organization and by continuing and ever-closer collaboration among the nations of this hemisphere and among all nations toward a rising standard of living and wider opportunities for all men and women, regardless of race, creed, or color.

The United Nations, which have fought so successfully together against the Axis in this war, must join together in the years after victory in waging war with equal vigor and unity against hunger, poverty, ignorance, and disease. The accomplishment of this purpose is the fifth of the fundamental objectives of United States foreign policy to which I have referred tonight.

Consideration of the practical steps that we can take together toward this end is part of the business of this conference, as it was in the Crimea and as it will be at San Francisco.

Here in Mexico City we are particularly concerned with the application of this policy in the Western Hemisphere.

The United States intends to propose and support measures for closer cooperation among us in public health, nutrition, and food supply, labor, education, science, freedom of information, transportation, and in economic development, including industrialization and the modernization of agriculture.

We are also faced with the immediate necessity of preparing to meet the many problems of transition from our wartime economic collaboration to the methods of peacetime collaboration.

It is the fixed purpose of the United States Government to undertake, in cooperation with the other American Republics, to reduce to the minimum the inevitable dislocations of this transition period.

Adjustments will be required in the production of some strategic commodities, the output of which has been stimulated greatly by the common war effort. My Government hopes that a program can be agreed upon by the nations here represented which will provide a basis for accomplishing this adjustment in such a way as to protect the economics of the American republics.

The war has placed many restrictive controls upon normal trade. During the transition period, which will begin after the defeat of Germany, we should relax these artificial wartime restrictions as rapidly as our primary objective of winning the war makes possible.

We must seek also positive measures to promote constantly rising levels of international trade among the nations of this hemisphere and among all nations—much higher than we ever enjoyed before.

Economically sound industrial development and the modernization of agriculture are essential to sustain these higher levels of trade and to fuller employment and rising standards of living.

This requires arrangements to assure reasonably stable rates of exchange and to promote international investment in profitable new enterprises which will increase the productive capacity of the countries of the Western Hemisphere as well as in other parts of the world.

We should take the necessary international action at the earliest possible moment. Supplementary measures of various kinds are also required on a national level to encourage foreign investment. In our country we propose to extend our operations in this field, making full use of the facilities available, including the Export-Import Bank.

By collaborating in these economic and financial measures and combining them with our programs of mutual technical assistance in industry, agriculture, labor, cultural relations, public health, nutrition, and their related fields, we can achieve together the rising standard of living that we all seek.

IX

The nations of the world today are face to face with an historic crisis and an historic opportunity—an opportunity greater than any offered to all the generations of men who have preceded us.

We of this generation for the first time have it truly within our power to build a lasting peace and to build it in such a manner that a new world of freedom and opportunity for all men can actually be realized within the foreseeable future.

The achievement of these tasks is the joint responsibility of all peace-loving nations, large and small. A special obligation also rests with the great powers which are carrying the main burden of the war. Effective and continuing collaboration among themselves and with other peace-loving nations is essential both to victory and to peace. That sacred obligation was recognized and met at the Crimea Conference.

It is equally true that neither victory nor peace can be won without the full support of the American republics and without effective and continuing collaboration among themselves and with the rest of the world. That sacred obligation we must recognize and meet here at Mexico City.

We know that without the contributions that have been made by the American republics in the war the United Nations could not defeat the Axis aggressors.

This American strength—this strength of the New World—must also be built into the structure of peace if that structure is to endure.

I am thinking not only of the factories and farms and mines and forests—of all the developed and still undeveloped wealth of these western continents.

I am thinking not only of the power and the will of our nations to use this wealth for the good of all the people.

I am thinking also of those beliefs for which Americans of all our countries have lived and fought—beliefs that form for our peoples an unbreakable core of unity.

We believe in the essential worth and integrity and equal rights of the individuals and of individual nations, large and small.

We believe in the people and therefore in the right of the people to govern themselves in accordance with their own customs and desires.

We believe in peace, not war, and we have sought to practice peace, not war, in our dealings with each other and with countries in other parts of the world.

Let us recognize that this hour of our greatest opportunity is also an hour of danger and difficulty. We can as easily lose this opportunity as we can seize and use it. This is partly because our old enemies, aggression and tyranny, are now able to use for the corruption and oppression of the minds of men the very science that we seek to use for the enlightenment and freedom of men. So long as nazi-fascism exists anywhere in the world—or if it is ever permitted through disunity or indifference on our part to reestablish itself anywhere in the world—our peace and freedom are endangered.

Victory in this war will not of itself resolve the difficulty nor banish the danger. The months and years immediately ahead will see the supreme test of the faith that has always animated the American peoples and of the abilities and energies that have built the American nations.

I cannot escape the feeling that these are the times for which all that has gone into the making of the history of the Americas up to now was but the preparation.

The beliefs that have united the American peoples with each other can now unite them with the other freedom-loving peoples of the world. The unfinished pattern of the American purpose can now be completed in the larger fabric of a world purpose.

To this task and to this opportunity I ask the representatives of the nations represented here to join in dedicating ourselves.

I am reminded of the words of Abraham Lincoln to the Congress of the United States at a critical moment in the history of my country. They are words which might well be engraved in the hearts of all of us at this hour. He said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility."

That is what Abraham Lincoln said.

If we succeed—and as Americans who pioneered two virgin continents and founded here a new civilization, we know that all is possible—if we succeed, future generations will look back upon this conference in Mexico City, and the conference in the Crimea and the United Nations Conference in San Francisco as among the great historic milestones on the road to a lasting peace and a new world of security and opportunity for all mankind.

Unity on What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by one of my constituents:

UNITY ON WHAT?

EDITOR, OHIO STATE JOURNAL:

The political publicist, oral or in print, is effusively exhortative on the necessity of unity back of a foreign policy. Well, unity on what? Every mature person who has got anywhere in his personal affairs first swept his personal problems free of cobwebs, laid down a clear objective, sloughed off the nonessentials and concentrated his energies on achieving the desired result.

Sure we want unity back of our foreign policy. But what has there been that we could rally round? We have had the Atlantic Charter that assumed to set a standard but it has been a banner and nothing else.

And now when pinched in the pull and haul of power politics and caught in the melee of internal clashes of factions in the shattered nations, without implementation for the carrying out of its objectives, it leaves us in the position of the professor whose dog got into a street fight. All he could do was to dance around and yell "Desist."

We have had no forthright clear-cut foreign policy to rally round.

But now VANDENBERG'S great speech and those of Dulles and Dewey have charted a course we can understand. Definitely fix by treaty between the United States, Britain, Russia, and France the control of the conquered Axis Nations so that their slumbering hate cannot be implemented for war hereafter, and then go ahead with the formulation of a peace structure that will work.

And here the objectives of the Atlantic Charter represent the aspirations of America. No one that thinks straight assumes for a minute that any rabbits can be pulled out of a hat. It is human nature, not an inanimate pile of cogs of a machine, that our artificers have to work with. And the blood bath has worked no regeneration in spirit, be the man white, yellow, black, or red. National security, markets, access to or control of raw materials will be the pawns on the chessboard. And these divergent issues are to be channeled into harmonious working under an over-all control for the common good. Some problem, gentlemen, and much give and take in the offing.

The big job is to ease men everywhere back into productive conditions, clear the road so they can go about their daily work to which they are accustomed and take care individually of their present and future. How much overturn of forms of government will come about is on the lap of the gods.

It is hard to see that coalitions along the line of common interest will not take place. The big problem will be to dovetail these into harmonious working of over-all control.

For the present, for those of us who are harangued about unity and are asking unity about what? VANDENBERG'S great speech further clarified at Detroit, Dewey's at Washington, and Dulles, at Detroit, have charted a course that is in line with the practical horse sense of America.

FREDERIC C. TUTTLE.

GRANVILLE, OHIO.

The Forty-first Leads the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Roseburg (Oreg.) News-Review, which relates the combat history of the gallant Oregon National Guard:

Sixteen major assault-invasions launched by United States forces against the Japs in 1944, four—or one-quarter of the total—were sprung by the famed Forty-first Infantry Division. Such is a report released from the Army's public relations department, recounting the valiant exploits of the division composed almost entirely from the State of Oregon and including the Douglas County company of the Oregon National Guard.

One of the best war correspondents who accompanied the Forty-first in its Hollandia landing, declared the Oregon troops to be "the finest division in the United States Army," while relating to this writer an off-the-record account of that campaign. He had seen our military forces in many areas, but for coordinated teamwork, physical fitness, and high morale it was his opinion that the Forty-first was unexcelled by any similar force in any combat area.

His opinion of the Forty-first is substantiated by the fact that President Roosevelt conferred unit citations upon the Forty-firsters three times—a record no other division has attained in the Pacific war.

The amphibious attacks and subsequent conquests of Aitape, Hollandia, Wadke, and Biak were accomplished by the Forty-first, according to the Public Relations Department release. Twelve other Pacific invasions in 1944 include Saidor, the Marshalls, the Admiraltys, Saipan, Guam, Noemfoor, Sansapor, Morotai, Palau, Leyte, Ormoc, and Mindora.

"The Forty-first, commanded by Maj. Gen. Jens A. Doe, is the most veteran outfit in the Southwest Pacific, now serving its thirty-fourth month overseas," says the Army statement. "In addition to the aforementioned actions, the division, in 1943, participated in the jungle fighting at Buna, Sanananda, and Salamaua. During the latter campaign the Jungleers established a world record for continuous foxhole fighting by enduring 76 consecutive days and nights without relief or surcease."

Many of our boys from the Forty-first are still in the combat area. An increasingly large number have been coming home on furlough, under the rotation plan, but a substantial proportion are still in the fight, the division having the record of being kept in a combat theater longer than any body of troops in the history of the American Army.

Some, particularly men who have been transferred as officers into other units, are participating today in the march to Manila.

It is interesting to note that two Oregon outfits have had a major part in Philippine history.

Fred Wright, of Reedsport, recently sent us quotations from the tri-weekly newspaper Freedom, published on the island of Luzon in 1899. The quotations concern the charge of the famed Second Oregon Volunteers, of which Company B was composed principally of Ashland and Roseburg National Guard men under the command of Capt. John L. May, Ashland; Lieut. Frank B. Hamlin, Roseburk, and Lieut. Jerry Thornton, Ashland.

Freedom said:

"Say, stranger, did you see the Oregons make that charge Saturday morning, when so many of them went down under the withering fire from the enemy? You did not? Well, then you missed something worth a journey around the world to see. You may read of it now and in years to come, for history will record no more valiant work, but as long as you live you will never fully know what the love of country and home will inspire brave men to do. Go out over the field and note the position of the Second Oregon Regiment and the enemy entrenchments, especially the latter, with their shot and shell defying strength; stand there and imagine you hear the bugle call to arms and see the blueshirts rise up like magic from behind their entrenchments and charge across that open field in the very teeth of a storm of Mauser lead. Note that the enemy is completely under cover with every advantage on their side as they fire volley after volley into the line of charging blueshirts at short range. See the men from the Webfoot State fall under the murderous hail, and still keep coming without thought of turning back. Brave men, true soldiers; being shot down by the well-protected rebels and still charging right up into their very strongholds. And see, as the line of blue gets nearer, the enemy's position gets too hot and they break and run. See them go. See them fall. For the Oregons have carried Old Glory on to victory."

Such was the writer's description of the Battle of Malabon, fought 45 years ago by fathers and grandfathers of the boys from Oregon who have for the second time cleared the path for Philippine freedom and independence.

The Forty-first has been true to the glorious traditions handed down by their forebears. They have written a record page in the history of the Oregon National Guard.

The man largely responsible for that achievement did not live to glory in the honor attributed to his men. Gen. George A. White gave to the Forty-first its inspiration. He trained the men in teamwork and coordination. His patience and his great knowledge of military affairs, his prophetic vision of modern warfare, went into the preparation of the Forty-first for the victories which it achieved in the face of seemingly insurmountable obstacles. Death called him away before he could lead his men into battle, but the name of Gen. George A. White is written into the victories of Aitape, Hollandia, Wakde, and Biak, the difficult stepping stones to today's great Pacific victories.

Drafting of Agricultural Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, the current drafting of large numbers of our agricultural workers has caused widespread concern among all who realize the importance to our war effort of fulfillment of our increased food-production goals.

In this connection I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members of the Congress the following letter from a man in my district who is not a farmer but who realizes the vital job our farm operators are doing and must continue to do if our armed services are to be adequately fed, and if we expect to feed our civilian population and fulfill our overseas food commitments:

Congressman GEORGE W. GILLIE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The nature of my occupation brings me in close contact with hundreds of farm families in this community, and I therefore feel it my duty to join with the many of these people who have already expressed their feelings to you, urging you to use all influence at your command to prevent the drafting of essential young farmers into the armed forces until it has been established beyond the shadow of a doubt that this is absolutely essential to the successful prosecution and winning of the war.

We all realize that the needs of the armed forces must be met without fail and that, if this is the only way in which it can be accomplished, then it must be so. But we also believe that the continued capacity production from the farms of our Nation is a most vital factor in attaining victory and I, in the many contacts with farmers which my work brings me daily, have found dozens of cases in this immediate vicinity where production on these farms will halt completely, or be cut to less than half of the present level, if these

farm workers between the ages of 18 and 25 are called into military service. To me, the prospects if this is allowed to happen, are alarming.

I am not a farm owner or a farm worker, and this procedure will not directly affect me or any members of my family. However, I am deeply concerned about it as an American. I personally have twice volunteered for service with the armed forces and have been rejected both times because of some spots which appeared on my X-ray. Civilian physicians have checked this repeatedly, have observed me closely over long periods of time and have given me signed statements, declaring that the condition of my lungs is not dangerous. My work takes me out-of-doors in every sort of weather and entails considerable exposure, but I have been absent from my duties only 1 day in the past 6 years because of illness. Among other things, I have had considerable experience in the men's clothing field, have a number of years of experience in the postal service, have experience in photography and typing, and am a Red Cross first-aid instructor. I understand that the armed forces have great need for men with experience along these and numerous other lines. I am sure there are thousands of others like me, who because of very slight physical defects, are rejected from the services. We realize that we, who have these slight defects, would probably be unsuited for front-line duty, but with the services needing men so badly, would it not be possible to fill in the ranks in the proper places with these experienced men and thereby prevent the wholesale drafting of experienced farm workers and the crippling of our agricultural production?

I realize that the service with the armed forces would mean great sacrifice in many ways, but I am sure that all of us would be happy to make these sacrifices if given the opportunity to serve to the limit of our capacity, and thereby prevent this draft of men from our farms and the crippling of farm production.

We, of course, have no means of knowing the exact needs of the armed forces as have you who are informed in detail on these matters, and we are therefore simply expressing these, our sincere convictions, and trusting that you who represent us will give every consideration to these matters and put forth every effort toward the best possible solution of these pressing problems.

Thanking you kindly, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

———.

Dying Hero Doesn't Regret His Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from an article appearing in the Holton Recorder, February 19, 1945:

First Lt. Lawrence L. Beach died November 18, 1944, in a hospital in Belgium of wounds received in Germany on November 17, according to word received from the War Department to his wife, Mrs. Ragena Beach, at Manhattan, Route 4, on December 12. Lieutenant Beach was with the Fighting First Division, Company B, Sixteenth Infantry, and had been wounded three times since D-day. Lieutenant Beach had just been made company commander and a letter to his mother on November 4 stated:

"I hope I get my captain's rating, as I have been first lieutenant long enough, 2 years. Keep writing, Mom, and take care of my wife and baby and love them just the same as if they were me until I return, and if you ever think there might be a possibility that I shouldn't return and in case I don't, please remember I told you, and I'll tell you now, Mom, if this war lasts forever, and I fail to return, I want you to know that I won't feel sorry for myself but happy to know I had a part although so very small, in keeping Nazi domination and tyranny from American homes and families. You can never realize what the conquered people and the anti-Hitler Germans (and believe me there are plenty anti-Hitler) have gone through the past years. Russian women 15 to 65 are working on railroads in France; all young people between 18 and 30 practically either taken to Germany proper or sent to some factory to work. Everything of any real value taken from the French and Belgium homes, no pay for nothing. Believe me I'm an American and can share in beating this sort of ruling into defeat and destruction for all time. Take care of yourself, Mother, and remember I'm thinking of you always. I thought of you many times, when we liberated towns and the people came to us disregarding German fire and some of their friends being killed while standing and cheering us, and then women and men of all ages who were left in the town crying and clapping their hands and kissing us and shaking our hands. Giving us all kinds of fruit and drink. Maybe you think one don't think of home then. General Bradley is quite a general. He came down to the First with General 'Ike' to congratulate this outfit on our part of the landing. I am fine and getting fat and getting Jerries.

"Write often.

"All my love,

"LAWRENCE."

What Is the Influence of Farm Labor on Maximum Food Production?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following table indicates the wide variation in the daily and the monthly farm-wage rates in the 48 States:

Annual farm wage rates and index numbers, by States, 1944

State	Per month		Per day		Composite rate per month [1]	Indexes of composite rates (1910–14=100)
	With board	Without board	With board	Without board		
Alabama	$33.60	$46.20	$1.86	$2.33	$42.60	237
Arizona	94.30	131.00	3.87	4.93	96.50	276
Arkansas	41.60	57.40	2.21	2.79	52.30	241
California	133.00	169.00	5.90	7.27	145.00	369
Colorado	84.80	116.00	4.28	5.37	90.80	284
Connecticut	78.10	119.00	4.05	4.98	98.90	328
Delaware	64.70	89.20	4.14	5.11	83.10	365
Florida	48.30	68.70	2.43	3.42	60.50	266
Georgia	30.30	43.00	1.79	2.18	38.90	225
Idaho	117.00	149.00	5.45	6.39	120.00	315
Illinois	73.70	93.40	3.97	4.76	83.10	291
Indiana	60.90	83.00	3.52	4.26	71.90	283
Iowa	84.90	106.00	4.56	5.46	91.80	280
Kansas	73.10	96.40	4.55	5.41	83.80	305
Kentucky	43.60	58.90	2.44	3.13	55.60	266
Louisiana	35.00	49.90	2.06	2.51	46.30	241
Maine	84.30	120.00	4.59	5.59	105.00	342
Maryland	55.90	76.80	3.56	4.33	72.70	344
Massachusetts	81.10	122.00	3.93	4.98	102.00	317
Michigan	68.80	97.80	4.01	4.95	82.90	287
Minnesota	77.90	101.00	4.22	5.41	85.40	270
Mississippi	33.30	46.40	1.90	2.45	43.50	240
Missouri	55.30	72.20	2.95	3.66	60.40	263
Montana	110.00	137.00	5.48	6.36	116.00	293
Nebraska	80.50	103.00	4.50	5.46	88.90	288
Nevada	105.00	133.00	4.72	5.66	101.00	249
New Hampshire	74.10	114.00	4.02	5.08	97.00	311
New Jersey	81.30	116.00	4.10	5.09	96.20	356
New Mexico	71.90	94.80	3.59	4.21	75.90	288
New York	76.40	107.00	4.10	5.08	90.80	304
North Carolina	41.00	55.60	2.37	2.82	50.90	275
North Dakota	98.60	124.00	5.62	6.84	109.00	315
Ohio	55.60	78.70	3.49	4.32	68.40	260
Oklahoma	57.90	80.00	3.55	4.03	74.70	284
Oregon	125.00	160.00	5.94	7.00	138.00	373
Pennsylvania	56.80	84.30	3.38	4.21	70.70	282
Rhode Island	86.40	124.00	4.06	5.16	106.00	354
South Carolina	29.60	41.20	1.56	1.94	36.30	235
South Dakota	87.10	111.00	4.59	5.54	94.60	288
Tennessee	36.50	50.40	1.87	2.34	44.60	237
Texas	61.20	82.70	3.30	3.80	74.10	305
Utah	109.00	137.00	4.33	5.16	109.00	286
Vermont	75.80	103.00	3.82	4.86	91.80	298
Virginia	43.50	59.10	2.58	3.16	54.90	287
Washington	132.00	173.00	6.45	7.84	149.00	372
West Virginia	44.40	61.50	2.30	2.93	54.00	213
Wisconsin	70.90	98.50	3.68	4.66	82.50	258
Wyoming	96.50	130.00	4.26	5.29	100.00	267
United States	74.00	85.70	3.46	3.93	78.00	315

[1] Weighted average of all classes of payments. Daily rates were multiplied by 20 to obtain approximate monthly rates.

You will note that farm labor is over three times as much as it was in 1910 to 1914, the base period used in figuring parity, although this labor cost is not considered in arriving at the parity prices of the farm products. This table is from the official agricultural report, though I have arranged the States alphabetically for convenience of study.

Result of Soldier Ballots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith a timely editorial from the Janesville Gazette, of Janesville, Wis.:

SOLDIER BALLOTS

During the last Presidential campaign many hot words were passed back and forth over the soldier vote. Republicans and southern Democrats insisted that men in uniform should be given a chance to vote the full State ballot. New Dealers charged that the soldiers would be robbed of their vote and that Mr. Roosevelt might be robbed of the election unless Congress substituted an abbreviated Federal ballot.

Now the full returns are in and they leave no doubt whatever who was in the right.

Approximately 2,800,000 men in uniform cast their votes by means of the much-maligned State absentee ballots in the last election. This is a remarkably high total considering the difficulties involved. It is by all odds the largest vote ever cast by fighting men in time of war.

By contrast the use made of the highly touted Federal ballot was pitiably small. Of the 8,000,000 ballots printed, only 109,479 were used—an insignificant fraction of the total solider vote cast. Apparently the Federal ballot made a greater contribution toward making the paper shortage more acute than to anything else.

If this proves anything at all, it is that the men in uniform have a marked preference for voting the full State ballot when they are given the chance. And it has also raised the question whether the Federal ballot was worth all the trouble and expense it involved. Certainly if the United States is confronted with another wartime election — which heaven forbid—it would be better to prepare for it by improving State absentee ballot laws than by relying on a Federal ballot.

Discrimination in Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending in the House H. R. 2232, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. Its purpose is to put into form of permanent law that equality of opportunity to work, and to achieve a decent standard of living which I had always supposed to be one of the foundations of our great Republic, and which is certainly essential to the unity, strength, and health of our future.

You will note that I stress the word "opportunity." I do not believe it is the Nation's function to guarantee the comforts and happiness of its citizens, but I do sincerely believe that our Constitution directs us to preserve for all our people the chance to work, live, and pursue happiness, free from discrimination, prejudice, or improper control from any source.

Mr. Speaker, the very nature of Americanism is the protection of the vital rights of minorities, both with respect to their political freedom, and their rights as individuals to live self-respecting lives. Among those important minorities are 13,000,000 Americans who are Negroes. Seven hundred thousand of them now serve in the armed forces, and millions are producing in our war plants. The future of these Americans depends largely on the wisdom with which we now act.

I, for one, will welcome the opportunity to support the bill. I hope that history may record that the Seventy-ninth Congress was responsible for this great social advance in America.

The Duty of Americans To Win the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. J. H. Blundell, regional information executive of the O. P. A., before the Lions Club in St. Louis, Mo., November 15, 1944.

I find that the address is slightly longer than can be printed without an estimate under the rule, so I have requested an estimate from the Public Printer, who says that it will cost $117 to print the matter. I ask that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This generation has had its rendezvous with destiny—the generation that was too soft, too weak; the generation that was bred in the lap of luxury, that Hitler bet would never fight; found its soul at Pearl Harbor.

How surely, how courageously, how eagerly this generation of Americans kept its rendezvous with destiny has already been written indelibly upon the pages of history. On Bataan Peninsula, at Guadalcanal, Salerno, and Anzio, on the beaches of Tarawa and Saipan, and among the hedgerows of Normandy—there is history's evidence. Every day new chapters are being written—today in the Philippines and at the Siegfried line; tomorrow, in Berlin and Tokyo.

But Berlin and Tokyo will not be the final chapters in this brilliant history. Strange as it may seem, the gallant authors of these magnificent chapters will not have the privilege or opportunity of writing the closing and final chapter. Destiny has assigned that rendezvous to you and me.

Despite the fact that history repeats itself, it has taken the American people a long time—a century and a half and six wars—to learn that wars must be won at home after the enemy has been defeated abroad. Throughout our history we've never lost a war—nor won a peace.

It has taken us a hundred and sixty-eight years to learn that war is inevitably followed by inflation; that inflation is inevitably followed by deflation; that deflation is inevitably followed by depression; and that depression loses wars already won.

War, inflation, deflation, depression—that's the history lesson it took us so long to learn. Let's take a quick glance at a few pages of history. They are not pretty to read. We've forgotten about them because we don't like to be reminded of our ingratitude to those who died for us. But just in case we might forget again, let's see what the voices of history tell us.

Valley Forge. Does it make you proud when you hear the words? Proud? No. Every man should hang his head in shame because Americans and not the British were responsible for Valley Forge. Why? Listen to a part of a committee report written in 1776: "This committee, taking into consideration the unbounded avarice of many persons, by daily adding to the now almost intolerable exorbitant price of every necessary and convenient article of life * * * which at this time of distress, unless a speedy and effective stop be put thereto, will be attended with the most pernicious and fatal consequences."

It was the greed of some of our own American people who caused the little handful of patriots at Valley Forge to freeze, hunger, bleed, and die. General Washington could have had food and clothing and heat for his men except that a wagonload of supplies cost a wagon full of paper money.

Did we learn anything from Valley Forge? Did we profit from the lesson of history? Did another 89 years teach us anything? Listen:

"The houses of the most prosperous planters were found denuded of almost every article of furniture and in some sections women and children accustomed to luxury begged from door to door. * * * In the larger towns the weary soldiers found business prostrate except with the sutlers in full possession now that the merchants were ruined and these sutlers were amassing fortunes through profiteering without shame." (I had never heard the word "sutler" before. We call them war profiteers and black-market operators now. But let's go on). "There was no shipping in the harbors where the piers were decaying rapidly. Cows were feeding on the vacant lots and grass was growing between the paving stones in the principal streets. Warehouses were deserted * * * banks had closed their doors * * * the insurance companies had failed * * * the one hope for restoration was the resumption of normal activities in the country, the cultivation of the plantations as of old."

Yes. Eighty-nine years after Valley Forge, that was the America to which those brave soldiers on both sides came home after the War between the States. It's not pretty, is it?

By 1914 we had grown up as a nation. The industrial revolution had come to America. Little business had become big business. We were smart in the ways of money and economy. We knew how to produce and provide jobs. Let us see how smart we were.

We finally learned that war always caused inflation and we decided to do something about it. So we set up a few controls, a few brakes on the American economy for war. Only a few. And what resulted?

From 1917 to 1920 the American war costs were $32,000,000,000 actually spent. But calculations based on 1913 prices or 1930 prices indicate that little more than half of that amount would have been spent had it not been for wartime inflation. Without such inflationary price increases the taxes during the war and the Government indebtedness after the war would have been much lower.

But let us talk in simple terms. Do you remember those $25 silk shirts? Four dollar

shoes you paid $20 for? The long lines at the grocer's waiting to get sugar and to pay 29½ cents per pound for it when they could get it? Sure, you remember those things. Had we learned anything?

No. We even did away with the few brakes we had immediately on the signing of the armistice. Then what happened? Prices went higher. Anticipating continued increases, merchants scrambled for inventories, bid against each other in order to stock their shelves and storerooms so they could benefit and profit from the higher prices.

Inflation didn't end with the armistice. The cost-of-living index continued to rise, until in 1920 it reached 200 from a 1914 level of a hundred. When the armistice was signed, the cost of living stood at 160. It rose 40 more points after the war had ended.

Wholesale prices which rose from an index of a hundred in 1914 to 190 at the time the war ended continued to increase until 1920 when they stood at 225, or 125 points above the 1914 level.

Industrial prices, which form the backbone of our economy, rose 200 points from 1914 to the armistice. They levelled off for a few months and they skyrocketed even more until they reached 250.

Now, some businessmen may say, What's wrong with high prices? Let's see what happened as a result of these good prices. In 1919 corporation profits were $6,500,000,000; in 1921 there were no corporation profits in this country. In 2 short years, the reserves built up during the war had not only been wiped out but profits had turned to losses. Factory pay rolls which increased greatly during the war continued to increase through 1918 and in the year following, amounted to $240,000,000 per week; within 1 year the weekly take-home pay of factory workers was reduced to one hundred and fifty million, or nearly a hundred million less in 1921 than in 1920.

Let's see what happened to the farmer who could and did get one to two hundred dollars an acre for his land during the war. When the farmer prospers, everybody prospers, so we should be able to learn something from looking at the condition of the farmer's income.

He was pretty well off during the war. Annual farm income in 1918 amounted to $9,000,000,000. This income held fairly firm until the latter part of 1919. But when the cost of living and wholesale and industrial prices had not quite reached their peak, and when corporation profits and factory pay rolls were still increasing, the farmer's income began to drop. That should have been warning enough that something was about to pop, but apparently it wasn't. For farm income really started down in a hurry. During 1919 and 1920 it fell from the peak from nine billion to three billion.

That's the story of how well we learned our lesson. We got a smattering of knowledge and knew that war brought on inflation, and we tried to do a little something to prevent war inflation; when the war ended, we went back to our economic philosophy that Providence had blessed this Nation with unending security, and we went merrily on our way. We hadn't learned that inflation brings on deflation and that inflation is followed by depression.

The deflation of the 1920's which followed the wild inflation of the war ultimately resulted in depression. Need I describe that depression? It is unnecessary to spend the time here telling you something you know so well and so much about. Our time can be better spent in looking ahead.

There are some experts who maintain that war without inflation is an economic impossibility, that it is inevitable, an unavoidable consequence, too much money competing for too few goods; this is the explanation offered by some of those who insist nothing can be done to avoid inflation. Even after a century and a half and six wars they still maintain before we were forced into this present conflict that we should allow the natural laws of economics—supply and demand, etc.—to take care of things.

But there were some who said it must not happen again and who were determined to do something. The Congress and the President began to work as soon as inflationary tendencies became apparent. Our defense program created millions in new money and it wasn't long before Pearl Harbor shut us off from many vital war materials. Our production program began to demand nearly every factory and worker and it was no longer possible to produce many peacetime commodities. With more money and fewer goods we would have been on the high and wide road to inflation had it not been for the farsightedness of the Congress and the Chief Executive.

It is unnecessary to discuss in detail the various measures passed by the legislative branch of our Government or the Executive orders issued by the President. All of you recall the War Powers Act, the Stabilization Act, the Price Control Act. Let's look at the record of this war briefly.

For more than 2½ years we have all been trying to maintain a stable economy and, in general, our efforts have been successful. Since the spring of 1942, industrial prices have risen only 3 percent. During the same period the cost of living—prices of items purchased by the average middle-income family—has risen only 9 percent. Nearly all of this 9 percent occurred during the early days of the war when we were trying to get our economic feet on the ground. For the past 18 months there has been little or no increase.

There were some who said this might be done, but only at the expense of many of our economic groups. Let's see about that.

While prices have been held in line, corporate profits have increased nearly $5,000,000,000 over 1939 * * * and that's after taxes. In fact, they were greater last year than in that golden era we recall as 1929. Farm income last year was $13,000,000,000 compared to four and a half in 1939. Weekly earnings of factory workers were less than $462,000,000 in 1939—only a little more than that in 1929—but last year, in spite of wage controls, factory workers in this country took home every week of the year $800,000,000.

Now who's been hurt by price control?

That's an astonishing record and will be so recognized by future historians. Have you wondered how we were able to make such a record? Here are the reasons:

a. The tremendous productive ability of American farmers and American industry, even in wartime, which in addition to our huge war production, has provided $90,000,000,000 worth of consumer goods and services during the past year.

b. The patriotic desire of the American people to save their money, invest it in War bonds instead of spending during wartime.

c. The basic honesty of the American people which has kept the vast majority of them from patronizing the black market.

d. The Government stabilization program authorized by Congress, in the Stabilization Act.

It is under that act that the Office of Price Administration has the responsibility for the actual pricing of 8,000,000 products and services and the establishment of rents for 14,500,000 dwelling units. Without past experience and in many instances forced to use trial-and-fail, trial-and-success method, it has been a tremendous job. Naturally, there have been mistakes, delays, and irritations, but the job has been done and prices and rents have remained stable.

We have come a long way, but we've got a long way to go before the over-all job is complete. Like every businessman in America you are interested more with the future than the past. Like every father in America you are interested more in what can be done to provide a better country for those younger Americans who are every day meeting their destiny without hesitation. Like every citizen in America you are making this country one in which all "four freedoms" can be enjoyed by even the humblest among us, including the freedom from want.

Being businessmen, fathers and good citizens, you want to know about the job that lies ahead, and what might be done to overcome our economic enemies here just as those boys of yours are so gallantly overcoming our enemies abroad.

Our job here at home is twofold.

We must, first of all, continue to hold the line. The danger is not past. That danger is complacency on the part of our people. With victory in sight there may be a tendency to let up, to ease off, to let go, to cash our bonds, buy another car (if we can find one), spend our savings, maybe even pay a little more than the ceiling price for some desirable. We dare not. What would you say if our soldiers, sailors, or marines should conquer the Philippines, get to Manila, and say, "It looks like it's about all over r- maybe we can take it easy from here on? Or, if the boys in Germany should say, "We're nearly to Berlin, it's only 300 miles farther, so let's take it easy and coast the rest of the way"?

The answer is apparent. You wouldn't like it. Suppose those same boys hear that we are letting up, that because of our apathy and complacency, the cost of living starts up, and they know that every cent increase means fewer cents in those small allotment checks which are keeping their wives and kids from having to accept charity. You know what they would say. They wouldn't like it either.

We owe it to them to see that the line is held until all danger to their monthly allotments is past. What less could we do for them?

The second part of this twofold job is to discharge the trust and confidence those boys have placed in us to make certain they will return to a secure nation. Secure from want, from unemployment, bread lines, bonus marchers and all the other evil results of the unpardonable sins of apathy and complacency we committed after the last war.

That's our job. What are we going to do about it? Here's what you can do about it.

In the first place, you as individuals can refuse to buy anything above the legal ceiling—and everything you buy has a ceiling. In order to do that you must compare the prices quoted you with top legal prices and refuse to pay more. And you can get your families to do the same thing.

You have the leadership necessary to get this job done. You can carry the message to your friends, neighbors, and business associates. You can, as individuals, set an example for the people of your community which will be an inspiration for the entire country.

If that can be done individually, imagine what you might accomplish as a group with the benefit of organization. Your club has prestige, the esteem, and confidence of the people of the city, because you are organized for a worth-while purpose—to contribute to the welfare of the community. Why not put that force behind your Government's program to hold down the cost of living? Why not enlist in the fight to protect your serviceman's monthly allotment?

Here's a suggestion you might take under serious consideration. Why don't you enlist with your local war price and rationing board as price-panel assistants? They need you and your effective leadership. They are men just like you. They are giving their time faithfully and without compensation.

As price-panel assistants you can contribute greatly to this war here at home. You can do more than that. You can assist overworked and short-handed merchants in the

understanding of regulations with which they must comply if we are to win this fight.

Talk about the contribution to the war effort? You have the opportunity of starting something here which very likely would be followed by many other clubs over the country and with momentum might even get every club in America behind the fight. Think it over.

That's the first part of the job. But it is not enough if we just hold the line—if we only prevent further increases in the cost of living and then pat ourselves on the back and say we have done the job and let it go at that. We have to remember the lessons of history.

Do you think for a moment that we could live with ourselves, go to sleep at night with a clear conscience if we permit a repetition of what has happened after every war in which this Nation has engaged? Are you willing to welcome back our boys from the fighting fronts after they have finished their job and have them find business prostrate, with the war profiteers in full possession, amassing fortunes through profiteering without shame, or do you want them to return to this country to find no shipping in our harbors, where the piers are decaying, where cows are feeding on the vacant lots and the grass is growing between the paving stones in the principal streets? Do you want them to return to find empty warehouses, closed banks, failing insurance companies?

I know you do not want that but I am wondering if we have finally learned our lesson well enough, and if we are going to be sure it won't happen again. If we haven't learned that lesson and if we permit even a small part of the 4,000,000 men now fighting overseas to come home and find that we have forgotten them, may the Lord have mercy upon us.

There has been a lot of talk about keeping America American. Many people have said we should see to it that our boys come back to the things they left and the kind of country they sailed from to fight for. I don't believe they are going to be satisfied with that much alone. I know you and they are going to want and demand a better America than the one they knew before.

What does all this mean? It means that we have a sacred responsibility, that we too have a rendezvous with destiny.

And that brings us to what we must do to get the second part of our job done. According to the Department of Commerce, if we produce only as much as we produced in 1940 we will have 19,000,000 unemployed in this country. For in 1940 we produced 30 percent less than we are now producing. We don't want to go back to 1940 in any respect. In fact, we cannot go back. We have to go forward.

There is only one answer and that is full production in our factories and on our farms. Without full production in our factories, labor cannot purchase the products of the soil. Without full production on our farms, farmers cannot purchase the products of our factories.

I could give you many examples of the latent markets we now have for consumer goods, housing, and exports. It has been estimated that there is a present demand for a million and one-half houses a year as soon as materials are available, and that this market will hold firm for at least 10 years. When you stop to consider that for every man working on one dwelling there are nearly two men in the industry employed to furnish him with the material and equipment needed to construct that house, you get some idea of what full production means to America's future. Think along this line further—it isn't hard to visualize the employment which would be created if we provide every home in America with an electric ice box, radio, washing machine, new plumbing, paint and wallpaper, if every farm home in America could be provided with electricity, which in turn would create a huge demand for electrical appliances.

This is not the vague dream of economic theorists but it is the cold-blooded calculation of farsighted businessmen.

If we are to go forward, achieve full production—which will mean full employment, and we all know it will be absolutely essential to the future welfare of this Nation, there are several steps which must be taken.

In the first place, we must continue the team work of industry, labor, agriculture, and Government, which has been developed during the war. We must not go back to the days of open warfare between labor and capital, between agriculture and labor, the days of monopolies, cartels, and other practices which prevent free enterprise and full production.

Second. During the critical period of reconversion and the period immediately following the peace, we must continue to maintain a stabilization program so long as the threat of inflation is even remotely apparent; until the natural laws of economics can again become operative.

Third. The Congress must enact tax laws which will encourage the greatest possible investment of risk capital and which will discourage the hoarding of savings of corporations and individuals.

Fourth. Competitive free enterprise must be protected and encouraged in every possible way.

Fifth. Particular encouragement must be given to small business because small business is in the heart of competition.

Sixth. Farm income must be kept at its present high level.

Seventh. Social security benefits must be increased and broadened.

Eighth. We must provide for a broad and vigorous program of housing and slum clearance.

Ninth. Major works program must be developed to provide for reforestation, flood control, irrigation, highways, medical centers, hospitals, schools, and recreation facilities.

Tenth. Exports must be given every encouragement because one of our three greatest markets in the post-war era will be our exports to foreign countries, many of which are so badly in need of the products of our factories and our farms.

Eleventh. We must get rid of restrictive controls, so necessary during the war and post-war period, as soon as it is safe to do so.

If we are to maintain full production, provide jobs, avoid a depression, and create a prosperous America, this program must have the assistance and backing of businessmen throughout the country.

With full production in this country we can increase consumer expenditures to such an extent that the American people can purchase 40 percent more food than was purchased in 1940. We can buy 45 percent more clothing than we bought in that year. We can increase our purchases of electrical equipment by 55 percent, household furniture by 70 percent, and the farmers of America will be able to purchase 50 percent more farm machinery than they did in 1940. We will be able to construct 250 percent more new buildings than we built in that year.

If we go back to 1940 production, as we will if our manufacturers insist on 1940 prices; or, in other words, if we are going to operate on the theory of minimum production at a maximum price instead of maximum production and distribution at the lowest possible cost per unit, we are going to have a situation in this country which will not only rival but will exceed the depression of the early 1930's.

Here's what 1940 production will do for us: In that year there were 9,000,000 unemployed. In 1943, with war production at peak levels, we have had less than 1,000,000 unemployed. Since 1940 the growth in our population has provided us with 2,500,000 additional workers. In the meantime productivity of industry and technological improvements have grown steadily. Therefore we will be able to produce our 1940 volume with 8,000,000 fewer workers. On this basis, if we go back after the war to 1940 production when we had 9,000,000 unemployed and with two and a half million new workers plus 8,000,000 replaced by increased productivity and technological improvements, we will find ourselves with 19,000,000 unemployed.

That's the final chapter yet to be written in the history of this generation, which had a rendezvous with destiny. That's the chapter which has been left for you and me to write. If we keep our rendezvous as well, as courageously as the younger members of our generation have kept theirs, we will deserve and receive the gratitude of the millions of young Americans whose sacrifices have caused our meager contributions to pale into insignificance and future historians will record that one generation of Americans did not forget the lessons of history.

On the other hand, if we do not keep that rendezvous, if we become complacent and apathetic, the blood will be on our hands, and I pray again that when we meet those boys face to face the Lord will have mercy on us.

Bypassing of Japanese-Held Islands

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a mother's home whose boy was reported missing when the PT boat on which he was serving was sunk by our own bombers there comes a letter calling attention to the statement of Admiral Halsey, made the other day when he said in substance "Let the Japanese starve to death slowly and painfully on these bypassed islands." The letter follows:

I have just finished reading an article in the Chicago Tribune regarding a press conference held by Admiral Halsey. In this conference the admiral was asked what the plans were regarding the islands that have been bypassed. To this the admiral replied, "Let the Japs starve to death slowly and painfully."

I have a son in the Navy who has been missing since April 1944. He is being carried in the missing status because there is a possibility he reached one of these bypassed islands. Now, I beg of you, Mr. HOFFMAN, to tell me what hope we parents can have for our boys who are stranded on these islands. Is this to be their reward for serving their country? We certainly owe them more than that. It just made me sick to my stomach to read Admiral Halsey's remark—and yet he is being looked up to as an outstanding personality. I wonder what the rest of the parents think of this statement. We are given to understand there are tens of thousands of Allied men on these islands who have no doubt nothing more to look forward to than starving to death slowly and painfully along with the Japs.

My husband served in World War No. 1 not just as a soldier but as an engineer, serving 52 days on the firing line crawling through the mud. He has three major battles to his credit. Now his son serving in the Navy on

a PT boat—and this boat destroyed by our own Allied planes—is left no doubt to die on these islands with our enemy. I wonder sometimes what this world is coming to—and why we so carefully raise our sons—just to sacrifice them for such treatment.

This is not just a letter from a crank; I am the mother of this boy, and I beg of you, Mr. HOFFMAN, to let us parents be given some hope or assurance that something will be done to give them some help. I intend to follow this through. This is my son being deserted by his country and now I am going to fight, if I have to, for him. * * * Hoping to have some real authentic word from you, that we can feel our boys will receive some help, I remain.

Of course, I assume the answer is that Admiral Halsey did not mean exactly what he said, and that they will follow the same policy that has been followed by the Navy up to this date, that when one of our flyers goes down and is lost, every possible effort is made to rescue him. Nevertheless, that statement creates dismay.

Gold Reserve Ratios Should Be Maintained

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the attempt which is being made by the Federal Reserve Board to obtain the approval of the Congress for lowering the gold reserve requirement to 25 percent. Heretofore, and since the passage of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, the gold reserve requirement has been 40 percent against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation and 35 percent against Federal Reserve bank deposits. I am opposed to changing these figures.

It is stated that the need for currency is growing so rapidly that out of the vast store of gold available for backing Federal Reserve notes, only some four billion dollars worth remains unused and that by the end of this year, at the 40 percent figure, the note expansion will have reached its maximum. In other words, the gold reserve requirement seems to provide an automatic stopping-point for the expansion of Federal Reserve notes. Without such a check inflation would be inevitable.

Now, I am not a banker, and it is quite beyond me to explain the intricacies of high finance. But one thing seems plain—if we begin chiseling at this 40-percent reserve requirement it is only a question of time before we will be asked to entertain a further request for 15-percent, 10-percent reduction, or perhaps to remove the reserve requirement entirely. Then we will have a 100-percent-managed paper currency without gold to give it stability.

Mr. Speaker, if this idea should prove startling to the Members who still are old-fashioned enough to like the tinkle of gold and silver coin, and who feel that financial safety rests in convertibility, they should know the thoughts of Gov. Marriner Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board. At a recent hearing before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on S. 510, companion bill to H. R. 2124, which contemplates this reduction in the reserve figure, Governor Eccles is said to have made an all-out statement in favor of 100-percent-managed currency, sneered at the value of gold and silver as currency backing, and stated that as far as he was concerned the 25-percent figure is "a concession to orthodoxy"—he obviously would as soon it would be zero.

Now, in all the history of the world, all schemes for managed currency without metallic backing have been foredoomed to failure. All of them have ended disastrously and left the unfortunate countries who experimented with managed currency impoverished and often in the throes of revolution. The story of John Law of the Mississippi Bubble is still only too fresh. Every device of finance was used by Law to maintain his system—the pledging of taxes, the convertibility of his paper money with Government bonds, and a score of other tricks. He lacked but one thing—sufficient gold and silver to redeem his paper. As is well known, when this was realized and the nebulous nature of his security was comprehended the resulting catastrophe plunged the French people into poverty and despair.

Mr. Speaker, every proponent of managed currency since Law has sung the same tune—his system is infallible—no politics will be permitted to sway those controlling the currency—but the end is always the same—disaster. It scarcely should be necessary to remind you of the German currency inflation after the last war, which wrecked the German economy, paved the way to war and created a new class of rich speculators at the expense of the poor and the middle classes.

The ego of the financiers who advocate parting from gold and silver is beyond belief. That they think they can manage a nation's finances successfully where all others have failed shows more than just self-confidence; it shows a colossal disregard for the plain lessons of history and for the welfare of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Mr. Eccles' name be changed from Marriner Eccles to John Law Eccles so that his historic tie with that famous financier may be understood by all.

If an archeologist were to dig up a pot of gold in an ancient Cretan palace, he could spend it for current goods and services—but if he should find a sheaf of promissory notes of that day, they would be of no more monetary value than so many shinplasters.

Gold and silver endure while financial systems erected without them are ephemeral.

One would think, according to Governor Eccles, that no money is good except Federal Reserve notes. If we get short of currency, why not issue more against the Treasury silver that lies dormant at West Point, much of which has no issue against it? That, and the four billions in gold should carry us quite a while.

The facts are that the need for any gold or silver reserve at all irks the financiers of the Maynard Keynes school as it automatically puts a deadline on currency expansion. Zero reserves would mean unlimited power to inflate the currency. And, Mr. Speaker, it is easier to run a printing press than a gold mine.

There may be another reason than the one given—to permit necessary currency expansion—for starting this entering wedge to reduce the reserve requirement—perhaps our 40 percent requirement looks too fat compared with the lean reserves agreed on at Bretton Woods. Perhaps this is a move to make the comparison less odious.

It should be remembered that there is a school of banking which believes that the public only will be protected against flagrant mismanagement of the currency if we have 100 percent gold and silver backing, plus free convertibility and free circulation of gold and silver coins. This, of course, is the extreme conservative position. But it would obviously be safer than the zero position. Whatever faith the people have in our Government, and it is properly tremendous and abiding, the statement that our money is as good as the Government regardless of whether or not it has behind it gold and silver reserves, manifestly is not entirely true. The value of Government obligations frequently has fluctuated, while the Government itself has endured. Sound metallic backing of the currency stabilizes against undue fluctuation.

Mr. Speaker, if, as the Federal Reserve experts claim, it is necessary to expand the currency beyond the point permitted by the 40 percent gold reserve requirement, I propose an alternative which I believe will be sounder and more effective. I have this afternoon introduced a bill authorizing the revaluation of our gold stocks to $56 per ounce. This will increase the dollar value of our gold in precisely the same proportion and permit issuance of the same amount of currency as would be possible by reducing the reserve requirement from 40 percent to 25 percent.

Already the foreign gold markets reflect prices as high as $58 per ounce for gold. When the price of gold was raised to $35 per ounce we merely met the foreign prices. It is time to do so again. Such a revaluation will add greatly to the purchasing power of other countries and aid them materially to buy our much needed goods immediately following the cessation of hostilities. It will help balance the national debt and will, in my opinion, have other beneficial results.

I hope that when the House Banking and Currency Committee considers my bill to continue existing gold reserve ratios required to be maintained against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation and Federal Reserve bank deposits by increasing the monetary value of gold, it will give serious thought to this alternate proposal.

Rural Electrification

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest most vigorously against the ruling of the War Production Board with reference to extending rural electrification to the farmers of this country. They require now that all these extensions be based entirely upon animal units, and when they do that that excludes the great bulk of the American farmers.

This is the greatest wheat-growing country in the world; it is the greatest corn-growing country in the world; it is the greatest cotton-growing country in the world; it is the greatest barley-growing country in the world; and on the production of those crops to a large extent depends the very life of this Nation. Yet, under this ruling of the War Production Board, those farmers are not considered for rural electrification unless they can show a certain number of animal units.

As a matter of fact, a great many people who have large numbers of cattle keep them penned up and have to get cottonseed from the South, corn from the West, or wheat or barley from the Middle West with which to feed them, yet they can get rural electrification, and the cotton, wheat, corn, and barley farmers, who are supporting the country and whose sons are fighting our battles in this war, are excluded.

That ruling, or order, of the W. P. B. should be changed at once. I am inserting a letter of protest I wrote the W. P. B. on this proposition:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE OF WORLD WAR
VETERANS' LEGISLATION,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1945.

Mr. EDWARD FALCK,
Director, Office of War Utilities, War Production Board, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FALCK: Please accept my thanks for your communication of February 13, 1945, relative to the desire of the 4-County Electric Power Association, Columbus, Miss., to construct 67 miles of rural power lines in Choctaw County, Miss., to serve some 320 consumers.

It seems to me that the War Production Board overlooks the fact that cotton farmers, wheat farmers, and corn farmers, are just as essential to the war effort as are the raisers of hogs, sheep, and cattle; and I see no reason why they should be discriminated against in permits for the construction of rural-power lines.

Under the present regulations, the man who has a certain number of livestock may have a power line extended to his home; but the man who raises the feed to feed that livestock, and who in all probability needs electricity even worse than he does, is left out in the dark.

The same thing applies to the cotton farmer. I wonder how the W. P. B. thinks we could conduct this war without the crops produced by the cotton farmers—to say nothing of the sons they are furnishing to the service.

If every cotton farmer were to fold up and quit, we probably could not carry on the war for another year, as result of the shortage in those necessary war materials manufactured from cotton, including the explosives with which our men are fighting.

It may not have occurred to the W. P. B., but there are 1,000 pounds of seed in every bale of cotton. That 1,000 pounds of seed contains 22 gallons of the finest vegetable oil produced. Every man in the service eats something prepared with, or containing, cottonseed oil, practically every day, and probably every meal—just the same as do the rest of the 130,000,000 Americans. The balance of this 1,000 pounds of cottonseed is transformed into cottonseed meal and hulls—the finest dairy feed in the world.

Yet, the man who has a dairy herd, or a herd of beef cattle to feed, and who is using cottonseed meal and hulls for that purpose, may have a power line extended to his home, while the man who is producing the material with which those cattle are fed, whether it be cottonseed, wheat, or corn, is denied service under these regulations.

I realize that you are not responsible for this regulation, but being head of the Power Division of the W. P. B., I am writing to urge that you take the proposition up and get the regulation amended so that it will not discriminate against those farmers who are growing wheat, corn, and cotton and other essential crops.

As you know, I represent a cotton-growing district. Our cotton farmers are contributing just as much to the war effort, and just as many of their sons to the firing line, as any other class of people in the country; and I want to see them given equal treatment under these regulations affecting the extension of rural power lines to their homes.

Please take this proposition up with the Chairman of the War Production Board, and see if you cannot get these regulations so amended as to render justice to the cotton, the wheat, and the corn farmers of the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. RANKIN.

Midnight Curfew in California

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of inquiries from constituents in California concerning the purposes and expected effects of the midnight curfew "request" which becomes effective tonight throughout the United States.

Apparently the word "request" is a misnomer, as the proprietors of all entertainment establishments operated for private profit have been notified that failure to comply with the terms of this pronouncement will result in drastic penalties.

It has been officially stated that the purpose of this so-called request is primarily to conserve critically needed coal for vital war industries and for civilian needs, and also to alleviate the manpower shortage and burden upon transportation and other facilities.

Patriotic Californians will have no quarrel with these announced objectives, provided they can be attained by the enforcement of this edict. But, Mr. Speaker, the State of California, with the exception of a few areas, has been declared exempt from the provisions of the recent "Brown-out" order, because it was officially determined that curtailment of electric lighting in most of the sections of my State would not result in conservation of coal or other essential fuels. The electricity used throughout the greater part of California is produced by water power. And this hydroelectricity is also widely used for heating.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the announced primary purpose of this curfew "request" cannot be served by its enforcement in my State, it is very natural that many businessmen out there should wonder why they must be subjected to the financial sacrifices which it will entail.

Proprietors of motion-picture theaters and bowling alleys, which are largely patronized in the post midnight hours by servicemen and swing-shift workers in war-industry plants, inform me that the contribution to available manpower for employment in the war effort resulting from midnight closing of their establishments will be practically negligible, as many of their employees are classified by the Manpower Commission as unemployables for essential industries.

I heard on a radio news broadcast the other evening a statement that the head of the Prohibition Party in America had acclaimed the curfew order as a long deferred step toward the enforcement of wartime prohibition in this country.

I do not understand that the Congress has included in its delegation of extraordinary war powers to the executive branch of the Government any authorization to enforce prohibition without further legislative action.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Congress and the people of all parts of this country where the midnight curfew will not accomplish its announced objectives are entitled to further clarification of this order.

The Wrong Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan Legislature is barking up the wrong tree with its Resolution No. 8, as my reply, which follows, will indicate:

FEBRUARY 20, 1945.

HON. FRED I. CASE,
Secretary of the Senate,
Lansing, Mich.

HON. NORMAN B. PHILLEO,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR SIR: Michigan House Concurrent Resolution 8, forwarded to Congressmen and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, would

be funny had not the interpretation, the maladministration, of the Selective Service Act, resulted in so many tragedies.

The resolution urges the Congress "to enact legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort, which action should be taken immediately to forestall a possible emergency, due to the recent ruling of Selective Service."

The Congress passed that kind of legislation when it enacted the Tydings amendment, which provides that—

"Every registrant found by a selective-service local board * * * to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained."

The Congress cannot anticipate either misinterpretation or maladministration by administrative officials.

The present confusion and injustice stems from the fact that the President took it upon himself to ignore the Tydings amendment; to say that those who were exempt under its provisions should be drafted if needed for the war effort. That he had no right to do.

Under the amendment, when the local board finds that a registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation, it should automatically defer him, "so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be found."

A week ago last Thursday, General Hershey, in my office, in the presence of Lieutenant Colonel Berry, gave as his excuse for ignoring the Tydings amendment, the President's demand that 900,000 men were needed for the service, and he asked me what I would do under like circumstances.

My reply was that, no matter how many men the President or the Army and the Navy demanded be drafted, I would not go out upon the highways, to the farms or the factories, and kidnap or shanghai them in disregard of the law; that if, under the terms of the act, they were not available, I would ask that the act be amended; that, in any event, if I was on a local board, I would follow the law as written and exempt those who fell within the provisions requiring exemption.

I agree with the members of the legislature in their conclusion that there is grave danger of a possible emergency. In my opinion, it is due to the recent misinterpretation of the Selective Service Act.

Further legislation is not the remedy. If the legislature will call upon Governor Kelly, Brig. Gen. LeRoy Pearson, and the brigadier general's representatives, like Major Luscombe, who have been giving local boards improper instructions, the situation, except as to those who have already been drafted illegally, will be remedied.

The acts of General Hershey, of Brigadier General Pearson and some of his subordinates should be made public, and they should be compelled to correct, without equivocation, without evasion, the erroneous instructions they have given local boards.

I do not criticize local boards, for while it is their duty to follow the law, I can readily understand how, in time of war, with orders and directives piling down on them from Lansing and Washington, they become confused and unduly influenced.

The remedy for the trouble to which you call attention lies not here in Washington, but in the office of the Governor; in the offices of Brigadier General Pearson and his subordinates.

The foregoing is most humbly, most respectfully, submitted for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

Government Manpower Wastage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times:

GOVERNMENT MANPOWER WASTAGE

With war requirements calling for a heavier draft on the Nation's manpower, the latest figures on the number of civilian employees on Government pay rolls in this country suggest more energetic efforts to prune these pay rolls and release workers for more essential war activities.

According to a recent Census Bureau report nearly 1 person in 20 is on such pay rolls in the United States. As of October 1 they totaled 6,503,000, and more than half of this total, or 3,335,000, were on the Federal pay roll.

Until the spring of 1943, Federal employees for more than a year had been added to the pay rolls at a rate of 100,000 a month. This trend was halted under the fire of Senator BYRD'S committee on nonessential expenditures and Representative RAMSPECK'S civil-service committee which aimed at a reduction of 400,000 jobs. By the fall of 1943 some 200,000 jobs had been lopped off the June 1943 peak of more than 3,000,000 in the executive branch of the Federal Government. The bulk of that reduction was in the war agencies. In 1944 monthly reports of increases again appeared.

In this war there has been about a 3 to 1 expansion in the number of Federal civilian employees, compared to the 918,000 employees on Federal pay rolls at the end of World War No. 1. But this trend toward a greater army of Government employees did not start with the present war.

The number of Federal employees had been reduced to 500,000 before 1930. When President Roosevelt took office on March 4, 1933, there were 572,091 employees on the Federal pay roll. Before the 1936 election that number had risen to 824,259 and 4 years later, in 1940, it was up to 976,863, or 58,000 more than the total at the close of World War No. 1.

When the New Deal began sprouting its alphabetical agencies there were 30 Federal bureaus and agencies. Now there are around 150.

As Congressional investigations and reports have shown, there is much duplication and overlapping of functions and duties. There has been rivalry in recruiting personnel for wartime expansion and agencies competing with private business which helps pay the taxes that support this massive system of bureaucracy still function although the emergency for which they were created has long passed. Currently there are charges by union leaders and Members of Congress of wastage of manpower in Government war plants.

Before the November election President Roosevelt ordered the Budget Director to make plans for liquidating war agencies and reducing governmental personnel to a peace footing. But the evidence before the public indicates that here at this critical time is where the Government itself could help ease the manpower shortage by starting a real pruning job now.

President Roosevelt has in mind the need of close to 60,000,000 post-war jobs to provide full employment. He recognizes that taxes must not be a brake on post-war demand for goods and on investment in new enterprise. He also stresses that he means productive jobs at good wages—not W. P. A. relief.

Well, he has a chance to kill several birds at one shot right now by ordering the trimming down of Government pay rolls, thus releasing workers for other jobs more essential in the winning of the war. That would be a step toward reducing Government expenditures. It would give business a little practical encouragement as to the post-war tax outlook. And if he went a little further and lessened the threat of Government competition, it could be that private enterprise in the postwar era would bloom to the point where two or three jobs grow in place of one.

Also individual taxpayers who are beginning to get the tax staggers under their tax load might get a break if some of the Government employees were taken off the list.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution unanimously adopted at the twenty-seventh annual banquet in observance of the Republic of Lithuania Day, in Baltimore, on February 16, 1945.

I hope that in the establishment of peace in the construction of the post-war period the autonomy and independence of Lithuania and other small and independent nations will be maintained and their separate identity as a people and nation respected.

Our Government continues to recognize the sovereignty of Lithuania and we have an announced national policy of preserving the independence of small nations.

The Legislature of Maryland approved in 1935 a resolution directing the Governor to proclaim February 16 of each year for the observance and commemoration of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, and invited the people of the State to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies. I was president of the Maryland Senate at this time and sponsored this resolution through that body, and recall with pleasure the pride that the Americans of Lithuanian descent evidenced at an appropriate ceremony in connection with the signing of the resolution.

The tradition of this little republic, its evidence of ability to carry on self-government, and our expressed national and State policies place an obligation upon those in authority to strive for the post-war restoration of the independence of Lithuania.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the United States Government has declared that it opposes all forms of

aggression and territorial changes made during the war; and

Whereas the United States Government continues to recognize the sovereignty of the Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; and

Whereas the Nazi invaders have been driven from Lithuania and this war-torn nation has been reoccupied by Soviet Russia without a renunciation of her pretensions toward the sovereignty of Lithuania; and

Whereas the elections, which preceded Lithuania's incorporation into the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, were under pressure and did not express the free will of her people; and

Whereas the oppressed people of Lithuania are unable to voice their grievances, defend their rights, or express their views in protest against the incorporation of Lithuania into the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics while occupied by Russia, and so many of her leading citizens have been deported to foreign countries; and

Whereas we, as citizens of the United States of America, are deeply concerned over the post-war restoration of Lithuania: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the incorporation of Lithuania into the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics would constitute, from religious, national, and cultural points of view, a crime of international magnitude; be it further

Resolved, That we appeal to the United States Government to continue to uphold the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, in accordance with the noble and traditional principles of American policy of self-determination of nations and the sovereign equality of all states, irrespective of their size or strength; be it further

Resolved, That we beseech the United States Government to intervene in behalf of the nationals of Lithuanian, deported to foreign countries, for the purpose of securing their repatriation, through the proper relief agencies; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, His Excellency Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.; to the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Maryland; the Governor of the State of Maryland; and the Lithuanian Legation.

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN
SOCIETIES OF BALTIMORE,
ANTHONY J. MICEIKA,
President,
VERA MIKUSAUCKAS, *Secretary*.

What Is the Best Approach To Obtain Maximum Milk Production in 1945?

REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Commodity Credit Corporation bill is to be presented soon for congressional consideration. The following facts should assist in effectuating a program which will result in the maximum milk production in 1945:

1944 records

States	Amount of milk produced in 1944	Average price per hundredweight received by farmers in 1944 [1]	Composite rate per month for farm labor in 1944 [2]	Payments made during the 1944 calendar year [3]	Proposed subsidy to begin Apr. 1, 1945, through June 1945, per hundredweight [4]
	Pounds				*Cents*
Alabama	1,360,000,000	$3.75	$42.60	$1,512,528	35.55
Arizona	249,000,000	3.05	96.50	1,008,806	35
Arkansas	1,445,000,000	3.25	52.30	2,103,764	35
California	5,479,000,000	3.60	145.00	26,920,256	35.45
Colorado	1,056,000,000	2.95	90.80	2,607,260	35
Connecticut	717,000,000	3.90	98.90	3,687,687	45
Delaware	152,000,000	3.55	83.10	720,226	35
Florida	437,000,000	4.80	60.50	2,141,744	55
Georgia	1,146,000,000	4.00	38.90	1,910,249	55
Idaho	1,405,000,000	2.85	120.00	4,246,318	25.35
Illinois	5,503,000,000	3.00	83.10	16,281,090	25
Indiana	3,492,000,000	3.25	71.90	11,757,212	25
Iowa	6,726,000,000	2.70	91.80	12,390,818	25
Kansas	3,172,000,000	3.05	83.80	5,811,151	25
Kentucky	2,147,000,000	3.20	55.60	4,225,544	25
Louisiana	696,000,000	3.75	46.30	1,468,098	35
Maine	654,000,000	3.50	105.00	2,013,446	35
Maryland	961,000,000	4.00	72.70	4,281,523	35
Massachusetts	777,000,000	4.00	102.00	4,322,813	45
Michigan	5,375,000,000	3.30	82.90	15,361,213	25
Minnesota	8,508,000,000	2.70	85.40	20,803,764	25
Mississippi	1,410,000,000	3.40	43.50	2,643,206	35
Missouri	4,090,000,000	3.25	60.40	8,622,484	25
Montana	721,000,000	2.75	116.00	1,204,493	25
Nebraska	2,785,000,000	2.85	88.90	4,165,337	25
Nevada	108,000,000	3.10	101.00	254,799	35
New Hampshire	340,000,000	3.60	97.00	1,423,154	35
New Jersey	1,015,000,000	4.00	96.20	5,520,301	45
New Mexico	270,000,000	3.90	75.90	576,714	35
New York	7,722,000,000	3.45	90.80	34,072,213	35
North Carolina	1,540,000,000	4.00	50.90	3,098,529	55
North Dakota	2,183,000,000	2.60	109.00	3,191,696	25
Ohio	5,174,000,000	3.30	68.40	16,219,159	25
Oklahoma	2,696,000,000	3.40	74.70	5,554,155	35
Oregon	1,463,000,000	3.65	138.00	4,408,040	35
Pennsylvania	4,976,000,000	3.55	70.70	19,750,302	35
Rhode Island	129,000,000	3.90	106.00	734,770	45
South Carolina	604,000,000	4.10	36.30	932,364	55
South Dakota	1,710,000,000	2.65	94.60	2,467,857	25
Tennessee	2,232,000,000	3.55	44.60	4,509,287	25.35
Texas	4,406,000,000	3.60	74.10	8,604,085	35
Utah	709,000,000	2.85	109.00	2,461,345	35
Vermont	1,498,000,000	3.40	91.80	6,465,603	35
Virginia	1,691,000,000	4.05	54.90	3,628,426	35
Washington	2,242,000,000	3.15	149.00	7,079,779	35
West Virginia	824,000,000	3.50	54.00	1,363,944	35
Wisconsin	14,643,000,000	2.70	82.50	49,532,729	25
Wyoming	314,000,000	3.00	100.00	559,846	25
United States total	118,952,000,000	[5] 3.24	78.00	344,620,127	

[1] 1944 figures taken from Jan. 30, 1945, Agricultural Prices, arranged alphabetically.
[2] Weighted average of all classes of payments. Daily rates were multiplied by 20 to obtain approximate monthly rates. From official table found on p. A-871 of the Feb. 23, 1945 record.
[3] Includes payments for 1943 production which were made after Dec. 31, 1943, and payments for 1944 production which were made through Dec. 31, 1944.
[4] From War Food Administration release 1988, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 287-45 for Feb. 15 p. m. release.
[5] All prices without feed subsidy for States and the United States.

Source: Agricultural Adjustment Agency February 1945.

You will note that while Wisconsin received the largest amount as subsidy, $49,000,000, the 14,000,000,000 pounds of Wisconsin milk brought an average of 54 cents per hundredweight, less than the average per hundredweight for the United States, or over $70,000,000 less than it would if it brought the national average price of milk.

In addition to the above, I include the letter of transmittal and the tables showing the ceiling prices on protein feeds and the estimated costs of 100 pounds of dairy concentrate ration for January 1945, as furnished by Mr. Walter C. Berger, director, Feed Management Division of the War Food Administration. The letter and tables are as follows:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your telephone request of a few days ago in which you asked for information on ceiling prices of oilmeals and prices of feeds used in dairy rations in different parts of the country.

The enclosed tables show the information which you requested. The first one is entitled "Ceiling Prices for Oilmeals, Bulk, F. O. B. Cities Shown." This gives the price in bulk, f. o. b. the cities named, when the meal is obtained from the processors most likely to supply the market.

The second table, entitled "State Average Estimated Cost Per 100 Pounds Dairy Concentrate Ration for January," shows for a number of dairy States in various parts of the country the estimated cost per 100 pounds of concentrate dairy ration in January for the 1938–40 average and for 1945. These estimates were prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics from data received from dairy correspondents and other sources. Since the ingredients of dairy rations vary according to the supplies of different feeds available and their price relationships, a comparison of the value per 100 pounds of this concentrate ration is usually considered to be more valuable than a comparison of the price of individual ingredients.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER C. BERGER,
Director, Feed Management Division.

Ceiling prices for oilmeals, bulk, f. o. b. cities shown (when obtained from usual sources)

City and State	Soybean meal 41 percent protein	Linseed meal 34 percent protein	Cottonseed meal 41 percent protein [1]
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	$48.91	$44.50	$51.50
Minnesota: St. Paul and Minneapolis	50.77	42.00	53.90
Illinois: Chicago	48.50	44.50	51.30
North Carolina: Raleigh	52.21	51.80	47.50
Georgia: Atlanta	52.21	54.40	46.50
New York:			
New York	52.93	45.00	54.10
Buffalo	51.70	46.00	54.90
Massachusetts: Boston	53.24	----------	54.70
Tennessee: Nashville	49.94	----------	45.50
California:			
San Francisco	57.98	46.00	48.00
Los Angeles	58.65	46.00	48.00

[1] Averages computed in my office.

State average estimated cost per 100 pounds dairy concentrate ration for January

State	1938–40 average	1945 [1]	Increase, dollars per hundredweight
Wisconsin	$1.25	$2.48	$1.23
Minnesota	1.00	2.10	1.10
North Carolina	1.57	3.01	1.44
Georgia	1.42	3.06	1.64
Tennessee	1.34	2.93	1.59
New York	1.69	2.99	1.30
Massachusetts	1.88	3.09	1.21
California	1.57	2.93	1.36

[1] Unpublished.

I shall not discuss the various factors involved in arriving at a fair approach for maximum milk production. I submit the above for study and consideration with the hope that maximum milk production will be obtained in 1945.

You will, however, note that less than 4,000,000,000 pounds of the national milk production of 118,000,000,000 pounds will receive the 55 cents per hundredweight subsidy. You will readily note that the great bulk of the milk produced, representing from sixty-five to seventy billion pounds of the national production, comes under the 25 cents per hundredweight subsidy plan and that the remainder of the Nation's milk comes under the 35 cents and 45 cents per hundredweight proposed subsidy.

When the Commodity Credit Corporation bill is presented for consideration the above facts should be given the proper attention by the Congress if maximum milk production is to be obtained in 1945.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Star of February 22, 1945:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The ambassador of the Polish Government in exile at London, Dr. Edouard Raczynski, was informed on Tuesday by Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden that the recognition extended by Great Britain to his government would be withdrawn as soon as the provisional government in Warsaw has been "properly" formed.

Mr. Eden is perhaps somewhat embarrassed in making this communication since Ambassador Raczynski, who has represented Poland at the Court of St. James's since 1935, is the same man who on August 25, 1939, signed the British-Polish treaty of military alliance to offset the Russian-German military agreement signed 2 days earlier.

It was the Earl of Halifax, the present British Ambassador to the United States, who affixed his signature as His Majesty's foreign secretary on that now-discarded treaty. The United States Government has not yet informed the Polish Government as to when it will withdraw its recognition, but it is believed in diplomatic quarters that London and Washington will act simultaneously.

Whether this step will put an end to the Polish problem is still questionable. There seems to be resentment in Britain's political and military circles, even stronger than in this country, over the way the Big Three treated the Poles. The British parliamentarians are in a better position than their American colleagues to demand a full explanation of Prime Minister Churchill's cabinet policies.

In the United States Members of the Senate can talk as long and as loud as they wish about international problems and agreements but they have no way of forcing the Government to come out in the open and explain whys and wherefores of its action.

The situation is quite different in Britain. If the actions of a government are sufficiently distasteful to the House of Commons, the protests of its Members compel the Prime Minister to ask for a vote of confidence. If the result is adverse to the Government, the Prime Minister must resign and all his previous commitments and agreements are of no value unless they are endorsed by his successor.

It is not likely that because of the present world turmoil the British Parliament will deny Mr. Churchill a vote of confidence. Britain, like the United States, is placed in the same dilemma. What can the Parliament members do to avoid an accomplished fact?

Premier Stalin made it very clear at Yalta that the Polish problem must be settled in his own way since Poland already is occupied by a force of hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers. At Teheran the fate of Poland had been only blueprinted by the Big Three. At Yalta the final settlement was reached on the basis of military realities rather than on the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

But the British Parliament, which recognizes more than ever before how valuable the charter could have been for Great Britain if fully applied to Europe, is likely to needle Mr. Churchill when he discusses the Yalta agreements in a full-dress debate next week. There is a strong feeling, particularly among the military men, that the British and American Governments have not stood up for the Poles, whose soldiers and aviators have behaved so valiantly even when fighting for their country in foreign lands.

The British aviators feel that Britain owes a deep debt of gratitude to the Polish flyers who did a magnificent job in 1940 and 1941 for the defense of London. Censorship has prevented publication of an incident which occurred a few months ago in Scotland when the officers of a British air unit officially called on their Polish colleagues some 20 miles away. The British presented their regrets for the words of the Prime Minister, who had indicated in a speech that Poland would have to be sacrificed.

More recently a significant manifestation occurred on the Bologna front in Italy which is partially held by Polish forces. Gen. George C. Marshall, accompanied by Field Marshal Sir Harold Alexander, Lt. Gen. McNarney, Lieutenant General Clark, and other high-ranking American and British officers, called on the Polish commander, Gen. Wladislaw Anders, to congratulate him on receiving America's Legion of Merit for bravery against the enemy.

The incident took place on February 12, a few hours before the release of the Yalta communique which sounded the death knell of Poland. The group of American and British generals, some of whom had just returned from the Black Sea conference, did not mention politics but went out of their way to be most cordial and complimentary to the Polish commander, who could not quite understand the reason for the unprecedented demonstration. It was only several hours later when the editor of the Polish soldiers' newspaper in Rome informed him of the communique that he realized the reason for the American and British generals' gesture.

But, in spite of the feeling in Britain and to a less extent in this country, and in spite of the protests which will be voiced by many Members of Congress and Commons, the fate of Poland has been settled with a finality which cannot be changed.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, attached hereto is a letter and a report which I received from the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and also my reply to same, which I would like to include in the RECORD:

NATIONAL CATHOLIC
WELFARE CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1945.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I enclose for your information copy of a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

I believe you will be interested in this clear, energetic statement by the very reverend director of the department of education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and will give it due consideration.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM F. MONTAVON.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1945.

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Since the subject of Federal aid to education is again a current one, the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference wishes to express its opposition to Senate bill 181, which is entitled "A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their system of public education during emer-

gency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools."

In defining the assistance to be extended by Federal funds Senate bill 181 discriminates in the type of school to be aided. In section 5d it provides "that funds paid to a State under this act shall be expended only by public agencies and under public control." Throughout the bill there are other similar references. In effect, this means a prohibition on the part of the Federal Government that would prevent the States, if they so pleased, from using Federal funds for the aid of private schools.

However, at the recent White House conference on rural education, the President, speaking on Government financial aid, said, "It must purely and simply provide the guarantee that this country is big enough to give all of its children the right to a free education." All right-thinking Americans would agree with the President's declaration. But the legislation proposed in Senate bill 181 seems to take issue with the inclusiveness of the President's position, since private schools have been excluded from participating in the proposed distribution of funds. It seems difficult to understand how the proposed legislation should fail to consider general welfare in the most democratic sense of the world.

There are groups of citizens within our country who maintain their own schools because their conscience requires that they bring their children up according to the tenets and in the spirit of the religion that they profess. Their right to maintain schools is protected by the constitutional guaranty of freedom of religion. Freedom of religion involves more than the opportunity to participate in public worship in a church of one's choice. It means, too, that citizens should enjoy the full freedom to live their religion and to enable their children to do likewise. For many of our citizens this means freedom to provide schools and means of education that accord with the dictates of their conscience. It is not enough for government to refrain from legislation that would prohibit the existence of nonpublic schools. If the program of education within the United States is to be aided, then the real spirit of democracy and the true conception of general welfare should direct that this aid be extended to all children in all schools.

Catholic citizens of the United States are maintaining 2,119 secondary schools, 8,017 elementary schools, enrolling 2,399,908 children. They are supporting these schools out of their own resources and at the same time paying their share of the taxes which support public education.

The Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference maintains that aid given by the Federal Government for education should be distributed according to a law or plan that will bring this aid only to areas in which it is needed and where such need can be demonstrated; moreover, this distribution should be equitable to all children in that area without regard to color, origin, or creed; finally, this distribution should be extended to the children in attendance at any school that meets the requirements of compulsory education.

The department of education holds that, where Federal funds are distributed, they should supplement State, local, or private funds and never supplant them. These State, local, and private funds should be used to the utmost before invoking Federal assistance.

Federal aid should never impose in our country Federal control of education either in law or in practice. The American tradition of local control of education is more responsive to the parent or to the family that has the primary and imprescriptible right in the education of children.

The department of education, National Catholic Welfare Conference, has in the past opposed educational legislation which was undemocratic, discriminatory, and wasteful of public funds. It has opposed measures so worded as to defeat the purpose of equalizing educational opportunity for all children in those areas where such equalization was really needed. It is un-American to offer as an argument for Federal aid to education the poverty and need of many children and at the same time to exclude millions of other children, equally poor and in need, because of religious or racial considerations.

All fair-minded citizens, if not misinformed by propaganda, will oppose any bill advocating Federal aid which is not fair to all American children, regardless of color, origin, or creed.

In stating its official position, the Department of Education is opposed to:

1. Senate bill 181 in its present form.
2. A Federal Department of Education.
3. Federal control of education.
4. Any form of Federal aid which cannot be demonstrated as needed to meet the minimum educational requirements in areas where resources are inadequate.
5. Any distribution of Federal funds which shall not be equitable to all children in the area of need without regard to color, origin or creed, as long as they are in attendance at any school that meets the requirements of compulsory education.

Very sincerely yours,

Very Rev. Msgr. FREDERICK G. HOCHWALT,
Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1945.

Mr. WILLIAM F. MONTAVON,
Director, National Catholic Welfare Conference,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MONTAVON: I am in receipt of your recent communication, together with a copy of a letter addressed to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, which I have read with interest.

In order that the Members of Congress may have this valuable information, I am today placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I am sure every Member will give it his serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Maryland.

Story of a Guy From Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times magazine of Sunday, February 25, 1945, contains a story of a guy from Brooklyn by Sgt. Bud Hutton of the Stars and Stripes. It is about a boy from Brooklyn of a kind Noel Coward apparently never met. In pursuit of the German armies withdrawing from the Ardennes, our Ninetieth Infantry Division was one of those which broke through the Siegfried line and, with other divisions of Gen. George S. Patton's Third Army, enveloped the key road center of Pruem. Sergeant Hutton, who rode with the division into Germany, recounts the following realistic story of this typical guy from Brooklyn:

STORY OF A GUY FROM BROOKLYN—D COMPANY DIDN'T KNOW HIM WELL, BUT HE WAS A HERO IN HIS OWN RIGHT—THIS IS WHAT HE DID

(By Sgt. Bud Hutton)

ON THE SIEGFRIED LINE.—The countryside was ragged with ridges and freshet-full gullies. The stone houses were in ruins and the fields pocked where shells had fallen. And it was cold.

What had been done was very important. American infantry, as the saying goes, had advanced 2 miles and was fighting inside the Siegfried line.

But what had been done before this was important, too. For they had to hold what they had taken, before they could go on to the river and into the west wall's outer defenses.

The new guy from Brooklyn, as he settled himself behind the .50-caliber machine gun and watched the German tanks coming toward him in the moonlight, must have known how important it was. He must have known, too, what would happen if he stayed there.

He had come up to D Company in the First Battalion of a Ninetieth Division regiment at Christmastime. They made him an ammunition bearer with the machine guns. He was a private, 19, about 5 feet 7, sort of medium build, and if there was a job to do he did it and didn't say much about it. Because he was the way he was, and there were a lot of other reinforcements who came at the same time, no one in D Company knew him very well, and they got to calling him "the new guy from Brooklyn," and let it go at that.

The outfit moved north in the night, jammed in trucks that creaked across the snow, and jumped off against the south flank of the bulge that the Nazis had driven into the Ardennes. The new guy from Brooklyn did a good job in the rough going that led them past Bastogne and eastward toward Germany, so Capt. John McLean, of Los Angeles, skipper of D Company, made him a gunner. The new guy said that was swell and slipped back into the obscurity of the company.

They moved into the country where the war on the western front is now. Lt. Col. Bill Du Puy, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., battalion commander, and the new guy from Brooklyn and the ones in between slogged through waist-deep snow and found it like the winter in Sioux Falls and a lot of other American places. They found hemlocks, black and green, against the winter countryside, but placed in symmetrical clumps not at all like what you see in the Adirondacks or the Black Hills; and the birds that flew up from the bare spaces beneath the heavy green boughs were seldom like the north country birds at home.

They found that it was harder to stay alive now because they were in territory that the Germans considered to be German. For it the enemy fought with a fierceness and hard-dying tenacity he had not shown back in France or in Belgium. When he fought for a clump of houses in the gullied land along the Our River he fought for each house, each room, each wall, and smashed what he could not take with him.

In snow and 10-below temperatures, and in wet when the thaws came and sharp slopes began to run with water, war became a fight almost as much for shelter as anything else, because unless the companies and battalions in reserve could get shelter and a chance to dry their clothes and shoes and change their socks—if they could find any dry ones—to eat some hot food—unless they could do those things there would come a time when they could not go on against weather and terrain and the Germans.

So they fought to take towns with names like Hontheim and Sellerich and Herscheid, and to take them so that some of the walls and some of the roofs were left when they got there. About the time their winter footwear and gloves and snow capes got up to

the line—about a week before the thaw set in, that is—they had reached a point in the tiredness, in the dull, unrelenting weariness of fighting, that they had begun to call the enemy simply "he" or "him"—"He's dug in behind the station," First Lt. Bob Smith, of Boston, would say when he called back for artillery fire. And when the shells came and smashed the station, the doughs would go in and they'd report back over the phone, "He's all through here."

If they were attacking or holding the line they lived on K rations, which are dry biscuits and a small can of chopped egg yolk and ham or a small can of cheese and stick of gum and a packet of coffee or lemon powder. By this time they had forgotten even to think about that Senator or somebody back in Washington who said last year that he'd tried K rations for dinner and they'd been very tasty, very tasty indeed.

D Company and the rest fought along the bottoms of narrow gullies, where rocky and hemlocked slopes went almost straight up on each side, with Jerry looking down your throat if you tipped your head back to curse him and his mortars. They fought up the narrow goat track roads to the top of the next sharp ridge, and when they got there they found there was another gully beyond it and another ridge beyond that.

So they came that night to Binsfeld, which was a clump of houses on a crossroads, or maybe a little more, that we had to have before we could sweep down to the Our River and do that piercing of the Siegfried line that they write about. D Company chased the enemy out of town and in bright moonlight hurried to dig in for the inevitable counterattack, which is as German as the Panzer Grenadiers they had captured that day.

There were three houses in a triangle on the far edge of the town and in them Tech. Sgt. Paul Landolt of Aberdeen, Idaho, put his men from the first platoon of B Company. They found on the second floor of the house farthest from the town the new guy from Brooklyn with a D Company machine gun already set up where he could see a dirt road and the fields which stretched out white to the woods where the Germans were.

Sergeant Landolt didn't know the new guy's name, but he had seen him around. He asked the new guy if he was all right and the kid said "Yes," and Landolt said did he know about the bazooka ammunition being all gone, and the kid said "Yes" again. Landolt went back to his men.

Three hundred yards away, out of the black shadows of hemlocks, came two German tanks, their images sharp in the moon's light. They clanked toward the houses and behind them came their infantry.

The new guy from Brooklyn sat up there with the .50 caliber, and he knew that if he could kill the Nazi infantry the tanks would not come in, because they needed their infantry to keep the antitank teams down; and they wouldn't know, he figured, that the antitank teams had run out of bazooka ammunition. The kid had been there long enough to know, too, that you have to hold what you take to be able to go on.

The noise of tanks came across the field and the new guy must have known about a muzzle flash of a .50-caliber at night—how it sputters there all red and orange, and everyone, for a mile around, opens up on it. Of course a gun could jam, or he could run out of ammunition, and the flash wouldn't be there any more to draw the enemy's fire.

Other doughs in the house heard the kid's gun begin to yammer, saw the tracers go out and some of the German infantrymen crumple onto the snow. The tanks clanked on across the field. They came to a point 20 yards from the machine gun and stopped there because there wasn't enough of their infantry with them to go on. The new guy's gun kept firing.

The men who are left in D Company will tell you about what happened later. They will tell you how it was after Binsfeld, how the Our River turned out to be only 6 feet wide, and wasn't that a hell of a come-down for a river? How it seemed that the farther they went the flatter the houses were smashed, until you never got a chance to dry your clothes, and more than ever the horizon of your thoughts and prayers was, "Just let me get through tonight."

Mostly, though, they'll tell you about the new guy from Brooklyn and how he sat there in that window in Binsfeld and kept firing until the infantry was beaten back and the tanks stopped and the tank turrets began to turn toward the orange and red fire at the end of that gun. They'll tell you they could see the reflection of the muzzle blast dancing on the sides of the tanks, and they'll tell you that the new guy must have known what would happen if he stayed there and fired.

The first shell from the tanks smashed the wall next to him, and he kept on firing. The second one passed straight through the spurting orange and red at the end of the gun and exploded.

He had a name all right—Pvt. Paul Kolbert, 1325 East Eighteenth Street, Brooklyn. They found it afterward, of course, on his dog tag. But to most of D Company he was just the new guy from Brooklyn.

Ground for Optimism About Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of February 16, 1945:

GROUND FOR OPTIMISM ABOUT POLAND

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

The Crimea Conference stands out from previous such conferences because of its mood of decision.

The meetings which produced the Atlantic Charter, Casablanca, Teheran, Quebec—all these were dominated, politically, by declarative moods. There were declarations of policy, of aspirations, of intents. But they were not meetings of decision. The meeting at Yalta was plainly dominated by a desire, willingness, and determination to reach solid decisions.

This stood out more pointedly in regard to Poland than any single other issue. The Polish issue is certainly the kind of issue which politicians always, if possible, sidestep by some device. It could, in theory, have been sidestepped at Yalta. But it was not.

That nettle pricks today and will undoubtedly continue to prick for a very long time to come. A completely satisfying Polish settlement is unobtainable. But there is now a settlement which, if supplied in good faith under the terms written at Yalta, has every prospect of being as successful a settlement as the circumstances would permit.

It is already being charged, and will undoubtedly continue to be charged, that it represented a western capitulation to Russia. The charge is not warranted at this time. Poland does not get what its London representatives desire. But neither London nor Washington ever believed that they should have all they desire. There are three main elements in the Polish problem as it arose at Yalta: (a) Frontiers, (b) political self-determination, (c) attitude toward Russia.

On the first point, the agreement in substance on the Curzon line represents a recession from the most extreme Russian position with the door still open to further recession. The Russians originally insisted on the Ribbentrop-Molotov line of 1939. It included the Province of Bialystok in the north, which lies west of the Curzon line. This province remains Polish under the Yalta settlement. The Ribbentrop-Molotov line also took in for Russia all of Galicia which lies south of the Curzon line. (It needs to be remembered that the Curzon line was never drawn south into Galicia.)

Where Galicia goes, under the Yalta settlement, is not indicated definitively in the text. At his press conference, Mr. Byrnes appeared to be under the impression that its disposal remained unsettled; therefore, implying that the door was still open for its retention by Poland.

It can be reported that both London and Washington have long regarded the Curzon line as being the nearest approximation to a true ethnographic frontier between Russia and Poland that could probably be drawn. In accepting the Curzon line they were, therefore, not making a concession to Russia. They were approving what has been regarded ever since 1919 as a valid eastern frontier for Poland.

Particularly if the province of Galicia, with the city of Lwow, is finally given to Poland, Washington will feel that justice has been done.

On the point of political self-determination there was certainly no concession to Russia whatever. The ultimate government is to be chosen through secret elections supervised by a commission in which the British and American Ambassadors in Moscow hold two of the three seats. If the election is truly secret and if the ballots are counted honestly, there can be no question about the fairness of this arrangement. The "if," of course, remains to be tested.

Finally, on the point of attitude toward Russia, there was no concession. London and Washington have long accepted the doctrine that a Poland oriented in its foreign affairs to Moscow is as necessary to stability in eastern Europe as a Mexico oriented to Washington in its foreign affairs is essential to stability in Central America.

Thus, if the Crimean settlement is implemented in honest elections, the results will come short of many Polish desires, but will not in fact represent western capitulation to Russia. Galicia would be a concession, at least in official Washington eyes. But the Curzon line is not capitulation because its substantial fairness is not officially or even privately questioned. American diplomacy obtained, on paper, what it regarded as the essential elements of a sound settlement of the Polish question.

Manpower Problem

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have received from a prominent citizen of my district a letter crying out against the giving of greater power to the executive

departments down here in Washington, setting out a number of abuses of power that have already been exercised against a number of people in my district. I desire to include this letter for whatever benefit it my be to the Members of the House. Now that we are considering manpower legislation, which is a very live subject over in the other body, I think it behooves the Members of the House to continuously watch this legislation as it develops, and to see to it that there is no greater grab of power and centralization of government given to those here in Washington, and to see to it that a program is worked out in legislation between the two bodies, that will solve the manpower problem.

The letter referred to is as follows:

OLNEY, ILL., *February 24, 1945.*

Hon. CHARLES N. VURSELL,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VURSELL: Into this town has been sent an individual representing, I suppose, the War Labor Board, who I assume is following orders.

When the First National Bank of this town receives a letter that it cannot hire and fire its own employees, but must go through this Government agency, and where the Baker Oil Tools Co. is given like instructions, it looks like there is something wrong with the freedoms that our boys are fighting for.

When a man operating a restaurant advertises for help and is ordered to take his ad out of the paper, and another man reopening his burned restaurant with over 200 applicants for jobs is told that he can only work 6 days a week, it looks like we are not running our own businesses.

I can cite you another example of an oil-drilling company that through weather conditions was forced to suspend drilling operations at a certain point and another company wanted to use the drilling crews during the interim but were told that this was against the rules and regulations, so several crews, or towers as we call them in the oil field, were idle until the weather conditions made it possible to go back and resume drilling.

This is only a fair example of what is happening in these United States, and if you gentlemen pass any more legislation giving additional powers and authorities to boards, commissions, and bureaus, it would appear that our boys who are giving their lives overseas for our form of government have been wasting their lives in vain.

It may be a matter of interest to know that the shipyards in Evansville, Ind., which employs several thousand people, is closing down. There is not the manpower shortage that we are told there is. It is being manufactured to place more power in the hands of bureaucrats in Washington, and I hope you gentleman have the guts to stand up and fight against that sort of thing.

Very truly yours,

DONOVAN D. MCCARTY.

Proof of the Pudding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House on February 23 to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several newspaper articles and editorials, I submit an article entitled "The Proof of the Pudding" which appeared in the Larchmont (N. Y.) Times on February 1, 1945:

PROOF OF THE PUDDING

Prior to the national election last year there were frequent outbursts from left of center by New Deal propagandists who were certain that Thomas E. Dewey and the horrible Republicans were attempting to steal the election by depriving the Nation's fighting men of the ballot. They paid little or no attention to the honest efforts of the Albany administration and our energetic boards of elections in getting the State ballots into the hands of the men and women in armed service.

Instead, they rather resented such efforts, terming them mere "alibis" and "a disguise for the real purpose of keeping the vote small" so that thereby Mr. Dewey's chances would be bettered. As a matter of fact, the resentment probably was based on the actual realization that every State ballot which reached a soldier meant one less Federal ballot, the method of franchise favored by these propagandists.

Now, with the heat of election well past and no possibility that anyone can be suspected of grinding personal or partisan axes, it is interesting to note from a member of President Roosevelt's own Cabinet, the Secretary of War, that soldiers serving overseas preferred the State ballot over the Federal bobtail ballot. Only "insignificant use" of the short-form Federal ballot resulted, said Secretary Stimson, and its administration was "excessively complex."

In fact, said Mr. Stimson, the distribution and collection of the Federal ballots represented "burdens which appear disproportionate to any resulting utility," which is a diplomatic way of saying that the results did not justify the expenditure of time and labor.

There was no shortage of Federal ballots at any time, or at any place, reported Mr. Stimson, and yet in 10 States which approved the Federal ballot and reported to the Army, only 28,136 or 2.2 percent of the eligible persons used the Federal ballot while 446,974 or 34.6 percent used the State ballots. And in the merchant marine, where 400,000 Federal ballots had been made available to the War Shipping Administration, only 200 Federal ballots were cast. And in the entire 20 States approving the Federal ballots, only 5.3 percent of those eligible, about 1 out of 20, exercised this type of franchise.

The principle reason why State ballots were favored, as we pointed out at the time, was that they carried the names of candidates, while the Federal ballots did not. Further, the State ballots permitted voting for all candidates on the ticket; the Federal did not. "Most servicemen who desired to vote were able to obtain, then vote and return their State absentee ballots, leaving relatively few who needed to (or legally could) use Federal ballots," was Mr. Stimson's conclusion.

Use of Animals in Research at the Naval Medical Research Institute

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there has been much misinformation given to the public regarding vivisection. Criticism has been directed at the Naval Medical Research Institute and the new facilities at the Naval Medical Center, at Bethesda, Md. Criticism of these activities, I believe, springs from a lack of information as to what they are and how such activities are pursued by those interested in saving human life.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that the facts, and all the facts, are laid before the House and the country. In my hand, I hold a report on this question, which I recently received from Rear Admiral W. J. C. Agnew, Acting Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Navy Department. It is most comprehensive. It is entirely complete, and, inasmuch as the House is being urged to pass a bill which has for its purpose putting an end to this activity, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to include with these remarks this report.

I have submitted the report to the Government Printing Office and I have a statement to the effect that it is estimated it will make two and three-fifths pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $135.20. I ask to extend my remarks in the manner indicated notwithstanding this cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the cost to the contrary notwithstanding, the extension will be made.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1945.

To: Representative ROY O. WOODRUFF, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subject: The use of animals in research at the Naval Medical Research Institute, information on, and miscellaneous antivivisection rebuttal material.

Reference: (a) Phone call by Representative WOODRUFF to Admiral H. W. Smith, February 6, 1945, re request for subject materials.

Enclosures: 1. Treatise on antivivisection rebuttal information. 2. Information on new structure to house animals for research at National Naval Medical Center. 3. Copy of letter used by Surgeon General of the Navy in reply to antivivisection letters addressed to him.

1. In response to reference (a) I am forwarding to you the material requested regarding the defense of animal experimentation at the Naval Medical Research Institute.

2. The purpose of the animal laboratories is to provide housing quarters and treatment rooms for all animals used in the wide variety of medical problems under investigation at the Institute. Almost three-quarters of the members of the officer staff have devoted a greater or less part of their time to problems directly involving animal experimentation.

3. Examples of medical research problems, details of which may or may not be disclosed publicly, but which depend almost exclusively upon tests with animals, are:

A. Successful treatment of peritonitis with penicillin; experimental work carried out on dogs.

B. Study of malaria and antimalarial drugs; experimental work prior to clinical trials carried out on monkeys, dogs, rats, and chickens.

C. Study of filariasis and antifilarial drugs; experimental work carried out on dogs.

D. Study of burn treatment methods; experimental work carried out on rabbits.

E. Study of shock therapy; experimental work carried out on rabbits.

In addition to these sample experiments, it may be added that certain of the studies have led to advances so revolutionary as to be classified as "secret" by military intelligence.

4. The record for the month of December 1944 is given as a sample of the kinds and numbers of animals used at the N. M. R. I. (including those also issued to the staff of the hospital): Monkeys, 11; dogs, 28; cats, 12; rabbits, 29; guinea pigs, 188; mice, 3,585.

5. An insectarium provides the special environment essential for the propagation and study of insects in relation to the prevention of insect-borne diseases.

6. Dogs are used only in experimental studies for which lower animal species are unsuited for one reason or another.

7. In compliance with the explicit orders of N. M. R. I. Order No. 16, "Laboratory animals," animals are anesthetized for all experiments which involve discomfort to the animal greater than that attending anesthetization. At the end of an experiment the animal is killed painlessly. Exceptions to this rule are made only when continuance of the animal's life is necessary for the observation of results.

Local anesthetics and the spinal-block type are almost never used in animal experiments (the undersigned know of no instances of its use at the N. M. R. I.). Anesthesia is most generally induced by an injection of veterinary nembutal, or, more rarely, by ether inhalation, both of which induce and sustain sleep during the full course of the experiment.

8. Although the results sought from animal experiments at the N. M. R. I. will generally benefit all people in the end, the immediate purpose in initiating these studies is to conserve the health of the members of the armed services.

9. Excerpts of references: Animal Experimentation, Its Importance and Value to Scientific Medicine. Published by Board of Regents. American College of Surgeons, Chicago. Health Benefits from Animal Experimentation. Prepared by Bowman C. Crowell, M. D. Issued by American College of Surgeons, Chicago. The Seven Wonders of Medical Science. Published by Illinois Society for the Protection of Medical Research. Some contributions by Animals to Human Health, by A. C. Ivy, M. D., California and Western Medicine, 1934. Published by California Medical Association, 450 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif. Modern Medical Miracles, by A. C. Ivy, M. D., California and Western Medicine, 1934, are submitted herewith.

They consist of a few of the many statements that have been made from time to time by eminent medical authorities, who are periodically obliged to defend animal experimentation in the face of threatened antivivisection legislation which would definitely impede medical scientific progress. Furthermore, no recognized medical authority has ever gone on record as opposing animal experimentation (this statement might well be verfied through Dr. A. C. Ivy).

Similarly, and particularly in view of the recent antivivisection campaign in Chicago, in which he was involved, it is suggested that the help of Dr. Ivy would be of considerable value in the present connection.

It is further suggested that it may be of assistance to you to have a scientist from the institute, such as Dr. C. C. Pfeiffer, to elucidate with technical points.

10. Trusting that the above will supply the information requested, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

W. J. C. AGNEW,
Rear Admiral (M. C.), U. S. N.
Acting Chief of Bureau.

---

1. Animal Experimentation, Its Importance and Value to Scientific Medicine. Published by board of regents, American College of Surgeons, Chicago. Page 4: "In the words of that eminent citizen, Charles W. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard University:

"The number of animals used for the benefits of the human race in making possible the recent advances of surgery and medicine is insignificant, indeed infinitesimal, compared with the number used for human food and human service; but the benefits to mankind which result from animal experimentation are immeasurable in quantity, and very precious in quality. The benefits of the discoveries go on, generation after generation, multiplying as they go."

"Animal experimentation has conferred immense benefits upon mankind, and doctors themselves have volunteered as subjects when animals have not afforded suitable media for experimental research." (Franklin H. Martin, M. D., Director General.)

2. Health Benefits From Animal Experimentation. Prepared by Bowmann C. Crowell, M. D.; issued by American College of Surgeons, Chicago. Pages 5–7:

"Over at the veterinary station we will find all sorts of animals benefiting from the experimental work. Animals are subject to many of the same diseases as are humans, and their methods of prevention and treatment are similar. Moreover, the control of diseases that are peculiar to animals is as great an accomplishment as has occurred with human diseases. In serving others they have served themselves. In dogs distemper can be prevented, and rabies can be reduced. In cattle tuberculosis easily can be detected and eliminated. Parasites can be removed. Anthrax, tetanus, and hog cholera can be prevented. All of these diseases have caused untold suffering and economic loss, which research has made needless, as, for example, in hog cholera which in 1914 killed 12 percent of the swine in the United States, and against which it is now possible to obtain nearly 100 percent protection.

"What is worse than a rabid dog? What gives greater fear than the bite of a mad dog? Through the Pasteur treatment the dangers of hydrophobia have been reduced enormously, and the number of persons now annually treated for this disease mounts to the almost unbelievable number of hundreds of thousands. How many would hesitate thus to protect themselves after being bitten by a rabid dog even with the knowledge that their individual case will entail the sacrifice of several animals?

"Having witnessed these evidences of progress, and knowing of much else that cannot be included in detail in a limited space—the great reduction in infant mortality and the control of infectious diseases, the purification of our water, milk, and food, which we all take for granted, and by reason of which we continue to exist, the progress in the control of cancer, and the increase in the life span from 45 to 59 years within the past 35 years, with the prediction that it will be increased still further—let us pause a moment to consider some of the factors that have served to bring all this about.

"If this preservation of health and increased longevity are to be continued then the use of animals must be allowed. Physicians have not hesitated to sacrifice themselves in experiments for the progress of science or to prove their theories. Very recently we have the example of Dr. Park of New York and his associates allowing themselves to be injected with the killed virus of infantile paralysis in order that their bodies might produce substances that would protect others against the disease. James Carroll of the Walter Reed Yellow Fever Commission submitted himself to the bite of a mosquito infectod with the yellow fever virus and came successfully through an attack of yellow fever. Not so fortunate was his fellow member on the Commission, Jesse W. Lazear, who was accidentally bitten by an infected mosquito during their experiment and died from the disease. Noguchi is another notable example of a martyr to science. Daniel Carrion, Dutton, Ricketts, and McClintic all lost their lives in investigating the diseases with which their names are associated.

"Sir Frederick G. Banting proved his theory and developed insulin at the sacrifice of approximately 30 dogs. Today the lives of a million people have benefited from its use. John B. Murphy, in perfecting his method of sealing together the torn or cut ends of the intestine by an ingenious button, used 15 or 20 dogs, and as a result countless human lives have been saved.

"Such examples could be multiplied almost ad infinitum. We know that the medical scientists unselfishly have made possible all the progress of which we have spoken. We discern the unreasonableness and inconsistency of those who would hamper it when they daily eat fish, flesh, or fowl. We know the human and humane character of our medical fraternity who will sit up night after night with you when you need them, and we also know the conditions under which they practice animal experimentation.

"Let me refer to only a few of them with reference especially to dogs. Only derelict or condemned dogs from the pounds are so used, and not the pets of ourselves or our friends or even of our enemies. In order to be allowed to obtain dogs for experimental purposes an institution first must submit to thorough investigation before approval is given.

"Laboratory workers have drawn up sets of rules for the care of the dogs and these are adhered to rigidly. The dogs really live lives of luxury compared to ordinary street life. Cages and runways are kept clean and airy and are sterilized at regular intervals. Food is especially prepared for them in diet kitchens, fom which recently has come much of our knowledge of the all essential vitamin contents of our foods. Before most operations they are anaesthetized and if to be sacrificed are killed painlessly. After operations their care is as important in the result of the work as is the operation itself. The affection that develops between a dog that has been experimented on and his surgeon is sufficient evidence of the lack of cruelty."

3. The Seven Wonders of Medical Science, published by Illinois Society for the Protection of Medical Research. Discoveries resulting solely or chiefly from experiments on dogs.

"1. Insulin which controls diabetes in man and dog. There are 1,000,000 people living in the United States today, who now have or will later develop diabetes and who will have their lives prolonged and enriched by the use of insulin. This discovery was made solely on dogs.

"2. Liver extract for pernicious anemia. Liver extract causes the blood to return to normal in patients afflicted with this disease. Liver was found to be a good food for anemic dogs. This was applied to patients with miraculous results.

"3. Treatment of parathyroid tetany. Prior to 1925 practically all patients afflicted with this dreadful disease died. Today no patient need die of this disease.

"4. Ethylene anesthesia. The discovery of many and our knowledge of the action of all anesthetics and sleep-producing drugs have come chiefly from experiments on dogs.

"5. Ether, which has been called the greatest gift of medicine to mankind, was first tried out by Dr. W. T. G. Morton in a series of experiments on his own dog. His success in the dog led to a trial in man.

"6. Rabies treatment. The use of the Pasteur treatment for rabies (mad-dog bite) has reduced the mortality from 16 to less than 1 percent. There is a preventative treatment for dogs which protects them to a great extent against this disease.

"7. Hookworm cure. The hookworm infests both man and dog. One hundred million people in our own and in tropical countries are infested with this parasite.

Most all we know about this parasite resulted from studies on the dog. Carbon tetrachloride was found to rid the body of hookworm. Then, tetrachlorethylene was found to be as effective but less toxic to the patients. More than 15,000,000 treatments have been given to dogs and human beings.

"8. Treatement of Addison's disease. Addison's disease is caused by disease of the adrenal glands. These patients die slowly. Recently it has been discovered by experiments on dogs and cats that this disease can be controlled by the administration of appropriate extracts of the adrenal glands.

"9. In regard to Chemical Warfare Service:

"(a) A statisfactory treatment for phosphorus burns.

"(b) A satisfactory treatment for burns and other effects caused by poisonous gases.

"(c) An improved method for treatment for lung irritants like phosgene.

"(d) Effects of gas (automobile exhaust, cooking gas) poisoning and process of recovery.

"(e) Facts bearing on shell shock.

"(f) Facts bearing on treatment of traumatic shock, or shock following severe injury.

"10. Methods of Resuscitation: In drowning, coal-gas poisoning, and electrocution, cyanide poisoning.

"11. Almost all we know about the stomach, intestine, and liver.

"12. Much that we know about heart action and the effects of drugs on it.

"13. Much that we know about dropsy and kidney disease.

"14. The accuracy of the indirect method of measuring blood pressure in man. When the physician takes the blood pressure, he and his patient should remember the debt owed to the dog.

"15. Development of new operations:

"(a) On the heart and its valves.

"(b) On the lungs.

"(c) On the blood vessels.

"(d) On the brain.

"(e) On the stomach and intestines.

"(f) On the blood transfusion.

"(g) On the ovaries and womb.

"16. Rickets, a common disease that affects children and young animals. The first experiments bearing on the cause and cure of this disease were performed on puppies. Now this disease can be prevented and cured.

"17. Antidotes to veronal and luminal (sleeping drugs) poisoning.

"18. The action of a number of medicines: Epinephrine, which is used to check hemorrhage and to abolish distress in asthma is tested on dogs by United States Government requirement. Pituitrine, a drug used in childbirth is tested on guinea pigs and dogs. Wood alcohol was first shown to be harmful by experiments on dogs and the cause of "ginger jake paralysis" was found by studies on the dog.

"The dog's contribution to our knowledge of the function of the organs of the body would fill a volume. Scientists, who know their business and duty to society just as the lawyer, banker, engineer, and architect know their business and duty, hold that the dog is necessary for experimental purposes. Detailed reasons cannot be pointed out to lay persons, because they do not know enough anatomy and physiology. But the following general statements can be made: Dogs are necessary because (1) they can live a healthy life in relative confinement. (2) They are large and their structures can be easily operated. (3) Like man they eat all kinds of foods. (4) They have diseases in common with man. (5) Structurally and functionally they are very similar to man. (6) They are so numerous that in large cities thousands are picked up and killed yearly. Of these, a small number are drafted for humane experiments, the results of which serve dog and man alike.

"When a dog is operated on it is put to sleep or a powerful pain-killing drug is used.

"What science has done for the dog:

"1. We can now prevent and cure rabies in the dog.

"2. We can now kill the hookworm which infests dogs as well as man and which makes it difficult for dog fanciers to raise dogs.

"3. We can now prevent and cure blacktongue in the dog.

"4. We can do much to prevent and control distemper. The treatment is not perfect and further experiments must be done on the dog for the good of the dog.

"5. We are now working to find a medicine that will kill the cruel heartworm in the dog.

"6. We know how to operate on the dog and cure certain diseases of the thyroid gland and intestines.

"7. We are learning about 'puppy birth' in the dog which is important to dog fanciers.

"8. We can prevent diseases in the dog due to improper food. Dogs need vitamins just as other animals do.

"What have the opponents of animal experimentation done for either man or dog?

"Nothing! The opponents of animal experimentation, known also as antivivisectionists, would prevent experiments on dogs for the sake of dogkind. Antivivisection would make it impossible for veterinary science to experiment on one dog for the sake of dogs as a group.

"Also, the opponents of animal experimentation themselves profit daily from the benefits of animal experimentation. They do not sense the fact that city life could not exist as we now know it if animal experimentation had not been practiced in the past. Without the knowledge which has come from animal experimentation, the grim specters of plague, typhus, yellow fever, malaria, and typhoid would still be rampant amongst us. Diphtheria would still take its toll of children's lives. Surgery would be primitive and anesthesia inadequate and unduly dangerous. Our knowledge of the function of the organs of the body and of life processes upon which the progress of medicine and the diagnosis of disease depends, would not have been gained, unless cats, dogs, guinea pigs, and other laboratory animals had been used. Scientific knowledge and the discoveries of medical science do not fall from the heavens like the manna upon which the children of Israel fed, but must be obtained through the arduous and persevering use of the scientific or experimental method. This method is the only known and proven method by which the warfare on disease may be conducted adequately and effectively. The opponents of biologic and medical progress would abolish this method, the use of which has been and still promises to be of such tremendous value to mankind.

"It should not be forgotten that when crops are threatened with parasites, when farm animals and the human family are threatened by an epidemic disease, the legislators and citizens turn to the biologist and medical scientists for aid, and that the work of public-health agencies are carried on either by, or under the direction of, men and women trained in the medical sciences. The public has and must continue to manifest confidence in the moral and intellectual integrity, the sincerity of purpose and the humaneness of its biologists and medical scientists. The public must support them in their work, if in the future the public shall expect to benefit to a maximum extent, as it has in the past by expert advice, because expert advice is based on scientific facts which come from experimentation."

4. Some Contributions by Animals to Human Health. By A. C. Ivy, M. D. California and Western Medicine, 1934. Page 13:

"Dog: Echinococcus disease: Taenia echinococcus, a small tapeworm which sometimes inhabits the intestines of dogs, gives rise in man to cysts that may be the cause of death.

"Hydrophobia: The dog is the animal chiefly responsible for the perpetuation of this disease, so fatal to both man and dog.

"Tapeworm: A tapeworm, diphyllidium caninum, may be acquired by man (especially children) from the dog.

"Mange: Of the three types of mange from which dogs suffer, one is transmissible to man.

"Ringworm: The dog is subject to four types of ringworm which it may occasionally transmit to man.

"Scarlet fever: Dogs are susceptible to the scarlet-fever germ. Close association of a dog with a child suffering from this disease may endanger other children."

5. Modern Medical Miracles. By A. C. Ivy, M. D., California and Western Medicine, 1934. Pages 20–25. To summarize:

"The dog's contribution to our knowledge of the function of the organs of the body would fill a volume. Scientists, who know their business and duty to society, just as the lawyer, banker, engineer, and architect, know their business and duty, hold that the dog is necessary for experimental purposes. Detailed reasons cannot be pointed out to lay persons, because they do not know enough anatomy and physiology. But the following general statements can be made: Dogs are necessary because—

"1. They can live a healthy life in relative confinement.

"2. They are large and their structures can be easily operated.

"3. Like man, they eat all kinds of foods.

"4. They have diseases in common with man.

"5. Structurally and functionally they are very similar to man.

"6. They are so numerous that in large cities thousands are picked up and killed yearly. Of these, a small number are drafted for humane experiments, the results of which serve dog and man alike.

"When a dog is operated on, it is put to sleep or a powerful pain-killing drug is used.

"What science has done for the dog:

"1. We can now prevent and cure rabies in the dog.

"2. We can now kill the hookworm, which infests dogs as well as man, and which makes it difficult for dog fanciers to raise dogs.

"3. We can now prevent and cure blacktongue in the dog.

"4. We can do much to prevent and control distemper. The treatment is not perfect and further experiments must be done on the dog for the good of the dog.

"5. We are now working to find a medicine that will kill the cruel heartworm in the dog.

"6. We know how to operate on the dog and cure certain disease of the thyroid gland and intestines.

"7. We are learning about puppy birth in the dog which is important to dog fanciers.

"8. We can prevent diseases in the dog due to improper food. Dogs need vitamins just as other animals do.

"What have the opponents of animal experimentation done for either man or dog?

"Nothing! The opponents of animal experimentation, known also as antivivisectionists, would prevent experiments on dogs for the sake of dogkind. Antivivisection would make it impossible for veterinary science to experiment on one dog for the sake of dogs as a group.

"Also, the opponents of animal experimentation themselves profit daily from the benefits of animal experimentation. They do not sense the fact that city life could not exist as we now know it if animal experimentation had not been practiced in the past. Without the knowledge which has come from animal experimentation, the grim specters of plague, typhus, yellow fever, malaria, and typhoid would still be rampant among us. Diphtheria

would still take its toll of children's lives. Surgery would be primitive and anesthesia inadequate and unduly dangerous. Our knowledge of the function of the organs of the body and of life process upon which the progress of medicine and the diagnosis of disease depends, would not have been gained, unless cats, dogs, guinea-pigs and other laboratory animals had been used. Scientific knowledge and the discoveries of medical science do not fall from the heavens like the manna upon which the children of Israel fed, but must be obtained through the arduous and persevering use of the scientific or experimental method. This method is the only known and proven method by which the warfare on disease may be conducted adequately and effectively. The opponents of biologic and medical progress would abolish this method, the use of which has been and still promises to be of such tremendous value to mankind.

"It should not be forgotten that when crops are threatened with parasites, when farm animals and the human family are threatened by an epidemic disease, the legislators and citizens turn to the biologist and medical scientist for aid, and that the work of public-health agencies are carried on either by, or under the direction of, men and women trained in the medical sciences. The public has and must continue to manifest confidence in the moral and intellectual integrity, the sincerity of purpose, and the humaneness of its biologists and medical scientists. The public must support them in their work, if in the future the public shall expect to benefit to a maximum extent, as it has in the past by expert advice, because expert advice is based on scientific facts which come from experimentation.

"TRUSTS OPPOSING ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION NOT CHARITABLE

"Animal experimentation as a means of promoting human and animal welfare has recently received the sanction of two tribunals of great importance, one in the United States and the other in England.

"In the American case, the United States Board of Tax Appeals (25 B. T. A., *Penn. Co. Insurance on Lives and Annuities, Executive Estate of A. S. Logan, Deceased, petitioner* v. *Comm. Int. Rev., respondent*) held that a bequest to a society organized for 'the total abolition of all vivisectional experiments on animals and other experiments of a painful nature' was not a bequest to a corporation organized and operated exclusively for the prevention of cruelty to animals, and that the amount of such a bequest could not be deducted in computing the Federal estate tax.

"In the English case the court of appeal (The Law Journal, 71: 329, 1931) raised the question whether 'in the light of later knowledge in regard to the benefits accruing to mankind from vivisection' bequests designed to hinder and prevent vivisection would today be regarded as charitable bequests. On appeal, the House of Lords forbade the use for antivivisection propaganda of any part of the legacy concerning which the question was raised.

"Probably these two decisions represent the general trend of mature and cultured thought on the subject of animal experimentation, when uninfluenced by lurid appeals to the imagination. Both decisions were based on the orderly presentation of legal evidence, not on such clamorous, virulent, emotional speech-making as commonly fills the air when animal experimentation is discussed by antivivisectionists before legislative committees." (Northwestern University, 303 East Chicago Avenue.)

SOME OPINIONS ON ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION

Jane Addams, Hull House, Chicago: "Dr. A. J. Carlson, a distinguished professor of the University of Chicago, during the World War made a most valuable study of the piteous children who were suffering from starvation, and for months worked on their behalf in southeastern Europe. Immediately after the war I accompanied a scientific friend, whose discoveries in industrial disease have necessitated research with living animals, in a survey of the war children throughout one country after another.

"It is impossible to associate either Dr. Carlson or Dr. Alice Hamilton with inhumanity or lack of tender care for helpless creatures; to charge them, or their scientific colleagues, with cruelty is utterly to misapprehend them of their motives."

Charles W. Eliot, LL. D., president emeritus, Harvard University: "We owe to scientific experimentation on animals the means of saving hundreds of thousands of children within the past 50 years, and untold millions of children in the coming years. But it is not human beings alone that owe an immense debt to modern animal experimentation. Animals also owe to vivisection great deliverance from disease and death. All the agricultural industries in the United States are deeply indebted to animal experimentation."

Harry Pratt Judson, until recently president of the University of Chicago: "Men of real scientific attainments must not be prevented from pursuing their investigations for the benefit of humanity by idle sentimentality."

His Eminence Denis Cardinal Dougherty, archbishop of Philadelphia, Pa.: "To forbid vivisection would be to hamper science, do a mischief to the human race, and foster misplaced sympathy."

Rt. Rev. C. H. Brent, bishop of western New York: "I sincerely hope that the efforts made by the antivivisectionists to eliminate this mode of scientific investigation will not meet with success."

Rev. John Haynes Holmes, minister of the Community Church, New York: "As regards the surgeons who are engaged in this business of vivisection, I have to state that I do not believe for a single moment the charges that are so wantonly brought against them. I know some of these men. I have met the most distinguished of them, who has been for years under most virulent attack. I have gone through his laboratories. I have witnessed his performance of a vivisection experiment, which was of the character of most severe major operations. To accept the charges of cruelty against scientists of this type—this is a thing impossible to me."

Ernest Thompson Seton: "I learn now from your reply to the Baynes article that you (the opponents of medical science, called antivivisectionists) are opposed to all experiments on living animals, and that you utterly condemn the work of the Pasteur Institute, the Rockefeller Institute, and allied laboratories. I have to thank the studies of such institutions for the fact that my wife is alive today. Kindly accept my resignation from the Vivisection Investigation League, to take effect immediately."

Col. David S. White, Chief Veterinarian of the American Expeditionary Forces: "Anyone who is familiar with what vivisection has done for mankind and animal kind must realize its value to the world."

William J. Mayo, M. D., the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.: "My brother and I are strongly in favor of vivisection. In the clinic there are large laboratories in which a number of physicians are constantly at work on investigations which depend on animal experimentation."

President Angell, of Yale University: "We find no obstacle to the practice of animal experimentation in any intuitive moral convictions, nor in the traditional morality of our race."

6. Animal Experimentation, Its Importance and Value to Scientific Medicine. Page 6:

"The claim that animal experimentations, even though beneficial is morally wrong, is in opposition to the ethics of our civilization. We kill calves and take their mothers' milk; we slaughter annually hundreds of thousands of cattle, sheep, and hogs; we castrate male creatures without anesthesia, merely to make them more tractable or to please cur palates; we hunt and trap with every possibility of inflicting pain. In the face of these habits, there is no reason why the use of animals in laboratories, with care to avoid causing unnecessary discomfort and with the object of increasing knowledge and lessening human misery, should be regarded as specially immoral. Indeed the fact that animal experimentation has vastly reduced the suffering of mankind and that, if persisted in, it will continue to do so, renders the work of medical investigation highly moral—even a moral duty."

WALTER B. CANNON,
George Higginson Professor of Physiology, Harvard University Medical School, Boston.

INFORMATION ON NEW STRUCTURE TO HOUSE ANIMALS FOR RESEARCH AT NATIONAL NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER

The present animal house is quite inadequate and does not permit the healthful living conditions which we desire for our animals. The new animal house will have ample indoor space, runways, and other facilities for taking the best care of the animals.

As to the use of animals in investigations of the many problems of prevention and treatment of disease and injuries, it should be considered that the whole structure of modern medicine and the measures now being employed which are so successful in saving the lives of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers and sailors are rooted in observations made possible only by utilization of lower animals.

Our staff members are humane persons both in character and in works; and not even the simplest procedure involving animals is undertaken without the defined purpose of prolonging or saving human life, or is conducting without the utmost consideration.

The Naval Medical Research Institute order governing the use of animals contains the following provisions:

"Animals shall receive every consideration for their bodily comfort; they shall be kindly treated, properly fed, and their surroundings kept in the best possible sanitary condition.

"No operations on animals shall be made except with the sanction of the research executive who will hold himself responsible for the importance of the problem studied and for the propriety of the procedures used in the solution of these problems.

"In any operation likely to cause greater discomfort than that attending anesthetization, the animal shall first be rendered incapable of perceiving pain and shall be maintained in that condition until the operation is ended.

"Exceptions to this rule will be made by the research executive alone and then only when anesthesia would defeat the object of the experiment. In such cases an anesthetic shall be used so far as possible and may be discontinued only so long as is absolutely essential for the necessary observations.

"At the conclusion of the experiment the animal shall be killed painlessly.

"Exceptions to this rule will be made only when continuance of the animal's life is necessary to determine the result of the experiment. In that case, the same asceptic precautions shall be observed duirng the operation and so far as possible the same care shall be taken to minimize discomforts during the convalescence as in a hospital for human beings."

FEBRUARY 8, 1945.

DEAR MR. —: I have your letter of ———, expressing concern over the proposed extension of laboratory facilities at the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.; which

was referred by the President to me as the one most directly concerned.

You are, evidently, misinformed regarding the purposes to which new construction is to be devoted. Most of it is designed to house physical, chemical, bacteriological, pathological, and similar laboratories, a diving tank, and facilities for studies on the effects of environment in which human volunteers are used to gain data as to their efficiency and general well-being under conditions of service.

Quarters are included in the plans, but only for the purpose of improving the housing of animals by providing them with more healthful living conditions: for example, a tropical environment essential for the propagation and study of disease-bearing insects.

That animals should not be used in medical research, developments, testing, or standardization is apparently the grounds for your letter of protest. It will suffice here if I state that the whole structure of modern medicine and the measures now being employed which are so successful in saving lives of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers and sailors are rooted in observations made possible only by utilization of lower animals. I consider that statement irrefutable.

In charging our officers with mutilation and torture you are quite mistaken. In no case are there practices which could possibly be described as torturing or even pain producing. I can assure you that our staff members are humane persons both in character and in works. Even the simplest procedure involving animals is undertaken with the definite purpose of saving human life, and is conducted with the utmost consideration.

Trusting that this assurance will suffice to allay your distress, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROSS T MCINTYRE,
Vice Admiral (MC), Surgeon General,
United States Navy.

Send Mr. Pell Back to London

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Send Mr. Pell Back to London," written by Edgar Ansel Mowrer and published in the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily of February 6, 1945.

The author of the article stands firmly behind Mr. Pell's contention that although the perpetrators of the atrocities committed against the Hebrew peoples of Europe are not considered to be United Nations nationals, they should be punished as war criminals. I believe that Mr. Mowrer's remarks on the subject are very worth while.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEND MR. PELL BACK TO LONDON

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Acting Secretary of State Joseph Grew has, at long last, announced that the State Department wants to see the Germans punished for all their crimes, within the Reich as well as in the victim countries. If so the sooner the Department ships Herbert Claiborne Pell, American representative on the United Nations War Crimes Commission, back to his job in London, the better for all concerned. For in the eyes of the entire Allied world, Mr. Pell represents those Americans who want Allied justice to do a clean job, as against those Americans who want something less.

Failure of the State Department to return Mr. Pell to the position to which the President appointed him and from which nobody but the President has the right to remove him, will convince a lot of people, including this writer, that the State Department, following an ancient habit, is double-tonguing to the American people.

On paper, the Department's position is clear and shining. In the New York Times (February 2) you may read:

"It was stated today in high quarters that the decision for Mr. Pell not to return was based exclusively in the failure of Congress to make an appropriation for him and in no other consideration. The failure to appropriate was said to have been due to a misunderstanding in Congress with the result that the State Department has requested a special appropriation for the purpose."

"High quarters" like these must be right, and yet—

And yet Members of Congress have personally stated that they are willing to restore the appropriation for the American representative on the United Nations War Crimes Commission any time the State Department asks for it and that they would have done so earlier had its importance been made clear to them.

This being the case, certain questions are pertinent. For instance:

Why—since only lack of funds prevented it from sending Mr. Pell back to London—did not the State Department put in its new request for funds earlier?

How—in the absence of an appropriation, has the Department been keeping up the office in London with its four employes? Mr. Pell's second, Lt. Col. Joseph Hodgson, is paid by the War Department. But of the $30,000 needed, Mr. Pell would normally receive only $6,500. The rest goes for rent, other employees, and incidental expenses, all of which have been regularly paid. Where has the money been coming from?

Why—since nothing but Congress' failure to appropriate money stood in the way of Mr. Pell's return—was he informed that the refusal to send him back to London was tantamount to a dismissal by the Secretary of State?

Finally, since funds are now going to be made available, why has not Mr. Pell—as of February 4—been asked to prepare to return to his old job?

In the absence of clear and convincing answers to these questions some people, and among them this writer, will perhaps be pardoned if they stick to the conclusion that the State Department does not wish Mr. Pell to return. Conceivably these people do not really desire to see the United States represented by a man who stands out so sturdily for the full punishment of all war criminals. Conceivably they would prefer a weaker sister, more amenable to "hints" from the Department.

At London Mr. Pell took the lead in demanding that while national courts handle crimes by specific Germans, the Nazi big shots responsible for the war and for the murder of millions be brought before an international court or courts, Mr. Pell asked that an international United Nations court take the lead in extraditing Nazis from neutral countries. And he took the lead in demanding that the Germans at home be punished for their crimes against German Jews, pacifists, and other objects of their sadism.

The Department has followed Mr. Pell all too slowly. But he has persisted in his demands for full justice. Back here in the United States, although informed that he would not be sent back to London, he has taken his case to the American people. He has been so successful that now Acting Secretary Grew has admitted that the American people want all the guilty punished. "The Department of State and the Government," Mr. Grew stated, "share that inexorable determination."

Splendid, splendid, Mr. Grew. We the people ask nothing more. Better late than never. But since the Department of State, its legal adviser Green Hackworth and others, have not always held this sane view, it would be useful if the Department would begin to demonstrate its conviction not only in words but in deeds. The first of these should be the announcement that Mr. Herbert Pell is returning to his old job with the full support of the American administration.

Short of this, we shall wonder how far our State Department really wants the punishment of all guilty Germans.

Why Compulsory Military Training Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an article from The Ave Maria, written by the Reverend J. Hugh O'Donnel, C. S. C., president of the University of Notre Dame, on the subject of compulsory military training.

WHY COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING NOW?

(By J. Hugh O'Donnell, C. S. C.)

In order to appreciate the full implications of the demand for compulsory military training one must realize at the outset that it is a peacetime, and not a wartime, proposal. It cannot be classified under the head of what we have come to call emergency legislation. It has no connection with the Selective Service Act, nor has it any bearing on the policing of defeated Axis countries after the war. Basically, it proposes a complete and permanent reversal of the traditional American military policy and principle. Compulsory military training would bring about a fundamental change in the lives of millions of young Americans for generations to come.

Two bills providing for compulsory peacetime military training have been introduced in Congress and are now before the House Committee on Military Affairs. One is the Gurney-Wadsworth bill (H. R. 1806) and the other is the May bill (H. R. 3947). Both propose a full year of compulsory military training for all able-bodied male citizens residing in the United States. Both provide that after the year of training the trainees shall be enrolled as reservists in the Army or Navy for a period of 4 or 8 years, and that they shall take such refreshing courses as may from time to time be prescribed by law. The Gurney-Wadsworth bill puts the age of training at "18 years, or within 3 years thereafter," while the May bill puts the age at "17 years, or immediately upon the successful completion of the full course of an accredited high school or preparatory school, whichever first comes."

The real issues involved here have been obscured for a number of reasons. Not the least important cause of confused thinking is that we are being asked to consider, and

to take action upon, this radical departure at a time when we are well into our fourth year of World War No. 2, when we have been well indoctrinated with wartime psychology and therefore perhaps too much inclined to translate the problems of a very long tomorrow into terms of an instant and momentous today.

At first, to the sincere patriot who is concerned only with national security, and who has not taken time to think the matter through, opposition to compulsory military training in time of peace seems a tentative invitation to World War No. 3, if it does not actually smack of treason. But as Albert G. Parker, Jr., president of Hanover College, has well said: "Opposition to taking a year from every boy's life for military training does not imply one to be a pacifist, an isolationist, or opposed to a strong military defense of our country, and a defense of the principles of right and justice throughout the world. An honest, thoughtful, patriotic man can believe in a strong support of right and justice and still be opposed to any plan of compulsory military training."

Those who favor compulsory military training in time of peace argue that such a system will assure the United States sufficient military strength whenever needed. Of course, in the light of history such an assumption is difficult, if not impossible, to prove. Compulsory military training failed Germany, its foremost exponent, in World War No. 1, just as it later failed France and Belgium in World War No. 2. In the latter countries it actually contributed to their downfall because it lulled them into a sense of false security. But this is beside the point. Even if the assumption were tenable, the advocates of compulsory military training would still be guilty of the fallacy of ignoring alternatives. A compulsory system is not the only way of assuring the United States sufficient military strength in time of need, and assuredly it is not the best way. In fact, of all ways, it is the least American. It is the way that leads to the totalitarian regimentation which we are now fighting against in all quarters of the globe.

No sensible person can deny that henceforth we must be a military nation. We will maintain a larger army and navy than ever before. We must not become a militaristic nation, which is a vastly different thing. That is, we do not want to adopt the European system, which would weaken our schools and undermine our family life. (Both institutions are already suffering from the impact of pernicious influences inimical to the Christian, and hence American, tradition.) We do not want to form a military caste. Far less do we want to become the victims of the pragmatic ideology characteristic of such a caste. Furthermore, we must be careful to protect the parent's right to determine the education of his child.

Above all, we must protect the rights of approximately 1,200,000 boys who become 18 years of age each year in the United States, and who under the new order, by legislative fiat, would be compelled to spend one of the most formative years of their lives in a boot camp. And, as Father Edward V. Stanford, former president of Villanova College, writes in his able analysis, The Case Against Peacetime Conscription: "It only beclouds the issue to link up with peacetime conscription such matters as improving physical fitness, developing habits of character and discipline, indoctrinating in the democratic way of life, removing illiteracy, etc. * * * It does violence to the meaning of words, whether in war or in peace, to call military conscription—the favorite tool of dictators for more than a hundred years—the more democratic method of raising armed forces."

Let us make haste slowly. Why all the commotion now in regard to a matter that is so open to debate when we should be strongly united in the winning of the war? There is no need for headlong speed in enacting legislation that is so far-reaching in its effects, so permanent, and so completely at odds with the way we Americans have been doing things—and doing them pretty successfully—for the past 169 years. Common sense dictates that we explore other courses of action. It also demands that we wait until the war is over before we make our final decision. Our perspective will be better then. And also, after the war we can ask the opinion of the 10,000,000 men now in the armed forces. In justice they, of all Americans, have a right to be heard on a question that so vitally affects the future of their country and their children. The problem is difficult, but we should be able to work out a solution in the true American way that will best serve our country's interests.

As a means to the end we want, I suggest the encouragement of voluntary enlistments, a more intensive use of universities, colleges, and high schools as a training ground for the Army and Navy, and also a revival of the National Guard, strengthened and adapted to the mechanism of modern warfare so that it will literally be a guard of the Nation.

My proposal presumes a peacetime nation. It presumes what Father Stanford has referred to as "the forging of a just peace and the building of an international organization to protect it." If we are merely to have another armistice—that is, a breathing spell that exhausted belligerents will use to get ready for another conflict—if the United States must prepare for another war, which God forbid, the complexion of the problem is entirely changed. Then, I suppose, the only course to follow is to apply the principles of the Selective Service Act, but with this reservation, namely, that some serious thought be given to the Nation's future leadership. The reason is that if we continue the present policy it will not be long until we will have lost most of our men who are capable of leadership in all branches of human endeavor. The fact is that we have already lost one complete college generation, and we are on the way to lose another. And the real tragedy is that the United States is practically the only nation in the world that has permitted higher education to be sacrificed on the altar of global war.

It has yet to be proved that an adequate standing army, even as large an army as we shall have after the war, cannot be raised on a voluntary basis. In the past, volunteers have been turned away because the enlisted personnel had reached the maximum fixed by law. In the future, large numbers of young men will enlist, provided there are reasonable incentives to do so, because some men are attracted to the army life just as others are drawn to a variety of other pursuits. Let the Army offer a pay scale comparable to that in other occupations, let it teach technical skills that will be useful in civil life, and the volunteers will not be long in taking advantage of their opportunities.

I referred to a revival of the National Guard. "Revival" is not too strong a word, because this historic branch of the service has been permitted to lose something of its character and much of its identity. It should be restored to its proper place, and then effectively implemented and supported by public opinion. A strong National Guard with an accelerated program would be an asset of inestimable value. There is some reason to believe that basic training such as the National Guard could give—and give in the guardsman's home town under experienced officers—could be the equal of that given in time of war. The Army, for example, has found that men can be trained for replacements in the battle line in from 4 to 6 months, and the Navy is sending recruits into the fleet after only 12 weeks in boot camp.

I realize that the president of a university may be suspected of special pleading when he suggests a more intensive use of colleges, universities, and high schools as a training ground for the Army and Navy. The suspicion, however, is unwarranted. As a matter of record, the Army and Navy, in World War No. 1 and in World War No. 2, turned to the colleges and universities as the institutions whose physical facilities were best suited to a training program for potential officer personnel. At the same time the V–12 program has demonstrated the Navy's realization of the need of higher education as part of officer training, and that program has been administered well. Hence, it is reasonable to suppose that the programs which the schools have been able to carry on successfully in time of war could be satisfactorily adapted to times of peace.

Finally, it seems to me that in their haste to stress the "how" of military training, a great many persons are in danger of losing sight of the all-important "why" of military training. American colleges and universities have long since proved that they have the "know-how." For generations they have been increasing specialized scientific knowledge and disseminating it where it is most useful. They have the research laboratories that the technics of modern warfare find essential.

What else have they to offer? The colleges and universities that have remained faithful to the American—and Christian—tradition of education, and perhaps they alone, have the "know-why" as well, and they do not confuse the means to an end with the end itself. They know, for example, the danger of defining national security too narrowly. They know that phrase to be little more than a semantic cipher if it does not denote constant vigilance against enemies from within who would destroy the substance of American democracy while advocating armed preparedness against enemies from without.

Therefore, let us attack the problem of military training intelligently, sympathetically, but slowly. Let all Americans reflect on the implications involved before permitting Congress to rush through legislation that means such a radical departure from our traditional way of life. We may need some form of military training in the postwar world, but we do not need compulsory military training now.

International Fund or Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, those who have visited some of the European museums may have examined the Roman coin collections which fully illustrate the difference in character of the respective rulers under whom the coins were issued.

The coins issued under Augustus were pure silver. Marcus Aurelius debased the coins he issued by using 25 percent of alloy. This debasement of the coin of the realm went on until there was only 5 percent of silver in a government coin. Even a denarius, a coin valued at nearly 20 cents under Augustus, was, a century later, worth only half a cent. There may

have been extenuating circumstances for this debasement of the Roman money in that the gold and silver mines of that period had been somewhat depleted.

A shortage of gold and silver, however, cannot be given as an excuse for the debasement of our own currency which began in 1933. The devaluation, by which the people of the United States were deliberately deprived of gold valued at $2,806,000,000 by the Roosevelt administration, has proved to be an invitation to the rest of the world to set up an international fund or bank as a means to further plunder the American people. An international fund or bank largely financed by the United States and operated by the foreign borrowers, especially now that the debt limit of our country is to be fixed at $300,000,000,000 with the expectation that this debt limit will have to be increased from time to time, ought to be cheerful news for the American taxpayers and bond holders.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting as a part of my remarks, the statement of Dr. Ivan Wright, professor of economics, Brooklyn College:

RESTORING STABLE MONEYS AND FOREIGN EXCHANGE—ECONOMIST STRESSES NEED OF CONFIDENCE IN A GOVERNMENT'S STABILITY TO MAINTAIN MONETARY STABILITY AND ASSERTS MERE LEGAL AND POLITICAL ENACTMENTS AND PROMISES WILL NOT ESTABLISH SOUND AND DEPENDABLE CURRENCIES—HOLDS THAT GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS, SUCH AS TARIFFS, QUOTAS, TWO-PRICE SYSTEMS, AND THE LIKE, MUST BE CORRECTED BEFORE STABLE CURRENCIES CAN PERFORM THEIR FUNCTIONS IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND THAT ANY ATTEMPT TO SUPERIMPOSE NEW AND CONTROLLED MONEY UPON THE PRESENT CHAOTIC CURRENCY CONDITIONS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD WILL NOT SUCCEED—ADVOCATES A SOUND CONVERTIBLE CURRENCY WITH INTERNATIONAL BALANCES PAYABLE IN GOLD OR ITS EQUIVALENT

(By Ivan Wright, professor of economics, Brooklyn College)

It is the duty of the government of each country to provide an honest and dependable currency. Without a stable currency in which people can have confidence all credit transactions are restrained, and production and trade are subdued to a hand-to-mouth basis. When the value of money cannot be counted on indefinitely, trade between countries is reduced to a cash or barter basis, and trade regulations are set up to protect the economies of the stable currency countries against the cheap money and cheap goods of the countries with unstable currencies.

Mere legal and political enactments and promises will not establish sound and dependable currencies. Efforts to legislate or decree monetary values by governments have a complete record of failure. The entire records of coin clipping and stamping coins and paper moneys with values which they did not represent fails to reveal a single case of either legal or economic success.

Functions of government in restoring stable moneys seem to be that of first establishing a government in which both the governed and foreign peoples have confidence in its integrity. Such a government can then proceed with the cooperation of the people to set up dependable standards. One of these standards will have to be money. A money must have a unit measure of some well known and universally accepted value such as so many grains of fine gold. The number of grains of gold in the money unit should be adopted to custom and convenience. For foreign exchange purposes the size of the unit is of no importance. In free markets two moneys will exchange for each other in the same ratio as their physical contents, varying only to the amount of the costs of other means of delivering cash payments. The laws of the countries of the respective governments can fix the size of the money units and help create the confidence whereby the currencies of the countries will maintain the value of the standards into which they are convertible. But the laws of any country can never maintain the value of a currency once the people either at home or abroad have lost confidence in its conversion value. While it is the function of law and government to do what it can to maintain the economic and social conditions in which sound money can live, at times these conditions may be outside of the powers of the best informed economic management. Wars, foreign crises, domestic revolutions, famines, and foreign trade barriers may upset the currency stabilization of any country. Restoring stable moneys under these conditions may have to be delayed until these conditions are righted. In fact what people mean when they speak of the gold standard or the foreign exchanges breaking down in 1914, or in 1930 or 1939 is that the world economic conditions were in such undependable relations that the gold standard and the established foreign exchange systems could not function. This of course resulted from war upsetting contract performances, and overextended debtor obligations which could not be met under the economic and political conditions of the times. Instead of the exchanges breaking down, law, order, integrity, and governments had broken down. Once order, integrity and simple honesty have been restored in governments and social institutions the establishment of sound and dependable moneys can easily follow as a matter of routine and square dealing.

There are, of course, other matters of legal and Government regulations which must be corrected before stable currencies can perform their functions in international trade. To establish sound or convertible currencies will not restore free markets between countries unless the other major barriers are removed. Here are conditions which are mainly the work of misguided law and Government and only the correction of these unfortunate laws and directives can restore the conditions in which the international exchanges can function smoothly. Among these unfortunate laws are such as extraordinary and unnecessary tariffs, both Government and private cartels, two-currency systems, dual-price systems, quotas, bilateral trade quotas, and a host of other legalized practices far more damaging than tariffs. Most people seem not to know about other ways of restricting trade in addition to the tariffs. A devaluation of the currency has the same effect as a proportionate tariff against all foreign goods. A two-price or two-currency system may discriminate only against such countries as allow these arts to be practiced upon them. But the restoration of sound moneys, stable exchanges, and free markets which will provoke increased production and trade all over the world cannot take place until many other legal and Government barriers are removed. Some of the conditions necessary within the domestic economy of each country for restoring sound currency and exchange conditions are balanced budgets, the eradication of inflated currencies and credits, free markets, eliminating of deficit financing, debts refunded into the hands of investors, and out of the currency and credit collateral use now being made of Government debts, and free interest rates governed only by the conditions of free money markets and the demand and supply of capital. Any attempt to superimpose new and controlled money upon the present chaotic currency conditions in the money markets throughout the world will only result in another demonstration of the power of Gresham's Law, an economic law, over any legal or political rule or regulation—that bad money drives out the good money.

AN INTERNATIONAL MONEY

The many suggestions and legal and international documents propounding ways and means of setting up an international currency or a scheme of international currencies which can be juggled at will all seem to lose sight of the fact that the world has had an international money that has worked rather well so long that history is not able to establish the date of its origin. We have very good records of the use of gold for both domestic and international exchange purposes in ancient Egypt, Assyria, Greece, Babylon, and other countries. The use of gold and silver as money is found throughout the Old Testament, and as early as 550 B. C. records of coining gold and silver into money are well established. Nothing else seems to have functioned successfully as a means of international payments or measure of values. This appears to be because there are few if any other metals or commodities of such universal acceptability, and available in supply needed with such large value in small bulk and other characteristics adaptable for money use. Paper money, government credits and promises have a notorious record of failure in general acceptability for any very long period of time. Until governments and their legal systems establish a reputation for dependability, and until their credits and their bonds become as dependable as gold, it seems that gold will continue to be in demand for international exchange purposes. It would seem from the present state of government paper moneys and debts that gold will hold the preferred place in international money values for some generations to come.

In 1869 Walter Bagehot urged in numerous articles an international or universal money. He assembled some of these articles in a book called A Practical Plan for Assimilating the English and American Money as a Step Toward Universal Money. He saw the advantage of a currency or coin that would have universal circulation in addition to the uniformity brought about by the universal acceptability of gold in settling exchange balances. But in Bagehot's recommendations of a universal coin or international money he had in mind strictly sound money in the accepted sense. Bagehot's ideas of money had an integrity that would not fit into modern currency juggling or the proposed international schemes of reconstructing the currencies of the world. This paragraph seems to sum up his ideas of money:

"Money seems to do what nothing else will do. Those who have it need nothing else, for it will buy everything else; those who are destitute of it are eager to get it, for without it they may on occasion be unable to obtain what they most want. Money is the universal procurer, the one thing by which you are sure of everything, and without which you are sure of nothing. It seems proof against time, too; other things are less valuable today, though you only bought them yesterday; but money is never second-hand. You may hoard it for years and be sure it will be as good when you extract it as it ever was at first. Government is the only maker of this magic and consequently the prerogative of making it seems half magical, too. As an impressive and penetrating advertisement of royal power the image and superscription had, and even has, a curious efficacy."

LEGAL RULES AND GOVERNMENT PROMISES CANNOT ESTABLISH EXCHANGE RELATIONS OR PROVOKE TRADE, BUT THEY CAN DESTROY BOTH

International exchange is governed by very definite economic laws or rules of value. Some of these economic rules may be mentioned here: (1) Exchange between two countries with currencies convertible into gold and with free markets, the price of the two currencies, one to the other cannot vary more than the costs of shipping gold. (2) The exchange between a gold-standard country and a silver-standard country varies with the changing relative prices of gold and

silver. (3) The exchange between the gold or silver standard and a managed paper-currency standard varies with the changing price of the metal in terms of the paper money. This instability of paper money results from the fact that the money in itself has no value, but fluctuates with its buying power and every economic and political threat that occurs. It is provocative of instability, and foreign commitments in a country with an inconvertible currency will be limited to the speculative and large-profit opportunities. Nothing could be more destructive of international trade. International trade depends on credit, and long-term credit is not practical with uncertain values of money. (4) Exchange between two inconvertible currencies in free markets will be limited for the most part to cash barter trades and speculation in transactions with large enough profits to tempt extreme risks.

It seems quite possible that a country with sound economic conditions could manage its currencies within relatively stable limits of fluctuations and build up a measure of trade relations with the necessary credit terms. But a country with a sound economy suitable for these conditions will find it unnecessary to maintain an inconvertible paper currency. The trade advantages of a convertible currency or paying international balances in gold or its equivalent will be found so great that any country economically capable of meeting these conditions will cling to the international gold standard because of its commercial advantages. Laws and governments can be of great help in bringing about the economic freedom in which trade can flourish and sound money exchanges based upon gold can be maintained against all except the extraordinary crises. But to legislate or decree money values and at the same time maintain unstable domestic financial conditions and controlled trade, price, and currency relations with other countries will reduce foreign trade to the minimum on a cash-and-carry basis.

Conference on Urgent Problems of War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Time Is Now, Mr. Roosevelt," written by Morris H. Rubin, and published in the Progressive of February 5, 1945.

I am informed by the Public Printer that it will cost $124.80 to print the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIME IS NOW, MR. ROOSEVELT

(By Morris H. Rubin, editor of the Progressive)

President Roosevelt is about to confer with Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin on urgent problems of the war and the peace.

Mr. Roosevelt carries with him the hopes of all America, and yes, of all humanity, as he confers at the appointed place. The eyes of the whole world, of all men everywhere who yearn and dream and plan for peace and freedom, will be riveted on that conference as on no other in our time. For even though they have been kept in the dark about so much that affects their lives and their futures, the plain people sense instinctively that this conference is critically important, that on its outcome and its decisions ride so many of our hopes for a better tomorrow.

The Progressive wants to offer encouragement, in all sincerity, and counsel, in all humility, to President Roosevelt as he prepares to launch into fateful negotiations at the conference. Speaking as one who has disagreed frequently and basically with many of the President's policies in the field of foreign affairs, I want to emphasize my conviction that the whole country is prepared to turn a fresh page with him at this critical moment—a page on which is recorded our mutual longing for enduring peace based on the attainable principles of the four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter.

Two concrete needs are critically important:

1. Subject to the genuine requirements of military security, open the conference to the people by permitting the press to get day-to-day developments and by providing adequate facilities for prompt dispatch of news to the people.

2. Let nothing, literally nothing, stand in the way of President Roosevelt's employing to the fullest the moral support of the plain people of the world, his enormous bargaining power as the spokesman for America, and his great gifts of persuasion to win his colleagues at the conference to democratic, anti-imperialistic policies which will strike at the very causes of war and fascism.

The need for the fullest publicity consistent with the clear-cut requirements of military security, must be abundantly clear. The secret conferences of the past few years have been responsible, in large measure, for much of the present inter-Allied strife, and for much of the present disillusionment among the people.

Secret diplomacy, of course, is the method of imperialism, and suppression of the press is the method of totalitarianism. But we have tried these methods at conferences at Tehran, and Casablanca, and Cairo, and Quebec, with results that have cost us dearly in unity, in morale, and, most of all, in the pursuit of a democratic peace settlement.

Isn't it time we tried the American way—the democratic way? Isn't it time we reminded our allies, politely but firmly, that we are determined to fight for principles which must and can stand up under the white light of publicity, and that we are not pouring our men, money, and materials into the quest for political deals which can survive only in the hothouse climate of a Persian castle in Teheran?

I come now to a brief statement on the second of my two appeals to Mr. Roosevelt—to let nothing, literally nothing, stand in the way of his employing to the fullest the moral support of the plain people of the world, his enormous bargaining power as the spokesman for America, and his great gifts of persuasion to win his colleagues at the conferences to democratic, anti-imperialistic policies which will strike at the very causes of war and fascism.

Here, it seems to me, is the very heart of the problem which confronts mankind today and challenges the leaders of the United Nations. The new conference offers Allied leaders their great opportunity to make a fresh start in the field of their greatest failure—the political conduct of the war and planning for the peace.

It is clear that we of America must raise our banner of freedom now, and make it a standard of hope around which the peoples of all lands can rally—the people of enemy as well as Allied and neutral nations—and thus make common cause for democratic principles.

The great and simple theme of American foreign policy can be stated in the same two words which express our deepest aspirations at home—freedom and equality. In the field of foreign policy all our actions and all our negotiations must be rooted in the principles of freedom and equality—freedom of all peoples to live and speak and write and worship as they please, and equality of economic opportunity—for individuals—to earn a decent, secure living, and equality of economic opportunity—for nations—to share in the great natural resources and raw materials of this bountiful earth.

Freedom and equality must be our watchwords, our goal, our standard. Freedom and equality must be the foundation stones of our foreign policy. Freedom and equality must be the basic principles to guide Mr. Roosevelt at this conference.

Specifically and for the immediate future, the United States must take the lead at the forthcoming conference in seeking Allied agreement on the following basic propositions:

1. We must abandon the sterile demand for unconditional surrender and substitute a more meaningful and workable doctrine.

It is the rankest sort of distortion and falsification to allege, as have some in high places, that the demand for an abandonment of the doctrine of unconditional surrender is motivated by any desire to conclude a negotiated peace with the diabolical Hitler and his diabolical Nazis.

The simple fact is, that the very first condition of any peace terms offered the people of Germany—once we have discarded unconditional surrender—must be the destruction of Nazism and all its works.

It has become painfully clear that our present insistence on unconditional surrender is accomplishing the very opposite of what is desired. It is strengthening the grip of the Nazis in Germany, prolonging the war, and endangering the peace.

The evidence is overwhelming that our continued reliance on the slogan of unconditional surrender has played into the hands of Hitler, Goebbels, and company. They have taken that slogan and all the loose and irresponsible schemes for destroying and dismembering Germany that go with it, and have used them as a powerful weapon to rally lagging German morale for a costly continuation of the war. It is eternally true that preservation is the first law of human nature. Told that unconditional surrender means destruction, the Germans naturally go on fighting in the absence of any more hopeful alternative.

To err is human, to admit error and start afresh is courageous. I hope President Roosevelt, who, we are now told, persuaded Mr. Churchill at Casablanca to accept the doctrine of unconditional surrender against the Prime Minister's better judgment, will admit his error and make a new start. As a substitute for the Hitler-helping doctrine of unconditional surrender, the Allied leaders must proclaim a program of attainable objectives, terms of peace, and conditions for an armistice which will strengthen the grip of anti-Nazis and place a premium on surrender rather than on fanatical resistance, as is the case now. This brings me to my second basic proposition:

2. For our own good and for the peace of the next generation we must reject all plans for a peace settlement based on revenge and dismemberment.

When hateful nazi-ism is destroyed and Nazi leaders and their contemptible stooges are banished from power the victorious Allies will face a supreme test of statesmanship.

One road leads toward a program of vengeance, destruction, dismemberment, and enslavement—a program which will satisfy a lust for vengeance on the part of some of our generation but create a spirit of brooding antagonism and permanent plotting which

can only explode in another world-wide conflagration a generation hence.

No one, not even the most violent of the professional haters, can deny that nazi-ism is rooted in the treacherous soil of the last peace settlement—a settlement which saddled a beaten Germany with impossible reparations, appropriated large portions of her natural resources, deprived her of the means with which to rehabilitate herself, and denied her the right to enter into trade agreements with her natural economic neighbors, thus creating fertile soil for the growth of Hitlerism.

The moral rehabilitation and political reconstruction of Germany along democratic lines will be no easy task; far from it. There are bound to be many heartaches and headaches. Progress is certain to be slow at first, and I know the faint-hearted will join the professional haters in arguing that the task should not be undertaken. But men and women of courage, men and women of vision who know that enduring peace is not attained by passing resolutions or by indulging in hate sprees, are not afraid of the slow, uphill, painful, and often discouraging task that lies ahead if we are to meet the supreme challenge of our time.

Nazi Germany must bear a frightful share of the blame for the present world-wide cataclysm. But we are confronted here, as one prominent journalist put it, not with the question of what Germany deserves but what we of the rest of the world can afford. It seems to me painfully clear that we cannot afford to wreck the Germany economy, dismember German territory, and thus embitter a whole new generation of Germans.

There are no dividends in dismemberment, no rewards in revenge. The other road—the road on which President Roosevelt must lead us—is the road of tolerance and understanding and help—not for the Nazi gangsters but for the German people once they are freed from brutalitarianism. This is the road of the martyred Lincoln—"with malice toward none and charity for all."

The next basic proposition for which President Roosevelt must contend at the conference is:

3. The unification of Europe, the area which has been the spawning ground of most of the wars and misery of modern times.

I can conceive of nothing which will do more to end the age-old rivalries, the perpetual bickering, and the endless strife of the Old World, which in our time have twice erupted into global wars, than its unification into a United States of Europe. Much useful work has already been done in studying and planning the possibilities for such a unification, and I believe we have come to the point where bold and imaginative leadership can translate those plans and dreams into living reality.

It is a curious fact that some of those who shrink from the difficulties of unifying Europe—and there are difficulties aplenty—talk blithely of unifying the whole world into a single federation. I hope we can strive in time toward a genuine world federation, but the goal will never be reached if we continue to run away from the challenge of intermediary steps in the evolutionary process.

Here is America a vast variety of racial, religious, cultural, and ethnic groups have found it possible to live and thrive together. Europe is actually more homogeneous economically than is the United States of America. The Slavs, the Teutons, the Scandinavians, the Latins, and the Anglo-Saxons have learned to live and let live in America. Is it fantastic to hope that through instruments of political and economic unification and cultural and local autonomy, the peoples of Europe could not learn to act in concert for the greater good of all?

Perhaps a better example of what can be done is to be found in the very heart of the madcap continent of Europe. I refer to the Swiss Confederation which is made up of 22 small states, although its total area is only 15,944 square miles. The tersely factual Encyclopedia Britannica sums it all up in a sentence:

"The Swiss Confederation is made up of 22 small states, differing from each other in nearly every point—religious, political, social, industrial, physical, and linguistic; yet it forms a nation the patriotism of whose members is universally acknowledged."

Here, then, is the model for Europe, with her score of states, large and small. Here is the pattern of democratic unification which, by wiping out the multitude of artificial economic barriers that have so long plagued that unhappy continent, would permit economic integration into a unified whole and thus go far toward striking at the causes of social and economic maladjustments which lie at the roots of conflict in Europe.

Another of the basic propositions which should guide Mr. Roosevelt when he confers with the leaders of our principal allies.

4. There must be no territorial aggrandizement for any nation arising out the present war.

This premise need not detain us long. It was written into the Atlantic Charter by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, and it was subscribed to by Marshal Stalin when the Soviet Union became a part of the United Nations.

What needs to be impressed on President Roosevelt, however, is the fact that the people of the United States, and, I think, the people of the world, took him and his associates at their word when they proclaimed this principle, and if I understand the temper of the people, they are in no mood to accept any doctoring of the clear meaning of that promise, nor are they in a mood to enjoy any attempt to slough off that commitment with light-hearted remarks one day about the informality of shipboard scribbling, and solemn preachments on another day, that the ideal is unattainable in our time.

It must be a cardinal principle of American foreign policy that no people shall be placed under alien political rule, except as they themselves may consent.

Mr. Roosevelt must resist, with the full backing of the American people, any and every attempt by one nation or another to annex territory which did not belong to it when the guns went off. I realize that there are many conflicting claims and a multitude of perplexing, long-standing boundary disputes, but in a genuinely American and democratic foreign policy, there can be only one method of settling those disputes: a free, fair, and honest referendum of the people concerned, held under international auspices.

I grant that there will be an enormous amount of difficulty in solving some of the problems and resolving some of the disputes, but again, we shall never come even close to achieving enduring peace if we run away from our difficulties and resign ourselves to underwriting injustices.

The fifth basic proposition which I commend to Mr. Roosevelt is closely alined with number four.

5. We must strive for the earliest possible liquidation of imperialism by the Great Powers of the world.

Here, I know, Mr. Roosevelt would find the going difficult if he were prepared to accept this proposition, but few principles seem more important. The domination and exploitation of other peoples by the Western Powers is morally indefensible on every ground, and we cannot much longer talk of a war for freedom and liberation unless we are prepared to make a real fight for the liberation of peoples now held in bondage by the Allies as well as the Axis.

But quite apart from the deep-going moral considerations, it must be clear to all who read history and ponder the current world scene that imperialism has been the source of jealousies, rivalries, and frictions among the major western powers, and will become, in the near future, the cause of violent revolution on the part of the native populations of the colonies and dependencies who are determined to wrest their freedom from their white overlords.

I am well aware that some of the areas now held in bondage may not be quite ready for complete independence. But it must be a basic tenet of American policy to contend for as large a measure of self-rule as is presently feasible, and pending the time when complete independence can be granted, there should be established a system of international administration whose single purpose would be to aid the natives in every way possible to prepare for eventual complete independence.

6. Development of a program of progressive world-wide disarmament to strike at a major source of world conflict.

The basis of such a program must be the universal abolition of military conscription and forced labor. Nothing could be more tragic than to have America contribute so much to the smashing of the Axis Powers, only to find ourselves saddled with the worst features of European and Japanese militarism. Americans, I am sure, are convinced that it must be America's role to win the acceptance of the other nations to the democratic system of the smallest possible armaments and a volunteer peacetime army, rather than have the reverse occur and the United States be betrayed into adopting the old world devices—devices which have kept nations impoverished for centuries and have played such a decisive role in preventing the development of freedom and democracy.

Along with the struggle for universal abolition of peacetime conscription must go the fight for progressive reduction of armaments. Total disarmament cannot be achieved over night, of course, and we shall want to be watchful of worldwide developments. But if Germany and Japan will disarm to start with, and if we maintain our determination to keep them disarmed, we can move safely then for progressive disarmament throughout the world and thus remove one of the greatest curses of modern man—militarism.

7. The formulation of a just, democratic, anti-imperialistic peace cannot be separated from the planning for a world organization to preserve the peace settlement.

That the United States must cooperate closely with all the nations of the world when the war ends seems to me to be an elementary truism and is so recognized by almost all Americans in public and private life—despite the attempt of certain mischievous partisans to divide the Nation into two warring factions, isolationists and internationalists.

There is a division of sentiment in the Nation, as there is in Congress, but on the proposition that international cooperation is one of the essentials of lasting peace, there is no real dispute that I know about. The controversy, rather, is between those who insist that security through some form of organization is our paramount need and those who contend that a just and democratic peace is our most urgent and most vital need.

Progressives want to be able to give their support to American participation in a democratically conceived world organization, but they are not prepared to agree in advance to police and enforce whatever peace settlement may ultimately emerge from the back rooms of secret diplomacy, especially after some of the samples we have seen thus far.

They are profoundly convinced that the very aims and ideals which would help bring into being this world organization would be thwarted and betrayed if that organization were created to sit on the lid, to preserve an intolerable status quo, and to enforce partitions of nations, subjugation of colonial peoples, vengeance-minded dismemberment, perpetuation of militarism, and the enthronement of power politics. Such a development, with the accompanying disillusionment and reversion to extreme nationalism, would only deal a paralyzing blow to the

whole concept of world organization and international cooperation and hand it a setback from which recovery would not be easy.

I want to urge on Mr. Roosevelt the imperative necessity of making a supreme effort to wring democratic, anti-imperialistic concession from our allies before we commit ourselves to enforce the settlement and while we still retain some semblance of bargaining power. The history of our role in the tragic peacemaking of the last World War period is grim confirmation of this position. To refresh our memories on that ill-fated episode in our history:

On September 3, 1918, Col. Edward House, President Wilson's personal representative at all the peacemaking negotiations and conferences, took almost precisely the same position I urge now. He wrote to Mr. Wilson:

"As the Allies succeed, your influence will diminish. This is inevitable. By the time of the peace conference you will be nearing the end of your second term" (regarded as automatic retirement in those ancient days), "and this, too, will be something of a challenge to those, both at home and abroad, who have the will to oppose you. Therefore I believe that you should commit the Allies now to as much of your program as possible."

But the tragic fact is that President Wilson did not exert himself to commit the Allies, but rather engrossed himself in the idea of a League of Nations, on the theory that a just peace would be easier to arrive at if only the League were established first. What are the facts?

The war came to an end without clear-cut commitments from our allies. Wilson won acceptance of his proposal for a League of Nations—and then spent the rest of the period of negotiations compromising away the principles which might have made for a lasting peace.

In his book, the Time for Decision, former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles recalls:

"One of the chief reasons for the compromises which President Wilson felt himself obliged to accept at Paris was the fact that the United States had made no effort to reach any prior understanding with its Allies on political and territorial problems."

And what of House himself—the man who spent 8 fateful months in Paris carrying the ball for Wilson? Writing in his diary as he left France for America, Colonel House noted:

"It is now evident that the peace will not be such a peace as I had hoped, or one which this terrible upheaval should have brought about * * * I dislike to sit and have forced upon us [such] a peace as we are facing."

Colonel House recognized, in the wave of disillusionment that followed the Paris conference, that to have made a greater fight for justice, for democratic principles, and for a settlement founded on freedom would have been an enormously more difficult job than the one accomplished. But looking back with more than just a trace of sadness, he wished he had taken the road which still lies open to us today. Writing from the richness of his vast experience in peacemaking, he might almost have been recording his final judgment to guide us when he confided to his diary:

"And yet I wish we had taken the other road, even if it were less smooth, both now and afterward, than the one we took. We would at least have gone in the right direction and if those who follow us had made it impossible to go the full length of the journey planned, the responsibility would have rested with them and not with us."

These words are vibrant with meaning for us today and especially for President Roosevelt as he launches his fateful conference with the leaders of the other great powers.

We cannot longer compromise away our principles. We must stand and stand firmly for the attainable principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" for the basic propositions which have been sketched in this article. Expediency is the easy road to quick settlements, but it will betray us on the long haul.

The American people are in a position to lead the warweary world to a democratic peace because we are the one great Nation which seeks no conquest, no domination over other peoples, no spoils of war.

The American people believe that a free world, a world of free people, will be a world at peace, a world determined to bind up its wounds and work through democratic instruments of international cooperation for the greater good of all.

President Roosevelt must give this faith a voice that can be heard throughout the world so that, as BOB LA FOLLETTE has said, the deadly wartime destructive power of American arms may be matched by the healing, constructive power of American principles.

On What Standard United States Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in the present status of the money of this country there is some uncertainty as to the exact standard on which our money is based. In answer to the inquiry of a teacher in my district I have endeavored to define the present status of the national currency. The letter with my answer is inserted herewith in the RECORD:

PRIEST RIVER INDEPENDENT
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 13,
Priest River, Idaho, February 12, 1945.

Mr. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Idaho State Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: The question of our monetary system has been raised in my class. When and why did the United States go off the gold standard? Are we now on the silver standard? What is back of our paper money? How and where does the gold which we have in the United States enter the picture?

I have been unable to find any material that answers these questions satisfactorily.

Any information you can supply will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

Mrs. KATHERINE THOMPSON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS,
AND MEASURES,
Washington, D. C., February 24, 1945.

Mrs. KATHERINE THOMPSON,
Priest River, Idaho.

DEAR MRS. THOMPSON: In response to your letter of February 12, I have requested my secretary to secure and mail you a compilation of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, which contains the Thomas amendment to the Federal Reserve law on page 51, the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, on page 205, the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, on page 227, and the Domestic Silver Purchase Act of 1939, on page 309.

In answer to your question, you will find that the gold convertibility or redemption was suspended by the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. All Federal Reserve notes were, by this act, made payable in lawful money, as appears printed on the face of this paper money, which comprises most of the common 5-, 10-, and 20-dollar bills and those of larger denomination found in everyday circulation.

Answering your question "* * * did the United States go off the gold standard?" While the national currency issued by the banks is, as stated by some economist, "anchored to gold" by the provision of law (see p. 17) which provides, "Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold * * * of not less than 40 percent against its Federal reserve notes in actual circulation," the law that provided for gold redemption of Federal Reserve notes has been repealed. The amended law provides that all the gold in this country shall become the property of the Federal Government which has taken possession of the gold and issued gold certificates to the banks in exchange for the gold received into the Treasury. Most of these gold certificates that have been received from the Treasury in exchange for gold are held by the Federal Reserve bank as security under the 40-percent provision of the law for the security of the Federal Reserve notes in circulation.

As to why our Government went off the gold standard, it may be that the answer to this question is found in a statement appearing in the report of the United States Monetary Commission of 1878, which states:

"No country, Mr. President, can keep more than its distributive share of what may be called international money. You might issue bonds until doomsday, and even if you got with them hundreds of millions of gold for your treasury, yet if you do not lock up that gold and keep it under guard it would not remain. The vacuum created in the money volume abroad would lead to a fall of prices abroad, while the increase of the money volume here by the inflow of the gold would create a rise here, and the moment you unlocked your treasury it would flow out again. It would be as futile to keep gold under such circumstances as to attempt to pump water out of the harbor of Liverpool into the harbor of New York and expect to maintain two separate levels of the ocean by the operation. It would be utterly impossible."

We do know that speculation in and the movement of gold in this country and abroad in the depression years disturbed and reduced the circulation of money and secondly impaired business credit which may be a reason for abandoning gold convertibility by our Government.

The law now provides, with respect to Federal Reserve notes (see p. 205) "they shall be redeemed in lawful money on demand" which means that for the most part, the credit of the Government with a 40 percent gold coverage is back of the Federal Reserve notes which constitute the bulk of the money now in circulation. You will note from the Monthly Circulation Statement which I have asked the Treasury to send you, that there is approximately $1,900,000,000 in silver certificates (mostly dollar bills) outstanding. This paper money is fully covered and redeemable in silver dollars.

By referring to the seigniorage table found on one of the last pages of the Monthly Treasury Bulletin, also requested to be sent you, you will note the Government has made a substantial profit in the form of silver seigniorage by buying silver bullion and converting it into silver money (see p. 72, first column, entitled "Minor Coin," which shows a seignorage of $362,300,000 which is the profit the Government has made in buying silver and coining dimes, quarters, and half dollars.)

Looking at the seventh column, you will find the seigniorage on silver dollars since 1934 totaled $820,700,000. The next and last column shows a potential seigniorage of $717,300,000, which indicates that if all the silver bought by the Treasury had been revalued and used for money, the Government

would have made this additional profit in the form of seigniorage.

In reviewing the record of the Treasury's purchase of silver, we find about half of all the silver bought by the Treasury was purchased at an average price of 50 cents per ounce and revalued after it was bought, with the price fixed at its monetary value of $1.29½ per ounce. This revalued silver has been placed in circulation in the form of silver dollars and silver certificates (mostly $1 bills). The other half of the silver purchased has been stored in the Treasury and carried on the books at its purchase price, as you will note from the silver item under "General Fund" as shown on the Daily Statement. This silver, stored in the Treasury, was later loaned to the Defense Plant Corporation for industrial uses and lease-lend in connection with the war effort.

In making response to your inquiry, it is apparent our money system is not on a gold standard as far as redemption is concerned but is anchored to the value of gold which has been fixed by Presidential proclamation. About $2,000,000,000 of the national currency is in silver dollars or silver certificates redeemable in silver dollars. The value of all the money of the United States is supported by section 314 of the United States statute which provides:

"Standard unit of value: The dollar consisting of twenty-five and eight-tenths grains of gold nine-tenths fine shall be the standard unit of value, and all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity of value with this standard, and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain such parity."

This law has been amended to give the President authority to fix the gold content of the dollar which is now fixed at fifteen and five twenty-firsts of gold nine-tenths fine, and the value of all United States money is maintained under the provisions of this statute at this value.

Trusting I have given you the information you requested, I am,

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Air Crash Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, an amazing accumulation of evidence, proving that only Congress can correct the startling scandal that exists behind untold thousands of depressing and heartbreaking service air crashes, has been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As a Member of this Congress I emphatically urge a congressional investigation of this outrageous scandal. I demand that this great American tragedy be corrected, and that the persons responsible for this situation be prosecuted.

Today I wish to discuss particularly the history of a jury inquest of a Consolidated-Vultee bomber crash at San Diego, Calif.

This case appears to have been whitewashed by some very clever legal manipulations.

On January 6, 1945, a San Diego coroner's jury announced:

We, the jury, find that any criminal negligence would rest with the Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft Corporation due to gross negligence and lax and haphazard methods of inspection.

That statement is as definite and as clear as anything could be.

In this tragedy six civilian fliers were killed in a crash, attributed by inquest witnesses to the absence of almost 100 bolts from the outer wing panel, which sheered away during the take-off and caused the plane to plunge out of control.

There is something ominous about this case.

At first the San Diego district attorney let it be known publicly that he would take action regardless of what the grand jury decided to do.

Suddenly and before the grand jury even deliberated the matter the district attorney changed his mind and was quoted in the San Diego Union of January 12, 1945, as refusing to indicate what his actions would be if no indictments were recommended by the grand jury.

Here is the startling story behind this incident.

On November 28, 1944, Joseph Leib, Washington researcher, noticed in the press, a dispatch from San Diego, Calif., captioned: "Four plane workers fired after crash killing six."

Interested in air crashes, Leib forwarded the clipping to Governor Warren of California urging an investigation of the matter.

Governor Warren in turn took the matter up with the San Diego district attorney. On December 14, the district attorney's office undertook an investigation of the crash.

However, from the evidence available the district attorney appeared interested only in prosecuting the workers but steadfastly refused to consider or take proper action against the corporation.

Remember, as previously mentioned, the coroner's jury held the corporation responsible for the accident—not the workers.

A telegram from Governor Warren's office says:

San Diego grand jury refused to issue indictments recommended by the district attorney.

In a letter to Governor Warren dated January 22, 1945, the San Diego district attorney wrote:

Following failure of the Navy and the F. B. I. to take any action, my office and the coroner's office made a very complete investigation and presented the evidence to the coroner's jury. The coroner's jury returned a verdict which seemed to place the responsibility for the crash on the method used by Consolidated-Vultee in the construction of their planes. In view of the fact that this seemed to be against the evidence which we had gathered, and in view of the fact that we felt that at least three individuals were responsible for negligence in the construction of the plane, we presented the entire evidence to our 1944 grand jury, which body after considerable deliberation, wrangling, and rancor, arrived at the conclusion that the crash was unavoidable.

Some members of the grand jury were in favor of indicting the individuals whose duty it was to inspect the bolts. Other members of the grand jury took an opposite view, and the result seemed to be one of compromise. Our office sought the indictments and even had them prepared, but following the action of the grand jury, destroyed them.

Of course, we could file criminal complaints against the individuals whom we believe to have been responsible for the crash, but if two juries, one a coroner's jury, another a grand jury, have more or less exonerated the individuals, it seems like it would be a waste of money, time, and effort to proceed directly against the individuals. As far as we are concerned the matter is a closed incident, and unless the attorney general of the State wishes to take the matter up directly, which he is at liberty to do, there will be no criminal prosecution.

Nowhere in this amazing letter does the district attorney say anything about indicting the Corporation which I repeat again the coroner's jury charged was responsible for the crash.

To prove that the district attorney was solely interested in indicating the workers and not the corporation regardless of what the circumstances proved to be I desire to quote from an earlier letter than the district attorney addressed to Governor Warren. It is dated December 8, 1944:

An inquest will be held during the coming week after a representative of the coroner's office, my office and the local police have thoroughly analyzed the facts, and it is my opinion that following the inquest my office will instigate a prosecution for involuntary manslaughter against the four individuals whose duty it was to check this plane before it passed inspection.

I also call attention to his explanation of what transpired behind the closed doors of the jury room.

Listen to this:

After considerable deliberation, wrangling and rancor, arrived at the conclusion that the crash was unavoidable.

I ask, Was this commotion stirred up because the district attorney refused to present evidence to prosecute the aircraft company?

Ponder, too, that the district attorney also stated that the result was a compromise.

I say, there is no compromise when the lives of our fighting men are at stake. I say, that it is the solemn duty of Congress to see that our boys are furnished with the best and safest planes that this country can produce.

According to the San Diego Union of January 18, 1945, the district attorney is quoted as saying:

Investigators from my office will continue to probe the matter. If evidence not hitherto disclosed is found which will justify prosecution, I will issue complaints and cause the arrest on charges of manslaughter of those responsible.

But in his letter to the Governor of California on January 22, 1945—7 days later—the district attorney again changed his mind and said:

As far as we are concerned the matter is a closed incident; and unless the attorney general of the State wishes to take the matter up directly, which he is at liberty to do, there will be no criminal prosecution.

In that same interview he went on to explain that the grand jury after a 2-day session held that the plane collapse was due to "uncontrollable circumstances."

I appeal to the intelligence of the House.

How can any sane man say that such a tragedy was "uncontrollable" when evidence proves that almost 100 bolts were missing when the wing was attached to the plane.

Imagine almost 100 empty bolt holes and the district attorney says that it was "uncontrollable circumstances."

Now, if the district attorney wants further evidence I will read for him a letter I have from an official of the Consolidated-Vultee Corporation in San Diego who believed in America enough to risk his job by furnishing us with this information. It is the most startling letter that has ever come to my attention.

Here it is:

JANUARY 21, 1945.

I desire to provide you with pertinent information regarding the aircraft manufactured by Consolidated-Vultee Corporation, and unless measures are taken to correct certain existing conditions aircraft accidents will continue to occur at the same rate, if not greater than in the past.

Since the fatal accident of last November caused by a wing breaking loose on a Navy PB4Y-2 bomber on its first flight, I would especially like to mention facts pertaining to other airplanes.

On one of the 4Y-3 type airplanes (a transport version of the PB4Y-2) lend-leased to the British, recently put into operation by the Royal Air Force Ferrying Command, the following was noted on January 11, 1945.

Before installing additional fuel cells for overseas operation after all original test flights had been made, the internal wing splice bolts (same as those missing in the wing of airplane that crashed) were inspected for proper installation.

Approximately one-half of them were found to be loose, not only in one but both wings. Those bolts were loose enough that they could be turned just by the weight of a wrench. This indicates that when the original installation was made someone had only tightened or torqued part of them and forgot to tighten the nuts on the others. Also, the inspector had not checked all of them and was not performing his duty in this case. I think it is easy to realize how serious this may have been had the necessity arisen for any violent maneuvers during the test flights of this airplane. The bolts which were properly tightened carried all of the load; if they had broken, it is quite likely the others would have broken, too, when receiving the shock.

(At this point this official gave the British serial number of this plane.)

As you know, our company is building the B-32 bombers, and an assembly line is being set up for that purpose. Several of these planes were built some time ago in the experimental department of the San Diego division, and our plant at Fort Worth has recently completed a number of the latest model, one of which was flown to San Diego a few weeks ago. Through a reliable source I have received information that this airplane was very poorly assembled, requiring practically an overhaul before airworthy.

Many rivets throughout the airplane were improperly installed, and large numbers of them were omitted entirely. In some places where holes had been drilled for rivets the fasteners were still in them. (These fasteners are only for the purpose of holding the material together while assembling and must be removed to install the rivets, as they have no strength value.)

The exhaust system on one of the engines had not been correctly installed and the area around it not properly protected, part of which had burned through and may have caused a serious fire while in flight.

Altogether, I have been told there were about 2,000 discrepancies found on this airplane by the inspection department. With this information it isn't difficult to determine the elements responsible for this deplorable condition.

In my opinion, I believe the management is responsible for the existing situation. Apparently not enough emphasis is made to influence the employees to do a good, thorough job. Instead, they are encouraged to do just enough to get by inspection. Cases arise when an inspectors judgment is overruled by the management of the production department.

In other words, the inspection department does not have the authority they should and are controlled by the production department which is responsible for the lowering of the general aircraft standards. Both Army and Navy inspectors seem to be restricted in many respects which is detrimental, also.

This condition can be remedied by requiring management to encourage the employees to improve their workmanship. Of course, management will say this will slow down production, because they seem more interested in getting out the planes than improving the quality of them.

However, I know that this improved method would result in increased production in a very short time because there would be very little rework required, as has been necessary in the past.

For example, the air lines require their personnel exercise care and diligence in the performance of their duties and there is no reason why this method could not be just as successful in the aircraft industries.

Another unfavorable situation exists in the flight department. Not only is the quality of workmanship low, but there is a great deal of waste of both material and manpower.

Listen to this.

Employees are encouraged to work overtime, when it is not necessary. I have seen men idle half of their regular hours and still be asked to work overtime.

Being that many like to receive time and one-half pay for hours worked overtime, they gladly accept this request.

In my opinion, orders should be given the company at once to cut out this needless expense to the Government.

I believe this information is sufficient for the present time to enable you to take steps to rectify this deplorable situation.

Mr. Speaker, here is an official begging us to rectify this deplorable situation. Mind you, a situation that has caused the deaths of many of our fighting men.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that a congressional committee be appointed to investigate this matter.

I ask that Governor Warren be requested to instruct his attorney general to investigate these facts.

A copy of my resolution follows:

House Resolution 124

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives appoint a committee of five Members of the House of Representatives to make a full and complete investigation of all crashes of United States airplanes which have occurred within the continental United States since Pearl Harbor or which may hereafter occur therein during the present war, with a particular view to determining the causes of such crashes and whether any of them was attributable to the activities of enemy agents or fifth columnists or due to gross negligence by aircraft workers or caused by lax and haphazard inspection by aircraft company, Army, or Navy inspectors. The committee shall report to the House of Representatives, from time to time, the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; and be it further

Resolved, That the necessary funds to conduct this investigation be appropriated.

Deferment of Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Ohio State Grange and a letter written by me with reference thereto:

OHIO STATE GRANGE,
February 24, 1945.

Hon. J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCGREGOR: The following resolution was adopted by the executive committee of the Ohio State Grange February 21, 1945:

"Due to the uncertainty of interpretation of the Tydings amendment to the selective-service law; Be it

"*Resolved*, That the amendment be clarified to all draft boards, by legislation if necessary, so that uniformity of action might prevail; be it further

"*Resolved*, That young men engaged in efficient and essential farm production be deferred for the current agricultural season in order that much-needed farm food commodities may not become a serious problem in the war effort."

Sincerely,

JOSEPH W. FICHTER,
Master, Ohio State Grange.

FEBRUARY 26, 1945.

Mr. JOSEPH W. FICHTER,
Master, Ohio State Grange,
Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR MR. FICHTER: I am today in receipt of yours of the 24th relative to a resolution adopted by your executive committee in regard to the Tydings amendment. Please be assured I will favor any reasonable legislation that will prevent our true farm boys from being taken into the service as I am one who firmly believes that farming is an essential industry and food is absolutely necessary to the winning of the war and of the peace.

It seems somewhat ridiculous to me that we have to have any other legislation than the Tydings amendment. This amendment is very clear and to the point, and it is regretted that we have an administration which refuses to administer the law. Our Nation is in a deplorable condition, Mr. Fichter, when Congress has to pass a resolution calling upon those who are in power to enforce laws which have been passed by the legislative body.

Assuring you I am always glad to have your comments and with kindest regards, I am,

Respectfully yours,

J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
Member of Congress.

Two-thirds Rule Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 26, 1945:

TWO-THIRDS RULE REPEAL

At last it appears a showndown is approaching on repeal of the two-thirds rule for approval of treaties. House leaders have given their blessing to the Sumners resolution proposing a constitutional amendment abolishing the two-thirds rule and giving the House a share in the treaty-making process. The House Judiciary Committee has approved it unanimously. With a rule on the measure expected this week, it will be carried to the House where it doubtless will be passed by an overwhelming vote.

That resolution will put the Senate on the spot. It will reflect the wishes of the people as well as the House for abolition of the undemocratic arrangement under which one-third plus one of the Senate, or one-sixteenth of the entire Congress can defeat a treaty. The Senate will be left in the position of obstructing the reasonable operations of democratic government. It will have no satisfactory answer to the charge that it is clinging to power against the national interest. The Senate cannot long stand in the way of this essential reform during an era of active international cooperation without gravely detracting from its own prestige.

We think the Senate is incredibly short-sighted to let the House take the leadership in this movement. Its Members had an opportunity for statesmanship of a high order. A strong senatorial movement for abolition of the two-thirds rule within the body that has so flagrantly abused that device would have lifted the country up to new faith in democracy. It would have given the leaders of such a movement claim to a place in history that can be won in no other way. To be sure, a number of Senators have interested themselves in the problem, and a good many will vote for abolition of the two-thirds rule when that issue is forced to a vote. As to giving leadership to the movement, however, the Senate has fizzled.

In the circumstances, the House has a duty to go ahead with its own proposed amendment. Denna Frank Fleming, professor of political science at Vanderbilt University, points out in a useful little book entitled "The United States and the World Court" that the Senate was "finally compelled to permit the direct election of Senators against its will, and enough popular presure would relax its grip on our treaties." "We can have normal popular control of our foreign affairs," he goes on to say, "whenever we become aroused enough to demand it. But it would be far better for the Senate itself to recognize that it cannot defend much longer an indefensible prerogative."

By its standpat attitude the Senate has invited the House and the people to force its hand. Because of the magnitude of the national interest that is at stake the House and the people should now lose no time in pressing their demands. The blunt fact is that in the long run the peace system to which the Nation is committing itself will be unworkable if one sixteenth of the Congress can block a treaty with our allies. Every Senator must know in his heart that such an obstacle to international cooperation cannot stand in the post-war setting contemplated by the Dumbarton Oaks plan. The present task is to make that fact so plain that even the power-loving minority will bow to the inevitable.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

House Joint Memorial 6

To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas President Roosevelt and the heads of our military forces have been unstinted in their praise of the heroic services performed by our merchant marine, of which more than five thousand sailors, volunteers in the battle zones of the sea, engaged in transporting men and munitions to the fronts, have been killed by submarines and aircraft; and

Whereas Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, in recognition of the valiant services of the men in the merchant marine, has proposed a series of minimum measures similar to those accorded to those in the armed forces, which measures have been submitted to Congress, namely, hospitalization, care for the wounded; economic rehabilitation by creating educational and placement privileges (including civil-service preference); together with financial assistance to enter into farming or commercial pursuits; more adequate provisions for the dependents of those killed on ships, and those who have been rendered partially, as well as permanently, disabled by the enemy; and the use of the National flag at burials of seamen, with the privilege of burial in the national cemeteries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, That we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to approve and pass the minimum measures for the benefit of the merchant marine as submittted by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Washington.

Passed the house February 9, 1945.
GEORGE F. YANTIZ,
Speaker of the House.
Passed the senate February 13, 1945.
VICTOR A. MEYERS,
President of the Senate.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Olympia, Wash., February 15, 1945.
I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of House Joint Memorial No. 6.
S. R. HOLCOMB, *Chief Clerk.*

Petrillo Versus U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Minneapolis Star-Journal of February 17, 1945:

For the first time in 10 months, "live" music today emanated from KSTP's Minneapolis studios as result of settlement of the strike of the A. F. of L. Minneapolis Musicians association.

During the strike, all such broadcasts originated in St. Paul studios of the station. KSTP officials said many of the programs now will be transferred back to Minneapolis.

The new contract is for 2 years and calls for hiring of 8 musicians at not less than $52 a week, the leader to get $75. The station also has agreed to employ only union musicians.

Stanley Hubbard, KSTP president, issued the following statement:

"For nearly 11 months we have been fighting Petrillo and defending the American principle of freedom. We have sought justice through the proper legal and administrative channels afforded us—the State labor conciliator, the Federal labor conciliator, the Regional War Labor Board and the National War Labor Board.

"We have had unqualified decisions from every one of these agencies, but to no avail, because Petrillo has demonstrated to the world that he has more power than all of them.

"He has circumvented our courts and defied the Regional and National War Labor Boards. He has successfully and daringly defied the President of the United States. Now he is successfully defying and outwitting Congress by his recent action barring high school children from the air.

"The American public and the working men and women of America, as well as the majority of the unions, have told us they are with us in this fight, but in these 11 months the Government has done nothing to force Petrillo to change his demands and methods.

"While our boys are overseas fighting for freedom, we at home are losing our independence. Individualism is gone.

"We have fought for a fundamental American principle, but after all these months it has been made quite clear to us that the Government is unable to assist us. As long as matters are as they are at present, we had no alternative but to accept, at least temporarily, the situation.

"We, therefore, have capitulated and accepted Petrillo's terms, and have signed a contract with his union acceding to his demands that we employ men under contract regardless of whether or not we need them.

"If the Petrillo system of forcing an employer to contract for men he does not need, and to pay royalties directly to the union because union members are employed in the manufacture of his commodity, is adopted by other unions, it means the finish of American business.

"We fully recognize the reasonable rights of labor, and by the same token labor should recognize the problems and rights of management. The difficulty which exists today in our country is that labor and management cannot deal on a parity. The remedy to this situation lies in the hands of the legislative branch of our Government, and that is where immediate relief should be worked out."

The Unanimous and Energetic Voice of the American Serbs—An Appeal for the Salvation of Democracy and the Heroic Serbian People in Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Serbian Nation showed to the entire world its undying devotion to freedom when it defied the Nazi-Fascist dictators at the pinnacle of their power. Eight months before Pearl Harbor, when the Nazi conquerors stood at the threshold of Great Britain, when even the great and mighty Soviet Union still maintaned its friendship with Germany, the small but heroic Serbian Nation, faithful to its traditions, went to the aid of the hard-pressed democracies at the risk of its own life. At that time the civilized world hailed the action of the Serbian people of Yugoslavia who, alone, among the smaller nations, resisted Hitler's new order.

Although these events already belong to history, the indisputable fact is that the Serbian people never submitted to the enemy even though nearly all Croats, Mohammedans, and other minorities in Yugoslavia offered their collaboration to the invaders. This led to the defeat of the regular Yugoslav Army.

The massacres of hundreds of thousands of innocent Serbian women, chilren, and helpless old men; the forgotten promises of military aid on the part of the United States and Great Britain, and, finally, the campaign of vituperative propaganda conducted by leftists and collaborationist elements against the Serbian people under the leadership of Gen. Drazha Mihailovich have been the reward of the Serbian people for their unique sacrifices in defense of genuine democracy.

Verified reports recently received concerning the situation of the Serbian people in Yugoslavia offer further proof that the Serbian people have been abandoned by their allies and their friends at the moment when they should have rightfully enjoyed the fruits of their war efforts.

If urgent aid is not given by the United States and Great Britain, the Serbian people, abandoned by the Royal Yugoslav Government, which had been created under pressure, are in danger of complete annihilation by those same enemies against whom they have been fighting for 3½ years in defense of democracy.

Here are the proofs:

First. Gen. Drazha Mihailovich as Minister of War, Navy, and the Air Forces of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, in accordance with the instructions given him by his Government and the Supreme Allied Command in the Mediterranean, prepared everything and waited only for orders for the final decisive blow against the enemy forces in Yugoslavia.

Second. Besides carrying out the above-mentioned instructions and orders—also given by the Allies to other enslaved nations—General Mihailovich's constant actions of smaller dimensions, namely, the destruction of enemy objectives, and communications and attack on smaller garrisons in order to get war material because he was left to himself and deprived of Allied aid. The Allies in the meantime aided the forces of "Marshal" Tito with war material, although these forces were engaged in a political crusade alien to the national interests of the Serbian people and the Army of General Mihailovich. Such Allied action encouraged and spread the civil war, introduced by Tito's forces, in the entire country.

Third. By systematic propaganda the Allies made it possible for all kinds of bandits, Ustashi terrorists, and former Nazis to join the ranks of the so-called Army of National Liberation and thereby enabled them to carry on terrorism and massacres against the unprotected Serbian population in Yugoslavia. In this manner, many notorious war criminals, such as Suleiman Filipovich, who in 1942 had been condemned in London, escaped well-deserved punishment for their actions which were contrary to all principles of humaneness, justice, and democracy.

Fourth. On September 1, 1944, when the Red Army was approaching Yugoslavia through Rumania and Bulgaria, General Mihailovich proclaimed a general mobilization of all national forces. Four hundred thousand men from Serbia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Voivodina, and other Serbian regions enthusiastically responded to this proclamation. These mobilized units awaited orders for the beginning of major operations. In the meantime successful operations against smaller enemy garrisons were already in progress.

Fifth. A special mission was sent to Turnu-Severin to establish contact with the Red Army so that the action of the Yugoslavs and Red Army might be coordinated. The Soviet command refused to negotiate, and the mission was forced to return. All repeated attempts to establish contact and coordination with the Soviet Army remained without success.

Sixth. In the meantime the Allies gave their support to Partisan units, which were numerically much weaker and which had earned the marked hostility of the common people. This encouraged masses of Ustashi, Albanians, Hungarians, and even German minorities to join the Partisans. Through propaganda and aid in war material, the Partisans continued to terrorize the Serbian people who refused to subject themselves to their arbitrary rule.

Seventh. In spite of the aid, Tito was unable to penetrate into Serbia with his units and establish contact with the Red Army, which had waited for him a whole month at the Yugoslav border. Therefore, two Bulgarian armies stationed in Serbia and south Serbia as forces of occupation were ordered to join the Partisans and facilitate their action in Serbia. It was no secret that the Partisan units also included, aside from the above-mentioned elements, a handful of Serbian Communists, who represent only an insignificant number of the Serbian people.

Eighth. At the beginning of October of this year, the Russians entered Yugoslavia after previously obtaining "permission" from "Marshal" Tito, who, despite all the efforts of his Partisan units, had been unable to do so himself.

Ninth. The Red Army, in occupying parts of eastern Serbia, met only units of General Mihailovich which it began immediately to disarm. A large number of active pro-Ally Serbian officers who had fought under the command of General Mihailovich were shot. Many other officers and soldiers of the Regular Army who had fought the Nazis were imprisoned in concentration camps in the towns of Mladenovac and Paracin by the Red invaders.

Tenth. In the Zapadna Morava Valley, the Red Army accepted the aid of the Yugoslav troops—the guerrilla corps of Colonel Keserovich. In combined action, they took the cities of Kregujevac and Krusevac—centers of Yugoslav war industry before the war. After the liberation of these places, Red troops, suddenly during the night, disarmed this corps and arrested even the United States military mission attached to the staff of this guerrilla group.

Eleventh. Placed in a very difficult and delicate position by the refusal of cooperation on the part of the Soviet Command, General Mihailovich, in order to prevent probable conflicts which could only hinder operations against the common enemy, ordered the following:

(a) That under death penalty, no gun be fired against the Russian forces.

(b) That his mobilization proclamation be voided and that each individual was free to decide either to return home or to join the retreat to the west of units of the Yugoslav Army.

Twelfth. Today in the high mountains of Eastern Bosnia there are with General Mihailovitch about 70,000 officers and men of his army and over 30,000 members of the free professions who joined him to escape the massacres being carried out by Partisans in all parts of Serbia under the eyes of the Red Army.

Thirteenth. After General Mihailovitch ordered demobilization and withdrawal of his units from Serbia proper the Partisans began the systematic extermination of Serbian intellectuals and of other prominent citizens in order to force the Serbian people by this terrorism to accept Communist rule.

Tito's Communists launched a reign of terror in the liberated parts of Serbia proper. They are exterminating all the followers of General Mihailovich and "potential enemies" of the newly established Soviet regime in the country. In the already devastated cities and towns of Serbia, taken over by the Partisans, hundreds and hundreds of the most prominent democrats and intellectuals have been executed. In Belgrade alone some 400 were shot; in Kraguyevats, where the Germans killed even high-schools boys to avenge German soldiers who fell under attacks by the Chetniks, 200; in Kralyevo over 200; in Gorny Milanovats 100; in Shabats over 200; in the

districts of Machva, populated by prosperous peasants, over 200. No one is sure of his life. Before being taken out to the executions the victims are subjected to medieval torture. The officers and men of General Mihailovich's army are killed the very moment they surrender to the Partisans.

Fourteenth. Following the liberation of Belgrade Partisan authorities, in the presence of the Red Army, introduced an 8 o'clock curfew. After that hour they searched Serbian homes, arresting followers of General Mihailovich as well as officers of the Yugoslav Army, who in March 1941 were the leaders of the movement that overthrew the pro-Nazi government in Belgrade. Such prisoners were immediately led to concentration camps or shot during the night.

Tito's press in Belgrade openly attacks the ideas of democracy, advocating and praising the already introduced Soviet systems of justice, economy, and education. All the former functionaries of the State, including those of the lower grades, are automatically discharged from Government service and deprived of their means of livelihood.

Fifteenth. A certain number of imprisoned intellectuals and members of the Yugoslav Army, known for their patriotic deeds, are being deported from concentration camps to unknown places under the pretext that they have collaborated with the enemy. All this is done without hearing or any proof of their guilt.

Sixteenth. Since the liberation of Belgrade, Dictator Tito has imposed a news blackout on the country under his regime. He has barred representatives of the American press, seven of whom have been waiting for a long time in Italy for permission to enter Yugoslavia. Finally permission was given to a few selected Allied correspondents, among whom was Mrs. Eleanor Packard of the United Press. She was expelled from Belgrade by Tito's regime after her first report in which she dared to tell the truth, namely, that 40,000 Serbs had been arrested in Belgrade only because they were followers of General Mihailovich, that the Serbian people were unhappy, and that Belgrade citizens were forced to decorate the city exclusively with pictures of Marshal Stalin and Dictator Tito without displaying even a picture of President Roosevelt or Premier Churchill.

Seventeenth. Dictator Tito and the Premier of the Yugoslav Government in London, Dr. Subasich, agreed on the establishment of a regency in Yugoslavia. This regency was supposed to exercise royal power pending the outcome of a plebiscite on the return of King Peter II. All of this is only an obvious device for the purpose of concealing from the democratic world the real intentions of Tito's regime.

Eighteenth. Dictator Tito ordered all to join his liberation movement, including government employees as well as officers and soldiers both in the country and abroad—in Italy and Egypt—under the threat of losing their rights and livelihood. This tyrannical and undemocratic ukase is contrary to all fundamental civil rights and liberties.

Nineteenth. One of the aims of the numerous arrests in Belgrade, over 40,000, and Serbia is to force officers and other persons in German concentration camps and abroad to recognize Tito's regime, if they care about the fate of their families in the country.

Twentieth. Tito has mobilized all male and female population from 16 to 40 years of age. Thousands of young girls were forcibly taken into the Partisan camps where unspeakable immorality prevails. This has added to the terror and despair of the Serbian people. Tito is sending off to Russia over 20,000 young boys, despite their parents' protests, for compulsory "ideological education." In order to accelerate the Bolshevization of the country, many universities for ideological education have been opened in the occupied areas.

Twenty-first. The seizure of over 30,000 small farms for the purpose of collectivization is a shameful plunder of the impoverished Serbian farmers. The Soviet system of collectivization, however it may work in Russia, is completely unworkable in Serbia where every peasant is a small freeholder.

Twenty-second. Dictator Tito recently ordered the convocation of an assembly of so-called People's Representatives from the already decreed federation of the "new" Yugoslavia, where he established a one-party system. The only party permitted is his own. This is contrary to the constitution of Yugoslavia and a negation of all principles of self-government, as well as the Atlantic Charter.

Twenty-third. General Mihailovich with his army, despite the difficult situation in which he finds himself, continues in a state of war against German forces in Yugoslavia. He is determined to remain there to share the fate of the Serbian people whose motto is: "Liberty or death."

The following is an appeal for the salvation of democracy and the heroic Serbian people in Yugoslavia:

We, the officially elected representatives of American citizens of Serbian ancestry, upon verification of the facts above mentioned and conscious of all the hardships of our brethren in the Old Country, united in thought and purpose, consider it our duty:

To appeal to the President of the United States of America, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, the United States Government, and all the members of the United Nations, to the American press, known for its fairness and objectivity, and to all our American fellow citizens to raise their voices in protest against the terror which is now being perpetrated against our ally, the Serbian people of Yugoslavia.

We beseech that aid be urgently extended to the Serbian people.

We request that the Regular Army under the command of General Mihailovich be permitted to join the Allied armies of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in order that it may be able to participate in the final battles for the liberation of Europe.

We request that to the Serbian officers of the Yugoslav Army abroad, who do not wish to submit to the dictatorial regime of "Marshal" Tito, be sent most urgent aid and that they be freed from the concentration camps in which they are now held; that these officers and soldiers be immediately inducted into Allied military units.

We wish to call to the attention of the public the fate of 130,000 Serbian prisoners of war and 300,000 Serbs doing forced labor in Germany. These 130,000 prisoners in Germany include no Croats and Slovenes; they are all Serbs.

We request that the Serbian people who comprise more than half of the entire population of Yugoslavia be given the right of self-determination like other nations, the right to choose their own form of government, and that they be assured freedom of speech, press, and worship.

We protest the treatment meted out to the Allied Serbian people in this war. The Serbian people have been made the subjects of experiments in Soviet ideology by Tito in spite of all that the Serbs have given in defense of democracy and the common Allied cause. Since Tito has allowed various enemies of the Serbian Nation to join his units and, under the guise of liberation, to occupy Serbian regions and massacre Serbian people, we most energetically request that all these elements be withdrawn from Serbian territory.

We beg and demand that an Anglo-American mission be sent to Yugoslavia in the shortest possible time to protect the Serbian Nation and other democratic citizens from the tyrannical methods of Tito's regime. Today our sons are not dying on the battlefields of the world for a new despotism.

The Serbian people in Yugoslavia sincerely and solemnly believed in the promise of their allies that their liberty would be restored to them. For the fulfillment of this promise, the Serbian people hold the United States of America, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union answerable to God and humanity.

The martyred Serbian people ask for justice and for the application of the Atlantic Charter.

Words of a Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star Journal of February 21, 1945:

WORDS OF A PATRIOT

If proof were needed that Harold Stassen is no calculating small-bore political opportunist, the former governor's interview with newspapermen in Washington yesterday provides it.

Reminded of predictions by professional politicians that acceptance of the appointment as a delegate to the San Francisco conference may prove to be a "kiss of death" for his aspirations for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1948, Commander Stassen said:

"You cannot weigh a matter as important and as serious as building world peace in ordinary political scales. I have accepted the appointment without the least hesitation and with the conviction it is as much my duty to work for a successful peace as it is to win the war."

Those are the words of a far-sighted patriot, and Minnesotans read them with pride. So will millions of Stassen's comrades in the armed forces who don't want their children to have to undergo the ordeals of

battle which they themselves must undergo because previous attempts to create a warless world came to naught. So will millions of relatives and friends of men and women serving in the armed forces.

Stassen's friends know that he would take the course he is taking even if it meant political suicide. With so many millions of his countrymen sympathetically following Stassen's efforts to help create a stable world organization, however, his presence at San Francisco seems more likely to prove a political asset than a political liability.

Leading Pacific Northwest Newspaper Speaks of Polish Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention of the Members of Congress to an editorial, published February 16 by the Seattle Times, one of the leading conservative newspapers of this country and an outstanding journal on the Pacific coast. I believe this editorial makes a distinct contribution to our thinking on the Big Three agreements reached at Yalta and to the settlement of the question involving the Polish people and their Government. Its sane and reasoned approach to the problem is worthy of deep consideration. The editorial reads:

THAT SQUAWK FROM LONDON NOT THE VOICE OF POLAND

First member of the American party to come flying home from the Big Three conference, James F. Byrnes, our War Mobilizer, says more news of what went on at Yalta than was given in the joint statement of Messrs. Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin, soon will be made public.

A world for many weeks on tiptoe of expectancy will eagerly await whatever else the Big Three or any of them may permit to be told. But the members of Poland's government-in-exile already seem to have heard enough—far more than they cared to hear, and none of it to their liking.

The Polish government-in-exile is up in arms; refusing to accept any of the Big Three decisions with respect to Poland. Premier-in-Exile Arciszewski says that before this latest conference was held, Britain and the United States had been handed a memorandum warning against any decisions affecting Poland unless duly authorized by the refugee government. Neither that government, says its premier, nor the Polish people, will be bound by the decisions announced in the Big Three statement.

Premier Arciszewski insists that his government is the "sole legal and generally recognized government of Poland." No need to dispute that claim. The Polish refugee group in London has carried on as well as any other government-in-exile, and much better than some of them.

But at the beginning it was self-constituted, and in no direct line of survival from or succession to the government that was overthrown and routed out of Poland by the Nazis in the autumn of 1939. The powers it assumed and has exercised were not by grant of the people of Poland, who have had no chance to express themselves.

The refugee government, in this height of resentment against the Big Three plan, reiterates the assertion that it has always been ready to cooperate in the creation of a government of Poland "truly representative of the will of the Polish people."

To secure an expression of the will of the Polish people is a practical, rather than a sentimental undertaking. Hitherto the London group has been quite uncompromising as to terms, both in the matter of Poland's boundaries and the kind of government it thinks would be best for Poland.

It must be remembered, too, that during the last stretch of assured Polish independence, from 1919 to 1939, the will of the Polish people was poorly expressed—if permitted any expression—in as inefficient and feeble government as any country could have been given. Of course the Polish people want good government; all people do; but throughout those 20 years of opportunity they made no move toward getting what they wanted.

The Big Three agreement on Poland is obviously a compromise. Roosevelt and Churchill were moved to take cognizance of the impossibility of reconciliation between Stalin and the London Polish group. Stalin yielded in consent to a reorganized provisional government for Poland, to replace the puppet creation established first at Lublin and now in Warsaw. The will of the Polish people is to be given expression at the earliest possible moment.

The patriotism and sincerity of the refugee government in London is not in question, but its desire for popular government of Poland is somewhat shaded by over-hasty denunciation of the Big Three plan. In refusing to accept that plan and declaring itself out, the refugee government evinces little confidence in the ultimate judgment of the Polish people.

Literally the Water of Life for Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of February 22:

LITERALLY THE WATER OF LIFE FOR ARKANSAS

You never miss the water until the well runs dry. And you don't appreciate such downpours of water as fell on Arkansas yesterday. But whether rain is scanty or superabundant, it is fundamental that water is one of Arkansas' great assets. This is a well-watered State. The question is one of bringing water under control and putting it to the best use.

Without water you cannot have agriculture or cities or industries. To get it, Los Angeles reached out across the Mojave Desert to the eastern slope of the Sierras and at a cost of $25,000,000 built a 233-mile aqueduct, the world's longest. On the other side of the continent, New York has gone 100 miles north into the Catskills for a source, and for a distribution system has bored a 15-foot tunnel through solid rock at depths ranging from 200 to 750 feet below street level. And consumption has so nearly caught up to available supply that several years ago a program was started to draw additional water from the Delaware River on the far side of New Jersey.

Water mills have been employed as a direct source of power immemorially. In modern times hydroelectric installations have made it possible to distribute water-generated power over wide areas. And aside from power, some industries use literal rivers of water for cooling and other manufacturing purposes.

The march of progress in Arkansas has been largely a story of increasing control of water. At first the rivers that seam the State were free and uncontrolled. Men and their farms and towns accommodated themselves as best they could to untrammeled nature. Then levees were built for protection against floods—protection that did not always prove wholly effective. Finally, there was launched the comprehensive program of impounding reservoirs which was interrupted by the war but will doubtless be resumed and completed when normal conditions return. And Arkansans today are also practicing water control in detail on their farms and in their woodlands by measures to check erosion and retain soil moisture for the thirsty roots of crops and trees.

America's War and Peace Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio program entitled "What Should Be America's War and Peace Aims?", nationally broadcast by the Town Meeting of the Air, in which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and I participated.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT SHOULD BE AMERICA'S WAR AND PEACE AIMS?

ANNOUNCER. The editors of the Reader's Digest, America's most widely read magazine, invite you to hear noted authorities discuss one of the most momentous questions ever presented on America's Town Meeting. For over 3 years we've been at war with Germany and Japan. We know what we're fighting against, but do we know exactly what we're fighting for? The object of these discussions on Town Meeting and of the many informative articles in the Reader's Digest is to give you facts, to keep you well informed on national and world topics.

Now here's the man who each week urges you to hear both sides—the president of Town Hall, founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Good evening, neighbors. First, you'll be interested in your own opinions on last week's question, "Is communism a threat to the American way of life?" Of the more than 3,000 Town Meeting listeners who responded to this program after hearing both sides, 79 percent believe that communism is a threat to the American way of life; 15 percent believe it is not a threat; and 6 percent did not express themselves either way. Please remember that this is no poll, but an expression of opinion by Town Meeting listeners representing 43 different States in the Union.

This evening we're presenting what may prove to be the most important program we've put on in more than 10 years. Twenty-five years ago we fought a war to make the world safe for democracy and we got a world bristling with dictatorships. We fought a war to end all wars and in less than 25 years we began the most gigantic war in all human history.

Millions of men are fighting tonight in the blizzards of northern Europe, on the icy seas of the North Atlantic, and in the loathsome jungles of the tropics with faith in their hearts that the world can be made safe for democracy and decency and that somehow a way can be found to rid the world of this scourge of war and that we can build an enduring peace.

Never before, my friends, has so much responsibility rested upon us—each one of us, the free people of America—to find the right answers. Now with the generous cooperation of the Blue Network and our sponsors, the Reader's Digest, we've brought you many discussions of vital importance bearing on tonight's question. But tonight we ask you to think as you've never thought before about this question: "What should be America's war and peace aims?"

We are on the eve of a momentous meeting between the President of the United States, Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin. Decisions made at that conference will undoubtedly determine the length of the war and will profoundly affect the peace to come. The influence of President Roosevelt at this conference will depend in large measure upon the extent to which the American people give support to his position and his position will be determined in no small measure by the opinion of the American people, themselves, and their respresentatives in the United States Senate.

It is our privilege this evening to present four distinguished Members of the Senate who have often been in sharp disagreement on this subject. At the close of the program in order to encourage you to put your own thoughts in writing, we'll tell you how you may win from $25 to $250 in cash prizes for writing a 500-word letter on this topic.

Our speakers this evening are widely representative of the Nation. From the State of New Hampshire we have Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY; from Florida, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER; from New Mexico, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ; from Louisiana, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, our subject is What Should Be America's War and Peace Aims? So that we may thoroughly understand what this discussion is about, let's see at the outset on what major points we're in agreement and then we can discuss more clearly the areas of disagreement. Now first, gentlemen, do I understand that all of you are in agreement as to our primary war aim that we must fight until we have unconditional surrender?

SPEAKERS. Yes!

Moderator DENNY. All of you say "Yes" to that question. It's been stated in some quarters that we should have a Council of United Nations right now to deal with the urgent problems concerning the Allied Nations. Do you agree to this, Senator PEPPER?

Senator PEPPER. Decidedly so. As soon as our leaders get together in the next conference and reestablish unity among the United Nations, we should preserve that unity through some sort of council or agency until the permanent Dumbarton Oaks organization is established. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you. Senator ELLENDER?

Senator ELLENDER. I see no necessity of creating a council of that kind. I believe that what we need is to give vitality and life to the Teheran Conference. At Teheran it was agreed that no nation would take independent action without consulting other nations. That course has been adopted. Let us adhere to it. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Senator CHAVEZ?

Senator CHAVEZ. I agree with Senator ELLENDER. If Churchill and Stalin and Roosevelt cannot reestablish unity and maintain it, the problem is beyond redemption.

Moderator DENNY. Senator TOBEY?

Senator TOBEY. I do not think we need a council, for today Mr. Stettinius received a message from Anthony Eden asking for periodic Anglo-American-Russian conferences to tighten cooperation with the Allies. I think that's sufficient.

Moderator DENNY. Well, gentlemen, you seem to agree in principle if not as to method. Now, about the principal peace aims. Are you all agreed that some kind of world organization after victory is essential to maintain world peace?

Senator ELLENDER. I am. Senator ELLENDER talking.

Mr. DENNY. Yes.

Senator CHAVEZ. I can answer that quickly. If the agreement is based on the concepts of the Atlantic Charter, I would be in favor of the strongest organization possible and the Atlantic Charter.

Moderator DENNY. Senator CHAVEZ, you jumped the gun on me there. I wanted to ask you next about the nature of this organization. Should it be a strong or a loose world organization? Should it be organized along the pattern of the old League of Nations, where the member nations had the right of withdrawal if they did not approve of decisions of that organization, or should it be strong enough to enforce its own decisions against member nations?

Senator CHAVEZ As I stated heretofore, if the agreement is based upon the concepts of the Atlantic Charter, I would be in favor of the strongest organization possible to enforce that peace.

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Senator CHAVEZ. Senator TOBEY?

Senator TOBEY. But I question the virility and the values of any association of nations when any one participant can negative action for the whole if in his judgment it affects his country's interests adversely. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Senator PEPPER?

Senator PEPPER. Obviously, the organization would have to be strong enough to meet the challenge of war and to keep the peace of the world. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you. Senator ELLENDER?

Senator ELLENDER. In order to accomplish that end, that is, to enforce its own decisions, the organization must not act merely in an advisory capacity, but it must be clothed with the power to act quickly and decisively if the occasion arises.

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Senator ELLENDER. Now, Senator CHAVEZ, we come to the Atlantic Charter, which, although originating with Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill in August of 1941, was also included in the United Nations' declaration of January 1942, which was signed by representatives of each of the United Nations, including Russia. Do you all accept the principles of the Atlantic Charter as one of our principal peace aims? Senator CHAVEZ, first.

Senator CHAVEZ. There can't be any real peace aims or a lasting and just peace unless the principles of the Atlantic Charter are carried out and agreed to.

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Senator CHAVEZ. Mr. TOBEY?

Senator TOBEY. And I believe that the final results of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference when enacted by the various nations must square with the principles of the Atlantic Charter. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you. Senator PEPPER?

Senator PEPPER. This country has never deviated from the Atlantic Charter. It's been reaffirmed many times by Prime Minister Churchill and by President Roosevelt—by each of them, incidentally, in this present month of January.

Moderator DENNY. Thank you. Senator ELLENDER?

Senator ELLENDER. I agree with Senator CHAVEZ. The principles incorporated in the Charter must be brought into being through the security organization.

Moderator DENNY. Thank you. Now, gentlemen, we have in the past depended for our security upon our own Army and Navy, our strategic position, and alliances. If we're to have this world organization—which you all agree we must have—will it also be necessary to have a large military force of our own as well? Senator ELLENDER?

Senator ELLENDER. My answer is decidedly; yes. We should maintain sizable forces until such a time that the organization has demonstrated its ability to maintain peace.

Moderator DENNY. Senator CHAVEZ?

Senator CHAVEZ. That is my position, too.

Moderator DENNY. Senator PEPPER?

Senator PEPPER. Of course, the organization must have sufficient force to enable it to carry out its objectives, and we must furnish our part of that force. But all of us will be disillusioned and disappointed if, as confidence in the organization grows, and it establishes a good record, it's not possible for all nations, relatively, to reduce their armies. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Here's Senator TOBEY.

Senator TOBEY. I concur with Senator PEPPER'S statement on the thesis of the diminishing scale of military force in accordance with the growing strength of such a world organization. But we must not overlook article 8 of the Atlantic Charter.

Moderator DENNY. Thank you. There's one more important question, gentlemen. Will the regional alliances, such as Russia and England have been making recently, help or hinder the effectiveness of such a world organization? Senator CHAVEZ?

Senator CHAVEZ. It will hinder a world organization, in my opinion, for people will lose faith in that kind of a treaty that they desire.

Moderator DENNY. Thank you. Senator ELLENDER?

Senator ELLENDER. I am against the formation of any of the agreements to which you have referred, Mr. Denny, because it will, no doubt, have a tendency to weaken the world organization that we are supporting and which we are saying should be the instrument by which and through which peace should be established and maintained. My hope is that every nation that becomes a party to this world organization will look to it for relief and not be compelled to seek help from stronger nations. Every nation should be compelled to sign a pledge that it has made no secret agreements of any kind with any other nation. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Senator ELLENDER. Senator TOBEY?

Senator TOBEY. I feel strongly that such agreements should be only on a temporary basis and subject to review by the conference of nations at Dumbarton Oaks.

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Senator TOBEY. Senator PEPPER?

Senator PEPPER. I agree with Senator TOBEY on that. It's only natural that nations will make private agreements for their security until we make available to them the machinery through which they may get assured collective security. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, gentlemen. I think a great many of your colleagues, in the country at large, will be surprised to find four United States Senators agreeing on so many things. [Laughter.] You seem to be in agreement on a great many very important principles, but the application of these principles is another story. We've not yet touched upon such vital questions as international control of armaments, reeducation of enemy nations, tariffs, trade agreements, a world court, a world police force, and the highly perplexing question of the extent to

which national sovereignty should permit a nation to select a form of government which would enable that nation to make war against the peace-loving nations of the world.

This is a big subject but I'm sure you'll do justice by it within the limits of time available. Now may we hear first from the distinguished Senator from Florida, Democratic Senator CLAUDE PEPPER. Senator PEPPER. [Applause.]

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Chairman and friends. Surely, when we are entering upon this, the fourth year of this awful war, it is fitting that we should reclarify and rededicate ourselves to the things for which we are fighting.

We are determined to crush those international gangsters who attacked us, or who declared war upon us, and who are striving to conquer the world. That means unconditional surrender.

It means what it meant when we started the war. But we are fighting for something even more than our independence and security. We are fighting to establish law and order among the nations as among men.

We're not merely fighting the nations who have warred upon us. We are fighting war itself and are determined to slay and crush that monster, too. When we have finished the job and torn the fangs of war out of the enemy, then we are going to forge the chains of peace so strongly and so surely that we shall not again allow war to break out and curse mankind.

The German offensive of December shocked us into the realization that we had not yet won the war upon the battlefronts. Events which have been happening in various parts of Europe have been shocking us, also. Individual decisions about crucial matters by individual nations, when many of us thought they should have been made by at least the Big Three and all together, have been made.

In the press of Russia and Britain and this country charges and countercharges have been hurled at other United Nations. Good faith even has been questioned. We were almost frightened when the stark realization that the United Nations might fall apart dawned upon us.

Now we know that disagreements must be repaired and that we must reforge the bonds of unity and purpose which hold us together. We are about to see in the near future a meeting of Prime Minister Churchill, Marshal Stalin, and our President. I know we can feel with confidence that they are going to resolve and settle, in the best way possible, all the conflicts that have grown up among us in the last few months when they were not able to keep closely together.

I know we all can expect that they will prepare the way for a final conference among the United Nations for the drafting of the final agreement begun at Dumbarton Oaks. It is to be hoped that not later than this summer the completed charter for an international organization can be submitted to the United States Senate and to all the United Nations.

We have also been troubled by certain public opinion and by certain sentiment in the United States Senate. There are dangers in both, but it has been deeply heartening to me, and I'm sure it has been to you, to see the way the people of the United States have shown their determination to stand behind the Atlantic Charter and its everliving principles, and to make this Nation not only take a part but assume the leadership in establishing the sort of international organization which shall give us both a safer and a better world.

There are disturbing voices, it must be admitted, in the United States Senate, yet I believe that we four Senators here tonight speak for the overwhelming majority of that body when we declare that the Senate this time will measure up to its great part in building a just and a lasting peace. [Applause.]

We might as well realize that we have almost frightening problems in this great task of saving future generations from war. We shall have to abandon many of our old ideals and concepts. We shall have to march out upon the world stage and play our part in full view of mankind.

We shall have to make commitments we have never dreamed of making. We shall have to have a part in the making of decisions in what we have always thought of as strange and remote parts of the world. We shall have to have force ready to be thrown against an aggressor who would start wars.

Yes, we shall have to take many risks to stop war, yet we know that twice in our own time war has come to scourge us because we were not willing to take risks to hold it back.

It must be a function of the United Nations not only to curb aggression but to right wrongs out of which wars come. We must assuredly, chastened as we are by the sacrifices of this war, be willing, nation with nation as the Bible tells us, "to do justly, and to love mercy and to walk humbly * * * with God."

This organization will also be the medium through which we shall stimulate commerce and trade, disseminate sicence and culture and in a thousand ways be the clearinghouse of this busy world. It is not too much to hope that we may even foster a world language.

Bravely, therefore, and boldly let us strive to do our part and to do right. America has a rendezvous with destiny, and, God helping us, we must and shall at last keep it. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Senator PEPPER.

Now, may we hear from Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana. Senator ELLENDER. [Applause.]

Senator ELLENDER. Ladies and gentlemen, in less than 25 years America has engaged in two global wars. In the first, we won the conflict but we lost the peace. In the second World War, we must profit by that experience and our first aim must be to dedicate ourselves to the proposition that there shall never be a World War No. 3.

We must focus our sights for a long and lasting peace. We must exert every ounce of energy to bring about a lasting peace.

We must take the leadership in the formation of an international organization whose aim and whose purpose shall be to maintain peace and security among the peoples of the world. The organization should not merely advise and recommend such a course, but it should be clothed with absolute power to take effective collective measures to prevent war and to bring about by peaceful means the settlement of international disputes.

Membership in the organization must be open to all peace-loving nations. These nations must have a voice in its deliberations in one form or another. The organization must not be looked upon with suspicion. It must not be thought of as a make-believe organization.

This organization should be regarded as an organization which every nation, be it large or small, strong or weak, can depend upon it as the instrumentality through which and by which peace will be maintained.

We must not permit the formation of secret treaties, or private international understandings. It is my firm belief that the formation or existence of any bloc or regional group of nations is inconsistent with international peace and security. These regional blocs jeopardize world peace unless they exist with the approval of the international security organization.

We must use all the force at our command to destroy every vestige of military power in Germany and Japan so that the warlords of those countries shall never again be able to make war. Although I believe it has been our purpose all along to accomplish that task, we should let the world know that all of our resources are dedicated to that end.

In August 1941 the Atlantic Charter came into being. It was hailed as a new world Magna Carta. In January 1942 the United Nations, including ourselves, subscribed to the common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Charter. We must assist in carrying out its pledges, else the world may remain in turmoil and a lasting peace may become but a dim hope.

All nations should have free access to the seas. The Panama Canal, the Suez Canal, the Dardanelles, and similar channels should be opened to traffic of all nations. The charges for their use should be limited to an amount sufficient to pay existing obligations which may have been expended for their construction and to cover the cost of their maintenance and operation.

Senator PEPPER. America has spent hundreds of millions of dollars in building airports and harbors throughout the world for waging this war. I believe that those that have been built on the far-flung possessions of sovereign nations, and that may be necessary for us in order to assist in maintaining peace, should be retained by us in trust. As to those that have been built on the home lands of sovereign nations, an agreement should be entered into for their use should they become necessary in maintaining the peace of the world.

America has been dissipating her God-given natural resources unstintingly in her efforts to help win the war and she should make every effort to acquire, in kind, from certain of her Allies some of their resources as replacements.

We should never agree to disarm unless and until a world organization has been firmly established and has proven its ability to maintain peace and then only progressively. We should maintain a substantial Navy, a sizeable air force, and a fairly large mechanized Army—not so much for our own protection but to assist in maintaining world peace. We have shown the world in the past that we are not reaching out for more territory for our own aggrandizement. The peoples of the earth should know by now that our purpose is to maintain our way of life and accord the same right to them. My hope is that the security organization will become such a potent factor in the lives of the peoples of all nations that through it orderly and progressive disarmament can become an accomplished fact. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Senator ELLENDER, and congratulations for covering so much territory in 5 minutes. Next, we hear from Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire. Senator TOBEY. [Applause.]

Senator TOBEY. What are America's war and peace aims? A trite answer is: "To win the war and establish a just and enduring peace." We shall not win the war, however, until we compel Germany and Japan to disarm; prohibit their rearmament and construction of planes, and cause to be removed from power the warmongers of those nations.

That we shall win the war eventually is certain. That we shall have a just and enduring peace is not so certain. As Hamlet said, "Aye! There's the rub."

Let us turn to Patrick Henry's guide, "The light from the lamp of experience." Twenty-five years ago, a so-called peace was made. It proved to be a farce. Let us ask ourselves whether we have learned anything from the bitter experiences of that war. One recalls the ironic comment of Briand who said, "The only lesson we learn from experience is that we learn nothing from experience."

A few years ago, Mr. Churchill and our President gave to the world a statement of aims and purposes called the Atlantic Charter. It was endorsed by every Allied Nation. Millions of plain people the world over took courage and new hope—let them not be

swayed from its principles by any statement that it never was formally executed and that it cannot be carried out.

The pronouncements in that charter are graven in the hearts and aspirations of millions here and abroad, and the principles it expressed stimulated the deepest emotion of all: "The yearning for freedom by the people." It is for that ideal we thought we were waging this war.

Soon another vital conference is to be held. The prayers and hopes of the Nation will be with our President. Nothing would unite public opinion more than a statement by our President reaffirming the principles of the Atlantic Charter and promising to use his great influence to making it a living reality in the provisions of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. Such a statement now would result in the united public approval which would constitute a vis a tergo, or strength at the back of the Executive, as he proceeds to the conference.

My colleague, Senator VANDENBERG, has shown the way to an interim treaty pledging our resources to our allies against Nazi and Nipponese aggression. For such assurance, we should ask that our allies pledge their allegiance to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which each has accepted.

That great liberal, the late Justice Brandeis, said: "If we would guide in the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold." I believe the present situation calls for bold, constructive action on the part of the Executive, and the Nation will be behind him if he will practice it.

There are precedents. In 1899, at the time of the Boxer Rebellion in China, the great powers decided to dismember China. Then in stepped America boldly, through John Hay, Secretary of State, and served an ultimatum, "The integrity of China must be preserved," and there was no dismemberment. That was America in bold action.

As one who supported and worked for the League of Nations 25 years ago, I strongly favored our participation in an association of nations, with power to put down aggression when it shows its head. I favor a world court, an international bill of rights, and a code of fundamental principles of international law.

If free people are bound together in an association of nations which can enforce international morality upon any aggressor nation, I believe there is hope for lasting peace. And the time to make such commitments is now, while the Allies are dependent upon each other, for, if we wait until the shooting stops, it will be a case again of everyone to his own way.

Coming events will prove whether or not the world is ready for real peace. There are obstacles in the pathway. Some of the strongest nations are approaching the matter with reservations and from the standpoint of self-interest. We need to learn the great lesson of interdependence. Each of the Allied Nations must be willing to surrender some of its prerogatives for the common good or else we shall fail. As an able editor in my own State wrote: "Here in this country we organize the great Nation by surrender of some of the sovereignty of the several States to the Central Government. That unity which obtains among the States of our Nation is essential in the world if world peace is to come. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Senator TOBEY. Our last speaker is the distinguished United States Senator, Democrat from the State of New Mexico, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ. Senator CHAVEZ. [Applause.]

Senator CHAVEZ. Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans. Not even by straining at the toughest sinews of the imagination is it possible to conceive of a problem more solicitous of solution than that which embraces the establishment of a just and lasting peace when the present military issues have come to their bloody conclusion.

Under the pressure of military necessity, the so-called practical genius of man has invented weapons of such devastating character that the better nature of men cries to the higher heavens for some form of a miracle which might guide the minds and the hearts of humankind into channels of more humane, more rational, and more Christian currents.

If someone does not start a little dreaming along the lines of universal application of the American Bill of Rights, the American Constitution, the Atlantic Charter, the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, the affairs of man will one day assume the functions of the apocalyptic horsemen.

The purposes and principles of the proposed charter of the United Nations are indeed adequate—all destined to harmonize the actions of nations in the achievement of the common ends outlined in the proposals. These proposals must, perforce, be the center of our attention this evening in discussing the general topic What Should Be America's War and Peace Aims? We should, in order to avoid any possible departures from the basic facts and issues, adhere as closely as possible to the question stated.

The uneasiness of some of our allies is predicated mainly upon the uncertainty of the American ideas regarding a post-war foreign policy. The American citizen is equally in a state of uncertainty. The adoption of the Fulbright resolution, which would commit the United States to a responsible international security organization, would serve as a unique purpose in clearing the world atmosphere regarding our position. It would set at ease the confused minds of all freedom-loving men as to the American position.

Again, all maneuvers on the part of our State Department should be undertaken with the full counsel and advice of the United States Senate, and in this way steer clear of a repetition of President Wilson's failure in 1919 to negotiate the necessary two-thirds approval by that body in order to render effective any international commitment for American participation in a world organization.

However, any agreement by the association of nations based upon the above comments and consistent with the Constitution of the United States should be enforced by the Congress through the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution.

It is my studied opinion that any organization for the maintenance of a just and lasting peace must, by all manner of means, be predicated on the absolute sovereignty of nations, large and small. Every nation should be welcomed to affiliate with this world organization, and should be given not only assurance but guaranty that no decision will issue from the capacity of the larger and more powerful nations to impose their wishes on the small and the weak just because historical circumstances have given the larger nations a more potent economic and, consequently, military fist with which to enforce any aggressive or selfish plans.

If the dignity of all sovereign states is not recognized and respected, I see no possibility whatsoever of maintaining a just and lasting peace. In this case, it would be a peace depending upon force, and as history teaches us, in a well-established example, any peace depending upon might cannot possibly endure. This is a core of my position.

It is the core of those tenets purported to be part and parcel of the Atlantic Charter, and whether this charter be in the form of a verbal understanding or that of a written document, I am for it simply because the all-embracing principle of the equality of nations before the universal law must be the cornerstone of any edifice of international good will, cooperation, and peace.

We must proceed on moral and rational grounds. The doctrine that might makes right will eventually lead to world anarchy, and any policy of intervention in the internal affairs of other nations runs contrary to the most elementary standards of international justice and morality.

A momentous issue has indeed arisen in international affairs. My own ideas centering upon the happy guidance of this issue are unqualifiedly based upon the establishment of a world organization and, the adoption by this organization of standards of international conduct which will assure to every nation, great and small, the same right to pursue an honorable course and to play its own role in the world community, and this with a complete absence of interference on the part of other nations within the limit fixed by the international organization. Thank you. [Applause.]

Moderator DENNY. Thank you, Senator CHAVEZ. Now while we prepare to let the audience in on this discussion, let's pause briefly for station identification.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE

Mr. DENNY. Now we are ready to hear questions from this audience of 1,500 representative Americans here in Town Hall, 90 percent of whom have indicated that they have never been here before, on the topic, "What Should Be America's War and Peace Aims?" Our speakers, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, will take your questions, if you will limit them to 25 words. Questions, please.

MAN. Senator TOBEY, would you be willing to abandon the demand for unconditional surrender if good peace aims can be obtained by negotiation?

Senator TOBEY. I think it imperative that we stick to unconditional surrender. [Applause.] There's sequel to that answer. Here it is. I go back to Appomattox when Lee surrendered to Grant. It was unconditional surrender. That does not mean that we can't give humane, just, and decent treatment after surrender.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. The lady in the balcony.

LADY. Senator PEPPER, is it possible to apply the principles of our Securities and Exchange Commission to supervision of international commerce under a Commission of United Nations council?

Senator PEPPER. Well, I think that's quite a way in the future. It's naturally to be expected that this international organization will not only keep the peace but promote the welfare of the nations and the people of the world, according to my concept of it. But naturally we are not prepared, yet, to enter into detailed international regulation of commercial affairs. We can reduce tariffs and help credit to be disseminated and all that sort of thing.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. The lady in the back.

LADY. Senator ELLENDER, up to now our economic structure has depended upon competitive rearmament. If this is true, how can we avoid World War No. 3?

Mr. DENNY. Senator ELLENDER.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, as I tried to state in my opening remarks, it strikes me that if we have an organization that we can create and that all nations can belong to, and let that organization be the instrument through which we can stop war as soon as that organization gets to working, I believe that it will mean peace and there won't be any more need for any armament.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. The gentleman right here.

MAN. Senator TOBEY, this question is predicated on the fact that the American people have proven they can take it and are willing to deliver. I would like to ask you, please, if you will name the most constructive services that can be rendered by the citizenry to

support and permanently sustain our future peace aims?

Senator TOBEY. Yes. What I am going to mention though is fundamental. It is ultra-idealistic. You may be cynical and may scoff at it. But we can have charters and we can have conferences and we can go through all these maneuvers and theories but only one thing will do it, gentlemen, successfully, and there is no solution save in the rule of Christ alone. Religion is the only thing that will do it. The love of man for man. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. The young lady in the back row of the balcony.

LADY. Senator CHAVEZ, just exactly what are the aims of this country set forth in the Atlantic Charter?

Mr. DENNY. Well, we will have to give her a copy of the Atlantic Charter. We cannot read that now. [Laughter.]

Senator CHAVEZ. Well, in short, it means letting every nation handle its own affairs without any interference whatsoever—live and let live. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Your teacher is not going to be proud of you, not knowing about the Atlantic Charter. [Laughter.] Just a minute, the man back there. Will you speak in the direction of the microphone, please.

MAN. Senator ELLENDER, the post-war organization you suggest is to be open to all peace-loving nations. Who is to be judge? Will the barometer be past actions or lip service?

Mr. DENNY. Senator ELLENDER, the $64 question. [Laughter.]

Senator ELLENDER. Well, it is to be hoped that when the organization is finally put into effect that we will be at peace. It strikes me that every nation that wants peace, that is determined to have peace, should belong to it. I have no doubt that if the peoples of all nations make up their minds that we want peace, I believe we can have it.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. The gentleman away over on the side.

MAN. My question is for Senator CHAVEZ. Senator CHAVEZ, what strength can a United Nations organization have if sovereign rights of individual nations are placed above collective rights of all nations?

Senator CHAVEZ. It can't have any authority or strength whatsoever. But that is not the purpose of the organization that I have in mind. The organization that I have in mind is that the interest of all the peoples everywhere in any nation be taken care of first in the way of peace, because they're the ones who do the suffering and the dying in wartime.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Next question.

MAN. Senator PEPPER, please. Should we first secure a demonstration of positive good faith in Russia and England before we submit our fate to a world police organization?

Senator PEPPER. Well, you know, this matter of good faith is reciprocal. I think if you'll go back over the history of the last 25 years—I don't have to be an apologist for Russia, but I think the cold pages of history will show that Russia's record for internationalism and collective security is about as good as that of any of us. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. The other soldier. I'm glad to see so many men in uniform here tonight. Yes?

MAN. Senator ELLENDER, please. Since you disapprove of regional associations and world organizations, do you suggest we forget the Good Neighbor policy and disallow the Monroe Doctrine?

Mr. DENNY. Wow! What is that Monroe Doctrine we've been hearing about?

Senator ELLENDER. The Monroe Doctrine does not involve treaties or secret alliances. It was a declaration of policy made by President Monroe more than 150 years ago. So far all nations have respected it and I hope they will continue to do so. I hope, too, that the Good Neighbor policy will be extended to other nations. However, if that policy conflicts with the world organization, the world organization should take precedence.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Now the young lady in the third row, balcony.

LADY. Senator TOBEY, do you think England will tolerate a world organization interfering with its colonial policy? [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Wow!

Senator TOBEY. I'm afraid I must say I refuse to answer without advice of counsel on that. [Shouts and laughter.]

Mr. DENNY. I think you ought to be excused from that too. I may say to the young lady that that is another Town Meeting topic, on which even United States Senators disagree. The young lady way back in the balcony in the lovely red jacket.

LADY. Senator PEPPER, how can the Atlantic Charter be of use if Roosevelt and Churchill affirm it while Stalin keeps only those agreements which are definitely beneficial to him? [Applause.]

Senator PEPPER. Well now, in the first place, the Atlantic Charter was agreed to specifically by Marshal Stalin in a written declaration. In the second place, it raises the whole question of the issues that are involved in central Europe and in the Polish boundary question, before you decide that matter. I think you are justified in saying that in respect to both Russia and Britain, individual decisions have been made which ought not to have been made without the concurrence of all—at least the three leading powers—and I hope that matter can be straightened out in the next conference and hereafter no decisions will be taken in which all do not take part. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Next question.

MAN. Senator CHAVEZ, do you think it's possible to have a strong world organization without sacrificing our national sovereignty?

Senator CHAVEZ. I believe that it is possible to have a strong world organization. Peaceful men give up many of their so-called rights in order to get along with their fellow man. If you can get along with your neighbor in St. Louis, there's no reason why we couldn't get along with the neighbors throughout the world provided we act in good faith. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Thank you.

MAN. Senator ELLENDER, even if the war lords of the Axis countries are abolished, how do you expect to change the minds of the young who will be the future leaders of the country?

Senator ELLENDER. Well, I think in dealing with the youth of Germany and Japan that we can provide some kind of system—an education for them—or direct them so that they'll forever forget nazi-ism and any kind of isms. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. All right. Well, that was also a Town Hall meeting topic. All right, the gentleman there.

MAN. Senator CHAVEZ, what will our Government do to make it possible for people like the Spanish people to overthrow their oppressive government and have free elections in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter? [Applause.]

Senator CHAVEZ. That is a $64 question. [Laughter.] In the first place, I believe that this Government, while it should take a definite strong stand with reference to any collaboration by Spain with the Axis, at the same time, when it comes to the matter of deciding what kind of government Spain should have, I believe that's Spain's business [applause] as long as it does not interfere with the rights of other peoples elsewhere. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. The next question over here.

MAN. Senator PEPPER, isn't it true that if we are to protect the small nations and to carry out the Atlantic Charter, that we must do so by force? What is your plan to enforce the Atlantic Charter?

Senator PEPPER. Well, we have generally thought, of course, of the Atlantic Charter as negative—that is, thou shalt not do this, that, and the other—and you quite properly emphasized the affirmative part of it which holds out hopes to little nations and little people everywhere to have a better opportunity than they've ever had. Naturally, we can't be consistent with the Atlantic Charter and go cram a lot of these things by force down individual nations' throats and not violate their own right to have their government and their affairs inside their country. But we certainly can, by cooperation, by working one with another, and by good faith, and, of course, by restraining those who would use force for wrong, we can, as a whole success, do better than has ever been done by little nations and men, women, and children as well. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. The lady in the balcony.

LADY. Senator TOBEY, how can we avoid the Big Three becoming a thinly disguised old-fashioned military alliance, such as have always pursued imperialistic aims and produced wars rather than peace?

Mr. DENNY. Senator TOBEY, that teacher asked a pretty lively question.

Senator TOBEY. That's a matter, of course, of good faith based upon the utterances and principles of the organization that brings the three together in an alliance. We've got to take that on faith, but I believe that the alternative of this whole thing is chaos and that under this great sense of responsibility, the Big Three would measure up to their opportunities and privilege of service. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. The gentleman in the back row there.

MAN. Senator CHAVEZ, don't you think we need a Pacific Charter? How can the Atlantic Charter be applied to such countries as India? [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. How can the Atlantic Charter be applied to such countries as India?

Senator CHAVEZ. It's a fair question and I'll give a fair answer. I believe that the principles of the Atlantic Charter should apply all over the world. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Where's the man in uniform I saw a moment ago. Here he is right here. The sailor, yes.

MAN. (Question indistinguishable.)

Mr. DENNY. I don't think we got that.

Senator PEPPER. Did I understand you to say, Captain, that do I think it right that Greece should have restored to her certain islands like the Dodecanese Islands and others? And not only do I think so but I have a resolution to that effect pending in the Foreign Relations Committee now. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. That was the right question for the Senator. All right, the gentleman there on the aisle.

MAN. Senator TOBEY, you say that religion is the answer. I agree with you, but how do you account for the fact that great centers of religion have been neutral against the war of fascism?

Mr. DENNY. How do you account for the fact that great centers of religion have been neutral against the war on fascism?

Senator TOBEY. Well, I don't want to criticize great centers of religion. But let me read this to you, if I may. It's from the Jewish group—not only the liberals but the reformists and all—and it came out tonight in the New York Times. It is a criticism by Rabbi Landman, "The Dumbarton Oaks document provides the machinery for the possible prevention of future wars, not for the establishing of universal peace; proposals for the suppression of international violence after these occur, not for their prevention; a mechanism calculated to rectify and adjudicate international strife, not an instrument to eliminate the bases of strife and violence and war." So we've got to implement the Dum-

barton Oaks Conference agreement with the broad humanitarian Christian principles of the Atlantic Charter. That's my judgment in the way to handle this thing. [Applause.]

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. The gentleman on the aisle here.

MAN. Senator PEPPER, should not the Department of State pay more attention to labor's desire for 60,000,000 jobs here and for world prosperity and freer trade?

Mr. DENNY. All wrapped up in one package.

Senator PEPPER. Well, as to the first part of it—about the 60,000,000 jobs—as you realize, that's more of a domestic matter and comes in the scope of the departments of the Government which deals with domestic matters and in the scope of the Department of State. The Department of State, however, for the last 12 years has certainly been working hard and diligently upon the question of stimulating world trade by reciprocal trade agreements which lowered tariff wars.

Mr. DENNY. Thank you. Now, before we give you this important announcement that I told you about at the opening of the program and next week's subject, Mr. Cole has an important announcement to make to you showing how you may help save not one, but hundreds, of wounded fighting men.

ANNOUNCER. Today, many wounded men are returning from overseas, returning home. An article in a recent Reader's Digest tells how these men feel as they ride in an American train headed for further treatment in Army hospitals near their own home towns. As the trains roar along, even the most seriously wounded are happy. They find strength in knowing they are home. One soldier looking out of the window says, "I got to keep looking—I keep thinking maybe it will fade out like a movie." As the train whizzes through a town another remarks, "Gee, even the dump piles look swell."

Yes; these men are glad to be home and one reason they can be home is because Army nurses are devoting their strength and knowledge to men in need on battle fronts all over the world. Wherever American men are fighting, Army nurses are helping to save lives. In hospitals here at home, Army nurses carry on the job to restore health and hope, but more and more nurses are needed.

Today, the Army Nurse Corps must have 10,000 registered nurses immediately. If you know a registered nurse, tell her how urgently she is needed in the Army Nurse Corps. If you are a registered nurse, make your application today. Write to the Surgeon General, United States Army, Washington, D. C., or get in touch with your local Red Cross. The Army Nurse Corps needs you now. The Reader's Digest returns you to Mr. Denny.

Mr. DENNY. I want to thank Senators PEPPER, ELLENDER, TOBEY, and CHAVEZ for their magnificent contributions to tonight's program. I must say that they surprised many of us in the extent of their agreement—agreeing upon such principles as the Atlantic Charter, a strong world organization, progressive disarmament after the world organization proves itself to be strong enough to maintain peace and other such questions.

Byrnes' Curfew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of Wednesday, February 21, 1945:

BYRNES' CURFEW

In adopting a midnight curfew for the United States, War Mobilization Director Byrnes, as he usually does, appears to have ignored the special conditions in the West, and particularly in California, which call for special treatment.

It is well enough to close the bars and the night clubs here in accordance with the military curfew. But closing motion-picture shows and other places of entertainment will in this vicinity save no coal and a negligible amount of fuel and manpower, and what, if anything, is to be gained by it is far from apparent. In San Diego they have been trying to keep the U. S. O.'s and other innocent amusement places open on a 24-hour basis to provide for servicemen. And the swing-shift workers have a right to amusement, too.

Washington indignantly denies every time it puts out one of these sweeping orders that it is trying to penalize the West to make its sufferings equal to those of the East, but some aspects of this curfew order lack any other explanation.

Need Expansion But Not Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which was sent to me by one who has been very actively interested in the small independent businessman for many years. I commend the reading of the article to the membership of the House:

NEED EXPANSION BUT NOT MONOPOLY

Price Administrator Bowles says he is going to assist returning service veterans to enter the mercantile business and will provide them with an opportunity to get rationed goods. That is fine and shows the proper spirit. Many of these men have been in business and were forced to dispose of it when drafted while others worked in stores and want to advance themselves on their return.

This illustrates the thinking that is going around to small business, with especial reference to the servicemen because of what they have sacrificed for the cause of lasting peace. There is a sincere desire to recognize small business but care must be exercised to see that this tendency is not scuttled. A lot of people are expressing sympathy who are sincere but there are others who are hiding their real feelings. If small business is encouraged and helped to become the real backbone of the nation in fact there are others who are only giving lip service.

Big business is not going to take this support of small business lying down if it affects its progress. It wants to become bigger and if that is permitted it will have to be at the expense of small business. The latter has suffered enough through this encroachment but if plans are carried out to expand operations small business will indeed be subjected to a test for existence that will call for earnest assistance from the Government to ward off elimination.

The thing that must be guarded against is more complete domination of production and distribution by the very large corporations operating in these fields. They have it definitely in mind that they are going forward when this war closes and free to operate without restraint. They are in a position to carry out a program which small business cannot counteract irrespective of efficiency. It must therefore be appreciated that only Government can intervene to prevent such a calamity in the interest of general public welfare and to safeguard servicemen who enter business on their own account.

Big business has depended largely on subsidies of one type or another at the expense of small business. Where this is practiced it must be stopped for the common good of the country. We need expansion of business but on behalf of small rather than large business if we are to have the utmost of employment and prevent even greater monopoly.

Southern States Cooperative Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD herewith a portion of the annual report of Mr. W. G. Wysor, general manager of the Southern States Cooperative, with headquarters at Richmond, Va., for the fiscal year 1944.

This portion of Mr. Wysor's report deals with the attack now being made on the farm cooperatives throughout the country and led by the so-called National Tax Equality Association. Mr. Wysor explains so clearly the injustice and utterly false basis for this attack that I hope every Member will take the trouble to read his statement.

PORTION OF REPORT OF W. G. WYSOR, MANAGER OF SOUTHERN STATES COOPERATIVE

I have reported to you rather briefly on the affairs of Southern States Cooperative. As previously indicated, I hope this shortcoming will be compensated by the complete printed report which will reach you in due time. On the part of the directors and management in Southern States there is not, and never has been, the slightest desire to cover up or withhold information either from the membership or from the public. The fixed policy is to put the cards—all of them—face up on the table; to present the facts, be they good or bad.

The facts to report are this year nearly all so good that I would like, even more than usual, to elaborate on them. I have tried to be brief in order to have time to present to you a matter of the most vital significance to the farm cooperative movement and, therefore, to farm people.

I refer to the Nation-wide attack, now well under way, on farmer-owned and controlled cooperatives. About a year ago, misguided business interests, largely in the feed, grain, fertilizer, seed, and petroleum industries, organized what they chose to call the National Tax Equality Association.

It is now quite clear that these gentry, under this high-sounding but phony name, have one and only one objective. It is the destruction by legalistic means of farm cooperatives and of the fundamental right of the

farmer to perform services for himself through the mechanism of the cooperative association.

The business interests back of this movement are rich, powerful, and determined. They are raising millions of dollars to carry out their nefarious scheme. They are right now busily engaged in propagandizing the country—through direct mail, trade publications, the public press, meetings, and any other means they can employ to mislead and misinform the public in order that they may jam through Congress legislation to destroy farm cooperatives.

In fairness to American business and industry, I would like to say here that by no means all business is a party to this unseemly attack. As a matter of fact, leaders of the really big business institutions are definitely on the farmers' side of the fence, and to my own personal knowledge, have made heroic efforts to restrain and stop the antifarmer blitz. They recognize the farmer's right in a free country to go in business for himself. They know also that a last-ditch fight over this issue will result in ill will between agriculture and business for the next generation.

The propaganda of the National Tax Equality Association in brief is that farm cooperatives pay no taxes, whereas private business is heavily taxed and that in consequence of this alleged discrimination private business is being destroyed by the competition of farmer owned and controlled cooperatives.

Actually their attack is not against farm cooperatives as such. They are attacking the American farmer. Although they loudly proclaim they are for free enterprise, they are challenging the farmer's right to free enterprise. They challenge the farmer's right to go into business for himself, and to perform for himself services that are vital to the successful operation of his farm as a means of livelihood.

These exploiters in the business world want to take care of the farmer in their own special way and are, therefore, unalterably opposed to his taking care of himself. They seek to throw the farmer back into economic bondage, from which he is making some progress in escaping by employment of self-help cooperation. Let us examine calmly and dispassionately, if we can, the facts underlying this attack, which seeks to strike straight home to three out of every five farmers in this country.

They would strike at the 60 percent of American farmers doing some of their business cooperatively by denying to them the right to use their producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperatives on a cost-of-doing-business basis.

Farmers set up these cooperatives because they needed them. They use them to provide services they need to carry on their farming operations, services which it would rarely be practical for the individual farmer to provide for himself.

Farming is a small business. Most of our agricultural production in this country is on family-sized farms. Farming is not only a small business, it is a highly competitive business. Even with the progress farmers have made in organization during the recent years, the farmer is far less effectively organized than is either labor or industry. Every fair-minded person, on or off the farm, recognizes the need for farmers to organize. The farmer in his individual capacity is perfectly helpless to protect his economic interests in his relations with highly organized and powerful business and industry.

Yet the would-be destroyers of farmer cooperatives, operating behind the false front of alleged tax discrimination, would take from farmers the right to join with their neighbors to provide themselves on a sound basis with the services they need.

Such an attack threatens our free enterprise system in America right at a time when two opposing and contradictory philosophies are under test in this country. The newer of these philosophies looks to the National Government to solve our problems, meet the emergencies, and to regulate the economic life of the individual.

The older and traditional American philosophy calls for the individual to be strong and self-reliant through the exercise of his own initiative and the application of his own courage and resourcefulness.

In American agriculture, the producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative has been developed as a vitally important means by which the farmer, working with his neighbors, preserves and exercises his right of free enterprise. Without cooperatives as a means of mobilizing their economic strength, farmers will either become the serf of other interests or the ward of the Government.

If the farmer lands in either position, free enterprise in the United States of America will be dealt a death blow. The very foundation of our economic life in this country rests on the ownership of land, and its production employment by the maximum number of freeholders.

To enable the individual family farm operator to cope with the advantages in capital, factilities and trained personnel of the other great industries of the country, the Federal Government and the legislatures of every one of the States in the Union have authorized the organization and operation of producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations by farmers. At the same time the legislative bodies, both Federal and State, have imposed certain conditions and requirements which effectively safeguard both farmers and the general public from misuse of cooperatives. There are many such safeguards. Among the most important are:

1. The restriction of participation to bona fide agricultural producers. Only farmers may be members.

2. The vesting of control in membership rather than in money. Cooperatives are organizations of individuals; not of money. In a true cooperative, it is the individual who counts and votes, each individual having one and only one vote. Prvate business corporations are organizations of money and it is the invested money which counts and votes.

3. The limitation of the interest or dividends which may be paid on invested capital. The Federal Statutes impose a maximum of 8 percent. The Virginia statutes under which Southern States operates impose a maximum of 6 percent per annum.

4. The treatment of all users alike, whether members or nonmembers There may be no discrimination.

5. The requirement that cooperatives shall do business at cost—shall be nonprofit institutions. Any overcharges for services performed must be returned to the patrons in proportion to the use they made of those services. A cooperative can have no profit for its own account. No stockholder can, in the event of liquidation or under any other circumstances, receive in his capacity as a stockholder more than the par value of the securities he owns plus interest not to exceed the maximum fixed by law.

Now, let us examine the tax discrimination claims of the opponents of farm cooperatives. Despite clever propaganda to the contrary, farmer cooperatives are not exempt from taxation. Generally speaking, they pay taxes the same as other business.

They pay State and local property taxes. They pay license and capital taxes. They pay excise taxes. They pay transportation taxes. They pay stamp taxes, use taxes, import taxes, and various other taxes just as are paid by other business. Southern States paid $159,735.36 in taxes last year.

A true cooperative pays no income tax for the very simple and very good reason there is no income to tax. You can't tax a nonexistent income.

Cooperatives operate on a basis of taking margins for services rendered sufficient to recover estimated costs plus a provision for contingencies and for safety. What is left after actual costs are covered belongs to the member or patron and is systematically returned to him. Even margins set aside for contingency reserves, if unused for the purposes for which reserved, are so returned. Overcharges are in no sense a profit to the cooperative association. They belong to the patron and the patronage refunds returned by cooperatives are taxable income in the hands of the farmer whether paid in cash or stock.

Any other corporation operating on a nonprofit basis would also pay no income tax for the simple reason there would be no income to tax.

The relationship between a cooperative and the farmer member is that of agent and principal. To tax the cooperative for overcharges refunded to the farmer would be taxing an agent for income belonging to the principal, which obviously is absurd.

May I illustrate this point. If a farmer (the principal) gave his hired man (his agent) $10 with which to buy 3 bushels of timothy seed on his trip to town, and the hired man was able to get the seed for $9 and returned the $1 not needed for the purpose to the farmer, nobody would maintain that the hired man made a dollar profit and should pay income tax on it. Yet the application of the income tax to patronage refunds paid by cooperative associations would be nothing more than taxing the hired man on the money returned to his employer or principal.

The seekers of monopoly in private business financing this attack on the American farmer are demanding a Federal statute which would say to those of you who have set up Southern States Cooperative to perform services for yourselves that the $2,000,000 overcharge now being refunded to patrons is a taxable profit in the hands of your nonprofit association. They would tax your association for a nonexistent income. They would tax the refunded overcharge even though the refunds you receive are subject to income tax payments by you as individuals.

Well, I agree with you. This sounds, and is, preposterous. It is difficult to conceive of the Congress of the United States of America adopting such a policy. It is very doubtful, I am told by lawyers of high ability, that the legislation sought would be constitutional.

Yet the would-be destroyers of farmer cooperatives believe they can perpetrate this gross injustice. They are determined. They are powerful. They are putting up millions to carry out their scheme. Many members of Congress have no knowledge of farm cooperatives or the principles on which they operate. Not a few in Congress are indifferent to the welfare of the man on the land and are not too concerned over injustice to the farmer if it means votes from city constituents.

I want to say to you with all the earnestness I can command that we on the farm cannot and must not take this issue lightly. The future of American agriculture is at stake. I know you will fight and fight hard. We will win, too—because our cause is just. It is the cause of economic Christianity.

Address at Memorial Service for Donald Andrew Stokes, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently delivered by me at the memorial service for Donald Andrew Stokes, United States Army, Taylors Baptist Church, Sunday, February 25, 1945, Taylors, S. C.:

Mr. and Mrs. Stokes, family, relatives, and friends of Donald Andrew Stokes, who was killed in action somewhere in France August 14, 1944.

Soon after assuming my duties as a Member of the United States Congress in Washington, I found need for a worthy, ambitious, young man.

On one occasion in conversation with our mutual friend the late Thomas F. McAfee, Sr., I requested him to choose for me some young man trustworthy, ambitious and capable. In a short while Mr. McAfee sent me the name of Donald Stokes. After talking with young Stokes I realized that he was just the type boy I would like to have associated with me and, as a result, he went to Washington where he was employed until his induction into the armed forces.

Donald's first work was of the humblest sort but by reason of his devotion to the task assigned him and his faithful discharge thereof, he was soon advanced and finally was employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This outstanding agency of the Government accepts only the top boys and girls both in ability and character. No greater compliment can come to a young person than to be employed by the now world-famed Federal Bureau of Investigation.

At night and other times when not actually on his work Donald was studying either privately or at some institution in Washington. Always keeping alive his church activities.

Washington, as you know, is probably the most crowded city in the world by reason of its strategic importance during these war days. In spite of the many distractions and temptations young Stokes retained those fine qualities instilled into him by his godly parents and good teachers at whose feet he had been privileged to sit.

"He was just in the bloom of life's morning,
He was happy and free and fair,
A glance in his bright eyes would tell you
Of nothing but innocence there."

Occasionally there would be a moment in which Donald and I would talk together because the path over which he had traveled was comparable to my own early days.

The last word I had with Donald was after he had finished his basic training and was under alert orders, when in observing how handsome he was and how well he carried himself in his country's uniform, I admonished him to come home as clean as he went away.

We wrote to each other from time to time and on July 26, 1944, he wrote me a cheerful V-mail letter from somewhere in France, which I hold in my hand. I promptly replied but after several months of delay my letter, which I now hold in my hand, was returned marked "deceased." Thus came to an end a beautiful, useful, Christian life gladly sacrificed upon the altar of his country so that we and others who live after us may enjoy the priceless heritage of a free Government.

No greater sacrifice can be made than that which has been made by young Donald Stokes. In eulogizing this fine boy, I would not forget others who likewise have made the supreme sacrifice. Since it is impossible for me to memorialize each mother's son, will you please accept what I now say for others who, too, have given their all for our country's cause?

Our country never stood in greater danger that it did when it entered this World War. The Allied forces were being gradually hammered to pieces. It was only a question of time when they must fall before the sledgehammer blows of well-drilled military nations, and when that time would come, we dreaded to think of the result.

While full honors should be shown to those who go to the front, there are many others who should be given a share in the glories of a successful war. A modern conflict of arms requires not alone the soldiers who do the actual fighting but it requires a far more numerous army at home to supply the equipment for our fighting men. We are apt to laud the soldiers as deserving as they are and overlook the others who also make heroic sacrifices for the cause, in the civil walks of life.

We should honor the farmer and his wife and family, who work from sun to sun to provide the necessary things to eat for our boys and our starving Allies across the water. Had it not been for them, the war would be lost and civilization would be lost and supplanted by a military despotism.

We honor those who refuse to use the usual supply of food but willingly consent to a restricted diet, that those who need it could have our bread and meat. We honor the men and especially the women, who gladly give up the comforts of home and go into the machine shops and factories and there toil throughout the heat of summer and the cold of winter, to furnish the means of blasting the enemies.

We honor those who joined the Red Cross organization and either went to the front as nurses or work at home making bandages and clothing fit for sick or wounded soldiers.

We honor those brave mothers who gave their sons for the war and held back the tears that welled up from aching hearts as they bade good-bye to their boys.

We seem to be standing today in a liquid world and the streams of human lava are flowing hither and thither. If these streams can be guided by wise minds into proper channels, then civilization will go forward with a bound; but if they are guided by the irresponsible demagogs, then the hands of the clock of progress will be turned backward for hundreds of years.

Whatever we see on all sides of us reminds us of the lapse of time and the flux of life. The day and the night succeed each other. The sun rises, attains the meridian, declines, and sets. And the moon every night changes its form. The day has been considered the image of the year and the year is the representation of life.

The morning answers to spring, and spring to young childhood, with its happy and carefree abandonment to all the joys and pleasures which make that period of life such a glorious one.

The summer answers to young manhood and brings to life all of the joy that characterized his youthful hopes. With clear vision and far-seeing penetration, he maps out his course. But he is inexperienced, and there are rocks upon which his frail bark may crack and all his hopes may sink without a struggle. The evening is an emblem of autumn, and autumn of declining life.

The night with its shadows and darkness speaks of winter, when all the flowers and vegetation are gone. And winter speaks of that time when life shall cease.

Throughout all the ages men have argued over this question of death. They have reverenced it, they have fought it, they have flaunted it, and have mocked it by turns. Yet each and every one no matter what his station in life inevitably comes face to face with the question of death.

Instead of considering death as the end of all hopes and achievements we think of it as the beginning of a new life in another sphere. Instead of thinking of death as the end of life, we look upon it as the means of a new beginning, from which the soul rises refreshed as from a night of slumber, ready to enter joyfully upon the labors and pleasures of a new world. These narrow beds wherein we laid our friends one by one as they fell asleep are not tombs of the dead but merely pillars showing with pilgrims fared this way and where they rested at the close of the day, seeking refreshment for the bright tomorrow, and where, as the poet Beattie says: "Beauty immortal was wakened from the tomb."

The soul of man is the child of God sent on a long journey from the Father's house. Out of His house, but not out of His kingdom we wander until His voice shall call us home. And that call is not a summons of doom, but an invitation home to the joys of the Father's house and bounty of His table, and the royal welcome that awaits beloved children returning from a far journey. So, if we weep for those who have gone, our sorrow is not for them but for ourselves that we see them no more, that we no longer feel the touch of their hands nor hear the sound of their voices. And knowing we shall one day join them, we should learn to look forward to the event as to a pleasant journey back to the fair land we left long ago, back to the arms of friends and loved ones.

Christ demonstrated before the eys of men the eternal nature of the human soul, in that He rose from the grave on the third day, showing that death is not a reality in the sense of being an end of life. It is merely the end of one short chapter, in life which is eternal.

These are days of memories. With bowed head and reverential mien we pause at the threshhold of the future and involuntarily turn in retrospection, not to find material for regrets, but to dwell upon those things which are beautiful, and to recall virtues that we may emulate.

My friends, we are all sailing on the great river of life together and we should feel toward each other as officers and crew of a great ship.

A poet once wrote:

"Life is like a mighty river
Rolling on from day to day,
Men and women launched upon it
Sometimes wrecked and cast away.
"Then do your best for one another
Making life a pleasant dream;
Help a worn and weary brother
Pulling hard against the stream."

So, my friends, while we mourn for those who are gone, we should rejoice for the many good things with which we are blessed in life and make the most of our surroundings as we go along. We are living in the most glorious country and in the most glorious age that this world has even known.

If those whom we call dead, if those companions could speak to us today—if the sound of their voice could come back to us from the silent shore, what words would they speak into our listening ears? Would they speak aught of the great political and economic questions which vex us? Would their

words concern the grasping schemes of nations and the petty ambitions of men? Would they speak to us of party, or business, or commerce?

Nay, out of their richer and holier experiences they would speak to us in the old familiar way of the simple things of life—the things nearest and dearest to the human heart.

If the boys who have made the supreme sacrifice could speak to us today, I think, first of all they would tell us that we should face the future with faith, hope, and courage; that we should not fear death, for at eventide there is light. They would tell us that there is a life beyond this life, and that in that life there is work to do and tasks to accomplish. They would tell us that there are sweet and unchanging friendships in the spirit land—that it is a beautiful home where there are many happy reunions, but no sad parting—a glory land where no sorrows shall gnaw the heart nor even a tender tie be broken.

They would remind us, too, of the nobility of sacrifice and of the duty to minister unto others. They would tell us that the world remembers only for a while those who have been its masters, but that it never forgets those who have been its servants.

They would have us remember the spirit of American patriotism. They would tell us that the noblest thing anyone can do is to live for their country—live to make it a purer, nobler, and finer nation.

Fathers and mothers, wives and sweethearts, brothers and sisters, you do not give your boys in vain, for their works will come back to you in the glorious golden age which all countries will finally enter upon.

Collins, the English poet, expresses our sentiments in his Ode to the Soldier Dead:

"How sleep the brave who sink to rest,
By all their country's wishes Blest!
When Spring with dewy fingers cold,
Returns to deck their hallowed mold
She there shall find a sweeter sod
Than Fancy's feet have ever trod!

"By forms unseen their dirge is sung,
By hands unseen their knell is rung.
Here Honor comes a Pilgrim grey,
To bless the turf that wraps their clay,
And Freedom shall awhile repair,
And dwell a weeping Hermit there!"

The Connecticut Reemployment Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Carl A. Gray, chairman of the Connecticut Reemployment Commission, concerning their reemployment program:

THE CONNECTICUTT REEMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

(By Carl A. Gray, chairman, Connecticut Reemployment Commission)

When Governor Baldwin created the Connecticut Reemployment Commission a year and a half ago he set in motion the machinery which will give every war veteran and displaced war worker of this State the best possible chance of getting happily reestablished in civilian life after the war.

And, what is more important, the program of the reemployment commission will give these veterans and displaced war workers an opportunity for adjustment in their own home towns where they are known and where they are familiar with existing and potential jobs.

In its general concept the program of Governor Baldwin's commission is being built around the fundamental conviction that the future welfare and happiness of all the people of Connecticut depends upon the extent to which its working population is suitably employed after the war, with emphasis on the compatability of the worker and his job.

Consequently, the reemployment commission is directing its attention to the ultimate goal of every worker on a job for which he is best adapted and which will give him the greatest assurance of happiness and economic security.

To some, no doubt, this goal may sound idealistic. In fact, it is simply a realization that the welfare of each individual worker in the state is affected by the welfare of all the others, no matter how remote one may seem from another.

In other words, every worker who is unemployed must be supported by those who are employed, and ultimately this has an adverse affect on the economy of the state as a whole.

On the other hand, every worker who is happily employed makes a substantial contribution to the over-all economic welfare of the state and adds to the happiness and contentment of the people in general.

The thing that has been overlooked too much in the past is the idea that any job is good enough. We know now, that this is not so. After the last World War we saw thousands of veterans shoved into the first job which came along, regardless of aptitude, interest, or qualification, with the result that they were unhappy and remained on a job only a short time. Many of these, by chance, ultimately found themselves on jobs to their liking and in keeping with their ability. But far too many never did find satisfactory jobs and drifted from one job to another until, after a period of years, they found themselves well along in life and still without any special work skill and less and less desirable as employees.

We don't want this to happen after this war. There are four times as many men serving in this war as served in the last one. Millions of them are now serving on battle fronts all over the globe. They are fighting for freedom. And to them, freedom means an opportunity to come back to their native land, get into the kind of work they like, and settle down and raise a family.

Many of these men today are huddled in cold and wet fox holes on the war-torn battle fronts of Europe while shells scream overhead and explode nearby. Countless numbers are cutting their way through heavy jungle to ferret out ratlike Japs on islands in the Pacific, never knowing at what moment the bullet of an enemy sniper will end their lives. Flying over dangerous and hostile land and water on bombing and fighter missions every day are thousands more who know that every second they are in the air their lives are in the laps of the Gods.

Moving majestically, but always with the risk of a torpedo in their sides or bombs from above, are ships of our Navy and Coast Guard and their crews. And even under the sea, in submarines, our men are risking sudden and violent death hourly as this titantic struggle with our enemies is pressed to victory.

For these men, who are daily risking their lives for their country, life is reduced to fundamentals. They are not afraid of the enemy. They are faithful and loyal. They will die bravely if need be. And they will give their lives to save their comrades.

But they do have one fear. A fear of the future. We have this straight from hundreds who have been through this hell.

When they come back they want job opportunities. If they happened to have been physically handicapped in the war they still want an opportunity to earn their own living. They do not want to be pampered or catered to. They want to make their own way. That is what they are fighting for. If they are denied this opportunity they will feel they have fought in vain.

We at home should realize that they are asking very little. And we should make certain that they get the little they ask for in every city and town in the State and Nation.

Actually, it isn't going to be any great task to give these returning veterans what they want, right in their home communities.

First of all, they will need one place they can go to for information, advice, counseling, and service. To meet this need the Connecticut Reemployment Commission has organized reemployment and veterans advisory committees in 145 of our 169 towns and charged these committees with the responsibility of designating one central place where veterans may go for information and assistance. This central point of contact may be the office of an established agency such as the United States Employment Service, Selective Service, the Red Cross, or Veterans' Administration. In smaller communities it is more apt to be an office in the town hall or the post office. But wherever it is, each community will know, and veterans of that community will not have to go from one individual or agency to another and get the run-around which veterans of World War No. 1 remember so well.

These local committees, on which about 2,500 public-spirited citizens are now serving, are made up of representatives of all the agencies, groups, and organizations in each community which can contribute toward the ultimate adjustment and reemployment of veterans and displaced war workers. They were picked as representatives of these organizations so that they can coordinate the efforts of all agencies and facilities in the community.

At least one member of the committee is a specialist in education and training and through him or such a committee the educational and job training facilities and opportunities available are made known to the veteran. Another member, or a subcommittee, is especially informed in regard to employment opportunities. Another group is well versed in how claims for disability compensation and other service-connected correspondence can best be expedited. And there are one or more persons who are prepared to aid a veteran in any domestic problems he may have.

Above and beyond these mechanics of human engineering, the reemployment commission is endeavoring to develop a better understanding of the changes which have taken place in veterans and how we can aid in their readjustment.

This is being accomplished through community personnel training courses, talks before organized groups, foreman training courses, through our educational facilities and by members of the clergy.

Our program is a comparatively simple one, dealing in human values. Our aim is to give every veteran and displaced war worker a fair opportunity to reestablish themselves in peaceful pursuits on jobs for which they are best fitted and which will bring them a maximum of contentment. To provide this opportunity we are endeavoring to see that every possible assistance in the way of information, counseling, training, education, and mental and physical aid is made available to them in their own home towns.

We can do no less.

The Coast Guard Does Another Great Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the following article, entitled "The Coast Guard Does Another Great Job":

THE COAST GUARD DOES ANOTHER GREAT JOB

Both in Europe and in the Pacific our armies and those of our allies are on the offensive. Great battles have been won and more victories are in the offing. Millions of our men are now hurling themselves upon our enemies. In their hands are the finest weapons which our factories and our working men and women can produce. And backing them up are the millions of tons of supplies needed by a modern army. Compare today's situation with that of 3 years ago, when our enemies were on the march and our primary objective was to hold on until our war machine could be shifted into high gear.

This change in our war fortunes has resulted from prodigious efforts made by both our fighting men and by our citizens from all parts of the country. We have produced war equipment in volumes far beyond even our own optimistic predictions. Our fighting armies have been rapidly and well trained and have demonstrated their superiority in all theaters. While their fighting record and the record fo our war output are well known, comparatively little public notice has been given to one most important phase of the remarkable job that has been done in transporting these men and their war material from the United States to the far-flung battlefields of the world where they are being used so well. That is the magnificent work that has been done by the Coast Guard in protecting the port facilities required to load our ships and in protecting our vessels while in port.

Almost all war equipment must be carried overseas by ships and all ships must be loaded over our port facilities. Of the huge amount of war material we can produce, our armies abroad can only utilize that amount which our ships can carry to them. Thus the bottleneck of our entire war effort is our ability to ship, and this, in turn, depends upon the capacity of our port facilities to load. Any damage to our vessels, or to the waterfront facilities used to load these vessels, which hinders their maximum use would thus result in a proportionate reduction in the battle power of our armed forces.

That fact, and the necessity to protect our ports and vessels in ports, was early recognized by the President and the Navy. Just 3 years ago the President delegated responsibility for the safeguarding of our ports and vessels in port to the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary designated the commandant of the Coast Guard to perform these duties. Under the leadership of Admiral Waesche, a remarkable job has been done.

Starting from scratch, the Coast Guard has built up an organization of trained experts in all phases of port protection. To protect against fire, that greatest of menaces to maritime safety, the largest fleet of fireboats in the world has been created. Over 250 Coast Guard fireboats are now in operation, the smallest having a pumping capacity of 2,000 gallons per minute, and all carrying the latest fire-fighting equipment. To prevent access to our vessels and water-front facilities by undesirables, all persons seeking admittance to them are first required to obtain Coast Guard identification cards. To control the movement of vessels in our local waters, a system of Coast Guard licenses and harbor patrols was instituted. And to protect our harbors and vessels and the civil population living in port areas from dangers incident to the loading of war explosives, a comprehensive precautionary program has been developed to insure that all loadings are properly supervised and stowed.

The success of the Coast Guard port security program is demonstrated by the fact that no disaster or serious loss impeding our war effort has occurred upon any vessel or facility for which the Coast Guard has been responsible. That has not been the result of luck, but of hard work and effort. During the past 3 years this port protection job has been steadily increasing with the increase in the volume of ships and cargo using our ports. Despite the need for Coast Guard manpower at sea, their port security program has never faltered, but has successfully kept pace despite substantial personnel reductions. To the officers and men of the Coast Guard who have made this port security record possible and who have done so important a job to get the equipment of war to our men abroad, we all owe our gratitude. To them we say, "Well done."

The F. E. P. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial appearing in the Vernon Daily Record of February 20, 1945:

THE HIGH COST OF POLITICAL OBLIGATIONS

The Fair-Employment Practice Committee, known to the public as F. E. P. C., is a Government agency created by Executive order to prevent discrimination against Negroes in defense industries. That this was an essential move to prevent trouble which would have hampered the war effort is generally agreed. Hence there was no complaint against the original purpose of the order.

But the Committee appointed by the President to prevent unfair practices in defense industries very soon decided to extend its authority to all business. It began telling private employers who had no connection with contracts for producing war materials that they must employ Negroes according to certain arbitrary ratios fixed by the Committee. Newspapers were told that they must not carry advertisements that either whites or Negroes were wanted for certain kinds of work.

Naturally that created a stir in Washington and the F. E. P. C. was compelled to back up on some of its more presumptuous policies. Congress was about to abolish the whole thing and then came the Presidential election. Both major parties took up the discredited F. E. P. C. and promised to make it a permanent agency of Government with full legal status. A bill is now before the House of Representatives to make good on the campaign promises made for the specific purpose of attracting Negro votes.

If this measure becomes law a new carpetbag movement will be in full swing. It will eventually fail as all such ideas do, unless the authors of a new order for the United States succeed in their plans to introduce a system of State socialism.

This is an excellent editorial, with which most intelligent citizens will largely agree. However, I do not fully agree with the first paragraph. In my opinion, the F. E. P. C., even as an executive agency and even during wartime, has been more detrimental than beneficial. Such an organization belies its name. To perpetuate such an organization as a permanent, peacetime agency of government is wholly inconsistent with all principles of Americanism and democracy.

If political shysters, together with sincere proponents, are able to hang this millstone about the necks of the American people, then we certainly have cause to despair of the future. Within such legislation lie the seeds of another Ku Klux Klan, as well as the germs of other pernicious social and political diseases.

The Polish Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Schenectady (N. Y.) Gazette of February 19, 1945, relative to the Polish situation:

THE POLISH SITUATION

As expected, many Poles in this country are furious over what they term the "sell-out" of Poland to Russia by Roosevelt and Churchill at the Yalta Conference of the Big Three. Polish-Americans are not the only ones who are incensed. Senator WALSH, of Massachusetts, said the proposals concerning Poland are "shocking."

There is some basis for the charge. As WALSH said, the provisions concerning Poland are "wholly at variance with the Atlantic Charter pledge." But that is merely another example, if such were still needed, of the futility of such pronouncements, pacts, and codes as the Atlantic Charter, Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, and the like (and even solemn treaties), which are all based on a superficial, artificial, and thoroughly ephemeral agreement on principles by a number of individuals. Such charters and agreements always have been and always will be meaningless because they are backed by no compelling forces that make for permanent compliance. They are merely statements of supposed intention. Tomorrow's intentions may be, and usually are, different from today's.

Time is wasted, therefore, if the Poles call for adherence to the Atlantic Charter, since there is no more reason to rely on that charter today than there was when it was promulgated. It was as dead as the dodo the moment it was uttered. It could not possibly carry any more weight than the numerous promises made by Hitler of no more territorial designs.

The reason the Poles can expect nothing from such documents as the Atlantic Charter is that when the influential leaders among the big powers get down to brass tacks and leave off their high-sounding phrases the actions they take are along defensive lines for the purpose of protecting their own countries' positions, their own economic or political systems, their own trade empires, their own way of life. Those men could come forth with a hundred Atlantic Charters if they so desired, but when it reaches the point of taking action they approach the problem of Poland on the same basis it has been met by conquerors throughout history. They bargain among themselves, slice up Poland if such is necessary, agree on new spheres of influence and on disposition of wealth and manpower, and take any other steps they think needed to insure the security of their own governments in coming years. Poland obviously has nothing to say about all this, and it would make no difference even if it had been represented at the Yalta Conference, for the power of the greater nations would overwhelm it.

Each of the minor nations of Europe, and of the globe, is a pawn in such matters. If some international organization, along the lines of those frequently discussed these days, had already been set up and were now in operation, the Poles and others in the same unfortunate position presumably would have recourse in somewhat the same manner as one of our States which may appeal to the United States Supreme Court for settlement of an interstate dispute. That is not to say the Poles would receive fair treatment, but at least the machinery would be there. As it is, no international organization or code has been set up, accepted, and made workable. The Big Three nations therefore are jumping the gun, taking matters in their own hands, trying to settle the post-war problems of Europe now and in their own way. Why? Because the strong and early bird gets the worm, and any nation that innocently waits until after the war for the establishment of a supposedly just international control body will find the world was already carved up the way the largest powers wanted it long before the war was even ended.

There is nothing Poland or any other helpless nation can do about it except to choose the right allies in the next war.

Why Not Use Male Nurses?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement by a group of male nurses. It is hard to explain the Army's portrayal of its dire need for more nursing care while it steadfastly refuses to use the hundreds of registered male nurses who are available.

In a recent article by Joseph Israels in Look magazine, he said:

In a recent 6,000 miles of travel from end to end of the Pacific theater, every man I met agreed that his part of the war would go better without American women in the forward areas.

Army and Navy doctors, even nurses themselves, will admit the female nurses in forward areas do nothing male Medical Corps men cannot do better. And do without the protective worrying of those officers and men who don't like to see women shot at.

It has been suggested by a colonel in the Medical Corps now serving in the far Pacific that a subdivision of the Medical Administrative Corps be created purely for male nurses, that as nurses they be given direct commissions in that subdivision, and be used in a specific capacity that best fits their qualifications.

When the need for nursing care is so desperate that we are urged to draft women nurses, surely it is time to revise some ancient traditions in the Army Medical Corps and use the male nurses who want to volunteer.

WHY NOT USE MALE NURSES?

Ever since Pearl Harbor we men nurses have been striving for recognition as nurses in the armed forces. We are not seeking glory; rather, we wish to serve in a capacity in which we sincerely believe the greatest value would be gained from our highly specialized training and experience.

We have intensified our efforts recently because of the critical shortage of nurses in the services. We want our fighting men to have the best care that medical science can give. We have received favorable replies from many Congressmen and other interested officials, yet the Army and Navy Medical Departments continue to offer the same objections to our recognition.

It is time to analyze these objections. From the Surgeon General of the Army, we quote two statements. One: "The situation concerning male nurses is not at all parallel to that of female nurses, who are appointed for a single specific type of duty for which they are peculiarly qualified by reason of their sex."

What does this mean? What is this "specific type of duty" for which men nurses are not qualified? Both men and women nurses have the same education and training. Both pass all regulations set by the National League of Nursing Education. Both are licensed in the same manner.

Statement No. 2: "Army nurses of either sex must accord patients all the usual care required by the duties of their profession, including a variety of intimate offices and quasi-menial services. Women of officer rank can render these duties without incongruity, while men of such rank could not."

We ask, Why not? We realized we would have to render such services when we entered our chosen profession and have rendered these services in civilian life without loss of respect. In fact, in certain types of conditions, male patients have particularly appreciated our relieving the embarrassment occasioned when women performed these duties, and often the treatment has been much more effective just because the barrier of sex was removed. Not infrequently the care of male patients has been left to untrained personnel because of the ever-present problem of sex, and the results have been very unsatisfactory. This is particularly true of psychiatric and genito-urinary diseases. If men cannot render such services to their fellow men without losing respect, then certainly the whole medical and scientific field should have lost its respect and high standing long ago. In many instances doctors have had to perform menial tasks because of the lack of trained coworkers, and yet have retained the respect and undying gratitude of their patients. That is part of the tradition of both the nursing and medical professions.

We are informed that male nurses may enter the Hospital Corps, where, if qualified, they may enter officer candidate school and obtain a commissioned rank. Many men nurses have tried for the past 4 years to qualify for officer candidate school, and yet none have rank equal to that of women nurses with whom they have trained (and whom in many cases they have supervised). If these men were qualified to supervise these women and have equal or more experience in their profession, surely they should be allowed to serve side by side with them rather than under them in an entirely different branch of the service.

Moreover, there is a difference between the Nurse and Hospital Corps. The Nurse Corps is composed of qualified trained personnel which supervises the work of the Hospital Corps. The latter is largely composed of previously untrained personnel who have received their training from the military schools. Since men nurses are trained, qualified workers in civilian life, why is it impossible to utilize this skill in military life on the same basis as that of women nurses, namely, in the Nurse Corps? Is it fair to ask men nurses, who have expended time and effort to gain further education and the right to call themselves registered nurses in civilian life, to start all over again in military life to finally gain recognition as nurses, and on the other hand grant women nurses full recognition immediately upon enrollment?

The Surgeon General of the Medical Corps tells us how simple it is to gain entrance into the medical units of the armed services, but here are a few facts we have found out from actual experience. We are barred from the Army and Navy Nurse Corps, and under present draft laws are unable even to enlist in the armed forces. We may only apply for voluntary induction and hope to be put in the Hospital Corps, though even this is not guaranteed. We are unable to benefit at all from our previous medical training. We receive the rank of private if we are allowed to enter the Army Medical Corps. It has been said that it is easier to get into heaven than into the Army or Navy Nurse Corps, yet 10,000 nurses are still urgently needed. We are merely asking permisison to share the same standing in military life accorded us in civilian life; that is, the right to join the nursing corps, where we can make our maximum contribution to the war effort.

May we have that chance?

America Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

AMERICA LAST

(By Roy C. McKenna, member, executive committee of the American Tariff League, and chairman of the board, Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co.)

Internationalists, advocates of the policy of America last, had their inning at the Monetary Conference at Bretton Woods and at the International Business Conference at Rye. Policies, which President Roosevelt states were arrived at by "the best brains," are not accepted by those who believe that America can win the war and the peace without adopting the economic theories of either our allies or our enemies. Internationally minded politicians who advocate a policy of defeatism, America last, place upon those who believe in American principles back in the horse-and-buggy age, and believe that they are uninformed in modern economics. Their objective is, by continual sniping, to bring about the abolition of the century-and-a-half-old

American custom of safeguarding our standard of living by a protective tariff.

Those of us who refuse to accept imported economic theories or a policy of defeatism, America last, despite continuous allegations, have studied history, economics, and are familiar with the aspects of international trade both practically and theoretically. We date the growth of individual government from 1066 when William the Conqueror crossed the English Channel. We recognize the Constitution of the United States of America, adopted in 1787, as the basis of acceptance of government by the individual.

Advocates of the policy of America last do not hesitate to imply ignorance of world affairs to their opponents, but they themselves seem unfamiliar with the history of the tariff, and the adoption, in 1816, of America's policy of protection. From 1791 to 1815 imported items were subjected to a revenue duty, or tariff; and only about 5 percent of all imports were admitted duty free. With the adoption by America of the policy of protection, imports upon the free list increased from 6 percent in 1816 to 66 percent in 1938–40. International trade, therefore, was not handicapped by protection. Imports and exports have risen and fallen with America's prosperity; and for over a century all business recessions in America followed downward revisions in the tariff.

Advocates of the policy of America last have chosen as their spokesmen the crusaders Eric Johnston and Beardsley Ruml. Eric Johnston, who always has an eye to personal popularity, had the audacity to say over the radio, in a national hook-up, The Town Meeting, "We pay in the United States, for instance, about four times the wage that is paid in England to coal miners, and yet the coal miner in this country produces about four times as much." He ignores the difference between virgin mines and those centuries old, and unjustly implies that the difference is in the men working the mine. In the industrial world of today, the production is set by the machine and not by the operator. He is right, however, in his statement that American wages are four times those of England, and that those of other countries are lower still; but he does not follow through and define the effect upon American mining and miners by the importation of coal at less than the cost of domestic production.

The ordinary man recognizes the justice of American workers asking a tariff equivalent to the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. President Wilson, in 1913, stated, "The object of tariff legislation henceforth enacted, must be effective competition." Andrew Carnegie, part of whose fortune is being used by advocates of the policy of America last to advocate free trade, said that in tariff legislation we should in all cases take the safe side.

Those of us who have not lost faith in America, believe in free enterprise, in competition nationally and internationally, but always upon a basis of recognizing the difference in the economic status of peoples. Eric Johnston said, "When our exports exceed our imports, other countries aren't dumping things in America." [Applause.] This statement could have been made for no other purpose by a thinking man than to elicit applause from an unthinking audience. It may be true that for 12 years, under the administration of a Treasury Department favoring a policy of "America last," antidumping provisions of tariff legislation have not been enforced or foreign valuations questioned. A cuckoo clock bought at retail at Fifth Avenue and Fourteenth Street in New York City, valued in Germany where it was made, at 94 cents, upon which a duty of 28 cents was paid (30 cents ad valorem) was priced at $22, a mark-up of 1,636 percent above landed cost in the United States.

Nations will make great sacrifices to balance exchange. At a time when our policy was to plow under, we were importing from areas where people were starving, billions of pounds of starches, vegetable oils, and carbohydrates which under a liberal interpretation of the policy of protection, could have been produced at home.

I know of no group in America which advocates prohibitive tariffs. Those who most violently attack as exorbitant the rates of the Smoot-Hawley Act, fail to remember that they themselves were responsible for a blanket increase of 40 percent in all duties when they devalued the dollar. Since the devaluation of the dollar 12 years ago, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, reductions in rates have been made on over 1,200 articles, mostly to the full legal extent of 50 percent. Few men realize that our tariff is now on about the same level as that of 1913; in fact, there has been little change in the tariff since the adoption of the principle of protection in 1816. From 1821 to 1830 the average revenue from duties amounted to $2.32 per inhabitant per year, and this compares with $2.37 for the period 1938–40. During both these periods the rates of ad valorem duties averaged between 40 an 50 percent, but the free list grew from 6 to 66 percent.

Advocates of the policy of "America Last" always visualize as American exports to the Hottentot nations such articles as automobiles, typewriters, household appliances—all the products of industries so young that they always have had the benefit of a high wage and the American market and have never been called upon to face foreign competition. America's exports to the world should be materials needed to establish throughout the world nations with balanced economies—machine tools, agricultural implements, and American technology.

Beardsley Ruml states that America does not need duties either for the purpose of revenue or for the purpose of balancing our exchange. This is fortunate. However, the same economic laws that apply to other nations apply also to America. We must ultimately balance our exchange. We may, however, select those things which we need for our happiness and well-being, raw materials, luxuries, and in general, articles which are noncompetitive. America must have a sound fiscal policy, low interest rates, high wages, high prices for agricultural products, in order to hold faith with the patriotic buyers of Government securities which must be retired at full value. To do this, American agriculture and American industry must have the American market. Beardsley Ruml, merchant, economist, social reformer, who has accepted in part imported economic theories, has become a spokesman for advocates of the policy, "America Last." He states, "the tariff is a sales tax paid by the consumer through the retailer direct to the producer without the intervention of any public agency." A merchant, treasurer of R. H. Macy & Co., should know how prices are set in a profit and loss economy, and how much a duty of 2 cents, paid upon a marcel iron, (20 percent advalorem on a valuation of less than 10 cents in Germany) accounts for a price paid to R. H. Macy & Co. of $1.39 retail, or a percentage of retail price to landed cost of 1012 percent.

Information on 10 articles for sale by R. H. Macy & Co. obtained at the request of the Senate Committee on Finance and published by the Treasury Department as a report on foreign and landed valuations of imported merchandise and their retail selling price in the United States, shows percentage of retail selling price to landed cost of a minimum of 187 percent to over 1,000 percent.

As an economist, Mr. Ruml should recognize that the larger part of any duty is paid by the exporter, and only a lesser percentage is divided between the merchant and the consumer. The increase in retail price due to the tariff on commodities is negligible. Merchants search the world for cheap-labor markets, and sell the merchandise which they secure in the sweat shops of the world at American valuation; that is, the assumed cost of reproduction under the privileges and upon the wage scale of American workers who for over 150 years have been partially protected by tariffs.

Defenders of the principle of protection believe in a flexible tariff. The Smoot-Hawley Act provided for increases or decreases of 50 percent. President McKinley advocated reciprocity. Reciprocity, however, should work both ways, and by bargaining we should get value received. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, for the last 12 years, has been administered only to purchase international good will. A reduction to Canada of the tariff on whisky, in spite of the fact that Canada is a small producer of whisky, automatically applies to Scotland, the principal producer. The agreement with France on rayon, of which France is a large manufacturer but small exporter, would apply equally to Japan, who could easily put America out of the business.

Mr. Ruml warns America that other nations may increase their duties because of needed revenue; of which the tariff to many is still the chief source. He admits that any nation with a limited quantity of exports, in dire need of balancing its exchange, would be forced by one means or another to limit imports to those commodities essential to their economy. Nations struggling for reconstruction will undoubtedly not permit the importation of luxuries when machine tools, food, and agricultural implements are needed. Throughout the entire period of sniping at the idea of a protective tariff for America under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, other nations have increased their rates of duties, as demonstrated by recent acts of Brazil and Chile. Mr. Ruml, however, states that increases in duties by these nations were not for the purpose of discrimination against America, and that such acts should not influence our policy (of America last?).

The greatest contribution that America can make to the devastated and conquered nations struggling for reconstruction, would be the establishment of an America as self-sufficient as possible under modern conditions. The rest of the world knows that it mut work out its own salvation. Money will not do the job. Temporary assistance will help, but only by years of toil can the job of reconstruction be done in any country.

An American merchant is free to buy in the cheapest market, and is asked to pay duties only at rates which have remained practically unchanged for a hundred and twenty-five years. He sells on the American market at American prices. Thus he has the preferential position. Agriculture and industry ask only a tariff high enough to guarantee effective competition with foreign produced goods. A square deal, for which they ask, can be secured by a duty equivalent to the cost of production at home and abroad. In the post-war era merchants of other lands will not have this privilege. Most of the world will be under state socialism with planned economies under which foreign trade is rigidly controlled by the government. The individual in these countries will have no part in government.

Political opportunists dare not make the tariff the principal political issue. The ordinary man doesn't want to throw out of work men who have devoted their lives to learning and practising specialized trades, only to save a few cents per dollar on foreign ware. The ordinary man knows that resources invested in sheltered industries, as they are referred to by Mr. Ruml, are made in good faith and that fairness demands the continuation of established principle. The ordinary man who has seen a steam shovel or a bulldozer

work, knows that it is investment in tools and not the physical or psychological difference in nationalities which makes production. The ordinary man thinks of free traders as economic crackpots.

If America has not fought the war in vain, we need not accept the economic philosophy of either our enemies or of our allies. We can maintain a government based upon individuality, with free enterprise, competition in business open and regulated by government only to the extent necessary to maintain order.

Free Enterprise Is You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very splendid editorial written by S. S. Hoffman and published in the Waterloo Press, of Waterloo, Iowa, on February 8, 1945. The editorial is as follows:

FREE ENTERPRISE IS YOU

If you want anybody to do anything well, you'll have to let them make a little money at it. Nobody does anything very well free. So the profit system and good wages are right and proper. American prosperity is a mighty big job and it cannot be pulled out of a hat by any one genius or a set of geniuses in Washington. This responsibility for achievement must be the job for millions of enterprising initiators all over America. The only way to get their achievement is to let them make some money—hitting them with a baseball bat is absolutely killing the goose that laid the golden egg.

The American system of free enterprise is not only privately owned but the souls of the initiators are privately owned. Any government which owns or runs business also owns and runs the souls of every man, woman, and child in the country. Even going so far as to grant that collectivism in some countries is all right would never work here in America—this in spite of some ideas we have had from Washington.

Free enterprise means more to the worker by far than it does to the investors Rockefeller or Ford.

DREAMS

Some day I want to own a big factory or own a garage or invent something and manufacture it. Life, liberty, and the right to dream is something we have in this country which most other countries do not have. This dreaming and working to accomplish these dreams is what millions of little fellows start and keep rising to the top. When the right to dream is taken away all incentive to hustle is destroyed and this country will not be America.

FREE ENTERPRISE

These words have been twisted until they are getting hard to define. We'll try this: Freedom to hustle, freedom of opportunity, freedom for individual initiative, freedom to rise to the top—but not at others' expense. Free enterprise means that your children and mine can go much further than we have come. Business and people in America are not enemies—they both have much in common. Some of us may be fitted to be a machinist or carpenter or brick mason all our lives. Nevertheless we want a chance to save a little and invest a little and this is where we too become businessmen. A man who digs ditches all his life has ambitions and perhaps the outstanding one is to live in a country like America where his children may some day enter the professions or business.

In America everybody is or would like to be a capitalist. A little fellow who has earned a little money and invests it in a business is a capitalist. Anybody who saves it a capitalist.

A CONTINUOUS HALLOWEEN

We kids used to go out Halloween and upset the chicken houses, put the buggy on top of the schoolhouse and in general have a good time. It was fun. We have here in America those economic pranksters who have been getting the same sort of fun out of upsetting any American institution a few years old. The fact that we had a depression which was world-wide in '29 and '30 is no reason why we should continue the Halloween party henceforth and keep upsetting not only business but about everything else.

Now if the Government will realize that the real way to create those millions of jobs is to let business and free enterprise go ahead and take the initiative we will have post-war prosperity of a solid kind and not one created by a lot of Washington politicians who never have been a success in business of any kind.

Butter Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. HENRY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received from Mr. George F. Christian, of Johnson Creek, Wis.:

Hon. ROBERT K. HENRY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The butter situation is very critical and unless something is done to increase the price of butter and make butter prices more in line with prices on other dairy products we can only look forward to a continuing decline in butter production, and this will eventually work to the detriment of the entire dairy industry throughout the United States. There has been such a tremendous decrease in butter consumption as a result of continued shortages and rationing that it may take years to get consumption back to normal, and when conditions change the surplus from all other dairy products' lines will go into butter production, and there can be only one result—and that is a tremendous oversupply that will force prices down to low levels or force Government agencies to purchase large quantities of butter on a price-support program basis.

If butter prices were more in line with other dairy products now so that production would gradually increase and larger supplies of butter would be available for domestic consumption, the situation would not become quite as critical. The members of the butter industry advisory committee have about given up hope of securing any relief from the O. P. A. or War Food Administration and I believe they are going to make a determined effort to secure the necessary support to correct this situation from the Members of Congress. Butter has been deliberately discriminated against and no creamery in the United States can afford to churn butter if they can sell whole milk or fluid cream, which most of them are doing now. It is a sad state of affairs when a large butter-producing State such as the State of Wisconsin used to be is now producing very little butter. A large per capita domestic consumption of butter is vital to the interest of dairymen everywhere.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE F. CHRISTIAN.

Aluminum Discovers the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, one-third of the aluminum for war is coming from the Pacific Northwest. This is due to the fact that the Bonneville and Grand Coulee hydroelectric power plants are making available a large pool of low-cost electric power which is essential in the production of aluminum. It is reported that by reason of this and other facts, aluminum is being produced in the Pacific Northwest at a cost of 13 percent under the national average and 30 percent lower than the highest-cost plants. In the post-war period it is important for Northwest economy that the large Government aluminum plants now operating in that area be continued in order to supply the market with the light metal which will be in demand in the post-war activities.

An informative discussion of aluminum in the Northwest was made by N. H. Engle, director, bureau of business research, College of Economics and Business, University of Washington, which appeared in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor. The article is as follows:

ALUMINUM DISCOVERS THE NORTHWEST—THE WIDE HORIZON

(By N. H. Engle, director, bureau of business research, College of Economics and Business, University of Washington)

A new industry has sprung up in the Pacific Northwest which intrigues the imagination of post-war planners by its very magnitude. Attracted originally by the abundant and cheap electric power from the great Bonneville-Coulee system, by the growing demand for aluminum by the west coast aircraft industry, and by the easy access to the raw materials and markets of the world from tidewater ports, both the Aluminum Co. of America and Reynolds Metals Co. began to build aluminum reduction works shortly before the United States entered the war. The great war demand for this light metal stimulated construction by the Defense Plant Corporation of three more aluminum works and a large aluminum rolling mill. As a result, Washington and Oregon now possess capacity to produce more than twice as much aluminum as the entire United States had before the war.

Three of the five reduction plants are located close to Portland, Oreg.—one at Troutdale, Oreg., a few miles up the Columbia River, one each across the river at Vancouver and Longview, Wash. These three plants account for 60 percent of total Northwest capacity. Spokane, Wash., 300 miles inland

but less than 100 miles from the Grand Coulee Dam, has the largest single reduction works in the West and one of the three largest aluminum rolling mills in the world. The fifth reduction plant is a small, two potline plant (40,000,000 pounds capacity) located at Tacoma, Wash., on Puget Sound, and operated for the Government by the Olin Corporation. All of the other D. P. C. plants are operated by Alcoa.

To appraise the post-war outlook for this new western industry, the structure of the aluminum industry must be understood. As the industry exists today, there are really five stages or levels of aluminum production, beginning with the mining of bauxite. While aluminum is the most abundant metal in the earth's crust, thus far commercial production has depended on bauxite, the only ore of aluminum which has yielded to economical treatment. Bauxite has been found all over the world since its original discovery many years ago in southern France. The chief deposits in the United States have been in Arkansas, with some traces in Alabama, Georgia, and other Southeastern States. United States reserves have been very largely exhausted by the heavy demands of this war. In fact, for many years the United States has imported substantial quantities of bauxite from Dutch Guiana and some from British Guiana.

Th new Pacific Northwest aluminum industry is looking toward the Caroline Islands and the Dutch East Indies for a post-war supply of this basic raw material. It should also be mentioned, in passing, that efforts are being made to use alunite and local clays as a raw material. Thus far definitive results are lacking.

The second stage of the industry consists in refining the raw material. From bauxite a pure aluminum oxide, called alumina, is obtained by the Bayer chemical process. Alumina exists in both alunite and clay but it is difficult to separate from the ore in a pure state economically. A plant at Salt Lake City has been struggling with alunite for about a year with but limited success. A small clay plant is under construction at Salem, Oreg. If this plant is completed and is able to produce pure, cheap alumina from the abundant clays of the region, the new western industry will be free from concern about bauxite supplies.

Aluminum reduction is the third stage of the industry. Aluminum oxide, a white powdery material resembling powdered sugar or finely ground pure white sand, is dissolved in an electrolytic bath of molten cryolite, in an electric "pot" or furnace. By passing an electric current through the bath, the oxygen is separated from the alumina and pure aluminum collects in liquid form in the bottom of the furnace. It is siphoned off at regular intervals and poured into pigs of pure aluminum.

This virgin aluminum is the raw material for the fourth stage of the industry, which consists of converting the pig metal into many different alloys and shapes. Rolling mills roll it into thin strips or sheets; extrusion mills force it through dies into the form of rods, bars, channels, and tubes; forging plants shape it into airplane propellers and many other forms; foundries cast it into a multitude of designs for the industrial market.

Finally, in the fifth stage of the industry, aluminum is made into pots and pans, airplanes, automobiles, washing machines, and thousands of other consumer products.

Two problems or groups of problems face the new aluminum industry of the Pacific Northwest. The first is the disposition of the Defense Plant Corporation plants by the Government. Will these plants be sold or leased, closed down, or dismantled? The second question facing the industrial leaders of the region is: Can an integrated aluminum industry be established? What is the prospect for a plant to refine bauxite from the South Pacific? At present, alumina comes from southeastern United States and bears a heavy freight burden of $8 to $11 per ton. Can the inland Spokane plants be kept in operation after the war, especially the great modern rolling mill? Can additional fabricating plants and consumer industries be established?

The only answer that can be given to these questions now is to point out two cogent facts. First is that the post-war market outlook for aluminum in the United States is very strong. If the price for virgin aluminum can be cut below its present level of 15 cents a pound to 13 cents, it is estimated that over a billion pounds a year of new metal will be used by the fifth year after the war. At 10 cents an even greater demand is forecast. In other words, the post-war demand may rise to four or five times the prewar average.

The second fact of significance to the appraisal of the future of Pacific Northwest aluminum is the potential competitive strength of these new plants. The Spokane reduction plant has been one of the lowest cost producers in America during the war. Low-cost power and efficient operation growing out of superior management and the large capacity have contributed to this fact. Also, the uniform price for alumina has helped.

After the war, all of the Pacific Northwest plants, with the possible exception of the small one at Tacoma, should have very low costs as soon as an alumina plant using South Pacific bauxite is built in the region, preferably near the center of production on the lower Columbia River. In addition to the advantages of new, modern plants, low-cost power, and, for the tidewater plants, proximity by cheap transport to raw materials and markets, labor efficiency has been high. Despite higher wage rates, labor costs per pound of aluminum in Pacific Northwest Defense Plant Corporation plants now average 13 percent under the national average and 30 percent under the highest cost plant. As a consequence, aluminum, particularly from Pacific Northwest tidewater plants, can be made and delivered to eastern and foreign markets cheaper than elsewhere in the United States and possibly on a competitive level with the great Shipshaw project in Canada.

In a word, the war has given a potential new industry to the Pacific Northwest that 20 years of peace might not have built. Here is an opportunity made to order which needs only to be recognized and improved.

F. E. P. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Dallas News on February 19, 1945:

F. E. P. C. BILL

It is granted that there is a good deal of unfair discrimination against the Negro and some other racial groups in this country. It should be eliminated, of course. It can be eliminated by law in political matters and should be. And there is no need of new laws, but only that the present provisions of the statutes and the Constitution be enforced. If the Southern States are wise they will beat Congress and the Supreme Court to the draw in seeing that justice is done.

But what some people seem not to understand is that you cannot go into the individual lives of people in economic and social matters to force adjustments such as those aimed at in the new bill to make the Fair Employment Practice Committee a permanent Government agency. We have had one grand, so-called noble experiment of this kind in the past. The prohibition-by-law prohibitionists argued perfectly truthfully that there were millions of people harming their health with drink, and not only harming their health but neglecting their wives and children in the homes, endangering the lives of the public while driving on the highways and, in many other ways, commiting social error. But the American people stood pat on the constitutional guarantee that the individual has a right to eat and drink what he pleases, on the further sound theory that individual responsibility cannot be assumed by the Government in such matters.

The same applies to the matter of racial discrimination in individual economic and social affairs. Any fair-minded American would grant the Negro his full political rights. At the same time, he would grant the employer the right to employ only white stenographers if he pleases and the labor union to admit only white members if it pleases. And the Government ukase that sets up a formula under which the employer must employ, or the union must admit, one fourth or one fifth of its personnel from the Negro race is not going to work any more than prohibition worked.

Representative FISHER, of San Angelo, is right in saying that it is pressure group and class legislation of the rankest kind, and that it will result only in increasing racial prejudice. Mr. FISHER calls attention to "the system of force and compulsion centered in Washington * * * of roving one-man kangaroo courts almost unlimited in power" to be set up to enforce the proposed F. E. P. C. regulations. This reminds one of the fantastically drastic measures adopted to enforce prohibition. It did not work, and it will not work. Prohibition by law set temperance back a generation in this country. Passage of the F. E. P. C. bill would do the same thing in the matter of racial relationships.

A New Mitchell Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. HENRY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Waukesha Daily Freeman, Waukesha, Wis., on February 21, 1945:

A NEW MITCHELL RESOLUTION

United States Senator ALEX WILEY paid deserving tribute this week on the floor of the Senate to William L. "Billy" Mitchell on the day—February 19—which marked the ninth anniversary of his death. WILEY has worked untiringly to posthumously restore the rank of brigadier general to Mitchell and we compliment him for it. Never was an American officer treated as badly and for less reason than was General Mitchell and while Congress can never undo the injustice imposed upon Wisconsin's greatest officer and one of the most outstanding military men the Nation

ever had, it can belatedly erase the error his muddle-headed gold-braid superiors made when they court martialed him, deprived him of his rank and made him forfeit all pay and allowances for 5 years and virtually forced his retirement on February 1, 1926.

General Mitchell is a legend and his utterances of as long as 20 years ago are as though he were talking from his grave in Milwaukee. In 1925 he said:

"An air force could reduce our Pacific islands easily and we couldn't defend them with our present armament. Why, conditions are so bad out there that when I was in Hawaii last October and November I found the commanding general wouldn't speak to the commanding admiral and they wouldn't even go to the same social functions together."

That is how Billy Mitchell described Pearl Harbor when he testified before a congressional committee 20 years ago in February 1925. He might just as well have said it on December 6, 1941, the day before Pearl Harbor.

Here is Billy Mitchell calling America to arms in June 1932:

"In case war occurred with Japan what would Japan do? Would she sit still and await the gathering of our resources for a blow at her or would she try a surprise attack? * * * Japan is much more vulnerable than the United States and we could attack her directly from Alaska; but if we do not organize our Air Forces to do so, in case of trouble Japan will have the jump on us and could pull off the greatest military surprise in history. The American people must not think that the Japanese are afraid to do it when they get ready. They are a bold, sagacious, and intelligent people. The American people must not sit back and listen to the doctrines of the mossbacks of a bygone age in the Army and Navy."

Congress now has a new opportunity to write the final chapter in the epic of this great man by adopting the Wiley resolution to restore Mitchell's rank. With gentle and reverent hands Congress can take down from the cross on which he has hung for 20 years the spirit of Wisconsin's outstanding son, the courageous William L. Mitchell.

Foreign Borrowers Control the Fund Under the Bretton Woods Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

THE BRETTON WOODS PROPOSAL

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, as part of a broad program to launch this country on vast foreign loans and investments, the administration has recently introduced the bill H. R. 2211, known as the Spence bill. The measure calls for this country to contribute at the outset approximately $6,000,000,000 to a world monetary stabilization fund and a world reconstruction and development bank. Those two unprecedented international bodies, which some have likened to cartels, would proceed to relend our dollars to other members of these financial unions. Both fund and bank would be authorized to borrow in our money markets. Both, moreover, might be increased in size. Our $6,000,000,000 contribution, therefore, would be only our initial commitment. Once Congress agrees to the bill H. R. 2211, the United States will be under an unwritten, but no less real obligation, to see the thing through, however much additional money we are later requested to put up.

Even $6,000,000,000 is a whale of a lot of money in my district. That is $6,000,000,000,000 to be paid out by this country for certain promised benefits, such as that it will mean no more wars. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee encharged with raising revenue no less than as a Member of Congress who must vote on this proposition, I was interested to see how the administration proposes to raise those $6,000,000,000 from the taxpayers. I find that, in the anxiety to get the Bretton Woods program enacted with a minimum of questioning in Congress, they have worked out a method of financing the Bretton Woods program that will bypass not only the Ways and Means Committee, but also the Appropriations Committees of both House and Senate. Evidently, we're not supposed to be too inquisitive about this program. It will be financed partly by inflation—using profits of the 1934 devaluation—and, principally, by increasing the public debt.

The idea behind the Bretton Woods program is that the world will want from us after the war a tremendous lot of goods and services for which the various countries either will not have the means to pay or, as in many instances, possessing gold and United States dollar balances, prefer not to spend them. The taxpayers of other countries naturally will benefit by any scheme of trade which this country will finance. The nature of the proposed world bank as a lending body is obvious. It will be able to make or guarantee loans up to a total of $9,100,000,000. The bank agreement does not say so in words, but it was made clear at Bretton Woods by the Latin-American bloc that this world bank is to lend $50 for development purposes to every $50 it lends for reconstruction. Therefore, the understanding is, members of the bank expect to obtain loans from it as a matter of right. That is a principle which I regard with understandable misgiving.

The proposed stabilization fund would have $8,800,000,000 of miscellaneous paper currencies and gold to play with. We would supply in American dollars $2,750,000,000 of the $8,800,000,000. For an understanding of the fund I turn to articles written by members of the American delegation and staff at Bretton Woods. These statements make perfectly clear that the fund, too, would be a lending institution.

Prof. Mabel Newcomber, a member of our delegation at Bretton Woods, writes:

> Each nation can borrow from this fund to a maximum of its subscribed quota, if necessary.

Mr. Edward E. Brown, another member of our delegation at Bretton Woods, gives this description of the proposed fund's operation:

> Each country receives a right to borrow the currencies of other countries held by the fund up to the amount of its quota, subject to the condition that the money borrowed is for the purposes of the fund, with the proviso that no country shall have the right to borrow more than 25 percent of its quota in any 1 year. When a country borrows it is required to pay a small initial fee and after a certain length of time must pay interest on its borrowings at a rate which increases progressively with the percentage of its quota borrowed and with the length of time the loan is outstanding. The fund agreement, however, does not speak of a country's borrowing or of interest. Instead, it speaks of the fund's acquiring an amount of the currency (meaning thereby a bank deposit in its central bank or else its demand Treasury bills) of a country in excess of its quota and of charges to be paid by a country whose currency is held by the fund in excess of that country's quota.
>
> It is difficult for the average man reading the plan to realize that when the fund acquires currency of a country beyond that country's quota, it is really loaning money to that country, and it is also difficult for the average man to realize that a "charge" paid by that country on such excess is interest on the amount borrowed.

Dr. E. A. Goldenweiser and Miss Alice Bourneuf, of the Federal Reserve Board staff, who were on the staff of our delegation at the Bretton Woods Conference, in their article in the official bulletin of the Federal Reserve Board, write:

> It is important to an understanding of the fund's operations to recognize that a country's currency, as such, is good only in the issuing country, and that when it acquires foreign currencies from the fund and pays from them in its own currency, it, in effect, borrows these foreign currencies and gives the fund, in exchange, demand obligations which constitute a claim on its goods and services. * * * The transaction has elements of a loan by the fund to the country which purchases exchange from it, notwithstanding the fact that the currency paid into the fund for the foreign exchange is money in its own country.

The bankers who have studied the proposed fund naturally come to the same conclusion. They ought to know a lending institution when they see one. Three leading bankers associations in a report published February 5 state, concerning the fund, that it "introduces a method of lending which is novel and contrary to accepted credit principles. Under the system of quotas in the fund, a member country would be virtually entitled to borrow in certain specified annual amounts."

The report of the New York State Bankers Association, "Bretton Woods Proposals," makes it clear enough for a grade school pupil to understand that the proposed monetary found would make loans.

What shall we say, then, of the statement broadcast to the Nation by Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., from St. Louis on February 14, 1945, which reads:

> Now let me make this clear—the Fund is not a scheme for lending money to debtor nations—and those who see it in that light are missing its entire meaning.

The Secretary of the Treasury was party to the long negotiations with the British concerning his own credit plan and that of Lord Keynes, who advocates world-wide pump priming with American dollars. The Treasury itself reports that "3 years of study" have gone into the Bretton Woods proposals. Mr. Morgenthau himself headed the United States delegation to Bretton Woods and served as president of the conference. Yet he either does not know that the Bretton Woods fund is a scheme for lending American dollars to debtor nations, or he does not want the American people to know it. That is the only interpretation I can make of the statement which he broadcast to the nation from St. Louis and gave out to the newspapers.

I think this Bretton Woods scheme should have the most careful examination by Congress and the public before we take the Treasury's word for what it is.

I am including an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune under date of February 23, 1945:

THE "POLL OF ECONOMISTS"

Commenting upon the changes proposed in the so-called Bretton Woods program the other day, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr. compared the situation with that of the League of Nations, which, he recalled, was defeated by loading it down with amendments.

We venture to predict that if the Bretton Woods program dies, it will have died not at the hands of its enemies, but at the hands of its overzealous sponsors. The high-handed tactics of these latter, their intolerance of criticism and devious strategy could hardly be better calculated to alienate the support of disinterested observers who, though in sympathy with the objectives sought, believe that they have not only a right but a duty to insist upon a thorough airing of the several mechanisms that have been proposed.

The latest example of the kind of misleading propaganda tha has been employed from the outset to create favorable sentiment for the White-Keynes plan is the announcement of the formation of a committee of economists set up within the American Economic Association and a poll conducted of the association's membership purporting to show an overwhelming majority of those canvassed in favor of the Treasury program. While a careful reading of the official release shows that it does not say precisely this, the statement is so worded as to create the impression that 90 percent of those canvassed favor the plan as it now stands.

Actually, only half those polled replied, and it is a fair presumption that most of those who did not return their ballots were out of sympathy with the declaration. But one need not go further than the list of 33 "distinguished economists" who constitute the Committee for Bretton Woods to appreciate the lack of intellectual honesty in this report. First, while the average reader will get the impression that it is a committee named by the American Economic Association, actually its author is a former member of, and still a consultant to, the Office of Price Administration. But that is only a beginning. While its 33 members are identified in the press release by their universities, a check-up reveals that 18 of them, or 54 percent, either are or have been associated with the New Deal administration. Here is the way that a forthright identification of these 18 would read:

James W. Angell, Foreign Economic Administration; also technical adviser to the Bretton Woods delegation.

John D. Black, consultant to Department of Agriculture.

J. M. Clark, Office of Price Administration.

Howard S. Ellis, Department of Research, Federal Reserve Board.

Paul T. Ellsworth, Treasury Department.

J. K. Galbraith, Lend-Lease Administration; formerly with Office of Price Administration.

Seymour E. Harris, Office of Price Administration.

William Haber, War Manpower Commission.

G. Haberler, Federal Reserve Board.

Wassily Leontief, Department of Labor.

Fritz Machlup, Alien Property Custodian.

Edward S. Mason, State Department formerly with the Office of Strategic Services.

Mabel Newcomer, delegate to Bretton Woods.

Paul M. O'Leary, Office of Price Administration.

Winfield Riefler, formerly Minister to England; earlier, with Federal Reserve Board.

Arthur Smithies, Bureau of the Budget, Bretton Woods secretariat.

Jacob Viner, Treasury adviser.

Clair Wilcox, Office of Price Administration.

Analysis of the remaining 15 names, moreover, shows that not more than half a dozen of them at the most can be regarded as specialists in the highly technical subject of foreign exchange. In short, this so-called "poll of expert opinion" is misleading from beginning to end, and it seems to us that the American Economic Association has just grounds for complaint that its name has been used for propaganda purposes.

Supplies and Munitions for Our Fighters—Comparison of May Bill, As It Passed the House, With the Proposed Senate Substitute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion concerning the May bill which passed the House by a substantial majority. I worked and voted for the bill because I felt it was the most practical and sensible means to give proper support to our fighters by assuring them adequate supplies of everything they needed at the time and place that these things were needed.

Recently there appeared an editorial in the Washington Star in which a substitute bill for the May bill was analyzed. By unanimous consent, I insert the editorial in the RECORD for the information of Members. It reads as follows:

A DISMAL SPECTACLE

Many members of the Senate Military Affairs Committee probably would be the first to agree that the work bill reported to the Senate yesterday, after 3 weeks of consideration, is neither fish nor fowl nor good red herring and that the committee has fallen down miserably in its attempt to deal effectively with a serious national emergency.

That is a disappointment, not merely because of the confused mess which is left to be unscrambled in Senate debate but because of the spectacle of indecision and refusal to face the issues which the committee has placed before the country. There is dismal contrast between such conduct on Capitol Hill and that of the splendid young men marching bravely to their death in Germany and in the Pacific.

What is the essential difference between the May bill, passed by a courageous combination of Republicans and Democrats in the House, and the version of that measure reported to the Senate?

Under the House bill a man holding an essential war job may be ordered by his local draft board to stay there; should his draft board decide that he can be used more effectively somewhere else, he must go there and serve.

Under the Senate bill the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, acting under the War Mobilization Director, may set a maximum on the number of workers in any plant or area, fixing that maximum in terms of age, sex, or occupation of employees. He could forbid or regulate hiring new employees. The workers discharged in order to keep below the employment ceilings must find war jobs, remain unemployed or starve. Deferred farm workers who leave the farm are subject to fine and imprisonment. Employers (and perhaps employees—there is disagreement among the lawyers) who violate War Manpower Commission rules are subject to fine and imprisonment.

The ostensible philosophy of the Senate bill in to follow a voluntary instead of compulsory method of meeting manpower needs. But the Senate bill is not voluntary. It is more obnoxiously compulsory, because its compulsion is gained through indirection and subterfuge, than the House bill. It walks up to and then backs away from the sound principle that in total war the citizen must serve where he is most needed, on the bloody island of Iwo or in a foundry or a shipyard, at time-and-a-half for overtime.

As a practical method of meeting the manpower shortage, the Senate bill probably would fail. Its principles have been tried and they are not satisfactory. They are not working in New Bedford, where labor spokesmen have tried fruitlessly but furiously to get the courts to intervene. They did not work in Allentown. The Senate bill is a half-hearted, spineless, short-sighted and politically expedient method of meeting a condition which can mean the difference between life or death of men on the fighting fronts. The Senate Military Affairs Committee has gained for itself no glory.

World Shipbuilding Record Here—Richmond Yards Nearing End of New Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to direct the attention of the Members of the House to one of the outstanding jobs of production that has been done in a country that has shown the world the meaning of production. The job of building ships done by the

Kaiser interests at Richmond, Calif., is phenomenal.

Here intelligent management recognized that to do the job with efficiency there must be teamwork between labor and management. It proceeded to establish the basis for that team work and as a result established a record in shipbuilding that will long stand.

This is better recorded in an article appearing in the Richmond Independent that I ask leave to present.

WORLD SHIPBUILDING RECORD HERE—RICHMOND YARDS NEARING END OF NEW PRODUCTION

When the last ship under existing contracts has been launched at the Richmond shipyards a world's record of construction that will probably stand forever will have been hung up by the Kaiser company and its thousands of workers.

Starting from scratch on January 14, 1941, when the huge area now filled by the 4 shipyards and a prefabrication plant was only a mud flat, the local yards have launched and delivered 638 vessels, have launched an additional 22 which have yet to be delivered, and are working on the final 87 of a 747-vessel contract.

And the ships built here have ranged in size and tonnage from the little coastal cargoes at yard 4 to the giant troop transports now building at yard 3.

Never in the history of shipbuilding anywhere in the world has such huge tonnage of ships been constructed, launched, and commissioned as fast as they were at Richmond.

In a little over 4 years workers at the Kaiser yards have continually hammered down the man-hours it required to construct the cargo ships, first the 30 V fleet built for the British at yard 1, then the 489 Liberties at both yards 1 and 2, then the Victory ships also built at yards 1 and 2, and the transports, the frigates, the coastal cargoes, and the Navy attack transports.

In 1941 it required 1,165,000 man-hours for the construction of the old Libertys. Before the contract was completed the average was smashed down to 330,000 man-hours.

The fastest production on a Liberty ship ever attained anywhere in the Nation was the record at yard 2, when the *Robert Perry* was launched 4½ days after the keel was laid and commissioned in 7 days. Oregon shipbuilding had previously claimed the record of 10 days. The best eastern yard was 28 days to launching and 70 days to commissioning.

Since the construction of ships was started in 1941, with *Vanguard* hitting the waters of the channel August 16 of that year for the first launching, the local yards have turned out the following ships: 30 British cargo; 43 Victorys; 489 Libertys; 15 landing ships, tanks; 12 frigates; 19 C–4, 18,500-ton troop transports; 22 AP–5 Navy attack transports; 8 coast cargoes.

Remaining to be delivered are:

Yard 1: 23 Victorys.

Yard 2: 54 Victorys.

Yard 3: 16 C–4's.

Yard 4: 16 C–1 coastal cargoes.

This totals 109 ships to be turned over to the Government, but of this total 22 already have been launched and are being outfitted or awaiting acceptance by the Maritime Commission or the Navy.

In paying tribute to the record established here, Kaiser officials said that the speed in construction of ships was due to:

1. Sufficient labor.

2. Sufficient acreage to allow for prefabrication and the use of 140 acres for storage space.

3. Efficient management.

4. Cooperation between labor and management. Yard 2 holds the national record in man-hours saved through labor-saving suggestions. Other yards here are close to the record.

The Bretton Woods Monetary Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a summary report on the Bretton Woods Conference, prepared by George H. E. Smith, research assistant to the minority leader. I am sure the report will be of interest to all Members of the Senate. While it is somewhat lengthy, I believe it to be worth the cost of printing, which, as estimated by the Public Printer, is $426.40.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY REPORT ON BRETTON WOODS MONETARY CONFERENCE

(By George H. E. Smith, research assistant to the minority leader)

SOME ASPECTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS MONETARY AND FINANCIAL CONFERENCE AT BRETTON WOODS

After more than a year of spadework by experts, the delegates of 44 nations met in an International Monetary Conference at Bretton Woods, July 1–22, 1944, and produced two proposed agreements, as follows:

1. Plan for an International Monetary Fund.

2. Plan for an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

These proposals were cast in the form of agreements open for signature by the nations participating in the conference. In passing upon the final agreements, many of the delegates entered reservations in the official minutes of the conference. This, and the debatable character of the proposed plans, points to the conclusion that not all countries will sign the agreements in their present form. Certainly Congress will insist upon a thorough study of the proposals, and it will be surprising if the present plans are approved without change.

In these circumstances the following is an attempt to present the problems involved in summary, digest form. In order to be brief, many matters have been taken for granted without discussion, and extreme technical detail cannot be offered. More comprehensive information is available, however, on special request.

While the problems arise in a world setting, they are also of vital concern to each individual nation. The focal point of the present offering is the interest of the United States in financial aspects of world economy.

International economic relations between two world wars

Every country is profoundly affected by the World War. The internal economy of every nation, neutral and belligerent, has been radically altered. The character of exports and imports has been changed. Normal trade channels have been disorganized, and new ones have been cut throughout the globe. The same confusion is true of international shipping, freight, and insurance services; of international travel, personal remittances, dividend and interest payments, intergovernmental dealings, and of all other transaction which enter into the balance of payments of one nation with all other nations.

International settlements—through the bill or exchange market, through gold transactions, and through the movement of short and long-term capital—have been interrupted and distorted by the war.

Finally, the net affect of all these conditions has drastically altered monetary exchange rates—the relation of the currency of one country to that of other countries.

In the years between the two world wars, international economic relations were grossly distorted by reparations, interallied debts, indiscriminate American foreign lending, tariffs and other foreign trade controls, currency depreciation, and fluctuating exchanges. These conditions and the concurrence in 1929 of a downswing in the business cycle led finally to the complete collapse of the gold-exchange system. Thereafter, economic warfare was intensified and contributed to the political upheavals that finally ended in the Second World War.

The job ahead

During the present war, lend-lease and other devices have taken the place of normal arrangements in international economic relations. As the war draws to a close, and immediately thereafter, new arrangements will have to be made to meet the following problems:

1. Reestablish and adjust the exchange rates between countries (stabilization).

2. Restore the internal economy of nations which have been disorganized by war.

3. Reestablish trade relations between nations, and encourage total trade expansion.

4. Encourage economic productivity and rising standards of living.

The problems involved in these objects fall generally into two broad classes: (1) Those dealing mainly with current transactions; and (2) those concerning long-term capital operations. The problems in each class are different and require special methods of treatment, but there is always a close relation between them.

The International Monetary Fund deals chiefly with current transactions; that is, from year to year. The International Bank also deals with current matters, such as reconstruction, but in the main its major utility looks toward long-term economic developments.

Part I. International Monetary Fund

The fund is an international agency—something like an international corporation with nations as members—having general and specific powers affecting international monetary conditions. It creates a pool of gold and foreign currencies as one of the main devices for carrying out the following purposes:

1. Assist in stabilizing exchange rates.

2. Provide a multilateral system for international payments in current transactions.

3. Assist in maintaining equilibrium in the international balance of payments of all members.

4. To provide for monetary cooperation.

5. To facilitate expansion and balanced growth of international trade.

The fund would work something like this: Nations would trade and conduct other economic transactions through normal channels. Exporters and importers would deal with each other as usual. Familiar exchange markets would resume operation. The banking systems of all countries would perform their usual functions with respect to international transactions. All these operations would be influenced, of course, by many operations and regulations set in motion by the fund.

But the fund would come into operation chiefly as a last resort in maintaining equilibrium in the exchanges and in international economic transactions. Managed fund operations would serve as a balancing factor. This is not exactly a dual monetary system, but there are many features in the fund plan that may lead to that result.

The questions most likely to be of interest to Congress center around the following topics:

1. Quotas and subscriptions to the fund.
2. Monetary exchange adjustments:
(a) Gold transactions.
(b) Par value of currencies.
(c) Foreign exchange dealings.
3. Transactions with the fund.
4. Scarce currencies.
5. Management of the fund and voting rights.
6. Relation of the fund to international economic relations.
7. Alternatives offered.
8. Miscellaneous observations.

1. Quotas and subscriptions to the fund

The initial fund or pool is $8,800,000,000, with quotas as shown in chart I. Quotas may be adjusted from time to time but only on four-fifth majority vote and with the consent of the member concerned.

The fund consists of gold and national currencies, but may also include member securities, nonnegotiable, noninterest bearing, and payable on demand. Members contribute only 25 percent gold, or 10 percent of their net gold holdings and United States dollars, whichever is smaller; but even this provision may be waived in favor of currencies or securities. These provisions, combined with those which allow a member to borrow other currencies at least as high as 200 percent of its quota (100 percent over quotas is the effective amount), mean that the amount of gold is likely to be very small compared to the volume of member paper.

The size of the quota not only determines what a nation puts into the fund, but, more important, what it may take out in the form of international purchasing power. Members have the right to purchase (borrow) other currencies with their own. This makes the fund a lending agency with considerable possibilities of expansion (see below).

What is the position of the United States in these circumstances? In effect, the United States quota would be the soundest contribution to the fund. It consists of gold and dollar currency readily convertible to gold, goods, or services, making the United States quota full and unlimited means of international purchasing power. The situation is almost, but not quite, the same for Great Britain and Russia. In this respect, the currencies of other nations would be graduated downward in value, depending upon a number of factors, until some currencies would merely represent printing-press money.

The United States would take very little out of the fund simply because there would be no occasion for it. The United States has large gold stocks; it would have a large export volume. These and other items in the United States balance would enable the United States to pay for all its own imports and other needs without recourse to the fund. The effect is to make the United States an international lender through the fund to the extent of its quota and beyond its quota in some cases. What is more, by the mechanics of the plan, the United States agrees in advance to lend to forty or more countries a fixed amount of dollars with precarious possibilities of repayment.

A similar situation would be true of other persistent creditor countries. Two explanations are most frequently given in answer to this feature of the plan. One is that the plan is intended to add a new means of international payment to the stock of gold and to all normally acceptable means of payment. An important feature of the plan is its expansionist provisions which are held to be necessary if economic progress (capacity production, full employment, and increased foreign trade) is to be made. In other words, this is the thesis that if the United States wishes to have prosperity at home, it must be prepared to lend abroad, or to open its doors to much larger imports. The second explanation is that loans to debtor countries are intended to be temporary—only to make up a deficiency in their balances until more fundamental measures can be devised. This would make for stability in international exchange and prevent resort to exchange, trade, and other controls which would again disrupt international economic relations.

2. Monetary exchange adjustments

(a) Gold transactions: The fund will prescribe the gold points (par value with plus or minus margins) at which member gold purchases or sales may be made. Members desiring to buy the currency of another member for gold shall do so through the fund, if they can do so with equal advantage. Newly mined gold may be sold in any market.

This is one point at which a dual monetary system may arise. These provisions may have the curious effect of causing a gold-goods group of transactions to compete with and perhaps undermine par values of currencies—exchange competition by another device—something like a black market in international purchasing power. It is also likely to result in channeling considerable unwanted gold into a creditor country like the United States.

(b) Par values of member currencies: The par value of members' currencies shall be expressed in gold or in terms of the United States dollar (weight and fineness, July 1, 1944).

Rates of exchange prevailing on the sixtieth day before the entry into force of the agreement shall be the par value of each member's currency. Where the rate is unknown (as in enemy-occupied areas) or unsatisfactory to the members or to the fund, adjustments for a different rate may be made between the members and the fund.

Provisions are made for changes in par values of member currencies to correct a fundamental disequilibrium. Where international transactions are not affected, or where the cumulative changes do not exceed 10 percent of the initial par value, the proposed change may be made without objection. In all other cases, limits are placed upon the freedom of a member to change the par values of its currency without concurrence of the fund. Unauthorized changes may result in denying the use of fund resources to the member or compel the member to withdraw from the fund altogether.

Uniform proportionate changes in par values of the currencies of all members may be made on approval of every member having 10 percent or more of the total of the quotas; but no par value can be altered over a member's objection expressed within 72 hours of the fund's action.

There is enough in these provisions to give a member considerable leeway in setting its own exchange values on an arbitrary basis. When taken against the background of the plan as a whole, these provisions point toward periodic exchange depreciation. This, and the fact that some currencies would have exceptionally sound support while others may be no more than printing paper, has called forth the objection that good currencies might be pulled down to the bad. Such criticism is hardly intelligent. So long as they have gold and exportable goods, the countries with the good currencies are not going to default on redemption.

What is more likely to happen is that the fund will increasingly lose dollars and other strong currencies and acquire weak currencies. Its assets may progressively deteriorate. Drastic controls may have to be set up in order to appreciate the weak currencies. Failing that, the fund must then either accept the insolvency of its collection of weak currencies, or permit periodic currency depreciation. This would place the creditor countries in the position of lenders who periodically permit partial cancelation of the debt.

The chief counter-argument to this is that by such a device creditors are able to keep export industries flourishing as one means of maintaining full employment at home. No export (creditor) country would persistently and frankly give away the goods produced by its people; but it may be persuaded to do the same thing if a psychologically acceptable mechanism like the fund is used for that purpose. The only other solution for the United States is to increase greatly the distribution of goods at home, among its own people, and then work toward methods that will balance its exportable surplus by imports or other credits beneficial to the American people.

Internationally, the remedy suggested is outright gifts to help start the weakest countries, productive type loans through the International Bank, and carefully planned stabilization loans of modest amount only to those countries in obvious need of them, instead of blanket credits through the fund to all countries.

(c) Foreign exchange dealings: Foreign exchange dealings within member territories shall be based on margins acceptable to the fund except that spot exchange transactions shall not differ from parity by more than 1 percent.

In exchange dealings, as in gold transactions, another market outside of the fund is contemplated. The fund enjoins countries to control exchange operations within acceptable margins. This implies indefinite exchange control—something that was intended to be abolished by the fund. Exchange controls are almost certain to imply government planned trade and other transactions as countries seek to keep within prescribed margins. Advocates of the fund do not say this, but it seems to be the inevitable consequence.

3. Transactions with the fund

Members deal with the fund only through official agencies—no private fiscal transactions contemplated.

The chief feature of the fund appears to be its provisions for making international purchasing power available to members.

When countries run low in their balances of payments (owe on balance more than they have available credits to discharge) or find themselves in exchange difficulties, they may purchase (in effect borrow) the currency of any other nation with their own currency or securities.

Does this power to borrow, together with discretion in the fund under article V, section 4 to waive borrowing limits, give a debtor country unlimited credit? Can a member, as has been charged, just put in enough gold to cover service charges, and then extend its debits indefinitely?

Several limitations restrict a member in this operation as follows:

(1) The outside limit in any 12-month period is 25 percent of its quota.

(2) The maximum (over all) shall not exceed 200 percent of its quota.

(3) A flat service charge of ¾ percent (which the fund may decrease to ½ or increase to 1 percent) shall be payable by the member purchasing (borrowing) the currencies of other members.

(4) Further (interest) charges graduated in brackets according to the amount of currency purchased in excess of quota and according to the time so held, until the ultimate charge reaches 4 percent whereupon the fund and the member shall consult. Thereafter, further borrowing up to a 5-percent charge is permissible whereupon the fund may impose other charges. Charges are payable in gold, but in certain circumstances may be payable in member currency.

(5) Members must be eligible to use resources of the fund (in good standing relative to the rules and operations of the fund).

(6) The currency to be purchased (borrowed) has not been declared scarce.

The fund seeks to keep members as nearly as possible in their initial relation to the fund and to prevent excesses either above or below the quotas plus permissible margins. The plan contains provisions for adjustments working toward that end.

Among the more important of these are the repurchase provisions (art. V, sec. 7, and schedule B) intended to keep a reasonable balance between the supply of key currencies and the demand for them by other countries utilizing their borrowing capacity as set by the quotas. These repurchase provisions and other provisions (such as interest charges on borrowed currencies) attracting gold to the fund are intended to work in two directions: (1) Replenish the fund's supply of key currencies; and (2) reduce the fund's holdings of excess domestic (multiple) currencies for which there is obviously no demand. How effective these provisions will be depends to a large extent on the amount of gold and convertible foreign currencies a heavy debtor to the fund may acquire in transactions outside the fund. But how, if the fund is to correct a debit position of a country arising from that country's transactions outside the fund, can that country have any credit resources with which to redeem its excess currencies in the fund? This is not made clear.

It is the intention of the fund, of course, not to permit debtor countries to borrow indefinitely; and creditor countries will be persuaded to alter such economic conditions as may be responsible for the excessive demand for their currencies.

The power to buy (borrow) member currencies is one of the most controversial features of the plan.

Objection is made that this turns the fund away from its stabilizing function and makes it another lending institution; and that the international bank is a better device for such purposes.

In answer it is declared that the lending is temporary only; that it is controlled; and that it is for stabilizing purposes.

Moreover, it is said, that the United States will give credit to importing countries anyway. If it does not, its export markets will be limited to the value of its imports. Export industries will be disorganized, commercial export houses will be affected, and the effort toward full employment at home will be endangered. Importing countries, on the other hand, will seek credits, or else will resort to internal deflation, currency depreciation, and trade controls. Such measures will once more confuse and restrict foreign trade to the disadvantage of all nations.

The United States, runs another objection, will supply gold, goods, and dollars, and in return accumulate irredeemable paper. This could happen to the extent of the United States quota obligations. In certain circumstances the United States might provide credits considerably beyond its quota. But conditions are not likely to be as bad as that. Foreigners are apt to be wary of United States credits after experiences of the 1920's when American credits first produced a boom and then a collapse when credits ceased.

It is pointed out that the fund increases the probability that repayments of credit will be made because the United States has resort to a pool created by many governments. The United States could increase its imports from any part of the world and would not have to look to one debtor country alone. To benefit by this, however, it would seem that the United States would have to enter upon a very large import trade (and greatly increase its other debit items in the balance) because its nomal tansactions furnish a heavy creditor balance wholly aside from the fund. In other words, the United States would have to increase its imports sufficiently to offset its regular exports and its quota position in the fund

4. Scarce currencies

It is quite possible that the fund may run short of a particular member's currency from time to time. This would create a scarce currency situation. In such cases:

(1) The fund reports the fact, states the causes and makes recommendations for correction, with the scarce-currency member participating.

(2) The fund may replenish the scarce currency by loans from the member or from other sources, but the member is under no obligation to lend currency or approve other borrowings.

(3) The fund may require the member to sell its currency for gold.

(4) The fund shall ration its supply of scarce currency.

(5) When a currency is declared scarce, and after consultation with the fund, a member may impose temporary limitations on exchange operations in the scarce currency.

What position will the United States be in here? It is quite probable that shortly after the fund is in operation, United States currency will become a scarce currency.. The reason is that the dollar will be one of the principal means of international payment, owing to American resources and gold holdings. The large demand for American goods will also work toward the direct exhaustion of dollars in the fund.

In such circumstances the United States would be under several disadvantages. It might have to sell more of its currency to the fund for gold. This would channel gold into the United States where it is not needed or wanted while useful resources and produced goods would continue to flow out of the country. Otherwise, the United States would have to accept restrictions on trading in dollar exchange. This would sacrifice American foreign markets, cut down the volume of foreign trade, and result in unemployment in the export industries.

In cases of scarce currency, the fund has the power to ration the supply. This may easily put it in the power of an outside agency to decide what particular foreign markets the United States should have.

To avoid such difficulties the United States might either have to sell dollars for gold without benefit as above described, or lend dollars to the fund in hopes of working off the excess credits over longer periods of time. If no methods were discovered for doing this, the United States would again be in the position of a creditor who cannot collect. This was the case with reparations, with American loans to Germany, with many American loans to Latin America, and will be the real effect with a great part of the lend-lease transactions.

5. Management of the fund and voting rights

The fund is to have a status and organization very much like a corporation in the international sphere. The fund and its officials are to have certain specified privileges and immunities (including certain exemptions from taxation).

Elaborate arrangements provide for the election or appointment (as the case may be) of a board of governors, a body of executive directors, a managing director, and a staff.

(a) Board of governors: Each member of the fund appoints one governor and an alternate to serve for 5 years. The board may delegate any of its powers to the executive directors, except:

(1) Admission of new members.

(2) Revision of quotas.

(3) Uniform changes in par values of member currencies.

(4) Arrangements (other than temporary) with other international organizations.

(5) Distribution of net income of the fund.

(6) Withdrawal of members.

(7) Liquidation of the fund.

(8) Decide appeals on interpretation of this agreement.

The board is to meet annually and on special request. A quorum is a majority of the board exercising not less than two-thirds of total voting power. By board regulations the vote may be had on a question without calling a meeting. Each governor casts the votes allotted to the member appointing him.

(b) Voting: Each member has 250 votes plus one additional vote for each part of its quota equivalent to $100,000. The distribution of voting power is shown in table I. Except as otherwise provided decisions shall be by a majority of the votes cast.

In waivers of conditions on use of the fund's resources and other limitations or ineligibility of members to use fund resources, the vote shall be increased by one vote for each $400,000 net sales of its currency or decreased by one vote for each $400,000 net purchases of the currencies of other members to the date of the vote, provided that neither net sales nor purchases shall be deemed to exceed an amount equal to the quota of the member involved.

TABLE I.—*Voting power, International Monetary Fund (as set forth in Federal Reserve Bulletin, September 1944, table III, p. 862)*

Country	Number of votes	Percent of total votes [1]
Australia	2,250	2.3
Belgium	2,500	2.5
Bolivia	350	.3
Brazil	1,750	1.8
Canada	3,250	3.3
Chile	750	.8
China	5,750	5.8
Colombia	750	.8
Costa Rica	300	.3
Cuba	750	.8
Czechoslovakia	1,500	1.5
Denmark	[2]	[2]
Dominican Republic	300	.3
Ecuador	300	.3
Egypt	700	.7
El Salvador	275	.3
Ethiopia	310	.3
France	4,750	4.8
Greece	650	.6
Guatemala	300	.3
Haiti	300	.3
Honduras	275	.3
Iceland	260	.3
India	4,250	4.3
Iran	500	.5
Iraq	330	.3
Liberia	255	.2
Luxemburg	350	.3
Mexico	1,150	1.2
Netherlands	3,000	3.0
New Zealand	750	.8
Nicaragua	270	.3
Norway	750	.8
Panama	255	.2
Paraguay	270	.3
Peru	500	.5
Philippine Commonwealth	400	.4
Poland	1,500	1.5
Union of South Africa	1,250	1.3
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	12,250	12.4
United Kingdom	13,250	13.4
United States	27,750	28.0
Uruguay	400	.4
Venezuela	400	.4
Yugoslavia	850	.8
Total	99,000	100.0

[1] The percentage of total votes is calculated on the assumption that only those nations represented at the conference will join the fund. As other countries join the fund, each individual country's share of the total votes will decline.

[2] To be determined when the Danish Government has declared its readiness to sign the agreement.

NOTE.—Of the total number of votes, the British Empire controls 25.3 percent, Continental Europe, excluding the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 16 and Latin America 9.7 percent.

(c) Executive directors: Executive directors are responsible for the general operations of the fund and may exercise delegated powers of the board of governors with certain exceptions. There shall not be less than 12 who need not be governors and of whom—

(1) Five shall be appointed by the five members having the largest quotas;

(2) Not more than two shall be appointed in certain circumstances;

(3) Five shall be elected by members not entitled to appoint directors, other than the American republics; and

(4) Two shall be elected by the American republics not entitled to appoint directors.

Elaborate provisions for the election of directors at intervals of 2 years are contained in schedule C.

Executive directors function in continuous session. A quorum shall be a majority of the directors representing not less than half of the voting power.

Appointed directors have the number of votes allotted to the members appointing them. Elected directors have the number of votes counted toward his election. Votes are cast as a unit.

The executive director shall select a managing director, who shall not be a governor or executive director. He shall appoint the staff and conduct the ordinary business of the fund.

(d) Offices and depositories: The principal office of the fund shall be located in the territory of the member having the largest quota (the United States at the start), with agencies or branches elsewhere as the fund determines.

Each member may designate its central bank or other accepted institution as depository for the fund's holdings of its currency.

Other assets of the fund, including gold, shall be held in depositories designated by the five members having the largest quotas, or as the fund may select. Initially, at least one-half of the fund holdings shall be held in the depository designated by the United States and at least 40 percent in depositories designated by the remaining four members. A member guarantees the fund's assets against loss on the part of its designated depository.

(e) Observations on management of the fund: One of the outstanding criticisms of the fund is its overemphasis on machinery. The criticism is justified.

There is no reason, for example, why there should be two directing bodies, such as the board of governors and the executive directors, with vague lines of authority divided between them. A single working executive head would suffice. If it is necessary to have a semipolitical body to supervise the work of the fund, as seems to be the function of the board of governors, it could be done by correlation to a section of the general international organization to be set up by the United Nations. Such a body would include other economic matters, too, and thus avoid an excess of international organizations.

Other parts of the plan for the fund appear to be equally cumbersome. And it should be observed here that the international bank has a similar structure to which the same criticism above applies. Yet it is perfectly understandable that if the plan did not offer these organizational details, it would be criticized for omitting them.

Some critics point out that while the United States puts up a substantial part of the soundest assets of the fund, it will not have a large voice in the management. The aggregate voting power of those who are likely to be debtors to the fund is greater than the creditor voting power. In other words, the fear is that the United States will be outvoted by those nations who will be most interested in voting themselves favors while the United States foots the bill.

Voting rights might be of some consequence if an international agency had the power to make and to enforce a decision detrimental to the United States. This is hardly the case here. The United States is part of the rule-making and enforcing mechanism. Execution of any such decision depends upon the good will and voluntary cooperation of the United States. In the monetary field, few decisions are likely to be made over the protest of the United States even if the American representative holds a minority vote in the international authority. Were the United States to be given a dominant or deciding voice, decisions of the international authority would be widely suspect as the dictation of powerful interests or the unwelcome largess of a rich uncle. In either case, the needed good will and cooperation of small countries may easily be lost. Quibbling over voting rights may be necessary in some matters of international organization, but the fund is not one of them.

Perhaps the strongest criticism that can be made of the fund plan, aside from its cumbersome mechanics, is that its terms are far too flexible—that is, flexible in an undesirable way. The plan is loaded down with so many qualifying, waiver, escape and other provisos attached to its positive statements that the greater part of the fund's operations rest either in the outright discretion of its managers or in powers permitting member nations to nullify their obligations. Flexibility is necessary, of course, but if too many positive commitments can be avoided, the plan has little utility. Why have a plan at all if it is to be filled with escalator clauses? As a matter of fact, the superflexibility of the plan is proof of its novelty. When it is not known for certainty what may transpire or what effects may flow from the experiment, everyone wishes to be safeguarded. This, in effect, is a strong argument for a more modest, simpler and more familiar approach to the whole problem than the fund provides.

6. Relation of the fund to international economic relations

One of the most serious criticisms of the fund is that obsession with technical machinery pushed fundamental matters of international economic policy to the background. Stabilization deals with symptoms while it overlooks the disease. The plan, it is further said, does not strike at the causes of instability.

Exchanges, it is held, will take care of themselves if nations first agree on some principles of sound internal economy. There can be no stability without balanced budgets, sound financial and credit policies, moderate tariffs and agreement on cooperative efforts for better distribution of raw materials, for sound international investment, for expansion of production and trade, and upon other elements of commercial policy. Critics declare that if sound economic policies are followed, no fund will be needed; if they are not followed, the fund would merely produce an artificial stability that will break down.

There is much truth in these views. Sound internal policies and cooperative international economic relations are absolutely essential to stabilization. Delegates to the Monetary Conference recognized the validity of this view. They do not offer monetary stabilization as the main tool of economic progress, but merely as a facilitating means. The fund and the bank, they intimated, are merely parts in a broader program which is to be set in motion as time and occasion permit. Meanwhile, they say, the monetary aspects of international economic relations can be fully discussed and brought to fruition.

Further criticisms hold that the fund actually promotes instability. Its managers are expressly precluded from interference with the internal policies of members. This means that the fund will have little influence over the real causes of instability. The expansionist features of the fund may promote world-wide inflation. And the very thing the fund is supposed to achieve—the abolition of exchange restrictions—is permitted under the fund.

In answer to these criticisms, it can be said that it is not wholly true that the managers of the fund will be unable to influence the internal policies of members. The prime restrictions on the fund are that in publishing reports, making decisions, or taking other actions, it is not to interfere with the economic, political, or social policies of any member. The reason for this is obvious when it is realized that many national economic systems (like Russia and the United States) differ widely. Moreover, in this period when nations are yielding so reluctantly to the need for international action, progress has to be made slowly, if it is to be made at all.

But in many provisions of the plan there are expectations looking toward cooperative action between the fund and its members. Member States have direct representation in the fund management. There are provisions for adjustments in many phases of member economies, for consultations, and for public reports by the fund when undesirable conditions exist. Members expressly agree to cooperate with the fund, to keep the fund informed on a wide variety of national conditions, and to refrain from actions inconsistent with fund operations. In cases of flagrant disregard of the fund's purposes and operations, the fund may declare a member ineligible to use the fund's resources; and may even ask a member to withdraw. Even though lacking arbitrary coercive power, the fund thus has many channels through which to influence the conduct of members. Moreover, the United States and other creditor countries have the power and are almost certain to call a halt to practices abusive of their credit or destructive of the purposes of the fund.

(a) Exchange controls: Exchange restrictions are permitted under the fund for several reasons. They are held necessary in the transition period until experience and adjustment overcome the economic disruption wrought by the war and make international stability possible. Time and interim controls will be needed until national currencies find working levels with each other. Controls will also be needed from time to time when a disequilibrium occurs in the balance of one or more countries. In this case, restrictions will be permitted to avoid break-downs until more fundamental correctives have a chance to work.

(b) The gold standard: It is said that the fund does not adopt the gold standard. This is true; it does not. The plan finds a place for gold, but the emphasis is on a managed system rather than upon the regulation formally exercised by gold.

Gold was not entirely eliminated for several reasons. Traditional thought on the usefulness of gold as a money metal still runs strong. To eliminate gold might produce such a reaction as to endanger the acceptability of the new plan. Equally important is the fact that the United States possesses so large a stock of gold that it would not willingly stand by and see gold reduced from monetary to commercial (commodity) value. A third reason for the retention of gold is that such gold-producing countries as Great Britain, Russia, the United States, and others would be unwilling to give up the extra international purchasing power which gold as a money medium gives them. Another, and by no means unimportant reason, is that gold still possesses utility as a universal currency. In the absence of some internationally acceptable unit of money, gold remains sovereign.

Few countries, it is said, will be willing to accept the severe regulation over their affairs which a rigid gold standard imposes. One of the chief goals of economic life in every country will be full employment, an objective that many economists believe would be hampered by any automatic controls exercised by gold over national monetary affairs.

Through the use of managed currencies the plan of the fund permits discretionary expansion. This need not be undesirable inflation. To some extent the fund looks

toward periodic adjustments through controlled currency depreciation. This, it is believed, provides the flexibility needed to make greater use of international resources and thus contribute toward greater employment in each nation. Currency depreciation, with a multilateral system like the fund, will distribute adjustments (possible losses) over many countries rather than only upon those countries having major dealings with the depreciating country. These losses will undoubtedly be considered the price that has to be paid for more widespread economic progress. Moreover, currency depreciation is probably considered more psychologically acceptable than outright defaults and other devices open to debtors under the gold standard.

(c) Capital transfers: Since it is the function of the fund to deal mainly with the current transactions, members may not use the fund's resources to meet large capital transfers. Controls, at the request of the fund or by members, may be exercised over such transfers provided they are in accord with fund operations.

(d) General obligations of members: In addition to all other obligations,

(1) Members shall not impose restrictions on payments or transfers affecting current transactions without approval of fund.

(2) Exchange contracts in member currency contrary to the exchange controls imposed by the member in accord with this agreement shall be unenforcible. Where consistent with this agreement members may cooperate to make controls more effective.

(3) Members shall not permit discriminatory or multiple currency practices, except as authorized by the fund.

(4) Members shall buy balances of their currencies held by others in certain conditions.

(5) The fund may require members to furnish it with national data and information necessary to the fund's operations.

(6) Members are not to deal with nonmembers in any way contrary to the functions or operations of the fund.

7. Alternatives offered

Many alternatives have been offered to the plans drawn up at Bretton Woods. Space and discretion prevent any complete discussion here, but a few typical and authoritative views follow:

(a) Pre-war gold or gold exchange standards: There are many qualified persons who propose a return to these standards. They point out with considerable force and logic the great utility of gold as a universally acceptable means of payment.[1] The advisability of doing so is highly debatable and the chances for success are questionable. Gold maladjustment has been pronounced ever since 1914.[2] Complete convertibility has become increasingly impracticable. And there is little dispute but that the gold standard collapsed under the pressure of economic distress after 1929. There has been growing objection to the rigidity of the automatic gold standard in any of its pre-war forms. In the face of domestic distress, few countries have been willing to allow external standards to control internal conditions. So much so, in fact, that monetary management gradually came to displace automatic operation. With full employment as a post-war goal in every country, currency and credit management will be even more heavily brought into play.

To these weighty objections to a return to the older forms of the gold standard, there is the very practical one that the United States now holds over 75 percent of the world's gold supply. Insuperable problems present themselves when the distribution of this gold is considered. Gold, it seems, will have to play a part in international monetary stabilization for some time to come, but it is apparent that it will have to be greatly subordinated to managed currency and credit. For more than a generation the world has been groping toward some more workable variant than the old gold standard system. Both the British and American plans (Keynes and White) offered such variants; and the Bretton Woods plan is the outcome.

The main trouble with all these plans is that they place too much emphasis on the monetary aspects of the problem. Machinery and ready cash are not certain guarantors of productive projects wisely planned and soundly executed. Money alone does not affect nature's uneven distribution of wealth, resources, and human energy and talent. These are the things in need of deep thought. Specific methods to make progress in these fields are needed far more than mechanisms for making cash and credit available without assurances that the funds will be wisely employed.

(b) Key currency stabilization: Briefly, this is a proposal to arrange acceptable ratios between those countries whose economic activities are internationally significant or which exert predominant influences in particular trade areas. If this is done, the currencies of all other countries are likely to find their proper relation to the key currencies and also to each other.

The basis of this suggestion, advanced in several quarters and quite strongly by the well-known economist John H. Williams,[3] is that the economic behavior of key countries largely determines conditions in other countries. If stabilization is achieved between the key countries, others will make workable adjustments to them. This approach is held to be more modest and realistic than those plans which introduce novel and dubious changes in traditional economic patterns. Something of the key country principle was tried, with resaonable success, in the Tripartite Agreement of 1936 (United States, Britain, France). There would be nothing basically inconsistent in a proposal to incorporate the key countries principle into the framework of the Bretton Woods proposals; and it may even work toward the simplification of the proposed plan for the fund.

Mr. Williams also suggests that the Bank of International Settlements might easily be adapted to post-war monetary needs without setting up elaborate new machinery. Stabilization and the needs of countries for temporary loans should not be approached in a wholesale manner as the fund does, but with discrimination and modestly. Many countries (such as some neutrals and many of the Latin American nations) have accumulated purchasing power ample to last them for some time. This means that the need for exchange is likely to be specific rather than general. The fund, on the other hand, treats the problem as a general one, thereby going beyond necessity into new and untried territory.

(c) Observations of Charles S. Dewey:[4] Mr. Dewey rejects the Bretton Woods approach as too grandiose and would follow a more modest course by enabling the Export-Import Bank to make carefully considered loans on a 50-50 basis with a foreign government or enterprise needing loans for reconstruction. The Export-Import Bank should be assisted by an advisory board with representatives from Congress, from Government departments, and from a variety of private interests concerned with foreign economic activities. Wherever possible private capital should first be encouraged and assisted in undertaking foreign loans.

By House Joint Resolution 226, introduced by Mr. Dewey February 1, 1944, it is proposed to set up a revolving fund of $500,000,000 as a central reconstruction fund for foreign loans under control of an American advisory board. The purpose of the fund is to enable the United States to participate with other countries on a 50-50 basis in making loans in cash or kind to needy countries for productive operations and to stabilize currency. The bill presupposes U. N. R. R. A. aid for relief and would be devoted mainly to economic reconstruction in foreign countries on a businesslike basis.

(d) The Aldrich proposals:[5] Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the board of the Chase National Bank opposes the Bretton Woods plans as being "unrealistic and unnecessarily complex." They obscure rather than solve the fundamental problems in international economy.

In his substitute, Mr. Aldrich combines several features. He calls for immediate conversations between the United States, the United Kingdom and other members of the British Commonwealth of Nations on problems of tariff barriers, imperial preferences, export subsidies, bulk purchasing and regional currency arrangements. The purpose of such a conference would be to reduce trade barriers, increase trade by reciprocal exchange of real goods and services and provide for a stabilized dollar-pound rate.

If necessary the United States should give Great Britain a grant-in-aid to help stabilize the dollar-pound rate. Other countries should be encouraged to adopt sound internal policies. Many countries will not need aid to adjust to the dollar-pound rate. Those that do can be helped more simply by loans through the Export-Import Bank than through the unrealistic monetary approach of the Bretton Woods plans.

Powers to the Export-Import Bank can also be enlarged to permit it to make longer-term stabilization loans and also loans for reconstruction and development purposes where such loans cannot be obtained privately.

On the initiative of the Federal Reserve banks a simple international institution could be set up where central bankers could meet to consider monetary and credit problems. A modest fund for international lending might be palced at its disposal.

Mr. Aldrich makes a number of recommendations aimed to put the dollar in a better position to function as international currency. He recommends that the debts of World War No. 1 should be canceled; and a liberal settlement made in the lend-lease obligations due to the United States in World War No. 2. The Johnson Act of 1934 (prohibiting foreign countries in default to the

[1] There is the view, for example, of an outstanding expert such as Dr. Benjamin M. Anderson, professor of economics, University of California and member of the executive committee of the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy. His argument in behalf of gold (address before the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, February 3, 1944) is reprinted in hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives (78th Cong., 2d sess.) on House Joint Resolution 226 (April–May 1944), p. 114 ff.

[2] International Currency Experience, Economic, Financial, and Transit Department, League of Nations, Princeton University Press, 1944.

[3] See his book, Post-war Monetary Plans, 1944, and his article, International Monetary Plans, Foreign Affairs, October 1944.

[4] Representative in Congress from Illinois. Formerly associated with the Treasury Department and assigned by the Federal Reserve Board to develop a rehabilitation plan for Poland, 1928–30. His observations on the Bretton Woods proposals are set forth in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 78th Cong., 2d sess., p. 6924 ff. (August 14, 1944).

[5] The New York Times, September 16, 1944.

United States from floating loans in the United States) should be repealed. Also silver legislation, the Thomas amendment of 1933, and sections 8 and 9 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 should be repealed in the interests of sound monetary policies. Other measures necessary to establish the dollar as an international currency are unblocking of dollar assets of foreigners, elimination of exchange controls on the dollar, balancing of the Federal Budget, refinancing of the Federal floating debt, achievement of a high level of national income at home, and avoiding the excesses of domestic boom or depression by sound governmental policies.

Mr. Aldrich's plan seems to incorporate, in part at least, the key country principle, and some of John H. Williams' and Representative Dewey's suggestions. It attacks the weakness of the fund plan by emphasizing the need of creating sound internal economic conditions in each country as a condition precedent to stabilized exchange between countries.

8. Miscellaneous observations

A number of general questions and observations remain for consideration.

(a) Effect on United States of international money management: Although the fund does not mention the matter directly, it is obvious that any managed monetary system requires highly disciplined planning and controls. Could some of these controls be exercised over the United States and would the United States be willing to accept them?

For example, it has been asserted that the fund has power to block United States capital investments in foreign countries by interpretation derived from article I, sections 5–6 and article VI, section 1 (b).[6]

By other provisions, it is held, the fund has the power to compel the United States to buy gold, provide dollars, and thus take in gold and give up useful resources.[7] In certain conditions, the fund may acquire assets (collateral such as goods) which are held not to be taxable and may be disposed in the United States free from American tariff restrictions.[8] Through an anomalous institution, it is said, the United States may have to assist countries whose political policies are undesirable to us.

Again, as in the case of scarce currencies, the fund has the power to apportion the supply. This, it is said, may have the effect of indirectly determining the course of foreign trade conducted by the United States.

To all these and similar criticisms it is possible to say—not that the circumstances described cannot occur, because some of them may—but that if the fund acted flagrantly contrary to America's interests or over the protest of American representatives the fund would defeat its own purposes and probably collapse for want of American support. There is always the risk in a cooperative undertaking that some of the partners may act against the interests of other partners. If this risk were to be considered valid in all conditions no international cooperation would be possible at all. The point to bear constantly in mind is that by the very nature of the fund's operations the United States is a part of the enforcing power. The fund cannot succeed without America's voluntary cooperation. And the United States would not cooperate when the object was to coerce itself. It is more reasonable to take the view that the risk will not materialize because if it does, the whole enterprise will be doomed to the detriment of the very partners who sought to gain undue advantage.

(b) Significance to American foreign trade: If the United States is not to find itself a chronic creditor in the fund with dubious chances for receiving payment, it is obvious that the United States will have to alter its tariffs to permit much larger imports. One of the weaknesses of the fund is that while other countries in paying for United States exports would use the fund supply of dollars, the United States payments for imports would not be replacing these dollars in the fund, unless somehow the United States contrives a large excess of imports.

(c) Transition period: The fund permits members to impose restrictions on payments and transfers for current international transactions during the transition to peace. The war has destroyed all trade and exchange relationships, and it may require a period of trial and adjustment to establish new relationships. Restrictions may be continued for 5 years without compulsion to change, and longer if the fund makes no objection. Where the fund orders an end of restrictions and a member persists in maintaining them the member may become ineligible to use the resources of the fund.

The fund is not to deal with relief, reconstruction or with international indebtedness arising out of the war.[9]

These provisions were added to the final agreement to meet earlier criticisms and in recognition of the fear that insuperable war problems may endanger the success of the stabilization plan. There is considerable question, however, about these provisions. Either they will delay the full operation of the fund for at least 5 years or nations will come in at once and work out their adjustments at the fund's expense. If there is delay, and the United States acquires a large amount of foreign currencies in the interim period, might it not have to keep them indefinitely under the provisions of article VIII, section 4 (b), providing that the obligations of members to buy back their currencies need not operate in certain circumstances?

Nations, on the other hand, may decide to enter the fund at once and work out adjustment as they go along. If the fund is at work in this way during the transition period, it will not always be possible to say that a country's need for fund exchange is or is not caused by relief, reconstruction, or even unsettled war indebtedness. It has always been difficult in practice, for example, to separate capital from current transactions in the exchange market. The fund has no power to interfere in the internal policies of its members.

(d) Source of criticisms of the fund: It should be of interest that a number of large American banks—those most interested in international payments—are decidedly critical of the fund. Is this because of disinterested technical dissatisfaction with the fund plan? Is it because these banks see a transfer of international monetary business to Government and international agencies with a consequent loss of business to the private banks? If the agreement brought these banks more directly into the plan, would it dispose of their objections? The problem here is one that might very well be pressed when Congress conducts hearings on the Bretton Woods proposals.

Part II. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Much less detailed analysis is called for in the case of the bank than of the fund. The purposes and structure of the bank are simple and clear; its proposed methods and operations are familiar from precedents in international lending, and the plan as a whole is cast upon conservative lines.

Close similarity exists between corresponding provisions of the fund and of the bank plan regarding structure and management; location and depositories; international status and privileges; admission, withdrawal, and voting rights of members (table II); distribution of income and assets, and other operating details. Reference should be made to these topics discussed in connection with the fund plan. Particular observations follow.

All members of the bank must also be members of the International Monetary Fund.

Purposes

Stated succinctly, the bank plans to assist its members in capital financing for productive purposes, for restoration of economies disrupted by war, for reconversion, and to encourage economic development in less developed countries. It seeks to encourage private foreign investment by guarantees and participation and to undertake financing when private capital is not available on reasonable terms. By its operations it aims to promote long-range balanced growth of international trade and equilibrium in balances of payments of its members. Loans are to be coordinated with loans through other channels with a view toward dealing first with more useful and urgent projects. All its operations are to be pointed toward the ends of bringing about a smooth transition from war to peace economy, and toward raising productivity, standards of living, and conditions of labor in member territories.

TABLE II.—*Voting power, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (as set forth in Federal Reserve Bulletin, September 1944, table V, p. 869)*

Country	Number of votes	Percent of total votes [1]
Australia	2,250	2.2
Belgium	2,500	2.4
Bolivia	320	.3
Brazil	1,300	1.3
Canada	3,500	3.4
Chile	600	.6
China	6,250	6.1
Colombia	600	.6
Costa Rica	270	.3
Cuba	600	.6
Czechoslovakia	1,500	1.5
Denmark	(2)	(2)
Dominican Republic	270	.3
Ecuador	282	.3
Egypt	650	.6
El Salvador	260	.3
Ethiopia	280	.3
France	4,750	4.6
Greece	500	.5
Guatemala	270	.3
Haiti	270	.3
Honduras	260	.3
Iceland	260	.3
India	4,250	4.2
Iran	490	.5
Iraq	310	.3
Liberia	255	.2
Luxemburg	350	.3
Mexico	900	.9

[1] The percentage of total votes is calculated on assumption that only those nations represented at the conference will join the bank. As other countries join the bank, each individual country's share of the total votes will decline.

[2] To be determined when Danish Government accepts membership.

[6] Statement of Bronson Trevor, The Bretton Woods Program and Its Effect on American Business and Labor, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 78th Cong., 2d sess., p. 6762 ff.

[7] Ibid. The provisions referred to in the fund plan are: Art. IV, sec. 1, par. (a); art. IV, sec. 5, par. (a); and art. VII, sec. 2, par. (2).

[8] Bronson Trevor statement.

[9] The last difficulty centers mainly around the large blocked sterling balances which Great Britain owes India and others. There was objection to working these off through the fund.

TABLE II.—*Voting power, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (as set forth in Federal Reserve Bulletin, September 1944, table V, p. 869)*—Continued

Country	Number of votes	Percent of total votes
Netherlands	3,000	2.9
New Zealand	750	.7
Nicaragua	258	.3
Norway	750	.7
Panama	252	.2
Paraguay	258	.3
Peru	425	.4
Philippine Commonwealth	400	.4
Poland	1,500	1.5
Union of South Africa	1,250	1.2
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	12,250	12.0
United Kingdom	13,250	13.0
United States	32,000	31.4
Uruguay	355	.3
Venezuela	355	.3
Yugoslavia	650	.6
Total	102,000	100.0

NOTE.—Of total number of votes, British Empire controls 24.8 percent, Continental Europe, excluding the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 15.2 percent, and Latin America 7.9 percent.

Capital

Authorized capital is fixed at $10,000,000,000 ($9,100,000,000 initially subscribed), distributed as shown in chart II. Initial payments of each country are set at 20 percent—2 percent in gold (deferred in certain cases) and 18 percent in member currency (or acceptable notes in the bank's discretion). The balance of 80 percent would consist of unpaid subscriptions designed as a surety fund on securities marked by the bank itself or guaranteed by it.

The United States share of the total capital is $3,175,000,000 and its initial payment would be $635,000,000.

Loans

The over-all limit of loans, guaranties, and participations the bank can make is 100 percent of its unimpaired capital, surplus, and reserves. Under carefully guarded conditions the bank "may guarantee, participate in, or make loans to any member, or a political subdivision thereof, and any business, industrial, and agricultural enterprise in the territories of a member."

A competent committee appointed by the bank must recommend the project after careful study. If a member is not itself the borrower, an official guaranty acceptable to the bank will be required. Due regard must be paid to the prospect that the borrower will be in a position to meet the obligation. Loans are to be made chiefly for reconstruction and development.

The bank may raise loans on its own debentures or participate in loans raised in member countries, but only with their approval.

The bank will have some powers of supervision over the expenditure of the loans. The bank cannot require a borrower to spend the proceeds of the loan in any particular country, but in certain cases its shortage of a particular currency may cause a borrower to direct purchases from one country to another.

Several observations have been made on the loan features of the bank. The initial capital is conservative and the limitation on its total lending capacity is wise. Administrative safeguards on the flotation of securities and upon expenditure of funds appear adequate.

The distribution of loans seems to be left to the discretion of the bank. It may not be sound economically to include a provision limiting the proportion of the total lending capacity that can be employed in any one country, but it is quite possible that the pressures on the bank for loans will reflect some dissatisfaction among countries over the allocation of loans. This may lead to considerable friction over the make-up of the loan committees which will have to pass upon projects.

The conflict likely to arise in this connection may well become intensified by the bank's relation to private lending. The apparent intention is to have the bank supplement and not displace private lending. But it may not work out this way in practice. The bank will strongly influence private investment by its power to offer "reasonable terms," grant "suitable conditions," and make loans of a kind lacking commercial appeal. Such provisions point toward possible competition on interest rates, time provisions, and other features of large-scale lending between the bank and private investors. In any such competition private investors would be at a disadvantage, and they may easily adopt the practice of channeling loans through the bank, preferring the multiple-country guarantee of low, well-secured profits to operations on their own.

In the long run displacement of private lending by an international bank is likely to be an advantage, but only if the bank's loans are confined to the field of international lending operations in which experience has proved the special need of an international agency. In this field, for example, loans for the development of independent but backward countries would be better administered by a bank of international character than by the banks of separate countries. Too often in the past such loans were made for political purposes and upon exploitive terms, creating international friction.[10] Loans for the development of certain raw materials might be placed in the same category if provisions of the Atlantic Charter are to be realized in the spirit of equal opportunity for all nations. Loans to particular governments for stabilization purposes form a third group in the field of operations best suited for an international banking agency to handle.

Studies should be set in motion to locate the limits of this field, and then the plan for the bank should expressly confine the bank's operations to the prescribed field. Private foreign investment can then function legitimately and without the irritations and superior competition that would come from a government-financed international bank.

Distribution of income

It would seem that some equitable reservation should be made (perhaps in art. V, sec. 14 (b)) that where a member has contingent liabilities as guarantor of outstanding loans, its share of distributed income shall be held in escrow or shall be applied against the debt if the loan is in default. A provision such as this applies to the withdrawal of a member (art. VI, sec 4 (c) (i)) but why not on current account?

Interpretation of the agreement

Where there is a case of appeal by a member of the bank against a decision of the executive directors, the agreement permits the bank to proceed notwithstanding the appeal. A proviso should be made to this that no action can be taken until the board of governors decides the appeal if the member declares that irreparable damage will be done to it.

The provision for arbitration of disagreements appear to be limited to two cases: (1) between the bank and a country which has ceased to be a member; and (2) between the bank and any member during the permanent suspension of the bank.

These limitations leave all other disagreements to be settled by the executive directors of the bank with an appeal only to the board of governors of the bank. The obvious intention is to avoid long-drawn out legal proceedings in disputes while the bank is operating. While the intention is fair and understandable, the provision is likely to become the cause of great friction and may even endanger the success of the bank as a project.

Objection will certainly be made that decisions made by official bodies of the bank will be self-interested, ex parte decisions, even though the board of governors is supposed to represent member countries.

It would seem to be much wiser, and more conducive to building a genuine body of international law, if provision were made for appeals to the Permanent Court of International Justice or to some other impartial, judicial, or arbitral agency.

Part III. Other Bretton Woods Recommendations

The Bretton Woods Conference made certain supplementary recommendations as follows: (a) a study by interested countries of the problems resulting from wide fluctuations in the value of silver; (b) liquidation of the Bank for International Settlements; (c) approval of steps being taken by the United Nations for the restoration to lawful owners of the property looted by enemy countries; and (d) urging the governments represented at the conference to reach agreements reducing obstacles to trade, securing orderly marketing of staple commodities, and promoting high levels of employment and rising standards of living.

Part IV. Conclusions

1. National or international solution?

The prime question facing Congress in the problem of monetary stabilization and international investment is: shall the solution be sought through a national or international approach? Should the United States go it alone or join with other nations in setting up international agencies to deal with monetary problems?

The answer to this question is inherent in the very nature of the problem. It is true that sound national economy and stability are a prerequisite to international stabilization and economic progress. The parts must be consistent with and be coordinated in the whole. But world monetary stabilization and international investment is primarily an international problem and requires an international approach and international agencies.

No one nation can bring about coordination of different currencies. No nation has the power to coerce others into taking actions or refraining from actions in the monetary field. Stabilization is a cooperative effort if confusion and conflict are to be avoided. Many fields of foreign investment expressly demand an international rather than a national approach. This was true even in the period between the two World Wars. Foreign investments controlled by single nations have left an unsavory record in history. They have strongly contributed to international friction and wars.

Technology and the spiritual forces now at work to bring the nations of the world closer together point in the same direction—that where problems by their very nature are essentially international, an international approach through international agencies is the best course to pursue.

The answer, therefore, is that international solutions of monetary stabilization and of certain kinds of international investment are preferable to national solutions. This conclusion rules out one of the alternatives that has been offered—the suggestions made by Representative Dewey. Mr. Dewey admits the need of American cooperation with other nations, and one of his proposals provides for it. But in the main he places far too heavy emphasis on American controls over the whole process. This is essentially a

[10] Herbert Feis, Europe, the World's Banker.

national approach and does not grasp the international character of the problems. Yet there is much in the Dewey proposals to guide the United States toward a sounder solution than the one offered at Bretton Woods.

All other alternatives offered, and, of course, the Bretton Woods plans themselves, follow the international approach in various forms. They indicate the correct course to follow.

2. Should the Bretton Woods plans for the fund and the bank be approved as they stand?

From the present study the answer is "No." The plan for the fund should be separated from the bank (which is very easy to do) and completely discarded. The reasons are as pointed out previously in detail. They are:

(1) The fund plan is far too novel, attempts too much without a basis of genuine experience.

(2) The fund emphasizes mechanics and cumbersome organization over fundamental economic principles.

(3) The fund is too vague and flexible, leaving too many loopholes for the fund management and for the member countries.

(4) The fund subordinates stabilization (its real reason for being) to something very close to international lending by a monetary inflation device.

(5) The fund inadvertently lays open a path to a dual monetary system which could lead to confusion and economic conflict.

(6) The fund would put the United States at a disadvantage on occasion after occasion.

(7) In abandoning the idea of a clearing union through some common unit and by sidetracking gold as such a unit, the fund handicaps its primary function as a clearing and stabilizing mechanism.

(8) The plan of stabilizing by permissible currency depreciation is likely to be resented when the realities behind it become evident.

(9) Possible deterioration of the fund's assets may endanger the whole plan.

(10) The early years of the fund afford a poor time to provide indiscriminate credits to all members when many members are in no need of such credits and others should make fundamental economic rather than monetary adjustments.

Other points may be suggested by the analysis in this study but those above appear to be the most prominent. The conclusion follows that the fund plan should be rejected both for the interests of the United States and for the welfare of the world economy. The bank, on the other hand, merits approval for the reasons given in part II.

3. Suggested approach

The criticisms and suggestions offered by economists and bankers afford the basis for an approach that would preserve the greater part of the work done at Bretton Woods while avoiding some of the mistakes made there. Such an approach might combine the following features:

(a) Key country stabilization: This follows the suggestion made by Dr. John H. Williams. It goes beyond the undesirable limitation in the Aldrich plan by embracing more countries than the British Empire and the United States. The key country plan affords a greater opportunity for gold to play a more constructive part in monetary relations.

(b) Establish a department in the international bank to make specific stabilization loans: This is another one of Dr. Williams' suggestions. It avoids the grant of wholesale stabilization credits, especially where they are not needed. It economizes on the amount of credits that will be needed. It provides a basis to build upon experience rather than striking out with some grandiose novelty which may retard rather than advance international collaboration. At the same time it correlates stabilization with long-term investment through an international agency.

(c) The bank for reconstruction and development should be approved. A stabilization department should be added as outlined in (b) above. The organizational structure might well be simplified by eliminating the board of governors and replacing that feature by correlation of the bank to the general international organization to be set up by the United Nations. The field for the bank's operations should be more carefully studied and its limits carefully defined so as to preserve a field where private international investment can function better than can governmental agencies.

(d) Utilize the Export-Import Bank along its present lines—chiefly as guarantor of American private investments in foreign countries and in fields of productive enterprise bearing some complementary relation to the American economy. If the long-term lending field of the International Bank is limited as in (c) above, private foreign investors of the United States—and of other countries—will have scope for sound operations best performed by private investors and to the direct welfare of the United States. In that event some national agency, such as the Export-Import Bank, will be essential to sound foreign investment procedure.

(e) The international conference—urged by almost all critics of the fund—on tariff barriers, export subsidies, and other practices restricting international trade and monetary exchange should be encouraged without delay. The delegates at Bretton Woods recognized the need for this (pt. III) and other conferences on correlative topics—so that the time is ripe for progress on these lines.

It is believed that the foregoing suggestions, taken together, offer an international approach to an international problem. They offer progress on lines more certain to be grounded in experience and sound growth. They afford reasonable protection to the United States while they open the way for American constructive participation in the world economy. And they avoid the confusion and hazards which the fund plan, in particular, so carelessly invites.

4. Congressional approval

On this point, the question is asked: "Does the form of the monetary agreement lend itself to constitutional approval by Congress by simple resolution or by the two-thirds rule as in the case of treaties?"

The question appears to be an open one. The agreement itself merely provides that each country "shall deposit with the Government of the United States an instrument setting forth that it has accepted this agreement in accordance with its law and has taken all steps necessary to enable it to carry out all of its obligations under this agreement."

So far as the United States is concerned this leaves the question open to a debate over the appropriate form of congressional approval. A cogent argument can be made that the agreement amounts to a treaty and must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. But an equally valid argument could be made that this is an agreement that can be approved by a simple majority resolution of both Houses on the ground that the agreement contemplates operations either exclusively left to the House of Representatives (such as bills for raising revenue—for example, the American quota to the fund) or shared equally by both Houses as in powers given to Congress by article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

NOVEMBER 10, 1944.

Oregon Legislature Opposes Daylight-Saving Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Oregon Legislature, which is now in session, on February 15, adopted House Joint Memorial No. 3, memorializing the President to revoke the Executive order heretofore promulgated changing the standard time to daylight-saving time. In the memorial the Oregon Legislature submits that daylight-saving time has not served the purpose for which it was intended, but, in fact, has cut down the working day rather than extending it, particularly with reference to agricultural labor. They also call attention to the fact that it has caused great inconvenience to laboring people and has compelled school children to travel long distances or to wait for school busses in the dark, which has not only been a menace to their welfare and health but subjected them to great danger. It is also set forth in the resolution that the consensus of opinion of the employers and leaders is that daylight saving has not proved practicable for industrial workers, and they urge that standard time may be restored.

The memorial is as follows:

House Joint Memorial 3

To the Honorable FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas by Executive order of your office standard time was changed to daylight-saving time as an aid to the war effort; and

Whereas, although the purpose of issuing this Executive order was laudable in its purpose, we submit that daylight-saving time has not served the purpose for which it was intended. In fact it has cut down the working day rather than extending it. This is particularly true in regard to agricultural labor. And this is more particularly true of that segment of agricultural labor which lives in settled communities and travels to and from places of work, especially in the winter months. It does not become daylight until quite late and labor is not prone to make up hours that cannot be worked on account of darkness at the beginning of the workday. Those who live in the settled communities desire to return home in time to avail themselves of store and pleasure facilities. The matter of safety to school children is also involved. There is a menace to young children who are alone in the dark at any time. In the eastern part of this State children travel long distances to school, usually being picked up by school busses. Sometimes they stand for a long period of time in the dark in subzero temperatures. The consensus of opinion of employers and labor leaders is that daylight saving has not proved practicable for industrial workers. Much time is lost due to total darkness in many of the industrial plants of Portland. It is common

knowledge that working under artificial light is not as productive as that performed in daylight: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That you, Mr. President, give serious consideration to restoring our country to standard time in the name of the war effort; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be submitted to the Members of Congress from the State of Oregon.

Capture of Rubber Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, that we should post-war build up a stock pile of rubber which shall insure no repetition of the situation which has confronted us is not to be gainsaid.

How much of the taxpayers' money should we spend for experimentation along synthetic rubber production lines is one question. How much should we spend in an attempt to create a stock pile from guayule and other rubber-yielding plants is another question.

I am interested in a newspaper article which, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including:

PROSPECTS BRIGHT FOR EARLY RECAPTURE OF RUBBER AREAS

NEW YORK.—Prospects of recapturing major natural rubber production areas well before Japan's final defeat are brightening.

Large plantings await liberation on Mindanao's 37,000 square miles in the southern Philippines.

There are bigger plantations on Borneo, where invasion also would cut the Japanese off from a major source of oil.

In the China-Burma-India theater our forces are nearing areas in Thailand and French Indochina which in pre-war years supplied around 100,000 tons a year, about the equivalent of all we are able to squeeze now out of Ceylon, South America and Africa.

Biggest goals from a rubber standpoint, of course, are the Dutch East Indies—chiefly Sumatra and Java—and the Malay Peninsula. Each in 1940 shipped out more than half a million tons.

It may take several years to restore plantations to full productivity, but considerable quantities may be captured when our troops land, the industry believes.

They think now the groves are likely to be in better shape than pessimistic forecasts made early in the war indicated.

A trickle of information from underground sources—along with a slim flow of actual rubber into our hands—occasionally reaches this country.

Estimates are that the huge plantings of trees are 80 percent unspoiled. The trees were too numerous to cut down—one company alone for example, had around 7,000,000 trees in its pre-war holdings centered in Sumatra. They are too juicy and too green to burn and the Japanese apparently feared they might earn the hatred of the natives if they detroyed the rubber groves, major source of native income.

Just how many millions would you appropriate in view of the above article?

Five Months and Nine Days After Induction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from one of my constituents, also an article and editorial from the Bethlehem Globe-Times:

BETHLEHEM, PA., *February 25, 1945.*

Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GERLACH: I desire to direct your attention to the enclosed editorial which appeared in the Bethlehem Globe-Times Saturday evening, February 25, 1945. It is indeed a tragedy that an American boy of 18, who so willingly accepted the call of his country, should be denied sufficient and adequate military training which he and thousands of boys attaining this age are entitled to have before entering upon their dangerous duties on the world's battle fronts.

Yes, Mr. GERLACH; the American people have been assured from time to time—the Chief of Staff of the Army has repeatedly made this declaration—that no American soldier would be sent overseas and into actual combat until he had had sufficient time and seasoned training to learn the methods of modern warfare. Paul V. Bidwell had little opportunity to adjust himself mentally, physically, and psychologically to the exacting demands made upon a professional soldier. Undoubtedly there are more fine American boys like Paul Bidwell who are being rushed into the maelstrom of war with only superficial training, and we know the terrific price that is being paid by men with much more extensive training. I do not underestimate the large-scale operations that are required both in the use of men and material to prosecute a war such as we are engaged in, but as the editor has so ably pointed out, if the Army manpower requirements are not as critical as the Paul V. Bidwell experience would indicate, then his death is a sacrifice to War Department bungling and inefficiency.

I realize fully, Mr. GERLACH, that you are in no way responsible for such practices, but matters of such grave consequences certainly should be brought to the attention of your colleagues, particularly those on the House Military Affairs Committee. May I respectfully ask you to do this?

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. RODENBACK.

[Enclosure]

OVERSEAS LESS THAN 3 WEEKS, LOCAL YOUTH DIES IN ACTION

Overseas less than 3 weeks, Pvt. Paul V. Bidwell, 18-year-old Liberty High School graduate, has been reported killed in action in Germany. News of his heroic death was contained in a telegram sent to his mother and relayed to his aunt, Mrs. Ruth Bidwell, 1110 Fritz Drive, this city, where he had made his home during his high-school days.

Simultaneously with the tragic news of young Bidwell's death, Mrs. Bidwell received word that the lad's cousin, Lt. Harrison S. Whitman, native of Scranton and well known in this city, had been liberated from a German prison camp in Poland by the Russians. He had been reported missing on December 16.

Private Bidwell was graduated from Liberty High School with the class of 1944. For a brief time he worked at the Laros textile plant and then got employment at the Bethlehem steel plant. However, with others of his class, he felt the urge to enter the Army and he enlisted on August 24. His training was brief in several camps and as far as is known he was sent overseas sometime between January 8 and 15. The telegram from the War Department says he was killed in Germany on February 2.

Bidwell is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alvoyda Bidwell, of Blakely, Pa., three sisters and two brothers.

FIVE MONTHS AND NINE DAYS AFTER INDUCTION

Five months and nine days from the time Paul V. Bidwell of this city—he had been 18 years old on June 12—left home to answer the call of the colors, he was killed in action on the western front. And that's too soon in an offensive war.

Thats too soon, too, in an Army approximating 12,000,000 men.

It's all wrong at any time in this twentieth century after the birth of Christ. But accepting the fact of war, as one must and as our people all do, it's wrong for a boy to be pushed into the midst of civilization's most brutal and terrible war less than 6 months from the time he had his last civilian sundae, or soft drink, or date, or meal.

Had Paul V. Bidwell, in the normal course of things, accepted his first job on August 24, the day he was inducted into service, it is hardly likely that he would have received his first raise until he had been on the job at least 6 months. He would not now be thoroughly at home in many types of employment. He should be just now getting "his feet on the ground," just now developing a competent know-how, just now getting the feel of things.

But the greed and rapaciousness and inhumanity of man, the economic disturbances of the world, international politics, the lust for power of a Hitler, the disorders of civilization set the stage to the end that Paul V. Bidwell became a professional soldier on August 24 instead of an apprentice, or an errand boy, or a college freshman. And on February 2 he was killed on the western front.

Paul V. Bidwell personifies hundreds, thousands of other Bethlehem and American boys. And it isn't right.

We have been assured from time to time that no soldier is sent overseas until he is ready—physically ready. These young boys, the military officials tell us, learn quickly, get into shape rapidly, adjust readily to the demands upon them. They make our best soldiers, we are told.

Yes, the physically-fit American boy is quick to learn. And he is eager, enthusiatic. He is the finest type of youth.

But he needs seasoning, maturity, orientation if he is to use fully his capabilities—and protect them. A soldier, like anyone else, needs to be around for awhile. He needs to hear cannonading and get accustomed to it from afar before he enters the range of its fire. He needs to observe the hustle and bustle and rumble of equipment and supplies going up to the front lines. He needs to spend more than 5 months and 9 days getting adjusted physically, and mentally, and psychologically to the job he is expected to do.

We don't know how Paul V. Bidwell was killed. We don't know whether he had had thorough training in the art of protecting himself, of "taking care of himself," as the young soldiers term it today. We can only assume that he had. He must have known what a fox hole is, and how to take cover. But even with that knowledge and with the muscular timing and quick reactions which young soldiers possess, a seasoned psychological adjustment is necessary. And that takes more than 5 months and 9 days from a last kiss at the union depot to a breakthrough of the Siegfried Line.

If Army manpower requirements are as critical as the Paul V. Bidwell experience

would indicate, then his death is Bethlehem's most urgent call to date to buckle down to the job and to stay on the job.

If Army manpower requirements are not as critical as the Paul V. Bidwell experience would indicate, then his death is a sacrifice to War Department bungling and inefficiency. And it is high time to write one's Congressman.

Unfortunately, with all the information we get and with all the misinformation too, we are somewhat confused. We do not know how many of America's 12,000,000 men are still in this country and, thus, how many are on the world's battle fronts. We do not know how many of those who have been in this country for periods longer than 5 months and 9 days are less capable than Paul V. Bidwell was.

We know that many of America's fine youth must die—the figure for Bethlehem alone is now approximately 160—but we want them fully prepared and seasoned physically and psychologically before they move into the thick of an offensive action.

A seasoned veteran of World War No. 1, with considerable action in France and Belgium in 1918, assures us that 5 months and 9 days are not enough to make a front line soldier. It was not enough in those days, he says, and it cannot possibly be enough in this greatly speeded up type of warfare today.

Actually, Paul V. Bidwell was sent overseas some time between January 8 and 15, less than 5 months after his induction. And he was killed less than 4 weeks later. It is not right.

How Broke Is Great Britain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the February issue of the Nation's Business. This article by Junius P. Wood, well-known authority on world affairs, shows what has been happening to Great Britain's economy and how she plans to regain her former strong position in foreign trade.

HOW BROKE IS GREAT BRITAIN?

(By Junius B. Wood)

The economic condition of England is a problem for every American businessman—exceeded only by his responsibility for his own country. World trade, prosperity, and the future peace depend on the two nations. They are the outstanding commercial leaders. In world markets they are rivals, but the Empire normally buys two-fifths of our exports and supplies one-third of our imports. Britain is the world's greatest importer and the United States its greatest exporter. Unless industry and trade resume on a firm foundation in both countries, both will be crippled and the blight will spread around the world.

So what of England? Is it a bankrupt nation as so many believe? Has it lost or sold the overseas investments which balanced its excess of imports? Is its merchant shipping gone? Has the United States stolen the export trade, the backbone of United Kingdom economy? Can it survive its war debts? Will it emerge from the war a going commercial concern as before?

Lord Catto, governor af the Bank of England, spoke to the point on the last question when he said:

"I am fully confident that the country will regain its old financial and industrial leadership in the world. If it were not for the financial miracle of lend-lease and the Canadian war contribution, it might be different. Other countries have debts in the same proportion but without our external financial problems. However, our external obligations should not fill us with dismay. Our national debt is three times that of the last war, but our productive capacity has increased and we have generations of accumulated experience."

A FISCAL COMPARISON

Government expenditures and debts show the financial situation in the two countries. The comparative figures are from the United States Treasury report for 1943–44 and the latest British white paper giving 1943 totals. As the fiscal years do not coincide, some variation must be allowed for in the comparisons. The pound sterling is converted into dollars at the rate of 4.03, as specified by London, and the population estimates are 135,000,000 and 47,000,000, respectively. The figures are:

	Millions of dollars		Per capita	
	United States	United Kingdom	United States	United Kingdom
Annual expenditure	93,744	23,301	$694	$496
From receipts	44,149	11,590	327	247
From loans	49,595	11,711	367	249
Percent from cash	47.1	49.7		
National debt	201,003	64,003	1,489	1,361

Not included in this total of the United Kingdom national debt is $4,368,000,000 which the British still carry on their books as owing to the United States from the First World War. Nor do the British include lend-lease from the United States or mutual aid from Canada in their figures. The former, by the President's last report, has reached $9,321,000,000, with a reverse lend-lease deduction of $1,934,000,000.

By meeting close to 50 percent of its annual expenditure by heavy taxes and other government revenue, the United Kingdom has held down the debt burden which it must carry after the war. Through the 6 years since 1938, current receipts have covered 47.6 percent of all expenses.

Though our expenditures increased $14,930,000,000 over 1942–43, this is the first year that the United States has even approached a 50–50 pay-as-you-go status. In 1942–43, only 28.5 percent of our expenses were met by current receipts. However, 92.2 percent of the 1942–43 expenditures and 92.8 percent of 1943–44 were for war activities, indicating that receipts can cover expenses in normal times.

Our Treasury Department's year-end report fixes the national debt of the United States at $230,630,000,000, or $1,662.68 per capita, on January 1, 1945. During the year it had increased $64,752,000,000, or $454.20 per capita, an addition of $176,920,000 for each of the 366 days. After World War No. 1, on August 31, 1919, our national debt, the greatest to that time, was $26,597,000,000, which divided to $250.18 for each man, woman, or child.

Like any other country, or the humblest merchant, England's problem divides into two parts: Debts and resources for resuming post-war trade. Although the latter is the more urgent because debts can be liquidated over the years, let us dispose of debts first.

Of the British national debt only 7.6 percent is external—chiefly the $4,000,000,000 still carried as an American World War No. 1 loan. The internal debt consists almost entirely of bond issues to support the war. Carrying charges on the entire debt are $1,310,000,000, or 1.8 percent. The internal debt is an expense but not a problem.

In addition to this debt and not appearing in the Government figures are the much-discussed blocked sterling balances. They are what the United Kingdom owes to other countries for materials and services, some received before the war. The total, while increasing, is roughly $3,000,000,000.

All of the dominions and most of the colonies and protectorates in the British Commonwealth are among the creditors. About three-eighths of the total is owed to India and one-eighth to Egypt. Included is the Canadian interest-free loan, our Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan, and $180,000,000 from Argentina; $180,000,000 from Portugal; $121,000,000 from Brazil; $20,000,000 from Iceland; and $16,000,000 from Uruguay.

CONFIDENCE IN BRITAIN

No interest is paid on these balances and they are an impressive evidence of sympathy for Britain and confidence in her economic stability. They are not a serious obstacle to post-war recovery as so often claimed. They have accumulated because of the conversion of Britain's industries to war production and the curtailing of exports which normally balanced the raw materials received from the various countries.

It is lain that, when Britain returns to a peace-production basis, these countries cannot be permitted to place unlimited orders against their credits. Britain must have current receipts to buy more goods.

Among the many proposed solutions is a glorified tie-in selling plan fixing a proportion between what each country can charge off against its blocked sterling and what new purchases it must make in Britain. Another plan is to fund the debt in long-term British bonds. Finally, fearsomely suggested by some of the creditors, is that the pound sterling may be depreciated to reduce the debt. While that might increase exports, it also would increase the price of imports on which Britain so largely depends. Whatever solution is reached, the blocked credits will be a potent inducement to "Buy British."

Argentina already has liquidated part of its credit in exchange for Argentine bonds held in Britain. While these covered a long-term loan, desirable for Argentina, Buenos Aires was paying service charges on the loan and receiving no interest on the credit. British interests also own nearly 70 percent of the railroad mileage in Argentina. They are willing, some say eager, to sell a minority holding of stock to Argentina, further reducing the frozen credits. Argentine stockholders might induce their government to permit increases in rail rates while the majority stockholders would still control the roads, buying British equipment and supplies.

India was a big factor in British recovery after the last war and, with increasing disturbed political conditions and larger sterling credits, will have a larger role after this one. The credits may be a substantial exchange for greater political independence. Included in these credits, according to Indian Nationalists, are more than $200,000,000 in Britain's dollar pool. They cite one transaction—a jute purchase by the Soviet Union through the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation where 40 percent was paid in dollars. This was added to the London dollar pool and India received credit in pound sterling.

Like its internal debt, the large frozen credits can be settled largely on Britain's terms. The creditor countries obviously must cooperate as their exports and their own

prosperity depend on continuing trade with the United Kingdom.

LOSSES AND GAINS FROM WAR

So much for the problem of indebtedness. Meanwhile, Britain's first problem is adjusting its current economies to the losses and gains in assets from the war. Prevailing discussions in this country emphasize the losses. More optimistic English economists contend that, over the years, the gains will be greater. Let us consider the losses.

The outstanding items are gold, dollar balances, foreign investments, shipping, and property destruction. They were important for England's balance of trade. For banks and insurance companies, also important, war has not been a hardship. American tourists who were another profitable source of income, are expected to return with peace in greater numbers than ever.

Since the war began, according to British figures, $1,887,000,000 in gold and $231,000,000 in dollar balances have been sold in the United States. The United Kingdom holdings in 1938, our Government figures show, were $2,038,000,000 and $595,000,000, respectively. Britain's present holdings are a war secret. The future value of the yellow metal depends on how many countries return to the gold standard and whether the United States continues to buy it for burial at Fort Knox. Gold-producing countries are hopeful.

In addition to gold, dollars, and foreign currencies, British pre-war investments overseas totaled $16,000,000,000. Little of this was originally Government investment but, since all private holdings abroad have been taken over under war-emergency acts, it is, at present, Government-owned for all practical purposes. British investments in all parts of the globe include property and business but are chiefly stocks or bonds of foreign companies. Investments of nearly $1,000,000,000 were engulfed in Axis-occupied Europe and an equal amount in the Orient. They are not lost, but their value when recovered and their future earnings—of rubber plantations, for instance—are speculative.

Other holdings, as in India, Canada, and the United States, probably have increased in value. The investment in Latin America has been given as $4,000,000,000, nearly half in railroads. Britain also owns outright or has stock holdings in railroads in Canada, the United States, and elsewhere.

Of the total mileage south of Mexico, 42 percent is British-owned. Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Haiti, and Ecuador are the only countries without a British railroad. Mileage, however, is not a criterion of a railroad's value. In Mexico, the "Mexicano" between Mexico City and Vera Cruz, British-owned, is one of the heaviest traveled in the country, though only 4 percent of the total mileage. Other roads show unpaid dividends, as the "United" of Habana, but after each listing of a British-owned road in a recent survey by our Department of Commerce is the significant note: "Purchases made by London office." Even a railroad which shows no profit may be a big money maker for British industry, finance, shipping, and corporation officers and employees.

MANY FOREIGN HOLDINGS LEFT

Of the $16,000,000,000 in overseas investments, Sir John Anderson, chancellor of the exchequer, says $4,000,000,000 have been sold. Lord Kindersley, banker, says the income has dropped from $800,000,000 to $500,000,000 a year. Axis-occupied countries contributed $100,000,000. Presumably most of the three-fourths still in British hands will be returned to private owners. Some assert that the cream has been skimmed, but other reputable economists contend that the securities sold were largely those bringing low returns and that the increased market value of the remainder is greater than that of the total before liquidation. They figure that if trade is restored as hoped for, the income will not be appreciably reduced. It is certain, however, that the United Kingdom has not been stripped of overseas investments as so many believe.

Liquidation of British investments in the United States gives a clearer picture. When British war buying started, gold reserves were used until early in 1940. In the next few months, the dollar balances were added. As these ran low, liquidation of investments started. At that time our Government survey showed $2,743,000,000 in British investments in the United States, of which $833,000,000 were direct investments. The remainder was in stocks, bonds, and assorted funds.

Securities were offered on the New York Stock Exchange in small lots to avoid breaking the market. The American Viscose Corporation, a United States subsidiary entirely owned by Courtaulds, Ltd., was a test for liquidating the direct investments. Though it was a profitable $100,000,000 going concern, it brought only $54,350,000 at a distress sale. When the Brown & Williamson Tobacco Co., subsidiary of the British-American Tobacco Co., Ltd., was put on the block, our Government made a $25,000,000 loan and the British retained control through the common stock.

In the interim until lend-lease in March 1941, obviated further direct purchasing, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation advanced money for British purchases. R. F. C. was authorized to lend $425,000,000—only $390,000,000 was called for—at 3 percent for 15 years with a possible extension of 5 years. Deposited as security for this loan are: British-owned listed securities of 75 American companies ($205,000,000), unlisted securities of 47 companies ($115,000,000), the capital stock of 41 British-owned American insurance companies ($180,000,000), and the pledged earnings of the American branches of 41 British insurance companies (reserves $200,000,000).

In the 3 years, the British Ministry of Supply mission in New York, with R. F. C. approval, sold $13,474,000 of the securities, the only liquidation out of the $700,000,000 holdings pledged for the loan.

The rest of the securities for these loans, of course, continue British owned. In 3 years ending June 30, 1944, they earned $120,457,000. From the total income from sale and interest, the R. F. C. deducted $28,000,000 for interest and set aside $11,000,000 toward future interest and sinking fund. The remaining $94,000,000 was applied to the principal, reducing the loan to less than $296,000,000.

Canada, which wants to retain British investments for postwar purposes, has adopted a modified form of lend-lease. When liquidation of these investments approached $750,000,000, Canada voted $1,000,000,000 mutual aid as a gift and followed that with interest-free loans which promise to be even larger.

Through the centuries, shipping has been the next big producer of British overseas income. Profits in 1939 were $525,000,000. The usual off-hand estimate is that they will be less than $325,000,000 after the war. That figure is based on tonnage. In the 25 years between the wars, world tonnage increased 51 percent, that of the United States more than four and one-third times, that of Japan more than three times, while that of the United Kingdom decreased 5.3 percent.

In 1939, the empire had 21,000,000 tons of merchant shipping, one-seventh flying flags of the Dominions. According to the British white paper, 11,643,000 tons were lost up to this year by enemy action or marine risks. In the same 5 years, the white paper reports, 4,717,000 tons were built in the United Kingdom. The net loss on these figures is only one-third. Nor do the figures include what has been built for Britain in Canada, Australia, and the United States.

OCEAN SHIPPING NOT RUINED

It is true that increased tonnage under the American flag dwarfs that of the United Kingdom. The shipping business will continue highly competitive and none is so optimistic as to expect that future world agreements will prorate cargoes on the basis of available national tonnage. Shipping profits depend not only on a vessel's tonnage and knots but on utilization of cargo space, economy of operation, quick turnaround and other factors in which the seafaring British have generations of experience. England's shipping income therefore will not be reduced in the same proportion as its possible loss in tonnage.

According to official figures, the United Kingdom's exports went down from $1,898,000,000 in 1938 to $935,000,000 in 1943, whereas America's exports went up from $3,094,000,000 in 1938 to $12,718,000,000 in 1943. But there is a catch in these official figures because 80 percent of America's exports in 1943—more in 1944—were lend-lease shippings. With lend-lease deducted, America's commercial exports for 1943 were only $2,609,000,000 which represents a decrease from 1938.

Any forecast of future commerce based on wartime figures with all the restrictions in production and shipping is therefore ridiculous.

Apprehensive of future American encroachment in the export field, one British industry reports a reassuring canvas of commercial representatives of foreign governments in London. A couple of the published replies, while possibly tuned to please the callers, are illuminating. Trade will return to an unsentimental competitive business basis.

"We definitely prefer British goods when local production is not sufficient," the Commerce Officer of Australia is quoted as saying. "Neither the United States nor Australia will have any claim on the other after the return of peace. Only the operation of American lend-lease prevents Australia from buying heavily from England at present."

"Brazil not only favors buying British goods but once imported everything from Great Britain," that country's Commercial Counsellor said. "This has changed somewhat as Americans have studied the Brazilian market, printed catalogs in Portuguese, allowed 6 months' credit, and given better service than British exporters."

The representative of Argentina explained that most commercial houses in his country are pro-British and eager to buy British goods, but that British export methods, compared to those of the United States, leave much to be desired.

With large debts and liquid foreign assets close to exhaustion but with substantial productive overseas investments remaining and vastly increased productive capacity at home, the United Kingdom is confident of its future as a going concern.

"Our tax load for reconstruction will be greater," says Lord Woolton, minister of reconstruction. "The budget will not balance each year, but will balance over a long term. We need not dismay if exports do not immediately balance imports. Our experience and our continued progress in technical efficiency and production will soon change the picture."

INCOME IS HIGHER

Figures justify his confidence. The net national income, exclusive of pension, unemployment, relief, and health insurance payments and interest on the national debt, increased from $18,554,000,000 in 1938 to $32,933,000,000 in 1943. Annual private income, including the above transfer items but deducting $2,212,000,000 direct taxes in 1938, and $7,677,000,000 in 1943, increased from $18,091,000,000 to $27,392,000,000. Private savings, after living or operating expenses, steadily increased from $1,414,000,000 in 1938, to $7,048,000,000 in 1943.

This result has been accomplished chiefly by increased production through reduced unemployment and higher efficiency, doubling the food production at home, curtailing investments and reducing consumer consumption by one-fifth. The country's machine tool production has increased 70 percent and, in addition to its established position in cutlery, machinery, textiles, glass, chinaware, and whiskies, war experience has brought efficiency in other high-grade export lines.

The post-war home demand for clothing and other consumer goods will be great, but war controls will not be abolished or relaxed to the extent of threatening the present regulated national economy. Britain at the same time foresees increased expenses for debt charges, war pensions, military, education, health, and social insurance—the Beveridge plan under another label.

But Nicolas Kalder, of the London School of Economics, calls fears that the proposed social burdens will be heavy nonsense.

BRITISH INCOME HIGHER

He estimates that national income, though lower than now, will be almost half again as much as in 1938.

"Contrary to a widely held opinion, the financial burden which the Beveridge plan imposes on the various classes of the community (even if its benefits are not considered), is extremely small and cannot affect the post-war levels of taxation or disposable income to any significant extent."

How the overseas markets which Britain must have for its increased production will finance their purchases is the real problem and this brings the United States into the plans.

The demand will be there but most countries will need credit or other help until their own economies are restored.

The most popular suggestion in England is that the United States become the world's creditor nation, also lower the tariffs for freer entry of British goods.

Specifically, the suggestion as explained in the New Statesman and Nation of London is that Britain "continue to borrow from the United States—lend-lease supplies under another name—to cover the deficits in its current international accounts and to obtain resources for investment in less-developed parts of the world."

READY FOR COMPETITION

On the theory that high wages in the United States increase production costs and that its own domestic economy can be controlled, Britain is ready to meet its only worth-while competitor in world markets after Germany and Japan have been eliminated.

It is satisfied that its seasoned judgment is better than that of the United States "with its still immature attitude toward world affairs," a valuation of American foreign policy by the Round Table, a British Empire political quarterly.

"We want to be in friendly collaboration with the United States," the Chancellor of Exchequer explained to a correspondent, "but do not want to be in a position in which, if unhappily some disaster befell the United States, we should similarly have to go down and suffer with them. We do not want to be tied in that way."

The United States wants to bring prosperity to all nations and to all people, but the United States is not the eternal almoner of the world. Bretton Woods plans are for the participation of many nations instead of a dual combination.

Those plans as summarized by Harry D. White, assistant to Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, "are to eliminate competitive depreciated currencies and discriminatory bilateral agreements, to reduce the likelihood of economic warfare which leads to political wars, to put nations on their feet economically and to increase trade and employment, both for us and for all other nations."

ENGLAND WILL HAVE TRADE PLANS

Britain's policy still awaits adoption and Britain will decide for its best interests.

The Federation of British Industries favors continual government controls and bilateral trade agreements with other countries. The British Chamber of Commerce, London Chamber of Commerce, and the National Union of Manufacturers endorse the imperial preference policy.

Import and export controls, bilateral or multilateral agreements, bulk government purchases, blocked balances and clearing restrictions, another sterling bloc area, government supercartels and even a world divided into four marketing spheres are also in the hopper from which Britain's final plan will emerge.

The United States has faced most of them in the past without serious handicap to its own trad-

Its future policies can wait until Britain's plan emerges. In the meantime, the United States may well raise an eyebrow at any suggestion that the great trader nation of the world is either impoverished or discouraged.

An Awakening Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Rip Van Winkle, it is said, slept 20 years in the Catskill Mountains and finally awakened to find a greatly changed world.

For the past 12 years Congress may have been awake but for practical purposes it might just as well have been asleep. Playing the old game of following the leader, which in childhood days took us over the top of fences, the ridge pole, on top of barns, into the tallest trees and in winter out on thin ice, for something like 12 years the Congress has been blindly following New Deal leadership.

Now, jolted partly awake by the arbitrary acts of bureaucrats, it dazedly looks around and finds that it has entrusted to other hands much of the power which, under the Constitution, it should zealously guard and exercise and which is shackling much of our liberty.

Before the war, repeatedly, upon Mr. Roosevelt's cry that some sort of an emergency confronted the Nation, Congress handed him blank checks for billions of dollars and almost unlimited power. Between 40 and 50 corporations have been established by the President under these grants of power, and they have control of billions—yes; I mean billions upon billions—of dollars, which all too often have been used in such a manner as to curtail private business, sometimes wipe it out and usually advance the political fortunes of the administration.

THE DRAFT

More recently, the President took it upon himself to adopt a change in the Selective Service Act, governing induction of agricultural workers. He was so successful that Congress was shocked at the results, and this next week will have up for consideration a resolution to investigate the whole matter, pass adequate legislation, designed to compel selective service to follow the intent of Congress.

MANPOWER BILL

On January 31, Democratic Speaker SAM RAYBURN, making one of his rare speeches, told the House, in substance, that the so-called work-or-fight bill must be passed without delay or we might lose the war. The House fell in line and passed the bill, but it has not yet been adopted by the Senate; all of which goes to show that sometimes haste is not progress; that a cry of "Wolf! Wolf!" does not always mean that one of the beasts is around ready to devour us.

CONTRAST

One day the press advises us that the not-yet-won battle on the little island of Iwo had cost us more than 1,000 dead or missing in some 70 hours of desperate fighting.

The press of the same day carried the news that in one plant 8,500 workers, because of a jurisdictional dispute, left their jobs at a cost to the armed forces of 6,000 tons of steel daily. At the same time, our losses on Iwo were piling up at the rate of 90 casualties an hour.

Why is it, when men drafted by the millions, leaving their loved ones, enduring all kinds of hardships, of suffering, dying by the thousands, far from their loved ones, that, here at home, other thousands of men, living with their families in comfortable, well-furnished homes, with plenty to eat and to wear, with almost everything which men can ask at their command, are permitted, for trivial reasons or for no reason, to go on strike and stop the flow of the guns, the ammunition, the trucks, the tanks, the bombers, which our fighting men must have if they are to live, if they are to win the war for us?

The administration has power to end these strikes. It fails to exercise that power, and Congress, after a brief awakening, seems to be dropping back into its somnambulant state. Vigorous kicks administered in the right place, from those at home, whose flesh and blood are paying the cost, seems to be the only thing which will awaken us to effective action.

Railroad Grant Lands in Oregon Should Be Restored to Mineral Entry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Interior has ruled that the act of Congress of August 28, 1937, providing for permanent forest yield has impliedly prevented mineral entries on the revested Oregon and California grant lands and the reconveyed Coos Bay Road grant lands. As a result of this holding

it becomes necessary to enact legislation to restore these lands to mineral entry, which should be done.

Senator CORDON, of Oregon, has introduced a bill, S. 313, for this purpose, which should have the favorable consideration of the Congress and be enacted into law at an early date. The Oregon Legislature, which is now in session, on February 15, 1945, adopted Senate Joint Memorial No. 6, memorializing the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States to enact this legislation. I respectfully urge all of my colleagues in the House to give careful and favorable consideration to this proposal, which is essential to the welfare of the people of Oregon.

The Senate joint memorial is as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 6

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the original act of the Congress providing for the administration of the revested Oregon and California grant lands and the reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands restored to mineral entry all of such revested and reconveyed lands; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has ruled that the act of Congress of August 28, 1937, providing for permanent forest yield has impliedly prevented mineral entries on said lands; and

Whereas this ruling forever forecloses the development of more than 2,000,000 acres of the public domain within the State of Oregon containing vast mineral potentialities and prevents the proper economic development of the State of Oregon; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States a bill (S. 313), introduced by Senator CORDON, to restore to the citizens of Oregon the right to locate, explore, and develop these mineral lands as intended by the original act of Congress relating thereto: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is memorialized and requested to enact S. 313, to the end that those lands may be opened to mineral entry; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be authorized and he hereby is directed to forward immediately a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon delegation in the Congress of the United States.

On the Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of February 26, 1945:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

War and the Working Class, continuing the Soviet press campaign against American journalists, has accused several journalists, including myself, of spreading "poisonous rumors," a "structure of lies," and "myth," about the Free German Committee and Union of German Officers in Moscow by suggesting that these groups might form the basis for a post-Hitler German government.

Now what does War and Working Class want? Shall I recant? Shall I say:

1. There never was a Free German Committee headed by Eric Weinert, and Soviet newsreels released here showing him surrounded by his collaborators are fiction?

2. There never was a Union of German Officers headed by Gen. von Seidlitz, broadcasting regularly to Germany, as recorded by the F. C. C., appealing to German officers and soldiers to overthrow Hitler and help recreate a new German republic?

3. Shall I say that Miss Ella Winter, well-known apologist for the Soviets, never brought from Moscow accounts of the activities of these committees and her articles in the New York Post on the eve of Yalta were figments of imagination?

4. Marshal Stalin never spoke the following words on November 6, 1942:

"It is not our aim to destroy Germany, just as it would be impossible to destroy Russia, but the Hitlerite state can and should be destroyed. That cannibal Hitler said, 'We shall continue the war until Russia ceases to have an organized military force.' That would appear clear but illiterate. It is not our aim to destroy all military force in Germany, for every literate person will understand that this is not only impossible in regard to Germany as it is in regard to Russia, but it is also inadvisable from the viewpoint of the future. But Hitler's army can and should be destroyed."

5. The manifesto of the Free German Committee of July 1943, as printed in the Soviet press, was an optical illusion, and did not contain the following words:

"The formation of a genuine national German Government is the most urgent task of the people. Only such a government can bring peace. This government must be strong and possess the necessary power to render harmless the enemies of the people. It must establish firm order and represent Germany with dignity to the outside world. There are forces in the German Army which are loyal to the country. This government will immediately cease military operations, recall the German troops to the Reich's frontiers, and embark on peace negotiations. In this manner it will obtain peace and once again place Germany on an equal footing with other nations."

6. Shall I say that Miss Winter's reports that every German prisoner of war in Russia has been invited to get in touch with the Free German Committee, that many of the German officers are genuine converts, that prisoners are asked to answer questionnaires regarding the form of a future German Government—all this, and more, is a tissue of poisonous lies?

But should I so recant, just where do we stand? Would I be convinced? Are the Soviets? or the American public?

Students of the Soviet Government know that changes of policy are accompanied by purges and covered by denials that the previous policy ever existed. This has had a queer effect on the Soviet history. During the lifetime of the Soviet-German pact things were said by Mr. Molotoff, which were afterward expunged from the record. Soviet histories pass over the role of Trotsky in the Russian revolution, I doubt whether future Russian histories will contain any account of the long period of close collaboration between the Reichswehr and the Red Army in the 1920s, nor of the official Soviet attacks on the Treaty of Versailles. But what can be unsaid in Moscow cannot be unsaid in New York, and it is extremely silly of the Soviet press to try to do it. Here it is not a crime to change one's mind.

But the falsification of history cannot be maintained in a world of free journalism, whose writers try to discern truth, and are not organized propagandists for one policy or another. To try to present this search for truth as a conspiracy will fail. American journalists are intelligent enough to see through such transparencies, and so is the American public.

Pollution Is Choking Our Rivers and Suffocating Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point an interesting and informative discussion of pollution which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Post and which was written by Richard L. Neuberger. It merits careful reading.

On the opening day of this Congress I introduced H. R. 519, known as the water pollution control act. It is now before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I am hopeful that as we get a little further into the session it will be possible for the Rivers and Harbors Committee to hold hearings on H. R. 519 and all other legislation dealing with the pollution problem. Shameful pollution is verily choking our rivers and suffocating our streams. It is to be hoped that the Seventy-ninth session of Congress will take definite action to remedy this sorry situation.

Mr. Neuberger's article follows:

CHOKING OUR RIVERS

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

DELIBERATE WASTE OF RESOURCES

Thoreau said the only good river was one you could drink. Not so long ago this description applied to nearly all the streams in America. A wayfarer could quench his thirst in any of their quiet reaches. Now thousands of the rivers of the land are toxic to man and lethal to fish. A drink from them involves risk of a hospital, if not of life itself. Trout, salmon, and sturgeon cannot find enough oxygen to billow their gills. These rivers are open sewers, clogged with chemicals, offal, sawdust, and sludge.

The white man has done this—deliberately, consciously, and with full knowledge of the consequences of his acts.

In the days when the Indians roamed America, the rivers were pure. Only an occasional landslide or flood ever clouded them. They teemed with fish. Elk, moose, deer, and bison drank at the fords. But civilization—a civilization that we like to think of as the most highly developed in history—has fouled and polluted the waterways which drain this continent.

PROGRESS MADE

For many years two Government agencies have denounced the practice of turning our rivers into chutes of industrial waste and urban excretion. These agencies are the United States Public Health Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. One is concerned with the effect of pollution on humans, the other with its effect on fish and animals. Both effects are threatening and harmful.

During the past decade progress has been made in the prevention of pollution. Yet the Public Health Service has warned, "The discharge of raw sewage and of inadequately treated effluents into our coastal and inland waters still constitutes a sanitary problem of great importance, as is attested by the deteriorated condition of many natural waterways in the more populous sections of the country."

Epidemics of typhoid, malaria, dysentery, and similar diseases have focused public attention on pollution and its dangers. So, too, has the disappearance of valuable fish runs which once contributed materially to the Nation's food supply. As a result of these epidemics and the dwindling of our aquatic life, a number of large cities have installed modern sewage-disposal plants. Rivers formerly heavy with sludge and offal are being restored to their natural condition.

Yet despite these advances, approximately 3,300 communities in the United States still dump raw sewage into nearby rivers, brooks, and creeks. Another 240 communities dump raw sewage into adjacent salt water—the ocean, bays, or inlets.

Nor is ordinary sewage the only source of stream pollution. Dredging and strip mining fill rivers until they are the color of rust. Careless grazing and lumbering take away the grass and roots anchoring the soil; the result is invariably a waterway choked with silt and top soil.

SILT COAT

"With the advent of civilized man and unrestricted deforestation," reports the Fish and Wildlife Service, "the erosion problem has become gigantic, and the effects of the loads of erosion silt carried by inland streams overwhelming on aquatic life in many places."

This silt coats the riverbed with a stifling layer that kills the plants, insects, and crustaceans on which fish depend for food. It also clogs the gills and respiratory tubes of the fish themselves. In addition, it reduces the oxygen content of the water. "Silt and sewage are far more deadly enemies of our fish than an angler's hook," says Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Pollution has killed billions of fish. Some rivers even have been stripped of their fish life completely by city sewage and industrial wastes. Sludge from towns, coke companies, and steel mills has destroyed so many fish in the Niagara River for example, that in recent years hundreds of tons of dead fish have been observed floating in the current. The Buffalo River, which discharges into the Niagara, is heavy with waste products.

This recklessness has not been confined to the eastern part of the country. Even in the wilderness of the far West, pollution has worked its grim havoc. The sludge from zinc and lead mining has annihilated countless trout, perch, and bass in the Cœur d'Alene River of Idaho. Sewage from the city of Portland has blocked off the autumn salmon runs in the Willamette River of Oregon.

Yet the outlook is not hopeless. Public opinion can force many reforms and the cleaning up of America's rivers is one of them. New sewage-disposal units have been built in recent years in Illinois, Maryland, Minnesota, Texas, and Wisconsin, placing those States near the head of the list in the adequate treatment of wastes. Of course, sewage-disposal plants are not so necessary in the far-flung fastnesses of the West, where there are comparatively few cities and not much manufacturing.

HOPEFUL STEP

To protect the salmon runs of the Columbia River, the Bonneville Dam Power Administration has inserted in its contracts with industrial plants a clause requiring the disposal and reduction of waste products. If chemicals and sludge harmful to fish are dumped in the river, the Power Administrator, Dr. Paul J. Raver, can cut off the offending factory's electric supply. However, this forward-looking step has been canceled somewhat by the fact that mushrooming war communities near the new factories are not compelled to demonstrate the same care in the disposal of sewage.

Various wildlife and conservation groups throughout the country are demanding that post-war public works funds be withheld from cities which pollute neighboring rivers and bays. This could be a threat that would force the construction of thousands of modern sewage-disposal units. Hotels, laundries, and other large users of water have often resisted the move to build such units, because it is a customary plan to prorate the cost of the sewage-disposal plant against all local water bills.

Whether it stems from open sewers, belching factories, or eroded hillsides, pollution is a threat to practically all the values which the Nation holds dear. It imperils health and life. It reduces the food supply. It mars the landscape and blots the countryside. It lowers pride in countless cities. It is a symbol of man's inability to protect the resources with which this Nation has been endowed.

Our rivers rank near the forefront of the wealth of America. They provide hydroelectricity, navigation, recreation, irrigation, and drinking supplies. Much of the history of the United States is told in the tale of the Hudson, the Potomac, the Columbia, the Colorado, the Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Ohio. To foul and choke and stifle these great waterways with wastes and excretion constitutes a sin against America itself.

Contributions of Farmer Cooperatives to the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address recently delivered by Mr. John H. Davis, executive secretary of the National Council of Farm Cooperatives.

This is a most interesting and informative address and should have a wide circulation. I hope that it will be read extensively by American businessmen, particularly small businessmen, as an antidote to the fantastic propaganda being circulated by an organization calling itself the National Tax Equality Association:

CONTRIBUTIONS OF FARMER COOPERATIVES TO THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

(By John H. Davis)

I want to talk with you today about farmer cooperatives with an eye to the post-war period—particularly about how they can strengthen American agriculture and at the same time contribute to the general welfare in terms of a high standard of food, clothing, and shelter.

During the war period the American farmer has achieved the greatest production record in history both in terms of quantity and quality. He has done this despite the lack of adequate equipment and an acute shortage of labor. The whole Nation—yes, the entire Allied world—can be grateful to the American farmer and his wife and children for the food and fiber they have produced. Our health and energy to do the war job—even our ammunition of war—have depended on 11-hour days in field and barn.

Our agricultural plant has expanded roughly 130 percent of pre-war. Our supply of such commodities as cotton, wheat, and wool will be very large and we will have dislocations in production of certain so-called war crops such as peanuts, soybeans, and hemp. All of this will necessitate major adjustments. But agricultural production does not adjust too easily. In this respect it is like taffy which stretches but does not contract automatically.

And there are other factors peculiar to agriculture which will complicate the farmer's job after the war. For one thing there will be no backlog of demand for food or fiber when the war ends such as will exist for such industrial products as automobiles, refrigerators, typewriters, and a thousand other items, because the farmer, unlike many industrial producers, has been producing the same things during the war that he did before the war and will produce after the war. The big difference is that he has been producing more of them.

Another general characteristic of agriculture is that the amount of most farm commodities consumed does not increase greatly when prices fall. One might liken the effect of even a small surplus on farm prices to a rowboat loaded until it is floating deep in the water. Each additional pound of cargo affects the depth of the boat in the water very little up to the point that the density of the boat about equals that of the water. Then as little as 1 pound more weight will sink it.

In a similar way, the domestic market will absorb food and fiber at fair prices up to a certain point. But a surplus beyond this quantity causes prices to drop all out of proportion to the extent of the surplus. In other words, large surpluses of foodstuffs are not moved by letting prices sag.

More land may come under cultivation and there is every reason to believe that higher yields and improved varieties of agricultural commodities will be developed and better techniques of production designed. This may well mean that fewer people will be needed to produce sufficiently for pre-war levels of national and world consumption.

FARMING A SMALL SIZE ENTERPRISE

Still another characteristic of agriculture is that most types of farm production do not lend themselves to large-scale operation. The widespread areas involved in farming, the peculiarities of animal husbandry, the combining of livestock and crop enterprises, the changes with the seasons, the advantages of family labor are all factors which tend to make the assembly line technique uneconomic in agriculture. We have more than 6,000,000 farm units averaging less than 100 acres each. It is difficult for so many farmers to decide on business policies as do industries composed of relatively few units, unless a system adapted to their needs is

found. The cooperative type of organization particularly suits the farmers' needs.

Fundamentally the economic reasons why farmers have formed cooperatives have been to give these widespread individaul farm operators the advantages of large-scale wholesale buying and marketing operations practiced by industrial and commercial enterprise. While production has been proved more efficient on an American family farm than any other farming system in the world, the buying of production supplies and marketing of farm products is most economic when farmers pool their volume. They can bring down the net cost of production by no other practical means at present.

However, at the same time we are worrying about surpluses of food and fiber there is widespread want for such articles, even within our own country. Nutrionists have recently written volumes which on the face of them appear to show that if everyone in the world had adequate food and clothing we would have to considerably increase agricultural production even above that of 1944. This, in general, was the theme of the Hot Springs Conference.

There are some, who seeing the shadows ahead for agriculture, are calling for severe production control. This is the road we took in the thirties and we may be hard pressed to take it again. If we are, I hope that we do so with our eyes open and mindful of the fact that adequate production is the basis of all new wealth. To the extent that needed production is curtailed or unbalanced we reduce our potential standard of living. This is a fact of which we should remind ourselves over and over again. I submit that full employment must be predicated by a high level of production.

AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY MUST MOVE TOGETHER

A corollary to this is that agriculture cannot successfully continue on a basis of full production if industry is on a basis of controlled production and sustained prices such as existed during much of the twenties and thirties. I hope that business and industrial leaders will ponder this fact seriously. I am convinced that we simply cannot have full employment if any great segment of our economy attempts to maintain wartime price structures by controlled output. This goes for the prices of labor as well as for industrial items and other goods and services. I think that it is high time that we learn that the mere manipulation of production and prices is no substitute for developing an adequate and sustained demand. A high rate of industrial production and employment is basic to any satisfactory solution to our agricultural problems.

While I do not pretend to know the answer to all our economic ills and problems, I believe that an important part of the answer to so-called overproduction and unsatisfied consumer demand lies in more efficient distribution at all levels both in agriculture and industry. One is almost forced to this conclusion when he stops to reflect that up until the war we were able to produce more of many things than we were able to put into use. One cannot but suspect that part of our problem lies in the throttling effect of hoarded patents, monopolies, hoarded labor, soldiering on the job, excess profit margins, excess handling margins, excess salaries to management, and wage increases out of proportion to increased labor efficiency—all of which have increased the price and reduced effective demand. Management, labor, and capital have all contributed to these inefficiencies in our industrial and trade economy.

ECONOMY THROUGH COOPERATION

It is in reduction in the cost of production supplies and distribution that farmer cooperatives can and will, I believe, render yeoman service in the post-war period. Through their cooperatives, farmers reduce their cost of production, and of marketing—thus freeing purchasing power for the other things which industry produces. Through their cooperatives, farmers foster better grading and standardization of products, better varieties, improved storage facilities, and reduced costs and increased values to the ultimate buyer. In brief, cooperatives have narrowed distribution margins from both ends—thus making both the producer's and consumer's dollars go farther.

The New England supply of many foodstuffs depends on large quantities of imported feeds, fertilizers, machinery, and other farm supplies shipped in and distributed by farmer cooperatives to members, who turn them into the quarts of milk found on the doorstep, bags of potatoes, baskets of apples, crates of berries and cranberries, cans of fruits and vegetables, cartons of eggs, crates of vegetables, tobacco, and many other products sold in stores and shops. That these products are graded and fresh and dependable and available at the lowest percentage of the consumer dollar on record, is due in no small measure to self-starting efforts of farmers through cooperative effort.

As I see it, the principles underlying farmer cooperatives stand foursquare with the principles of democracy, free enterprise, and the Golden Rule. They might have originated wherever, and only wherever, free people with restricted resources get together to meet a common need. One would expect cooperatives to be prominent in New England. Certainly the principles were early exemplified and perfected in the development of the New England church societies and the town meeting. Certainly the cooperative principle is well established in insurance societies, thrift and savings institutions, and both urban and farmer cooperative associations serving the area now. The cooperative society is basically a thrifty conservator of both human effort and shy economic resources. It provides a working economic and cultural democracy for small operators who pool their common interests, and yet maintain their individual independence and dignity.

Basic to farmer cooperatives is the fact that they are owned and controlled by the people they serve—for the most part the stable, sound, middle classes who are the backbone of America. Farmer cooperatives contribute to the building of America as we want it to be, by making for a stronger, self-reliant rural economy. Through cooperatives groups of farmers work together to supplement their primary tilling operations and husbandry. Those interested in maintaining the free enterprise system at its best can render no greater contribution than to strengthen the family owned and operated farm. Farmer cooperatives do this by providing the economies of large-scale buying and marketing at cost for the operators of family farms.

And may I say here that mere size of a cooperative is no test as to its genuineness. In many lines today cooperatives must deal in large volume to be efficient. The truth is that if you will examine a so-called big cooperative closely you will usually find that it is composed of many local units all operated by the farmers they serve. The ownership of bona fide cooperatives is never by a small group at the top but by the farmers at the bottom. Farmers engage in processing and manufacturing through their cooperatives, provided it is related to their production or marketing operations. However, it is not farmer cooperative policy for a group of farmers to engage in the manufacturing or merchandising of things they neither produce nor use in farming operations and contend that such is a farmer cooperative enterprise.

COOPERATION IN OTHER FIELDS

I think that to get the true perspective of the use of the cooperative principle we might consider the scope of nonprofit business in America. In addition to farmer and consumer cooperatives, it includes mutual insurance companies, mutual savings banks, mutual building and loan associations, mutual telephone companies, mutual irrigation companies, mutual power and light associations, and a host of others.

For the most part, farmer cooperatives constitute a different method of doing business than does the ordinary corporation. The relationship between the patron and the association is that of principal and agent. This is distinctly different than the relationship between an ordinary corporation and its stockholders, or for that matter between a cooperative and its stockholder. In neither of the latter instances do the courts hold the relationship to be that of principal and agent. In other words, the savings dollar of a cooperative belongs to the patron and not the association, whereas the profit dollar of a corporation belongs to the corporate entity itself. The investor in a corporation frequently does not patronize the business at all. He is interested in profits from use of his capital only. This is the fundamental difference between a savings dollar and a profit dollar—they result from different methods of doing business. Both partnerships and proprietary businesses resemble cooperatives in that the title to earnings is vested in the partners or proprietors, respectively, and not in artificial business entities. Of course, the source of their earnings is not from within their membership patronage as in the case of a cooperative.

In view of this, a strange thing about the groups of tradesmen and businessmen who have been inveigled into opposing cooperatives is that many of them—in small communities almost all of them—are partners or samll proprietors of private business enterprises and are not corporations. And here I want to pause long enough to say that not by any means are all business interests fighting cooperatives—in fact, those that are no doubt constitute a minority. Nor is there any strong evidence that it is big business that is fighting cooperatives. The truth seems to be that certain competitive trade groups are the most active.

COOPERATIVES PAY TAXES

Still another point often overlooked is that savings of cooperatives do not escape income taxation since the patrons must include such earnings as income in their personal tax returns. The same is true of small proprietors and partnerships.

Of course, farmer cooperatives contribute to the support of Government and pay taxes on about the same basis as other businesses. To mention some of them, they pay State and local property taxes, excise taxes, transportation taxes, social-security taxes, unemployment insurance taxes, use taxes, import taxes, and occupational taxes. In general they even pay income taxes to the extent that they issue stock or do business with nonmembers for profit. If a way could be found of taxing the farmer's income while it is in the custody of his cooperative, farmers might be forced to reduce deductions and overcharges (commonly referred to as margins) to the point that there would be no savings. This, of course, would result in a competitive situation which cooperatives historically sought to avoid.

I am sure that if the American public fully understands what farmer cooperatives are, what they stand for, how they operate, and how they have contributed to our national interest in the field of foodstuffs and materials, they would have undivided support in their efforts to narrow the gap between farm and urban tables and clothes closets.

THE COOPERATIVE STORY MUST BE TOLD FAR AND WIDE

In the last analysis the big job of education necessary to bring about a general understanding of cooperative principles must

take place at the grass roots. This means that local cooperatives and cooperative leaders must do a large part of it. There is plenty of room for rural educational services to contribute unbiased research and information on the whole subject of farmer cooperatives. The major task of the national council, as we see it, is to supply information, coordinate the activities of local units, and assist them so that the total efforts will add up to an effective national operating program.

We are not attempting to do the whole job from Washington. Nor are we in any sense attempting to advise regional, State, and local groups as to just how they are to go about the details. Because conditions differ so from State to State and area to area, we believe that our work of organizing and developing a program for cooperatives should leave details to be worked out locally. Experience already indicates that this procedure is sound. I wish I had time to tell you what different groups are doing.

There is another phase to this educational process which is equally as important as that of teaching cooperative principles to the public and to national leaders, and that is getting farmer cooperatives and cooperators to realize the limitations and responsibilities of cooperatives under the law. In this connection questions of law, adequate records, allocation of reserves, revolving funds, patronage refunds, and the responsibilities of patrons for reporting taxable equities not paid out in cash are particularly important. Cooperative leaders and officials should discuss these and related matters among themselves and with their attorneys and accountants. We must keep these matters straight with members and with the public. I am glad to report that State councils of farmer cooperatives are rendering excellent service in this direction.

In carrying forward this or any other program for farmer cooperatives, we must provide for active participation of the farmer members and patrons themselves. Farmer cooperatives do not exist as ends unto themselves, but as means to a sounder economy based on free enterprise. And in the same way farm organizations at the local, State, regional as well as national levels can justify their existence only by serving the farmers of America within the pattern of the general welfare.

FREE ENTERPRISE MUST ENDURE

One of our main concerns is that lack of understanding of the farmer cooperatives may be used to drive a wedge between agriculture and business which will be to the detriment of both groups and may take a generation or longer to overcome. It would be extremely unfortunate if these two large segments of American free enterprise should dissipate their strength baiting each other at a time when the system of free enterprise is engaged in a serious struggle to maintain itself. Both agriculture and business should devote their entire energy in constructive positive action rather than trying to hinder the other fellow. Such efforts might include improving the preservation and storing of perishables, such as by dehydration and quick freezing; improving the tools and equipment for cultivation and harvesting; improving the effectiveness of disease-control equipment and materials; improving distribution between farmer and consumer; finding new uses for farm products; enlarging our foreign outlets. The ultimate reward will go to those who fill each minute with 60 seconds of constructive effort rather than destructive horseplay. Farmer cooperatives are prepared to go ahead, and if others lag, will set the pace and lead the way toward processing higher-quality foods and distributing them widely and efficiently.

I believe that in the post-war period, agriculture, industry, and labor must each look beyond its own narrow restricted interest to the common good and the national welfare if we are to achieve our greatest potential success as a nation. An Army officer stated recently that if an army's strategy is right it can make mistakes in tactics and still win the battle. I submit that the correct over-all strategy of industry, labor, and agriculture should be to work directly for the good of the whole Nation. If this strategy is used, the Nation will win out in the post-war period in spite of mistakes in tactics. If this fails, there is the alternative of more governmental controls and ultimately statism.

Finally, the need of the country for sound rural institutions was never greater nor the opportunities more challenging than they are today. Farmer cooperatives shall not lack for public approval if they are sufficiently diligent in proclaiming sound objectives to the world and in maintaining sound cooperative principles. Cooperatives should not seek competitive advantages through special privileges under the law, nor should the public be denied the advantages inherent in the cooperative way of preparing and delivering its food and textiles. A prominent business leader recently struck a true note when he said that the expansion of farmer cooperatives in the future will depend in a large degree upon how well other business serves the farmer's needs. I see no inherent conflict between farmer cooperatives and other business. From the farmer's viewpoint, the future of farmer cooperatives will depend on what is done through cooperatives, not on what is done to cooperatives.

Memorandum on Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to exend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Philip Wylie, appearing in the American Mercury for January 1945:

MEMORANDUM ON ANTI-SEMITISM

(By Philip Wylie)

"Hitler," said the man beside me on the train, "was right about one thing: the Jews. After the war, we'll have to take care of them."

I asked how. "Build furnaces and burn them?"

He was shocked. "Deport 'em. Segregate 'em. Maybe, later, sterilize 'em. Painlessly," he added. "I'm no murderer. We've got to do it in a decent, democratic way."

Up a couple of seats, Sam Morris rose and went to the smoking car. I know Sam. He has served in the war. He has stars on his ribbons. He is an athlete. He wasn't afraid of the man beside me; indeed, he could have licked him with one hand tied behind his back. But Sam is a Jew. Sam cannot argue with a man who has already condemned him; Sam's persecutors are out to get Sam—not to hear him.

So it was up to me to answer. To me, because I'm a Gentile. To me, because anti-Semitism is a sickness of Gentiles' minds that has nothing whatever to do with Jews.

"What business are you in?" I enquired.

His name was Johnson—though he wasn't one. ("Johnsons" are the honest, generous, bright people of this world.) He was an engineer—built skyscrapers—a graduate of a leading technical institute.

"What's the matter with Jews," I asked, "that isn't, equally, the matter with other human beings?"

Mr. Johnson made the standard accusations. Launched them like clay pigeons, which they are, and I shot at them with the truth any Gentile can discover in a day, if he respects himself enough to want to be guided by truth instead of prejudice. It's an easy list of facts. Everybody ought to learn it.

The Jews, said Mr. Johnson, own everything—the banks, Wall Street, the newspapers, the movies, the theater, radio, and so on.

They don't, of course. Less than 5 percent of the population of America is Jewish. Jews do not own 5 percent of the national wealth. A mere half dozen of Wall Street's myriad gentile bankers could buy out the banking interests of all the Jews.

He thinks he can distinguish Jews. That, too, is part of his easily demonstrated illusion. He cannot point out the Jews in the car where we are sitting—with accuracy. He tries. He skips a tall, pug-nosed blond who is the son of a rabbi. He indicates a dark, hook-nosed gentleman who presently begins to converse in Italian—with a red-headed Italian woman.

Here, Mr. Johnson is partly the victim of our poor American education; he has not had the energy or will to remedy its oversights, after growing up. In spite of the fact that America understood its biologically superb and idealistically wonderful function as a melting pot, America's little red schoolhouse never taught the similarities of people. It concentrated on their differentness. The fact that people are alike fundamentally—with the same feelings, the same power for good, the same capacities for harm—is always lost through classroom attention to dissimilarities.

That blunder is a terrible one. Mr. Johnson—and you and I—were told to think of Eskimos not as uneducated people but as strange, primeval creatures. Frenchmen were presented to us as total foreigners. Germans were a quaint folk who dressed in their native costumes. The fact that the Chinese used chopsticks instead of knives and forks set them far apart from us in our young minds; we did not learn that they were philosophers, scientists, inventors, and city builders thousands of years before there was a London. Fiji Islanders were described to us as cannibals—as remote in space as Mars and, in heredity, as monkeys.

Mr. Johnson still thinks of people in those terms. An accent or a different trouser-cut is to him non-Johnson and therefore sub-Johnson. Since he has held pieces of this attitude from the first grade on, he seems to sense a reality in anti-Semitism. Mr. Johnson nowadays is distressed. The years of his life have been lived amid wars, plague, holocaust, depression, and global madness. He is a "practical" man; if he could find persons responsible for his travail, he would destroy those people or, at least, their power. He yearns to locate the responsible ones because he yearns for peace, progress, and prosperity. He wants of life only an assurance that he will be able to go on putting up skyscrapers at a reasonable profit. In all of that, he is sincere and he is justified.

II

To be told that the Jews have been man's nemesis suggests a name for the wanted culprit; it satisfies his tribal feeling; it falls in line with the prejudices he was casually given in the name of education, and Johnson doesn't really know anything about Jews. He is acquainted with a dozen, likes two or three, and knows the rest only through crowd-competition on streets and subways and in the offices of a big city. He never studied the history of Jews—or Johnsons, for that matter. He knows nothing of Jewish religion and cares to know less. Since many

people say that the ruinous estate of man is the fault of Jews, he is willing to listen.

And people have been saying it everywhere in America at the top of their lungs. Nazis, for instance. Nazis, bigots, and the deathless mass of mere ignorant haters. But many of these people have a shrewd reason for saying so. If they can make enough Johnsons believe that the Jews are enemies of mankind, they can keep American eyes turned from man's real enemies—their own conniving organizations. Hitler accomplished that. He consumed the minds of the Germans and of millions of Europeans and even of many Americans by lighting in them the fire of anti-Semitism. Then, while they were blazing with irrelevant fury, he closed his iron fingers upon Europe. That is today the hidden policy, and the hope, of various organized and articulate minorities in America. It has always been and will always be. If enough of us can be convinced of the baseless notion that our troubles stem from Jews we will go blind, politically and socially, and intellectually. Then we'll be easy pickings for the plotters. Because the mind that believes in anti-Semitism has ceased thinking, it is perfectly prepared to accept the next lie, and the next. Catastrophe comes that way. Look across the Atlantic and see.

Curdle the common sense of the common people and you can capture them. Anti-Semitism curdles every cranium in which it reposes for just one simple reason; it's not based on truth—any truth. And it is not based on religious principle, either. Mr. Johnson professes Christianity. I mentioned the fact to him. He has that all figured out. The Jews, he says, slew Jesus.

Now, according to the Bible, the Romans put Jesus to death to satisfy the indignation of certain dogmatic Jews who resented Him. Even then, as we can see, the Jews were divided among themselves. Mr. Johnson is still holding today's Jews responsible for that 2,000-year-old tragedy. If you told Mr. Johnson that he was to blame for the comparatively recent Gentile assassination of Lincoln, he would think you were crazy. But that is what he is saying about the Jews. You see, Mr. Johnson's sense of justice isn't doing business any more.

That makes Mr. Johnson a pretty dangerous person—no matter how earnest he is, or how good to his children, or how honest about his taxes, or how ingenious with steel, concrete, and a drawing board. Part of his brain is already on the sucker list of various groups of people who are out to sabotage the rest of it.

All the failings of mankind, failings of which he secretly knows we are equally guilty, have been loaded by Mr. Johnson upon the Jews, as if only they could sin. That lack of heart and wisdom is man's snidest weakness—a weakness born out of blind fear and its answering rage. Numberless times in history we have punished one group in spiteful vengeance for calamities caused by the greed and stupidity of all groups together. That is the real source of every calamity. But Mr. Johnson is eying Jews with the old, lop-sided malignance if he can, will hide from himself his portion of responsibility for today's disasters by this outrageous claim that one small fraction of humanity is to blame.

That will undo his senses, for Mr. Johnson has thereby made himself believe he is afraid of Jews. Afraid! In the last 10 years, they have been cut a quarter or a third. Hitler's ashpits contain the murdered millions. Here in America, their number is so small that even if they were armed and organized, we gentiles would be feeble indeed to fear them. And they are without organization. And they have no arms at all. Through the centuries they never armed themselves. They fought bravely in hundreds of wars for the lands they hopefully adopted. But they were always the few. They loved peace. For this they have been bullied. So Mr. Johnson is actually growing afraid of nimself—or of mankind in general. Scared by the suspected intellectual consequences of a creeping hypnosis—anti-Semitism. It is a very self-frightening state of mind. I know. Some of my best friends are anti-Semites.

III

To be an anti-Semite is to repudiate our Constitution and to deny every syllable of meaning in the story of America. People don't think of that, but every law we have made is based upon the principle of the individual and his rights. Talk does not often lead to chaos. But there has never been a chaos that was not preceded by talk, much talk, all prejudiced, ignorant, underground, dishonest and evil. Unlike Mr. Johnson, most of my mean-talking friends are not planning action. The very thought would make them shudder. But the tone their muttering takes is the sort that can stampede idiots—and has done so a thousand times. They are people who should not stand as poor examples to the less intelligent, the less decent, the vicious and the morally deficient.

They just don't reason. They tell me—all of them—that some of their best friends are Jews and that there are "fine" Jews. Five minutes later, they belittle and demean Jews—thus thrusting knives in the backs of those very friends. They are too empty-headed to perceive that, by everybody else, their Jewish friends are automatically included in their debasing generality. That is one measure of their stupidity. They ought to know, if they are over 10 years old, that the proportion of "fine" people among Jews and Gentiles runs just the same, to the last decimal point. And they should remember that whenever a group is disenfranchised or destroyed, mankind then has the tyrant or executioner to deal with. In such a case it would be—themselves. Finally, they should have been taught this truth: Those who persecute one group inevitably turn upon others. I daresay 50 percent of the anti-Semitic talkers known to me are also anti-Catholic. Suppose their words, which have the same darkling color that made pogroms in Europe, become reality? Against whom would they strike next?

But—let us half-suppose it. Like the shrewd hill-billy in the fable, let us turn propaganda into imagined reality. If it happened—what? Suppose all Jews vanished at the stroke of midnight. What evil would be undone? What blessing would result? What's this talk all about? If Mr. Johnson drew a graph, what would it reveal?

The next day there would still be as many crimes committed, per capita. Prisons would remain proportionately as full. The number of corrupt politicians and office-holders would hardly diminish by a handful. We would lose ground in the war, because the Axis would lose nobody, but hundreds of thousands of good allied soldiers would be missing. No problem of the peace would change a hair-breadth. Even Palestine would then be the Arab problem it always was. The strikers would still strike; John L. Lewis and Petrillo would still haunt us. There would be 5 percent more food—but distribution would buckle; 5 percent more material for clothes—and nobody much left to make clothes, and, of course, taxes would rise 5 percent. The movies and the radio wouldn't miss a beat, in spite of what the anti-Semites have said. Only the quality would suffer. The market would sag, but not collapse, for there are not that many Jews in it and the average Jew is poor, in spite, again, of the illiterate folklore.

No gain. What loss? Well—most of the people who make America laugh would be gone, for one thing. And many of the people who touch our hearts every day. Poets, writers, dramatists, journalists, best-loved radio and movie stars and musicians—thousands upon thousands of these. You can write the list yourself. We would lose hundreds of great philanthropists, myriads of lesser ones, and hundreds of thousands of the kindest people in America, besides. Our culture would be knocked out and the throat of our mirth would be cut. Quite a loss. We would lose so many scientists that the progress of man would be set back the length of your whole lifetime. We would lose the millions of babies and adults their research was going to have saved. We would lose thousands of men now thinking up instruments of victory—and all the uncountable engines they would have invented for the empire we call the future. If we had caused this, we would lose the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, our security, everybody's liberty, our self-respect, and the immortal souls of those who had contributed to the measureless catastrophe even by talk. "Information, please," would be wiped out. We would lose Barney Baruch and Hedy LaMarr and Albert Einstein, and Walter Lippmann, and—

That's what anti-Semitism is.

And what I have had to say about it is not merely what I think. It is what I know. What can easily be known by you, to the great relief and enlargement of your soul, if you are anti-Semitic. It is the truth known by me, Philip Wylie, a sixth-and-seventh generation Scotch-Irish-Presbyterian American. It is written by me of my own free will in this great, freedom-loving land, because I, too, love liberty and justice and truth. Written by me, who, because I am part Irish and because Caesar's legions stayed so long in Ireland, am also part wop. Who because I am of that Iberian descent, am also part spic and possibly (as every living man may be) in some minute part, Negro. By me, whose ancestors on the British Isles, 70 matings' distant in my direct line, were cannibals—as, definitely, were yours if you claim British blood.

During the days when our sires were stewing each other's joints in clay pots—a mere 70 grandfathers back—the Jews had been civilized for 2,000 years. They had already given to humanity its first concept of organized law and the stupendous idea of one God. At that time they also produced the most deeply-discerning and articulate philosopher the world has ever known—a Man who spent his life teaching people the whole truth about human relations: "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

National Farmers Union 1945 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as a long-time member of the Farmers Union, and having, among other capacities, served as manager of a Farmers' Union cooperative for 11 years, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the Farmers Union program for 1945.

I have received from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing, which indicates that the matter will cover approximately 4⅘ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $249.60.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION 1945 PROGRAM

The lives of our finest men and women are being spent on the world's battle fronts to give us, and all peoples, another chance to organize a people's peace. If we fail, they are betrayed.

Their hopes and the hopes of millions in every land add up to nothing less than a new world, a world that will make sense to returning veterans and to all productive workers, a world in which they can buy back with their incomes and wages the products of their hands and brains and their eternal courage, a world in which abundance for the first time spells health, security, and happiness not breadlines, foreclosure sales, bonus marches, and "made work" at pauper's wages. The world they want will deny the rule that because we can always produce too much we shall never have enough except in war. The world they seek will accept abundance and know how to use it for people.

Most of those who fight and produce to win this people's war have promised themselves that this time we shall not again lose the peace after we have won the war.

If permanent world peace is to be a reality, we must maintain the level of production, prosperity, and practical international cooperation which we have achieved in war.

We must have a world organization with power to enforce decisions against those who disturb or break the peace.

There must be full employment, with all it means in terms of prosperity, security, happiness, and good will among men and among groups in our society. It must be maintained by private enterprise if possible, by a combination of private enterprise and public undertakings if necessary.

Neither of these two goals can be won and held without the other; they are dependent upon each other; we must work for both at once.

The President and the Congress that our democracy has just elected must be held to these principles. This we propose to do, and we call upon all other people's organizations and individuals of good will to cooperate in that endeavor. We note this statement of the citizen's responsibility made by the successful candidate for the Presidency on the eve of the national election:

"When the ballots are cast, your responsibilities do not cease. The public servants you elect cannot fulfill their trust unless you, the people, watch and advise them, raise your voices in protest when you believe your public servants to be wrong, back them up when you believe them to be right."

So be it. We have done so; we will continue to do so.

Actions, and failures to act, in the coming year will largely determine the lives and well-being of farm people, and all people, for many years to come. In a democracy such as ours, all responsibility rests with the people. In an organized society such as ours, people must effectively express themselves between elections through organizations of their own choosing and whose policies and officials they control and direct. We shall continue vigilant, quick to criticize, to support, and to recommend.

As a people's organization of, by, and for working farm operators and their families, we, the democratically elected delegates to the thirty-ninth annual convention of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (commonly known as the National Farmers Union), on this 22d day of November 1944, at Denver, Colo., do adopt the following program for the coming year, the same to be the guide and mandate for united action by our members, our officials, and employees, and by affiliated cooperatives which Farmers Union members, as stockholders, build and control as instruments to achieve the whole program of our educational and cooperative union.

We pledge our continued utmost efforts to bring the war to its speediest complete victory.

We pledge ourselves to work with men of good will everywhere for an international organization which, through political and economic cooperation, can bring about an era of enduring peace and universal brotherhood. This time we must not fail.

We pledge ourselves to use every resource at our command to create and implement a post-war program that will continue full production and full employment, allowing for the employment of all returning veterans, and that will provide full distribution and full consumption.

We pledge ourselves to cooperate with other forces to eradicate discriminations and prejudices of race, religion, nationality, color, political belief, or other distinguishing features that now expose any minority to persecution and intolerance.

We pledge our renewed faith in, and loyalty to, the basic principles that have guided the Farmers Union down through the years as sound means of building this world of abundance for ourselves and our families, and for families everywhere. Those principles are expressed in the Farmers Union creed and the triangle representing education, cooperation, and legislation as equally important and inseparable means of achieving these ends.

We pledge ourselves, and call on all farm families not yet members of our union to join with us in our pledge, to support the way of farming by farm families secure on the land as basic to American democracy, and to maintain stable farm prices at a fair exchange value as an essential of security.

We pledge ourselves to cooperate with other groups, including such parts of organized labor, business, and industry, such technical, professional, religious, political, civic, and welfare groups as concur in the objective of abundance for all to be attained by creating a system of genuine free enterprise. Such a system will include:

The right of people to cooperate freely to supply their needs;

The rights of businessmen and firms to compete freely to supply wants of customers;

The right of all the people to use freely their Government to curb monopoly and scarcity practices, together with the people's rights to provide through Government action for the common good, wherever, whenever, and to the extent that common good cannot be, or is not being, provided by private and cooperative enterprises.

In conformity with this general statement, we adopt the following specific proposals:

I. LAND POLICY

A. Action to save family-type farming

For years, farm organizations, legislators, and Government spokesmen have declared that family type farming must be made the basic pattern of American agriculture, that it is the basis of rural democracy and thus one of the foundation stones of democracy for all Americans. Yet, with few exceptions, no realistic effort has been made to advance this pattern in agriculture.

It is time to act to check and reverse the dispossession of American farm families from the land. Fair competition must be established within American agriculture. To do this, we propose the following program:

1. To extend the Wages and Hours Act to include all farm-wage earners, and the amendment of that act to set a minimum of 60 cents an hour, the least that will sustain purchasing power necessary to meet dietary needs. The same minimum must, of course, be used in computing the payment for the labor of a farm family in determining the price formula to be used in production agreements, as set forth under B below.

2. To extend the Social Security Act to cover all farm people, including farm labor.

3. To extend the National Labor Relations Act to include farm labor and employers of more than two wage earners for more than 30 days in any calendar year.

4. To direct greater production by family-type farming through adoption of a conscious and deliberate policy of assigning progressively larger shares of needed production goals and of such farm-program payments as may become necessary to family-size operations.

5. Vastly increased use by farmers themselves of cooperative mechanisms not only in the purchase of supplies and the assembly and marketing of farm products in their original state but the use of such mechanisms in every stage of the entire farming, marketing, processing, and distribution cycle. This must be done with utmost speed to take advantage of:

(a) The surplus materials and war plants already being made available; and

(b) To survive against the competition of factory-type farming in the rapid transformation of farming practices that accumulated technological development has stored up and will release when the war ends. Government aid in credit, in technical assistance, research, and the release of patents and know-how must be available, starting at once.

B. Production and pricing

For the immediate post-war period as well as for a long-time agricultural program there must be adopted a sound land policy which fortifies the security of farm families on the land. Family-type farming can best conserve and enrich the irreplaceable natural resources and develop and enrich the human resources of people made free and happy.

The Farmers Union has long called for such declaration of land policy as the basis of all farm programs. But to date all agricultural programs have been developed on an emergency basis without consistent regard for their effect on the pattern of farming and rural life.

Therefore, we propose the following items to carry out a policy for the benefit of farm families:

1. Production agreements voluntarily entered into by individual farmers and the Federal Government to assure production of an abundance of needed foods and fiber for a high and rising standard of living and for use in cooperative trade with other nations; and to provide a stable price structure based on fair exchange value.

While such agreements would take each participating farmer into partnership with the Federal Government, they would be administered by democratically elected farmer committees who would have full authority to pass on the justice, equity, and practicality of each agreement (which is to be adapted to each individual farm unit) and thereafter to cooperate with and assist participating farmers.

2. Such fair exchange value requires the determination of a new price formula, including, in addition to accepted costs:

(a) Payment for the labor of the farmer and the working members of his family at prevailing American wage levels, and payment of necessary hired labor at the same levels, but in no event less than the statutory minimum herein recommended;

(b) Insurance of production costs and of minimum income of farm families;

(c) Costs of proper conservation and soil building practices.

Such a price formula should be a yardstick of fair income.

3. In such production agreements, the Government stipulates in advance of the growing season the prices at which it will support the market for production pursuant to these agreements. These prices are to be set so as to secure production in the kinds

and quantities determined to be needed to meet the nation's nutritional and health requirements, plus ample reserves, and with due allowance for sales in international trade, on an orderly, not a dumping, basis.

4. Adjustment of farm lands into sound economic family-type units is part of basic policy in all such farm programs as here proposed.

5. As a possible supplement to the steps set forth in this section, we authorize the National Board and other officers to study carefully the principles and method of a National Agricultural Relations Act designed to enable farmers to use their own bona fide organizations and genuine cooperatives effectively to bargain collectively for fair exchanges prices, to determine the contract price at which various commodities would be sold and to determine the schedule of premiums and discounts for grade and quality; these collective bargaining agreements to be binding upon all participating sellers and buyers, with appropriate enforcement procedure under Federal statute.

C. Credit

If America is to have an economy of abundance, in which family-type farmers are to produce the bulk of fiber and foodstuffs, then such farmers, and those desirous and capable of becoming family-type farmers—veterans, war workers, and young farm boys—must have access to adequate low-cost credit which will enable them to acquire economic farm units, sufficient modern machinery and foundation herds, decent housing, and provide for conservation practices, production and marketing needs. Such a credit system will enable a farmer to utilize more efficiently his farm plants and his energies, meet his obligations, and give him an incentive to participate in more abundant living.

Such a credit embraces a wider use of private, cooperative, and Government-guaranteed and Government-sponsored credit agencies than has yet been utilized in agriculture, and the development and use of more trained practical personnel for credit work and credit supervision in agriculture.

Such credit structure should provide:

1. Long-term real-estate loans amortized over a long-time period with low interest rates based on actual cost of the money; such loans to be made on noninflated values, geared to production potentials, for proven farming ability and good character, and, where needed and desirable, at substantially full value.

2. Long-term loans for all types of agricultural credit, except feeder operations; repayments to be based on recognized depreciation schedules.

3. Credit for farm housing and other farm buildings, to provide adequate farm plants based on needs of each farm unit with repayments spread over enough years to permit the use of buildings and improvements while paying for them.

4. Credit for modern machinery and equipment on a depreciation basis, if desired.

5. Adequate credit for livestock, seeds, fertilizer, household improvements, farm electrification, and other farm supplies to enable the farm family on an economic farm unit to enjoy efficient operation and desirable rural life.

6. Adequate credit to attain objectives in conservation and better soil management.

7. Extension of the ever-normal granary type of credit (C. C. C. loans) to agricultural commodities not now covered, such as livestock and poultry products, dried and frozen products, etc.

8. Use of nonrecourse loans as a risk-sharing device in encouraging production of any necessary high-risk crops needed for immediate production without resorting to undue price incentives.

9. Long-time credits for hospital and clinic facilities, such health centers to include a cooperative prepayment plan for adequate health care. We recommend that the banks for cooperatives expend their facilities to cover health-center needs.

10. Credit for educational loans, on a deferred payment plan tied to the income-producing years, for college educations and other training.

11. To safeguard the extension of low-cost, long-term credit for all of these types of loans we advocate the creation of an extensive insurance program covering all farm production hazards.

D. Temporary action

Pending enactment of such a land and credit policy as the foregoing, we reiterate our support, as in past years, of present agencies such as Farm Security Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, Farm Credit Administration and its various agencies, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, War Food Administration, and other action programs endorsed by the Farmers Union in the past, each with adequate appropriations and each to be continued within the Department of Agriculture.

II. CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

A. Regional development

The measure of abundance and standard of living which can be attained in our Nation has no real limitation, unchangeable by man, except the extent of our human and natural resources. They must be developed to their fullest and finest uses for the people of our generation and all the generations of men to come. They must not be dedicated to exploitation, waste, or idleness by the few.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, a new type or regional government corporation without bureaucratic powers but with full responsibility for the best development of a valley's resources, has proved in 10 years' existence the vast superiority of unified development of the valleys of our Nation over development by exploitive interests or numerous unintegrated bureaus of Government.

We endorse the extension of the T. V. A. principles to all the river valleys of America, beginning with a Missouri Valley Authority, which is now before Congress.

We oppose the passage of any legislation by Congress whatsoever that would in any way jeopardize or foreclose the full development of the basin by a Missouri Valley Authority and of other river basins using T. V. A. principles. The establishment of this Authority should be followed by others in the Arkansas, Colorado, Columbia, St. Lawrence, Delaware, Mississippi, Ohio, and other major basins in the order of their importance.

We direct that major attention be given to this important and symbolic struggle in which bureaus of government, power monopolists, the railroads, the Fertilizer Trust, and other greedy and avaricious, selfish interests are conspiring to prevent development of our God-given heritage in the interests of all the people.

We oppose alteration of the 160-acre limitation on individual lands served by Government irrigation development as proposed in the so-called Elliott amendment to the river and harbor bill. Our Government must not subsidize large commercialized farming.

B. Soil conservation

We urge all farmers, union members, in areas not now in soil conservation districts, to work for the creation of such districts, and urge a speeding up of soil conservation work. We propose that surplus war equipment such as heavy-duty tractors, bulldozers, blades, scrapers, and other equipment adaptable to soil conservation work be transferred at the earliest possible time from the War and Navy Departments to the Soil Conservation Service.

C. Technology

1. We urge extensive research by the United States Department of Agriculture into full possibilities of the mechanization of family-type farm units to the end that the smaller units can secure the full benefit of modern science and technology. Further, we urge that the Congress make adequate appropriations for such purpose.

2. The age of abundance is dependent on technical progress and on the wise use of natural resources; it is the duty of government, therefore, to conduct extensive research into all phases of technology to the end that all technical progress may be made available to all the people. In peace, no less than in war, no cartel or patent agreement should be permitted to stand in the way of use of technical, scientific, and natural resources.

3. We particularly urge immediate preparation for the conversion of agricultural products into alcohol and other industrial products, and to develop processes and plants for making various synthetics out of lignite, clays, and other mineral resources of the Nation.

III. CONSERVATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES

If an era of abundance is to work for the common good, the human resources of our country must be conserved and develped so that every individual may have opportunity to develop his potentialities to the fullest. To this end we propose:

1. Health service

Adequate public-health services for rural areas, clinics and hospitals in rural areas, mobile health units, and the inducements needed to attract doctors to these areas, and a program to provide such facilities and opportunities, through private and cooperative action, supplemented by Government funds where necessary.

In such a program, the $264,000,000 worth of hospital equipment already declared to be war surplus should be used for equipping such hospitals and clinics in areas not now being served.

Such a program should supplement the medical-care provisions of the social-security program expanded along the lines proposed by the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

2. Standard of nutrition

An adequate diet for the maintenance of health for all as a prerequisite of an age of abundance for both producer and consumer, including nutritional education, hot school lunch plan, stamp plan, or similar plan to insure those not yet receiving a minimum standard of income the food necessary for an adequate diet.

3. Farm homes

Decent housing for all farm families, including tenants; rapid post-war extension of rural electrification; creation of a national agency to develop rural telephone service in areas not now served on a basis similar to rural electrification, and to be made a part of R. E. A. if possible and practicable.

4. Federal highway program

We urge an expended Federal-aid program to bring all-weather roads to all family-type farms in America; we particularly urge that wartime technological advances and economies in the building of roads and air strips be made freely available for use in this road program and for other purposes; we urge early enactment of the pending Federal roads program with amendment to provide larger amounts for farm-to-market roads and to do away with the 50–50 Federal-State matching provision. We urge that the Federal Surplus War Property Board, by policy and regulation, provide for the leasing of surplus road-building machinery to smaller governmental units, such as township boards, such leases to be at the nominal sum of $1 a year.

5. Public education

Education in America must be free, not only in terms of money, but also in terms of academic standards. The extension services in many States are not only subservient to a private pressure group but are contaminating academic standards within the land grant colleges themselves, also involving them in improper use of public moneys, and in political, social, and economic partisanship. As a first step in the overhauling and coordination of our agricultural education system, we demand the complete separation of the Extension Service from any private organization.

We further recommend that: The Farmers Union launch a study of changes and improvements needed to provide educational facilities that will better meet the needs of farm boys and girls in preparing them to develop a more attractive and satisfying rural living for themselves and their communities. Included in this study should be consideration of means of making the rural teaching profession more attractive to those capable of assisting in community development, by providing longer tenure, better salaries, and more desirable living opportunities. Federal aid should be extended to schools on a basis of need without disturbing the autonomy of existing school administration.

College education should be made available to all by providing for those who need it, payment of tuition and living expenses.

6. Veterans

To enable returning servicemen to reestablish themselves in civilian life under a post-war age of abundance, we propose:

A public-appraisal system to be made available to any veteran or any other person to determine the true productive value of any property to be acquired;

Extension of medical care and health services, now available to veterans, to members of veterans' families;

Early completion of a survey in every agricultural township in the Nation by local community groups to determine the availability of land of family type units to provide homes for returning servicemen and war workers.

Immediate action by Congress to authorize acquisition, by option or otherwise, of available land suitable for resale or long-time lease with option to purchase, to veterans and others.

Amendment of the G. I. bill of rights to provide full rehabilitation, vocational training; and educational opportunities for all service men and women.

Since young men and women who are old enough to die in the service of their country should be deemed old enough to vote, we recommend that the voting age be lowered to 18 years.

7. Recreation

Recreation, long recognized as socially desirable, is now seen to be economically necessary to maintain and develop morale and the national health and well-being. We urge further development of cooperative recreation, including community centers, which the Fermars Union has pioneered, and that such recreation facilities be available to people of the entire community under community sponsorship and control but financed where necessary with public funds.

8. Minority groups

All minority groups must be given protection against discrimination as to employment, voting franchise, education, and living conditions in the transition period and must be given opportunity to participate fully in the coming age of abundance. Specifically, this requires abolition of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, and the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

IV. THE PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT

Organized farm families, as well as other people's organizations, must have a voice and participate in the creation of a durable peace and the creation of an economy wherein we can live with abundance and like it. To that end we propose:

A. The making of a people's peace

1. Farmers and wage earners should be represented at all peace conferences through delegates chosen from their respective organizations.

2. Full participation by the United States in a world organization based on political and economic justice, governed by law and with power to enforce its decisions, and in which all peace-loving nations, great and small, cooperate.

3. Full adherence to world trade policies that will give all peoples everywhere real opportunity to make a decent living. Trade barriers contributed to World War No. 2 and, if permitted to continue, will bring on World War No. 3. When peace comes we must freely exchange substantial parts of our farm and industrial production with other nations, receiving from them products which we need.

In applying such a policy, groups adversely affected must be provided economic assistance and technical information in order to bring about a sound readjustment within the national economy. This must be provided before, not after, adoption of such policies.

4. We commend the ground work that has already been laid to accomplish these ends by the proposed international organization for food and agriculture, monetary stabilization, trade, air, shipping, communications and world security itself. We urge all farm people to support ratification by the Congress of such proposals for building the structure of world peace.

5. We oppose any attempt to establish permanent peacetime conscription while plans are being formulated for a decent peace that will make nationalistic militarism unnecessary.

6. We oppose the forced rule of any people by a foreign power, except such supervision as the United Nations may find necessary in relation to aggressor nations in the interest of world peace.

B. The post-war economy

1. Compensatory fiscal policies: For farm people, as for all other people, the prime need is for full employment, the same full use of our human and material resources in peace that we have achieved in war. This can be achieved only as the people, through their Government, plan and provide that their Government will take up the slack whenever private and cooperaitve enterprise fall short of investing sufficient capital to provide jobs and markets for all. The Farmers Union has proposed that the Federal Government do this through a planned program of useful public works and services, the necessary funds to be obtained by taxation based on ability to pay. We are proud that the Farmers Union first proposed this practical plan whereby the people would guarantee themselves full production, full employment, fair distribution, and full consumption at fair prices and wages.

2. We urge that farm-machinery production be given high priority in reconverting plants from war to peace production and, in any event, that production for the next crop year be expedited.

3. To attain an abundance in the post-war economy, Congress must create an agency to formulate and recommend methods to utilize all national resources to the fullest extent and enact legislation creating agencies with full responsibility for developing such resources.

4. A Government-cost analysis of every product and service in our farm, industrial, commercial, professional, and service operations so that every person may be informed of the true costs of the goods and services he buys and sells.

5. We commend the National Farmers Union representatives for writing into the Surplus War Property Act provisions to protect family-type farming, to give farmers and farmers' cooperatives equal access to surplus goods and plants on terms that will make it possible for farmers and their cooperatives to acquire such goods and facilities. We demand that in the administration of this act these provisions be carried out in letter and spirit. We commend National Farmers Union President Patton for exposing the now discredited Baruch reconversion plan and the late Surplus War Property Administrator, Will Clayton.

6. The Farmers Union position on price control and in opposition to inflationary propcsals has been proven sound and is now recognized as desirable for the reconversion period by those who fought us bitterly. We recommend that the Price Control Act be extended for 2 years after the war, when inflationary pressure of more than $120,000,000,000 in liquid funds will be competing for scarce manufactured goods.

7. We again urge long-overdue congressional action to prevent further land-price inflation by enactment of a 100-percent capital-gains tax on increases in sale prices over purchase prices on all farm lands purchased subsequent to the introduction of such legislation and sold prior to 5 years after the war, with appropriate allowance for interest on investment and improvements.

8. We renew our demand for removal of all interstate trade barriers, including discriminatory freight rates, trucking regulations, licensing, etc. We continue to oppose proposed increases in freight rates on agricultural products now pending before the I. C. C. We urge standardization of State insurance laws and we oppose exempting the $10,000,000,000 insurance industry from the provisions of the antitrust laws.

9. The right to cooperate—

(a) The right of farmers to cooperate to serve their needs at cost is being challenged in a well-financed campaign by antidemocratic forces who speak of free enterprise but who seek to misrepresent and discredit free enterprise when exercised by peoples' cooperatives. Most conspicuous of these forces is the National Tax Equality Association, whose stated objectives are to destroy the income-tax exemption status of bona fide farmers cooperatives and to deprive cooperatives of access to Government credit on terms comparable to those available to big private business enterprises.

Farmers' cooperatives pay all other taxes paid by other enterprises. Having no profits and no income, since savings are the property of its members, not of their agent, which is the cooperative, a cooperative cannot pay taxes on what it does not have—profits—and it should not be required to pay taxes on savings belonging to its members.

The National Farmers Union, which alone among farm and cooperative organizations immediately denounced and opposed the requirement, now written into the Federal Tax Act, that farmers cooperatives file income-tax returns, will continue to lead the fight to protect cooperatives and their members against double taxation. We shall gladly cooperate with other groups whose purpose is to protect bona fide cooperatives from all such attacks.

(b) Another instance of discrimination against farmers marketing organizations is the rule of the American Association of Railroads providing for equal allotment of boxcars, in case of short supply, to elevators at a

shipping point regardless of their past shipping volume. We deplore the edict of the Interstate Commerce Commission which puts the force of that Federal regulatory agency back of this unfair rule and direct our National Board and officers to take whatever steps are deemed advisable to correct this situation.

10. Taxation: We have always favored taxation based on ability to pay and have opposed in principle all forms of general sales and consumer taxes. A powerful and plausible drive is now being made to shift more of the post-war Federal tax burden from those best able to pay to the lower and middle income brackets. If tax programs now proposed should become law, the tax burden inevitably would be shifted to sales and other taxes which would limit consumption.

While recognizing the need for carefully revising Federal tax policies, we oppose beginning such revision by wiping out corporation and excess-profits taxes before the various loopholes, evasions, and inequities are cured. We specifically oppose the preposterous proposed constitutional amendment that would limit all income, gift, and inheritance taxes to 25 percent and thereby wipe out two-thirds of present taxes on higher incomes and inevitably bring on extortionate sales taxes.

11. Department of political information: Because final effectiveness of our legislative program requires that our members be currently informed of the record and attitude of public officials and candidates for public office on issues pertinent to the Farmers Union total program, we authorize and direct the national board to create a department of political information which will keep us informed on the record of all public officials. We recommend that State unions consider the establishment of such a department.

12. We endorse the proposal to put Congress on the air so that all citizens may have direct complete current information about the proceeding of their Representatives and Senators.

13. We urge that there be no closed hearings before congressional committees, except when national security is involved.

14. Cooperation with other people's organizations: We recommend and again endorse the Farmers Union policy of cooperation with other people's organizations in areas of agreement, which policy has proven its value in saving programs of vital importance to farm people and the general welfare.

V. THE FARMERS UNION MOVEMENT

As members of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union and stockholders in its various affiliated cooperatives, we mandate ourselves, local, county, State, and National officials and personnel of Farmers Union cooperatives to adhere to the following program in order that the Farmers Union may play its rightful role in the people's movement and promote greater unity in the total Farmers Union program for farm families:

A. Farmers Union cooperatives

1. To make the tremendous growth of all our Farmers Union cooperatives in the past few years even more effective in our total program, we urge every Farmers Union member to direct his entire patronage to all the various activities which Farmers Union members have set up and which they control.

2. We commend the National Farmers Union board and officers for creation of the National Farmers Union Service Corporation and recommend that it conduct a campaign to raise capital from Farmers Union members and cooperatives to the end that it may more speedily develop needed services, including a Farmers Union automobile insurance company serving members in the various States.

3. We recognize the necessity of the producer to carry business operations, on the cooperative plan, into the distributing as well as the productive field, whereby we are able, by taking our production to the consumer, to eliminate all unnecessary labor and profits.

Recognizing this charge to develop cooperatives placed upon our organization in 1902 by the founders, we commend our National Farmers Union for the establishment of national insurance services through National Farmers Union Service Corporation, and direct Farmers Union organizations everywhere to give due emphasis to the organization of cooperative services in geographic areas not now properly served and in fields of service not now developed by Farmers Union cooperatives.

4. Ties of Farmers Union cooperatives to the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union are paramount to any other affiliation because such activities have been built by Farmers Union people as component parts of an organization of, by, and for farm families. Affiliations of Farmers Union cooperative activities with other cooperatives in associations, federations, and joint undertakings are highly desirable if they do not jeopardize ties with the Farmers Union or harm any other Farmers Union cooperatives.

Farmers Union members determine broad policy through county, State, and national conventions and authorize their elected officials and personnel employed by those officials to speak for them in accordance with those policies.

Farmers Union cooperatives support this Farmers Union program and must not permit any association or federation to which they belong to speak for them in conflict with any part of this program. No cooperative organization can truly represent farmers on general farm policy because farmers can only make their wishes known through organizations which they specifically join for that purpose.

We favor cooperation between our affiliated regional cooperatives and other bona fide cooperatives to the fullest extent possible without sacrificing their relationship to the parent organization and to other Farmers Union business activities which Farmers Union members have built as instruments to use in advancing the total Farmers Union program. Such relationships include, of course, payment by regional cooperatives of the 5-percent educational fund to State Farmers Unions and the encouragement of existing and new local cooperatives to check dues of shareholders in the Farmers Union and payment of the 5-percent education fund to State and county unions.

We direct our national board and officers and personnel to keep us informed regarding progress and relationships among the various co-operatives as these may concern the total Farmers Union program.

B. National Farmers Union education

Democracy depends on education. Knowledge of social and economic problems will provide the understanding necessary to achieve the goals set forth in the National Farmers Union program. We know that an organization is not strong and useful solely because of large membership, but that our real strength derives as much from the quality of membership in understanding of our total problems as it does from numbers. We recognize that the National Farmers Union has held together and has grown in numbers, and even more, in standing and power in American life only because, in good times and bad, the informed and educated membership has known and understood, and has not been divided by enemies of family-type farming and democracy.

It is the responsibility of the National Farmers Union department of education to assist with leadership training and to make available study materials for all age groups on long-range policies and current issues affecting family-type farmers.

It is also the responsibility of this department to interpret in new areas the Farmers Union program.

1. The necessary mechanism to carry out the aims of the Farmers Union educational program consists of the National Farmers Union department of education, with its director and advisory council appointed by the national board, who work through the State, county, and local directors of education. This department is set up for the purpose of developing a pattern and building mechanics for the Farmers Union program of education. It is a coordinating center for the maintenance of a uniform pattern for education throughout the union. In States where this plan is not in effect, it should be put into operation.

To further carry on leadership training, the program of camps, schools, and conferences should be developed and enlarged. This training should be made available to leaders in all departments of the Farmers Union.

2. Action officials: In order that current information on all phases of the Farmers Union program may be given to the members and that a maximum number of people in the local may be active, we recommend that the full slate of action officials be appointed in all local and county organizations. These will include legislative, cooperative, and membership officials, in addition to the program director and education director. The Action Guide, which specifically states the duties of these action officials, should be distributed to all Farmers Union locals.

In order to assist them in carrying out their work, information should be available to these action officials through the program service, State and national union farmers, and through direct contact with the State and national offices.

3. National study topic: The uniform study topic for the year 1945 shall be, Recreation. This is the first-year topic under the 5-year plan of study, designed to give the junior a well-balanced background for adult membership. The 5-year plan includes: The first-year study on recreation and its place in community life and total living; the second year, the Farmers Union as a people's movement and a family organization; the third year, the farm family and its relation to government; the fourth year, cooperatives and their relation to a people's organization; and the fifth year, techniques in building the Farmers Union. Throughout the 5 years there will be coordination of special projects and actual practice in each field under study.

In addition to the national study topic, the National Farmers Union Department of Education will prepare study packets and one-night discussion outlines on current topics such as: M. V. A., Rural Health, Social Security, and Housing.

4. The Department of Education should continue to follow up the work of other departments, such as organization, as rapidly as personnel funds permit.

5. We urge county and local leaders to include a program of education and recreation of special interest to the group of young people, who, although adults, are not completely acclimated to the local, thus encouraging them to participate in the regular activities of the local.

6. Farmers Union study units should be placed in public schools to the greatest extent possible. In some states, this has already been done through the approval and recommendation of the State superintendent of schools. Many county Farmers Unions have provided kits of study materials for their county libraries and county schools. We recommend that the county education directors bring our study materials to the at-

tention of the superintendents of schools in their counties.

7. Insofar as possible, Farmers Union study materials should be adapted for use of those members who have special language difficulties. Primarily, this calls for a simplification of terminology, but in some instances, there should be actual translations into Spanish, French, etc.

We commend National Educational Director Gladys Talbott Edwards for her vision and leadership in developing a program of education, and her inspiration that has given the leaders the will to put that program into effect.

We also commend all those who have given voluntarily of their time and energy in making this educational program a vital part in rural community living.

C. Organizational recommendations

In the difficult days of post-war adjustment and momentous decisions, family farmers will need, as never before, a voice that is powerful and respected in the legislative and administrative offices of the Nation. Expanding membership is consequently vital. It can be achieved, in effective numbers, only by the cooperation of every division and every member of the National Farmers Union. We recognize the challenge to increase membership all over the Nation implicit in the splendid accomplishments of South Dakota, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and other States which, this year, have led membership increases. We pledge our local, county, State, and regional organizations to accept that challenge and to strive with renewed devotion to attain new membership goals in an all-out effort to match and exceed the membership gains of the past 3 years.

1. We direct the National Farmers Union to promote and assist in the development of the Farmers Union movement in new States and regions in the Nation.

2. We direct our established State and regional divisions to devote the limit of their finances and strength to enrollment of new membership in their areas, assisting county and local organizations in conducting Statewide membership drives.

3. We note with gratification the phenomenal expansion of the National Union Farmer, and urge that our members and divisions use it extensively in connection with their organization work to educate nonmembers in the objectives and activities of the Farmers Union. Further, we urge all members and divisions to cooperate in its further expansion in circulation as soon as paper rationing is relaxed, by conducting circulation campaigns.

4. We urge the intensification of leadership training, to the end that understanding of national problems, techniques of organization and administration of our union shall be improved.

5. We take pride in the development of our national staff and in its outstanding competency. Farm people deserve and must have the services of men and women second to no other organization if our goals and immediate objectives are to be won. We direct the maintenance of our staff at its present high degree of excellence and its expansion, to render additional services, as conditions permit.

6. The National Farmers Union shall again plan and conduct a campaign through Farmers Union divisions and cooperatives to provide, in addition to other income, a national budget of $100,000 to support the services and the continued expansion of our organization.

7. The national officers are directed to appoint a drafting committee of five persons, to be in session at the national office 1 week before the national convention. Recommendations and resolutions are to be presented to the national secretary-treasurer and be in his hands at the national office 1 week prior to the convention so that they may be considered by the drafting committee.

No resolution may be presented from the floor of the convention without a majority vote of the delegates.

This directive shall be printed in the next issue of the National Union Farmer and again 60 days prior to the next national convention, so that all State, county, and local farmers unions and members shall have had adequate notice.

To supply the means and achieve the ends set forth in this program, we, the delegates to the thirty-ninth annual convention of the National Farmers Union, dedicate ourselves and the farmers union members we represent.

We will devote all our thought and energy and cooperative effort to bringing complete military victory at the earliest hour.

We will, in thought and action, seek a sensible, just, and lasting peace.

And we will cooperate with all people of good will in this and other lands to make that peace a peace of abundance for all within this Nation, and increasingly, among nations, so that it will endure and grow stronger through the generations yet to come. Insofar as it lies within our individual and organized power, and with the help of a Supreme Being, we shall prove our faith by our works.

The Philippine Commonwealth

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's news that General MacArthur had turned the civil government of the Philippines over the Philippine Commonwealth was received with much rejoicing by the American friends of the Filipino people. Those of us who assisted in the inauguration of the Philippine Commonwealth Government at Manila in 1935 are thrilled by the ceremonies that occurred in the Philippine capital yesterday. This action by a great American general is the essence of the determination of the Government of the United States that complete freedom and political independence shall come to the people of the Philippines.

The original Tydings-McDuffie Act provided for complete independence of the Philippines on July 4, 1946. This act was later amended by the Congress to give the President of the United States authority to declare complete independence of the Philippine Islands after the enemy has been driven from the Islands and when constitutional processes may have been restored.

The first step toward Philippine independence was taken in Manila when the Philippine Commonwealth Government was inaugurated. The amendment to the Tydings-McDuffie Act was the second step. The third step was taken on Leyte Island when General MacArthur turned over the civil functions of government of that island to President Osmeña. The fourth step was taken yesterday in Manila when, in historic setting, MacArthur restored civil government to President Osmeña.

We now join our Filipino brethren in the fervent prayer that the fifth and final step can soon be taken—taken when the enemy has been driven from the islands and the President of the United States has proclaimed complete Philippine independence.

Americans and Filipinos fighting side by side for freedom have shed blood in many battles from Bataan to Australia and back to Bataan. Americans and Filipinos are fighting together against the common enemy at the very door of Tokyo. Victory will be the inevitable outcome of this great effort, and that victory will make sure and secure the dream of Philippine independence. That victory will release the will of the American people to aid the rehabilitation of the Philippine Commonwealth.

In this hour of rejoicing in Manila I join with many others in this Congress in sending to that great American soldier, Douglas MacArthur, and his heroic forces, to President Sergio Osmeña, and our colleague, the Honorable CARLOS ROMULO, and the people of the Philippine Islands, our felicitations and prayers for early victory and freedom.

Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Whither R. E. A.," written by Judson King and published in the March 1, 1945, issue of the magazine Public Utilities Fortnightly.

I have received from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of publication in the RECORD, which indicates that the cost will be $160.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITHER R. E. A.?

(By Judson King, director, National Popular Government League)

The introduction in both Houses of Congress of an identical bill to take the Rural Electrification Administration out of the Department of Agriculture and restore it to its original independent status, the resignation of Harry Slattery as Administrator, and the appointment of Aubrey Williams to succeed him, once more focus attention upon the fortunes of that popular but troubled agency. Its fate has been hanging in the balance for nearly 2 years as the result of a heated controversy over its administration, of importance enough to hit the front page even in wartime.

What is the present status of the controversy? What effect will the appointment of Mr. Williams have upon the movement for

independence? What, from the viewpoint of businesslike, honest, nonpartisan management, is best for R. E. A.? In short, where should we go from here? These are the queries posed for answer by the editor of the Fortnightly as a contribution to his forum in which are printed articles on all sides of utility problems.

I am glad to comply. The Fortnightly, though not an advocate of public power, has been fair in its treatment of this R. E. A. matter, and reported accurately and impartially the hearings of the Senate committee investigating the administration of the agency. This committee, it will be recalled, last June reported an "emergency situation within R. E. A." due to disintegration and confusion which "is an indictment of the administration under the Agriculture Department"; recommended restoration of its independence "at the earliest possible date"; and introduced a bill (S. 2034) to take the agency out of the Department. The report was unanimous, and was signed by the late Senator Smith, Democrat, South Carolina, Senator SHIPSTEAD, Republican, Minnesota; Senator AIKEN, Republican, Vermont; and Senator Gillette, Democrat, Iowa. The Presidential campaign intervened and the bill died with the Seventy-eighth Congress.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SITUATION

The bill in exact text (S. 309) was reintroduced on January 15 by Senator SHIPSTEAD on behalf of himself and Senators AIKEN and WHEELER (Democrat, Montana), and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, of which Senator THOMAS, of Oklahoma, is now chairman. The next day it was introduced in the House by Representatives A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Democrat of Missouri, and HENRY O. TALLE, Republican of Iowa. These bills are numbered H. R. 1505 and 1532, respectively, and were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the chairman of which is Representative CLARENCE F. LEA of California. From its inception rural electrification has always been considered a nonpartisan issue, and bills and appropriations have been handled in Congress upon that basis. The introduction of this bill for independence by members of both parties further emphasizes that fact.

Senator THOMAS has appointed a subcommittee, with himself as chairman, to hold hearings on the bill. The other members are Senators RUSSELL of Georgia, ELLENDER of Louisiana, and BILBO of Mississippi, Democrats; and SHIPSTEAD of Minnesota, and AIKEN of Vermont, Republicans. The House subcommittee had not been announced at this writing.

As to the appointment by the President of Mr. Williams as Administrator, the five Members of Congress who have introduced this bill state that they are urging the freedom of R. E. A. as a matter of principle distinct from personalities; that they are concerned over the permanent, as well as the immediate, welfare of the agency; and that they will present evidence and press for the passage of the bill regardless of who is Secretary of Agriculture or Administrator, and also in complete disregard of partisan politics.

It is no secret that Senators Shipstead, Aiken, and Gillette, who did the hard work on last year's investigation (Smith was preoccupied with his campaign and BILBO did not attend or sign), did not take kindly to the contemptuous propaganda campaign set going by Secretary Wickard, his Department heads in R. E. A., and the officials of the N. R. E. C. A. They contended that the probe was a farce, one-sided, and merely a political smear campaign to embarrass the Roosevelt administration. The committee indicated in its interim report that the scant appropriation allowed it (it was only $7,000) permitted the employment of an utterly inadequate staff to sift a mountain of official documents, and did not allow the holding of hearings in St. Louis and elsewhere as they desired, or even to bring witnesses to Washington. With Senators SHIPSTEAD and AIKEN who are thoroughly aware of the shortcomings of the inquiry to date and who know the subject as did Senator Gillette, made members of the new committee, it is practically certain that a mass of new evidence will be produced, with special attention paid to the political and managerial activities of Secretary Wickard since the interim report of last June, which seems to have had no effect upon him.

THE KEY TO THE CONFLICT

The parliamentary situation cleared, we may now turn to a brief review of Mr. Wickard's administration of R. E. A., which led to the present crisis in its affairs. It can be cheerfully recalled that for the first 4 years of its history R. E. A. had the proud reputation of being one of the cleanest and most efficient nonpartisan agencies of the Government. It was then independent like T. V. A.

When it was put under the Department of Agriculture in 1939, Administrator Carmody promptly resigned, sensing political interference and because, as he told the Senate committee, in essence, no executive could efficiently administer an action agency like R. E. A. in the highly competitive utility field if he had three or four "layers of authority" over him. Its troubles began when Secretary Wickard on his accession to power in 1940 promptly started to dismantle the united organization which had been built up and trained by Carmody for this experiment in cooperation, and to distribute its functions among the various divisions of his department. Administrator Slattery, who succeeded Carmody, objected because he perceived the political purpose behind these changes. Wickard's efforts to eliminate him began at that time, and mainly for that reason.

At bottom this whole ruckus over R. E. A. stems from the Secretary's violation of the letter and spirit of the Norris-Rayburn Act of 1936, which provided independence in management and nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration.

Indeed, a measure of independence was retained in the Reorganization Act of 1939, since it gave the Secretary of Agriculture only general supervision and left execution to be exercised by the Administrator. At that time Chief Counsel Nicholson, of R. E. A., in a requested legal opinion, advised Mr. Slattery in substance that he, not Wickard, was legally responsible for the day-to-day management of R. E. A. and its various divisions. He has since apparently revised his opinion in favor of Wickard. (See Senate subcommittee hearings pt. 3, p. 792.)

There follows some account of the attempts to turn R. E. A. and the co-ops into a political machine; the inevitable repercussions of this policy upon the business management of R. E. A.; and the enlistment of R. E. A. personnel in the campaign to defeat the Senate bill removing the agency from Wickard's control.

ENTER DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR CRAIG

One of the mosrt astonishing aspects of Mr. Wickard's official conduct has been his close connection with the heads of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association before mentioned (N. R. E. C. A. for short), an organization which now claims a membership of 547 of the 815 R. E. A. cooperatives.

Note that I say "the heads," because the member cooperatives were not consulted upon, and did not authorize, the actions of these gentlemen which have been so severely criticized.

The writer is a strong advocate of a democratically controlled national organization. The Public Utilities Fortnightly of July 8, 1943, carried an article of mine which first exposed the actual origin of this association, and the facts of which were substantiated later by testimony before the Senate investigating committee. This evidence proves that the National was the brain child of Deputy Administrator Robert B. Craig, who secretly and in violation of Department regulations, planned and promoted it.

Considerable attention must be paid in this article to the varied activities of Mr. Craig, because in his present position he, in my opinion, is still a factor to reckon with and because all known evidence points to the conclusion that it was he who sold Mr. Wickard a bill of goods as to the potential political influence and power of the infant N. R. E. C. A. It was the Secretary's second major bungle, the first being his move to integrate the staff and functions of R. E. A. with the Agriculture Department.

Any sound adviser could have told him that the cooperatives in this respect are nonpartisan in fact and spirit and would resent any attempt to influence their votes. Also, such a move would boomerang, as far as the general public was concerned, about as effectively as an attempt to commandeer the Sunday-school vote.

Returning to the National, it was incorporated March 20, 1942, by 10 men, hand picked by Mr. Craig, who became its officers—Steve C. Tate, a Georgia businessman-politician and head of a co-op, president, and E. J. Stoneman, a co-op president of Wisconsin, vice president. It was these officers and board members who, upon their own initiative, brought charges against Administrator Slattery last year in an effort to eliminate him and secure an Administrator more to their liking.

This after he had refused to endorse a now notorious insurance scheme they were promoting. Mr. Wickard joined in this effort. There was widespread resentment among the cooperatives over this high-handed business. Many withdrew and some 260 of them never have joined the N. R. E. C. A.

But right at the time when the prestige of these leaders and promoters was imperiled, Wickard promptly threw his support behind them and in particular ex-Congressman Clyde T. Ellis of Arkansas, its executive manager. Mr. Craig was permittted to resign, without prejudice, on May 5, 1943, while still under official investigation, and 10 days later accepted a position with the Copperweld Steel Co. at a salary reported to be $20,000 a year.

Mr. Craig was succeeded by William J. Neal, president of the New Hampshire Cooperative.

TEAM PLAY BEGINS

Active team play then began. Unlike Slattery, Neal was not a "disturbing" factor, but obeyed Wickard's directives most satisfactorily. When Mr. Neal spoke before State-wide meetings of the co-ops, Mr. Ellis was allowed to appear with him, and made long speeches against Slattery, with Neal never protesting. On the other hand, when Mr. Ellis attended regional meetings of the national association, Mr. Neal would appear, usually accompanied by several headquarters and field men of R. E. A. This cooperation continued right through the campaign of last fall and still continues.

It is germane to note that in April of 1943, when Wickard began working with Mr. Ellis and his board, the National claimed a membership of 494 cooperatives, with 570,845 rural consumers connected. In that year it reported collections of $69,786 from the co-ops in fees and dues, although expenses exceeded income by $5,848. Dues reported for 1944, totaled nearly $75,000. Such an association could be useful if kept well in hand, and Wickard was looking ahead. The sentiment for independence was growing, and he needed the aid of N. R. E. C. A. to keep his hold on R. E. A. Besides, the 1944 campaign was approaching.

During the summer of 1944 the N. R. E. C. A. pay-off for his support came. After

the Senate bill for independence was introduced on June 23, the executive committee of the National announced it would remain neutral on the issue. But President E. J. Stoneman, who had succeeded Tate, came to Washington, had a conference with Secretary Wickard, and from then on conducted a campaign among the co-ops, which he said was personal, to keep R. E. A. in Agriculture. His board members stood by him.

This action caused a lifting of eyebrows among the cooperatives and many regarded themselves betrayed. The demand for independence grew and became organized and vocal.

THE SAN ANTONIO CONVENTION

The third annual convention of the N. R. E. C. A. was held at San Antonio, Tex., on January 16 and 17, last. There were 276 voting delegates present out of the 547 member co-ops, and a general attendance of around 1,100. President Stoneman, ex-President Steve C. Tate, Secretary Avery C. Moore, and a majority of the board of directors, which majority consisted of hold-overs, were in command and opposed to independence which was the only real controversial issue in sight, and scheduled to be silenced. In addition there were an estimated 30 or 40 R. E. A. men in attendance from St. Louis and Washington headquarters and the field, headed by Acting Administrator Neal and Deputy Nicholson, who made addresses, and several division chiefs. All these, of course, were for retaining R. E. A. in Agriculture.

Present also were former Deputy Administrator Robert B. Craig and Executive Manager Clyde T. Ellis, who traveled together from Washington to attend. Mr. Craig was in charge of an exhibit for his company. Mr. Ellis is now a lieutenant in the Navy, having been granted a leave of absence by the N. R. E. C. A. board for the duration, but plans to return to his old position when peace comes. Delegates report that in his address he affirmed his continued interest in the work of the association, and explained that although he was unable to obtain a leave from his commanding officer to attend the Chicago convention on invitation last year, this time he succeeded, and had come by plane from England, where he is now stationed. The lieutenant's attendance is of interest here because he had previously, while Congressman, and later as manager, been an advocate of independence for R. E. A., but unfortunately made no mention of it in his address.

THE INSURGENTS ORGANIZE

The night before the convention opened over 100 delegates and co-op representatives, who were not delegates but in attendance, met and formed a permanent committee to work for independence and to support the Senate and House bills lately introduced. It was unanimously voted to present the following resolution to the resolutions committee for consideration:

"Whereas we desire the very greatest opportunity for R. E. A. to expand to the utmost in electrifying rural America; and

"Whereas the aim and purpose of the R. E. A. Act is definitely nonpartisan: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this National Rural Electric Cooperative Association favor the restoration of R. E. A. to an independent status; and further, be it

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be voted on by secret ballot by delegates assembled.

"*Resolved*, That the program be changed on Wednesday, January 17, 1945, so that the business session can be held in the morning due to the amount and importance of business at hand and in fairness to the delegates whose reservations require that they must leave early."

The resolutions committee, after a long baittle, by a 9 to 7 vote reported the resolution with the recommendation that "it was the opinion of the committee that ultimately the R. E. A. should become an independent agency of the United States Government," but that due to the war emergency the resolution should not be acted upon. Former President Steve C. Tate was in the chair and the recommendation was adopted without debate just before adjournment. It is the opinion of the insurgents that if open debate had been allowed and a secret ballot taken their independence resolution would have been adopted by a large majority.

The result spells victory for the insurgents. Manifestly they represented the majority sentiment of the 276 accredited delegates in attendance, the 271 cooperatives that are members of the N. R. E. C. A. but which did not send delegates, and the 277 coperatives which are not members of the association. Otherwise, the officers in control of the gathering, despite their devotion to Wickard, would not have conceded the principle of independence. They were forced to do that, however, to maintain their standing among the cooperatives and to prevent further withdrawals from the National. Hence, they stalled for time. A former R. E. A. engineer writes, "same old steam roller."

It is generally agreed, and even President Stoneman had admitted in private, that a big majority of the cooperatives desire the freedom of R. E. A. from Agriculture. It is undeniable that a large number of them have to date refrained from expressing their will for fear that open action would adversely affect their receiving allocations and permission to extend their lines at the hands of the present administration of R. E. A.

R. E. A. CO-OPS USED AS CAMPAIGN PLATFORMS

Admittedly any man in public life has not only the right but the duty, especially in campaign times, to explain to the voters the attitude of himself and his party toward such nonpartisan agencies as R. E. A., and it is noticeable that most speakers in agricultural states do.

I trust it will also be admitted that it is highly improper for a Secretary of Agriculture, who is boss of R. E. A. and controls allocations of money and permission to extend lines in this difficult time, to invade the regular business meetings of the statewide cooperatives to make speeches in the midst of a Presidential campaign. And is it exactly in conformity with the Hatch act or Civil Service regulations for his subordinates in R. E. A. to solicit and insist upon appointments for such speeches?

Yet that is what Mr. Wickard did last fall in the doubtful states of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Wisconsin, and Oklahoma, in the course of his regular campaigning for his party. He did not urge his co-op audiences to vote the Democratic ticket. That would be playing politics. He simply stated his profound devotion to rural electrification, and announced that he had reccommended an appropriation of $585,000,000 for an immediate post-war program, and urged the cooperatives to make commitments at once for materials and be ready to start construction when Germany surrendered. The amount allocated to each state was announced, all of which got a good press. In arranging some of these meetings N. R. E. C. A. leaders were very active.

The proposal is fine. The money will be needed, but I am informed that many co-op members raised the question, Why break the good news at this time and in this way, leaving other States to be informed by mail? The Missouri State-wide declined to allow Mr. Wickard to appear at their meeting on the grounds that theirs was a nonpolitical, nonpartisan affair.

THE SPLIT IN THE R. E. A. STAFF

The cause of another phase of R. E. A.'s misfortunes requires further account of the activities of former Deputy Administrator Craig. One of the most startling and revealing pieces of testimony given at the Senate inquiry was by John A. Becker, a rural-electrification leader of Wisconsin, who swore that in December 1940 Craig had revealed to him his ambition to "run R. E. A."; this, by means of a personal machine loyal to himself he was building up within the organization's staff, and, secondly, by a national asscciation of the co-ops he proposed to organize and dominate. One method of control was to be through such adjuncts as appliance and insurance cooperatives which would be profitable to both the head office and local co-op officials who were to be also officers of the appliance-vending concerns. The National would engage in politics since there would be a potential 4,000,000 votes in the co-ops' families. Big campaign contributions could be secured from private corporations doing business with the selling concerns. Craig denied the interview, but the pattern of N. R. E. C. A., as organized 15 months later, checked with the memorandum in which Becker recorded the talk.

Craig had established his personal machine in R. E. A. all right, long before the unexpectedly resigned in May 1943, but the chiefs of some divisions and their subordinates, men and women down the line, refused to cooperate with Craig because they disliked his methods, and well knew the danger to R. E. A. from his aims. These employees privately favored Mr. Slattery's side of the ensuing controversy, although they took no open part in it. They became marked persons, however, when Mr. Wickard teamed up with Ellis and the national board in May 1943 to eliminate Slattery, in which effort Craig participated, as his testimony shows. As a result of all this, when Mr. Neal succeeded Craig as Deputy Administrator, he, in cooperation with Carl Hamilton, Wickard's assistant handling R. E. A. affairs, started a purge of the anti-Craig personnel, which continues to the present day. And it is significant that scarcely any pro-Craig, pro-N. R. E. C. A. men have been discharged or forced out; rather they have been advanced. True, the personnel appropriation had been cut, but why this discrimination in discharge of employees for that reason?

In this process civil service provisions were blandly disregarded in several cases. Many were loyal, experienced veterans of unquestioned professional ability who had helped build up R. E. A. from scratch. Several others resigned in disgust. Such management is disastrous in two ways: it discourages faithful employees, and, when eliminated, deprives the cooperatives of their trained and competent services, which in practice means millions saved in money and time.

This situation was a prime cause of the "growing discontent and distrust" which the Senate committee found to exist. But Mr. Wickard, determined on running R. E. A. in his own fashion, and with not too much attention to the statutes, made what, in my opinion, was another blunder.

BETWEEN TWO BOSSES

Administrator Slattery would not play Mr. Wickard's kind of ball, and Wickard determined on putting in a pitcher who would. Note the curious language in the memorandum appointing Mr. Neal, dated June 23, 1943:

"William J. Neal has been appointed Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. Effective immediately, Mr. Neal will exercise coordinating and administrative authority for the operation of the Rural Electrification Administration. All section and division heads and the members of the administrative staff will report to the Administrator through Mr. Neal."

The press has sufficiently reported that this directive resulted in conflict between Administrator Slattery, who held it illegal, and Deputy Neal, as to who was what. Conflicting orders demoralized the staff for

months, and of course interfered with efficient administration.

But the big point raised here is, did the memorandum of the Secretary amend the act of Congress which requires that all allocations of money and contracts must be signed by the Administrator? Incidentally, when Wickard was testifying, Counsel Beedy asked him if he had asked for a legal opinion on his authority to vest such powers in a deputy. The Secretary replied: "No; I don't remember of having thought that was in question." He further stated, "If you will read that memorandum you will see that all the agencies are to report to Mr. Neal through Mr. Slattery, . . . " which is the precise reverse of the language (hearings, pt. 2, pp. 387–388).

To be sure, the Solicitor General, a year later, rendered an opinion that the transfer did give the Secretary administrative as well as supervisory authority. This was a surprise to certain able lawyers in and out of Congress who hold a contrary opinion. Meantime, as Slattery will testify, Deputy Neal ignored him and signed many allotments and contracts aggregating millions, with Slattery sitting in his office a few feet from Neal's office. Question. What would happen if the Federal courts should overturn the Solicitor General's opinion, and the contracts and documents which bear Noel's signature become void?

WHAT THE NEW CONGRESS FACES

For 18 months Administrator Slattery, in defense of the basic principles on which R. E. A. was founded, resisted what he regarded as betrayal of those principles, and in that alone rendered a great public service. He held on until he had had his day in court, which the late Senator Norris demanded for him and Wickard had denied, and the Senate committee had cleared him of slanderous charges against his private character and public service which the report states were "suddenly discovered." Finally he resigned on November 25 last, and in a statement to the press made charges of illegal acts which "jeopardize the repayment of Government loans and are dangerous to the welfare and permanent success of R. E. A." Such charges indicate a slumbering volcano of misrule and cannot be dismissed as the vaporizings of an ousted officeholder.

They lay a very serious responsibility upon the doorstep of this Congress, serious indeed if rural electrification is a necessary factor in the rehabilitation of American agriculture, and agriculture is a major part of the national economy. Also serious if public confidence in the capacity of the Federal Government rightly to manage public power projects is to be established and maintained in the fashion exemplified by T. V. A.

GETTING DOWN TO CASES

I surmise it will be helpful if we now get down to some illustrative, concrete cases. Let us first glance at a few hang-overs from the incomplete probe of last year, which Senators AIKEN and SHIPSTEAD already know a lot about.

There is that copper versus aluminum controversy. The committee found there was "the almost constant effort of some of the employees and engineers of the R. E. A. to force upon the farm coperatives a higher cost of conductors than was desired by some of the farm cooperatives, that the products of the Copperweld Steel Co. were favored over aluminum by some of the engineers having to do with the approval of contracts." In this connection we now have the report of the Department of Agriculture investigators made March 24, 1942, not made public by Wickard but published by the committee (hearings, pt. 5, pp. 1517–1798), which names the engineers responsible, whose chief was Mr. Craig at the time and who also is named. The Senate committee states its opinion "that there was something more than a legitimate and ethical connection" in all this copper business.

This statement, considered in the light of the testimony of several engineers who protested the policy, seems rather significant. Mr. Craig testified that 10 days after he resigned from R. E. A. he took a position with the Copperweld Steel Co., but on condition that he was "to have nothing to do with R. E. A." Incidentally, this part 5 of the hearings contains three other reports of Department investigators, likewise not made public, which contain evidence quite adverse to Mr. Wickard's attitude in this controversy.

Next. The Shipstead resolution, in effect, directed an inquiry into the financing of the N. R. E. C. A., and what efforts it had made to influence the administration of the act. The first was not done; the latter only partially. It seems clear from available data that the National has to date collected in the neighborhood of $175,000 from the co-ops in membership fees and dues.

The committee reports that the evidence before it raised questions about many matters of administration within R. E. A. which deserve and even demand further study. But enough for the hold-overs. Pass now to more recent happenings.

As a rule Government bureaus send only one or two representatives to attend or speak at the conventions of voluntary associations at Government expense. It might be fruitful, therefore, to discover the real purpose of and the cost to R. E. A. in money and time expended in sending 30 or 40 R. E. A. chiefs, division heads, subordinates, and field men to attend the national conventions of N. R. E. C. A. Also, why dispatch half a dozen to attend the 10 regional meetings of the association, at each of which a member of the board of directors of the National is elected?

There are also the meetings of the statewide organizations of the cooperative managers and directors quite distinct from the N. R. E. C. A. It may be fairly asked, why was it desirable that 10 headquarters and field men should travel from St. Louis, Washington, and nearby regional points to be present at the meeting of the South Carolina State-wide at Myrtle Beach last fall? What was the purpose St. Louis officials had in mind when they called a special meeting of the Colorado State-wide at Denver last June? It turns out that in both instances the hot, undercover issue was the attitude of the cooperatives on independence. The same is true of the North Carolina, Georgia, and other State-wide meetings.

If it be maintained that only a few R. E. A. chiefs and employees were given orders and travel permits to attend these meetings, how did it happen that so many others just chanced to have customary work to do on those particular days in those particular towns and cities and, so, incidentally dropped in to meet the boys and girls?

Pertinent questions arise as to the use of the R. E. A. personnel for partisan campaign purposes already dealt with. If such use become an allowed practice what will happen to R. E. A.? And what about the enforcement of the Pernicious Political Activities Act of 1939 which prohibits such conduct?

If Mr. Wickard, Mr. Neal, or their aides have directed or permitted office and field men to influence the cooperatives against the pending bill for independence, as repeatedly reported, what about the 1919 act prohibiting Government employees from attempting to influence legislation pending in Congress?

Mr. Slattery asserts serious infractions of the rules governing competitive bidding, a subject important enough in itself to justify a probe. Not only are hundreds of millions of dollars involved, along with the integrity of the agency but, as is well known, finagling in this respect is a hoary method of paying political party debts or securing support.

These are a few of the questions forced by the tactics of the present administration of R. E. A. which is now asking Congress to appropriate for expenditure by it a special fund of $585,000,000, to be spent in 3 years, along with the continued supervision of the $525,428,288 already appropriated. There is widespread dissatisfaction and disillusionment among the cooperatives themselves over the present fiasco. Not for light reasons did the insurgents organize and force the machine-controlled convention of N. R. E. C. A., at San Antonio, to endorse the principle of independence, while stalling for time.

The public power world is shocked by the R. E. A. debacle and is fearful of its repercussions upon the movement. No doubt most private power executives are gleeful and have an "I told you so" attitude; but not all. Many of them sell wholesale power to the cooperatives and many would prefer a stable, impartial administration of R. E. A., unaffected by politics. The same is true of reputable manufacturers and dealers selling equipment and appliances to the cooperatives to the tune of millions of dollars now, and more to come.

THE STAKE OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

No appropriations by Congress for domestic purposes in recent years have met with more genuine approval from the American public—urban and rural alike—than those to finance loans to the R. E. A. cooperatives. It would be most unfortunate if the prestige of this splendid enterprise be further besmirched by party politics and its twin sister, bad administration. It is high time to restore confidence, and the answer to the editor's question, "Where should we go from here?" is this: The first step is to set R. E. A. free from agriculture or any other Government department or bureau, including Interior. In support of that position I can quote no more competent authorities than the father of the R. E. A. Act and the Administrator who brought together the harmonious, efficient organization which Messrs. Craig and Wickard have done so much to wreck. There follows an excerpt from a long letter Senator George W. Norris wrote me shortly before his death last August:

"You ask if I favor setting R. E. A. free. I answer emphatically 'Yes.' I am in favor of any bill that Congress can enact into law that will restore the R. E. A. to its independent organization and you can say so in the bulletin.

"I think the transfer of R. E. A. to the Agriculture Department in 1939 was a mistake. I said so then. I told the President it was. I regretted very much that this transfer took place. I have been opposed to this transfer to Agriculture or any other department ever since because the truth is that it will not fit in with any department. I have not changed my mind. R. E. A. ought to be an independent, nonpartisan organization and it must be if it is going to succeed. If it becomes a political football it is bound to fail."

In the same month Hon. John M. Carmody, Administrator of R. E. A., just prior to its transfer to Agriculture, made this statement:

"In spite of this forthright policy of independence that laid the foundation that not even maladministration has been able completely to destroy, R. E. A. during its period of independence never once caused the administration a moment's embarrassment. It was a clean show. He took care of our own business. We told the selfish power operators to stay on their own side of the fence and we would stay on our side—precisely as the Congress provided in the R. E. A. Act. We worked for the farm people and they worked with us. We had no subtle plans; our cards were on top of the table. We went on the theory that good adminis-

tration will make plenty of friends for any administration and let it go at that. What a pity the tinkers tinkered in this case."

From the outset those in R. E. A. and N. R. E. C. A. responsible for this whole mess have advised a hush-hush policy. They argue that if uncovered the power trust would make capital of it and that would hurt R. E. A. or hurt the National. That is quite uncomplimentary to the astuteness of the utility boys and their political friends, and I am one of those who advise that it is better that the friends of R. E. A. and an honest National Association should clean house before our opponents and a disgusted public do it for us. The only safe way to conduct the public business is right on the barrel head—especially in a democracy.

Adequate Hospital Facilities for Disabled Persons in Albany (N. Y.) Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I hereby insert Senate Resolution 50, which was adopted by the Senate of the State of New York on February 14, 1945, and concurred in by the assembly on February 15, 1945, memorializing Congress to take appropriate action for the construction of adequate hospital facilities to take care of disabled persons and service-connected veterans in the Albany area of the State of New York:

Senate Resolution 50

Whereas the city of Albany and adjacent communities, commonly referred to as the Albany area of our State, is the home of large numbers of members of the armed forces of the United States on the many battle fronts throughout the world, and

Whereas many of these residents of this area in our armed forces already have been disabled in combat with the enemies of our country and have been returned to the United States, and are being returned in increasing numbers at the present time for hospitalization, and

Whereas an urgent and immediate need exists for a hospital and other facilities for these disabled persons and service-connected veterans in the Albany area of the State in order that they may be near their homes and accessible for visits by their relatives and friends, and

Whereas at the present time no hospital for the care and treatment of these disabled service-connected members of our armed forces and veterans has been provided in this area by the Federal Government, and

Whereas the vital need for the establishment of such hospital, or other disabled-veteran facility, repeatedly and forcibly has been brought to public attention by the Albany Times Union and the Veterans Service Officers of the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully memorialized to take appropriate action to provide for the construction of adequate hospital facilities for the care of the wounded and service-connected veterans hereinabove described at a suitable location within the Albany area of our State, and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Administrator of the United States Veterans' Administration, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and to each United States Senator and each Member of the House of Representatives elected from the State of New York.

By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

In assembly, February 15, 1945, concurred in without amendment.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

The International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT before the Economic Club of Detroit, on February 26, 1945:

Mr. Chairman, I consider it a distinct honor to share this discussion of post-war international exchange stabilization and reconstruction and development with our distinguished guest, the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr.

Secretary Morgenthau represents an administration with which many of us have frequently disagreed; however, the Treasury Department is outstanding in the manner in which it has functioned under his very able management. No finer tribute has ever been paid to a man than that expressed by Hon. FRANK KEEFE, an ardent anti-administration Republican Member from Wisconsin, speaking in the House of Representatives last Tuesday; Mr. KEEFE told the House:

"The Treasury Department, struggling with problems of a magnitude undreamed of a few years back, is in the over-all picture, staffed and manned by men and women of courage, rare intelligence, and distinction. I have nothing but praise for the manner in which the functions of this great department of Government have been carried on. In my judgment, it is simply amazing that the Department has been able to attract and keep men of such outstanding character and ability. The tremendous problems of finance have been met with courage and fidelity. The people of the country are entitled to know that from the Secretary of the Treasury down through the long list of administrative assistants and heads of bureaus and agencies, the work of this great department of government has been met in a manner that should challenge the admiration of the people of the country, regardless of political affiliation."

It was under this leadership that the representatives of 44 of the United Nations met last July at Bretton Woods, N. H., to formulate proposals for an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

We met in an atmosphere of tolerance and cooperation.

The professed objectives, as I understood them, were: (1) the expansion of our trade with other countries by making available cerdits and exchange; it was expected that his would result in (2) full employment and would be a dominating factor in (3) preserving peace by offering assurance against economic maladjustments which sometimes cause wars.

Many were skeptical of the proposed means of accomplishing these objectives. No one denied the advisability of attempting to devise plans to stabilize the relatioinship of world currencies and to give each county a fair and proportionate share of the world's business. Many thought, and still think, that in balancing world trade in the manner proposed and agreed upon, we should be certain that in the accomplishment we did not destroy our own commercial and financial position in world affairs to the prejudice of American industry, agriculture and labor. Full employment does not depend entirely upon full approval without amendment of the Bretton Woods Articles of Agreement; but will it be an aid or will it be a deterrent to the gainful employment of from fifty-five to sixty-five million of our people? That is the question which the American people and the Congress must satisfactorily answer after full consideration has been given to the claims of both the proponents and opponents before it will be wise to take definite action.

The conference was careful not to bind any country it agreed only to submit the Articles of Agreement to the various countries for such action as they see fit to take. No government will be bound by the articles until it has formally approved them, and then only when they have been approved and signed on behalf of governments having 65 percent of the total of the quotas.

Enabling legislation has been introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives. It is expected that hearings will start within the next 2 weeks.

The subject is of tremendous and far-reaching importance. It is important, not only as a possible key to our economic destiny, but I cannot emphasize too strongly that it may well become a potential and perhaps controlling influence to our social and political position in the world of nations. Congress realizes its responsibility and will have a thorough understanding of the basic and affiliated issues before it finally takes action.

It is only because I want to provoke thought and debate, as an aid to a full understanding of the many questions which must be considered and satisfactorily answered before the Congress can intelligently act, that I call attention to some of the alleged deficiencies and to some of the objections made to both the fund and the bank.

Time and space will not permit an enumeration of all of them, but from what has been published and from many conferences I conclude that the following are considered fundamental and are those most likely to be considered by Congress. I submit them without comment in the hope that public discussion of them will crystallize intelligent popular opinion and thus fortify Congress in any action it may finally take.

SOME ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

It is alleged that:

1. The Bretton Woods lending program is only a part of a much larger program of expanded exports through loans, and will inevitably results in defaults abroad and disillusionment at home, because this country will not permit the large-scale imports necessary for the repayment of all the loans and investments.

2. The program for vast exports, predicated in part on Bretton Woods credits, will ultimately produce a third world war, for the reason that it will cause a disequilibrium in world trade.

3. Although the stated objective of the Bretton Woods program is the balanced growth of world trade, by financing the industrialization of other countries, we may rather find that, in the end, we shall have balanced trade at low level, instead of at our high level, to the detriment of our laboring men, our farmers and industrialists.

4. The bank will be under political pressure to make unwise loans.

5. Our past lending experience should dampen our ardor for such a scheme.

6. The bank will kill off private lending, to the detriment of foreign borrowers.

7. The bank would be under debtor-country control.

8. Private bankers can take care of all lending needs.

9. If American dollars are to be loaned, they should be loaned without the intermediation of other nationals.

10. The bank and the fund should be separated, and not regarded as one program for simultaneous enactment.

11. The guaranty of debtor countries is of questionable value to the United States.

12. Concessions to the other countries like the Latin Americas, who insisted at Bretton Woods that the bank be devoted equally to reconstruction and development, mean in effect that members desiring to develop have an automatic right to loans.

13. Our subscription is unlikely to be the full measure of our contribution, since the bank may later increase its capital.

14. Repeal or suspension of the Johnson Act, as is provided in the Wagner-Tobey-Spence bill, means tearing up billions in old I O U's, and the pouring out of new billions of private American capital.

SOME ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

1. It is contended that it is inadvisable to set up two distinct agencies; that there is no necessity for the fund; that the functions of the fund can be better administered by creating a department in the International Bank for making exchange stabilization loans, and that the functions of the bank in this respect may be supplemented by increasing the capital and powers of the Export-Import Bank of Washington. It was partly in deference to this theory that in considering the so-called George bill in the House last week amendments were suggested which in effect would create the Export-Import Bank of Washington as an independent agency of the Government, divorcing it from all domination by the Secretary of Commerce and making it possible for the Congress to control its policies.

2. From the United States standpoint, the stabilization fund created out of the devaluation profits of 1934 is more than ample for our needs, since $1,800,000,000 of the original $2,000,000,000 has never had to be touched.

3. If we are going to attempt to stabilize the economies of other countries, it should not be done in the guise of currency stabilization.

4. The fund in most cases would start out by recognizing as the value of individual foreign monetary units the artificial quotations which have been in force throughout the war, whereas many foreign currencies if released from control would have a true buying power of only a fraction of the present artificial quotations. Therefore, the fund would conceal the true condition.

5. The fund will be used for capital purposes, as well as for the intended short-term purposes.

6. Our subscriptions to the Bretton Woods program (fund and bank) would be as much money as the value of all the goods we exported in 3 entire pre-war years: 1936, 1937, and 1938. We should therefore look this program over carefully before committing ourselves.

7. The hope that the Bretton Woods fund will assure or even materially contribute to world peace is vain in the light of the realities among which the world lives.

8. The Bretton Woods program is really just a variation of the W. P. A., but on a world-wide scale. It is international pump priming.

9. The fund will destroy the control by Congress over the dollar, and the constitutional prerogative to regulate the value of our money will be imperiled.

10. The fund is premature; the world is not yet ready for it. Domestic currencies should be stabilized before we attempt to stabilize foreign exchange.

11. The fund is too large for stabilization purposes, and consequently would encourage member nations to delay the necessary steps, generally disagreeable to effect a balance in their international payments.

12. The fund gives the member countries virtually an automatic right to borrow and leaves little or no discretion to the fund to refuse to make a loan.

13. The fund would be controlled by the debtor countries.

14. The fund will not, as asserted by some advocates, eliminate exchange control.

15. The fund does not tackle the important question of blocked balances.

16. The fund will acually encourage exchange control. To control capital movements, the members must control short-term transactions as well.

17. Virtually the only internationally desired money in the fund, apart from about $1,000,000,000 of gold, would be that money contributed by the United States.

18. The fund will interfere with the sovereignty of its members and with their powers to control their own economic lives.

19. The fund is too complex to be understood or honestly explained so that the average person can undersetand it.

20. The fund has a marked inflationary bias. Under it, all changes will be in the direction of devaluation.

21. Our past lending experience should dampen our ardor for such a scheme. (See bank No. 5.)

22. The fund erroneously presumes that there is a general scarcity of international monetary resources.

23. The fund would be dissipated without any material accomplishments.

24. The benefits of the fund in the monetary field could readily be offset by trade controls.

25. The wide divergence of interpretation of the meaning and operation of the fund, both here and in Britain, bodes only ill for the fund's future.

26. The funds' safeguards are inadequate.

27. The fund is likely to break down because currencies and trade outside the fund will far exceed those within the fund area.

28. The fund is objectionable because it is a cartel.

29. The Fund, by section 5 of article IV, is rendered powerless to achieve its proclaimed purpose of ending economic warfare.

30. There is no real compulsion on members to continue membership, once their quotas have been exhausted.

31. The United States would have the legal right to withdraw from the fund, but once a member it would not have the moral right to do so. Withdrawal later would be much more difficult than abstention now.

32. Since the fund may borrow here, there is no telling what its total cost will be to us.

33. The fund is unsuited to the problems of the transition period; it is primarily a long-run agency.

34. Government and other organized propaganda has focused attention on the Bretton Woods program, to the exclusion of other solutions of the problem. The President instructed the American delegation at Bretton Woods to consider no alternative plan.

35. The fund will only obscure the underlying problems and render more difficult their ultimate solution.

36. Under the Bretton Woods program (fund and bank) gifts will be confused with loans.

39. The fund promises too much; in particular, there is a gap between the fund's supply of dollars and the rights under the fund to dollars.

38. The quotas have no realistic relation to credit needs and credit worthiness of members.

39. The fund does not really stabilize.

40. The fund does not provide for two-way adjustment.

41. The best solution of the world currency problem is restoration of the gold standard.

42. The best world monetary system is international bimetalism.

43. The fund is only a device for lending dollars cheaply and will soon be wasted or lost.

44. The fund gives to its members indiscriminately, without regard to credit worthiness, the automatic right to borrow foreign exchange.

45. Both because of the terms of the agreement, and the nature of the good-neighbor policy, the fund will be managed by debtor countries, and the U. S. A. in reality will exercise only a minority voice.

46. The fund is too ambitious; stabilization of key currencies is more practical.

47. Before stabilization is attempted, trade barriers must be removed. To set up the fund now is to put the cart before the horse.

48. International currency stability cannot endure unless based upon prior economic and political stability within the various individual nations.

49. The fund may force us to lower our tariffs.

50. The fund's safeguards are not effective safeguards, because they may be waived.

51. In the Bretton Woods program, we should be pouring our money down a rat-hole.

52. The fund implies Government control of foreign trade.

53. The fund is an unnatural monstrosity, because it attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable; its appearance of agreement is really a diplomatic fiction.

54. The fund cannot work as we are told it would, because economic considerations were set aside for military and political reasons at Bretton Woods.

The proponents of the fund and the bank, especially the Treasury, have given assurance that many of these criticisms are not justified, and answers have been offered to many others; to many persons, however, the answers are not considered sufficient. Apparently much study must still be given to many of them by the people and the Congress.

You, as a club, and as representatives of units of our economy, vitally interested in the purposes, plans, and operation of the fund and bank, can be of tremendous assistance.

The economic, social, and political future of America was at stake at Bretton Woods. The final decision will be dictated by the people of America.

It has been a pleasure to be here today, and I know that you will feel at liberty to give the Congress the benefit of any decisions you make in respect to these proposals.

Pennsylvania Victory Ships Launched—U. S. S. "Pittston," U. S. S. "Coaldale," and U. S. S. "Mahanoy City" Slide Down the Ways at Baltimore and Are Christened in Tribute to the Record Wartime Production Achievements of the Anthracite Mine Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, on Saturday, February 24, 1945, I had the privilege and honor of attending the christening and launching of the Victory ship *Mahanoy City* at the Bethlehem-Fairfield shipyard at Baltimore, the third of three ships christened in tribute to the record wartime production achievements of the anthracite mine workers. The other two Victory ships launched in tribute to "King Coal" and which are certain to be kings of the waves, are the U. S. S. *Pittston* and the U. S. S. *Coaldale*.

I regret very much that I did not have the opportunity of attending the launching of the *Pittston* and *Coaldale*, the former being a tribute to the hard coal mine workers of district 1, United Mine Workers of America, and the latter honoring the anthracite workers of district 7, part of which is in my congressional district which includes the whole of district 9, United Mine Workers of America, for whom the *Mahanoy City* was dedicated.

It was a thrill to me and every one present to see the *Mahanoy City* slide down the ways, and to witness a tangible recognition by the Solid Fuels Administration and the United States Maritime Commission of the great part the anthracite coal industry has played in the superb war effort made by labor and management in the United States. The recent triple launchings of the Victory ships were made possible also through the cooperation of the United Mine Workers of America, the Victory ships bearing names proposed by Theresa Grodzki, 13, Wilkes-Barre—district 1, U. M. W. A.; Regina Miller, 17, Coaldale, district 7; and Roseann Konsavage, 13, Mahanoy City, district 9; miners' daughters who wrote prize winning essays on "Why maximum production of anthracite is essential to the war effort and to the post-war future of the industry."

The honor of christening the *Mahanoy City* fell to Miss Roseann Konsavage, a student in the ninth grade schools and the daughter of Joseph N. Konsavage, of Mahanoy City, Pa., my home town. Roseann was escorted by Reginald Razzi, 15, of Minersville, son of Leo Razzi, whose essay was judged the best by young men in district 9. The other two young men sharing honors at the previous launchings of the U. S. S. *Pittston* and the U. S. S. *Coaldale*, were Kenneth Edwards, 15, of Wanamie, and Nicholas Popiak, 17, of West Hazleton.

Three distinguished citizens from each of the three anthracite coal-producing districts in Pennsylvania served as judges in the contest, one of the most successful of its kind ever staged in the area. They read more than 1,000 entries submitted from schools in 10 hard-coal counties in picking the final winners from among the several thousand entrants. Only essays written by sons and daughters and brothers and sisters of the United Mine Workers of America were accepted in the competition.

To all those organizations and individuals who contributed in any way to make the triple launchings possible as an indelible expression of recognition to the part the anthracite-coal industry and mine workers have played in the war program, I want to extend my congratulations and heartfelt gratitude. Space does not permit naming all the individuals who contributed to the success of the launchings, but through the Messrs. Michael J. Kosik, Martin F. Brennan, and Joseph Kershetsky, presidents respectively of districts 1, 7, and 9, United Mine Workers of America, I want to extend my appreciation to them and all those mine workers, members of their families, civic, professional, and business groups, who contributed in any way with the officials of the Solid Fuels Administration and the U. S. Maritime Commission, in making the launching of the three Victory ships, the U. S. S. *Pittston*, the U. S. S. *Coaldale*, and the U. S. S. *Mahanoy City*, possible.

And before closing I would like to cite that the ship which made the 4-year-old Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard at Baltimore the first single yard in the country to launch 450 ships is the *Mahanoy City Victory*.

Improvement in the efficiency and mass-production technique is to some extent compensating for lack of manpower, and is permitting the Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard at Baltimore to produce 9 or 10 Victory ships each month with half the labor force it once had.

Although the yard's employment figures have dropped to the 26,000 mark from a peak of 47,000 in late 1943, launchings of Victory ships are being stepped up to 9 or 10 a month now, according to Mr. J. M. Willis, vice president and general manager.

The yard's 450 ships include 384 Libertys, 30 tank-landing ships, and 36 Victory ships; a record of which Mr. Willis the other officials, and employees of the Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard can well feel proud.

The Coal Miners of the Country Broke All Records in Coal Production in 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in these stressful times we are occasionally advised that some of our industries are not producing to their capacity. However, that may be I am glad to be able to bring to you some facts that will prove conclusively that the American coal-mining industry is doing its part. This applies to those who manage the mines and it applies especially to the miners themselves.

In 1944 the miners broke all records for the production of coal. They produced 620,000,000 tons of bituminous coal and 64,455,000 tons of anthracite coal in 1944. The coal-mining industry is peculiar in that it is almost impossible to produce to the total capacity. In fact it is difficult to estimate definitely a total capacity. The reason for this is that there are many thousands of mines operating in the country. It is impossible to keep all of these mines operating at full capacity every day. Frequently mines are closed down through no fault of the mine operators or the miners. For instance, the railroads, which everyone knows have been doing a magnificent job in the last few years, suffer accidents and wrecks and congested conditions which prevent them from moving the coal as rapidly as it can be produced. Probably not in the history of the country have the railroads had more difficulty by reason of snow and ice than they have had during the past 3 months. It must be remembered that the great coal-carrying railroads of the Nation are located principally in the northern half of the United States and naturally are subjected to all inconveniences of cold weather.

The coal-mining industry has given to the armed forces a fair share of its employees. Out of a normal personnel of 550,000, the miners have given 130,136 men to the armed services. Of this number 2,345 have been killed in action.

When the young men among the miners answered the call of their country, many old men who had retired from active work around the mines returned to their places. There are 15,000 men past the age of 65 now doing their daily turn in the coal mines. There are many over 70 and there are some over 80 years of age doing their part to win the war through the production of coal.

It is well known that coal mining is the most hazardous of any of our great industrial activities. When coal mines are operated under high pressure and when many of the most agile and capable men are taken into the service, it is only natural that the hazards of the mine business would be commensurately increased. Since the war and during the years 1941, 1942, and 1943, the total fatalities in the coal mines of this country were 4,213. The statistics are not complete for the year 1944, but incomplete statistics show that 1,306 lost their lives in the coal mines of this country in 1944. Thousands of additional men were injured in many different ways, but the sad feature of mine accidents is that the majority of all recorded mine accidents are fatal.

Mr. Speaker, I know from experience something of the life and hazards of coal mining. There are a large number of coal miners in the district which I have the honor to represent. All of them that I know are loyal American citizens.

Many of them own their own homes and many of them are prominent in the church, civic, and public life of the communities in which they live. They need no encomium from me. Their performance in 1944 proves their patriotism and shows that they have assumed and discharged their full duty in this great emergency which is confronting our country and the world.

Drafting Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *February 17, 1945.*

Dr. WALTER JUDD,
Congressman from Minnesota,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Rumor Military Affairs Committee is recommending draft of cadet nurses as first step. Could you contact committee members to prevent this discrimination against one small group of nurses? If draft of nurses to be recommended it should affect all nurses. Law creating Cadet Corps specifically names it a civilian corps. Nurse applications for military being processed very slowly. As of February 16, 250 applications from Minneapolis area alone since January 1. Of these only 38 have received notice of assignment from the military. Two hundred and twelve wondering why they must wait to be drafted.

KATHERINE J. DENSFORD.

ROCHESTER, MINN., *February 24, 1945.*

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House Office Building:

Draft bill No. 2277 discriminates against nurses. Many nurses in service state need is for better utilization of those already in service rather than more nurses. Threat of draft caused 12 percent of applicants for our February class to cancel registration. Nurse question badly jumbled, but think they will enlist if need is shown.

ROY WATSON KAHLER HOSPITALS.

Spending or Economy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 26, 1945:

SPENDING OR ECONOMY?

The President's recent budget message, as the National City Bank points out in its current monthly letter, was less a war-budget message than it was a peace-budget message. Perhaps the most significant feature of the budget figures, from the long-range point of view, is the rapid growth of nonwar costs. The total of such expenditures for 1946 is estimated at more than $13,000,000,000, which is twice as high as such expenditures just before we entered the war, and five times as high as the average of the 1920's.

What we seem to be pointing toward is a level of post-war Federal expenditures that may easily reach $25,000,000,000, and even this figure may prove too low if Government-spending and subsidies are looked to as a major reliance for reaching desired social objectives. How are we going to get the tax relief that is needed to stimulate post-war enterprise? How are we ever going to get the budget under control?

The bank puts forward the suggestion that in our thinking about post-war problems we are being influenced unduly by the memory of conditions in the 1930's, when we were constantly contending with unemployment and striving to build up purchasing power. Today, we may be underestimating the force of inflationary elements now accumulating. Potentialities for a great wave of spending lie in the huge extension of bank depcsits and currencies since 1939, and in the pent-up demands for goods of almost every description for consumers and industry.

Nevertheless, scarcely a day passes without new announcements of post-war spending plans not only by the Federal but by local governments. After detailing some of the latter, the bank finds that "the conclusion of the war threatens to let loose the greatest concentrated spending in the history of States and municipalities." The latter may discover that this spending is badly timed, that instead of bridging over a period of depression it will only compete unnecessarily with private employment. The State and city spending plans nearly all depend, moreover, upon the assumption of generous aid from the Federal Government. The Federal-aid policy ought to be reexamined in the light of the war debt now loaded on the Federal Treasury and of the vast improvement in the finances of States and municipalities.

The many State and Federal spending projects are usually put forward on the ground that they will make jobs for returning soldiers. We must remind ourselves that they will also make taxes to be paid by those same soldiers, and perhaps create an inflationary rise in living costs with which these soldiers and their families will have to contend.

Dawning of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Grosse Point (Mich.) News. It is a timely and analytic commentary on the Yalta Conference:

DAWNING OF WORLD PEACE

The announcement that came from the Big Three conference at Yalta on the eve of Washington's birthday contained a greater assurance for a world free from the fear of war than any previous document in history. Its formal signing by Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin gives it a character and substance utterly beyond the mere expression of generalities such as occurred in the scribbled memoranda issued, unsigned, to the world by Roosevelt and Churchill under the impressive title of the Atlantic Charter.

While the implementation of many of the principles and objectives set forth in the Yalta Declaration may yet encounter many checks and disagreements, the concrete fact stands out that the heads of the world's three greatest states have pledged over their signatures the ultimate fulfillment of these aspirations. It is difficult for heads of state, even in a period of flouted international obligations, to renege on their promised best efforts to carry through to fulfillment the purposes to which they have subscribed with their own signatures.

The mere pledge of the Big Three to fight the war through to a victorious end had been well discounted in advance by the peoples of all the nations involved, but the explicit declaration that the victory is to be secured by the military occupation of Germany for an indefinite period will be heartening to the many who have feared a revival of the maudlin "generous treatment of a fallen foe" sentiment which negatived the sacrifices of the men who died in 1917–18 in the "war to end wars."

Probably the most satisfactory accomplishment of the Yalta Declaration is the definite and complete denial of any hope the Germans may have had of profiting in the war settlement through disagreement among the Allies.

The provision for the establishment of a reparations commission with headquarters in Moscow is a natural disposition of this question, as Russia is more deeply concerned with it than even Britain, and the United States not at all, as it affects our homeland. Germany may be required to replace some of our 500 ships her submarines sank in the Atlantic. Russia has claimed and been given the green light on her demand for reparations in the form of payments in kind, which may take the form in part of several hundred thousand Germans laboring for many years in Russia to replace the property she destroyed in that country.

Russia has a moral support for her demands exceeding that of Britain or France, as she was wantonly attacked by Germany in June 1941, when there was still in force between her and Germany a treaty of friendship and nonaggression whereas Britain and France did take the initiative in declaring war on Germany when she invaded Poland on September 1, 1939, as had been threatened after the absorption of Czechoslovakia.

There is hope that the rankling Polish boundary question will be disposed of to the reasonable satisfaction of the Polish people in the acceptance of the Curzon line which was set up by Britain, France, and ourselves in 1919. It is the reestablishment of this line which Russia now accepts as satisfying her territorial and ethnical demands.

One of the most encouraging assurances, for the continued political and military collaboration of the three great powers is in the provision that their foreign ministers are to meet every 3 or 4 months, with the first such meeting scheduled for London by the middle of the year.

Probably the most important decision coming out of the conference looking to the establishment of a long-ranged and enduring world peace, covering world economic problems and the building up of a world will for peace affecting intimately or directly every country in the world, is the provision for a great meeting of all the United Nations in San Francisco beginning April 25. The purpose and spirit of this meeting is to examine the ways and means of implementing the principles of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, to which, happily, all of them are committed in spirit.

The three big powers have agreed to assist all of the liberated countries in carrying out their desires, by their own free untrammeled vote, to choose their own government.

The significance of the total pronouncement to the American people is that we are henceforth committed to an active participation in the affairs of Europe not only for

the maintenance of world peace, but in the support of free government in that continent. It bids a final farewell to the political isolation which we have consistently advocated since the founding of the American Commonwealth, but which in fact we have never wholly practiced. The rush of world events in the past quarter century has uprooted this policy and the Yalta Conference has finally proclaimed our complete divorcement from it to the world.

The last expression in the Yalta declaration comes as an inspiring promise to a war-weary world. It denies the age-long and despairing acceptance of the belief that wars will always be, and its words that it "will provide the greatest opportunity in all history to create a lasting peace," falls on the ears of the world as the answer to the prayer of suffering humanity for centuries past.

One of the disturbing developments following the Yalta Conference is the reaction of De Gaulle in France and the present government in Italy. De Gaulle is peeved because he was not invited to sit in as a full-fledged and equal fourth of the Allied leaders. He has doubtless been told already that France will be welcomed by the Allies as a partner in the occupation and policing of those parts of Germany which impinge on her territory.

France was defeated and crushed in the war. The liberation of her territory was achieved wholly by American, British, and Canadian arms. Her people are going to need vast aid in food, clothing, and every variety of commodity before they can resume normal peacetime processes of living. These will have to continue to come out of the sacrifices of her civilian allies, largely those in America. She was illy prepared to fulfill the role of a fulltime, efficient partner in the great decisions that must be made immediately with the ending of the war in Europe.

De Gaulle deserves credit and honor for his patriotic role in keeping alive the light of liberty among his people. He has received them, but when his ruffled dignity moved him to spurn an invitation from the President of the United States for a friendly conference some place in the Mediterranean area he shrinks his own stature as a statesman and does an immeasurable harm to his country.

The case of Italy is more simple. This country was a late enemy of the Allies. She was defeated by them, but even yet a substantial part of her territory is occupied by forces of her former good friend and ally, Germany. Italy has a long way to go before she can be accepted as a member in good standing of the company of great States which must assume the direct responsibility for arranging a world of peace and order.

Reference of Missouri Valley Authority Bill to Commerce Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of Saturday, February 24, 1945, in defense of a certain ruling made by the able and distinguished presiding officer of the Senate, the Vice President.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE SHOE PINCHES

Vice President TRUMAN has drawn the fire of proponents of a Missouri Valley Authority. The high crime of which he is accused is that he followed the rules of the Senate in assigning the 1945 Murray M. V. A. bill to the Commerce Committee, where it belongs, instead of to the friendly Committee on Agriculture.

This betrayal of the cause, complain the M. V. A. supporters, is not cricket. Moreover, the Commerce Committee, they charge, has had no experience with the subjects dealt with in the bill, whereas, we would infer from the M. V. A. proponents, the Committee on Agriculture qualifies as an expert.

This harsh criticism of the Commerce Committee must come as a surprise to its members. This committee has, since the inception of the Federal programs of flood control and river improvement, handled all legislation on this subject in the Senate, including the flood-control bill of 1944, which incorporates the Pick Plan for the Missouri Valley, and the 1945 rivers and harbors bill, passed yesterday by the House.

The Commerce Committee also has been concerned with electric power, particularly in connection with the rivers, and may be presumed to be as much an authority as the Committee on Agriculture.

The bill of complaint against the Vice President seems to resolve itself to this charge: The Murray bill has not been placed in the hands of its friends. There is, of course, no connection between this fact and the demand of the M. V. A. proponents for a "fair and impartial hearing."

Premium Payments to Nonferrous Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, the nonferrous mining industry is deserving of much praise for its patriotic contribution to the Nation's war efforts. The men who have worked in the production of the vital war metals are to be congratulated; they have worked hard and long to keep the industrial wheels of our Nation turning. Many of these workers transferred to the mines after induction into the Army because they felt their job in the shafts were important and vital in our great fight to preserve our democracy.

But at the present time many, possibly the majority, of the domestic nonferrous mines are faced with costs of operation that ceiling prices do not bring in sufficient revenue to permit continued operation. Withdrawal of producer subsidy support to our strategic and critical minerals would immediately force suspension of operations in scores of mines. The effect upon the Nation's war effort might be disastrous. The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Act of 1944, states that no subsidies may be paid after June 30, 1945, without a specific appropriation from Congress. We cannot question the thought behind the amendment, as it was well-meaning, and certainly Congress has the right to know the amounts necessary to carry out the producer subsidy program and receiving full information as to the way the money is spent.

But the amendment to the Stabilization Act of 1944 went too far. While designed to check the wholesale application of consumer roll-back and similar subsidy devices, these vital producer subsidies affecting principally copper, lead, zinc were not exempted as previously had been the case.

Prior to the passage of the restrictive amendment, Metals Reserve Co. had announced the extension of the subsidy plan for copper, lead, and zinc until July 31, 1945, a month beyond the limiting date afterward established by the Stabilization Act of 1944. Reports say that certain individual contracts had been made for even longer periods. In some instances the Government may not be able to carry out its contractual obligations. The industry, including both employers and employees, is being affected adversely by the uncertainties of the situation. As far as is known to thousands of mine operators, they must close down within the next few months or must start making arrangements to do so. Metals Reserve Company, it is said, is ready to announce the terms of premium payments for the new fiscal year the moment Congress gives it the green light. It is obvious that producers should know at the very earliest moment what they can expect in the way of premium payments. It goes without saying that we must have full production of these vital war metals; we cannot tarry, for our future depends upon the rolling wheels of our industry.

H. R. 2077 amends the Stabilization Act of 1944 and if approved will permit the Metals Reserve Company to continue the subsidy payments to the nonferrous mine operators. I trust that my colleagues realize the seriousness of the situation and support the measure.

Huge Beer and Whisky Profits Bypass the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by William Paul Walker, agricultural economist of the University of Maryland, and published by the Civic Forum, organ of the National Civic League, in its issue of January-March 1945.

The article follows:

HUGE BEER AND WHISKY PROFITS BYPASS THE FARMER

(By William Paul Walker, agricultural economist, University of Maryland)

There is scant foundation for the liquor industry's contention that it is an economic

asset to the community and the country at large, providing a vast market for the farmer's products, giving employment to labor, and making a generous contribution to the Nation's over-all prosperity.

In fact, it is not beyond the range of possibility that the distillers, in pleading for the use of corn in making whisky during the August 1944 holiday, emphasized how small a percentage of grain after all goes into the manufacture of alcoholic beverages, quite a different tune from the one they sang during the pre-repeal campaign, when their objective was to round up enough votes to do away with the eighteenth amendment.

Warren M. Persons, in Beer and Brewing in America, states, in substance, that the revival of the brewing industry opened up a large market for farm products, requiring the yearly cultivation of 3,000,000 acres of land in supplying farm products used in beer production.

Based on average yields of crops used in making beer, average pounds of materials used per barrel of beer produced for the 5-year period, 1939 to 1943, and allowing for loss or shrinkage in converting farm products to base materials used in brewing, the equivalent of 4,100,000 acres of land is required to raise the crops used in making the 76,900,000 barrels of beer reported as being tax-paid for the 12 months ending June 30, 1944. This acreage represents nine-tenths of 1 percent of all land in crops and plowable pasture in the United States.

Assuming a premium above average farm prices paid for crops used in brewing, farmers received in 1943 about $154,237,000 for their crops sold for beer making. Allowing for wastage in bottling and in selling draught beer, and assuming a retail price of 12 cents per 16 ounces of beer, excluding excise taxes, the 76,900,000 barrels of beer sold at retail for approximately $2,236,000,000. Therefore, farmers receive 6.9 cents of the retail dollar spent for beer made principally from farm products. If Federal and State excise taxes are included in the retail price the farmers get only 5.3 cents of the retail dollar.

This national picture can be illustrated more clearly perhaps if a farm is used as the basis for comparison. Let us compare the use of land in producing milk with its use for producing raw materials for brewing. Five acres of land will produce the feed for a cow giving 6,500 pounds of milk per year. The farmer gets $201 for the milk (in 1943) which sells at retail for $384 (in 1943). Therefore, the farmer receives 52 cents of the retail dollar spent for milk.

However, the 5 acres will produce the equivalent of materials used in making about 672 gallons of whisky, which retails for $4,032, excluding excise taxes, for $1,875. The farmer gets $127 for his crops sold for brewing, or 6.7 cents of the retail dollar for beer. If the excise taxes are included in the price, the farmer received 5.2 cents of the beer retail dollar.

Based on average yields of crops used in making whisky, average pounds of materials used per gallon of whisky made during the 3-year period, 1939 to 1941, and allowing for loss and shrinkage in converting farm products into base materials for distilling, the equivalent of 1,239,500 acres of land is required to raise the farm products used in making the 141,400,000 gallons of whisky reported as being tax-paid for the 12 months ending June 30, 1944.

At $6 per proof-gallon, excluding excise taxes, consumers will pay $848,000,000 for that amount of whisky. Based on farm prices, plus premiums, farmers would receive $35,300,000 for their products used in making the whisky. Therefore, farmers receive 4.2 cents of the retail dollar spent for whisky if excise taxes are excluded, or 1.5 cents of the retail dollar if such taxes are included in the retail price.

Again let us bring the national comparison down to an individual farm basis. Five acres of grain fed to hogs will produce 1,570 pounds of live-weight pork. This pork sells at retail for $309 in 1943. The farmer gets $219 for his hogs, or 71 cents of the retail dollar spent for pork.

However, the 5 acres will produce the equivalent of materials used in making about 672 gallons of whisky, which retails for $4,032, excluding excise taxes, or $10,920, including excise taxes. The farmer receives $164 for his grain sold for distilling. Thus, the farmer gets 4.1 cents of the retail dollar spent for whisky if excise taxes are excluded from the price or, if included, 1.5 cents of the retail dollar.

Based on their experience in 1943, the farmers get from 25 to 75 cents of the retail dollar spent for most of the important foods. In contrast, the farmers get from 4 to 7 cents of the retail dollar spent for whisky and beer made from farm products, if excise taxes are excluded, and if included, from 1.5 to 5.3 cents of the retail dollar. It should be noted, however, that some of the grain used in brewing and distilling is recovered and utilized as livestock feed.

The total acreage of land used in producing the crops for brewing and distilling purposes (excluding crops used in producing wines) is equivalent to about 1.2 percent of all land in crops and plowable pasture in the United States. Farm income from the sale of such crops to manufacturers of alcoholic beverages (excluding wine) is equivalent to only 1 percent of the total farm cash receipts from marketing farm products in the United States in 1943.

It is obvious that the manufacturing of beer and whisky offers limited opportunity to the American farmers as a whole in disposing of their crops. In fact, the depletion of consumer income by the purchase of alcoholic beverages to the extent of $7,000,000,000 a year could mean that fewer dollars are available for buying the necessities of life, upon the production of which in the form of food most farmers depend for a living.

Compulsory Military Training During Peacetime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was written to me by Mr. G. Barry Shannon, publisher of the Palm Beach Publications, Inc., of West Palm Beach, Fla., dated February 16, 1945:

PALM BEACH PUBLICATIONS, INC.,
West Palm Beach, Fla., February 16, 1945.

Hon. DWIGHT L. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROGERS: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 12, asking me for my advice on the question of compulsory military training during peacetime.

In reply, I wish to state that I am utterly opposed to compulsory military training when a boy becomes 18 years of age. I served with the Seventh Cavalry during the last war and, while I am a great believer in military training, I think that our country has proved conclusively that we raised two pretty good fighting armies during World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 without compulsory military training.

I believe in military training, but I believe that it should be taught in the high schools and colleges on the same basis that we have taught it in the past. No doubt, the standards of this sort of training will have to be raised to meet the demands of highly technical warfare as it is today, but this can also be taught in the high schools and colleges under military tutorship rather than take a young man at the age of 18 and put him directly under Army training.

What we want to avoid in this country is anything pertaining to dictatorship and classifying the American people as "the masses." We still want to remain a people and have some sort of individuality and initiative, and a soul left in us, but to take a young boy at the age of 18, when he is deciding upon his career, would be to destroy all his personality and his initiative.

When the people of the United States are no longer known as "the people" and are referred to as "the masses," then we have lost everything we have fought for since the Declaration of Independence. To take a full year out of a boy's life at a time when he is trying to build the beginning of a career is likely to be highly disruptive, for training can be spread over a period of years in high school and in college which will serve the same purpose without disruption.

The war is not altogether won by its fighting forces. Too much credit cannot be given the big industries of this country that have made this present war such a success. Had it not been for the various scientists, big industrialists, surgeons, doctors, chemists, and other highly technical trained men, our fighting forces would have been of little use, and the military heads would have been lost without them. These highly trained men followed their vocations and studies without any interruption, and, had they been forced into military training for 1 year at the age of 18 years, their careers might have been diverted so that they would not have been the successful men they are today, and who have assisted the military heads with their skill and judgment. The Army leaders themselves have stated on numerous occasions that we have the best fighting force and best trained men of any army in the world; so why try and inaugurate and experiment with a foreign atmosphere of military training into a program which heretofore has been highly successful?

I also put your question up to Don Morris, our editor, and he feels that a great need of military training in schools and elsewhere will depend on what sort of peace plans are drawn up and what type of international organization remains thereafter.

Trusting that you are enjoying good health, and with best wishes and kind regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

BARRY SHANNON.

Today's Challenge to American Moral Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the entire world today a spirit of deep unrest is clearly at work. Men and wom-

en whose job it is to observe and analyze the daily activities of the human family sense this disturbed atmosphere. They feel it as something almost alive and sometimes almost frightening in its intensity. Yet, properly directed and properly used this new stirring of the energies of mankind can give rise to a new era of productive creativity in which all peoples may share a richer, more satisfactory, and orderly life.

To achieve this goal, there must emerge from the chaos of this bitter war a vision big enough to mobilize the resources of the entire world. In the years of World War No. 1, the spiritual leadership which came closest to rallying the strength of the embattled nations and revitalizing those who were the victims of that struggle was furnished by Woodrow Wilson. His "fourteen points" became the rallying cry of the oppressed and the discouraged. They saw Wilson as someone striving to achieve a peaceful world without planting a new wilderness of dragons' teeth. However, history may record its conception of Wilsonian ideals, it must be granted that for at least a moment it seemed possible for even our cobelligerents to rise to this American position. The vision faded; and with its disappearance another war became inevitable in the gloom of that failure.

Today, American moral leadership is still the beneficiary of that Wilsonian era. Our flag is hailed wherever American arms gain the day, and even those who oppose us know that our men and our country are freer of malice—softer-hearted if you wish—than any other people whom they fight. This attitude toward us constitutes that reservoir of good will which the late Wendell Willkie remarked in his trip around the globe a few years ago.

But no amount of good will can survive the challenges and strains of time unless it is constantly rewon by those who seek it. Now is the time for America to reassert her claims to the moral leadership of the world. Now is the time when the victory of our arms grows daily more certain for us to enunciate the principles for which we have been willing to fight.

So many events have occurred to becloud those principles that many among us have lost sight of the forest in the depths of the woods. The war for liberation has become obscured by the rise of new antagonisms, by the rebirth of "blocs," "power politics," seizures of territory, establishment of regimes upon a basis of force rather than the will of the governed. These developments must be labeled "temporary" if we are to achieve the goals of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." We owe it to the men who have died in the name of America on the battlefields of this war to keep the faith for which they fought. To whittle it down, to dismiss it as the empty phrasing of wartime oratory is to make a mockery of all that our people regard most sacred.

The time is at hand when the highway markers must be erected. We must know where we are going, and we must illuminate the road for those who come after us to follow. Walking in the darkness offers neither safety nor assurance to those who would march under our banners or to those who would march at our side.

Thus far, neither our State Department nor our President has seen fit to utilize the tremendous prestige of the United States to mobilize world-wide sentiment. Inevitably the result of this silence has been the rallying of large sections of central and eastern Europe to the economic and political causes represented by Russia. There they have found clarity and decisiveness in action. From us they have found nothing but pleasant platitudes, easy to speak, easy to ignore.

If we are to rebuild on the ashes of this terrible war anything of value, we must prepare the blueprints now; we must publish them to the world; we must convince the world that they are both desirable and meaningful in the establishment of a better international society. The time to undertake this task is now. The place is here.

The Big Three conference has done much to reinforce our determination. But there is still lacking the moral and spiritual upsurge required to make of this war a new rebirth of international freedom and human betterment.

Appraisal on Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GARDNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial and article from the Hamilton (Ohio) Journal News:

APPRAISAL ON TAFT

Have you read Walter Lippmann's column appearing elsewhere on this page today? If you have not, we'd like to suggest that you let your eyes glance to the right for the best appraisal of Senator ROBERT TAFT we have yet seen in print.

Mr. Lippmann, a few days ago, criticized TAFT and others for their attitude on the Henry Wallace appointment. TAFT made his reply, after a fashion, in the United States Senate. Today Mr. Lippmann comments on that TAFT reply. Read it, please. You'll get a kick out of such statement as this:

"But though Mr. TAFT is an intelligent man, who would always get a high mark in school, he has never acquired sufficient wisdom and understanding to be a good and sound conservative leader in times like these. He is probably more responsible than any other single man for leading the Republican Party into blind alleys of dumb obstruction on the vital issues of our time, and of making it incapable of offering a trustworthy alternative to a third and a fourth term for Roosevelt."

That is what we call getting down to cold facts. It's the best appraisal of TAFT's lack of ability yet put into words. Please read the entire column. It's worth anyone's time.

TAFT LACKING IN WISDOM AND UNDERSTANDING NEEDED TODAY

(By Walter Lippmann)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—The other day I wrote that it was contrary to the American constitutional tradition and incompatible with our form of government to confirm a member of the President's Cabinet on the ground that the Senate did not like him or approve of his ideas. On Monday, in the Senate, Mr. TAFT, of Ohio, declared this was the most blandly nonsensical argument that I have ever happened to read. Any college boy has more knowledge about the Constitution than Mr. Lippmann exhibits in this article. I know of no one who has ever before questioned the Senate's right to refuse to confirm.

What Senator TAFT does not know on this subject, as on a good many others, is most of what there is to be known about it.

"History shows," says Mr. TAFT, "that Cabinet appointments have been rejected." In support of this statement, Mr. TAFT cites just one case—that of President Coolidge's appointment in 1925 of Charles B. Warren as Attorney General. Now, as a matter of fact, the Warren case is a perfect example of the exception that proves the rule.

The objection raised against confirming Warren as Attorney General was that as a lawyer he had been closely connected with the sugar companies which had just been charged by the Federal Trade Commission with conspiracy in restraint of trade. As Attorney General he would have had to decide whether to prosecute his own clients for a violation of the Sherman Act, and on this ground Warren was rejected by a vote of 41 to 39. The issue was not Warren's general views, or wild and woolly words he had used, but whether he could be relied upon to execute the law without fear or favor against his own clients.

Although Mr. TAFT told the Senate that he knew of "no one who has ever before questioned the Senate's right" to reject cabinet appointments, the fact is that the Senate's right was questioned in this very case. It was questioned by President Coolidge, who issued a statement expressing the hope "that the unbroken practice of three generations of permitting the President to choose his own Cabinet will not now be changed, and that the opposition to Mr. Warren, upon further consideration, will be withdrawn, in order that the country may have the benefit of his excellent qualities and the President may be unhampered in choosing his own method of executing the laws."

So strongly did President Coolidge question a right, which Mr. TAFT says has never been questioned, that he sent Warren's name back to the Senate and announced that he would give Mr. Warren a recess appointment if on a second vote the Senate rejected Warren again. The Senate did reject him again, and the controversy ended with Mr. Warren's refusal to accept a recess appointment.

When President Coolidge spoke of the unbroken practice of three generations, he was evidently referring to the rejection in 1868 of Andrew Johnson's nominee for Attorney General. No one would ever site anything that happened between Congress and the President during that dark period as a good precedent in constitutional usage. Whether there is any case of the rejection of a Cabinet officer in our early history I do not know.

But it may be safely stated that there is no single case in our whole history where a Cabinet appointment was rejected on the ground that the nominee's views were not acceptable to the Senate. The Warren case shows that the outer limit is the Senate's right under the usage of the Constitution to reject on the ground that the nominee is

disqualified to execute the laws. Thus President Grant withdrew the nomination of A. T. Stewart for Secretary of the Treasury when the Senate pointed out to him that as head of Wanamaker's department store, he was a large importer, and was, therefore, by statute ineligible to administer the tariff.

So much for Senator TAFT's right to dismiss as "blandly nonsensical" an argument in which I did no more than remind him of an American constitutional usage that, except for the Warren case which proves the rule, is unbroken. A Senator who sets himself up to be the leader of American conservatives ought to be sufficiently well grounded in American history and American political wisdom to understand what he is doing.

But though Mr. TAFT is an intelligent man, who would always get a high mark in school, he has never acquired sufficient wisdom and understanding to be a good and sound conservative leader in times like these. He is probably more responsible than any other single man for leading the Republican Party into blind alleys of dumb obstruction on the vital issues of our time, and of making it incapable of offering a trustworthy alternative to a third and a fourth term for Roosevelt.

The difference between a sound conservative and Mr. TAFT's kind of conservative has been illustrated in the Wallace affair. The sound conservative position was that since Mr. Wallace is the exponent of a radically new national policy, he should be deprived of the personal power to carry out that policy on his own initiative and that Congress and the country must be guaranteed full opportunity to pass upon the concrete measures under that policy. That was the reason for not confirming Mr. Wallace until the George bill had been passed.

But after that a wise conservative would recognize that the policy which Mr. Wallace proclaims, often in wild and wooly words, is going indubitably to be attempted and that it is the first duty of conservatives to identify themselves with its purposes and to participate in making a program for it. Thus Governor Dewey is as explicitly committed to these purposes as is President Roosevelt or Mr. Wallace. Yet it is an inordinately difficult undertaking in which the chances of complete success are far from certain. In the circumstances a wise conservative will welcome, indeed insist upon, the popular exponent of the new and radical policy sharing the responsibilities and facing personally the enormous practical difficulties.

Mr. TAFT's desire, which is to keep Mr. Wallace on the outside looking in, would simply mean that Mr. Wallace's fervent following would attribute to him all the successes of the undertaking and feel forever sure that its failures would not have occurred if prejudiced partisan politicians had allowed him to become Secretary of Commerce. That is what the wiser men among Mr. TAFT's colleagues have understood and that is why the Senate will not follow him.

Jackson Day Dinner Address of Hon. Philip J. Philbin, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me February 24, 1945, at Boston, Mass.:

Mr. Toastmaster, Senator WALSH, Governor Tobin, distinguished guests, fellow Democrats, and friends, I am very much honored to join with this impressive gathering tonight in celebrating the birthday of one of our truly great Americans. To be here is a happy privilege indeed for which I am deeply indebted to our able and militant State chairman, my friend, John Cahill. To him, as to his distinguished predecessors in office, it is my pleasure in common with our fellow party members throughout the State, to pledge humbly my aid and whole-hearted support of his endeavors. There is no doubt whatever in my mind but that under his able and forceful leadership, our party more united and harmonious than ever in its long history will sweep forward militantly and unflinchingly to new successes.

I will confine my remarks to a few general observations.

We have seldom met in such happy circumstances for party as those in which we meet tonight. The laurels of one of our greatest State-wide victories are still fresh on our brows. Governor Tobin's election by such an emphatic majority was an outstanding demonstration of the popular will—an expression of confidence and approval of which he, his associates on the ticket, and indeed all leaders and members of our party may well be proud. That our vigorous and able young governor will amply vindicate that confidence and that approval we have the most abundant faith.

But we must also remember that victories like these do not come out of the clear sky. Behind them lies great ability, persistency, and perseverance on the part of candidates, and immeasurable zeal, self-sacrifice, and devotion on the part of many faithful workers for the party. Behind them, too, lies years and years—many long years—of constructive effort and superlative conscientious service to party, State, and country of great Democratic leaders of the caliber of our unsurpassed senior Senator, DAVID I. WALSH; Governor Curley; our splendid majority leader, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and many great leaders too numerous to mention. We must never lose sight of the fact that unity, harmony, common American ideals, and unselfish cooperation have been the sound foundation stones for these victories as they will continue to be the only secure basis for future party success.

When we speak of common American ideals, it is most appropriate that we should on this occasion pay our tribute to that shining patriotic figure, Andrew Jackson, soldier and statesman, who exemplified such sterling Americanism and vigorous, unrelenting devotion to democratic principles.

Of very humblest origin, not favored by background, education, or early training, Jackson possessed great natural powers which he concentrated on the preservation of the American form of government and the American way of life. He was an avowed enemy of too much centralization of power in the National Government and the tendency, apparent even in his day, to interpret the Constitution too broadly. The American people trusted Jackson because he was one of them, because he sprang from the great rank and file of the masses, because with indomitable spirit he was willing to fight for his beliefs and convictions, because he was faithful and true to basic American principles of liberty, justice and righteousness, because he was eager to battle fearlessly against exploitation, special privilege, and selfish aggrandizements of class and group.

In these days of peril to democratic institutions when totalitarian government is threatening to engulf human freedom the world over, we may well give serious thought tonight as we rededicate ourselves to the exalted principles of Jackson and other great American leaders, to the future shape of America.

Will we, of this war-torn generation, succumb like the peoples of Babylonia, Greece, Rome, and practically all the other great governments of history to the blandishments, threats, and impossible, oily promises of zealous visionaries and take the same course they did to ruin and destruction, or will we, bravely and resolutely, like the early founders, like our noble sons of the battle fronts, do our full part, as the founders did and our gallant sons are doing, to sustain here against foreign foes or domestic enemies alike, the glorious form of government and way of life that have constituted our beloved Nation as the greatest democracy of all times?

Will we, in brief, in our humble way, strive to do for our country in our time what Jackson and the other great American immortals did for our country in theirs—to save it as a citadel of liberty and a sanctuary for political, social, and economic freedom where every man, woman, and child, regardless of origin, faith, color, or creed has the right to live in decency and comfort under free institutions?

With swiftest possible prosecution of the war to an early victorious conclusion as our watchword and ever-present goal, let us go forward under the Commander in Chief to the establishment of an honest just peace that will treat all nations, the great and the small, fairly and honorably, to a future America which will provide unbounded opportunities for all our citizens.

It has been a great pleasure to greet you all this evening, and I look forward with anticipation and confidence to continued participation with you in the great democratic success of the future that is bound to crown our efforts if we cling to the principles of Andrew Jackson whom we honor at this auspicious meeting. Let us go forward in unity and determination to victory and peace.

Full Employment After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT J. McGLINCHEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. MCGLINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech I delivered at a legislative conference of the Sixth Congressional District in Philadelphia on February 23:

Ladies and gentlemen, I feel honored to have been invited to address this first legislative conference of the Sixth Congressional District legislative committee. And I wish to congratulate this committee, composed of representatives of all parties and all shades of opinion in this congressional district, on its organization and its program. Although I was elected to Congress from this district on the Democratic ticket, as a Democrat, I do and will in my work as Congressman, represent everyone in this district in Congress. All of your interests and all of your concerns in Congress are my interests and my concerns, regardless of party affiliation.

It is a wonderful thing that the citizens of this district are taking such an active interest in governmental affairs, and have organized this committee to keep this interest alive. As you know, this is not the usual thing in American politics, where interest in Government seems to pick up only

around election time. As a Congressman, I welcome your activities, because through organizations like yours I can keep in close touch with public opinion in this district and can know what the citizens who elected me feel and think and want. In conferences such as this one we can exchange ideas and discuss the problems which confront you and which confront us in Congress.

Now one of the subjects to which I am sure you have all given thought is the problem of full employment after the war. This is not a faraway problem. It is not too much to say that the war in Europe is drawing to a victorious close. Our glorious successes in the Pacific may indeed shorten that war, too. I do not prophesy in saying this—but with all of you, I utter this as a fervent prayer and hope. What are we doing, what can be done in Congress to make sure that after the war we will have the full employment in this country upon which our high American standard of living and our American prosperity depend?

One thing is sure—we cannot just let things take their course and just hope for the best. We cannot afford to just sit back and say that the enormous backlog of demand for automobiles and refrigerators and electric irons, and the backlog of demand in foreign countries for their reconstruction will take care of everything. We have before us the bad example of what happened after World War No. 1 as a warning of the dangers of lack of foresight and lack of planning. In addition, this war is infinitely bigger than World War No. 1. So many more millions of men are involved and our whole economy (not only a part of it) is now geared to the war effort. The job of changing over, of conversion to normal peacetime production and peacetime living will, after this war, be tremendously more complex and tremendously more difficult.

The first objective, to my mind, of a full post-war employment program, is the goal of 60,000,000 productive jobs in our factories, offices, shops, mines, and farms—and all of them paying enough for a decent living up to our high American standard of living. If we can achieve and maintain this goal, we need have no worries about our continued prosperity. To me, one thing about this goal is clear—its achievement rests fundamentally on our system of private enterprise. It can and must and will be reached by the brain and brawn of American businessmen, American labor, and the American farmer. It is they who must have the ideas and make the plans, invest the necessary capital, produce the raw materials, machinery and finished products, develop the markets, and deliver the goods and services.

Although, as I see it, the chief responsibility for this goal of 60,000,000 jobs rests on our private enterprise system, the Federal Government must inevitably have a part in it. Our entire economy is so complex that it must have a necessary measure of governmental regulation to make sure the system does not get out of hand, to make sure that bottlenecks do not develop, and to make sure that the big do not crush the small.

For instance, as you know, the Government has built a large number of new industrial plants for essential war production. These plants are now operated mostly by private industry. The conversion of these plants to peacetime production will be a vital factor in shaping the goal of 60,000,000 peacetime jobs. How will the conversion of these plants take place? To whom will they be sold? How will they be used? Will they be shut down to protect some monopoly, or will they be sold to whomever wants to buy them to keep tens of thousand of men and women at work, to make more and better goods for open competition in an open market? You can readily see the part that controlling legislation and proper administration of such laws must play in this vital phase of achieving the goal of full post-war employment.

For another example, What should be the Government's part in financing post-war business enterprise? What should the Government do to encourage the financing of the great post-war productive capacity on which the 60,000,000 jobs depend? Should the Government, if necessary, assist in such financing, and if so, how? That, too, will require Congressional legislation.

In peacetime, as you know, a large part of our economic enterprise consists of the service industries, such as retail and wholesale trade, repairs, and servicing of our various mechanical installations in business and at home, and the like. These service industries are generally in the hands of what we call little business. They employ hundreds of thousands of workers. What will be done to encourage and develop these businesses?

A housing program, with a goal of millions of new houses; a farm program, with a goal of fair prices and decent living returns for farmers; a program for economic readjustment for millions of men now in military service—all these are factors in the goal of the 60,000,000 peacetime jobs which must be the measure of a prosperous post-war United States. In all of these factors, a measure of Congressional regulation has been and will be required.

Time, this evening, does not permit any more than this sketch of the many, many parts of this complex problem. As you see from this brief outline of the problem, the attainment of this great goal is not a simple matter. To a large extent, it will be worked out through our private enterprise system. Congressional laws will undoubtedly be required for regulation and, when necessary, to prime the pump. I can assure you that in regard to such legislation, I will always be vitally interested in your opinions, and will be constantly vigilant to advocate and support all measures which seek to lead us to the goal of 60,000,000 post-war productive jobs.

The War Food Administration—What Is the Truth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two recent newspaper articles referring to a situation alleged to exist in the War Food Administration.

The Des Moines Register of February 23, 1945, said:

CHARGES OF FOOD SPOILAGE BRING CALL FOR F. B. I. PROBE

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Sensational reports of inefficiency and maladministration in the War Food Administration (W. F. A.) have been placed before a House appropriation subcommittee by investigators for the committee.

The nature of these charges has caused Marvin Jones, Food Administrator, to ask the subcommittee to request a Federal Bureau of Investigation inquiry.

Spoilage of food acquired by W. F. A. is the principal topic of reports which have been made by three investigators.

Mysterious references to alleged poker parties at the home of a high W. F. A. official in which warehousemen are reported to have participated in games with W. F. A. officials make up the most sensational portion of the reports.

MALICIOUS LIES

Names of those mentioned in the reports are withheld, and at W. F. A. the stories about the poker parties were branded as "malicious lies."

Jones disclosed Thursday that he has asked the subcommittee, headed by Representative MALCOLM C. TARVER (Democrat), of Georgia, to call on the F. B. I. for an investigation which will go to the bottom of the reports. Whether such inquiry will be made was not disclosed.

READ THE REPORTS

TARVER refused to comment on the reports which other members of the Appropriations Committee described. Jones, as well as other officials of W. F. A., acknowledged, however, that they had read the reports.

"These reports," Jones said, "are confessedly based on hearsay, gossip, and rumors. I want to go to the bottom of this whole matter, and I have every confidence the persons involved will be cleared. There are, of course, disgruntled employees in W. F. A., as elsewhere. We have had the biggest farm production in history and have furnished all the demands of our fighting allies.

"Spoilage in all this has been exceedingly small. In this matter we want to know what all the facts are."

DENIES IMPUTATIONS

Reference is made in the reports to the subcommittee to the poker parties at the home of a W. F. A. official. That official acknowledged, Thursday, that he and his friends sometimes did play at his home for small stakes but denied every imputation that any hidden transactions with warehousemen were involved. He said that so far as he knows, there never has been a warehouseman in his home.

Some members of the House Appropriations Committee regarded the reports of the poker parties as very flimsy, but were impressed by reports of large-scale spoilage and what they described as inefficiency and maladministration.

One incident dealt with in the report placed in the subcommittee's hands has to do with 20,000,000 pounds of lard which allegedly became unfit for human consumption while in storage in a warehouse without a cooling system. This lard later was sold to soap manufacturers under circumstances regarded as unsatisfactory by the investigators.

Lt. Col. Ralph Olmstead, vice president of the Commodity Credit Corporation in charge of supply, said the transaction involving the lard had been completely above board. He said that last year when there had been a heavy hog marketing run, the Government ran out of adequate storage space for lard in ordinary containers.

The Government acquired, he said, 150,000 tons of lard in steel drums. It contained antioxygen ingredients intended to prevent it from spoiling for a relatively short period of time.

LARD PACKERS

Even this large purchase, Olmstead said, was found not to be enough and the lard packers were calling for further Government buying to relieve the pressure of surplus supplies.

Twenty million additional pounds were purchased, he said, for relief needs on the basis that if relief needs did not develop the lard could be used for the manufacture of soap.

SOLD TO ARMY

As it turned out, he added, the relief needs did not develop, and it was necessary to offer the lard for sale. Representatives of the Army, upon hearing of this offer, requested that the lard be sold to the Army, Olmstead said, and that was done.

Later, he declared, and at the direction of the Army, the lard was sold for the manufacture of soap, which he said was the high on the list of desired materials for the Army.

Olmstead said it was true that the lard had become unfit for human consumption.

The question of what shall be done with the reports and whether there shall be open hearings on them is holding up House consideration of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill which renews that agency's authority to use Federal funds in controlling the supply of surplus food commodities.

One member of Representative TARVER'S subcommittee said Thursday that the committee would take no further action until it had heard from the F. B. I. This was the first indication that the F. B. I. would actually take up the matter as Jones requested, but there is no official confirmation of it.

The Times-Herald of this morning, Tuesday, February 27, 1945, carried the following:

W. F. A. HEAD ASKS THAT F. B. I. PROBE FOOD SPOILAGE CHARGE—ANSWERS REPRESENTATIVE TABER'S CLAIM TO EVIDENCE THAT SUPPLIES ARE GROSSLY MISHANDLED

(By Dorothy Williams)

War Food Administrator Jones disclosed last night that he has asked the F. B. I. to investigate reports of food spoilage that one Member of Congress claims would "make the Teapot Dome scandal look like a piker."

Jones said he proposed the inquiry before a House appropriations subcommittee hearing last week. He said he understood the group has asked the F. B. I. to go ahead.

EVIDENCE OF MISHANDLING

Representative TABER, of New York, ranking Republican member of the full Appropriation Committee, reported that he had evidence of flagrant W. F. A. mishandling of the Nation's food supply that would overshadow even the Teapot Dome oil scandal.

He contended that Jones was at fault "because he knew some of the things that were going on and did nothing about it." He also placed part of the blame on former Vice President Wallace, one-time Agriculture Sectary, and on present Agriculture Secretary Wickard for their selection of personnel.

Jones said he was told by a congressional investigator that it would be "surprising" if some errors were not brought to light by the F. B. I. inquiry in view of the large quantities of food W. F. A. handled. He asked for the investigation after a congressional committee investigator said there should be one.

"ONE OR TWO" INSTANCES

He said there had been "one or two" instances of food spoilage, but that he doubted if an investigation would reveal widespread waste.

TABER said congressional investigators had uncovered unsavory evidence about management of the Agriculture Department, W. F. A., and Commodity Credit Corporation during a routine spot check of departmental appropriations requests.

The Foreign Affairs Committee should look into this and the authority for it.

The article follows:

LEND-LEASE PACT ADOPTED BY FRANCE—AGREEMENT IS SAID TO INVOLVE $2,500,000,000, WITH AID TO US OF $1,000,000,000

(By Harold Callender)

PARIS, February 23—The French cabinet approved today a lend-lease agreement with the United States. There were reported to be only slight modifications.

Jean Monnet brought the text of the proposed agreement from Washington, where he negotiated it for about a year. He will return to Washington next week to sign it. It is expected to take effect immediately thereafter.

While the terms have not been made public, it is understood that the total involved is $2,500,000,000. Of this amount, $1,600,000,000, covered by section 3 (c) of the act, will be on a lend-lease basis until the end of hostilities, when it will be transformed into a 30-year credit, at about 2¼ percent interest, it is understood.

Apart from this sum, there are understood to be $900,000,000, which will be on a 30-year-credit basis from the beginning, except for about 20 percent for which cash will be paid by the French Government on delivery of goods. This part of the agreement is said to be intended to cover durable capital goods such as locomotives and machinery.

The French 8-month plan for relief and industrial supplies, which was designed to provide a criterion for shipping allocations, will now disappear, since the program which it involved is expected to be covered by the new agreement.

In addition to the master lend-lease agreement, there is a reciprocal-aid agreement, similar to those made with other countries, by which the French will contribute to the American war effort to the extent of possibly $1,000,000,000, at the present rate of exchange, the French say. This would assume that aid would continue at about the present volume.

The Cabinet was said to be pleased that the new agreement, which should hasten shipping equipment and raw materials for the revival of French industry and transport, would permit the French to retain most of their gold and dollar exchange in the United States, which otherwise they would have been obliged to spend for indispensable supplies.

Present industrial production in France is about one-third that of 1939. It is expected that a low living standard will be necessary for several years, although this will depend upon the rapidity of reconstruction by means of imported capital goods.

It was emphasized that the Cabinet, including Gen. Charles de Gaulle, was impressed by the agreement.

Some Government officials voiced gratification that the lend-lease accord was reached at this time because, they said, it might serve to offset a possible adverse effect on French-American relations resulting from General de Gaulle's refusal to meet President Roosevelt in Algiers.

Lend-Lease Pact Adopted by France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD an abstract of an agreement with France allegedly made under the authority of the Lend-Lease Act.

Alaska and Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a joint resolution from the Legislature of the State of Montana duly passed by both houses and approved by the Governor, requesting the Congress of the United States to initiate proper action for the admission of Alaska as a State.

I wish to go on record as being wholeheartedly in favor of this resolution and to urge the Members of this body to give it their most earnest and serious consideration. Alaska, with its huge territory, great natural resources, and fine citizenry, is capable of becoming a State with all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities that go with it. Because of the war, Alaska is much closer to us than before and with the development of highways and air transport systems her future is more closely tied up with the rest of the States. Speaking from the viewpoint of one State alone, great progress has been made in furthering the already fine friendship and understanding which has always existed between the Territory of Alaska and the State of Montana. The military highway built because of the war has furthered that understanding a great deal, and the development of an air-transport system extending from Great Falls, Mont., to Fairbanks, Alaska, has proved its worth and brought the territory and Montana within a few hours of each other.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House the fact that millions of pounds of strategic material and thousands of planes have been flown from the port of Great Falls to Fairbanks, Alaska, and from there have continued their flight under Russian supervision to the fighting fronts in Europe. This economic start between Alaska and Montana augurs well for the future and we in Montana stand ready and willing to do all that we possibly can in furthering the admission of Alaska as a State at the earliest possible moment.

The resolution follows:

House Joint Resolution 4

A joint resolution to the Congress of the United States to initiate proper action for the immediate admission of Alaska as a State

Whereas realizing the crucial importance of Alaska to the defense of our country; and

Whereas being ever increasingly aware of her matchless natural resources and of the growing community of interest between that Territory and the United States of America, but more particularly with the State of Montana; and

Whereas we have observed the highly successful and uninterrupted operation of communications and transportation between Montana and Alaska, both by highway and air; and

Whereas appreciating the difficulties of administration under existing conditions or under legislation now before the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-ninth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America is urged to initiate proper action for the immediate admission of Alaska as a State; be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof, duly authenticated, be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Montana in the Congress, to the Territorial Governor of Alaska, and to the Delegate from Alaska in the Congress.

GEO. W. O'CONNOR,
Speaker of the House.
ERNEST F. EATON,
President of the Senate.

General Hines Admits Need for District of Columbia Veteran Medical Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph Lieb:

GENERAL HINES FINALLY ADMITS NEED FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA VETERAN MEDICAL CENTER—BUT ACTION MEETS DELAYING TACTICS

(By Joseph Leib)

On January 31, 1945, the writer issued a caustic statement regarding certain objectionable conditions that exist at the veterans' hospital in Washington, D. C., known as Mount Alto. This appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Reference was made to the fact that the Costello Post of the American Legion had instituted a resolution requesting an investigation of a number of inadequacies at the mentioned veterans' facility and that this resolution was approved and adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia.

This was followed by a bitter controversy in the public press.

In what appears to have been an effort to offset criticism of deplorable conditions at Mount Alto, a story was planted in the Washington Times-Herald on February 12, 1945, in the hope that the dogs would be called off.

The Times-Herald article went into detail to explain that final approval of a mammoth veterans' medical center awaited only President Roosevelt's signature and that the project would be started in time to provide accommodations for Washington veterans needing hospitalization.

This story, however, confirmed Costello Post's charges that Mount Alto has only 327 beds and that the hospital was constantly overcrowded.

In order to confirm the authenticity of the statements made in this apparently planted story, a letter was directed to General Hines.

Here is his confusing reply, but note that the Veterans' Administrator now definitely admits the need for additional facilities.

FEBRUARY 22, 1945.

I have received your letter of February 12, 1945, that forwarded a clipping that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, concerning the construction of a medical center for veterans residing in the District of Columbia.

While it has been determined that there is a need for expanded facilities for the hospitalization of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration in the District of Columbia area, provision for the establishment of additional facilities has not been made in our present program. It is expected that such a project will be included in our next submission to the Federal Board of Hospitalization.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

As can be seen this letter is as clear as mud. The Veterans' Administration was respectfully requested to send a more detailed report.

Here is the second reply:

FEBRUARY 23, 1945.

Reference is made to the inquiry from your office regarding the erection of a medical center for veterans in the District of Columbia area.

As stated in my letter of February 22, 1945, it is expected that the inclusion of such a project will be made in our next submission to the Federal Board of Hospitalization. Our next program of additional hospital construction will be submitted not later than July of this year.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

Now, the question arose as to who represented the Federal Board of Hospitalization.

An inquiry revealed that General Hines, himself, is the Chairman of this Federal Board of Hospitalization. Among his assistants are: Dr. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General of the Army; Dr. Ross T McIntire, Surgeon General of the Navy; Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service.

(Note, that all of these men play a leading role in the American Medical Association. This will be discussed later.)

According to General Hines the Washington project hadn't even reached first base.

A break-down of the above-quoted communications indicates that by the time the proposed District of Columbia Medical Center is unraveled from bureaucratic red tape it will be years before the project could be ready for occupancy.

In the meantime conditions are and will become more desperate as each day goes by. Washington has a permanent population of many thousands of locally registered veterans.

But Washington is not the only city that is in need of additional veteran hospital beds. We are not the only ones that have been confronted by these same dodging and ducking tactics.

What are the facts behind this controversy?

Why is this admitted need for a Washington veteran medical center now faced with all kinds of disheartening obstacles?

Here are the unvarnished facts and the complete story behind this conspiracy.

Since September 7, 1944, this writer had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of critical analyses of the Veterans' Administration. Immediately after these constructive and illuminating criticisms were published, the Veterans' Administration started to send its trouble shooters to Capitol Hill in an attempt to mollify certain Members of Congress who have thought first of the welfare of veterans and secondly of the bureaucrats who are paid to administer the laws enacted by the Congress.

In some of these articles this writer charged that the greedy American Medical Association was fighting and would continue to bitterly oppose the adoption and construction of a forward-looking veterans' hospital program.

In the foregoing I shall substantiate this charge with documentary evidence in the form of a letter written by the American Medical Association.

General Hines has protested that a hospitalization program for veterans is receiving his active consideration. Perhaps General Hines does mean well, for it is claimed that he has done a pretty good job since he has been Administrator, but it is becoming increasingly apparent that someone is pulling his leg and that he is not the master of his own house.

Time and time again, in the hope of offsetting constructive criticism, General Hines and his associates have reported that hospital facilities are being steadily enlarged to eventually provide more than 300,000 beds throughout the United States. But when you try to pin them down to facts and dates, you get nowhere fast. They talk only in obscure generalities.

The startling fact remains that, according to the Veterans' Administration's own reports, there were 82,204 available domiciliary and hospital beds in all United States veterans' hospitals on June 30, 1940. (Source: American Legion National Legislative Committee Report, September 1940.)

Today there are 89,000 domiciliary and hospital beds—an increase of merely seven-thousand-odd beds. (Source: The Veterans' Administration Statistical Section.)

Think of it! There have been more than 1,167,000 servicemen medically discharged from this war alone, and out of this total over 300,000 of them are now drawing disability pensions. Each of these veterans are potential hospital cases. Where are they to go for medical treatment or hospitalization?

The American Medical Association is out to get this trade. They are determined that this future business will not be taken away from their membership; i. e., the civilian doctors.

As proof of this statement I cite the American Medical Association's stand toward the construction of veterans' hospitals.

On March 14, 1933, during the economy debate, Senator Walcott placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter from Dr. Hugh H. Young, famous surgeon, of Johns Hopkins Hospital. (Source: P. 343, bound copy; p. 327, unbound RECORD.)

As noted, Dr. Young was the spokesman for the American Medical Association.

The letter is as follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., *March 14, 1933.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WALCOTT: You will be interested to learn that Dr. Dean Lewis, president-elect of the American Medical Association, telephoned to the executive offices of the American Medical Association in Chicago and presented to them the great desirability of the American Medical Association, showing how strongly the organized medical profession of America felt against the payment of the huge sums to veterans, particularly for nonservice disabilities and the fabulous hospital program which they have begun. As a result of this, a letter was dispatched from the executive offices of the American Medical Association strongly urging that the President be upheld in his efforts to effect these large economies, vitally important at this time in the balancing of the Budget; in particular, the great reduction of the money to be paid to nonservice veterans and for the program of excessive hospitalization.

I would like to say personally that this hospital program, if continued, will injure very greatly the established hospitals of the country, the great hospitals connected with medical schools, and will also be of incalculable injury to the medical profession of America.

Very sincerely,

HUGH H. YOUNG, M. D.

There you have the crux for the delaying tactics of the Veterans' Administration towards the construction of additional veteran hospitals.

Maybe General Hines is not to be blamed. Maybe his hands are thoroughly tied.

To get a complete picture of this situation it is well to read the recent letter from the American Medical Association that Representative GILLIE placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 30, 1944. (Source: Appendix of the RECORD, pp. A4569–A4570.)

Obviously the position of the American Medical Association remains the same down through the years. They have their powerful friends holding high offices in Washington. In their hands lay the fate, health, and hospitalization of millions of veterans.

They are the ones responsible for the obnoxious pauper's oath that veterans must sign before being granted hospitalization. Through the medium of the pauper oath scheme this selfish and greedy group intend to scare and humiliate veterans in the hope that they will take their business to private doctors. It is difficult to believe that the rank and file of the medical profession approve the stand taken by the American Medical Association.

Still the A. M. A. is opposed to the deletion of this degrading oath from the Veteran Hospital Application Form P–10. Through their lobby in official Washington they insist that the pauper's oath must remain undisturbed.

The Tydings Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM LEMKE, has tried diligently to bring to the floor of this Congress House Concurrent Resolution No. 27, which provides for the investigation and interpretation of the Tydings Amendment to the Selective Service Act.

It is regrettable, indeed, that the distinguished gentleman seems to be having difficulties in getting this resolution presented to the Congress.

I want, however, the record to show that I stand unconditionally behind this resolution. I am in full and complete support of its aims and objects. And, further, I want the record to show that I highly commend my colleague for the leadership he has shown in his devotion to so worthy a cause, that cause being the giving to the young American farmers their rightful place in this most important national crisis.

The country has been annoyed by much discussion on the question of the Tydings amendment. Meeting after meeting has been held with General Hershey on this question, and still, with few exceptions, there is evidence that the local boards continue to follow the call of Justice Byrnes, issued through General Hershey, and by so doing placed a new interpretation upon the meaning of the legal statute known as the Tydings amendment passed by this Congress.

There is a side to this great question, Mr. Speaker, that I think in many respects has been lost sight of. I think it is clearly the intent of the Tydings amendment to defer farm workers and farmers themselves in the food-producing industry and recognizing the same as an essential part of our war program. Men who have been thus deferred should be dealt with with honor. If their industry has been recognized as one indispensable in the war effort, then those who work in it must be given a place in the world today and particularly in the world of tomorrow, where they feel they have measured up and answered the call of their Government in a great hour of need. Theirs must be a duty of patriotism, and they must be made to feel that their efforts are patriotic. Young men who are working today, deferred under the Tydings amendment, dedicating themselves to the noble work of farming must never feel in the days to come that they failed their Government in an hour of need. It must be clearly impressed upon them that they are doing as great a service to remain on the farm and produce food in the interest of our country and our allies as would be the case were they carrying a gun, driving a tank, or flying an airplane. And in that period following the war there must never come a time when they fail to receive equal recognition with those who have the fighting part of the real war.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Tydings amendment, if properly administered, would justify that. The fact that General Hershey, under his orders from Mr. Byrnes, has seen fit to treat the Tydings amendment as a scrap of paper has placed a stigma upon these young American farmers which they will long have to carry. The confusion and the great controversies has reached a point in which many ask, Is the Tydings amendment the law of the land?

Let me remind you that these young farmers are patriotic; they work without question long hours, and they work with great devotion in their given profession for their country.

It is the duty of this Congress, now, to find a way to return to these young men a condition in which they may feel they are accorded equal honor with the men in the fighting fronts. The problem will not end with an Armistice Day, the rehabilitation and feeding of liberated countries, and assistance which must be given to our allies will require that they continue for an indefinite period in these long days of hard work.

Credit Where Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the Washington Post, Thursday, February 20, 1945, and letter concerning the article written by Constantin Fotitch, former Ambassador of Yugoslavia:

RADIO SIGNAL LEADS TO RESCUE OF 250 STRANDED ALLIED FLYERS

ROME, February 16.—A mystery radio message, picked up and recorded by R. A. F. radio operators in Italy, led to the rescue recently of 250 Allied airmen, mostly American, who had bailed out over the Balkans.

One afternoon an operator attached to an R. A. F. heavy bomber wing received a call sign which he could not identify. For 2 hours he struggled with signals, trying to determine the location of the caller.

The next day the mystery station called again and the sender used a commercial rather than a service procedure. R. A. F. operators suspected that the mysterious calls came from Yugoslavia.

Gradually a procedure was worked out. The mystery station used ingenious phrases—there was no code—which were at first unintelligible. Translation of the messages indicated that a large number of Americans, some of whom were sick, were stranded in Yugoslavia. They were awaiting rescue anxiously, for enemy troops were not far distant.

The Balkan air force dropped a parachutist at a spot indicated by the unknown wireless operator. Full arrangements were soon completed and the airmen congregated at a secret airfield. There they were all picked up and brought back to their bases.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

CREDIT WHERE DUE

In the Post of February 20 you published a story about a mystery radio message picked up by R. A. F. radio operators in Italy, which led to the rescue of 250 Allied airmen, mostly Americans, who had bailed out over the Balkans.

Now that there seems to be no reason for keeping this matter secret, I should like to bring to light the full story of the action which led to the rescue of more than 200 American airmen plus scores of British and other Allied airmen from Yugoslavia. In the course of the year 1944, when the Allied Air Force from Italy launched heavy bombardment operations over the Balkans and Central Europe, many of the Allied and especially American airmen, while returning to their bases, were forced to bail out from their damaged ships in the territory which was under the control of the army of General Mihailovich. General Mihailovich's men were given strict orders that whenever Allied airmen were forced down over their territory, those detachments which were close by must go at once to their rescue, and bring them to his headquarters for further evacuation. In several instances these rescues were effected only after severe fighting with the Bulgarian and German troops of occupation.

Almost daily report came from General Mihailovich giving the names of the rescued Allied aviators with their serial numbers and the number of the plane assigned to each of them, so that the American authorities were promptly and fully informed about many of their airmen who had been missing in action. I have in my possession many touching letters which I received from the families of these airmen, expressing their gratitude and telling of the great comfort that this information was to them.

By the middle of this summer the number of airmen gathered around Mihailovich's headquarters amounted to several hundred, and the problem for the general was how to return them safely back to their respective units in Italy. As it was practically impossible to reach the seacoast through the occupied country, General Mihailovich's men built an air field in southwestern Serbia, near the village of Pr——, on which the American planes could land in order to evacuate their comrades. With no bulldozers and modern equipment at their disposal, Mihailovich's men built this air field by the use of their bare hand and what primitive equipment they possessed.

On July 17, I was informed by General Mihailovich that the airfield was completed, and that they were ready to receive the American transport planes. He stated that his army would take full protection of the landing and evacuation operations. The next day I conveyed this information to the proper authorities in Washington, who in turn, made the further necessary arrangements with General Mihailovich. In one single day, on August 10, 17 American Liberators landed on Mihailovich's airfield and evacuated the first group of 254 airmen. Further evacuation continued, until all were brought safely home.

Even this action did not prevent a continuation of slanderous accusations against General Mihailovich, and I am not aware what recognition was given him for this contribution to the Allied cause. Probably the general did not expect any recognition, because he felt that he was merely carrying out his duties as an ally. Nevertheless, today, when the story of this rescue is disclosed,

credit should be given to those who deserve it, and should not be presented as an anonymous action which occurred somewhere in the Balkans.

CONSTANTIN FOTITCH,
Former Ambassador of Yugoslavia.
WASHINGTON, *February 20.*

Nazi Reeducation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT SIKES
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD an article on reeducation of Nazi prisoners of war which I believe is worthy of the consideration of the Members of the House. It is from the Christian Science Monitor for January 27, 1945:

REEDUCATION OF NAZI WAR PRISONERS TERMED "KEY TO REFORMATION OF GERMANY"

(By Ernest S. Pisko)

The problem of whether or not attempt should be made to reeducate German war prisoners in the United States is approached with somewhat more than caution by the War Department, but with enthusiasm by those interested in the post-war reformation of Germany.

There is evidence of the efficient manner in which German prisoners uphold Nazi ideals in their camps. They still greet each other with "Heil Hitler"; they keep pictures of "Der Führer" in their barracks; they display the swastika flag on suitable occasions; and, by means of a well-organized camp gestapo, they maintain rigid party discipline among camp inmates.

The St. Pölten (Austria) newspaper, Heimatbote, on July 6, published an article by Lt. Christian Köhler, a former prisoner of war in this country who was returned as an exchange prisoner. Lieutenant Köhler described the attitude of his captiv comrades in the United States as marvelous. He particularly praised the noncommissioned officers for the splendid propaganda work they were doing among enlisted men. "Although the only news available to war prisoners," he wrote, "is the fabricated news from our enemies, the sergeants explain to their comrades the political and military situation day after day. Their sound political instinct helps them to detect any lie at once."

For obvious reasons Lieutenant Köhler kept silent on the specific methods by which the "sound political instinct" of the German noncoms succeeds in asserting itself. These methods begin with social boycott against any nonconformist and end with murder or compulsory suicide.

Public opinion in the United States, though basically in favor of reeducating German war prisoners, has been hampered in expressing itself by the notion that any attempt to interfere with the political views of the prisoners would violate the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners of war.

Actually there is nothing in either the Geneva Convention of 1929 or in earlier international agreements to vindicate this opinion.

The only article that could be interpreted as recommending a hands-off policy is article 3 of the Geneva Convention, which stipulates that prisoners of war "have the right to have their person and their honor respected." While it must be admitted that the special brand of "Nazi honor" would be infringed upon by anyone suggesting that Hitler is wrong or that democratic procedure is superior to totalitarianism, the question arises whether the term "honor," as used in the Geneva Convention, does not apply to human dignity in general rather than to any specific political creed.

Besides, two articles of the Geneva Convention must be construed as coming out expressly in favor of reeducation.

Article 17 provides that "so far as possible belligerents shall encourage intellectual discussions * * * organized by prisoners of war.

And article 33, which states that war prisoners shall be allowed to receive shipments of books individually, adds that "duly recognized and authorized aid societies may send books and collections of books to libraries of prisoner camps."

Perhaps even more important than those two positive provisions is the fact that the drafters of the 1929 convention rejected three separate motions advocating the banning of political propaganda among war prisoners.

The question remains whether it is possible to awaken German war prisoners to democracy by means of discussion groups, lectures, and books. An affirmative answer was given by two countries—Russia and Sweden.

The Russians embarked on reeducation of their war prisoners almost immediately after the German invasion. They are said to have scored a tremendous success and to have denazified the overwhelming majority of the prisoners. The anti-Nazi union of German officers in the U. S. S. R. has among its members 1 field marshal, 1 colonel general, more than 30 generals, and thousands of commissioned officers of all ranks. Scores of thousands of noncoms and enlisted men are said to be members of or sympathizers with the Free Germany Committee in Moscow.

In Sweden, a number of youth organizations have begun carrying out a program of "enlightenment" among some 5,000 German Army deserters interned in Swedish camps. The internees not only are given lecture courses on various political and historic topics, but they also are provided with copies of those German books that have been banned and burned by the Nazis. The Swedish youth organizations concerned hope that the internees, upon their return home, will be spiritually equipped and eager to act as "reeducators" in their own circles.

SUSPICION, HOSTILITY, AND RESISTANCE

It has been suggested by various political and educational organizations and by many individuals that the opportunity to awaken German war prisoners to the value of democracy, and perhaps make them the spearhead of a democratic post-war Reich, should not be missed.

On the other hand, the War Department and the office of the Provost Marshal General have rejected suggestions for a program of reducation among German war prisoners.

Only recently, Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, denied the request of a Harvard University group to make an educational survey among German prisoners and send literature and lectures into prison camps. "Any such procedure," Mr. Stimson stated in his reply, "would be met with suspicion, hostility, and resistance, and instead of being persuaded by unwelcome teaching, the prisoners would turn against it."

The fact that lectures on democratic government or on modern history, as seen by non-Nazis, should be "unwelcome" to German prisoners is regrettable. It not only proves how badly the German captives need reeducation, but it also implies that, after having helped to destroy nazi-ism in Germany, the United States is going to repatriate several hundred thousand Nazis, well-fed, well-rested, spiritually unchanged, and eager for action.

The Tydings Amendment Is Not Being Considered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, that the Tydings amendment is being given very little consideration, if any, in the deferment of farm-labor workers in the age bracket, 18–26, is a matter of general knowledge. That the National Selective Service has given a different interpretation to it than the Congress intended is a well-known fact that has been stated on the floor of the House of Representatives a number of times in the last few weeks. That, following this wrong interpretation, Selective Service has apparently been determined to put almost all farm laborers in the age bracket 18–26 in military service cannot be successfully denied by anyone. And that the National Selective Service System has been and is now putting pressure on the local draft boards generally to conscript more and more young farmers in the 18–26 age bracket, has also been evidenced on the floor of the House by several Members who have given instances of such pressure in their respective States. That the same high-pressure method has been used in the State of Ohio is disclosed in the subject matter of three affidavits made by members or officials of the Lucas County U. S. D. A. War Board and handed to me by Hon. HOMER A. RAMEY, of the Ninth Ohio District:

STATE OF OHIO,
Lucas County, ss:

John A. Zenk, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is past chairman of the Lucas County U. S. D. A. War Board, and is representing the present chairman of the Lucas County U. S. D. A. War Board, Toledo, Ohio, and that on the 9th day of January 1945, Lt. S. A. Dwyer appeared before selective service board, No. 22, located in Toledo, Lucas County, Ohio, representing that he was acting for and under the direction of the State selective-service board, headed by Col. C. W. Goble, and made the following statements to said board regarding drafting of farm boys, stated in substance as follows:

In reply to a case submitted by the selective-service board of a lone owner-operator of a 40-unit farm, whose brothers were all owner-operators whose units average approximately 40 units, Lieutenant Dwyer said, "Let the brothers farm it."

He further said in substance that the Tydings amendment is still in effect but these boys are deferred for the convenience of the Government, therefore, they can be taken at any time. They will all have to go sooner or later.

There are enough people on farms to produce enough food to supply the armed forces and lend-lease; if civilians want to eat let the city people come out and help grow the food.

And further affiant saith not.

JOHN A. ZENK.

Notarized by Lavon M. Saneholtz, notary public.

LUCAS COUNTY, OHIO, *February 20, 1945.*

STATE OF OHIO,
Lucas County, ss:

John C. Maddy, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is agricultural investigator for the Lucas County U. S. D. A. War Board, Toledo, Ohio, and that on the 9th day of January 1945, Lt. S. A. Dwyer appeared before selective-service board, No. 22, located in Toledo, Lucas County, Ohio, representing that he was acting for and under the direction of the State selective-service board, headed by Col. C. W. Goble, and made the following statements to said board regarding drafting of farm boys, stated in substance as follows:

All registrants between 18 and 26 years of age presently classified in II–C shall be reclassified in I–A and given preinduction physical examination, all of which shall be inducted except a few hardship cases.

Food production should no longer be given consideration, as the need for young men is more important in the armed services than in the production of food. If civilians expect to have sufficient food to meet the need for 1945, it will be necessary for them to do their share on the farm front.

And further affiant saith not.

JOHN C. MADDY.

Notarized by Lavon M. Saneholtz, notary public.

LUCAS COUNTY, OHIO, *February 20, 1945.*

STATE OF OHIO,
Lucas County, ss:

H. W. Waugh, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is a member of the Lucas County U. S. D. A. War Board, Toledo, Ohio, and that on the 9th day of January 1945, Lieut. S. A. Dwyer appeared before selective service board, No. 22, located in Toledo, Lucas County, Ohio, representing that he was acting for and under the direction of the State selective-service board, headed by Col. C. W. Goble, and made the following statement to said board regarding drafting of farm boys, stated in substance as follows:

The Tydings amendment is to be no longer considered for the age group from 18 to 26 years. Food production would have to suffer if the induction of this group causes it. Other means of production will have to be worked out.

The tomatoes you are talking about might well be produced in the South where they have plenty of labor. The prisoners of war in your area might well perform all of the farming operations.

Each II–C below 26 should be placed in I–A. All of these cases should go to the board of appeals and the war board should appeal them.

And further affiant saith not.

H. W. WAUGH.

Notarized by Lavon M. Saneholtz, notary public.

LUCAS COUNTY, OHIO, *February 20, 1945.*

Mr. Speaker, these affidavits do not carry any personal reflection whatever on the officials mentioned in the respective affidavits, because they doubtless are working under orders from higher up. The affidavits speak for themselves and show that local draft boards in Ohio while having been told the Tydings amendment is still in effect, at the same time they are given an interpretation by the national Selective Service contrary to what the Congress intended and are high pressured by being verbally told in substance by Army officers in uniform not to consider the Tydings amendment, not to consider the production of food, but to put farm-labor draftees in the 18–26 age bracket in the Army. While the affidavits refer only to one county, there is reason to believe that the practice has been general in other parts, if not all, of the State.

Now the Congress is attempting to reenact the Tydings amendment to try to make it necessary for the National Selective Service System to apply the law according to the meaning intended by Congress. There should never have been any confusion on the Tydings amendment. It was written in very clear and forceful English.

Is the interpretation of laws to suit themselves becoming a habit of Government officials?

Is This Pampering?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit two articles, one of them from Time, of February 19, 1945, and the other from the Mobile Register, of February 22, 1945. They portray all too clearly the difference in German and American conceptions of proper treatment of prisoners of war under the rules set forth by the Geneva convention.

[From Time Magazine of February 19, 1945]

NOTHING BUT THE BEST

Passengers boarding the Pennsylvania Limited at Washington, D. C., one day last week peered curiously at the 16 prisoners of war in the private car at the end of the train. They were Germans—mostly veterans of the ill-fated Afrika Korps; they looked smug and well-fed in their khaki uniforms stenciled with large P. W.'s. Three United States Army noncoms watched over them.

Halfway to New York City some of the passengers got a better look. The dining car was crowded for lunch. Waiters hustled to clear away the debris of departed diners. Four standees waited to be fed. Then the Germans filed in, stood stiffly while their guards bustled about ordering diners to seats at other tables so the prisoners could sit together.

The P. W.'s ate a hearty dinner of stewed chicken, white bread, jam, ice cream. The standees swallowed their anger. On the battle fronts United States soldiers ate C rations from cans, and were glad to have them.

[From the Mobile Register of February 22, 1945]

OFFICER TELLS OF NAZI PRISON CAMP

(By Lt. John N. Dimling, Jr.)

(U. S. Army officer of Winston-Salem, N. C., captured a year ago on the Anzio beachhead in Italy and freed by the Red Army drive through Poland, where he was held with other Americans in a Nazi prison camp.)

Moscow.—One year ago I was in no man's land outside of Anzio beachhead when a German counterattack cut me off and I was taken prisoner. It was a mighty tough moment.

But last month sitting in a blacked-out Polish farmhouse behind what was the enemy's line, I had the thrill of my 30-year life. Off in the distance a bunch of us American officers who had eluded German guards that morning could hear the rumble of tanks.

"Lord, they can't be Jerry tanks," I told my side-kick. "They sound like M–4's—Shermans."

The rumble came nearer, then right past on the road a hundred yards from the farmhouse. It blended in with people's voices shouting and screaming with joy in Polish.

EMBRACED BY POLES

A Polish farmer burst into the room where we were lying low, "Russky, Russky," he yelled. I don't know when news like that could ever sound better. Then and there Marshal Zhukov became our favorite army commander.

The Poles, men, women, and children, crowded in and embraced us. They sang one of their hymns. I sang, "God Bless America," and how we meant it!

Soon a Russian tanker poked his head in just for a few seconds' chat with our senior officer, a colonel who used to be with the armored force himself.

The Russian through our interpreter said he was very pleased to see us, shook hands all around, whipped out a bottle of vodka, and proposed a toast to our common victory. We offered him cigarettes.

"Got to keep going to Berlin," he said in Russian as he saluted good-bye. And off he went. It was like that all night as the Russian armored spearhead, mostly Stalin and Sherman tanks, raced after the retreating German Army.

LAUDS RED FIGHTERS

I've never met a better type of rough and ready soldier than the Red Army fighting men. All of them hate the Germans worse than anything else in the world and all of them are determined to get to Berlin just as fast as humanly possible.

Liberation by the Red Army ended what had been 1 year of modified hell for me. You can't realize what freedom means to you until you lose it. The Germans in handling American prisoners had thought of many ways, large and small, to harass us. They did as little as possible for us. Rations they provided would have broken us by starvation if it hadn't been for Red Cross parcels.

As a "kriegie," our name for war prisoners, of Kriegsgefangener, I suppose my experience has been typical until the Red Army fortunately cut it short.

Four months before the American Fifth Army ever saw Rome the Germans marched me and hundreds of other prisoners from Anzio through the Eternal City in a parade designed to humiliate Allied arms in the eyes of the wavering Italians.

CAPTURED BY "GOONS"

I had been snagged by "goons"—the name the American prisoners gave their captors—while commanding Company A of the Thirtieth Regiment in an attack in the direction of Cisterna by the Third Division. That was February 1, 1944. Our executive officer was wounded and I had taken over temporarily.

The Goons sucked in our attack, then came at us from ambush. A dozen of them with burp guns—Schmeisser automatic pistols—got the drop on me and my company radio operator.

At Velletri they grilled us and an English-speaking Goon private sneered, "When our artillery comes from the Russian front we'll push your comrades back into the sea."

"How can you spare anything from the Russian front?" I asked.

He couldn't answer that one.

Outside Rome in a kind of car barn the Goons assembled over a hundred United States officers and enlisted men and trucked us to the Coliseum. There they lined us up in columns of fives and we were marched across the city along streets jammed with curious but undemonstrative crowds.

Believe it or not, but some of the Italians furtively gave us the "V" sign. Some of us sang, "Heigh ho, Methusaleh," to keep up our spirits and we named the whole thing "our victory."

On the other side the Germans reloaded us in trucks and off we went to spend 7 weeks in a modern black hole—a stinking prison camp at Laterina, south of Florence.

The camp had no water supply of its own and what we used was carted in unpurified from an open stream nearby. Lice and fleas abounded. Many prisoners suffered dysentery. Our daily ration consisted of ersatz tea or coffee unsweetened, in the morning; a small chunk of bread and watery soup and a dab of margarine at noon, and the same thing at 5 p. m. Sundays we got nothing at all in the afternoon.

PRISONERS FAINTED

All of us got so weak it was difficult to walk around. At two roll calls daily there were always a number of prisoners who fainted. Any sudden physical movement made the brain whirl and the effect was like a blackout.

Our senior officer was a British major, who protested continually to Germans over camp conditions, but there was no improvement. At last they loaded us on boxcars, 25 prisoners and 5 guards in each, and shifted us to Moosberg, Bavaria. They took away our shoes and belts to prevent attempts to escape and furnished us only a small loaf of bread, less than a pound of canned beef and one portion of soup per man for the entire journey.

At Moosberg we were deloused and handed our first Red Cross package. It was like Christmas. In fact, thereafter the weekly issuance of the Red Cross package always was referred to as "Christmas Day."

Another month and they shipped us off to western Poland to a camp at Szubin, once used for the R. A. F.

Farmers' Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of a letter which I have received from one of my constituents in regard to the problems of the farmers.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1945.

Hon. HENRY L. LARCADE, Jr.,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have yours of the 19th instant enclosing copy of the bill, H. R. 754, by Mr. PACE amending the Agricultural Marketing Agreement of 1937, etc.

Many thanks.

I further note what you have to say in regard to Mr. PACE's efforts in having the Government take into consideration the increased farm wages, etc., and what he has been able to secure from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

I hope that you are correct in your estimate of the situation but in all frankness I have never seen a period in the country's history when it was more plain than right now that the farmer is not only being discriminated against but actually robbed by the very agencies created to protect him.

To begin with Henry I do not recognize the so-called Bureau of Agricultural Economics or any other Bureau as the Government.

I say to you that the lawmaking part of the Government is the Congress of the United States, and if there is anything wrong, and you know there is, then Congress must correct it or bear the blame.

I wrote you many times before calling your attention to certain rulings and orders that seemed designed for and did result in the farmer being robbed. I have sent you carbon copies of letters to Senators OVERTON and ELLENDER going into detail.

Sad to relate, it is getting badder and badder instead of better.

To start off, Henry, if you were to take all your clothes off of your body and your shoes off your feet and then put the shoes to one side and put all the clothes on a pair of scales and weigh them and then list what each item of clothes cost you would realize that the costs of the cotton or wool in what you had on your body has as much to do with fixing the prices you paid for your clothing as the salt and black pepper had in the price of the meal you purchased in the House Restaurant.

Your hat would be the same and your shoes at the price you paid for them would buy at the price the farmer is paid in your congressional district 22 cow hides.

What is the trouble? Nothing except Congress has delegated its authority to others who study some way and generally find it by which the farmer may be robbed.

To illustrate: (And page Mr. PACE) A floor price of $56 per ton is fixed for cottonseed so as to protect the producer.

We are paid our seed from $40 to $30 per ton.

We protest, protest, and protest.

The result: You are advised in writing by C. C. Farrington, vice president, United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation, that to get the support prices the farmers must combine and offer five tons, or more, lots to the mill.

If this floor price was to protect the farmer, then the blush of shame should cover the face of every self-respecting Congressman who reads Mr. C. C. Farrington's letter.

What southern Congressman outside of the larger cities who does not know that the farmer sells his cottonseed to the ginner. The cotton is sucked up by air and sent to the gin saws and then placed in the bin or storage at the gin from the wagon or truck, and to expect the farmer to have 5 tons of seed at the gin at one time assumes an ignorance unworthy of one in high place and authority.

That's not the worst, as the oil mill buys from the ginner, but the prices shown in the parity arrangements covered by Mr. PACE'S bill are listed as if the farmer had gotten the price paid to the ginner.

If you will take the World-Telegram Almanac and see the tables showing what the producer gets from his seed and other agricultural products, you will realize what I mean.

In other words, Congressman LARCADE, the floor prices should be to protect the producer or farmer and not the processor, oil mill, ginner, and others who have for too long already enjoyed too much from what the farmer produced.

You know all the oil mills and ginners in your congressional district act together and that they are all prosperous.

What the farmer wants and what he needs is a fair share of what the consumer pays for what the farmer produces.

Most of the Congressmen worry about the dangers of communism, but they get mighty silent when Mr. Farrington requires that the farmer reload his seed and combine it with the seed of other farmers and then go to the oil mill or else lose the floor price, supposedly in their interest.

Isn't this compulsory communism?

The real remedy is very easy if Congress really wants to do something?

All that has to be done is to do for the farmer what is done for the consumer. The ceiling prices are fixed for the consumer, and the floor prices are supposedly fixed for the producer. But it is a criminal offense to either buy or sell at above the ceiling price. One who violates the ceiling price not only may be punished criminally but he may be sued civilly in triple damages with his attorney's fees paid by the defendant. Yet, strange to say, the one who was to be protected by the floor price is told that his sole and only remedy is to combine and haul it directly to a mill who is selling its product on a contract by which the Government hopes will result in the producer receiving floor prices.

Is there any reason in the world why the floor-price violation cannot be punished either by civil or criminal action?

Absolutely none, save and except that those in authority do not want it.

The southern representative on the triple-A for the Department of Agriculture takes the position that to make it a criminal offense to buy or sell below floor prices would result in the Government having to buy perishable products and then sell them later in competition with regular dealers.

My answer was that if it were true that was no more than what the Government agencies were then doing, and I called attention to the fact that cabbage and all other manner of truck was being given to the asylum at Pineville and other places free and thereby destroying the chance of the farmer who had been raising truck near Pineville to sell to the asylum by a governmental agency dumping its surplus free to the one purchaser the trucker planted to sell his product to at Pineville. A strange doctrine it is that holds it to be unfair for a governmental agency to sell a product in competition with a dealer in the same product yet who is so dumb as to fail to see the injustice of dumping or giving away a product that a poor farmer had to plant, cultivate, and harvest and then find that the very governmental agency that asked him to plant truck had destroyed his market by giving to the very party to whom the farmer was to sell.

But, Mr. Congressman, there is no logic in saying that the Government would have to enter the market and buy if it made it a crime to sell at below the floor price than to hold that the Government would have to buy when no one wanted to pay the ceiling price.

If there was a law making it a crime to sell mean that at times there would be no market but not nearly as often as a lack of market caused by ceiling-price fixing. Again, a or buy below the flooring prices it might governmental agency that has limited our acreage as well as the little pigs ought not to give up and say "we are helpless" just because no one will buy at floor prices. Let them try it and see. If it hurts the farmer, then let it hurt him. He has been hurt by everything else tried thus far, at least to the extent that he now, as in the past, has and is not receiving a fair share for what he raises when compared with what the consumer pays for the product.

With personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours.

The Wallace Pattern: Go-to-Work Paternalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I am including as an extension of my remarks an article by Gould Lincoln which discusses what might happen after former Vice President Wallace is confirmed by the Senate tomorrow, "if"—

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

The approaching confirmation of former Vice President Wallace's appointment to be Secretary of Commerce shoves into the foreground the Murray "full employment" bill. This bill, which was introduced by Senator MURRAY, of Wyoming, for himself and Senators WAGNER, of New York, THOMAS of Utah, and O'MAHONEY of Wyoming, all Democrats, seeks to set up a system to assure full employment in this country—with the Federal Government carrying on if and when private industry fails to provide enough jobs. More than that, the Federal Government under the terms of the proposed law would undertake to bolster private industry. When that bolstering takes place it is likely to be at a price.

The reason the Murray bill steps into the limelight, along with Mr. Wallace, is that its objectives, and probably its performances, are right in line with the theories and program for full employment laid down by the former Vice President in his statement to the Senate Commerce Committee not long ago. Whether the bill will ever become law is another matter. Mr. Wallace—because of his ideas—received what amounted to a vote of no confidence in both the House and Senate, when those bodies voted for the passage of the George bill, stripping from the Commerce Department the R. F. C. and other great Federal lending agencies as prerequisite to confirmation of the Wallace appointment.

In brief, the bill provides for a "National Production and Employment Budget," to be transmitted to Congress at the beginning of each regular session. This budget would set forth the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local and Federal Governments. It would also estimate the size of the labor force, including the self-employed in industry and agriculture. If it appears that employment offered by private industry, agriculture, and the various State, local, and Federal Governments is insufficient, then recommendations will be made to aid private industry and to provide Government employment if necessary.

This is superplanning. While on the surface it leaves a great deal to private initiative, underneath it looks to regimentation to the nth degree, if it becomes necessary. The bill asserts: "All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular and full-time employment." Once it has been established by law that a man or a woman has a right to work it will not be a long step to assert that a man or a woman has a duty to work—that has to work. It is easy to imagine that a paternalistic government, having set up its plans for full employment and finding perhaps a million persons who do not wish, for one reason or another, to take the jobs, will become a bit sore and insist on these individuals going to work. Involuntary unemployment, of which the bill speaks and which it seeks to cure, might on occasion find itself turned into involuntary employment. This is far from the thoughts of the proponents of the measure—but that does not mean it cannot happen.

Opponents of the Murray bill, including Senator TAFT, of Ohio, argue that in addition to regimentation by the Government, the measure would result in huge deficit spending. This its supporters flatly deny. Mr. TAFT has pointed out that Mr. Wallace is talking about the need of supplying 57,000,000 jobs—a bit less than the President's estimate of 60,000,000. If only 50,000,000 jobs are available—a far greater number than have been employed in this country in the past—then 7,000,000 workers would have to be provided by the Federal Government with jobs at a cost of $2,000 a year each. This would make a total layout of $14,000,000,000.

The Wallace confirmation, which may be completed March 1 or soon after by the Senate if the George bill is approved by the President by that time, will be hailed by the C. I. O. as a great victory. It is true that Mr. Wallace and the C. I. O. have been compelled to withdraw from their original demand that Mr. Wallace have the loan agencies along with the Commerce Department. But they have faith that Mr. Roosevelt will give other powers, and broad ones, to Mr. Wallace. And they will drive ahead in support of the Murray bill in the hope Wallace will have its administration.

Synopsis of Federal Taxes on the Income Since Adoption of Sixteenth Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a synopsis of the Federal income taxes imposed on the income of individuals and of the normal, excess-profits, and war-profits taxes imposed on the income of corporations since the adoption of the Sixteenth Amendment. In the case of individuals, the special treatment of gains and losses from sales or exchanges of capital assets after 1921 is included.

SYNOPSIS OF FEDERAL TAXES ON THE INCOME OF INDIVIDUALS SINCE THE ADOPTION OF THE SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT

Normal Tax, Individual

Rates, personal exemptions, and credits for dependents in effect for normal tax purposes during 1913 and subsequent years

Act	Year [1]	Personal exemption [2]		Credit for each dependent [3]	Rate
		Single	Married		
1913	1913 (Mar. 1)–15.	$3,000	$4,000	None	1 percent.
1916	1916	3,000	4,000	None	2 percent.
1916	1917	1,000	2,000	$200	4 percent (2 percent on first $2,000).
1917					
1918	1918	1,000	2,000	200	12 percent (6 percent on first $4,000).
	1919–20	1,000	2,000	200	8 percent (4 percent on first $4,000).
1921	1921–23	1,000	[4] 2,500	400	Same. [5]
1924	1924	1,000	2,500	400	6 percent (2 percent on first $4,000; 4 percent on second $4,000).
1926	1925–27	1,500	3,500	400	5 percent (1½ percent on first $4,000; 3 percent on second $4,000).
1928	1928	1,500	3,500	400	Same.
1928	1929	$1,500	$3,500	$400	4 percent (1½ percent on first $4,000; 2 percent on second $4,000).
	1930–31	1,500	3,500	400	5 percent (1½ percent on first $4,000; 3 percent on second $4,000).
1932	1932–33	1,000	2,500	400	8 percent (4 percent on first $4,000).
1934	1934–35	1,000	2,500	400	4 percent.
1936	1936–37	1,000	2,500	400	4 percent
1938	1938	1,000	2,500	400	4 percent.
I. R. C.	1939	1,000	2,500	400	4 percent.
	1940	800	2,000	400	4 percent. [6]
	1941	750	1,500	400	4 percent.
	1942–43	500	1,200	350	6 percent.
	1944–	500	[7] 500	None	3 percent.

[1] For 1917 and earlier, the calendar year; for 1918 to 1932, inclusive, the calendar year and fiscal years ending therein; for 1933, the calendar year and fiscal years beginning or ending therein; and for 1934 and later, the calendar year and fiscal years beginning therein. In the case of a rate change during a fiscal year ending in the period 1918 to 1933, inclusive, the tax was prorated. Proration is also provided for in the case of fiscal years ending after June 30, 1942, and in the case of fiscal years ending in 1944.

[2] In the statute effective for 1944 and subsequent years, the term "personal exemption" is no longer used to describe this credit against net income; it is supplanted, for normal tax purposes, by the term "normal tax exemption."

[3] For the years 1934 to 1940, inclusive, the credit was allowed "for each person (other than husband or wife) dependent upon and receiving his chief support from the taxpayer if such dependent person is under 18 years of age or is incapable of self-support because mentally or physically defective." For the years 1941, 1942, and 1943, this allowance was qualified by the provision that "if the taxpayer would not occupy the status of head of a family except by reason of there being 1 or more dependents for whom he would be entitled to credit * * * the credit * * * shall be disallowed with respect to 1 of such dependents."

[4] $2,000 in the case of net incomes in excess of $5,000.

[5] The tax for 1923 was reduced 25 percent by the 1924 act.

[6] Not including the defense tax, which was 10 percent of the combined normal tax and surtax but not to exceed 10 percent of the excess of the net income over the combined normal tax and surtax.

[7] In the case of a joint return, the exemption is $1,000, except that if the adjusted gross income of one spouse is less than $500, it is $500 plus the adjusted gross income of such spouse.

Surtax, individual—Personal exemptions and credits for dependents in effect for surtax purposes during 1934 and subsequent years

Act	Year [1]	Personal exemption [2]		Credit for each dependent [4]
		Single	Married [3]	
1934	1934–35	$1,000	$2,500	$400
1936	1936–37	1,000	2,500	400
1938	1938	1,000	2,500	400
I. R. C.	1939	1,000	2,500	400
	1940	800	2,000	400
	1941	750	1,500	400
	1942–43	500	1,200	350
	1944–	500	[5] 1,000	[5] 500

[1] The calendar year and fiscal years beginning therein. Prior to 1934, no personal exemption or credit for dependents was allowed for surtax purposes.

[2] In the statute effective for 1944 and subsequent years, the term "personal exemption" is no longer used to describe this credit against net income; it is supplanted, for surtax purposes, by the term "surtax exemption."

This surtax exemption is $500 each for the taxpayer, the taxpayer's spouse (in case of a joint return or, if the spouse has no gross income and is not the dependent of another taxpayer, in the case of a separate return), and each of the taxpayer's dependents whose gross income for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins is less than $500. No surtax exemption is allowed for a dependent who is married and has made a joint return for a taxable year beginning in such calendar year.

[3] For the years 1934 to 1943, inclusive, a head of a family was allowed the same personal exemption as a married person living with husband or wife. Effective for 1944 and subsequent years, a head of a family, as such, is allowed no surtax exemption.

For the years 1934 to 1943, inclusive, if a husband and wife made separate returns, the personal exemption could be taken by either or divided between them. Effective for 1944 and subsequent years, a married person making a separate return is allowed a surtax exemption of only $500, unless the spouse has no gross income and is not the dependent of another taxpayer, in which case the surtax exemption is $1,000.

[4] For the years 1934 to 1940, inclusive, the credit was allowed "for each person (other than husband or wife) dependent upon and receiving his chief support from the taxpayer if such dependent person is under 18 years of age or is incapable of self-support because mentally or physically defective."

For the years 1941, 1942, and 1943, this allowance was qualified by the provision that "if the taxpayer would not occupy the status of head of a family except by reason of there being one or more dependents for whom he would be entitled to credit * * *, the credit * * * shall be disallowed with respect to one of such dependents."

Effective for 1944 and subsequent years, the statute defines the term "dependent" to mean "any of the following persons over half of whose support, for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins, was received from the taxpayer:

(A) a son or daughter of the taxpayer, or a descendant of either,

(B) a stepson or stepdaughter of the taxpayer,

(C) a brother, sister, stepbrother, or stepsister of the taxpayer,

(D) the father or mother of the taxpayer, or an ancestor of either,

(E) a stepfather or stepmother of the taxpayer,

(F) a son or daughter of a brother or sister of the taxpayer,

(G) a brother or sister of the father or mother of the taxpayer,

(H) a son-in-law, daughter-in-law, father-in-law, mother-in-law, brother-in-law, or sister-in-law of the taxpayer."

As used in the above definition, "brother" and "sister" nclude a brother and sister of the half-blood and "for the purposes of determining whether any of the foregoing relationships exist a legally adopted child of a person shall be considered a child of such person by blood. The term 'dependent' does not include any individual who is a citizen or subject of a foreign country unless such individual is resident of the United States or of a country contiguous to the United States."

VICTORY TAX [1]

Specific exemption, rate, and tax credits

Specific exemption [2]		$624
Rate [3]		5%
	Maximum Percent	*amount*
Tax credits:		
Single	25	$500
Married or head of family	40	[4] $1,000
For each dependent	2	100

[1] Imposed on the "Victory tax net income" of individuals for taxable years beginning in 1943. In general, Victory tax net income was gross income with certain exceptions and less certain deductions, generally of a business character, specified in the statute.

[2] In the case of a joint return by husband and wife, if the Victory tax net income of one was less than $624, the aggregate exemption of both was limited to $624 plus the Victory tax net income of that one.

[3] The amount of the tax was limited to the excess of 90 percent of the net income over the sum of the normal tax and surtax.

[4] In the case of a separate return by each spouse, the maximum was $500.

Surtax, individual—Rates in effect during 1913 and subsequent years [1]

Net income [2] (in thousands)		1913 (Mar. 1)–1915	1916	1917	1918–21	1922–23 [3]	1924	1925–31	1932–33	1934–35	1936–39	1940 [4]	1941	1942–43	1944–
Over	Not over														
		Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
$0	$2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	20
2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	22
4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	13	20	26
5	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	13	20	26
6	7.5	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	5	5	6	17	24	30
7.5	8	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	1	5	5	6	17	24	30
8	10	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	1	6	6	8	21	28	34
10	12	0	0	3	4	2	1	1	2	7	7	10	25	32	38
12	12.5	0	0	3	5	3	1	1	3	8	8	12	29	36	43
12.5	13	0	0	4	5	3	1	1	3	8	8	12	29	36	43
13	14	0	0	4	5	3	1	1	3	8	8	12	29	36	43
14	15	0	0	4	6	4	2	2	4	9	9	15	32	40	47
15	16	0	0	5	6	4	2	2	4	9	9	15	32	40	47
16	18	0	0	5	7	5	3	3	5	11	11	18	35	43	50
18	20	0	0	5	8	6	4	4	6	13	13	21	38	46	53
20	22	1	1	8	9	8	5	5	8	15	15	24	41	49	56
22	24	1	1	8	10	9	6	6	9	17	17	27	44	52	59
24	26	1	1	8	11	10	7	7	10	17	17	27	44	52	59
26	28	1	1	8	12	11	8	7	11	19	19	30	47	55	62
28	30	1	1	8	13	12	9	8	12	19	19	30	47	55	62
30	32	1	1	8	14	13	10	8	13	19	19	30	47	55	62
32	34	1	1	8	15	15	10	9	15	21	21	33	50	58	65
34	36	1	1	8	16	15	11	9	15	21	21	33	50	58	65
36	38	1	1	8	17	16	12	10	16	21	21	33	50	58	65
38	40	1	1	8	18	17	13	10	17	24	24	36	53	61	69
40	42	1	2	12	19	18	13	11	18	24	24	36	53	61	69
42	44	1	2	12	20	19	14	11	19	24	24	36	53	61	69
44	46	1	2	12	21	20	15	12	20	27	27	40	55	63	72
46	48	1	2	12	22	21	16	12	21	27	27	40	55	63	72
48	50	1	2	12	23	22	17	13	22	27	27	40	55	63	72
50	52	2	2	12	24	23	18	13	23	30	31	44	57	66	75
52	54	2	2	12	25	24	19	14	24	30	31	44	57	66	75
54	56	2	2	12	26	25	19	14	25	30	31	44	57	66	75
56	58	2	2	12	27	26	20	15	26	33	35	44	57	66	75
58	60	2	2	12	28	27	21	15	27	33	35	44	57	66	75
60	62	2	3	17	29	28	21	16	28	33	35	47	59	69	78
62	64	2	3	17	30	29	22	16	29	36	39	47	59	69	78
64	66	2	3	17	31	30	23	17	30	36	39	47	59	69	78
66	68	2	3	17	32	31	24	17	31	36	39	47	59	69	78
68	70	2	3	17	33	32	25	17	32	39	43	47	59	69	78
70	72	2	3	17	34	33	26	18	33	39	43	50	61	72	81
72	74	2	3	17	35	34	26	18	34	39	43	50	61	72	81
74	75	2	3	17	36	35	27	18	35	42	47	50	61	72	81
75	76	3	3	17	36	35	27	18	35	42	47	50	61	72	81
76	78	3	3	17	37	36	28	18	36	42	47	50	61	72	81
78	80	3	3	17	38	37	28	18	37	42	47	50	61	72	81
80	82	3	4	22	39	38	29	19	38	45	51	53	63	75	84
82	84	3	4	22	40	39	30	19	39	45	51	53	63	75	84
84	86	3	4	22	41	40	31	19	40	45	51	53	63	75	84
86	88	3	4	22	42	41	31	19	41	45	51	53	63	75	84
88	90	3	4	22	43	42	32	19	42	45	51	53	63	75	84
90	92	3	4	22	44	43	33	19	43	50	55	56	64	77	87
92	94	3	4	22	45	44	34	19	44	50	55	56	64	77	87
94	96	3	4	22	46	45	35	19	45	50	55	56	64	77	87
96	98	3	4	22	47	46	36	19	46	50	55	56	64	77	87
98	100	3	4	22	48	47	36	19	47	50	55	56	64	77	87
100	150	4	5	27	52	48	37	20	48	52	58	58	65	79	89
150	200	4	6	31	56	49	37	20	49	53	60	60	66	81	90
200	250	4	7	37	60	50	38	20	50	54	62	62	67	82	91
250	300	5	8	42	60	50	38	20	50	54	64	64	69	82	91
300	400	5	9	46	63	50	39	20	51	55	66	66	71	82	91
400	500	5	9	46	63	50	39	20	52	56	68	68	72	82	91
500	750	6	10	50	64	50	40	20	53	57	70	70	73	82	91
750	1,000	6	10	55	64	50	40	20	54	58	72	72	74	82	91
1,000	1,500	6	11	61	65	50	40	20	55	59	73	73	75	82	91
1,500	2,000	6	12	62	65	50	40	20	55	59	73	73	75	82	91
2,000	5,000	6	13	63	65	50	40	20	55	59	74	74	76	82	91
5,000	--------	6	13	63	65	50	40	20	55	59	75	75	77	82	91

[1] For 1917 and earlier, the calendar year; for 1918 to 1932, inclusive, the calendar year and fiscal years ending therein; for 1933, the calendar year and fiscal years beginning or ending therein; and for 1934 and later, the calendar year and fiscal years beginning therein. In the case of a rate change during a fiscal year ending in the period 1918 to 1933, inclusive, the tax was prorated. Proration is also provided for in the case of fiscal years ending after June 30, 1942, and in the case of fiscal years ending in 1944.

[2] For 1933 and prior years, the entire net income; for 1934 and subsequent years, the net income after credit thereagainst of the personal exemption and credit for dependents.

[3] The tax for 1923 was reduced 25 percent by the 1924 act.

[4] Not including the defense tax, which was 10 percent of the combined normal tax and surtax, but not to exceed 10 percent of the excess of the net income over the combined normal tax and surtax.

Income tax, individual—Treatment of capital gains and losses in 1922 and subsequent years

Act	Year [1]	Capital assets	Holding period	Percentage of gain or loss taken into account in computing net income	Treatment of capital gain	Treatment of capital loss
1921	1922-23	Property acquired and held by the taxpayer for profit or investment for more than 2 years (whether or not connected with his trade or business) not including property held for the personal use or consumption of the taxpayer or his family or stock in trade of the taxpayer or other property of a kind which would properly be included in his inventory if on hand at the close of the taxable year.	More than 2 years	100	Net gain (the excess of capital gain over the sum of capital deductions and capital losses) is taxed at 12½ percent at the election of the taxpayer 12½ percent of the capital net gain plus the tax on the ordinary net income to be not less than 12½ percent of the total net income in the event of such an election.	No special treatment as such.
1924	1924	Property held by the taxpayer for more than 2 years (whether or not connected with his trade or business) not including stock in trade of the taxpayer or other property of a kind which would properly be included in his inventory if on hand at the close of the taxable year or property held primarily for sale in the course of his trade or business.	do	100	Net gain (the excess of capital gain over the sum of capital deductions, capital losses and the excess of ordinary deductions over ordinary gross income) is taxed at 12½ percent at the election of the taxpayer the total tax in the event of such an election to be 12½ percent of the capital net gain plus the tax on the ordinary net income.	12½ percent of the capital net loss is deducted from a tax computed on the basis of the ordinary net income the remainder to be not less than a tax computed on the basis of the net income (determined by allowing the capital net loss as a deduction).
1926	1925-27	do	do	100	do	Do.
1928	1928-31	do	do	100	do	Do.
1932	1932-33	do	do	100	do	Do.
1934	1934-35	Property held by the taxpayer (whether or not connected with his trade or business), not including stock in trade of the taxpayer or other property of a kind which would be properly included in his inventory if on hand at the close of the taxable year, or property held by him primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business.[2]	Not over 1 year	100	No special treatment of the amount taken into account in computing net income.	No special treatment of the amount taken into account in computing net income. That amount, however, is limited to $2,000 plus the capital gains taken into account.
			Over 1, but not over 2 years.	80		
			Over 2, but not over 5 years.	60		
			Over 5, but not over 10 years.	40		
			Over 10 years	30		
1936	1936-37	do.[2]	do	30	do	Do.
1938	1938	Same, with the additional exception of property, used in the trade or business, of a character which is subject to an allowance for depreciation.[2]	Short-term: Not over 18 months.	100	Net short-term gain (the excess of the short-term gains for the taxable year over the sum of the short-term losses for the taxable year and the net short-term loss of the preceding taxable year, brought forward to the extent not in excess of the net income for such preceding year) receives no special treatment. ("Preceding taxable year" includes none beginning before 1938.)	Net short-term loss (the excess of short-term losses over short-term gains) is treated as a short-term loss in the succeeding taxable year (for the purpose only of determining the net short-term gain for such year), to the extent not in excess of the net income for the taxable year.
			Long-term: Over 18 but not over 24 months.	66⅔	Net long-term gain (the excess of long-term gains over long-term losses, each to the extent taken into account in computing net income) is taxed at 30 percent, if such a tax plus a tax computed upon the net income reduced by the net long-term gain is less than a tax computed on the net income.	30 percent of the net long-term loss (the excess of long-term losses over long-term gains, each to the extent taken into account in computing net income) is deductible from the tax computed on the net income increased by such loss, if the result is an amount greater than the tax computed on the net income.
			Over 24 months	50		
I. R. C.	1939	do.[2]	do	50	do	Do.
	1940-41	Same, with the additional exception of obligations of the United States or any of its possessions, or of a State, territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or of the District of Columbia, issued on or after Mar. 1, 1941, on a discount basis and payable without interest at a fixed maturity date not exceeding 1 year from the date of issue.[2]	do	50	do	Do.
	1942	Same, with the additional exception of real property used in the trade or business of the taxpayer.[2]	Short term: Not over 6 months.	100	Excess of net long-term gain (the excess of long-term gains over long-term losses, each to the extent taken into account in computing net income) over net short-term loss (the excess of short-term losses over short-term gains, each to the extent taken into account in computing net income) is taxed at 50 percent, if such a tax plus a tax computed on the net income reduced by such excess is less than a tax computed on the net income.	Net capital loss (the excess of losses over the sum of gains—each to the extent taken into account in computing net income—plus the smaller of $1,000 or the net income computed without regard to capital gains and losses) in any taxable year beginning after 1941 is treated as a short-term capital loss in each of the 5 succeeding taxable years, to the extent of the excess of such net capital loss over the total of any net capital gains [3] of any taxable years intervening between the taxable year in which the net capital loss arose and such succeeding taxable year.
			Long term: Over 6 months.	50		
	1943-	do.[2]	do	50	do	Do.

[1] For 1921 to 1932, inclusive, the calendar year and fiscal years ending therein; for 1933, the calendar year and fiscal years beginning or ending therein; and for 1934 and later, the calendar year and fiscal years beginning therein.

The Revenue Act of 1921, the first to provide for special treatment of capital gains and losses, applied to such gains and losses from sales or exchanges consummated after Dec. 31, 1921.

[2] In taxable years beginning in 1934 or later, gains or losses from short sales of property are considered as from sales or exchanges of capital assets. Gains or losses attributable to the failure to exercise privileges or options to buy or sell property are considered as gains or losses from sales or exchanges of capital assets held for 1 year or less under the 1934 and 1936 acts and as short-term capital gains or losses under the 1938 and subsequent acts.

In taxable years beginning in 1934 or later, amounts received by the holder upon the retirement of corporate (including Government) evidences of indebtedness are considered as received in exchange therefor.

In taxable years beginning in 1938 or later, if shares of stock in a corporation or rights to subscribe for or to receive such shares become worthless during the taxable year and are capital assets, the loss resulting therefrom is considered as a loss from the sale or exchange, on the last day of the taxable year, of capital assets.

In taxable years beginning in 1938 or later, if evidences of indebtedness issued by a corporation (including a Government) with interest coupons or in registered form are ascertained to be worthless and charged off during the taxable year, and are capital assets, the loss resulting therefrom is considered as a loss from the sale or exchange, on the last day of the taxable year, of capital assets.

In taxable years beginning in 1942 or later, if the gains from sales or exchanges of "property used in the trade or business," held for more than 6 months, plus the gains from the compulsory or involuntary conversion of such property and capital assets held for more than 6 months, exceed the losses from such sales, exchanges, and conversions, such gains and losses shall be considered as from sales or exchanges of capital assets held for more than 6 months. If such gains do not exceed such losses, neither

are considered as from sales or exchanges of capital assets. (For the purpose of this provision, neither the percentage limitation on gains and losses taken into account nor the income and gains limitation on allowable losses is applicable; and losses upon the distribution, in whole or in part, theft or seizure, or requisition or condemnation of "property used in the trade or business" or capital assets held for more than 6 months are considered losses from a compulsory or involuntary conversion.)

In taxable years beginning in 1943 or later, if a nonbusiness debt becomes worthless within the taxable year, the loss resulting therefrom is considered a loss from the sale or exchange, during the taxable year, of a capital asset held for not more than 6 months.

In taxable years beginning in 1944 or later, at the election of the taxpayer, the cutting of timber (for sale or use in the taxpayer's trade or business) by the taxpayer who owns or has the contract right to cut the timber (provided he owned or had the contract right to cut it for a period of more than 6 months prior to the beginning of the taxable year) is considered a sale or exchange.

[3] Net capital gain is the excess of the sum of capital gains plus the smaller of $1,000 or the net income (computed without regard to capital gains and losses) over capital losses. Net capital gain and net capital loss for the taxable year are computed without regard to any net capital loss carry-over to that year. For the purposes of the net income limitations on net capital gain and net capital loss, adjusted gross income is substituted for net income if the tax is measured by adjusted gross income.

A net short-term capital loss for the last taxable year beginning in 1941 (computed without regard to any carry-over from the preceding taxable year), in an amount not in excess of the net income for such taxable year, is treated as a short-term capital loss for the succeeding taxable year, to the extent of the net short-term capital gain of such succeeding taxable year. This treatment is in consideration of the carry-over from taxable years 1941 previously allowed.

SYNOPSIS OF FEDERAL NORMAL TAX AND PROFITS TAXES ON THE INCOME OF CORPORATIONS SINCE THE ADOPTION OF THE SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT [3]

Normal tax, corporation—Rates in effect during 1909 and subsequent years

Act	Year [1]	Rate base [2]	Rate (percent)
1909 [3]	1909–13 (Feb. 28).	Net income in excess of $5,000	1
1913	1913 (Mar. 1) to 1915.	Net income	1
1916	1916	do	2
1916, 1917	1917	Net income from dividends out of Mar. 1, 1913, to Dec. 31, 1915, earnings.	1
		Net income from dividends out of 1916–17 earnings.	2
		Net income other than from dividends, after credit of excess profits tax for the current year.	6
1918	1918	Net income after credit of: $2,000; excess profits and war profits taxes for the current year; and interest (if included in gross income) in United States obligations and War Finance Corporation bonds.	12
	1919–20	Net income after credit of: $2,000; excess profits tax for the current year; excess profits and war profits taxes for the current year on income from Government contracts; and interest (if included in gross income) on United States obligations and War Finance Corporation bonds.	10
1921	1921	Same, except for restriction of the specific credit of $2,000 to net incomes of $25,000 or less (the tax on a net income of more than $25,000, however, not to exceed the tax payable if the credit were allowed, plus the amount of the net income in excess of $25,000).	10
	1922–23	Same	12½
1924	1924	Net income after same specific credit and credit of interest (if included in gross income) on United States obligations.	12½
1926	1925	do	13
	1926–27	do	13½
1928	1928	Net income after a specific credit, in the case of net incomes of $25,000 or less, of $3,000 (with a marginal relief provision corresponding to that in force since 1921) and credit of interest on United States obligations (if included in gross income).	12
	1929	do	11
	1930–31	do	12
1932	1932–33	Net income after credit of interest (if included in gross income) on United States obligations.	13¾
1934	1934–35	Net income after credit of interest (if included in gross income) on United States obligations and of interest (if included in gross income and exempt, under the act authorizing issue, from normal tax) on obligations of corporate instrumentalities of the United States.	13¾
1936	1936–37	Normal tax net income: [4]	
		First $2,000	8
		Next $13,000	11
		Next $25,000	13
		Amount in excess of $40,000	15
1938	1938	Net income $25,000 or less:	
		First $5,000 of special class net income [5]	12½
		Next $15,000 of special class net income	14
		Next $5,000 of special class net income	16
		Net income slightly over $25,000:	
		If no credit for dividends or interest:	
		First $25,000	16
		Amount over $25,000	32
		If credit for dividends or interest:	
		First $25,000 of net income: [6]	
		First $5,000 of special class net income.	12½
		Next $15,000 of special class net income.	14
		Balance of special class net income	16
		Amount of net income over $25,000:	
		Credited dividends not included in first $25,000 of net income.	12
		Balance, except credited interest	32
		Net income over $25,000 (if tax is less than if computed as immediately above):	
		On adjusted net income	19
		Less the sum of the following:	
		16½ percent of the credit for dividends received; [7] and 2½ percent of the credit for dividends paid.	
I. R. C.	1939	do	19
	1940	Normal tax net income: [8]	
		$25,000 or less:	
		First $5,000	14.85
		Next $15,000	16.5
		Next $5,000	18.7
		Over $25,000 and not over $31,964.29:	
		First $25,000	18.7
		Next $6,964.29	38.3
		Over $31,964.29 and not over $38,565.89:	
		First $5,000	15.4
		Next $15,000	16.9
		Next $5,000	18.9
		Next $13,565.89	36.9
		Over $38,565.89	24
	1941	Normal tax net income: [9]	
		$25,000 or less:	
		First $5,000	15
		Next $15,000	17
		Next $5,000	19
		Over $25,000 and not over $38,461.54	37
		Over $38,461.54	24
	1942	Normal tax net income: [9]	
		$25,000 or less:	
		First $5,000	15
		Next $15,000	17
		Next $5,000	19
		Over $25,000 and not over $50,000	31
		Over $50,000	24

[1] For 1909 to 1912, inclusive, the calendar year; for 1913 to 1932, inclusive, the calendar year and fiscal years ending therein; for 1933, the calendar year and fiscal years beginning or ending therein; for 1934 and later, the calendar year and fiscal years beginning therein.

In the case of a rate change during a fiscal year ending in any of the years 1916 to 1933, inclusive, the tax was prorated. Proration is also provided for in the case of fiscal years ending after June 30 in 1942, and in the case of fiscal years ending in 1944.

[2] Net income, the excess of gross income over deductions, varies under the several acts by reason of variation in the character of items excluded from gross income or allowed as deductions. Credits against net income are indicated in this column.

Dividends received from domestic corporations have been treated as follows: From 1909 through Feb. 28, 1913, net income was "exclusive" of such dividends; from Mar. 1, 1913, through 1917, they were not excluded or deducted from gross income or credited against net income; from 1918 through 1935, they were deducted from gross income; and for 1936 and subsequent years, credited 85 percent against net income, the credit not to exceed, during the years 1938 to 1941, inclusive, 85 percent of the adjusted net income, or, in 1942 and subsequent years, 85 percent of the adjusted net income reduced by the credit for income subject to excess-profits tax.

Adjusted net income, for 1938 and subsequent years, is net income minus the credit for interest on obligations of the United States and corporations organized by the United States.

[3] Although the Sixteenth Amendment was not adopted until 1913, the excise tax imposed by the Tariff Act of 1909 is included in the table, as essentially like the taxes imposed directly on income by subsequent legislation. Section 38 of that act imposed on corporations an annual "special excise tax with respect to the carrying on or doing business * * * equivalent to 1 percent upon the entire net income * * * over and above $5,000 * * * exclusive of * * * dividends * * * ."

[4] The net income minus the credit for interest (if included in gross income) on United States obligations and for 85 percent of dividends received from domestic corporations.

[5] Special class net income is the adjusted net income minus the credit for dividends received. That credit is 85 percent of the amount of dividends received from domestic corporations subject to the income tax; it may not exceed, however, 85 percent of the adjusted net income, which is the net income minus the credit for interest on obligations of the United States and corporate instrumentalities thereof.

[6] This first $25,000 is made up of: First, interest subject to credit; second, dividends subject to credit; and third, the excess, if any, of $25,000 over such interest and dividends.

The portion of the net income in excess of $25,000 is made up of: First, any interest subject to credit which is not included in the first $25,000; second, any dividends subject to credit which are not included in the first $25,000; and third, any balance of net income.

[7] See the second and third paragraphs of the note, above, designated (2).

[8] Normal tax net income means the adjusted net income minus the credit for dividends received.

Adjusted net income means the normal tax net income minus the credit for interest on obligations of the United States and corporate instrumentalities of the United States.

[9] Normal tax net income here means the adjusted net income minus the credits for income subject to excess-profits tax and for dividends received.

Profits taxes, corporation—Rates of excess-profits and war-profits taxes for 1917 and subsequent years

Act	Year[1]	Credit	Rate base	Rate
1917	1917	For invested capital corporations in existence at least 1 whole calendar year during the pre-war period (1911–13): $3,000 (in the case of domestic corporations only),[2] plus (1) the same percentage (but not less than 7 nor more than 9) of invested capital for the taxable year as the average annual pre-war net income was of pre-war invested capital, or (2), in the case of no pre-war net income, of a comparatively low pre-war percentage of net income to invested capital, of an indeterminable pre-war net income, or of indeterminable invested capital, the same percentage of invested capital for the taxable year as shown by representative taxpayers in the same or a similar trade or business.	Net income, after the credit: Not in excess of 15 percent of invested capital In excess of 15 percent but not in excess of 20 percent of invested capital. In excess of 20 percent but not in excess of 25 percent of invested capital. In excess of 25 percent but not in excess of 33 percent of invested capital. In excess of 33 percent of invested capital	 20 percent. 25 percent. 35 percent. 45 percent. 60 percent.
		For invested capital corporations not in existence at least 1 whole pre-war calendar year: $3,000 (in the case of domestic corporations only),[2] plus 8 percent of invested capital;		
		For corporations with no, or nominal invested capital: $3,000 (in the case of domestic corporations only).[2]	Net income, after the credit, if any	8 percent.
1918	1918	Excess profits credit: $3,000 (in the case of domestic corporations only),[2] plus 8 percent of the invested capital for the taxable year.	Net income: In excess of the excess-profits credit and not in excess of 20 percent of the invested capital. In excess of the greater of the excess-profits credit or 20 percent of the invested capital.	30 percent. 65 percent.
		War profits credit: For corporations in existence at least 1 whole calendar year during the pre-war period (1911–13): $3,000 (in the case of domestic corporations only),[2] plus the greater of the following: (1) average pre-war net income, plus 10 percent of the increase or minus 10 percent of the decrease in invested capital for the taxable year as compared with average pre-war invested capital or (2) 10 percent of invested capital for the taxable year. For any corporation not in existence at least 1 whole calendar year during the pre-war period, if (1) the majority of its stock was owned or controlled at any time during the taxable year by a corporation which was in existence at least 1 whole calendar year during the pre-war period; or (2) 50 percent or more of its gross income was derived from Government contracts made after Apr. 5, 1917, and before Nov. 12, 1918: $3,000 (in the case of domestic corporations only),[2] plus 10 percent of invested capital for the taxable year. For other corporations not in existence at least 1 whole calendar year during the pre-war period: $3,000 (in the case of domestic corporations only),[2] plus the same percentage (but not less than 10) of invested capital for the taxable year as the average pre-war percentage of net income to invested capital of corporations in a trade or business of the same general class as that of the taxpayer.	The amount by which 80 percent of the net income in excess of the war-profits credit exceeds the excess-profits tax. [Maximum total of excess-profits tax and war-profits tax equals $5,100 (30 percent of the net income in excess of $3,000 and not in excess of $20,000) plus 80 percent of the net income in excess of $20,000.]	100 percent.
1919–20		Same as for 1918	Net income (if not more than $10,000 thereof is from Government contracts made after Apr. 5, 1917, and before Nov. 12, 1918): In excess of the excess-profits credit and not in excess of 20 percent of invested capital. In excess of the greater of the excess-profits credit or 20 percent of invested capital. [Maximum tax=$3,400 (20 percent of the net income in excess of $3,000 and not in excess of $20,000) plus 40 percent of the net income in excess of $20,000.]	 20 percent. 40 percent.
			Net income (if more than $10,000 thereof is from Government contracts made after Apr. 5, 1917, and before Nov. 12, 1918).	Prorated tax computed at 1918 and current rates.[3]
1921	1921	do	Same as for 1919 and 1920	Same as for 1919 and 1920.
I. R. C.	1940	The sum of $5,000: The excess-profits credit (that is, in the case of (1) a domestic corporation in existence before 1940, or (2) a foreign corporation engaged in trade or business in the United States or having an office or place of business therein, of which the first excess-profits tax taxable year begins on any date in 1940, which was in existence 48 months prior to such date, and which at any time during each of the taxable years in such 48 months was engaged in trade or business or had an office or place of business therein, whichever of the following results in the lesser tax: 8 percent of the invested capital for the taxable year, or 95 percent of the average base period (1936–39) net income, plus, in the case of a domestic corporation, 8 percent of the net capital addition or minus 6 percent of the net capital reduction for the taxable year; in the case of all other corporations, 8 percent of the invested capital for the taxable year); and The excess profits credit carry-over (that is, the excess of the excess-profits credit over the excess-profits net income for the first preceding taxable year; plus such an excess for the second preceding taxable year, reduced by the excess, if any, of the excess-profits net income for the first preceding taxable year over the sum of the excess-profits credit for such year and the excess of such credit over such net income for the third preceding taxable year).	Adjusted excess-profits net income (excess-profits net income minus the credit): First $20,000 Next $30,000 Next $50,000 Next $150,000 Next $250,000 Remainder	 25 percent. 30 percent. 35 percent. 40 percent. 45 percent. 50 percent.
	1941	The sum of $5,000: The excess-profits credit (the same as for 1940, except that the invested capital credit is 8 percent of first $5,000,000 plus 7 percent of the remainder of the invested capital for the taxable year); and The unused excess-profits credit adjustment (the aggregate of the unused excess-profits credit carry-overs and carry-backs from the 2 preceding or succeeding taxable years).	Adjusted excess-profits net income (excess-profits net income minus the credit): First $20,000 Next $30,000 Next $50,000 Next $150,000 Next $250,000 Remainder	 35 percent. 40 percent. 45 percent. 50 percent. 55 percent. 60 percent.
	1942–43	Same as for 1941, except that the invested capital credit is 8 percent of the first $5,000,000 of invested capital, 7 percent of the next $5,000,000, 6 percent of the next $190,000,000 and 5 percent of the remainder of the invested capital for the taxable year; and, in the case of a mutual insurance company (other than life or marine) which is an interinsurer or reciprocal underwriter, the specific exemption is $50,000.	Adjusted excess-profits net income (excess-profits net income minus the credit). [Maximum tax=an amount which, when added to the normal tax and surtax, makes a total equal to 80 percent of the surtax net income, computed without regard to the credit for the adjusted excess profits net income.]	90 percent.
	1944	Same as for 1942–3, except that the invested capital credit is 8 percent of the first $5 000,000, 6 percent of the next $5,000,000, and 5 percent of the remainder of the invested capital for the taxable year; and the specific exemption of $5,000 is increased to $10,000.	Adjusted excess-profits net income (excess-profits net income minus the credit). [Maximum tax=an amount which, when added to the normal tax and surtax, equals 80 percent of the surtax net income, computed without regard to the credit for the adjusted excess-profits net income and without regard to 80 percent of the credit for dividends paid by a public utility on its preferred stock.]	95 percent.

[1] For 1917 to 1921, inclusive, the calendar year and fiscal years ending therein; for 1940 and thereafter, the calendar year and fiscal years beginning therein.

In the case of fiscal years beginning in 1916 and ending in 1917, the tax is proportioned to the 1917 portion of the fiscal year. In the case of fiscal years ending in any of the years 1918 to 1921, inclusive, the tax is the sum of the taxes computed on the basis of the 2 calendar years involved, proportioned to the calendar year portion of the fiscal year. In the case of fiscal years ending in 1922, the tax is proportioned to the 1921 portion of the fiscal year.

Proration is also provided for in the case of fiscal years ending after June 30 in 1942, and in the case of fiscal years ending in 1944.

[2] Any corporation the net income of which is less than $3,000 is exempt from the tax, however.

[3] Proration is on the basis of the net income attributable to Government contracts, which determines the portion of the tax payable on the basis of the 1918 rates. Net income not so attributable determines the portion payable at current year rates.

Medals for Congress an Inappropriate Gesture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me to be wrong in principle for Congress to vote itself medals as provided by a bill now pending.

From every contact that I have had with Members of Congress they are working hard and each is doing his level best to do his full duty. That is exactly what we were elected to do and for performing our duty we are paid a salary and are provided money for clerical hire and other purposes. It does not seem right to me, for us to vote medals to ourselves for doing our duty. Medals are bestowed for unusual service or extraordinary heroism. Also, the award is made by someone else than the recipient of the medal.

For the information of the Members I am including in my remarks an article from the Stockton Record by a veteran of both this war and the last one. Colonel Rohrbacher, the author of the article, has performed a remarkable job in this war as the director of an Army hospital in Australia. He not only made a remarkable record as an Army surgeon in the administration of the hospital unit referred to, but he literally worked so hard that he broke down his health and had to be retired for medical reasons. This is the article:

MEDALS—FOR VALIANT CONGRESSMEN

EDITOR, RECORD:

As a veteran of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, I offer my services as chairman of a "medals for Congress" committee for this county. The offer is prompted by Representative DINGELL'S bill to furnish medals for Congressmen and Cabinet members.

Because of the metals shortage we can ill afford to use any of our precious metal for this purpose, so I propose that we collect enough service medals from the disabled veterans of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans so that every Congressman and Cabinet member will have a medal of some description. Because their secretaries, office boys, and members of their families might feel slighted if they, too, were not so honored, I would be glad to accept medals from Boy and Girl Scouts, various and sundry convention badges and last year's dog licenses, and, in fact, any sort of medal that the donor might think appropriate. I would be more than happy to forward these at my own expense to Mr. DINGELL. He could distribute them at his own discretion.

I feel certain that within the boundaries of this county there are many sorrowing parents whose sons and whose daughters have given their all in combat with the enemy. Many of these parents have received posthumous awards for the valiant deeds of their children. If everyone connected with the war is to wear a medal these awards would be of little value. Maybe some of these parents would be glad to relinquish these medals and they, too, could be used to decorate the chests of our wishful Congressmen.

This is written with apologies to our own Congressman LEROY JOHNSON, who has no need of a medal of any sort. He earned his own on the field of battle during World War No. 1.

GEORGE H. ROHRBACHER,
Lieutenant Colonel, Army of the United States (Retired).

Jobs and the Little Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the San Diego Journal on February 6, 1945:

JOBS AND THE LITTLE MAN

San Diego workers and businessmen have almost a life-and-death stake in the jobs-for-all bill, which has just been introduced in the Senate, and in the Government lending policies for which Henry A. Wallace stands.

The two are tied together. The jobs bill makes employment one of the rights of man—an economic right just as his personal freedoms are among his civil rights. It empowers the Federal Government to step in and bolster employment when private industry fails to provide enough jobs to go around.

The Wallace lending policies propose to use Government credit to expand our free enterprise system to make sure that there will be enough jobs to go around. The chief means of doing it would be credit to stimulate small business. The jobs bill thus creates a national employment policy, and the Wallace proposals provide an economic foundation to give full employment by private business.

That is why the two proposals are so important to San Diego: First, because our people need jobs just as people everywhere need them; second, because small business is the life blood of this city, the source of jobs for most of its workers.

We are not a big-industry town. But we are admirably situated for little business, small manufactures, mercantile and service trades, food processing and handling, etc. The aggregate of jobs to be provided by expanding our numberless small independent businesses, and enabling enterprising men to start new private businesses is enormous.

Moreover, it is what free enterprise is intended to be—opportunity for the little man with an idea to gain independence; not trustified big industry under the free enterprise label.

San Diego's interest in such a choice is clear. It wants real free enterprise—the kind that will enable its businessmen to expand their factories and stores and give jobs to more people; the kind that will enable new enterprises to get a footing here. For every new enterprise means more employment.

Such a program gives this city a real chance to take up the employment slack that will come with reconversion. With it San Diego not only may be able to take up the slack but even increase its employment ceilings, and build a great and diversified economic life for itself.

New Crops for the New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Atlantic Monthly of January 1945:

NEW CROPS FOR THE NEW WORLD

(By Samuel ZeMurray and John Terry)

I

The Japanese had just hit Pearl Harbor and the Philippines when a representative of the United States Government came to see me in our Boston office of the United Fruit Co. He said: "All the Manila hemp for hawsers needed by our warships, auxiliaries, transports, and merchant vessels comes from the Far East—or did up to December 7. The supplies we have on hand will last for a while, but from now on we'll not get any more where it has been coming from—not for a long time. You know the need. What can you do?"

The need? Liberty ships were soon to go down the ways and out to sea by the score. Our Navy was tripling its pre-war size. Yet for a century American vessels had been wholly dependent on far eastern sources for Manila hemp, which makes the finest cordage. Ninety-five percent of the supply came from the Philippine Islands and the rest from the East Indies. At the time of Pearl Harbor our supply was limited to coiled lines on ship decks or what was stored in warehouses.

Something could be done, as the Government knew when its representatives came to see us. In 1925 we had worked with the United States Department of Agriculture in a 10-acre planting of abaca (the bananalike plant from which Manila hemp is produced) in the Almirante district of Panama. By 1940 we had 2,000 acres planted, all on an experimental basis. There, in the Middle American Republic of Panama, was the only supply of abaca seeds in the world available for American use at the time when our normal supply was cut off by the Japanese.

On January 3, 1942, less than a month after Pearl Harbor, we entered into contract with the Defense Supplies Corporation to plant from 7,000 to 30,000 acres of abaca, and to supply fiber to the Government. On our own stipulation, the contract provides that we receive not a dime of profit.

Last August, Almirante was producing 50,000 to 60,000 pounds of dry abaca fiber weekly, the equivalent of 6 miles of 8-inch circumference hawser. As I write, the latest weekly report shows a yield of 173,520 pounds from the same fields. Today abaca plants are growing on 29,000 acres of rich Middle American tropical soil. Plants in Guatemala came into production in August 1944. A mill in Honduras started stripping fiber in October. By the end of the year, two plantations in Costa Rica, and one each in Panama, Guatemala, and Honduras, were producing fiber at the estimated rate of a millions pounds a week.

For the first time since the early days of whaling, American ships are being moored by hawsers of all-American production, at berths from India to the docks of Cherbourg. Never again should the Americas be cut off from this vital material.

In abaca, one of the great crops has moved nearly halfway around the earth and has come to the Americas, where it will stay. What has happened with abaca can happen

with many other growing things, for in the republics of Middle America and the northern part of South America are the soil, the sun, the rain, and the people to grow crops which heretofore have been the almost exclusive monopoly of the far eastern tropics.

I am convinced that various crops of the Asiatic tropics can grow as well or better in the American tropics. For strategic reasons they should be developed in this hemisphere, so that never again can an enemy fleet cut us off from such indispensables as rubber, quinine, and fiber for rope.

That is not all. The crops of the East, replanted in the Americas, where in many instances they originated, can offer new peacetime employment and industrial opportunities for the Americas.

What we call Middle America comprises much of Mexico and all of the six republics of Central America—Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama; the three Caribbean island republics—Cuba, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic; Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; and the British possession of Jamaica. In those countries live about 40,000,000 people, some of them our own citizens.

Such, geographically, is Middle America. But if the criterion is one of tropic climate, we should properly include in that designation lands and additional millions of people in the three northern republics of South America—Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela—and whatever tropical lands lie still farther to the south—certainly part of Brazil. The enormous agricultural importance of this region has long been overlooked. Japan's invasion of the fertile lands of southeast Asia has brought the American Tropics into the lives of all of us. The war has made Middle America a reservoir of manpower, food, and other needs vital to our common well-being; the peace must do no less.

II

Abaca is only one example on a long list of commercially valuable trees and plants and grasses that grow untended in the jungles and uplands of Middle America, or are now cultivated in experimental gardens under the eyes of agricultural scientists.

Since the 1880's the United States has imported millions of gallons of palm oil annually. By the time of Pearl Harbor, virtually all such oils used in this country came from Oceania and tropical Africa. Yet it is common knowledge that many varieties of oil-bearing palms can be grown successfully in Middle America—notably the African variety, for which the field as a new Middle American crop is almost unlimited. I predict that in 10 years copra will be scarce as a result of the disease known as bud rot, which is attacking coco palms of the Pacific Tropics. African palm oil is just as good as coconut oil. Such oil is required in vast bulk for chemical and industrial uses, and is critically needed in peace and war. It furnishes food for man as well as for livestock, and it makes a valuable fertilizer.

A powerful and efficient organization was operated by the Dutch in the manufacture and distribution of quinine, which is produced from the bark of cinchona, the "fever tree," much of it on the islands of Java and Sumatra. To get quinine for the treatment of malaria, the world went to the Dutch. Early in 1942 the Japanese took over. But cinchona, a tree native to Middle America and transplanted years ago to the East Indies, can return to the land of its birth, where its systematic cultivation as a product of Middle America can free malaria sufferers everywhere from dependence on a virtual East Indian monopoly. Perhaps more than a million and a half cinchona trees are growing wild in the forests of Guatemala today. One great lesson of agricultural history, however, is this: Wild crops can never compete with the same crops in farm production. Today the systematic planting of cinchona in Middle America has begun.

What Japan's southward sweep did to our rubber supply is only too well known. By heroic effort we have developed a notable synthetic industry. But there is no doubt we shall have a continuing need for natural rubber. If the Middle Americas could supply 100,000 tons a year or better—and there is no question that the finest rubber can be grown there—it would seem to me that the United States could readily absorb that amount.

There are the essential oils, basic in the manufacture of menthols, perfumes, and insect sprays, produced from citronella, vetiver, and lemon grass. Thanks again to the necessity imposed by the Japanese offensive of 1942, these grasses are beginning to win an important place in the trade and agriculture of the Middle American Tropics.

Many commercially valuable trees thrive in the rich tropical soil of Middle America. Among them is teak, which supplies a splendid timber used in ship construction. Heretofore our teak has come exclusively from the Tropics of the Far East. Teakwood seeds have been imported from Siam and Burma, and the young trees are now thriving in experimental growths in Panama, Costa Rica, and Honduras.

Mahogany, balsa, tropical cedar, rosewood, and lignum vitae are other tree crops that can be developed over wide areas of the middle Americas, and can find markets in this hemisphere and in Europe. Bamboo furnishes still another example of a plant for which we have looked in the past to lands across the Pacific; yet bamboo, useful in construction of furniture, can be a worthy addition to the crops that can be grown profitably in our own tropics of the Americas.

Rotenone, a powerful insecticide produced from the root of derris and similar plants, is needed in multi-million-pound quantities to protect crops of the United States from ruinous insect enemies. Two million pounds of rotenone powders were recently allocated to our military services by the War Production Board. Derris, already growing in middle America, is capable of great expansion.

The list could be extended indefinitely—spices historically associated with tropics other than American, the oil-bearing seed of the manaca palm and the tung tree, fruits, and a vast array of commercial and subsistence crops, among them the soybean. The middle Americas are fast becoming the food laboratory of the world.

In realization of this, the United Fruit Co. recently established a department of new crops. The department has as its unfettered function the investigation of every possibility in the development of new crops. It is to learn what new products can be raised economically and marketed advantageously in the interest of middle American agriculture, the people of middle America, and consumers wherever they may profitably be reached. Promising results of experimental plantings on a 2,000-mile stretch from Honduras to Ecuador are already visible. Governments of the middle American republics and the United States are showing keen interest, and their research organizations and ours work in close cooperation.

Superior productivity of middle American soil, shorter lines of transport to American markets, and application of advanced scientific technology are the factors which favor agriculture in our own tropics.

Under the abnormal economy of wartime it is possible to develop new crops in Middle America even at wage levels far above East Asian rates. On the other hand, the postwar restoration of competition will pose serious questions. Reasons of hemispheric security should compel the continued cultivation of the strategically valuable crops we have neglected in the past. Likewise there is need for greater crop diversification in the interest of a balanced Middle American economy. Can these objectives be retained after the war without some modification of competitive free trade? That is a question which calls for careful calculation and statesmanship.

III

To grow the new crops successfully and to maintain the old ones will require more and more technical knowledge. As one response to the need, Escuela Agricola Panamericana—the School of Pan-American Agriculture—which was formally opened on Columbus Day, October 12, 1944, has come into being. Early in 1942 the National Congress of Honduras authorized establishment of such a school in the beautiful Zamorano Valley, 25 miles from the Honduran capital of Tegucigalpa, on lands purchased out of an original appropriation of $500,000 by the United Fruit Co. (Since then the company has added another $300,000 and has guaranteed the permanent maintenance of the school.)

Some months later, in September of 1942, we opened the school experimentally in response to urgent needs. At that time 74 carefully selected students moved into the new red-tiled buildings to begin their study. They were representative of Middle America, coming from Mexico, Nicaragua, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, and Panama. We planned for a capacity enrollment of 160 students.

The course covers 3 years of intensive study, with a fourth year of specialization for students who have displayed outstanding proficiency. No tuition is charged, and classroom and laboratory equipment, lodging, and other necessities are supplied without cost.

A pan-American faculty has outlined a course of study designed to develop native agrarian leadership in whatever fields of agriculture the students may choose—independent farming or agricultural extension service. The school is entirely divorced from any personnel requirements of our company and is recognized as a Middle-American institution serving middle America's students. Its curriculum includes modern training in soil analysis, land survey, the building of roads, irrigation and drainage systems; physiology and hygiene, with emphasis on treatment of common tropical diseases; forestry, crop rotation, animal husbandry, blacksmithing, practical farm engineering, carpentry, orchard culture, and marketing.

Dr. Wilson Popenoe, whose reputation in the field of tropical agriculture is international, is the head of the school and its professor of horticulture.

Dairy barns, stables, plant propagation sheds, greenhouses, a creamery, a splendidly equipped carpenter shop, together with classroom buildings, a dormitory, faculty residences, an emergency hospital, and a dental clinic, have been built. Work in the classroom is matched by farm work in the field. The school will also publish information of value to farmers everywhere in middle America, on new crops that can be grown for cash income, on improved methods of cultivating the old crops, on public health, on producing better and more varied foods for home consumption.

Education in the past has too often had the effect of separating the ablest Middle-American youth from the soil. But it is from the land that the strength and the ultimate well-being of the people must come.

Commenting on the development of new crops in Middle America and the establishments of Escuela Agricola Panamericana, Vice President Henry A. Wallace recently said: "The United Fruit Co. in the future intends to bring to bear even more than in the past the full force of modern technology on the production of crops which will diversify the agriculture and improve the standards of living of tropical America.

Above everything, the school in Honduras interests me. Would that every corporation had such precise plans for expanding its activities in terms of the welfare of the common man and his children."

IV

Through a gap in the Montaña del Mico Quemada—the Burnt Monkey Mountains—the Comayagua River flows out to join a larger stream, the Ulua, which, as it meanders toward the sea, forms the 65-mile Ulua Valley of Honduras. In October the heavy rains of the tropics drench the watershed, swelling the Comayagua and Ulua to flood. Through winter months the rains continue; and for decades past, the Ulua has swept through the valley, destroying planted fields and discharging its excess waters into pestilential swamps and jungles characteristic of much of the Middle American lowland.

Some 20 years ago our engineers sought to tame the Ulua. They began with swamp drainage, a task which called for flood control. Permanent spillways and levees were built, holding the river in check here, guiding its floodwaters there, in channels that spared the cultivated fields.

When the Ulua is in flood, it carries perhaps 20 percent silt in suspension. It occurred to us that, valuable as drainage and flood control had proved in the preservation of existing agricultural enterprise, these two processes could be utilized to accomplish a third result: the building of new land where crops had never grown before. So the waters that poured over the spillways in the rainy season were deliberately swung back and forth across the western side of the valley, and the silt gradually settled over the drained swamps year after year, in depths ranging from 6 inches to 10 feet. No richer soil exists on earth.

Conservative estimates indicate that more than 15,000 acres of land have been built up in this fashion. With the extension of this program to the eastern side of the valley, we believe another 35,000 acres will become available in time. Similar methods were employed by the Egyptians along the Nile, but the process is new in Middle America, where the ancient Mayans moved to new land when old land gave out.

I mention the Ulua River development because, while silting itself is an exceptional process that can be utilized in few areas, the making of new land is characteristic of the banana industry in Middle America. Bananas are not planted on lands which the natives have developed; rather the plantations have been developed on soil that had literally been created from jungle and swamp. As the new lands have come into productive use, diseases have been fought back by specialists in tropical medicine, and healthful, productive plantations flourish in regions once given over to malarial swamps.

The fight against pestilence has meant the expenditure of enormous sums, and science has not always won. For instance, Panama disease, known as the wilt, has attacked several of our plantations where the Gros Michel banana once flourished.

Because the wilt has forced banana plantations to move to uninfested areas, some critics have jumped to the conclusion that banana culture robs the soil of its fertility. Inasmuch as the banana industry is of tremendous importance in the economy of Middle America and in our relations with these republics, I will quote—with utmost emphasis—one of the most respected authorities on tropical agriculture, Dr. Lewis Knudson, profesor of botany at Cornell University, who says:

"Panama disease (wilt of the banana) is caused by a specific fungus which will live in the soil for many years after the land is no longer used for the production of bananas. Such an area replanted to bananas will not be productive of bananas because Panama disease reoccurs. The fungus causing the disease is specific for the Gros Michel variety and various other species of bananas but does not cause disease in other crops. Since Panama disease may occur in very fertile soil the question arises, can such land be reutilized for crops other than bananas? The answer is definitely yes, for the organism causing Panama disease in no way decreases the fertility of the soil."

The United Fruit Co. has not surrendered without a fight. Obviously we are reluctant to abandon any producing properties brought to bearing after much time and expense. For many years we have conducted the most thorough research in the hope of combating the disease, which, nevertheless, remains the great unsolved mystery of banana agriculture. If we find the answer, the cure will be made known to every agricultural company and every individual Middle American who grows the Gros Michel for sale or for his own consumption. That we have already done in the case of another banana blight, the Sigatoka disease.

If the hope of conquering Panama disease is not realized, however, the company is determined to use its resources and organization to help work out methods whereby lands which can no longer produce bananas successfully may be planted with other crops on a commercially profitable basis.

For all other crops the fertility of the deep alluvial soil remains unimpaired. The infested areas total only a minute fraction of Middle America—approximately 100,000 acres for the United Fruit Co. At least 68,000 acres of that land are now growing healthy crops of cacao and abaca. Perhaps another 100,000 acres cultivated by other companies or private farmers may be unavailable for bananas because of Panama disease. We see the problem not as a lack of fertile soil but as one of getting more of it into production for the benefit of more people. Our thoughts have not been directed exclusively or especially to lands suitable for banana cultivation, but, rather, to all productive soils.

V

On the afternoon of June 2, 1944, a rising wind blew in from the Pacific over the west coast of Guatemala. As it mounted to gale proportions, banana plants loosely rooted in rain-sodden soil started to fall. The top-heavy weight of hundred-pound stems of bananas pushed against the nearest plants, and these fell in turn, pushing against the next row. So, like collapsing cards, the plants went down. After 1 afternoon and night of such wind we surveyed the damage at our Tiquisate division.

Nearly a million and a half available banana plants (those with fruit at or nearing the harvest) were destroyed. Another 2.3 million, not yet available, were down. Strewn like green straws over 18,000 acres of plantation lay a total of 3.7 million plants, either bearing or soon to bear a valuable food product.

Unusual? Not at all. Banana cultivation not only faces natural enemies such as wilt, but is subject to all the hazards of agriculture. Drought, flood, hurricane, or even a fairly high wind can wipe out whole sections, as I have just related, while plantations elsewhere go unscathed. So far it has never happened that all our crops have been destroyed in any one year.

I mention this because it has a bearing on the size of companies engaged in the banana industry of middle America. Limited to a single division such as Tiquisate, a producer would be wiped out by a blowdown like that of June 2. If disaster comes to one producing region, there must be others to make up the deficiency. If ships cannot load in one country or can obtain but a partial cargo, there must be others where they can load or fill out the cargo in order to maintain the economic flow of supplies.

Our fruit is consumed in the United States, Canada, the British Isles, and normally in continental Europe, as well as in middle and South America. Transportation to a world market of a tropical food product such as bananas requires a fleet of fast, specially designed, refrigerated ships. Distributing this fruit calls for an organization that can handle a perishable commodity in any kind of weather.

Some figures may be helpful at this point. In normal times we operate a fleet of about a hundred merchant ships plying between the important harbors of Middle America, 18 ports in the United States and Canada, and others in the British Isles and Europe. At the moment, of course, practically all these vessels are in Government war service.

Keeping our farms in effective operation requires the maintenance of 1,425 miles of railroad built and financed by the company. Our various operations require a quarter of a million acres of improved land, bearing the year around. The nomal complement of employees totals 70,000 persons, 90 percent of them residents of middle America. The greater part of the proceeds from the sale throughout the world of bananas, sugar, and cacao, returns to the countries of production, in the form of taxes, pay rolls, and the purchase of native commodities. In the past 10 years our operations have left for such purposes the total sum of $385,160,000 in the lands of middle America as compared with net earnings of $125,904,000 from all operations within the same period—an average return of approximately 5½ percent on amounts invested.

Such operations require extensive housing and a dozen hospitals to care for employees, their families, and other people living in the neighborhood of the plantations. Out of our medical activities have come important results in the field of tropical medicine. The incidence of malaria has been drastically reduced. In the year 1925 at our hospital at Banes, Cuba, a sugar-growing district, 2,924 patients were admitted after primary diagnosis of that fever, a ratio of 523 employees out of every 1,000. In 1942 the admission for malaria at Banes had dropped to 10 in the entire year, or 1 employee in each 1,000.

Just as our agricultural research staff and experiment stations work in constant cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture and similar agencies of the middle American republics, so our medical organization works with other private and government agencies in the field of tropical medicine, including the medical staffs of the United States Army and Navy.

Modern tropical agriculture is a major undertaking. To conduct it on a scale adequate to grow and transport food products to great markets, to pay good wages, to banish deadly human disease, to conduct research in the never-ending war against plant enemies, to carve new land from jungles and swamps, to develop new crops for the betterment of farmers big and small, requires sizable enterprise.

VI

More than earnings are involved today when major business activities move back and forth across the boundary lines of nations. The time was when my thinking was concentrated mainly on United Fruit Co. profits and prosperity. Even though I believe in profits and prosperity, I nevertheless thought we were headed for trouble, but I did not see the answer then. I did not see it until war proved what should have been obvious all the time: that the great tropical crops that grow on the other side of the world can and must grow in our own tropics, to provide a balanced economy for middle America and to free the New World from dependence on the East for strategic materials.

The economic and social evils of a one- or two-crop economy must not be fastened on

middle America. The lessons of World War No. 2 point to the path of agricultural variety and abundance, not only in cash crops which the farmers of middle America can sell, but in subsistence crops for their own food, freeing them in considerable degree from the worst effects of fluctuations in world markets. Should the price of palm oil drop, those same plants can furnish rich edible fats which the farmer can eat until the market is restored. So it can be with other crops.

It is worth noting that the old crops of middle America and the new ones which can be introduced are not suited to the climate of the United States and Canada and therefore present no competition with agricultural production in the United States and Canada. Furthermore, where middle America is essentially agricultural, we of the north are in large measure industrial. Fortunately for relations between Middle and North America, each of us produces what the other needs and does not produce.

In the past, when Panama disease infested one of our plantations and wilted the bananas, we moved out. We tore up the railroads. Behind us we left fertile land clawed out of the jungle. We moved out, and the people left the land and followed us.

I felt guilty about it. We should have had the sense to say, "Hell, we're staying here," and to have replanted those fields in new crops for the New World. We are doing that now. To our employees who are interested and qualified we are prepared to say, "We will help you to become established as independent farmers. Here is land for you to cultivate while you are still in our employ. Because it takes capital and scientific training to grow crops well, we will get you established. It may take 5 to 10 years for you to make a go of it on your own, with mature crops to sell and with subsistence crops for your own family. We will buy your crops or you can sell them elsewhere."

Details of this plan have been entrusted to our department of new crops, which will determine how large these independent farms should be. Forty acres may prove to be the most advantageous size, or 30 or 50.

In 1942 the directors of the United Fruit Co. adopted a statement of policy which gave formal expression to the program of utilizing the company organization and tropical resources to assist the native population in growing diversified food products "without expectation other than good will from friendly neighbors" in the interest of a balanced Middle American economy based on a contented, prosperous agricultural population.

To recognize the necessity of growing new crops in the American Tropics is not to forget the East Asian Tropics, with whose peoples we must live and trade in this shrinking world. Surely no sane program of crop migration can envisage the enrichment of one hemisphere to the lasting injury of another, nor can it be permitted to foster demoralizing competition between agricultural regions. Actually, rigid limitation of crops to a few similar varieties can produce the most ravaging sort of competition, whereas a wider diversification reduces the chance of head-on collision.

It would be foolish to expect miracles in a program of new cropping. There will be set-backs and disappointments, and the overall progress may be slow. This sort of thing will not just happen; it requires work, thinking, planning, large-scale organization and small, and far-sighted cooperative effort between private companies and Government agencies. Granting the inevitable delays, a place is left for imagination; indeed, an essential place. It is a great thing, this that we are looking at, and it can be a historic thing. For it is nothing less than the deliberate intercontinental transfer of the great tropical crops, directed by man, for man.

Is the Profit Motive Immoral?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, our Government is today deeply involved in the future of the American system of freedom in competitive, private enterprise. The size of the direct interest-bearing Federal debt, and the return, or rate of interest, which shall govern original and refunding issues and private paper, all have a bearing on the number of people who will be employed and listed on private industry pay rolls, as against those citizens who will have to be supported by checks issued by the Federal Treasury.

Not only are high officials of government concerned about these matters, but all of the thinking portion of our adult population have questions in their minds as to what the future shall be as it relates to these problems. Economists, scientists, inventors, and others who contribute articles to leading magazines and publications which cover these fields are having their say. What is spoken over the radio, and the statements which appear in newspapers and professional magazines and publications of various natures, help to broaden the public's knowledge of such questions and contribute to the better understanding of what occurs behind the scenes. Without such understanding it will be difficult to meet modern problems by changes that will not destroy the principles of competitive industry so essential to economic justice and freedom.

Among such contributions I find one on A Theory of Interest, in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle for December 14, last year, which I feel calls for no little consideration because of its positive questioning of the widely accepted views of Lord Keynes, of England, on savings and investment, including his approval of the doctrine that the ideal state of capital development calls for a disappearing rate of return, that is, of interest on capital investments and loans. Being well acquainted with the author of this article, I know the great amount of time and energy which he has devoted to study and discussion of these problems.

In submitting this study to the readers of the RECORD it seems worth while to dwell briefly on the relation of its argument to international difficulties and permanent peace possibilities, for nations today can hardly be insulated from each other ideologically now that they cannot be isolated from each other geographically. We cannot afford to ignore the form of government which is established in other nations, however friendly we may feel toward them as a people and disposed to respect their right to choose their own political leaders. As plainly stated by the President in his recent message to Congress on the admittedly dubious Bretton Woods financial proposals, "international political relations will be friendly and constructive only if solutions are found to the difficult economic problems we face today." Political arrangements conceived in the isolation of nationalistic self-determination can be little more than power politics, attempting in vain to make right out of might. Nothing but disillusionment can await the organization of peace between nations who condemn each other's institutions as "bourgeois capitalism" and "totalitarian collectivism." International cooperation to promote trade can hardly be maintained for long between peoples who do and do not believe in private property and free, competitive enterprise.

Since the President has asserted that the cornerstone for international economic cooperation is in the field of monetary arrangements, it may be well to note how ancient man's money troubles are. The Greeks had long anticipated St. Paul's remark to Timothy that "the love of money is the root of all evil." Unfortunately, certain theologians have distorted this plain statement so as to condemn "greed" for wealth as the root of all evil; and even when the distinction between money and wealth is pointed out they cling to their notion by asserting that money may be involved in some evils but we need not worry about them if we will but follow these vicars into a utopia where there is abundance for all—"freedom from want"—because there is no "greed" and everyone is his "brother's keeper." It is such inept misconstruction of biblical wisdom that has laid the groundwork for the familiar Russian rejection of "religion" as an "opiate of the people" calculated to lull the masses into a false assurance as to the generous impulses of their ruling class. Hence the Marxian idea of the inevitability of a class war.

The falsity of the Russian position is simply that of substituting their own communistic utopia for that of our misguided theologians. That communism is just another pot full of illusions which is calling black our "bourgeois" kettle full of gold seems clear from recent revelations of the official teaching of Russia's economic ideology. We have had the translation of the article by Leontiev and others—see Teaching of Economics in the Soviet Union in the American Economic Review for September 1944; also the Dunayevskaya criticism of this New Revision of Marxian Economics in the same number. Of even greater interest to Americans, however, is the presence in our own Office of Strategic Services of Paul A. Baran, educated in Moscow and Breslau as a specialist, I am informed, in Russian and German "planning," who in the current—December 1944—issue of the Review, raises his Russian eyebrows at the idea that there are "New Trends in Russian Economic Thinking?"

Comrade Baran explains that—

> The impossibility * * * of providing members of the Soviet society at its present stage of development with goods and services in quantities which would satisfy all their needs is not an "economic law." It is a limitation resulting from a scarcity which may (and certainly will) be overcome in the future Communist society, but which has

to prevail under conditions of only inadequately developed productive resources. The compulsion, furthermore, to keep the standard of living of the masses on a rather low level in order to be able to devote a considerable share of the national product to purposes of investment is another case in which it is misleading to speak of an "economic law." It simply is a statement of the elementary physical fact that one cannot have one's cake and eat it too.

But is capital formed by saving, that is, by sacrifice of present for the sake of future consumption? Is this cake-eating alibi for the failure of communism to live up to its promises valid? Capital is a speculative, not an accumulative, value, says Mr. Potter, whose paper is offered here for consideration. Costs, it is held, cannot determine economic value at all, much less in the class of capital values which must be computed, not by adding up the contributions of savers, but by "capitalizing" the net productivity of investment, regardless of cost. It is not when consumption is deferred, but rather when it can be and is increased under the stimulus of the private-profit-and-loss motive, that capital can be and is formed. Without profit—interest on investment—there can be no wealth; and the competitive distribution of wealth to those whose energy and intelligence have created it is essential to stability of incentive in any human society. This defense of capitalism and the competitive profit motive as essential to the moral and practical character of human society is the essence of the paper on interest theory which follows:

A THEORY OF INTEREST

(By Alden A. Potter)

I. A QUANDARY

In reviewing a report by W. W. Riefler and other economists of a League of Nations committee in 1938 on Statistics Relating to Capital Formation, John Maynard Keynes (now Lord Keynes) had this to say (Economic Journal, September 1939, p. 574): "We have been all of us brought up, like the members of this committee, in deep confusion of mind between the demand and supply of savings, and until we rid ourselves of it we cannot think correctly."

It is hard to see how this confusion over capital formation by savings can be separated from the problem of interest in which equal confusion has been widely acknowledged by competent students of the subject. Somers (Quarterly Journal of Economics, May 1941) has pointed out that while "Mr. Keynes * * * claimed that the rate of interest was a purely monetary phenomenon * * * the price paid for parting with liquidity," this is involved in what Hicks, a British authority, has called "a real dispute, in which one side must be right and the other wrong." Says Professor Somers, "Few topics in economics, in fact, have received as varied treatment as has the theory of interest. Few topics, moreover, have resulted in as many divisions of opinion, misunderstandings, vigorous attacks, and equally vigorous defenses." Among these is the sharp refutation of Marshallian theory by Ernst Dick in his book (1929) The Problem of Interest. In his treatise on interest theory (1930) Irving Fisher has called the problem "the great economic riddle."

"Pure" interest neglected

"Pure" interest, as distinguished by Fisher from the impurities injected by the business cycle, that is, by the influence of changes in the purchasing power of money (rising and falling prices) is too generally neglected in practical discussions of interest rates. This leads to the Keynesian notion that under ideal conditions, with risk eliminated and abundance of savings (capital), interest should be zero. Confusion derives from the fact that the rates under discussion are really bank rates and not at all what rates would be if loans were in fact dependent entirely upon savings. A current example of such a discussion is that of Prof. Ivan Wright (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, September 21, 1944) in which he says that "interest rates are a function of money reserves," and predicts, doubtless correctly, a post-war rise in rates due to sustained peacetime investment profits that must exceed the rate of return on Government bonds and so come into conflict with attempts to maintain bond values. Present banking practice does indeed dominate the money market and crowd out savings seeking investment, at times (like the present) forcing their rates down, even to zero in some banks' savings accounts.

Under the depression phase of the business cycle, that is, when there is too little money to sustain prices and so profits and employment, the banks are restrained in their loans and are thereby shrinking both the market for, and the supply of, money in the all-too familiar perversity of banking operations as now conducted. As they shrink the supply of funds, which but for this shrinkage would be on the money market as savings, these operations create the vicious spiral of "panic" conditions which eliminate all "demand" for money regardless of the need for it or the extent of bank reserves and the lowering of rates by the "excess" of these "loanable funds" (reserves). The relation of reserves to this process, though a pure legal fiction, determines the position of the bank as to liquidity relative to loans; so these "loans," which represent liquidity to every business except banking, put "liquidity" in banking assets (reserves, which are money only to bankers) into conflict with "liquidity" in banking liabilities (loans, which are money to nonbankers). Bank rates may then fall—proximately because of "excess reserves"; but if they do the change even to zero must be so small relative to the accompanying slump in capital values, that is, investment returns become so impure relative to pure interest[1] that no loan can be made with assurance of liquidity to either bank or client. So loans are not made; and there is no such spontaneity in the "recovery" as there was in the slump.

Quandary of capitalism

Advice to maintain liquidity with short-term securities guaranteed by the taxing power is therefore always "sound" advice relative to those operations governing "current" rates which are, indeed, a function of money reserves; and such advice is clearly a hedge against the irregularities—the impurities in interest—that are induced by the banking process itself and are deeply involved, particularly in time of war, in the issues surrounding the national debt (which Thomas Jefferson wanted to prohibit entirely by constitutional amendment). It is thus the highly impure and speculative bank rate of interest of which Professor Wright can truly say "it would be foolhardy to lay dawn any * * * working time table for interest rates and construct an inflexible (investment) policy to harmonize with it." Such uncertainty inevitably results from the conflict between the Government's involvement in keeping its chief creditors (the banks) liquid while also maintaining its own, conflicting liquidity as the chief debtor to those same banks. So the Government is "damned if it does, and damned if it doesn't" correct the status of whichever it has set awry by its latest action; and it (personified!) is always at hand to take the rap from political and other demagogues who obscure the real issues by alleging bad management, rather than a bad system, so they can "turn the rascals out" rather than eliminate the "racket" in politics and business. This, of course, is perennially "the life of the party." Meanwhile the quandary of capitalism remains unabated in perpetuity.

[1] May we at this point define "pure" interest as that return which investments, apart from the risk of "freezing" by a fall or the chance of "windfall" profit by a rise in price level, must yield to maintain capital values.

Social-security illusions

The way out of this dilemma certainly can lie only in a revolution in thinking based upon dismissal of every predilection. The solution will certainly involve heresy, deep-seated heresy, which is, nevertheless, conservative in its implications relative to the bureaucracy set to distribute largesse under the false assumption that "social security" can be thus assured because "the world can now produce enough to supply the people of all countries with the necessities and comforts (sic!) of life"—if only a "liberal" government (in alleged support of "private industry") is allowed to spend gloriously in "planning it that way." No; this is not the "globaloney" of Vice President Wallace. It is quoted from a general resolution adopted at the Tenth Biennial Congress of the International Chamber of Commerce at Copenhagen, July 1, 1939, just prior to the jolt which Germany handed the world in her bid for lebensraum. Are we to emerge from the war triumphant in such illusions, to plunge on into the futilities of socialism and autocracy ("democratically" controlled!) as against a realistic recognition of the inevitability of competition for that "place in the sun" that makes life possible? If we do, we shall surely perpetuate the confusion that cannot fail to lead on to another and more bitter war, this time involving not merely the decline of the presently fratricidal West as against Russia and the East, but the very continuance of civilization itself. (Opposing "globaloney," see Population Problems of a New World Order, reprinted from the Scientific Monthly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Friday, January 21, 1944.)

If human destiny could ever hinge on any social device it hinges now on a search for innovation; not for hasty acceptance but for prompt and searching, democratic consideration by every literate element so as to avoid continuance of a blind leading of the blind through the needless and repetitious disasters of the trial-and-error method in developing social institutions. Ancient and bitter controversies are involved which must be resolved in the intellectual sphere if we would avoid their development, into physical conflicts of today's disastrous proportions, over the issue of "capitalism" which in older times centered on the problem of interest and usury. A recent treatise on this subject by Fr. Bernard Dempsey, of St. Louis University, sharply revives the moralizing of scholastic thinkers regarding usury. Dr. Joseph Schumpeter, professor of economics at Harvard, has presented this study with an introduction of trenchant import.

Controversy renewed

"The time-honored controversy on the nature and functions of interest that had almost died out," says Professor Schumpeter, "has flared up again during the past decade. New points of view have emerged. Propositions diametrically opposed to some that used to command almost universal assent have been put forth. My impression is that, as a result, a majority of economists interested in the problem have modified their views. Needless to say, no agreement has been reached. The reason is not far to seek. Interest holds so central a position in the capitalist organism that it intrudes in practically every economic consideration or valuation. In consequence, the phenomenon of interest as such and any particular

rate of interest are the result of so many factors that it is easy to evolve a distinctive theory by the simple device of stressing one of them at the expense of the others. To illustrate by an example: in a sense it is correct to say that interest is the price paid for inducing someone to part with cash. If people's propensity to hold cash suddenly changed, then the market rate of interest would certainly change also. But this indicates just one of the many conditions to which the equilibrium rate of interest must conform and does not in itself provide sufficient ground on which to build a theory of interest. Understandable or not, however, that state of things is deplorable. For much of our outlook on economic life and on its most pressing practical problems depends upon the views about the nature and function of interest which we happen to hold.

"More often than was the case a hundred years ago, we today hear pronouncements by leaders of religious communities of all types not only upon general issues of social right or wrong but also upon economic questions of complex character. Admirable intention is practically always in evidence. But so is, also practically always, lack of familiarity with what the economic facts are and what they mean. This was not so with the great Jesuits of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They were no doubt judges and directors of consciences. * * * But to put it bluntly, they always knew what they were talking about. Their pronouncements rested as much on a mastery of economic facts and of the relations between these facts—that is to say, of 'theory'—as they did on that hyperempirical system. This fact not only makes them interesting to the scientific economist. It also lends a weight to their pronouncements which those of modern ecclesiastics of all denominations very often fail to carry. * * *

"To the instance of interest and usury the above applies with particular force. Our time witnesses not only another revival of the theoretical controversy about interest but also another revival of the practical controversy about the reform of money and banking. Few people would be so foolish as to deny the existence of a moral aspect of it or the right of the churches to speak out about it. But those who wish to do so had better recognize in turn the rather technical nature of the subject. However far some of them may feel themselves removed from Father Dempsey in matters of theology, they might well be advised to peruse his book which, though with restraint proper to a scientific study, indicates clearly enough how analysis may implement moral principle."

What makes the subject "rather technical," in the sense of being complex in its difficulties, is a lack of simplicity—of that truth and clarity that constitutes the only realistic basis for morality. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" implies the need for eternal vigilance in avoiding the confusion of tongues with which our economic Tower of Babel is fraught. We cannot be vigilant in a mental smokescreen. It is a struthionoidal (ostrich-like) vigilance that fatuously says there is no smoke getting in our eyes—that we are only puzzled by "the many conditions to which the equilibrium rate of interest must conform." If we bury our heads in the sands of empirical detail we cannot hope to see our circumstances in perspective—cannot orient the "many factors" and put first things first in the economic chain of events, so that we may know that which is to be rendered unto Caesar from that which is God's—from that which requires freedom from all governmental constraints.

II. A SOLUTION

First among the values of life is life itself—human beings, physically and individually alive. This plain fact serves to reduce the meaning of "general good" to its Darwinian definition (Descent of Man, p. 122) as "the rearing of the greatest number of individuals, in full vigor and health, with all their faculties perfect, under the conditions to which they are subjected." Also as morality has a social origin and meaning, we must, says Darwin, "take as the standard of morality the general good or welfare of the community" thus defined.

What man is or may become in any nonphysical sense is not a matter of concern to Caesar—to the science of political economy. Certainly, not even physical evolution has anything to do with morality when seen in the light of the simplicity of this Darwinian definition. We cannot "plan it that way"—cannot control human destiny politically, or even scientifically. We are not masters of our own fate in eternity. We are morally bound, therefore, to the "general good" only in properly "rearing the greatest number of individuals in full vigor and health." As living things, normally motivated, that is precisely what we are primarily and naturally—and morally—interested in: parenthood. "Reproduction is the first law of life."

A moral—a normal—society is, therefore, primarily a parental association. All human industry that is normal—and moral—in its controls must be subject to this biological norm in motivation. Its primary, its ultimate, business interest must be that of rearing another generation—of creating homes and families, not because of legal or social traditions or sanctions, but because of that elementally competitive and cosmic urge which is "the secret of it all; all the longing, seeking, striving, waiting, yearning, the burning hopes, the joys and idle tears that fall."

"Mother of necessity"

The simple "economic" truth concerned is that, in acquiring a living competitively, for the sake, that is, of reproduction, an elaborate system of valuation has been developed, involving numbers called "prices," in which capital values have become increasingly important as productive implements have multiplied. The pressure to acquire a surplus of a food supply for the sake of "security" in expanding the population at "full vigor and health" has been the necessity that has "mothered" these inventions, literally, because "the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world."

But a surplus so developed has required a complex system of diversions or "costs" which are not the source of the values developed but on the contrary are always set off against them as "debits" offset against "credits." It seems certain, however, that this system has yet to be developed correctly as to the elements involved. Among these beclouded elements have been interest, profit, depreciation, and obsolescence, all associated as factors in these "capital" values; and all with a moral context; that is, with an essential relation to the reproduction of the species. The problem before us is thus a problem in accountancy; that is, in accounting for this reproductive relationship in economic values as involved in "costs."

Certainly we are not engaging in these diversions—these costs which accumulate as "price" in trading during productive processes—for their own sake. The resulting capital values are therefore not "intrinsic." They are subject to continual risk of loss and chance of gain because of their changing relation to "productivity" in terms of the values that are intrinsic, ultimately because of their relation to food supply. Those who labor at the multiplicity of tasks involved are never sure of remaining productively employed. Directly or indirectly through "free enterprise" the utility of these diversionary costs is competitively displaced and made obsolete by innovations. They thus become costs that afford no value, since they can no longer contribute competitively to our cooperative cradle of productive capacity which is of "capital" value.

A real structure

A system of valuation, therefore, can have no realistic significance nor any moral standing if it does not put first things first and base its whole structure on the elemental facts of the physical processes of nutrition and reproduction. Obviously the rearing of the greatest number of individuals in full vigor and health is a process in which nutrition is primarily involved and in which, as a rule, there will not be enough food for potential population; i. e., there will be competition for it in the effort to fulfill the "cosmic urge"; and the "full vigor and health" of offspring will be brought into jeopardy "under the conditions to which they are subjected" by competition.

Reducing that jeopardy despite competition—indeed, by means of it—has been the task of science and its "innovations." Its successes have hinged upon mechanical implements, its failures upon a social structure that has been incapable of harmonizing, with a competition that cannot be either practically or morally eliminated, the community of effort involved in mechanization. Wishful attempts to harmonize them have signally failed, and failed because emotionally we are not cooperatively but rather competitively conditioned—because, in short, truth is knowable and usable only intellectually, not emotionally. Because, let us add, it is the human brain, not the human gland or hormone, that is of social significance.

With technological advance, however, there is a "kind of balance which is vital to economic progress and which may be ruined by overrapid innovation," said Lord Stamp. (See The Science of Social Adjustment, 1937, section on The Factor of Obsolescence, p. 34.) It is a balance "between obsolescence and depreciation. To be effective nearly all scientific advance for economic progress has to be embodied in capital forms, more and more elaborate, large, and costly. * * * The total satisfaction is continually produced with less and less human effort. * * * But if the expensive embodiment of the latest science can be outmoded and superseded long before it is worn out, there is waste of capital, loss of interest, and resulting insecurity of business and investment."

Loss in interest, in addition to costs already "invested" in physical form which are unreplaced (are not amortized), is involved. Yet scientists, says this British financier who was killed in the bombing blitz of London, "often look at the problem of practical application as if getting at it as rapidly as possible were the only factor to be considered in social advantages, and the difference in the position of monopoly or single management in their ability to 'hold up' new ideas is treated as a frustration in itself. Thus it has been said (J. D. Bernal, on Science and Industry in The Frustration of Science, p. 72): 'The danger of obsolescence is a great preventive of fundamental applications to science. * * *' Supposing that the obsolescence in question is a real factor of cost, it would fall to be reckoned with in the computation for transition, whatever the form of society, and even if the personal 'profit' incentive were inoperative. It cannot be spirited away * * *" (op. cit., p. 43).

Value of capital cost

How, then, can obsolescence be a "real factor of cost"? And just how is it related to interest or profit from property values?

Certainly, capital values are often evanescent; as already noted they bear no necessary relation to antecedent cost, for the ratio between cost and resulting income that is warranted by competitive conditions is being continually reduced by innovations that lower costs or raise productivity, or both. Such a ratio is, obviously, conditioned by time; that is, both costs and productivity must relate to the same period, say a year, in order to be expressive of comparable values

in productive equipment. Capital costs, in other words, can be related to value that is attributable to income, only as affected by durability or "life expectancy" in service on the one hand, and by total productive capacity during "life" on the other. To make value comparisons that are universal (as is done in the price system) it is necessary that there be a standard ratio involving net income, within a fixed time (year) as related to depreciation costs in the same period—for only depreciation can be charged against competitive values, never research or development costs except as these may be protected by patent, in which case they still do not control the value of the monopoly accorded to the invention. This standard ratio is interest, or the ratio of capitalization. How has such a ratio, or "natural" rate of interest, come about?

Function of investments

Competitively, all investments must, obviously, equate efficiency, i. e., any one investment must produce as effectively as any other, per unit of cost per unit of time, in order not to be obsolete. It must be equally obvious, however, that if productivity is to be the basis of numerical valuation it can only be as related to some invariant, some alternative opportunity in cost and income which is universally and naturally present; that is, a standard ratio must be comparable to "constants" in physics, which are always natural ratios determined by observations employing measurement by figures based on purely artificial units. While such a relation is a natural invariant, its numerical magnitude is determined by the size of units employed in measurements involved. Similarly, the ratio for capitalization (the reciprocal of the interest ratio) is a function of the unit of time employed in measuring the factors involved in productivity, otherwise it is a constant; and when the unit of time employed is a year, the ratio is approximately 20 to 1. That is, since there exists in human life an investment opportunity which is a norm, and which will "return" 5–6 percent per annum as against total cost, it can never be good business to invest income at a lesser rate of annual return. (Obviously, if that which is invested is borrowed the lender will be presumed to have sacrificed, and so be owed, the gain afforded by this standard opportunity in good business. If, however, he sacrificed nothing to make the loan, as by counterfeiting money, the transaction is usurious as to both lender and borrower, neither of whom can have moral claim to either principal or interest. Cf. Fr. Dempsey's analysis of "forced saving" in the treatise cited above.)

There is, indeed, one cost account in the human economy that is invaluable, and that is the account which would otherwise be insolvent (because productive of no income)—the account with our offspring. The Greeks used the same word (Tokos) for both offspring and interest. They must have been at least subconsciously aware that the rising generation is an investment without profit—because it is profit. Certainly its cost does not require amortization, by income contributed, in order to be afforded a motive; for new life is amortization for the procreating generation. It needs no ulterior motive, for it is the ultimate in motivation—"for 'tis love and love alone the world is seeking." If it is not an investment, that is because it is the investment from which, as the "opportunity cost," all other costs must derive their pattern and their "profit" motive.

Nor is this a mere matter of personal volition in determining whether to be or not to be—whether to Sangerize or not to Sangerize; for the difference between morality and immorality is the difference between mortality and immortality—between life and death—in making the choice between the cosmic urge and the competitive and other inherent difficulties in undertaking that free (?) enterprise which is the ultimate investment in happiness for ourselves and our posterity, "the rearing of the greatest number of individuals" consistent with "full vigor and health."

Reproduction as an investment involves an always current cost which must be available as a surplus and be incurred through the unproductive and self-centered period of immaturity up to the love-motivated period of productivity, or maturity. It is a cost which literally returns for reinvestment at maturity (after about 20 years) when the individual is detached from dependency. No other cost can be economical unless it returns a surplus, above its time-distributed cost as a maintenance reserve (or rate of amortization), at the same ratio to its undistributed or total cost as that determined by the length of our immaturity. If an investment cost returns more or less than this "interest" ratio, its value is altered accordingly in the multiple proportion of "capitalization," which is derived directly from the period of dependency in years and of which the interest ratio is the reciprocal. This ratio is therefore a controlling constant, not a controlled variable.

Importance of profit motive

We find, then, that it is not a system which does demand interest at a fixed (5–6 percent) rate on captial (borrowed or unborrowed) that is immoral. One which does not so provide is immoral! Incidentally, an immoral system is also an unworkable system, lacking the profit motive or any incentive at all such as competitive "capitalism" does afford as a cradle for the rising generation. A race which attempts to eliminate the competitive motive of the cosmic urge by an "unselfish," doctrinaire "golden rule" behavior that "loves thy neighbor" regardless of sex, is on the hypocritical road to suicide—to being displaced by a less "educated and refined" people who dare not or will not neglect their own, selfish amortization.

A civilized race which intends to survive, therefore, must have a good (yes, moral) business organization which forces the profit motive into all business and even nonbusiness behavior, automatically, by sound, interest-bearing finance with stable money which keeps the interest rate pure in its relation to distributed real costs, that is, as related to amortization of investments which are not obsolete in competition. No nation can be social—can reproduce and so endure—that does not know that "'tis love and love alone that can repay," even in business, and that therefore production for use and for profit must be the watchword for every moral, and normal, and social "ism."

Projects Listed in H. R. 2374, First Deficiency Appropriation Bill for 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I called to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that there were several items in the bill having to do with additional facilities for war plants. I referred to the project at Duluth, Minn., known as Minnesota project 21–139–N, Federal Works Agency. My testimony before the House Appropriations Committee appears on page 744 of the printed hearings and, in part, is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. PITTENGER.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am interested in what is known as Minnesota project 21–139–N, Federal Works Agency, before Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations. This is known as the Riverside sewage project and is made necessary because of developments at the shipyards at Duluth, Minn., which yards are engaged in producing ships for the Government in connection with the war effort.

It is my understanding that the Federal Works Administration recognizes the fact that sanitary conditions at the shipyards are very bad, and in the interest of the health of the people working in these yards this project should be undertaken and completed as soon as possible. I submit herewith certified copy of the resolution of the City Council of the city of Duluth, which bears date of January 31 and which explains in detail the need for this important development.

I trust that the committee will act favorably.

I then submitted certified copy of the resolution which was adopted by the city council, and which requests favorable action in connection with this project, so as to expedite the financing and completion of the same at the earliest possible date.

The resolution of the city council recites that the project which involves construction of sewage disposal facilities is necessary in order to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the people in this section, as well as persons engaged in national defense activity.

I am advised by the Government agency involved in this matter that unless there is an amendment to H. R. 2374 no funds will be available for the Riverside project. Attention is directed to page 8 of the bill which refers to an increased appropriation, but which provides practically all of the increased appropriation shall be reserved for projects subsequent to June 30, 1945. I think it necessary that this limitation be removed and I shall support an amendment for that purpose at the appropriate time.

Address by Hon. David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts, at Jackson Day Dinner in Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by me at the Jackson Day dinner held under the auspices of the Massachusetts Democratic State Committee in Boston on Saturday, February 24, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the viewpoint of political success we meet on this occasion under most favorable circumstances. The executive and

the legislative branches of the National Government are entirely under the control of our party. In the election held last November, in the midst of the present war, President Roosevelt, our honored party leader for 12 years, was given an emphatic and unprecedented endorsement notwithstanding the fact that no man since the establishment of the American Republic has heretofore held the Presidency for more than 8 years. Not only was President Roosevelt and his administration endorsed, but the Democratic Party was given increased numerical strength in the Congress.

Here in Massachusetts we are honored tonight by the presence for the first time in 7 years of a Democratic Governor. His outstanding achievement in the political life of the metropolitan city of Boston, as well as his long and devoted service to the Democratic Party, give every assurance of a successful and brilliant record as our chief executive. The Democrats of Massachusetts are behind you Governor Tobin and you have but to command us to render every assistance to make your administration the glorious page which we confidently expect it to be, in the history of Massachusetts.

This is also an occasion for us to take pride in the services rendered to our party by those who have, and will have in the immediate future, the difficult task of strengthening our party organization in order to make it an effective instrument for success in the future. Much of the credit for our party's success in Massachusetts is due to you who are here assembled, who represent the workers and leaders in the party organization—the lieutenants, and the captains who must organize, educate, and lead the large army of men and women who support our political principles and who look to you leaders for guidance in the performance of their civic duties. Preparation for battles in a political field have many features in common with military engagements. After each military conflict there must be realinement and reorganization of the participants in the next contest. A good general must never fail to measure the strength and power of the opposition and prepare to outnumber and outgeneral the enemy. Therefore, this occasion should be a source of encouragement to you, Chairman Cahill, and your coworkers, for this large and enthusiastic gathering indicates you and they deservedly possess the confidence and loyalty of the workers of our party.

It is most appropriate that we Democrats should yearly celebrate Andrew Jackson's anniversary and also that of Thomas Jefferson. They are the patron saints of our American democracy and of our political party. It is from them that we have inherited our political faith. It is to the fundamental principles that they enunciated that we must continue, in the trying days ahead, to turn to for guidance and direction.

The arbitrary power that has entrenched itself in recent years in Europe has risen largely because of the belief that people are not to be entrusted to shape their own lives, that they should be controlled and guided, and either patronized or exploited, by those who have the power to seize authority over them or to rob them of their resources. Jackson and Jefferson had explicit faith in popular government. The guiding principle of these two great leaders was the right of the people of the Nation to work out its life and destiny in its own way, to enjoy individual independence to the end that a man may think as his mind directs, believe as his heart desires, and worship as he sees fit.

It was those leaders that not only preached, but builded the Nation upon, and imbued our party with, the doctrine that all men are equal in the eyes of nature and the law; that life, liberty, and happiness are inalienable rights; that the function of Government is to safeguard and guarantee those rights; and that all authority and inspiration of Government are drawn from the consent of the governed. How inspiring are such utterances as this: "The whole art of government" thundered the great Virginian, "consists in the art of being honest. Only aim to do your duty and mankind will give you credit where you fail."

These founders of our party struck a death blow in their day at aristocracy and tyranny and the privileged groups, who sought to determine and control what the people should think, how they should be governed, and how they should live, as against the theory that people were created for the Government, which is at the root of many of the evils throughout the world today.

Yet today, many legislative proposals supported by strong and vigorous groups, some of them even within the Democratic fold, are pending in the Congress and State legislatures, seeking to control what the people should think, how they should be governed, and how they should live. One major experience we had with such proposals, namely prohibition, has evidently been forgotten.

It is the fundamental principles of these leaders of our party that must guide us in solving the stupendous, domestic, and international problems that are beginning to unfold as we approach the end of the war.

But what of the future?

First, and foremost, we must repay the debt we owe those who have been our shield against the enemy during this frightful holocaust. There is no higher or more solemn obligation than the proper recognition of the obligation we owe our war heroes, and the necessity of realizing that, though we cannot lessen the sacrifices, the grief, and the suffering that they and their dependents have and will continue to experience, we can and we must remove any and every physical and material hardship that will interfere with their future happiness. There must never be any hesitancy or question about generously providing for the safety and security of every war veteran and his dependents as long as they live.

Time does not permit more than a mere mention of the exceedingly large number of grave post-war problems that will immediately press for solution following the transition from the present war economy to a peacetime economy. Among them, however, may be mentioned the adoption of legislation to prevent the possible annihilation of small businesses; the providing of jobs for the millions who are now employed in war industries, employment for the millions returning from war service; the maintenance of the wage that will prevent any reduction in the standards of living of our workers; the unloading of the innumerable bureaucratic agencies and the decentralization of the functions of Government that have exercised an autocratic control of the lives and activities of our people during the war.

In the background of all our planning there is a still more gigantic task. How are we to deal with the national debt approaching $400,000,000,000, representing approximately a per capita debt of $3,000, a debt greater than that any country of the world ever had or ever dreamt of having—one that no American a few years ago would predict it was possible for our Nation to carry and survive.

I repeat, the problems of readjustment, social, economic and political, domestic and foreign, are of a magnitude that it is not possible to overestimate. We must avoid in the years following the war what has frequently been the aftermath evils of wars throughout the world—imperialism, monopoly, and dictatorship. These three are the eternal and impregnable enemies of liberty.

The aim of our foreign policy should be the security and defense of our Nation and the maintenance of its peace. Wide, sincere, and legitimate differences of opinion in regard to our foreign policy following the war seem to be inevitable. All Americans are for peace at home and abroad. The dissent will arise over the methods by which our own security, as well as world peace, is to be assured, such as the details of the terms of peace, the obligations assumed under international agreements, the extent of the use of our armed forces to police the world; the extent of peacetime lend-lease obligations, etc. It is recognized by many, and that is the basis of sharp differences, that international commitments, even when carefully safeguarded, may become the reverse of what they were intended for, namely instruments of war instead of instruments of peace. Such stupendously important decisions as our international relations are certain to lead to honest differences in our own party ranks and, indeed, the same diversities are bound to arise in connection with plans proposed for the transition from wartime to peacetime economy. However, let us remember that violent disagreements in regard to foreign and domestic policies are, and will continue to be, just as prevalent, if not more so, in the Republican Party as in our own. Neither one of the great political parties posseses any infallibility in its leadership for the solution, harmonious and unanimous, of the new, untried, and frightfully momentous issues of the future.

Whatever steps are agreed upon to promote world peace, for united action with other nations to prevent aggression and future war, we must not be lulled into the condition of weakness and unpreparedness that followed World War No. 1. We must insist that our country be so strong that no possible combination of powers would attempt to attack us. We must, in the future, provide America with an invincible air force and a navy strong enough to protect all our seacoast, and a fully equipped and mechanized army. We must supplement our armaments in order to promote peace throughout the nations of the world, by an unmistakable policy of good will among all nations, both large and small. We should foster economic collaboration, especially with the republics of the Western Hemisphere, but as well with all free nations to the end that peace and national good faith may triumph.

It is but natural that there should be in the solution of the momentous problems of the future sincere, strong, and legitimate differences of opinion as to what policies are most likely to preserve and protect our free institutions as to what principles are more conducive than others to promote the general welfare of all our people.

It is my opinion that the people believe that that political party and those political leaders who will apply principles of natural justice and truth to the great facts involved in any question or issue can best render the most useful service and thereby secure and preserve an abiding faith in the capacity of our form of government to serve society.

Something more than political platforms or party principles, or promises is of supreme importance. From the viewpoint of the average fair-sized citizen, the important consideration that confronts him is to know clearly the kind of political philosophy that leaders and candidates of political organizations represent. Fellow Democrats, because we believe the Democratic Party has been more responsive to the natural, inborn aspirations of the masses for the improvement of their lot, we have accepted its standards. It is the Democratic Party, we believe, that through the long years has been thinking most constantly of the needs of the lowly and the suffering and toil-worn people and when given the opportunity, has translated these thoughts into action.

We are Democrats also because it has given us the best opportunity to defend the rights and champion the causes that have brought hope and cheer into the lives of the underprivileged in their struggle for a reasonable

share in the wealth of the country that they have largely produced.

Our party must now, in the momentous days ahead, prove that it is still capable of performing the new tasks that are before us. We should do it with as much harmony and cohesion as possible, without asking any member of our party to surrender his individual and intellectual integrity for some particular phase of legislation or administration.

We should possess constructive ability to recognize that we may have made some mistakes in the past—any other attitude would indicate a claim to be superhuman—and that it is possible to make mistakes in the future. If we are capable of recognizing mistakes and correcting them, we may go forth with renewed vigor and confidence to future victories.

This is no time for cessation of effort, no time for sectional differences or racial hatred. Strong and vigorous constructive criticism and honest differences over policies for the Nation's welfare will not only help our party, but be of inestimable value to our country. Personal animosities and jealousies, and an unwillingness to recognize that those who differ with us are usually as sincerely and honest as ourselves, will keep us disunited.

Fellow Democrats, we cannot obliterate from our thoughts tonight that Americans are dying on land, sea, and under the seas in defense of our liberties and institutions. We cannot drive from our minds the thought that not only thousands of our youth who are in this war will never return, but that those who come back to us, after suffering from the debilitating heat of the tropics and the winter blizzards in lands far from their homes and loved ones, will have no future because they will be broken in body, some in mind. We can best show our gratitude for what they are doing, and for what they are still to do, by taking advantage on occasions like this to reexamine the principles upon which our Government was founded, to reappraise our national progress, and to decide what kind of a country and world we want to live in when this terrible cataclysm is ended.

More than ever, the great masses of people are calling for leadership, honest, courageous, and able; leadership which will carry the torch of democracy in helping to solve the complex problems ahead and dispel the gloom, grief, and discouragement that the war has brought. We of the Democratic Party must become the inspired leaders in all the great movements of the immediate future for the advancement and progress of our beloved country. Our voices must bring hope and confidence to the masses of men as no other voices in America. Inspired by the sacrifices of our war heroes, let us become crusaders to fight those forces that place material values, government by force, hatred, and selfishness above the spiritual values upon which our founders built this Republic. In a word, we must vigorously fight those false theories of government which have brought other democracies to ruin and which have destroyed progress and liberty everywhere.

In the days of peace our enemies will be those who permit any and every form of social and industrial injustice, racial and class hatred, religious prejudice, monopolistic combinations that enhance the cost of living, lessen the purchasing power of wages, and increase the already too great disparity in living conditions between the rich and the poor, the possession of the country's resources by a limited few—all these are enemies of democracy.

The conflict before us and in which we are engaged is to preserve the soul of America, the soul that Jefferson and Jackson breathed into our institutions—to preserve the truths and ideals which in the past have made our people the happiest and most contented in all the world, and our country, notwithstanding its temporary economic recessions and its yet unsolved social and economic problems, the best place in all the world in which to live, to work, and to die. At all hazards let our party exert every effort to safeguard American institutions, preserve our self-government, respect and maintain our best traditions, for these are the fundamental principles for which our sons and their loved ones have suffered, sacrificed, and died.

Further Manpower Bill Delays Foreseen Despite Army's Pleas—Two Bretton Woods Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House on February 23, 1945, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several newspaper articles and editorials, I submit an article by Mark Sullivan, Further Manpower Bill Delays Foreseen Despite Army's Pleas, and an editorial Two Bretton Woods Polls:

FURTHER MANPOWER BILL DELAYS FORESEEN DESPITE ARMY'S PLEAS—MARK SULLIVAN BELIEVES SENATE MAY WRITE A NEW MEASURE, DOUBTS FINAL PASSAGE UNTIL MARCH; FINAL SHAPE OF LAW STILL UNCERTAIN

(By Mark Sullivan)

During the present week the manpower bill will be in the Senate. This is about as much as can be said, for the situation is such as not to promise either early action or any particular kind of action.

If a measure is not passed by Thursday the Senate is scheduled on that date to take up the appointment of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce; and this, regardless of the outcome, may be attended by time-consuming discussion. Further, the manpower bill that goes before the Senate, from its Military Affairs Committee, is more or less frankly intended to be merely a starting point for discusison and amendment. This is suggested by the fact that several members of the committee, in voting to lay the bill before the Senate, reserved to themselves the right to oppose it on the Senate floor.

NEW MEASURE IS LIKELY

The visible likelihood is that in substance a new measure will be written in the Senate, that this will defer materially from the bill the House passed more than 3 weeks ago, that there must therefore follow conference between the House and the Senate, and, finally, passage by both House and Senate of whatever compromise the conference arrives at. The process will take well into March a measure which in early January was advocated as immediately urgent by the President and by the heads of the armed forces.

Why the delay and why the uncertainty about the nature of the final measure? This House was reasonably prompt and completely definite. It passed on February 1 a measure that met squarely the request of the President and of the armed forces. The House bill requires every worker in a war industry to remain on his job unless released by his draft board and requires every worker not now on a war job to take one. For failure to obey these requirements the same penalty is provided that the selective service law provides for failure to obey a draft into the armed forces.

In passing that forthright measure the House stuck strictly to the point. It rejected 19 proposed alternatives or amendments. Some of these, if they stood alone or were considered on merit, would have commanded a majority of the House. One such was an amendment which would have relieved a worker assigned to a war industry from having to join a union. Such amendments were voted down not because the House did not believe in them but in the interest of sticking to the issue, of not loading the measure down with amendments. The House course was a deference to the majority party's leadership.

REASONS FOR SENATE DELAY

For the delay in the Senate Military Affairs Committee there are many reasons. Most of them are good, provided you begin by departing from the central principle that animated the House, namely, that promptness and definiteness are more important than anything else. The method adopted by the House is that all men between 18 and 45 not already in the armed forces must work in a war industry under penalty of fine or imprisonment. That is the most direct method of getting maximum manpower into war industry and has been recognized as the most definite ever since the idea of total mobilization of manpower for war was first brought forward.

If time can be afforded for search for the ideal method some of the alternatives brought forward in the Senate Military Affairs Committee might be better at this stage of the war than the House bill. But the heads of the armed forces say that promptness and definiteness are all important. They make two points. One is that the need for war materials, to be produced by workers in war industry, will be greater during 1945 than in any previous stage of the war. The other is that during the first 6 months of 1945 some 900,000 additional draftees must be taken into the armed forces and that these must be found among men now working in war industry. In addition to these taken out of war industry, for whom substitutes must be found, a further 700,000 workers in war industry are needed in order to produce the excess of war materials needed during the present year.

TWO BRETTON WOODS POLLS

About a week ago a group calling itself "The Economists' Committee on Bretton Woods," published the results of what purported to be an objective poll of members of the American Economic Association on the so-called Bretton Woods program and which allegedly showed substantial unanimity of opinion in favor of that program.

It subsequently developed that the membership of this committee consisted preponderantly of economists who are, or at various times have been, members of the New Deal Administration and active in the formulation of its policies. It also developed that the statement indorsed by some 224 economists was so loosely worded that almost any economist believing in some form of post-war international currency co-operation, but with no very precise ideas as to what form it should take, would be inclinded to sign it.

Convinced that the results of the poll of the "Committee on Bretton Woods" gave a distorted picture of economic opinion, the Economist National Committee on Monetary Policy, of which Professor Kemmerer of Princeton, is president, make a telegraphic survey of its membership last week. Unlike the "Bretton Woods Committee" poll, this one recognized that there are several schools of opinion on the problem, and made a reasonable attempt to take that fact into account. The results, made public over the week end, show that of the 69 members who could be reached by telegrams, replies were

received from 61. Of these, 13 approved the monetary fund as proposed; 8 approved it with amendments, and 37 voted for its rejection. With respect to the International Bank for Reconstruction, the second of the two instruments provided for under the Treasury plan, only 5 voted for outright rejection, as against the 37 in the case of the fund; 13 approved without qualification, and 37 approved with reservations.

To say that the poll of the Committee on Bretton Woods was meaningless is not to say that the poll of the Economists National Committee necessarily represents an exact cross section of expert opinion. It is only fair to note that this committee, which has been in existence since 1934, was formed in protest against the New Deal's devaluation and silver policies of that time, and that its monetary philosophy leans as a whole to orthodoxy.

But when this has been said, two facts stand out in these polls. One of these is that there is a deep cleavage of opinion on the Bretton Woods program; the other is that the cleavage centers almost exclusively in the monetary fund. Here is another forceful argument, it seems to us, in favor of the policy urged by an increasing number of objective and informed students of the problem, here and in England. That is the policy of pushing legislation on the bank, which, as the London Economist notes, is "less controversial than the fund, and more urgently needed," and withholding action on the fund until there is more general agreement on its basic principles and until conditions have become sufficiently stable to provide a reasonable hope that it will achieve its objectives.

Address by Hon. Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, During Services Sponsored by the Forty-second Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] during services sponsored by the Forty-second—Rainbow—Division veterans at Washington, D. C., February 22, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the radio audience, it is, indeed, a pleasure for me to take part in these services sponsored by the Forty-second (Rainbow) Division.

I am not unmindful of what our men and women—especially the boys on the battle fronts—are now undergoing to preserve the freedom and liberty which this Nation has enjoyed for so many years. Men and women who represent us on the battle fronts today have, in reality, said to this Nation: "Here is my life. Take it and use it that liberty and happiness may be assured for my loved ones whom I leave at home." They have said even more than this. They have in reality placed their lives upon the altar of sacrifice for their country. They have given up their jobs, their homes, their friends, and their loved ones and with faith in us, in their Nation and in their God they are today marching, advancing in far-flung battle fronts raising high the standard of Old Glory and proving themselves heroes and patriots in every task.

The boys who are today fighting in the South Pacific under Gen. Douglas MacArthur, our great leader of the Forty-second (Rainbow) Division of the First World War, are going through trials that we here at home can scarcely conceive of unless you have experienced the horrors on the battlefield.

In the short time allotted to me it is impossible to relate at length any of my experiences on the battlefield, but I recall to mind, especially in that Second Battle of the Marne and in the Argonne, where the dead were literally heaped on top of each other, and many a time I have seen my comrades lying there bleeding and dying upon the battlefields of France. The same is taking place upon the battlefields today.

One place not far from where my division was when the armistice was signed November 11, 1918, the boys in this present war have just passed that place, Sedan, and are now fighting in Germany not far from the Rhine where the old Forty-second (Rainbow) Division was stationed in the Army of Occupation. This naturally makes me feel close to the boys who are fighting this war.

We do not want to do anything that might make this war 1 day or 1 hour longer. I have ofttimes said there is no need for us here at home grumbling while our boys are dying. After the war we can grumble as much as we please, but now is the time to fight the Japs and Germans and stop fighting among ourselves.

I wish to quote from a speech of Benjamin Franklin. Though spoken more than 150 years ago, it still can be translated into present-day conditions:

"The eyes of Christendom are upon us, and our honor as a people is become a matter of the utmost consequence to be taken care of. If we give up our rights in this contest, a century to come will not restore to us the opinion of the world; we shall be stamped with the character of poltroons and fools. Present inconveniences are, therefore, to be borne with fortitude and better times expected."

I am also anxious that America should have the right kind of peace. This is as important as the winning of the war itself, for we won the last war and lost the peace. We owe it to our boys to help them win this war and then have the right kind of peace.

River and Valley Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the well-known industrial engineer and administrator, Mr. Morris L. Cooke, on the subject of river and valley developments. The article was originally published in the New Republic, but because of its great value to the subject, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch reprinted it under date of December 15, 1944.

Mr. Cooke's authority in this field has been recognized in this country and all over the world. I feel that this article is an outstanding contribution to the proper understanding of the significance of developing our great river valleys as a unity, patterned after the T. V. A.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY TYPE RIVER DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USE HAILED AS ASSURANCE OF JOBS AND EXPANDING PROSPERITY

(By Morris L. Cooke)

(Reprinted from the New Republic by special arrangement)

(Morris L. Cooke, engineer and administrator, declares one river-one-problem program as dynamic as industrial revolution. It is "Democracy intimately nurtured by socially minded science—Process only in its infancy," says former head of R. E. A.)

Widespread acclaim for the 10-year accomplishments of the Tennessee Valley Authority is promoting at home and abroad the adoption of new types of river development and land use such as will make possible over great areas improved standards of living and intriguing opportunities for commercial and industrial activity. The generous support being accorded Senator MURRAY'S proposal for a Missouri Valley Authority—M. V. A.—is one telling bit of evidence as to the influence which T. V. A. is exerting.

All over the world—in India, China, Africa, Russia, Palestine, Brazil, and other parts of South America, and in the Balkans—comparable river-valley projects have been started or are being actively planned with T. V. A. usually as their acknowledged inspiration.

DEVELOPING SITUATION

Every such project necessarily involves engineering works—sometimes on a vast scale—and the acquisition of all kinds of paraphernalia required for the new and often novel types of activity, both agricultural and industrial, which are brought into fruitful being. The implications will hardly be overlooked by dynamic American business enterprise.

This developing situation opens up promising opportunities for employment in the years just ahead when the returning armies and workers released from war plants will have to be absorbed back into a peacetime economy. Fortunately this widening in our work outlook occurs at a time when progress in technology has been putting limits on employment as ordinarily conceived and thus threatening the whole social structure.

But, looking beyond these immediate objectives, we may be witnessing a synthesis of administration and science comparable in the life of the race to the industrial revolution, which came into being 150 years ago with the invention of the steam engine.

Note these occurrences—recent as history goes. Edison gave us light in 1883 with electricity generated by burning coal under a boiler. About 1890 this coal-generated electric energy began to be used for power and industry adjacent to the power plant. Then was developed the ability to transmit electricity increasing distances from the point of generation to the point of use. And finally, around the turn of the century, electricity began to be obtained in volume from falling waters. We can now generate electricity in any desired volume, with either coal or from falling water, and send it economically hundreds of miles to the point of use. This cycle is complete.

DEPLETION OF THE SOIL

Now witness developments in an entirely new field. About the time President Theodore Roosevelt held his 1907 conservation conference in the White House, the Department of Agriculture officially expressed the view that "the soil is the one indestructible, immutable asset that the Nation possesses. It

is the one resource that cannot be exhausted; that cannot be used up." In other words, there was nothing to worry about.

Since then, we have become convinced that, through gulley and sheet erosion and other types of depletion, the soil—the foundation of practically all life—over vast areas throughout the world, has been ruined. Everywhere the baneful process is actually being accelerated. In low moments we worry with Shaler as to whether "human culture can devise and enforce ways of dealing with the earth so that it may support men of the ages to come"—a statement made before the rise to power of mechanized agriculture.

However, beginning early in the present administration in the United States, a wide variety of steps have been taken in the line of soil conservation and improved land use. The sciences involved have grown by leaps and bounds. While the integration of the wide variety of specialization has hardly started it begins to look as if a solution of this appalling problem may be in sight or, at least, around the corner. It is generally agreed that if adequate remedies are to be found, the United States must discover them.

ALONG COMES T. V. A.

At this crisis in our dilemma along comes T. V. A. combining the advantages that go with abundant low-priced electricity and enlightened land use. It operates under legislation prohibiting politics and encouraging efficiency. Through a large measure of local autonomy, which has been wisely administered, the term "consent of the governed" has been given a new significance—startling in a "tired old" world because it operates constructively at the lower economic levels.

T. V. A. is democracy intimately nurtured by socially minded science and engineering. The process is only in its infancy. But the demonstration of gains has been so dramatic that we must hold the hope that a public continuously on guard will safeguard what is now vastly more than a social experiment carried on in what has been considered one of the less desirable sections of the United States. T. V. A. is already economically a symbol for a new and promising phrase in mankind's forward march.

The essence of the authority type of administration is "one river—one problem." All individual policy and managerial questions are balanced in the light of what is best for the watershed as a whole. The whole river and all its people are under the largest measure of local autonomy consistent with the controlling legislation.

NOT FOR ALL RIVERS

Many important rivers do not invite authority administration. They do not have the characteristics required for multiple-purpose use such as have been developed in the Tennessee Valley—navigation, power, industry development, recreation, potable water supply, soil conservation, flood control, higher standards of living, and all the rest.

For instance, it is hard to envision the Amazon, draining seven countries in northern South America, as anything but a transportation agency, an arm of the sea. Again, the Skagit, flowing from Canada into the State of Washington, equipped with a series of high dams, provides the city of Seattle with its electric supply and that is all.

In transmitting the T. V. A. bill to Congress, President Roosevelt said, "If we are successful here (in the Tennessee Valley) we can march on, step by step, in a like development of other great natural territorial units within our borders."

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

Consistent therewith, at a news conference held just after the recent election, in endorsing the Missouri Valley Authority, the President said that, even if "blindfolded," he could outline the seven principal river valleys which would profit by the authority type of administration.

Hazarding a guess as the matter stands today, these might be—omitting T. V. A.—the valleys of the Missouri, Arkansas, Columbia, Colorado, Trinity, Sacramento-San Joaquin, and the Ohio. The Yazoo in Mississippi would be among the close seconds. My own Delaware should be included.

As we launch this epochal new scheme for the better internal organization of our country we should get away from the idea that every river development is different. They will vary, of course, as to engineering and other relatively minor details, but hardly at all as to their broad social, economic, political, and technological implications.

To emphasize similarities rather than to stress differences should be our aim. We have learned this lesson to advantage in so many other fields that it should not be too difficult here. The outcry, "but my business is different," is invariably an early obstacle to the development of modern scientific, industrial organizations. So what is admitted to be a thoroughly successful T. V. A. then becomes a carefully worked out pattern, not to be blindly copied, but rather used as a dependable guide to avoid unnecessary experimentation.

DISTINCTION TO BE MADE

One distinction to be made between T. V. A. and the proposed M. V. A. is found in the fact that in the upper parts of the Missouri Valley, because of the climate, water is very scarce, and agriculture difficult for the lack of it, while in the lower reaches of the river floods and navigation have been considered the major problems.

This simply means that the M. V. A. must make every endeavor possible to conserve and augment the available supply of water in the north, while dealing with the seasonal surpluses downstream. It may easily mean that the M. V. A. will rate irrigation a top first in deciding the several uses to which the available water may be put. But under Authority administration every such question will be discussed and decided in the light of the "total situation," as Mary Follett called it.

In recognizing differences between Authorities we must have in mind the distinction to be made between questions such as the one just mentioned, affected by unchangeable weather conditions, and those which are man-made, such as battles for prestige and power between departments or lobbies.

T. V. A. MIGHT HAVE FAILED

If for instance, the Corps of Engineers of the Army had won its strenuous fight to build the dams on the Tennessee, the T. V. A. might well have been a failure. The Army Engineers, with navigation as their chief responsibility, proposed a system of high dams for the Tennessee River, but only on the condition that they be built by private interests or by States or cities, with the Federal Government contributing only the cost of navigation facilities. This cost was to be measured by the estimated cost of a system of 32 low dams providing navigation only and proposed for construction in case utilities or the States were uninterested—as they proved to be, despite persuasive efforts—in building the high dams.

Had these low dams been built, they might have forestalled forever the construction of the system of nine high dams on the Tennessee which now produce large amounts of power as well as helping to control floods.

Likewise, if the Bureau of Reclamation all by its lonesome makes the decisions as to the location, size, and characteristics of irrigation projects in the Missouri Valley without regard to the interests and future of the watershed as a whole, unified control becomes impossible in the sense that under congressional direction it has been practiced by T. V. A.

The most effective relationship between the projected authorities and certain functional agencies of the Federal Government, such as Soil Conservation Service, Army engineers, Reclamation Service, of course, remains to be worked out. In the process local autonomy must not be sacrificed.

OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE

If the agitation for an authority to control works and operations in the Sacramento-San Joaquin area, constituting two-thirds of the State of California, is successful, it will be the first such Federal agency to function wholly within the bounds of a single State. The authority type of administration for these particular valleys has very great national importance.

Certain suggested river-valley projects abroad are complicated by the fact that the streams to be developed cross national boundaries, and therefore might introduce difficulties growing out of differences in language, race, religion, and politically entrenched interests—age-old causes of strife. However, the promise of better living conditions growing out of river development may prove irresistible in such situation. "Ideologies separate; projects unite."

DIFFERENCES IRONED OUT

It will be recalled in this connection that in the debates over T. V. A., conflicts among the seven States in the region were anticipated. Such conflicts did develop—some of them of serious magnitude potentially. But through the consultation method all have been amicably adjusted.

Another handicap to be encountered in some of the foreign proposals is industrial backwardness especially noticeable in regions with most to gain from a coordinated river development. The best development of a river valley calls for a nice integration between industry and agriculture, such as is developing in the Tennessee watershed.

This sequence closely resembles that now current between some of the States of the Union—especially noticeable as they are grouped into regions.

For historical reasons, as well as because of the present-day balance of financial and political power, our northeastern section, where industry was first developed and where it still flourishes, fabricates a disproportionate share of the minerals and agricultural products of the South and West and then ships back the manufactured products at generally favorable freight rates to be sold frequently at protected prices.

As recently as 1905, 60 percent of cotton, a product grown exclusively in the South and Southwest, was fabricated in the North.

Today about 90 percent of American wool, mostly the product of the Ohio Valley and the Mountain States, is used in New England mills. Of the copper mined in the West two-thirds is refined and about the same percentage is manufactured along the northern sector of the Atlantic seaboard.

POWER CHANGES ALL THIS

As in the case between nations, the coming of electric power is changing all this. If and when a greater measure of local economic control can be achieved, region by region, as has already happened to a considerable extent in the Tennessee Valley, the local utilization and manufacture of resources will put an end to the uneconomic and antisocial regional dominance born of historical and other purely accidental causes.

The war has taught us that our capacity for production is almost without limit. But with the coming of peace there will arise the spectre of the unsolved distribution problem. A large part of the answer can be local processing and sale, and this whether on a national or an international scale. The garden truck now grown and frozen in New Jersey and shipped west and south can be

grown, packed, and sold in those regions. The rice formerly obtained from Burma for native use in French West Africa is now being harvested on the Niger River on a project of T. V. A. parentage under the French Colonial Administration.

TRADE POTENTIALITIES

Let us look at the trade potentialities for this class of undertakings at home and abroad. The following 30 concerns are among a long list of those from whom T. V. A. as a public agency has made its larger purchases:

Allis-Chalmers, Baldwin Locomotive Works, Newport News Shipbuilding Co., General Electric, Westinghouse Electric, Aluminum Co., American Steel & Wire, Anaconda Wire & Cable, Phelps-Dodge Corporation, Ohio Brass Co., Graybar Electric, American Bridge, Koppers Co., Bethlehem Steel, Ingalls Iron Works, Virginia Bridge Co., American Radiator, Crane, American Blower, Babcock & Wilcox, Fairbanks-Morse, Food Machinery Corporation, Ingersoll-Rand Co., Lehigh Portland Cement, Marquette Cement, Caterpillar Tractor, Dravo Corporation, Ford, International Harvester, and Marion Steam Shovel. These names give some idea of the spread by industries.

As a key to the volume of consumer sales of appliances, dealer reports in the T. V. A. power service area for 1941, the last year in which complete records were kept, show that 56,312 refrigerators, 19,286 ranges, and 8,310 water heaters were sold. The total dealer sales amounted to $18,985,505, representing annual sales per customer of $50.38. In 1940, the last year in which annual sales per customer in the Nation as a whole were estimated, the per capita sales were $7.21, and in the Southeast $6.43.

ONE FINAL OBSERVATION

As to our American projects, one final observation. An outstanding characteristic of the nineteenth century was the colonial economy through which Great Britain, and other nations to a lesser extent, waxed rich and powerful through importing the raw products of far-away lands, processing them, and then shipping the manufactured articles overseas to countries then unequipped to produce them. These articles were almost invariably sold at fancy prices.

For American business, in cooperation with the Government, labor, and agriculture, enthusiastically and successfully to promote river valley projects at home and abroad would seem to be an inviting task, and one which could indefinitely postpone the possibility of widespread unemployment. It seems entirely probable that some Government credit will be immediately available for domestic projects. Some of the Indian projects, that on the Godavaris River, for instance, and the one in French West Africa are being financed right at home by public authority. Presumably the Soviet Union knows where the rubles are coming from required for the largest hydro plant in the world, now building on the reconstructed Dnepropetrovsk site.

One American company has given to one foreign country a fabulous drawing account to be used for works including river projects. A long-term credit pool, supported by a dozen American industrial concerns such as those listed earlier in this article, could make a substantial start in eradicating that abject poverty and squalor which not only disgrace civilization but threaten the peace of the world.

Whatever the source of the financing, these developments must be permitted to stimulate, strengthen, and broaden the base for democratic ways and greater human freedom. In the face of such an opportunity we should abandon all thoughts of a shrinking economy.

A large part of the earth's surface is yearning to be made over T. V. A.-wise.

Farm Communications After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Farm Communications After the War," delivered by Commissioner Paul A. Walker, of the Federal Communications Commission, before the third annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, San Antonio, Tex., January 16, 1945. The address deals to a considerable extent with the matter of rural telephone service.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure to be here today to meet with you who represent the farmers throughout the Nation. We salute the farmers of America in recognition of their splendid contribution to the war. According to official reports, total farm production increased more than 20 percent from 1940 to 1944. This was accomplished, notwithstanding the fact that during this time farm population dropped about 16 percent.

The war is not over. There is still much bloody fighting ahead. All of us at home will be called upon to make continued effort and sacrifice to see that our heroic men at the front have adequate food and fighting materials and that this war is prosecuted to a speedy and victorious conclusion.

Out of the horrors of this global struggle, have come many technological improvements. In the fields of medicine, transportation, agriculture, communications, etc., great advances have been made. Science has given us new methods of preventing malaria. We have achieved more effective control of infection through the use of sulfa drugs. The speed and efficiency of airplanes have almost revolutionized transportation. In agriculture, new methods of insect control have been developed. Better fertilizers are being used. More effective livestock breeding and feeding are being practiced.

In the electronics field, with which I am more familiar, almost phenomenal developments have taken place. War research has brought about striking improvements in radio, television, facsimile, and radar. New and challenging frontiers in communications beckon us.

If we are to reap the maximum social and economic benefits of these many technological advances when peace comes, we must make plans now. As President Roosevelt said in his recent message to Congress: "We must begin plans to transform an all-out war economy into a full-employment peace economy whenever demobilization becomes possible." We must be prepared to fill the huge production gap which will be left when the war ends by the production of peacetime goods and services in order to maintain the level of employment essential to prosperity. The choice we face is one of high production, full employment, and general prosperity; or low production, widespread unemployment, and depression.

This full production can mean improvement in our standards of living. It can mean better homes, better food and clothing, improved health, and wider educational opportunities. It can mean many new comforts and conveniences heretofore not enjoyed by the American people. It means that all of us must use more and produce more than we did before 1941 and that farmers must attain parity in comfort of living with that enjoyed by city dwellers.

One important service with which farmers have been inadequately supplied is communications. While no one denies that we have one of the finest broadcasting systems in the world, the fact is that about one-third of the United States is still outside the daytime primary service area of any station, and a large portion of those people not receiving adequate service are farmers. The problem is especially acute in the sparsely settled sections of the country where there are few radio stations.

In some sections where radio reception is satisfactory, there still is a lack of variety in programs and the farmer may find that few broadcasts are designed to arouse his interest or meet his needs. While, of course, our networks and many of our stations carry excellent farm programs, unfortunately many of our farmers are unable to hear them.

Moreover, the farmer's access to the microphone has been limited. Too often because he has been too far removed from the great broadcasting centers or does not live where adequate radio facilities are available, he has had little opportunity to broadcast. This has been a loss in two ways. The indigenous growth of farm communities has suffered and the Nation as a whole has lost by not having more opportunity to hear programs presented by those actively engaged in the agricultural industry.

There is reason to believe that with new technological developments, more complete and satisfactory radio communication will be available to farmers. Frequency modulation broadcasting, popularly known as FM, has been improved and will expand rapidly when the war is over. This new type of broadcasting has some advantages over standard radio. For one thing, it is better able to overcome static. Another advantage is that a number of stations can operate on the same frequency with less mileage separation than is possible with standard broadcasting. It also appears that FM stations can be constructed more economically. Already, there are 329 applications for such stations on file with the Federal Communications Commission, and some experts believe that we may have as many as four or five thousand FM stations operating in this country within 5 years after VE-day. There is reason to hope that FM may help solve the problem of providing good radio programs to farmers, particularly in those remote areas inadequately served now.

The science of television has rapidly developed since the beginning of the war. Excellent pictures with superior definition are now being shown. A great deal of successful experimentation has been done with color pictures. There is good reason to believe that television networks may span the Nation by 1954. The great masses of our people may be able to see as well as hear the finest programs in their homes. Without moving from the fireside, we shall be able to observe the important news events, televised from different sections of the country. We shall see in our homes the pictures of important educators, musical and dramatic stars, and leaders in government and industry.

There are now 101 applications for television stations on file with the Federal Communications Commission, further evidence of the increasing interest being manifested in this new medium.

Add to FM and television the possibilities of facsimile, with its presentation of the news in printed form as it is broadcast, and we have an even more attractive outlook for communications. The transmission of writing, printing, photographs, and other images by means of radio is now a well-established art. We are told that after the war, facsimile stations will be set up in various parts

of the country and that we may be able to buy FM receiving sets equipped with attachments on which images will be reproduced from the broadcasting studios.

The rancher in Texas, Oklahoma, or Montana who now may wait as long as a week to get his newspaper, could receive the news at frequent intervals, directly recorded in his home. The latest official information on crop production, soil conservation, and farm prices, could be available by facsimile broadcasting.

So far I have been discussing the needs of the farmer in terms of radio communication, but the most pronounced disparity as regards communications between rural and city people is in telephone service. In this respect, the farmers have been seriously neglected. In 1940, 3 out of 4 of the farms in the country were without telephones. In the State of Texas, where we are privileged to meet, more than 8 out of 10 farms did not have telephones. In some of the Southern States the percentage runs as high as 96 percent.

During the past two decades, while the number of telephones in the country was expanding, the number of telephones on farms was declining sharply. In 1920 there were 2,498,000 farms with telephones. In 1940 the figure had dropped to 1,527,000. There has been some claim that the number has increased since 1940. Even if this be true, still the vast majority of our farmers are without telephone service. This decline occurred in practically every region and in most States. The downward trend was most marked in the three southern regions—the South Atlantic, the East South Central, and the West South Central. During this 20-year period the number of farms in these three regions dropped 6.2 percent, whereas the number of farms with telephones was reduced by 55.6 percent. In 1920 there was 1 telephone to every 5 farms in these regions. In 1940 there was only 1 telephone to every 11 farms.

You may be interested to know that the largest number of farms without telephones in 1940 lie in one contiguous group. Texas, with more than one-third of a million farms, heads the list. Mississippi, North Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, and Kentucky follow in that order, each of them containing between 200,000 and 300,000 farms without telephones. The others are Georgia, Arkansas, Missouri, Virginia, Louisiana, and Oklahoma. These 12 States contain 2,391,000 farms without telephones, or 57 percent of the total of such farms in the entire country in 1940.

It is almost incredible that a nation blessed with the abundance of material resources which we have and which boasts of the finest telephone system in the world, should have so many farms without any telephone service.

For the vast majority of our farmers, this means real inconvenience. It may mean a long trip to town or a neighbor's house to call the doctor when a member of the family is sick. Or it may mean inability or delay in getting market information which a telephone call might immediately provide. It means that farmers cannot exchange ideas as frequently as need feel on problems of production, etc., and are handicapped in promoting group programs helpful to community life.

Another discouraging aspect of this problem is the fact that too often those farmers who do have telephones find the service unsatisfactory. In some rural areas, it is not unusual to see telephone wires attached to tree trunks and fence posts because the poles have rotted and have not been replaced. Often the wires break down completely and service may be suspended for days at a time. Thousands of the smaller companies have been unable to keep up repairs and have, from this and other causes, been forced to discontinue operations.

From 1927 to 1937, the number of independent telephone companies dropped from 60,123 to 50,534 and many of those discontinuing operations were companies serving rural areas. Where big industry has taken an active interest, there has been some improvement but big industry too often has moved slowly because of the feeling that extension of rural service would be unprofitable; and it has been known to withdraw from such service when it could persuade others to take over the field.

The telephone industry has been giving thought to the problem of extending service to the farmers. I understand that studies have been made by the industry and the Rural Electrification Administration on the feasibility of superimposing carrier telephone channels on rural wires already installed for the distribution of electricity. Recently officials have shown renewed interest in this project and have indicated an intention to put it into operation as soon as materials and manpower are available. Perhaps this system can eventually be a partial answer to the problem of providing the farmers with effective and economical telephone service. However, with the presently available techniques, I believe that American farmers have a right to expect low cost, efficient telephone service as soon as materials and manpower are available.

For the type of telephone service available to the farmer, the costs have generally been higher than he could afford. According to the Department of Agriculture, from 1910 to 1914, the average telephone service charge was $1.39 per month. In 1935-36, it had increased to $1.80. In addition to the basic service charge, in many cases the farmer has had to buy his own telephone, pay for its installation, pay for line extension, and in many instances, pay mileage charges. These combined costs, no doubt, have prevented many farmers, who really want and need it, from getting or maintaining service.

It is significant to note that during the periods when rural telephone service has been declining and when the charges for this service have increased or remained stationary, long-distance toll-telephone rates have gradually decreased. For example, in 1934, the year of the beginning of the administration of the Federal Communications Commission, long-distance toll rates between New York and San Francisco, were $11.25 for person-to-person calls and $9 for station-to-station calls. Present rates from New York to San Francisco are $5 for person-to-person calls and $4 for station-to-station calls, or a reduction of more than 50 percent. And the end has not yet been reached in toll-rate reductions. My dream has been for a $2.50 rate from coast to coast, but I am advised that telephone officials believe that we may some day expect a rate of $1.50 for such calls. Surely new inventions and new techniques, if applied with the same earnestness to rural telephony, will make possible more widespread use of telephones by farmers at lower costs.

The same level of interstate toll rates now prevails over the entire Bell System. That is as I think it should be. Toll rates should be uniform in all localities regardless of the density of population in the area served. In the case of rural communities, however, I would prefer telephone rates which tend to favor rather than handicap those communities.

It is interesting to note that during the thirties while the number of telephones on farms decreased nearly 30 percent, the number of eleectrified farms increased more than 200 percent. In January 1935, only 744,000 out of nearly seven million farms in the United States were served by central electric stations. In January 1940, there were over 1,700,000 so served. More farms were electrified during that 5-year period than during the previous 50 years.

In addition to the wider availability of electric service, the cost to the farmer has progressively dropped since 1910. The reports show that the average cost to the farmer from 1910 to 1923, was 18 cents per kilowatt-hour. From 1923 to 1935, the average approximated 9 cents per kilowatt. During the period from 1935 to 1940, the cost of service dropped to 4½ cents per kilowatt-hour.

The most rapid extension of farm electrification, of course, has taken place since 1935. A large share of the responsibility for this rests squarely on the Rural Electrification Administration and those who have worked with it, a fact of which I am sure you are all aware. You know how the costs of poles, transformers, meters, etc., were reduced, and how lower costs for electric service were realized through the Rural Electrification Administration and those cooperating with it.

In looking further for the explanation of how and why this remarkable progress in rural electrification was achieved, it is necessary to recognize that you have organized to do this job in a way which utilized the tremendous potential of ingenuity, energy, and loyalty within the group of cooperating farmers.

In the field of interstate telephone communication, much progress has been made in improvement of service and reduction in costs. It is estimated that the total reductions in long distance interstate telephone rates during the past 9 years, has amounted to $200,000,000 per year, based on the present volume of business.

While this has been possible partly through new inventions and improved methods of operation, accompanied by a tremendous increase in volume of business, it probably would not have been accomplished in the absence of effective public regulation. It follows from what I have said that the solution of the farm telephone problem calls for the concerted efforts of the industry, the farmers themselves, and the regulatory bodies. However, if the telephone industry with all its resources cannot or will not provide rural telephone service promptly and at reasonable costs when materials and manpower become available, then the millions of farmers in America may well resort to their own collective efforts to secure it as they have secured electric service through the Rural Electrification Administration.

I have suggested certain ways in which farmers can seek to get the higher standard of living which it is our privilege and duty to achieve in these United States. Let me in closing remind you that the obligation will rest on all of us to plan for full employment and a higher standard of living in the post-war period. To bring to farmers the convenience, comfort and other benefits of the communications facilities not now available to them is at once the challenge and the privilege which I present to you.

If you achieve your objectives, you will benefit not only yourselves but the country as well. Greater access to the microphone and the telephone for both rural and city people will raise the cultural and educational level of the whole Nation. It also will stimulate the flow of intelligence which is indispensable to successful democracy.

New York State Merchant Marine Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I hereby insert Senate Resolution 47, which was adopted by the Senate of the State of New York on February 20, 1945, and concurred in by the assembly on February 21, 1945:

Whereas the proper training of officers for the American merchant marine is of recognized importance to the State of New York; and

Whereas the New York State Merchant Marine Academy, which was founded in 1875 by the New York City Board of Education and which became a State institution by chapter 322 of the laws of 1913, has over the years provided training and facilities for many hundreds of men who have served efficiently and honorably in the American merchant marine; and

Whereas said New York State Merchant Marine Academy is now located on lands known as Fort Schuyler Reservation, owned by the United States and leased under act of Congress, approved August 19, 1937 (Public, No. 316, 75th Cong.); and

Whereas in order that the State of New York may fully utilize such land now owned by the United States by providing such new construction as appears necessary and securing the most modern equipment for training purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to accord to the State of New York title in fee to the land now owned by the United States and leased to the State of New York for the use of the New York State Merchant Marine Academy; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

By order of the senate,

WILLIAM S. KING, *Clerk*.

Interview With Hon. Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania, by Mary Morris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] by Mary Morris, published in the February 25 issue of PM. The interview is entitled "Joe Guffey."

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOE GUFFEY—THE BIG-SHOT POLITICAL BOSS WHO IS ALSO A SENATE LIBERAL TELLS MARY MORRIS WHAT MAKES HIM TICK, AND HOW THE SENATE IS LIKELY TO VOTE ON PEACE

(By Mary Morris)

One of the men I was most eager to meet when I went to Washington recently was the paunchy Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania, JOE GUFFEY.

I wanted to find out why, although he is reputed to be a pretty high-handed political boss in Pennsylvania, he has an almost perfect liberal voting record in the Senate; and why, although he is passionately loyal to Franklin D. Roosevelt, he fought against the President's appointment of Will Clayton and other nonliberals to the State Department.

Before I went to see him, I knew this much about JOE GUFFEY: That his importance as a national political figure stems as much from the fact that he bosses the Democratic machine in the second most populous State in the Union as from his position as a Senator. Before 1932 he was active in State politics and was a businessman who played with big-shot financiers. He made—and lost and made again—large sums in oil.

SOURCE OF HIS POWER

But it was his activity at the national convention in '32 and the subsequent Democratic victory that brought him the power he wields today. He went to that convention controlling two-thirds of the Pennsylvania delegates and was among the first to climb on the Roosevelt band-wagon.

When his man won, Boss GUFFEY had a tremendous claim on Federal patronage—in other words, he had the wherewithal to make his boss-ship secure.

I knew also that, unlike most bosses, he had not tied up with big business—he had fought the Pews, the Weirs, the Mellons—and that he had not tied up with the underworld. The powers behind his machine are unions, Negroes, mortgage-ridden farmers. Roosevelt social reforms helped put them behind GUFFEY—Washington newspapermen told me—but there wasn't much doubt they'd been welded there by his manipulation of Federal patronage.

Finally, I knew that many newspapermen and other persons interested in politics considered Guffey simply an opportunist riding a liberal wave. But why, then, in the case of the State Department appointments, had he been more of a liberal than his chief?

SAYS F. D. R. WAS WRONG

When I called on Joe Guffey, I had to wait only a few minutes in the outer office before one of his secretaries told me to go in. I walked through three rooms full of secretaries and clerks. In the fourth, I saw the Senator sitting behind his deck.

I was in my customary pack-horse condition, loaded down with photo paraphernalia, and he commented on it. People always do. I came around the side of the desk to put down the stuff and shake his hand. I saw that he was paunchy, white-haired with black and white tufted eyebrows—a stereotype of the affable politician.

But this affable politician was gazing at me pretty sternly. He said: "You're not going to take my picture!"

It sounded like a statement of fact—not a question—but I figured he was too smart a politician to start arguing with me the moment I stepped into his office.

"Why shouldn't I take your picture?"

"That one PM uses of me is terrible."

I told him I couldn't follow his logic. If he didn't like the picture, this was a good way to get a new one.

"How do I know you're a good photographer?" he said.

If he hadn't seen any of my pictures, there wasn't much I could say—except tell him to trust me and hope for the best.

"There are two questions I won't answer," he said, still stern, but I figured he must be joking. "One is about my age, the other is my religion."

I said that didn't bother me a bit. I'd noticed his age—70—in Who's Who. And I said I didn't have to know his religion—he probably didn't have any. I thought this might get a rise out of him but it didn't. He watched me like a happy cat and we were off to a good start.

I began: How had he felt about opposing the President on the State Department appointments? Wasn't this the first time he'd led a fight against Roosevelt?

"This is the first time he's ever been wrong," GUFFEY snapped. Then he turned down the corners of his mouth in a peculiar, amusing grimace and let out a barking laugh. "First big mistake he's made."

Had he seen the President since?

"Talked to him on the phone—told him I knew I was right. We're still friends."

How did he feel to hear people referring to him as a fighting liberal instead of a machine politician?

WHAT HIS PEOPLE WERE LIKE

"I object to being called a machine politician. Those newspapermen have peculiar ideas. When I'm a leader of a minority party [as he was in Pennsylvania before 1932] I'm a hero. As soon as we elect a Democratic President I'm a machine politician. Now they call me a fighting liberal because I opposed the President. I was born a liberal. The Guffeys have always been liberals. Even on my mother's side we were rebellious—regicides. We got Charles I out and brought Cromwell in. Ten years later, when Charles II ascended the throne, our ancestor was beheaded."

I asked how he had got into politics. All I had found about him in the Congressional Directory, where most men with GUFFEY'S years of political activity fill half a page, was: "Democratic, Pittsburgh, Pa., unmarried." I told him a lot of newspapermen must cuss him out when they turn to that volume looking for a factual history of his career.

"It satisfies me," he said.

Then he got going on the story of his life: "We're Scotch-Irish—left Ireland in 1738, sailed to Philadelphia. Once I put in a speech that we left singing, 'We're off to Philadelphia in the morning.' Lucky I looked it up before I gave the speech. When do you think that song was written?"

I shook my head.

"In 1858. So I changed the speech to say, 'The Guffeys left Ireland in the spirit of that song.'" He smiled with the corners of his mouth down again—sign of a confidential joke.

"Family stayed in Philadelphia for a while, then followed Forbes over the Alleghenies into western Pennsylvania."

When had his interest in politics begun?

"Just old enough in 1896 to vote for Bryan. All the family were Jeffersonians. Father was owner of a gas company, county sheriff on the side. My Uncle Jim, a wealthy man, was State Democratic leader for many years."

I knew he'd left Princeton after 2 years. Why?

"Came home and said, 'Father, there are too many of us in school (three boys and three girls) for your income. When boys leave Princeton they say they're going into business—I want to leave Princeton and go to work. You want me to be a lawyer and I never will.'

"Thank God, I never became a lawyer."

Had he something against lawyers?

"Never mind about that—don't go into it."

Had he met Wilson at Princeton?

"Joined the Undergraduate Democratic Club in freshman year. Met Professor Wilson at the first meeting. Great man—most profound political thinker since Jefferson.

"Later—in 1912—went back to Princeton for a football game and dropped in at Prospect House to see Wilson. Told him I would be a delegate to the convention and would vote for his nomination for President. Came back home and found my Uncle Jim in the other camp—he was for Champ Clark. We fought. After the convention the Wilsonians held the party power in the State. Uncle Jim was out."

What happened?

"We're good fighters in our family," he said. He was quiet for a moment, think-

ing, with a smile across his face. Then he continued, "On election day I handed out $2,500 to my campaign manager. I like to tell this story. At the end of the day he gave me back $1,500. Now doesn't that prove there are some honest politicians?"

I sat there a trifle stunned—trying to get the point of the story. Why had he given out the money at all? Was it quite honest?

"Somebody's got to get out the vote," he went on. "That Hatch Act and the Civil Service—they make the accomplishment of our work very difficult."

"People who sponsored it said the Hatch Act would help clean up politics," I said.

DOES NOT LIKE CIVIL SERVICE

"Who's to pay the costs of running a political party but the people who benefit from it?" he asked. "Now they hide and don't contribute. I've made speeches to them—they've got something at stake worth fighting for. What's wrong with contributing to the campaign fund of a party that works for you?"

In turn, I asked him what he found wrong with civil service.

"Let me tell you," said the Senator, "once I thought civil service would be the millennium but it turned out a delusion and a snare. It develops inefficiency, protects incompetence and promotes extravagance. Young lady," he rose to finish this thought with emphasis, "through civil service in this country we are developing a race of people with nothing for a backbone but a bath towel."

I laughed and asked what he wanted done about it.

"Want the laws improved. Something done about the rules for advancement. It is automatic, you go ahead regardless of whether you are competent.

"Why those people have a lobby down here that beats any other, including the National Association of Manufacturers."

PREFERS POLITICAL MACHINES

I said some people thought Government jobs were handled better through civil service than through political machines.

"You can always change a political machine—weed out the chaff by throwing out the party leaders," he said.

"Since Roosevelt we've rebuilt Pennsylvania as a Democratic State—we've fought for the right things. We saved it from a one-party system. Both parties—Republican and Democratic—were run by big businessmen who cooperated to cheat the common man. We seized the party machinery from the economic royalists and rehabilitated our ranks with members of the working class. Roosevelt got a break for the common man when he set up W. P. A. and P. W. A. Guess it sounds kind of crude, but we removed the wrinkles from the workingman's belly."

I asked if he approved of party machines controlling jobs in schools, post offices, relief projects.

He answered with a story: "Once we appointed an able man to be superintendent of schools. He said he didn't think it should be a political appointment. I told him to wait till the Republicans came in again, and he'd see that politics controlled school jobs whether he liked it or not. He took the job, and a few years later we lost to a Republican governor. My man was swept out."

Maybe, I said, they'd appointed a better man.

"Republicans, in our State, don't consider competent people. They will appoint Republicans. Democrats do a better job by 50 or 60 percent." He watched me write this down. "Make it 75 percent," he said.

WHY HE'S FOR WALLACE

"But remember, young lady," he went on, "no government is 100 percent. There are dishonest men in every branch of life. But the Republican Party, in our State, was conceived in sin and born in corruption." He was standing now behind his desk leaning his elbows on the mantel. He was rather short and his figure reminded me of a duck—dressed in a well-made brown suit, of course.

He continued, "History of this country tells us there can be only two parties—one liberal, the other conservative. The Democrats can't win without the support of industrial laborers and farmers."

I interrupted to ask why, if the Democratic Party knew that, it had not nominated Wallace, the common man's candidate?

"If I'd known about it sooner I'd have won that fight," he said. "Wallace is the most liberal man in the country today. He's the white hope of the liberals. I prefer to vote for a cause rather than a man—with Wallace you've got both."

He walked around the room quickly, restlessly. "The Republican Party has no cause and no candidates to fight for—all they have is money."

He was getting impatient—he had talked swiftly from the start. "Fire on, Gridley—what else do you want to know?"

I said a Democratic Congressman had told me that 80 percent of his work consisted in doing trivial things for his constituents. So long as he tended to their requests, he had said, they didn't care how he voted on such issues as the Dies committee, or on international problems.

"I want to see more internationally minded men in the Congress and the Senate," GUFFEY said, before I could frame a question. "There are too few. Of course, you've got to tend to the people back home. I'll tell you my philosophy, young lady—unless a person likes service he shouldn't go into politics. We get a big mail but I have seven clerks who attend to that. Should have seen the letters that came in when we were opposing the State Department appointments—Maine to California; Portland, Oreg., to Florida. Wasn't a State in the Union we didn't hear from.

"It was the biggest mail we got in here," he said, "since the fight over the holding company bill (an F. D. R. measure outlawing holding companies). That time got ten or twelve thousand in one day from the State of Pennsylvania—obvious propaganda—paid no attention to it.

HE TALLIES THE SENATE

"I used to be in the public-utilities business, you know, greatest of all holding companies. But I was for the bill." He smiled proudly. "I wanta say this: I appreciate the fact that my former friends never tried to buttonhole me and change my views. They knew damn well it wouldn't do any good."

I asked how he knew the mail was organized propaganda. He said it came all in one day, 100 in a bundle, same wording, same ideas. "Straight and to the point," he said. "Letters from real, honest, interested citizens don't sound like that."

I said I supposed the next big fight in the Senate would be over setting up effective machinery for a world organization to make and keep the peace. Was he as fearful as many liberals that the Senate isolationists would cause trouble?

"Listen, young lady, I fought for a world organization last time and I've been fightin' ever since. I've learned a thing or two. We're going to put it over this time. Franklin Roosevelt will avoid the mistakes of Wilson."

But mightn't the isolationists block him if he made international commitments?

He reached across the desk and opened the Congressional Directory. "Let's have a look—don't think there are so many contrary ones." For the next 10 minutes he read off the names of his colleagues saying, "He's all right" or "He isn't." Sometimes he amplified the tag with a comment like, "Can't tell about ——— ———, he's so damned contrary he turns on himself occasionally." Or, "——— ——— is all right, he just doesn't talk. Like GUFFEY **he's** a voter." The final tally was about 75 percent "all rights" and the rest doubtful.

WHY HE DIDN'T MARRY

I said I hoped he was right; then I asked if it was true he didn't make many speeches on the Senate floor.

"I'm a voting Member. Once in awhile when I have something to say I write it down and get up and read it off. There's too much debate, gabble-gabble going on over there."

He paced around again and said, "Where are we now? Suppose you want to know why I never got married." He smiled his foxiest smile, "I'm not going to tell you." A moment later Mr. Bailey, the Senator's man Friday, came in and I asked him why his boss hadn't married. He smiled, too, and said, "Guess the Senator never fell in love. And he wouldn't marry for money."

We all laughed.

Then GUFFEY picked up the phone and put in a call for Sam Rosenman at the White House. While he waited for it to get through, I suggested he ask Judge Rosenman for references on my photography. When the Senator rang off he said the judge had given me a build-up. "Said you like to come to the house. Wanta come to my house?"

I said I would like to. I wanted especially to meet his three sisters, who live with him. "Come tomorrow [Saturday] for lunch. One o'clock." He gave me the address and I left.

Next day I taxied out Massachusetts Avenue to Rock Creek Park, where we turned right to Benton Place. At 1, sharp, I was on the steps of the handsome red-brick Georgian house, admiring the shiny-leafed magnolia in the front yard and the two old carriage lamps on either side of the door. My ring was answered by a Filipino butler in a white jacket. As I entered, the Senator was coming down the stairs at the end of the hall. We shook hands, and then, just as in a well-directed stage play, his two maiden sisters made their entrances, each coming into the hallway from a different room, one at a time. First the elder. "May I present my sister, Ida?" said the Senator. She was most gracious, said she was happy I had come. Then came Miss Pauletta, who said the same thing. She looked more like the Senator—Miss Ida was taller and thinner, reminded me of the late Sarah Delano Roosevelt, the President's mother.

We walked through the handsomely decorated living room—fine old furniture—to the sun porch. There we were joined by Emma Guffey Miller, Democratic National Committeewoman from Pennsylvania, who came in with a burst and shook my hand stoutly.

HIS FATHER'S BEST ADVICE

Conversation flew, all the girls talking like mad. Once in a while I'd shoot a glance at the Senator, who was sitting next to me. He watched his sisters like a man following the ball at a tennis match; he didn't have a chance. Finally our eyes met. "Have to wait," he said. "I'll get my say when they're tired."

While the conversation was not brilliant, it was lively—about problems of the hour and the Washington personalities involved. For me there was a certain wonder and amusement in finding in one house three leisure-class women so full of ideas and information about matters outside their household.

Old-fashioneds were served but the Senator had tomato juice. "Trying to take off some weight," he said. Then he recalled the best advice his father had given him. "Before I left for Princeton, father said, "Never drink on an empty stomach and remember we're Scotch-Irish: no champagne—whisky is our drink.'"

With this Mrs. Miller shot off on stories about her work for repeal and about other battles she's had in her day. "First I was a suffragette—now I campaign for equal

rights. Women have only the vote; they still haven't equality before the law."

HOW IT WAS AT HOME

At lunch, when the soup had been served, I asked the question that had been in the front of my mind. How had the Guffey girls become so interested in politics?

"Why, we've been talking politics as long as we can remember," piped up Miss Pauletta. "Our family's been political minded since they landed in Philadelphia in 1736."

"But where'd you get your liberalism from—your father?"

All four soup spoons paused in the air. The Guffeys were shocked. They replied in unison with an ascending inflection, "Thomas Jefferson!"

"We were Jeffersonians from the begining," said the Senator. "In Andrew Jackson's time we became militant—just as we have under Franklin Roosevelt."

"Our mother's family may have been Republicans. But further back," said Miss Ida, "they were regicides. When mother married father she became a Democrat."

"Our grandmother was very independent," said Miss Pauletta.

"They used to tell the story about grandmother," said Mrs. Miller. "She took her bridal trip on horseback and when they came to a stream grandfather hesitated, saying, 'Martha, I'm afraid to have you cross the water.' Grandmother just kicked her horse and said, 'Come on, Paul.' "

"Grandmother used to go outdoors and enjoy herself," said Miss Ida. "Women in our family didn't knit."

"We had the first stone house west of the Alleghenies," put in Miss Pauletta.

"Mother was a conservationist," said Mrs. Miller. "Know what that is?"

"Saving trees," I said.

"Yes; but also to prevent erosion and floods."

"How did your father feel about suffrage?" I asked.

"He was for it," said Mrs. Miller. "In our family he didn't make any difference between the boys and the girls. We all always talked affairs at the table."

"Remember when Miss Kate McKnight ran for school director in Pittsburgh?" said Miss Ida. "He was for her."

"Of course, you can't get liberal ideas," said the Senator, "unless you've seen something. I saw what happened to the miners, I saw H. C. Frick wreck the Knights of Labor. In 1892, I watched the Homestead strike—150 to 200 strikers killed."

"How'd your father feel about strikes?"

"He didn't like to see property destroyed but he was for human rights above property rights."

HE CONSIDERS AN EPITAPH

After lunch I pulled out my camera, longing to take a picture of this extraordinary family but the Senator put his foot down. "Only Mrs. Miller and I will pose—we are the politicians."

I am sorry to report I did not get the kind of pictures I wanted even with the Senator. He posed with that very polite impatience that is plain murder to good portraiture. There are almost no good pictures of him though he is often photographed and is very photogenic.

When I left at 3 o'clock, he came to the door with me. We were talking about his battle for a workable Federal soldiers' vote law. During the fight he had read a strong statement on the floor of the Senate and there had been a flare-up. He was lashed even by some Democrats. "They sold the party down the river."

"But the fight you put up," I said "was good work."

"Well," he said, "we've got the Guffey burying ground in West Newton, Pennsylvania—three or four generations planted there. When they bury me they can say, He kept the faith." He smiled and looked at me thoughtfully. "Nope," he said, "that's too sentimental for a practical fella like me."

The Army's Furlough Rotation Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from a Paterson, N. J., G. I. in the South Pacific commenting on the War Department's rotation furlough policy.

Some of us—

He writes—

could not wait for a definite policy so we have prepared one of our own. With all our difficulties it serves to emphasize that even here the good old American sense of humor still prevails.

The G. I. rotation policy, described as "W. D. Circular 10739, Rotation of Personnel, dated 5 November 1944," reads as follows:

Under WD Circular No. 10739, minimum periods of eligibility for relief via rotation have been established for the S. W. P. A. Selection of home-bound contingents is strictly up to the theater commander, and it must be kept in mind that eligibility does not bestow the right to be relieved, but only establishes a basis for selection. In accordance with USAFFE Regulation No. 11-12, Homesickness and Nostalgia in Isolated Regions, the following eligibility rules will govern the rotation of troops in this area:

I. Enlisted men, officers, and second lieutenants eligible:

Must have spent 7 or more years in the S. W. P. A., at least 4 of which were in regions north of the Philippine Islands. He is ineligible, however, if his name has been entered on the sick book during that period. The following are the qualifications for men declared eligible:

A. Must have at least 3 broken limbs at the time of application. Compound or linear fractures, strains, sprains, or ruptures will not be accepted, the break must be clean. The condition of each injured limb must be authenticated on MD Form No. 212p, Minor Mishaps and Abrasions, in triplicate.

B. Must have been awarded the Order of the Purple Heart with at least two (2) Oak Leaf Clusters. In addition, he must have in his possession at least five (5) of the following medals: Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, Iron Cross, Order of the Knights of the Bath, Navy Cross, Legion of Merit, Order of the Soviet Union, Order of the Rising Sun, or the D. O. F. Documentary proof must accompany each decoration.

II. The following men, even though they may possess the above qualifications, will not, repeat not, be eligible for return to the continental limits of the United States:

A. Men who during the course of their Army tenure have contracted any of the following diseases: Athlete's foot, scurvy, beriberi, ringworm, malaria, St. Vitus dance, bubonic plague, common cold, sore throat, B. O., or halitosis.

B. Men who have been in New Guinea for a period in excess of 30 days. Exceptions to this rule will be those men who may be considered inured to the climate by reason of having spent at least 12 years in either the Panama jungles, Tibet, Burma, Texas, Georgia, or Utah. In this case the man will present a written request to his first sergeant asking that WD AGO Form No. 0-212j, Previous Record of Uncivilized Habitants, be obtained from Washington, D. C. This form will be filled out in quadruplicate and the following documents appended thereto:

1. Photostatic copies of graduate degrees from not less than four accredited universities or colleges.

2. Civilian driver's license in duplicate.

3. Financial statement of earnings for the fiscal year ending December 10, 1943, in triplicate, if any.

4. Clinical history of family, friends, previous employer, and associated pool hall proprietors, entered on WD AGO Form No. 225b.

III. Among those eligible for rotation, the following precedence has been established:

A. Men over 55 years of age who have completed 44 consecutive years of faithful overseas service.

B. Married men with 12 or more children. Must have been formally engaged prior to December 7, 1941, midnight.

C. Men who have become deceased, providing the fatality was incurred in line of duty and his name has been properly registered with the Graves Registration Office. In no case will a deceased man be repatriated to the mother country if he has been deceased over 3 months unless WD AGO Form No. 363p, Authorized Mortality, has been accomplished in triplicate. If a man dies while waiting to be rotated, it will be interpreted to mean that he does not wish to return to the United States, and his application will be automatically canceled. Furthermore, if it is established that he has accepted mortality without authorization, his corpse is subject to disciplinary action under AW 96, Deliberately Circumvention of Authorized Dying Procedure.

D. Men in lower ranks, or EM, who formerly held the rank of major general or over, providing the reduction in grade was not the result of his own misconduct.

IV. If a man possesses all the above qualifications, he may then obtain IG Form No. 27730, Application to the Interviewed and Preparation for Packing "B" Barracks Bag, and having filled out the required 23 copies, will await further instructions. Men who violate the foregoing instructions by questioning competent authorities on matters pertaining to their status will be remanded to the custody of the officer in charge, base stockade, to await a general court-martial in conformance with USAFFE Regulation No. 7-9681, Impertinent Overtures.

V. No troops will be rotated before 1947, and a 2-year statute of limitations will be imposed on all applications. This does not prevent anyone from reapplying after the 2-year period has elapsed, providing AF Form No. 7768p, Reasons for Establishment of Priority to Regain Citizenship, is executed in quintuplicate.

No applications will be accepted until further notice, as all troops are at present frozen.

Bon voyage.

Four Hundred Million Tons of Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a timely editorial appeared in the Washington News yesterday in reference to the Missouri Valley Authority. Under the per-

mission granted me, I include it as part of my remarks:

Soil students say the Missouri River carries 400,000,000 tons of farm soil from the basin into the Gulf of Mexico every 12 months. That's too extravagant, not only for Missouri Basin dwellers, but also for every American who likes dinner.

It means bright youngsters quit the basin and go elsewhere to earn a living. It means those who remain face an unnecessarily restricted existence. It means a vast area which could prosper is backsliding along its own sort of "Tobacco Road."

The Tennessee River Valley was like that. But in 1933 the American people created the T. V. A. Now look at the place: Jobs, light bulbs, for barns, youngsters winning niches of contentment right where they grew up. The community is becoming a dream spot of the world.

It can happen to the Missouri Basin. The Missouri River can be dammed to produce electricity and to provide irrigation as needed. The river is willing. But it has to be harnessed.

An M. V. A. will mean an end to carrying loam from farm to ocean. It's a post-war must.

The Juke-Box Curfew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include therewith an editorial from the Toledo Blade of February 26, 1945, directing our attention to the dangers of falling into totalitarianism when we are fighting against it. The Toledo Blade is that great newspaper founded by the philosopher and humorist, David R. Locke, better known as "Petroleum" V. Nasby. This editorial was written by his residuary-legatee, Grove Patterson, outstanding philosopher, journalist, and a man who in moral character is, like Caesar's wife, above reproach.

THE JUKE-BOX CURFEW

We find it a little amusing to assume the role of advocate for the juke-box. It happens that we don't care much for the sort of music which most such boxes emit. When some hot jive fan drops a nickel in the slot to bring forth the strains of "One O'clock Jump" we wish there were a slot where we could drop a second nickel to restore peace and quiet. It would be cheap at half the price.

But the juke-box has become a symbol, thanks to a stupid, senseless, arbitrary order by the War Manpower Commission implementing Director Byrnes' request for a midnight curfew in all entertainment places, including private clubs.

To maintain the proper perspective on the issue, let's not forget that when Mr. Byrnes announced his "request" last Monday, it was stated that its purpose was to save gas and coal. We expressed doubt at the time as to whether that was the real purpose and suggested that somebody in Washington had sold a bill of puritanism to the Government. The W. M. C. directive bears out that suspicion beyond the possibility of challenge.

How much gas or coal is consumed operating a juke box? Suppose the owner turned off the fancy lights and used just enough current to revolve the record and amplify the music. You might as well order every owner of a radio set to turn it off at midnight. Perhaps the next thing will be an order to housewives to disconnect their electric refrigerators before retiring.

The whole business, insofar as saving gas and coal is concerned, is a farce. It applies to sunny Florida as well as snow-bound Maine. It is of indefinite duration, not for a week or two until winter-stalled freight yards can be cleared. Light company officials laugh at the possible saving involved. Night clubs will open a couple hours earlier and burn just as much electricity as on the old schedule—which is quite all right with W. M. C. and Mr. Byrnes so long as the doors close at midnight.

The regulations are a preposterous abuse of power granted for wholly different purposes. That is the crux of the matter, which should concern every citizen—including those who don't know what the inside of a bar or a skating rink or a circus or a country club looks like. If administration agencies can twist measures designed to help the war into strait-laced restrictions to govern the manners, morals, or personal habits of every man and woman in the country—without any chance for them to say yes, no, or maybe—it is time to call a halt.

The philosophy back of this regulation is that the state knows best. That is totalitarian philosophy and we thought we were fighting against it.

Signal to the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 28, 1945:

SIGNAL TO THE HOUSE

The Senate Judiciary Committee should not suppose for a moment that the public will fail to see through the flimsy barricade it has thrown up against current demands for repeal of the two-thirds rule for approval of treaties. The only excuse it can find for refusing to consider any proposed constitutional amendment during the war is that soldiers who are out of the country might not like it. There are many indications that an overwhelming majority of our men in uniform would warmly approve the amendment designed to take from one-third plus one of the Senate control over major segments of our foreign policy.

We think the Senate ought to have the courage to translate this demand of soldiers and civilians alike into legislative action. This is no time for statesmen to be hiding behind the pretense that preparation for peace must await the return of our defenders from the battle lines. Soldiers are men of action. They expect Congress to do its duty here at home as they are doing theirs on the firing line.

This timorous maneuver on the part of the Senate should not impede the House in its determination to go forward with a resolution repealing the two-thirds rule. In fact, the Senate committee's reactionary attitude is the signal for the House to move forward. Apparently the Senate will have to be blasted out of its foxhole of entrenched power from which a minority can thwart the majority will on peace. Let the House lead the attack on this indefensible position and the people will quickly rally to its support.

Full Employment After the War—The Murray Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Charles Darlington, containing an interview with Beardsley Ruml, published in the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune of February 8, 1945, relating to the full employment bill which is now pending in the Senate, and also an editorial entitled "The Murray Bill," published in the last issue of the Commonweal.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune of February 8, 1945]

WOULD ADOPT THREE MEASURES

(By Charles Darlington)

Beardsley Ruml, nationally known author of the Ruml pay-as-you-go Federal income-tax plan, addressed a combined meeting of the chamber of commerce and Rotary Club Thursday noon at Hotel Fort Des Moines.

Ruml, a native of Cedar Rapids, is treasurer of R. H. Macy & Co., and chairman of the New York Federal Reserve Bank. He is 6 feet tall and weighs more than 200 pounds. He is a graduate of Dartmouth College, but admitted Thursday that he did not do much with football.

Ruml in an interview praised the Murray full employment bill, just introduced in the United States Senate to provide post-war jobs.

He said that, briefly, it provides that every man in the country able and willing to work is to have a job after reconversion is accomplished. These jobs are to be furnished by private enterprise on private projects, and by letting contracts for public works to private enterprise to piece out the program if necessary.

BACKING

He said the bill has the backing of Senators MURRAY, WAGNER, O'MAHONEY, and THOMAS, and predicted that it will receive strong support in the Senate.

"The Murray bill has an intellectual history which began back in the 1920's," he said. "The idea of using public works to piece out the business cycle is not new.

"It is the American expression of a world-wide tendency to make sure that the powers of the people are used to eliminate mass unemployment.

"In my opinion, the objectives of the bill can be more surely obtained if three measures are adopted that will tend automatically to stabilize prosperity at a high level."

MEASURES

These measures are:

1. The tax rate should be reduced to a point where it will balance the Budget at a high level of employment.

2. Public works should be planned and administered to stabilize the construction industry at around $15,000,000,000 a year.

3. We should get the inflation out of social security by putting it on a pay-as-you-go basis.

"If these three policies are adopted, the tasks to be performed under the Murray bill will be of much more manageable proportions."

INCOME

Ruml was definitely of the opinion that the United States must have a post-war annual income of $140,000,000,000 or must face the only alternative—mass unemployment. He said the standard of living must be from 40 to 50 percent higher after the war.

"That's no New Deal propaganda," he said, with his quick smile," but just plain arithmetic."

Discussing the problem of employment in his address, Ruml said along this same line: "High employment requires a standard of living nearly a generation in advance of where we are today. We face a compelling situation of unprecedented magnitude, and our social, political, and economic ideas must be adapted to the realities as they exist in fact.

"We must guard ourselves from dangers from two quarters—on the one side, from the regimenters and on the other, from the economic appeasers. The regimenters would attack the employment problem by over-all regimentation of supply and demand, wages, prices, and profits, forgetting that the end result would be regimented employment.

"The economic appeasers would get rid of the problem by saying that mass unemployment is inevitable and that we might as well make the best of it. To them, 8,000,000 unemployed is the statistical consequence of a private, free enterprise system. They forget that the unemployed and their families are not willing to be the statistical consequence of anything, and that there are more of them than there are of the appeasers."

The speaker emphasized that the primary post-war objective is high employment under a democratic private enterprise system, and that the national fiscal and monetary policies should contribute to that end.

He expressed opposition to a general sales tax as a "burden on the standard of living," and advocated abolition of all excise taxes except those on tobacco, alcohol, and perhaps gasoline. He advocated also abolition of the corporation income tax, pointing out that "after sales and excise taxes, the corporation income tax weighs heavily on the standard of living of the people, and at the same time, obstructs the flow of savings to investment."

He added that another unfortunate consequence of the corporation income tax is that the same earnings are taxed twice—once when they are earned, and again when they are distributed.

[From the Commonweal]

THE MURRAY BILL

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, has introduced a bill of monumental consequences. It is significant less for what it proposes to do than for its declaration of principles. Section 2 of this bill reads in part as follows: "The Congress hereby declares that—(a) It is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce and in the development of the natural resources of the United States; (b) All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right; (c) In order to carry out the policies set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and in order to (1) promote the general welfare of the Nation; (2) foster and protect the American home and the American family as the foundation of the American way of life; (3) raise the standard of living of the American people; (4) provide adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans; (5) contribute to the full utilization of our national resources; (6) develop trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations; (7) preserve and strengthen competitive private enterprise, particularly small business enterprise; (8) strengthen the national defense and security; and (9) contribute to the establishment and maintenance of lasting peace among nations, it is essential that continuing full employment be maintained in the United States."

This proposal to acknowledge juridically the citizen's right to a job is extraordinarily significant and completely sound morally. From the point of view of a hard-boiled economist, such a juridical principle may seem absurd because impractical. But we have no proof from experience that it is impractical, and since the end it seeks to accomplish is obviously desirable, the proposed legislation, we believe, represents one of those gambles which our society must make.

The Murray bill will be attacked both from the right and from the left. The disciples of Marx will accuse it of not going far enough and of placing too much reliance upon free enterprise. Conservatives will call it visionary and will see in it a dire threat to liberty and an increase in the power of government over the daily lives of its citizens. It will be labeled totalitarian by some and weakly conservative by others. Yet it is certainly a notable proposal in its bold juridical novelty, and all but the most die-hard of old fashioned capitalists will probably have to grant that it is a step in the right direction. The means whereby the bill proposes to implement its preamble are debatable; the preamble itself comes like a breath of fresh air in our legislative thinking.

Hawaii's Debt to New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia each year commemorates the anniversary of the signing of the famous Mayflower Compact on board the *Mayflower*, in Cape Cod waters, on November 21, 1620, with a Compact Day dinner, and appropriate attendant features. Thus, the three hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of the signing was celebrated by the society on the 21st of last November, at Hotel 2400, Sixteenth Street, Washington. The occasion was a notable one. Music was furnished by the United States Marine Band Orchestra, and two distinguished speakers addressed the gathering—the Netherlands Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Alexander Loudon; and the able Delegate in Congress from Hawaii, Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON. Our former colleague in the House, Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky and Washington, governor of the society, presided.

Delegate FARRINGTON'S address was of such an interesting and informative character that, under leave granted, I include it herewith:

NEW ENGLAND GAVE HAWAII CHRISTIANITY

One author describes the New England missionaries who went to Hawaii as the pilgrims of Hawaii. They sprang from the same hardy stock of people, were fired by the same religious zeal, traveled even further than the original Pilgrims to accomplish their mission, and despite enormous differences in environment achieved results of remarkable similarity.

The New England missionaries arrived in Hawaii on March 30, 1820, 200 years after their forebears reached New England. The latter traveled to American in search of religious freedom for themselves. The New England missionaries traveled to Hawaii to carry the word of God to the native people of those islands.

And this they did most effectively. They left Boston on October 23, 1819. At that time they did not know that within 2 weeks of their departure the kapu system of idolatrous worship had been overthrown by the native people of the islands. This was subsequently accepted by them as evidence of the favor of God. In any event, it paved the way for the rapid introduction of Christianity.

The ruling chiefs readily embraced this new religion. By 1840 there were missions on all the islands. And some years before that time, the missionaries in Hawaii were being advised from Boston to be more lenient in admitting the native people to membership in the church, so eager were the latter to join. And thus Christianity was firmly established among the people of these islands.

NEW ENGLAND GAVE HAWAII ITS WRITTEN LANGUAGE IN CONVERTING THE NATIVE PEOPLE TO CHRISTIANITY

In the process it was necessary to reduce the language of the native people to writing. By 1826, 6 years after the arrival of the missionaries, the alphabet had been perfected. By 1832 the printing of the New Testament in Hawaiian had been completed and by 1839, the printing of the entire Bible in the native tongue had been finished. The missionaries had been thoughtful enough to include among their original number a printer. So even before the Bible had been reproduced in the native language, many tracts and pamphlets appropriate to the work of converting and educating the Hawaiian people had been produced.

NEW ENGLAND GAVE HAWAII THE COMMON SCHOOL

As an essential counterpart of this work was the introduction of educational training. The enthusiasm of the ruling chiefs for the training of the New England missionaries was so great that it was only on the insistence of the latter that they be allowed time to extend their work to the common people. The ruling chiefs were taught the English language in the first classes. The text books were Webster's spelling book, Watts' catechism, and the English Bible.

In the meantime the people were rapidly mastering the ability to read their own language as it had been reduced to writing by the missionaries. There was developing a strong appetite for education. Recognizing this development, the queen regent, prime minister, and chief met in 1824 in Honolulu and "declared their determination to adhere to the instructions of the missionaries, to attend to learning, observe the Sabbath, worship God, and obey his law, and have all their people instructed." Common schools sprang up all over the Islands.

NEW ENGLAND GAVE HAWAII PUBLIC-SCHOOL EDUCATION

By 1840 public education was established by law as the result of these influences.

These laws were corollary to the first Hawaiian Constitution, which was likewise the work of these New England missionaries who saw the necessity of stabilizing political practices if the results of their efforts were to be successfully maintained. Within slightly more than 10 years the foundation had been laid for a thoroughly American type of education with hundreds of small schools welded into a well-organized system on a tax-supported basis. Not the least interesting fact of this development is that it was carried out under the direction of Richard Armstrong, whose son, Samuel A. Armstrong, was to found, after the Civil War, the Hampton Institute in Virginia. It was Richard Armstrong who introduced English as a medium of instruction in public education, and who gave to the curriculum a vocational education emphasis long before it was the common practice elsewhere.

The development of a school system in Hawaii along American lines is well described by Dr. Benjamin O. Wist, dean of the teachers' college of the University of Hawaii, who writes:

"In every particular the Hawaiian public school system became American in practice before it became American in fact. With the very first school laws of 1840, the propriety of the state to control public education was established. Legal enactments which followed from time to time served to strengthen and to fix this principle in Hawaiian educational philosophy. With the reorganization effected in 1855, the board-control concept was adopted. Changes later effected brought about a standard-sized board and one that was lay in its composition. Even more than is typical in American practice, the board of educational control in Hawaii has established general educational policy and has exercised direct administrative jurisdiction. Before annexation Hawaii was exercising its right to establish and maintain state institutions, in the establishment of the Honolulu Normal School."

"Since the year 1852, public education in Hawaii has received part of its support from public lands realizations. Perhaps the most interesting development in Hawaiian educational history was the change from the Hawaiian to the English language. Its use became almost universal before the end of the monarchy. By legal enactment the English language was made the sole medium of instruction in the public schools during the period of the Republic."

NEW ENGLAND GAVE HAWAII DEMOCRACY

The devotion to the principles and the spirit of democracy that ruled the attitudes of these New England missionaries was evident from the outset of their work in Hawaii. The Pilgrims who had come from Holland and England to America organized in a meeting held in the cabin of the Mayflower before landing on Plymouth Rock. The pilgrims who set out for Hawaii met in the mission on February 23, 1823 and in a single sentence perfected what has been called their Organic Act. It said:

"We, the undersigned ministers and missionaries of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Sandwich Islands being sent for the defence of the truth and for the enlightening of the Gentiles, agree to unite in an association for mutual improvement and mutual aid in laying the foundation, maintaining the order, and building up the house of the Lord in these islands of the sea."

The Reverend and Mrs. Orramel Hinckley Gulick, in describing the operation of this mission, said:

"This mission was a democracy, a small but a true one, where the majority ruled and where no dictator prevailed. Every vital question was fully and frankly discussed until a decision was reached in a vote of the majority."

NEW ENGLAND GAVE HAWAII MODERN GOVERNMENT

It was to the New England missionaries that the native rulers turned for advice as the needs for modernizing their government became pressing. William Richards was released from the mission to enter the service of the king as an advisor and instructor. His first service was to deliver a course of lectures to the chiefs on political economy and the general science of government. He used as the basis for his lectures the Waylands system set forth in the Elements of Political Economy by Francis Wayland, the president of Brown University.

Out of these influences evolved a bill of rights for the native people, constitutional government in which the absolute rule of the native monarchs was gradually displaced by a more modern pattern of government; private ownership of land once the exclusive right of the native monarchs, an adequate system of financial management that was largely the work of another missionary, a judicial system patterned along American lines and a form of government whose stability won for the island kingdom recognition of its right to independence.

NEW ENGLAND GAVE HAWAII MODERN INDUSTRY

Thus was laid the groundwork for the industrial development that followed the treaty of reciprocity of 1876 between the Hawaiian monarchy and the United States. The genius for organization and the industry of New England began then to express itself in the development of the Hawaiian Islands along agricultural lines. The importation of labor from many parts of the world followed. The evolution of the islands from an isolated and primitive Polynesian community into an industrialized American commonwealth was entering its final stages.

NEW ENGLAND GAVE HAWAII AMERICA

It was only natural, therefore, that in the course of another generation these islands which had been so thoroughly nurtured and developed in the religious, educational, governmental, and industrial traditions of New England should achieve annexation as an integral part of this country by the mutual agreement of the people of the islands and the people of this country.

Through almost a century they had been prepared in the school of New England training to take their place as a Territory in the American scheme of things. They became, by law of Congress enacted in 1900, American citizens with a large measure of local control that was the result of the recognition that much progress along American lines had already been achieved under the influences that took hold in Hawaii in 1820.

Today the Territory of Hawaii is an American community in all the essential features of its life and thinking despite its Polynesian background, the great diversity in the racial origin of its people, and its thoroughly tropical environment.

It lives and thinks in the same pattern as the people of New England with the sons and daughters of native Hawaiians holding their American citizenship as the source of their greatest pride, the sons and daughters of oriental immigrants declaiming in oratorical contests their devotion to the principles of our forefathers who landed at Plymouth Rock, and the sons and daughters of New England pioneers the first and most aggressive in attesting to the thorough loyalty to the highest American traditions of all the American citizens of these islands.

The New England church steeple is a familiar landmark in almost every community of Hawaii. But even more impressive are the results of the philanthropy of the descendants of those who came to establish these churches. Their philanthropies include a remarkably diverse group of institutions for religious worship and training, education in many fields to meet the special needs of virtually every group of people who have come to the islands; libraries, academies of art, museums and hospitals, and homes for the care of the sick, the aged and the friendless. The names that they carry in their list of benefactors, directors, buildings, and rooms sound like a roster of the original visitors from New England.

It was the little grass shack that originally performed the functions of the little red schoolhouse, but the difference in housing material altered in none of its essential spirit the functioning of this fundamental New England institution in Hawaii. From this humble beginning has emerged a system of free public school education for which the government of the Territory spends almost half of all its funds, employs more than 3,000 teachers, and provides a high standard of training for about 100,000 boys and girls, or almost a fourth of the entire population. One of the private schools that came into being soon after the missionaries arrived is today among the leading institutions of its kind in the country, and operates as thoroughly in the tradition of New England's preparatory schools as it did more than 100 years ago. The special needs of virtually every racial and religious group have brought into being appropriate schools in consequence of the conviction, early established in these islands by the New England missionaries, that in education is to be found not only the solution of most of the problems of human life, but the means for successfully maintaining the democratic and American way of life.

The territorial form of government very readily met the needs of the people of these islands when by annexation they became an integral part of the country.

The citizens of the Republic of Hawaii became citizens of the United States by act of Congress. By long training in the traditions of New England, the Hawaiians were well prepared to assume this responsibility as the record of some 44 years will well testify. They carry today virtually all the responsibilities of a State government, and look forward to becoming a State in the near future.

The development of the cultural, social, political, and industrial life of these islands in the pattern of the New England tradition has long passed the state where it can still be described as an experiment. This term was popular with those who were in doubt as to whether these methods were best adapted to a population which, unlike that of New England or any other part of the country, had been drawn for the most part from the Pacific, from Polynesian, and Asiatic stock. Certainly there can be no question of the deep devotion of the people of these islands to the idea of American democracy so thoroughly implanted by their New England training.

They have found in these principles the basis upon which they can live together in harmony to their mutual advancement and profit. They have been happy. They have prospered. They have achieved a measure of racial tolerance refreshing and unique to people more accustomed to the attitudes that prevail in many parts of the States.

Their devotion to the best traditions and customs of this country are always particularly evident at this time of the year as the children in all the schools and the families in most of the island homes prepare for the observance of Thanksgiving Day with all the traditional detail of New England. Few of them have ever been in New England. More likely than not their ancestors originated in the islands of the Pacific, in the Far East, and in recent generations in Europe. But this will not alter the enthusiasm, and may indeed add a certain measure of extra zeal in a celebration that will be marked by a deep sense of obligation and great pride in the

New England background, in the contribution of the New England missionaries to making these islands a typically American commonwealth, and to give thanks anew to divine providence for the abundant life that they enjoy.

The U. S. S. "Amherst Victory", Mrs. Edith Mayer Goetz, Sponsor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, another Victory ship, the U. S. S. *Amherst Victory*, was launched today at the yards of the California Ship Building Corporation, Wilmington, Calif.

It is teamwork that will win this war for the United States and one of the most valuable assets of the team is the program of the Maritime Commission. When history is written great credit will be given not only to the Maritime Commission but to the men and women employed in the shipyards throughout the United States.

Naming cargo ships is no easy task. In connection with the Victory ships, 62 names of old American colleges and universities have been assigned to this type of vessel. I have been advised by the Maritime Commission that the Victory ship has been designed by the Maritime Commission as a fast, modern cargo ship, supplanting the slower Liberty type, and adaptable for post-war service in the American merchant marine. The hull of the first Victory ship was laid November 19, 1943, at the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg. This vessel, the *United Victory*, was launched on January 12, 1944, and delivered February 29. At this time, Liberty ships, of which the Commission has built and delivered 2,620 to date, were still being launched from 10 shipyards. During the following months, 6 yards were turned over to Victory ship production, 5 on the west coast and 1 in the East.

To date contracts have been let for the construction of 668 Victory type ships. As of February 1, 1945, 287 Victory hulls have been launched, including 113 of a special military type delivered to the Navy. The first 35 in the Victory cargo series were named for the United Nations. The following 165 were named for small cities and towns in the United States. Those delivered to the Navy have been named for counties. A current series is being named in honor of American colleges and universities.

Under the program honoring educational institutions, the name of the ship consists of the name of the college followed by the word "victory," such as *Harvard Victory, Yale Victory*. The list from which names are selected is made up of all colleges and universities in the United States having a student body of more than 500. The order of assignment follows as closely as possible the chronological order of the dates of founding. Names which duplicate names already assigned to naval or merchant vessels cannot be used. In most cases, names of more than two words have also been eliminated because of undue length in combination with the word "victory." For both these reasons the names of State universities have not been included in the program.

Greatest advantage of the Victory ship over the Liberty is her increased speed. The Liberty has a speed of a little more than 11 knots, while the Victory is designed for 15 knots or more.

The increased speed of the Victory ship has been made possible by installing a turbine-gear power plant of 6,000 horsepower or more. The reciprocating engine of the Liberty has 2,500 horsepower.

Another difference between the two types of ships is the design of finer bow and stern lines for the Victory to conform to its greater propulsion power.

The new Victory ship also has slightly greater length—455 feet, compared with 441.5 feet for the Liberty. The Victory has a beam of 62 feet, while that of the Liberty is 57 feet.

The *Amherst Victory* is named for Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., founded in 1821, and is the seventh of the college-named Victory ships to be launched by the California Ship Building Corporation at Wilmington, Calif. This vessel is the eighty-fourth in the Victory-type series built by this yard.

There is no doubt in my mind that Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, was thinking of his own college days when the decision was reached to honor the colleges and universities. "Jerry Land," as he is known, not only made a great record during the period that he was at Annapolis but he was a great athlete and participated in many a victory in connection with the Naval Academy's athletic program. Next to ships and shipbuilding he knows as much about football, baseball, and other sports as any graduate of the Naval Academy. There are few men in the world who have a more thorough knowledge of ships and shipbuilding than Admiral Land. He was a retired naval officer when called upon to head the Maritime Commission and many will be surprised to know that the great service he rendered has cost the Government but a small amount of money. As a retired naval officer he received retired pay but under the law when he accepted the position as head of the Maritime Commission his increase in pay was only that between what he was receiving as a retired officer and the statutory salary allowed the Chairman of the Commission, a few thousand dollars a year. There is not a shipbuilding corporation in the world that would not be overanxious to secure his services at a salary many times above that which he is paid by his Government. Too advanced in years to serve on the high seas he makes his contribution to his Government toward winning the war by being the head of the Maritime Commission.

The men at the battle front are in the front line but the cargo vessels are in the back field. Without the cargo vessels we could never win this war. They must take to Europe and the Far East not only the munitions of war but the food and other supplies that are so necessary for the upkeep of our Army and Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I come from St. Louis, in the center of the country. Thousands of skilled mechanics, too old to serve with the Army or Navy, are contributing toward the success of the Maritime Commission by accepting employment in the various shipbuilding yards on the Atlantic, Pacific, and the Gulf. The great majority of them never saw the ocean nor an oceangoing ship before they accepted this employment. They not only are contributing their skill but their sons and daughters are members of the armed forces.

The sponsor for the U. S. S. *Amherst Victory* was Mrs. Edith Mayer Goetz, charming wife of Mr. William Goetz, founder and owner of the International Picture, Inc. She is the daughter of Mr. Louis B. Mayer, the motion picture magnate. Mr. Mayer and other outstanding officials of the motion-picture industry have made great contributions during the period of this war, which has helped materially to improve the morale of those in our armed forces. Their films are sent throughout the world and the outstanding actors and actresses, under contract to the industry, have covered the globe entertaining our armed forces in foreign countries.

Having had letters from residents of my city who are employed by the California Ship Building Corporation, I sent a message of congratulations to Mrs. Goetz and through her to those who are responsible for the construction of the ship. That message follows:

DEAR MRS. GOETZ: The launching of the U. S. S. *Amherst Victory* is an additional contribution toward ultimate victory. Your sponsorship of this outstanding vessel will be an inspiration to those who will carry out the important part that it will play in future war operations.

My congratulations to you and through you to those who were responsible for the construction of this great vessel.

With best wishes for its success.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. COCHRAN.

From the Maritime Commission I secured a copy of the message sent to Mrs. Goetz by Admiral Land. It follows:

Congratulations and every good wish for the successful launching of the good ship *Amherst Victory*. The combination of a charming sponsor and a splendid ship at Calship speaks well for her success on her important war mission. Godspeed to the *Amherst Victory* and congratulations to all hands.

E. S. LAND, *Chairman*.

Mr. Speaker, what a vast difference there is between our ship-building program during the First World War and our present ship-building program. As we all remember, many wooden vessels were constructed during the First World War. They were slow, costly to operate, and at the conclusion of the war were destroyed. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a different story this time because at the conclusion of this war we will be in a position to have the greatest merchant marine that any nation of the world has

ever known. We must see to it that the best of these ships will forever fly the American flag, not to be turned over to foreign nations to compete with us on the high seas.

We owe a debt of gratitude to the great shipbuilding corporations and their employees for the contribution that they are making toward winning the war.

What Can the Negro Press Do To Contribute to the Cause of Right and Justice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered last Monday:

I take this opportunity of greeting my fellow members of the Negro press during the national observance of Negro Newspaper Week.

The Negro press is still a bawling infant when compared with the rest of the press of this democracy. However, when measured in terms of its own advancement it is coming of age and maturing rapidly. The Negro press sprang from the womb of protest. One of the most significant papers in the early period was edited by that stalwart champion of a people's democracy, Frederick Douglass in Rochester, N. Y., under the masthead The North Star. From that moment until now the Negro press has served as a specialized organ of protest. It cannot in anyway be conceived as a competitor of those papers owned by whites because, except for one newspaper, the Atlanta Daily World, it is a weekly.

The policy of the Negro press is forced upon it by the white press. It, therefore, succeeds by compulsion. When people of my race perform acts that are illegal and antisocial they receive more than their share of space in the daily press. We are the only race in America who in connection with crime are labeled according to race. On the other hand when Negroes perform deeds of importance and make contributions to the development of our Nation and the world the columns of newspapers are either closed to us or the news item is small and printed in an obscure place. The Negro press, therefore, has to continually keep before the eyes of the Negro people their deeds and their contributions.

As regards editorials the same is true. During this war period we of the Negro press have had to constantly champion our own cause. Through the great voice of over 200 Negro papers with a circulation of several million, we have been able to obtain jobs of all classifications for Negro workers in war industries; Negro men now fly in our Air Corps, fight with the Marines and serve as commissioned officers in the Navy; Negro women can be found not only in the ranks of the WAC's but also in the WAVES and SPARS. We are fighting for the abolition of the white primary, the abolition of the poll tax, the passage of an antilynching bill, to make the F. E. P. C. a permanent commission and the passage of a bill prohibiting trains and busses discriminating on interstate commerce. In other words, we are out to win the war at home and abroad and to defeat not only the Fascists in Italy, the Nazis in Germany, and the Japs but also those Americans on the home front who are un-American and undemocratic.

There is much more that the Negro press can do and must do. In the first place, we must be more objective in reporting news. Regardless of what our personal feelings may be, we must know that there is no stronger weapon in the world than truth accurately stated and objectively presented.

Second, we must learn to constructively criticize not only enemies without but enemies within the race, and to ever forthrightly and militantly lead the Negro people into broader channels of service.

Third. We must stop thinking of ourselves as a press for Negroes only, and start being more concerned with the problems of all peoples who are suffering from the common enemies—prejudice, discrimination, and exploitation. The Negro press must fight for the rights of Catholics and Protestants, black and white, Jew and gentile—because prejudice and group hatred are things that cannot be confined to any one people. Where it's a Catholic today it will be a Negro tomorrow, and where it's the Jew today it will be an Italian tomorrow. In other words, the hour has come for the Negro press to become a people's press.

Fourth. We must take a forthright stand with labor. The Negro is a working-class race. Within the ranks of the labor movement we are finding day by day more allies than we have found in any other movement in America, including the Christian church.

And lastly, we must envision ourselves as a people who are no longer a minority. We are living in one world and in this one world we must take our place with hundreds of millions of people of the darker races, with the laboring class in general, with the whole people's movement. These people are marching today. The world is on the move. This is the century of the common man. We must take our rightful place in bringing about a permanent people's victory, a people's peace and, thereby, guaranteeing a people's world.

France and De Gaulle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, France has, in the past, been one of the great nations of the world. She is needed and wanted again among the great nations in the making and keeping of the peace that is to come.

Unfortunately, relations between France and the United States now are not all that could be desired. The explanation for this situation lies partly in the conditions that have followed the liberation of France and partly in what is generally regarded as blundering on the part of General de Gaulle.

There have recently appeared in various newspapers, editorials and columns by some of our best writers dealing with this situation. I am including some of those articles because I feel that they have dealt with this problem in an interesting and informative manner:

[From the Washington Post of February 20, 1945]

FRENCH RESENTMENT

(By Marquis Childs)

PARIS.—Rumors which appear to have been baseless have had President Roosevelt paying an official visit to Paris. If he had driven down the Champs Elysees he would have been given a demonstration of fervent approval. Paris would have lined the streets to shout for Monsieur le President.

Those who follow trends closely here say there can be no doubt of that. But at the same time they say that if Roosevelt comes several months from now his welcome may be considerably cooler.

Inside the government there is deep resentment of the failure to help France through the bitter winter. Whether rightly or wrongly, the blame is put on America. That same resentment, however, has only begun to spread to the general public. They have not directly connected their hunger and cold with the American policy, nor has the general public here been aware of Roosevelt's resistance to Gen. Charles de Gaulle and the ill will that grew up between them.

The contest between the two men took place for the most part before the liberation of France, when almost no news from the outside world came in. The reception of De Gaulle inside France, together with the political skill with which he maneuvered, made recognition of his provisional government by America inevitable, regardless of what anyone thought of him personally.

To a certain degree it is true that he has used American opposition to solidify his position in this country. In his speeches De Gaulle stresses the desperate transportation picture in France—the fact that under German occupation 47,000 cars were used to haul fuel for civilians and even at the worst period this never fell below 11,000, while on January 21 of this year it was only 7,000 cars. He does not say, however, that Americans have brought in hundreds of new locomotives, which made it possible to turn others back to the French for civilian use.

One factor in the French attitude toward Americans is our bombing before the liberation. Frenchmen in the government have told me that we are getting the blame we do not deserve and that if we made a real effort we could get across to the French people the true story of bombings and our part in them.

This, incidentally, is likely to color the attitude throughout Europe. By one of those curious coincidences always occurring, I shared a compartment on the Paris-to-Brussels train with Walter Farr, whom I had known in Washington as correspondent for the London Daily Mail. Coming from 8 months in Stockholm, he told me that many Swedes are now beginning to say that the American bombing is responsible for the destruction of the Continent.

That, of course, is an easy out for Europeans. They forgot it was the Fascist countries that originated the mass bombing technique, while Americans have made every effort with precision instruments to limit it. But for those who have seen it from the beginning, the appraisal of influence of the American military might in France is difficult.

The agreement De Gaulle signed with General Eisenhower on August 27 gave the Allied military leaders great powers—greater, perhaps, than the French people have ever understood. For the military it was supremely important to have a stable France at the back of the fighting forces. For example, a strike on the railroads of France simply could not have been tolerated. Our influence as a result of military preponderance here has, therefore, inevitably been on the side of conservatism, just as the weight of the Russian influence has been thrown in different fashion on the side of order and repression

of the more fiery elements in the underground.

To an overwhelming majority of Frenchmen I should guess that Roosevelt still stands as the symbol of liberation. That is why they would cheer him if he moved down the broad avenue toward the Arc de Triomphe.

No matter what our faults of omission or commission, we always have a contrast with the German behavior in our favor. The ordinary middle-class Frenchmen have told me of shocking things they saw during the German occupation, which Germans made no effort to conceal. This was particularly true of brutalities against the Jews, who won widespread sympathy and aid from the French.

The De Gaulle government would hardly have welcomed Roosevelt, but the people would have. That may still be true in early summer, but it will depend on whether the French have had to hitch their belts even tighter than they are today.

[From the Washington Post of February 21, 1945]

FRENCH LIFE RUNNING IN LOW GEAR

(By Marquis Childs)

PARIS.—Paris, once called the city of light, is today a city of darkness and misery. A pretense of the old Paris is kept up but it is a rather pathetic gilding on what is an empty shell.

Shops on the Rue de la Paix and the Place de l'Opera still have smart things in the windows, but these articles are merely window dressing. Nothing like them is for sale inside the shops. Similarly, perfume bottles are displayed in windows, but the American Army has long since cleaned out the supply.

It is a little like the huge peach-basket hats worn by women who still try to look fashionable. They are pretentious in a sad sort of way and very, very expensive. An American tripper who wanted to take a Paris hat back to his wife found that the minimum price at a lesser-known establishment was $100.

Prices on the black market are fantastic, somewhat reminiscent of the German inflation of the early twenties. Butter, if you can find it, costs $16 a pound. Automobile tires—and they are scarcer than butter—cost $125 or more. A woman's suit in a shop window in a provincial town, though shoddy looking, was priced at $80.

A meal of horse meat and poor macaroni in a working-class restaurant costs just under $2. In the few black market restaurants you see hard-faced men and women—undoubtedly operators in one phase or another of the black bourse—who pay $100 or $150 for a dinner for three or four persons. In these restaurants, patronized only by hated profiteers or foreigners, the food is up to the old Parisian standards, and vintage champagnes are obtainable at $25 or $30 per bottle. While heavy fines are putting a stop to some of this, the black market still flourishes.

Resentment against profiteers, some of whom were on the border line of collaboration, is growing throughout France. Some people feel that De Gaulle is not proceeding rapidly enough with the liquidation of collaborationists. Former collaborationists say cynically, "You're not dead until you're shot."

On the other hand, many housewives admit frankly they could not feed their families without the black market. Minimum rations simply are not obtainable without behind-door meals. During the recent severe cold spell the food crisis was so acute that the United States Army was persuaded to turn over a small amount of its stores to relieve the situation at least temporarily.

A marked rise in infant mortality and deaths of older persons is a sure indication of near famine. Likewise a sharp increase in cases of tuberculosis, as shown by recent U. N. R. R. A. studies, is a sign of what is happening.

With the machinery of living barely functioning, existence is full of annoyances and frustrations. The French telephone system, never very efficient, now hardly works at all. One reason is that cams and switches were frozen in unheated office buildings and apartments.

Almost no transportation exists outside of the subway system. Near the Place de l'Opera shabby horse-drawn cabs wait for fares, but they are only for the very rich. For $3 or $4 you can hire a bicyclist with a side car. That is, you can hire him if you're lucky enough to find him.

One of the strange phenomena of this now somber city is the separation of the English-speaking world and the French-speaking world. Or I should say the American-speaking world, since the responsibility is ours and you rarely see a Britisher. This has its advantages for the British, who can put off on us any blame for the friction growing out of the minimum association between the two spheres.

Comparatively few American officers speak French. Very few French speak English. The difference in language makes for a barrier that is hard to cross.

The American-speaking world has facilities—heat and transportation—beyond the reach of the French-speaking sphere. Barriers make for misunderstandings. It is so easy to misunderstand.

A recent American visitor commented that the children in the parks all had fur coats. The implication was that no nation could be very badly off that could provide fur coats for its children, but the truth is something quite different. France has had almost no wool for the past 5 years. Warm clothing for children is one of the gravest scarcities. If you can find $150 or $200, you can buy a rabbit-skin coat for your small daughter. Trapping of rabbits has gone on regardless of the war.

Official sources here have confirmed reports that food from America is on the way to relieve the civilian food shortage, but this can be only a stopgap. Somehow, and quickly, French productive capacity must be restored.

[From the Washington Post of February 20, 1945]

DE GAULLE'S ERROR

General de Gaulle's reported refusal to confer with President Roosevelt in Algiers is understandable but unfortunate, even though it was apparently accompanied by an invitation to the President to go to Paris. The general's attitude reflects a falling off from the magnanimity and high statesmanship which has characterized him until now. That he has construed the fact that he was not asked to the Crimea Conference as a slight is fairly obvious—a slight, however, less to himself than to France. In this he probably reflects the present hypersensitive mood of his compatriots, rendered acute not only by a conscious or subconscious sense of national guilt for the disaster of 1940, but also by the terrible material privations which the liberation has aggravated rather than relieved. The recollection by the French of former power and grandeur joined to the vivid awareness of their recent humiliations and of their present political dependence makes the problem of aiding the work of French rehabilitation enormously delicate and difficult, and it has not been rendered any less so by certain apparent Allied blunders in the matter of promised relief supplies.

The present French attitude is familiar enough to us as it shows itself in individuals. Compensation for a sense of national inadequacy takes the form of extreme national self-assertion. Also, as Mr. Howard Callender has pointed out in a sympathetic and illuminating analysis in the New York Times Magazine, prolonged hardships and the sense of economic insecurity which now pervades all classes is reflected in great internal unrest and has intensified the desire for revolutionary solutions, which, coming at this phase of the war might have grave and tremendous consequences for the Allies' cause.

But apart from this it is altogether unlikely the spiritual, material, and historical energies of France can be revived by any process so simple and heroic as a revolution. What France needs most is external help, and the task of providing it will become enormously more difficult if the French Nation should assume an attitude of touchiness and resentment toward its Allies. Mr. Callender says truly that in an identical situation Americans would exhibit the same jealous hypersensitiveness now characteristic of the French. It is well for us to understand this, but mere understanding is not enough. What is needed now is cooperative effort and for real cooperation two wills are necessary.

[From the Washington Post, February 22, 1945]

POLLYANNA IN PARIS

As a rather choice example of the ineptitude of the military mind in dealing with civilian problems, we submit the statement recently issued at Paris by the Army communication zone headquarters concerning material relief for the people of France. Some inkling of conditions in France after 6 months of liberation is now beginning to break through the welter of bureaucratic obfuscation, and has caused much indignation and more anxiety on this side of the water. The truth seems to be that the material hardships of the French under the liberation are considerably greater than under the Germans and that even those French industries which the Germans permitted to function are now being paralyzed for lack of raw material.

This situation has certainly not been created through any lack of American good will toward the French people, or any lack of desire to relieve their present hardships. It has been created because the military have diverted to war making the shipping that was intended for the transport of relief supplies and raw materials to France, Belgium, and Holland. The position of the military is that the movement of strictly military supplies must have priority over all others, no matter what promises may have been made by political representatives.

It is curious, however, that the military should choose the moment when resentment in France and apprehension at home over the breakdown of the relief program have grown acute to preen themselves on having already accomplished in France a relief job so magnificent that "there has probably been no parallel in previous history." Actually, all that the Army claims to have delivered is 400,000 tons of supplies since the liberation, which is to say about 2 percent of France's normal requirements for such a period. This is what Brigadier General Stearns, of the Communications Zone, considers rehabilitation on such a scale that "France is rapidly being placed on an operational basis."

Some indication of how far French industry really is from being on "an operational basis" may be gleaned from a glance at the textile situation. The French cotton textile industry, it is said, is capable of absorbing nearly a half million workers, of greatly alleviating the severe shortages of clothing in all the liberated countries, and to that extent reducing the demand for shipping space for relief supplies. Even under the German occupation these factories were kept in operation and supplied with synthetic materials. The normal requirements of the French textile mills for a 6-month period would be about 650,000 bales. Actually only a few thousand bales from the United States have been delivered, although upward of 50,000 bales, purchased through the Commodity Credit Corporation, have been set aside for

France and are awaiting shipment. French cotton stocks are now down to about 300 tons and unless these are soon replenished the industry may have to close down entirely. It seems fair to infer that a similar situation exists in many other French industries.

To some typewriter strategists on this side of the water it might seem that any materials which might be calculated to prevent a situation of general privation, unemployment, and revolutionary ferment from developing in the rear of an embattled army could be essential and urgent war materials. But that, we suppose, is for the military to decide. What we object to is the tendency of the military to suppose that a bad state of affairs can be improved by extravagant rhetoric.

War Record of the Hollywood Victory Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the third annual report of the Hollywood Victory Committee:

Without detracting from any other worthy civilian war activity, nevertheless with a desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the outstanding job that has been done by the Hollywood Victory Committee which was organized 3 days after the Pearl Harbor attack, I would like to recount briefly a few of the services they have rendered to our armed forces on all battle fronts of the world.

Members of the Hollywood Victory Committee have—

Traveled 4,000,000 miles.

Made 37,979 free appearances.

Sent 139 guest stars to appear on the fighting fronts.

Provided 341 actor players for 324 camp and hospital shows.

Given 1,510 1-night stands at embarkation points.

Helped the War Department Armed Forces Radio Service by making 1,574 entertainment transcriptions.

Volunteered the services of 233 actors and musicians in six War-loan bond selling drives.

Made 100 broadcasts and transcriptions for inter-American affairs.

Cooperated with the War Activities Committee of the motion-picture industry in producing 37 film shorts for distribution in 16,000 theaters.

Assisted the Red Cross, Infantile Paralysis Foundation, War Chest, Army Emergency Relief Fund, Navy Relief Society.

Kept up this show every day for 3 years.

Their services have brought smiles and happiness to the boys at the front when keeping up morale was a tough job for their commanding officers.

They all deserve credit and applause for their work. They are good American citizens and have done their best by lending their talents to help win the war.

In doing this creditable job, the Hollywood Victory Committee has had the wholehearted cooperation of the following organizations:

Actors Equity Association.

American Federation of Radio Artists.

American Guild of Musical Artists, Inc.

American Guild of Variety Artists.

American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers.

Artists' Managers Guild.

Association of Motion Picture Producers, Inc.

Hollywood Writers Mobilization.

Independent Motion Picture Producers Association.

Independent Publicists Association.

Public Information Committee of the Motion Picture Industry.

Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, Inc.

The Radio Networks.

Musicians Mutual Protective Association.

Radio Writers Guild.

Screen Actors Guild.

Screen Directors Guild.

Screen Publicists Guild.

Screen Writers Guild.

Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers.

Southern California Broadcasters Association.

Theater Authority, Inc.

Credit is due where it has been earned. Here is one group that has earned recognition.

Democracy at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Missouri's most illustrious son, Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN, Vice President of the United States, at Jefferson City, on February 22. The title of the address is Democracy at the Crossroads.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a son of Missouri, I am especially grateful to the people of my State for giving me this opportunity to come home. I know that apart from any partisan practices every citizen of Missouri subscribes to the sound principle of our State motto: "Let the welfare of the people be the supreme law."

We of Missouri are especially fortunate in our geographical position near the great heart of America. Situated at the crossroads of the North and the South, as well as of the East and the West, we have acquired a more tolerant understanding of the viewpoints and problems of each section of the country.

National commentators carefully watch Missouri as a political weathervane. We are not merely a border State. We are a sort of political barometer, reflecting the rapid changes in the social climate of America. With the benefits of our favored position come grave responsibilities. For every right there is always a corresponding duty.

While we draw upon all sections of the country for the blessings which come to our State, Missourians have the duty to repay America by being the binding link between these different sections. I like to think of our State of Missouri as situated near the heart of America, and politically—like its physical counterpart—as leaning toward neither extreme. Bitter experience has taught Missourians that it is disastrous to permit either radicals or reactionaries to obtain control of our political affairs.

In these times of violent partisanship there is a great need for tolerance. The world requires statesmen with understanding of the many shortcomings of human nature. All lasting progress has been the product of evolution. Sound social advancements require time and tolerance.

Today we celebrate the two hundred and thirteenth birthday of the father of our country—George Washington. A man without political ambition, George Washington became one of the moving spirits who made possible the Constitutional Convention, the convention which gave us our Constitution and the form of government under which we have become the world's greatest Republic. Contrary to his personal desires, Washington served as our first President. It became evident early that he was the only leader who would command sufficient support for a united nation of 13 States, then more diverse than our 48 States of today. From July 1775 until his retirement from the Presidency in March 1797 Washington served our country almost continuously for 20 years. Few men have rendered equal service in time or lasting value.

Between the victory over Cornwallis at Yorktown in October 1781 and the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in May 1787, America faced its first and most trying emergency. The basic test was whether the thirteen separate and sovereign States were willing to give up a part of their unquestioned power for the benefit of all.

Urging a stronger union, George Washington warned America it must choose unity or disunion. Today, more than 150 years later, America must choose—common sense world organization for peace—or disunion. We must decide if we are willing to sacrifice our own temporary advantages for ultimate world benefit. It is not an easy decision to make. The independence of our ancestors makes us answer that Americans do not need the aid of others, and do not propose to become involved in foreign quarrels. Mere prudence requires, however, that we Americans take a good look at modern maps. By air, no place on the globe is more than 60 hours away from our comfortable homes—we know this time is steadily decreasing. We must, therefore, alter our former views on national security. Americans can no longer sit behind any mental Maginot line. Too much is at stake for us to shut our eyes to facts. Either we must be ready to repel alone all and any attacks from the rest of the world—or we must be willing to cooperate with friendly States to check the first sign of aggression on the part of any nation. The choice is ours. I am confident that the average American can use his most precious heritage—common sense—in the solution of the pressing problems of the day.

In this exercise of hard common sense in the search for peace and good will among nations, we, the United States and her two chief allies, have made a magnificent beginning. A few days ago, from Yalta on the Black Sea coast, we received good news. Another long stride had just been made not only toward victory, but toward a lasting peace. The agreement, like those reached before, is a product of good common sense. By all but a few, it was immediately accepted. It promises another exercise of common sense cooperation among all nations in the conference that is to follow in April in San Francisco.

We can recall how a minority, lacking in vision or in the will to use what vision they had, cried out against lend-lease. Today we hear no more from those alarmists. We know that the lives of many thousands of our own American boys have been saved through the shortening of the war as a result of lend-lease. Lend-lease was cooperation among nations to put down aggressors. Now we propose to go beyond that, to keep down aggressors. The policy which we believe

will emerge from the San Francisco Conference—and others to follow—will embody cooperation among all nations for peace.

In Washington's time the Thirteen States were reluctant to give up some of their powers for the benefit of all. Today, there is a temptation to declare that no state, or group of states, can dictate to us in any matter which we consider essential. It is this same political philosophy which has caused the trouble in international relations. Common sense, of the Missouri "show me" brand, should warn us that obviously all states cannot remain supreme in all they choose to do, unless we are willing to accept the cynical view that "might makes right." The only alternative to world-wide anarchy lies in some reasonable form of international organization. This means a happy balance between the rights of individual nations and their obligations to others. This is merely an extension of our local and national practices to the international plane. The way to lasting peace is not easy, nor is the way to personal security easy. As the American philosopher, Emerson, well stated, "Nothing can bring you peace but yourself. Nothing can bring you peace but the triumph of principles."

In the long run, the same basic philosophy applies to the nations. America must live up to its highest principles, otherwise peace and security become impossible. It is not something we can rationalize. We cannot place this in a test tube and record scientific results. It is in the heart and spirit of our people. It is among those things which made America great.

I wonder if it may not be such wholesome characters as Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn who will, as symbols, show the world our undying contribution to civilization. I do not refer entirely to the literary genius of Sam Clemens but rather to the type of Americans he portrayed so understandingly. They are our people and our lives. I feel that his healthy American characters, with their tolerance, energy, and ambitions, really represent the citizens of our state—frank, industrious, and sympathetic, but, above all, Americans.

Today, American democracy is again at the crossroads. I feel that Americans fully intend to have their say as to the future destiny of mankind on this shrinking planet. Americans never did follow others meekly, but usually were found among the leaders, especially when the public welfare was involved. No matter how grave the post-war problems may be, I am sure that our American sense of proportion and—yes—our sense of humor will see us through to victory. Like the living characters of Mark Twain, we shall continue to do our job with characteristic American energy and enthusiasm. The most pressing problem before us remains the winning of the war at the earliest possible moment. That requires a mighty national effort and a united home front. Surely this is no time for petty, partisan politics. This is a time for greater national unity—for greater sacrifice to our national interests.

Both winning of the war and winning of the peace are not partisan objectives; they are the all-essential American objectives, which must be attained if our country is to continue to exist and prosper.

Let us, therefore, all close ranks and remain closely united.

When the last gun is fired on some remote enemy stronghold, we must still continue the ceaseless crusade for a just and durable peace.

We must dedicate our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to the cause of lasting peace.

This requires patience and persistence, time and tolerance.

When the people of the world fully realize that the public welfare really is the supreme law, we may at last have real peace on earth, and good will toward all mankind.

The Crimea Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Crimea Conference," delivered by me February 27, 1945, and broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, in the more than 2 weeks that have elapsed since the declaration of the Crimea Conference was flashed across the world, it has become perfectly clear that this echo of some of the mysteries that were recited within the secret chambers of a Yalta palace has not stampeded the American people into an unconditional surrender to the results.

In spite of the fact that the press and the radio have barraged the Nation with hysterical hallelujahs of praise, inspired by our playboys and poets in the State Department, it now appears that Mr. and Mrs. America have become so apprehensive as a result of past promises—unfulfilled—that they are now looking over the performances on the international stage with a "you-have-to-show-me" look in their eyes. The American people now know such grave decisions are in the making—both openly and secretly—that what we as a people have got to get straight, and quickly, is what future policies are still possible that will be to America's highest interest and to the hopes of humanity in the years ahead.

This growing uneasiness over the international situation which is reflected in the rapidly growing volume of my mail is only intensified by the violent contradiction in the Crimea report between the lyric splendor of the beautiful and noble words in which it is couched and the ugly impudence of its decisions.

Let us recall for just a moment what was actually decided at Yalta. There was the cynical partition of Poland and what in fact amounts to the recognition of the Moscow-spawned Lublin Government. There was the betrayal of Yugoslavia—and we can only guess at what has happened to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—when we read in the New York Times dispatch of February 25 that only 3 days ago "large groups of armed Communists attempted to overthrow the Rumanian Government and install a Rumanian Soviet." Free elections were promised—but what is a free election without free speech, free press, a free radio—just a mockery—and even these elections obtain only where in the judgment of the Big Three conditions require. There was the determination to partition, dismember, de-industrialize, and enslave the German nation, all in the sweet name of peace. There was final agreement to permit any member of the Big Three to veto action against its own aggression. We are told there was agreement on the principle of trusteeship to be applied to over 600,000,000 colonial peoples. However, in lieu of any specific solution to the war-breeding problem of the British, French, and Dutch imperialism, it simply means that we are going to turn over the subject peoples of Africa, India, and Asia to their old masters. It has been further revealed that at Yalta an agreement was reached which, in effect, established a three-power—I should say one-power—control of the Old World in which we are supposed to be committed to enforcing, policing, and guaranteeing jointly with Rusisa and Britain the post-war settlements in Europe—whatever they may be. All of which provides a shocking violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. There are those who believe that the only solution of Europe's troubles is to turn them over to Russia. If that is the object, then we should do it with our eyes open.

Surely we need no more facts now to trace the old pattern of power politics around the world all shined up in new paraphernalia. Surely, we need no more proof than these decisions of the Yalta Conference to conclude that the principle of brute force has now become the criterion of what is right and the basis of all future action in international affairs. For these Yalta decisions are the incredible proofs that the Big Three have agreed to impose their collective will not only on the nations of Europe, but on the nations of Africa and Asia.

Despite attempts to suppress news of the resentment these decisions aroused in Europe, we now know that our own apprehensions are widely shared abroad. For instance, Raymond Daniell, the head of the New York Times' London Bureau, said in his first report on British reaction: "Whatever satisfaction there is tonight or tomorrow in the continued agreement of the major powers will be dissipated in the coming weeks." Concerning the reactions of the small nations of Europe, Mr. Daniell went on to say, "What it all amounts to, in the view of the several small governments in London, is that the big powers have usurped sovereignty over all Europe and have accepted jointly the responsibility of running it, at least until they fall out among themselves." The reaction in France is clearly revealed in General de Gaulle's lamentable snub of President Roosevelt and in a United Press dispatch that "the French press displayed a distinct coolness toward the Big Three decisions." In Italy the reaction was much the same. The United Press stated that "Italian Government quarters were disappointed," and the same source went on to say that "authoritative Vatican quarters expressed anxiety lest the seeds of a future war were sown at Yalta." The premier of the Polish government-in-exile bitterly denounced the Polish decision saying, "The method adopted in the case of Poland was a contradiction of the elementary principles binding the Allies, and constitutes a violation of the letter and spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the right of every nation to defend its own interest."

We do not need to wait for any more crumbs of information to fall from another diplomatic love feast for us to see clearly what these Yalta decisions and reactions mean to us as a people. In the case of Poland it means that for the first time we are a party to a betrayal of one of our allies, and yet Mr. Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, has recently remarked that, "for the immediate future, the decision on the Polish question was a great achievement," yet this decision is almost identical with the treacherous Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement of 1939 which both England and America so bitterly denounced and over which Britain eventually went to war.

But what concerns me most is that our formal recognition of such an immoral outrage can only contribute further to the bankruptcy of our moral and political credit in Europe and throughout the world. For instance, in Rumania, we have given Russia authority to act directly in our behalf. In Bulgaria our representative on the Allied Commission is an unwilling but helpless stooge of Russian policies which—according to eyewitness accounts—are liquidating, deporting, or terrorizing the helpless population, regardless of whether they were friends

or enemies of the Axis Powers. It must have been to just such a predicament as this that Mr. Stettinius referred when he is reported to have said, "We are virtually the prisoners of our allies."

The British Government has just published a white paper on the Situation in Greece from which I quote: "Ever since the Germans left, the small but well-armed Communist Party has been practicing a reign of terror all over the country. Men, women, and children were murdered here in large numbers and thousands of hostages were taken. * * * Red terror soon leads to white terror." When we realize that at Yalta the decisions that were reached were the result of an abject appeasement of Stalin, we can better picture the grim nature of the struggle that is already going on between Russia and Britain in every country in Europe, toward which we will never be permitted to remain neutral. Furthermore, we now see the Nazi officials and the Nazi press using the Yalta decisions to try to stiffen German resistance, just as they used the Morgenthau proposals, at the cost of thousands of American lives. Even now, we are told by the press that Goebbels and company are engaged in telling the German people, "We told you so. It is far better that we died on the battlefields." While I am sure we all agree with the laudable decision of the Big Three to stand united "to destroy German militarism and nazi-ism" such a declaration becomes nothing but a costly psychological blunder when the Big Three continue to refuse the offer of a democratic and decent alternative to those Germans who are ready and willing to risk their lives to destroy the Hitler tyranny.

These are just some of the decisions we are now being urged to underwrite by accepting the present Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I am now and I have been at all times in favor of a genuinely democratic and international world organization to keep the peace and to prevent future wars. But the agreement at Yalta by the Big Three that their decisions will not even be permitted discussion at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, compels me to warn the American people that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals—as they now stand—represent nothing more than an international straitjacket—the blueprint of which was drawn up behind the scenes at Moscow, Teheran, and Yalta.

Whatever happens we must never be a party to the enslavement of free peoples by a dictatorship which Mr. Churchill has said, in speaking of communism, "rots the soul of a nation," and which President Roosevelt has declared to be a "dictatorship as absolute as any in the world." I am sure the American people will never commit themselves to suppress, by force of arms, and with the blood of our youth, every future rebellion against such a tyranny.

I am further convinced there are still certain steps the American people can take to arrest and alter the present fatal trends in international affairs. First, if we are to have a genuine spirit of international collaboration there could be no simpler way to obtain it than for our allies immediately to accord our diplomatic, military, and press representatives the same courtesies and privileges we accord to theirs.

Secondly, a United Nations political council should immediately be set up in Europe to include representatives of the peoples whose destinies are now directly involved, with power not merely to talk but to act in the interest of humanity. I know of no other alternative to the domination of Europe by Russia.

Third, this council must be guided and implemented by policies that are directed towards the establishment of a United States of Europe. Again I see no other alternative to a Europe divided against itself and a return to its ancient power politics—this time with England and Russia pitted against each other in a struggle that cannot help but result in another bloody conflict—in which American boys will again be called to give up their lives.

In conclusion, we must throw the full weight of our influence behind a demand that the principles of the Atlantic Charter be incorporated into any future plans for world organization. We must make certain that at least our American representatives at the coming United Nations conference insist upon the alteration and amendment of the present Dumbarton Oaks proposals to bring about the changes that are imperative, if this world is not to be run on the basis of brute force in the hands of a few. If we do not want to see our American way of life and the ideals for which we have fought dragged down into the muck and mire of the Old World's ancient evils and hatreds, and if we do not want our boys to have fought and suffered and died in vain, we must act now in the name of humanity.

The Primacy of the Spiritual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Primacy of the Spiritual," delivered by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries, Inc., on the occasion of his retiring as president of the Kiwanis Club of New York City on January 3, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today I complete 4 consecutive years of executive work in our club: 2 years as program chairman and 2 years as president. You have been most patient, considerate, and cooperative. It was a pleasure and a rare honor to serve you.

We have with us a relatively large number of new members, whose attention I should like to focus on a few of the fundamental objectives of Kiwanis.

To my mind, the first objective of Kiwanis is to "develop by precept and example a more intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship." This we are attempting to do through the medium of balanced programs, presenting many sides of controversial subjects.

For example, the Honorable Hamilton Fish, Member of Congress from New York, told us that any aid we might give to the allies meant war; while the Honorable Ernest W. Gibson, United States Senator from Vermont, urged all possible aid to the allies.

Thomas Roy Jones, industry member of the War Labor Board, president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce and president of American Type Founders, Inc., presented management's view of labor and labor organizations. Lew Herrmann, widely known editor and publisher of the New Jersey Labor Herald, told us what labor thinks of management. The Honorable Raymond E. Baldwin, Governor of Connecticut, told us how labor and management could maintain peace in industry.

The Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, now Member of the United States Senate, took to task the reactionaries in both parties. The Honorable ERNEST MCFARLAND, United States Senator from Arizona, acknowledged New Dealer, in general gave us the New Deal viewpoint.

Dr. Norman Thomas, well-known advocate of state socialism, presented the reasons why we should support that philosophy of government. Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce and now senior United States Senator from New Jersey, outlined the advantages of our capitalistic system and free enterprise.

Sir Norman Angell, widely recognized as a liberal, and recipient of the Nobel peace award, outlined what America must do to help win a lasting peace.

Jewish rabbis, Catholic priests, and Protestant ministers have enriched us by their views on religion.

May I tell you of an experience I had with that great scientific genius of our century, Thomas Alva Edison, of whom it was my good fortune to have been a daily business associate during the last decade of his long and productive life. I once laid before this profound thinker a problem which I could have solved had I applied myself to thinking it through. Having heard my story, the Wizard of Menlo Park pointed to a motto by Sir Joshua Reynolds: "There is no expedient to which a man will not resort to avoid the real labor of thinking."

If our programs have made you think, even though one or more of them may have riled you, they have served a worth-while purpose.

A second objective of Kiwanis is to "provide practical means to form enduring friendships."

One of the important reasons why our Kiwanis Club has grown so rapidly in recent years is to be found in the friendly atmosphere of our meetings. I was impressed 2 years ago by the results of a questionnaire sent to our club members. The answers to this questionnaire indicated that our members rate this friendly atmosphere as more important even than our program activities.

A third objective of Kiwanis is to "render altruistic service to build a better humanity."

Our club has operated a boys' camp for more than 20 years. We Kiwanians have undertaken to build a better tomorrow by giving our boys a better opportunity today. Every summer we give underprivileged boys from the sidewalks of New York a vacation in the country in a fine environment.

In order to improve and increase our facilities, we decided to rebuild that camp. To date, we have raised more than $25,000. To you and to my distinguished and gracious successor, I commend the task of reaching the goal of $50,000.

May I present another objective which ought to receive our attention—that is, cooperation with other service clubs and the American Legion.

I know that members of Rotary and other service organizations rejoice as much as you and I over the improvement in relationships that has developed over the past few years. Now we are in the midst of a cruel war that threatened the very foundation of democracy, which is so precious to all of us. With the problems of post-war reconstruction looming every day, the service clubs of America are beginning to prepare, as they should, for the great challenge that faces us.

Particularly vital are the problems involved in the rehabilitation of the returning veteran. His future is largely in our hands. Our people are determined to be decent, honorable, and generous in helping him integrate himself into our society. And let us not forget that if his future is in our hands tomorrow, our future is in his hands today.

In all of our activities, there is one high purpose which every Kiwanis club must ob-

serve. It is the very atmosphere we breathe—the spirit of Kiwanis—to "encourage the daily living of the Golden Rule in all human relationships; to cooperate in creating and maintaining that sound public opinion and high idealism which makes possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism, and good will."

Indeed, the summary of our objectives is to "give primacy to the human and spiritual rather than to the material values of life." This, I believe, is the heart of every religion. Kiwanis and other service clubs are made up of Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, because these clubs represent segments of America. All three religions are devoted to those objectives which are so precious to Kiwanis.

History shows that every tyrant, in his lust for power recognizes the influence of the church as one of his principal enemies, and therefore sets out to destroy it.

For years, I have felt that one of the great needs of our time is better financial support of our religious institutions, for these are the institutions which give the stamp of character and decency to civilization. I don't see how it is possible for a good Kiwanian to be a poor member of his church.

Because of the hatreds engendered by the cruelties inflicted upon innocent men, women, and children by the ruthless war lords, I believe that the influence of God, the power of religion, and the work of the churches of all faiths will be more necessary in the post-war period than ever before.

If the ideals of Rotary and Kiwanis were universally practiced, this would indeed be a happy world—free from war, free from strife, free from greed and selfishness. In the furtherance of these objectives, I pledge my support to the new administration.

True Facts Regarding Use of Federal Ballot in November 1944 General Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, since the United States War Ballot Commission filed its report with the Congress, there has been considerable editorial interpretation through the country of the significance of the relatively small number of Federal ballots cast in the November 1944 general election. Some of these interpretations have been wrong, because they were based on a failure to understand the applicable provisions of the Federal Serviceman's Voting Law—Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended by Public Laws 277 and 418, Seventy-eighth Congress.

It appears that, in the recent election, about 2,700,000 absent servicemen voted by State absentee ballot and about 100,000 absent servicemen voted by Federal ballot.

The most common misapprehensions, based on these figures, have been:

First. That the servicemen, having a free choice between the State absentee ballot and the Federal ballot, preferred to vote by the former; and

Second. That the effective use of State absentee ballots in the November election proved that the claimed need for a Federal ballot, which was so strongly argued in congressional debates last winter, was without foundation.

The facts make abundantly plain that neither of these positions is correct.

SERVICEMEN DID NOT HAVE A FREE CHOICE BETWEEN USING A STATE ABSENTEE BALLOT AND USING A FEDERAL BALLOT

In the recent election, a serviceman could not choose whether he would vote by Federal ballot or by State absentee ballot.

Under the Federal servicemen's voting law, voting by Federal ballot was not an alternative to voting by State absentee ballot. The Federal balloting procedure was a supplementary means of voting. That is to say, a serviceman could not be furnished and vote a Federal ballot, unless he had first tried to obtain and vote a State absentee ballot.

Furthermore, whereas all of the 43 States provided State absentee ballots for use by servicemen of voting age, only 20 States—California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington—authorized the use by their absent servicemen of Federal ballots as a supplementary voting procedure. In addition, whereas State absentee ballots were available to servicemen from all 48 States, both inside and outside the United States, Federal ballots were available only to servicemen from these 20 States who were physically outside the United States at the time of voting. Because of these restrictions on the use of the Federal ballot, only about one-fifth of the armed forces of voting age were legally entitled, subject to their prior application for and nonreceipt of a State absentee ballot, to be furnished and vote a Federal ballot.

It is, therefore, an obvious misstatement to say that the relatively small use of the Federal ballot in the recent election demonstrated any preference for State absentee ballots over Federal ballots.

FACTS AS TO VOTING BY STATE AND FEDERAL BALLOT IN THE NOVEMBER 1944 GENERAL ELECTION

In giving the facts as to the number of State absentee ballots and Federal ballots used in the last election, it is necessary to point out that only about half the States have reported a separate count of State absentee ballots cast by servicemen. Ten of these separately reporting States authorized the use of the Federal ballot. It has, therefore, been necessary to estimate the number of State absentee ballots cast in the States which make no separate report. On this basis, it has been widely estimated that about 2,700,000 servicemen from all 48 States voted by State absentee ballot.

With regard to the Federal ballot, which was authorized by 20 States, the United States War Ballot Commission reports that a total of 98,823 Federal ballots were transmitted by the secretaries of state of these States to local election officials for canvassing and counting. The figures for both State—about 2,700,000—and Federal—98,823—ballots include some ballots cast by members of the merchant marine, the exact number of which is not known but is so relatively small that it may be disregarded.

The following estimated figures graphically set forth the basic facts with reference to voting by members of the Army and Navy in the recent election:

A. Servicemen of voting age, at time for voting in election	
(1) From all 48 States, located inside and outside United States (100 percent)	9,000,000
(2) From all 48 States, located outside United States (53.5 percent)	4,820,000
(3) From 20 States authorizing Federal ballot, located inside and outside United States (39.3 percent)	3,540,000
(4) From 20 States authorizing Federal ballot, located outside United States (21 percent)	1,890,000
B. Voting by State absentee ballot	
(1) By servicemen from all 48 States, located inside and outside United States:	
20 States authorizing Federal ballot	1,012,000
28 States not authorizing Federal ballot	1,674,000
Total	2,686,000
(2) By servicemen from 20 States authorizing Federal ballot, located outside United States	[1] 506,000

[1] No exact figures are available as to how many State ballots were cast by servicemen overseas. This figure (506,000) is 50 percent of the total State ballots cast by absentee servicemen, wherever located, from these 20 States (1,012,000). Actually 53.5 percent of the servicemen from these 20 States are estimated to have been overseas at the time for voting.

C. Voting by Federal ballot	
(1) Total Federal ballots received by Secretaries of State of all 48 States	108,962
Less: ballots received in non-authorizing States, ballots prematurely executed, ballots received too late for transmission, or otherwise invalid	9,869
(2) Total F deral ballots transmitted to local election officials in 20 authorizing States	98,823

As shown in the above table, State absentee ballots were available to 9,000,000 servicemen of voting age from 48 States, located inside and outside the United States at the time of voting. A total of 2,686,000, or just under 30 percent, voted by State absentee ballot.

As shown in the above table, Federal ballots were available to 1,890,000 servicemen of voting age from 20 States, located outside the United States at the time of voting. A total of 98,823, or just over 5 percent, voted by Federal ballot. It will be recalled that none of these servicemen could be furnished or vote a Federal ballot, unless they first made oath that they had applied for a State absentee ballot prior to September 1, but had not received it by October 1.

Of this group of 1,890,000 servicemen of voting age from the 20 authorizing

States, located outside the United States, 506,000 voted by State absentee ballot and 98,823 voted by Federal ballot. In other words, one out of each 6 servicemen in this group, who chose to vote in the election, executed and sent in a Federal ballot.

Of course, no one knows how many of these 98,823 Federal ballots were effective as votes. In accordance with section 311 (b) (1) of the Federal serviceman's voting law, no Federal ballot may be counted if a State ballot from the voter arrives in time to be counted, and it is believed that many State ballots executed after Federal ballots were voted did arrive in such time. In accordance with the intent of section 307 (b) (2) of the Federal serviceman's voting law, most servicemen's voting by Federal ballot took place outside the United States before the middle of October.

It is apparent, however, that where the Federal ballot was available for use by servicemen who had not received their State absentee ballots, it had utility as a supplementary means of voting.

RELATIVELY SMALL USE OF FEDERAL BALLOT IS EVIDENCE OF THE COMPLEX RESTRICTIONS UPON THE USE OF THE FEDERAL BALLOT

It is apparent that the Federal ballot was comparatively little used in the recent election, not necessarily because servicemen "preferred the State ballot," but because the Federal ballot's availability for use was greatly restricted and because of the complexity of these restrictions.

In the November election, a serviceman could be furnished a Federal ballot only if he met these conditions:

First. That he had a voting residence in 1 of the 20 authorizing States.

Second. That he was physically outside the United States.

Third. That he made oath that he had applied before September 1 for a State ballot and had not received it by October 1.

The first 2 conditions reduced the potential voters by Federal ballots from 9,000,000 to 1,890,000, 21 percent of the members of the armed forces of voting age.

The third condition further reduced the potential voters by Federal ballot—1,890,000 persons—in accordance with their lack of diligence in making due application for State absentee ballots.

In this last-mentioned regard, many servicemen citizens of the State of Texas were at a particular disadvantage in the recent election. Payment of poll tax in January is a prerequisite to obtaining a Texas State absentee ballot for the general election in November. Many absentee servicemen, not having paid their poll taxes, did not bother to apply for a State absentee ballot, knowing that none would be sent pursuant to such application. Accordingly, they were later not able to meet the condition upon which they could be furnished a Federal ballot; that is, that they had applied to Texas for but had not received a State absentee ballot. Yet Texas was prepared to accept Federal ballots, regardless of nonpayment of poll tax. As a result of this situation, out of 450,000 Texas servicemen of voting age, only about 5,000, or 1.1 percent, voted by State absentee ballot and 17,975—4 percent of all Texas servicemen of voting age, or 7.5 percent of those of voting age overseas—voted by Federal ballot. Had the right of Texas servicemen to vote by Federal ballot not been conditioned upon their making useless application for State absentee ballots, it seems probable that many thousand more would have requested and voted by Federal ballot.

In his statutory report to the United States War Ballot Commission, the Secretary of War commented upon this compexity of the Federal ballot—paragraphs 25b and 26:

> The Federal ballotting procedure provided in title III is excessively complex. The use of the Federal ballot is restricted to certain persons from certain States, and the Army is specifically prohibited from furnishing the Federal ballot to any other persons. To appreciate the complexity of these restrictions, it is only necessary to read section.302 of the statute. The mere statement of the restrictions requires 32 printed lines. Yet even as thus fully stated, the restrictions must be implemented by certifications of the Governors of 48 States. It is not possible, with accuracy, to make a simple statement to soldiers of the applicability of title III. Accordingly, despite detailed instructions * * *, confusion resulted in 1944 in the minds of soldiers and soldier-voting officers. Furthermore, many soldiers were not sufficiently interested in voting, particularly in far distant or in static theaters, to make any particular effort to vote.
>
> Because of its complexity, title III laid upon the services, while engaged in military and naval operations of the first magnitude, administrative burdens which appear disproportionate to any resulting utility. In addition to having to provide sufficient Federal balloting units to company levels all over the world to meet an estimated potential of voters in each organization, it was necessary to print and similarly distribute three soldier-voting posters in 140,000 copies each. Furthermore, half of each soldier-voting manual was devoted to the Federal procedure. The time and effort employed by already busy officers and men overseas in the global distribution of these units, posters, manuals, etc., to every company, detachment, and vessel outside of the United States, and in the actual administration of title III cannot be readily measured. Perhaps as much as 75 percent of the time employed by overseas soldier-voting personnel in voting administration was of necessity spent on the Federal ballot, which was used by less than 2 percent of the soldiers overseas of voting age. It was estimated by the second largest overseas theater that about 30,000 man-hours were devoted, in addition to regular full-time military duties, to administering the Federal balloting procedure; and in this theater only 7,154 Federal ballots were executed. And, as stated above, a large percentage of those who voted by Federal ballot later received, voted, and sent in their State absentee ballots, further reducing the effective use of the Federal ballot.

For these reasons, the Secretary of War in his report raised question whether the Federal ballot, as now provided under title III of the statute, was of sufficient utility to justify its continuance as a voting procedure in time of war.

CHANGES MADE IN STATE VOTING LAWS SINCE THE CONGRESSIONAL DEBATES IN 1944 RENDERED STATE BALLOTS CAPABLE OF EFFECTIVE USE BY ABSENTEE SERVICEMEN IN THE NOVEMBER ELECTION

The second mistaken conclusion drawn from the relatively small number of Federal ballots cast in the November election has been that the effective use of State absentee ballots in that election demonstrated that the claim for a need of a Federal ballot, which was so strongly argued in congressional debate last winter, was unfounded. This conclusion entirely disregards the fact that 38 State legislatures in sessions during the winter and spring of 1944 modified their State absentee voting laws so as to make them more readily utilizable by servicemen voters.

In his statutory report to the United States War Ballot Commission, the Secretary of War commented on these beneficial changes in State absentee voting laws—paragraph 25a:

> Most servicemen who desired to vote were able to obtain, vote, and return their State absentee ballots, leaving relatively few who needed to (or legally could) use the supplementary Federal procedure. At the time when Congress was debating the measures which led to Public Law 277 such a result would not have been possible under then existing State laws. But during and after January 1944 those State laws were radically changed in 38 State legislative sessions so as to make them in the main capable of being effectively used by servicemen.

Two principal difficulties with the effective use by absentee servicemen of State absentee ballots under State laws as they existed in January 1944, when the congressional debates were occurring, concerned: first, State law requirements that the absentee serviceman make application for a State absentee ballot on a specially supplied State form rather than on the Federal post-card application supplied to servicemen by the services; and second, insufficient time interval under State law for the absentee serviceman to obtain, execute, and return his State absentee ballot.

First. Under State laws in effect in January 1944, 18 States required the soldier to make application for a State-absentee ballot on a special State-supplied form, and 4 States made no provision for absentee voting in the general election. This meant that servicemen from these 18 States were involved in 5 steps in obtaining and voting a State ballot—request for form; transmission of form; return of executed form; transmission of blank ballot; return of executed ballot. After the State legislatures had met, the laws of 47 States authorized the use by absent servicemen of the Federal post-card application as an application for a State-absentee ballot. In these 47 States, accordingly, the serviceman was thereafter involved in only 3 steps in obtaining and voting by State ballot—application for ballot; transmission of blank ballot; return of evacuted ballot. It was still true, of course, that the several States fixed different dates on or before which they would receive such applications, on which they would first mail out State-absentee ballots, and on or before which the executed State-absentee ballots must be received back within the State in order to be eligible to be counted.

Second. Under State laws in effect in January 1944, the so-called critical time interval was too short in numerous

States to permit many absentee servicemen overseas to obtain, execute, and return their State-absentee ballots in time to be eligible to be counted, even assuming the most expeditious air carriage. The critical time interval is the number of days between the earliest date the ballot will be sent out by a State to an applicant and the last date the executed ballot must be received back in the State to be eligible to be counted. The following table graphically illustrates the striking changes made after January 1944 by the State legislatures in the length of the critical time intervals under their respective laws:

"Critical time interval"	State laws in effect at Jan. 7, 1944	State laws in effect at date of voting in general election
1 to 19 days	7	1
20 to 24 days	7	1
25 to 34 days	13	1
35 to 44 days	5	4
Under 45 days	32	7
45 days and over		41
No provision for absentee voting or uncertain	7	0
Total	48	48

Without reviewing other changes made by the States in their absentee-voting laws, after the date of the congressional debates and prior to the time for voting in the November 1944 general election, it is apparent at once that the changes above referred to radically changed the utility of State absentee-voting procedures to very many servicemen overseas and rendered voting by State absentee ballot a feasible procedure where in many instances it had been impossible of use.

It is obvious that as the States cooperatively improved their absentee-voting laws, as a result of the congressional debates in January and February 1944, and in accordance with the recommendations of the Congress set forth in title II of Public Law 277, the need for the Federal ballot as originally proposed, and even as later modified, progressively diminished.

However, it is equally obvious that a simple Federal ballot, available to servicemen from States authorizing its use who have for one reason or another not received their State absentee ballots, has utility as a supplementary voting procedure.

Utilization of Manpower Resources and Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD three short editorials from North Carolina newspapers dealing with the work-or-fight bill and strikes in essential war industries. These represent the thought of the American people with reference to the vital issues now before the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Charlotte Observer of February 25, 1945]

THIS IS BASIC

Senator BURNETT MAYBANK, of South Carolina, has dared to make the remark in connection with the proposed work-or-else bill that employees who violate its terms should be held by law to be equally guilty with employers who disregard its proposed provisions.

"All Americans," said Senator MAYBANK, "should be treated alike."

We had rather been taught to believe that treating everybody alike was basic and fundamental in a democracy.

"Equal rights to all, special privileges to none," is a classic expression of the core and meaning of democratic action and of democratic government.

But, unhappily, we seem to have gotten other notions in our heads.

Lots of Federal laws have been written the last 10 years which are clearly designed to give certain groups rights and privileges which are denied other groups.

The Senate Military Affairs Committee has produced a milk-and-water hodgepodge of a work bill which would impose upon employers all the punishment for its violation, but no punishment at all upon employees who may be equally guilty under this same law.

Senator MAYBANK doesn't like that sort of discrimination. No American who has any love for the democracy of his country or hope for its survival should like it.

[From Greensboro News of February 26, 1945]

BIG VOID STILL THERE

If the Senate Military Affairs Committee had been deliberately trying to draft a work-or-fight bill most likely to draw opposition from all sides and deserving of defeat accordingly, it could not have done better than bring out the version of this measure which it has brought out.

First off, the Senate measure is one-sided and discriminatory, legislation of the sort that the country already has too much of. And in that one-sidedness it moves over into the realm of ineffectuality. In marked contrast to the House bill, which penalizes workers who leave essential jobs without their draft board's permission or who refuse to leave their present jobs for more essential work, the Senate version would shift these penalties to the employers who disregarded War Manpower Commission employment ceilings or hired new workers in defiance of W. M. C. orders.

The weakness of that change of emphasis is immediately seen. Employers are already on the spot and can be handled by imposition of sanctions by W. P. B., O. D. T., W. M. C., and what-not. But there is nothing that can be done about employees who quit, or who refuse to transfer; and the Senate bill leaves that void just as big as it ever was. Now, if conferees from House and Senate should get together and decide that punitive provisions of the statute should apply to both groups, employers and employees, that would be something else.

The biggest industrial issue before the country right now is the annual show-down between John L. Lewis and the Government of the United States, as the existing contract between Lewis' United Mine Workers and the Nation's coal producers expires April 1 and already the preliminaries for a first-class scrap are clearly discernible.

Where in the Senate work-or-fight bill is anything that will keep the mines going along about April 1 and John L. Lewis from thumbing his nose at any such directives as employers are ordered to obey upon penalty of stiff fine and/or imprisonment?

[From Wilmington Star-News of February 25, 1945]

SERVICEMEN AND STRIKES

The views of American soldiers and sailors on industrial strikes are pretty well known. They've been expressed often but seldom as well as in the following story and poem which appeared recently in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer:

Right after Pearl Harbor, two buddies in navy blues out there in the South Pacific saw only "Strikes, strikes, strikes for more pay, shorter hours, or some darn thing" when they read the newspapers from home.

One of the buddies—Ship's Cook (2d cl.) Fred E. Truman, of somewhere in Wyoming—in one of his free moments, dashed off a poem that told his reaction.

The other buddy—Chief Commissary Steward C. Lotti, of San Bernardino, Calif.—who felt the same way about the strikes "back home in the States" folded the clipping (after the poem was printed) in his wallet.

A year later, in 1942, Truman, the author of the poem, was killed in action on a destroyer when he was manning a gun.

Yesterday, Lotti, who is temporarily stationed in Seattle, read of the shipyard strike.

"It made me mad," he said last night, when he brought the copy of his buddy's poem to the Post-Intelligencer.

"Out there in the Pacific, we didn't have time to think about wages or hours. We had other things to worry about. Our lives, for instance, and the lives of those around us. We were lucky, sometimes, if we could find time to eat."

He tenderly refolded the clipping and placed it back in his wallet.

"Thank you for reading it," he said, "I just had to bring it in."

FOR THOSE WHO STRIKE

It seems so childish and so cruel, too,
To call a strike, while life's blood drains away
From veins of some young boy, whose lips turn blue
Along red fringes of an acrid day.
Who are these puny gnats with twisted souls,
That drop their tools of toil, while some lad bleeds
Upon a reef of jagged coral shoals,
Or in a jungle muck among tall reeds.

Our boys are dying there, yet human worms,
Who shape the destiny of toiling hands,
Dictate a strike, while in some foxhole squirms
The lad who keeps war distant from our lands.
A safe and well-fed picket walks the street—
Unfit to kiss some boy's war-shattered feet.

—*Fred E. Truman.*

Speech of Winston Churchill on the Yalta Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address on the Yalta Conference delivered by Prime Minister Winston Churchill before the British House of Commons on Tuesday, February 27, 1945.

The address referred to follows:

The recent conference in the Crimea faced realities and difficulties in so exceptional a manner that the results constitute an act of state on which Parliament should formally express its opinion.

The Government feel that they have the right to know where they stand with the House of Commons. A strong expression of support by the House will strengthen our position among the Allies. The intimate and sensitive connection between the executive government and the House of Commons will thereby be made plain, thus showing the liveliness of our democratic institutions and the subordination of ministers to parliamentary authority.

The House should not shrink from its duty of pronouncing. We live in a time when the quality of decision is required from all who take part in our public affairs. In this we also see the firm, tenacious character of the present Parliament and generally of our parliamentary institutions, emerging as they do fortified from storms of wars, and they will be made manifest.

We have therefore thought it right and necessary to place a positive motion on paper in support of which I should like to submit facts and arguments to the House as the opening of this 3 days of debate.

The difficulties of bringing about a conference of the three heads of government of the principal allies are only too obvious. The fact that, in spite of all modern methods of communication, 14 months elapsed between Teheran and Yalta, is a measure of those difficulties. It is well known that the British Government greatly desired a triple meeting in the autumn. We rejoiced when at last Yalta was fixed.

UNITED STATES-BRITISH MEETING EN ROUTE

On the way there the British and United States delegations met at Malta to discuss the wide range of our joint military and political affairs. The Combined Chiefs of Staff of the two countries were for 3 days in conference upon the great operations now developing on the western front and upon plans against Japan that it was appropriate to discuss together.

The Foreign Secretary, accompanied by high officials and assistants—some of whom unfortunately perished on the way—also met Mr. Stettinius there. On the morning of the 2d a cruiser which bore the President steamed majestically into the battle-scarred harbor.

The meeting of the Combined Chiefs of Staffs was held in the afternoon, at which the President and I approved proposals which had been so carefully worked out in the preceding day for carrying out joint war efforts to the highest pitch and for the shaping and timing of military operations.

Meanwhile the Ministry of War Transport and American authorities concerned had been laboring on a vessel all to themselves at the problems of shipping which govern our efforts at the present time and which affect employment and the reserve of oil, food, munitions, and troops.

On all of these matters complete agreement was reached—very difficult complicated matters, like making an international Bradshaw in which the times of all trains have to be varied if half a dozen unforeseen contingencies arise.

No hard and fast agreements were made on any of the political issues. Those naturally were to form the subject of the triple conference and they were carefully kept open for the full meeting.

The reason why shipping is so tight at present is because the peak period of the war in Europe has been prolonged for a good many months beyond what was hoped for last autumn and meanwhile the peak period against Japan had been brought forward by American victories in the Pacific.

But instead of one peak period fading out or dovetailing into another, there is an overlap or double-peak period in two wars which we are waging together on opposite sides of the globe.

SHIPPING SHORTAGE GREAT

Though for a couple of years our joint losses by U-boats have ceased to be an appreciable factor in our main business and although the shipbuilding output of the United States flows on gigantically and although the Allies have today far more shipping than they ever had at any time previously during the war, we are, in fact, more hard pressed by shipping shortages than ever before in the war.

The same double peak of war effort, of course, affects all of our preparations for a turnover to peace, including housing and much needed supplies for civilians.

All of these facts call for most stringent and searching economies on the military side, where indulgence or miscalculation or extravagance of any kind is grave injury to the common cause.

They also lamentably hamper our power to provide for the dire needs of liberated territories. I am not prepared to have this island cut below its immediate safety reserves of food and oil except in cases where sure and speedy replacement can be made. Subject to this, we shall do everything in our power to help the liberated countries.

It is easy to see the rigorous character of discussions which Lord Leathers, who is highly competent in these matters, has conducted on our behalf, and we may be satisfied today with a fair and friendly distribution of the burden and hardship which has been agreed upon between Great Britain and the United States over the whole field of the interallied shipping pool.

There were diplomatic conferences proceeding on one vessel, military discussions proceeding on another, and there was this long business of shipping going forward on a third vessel. Then, at the end, the President arrived and the results were submitted to him and to me.

I kept in touch with what was going on and we jointly approved all these matters, on which action is immediately being taken. After that we all flew safely from Malta to airfields in the Crimea and motored over the mountains, about which very alarming accounts had been given but which proved to be greatly exaggerated.

We found shelter on the southern shores of Crimea, which, protected by mountains behind them, form the beautiful Black Sea Riviera and where there still remain undestroyed by the Nazis a few of the villas and palaces of the vanished imperial and aristocratic regime.

By extreme exertions and every form of thoughtfulness and ingenuity our Russian hosts restored these dwellings to good order and had provided for our accommodation and comfort in the true style of Russian hospitality.

In the background were precipices of mountains and beyond them devastated fields and shattered buildings of Crimea, twice crossed by armies which surged in deadly combat. Here on this shore we labored for 9 days and grappled with many problems, while friendship grew.

WHY FRANCE WAS LEFT OUT

I have seen criticisms in this country that France was not invited to participate in the conference at Yalta. The first principle of British policy in western Europe is a strong France and a strong French Army. It was, however, felt by all three great powers assembled in the Crimea that while they were responsible for bearing to an overwhelming degree the main brunt and burden of the conduct of the war and the policy intimately connected with the operations, they could not allow any restriction to be placed on their right to meet together as they deemed necessary in order that they might effectively discharge their duties to the common cause.

This view does not, of course, exclude meetings on the highest level to which other powers will be invited. France may, therefore, find many reasons for contentment with the Crimea decisions. Under these decisions France is to be invited to take over a zone of occupation in Germany which we will immediately proceed to delimit with her, and to sit on the Allied Control Commission in Germany, which will regulate the whole affairs of the country after unconditional surrender has been obtained.

France is to be invited to join the United States, the United Kingdom, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and China in sponsoring invitations to the San Francisco Conference, which has been arranged for April 25 this year. She is invited to join the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union in operating the procedure laid down in the declaration of liberated Europe.

She is also a member of the European Advisory Commission, to which most of the important tasks have been relegated—including advice to the governments upon the most important matters connected with the treatment of Germany—and which with French assistance has already completed in great detail all the terms upon which unconditional surrender will be received and accepted. Everything is provided for in that sphere.

FOE'S COLLAPSE PREPARED FOR

If we were confronted tomorrow with the collapse of German power there is nothing which has not been foreseen and arranged beforehand by this important European Advisory Commission, consisting of Mr. Winant, Ambassador Gousev, and Sir William Strang of the Foreign Office, which is also to advise us on various matters connected with Germany apart from the actual taking over by our military authorities.

All these arrangements show clearly the importance of the role which France is called upon to play in the settlement of Europe and how fully it is realized she must be intimately associated with the other great powers in this task.

In order to give a further explanation of the proceedings of the conference, we invited M. Bidault, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, to visit London at the earliest opportunity. He was good enough to come, and during the last few days we have had the pleasure of a series of clarifying talks with him in which he has been able to become fully informed of the whole position and to express in the most effective manner the views and wishes of France upon it.

Of the world organization there is little I can say beyond what is contained in the report of the conference and, of course, in the earlier reports which emanated from Dumbarton Oaks. At the Crimea the three great powers agreed on the solution of a difficult question of voting procedure to which no answer had been found at Dumbarton Oaks.

Agreement on this vital matter has enabled us to take the next step forward in the setting up of a new world organization, and arrangements are in hand for the issue of invitations to the United Nations conference, which, as I have said, will meet in a couple of months at San Francisco.

I wish I could give the House the full particulars of the solution of this question of voting procedure to which representatives of the three great powers, formerly in disagreement, have now wholeheartedly agreed to. We thought it right, however, that we should consult both France and China and should endeavor to secure their acceptance before the formula was published. For the moment, therefore, I can only deal with the matter in general terms.

DIFFICULTY TO BE FACED

Here is the difficulty which has to be faced. It is on the great powers that the chief burden of maintaining peace and security will fall. A new world organization must be so framed as not to compromise their unity or their capacity for effective action if it is called for at short notice. At the same time a world organization cannot be based on a dictatorship of the great powers.

It is their duty to serve the world and not to rule it. We trust that the voting procedure on which we agreed at Yalta meets these two essential points and provides a system which is fair and acceptable, having regard to the evident difficulties which will meet anyone who gives prolonged thought to the subject.

The conference at San Francisco will bring together upon the invitation of the United States, of Great Britain, of the British Commonwealth, of the Union of Soviet Republics, of the Provisional Government of the French Republic and the Republic of China, all those representatives of the United Nations who have declared war upon Germany and Japan by the first of March 1945, and who have signed the United Nations Conference declaration.

Many are declaring war or have done so since Yalta and their act should be treated with respect and satisfaction by those who have borne the heat and burden of the day. Our future will be consolidated and enriched by the participation of these powers together as founder members. We should all take the opening steps to form a world organization to which it is hoped ultimately and in due course all states will belong.

It is to this strongly armed body we look to prevent wars of aggression, or preparation of such wars, and to enable disputes between states, both great and small, to be adjusted by peaceful and lawful means, by persuasion, by pressure of public opinion, by legal methods and eventually by another category of methods which constitute principles of this new organization.

UNITED STATES IN NEW LEAGUE

The former League of Nations, which was so hardly used and found to be inadequate for the tasks it attempted, will be replaced by a far stronger body in which the United States will play a vitally important part. It will embody much of the structure of the characteristics of its predecessor. All the work that was done in the past, all the experience that has been gathered by the working of the League of Nations, will not be cast away; but the new body will differ from it in the essential point that it will not shrink from establishing its will against the evil doer or the evil planner in good time and by the force of arms.

This organization, which will be capable of continuous progress and development, is at any rate appropriate to the phase into which the world will enter after the present enemies have been beaten down, and we may have good hopes—and more than hopes, a resolute determination—that it shall shield humanity from the third renewal of its agony.

We have all been made aware in the interval between the two world wars of weaknesses of international bodies whose work is seriously complicated by the misfortune which occurred in building the Tower of Babel. Taught by bitter experience, we hope now to make the world conscious of the strength of the new instrument and of the protection which it will be able to afford to all who wish to dwell in peace within their habitations.

This new world structure will, from the outset and in all parts of its work, be aided to the utmost by the ordinary channels of friendly diplomatic relations, which it in no way supersedes. We are determined to do all in our power to insure the success of the conference.

On such an occasion it is clearly right that the two leading parties of His Majesty's Government and the British Nation should be represented and, as all parties are bound for the future in this decision, I am glad to inform the House that His Majesty's chief representatives at this conference will be the Secretary for Foreign Affairs and the Lord President of the Council and leader of the Labor Party.

I, myself, am anxious that this principle should be established even in what are perhaps the closing stages of this memorable coalition. I am anxious that all parties should be united in this new instrument so that this supreme force should be, in Mr. Gladstone's words, high and dry above the ebb and flow of party politics—I have not verified that quotation and I ask for indulgence if I should prove to have made any slip.

WHAT IMPENDS FOR GERMANY

The Crimea Conference finds the Allies more closely united than ever before, both in the military and political sphere. Let Germany recognize that it is futile to hope for divisions among the Allies and that nothing can avert her utter defeat. Further resistance will only be cause of needless suffering.

The Allies are resolved that Germany shall be totally disarmed; that nazi-ism and militarism in Germany shall be destroyed; that war criminals shall be tried justly and quickly punished; that all German industries capable of military production shall be eliminated or controlled; and that Germany shall make compensation in kind to the utmost of her ability for damage done to Allied Nations.

On the other hand it is not the purpose of the Allies to destroy the people of Germany or to leave them without the necessary means of subsistence. Our policy is not revenge, but to take such measures as may be necessary to secure the future peace and safety of the world. There will be a place one day for Germans in the community of nations, but only when all traces of nazi-ism and the military have been effectively and finally extirpated.

In the general plan there is complete agreement. As to measures to give effect to it, there is much which still remains to be done. Plans for the Allied Control Commission will come into operation immediately on the defeat of Germany. On the longer-term measures there are many points of great importance on which detailed plans have yet to be worked out between the Allies.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that questions of this kind can be thrashed out and solutions found for all the many intractable and complex problems involved while the armies are still on the march, and to hurry and press matters of this kind might well be to risk causing disunity between the Allies.

Many of these matters must await the time when the leaders of the Allies, freed from the burdens of direction of the war, can turn their whole or main attention to the making of wise and far-seeing peace, which will, I trust, become the foundation for greatly facilitating the work of the world organization.

QUESTION OF POLAND

I now come to the most difficult and agitated part of the statement I have to make to the House—the question of Poland.

For more than a year past and since the tide of war has turned so strongly against Germany the Polish problem has been divided into two main issues—frontiers of Poland and the freedom of Poland. The House is well aware from the speeches I have made to them that freedom, independence, integrity, and sovereignty of Poland have always seemed to His Majesty's Government more important than the actual frontiers.

To establish a free Polish Nation with a good home to live in has always far outweighed in my mind the actual tracing of a frontier line or whether those boundaries should be shifted on both sides of Poland farther to the west.

The Russian claim, first advanced at Teheran in November 1943, has always been unchanged for the Curzon line in the east, and the Russian offer has always been that ample compensation should be gained for Poland at the expense of Germany in the north and west.

All these aspects are tolerably well known. The foreign secretary explained in detail last December the story of the Curzon line. I have never concealed from the House that, personally, I think the Russian claim to it is just and right.

If I champion this frontier for Russia it is not because I bow to force; it is because I have believed in the fairest division of territory that can in all circumstances be made between two countries whose history has been so checkered and intermingled.

The Curzon line was drawn in 1919 by an expert commission on which one of our most distinguished foreign representatives of those days, Sir Eyre Crowe, was a member. It was drawn at a time when Russia had few friends among the Allies. Indeed, I may say she was extremely unpopular. One cannot feel that either circumstances or personalities concerned would have given undue favor to Soviet Russia. They just tried to find out what was the right and proper line to draw. The British Government of those days approved this line, including of course, the exclusion of Lwow from Poland.

TWO THINGS TO REMEMBER

Apart from all that has happened I cannot conceive we should not regard it as a well-informed and fair proposal. There are two things to be remembered in justice to our great ally. First, I can look back to August 1914, when Germany first declared war against Russia under the Czar. In those days Russia's frontiers on the west were far more spacious than those Soviet Russia is now asking after all her sufferings and after all her victories.

The Russian frontiers included all Finland and the Warsaw salient stretching to within 60 miles of Breslau. Russia is, in fact, accepting a frontier which over immense distances is 200 or 300 miles farther to the east of that which was Russian territory and had been for many generations under the Czarist regime.

Marshal Stalin told me one day that Lenin objected to the Curzon Line because Bialystok and regions around it were taken from Russia. Marshal Stalin and the modern Soviet Government make no such claim and freely agree to that view taken by the Allied Commission in 1919, that the Bialystok region should go to Poland because of the Polish population predominating there.

A line is not a frontier. If it is a frontier it has to be surveyed and traced on the ground and not merely cut in on a map by pencil and ruler. When we were at Moscow in October Marshal Stalin made this point to me and told me he thought there might be deviations of 8 to 10 kilometers in either direction to follow the course of streams or hills or actual sites of particular villages. It seems to me this was an eminently sensible way of looking at the problem.

However, when we met at Yalta the Russian proposal was changed. It was made clear that all such minor alterations would be at the expense of Russia and not at the expense of Poland in order that the Poles might have their minds set at rest once and for all and that there should be no further discussion about that part of the business. We welcomed the Soviet proposal.

We must regard these things as part of one story. I have been through the whole story since 1911, when I was sent to the Admiralty to prepare the fleet for the impending German war. In its main essentials it seems to be one story of a 30-year war in which the British, Russians, Amer-

icans, and French have struggled to their utmost to resist German aggression, which caused the most grievous sacrifices to all of us, but none more frightful than to the Russian people, whose country has been twice ravaged over whole areas and whose blood has been poured out in tens of millions of lives in the common cause now reaching its final accomplishment.

POLAND SAVED BY RUSSIA

There is a second reason which appears to be apart from this sense of continuity which I feel. But for the prodigious exertions and sacrifices of Russia, Poland was doomed to utter destruction at the hands of the Germans. Not only Poland as a state and nation, but the Poles as a race were doomed by Hitler to be destroyed or reduced to a servile state.

Three and a half million Polish Jews are said to have been actually slaughtered. It is certain that enormous numbers have perished in one of the most horrifying acts of cruelty—presumably the most horrifying act of cruelty—which have ever darkened the passage of man.

When the Germans clearly avowed their intention of making the Poles a subject and lower-grade race under the Herrenvolk, suddenly, by a superb effort of military force and skill, Russian armies in little more than 3 weeks—since in fact we spoke on these matters here—have advanced from the Vistula to the Oder, driving the Germans in ruins before them and freeing the whole of Poland from the foul cruelty and oppression under which the Poles were writhing.

In supporting the Russian claim for the Curzon line I repudiate and repulse any suggestion that we are making a questionable compromise or yielding to force or fear, and I assert with the utmost conviction the broad justice of the policy upon which, for the first time, all the three great allies have now taken their stand.

Moreover, the three powers have now agreed that Poland should receive a substantial accession of territory both in the north and west. In the north she will certainly receive in place of the precarious corridor the great city of Danzig and the greater part of East Prussia west of Koenigsberg and south, and a long wide sea front on the Baltic.

In the west she will receive the important industrial province of Upper Silesia and in addition such other territories to the east of the Oder as may be decided at the peace settlement to detach from Germany after the views of a broadly based Polish Government have been ascertained.

Thus it seems to me that this talk of cutting half of Poland off is very misleading. In fact, the part which is to be east of the Curzon line cannot in any case be measured by its size. It includes the enormous dismal region of the Pripet Marshes which Poland held between two wars and it exchanges for that far more fertile and developed land in the west from which a very large proportion of the German population have already departed.

NO SEED OF FUTURE WARS

We need not feel that the task of holding these new lands will be too heavy for Poland, or that it will bring about another German revenge, or that it will—to use a conventional phrase—lay the seed of future wars. We intend to take steps far more drastic and effective than those which followed the last war, because we know much more about this business so as to render all offensive action by Germany impossible for generations to come. Finally under a world organization of nations great and small, victors or vanquished will be secure against aggression by indisputable law and overwhelming international force.

The published Crimea agreement is not a ready-made plan imposed by the great powers on the Polish people. It sets out the agreed view of the three major allies on means whereby their common desire to see established a strong, free, independent Poland may be fulfilled in cooperation with the Poles themselves and whereby a Polish Government which all the United Nations can recognize may be set up in Poland, which will become for the first time a possibility now that practically the whole country has been liberated by the Soviet armies.

The fulfillment of the plan will depend upon the willingness of all sections of democratic Polish opinion in Poland or abroad to work together to give it effect. But the plan should be studied as a whole and with the main common objective always in view. The three powers are agreed that the acceptance by the Poles of the provisions of the eastern frontiers, and so far as now can be ascertained on the western frontiers, is an essential condition of the establishment and future welfare of a strong, independent, homogeneous Polish state.

The proposals on the frontiers are in complete accordance, as the House will remember, with the views expressed by me in Parliament on behalf of the British Government many times during the past year. I ventured to make announcements upon this subject at a time when a great measure of agreement was not expressed by other important parties to the affair.

The eastern frontier must be settled now if the new Polish administration is to be able to carry on its work in its own territory and to do this in unity with the Russians who are behind their fighting front.

The western frontiers, which will involve substantial accession of German territory to Poland, cannot be fixed as part of the whole German settlement until after the Allies have occupied German territory and until after a fully representative Polish Government has been able to make its wishes known.

It would be a great mistake to press Poland to take a larger portion of these lands than is considered by her and her friends and allies to be within her compass to man, to develop, and, with the aid of the Allies and the world organization, to maintain.

CASE PUT UP TO THE COMMONS

I have now dealt with the frontiers of Poland. I must say I think it is a case which I can confide with the greatest of confidence to the House of Commons—to take an impartial line drawn long ago in which the British commission took a leading part, the moderation with which the Russians have strictly confined themselves to this line, the enormous sacrifices they have made and the sufferings they have undergone, the contribution they have made to our present victory, the great victory in which Poland has a vital interest to have complete agreement with her powerful neighbor to the east—when you consider all these matters and the way they have been put forward and the temperate, patient manner in which they have been put forward and discussed, I have rarely put a case in this House which I could commend more confidently to the good sense of members of all parties.

Even more important than the frontier of Poland within limits now disclosed is the freedom of Poland. The home of the Poles is settled. Are they to be masters in their own house? Are they to be free, as we in Britain or the United States or France are free? Is their sovereignty and independence to be untrammeled, or are they to come to the mere protection of the Soviet state, forced against their will by an armed majority to adopt a Communist or totalitarian system? I am putting the whole case now. This is a touchstone far more sensitive and vital than the drawing of frontier lines. Where does Poland stand and where do we all stand on this?

A most sovereign declaration has been made by Marshal Stalin and the Soviet Union that the sovereign independence of Poland is to be maintained, and this decision is now joined in by Great Britain and the United States. Here also a world organization will in due course assume a measure of responsibility. Poles will have their future in their own hands with the single limitation that they must honestly follow in harmony with their allies a policy friendly to Russia.

The procedure which the three great powers have united to adopt to achieve this vital aim is set forth in unmistakable terms in the Crimea declarations. The agreement provides for consultations with a view to the establishment in Poland of a new provisional government of national unity, with which the three major powers can all enter into diplomatic relations instead of some recognizing one Polish government and the rest another—a situation which, if it had survived the Yalta Conference, would have proclaimed to the world disunity and confusion. We had to settle it, and we settled it there.

NO BINDING RESTRICTIONS

No binding restrictions have been imposed on the scope and method of these consultations. The British Government intend to do all in their power to insure that they shall be as wide as possible, and representative Poles of all democratic parties are given full freedom to come and make their views known.

Arrangements for this are now being made in Moscow by a commission of three, comprising Mr. Molotov and Mr. Harriman and Sir Archibald Clark-Kerr, representing the U. S. S. R., the United States, and Great Britain, respectively.

It will be for the Poles themselves, with such assistance as the Allies are able to give them, to agree upon the composition and constitution of the new Polish Government of national unity. Thereafter His Majesty's Government, through their representatives in Poland, will use all their influence to insure that the free election to which the new Polish Government will be pledged shall be fairly carried out under all proper democratic safeguards. Our two guiding principles in dealing with all these problems on the Continent and with liberated countries have been clear.

While the war is on we will give aid to anyone who can kill a Hun. When the war is over we will look to the solution of free, unfettered, democratic elections. These are the two principles which this coalition government has applied to the best of its ability to the circumstances in this infinitely tangled and varied situation.

[At this point Lord Dunglass, Conservative, interposed: "Very much depends on the interpretation which the Prime Minister is now putting on these words. Can he perhaps develop this a little more? For instance, is there going to be for some time some kind of international supervision? His interpretation will make a great difference in many places."]

We will have to wait until the new Polish Government is set up and see what are the proposals they will make for the carrying out of this free, unfettered election to which they will be pledged and to which we are pledged by the responsibility we assume. But I have not finished yet on this point and it may be that some further words of mine may give comfort to the noble lord. I should be sorry if I cannot persuade him that the course we have adopted is simple, direct, and trustworthy.

The agreement does not so far affect the recognition of His Majesty's Government of the Polish Government in London. This will be maintained until such time as His Majesty's Government considers that the new provisional government has been properly formed in Poland in accordance with the agreed provision. Nor does it involve a previous or immediate recognition by His Majesty's Government of the present provisional government which is now functioning in Poland.

LONDON POLES DEAF TO ADVICE

But let me remind the House and those honorable Members who undertake the honorable task of being careful that our affairs

in Poland are regulated in accordance with the honor and dignity of this country, that I have no quarrel with them. We ought to make known all the facts, which I hope will clear away any difference that there is between us. But there would have been no Lublin committee or Lublin provisional government if the Polish Government in London had accepted our faithful counsel of a year ago.

They would have entered into Poland as its actual government. They would have entered with the liberating armies of Russia. Even in October, when the foreign secretary and I toiled day and night in Moscow, Monsieur Mikolajczyk could have entered Poland with Marshal Stalin's friendship and become prime minister of a more broadly constructed government which could now be set up at Warsaw, or wherever, in view of the ruins of Warsaw, the center of government is placed. But these opportunities were cast aside and meanwhile complete expulsion of Germans from Poland has taken place.

Of course, the Lublin government advanced with the victorious Russian armies, who were received with great joy in large areas of Poland. Many of its great cities changed hands without a shot being fired, and none of that terrible business of underground armies being shot by both sides which we feared. So much has actually in fact taken place during the great forward advance.

But these opportunities were cast aside. Russians who are executing and preparing military operations on the largest scale against the heart of Germany have a right to have their communications, the communications of their armies, protected by an orderly countryside under a government acting in accordance with their needs.

It was not, therefore, possible, so far as recognition was concerned, to procure dissolution of the Lublin government simultaneously and to start from a swept table. To do that would have been to endanger the success of the Russian offensive and consequently to prolong the war, with increased loss of Russian, British, and American blood.

The House should read carefully again and again—those Members who have doubts—the terms of the declaration, every word of which was the subject of the most profound and searching attention by the heads of the three states and by their foreign secretaries and their experts.

AS TO ELECTIONS IN POLAND

How will this declaration be carried out? How will phrases like "Free and unfettered elections on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot" be interpreted?

Will the new government be properly constituted with a fair representation of the Polish people as far as can be made practicable at the moment and as soon as possible? Will the elections be free and unfettered? Will candidates of all democratic parties be able to present themselves to the electors and conduct their campaigns?

What are democratic parties? People always take different views on that. Even in our own country there have been from time to time feeble efforts by one party or the other to claim that they are the true democratic party and the rest are either Bolsheviks or Tory landlords.

What are democratic parties? Obviously that is capable of being settled. Will the elections be what we should say was free and fair in this country, making some allowance for the great disorder and confusion which prevail?

Here a Member asked, "Will there be any caucuses?"

We cannot entirely avoid some nucleus of party inspiration being formed, even in this country, and no doubt sometimes very able Members find themselves a little out of joint with party arrangements. But there are a great number of parties in Poland and we have agreed that all those who are democratic parties—not Nazi or Fascist parties or collaborators with the enemy—will be able to take their part.

These are questions upon which we have the clearest views in accordance with the principles of the declaration on liberated Europe to which all three Governments have subscribed. It is on that basis that the Moscow Commission of three was intended to work, and it is on that basis that it has already begun to work.

HAS FAITH IN RUSSIA

The impression that I brought back from the Crimea, and from all my other contacts is that Marshal Stalin and the other Soviet leaders wish to live in honorable friendship and democracy with the western democracies. I also feel that no government stands more to its obligations than the Russian Soviet Government.

I decline absolutely to embark here upon a discussion about Russian good faith. It is quite evident that these matters touch the whole future of the world. Terrible, indeed, would be the fortunes of mankind if some awful schism arose between the western democracies and the Russian people, if all future world organizations were rent asunder and a new cataclysm of inconceivable violence destroyed what is left of the treasures and liberties of mankind.

His Majesty's government recognize that large forces of Polish troops, sailors, and airmen now fighting gallantly, as they have fought during the whole of the war under British command, owe allegiance to the Polish Government in London. We have every confidence that once a new government more fully representative of the will of the Polish people than either the government in London or the provisional government in Poland can be established and recognized by the Great Powers, means will be found to overcome these difficulties in the wide interests of the people of Poland.

Above all, His Majesty's Government are resolved that as many as possible of the troops shall be enabled to return in due course to Poland of their own free will and under every safeguard to play their part in the future life of their country.

In any event His Majesty's Government will never forget the debt they owe to the Polish troops who fought so valiantly and for all those who fought under our command. I earnestly hope it will be possible for them to have citizenship and freedom of the British Empire, if they so desire. I am not able to make a declaration on that subject today because all matters respecting citizenship are required to be discussed between this country and its Dominions, and that takes time. So far as we are concerned, we should think it an honor to have such faithful and valiant warriors dwelling among us as if they were men of our own blood.

[Here Churchill asked for the indulgence of his audience and suggested adjournment until 2:15 p. m. The House then adjourned until that time. The Prime Minister's speech was resumed at 2:17 p. m.]

The brief interval which has separated us enables me to carry the House through altogether differing fields. We leave the Crimean shores and travel southward to warmer winter climes in which also we find many matters where British interests are important and where we are involved.

President Roosevelt invited the Emperor of Ethiopia, King Farouk, of Egypt, and the King of Saudi Arabia to meet him at Ismailia before sailing for home, and conferences upon his cruiser were accordingly arranged by him.

LAST TALK WITH PRESIDENT

I myself took leave of the President on the 15th of this month in Alexandria Harbor after long and most agreeable talks about the state of our affairs in the light of the Crimea Conference and also talk about our special business in the Far East, in which, as the Japanese are aware, we both take some interest.

We also spoke of our joint occupation of Italy and of our policy there. Upon this, as the House is aware, there was a great deal of misunderstanding in large sections of the American press some weeks ago. During our recent talks I have repeatedly asked both the President and Mr. Stettinius to state whether there are any and, if so, what complaints by the United States Government against us for any steps we have taken in Italy or not taken in Italy, and I have received categorical assurances that there are none.

Moreover I must place it on record that when I visited Italy in August last I made a series of proposals to the British Government, of which I informed the President, for mitigating the severity of Allied occupation of Italy and generally for alleviating the hard lot of the Italian people.

These matters were discussed at our Second Quebec Conference and it was at Hyde Park, the President's private country home, that he and I drafted the declaration of September 28, which was and is intended to make very definite mitigation in the attitude of the victorious powers toward the Italian people and to show our desire to help them in due course to resume their place among the leading nations of Europe.

DECISIONS ON ITALY

Last Saturday Mr. MacMillan (Harold McMillan), acting president of the Allied Commission (for Italy) and Admiral Stone (Commodore Ellery Stone), who is its chief commissioner, were received by the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary, and announced to them the new measures decided upon in favor of the Italian Government in fulfillment of this September declaration.

As I myself had taken the lead in bringing these proposals forward and eventually in securing their adoption, I am not prepared to accept suggestions from any quarter that, although we had suffered so much injury and ill usage at Italy's hands in the days of Mussolini's power, Great Britain has fallen behind other victorious powers in taking a generous view toward Italy or that we nourish any design of power politics which involve Italy. (Churchill referred to a sentence he had used in a recent speech that we had no need of Italy and said this was wrested from its context.)

As a matter of fact, it was merely a reply which I was bound to make to suggestions in some quarters of the United States press that we were embarking on some power politics, whatever they may be, in the Mediterranean. I am glad to say that the facts I am now setting forth have been explicitly accepted by the United States, or at any rate in all responsible quarters, and that this view was thoroughly endorsed by the President and by Mr. Stettinius and I received quite definite assurances that no complaints of any kind were or are professed against us which would call for any reply on my part such as certainly would be forthcoming.

Our two nations can therefore proceed on their joint task in Italy, which in the future will be burdened with many new complications and difficulties, but at any rate we can proceed in closest confidence and unity.

We look forward to Italy's return under a truly democratic regime to a community of industrious and peace-loving people. In her efforts to help herself Italy can count on British good will and on Allied good will. She can count also upon such material aid as is at our disposal and she will certainly continue to receive her fair share.

I said some time ago that Italy would have to work her passage home. She has some way to go yet. It would be less than just if I did not pay tribute to the invaluable services, the full tale of which cannot be told, of the Italian men and women in the armed forces, on the seas, in the countryside, and behind the enemy lines in

the north which are being rendered steadfastly to the common cause.

New difficulties may be cast upon us when the great districts in the north are cleared and when the problem of feeding the great masses for whom we shall then become responsible is cast upon us, and the provisional government itself may be called upon to undergo changes as a consequence of the greatly increased constituency to which it will become responsible as a result of that liberation.

The Foreign Secretary and I thought it would be becoming as well as convenient and agreeable that we should also see the two rulers who had made long journeys to come to Egypt at the President's invitation and that we should pass under friendly review with them the many matters with which we have common concern.

It was our duty also to pay our respects to King Farouk of Egypt and we thought it right to seek a talk with the President of Syria in order to calm things down as much as possible in the Levant. It should not be supposed that anything in the nature of general conference on Middle East affairs took place. The mere fact that the Regent of Iraq and the Amir Abdullah of Transjordania were not upon the spot should make this perfectly clear.

Any conference would naturally include such authorities. There was no question of shaping a new policy for the Middle East but rather to make those friendly, personal contacts by which public business between various states is often helped.

I must at once express our grief and horror at the assassination of the Egyptian Prime Minister, with whom the Foreign Secretary had a long and cordial interview only a few days before he fell victim of the foul blow.

His death is a serious loss to his Government and country. The sympathy of Great Britain for the widow and family of the late Prime Minister of Egypt has, of course, been expressed, not only in telegrams from the Foreign Office but also by various personal visits of our Ambassador. I am sure the House will associate itself with those expressions.

There is little doubt that security measures in Egypt require considerable tightening and above all that the execution of justice upon the men proved guilty of this political murder should be swift and exemplary.

EGYPT'S ATTITUDE HELD CORRECT

The Egyptian Government have, we feel, acted rightly and wisely in declaring war upon Germany and Japan and to sign unanimous declarations. We did not press the Egyptian Government at any time to come into the war and indeed on more than one occasion in the past our advice had been to the contrary. There were evident advantages in sparing the populous and famous cities of Egypt from wholesale bombardment.

The Egyptian troops have during the war played an important part. They have maintained order throughout the Delta and guarded many strong points and depots and in all kinds of ways have been of assistance to our war effort, which has once again proven successful in sheltering the fertile lands of the Delta from all assaults by foreign invaders.

We have had every facility from the Egyptians under our treaty of alliance, and successive Egyptian Prime Ministers and governments have given us support in a manner which we deemed most effective. Egypt is an associate power and she should take her rightful place as a future member of the world organization and as one of its founders when the occasion is reached at San Francisco at the end of April.

We are also glad to welcome Turkey into the ranks of the United Nations. Turkey declared herself firmly on our side by the Treaty of Alliance in 1939 at a time when gathering dangers were only too apparent.

As I explained to the House on a former occasion, Turkey became conscious of unexpected military weaknesses after war had started in earnest on account of the decisive influence of new weapons with which she was quite unprovided and which we were not in a position to supply.

As these weapons exercised a dominating effect upon the modern battlefield the Turks felt that they could no longer confide their safety to their renowned infantry and artillery of the last war. We did not, therefore, for a long time press for a Turkish declaration of war. It was not until after the Teheran Conference that we felt the moment had come when Turkey could enter the struggle without great imprudence.

The Turkish Government did not feel able to do so at that time, but they have aided us in various ways which it would not be profitable to recount and we have never had the slightest doubt where their hearts lay. They also will be welcomed by Great Britain into the ranks of the United Nations and I do not consider that the tie renewed between our two countries after the disaster of the last war has been in any way impaired.

INTERESTED IN MEETING IBN SAUD

I was greatly interested in meeting King Ibn Saud, famous ruler of Saudi Arabia. I had the honor of entertaining this most remarkable man at luncheon at the Fayoum Oasis. I expressed to him the thanks of Great Britain for his steadfast, unswerving and unflinching loyalty to our country and to the common cause which never shone more brightly than in the darkest hours of the day of mortal peril.

Although we did not reach a solution of the problems of the Arab world and of the Jewish people in Palestine, I have hopes that when the war is over good arrangements can be made for securing the peace and progress of the Arab world and generally of the Middle East and that Great Britain and visitors who are taking an increasing interest in those regions will be able to play a valuable part in proving the well known maxim of the old free trader, "All legitimate interests are in harmony."

My discussions with the Emperor of Ethiopia raised no serious difficulty because agreement for the next 2 years had already been reached as a result of the mission to Ethiopia which Lord de La Warr had just completed with much patience and address.

It was satisfaction for me to see for the first time in the flesh Haile Selassie, that historic figure who pleaded the cause of his country amid the storms of the League of Nations. He was the first victim of Mussolini's thirst for power and conquest and he was also the first to have restored his ancient throne by the heavy exertions of our British and Indian Armies in the far-off days of 1940–41.

Finally, we had the pleasure of a long discussion with President Shukri of Syria in which we did the utmost to enjoin a friendly attitude toward the French and to encourage the negotiation of a suitable settlement with the French, affecting not only Syria but also Lebanon.

SYRIA-LEBANON PROBLEM STATED

I must make clear the position of His Majesty's Government in respect of Syria and Lebanon and in relation to our French Allies. The position is governed by a settlement made in 1941 in which the independence of these Levant states was definitely declared by Great Britain and France. At that time and ever since His Majesty's Government have made it clear that they would never seek to supplant French influence by British influence in the Levant states.

We trust these States will be firmly established by the authority of a world organization and that French privilege will also be recognized. However, I must make it clear that it is not for us alone to defend by force either Syrian and Lebanon independence or French privilege. We seek both and do not believe they are incompatible.

Too much must not be placed, however, upon the shoulders of Great Britain alone, and we have to take note of the fact that Russia and the United States have recognized and favor Syrian and Lebanon independence but do not favor any special positions for any foreign countries.

All these and many other matters affecting the Middle East are necessary subjects for a peace conference at which we must resolutely strive for a final settlement and a lasting peace between all states and races comprised in the Middle East and the eastern basin of the Mediterranean.

ATHENS VISIT CALLED HIGH SPOT

On my way back from the Crimea to say good-bye to the President at Alexandria the Foreign Secretary and I stopped at Athens. I must say, from my point of view, this was the high spot of the whole journey.

I cannot help recalling the grim conditions of our visit only 7 weeks before, when guns were firing and bullets continually struck the wall, and people were killed and wounded in streets not far away.

The contrast between these violent scenes and the really rapturous welcome we received from vast crowds of delighted citizens was one of the most vivid and impressive and agreeable experiences of my life. [Cheers.] Peace reigned over this beautiful, immortal city. Its citizens were wild with joy. His Beatitude the Archbishop was seated in the regency firmly grasping the reins of power.

Together we drove through crowds on the streets lined by the first installment of the new national Greek Army until I found myself called upon to address what was incomparably the largest and most enthusiastic gathering that in my very long experience of such demonstrations I have ever seen.

There is no subject in which the policy of His Majesty's Government has received more complete vindications. [Cheers.] Nor has there been any on which greater prejudice and misrepresentation have been poured out against them in the United States.

[Replying to an interjection Mr. Churchill said, "And with some assistance from this side."]

All this was done with a wanton disregard of ill effects produced on the spot and encouragement given to the resistance of terrorists in Greece. I am sure we rescued Athens from a horrible fate and I believe the Greek people will long acclaim our actions, both military and political.

PEACE WITHOUT VENGEANCE

Peace without vengeance has been achieved. A great mass of arms has been surrendered. Most of the prisoners and hostages have been restored. The great work of bringing in food and supplies has resumed its former activity. Public order and security are so established that U. N. R. R. A. is about to resume its functions. [Laughter.]

The popularity of British troops and those who have guided the course of policy, such as Mr. Leeper and General Scobie, is unbounded, and their conduct continues to receive the approbation of His Majesty's coalition government. I could, however, by no means lead the House to suppose our difficulties are over. The Greek National Army has still to be formed and to be effective to maintain impartial order. The Greek budget has to be balanced in some way or other.

The drachma has to be restrained within reasonable limits. Raw materials have to be provided to enable industries of various kinds to get to work in Athens, where there are considerably more than 1,000,000 people. The sense of unity and responsibility has to grow stronger with the Greek people. Here I must remark that the future of Greece is in their own hands. The Greeks must not expect that the whole process of their restoration

can be accomplished by British labors or American assistance.

The Foreign Secretary remained a day longer in Athens than I did and he was at pains to bring home to Greek authorities the fact that, now that political stability had been achieved, financial and economic problems must take first place and that the burden and responsibility are upon the Greek ministers and that they must on no account sit back and leave these tasks to foreigners.

I am sorry if those remarks should in any way detract from the great kindness and enthusiasm with which I was received a little time ago, and if my words cause pain I'm not entirely sorry for it.

The intense political activity of the Greek mind must continue to give way to practical problems. As soon as possible they must reach that election, fair, free, and unfettered, in a secret ballot on the basis of universal suffrage, to which everyone is looking forward and which alone can regulate and adjust all that has been done.

I look forward in the greatest confidence and particularly welcome with the Greek Government that Russian, British, and American observers shall be free on the spot to make sure the will of the people will find complete and sincere expression. So much for that episode, on which we have had so many exciting, even momentarily heated, debates in recent times.

I thank the House very much for their courtesy and attention. I refer, before sitting down for a moment or two, to the conference as a whole and in relation to the grave matters which I mentioned before the interval wherein the House indulged me.

It was the custom of the Conference at Yalta to hold its meetings of the heads of the three Governments and their Foreign Secretaries in the late afternoon and sit for several hours each day. Here important issues were deployed, and measures, both in agreement and on which there were differences, were clearly revealed.

I remember particularly one moment when a prolonged silence fell upon our small body and was maintained for 2 or 3 minutes, but it was immediately found very convenient to remit measures of agreement, or of difference, wherever our discussion had carried them to morning meetings of Foreign Secretaries.

Each Foreign Secretary was president over the meetings in rotation. So excellent was the combined work of the Foreign Secretaries that our problems were returned nearly every day for the combined meeting in a form in which final agreement could be reached and lasting decisions taken.

There was a proposal on the agenda for institution during the present anxious period of regulation of the meetings of the Foreign Secretaries. Improvement of combined and collective work has been often asked for here in order to prevent avoidable divergencies of view and to concert actions of the three great powers.

This was to me a felt want and one to serve to bridge the inevitable gap in the meetings of the three Foreign Secretaries showed itself to be so valuable, efficient, and indispensable that its continuing collective activity was acclaimed by all.

It is, of course, only a temporary arrangement appropriate to these times of special stress when so heavy a burden—military burden—is resting on three great powers, and we may expect it eventually to merge in a larger and permanent organization which will be set up in San Francisco once that organization is in full working order and the peace conference has finished its labors. In the intervening period these meetings of the three Foreign Secretaries, to whom from time to time the Foreign Secretaries of other countries will be added, will prove of undoubted advantage.

HIGH PRAISE FOR EDEN

Here is a moment when the House should pay tribute to the work of the Foreign Secretary. I cannot describe to the House the aid and comfort he has been to me in all our difficulties.

A hard life when quite young, in the last war in the infantry, in constant self-preparation for the task which has fallen to him, his unequaled experience as Minister of the Foreign Office, his knowledge of foreign affairs and its past history, his experience of conferences of all kinds, his breadth of view, his power of exposition, his moral courage, have gained for him a position second to none among the foreign secretaries of the Grand Alliance.

It is not only my personal debt but that of the House to him which I now acknowledge.

I suppose that during these last 3 winter months the human race all the world over have undergone more physical agony and misery than at any other period through which this planet has passed.

In the Stone Age numbers were fewer and primitive creatures little removed from animal origin knew no better. We suffer more. We feel more. I must admit in this war I never felt so grave a sense of responsibility as I did at Yalta. In 1940 and 1941, when we in this island were all alone and invasion was so near, the actual steps we ought to take and our attitude toward them seemed plain and simple. If a man is coming across the sea to kill you, you do everything in your power to make sure he dies before he finishes his journey. That may be difficult and it may be painful, but at least it is simple. [Laughter.]

Now we enter into a world of imponderables, and at every stage self-questioning arises. It is a mistake to look too far ahead. Only one link in the chain of destiny can be handled at will.

I trust that the House will feel that hope has been powerfully strengthened by our meeting in the Crimea. The ties that bind the three Great Powers together and their mutual comprehension of each other have grown.

The United States has entered deeply and constructively into the life and salvation of Europe. We all three set our hands to far-reaching engagements, at once practical and solemn.

The United Nations are an unchallengeable power to lead the world to prosperity, freedom, and happiness. The Great Powers must seek to serve and not to rule. Joined with other states, both large and small, we may found a large world organization which, armed with ample power, will guard the rights of all states, great and small, from aggression or from the gathering of the means of aggression.

I am sure that a fairer choice is open to mankind than they have known in recorded ages. Lights burn brighter and shine more broadly than before. Let us walk forward together.

The 60,000,000-Job Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Indianapolis Star, Sunday, February 18, entitled "Willis Calls 60,000,000-Job Plan 'Political Propaganda,'" written by Jack Reed, head of the Washington bureau of the Indianapolis Star and the Yankee News Service.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIS CALLS 60,000,000 JOB PLAN "POLITICAL PROPAGANDA"—ADOPTION WOULD MEAN DESTRUCTION OF POLITICAL SYSTEM, SENATOR DECLARES

(By Jack Reed)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS tonight labeled as "political propaganda, intended to mislead and misinform, perhaps with vicious purposes," the proposal that the Government now plan to create a 60,000,000-job international economy for the post-war United States.

"The proposal is either political propaganda, sugar coated to conceal its effect of regimenting the Nation," he added, "or it is the product of gross ignorance and fantastic disregard for the fact."

Senator WILLIS said that 60,000,000 jobs for America is a possible goal. He thinks it could be attained. But in the doing, he concludes, the Nation would involve itself in a program of complete regimentation which would destroy the American political system and disrupt the traditional home life of the Nation.

"SOCIALLY UNEMPLOYABLE"

"Third-grade arithmetic," he continued, shows that if President Roosevelt and Henry Wallace succeeded in forcing the development of 60,000,000 jobs by regimental process, they will have to force employment upon children, housewives, the aged, the ill, the incompetent. The plan which would develop 60,000,000 jobs will require the performance of 60,000,000 jobs and a commitment for their performance. So a proposal to provide them stands revealed as idle and immature thinking, or a deep plot to control the lives of Americans through control of their incomes."

Senator WILLIS says certain elements of the population are "socially unemployable."

"They are the children under 18; the men over 65, and the women over 60; the young men and women over 18 who are going to colleges and universities and the unfortunates who are institutionalized by reason of mental, physical, or social handicap or shortcoming; the inmates of penal institutions and the matured, physically fit women of two groups—those who are expectant mothers and those who are the mothers of very young children."

CENSUS FIGURES CITED

"Certainly, we do not want these people employed in mills, mines, and factories, or working the roads and building dams. In general, we have sought to support the Nation's economy without their labor."

The Senator submitted the following compilation of census figures from the last exact census, taken in 1940:

Socially unemployable:	
Youth and children under 18	40,300,000
Men over 65, women over 60	11,475,000
Confined in social institutions	1,175,000
Confined in United States penitentiaries	170,000
Mothers of babies in first year	1,900,000
Unemployable expectant mothers	950,000
College enrollment	2,435,000
Total	58,400,000

"Of these figures," he said, "only those on mothers and expectant mothers are estimates. The others are from the records of

the Census Bureau, which then calculated the total population at 131,000,000."

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIX MILLION POPULATION

"It estimated that by this year the population would have increased to 136,000,000. Applying the increase factor to the total number of unemployables, there now are 60,500,000 in what is normally the socially unemployable group.

"That leaves us, then, a total working force of 75,500,000 people in the United States if we include every woman in the Nation between 18 and 60, except those who are expectant, or the mothers of yearling children.

"If we push 60,000,000 of that number into jobs, there will be 15,500,000 left. They will comprise the force which has the job of running the American home.

"There will be, at the end of the war, close to 40,000,000 homes in the Nation.

"The case stands proved.

"PRODUCTION FOR WORLD

"If you have 60,000,000 jobs, you have nobody left to do the cooking, to maintain the homes, to guide the children and to function in that most important employment in the world, the job of being an American housewife.

"The plan," he said, "means production of American goods for the whole world, goods for which the rest of the world cannot pay except in kind. Therefore the sixty-million job proposal means the cessation of profitable world commerce and the substitution of world philanthropy—or it means the reduction of the American standard of living to the world average. It means that our economic progress must lag while all others in the world—the Hottentots, the Hindus, the Chinese, the Arabs and the rest of them—acquire shoes and electric refrigeration.

"All employables in America can be given jobs in the post-war world if we lift the excessive taxation, unnecessary restriction and regimentation from the workers and the employers of the land."

The Bretton Woods Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very interesting and instructive editorial recently published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on the subject of the Bretton Woods agreement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT

Congress should endorse both the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development embodied in the Bretton Woods agreement. It should do so without undue hedging or delay.

The Globe-Democrat advocates this course in full knowledge that the plan is not perfect and that it contains some weaknesses which, without wise and courageous administration, could produce some discouraging results. But it is an available vehicle which shows promise of reaching, with probable minor repairs en route, its avowed goal.

Some of the criticisms, emanating from a group in the American Bankers Association, are that the program could be better operated as a single institution, that stabilization loans would not be properly safeguarded, that easy access to the fund would tend to make nations over-borrow, and that the United States is called upon for too great a portion of the quotas. Numerous other more technical objections have been raised.

It should be remembered that the fund and bank, speaking simply, have a single purpose each: The former to stabilize currencies and prevent another disastrous outbreak of economic warfare; the latter to provide damaged countries with loans for such reconstruction projects as utilities, industrial repair, irrigation projects, and the like.

The fund's personnel, then, must keep a daily check on the values of 50 or 60 currencies in relation to the dollar and to each other. This obviously calls for the highest-type specialized management. And no less technical skill will be required to investigate and supervise the dozens of long-term loans made by the bank to war-damaged nations. This difference in functions and required skills would appear to demand separate institutions in the interest of efficiency.

The question of safeguards is one most of us are willing to leave to the experts in view of the agreement's general provisions for disciplinary action against recalcitrant members. Over-borrowing, for example, would seem, even if permitted by a majority vote, to create a self-correcting disequilibrium, while any nation devaluing its currency beyond prescribed limits would risk suspension from the fund, which also would automatically close bank loans to it.

On the issue of our subscription, realism forces us to admit that we, as the world's most prosperous nation, must foot a good part of the reconstruction bill whether it is under the Bretton Woods agreement or some other device. United States quotas will be roughly one-third of the totals—$5,925,000,000 out of $17,900,000,000. That, however, is the maximum and likely will never be called for.

It is possible, perhaps even probable, the operations in the long run may cost us next to nothing—certainly far less than the $2,000,000,000 in the Government's present stabilization fund—for at the beginning we will pay in only about 10 percent of our fund quota and 20 percent of our bank commitment, the rest to be demanded only when and if needed.

This is by virtue of the fact that neither the bank nor the fund swings into action until such time as private-investment capital fails to come in through normal investment channels in sufficient quantity to do the job. At this point, the institutions perform their function by guaranteeing, for a fee, private loans. Only in case of a borrowing nation defaulting will the institutions be obliged to pay out money. And since the debtor will be defaulting against an organization of 44 nations instead of 1, it is expected the resulting adverse credit reputation will encourage such prompt repayment that the bank's cash disbursements in the long run will not exceed the reserves accumulated from fees.

It has been stated the United States will not get a return from the plan in proportion to its investment—an attitude which overlooks entirely our greatest return. For what we will receive is an agreement from those nations vital to our commerce that they will not use the tactics of economic warfare which crushed world trade in the 1930's; a sort of economic nonaggression pact. This is a return of dollars-and-cents benefit to every worker in America.

Another important consideration is that the Bretton Woods program is the work of 44 nations—not just the Big Three. Financial experts from all these countries labored more than 2 years to make it as nearly perfect as possible, and the product represents compromises by all. They admit imperfections but point out with logic that the operational details of such a new and bold plan present problems which can be best met by the institutions' governors and staffs as they arise. They present this draft only as a means of doing something—rather than nothing—to forestall another world-wide economic disaster.

Certainly we cannot afford to do nothing. There can be no full employment for us without foreign trade, for on our 10-percent margin of that trade depends our high standard of wages. And there can be no foreign trade without world monetary stability. The fund proposes to insure that stability while the bank's purpose is to see that needy nations get the loans by which alone they can rebuild their capacity to trade with us.

At the conference there was a remarkable sincerity of purpose, a unity which seems to justify faith that the participants now perceive that world interest and self-interest are inseparable. If this sincerity really exists, we are bound to concede that any reasonable plan can be made to work. If it doesn't exist, we can hold little hope that any economic plan, however perfect, can be made successful. In that case we may as well go our isolationist way and await inevitable economic chaos and World War No. 3.

We can hold Dumbarton Oaks peace conferences until doomsday, but they will not prevent war unless some economic formula is accepted by all under which each nation has a fair opportunity to survive and prosper.

Bluntly the Bretton Woods agreement is a challenge to the United States to put up or shut up on its pose as the great and good neighbor in the world community. If Congress approves it speedily and without crippling amendments, it is regarded as certain a majority of the other countries will do likewise by the December 31 deadline. If it refuses or delays too long, it is laying itself open to proper suspicion of hypocrisy, with the probability that neither the Bretton Woods nor any similar pact will ever go into effect.

Government Regulation of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial taken from the Wall Street Journal, of New York, under date of February 13, 1945, entitled "The Compulsory State, The Men of Business Who Build Booby Traps for Themselves."

I believe this editorial contains thoughts which should be interesting to all who read it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMPULSORY STATE—THE MEN OF BUSINESS WHO BUILD BOOBY TRAPS FOR THEMSELVES

No people ever entered the compulsory state through a door on which the price of admission was plainly posted. Not even the

Germans, who seem to like regimentation more than they value freedom, did that.

There are other entrances well camouflaged, sometimes with one pretty theory and sometimes with another. But underneath the glitter of slogan and economic scrollwork they are the same. Those who pass through them have a sense of carefree well-being, of having deposited their burdens outside. They seem to be traveling a smooth and sunlit road and they proceed under a peculiar enchantment, for while they can see where the road has taken others, they are blind as to their own destination.

The road we look at now is paved with things labeled subsidies, Government guaranties, floors under this, ceiling over that, Government partnership. Traveling the road are three caravans: agriculture, labor, and business.

Agriculture has been on the way for a long time. Many of the caravan already see the smooth highway leading into the jagged rocks of compulsion. Some would like to turn back, but when they look the pleasant road seems to have closed in behind them.

In the labor caravan there are fewer misgivings. Mostly its members are bedazzled with some pretty new baubles of power. Perhaps, they think, there are more of these ahead and they want to push on.

The business caravan lectures its fellow travelers. It tells them about "free enterprise" and it warns them gravely that their yearnings for security will bring them to a bad end. But the other two look puzzled and say, "Then what are you doing here?"

Well, as a cold practical matter, business has less reason to be there than either labor or agriculture. Those two constitute numerous and comparatively cohesive groups, which control votes and so have political power. At least in the compulsory state they might be represented on the committee.

Business is not cohesive. By its very nature it is as diverse as the American landscape. Its political power is represented by no more than zero and it is probably a minus quantity.

So what is it doing there?

And the question becomes more puzzling when we recollect that business once before started down this road but was turned back by wholly fortuitous circumstances.

That original excursion was the N. R. A., conceived and proposed by business groups. Under Government sponsorship, business was to draw up codes, agreements to do or not to do certain things. Competition was not to be lessened, of course, but just the same there were provisions covering expansion, installation of new machinery, and like subjects. What we saw was a budding experiment in cartelization.

The experiment failed because it was put in charge of a sincere and honest man. Believing in what he was doing, failing to see the results, Gen. Hugh Johnson went ahead at breakneck speed and he had not gone far before a pants presser was brought to court for working too cheap. Had General Johnson been a crafty man, able to bide his time, that grisly set-up that appeared in the early New Deal days might well have taken a hold that not even the Supreme Court would have broken. And if it had, the production machine that is winning this war would have been rusty and antiquated.

Now what is the evidence that a good many businessmen again want to crawl under the Government umbrella?

Here is a quotation from Charles P. Taft, son of an ex-President, brother of a leading Senator, and himself director of the Office of Wartime Economic Affairs in the State Department:

"It seems to me high time that private business got away from its liking, perhaps unadmitted, for the security of Government distribution of business under a quota system and began to justify the descriptive term 'enterprise.' The only reason I mention that is that, within the past few months, we in the State Department who have been pushing with all our ability for the reduction of trade controls have been startled on at least two occasions to have delegations from the trade coming in to insist with us on the continuance of public purchase or other Government intervention, because they were not prepared to take the kind of chances which I have always assumed were part of normal business risks."

Within the past few days we have seen the head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the president of the American Bankers Association, and the former president of that body battling against Government guaranties of loans. They know that many bankers want such guaranties and are so telling their Congressmen. Such men are afraid of risks. They don't want to be bankers. They want to handle Government funds on a commission basis. How long do they suppose the Government will pay them for such a parasitical performance?

It was not long ago that there was a drive on Congress to get a huge appropriation for Government advertising in newspapers, which fortunately was defeated. But in a country which should prize its free press, some of the custodians were looking for a Government subsidy.

There has recently been an unusual amount of literature setting forth the benefits of cartels—and those booklets don't just happen. Someone pays to print and distribute them. Now one simple fact about cartels is that there must be some power to enforce the agreements that bind them. Either directly or indirectly, that hand is a government. There probably never has been a cartel of any pretensions or prestige which did not involve government power openly or secretly.

Talk to some of our so-called bureaucrats about "free enterprise" and see the smug look. If they will unloosen their tongues, they can tell a great deal about how this business group thinks perhaps one government control is permanently good and how that group likes another. So there it is again, the flight from risk.

How much good do solemn lectures on the illusion of "security" do when the wage earners to whom they are addressed can read the financial pages and see how some executives are being given annuities and pensions on top of sizable salaries? Stockholders read of these and complain with just cause. Some propose action, but not always the action that lies within their power as stockholders and investors. Some suggest that this or that Government agency take a hand. Could it be that they are under the delusion that Government will manage their affairs and still allow them dividends?

The vast majority of those in business and finance in this country do not, we believe, desire the Government in their affairs. They want the situation which put the Government there ended as soon as possible. But there are far too many who want the Government to build them shelters from the risks without which free enterprise is not free.

A good many German industrialists and financiers thought that Adolf Hitler was not so bad. They gave him money. He came to power and for a time they had pleasant sailing with the government the main partner in their cartels.

But there came a day when they went to Herr Hitler and he was no longer so agreeable. He is reputed to have remarked that he "hoped these gentlemen were under no delusion that he had built this structure for their benefit."

Those German businessmen must have left that conference with the sickly feeling of a man who is the victim of his own booby trap.

What a tragedy if history recorded that business in America was as stupid.

Address of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy:

The custom of requiring a graduating class to listen to an address before receiving the tokens of their hard work has always seemed to me to be semibarbaric—a refined method of tantalization. I have sat in your places many times, both as prospective graduate and as guest. With all deference to men here on the platform who may have talked at me in the past, I long ago resolved never to inflict myself on any other groups. But here I am—bowing to custom and circumstances. My thoughts as to the barbarism of the custom have not changed. The only consolation I can offer you is that I am just as sensitive as you.

I wish I knew the origin of this custom. I cannot believe it is based solely on the human propensity to talk and attract attention. I would like to think that it was intended to mark a pause between the successful conclusion of a period of study and the application of that study—a pause for reflection on the past and speculation as to the future. I would like to think that when I graduated from Princeton some years ago, I thought back on the 4 years of study and tried to see that past in its proper perspective as a part of my life. I know I never did any such thing, but I know now that it would have been helpful.

I know very little of pedagogy. I was exposed to 4 years of college and 3 years of law school. I assume that I was an ordinary student treated to orthodox education. My recollection of the courses here in science, economics, and history is extremely blurred. I am confident I could not today pass any of the examinations. Yet I received here something far more important than the knowledge of facts and formulas—far more important than the remembrance of a chain of events. I received a background and the inspiration to continue to study on my own. An intellectual curiosity was developed. I did not realize that until many years later. Then I discovered that I had been given a foundation upon which I could build.

Today you are completing a concentrated course in which you have learned a military trade—a trade most important to the combat troops. You will soon move into devastated areas seemingly incapable of supporting any form of life. You must bring order out of chaos. It will be imperative to turn rubbish heaps into communities. You will have no time for fine theories of government. You will work with your sleeves rolled up. You will combat disease, starvation, and shattered nerves. It will not be any easy task and will probably often make you scornful of theories and philosophies and respectful only of hard facts—life, death, food, sleep, and shelter. In that, I can help you little. You know more about your work than I do. I have not been where you are going.

All I can do is to speculate on the niche into which your study and work in this war may fit as a part of your life and this country's history. What I hope I see ahead is that your study and work will engender in you the desire to continue to study and think about government—our Government—its forms and procedures, its successes and its

failures. I hope you will provide a force which will impel us all to test government and our theories. In that your background and your experiences will be important factors. I hope you represent the start of a group which will not let us forget that whether we survive will be determined by the way we govern ourselves.

As a matter of fact, the art or science of government is an extremely broad philosophy. It involves more than a study of organizational forms and the memorizing of maxims and procedures. It requires more than the knowledge of political theories and of the natural rights of man. Today it covers the whole field of economics, finance, geography, labor relations, trade movements, industrial forms, and a host of other subjects. The politician in the true sense of the word should be the most comprehensively educated and experienced man in the world.

Such facts have obviously been recognized by your instructors. As I ran through an outline of your curriculum, I was impressed with the time devoted to the study of economics and finance, physical geography, public health, public welfare, and labor problems. You were being introduced to substance.

Your course provides some contrast with our preparation for governing ourselves. Before you are permitted to bring government to the islands of the Pacific, you are subjected to a concentrated course of study. Too often in governing ourselves we forget the need for preparation, training, and study. We seem too often to proceed on the theory that political intelligence is a matter of divine inspiration—always coincident with choice by the people.

We demand that our lawyers and doctors pass rigid examinations. Then we would not think of employing any who did not make those professions a lifetime work. We do not seem to be so exacting with respect to the profession of government. Few except by accident—and then at the risk of being derogatorily called politicians—make government a career. At elections we do not always weigh the backgrounds and training of the candidates. There is a Federal civil service, but few of the highest administrative positions are filled by civil servants. There is no part of the civil service with the standards of a profession. There is no program under which men may enter the administrative work at the bottom and proceed to the top by orderly and expected steps.

On the legislative side I have also been struck with the lack of analytical assistance furnished to our legislators. The mess of detail with which they are expected to familiarize themselves and at the same time maintain close contact with their constituents is staggering. They are expected to be experts in finance, taxation, economics, labor matters, appropriations, and many other complicated problems without special training, informed analyses, or adequate help. They are continually bombarded with communications from special pressure groups. They are expected to separate the wheat from the chaff. The job they do is a back-breaking and a stupendous one. They are continually criticized, but I marvel at their high standard of achievement.

We are extremely proud of our achievements in industry, business, and the professions. We feel our best men reach their heights in such endeavors. But those best men seem to me to exhibit a too restrained interest in good government. It is true that careful attention is paid to specific statutes and practices by those affected by such statutes and practices. Few, however, stray into fields which affect others. The over-all problems of our country—the fundamental issues of our place on the globe—are more for dinner-table conversation. Even the legal profession seems mostly attentive to the interests of their clients or to the specialty fields in which they work. Nearly everyone seems to be relying on someone else. We are hoping that somehow the whole field will be covered. But it is no one's job to see that it is. I sometimes wonder why we do as well as we do. It must be a tremendous tribute to the vitality of our democratic form of government.

In the period to come after this war we will need experienced men in Government. Think for a few moments of the facets of our domestic problems—ranging from currency and finance to flood control. Think of the problems in foreign relations. It will not be enough to believe in justice and fair play. We will have to know—and know familiarly—the geography, economy, and cultures of many nations. The men now in Government who have the experience to deal with such matters are all too few. How can we attract more? How can our men achieve the essential knowledge and experience? Can we really expect successfully to cross the post-war period unless we strengthen our public service?

It is to a solution to these problems that I would like you to turn your reflective moments. I cannot offer you any conclusions. I have been thinking of two possible methods of insuring trained and experienced men in the Government service. The first is fairly obvious and yet difficult to carry out. It is the creation of a trained corps of career men and women, resembling the officers in our Regular Army and Navy, who will devote their lives to the business and science of government—our Government. The second method has been followed—somewhat unconsciously, perhaps, in this war. It has not, however, flourished in peacetime. Today, in wartime, men with special skills and experiences are devoting months and years to the Government service. They are serving without regard to political faiths and theories in capacities for which they are best fitted. Today I feel our Government is better equipped than in many decades—but that condition does not promise to be permanent.

Both methods have their own particular advantages and disadvantages. Other approaches may occur to you. I shall be pleased if I do no more than stimulate thinking on the subject.

The creation of a trained career staff of civil servants in this country will not be easy. It will be opposed as bureaucratic. It will be said to lead to a surrender of our liberties—to the creation of a class not responsible to the people. To some extent such attacks will be fair. The argument will be made that liberty and freedom breed vitality and that considerable efficiency can be sacrificed to preserve vitality. Our history furnishes some solid support for that argument.

The people making such arguments, however, must face reality. How else can a trained government staff be produced? How else can our administrators gain the knowledge to measure up to the men of other nations? Is not government today so intricate that it demands a professional group? Is not our democracy firmly enough imbedded that we can overcome any tendency toward restricted liberties?

If this method is adopted, we cannot take half measures. If we are to establish an American career service, it must be on a firm foundation. Entrance into the service must be by competitive examination. I would also establish a rather youthful age as a ceiling and permit no one older to enter the service. In that way the men arriving at the top administrative positions will have their competence and qualifications tested over many years. Promotion within the service must be in the hands of the service itself. It is also axiomatic that adequate pay must be provided. The compensation for public service need not, perhaps, be commensuate with the standards of the commercial world, but it must be sufficent to assure a respectable and comfortable living. National recognition and tokens of respect will also be helpful. I think we should offer more than inward satisfaction to a career of public service.

Perhaps such system is impracticable in this country. If we reach that decision, we are not through with the problem. We still need experience and capable men in Government service. As I mentioned, in wartime the Government has found it practicable to attract, for limited periods, men who have made their mark in the business and professional world. Why could this not be put on a regular and established basis—with some period of Government service recognized as the hallmark of success? There is a mutual advantage in this approach. Not only will Government be well served but as the men return to the commercial world, business will obtain a broader horizon of great value to itself. After a period of interchange, business would become fully aware of the problems of government—and Government would become familiar with the problems of the commercial world. Furthermore, the men will know each other. We have no problems that mutual confidence and respect cannot solve.

If such approach seems too idealistic, I think a few years in Government service will constitute an asset, almost measurable in cash. Business will be much closer to government over the next decade. Business must know more about government. The aura of mystery must be dispelled. I came to the Government service in 1941 for what I thought was to be 60 days. I was astounded at my lack of appreciation of many factors. I cannot now compute the fair price of my education. The Government owes me nothing. As one businessman who had spent some time in Washington put it, "If a firm were offered the opportunity to send men free of charge to the Harvard Business School for just 1 year, the firm would jump at the chance, send its best men with alacrity, and consider itself fortunate. It is a pity so few are aware that the Government offers even greater education at less cost."

It can be argued that this approach is more in accord with what we have come to consider "our democratic principles." The creation of a bureaucratic class is avoided. No man is set apart from his fellows as a career civil servant to be supported by the state and to labor for the state. Additional vitality will be imparted to our institutions by the frequent interchange of views and the varied expressions of opinion. Some continuity and efficiency may be lost but there should be full compensation for that loss in an increase in force and unity.

In the years to come our form of government will be severely tested. For generations we have been sure that we had the best form of government. We still think so—and for us I think the demonstration has been conclusive. There is no doubt that our particular brand of democracy works in our country with our people. We are, however, about to encounter new problems. We cannot be complacent. We must be ready to change whenever desirable. Eternal vigilance is the price not only of liberty but of survival.

For the sake of our future, I hope this marks a commencement for you. I do not have any doubt that you will do your part in the war with courage, force, and intelligence. I would urge upon you, however, that you never permit your interest in the science of government to lag. I hope you will consider that you have acquired a serious hobby—that this group will be a nucleus to arouse the public consciousness.

You have ahead of you an unusual opportunity. You will test the form and substance of government. You will start from the grass roots. You will come in contact with people who have entirely different ideas as to the purposes and ends of satisfactory government. You will meet with people who have never heard of democracy; who will not understand it when explained; and who will not like it even when it is understood. You

will return better able not only to understand the real fabric of our methods but also to understand the foreign nations with whom we must live and deal.

If your study here and the work to which you are going can inspire you to further thought and effort, all with a view not only to speeding the victory but also with a view to bringing back to this country fresh ideas and fresh vigor, we will more than win the war. Your ideas will spread. We will be victorious in the peace to come.

I envy you your coming experiences. You will be in the attack. You will see and feel contact with the enemy. May God speed you in your service of our country.

The Life of the Enlisted Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over radio station WJAR, Providence, R. I., on Saturday evening, February 17, 1945:

I wish I had the ability of an Ernie Pyle, so that I might paint for you a word picture of the life an enlisted man lives out in the islands of the Pacific. However, the area is so vast, the obstacles being overcome so great, the undertaking itself of such huge proportions, it is my belief even the great Ernie Pyle will find his gifts sorely taxed in trying to tell you what those young men go through day in and day out.

A great deal has already been written about the life of the enlisted man, both in the course of this war and the last one. But no one can possibly know what he must contend with until he has lived and worked with enlisted men.

As you know, I am a member of the House Committee on Naval Affairs. For over 2 years now, a portion of every day has been taken up with problems arising through the operations of our Navy in the Pacific theater of war. In addition to the work involved as a committee member, there are a great many of my personal friends who are out there—almost all of them enlisted men. Too, there were the letters and wires and phone calls I received from many of you good people, asking for information, advice, help—in trying to solve some of the problems of your own boys who were out there.

Many times I was bitterly disappointed in my efforts to work out a solution to some of these problems. Many of you know there were times when we had to be satisfied with far less than we had hoped to accomplish.

I decided I must see for myself what the conditions were. I resolved to go out there, any way I could get there, except in the comfort of a committee assignment, and learn for myself what I could do to resolve the difficulties which beset my mind.

During the first days of December the Naval Affairs Committee was planning its tour of the Pacific theater of war. I decided then, as I am sure you will agree, I could not learn what I wanted to know, by meeting the top-ranking officers of the fleets. While I admire the admirals and members of their staffs—Lord knows too much praise can't possibly be given them—my interest is in the enlisted man, and I decided there was but one way to understand his problem. That was to live with enlisted men, to eat with then, to work with them—in short, to be one of them.

I took advantage of an opportunity to do just this, knowing full well there would be criticism from a certain quarter, but knowing too that nothing I could ever do would meet with anything but criticism from that quarter. And let me add this, if the experience I have gained will enable me to help the enlisted men, if but one man is benefited thereby, then a thousand times as much criticism would be welcome.

Perhaps I entertain a unique conception of the responsibilities which go with the office I have the honor of holding. But I don't think those responsibilities justify my being glued to my chair when there is work to be done. I have learned since my return home, that I have been charged with false motives. Let me assure you, so long as I am your Representative, no fear of such attacks will ever deter me from doing what I deem is my duty in order that I may more ably serve you in Congress. My time in uniform entitles me to nothing but mustering-out pay. That has already gone to Navy Relief.

I have to admit I haven't solved everything. On some things a solution seems as far away as ever. However, I can say with confidence that I have accomplished a great deal. I have obtained experience and information which would never have been mine had I spent the next 10 years in my office in Washington. One thing above all else—when I speak to the military authorities about conditions I dislike it must be admitted that I know what I'm talking about.

I know there is bound to be a certain amount of "griping," as it is termed.

I am conscious of the fact that it is a dangerous thing to appear to be interfering with the military authorities in the prosecution of the war. All this I have taken into consideration. Yet I am certain there is an area within which disagreement is possible, in which differences of opinion can and do exist, even among officers. Within this area some questioning is a good and healthy thing, and I intend to do considerable questioning.

Admitting that many of the so-called "gripes" can be disregarded as the natural result of men living together for long periods of time, under worse than trying conditions, it is my opinion, when a complaint becomes general throughout a large sector of the armed forces, it is time for superior officers to investigate the matter, conscientiously, and do something promptly to alleviate the conditions complained of.

I know there are a lot of obstacles in the way. I have heard—over and over again—the much abused phrase, "there's a war on." There are a lot of enlisted men, and it is not easy to accommodate all their needs. However, I have seen some extraordinary measures taken to satisfy the convenience and comfort of officers. So, I insist, some extraordinary measures should be taken—not to accommodate the comfort of enlisted men, but to meet their essential requirements.

I have already expressed myself on the subject of the length of service overseas for enlisted men. I assure you I did not arrive at this decision hastily. My conclusion was reached only after living with the men and seeing them in action. After a man has been on active duty overseas for 18 months he should be returned home. Let me tell you why I say that.

In time of actual warfare it is impossible to consider a man's personal comfort. It is folly to think time can be devoted to carrying on life as near normal as is possible, that the military authorities should consider the enlisted man's personal desires. I know that is so, and my reason for asking that these men be returned is not based on any thought of their comfort at all. It is a matter of efficiency and of getting the best out of every man who is available for duty.

I talked with a great many men out there. The places where I worked were, I have been assured, fairly representative of all the islands in the forward area. I can tell you, in all honesty, the first thought of these men on waking in the morning is of home. The thoughts that linger as they lie in their bunks at night, or as they travel silent patrols, the thought that pursues them through dreams is home. Every man who leaves these shores takes with him a powerful desire to go back home. And despite the valiant efforts of mothers and fathers, of brave wives and children, to paint a rosy picture of life back home, they soon begin to worry. One Seabee from Rhode Island told me about his wife and kids. His wife was doing her best to convince him the kids were well and happy, but he was worried sick because he had read about the terrible winter we were having. One wife, in the course of telling her man all the news of home, mentioned their little girl had fallen—a minor accident—but the Seabee had worried so about it he was convinced his wife wasn't telling him all the truth, and made me swear I'd go and see her as soon as I got home.

Such men eventually pass the peak of their efficiency and are in danger of becoming a problem. Their own morale deteriorates and what is of greater consequence—they interfere with the maximum efficiency of younger men—men more recently sent into the forward areas.

There are two stock answers to this request—lack of replacements and lack of shipping space. The first could be met, I am positive, by a more efficient use of men in the camps in the United States and in some of the bases far removed from the combat areas.

On the matter of shipping, the problem is difficult, I admit. But it is not insurmountable. Less emphasis on material and equipment for officers' clubs and officers' quarters would release some very valuable space. Less concern with whether to give our merchant ships away or sink them—and more concentration on getting a lot of them out into the Pacific—would provide additional space. There is more on this I could tell you, but, in fairness, I think it should wait upon a conscientious effort to work out a solution. I am confident a solution can be found.

There is altogether too much slavishness in the matter of red tape. There is too much thinking of the men as if they were machines. From a decision which they feel is unjust they have no recourse. What meager appeal procedure there is—is not explained to them. For all practical purposes such appeals are impossible or fraught with so much danger to the enlisted man—he almost never tries one. Writing to a Member of Congress is the worst sin in the book. It reminded me of Agrippa who said, speaking of Saint Paul, "This man might have been set at liberty had he not appealed to Caesar." Such things must cease.

I know you will understand many of the things I'd like to tell you must go unsaid. A lot can be done, I am convinced, and I intend to direct myself to the job.

I met some splendid officers in the Navy—men sincerely concerned for the welfare of the men under their command. They are the type of men who inspire in us that great pride we all feel for our Navy.

The chaplains are really God's noblemen. There must be a special corner of heaven reserved for them. Their patience and kindness have become bywords, and it is common to hear a Navy man say, "You be the chaplain," as he pours out his heart to a friend.

There should be more doctors. Most of the doctors now serving are men of integrity and skill, who try valiantly to do all that must be done—often at the cost of destroying their own health.

The legal-assistance program should be expanded at once. Every command should have a competent, sympathetic legal-assistance officer to whom an enlisted man could

go for advice and help. Steps in this direction have already been taken. This will be a great factor in building and preserving the morale of an enlisted man. No one can appreciate the importance of this kind of assistance until he sees it with his own eyes. Thousands of men breathe easier and feel better after consultation with these men who are equipped to give sound and kindly advice in all kinds of problems.

I have received hundreds of letters. It will take me a long time to answer them, and I trust you will bear with me. I am deeply grateful for the interest you have shown. I promise you I shall try to carry out the wishes you have conveyed to me and to help achieve the hopes to which you have given expression.

I have seen the tremendous might and power of our Navy. A people who can resurrect and rebuild the bleeding, battered hulk that was left at Pearl Harbor into the most powerful fighting force on all the seas surely can accomplish some little things for its ordinary fighting men. The welfare of the enlisted men should be of primary concern to all of us. They are not able to speak, but I serve notice that every day I serve in Congress I will apply what I have learned so that I may contribute something toward making their lot a little easier.

Railroads Are Doing a Marvelous Wartime Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, having at one time been engaged in railroad work in one capacity or another, I have maintained a great deal of interest in the welfare of the "rails" and have watched with admiration the manner in which both railroad management and labor has successfully coped with critical wartime situations and problems from time to time.

One of the dramatic episodes on the home front is the miracle of wartime railroad transportation.

In spite of the loss of experienced personnel and the tremendously increased demands made upon railroad facilities by the military and civilian population, the American railroads have more than met the test with flying colors.

Of interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be an article written by Mr. Levitt F. Morris, entitled "The Victory of the Rails," which was published in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor. The article follows:

THE VICTORY OF THE RAILS

(By Leavitt F. Morris)

If any major industry in this Nation has a right to toot its own whistle for a war job well done—then it is the railroads. And what a to-do there would be in the old Nation tonight if engineers of the some 42,000-odd locomotives now in operation should decide to pull that cord simultaneously!

But right now the railroads are setting their wheels closer to the rails in the continued determination to get the big job finished at the quickest possible moment. They are saving their "toots" for grade crossings—and for V-day.

Now, take Conductor Sam Jones, standing by that commuter train to Brookville, U. S. A. See, he's fingering that big, gold watch preparing to cry "Board" for the 5:05 p. m. crowd returning to their homes from war jobs, offices, and civilian tasks. We haven't noticed that he's wearing any "E" award. But Sam told us the other day that if this war hadn't come along he'd have given up railroading and retired to his little poultry farm.

"But somebody's got to make these trains roll," he grinned. "Doesn't make much difference whether it's a little local like this or the crack coast special or the long string of freight cars carrying war materials. I'm glad to do my part. Got a couple of boys out there myself and I'm mighty glad to be helping on this end."

Sam sort of admitted that it is harder taking tickets than it used to be, the trains being crowded the way they are. But the folks are pretty understanding these days and you get to know more people.

"Maybe I'll have a lot more customers for my fresh eggs when this is over," he said.

There are hundreds of Sam Jonses doing their bit for their country's railroads today. They, along with the thousands of new workers, are responsible for successfully meeting one of the greatest transportation challenges in the history of the world. Ever since the first Japanese bomb exploded at Pearl Harbor these railroad men began breaking transportation records. And, what's more, they are still doing it!

Listen to this: In 1944 every previous transportation record established went out the window—"by the board," as a railroad man would say. The railroads handled the greatest volume of freight and passenger traffic in their history. Such is the statement of J. J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads. And, he modestly adds, all this was accomplished without serious transportation difficulties.

The amazing and interesting fact to note in this remarkable achievement is that the 1944 traffic load, far heavier than that of the preceding year, was handled with virtually the same number of locomotives and with hardly more than a nominal increase in freight cars compared with 1939. There was a slight increase in the number of passenger cars.

Perhaps you were one of the many railroad passengers that contributed to the astronomical figure of 96,000,000,000 passenger-miles which the railroads piled up in 1944. This is an increase of 9.3 percent above the number of passenger-miles recorded in 1943. This nine-cipher figure goes down as the greatest passenger traffic year in the history of the railroads.

And, mind you, this does not include troop movements of more than 10,700,000 men. It does not, if you please, include the millions on furlough who traveled during the year or individuals moving on order, Navy and Marine Corps movements, nor prisoners of war.

The railroads believe that, so far as passenger travel is concerned, the peak has been reached. In other words, passenger travel is over the hump and should not be so heavy in 1945.

This doesn't mean, railroad officials are quick to point out, that civilians can now make that long-desired rail journey to visit Aunt Sue in Oshkosh; a trip which the Office of Defense Transportation definitely labels as unnecessary travel. The railroads still have a big job to do, carrying troops, military and Government officials, workers to their jobs in war plants, offices, and civilian activities, and, most important of all, speeding returning wounded soldiers to rehabilitation centers.

From a freight standpoint the railroads have even a bigger task ahead of them for 1945. More and more war materials must be kept moving to the fighting fronts. It is going to take thousands of freight cars to carry the essentials of a modern war from factory to embarkation point. Food crops must be moved in season. The railroads indeed have their work cut out for them during the coming year. Are they going to be equal to it? You can't get any railroad man to say anything but "We've done it once; we can do it again."

Nevertheless, the railroads are facing a serious problem in the shortage of labor to maintain their rolling stock and keep rights-of-way repaired. When considering how important the railroads are to the successful prosecution of this war remember they have not received their share of new equipment—equipment badly needed to replace worn-out cars and engines. What has trickled through has barely met the needs. Lack of experienced help has handicapped the railroads, but even in the face of all this, somehow they have maintained a high rate of efficiency through sheer perseverance. With the Army needing more men, the railroads look for further losses in manpower but, come what may, they fully intend to keep 'em rolling at the same rate of efficiency during 1945.

One of the trials of the past year confronting most of the Nation's major lines has been feeding thousands of passengers. Yes, there have been long lines for breakfast and dinner. Most western lines serve only 2 meals a day. But try getting, say, 175,000 meals a month in a little two-by-four kitchen. This figure, picked at random, happened to be what 1 railroad did during the first 10 months of 1944.

When the war is over the railroads certainly are not going to rest on their laurels. Already alert eyes are focused on the future. Already it has been said that the standard that enabled carriers to do their wartime work would be set even higher when peace comes, because railroad research has been expanded and intensified during the conflict to keep pace with urgent demands.

Plans are on the drawing boards for faster, more comfortable and commodious trains. Schedules are in the making for faster and smoother service to all parts of the Nation. Lower travel costs are a certainty.

So, our hats are off to American railroads. Especially to those men, yes, and women, that make them roll on toward victory and a glorious peace.

Alaska, the Last Frontier, Calls for New Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Territories, which has jurisdiction over the Territory of Alaska, I am deeply interested in the post-war development of this great territorial possession as a frontier which will afford opportunities to our returning soldiers and war workers. Factual presentation of the possibilities of Alaska were set forth in an article by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger

which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch February 18, 1945. The article follows:

ALASKA NOW LAST FRONTIER—CALLS TO NEW PIONEERS—THOUSANDS OF SOLDIERS ARE LOOKING NORTHWARD TO LAND THAT OFFERS GREAT OPPORTUNITIES ALONG WITH ITS HARDSHIPS

(By Capt. Richard L. Neuberger)

After every war there has been a frontier to settle. George Washington's soldiers took up land in the Ohio Valley. The men of the Lewis and Clark Expedition got 640 acres each in the Louisiana Purchase. The veterans of 1812 settled the lower Missouri country. Soldiers in Union blue and Confederate gray moved beyond the Rockies. Many veterans of World War No. 1 looked to the valley and lowlands along the Pacific seaboard.

Now the frontier is Alaska.

The eyes of thousands of soldiers of World War No. 2 are gazing northward in the direction of the vast rampart which the United States purchased from Russia more than three-fourths of a century ago.

"I was told," said President Roosevelt on his return from Alaska last summer, "that a number of officers and men are considering settling in Alaska after the war is over. I do hope that this is so, because the development of Alaska has only been scratched and it is still the country of the pioneers, and in one sense every American is a descendant of pioneers."

"On my return to Washington," the President added, "I am going to set up a study of Alaska as a place to which many veterans of this war, especially those who do not have strong home roots, can go to become pioneers. Alaska is a land with a very small population, but I am convinced it has great opportunities for those who are willing to work and to help build up all kinds of new things in new lands."

Will these hopes of the President be realized?

PRACTICALLY ALL LAND STILL IN PUBLIC DOMAIN

Since the days of the gold rush—and those days were almost half a century ago—Alaska has developed comparatively little from the standpoint of population. In 1898 there were 30,493 white people in Alaska. In 1940, there were not many more than that—39,170. The total population of Alaska in 1940 was 72,524, nearly half of whom were Indians and Eskimos. Practically all the land in Alaska is still public domain, as it was in 1867 when Secretary of State William H. Seward paid Czar Alexander II the sum of $7,200,000 for America's largest Territorial possession.

But since 1940 a new development has occurred in Alaska. That development has been the construction of a vast system of defenses by the American Army and Navy. Five years ago there was only one military post in Alaska, the ancient and outmoded garrison at Chilkoot Barracks on the shores of the Inside Passage. Today, Alaska is dotted with vast airfields, harbor installations, and guns and artillery of all caliber. Where primeval wilderness locked the land in 1940, an airport as large as that at Seattle or Minneapolis is now spread out across the terrain. The Alaska Military Highway threads for more than 1,600 miles through the mountain fastnesses of Alaska, British Columbia, and through the Yukon Territory of Canada.

"During the past few years," said Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL, of Oregon, after a recent Alaskan journey, "Alaska has attained its greatest advances. This huge Territory of 586,400 square miles is on the threshold of its most important development. More than 100,000 American soldiers have been serving in Alaska. These are healthy, vigorous, young men. Many of them will be the Alaskan frontiersmen of the future."

COUNTRY COMPARED WITH SCANDINAVIA

This was what President Roosevelt was looking to when, in a speech at Puget Sound Navy Yard, he compared Alaska with the Scandinavian countries. In Norway, Sweden, and Finland, the President pointed out, "the people have brought their civilization to a very high and prosperous level, despite the cold and winter darkness."

Alaska has many similarities to Scandinavia. I remember standing on the bridge of an American Coast Guard cutter commanded by a lieutenant who was a naturalized Norwegian. Our boat poked into the towering fiords of southeastern Alaska's long "panhandle." It stood beneath cliffs which loomed like skyscrapers above the sea. The shrill echoes of its whistle shivered off splinters of ice from glaciers which guarded the heads of these immense coves. It cruised into lonely harbors where spruce forests swept up like aprons from the blue North Pacific.

The lieutenant shaded his eyes and looked at the summits of the fiords. "This is like Norway, where I was born," he said. "I do not see why this part of Alaska could not have all the economic activities of Norway. There are woods here for lumber where dairy cattle can graze. There are fish off the shore. There are minerals in the mountains. There are streams which can be dammed up for water power. Yet Trondheim, in Norway, has 55,000 people, and how many has Juneau, the capital of Alaska?"

I looked in the World Almanac in the bottom of my musette bag, Juneau's population was listed as only 5,729. Why, I wondered?

E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Delegate in Congress from Alaska, and Ernest Gruening, Alaska's Governor, are agreed that lack of adequate transportation has held back Alaska more than any other factor. Where Sweden has had 7,000 miles of railways, Alaska, three times the size of Sweden, has had 509 miles—and not all of that standard gauge. In 1940 Sweden had 38,830 miles of automobile roads, Alaska 1,978. And where the Scandinavian lands are hard by such great European centers as Antwerp, Leningrad, Brussels, and Berlin, Alaska is a minimum of 1,000 miles from Vancouver and Seattle.

WAR DEVELOPMENTS IMPORTANT

This is why developments of the war have been so important to Alaska. The United States Army Air Corps has pioneered a remarkable new air ferry route to Fairbanks, Nome, and Soviet Russia. Ports and docks now stud many of Alaska's coves. A telephone line threads along the Alaska Highway, and for the first time Alaskans can converse with continental United States. Innumerable airfields and flight strips have made travel possible by air, where the only transportation was on foot, dog sled, or canoe.

Few Americans realize how favorably Alaska compares in resources to the Scandinavian nations.

Delegate BARTLETT has pointed out that Sweden has a reindeer pasturage of 40,000 square miles, as contrasted with 240,000 square miles in Alaska. Alaska and Sweden are not far apart in available hydroelectric power. Sweden has less than half the potential farm and grazing land of Alaska, yet its agricultural population comprises 2,700,000 people. Alaska's total civilian population is barely one-thirtieth of this figure.

Summer flowers thrive in the seacoast settlements of Skagway, Anchorage, and Valdez, but Alaska has not been a region of homes. Women make homes, and Alaska's population has been primarily male—more than three white men to every white woman. In the gold-rush days of 1898 the Yukon poet Robert Service wrote of "the hunger that's not banished by bacon and beans," the hunger for a woman and a home. Four decades after Service penned his poem at Whitehorse American soldiers serving there stood on the airfield and cheered ringingly as the first C-47 bringing Army nurses winged in from the South.

Many soldiers who have been on duty in Alaska hope to return with their families. The principal objection to service in the Arctic has been the absence of feminine companionship. "There's nothing the matter with this ol' island that a babe wouldn't fix," said a soldier in the Aleutians who later fell at Attu.

SOLDIER WANTS TO RETURN

Flying across the Continental Divide from St. John to Whitehorse in a plane bound for the Soviet Union, an Air Corps lieutenant from Michigan told me that he intended to come back to Alaska with his wife and run a silver fox farm.

"Having my wife with me," the lieutenant said, "will make the difference between this being a prison and a great place to live."

Hunting and fishing in Alaska are incomparable. There are lakes where an angler's fly has never rested. Moose and caribou roam the wilderness. When we of the Army went north in 1942 our diet of canned meat was varied when sharpshooters brought down Alaskan big game. Lake trout in Alaska often measure more than 24 inches. Governor Gruening believes that Alaska has a future as one of the world's greatest tourist centers, a rival to Switzerland.

The war has created a newsprint shortage, and the woodlands of Alaska may alleviate this shortage in the not distant future. Lyle F. Watts, chief of the United States Forest Service, has pointed out that the national forests of Alaska can support an industry employing more than 8,000 men in the production of pulp and paper. Hemlock and Sitka spruce in the Tongass National Forest, according to Watts, would provide the foundations for this new industry.

Soldiers first coming to Alaska do not enjoy the experience. I remember seeing Ketchikan from the deck of the transport *Aleutian* in the late summer of 1942. The little Alaskan town seemed dingy and primitive after the bright lights of Portland and Seattle.

I recall the queer feeling of thinking that this was one of Alaska's larger settlements.

I wondered what the smaller ones would be like.

I saw Ketchikan a year later on a trip down the inside passage on the S. S. *Prince Rupert*. The little Alaskan community looked little no longer. Its girls, its neon signs, its attenuated bus system, its two drug stores, its shops with real plate-glass windows, its pavement—these things symbolized the epitome of civilization. After a long period up in the far-flung fastness of the Yukon and Mackenzie watersheds, our first glimpse of Alaska's port of entry brought quite a different reaction.

Many soldiers will return to Alaska after the war if they can obtain a reasonable means of livelihood. Governor Gruening's office at Juneau receives many inquiries from servicemen requesting information on how to acquire land in Alaska. Most of them hope to establish farms. For example, the Forest Service estimates that approximately 1,000,000 acres on the timbered Kenai Peninsula will maintain livestock grazing comparable with eastern Oregon and Montana.

FARMING POSSIBLE IN NORTH

The frozen soil of the Alaskan interior offers a grave obstacle to farming in the Tanana and Yukon Valleys, where winter temperatures often crowd 70 degrees below zero. I have seen Scotch whisky freeze near the Donjek River on the Alaska Highway. However, experiments recently conducted in Siberia may increase vastly the growing potentialities of the northern latitudes.

Successful farming is possible in the North. I have eaten potatoes as big as baseballs which were grown in the shadow of the Arctic Circle. Dr. Charles Camsell, veteran commissioner of Canada's northwest territories, says that beets, carrots, and cauliflower thrive at Fort Good Hope and that a dairy herd flourishes at Aklivik. These places are near the shores of the Arctic Ocean. More than 200 families in Alaska's mountain-barricaded Matanuska Valley are operating farms which produce grain, milk, beef, and other commodities.

Many advocates of Alaskan development hope that a Government corporation, known as the Alaska Development Authority, will be established. They want this agency to have both power and funds to help soldiers settle in Alaska—power to clear land, build fences, erect barns, string telephone lines, construct roads and survey railways. Exponents of such a step point out that in the past the Government has subsidized railroads through land grants and irrigation farmers through dams and canals. Why not, they ask, assist men desiring to settle in Alaska?

The Alaska Military Highway, first land route in history to America's largest territorial possession, threads through Canada's Yukon Territory and Province of British Columbia. Some soldiers have picked out lodge, inn, and tourist-camp sites along the 1,600-mile road. Governor Gruening, of Alaska, proudly cites the story of the Army couple, a sergeant and his nurse wife, who have opened and maintained a successul lodge on the Richardson Highway, the Alaskan road which connects with the Alaska Military Highway. Starting out in debt, the couple now owns the entire establishment and the soldier and his wife have raised a whopping baby boy to boot.

Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, Army engineer officer who built the Alaska Highway, thinks that many soldiers who are "sold" on hunting and fishing will want to come back to Alaska after the war. "They will bring their families with them," the general predicts, "and will become the nucleus of a new civilization in the north country. Despite all the difficulties, the north lays claim to a man's allegiance and never lets go."

Alaska is the final frontier. It has the hardships and perils of a frontier. Yet it also offers the opportunities which go hand in hand with a new country. What Oregon was half a century ago, what the Louisiana Purchase was 100 years ago, the Territory of Alaska is today—the promised land, the new Canaan beyond the next horizon.

Planting of the Flag on Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of the House must have observed the photograph of the four marines of the Twenty-eighth Regiment, Fifth Division, planting the flag of the United States atop Mount Suribachi, the volcanic fort on Iwo Jima Island. This picture, copy of which I hold in my hand, appeared in the Washington Post Sunday, February 25, and on page 3 of the same paper Wednesday, February 28. Never have I seen a more striking photograph than the one made by Joe Rosenthal, Associated Press photographer on assignment with the wartime still-picture pool.

I have today introduced a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to erect a monument in the District of Columbia to the heroic action of the Marine Corps as typified by the four marines of the Twenty-eighth Regiment, Fifth Division, in this photograph.

I have provided in the bill that this picture be a model for the monument because I do not believe any product of the mind of the artist could equal this photograph on actual action.

The photograph is extremely typical when analyzed. The base of the flag is the crown of Mount Suribachi, which typifies the crowning success of the sacrifices made to plant it there. The base on which the feet of the four marines are planted is of the most rugged terrain. The action of the men is symbolic of the efforts of the Nation to crush the despicable enemy, Japan. Even while three of the marines grasp the flag pole the fourth is making every effort to help finish the job, and his upstretched hands are indicative of the fact that he had already raised the flag to his greatest height. The right leg of each man is bent in the same direction and each body leans forward, typifying concerted action and forward movement. Their backs are to the camera as though they were baring their breasts to the enemy and protecting their homeland and loved ones who are far behind them.

Even the half-unfurled flag has a message. With a bit of imagination one can hear it say: "I have not completely unfurled, but soon I will reach my destination and in the God-given air shall wave in full length over a free world."

The almost extinct volcano of Suribachi is, within itself, very symbolic. It is symbolic of the nation which erupted forth with great stench and violence, soon to recede and be conquered.

I am proud that a Florida boy, Sgt. Ernest I. Thomas, of 112 East First Avenue, Tallahassee, Fla., was one of those who helped to plant our flag on Suribachi.

The Need for War Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we are facing a critical shortage of housing on the Pacific coast.

With the upswing of the war in the Pacific, there will be a concentration of workers on the Pacific coast that will tax our housing, transportation, and community facilities beyond any conditions we have so far experienced in areas that are already recognized as critical.

As the theater of operations moves further to the west more shipping is needed to supply our Army and Navy fighting the fanatical Jap. With victory assured in Europe, men and materials engaged in the west will be made available to the Orient, requiring more and more supplies to pass through Pacific coast ports.

The San Francisco Bay area, with its army and naval installations distributed on all sides of California's great inland water system, is now one of the congested areas in our country, it needs housing, transportation, hospitals, and other community facilities to meet the demands made upon it because of its geographical and strategic importance in the all-out war against Japan.

The primary necessity of the moment is additional housing. This crying need is best represented by the following teletype from the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen Union, from which I quote:

The longshore industry here faces a critical housing problem which seriously handicaps recruiting of adequate manpower to handle vital war cargoes. The situation is becoming progressively worse with the accentuation of the Nation's war effort to the Pacific area. The Pacific Coast Maritime Industry Board, official Government agency charged with the responsibility of securing maximum production and efficiency in the west coast longshore industry, has long recognized longshore housing as a serious impediment to securing sufficient manpower. With the approval of the National Housing Authority the Maritime Board conducted an extensive survey in July 1944 to establish facts and figures as to the extent of the longshore housing problem. The survey was conducted by personal contact and examination by questionnaires of individual cases. The survey disclosed the following:

1. Five hundred and forty-seven longshoremen faced critical housing problems, 402 of whom were colored.

2. Overcrowding is the most acute phase of the problem. In many cases large families are living in one or two hotel rooms. Wives and children of longshoremen are living in close proximity to prostitutes and other disreputable characters. Large families are living in unhealthy basement rooms with no ventilation and no bathing or cooking facilities. The quarters are dirty and infested with vermin and rats. There are several cases of 11 and 12 members of a family living in one room. Some families were found sleeping in shifts or relays. Night workers are sleeping in the same beds day workers have just vacated. Some are forced to sleep in railway stations and picture shows as a result of evictions by public-health officers because of condemnation and overcrowding. Public health officers state quarters are unfit for human occupancy.

Employers of waterfront labor are equally concerned with the Maritime Board and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union in remedying this situation.

A letter from employers to John Collins, National Housing Authority, dated May 8, 1944, stated:

"At the present time all shipping is under the control of the Federal Government through the Army, Navy, War Shipping Administration, and Lend-Lease. Ninety percent of the cargo handled consists of military supplies and munitions. Recruiting at the present time varies from 50 to 100 men per week, although efforts have been made

to increase the rate. Approximately 50 percent of the new recruits are Negroes. Approximately 90 percent of the Negro recruits are married, although some do not have their families with them because of the lack of suitable housing. Our labor turn-over of all new employees has been adversely affected by lack of housing. We are requesting your continued assistance in meeting housing problems for our longshoremen."

The Maritime Board has held numerous conferences with local housing authorities and has exchanged letters and wires with the National Housing Authority and others in an attempt to get more Government housing constructed and allocated to longshoremen.

The following excerpt from a report from Paul Eliel, Chairman of the Maritime Board, to John Cushing, Assistant Deputy War Shipping Administrator, summarizes the situation prevailing July 1944, which situation has grown progressively worse with the continuous and unremitting recruitment of additional workers for the industry:

"Attached please find a memo covering results of the housing questionnaire which we filled out last week at the longshore hiring hall. It indicates something of the deplorable conditions that prevail in re to housing, particularly of Negroes at this time. It shows, among other things, that 285 families have only one room in which to live and that over half of these families consist of a married couple with children, with children running up to families of seven."

The following teletype message from Mr. Cushing to Mr. Helmbold, War Shipping Administration, under date July 17, 1944, further underscores the serious nature of the problem:

"Pacific Coast Maritime Industry Board is making strenuous effort to improve longshore housing situation in San Francisco which is definitely in deplorable shape, particularly with respect to our colored labor. It is so bad that it is unquestionably affecting the efficiency of a substantial number of the men."

The following is an excerpt from a report by the Administrative Assistant to the Maritime Board:

"From observations made in this office, the general tension, loss of working hours, labor turn-over and low morale is increased by aggravated personal and family problems and relationship springing from intolerable housing, overcrowding, fear of eviction, and actual eviction, profiteering and general maladjustment."

Following the survey of the Maritime Board, authorities were requested to allocate 500 family units for exclusive use of longshoremen. Housing authorities recognized the seriousness of the problem but it was impossible to get substantial relief because of general housing shortage and because of the large majority of critical cases among colored longshoremen. A few units were made available in outlying districts so far removed that unsolvable transportation problems developed.

The only effective solution to the problem is the construction of additional Government housing and specific allocation, in large measure, to Negro longshoremen.

The Maritime Board recently conferred with Admiral Greenslade, coordinator for western sea frontier, on the matter of manpower to handle future cargo movement. Based on this and other information received through contacts with the War Shipping Administration, Maritime Board has undertaken a program to increase the working force by the addition of 1,750 men. This will bring the total of longshoremen and closely related workers close to 12,000 men, which is a significant contrast to pre-war manpower pool of four to five thousand men.

The situation is so serious that Joint Employer-Union Longshore Recruiting Agency agreed recently no more men would be recruited unless they could be adequately housed. This action which was taken as a last resort resulted in 107 suitable longshore recruits turned down between January 5 and 31, 1945. Since Maritime Board survey in July 1944 there has been an approximate net increase of 800 men to the working force, a large percentage of which are inadequately housed when recruited.

The efficiency and production of a vital war industry is jeopardized by this situation. Night workers spend days searching for housing, thereby losing sleep. Day workers become absentees while searching for housing during the day. Defense Plant Corporation recently made available $675,000 to be used to construct central kitchen and four cafeterias on the water front as they realized longshoremen must be provided with proper food. That being the case, housing authorities should be provided with funds to erect the required housing. The facts set forth above are official records in the files of the Pacific Coast Maritime Industry Board, an adjunct of the War Shipping Administration, with offices at 220 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. The Pacific Coast Maritime Industry Board joins with the union and employers of the west coast longshore industry in urging that action be taken to meet and overcome the housing problem in the port of San Francisco.

Our recommendations are as follows:

1. A minimum of 1,100 family units of Government housing be immediately constructed and assigned for exclusive use by longshoremen and 1,000 units for Negro longshoremen.

2. The establishment of necessary funds, as determined by the National Housing Authority in submitting its budget for the next fiscal period, be appropriated and specifically earmarked for this construction.

The situation in housing is the same in the major port areas of San Pedro, Calif., and Seattle, but a study of the conditions there have not yet been made. The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union recommends further that a study be made of housing in these areas and necessary funds be appropriated to solve the housing problem in these areas.

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union has also just received from its San Francisco office the following wire:

"Navy presently making survey of residents at Hunters Point housing project with an intention to evict all who are not employees at Hunters Point. Several tenants, namely, longshoremen, have doubled up there with employees of Hunters Point. Longshoremen considered residing there illegally and are receiving eviction notices signed by the sheriff. Absolutely no housing available for these Negro longshoremen in San Francisco or Eastbay town or projects. One couple and two children are now sitting in board office demanding that something be done. We anticipate office will soon be crowded with evictees."

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union believes that the foregoing facts demonstrate the urgent need for action and respectfully request that immediate action be taken to solve this critical housing problem.

Respectfully submitted.

EXECUTIVE BOARD,
INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION.

Mr. Speaker, while housing is not the only shortage that besets this area, it is the critical one of the moment and the one that must be solved now.

To meet the demands of our all-out war effort to crush Japan, we must solve the problems of housing, transportation, and community facilities in the order of their importance, accepting the principle of first things first.

Effect of Smoke Ordinances on Coal Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, from the Honorable Calvin T. Johnson, former Congressman from the Twenty-second District of Illinois, regarding smoke ordinances of midwestern cities, and their effect on the production of coal in the State of Illinois:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 23, 1945.*
Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Director Office of War Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Noting the intensive drive initiated by your office to conserve both manpower and facilities, may I call to your attention the smoke ordinances of midwestern cities.

May I cite, as an example, the city of St. Louis, Mo., which for more than a century obtained her fuel supply from Illinois coal fields lying within radii of 20 to 50 miles. In 1939, a rigid smoke ordinance was enacted which forces the importation of more than 1,500,000 tons each year from West Virginia and Arkansas coal fields which are 400 to 600 miles distant from St. Louis, thus wasting approximately 25,000,000 car miles annually.

The importation of this coal not only caused idleness among miners but also forced dozens of Illinois mines to be closed and junked, that formerly produced coal for the St. Louis market. Illinois coal is permitted in St. Louis today for use in mechanically fired equipment, but approximately a 2,000,000-ton market has been lost to Illinois mines through the restrictions which force the small home owner and renter to purchase high grade fuels for all hand-fired equipment.

I am enclosing a clipping from the Granite City Press Record which states that coal production in Madison County, Ill., declined in 1944 from 1943, and that where some years ago 4,000,000 tons of coal were produced annually, only 2,114,632 tons were produced in 1944. It further states that 10 mines are now idle and that those operating worked only an average of 232 days in 1944. A similar situation exists in adjoining St. Clair County where dozens of mines have been closed and junked in recent years. These two counties lie directly across the Mississippi River from St. Louis, Mo.

Geologists estimate that Illinois fuel beds contain approximately 200,000,000,000 tons of bituminous coal, and although it has been mined commercially since 1828, only 6 percent of the total has been removed. Illinois mines experience difficulty in disposing of lump coal during the summer months, and as a result, miners do not have full-time employment during that period. This coal could be stored in dealers' yards and used to meet fuel emergencies, if existing smoke ordinances were eliminated and Illinois coal accepted for use in hand-fired equipment. Illinois coal sells in St. Louis for approximately $5 per ton, compared to $9 per ton for eastern bituminous and Arkansas semi-anthracite coal.

I am informed that owners of the Radium Coal Mine, located at Belleville, Ill., 14 miles from St. Louis, are contemplating junking that property because of their inability to reopen and operate at a profit. This mine is

known as one of the best in southern Illinois but has not been operated in recent years because of the inability to find a market. This condition is due largely to the St. Louis smoke ordinance.

Trusting you will investigate this matter thoroughly, and that this ordinance can be set aside during the emergency, thus utilizing to the fullest, the existing manpower and facilities of the Illinois coal fields, I am,

Sincerely,

CALVIN D. JOHNSON,
Former Congressman from the Twenty-second District of Illinois.

Army Backs London Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Milwaukee Journal, of February 27, 1945:

ARMY BACKS LONDON POLES—SHOCKED BY YALTA PACT

(By L. S. B. Shapiro)

WITH THE POLISH FORCES WITH CANADIAN FIRST ARMY, February 22.—The Polish formation under Gen. Maczek fighting with the Canadian army remain bound by voluntary loyalty and solemn oath to the Polish emigre government in London. Under no conditions will they take direction from Lublin, and the troops are determined never to return to Poland as long as the Lublinites retain power. No matter how the Allied powers dispose of the London government, these troops will follow its direction to the end, even if it means a lifetime of exile.

It is this correspondent's unmistakable impression that if the London government is bankrupted, the Polish troops will seek their release from the armed forces of the Allies.

Though their hatred of the Germans is unflagged, they have no wish to continue as mercenaries which is what they would consider themselves if they fought under any auspices other than the London government. They say they now are fighting for Poland and they consider the Lublin government bears no relation to true Polish interests. Shocked at first to the point of despair by what they had read of the decisions made at the Crimea meeting of the Big Three, their attitudes now are hardened into firm determination to stand by the London government no matter how bitter the consequences to them.

I was told the attitude of the Polish forces in the Mediterranean is even more uncompromising than that of Maczek's formations—if this be possible. It was pointed out that only 25 percent of Maczek's troops come from the territory east of the Curzon line.

In Italy, 65 percent of the Polish troops have their homes in annexed portions. Gen. Maczek's home town, Lwow, now is in Russian territory. Thus the world is faced with an emigre population of 300,000 Poles, which is the approximate number of soldiers, sailors and airmen fighting with the western Allies. They will be, they said, like Jews—a wandering race everywhere in the world.

The principal reason for the determination of these men not to return to Poland seems to be fear. They unashamedly admit this.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Felix B. Mestas, Jr., of La Veta, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, when the heroes of this war are tabulated the name of Pvt. (1st cl.) Felix B. Mestas, Jr., of La Veta, Colo., will be high on the list. Private Mestas was killed in action on the Italian front on September 29, 1944. However, before he met his death he gave one of the greatest exhibitions of courage under fire that will be recorded in the entire war.

Private Mestas was a member of the Three Hundred and Fiftieth Regiment, known as the Battle Mountain Regiment. For its valor during the battle of Battle Mountain his battalion was awarded a Distinguished Unit Citation. It was also during this battle that Private Mestas distinguished himself when the Nazis made a fanatical charge on Montebattaglia.

Members of the battalion took up positions on the mountain 2 days before the attack and stood off a number of counterattacks on September 29. During one particular vicious attack the official record contains the following notation:

One unknown hero was seen standing on the crest of the hill in full view of a charging group of fanatical Germans, and firing his Browning automatic rifle from the hip in order to get a better field of fire down the slope. With the heavy rifle he killed 24 of the advancing Germans and accounted for two more with grenades.

The name of this hero was not at first learned. His accomplishments became the talk of the regiment. It was Sgt. Cleo Peek of Arvin, Calif., who finally established his identity. He was with Private Mestas just before he was killed.

Peek and Mestas were at an advanced post on the height. They were almost out of ammunition and knew they would have to leave. Standing up in his position and starting to fire Mestas insisted that Peek leave first. Peek says that the Germans were charging up the hill like wild men, and that Mestas killed at least 24 with his last clip. Peek crawled back, stiff and lame, after 2 days of exposure. He and two riflemen were the only survivors of their entire squad. Peek referred to Mestas as Cowboy, and states:

The cowboy was never scared. Why just 10 minutes before I left he was singing a little song.

Pvt. (1st cl.) L. C. Burnett, of Floral, Ark., one of the surviving riflemen, was in a place where he could observe the final stand of Mestas. His version of the incident follows:

After Peek left the entrenchment I saw Cowboy stand up again and fire that last clip. Then I saw his steel helmet fall back and he stooped to pick it up. That's the last I saw of him. I have never seen a better man with a B. A. R.

The parents of this brave soldier are Mr. and Mrs. Felix Mestas, of La Veta, Colo. I have a letter from Mr. Mestas and wish to quote therefrom:

Felix made the supreme sacrifice for his country and his buddies. We are proud of his unselfish deed. The kind expressions we receive from friends help ease the ache in our sorrowing hearts, but as you can appreciate, to us he was our little boy.

He died as he lived, with a smile and a song, as that was his nature. The last time we saw him I told him since you are to be a soldier I want you to be a good one, and he answered, "I will, Dad," and he was.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Private Mestas was a real soldier, and I am proud to relate his accomplishments to the House. I am sure his heroism will be duly and appropriately recognized by the War Department.

The Farmer Faces a Tough Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of March 3, 1945:

THE FARMER FACES ANOTHER TOUGH YEAR

That record buster, the American farmer, is being asked for a repeat performance with this year's output of food. Livestock and crop-production quotas, set by the War Food Administration, are based on a continued heavy war and relief demand. They ask for a 363,635,000 crop acreage, 3 percent more than was planted last year. "Better to have too much than too little," is the view expressed by one official.

It is a justifiable precaution. But in the light of contradictory policies, many people in the farm areas wonder if the Government really means it. For the farmer is having to tackle the job with still less to do it with than before.

The farm population has continued to drop until its proportion to the Nation's total is the lowest in our history. This decline reflects a further departure for war jobs and the drafting of young farmers. Confusion over Selective Service policies and the necessity local boards face in filling draft quotas have led to such effects as this farm-sales ad in the Archbold (Ohio) Buckeye, beginning "Due to tenant being called into military service——" In the list of items to be sold were 18 head of registered Jersey cows and a bull. This followed the War Food Administration's request to increase milk production to more than 120,000,000,000 pounds in 1945.

Farm work along American lines calls not only for physical stamina but experience and training in a variety of skills. One possessing these abilities is an almost irreplaceable man. What the lack of such men means is indicated by a recent official Nebraska farm-crop report, which said: "Reduction in the output of livestock products reflects, among other things, the shortage of labor. Most farms are large enough to require two men to produce and harvest crops and to raise and finish livestock. Many farm units cannot maintain livestock raising and finishing

for market unless they can depend on getting help that will remain until all operations are finished."

Some of the quotas for new farm machinery will not be filled. Power machinery is as indispensable as manpower because it increases the capacity of the man, and thus helps to offset the shortage of labor. This is the third year farmers have operated under restricted implement schedules and the proportion of old and repaired machinery has increased. The danger in this combination of thinned labor supply and machinery uncertainties is that it leaves farmers more vulnerable to weather hazards. We have had a longer cycle of generally favorable weather than usual and it has contributed materially to the large food production. Even with these handicaps and risks, it does not necessarily follow that the American people will have less to eat. For three successive years, farmers have crossed up the prophets of scarcity and, by dint of ingenuity and hard work, have produced more food than the same number of people ever did before in history. The one big crop in the growing stage, winter wheat, looks even more promising than usual. In all the six hard-winter-wheat States of the lower plains there is a deep penetration of subsoil moisture that ordinarily foretokens a large yield.

But, with an eye to the doubtful factors, the Government is asking the public to hedge its bets on the food supply by planting another 18,500,000 Victory gardens. Forty percent of the fresh vegetables came from this source last year, and home canners are estimated to have put up 3,400,000,000 quarts of food. To lend further incentive, it is officially stated that the armed forces will require an even larger percentage of this year's commercial-canning production.

The headlines offer no occasion to relax. Knock-out of Germany, food experts say, will make no difference in requirements for 3 months afterward, little in 6.

Statement by the American Labor Party on the Punishment of War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the statement of the American Labor Party on the punishment of war criminals:

Full and complete punishment must be imposed on all war criminals. The mistakes of the last war must be avoided.

This is not merely a matter of elemantary human justice. It is a matter which is tied up indivisibly with the problem of achieving a secure and lasting peace. If any of the men who were responsible for unloosing this war against mankind and perpetrating the monstrous crimes which attended it, should go unpunished, they would constitue a continuing threat to the security of the world and be a source of disunity among the United Nations.

The punishment of war criminals, therefore, goes to the heart of our war policy.

The United Nations Commission for Investigation of War Crimes was created (a) "with a view to establishing responsibility of the guilty individuals through the collection and assessment of all available evidence," and (b) "to take concrete steps looking to the punishment of agents of the Axis Powers who have perpetrated atrocious crimes against their innocent victims."

The establishment of this Commission with such avowed purposes is an improvement over policies followed in the last war. The Commission, however, is in grave default in the discharge of its responsibilities, because—

(a) The Moscow Declaration contemplated punishment of all war criminals. Yet the Commission has adopted no positive definition of war criminals, has ignored treasonous acts not involving physical atrocities, and has refused to consider atrocities against persons who are not nationals of the United Nations.

(b) Former Secretary Hull has stated that "Hitler and other top Nazi officials" are included in the Moscow Declaration. Yet the United Nations Commission has announced no plans for the punishment of heads of state and has neither established nor proposed machinery for the punishment of any war criminals.

The danger that history may repeat itself is real and imminent: To assure that all war criminals shall receive full punishment, we propose the following:

1. DEFINITION OF WAR CRIMINALS

The term "war criminals" shall include:

(a) All persons who launched this war or who engaged in acts of aggression.

(b) All persons responsible for or who participated in mass executions, slaughter of civilians and hostages, deportation of slave labor, violence against women and children, starvation and extermination of racial groups, acts of treason, looting, theft, and destruction of property, violence upon prisoners of war, and the like, including crimes of such character against their own nationals.

(c) All persons who aided or abetted in any of the foregoing, including heads of state, militarists, politicians, and industrialists.

2. JURISDICTION AND TRIAL

(a) Supermalefactors, such as Hitler and other heads of state responsible for launching the war or for widespread crimes in several countries, or against stateless persons, or whose crimes have no particular localization, or whom an offended nation may prefer not to try, should be brought to justice through an international tribunal, acting as the agent of all of the United Nations.

(b) All other war criminals should be tried and punished as soon as possible after their apprehension by tribunals of the country in or against which their abominable deeds were done.

(c) Under no circumstances, should German and Japanese war criminals be left to trial by tribunals of their own countries.

3. MACHINERY FOR PROSECUTION

Each of the United Nations should forthwith instruct its representative to the War Crimes Commission:

(a) To extend investigations by the Commission to all war crimes, whether or not the victims are nationals of the United Nations.

(b) To forthwith establish an adequate prosecuting staff charged with the duty of compiling lists of all persons accused as war criminals as above defined and of at once proceeding with the assembling of all pertinent evidence and testimony with the view toward expediting prompt trials of such criminals.

(c) To immediately take all other concrete steps necessary to provide machinery for the punishment of those war criminals triable by an international tribunal and to proceed with the trial and punishment of such criminals as soon as apprehended.

4. NO ASYLUM

The United Nations have promised that war criminals will be pursued to the uttermost ends of the earth. This obligation must be implemented with the formulation of a concrete program of sanctions to be applied to those neutral countries which have not yet undertaken to close their frontiers to war criminals, to the end that protection or asylum in any country for any war criminal shall be rendered impossible.

Distribution of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, recently a businessman in my district in Brooklyn who conducts a well known and reputable 5-cents-to-$5 department-store business established a half century ago, sent me a communication in connection with the very important problem of equitable distribution of Government surplus property. The contents of this letter so accurately describes the problems of purchasing surplus Government property insofar as so-called small business is concerned, that I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues.

The body of this letter is as follows:

Suggestions seem to be in order with reference to the disposal of surplus property and this letter is offered in a completely constructive vein to help effectuate the Government's policies in surplus merchandise disposal.

For purposes of clarity, may I say that this is being written with the recognition that the following are the general policy of the Government:

To dispose of surpluses—

(a) Quickly.
(b) Fairly.
(c) With the least loss to the Government.
(d) With as little red tape as possible.
(e) With as little disturbance to the commercial and economic structure of the country as possible.

We are not a very small store. We are in what might be known as the junior class but as far as our ability to avail ourselves of the opportunity to purchase surplus merchandise is concerned we are just out of the running.

The reasons are obvious but for the purposes of clarity may we enumerate them.

1. Surplus merchandise is located all over the country. We cannot afford nor, because of the help situation, are we able to have any one travel around to inspect the merchandise.

2. Most lots of desirable merchandise are too large for us to think of purchasing.

3. As small merchants, we have a natural fear of buying merchandise in condition "as is" without the opportunity of thoroughly inspecting the goods.

4. The amount of paper work necessary to enter bids, make deposits, etc., would involve an expense which we cannot afford and help which we do not have and cannot obtain.

5. Our purchases would not be for speculative resale but for sale direct to the consumer, which means that we have to be more careful than speculative buyers.

For the above reasons we find it impossible, therefore, to participate in any of the Gov-

ernment's offerings of merchandise as reported through the Surplus Reporter. (Please don't take us off the list. We would like to receive it in order to be informed.)

We therefore wish to offer the following constructive suggestion which would be a great help to us and would effectuate the Government's program.

Can't the Government publish, periodically, a list of surplus merchandise sales made during the previous month, giving the name of the purchaser, the quantity purchased, a short description of the item purchased, and the price paid?

We would then be able to contact this private buyer and negotiate a deal with him for the amount of merchandise at a price and terms that would be satisfactory to us.

We do not believe that this would be violating any ethics since all such transactions are public information. The price paid need not be secret because there is an O. P. A. ceiling and competition will take care of the rest.

If it would be possible for the Treasury, or whatever branch of the Government would have this method in their care, to issue these lists every 2 weeks or on the 1st and 15th of the month instead of every month, it would be still better.

We hope that this suggestion may receive consideration as it seems that this is the only practical way in which the smaller business people of the country (not only retail but also industrial, farming, etc.) will be able to obtain any real advantage out of the Government program of surplus merchandise disposal.

Respectfully yours,

GERMAIN STORES, INC.,
By ALLEN GERMAIN, *Comptroller.*
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Norway, Europe's Forgotten Country?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, Norway was the birthplace of my parents. Both of them came to this country when they were young people and both of them were proud of their citizenship secured shortly after their arrival in Minnesota and North Dakota.

My father, a journalist, edited a Norwegian-language newspaper, the Vesterheimen, and became known throughout Minnesota and North Dakota for his unwavering adherence to the principles of righteous living. He became an important factor in political circles in northwestern Minnesota.

Through him and my mother I have learned to know something of the social, cultural, and political history of Norway. I have grown to respect the stable, down-to-earth philosophy that characterizes Norwegian thinking.

Norway was a peaceful nation. She wanted war with no one. When Hitler invaded Norway I, like all good Americans, acquired a deep hatred for the ugly things for which nazi-ism stood. I knew from news that filtered out of Norway what those good people were suffering greatly. On many occasions my messages of hope and encouragement were short-waved by the O. W. I. toward Norway and to the listening underground.

But hope is not enough. Promises of liberation are not a substitute for food and freedom.

Norway must not be the forgotten nation, left to starve in the midst of the growing brutality of the cornered Nazis.

Marquis W. Childs, well-known columnist, has the following to say about conditions in Norway, in his article entitled "Norway Almost Europe's Forgotten Country," published January 15, 1945, in many American newspapers.

The article follows:

THE STATE OF THE NATION—NORWAY ALMOST EUROPE'S FORGOTTEN COUNTRY

(By Marquis W. Childs)

WASHINGTON.—For all the Allied world, the postponement of victory in Europe has been a crushing blow.

But if we feel it here in America, especially the prolongation of the tension which is the state of mind of millions with sons and fathers and husbands in the fighting, consider the plight of one small country that for nearly 5 years has known no surcease from suffering.

Virtually outside the orbit of the Allied victories of 1944, Norway is almost a forgotten country. Yet Norway was among the first of the western democracies to come under the tyranny of the Nazis. Not long ago, the Norwegian government-in-exile asked the Allies to invade Norway, and that appeal had in it a note of desperation.

When I was in Sweden a year and a half ago, Norwegians who came out of their country via the underground took a grave view of what another winter of Nazi occupation would do. The Norwegian people had not starved, but they were close to the line.

Inside Norway, they were pinning their hope on liberation in the spring of 1944. The theory—and it certainly was not confined to Norway—was that Germany could not last through another winter. Lacking any real hope, the Norwegians lived on rumors of hope which went in waves via the underground.

Now they are enduring still another winter of Nazi occupation. The reluctant sun sheds a thin light for a little while in the middle of the day. The rest is darkness and raw, numbing cold knifing into bodies long in want of sustaining foods.

BRUTALITY INCREASED

Recent reports coming out of Norway show that the occupation has become more savage and brutal during the past 6 months. While there was even a slim chance of a negotiated peace which would not sacrifice everything, the Nazi troops maintained some moderation. They even resisted the worst excesses of the Gestapo.

Today there are no restraints. The arrogance of victory has been replaced by the hatred and frustration of defeat.

Latest estimates put about 200,000 Germans in Norway. The army of occupation is comprised of more than 100,000 troops—about 10 to 11 divisions of about 10,000 each. For the most part, these are young boys or middle-aged men. The German civilian organization, the Gestapo, and the Todt, slave labor battalions under the German lash, make up the rest. And many Nazis have their wives with them.

The invaders live almost entirely off the country. For a time, the Germans sent in some food. That has now stopped. They have said they have no interest in what happens to the Norwegian population. Obviously, this is part of the calculated policy to weaken all peoples as much as possible.

In the Arctic north, the Russians have driven the Nazis out of several hundred square miles of Norwegian territory. As the Russians came in, the Germans burned the villages, turning families out of their little wooden houses to almost certain death in the Arctic winter. The saga of the wanderings of the dispossessed women and children of Kirkenes and the smaller communities is one more chapter in the record of Nazi ruthlessness.

RUSSIAN RELATIONS GOOD

According to reports out of Norway, relations with the invading Russians have been good. Administration of civil affairs has been left to Norwegians. But the Russians can do little to alleviate the suffering, since they have only their own rations.

In fact, recent dispatches from London reveal that Russia has requested her western allies to relieve her even of the task of garrisoning the territory her armies have liberated. But the United States and Britain had to refuse on the grounds that, because of the demands of the western front, they could not yet spare the necessary troops and supplies.

The Norwegians are a strong proud people. But hunger is a cruel despot. When total liberation of Norway finally comes, the machinery of relief and reconstruction must be ready to move immediately. There must be no delay.

The President's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the President's report to the Nation added little to our knowledge of the Yalta Conference. What was left unsaid must give us deep concern. There was no reference to the Atlantic Charter, and the revelation from the President on his return to Washington that secret commitments have been made is most disturbing. One of the major sources of dissatisfaction with our conduct of foreign affairs has been the widespread belief that America is being bound to courses of action without previous knowledge or approval of Congress. Nothing was said by the President to dispel this belief. In my judgment, the Nation is entitled to know every commitment undertaken by our Government without any exceptions whatever.

How Much Can We Carry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, already, before either war has been won,

those who wish to remake America, reform the world, are planning our contributions to the rebuilding of the world. They not only wish to rehabilitate, to rebuild industries in other lands, to feed, clothe, and shelter the peoples of other nations, but they wish to make America carry the major portion of the burden.

Every farmer knows that a two-bottom plow cannot be pulled with a 2-horse team; every truck driver knows that a 2-ton truck cannot successfully move a 10-ton load. Every effort has its limitations.

No matter what the administration tells us, for our own good we must shortly determine how great a burden our people can successfully assume, how much of a load our taxpayers can carry, without destroying our own economic machinery, our own manpower.

The war has already cost us $250,000,000,000. Before it is over, the cost will certainly exceed $300,000,000,000. That means an annual interest charge of at least $6,000,000,000 — approximately $500,000,000 per month, or $3.70 each month from every man, woman, and child in the country. The Government now takes 20 percent of your pay check. Will you be able to pay $3.70 each month for interest? In addition, can you pay your share of what children and others cannot pay? That $3.70 per month will be due for interest alone and, in addition, there will be payments to be made upon the principal and payment of the current expenses of operating the Government.

In addition to all that, we are now being asked to put up as much as $6,000,000,000 for additional post-war machinery to help other nations. It is proposed to create a world bank—contributions to the capital of that bank are to be made as follows:

United States	$3,175,000,000
Britain	1,300,000,000
Russia	1,200,000,000
Rest of the world	3,425,000,000
Total	9,100,000,000

The world bank would make loans to other countries for all sorts of purposes and it would be controlled not by the United States but by a board of international directors, on which we would have a minor representation.

In addition to this world bank, we are advised that a monetary fund of $8,800,000,000, made up of a pool of currency and gold, is to be established. Contributions to that fund are to be made in the following sums:

United States	$2,750,000,000
Britain	1,300,000,000
Russia	1,200,000,000
Rest of the world	3,550,000,000
Total	8,800,000,000

You will note that to the bank we contribute more than one-third; to the fund we contribute more than one-fourth, and in the administration of neither the bank nor the fund will we have a controlling voice, though our contributions to the fund will be $250,000,000 more than the combined contributions of Great Britain and Russia. Our kick-in to the bank will be $675,000,000 more than the combined contributions of the British Empire and Russia.

Our contribution to the Bank is within $250,000,000 of what all the rest of the nations, other than Russia and Great Britain, will contribute, and to the fund within $800,000,000 of what all other nations, other than Great Britain and Russia, contribute.

To all intent and purposes, the $5,925,000,000 which our taxpayers contribute to this world plan will be used, in part at least, to rebuild in other lands industry and agriculture which will come in competition with our own farmers, industrial workers, and industrialists.

War is always destructive; millions of tons of supplies of all kinds will, before this war ends, have been shipped out of this country; little, if any, will ever be returned; most of it will have been destroyed. Our dollars by the tens of billions have gone into the war; our young men and our young women have been sacrificed by the millions; our country will be poorer in resources of all kinds. The best of its young manhood will have been destroyed; gone forever. In sweat and in toil, future generations for 100 years will be paying the cost of this war.

It is well that the people of America awaken to what is proposed, face the facts, and pass sound judgment upon just how much help they can give to the rest of the world without destroying here in America the power to help, to carry on for our own preservation. How much of an additional load can we assume, permit to be piled upon us, without breaking down our ability to produce?

Do You Know Your Congressman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial by Bill Cahn, United States News staff writer:

DO YOU KNOW YOUR CONGRESSMAN?

(By Bill Cahn)

From a big eastern city comes the interesting news that 82 percent of the people of that city do not know the names of their Congressmen.

A daily newspaper has made a survey of what is described as a "carefully selected cross section of the city's voters." Seemingly, there were no tricks involved. Just a question: "Will you tell me the name of your Congressman?"

According to the newspaper, 82 percent frankly confessed they didn't know. Ten percent more hazarded a guess, but were wrong.

Well, it isn't our intention to give encouragement to the notion that because something is printed in a newspaper, it is necessarily true. Nor is there anything about the history of newspaper polls which makes for extreme confidence in their dependability.

But the chances are that this particular poll is fairly accurate and not only for this big eastern city but for other cities as well. Most people don't know the name of their Congressman even though they may have waited an hour or two to vote for him along with President Roosevelt, just a few months ago.

Can it be that the American people are a forgetful people? Or that they just have no head for remembering names? The answer is an emphatic "No."

Millions of American baseball fans memorizes scores of names and batting averages each year, and millions more know names, weights, and records of football teams from one end of the Nation to the other. Millions of housewives turn out fine meals, remembering recipes without research in a cookbook. Millions of G. I.'s remember their serial number, rifle number, bayonet number, general orders, and plenty more—without undue strain.

Therefore, the only conclusion to be reached is that about 82 percent of the people haven't been convinced that remembering the name of their Congressman—much less writing to him regularly—is personally important to them.

Of course, the newspapers we read don't help much. If the press were interested in keeping people informed, most of us would be as familiar with the batting averages of our Congressman as we are with our favorite ballplayer.

If most voters had the chance of studying box scores of congressional sessions like they have of big-league ball games, probably 82 percent of the voters would not only remember the names of their Congressman but also let him know in no uncertain terms what they think of his actions.

But that doesn't explain it all either. The crude fact remains that most people don't yet savvy the blunt fact that knowing the name, address, telephone number, and record of their Congressman is as important to them as life itself.

True, we are beginning to catch on to this. The mail bag of the average Congressman is getting heavier. But the victory the United Nations are carving out of human lives won't be safe for us until the name of our Congressman is as common a word in our household as Joe DiMaggio's or Lana Turner's.

Drafting of Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 22, 1945.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES.

DEAR SIR: A draft of nurses, or to use the more specific language, the Nurses Selective Service Act is no doubt the one way to distribute equitably the vital professional services in which there is a real shortage. I believe a law should be put into effect immediately because there should be no delay in providing skilled nursing care for the war wounded. It is equally important, however, that such legislation should be written in a form that will bring about desirable results. The bill which the Times of February 20 reports as approved by the House Military Affairs Committee, should be revised now to avoid future difficulty. The public should

be well enough informed to request such revision in the best interests of all concerned.

First, a compulsory registration of all nurses is imperative, since a major difficulty in the current nursing crisis is that no one actually knows how many nurses there are in the United States. The bill as approved by the committee applies only to nurses between 20 and 45 years of age who are unmarried.

The Army should be interested in getting a comprehensive picture of the nursing resources of the Nation, since it is using approximately 1,000 civilian nurses in military hospitals in this country, many of them over the age to enter military service.

A high proportion of nurses marry soon after graduation from nursing school. They make excellent wives and mothers and liberal exemptions should be granted to bona fide home makers. The military services do not now accept nurses with dependents under 14 years of age. It would, however, be a mistake to overlook those nurses without real home responsibilities who choose to find in marriage an excuse for not devoting their needed professional skills to helping win the war. Nurses who wish to avoid induction could marry immediately and it would be shortsighted if such a group were not included in a registration of our total nursing resources.

The House Military Affairs Committee is to be commended for seeing that all graduate nurses should be subjected to draft. The original May bill applied only to registered nurses, which would have made it possible for those wishing to avoid induction simply to let their nurses' registration lapse. But there should be no loopholes. It has been estimated that there may be as many as 400,000 graduates of accredited schools of nursing in the country able to give at least part-time service if need be, as compared with about 275,000 nurses now active in their profession (the number includes approximately 53,000 already in military service.) It will cost the Government very little more to register them all. Then wise and liberal regulations should be set up, with the help of nurses themselves, to be administered by draft boards on which nurses are serving and exemptions granted on the basis of essentiality of service on the home front.

The situation in civilian hospitals is already so desperate that during the recent committee hearings in Washington, Dr. Donald C. Smelzer, president of the American Hospital Association said "We accept any nurse of any age, just so she has two arms and two legs."

Our nursing staff at the Visiting Nurse Service of New York is 30 percent below its pre-war figure, and most health agencies have an equally serious shortage of staff. A recent study of all public health nursing resources in greater New York, which includes both health department and private agency staff, revealed that there is approximately one public health nurse to 9,000 population. Revised wartime standards for public health practice state that one public health nurse to 5,000 population should be the absolute minimum.

Every citizen should know the potential dangers in the seriously reduced nursing forces on the home front. When we thought there were dangers to our country from enemy action, citizens in all walks of life were anxious to have their abilities and willingness registered for call. I had an opportunity to know what this meant from the national standpoint when I was chief nurse in the Medical Division of the United States Office of Civilian Defense. If properly informed, the public will be equally willing now to have all resources duly registered to be called upon as needed.

Second. I am glad to see that nurses (other than cadets) classified as essential by the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission will not be inducted, and that nurses employed by the Veterans' Administration will be considered essential. As a member of the National Committee on allocation of Medical Personnel of the Procurement and Assignment Service, I know of the work that has been done in estimating State quotas for military service and the careful attention given to the criteria for classification of all nurses. Nearly 900 procurement and assignment service committees all over the country have classified about 235,000 nurses during the past year and a half, and in so doing have secured the greatest body of information about nurses to be had anywhere. This information should be used.

Third. The worst feature of the committee-approved bill is that it seems to exempt all other nurses until all United States Cadet Nurse Corps graduates have been inducted. To be sure, a high percentage of service should be expected of the cadets, who are educated at public expense. The number of cadets now available will not begin to fill the immediate need, however, and those already graduated have received Government funds only during their senior year, since the corps was organized in July 1943. The immediate effect of such a regulation would be to stop the volunteering of noncadet eligible nurses, even those who may be doing no essential work and should have answered the call to military service long ago. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that volunteering must continue while a draft law is being shaped and put into operation, if our wounded are not to suffer for lack of nursing care.

The long-range effect of such a regulation will be to dry up the supply of nursing services at the source. The cadet nurses were promised a choice between military service and essential work at home upon graduation. If the law is changed now, many of those now in school may drop out. This must not happen. But think of the difficulty of recruiting incoming students for new classes. It will be hard enough if nurses are the only women to be drafted, but if cadets are inevitably to be the first nurses taken, regardless of how many other nurses should be serving the situation will be impossible.

The Cadet Corps, members of which receive only school expenses and a modest stipend of $15 or $20 a month from the Government, was set up for the dual purpose of supplying both military and civilian nursing needs. It is estimated that student nurses are giving 80 percent of the actual care to patients in the hospitals with which their schools are connected and which, like most other civilian services, now operate with extremely depleted graduate nurse staffs.

Civilian nursing needs have expanded during the war years while military needs were mounting rapidly. The Cadet Corps was set up at the request of the nursing profession because they saw no other way to guarantee continued acceleration of admissions to schools—no 76 percent above those in 1940—for education in a profession that is relatively underpaid, in the face of growing competition in other fields.

We must play fair with these students. Draft regulations can be so written as to place greater obligations upon cadets than upon other nurses without giving a blanket excuse from military service to all other nurses, and without dragnetting in the cadet graduate who should perhaps teach in a school of nursing (some schools are actually refusing new students because of teacher shortages) or do other specialized work.

Fourth. It is regrettable that the House Committee on Military Affairs is attempting to break down standards set up by the Army and Navy Nurse Corps by specifying that no nurse shall be disqualified because the school from which she received her training was affiliated with a hospital not having a specified number of beds or patients. Obviously, a nurse who has worked only in a very small hospital may never have seen types of injury and illness including communicable disease, that are prevalent in military hospitals. Obviously too, the Navy nurse, who is essentially a teacher of hospital corpsmen, and the Army nurse, who has any number of corpsmen working under her direction, must be a genuinely versatile person, highly skilled in nursing technique.

While there has been a great hue and cry from the nurses trained in schools that do not meet standards set up by the military services, their numbers are not large. Only 90 out of 1,300 schools in the country do not qualify and since they are small, they average only about 10 graduates each a year. Both Army and Navy have modified rules to admit nurses from these schools who have, subsequent to graduation, had adequate supplemental training in large hospitals.

The Army and Navy should certainly decide what standards their nurses must meet. If the Congress insists upon making that decision, it must take the responsibility for inadequate care that our wounded may receive in consequence.

Five, and finally, I would like the public to say that even a comprehensive draft of nurses will be inadequate without a national service act. It is not a question of discrimination. Nurses are proud that their skills are needed first. It is a question of use of those skills. Too many nurses are now washing dishes and scrubbing floors to keep civilian services in operation. Their entire time could be given to nursing duties if it was possible to secure adequate auxiliary help.

A great many matters should be taken into consideration that might better be left to regulations than written into the text itself. For example, the Navy Nurse Corps should admit Negro nurses, and the Army Nurse Corps, which now has 330, should use more of the estimated 2,000 Negro nurses who are qualified. I would urge that the simplest sort of law be passed, and then selective service and the War Manpower Commission work closely with the nurses in setting up wise and fair regulations for carrying out the law. When over a third of all those active in a profession and of military age have already volunteered for military service—a remarkable record, by the way—we can safely trust the profession to guide a selective-service procedure.

We cannot afford delay in getting nurses to the war wounded while we struggle with the inevitably tough job of passing a National Service Act for all women and men. But nurses want it clearly understood that they know a draft of nurses alone is only piecemeal legislation, and that the whole problem should be tackled as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

MARIAN G. RANDALL,
Executive Director, Visiting Nurse Service of New York, formerly Henry Street Visiting Nurse Service.

These Chickens Are Coming Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following news article from the Washington Post of March 1 should

be of interest to every Member of Congress:

NEW UNITED STATES POLICY FOR IMPORTS PRESENTED AT MEXICO CITY

(By Herbert B. Elliston)

MEXICO CITY.—Assistant Secretary of State William H. Clayton unfolded yesterday in the name of the United States delegation to the Inter-American Conference a new import policy for the Federal Government.

This policy would direct buying abroad both to accumulate and to consume goods needed here. The program is based upon two needs which, it is hoped, will appeal to the American people: security and conservation. Legislation would be required to put this program into effect, as some doubt exists in the minds of members of the United States delegation whether the Government legally can keep or stock-pile imports which have no relation to our war requirements.

MUTUAL BENEFITS SEEN

It is the contention of the American delegation that the program would have the double purpose of serving the interests of the United States and of Latin America alike.

National security is held to be virtually the price of this import program from the United States' standpoint. What is contemplated is the hoarding of all those critical and strategic materials, procured with such difficulty as to have imposed great strain upon Allied war-making. In getting these materials for war purposes the United States had to scour the world, paying huge prices in competition with Germany. Most of the alloys, such as tungsten, manganese, and chrome, used by America's steel industry are cited in this category. It is felt that a stockpile of these materials is necessary in assuming new responsibilities in the post-war world.

AID TO CONSERVATION

Another benefit flowing from this important policy, according to Clayton, would be that it would help the United States to conserve its own resources. War has taken a drastic toll of American raw materials, he pointed out.

Soaring copper ore needs were mentioned by Clayton as an illustration of the ravages of war. At the present rate of consumption America faces exhaustion of copper, and of other resources within a generation. American delegates here feel that the only way to make supplies last is to eke out domestic production with foreign buying. According to this view, the emphasis on conservation will make the new import program more palatable to the American people.

FUNDAMENTAL APPROACH

America's interest is likewise served, it is argued, in the aid that would accrue to Latin American economics from such an important program. It is fundamental in the approach of the American delegation to this conference that the political solidarity of the Americas depends upon what contribution the United States makes to maintenance of economic stability when war buying is over.

Nineteen revolutions occurred in the Latin-American countries during the transition to peace after the last war. If similar upheavals are to be avoided this time, the United States delegation here agrees, this import program's adoption is imperative. In other words, peace buying in the Americas must cushion the shock of the abrupt loss to Latin America of our war buying. It so happens that most of the critical and strategic materials which the United States lacks, or which are in short supply, are to be found in this rich, and relatively virgin continent.

GREETED WITH AVID INTEREST

Clayton's program has been greeted with avid interest by Latin-American nations' delegates. On no other matter are they more worried than on the problem of their economic adjustment when war contracts have been canceled. There seems to be more faith in the United States' performance in this conference than fear of the lack of it. So far as can be made out, this faith rests primarily on the new world situation of the United States.

"The Crimea Conference makes this conference a success," said one delegate, "because it was apparent there that the United States was going to live up to its responsibilities as one of the world's predominant powers."

However, the fear obtrudes itself in one or two of the hundred or more resolutions which have been poured into the conference hopper, notably in the antidumping resolutions proffered by Brazil and Uruguay. This resolution is aimed at the cotton export subsidy voted last year by Congress. Brazil, which is seeking a cotton agreement with the United States, considers this subsidy a violation of the spirit, if not of the letter, of its trade agreement with the United States.

Here we have Mr. Clayton taking upon himself the responsibility of doing considerable talking about something that Congress itself should have the voice. I heard Mr. Clayton on the radio a few nights before election telling about the inequities of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. However, he did not tell the radio audience that the Smoot-Hawley Act is still on the statute books after 12 years of the present administration. Nor did he tell them that the Smoot-Hawley Act has been made still more severe by the embargo on exports such as tobacco seed, which was passed in 1940, after Marvin Jones had been chairman of the Agriculture Committee for 9 years and Henry Wallace had been Secretary of Agriculture for 8 years. Nor did he relate how the present administration continued the high duty on wheat as provided by the Smoot-Hawley Act and then in addition put on a near embargo on wheat imports.

Have not thinking people in our own country begun to realize the deceit and deception of these new dealers that run around and talk about a good-neighbor policy when they are really passing legislation to jeopardize the good-neighbor policy? I am still waiting to hear some new dealer justify, first, export embargoes, and, second, subsidized exports. If he cannot he better introduce legislation to repeal the legislation, or at least quit running around the country deceiving women's organizations and others and let them see the real color of the New Deal banner.

You will observe in the last paragraph of the article that Brazil and Uruguay have made note and protest to the subsidized exports as practiced by the present administration.

War Department Policy Regarding 18-Year-Old Youths in Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. EWING THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of War, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, today was asked the following question at his press and radio conference: "Congressional and some popular comment has indicated that youths of 18 are being sent to combat with no more than 15 weeks of basic training and in well less than 8 months in the service. Can you say whether this indicates any change in policy in this regard?"

He made the following reply:

Subsequent battle emergencies have forced considerable variations from the policy you mention.

In discussing this matter I wish to make several points clear. These young men are being trained more intensively and effectively than American soldiers have ever been trained heretofore.

Some Members of the Congress and the public have confused the training of a division with the training of an individual. The former requires a minimum of a year, preferably longer. The training of an individual to go into a veteran unit is an entirely different matter.

So long as there were numerous divisions in this country the practice was followed of drawing from the ranks of those divisions the majority of Infantry privates who had been in training from a year to 2 years and sending them overseas. Their places were then filled by transfers of the young men from the replacement training camps. This procedure was very hard on the divisional teams. Nevertheless the War Department followed this practice so long as it was practicable. The movement of divisions out of the United States has progressed to such a point that such a procedure has not been possible for a considerable period of months.

The impression apparently has grown that the Army is maintaining men of great experience and training in the United States who might well have been sent overseas; and that if we had sent these older men overseas, the younger men could have been continued longer in training before actually committed to combat. This is not the case. During the past year practically every man under 35 who was physically qualified and for whose job a replacement could be found—either in the form of a physically disqualified man who had been returned from overseas or a civilian—has been ordered overseas. This process is continuing. Furthermore, the same procedure is being followed in regard to the men in the rear areas overseas.

Men recently inducted into the Army are given a minimum of 15 weeks of the most rigorous training which the Army has been able to devise after 4 years experience. Most of the replacements since July 1943 have received 17 weeks in the basic camps. All have received additional training in staging camps en route to the ports in this country or in replacement receiving pools overseas where they are under veteran tutelage.

Before any man is sent overseas he is submitted to a thorough test to insure that he has assimilated his training and is in fact prepared for combat duty. As I have just mentioned this training continues to the maximum extent practicable from the time he leaves the United States until he actually joins his division. There, if the division is not in the line a still more intensive period of training follows.

It is my opinion that never before have American soldiers been so thoroughly prepared for their duty in battle. Probably the best testimony regarding this matter has been given by a captive German officer who complained that no matter how heavily our units might suffer on a given day they were always back in full strength the next morning and as tough as ever. That represents a very great advance over our training practice and results in any former wars.

Finally, I would say this: Considering the fact that the majority of our inductees dur-

ing the past few months have been in the lowest age brackets, including a large number of 18-year-olds, a policy which prevented the use of such men would have imposed the necessity of delaying the entire campaign in Europe, and probably also in the Pacific. This, of course, would mean a tremendous additional loss of life, not to mention the other attending tragic results. Such a procedure would be wholly inexcusable.

The Hottest Story in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech which I made at the Overseas Press Club annual banquet on March 1, 1945:

To get to the point of what I want to say tonight, I must first make some statements that may seem like polishing an apple for the teacher. Believe me, this is not so. My statements will be made to remind you of your power and your responsibility. It is a responsibility you cannot escape, and I know you will not try to.

In a very real sense, news correspondents are teachers. They inform. The great ones lead. It is our fault, ours, your readers, the public, the Members of Congress, and administrators, not yours, that in the past we have not always paid enough attention, have not heeded, have not acted often, quickly, and decisively enough upon the reports of our correspondents, particularly our foreign correspondents. I recall a few of many who told us the facts—and their meaning—while they were white hot on the smoking anvil of the present, and not years after: Mowrer, Shirer, Murrow, Gunther, Jay Allen, Leland Stowe, and a score of others—all of whom told the meaning of fascism for us.

All of those I have mentioned and most of you, I hope, know one fact:

This is one world. No place is as far away from any other place as Washington was from New York in 1776. We are all neighbors—all nations, all peoples, all races.

Either we, the peoples of the world, will organize ourselves as good neighbors, or this war will be only another in a series that can end our civilization.

Here, and in other countries, plain people have seen how science and the spirit of man can produce for war. Here, and all over the world, the people are asking, "If for war, why not for peace?"

Wendell Willkie said it. Harold Stassen said it. Franklin D. Roosevelt said it. And Henry A. Wallace has said it.

One of your colleagues, William Philip Simms, telegraphed what I thought was an eloquent and hopeful report from the Inter-American Conference on War and Peace at Mexico City. Mr. Simms said, and I quote:

"I have been present at most of the great international conferences since Versailles, but this is the first to place the rights of man ahead of the rights of nations."

This is testimony that we are making progress.

Ezequiel Padilla, Mexico's intelligent and extremely well informed foreign minister, said:

"Peace is not enough; there must be jobs for all. The only thing the world needs to fear is poverty."

Listen to Simms' comment. I quote him again:

"This is something new in the world. Mexico's remarkable Padilla takes the position that if each country sets about improving the lot of its workers and raising their purchasing power by providing jobs, national contentment will predispose such a country to peace * * *.

"A world that can spend hundreds of billions to win a war can well afford to spend a fraction of that amount in order to win the peace * * * the remedy can be found only by uniting the energies and the resources of all the Americas and the rest of the democratic world.

"Whenever Padilla, Stettinius, or any other delegate here touches on this subject they win instant applause. At previous conferences the human equation has never lacked a certain perfunctory lip-service. In Mexico City it comes close to being put first."

This is certainly eloquent testimony to the fact that we are making progress.

All over Washington and from, frankly, what I may say are the most unexpected quarters, I have discovered a rise on every hand, men and women of good will, people struggling to find the answer to the problems of this country and this world.

They are warm, human people, like yourselves, struggling to make democracy work.

Washington today is witnessing some very crucial tests for democracy. However, under the magnificent leadership of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Congress and the people have arisen to the occasion again, and again, and again.

Two great tests came today. The first was the enthusiastic response to our President's magnificent report on historic decisions reached by himself, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin through the momentous conference at the Crimea. The next came a few hours later in the Senate, where that distinguished body acted at last to elevate a great American to another place in the Cabinet as Secretary of Commerce. I refer to that champion of the common man, Henry A. Wallace.

The next month will see much more crucial legislation. There will be the problem of implementing the historic agreements which will be reached at the San Francisco United Nations Conference with the sinus to make a just and last peace work. If we fail to achieve full employment there will be no just and lasting peace.

But full employment is not going to be achieved merely by resolutions adopted at Mexico City, or at San Francisco, or at later meetings of the United Nations and the world organization when established. You know and I know that it is often easier to be progressive and bold in our words and actions a thousand or five thousand miles from home, from Main Street, or either end of Pennsylvania Avenue. We are not going to have full employment in the Americas, or anywhere else in the world, we are not going to have lasting world peace, unless we here in the United States stop walking around the problem and get down to the business of insuring full employment here at home—the same production and employment level in peace that we have achieved in war.

This is what I came here to say. You, who know that the economy of the world is today one seamless web, have a responsibility which, it seems to me, you cannot and should not try to avoid. That responsibility is to help us, all of us, Members of Congress, business men, labor, farmers, professional people, face up to this problem of getting full employment here at home after the war, and at the same time keeping both the form and spirit of true democracy.

A beginning has been made in the full employment bill introduced in the Senate by Senators MURRAY, O'MAHONEY, THOMAS, and WAGNER, and in the House of Representatives by WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee. It is not offered as a complete solution. Perhaps it has many imperfections. Perhaps it does not go far enough. In offering it, Senator MURRAY invited those who disagreed with it to offer alternatives. Others have denounced it, talked of regimentation, totalitarianism, and the road to serfdom. Senator TAFT has boldly announced that 50,000,000 jobs are about enough, and has assumed a national income of $120,000,000,000 is about the best we can do. He thinks a great many women should go back into the home. That would be all right, if they have homes and if they want to do that. He and other critics of the bill say nothing of the regimentation of unemployment, of evictions, of bread lines and the serfdom of chronic insecurity or, to put it plainly, the chronic fear of tomorrow in a Nation and world that for the first time can produce enough for all. To date, no one has offered an alternative.

As correspondents, as reporters, as teachers, as men and women, you know with your own eyes and ears and minds that this is one world and that, this time, we must not only take part but must lead, first in rehabilitation of a shattered world and, second, in the establishment of decent and rising standards of living throughout this great new neighborhood. You can realize, more quickly and profoundly than most persons, the vital importance of getting some such bill enacted into law before the war ends and the gigantic problems and opportunities of reconversion and peace are upon us.

Let me quote from Senator MURRAY's statement in offering the full employment bill. After describing the grave dangers that post-war mass unemployment would present within the Nation, he continued:

"An unemployment crisis in America would spread like wildfire throughout the world. It would give us dumping, higher tariffs, export subsidies, blocked currencies, and every other new and old type of economic warfare. And this, I submit, would inevitably wreck our plans for an effective international security organization, turn back the clock of progress, and plunge us into another holocaust of blood, suffering, and chaos."

Full employment is not just a domestic matter. It is related to inter-American stability, to world peace. To achieve it, we need your attention, your help. In a very real sense, insurance of full employment in the United States is today the hottest story in the world. If we achieve it, our children and their children can know peace, security, opportunity, and happiness—we can finally win a people's peace—the peace about which the President spoke so simply and beautifully today to liberty-loving people of this Nation who do not want to see their sons in another war.

Poland's Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter

from the Jersey Journal of February 27, 1945:

POLAND'S PLIGHT

EDITOR, JERSEY JOURNAL:

Now that the Yalta Conference is over and the Big Three are on the way home, Poland once again looks to the world for help. She looks for help from those who believe in justice and freedom and this help to come from the people whose voices can be raised to defend righteousness. Both in this country and in England the so-called Fifth Partition of Poland is on the lips of everyone. We are not forgetting the 12,000,000 boys of ours who are also in there fighting the enemy, when we speak for Poland. Of these close to 1,000,000 are Poles who fight twice as hard because the enemy of their ancestors is also the enemy of their homeland. Our American boys, in my opinion, would settle the political aspects in the same manner as they master the military issues.

Since September 1939, Poland has fought on against terrific odds. She was promised help from England and France, but never received it. Has England forgotten the part played by the Polish Air Force in the defense of London? Has she forgotten the Polish merchant marine, which has almost been completely sunk carrying supplies to her shores? Does she remember how the Poles fought at Tobruk for 4 long months holding on and drawing heavy fire from Medauer Hill? Those who fought there know. During the entire campaign only a few Poles were taken prisoners. When the French withdrew to England, the Poles covered the French troops and were the last to leave France. They suffered 45 percent casualties. The Polish Army was the first to land in Narvik, Norway, and push the Nazis back. The Polish Navy has taken part in almost every major naval engagement against the Nazis. The records of the American and English Fleets show that. That all seems to be forgotten now.

Remember how the underground held out for 63 days in Warsaw and no help came from Russia?

Out of a total population of 35,000,000 the records show that 7,000,000 have been slaughtered by the "master (dumb) race." Will their deaths be in vain? If people have anything to say in the matter they will see that justice comes to Poland. We of Polish descent appeal to all of you to raise your voices and be heard in helping to bring a peace to this world so that another war shall not sow its seeds in this one.

FELIX F. HRYNKIEWICZ.

Tideland Oil Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, it is reported on apparently good authority that the Federal Government, through the Secretary of the Interior, is ready at last to launch its long threatened attack on State ownership of the tide and submerged lands of the coastal United States.

Although California will have the dubious honor of being singled out as the proving ground for Mr. Ickes' theory that the United States owns her several billion dollars' worth of submerged oil deposits, harbor developments, and lands filled in below the low-water mark of the Pacific Ocean, this is a matter affecting every State bordering on navigable water.

In the strongest words I must protest against any action, during a period when we are at war, designed to disrupt the unity existing between the United States of America and the several States.

Whether the issue of tidelands ownership is taken into court—which is Mr. Ickes' stated intention—or whether Congress decides to settle the question by legislation, a fight over State versus Federal title to the lands will result, with its consequent effect upon our war unity.

This will not be a fight confined solely to the State of California and the Interior Department, as several of my colleagues already have learned. The fact that Mr. Ickes has inquired about Mississippi's stand on the ownership question—through a letter sent to Governor Bailey of that State—and that there have been other indications of a desire on his part to apply the test of ownership in other coastal States with offshore oil deposits already has caused consternation in those localities.

The port authorities of all States, including the great State of New York, are vitally interested in the eventual disposition of the tidelands; municipalities with staggering harbor investments and with uncounted billions of dollars in revenues from tidelands property at stake are equally concerned.

The Secretary of the Interior Department is not a man who does things by half measures. Since he has stated his determination to go through with the granting of one or more applications for drilling permits in the Long Beach-Seal Beach area of southern California, and since he is making inquiry into the stand taken by the State of Mississippi on the ownership of valuable tidelands in that State, it would appear the "test" will apply throughout all the coastal regions of this country.

Many Members present here today and many of our colleagues in the Senate recall the bitter battle that occurred in 1939, when the bill introduced by former Senator Nye, of North Dakota, was up for hearings in both Houses of Congress. Briefly, this legislation would have declared title in the tidelands to rest in the United States and not in the several States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want at this time to take up more than the few minutes sufficient to call this matter to the attention of the House. I want, simply, to point out that issues of this character almost invariably attract little attention until it is very nearly too late.

Any action affecting the States' rights of any individual State is wont to go unnoticed, until it becomes evident a precedent would be established which would apply to many other States—in this instance, all the coastal States.

I earnestly urge all Members of this House, and especially those from States fronting on the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Gulf of Mexico, to study the testimony taken by the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Public Lands Committee a few years ago when California, Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and some other States were battling for their rights against the Nye resolution.

This legislation was defeated, but only after long arguments and at considerable cost, when the weight of public opinion and the sense of fair play backed up the contention of Members from coastal States that the Federal Government has no just claim to submerged and filled-in lands.

[From the Los Angeles Times of February 6, 1945]

ICKES AGAIN

Reports in Washington that Secretary of the Interior Ickes is about to test the ownership of tidal lands by granting an oil lease in the California coastal strip indicate that the threat to this State's possessions has not disappeared with the forced retirement of Senator Nye.

Ickes and other foes of the various States have sought for a number of years to gain control of tidal acreage for the Federal Government, in spite of the uniform court decisions which hold that the title to such lands is vested in the respective States. Senator Nye introduced bills at several sessions directing the Federal Government to seize the tidal lands, his last attempts singling out California. Nye finally dropped his efforts, but apparently Ickes has not abandoned the notion. If the reports are correct, he means to proceed despite the refusal of Congress to take a stand for his point of view.

California probably has little to fear from a court test, but should not be put to the expense of defending its rights. To head Ickes off, Congress should adopt some such legislation as the bill introduced by Oregon's Representative Angell specifically renouncing any Federal interest in tidal lands and declaring them the property of the States, as they have invariably been considered from the foundation of the Republic up to a few years ago.

PETTY'S OIL LETTER

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 10, 1945.*

Industry representatives here feel that if Secretary Ickes grants a public lands oil and gas lease on California tidelands—as it is persistently rumored he is planning to do—it would be definite indication that his New Deal advisers in the Interior Department are gaining the ascendancy on oil matters.

Mississippi tidelands: Checking on reports that Interior Department was interested in a December 30 advertisement by the State of Mississippi to lease submerged lands for oil and gas exploration, I telephoned Jackson, Miss., the State capital, and learned:

Secretary Ickes recently wrote to Governor Bailey asking about Mississippi's claim of title to these submerged lands.

Governor Bailey replied that Mississippi had always claimed title. He referred Ickes to hearings on Senator Nye's tidelands bill several years ago, adding he thought the Federal Government had dropped its claim.

This would indicate Ickes is eyeing Gulf coast tidelands as well as those off the California coast.

Mississippi has leased 400,000 acres of submerged lands in Mississippi Sound to the Kerlyn Oil Co., Oklahoma City. This company is owned by Robert S. Kerr who is not without political influence here as Governor of Oklahoma and keynoter of the Democratic National Convention last year.

[From the California Oil World of February 1945]

Years of waiting for the blow-off on the issue of tidelands ownership will be ended shortly, when Secretary of the Interior Ickes accepts a California filing for drilling privileges in the oil-rich strip of land extending from the line of mean high tide into the Pacific Ocean.

This precedent-breaking action—which responsible authorities agree is imminent—will raise the curtain on a show which will make the Senate hearings on the Nye bill (1939–40) look like tank-town circuit.

The State of California is poised for an aggressive battle in the courts—providing Congress does not take things into its own hands by rushing legislation to declare ownership of the disputed tidelands is vested solely in the several States. High State officials express supreme confidence in the outcome, whether the issue has to grind its way up to the United States Supreme Court, or whether the House and Senate pitch in to decide, once and for all, the right of the States to the coveted strip of half-submerged land that virtually encircles the United States.

While the second Nye bill—seeking to hand over to the United States the billion-dollar-plus oil deposits off the shore of southern California—affected only one State, granting by the Interior Department of an application to drill on property whose title has remained clouded for generations will open to question the ownership of docks, harbor improvements, and shore installations of every variety, up and down the Pacific and Atlantic coasts and along the Gulf coast. Vast and costly port installations in States far removed from oil-producing areas will be threatened by such Federal action, and port authorities, and municipal and State officials from every State bounded by salt water can be counted on to jump into the State versus Federal ownership battle.

Secretary Ickes, for a long time, has been hankering to put the tidelands matter to issue, and—unless publicity scares him off—this appears to be the golden opportunity for a test of strength.

Already reposing in the pigeonholes of the House Judiciary Committee is a resolution, sponsored by Representative HOMER D. ANGELL (Republican, of Oregon), calling upon Congress to reaffirm the doctrine that title to the tidelands is vested in the States and not in the Federal Government. There is a good likelihood that this legislation will be trotted out as the opening gun in a congressional drive to block the Interior Department in its designs upon the richly productive oil deposits underlying the shores of California and Texas (and to a lesser degree Louisiana and other States which have not yet found the means nor the incentive for intensive exploratory activities on offshore properties).

The Angell resolution (introduced last year, without any fanfare, but dropped in the hopper for a second time by ANGELL, who is concerned over Federal threats against Oregon harbor developments, rather than oil) states that the accepted policy of the United States has been, for over a century that the States had title to the lands within their boundary "as an incident of sovereignty." This rule was first disturbed by the introduction of the Nye bill, the measure points out, and—more recently—by the Justice Department's condemnation action against the 330-acre Terminal Island tract in Los Angeles and Long Beach harbors.

War Destroying Europe's Middle Classes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing the following article taken from Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly February 26, 1945:

WAR DESTROYING EUROPE'S MIDDLE CLASSES—INFLATIONARY LOSS IN VALUE OF GOVERNMENT BONDS SEEN LEADING TO SOCIALISM

(By Franz Pick)

Perhaps as great as any other factor in the political and social orientation of future Europe is what the war has done to impoverish the middle classes through inflationary destruction of their most trusted investments. The effects of food shortages, bombings, maimings, and killings are well-understood and have been given much sympathetic attention. But what is little understood is the degree of destruction of savings in the form of bondholdings and insurance, on which millions of the thrifty had been counting for future security.

We know the German inflation of 1919 to 1922, by destroying the assets of the middle classes of that country, made the children of the new poor ideal material for national socialism. In Italy, Hungary, Austria, and Spain the Fascist movements recruited their best fighters from the ranks of inflation-ruined families.

TURN TO THE LEFT INDICATED

Where will Europe's population turn when this war is over? No one knows. We can only state the fact that this time the Leftists—as the development of the underground movements all over the continent show—have a great attraction for people who know they owe their ruin to Nazi-fascism.

The number of the populations affected by inflation and the total to which their investment losses may climb is hardly at all appreciated as yet. Approximately 400,000,000 people were living in the capitalistic countries of Europe before September 1, 1939. And throughout those nations government bonds furnished the chief medium of investment, totaling more than all other securities combined, as has become the case in this country, too.

With the outbreak of World War No. 2 private capitalism in every one of the warring European nations was replaced by more or less complete government control of all phases of economic and industrial life. After June 1940 only three neutral countries, plus nonbelligerent Spain, could boast of having maintained some remnants of pre-war capitalistic methods and of bringing their respective budgets nearly into balance.

All other countries had to face the task of financing the war and handling enormous budgetary losses. In the European democracies, as well as in the Axis and Axis satellite countries, the means adopted to achieve this task followed the same pattern—an increase in the public debt and in the circulation of paper currency.

In July 1940 Germany and Italy seemed to be nearing victory, but it soon became evident that the touted finance methods of the Axis lacked the efficiency which distinguished its armies. Quantities of booty, ranging from gold hoards seized from bank vaults, to famous art treasures which had a sales value in neutral places, were being transferred to Berlin and Rome. In Paris, Amsterdam, and Zurich, people began to worry about the dangers of the "second German inflation."

CONQUERED COUNTRIES LOOTED

These worries soon were extended to include the economies of all the German-occupied countries. From Norway to Greece, and from Poland to France, the Nazi governors were removing to Germany all transportable assets, including rolling stock, machinery, food, and entire crops. In addition, billions of francs (or other currencies, depending upon the country), were taken from the subjected peoples as "contributions." Conquered countries had only one method for financing these occupation taxes, namely, the printing of new bank notes. Poland and Norway did this. Greece was forced to do it, and the Netherlands, Denmark, Belgium, and France followed.

No one knows the total amount of these contributions to the German war effort. But we do know that the currency systems of all countries occupied by German troops were skillfully ruined before the Allies landed. Hand in hand with the destruction of these monetary systems went an increase in the general price level, and with this an increase in the number of black markets. The combination toppled the value of government bonds.

The most serious financial problems were faced by the new Governments of France, Belgium, Greece, and Yugoslavia when they began the enormous task of rebuilding their countries. None of these nations has yet been able to reestablish a sound currency and healthy economic conditions. As long as inflation and diminishing purchasing power of money prevail, the whole European Continent will remain an economic danger zone.

Obviously, the destruction of currency through inflation implies the destruction of assets of savings banks, and it destroys also the purchasing power of government, State, and municipal bonds. From Norway to Yugoslavia, such bonds are the major asset of all insurance companies, and it is easy to imagine how far-reaching a quasi-general collapse of most of the European private insurance systems would become. All the Scandinavian countries, Great Britain, Holland, Belgium, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and especially Switzerland have or did have highly successful insurance organizations. Many of these countries also had excellent social-security systems, whose strength was maintained by the stability of government bonds.

Investments based on government bonds not only enjoyed legal protection but were compulsory in the care of every minor's estate, for all banks and charity organizations, and for a certain percentage of the assets of every European corporation. Their destruction poses many important questions which cannot be enumerated in full but which will handicap the economic and social reconstruction of Europe.

Aside from the direct losses each private investor will sustain when he writes down the value of his bonds, he will, in most countries of the Continent, lose part or all of the value of his life-insurance policies and annuities.

Retired middle class families in France, Belgium, Italy, and England, who lived modestly on the interest from their government bonds, are already, or wil be, hard hit by the reduction of the purchasing power of their income. Former purchasers of annuities, which nearly all of the larger insurance concerns sold in western Europe, may well increase the growing ranks of the "new poor."

Complete destruction of the value of government bonds and currency already has contributed to civil war in Greece, and in Belgium clashes between "new poor" and police troops occurred in large part because of inefficient handling of currency problems by the government. Nor is it any secret that the financial situation of France is far from good and contains elements of social dynamite. Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, Italy, and Bulgaria too, face large or complete annihilation of the value of their government bonds. In Spain the situation may be somewhat better, although it is far from satisfactory. The real value of the famous British Consols is not, and probably will not, be any greater than it was in August 1939, if as great.

ONLY 6 PERCENT PRESERVING SAVINGS

The figures in the table herewith may be altered before the end of the war, but any changes should not be important. We face the unprecedented possibility that less than

6 percent of Europe's post-war population will have conserved its investment in government, state, and municipal bonds, as well as in life insurance. The remaining 94 percent will have to take losses ranging from 25 percent to 100 percent of their savings.

The question which is uppermost is: Can something be done now to change the trend of investment destruction in Europe? The answer, unfortunately, is no.

Inflation holds to its course in most of Europe, and about 70 percent of the Old World's population is faced with the possibility of nearly complete loss of its currency.

France, at today's official exchange rate, has lost a minimum of forty to fifty billions of actual dollars. We may expect that Germany will finally lose at least twice this amount, and that Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom will have to consider losses of many dozens of billions of actual dollars. The Balkans and the Scandinavian states will join the general write-off action once peace comes again to Europe, and it is quite possible that the final amount of investment destruction will reach a size making impossible every attempt of important help from abroad. The $8,000,000,000 fund of the proposed world bank may well be too small to work, and it is doubtful if the United States, considered to be the only country in the world which could really give credits, will do it to the needed extent of at least $50,000,000,000.

FOR MANY IT IS THE THIRD LIQUIDATION

For many European countries, and especially for the central European population, it will be the second or third time within one generation that life insurance and government, state, and municipal bonds have become nearly worthless. There should be very little doubt about the political repercussions of such events. The victorious Allies will have liberated Europe. With whatever transportation is available they will provide necessary raw materials, food, medications, and pharmaceutical products, but they cannot take complete care of between 280,000,000 and 300,000,000 people of some 15 countries.

Europe itself must provide for most of her own reconstruction. For this reason the social initiative of the various European governments will tend to increase, as demonstrated already by the nationalization of the French coal mines, which may be followed by nationalization of the banks and public utilities. England doubtless will also become more socialistic as well as Italy, Belgium, Holland, and many other countries in eastern Europe. Whether this war-born socialism will give full satisfaction to the more than 280,000,000 ruined Europeans is a question no one can answer.

Wage Readjustment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1945.

Hon. FRED M. VINSON,
Chairman, Economic Stabilization Board,
Federal Reserve Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE VINSON: With regard to the application of certain labor organizations, particularly the United Steel Workers, C. I. O., for revision and readjustment of wages under or outside of provisions of the Little Steel formula, I would like to urge upon you the immediate necessity for consideration of these proposals, entailing equitable readjustment of the entire wage-price structure.

It is common knowledge that since the freezing of certain prices and the establishment of purported wage ceilings many variations have occurred in both wages and prices. I believe it can be successfully demonstrated that these variations have worked to the great disadvantage of the laboring and middle-class groups who are borne down increasingly under very heavy economic burdens arising out of advancing living costs. That these conditions have resulted in many instances of hardship is indisputable.

I know that you have full statistical information at hand and for that reason will not allude to the abundant quantity of factual data which supports the contentions made by those of us who are urging readjustments of the wage-price situation.

I desire, however, to express the hope that you will find it possible in the near future to give careful consideration to this very important factor which is occasioning no inconsiderable degree of dissatisfaction and unrest among our laboring and white-collar workers.

It seems to me that the matter could be worked out scientifically by means available to you and other Government agencies concerned through the use of price index systems or such other instruments and methods as you may decide would be most efficacious in coping with this very grave situation.

If these methods were adopted and applied with appropriate timing and care, I do not believe that there would be any substantial or dangerous dislocation of our price-wage relationship such as might be considered inflationary. On the other hand, unless some definite action is taken now to provide some relief for the long suffering wage earners, this and related problems will be aggravated to the detriment of our war effort and post-war stability in industry and our social order.

With usual good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Drafting Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Australia, South Africa, Canada, New Zealand, integral parts of the British Empire, which is fighting a battle for national existence, refused to draft men for service abroad.

This administration, in furtherance of its effort to remake America, as advocated by the new Secretary of Commerce, Henry Wallace, who would impose a burden upon every thrifty, industrious American to contribute to the support, not only of the unfortunate—which is a charitable task and duty we have always gladly assumed—but to enable the lazy, indolent, shiftless, in our population to live not only in comfort but, as compared with other people, in luxury, not only forced through Congress a bill to conscript American young men to fight for the preservation of the British Empire and the security of Russia, but it is now asking that nurses be drafted for military service, that women as well as men be drafted to work in industry and for private profit.

The administration's purpose and method are outlined in a letter dated February 19, placed upon the desk of the Members of Congress by Women Investors in America, Inc. A copy of that letter reads as follows:

WOMEN INVESTORS IN AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1945.

SENATE COMMITTEE MOVES TO DRAFT WOMEN

Do you know that the work-or-jail bill, namely the Kilgore-C. I. O.-P. A. C. sponsored bill now before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, if adopted, will place all women between the ages of 18 and 45 under control of Selective Service?

Do you know that the Kilgore bill will grant the Government power to shift men and women in these age groups—in fact entire families—from one locality to another?

This situation is a result of the President's request in his January 6 message to Congress in which he said:

"Pending action by the Congress on the broader aspects of national service, I recommend that the Congress immediately enact legislation which will be effective in using the services of the 4,000,000 men now classified as IV-F, in whatever capacity is best for the war effort."

Immediately following receipt of this message on Capitol Hill, Chairman A. J. MAY, (Democrat), Kentucky, of House Military Affairs Committee introduced H. R. 1119—called the work-or-fight bill. This bill not only would affect the 4,000,000 IV-F's named by the President, but the entire 18,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 45.

The bill was referred to Chairman MAY's committee. Hearings opened January 10 and ended January 18.

There were 22 witnesses heard—8 Government officials, 8 labor representatives (6 from the C. I. O.), 2 Members of Congress, and 1 each representing the Socialist Party, United States Conference of Mayors, Agriculture, and Industry. Mr. F. C. Crawford, chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers—speaking for industry—weakened his testimony by admitting to the committee he had not read the bill.

Of these—the 8 Government officials and Mayor LaGuardia of New York representing the mayor's conference, favored the legislation—while the remaining 13 witnesses representing labor, industry, and agriculture opposed it.

TESTIMONY LIMITED

Many prominent individuals and nationally-known organizations asked for time to testify—but were refused. Some were informed they could submit statements for the printed record. They did—but their statements fail to appear in that record.

The House committee reported out a new bill, H. R. 1752, January 24. This was termed the work-or-jail bill because it carried penalties of 5 years in jail and/or a $10,000 fine. It also was called the slave labor bill.

This bill was passed—without amendments—in the House February 1 by the New Deal machine, with the help of 65 Republicans who voted for it—including House Minority Leader JOE MARTIN.

Hearings on work-or-jail legislation commenced before the Senate Military Affairs Committee February 6 and ended February 16. It was assumed these hearings would be on H. R. 1752, the bill which passed the House.

It was learned after these hearings closed that they had been held on S. 36, a bill introduced January 6 by Senators BAILEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, and BREWSTER, Re-

publican, of Maine, which was identical to H. R. 1119, the bill which the House committee had discarded in favor of H. R. 1752.

HUSH-HUSH POLICY ADOPTED

The Senate committee carried the House committee censorship a step further. While the press and public had been admitted to the House hearings, the Senate committee held closed hearings, with the press and public barred.

The committee open-hearings system is a vitally important part of our representative constitutional Government. Under it, the people have an opportunity to appear before committees, express their opinions and present facts bearing on important legislation.

When conducted as originally planned by the wise men who conceived our form of government, the open-hearing system enables committee members to obtain important facts on legislation under consideration. It also serves as an effective bar to censorship by preventing those favoring the proposed legislation from suppressing facts that might tend to change its original intent or even prevent its adoption.

Federal licensing of industry was defeated in 1938 by the weight of testimony presented by nongovernment witnesses against it in open hearings. Mandatory joint returns for husbands and wives has been defeated three times in succession in the same manner. Necessary changes in both management and operation of O. P. A. were forced only by the testimony of nongovernment witnesses in open hearings.

OPEN HEARING AND FREE SPEECH

Open hearings—with the free speech of witnesses plus the public questioning of both Government and nongovernment witnesses by committee members—creates news and thereby enables a free press to place both sides of a legislative issue before the public. Closed hearings permit suppression of important facts and prevent the press from telling the complete story to the public.

Further, the Senate committee decided to hear "only representatives of officially recognized organizations"—that is, those organizations named by War Manpower Commission Chairman McNutt to represent labor, industry, and agriculture on the W. M. C. advisory committee, which was created by Presidential Executive order.

These representatives of labor, industry, and agriculture, with few exceptions, told the committee there was no need for such legislation that the voluntary labor system of this country, had, could, and would produce all the labor needed for war production.

One exception was United States Chamber of Commerce President Eric Johnston, who objected to the "men only" features of the May and Bailey-Brewster bills and urged adoption of legislation that would "include everybody in the labor market, regardless of age or sex," in a statement he made to the press after leaving the committee's closed hearings.

Another exception was Clinton Golden of the C. I. O., who told the committee he was opposed to the May and Bailey-Brewster bills but favored the Kilgore bill. Prior to Mr. Golden's testimony few, if any, members of the Senate committee knew anything about the so-called Kilgore bill which was written by an influential member of the C. I. O.-P. A. C. group and introduced by Senator KILGORE, Democrat, West Virginia.

The Selective Service Act applies only to men. It does not yet apply, even by implication, to women.

WOMEN INCLUDED IN SELECTIVE SERVICE?

But the Kilgore bill, which is proposed as an amendment to the Selective Service Act, states that: "The Congress hereby declares the policy that every individual is obligated to serve the Nation in that capacity for which he or she is best qualified, and to continue in such capacity so long as his or her services are required."

If the Kilgore bill is adopted by Congress—the above language automatically becomes part of the Selective Service Act.

We all have a duty to serve our country in a war emergency. A duty is that which we should perform, but, an obligation is that which we are bound to perform.

Therefore, if this bill becomes law, women as well as men will be included in selective service and the Government will be empowered to tell every woman between the ages of 18 and 45 where and when she will work under penalty of 5 years in jail or a $10,000 fine.

If this is not the intent of the Kilgore bill, why are women included in its proposed congressional declaration of Selective Service Act policy?

DO GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WANT TO DRAFT WOMEN FOR COMPULSORY LABOR?

All Government witnesses appearing before the House committee stated that they considered the work-or-jail legislation only a stopgap to a national-service law, which would give the Government power to compel all men and women to work.

J. A. Krug, War Production Board Chairman, told the committee he favored drafting women for war-plant work.

"IT DOES MEAN YOU"

Harry Hopkins, writing in a national magazine early in 1942, said:

"No American, anywhere, not in the war effort, should be allowed to decide for himself how much he will do or how much he will give. * * * Women who cannot work in factories and shops will perform such essential tasks as caring for children whose mothers are working in munitions plants. Workers will have to be billeted in homes and many a social leader will become a boarding-house keeper. * * *

"Doctors and dentists will go to communities where they are most needed. Some students will quit high school. I see no reason for wasting time on nonessentials such as Chaucer and Latin. A diploma can only be framed and hung on the wall. * * *

"It does mean you—for it isn't just talk—and it won't blow over."

Mrs. Roosevelt, at a recent White House press conference, said she favors a national service law which would include women, but didn't believe it could be adopted until a majority of the women favor it.

If the Kilgore bill becomes law, all women in war plants immediately are placed under Government control. It therefore would seem that they and their families would favor similar controls for other women.

If the nurse-draft bill, now before the House Military Affairs Committee, becomes law, nurses will be subject to military draft. It would seem they, also, and their families, would favor similar controls for other groups.

Would these two groups then supply that majority Mrs. Roosevelt said was necessary to permit adoption of an all-out draft of women?

Or—will the broad and clever language of the Kilgore-C. I. O.-P. A. C. bill provide the controls desired?

It may be said that, although the Kilgore bill states it is the obligation of women as well as men to serve the Nation, it does not compel them to work unless they wish to.

Actually, once this bill becomes law, no employer may hire anyone unless he or she has permission of the War Manpower Commission, without suffering severe penalties. Therefore, you either will work where you are told to work, or no one can hire you; and starvation will be your probable alternative.

IS A LABOR DRAFT NECESSARY?

There is no evidence in the House committee hearings—the only printed record now available—to support such a claim. Government witnesses stated 700,000 additional workers will be needed to meet increased war-production schedules and insisted this number only could be obtained by compulsory labor. They offered no factual evidence to support their claim that war-plant labor needs can only be met by compulsory, or slave labor, but insisted the legislation must be adopted at once.

If this claim cannot be supported by facts, does it not provide the enemy with an excellent propaganda weapon to bolster their people's waning morale? Does it not permit enemy propagandists to claim American labor is not in sympathy with this war and labor draft legislation is necessary to get the munitions needed to keep us in the war?

Representatives of industry, labor, and agriculture denied labor-draft legislation was necessary. They proved, with factual evidence, that the voluntary labor recruiting system has functioned satisfactorily to date. They also pointed to overloading of war-plant pay rolls—particularly on jobs controlled by the Navy Department—as proof that the problem was not one of labor shortage, but (1) efficient use of the present labor supply and (2) proper coordination of the various Government agencies whose duties are to provide manpower for both the armed services and war production.

War Manpower Commission officials—under committee questioning—stated the first big drop in war-plant employment came after the President issued his Executive order exempting men between 38 and 45 from the draft and the second major drop came last fall when official Washington was issuing statements that led the public to believe the European war was nearly finished.

Selective-service officials stated—under questioning—there are 7,000,000 men in the 38–45 age bracket and admitted they did not know what these men now are doing. They also admitted that—if the President's Executive order was withdrawn—they then could check these 7,000,000 and give all who are not on war-plant jobs a choice of seeking war employment or be drafted.

WILL COMPULSORY LABOR PRODUCE MORE THAN FREE, VOLUNTARY LABOR?

Testimony before the House committee proved it was the free, voluntary labor system of the United States that enabled us to supply the needed war equipment not only for our own troops, but also for those of Britain, Russia, China, France—in fact, for practically all the armed forces of the Allies; whereas the Russian Government, with its controlled labor system, could not even supply the needs of its own Army, despite the fact its population is much larger than ours.

This testimony also established that it took Britain 17 months to get its compulsory labor system to function and, under that system, it still requires three men there to produce as much as one man produces in this country under our voluntary labor system.

Personal freedom, individual initiative, and the right to seek employment and occupation in accordance with personal desires and qualifications have been our basic American tradition and directly responsible for our amazing and continued productivity.

Following the Civil War the principle of slavery adopted from the old country was completely abolished here, and it is since then that the greatest industrial growth of this country has taken place.

Wages and production have increased since the Civil War ended slave labor in this country.

Will not adoption of work-or-jail legislation in effect return us to the slave-labor principle?

HOW WILL DRAFTING WOMEN AFFECT AMERICAN HOMES?

The Kilgore and nurse draft proposals will permit drafting our American women for war-plant and military service, with far-

reaching effects upon the home life of our country. The Kilgore-C. I. O.-P. A. C. proposals also will permit the Government to shift entire families from one part of the country to another.

Hitler, prior to the start of this war, gained control of many European countries by shifting large groups of people in order to control elections.

The home is the very foundation and spiritual inspiration of our American economy.

If our women, under a general draft law, can be made to choose between jail or a war-plant job—what is the future of the American home and the care and education of our children?

Will Government nurseries and general Government supervision be the eventual result?

One of the basic requisites for a dictatorship government to be successful is to obtain control of the care and education of a country's children.

What easier way can be found to obtain such control than by compelling our women, under guise of war necessity, to leave their homes for either military or war-plant service?

If women are drafted—what next?

We now draft men for military and naval service.

The move already is well under way to draft women both for military and war-plant service. If this succeeds, there is but one more logical and final step.

The wealth of the Nation—including private capital, savings, industry, and farms—also must be drafted. Was this the real and final objective Harry Hopkins had in mind when he wrote:

"No American, anywhere, not in the war effort, should be allowed to decide for himself how much he will do or how much he will give."

And our returning wounded say the one great hope of every man overseas is—some day—to return to his own home in a free United States.

Time is short. Every effort is being made here to rush this legislation through before the women of the country know anything about it. Remember—"It does mean you—for it isn't just talk—and it won't blow over."

Therefore—you must act immediately. Write—or wire your Senators now—get other women to do likewise—and tell your local newspaper editors your views on this. Do we hear from you?

CATHRINE CURTIS,
National Director.

P. S.—February 20:

Another work-or-jail bill was presented the Senate committee today by Senators O'MAHONEY (Democrat), Wyoming, and BALL, Minnesota. We are informed this includes the Kilgore bill, features of the Bailey-Brewster bill, a proposed amendment by Senator TYDINGS on agriculture as well as proposals made by Senator TAFT and other Senators.

The committee now is considering this omnibus bill. However, do not be confused. It still carries the language that will place women under control of the Selective Service Act as does the language of the Kilgore-CIO-PAC bill.

Employment of Returning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article, written by Richard B. Cole and published in the Boston News Bureau, containing an interview with Mr. John J. Hagerty, the New England R. F. C. manager, dealing with the subject of the absorption of servicemen and women in revitalized industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETURNING VETERANS POSE VITAL POST-WAR CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY—NEW ENGLAND MUST LAY PLANS NOW TO ABSORB SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN IN REVITALIZED INDUSTRY, SAYS J. J. HAGERTY, NEW ENGLAND R. F. C. MANAGER—WITH DIVERSE INTERESTS ALL SHARING IN PROBLEM, PLANNING SHOULD BE DONE ON COMMUNITY BASIS

(By Richard B. Cole)

In the post-war era, New England faces both an arresting challenge and unparalleled opportunity, through the manner in which it receives back its returned war veterans into an industry geared to the exacting demands of the future, in the opinion of John J. Hagerty, New England manager of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"But to meet the challenge and seize the opportunity, New England must coordinate its post-war thinking and planning, acting on the democratic principle of individual municipal responsibility," Mr. Hagerty declared in an exclusive interview with the Boston News Bureau. "Our cities and towns should organize committees, made up of leading bankers, industrialists, doctors, and other civic leaders, to study the problems of the returning veterans and to guard against their unemployment," he continued.

"Industry fits prominently into the picture, for it must be prepared both to absorb the returning workers and to put itself into such physical shape, as to machinery and equipment, that it can compete with other areas equally aggressive. Surplus capital goods and machinery now owned by the R. F. C. will help to make this possible."

CLOSE TO MILLION NEW ENGLAND VETERANS

Room must be made in industry and business for nearly a million New England veterans of this war, nearly a half-million in Massachusetts alone, declared Mr. Hagerty, as he outlined the dimensions of the post-war problem. The majority—around 70 percent—of the boys in the Army and Navy are 24 years or younger, and they are the cream of the country's youth.

The problem is more serious now than it was after the First World War, he declared, for men returning from that war were more mature, and there were not so many taken directly from high school and college, having no specialized training.

In the past, stated Mr. Hagerty, we have permitted our New England young men, after they have been educated here in the best colleges and universities in the world, to go elsewhere for employment, and that is a mistake.

Three things are imperative to correct such a situation in the future; the young men returning from the services must be given an opportunity to increase their knowledge through additional education, as is provided in the G. I. bill of rights; they must be given an opportunity to learn through industry, by in-plant training or other means; they must be put in positions where they can learn quickly, lest there be millions of unskilled men.

"We have the schools here in New England to do this job," Mr. Hagerty stated. "We have the money, much of which is in trust funds but can be put to work—may be made dynamic rather than static. We have the administrative brains. We have the market, for the most populous part of New England lies within a radius of 250 miles of New York, wherein is concentrated the greatest purchasing power in the world. We have the desire and the willingness to do the job, once the need is fully realized."

COORDINATED THINKING AND PLANNING

"What is lacking is coordinated thinking and planning. With our economy built on the township idea, individual community committees consisting of those who understand the veterans' problems and the possibilities of local employment should work out plans which will insure that the wheels of industry be kept turning.

"In order that our men may know how to handle veterans, we in the R. F. C. will all take courses in vocational training and guidance, and the same policy should be followed by responsible men in industry, in the banks, the unions, and fraternal societies, because the problems is one in which all of us share. The newspapers should be represented on the local committees to tell the story of what is being done and still remains to be done.

"It will be necessary to provide industrial education for college men who will perhaps prefer to go directly into industry rather than take that extra year which they will be allowed under the G. I. bill in order to complete their education. The veterans are entitled to a year, and the Government should meet the expense of training until the service men and women are trained sufficiently to be taken over by industry itself.

"Large companies should begin to think now about educational programs for these young men and women, working in cooperation with the Government. Industries will want leadership material and will be much concerned to obtain the right kind of people with proper training. Industry will be called upon to conduct its own schools, with the help of the Government, the unions, or any other source, permitting its employees to earn as they learn.

"Sound community projects should be developed in a spirit of civic responsibility. In Boston we should have one of the finest parking areas in the world, perhaps under Boston Common. It can be worked out. The idea is sound. The city of Boston can come to the R. F. C. for aid. Other sound, self-paying propositions can be worked out in other cities. But public works should be relied upon only after private enterprise and private initiative have sought to do the job."

THE R. F. C. AND BUSINESS

"Reconstruction Finance Corporation is in position to help communities and individual businesses meet their share of the future responsibility. We have the organization to help counsel and advise; we have machinery and equipment that is needed; we can help industry finance the acquisition of machinery if it requires aid.

"Over the past the New England R. F. C. office has made about 700 business loans, exclusive of disaster loans. We have saved over 700 companies, at least a half of which now are doing essential war work, and are vital parts of the New England economy.

"We now hold about $9,000,000 in property which has been declared surplus. In time Government-owned property running into the scores of millions in value will become surplus. On the basis of experience of the last war, this should bring about 50 cents on the dollar. The R. F. C. has sent 10,000 catalogs describing the surplus property to all commercial banks in New England, to all manufacturers compiled from lists sent in by chambers of commerce, the Associated Industries, the War Production Board.

"It is the province of the 17,000 industries making up our New England economy to select what they need from this surplus and get it in place for post-war. This should not be done at the expense of the war effort, and where necessary we will sell now for delivery later. We will enter into arrangements to

finance concerns that need financing, particularly the smaller ones. If they ask us to do so, we will make an analysis, in cooperation with the banks, of what is needed. In reality, the R. F. C. is just a public-service organization for banks and industries.

"During the war, industry has learned that it is absolutely essential to have the most modern machinery and equipment that money can buy. Our office is using the slogan 'Be wise—Modernize' on all its letters, because modernization is needed more in New England than in many other parts of the country."

HELPING THE VETERANS

"And what applies to helping business applies to helping the veterans. The R. F. C. is in the same position as the banks as regards loans under the G. I. bill, and also we will be the reference agency to see whether loans should be guaranteed by the Veterans' Administrator.

"Here in New England we have many things in our favor to help the returning boys and girls. We have an excellent climate; the finest schools in the world; we have beautiful places in which to live, and good transportation; and we have high sense of moral value, which is one of our greatest assets in a time of stress.

"But there is a negative side to the problem. If the veteran should get the idea he is being pushed around—and many felt that way after the other war—his family will get it and before long the majority of the citizens may think the veterans are getting nowhere. We might have these four horsemen riding the streets: disillusionment, such as follows all wars; desire for escape, resulting from so many people being hemmed in by the war; social disintegration, resulting from hasty marriages, broken homes, neglected children, illness, family losses; and economic change resulting from all these other trends, and affecting the whole Nation to greater or less degree.

"It is to forestall such factors of disunity that all of us must begin now to formulate our post-war plans, that they may be in readiness when needed."

Nation's Children Must Not Be Penalized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when I spoke extemporaneously during the debate in this distinguished House on whether or not certain services and important funds would be suddenly taken from the operations of the beneficent Lanham Act time was too limited.

Yes, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, next to winning the war with as little loss of life as possible, the most important asset this Nation has to conserve, protect, and encourage, is the childhood and youth of America. What about these children, hundreds of thousands of them all over the Nation, from homes in which both parents at this time are working in plants essential to winning the war? What about the hundreds of thousands of children of elementary school age? What about the lack of supervision and direction of these teen-age youngsters of our Nation, after school hours before the parents return home from work? What are these youngsters to do when you take away their sensible, constructive supervision, direction, and protection, made possible by the wise distribution over the Nation of this Lanham Act fund throughout the extension services in school departments, physical educational departments, municipal and school recreation departments?

The relatively few millions of dollars now asked for under this Lanham program, and for which I emphatically ask the support of every Congressman on the floor of this House, goes most directly to the protection of this very childhood of our Nation. If you take away this fund by the proposal today, what substitute or arrangement do you offer to these teen-age youngsters? Since I know you have no substitute to offer, are you willing to assume the just blame and criticism for the reasonable assurance that too great a portion of these very children will grow up less hearty, less able, less independent, on account of your votes today?

Furthermore, there is not one scintilla of evidence before this House showing the need or any good reason to take away this fund, comparable with the manifest benefaction and security extended the millions of growing lads and lasses as a result of its further appropriation. Criticism, even though partially just, of administrative agencies, departments, or offices is no justification for discontinuing a necessary fund during this hellish war to give reasonable and necessary protection and security to our American youth. As a child is raised the first 14 or 15 years, he is very apt to continue to live.

I do not want to take the criticism, nor do I want any Member of this House to be criticized in the years to come, by the youth of our Nation, regardless of race, creed, or color, because our youths were deprived of reasonable opportunity to grow up under as favorable community conditions as it is possible to maintain—in spite of this hellish war. I would not care to have that sort of blame on my shoulders as a Member of this Congress.

I challenge you to the proposition that this Congress cannot, now, in good faith with these millions of American children—almost from the cradle to the Army and Navy—discontinue the services provided by this Lanham Act.

Since children come into the world without their consent, are being raised during years of global war under subnormal and abnormal community conditions, and are now under such tragic stress and strain, I say that nothing we can do, at any reasonable cost, is doing more than is our obligation. Yes, our bounden duty.

Already, as a result of the extent and duration of this global conflict, there is certain to be millions of American men and women coming out of the conflict who will always remain illiterate—educationally and recreationally—to too large an extent for the safety and welfare of our Nation. In time these returned veterans will become the parents of future generations, thus seemingly, we cannot now prevent it becoming a fact that some millions of normal boys and girls, who would otherwise have become graduates of schools, colleges, and other institutions of higher education, will never have that opportunity nor will they get that training. The ultimate result of this lack of opportunity, all without fault or lack of ambition on their own part, can be permanently tragic as relates to our national and international understanding, security, appreciation of education, art, homemaking, and other vital matters.

California has not only become the front door to the largest populations of the world on other shores of the Pacific, by reason of its geographical and strategic relationship thereto in matters of export, import, good will, transportation, and communication—whether eastern manufacturers and merchants want to admit it or not—the fact is, California, my home State, including the port of Long Beach, my home city, is daily almost instantly becoming the most critical State in the Union for operations of the Pacific war. No human selfishness or greed, or any individual or group, can stop this necessary development—the winning of the war establishes it as a fact.

Thousands of highly trained expert workers will necessarily still have to go to California to supply the daily increasing demands for such labor. They will necessarily center their families in already critically constituted areas and other critical areas yet to be established. God forbid that more will have to be established on the west coast or any coast. For every man going to California to help win the war, it will mean his wife and at least three children as an average family will also go to California. This shift in population as relates to their school attendance, changing of home and community surroundings and relationships, changing in economic and social conditions, with rising tension and strain about them, will mean a too rapid increase in delinquency of children in California and all over the Nation, unless Congress does its share in good faith and continues, for the duration at least, to stabilize home and community conditions by continuing such supplemental assistance as is provided by the Lanham amendment before us.

It is inescapable, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, that no amount of money will make up to these millions of children all over our Nation, if you take away from this present generation these services provided by this Lanham Act. The children of our Nation and of the world are not at fault insofar as this war is concerned—let us not penalize them and their posterity by being selfish and shortsighted. Let us make up to them what we have lacked in previous foresight in handling such national necessities for the conservation of child character and welfare. This will save money—it will conserve character—help prevent child delinquency, and therefore numerically reduce the number of crime cases. It will create happier home conditions and surroundings for workers winning the war. It will help continue sensible, sane schools, municipal housing, and similar child-welfare programs—all of which are

not less important in the morale sustaining throughout the war—than is any other program I know of as relates to civilians.

Federal Taxes and the Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there came to my office this morning one of the clearest, soundest, briefest discussions of economic law which has come to my notice.

This article is entitled "Federal Taxes and the Worker." It is taken from the Railroad Workers Journal and written by Robert B. Dresser. It is particularly important that every Member of this House have an opportunity not only to read this splendid document, but to have it where he can readily refer to it. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I include this splendid article in the RECORD:

FEDERAL TAXES AND THE WORKER

(By Robert B. Dresser)

LABOR HAS A DECIDED INTEREST IN THE PROPOSED 25 PERCENT CEILING ON FEDERAL INCOME, INHERITANCE, AND GIFT TAXES

A movement to amend the Federal Constitution so as to limit the power of Congress in peacetime to impose taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts to a maximum rate of 25 percent has been under way since 1939. To date the legislatures of the following 14 States have endorsed the proposal: Wyoming, Rhode Island, Mississippi, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Indiana, Arkansas, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Alabama.

The principal objectives sought to be accomplished by the amendment are: (1) To increase the national wealth and over the years the Federal revenue; (2) to save our free-enterprise system; and (3) to free the States from Federal domination.

In discussing this proposal it is necessary to bear in mind that since the defense program was started in the spring of 1940 our whole economy has been subject to the artificial stimulus of war. This stimulus removed, the forces operative in peacetime will again determine the course of our economy and the degree of our prosperity. It is, therefore, the conditions that prevailed prior to the starting of the defense program that are important here.

The issue raised by the proposed amendment is, of course, not a political one, nor will its beneficial effects be confined to capital. All groups will benefit—labor, the farmer, and the investor. It is high time that we awaken to the fact that each group has a selfish interest in the welfare of the others, and that if any group is not prosperous the others will not prosper. For example, let the steady flow of capital into industry be stopped, and business stagnation, reduced employment, and loss of market for both the factory and the farm will inevitably follow.

In normal times it requires on an average about $7,000 of capital for industry to provide a job for one person, capital needed to build and equip the plant and supply the working capital. The amount, of course, varies with the different industries; but this is the average of all. With an average annual addition to our labor force of about 600,000 in normal times, this means over $4,000,000,000 of new capital is needed each year merely to give jobs to the new applicants. Besides this there is of course a large amount needed to maintain and improve the existing plant and equipment.

AMERICAN WORKER WORLD'S GREATEST PRODUCER

The average American produces more and earns more than the citizen of any other nation, because he is assisted by a larger investment in plant, equipment and working capital. For example a Chinese coolie porter with his unaided muscles takes a number of hours to move a ton of goods a mile and gets but a few cents for doing it. Aided by $25,000 of transportation equipment and other investment, the amount invested in the railroad industry per employee, the American railroad worker moves a ton of freight a mile in several minutes for a charge made by the railroad of less than 1 cent and earns dollars where the coolie earns cents.

Through improved machinery and equipment American workers can now produce wealth enough to earn $1 per hour instead of the $1 per day of two generations ago.

It is these high wages that provide a market for the farmer's products at good prices. Likewise it is the good prices received by the farmer that make possible an adequate market for the products of the factory.

To provide the machinery and equipment that have so greatly improved the lot of the American worker, a steady supply of new capital is required. Excessive taxation prevents this by discouraging the investment of capital in industry. It is the so-called venture or risk capital that is most important—capital required by new and hazardous enterprises, such as the railroads, the automobile industry, the aircraft industry, and many others, which have provided jobs and good wages for millions of workers. The starting and development of such industries mean more jobs and higher wages. It is the only way of improving the worker's lot.

But such enterprises are risky. Many of them fail and the investor loses his investment. If high taxes take the great bulk of the profits where the enterprise is successful, the investor's position is one of "heads you win, tails I lose."

In such circumstances, who would be willing to risk his money?

LABOR OFFICIALS FEAR HIGH TAXATION

It is evidently this thought that prompted Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, to say a few years ago:

"The real remedy for unemployment is the creation and maintenance of work opportunities for working men and women in private industry.

"How can this best be accomplished?

"There should be a complete revision of our tax laws. * * *

"There is abroad the general belief and conviction that the tax policy of the Government, coupled with its apparent attitude toward industry is preventing the normal expansion of American industry. It is the common belief that undue and unjust taxes are keeping billions of dollars of idle capital lying in the banks of the country because capital is afraid to take excursions into new enterprises or to assist in the expansion of old ones."

It is this thought that led the executive council of the American Federation of Labor to make the following statement at Chicago on August 15 of this year:

"The second major step must be the encouragement of capital investment and industrial expansion for peacetime production. The executive council believes that the Government should not only permit but stimulate opportunities to make a reasonable and fair profit for firms that are willing to increase production and employment. Furthermore, these business firms must be given assurances that they will not be taxed to death. In the long run, the best incentive for bigger and better business under our free-enterprise system is a chance to make a profit. No better way can be found to promote confidence and stimulate business activity."

The proposed constitutional amendment would give this assurance.

WHY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IS NEEDED

But admitting all this, why, it may be asked, do we need a constitutional amendment? We need it for the simple reason that oftentimes in the past Congress has disregarded these fundamental principles and there can be no assurance that it will refrain from doing so in the future, unless it is restrained by the Constitution. This is the only effective way to safeguard the Nation against the destructive effects of excessive taxation.

The Constitution is filled with curbs on the power of Congress, which were placed there to protect the people's rights; such, for example, as freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures, and freedom from being deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. Excessive taxation would render these rights of little value. There is no curb more important to the people than one on the taxing power. Congress should no more have unlimited power over one's property than over his person; for, in the language of Chief Justice Marshall, "the power to tax involves the power to destroy."

HIGH FEDERAL TAXES WEAKEN STATES

A further effect of the Federal Government's high tax policy is to make the States dependent upon the Federal Government by draining the wealth of the people of the States into Washington and then doling part of it back to the States on conditions. If continued long enough, the inevitable result will be to deprive the States of all independence.

The proposed amendment would serve the double purpose of limiting the power of the Federal Government and at the same time restoring to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination.

AMENDMENT WOULD NOT ENDANGER FEDERAL FINANCES

A question frequently asked is whether the proposed limitation of 25 percent would prevent raising enough revenue to balance the post-war Budget. This, of course, is a most important question.

In the case of the income tax, which produces most of the revenue, there can be no doubt that within reasonable limits the lower rate will, over a period of time, produce the greater revenue; for there is a point of diminishing returns beyond which the revenue produced is less rather than more. Economists and many political leaders of both parties have long recognized this principle. President Wilson called attention to it in his message to Congress in 1919. In 1924 President Coolidge expressed the view that the point of diminishing returns was reached at 25 percent, if not sooner. This conclusion, he said, was based upon "the experience of the Treasury and the opinion of the best experts."

Two years later, in 1926, Congress passed a tax act reducing the maximum individual income tax rate from 40 percent to 25 percent, applicable to the year 1925 and succeeding years. In 1929 the rate was still further reduced to 24 percent. The individual incomes taxes reported for each of the 3 calendar years 1927, 1928, and 1929, with the lower rate, were greater than those reported for 1924, when the rate was 46 percent.

The explanation of his seeming paradox that the lower rate will produce the greater revenue is (1) that the lower rate leaves more

income in the hands of the taxpayers, which when invested and put to work produces more wealth, and (2) that the lower rate encourages the production of wealth. This increase in wealth, when invested, produces additional income, which in turn when invested produces still more income, and so on ad infinitum. By thus increasing the national income, which is the base on which the tax is levied, the revenue is increased.

The point may be illustrated by the following homely example: Let us conceive the national income as constituting a round pie. A Federal tax of 50 percent would take one-half of the pie, leaving the remaining half to be divided among the States, the municipalities, and the taxpayers. Now, suppose that the national income is doubled. We would have a pie twice the size of the first. A Federal tax of 25 percent would then produce exactly the same revenue as the 50-percent tax in the case first supposed, leaving 75 percent of a pie twice the size of the first to be divided among the States, the municipalities, and the taxpayers. If the size of the pie increases still further, a Federal rate of 25 percent would produce more revenue than the 50-percent rate in the first case. Obviously, it is to the advantage of everybody to increase the size of the pie, and that is exactly what the low tax rate does.

The principle involved is the same as that governing the operation of a successful business, namely that within certain limits the greatest profits come from charging a low rather than a high price for goods sold. The Ford Motor Co. is an outstanding example. Had Henry Ford charged $2,500 instead of less than $1,000 for each Ford car, he would have sold a much smaller number of cars and have made far less money for his company.

The high price lessens the ability and incentive to buy. The high tax rate lessens the ability and incentive to produce. The effect of high tax rates is to curtail saving and investment, lower production, reduce employment, lessen the national income, and thereby reduce the revenue from taxation.

As for the estate and gift taxes, the maximum theoretical loss from an adoption of the 25-percent limitation would be trivial. As an offset to this, the stimulus to the production of wealth provided by the lower income-, estate-, and gift-tax rates would increase the amount of property subject to the estate and gift taxes and hence the revenue from them.

SHALL WE HAVE FREE ENTERPRISE OR SOCIALISM?

Necessarily involved in this controversy as to taxes is the question of whether our system of free enterprise is to be replaced by national socialism. Under free enterprise the capital required to provide jobs is furnished by the individual, and ownership of the business is in him. Under socialism the capital is furnished by the government, and it becomes the owner.

Under socialism the management and control of an industry would be taken from the individual who with years of experience and demonstrated ability has made his way to the top, and would pass to the Government agent who owes his position, not to ability, but to political favor.

Can anyone doubt that this system would be more wasteful and less efficient, that it would produce less, and that it would lead to a lower standard of living for all?

Under this system all authority would be centered in Washington and citizens of the States and municipalities would be governed by a host of bureaucrats owing allegiance, not to the State or municipality, but to the Federal Government, and the present regimentation of the people would be continued and increased. Our experience of the last few years has clearly demonstrated that the best government is that provided by the people's own locally elected representatives and not by agents of the Federal Government. I am confident that if the people were given an opportunity to vote on this question their vote would be overwhelmingly against the change. Unfortunately, we have gone a long way toward accomplishing this change without many realizing what has happened.

A. F. OF L. DECRIES CONCENTRATION OF POWER IN WASHINGTON

The views of the American Federation of Labor on this subject are most forcefully expressed in a statement issued by a group of its leaders on February 4, 1940, from which I quote:

"One of the great drags upon industry during the past 7 years has been the burden of taxation that has been imposed upon big and little business. There are literally thousands of industrial and commercial concerns which have been forced into red figures by the taxes which have been imposed on flagging business.

"With money taxed or borrowed from the people the Federal Government has set up a multitude of public and semipublic corporations, which have gone into the States to weaken the authority and the financial soundness of the States.

"In many of these instances the Federal corporations and agencies have gone far beyond the intention of the authority which was granted to them by the Congress. But steadily and surely they have undermined the sharp line between State and Federal authority to increase the concentration of power in Washington.

"As labor and industry survey what has happened to labor and industry in those lands where all powers have been concentrated in the central authority, they fear and oppose the steps which thus far have been taken here, to enlarge the dominion of the Federal Government over the lives and fortunes of the American people.

"It is not a problem for labor alone, or industry and agriculture alone. It is a problem which must be solved by an awakened citizenship. It is a problem to be discussed at every fireside, to be dealt with by every publicist, to be prayerfully considered by those Americans who this year will be called upon to draft the platforms of both political parties.

"The hour has come for Americans to recognize the dangers that confront them, and to join in a united effort to halt the drift toward national insolvency and industrial collapse, and to extend opportunity for the Americans of today and tomorrow."

Agricultural Production in Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication sent me by the director of the western division of the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, under date of February 28, 1945, relating to food production and food production goals in Utah.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1945.

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Since our farmer-committeemen of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency are actively at work on a vigorous campaign aimed at reaching the high food production goals for 1945, I thought you might be interested at this time in a brief summary of the past year's production and the production goals adopted by Utah agricultural leaders for 1945. The Utah goals were established after careful consideration of both the national requirements and the State's capacity to produce.

You will note from the attached table that Utah farmers are again asked to carry through a huge production assignment. While the goals actually add up rather closely to about the same effort as your farmers performed so successfully in 1944, the job is more difficult due to the expanding complications that have been added to the production job by another year of war.

With the exception of the corn and sugar-beet acreages, the Utah crop goals are considerably above the averages for the 1937–41 period when production facilities were still available to your farmers in normal supply. The sugar-beet acreage is lower than the 5-year average but considerably above the 35,000 acres planted in 1944. I had an opportunity to discuss this acreage with farmers from your sugar-beet-producing counties and they were unanimously of the opinion that the goal would be extremely difficult to attain. The goal is being presented as a minimum in the vigorous campaign for acreage. The labor problem which makes the beet goal difficult is also responsible to a very large degree for the decline in sheep numbers which has been taking place since 1943.

This production effort will undoubtedly be the most difficult war job that your farmers have tackled to date due to the tight labor and transportation situations as well as shortages of other production facilities which must be overcome. However, present indications are that farmers will again plant to meet war needs and rely on their own ingenuity and maximum cooperation to pull them through production problems that would seem impossible if their production results were not so important. The farmer-committeemen of the A. A. A. will be working with farmers throughout the entire production period to assist in every way possible in meeting problems that threaten to curb production. I was very impressed at the State meeting of Utah's county A. A. A. committeemen by the determination of your farmers to attain their share of the war production job. I am confident that a real food production job will be done in Utah if courage, ingenuity, and extra effort can get the job done.

On the right hand side of the attached table, you have a comparison of Utah's 1944 production with average production in the 1937–41 period. It tells a story of an outstanding war production achievement. You will note the effect of the labor problem reflected in sugar beets and the number of sheep and lambs as compared with the prewar period.

Obviously, this heavy production has cost a price in soil resources; so you will be interested to know that your farmers were able to accompany their heavy 1944 production with a record performance in soil and water conservation work. It might have been expected that in the face of the shortages of labor, equipment and materials, your farmers would reduce rather than increase their conservation work. The record amount of conservation practices which they carried out under the 1944 Agricultural Conservation Program indicates a real understanding and

appreciation of the importance to themselves and the Nation of conserving our soil and water resources. It is estimated that Utah farmers will receive almost $1,500,000 in payments as Government assistance under the A. A. A. program on their 1944 conservation work compared with $885,000 of assistance in 1943.

When the Utah farmer-committeemen of the A. A. A. have completed the important 1945 farm plan signup and accurate estimates can be made of the total of the farm goals that your farmers have voluntarily set for themselves, I will report to you regarding our success in getting the right crops planted in the right amounts. I will also relay to you the major production problems that exist at that time and the progress that is being made on our 1945 Agricultural Conservation Program.

Sincerely yours,

G. F. GEISSLER,
Director, Western Division.

Utah

Commodity	1945 goals with comparisons				1944 production with comparisons			
	Unit	1945 goal	1937–41 average	Goal as percent of average	Unit	1944 production	1937–41 average	1944 as percent of average
Corn	Acre	26,000	27,000	96	Bushel	754,000	691,000	109
Oats	Acre	55,000	46,000	120	Bushel	2,107,000	1,529,000	138
Barley	Acre	150,000	100,000	150	Bushel	7,038,000	4,043,000	174
Wheat	Acre	300,000	273,000	110	Bushel	7,361,000	5,927,000	124
Dry beans	Acre	8,000	6,000	133	100-pound bag	48,000	37,000	130
Sugar beets	Acre	45,000	51,000	88	Short ton	409,000	629,000	65
Irish potatoes	Acre	18,000	13,000	138	Bushel	2,765,000	2,143,000	129
Alfalfa seed	Acre	43,000	41,000	105	Bushel	42,000	77,000	55
Sows farrowed:								
Spring	Number	14,000	14,000	100	Number	14,000	14,000	100
Fall	Number	(1)	10,000		Number	10,000	10,000	100
On farms, Jan. 1:								
Cattle and calves	Number	[2] 500,000	436,000	115	Number	[3] 541,000	436,000	124
Sheep and lambs	Number	[2] 2,300,000	2,574,000	89	Number	[3] 2,289,000	2,574,000	89
Raised on farms:								
Chickens	Number	2,709,000	2,670,000	101	Number	2,620,000	2,670,000	98
Turkeys	Number	1,743,000	739,000	236	Number	1,743,000	739,000	236
Farm production:								
Eggs	Dozen	(4)	23,750,000		Dozen	31,583,000	23,750,000	133
Milk	Pound	696,000,000	542,000,000	128	Pound	709,000,000	542,000,000	131

[1] To be announced later. [2] Jan. 1, 1946. [3] Jan. 1, 1945. [4] No State goals established.

Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include excerpts from an authoritative address on the China-American Entente, made by the Honorable Chen Chih-Mai, counselor of the Chinese Embassy, to the Overseas Press Club of America in New York City on February 14, 1945:

The subject on which you have asked me to speak is one of great importance to all of us. Much was said in the past about the future importance of the Pacific in world history.

For half a century Japan dominated the Pacific scene. Her initial successes in the game of power politics led her to dream of the complete domination of China and subsequently of all Asia as a preliminary to the conquest of the world.

China stood four square in the path of the fulfillment of Japan's ambitions. So China became Japan's first victim. China knew that she could not defeat Japan without outside assistance. She swallowed one Japanese insult after another to gain time after the rape of Manchuria in 1931. Even after 1937 the Chinese Government refrained from declaring war on Japan. Because if she had done so, the American Neutrality Act would have worked against her.

But China knew then, as she knows now, that there is one country in the world to whom she can look for support and aid. One country which is not imperialist and which shared with her the conviction that Japan must be defeated. That country is, of course, the United States.

It is to America's interest to see China emerge from this war a strong nation. For China is the only country in Asia which can be relied upon in the future to maintain the stability of the Far East in the interests of world security and peace.

It is no less to America's interest that China should shoulder a major burden in the forthcoming campaigns on the Asiatic mainland. Not only on account of the future stability of the Far East and its evolution toward Democracy, but also because it means saving American lives.

Thus both the present and future interests of China and the United States happen to coincide. This is the basis for a China-American Entente.

Nevertheless it often happens in world affairs that a perfectly obvious and reasonable relationship, based on mutual self-interest, is confronted with difficulties. We may have common interests which are of paramount importance. But we often do not approach a problem and its solution from the same angle, or see it in the same light. This sometimes leads the peoples of our two countries to misread and misinterpret facts which seem perfectly simple to the other side.

I think I may be permitted to remark that the Chinese generally seem to understand America better than Americans understand China. This is perhaps due to there being so many more Chinese who can speak and read the English language than Americans who know Chinese. Not only this; a great many Chinese in responsible positions, including government leaders and officials, were educated in America. If they do not share all the views of Americans—and you know better than I how many different views there can be in a given situation—they can claim to understand them.

These things add up to a great deal. They are among the factors which will bring about a better understanding between us. But now and then there are disturbing incidents and opinions which work the other way. What do you imagine are the feelings of a Chinese when he reads in an American newspaper that some Chinese, I quote, "would prefer to first fight the Russians, second the British, third the United States, least of all the Japs"? This was actually said by a certain widely read columnist in July 1944—and repeated by him 4 months later; said at a time when China had already been at war with Japan for 7½ years, and had repeatedly rejected Japanese peace offers designed to wean her away from the democracies.

However, these things are only ripples on the ocean, when you come to view them in relation to the over-all picture. After all, the Chinese people know that the United States and Great Britain are China's great allies in this war. They have no other feeling than the most profound respect and gratitude toward Americans. For instance, no single citizen of Chungking is unaware of the fact that thanks to General Chennault and his gallant fliers we are no longer bombed by the Japanese.

In our schools and colleges few care to study philosophy and literature, which used to monopolize all our learning. Most of our young men and women today have taken up the applied sciences. They dream of going to the United States, not because they yearn for material comforts or want to escape from the rigors of wartime life in China; but because they hope to learn from you how to construct roads and bridges and railways; build factories; cure the sick and wounded; in a word, bring China out of her age-old poverty to be prosperous and strong and healthy like the United States.

While in the natural sciences there are no national boundaries, in the fields of political, economic, and social affairs, one people usually finds it very difficult really to understand the problems of another.

A recent analysis of American opinion on China, undertaken by one of my colleagues, showed that one of the most common subjects of discussion is the question of the Chinese Communists. It is amazing to a

new arrival from China to see the problem presented here entirely out of proportion to its actual dimensions.

As presented by some writers here, the Communist question of China is important because it is believed that China's war effort would be vastly increased if the Kuomintang and the Communists were to compose their differences. Also, that a rapprochement between the two parties would constitute a step forward in the development of democracy in China.

Something can be said to support this line of argument. But in China open-minded persons do not see the situation in quite the same light.

As we see it, the Communist problem in China is a domestic issue which can and will be solved by political means. Recently, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, in a press interview, announced that as long as he is the head of the Chinese Government there will be no civil war in China.

Secondly, the importance of the Chinese Communists is entirely overrated. For instance, they claim that they have 60,000,000 people under them. This figure is arrived at by adding up the population in the areas in which they operate. If such a method were used by the Kuomintang, the number of people under the Kuomintang would be 390,000,000. Of course, such calculations are preposterous.

Thirdly, as far as fighting is concerned, the government forces have been doing practically all the fighting. No Communist forces were operating in the battles of Shanghai and Nanking, of Taierchuang and Jsuchow, of Hankow, or in the four campaigns at Changsha and Changteh; or last year in Hengyang and Kweilin; not to mention the campaigns of the Stilwell Road in Burma. A number of American leaders in China—I wish I were at liberty to give you their names—have told us that the effect of Communist guerilla activities is very limited.

The point is that we regard our present-day problem as first of all military. And in military affairs, nothing is more essential than unity of command. The fact that there is a Communist question in China is essentially because they refuse to place their armed forces under the command of the Government.

It was Disraeli who once said that Britain does not love coalitions. Whether a country is democratic or not is not to be judged by the number of political parties represented in its Cabinet. Certainly we do not want to champion the cause of parties which are totalitarian in thought and action. The democratic process ceases to function the moment political parties seek to advance their political fortunes, not by political means, but by the maintenance of private armies, as in the case of the Nazis under the German Weimar Republic.

What I wish to point out is that the liberals and democrats of China do not support the Chinese Communists, precisely because the Communists are not liberals and democrats. We recognize the fact that the Communists are a group of hard-working people. They have managed to exist and expand themselves with very meager means. They are quite successful in improving from practically nothing. They have likewise effected some reforms in their own way.

But what the Chinese liberals and democrats do not like about the Communists is the fact that these things are accomplished at a tremendous cost in human lives and human freedom. Take for instance, the widely publicized redistribution of land effected by the Communists both in Kiangsi and northern Shensi. It was effected by wholesale "liquidation" of landowners with a tremendous amount of bloodshed. Even Chou En-Lai, the Communist leader, admitted to Mr. Carl Crow that the policy of confiscation of estates, to use his own words, "worked a hardship on a great many innocent people, created in others wrong ideas about the ownership of property."

The liberals are more in favor of the method adopted by the Government which is milder and slower, but in the long run more effective. The policy of the Government is based on the fact that the agrarian problem of China is primarily one of population congestion which results in poverty.

To relieve this population pressure, several things can and are being done. One is the industrialization of China, attracting the agrarian population into industry. Another is land reclamation by large-scale projects of irrigation and reforestation. This newly reclaimed land in hitherto sparsely populated areas, such as the northwest, will help to absorb the surplus agrarian population in the densely populated areas, such as the Yangtze Valley, and certain parts in the north.

Another measure is for the government banks to make loans to the peasants at low interest rates to purchase land and to free them from servitude to the usurers. For 1945 alone 800,000,000 Chinese dollars have been allocated for this purpose. I happen to be a student of the land problem of China, and I can say with a certain degree of assurance that these measures are destined to produce lasting results. To say that the complicated land problem of China, a problem or group of problems which have existed for thousands of years; to say that it can be solved by simply issuing a few government decrees and by chopping off a number of heads is at least an oversimplification.

By all standards, the Communist regime in China is not liberal and democratic, much less so than the Kuomintang and the Chinese Government. While Chungking has a Communist daily, and a Communist periodical, and all other parties in China have their own organs of opinion, including the outspokenly liberal paper Ta Kung Pao (The Impartial), for which I have frequently written during the past 12 years, Yenan, the center of Communist China, has nothing but Communist papers and magazines. The censorship in Chungking, strict as it is, is far more liberal than that of Yenan. People in Chungking enjoy a degree of freedom of expression which is not to be found in Yenan now under the movement of Chi Tuan Yih Shih Sheng Ho, "collective ideological life," which means that everybody must think alike—or else. The Chinese Communists are often referred to as Partisans. No term could be more appropriate, for they have consistently placed their party interests above the national interests.

The fact is that there are a large body of liberals and democrats in China. They are to be found inside and outside the Kuomintang and the government. Their opinions are articulate, and, as I pointed out awhile ago, they are unsympathetic to the Chinese Communists. And it is their consensus of opinion that China should be guided to develop into a liberal and democratic regime under a constitution adopted by the people. This constitution should provide for an adequate bill of rights and a machinery of government responsive to the will of the people. In his New Year message, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek announced that he will make a proposal to call for the election of a national people's congress in 1945 to adopt a constitution for China. This is going to be a momentous step forward in the fulfillment of democracy in China. I am sure that you will be interested to follow this line of development closely, for it is a democratic China, not a totalitarian one, which can be a useful partner in a China-America Entente.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving numerous letters from mothers in the State of North Dakota protesting against their 18-year-old sons being rushed overseas and into combat duty without a year's training, contrary to their understanding of the policy of officials of the War Department.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD two letters written me on this important subject by mothers of 18-year-old sons who have been sent to the front after but a few weeks training, expressing their concern over methods adopted by the War Department:

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *February 19, 1945.*
Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.,

DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: I am writing you in regard to my son, Pvt. Francis John Smith, whose address is Casual Company 91, Platoon 1, A. P. O. No. 15801, care of Postmaster, San Francisco, Calif. His Army serial number is 37774683.

Johnny tried to enlist in the Navy in January 1944. He was turned down by Recruiters Henry Handtmann and R. T. Tole, of Bismarck, because of poor eyesight. He was 18 on June 12, 1944, and went to Fort Snelling, Minn., for a premedical examination in August. He was put into limited service but persuaded an examiner to put him into general service. He returned home until September 19, when he returned to Snelling. About 1 week later, he was sent to Camp Fannin, Tex., which is an infantry replacement camp. I was notified by the War Department that my son would be there for 17 weeks' training. As a matter of fact, he was there for only 15 weeks; was then ordered to Fort Ord, Calif., which is a staging area. He was allowed to come to Bismarck from Kansas City, Mo., arriving Friday noon, January 19. He would have had to leave here on Tuesday, the 23d, but, by phoning all over, I finally got a plane priority for him, and he stayed at home until Wednesday morning, the 24th.

Johnny arrived at Fort Ord on Saturday, January 27, 1945. On February 9, I sent him a telegram which was returned as he had left there "destination unknown." Yesterday I received the above A. P. O. number, which means he has been shipped out.

Mr. Robertson, what I would like to have you find out for me is: What has become of the year's training in the United States that has been promised to the mothers of America for their sons? My boy will not be 19 until the 12th of June 1945, and with approximately 15 weeks' Army training, he is being sent out into the South Pacific war theater as an infantry replacement. It is almost unbelievable. He had had no previous military training; was totally unfamiliar with the use of firearms. It doesn't make sense, and I would like to have you delve into this matter, not only for my sake but for the other mothers whose boys may be sent out in this same way with several million trained soldiers still in this country, according to report.

I trust you will be able to do something to correct this situation. I note with much

satisfaction that Senator TAFT is taking this up in the Senate. I will send him a copy of this letter, and perhaps you will get in touch with him and give him any personal information he may need in our case.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

RUTH M. SMITH.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *February 27, 1945.*

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: I am writing you in regard to my son, Pvt. Kenneth L. Bergo, 37774701, Casual Company 82, Platoon 3, A. P. O. No. 15801, care of Postmaster, San Francisco, Calif.

Kenneth was 18 the 8th of August 1944. Before he was 18 his father signed papers for him to enlist in the Navy. He was turned down by Recruiter Henry Handtmann, of Bismarck, a physical reason being of that nature that there was a possibility of him being rejected in the Army, too. When he was 18 he registered. He was sent to Fort Snelling and passed. He returned home until September 19, when he returned to Snelling from there he was sent to Camp Fannin, Tex., which is an infantry replacement camp. He was to have been trained there 17 weeks, but this was cut to 15 weeks. At the end of this training he was home for 4½ days. He was ordered to Fort Ord, Calif., after this leave. His orders stated he would be sent into combat duty overseas, I just didn't believe it, I couldn't or wouldn't believe our country would send these 18-year-old boys into combat duty overseas with only 15 weeks training, but it seems to be true. We have received Kenneth's A. P. O. number and think he has gone into the South Pacific war zone, as an infantry replacement. Weren't the mothers promised a year's training for their sons? Will you please find out for me what became of the year's training? I feel boys of 18 do not know how to take care of themselves in battles, besides I know of men 23 to 30 that have had or been trained from 1 to 2 years and are still in the United States. Why must these boys of 18 be killed? My son won't be 19 till the 8th of August 1945. I am very much concerned over this.

I noticed in the Bismarck paper that Senator Taft is taking this up in the Senate. I will write to him, too.

I trust that something can be done about this situation, which seems very unfair to these boys and their mothers. Please do what you can to help the cause.

Very sincerely yours,

VIVIAN BERGO.

Overseas Veteran Opposes Nurse Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a soldier overseas expressing his opposition to the drafting of nurses:

FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

DEAR MOTHER: Today I got four letters from Ruthy, and in every one of them she was all torn up about the nurses' draft. As you know, I am bitterly opposed to her being in the Army. My reasons may not be good or sufficient, but I have them. It is hard to fight her and the United States Government both, but I'm willing to try. When a man is in service and in a foreign country, it seems a monstrous thing to me that they could consider drafting his wife and destroying the integrity and freedom of his family, which he is fighting to preserve. I just can't believe it will be done. I certainly can't see the necessity for it. Until it is law, I can speak my piece. I want you to send me the name of our district Representative and two Senators from Ohio. At least I can write to them and register my protest. So please find out for me right away. And in the meantime would you forward this letter to our United States Representative? It may seem a tempest in a teapot to you, but it is vital to me. Until tomorrow,

Your loving son.

Our Fighting Men Must Have an Extension of the Life of Their National Service Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from a letter from Mr. C. J. McDonald, who is a prominent member of the Fleet Reserve Association, regarding the need to extend the life of national service life insurance policies held by our fighting men:

If the present law remains as it is it will mean that all the men who have this insurance will have to execute new allotments to cover the increased cost that will cover whatever form of conversion that they choose. For instance, I was just talking to a shipmate who was 44 years old when called back. He has $5,000 of this insurance, and it will have to be converted in September of this year if the law is not amended. Now if he has to convert it to an ordinary policy it will jump his cost to nearly $15 and in the case of a man who has the full $10,000 it will mean $30 per month instead of the $9.50. An amendment to the existing law will also protect many who in the process of going through all the red tape of converting and executing new allotments from losing the protection that they are carrying by virtue of delays and the many other things that could happen that would cause the lapsing of the policy. The men and the families would be fully protected by simply writing 10 years instead of the present 5.

Freemen Produce More Than Slaves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife for March 1945:

FREEMEN PRODUCE MORE THAN SLAVES

FEBRUARY 12, 1945.

Mr. GRAHAM PATTERSON,
Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR GRAHAM: On this the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln you asked me for my thoughts on the manpower draft. I have never tried to influence your editorial policy against your judgment and do not wish to do so now. You and your editorial staff have fought a magnificent battle for the freedoms of rural America, and I am very proud to be a stockholder in your publications.

All my life I have been a staunch Republican, and especially since the N. R. A. days have I done everything I could to promote the cause of a free people. I felt that this was best served through the Republican Party because I come from an abolitionist family with a deep and abiding faith in Abraham Lincoln and the things for which he stood. I have in my lifetime seen the productivity of our people in industry and agriculture grow to 3 times that of any other nation on earth and 10 to 20 times that of Asia, where the great masses of population in this world live. I am deeply convinced that this added productivity is simply the manifestation of the resourcefulness of a free people, which can continue to grow without limit if individual freedom is preserved.

The living standards of our people have fully kept pace with this increase of productivity, and even during the worst of the depression America was able to support its unemployed, the ill-clothed, the ill-housed, on a higher living standard than that enjoyed by skilled mechanics in the Old World.

This is the history of a free representative republic in a nutshell, and should not be lightly tampered with. We are in the midst of a great war, with 12,000,000 of our sons and brothers fighting for their country in all parts of the globe. The issues are deep and the tempers uncertain, and regardless of our magnificent victories in one spot or another it will necessarily be a great many years before complete peace can be restored on this earth. We must not resort to any expediency which sacrifices the principles of a free people under the illusion that it is only temporary. "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." This is just as true today as it was when Benjamin Franklin wrote it many years ago.

The manpower draft bill, which has already passed the House of Representatives and is before the Senate, is in no sense a partisan measure. Its proponents say that it is necessary in order to improve the morale of the soldiers and, more significantly, they testify that it is more important after V-day in Europe than it is today. And so they want to have the power to enslave 18,000,000 of their fellow men, including the soldiers as they return, for an indefinite period which may last for a generation in the twilight zone between war and peace.

Of course, we are all tremendously worried by the obvious lack of interest in the war effort on the part of many people, and disturbed by their unwillingness to take war jobs, but should we not look into the cause of these things and cure them at the source rather than put despair in the hearts of men by selling them down the river into bondage? We must remember that it is the invisible chains that clank the loudest in the hearts and souls of men.

Today one can travel from one end of America to the other and hardly see a flag flying from any home. In the last war, to the contrary, there were few homes that did not respectfully raise their flag in the morning and take it down reverently at

night. This in turn was coupled with enthusiastic and patriotic cooperation in the conservation of wheat, gasless Sundays, meatless days, restrictions in the operation of saloons, and a hundred and one other helpful and cooperative activities. The oil industry and many others set up voluntary cooperative groups that did a magnificent job in supplying our war needs. So outstanding was this particular performance that Clemenceau remarked that we had floated to victory on the sea of oil. But in those days we were told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and more than 2,000,000 American soldiers were landed in France. True, they lacked training and in some cases arms, but one never heard of sagging morale.

What has made this difference? It seems to me that it is lack of candor and frankness to the people, the application of heat in the form of threats, intimidation and coercion, and sometimes downright falsehood regarding the progress of and conduct of the war, coupled with outrageously optimistic statements such as the pretense for over 3 years that the end of the war is just around the corner. This, no informed person believed, but the veil of secrecy is so thick that few men can penetrate it.

I am chairman of the Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., which has, I think, generally been conceded to be America's most efficient shipyard, and has been so for many years. Nevertheless, within the last 15 months the men there, working as freemen in a close spirit of cooperation, have increased their productivity per man 50 percent. They are allowed incentive pay which has increased their earnings about 30 percent, and the cost of the ships to the Government is considerably reduced. Among the men working with tools we find over 7,000 men whose earnings in the aggregate average over $400 a month, and they are earning every penny of it. They are producing ships with fewer man-hours than ever before in the world's history.

In the oil industry we find the same thing. With a slight decrease in employment the oil industry has increased its output of products nearly 40 percent, and the quality of the products is tremendously improved to meet the exacting war demands. This is true not only of one oil company but the entire cross-section of the industry. Some places we find the C. I. O., some places the A. F. of L., and some places independent unions, but all with cooperative urge of men working together as free men for the common purpose.

Why then do we find the arguments for conscription of 18,000,000 men? America has not failed. It is absolutely futile for the Government to attempt to cover up its own shortcomings in leadership by piling threat upon threat, intimidation upon intimidation, and coercion upon coercion.

Freemen produce best, and we have a host of witnesses to this back through thousands of years. Four thousand years ago Homer wrote, "Whatever day makes man a slave takes half his worth away." But it wasn't until Abraham Lincoln came along that a whole Nation became free, with citizenship for all and involuntary servitude outlawed by the Constitution, we thought forever. It was Lincoln that first brought home that the chain which is fastened to the slave was also fastened to his master, and that all men had to be free before any man could be free. Civilization failed in the Old World because the "master races" wanted to be free themselves, and still maintain colonial empires which were in truth nothing but vassal states. Lincoln in his second inaugural address brought out that in giving freedom to the slave you assure freedom to the free. Are we then going to meanly lose the last best hope of earth?

The farmers and agricultural leaders of America have solidly taken their stand against this bill. Industry is unanimously opposed to it, because management knows that slave labor is not only worthless labor, but poisons everything it touches and undermines the productivity of freemen.

The heads of our great labor unions have taken a strong stand against the bill, although we have heard nothing from Mr. Browder and Mr. Hillman, who apparently sit chuckling in their tent because they know full well that such legislation will reduce American productivity to that of the Old World, cut our standards of living, and make us ripe for their Old World philosophies.

No; we must recognize that our war effort must be divided into two distinct parts. The art of production and the art of destruction are as far apart as the poles. Let every man, therefore, stick to his trade. Give us honest, truthful, and inspiring leadership on the home front, and American production will give to the armed forces everything they can conceivably use. The manpower-draft bill takes us back to the antebellum days, and it is just as true now as it was in Lincoln's time that this Nation cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. Let us hope and pray that our fathers did not die in vain at Antietam, in the Wilderness, and at Gettysburg. I would not like to be in the shoes of any Member of Congress who succeeded in voting his fellowmen into slavery for something which means nothing more or less than post-war controls of the bodies and souls of men.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH N. PEW, Jr.

Gentleman From Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a story by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, United States Army, about the Delegate from Alaska, BOB BARTLETT. I was very much impressed with this well-written article by Captain Neuberger concerning the gentleman from Alaska, BOB BARTLETT, because it describes quite thoroughly Bob's background, gives a synopsis of his ideas, and indicates what he is capable of doing and will do, I am sure, in representing his great Territory.

Since succeeding our old and universally liked friend Tony Dimond, Bob has made his presence felt in Washington through his attendance at committee meetings, through his activities in behalf of anything in the interests of Alaska, and through his personality which already has endeared him to those of us who have come to know him. While I, along with the entire membership of the House, regretted Tony Dimond's leaving us, I feel certain that in BOB BARTLETT Alaska will have a worthy successor to Judge Dimond, and one who will continue to represent Alaska with dignity and honor. We of Montana are extremely pleased with the cooperation extended to us by the people of Alaska. I am very happy to assure BOB BARTLETT that we stand ready and willing to do everything we possibly can to further Alaska's admission as a State into the Union and do our very best to see that that huge and relatively unknown territory is developed as it should and must be.

Alaska not only has much in the way of internal development which will take place, but she also has a position of international economic and strategic importance. Gen. Billy Mitchell made no truer statement than when he said that he who controls Alaska has to assume, as a matter of course, a dominant position in world affairs. He was talking from the viewpoint of strategy and he had in mind the strategy of the air. With the air age upon us, with its expansion bound to increase tremendously, and with Alaska's location as a hub, it can readily be understood why it is important in so many different ways today, and why it will become more and more important in the days to come.

I wish to commend Captain Neuberger, our outstanding authority on Alaska and the Northwest, for writing a splendid article about a real Representative, and to Alaska I can say that its interests will be looked after capably and well all the time that BOB BARTLETT is here—and I hope it will be a long time—representing it.

The article from the February 26, 1945, issue of the Progressive follows:

GENTLEMAN FROM ALASKA

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Alaska is now the goal of many men's hopes. It is the "promised land" of this war. What Oregon was to the veterans of the Civil War, what the Louisiana Purchase was to George Washington's soldiers—Alaska is to the fighting men of World War No. 2. President Roosevelt has called Alaska "the last frontier, a country for pioneers." Thousands of servicemen share his viewpoint.

At this moment in history, when Alaska is in the minds of millions of Americans, a typical Alaskan represents the Territory in the Capital of the Nation. His name is EDWARD L. BARTLETT, but from the tip of the Aleutians to the panhandle of southeastern Alaska he is known as "BOB." He is Alaska's Delegate in the Congress of the United States, the lone spokesman of a region more than twice the size of Texas.

"Alaska," said President Roosevelt, "is still the country of the pioneers, and in one sense every American is a descendant of pioneers."

This description fits BOB BARTLETT, New Deal Democrat, frontiersman's son and gold miner himself, who now is one of the few Members of the House of Representatives serving on both the Naval Affairs Committee and the Committee on Military Affairs.

ALASKA AS THE FORTY-NINTH STATE

Statehood for Alaska is BOB'S principal advocacy. He sees no reason why the vast domain in the North, a domain far larger than any State, should not be the forty-ninth star in the American flag. At a time when Alaska is closer to statehood than ever before, BARTLETT will press that claim in Congress. Already Senator BILL LANGER, of North Dakota, has put a statehood bill in the hopper. Other Senators and Representatives have pledged support. Much of this support comes from men who have visited Alaska with various congressional committees during the past few years. LANGER made such a visit.

"Go to Alaska once and you are sold on Alaska forever," says BOB BARTLETT. He should know. His own parents prove the statement.

His mother read about the Klondike gold rush in 1898 and traveled to Skagway and over the bleak Chilkoot Pass. In Fairbanks she met a big, broad-shouldered man named

Ed Bartlett, who was packing supplies into the wilderness for the frenzied gold seekers. His firm of Bartlett Brothers was the most noted packing enterprise in the North. The couple were married and on April 20, 1904, a son, EDWARD, Jr., was born.

As soon as he was old enough to read, EDWARD L. BARTLETT become known as "BOB." He assiduously sought for books about the North and read about the famous Arctic sea captain, Bob Bartlett. The captain, decided young EDWARD, was somehow related to the Fairbanks Bartletts. Why shouldn't he be? They were all Bartletts, weren't they, and didn't they all live in the Far North? So "BOB" BARTLETT he was called and "BOB" BARTLETT he has remained.

BOB grew up in Fairbanks, pioneer trading center in Alaska's Golden Heart. At the age of 15 he went with his father on a pioneering trip into the Circle Region. There were no roads and the elder Bartlett drove a team and wagon over the jolting ground to Chatanika. It took them 11 days to travel the 109 miles from Chatanika to Eagle Creek, a trip now made in 3 hours by car and 20 minutes by plane.

BOB left high school one semester to go with his father to the Kantihna mining district where ED BARTLETT was freighting ore for Tom Aitken. They snowshoed most of the way. It was a tough, hard trip and BOB remembers falling all over the big, webbed feet until he got used to them. Snowshoes require strong leg muscles and he was exhausted by the time camp was reached.

At camp BOB found that the main need of the moment was for a cook. With the optimism of the native Texan that he was, the elder Bartlett had set up a camp in the Alaskan wilderness without a cook. In obvious embarrassment Ed Bartlett called his young son aside and explained gingerly that perhaps he had learned something of value while helping his mother in the kitchen at Fairbanks.

"Think you can swing the job, son?" asked Ed Bartlett. "These men have to eat, you know."

BOB looked dubiously at the 10 husky packers hired by his father. He gulped and said, "I'll try, Dad."

The results were disastrous. BOB immediately learned that the one indispensable ingredient in the goodies which came from the Bartlett kitchen was, namely, Mrs. Bartlett. The first morning's hot cakes were in a highly liquid state, the coffee tasted slightly muddy, and the bacon was burned. The 10 husky packers demanded a genuine cook, or else.

Ed Bartlett mushed to Fairbanks for a new kitchen hand, and BOB went to the job he really wanted—driving a team.

TO CONGRESS AS A SECRETARY

BOB graduated from high school at Fairbanks and then attended the University of Alaska. He is the first graduate of Alaska's college—the farthest north university in the world—to sit in the Halls of Congress. In 1927 he went to work as a reporter for the Fairbanks News-Miner, after having gotten some preliminary experience there under the famous old Alaskan editor, W. F. (Wrong Foot) Thompson.

BOB was the main writer for the News-Miner until 1932. That year Alaska elected a new Delegate in Congress—a tall, lean lawyer from Valdez named Anthony J. (Tony) Dimond. He was destined to become the Territory's best known public servant and to serve longer in Congress than any other man in Alaskan history. When he went to Washington, Tony took BOB BARTLETT with him as his principal secretary.

For 4 years BOB continued in this capacity. He had a chance to study government and to become acquainted with the Federal departments handling Alaskan business. Then in 1936 he felt the call of the north country, luring him across a continent of space and time. He returned to Alaska with his family and moved from Fairbanks to Circle, operating a gold mine on Independence Creek. In the shadow of the Arctic Circle BOB'S 2 children grew up. Doris Ann is now 11 and Susan is 4. His wife, Vide, is also a native Alaskan and, like her husband, a graduate of the University of Alaska.

In 1939 President Roosevelt appointed this far northern gold miner to be Secretary of Alaska, a position second only to that of Governor. As chairman of the Alaskan Unemployment Compensation Commission, BOB'S work had come favorably to the President's attention. In the position of Secretary of Alaska, BOB became a close friend and follower of Gov. Ernest Greuning, who for more than 2 decades had been a prominent figure in American journalism and in the American progressive movement.

In 1944, after a dozen years in Congress, Tony Dimond retired from politics. President Roosevelt promptly nominated him to be a Federal judge in Alaska and the Senate confirmed the nomination unanimously. In his last election contests Tony Dimond had not even had opposition. Now the post of Delegate was thrown wide open. BOB BARTLETT filed for the Democrat nomination. A bitter race followed, with BARTLETT endorsed by both Tony Dimond and Gov. Ernest L. Gruening.

Alaskan Democrats nominated BARTLETT, and he went on to win the general election by a decisive majority. To him the most pleasing phase of the contest was the fact that his old gold-mining friends voted for him unanimously. He won every vote in Circle.

"I commend to you my successor," said Tony Dimond, as he took leave of the Committee on Territories. "His name is EDWARD L. BARTLETT, but everyone in Alaska calls him Bob. He is a man of integrity, honor, and ability. I leave Congress with regret and sorrow, but I know that my work here in the House of Representatives will be left in able hands."

BOB BARTLETT is an Alaskan in spirit and in deed. His main ambition is that Alaska should become a State while he is serving as Delegate in Congress, for he believes that the great Territory is more than ready for statehood. He often points out that Alaska has a far greater population than such States as Idaho, Nevada, Montana, and Oregon when they were added to the Union. "Alaska is vital to the defense of the United States," he said recently. "In the post-war world Alaska may be the last frontier. These facts alone justify statehood for Alaska."

BARTLETT believes strongly in local home rule. He thinks that greater local autonomy should be vested in Alaskan officials, with less authority being granted to the Federal departments and agencies in far-off Washington. "The T. V. A. is a conspicuous success," claims BARTLETT. "I want to see the same sort of local rule applied to Alaska."

A FRIEND OF THE INDIANS

BARTLETT is opposed to the recent plan to divide southeastern Alaska into huge Indian reservations. "This would hurt the Indians," he charges, "and would retard the development of Alaska for many years to come. The Indians should be compensated for their lands, but I do not want to see Alaska chopped into vast reservations. This would only erect a strong barrier of prejudice and hatred between native and white."

BOB BARTLETT bristles angrily whenever he sees a sign in an Alaskan restaurant or hotel declaring, "We do not cater to native trade." He says that people often forget that the Indians and Eskimos are the original owners of Alaska. "These people's ancestors saw the first white men land on Alaska's shores," he said not long ago. "When we discriminate against these people we are guilty of aggression and tyranny." Bob rejoiced last autumn when two Indians were elected to seats in the Alaska Territorial Legislature.

BOB BARTLETT will be 41 years of age in the spring. He is Alaska's youngest Delegate in Congress, as well as the first graduate of the University of Alaska ever to sit there. A few years ago, when Governor Gruening was in Washington on official business, Bob represented the Territory at the official dedication of the Alaska Military Highway. In the 29° below zero cold at Kluane Lake, he wielded the golden scissors with Ian A. Mackenzie, Canadian cabinet minister representing the Dominion Government. Bob's remarks at that time epitomize his philosophy and hopes for Alaska.

"We are seeing a new age in the North Country," he said. "The war has brought about sudden and rapid development of Alaska and the Canadian Arctic. If we are wise and farsighted, we can make these advances be of immeasurable benefits to the people of the North American continent for many generations to come. In the days of peace ahead, we of the North Country must help to extend and prolong the march of civilization. We have resources, space, and raw materials for many thousands of souls. We must see to it that these natural assets are used in the interest of all the people.

"A generous Creator has endowed this continent well. We must make a fair and just use of His gifts."

Eri Jabotinsky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NEW YORK, *February 26, 1945.*

The Right Honorable the EARL OF HALIFAX, K. G.,

British Ambassador, Washington, D. C.

EXCELLENCY: A friend of mine has been arrested in Turkey and apparently whisked off to a British concentration camp.

My friend's name is Eri Jabotinsky. He is the son of the redoubtable Vladimir Jabotinsky who organized the Jewish legions that fought for England in 1917 and helped wrest Palestine from the Germans and the Turks.

Eri Jabotinsky is the second member of the Hebrew Liberation Committee who has been manhandled. He was preceded to the British concentration camp by another fine and redoubtable friend of mine—Arieh Ben-Eliezer, who is at the moment sizzling in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, together with hundreds of his fellow Palestinians.

I should like to know why my friend Eri has been whisked off to a British concentration camp, to be held incommunicado on some malarial sand pile over which the flag of Britain flies.

For my friend Eri is almost as redoubtable a man as his father. He has an excellent record of patient and valorous activities on behalf of the Jews of Europe. He has done as much as any one man to help save the remnants of the massacred millions.

It was my friend Eri who recently sent the news out of Turkey that certain officials of the British Government had persuaded the Turkish Government to refuse passage through that country to the refugee Hebrews from eastern Europe. These refugees were trying to stagger a last mile toward Palestine—where life and hope awaited them.

Eri did a great service to England—at least to that part of England which is fighting so valiantly for the sacred rights of man. I say, my friend Eri did a fine service for all good Britons by bringing this matter into the light. I am old enough to know that a nation, even so fine a nation as the English, does not always function with its best foot forward, especially in its colonies. Nevertheless, I find it hard to believe that the British Government may have arrested and rustled my friend Eri off to one of its concentration camps for calling England's attention to the fact that its servants in that part of the world were behaving in a cruel and un-English manner. There must be some other reason for Eri's troubles—and I am asking, as his friend, for information.

The Associated Press item recounting the episode reports that Eri has no complaint against the Turks who, he says, handled him with complete decency. The item also relates that Eri dispatched a letter of protest to the British Ambassador in Ankara. Unfortunately, the contents of this letter are not available, owing, no doubt, to the spryness of the British censor. But they are contents easy enough to imagine. And since this British news-throttler, mighty though he be, is not yet able to throttle my American pencil, I echo them here.

Said Eri, as he was being bundled off without trial or voice to the "unknown destination"—the euphonious English phrase for concentration camps—said Eri, "England betrays herself more than she does the Jews. England betrays herself and all her fine history when she starts playing Gestapo to the bedevilled Hebrews of Palestine, and clamping a gag on their outcries. The thousands of Hebrews who have been whisked out of sight without trial or voice to repine behind English barbed wire, are as much symbols of British moral collapse as they are of Jewish travail."

And in saying this my friend Eri is doing another high service for England. Most certainly it is the English who will profit most in the long run from Eri's efforts to scrub clean the English escutcheon and keep it from degenerating into a Gestapo blackjack.

But, to return to my friend Eri's exterminated letter to the British Minister at Ankara—I'm sure, also, that Eri had a lot to say in it about the necessity of moving the Hebrew survivors of eastern Europe into the only haven available to them—his own beloved Palestine. At the time of his arrest and deportation, Eri was very busy with a boat called the S. S. *Tari*, capacity 2,500 passengers. It was Eri's idea that he would save 2,500 Hebrews every week by shuttling them aboard this craft from Constanza to Palestine. The Rumanian and Bulgarian Governments, arm-weary with the massacre of Jews, had expressed their willingness to cooperate to the hilt in finding live Jews to rescue.

In this business with the boat, my friend Eri was operating as a special representative of the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe. I am also a member of this committee, as are thousands of other Americans.

In my bid for information, Excellency, I should like to know particularly whether my friend Eri ran into trouble (and a concentration camp) because of his work as a refugee saver. I understand, of course, that the British policy to date has been to refuse haven to the survivors of Treblinka, Majdanek, and Oswiecim. And I know, also, that not even the 3,000,000 Jewish corpses have been able to move the "tweedledum" boys presiding over the doors of Palestine. I have read considerable in the past about the antics of the notorious Colonial Office in helping turn back the desperate refugees from Europe—to die at sea—rather than be allowed to defile the shores of a British colonial port—et cetera, et cetera. I am, therefore, not naively excited about the absence of common decency and elementary humanitarianism from the annals of the British colonial policies. That these qualities do not exist in these particular sectors of the British soul has been abundantly illustrated in the past 10 years.

But certainly the absence of these qualities is neither a basic British characteristic nor basic British policy. And, certainly, Excellency, my friend Eri, struggling as much to restore English honor as to save Jewish lives, is not a fellow to be bundled off to a hidden sand dune.

As I say, I know that there is some sort of a bull-headed British determination to chalk up a bloody and depressing anti-Hebrew record for your Empire. But surely this determination is not as idiotic as it seems. Surely the British know as well as do I that whisking people off to concentration camps and stuffing gags in their mouths at the same time isn't cricket. It is for this reason that I appeal to you for information concerning my friend Eri Jabotinsky.

It would confuse me and many other admirers of England's long record as champion of humanity to believe that the English have taken to bedeviling fine Hebrew fellows like Eri Jabotinsky—pour la sport.

Awaiting more soothing explanation of my friend Eri's troubles, I beg to remain

Yours faithfully,

BEN HECHT,
Co-Chairman, American League for a Free Palestine.

The American War Correspondent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, war correspondents, notwithstanding the limitations placed upon them by censorship, are doing a splendid job in keeping our people informed as to the actual life and happenings on the battlefields all over the world. We are too apt to forget the hardships endured and the hazards faced by these correspondents.

Pursuant to the permission granted, I am including an editorial written by Mr. Carl Saunders, publisher of the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, which is as follows:

SALUTE!

He was at Pearl Harbor when the sneaking Japs struck from a peaceful sky. He traveled with MacArthur to Australia and to a Jap prison camp with Wainwright. He struggled westward and northward from Port Moresby over steep mountains, through sweating jungles and across stormy seas. He was at Guadalcanal, and he lay in the steaming, fetid, vermin-invested fox holes of Rendova. He flew over Rabaul.

He stood staunch with Montgomery at El Alemein. At Malta he felt the sting of enemy bombs. He landed with the first wave in Morocco. He counted the disheartened, broken thousands of the Afrika Korps as they surrendered in Tunisia. He leap-frogged to Sicily, and he suffered at Anzio.

He watched men die at Kwajalein and bloody Tarawa.

He crossed the treacherous channel and splashed through cold surf to the mine-strewn, inhospitable Normandy beach. He saw Rommel's back broken at St. Lo, and he stood up to Von Rundstedt at Bastogne.

With MacArthur he struggled across Leyte as Yamashita's boasts echoed over the bodies of the Jap dead. He cheated the tricksters in the Lingayen Gulf, and he rode a jeep into Manila. He heard MacArthur's "I have returned," and there were tears in his eyes, too.

At Santo Tomas, Los Banos, and Cabanatuan he welcomed old friends and fellows of his craft, freed from famined durance.

He flies over Tokyo and over Berlin. He struggles with the British through burning Burma, and he watches hopefully as Chiang musters his legions.

He died, unarmed but facing forward, at the battle front in New Guinea, in Italy, in the Philippines, in Burma, in Belgium, in France, in Germany.

Yet he carries on. He is the eyes and the ears of the American home front. His only defense is a steel helmet. His only tools a typewriter and a camera.

We salute the American war correspondent, living and dead, who has written for the record journalism's proudest page. All men and women who have a part in chronicling contemporary history are proud to be of the same craft.

More About Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I beg to submit copy of a letter which I have received from one of my constituents in Louisiana in regard to the problems of the farmer. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 26, 1945.

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Referring again to yours of the 19th and particularly about the Pace bill introduced in the House on January 4 and given the number H. R. 754, I wish to call your attention to the following:

1. That according to the letter of Mr. Hill, Acting Administrator, of the War Food Administration, the offer of the Credit (Commodity) Corporation to purchase cotton on parity prices will expire on June 30, 1945.

This means Mr. Congressman that if something is not done to extend the offer of the War Food Administration of September 23, 1944, to purchase at full parity prices until June 30, 1945, the bill of your friend PACE will be of litle avail to the cotton farmer.

Not only must the purchase plan be extended but someone must see to it that the plan is not changed so as to allow the purchase and loan value of cotton to be limited to 80 percent or less as some speculators propose.

I might also suggest that something should be done to see that the plan for help is not nullified as it was last year by freight embargo and inability to warehouse to such an extent that the War Food Administration won't be able to advise you to in turn advise your constituent "to hold his cotton until it can be properly stored, he can then sell it to the Commodity Credit Corporation should he so desire."

Do you see the barb in the plan that caught the cotton farmer hog tight?

The cotton producer in the first place is almost unable to use the plan but when

some of them are able to qualify they face inability to store or ship.

The fact that Marvin Jones and Anderson Clayton hail from Texas is entirely beside the question as it is Congress, and not Marvin Jones or Clayton, that passes and makes the laws.

This covers the cotton problem.

The cottonseed problem I covered in my letter to you of the 24th instant and in which I pointed out to you that the minimum or floor price fixed for the farmer of $56 resulted in the farmer only getting about an average of $32 to $35, or a little more than half of what he was to get and that the relief for the farmer should have been entitled "An aid to the middleman and dealers, processors and everybody except the producer and farmer."

In my letters to Senators ELLENDER and OVERTON and copies which were sent to you I pointed out the jokers in the so-called aid for sweetpotatoes, cabbage, cane, and Irish potatoes.

But for the benefit of your friend PACE I am now taking up at this time the dangers of the plans which are generally given out at this time of the year and intended to be rules to protect the producers but when the time comes ends up as a failure, a delusion and a snare. You remember my long letter to Senator OVERTON about cabbage.

Well, Mr. Congressman, here is another chapter in the shameful and disgraceful practice of subsidies to those who do not need it under the guise of help to the southern farmer. This pretended but fraudulent effort runs through the entire gauntlet of the alleged effort to give to the farmer a fair part of what the consumer pays for what he gets.

Pass it on to Mr. PACE and see what he has to say about it.

I am enclosing you two copies, one to your letter and one to the carbon copy I am making for Mr. PACE:

An Associated Press release dated Washington, February 25, announcing—The Government offered today to pay packers subsidies up to $23 per ton to divert 35,000 tons of surplus southern-grown cabbage in kraut.

Payment of the subsidy is necessary, officials said, to enable kraut packers to pay growers a promised minimum price of $15 per ton and transport it to northern packing plants, and pack it for sale at existing ceiling prices.

What a propaganda announcing is this?

The poor farmer is to be given the minimum promised him of only $15, but the packer is to be given a subsidy of $23 so that he might get the ceiling price.

The railroads, we are told, are now overburdened with freight, yet the same people who put an embargo on southern cotton shipments are willing to spend $23 a ton to get $15-a-ton cabbage to a northern packer so that the poor farmer can get the minimum promised to him.

The southern Congressmen who, having loaded the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with verbal swats and kicks at the "krauts," could if they would, find here a field for their oratory.

Thirty-five thousand tons at $23 per ton, making $805,000 of the people's money, given to kraut packers so that the packers might sell at ceiling prices.

Of course the article did not say, nor are the Congressmen supposed to ask, what the ceiling price per ton is to the packer.

You know the farmer gets, or at least is promised, $15, the floor or minimum promised to him before he planted, but the packer is to get the ceiling.

And thus it goes on down the line insofar as the farmer is concerned.

Three-fourths of 1 cent a pound for the farmer who has to plow, harrow, hoe, and harvest, and haul to the market, while the packer gets a bonus of 1 3/20 cents per pound plus the ceiling.

What's the ceiling price? All the law permits.

I ask you, Mr. Congressman, to find out from the Government what the ceiling price is and compare it with what the farmer gets; put your hand on your heart and ask yourself if the Government is fair. I used the word "Government" just as it is used in the Associated Press release.

I ask you, Mr. Congressman, if it would not be better for the Government to give the $23 bonus to the farmer instead of to the packer?

What sense is there in paying a bonus of $23 on something that costs $15?

Do you know what the result will be, Mr. Congressman, of this plan?

The farmer gets the floor price of $15, but as the kraut is surplus the result is that if something should happen and the price went up so that the farmer could get more than the minimum the surplus is thrown on the market and thereby deprive the farmer of a chance to profit by the scarcety or high market condition.

To show you that it is the processor, dealer, and middleman and not the farmer that gets the thought, the labor and efforts of those in charge, I also enclose you in duplicate another Associated Press release of the same date as the one on kraut and which applies to Florida sugarcane.

You will note that the farmer in the case of sugarcane is to get substantial Government aid in the sum of 85 cents a ton. Imagine how conservative these Government agencies may become when the farmer gets something, 85 cents per ton means 4¼ mills, or say, $0.004¼ per pound. The packer gets for cabbage a bonus of $23 per ton of 2,000 pounds, but in cane the bonus to the farmer is 85 cents per ton.

Now don't run away and say yes but the farmer gets $15 a ton for his cabbage. No, siree, Mr. Congressman. That $15 is the minimum the farmer was promised to make the cabbage. The packer gets not the minimum price but the ceiling price plus a bonus of $23 per ton.

The 3,500 tons alone at $23 making the sum of $805,000 goes north as a bonus.

I ask you, Mr. Congressman, would it not be better to use this $805,000 in putting up a packing plant in the South and take off of the overburdened railroad the hauling of Southern cabbage kraut croup, if it be held unwise to give the farmer direct the bonus of $23 per ton and let the surplus be destroyed or fed to the hogs. I do not believe that the farmers would object to forego the $15 per ton and accept the $23.

Your friend, Mr. PACE, comes from Georgia, the home of Henry Grady, Benjamin H. Hill, Thomas E. Watson, and many another man who battled for the South, and whose names go down in history as men who not only had the vision but the courage of their convictions.

There is graven on the statue of Benjamin H. Hill in the city of Atlanta these words which should be in the hearts of every Southerner:

"Who saves his country, saves all things, and all things saved will bless him. Who lets his country die, lets all things die, and all things dying curse him."

I say to you, Mr. Congressman, in all seriousness that farming in America must be made to pay or else democracy and freedom in America will perish.

Those who make the food to feed the balance of the groups who make up the citizenship of the country, and those who make the cotton and the wool should be at least as well fed, well clothed, and housed as those whom they feed, clothe, and house.

I need not tell you that such is not the case.

I need not tell you that it was not always this way.

There was a day when the farming population had a say in the affairs of the Government. There was a day when they had spokesmen on the floor of Congress whose voices were heeded and whose statsmanship was equal to the valor of their soldiers on the battle front.

In that day and time the inscription carved on the front of the Union Station at Washington, D. C., had some meaning.

When you get out of your car at the Union Station you will, if you look heavenward, read these words:

"The farm—the best home of the family—main source of national wealth—foundation of civilized society."

When I read the offer of the Government as given out on February 25, 1945, to pay packers $23 a ton bonus so they could sell their product at ceiling prices if they would be kind enough to pay the farmer the $15 a ton the Government had promised the farmer as the minimum or floor price, I wondered if the architect of the Union Station had not made a mistake when he had that inscription placed where it could be seen only by the Congressman leaving Washington instead of at a place where the Congressman going to Washington might be able to see it when he arrived at Washington.

The inscription teaches a truth that is as much a truth today as it was in the days of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, and it should be occasionally read and pondered by every Congressman, whether he be from the South or the North.

Now, Mr. Congressman, I voted for you, for Senator OVERTON and for Senator ELLENDER, and I am personally friendly with all the other Louisiana Congressmen, but I would be unfair to myself, or to you, or to them, if I failed to say that I am at a loss to understand why the farmer has been treated as he has during late years.

I do not believe that any Congressman from Texas or Mississippi believes it to be right to pay more for Irish potatoes at Orange, Tex., than at Sulphur, La., or more for potatoes at Gulfport than at Hammond, nor do I believe that the Congressmen from the Western States or the East believe it to be right to pay packers $23 a ton for a per-ton bonus on cabbage that the farmer is forced to take $15 as the minimum promised him by the Government.

None of you believe this is right; none of you would stand for it if you had to legislate on it.

You become lost in a maze of directives, parity rules, and tables that neither make sense or do justice to the people whom these bureaus and alphabetical agencies are supposed to protect.

Right now, Mr. Congressman, is the time to see the new offers, subsidies, bonuses, rules, and regulations being issued for 1945, and certainly you can do no good if you sit tight and wait for the rules to be made and contracts signed and delivered.

As I have heretofore tried to indicate to you nearly every important directive or contract that is given out supposedly to help the farmer either has jokers or regulations that make it impossible for him to use it. For instance, floor of $56 for cotton seed, a fraud because it guaranteed to the processor a sale of the oil, meal, hulls, and other products at a price based on the processor paying the farmer $56 per ton for his cottonseed, but lo and behold, the joker required the farmer to haul to the mill 5 tons at one time when as a matter of fact a bale of cotton seldom has more than 1,200 pounds of seed and no wagon or truck any farmer has can hold enough cotton in the seed to make 5 tons.

Sweetpotatoes, eggs, the joker is the requirement of a number of cases beyond the ability of any one farmer to furnish.

And thus down the line.

Be it cotton, potatoes, eggs, wool, cottonseed, pecans or meat, hair or moss, the joker is there to see that the producer or farmer gets it in the neck.

The farmer is in the fix the old Negro was when he went to settle with the merchant for the advances of making the crop. He was explained the figures in the account and told just how and why there was nothing coming to him. The old darkey with his hat off, and bowed head, is quoted as saying, "It's all right, Boss, but it does seem strange that while an aught is an aught, and a figure is a figure, it is always all for the white man and none for the nigger."

It is indeed strange, Mr. Congressman, that every time it looks as if the farmer is going to make something, he runs either on an embargo, a quarantine, a ceiling price regulation, or some other man-made rule or order, that changes the whole affair in the middle of the game.

He is beaten before he starts because he suspicions that the cards in the game are marked.

It is the duty of Congress to come to his relief. Congress has the power as well as the duty and the remedy is either by making it a crime to violate the floor price regulation just as it is to violate the ceiling price regulation, or to give the subsidies direct to the farmer producer and not to continue the shameful practice of giving the subsidy to the processor or dealers.

As told you in the beginning I am sending a carbon copy of this letter as well as a duplicate of the Associated Press release for both you and Mr. PACE.

With best wishes for yourself and regards to Mr. PACE, I am,

Sincerely yours.

PACKERS OFFERED KRAUT SUBSIDIES

(The Associated Press)

WASHINGTON, February 25.—The Government offered today to pay packers subsidies up to $23 a ton to divert 35,000 tons of surplus southern-grown cabbage into kraut.

In announcing the subsidy, the War Food Administration said the production of winter cabbage was about 56 percent above average and considerably in excess of civilian requirements.

Payments of the subsidy is necessary, officials said, to enable kraut packers to pay growers a promised minimum price of $15 a ton, transport it to northern packing plants, and pack it for sale at existing ceiling prices.

Normally, winter-grown cabbage is not widely used in making kraut.

Resolution of the Michigan Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan:

House Concurrent Resolution 11

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass legislation for the creation of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes as an integral part of Interstate Commerce

Whereas it has long been recognized that the absence of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes has been a definite deterrent to Michigan's tourist and resort business; and

Whereas the United States War Department has spent a large amount of money and time making a survey of the Michigan shore line, as a result of which a river and harbor bill is now pending in Congress which includes proposed construction of 15 small boat harbors on Lake Superior and Lake Huron; and

Whereas two groups of harbors on Lake Superior have been proposed, a primary group to be constructed at Black River, Big Bay, Little Lake, and White Fish Point, and a secondary group consisting of harbors at Grand Traverse Bay, Lac La Belle, Eagle Harbor, and Isle Royale; and on Lake Huron harbors are recommended for Port Sanilac, Port Austin, Au Sable, Harrisville, Hammond Bay, and Point Lookout; and a harbor is also proposed on Beaver Island in Lake Michigan; and

Whereas the congressional proposal as presented is that part of the cost should be borne by the Federal Government and part by the State government, but, in view of the fact that the Federal Government in the past has absorbed the entire cost on such harbors on the Atlantic seaboard, the Atlantic seaboard policy should be written in the congressional proposal on the theory that such harbors are considered an integral part of interstate commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress is urgently requested to enact legislation for the creation of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes as an integral part of interstate commerce, the cost to be borne by the Federal Government, in view of the policy of the Federal Government with respect to bearing the cost of similar harbors on the Atlantic seaboard; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

Adopted by the house of representatives January 30, 1945.

Adopted by the senate February 9, 1945.

NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Legion Demands Army End Its O. K. on Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Willard Edwards, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of March 2, 1945:

LEGION DEMANDS ARMY END ITS O. K. ON REDS

(By Willard Edwards)

The American Legion yesterday called upon the War Department to withdraw immediately its recent directive permitting Communists to attain officer rank and serve in positions involving military security.

National Commander Edward N. Scheiberling, acting under authority voted by the Legion's national defense committee, said the new directive must be rescinded "for the safety and security of America, now and in the future."

"Commissions in our armed services must be confined to those whose sole loyalty is to the United States of America," he declared.

CITES M'CLOY'S TESTIMONY

Scheiberling noted that Assistant Secretary of War McCloy, testifying before a House Military Affairs subcommittee investigating the directive, conceded that the new policy would theoretically admit to officer rank persons 49 percent loyal to Soviet Russia and only 51 percent loyal to the United States.

"Fifty-one percent loyalty is not enough when the security of our country is at stake," he said.

"The new policy for the armed forces states that no Communist, or person of other alien leaning, may be barred from officer rank unless his alien loyalty 'overrides' his loyalty to the United States. The lives of our sons, the vital military secrets of our armed forces must not be entrusted to men of divided loyalty."

The Army's policy opens the door for Communists to penetrate any and every office in the armed services, Scheiberling said. He continued:

"The Attorney General of the United States has held that the purpose of the Communist Party is the overthrow of the Government of the United States. Communism is an avowedly revolutionary movement. Every Communist, as a condition of membership in the party, swears supreme loyalty to the party and to the revolution.

"The American Legion is unalterably opposed to permitting any person to hold a commission in the armed forces of this nation whose loyalty is not solely to the Government of the United States."

SHOULD IT ASK LESS

"The Legion is cognizant of the fact that few members of the Communist Party today will openly confess their loyalty to communism.

"Our Government requires in the conduct of its civil affairs an oath from its employees to the effect that they are not members 'of any political party or organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.'

"Should it ask less from commissioned officers of its armed forces?

"Membership in or adherence to, any alien organization of subversive philosophy should be enough to disqualify a man from commissioned rank in our Army. We are dealing here, not with a matter of civil rights, but of military security. And far more rigorous tests should be applied in choosing men for positions of military trust.

"The honor of holding a commission in the armed forces of our country is a sacred privilege which should be earned only by total, unquestioned loyalty."

Fair Treatment and Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RILEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith a timely editorial from the State of Columbia, S. C., a daily newspaper having the largest circulation in

South Carolina of any paper published in that State:

AS WAS TO BE EXPECTED

At Sumter, Wednesday, Judge G. Duncan Bellinger directed a verdict of acquittal in the case of a young Negro charged with the slaying of a white woman, whose body was found in the woods near her home last October. There was not sufficient evidence, he declared, to connect the 17-year-old boy with the crime.

We know nothing of the details.

We do know, however, that Judge Bellinger is a just man who would act as he felt fair and right.

The point is that when the jurist became convinced there was no proof of the charges he proceeded promptly to give the defendant his freedom. And we believe every other judge on the South Carolina bench would have done likewise. No particular credit is claimed or due, since the Negro is just as much entitled to justice as the white man, but many critics of the South seem to look only for injustices, some of which are actual, some of which are manufactured; hence this comment.

If those who would make mountains out of every real or imagined injustice, where the Negro is involved, would take equal cognizance of attitudes such as evidenced by Judge Bellinger, and do less agitating, relations between the two races, as a whole, would be improved.

Of course, there are prejudices which burn every right thinking person, but these prejudices are not limited to any one side. All is not gold that glitters, so all is not injustice that is made to appear that way. There is too much of an inclination among the self-appointed regulators of the South to feel that in every case in which the Negroes and the whites are both concerned, the Negro is being punished solely because he is a Negro. When the Negro fails to get justice because he is a Negro, then something should be done about it, but each case must rest on its own bottom. When allegations of injustice are made that cannot be substantiated, the cause of good feeling between the races is damaged.

The State is proud of how well the Negroes and the whites get along together in South Carolina. A very necessary ingredient is fair treatment, especially in the courts. Judge Bellinger did no more than we would expect him to do, but nevertheless his directed verdict in the case of this young Negro, after he was convinced that there was no case against him, is worth citing as the kind of treatment that makes for the understanding that is so desired between the races.

Need for Great Supplies of Cheap Power Cited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent statement by the Honorable R. A. Newton, of Massena, N. Y., president of the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce:

MASSENA.—The need for great supplies of cheap hydroelectric power, such as would be made available by the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and the current coal shortage were discussed today in a statement by Mayor R. A. Newton, of Massena.

His statement follows:

"The acute coal shortage which a large part of New York State is now experiencing has reached a very grave and serious condition. As a public official, I feel very deeply the gravity of the situation. I am beginning to get several calls every day from our citizens who are practically out of coal.

"I read recently that the Niagara Power Co. produced only 44 percent of the electric energy by water power. The balance of 56 percent is produced by steam power. The St. Lawrence plant at Massena was closed some time ago because of the lack of hydroelectric power. When the plant was closed hundreds of our people were shipped west to work at Vancouver as a result.

"Attention should be called here to the fact that it takes 10 to 12 kilowatt-hours of electricity to produce a pound of aluminum. With aluminum ingots selling at 15 cents a pound, the cost of electricity used in producing them is important. With hydroelectric energy selling at 2 mills, the cost for electricity for producing a pound of aluminum is approximately 2 cents. Steam-produced electricity costs much more. I assume about twice as much. That would make the cost roughly 4 cents a pound for electricity alone.

"The electric energy required to run this St. Lawrence plant was made from a steam-generated plant in New York City and transmitted to Massena.

"The tie-up on our railroads and the curtailment of the use of electricity requested by the officials of the Central New York Power Co. at this time, goes to show the great need of more hydrodeveloped electric energy in our State.

If the St. Lawrence seaway and power development was in operation, we would have plenty of power which in emergency like the present could be used for heating. It might be interesting to the people of northern New York to know that the great Niagara Power was sold to Jacob F. Schoellkopf, of Buffalo, in 1877 for $71,000. At that time, the jumbo generator had not been invented; also the problem of transmitting electric energy had not been solved.

You probably know what this power development did for Niagara Falls. I was in Niagara Falls in 1898 and at that time my recollection is that the population of that city was around 7,000 people. Today they claim 75,000 people and as a result of the electrical development, I have been told they have 49 different industries.

What the Niagara Falls development did for Buffalo and that area, the development of our St. Lawrence seaway would do for all of the northern New York and the whole northeastern area.

Since Washington has been so reluctant to get this great project underway, I wish at this time to commend our progressive Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, in recommending to the legislature that the State of New York, in conjunction with the Ontario and Canadian Governments proceed with the development, provided the Federal Government neglects to do so.

Fair Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of March 2, 1945:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

Here is a sample of the impudence that has developed into a fixed attitude toward the people since our press formed the habit of obedience to censorship. President Roosevelt's army of occupation at Montgomery Ward's in Chicago announced that a portion of the property had been turned back to its rightful owners, but when a colonel on that front was asked why, he replied: "We feel it is not necessary to comment on that."

In that case, the situation calls for initiative in reporting because this reticence might be a self-serving cover for incompetence or worse in the administration of this job by officers who were sent in to turn a trick for a political auxiliary of the Roosevelt party, namely, the C. I. O.

No military information of any possible interest, much less value, to the enemy can be involved here and foregoing events show that if these belted and buckled floorwalkers had any excuse to boast of work well done, their press agent would have cranked up his mimeograph and told the world about it.

They weren't bashful when they took over, so this sudden shyness naturally arouses suspicion, the more so now that the United States District Court has placed them in the position of trespassers.

By stealth, the Army has developed a domestic political propaganda service for use in such cases, employing for the ballyhoo ex-reporters who have been given fat commissions but haven't necessarily changed or abandoned their politics.

To assign to such a job a major or lieutenant colonel who belongs to the Newspaper Guild, also a union of the C. I. O. and heavily sprinkled with Communists and communism, at that, would be a piece of deceit that the newspapers should expose.

To the public and, indeed, to reporters on the job, the press agent in such a case would be just another Army officer in whose press releases they would not suspect political sympathy or motivation.

Actually, however, his first duty would be to give his commanding officer in the seized property a magnificent reputation as an organizer and administrator, failing which he would get a bad report, himself, and might have to wait 6 months extra for the right to wear chickens on his shoulders.

And, this new and peculiar service being strictly political and prounion, the lawful owners and management of the property obviously cannot hope for fair treatment. So, not only is their property seized if only some loafer provokes a mere threat of a strike but the owners, through their taxes, pay the salary of some unioneer in a major's uniform to disseminate propaganda injurious to their reputation.

The Regular Army kept Communists out of the commissioned ranks and there were only a few ideological politicians in the upper brackets who had found the way to promotion and pay in the Roosevelt social experiments before the war.

Now, however, the bars are down and, as always, the inveterate ideologist will gravitate toward jobs in which he can wield influence, the most inviting of which is publicity.

The incident of Elliott Roosevelt's dog was a similar piece of lofty arrogance. The Army, from Secretary Stimson down, conspired to smother a legitimate piece of news to which the whole people were entitled, through their press.

Their purpose was not to confuse the enemy but to shield individuals who had deliberately violated the law and rated an animal above the enlisted American soldier and sailor.

It is absurd to pretend that the facts of this story could not have been whipped out of the files within a few hours but, instead, Congress had to drag it out of a number of guilty individuals, word by word. Any reporter who had been able to get at the facts of that imposition would have been justified in writing them regardless of the censorship and, moreover, this secrecy invited cold examination of the purpose for which censorship was imposed on one hand and accepted on the other.

The Army was in politics last summer when a group of Roosevelt union politicians were sent to France to lie to the soldiers about the record of strikes and other wastes of manpower on the production front at home.

These people had no legitimate business aboard public transportation nor any excuse to clutter up the scene and impose on the time of officers abroad who should have had more important work to do. Theirs was a political campaign trip on behalf of the fourth term and the favoritism showed in the fact that no other group was invited to go along to refute their propaganda.

Now who issues the orders in such a case and what is the Army up to, anyway?

In the absence of any dispatches from France exposing this political fraud, intended to swing the soldier vote to Roosevelt, it is fair to assume either that the censorship precluded such writing or that these politicians were kept out of the way of the press.

In another case, the Democratic nominee, addressing the aristocracy of the Teamsters' Union last fall, dragged in a rumor that his dog, Fala, had been left behind in the Aleutians during his summer cruise and that a naval vessel had been sent back, at great expense to the public, to fetch him.

No such story had had general circulation and there is no reason to grant that it wasn't planted by one of his political agents so he could deny it.

However, inasmuch as he had raised the question of expenses, it would have done no harm, except to his political interests, to say how much it had cost the taxpayers to refit an important ship, before and after his voyage, for his special accommodation. But, any naval officer who had revealed that information then or who should do so now would simply wind up his career.

The Army is in dirty business doing the work of the C. I. O. in privately owned property and should have better use for its generals and colonels if they have ability suitable to their rank.

But, if this must be, then the press agents should be dropped from the organization table because we know they are only going to butter up the men they have to salute and that, my friends, is not press relations but ballyhoo and politics.

Censorship should apply only to military matters and the security of individuals who might be exposed to danger by reckless publicity.

It was not presented nor was it ever accepted by the press as a device to create a racket for Roosevelt's personal friends with a sideline of exclusive news, sold for a price, regarding events affecting the whole American Nation.

Young Men Badly Needed on the Farm Should Stay There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HADWEN C. FULLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the question of the farm draft and its effect on our wartime food supply has been of paramount interest to the country and to the Congress. Recently I discussed this problem over radio station WFBL at Syracuse, N. Y., being interviewed on the subject by Bob Evans, of the Washington news staff of C. B. S.

With the permission of the House, I include in my remarks this radio interview, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. Each Friday night at this time, WFBL's special events department presents Your Congressman Speaks. Each week, Bob Evans, WFBL's Washington correspondent, will have as his guest, one of central New York's Congressmen. Here tonight, in the Washington studios of C. B. S., is Congressman HADWEN C. FULLER, of the Thirty-fifth Congressional District. Now, here is Bob Evans.

Mr. EVANS. One of the most controversial subjects in Washington is manpower. Work-or-fight legislation, work-or-jail legislation, whatever it may be called. It has more ramifications than there are rivers to be crossed before Berlin. However, some of the ramifications were set aside today when the Senate Military Affairs Committee wound up hearings on manpower and decided to discuss the bill among themselves next week. This is, discuss the bill and various proposed amendments and substitutes. Closely allied with manpower are the recent Executive Directives to Selective Service to cull more manpower from war industries and farms. Many Members of Congress feel that agriculture has taken all the draft it can stand. One of these is Mr. HADWEN C. FULLER, of the Thirty-fifth New York District. He is going to talk tonight about the draft of farm labor.

Representative FULLER. Yes, Bob, and I am going to say that I oppose any more unnecessary drafting of farm workers. I am going to give my reasons for this opposition, but you have a regular custom on this program, I understand, of giving the highlights of the week in Washington, before getting into other subjects—so, will you do that now and then we'll get on to the farm-labor draft.

Mr. EVANS. O. K., HAD, and here it is:

Of course, the big story in Washington this week, as it has been all over the world, is the release of decisions reached by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshal Stalin at the Crimean Conference. Those decisions have been discussed at such length throughout the week, it would be too repetitious to go into them again here. What we await now is the return of Mr. Roosevelt, and the possibility that he will have more to say to the American people about the decisions after his arrival. Administration sources say that the resident is pleased over results and in a frame of mind to discuss them personally in direct radio talks. Just when he will return is still a secret for security reasons as is information about his present whereabouts. Meanwhile, other decisions have been reached here in Washington which cause newsmen to breathe a sigh of relief. For weeks we have been rehashing, rewriting work or jail legislation, the George bill and will Henry Wallace be Secretary of Commerce. To say nothing of the appointment of Aubrey Williams as Rural Electrification Administrator. The Williams appointments is still up in the air—latest developments on work or jail I mentioned a little earlier and now, it may be we can stop talking after this week about the George bill. The George bill passed the House this afternoon, it already had passed the Senate and now it goes to the President for his signature. Mr. Roosevelt already had indicated that he will sign the George bill. It is, of course, that piece of legislation that removes all of the Federal lending agencies from jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce. And now that it has passed both Houses, it looks as if the way may be clear for the Senate to give its okay to Mr. Wallace to hold down the greatly circumscribed post of Commerce Secretary. That okay may be forthcoming on March 1. And those are the Washington highlights this week.

Some weeks ago the administration here in Washington, under the importunities of the War and Navy Departments, ordered Selective Service to institute a new screening of already deferred men between 18 and 45 in order that mounting needs of manpower for the armed services might be met. Many men in Congress immediately became alarmed that the Nation's food supply, and of course, the supply of food for the armed forces, might suffer under a wholesale drafting of deferred farm labor. One of those Members of Congress was Mr. HADWEN C. FULLER. He has been in the forefront of the battle for weeks to see that necessary farm labor stays on the farm.

Representative FULLER. I have, Bob. Because we must have food to exist, both on the war fronts and on the home front. The Congress some time ago enacted the Tydings amendment, an amendment which was written to make sure that our farms could be kept in operation.

Mr. EVANS. You have the wording of portions of that amendment with you?

Representative FULLER. I have. The Tydings amendment defers necessary farm help in the following terms. It says "Every registrant found by a selective service local board to be necessary to, and regularly engaged in, an agricultural occupation or essential endeavor to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces, so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained."

Mr. EVANS. The wording is clear enough.

Representative FULLER. Very clear. From this you may see that Congress intended that young men who were badly needed on the farm should stay there. For some time local boards and the administration here in Washington held the same view. But recently a drive started in the highest Government circles to bypass this amendment and to put into uniform boys whose presence on the farm is vital to the production of the food we eat. Director James Byrnes of the Office of War Mobilization launched the attack with a letter to General Hershey, head of the Selective Service, in which Mr. Byrnes said this, "I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through-25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men." Those are Mr. Byrnes' words.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Byrnes, of course, referred specifically to young men, farm workers between 18 and 25.

Representative FULLER. Exactly; and as a former chairman of a local draft board in a farming district, I know just how much young men and middle-aged men and old men are needed on the farms. I know scores of specific cases in which young men, 18 to 25, are the sole means of a farm's support. But, in the over-all picture, so far as farm workers are concerned throughout the Nation, actually very few young men of military age have been deferred under the Tydings amendment. But Director Byrnes, in his letter to General Hershey, plainly pushed aside the Tydings amendment, which was a law of the land, and said it should no longer exist. General Hershey, who is a good soldier, took his orders from his superiors and got out a directive to local boards which had the effect of an order to them to forget the Tydings amendment. Many of these boards lost no time in calling in young farmers, and the Congress received hundreds of telegrams and letters from farm

workers stating they had been given a few days to get into uniform.

Mr. EVANS. Well, tell us of a specific case.

Representative FULLER. All right. Here is the case of one young farmer in the Midwest. I have his name and address in my office, but I'm not going to use it here for obvious reasons. He had a 320-acre farm which he was farming by himself. He had 37 head of cattle, 15 hogs, 150 chickens. As a result of the setting aside of the Tydings amendment he was given 10 days to dispose of all that and report for duty. There are hundreds of similar cases. Throughout New York State last summer we all saw farms being run by children and old people for the most part. But, in spite of this handicap and many other difficulties, the workers on the farms did their job in grand fashion. Farm production figures show that. And the relatively few young men of military age who were deferred under the Tydings amendment were most essential. Without them we could not have kept going.

Mr. EVANS. Yes. It seems to me that the average age of farmers in this country must be much greater than 18 to 25.

Representative FULLER. I am told that the average age of farm operators in New York State alone is 59 years. But the question is, Are the young men on the farms who have been deferred as farm workers, needed right where they are? Again, as a former draft board chairman in a farm district, I would say emphatically "Yes." But as a result of Director Byrnes' and General Hershey's orders, agriculture in this country has been thrown into confusion and turmoil. So we in Congress had to do something about it, and we did.

Mr. EVANS. And you did what?

Representative FULLER. An informal meeting of Congressmen was held. Then a second meeting at which General Hershey was a witness. Now General Hershey is a fluent and able speaker, but before the hearing was over, 250 Members of the House had made it plain to him that they felt he had overstepped; that he was threatening the wartime welfare of agriculture by his directive of January 3.

Mr. EVANS. Well, before this array of Congressmen, did General Hershey sidestep or back track, or what?

Representative FULLER. These Congressmen asked for and got a promise from General Hershey that he would issue another directive, this time making it clear to State directors of selective service and local boards, that he did not intend that the Tydings amendment would be modified by any of his actions or statements. General Hershey consented to this, and his later directive said this "The directive of January 3, 1945, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment." By this action the Members of the Congress from farm districts were able to remove the pressure on local boards from the top, and every local board could proceed in drafting boys, in the light of the Tydings amendment as was intended by law.

Mr. EVANS. Well, how is the situation working out?

Representative FULLER. In New York State some complaints are still being made, but I am informed that the situation generally is good. However, in the South and some sections of the Midwest, reports show that local boards are still drafting farmers badly needed on the farm. Congress is watching this picture closely and the informal group which got General Hershey to modify his directives, also has written to the Governors of several States, pointing out that food production also is their problem, and recommending they should take necessary action to protect this supply. Likewise, there is a proposal before the House to reaffirm the Tydings amendment, for the purpose of stressing its importance in the winning of the war.

Mr. EVANS. In addition, you are making further personal effort so far as your own constituents in Oswego and Oneida counties are concerned?

Representative FULLER. I am. I am writing to members of the boards of supervisors in my district asking that they provide me with specific information concerning the farm draft problems in their towns. If they will send me the proper information concerning their specific cases, I shall be very happy to take these up, all of them, with the proper authorities for further consideration and appeal. If the farm worker belongs definitely in II–C classification, I want to see that he stays there.

Mr. EVANS. Perhaps some of the farm workers in your district may be listening right now, HAD, so suppose you tell these farmers with draft problems just how to go about it.

Representative FULLER. They may write to me, Congressman HADWEN C. FULLER, at 140 House Office Building, right here in Washington, D. C. But, in closing Bob, I want to say that one wouldn't think it necessary to tell Washington administrators that our armed forces, our fighting allies and our people on the home front, must eat to carry on. In this case, however, some persons in high places here in Washington overlooked this elementary fact. We Members of Congress who are greatly interested in this problem do not intend that any administrator should forget the vital contribution of our farmers in this war effort, or the fact that without their splendid work we could do nothing against our enemies.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, HAD FULLER.

In closing, I think this would be an appropriate time to set at rest at least a few of the rumors which have besieged us this week. Recurrent rumors that crop up frequently. Rumors that clothing is to be rationed, that coffee is to be rationed, and potatoes, too. The latest is potatoes. It is true that potatoes have been short for the past couple of weeks and may be for 2 or 3 more weeks, but so far as rationing is concerned, the War Food Administration says definitely, "No." No freeze on potatoes, no Government seizure. No nothing. Coffee is in again, too. But the Office of Price Administration tells me that there are approximately 9,000,000 bags of coffee either in the country or on the way by ship. That's a lot of coffee, enough to last for 5 months, and meanwhile more will be coming in right along. So make up your mind, no coffee rationing. And now the rumor on clothing rationing; it is a rumor and nothing more. For here, too, O. P. A. says it has no plans for any clothing rationing of any kind. At the moment O. P. A. is optimistic about its new spring pricing schedules, which it hopes to release within the next few days. These will include the recent order for low-priced clothing, particularly clothing for children. So that sets at rest three constantly recurring rumors. Sets them at rest until somebody starts them up again.

ANNOUNCER. You have heard a special broadcast, one in a series from the Nation's Capital. On this program Bob Evans, WFBL's Washington correspondent, interviewed Congressman HADWEN C. FULLER, of the Thirty-fifth Congressional District. Listen again next Friday evening when Bob Evans will bring you another of central New York's Congressmen.

Edwin Rogers speaking. This is CBS, the Columbia Broadcasting System.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by both Houses of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania:

Whereas agitation for the passage of Federal legislation approving the completion of the St. Lawrence Waterway and Power Project has been revived in the Federal Congress; and

Whereas the General Assembly of Pennsylvania is vitally concerned in the effect that the completion of said project would have upon its citizens; and

Whereas the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relies substantially for its economic stability and future prosperity on the preservation of its essential mining, manufacturing and transportation industries; and

Whereas the production of bituminous and anthracite coal, the manufacture of steel products and the transportation of freight by steam railroads constitute important segments of the industrial life and well-being of the commonwealth and its citizens; and

Whereas the development of 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectricity as contemplated by the St. Lawrence project would displace in excess of 5,000,000 tons of bituminous coal annually; and

Whereas the completion of the St. Lawrence Waterway would open existing markets for bituminous and anthracite coal mined in the Commonwealth, to ruinous competition from foreign coal mined by cheap labor and transported to Great Lakes ports of the United States and Canada in tramp foreign flag vessels at ballast rates; and

Whereas the importation of steel and other manufactured products similarly produced at low cost in foreign countries and sold in competition with Pennsylvania manufactured goods would injuriously affect manufacturing industry and employment in the Commonwealth; and

Whereas the diversion of freight tonnage to the proposed waterways from steam railroads serving the Commonwealth and the loss of traffic due to the diminution of coal tonnage would seriously and adversely affect the railroad industry; and

Whereas, as a result of the foregoing, thousands of citizens of Pennsylvania engaged in the mining and production of coal, the making and fabrication of steel and other products, and the transporting of freight would be deprived of their means of earning a livelihood at their chosen occupations; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence project would have an injurious effect upon the economy of the country, with incidental benefit, if any, being confined to relatively few small areas and certain manufacturers; and

Whereas a large part of the enormous cost of this unwise and uneconomical project would fall upon the taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the house of representatives concurs), That the General Assembly of Pennsylvania hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States not to approve or authorize the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative elected from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Drafting of Female Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *February 24, 1945.*

DONALD C. SMELZER,
President, American
Hospital Association,
Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: President Roosevelt has drawn attention to the urgent need in the armed forces for trained nursing personnel, which had not been supplied through voluntary enlistment, and the President has called on Congress to pass appropriate legislation. The Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives has been conducting hearings at which you inform us officials of the Army and the Navy, the Director of United States Civilian Health, and representatives of the Red Cross, the War Manpower Commission, and the American Hospital Association have all testified that such legislation was necessary, not only to supply the armed forces, but to provide for the orderly distribution of nursing personnel for the armed forces and needs of national importance during the war.

Since nurses are predominantly females, it is obvious that the Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. A., App. 301), requiring only males 18 to 65 to register and making only males 18 to 45 liable for training and service in the land or naval services, does not apply, excepting as to such males who may be qualified or trained as nurses.

You have asked us to advise the American Hospital Association whether an act of Congress to effectuate these purposes, which might affect only females as nurses, would be constitutional.

This is to advise that in our opinion such an act of Congress passed for these purposes should be held to be constitutional.

Congress, during war, has the power, in our opinion, if it deems it necessary for the conduct of the war, to draft and induct trained female nurses into the military services and also the power to draft and assign them to work of national importance under civilian direction.

It also seems clear that Congress could specifically include as works of national importance veterans' and other public and nonprofit hospitals and other community centers of medical or health service.

Further, in our opinion, the power of Congress to do this, if Congress deems it necessary for the conduct of the war, should be upheld irrespective of whether or not only female nurses, and not other females, would be affected by such legislation.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL WAR POWER OF CONGRESS

Study of the framing of the Constitution and the interpretation by the courts of the war powers conferred upon Congress by the Constitution leads to the definite conclusion that the power of Congress to legislate with respect to citizens during time of war, if Congress deems it necessary for the conduct of war, is plenary and absolute. This conclusion is substantiated by the unlimited war powers vested in Congress under the Constitution, by the fact that proposals by the States in framing the Constitution to restrict the Federal war powers were uniformly rejected, and by the principles enunciated in the decisions of our courts in interpreting the war powers.

The war powers granted unconditionally to Congress by the Constitution are power—

"To declare war",

"To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years";

"To provide and maintain a Navy";

"To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces";

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers,"—Article I, Section 8.

The Preamble to the Constitution also recites as among its purposes—

"To provide for the common defense,—"

The framers of the Constitution well knew the defects of the Articles of Confederation and the impotence of the central government in this respect and the fact they rejected the proposals of the States to limit the power of the Federal Government (except that "no appropriation of money to that use (the raising and support of armies) shall be for a term longer than 2 years"), is strong evidence the war powers of Congress as the central government were to be unfettered.

See Hamilton, Federalist, Nos. 22, 23; Virginia, 3 Elliot's Debates 659; North Carolina, 4 Elliot's Debates, 242, 244, 251, 252; Rhode Island, 1 Elliot's Debates, 336; American Bar Association Journal, volume 26, page 701, "Legal Basis for Conscription," Claude B. Mickelwait, major, United States Army, Office of Judge Advocate General.

In 1871 Justice Field in *Tarble's Case* (13 Wall, 397 (at p. 408)), stated:

"Now, among the powers assigned to the National Government is the power 'to raise and support armies' and the power 'to provide for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.' The execution of these powers falls within the line of its duties; and its control over the subject is plenary and exclusive."

In the Selective Draft Law cases (245 U. S. 366), arising out of the Draft Act of 1917, and disposing of the contentions that the law was unconstitutional, Chief Justice White pointed out that the authority which Congress had to pass such legislation was embedded in the above-quoted provisions of the Constitution, and said (at p. 377):

"It is said the right to provide is not denied by calling for voluntary enlistments, but it does not and cannot include the power to exact enforced military duty by the citizen. This, however, but challenges the existence of all power for a governmental power which has no saction to it and which, therefore, can only be exercised provided the citizen consent to its exercise, is in no substantial sense a power."

And continuing (p. 378):

"It may not be doubted that the very conception of a just government and its duty to the citizen includes the reciprocal duty of the citizen to render military service in case of need, and the right to compel it" (Vattel, Law of Nations, Book III, ch. 1 and 2).

Speaking to the point that Congress had not fully exercised its powers and hence the erroneous belief that Congress may be limited in this field, Chief Justice White, at page 383, states:

"Because the power of Congress to raise armies was not required to be exerted to its full limit, but only as in the discretion of Congress it was deemed the public interest required, furnishes no ground for supposing that the complete power was lost by its partial exertion."

The plenary war power of Congress is also clearly expounded in Justice Sutherland's opinion in *U. S.* v. *Macintosh* (283 U. S. 605) in which the Supreme Court denied the petition for naturalization of an alien who declined to take the oath that he would bear arms.

In analyzing the war power, Justice Sutherland, at page 622, remarked:

"From its very nature, the war power, when necessity calls for its exercise, tolerates no qualifications or limitations, unless found in the Constitution or in applicable principles of international law. In the words of John Quincy Adams, 'This power is tremendous; it is strictly constitutional; but it breaks down every barrier so anxiously erected for the protection of liberty, property, and of life.' To the end that war may not result in defeat, freedom of speech may, by act of Congress, be curtailed or denied so that the morale of the people and the spirit of the Army may not be broken by seditious utterances; freedom of the press curtailed to preserve our military plans and movements from the knowledge of the enemy; deserters and spies put to death without indictment or trial by jury; ships and supplies requisitioned; property of alien enemies, theretofore under the protection of the Constitution, seized without process and converted to the public use without compensation and without due process of law in the ordinary sense of that term; prices of food and other necessities of life fixed or regulated; railways taken over and operated by the Government; and other drastic powers, wholly inadmissible in time of peace, exercised to meet the emergencies of war.

"These are but illustrations of the breadth of the power; * * *."

In considering as a whole the war powers of Congress under the Constitution, the preamble to the Constitution should also be noted, in that among the Constitution's express purposes is "to provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, * * *." While this helps to clarify the aims of Congress in the exercise of its powers, it is conceded, as Justice Harlan remarked in *Jacobson* v. *Mass.* (197 U. S. 11, p. 22) that the preamble itself is not basic for the passage of congressional legislation.

FEMALES AS WELL AS MALE CITIZENS SUBJECT TO COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

Since the power of Congress is plenary and absolute over all citizens in the exercise of the war power, it follows that females also, as citizens, may in the discretion of Congress be called on to serve in wartime. While there is, obviously as yet, no case in point, it is clear in principle that Congress may call on them to serve. Justice Sutherland in *U. S.* v. *MacIntosh*, supra (at p. 622), states:

"In express terms Congress is empowered 'to declare war' which necessarily connotes the plenary power to wage war with all the force necessary to make it effective; and 'to raise * * * armies,' which necessarily

connotes the like power to say who shall serve in them and in what way."

And (at p. 623):

"Whether any citizen shall be exempt from serving in the armed forces of the Nation in time of war is dependent upon the will of Congress and not upon the scruples of the individual, except as Congress provides."

In *U. S.* v. *Schwimmer* (279 U. S. 644) a woman alien who refused in her petition for naturalization to aver that she would bear arms was denied the right to citizenship, and Justice Butler speaking (at p. 650) with reference to this, said:

"That it is the duty of citizens by force of arms to defend our Government against all enemies whenever necessity arises is a fundamental principle of the Constitution."

FEMALE NURSES ONLY MAY BE SUBJECT TO COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

The fact that female nurses only as a class may be subject to the female draft cannot be held to violate any constitutional requirements.

Again, the plenary power of Congress under the war powers over any and all citizens or any segment of its citizens, is absolute. A recent case illustrative of the proposition that during war one class of citizens but no others may be subjected to regulation is *Hirabayashi* v. *U. S.* (320 U. S. 81). This involved the constitutionality of an Executive curfew order issued under act of Congress to be applied against persons of Japanese ancestry within a designated military area as a protective measure to meet the threat of sabotage and espionage. The curfew order was held not to discriminate unconstitutionally against citizens of Japanese ancestry, and, as Chief Justice Stone stated (at p. 100):

"The fifth amendment contains no equal protection clause and it restrains only such discriminatory legislation by Congress as amounts to a denial of due process."

It is to be noted, as Chief Justice Stone remarks (p. 100) that:

"Legislative classification or discrimination based on race alone has even been held to be a denial of equal protection" (*Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 356)).

And yet, as Justice Stone went on to say:

"Because racial discriminations are in most circumstances irrelevant and therefore prohibited, it by no means follows that in dealing with the perils of war Congress and the Executive are wholly precluded from taking into account those facts and circumstances which are relevant to measures for our national defense and for the successful prosecution of the war and which may, in fact, place citizens of one ancestry in a different category from others."

Accordingly, if Congress should conclude that it is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war to draft from among female nurses only, as a class, Congress may do so.

Justice Murphy, in his concurring opinion, at page 109, also emphasizes this point:

"This (Congress' power to provide for the common defense and to wage war 'with all the force to make it effective') includes authority to exercise measures of control over persons and property which would not in all cases be permissible in normal times."

See also *Korematsu* v. *U. S.* (Sup. Ct. 22, October term, 1944, decided Dec. 18, 1944, 13 U. S. Law Week, 4062), which upheld the war power of Congress and the Executive to exclude at the time they did citizens of Japanese ancestry from the west coast area. Justice Black, in the majority opinion (4063, 13 U. S. Law Week), said:

"But hardships are part of war and war is an aggregation of hardships. All citizens alike, both in and out of uniform, feel the impact of war in greater or lesser measure. Citizenship has its responsibilities as well as its privileges and in time of war the burden is always heavier. Compulsory exclusion of large groups of citizens from their homes, except under circumstances of direst emergency and peril, is inconsistent with our basic governmental institutions. But when, under conditions of modern warfare, our shores are threatened by hostile forces, the power to protect must be commensurate with the threatened danger."

Likewise, if under conditions of modern warfare the successful prosecution of the war requires the services of a particular class of citizens, the power of Congress to require them to serve is unquestioned.

Further support for treating nurses as a separate class is found in the cases holding that a statute is not unconstitutional which places impositions on a certain class only, so long as the classification is reasonable and uniform standards of treatment are prescribed for those within that class. While the cases substantiating this principle relate chiefly to the construction of the fourteenth amendment requiring of the States the equal protection of the laws (see *Missouri ex rel. Hurwitz* v. *North et al* (271 U. S. 40); *Jacobson* v. *Mass* (197 U. S. 11); also *Middleton* v. *Texas Power and Light Co.* (249 U. S. 152)), they clearly sustain similar classification by the Federal Government, to which the requirements of the equal-protection clause do not apply. The cases also confirm that the mere fact that a law regulating or placing impositions upon certain classes might properly have included certain others does not condemn it under the equal-protection clause. As was said in *Chicago Dock Co.* v. *Fraley* (228 U. S. 680 (at p. 687)):

"The Constitution does not require that all State laws shall be perfect, nor that the entire field of proper legislation shall be covered by a single enactment."

It is quite clear that females, by reason of their training and qualifications to act as nurses, constitute a distinct class, and as such would justify classification, and legislation for good cause in the discretion of Congress affecting only such class would be justifiable classification.

Again, the main basis for such classification and any draft legislation with respect to female nurses is to be found in the plenary war power of Congress. As stated by Justice Sutherland (at p. 622) in *U. S.* v. *Macintosh*, supra:

"From its very nature, the war power, when necessity calls for its exercise, tolerates no qualifications or limitations unless found in the Constitution or in applicable principles of international law."

ASSIGNMENT OF DRAFTEES WITHOUT MILITARY INDUCTION TO WORK OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE

The power of Congress to draft and assign female nurses to work of national importance under civilian control would also appear to be well founded. It is based on the absolute war powers of Congress as a war necessity. As Chief Justice Stone remarked in *Hirabayashi* v. *U. S.*, supra (at p. 93):

"The war power of the National Government is the 'power to wage war successfully.' See Charles Evans Hughes, War Powers Under the Constitution (42 A. B. A., Rep. 232, 238). It extends to every matter and activity so related to war as substantially to affect its conduct and progress. The power is not restricted to the winning of victories in the field and the repulse of enemy forces. It embraces every phase of the national defense including the protection of war materials and the members of the armed forces from injury and from the dangers which attend the rise, prosecution, and progress of war" (cases cited).

The power to require a citizen to work, contrary to general public conception, has, nevertheless, been recognized in the history of this country not only in war but in peacetime in certain fields affected by the public interest. See *Butler* v. *Perry* (240 U. S. 328), wherein the Court upheld a Florida statute requiring able-bodied male persons between 21 and 45 years to labor on the highways of a county. Justice Brown (at p. 333) remarked:

"It (the thirteenth amendment) introduced no novel doctrine with respect of services always treated as exceptional, and certainly was not intended to interdict enforcement of those duties which individuals owe to the state, such as services in the Army, militia, on the jury, etc. The great purpose in view was liberty under the protection of effective government, not the destruction of the latter by depriving it of essential powers" (cases cited).

See also *Robertson* v. *Baldwin* (165 U. S. 275), confirming the principle that the contract of a sailor has always been treated as an exceptional one and that his labor may be enforced, although it involves to a certain extent the surrender of his personal liberty.

There is also the duty of the able-bodied citizen to aid in suppressing crime, as to which Justice Cardozo in *Hamilton* v. *Regents* (293 U. S. 245) (footnote at p. 265), referred to the authorities assembled in *Babington* v. *Yellow Taxi Corp.* (250 N. Y. 14, 164 N. E. 726).

The only wartime case analagous as to the propriety of assigning nurses to work of national importance appears to be found in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 as amended, U. S. C. A., title 50, section 305 (g), in which provision is made for conscientious objectors either to be inducted into the land or naval forces under the act and assigned to noncombatant service, as defined by the President, or, if opposed to participation therein "* * * in lieu of such induction be assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction."

The right of Congress or its duly authorized representatives to impose such work has been repeatedly upheld. In the recent case of *Falbo* v. *U. S.* (320 U. S. 549), dealing with the criminal prosecution for failure of a registrant to report for assignment by his local draft board to work of national importance, he claiming that he was a minister and wrongly classified, the Supreme Court confirmed Congress' power on the basis of which the assignment to work was made, Justice Black stating (at p. 551):

"The Congress was faced with the urgent necessity of integrating all the Nation's people and forces for national defense * * *. If he (the registrant) has been classified a conscientious objector opposed to noncombatant military service, as was petitioner, he ultimately is ordered by the local board to report for work of national importance. In each case the registrant is under the same obligation to obey the order."

In *Heflin* v. *Sanford* (142 F. 2d. 788 (C. C. A. 5th)) the circuit court of appeals, per Sibley, C. J., in denying the registrant's contention that he was ordered to do something prohibited by the Constitution, and his refusal cannot be made a crime, stated (at p. 799):

"The answer to appellant's complaint lies in the broad principle that the thirteenth amendment has no application to a call for service made by one's government according to law to meet a public need, * * *. The service required here is 'work of national importance,' that is to say, it is of a public nature. * * * The present war is described by its authors as 'total war,' meaning that every means of destruction will be used, and men, women, and children alike killed. It means also that total effort may be necessary to resist it, men, women, and children all doing what they can. * * * There can be no doubt whatever that Congress has the constitutional power to require appellant, an able-bodied man, to serve in the Army or in lieu of such service to perform other work of national importance. The thirteenth amendment abolished slavery and involuntary servitude except as a punishment for crime, but was never intended to limit the war powers of government or its right to exact by law public service from all to meet the public need."

It cannot be argued that the principles underlying the decisions of the cases dealing with conscientious objectors rest on a separate basis, and that they are not applicable to the question at issue since the immunities and exemptions granted this class of registrants are solely at the discretion of Congress. Justice Sutherland in *United States* v. *Macintosh*, supra (at p. 623), pointed this out with respect to the 1917 Draft Act:

"That body (Congress), thus far has seen fit, by express enactment, to relieve from the obligation of armed service those persons who belong to the class known as conscientious objectors; and this policy is of such long standing that it is thought by some to be beyond the possibility of alteration. * * * Of course, there is no such principle of the Constitution fixed or otherwise. The conscientious objector is relieved from the obligation to bear arms in obedience to no constitutional provision, express or implied; but because and only because it has accorded with the policy of Congress thus to relieve him. * * * That body may grant or withhold the exemption as in its wisdom it sees fit; * * * No other conclusion is compatible with the well nigh limitless extent of the war powers as above illustrated which include by necessary implication the power, in the last extremity, to compel the armed service of any citizen in the land without regard to his objections or his views in respect of the justice or morality of the particular war or of war in general."

Since these prerogatives belong solely to Congress and it has seen fit in the case of conscientious objectors to prescribe that either they be drafted and inducted into the armed services for noncombatant duty, or if not compatible with their beliefs then assigned, without being inducted, to work of national importance under civilian control, it follows that Congress may also prescribe either for the drafting and inducting into the armed forces of any class of citizens such as female nurses, or assign them to work of national importance under civilian control, such as Veterans' and other public and nonprofit hospitals and other community centers of medical or health service.

Very truly yours,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS.

The Byrnes Curfew Order

REMARKS

OF

HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, since I left the United States Senate 2 years ago I have watched with increasing alarm as some of our power-drunk administrative officials have paraphrased and applied line by line, paragraph by paragraph, and chapter by chapter many of the orders that have been promulgated by loathsome dictators against whom our American boys and girls are fighting on the war fronts of the world.

The latest innovation in the way of dictator decrees is the so-called Byrnes curfew order, which to me plainly violates the very thing that our Constitution guaranteed to our people in the way of liberty.

Parenthetically speaking, I am one of the 76,000,000 of our 80,000,000 adult Americans who consistently are in bed at midnight, according to the Gallup poll.

Nobody wants the war won quickly and decisively more than I do, but I intend to defend—in strict accordance with my oath of office—every sentence of the American Constitution, which is the greatest and most important document outside of the Bible. If this means that a few more people get their recreation after midnight rather than before midnight, and a few more kilowatts of power are consumed, so be it. That means infinitely less than scrapping another phrase or two of our beloved Constitution.

I for one am at a total loss to understand why the midnight closing order was postponed until February 26, 1945, until now when victory is in sight and when many of our factories have passed the peak of production demands.

I propose, with the help of my colleagues who intend to abide by the Constitution, to ascertain by this resolution and give the American people some answer—if any exists—other than it is another measure to win the war.

The operation of bowling alleys, restaurants, theaters, and other amusement places has nothing to do with Army and Navy manpower. The National Selective Service has gone its own austere way—even to the extent of ignoring such mandates of Congress as the Tydings amendment to exempt vitally needed farm labor.

Most of the employers and employees of the industry restricted by the Byrnes decree can make little other contribution to the war effort than to help maintain the morale of such people as war plant swing shifters who seek such services, and to pay the income taxes that the Government imposes upon them.

I have no quarrel with the Anti-Saloon League or kindred organizations. If the intent was to prohibit sales of liquor after midnight, that could easily have been done without broad interference with the guaranteed liberties to our people. If it is to save coal, as Byrnes is quoted by the press as saying, it is peculiar that it came after winter is virtually over.

We are at the crossroads in the long march of democracy. We cannot afford to let any administrative official establish precedents which could be invoked by less scrupulous officials in the years ahead possibly to help accomplish what the gangsters in other nations did in less than a score of years.

The American public is entitled to the facts behind such decrees as the Byrnes curfew order, and I cannot be satisfied with the mere mouthings of those in high places.

The Federal Prison System

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, because some functions of our society are performed so smoothly and so unostentatiously, we are inclinded to take them for granted, particularly in these days when so much of our time and energies are directed toward the immediate and pressing problem of winning the war. Our natural tendency, with less clamoring problems, is to go along on the comfortable assumption that so long as the wheel does not squeak it does not need oil. Any good mechanic knows that the real extravagance is not the investment in the oil can, but the break-down of the equipment. Our country cannot afford a less intelligent policy toward these smooth functioning units of our Government. Today I have in mind, particularly, the Federal Prison System.

It has been said that, with the exception of those who administer them and those who get into them, nobody knows anything about prisons. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, however, it has been a part of my duty to know something about the program of our Federal Bureau of Prisons; and as a member of our democratic society it has been a privilege to add to that knowledge. I have been interested in this agency for a number of years, and in all my contacts with those who manage it I have been increasingly impressed with the compelling responsibility they face and the absorbing experiment in human values they are conducting.

In the past I have outlined the history and major functions of the Federal prison system, and it will not be necessary now to go into repetitious detail. Under the able direction of Attorney General Francis Biddle and Director James V. Bennett it pursues its humane and progressive program in spite of serious wartime handicaps, honestly seeking after the rebuilding of character and the resocializing of personality.

It is from this standpoint I wish to present its problems—not because of its enviable record for efficient organization in the 15 years since its inception, nor because it sets the standard for the world in the physical set-up of its institutions, but because of its notable contribution to the human assets of our society.

Federal prisons are not, as some have grimly joked, "country clubs" which cater to the whims and fancies of their members. Nor, on the other hand, are they cold-storage warehouses for stifling and congealing human aspirations and energies. They are dynamic organisms of our culture, striving with determination and intelligence to treat maladjustments of personality, to bring about a rebirth of right thinking, and to rehabilitate and reclothe with the attributes of honest, respectable citizenship.

This is not an easy program, nor is it always, of course, successful. If every man who committed a crime, or crimes, had the genuine desire to change his way of life, there would be little need for prisons. To create that desire is the staggering problem. I say little need for prisons because in addition to those who have grown cynical and sophisticated in crime, the mentally deficient, and those few who seem entirely to lack a sense of moral values, there are always some who must be restrained because they fail to grasp any fundamental relationship

between their acts and infraction of the law—the traditional bootleggers, for instance, who see no harm in turning their corn into moonshine. Take the case of Zebe, who had served a term for this offense and who, while in the institution, had received some vocational training in the tin shop. Some time after his release, the superintendent of the tin shop received from him the following letter:

DEAR WARDEN: I write to tell how much yer training has meant to me. When my revenoo case came up in Tennessee court they showed my still. The jedge and jury all looked it over most kerful and admittted to a man that it war the finest piece of coppersmithin they had ever seen in these here parts, barring none. I jes wanted you all to know I owe it to yer sheet metal course.

Sincerely,

ZEBE.

Our Federal prisons have not now, of course, so many of this type of offender, but wartime statutes have filled them with a whole new crop. From 1942 to 1944 the number committted for wartime offenses and military courts-martial increased from 10.3 percent to 34.4 percent. A certain proportion of disloyal citizens, saboteurs, spies, and bundists make up a part of this group, together with those who have committed serious military offenses, but by far the largest percentage is composed of violators of the Selective Service Act. Among these last named are some who seem sincere and who, once they are convinced their assignment has no connection with the prosecution of the war, are willing to cooperate and take their places in the institutional life. A few present a problem unique in the history of prison administration in that their real identity is difficult to determine. They claim they are registered with Allah or some other leader, and that they cannot reveal any but their chosen names. These include such euphonious appellations as Radical Love, Unison Heart, Brother Daniel, Walking T. Jerusalem, Serious Ezekiel, Meekness Faith, David Guileless, and so on.

However, the element of humor, grim though it may be, is not always present. Often the inescapable factor of life and death is involved. The most difficult and baffling lot in the whole range of Selective Service Act violators is composed of the ultrapacifists, the extremist war resisters, the Ghandi-ites, the radicals, the fanatical vegetarians, and so on, the group that the editor of one of the institutional papers calls "drydocked intellectuals." The leader of one of these cliques, for instance, is a graduate of an ivy-league college, a captain of the track team, a fellow at Oxford, and an honor student with real leadership abilities. He seems determined, however, to become a martyr and to cause trouble for the Government whenever possible. At one time he felt that even death was worth while in upholding the right of a prisoner to carry on, without censorship, correspondence with outside parties. He held that it was fundamentally undemocratic to inspect the mail of a prisoner and in protest he and some of his friends went on a hunger strike for nearly 80 days. He steadfastly refused food for 27 days and then was tube-fed for 53 more days before he would voluntarily accept food.

Practically all of these extremist groups are believers in pressure techniques. Some are militant pacifists, some are Trotskyites, some believe in complete civil disobedience, some resort to every conceivable nonviolent coercive measure. They will not work, they will not comply with institutional rules, they foment trouble and seek always to embarrass and discredit those responsible for enforcing the law. We might ask whether it would be censurable to permit such persons to starve themselves to death, but Director Bennett, of the Federal Prison System, feels that one of the symbols of our democracy is belief in the essential dignity of every human being, no matter how deluded or misguided he may be, that we are required to do our utmost to save life, and, if possible, to redirect its energies in constructive channels. Like the physician, the prison administrator cannot deny the resources at his command to anyone, the obstructionist, the bigoted, or even the disloyal. Incidentally, one former prisoner who had claimed to be a conscientious objector has since his parole to the Army written in to say, "I could kick myself a million times for not going in the first place." So you see it is possible sometimes to bring about a change in attitude even among those who arrogate solely to themselves the power to determine whether we are fighting in a righteous cause.

Instances of this kind, which are not infrequent, are what leaven the burden and give those responsible for administering our prisons the faith and courage to go forward with their intrinsically progressive program. Director Bennett has the satisfaction of knowing that many men who leave the gates of a Federal prison will never return. And occasionally he experiences the thrill of following through to real success the career of one of his graduates. A man whom he calls Edward is a case in point.

It would seem that of all men who run afoul of the law and are committed to penal institutions, Edward had the least potentiality for improvement. As a young man he had become a drifter, a transient, had never held a job, and had lived by the shadiest means. He was eventually committed to a Federal penitentiary on a charge of violation of the White Slave Traffic Act. His offense was such as to lead the United States attorney to report, "There are no mitigating circumstances." In just about 2 years after completion of that sentence he was again in serious trouble—this time for concealing and selling narcotics. He had himself become an addict. This time his sentence was for 5 years; but during this time something began to happen to him. In the first place he was cured of his addiction. His interest in religion, long nonexistent, was reborn, and he found in the institutional psychologist not only one who was able to give him professional aid, but also a man who was interested in him as a man and who helped him to gain some insight into his unsavory career. A real change appeared to take place in his inner attitudes and perspectives. He was denied parole, but was later released with 480 days good time to his credit. A job had been procured for him in a city far removed from old associates. It was not the most desirable job in the world, and it was unequal to his capabilities, for he is a man of superior intelligence, but he worked hard and his employer, who knew his history, liked him and respected him. When the opportunity arose it was this employer who loaned him the money to start a small but legitimate merchandising business on the side. This enterprise proved so successful that eventually he was forced to give his entire time to it. The rest of the story sounds like a novel, but it is true. Edward's business grew so rapidly that it was necessary to hire four clerks in addition to his wife, who works in his store. He has made numerous investments and managed them all so well that he has consistently made money. But the important thing in this story is not so much his financial success as that he has achieved a moral triumph. Many people have tried to make trouble for him. His criminal record leaked out. Dealers in narcotics have tried to get him involved again. Federal narcotics agents have sent undercover men to discover whether he is still interested in the traffic, but he remains incorruptible, and all investigations have proved only that he works hard, long hours, and is conducting a legitimate, well-managed, profitable business. His parole adviser, incidentally a police lieutenant who might have every reason to be cynical, writes:

I am proud to call him my friend and I consider his case by far the greatest example of rehabilitation that has ever come to my attention in my 20 years of police experience.

Another encouraging case, although in an entirely different category, is that of Paul, a boy under 17 years of age, whose offense involved violation of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act, armed robbery, and kidnapping. His institutional record was good, but he was denied parole and served his full term. Shortly after his release he was inducted into the Army Air Corps, earned his sergeant's chevrons, and became a gunner on a Flying Fortress. He has since completed 30 bombing missions in Europe, his unit has received a Presidential citation, and he himself the Flying Cross with five oakleaf clusters, and the Distinguished Flying Cross.

Even the traditional bootlegger can sometimes be turned to lawful pursuits. Because he was a member of an outlaw family and could not get a job, Noah had drifted into the illegal liquor traffic. So confirmed was the family in unlawful ways that at one time Noah's father alone constituted a special exhibit at a carnival celebration in a neighboring town. Admission was charged to enter the tent where the man sat on a platform in a comfortable chair, surrounded by some of his equipment for making moonshine whisky, and by the various weapons used by himself and his relatives in their conflicts with the law. It seemed inevitable that Noah would return to

the same occupation. But a job was secured for him, and although it was not a very lucrative one, he worked hard, seeming to feel that at least someone was really interested in him and wanted to help him. He wrote:

Thank you very much for your kind regards and wishes to me and family for better success and health. Thank God, someone cares. I am sure that the God of the universe will help me in the long run. I never give up hope.

He says now that he is very grateful for the consideration shown him and the confidence placed in him, that he is enjoying life more than at any time within his memory, and that he can sleep at night, being no longer fearful when anyone comes to his house because he knows that his conduct has been within the law and he will not be taken away from his family.

Although the problems are knotty and often discouraging, a great deal is being accomplished of which the Department of Justice and we as a country can be proud.

I have previously told you about the war work being done by Federal prisoners. They are still producing about $20,000,000 worth of goods annually, of which 95 percent is in war materials. There has been no diminution of the inmates' enthusiastic contributions to Red Cross blood banks or in their investments in War Bonds. And they have willingly lent themselves as guinea pigs to numerous scientific experiments designed to save the health and lives of our fighting men. We all know what a devastating disease malaria is, and we have been shocked by the fact that five times as many men have been sent back from the Pacific theater because of malaria as for all other battle casualties combined. It is a disease which we can certainly not afford from a military standpoint, quite apart from the untold human suffering involved, and yet for years scientists have been unsuccessful in finding a real cure. Some drugs have been helpful in alleviating its miseries, but no complete cures or preventive drugs had been discovered. When the National Research Council and the Office of Scientific Research and Development needed to make a clinical test of certain new drugs which seemed potentially effective, they found more eager volunteers than they could use at the United States Penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga., and with the approval of the Attorney General, Director Bennett, and Warden Joseph W. Sanford of Atlanta, they established behind prison walls what was to prove almost an ideal medical laboratory and hospital.

Here 114 of the many times greater number who have volunteered have been infected by the bite of the Anopheles mosquito. The prisoners call it "keeping a date with Ann." The efficacy of the different drugs, different methods of administering them, different post-infection controls, regular chemical blood tests—all are part of the project. Only those men in excellent physical condition are allowed to undertake this rigorous experiment, for—make no mistake about it—many of them become very ill. It is still too early to predict the final results, but it may very well be that through their sacrifice may be found the drug that will mean to millions release from a devastating disease, and perhaps—in effect—one component of the victory to come.

What part will our prisons play in the days to follow that victory? Will there be, as some predict, a resurgence of crime such as has occurred following other wars? Director Bennett does not believe this is inevitable, and he has convinced me that it need not be inevitable. We must plan wisely; we must display the resourcefulness and initiative in the prevention of crime that our Federal prisons exercise in its treatment; we must make sure that demobilization is intelligent and systematic; we must, above all, solve the basic problem of providing jobs, so that the real aims and purposes of the G. I. bill of rights may be realized. If we do these things—and again I say we must—we will go a long way toward preventing any widespread post-war crime wave. But even with success in attaining these objectives, we still must recognize that crime has never been, and will not be, entirely eradicated from the peacetime world, and that if our correction program is to play its part in organizing the kind of society we hope to have some of our out-moded procedures must be revamped and revitalized.

The correctional function of our Federal prisons is seriously handicapped by the fact that those responsible for planning and administering the treatment have nothing to say about the length of time required to accomplish the best results. Most prison officials can recall scores of prisoners who have adjusted well, who have made good use of the rehabilitative resources of the institution, and who, at the end of perhaps 2 or 3 years, have seemed fitted to return to the free community. But because their sentences must run for 6 or 10 or even 50 more years they retrogress, become "prisonized," and finally go out broken, dispirited, and embittered, probably to return to that or some other institution. It is difficult for us to put ourselves in the place of men who must spend years of their lives behind prison walls, but here is a letter to Director Bennett from one of them which may help us to do this:

Maybe you have asked yourself how can a man of even ordinary intelligence put up with this kind of life day in, day out, week after week, month after month, year after year. To put it more mildly still, what is this life of mine like? You might wonder whence do I draw sufficient courage to endure it. To begin with, these five words seem written in fire on the walls of my cell, "Nothing can be worth this." This—the kind of life I am leading.

No one knows what it is like to suffer from the intellectual atrophy, the pernicious mental scurvy that comes of long privations of all the things that make life real because even the analogy of thirst cannot possibly give you an inkling of what it is like to be tortured by the absence of everything that makes life worth living. A prisoner in prison cannot keep from being haunted by a vision of life as it used to be when it was real and lovely. At such times I pay with a sense of delicious overwhelming melancholy my tribute to life as it once was.

Not only should some steps be taken to insure that prisoners are released at the right time, but we should also do something about the disparity between sentences imposed for the same offense in different parts of the country. This is so great as to be ridiculous if it were not so tragic. For example, during the fiscal year 1944 the average sentence imposed upon Selective Service Act violators in Montana was less than 1 year; in my own State of Nebraska it was slightly less than 2 years; in New Jersey it was 3 years; in southern Ohio it was 4 years; and in South Dakota, 5 years.

There is no simple solution to these problems, of course, but the proposed Federal corrections bill, if enacted, would represent a step forward in fitting the sentence to the need of the individual offender, as well as in reducing the disparities between the sentences in different districts. This act would, you will remember, delay imposition of sentence in felony convictions for not more than 6 months after commitment to the institution. During that period the Federal board of correction would study the case, interview the offender, and recommend a sentence which the judge might, although he need not, impose. It is a proposal recommended to Congress by a distinguished group of judges, including the Chief Justice of the United States and the Attorney General, which should have our prompt attention.

Attorney General Biddle and his staff are giving a great deal of thought to this and other measures which will help solve some of the problems we must squarely face during the years of readjustment. The Attorney General and the great Department of Justice over which he presides have had to cope with many vexatious questions during the war, but they will have no less important or difficult situations to solve in the days ahead. He and his staff believe that out of the ferment of war and in the making of a sound peace may come opportunities for notable changes. In an era when many values deemed immutable have proved transitory, when faith in the inevitability of progress in many realms has been shaken, the advance of Federal law enforcement and the Federal prison program through the last decade should be a source of satisfaction and pride to all lovers of democracy.

The problems of our prisons and those who get into them cannot be ignored; they cannot be shrugged off; they are in our midst, and they are real. Let us then not fall below the standard suggested by the leader of one of our great allies, Mr. Winston Churchill, when he says:

The mood and temper of the public with regard to the treatment of crime and criminals is one of the most unfailing tests of the civilization of any country.

A calm, dispassionate recognition of the rights of the accused, and even of the convicted criminal against the state—a constant heart-searching by all charged with the duty of punishment—a desire and an eagerness to rehabilitate in the world of industry those who have paid their due in the hard coinage of punishment; tireless efforts toward the

discovery of curative and regenerative processes; unfailing faith that there is treasure, if you can only find it, in the heart of every man.

These are the symbols which in the treatment of crime and criminal mark and measure the stored up strength of a nation and are a sign and proof of the living virtue in it.

Communists in Our Armed Forces

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, when Earl Browder, the leader of the Communist Party, came out on yesterday and boasted that "of course there are Communists holding commissions in the United States Army," it was enough to sound an alarm in every American home, and especially every home that has a son in our armed forces.

What could be more dangerous to our country's safety, or more detrimental to the morale of our fighting men, than to place in key positions individuals who are devoted to the destruction of everything we are fighting for.

Remember that Earl Browder was a Trotskyite Communist and was lined up with Trotsky in plotting the overthrow of this Government at a time when Trotsky was murdering Christians by the millions in Russia, and even later when Trotsky was plotting the murder of Stalin himself.

If Browder and his gang had succeeded in their subversive designs, we would not have had a ship or a shell with which to defend ourselves when Pearl Harbor was attacked. Thousands of our brave young men have already paid with their lives for the strikes in our defense plants which these un-American elements have inspired.

The people of this country are sick and tired of having Earl Browder and his communistic cohorts attempt to smear patriotic Americans by referring to them as "Nazis" or "Fascists" or "Bourbons" or "reactionaries," when their sons are dying by the thousands to defend this country against enemies from without while they are trying to protect it against enemies from within.

The Communists holding commissions in the Army to which Browder refers as a rule are not on the firing line. They are in key positions such as the intelligence service, or communications service, where they can secure the most valuable information touching our war efforts; or else they are engaged as instructors in indoctrination centers where they preach their un-American propaganda in broken English to their communistic cohorts and parlor pink sympathizers, or drum it into the ears of our servicemen who cannot help themselves.

These subversive elements must be driven from power. No wonder they want to get rid of the Committee on Un-American Activities. It is in their way.

As a member of that committee, I can assure Earl Browder now, and I can assure the American people, that we are not going to be intimidated from our course.

We are going to select the finest investigating staff this country affords.

We are going to turn the pitiless sunlight of merciless publicity on to these subversive elements and organizations that are now attempting to undermine this Government and destroy the American way of life.

We are going to expose their lying propaganda and their insidious work of subversive indoctrinations in these so-called centers, as well as their stooges in our great educational institutions, in the press, and on the radio.

We are going to do our best to save America for Americans.

It Is Up to Congress

REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper headlines reveal that 13,500 workers in the Dodge plant in Detroit have been idle for 8 days. Other strikes in war production brings the total absentee strikers to 27,050. It is estimated that a total of 6,550 more vital war workers are idle because of a shortage of parts due to the walk-outs.

In the news also are demands by John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers for an increase of 10 and 15 cents an hour for second and third shift work; an increase in vacation pay from the present $50 to $100; pay for 6 holidays and for travel to and from the coal face; elimination of differentials within and between districts and many others. In addition Lewis demands that a 10-cent royalty on every ton of soft coal mined be paid by the operators to the United Mine Workers treasury. The union leader gave notice on February 26 to the Secretary of Labor "that a labor dispute exists between the United Mine Workers of America and the bituminous coal operators." This notice for a strike vote to be held within 30 days, as provided in the Smith-Connally Act, was made even though he had not sat down to discuss the negotiation of the contract with the operators and determine the chances of settling any disagreement between the parties.

There is no surprise in the minds of the American people that John L. Lewis is ever ready to call a strike to gain his objectives. We are aware of what these coal mine strikes have cost. The first wartime strike which he called was in the fall of 1941. His purpose was to win a closed shop in the steel mills' captive mines. This strike caused the loss of nearly 1,000,000 man-days of work. In 1943 strikes to break the Little Steel formula in behalf of coal miners cost 7,510,397 man days and 39,000,000 tons of coal to the war effort.

A shut-down in 1945 would mean a much more damaging condition than at any time before in the history of the Nation. Many factories, railroads, and utilities have only a few days' supply of coal at their disposal. As a result, it has become necessary that thermostats be kept at a maximum of 68 degrees, that display lighting be eliminated, that some railroad passenger service be discontinued. A coal strike now would postpone the day of victory for our armed forces. From past experience, there is little reason to believe that John L. Lewis will be moved by such considerations.

We are faced with the choice of capitulating to the far-reaching demands of Lewis or curbing his destructiveness. To yield to any great degree would cause an inflationary trend in all wages and prices.

Those to whom it has fallen their lot to mine coal during this war should make their arrangements to continue at the job even if they would be denied certain increases in wages which may or may not be justified. That would not be asking too much of them when millions of Americans on land, sea, and in the air carry the fight to the enemy without quibbling over wages or conditions under which they work.

It is up to Congress to provide the urgent legislation to meet this most critical situation. The manpower bill now being debated in the Senate should carry a provision that workers engaged in war-essential occupations be subjected to jail sentences or inducted immediately into the armed services should they strike for any reason, however valid, during the existence of the present world conflict. The occasion demands this drastic action.

Procurement and Assignment Service for Physicians, Dentists, and Veterinarians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

NOTES ON THE PROCUREMENT AND ASSIGNMENT SERVICE

GENERAL

The Procurement and Assignment Service for Physicians, Dentists, and Veterinarians has been operating since before Pearl Harbor. Sanitary engineers and nurses were added about 18 months ago. The physicians and the dentists have been organized by county and State committees who have worked on a combined front of recruiting for the armed services from the group declared to be available for military service. The closest kind of relationship with the Selective Service System, the Army, and the Navy has been maintained, and in almost no instance has any member of these professions considered essential to the civilian economy been taken. On the other hand, the active recruitment

efforts of this network of local committees has resulted in every possible available doctor and dentist who was acceptable to the services being procured for them.

The original directing board of the Procurement and Assignment Service, whose appointment was approved by the President, consisted of four doctors and one dentist: Dr. Frank H. Lahey, chairman, the Lahey Clinic, Boston, Mass.; Dr. Harvey B. Stone, vice chairman, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Dr. Harold S. Diehl, dean of medical sciences, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Dr. James E. Paullin, professor of clinical medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, Ga.; Dr. C. Willard Camalier, past president of American Dental Association, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Abel Wolman, professor of sanitary engineering, the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., was added to represent the sanitary engineers.

When nursing was added to the functions, two nurse members were added to the directing board: Miss Laura Grant, director of nursing service, New Haven Hospital, New Haven, Conn.; Miss Katharine Tucker, department of nursing education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

NURSING DIVISION

The procurement and assignment service for nurses operates through 867 local and State committees. These committees are made up of the prominent members of the nursing profession in the various communities and, in addition, the committees have citizen or lay members, and sometimes local physicians and others. The nurse members are usually those who have taken a prominent part in organized community service, like the visiting nurse services, hospitals, schools of nursing, and so forth. Each field of nursing is represented—teaching, private duty, public health, and so forth. Committees often have on them some staff member of the local hospital group. On the whole they are very representative.

The State chairman for nurses is usually a nurse who has given a great deal of time to nursing activities, is influential both professionally and otherwise, and who has a position which permits her to devote a good deal of time to procurement and assignment service activities. All serve without compensation and work hard. Most of their tasks are accomplished by meeting together in the evening. A limited amount of paid clerical assistance is supplied to the larger committees by the War Manpower Commission. Four nurses on the Federal staff help with problem areas.

The determinations of what nurses are in essential positions and what nurses are available for military service are made by these local committees on the basis of standards and policies established by the national directing board of the procurement and assignment service. These standards and policies are worked out by national nursing advisory committees in the various fields of nursing.

The National Nursing Advisory Committee, in addition to the two members of the directing board, is made up of the following people: Miss Irene Murchison, Colorado State Board of Nurse Examiners, Denver, Colo.; Miss M. Annie Leitch, director of school of nursing, Butterworth Hospital, Grand Rapids, Mich.; Miss Lola Knoller, American Nurses Association, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Edward Walsh, American Red Cross, Clayton, Mo.; Dr. Claude W. Munger, director, St. Luke's Hospital, New York, N. Y.; Miss Alma C. Haupt, director, nursing service, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York, N. Y.

These people all have a national reputation in their field and have devoted a great deal of their time to furthering the profession of nursing, and during wartime have worked continuously on joint projects with governmental agencies.

The National Nursing Council for War Service, Inc., which is made up of representatives of all the national nursing organizations, recommended and supports the Procurement and Assignment Service, and believes firmly that professional groups must have a controlling influence in the selection of the nurses for the military, and in determining what are the essential positions in the community.

During the past year, the committees of the Procurement and Assignment Service have made lists of all nurses under their jurisdiction; altogether about 240,000. It has classified these nurses according to the type of work they are doing and has accumulated a list of about 50,000 nurses immediately available for military service. It is estimated that about 32,000 of this number are unmarried. Of the total 50,000 nurses available, about 50 percent are private-duty nurses. Others come from hospitals, institutions, and so forth, that had a staff more numerous than the ceiling allowed.

Since the Army needs for nurses became acute last fall, the Procurement and Assignment Service has worked diligently to make the maximum number of nurses available, stressing the immediate availability of large numbers of private-duty nurses and of recent graduates. It has worked also to bring inactive nurses back into service, suggesting ways and means in which married nurses might help out in part-time positions and relieve some eligible for military service so they could join the Army. It is estimated that 15,000 nurses who were inactive have been brought back into essential nursing.

Since the War Department has said it will accept the applications of all volunteers, regardless of classification, the Procurement and Assignment Service has cooperated closely with the American Red Cross and with the Army Service Command headquarters to be of all possible assistance in safeguarding the nurses in the essential positions, especially in schools of nursing.

QUOTAS

The quotas were established by the staff in the central office of the Procurement and Assignment Service in cooperation with the United States Public Health Service statistical experts and are based on a formula giving due weight to the density of nurse population and its relationship to the total number of citizens to be served and also giving due weight to the number of nurses graduating in the period September 1, 1944, to April 30, 1945.

The existing quotas (see tables) have been worked out on the basis of the Army's ceiling of 50,000 nurses. New quotas on the basis of the Army's new ceiling of 60,000 are in the process of preparation.

Nurse quotas starting Jan. 1, 1945, by States, percentages of total quota

States in order of size of quota	Quota starting Jan. 1, 1945	Percent of total quota	Cumulative percent of total quota
Total	15,000	100.0	100.0
New York	1,896	12.6	12.6
Pennsylvania	1,676	11.2	23.8
Illinois	1,163	7.8	31.6
California	970	6.5	38.0
Massachusetts	969	6.5	44.5
Ohio	839	5.6	50.1
New Jersey	627	4.2	54.3
Minnesota	537	3.6	57.8
Michigan	500	3.3	61.2
Maryland	388	2.6	63.8
Connecticut	378	2.5	66.3
Texas	351	2.3	68.6
Indiana	312	2.1	70.7
Missouri	298	2.0	72.7
Iowa	292	2.0	74.6
Wisconsin	274	1.8	76.5
Washington	257	1.7	78.2
Tennessee	198	1.3	79.5
North Carolina	185	1.2	80.7

Nurse quotas starting Jan. 1, 1945, by States, percentages of total quota—Continued

States in order of size of quota	Quota starting Jan. 1, 1945	Percent of total quota	Cumulative percent of total quota
Oregon	158	1.1	81.8
Maine	157	1.1	82.8
Virginia	155	1.0	83.9
Georgia	153	1.0	84.9
Rhode Island	142	1.0	85.8
Kentucky	141	1.0	86.8
Colorado	137	0.9	87.7
Montana	135	0.9	88.6
Kansas	128	0.9	89.4
West Virginia	122	0.8	90.3
Florida	118	0.8	91.0
Alabama	114	0.8	91.8
South Carolina	111	0.7	92.5
New Hampshire	111	0.7	93.3
Louisiana	111	0.7	94.0
District of Columbia	110	0.7	94.8
Oklahoma	107	0.7	95.5
Nebraska	105	0.7	96.2
Delaware	80	0.5	96.7
Vermont	76	0.5	97.2
Arizona	70	0.5	97.7
Utah	63	0.4	98.1
North Dakota	61	0.4	98.5
South Dakota	52	0.3	98.8
Arkansas	50	0.3	99.2
Mississippi	48	0.3	99.5
Idaho	46	0.3	99.8
Wyoming	11	0.1	99.9
Nevada	10	0.1	99.9
New Mexico	8	0.1	100.0

Active graduate nurses classified to Jan. 1, 1945

	Estimated active graduate nurses	Total nurses classified Jan. 1, 1945	Inactive nurses classified Jan. 1, 1945	Active nurses classified Jan. 1, 1945	Percent of total active nurses classified Jan. 1, 1945
Total	222,552	234,837	47,541	187,296	84.2
Alabama	2,460	2,243	385	1,858	75.5
Arizona	1,126	1,143	354	789	70.1
Arkansas	877	927	8	919	104.8
California	17,104	19,898	8,332	11,566	67.6
Colorado	1,953	2,656	538	2,118	108.4
Connecticut	5,475	7,645	2,902	4,743	86.6
Delaware	596	670	98	572	96.0
Dist. of Columbia	2,522	2,839	63	2,776	110.1
Florida	3,065	4,022	434	3,588	117.1
Georgia	2,964	3,992	699	3,293	111.1
Idaho	525	566	178	388	73.9
Illinois	14,317	15,013	1,906	13,107	91.5
Indiana	4,605	5,228	1,292	3,936	85.5
Iowa	3,075	5,766	2,564	3,202	104.1
Kansas	2,439	3,419	1,202	2,217	90.9
Kentucky	2,733	2,305	184	2,121	77.6
Louisiana	2,735	2,733	726	2,007	73.4
Maine	1,649	910	310	600	36.4
Maryland	3,908	3,287	562	2,725	69.7
Massachusetts	9,708	7,007	484	6,523	67.2
Michigan	8,886	13,507	3,119	10,388	116.9
Minnesota	5,282	5,159	126	5,033	95.3
Mississippi	1,442	-------	-------	-------	-------
Missouri	5,610	4,712	363	4,349	77.5
Montana	944	1,094	301	793	84.0
Nebraska	1,683	1,887	376	1,511	89.8
Nevada	214	527	193	334	156.1
New Hampshire	1,195	1,908	792	1,116	93.4
New Jersey	8,312	7,352	1,433	5,919	71.2
New Mexico	520	734	344	390	75.0
New York	35,400	35,092	6,479	28,613	72.3
North Carolina	4,050	3,563	636	2,927	51.6
North Dakota	959	718	223	495	55.6
Ohio	11,932	7,351	719	6,632	74.9
Oklahoma	1,587	1,214	26	1,188	76.9
Oregon	2,117	1,938	309	1,629	77.9
Pennsylvania	18,069	17,455	3,380	14,075	115.2
Rhode Island	1,283	2,166	688	1,478	124.9
South Carolina	1,965	2,455	-------	2,455	42.9
South Dakota	903	387	-------	387	98.2
Tennessee	2,787	3,127	391	2,736	66.4
Texas	7,476	6,392	1,429	4,963	59.7
Utah	875	584	62	522	105.7
Vermont	977	1,872	839	1,033	88.5
Virginia	3,874	4,458	1,028	3,430	76.5
Washington	3,073	2,408	56	2,352	75.1
West Virginia	2,300	2,294	567	1,727	91.7
Wisconsin	4,647	4,704	441	4,263	-------
Wyoming	354	-------	-------	-------	-------
National Classification Committee	-------	7,510	-------	7,510	-------

Nurses Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 27, 1945.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned group of graduate, registered nurses, temporarily residing in Washington, are seriously concerned with the present status of the Nurses' Selective Service Act of 1945, known as bill H. R. 2277, and solicit your consideration of the following facts which are representative of our group thinking. We present these facts as interested individuals and not as representatives of any professional group or agency.

As nurses, our first concern is the assurance that our men in military service receive adequate nursing care, and we have reluctantly come to the conclusion that a nurse draft is necessary if this is to be accomplished quickly. We believe, however, that there are certain objectionable features in bill H. R. 2277 as it now stands, which will adversely affect the care of civilians as well as result in inferior service to the sick and wounded in the armed forces. We appreciate the privilege of bringing these objectionable features, as we see them, to your attention.

1. THE COMPULSORY INDUCTION OF ALL CADET NURSES TO OTHER ELIGIBLE NURSES

When thousands of young women entered the Cadet Nurse Corps, they did so with the explicit promise of the United States Government that they could choose the type of essential nursing they would give for a specified length of time, following their training. In other words, they were told that they would not be required to enter military service. The induction of cadet nurses prior to the induction of other nurses constitutes a breach of faith on the part of the United States Government with the cadet nurses, their parents, those who helped recruit them, and the institutions that expanded their resources to teach them. The Bolton bill might be amended to make all future cadet nurses subject to military service, but retroactive action will not only break faith, but will undoubtedly cause serious disruption to the cadet nurse service in our civilian hospitals.

A high percentage of the nursing service in civilian hospitals is being done by student nurses. Any considerable number of resignations from the Cadet Corps, because of objections to a nurse draft, would constitute a serious hazard to the maintenace of adequate civilian nursing care. The future recruitment of other cadet students would also markedly curtailed.

We believe that the young nurse has much to contribute to the military service but the induction of all eligible cadet nurses prior to that of any other nurses as required by the bill, seems unwise. By a better distribution of nurses of all age groups between the civilian and military services, both will have the benefits of the experience and mature judgment of the older nurses.

2. THE ASSIGNMENT TO MILITARY SERVICE OF NURSES FROM SUBSTANDARD SCHOOLS

A nurse in military service must have had professional training that will permit her to give highly skilled nursing care to the sick and wounded, frequently under adverse working conditions with little or no medical supervision; be able to make vital decisions involving the safeguarding of human life; and to give training and supervision to military corpsmen. In order to carry the responsibilities of military service, the nurse should have had a wide variety of hospital experiences under close supervision, and a thorough technical education which cannot be given in very small hospitals with limited services, equipment, and teaching personnel. We believe that nurses from these substandard schools may be much more safely employed in civilian hospitals where more strict supervision can be maintained.

We believe that if this bill is passed as it now stands it will have a serious effect upon future nursing education. The giving of military rank and professional recognition to graduates of substandard schools will place them in positions of responsibility for which they are poorly prepared, and will stimulate the establishment of more substandard schools of nursing.

While there are a considerable number of substandard schools of nursing in the United States, the number of students in each school is so small that their graduates make up only about 3 percent of the total of each year's graduates. The small number of these graduates available for military service will not aid this program materially, but their assignment to positions of responsibility will jeopardize the future standards of nursing education.

We recognize that in your position you will have very important decisions to make during these momentous times. Our opinions, as herein expressed, are offered in a spirit of helpfulness to those who are guiding us through this critical period.

Very truly yours,

OLIVIA T. PETERSON,
Registered Nurse (Minneapolis, Hennepin County).
ELLEN L. AIRD,
Registered Nurse (Minneapolis, Hennepin County).
IDA MACDONALD,
Registered Nurse (Minneapolis, Hennepin County).
GERTRUDE BANFIELD,
Registered Nurse (Austin, Mower County).
ELSBETH H. VAUGHAN,
Registered Nurse (Duluth, St. Louis County).
ELLA GIMMESTAD,
Registered Nurse (Belview, Redwood County).
ESTHER GILBERTSON,
Registered Nurse (Glencoe, McLeod County).

From Yahweh to Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Milton Mayer, which appeared in the Progressive of March 5, 1945:

FROM YAHWEH TO YALTA

(By Milton Mayer)

"And what," said my eminent friend, the editor of a great magazine, "do you think of Yalta?"

"The same thing," I replied, "that I thought of Munich, with Churchill and Roosevelt and Stalin batting for Chamberlain, Daladier, and Hitler, respectively, and poor little Poland batting for poor little Czechoslovakia. And what," I went on, "do you think of Yalta?"

"I," said my eminent friend, "think it is hopeful."

"Why?" I said.

"Why?" he said.

"Yes; why?" I said.

"Well," he said, "well—well; damn it all, a man has got to believe in something."

"Ah, so he has," said I.

And within a week my friend who has got to believe in something, and has nothing to believe in but Yalta, had written an editorial declaring that Yalta was a hard-headed decision, a victory for realism, and a genuine step forward toward American participation in world affairs.

THE SHOCKING PART

My friend did not declare that Yalta was the new Magna Carta and the realization of the hopes and dreams of the common man. But this was because my friend's magazine is a reactionary, bloated with advertising and crazy with power. Yalta merely looked good, sound, and workable to my friend's reactionary magazine.

It took the liberals to discover that Yalta was, in very fact, the modern Bethlehem. Only instead of the three wise men coming to worship before the miracle of miracles, this time the wise men produced it.

No child of 5 or over should have been shocked by Yalta. The hypocrisy of mentioning the Atlantic Charter—more properly known, I would suppose, as the Bottom-of-the-Atlantic Charter—is nothing new in the last 3 years. True, the hypocrisy was a little more livid on this occasion, in view of the fact that Mr. Roosevelt had just announced that there was no such animal as the charter, and a little more brazen, in view of the fact that Yalta's sole solid achievement was the partition of Poland, and the charter's first clause alleges that none of the signatories seeks territorial aggrandizement.

But none of this—not after 3 years beginning with Darlan and ending with Bonomi—was shocking. What was shocking—or should have been—was the ecstasy with which the battered and bleeding liberals received the news of their grisly fate and the world's. Like one man, or rather like one slave, that section of the press represented by the Nation and PM, and of the radio represented by Raymond Gram Swing, burbled deliriously at the wisdom and charity of the "big three"—no longer the "big three" nations but the "big three" men.

READ AND WEEP

This, my friends, is unconditional surrender—unconditional surrender of freemen and free minds to the theory of the divinity of kings. This is the awful plight of people who have got to believe in something and have nothing to believe in. This is what the anti-Democrats from Hobbes, who called democracy a government of orators, to Hitler, who call it a government of politicians, meant when they poured out their scorn upon parliamentary institutions. This—this theory that one man, or two men or three men, could say, "I am the law," and make it stick—was the ground for the American Revolution.

This unconditional surrender to the divinity of kings comes hard to the liberals, but it comes. For 4 years now they have been earning their living on the flat of their backs and it's only a matter now of beginning each wayward week end with a cheer and winding up with a prayer. Thus, the New Republic, which begins its editorial on the Crimea Conference at Yalta with the statement that "we have moved a step closer to realization of Dumbarton Oaks," closes it as follows:

"All over the world, people are demanding peace, security, and freedom, and in that sense, time is on the side of the angels. It

remains for us to do our part by fighting, through every means at our command, for a decent peace and a decent world after the peace."

Just skip the middle of the editorial and feel wonderful with the editors of the New Republic. Or read it and weep. I quote five successive sentences from the peroration, or semiwind-up, and with no excisions:

"Are we any closer to permanent peace? Yes; a little, insofar as we have moved a step nearer to a new world organization. True, the plans for the future of Germany seem to carry within themselves the seeds of a third world war, for the reasons stated above. But we are no worse off in this respect after Yalta than we were before. The hopeful fact here is that plans are not permanent."

WHO ARE THESE BIG THREE?

Here we have the party line explicit for the doctrine that the kings can do no wrong: Yalta is a step toward permanent peace; but it is also a step toward the third world war; still, the kings have left us no worse off than we were before they assembled; or, if you insist that they have, remember that they may change their minds. We can always pray. But we cannot carp, because then we would be against Yalta and to be against God, after the second coming in the Crimea, is to be for the devil in Berlin.

Tempora, hell! Mores, my eye! If these "big three" men had been chosen for wisdom and virtue, if they were the finest flower of mankind, they would still be mere men, fallible and heavy laden with the fallen nature that fetters us all. But who are they, these Big Three? One is a dictator-tyrant, much like Adolf Hitler except for the size of his mustache and the religion of his victims; one an atavistic imperialist who uses the word "democracy," like Pericles before him, to describe an aristocracy at home based on a slave empire abroad; and one a chameleon politician, sentimental, good-natured, riding the New Deal, the War Deal, the Old Deal, depending on which one is winning, and without the redeeming feature of singleness of purpose that characterizes the other two.

A man, as my friend said, has got to believe in something.

Does he have to believe in this?

Needed Amendments to Nurses Draft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New York Times of March 3, 1945:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Nurses Selective Service Act should, no doubt, be put into effect immediately, because there should be no delay in providing skilled nursing care for the war wounded. It is equally important, however, that such legislation should be written in a form to bring about desirable results. The bill which the Times of February 20 reports as approved by the House Military Affairs Committee should be revised now to avoid future difficulty.

First, a compulsory registration of all nurses is imperative, since a major difficulty in the current nursing crisis is that no one actually knows how many nurses there are in the United States. It has been estimated that we have 400,000 graduates of accredited schools able to give at least part-time service if need be, and about 275,000 of these are now active in their profession, including approximatly 53,000 in military service. It will cost the Government very little more to register all of them. The bill as approved by the committee applies only to nurses between 20 and 45 who are unmarried.

A high proportion of nurses marry soon after graduation. They make excellent mothers, and exemptions should be granted to bona-fide homemakers. The military services do not now accept nurses with dependents under 14. It would, however, be a mistake to overlook those nurses without real home responsibilities who choose to find in marriage an excuse for not devoting their needed professional skills to helping win the war.

CIVILIAN NEEDS HEAVY

The situation in civilian hospitals is really desperate. The nursing staff of the visiting nurse service of New York is 30 percent below its pre-war figure, and most health agencies have a similar shortage of staff. A recent study of public health nursing resources in Greater New York—both health department and private nursing agency staff—revealed approximately 1 public health nurse to 9,000 population. Revised wartime standards for public health practice state, as a minimum, 1 public health nurse to 5,000 population.

Second, I am glad to see that nurses classified as essential by the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission will not be inducted, and that nurses employed by the Veterans' Administration will be considered essential. As a member of the National Committee on Allocation of Medical Personnel of the Procurement and Assignment Service, I know the careful attention given to the criteria for classification of all nurses. Nearly 900 Procurement and Assignment Service committees all over the country have classified about 235,000 nurses during the past year and a half, and in so doing have secured the greatest body of information about nurses to be had anywhere. This information should be used.

Third, a serious feature of the committee-approved bill is that it seems to exempt all other nurses until all United States Cadet Nurse Corps graduates have been inducted. A high percentage of service should be expected of the cadets, who are educated at public expense, but the number of cadets now available will not begin to fill the immediate need and those already graduated have received Government funds only during their senior year. The corps was organized in July 1943. The immediate effect of such a regulation would be to slow up volunteering of noncadet eligible nurses, even those doing unessential work, who should have answered the call to military service long ago. Volunteering must continue while a draft law is being shaped and put into operation if our wounded are not to suffer for lack of nursing care.

PROPOSED RULE DISAPPROVED

But more important, the long-range effect of such a regulation will be to dry up the nursing service supply at the source. Cadet nurses were promised a choice between military service and essential work at home upon graduation. If the law is changed now many of those now in school may drop out. This must not happen. And think of the difficulty of recruiting students for new classes! It will be hard enough if nurses are the only women drafted, but if cadets are inevitably to be the first nurses taken, regardless of how many other nurses should be serving, the situation will be impossible.

Draft regulations can be so written as to place greater obligations upon cadets than upon other nurses without giving a blanket excuse from military service to all other nurses and without dragnetting the cadet graduate who should teach in a school of nursing or do other specialized work.

Fourth, the Committee on Military Affairs should think carefully before it lowers standards set up by the Army and Navy Nurse Corps by specifying that no nurse shall be disqualified because the school from which she received her training was affiliated with a hospital not having a specified number of beds or patients. Obviously, a nurse who has worked only in a very small hospital may never have seen types of injury and illness, including communicable diseases, that are prevalent in military hospitals. On first thought it is easy to say that an inexperienced nurse is better than no nurse, but it is more comprehensive than just having a person to attend the wounded. Both the Army and the Navy nurses teach and supervise the hospital corpsmen, and the skill and knowledge of these nurses has a far-reaching effect.

While there has been a great cry from nurses trained in schools that do not meet military standards, their numbers are not large. Only 90 of 1,300 schools in the country do not qualify, and since they are small, average only about 10 graduates each a year. Both Army and Navy have modified rules to admit nurses from these schools who have, subsequent to graduation, had adequate supplemental training in large hospitals.

Fifth, and finally, I hope the public will say that even a comprehensive draft of nurses will be inadequate without a national service act. It is not a question of discrimination. Nurses are proud that their skills are needed first. It is a question of use of those skills. Too many nurses are now washing dishes and scrubbing floors to keep civilian services in operation. Their entire time could be given to nursing duties if adequate auxiliary help could be secured.

There are a great many matters which might better be left to regulations than written into the text. I urge that the simplest sort of law be passed and then Selective Service and the War Manpower Commission work closely with nurses in setting up wise and fair regulations for carrying out the law. When over a third of all those of military age active in a profession have volunteered for military service—a remarkable record—we can trust that profession to guide a selective service procedure.

We cannot afford delay in getting nurses to the war wounded while we struggle with the inevitably tough job of passing a national service act for all women and men. But nurses want it clearly understood that they believe a draft of nurses alone is only piecemeal legislation and that the whole problem should be tackled as soon as possible.

MARIAN G. RANDALL,
Executive Director Visiting Nurse Service of New York.

NEW YORK, *February 28, 1945.*

The Draft of Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial on the draft of nurses by Janet M. Geister, registered nurse, editor, the Trained Nurse and Hospital Review, February 1945:

As this is written, the bill for drafting nurses is still before the House Committee

on Military Affairs. As it is read, the die will probably have been cast. Nurses will either have the doubtful distinction of being the first special group in our country's history to be singled out for a draft—or we will be free to make the volunteer system of recruiting more completely successful.

The shock to the profession of the President's demand for a draft was profound. Coming after a long series of major adjustments, it hit hard. First, we foreswore the lessons we had bitterly learned, of producing more nurses than the public would use. We added thousands upon thousands of students over our normal strength. We severely cut the length of undergraduate courses, doing so only because of war exigency. We lowered entrance requirements to nursing schools, standards won by patience and long toil. We moved over to let the Government enter nursing education. State registration rules were relaxed to bring in large numbers of nurses, otherwise ineligible. And, though the move to recognize and encourage the practical nurses shook the profession from stem to stern, we took it.

And all the while, through the months of war, nurses everywhere were lengthening their strides and hours. The departure of almost 50,000 nurses for war added extra loads to those left behind. Pre-war we had no marked unemployment. Most nurses were busy. War put a very heavy extra load on the existing supply of nurses. The bulk of the cadet crop will not emerge until late this year.

Few realize what a stupendous lot of nursing there is to do, and that many of us counted as active cannot do active nursing. The war has given us at present 450,000 military patients, all extra over normal times. Too, the 75,000 beds in veterans' hospitals are filling up fast. Nearly one and one-quarter million civilian hospital beds are full all the time. Sixteen and one-half million people are now members of the Blue Cross Hospital plans which paid $75,000,000 to the hospitals for care in 1944. The demand for this care is increasing.

Nursing-school faculties, teaching two and three cadet classes yearly, besides nurses' aides and refresher courses, are already 37 percent short. Public-health nurses, a big factor in our freedom from epidemics, are caring for many thousands of sick in their homes. Industrial nurses are vital to industry where many over-age, inexperienced, and handicapped people must be preserved. We need a great deal of nursing.

Recruitment and war manpower committees have labored valiantly to get nurses, but a lot of things were in the way. The Army several times changed its ceiling. First it was 40,000, then 50,000, then, I believe, 40,000 again. Now it is 60,000. Nurses, like all others, believed that the European war was about over, and needs were tapering. Only in December did we feel the great weight of the casualty lists.

Many other factors slowed up enlistments. The obstacle course the applicant had to run in getting into the services distinctly cooled ardor. The failure to use men graduates at all, and Negro nurses only scantily, the while we heard that "men were dying for want of nursing," did so too. The inclusion of soldiers' "dependents" in military hospitals, especially large numbers of obstetrical patients, contributed not one jot to good morale. Many nurses were held by a sense of duty to their unglamorous tasks; some employers and physicians and many consumers of nursing held invisible strings beyond the control of nurses; and bad planning at the top played its part too.

Two prime factors, in my judgment, definitely slowed up enlistments. Strange as it may seem, I am far from alone in my belief that we have run out of easily available nurses. Regardless of the statistical estimates, I have long thought that we do not have nearly as many workable nurses as is generally believed. That is why I feel deeply that a draft of nurses that arbitrarily removes 10,000 and more from civilian work, without concurrent official control of the distribution of nursing, and without bringing in other women to aid in all areas, will solve one problem but create a half dozen more.

No one knows precisely how many usable nurses there are. President Roosevelt stated: "There are 280,000 practicing graduate nurses in our country." Those of us who are registered in two States believe we are being counted twice. The War Nursing Council, citing the Procurement and Assignment Committee of the War Manpower Commission as its authority, places the present civilian active nurse total at 223,000. We accepted the War Manpower Commission estimate of 42,000 A–1 nurses as available for service, and we sounded the drums to get them out. Yet a few days ago Basil O'Connor, director of the American Red Cross, told an audience that a revaluation of this group left but 15,000 as likely to meet military requirements. A mandatory count to reveal if and where there are large hidden pools of nurses seems an imperative predraft requisite.

The other factor in slowing enlistments was, in my opinion, the growing sterility of the approach. For 3 years the "urgent need" has been cried. In time any story grows old and words lose their meaning. But all of the burden of the call to the colors was placed on the nurse alone. None was placed on the prescriber, the conveyor, the consumer of nursing, whose pleas or coercions were often very real influences in nurses' decisions. Recently appeals have gone to others besides nurses. They have been very polite. But much of the thunder directed at nurses was accusatory in tone. "You are there, young lady," it implied, "and we will increase our clamor until we flush you out." In our very zeal to help we, instead of pressing the public to take more care of its own mildly sick and to relieve us more, have unwillingly told it that a lot of nurses were slackers.

The public airing of nursing's problems has done some good, but it has also left its evils. In a quarter-page "ad" in the New York Herald Tribune January 23, 1945, the Woman's Home Companion appeals to women to do more, and tells that "not long ago when the Army appealed to 27,000 civilian nurses not engaged in essential nursing only 227 signed up." A feature writer in a leading paper says: "A few months ago when the Army called on 27,000 nurses listed as not doing essential nursing, only 760 answers were received." One woman told me the situation was disgraceful; another called it a national scandal. Our very failure to challenge these statements gives them tacit approval.

Over and over we hear the story of the famous 27,000. I want very much to know what happened to the 26,240 who did not answer; why out of 760, only 30 percent (226) were signed up. It is inconceivable to me that 26,240 fine American girls could emerge from nurses' training completely impervious to any need but their own. Yet that is the implication. I cannot believe that nurses are divided into two camps—the patriotic ones who go voluntarily, and the unpatriotic ones who go only on the arm of a policeman. It is not as simple as that.

How can anyone who knows nurses believe that the cause of our wounded men is not close to every true nurse's heart? I am not speaking of the slackers but of the average nurse that you and I know. Many, many, like me, have a very deep personal concern. Regardless of statistics, regardless of the despair of weary recruiting officers, we, who have lived and worked with nurses, who have seen the miracles of love and labor wrought daily, year after year by simple, selfless, superb rank-and-filers, cannot believe that nurses in large degree have finally and flatly turned a deaf ear to a mercy call. If they have, then we have a strange, new phenomenon in nursing that should shake us to our very bones.

Nurses' resentment over the draft threat was not at the needs it reflected, but at the draft itself. They feel that the volunteer system has not had a fair chance until only recently when common sense was injected into the requirements and routines of entry. A nurse with a poor bite, or without a high-school diploma, who has done her fine day's work for years in our hospitals, might conceivably be trusted to look after our lads. Happily now, peremptory rejections and 3 months' delays are rarer. Nurses' pride in their profession has been deeply stirred by the draft threat. They feel that the real slackers can be reached without putting a proud profession under a shadow.

Many agree with me, that rationing must accompany any further large withdrawal of nurses from civilian work, or the results can be disastrous. Only the most skillful balancing of quotas, plus a rigid guard on what nursing is left, can reduce the perils. And while nurses cannot be made in 6 weeks or 6 months, helpers trained in techniques can—and other women must help. It is wholly unrealistic to draft nurses, but to leave the potential helpers to their own inclinations.

"Before we go further, we must go deeper," said a wise man. Let too many more instructors sign up and who will teach our replacements? The danger of schools closing for want of instructors is real. Let too many more public health and industrial nurses drop their present restraints and sign up—and we at home can worry over the epidemic that can bring wholesale havoc. Let too many more hospital and private nurses, weary of the incriminations, walk out willy nilly to the services, and mayhap when our own people are ill, we shall call it sheer luck to find the care they need.

An uncontrolled "market" can find nurses concentrated in the employ of those with the greatest power over nurses. Nurses, unorganized in self-protection, are especially vulnerable to controls. Long years of regimentation come to plague us now. It is easy to say that older women can replace all the young. That is only partially true. There are places where the 60-year-old can replace the 30-year-old, but not many. The greater the strain, the more important it is to have the better preparation and greater physical strength of the young.

A draft of nurses alone is a piecemeal approach. It is fraught with peril. To remove 20,000 more civilian nurses without legal rationing and the provision of a rich well of supplementary aid, would, in my opinion, take care of our lads, but leave their families in jeopardy.

Whichever way the die is cast, a draft or no draft, American nurses in the main will continue to put service to others above thought of self. Feeling among them at the moment is high, yet ingrained discipline and deeply rooted altruism are tempering their resentment. The stake is higher than professional pride. The usefulness of a great profession to our servicemen, to our fellow citizens, and to the coming generation of nurses is before the bar. Our record so far is one of great fidelity to our purposes. I believe profoundly that whatever new facts are revealed by a draft, or by other means, that record will remain untarnished.

Questions and Answers on Nursing in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements:

THIRTY QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON NURSING IN WARTIME PREPARED IN COOPERATION WITH NATIONAL NURSING ORGANIZATIONS AND SERVICES BY THE NATIONAL NURSING COUNCIL FOR WAR SERVICE

I. ARMY AND NAVY NEEDS

1. How many nurses does the Army have now?

About 44,000.

How many nurses does the Army need by July 1945?

Sixteen thousand more, for a ceiling of 60,000, plus replacements.

2. How many nurses does the Navy have now?

About 9,165.

How many nurses does the Navy need by July 1945?

Two thousand three hundred and thirty-five more, for a total of 11,500.

3. What other types of nursing personnel, besides graduate nurses, are used by the armed forces?

Corps men (both Army and Navy), including WAC's and WAVES, nurses' aides, paid or volunteer (Army); civilian nurses, paid or volunteer (Army); senior cadet nurses, in Army and Navy hospitals in the United States. All work under supervision of Army or Navy nurses and doctors.

3. What do Army and Navy nurses do, besides bedside nursing?

They are also teachers, supervisors, administrators. They must function as officers in relation to those named above, and to their patients; therefore they hold commissioned rank as officers.

5. Who determines the professional and physical requirements?

The Army and the Navy, in the light of the responsibilities which the nurse must be prepared to take for herself and for others.

6. How long in relation to the war will the present military need continue?

Nursing service will have to continue being given for an indefinite period after the cessation of hostilities.

II. EXPANDING ARMY AND NAVY RESOURCES

7. Are Negro nurses being assigned to the armed forces?

The Army has assigned 330, stating that Negroes are accepted on the same basis as any other applicant. The Navy has assigned none as yet, but has stated readiness to accept any qualified applicant. Of the 8,000 Negro graduate nurses who are active in nursing, about 2,000 are believed potentially eligible for the Army or Navy.

8. Are men nurses being used by the Army?

Not as commissioned officers in the Army Nurse Corps. They have been subject to draft like other men, but are entitled to apply for officers' candidate schools the same as other soldiers and can be commissioned in the Medical Department. Of 8,169 men nurses (1940) possibly one-fourth are in the Army and Navy.

9. What about the schools not "approved"?

Out of approximately 1,300 State-accredited schools of nursing, about 90 have too limited clinical facilities, faculties, and instruction to prepare nurses adequately to meet requirements of the Army and Navy Nurse Corps. The Army and Navy believe such training should be supplemented by post-graduate work or by experience in a larger hospital under good supervision, to qualify graduates for the emergencies they must meet.

10. How can the graduates of schools not "approved" give service?

They can render essential service in civilian institutions; or, if sincerely interested in entering the Army or Navy Nurse Corps, they can obtain individual consideration of any supplementary education and experience. The numbers represented are estimated at 3 percent of the total number graduating.

11. Would raising the age limit or lowering the physical requirements materially strengthen the Army or Navy Nurse Corps?

In view of the responsibilities to be carried both in the United States and overseas, the Army and Navy Nurse Corps have repeatedly expressed belief that present standards must be maintained. It is pointed out that nurses rejected for reasons of age or physical condition, but eager to serve where they are needed, may apply either for (a) civilian status in an Army hospital or (b) an essential civilian nursing position, as in a Veterans' Administration hospital.

III. WHAT ARE GRADUATE, REGISTERED, STUDENT, CADET NURSES?

12. What is a graduate nurse?

One who has satisfactorily completed the basic professional program of study (usually 3 years) in a State-accredited school of nursing.

13. What is a registered nurse?

"R. N." or registered nurse is a graduate nurse who has met the legal qualifications to practice as a registered nurse in the State. The qualifications have been set to protect the public as well as the nurse

14. What is a student nurse?

Any person who is preparing for nursing in a State-accredited school of nursing. High-school graduation is a minimum educational requirement for entrance. There are now over 135,000 student nurses, giving an estimated 80 percent of the care to patients in the hospitals with which their schools are connected.

15. What is a cadet nurse?

A student nurse in any school participating in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps program established in the United States Public Health Service under the Bolton Act, July 1, 1943, who has joined the Corps and promised to engage in essential military or civilian nursing for the duration of the war, and is receiving a Federal scholarship under the act. The law as passed does not obligate the cadet to enter military service. Approximately 77 percent of the present undergraduate student body belong to the Cadet Nurse Corps, but the proportion is less among upper classmen than lower. About 10,500 cadet nurses have graduated thus far. They entered training before Bolton Act funds were available and transferred to the Cadet Corps at its inception or later, in the belief that they were free to choose either essential civilian or military nursing upon graduation.

16. What is a senior cadet?

After completing her basic program of study (24–30 months), but before she has had enough supervised practice to qualify for graduation, a cadet nurse may have 6 months' supervised practice in this country in either a Government hospital (Army, Navy, Veterans, U. S. Public Health Service, or Indian Service) or a civilian agency, which may be the hospital with which her school is associated. As a senior cadet, she is paid by the hospital employing her. Fully 10,000 senior cadets applied for Federal service up to January 1, 1945. More than 24,000 cadet nurses will become senior cadets between July 1, 1944, and June 30, 1945.

IV. HOW MANY NURSES?

17. How many graduate nurses are there?

Two hundred and seventy-four thousand four hundred and five is the number of active graduate nurses estimated January 1, 1945, including the 53,165 now serving with the armed forces. The number inactive but available in case of emergency is somewhat greater. The number of all graduate nurses, including those inactive, retired, and unavailable because of health or family responsibilities, is sometimes estimated as over 400,000.

18. What information is there about the total numbers of nurses, their age, location, marital status, and availability?

None that is entirely accurate, inclusive, and up to date.

A mandatory registration or census of all nurses at this time has been strongly recommended by national nursing organizations, as supplying information that is greatly needed. They believe it should include both married and unmarried nurses, and those aged at least up to 65.

(NOTE.—"Registration" is used here in the meaning of census or inventory; elsewhere it is used to refer to the State procedures under which a graduate nurse is registered to practice as a registered nurse.)

19. How many are expected to graduate during 1945?

Thirty-two thousand, five hundred and eighty-seven, of whom 20,842 are cadet nurses. A large proportion of the total will graduate in September.

20. How many nurses are eligible for military service?

About 60 percent of the active civilian nurses are estimated as potentially eligible, being under 45, and not having children under 14. Included are those who may be physically disqualified.

21. How many nurses are now serving with the armed forces?

About one out of five active nurses (53,165). When present Army and Navy ceilings are reached, with the assignment of 18,335 additional, the proportion will be about 1 out of 4.

V. BALANCING CIVILIAN—MILITARY NEEDS

22. Are there enough graduate nurses for both military and civilian needs?

Yes; provided civilian nursing is reduced to minimum standards by a selective withdrawal to the military, and nurses not in essential positions do essential nursing.

23. How can persons not professional nurses help to relieve the civilian nurse shortage?

As nurse's aides, practical nurses, attendants, orderlies, employed as either volunteers or paid staff in a wide variety of positions. Hospital personnel shortages are particularly acute.

24. What protection is there for the nursing services most essential to civilian health?

Criteria have been developed by the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission for every field of nursing, as a means for determining whether a nurse should enter military service or whether she is essential in her present position, in order to maintain minimum essential civilian services. Using voluntary methods, 867 procurement and assignment committees of nurses, hospital, and medical authorities have since July 1, 1943, classified 235,000 nurses in one of the following:

I. Available for military service and potentially eligible;

II. Available for relocation into more essential positions;

III. Essential in present position for a limited time;

IV. Essential for unlimited duration; and

V. Not available for military or civilian duties.

Any nurse not in agreement with her classification may appeal it.

The natural nursing organizations have gone on record as urging the continuation and strengthening of procurement and assignment service procedures, as an orderly way of providing for military needs.

25. Is there a shortage of instructors in schools of nursing?

Yes; the shortage has increased greatly since the beginning of the war. Schools are now admitting 76 percent more students than in 1940. The condition is considered grave unless those remaining in essential positions can be retained.

26. What about nurses for Veterans' Administration hospitals?

A serious shortage exists. To the 4,150 nurses now employed must be added at least 3,000 by July 1. Veterans' nurses are in civilian service. They have been classed in IV, as essential for unlimited duration.

VI. VOLUNTARY RESPONSE

27. How many nurses have volunteered?

Red Cross records show a total, from Pearl Harbor to January 1, 1943, of 81,145 certified to the Army and Navy as meeting all professional requirements and indicating a definite date of availability. In addition, the Navy has handled several thousand applications direct. Without counting those rejected earlier, the record shows 30 percent of all active nurses have applied and been certified.

28. How do nurses join the armed forces?

(1) Procurement and Assignment Service committees classify nurses, notifying the Red Cross of those classified "available." In January 1945, they also began notifying the Army and Navy of those so classified.

(2) The Red Cross recruits those available. As the official recruiting agency for Army and Navy Nurse Corps it arranges publicity, rallies, personal interviews, etc.; checks credentials of nurses applying; certifies to Army and Navy those found professionally qualified. The Army and Navy have in recent months undertaken a more active program of procurement, publicity, etc., in cooperation with the Red Cross.

(3) The Army and Navy assign to duty, from those certified, nurses who are professionally qualified and who pass physical examinations.

29. What has the voluntary response been since the President's message January 6, 1945?

(1) Applications. Approximately 15,700 applications were filed with Red Cross recruitment committees, January 8 to February 24. Over one-third of these were filed in the first week; the number was diminished each successive week to approximately 800 in the last week.

(2) Certifications. During the same period 9,641 nurses have been professionally certified by the Red Cross to the military for appointment. The difference between the number of applications and the number certified may be explained by duplicate applications, nurses not yet registered, applicants who do not meet professional requirements, cases that need further study, or applications still to be completed.

(3) Assignments. Approximately 4,000 have been commissioned and ordered to active duty in the Army during January and February. The number of actual assignments does not reflect the volume of applications because of the applicants' stated date when available, failure to meet physical qualifications, or the time required to process applications.

30. What are the prospects for enough voluntary applications?

Increased publicity and promotion now in progress through the War Advertising Council, Office of War Information, Red Cross, Army, Navy, and nursing organizations, may produce more. On the other hand, favorable progress of the war in Europe may slow up response.

VII. WHAT NURSING ORGANIZATIONS BELIEVE

The position of the national nursing organizations on war-nursing needs may be summed up briefly:

(1) The care of wounded servicemen is the first responsibility of the nursing profession.

(2) Nurses' voluntary response has been outstanding, but not rapid enough to keep pace with mounting casualties or with the newly raised Army Nurse Corps ceiling of 60,000.

(3) Selective service for nurses is acceptable as the first step in selective service for all women, but this should be supplemented by a National Service Act applying to all men and women.

(4) Wth one-fourth of all active nurses in the armed forces, civilian nursing should operate on a carefully planned minimum, in which every nurse does essential nursing.

(5) Civilian health requires more assistance by men and women, paid or volunteer, at every level where they are competent to serve in health agencies and institutions.

(6) Efforts should be made to increase the number of students in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps as a present major source of nursing care for civilians and a reservoir of future care for the armed forces.

(7) Military nursing needs should be met on a selective basis—whether voluntary or under draft—so that nurses most difficult to replace in key civilian positions are among the last to be taken.

(8) Voluntary recruitment should be intensified and nurses who are eligible and available should enlist now, regardless of legislation, because the need is now.

Coordinated activities

War nursing activities are coordinated through the National Nursing Council for War Service, established in 1940 as the Nursing Council on National Defense.

Included in it are representatives of the American Nurses' Association; National League of Nursing Education; National Organization for Public Health Nursing; Association of Collegiate Schools of Nursing; National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses; American Red Cross Nursing Service; Council of Federal Nursing Services; International Council of Nurses; Division of Nurse Education, United States Public Health Service; Nursing Division, Procurement and Assignment Service, War Manpower Commission; Subcommittee on Nursing, Health and Medical Committee, Federal Security Agency; National Association of Practical Nurse Education; and American Hospital Association.

Wood Waste of Nation a Treasure in the Chemist's Post-war World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an important article from Newsweek of February 12, 1945. It is entitled "Wood Waste of Nation a Treasure in the Chemist's Post-war World." The importance of our timber resources has never been fully realized in this land of prodigious resources. But the time is fast approaching when we must take an accounting lest the last of our great reserves be dissipated in the same manner that so much of our resources have gone.

The article follows:

WOOD WASTE OF NATION A TREASURE IN THE CHEMIST'S POST-WAR WORLD—SAWDUST HEAPS MAY FURNISH ALCOHOL, STOCK FOOD, MEDICINE, AND VITAL INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS

We have never been a nation of fagot pickers.

The conviction that our natural resources were inexhaustible has shaped our economy. At once the wonder and the scandal of the world, our industrial practices have always been wasteful. We did not bother with inferior stuff. We took the best and went on. Wasn't there plenty more where that came from?

Today the signs are many that America's traditional plenty, while by no means worn out, is fraying about the edges. Unparalleled calls for war have gouged our mines, oil wells, and forests. Industry thinks of going in for fagot picking after all. But it will be fagot picking on the typically American grand scale. Thanks to advanced technology, the mounds of rubbish cast off by industry can become profitable raw materials.

Post-war horizons cites an outstanding example: The wealth latent in sawing refuse, long the No. 1 disposal problem in lumbering. Through the magic of chemistry, the Nation's sawdust heaps can sustain new industries, with products ranging from ethyl alcohol (identical with alcohol made from grain), motor fuels, and cattle feeds to plastics, dyes, drugs, and flavors.

German industrial economy has had to rely heavily on wood. It is doubtful if the Nazis could have made war without the explosives, motor fuels, textiles, foods, and synthetic-rubber components which their scientists developed from odds and ends of wood.

In the United States only about 32 percent of any stand of timber finds its way into finished lumber. The remainder goes to waste, either in the woods or at the mill. When cut, many trees turn out to be bad. They are left to rot along with stumps, tops, branches, and other debris. Every sawmill spews out its flanking dunes of slabs, tailings, shavings, and scraggy sawdust.

Some of this waste can be used. It goes for kindling and stove wood. It powers donkey engines and logging saws. In the Northwest, special sawdust furnaces heat homes and public buildings. There are other outlets for carefully graded types of wood scrap. But all present uses combined are only nibbles at an endless glut. Mills have to destroy their litter by mass, or smother under it. In the Douglas fir region of the west coast sawmill burners do away with 1,800,000 tons of it annually. In all, we throw away about 60,000,000 tons of wood each year in the woods and at the mill.

TIPS FROM THE NAZIS

Appalled by such waste, knowing we can no longer afford it, industry and government are studying wood-scrap conversion. The American Forest Products Industries, with member firms across the country, have employed two refugee German wood specialists, Erwin Schaefer and Carl Levy, who helped develop the pioneer wood-wastes chemical works at Tornesch, near Hamburg—since bombed with the aid of details supplied to the R. A. F. by Schaefer and Levy.

Dr. Heinrich Scholler devised the wood-wastes recovery process. Sawdust and macerated wood are treated by hydrolysis—that is, percolated in mild sulphuric-acid solution under high pressure and temperature—until the wood cellulose converts into sugar. Germany built nearly 30 Scholler plants. Japan has put an undetermined number into operation.

However effective technically the German process may be, before it is used here it must be reevaluated in terms of American economy. In Germany and Japan profit doesn't matter. Industries are tightly controlled by government cartels. The principal aim is to bridge shortages.

Our position is the exact reverse. Where German sawdust costs 20 marks a ton, in the Pacific Northwest it brings little or nothing. German labor draws 1 mark an hour. Our workers in the Northwest average $1.10 an hour. Transportation there is cheap. Here it is high. They can afford to hand-pick wood waste. We cannot.

American economy demands lowering of production costs. That means considerable mechanization for harvesting and processing scrap wood. This is the only way that wood-waste and products can meet competition. The solution lies in research.

EVANS PROPOSES

The most practical approach so far is the plan of Col. Edward S. Evans, president of Evans Products Co., Detroit, manufacturers of molded plywood, wood battery separators, and similar products, with plants in the Pacific West and Northwest. The Evans program looks forward to Nation-wide marshaling of all wood-use research—whether by private industry or Government—for American industrial needs.

The research would be under the supervision of the Forest Products Division of the United States Department of Agriculture. Its Madison, Wis., laboratories, staffed by some of the world's best wood specialists, would serve as a clearing house.

For field work Colonel Evans would split the country into five regions—Northwest, South, Northeast, Middle West, and the Appalachian area—each with its own wood-utilization unit. The units would comprise industrial and chemical engineers, paper experts, and technicians. They would study and analyze local problems, such as uses of plentiful trees and ways of solving transportation and equipment bottlenecks. They would test new methods and products under local conditions. They would work closely with college, State, and industrial research groups, furnishing information gathered all over the world. For private firms the units would help work out cost, engineering, and other data on new wood uses keyed to local conditions.

The Evans plan has been adopted tentatively by the Department of Agriculture. Already two experimental units have taken the field, one for the South with headquarters at New Orleans, the other serving the Northeast seaboard region from Philadelphia.

WOOD THE UNIVERSALROHSTUFF

With reason the Germans term wood "universalrohstuff" (universal raw material). Their scientists view trees not simply as bundles of unsawn planks but as living chemical laboratories, drawing from soil, water, air, and sunlight the carbon compounds that make up all matter of organic source—coal and the human body alike.

Carbon compounds in wood take the form of cellulose and lignin. Every ton of dry sawdust or chips put through the Scholler process yields approximately 1,000 pounds of wood sugar from the cellulose and 500 pounds of lignin residue, a brown powder with dramatic chemical promise. The proportion of yield holds good for nearly every American species of tree, even "weed trees" such as sycamore, heretofore almost useless commercially.

Wood sugar is an edible mixture of glucose (starch sirup, usually made from corn) and other sugars. In a year an acre of choice forest land ean produce more sugar for industrial use than an acre of sugar beets. A ton of sawdust is good for nearly as much sugar as a ton of blackstrap molasses. Wood sugar is marketed in Europe for cooking and table. Combined with grain it makes excellent feed for cattle and poultry.

Alcohol distilled from wood sugar mash averages 50 gallons to 1,000 pounds. This is ethyl alcohol, 190 proof, not to be confused with methyl or "wood alcohol" of prohibition deadliness.

Normal, easily available waste accumulations around mills could produce at least 150,000,000 gallons of ethyl alcohol a year. Oregon alone could probably contribute some 50,000,000 gallons. If all waste in the woods and at the mills could be used, the amount could be multiplied by 20.

The first step toward commercial production of alcohol from wood was taken last spring when the Willamette Valley Wood Chemical Co. began a $2,247,000 hydrolysis plant near Eugene, Oreg. Through a simplification of the Scholler process, accomplished by Forest Service chemists, the plant is expected to turn out 4,100,000 gallons of industrial alcohol yearly, at a post-war wholesale price, before tax, of no more than 25 cents a gallon. At present, industrial alcohol made from blackstrap molasses sells at about 48 cents a gallon, while grain alcohol averages between 80 cents and $1.30 a gallon.

THREAT TO GASOLINE?

Potential cheapness of wood-ethyl warrants it a place in post-war industry. Grain as a source of industrial alcohol will probably be unable to compete with it. Even blackstrap will be hard-pressed unless ways to corners and prices can be found.

The gasoline industry, too, expects competition. The odds are that alcohol from wood scrap will bid for a share of the motor-fuel trade. But before alcohol can challenge gasoline as a fuel, its habit of absorbing moisture in storage must be overcome. Enthusiasts believe that it can be. They also say that attempts such as those made by grain-alcohol-producing States to force the mixing of alcohol and gasoline will not be necessary to support the embryo industry. Wood-ethyl should be able to compete briskly on its own merits. Germany has developed efficient motors that run on straight alcohol. Most racing cars have their gasoline "souped" with alcohol.

Bureau of Standards tests reveal that pure ethyl alcohol in blend with gasoline makes good fuel, no more harmful to engines than the usual mixtures. When straight gas is supplemented with 20 to 25 percent ethyl, the antiknock quality is improved. Performance equals that of high-test gasolines available before the war—though not the 100-plus octane fuel evolved for war aviation. Before these superfuels can be used, however, ordinary car engines must be redesigned.

The lowest price to distributors for straight gasoline currently swings between 6 and 7 cents a gallon, f. o. b. the California refineries. Wood chemists say that this price can be undercut, that wood-ethyl can be sold at the distillery for 4 cents or less a gallon—if lignin, the byproduct of hydrolysis, can be made for as little as 2 cents a pound.

THE PROMISE OF LIGNIN

Science has just begun exploring the potentialities of lignin. Although known to be made up of the same elements as coal and petroleum, it still awaits thorough analysis. But chemists believe that once they do hit upon the secret of how its hydrocarbon molecules link together, they can get from it, fairly simply, many coal-tar products, including aspirin, sleep-inducing drugs like sulfanol and veronal, the sulfa drugs, perfumes, resins, and bulk chemicals.

FUEL TO BURN

At present, however, there is practical use for lignin and its derivatives already known. From each ton of dry scrap wood processed by hydrolysis, 500 pounds of lignin remain. Its heat value is higher than that of wood. It burns with practically no smoke or ash. In briquettes, it helps fuel the hydrolysis process that produces it. The Willamette Valley alcohol plant will burn about 50 tons of lignin daily.

In European experiments, lignin briquettes have been found better than charcoal for gasogene—or wood gas—power units in motor vehicles. Pulverized lignin has been used successfully in the highly developed German Rupa dust motor. Chemists say, however, that any kind of stoking with lignin will eventually be considered wasteful because of the potential wealth locked in the material.

A TASTE—A PLASTIC

Treated with alkalis, lignin makes vanillin flavor, indistinguishable from the natural vanilla-bean extract. Add hydrogen and obtain phenol, cresol, methanol (the old wood alcohol), the higher alcohols, and heavy oils. From these derivatives come valuable plastics and drugs; even gasoline-type motor fuels are possible.

Lignin can also be used as humus. With nitrogen and phosphate, it makes a rich fertilizer.

Coal tar itself, once a vexatious problem for disposal, became the foundation of great industries when its carbon structure was charted. Of course, no one can predict the final tally for kindred lignin, but science is convinced it will be important. Meanwhile, it is the business of research to knock at doors, not sure what will open, but certain that something will.

EVERYTHING BUT THE LEAVES

Other prospects for further use of wood are:

Cork of the granulated type for gaskets and linoleum can be manufactured from the discarded bark of Douglas fir and other trees.

Tannin for processing leather can be extracted from the bark of hemlock and oak, perhaps freeing us from dependence on South American tannin monopolies.

Fabrics can be spun from shredded bark, especially of redwood trees; roofing felts and coarse sacking are examples.

Naval stores.—Tar, pitch, turpentine, and other resinous products derived from pine trees have new economic implications for the South. Better yields and improved techniques for making plastics and drugs may lift the standard of living in large areas.

Laminated flooring and lumber can now be made from cull timber. The Tennessee Valley Authority and the University of Georgia are operating a pilot plant designed to produce 1,000 board-feet hourly.

Synthetic plywoods are obtained by halting hydrolysis one step short of sugar. The resultant wood pulp can be bonded in laminated sheets that are extremely tough, and inexpensive.

Wood iron results from chemical impregnation, under pressure; in this process the lumber takes on the hardness of ebony or even metal, no matter how soft originally. The "Impreg" and "Compreg" woods developed by the Forest Products Laboratories at Madison, Wis., and several recently announced commercial adaptations have plastic qualities. Largely proof against fire, water, shrinkage, swelling, and insects, they are lighter and stronger than some steels. They machine easily. Military use and tests by private industry indicate that the post-war consumer can choose from a diversity of products made from transmuted wood.

PAUL BUNYANS OF STEEL

Most of these developments depend on wider use of equipment to harvest waste in the woods. Before branches, tops, and other logging debris can be hauled out economically, they must be concentrated—and logging firms are now designing "hoggers" (machines that chew and bale scrap) on caterpillar treads. They will process the scrap in

the forest much as a combine threshes and sacks grain. Mechanical chain sawing, a fairly standard practice in heavy timber operations, will probably be used more widely. In pulpwood areas, particularly the piney woods of the South, horizontal power saws operated from truck or tractor are already saving manpower and costs. They can salvage stumps and snags as efficiently as they cut timber. Giant shears to cut small trees at one snip are now being developed.

In the end, large-scale mechanization in the woods should bring more employment to more men than it displaces. Thousands of workers will find permanent jobs in the new industries.

Thus, through making the most of our wood wastes, we shall need to cut less timber to gain a greater volume of forest products than ever before. Coming generations of Americans can have more use from our forests—and more will remain for them to use.

Treaty-Making Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1944, I raised a question of the privilege of the House in connection with the subject matter of the Mexican water treaty. From then until now I have been studying the treaty-making powers under our Constitution and have learned that on numerous occasions over the years, beginning with the time of the Jay Treaty in 1796, the House has asserted its privilege and duty under the Constitution to consider certain matters contained in treaties and hence the treaties themselves as integral documents.

The inescapable conclusion from such a study is that the House should take a definite position on this vital matter.

Hence I have introduced House Resolution 156 as a declaration of policy and House Joint Resolution 112 as a legislative implementation of that policy. Following are those two resolutions:

House Resolution 156

Resolved, That, it being declared by the second section of the second article of the Constitution "that the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur," the House of Representatives do not claim any agency in making treaties; but that when a treaty by its terms stipulates any authority or regulation on any of the subjects submitted by the Constitution to the power of Congress, it must depend for its execution as to such stipulation on the law or laws to be passed by Congress and it is the constitutional right and duty of the House of Representatives in all such cases to deliberate on the expediency or inexpediency of carrying such treaty into effect, and to determine and act thereon as in their judgment may be most conducive to the public good.

House Joint Resolution 112

Joint resolution providing for the consideration of treaties by Congress in certain cases

Resolved, etc., That, it being declared by the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution, that the Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers granted to it and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof—

Therefore, in the making of any treaty which by its terms stipulates any authority or regulation on any subject submitted by the Constitution to the power of Congress, the President shall transmit such treaty to the Congress, together with his recommendations; and he shall not transmit such treaty to the Senate for ratification until the Congress shall declare that the treaty is conducive to the public good, and that it has passed all laws necessary and proper for its execution.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States grants certain powers and imposes certain duties upon the Congress. For at least 60 years the House of Representatives as a coordinate branch of the Congress has not asserted its right and duty to exercise these powers in connection with treaties. I believe it is about time that the House of Representatives resurrect its rights and exercise its powers and duties in this connection. House Resolution 156 is intended as a declaration of the constitutional rights and duties of the House of Representatives to deliberate and act upon any treaty which by its terms stipulates any authority or regulation on any of the subjects submitted to the power of the Congress by the Constitution.

This House Resolution 156 is almost identical with another resolution which was adopted by the House by more than two-thirds vote in 1871, and is similar to the first such resolution which was agreed to by the House in 1796, during the Administration of George Washington.

House Joint Resolution 112, if agreed to by both the House and Senate, and signed by the President, would accomplish almost the same end that is intended to be accomplished by those who propose that treaties shall be ratified by a majority vote in both the House and Senate. To all practical purposes, it would accomplish that end without an amendment to the Constitution, simply by Congress exercising its already existing constitutional power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers granted to it, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government or in any department or officer of the Government.

Under the terms of House Joint Resolution 112, the President, as an officer of the Government, would be required to transmit to the Congress (meaning both the House and Senate), any treaty which by its terms stipulated any authority or regulation on any subject submitted by the Constitution to the power of Congress, and would require that any such treaty should not be transmitted to the Senate for ratification until the treaty had been given congressional approval, and until the Congress had declared that it had passed all laws necessary and proper for its execution.

This would have a most salutary effect. The long standing custom has been for the Senate to consider itself the sole body concerned with treaties, and in that the House has acquiesed, since the time of the proposed treaty with the Kingdom of Hawaii in 1881.

If House Joint Resolution 112 should become law, then both the House and Senate would consider a treaty which involved subjects constitutionally submitted to the power of the Congress as a whole—deliberate upon the expediency or inexpediency of carrying the treaty into effect, and then if the treaty be deemed expedient, pass all laws necessary and proper for its execution—all this prior to its ratification. This, in my judgment is the proper course of action to insure against public dissatisfaction with such a treaty, and likewise to legally vest the powers to carry out such a treaty in the proper Government officers. After the processes of this resolution shall have been carried out by the Congress, as a whole, then its ratification by the Senate would be almost a pro forma affair. In my judgment no willful one-third would be able to stand up against the public pressure that would be brought against them, in the event that both bodies of Congress had already approved the measure by majority votes. The subsequent ratification by two-thirds of the Senate would merely serve as a final inspection and approval of the workmanship already accomplished.

Louisiana Produces More Muskrat Furs Than All of the Other States Combined, and More Than Canada and Alaska Together Produce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, in the March issue of Reader's Digest appears a story concerning the colorful and important muskrat-fur industry of Louisiana. I feel sure that this article will be of much educational interest to the Members of the House. The story is by Carolyn Ramsey, and is entitled "Louisiana's Fabulous Muskrat Marshland":

LOUISIANA'S FABULOUS MUSKRAT MARSHLAND

(By Carolyn Ramsey)

Alcée Broussard can make good wages right in Thibodaux, La., and live in comfort in his tidy little home. But, come autumn, Alcée gets restless. The marshes call. The love of outdoor life is strong in him—and so is the gambling fever. Enfin, one day in late November he tells the boss he is quitting, and the boss knows better than to try to dissuade him.

With 20,000 other Creoles, Cajuns, Isleños, Dalmatians, Sabines—the mixed folk of south Louisiana—Alcée is going to trap muskrats. For 9 months in the year the trappers are loggers, moss gatherers, fishermen, oystermen, and, nowadays, shipyard workers. Every winter they go camping in the marshes—they and their whole families in a great seasonal migration.

Alcée's outfit is typical: a houseboat—"campboat," he calls it—for himself; another for his married son; a half dozen skiffs; and two or three pirogues, those tricky little

canoes beautifully fashioned from a single log. The boats are piled high with stoves, mattresses, washtubs, pots, pans—all the gear of housekeeping. There are likely to be a crate of squawking hens, a hog in a pen; there may be room even for the family cow; and children, always children, waving to everyone they pass, gay with the thought of 3 month's camping far from the schoolroom.

The land into which a "putt-putt" tows the trappers is like no other in all America. It is a subtropical marsh, 400 miles long and 15 to 30 miles wide, fringing the Gulf from the mouth of the Mississippi to the Texas line. Over this watery, treeless wilderness grow luxuriant grasses, shoulder high, which in the winter turn to gold. There is no solid ground. A man can walk, stepping from clump to clump of the grass roots, but he must be wary or he will sink waist deep in muck.

This is muskrat paradise. Here the animals feast on their one food, the sweet roots of the grasses; here they multiply incredibly. From this one area trappers take more than 6,000,000 muskrat pelts a year—about as many as from all the rest of the States combined, and more than Canada and Alaska together produce. This narrow strip of quaking marsh supports the weight of the great American fur industry, for muskrat in its many guises is the staple, the bread and butter, of the fur trade.

The industry can count with reasonable certainty on a supply of pelts that will vary little from year to year, but the individual trapper has sharp ups and downs. Some years he doesn't take in the $350 he needs to pay for his supplies. Other years he makes a killing. Plenty of trappers earned $3,000 last season, some of them $5,000—big money to a Cajun. And he loves this gambling aspect.

The work is arduous. Alcée begins by firing the grass on the tract he has leased. It burns down to about 10 inches above the water line. That will make it easier to get around, and easier to find the traps. Next he makes a trainasse by dragging his pirogue several times over the route, breaking down the grass stubble and plowing the soft peat to create a water lane along which the pirogue will float and save him much weary walking. He learned that trick from the muskrat, whose little water paths, three inches wide, crisscross the marsh everywhere.

The 70-day season opens December 10. In the trapper's leased area are thousands of little trails which indicate feeding grounds. In a path where the water is just 6 inches deep he builds a little mound of mud, lays the trap on it, drops a little more mud on top as a camouflage, and marks the spot with a length of cane. No bait is needed. The tray is only two inches below the surface of the water, and when an adult muskrat comes along he cannot avoid being caught. A little one will swim right over the trap unscathed.

The daily routine of trap-tending starts before daybreak, when father and sons rise, gulp down their Louisiana-style coffee ("If she don' leave rings in the cup, she's no good"), don their hip boots, sling 'rat sacks over their shoulders, pick up the long poles to push the pirogue and "marsh sticks" to help them with the difficult walking, and set out.

In a good week the trapper may get 300 large top-grade pelts and 500 smaller ones; in a poor week about 75 "tops" and 150 poorer ones. The weather causes these striking fluctuations. Muskrats "run" best on cold nights, scurrying ceaselessly down their water trails, intent upon their search for food, their lovemaking, or upon repairing their houses.

The women of Alcée's family skin the 'rats and stretch the pelts on wire frames to dry. The fur buyer comes once a week. He divides the pelts into five grades, and pays an average price on the whole catch. The O. P. A. ceiling for a top-grade pelt was $1.44 last year. During the last war, the price was 25 cents. In 1927 it was $2.55, the record high.

The buyer works for the syndicate from which the trapper subleases his land. Five big syndicates control most of the marshes, leasing them from big landholders who bought up enormous tracts years ago at 10 to 20 cents an acre. The State itself owns large areas which it leases out, and some of the revenues go to the schools.

Agents of the syndicates make annual surveys and apportion the leaseholds so that each trapper should catch about 2,000 muskrats. Thee usual contract between syndicate and trapper calls for 35 percent of the catch as rental. The division is made not in pelts but in cash, after the company agent has bought the fur. This sharecropper system is bitterly resented, but it persists, though a few enterprising trappers are buying their own land, and some others have accumulated enough working capital to pay their rental in cash and sell their pelts in the open market.

And what about the little animal that is the cause of all this industry? To begin with, its name is half lie. The muskrat is not a rat at all, but it does secrete a powerful musk—as good as any of the expensive musks now imported by the perfume industry, recent experiments seem to prove. It is a sturdy creature, about 12 inches long, with a 10-inch tail which it uses as an oar and a rudder when swimming. It feeds at night. With its sharp teeth it cuts a grass root about 6 inches under water, then comes to the surface, holds the food in its little hands, washes it, and nibbles it daintily. The muskrat's beaverlike house, built of grass and mud, is an apartment building of ingenious design, with a central stair well and various rooms, of which the nursery is the largest. It rises 2 to 4 feet above the water line and is 4 to 10 feet in diameter at the base. Tunnels radiate like spokes of a wheel to underwater entrances.

In Louisiana, muskrats breed in any month of the year except August and September. Three times a year mama chases papa out of the house for 2 weeks, and produces a litter of three to seven "mice." The muskrat population may multiply sixfold in a single year, in spite of hungry mink, alligators, owls, hawks, snakes, garfish, and raccoons. Were it not for the trappers, the muskrats would soon outrun their food supply.

But neither preying beast nor man is the muskrat's worst enemy. In years of drought the marsh dries up, there is no good grass, many rats starve, and breeding almost stops. There is a short fur crop the following season.

Flood is as bad, drowning out the muskrat houses, covering the grass clumps until there is no place for the animal to rest. In the great flood of 1927, when water stood deep on the marshes for 108 days, conservation officials, trappers, and landowners built rafts, covered them with marsh grasses and set them afloat. Millions of muskrats climbed aboard these life rafts and rode out the flood.

There was a time when nobody would have cared what happened to the humble muskrat, but he has made Louisiana the leading fur-producing State of the Union, and Louisiana is grateful.

Experimental Forests for the South—A Plan for Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, March 6, a number of outstanding timber producers and foresters from the Southeast will appear before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in support of a plan of development for experimental forests for the South. I wish to call attention to their program and to emphasize its importance. I hope that it will be read by every Member of the House. The program is sponsored by the Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, and I include it in my remarks. It marks one of the most progressive forward steps yet undertaken in forest farming. It follows:

EXPERIMENTAL FORESTS FOR THE SOUTH—A PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT

This plan for developing a Southwide system of experimental forests results from recommendations by the research committee of the Forest Farmers Association. Organized in 1942, this committee of forest landowners from all Southern States has, under the leadership of Julian McGowin, chairman, studied the need for research, experiments, tests, and development leading to better forest farming practices. The committee has recommended and the association directors have unanimously approved the plan here outlined for a system of local experimental forests to investigate methods of forest farming and timber growing for each of the several major forest conditions of the South. All interested in a better and more prosperous South through the building up of its greatest, yet most neglected, resource—its forests—are urged to review and support this plan.

WE MUST REBUILD

This country has until recently depended for its wood supplies mainly upon its virgin forests. In order, the forests of the Northeast, the Lake States, and finally the South, were cut over until the last virgin timber supply of the country in Washington and Oregon is now being harvested. Obviously this virgin timber is limited—must soon give out. The South's virgin forests were largely liquidated to supply much of the timber vital in World War No. 1. The South's second-growth stands are being cut heavily to support the Nation in another war. Despite neglect and abuse these second growth southern forests are now producing nearly one-half of our tremendous lumber requirements. They yield a third more lumber than the Pacific Northwest, and nearly one-half more than all the remaining regions combined. In addition, they are producing all the Nation's naval stores, one-half its pulpwood, and most of its poles, piling, ties, and cooperage.

How can the South, from which virgin timber has long since been cut, continue to lead the country in wood production? The answer lies in its soil, its climate, and the quality and growth rate of southern trees. Stretching from the Potomac to the Florida Everglades and the plains of Texas and Oklahoma there is a vast empire of nearly 200,000,000 acres of woodland ideally suited to forest farming. Because of warm climate, long growing season, deep soils, ample rainfall, level terrain, and many valuable tree species, this is unquestionably one of the best timber-growing regions in the world.

This country can always have ample timber from these forest lands—if they are managed wisely for timber products. Only a small portion is being so managed now. Other land is being cut hard—even ruthlessly to supply war needs. This cannot continue forever without deterioration of this great southern resource. Although these lands have produced a fair second crop with little care, much land did not recover after the first harvest and under present cutting more is annually going out of forest production. We must reverse this trend—we must rebuild!

FOREST FARMING THE ANSWER

The answer to the Nation's wood supply is forest farming—the raising of timber crops by southern people on their own land—the American way. A new type of farming, it has come about only in the last 10 to 15 years. Throughout the South its advantages are apparent to some, and forest farming pioneers are found in some numbers in all Southern States. Forest farming is so new that no one knows very much about it; yet, from what is known, southerners, a people of the land, are strongly attracted by it.

Misconceptions abound on forest farming. It is not a process of planting trees in rows, then sitting idly by for 25 years or more until the crop matures. It is often the taking over of neglected second-growth woodland—some open, some poorly stocked, and some well stocked to good young timber—and working that woodland for a livelihood, year in and year out, while the timber stock (capital) is being built up and the growth (interest) rate increased to produce the maximum possible annual income. In forest farming, good trees of all sizes must be kept on the land to fatten and provide a substantial, regular harvest of wood products.

Forest farming promises much to the South. The outlook for our main cash crop, cotton, is not bright. A national and world shortage of wood exists and a steady demand is assured. The South can grow trees faster than any other section of the world comparable in size. In wood the South has one of its most promising crops, with a steady dependable demand in prospect. Even now southern forests produce a yearly harvest of wood products estimated at $950,000,000 delivered at the mill and provide employment for some 500,000 woods and mill workers. Wood manufacture is our most important industry. Over 20 percent of the total created wealth of the South comes directly from our forests—"a wooden nickel in every quarter."

The South needs industries to employ its large population and to raise the standards of its working people. Through forest farming the South can greatly expand its production of such wood products as veneer, lumber, and paper. But industry based on wood need not stop with these. By recently developed processes, wood can be converted into many forms—alcohol for motor fuel, synthetic rubber, and many other uses, into the plastics looming so large in post-war industrial plans, into fibers to be spun into fabrics, and into sugar for food. With a dependable nonexhaustible supply of wood from forest farming, the South can plan confidently on an era of industrial growth.

RESEARCH SHOWS THE WAY

The Nation and the South need forest farming as a substitute for present thoughtless methods of timber cutting. But forest farming is new and difficult. We need to learn a lot before we can say we know how to farm timber. The ax and saw are the main tools. If used wisely they result in better production each year; if poorly used they result in ruin of the forest farm.

How can a man farm a crop which takes a generation to mature? The answer lies in cutting timber every year not only to provide income for the owner but also to put the forest in better condition by culture with the ax—removing the poorer trees while leaving and improving the best. This sounds simple, but many questions arise. How much to cut? This is important because overcutting leads finally to bankruptcy. How often to cut each tract? And what to remove? Which trees by species, sizes, and form? What spacing to work for on the trees left? When does a stand reach full maturity? And how should it be cut to get a good new stand?

We need to know how much we can expect to make in forest farming, how much we can invest in land and young timber and yet get a reasonable return. We need to know the costs and returns of thinning, pruning, stand improvement, and other methods of culture. We need to know the costs justified for protection, for roads, for other forest improvement.

How to protect the forest? First, from fire, the one big draw-back to forest farming, and from insects and disease. Also we must develop practical methods of growing timber of a size and form that will stand up best under hurricanes and ice storms.

How best to combine cattle and tree growing? Does it pay? What breeds and sizes? Do we need to feed to supplement the forest grasses? We need a crop to supply additional income while the forest builds up, and cattle and other stock are most promising.

How to handle the harvest? Timber is a large, heavy crop. Special equipment is needed. Should we plan on cutting all our own timber or leave part of the harvest to specialists? What equipment to buy?

Which is best, most efficient? Can equipment be adapted to efficiently split or cut scrub oak and upland hickory, making these forest weeds merchantable? Are new tools or those used elsewhere better than our present equipment? If so, we want the facts after careful study under our local types and conditions.

We need demonstrations of good forest farming, planned and executed by capable men on similar land and similar timber, places where we can go to see for ourselves the results, talk with the man who did the work, learn the cost and returns, and apply the results finally on our own lands.

We need, in short, small public forests similar to experimental farms managed under a plan of research, development, and experimentation in all parts of the South, one for each major soil and forest type. As forest problems pass over State lines, the Federal Government is the logical one to take the lead. The Forest Service has already established a few such forests with fine results, but we need more experimental forests and larger programs.

Two of the country's best experimental forests are located in the South at Crosset, Ark., and Olustee, Fla. Each has had a big part in improving and guiding forest farming over 10 or more million acres of similar forest land. At each the Government has a few extremely able men working earnestly for the betterment of southern forests. At either place the forest farmer can get advice on many of the questions mentioned above. Though these programs are still small and inadequate, the money wisely appropriated therefor by Congress has been well expended. These forests have amply demonstrated what such programs can accomplish for forest landowners.

MORE EXPERIMENTAL FORESTS NEEDED

We need more such experimental forests, one for each of the major forest types of the South. Such a system, adequate for present needs, is shown on the accompanying map. Developed from detailed plans of long standing, it takes into account not only the needs for soil and forest types but also the differences in markets which bear so importantly on forest farming.

This calls for the establishment of 20 research centers at carefully selected locations throughout the South.

The full experimental forest program cannot be put into effect immediately. We recommend, however, that Congress appropriate in 1945 sufficient funds to (1) expand reaserch at five experimental forests where small programs are under way; (2) start work at two existing experimental forests which have been closed for lack of funds; and (3) establish three new experimental forests.

RESEARCH CENTERS TO BE EXPANDED, ACTIVATED, OR ESTABLISHED DURING 1945

Now operating on limited basis:
Crossett forest, Crossett, Ark.
Olustee forest, Olustee, Fla.
Delta forest, Stoneville, Miss.
Hitchiti forest, Round Oak, Ga.
Bent Creek forest, Asheville, N. C.
Established, not operating:
Harrison forest, Saucier, Miss.
Santee forest, Witherbee, S. C.
New experimental forests:
Alabama, north central Alabama.
Texas, east Texas.
Virginia, southeastern Virginia.

ACTION BY CONGRESS NEEDED

It is recommended that Congress appropriate $420,000, the amount needed to carry a minimum program at each of the research centers included in the association's research plan for 1945. This amount should be incorporated in the United States Department of Agriculture appropriation bill under the heading "Forest Service—Forest Management Research."

No land purchase is needed for this program. In most cases lands are already available. In others, necessary timberlands can be obtained by gift, lease, or by cooperative agreement with interested State or private agencies. The appropriation requested will be used to pay salaries and wages of technical foresters and other personnel, for operating expenses and to purchase supplies and equipment.

The cost is small—about one one-hundredth of 1 percent of present income from forest products and their utilization—and represents only 15 cents per $1,000 of investment in southern timberland—insignificant in comparison with the $13 per $1,000 of investment which American industry was spending annually for industrial research even prior to the war.

With these research centers fully developed, a big step will have been taken toward establishing forest farming in the South, building up the South's major resource and assuring the Nation's future wood supply.

These experimental forests will start paying dividends almost at once. The Crossett experimental forest, which has been managed only 7 years, has already helped to make southern Arkansas and northern Louisiana the outstanding timber-growing section of the country. Similarly, the Olustee experimental forest in the naval stores belt has helped every turpentine farmer in south Georgia and north Florida. Other research and demonstration forests can stimulate and develop the strong timber-growing interest now beginning to stir in all sections of the South.

The South's forests have suffered from the heavy demands for war supplies. They must be rebuilt. Now is the time to start the research and development which will show the way to substantial southern rural and industrial prosperity through forest farming.

Bretton Woods Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a letter from Mr. Ben Dubois, secretary of the Independent Bankers' Association,

and a report of that organization on the proposals of the Bretton Woods International Monetary and Financial Conference for the establishment of an international exchange stabilization fund and an international bank for recostruction and development:

INDEPENDENT BANKERS' ASSOCIATION,

Sauk Center, Minn., February 18, 1945.

SIRS: The executive council of the Independent Bankers' Association met in St. Louis on the 24th and 25th of February for the purpose of considering the Bretton Woods agreements. At the meeting the council on behalf of the association approved the attached report recommending the adoption of the Bretton Woods agreements and by resolution directed me to make this report available to the Congress of the United States.

As you know, the Independent Bankers' Association has a membership of over 2,000 country banks and extends into 40 States. While we can hardly claim to speak for Wall Street, we do believe we can speak for Main Street.

Copies of our report on the Bretton Woods agreements are being sent to each Member of Congress.

BEN DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

THE BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT BANKERS' ASSOCIATION

The Independent Bankers' Association, through its executive council makes the following report on the Bretton Woods agreements:

I. NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The United Nations in cooperating to win this war have been compelled to marshal their total resources for unrestrained use in a war for survival. Victory will find the territories of many of our allies in a state of ruin; their industries destroyed, their manpower depleted, and their population sick and hungry. Even the more fortunate of our allies will find their whole economic structure must be reconverted from war to peace and that years of war have depleted their productive facilities to the point where new equipment and new machinery must be introduced at once if economic paralysis is to be avoided. The United States, in turn, will find itself needing new outlets for the tremendous productive capacity we have generated during this war.

We are deeply conscious of the fact that the end of this war will confront the whole world with monetary and financial problems of a magnitude never before known to man. These problems will be international in scope, knowing no national boundaries and transcending solution except in terms of international cooperation.

Common sense alone would dictate that when we are face to face with monetary, financial, and economic problems which are international in scope, we should seek their solution through international action. Common sense would also dictate that when we are confronted with an international economic disaster it is nonsense to quibble over details. Disasters must be met with action. We are called upon to address all of our efforts to getting the most out of the machinery now available. It would be the height of folly to start overhauling the fire engine on the way to the fire.

In devising effective machinery for dealing with international economic problems, we must measure its adequacy by the task to be done rather than by conformity to traditional design. We shall win this war because we were prepared to adapt our military strategy to meet the problem before us. Our invasion of France, our air power, our naval action in the Pacific are but a few examples of doing the impossible because we were compelled to. These lessons should be remembered in our consideration of programs for international economic cooperation. There is no precedent for the magnitude of the international monetary, financial and economic problems we are facing with victory. We cannot, therefore, lightly cast aside any carefully considerated proposal merely because some groups regard it as novel.

II. THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION IN ACHIEVING LASTING PEACE

The President of the United States on February 12, 1945—the same day as the results of the Yalta Conference were announced—sent a special message to the Congress on the Bretton Woods agreements. In that message he stated:

"If we are to measure up to the task of peace with the same stature as we have measured up to the task of war, we must see that the institutions of peace rest firmly on the solid foundations of international political and economic cooperation. The cornerstone for international political cooperation is the Dumbarton Oaks proposal for a permanent United Nations. International political relations will be friendly and constructive, however, only if solutions are found to the difficult economic problems we face today. The cornerstone for international economic cooperation is the Bretton Woods proposal for an international monetary fund and an international bank for reconstruction and development."

The Independent Bankers' Association and its members have not always concurred with the views of President Roosevelt. At times we have bitterly opposed them. On this matter, however, there can be no dispute. We think he spoke for the Nation when he said that "we must see that the institutions of peace rest firmly on the solid foundations of international political and economic cooperation."

We see no hope for retaining the unity of the United Nations down through the years if the end of the war is the signal for each of us again to resume the attack in economic warfare. Just as you cannot steal your neighbor's bread from his hungry children and expect to retain his friendship, you cannot steal your allies' markets and expect the ally to be taken in by pious statements of friendship and cooperation.

We cannot permit the channels of world trade to be clogged with currency depreciation, discriminatory exchange controls, barter arrangements, and cutthroat competition and expect a world in economic chaos to cooperate in preserving the peace. We cannot isolate ourselves from the fact that our devastated and war-torn allies must be helped to get back on their economic feet or their collapse will shake the foundations of our own country. Neither can we ignore the pressing needs of some of our allies for economic development so that their people can have enough to eat and improve their standard of living.

These premises we hold to be obvious. On these premises we conclude that real international economic cooperation is as essential to lasting peace as Dumbarton Oaks and a world security organization.

III. THE BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS

Last July the delegates of 44 countries were represented at the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference at Bretton Woods, N. H. At this conference they formulated concrete proposals for an international monetary fund and an international bank for reconstruction and development.

The international monetary fund is designed to achieve three objectives through international cooperation:

1. To stabilize the values of all currencies in terms of gold.

2. To progressively remove barriers against making payments across international boundaries.

3. To provide a revolving fund of foreign exchange for member countries to enable them in times of stress to maintain stable and unrestricted exchange relationships without resorting to cutthroat competition and economic warfare.

Each country contributes gold and local currency to a common pool in the fund. Total assets of the fund will be $8,800,000,000 of which the United States will subscribe $2,750,000,000.

The international bank for reconstruction and development will operate as follows:

1. It will encourage profitable international investment in productive enterprises. Loans in which the bank is interested will be only for the purpose of rebuilding industries, publice utilities, etc., in war-devastated countries, and developing natural resources, public utilities, and industries in underdeveloped countries.

2. The principal function of the bank will be to guarantee loans made by private lenders, such as banks and investment houses. In addition, where necessary, the bank will make some loans out of its own resources.

3. Each of the 44 United Nations will purchase shares of stock in the bank. Only a small part of the value of each share will be paid immediately, and by far the larger part will constitute a reserve to support guaranties made by the bank.

4. The liability of each member country is limited to the value of the shares of stock in the bank purchased by that country. Each member will share in the bank's risks in proportion to the stock it holds.

The subscribed capital to the bank will be $9,100,000,000, of which the United States will subscribe $3,175,000,000. Members will pay in only 10 percent of their subscription, in our case $318,000,000.

The operations of the fund and bank are technical and involved. This is inevitable because international monetary and financial matters are technical and complicated. But, as the above analysis shows, the principles involved are simple and can be intelligently evaluated by the ordinary man in the street. We believe these principles to be both sound and workable.

We also believe that the technical details of the fund and bank, representing as they do the product of the technical experts of 44 nations, are as sound and workable as it is posible to formulate in advance of an actual trial and tested experience. We are fortified in this conviction by the fact that more than 200 of the Nation's top economists in this field—including 16 past presidents of the American Economic Association — approve the fund and bank agreements in their present form. No doubt some technical problems may develop in actual operation just as so frequently occurs in other fields. However, we believe the intelligent way to go about the improvement of these technical details is to get the institutions going and observe their results. Both agreements provide methods of amendment, and if experience demonstrates the need for improvement we are confident that all will be as anxious as we to see the improvements made.

The Independent Bankers' Association has carefully weighed the arguments against the Bretton Woods proposal. We feel that the opponents of the proposals completely misconceive the nature of the objections they are raising if they do not recognize that the changes they propose will most likely torpedo the whole Bretton Woods program for international economic cooperation. We are of the opinion that the changes proposed will not be acceptable to other countries and we will end up with another era of economic warfare with all of its tragic consequences to world peace.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Independent Bankers' Association therefore:

1. Endorses both the international monetary fund and the international bank for reconstruction and development.

2. Urges the Congress of the United States to act favorably on the Bretton Woods legislation at the earliest possible date and without crippling reservations.

3. Calls upon America to insure the sound economic foundations for a lasting peace by carefully studying the operation of the fund and bank so that we can improve such institutions as tried experience shows the need.

Change Our Procedure for Treaty Ratification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include an editorial written by Dr. Helen Dwight Reid, associate in international education of the American Association of University Women.

The editorial was printed in the winter 1945 Journal of American Association of University Women. Dr. Reid is a leading student of the Constitution. She testified in support of Congressman SUMNERS' resolution which is now pending before the Rules Committee. The editorial is succinct and persuasive:

REFORM OF OUR PROCEDURE FOR TREATY RATIFICATION

(By Helen Dwight Reid)

Modification of the constitutional rule requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate for approval of treaty ratification was brought to the fore as a live issue by the unexpected act of the House Judiciary Committe in holding public hearings and pressing for a vote in the Seventy-eighth Congress this December. Whether the House action will exert sufficient pressure on the Senate to produce favorable consideration will depend largely on the interest manifested by the public. If it is strong and clear, the history of the Fulbright and Connally resolutions may well be repeated. The fact that State legislatures are meeting in nearly all of our States during the coming year would make possible prompt adoption of the constitutional amendment, provided it could be submitted to them early in 1945.

The question has been widely studied by the A. A. U. W.; many of our branches and some State divisions have already taken action urging such modification. A specific item proposed by the International Relations committee has been endorsed by the legislative committee and approved by the board for inclusion in the A. A. U. W. tentative legislative program that will be voted on by the 1945 convention. Immediate consideration in all our branches would facilitate our effective action, should the issue be raised early in the sessions of the new Congress.

The Senate never has functioned as the advisory executive council envisaged by the framers of the Constitution in 1787. The Senate itself refused to exercise that function when first consulted by President Washington in 1789, and no other President has renewed his attempt. Thus the Senate has lost any initiative or positive influence in the process of negotiation, and has become a merely negative participant, able to block final action on an international commitment, often by a small minority.

Some legislative check on executive action in this field is highly desirable and fully in accord with the American system of representative democracy, with its use of checks and balances to restrain unlimited power in any one branch of the Government. However, the present system puts the power to check, not in the hands of the legislative representatives of the country as a whole but in the hands of a small group in the Senate—perhaps representing the most sparsely populated States.

The requirement of a two-thirds majority for certain purposes always puts the power of obstruction in the hands of a small and determined minority. This is justifiable as a democratic process only when it is needed to safeguard the rights and interests of minorities. But due protection of minority rights, however essential a part of the true spirit of democracy, does not entitle a small group of men to control the destiny of a great nation by thwarting the will of the majority of its citizens through abuse of procedural prerogatives. Unless an international commitment is approved by a majority of the people's representatives, it should not be entered into by the United States, but an international agreement which does receive such approval should not be definitively prevented by the will of a few.

Under our Constitution, treaties are explicitly declared to be part of the supreme law of the land along with the Constitution itself and "laws passed in pursuance thereof." This legislative status is all the more reason for associating both Houses in the treaty-making process, and permitting them to act by the same majority which suffices for other legislative acts. Even under present conditions, it is possible for a bare majority in Congress to render a treaty ineffective nationally, either by passing conflicting legislation or by failing to pass appropriations or subsidiary legislation necessary to carry out its provisions. Such actions leave the treaty in existence as an international obligation, but as law of the land the treaty is overruled by the later expression of the sovereign will. While it is true that a treaty in its character of international obligation cannot be modified or repealed by the unilateral action of a single nation but only by mutual agreement in accordance with international law, this does not now safeguard it from infringement by contradictory legislation, and therefore constitutes no justification for requiring that treaties be approved originally by two-thirds of one House rather than by a majority of both.

Our Boundary Dispute Right Here at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Don S. Warren, from the Washington Star of March 4, 1945:

OUR BOUNDARY DISPUTE RIGHT HERE AT HOME—WE ARE WORRIED OVER POLAND, BUT HOW ABOUT THE AIRPORT?

(By Don S. Warren)

If King Charles I had only known what could be done with such a simple phrase as "to the farther bank of said river," he might have been more specific and thereby saved 100 years of embarrassment to Congress for being unable to establish exactly the extent of its jurisdiction along this part of the Potomac.

King Charles used that phrase in 1632 to describe the western limits of the lands he was apportioning. It seemed good enough then, no doubt, for the region was "infested with ferocious Indians" and uninhabited by white men, but the phrase has been interpreted and explained away so much since then as to confound a lot of things.

Hence, we find the question of the limit of the exclusive power of Congress on the "farther bank" of the river, at the seat of the Federal Government, just as alive today as it was in 1791 when the District was created. The issue is up again in Congress, with no settlement yet in sight. While the United States owns much of "no man's land" across the river, neither Congress nor Virginia can say, "This is the line" and thereby positively assign jurisdiction.

It is no small issue. A lot of intelligent people have been working at it for a long time—including landowners, tax collectors, city planners, lawyers, the courts, arbitration and boundary commissions, the District Commissioners, the Virginia Legislature, Department of Justice, and Congress.

At first glance, it might seem that all that has to be done is for someone with a half decent regard for the rights involved and a true eye to draw a line showing where the Virginia border stops and the District begins. Not so. Just a few years ago, Congress spent a good bit of the taxpayers' money to have a commission do just that, but the experts could not find enough of the ancient markers to be sure of the line and gave up the ghost—suggesting that another commission be awarded the task. That suggestion, as well as some others as to where it thought the line ought to be drawn were laid aside.

There was quiet along the Potomac for a half century—in the period following the grant to the United States by Virginia of its portion of the original 10 miles square as a site for the National Capital. But in 1846 this portion was given back to Virginia. The Congress then sitting could not see that the area ever would be needed for governmental purposes. Again, the old issues were revived because Virginia at once began taxing properties lying between the old high-water mark and the waters of the river.

The problem was serious enough in earlier years to be carried several times to the Supreme Court and to bring about compacts between neighboring States. But it was multiplied in more recent years when the Federal Government developed the Mount Vernon Memorial Parkway, the Washington National Airport, the Pentagon Building, and other Government structures in or near that mysterious 1791 high-water mark. The parkway program brought a flock of land-title cases cleared only through Federal action to compromise claims, and jurisdiction in the airport area still is up in the air.

Is it a question of interest to none but a legal perfectionist? Hardly that, when police on duty near "no man's land" want to dive into the nearest air-raid shelter when a serious crime is committed, when the Justice Department confesses doubt as to whether a criminal case should be taken to the Virginia or the District courts, when coroners here and there debate for 36 hours which one should issue a death certificate for a person so unfortunate as to drop dead in the disputed zone.

Why, then, is it not settled? It must be remembered that Congress alone cannot settle the question. And neither can Virginia. Whatever is done must have the formal approval of both. Judging from the long trail of arguments, rulings, and judgments, it will take real statesmanship to negotiate and frame a pact that both will adopt. It has been tried several times in recent years. Friends of the District twice have blocked bills that would cede the airport to Virginia, and two proposals to declare the airport a part of the District have been stopped short by Virginia spokesmen in Congress.

Old reports show that Virginia has fared well in past boundary tests. And this recalls that phrase used by King Charles. Many years after he literally had lost his head, the phrase began to develop new meanings, all related to then current problems. Lawyers and arbitrators convinced themselves and others that "farther bank" didn't mean "high water mark" that so long had been accepted. Instead, it meant the Virginia shore of the Potomac and "shore" meant the area between high and low water marks. From such reasoning, arising over fishing rights disputes, it was but a short step to declare, as some authorities have, that the boundary was at the low-water mark. Such views were not unanimous and Government officials have been relying on later decisions by the Supreme Court which they say upholds the high-water mark.

Whether or not the bill recently reintroduced by Representative RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, proves the final answer, he is doing a service by again placing the question before Congress. And, in opposing this bill because it would cede the airport to Virginia, which he thinks is a mistake, Representative STEFAN, of Nebraska also is performing a service, especially since he has given extensive reasons why he opposes that plan. A frank joining of the issues in Congress and between spokesmen for Congress and Virginia might lead to something constructive.

As Mr. STEFAN told the House:

"How can we hope to engage in the settlement of vital boundary disputes between the great nations of the world when we are unable to settle one so simple as this between the National Government, Virginia, and the local municipality?"

The American Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I spent a couple of hours at the Casualty Branch of the War Department to obtain first-hand information regarding the melancholy task of reporting the news of war casualties. I was deeply impressed with the care that is taken to make sure that the sad news passing through this agency is delievered promptly, accurately, and sympathetically. And I learned something of the close cooperation between our armed forces and the Red Cross, of the inestimable value of the services of the Red Cross to men in prison camps, at the front, in camp, in hospitals, in rest areas, to veterans, and to the families of all these men.

The annual appeal of the American Red Cross to the Nation for funds to carry on its world-wide operations with troops at the battle front and on the home front and to relieve human suffering everywhere has now begun. A few days ago I spent a morning at the national headquarters here in Washington and talked to a number of the splendid men and women who are doing the executive work of this greatest of all humanitarian organizations.

The goal this year was first announced as $180,000,000. It has been raised to $200,000,000, which seems like a huge amount of money even to a Member of Congress in these days when appropriations for billions are commonplace. But it is not a staggering sum when you consider the magnitude and the diversity of Red Cross activities. The character and standing of the men and women who administer the spending of Red Cross funds guarantee that they will be expended wisely and economically. Furthermore, the act of Congress incorporating the American National Red Cross, approved February 28, 1905, provides that the financial transactions of the national organization shall be audited in detail by the War Department and reported to Congress. The charter sets forth its purposes as follows:

To furnish volunteer aid to the sick and wounded of armies in time of war.

To perform all the duties devolved upon a national society by each nation which has acceded to the Treaty of Geneva.

To act in matters of voluntary relief and in accord with the military and naval authorities as a medium of communication between the people of the United States of America and their Army and Navy.

To continue and carry on a system of national and international relief in time of peace and to apply the same in mitigating the suffering caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods, and other great national calamities, and to devise and carry on measures for preventing the same.

No organization was ever chartered with nobler aims.

There are over 3,000,000 trained volunteer workers in the volunteer special services corps alone who have qualified and are entitled to wear their distinctive uniforms. There are several hundred trained volunteer workers for every paid employee, and in addition there are millions of good people, mostly women, who volunteer for some particular work. It is impossible in this brief discussion to describe all their miscellaneous tasks, but the size of their job is shown by the fact that during the past fiscal year they knitted or made nearly 10,000,000 garments and almost a billion surgical dressings. The canteen corps served over 30,000,000 meals and the motor corps made over 2,000,000 calls.

The activities of the Red Cross with our boys and girls in uniform are the things which give it such a warm place in so many of our hearts. Our armed forces are engaged in global warfare and wherever our troops have gone, Red Cross workers are there to serve them. You will find them not only in the European theater but in Iceland, the Aleutians, the Fiji Islands, Guam, Saipan, India, Burma, China, and in every remote corner of the world where our men are fighting. On D-day, June 6, 1944, Red Cross field men accompanied assault troops on the beaches of Normandy. Many Red Cross men and women soon followed them to establish their facilities.

There were 727 overseas clubs operating on June 30, 1944. There are more now. There are on-post clubs located at camps overseas where there are games, books, writing paper, hot food, and the smiles of American girls. And maybe you do not think that last item is important. Ask any boy who is back from overseas service.

There are off-post clubs located in leave areas where exhausted soldiers and sailors can enjoy the comforts of home, relax and be entertained.

There are fleet clubs—homes in port for Navy men, and aero clubs established on air strips and at bases for men who are miles from the nearest village.

And then there are clubs on wheels which travel to men in isolated spots and bring them hot coffee and doughnuts, cigarettes and magazines, and the inspiration of seeing and meeting brave young American girls.

One thousand eight hundred and fifty-two men are engaged in this service overseas and 7,751 girls, as of January 31. The value of their work in lifting the morale of our men, relieving their anxiety, bringing news and good cheer, cannot be estimated or recompensed. These stout-hearted American girls are worth their weight in gold. I salute them.

The Red Cross, by special agreement with the Army and Navy, sends trained women to hospitals both here and abroad to relieve the worries of sick and wounded men, to create diversion for their lonely hours, to organize parties and games, movies and entertainment in the wards and the recreation rooms. Some of them go on hospital ships to comfort the wounded on their way home.

Life would be almost unendurable in an enemy prison camp without the relief afforded captured soldiers through the International Committee of Red Cross with headquarters in Switzerland. Our first news that a boy reported missing in action is a prisoner of war comes from the International Red Cross. When we contribute to the American Red Cross we also contribute to the International Committee.

It is through this agency that the food and clothing furnished by the Government and private relief organizations, and the medicine kits and emergency kits given by the American Red Cross reach the prisoners of war.

Every Red Cross chapter has home-service workers on duty day and night to help families in trouble because a father, son, or husband is in the service and to help servicemen who are worried about things back home. Sometimes a soldier's allotment check has not been received and his family is in distress. The Red Cross extends financial aid and sees that the allotment check comes through. Or a wife has not heard from her husband in a long time, or a family is desperate for news of a relative in occupied territory. Through its communication system between the home chapter and the men in the field, the Red Cross can often establish contact when other means fail. Often a man overseas is deeply worried because he has received news that his mother or wife is critically ill, or because he has not received word of the birth of an expected baby. The field worker contacts the local chapter and the anxious soldier receives a report through the Red Cross two-way communication system that reaches round the world. The number of ways in which home service helps soldiers, sailors, veterans, and their families is countless. You can get some idea of the extent of it when I tell you that during

the last 12 months 3,500,000 servicemen and families were assisted and 2,000,000 communications handled by home service.

Probably the greatest achievement of the medical profession in the present war is the successful use of blood plasma in saving the lives of desperately wounded men. The Red Cross has established and maintained all the blood-donor centers throughout the country and has obtained enough blood donors to meet the quotas set by the Army and Navy. The pints of blood donated by generous patriotic American men and women between March 1944 and March 1945 amounts to over 5,000,000 pints. We can only guess how many precious lives have been saved by the Red Cross service. The division surgeon at Tarawa reports:

Six thousand units of plasma went ashore at Tarawa and 4,000 of them came back in the veins of wounded marines. At least half the seriously wounded owe their lives to plasma.

I will not take the time to tell the rest of the story as I learned it at Red Cross headquarters—about disaster relief, lifesaving, and its many other activities. But let me say a word about the Nurses' Aide Corps of the Volunteer Services.

Civilian hospitals are losing their registered nurses in mounting numbers to meet the needs of the Army and Navy. Civilians must also have expert care and there are not enough registered nurses to meet all the demands. The Volunteer Nurses' Aide program is designed to help the hard-pressed nurses at home and to release more for overseas duty. Under the efficient leadership of Mrs. Walter Lippmann, 167,786 students have been recruited and have completed the 80-hour course given in 7 weeks by graduate nurses authorized to each by the American Red Cross. When trained, these girls assist the overworked graduate nurses in civilian hospitals, in Army and veterans hospitals. Without them, many of our hospitals could not function.

Mrs. Lippmann showed me a letter she recently received from one of her young aides. The girl said:

I was not content in finishing school. I felt lost at home. I wanted to help and the nurses' aide program offered me that opportunity. If the wives who have husbands in the service, if the single girls who are at home only knew how much they could help and the great satisfaction they would gain by coming into this type of work, I am sure we would then be able to relieve more nurses for vital overseas duty. It is hard to express in just words the feeling, interest, love, and excitement I have for my work.

Mrs. Lippmann asked me particularly to stress the need of volunteer aides, who can give much needed assistance in the busy hospitals hours, especially mornings.

The Red Cross has mobilized and organized the finest instincts of the human race and put them to work to alleviate suffering in war and in peace. Millions of our best boys and girls are in uniform and making the real sacrifices. Millions of others are gladly, cheerfully rendering volunteer service in many useful fields.

It is essential that we continue to buy War bonds to provide funds for the munitions and implements of war. Self-preservation requires that of us. But when we buy War bonds we give nothing. We are merely saving our money and investing it in the soundest security to be had anywhere.

In this campaign for the 1945 Red Cross war fund we are not being asked for charity. We are being given an opportunity to do our bit in the greatest conflict in history, ancient, modern, or medieval, to enlist on the side of morality, decency, religion, and the freedom for which men have struggled for centuries, and in the only practical way open to many of us, to bring aid and comfort to those gallant sons of ours who are bearing the full brunt of our battles.

Let us give our services and our money to the American Red Cross—all we can—freely, gladly, and gratefully.

Who Emasculated the League of Nations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that, under leave to extend my remarks, I am permitted to include as a part thereof an article written by Hon. Irvine L. Lenroot, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on March 4, 1945:

THE OPPORTUNITY AT SAN FRANCISCO—FUTURE PEACE OF WORLD TO REST ON ADHERENCE TO PRINCIPLES OF JUSTICE

(By Irvine L. Lenroot)

I write this article as one who sincerely hopes that the United Nations Conference at San Francisco may agree upon a plan, patterned upon that of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, that will be ratified by our Senate and all the participating nations and which will contribute in some degree, at least, to the maintenance of peace in the world.

It would be folly, however, not to fully understand and frankly acknowledge that world peace for many years depends primarily upon the powerful nations now allied in the prosecution of the war against Germany. If these nations shall in the future fulfill their obligations and establish the same codes of honor for themselves as is expected from individuals, and is demanded from small nations, then the United Nations organization to be formed at San Francisco will be a great step forward in establishing world peace.

Already orators and writers, who call themselves liberals, are proclaiming to our people daily and nightly that the Crimea Conference was a triumph for the democratic peoples of the earth and that Russia is entitled to great credit for the happy outcome. In this a grave disservice is being done to the American people, for the disillusionment which is sure to follow from such propaganda may result in creating millions of isolationists who will render impossible any proper participation of the United States in world affairs.

PEOPLE ENTITLED TO FACTS

If our country is to take the part that it should in preserving world peace, its people must make their decisions upon facts, facts which they are entitled to know, for a public sentiment built upon untruths is like a house built upon the sands.

To illustrate how facts are being misrepresented to the American people today: They are being constantly told—and millions believe it—that the covenant of the League of Nations for which President Wilson fought was defeated by his enemies in the Senate, and that if it had not been so defeated the Second World War might have been avoided.

The truth is that President Wilson himself was the cause of our failure to become a member of the League of Nations. Had it not been for his insistence that the Senate agree to article X of the covenant containing the promise that we would with our might and material resources preserve as against external aggression the boundaries of every nation member of the League as recognized by the Versailles Peace Conference the Senate would have ratified the treaty containing the covenant of the League of Nations by an overwhelming vote.

TOOK PART IN CONTEST

I speak from first-hand knowledge upon this point, for as a member of the Senate at that time I took a very active part in the contest over the ratification of the treaty as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show. The day before President Wilson left Washington on his ill-fated western trip to seek public support for the League Covenant without reservations, he invited me to the White House to discuss the matter with him. Our discussion lasted nearly an hour, in which I pointed out to him that the only real obstacle to the ratification of the treaty was article X, and that if he would agree to a reservation relieving the United States from the obligation of that article, ratification would be certain and his speaking trip would become unnecessary. He replied that he would not agree to such a reservation, for, in his opinion, article X was the heart of the covenant and that without it the League would be of no value in maintaining the peace of the world.

In accordance with his request his supporters in the Senate voted against ratification with the Lodge reservation and thus defeated it. I would here observe that Lord Grey, then the English Ambassador, indicated in a letter published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that the Lodge reservations were acceptable to Great Britain.

CITES SHANTUNG ISSUE

The memories of most men are short and probably in the intervening 25 years few have remembered that if President Wilson had had his way we would have been in honor bound to fight on the side of Japan against China had China sought to recover Shantung, which the Versailles Treaty gave to Japan. Shangtung was restored to China in 1929 as a result of the Nine Power Treaty adopted at the Washington Conference. It will be again restored to China at the end of our war with Japan.

Some supporters of the Dumbarton Oaks plan state that it is a vindication of the idea of President Wilson. It is interesting to note, therefore, that the Dumbarton Oaks plan has nothing in it akin to article X of the League Covenant, and hence if President Wilson was right that article X was the heart of the League Covenant, then the Dumbarton Oaks plan has no heart. I did not agree with President Wilson then, and I think it very fortunate that the Dumbarton Oaks plan does not contain the obligation of article X.

The League of Nations was organized without the membership of the United States,

and every member, including Great Britain and France and later Russia assumed the obligations of article X.

At this time, when Great Britain, Russia, and the United States are fighting together against a common foe, it is regrettable that it is necessary to recall and point out the broken promises of Great Britain, Russia, and France in the past, not with the purpose to create ill-will against them, but to emphasize that, looking forward to a peace based upon justice, we cannot rely too much on our present allies.

In the prosecution of the war we are united with our allies and must remain so to the end until the military might of Germany is permanently destroyed. I am confident that this will be done, for the selfish ends of the United Nations require this. Beyond this we should cooperate with Russia and Great Britain to the fullest extent possible consistent with our American ideals of honor and justice, but our people are entitled to know, from the experience of the past, that too much trust must not be placed in some of the promises made at the Crimea Conference.

With these comments we come to a brief survey of how the promises of Great Britain and Russia have been kept since World War No. 1. In 1931 Japan invaded Manchuria, a wanton aggression, violating the promise of Japan in the League of Nations Covenant to respect and preserve the political independence and territorial integrity of China. This occurred under the Hoover administration and the United States vigorously protested against this aggression. Through our State Department we sought the cooperation of Great Britain to find means, short of war, to prevent it. While Great Britain was under a solemn obligation under article X to preserve the territorial integrity of China, also a member of the League of Nations, she not only failed to keep such promise but declined to cooperate with the United States in measures of any kind against Japan.

ETHIOPIAN CASE CITED

In 1934 both Italy and Ethiopia were members of the League of Nations. Nevertheless, Italy, without cause, attacked Ethiopia, and while the League condemned the aggression and invoked economic sanctions against Italy, no serious efforts were made to put them into effect. Neither Great Britain nor France, separately, did anything to fulfill their promises to protect the territorial integrity of Ethiopia.

Furthermore, there was never a time, prior to 1936, when Great Britain and France could not easily have prevented the rearmament of Germany. Not only was there no attempt to do so for several years prior to 1936 but the industries of France and Great Britain were permitted to sell to Germany vast quantities of war material. It is true that Winston Churchill protested the rearmament of Germany, but at that time his was a voice crying in the wilderness and had no effect.

There is no doubt that Great Britain and France welcomed the rearmament of Germany under the mistaken belief that Germany would make war upon Russia alone and thus prevent the spread of communism in Europe. This tragic mistake has cost millions of lives.

With respect to Russia's record:

In 1934 Russia joined the League of Nations and subscribed to its ogligations. Finland was also a member. In violation of her promise to preserve the territorial integrity of Finland, Russia made war upon her. Because of this act of aggression Russia was expelled from the League of Nations.

BALTIC STATES VIOLATED

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were independent republics, created in 1918, and recognized as such by Russia, who also signed nonaggression pacts with each of them. They were occupied by Russia in 1940, and shortly afterward pretended plebiscites, under Russian auspices, were held in each of them, under which they were incorporated into the Soviet Union. With respect to these plebiscites, it should be stated that in Latvia only 11 percent of the population is Russian, in Estonia 20 percent, and in Lithuania 3 percent. In Latvia 55 percent of the population is Protestant and 24 percent Roman Catholic. In Estonia the population is 78 percent Lutheran and 19 percent Greek Orthodox. In Lithuania the percentage is 80 percent Roman Catholic, 10 percent Protestant, and 3 percent Greek Orthodox.

In the plebiscites referred to but one ballot was presented to the voters and there was no opportunity to vote otherwise.

In Latvia 97 percent of the votes were for the Communistic ticket, in Estonia 93 percent, and in Lithuania 99 percent.

PLEBISCITES NO TEST

Thus it is seen that these countries, overwhelmingly Roman Catholic and Protestant, and non-Russian, voted almost unanimously for communism. It is unthinkable that these plebiscites evidenced in any substantial degree the will of the people of these nations. The United States has not, at least prior to the Crimea Conference, recognized the incorporation of these countries into the Soviet Union, doubtless because the so-called plebiscites should not be given the slightest weight by any liberty-loving people.

I have thus detailed the situation in regard to these three small nations because it is very important in evaluating the promises of the Crimea Conference with respect to free elections in the "liberated" countries.

Coming now to consideration of the Crimea Conference, it is to be noted that the three republics I have discussed are not mentioned and that the partition of Poland is made absolute with the exception of a few miles of variation from the Curzon Line, which deprives Poland of one-third of its pre-war territory. In this connection it is interesting to note that a considerable part of the territory taken from Poland and given to Russia has no relation to the Curzon Line, viz: A part of former Galicia which did not belong to Russia but had belonged to Austria for more than 100 years prior to the First World War, at the conclusion of which it was granted to Poland by the Allies. In this territory there are extensive oil wells. Russia did not have the slightest claim upon it either ethnologically, politically, on religious grounds, or otherwise.

SILENT ON VIOLATIONS

The second paragraph of the Atlantic Charter provides that the parties thereto "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned." In signing the declaration of the United Nations pledging the parties thereto not to make a separate peace with Germany, Russia expressly subscribed to the purposes and principles of the Atlantic Charter. Both President Roosevelt in his address to Congress and Prime Minister Churchill in his address to Parliament were silent upon the violation of the above provision of the Atlantic Charter in discussing the partition of Poland.

I do not criticize President Roosevelt or Prime Minister Churchill for making the agreements that they did at the Crimea Conference. They no doubt felt that violation of the Atlantic Charter was necessary to secure Stalin's full cooperation in the prosecution of the war and demilitarizing Germany afterward. Stalin might have said that the Russian armies had done their share and that America and Great Britain should finish the job. To represent the outcome of the Crimea Conference as a great diplomatic victory for the United States, however, is to misrepresent the facts. It was a great diplomatic victory for Stalin, and for no one else.

While better terms undoubtedly could have been obtained from Russia in 1942, when she was sorely in need of material help from us, criticism of our failure to do so will profit nothing now.

SHOULD CORRECT WRONG

At the San Francisco Conference we should endeavor to correct the wrong done to Poland and the smaller countries of Europe. Russia should there be reminded of the promise of the Atlantic Charter that no territorial changes should be made that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. There every effort should be made to provide for an honest vote of the inhabitants of that part of Poland held by Russia upon the question of whether they desire to become a part of Russia or remain with Poland, and to secure an agreement with Russia and Poland to abide by the result.

With respect to submitting to the people of western Poland the question of the form, character, and personnel of their Government, I hope that the San Francisco Conference will endeavor to insure an honest election, which can be had if it is placed under the supervision of an international commission upon which neither Russia nor Poland shall be represented, but which will be composed of nationals of disinterested countries whose only concern shall be that the election be honestly conducted.

If the things I have mentioned should be provided for at San Francisco, and honestly carried out, the United Nations organization which will be created there can do much to prevent wars in the future. I hope that the experience of two world wars, and their awful cost, will convince those nations which have so frequently violated their obligations that in the future their promises must be kept if another world war is to be avoided.

HOPE FOR FREE CONSULTATIONS

At the very least we may hope that the organization to be formed at San Francisco will insure free consultation between all the nations upon all questions involving world peace and declarations with respect thereto which will tend to solidify the opinions of all peace-loving peoples and act as a deterrent to any nation contemplating aggressive war.

In my opinion one of the most important questions to be decided at San Francisco will be whether a nation charged with aggression shall be permitted to prevent any action against it by the United Nations organization without its consent. Of course, it is ridiculous to suppose that a nation guilty of aggression would consent to any act of punishment against itself. It is very doubtful if the smaller nations represented at San Francisco will agree to the plan insisted upon by Russia which would only prevent wars among small nations, leaving Russia, Great Britain, the United States, France, and China free to make war without any real hindrance by the United Nations organization.

However, even if this demand of Russia must be acceded to in order to secure her membership in the United Nations organization, this should not prevent our becoming a part of it, provided that we shall not be obliged to perpetuate the injustices found in the Crimea agreement. The United States member of the Security Council can be relied upon to prevent this.

FEW LEFT TO WAGE WAR

With Germany and Japan completely demilitarized for many generations to come, there will be no danger of another world war, so far as we can now foresee, unless it be from Russia. It is unthinkable that Great Britain and the United States will ever make

war upon each other. At the conclusion of this war, Russia and the United States will be the two most powerful nations in the world. Russia has resources in mines, forests, and lands beyond that of any other nation. There is no need for her to covet the territory of any other country, especially in the Western Hemisphere. If she should covet the territory of others, her purpose would be to bring communism to the entire world. It is possible, but not probable, that she may do this, but before we would be in danger she would have to prepare the ground for her ideology.

The liberty that the American people enjoy is as much unknown in Russia as it is in Germany. Russia has a benevolent dictatorship which improves the material well-being of its people but destroys their individual liberties. That the Russian people, as a whole, are satisfied with this dictatorship, is, I think, true, but should it be otherwise, the people of Russia will never gain their freedom so long as communism exists.

Too much credit cannot be given to the Russian people, especially the Ukrainians, for their magnificent stand against the Germans and the vigor and crushing power of their counteroffenses. This, however, should not blind us to the essential difference between communism and democracy.

RUSSIA HAS BEEN AIDED

We should freely acknowledge that in fighting for her own preservation Russia has fought for us as well, but we should also remember that, had it not been for the war materials which we have sent her, costing us many billions of dollars, Russia might have been defeated by Germany. Neither should we forget that in our war with Japan Russia has as great a stake in the outcome as have the United States and Great Britain and yet she remains neutral, giving us no help.

It is unfortunately true that we have some leaders who, while disavowing communism and giving lip service to democracy, are at heart communistic in their ideas or do not realize that their impractical proposals are preparing the ground for communistic growth. It is also true that abuses by organized wealth promote the growth of communism.

If the people of the United States will only take an active interest in preserving our democracy, which has made the United States the greatest and most prosperous nation on earth, there will be no danger of communism ever taking root here.

After the wars with Germany and Japan are won we shall see whether Russia will keep her promises in the matter of holding free elections in the liberated countries. If she should fail in these promises or fail to give evidence that they will be faithfully kept, then the United States should decline to give her any financial assistance for her economic rehabilitation until her promises are fulfilled.

If, however, Russia should thus fail, even so, we should cooperate with her upon matters of common concern although we may abhor her ideology and methods. During the time of the czars, oppressors though they were, we maintained diplomatic relations with them. The same is true of Hitler's Germany until shortly before she declared war upon us. If we could do those things in the years that have gone, we can remain friendly with communistic Russia so long as she does not threaten the American way of life that we know.

We all hope and pray that this is the last world war that this earth shall ever know. We hope that the measures agreed upon against Germany, and later, I hope, to be agreed upon against Japan, together with a United Nations agreement at San Francisco to which we shall be a party, will bring nearer the day when there, indeed, shall be "On earth peace, good will toward men."

Human Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a short account of a most unusual occurrence to Seaman Dewey Dupre, of Opelousas, La., my home town, as reported by my hometown newspaper, the Clarion-News of Opelousas, La., of date February 28, 1945:

DEWEY DUPRE, LOCAL YOUTH, "HUMAN BOMB"

After 47 days as a "human bomb," Dewey Dupre, 20-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Dewey Dupre, Sr., of route 2, Opelousas, is able to take a hard knock without blowing himself up. Dewey had a successful operation at the naval hospital in San Francisco, Calif., when a fused shell was removed from his body.

The Clarion-News, through the Associated Press, was the first to bring to his family the news that their son had successfully stood the dangerous and delicate operation. They had been notified by the War Department simply that their son was wounded. The Clarion-News and Herald received a wire from the Associated Press Wednesday afternoon, which read:

"Twelfth naval district headquarters at San Francisco disclosed today a successful operation had been performed at the naval hospital there to remove a fused 20-mm projectile from the body of Seaman Second Class Dewey Dupree, of Opelousas."

He was at his station as gun loader aboard a battleship at Lingayen Gulf, January 9, when an air attack came.

"The first thing I knew," Dupre said, "I was lying on deck with a compound fracture of my left leg and other injuries about my chest."

Dewey was moved to an advanced base and then to the hospital in San Francisco. Convalescing nicely, he told doctors he felt something inside of him low in his body. Surgeons, thinking they had missed a piece of shrapnel, ordered X-rays. Pictures disclosed the fused shell.

"Because the projectile was such a sensitive type and might explode on contact even with an operating instrument," the Navy said, "the situation remained full of danger."

Bomb-disposal experts as well as neutral men were consulted. In a tense atmosphere, Commander J. I. Hall, Medical Corps, United States Naval Reserve, operated successfully.

Returning Veterans Pose Vital Post-War Challenge and Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a splendid article written by Richard B. Cole, of the Boston News Bureau, appearing in the February 20, 1945, issue of this fine financial publication, setting forth certain views of John J. Hagerty, of Boston, Mass., manager of the New England office of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The opinions of Mr. Hagerty expressed in this article are worthy of deep consideration, not only in New England, but in other parts of the country. His constructive views are of a challenging nature.

I also include in my remarks an editorial in the same issue of this publication entitled "Ours the Choice."

The article and editorial follow:

RETURNING VETERANS POSE VITAL POST-WAR CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY—NEW ENGLAND MUST LAY PLANS NOW TO ABSORB SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN IN REVITALIZED INDUSTRY, SAYS J. J. HAGERTY, NEW ENGLAND R. F. C. MANAGER—WITH DIVERSE INTERESTS ALL SHARING IN PROBLEM, PLANNING SHOULD BE DONE ON COMMUNITY BASIS

(By Richard B. Cole)

In the post-war era, New England faces both an arresting challenge and unparalleled opportunity, through the manner in which it receives back its returned war veterans into an industry geared to the exacting demands of the future, in the opinion of John J. Hagerty, New England manager of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"But to meet the challenge and seize the opportunity, New England must coordinate its post-war thinking and planning, acting on the democratic principle of individual municipal responsibility," Mr. Hagerty declared in an exclusive interview with the Boston News Bureau. "Our cities and towns should organize committees, made up of leading bankers, industrialists, doctors, and other civic leaders, to study the problems of the returning veterans and to guard against their unemployment," he continued.

"Industry fits prominently into the picture, for it must be prepared both to absorb the returning workers and to put itself into such physical shape, as to machinery and equipment, that it can compete with other areas equally aggressive. Surplus capital goods and machinery now owned by the R. F. C. will help to make this possible."

CLOSE TO MILLION NEW ENGLAND VETERANS

Room must be made in industry and business for nearly a million New England veterans of this war, nearly a half million in Massachusetts alone, declared Mr. Hagerty, as he outlined the dimensions of the post-war problem. The majority—around 70 percent—of the boys in the Army and Navy are of 24 years or younger, and they are the cream of the country's youth.

The problem is more serious now than it was after the First World War, he declared, for men returning from that war were more mature, and there were not so many taken directly from high school and college, having no specialized training.

In the past, stated Mr. Hagerty, we have permitted our New England young men, after they have been educated here in the best colleges and universities in the world, to go elsewhere for employment, and that is a mistake.

Three things are imperative to correct such a situation in the future: The young men returning from the services must be given an opportunity to increase their knowledge through additional education, as is provided in the G. I. bill of rights; they must be given an opportunity to learn through industry, by in-plant training or other means; they must be put in positions

where they can learn quickly, lest there be millions of unskilled men.

"We have the schools here in New England to do this job," Mr. Hagerty stated. "We have the money, much of which is in trust funds but can be put to work—maybe made dynamic rather than static. We have the administrative brains. We have the market, for the most populous part of New England lies within a radius of 250 miles of New York, wherein is concentrated the greatest purchasing power in the world. We have the desire and the willingness to do the job, once the need is fully realized."

COORDINATED THINKING AND PLANNING

"What is lacking is coordinated thinking and planning. With our economy built on the township idea, individual community committees consisting of those who understand the veterans' problems and the possibilities of local employment should work out plans which will insure that the wheels of industry be kept turning.

"In order that our men may know how to handle veterans, we in the R. F. C. will all take courses in vocational training and guidance, and the same policy should be followed by responsible men in industry, in the banks, the unions and fraternal societies, because the problem is one in which all of us share. The newpapers should be represented on the local committees to tell the story of what is being done and still remains to be done.

"It will be necessary to provide industrial education for college men who will perhaps prefer to go directly into industry rather than take that extra year which they will be allowed under the G. I. bill in order to complete their education. The veterans are entitled to a year, and the Government should meet the expense of training until the service men—and women—are trained sufficiently to be taken over by industry itself.

"Large companies should begin to think now about educational programs for these young men and women, working in cooperation with the Government. Industries will want leadership material and will be much concerned to obtain the right kind of people with proper training. Industry will be called upon to conduct its own schools, with the help of the Government, the unions, or any other source, permitting its employees to earn as they learn.

"Sound community projects should be developed in a spirit of civic responsibility. In Boston we should have one of the finest parking areas in the world, perhaps under Boston Common. It can be worked out. The idea is sound. The city of Boston can come to the R. F. C. for aid. Other sound, self-paying propositions can be worked out in other cities. But public works should be relied upon only after private enterprise and private initiative have sought to do the job."

THE R. F. C. AND BUSINESS

"Reconstruction Finance Corporation is in position to help communities and individual businesses meet their share of the future responsibility. We have the organization to help counsel and advise, we have machinery and equipment that is needed, we can help industry finance the acquisition of machinery if it requires aid.

"Over the past the New England R. F. C. office has made about 700 business loans, exclusive of disaster loans. We have saved over 700 companies, at least a half of which now are doing essential war work, and are vital parts of the New England economy.

"We now hold about $9,000,000 in property which has been declared surplus. In true, Government-owned property running into the scores of millions in value will become surplus. On the basis of experience of the last war, this should bring about 50 cents on the dollar. The R. F. C. has sent 10,000 catalogs describing the surplus property to all commercial banks in New England, to all manufacturers compiled from lists sent in by chambers of commerce, the Associated Industries, the War Production Board.

"It is the province of the 17,000 industries making up our New England economy to select what they need from this surplus and get it in place for post-war. This should not be done at the expense of the war effort, and where necessary we will sell now for delivery later. We will enter into arrangements to finance concerns that need financing, particularly the smaller ones. If they ask us to do so, we will make an analysis, in cooperation with the banks, of what is needed. In reality, the R. F. C. is just a public-service organization for banks and industries.

"During the War, industry has learned that it is absolutely essential to have the most modern machinery and equipment that money can buy. Our office is using the slogan 'Be Wise—Modernize' on all its letters, because modernization is needed more in New England than in many other parts of the country."

HELPING THE VETERANS

"And what applies to helping business applies to helping the veterans. The R. F. C. is in the same position as the banks as regards loans under the G. I. bill, and also we will be the reference agency to see whether loans should be guaranteed by the Veterans' Administrator.

"Here in New England we have many things in our favor to help the returning boys and girls. We have an excellent climate; the finest schools in the world; we have beautiful places in which to live, and good transportation; and we have high sense of morale value, which is one of our greatest assets in a time of stress.

"But there is a negative side to the problem. If the veteran should get the idea he is being pushed around—and many felt that way after the other war—his family will get it and before long the majority of the citizens may think the veterans are getting nowhere. We might have these four horsemen riding the streets: disillusionment, such as follows all wars; desire for escape, resulting from so many people being hemmed in by the war; social disintegration, resulting from hasty marriages, broken homes, neglected children, illness, family losses; and economic change resulting from all these other trends, and affecting the whole Nation to greater or less degree."

"It is to forestall such factors of disunity that all of us must begin now to formulate our post-war plans, that they may be in readiness when needed."

[From the Boston News Bureau of February 20, 1945]

OURS THE CHOICE

Can we steer a sensible middle course between rampant optimism and just the same sort of pessimism? Also between an excess of governmental direction (by ever less remote control from Washington) and local independence and initiative, both political and industrial?

Such questions lurk over a near horizon in terms of the man, the machine, the dollar. Can we successfully harness in post-war teamplay the diverse forces they represent? Herein waits either a challenge or an opportunity, a test or a chance. The man, personified now by either G. I. Joe or war worker, represents the nearest, most personal phase—the human. Behind him (often also her) lurk other equations, including possibly idle men, war-created surplus goods, idle dollars now being saved too stingily or else too riotously spent.

An authoritative sidelight on the first of these latent problems is afforded in another column by the comments of the New England R. F. C. manager, John J. Hagerty, who stresses the need for truly regional as well as democratic thinking or planning on how best to link the futures of New England's industries and of its returning veterans, nearly a million in number. Hereabouts, in this first home of local self-government, is an unexampled chance to benefit both men and business, in terms of more jobs better done.

Hence the need he sees for collective self-study by all New England's communities through local committees of bankers, businessmen, professionalmen, and other civic leaders on how best to equip both industry and all potential workers. R. F. C. now controls much machinery and surplus goods which could well be so employed.

Training these young veterans for their new roles will be a bigger and a more exacting task than it was after the other great war, when the fewer returning were themselves more mature. New England, above all other sections, has the schools to retrain such youth—just as it had to give them their first schooling for making war. The G. I. bill of rights points out the path for such quick retraining, through a welding of book learning and practical job tuition.

Further, there is much idle capital hereabouts often timidly reposing in trust funds, which also could be put to work. Then there is also, as Mr. Hagerty cites, the existence nearby of perhaps the richest and most populous market in America. R. F. C. itself, besides selling machinery, equipment, etc., will through its own staff learn more about vocational training and guidance, etc., and trusts that businessmen, bankers, unions, fraternal societies, etc., will also join in such needed "adult education."

Here waits the potential industrial leadership of tomorrow. R. F. C., its regional manager declares, would here set a pattern for and give continuing guidance to the 17,000 industries in the New England economy, in utilizing both the human and the inanimate units available for building up post-war efficiency and prosperity here. Too often in the past New England-trained youth and hard-won New England dollars have migrated to other areas which later on became our competitors.

This country sorely needs a deal of decentralization of localization of many things which could be better handled much nearer to "grass roots." Daily, as the prospect of victory becomes surer, however vaguely so as to date or detail, that other needs increases of a firmer, more intelligent, better informed, treatment of the many and still to be answered questions as to what must be done for returning veterans and for post-war business.

Our pessimists conjure up many worries, beginning with those ten or a dozen million prospective veterans, then going on to our hundred billion of dormant savings, plus the other billions of potentially idle, Government-owned war plants (plus other outmoded factories.)

But, as the war itself proved, we shall not at least now need to worry about future raw materials. The single central task is our wisest future handling of the many ingredients lying so richly all about us in both human and material terms. All the needed ingredients for both success and prosperity are near to our hands. Have we the wit and wisdom to compound them rightly?

All that is really needed to mix those ingredients properly is some common sense, leavened by understanding and sympathy—all directed through organized, localized planning to the end of solving the problem of the returning veterans and the others who want to work. There is something inconsistent in worrying about too much buying power, or inflation, and overproduction;

for one ought to be able to balance out the other—if we use our heads. As is usually the case, the final result will probably be something in between the two extremes.

At Odds With the News Ends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I give below an editorial by Fred Robel, editor of the Granville Herald, published at Granville, N. Dak. It shows just how far bureaucracy has run amuck.

I cannot imagine any home in McHenry County, N. Dak., without storm doors and storm windows. I know there are very few if any. For the benefit of the bureaucrat who sent this information out, may I state that the temperature in North Dakota occasionally drops down to 30 degrees below zero. The people there know how to take care of themselves, and they need no outside assistance or suggestions. Especially do they resent being libeled by some Washington pencil pusher.

This particular pencil-pushing bureaucrat talks about fuel oil that could be saved with storm windows and storm doors. There are just two things wrong with that suggestion. First, the storm windows and storm doors are there, and next, I doubt whether there is a single oil burner in all of McHenry County. This bureaucrat ought to know that North Dakota has 700,000,000,000 tons of lignite coal and that a great deal of that coal is right in McHenry County. As far as McHenry County is concerned this particular pencil pusher can keep all the oil.

Here is the editorial:

Somehow I seem to have developed a sort of chronic gripe and it seems impossible to get out of that rut—if that's what it is.

But things happen in this great land of the free and home of the brave that just make one want to "tear his hair"—and I don't have any hair; not so much, any more.

This week comes a communication for immediate release. It carries a Washington (D. C.) date line, but no date, and the first paragraph reads:

"A total of $134,735, or enough to purchase two War bonds for every family in the county could be saved in McHenry County, N. Dak., this winter through the single expedient of installing storm windows on all residential buildings as a means of conserving fuel."

Think of that, folks, and then ask yourself: "Are my storm windows on?"

But, read further:

"The figure represents the cost of coal, oil, and gas which could be saved in that county as determined by a formula announced here by the Chief of the Federal Housing Administration's Mechanical Engineering Division. * * * The formula, devised for one fuel-saving measure, the storm window, a homely example familiar to all, shows that, in effect, from McHenry County alone 2,086 more gallons of fuel oil and 12,233 extra tons of coal would flow into the war effort—instead of up the chimney—if this one measure were universally adopted."

Read some more:

"The mathematical formula devised for computing potential savings, takes into account the number of oil-heated and coal-heated single- and multiple-family dwellings in each county as reported by the United States Bureau of Census, the number of degree days in each community estimated by the Weather Bureau, and conservative estimates of average glass areas in various types of dwellings."

After that you won't need to wonder more why we have some two million—more or less—people employed in the various bureaus and agencies of one kind and another in Washington, D. C.

Of course, you might wonder why since the Bureau of the Census and the chief engineer of the Federal Housing Administration, have no more important task before them than figuring out whether or not a McHenry County citizen put on his storm windows last fall, to effect what sounds like an important saving in fuel—oil and coal—it might not be a part of the responsibility of some Washington, D. C., institution, bureau, or agency, to start on other sources, not of mere waste alone, but flagrant extravagance.

Talk to any serviceman who has been on overseas duty, especially those attached to the merchant marine service. They can tell you stories of the extravagant use of manpower, the extravagant waste of time, the extravagant waste of ship's space in transporting luxuries rather than essentials.

Talk to people engaged in war industry, particularly Government docks and shipyards, where extravagance—willful extravagance—is the rule, not exception, and it sets you to wondering why a smart guy like the Chief of the Federal Housing Administration doesn't really get down to devising a formula" for real saving, or, aren't you listening?

A Bill To Outlaw the Use of Peyote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House a bill recently introduced by me, H. R. 2403. This bill would make the law in reference to marijuana applicable to peyote. In addition, it would prohibit the employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or any Government agency, from encouraging or promoting the use of peyote by Indians.

Peyote is a plant having many characteristics like marijuana. H. R. 2403 defines peyote as follows:

The term "peyote" means all parts, including the seeds, of the plant Lophophora williamsii (Lem.) Coulter, and of the plant Lophorphora lewinni Thompson, whether growing or not; any alkaloid extracted from any such part; and any compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of any such part of alkaloid.

The harmful effects of peyote have been disturbing to a great many physicians and many other citizens. This is especially true in those areas where Indians are living.

Back in April of 1940, the then Chief of the Food and Drug Administration wrote:

This Administration has at various times given consideration to the distribution of peyote. A number of years ago at the investigation of the Indian Bureau an effort was made to detain shipments of peyote at the Mexicon border and prevent entry into this country. More recently, also at the request of the Indian Bureau, we discontinued taking such action. This was partially due to the fact that we had never encountered peyote in any product intended for medicinal use and according to all of the information available, the product was used either by Indians in connection with religious ceremonies or by others for its apparent narcotic effect.

From a strictly humanitarian standpoint we will be interested in taking any steps possible to prevent the use of this product as a narcotic.

Notwithstanding the apparent attitude of some in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indians themselves recognize the harm and danger arising from the use of peyote.

I wish to quote from an Associated Press article appearing in a number of papers on June 4, 1940:

GALLUP, N. Mex., June 4.—Stringent penalties were decreed by the Navajo tribal council today for use of the narcotic peyote weed, the Indian equivalent of the poppy and marijuana.

The council, in its annual session at the Window Rock Agency voted to impose penalties of 9 months in jail and a fine of $100 for introduction, sale or use of peyote on the reservation. The vote was 52 to 1.

Action followed an investigation by Howard Gorman, vice chairman of the council, who reported Indians used it in orgies under the guise of religious rites.

A resolution also was prepared for presentation to Congress asking Federal control of traffic in the weed. New Mexico statutes exist covering the drug, but enforcement has not been effective.

Mr. Speaker, the use of peyote should be outlawed. The bill, H. R. 2403, ought to be the law of the land.

Where Is East Texas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include in the RECORD an article entitled "Where Is East Texas?":

WHERE IS EAST TEXAS?

A visitor in our State recently asked: "Just where is east Texas?" It is a question that develops wide difference of opinion and has puzzled the historians and the map makers. If you fold the map of Texas and place the Sabine River on top of El Paso, the center crease will fall between Sweetwater and Abilene. Yet there are many prominent and stalwart Texans who would not agree that east Texas extends that far.

There are those who say that east Texas is bounded on the west by the Trinity River or the Brazos. Others say that east Texas is confined to the 36 timber counties of the

"piney woods," where tall pine trees lift aloft their green branches to the sky and strew quiet aisles with pine needles like cloistered carpeted temple courts, and whispering winds from an invisible choir. There are those who say that east Texas is the land of the blackeyed pea, the sweet potato, ribbon-cane sirup, and bounteous family style meals. Many think of east Texas as a realm of rolling red hills where the sumac and the sweetgum are redolent with rich color in the autumn and the redbud, the dogwood, and the azalea bedeck the landscape with grandeur in the spring. Some say east Texas is a land of hills, rills, thrills, and stills.

There was in east Texas of sleepy towns and backward agriculture, where it was "too easy to do tolerably well." That east Texas has awakened into a new land of opportunity where modern agriculture and humming industry have begun a new era of progress in developing the natural resources of this richly blessed region.

When the great east Texas oil field was discovered, the geologists told us that the oil sand had been deposited ages ago along the shoreline of an ancient sea and that most of east Texas was formed later as this land rose and the waters receded. Perhaps after God Almighty had finished the rest of the earth, He reached the heights of His handiwork when He made east Texas last.

East Texas is the cradle of Texas history and culture. Here first came the brave men and women of the Old South, hardy souls who dared to venture forth into the wilds of a new frontier. They brought their traditions, their customs, their religion, their love of liberty. They wrested an empire from a foreign tyrant and won the Southwest for Anglo-Saxon civilization. Here we find an atmosphere and a manner which combine the hospitality of the Old South with the daring of the West.

East Texas is bounded on the north by Red River and by hearts that respond to the call of freedom; on the west by a line drawn through Waco and by the daring spirit that reaches toward new worlds of science and invention; on the east by Louisiana which has blended some of its charm and romance across the Sabine. On the south it is bounded by the sacred soil of San Jacinto and its shores are caressed by the waves of the Gulf of Mexico where great ports send forth their galleons of commerce to the far places of the earth.

Here's to east Texas—a land of romantic past and challenging future.

HUBERT M. HARRISON.

EAST TEXAS, *March 1945.*

Star Mail Routes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and letter to the editor of the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel:

AN UNFAIR SITUATION

Deserving of Congressional correction by passage of H. R. 4893 (a pending bill in the lower House) is an unjust economic situation of long standing in the United States Post Office Department.

Thousands of persons in all States receive their mail from what are known as star postal routes. These routes are operated by persons who enter bids to do so under 4-year contracts which for a large part are on a basis which prevents the successful bidders from making even a minimum wage under modern conditions.

The answer of some defenders of the system is that the bidders are not required to be bidders, which is true; but that defense neglects the matter of a Government's obligation to be something better than the operator of a business under a sweatshop philosophy.

One operator of a star route out of Fort Wayne is obliged to drive approximately 100 miles a day, for 6 days a week, devoting 6 hours daily to his work and receiving as compensation only a little more than $2,200 a year.

When his operating expenses (which include a bond fee, gasoline, oil, license, and depreciation on his truck) are deducted, it is obvious then the route operator is being victimized by an administration which regularly pretends great affection for the underpaid.

H. R. 4893 provides that star-route contractors be paid on a fair mileage basis and a fair hourly labor basis—approximately 7 cents for each mile driven, plus 75 cents an hour for time.

This bill is entitled to the support of every Member of Congress. A government such as ours certainly does not wish to be in the position of depriving the laborer of his proper hire.

RAPS STAR-ROUTE GOUGING

To the EDITOR OF THE NEWS-SENTINEL:

For several years I have wondered why the star routes have not been investigated, and I want to compliment the News-Sentinel for being wide awake and bringing this unfair situation before the people.

The News-Sentinel is the first Indiana paper that has been wide awake enough to cope with this situation, and they haven't made the situation deplorable enough.

These morning newspapers are the ones that really should investigate these star routes, because that is the way their papers get from town to town and there are some of these carriers that are sure irresponsible due to the fact that these star route contracts are a bonding and bidding racket.

Some of these carriers are losing money on their routes, and looks like the head officials of this administration wouldn't want such an unfair situation to continue when they stress on the problems of unfair and slave wages.

There have been only two minor changes made in the laws concerning these star routes since the stagecoach days, and I would say the Government is really slipping. One Government official made the statement at last year's hearings that even if they knew a contract was being let so the contractor was losing money he would be given the contract as long as he had adequate bond.

Now they have Senate investigations on elections, and they have dog investigations; why not have a Senate investigation on these star routes which about 12,000 families in the United States would benefit by?

A STAR ROUTE BOOSTER.

Lt. Col. John Thornton Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, central Illinois, as well as the entire Nation, mourns the death of Lt. Col. John Thornton Walker, air liaison officer of the Fifteenth Army Group, recently killed in a crash of an Army transport plane in Rome, Italy. Colonel Walker was Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark's personal pilot over the fighting lines, and only recently received the Legion of Merit, having previously been awarded the Silver Star and the Air Medal, all three from the hands of General Clark personally.

A tribute to my friend, an outstanding hero of World War No. 2, is included herewith in the news report of his death as carried in the Illinois State Journal, his home town newspaper, together with an editorial eulogy from the same paper under date of Thursday, March 1, 1945:

LT. COL. THORNTON WALKER KILLED IN PLANE CRASH EN ROUTE HOME TO VISIT FAMILY

Lt. Col. John Thornton Walker, 32, formerly of the Illinois State Journal editorial staff and later publicity director for the State department of agriculture, was killed February 19 along with 9 others while en route home on leave when a transport plane crashed after taking off from an airfield near Rome, it was announced yesterday.

The plane fell from a height of 400 feet.

Colonel Walker, who resided at 614½ South Douglas Avenue, was air liason officer of the 15th Army group. Three of those killed, including Colonel Walker, were officers of Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark's staff. Colonel Walker, who only last week received the Legion of Merit, frequently piloted Clark on inspection trips.

The other two were Lt. Col John Howard Faust, 32, assistant artillery officer of the 15th Army group, of Wyomissing, Pa., and Maj. Donald M. Kerr, transportation officer, of Portland, Oreg.

Maj. William N. Mallory, 42, intelligence officer of the tactical air force, was another American officer killed. He received the Legion of Merit December 1 for the famed "Operation Mallory" which resulted in the cutting of 22 of the 24 bridges crossing the Po in Lombardy.

Mallory, of Memphis, Tenn., was one of the all-time football greats at Yale where he was a star fullback in 1923. He was scheduled for release from the Army because of overage regulations.

BRITISH VICTIMS

Others killed in the crash were two British officers en route to Britain on leave. a British woman officer, the pilot, copilot, and a crew member, all British.

After he was graduated from Springfield High School in 1931, Colonel Walker started work on the Illinois State Journal as a cub reporter. He later became a general reporter and following that a statehouse legislative reporter. In August, 1938, he left the State Journal to accept a position with the State Rural Electrification Association and later became publicity director for the State department of agriculture.

He left Springfield in November 1940, as a second lieutenant with the One Hundred and Sixth Cavalry, formerly a unit of the Illinois National Guard. Prior to that he had gone through the various noncommissioned grades of the Illinois National Guard.

Colonel Walker was under training for 2 years at Camp Livingston, La., then was transferred to the Air Corps and attended school at Fort Sill, Okla., for 8 weeks. He was promoted from second to first lieutenant, and after being made a captain in April, 1942, was sent to North Africa the following October.

WINS PROMOTION

He became a major in April, 1943, before leaving Africa for the campaigns in Sicily and Italy. He was named lieutenant colonel in July, 1944.

Colonel Walker won distinction in Italy as a pilot of observation planes and other small-type ships. He became General Clark's personal pilot over the fighting lines, and his skill in handling his "puddle jumper" planes or "grasshoppers" and eluding German armored craft won wide notice.

He was credited with eluding five Nazi fighters on one occasion by maneuvering his slow ship among the trees. While flying alone, another time, he landed his light craft in a treetop when the chase became too hot.

Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark presented Walker with the Silver Star for gallantry in action in March 1944, in a ceremony at Fifth Army headquarters in Italy. The award was presented for successfully completing an aerial mission at the Anzio beachhead despite a strafing attack by six German planes.

AWARDED AIR MEDAL

Colonel Walker was awarded the Air Medal by General Clark in November 1944, in a ceremony near the front lines in northern Italy for meritorious achievement while participating in aerial flight. Through nearly 4 years of service he escaped injury.

Walker was born August 24, 1912, 4 miles west of Rochester in Rochester Township. The family moved to Springfield when he was 8 years old and he was graduated from Lawrence School and Springfield High School. At the age of 11, he began working for the Illinois State Journal, starting as a carrier boy. He wrote the high-school sports news while attending high school.

INTERESTED IN AVIATION

While employed by the Journal he became interested in aviation and materialized that interest by taking flight instruction and received a private certificate of competency at Springfield Airport. He served as aviation editor of the State Journal for several years and on one occasion flew a Taylocraft plane to Chesterfield to gather material and take pictures of a plane crash in that area.

Colonel Walker was a member of the First Christian Church. At one time he served as president of the Springfield chapter of the National Aeronautical Association.

He was married in 1934, to Geraldine Hudson, of Washington, Ind., who survives, together with a 3-year-old daughter, Connie Ann.

Also surviving are his father, James H., 1105 West Washington Street, assistant chief of the Springfield fire department; a brother, Edward W. Walker, a flight officer in France; and a sister, Mrs. Anna Mae Ripley, who resides in Montana.

His mother died when he was a child.

LT. COL. J. T. WALKER

Again the staff of the Illinois State Journal has been affected by close-up contact with the stark tragedy of World War No. 2. It grieves today for the death of Lt. Col. John Thornton Walker, third of major casualties which have struck the paper's organization.

It is difficult to express the depth of sentiment the news of Colonel Walker's death produced in this office. It is cumulative of sadness caused by the loss of Ulysses S. Phelps and Byrl Critser. It touched particularly the editorial department, where Thornton Walker began his career as a newspaperman. Here he was regarded with affection and admiration.

The war has claimed no better young man than Thornton Walker. He was physically, mentally, and morally typical of good American citizenship. He was strong of body and mind, courageous and loyal. Prior to the war he had distinguished himself as an aviator. During his service as a reporter he was a student of aeronautics. Later he was a teacher, and he went into the service well equipped.

With pride this city has followed the career of Colonel Walker, and with the deepest sorrow the Journal today records the tragedy of his death. Associates of Colonel Walker have lost a good friend and the country has been deprived all too soon of a strong, intelligent, and devoted defender. The deprivation suffered by his family touches every person with relatives in the service.

Death came to Colonel Walker at the beginning of a respite from active flying, in which he had won honor for his skill as a pilot. He was on his way home for a well-earned leave, traveling with other officers by transport. He was not at the controls. Ironically, death came to him while he was a passenger.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter signed by certain college professors:

DEAR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT: All American citizens are united in a common determination that never again shall this country be found lacking in the military strength to insure its security. Educators in every State in the Union have declared themselves in favor of an adequate program of national defense. Incident to such a program is the proposal for compulsory military training.

We whose signatures are appended to this letter believe that this proposition should be thought through now while we are conscious of the reality of a world at war. We are better able at this moment to reach a wise decision on this important matter than we will be after the war is over, when again we shall be lulled by a false sense of security. The judgment of the majority is now more sound on this issue than it will be after peace is declared. We know too well the reactions which occur after a conflict is over; the general desire to forget it.

The adoption of a sound plan for universal military training now will enable the United States to speak with greater authority at the peace table in favor of an international organization to enforce peace.

The adoption now will reassure the other peace-loving nations of the world that the United States purposes to cooperate with them in outlawing war and will not again retreat into isolationism. We believe that it is more fitting in our form of government to insure national security through the proper system of universal military training than through the maintenance of a large standing army.

These are the only alternatives. We believe that the maintenance of a large standing army is contrary to the traditions of our people and opposed to the best interests of the Nation. The adoption of the proper plan of universal training now involves no perpetual commitment. If out of the coming discussions among the nations, an effective international plan to insure peace should emerge and the unrighteous ambitions of aggressor nations permanently blocked, the Congress would always have the authority to modify or abrogate the military training system.

For these reasons it is our firm belief that the proposal for a system of universal military training should be considered now; its advantages and disadvantages carefully weighed and appropriate action taken without subjecting the nations to those hazards which are involved in postponement and delay.

Sincerely,

Signed by: Stanley King, Amherst College; Edwin S. Burdell, Cooper Union; Ernest M. Hopkins, Dartmouth; Blake R. Van Leer, Georgia Tech; William Mather Lewis, Lafayette College; Karl T. Compton, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Levering Tyson, Muhlenberg College; Robert L. Johnson, Temple University; Robert C. Clothier, Rutgers University; John J. Tigert, University of Florida; Thomas S. Gates, University of Pennsylvania; J. G. Bowman, University of Pittsburgh; Charles Seymour, Yale University; Franklyn B. Snyder, Northwestern University.

Bureaucracy Moves in Devious Ways Its Wonders To Perform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. EARTHMAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday morning, the 27th of February, I came before this House of Congress to report what I believe to be a condition that is un-American in principle and truly against the traditions laid down by the builders of democracy in government.

While it is not my intention to blast rationing, price ceilings, or any other sound governmental regulations in time of war, I do propose to take steps even to the point of being drastic in an effort to protest secret methods used to rule the people with an iron hand on the parts of some few who would use the agencies of government, with emergency as an excuse, to revamp and reshape the practices and policies laid down as yardsticks, to be made precedents with the hope of continuance even after the emergency terminates.

God forbid that any individuals be allowed to continue on the public pay roll who would use the generosity of the Government, supported by the people, to destroy the freedom of the people as individuals and to thwart the freedom of operation in business and industry.

Since taking a public stand and making a complaint of being refused the right as a Representative to attend an O. P. A. price-setting meeting, I have received an untold number of communications encouraging me to proceed further in calling the attention of Congress as well as the general public to the un-American attempts made by O. P. A., and it is my hope that the Smith committee will lose no time in calling the officials and responsible parties of O. P. A. before them to explain such secret and underhanded methods used against the American people.

Of these communications I have received letters from businessmen, farm-

ers, county judges, and other public officials as well as numerous individuals. I insert into the RECORD at this point an editorial taken from the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., which I think is very expressive, true, and timely:

BUREAUCRACY MOVES IN DEVIOUS WAYS ITS WONDERS TO PERFORM

In a policy study, price-ceiling study on strawberries—by the O. P. A. or any other Government agency—who would be more interested than a Congressman from a strawberry-growing State, or who would have greater "right" to sit in, either as observer or adviser, than a Congressman from a strawberry-growing State who is also a member of the House Agricultural Committee?

The question comes up with expulsion of Representative HAROLD H. EARTHMAN, of the Fifth Tennessee District, from the Washington conference of O. P. A. officials pondering the ceiling on strawberries. Along with Representatives JOHN JENNINGS, another Tennessean, and JAMES M. MORRISON, of Louisiana, he was denied the right to be present among those in the inner sanctum. His conclusion is that the O. P. A. hierarchy doesn't want its sacred premises defiled. Maybe he should have taken off his shoes as well as his hat, for was he not in the judgment of the bureaucrats assembled treading on holy ground?

Yes; it smacks of "gross, underhanded, secret methods," as "Doc" EARTHMAN subsequently told the House, and of "government without representation." But bureaucracy works that way, and tends in that direction.

Did the O. P. A. "experts" deciding the fate of the strawberry industry—its fate depends on the prices permitted—know more about strawberries than Representatives of the strawberry areas? Why should any O. P. A. session dealing with the public business be a closed, or secret, session? Why should the duly elected Representatives of the people be excluded from conferences shaping the future of any field of business, regardless of the identity of that business?

Bureaucracy moves in mysterious ways its wonders to perform. It comes into being as a servant, sometimes in the name of emergency, and before you know it the very creators thereof find it speaking to them in condescending tones, even denying them admission to its holy of holies.

The language it used is not that of strawberries, but of razzberries. In the domain of directives, rules, regimentation, and government-by-such, it submits to no poaching on its premises. It even kicks Congressmen out when they dare to even casually suggest an interest in its doings.

The strawberry incident is a case in point, merely symptomatic of the innumerable cases dotting bureaucracy's record, but brought to light with new emphasis because it was a Tennessee Congressman and a Tennessee industry involved in this treatment. It is inevitable because bureaucracy works that way. Its tones of condescension, its spirit, its whole general attitude, are in the pattern of its mosaic. Except when it comes up periodically for appropriations to continue, or perpetuate, itself, it regards itself as above the law and superior to constitutional authority. Portions of it have been told that their decisions and operations are not subject to court review!

So when bureaucracy, in any of its labyrinth of branches, flaunts its defy to Congressmen, one wonders not that Mr. and Mrs. John Public (the masses, and the governed) are treated somewhat as they are treated; are pushed around and told what they are to do and what they are not to do.

That the O. P. A. has a war job to do or that any other such agency has a war job to do in no wise justifies treatment suggestive of the very tyranny we are fighting a war to escape. In no way does it justify the cluttering-up of the American premises, in or out of Washington, with pipsqueak, two-by-four dictators, striving to pull the country in their chosen direction by the very teat they are tugging.

EARTHMAN AIDING STRAWBERRY GROWERS, GETS O. P. A. "RAZZBERRY," BUT THE BATTLE HAS JUST BEGUN

(By Mary James Cottrell)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—Plans moved forward on Capitol Hill today to bring O. P. A. officials before at least two congressional committees to explain why they invited three Congressmen to leave a meeting where ceiling prices on fresh strawberries were under discussion and their refusal to continue discussions in the presence of Members of Congress.

Refused admittance to the advisory committee meeting held Tuesday were Congressmen HAROLD H. EARTHMAN and JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., of Tennessee, and JAMES H. MORRISON, of Louisiana.

Declaring that "our soldiers are fighting all over the world to prevent this sort of secrecy in Government," EARTHMAN, member of the House Committee on Agriculture, today demanded an investigation of O. P. A. tactics and was assured that O. P. A. chieftains would be given ample opportunity to explain their stand before the Banking and Currency Committee and the Smith Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies.

Incensed by the incident, Chairman BRENT SPENCE, of the Banking and Currency Committee, which handles O. P. A. legislation, told EARTHMAN that his committee would investigate. JENNINGS, one of the trio invited to leave the meeting, is a member of the Smith committee and promised that the OPAsters would be given a thorough going-over by his committee.

Both EARTHMAN and JENNINGS denounced O. P. A.'s action from the floor of the House and their denunciation was shared by several Members from both sides of the aisle who had also locked horns with O. P. A. bureaucrats.

O. P. A. IN DITHER

According to EARTHMAN, the presence of the Congressmen at the meeting threw O. P. A. officials into a dither and they appeared very much wrought up. When EARTHMAN and MORRISON entered the conference room they were immediately asked to leave and told that it was not an open meeting. The solons insisted that they be permitted to listen to the discussion of ceiling prices on strawberries which are grown extensively in their districts. Thereupon the Congressmen were invited into the corridor and kept standing in the hall while lesser members of the O. P. A. staff scurried to find a higher authority to rule upon whether or not the Congressmen could enter.

While waiting, EARTHMAN and MORRISON were joined by Congressman JOHN JENNINGS, fiery east Tennessee Republican, who refused to tangle with O. P. A. and returned in disgust to Capitol Hill where he delivered a blast on the floor of the House, declaring "Brothers MORRISON, EARTHMAN, and myself got the 'razzberry.'"

"We were told that if we insisted on reentering the conference room the advisory committee would be forced to recess," said EARTHMAN.

"We did go back and they did recess the meeting. They started a round-table discussion, saying that while some of the people had traveled thousands of miles as members of the advisory committee, they could not proceed in an official meeting with the Congressmen, and that any recommendation that came out of the meeting could not be accepted as official," he added.

At this juncture, EARTHMAN said he told the group that he had come to represent his constituents and to see how they arrived at ceiling prices which set the price in Tennessee at $1.56 less per crate than other markets.

"Although I did not mind being an unwelcome visitor, I told them that rather than to jeopardize the official status of the meeting that I would retire and resort to other means."

"While I am not a big fish in Congress and do not have the power of seniority to gobble up anybody or any outfit, the O. P. A. can rest assured that so long as they employ such secret practices and policies, I am going to nibble them to death," he added.

"I don't like it and I am not ever going to like it. We have men all over the world fighting to prevent this kind of government. This is still the people's Government and such secrecy smacks of utter disregard for the people who support the Government."

JENNINGS, who is supporting EARTHMAN and MORRISON in their demands for an investigation, declared today that this "high-handed, pig-headed insolence" raises a number of questions, including the right of the people to assemble and petition the Government for a redress of grievance.

"Brothers MORRISON, EARTHMAN, and myself got the 'razzberry' from a few 'small potato' bureaucrats," said JENNINGS, "but I favor giving them the 'works.' It is in the power of this Congress to 'cut off their water.' The process of putting strait jackets on the free people of this country by a motley crew who could not be elected dog pelter back home must be stopped.

"We can and should reduce them to their proper size and when we do they will drop through a narrow crack into oblivion," JENNINGS added.

EARTHMAN declared today that he will not let up until a special investigation is made and the general public knows why and if they are going to continue secret meetings and secret tactics.

A Test of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

A TEST OF LEADERSHIP

Senate confirmation of Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce does not by any means end the political war touched off by his appointment. Since Congress made sure by passing the George bill that Mr. Wallace will not also exercise power as head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, most of the fireworks had vanished from the confirmation contest. But a real struggle over basic policies continues. And some drastic political realinements may result before it is over.

On the final test in the Senate 10 Republicans, led by OWEN BREWSTER, GEORGE AIKEN, and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, broke away from their party leadership and voted to approve Mr. Wallace. Apparently most of them did this, not because they considered him fitted for the post, but because they believed opposition would only help to build Mr. Wallace up as the outstanding exponent of full employment and appear to set them against it. Senator AIKEN declared that he favored the goal of 60,000,000 jobs, and Senator BREWSTER declared:

"If from hatred you show fear of this man, you are anointing him as the Messiah of a new day."

Others who can by no means be classed as radical have been questioning Republican leadership in Congress on this broad issue. In many respects it has appeared to be following too closely the tactics which have so handicapped recent Republican Presidential campaigns—opposing New Deal projects without themselves offering sounder methods of attaining popular goals.

There was solid ground for questioning the tactfulness of the President's choice for the Commerce post in view of the poor relations between Mr. Wallace and a large part of the business community. There was sound reason for Congress to separate the R. F. C. from the Commerce Department and set up safeguards over its power. But some of the opposition has appeared so hysterically inaccurate and unfair about Mr. Wallace's character and purposes as to defeat itself. And many were in the position of fighting the thing with which Mr. Wallace has identified himself—full employment.

In this struggle, as in many others of the last few years, many Republicans in Congress may find in the end that they have been led astray by simply following the anti-New Deal Democrats. Many of the latter from the South are unresponsive to great social and economic changes in the national scene. They are sure of their seats and do not have to bother. They may be able and patriotic Jeffersonians, but they are often out of touch with popular movements. And, finally, they are under no obligation to offer alternative programs.

It is not easy for those who must meet the political magic of the "60,000,000 jobs" slogan to find an alternative program which is both sound and attractive. But one of their first objectives should be to avoid a posture of opposing the purpose as well as the methods of Mr. Wallace. It may well prove that the young Republicans have so far in this struggle laid a better groundwork than their leaders for a politically effective as well as an economically sound program.

A Member of Congress Looks at Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 4, the New York Times Magazine published an article by our highly respected and beloved colleague, Hon. CHARLES A. EATON, dean of the congressional delegation from New Jersey, entitled "A Member of Congress Looks at Congress."

Affectionately known to all of us as "Doc," Mr. EATON has drawn from his years of experience in the Congress and his comprehensive knowledge of human nature to write this article as to what the Congress should do to make it a more effective branch of the Government.

Much has been written on this matter, but I venture to suggest that nothing has been written which is more human in its approach to the subject and makes more sense.

It is to be hoped that the committee having this matter in charge will bear Mr. EATON'S suggestions in mind because they are practical and constructive.

The article follows:

A MEMBER OF CONGRESS LOOKS AT CONGRESS

(By CHARLES A. EATON, Member of Congress from New Jersey)

The Times has asked me to discuss the question: What is the matter with Congress? My point of view is that of a Member now in his twenty-first consecutive year of service.

This question is a hardy perennial. Since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, it has troubled our intellectual elite and it has been the basis of hectic and usually inconclusive argument in every cracker-box forum where genuine grass-roots public opinion is shaped.

I believe that intelligent criticism of Congress and of all other governmental agencies is absolutely necessary if free self-government is to survive. But, traditionally, Congress has been singled out as a special whipping boy by our free and more or less intelligent citizenship. Through the press, over the radio and in public and private speech an endless barrage of fault finding is directed, in part against the institution itself but primarily against its membership.

Some of the fault finding is pertinent and justified by the facts. Much of it is silly and pointless, born out of that mental and moral vacuum in which is conceived an endless spawn of alleged witticisms and imitation cynicisms, to the discredit of every phase of our national life, public and private.

I am not sure that I can correctly diagnose the cause or causes of this persistent pillorying of Congress. It probably began in the Revolutionary period when the Continental Congress faced new and difficult tasks under a nebulous authority and when at best its national policies had to be tentative and uncertain.

There are personal and social considerations which may explain in part why normal and even subnormal American citizens select Congress as their favorite whipping boy.

In our scheme of life, Government is supposed to be the servant and not the master of the people. Since in our private relationships the word "servant" and all that it connotes is largely taboo, folks doubtless get a measure of relief for their suppressed feelings by shoving their public servants around and by exploiting the inadequacies and futilities of those governmental agencies in which and by which they are served.

It must be kept in mind that Congress is always representative of actively warring political parties and, in these enlightened times, is further bedeviled by an army of predatory groups who think and act only in terms of their own selfish advantage. It is inevitable that each of these power- and profit-hungry parties and groups should have few kind words for Members of Congress who refuse, as many do, to jump when they crack the whip.

The primary function of Congress under the Constitution is to make laws. With varying degrees of intelligence and succes, it has performed this service for 150 years. In making laws, whether good, bad, or indifferent, Congress not only discharges its constitutional duty but also responds to the ever-changing demands of public opinion and needs.

Every normal American citizen at some time in his life comes to believe that there "ought to be a law" implementing his pet personal grievance or political theory. This is probably why in our wonderful democratic way of life two of our major industries are the making and breaking of laws. How, indeed, could the free and equal citizens of our free democracy live their free lives in a climate of free disagreement and protest if they were not, at their own free behest, completely and continuously enmeshed in a labyrinth of mutually contradictory laws?

There always has been and doubtless always will be a measure of chronic confusion and inefficiency in the daily doings of Congress, due to the incessant and inevitable clash among its Members of personal and political ideals, objectives, and ambitions; aggravated by the limitations and frailties common to human nature, whether in or out of Congress.

While the heaving of verbal brickbats at Congress is probably useful and necessary in the practice of free self-government, it must not be forgotten that the Members of Congress, in character, ability, and patriotism, are representative of the people who elect them. Regardless of party labels they constitute a true cross section out of the upper and middle strata of our national life.

It is reassuring to note that in the Seventy-ninth Congress, as in practically our entire history, there is a small group of Representatives in both Houses and both major parties who, measured by experience, character, and intellectual ability, can fairly be classified as statesmen.

In contrast to this distinguished group, there occasionally sifts into the membership a slight sedimentary deposit of congenital crackpots and misfits. These political accidents are, of course, a veritable godsend to the professional cynic and purveyor of wisecracks.

Between these two extremes the membership of both houses and both parties is representative of that great middle class which has created and developed America, and in whose keeping lies its future progress and security. These representative men and women give all they have of ability and patriotic devotion to their job. Their acknowledged mistakes and failures are of the mind rather than of the heart. Under the stress and confusion of these tragic times they are occasionally stampeded into unwise decisions, just as are their constituents back home. But whether right or wrong as to their political judgments, in personal integrity and faithfulness to duty they need fear comparison with no other group in the Nation.

In this year of our Lord 1945 the question why American citizens take macabre satisfaction in lampooning their representatives in Congress is of minor importance. What is of vital concern to the country, and indeed to the world, is the fact that the present organization of Congress is inadequate for the job it has to do. Two main developments have created this situation.

First is the enormous expansion of authority, organization, and cost in the executive branch, which makes it imperative, if our three-pronged form of government is to continue, that Congress equip itself adequately to discharge its constitutional duty of direction and control over the horde of new administration agencies which it has created and for the constitutional operation of which it is responsible.

In the second place, it is increasingly evident that Congress, as now organized, cannot promptly and efficiently deal with those complex conditions, political, social, economic, and military, created by our new and rapidly expanding relationships with the rest of the world.

We are faced today with a menacing challenge to the very fundamentals of our constitutional form of free self-government. The storm center of this challenge is Congress. And Congress must meet this challenge with courage, constructive wisdom, and moral force if our American people are to retain in full vigor and authority the principles and ideals of their way of life.

This challenge is not American-made. It is born out of a world-wide movement, gaining momentum every hour, everywhere, which seeks to submerge the individual in the state; to transfer the lawmaking authority from the

legislative to the executive branch of government; to substitute a spurious economic security for personal and political freedom and to make a government by men rather than by law the master rather than the servant of the people.

In the closing days of the Seventy-eighth Congress a concurrent resolution was passed setting up a joint committee on organization. This committee is to be composed of 12 members, 6 from each House equally divided between the two major parties. It will, of course, receive all necessary support from the present Congress, to which it will make a report of its findings.

Under the resolution this committee is "to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of personnel by the Members and the committees of the Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress."

Congress, under the Constitution as the supreme lawmaking body, is the keystone in the arch of our constitutional system of government. Apart from explicit provisions of the Constitution, all legal authority originates in this representative body. The committee system is the workshop of Congress and it is at this point that the most urgent need of reorganization appears.

The first and most vitally important function of congressional committees is to filter out the enormous mass of bills and resolutions offered in large part under pressure, both private and public. In the Seventy-seventh Congress, from January 3, 1941, to December 16, 1942, 2,924 bills were introduced in the Senate and 7,869 in the House, a total of 10,793. In addition, 541 joint resolutions were introduced. Out of this flood of 11,334 the Seventy-seventh Congress passed 1,018 House bills and 476 Senate bills. It requires slight imagination to visualize the chaos and failure in our legislative process if this entire mass of bills and resolutions had been dumped upon the two bodies without previous study and selection.

In the Sixty-first Congress a total of 44,363 bills and resolutions were introduced. This is a record. Over a period of 150 years a total of 726,933 bills and resolutions were introduced in both Houses, of which astronomical number less than 8½ percent became law.

At the present time there are 42 standing committees of the Senate and 47 of the House which operate as a dike to prevent a flood of unnecessary legislation from submerging every landmark of social, economic, and political progress in the country at large. It is agreed by all students of the subject that the committee system of both houses must be completely overhauled. This would mean a reduction of their number to 10 or 15 in each body and a consolidation of committees dealing with lesser but related subjects into these main committees.

In view of the tremendous growth of administrative agencies in the executive branch, many of them clothed with law-making and enforcing authority, it is self-evident that congressional committees dealing with these agencies must be properly equipped in the way of legal and other necessary expert help. In the new set-up each of our Congressional committees ought to have a well-paid and thoroughly equipped staff of career advisers. The reason for this is simple. At present congressional committees have to depend largely upon the testimony of the very executive agencies for which they are responsible in preparing legislation covering these agencies.

Since following the trend of the times, government has thrust itself into the lives of our citizens to an extent never before imagined, and usually to the hurt of the citizens, it is inevitable that these citizens come to their representatives in Congress for relef. This has so increased the work of the Members of Congress that it is now necessary for every Congressional office to be equipped with properly paid assistants, at least one of whom should devote his entire time to dealing with problems created by governmental interference with affairs of the individual citizen.

All this means added expense but the total cost of the Congress of the United States at present amounts to around $13,000,000 while the annual cost of the Office of Indian Affairs, a small subsidiary of the Interior Department, is $27,000,000. We spend $33,000 a year for the important work of drafting legislation, while in the solicitor's office of the Department of Agriculture alone some 600 employees cost our Government $1,600,000 a year.

In the reorganization of our committee system the seniority question must be faced. While occasionally this long-tested method of advancement in committee work has been subject to abuse or failure, there seems to be no workable substitute for it. If advancement in committee position by seniority service is abandoned and these places of leadership are open to election either by the committee members or by the Members of the Congress at large, time and energy will be frittered away in an endless series of political contests resulting in disunity, dissatisfaction and general weakening in the processes of lawmaking.

While we are undertaking, in the terms of mechanics, to streamline Congress, there are fundamental questions growing out of changes in our national life which must receive consideration. First among these questions is the anomalous situation which gives to 96 Members of Congress final responsibility and authority in our foreign policy and relationships, and leaves 435 Members of Congress, who are elected in exactly the same manner, with the limited responsibility of money legislation connected with our foreign policy.

In the beginning the Senate was supposed to be made up of ambassadors from the governments of the sovereign States to the Central Government at Washington, while the House was to be directly representative of the people. When it was decided by constitutional amendment that Senators were to be chosen in the primaries and elected on exactly the same basis as Members of the House, Senators became, in fact, Congressmen at Large. It is this situation which has created the agitation for the implementation of treaties by a majority vote of both Houses rather than by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

One other fundamental question of congressional reorganization is receiving increasing attention both in and out of Congress; that is the extension of the term of House Members from 2 years to possibly 4 or 6.

These questions are no longer academic. They involve the successful function of our representative system of government, and we may expect increasing agitation for constitutional amendments, lengthening the terms of Members of the House of Representatives and placing constitutional limits upon the length of service for future Presidents.

Whatever necessary improvements may be made in the physical organization of Congress, they will not of themselves amount to much unless the people continue to elect as their representatives men and women of invincible faith in the principles of our constitutional republican form of government, and who have the knowledge, wisdom, and courage to lead our country in assuming its proper place of influence and responsibility among the nations of the world while at the same time safeguarding and strengthening every American ideal and institution here at home.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which expresses the views of many of my constituents on the Polish situation:

MARCH 1, 1945.

The Honorable AIME J. FORAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Assembled at a conference, February 20, 1945, at the chancery of the Right Reverend Joseph Lesniak, bishop of the eastern diocese of the Polish National Catholic Church, 44 Prospect Street, Springfield, Mass.

We, the American clergy of Polish descent, do hereby condemn as unjust and contrary to the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, the decision regarding the new partition of Poland, reached at Yalta.

We are convinced that this action will not aid nor will it bring lasting peace to the world, for injustice perpetrated upon one nation is an injustice to all humanity.

We, therefore, appeal to you to use your power and influence in counteracting the ignoble plan to partition Poland anew, thus destroying her great contribution in the common struggle for victory and justice.

We most respectfully ask that the United States Government take immediate steps to aid the starving people of Poland and assist in the rehabilitation of Polish war victims.

We pray that God, who rules over the destinies of men and nations, may inspire and direct you to do everything in your power that justice may prevail in the final settlement of the Polish question.

Very truly yours,

Rt. Rev. JOSEPH LESNIAK, *President.*
Very Rev. J. STOLTYSIAK, *Secretary.*
Rev. F. MIKLASZESKI.

WOONSOCKET, R. I.

Congressional Curb on Bureaucratic Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSF OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, one of the first remarks I heard after taking my seat in this body was a complaint about the manner in which the governmental boards, bureaus, and agencies

were exceeding the grants of power delegated to them. The complaint is heard today, with ever-increasing frequency.

These bureaus, the creatures of the legislature, read into statutes authorizations and powers which the Congress never intended they should exercise. The only curb or control over them at this time available to the Congress is the long, slow process of enacting a law to rescind unauthorized rules and regulations—a process which might conceivably require a two-thirds vote in each the Senate and the House. The bureaus in some instances now have arrogated unto themselves more power than the Congress that created them.

To keep at least a few of them in check—to "ride herd" on them so that they would keep within the limits of the law—I recently offered an amendment to the labor-draft bill. The amendment was defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent the following self-explanatory letter and draft of a proposed plan to bring about a congressional curb on administrative rules and regulations to my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] so that his committee might study the suggestion in connection with others relating to the organization of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, by the adoption of this plan and incorporating it as an amendment in future measures granting powers to executive agencies the Congress can regain and retain control over the bureaucracy which appears to be making rapid strides in displacing the Congress as the legislative branch of this Government—a constitutional representative republic.

Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Vice Chairman, Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MONRONEY: In connection with our recent discussion of suggestions for improving the functions of the Congress, there is attached a draft outlining the plan mentioned to provide at least one means by which Congress can effectively curb and control the agencies and bureaus of its creation. I am convinced, as I hope your committee will be, that this plan, if adopted, will meet the situations that may arise, for which no adequate remedy seems now to be available.

This Nation of ours finds itself governed, not so much by laws enacted by the elected representatives of the people as by rules, regulations, and orders issued by men—men in myriad agencies, boards, and bureaus who have no responsibility to the electors of the Nation. This condition apparently has arisen because of expediency, indecision, haste, and possibly the lethargy of the Congress—a Congress which, if it has not abrogated much of its power, has in the past at least delegated too much of it to too many bureaus.

In fact, the output of our legislative mill is vastly exceeded by the volume of rules, regulations, orders, and decrees of numerous executive agencies; many of which, so the Supreme Court says, have the force and effect of laws—laws that Congress had neither voice in making nor knowledge of until after their promulgation.

Many of these regulations, we well know, are not in conformity with the spirit or the purpose of the statute which created the issuing agency. Almost daily our attention is called to some rule going far beyond, or narrowing, the scope of the enabling act. Some of these agencies have not only exceeded the power given or intended to be exercised, but have, upon too frequent occasions, made unusual or unexpected uses of the power brought into being and placed in their hands by the Congress.

This proposed procedure was offered as an amendment to the labor draft bill recently before the House, and further comments relating thereto may be found on page 740 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1, 1945; and on pages 7067–7070 of the RECORD of August 17, 1944, when a similar amendment was offered to the surplus property bill.

You will note that the gist of this idea is to refer proposed rules and regulations back to the committee which handled the original legislation, for that committee's approval or rejection. If each of these committees is provided with additional help most, if not all, of the objections raised against this amendment will be eliminated.

There is no pretense on my part that the language used in this draft is perfect. Undoubtedly your committee, with its rich background of experience, can and will improve the verbal construction and smooth the details of procedure so that a more perfect plan to accomplish the purpose intended will be developed.

Thanking you for your interest, patience, and courteous consideration, I am

Sincerely yours,

ERRETT P. SCRIVNER.

LEGISLATIVE CONTROL OF ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

Before any proposed regulation or order to be prescribed under this act by any governmental agency exercising powers granted herein or authority conferred hereunder, other than intraagency administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of its activities or interagency rules governing relations with other agencies of the Government, shall issue, a draft thereof shall be submitted to the President of the Senate for the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House for the House of Representatives.

The draft of such proposed regulation or order shall be immediately assigned to the Committees on Military Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, for study to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be effective upon approval by the Committee on Military Affairs of either the Senate or the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either, or, unless previously disapproved, may go into effect not earlier than the fifteenth day following, but not including, the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

For the purposes of this act the Committees on Military Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, are authorized to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress.

The Tragedy of Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the United States News of March 2, 1945:

THE TRAGEDY OF YALTA
(By David Lawrence)

The defeat which America suffered at Yalta was more than a surrender to expediency by the President.

It was a defeat for American leadership at home, too—in Congress and in the press and on the radio.

Last week Americans were beginnng to rationalize the Polish boundary dispute. After all, some writers asked, wasn't this one-third of Poland taken by force originally from Russia many years ago, and wasn't the Curzon line the boundary that some of our own experts worked out more than a quarter of a century ago at the last peace conference, and didn't Russia lose out because she was weak in 1919 and had made a separate peace with Germany?

Also, even if the matter had been left to the decision of a tribunal at the end of this war, wouldn't Russia's claims have been recognized and the result the same?

Let's apply that method of rationalization to a simple proposition of justice as it relates to that occasional outburst of ours called lynching. Have we not heard it argued that the Negro was guilty and that if he had been tried by a court he would have been convicted and hanged anyhow? And aren't courts of justice too slow?

We had been told—and the young men who are fighting this war have been told—that this is a war to bring about a new reign of international law, a new order in the world, a system of justice.

But, instead, Poland has been lynched and most of the comments would indicate that American opinion in large part agrees the lynching was all right, and that the affair would have ended the same way anyway if it had been left to the peace conference. And besides, it is remarked with comfortable cynicism, what difference do a few square miles of Polish territory make to us if it makes Stalin happy? Little thought apparently is given to the fact that Poland is supposed to annex some German territory and create a new Alsace-Lorraine for World War No. 3.

It is our first major test. If we continue to appease and appease and play the game of expediency, we will find in the end that the price gets higher all the time. Didn't we rationalize as to Munich in 1938 that after all Hitler should have the Sudeten because there was a big German population in Czechoslovakia?

Let us examine the record before Yalta and see how the game of power politics works. The story goes back to Teheran. Here is the realistic chronology as it can be deduced from the files of the New York Times:

December 1943: Mr. Churchill at the Teheran Conference of the Big Three raises the question of the future of Poland. Stalin demands the Curzon line, Mr. Roosevelt is so informed. The world is told afterwards no agreements, secret pledges or partition of territory were consummated.

October 1944: Churchill and Eden go to Moscow and Stalin demands that the Polish question be settled before the peace conference is held. The American Ambassador is present at nearly all the talks.

December 15, 1944: Churchill tells the House of Commons he has decided to make an exception and not wait until the peace conference to settle the Polish question, and he reveals publicly that he has agreed with Stalin. He warns the Polish Government in exile to accept now or the price will be higher later on. Mr. Stalin must be appeased, he says in effect, and he betrays irritation that Mr. Roosevelt has not come through with his end of the appeasement.

December 16, 1944: President William Green of the American Federation of Labor

says he hopes America will say "No" to Churchill's plan to redraw Poland.

December 17, 1944: A New York Times dispatch from London says that Churchill made a secret deal at Teheran and Roosevelt was neutral, and adds:

"It is quite clear now that, in Teheran (December 1943), Mr. Churchill and Premier Stalin divided Europe into spheres of British and Russian influence. Stalin would not agree to coordinate the Red Army's operations with those of his western allies until he had definite assurance that Britain would support Russia's claim to Polish territory as far west as the Curzon line."

December 17, 1944: The Army and Navy Journal in Washington calls for an offensive through Poland by Russia, and Pravda denounces this publication as "a source for pro-Hitlerite propaganda," but many military men in Washington agree that Russia is stalling in order to force the hands of Churchill and Roosevelt.

December 18, 1944: The State Department issues a statement paving the way for the surrender to Stalin at Yalta. The statement says America has felt the Polish boundaries should be left to the peace conference at the end of the war but that if "a mutual agreement is reached by the United Nations directly concerned, this Government would have no objection to such an agreement." This is a tip-off that if Stalin can put across his puppet government through the Lublin committee, the United States can be counted on to approve the ultimate recognition of some sort of Lublin government, modified, of course, to make it appear national.

December 19, 1944: The Nazi offensive is costing tens of thousands of American casualties on the western front as Germany, knowing that Stalin has been stalling, takes advantage of the lull on the eastern front.

December 19, 1944: A wave of criticism of Churchill sweeps the United States. The New York Times refers to the Churchill proposal on Poland editorially:

"It must be admitted frankly that this is not the way border problems were to be settled, under the terms of the Atlantic Charter. This is not an idealistic settlement made in 'accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned' * * *. We invite the attention of the Russian Government to the hazards of making decisions in a coalition war on the basis of unilateral action. This is isolationism. It engenders isolationism in others."

The Times says bluntly also that agreement on the Curzon Line is apparently to be the go ahead signal for a resumption of the battle in the east.

December 19, 1944: Teamwork by President Roosevelt, who backs up Churchill's "lapse of memory" statement. Churchill in his December 15 speech had said that "it must not be forgotten that words are inserted in the Atlantic Charter, 'No changes before the peace table, except changes mutually agreed.'" Mr. Churchill next day said he was mistaken and that the words he quoted were somewhere in one of Mr. Hull's speeches. Anyway, Mr. Roosevelt now helps out by saying to a press conference that the Atlantic Charter was just a bunch of scribbled notes anyway and not a formal, signed document.

December 21, 1944: Stalin sees his way out. Dispatches announce from London that Stalin is to install the Lublin Committee as the government of Poland.

January 12, 1945: Stalin apparently decides he is tired of waiting for the concurrence of Mr. Roosevelt and that, since he has Mr. Churchill's backing, the Russians can resume their offensive and take the matter of a provisional government in their own hands.

February 1945: Mr. Roosevelt agrees at Yalta to the dismemberment of the territory of an ally—Poland.

That's the main sketch of the tragedy, but in that December 15, 1944, speech of Mr. Churchill to the House of Commons, he said:

"The President is aware of everything that has passed and of what is in the minds of the Russians and British."

It looks as if Mr. Roosevelt must have known all the time that the Atlantic Charter pledge was being torn to pieces. He was maneuvering for a way out. The Yalta communique, in effect, said that what had been wrong as a unilateral action was now all right. It was a confirmation of lynch law in international affairs. High-sounding phrases about military coordination plus the summoning of the United Nations meeting at San Francisco were all counted as a smokescreen to becloud the fiasco at Yalta.

But some people have asked, "What would you have done about it—gone to war with Russia?" Alas, that's the familiar cry of those who lose courage and falter where principle is at stake.

No; we need not have gone to war with Russia, but sooner or later appeasement must end, and Yalta was the place to end it. Russia would have respected us for it and a mere deferment of the Polish question to the peace conference—or its adjudication even before that time by a special international commission at which all interests, including those of Poland, could be heard, and the United Nations could sit in judgment—would never have caused a break in the present alliance between Russia, Britain, and the United States. If this partnership is founded on any such frail basis, then, indeed, we are in for trouble ahead and we must appease and appease and appease.

After all, America's military might has not been such an insignificant contribution to Russia. Our tanks, our planes, our ammunition, and our resources have been at the disposal of Stalin. He needs them, and he cannot conquer Germany without us.

We simply have been outmaneuvered and outbluffed and we on this side of the Atlantic already have begun to sacrifice our ideals and principles down the long painful road of rationalized surrender.

There's a way to save our souls and that's at San Francisco, where machinery must be inserted definitely pledging to give American guaranties only if there is review of interim agreements. The people of the United States should be asked to back up only those settlements which are in accord with the principles and the formula set forth by the Atlantic Charter.

The Nurses' Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE ABBOTT HOSPITAL AND
JANNEY CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL,
Minneapolis, February 27, 1945.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. JUDD: The May bill, if passed in its present form, would create a very serious problem for all the hospitals and civilians of the United States of America.

The hospitals recognize that nurses must be provided to care for the armed forces, and we have endeavored to cooperate to the limit of our ability by joining with the Federal Government in training as many nurses as possible through the Nurse Cadet Corps. When these young women were recruited, they were assured by the Surgeon General's office that they would not be obligated to join the armed forces. The proposed bill violates this promise and is unfair for it limits the conscription of women to nurses only. The nurses would have no objections if all women 18 years old or over were conscripted. Then we would be able to secure adequate nurse cadet students who would be available for the armed forces upon the completion of their course.

Immediately when this bill was proposed to draft nurses as privates, a large number of our graduate nurses were stampeded into signing up while they could still get commissions as second lieutenants. Since the publicity of this proposed bill all the hospitals have received very few applications for the Nurse Cadet Corps which creates a serious situation in the civilian hospitals. Unless we can secure cadet nurses, the potential supply for the armed forces will be seriously curtailed.

The proposed bill excludes married nurses. A large number of the cadet nurse students who have graduated are now married, and if they have no children, they should certainly be included if the draft bill is necessary.

If the draft bill is passed, consideration should be given to the States who have recruited a large percentage of their quotas of nurses. As you know, Minnesota has supplied a large number of both doctors and nurses to the armed forces. This State would be at a serious disadvantage if the recruitment of the number of nurses already supplied the armed forces from this area were not taken into consideration.

The nurses' procurement and assignment committee has done an outstanding piece of work in this State. They feel deeply offended that in the present recruitment the Red Cross was assigned the task of securing as many graduate nurses as possible without consulting the local nurses' procurement and assignment committee.

The Federal Government has spent considerable sums of money to recruit WAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and other women's groups, but very little organized effort has been made to recruit graduate nurses until just recently.

The nurses and hospitals wonder if the Army and Navy have used as much lay help as possible in caring for many of the duties performed by nurses.

The hospitals sincerely hope that if draft boards are to be established for considering deferments of nurses, qualified hospital people will be appointed to represent the interests of civilians requiring hospital care.

Yours sincerely,
ABBOTT HOSPITAL,
VICTOR M. ANDERSON, *Administrator.*

American Chapter Religious Emergency Council of the Chief Rabbi of Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the American Chapter, Religious Emergency Council of the Chief Rabbi of Great Britain, held at 55 Leonard Street, New York City, Mr. Moses

Schonfeld, the honorary secretary, reported on the past 5 years' activities of the Chapter and its parent body in Britain as follows:

He stated that the Religious Emergency Council is a recognized agency for religious and welfare activities for men of the Jewish faith in the Allied Armed Forces in Britain. It ministers also to the religious needs of refugees and bombed-out evacuees. It is registered under the British War Charities Act of 1940, as organized for the following purpose: "To provide religious facilities for observant Jews and Jewesses and to maintain and care for needy persons coming within the category of religious officers and their dependents." As a member of the standing conference of the Council of British Societies for Relief Abroad, the council is planning the religious reconstruction of liberated Jewish communities in Europe.

The American chapter was established in 1940, by a volunteer group of Americans, without any paid staff, to provide additional aid to the increased war activities of the British Chief Rabbi's Religious Emergency Council. The American Chapter raises its funds through the sale of books, publications, and through special drives. Among the books the chapter has published are the following:

First. The Mark of the Swastika, edited by Herman Appelman and Moses Schonfeld, containing extracts in English and Yiddish from the British War Blue Book, together with the white paper on the treatment of German nationals in Germany.

Second. Testament to Democracy, the last creative writing of the late Colonel the Right Honorable Lord Josiah C. Wedgwood. Containing a foreword by Prime Minister Winston Churchill; the work is a classic contribution to parliamentary procedures and a guide for those interested in the shape of the post-war world.

Third. Nutrition Problems in Relief and Rehabilitation, by Moses Schonfeld, prepared in connection with the Columbia University program of training in international administration.

Fourth. The Old and New World in Commoncause, by Col. Josiah C. Wedgwood, member of Parliament, expounding closer Anglo-American relations.

The cost of producing all these documents was donated by Mr. Arthur I. LeVine, president of the chapter and president of Ad Press, Ltd., New York. The proceeds from the sale of these books have been allocated by the Chapter for the emergency work of the Chief Rabbi's Council.

For 5 years, 1938–44, the Chief Rabbi's Religious Emergency Council has been dealing, on behalf of the chief rabbi, with practical religious problems arising during the present emergency.

The Chief Rabbi's Religious Emergency Council includes the following departments: Rescue and Refugees' Maintenance; Jewish Soldiers' Religious Welfare Committee; Jewish Servicemen's Passover Service; Assistance of Needy Clergy and War Victims; Office for Jewish Rededication and Religious Propaganda; Religious Department for Jewish Refugees; Department for Post-War Religious Reconstruction; American Chapter of the Chief Rabbi's Religious Emergency Council, New York; Canadian Chapter of the Chief Rabbi's Religious Emergency Council (Toronto and Montreal); the council is associated with the United Jewish Relief Appeal and with the Jewish Committee for Relief Abroad; the council maintains the Passover activities of the Chief Rabbi's Kosher Canteen Committee; the council is a member of the Standing Conference of the Council of British Societies for Relief Abroad.

During the first 5 years of its existence, the Chief Rabbi's Religious Emergency Council has:

Brought over to England, placed and cared for 300 children. Brought out from Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and so forth, 1,300 souls.

Participated in organizing the religious welfare of all Jewish refugee children in the country.

Obtained permits and enrolled in colleges in England over 200 students.

Arranged for the admission to Palestine of a number of rabbis and their families and many students.

Obtained the release from internment of over 1,000 persons.

Provided Passover needs to 20,000 Jewish men serving in H. M. and Allied forces.

Provided regular fortnightly parcels, totaling over 10,000, to hundreds of observant servicemen.

Assisted with regular grants, 150 needy rabbis and ministers in England, mainly those who have suffered as a result of war conditions.

Distributed 5,000 books and pamphlets on Jewish religious subjects among soldiers, evacuees, war workers, and refugees. Provided religious requisites, tephillin, prayer books, and so forth, to hundreds of children and adults, including Jewish soldiers.

Expended over $200,000 in direct relief.

Supported and supervised three yeshivah, six hostels, and five canteens.

Placed 400 individuals in suitable employment with facilities for Sabbath observance.

Assisted in the establishment of many Passover centers for evacuated Jewish children and for Jewish servicemen.

Arranged 25 broadcasts at home and overseas on Jewish religious subjects.

Maintained the National Council for Jewish Religious Education's activities and its educational publications.

Imported and distributed lulovim and esrogim for the requirements of all Jewish communities in the United Kingdom.

Supported the training and holiday camps of the Mizrachi and Agudah.

Supported youth activities of 25 clubs and societies.

Arranged for official provision of kosher food supplies for post-war Europe.

Collected 20,000 food packets for post-war relief.

Enrolled ministers for European relief work.

Organized the Mauritius rescue scheme by means of which hundreds of souls are being saved from Nazi murderers.

Expended over $400,000 on the above tasks.

In addition to the maintenance of the above activities, the council is now engaged on the collection of religious requisites—Sifrei Torah, tephillin, mezuzos, prayer books, Chumoshim, shechitah, and milah instruments, and so forth—for the reconstruction of Jewish Kehilla life in post-war Europe.

The council is taking a major part in reviving spiritual life in the liberated communities of Europe. It is a comprehensive plan for post-war religious reconstruction, has been submitted to U. N. R. R. A. and to the United Nations governmental authorities. The program covers Jewish civilian and military needs, particularly communal feeding, and the requests for foods prepared in accordance with dietary laws. To meet the needs of undernourished Jews in liberated countries the council has built up a stock of kosher canned foods.

Dr. Hertz, who is a recognized spiritual leader in the English speaking world, heads these activities, which encompass the rebuilding of schools and places of worship. His council has initiated the Synagogue Ambulance Plan, whereby several vehicles have been equipped for the use of Jewish army chaplains, in the Allied front lines, and also for liberated Jewish communities throughout Europe.

Large numbers of prominent scholars and rabbis, rescued from Europe are dependent on the council, and this year thousands of additional troops, fighting under all the flags of the United Nations, will receive spiritual and physical comforts.

Among the prominent sponsors of the various projects the American chapter has initiated are Miss Dorothy Thompson, Mrs. Mary Fels, Mrs. A. George de Mille, Miss Agnes de Mille, Secretary of the Interior the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, the Honorable Jan Masaryk, Vice Premier in the Czechoslovak Government, Sir Norman Angell, Pierre Van Paassen, Dr. Frank Kingdon, Rex Stout, Max Zaritsky, Dr. David De Sola Pool, Lady Wedgwood of Barlaston, Dr. Stephen S. Wise.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, during these trying times we are prone to overlook many groups and many helpful services that are contributing to the winning of the war.

Immediately after the conclusion of World War No. 1, the farmers of our country found themselves heavily in debt with dwindling prices for their commodities and dwindling markets. The unfortunate plight of the farmer until 1933 is too fresh in our minds to require any discussion.

In 1933 Congress and the administration initiated steps to relieve the deplorable condition of our farmers. The Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed in an effort to bring agriculture out of economic chaos and establish it on a sound basis. All agreed that the Agricultural Adjustment Act was stopgap legislation and could not accomplish everything desired. When the Supreme Court declared the Agricultural Adjustment Act unconstitutional, a great wave of pessimism swept throughout the agricultural areas. Fortunately, means were found to get around the decision of the Supreme Court. The soil-conservation program is the direct result of this adverse decision of the Supreme Court. To my way of thinking, the soil-conservation program has done more to put agriculture on a sound economic basis than all the other programs attempted by this or any other administration.

We Americans had not been conservation-minded. Until two or three decades ago, when land wore out, we could clear new land, but that day has passed, and through necessity we had to learn to rebuild worn-out soil. Until we learned this, farmers in large areas throughout the country were living in economic slavery. Many of them were not able to supply their own families with sufficient food to keep their health.

This war should convince anyone of the necessity of having a healthy agriculture. It has been truthfully said that no army can fight on an empty stomach; and thanks to the soil conservation program and the extra efforts of our farmers, our armed forces today are better fed than any of our allies. Our farmers have also made it possible to ship millions of tons of food and fiber to our allies. They have done this with 30 percent less labor than we had on the farm in 1930. They have done this without adequate equipment. We have recognized the production efforts of our factories by awarding Army and Navy E's. Without taking away any of the credit due to labor and management in our magnificent production record in munitions and matériel, it can be pointed out that our armament makers have been able to secure all the necessary machine tools and equipment to produce war matériel. They have been favored with the aid of every Government agency in obtaining labor. The farmers of our country today are producing 30 percent more food and fiber under great handicaps than were produced in 1930. They have done this without fanfare or publicity.

A large amount of credit for this enormous production under adverse circumstances should be given to the soil-building program. Without the increased yield per acre resulting from our soil-building program, we would not be able to ship 1 ton of food to our allies. We would not be able to supply the American workers with an adequate diet.

Some people look on the soil-conservation program as a raid on our Treasury by the farmers of this country. Those same people would raise the greatest howl if they failed to have food on their tables. Those same people are willing to tax themselves to build highways, inland waterways, and other public works, and I know that if they realize the benefits they are obtaining from the soil-building program, they would gladly support a program doubling the amount of payments that are now being made under the soil-conservation program.

It was a hard task to sell our farmers on this program, but they are now unanimous in their support.

I am including in my remarks an article that appeared in the Southern Democrat, of Oneonta, Ala., by Dr. J. S. Wittmeier, judge of probate of Blount County:

SOIL CONSERVATION—THE DISTRICT SOIL-CONSERVATION PROGRAM IN BLOUNT COUNTY

(By Dr. J. S. Wittmeier, judge of probate)

For many years as a business and professional man in Blount County, I have seen water dissolve the rich topsoil, starting sheet washing and finger erosion, making gullies, which carry the water off too rapidly, carrying away our good earth, causing floods, then droughts, resulting in poor, thin, barren, unhospitable land, which is reflected in the lives of both man and beast.

The waters that wash away the earth cream of Blount County, subtract customers from the stores of its merchants, reduce the amount of public revenue, and increase the cost of maintaining public roads and other utilities. It is being reflected in the lives of communities, which is shown by decadent churches and ill-kept graveyards.

If the living conditions of the farms of Blount County are to be improved, it will be because the land will support a better living. The main farm problem is the problem of land conservation, land improvement, and organizing a feed- and forage-production program. This problem can be met by intelligent farm planting and the carrying out of these plans.

It is obvious that the percentage of row crops must be minimized, and the acreage of kudzu, sericea, crotalaria, grasses, clovers, small grains, and lespedeza must be increased if the fertility of the soil is to be improved. It is certain that if the soils are to be improved, it will be done as the result of a planned program and considerable effort on the part of the farm operators. Every farmer should take advantage of existing agricultural agencies, set up for the purpose of land conservation and land improvement and work out a system of soil and crop management that not only will maintain but will increase the fertility of the soil.

Although it has only been a few years that we have had a planned soil-conservation program for the county, I can see definite improvement of farms, farmers, and communities, which have taken advantage of this program and have instituted practices for controlling erosion and establishing crops and methods for the improvement of their farms.

I have seen and talked with farmers in communities where the soil-conservation district program is being practiced and find that farming the conservation way pays. I know of land being reclaimed with kudzu and sericea. I know of other farmers who have practically doubled their yields of crops by following a systematic method of soil improvement by use of both summer and winter legumes and a well-established system of terraces. I have seen livestock grazing green fields of crimson clover, small grain, and other winter crops and making practical gains in beef, pork, and milk with very little additional feed. I know of farmers practicing strip cropping to a good advantage, thus saving and improving their soils. I have been on farms where no soil or water could leave the farm without first going over wide bands of sericea and other deep-rooted crops which silt out and save all the soil. These farmers, cooperating with the north central soil-conservation district, have proven that erosion can be controlled and soils can be improved, which will result in an improved living condition on the farms of Blount County.

Twenty-Million-Dollar Nylon Plant To Be Built by Du Pont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

TWENTY-MILLION-DOLLAR NYLON UNIT TO BE BUILT BY DU PONT—TEXAS PLANT TO INCREASE PRODUCTION FOR MILITARY PURPOSES

The Du Pont Co. will begin construction immediately of a new nylon plant, to cost $20,000,000, near Orange, Tex., it was announced Saturday.

The company said Texas production of the ingredients of nylon, manufactured by an intricate chemical process, would begin in 12 months.

The plant will increase nylon production for military purposes at the request of the Government. The nylon salt produced will be converted into flake and yarn at Seaford and Martinsville, W. Va., where facilities will be increased to handle the added basic material.

The plant will be built on a 1,000-acre tract adjacent to the Sabine River in southeast Texas, about 3 miles south of Orange, and is to be designated as the Sabine River Works.

First New Dealer Born in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am reprinting an Associated Press dispatch from Germany, as follows:

WITH THE THIRD ARMY IN GERMANY, March 2.—A frantic German and his wife sought the aid of the Third Army yesterday and the old rule against fraternizing with the enemy went by the boards.

In fact, Capts. Alfred Hartmann, Malone, N. Y., and Elwyn Akers, St. Louis, spent 4 hours with the couple and when it was over a 7½-pound boy had been ushered into the world to the accompaniment of heavy artillery fire.

The grateful parents named the baby Franklin Delano Ludwig.

Bretton Woods Puzzle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter which appeared in the New York Times, March 4, 1945, written by Mr. Robert Boothby, a Member of the House of Commons.

The contents of this letter indicate that there are responsible persons in the British Government who see the danger to their country in the adoption of the Bretton Woods agreement.

Mr. Boothby has given careful consideration to some very important implications that would be involved by the adoption of this international monetary proposal. He expresses what I have repeatedly said, that the sound thinking people in England who have examined this scheme must feel as many of us do in this country—that it is just as likely to damage them as it is us.

It is to be hoped that those people in the United States who are so enthusiastically promoting this scheme will give consideration to the sagacious thinking expressed in this letter:

BRETTON WOODS PUZZLE—BRITON SEEKS CLARIFICATION OF THE FINAL ACT OBSCURITIES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It would clearly be improper for me, as a British Member of Parliament, to discuss the merits or demerits of the Bretton Woods agreement in this country while it is under consideration by Congress.

There are, however, certain major obscurities in the final act which ought to be cleared up, in the interests of all concerned, before any irrevocable decisions are taken on either side of the Atlantic.

First of all, does it, or does it not, mean that the participating countries must apply the principle of nondiscrimination to international trade? Lord Keynes has assured us, in a letter to the Times of London, that voluntary trade agreements for reciprocal transactions between two countries will be permissible. But his letter was instantly contradicted by an American correspondent, and the point—a vital one—has never been clarified.

Secondly, does it put an end to the sterling area? Again we have been assured that it does not. But the maintenance of a sterling area after the war must involve restrictions on the movement of capital outside the area, and free convertibility of currency within it. Would not this in fact constitute a "discriminatory currency arrangement," which, beyond a comparatively brief transitional period, is categorically prohibited in the final act?

ASSUMPTION QUESTIONED

Thirdly, it is widely assumed that the proposed fund will insure stability of exchange rates, apart from certain clearly defined exceptions. But is this assumption justified? Article IV 4 (a) states: "Each member undertakes to collaborate with the fund to promote exchange stability, to maintain orderly exchange arrangements with other members, and to avoid competitive exchange alterations."

Does this mean that each member undertakes to maintain its currency at the agreed par value with gold or United States dollars, and thereby with each other currency? If it does mean this, it would have been easy to say so, although it would then have been less easy to persuade the British public that the scheme does not involve a return to the gold standard.

If it does not mean this, there would appear to be no provision to maintain par values. Under article IV 4 (b), each country undertakes to outlaw dealings except at par rates in other members' currencies. But this provision is not universal.

The text continues: "A member whose monetary authorities, for the settlement of international transactions, in fact freely buy and sell gold within the limits prescribed by the fund * * * shall be deemed to be fulfilling this undertaking."

There would therefore be at least one important market, New York, in which currencies could be freely dealt in at rates which would be illegal in London and other centers. The situation thus produced would be utterly fantastic, and can surely not have been intended by the authors of the scheme. We really ought to know how they propose to deal with it.

FUND OR BANK—WHICH?

One final point. Article VIII (4) requires each member country to buy balances of its currency held by another member country (presumably at par) if these balances have arisen through current transactions, but not if they have arisen through capital transactions. Article VI permits, but does not enjoin, control of capital movements and definitely prohibits the use of the fund's resources to meet a capital outflow from a member country.

Suppose a country has, simultaneously, a capital outflow, and a deficit on income account. She is not allowed to use the fund to check the former. She is apparently obliged to use the fund up to the limit of her quota to prevent any depreciation of her currency caused by the latter, although, under article V (8), she may be subjected to penal charges for doing so. What, precisely, are her obligations in this situation? It is one that is not unlikely to arise.

To ask these questions is to ask no more than that we should have some idea of what we are doing before we commit ourselves finally to the fund as opposed to the bank, for which there seems to be general approval. Nothing could be more deleterious to the future of Anglo-American relations than that the two countries should sign an agreement, each thinking that it means something quite different. And, in its present form, the final act of Bretton Woods provides ample scope for such a misunderstanding.

ROBERT BOOTHBY.

NEW YORK, *March 2, 1945.*

The Bretton Woods Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me on February 23 to insert several articles and editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune titled "The Bretton Woods Issue":

THE BRETTON WOODS ISSUE

There is a disturbing accumulation of evidence that the administration is determined to employ the most ruthless strong-arm tactics to drive through Congress without alteration the so-called Bretton Woods program, on which hearings are scheduled to begin this week before the House Ways and Means Committee.

For some time past there have been reports that sponsors of this legislation have boasted that they had "greased the wheels" to slide the measure through. Events have shown that such reports were not without foundation. When the House was being reorganized in January, membership of the Banking and Currency Committee, according to George B. Bryant, Jr., Washington correspondent of the Wall Street Journal, in a recent dispatch in that newspaper, was selected with unusual care. The five Democratic vacancies on this committee—which will have much to say about continuing New Deal financial and economical controls, in addition to its international financial plans—were filled with Democrats of the New Deal school, and it was then expanded to include two more. This new committee, which the administration refers to as "streamlined," and Republicans as "stacked," had its trial test a month ago on the George bill, and for the first time in recent years the Democratic members voted as a unit in opposition to a Republican-sponsored measure. Next, when the Wagner-Spence bill, designed to give legislative effect to the Bretton Woods program, was introduced it was revealed that it proposed to finance the initial needs of the monetary fund from the so-called "gold profits" in the present stabilization fund. Critics of this procedure interpret it as a device for bypassing the Appropriations Committee.

But a more insidious weapon than any of these is the studied effort on the part of the administration to tie the issue of all-or-none acceptance of the Treasury program with the issue of isolation. The theme is constantly reiterated that, as Dean Acheson, of the State Department, put it before representatives of 104 national organizations invited to Washington for a pep talk by the Treasury on Wednesday, other nations "would be chilled toward Dumbarton Oaks" if the Bretton Woods "proposals for international cooperation in the financial field" are rejected.

It would be a grave error of Republican leadership to permit itself to be maneuvered into a false position before the public on this measure, for the issue of isolationism here is a synthetic one, created for purely political purposes. The $18,000,000,000 financial set-up, which is conveniently referred to as the Bretton Woods program, did not emanate with that conference, nor was it drawn up under any authorization from Congress. It was developed out of plans produced by Lord Keynes and associates on behalf of the British Treasury and Dr. Harry White and others acting for our Treasury and as presented at Bretton Woods represented a tentative agreement among unnamed technical experts of 30 nations. Discussions at Bretton Woods were confined rigidly to this joint statement of principles, and no attempt was made to explore other proposals. Largely because of this limitation on discussion, the delegates were not authorized to bind their respective governments. Lord Keynes himself made this unequivocally clear when he declared:

"We (the British delegation), in common with other delegations, reserve the opinion of our Government on the document as a whole and on every part of it. * * * We do not even recommend our Governments to adopt the result. We merely submit it for what it is worth to the attention of the legislators concerned."

In other words, the so-called Bretton Woods program was never intended as anything but a starting point for legislative action to achieve the objectives it seeks. It is a complete distortion of the facts to imply that any modification of that agreement could be construed as in any sense a repudiation of the achievements of Dumbarton Oaks.

Federal Debt Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting the history, or rather a brief review, of past legislation relating to Federal debt and the limitations placed upon it from time to time from 1917 to 1945:

FEDERAL DEBT LIMITATION—A REVIEW OF PAST LEGISLATION 1917 TO 1945

Prior to the enactment of the Second Liberty Loan Act of 1917 (40 Stat. 288), each issue of United States bonds, notes or other obligations carried its own authorized face value limitation. No provision was made for a combined, aggregate limitation covering all types of securities issued by the Government. In other words, there was no over-all ceiling on the borrowing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury or of any other Government agency.

With the advent of war in 1917, bringing with it a greater need for Federal funds, increased borrowings were inevitable and the consolidation of borrowing limitations into a single over-all amount became imperative. Accordingly, in the Second Liberty Loan Act, approved September 24, 1917, all prior specific limitations were lumped into a face value limitation for the several types of securities to be issued, as follows:

Bonds, under sec. 1, including bonds previously authorized	$7,538,945,460
Bonds authorized under the First Liberty Loan Act, issued or offered	2,000,000,000
1-year certificates under section 5, and 3½ percent 5-year certificates authorized under sec. 6 of the First Liberty Loan Act. Combined authorization for both	4,000,000,000
51-year War Savings certificates under sec. 6 of the Second Liberty Loan Act	2,000,000,000
Total borrowing authorization	15,538,945,460

From time to time Congress has modified the limitations established in the Second Liberty Loan Act. Seventeen such amendments have been made to date. The eighteenth is contained in the bill H. R. 2404 recently introduced and now pending before the Ways and Means Committee. Of the 17 amendments to date, 12 have raised the borrowing limits, 2 have lowered them, while 3 made no changes in the over-all limits, although they did affect certain types of securities. Five other acts have been passed with respect to Treasury borrowing, issuance of bonds of Government agencies or otherwise relating to borrowing authority, but none of these had any direct bearing on the limitations under the Second Liberty Loan Act.

Until the act of July 20, 1939, the distinction between long-term and short-term obligations was still maintained in setting the amounts that could be borrowed under the Second Liberty Loan Act despite the consolidation of limits for particular types of securities. Under the act of February 4, 1935, for example, an over-all limit of $25,000,000,000 was established with respect to bonds and a limit of $20,000,000,000 for certain certificates, bills, and other short-term obligations. Upon passage of the act of July 20, 1939, however, even this distinction was removed and $45,000,000,000 became the top limit on Treasury borrowing under the Second Liberty Loan Act and under section 6 of the First Liberty Loan Act.

The 1935 law accomplished probably the most important change in the original provisions of the Second Liberty Loan Act, by making the limitations applicable to amounts "outstanding at any one time" rather than to amounts issued. This permitted the Treasury Department to operate more freely within the maximum restrictions through its ability to reissue obligations without obtaining new authority. Under the Second Liberty Loan Act and succeeding amendments prior to 1935, this had not been possible, with the result that the existing authority conferred by that act and its amendments, as of 1935, had been worked down to $2,000,000,000. All amendments since 1935 have continued to permit this latitude.

From 1919 to 1940, a period of 21 years, the borrowing power of the Treasury Department remained fairly stable, ranging from $43,000,000,000 to $54,000,000,000, its peak during this time. Fluctuations were relatively minor and occurred at intervals of 2 or 3 years. Indeed for a period of 10 years, from 1921 to 1931, the over-all borrowing limit was not changed at all, but remained at $43,500,000,000. The accompanying table shows all changes in the outside limits of the Treasury Department's borrowing authority, beginning with the Second Liberty Loan Act and including the proposed changes under H. R. 2404.

Because of the crisis in Europe and the mounting need for funds at home Congress, in the Revenue Act of 1940, section 302, raised the limitation by $4,000,000,000 in authorizing additional Treasury bills under section 5, and notes under section 18 of the Second Liberty Loan Act, as amended. This was the first important increase since the act of March 3, 1931, when the limit was raised by $8,000,000,000 to a total of $51,500,000,000, and it was the first of a series of annual increases which, since 1940, have resulted in total increases amounting to $216,000,000,000, bringing the borrowing limit to its present level of $260,000,000,000. Increases since 1940 are as follows:

Public law	Increase	New limitation
Public Debt Act of 1941	$16,000,000,000	$65,000,000,000
Public Debt Act of 1942	60,000,000,000	125,000,000,000
Public Debt Act of 1943	85,000,000,000	210,000,000,000
Public Debt Act of 1944	50,000,000,000	260,000,000,000
H. R. 2404 (proposed limitation)	40,000,000,000	300,000,000,000

In the attached table it will be observed that only two reductions in the limitation have been made. The largest cut was effected under the act of February 4, 1935, when the limitation was reduced by $5,000,000,000, from $54,000,000,000 to $49,000,000,000. This was accomplished by the reduction of the previous authorized limit on certain bonds from $30,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000. A reduction of $4,000,000,000 was effected under the act of May 26, 1938, through a consolidation of all borrowing limits on particular types of securities except bonds.

The demands of war obviously account for the tremendous growth of borrowing authority since 1940. In this connection the Secretary of the Treasury has pointed out in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee on January 15, 1945, that 54 percent of the cost of the war in each of the last 2 fiscal years has been financed through borrowing, with the remainder of the cost financed through revenue receipts.

An analysis of each of the 14 amendments to the Second Liberty Loan Act, which have resulted in changing the over-all limit originally fixed by that act, follows:

Second Liberty Loan Act

(Original authorization approved Sept. 24, 1917)

Section 1:	
Bonds, in addition to	$7,538,945,460
Bonds, previously authorized	2,000,000,000
	9,538,945,460
Section 5: 1-year certificates and 5-year certificates under sec. 6, First Liberty Loan Act; combined total for both	4,000,000,000
Section 6: 5-year War Savings certificates	2,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	15,538,945,460

Third Liberty Loan Act

(Approved Apr. 4, 1918)

Section 1:	
Bonds, in addition to	$12,000,000,000
Bonds, previously authorized	2,000,000,000
	14,000,000,000
Section 4: 1-year certificates under sec. 5, Second Liberty Loan Act and 5-year certificates under sec. 6, First Liberty Loan Act; combined total for both	8,000,000,000
Authority carried forward for 5-year War Savings certificates under sec. 6, Second Liberty Loan Act	2,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	24,000,000,000

Fourth Liberty Loan Act

(Approved July 9, 1918)

Section 1:	
Bonds, in addition to	$20,000,000,000
Bonds, previously authorized	2,000,000,000
	22,000,000,000
Authority carried forward for certificates under First and Second Liberty Loan Acts and War Savings certificates	10,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	32,000,000,000

Supplement to Second Liberty Loan Act

(Approved Sept. 24, 1918)

Section 2: 5-year War Savings Certificates under Sec 6, Second Liberty Loan Act	$4,000,000,000
Authority carried forward:	
Bonds, in addition to	20,000,000,000
Bonds, previously authorized	2,000,000,000
	22,000,000,000

Authority carried forward—Continued.	
Certificates under First and Second Liberty Loan Acts	$8,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	34,000,000,000

Victory Liberty Loan Act

(Approved Mar. 3, 1919)

Section 1: Notes under new sec. 18 (a), Second Liberty Loan Act	$7,000,000,000
Section 3: Certificates under First and Second Liberty Loan Acts	10,000,000,000
Authority carried forward:	
Bonds, in addition to	20,000,000,000
Bonds, previously authorized	2,000,000,000
	22,000,000,000
5-year War Savings Certificates under sec. 6, Second Liberty Loan Act	4,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	43,000,000,000

Act of Nov. 23, 1921

Section 1401: Notes under section 18 (a), Second Liberty Loan Act	$7,500,000,000
Authority carried forward:	
Bonds, in addition to	20,000,000,000
Bonds, previously authorized	2,000,000,000
	22,000,000,000
Certificates under First and Second Liberty Loan Acts	10,000,000,000
5-year War Savings Certificates under sec. 6, Second Liberty Loan Act	4,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	43,500,000,000

Act of Mar. 3, 1931

Section 1: Bonds, under sec. 1, Second Liberty Loan Act, in addition to	$28,000,000,000
Bonds, previously authorized	2,000,000,000
	30,000,000,000
Authority carried forward:	
Notes under sec. 18 (a), Second Liberty Loan Act	7,500,000,000
Certificates under First and Second Liberty Loan Acts	10,000,000,000
5-year War Savings Certificates under sec. 6, Second Liberty Loan Act	4,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	51,500,000,000

Gold Reserve Act of 1934

(Approved Jan. 30, 1934)

Section 14: Notes under sec. 18 (a), Second Liberty Loan Act	$10,000,000,000
Authority carried forward:	
Bonds, in addition to	28,000,000,000
Bonds, previously authorized	2,000,000,000
	40,000,000,000
Certificates under First and Second Liberty Loan Acts	10,000,000,000
Authority carried forward—Continued.	
5-year War Savings Certificates under sec. 6, Second Liberty Loan Act	$4,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	54,000,000,000

NOTE.—In addition to increasing the amount of the authorization for notes under section 18 (a) of the Second Liberty Loan Act, the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, in section 20 (c) authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to issue gold certificates in such form and in such denominations as he may determine, "against any gold held by the Treasurer of the United States, except the gold fund held as a reserve for any United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890. The amount of gold certificates issued and outstanding shall at no time exceed the value, at the legal standard, of the gold so held against gold certificates." This act also added two new sections, 19 and 20, to the Second Liberty Loan Act, authorizing issuance of securities for redemption or retirement purposes, and issuance of any obligations on a discount basis payable at maturity without interest.

Act of Feb. 4, 1935

Section 1: Bonds, including bonds previously authorized under First and Second Liberty Loan Acts and under new sec. 22. Consolidated revolving authority	$25,000,000,000
Section 2: Certificates previously authorized under sec. 6, First Liberty Loan Act, and under sec. 5, Second Liberty Loan Act. Notes previously authorized under sec. 18 (a), Second Liberty Loan Act. Consolidated revolving short-term authority	20,000,000,000
Authority carried forward:	
5-year War Savings certificates authorized under sec. 6, Second Liberty Loan Act	4,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	49,000,000,000

Act of May 26, 1938

Section 2: Redraft of sec. 21, Second Liberty Loan Act, as amended, continuing previous revolving authority for all bonds and short-term indebtedness but limiting issuance of bonds to $30,000,000,000.	
Consolidated previous authority for 5-year War Savings certificates under sec. 6, Second Liberty Loan Act, with authority for certificates and notes under sec. 6, First Liberty Loan Act, sec. 5, Second Liberty Loan Act, and sec. 18 (a), Second Liberty Loan Act.	
New consolidated revolving authority, all bonds and short-term obligations, bonds limited to $30,000,000,000	$45,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	45,000,000,000

Act of July 20, 1939

Section 1: Repealed the $30,000,000,000 limitation on the issuance of bonds.	
Authority carried forward:	
Bonds, certificates, notes authorized under the amendments in the act of May 26, 1938	$45,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	45,000,000,000

Revenue Act of 1940

(Approved June 25, 1940)

Section 302: Created new paragraph under sec. 21 authorizing a special series of short-term obligations designated National Defense Series, limited to $4,000,000,000 to be issued under secs. 5 and 18 of Second Liberty Loan Act, and in addition to over-all consolidated limitation established under sec. 21 (a), Second Liberty Loan Act	$4,000,000,000
Authority carried forward:	
Bonds, certificates, notes authorized under the amendments in the act of May 26, 1938	45,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	49,000,000,000

Public Debt Act of 1941

(Approved Feb. 19, 1941)

Section 2: Consolidated under one over-all limitation the authorized limit for all obligations issued under the authority of the Second Liberty Loan Act. Expressly terminated certain specific authorizations for particular issues, including certificates under sec. 6, First Liberty Loan Act. New over-all limit	$65,000,000,000
Total authorized borrowing limit	65,000,000,000

Public Debt Act of 1942

(Approved Mar. 28, 1942)

Section 2: Increased the face amount of obligations issuable to $125,000,000,000	$125,000,000,000
Section 3: Made certain modifications in administrative authority with respect to Treasury financing	
Section 4: Authorized use of authority for issuance of redemption or retirement obligations	
Sections 5–6: Authorized Postal Savings cards and stamps and imposed tax liabilities on interest received from Federal obligations.	
Total authorized borrowing limit	125,000,000,000

Public Debt Act of 1943

(Approved without Presidential signature)

Section 2: Increased the face amount of obligations issuable to	$210,000,000,000
Section 3: Amended section 22, Second Liberty Loan Act with respect to payments in connection with redemptions and recoveries on account of lost redemption payments	
Total authorized borrowing limit	210,000,000,000

Public Debt Act of 1944

(Approved June 9, 1944)

Section 2: Increased the face amount of obligations issuable to $260,000,000,000

Total authorized borrowing limit 260,000,000,000

Because of its broad provisions, the Second Liberty Loan Act, in its original form, provided a convenient vehicle for subsequent changes in the borrowing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury. It was the first statute of its kind permitting the Treasury to borrow funds for general public purposes. Thus it became a simple matter in later years to change the original dollar limitations by substituting a new figure. New sections were added without difficulty when it was felt desirable to extend its original scope. Accordingly the act as it stands today in its amended form is somewhat of a conglomeration of miscellaneous provisions dealing with Treasury borrowing operations.

Although the act sets a definite limit on the over-all amount of money that the Secretary of the Treasury may borrow and contains other provisions respecting the use of certain Federal securities in discharging tax liabilities, transactions in foreign-government securities, and the like, it does not limit or restrict capital financing by other Government agencies. Certain Government corporations, for example, with a combined borrowing authority of their own amounting to $33,700,000,000 are wholly free of the restrictions in the Second Liberty Loan Act, although, by an administrative requirement, they must consult the Secretary of the Treasury and in some cases obtain his consent before making commitments on loans.

Notwithstanding its defects, the Second Liberty Loan Act has achieved a venerable position. Amendments have become an annual event, and with each amendment the act assumes a more important role. Under its authority the Secretary of the Treasury may now borrow up to $260,000,000,000 instead of the fifteen-odd billion dollars authorized by its original provisions. The act does not now require apportionment of the over-all limit between long- and short-term obligations as it did originally, discount privileges have been extended in connection with the issuance of certain short-term obligations, Postal-savings bonds and stamps have been authorized, and in various ways the act has grown in stature through the years. It is now regarded as the basic statutory authority governing the Treasury's borrowing operations and with the growth of those operations has become one of the most important pieces of financial legislation ever enacted by the Congress.

Changes in debt limitation under amendments to Second Liberty Loan Act, 1918–45

[Amounts shown are in billions of dollars]

Statute	Approved	Maximum authorization	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Second Liberty Loan Act	Sept. 24, 1917	15.5	-------
Third Liberty Loan Act	Apr. 4, 1918	24.0	+8.5
Fourth Liberty Loan Act	July 9, 1918	32.0	+8.0
Supplement to Second Liberty Loan Act	Sept. 24, 1918	34.0	+2.0
Victory Liberty Loan Act	Mar. 3, 1919	43.0	+9.0
Act of Nov. 23, 1921	Nov. 23, 1921	43.5	+.5
Act of Mar. 3, 1931	Mar. 3, 1931	51.5	+8.0
Gold Reserve Act of 1934	Jan. 30, 1934	54.0	+2.5
Act of Feb. 4, 1935	Feb. 4, 1935	[1] 49.0	[1] −5.0
Act of May 26, 1938	May 26, 1938	[2] 45.0	[2] −4.0
Revenue Act of 1940	June 25, 1940	49.0	+4.0

Footnotes at end of table.

Changes in debt limitation under amendments to Second Liberty Loan Act, 1918–45—Continued

[Amounts shown are in billions of dollars]

Statute	Approved	Maximum authorization	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Public Debt Act of 1941	Feb. 19, 1941	65.0	+16.0
Public Debt Act of 1942	Mar. 28, 1942	125.0	+60.0
Public Debt Act of 1943 [3]	-------	210.0	+85.0
Public Debt Act of 1944	June 9, 1944	260.0	+50.0
Public Debt Act of 1945 (proposed)	-------	300.0	+40.0

[1] By basing the maximum authorization on amounts "outstanding" rather than upon amounts "issued," additional bond authority of $28,000,000,000 was created, in effect, by this act, since available bond-issuing authority of $30,000,000,000 had been reduced by that amount. However, the maximum authorization shown was actually less than the previous maximum authorization, as indicated.

[2] Limitation of $4,000,000,000 on War Savings certificates was consolidated with the over-all authority of $45,000,000,000 on long- and short-term paper.

[3] This act was presented to the President Mar. 30, 1943, but was not returned within the time prescribed by the Constitution and therefore became a law without Presidential signature.

Farm Census Unnecessary at This Time; a Duplication of Effort, a Waste of Manpower, Money, and Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, some people took exception to my statement that there was no necessity for taking a farm census at this time; first, because of manpower shortage; second, because necessary and essential information was already at hand, or could be obtained, since those responsible for the conduct of the war, of necessity had to have such information, had obtained the same, or had sufficient sources from which to obtain vital and essential information, rather than to depend upon a census the result of which could not be made available for 6 months.

In support of my contention, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am including as an extension of my remarks an article from the Barre Times, of Barre, Vt., which speaks for itself:

MORE CATTLE ON FARMS IN NEW ENGLAND—SLIGHT INCREASE COMPARED TO YEAR AGO; LESS CHICKENS LAST YEAR—OTHER CLASSES OF LIVESTOCK DECLINE—TURKEY POPULATION JUMPS 14 PERCENT IN 1944; FEWER HORSES

The numbers of all cattle and calves on the farms of New England on January 1, 1945, increased slightly from a year ago, while numbers of most other classes of livestock declined during 1944 according to the annual livestock report released today by the New England crop reporting service. Chicken numbers, declined 6 percent during 1944, but the number of turkeys in New England increased 14 percent.

Livestock numbers in the United States declined rather sharply during 1944 after having increased steadily from 1938 to an all-time peak in 1944 for numbers at the beginning of the year. The decline in numbers was caused largely by the tight feed situation during the first half of the year and the generally less favorable relationship of livestock prices to feed prices. As a result of the decrease in livestock numbers and of the record production of feed grain in 1944, the feed situation at the beginning of 1945 is much more favorable for livestock producers than it was a year ago. The supply of feed grain per animal unit of livestock (including chickens) on January 1, 1945, was 27 percent larger than a year earlier, and slightly above January 1, 1943. It was the highest in over 20 years, and was 7 percent above the 1939–43 average. However, hay supplies per unit of livestock were 1 percent below last year and 5 percent below the 5-year average.

DROP IN HORSE POPULATION

The number of horses on New England farms totaled 125,000 head on January 1, 1945, compared with 128,000 head a year earlier. Horse and mule numbers in the United States continued to decline during 1944 and on January 1, 1945, were about 4 percent lower than a year ago. The numbers of both horse and mule colts under 1 year of age decreased sharply and the end of the long decline in work-stock numbers is not yet in sight.

Cattle and calves on New England farms totaled 1,232,000 head on January 1, 1945, in comparison with 1,225,000 head on January 1 a year ago, and 1,161,000 head 2 years ago. Numbers increased 2 percent in New Hampshire and Vermont during 1944, and remained unchanged in Maine and Rhode Island, but declined 1 percent in Massachusetts and Connecticut. The cattle inventory at 81,760,000 head in the United States on January 1, 1945, is slightly below a year ago, but remains the second largest on record and exceeds the World War No. 1 peak in 1918 by eight and one-half million head. While cows and heifers over 2 years old increased nearly three-quarters of a million head during 1944, calf numbers decreased about one and one-half million head.

The number of milk cows (cows and heifers 2 years old and over kept for milk) estimated at 817,000 head in New England on January 1, 1945, exceeds the inventory of a year ago by 2 percent, and 2 years ago by 6 percent. The net increase of 15,000 head during 1944 includes increases of 3,000 head in both Maine and New Hampshire, 9,000 head in Vermont, 1,000 head in Connecticut, no change in Rhode Island, and a decrease of 1,000 head in Massachusetts. Numbers of heifers 1 to 2 years of age kept for dairy replacements increased to 175,000 head on January 1, 1945, and exceeded the estimate of 159,000 head a year earlier by 10 percent. In contrast with cows and heifers, numbers of heifer calves being raised for dairy cows on January 1, 1945, declined to 162,000 head from 184,000 head a year ago with decreases in each New England State. The number of milk cows (cows and heifers 2 years old and over kept for milk) in the United States at 27,785,000 head is only slightly larger than the 27,656,000 head estimated a year ago.

LESS SHEEP AND LAMBS

Numbers of sheep and lambs declined in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Massachusetts during the past year and totaled 82,000 head for New England as a whole on January 1, 1945, in comparison with 92,000 head last year. Sheep numbers in the United States declined to 47,945,000 head at the close of 1944 for a drop of 3,824,000 head or 7.4 percent during the year. During 1944, hog numbers declined in each New England State except Massachusetts which showed an increase of 5,000 head. On January 1, 1945, the New England total of 272,000 hogs was 14 percent below the 1944 total of 315,000 head. For the United States, hog numbers dropped to 60,660,000 head on farms on January 1, 1945, from the all-time record number of 82,852,000 head a year ago.

In New England a decline of 6 percent in chicken numbers (not including broilers) during 1944 to a total of 16,631,000 birds on January 1, 1945, was shared by each of the New England States. For the United States, the 511,130,000 birds excluding commercial broilers on farms January 1, 1945, was 11 percent below last year and included decrease varying from 3 percent in Massachusetts to 24 percent in Colorado.

The Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the equal rights amendment delivered by Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller on February 10, 1945, at Boston, Mass., before the National Association of University Women. I have received from the Public Printer an estimate which indicates that the cost of printing the address will be $169.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The history of the movement of the equal-rights amendment parallels closely the fight for the suffrage amendment and, strange as it may seem, many of the arguments against the equal-rights amendment are almost identical to the antisuffrage arguments of more than a generation ago.

During the struggle for suffrage, one of the important groups among the suffrage organizations was the College Equal Suffrage League led by M. Carey Thomas, president of Bryn Mawr. I recall that many college graduates of that day were members of this league throughout the country. It, therefore, came as a shock to many of us, who had been members of this group, to learn that the American Association of University Women was opposing the equal-rights amendment which reads: "Equality of rights under the law cannot be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. This amendment shall take effect 3 years after the date of ratification."

Today I welcome the opportunity to speak to this group of university women in the hope that you, as individuals here, will help change the attitude of your association.

Let us examine the arguments brought forward by the opposition—the Consumers' League, the League of Women Voters, officials of the A. F. of L., and C. I. O., and some church groups. These seem to be the most active opponents at present of equality under the law. While I acknowledge that many of our opponents are sincere in their opposition, I cannot help but feel that much of the opposition is due to ignorance and prejudice. Yes—but most of it, I suspect, comes from fear on the part of the men—that women may supplant them in their jobs and so they join in the so-called protective argument.

At a hearing last October in the office of ex-Senator Gillette, a group of opponents stated their reasons against the amendment. The C. I. O. representative, Attorney Raphael of New York, said in no uncertain terms why the C. I. O. was opposed to the equal-rights amendment. He declared that in the post-war period women would be in keen competition with men and the question of the adoption of the amendment is, therefore, of very great seriousness.

I agree with the C. I. O. attorney that the post-war period is going to be serious for some men, because many women have been doing better work in jobs which men have long considered their rightful province.

For example, I was chairman of the advisory committee of the N. Y. A. in Pennsylvania and deeply interested in the work it was doing for young men and women. Some time prior to the war we began to turn our attention to defense projects, and in a short time discovered that a majority of the girls made better riveters and welders than the boys. I am told this was also found to be true in the Kaiser shipbuilding yards and other war plants.

Women are working in navy yards—there are 6,000 in the Brooklyn Navy Yard alone; they are in munition factories; in automobile plants; driving trucks and busses; acting as conductors on streetcars as well as switch operators, and filling hundreds of other jobs for which women were once considered unfit. Mr. J. F. Deasy, operational vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, states: "Women are now working in 85 classified occupations, ranging for instance, from locomotive cleaner to claim agent; from train director to nurse; from dining-car steward to steam-hammer operator. There are women passenger trainmen and yard freight brakemen, gang foremen, car inspectors, mechanics and helpers, crane operators, boiler washers, laborers, station agents and ushers, train announcers, signal-tower operators, switch tenders and coach cleaners, to name a few of the occupations being filled." Only a couple of weeks ago, the first woman window cleaner was pictured in New York City accoutered the same as a man and apparently doing just as good a job. No wonder the men are fearful.

We have so long been accustomed to hearing that women are unable to do night work because it was bad for their morals or they were unable to stand the strain that almost everyone took it for granted that this is true.

The director of health in Buffalo, after one of the heavy snowfalls of the winter, advised white-collar men not to shovel snow because they were not equal physically to the job but to leave this job to their wives who were accustomed to heavy work.

I know plenty of women who have always put a shovel or two of coal on the furnace throughout the day but now more women than ever are faced with the job of tending the furnace all the time, and a recent Washington newspaper gave lengthy instructions to women as to how to keep the home fires burning.

It would seem, therefore, that the working man, who is so much concerned about women not being physically equal to so many jobs, is not thinking of her future so much as he is of his own.

It has long been a custom to provide seats for women in stores and factories but in a Chicago Dodge plant, where B-29 Superfortress engines are produced, a group of men staged a walk-out last December against an order banning chairs at their machines. I think the men were justified. If they can do their work sitting down there is no reason why they should not have chairs, but, the labor leaders need not think they can continue to fool working women by opposing the amendment on the grounds that women are so much weaker or unequal to any jobs, except ones the men don't want.

At the hearing previously referred to, a woman member of the C. I. O., Miss Molly Maloney, for years engaged in the printing and binding trade, gave the women workers' side of the question, proving that no-night-work laws for women and laws limiting their hours of work made women lose their jobs and took away opportunity for advancement. Many highly skilled jobs were lost to women in the printing trades because a law was passed in New York State forbidding them to work after a certain hour, and thus they lost the chance for extra pay by not being permitted to work an extra hour or two on rush jobs. Miss Maloney was an experienced folding-machine operator receiving $46.50 a week, but through the efforts of some men labor leaders and well-intentioned nonworking women such as the League of Women Voters and Consumers' League, she was unable to continue in her well-paid position and was obliged to accept a lesser job just because she could not stay a little longer on the bindery machine to complete a rush order. In this case, as well as under so many so-called protective provisions, only the men benefited. Their hearts bleed for women working at night when the pay is better, but we do not hear any protestations regarding charwomen who nightly clean offices all over the land. Regarding the argument that women are not safe in the streets at night seems entirely outside the question as the safety of its citizens is up to the police powers of a city, and during the war when it is necessary for women to work at night in many places we no longer hear about the dangers of the dark.

Opponents declare that the amendment is absurd because "it is an abstract statement of general princsiple" and, therefore, does not belong in the Constitution. May I remind them again, and again, and again that the Constitution of our country deals in general principles, and if the amendment is a general principle as they declare then it does belong in the Constitution.

It is argued that no one can define rights. This seems absurd for everyone knows what the word "right" in the Bill of Rights means and everyone realizes what is meant by a "fundamental right." Certainly equal justice is a fundamental right and justice to be real should apply to all alike, regardless of sex.

It is also argued that no one can define equality, that such a word does not belong in the Constitution. You might as well say that no one can define "liberty" or "freedom," both of which words are in the Constitution. The Supreme Court made clear a few years ago what it considers equality in its decision regarding the famous Scottsboro case in Alabama. The court at that time decided that several Negroes on trial for rape had not had a fair trial because no Negroes were permitted on the jury panel and a retrial was granted. Negro men, therefore, throughout the country have since had a right to serve on juries but that right may still be denied to both Negro and white women although all women may be tried for all sorts of crimes by juries composed entirely of men.

During the last depression married women in some places in Massachusetts, as you know, were barred from employment in city departments and in the schools. Many Boston concerns and industrial organizations followed suit and bills were introduced in the legislature attempting by law to ban further employment of married women. Later, six competent married women employees of Somerville were dismissed after a city ordinance had been passed barring the employment of married women. These women, feeling that their right to work was just as inviolate as men's, took their case to the courts and in 1938 the Supreme Court declared this ordnance invalid, saying, "It deprives married women of their constitutional right to equal opportunity for selection for public employment on grounds having no substantial relation to public welfare."

This was certainly a great victory for the Somerville women, but this was only a sop to married women for the court pointed out that this ruling in no way interfered with the previous opinion which held that

married women might be barred as school teachers because "married women in some public employments may be considered less qualified than unmarried women." Far be it from a Pennsylvania woman unlearned in law to criticize the high court of Massachusetts, but this decision on the one hand seems to say—a married woman has a right to be employed as a clerk in a city because that is her constitutional privilege but on the other hand, a school committee may refuse to employ a married woman as a teacher because some married women may not be good teachers, implying, of course, that single women are better. It seems to me that both married and single women should have a constitutional right to work either as a city clerk or as a teacher. Such a decision by the Massachusetts Supreme Court puts a stigma on marriage and penalizes women for fulfilling their God-given destiny.

One of the objections to the amendment is the argument that if women were equal under the law it would menace family life and prevent the husband being the head of the family. We believe that the amendment would not conflict with such a church pronouncement any more than equality of rights for all men of whatever race or status deprives the secular or spiritual heads of their rightful sovereignty.

In States or countries where husband and wife have already been given equality of rights under family law there has been no conflict with the church's attitude or position regarding the head of the family. In a true Christian family life there is always an equality of sacrifice which naturally makes for equal rights, equal responsibility and equal love and joy, and which in no wise prevents or interferes with any parental headship. Further, we all know that there are many families where the mother becomes the economic and moral leader and this in no way interferes with religious practices.

The League of Women Voters is also much concerned about support laws, suggesting that under the amendment a wife might be obliged to support her husband. In happy marriages, and I still believe there are millions of them, the husband and wife do not concern themselves about obligatory support, but all of us know that there are many households where the woman is obliged, not through laws, to support her husband and family but because the husband is either inefficient, incapable, or indifferent to his family. Such cases never go to court. Further, under present conditions both men and women are aiding in the family income in order to give their children a better upbringing. After every war there are more women workers and more women left without male supporters, and I predict that when this war is over there will be many women both single and married who will prefer to work outside the home. Our civilization does depend on homemakers and home owners and the majority of women do, I believe, prefer to remain in the home and raise a family, but after the children are well toward maturity and ready for further educational opportunities, many women will then want to earn extra money in order to give the children better advantages than they have had themselves.

If in the post-war era we are to avoid the catastrophes which occurred after the last war, we will have to provide millions of new jobs in order to keep up our purchasing power and standard of living. Therefore, many of these jobs will have to be filled by women.

The fear that men will not take care of their families under this amendment becomes less and less because the courts are now deciding that women who work or who have incomes should share in the responsibility of child support. In a recent decision in Allegheny County, Pa., Judge Kenneth L. Harkins ruled that a woman who brought suit against her husband for support of herself and child should not make this demand upon the husband because she was making $140 a month in a war plant which was a sufficient amount for her own support and a share in that of the child's, so ruled that she should contribute half the amount needed for the support of their child.

Women doctors had a long, arduous struggle to gain admittance to medical schools and then to hospitals. Some people may have an old-fashioned prejudice against women doctors but it matters little to most mothers whether a woman doctor or a man doctor takes care of the wounds of their sons in service. However, at the beginning of the war, according to a ruling of the office of the Comptroller General based on Supreme Court decisions, the War Department stated that women doctors were not eligible for service in the Army because they are not persons under the Constitution of the United States. Hence, a special act of Congress was needed in order to permit women doctors to serve during the war. This act is in effect for only 6 months after the war. It could only be a temporary act because of the court's decisions that women are not persons. In other words, the age we are living in and which we consider so advanced, still bases justice on sex. We boast about the freedom in our own country and yet as more and more women become independent there is a growing movement to curtail their rights. I would like to remind you that the first move of the Nazi and Fascist Governments in their own countries was to remove what few rights the women had there in public and professional life and to return them to the kitchen for good. Note the result in Rome and Berlin.

Inequality of the sexes under the law has always been a practice in the United States. This arose from the old English common law which made a woman a chattel not far removed from the ox, and since the common law prevails, in the absence of statutory law to the contrary, many of these disabilities remain. Recently a man was brought before Judge G. Malcolm McDonald in Pittsburgh charged with being a common scold. The judge declared that "surely a man could be a 'common scold' just as certainly as a woman. Our own experience has been that men can be just as ornery as women." However, the indictment against this man had to be quashed for "the simple reason, except for the common law, we have no law on the subject" and the common law recognizes only women as scolds. (See Blackstone, etc.) Hence, many, many times judges are obliged to go against their better judgment in cases where nothing but the common law applies. Because of these sixteenth and seventeenth century ideas regarding women, we are still denied true justice.

Twenty-six States restrict occupational opportunities for women and limitations vary from State to State. A woman may be free to engage in a given type of employment in one State and restricted in another. In some States women may not work at night. In others night work is limited. Wisconsin forbids the employment of women in any capacity as employees of the State legislature. Discriminations against married women are common, and though some of these discriminations are temporarily set aside because of the war, they may be resumed at the end of the war. In 46 States the husband has the right to choose his wife's domicile. In 7 States the law distinguishes between the husband and wife regarding the general right to sue and be sued. In 5 States the wife has the management of her property but cannot dispose of her real property without the consent of her husband. The husband, on the other hand, can dispose of his property without his wife's consent. In Pennsyvania I cannot mortgage the famiy home without the consent of my husband, which I think is a wise law, but should he own a million dollars worth of real estate he could mortgage and lose it without my consent.

In some cases the wife's earnings belong to the husband. In New York a wife may spend her earnings made outside the home, but inside the home earnings, such as from keeping boarders, belong to the husband—even one who beats her. In California a wife's earnings become the property of the husband if there is no agreement to the contrary. In Nevada a married woman cannot establish a business without her husband's consent through application to the courts. In 6 States the father is the natural guardian of the child. The mother is the natural guardian only when the father is dead or unfit for guardian. In Florida and North Carolina if the parents separate the father has the prior right to the chid, no difference what his status. In Georgia the father can be, or appoint, a guardian for a child not yet born and may exclude the mother as a guardian. In 16 States the father is entitled to the earnings of the child. I could go on ad infinitum with such examples as these.

Another favorite argument against the amendment is that former husbands would not pay alimony to their wives. Alimony has been a cause of contention for many, many years, so much so that 13 States have abandoned the idea, and no bad results have come about. Further, examine the court records and find out how difficult it is in numerous cases to collect alimony.

There are a thousand and one unjust and unfair discriminations against women on the statute books of the Nation, especially against married women. It is a curious thing that in every State a single woman, if she is of age, can handle her own property but let her subscribe to the marriage vows and she suddenly becomes incompetent. The adoption of the amendment would do more to improve the status of women than any measure since their enfranchisement.

People who wish to forestall the amendment keep saying workingwomen are not sufficiently organized to take this step. May I recall to your minds that workingmen were equal under the law with every other man before they were organized, a ditch digger was the equal of the banker under the law, and his strength lay in the fact that they were equal. The same should be true of women. Another favorite argument is that this amendment would overburden the courts in the various States. You will note that the amendment will not take effect for 3 years after the date of ratification. Now, while I am neither a lawyer nor a judge, there are many lawyers and judges who agree that this is ample time in which the States can remove the many discriminations which now exist against women. Our opponents say these discriminations should be removed State by State. May I remind them again, and again, and again that what one legislature may do another can undo and that the removal of one unjust law by one legislature can be reenacted into law by the next legislature. This has happened time after time in our Nation. We passed a much-needed Teachers' Tenure Act in Pennsylvania less than 10 years ago, one of whose provisions provided a woman could not be dismissed because she was married. However, no married teacher feels safe since, because in practically every session of the legislature someone wants to amend the act in such a way that it would discriminate against married women.

Last November the C. I. O. held its seventh constitutional convention in Chicago, and among the resolutions passed was one against the equal-rights amendment. Resolution No. 37 stated that the C. I. O. had always supported and worked for protective labor legislation for women, such as minimum wage and maximum hours, rest periods, laws prohibiting dangerous work or night work, or in places deemed unwholesome to the health or morals of women, apparently not taking into consideration that the women themselves might like to choose their times

and places of work. Then the resolution puts off the fatal day by stating "until the various States have enacted legislation to protect both men and women workers in interstate industries it is essential to maintain existing State laws for women," and, therefore, the C. I. O., because of "its great interest in the problems and working conditions of working women," calls upon its entire membership to defeat the equal-rights amendment and work for the following program: Equal pay for equal work, provision for collective bargaining, adequate housing and recreational facilities, education, etc. You will note that there is nothing said about any fundamental rights for women and equality under the law nor any plea for equal opportunity.

Miss Freida Miller, head of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, is in perfect agreement with the C. I. O.'s opposition to the equal-rights amendment. She uses practically the same arguments as the men do, only much less reasonable. One of her arguments is that under the equal-rights amendment industrialists will not be compelled to hire women or people will not be compelled to consult women doctors, lawyers, etc. No one ever claimed such for the amendment, and this statement (New York Times, September 1, 1944) shows that Miss Miller has really never studied the amendment. What it might do for women by far outweighs anything she believes it would do against them. At a later date in September Miss Miller seemed to be much concerned about the division of wage scales and working conditions in the industries in which women have usually outnumbered men. She also states that there may be 2,000,000 more women workers in the labor market after the war than in 1941. Presuming there are 18,000,000 women workers now, Miss Miller "guesses" that at least 4,000,000 will retire, leaving at least 14,000,000 women "whose only choice will be to find work or go on relief." Miss Miller's solution is that the setting of minimum wage-and-hour standards for women different from men will take care of the majority of women workers, again leaving entirely out of consideration the idea of what women may prefer to do or what their services may be worth.

A contradictory statement came later when Miss Miller, at the Women's National Democratic Club, urged that women be given equal opportunity with men for obtaining jobs in the post-war period, and, at the same time, advocating a system of State control over service industries, in order to encourage women to return to their former type of employment. These statements are both contradictory and confused, and one cannot help but feel that Miss Miller, instead of working for the advancement of women, is actually working against it. In a nine-point program (Washington Post, December 7, 1944) Miss Miller again comes out with a statement for at least adequate minimum conditions in the traditional women-employee industries. Does Miss Miller think that women who have been serving during the war and who have been working at nontraditional industries are now, at her suggestion, going back into the old established ruts? While she advocates equal pay for equal work, at the same time she wants a minimum standard for women leaving men doing the same work, I suppose, to benefit by higher wages.

Fear has been expressed that mothers' pensions could not be paid if the amendment were in force. May I remind people who put forth this argument that so-called mothers' pensions, which after all are to be used for the children, are a type of special legislation the same as pensions for war veterans and laws to that effect could still be passed and administered.

The League of Women Voters seems to be much concerned about what would happen in cases of rape under the amendment. May I remind these nervous ladies that rape is a crime and punishment for such a heinous crime can always be meted out. Further, there are already 13 States which make rape a crime for both men and women. Some of our States have very low figures regarding the age of consent for girls which have certainly been taken advantage of throughout the years. It would, therefore, seem beneficial to all to make the age of consent, which is 21 for boys in most States and far less for girls, the same for both.

Fear is expressed that women would not be protected as mothers of the race if they went out of the home to help make a living. This reminds me of the old antisuffrage argument, "Woman's place is in the home." Certainly the majority of married women, especially those with little children, would prefer to remain at home if they were not faced with the economic necessity of either making or adding to the family income. More and more new inventions give women greater leisure and more and more do women go out of the home to work either from necessity or because they want to maintain a higher standard of living. This has been true since the invention of the weaving machine and after every war more women have had to become breadwinners. It is the workingwomen out of the home the opposition seems so concerned with. They want to tell these women when and how they shall work and what wages they shall receive. Minimum wages for women alone have not brought the panacea that was expected. For example, in Ohio a number of years ago minimum wages and hours were set for women workers in laundries. Then came the depression and men and boys underbid the women, worked longer hours, and thus the standard of living was lowered for all. The present Department of Labor says that after the war "night work for women must go" without taking into consideration any thought of what women workers may prefer and without any idea apparently that these provisions against night work are almost without exception put into the laws by men whose motive is to keep women from good jobs or from working overtime—and hence, receiving overtime pay.

It is generally agreed that we could not fight the war successfully unless women were in shipyards, munition factories, etc. and etc.,—and thus these so-called protective laws have been held in abeyance or winked at in the various States due to the necessity of the occasion. In Pennsylvania in 1943 a law was passed permitting the Secretary of Labor and Industry to allow women to be employed any 6 days up to 10 hours a day for 48 hours a week "directly or indirectly in furtherance of the war effort." This was to continue during the present state of war and 6 months thereafter. The C. I. O. legislative program for the present session in Pennsylvania wants this bill changed, evidently being very fearful about that clause "6 months thereafter." They want the law now to read that this provision shall end "when the war in Europe is declared ended by the President of the United States." It is very plain that the men labor leaders are going to try to prevent as far as possible the continuance of women in industry.

Mrs. Beatrice Simuncic is the first woman of the United States to become president of a steel company's union. She upset all traditions last June when she was elected president of the C. I. O. Local Union, No. 1156, of Pittsburgh. Last November, Mrs. Simuncic made this statement: "Women have every right to take their places along with men, regardless of whatever occupation or business, now and in the future. I have only to point out what women are doing today to prove this. We women do not take credit for winning the war, but you can't take it away from us—we are sure helping." She continues: "Other than soldiers' jobs, women have every right to take other men's jobs after the war. If they are capable, I don't see why they should give their positions up to men when victory is won. Women are doing a man's work now, and they will continue to do it—and women can marry and raise healthy families while working, too. That old theory that a woman's place is in the home no longer exists. Those days are gone forever." I trust Mrs. Simuncic is correct, but she better wake up to what certain C. I. O. men are doing to thwart all her desires and plans.

We who advocate the equal-rights amendment are not opposed to protective laws, provided they protect both men and women. The so-called protective and minimum-wage laws for women alone tend to lower incomes, for in time of depression men underbid women, and thus the standard of living is lowered for all. The National Wage and Hour Act takes care of this provision and certainly should allay the fears and the arguments that have been furnished in this regard against the amendment.

Mr. Maury Maverick, who has been the head of the Smaller War Plants Corporation during the war, forecast a bright future for women in small business if the country steps into full production after the war. He stated that "under a system for restricted production where you have raised the price of production by virtue of scarcity, women will have to stay home. That isn't going to work out. Women have learned too much to go back." He told of a case of a woman welder who was faced with a cut-back so she formed her own shop and hired 25 other women welders to work under her and evidently made a great success. Mr. Maverick's advice was that we should permit women to do something constructive and, therefore, advised them to get into small business, stating, "the basis of small business is the home. Little business people own their homes; their wives, daughters, and sisters working with them. Think of the small dress shops, grocery shops, cleaning establishments, etc., that are and can be run by women. And to women whose husbands come back from the war maladjusted or injured, small business will offer the best opportunity for being a help to their husbands." But, may I remind Mr. Maverick that without the equal rights amendment many women in many States will not be able to take advantage of this bright future. It is interesting to note that many small loans have been made through Mr. Maverick's organization to women in business. A woman in Massachusetts was loaned just $250 and another $280 to help them turn out brass polish for the Navy. A woman in Texas received a total loan of $600,000 in operating a canning factory employing 350 people. No loans made to women by the Smaller War Plants Corporation had gone into default up to the date of Mr. Maverick's statement which was last August.

It has taken us a long time to declare that wages should not be based on sex, but should be paid for the work done. The Fair Labor Standards Act has been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court, hence the arguments against the equal rights amendment as they apply to wages fall into the discard. Many people would have you believe that all working women oppose the amendment, but such is not the case, as the Industrial Women's League for Equality, with headquarters at 452 Park Place, Brooklyn, N. Y., is composed of women members of both the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L., who back the amendment to the limit because they realize that without equality under the law no woman's job is ever safe. Equality does not mean a lowering of standards and we are confident that the position not only of working women but of all women will be raised by this amendment.

During my political life as well as that of my family we have fought strenuously for the rights of labor, and will continue to do so

both for women and men, but I want to ask the opponents of the amendment why they do not consider the millions of other women who demand equality under the law—why they only talk of women in industry? It seems to me that all women are of equal importance to the advance of civilization; that we should not deny equality to all women because it is said it will harm just one group.

The Northwestern National Life Insurance Co. has made a survey in various plants regarding post-war jobs. Seventy percent of the women war workers expect or want to remain in peacetime jobs. Most war-working women agree that the returning veterans should have first choice and the wives and mothers probably agree that the husband and sons should have jobs, but women who have been earning incomes during the war will feel that there is no reason why they, too, should not have jobs if it is necessary to add to the family income.

You will recall that during the early part of the depression there was a great deal of agitation against "working wives," which was certainly grossly unfair. "To work or not should be a question of individual decision." Women have every right to resent the idea that it is their duty to work in times like the present, but that, unlike men, they should stay meekly at home when jobs are scarce.

The real issue presented by the equal rights amendment is this:

Are women really a part of our democratic government or shall they be forever kept in a class apart, denied the basic rights and freedoms men have always had under our Constitution?

Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, after he retired as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court and before he became Chief Justice, wrote a book on the Court in which he said, "The Constitution is what the Court makes it." Thus, it is due to decisions of the Supreme Court over the past 150 years that women are denied equality under the law. The only sure and safe method, therefore, to give them equality is through the equal rights amendment.

In his inaugural address President Roosevelt said, "Our Constitution of 1787 was not a perfect instrument; it is not perfect yet." I do not know what the President had in mind regarding any improvement in the Constitution, but certainly its most glaring imperfection is the insecure position of women. While half our citizens are not equal under the law, we cannot claim that our Constitution even approaches perfection.

Some of our South American neighbors have given equal rights to their women and in China, Russia, and New Zealand women have full equality. We declare in the Dumbarton Oaks plan a desire to "promote everywhere respect for human rights and fundamental freedom." We stand before the world as the champion of freedom for all peoples. If we as a nation intend to be consistent, fair-minded, and jus , then let us prove it by passing the equal rights amendment.

Night

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short poem written in a hospital by a wounded soldier of the Seventh Army, Thirty-sixth Infantry Division, Pvt. (1st cl.) Albert T. Young. I knew him before he went into the Army. The poem deals with the terrors of night on the front, and I think it will strike a responsive chord in the heart of any soldier.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIGHT

Twelve hours of darkness,
Twelve hours of light;
But the ones we fear the most
Are those which pass in the night.

They take away your seeing,
They blind your very eyes;
Everything is hidden from view
Or distorted in shape and size.

We hate it—we fear it,
This thing they call the night;
It hides the cursed enemy
And protects him from our sight.

These twelve hours of darkness,
We loved them those years when
The world was at peace with God
And men were not killing men.

But now we are in a different year,
Death and danger walk the night.
O God! will this never end?
Will we never see the light?

—*Pvt. (1st cl.) Albert T. Young.*

FRANCE, *February 8, 1945.*

Value of the St. Lawrence Seaway to the City of Buffalo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., a small group, a very powerful group, who make it their business to attempt to convince the people of Buffalo that the St. Lawrence seaway would just about completely ruin that city.

There appeared in the Buffalo News on February 26, 1945, an article by Hilton Hornaday, financial editor of the Buffalo Evening News, in which he reports an interview with Hugh Thompson, regional director of the C. I. O. of that section. If one will read this article he will learn that the St. Lawrence seaway, far from ruining the city of Buffalo, would virtually assure its future prosperity.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article by Mr. Hornaday printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAWAY WOULD BE OF GREAT AID TO FRONTIER, SAYS C. I. O. LEADER

(By Hilton Hornaday)

Nothing would stand in the way of a great industrial advancement on the Niagara frontier if the St. Lawrence seaway project were to become a reality, Hugh Thompson, regional director of the C. I. O., said today.

Talk that the project would leave Buffalo "a desolate community" is nonsense, Mr. Thompson said.

"If the project goes through," he said, "I predict that within 50 years the Niagara frontier will have a population of between 3,000,000 and 5,000,000, and it would become the most outstanding industrial area in the entire United States. This, I say, is a prediction."

After studying the project for many months and reading Government reports and documents relating to the subject, Mr. Thompson said today that he has concluded that, from the standpoint of the welfare of the 150,000 Buffalo-area C. I. O. members working in more than 200 plants, the seaway should go through so that the area can benefit by cheap electric power and low water-transportation costs.

MAY LOSE STEEL INDUSTRY

He has so expressed himself in a letter to United States Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of Buffalo, in which he points out:

1. The steel industry, with 30,000 employees, is likely to drift away from Buffalo when supplies of Minnesota iron ore give out.

2. The St. Lawrence seaway would open a cheap, direct, all-water route for Swedish ores, assuring permanency for the steel industry in Buffalo.

"Whether the steel industry will be as firmly entrenched in Buffalo 5, 10, or 15 years from now is bound up with the question of whether there will be ample supplies of iron ore," Mr. Thompson wrote.

"It is well known that the Lake Superior ore or the high-grade ore from the Mesabi Range is almost depleted. Therefore high-grade ores will have to be brought in from foreign countries such as Chile, Brazil, or Sweden.

SWEDISH ORE MOST POPULAR

"The Swedish ore is the most popular at this time because of the short distance from Sweden to our Atlantic coast. However, the tremendous expense that would have to be borne by the steel companies in shipping this ore by railroad from the Atlantic seaboard to their plants on the Lakes would necessitate the companies moving closer to the Atlantic coast which actually means that the large steel industry would be lost to Buffalo—and I am not speaking of 50 or 100 years from now. I am speaking of something that is immediate.

"If you desire to get the real facts on this matter you will read a report (in 1941) of N. R. Danielian, director of the St. Lawrence Survey, and I quote:

" 'In trying to appraise the effect of the proposed St. Lawrence development upon imports of iron ore from the long-term viewpoint, the question of depletion of the Lake Superior reserve becomes critical.

UNTOLD POSSIBLE RESERVES

" 'The actual reserves will last under the present rate of extraction for over 20 years. Behind the actual reserves are untold possible reserves. The term "possible reserves" is used for ore that is not proven but the existence of which is indicated by formation and by the presence of low-grade ore that cannot be moved or used under present conditions and methods.

" 'Nevertheless, from the viewpoint of so vast an industry representing such tremendous investments, and of such great importance to the national economic power and well-being, 20 years is but a brief period. * * *

" 'In the face of such a prospect, by no means impossible, the St. Lawrence seaway stands as a form of insurance; through it the Great Lakes producers will be able to bring in the foreign ores for mixing with the domestic ores which will enable them to insure their investments in plant and transportation at their present locations.'

WAR HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE

"However, the war program has cut a large number of years from this 20 because three and four times (the 1937 rate of extraction of ore) has been extracted from the Mesabi Range during the war years.

"At the present time there are less than 5 years left in this range. Therefore, you can see how immediate this problem becomes for the Niagara frontier and its most important industry—steel."

A United States Department of Commerce publication has mentioned that the ore deposits on the Mesabi Range shows signs of depletion, Mr. Thompson said. He quoted an article in the January 6 issue of Foreign Commerce Weekly:

"'At a time when the great deposits of high-grade ores on the Mesabi Range in the United States show signs of being depleted, foreign ores are beginning to attract more and more attention from our steel manufacturers.'

"This proves conclusively how immediate and serious the St. Lawrence seaway and power project becomes for us on the Niagara frontier, for if we are to lose our steel industry with its more than 30,000 workers, we will also lose all of our related industries, and this will destroy Buffalo as a prosperous industrial area. These are the facts I believe you should consider carefully because the future of Buffalo hangs in the balance.

"MUST DEVELOP SEAWAY

"Col. William Kelly, representative of the Committee for Economic Development, has also made a survey in which he states that Buffalo's future is bright. However, I am sure he has not considered the devastation that would be wrought in Buffalo by the loss of our steel and related industries. To me the future of Buffalo and the Niagara frontier is bright, providing, however, we develop the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

* * *

"It is my opinion that the greatest good that you can do for the Niagara frontier is to aline yourself on the side of progress and prosperity by pushing and fighting for the passage of legislation which is for the purpose of developing the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

"The C. I. O. in the Niagara frontier has unanimously endorsed this program. The executive committee of the American Labor Party has also endorsed unanimously this program."

Growth of Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very outstanding editorial published in the Miles City Daily Star. The editorial was written by Mr. W. F. Flinn, general manager of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CANCEROUS GROWTH OF BUREAUCRACY

We have set forth our thoughts on the subject of bureaucracy this Sunday morning in the hope that during the day you will have time to settle back in your easy chair and ponder the matter. After that we further hope you will write a Senator or Congressman—not necessarily those from Montana—and register your thoughts with them. Most Senators and Congressmen are trying to fight off the inroads of bureaucracy, but they can't stand up against its onslaughts if we, the people, don't give them our help.

Cancer gnaws at the vitals of the body. Bureaucracy gnaws at the vitals of liberty and democracy. Cancer has laid many an otherwise healthy body low. Bureaucracy has laid many a progressive nation in waste and desolation, both in ancient and modern times. Germany, Italy, Spain, France, Japan are all modern examples of bureaucracy at its worst. Russia, an example of bureaucracy that destroys human liberties, becomes intolerant of those who disagree with it, destroying them at home or abroad, either by violence or insidious propaganda.

The United States must be saved from the totalitarian bureaucracy that has been taking over, first, under the guise of rehabilitating a country in a man-made depression, and then under the later cloak of aiding the effort of a country plunged into universal war. The majority of Congress is trying to resist this bureaucracy, but a strident minority of selfish interests and totalitarians of foreign viewpoints, plus a bevy of American dreamers and crackpots, are making it extremely difficult for Congress to carry the battle to them, for you must remember each Member of the House of Representatives stands for election every 2 years. This strident minority threatens opposing Congressmen with annihilation all during their 2-year term and then makes an effort to defeat them for reelection through the mass manipulation of a minority voting group. Senators, who have 6-year terms, are given different treatment. Take the case of Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada. This minority of selfish interests and entrenched bureaucrats made a determined effort to defeat him in last year's elections. Failing, they are now offering him the lure of appointment as a Federal judge—a lifetime job. Why? To get him out of their way for a more servile Senator whom they can bend to their will—much as they have bent Senator PEPPER, of Florida, Senator GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania—and as they will bend the freshman Senator from Washington, who owes his appointment to that strident minority.

We were regimented during the depression when Congress gave its rights and powers away to the bureaucrats. Farmers were told when to plant, what to plant, what to destroy, what to eat, what not to eat. Less than 2 years before we were plunged into war, farmers were commanded to destroy overplantings of wheat either by burning or plowing under. The bureaucrats did that. Today we could use that food, but now the bureaucrats regiment you and tell you what you shall eat, when you shall eat it, what you shall not eat; what time you will go to bed, what time you will get up; what temperature you will keep in your home, what time you will turn on the lights, what time you will turn them off, where you will travel, where you will not travel; where you will work, where you will not work; what union you may join, what union you may not join; what wages you may pay your employees, what wages you may not pay your employees; how, when, and where you can lose your money gambling; how, when, and where you can attend conventions or similar meetings; how much sugar, meat, canned vegetables, gasoline, and shoes you can have. They even tried to tell you when, where, and how you could buy gasoline for your car, and how and when to pay for it.

Now in order to carry on this gigantic regimentation a gigantic bureaucracy is required. So we have both—the gigantic bureaucracy and regimentation. It is fast approaching the state of totalitarianism that has already destroyed all the leading nations of the world, either in liberties and physical properties, or both with the exception of the United States and England. At the present moment we are far ahead of England in this matter of regimentation and totalitarianism. The majority of Congress is sincerely trying to extricate the country from the grip of this totalitarianism but they need your help—your letters and encouragement.

If you think we are exaggerating the danger existing from this bureaucracy in America, consider what goes on around you. A few years ago—before 1932—we had no Federal agencies in this small town except the post office. What have we today? The telephone directory has 10 departments listed under "United States Government" not counting the post office and in addition to that we know of a couple more that don't seem to have gotten a phone. There you have it in this small town alone—12 times as many arms of Federal bureaucracy as we had a few years ago. Imagine what that amounts to when spread over the Nation. In addition to that the town is flooded day after day with "special investigators," "special checkers," "special field agents," "special inspectors" of this and that, "special recruiters" for Army, Navy, Marine Corps, War Labor Board, and war industries; "special coordinators" and "special" everything in the dictionary of bureaucracy. Literally, they are falling over each other. That is bureaucracy at its worst.

The Army-Navy is the worse regimenter of human lives at the present moment, but they are followed closely by the O. P. A.; the W. P. B. and that fine old farce, the War Labor Board. Congress is trying hard to fight off the Army-Navy boys, who came forth with all their thunder for a work-or-fight law. The Mead committee (the old Truman investigating committee of the Senate) dropped in unexpectedly on the navy yards at Norfolk, Va. This yard was stuffed to the running boards with war help and was clamoring for 4,000 more. What do you suppose the committee found out just in that one cursory examination? They learned that the help on the job had so little to do that it was given over to making items for personal use, on the taxpayer's time. One of the Senators brought back to the halls of Congress a beautiful, inlaid, walnut checkerboard that one of these busy(?) war workers had turned out because he had nothing else to do. Furthermore, the committee found that the yard was overstaffed by 40 percent and didn't need the 4,000 extra workers that the Army-Navy wanted the work-or-fight bill by which to take people away from their home communities.

Then what happened? That bureaucracy called upon another bureaucracy, headed by Jimmie Byrnes, so-called "assistant President." Mr. Byrnes, issued his order closing the race tracks, thereby depriving States like Florida of millions of dollars of taxable revenue with which it has been maintaining many of its State agencies. Did he stop racing? Of course not. The race horses were shipped to Mexico and the betting and gambling goes merrily on in Mexico while the American taxpayer again foots the bill for bureaucracy.

The most recent move of the bureaucrats is Mr. Byrnes midnight curfew order, whereby all places of amusement must close at midnight. The evident purpose of that order is to force these operators and employees into war jobs—those jobs where they make fancy checkerboards on the taxpayers' time at the taxpayers' expense. But monopoly liquor States like Montana (and there are some 19 of them) depend on the sale of liquor for a great deal of their revenue. Montana's welfare and old-age assistance funds are augmented by that revenue. The general-tax funds of the State are enriched by some $1,500,000 annually. Now what's going to happen? Well, people are going to drink

and dance and sing in spite of Jimmie Byrnes and his bureaucrats, so we'll have speakeasies and joints operating without paying licenses and without supervision. But the bureaucrats say they'll close them up too. With what? Another horde of bureaucrats, of course.

A year or so ago Congress was inveigled by the Treasury Department into putting an additional tax of $3 per gallon on hard liquor. Then the alcohol unit of the Internal Revenue Bureau of the Treasury Department put on still another horde of bureaucrats to check the liquor vendors, to see that the Government got the tax. Now that horde has gotten down to the fine points of trying to figure out how much liquor should be taxed by the number of drinks sold by the emporium. That's just another sample of bureaucracy.

And then there is that fine racket that an unsuspecting Congress put over on an unwilling populace—the Federal auto use stamp tax. This is the racket where you beat it to the postoffice on July 1, buy a stamp for $5 and hotfoot it back to your car to plaster the stamp on before the snooping Internal Revenue agent hauls you before the bar of justice. This racket has even been extended to the point where agents, in order to keep themselves employed, invade public parking lots, filling station stands and public garages distributing their summons although the tax is supposed to be for the operation of a vehicle on a public highway. That is really bureaucracy in its penny-ante stages, and Congress let them get away with that one. If the Internal Revenue Bureau makes one thin dime out of the collection of that tax it is because the dime is plugged. But of course, it gives bureaucracy a further opportunity to regiment the folks.

All of the various schemes for T. V. A.'s, M. V. A.'s, and river authorities are nothing more or less than bureaucracy on the march. All of what they propose to do can be done or is being done by existing Federal agencies. But another layer on top of what we have, controlling something as vital to your welfare as electric current, would really regiment us all in the finest kind of bureaucratic dreams.

In all of the foregoing we have purposely avoided commenting on the O. P. A., the W. P. B., the selective service (which has been stripping the farms of essential workers in open defiance of congressional disapproval), the Wage and Hour Division of the War Labor Board (wait until you get a batch of them in your hair), and dozens of others of the more familiar type.

Now you just cannot sit back, fold your hands and say, "Well, we don't need to do anything about that. Just as soon as the war is over all these controls will disappear." That is the most dangerous kind of thinking. That is the kind of thinking that let a madman grow up in Europe to plunge the world into the second holocaust of a world war.

Did you ever hear of a bureaucrat quitting a soft chair (reports have it that a "swivel chair" shortage exists in Washington at the present time) to go out digging ditches? No, you didn't, and you never will. Bureaucrats will wreck a country, before they will give up their strangle hold on it, once they have perfected their controls.

At the present time we are being told by the bureaucrats of the O. P. A. that they must continue rationing for some period after the war, "in order to maintain regulated distribution of food and prevent inflation." What they mean by "some period after the war" is forever. The W. P. B. is saying that it must continue its controls after the war in order to maintain a balance of raw materials going to domestic users. What they mean is that they must have economic sanctions, so that when everything else fails, they can still continue control of such places as Montgomery Ward's—in which the court now says they are illegally operating. The bureaucrats don't think the court knows how to read law, so they simply go through the process of appealing the decision and say to Wards: "We'll enter into an agreement with you to sit here on our imagination, until the upper courts get through reading the law over and over and over, and you'll accept the agreement or we will wreck the place by applying economic sanctions." The W. F. A. is saying it must continue to tell the farmers what, when, and how to plant; what, when, and how to eat or not eat, after the war, so as to prevent surpluses, land speculation, inflation, and any other excuse they can think up. Remember, these are the same birds who burned our surplus wheat crops in 1940, who plowed the cotton under, and who killed pigs by the thousands to reduce surpluses of pork. That farce, the War Labor Board, wants Congress to give it a law with teeth in it. What for? So it can play off one group of union men against another group of union men; so that it can tell a man what union he may join and what union he may not join. When that power is complete, the unions of America will be destroyed as they were in Germany and Italy.

We urge you again to write your Senators and Congressmen, giving them moral support in their fight to regain the powers entrusted to them by the people and given away to bureaucrats by former rubber stamp representatives in Washington. If you want to know the names of Senators who will be glad to hear from you and who will ponder what you have to say, here are some of them: J. C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat from Wyoming; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat of Colorado; EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Republican of Colorado; HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat of Virginia; HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, Republican of South Dakota; WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat of Georgia; ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., former Progressive of Wisconsin; BURTON K. WHEELER, longtime leader of independent Democrats; ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin; MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Democrat of Maryland. We can furnish you other names and also those of Congressmen, if wanted.

Remember what we stated at the outset of this article. Bureaucracy, like cancer, gnaws at the vitals—the vitals of democracy. It is being aided and abetted by a strange conglomeration of fellow travelers, crackpots, totalitarians, money lenders, and socialistic "pinks" living off inherited wealth. We particularly have in mind certain "foundations" and certain wealthy individuals living in Washington, Chicago, Boston, St. Louis, and even one who inherited his wealth from the resources of the State of Montana.

Congress is fighting them and their accumulated bureaucracy; fighting to preserve the American way of life. Congress is calling on you for your help.

Will you give it?

Government Control of Money and Credit: A British View of the Way to Full Employment

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am glad indeed to include with my remarks the following article which appeared in the London Times on Saturday, January 20, of this year, and which will be both self-explanatory and, I hope, challenging to Members as they consider the problem of full employment after the war:

A WAY TO FULL EMPLOYMENT—GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF MONEY AND CREDIT

"The Engineer and the Nation's Money" was the title of a lecture given by Mr. Antony Vickers at the Institution of Mechanical Engineers last night.

The basic function of the engineer, he said, had been and was to raise the standard of living by providing the machines and other devices which enabled man to multiply his ability to produce. Until we began to appreciate the influence of the machine on the volume of production we could not realize the effect on the value of money.

The orthodox statement that you could only get a pint out of a pint pot, when applied to production and economics, was wrong, and simply meant that it was not yet realized that you got a great deal more out of a machine than was put into its construction. Fundamentally our peacetime goal was to maintain the highest standard of living with the maximum freedom of the individual, and this could only be obtained with the largest output for the minimum effort—i. e., the most efficient use of field, factory, and mine. Clearly this goal could not be obtained when there were millions of unemployed and the means for producing all kinds of goods and services were left idle.

What were the basic reasons for the enforced restriction of production in practically every country in the world? Even the social insurance bill debated last session in Parliament was allowing for over 1,000,000 unemployed who would otherwise produce goods and services of perhaps £600,000,000 a year.

LACK OF PURCHASING POWER

The reason why, in the pre-war period, this appalling state of affairs existed in practically every country was, he suggested, given at the Hot Springs conference last year when it was agreed that: "There has never been enough purchasing power in the hands of the people to enable them to purchase all that has been produced." If they could determine why there was not sufficient purchasing power, which meant, of course, insufficient money in circulation, then they would be getting at the root of the whole problem.

Just as it was essential in business to increase the working capital before and not after expansion so this policy must be followed by the nation, which was largely an aggregate of businesses. The nation's working capital must be increased just before and not after expansion, otherwise there would be a fall in the price level and money would be forced out of circulation.

In time of war the nation insisted that the new money was obtained first and not after, and while there were certain things that were definitely wrong in our wartime finance, nevertheless the vital principle of securing the money before and not after was adhered to.

Immediately after the war in this country there would relatively be too much money in circulation and too few goods, but as men and women were demobilized and production turned over from war to peace so the amount of goods and services would increase and the price level would fall. That was just what happened after the last war, and during this period there would be more jobs than manpower to fill them.

THE STABLE PRICE LEVEL

The time, however, would come when the value of money would have increased, due to expanding production, to such an extent that unemployment was again about to begin. This, then, was the time, perhaps in 1950, when the nation's working capital must be increased by positively injecting new money

into circulation by work to the best advantage of the community.

Only by so doing could a stable price level be maintained. The main problem for Parliament would then be to decide through what channels this newly created debt-free money was to be injected. Never again let it be asked, "Where is the money to come from?" but "Have we the manpower and the materials?"

To achieve the object of full employment in this machine age it would be necessary either to have nationalization of industry and commerce or to put into practice what was so clearly stated by Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, when he said: "Until the control and issue of money and credit is restored to the government and recognized as its most conspicuous and sacred responsibility, all talk of the sovereignty of Parliament and of democracy is idle and futile."

This would mean having a central bank, but joint stock banks would continue their excellent service to industry as at present, subject only to their not being able to create further new money. The primary duty of the central bank would be to create just sufficient new money to maintain a stable price level with full employment. The success of democracy depended on enlightened public opinion. So long as that opinion was based on the shifting sands of orthodox fallacy so long would there be poverty, misery, unemployment, and war.

The Bretton Woods Monetary Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, last July there was held at Bretton Woods, N. H., a conference participated in by 44 nations, in an effort to arrive at agreements on monetary matters. I was privileged to be one of the United States delegation at the conference, and sat through the deliberations. I may say that I went to the conference rather skeptical of the attainment of the objectives of the conference, but came away convinced of the great value that would flow and the constructive benefits which would result from the agreements.

Legislation authorizing our acceptance of and participation in these agreements was introduced in the Senate by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and myself, and is soon to be considered by the Congress.

Preliminary thereto, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum issued by the National League of Women Voters entitled "The Bretton Woods Monetary Proposals."

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRETTON WOODS MONETARY PROPOSALS

NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Gradually the foundation stones are being laid on which to build a firm post-war structure. The immediate objective of an international conference may be the problem of food, oil, or currency exchange, but the ultimate goal of them all is maintenance of a just and durable peace.

Our only chance to keep this peace lies in giving the peoples of the world a sense of well-being and a certain amount of economic security, but they will never achieve these aims if nations can't trade freely with each other. Even the comparatively self-sufficient United States cannot get along without importing such things as coffee, silk, and metals. Cut off from imported products, all nations would have to readjust their living habits, change production practices, and use equipment inferior in quality or higher in price. World trade, therefore, is not only desirable; it is essential.

METHODS OF STIMULATING TRADE BETWEEN NATIONS

I. Agencies for international cooperation

Under the proposed United Nations organization there will be an Economic and Social Council. It is intended to act as a coordinator over the special-purpose agencies such as those set up in the aviation, food and agriculture, oil and monetary agreements. All these agencies are designed to reduce the economic causes of war and assist the exchange of goods and services among the nations of the world. They are important. No security council can prevent war by threatening to use force if the people are discontented, hungry, poor, and therefore desperate enough to fight.

The world is now so closely linked together by radio, telephone, and rapid transportation that what happens in one section of the world has repercussions all over. We need each other's products. Depression and unemployment in Brazil will mean decreased purchases of American automobiles and machine tools. This can result in less employment here and the beginning of a depression in this country. Because we are interdependent, it is necessary to have agencies dealing with problems on a world-wide scale.

II. Constructive domestic policies facilitating trade

While international agencies can determine certain rules of the game and establish an atmosphere favorable to unrestricted trade, they cannot accomplish their objectives unless nations are willing to adopt internal policies implementing these objectives.

Outside groups must be able to sell their goods to us in order to get cash to buy our goods. It is true that at periods we have lent them the money to buy our produce or they have shipped us their gold in payment, but these policies obviously cannot go on for very long. The only sound basis for permanent trading is an exchange of goods with one another.

One of the difficulties of the pre-war period was that many restrictions were imposed on those who wanted to trade with each other. High tariffs were put on goods. Currencies had different values depending on how they were used and who used them. There were bilateral arrangements so that if A sold to B, B could only use the money to buy from A. Barter agreements were used by Germany under which she would take your wheat only in exchange for her harmonicas. All of these regulations stifled trade and directed it into uneconomic channels.

For the sake of our own prosperity we must act against such restrictions in the future. In many of our industries the size of their foreign sales will mean the difference between prosperity and depression. Tobacco farmers, for example, rely on foreign consumers to buy more than half their product.

III. Post-war stability of exchange rates

When an American producer sells in France, for instance, he is interested in two things—in the number of francs which the Frenchman will pay and in the number of dollars which those francs are worth. Suppose the manufacturer starts to make automobiles for the French market at a time when 20 francs equal an American dollar. Six months or a year may elapse before the cars are ready for sale in France. At that time the currency may have depreciated so that 30 francs are now required to equal an American dollar. This puts the American businessman in a very difficult position. Before, in order to obtain a reasonable profit, the auto he produced had to sell for 10,000 francs. Now it must bring 15,000 francs in order to make possible the same profit. Under these circumstances fewer Frenchmen will be able to afford the automobiles and the American businessman will have lost a part of his market. Stability of foreign exchange rates, therefore, is a prerequisite to healthy trade.

In the post-war world conditions are bound to be upset. While war-torn countries are getting back on their feet again their currencies may be unsteady. To help them and to protect the businessmen who want to trade with them an international bank and a currency stabilization fund have been proposed.

THE BRETTON WOODS CONFERENCE

To determine what kind of world monetary arrangements would be needed after the war representatives of 44 nations held a 3 weeks' meeting at Bretton Woods, N. H., in July 1944.

A good deal of spade work had been done prior to the conference. A year before two plans for a stabilization fund had been published—the White plan by the United States and the Keynes plan by Great Britain. In the spring of 1944 a joint statement was made by the experts of 30 nations setting out the principles for an international monetary fund. Just before the Bretton Woods Conference a preliminary meeting was held in Atlantic City. All this preparation meant that careful consideration had been given to the problem.

The plans for a bank and a fund as drawn up are probably not the plans that any of the participating countries would have drawn up for itself. They are a compromise representing the conflicting interests of countries which are large and small, debtor and creditor, highly industrialized and undeveloped. It is a great credit to the delegates that they could find such a large area of common agreement.

Alternative plans may be proposed which also have merit. Since it is probably impossible for the 44 nations to meet together again to iron out their differences on a new basis, it would seem wiser to go forward with the present plans which are workable, rather than start all over again with another approach. The Bretton Woods proposals can go into effect as soon as they are signed by governments subscribing 65 percent of the capital to the bank of the fund. Most of the opposition has centered around the proposals of the fund rather than the bank.

THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

I. Purpose

(a) To facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade.

(b) To maintain orderly exchange arrangements among members.

(c) To eliminate foreign exchange restrictions.

(d) To provide temporary assistance to countries whose trade is temporarily out of balance. The fund is meant to provide a breathing space during which time a country can make any long-run fundamental adjustments which are necessary.

II. Obligations

In return for the assistance obtained from the fund, each member is obligated to avoid international cut-throat competition and to remove monetary restrictions on current trade.

III. Management

(a) A board of governors composed of a representative from each nation will meet at least once a year and more often if necessary.

(b) Twelve executive directors will conduct the general operations of the fund.

(c) A paid director and staff will manage the fund.

IV. Voting

Voting power is closely related to quotas. The United States, having the biggest quota, will receive 28 percent of the votes. The United States' vote is greater than that of all the members of the United Kingdom combined.

V. Quota payments

(a) The member nations will make payments equalling $8,800,000,000. The quota of each country was based on many things, including its foreign trade, national income, and future position in world economic affairs.

(b) Ten to 25 percent of this money will be paid in gold and the rest in currency.

(c) The United States' share is $2,750,000,000, with $687,500,000 payable in gold.

(d) The currency of all member nations will be defined in terms of gold or the dollar.

(e) The amount of its quota determines how much currency a country can buy from the fund.

VI. Operation

(a) Formerly, if a country like Great Britain bought more from the United States than she sold to us, she would either have to ship us gold, borrow from us, or sell some of her investments here to pay for the difference. Since the fund would be a pool of foreign currencies, Great Britain could go to the fund and buy dollars with pounds in order to pay for her purchases. These dollars must be returned to the fund as soon as possible.

(b) To prevent the fund's reserves from being exhausted too rapidly, a country in 1 year may buy other currencies from the fund only up to 25 percent of its quota, unless special circumstances arise.

(c) To discourage heavy buying, service charges payable in gold will be levied, increasing with the amount of the foreign currency obtained and the length of time it is held. To add to the strength of nations whose currency is being purchased from the fund, every country drawing on the fund loses one vote for every $400,000 it buys; the nation whose currency is used gets that vote instead. Because dollars will be in great demand, the chances are that the United States will increase its voting strength.

(d) Since most nations will want to buy dollars from the fund, they may become scarce. The fund can then ask the United States either to buy gold from the fund with dollars or lend some dollars to the fund. There is no obligation to do either of these things.

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN THE FUND

(a) As one of the world's greatest traders, we are vitally concerned with the maintenance of stable and orderly exchange rates and with consequent expansion and growth of international trade.

(b) In the early post-war years when nations are getting back on their feet again the United States will be the chief seller, and will therefore be extending most of the credit. Critics of the fund say we will be "putting money down a rat hole." These critics forget that if we don't put money in the fund we will be lending it to nations so they can buy our goods. In this process we take all the risk of default—in the fund we would only take a portion of the risk. At worst the amount we could lose in the fund is only equal to the cost of about 11 days of war. The price of taking a chance on future prosperity is small.

OBJECTIONS TO THE FUND

Objection. In England there are complaints that the fund ties up too closely with the gold standard, while in the United States there are complaints that the fund doesn't tie up closely enough with the gold standard.

Answer. The fund represents a compromise between two opposite points of view. Since neither side feels it went far enough in its direction it is probably a pretty good compromise.

Objection. Many fear the abuse of the fund by debtor countries. These countries might put up their inferior currencies to buy all the valuable money of the more stable nations.

Answer. There are many safeguards in the fund's proposals to prevent excessive buying and depreciation of currencies.

Objection—

1. Some bankers oppose the fund. Instead they sponsor a key-country approach. They say that because most of the world's trading is done in terms of the pound and the dollar, these currencies must be stabilized first. The smaller countries would then define their currencies in terms of the pound or the dollar.

2. This approach would probably involve a large loan or gift to Great Britain.

3. Proponents of the key-country idea feel that unless each nation achieves domestic stability, cooperation on an international level would not be successful.

4. They also feel that more liberal commercial policies must be established before the International Monetary Fund is set up.

Answer—

1. Stabilizing the pound and the dollar first and letting the other nations tag along is not a very democratic method. The smaller nations are denied a part in international monetary arrangements. Economic blocs grouped around the pound and the dollar wolud seem to be encouraged. These might develop the trade restrictions which the fund is trying to prevent.

2. It is doubtful if Great Britain would want to accept a large loan to stabilize her currency.

3. It is true that the fund will not be effective unless nations put their financial houses in order. However, it will be impossible for many war-ravaged countries to do this themselves. They will need the outside help which the fund will provide.

4. The supporters of the Bretton Woods proposals emphasize that liberal trade policies are also important. However, monetary agreements need not wait for tariff changes in the various countries or for necessary domestic reforms.

THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

I. Purpose

(a) To facilitate the long-term investment of capital for productive purposes to:

1. Restore economies disrupted by the war.

2. Reconvert to peacetime production.

3. Develop resources and industry in less-advanced countries.

(b) To promote the long-range balanced growth of international trade by encouraging foreign investments.

II. Organization

The organization of the bank is similar to that of the fund in regard to membership, management, voting powers, and quota payments. The bank would also have the same advantage of centralized information and consultation as the fund.

III. Capitalization

The capitalization of the bank is set at $10,000,000,000, but only $2,000,000,000 of this amount will be paid in when the bank starts to function. The full share of the United States is $3,175,000,000 but it is unlikely that we will be asked to pay more than 10–20 percent of this amount. The rest will only be called if there are a large number of defaults on loans guaranteed by the bank.

IV. Operation

The bank does not intend to lend more than 20 percent of its capital. Its main purpose will be to guarantee long-term loans made by private lenders through the regular banking and investment houses.

Safeguards

1. Total of loans and guaranties cannot go over $10,000,000,000 plus reserves and surplus.

2. Loans must be guaranteed by the country whose citizens are borrowing and approved by the management of the bank. Low rates of interest will aid repayment.

3. The service charges of 1–1½ percent levied for guaranteeing loans and for direct loans will help pay for any defaults by borrowing countries.

4. The bank will be responsible only for loans needed for imports for productive works such as dams, factories, and railroads. This requirement prevents the money being spent for a domestic W. P. A. and stimulates foreign trade.

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN THE BANK

1. Because we are the greatest creditor nation in the world, our investors would make most of the loans with or without the bank. If the bank comes into existence, it will be our investors who will get protection from the bank's international guaranty. Instead of carrying all the burden of risk, the United States would be sharing any loss which occurs with Great Britain, France, Russia, and the other countries.

2. In pre-war years our private foreign investments were insecure. According to Professor Comstock, of Mount Holyoke, "in 1931 the United States Department of Commerce figures that one class of foreign commitments alone, private commerce long-term investments abroad, increased by nearly $1,000,000,000 a year from 1922 to 1929. Naturally, since no pains at all were taken to make sure that the projects were sensible, much of this money was permanently lost to the American economy. By 1937 the ratio of defaults was 68 percent in South America and well above 50 percent in Central America, Europe, and the West Indies. Even the Bretton Woods figures are not as big as those we have already tossed off."

How the fund and the bank help create prosperity

China, for example, obtains currency from the fund.

With this money China buys United States goods.

United States manufacturers make more goods.

Workers have more jobs.

Workers buy more goods.

Private enterprise system stimulated.

United States buys more goods from China as well as other countries.

China pays back currency to fund.

China, for example, obtains loans from the Bank.

With this money China buys United States goods.

United States manufacturers make more goods.

Workers have more jobs.

Workers buy more goods.

Private enterprise system stimulated.

United States buys more goods from China as well as other countries.

China pays back loans to bank.

National Insurance Policies

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES FOR SERVICEMEN MUST BE EXTENDED FROM 5 TO 10 YEARS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time in order to call to the attention of the House a piece of very vital and important legislation that I believe is timely and should be enacted very shortly.

I introduced the bill, H. R. 2441, which has been referred to the World War Veterans' Committee to extend the life of the national insurance policies from 5 years to 10 years. I have received letters from a number of people who have indicated their interest in it. As a matter of fact I have one here from the mother of a boy overseas. His policy expires on the 28th of this month. If something is not done he is going to be without insurance. There are others in a similar situation.

H. R. 2441

A bill to extend the life of national service life insurance policies owned by members of the armed formes to 10 years, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of subsection (f) of section 601 of the National Service Life Insurance Act shall be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding the following provisos: *"Provided,* That all such policies shall be automatically extended for an additional 5 years without any increase of premium for all persons (as defined in this act) serving outside the continental limits of the United States: *Provided further,* That all such policies shall be extended at the option of all such persons (as defined by this act) serving within the continental limits of the United States without any increase of premium therefor and upon application within 90 days of written notice of the expiration of their policies: *And provided further,* That the increased actuarial cost resulting from these extensions shall be paid by the United States, and the Administrator is authorized and directed to transfer from time to time an amount equal to the amount of such differences in premium from the national service life insurance appropriation to the national service life insurance fund."

POSTAL POST NO. 1581,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Baltimore, Md.

Hon. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McDONOUGH: The United Press has reported that you have introduced a bill to extend for 5 years national service life insurance policies held by members of the armed forces.

Please send me a copy of this bill.

Have had inquiries, from men in the armed forces overseas, about an extension of the "term" plan. One of the letters was from a man now in the battle area. His insurance will expire this month, unless the time is extended.

Yours very truly,
CHAS. F. MOONEY,
Service Officer.

MARCH 5, 1945.

Congressman McDONOUGH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In today's press I note you have introduced legislation to extend for 5 years insurance for servicemen overseas, etc.

Our son in the Navy in foreign service has a policy taken out 4 years ago. It is called "Five-year term policy with provision for exchange. Premiums payable for 5 years. Nonparticipating."

It has no war clause. Upon inquiry to the insurance company asking if policy may stand as it is for the duration, as other obligations, mortgages, taxes, debts, etc., for servicemen are handled, we are informed by the insurance company that they are sorry to have to say it, but the policy must be converted on or before 28th March this year, or we can carry the policy as is until end of 5-year term (28th March 1946) and then policy becomes null and void. Our son cannot be here to do anything about it. Your legislation seems to cover cases of this kind, and you are to be congratulated on your alertness. Insurance companies should not profit by absence of boys in service. That isn't my idea of patriotism.

If your legislation does not cover cases of this kind, please include it, as I dare say thousands and thousands of boys will lose their policies (to the gain of insurance companies) if something isn't done for their protection. When the insurance company was asked why they could not hold policies in abeyance, as other organizations are doing out of deference to servicemen, their answer was "This is a contract."

Mortgages are contracts, too, and taxes are laws, but are held in abeyance.

With sincere appreciation for your consideration.

Respectfully,
Mrs. W. T. HUNTLEY,
Aberdeen, N. C., March 4, 1945.

Article to Appear in Encyclopedia Americana on Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, special permission has been given by the Encyclopedia Americana to the author of the article on cartels which is shortly to be printed in Encyclopedia Americana for its inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The author, Mr. Howard W. Ambruster, of Westfield, N. J., has suggested to me that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and since there is so much discussion of the problem of cartels and so much need for a clear understanding of just what that word means, I am asking consent to include with my remarks on three occasions portions of Mr. Ambruster's article. It is understood that this material cannot be reproduced except by special permission from the Encyclopedia Americana.

Cartel (Ger. Kartell) kärtĕl', in modern usage a restrictive alliance of competitive enterprises, is a word with several very different meanings all stemming from its Latin derivations chartula: A little paper or small writing; and chart, paper or papyrus, or a thin leaf. The early English meanings of cartel include the type of written agreement between belligerents for the exchange of prisoners of war; the vessel which conveyed the messenger bearing such an agreement; and a letter of defiance or challenge to single combat.

In French the word "cartel" has also been used to describe a clock, or a clock dial or case, and, in heraldry, a shield. Another meaning is the political cartel which phrase appears to have been used in Germany in 1837 to describe an alliance of three parties friendly to the government of the German Reichstag; and again in France in 1924 to designate, as the "Cartel des Gauches," the political group which won the French elections in that year. The Germans have also used the phrases "Custom Kartell" to describe treaties between two countries for mutual assistance by their customs authorities; "Trades Union Kartell" to designate agreements between different unions; and "Students Kartell" to define associations of students.

Much more important than its earlier definitions, the word "cartel," toward the end of the nineteenth century began to be used to describe the vast group of different kinds of agreements made between two or more industrial or commercial enterprises in the same field of business with the object of influencing competitive factors. In Germany where this meaning originated the word is "Kartell" and Dr. Robert Liefmann, one of the oldest and best known German authorities on this subject defined it in 1899 as "a free and voluntary coalition contracted by houses in the same line with a view to monopolize the market in common while preserving to their several enterprises a greater or less autonomy." Over 30 years later the same authority defined "cartels" as "voluntary agreements between, or associations of, independent enterprises of similar type to secure a monopoly of the market." Briefly, Dr. Liefmann has called cartels "associations with monopolistic aim."

Very similar to these definitions were those given to the Temporary National Economic Committee, T. N. E. C., in 1941, as based upon several foreign sources, by Prof. Clair Wilcox, of Swarthmore College, who enlarged upon the ultimate purpose of the cartel "of increasing the profits of its members by subjecting their competitive activities to some form of common control." The German Meyer's Lexikon, in its 1927 edition, stressed the monopolistic purpose of weakening or eliminating competitors of cartel members. Dr. Rudolf Callmann, another well-known authority who left Germany for the United States in the 1930's, gave to the T. N. E. C. what he stated to be his own opinion and also the definition of the essential features of the cartel which underlies the decisions of the German courts, as:

"A contractual association of legally independent entrepreneurs in the same or similar field of business, formed with the intent, effect, or potentiality of influencing the market by means of regulation of competition." A concise definition might be that cartel means regulated competition as opposed to free competition.

According to other students, "collective private monopoly" or "private collectivism" are brief definitions which distinguish the cartel, as a contractual agreement, from the trust or combination as single legal entities (see Trusts). Some German dictionaries define the cartel as a ring or syndicate. In this definition it would appear that the word "ring" is used in its meaning as a combination of persons for attaining control of the price of a commodity, rather than that formed for political or legislative purposes. The word "syndicate" in this sense applies to a central agency which handles all sales in a designated market and performs other functions for members of a cartel.

The unanimity of these definitions on the issue of monopolistic aims and increased profits is of significance for the reason that considerable confusion has been apparent at times in arguments advanced relative to the merits of the cartel which, without actually defining it, imply that the purpose of such associations is neither monopoly nor an approach to monopoly.

PROTOTYPES OF ECONOMIC CARTELS

The word cartel was used in economic literature to describe these associations many years before it was recognized by compilers of dictionaries in the United States. From examination of German encyclopedias and reference works of the last half of the nineteenth century it would appear that the first mention of the cartel as an industrial or commercial organization was in volume 9 of Meyer's Konversations Lexikon published in 1876 (Leipzig) in which the word Kartell by a literal translation was said to have the meaning "That parties who otherwise are competitors * * * make provision to protect their common interest against third parties." The first reference to it in Brockhaus' Konversations Lexikon was in the fourteenth edition (Leipzig 1895) and according to Liefmann the earliest public mention of the economic kartell in the German Reichstag was in 1879. Prof. Friedrick Kleinwachter, well known Austrian economist, in 1883 published what appears to be the first monograph on the subject Die Kartelle, and the German or English spelling of the word then began to appear in other reference works and the economic literature of the period.

However, the origin of associations of independent enterprises or entrepreneurs having monopoly or restraint of competition as their object, goes back at least to the middle ages. Some writers have implied that the ancient guilds resembled the modern cartels in their functions of monopoly and self-rule, and some similarity to the modern cartel organization has been found in historical descriptions of collective monopolies such as the salt and alum selling syndicates of 1301 and 1470, respectively; also in a price and regional arrangement between European copper-mining groups in 1546. Wolfgang Menzel's History of Germany (London 1853) in referring to the "privileges of corporations and guilds" of the twelfth century states that "every trade imposes its particular regulations upon itself, the customs of the craft were everywhere similar, and merely the political privileges of the corporation differed in different towns."

Associations of commercial enterprises and syndicates intended to restrain competition continued to appear during the centuries which followed. But, despite their purpose these associations, prior to the era of modern industry, do not come within the accepted definition of the modern cartel nor have they the same significance as concentrations of economic, social, and political power.

Authorities differ as to the first such organization. Several authorities refer to the century-old Salt Union started in 1828 by mines of various German states, and to cartels formed by several alum works in 1836, and by Nassau pig-iron producers in 1842. However, Liefmann appears to regard these associations as the result of special conditions and an indication of reaction which has prevailed in Germany against the general principle of free and open competition.

One explanation of the German cartel movement which has been given by authors of that country is that the national characteristic of Germans is to prefer being led. That explanation appears to go to the root of the cartel theory as opposed to the individualism of the Anglo-Saxon race.

OBJECTIVES OF THE CONTEMPORARY CARTEL

The purpose of members of the cartel by united effort or common action to influence conditions under which their product is marketed, may be carried out by any one of a great variety of methods. These may be said to belong in three general classifications: (1) Price fixing, or agreement on terms or conditions of sale, by which the net return per unit may be controlled—central selling agencies and profit-sharing pools being, in effect, price-fixing devices; (2) market allotment of various types by which each member agrees to sell only in certain territories or to certain groups or individual customers; (3) production restriction by allotment of fixed quotas to which each member agrees to limit output in a designated period or for a designated territory. Exclusive production under patent licenses may be found in this last type of cartel, although patent and trade-mark rights are frequently utilized both for price fixing and for territorial division of market, without restrictions as to quantities to be produced.

This grouping of cartels into only three general classes may appear to be an attempt at over simplification, but so much confusion exists in the exact significance of many varieties of these methods that the obscurity appears to increase whenever attempt is made to list more elaborate subdivisions or a greater number of classifications.

Other students of the cartel place in separate classes those which combine to exclude competitors from the field, this, of course, being a common purpose inherent in all such associations. Still another classification has been awarded by some writers to those who utilize the cartel mechanism for war preparations. However, this appears to be a basic or fundamental purpose to which the cartel, as such, is entirely incidental, even though due to its essential features of organization and private control, the cartel has demonstrated, in Germany, its tremendous value to the war aims of its leaders.

Each of these general classes of cartels has an almost endless variety of restrictions to which the members agree, but they all aim at the one common end of influence on, or restraint upon, or positive control of, competition in order to secure some degree of monopoly. For example, if production quotas on a certain product are reduced materially, the resulting scarcity of the product automatically results in a general increase in the price level although no actual agreement to fix prices exists. A similar result occurs when some of the cartel members agree to refrain from making any sales at all in certain markets or to customers who have been reserved to other members. These restraints are voluntary as to the members of the cartel, but it would appear that frequently other restraints are forced upon outside competitors.

A fundamental purpose of the members of the cartel always appears to be to decrease or remove what is termed the "capital risk" of private enterprise or corporate structure in a capitalistic economy. In this respect the aim might be said to be to remove the loss factor from what is sometimes called the profit-and-loss system, as distinguished from state socialism or public collectivism.

COMPARISON WITH TRADE ASSOCIATIONS

Trade associations, especially those of a national character, of which over 2,000 have been reported in the United States during the twentieth century, have much the same fundamental purposes as cartels. The final report of the T. N. E. C., in 1941, illustrated their similarity by pointing out that many such associations exchanged patent rights; established common cost accounting systems; price reporting plans; codes of business conduct; and, by other devices attempted to control prices, allocate markets, and curtail output. A trade association in the United States which has carried on such activities has usually proceeded on a basis of voluntary cooperation which may avoid any semblance of illegal conspiracy in restraint of trade.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL TYPES

A different sort of classification of importance is that of the national and the international or supercartel; the latter may constitute an agreement between two or more national cartels; or between a single national cartel or enterprise and independent enterprises in one or more other countries. In such supercartels if the government is a party to a national enterprise involved, as has been the case in Germany, the private enterprises which have joined it thus undertake obligations which cannot be enforced by national or international law and, in effect, the cartel agreement becomes a treaty made between one national government and the private enterprise of another nation.

International cartels usually do not attempt to fix prices directly but rely upon allotment of markets or quotas of production in order to affect market values. The use of the restrictive patent license is a device frequently employed by international cartels to accomplish aims which appear foreign to the legitimate monopoly of patented invention.

Cartels may be temporary arrangements or limited for a period of time or entered into as permanent agreements. Usually a period of time is stipulated at the end of which the cartel may disband, or be continued with new and changed restrictions, possibly with some change in membership.

VOLUNTARY CHARACTER, WITH SOME EXCEPTIONS

Frequently in periods of great depression cartels fall apart as a result of the burden of their own restrictions, or of outside causes. The typical cartel agreement among members is invariably a written document or a series of such papers. However, verbal cartels, sometimes called gentlemen's agreements, have been made at times, and these, because of benefits derived, or fear of retaliation, have appeared just as binding among the members as though the agreements were in writing. Gentlemen's agreements of a trade restrictive character are resorted to at times as devices which may enable the members to evade legal penalties more readily than would be the case if the understandings were in writing.

Cartels are inherently voluntary but on occasion, in Germany, England, and elsewhere such contractual arrangements have been made compulsory by government order. At times such restrictive arrangements might have been considered compulsory, in effect, even in the United States, as will be discussed later. It does not appear that compulsion comes within the accepted definitions of the cartel. Likewise it has been said that there are three kinds of cartel agreements: those wholly between private enterprises; those between some enterprises which are privately owned and some which are government owned or controlled; and those which are wholly between government controlled or owned enterprises. The first two kinds are undoubtedly cartels but this last group would not appear to be so in the accepted sense.

From the authoritative definitions it is a misnomer to call any such trade restrictions cartels when private enterprise is compelled by government to become party to them or when all of the enterprises entering them are government owned or controlled. Such devices then would appear to assume the status of regulated industries, as public utilities, or of economic planning by the state, or to be a definite approach to state collectivism, this regardless of whether the governments involved are totalitarian dictatorships or democratic in character.

DEVICES TO ELIMINATE COMPETITION

In considering the degree of spontaniety with which business enterprises may become cartel members it must be borne in mind that the inducement of higher or more certain profits may be less enticing to a more efficient concern in a certain industry but the

management of that same enterprise may feel it the part of wisdom to join in with less efficient members rather than to remain outside and suffer possible retaliation from the combined opposition of its members. In this respect the resentment of a cartel at outside competition at times finds expression in what is called "dumping" or vicious price cutting by cartel members which continues until the outsider is driven out of the field, or into the cartel.

Dumping has been resorted to at times by international cartels in order to destroy the internal industry of a nation, in which the cartel desires an exclusive market, or the national security of which the cartel leaders wish to injure. Other retaliatory devices which have been utilized at times by cartels include interfering with, or cutting off, the competitors' supply of raw materials; attacking his financial resources, intimidating his customers, the boycott, and other business harassments. Such competitive regulatory devices are usually illegal and are identical with those used at times for the same purpose by trusts, combines, and other types of monopoly. Occasionally, single enterprises attempt to remain independent with the hope of deriving benefit from higher market prices brought about by cartel restriction and without being subject to cartel discipline. On such as these retribution is usually ruthless.

DISCIPLINING OF MEMBERS

Inside the cartels discipline, as a rule, is maintained by systems of penalties and voluntary fines for departure from agreed-upon prices, markets, or production quotas. Confidential accountants examine the books of the members just as do the official bank examiners in the banks of the United States. The cartel usually has a governing body or committee which designates the procedure used to execute the common purpose of its members and sees to it that such provisions are carried out. International cartel agreements invariably require that the members arbitrate all grievances, and, in case of disputes not so adjusted, then the party which brings a court action must accept the disadvantage of doing so in the country of his adversary. Usually the cartel, whether domestic or international, is dominated by one, or at most a very few, of its more powerful members; the weaker concerns go along. The structure, or rules, of a cartel may be so loose as to put little restraint upon its members but usually the regulations are rigid, and discipline is firmly exacted, especially against the weaker members. The cartel membership may include only a limited proportion of the total output of an industry, or territory, included in its operations, or occasionally it may approximate 100 percent control. Usually it is considered advisable to include at least 75 percent of total production of the article involved in order to permit the cartel restrictions to influence competitive factors effectively.

Lincoln as Commander in Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Lincoln as Commander in Chief," written by Mr. Walter P. Armstrong, of Memphis, Tenn., one of the leading lawyers of that city. The article appeared in the Saturday Review of Saturday, February 10, 1945. Mr. Armstrong is an able thinker and writer. He is a learned and gifted historian and is one of the most versatile men I know.

Mr. Armstrong treats this subject in an able way, and I commend the article to the careful reading of all Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF

(By Walter P. Armstrong)

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States." These 16 words confer a vast undefined power, the limits of which have never been fully explored.

In most of our wars the President has confined the exercise of this power to the selection of commanding officers and has not participated in the formulation of strategy because of the force of circumstances and the character of the Presidents rather than because of any narrow conception of the power of the Presidential office. This was true in the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War. A strong President, like Woodrow Wilson, would probably have been inclined at least to participate in decisions of strategy if occasion had been presented. However, the pattern of World War No. 1 was fully developed before we entered the conflict. During the brief time of our participation there was no need to consider a change.

But in the War between the States there existed circumstances which required a full exercise of the President's power as Commander in Chief. The war lasted for 4 years. For a considerable time its outcome was highly uncertain. In the beginning many of the Union commanders were incapable or unfortunate. Their plans frequently miscarried and changes in strategy had to be devised. Abraham Lincoln, a strong President, had no choice except to take part in the conduct of the war. Lincoln's first major problem was in regard to the forts in the South. Should they be surrendered or held? If held, should men and supplies be sent to relieve them? Lincoln sent a relief expedition to Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor. Jefferson Davis ordered General Beauregard to open fire and the war began.

Even in the beginning Lincoln's use of his war power was not limited to strictly military measures. On April 20, 1861, he ordered United States marshals to seize in the principal telegraph offices in the Northern States the originals of all telegrams sent and copies of all received during the preceding 12 months. The following day he directed the Secretary of the Treasury, without congressional authorization, to advance $2,000,000 for the arming of ships. Shortly thereafter, again without action by Congress, he suspended the writ of habeas corpus and ignored the decision of the Chief Justice of the United States that his action was unconstitutional.

Lincoln, not uninfluenced by political considerations, soon felt it necessary to disregard his military advisers. Both General Scott, who headed the Army, and General McDowell, the field commander, advised against fighting the first battle of Manassas on the ground that more time was required for disciplining and drilling the troops. The public, however, clamored for action, the generals were overruled, and the battle was fought with a disastrous result. The night after the battle Lincoln prepared a detailed plan of strategy which was completed by an addition made 4 days later.

Not always was an attempt made to carry out the strategy devised by Lincoln. Sometimes he submitted to the advice of his generals. Occasionally they disregarded his wishes if not his direct orders. Early in the war he was exceedingly desirous that General Buell should capture Cumberland Gap through which his grandfather and grandmother had made their way westward. Buell more than once promised to take this course, but in the end turned his back on the gap and moved toward Nashville.

As the war developed Lincoln became more concerned with questions of strategy. He was greatly troubled by his inability to stir McClellan, who was in command of the army of the Potomac, into action. He read military treatises which he procured from the Library of Congress and held long conversations with officers on the art of war. In December 1861 he presented McClellan with an elaborate memorandum asking technical questions and making suggestions as to an advance. McClellan returned it with penciled replies to the questions and a note rejecting all the suggestions.

On January 27, 1862, Lincoln issued his General War Order No. 1, in which he fixed February 22 as "the day for a general movement of the land and naval forces of the United States against the insurgent forces." The army of the Potomac and others as well as certain naval forces were named as ordered to "be ready to move on that day." Four days later he supplemented this with "President's Special War Order No. 1," commanding the army of the Potomac, after providing for the defense of Washington, to move on February 22 to seize Manassas Junction. This was followed on February 3 by a note to McClellan insisting upon Lincoln's own plan for an attack on the Confederate Army near Washington rather than an expedition by water against Richmond. However plans, suggestions, and orders were alike ineffective to move McClellan or his army.

It was shortly after this that Lincoln told John Hay, one of his secretaries, of his impulse to take charge of the Army of the Potomac and see what he could do as a field commander. He did not yield to this impulse at this time or later, though on May 23, 1863, the Chicago Tribune urged him to take the field as actual commander. During the week of May 5, 1852, he did assume personal command of the operations that resulted in the capture of Norfolk. The President not only ordered the advance on Norfolk but personally selected the place where the attack was to begin and gave the order to fire. Moreover, he countermanded the orders of Maj. Gen. John E. Wood as to the disposal of some of his troops.

Perhaps encouraged by this success, when Stonewall Jackson made one of his forays into the Shenandoah Valley, Lincoln gave specific orders to Generals McDowell, Fremont, and Buell as to how they were to surround and capture Jackson and his army. Fremont disobeyed two of Lincoln's orders, resting his men one day when they were ordered to march and again taking a different route from the one selected by Lincoln. Even if the orders had been literally obeyed, the capture of Stonewall Jackson's army would not have been an entirely simple task. After this experience Lincoln did not again attempt to direct the field movements of several armies a long distance from the White House.

He did, however, continue to issue orders for attack. McClellan was not the only commander who by his Fabian policy provoked the President. Impatient with Meade, on October 16, 1863, he sent to that commander, through General Halleck, a curious letter which was in effect an order to attack Lee and which concluded: "The honor will be yours if it succeeds and the blame will be mine if it fails." The letter was widely publicized and administration newspapers hailed the President as a great strategist.

Lincoln himself laid no claim to military genius and frankly admitted that his inter-

ference with his commanders was partly the result of their dilatoriness and ineptitude, and partly caused by political pressure. That this is true is evinced by the fact that as capable commanders emerged Lincoln interfered less and less.

And as Lincoln became less inclined personally to direct the strategy of the various campaigns he became more insistent upon generals who not only could work out a plan of campaign but who would fight.

In the beginning hundreds of commissions were issued, many to high ranking officers, for political reasons—because they had powerful friends, could raise troops, or because it was desired to obtain their full support of the war. The criticism was made—not without justification—that favoritism had officered the Army with incompetents. Even when such men as Butler and McClellan had repeatedly demonstrated their incapacity there was long hesitation in removing them for fear of unfavorable political reaction.

After Donelson, Shiloh, and Vicksburg, Grant had Lincoln's complete confidence and his reply to voluble criticism of him was: "I can't spare this man—he fights." After Grant moved to Virginia there was little interference and, indeed, on no other basis could the President and his chief commander have worked together. Grant was determined to go his own way and, though he attempted to conceal his feeling, was not particularly pleased when Lincoln visited his headquarters.

Finding in Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan a triumvirate upon whom he could depend, Lincoln in the latter months of the war, while he keenly followed the movements of the armies, permitted his commanders freely to conduct their own campaigns. On one occasion he said to Stanton, who was insisting that Grant was exceeding his authority, "Now, Mr. Secretary, you know we have been trying to manage the Army for 3 years and you know we haven't done much with it. We sent over the mountains and brought Mr. Grant, as Mrs. Grant calls him, to manage it for us and now I guess we'd better let Mr. Grant have his own way."

Lincoln withheld from Grant only the decision of questions that were within the politico-military zone as when he instructed him to have no conference with Lee except for the surrender of Lee's army or upon some minor or purely military matter. All proposals for peace were to be passed on by Lincoln.

Lincoln had reason to believe that sentiment in the Army favored his reelection in 1864 and was not reluctant to have the advantage of this influence. No restriction was placed upon electioneering for the soldier vote. Leaves were freely granted to officers that they might participate in the campaign. Many of them spoke at public meetings in behalf of the Lincoln-Johnson ticket. Furloughs were given privates that their influence might be felt in their home districts. Men on detached service and convalescents in hospitals were sent home to help.

Indiana, being the only large State whose soldier citizens could not vote in the field, presented a special problem. It was felt that the loss of the State election in October would be a severe blow to the Republicans. In General Sherman's army were 29 regiments and 2 batteries of Hoosiers. Upon the insistence of Governor Morton of that State Lincoln wrote Sherman suggesting that, so far as he safely could, he permit the Indiana soldiers to return home to vote. Sherman, feeling that their absence would endanger his army, declined to order the soldiers home, and Lincoln refused to overrule him. However, a few Indiana regiments from posts in Tennessee and Kentucky returned home for the State election. In addition Lincoln ordered sent to their home State all Indiana soldiers either hospitalized or unfit for service. Moreover, he ordered home from Sherman's army 6 prominent Hoosier officers along with Major Generals Logan and Frank Blair to stump Indiana and nearby States. Logan later wrote Sherman that "When I left on leave after the Atlanta campaign to canvass for Mr. Lincoln, I did it at the special and private request of the President."

Lincoln justified this conduct, just as he justified his yielding to political pressure in granting pardons and cotton trading permits, on the ground that in seeking his own reelection and strengthening the political influence of his administration he was working not for personal ends but for the salvation of the Union.

The greatest exercise of Lincoln's power as Commander in Chief was in regard to subjects which he could not delegate to any general. There was no other basis for the governments which during the war were set up in the occupied southern States. Congressman Olin, of New York, had said in the House of Representatives that in occupied territory in wartime the President had the power to do what must be done and that necessity justified him. "Of that necessity," he added, "the President is alone the judge; as Commander in Chief of the Army." It was on this theory that Lincoln proceeded.

The Emancipation Proclamation was, of course, the culmination of Lincoln's exercise of his power as Commander in Chief. Only on this ground could it be valid and on this ground alone Lincoln defended it: "You dislike the Emancipation Proclamation. You say it is unconstitutional. I think differently. I think the Constitution intrusts the Commander in Chief with the law of war in time of war."

Some of Lincoln's acts as Commander in Chief may have been questionable, some unwise, and others of doubtful constitutionality, but in retrospect it seems clear that he was in each instance motivated not by any thought of personal aggrandizement but by his desire to save the Union, and that taken together they contributed greatly to that end.

Post-war Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this morning the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], in presenting resolutions from his State legislature concerning the National Guard, indicated that the future of the National Guard and the part it will play in our post-war military establishment are of increasing concern.

Probably the most thorough public discussion of this subject is found in an address which was delivered by the present junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who was then Governor of his State, before the Governors' Conference last year at Hershey, Pa. I ask unanimous consent that this address of Governor HICKENLOOPER, now the junior Senator from Iowa, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that it will cost $260 to print the address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subject assigned to me for discussion is, to say the least, a comprehensive one. It involves consideration of our national origins, history, and experience as well as present and future aims and problems. It involves tradition and ideals and must consider the cold realism of experience as well as the certainty of the realism of the future.

In the time allotted it is manifestly impossible to dwell on details; even an attempt to discuss principles will be sketchy and inadequate.

One great realization, among others, is undoubtedly established in the public mind—the realization that our past policies, whatever they have been, have not been adequate to prevent our involvement, in one generation, in the two most destructive wars in history, and a growing conviction that something must be done.

In World War No. 1, we crusaded with high idealism and enthusiasm to make the world safe for democracy. With victory in that war and the supposed crushing of the central powers we sat back, secure in the belief that we had preserved freedom and the pursuit of happiness for a long, indefinite period. We mourned our dead, bound up the wounds of our disabled as best we could and solemnly and seriously said that, while the sacrifice was great, still, because the world was safe, the price was not too much. There was also a weariness with war and destruction and the anxiety to return to the comforts of peace.

Because we had suffered no invasion we still clung to the fallacy of security in our geographic isolation as a first line of defense and as a practical guarantee of safety. Not all of us followed these philosophies, but most of us did, and the unrealistic pacifist and the impractical idealist had a field day. True, many pacifists were realistic and many idealists were practical, but they were in the minority and the great lessons of World War No. 1, that should have been learned and heeded by our Nation were cast aside.

Then came World War No. 2—its rumblings had been more ominous, the gathering forces of opposition more definite, but when its fury struck, our Nation was incredulous. This was not the safety we and our allies had established in 1918; this was not the proof that our boys had not died in vain; this was not a justification of national and personal sacrifice; something was wrong; somehow, somewhere, the assurances and the beliefs had been false.

We were actually involved. Once more, in a single generation, life and treasure were being destroyed in war; our young men were being killed and wounded—the future genius of American enterprise, resources, and opportunity were being mortgaged beyond conception—yes, something was wrong.

But, we were in danger—our Navy had suffered disastrous defeat—the Philippines had been conquered, our western shores might be invaded. The Atlantic, even within sight of our own coast, was a happy hunting ground for enemy submarines. It couldn't be true, but it was. There was a temporary numbness of mind, a shock of unbelief, but it was very temporary. With true resourcefulness and responsibility of private initiative, we grimly set out to win. We are winning—we will win complete and crushing victory—and with that victory we must search out and expose the reasons why we had to sacrifice and destroy. In that search and exposure, however, the emotions of idealism, worthy as their objectives are, must not be permitted to obscure the practical and factual answers.

Even then the discovery of these reasons and the correction of our errors will not necessarily guarantee perpetual peace, but substantial correction of the mistakes, international as well as domestic, will give as great assurance of continued peace, as a failure of correction will assure a restless truce followed by far greater destruction and chaos.

The American people are thoughtful on this subject: Self-determination and self-responsibility teach them that there is a solution to evident mistake and there is an eagerness to find that solution and to correct the mistake.

It is true that our immediate and consuming purpose is victory in the war but if, with that victory and the tremendous effort and sacrifice it requires, we can develop a better approach to the problems of tomorrow, we will have added justification for the cost, beyond that of survival.

Our post-war military policy, if it is to serve our needs, must be governed by many factors. It must be sufficiently sound and substantial to meet our requirements and, if it be reasonably successful, it must be understood and supported by the American people. We must avoid a program of colossal cost.

But what are our needs? In the various answers to that question controversy begins.

In the first place, our people and our Nation seek peace. The very origins of our settlement and growth sprang from a desire for peace and the enjoyment of individual freedom, spiritual, social, and economic. Successive generations of Americans have fought wars to establish or to maintain our philosophy of government, and future generations may have to fight again, from time to time, for the same purpose. It is as short-sighted to say that there will be no more war as it is tragic and hopeless to assume that war is inevitable each generation.

Certainly, the great natural resources of our country and the genius of American enterprise cannot be devoted to the comforts and pursuits of peace and individual progress if they are to be dissipated and destroyed every 20 or 30 years in war.

It is apparent, therefore, that there should be two broad fields of action for us.

1. The establishment and maintenance of a peace that will contribute to and further our ideals and the objective of our system of individual opportunity and freedom, and

2. The realistic understanding that we can follow those ideals and approach those objectives only so long as we can protect them, by force if necessary, and a willingness to establish and maintain such organized force and the evidence of ability to quickly mobilize our potential force so that it can be brought to bear in defense of our Nation, either to prevent war or, if war is inevitable, to crush the enemy speedily.

As a peaceful nation, we have always made the military subservient to the civil authority and policy. Our great territorial expansion on this continent was economic in its origin and not military. The military followed the pioneer, who had opened up the frontier, rather than the settler moving into territory first acquired by military conquest.

The Federal Constitution makes the military subordinate to the civil authority. The President, a civilian, is made the Commander in Chief, not as a military strategist but in order to vest the supreme power over the armed forces in civil rather than military authority. The constitutions of our States recognize this same principle and subordinate the military to the civil control.

It must remain so if the Republic is to survive, for democracy cannot survive in the same land with military dominance. We must have organized military strength sufficient to assure our safety, but it must never be so organized as to dominate or control our civil policies. The military must serve the people rather than to be served by the people.

At any time we have vast potential power in this country. That has been demonstrated in this war and in World War No. 1. Because of our total unpreparedness prior to each war, it has taken superhuman effort and has called for unbelievable American genius to organize our strength and it has cost great and unnecessary loss of human as well as material treasure, but the power has been developed. We have won before, and we are winning now. Twice this power, once organized, has saved this world from autocratic domination.

But, unless we learn and profit from the bitter lessons, the next time our strength, or its timely development, might not be sufficient. This is not to say that there will inevitably be a next time in the near future, but it is to say that such policy, or lack of policy, as we have had in the past toward the realistic safety of our country and our institutions, if repeated, will inevitably contribute to inviting another world war of more terrible destructicon, at a too early date.

In fact, prior to World War No. 1, we never had a consistent military policy worthy of the name; at times there have been policies for short periods, but they have been nebulous, and at no time during peace have we been in any military condition to throw, with reasonable speed, any substantial portion of our potential force into the protection or defense of our country or its interests, with the exception of a relatively small but efficient Navy. Our land forces, such as we had, were no doubt efficient, but they trained on theory, and their equipment has always been on paper. Their power on the blueprint was great, but in the field it was negligible.

Our most consistent and ancient foreign policy has been the Monroe Doctrine. More recently we undertook the government and protection of the Philippines, carrying with it the defense of the Pacific. We have never had the organized strength alone (in peace) to defend the Monroe Doctrine against any reasonably strong and prepared enemy, and this is true in spite of the fact that there have been times when strong threats have been toward its violation and, on one occasion, in Mexico, it was openly violated by Napoleon III.

Our policy in the Pacific found us without sufficient strength to save the Philippines. The Aleutians were invaded and some islands occupied for a time.

The still unexplained, but nevertheless curious, circumstances surrounding the tragedy at Pearl Harbor left Hawaii open to possible capture and our west coast to threatened assault.

We have been victorious, eventually, in the past and will, of course, be victorious in this war, but at incalculable cost in life and resources. A reasonable, present military strength and a firm policy for its use in peacetime, to stop aggression and the apparent preparation therefor by the enemies of peace, might well have prevented this war and also World War No. 1.

Our very unpreparedness and our lack of a realistic military policy no doubt encouraged our enemies to strike, in reliance upon the hope that they could conquer before we could marshal our potential force in effective combat. They were almost right. They had assessed our policy correctly, but they misjudged the great ability of American genius and the potentials of individual initiative, in emergency.

Of course, past events and policy cannot be recalled and revised, but they can be of service in shaping our future attitude.

So much of our future policy depends upon the conditions of peace. Basically, we must protect our country and its interests. We must direct our policy toward the preservation of peace rather than toward the preparation for inevitable war under a theory that war is inevitable. We should point our program toward sufficient strength to help maintain order and meet our responsibilities, as contrasted to the building of a program designed for inevitable conflict.

There are those who say that strong military policies inevitably lead to war. This is not necessarily true. No doubt, strong military policies by opposing nations or groups of nations have led to war. But why permit such rivalries to grow. Strong military policies by nations sincerely and unitedly committed to policies of peace can be the guarantors of peace.

In the post-war period, if we can establish, among the nations of the world, and especially among our allies, honest, understandable and definite agreements to preserve peace, with equitable and mutual commitments to enforce such agreements, together with the maintenance of such efficient strength, by at least the stronger nations, to do the job, peace can be preserved indefinitely, and our military requirements will be diminished.

On the other hand, if there should be a failure of workable and unselfish cooperation for peace among the nations after present hostilities cease, then we will be thrown upon our own responsibility alone or upon the policy of individual military alliances for safety and our problems would be tremendous, indeed.

Regarding our past national program for defense, we had none of any merit or consequence until 1916 when the first national defense act was passed. Prior to that time, true, we had West Point and Annapolis, a small Navy, an insignificant Army and a feeling of security resulting from geographic isolation. We also had a frontier spirit of self-sufficiency that found oratorical, if not practical, expression in the high sounding words of one famous statesman who said, in effect, that if any one dared to attack us a million men would spring to arms over night. The million men could spring all right, and no doubt would, but there were not then, and have never been, in peacetime, the arms to which they could spring.

However, with some vision and realization that modern developments were shortening distances, the act of 1916 was passed, outlining a program for land forces consisting of the small Regular Army and a federally supervised National Guard. Some effort was made to coordinate this force and the Mexican border incident afforded a little training. We had no modern equipment, however, and 1917 saw us plunged into modern war without adequate officers or trained men, without equipment or the means for providing it. This emergency was met, to our cost.

In this discussion I am assuming that the evident success of our draft and selective service program, effectively used in two wars, will demand that it be continued as a basic policy for the raising of manpower in emergency. The system may be modified from time to time, based upon experience, but it has now proved its merit and its administration in this war has been generally admirable.

The Federal act of June 3, 1916, was the basis for the sound military policy established by the act of June 4, 1920, which provided for an Army of the United States to consist of:

1. The Regular Army.

2. The National Guard when in the active military service of the United States.

3. The Organized Reserves—including the Officers Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps.

Of the three components constituting the Army of the United States, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserves formed the civilian components with the National Guard, organized under the militia clauses of the Constitution, with the control thereof, by the States, unimpaired in time of peace. The other components, namely, the Regular Army and Organized Reserves were organized under the "army clause" of the Constitution and therefore wholly Federal at all times.

Under the terms of the act of June 15, 1933, there was added a fourth component,

namely, the National Guard of the United States as distinctive from the National Guard of the several States. This new component was a wholly Federal force. While the National Guard of the several States was nevertheless separate and distinct. The National Guard of the United States is wholly Federal while the National Guard of the several States is wholly State controlled, except when in the Federal service. When the National Guard of the United States is active, as it is now active in the military service of the United States, the National Guard of the several States is inactive. When the National Guard of the United States is released from active military service, at the conclusion of the war, it will become inactive and the National Guard of the several States will again be active, as it was during the period 1920–40.

By the terms of the National Defense Act the enlisted strength of the Regular Army was fixed at 280,000; the National Guard at 424,800—later modified to 210,531; and the Organized Reserves, unlimited. This policy was never supported or fully understood, by the people. As a result the strength of the Regular Army dwindled to 118,000; the National Guard never exceeded 200,000, and the Organized Reserves, save for the Officers Reserve Corps, was nonexistent.

Under this system the Regular Army was charged with the mission of garrisoning our insular possessions, certain other missions, and the training of the civilian components.

This policy is sound and is the most desirable and workable policy for our Nation yet proposed, but, in its operation, there were certain deficiencies.

First, the desire for peace caused a public reaction against military activity. Peace and disarmament became a watchword and we sank battleships—we disarmed—our Regular Military Establishment settled back to a life of honorable poverty, military courtesy, and a study of the promotion lists. Certain officers of the Regular Establishment, however, and notably General Mitchell, were far ahead of the thinking of their time in advocating the supremacy of air power, the strategic value of Alaska, and a unified department of national defense. General Mitchell was cashiered.

Nevertheless, the National Guard of the several States was to make great progress under this system as compared to its prior progress. Stimulated by the brilliant performance of National Guard divisions in World War I and by a knowledge that the Guard, officers and men, had established beyond question that they were equal or superior to any fighting men in the world, they maintained enthusiasm for their organizations and devoted their time and efforts, usually at sacrifice to themselves, to keep them intact. The Regular Army supervised and coordinated the training, although with some apathy at times, but on the whole the training was substantial and compared favorably with that of the Regular Army itself.

The States took pride in their units: Their officers studied hard, on their own time as a rule, and were proficient and reliable. They maintained a force in each State, under full State control, efficient, adequate, and available for all peacetime emergencies and this is vital to sovereign State government. They constituted a force, decentralized as to authority in peace, subject to civil control, but available to the Nation in war. When World War No. 2 came, the National Guard of the United States furnished a force of 300,000 trained officers and men for our first line of defense of the land forces.

Perhaps the word trained is not proper for while, as in the case of the Regular Army, they had some equipment and much theory, the material with which they were to fight was still in the blueprint stage when they were called to service.

Nevertheless, the National Guard constituted the major part of our land forces initially and the subsequent brilliance, efficiency, and heroism of their conduct in battle in all theaters again justified our faith in the Guard and the citizen soldier.

Unfortunately, there seems to have been, and still seems to be, a feeling on the part of the Regular Army toward the National Guard and the officers' reserve corps that is inclined to be noncooperative and at times contemptuous. Neither proven equality in action nor marked success in training seem to have dispelled this feeling. It was evident in World War No. 1, in the many instances of arbitrary action by the so-called "benzine boards," so far as dismissal of many capable emergency or Guard officers was concerned, and is evident in World War No. 2.

It has been evident in this war in the many instances where Guard, Reserve, or emergency officers of proven ability have been denied promotion or responsible command and Regular Army officers, often with much less experience, have been advanced: This is especially true where officers of field grades in command of battalions and regiments are concerned.

These references to the attitude of the Regular Army toward the civilian components are not made for the purpose of criticism alone, but to point out, candidly, a condition that must be corrected if the civilian components are to receive the most effective and efficient training in peace.

The collective ability of our regular establishment is high. The training for the command and staff is excellent and the ability of those officers selected for leadership, is in the main, being amply demonstrated. We must always look to our professional personnel for the training of our civilian components. But it is, nevertheless, true that, throughout the civilian population of the country, there are countless thousands, at all times, whose intelligence and ability to assimilate and efficiently utilize and apply military training is at an equally high level with the personnel of the professional forces and the effectiveness of the citizen-soldier is fully as great. It has always been, and, under our system should continue to be, this great reserve of civilian strength and ability upon which we must rely for our security.

In the post-war period our military policy will, of course, be substantially governed by the conditions of the peace and international attitudes. The most effective and hopeful results will flow from strong, honest, and equitable agreements among nations, having sufficient power to enforce them, sincerely organized for the maintenance of peace, able and determined to suppress aggression and, more especially, the preparation for aggression. However, we must, also consider the other extreme—the possibility of the failure of such agreements and the possibility, as a result, that we may be left entirely to our own resources for the security of our country.

The dimension of our post-war military and naval establishment will be determined by the manner in which this war is resolved: By the extent and degree of our foreign commitments; by the question of effective alliances; by the balance of power; by economic relationships and by many other factors which are bound to be involved. Our effectiveness in maintaining peace and precluding future involvements in war are wholly dependent upon the adoption of a sound foreign policy. It was the lack of a sound foreign policy which not only made us ineffective in preventing war but made it impossible for us to prepare for war when war became inevitable.

We will emerge from this war with over half of the naval power of the world. We must neither foolishly destroy this power nor maintain its full strength. But ample naval force, including vigorous reserve programs, should be efficiently maintained to protect our interests and commitments and to fully serve such outlying defenses as may be necessary, under future circumstances, for our national security. Any reduction in numbers of ships in active service should be accomplished by placing them in inactive reserve until they become outmoded rather than by destroying them. Their potential power would have a quieting influence upon future troublemakers.

There is also the vital question of internal policy in the organization of our defense forces, namely, complete Federal control of all of our armed forces or the retention of the National Guard of the several States in peace under State control, leaving the Regular Army and organized reserve forces under Federal jurisdiction. The Navy, manifestly, just as the Regular Army, must remain under Federal control, as an active component of our defense forces.

The most objectionable feature to complete Federal control of the National Guard is, that it would just about complete the nationalization of all phases of our system. In recent years we have been rushing with great speed toward nationalization of our economic and social fields. We have invaded, and often destroyed, substantial fields of sovereignty and responsibility of the States with a ruthlessness that is alarming. We have headed toward dominion in Washington and subjection in the States. To transfer the peacetime military establishment of the States to the complete and centralized control of the Federal Government would just about complete the job.

With economic, social, and military control in Washington, sectional rights and sovereignty would be basically gone and the States would become only supplicants to the Federal Government, and perpetuity in Federal office could be made convenient and easy for any individual or group, so minded, and once acquiring such power. We have only to look at the records of other nations where such concentration has occurred. Full self-government and its privileges and responsibilities cannot survive under our system with such centralization.

Our national security can be provided for efficiently, economically, and with enough elasticity to meet our needs and still retain sectional and State responsibility and with full benefit to our defense.

I know of no general pattern that is equal to our National Defense Act in effect between World Wars No. 1 and No. 2. Criticism of the program may well be directed at certain operational features, but it has the outline upon which we can build and it is elastic enough for our needs.

As referred to before, it provides for a Regular Army under Federal control. The Regular Army can be varied in size as our defense requirements, commitments, and policies develop. Its constant training and efficiency can and should be of the highest and it should be fully and modernly equipped at all times. It should never be permitted to relax into peacetime atrophy.

Its officers and men should be constantly zealous in the efficient training of the civilian components, as a vital part of their duty and responsibility and not as a routine detail. It must work vigorously with, and not with indifference or hostility to the civilian components.

The Regular Army and the Navy must have the practical and vigorous support of Congress and the public based upon an understanding and approval of policy and objective.

The National Guard under the peacetime control of the States must continue to be the backbone of our armed land forces. As in the case of the Regular Army, its numbers can be increased or diminished, dependent upon our requirements and responsibilities. The equipment of the National Guard should be modern, ample, and efficient and be supplied by the Federal Government.

Its training, vigorously supervised by the Regular Army, should be technically proficient and continuous and as extensive as

possible, consistent with the fact that the National Guard is not a professional full-time group but that its members earn their livelihood outside of the military profession. More extensive and varied tours of duty with the Regular Army should be made available to officers and key enlisted men of the civilian components, through periods of active service and through the medium of Army service schools.

The National Guard, on the other hand, must assume its full share of responsibility for cooperation with the Regular Army and for the continued proficiency of its forces and must receive the active support of the States.

The organized reserve should be continued, but it should be organized and maintained as provided by the National Defense Act and its training must be more extensive and consistent. After this war we will have a wealth of officers and men in all branches and in all appropriate grades and ranks returning to civil life. For a period they will constitute an adequate reserve. They will be professionally and technically trained and experienced. However the Organized Reserves should be so set up as to bring in new members to take the place of those who drop out in the future so that ample strength in this vital force can be maintained continuously. Ample training facilities should be provided and a reasonable degree of training required.

During the period 1920–40 the Officers' Reserve Corps received scant attention or support from the Congress and the people. As a result reserve officers were not afforded an opportunity to improve their professional fitness or materially increase their corps. The Organized Reserves during this period because of a complete lack of financial support by the Congress existed on paper only.

As in the case of the National Guard the Regular Army is responsible for the training of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Organized Reserves and should discharge that responsibility in its entirety subject of course to receipt of adequate financial aid. Insofar as practicable they should be trained and maintained in the same manner as the National Guard and a policy of joint training of the several components of the Army should be adopted.

In the determination of matters of policy affecting organization, distribution, training, and personnel, the civilian components should have an equal voice with the Regular Army through the medium of joint general staff committee, as is in fact now provided by law.

We should establish officers' training schools more readily accessible to capable young men who, for various reasons, cannot attend West Point or Annapolis or the other colleges where officer training is now available. The officer training provided in all of our schools should be sufficient so that the graduates are capable of accepting appointments in the Regular Army or the National Guard or the Officer Reserve Corps and such training should be encouraged and promoted vigorously.

The retention of such a policy, which has long since been in effect in principle and practice, can best serve our needs. It can expand or contract, with future events and, if approved and consistently adhered to by the American people, it will serve our needs and preserve the principle of decentralization of military force and control into the hands of the Sovereign States in time of peace.

I have not discussed the cost of such a program. That will depend, of course, upon the determination of our future requirements. Nor have I discussed international policy that will substantially affect our responsibilities. So far as cost is concerned, I can only say that I believe the interest on the $300,000,000,000 spent in this single war would more than pay the cost of such a program, and, if it could save the human sacrifice which this war has entailed, it would bring untold benefit. Certainly, we must avoid any policy that would consume our substance with unwarranted cost.

The questions of international policy have not been answered nor indefinitely proposed by those who are in possession of the facts, and experience shows that we cannot rely too much on generalities in this field.

But that subject is beyond the scope of this discussion.

There has been much discussion about placing the Army and the Navy, and, in fact, our entire Military Establishment, under one central head, such as a secretary for national defense, with under secretaries in charge of the various branches. This plan, although not new, nevertheless, has much to recommend it. Certainly, it would place the authority over all branches of service in one official and much duplication of effort, with corresponding efficiency in results, should obtain. Any attempts to establish such a reorganization of our armed forces would, no doubt, meet with vigorous and vocal opposition from various sources, but in the absence of more plausible reason for opposition, it appears that future national defense and public security would be better served by such a consolidation.

Any policy with respect to universal training in peacetime will also be substantially affected by the vital needs of our country. We have never adopted universal training as a military policy of this Nation. If adequate and satisfactory international associations and commitments follow this war, then our vital defense needs, no doubt, will be so reduced as not to demand universal training. However, in event of the failure of adequate and satisfactory international commitments, and in event that we are thrown entirely upon our own resources for the defense of our country and our interests in a hostile world, or a world in which the substantial portion is hostile, then, no doubt, in the interest of national security, universal training would be the only substantial guaranty for the immediate availability of great defensive power for our country.

In event universal training should become a part of our military policy, the general program outlined by the national defense act, and to which I have referred before, could be readily adoptable. National Guard units and facilities could be easily available within the States for the training of their proportionate numbers, and the Regular Army, through expansion of its facilities, could accommodate and train proper increments and groups. The particular method of training and of organization would consist of details that could be routinely worked out. But universal training, if necessary, and if a part of our policy, could also be adequately and efficiently conducted and administered without the necessity of converting our Nation into a vast military establishment under complete Federal control and dominion.

In any event, the policy of retaining sectional authority and control must be continued in peacetime as a civilian and State responsibility and right so far as the mass of our defense forces is concerned.

There are, of course, many sound and practical individuals who view universal military training as a necessary step in our post-war military policy and, no doubt, under the tension of war, many people would approve and advocate such a policy; whereas, with the return of peace the demand for such policy might diminish in the public mind. In any event, such a far-reaching program and policy will require the mature and studied consideration of the American people and its necessity will be governed by future events.

In conclusion, may I again point out that we are a nation of peace and peaceful pursuits; that our institutions are built upon the basis of peace and individual opportunity and that any military policy must serve these ends. It is, of course, our ideal and goal to outlaw war and to avoid its destruction. Disarmament is a worthy goal providing that, with disarmament, the ends of peace and of our system of government and our national responsibilities can be served. But peaceful nations only invite destruction when they disarm or so weaken themselves as to be unable to protect their system and their ideals, by force if necessary, against international banditry and savagery. Peace-loving nations can neither relax their vigilance nor weaken their physical power until, through experience and the proof of time, the power and the will for agression and destruction have been eliminated from those nations or groups of nations where vandalism breeds.

Until such time as practical assurance and proof are apparent, we as a nation must assume and discharge the ultimate responsibility for our own integrity, sovereignty, and safety. We must maintain our idealism and our goals, we must discuss our policies among ourselves, as a people, and our Nation must understand and approve their execution. I believe it was Theodore Roosevelt who said, "Speak softly, but carry a big stick," and the frontiersman, who sought to establish his home and secure the benefits of comfort and peace, nevertheless, looked constantly to his priming and kept his powder dry.

We must avoid military dominance of our Nation and keep the military subservient to our civil processes, but, at the same time, in our civil progress we must not permit our strength to be foolishly dissipated and unusable against the time of possible vital need.

The following resolution was adopted by the Conference of Governors May 31, 1944, at Hershey, Pa.:

"V. POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY

"Resolved, That we, the Governor's Conference, believe that the determination of our post-war policy and the size of our post-war Military Establishment should be deferred until after the cessation of hostilities because the dimensions of our post-war Military Establishment can better be determined then, and because those now serving in our armed forces may be accorded a voice in such determination.

"We believe that the post-war Army of the United States should conform generally to the act of June 3, 1916, as amended to date, retaining a National Guard as provided in said act."

Freemen Versus Slaves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item of February 28, 1945:

FREEMEN VERSUS SLAVES

There are living in Clinton and contiguous towns thousands of men and women who have seen the productivity of the American people in industry and agriculture grow to three times that of any other nation on earth and from 10 to 20 times that of Asia, where the great masses of population reside.

These residents are convinced that this added productivity is a manifestation of the resourcefulness of a free people which will continue to grow and expand without limit if individual freedom is preserved.

The living standards of the American people have kept apace with this increased productivity and even during the worst of the long depression which continued until World War No. 2 started, America was able to support its unemployed, the ill-clothed and the ill-housed, on a higher living standard than that enjoyed by the skilled mechanics in the countries of the old world.

In a nutshell, this is the history of a free representative republic and it should not be lightly tampered with or abridged.

We are in the midst of a great war with 12,000,000 of our sons and brothers fighting for their country in all parts of the globe. The issues of the war are deep, tempers are uncertain, and regardless of the magnificent victories already achieved it will necessarily be a great many years before complete peace can be restored on this earth.

We cannot afford to resort to any expediency which sacrifices an iota of the principles of a free people under the illusion that it is merely temporary.

"They that can give us essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety," wrote the wise sage, Benjamin Franklin, many years ago and these words are just as true today as they were when they were penned.

Naturally, everybody is worried by the obvious lack of interest in the war effort on the part of many Americans and are disturbed by their unwillingness to accept war jobs, but should we not carefully look into the cause of such conditions and cure them at the source rather than put despair in the hearts of men by selling them down the river in bondage?

We must remember that it is the invisible chains that clank the loudest in the hearts and souls of men and women.

Today you can travel from Maine to the Golden Gate and scarcely see a flag flying from any home.

In World War No. 1, to the contrary, there were few homes that did not respectfully raise its flag in the morning and take it down reverently at night.

This, in turn, was coupled with enthusiastic and patriotic cooperation in the conservation of wheat, in gasless Sundays and meatless days, in restrictions in the operation of saloons and a hundred and one other helpful and cooperative activities.

The oil industry and many others set up voluntary cooperative groups that performed a truly magnificent job in supplying our war needs. So outstanding was this performance that Clemenceau said we "had floated to victory on oil."

But in those war days we were told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and more than 2,000,000 American boys were landed in France.

What has caused the difference between that period and this? It is a lack of candor and frankness to the people, the application of heat in the forms of threats, intimidation and coercion, and many times downright falsehoods respecting the progress and conduct of the war, coupled with outrageously optimistic statements such as the silly, asinine, and untruthful pretense for more than 3 years that the end of the war is just around the corner.

Of course no informed person believed any such rot, but the veil of secrecy, at Washington, was so thick that only a few could penetrate it.

It is a matter of record that within the past 15 months men employed in one of America's vast shipyards, working as free men have increased their productivity per man 50 percent.

These men, given incentive pay, have increased their earnings 30 percent and the cost of ships for the Government has been considerably reduced over the former figures.

In that shipyard alone, more than 7,000 men working with tools have enjoyed average earnings of more than $400 per month and they earned every penny of the sum because they have produced ships with fewer man-hours than was ever before recorded anywhere in the history of the world.

In the oil industry similar conditions are reported. With a slight increase in employment the oil industry of America has increased its output nearly 40 percent and at the same time has enormously improved the quality to meet the exacting war demands.

Why then, in face of these and countless other facts that might be cited, do we find requests and arguments for the conscription of 18,000,000 men?

America has not failed. It is absolutely futile for the Government to attempt to cover up its own shortcomings in leadership by piling threat upon threat, intimidation upon intimidation, and coercion upon coercion.

Freemen produce best and a host of witnesses back up this statement through the years.

Little wonder that the farmers and agricultural leaders of America have solidly taken their stand against any measure to conscript American labor.

Industry is unanimously opposed to it because management knows that slave labor is not only worthless labor, but poisons everything it touches and undermines the productivity of freemen.

The heads of the labor unions have taken a strong stand against the proposal, although Messrs. Browder and Hillman are apparently still chuckling in their tents because they know full well that such legislation as has been proposed at Washington will reduce American productivity to that of the old world, cut our standards of living, and make us ripe for the adoption of the old world Communistic philosophies.

The art of production and the art of destruction are as far apart as the poles.

Give us honest, truthful, and inspiring leadership on the home front and American production will give to the armed forces everything they can conceivably use.

The pending manpower bill takes us back to the ante bellum days and it is just as true today as it was in Lincoln's time that this Nation cannot endure half slave and half free.

The sinister purpose of the propcsal before Congress is that those who espouse it really seek to be given the power to enslave 18,000,000 of their fellowmen, including the soldiers and sailors as they return, for an indefinite period which may well last for a generation in the twilight zone between war and peace.

An Independent Dealer Throws Light on the Oil Cartel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a very serious situation that confronts independent oil wholesalers throughout the east coast of the United States. If the information now before me is true there has been built up a gigantic domestic oil cartel under the guise of solving the oil transportation problem. Instead of facilitating the movement of petroleum products to the shortage areas on the east coast a virtual embargo has been placed thereon. Unless you are a member of the exclusive cartel an independent oil company is not permitted to move petroleum products into the shortage area.

This country opposes as a policy the operation of cartels in foreign trade. We should be as diligent in the prevention of cartels in our domestic industry. The workings of this oil cartel have been described in detail in a letter by Mr. Fred W. Herlihy of the Power Oil Co., Orangeburg, S. C., addressed to the Attorney General of the United States. It is hoped that the Attorney General will thoroughly investigate the situation and put an end to the nefarious activities. The letter from Mr. Herlihy to the Attorney General, dated February 14, 1945, follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1945.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,

Attorney General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: When you affixed your signature of approval to P. A. W. Directive No. 59, did you realize you were giving your consent to the foundation stone of one of the greatest monopolies ever to exist? Did you realize you were aiding the very thing you are supposed to prevent and fight?

The fact that such a directive was needed in the petroleum industry at that time is not questioned, but I do not believe that you have the knowledge that by subsequent regulations and orders (which did not carry your approval), independent competition has been throttled. Let me explain to you how this has been accomplished.

Schedule A of Petroleum Directive No. 59 set forth the names of certain companies as original suppliers. The fact that many names of companies who prior to the war had shipped petroleum products into the territory, now known as district No. 1, were left off this list and several names of large companies who prior to the war had never shipped a drop of petroleum products into district No. 1 are included, is evident proof that this list was made arbitrarily.

Despite the fact that the preamble of Directive No. 59 states that all methods and means of transportation were to be efficiently utilized, it was possible for some ingenious jobbers to transport petroleum products by the same methods used by the larger companies. Such quantities of products brought into district No. 1 by these jobbers were known as being outside of No. 59.

Even though these additional supplies were greatly aiding jobbers in shortage areas and contributing to the alleviation of this short product, an attempt was made to outlaw such supplies by an order known as PAO No. 5. In brief, this order required that a "permit" be issued before moving any product into district No. 1 which was not scheduled under Directive No. 59. The teeth in this order is that any product moved without a so-called permit would not carry compensability for excess transportation costs as refunded by Defense Supplies Corporation. Such excess costs were evidently incurred, but were to be given to only a privileged few while the balance had to stand their own excess costs, even though such costs were refunded from monies of a corporation of the United States. The writer had the personal assurance of the then director-in-charge of district No. 1 that no permits would be refused. Shortly after PAO No. 5 was revoked permits were given freely. Gradually they were discontinued and now the securing of a permit is an impossibility. The only excuse needed for the rejection of a permit is, "You were not an original supplier." Under the regulation, of course, an original supplier does not need a permit.

A district is divided into zones. The zones are subdivided into supply terminal areas (S. T. A.). The noose was further tightened by prohibiting the movement of products from one S. T. A. to another. Again refusal of excess transportation costs is the whip. The control of profitable movement of petroleum products is now complete.

In order that you might understand how this control works, I would like to present my own case as a concrete example. My company is what is known as a branded jobber, that is, we buy from one supplier and sell under that supplier's brand. Prior to the war, and in fact until May 1943, all the gasoline necessary to supply the rationed demand (as determined by O. P. A.) of our stations and commercial accounts was sold to us by this one company. Until this time we were not curtailed in any way. We were getting our supply from the pipe-line terminal at Spartanburg, S. C. On May 15, 1943, without previous notice or warning, our supply was drastically curtailed. Realizing that this reduced supply would not take care of the bona fide rationed demand, it became necessary to secure a portion of my supplies elsewhere. These were purchased from various suppliers, but it appeared that any arrangement which was made was only temporary and that as soon as a source of supply was secured, for some reason or other it was soon terminated. This condition existed until the first of this year. Beginning in January all sources of supply had been exhausted except for movements which had to be made by the permit arrangement referred to above. Many of my essential commercial accounts and all of my dealers have been out of gasoline since the first of the year. Some were fortunate enough to secure gasoline from other companies, such as Standard, Gulf, Texaco, and American. I freely gave my permission to the dealers to use my equipment in order to secure any available product.

Realizing that such a condition could not continue, I discussed this matter with the officials of P. A. W. in Washington, and they advised me to go to New York. This I did, spending 4 days there, but was unable to secure a P. A. W. permit for the importation of gasoline despite the fact that my prewar supplier was unable to furnish me with the necessary quantity of product. The only excuse which P. A. W. gave me for not issuing a permit was that I was not an original supplier before the war. They stated that it was up to my original supplier to furnish me with the necessary quantity of product, which I proved to the P. A. W. officials by factual information that it was necessary for me to have to furnish rationed demand. The changing of my source of supply from the pipe line terminal at Spartanburg to the ocean terminal at Charleston was the greatest factor in curtailing the ability of my supplier to furnish me with the necessary amount. Due to the loss of our tankers Charleston was put on a barge program to be fed by the Trans-Florida pipe line and barges through the Inter-Land Waterway. This program has never worked, nor has it been possible for any of the companies to bring into the southeastern ports the necessary amount of product. A major oil company selling all their products through direct operation is free to move products into any portion of the zone. However, an independent jobber is entirely limited to that product available in his particular supply terminal area. While supply terminal areas fed by the pipe line have been operating at 100 percent of the nominations made by the oil companies, the coastal supply terminal areas have been given as low as 42 percent of the product nominated for that particular area. This was caused by the failure of the barge program and the inability to deliver the product to the area needed.

It would appear that regardless of proven ration demand and the amount of coupons issued by the O. P. A., an independent jobber is entirely at the mercy of those people controlling the source of supply. Despite the fact that the original supplier of a jobber is unable to furnish ration demand does not seem to be enough excuse for P. A. W. to deviate from their present hard-and-fast rule that no permits will be issued to anyone not on the original supplier's list.

Continuance of the present situation for another 2 months' period will result in bankruptcy of my oil business. I am not looking for profit at this time, but I am trying to hold together my organization and maintain a status quo position as that held prior to the war. I have lost four accounts in the past month and a half, and as long as they can secure their supplies from other companies I in no way can blame them for leaving me.

I ask that you make an immediate investigation of these facts as set forth, and I will be glad to come to Washington to contribute in any way any additional information which you may desire.

Very truly yours,

POWER OIL CO.,
FRED W. HERLIHY.

Poland Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech I made last Sunday, which was proclaimed Poland Day by Governor O'Conor, of Maryland, and also a copy of the proclamation.

I am very happy to be present and join with you in the celebration of Poland Day and also wish to congratulate Governor O'Conor for proclaiming today Poland Day and his request to observe today as a day of prayer to the end that liberty and peace may be restored to Poland and that her people soon again in work out their future free from oppression.

The Polish people have been tragically oppressed. They have been hammered and tested in fires of affliction and have developed a quality of character, a religious faith, a self-defendence, a passion for freedom, an industry, and a courage, which makes them among the choice people of the world. We have millions of Poles in America as our fellow citizens and they have added enormously to our strength and to our progress.

America sympathizes with the people of Poland. America goes further. America is determined to do everything within its power to bring about that victory which means the reestablishment of Poland as an independent nation, with the right of the people of that country to go forward in an effort to obtain those national aspirations that will be consistent with their own best interests, and for a decent future world.

To the Polish Nation, therefore, on this occasion, we send our salute, our praise, our faith, and our prayers, to those who suffer, to those yet in arms all our trust and help, and the Poles, wherever they may be, have our solemn pledge of common fighting purposes, that her enemies shall go down and that Poland shall rise again.

I join with all of you in earnest hope there will be a lasting peace and out of it will emerge a strong Poland.

Out of the peace to come there must also be a better understanding of the problems of the Polish people. We in this country are going to help Poland economically and in every other way we can. We want her to become a strong, independent, prosperous nation under a government selected by the Polish people. The Nation Poland was before the Nazi invasion we want to see a readjustment of the boundaries by agreement arrived at through the council of nations to be set up under the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. Once and for all Poland must become and remain a nation of Polish people not under any alien government.

I know the results of the Yalta Conference are a great disappointment to you, and I for one share in the hope that the agreement is not final and will be amended in the future.

I am confident that America will do everything in its power to aid Poland and that the conference at San Francisco in April will go forth to advance the Polish cause.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Annapolis, Md.

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION, POLAND DAY, MARCH 4, 1945

Whereas the Polish people, by their tenacious and courageous fight against hopeless odds in this greatest of all wars for the freedom of mankind, have truly merited achievement of their national aim, the restoration of Poland as an independent nation; and

Whereas American citizens of Polish extraction now total many thousands in the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas Poland has contributed magnificently to the advancement, culture, and scientific knowledge of the world through such men and women as Kosciusko, Pulaski, Madame Curie, Joseph Conrad, Chopin, Paderewski, and many others: Now, therefore,

I, Herbert R. O'Conor, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim Sunday, March 4, as Poland Day in Maryland and urge our people to observe this day by special prayers to Almighty God, to the end that liberty and peace may be restored to this brave country, and that its people soon again may have the opportunity to work out their future free from oppression and with renewed faith in the justice of their national aspirations.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland, at the city of Annapolis, on this 23d day of February, in the year of our Lord, 1945.

HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Governor.
ARTHUR J. MCWILLIAMS,
Secretary of State.

Marquis Childs Supports Program for an International Peace Patrol of the Air to Prevent Future Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point an article by Marquis Childs appearing in the Washington Post. In this article Mr. Childs argues in support of the program to establish an international peace patrol of the air to prevent future wars.

On January 30 of this year, in an address appearing on page 635 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I outlined my own views on this subject under the title of "Peace—If We Want It" and detailed the reasons why I have proposed the establishment of an international peace patrol of the air as an effective device for preventing war. Since that time I have had a large number of letters and articles forwarded to me in support of this proposal, and I am gratified to learn that in writing from the headquarters of the Mediterranean Allied Air Command, Mr. Childs is in thorough accord with such a proposal.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

COMBINED AIR FORCE

HEADQUARTERS, MEDITERRANEAN ALLIED AIR COMMAND.—Under this command, which to a casual observer seems outside the main focus of the war, are thousands of planes and hundreds of thousands of men—more planes than the German Luftwaffe had at the height of its power.

The Mediterranean command includes Italy, southern France, the Balkans, and a part of the Middle East. It covers a complexity of political as well as technical troubles and, in some respects, seems to me to suggest a working design for the future.

In the course of this quiet swing through the European war, I have written a great deal about our air power. There are several reasons for this. One is that, with customary thorough organization, the Army Air Forces have made it possible to see their operations in every phase. But a more important reason is my conviction that the future belongs to the air.

The future in peace, no less than in war, is in the airplane and we have, it seems to me, only begun to understand the social and political implications of this machine that has annihilated space.

Two weapons have come out of the war with profound meanings for the years to come—jet-propulsion planes and rocket bombs. If we allow those weapons, with their astonishing potentialities, to be developed by rival nationalisms for war-making purposes, then our civilization, which may just avert complete disaster this time, will certainly be destroyed once and for all.

It is with this threat in mind that I see portents of hope in the air force that has been put together in the Mediterranean, for it is truly an international air force.

Under Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, here in this part of the world that was the cradle of our civilization, nine nationalities are flying daily missions to defeat Germany. In Eaker's squadrons are pilots and crews from Brazil, Greece, Poland, France, New Zealand, South Africa, Australia, Great Britain and the United States.

Moreover, the command is truly international. Usually in combined operations—for example, between British and Americans—two officers, one of each nationality, are assigned to the same task. Here in the Mediterranean, one officer is assigned to do a job regardless of nationality. It seems to work with a reasonable degree of harmony.

Presumably, when the war is ended, this international command will be dismantled. But why should it necessarily be taken apart? Why should it not serve as a nucleus for an international air force to keep peace?

It seems too valuable a precedent to discard lightly. It offers a working formula for the kind of cooperation that must come if we are to rescue ourselves from ultimate and final doom.

Eventually, in peacetime, this international force could be expended to include all nationalities in proportion to their air strength. Here is no less than the pattern for a United Nations air force. To wipe out the start that has been made here would seem to be a tragic waste. Sooner or later, in peace as in war, we must come to some such internationalism of the air.

The maturity and responsibility shown by airmen such as Eaker give the hope that this is not just a remote ideal but a real prospect for the post-war future.

Eaker's organizational genius has long since been demonstrated. It was almost 3 years ago today that he arrived in England, with five other officers and a briefcase full of plans, to help organize the Eighth Air Force. What he did in England is history, and the course of the war is so swift that today it seems almost like ancient history.

Now, in the Mediterranean, he has played an important part in the assembling of this extraordinary international air armada.

Inevitably, as head of such a force, Eaker has to make decisions with broad political and diplomatic implications. So far as I have been able to judge, he has moved through troubled waters in this part of the world with great skill.

He has formed a friendship with Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito. His knowledge of the ins and outs of the Balkans and the Mediterranean is broadened by daily contacts.

Britain's Air Chief Marshal, Sir Arthur Tedder, is a counterpart of Eaker in the new internationalism of the air. There are others like them on both sides of the Atlantic.

Here, perhaps, is the formula for the future. If only we have the wisdom to make use of the lessons learned in war, then all this seemingly endless horror may not have been in vain.

Broadcasting Congressional Debates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending in the Congress, House Joint Resolution 89, a bill to provide for the broadcast on the radio of congressional debates and proceedings under certain safeguards. A similar measure has been introduced in the Senate by the eminent and scholarly Senator from Florida, CLAUDE PEPPER.

This proposal has elicited much favorable comment from columnists, editors, and radio speakers. Among the interesting editorials which have discussed the suggested congressional broadcasts is one from the Journal of Commerce of Chicago, Ill.

Here it is:

LENDING OUR EARS

The proposal to broadcast proceedings of Congress is being taken seriously by such groups as labor unions, farmers, teachers, and church and women's societies who regard the idea as a logical extension of the pioneer day town meeting. Those who are supporting the resolution introduced by Senator PEPPER, of Florida, and Representative COFFEE, of Washington, to put the lawmakers on the air believe that it can be more than a dull recitation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Under one suggestion, a debate in the House of Representatives would be broadcast during daytime hours and a transcript of important to Senate proceedings would be played at night. Thus, if a housewife tired of a weeping widow on a daytime program she could turn her attention to the greater problems of the Nation, or the world, and at night, when the infantile quiz programs palled on the listener, he could do a little brain work by trying to follow a Senator's reasoning.

Supporters of the Pepper-Coffee resolution are primarily interested in having the people generally listen to discussion of world security and allied matters, but they also point out that many other topics of wide concern to the citizens will soon be coming up in Congress, such as compulsory military training, social security, low-cost medical care, employment, rehabilitation of veterans, and taxes, to name a few.

The more optimistic advocates of the proposal believe that its adoption would have a beneficial effect on Congress. They have hopes of shorter and meatier speeches, less demogoguery and an end of filibustering, on the theory that listeners would become mutinously impatient with parliamentary trickery and bombast.

There is no question that stimulation of interest in congressional activities is desirable, particularly with a good many major problems to be tackled in the near future, and the broadcasts might stir an awakening on the part of housewives who listen to the radio while doing their work. If proper safeguards were adopted against congressional pests and bores and the broadcasts limited to matters of national interest, the plan might bring government closer to the citizens.

Ralph W. Page Writes in Philadelphia Evening Bulletin About War Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I introduced H. R. 2098.

I am very gratified indeed to be able to include with my remarks the column on the general subject of this bill and the problem it seeks to remedy, written by Mr. Ralph W. Page in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin for February 22, 1945.

A PROPOSAL FOR "WAR MONEY"

(By Ralph W. Page)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—Practical men engaged in industry and finance are disturbed over the enormous and increasing national debt. They are willing to grant that they were mistaken about the size of the debt the country could stand. But arithmetic warns them that there is a limit—and that the result of exceeding it could be the catastrophe of inflation or even repudiation.

The repayment of the debt itself is not the main difficulty. This might be refunded and carried indefinitely. But the interest charges can reach a point where they cannot be met. Also, under our fiscal system accumulating bonds can be used as the basis for many times their face value of bank credit—thus creating an overwhelming flood of money. To avert this palpable danger the conservative advocate caution in Government spending for any purpose.

On the other hand the radicals or liberals propose that the spending proceed and the

debt mount to any degree necessary to keep everyone employed and to provide the social services they believe the people are entitled to. However, they admit that there exists some limit beyond which bonds and money lose their value and purpose.

So they devise various arguments to prove that this point is not reached until everyone is productively employed and they propound schemes to halt the process at that point. These schemes, being untried, are anathema to their opponents.

So far both factions have assumed that this system of issuing bonds and creating debt is the only conceivable source from which Government can obtain money over and above receipts. They both—and all of us—face a dilemma. If we spend too little we cause the calamity of a depression. If we spend too much we ruin the whole business.

Into this impasse JERRY VOORHIS, of California, injects a novel and daring idea. He believes the country can finance both the war and expanding economy of the ensuing peace without creating any more national debt.

He wants the Government to give his plan a trial for the rest of the war. And for this purpose he has introduced a bill in the House of Representatives.

The outline, though startling is simple.

He proposes that, instead of issuing interest-bearing bonds for all expenditures beyond receipts, the Government shall pay such expenses with a separate kind of war money. This cash, or greenbacks, would be legal tender for purchases, to pay debts and taxes. But he would take most of it out of circulation by requiring every bank to keep 100 percent of such currency in its vaults. Since practically all our money lands up in the banks, his contention is that the ultimate result would merely be that the banks would have bales of this money instead of interest-bearing bonds stowed away to balance their liabilities against deposits of such currency.

It isn't surprising that this plan isn't immediately adopted. But considering the stakes involved, it is strange that Congress will not even discuss it. And it is a fact that objectors find it much easier to ignore it than to refute it. VOORHIS is a scholar, steeped in the lore and history of money, and a very formidable antagonist in any debate on the subject. It would be interesting if he could obtain a national audience.

Modification of Little Steel Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1945.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: I have read with interest your letter of March 2 regarding the application of various labor organizations for modification of the so-called Little Steel formula, in which you urge immediate consderation of the problem looking toward an equitable readjustment of the entire wage-price structure.

The National War Labor Board has for some time past been conducting a comprehensive study of this particular problem. The public members of this Board recently submitted a report of their views based upon the results of this study. In their opinion no modification in the Little Steel formula is merited at this time—in fact, their report is adverse to such action.

The industry and labor members of the Board are now preparing their comments upon the report of the public members. These will be submitted to me very shortly. I will then transmit the full report of the Board to the President along with a statement of my conclusions respecting the problems involved.

I appreciate your informing me of your interest.

Very truly yours,

FRED M. VINSON,
Director.

Administration of Fiscal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I know that thoughtful citizens are becoming deeply concerned over the rapidly increasing complexity of the Federal Government. It has become a bewildering maze of bureaucratic activities, which in thousands of cases presents a picture of useless duplication of effort at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including under unanimous consent an article entitled "Administration of Fiscal Policy," by Charles C. Abbott, which appeared in the Harvard Business Review in the autumn number, 1944:

ADMINISTRATION OF FISCAL POLICY

(By Charles C. Abbott)

(At the present time, even if a fiscal and monetary policy to complement and supplement the activities of private business were adopted, there is no possibility under the present arrangements and within the organization of the Federal Government of its being made operative and effective.—Beardsley Ruml.)

Among the doctrines developed by social scientists during the last 20 years, the ideas which have come to be associated with the term "fiscal policy" appear to possess great significance for the management of business enterprise. The above quotation from Beardsley Ruml raises questions which neither businessmen nor Government officials can afford to ignore.

The ideas constituting what may be called the "fiscal-policy concept" are in some respects an outgrowth of the measures for "control of credit" undertaken by the Federal Reserve System and by the central banks of other countries during the 1920's; in part they stem from the attention given to "welfare economics" since the turn of the century. They now pertain to a vast range of governmental activities—to taxation, exation, exchange control, public works, tariffs, and the construction of the annual budget, to name but a few.

Financial operations of the Federal Government have always been matters of great moment to businessmen. And many of the individual ideas now generally regarded as constituent parts of the fiscal-policy concept are far from new. But the association and commingling of many of these ideas so as to produce a more or less integrated body of doctrine are more characteristic of the thought of the last two decades than they are of the financial and economic thinking of any other period.

Thus, current fiscal-policy doctrine constitutes an important part of the economic environment within which business enterprise now operates and within which it will operate in the postwar period. Moreover, recent developments have greatly augmented the significance which these ideas possess for business management. The number and the magnitude of Federal financial activities have grown tremendously during the last dozen years, as have the number of points of contact between Federal financial activities and business operations. And it may be confidently predicted that in the post-war period Federal financial operations will be on so large a scale that their importance for business undertakings will be far greater than was the case before the war.

In order to preclude any misapprehension, it should be made clear at this point that the importance of the post-war fiscal operations and policies of the Federal Government will be at least as great for the numerically largest element in business, the employees, as for the managers, the creditors, or the owners.

This article endeavors to place current thinking about fiscal policy in a useful perspective, particularly for business managers. The scope of the ideas contained in this body of doctrine must first be indicated and what appear to be major assumptions underlying these views must be summarized. Attention can then be directced to administrative mechanisms available for placing these policies in operation and to administrative difficulties that in the past have been encountered in implementing fiscal policies and that will, apparently, be met in the future. These difficulties will serve as a point of departure for suggesting proper and feasible objectives of fiscal policy and areas of public financial management in which reform is needed if policy is to be effective.

FISCAL POLICY AS COMMONLY DEFINED

The scope of the fiscal-policy concept as defined in many circles, though by no means everywhere, can be succinctly indicated through a series of quotations from writers on this subject.

One of the most eminent commentators, Alvin H. Hansen, outlines the concept as follows:

"For the public economy, expenditures ought to be weighed not in terms of the profit and loss of the state itself, but rather in terms of the effect of such expenditures on the full and efficient functioning of the economy as a whole. Fiscal policy is an important instrument for maximizing the real income of the community and for regulating the distribution of income and wealth."[1]

Abba P. Lerner expresses almost the same sentiments:

"The first condition for the survival of economic liberalism * * * is the permanent elimination of the twin evils of unemployment and inflation. This can be achieved by making it the primary function of Government finance to keep the level of monetary demand for goods and services in every country sufficient to give employment to all who seek it and yet not more than sufficient—because that would result in inflation. All other considerations or principles of Government finance must yield to this principle of functional finance. The first casualty is the principle that over any fiscal year the Government must spend no more than it collects in taxes. The second is any international monetary system that involves the maintenance of fixed rates of exchange

[1] Alvin H. Hansen, Fiscal Policy and Business Cycles (New York, W. W. Norton Co., 1941), p. 187.

between the currencies of different countries."[2]

In his study of recent financial history, G. Griffith Johnson, Jr., makes the significance of certain fiscal developments very clear:

"The implications of the abandonment of the gold standard for credit control and the Federal Reserve System were, of course, fundamental in character. The traditional regulating medium of international gold movements was abolished, and the internal credit structure was isolated from direct foreign monetary influences. * * * The deliberate departure from gold may be said to have marked in this country the transition in the status of monetary control from a supposedly technical nonpolitical function to an admittedly coordinate instrument of political policy."[3]

One final reference, from Fortune, summarizes the matter:

"Considered fiscally, the Government's prime task is to keep national purchasing power in balance with production, preventing it from falling so low as to produce deflation or from rising so high as to produce inflation. This involves the use of all of Government's fiscal and monetary powers—borrowing, spending, taxation, monetary regulation, regulation of banks and financial markets. These powers must be used in harmony. If deflation occurs and the Government sets out to overcome it, a deflationary tax policy cannot be allowed to cancel out an inflationary spending policy. If war or some other cause makes inflationary spending compulsory, deflationary taxes must be used to keep the economy in balance.[4]

What is the substance of these views? What is their meaning for business management?

Underlying assumptions: There are a number of underlying assumptions that seem common to these quotations and to many other writings on fiscal policy:

(1) One assumption, with which most persons will agree, is that the Federal Government's financial operations, the embodiment of its policies, cannot fail to be of immense importance to business. In the language of the technician, fiscal policies cannot be neutral, cannot be without influence on the economy.

(2) There is a further assumption at the heart of much theorizing about fiscal policy: That the Government can have and will have a single comprehensive, integrated, and logically consistent fiscal policy, or at least a group of logically consistent policies. This assumption will seem to many people to be of more doubtful validity.

(3) Many businessmen, basing their judgment on experience with practical affairs, will also question this cognate assumption: That all the manipulative devices and techniques needed for implementing a comprehensive and consistent policy are adequately known and understood, and that the Government either has or could readily obtain a full complement of the tools needed to execute its wishes—for instance, rediscount rate control, alterations in rates of spending, taxation, and tariff adjustments.

(4) Finally, many persons will disagree with the generally implicit assumption that the economy and the economic process can realistically be viewed, in mechanistic terms, as a kind of machine controllable by financial actions. It will not be in accord with their experience that a given amount of additional pressure on the accelerator increases the rate of business activity just so much, or that a measured amount of pressure on the brake brings down the rate of activity to the exact desired level.

Economic stability: In addition to these underlying assumptions it is to be noted that, from the point of view of the authors quoted, the primary goal of fiscal policy is economic stability—that stability to be maintained permanently at such volume of output as provides a high level of employment and maximizes the real income of the Nation. A redistribution of wealth or of income, should that step be necessary; a revaluation of the currency in terms of gold or of the currencies of other nations, if such a measure be required; an abrogation of a contract, such as the promise to pay debts in gold, should that kind of violation prove essential; these, or all other economic measures, become simply means to the end of maintaining economic stability.

This is indeed a materialistic aim to be made the primary purpose of government and of society. And to the businessman, the investor, or the employee, attempting to do business with the Government, this view of fiscal policy implies that, when any contract made by the Government is contrary to current fiscal policy, the Government need not and should not keep its bargain.

Range of Government activities. Analysis of much of the more elaborate theorizing about fiscal policy also indicates that the range of governmental activities, both executive and legislative, which must be woven together if there is to be a coordinated and logically consistent body of policy is very large. As a minimum, the concept appears to contemplate fusing the following governmental activities: Taxation, especially income taxation, both personal and corporate; Federal Reserve policy, including discount rate control, open-market operations, and changes in the reserve requirements of member banks; public spending, whether for the support of the Army, direct relief, slum clearance, or any other purpose; tariff making and tariff adjustment; lending operations of governmental agencies, such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and of quasi-governmental agencies, such as the Federal Reserve banks; the management of the public debt, including the rate of interest paid, the proportions of long-term and short-term obligations outstanding, and the placement of the debt in the hands of banks and insurance companies and elsewhere; international capital movements, particularly those made for public account, as in the case of the operations of the Export-Import Bank; extra financial measures for the control of commodity prices, such as the activities of the Office of Price Administration; and last, but by no means least, the process by which the Federal Budget is put together, appropriations made, and Government expenditures controlled, including the work of the Bureau of the Budget, various congressional committees, and the General Accounting Office.

Clearly, these doctrines contemplate also a close coordination between the fiscal policies of the Federal Government and the fiscal policies of the separate States, counties, municipalities, and so forth. The extremely complex operational problems and the constitutional questions involved in such coordination are not considered here. But such matters are of great practical significance.

A single, integrated policy: This definition of current fiscal doctrine raises two important questions: (1) Should the Federal Government have a single, integrated policy? (2) Could the Government, as presently organized and in the light of political realities, adopt a single policy, and more important, make it effective?

The answer to the first question appears to turn not only on the propriety of the objectives of such a policy but also, since this is in part an administrative question, on the administrative feasibility of the objectives. Policies which take as an avowed goal meticulous regulation of very many parts of the economic process seem both improper and impracticable. On the other hand, were the administrative mechanisms in existence which are needed to implement policy, an effective policy confined to the objectives indicated in the latter part of this study—the protection of the Federal Government's credit, the provision of a stable monetary unit, the protection of savings, and the provision of an adequate flow of capital and credit—would constitute a most constructive development in the eyes of many persons.

The answer to the second question must in large measure be conditioned by individual judgments regarding administrative difficulties inherent in the process. In view of the administrative techniques available and in view of the ways in which governmental committees, departments, and agencies actually operate, is it reasonable to expect that the Government can coordinate so large a number of separate activities and direct them toward a single and relatively specific goal? Furthermore, is it really desirable for the Government to adopt and embark upon a course of action that seemingly would leave the administrators of a large group of individual Government agencies with little, if any, flexibility or ability to adapt themselves to changing conditions?

Administration, be it noted, is a matter of considerable importance in this area. For a policy that is poorly or ineffectively administered, that is beyond the abilities of the administrative mechanism and is not put into operation, serves only to produce confusion, frustration, and pessimism among those subject to it. It gravely hinders such persons in the carrying on of their daily work.

Many of the discussions and presentations which are most concerned with defining the over-all objectives of fiscal policy are least concerned with the problems and mechanisms of public financial administration, with the types of organizations, administrative techniques, mechanisms of executive control, and abilities of personnel needed to put into operation and make effective their plans. Although many studies of fiscal policy are at pains to make the maintenance of a high level of employment—unquestionably a most desirable goal—a permanent function of the Government, such studies are little concerned with the fact that limitations to effective governmental action do exist. Nor do they have much interest in determining the character of these limitations or where they lie. As a consequence of this omission, such studies often suffer from a lack of realism. It is not too much to say that this apparent or actual ignorance of matters pertinent to public financial administration invalidates many of their political recommendations.

PUBLIC FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

It is generally agreed that in the determination and execution of governmental fiscal policies four major processes can be distinguished: (1) Formulation and adoption of the annual financial program, including revenues, expenditures, and numerous ancillary or peripheral activities, such as lending to business concerns, management of the public debt, subsidy payments, and foreign lending on Government account; (2) collection of the revenues; (3) receipt, custody, and disbursement of cash and the general management of the Treasury's resources; and (4) accounting for and reporting the financial condition and operations of the Government, including not only Government departments but Government agencies, like the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

One of the most careful inquiries into this general subject, by a congressional committee, gives the following definition:

[2] Abba P. Lerner, Economic Liberalism in the Post-war World," Post-war Economic Problems (New York and London, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1943), p. 132.

[3] G. Griffith Johnson, Jr., The Treasury and Monetary Policy, 1933–38 (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1939), p. 18.

[4] Our Form of Government, Fortune, vol. XXVIII, No. 5, Supplement (Nov. 1943), p. 4.

"Governmental financial administration consists of a series of related activities involved in planning, conducting, controlling, and reporting the financial operations of the Government."[5]

One authority, D. T. Selko, states:

"To permit efficient conduct of financial functions as well as to provide effective means for their control, systematic provision must exist for estimating revenue requirements; laying and collecting taxes; planning, authorizing and directing expenditures; receiving, keeping and disbursing money; recording and reporting financial information; and accounting for the use of all public funds."[6]

It is common knowledge that in the Federal Government a distinction is necessarily made between budgetary or administrative management and what may be termed protective or proprietary management of the Government's resources. The first type of management—concerned with formulating the annual financial plan of the Government, controlling the rate of expenditure, proposing new governmental activities, and coordinating the different parts of the Government's business—is centered in the executive branch of the Government. The second type of management—concerned with appropriating money for particular purposes and with ensuring that funds are expended in accord with such purposes—is centered in Congress. But in the broad view, public financial administration "is not so much the question of organization of a single agency with respect to given objectives as it is the establishment and maintenance of relationships between and among agencies which necessarily exist separately."[7]

The Bureau of the Budget: It is true that the Bureau of the Budget occupies a most strategic position as regards the formulation of fiscal policy and the control of financial administration; that the Budget system's purpose is "to provide central fiscal management of the administrative machinery of the Government."[8] But there are in fact numerous political and administrative limitations on the Bureau's operations, even inside its own sphere of administrative machinery. And notwithstanding the Bureau's many admirable achievements, the record of recent years gives little reason to suppose that it serves, or is intended to serve, as an effective link between policies such as have commonly been advocated by fiscal-policy theorists and the actual administration of public finances, or as a coordinating body between the legislative and executive elements in public financial administration.

BACKGROUND OF THE FISCAL-POLICY CONCEPT

Three distinct lines of development have led to the present status of fiscal-policy doctrine: (1) The evolution of the Government agencies whose actions embody governmental financial policy, such as the Treasury, the Federal Reserve System, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; (2) changes in the various types of operations which these agencies have undertaken from time to time and, even more important, changes in the motives that lay behind their operations; (3) the recent growth of the fiscal-policy concept, of the idea that the financial operations of all Government bodies whose actions are believed to influence business activity could be and should be integrated in such a way as to further a predetermined objective.

Various governmental activities of immediate concern to fiscal policy, such as the making of appropriations from the Government's funds, the levying of taxes, and the imposition of tariffs, have existed since the beginning of the country's history. The same may be said of a number of the governmental agencies essential to the implementation of fiscal policy, such as the Treasury and various of the bodies concerned with tariff-making.

But before the creation of the Federal Reserve System in 1913 and the passage of the Budget and Accounting Act in 1921, the United States lacked some of the more important agencies which modern thinking conceives as necessary to implement a fiscal policy. And not until 1923 or 1924 did the Federal Reserve System initiate open-market operations; even then the objective was credit control rather than fiscal policy. Only in 1926 was the Congressional Joint Committee on Internal Revenue established. Not until about 1933 did the Treasury find it necessary to make comprehensive analyses of the effects of particular taxes a permanent part of its work, and not until 1938 did it set up its Division of Tax Research.

Moreover, only since 1932 have many agencies whose operations must now be thought of as pregnant with fiscal implications come into existence—for instance, the Social Security Board, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, the Farm Credit Administration, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Home Loan Bank System.

And it is only since 1932 that the older agencies have been given many of the powers most significant in this connection—for instance, the power of the Federal Reserve System to alter member bank reserve requirements and the management by the Treasury of the currency stabilization fund. As a matter of fact, even among the agencies that were in existence before 1932, those motives now commonly designated as "fiscal-policy considerations" exerted little influence—the Treasury and the congressional committees interested in taxation and responsible for revenue legislation did not direct their actions with an eye toward creating or maintaining economic stability, redistributing wealth and income, or steering a meticulous course between unemployment and inflation.

As for the doctrines associated with the present fiscal concept, they first appeared prominently in the work of economists and financial writers in the middle 1920's. The events of the great depression and the rise of new types of economic controls in totalitarian states stimulated the development of this type of thinking. The growth since 1932 of governmental agencies, particularly of executive agencies, and the rise of a multitude of administrative techniques and activities that are of significance in this area have provided additional material for theorizing on the subject. Thus, within the last 15 or 20 years the elaboration of fiscal-policy doctrines has gone hand in hand with the growth of governmental institutions empowered, if not designed, to put many of these doctrines into effect.

FUTURE SIGNIFICANCE OF FISCAL POLICY

To gage the importance to business of post-war fiscal policy, take only two points of reference: Management of the Federal debt and open-market operations of the Federal Reserve System.

Management of the Federal debt: It is generally thought that the United States will emerge from the present war with a Federal debt in the neighborhood of two hundred and fifty to three hundred billion dollars. If the pattern of debt maturities that existed in the first quarter of 1944 is projected, 18 percent of the debt, or some $45,000,000,000, assuming a $250,000,000,000 total, will be in the form of demand obligations at the end of the war; another 22 percent, or $55,000,000,000, will be floating debt of a maturity of 1 year or less; and, including the demand and floating debt, 58 percent, or $145,000,000,000, will be either payable on demand or redeemable within 5 years. These figures, moreover, exclude obligations the Treasury will incur because of tax refunds due in the postwar period, as well as certain other liabilities, and it is conceivable that such obligations may be substantial.

Thus it seems plain that one of the major tasks of the Treasury in the immediate post-war period will be the management of the debt, i. e., the redemption or refunding of obligations coming due and of obligations presented for payment. This will be a considerable undertaking, regardless of whether the Government follows a policy of increasing or decreasing the proportion of short-dated debt outstanding and of whether the Budget is balanced or not.

Furthermore, no matter what the policy followed by the Treasury, it will influence considerably the flow of purchasing power and thus will affect intimately not only the financial world but also the corner grocery store and the national corporation listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

It is reasonable to expect that some portion of the bonds held by individuals and corporations will either be presented for redemption or offered for sale at the termination of hostilities. Unless the Treasury has a surplus of revenue at that time, or unless new savings then currently accruing in society not only are sufficient but also are held by those willing to supply the funds needed to meet those offerings, or unless there is a combination of these situations, the ultimate source of the buying power to take the bonds off the market—whether offered for sale or for redemption—must be the banking system.

Suppose only 5 percent of the debt, $12,500,000,000 or $15,000,000,000 thus seeks new ownership. This is a very substantial dollar figure; and the fiscal authorities will be faced with serious problems, whether the bonds are absorbed through direct purchase by banks for their own account, through bank loans to individuals wishing to purchase the securities, through a reduction of the Treasury's general funds, or through further Treasury borrowing from the banks and the creation of additional bank credit.

Open-market operations: Such a shifting in the ownership of the debt will also be of immediate concern to the Federal Reserve System, particularly in its open-market operations.

Open-market operations, the purchase and sale by Federal Reserve banks of Government securities, are designed to influence, among other things, the reserve position of member banks. Such operations are one of the traditional measures of fiscal control, and they have been made use of for many years. But a considerable relocation of the public debt is only one of the forces which will affect open-market technique and the nature of open-market operations in the post-war period.

The sheer scale of the post-war Federal debt will by itself constitute a new element in the money and capital markets. For some years after the war the Federal Reserve banks will need, as during the conflict, to take special cognizance of Treasury policy in their purchases and sales of Government bonds, and not to confine their attention to business activity, money rates, and bank reserves. Consequently, quantitative credit control may be extremely difficult, and more emphasis than formerly may be placed on qualitative controls.

The unprecedented growth in the volume of currency outstanding also represents a new element in the situation. As of April 1944

---

[5] Investigation of Executive Agencies of the Government, Preliminary Report of the Select Committee to Investigate the Executive Agencies of the Government, pursuant to Senate Resolution 217 (74th Cong.), 75th Cong., 1st sess., Rept. No. 1275, p. 65.

[6] D. T. Selko, The Federal Financial System (Washington, D. C., The Brookings Institution, 1940), p. 4.

[7] Ibid., p. 118.

[8] Gustave A. Moe, The Bureau of the Budget and Governmental Budgeting in Wartime, N. A. C. A. Bulletin, volume 25 (September 15, 1943), p. 44.

the amount had risen to over $20,500,000,000. Should a considerable portion of this currency outstanding be returned to the banks after the war, the reserve position of the banks will be commensurably enhanced, and open-market operations aimed at influencing the reserves of member banks may have to reckon with flows of currency into and out of banks of a magnitude not hitherto experienced.

Finally, one of the byproducts of war production and the geographical placement of war contracts has been not only a large but a very uneven growth of deposits as among different parts of the country and as among individual banks. While total bank deposits in the country, exclusive of Government and interbank deposits, increased some 40 percent in the 2 years ending December 31, 1943, in some States deposits more than doubled in that 2-year period.[9] Should many banks, as seems possible, lose large portions of their new war deposits in a relatively short period of time after peace returns, and should other banks gain them, open-market operations will necessarily be most intimately affected by this shifting of deposits between individual institutions. In fact, maintenance of sufficient banking liquidity to permit such shifting may of necessity be one of the major objects of governmental fiscal policies, not only because of the interest of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks but because of the even more direct concern of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

FISCAL ADMINISTRATION

What governmental bodies must be reckoned with in fiscal administration? What powers and activities of these bodies must be coordinated if there is to be an integrated and effective policy? What experience have we had with ineffective policies? What evidence does the record of recent years afford regarding administrative limits to effective governmental action?

Governmental bodies with fiscal and financial powers: It would be extremely difficult, perhaps impossible, to give a complete list of the legislative and executive bodies—to say nothing of their powers—whose actions influence fiscal and financial administration. The following quotation will serve to indicate the magnitude of the problem involved merely in surveying these agencies:

"This is a partial list (wartime agencies are omitted) of Federal agencies and their subagencies whose supervisory or independent borrowing or lending powers affect fiscal and monetary policy.

"Executive Office of the President: Bureau of the Budget.

"Department of the Treasury: Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency, Fiscal Service, Stabilization Fund.

"Department of Agriculture: Commodity Credit Corporation, Farm Security Administration, Farm Credit Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

"Department of Commerce: Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Federal National Mortgage Association of Washington.

"National Housing Agency: Federal Home Loan Bank System, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Federal Housing Administration, Federal National Mortgage Association, Federal Public Housing Authority.

"Federal Reserve System.

"Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

"General Accounting Office.

"Securities and Exchange Commission."[10]

Were the appropriate wartime agencies included this list obviously would be very much longer.

When the legislative bodies responsible for certain portions of the Government's financial operations are taken into account, the problems involved in formulating and administering a coordinated fiscal policy are still further increased. The following statement, published in 1940, gives a hint of this aspect of the matter.

"Revisions are more frequent in the case of internal revenue than in the case of the tariff, and are likely to consist of adjustments in selected taxes rather than general revision of the laws. There has been a new tax law approximately every 2 years since the World War, and since 1932 at least one a year. In addition to these major acts there have been a host of special acts during this same 20-year period carrying taxing provisions. Recent examples are the Liquor Taxing Act of January 11, 1934; Social Security Act of August 14, 1935; Bituminous Coal Act of April 26, 1937; and Carriers' Taxing Act of June 29, 1937."[11]

Actually, it is quite likely that changes in the tax situation wrought by rulings of the collector of internal revenue and by decisions of the Supreme Court have occasioned businessmen more difficulty and have been more disruptive of business plans than have even the frequent changes in the written law. In passing it is worth noticing that the Attorney General's office currently handles annually some 6,000 Federal tax cases, and that in 1942 such cases constituted 39 and 47 percent of all civil cases in the first and third circuits.[12]

In the light of the manifest difficulty of bringing into view all the Government agencies which have fiscal and monetary powers, and in the light of the immeasurably greater difficulty of integrating their actions into a consistent policy, the naked statement that it must be the primary function of "Government finance to keep the level of monetary demand for goods and services in every country sufficient to give employment to all who seek it and yet not more than sufficient."[13] seems far removed from the world in which we live and the practical considerations which induce business managers to provide employment. Admirable as such sentiments may be, they gloss over vital problems of administration and divert attention away from the essential question of what is administratively feasible. And, as has been noted earlier, the great difficulty with an ineffective or inoperative policy is that it immensely increases the problems of those persons nominally subject to it and thereby often goes a long way toward defeating its own purpose.

Unquestionably it is true that "there is imperative need for the coordination of all bodies possessing fiscal and monetary powers in the Federal Government to facilitate the proper use of such powers for the maintenance and restraint, when respectively necessary, of the demand for goods and services."[14]

But the danger of such well-intentioned generalizations lies in the fact that they fail to indicate that limits to effective governmental action do exist. The unsophisticated reader, not warned of the realities of political life, assumes only too readily that attainment of the goal is just around the corner.

Government corporations: Pertinent in this connection is a brief discussion of Federal corporations. Many of these organizations were created to carry out individual governmental policies containing important financial and monetary implications. Yet the autonomous or semiautonomous existence of these bodies, together with the large number of them instituted during the last 15 years, represents one of the greatest impediments in the way of implementing an articulated and consistent fiscal policy.

One recent attempt to survey the total number of Government corporations and corporate agencies lists upwards of 60 incorporated and unincorporated agencies or groups of agencies, counting as a single agency in each case the banks for cooperatives, the Federal home loan banks, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, the Federal land banks, the Federal saving and loan associations, and the production credit corporations and associations.[15]

It is generally agreed that one of the prime purposes leading to the creation of Government corporations has been their freedom from the "Government process," particularly the rules and regulations which bind the Government departments as regards Budget procedure, the borrowing of money, the issue of obligations, the type of accounts rendered, the acquisition of property, the method of purchasing materials and supplies, and the regulations governing appointment and promotion of personnel. The following quotation high-lights this point:

"Many of them [Government corporations] enjoy a degree of financial autonomy carefully withheld from Government departments and bureaus, such as independent borrowing power, establishment of a revolving fund, and freedom from auditing and budgetary control. Financial autonomy, however, implies a shift in fiscal responsibilities from the Government to its instrumentalities. As we gather from experience of the past decade, these prerogatves can greatly hamper a consistent fiscal policy and even conceal the Government's financial status.

"Budgetary control by Congress may be weakened while the goal of a balanced Budget loses its traditional function as a touchstone of sound fiscal policies. Moreover, by transferring expenditures of the Federal Government to independent agencies by increasing "contingent liabilities," and by other more elaborate devices * * * the balancing of the Budget may be made a mere formality or a fiction."[16]

The operations of these autonomous agencies are of particular significance when the possibility of implementing a fiscal policy is being considered. One other quotation makes this explicit:

"There is a considerable volume of transactions in regard to which the Treasury acts as a bank, handling funds not subject to control by the warrant system, and for which, therefore, the Treasurer of the United States cannot be held properly accountable. * * *

"Deposits in these accounts * * * are made to the credit of disbursing officers and are not subsequently covered into the Treasury. Disbursements are made without appropriation and without audit by the General Accounting Office.

"The financial statement of the United States, contained in the Annual Report of the Comptroller General for 1939, reports that the Treasurer had liabilities to the amount of $643,684,362.55 in the form of special accounts * * * and depositary accounts of governmental corporations and agencies. * * *

[9] Geographical Distribution of Bank Deposits, Federal Reserve Bulletin, 1943, and Distribution of Bank Deposits by Counties, December 31, 1942, December 31, 1943, and Increase or Decrease, Treasury Department, Office of the Secretary (March 1944).

[10] "Our Form of Government," Fortune, Supplement (November 1943), p. 4.

[11] D. T. Selko, op. cit., p. 153.

[12] Hon. Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Attorney General of the United States, address before the Federal Bar Association, January 21, 1943, cited in Some Recommendations for a National Post-war Fiscal Policy, a report of the subcommittee on taxation of the railroad committee for the study of transportation, April 1944, p. 7.

[13] Abba P. Lerner, op. cit., p. 132.

[14] T. O. Yntema, Full Employment in a Private Enterprise System, American Economic Review, vol. XXXIV, No. 1, pt. 2, Supplement (March 1944), p. 113.

[15] Citizens National Committee, Government Corporations (Washington, D. C., May 1943).

[16] Fritz Karl Mann, The Government Corporation as a Tool of Foreign Policy, Public Administration Review, vol. 3, No. 3 (Summer, 1943), p. 204.

Some indication of the volume of special deposit transactions is indicated by the fact that 47 agencies, representing approximately 40 percent of these special deposit liabilities as of June 30, 1938, collected over $1,000,000,000 in special deposits during the month of June 1938 alone. It is remarkable that such a large volume of business is transacted and that such large expenditures are made by governmental agencies, wholly without audit, without accountability, and without reports to Congress except such as the agency itself sees fit to render or such as Congress by special legislation requires." [17]

Such a statement acquires particular cogency when it is recalled that public financial officials in general agree that the actions of agencies so financed that they need not appear annually before the legislative branch to request appropriations are particularly difficult to shape to over-all governmental policies, whether the policies are determined by the executive or the legislative branch. State highway departments that have the exclusive use of proceeds of the gasoline tax are a case in point, as were the offices of State fish and game commissioners when hunting and fishing licenses were a fruitful source of revenue.

Conflicts between policies. In view of the number of government bodies with fiscal powers, it is not surprising that in the last 25 years there have been numerous instances in which the course followed by one governmental body was in direct conflict with the courses pursued by other agencies, committees, or administrators, at least so far as the effects upon the economy of the country were concerned. Such situations give real substance to the question: What are the practical administrative limitations to the governmental process, and where do they lie?

Perhaps the most famous instance of conflicting policies in recent years was the insistence of the Federal Government during the 1920's, on the one hand, that reparations and war debts should be paid and, on the other hand, that a high tariff should be maintained.

In the latter 1920's one of the striking conflicts, and one which perhaps contributed in no small measure to the final upsurge of the bull market and its ultimate crash, was the discrepancy in the spring of 1928 between the course followed by the Federal Reserve System in its purchase of acceptances and its action as regards open-market operations and rediscount rates. During 1927 the actions of the System had been, on the whole, directed to stimulating business activity. In January 1928 the System reversed its position and began to sell Government bonds; on February 3, the New York discount rate was raised from 3½ to 4 percent. The sale of Government bonds continued through July, and the New York discount rate was raised twice, once in May and once in July. Notwithstanding these restrictive measures, the Federal Reserve System, wholly contrary to its customary practice during the 1920's, continued after the turn of the year to buy acceptances, so that its total holdings, instead of declining seasonally, remained almost constant from December through May. Consequently, the funds which member banks lost because of the Federal Reserve banks' sales of Government bonds were in large measure restored to them by the continued, contraseasonal purchases of acceptances by the System. Thus the restrictive measures applied through sales of bonds and through increases in discount rates were very largely nullified at a point in the business cycle which was of crucial importance in credit control.

One of the most glaring recent conflicts of policy was the imposition of the social security program in 1935, with its deflationary implications, at a time when over-all Federal policy was admittedly aimed at economic recovery. Equally serious as a conflict in policy was the increasing burden of double taxation placed on corporate earnings during the 1930's. This burden was imposed at a time when the avowed over-all Federal policy was "economic recovery," at a time when one of the crying needs of the country was an enhanced flow of funds, particularly equity money, into business enterprise. But the growing severity of taxes, placed both on corporate earnings before payment of dividends and on the same earnings when paid to stockholders as dividends, continually diminished the attractiveness of equities to potential investors and tended to retard the flow of equity money into business.

Consider, also, the various types of mechanisms used to construct industrial facilities during the war. There have been the Emergency Plant Facilities contracts, the activities of the Defense Plant Corporation, the certificates of necessity, and the use by the armed services of their own appropriations for this purpose. In addition to, and separate from, these mechanisms there has been the allocation, up to June 30, 1943, of $870,000,000 of lend-lease funds for the purpose of expanding production facilities in the United States and the expenditure of some $600,000,000 of such allocations. This situation presents, if not a conflict in policies, at least a substantial duplication of activity.

Inoperative policies: In addition to cases where two or more mutually contradictory policies were pursued by the Government at one time, numerous instances can be found where a declared policy was inoperative, often because its aim was too high or because it was so finely gaged that the existing administrative mechanism could not put it into effect. Illustrations of this character indicate clearly that there are limits to the effective administrative action of governmental bodies or administrators.

It would be a bold man who would argue that the restrictive measures taken by the Federal Reserve System in 1928 and 1929 controlled the speculative boom in the stock market, even though the System's operations no doubt tempered the movement. It would be equally pretentious to argue that the cheap-money policy of the Federal Reserve banks and of the administration in the early 1930's led to any appreciable increase in the lending of commercial banks. Nor is there reason to believe that the forced devaluation of the dollar in 1933, allegedly undertaken at least in part to raise commodity prices, exerted any very considerable effect, except to a limited extent in the case of commodities entering into international trade.

Real control of the rate of Federal expenditure is implied in much fiscal-policy doctrine. For example:

"The central idea is that Government fiscal policy, is spending and taxing, its borrowing and repayment of loans, its issue of new money, and its withdrawal of money, shall all be undertaken with an eye only to the results of these actions on the economy and not to any established traditional doctrine about what is sound or unsound." [18]

But how is this control to be exercised, when the statement can be made that:

"The present accounting system of the Government is badly scattered and presents a rather incongruous mixture of antique and modern practices. Essential parts of the system are now found in the Treasury Department * * * the General Accounting Office, and in the various operating bureaus, departments, and etsablishments. * * * Consequently, prompt and detailed information for financial management by the President cannot be produced * * * it is virtually impossible to get out timely general reports on the financial condition of the Government." [19]

The methods of controlling expenditures—in the sense of accounting control—also deserve consideration. Responsibility for most kinds of control is located in the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office. By the establishment of these two agencies it was hoped to lessen the need for types of control measures formerly used, such as itemized appropriation bills and congressional investigations. Even under the new system, however, and even when appropriation bills are itemized, there is a question whether the control is as tight as is sometimes assumed. Although many appropriations are made on an annual basis, and although apportionments of annual appropriations into the amounts which may be spent each month by a department are controlled by the Bureau of the Budget, the Bureau does not allot a department's total appropriation as between individual divisions, officers, and bureaus.

"Thus it would be possible for one bureau within a department to have exceeded its apportionment under one allotment and been supported by a transfer from another allotment without the knowledge of the Bureau of the Budget." [20]

Furthermore, expenditures made by Government corporations and expenditures made from certain other types of special accounts are not subject to the supervision of the Bureau, or, in a number of instances, to that of the General Accounting Office.

To take another type of instance, the circumstances surrounding the issuance by the Comptroller General of General Regulation No. 84 suggest that the regulation, at least temporarily, failed of its purpose.

"This regulation provided for the complete resymbolization of all receipt and appropriation items, effective July 1, 1936. It was accompanied by a digest of symbols, containing several hundred pages, which did not reach the Treasury Department and the other departments and establishments until several days after the effective date. At that time the accounts for the fiscal year beginning July 1 had already been set up in the Treasury and in the accounting offices of several departments and agencies." [21]

A case selected from still another area of fiscal management may prove illuminating. In his message to Congress of April 14, 1938, President Roosevelt proposed to increase the available resources of the banking system and expressed the hope that Federal banking supervision could be better coordinated. One of the major results of this expression was a revision of the procedure in bank examination promulgated by the Comptroller of the Currency and agreed to by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.[22] In this regulation the methods of appraising bonds in the investment portfolios of banks were dealt with, and it was stated:

"Group I securities are marketable obligations in which the investment characteristics are not distinctly or predominantly speculative. This group includes general market obligations in the four highest grades and unrated securities of equivalent value.

[17] D. T. Selko, op. cit., pp. 464–465.

[18] Abba P. Lerner, Functional Finance and the Federal Debt, Social Research, vol. X, No. 1 (February 1943), p. 39.

[19] A. E. Buck, Financial Control and Accountability, Fiscal Management in the National Government, the President's Committee on Administrative Management (Washington, 1937), p. 14.

[20] D. T. Selko, op. cit., p. 161.

[21] A. E. Buck, op. cit., p. 23.

[22] Revision in Bank Examination Procedure and in the Investment Securities Regulation of the Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Reserve Bulletin, vol. 24, No. 7 (July 1938), p. 565.

Group II securities are those in which the investment characteristics are distinctly or predominantly speculative. This group includes general market obligations in grades below the four highest and unrated securities of equivalent value."

It seems reasonable to question the effectiveness, from an administrative point of view, of a regulation that used so ambiguous a phrase as "predominantly speculative" and which could not be interpreted without reference to the privately owned and sponsored bond rating services, which are organizations not mentioned directly in the regulation. There also seems to be a question whether it is in the public interest for a governmental policy to be predicated on the continuing honesty, accuracy, and existence of private organizations that have no responsibility or obligation, at least in the pertinent connection, to any governmental body.

One further aspect of this subject may be mentioned. An essential mechanism in administrative control of expenditures is the object classification of the Federal Government, more especially in connection with the objects for which appropriations are made. The complete Federal object classification is alleged to be distinctly out of date, and there is doubt whether its character is such as to give as good a control of expenditure as is often assumed in fiscal-policy doctrine. To take one detail:

"Gasoline, for example, is extensively used by a large department for stationary engines and for trucks and automobiles. In terms of object classification, therefore, it can be listed under either Supplies and Materials or Travel. Under existing conditions the money can be diverted from one use to another practically without restraint.[23]

Lack of flexibility in spending: A look at the record of new activities entered upon by the Federal Government and the attendant record of spending does not sustain the implication, inherent in much fiscal-policy doctrine, that Government expenditure not only should but can be turned on and off like water from a tap.

Against the simplified dictum that the Government "can reduce total spending by spending less itself or by raising taxes so that taxpayers have less money to spend" [24] can be set specific instances in which the Federal Government could not reduce its spending.

In 1937, when President Roosevelt instructed all executive agencies to set up 10 percent of their appropriations in a reserve fund, it was found that several agencies could not comply with this order and continue their operations. The question is raised as to how far the President can manage directly the expenditures of the executive branch.[25]

Spending begets an organization of spenders—an administrative staff as a minimum, supported by an administrative budget, to supervise the outlay of the appropriation. Spending necessarily produces records, and records in the Government seem to have a will and an ability to survive and perpetuate themselves that is almost independent of the desires or actions of the record keepers. Very often it results in the acquisition by the Government of assets that must be preserved and maintained—office furnishings, if nothing more.

Almost always it fathers projects which will take some months or years to complete and which must be continued or else result in a complete waste of the public moneys already spent. By its nature it develops, from out of its own administrative organization, experts who can, from their familiarity with the records which they themselves keep, assemble more facts in its defense than can be brought to bear by its opponents who do not have ready access to the information. Above all spending establishes a host of vested interests that range from the employees actually on the pay roll to the business firms and local government bodies in the districts where the funds are spent.

Director of the Budget Lord stated:

"There is never hope of completing a project or abandoning it for some new activity of greater importance and promise. Like Tennyson's brook the old job goes on forever. I am convinced we are carrying on work on which we have spent and are spending good Government money with little or nothing to show for the expenditure."[26]

And as a former Acting Director of the Budget has said:

"When the need for Government activity along a certain line declines the agency concerned generally finds some means of continuing that activity as fully as before and will be likely to continue to so continue it unless there is an agency of Government charged with the continuous duty of studying the Federal structure to prevent such superannuation."[27]

Thus it may be that the administrative aspects of spending and of controlling spending are, in many instances, of more real importance to the economy and to the individual taxpayer than are the intellectual justifications for increasing or decreasing the outlay of Federal funds. The bald statement that "the chief technical problem of fiscal policy in the business cycle is * * * to design formulas for public finance which, as a part of the regular system, make room for deficit spending during depressions by securing the building up of corresponding surpluses in good years" [28] so greatly oversimplifies the problem as to be quite misleading.

The bounds of administrative feasibility

It is evident that within the last 25 years, to go no further back, numerous examples can be found of conflicts and contradictions within and among the operations of governmental bodies. Also can be found instances in which declared policies simply were not operative. All the foregoing illustrations will perhaps serve to show that the governmental process works effectively only within the bounds of what is administratively feasible, and that there are in fact as well as in theory very real administrative limitations to governmental power.

The significance of such considerations, particularly to business operations, is very great. For it is unreasonable of businessmen to expect governmental policies to be effective beyond the bounds of administrative feasibility.

The location and character of these limits cannot be explored here, but three observations are appropriate:

"One possibility seems particularly disquieting; namely, that the total deficit burden may reach a point at which it is doing more to hold business back than current spending is doing to stimulate it, and still it may be true that the immediate effect of more spending will be a temporary stimulus. * * * [29]

"Objectives with widespread support include maintenance of real national income at a high level, prevention of inflation. * * * The war has taught us that such comprehensive objectives can be achieved only through the utilization of many material and spiritual forces. Central banks * * * cannot achieve them alone.[30]

"Quantitative control of member bank reserves has always been a blunt and limited instrument, capable of moving in a desired general direction, but without certainty, precision, or discrimination." [31]

In substance, the preceding analysis suggests that some of the most ambitious aims contained in fiscal policy theorizing do not fall within the area of what is politically and administratively practicable, and that as a consequence the more extravagant expectations of the results obtainable through fiscal policy and financial operations are, in practice, likely to end in disappointment. The social desirability of sketching plans and raising hopes which cannot be fulfilled or of arguing the merits of policies which cannot be made effective lies beyond the limits of this study. But this consideration is a question which cannot properly be omitted in an appraisal of the related subjects, fiscal-policy theory and public financial administration.

CONCLUSION

This study has outlined the dilemma that confronts the businessman and the public official:

On the one hand, we know that the financial operations of the Federal Government in the period following the war will be of so great a magnitude as to affect intimately many portions of the economy. Furthermore, the proliferation in recent years of governmental financial activities and the multiplication of the points of contact between public financial administration and business enterprise assure that many business decisions will be directly influenced by governmental attitudes and activities. In view of the tremendous scale of Federal financial operations inevitable during the next generation, the prospect of a multitude of congressional committees and executive agencies pursuing courses largely if not entirely independent of each other, and often contradictory, is most distressing, perhaps intolerable.

On the other hand, the more ambitious goals of many current fiscal-policy doctrines clearly are beyond the capabilities of the existing mechanisms of public financial administration and for the most part are far removed from the purposes for which such mechanisms were created. Thus, were such objectives adopted by Federal agencies, the probable result would be "confusion worse confounded." Even were the Federal administrative machinery greatly increased, it seems likly that the new bureaucracy might find the objectives set for it beyond the limits of effective governmental action. Furthermore, if—as is contemplated in some

[23] Robert H. Rawson, The Formulation of the Federal Budget, Public Policy (Cambridge, Harvard Graduate School of Public Administration, 1941), p. 99.

[24] Abba P. Lerner, Functional Finance and the Federal Debt, Social Research, vol. X, No. 1 (February 1943), p. 39.

[25] D. T. Selko, op. cit., p. 161.

[26] Director of the Budget, Gen. M. Lord, address at the eleventh regular meeting of the business organizations of the Government (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1926), p. 16.

[27] Hearing before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in Charge of Deficiency Appropriations on the second deficiency bill for 1936 (Washington, 1936), p. 741.

[28] Gunnar Mydral, Fiscal Policy in the Business Cycle, American Economic Review, Supplement, vol. XXIX, No. 1, pt. 2 (March 1939), p. 187.

[29] J. M. Clark, An Appraisal of the Workability of Compensatory Devices, American Economic Review, Supplement, vol. XXIX, No. 1, pt. 2 (March 1939), p. 204.

[30] Karl R. Bopp, Central Banking at the Crossroads, American Economic Review, Supplement, vol. XXXIV, No. 1, pt. 2 (March 1944), p. 272.

[31] Lawrence H. Saltzer, in Discussion—Post-war Domestic Monetary Problems, American Economic Review, Supplement, vol. XXXIV, No. 1, pt. 2 (March 1944), p. 283.

fiscal policy discussions[32]—governmental bodies took as their field of operations the manipulation of the gross income, the wage bill, the cost of materials, the salaries, the depreciation allowances, the tax liabilities, the net earnings of individual firms, the distribution of such earnings, and the rate of investment in particular companies, then the necessary amount of regulation would leave little discretion to business managers and would result in an economy highly regimented.

Possible solution. In what direction should the solution of this dilemma be sought? What line of action should the makers of public policy seek to follow in the public interest? What kind of reorganized governmental procedure should the businessman advocate in order that he be able to formulate working hypotheses regarding future events—hypotheses necessary to him in the management of his affairs?

As a first approximation, it may be stated that at least two types of reform are called for: (1) A reorganization of the Federal bodies whose activities are of fiscal significance, so that policies when and as adopted by the Government can be made effective; (2) a reformulation and simplification of the objectives of fiscal policy.

In order to make Federal fiscal procedure a more effective instrument for carrying out fiscal policy, improvement in the following areas of Federal financial management is imperative:

1. The appropriations procedure of the Congress—to the end that fewer types of appropriation bills be made use of and the possibility increased that the Congress consider all appropriation legislation as a unit.

2. The ways and means whereby the Congress views as a unit both the revenues and the appropriations of the Federal Government.

(3) The degree of coordination among the several standing congressional committees which are concerned with fiscal matters, in particular; in the House, the Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Coinage, Weights and Measures, Expenditures in Executive Departments, and Ways and Means; and in the Senate, the Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and Finance.

(4) The Federal accounting system—to the end that there be established a single, centralized accounting system that will produce quickly and easily those types of information necessary for effective financial administration.

(5) The financial operations of all Government corporations and independent executive agencies—to the end that the financial activities of all such bodies be brought within the orbit of the existing budgetary procedure and subjected to legislative scrutiny.

(6) The concentration of administrative responsibility for the operations of all executive agencies whose duties are primarily of a financial or fiscal character. (Such responsibility might be concentrated in one or perhaps two officials of Cabinet rank, or conceivably in a new Cabinet position created specifically to assume some or all of it.)

The reformulation of the purposes of fiscal policy should set objectives that are within the abilities of the administrative mechanisms of public financial management, in recognition of the fact that in actuality there are things which even the Government cannot do, for administrative if not for legal reasons.

[32] See, for instance, Charles E. Noyes, Economic Freedom (New York & London, Harper & Bros., 1943), p. 53.

These objectives must include and probably should be confined to:

1. The protection of the Federal Government's credit.

2. The provision of a monetary unit the value of which is subject to and determined by an objective test, and the purchasing power of which is not subject to wide variation, nor to political manipulation, nor to the threat of political manipulation.

3. The organization of a system of financial institutions that will, on the one hand, safeguard the savings and cash balances of the people and will, on the other hand, furnish credit and capital to business enterprise on terms suited to the needs of the economy.

Other Federal activities which from time to time may appear to be necessary or desirable for the welfare of the State should be adopted or rejected on their own merits—for instance, the provision of social security, the control of margin requirements for loans made against the collateral of stocks and bonds, or the extension of credits to the governments of foreign countries. Even though such measures affect the financial condition of the Federal Government, they should be appraised and then either advocated or combatted because of their own virtues or defects, not because their acceptance or refusal would facilitate or impede the basic purposes of fiscal policy.

Finally, so-called objectives of fiscal policy which in the light of experience lie beyond the competence of public financial administration and are outside the range of effective governmental action, at least in peacetime, should be dismissed as impractical goals, the pursuit of which serves only to obscure issues of basic significance. In this category, for instance, are precise control over the prices of individual commodities and meticulous regulation of the rates of public and private spending.

One further word of caution may be permissible. If, in the post-war period, the Federal Government fails to achieve some of the more elaborate aims posited by ambitious fiscal-policy doctrines, this failure should not be so much attributed to flaws in an admittedly imperfect economic system as to a failure on the part of fiscal-policy enthusiasts to recognize that there are in fact definite limitations on the governmental process and bounds beyond which administrative action is not effective. If the more modest and the basic objectives of fiscal policy are not achieved, if the policies themselves are not clear and understandable, if within reasonable limits they are not effective, if they do not encourage and assist business enterprise to provide employment and carry the necessary tax burden, such failures should be placed where they rightly belong—at the door of defective formulation of policy and of bad administration, rather than on the step of the existing economic structure and business practice.

Much of the internal history of the war agencies of the Federal Government, particularly those agencies which took Federal activities into new fields—for instance, the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Lend-Lease Administration, and the Board of Economic Warfare—is to be written in terms of attempts to create organizations that, in an administrative sense, were workable and effective. It will be most expensive for the country if, ultimately, the post-war fiscal history of the Nation is written in terms of attempted policies that were beyond the limits of administrative feasibility or were extraneous to the reasonable needs of a peacetime economy, or if the Nation's post-war fiscal history is punctuated by a series of unsuccessful efforts to construct effective administrative organizations equal to the tasks imposed on them.

The Spirit of '76 Marches On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem:

"THE SPIRIT OF '76 MARCHES ON"

Raise it up where the wild winds blow,
Out in the vast Pacific seas,
Out where the men of freedom beat
The hordes of evil to their knees,

Raise it up on the foeman's isle,
To float in grandeur in the skies,
This flag for which a freeman fights,
Or, facing the odds of battle, dies;

Up with the symbol of the bold,
The glorious guerdon of brave men,
That all the Nation's folk may feel
The spirit of seventy-six again!

—*Joe Colton.*

A Plea for an Amicable Modus Vivendi Between the Arab and Hebrew Peoples in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very significant message sent to the delegates of the six Middle Eastern states convening now in Cairo. Mr. Peter H. Bergson and Mr. Theodore Bennahum, members of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, have conferred with the Honorable Mahmoud Hassan, Egyptian Minister to Washington, before he departed for Cairo and through him the communication to the Cairo conference has been transmitted. I believe this message to be of special importance because it is a direct step toward the reconciliation of the Hebrew and Arab peoples who are the two main factors in any decision which can be made regarding Palestine. The message follows:

The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation has sent to the delegates of the six middle eastern states convening now in Cairo a message of "brotherly greetings and sincere wishes for the success of their endeavors to achieve unity and independence of the great Moslem peoples of the Near East."

Deploring the interference of "foreign self-interested powers," the Hebrew committee offered a policy of reconciliation looking toward the building up of Palestine (with the Arabs as equal partners) as "a free and democratic state in which Hebrews and Arabs will enjoy full equality of citizenship and government as fellow builders of a renascent civilization."

Mr. Peter H. Bergson and Mr. Theodore Bennahum, member of the Hebrew committee, have conferred with the Honorable Mahmoud Hassen, Egyptian Minister to Washington, through whom the communication to the Cairo conference has been transmitted. It is understood that the Minister is about to depart for Cairo to confer with his government.

The text of the communication follows:

"On behalf of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation I send you our brotherly greetings and sincere wishes for the success of your endeavors to achieve unity and independence of the great Moslem peoples of the Near East. Regardless of the unfortunate and artificial misunderstandings in recent years in Palestine, which arose solely from the instigation of foreign self-interested powers, the outstanding historic fact remains that whenever Moslems and Jews happened to live together, not only did they enjoy the warmest mutual respect and friendship, but the happy juxtaposition greatly contributed to the advancement of civilization and humanity at large. There is no reason why the Hebrew people, whose national territory from ancient times has been Palestine, and those Arabs who for many generations have lived there, should not form one free and democratic state, in which they will enjoy full equality of citizenship and government, as fellow rebuilders of an ancient glory.

"Our martyred people do not seek domination, but only a chance to survive with the dignity of human beings, and to enjoy freedom. We are sure that the sentiments of understanding and sympathy for the plight of our people, expressed by the most eminent Egyptian lawyers—Abdel Fattah el Sayed Bey, Tewfik Doss Pasha, and Hassan Hosni—at the recent Cairo trial, were not merely perfunctory and professional utterances but a further expression of the conscience and grandeur of Islam. As soon as this superficial issue between the renascent Hebrew Nation of Europe and Palestine and the Arab community in Palestine is resolved, we are sure that all Hebrews will welcome the prospect of a free Palestine participating in a larger regional constellation of middle eastern states. With this in view we hope that an understanding between the Hebrew Nation and the noble Moslem peoples of the Middle East will be a benediction for all mankind.

"We pray for the blessings of the Lord upon your peoples and that your deliberations may be guided by a spirit of true justice which is the highest wisdom.

"I beg to assure Your Excellency of my esteem and consideration.

"PETER H. BERGSON,
"Chairman, Hebrew Committee of National Liberation."

Go To It, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star:

GO TO IT, MR. PRESIDENT

That was a great report to the American people, Mr. President. You spoke to all the people as the representative of all the people. Your report and your comments were frank and presented in simple language which all can understand and which the American people appreciate.

There was not one word of incrimination in anything you said. You frankly declared your understanding of, your support of, and your allegiance to the Constitution. You told the world that the peace will not be your peace, not a Democratic Party peace, not a Republican Party peace, but a people's peace based on what the American people know and applaud as plain common sense.

In your report you were a leader in every sense of the word, Mr. President. You told us what we wanted to know. You promised to keep us advised. You gave assurances of thoroughgoing bipartisan representation in international conferences planning for world organization and international cooperation. You brilliantly avoided the mistake of your illustrious predecessor, Woodrow Wilson.

We have opposed you bitterly in the past on many issues, mainly on your multiple-term ambitions, but on the basis of your report yesterday and on your assurances of adherence to common sense and constitutional processes we pledge you our wholehearted support in your determination to create a world organization based on international good will and understanding.

Go to it, Mr. President. The American people are for you and with you. But for the sake of America and the world, stay on the beam.

West Presents Its Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial from the Standard Examiner, of Ogden, Utah, which, in my opinion, reflects the thinking of the people of the West with respect to industrial plants that have been established there during the war. This editorial clearly sets forth the determination of our people to maintain facilities that will utilize our raw materials of the West and remove the shackles of discrimination that have been imposed upon them all together too long:

WEST PRESENTS ITS CASE

It seems to us that the best way to tell our readers about the purpose and significance of the Western States Conference Steel Committee meetings in Salt Lake City and Geneva this week is to re-tell the story of the orchard heaters.

A California manufacturer set out to make orchard heaters for the big market in the citrus area of California only to discover that eastern manufacturers can sell heaters to Californians at a price which the California manufacturer must pay merely for the steel that is required to make an orchard heater.

Morris B. Pendleton, who manufactures tools in Los Angeles, told the story and described why the handicap to western steel manufacturing exists. Said he:

"The West enjoys an equitable position with respect to lumber, copper, aluminum, oil, ceramics, agriculture, and other products. We now feel we are entitled to an equitable position in steel.

"Present practice forces western manufacturers to pay approximately $21 per ton more for our steel made in the West now, or about $12 pre-war. This is a penalty for the western manufacturer and amounts to the equivalent of a subsidy of $21 a ton to our eastern competitors, giving them unfair advantage. Such unfair advantages are not in accordance with a free-market economy on which American business has been founded."

So long as the West lacked a steel industry western manufacturers saw little hope of escaping from a colonial position with regard to steel, but when the needs of war caused the construction of the huge plant at Geneva and the smaller plant at Fontana, hopes were aroused. If these plants can be retained as permanent industrial resources in the West and the inequitable steel price system altered so that western manufacturers may obtain steel at prices their eastern competitors enjoy, a vast new field of manufacturing is opened up for western industrial enterprise.

The steel committee of the Western States Council was appointed to strive for this objective. The Utah Conference just completed was an educational preparation for the battle to come. There was a war-of-nerves aspect to this conference. The Western States built up their case solidly and logically, as follows:

Arthur J. Boynton, a Chicago engineer with an international reputation as a steel industry authority, described the factors which have made for successful steel manufacture in the principal steel manufacturing centers of the world.

Dr. J. R. Mahoney, of the University of Utah, whose confident statements about Geneva's ability to produce steel at economic prices in peacetime have stood up under scrutiny, said that the factors for success described by Boynton exist at Geneva.

Then Mr. Pendleton, the Los Angeles manufacturer, said the West is determined to consolidate its gains (including the western steel industry) "and will provide a surprisingly large market for steel."

F. T. Letchfield, San Francisco industrial engineer, demonstrated that the industrial development of the West must continue because of economic forces at work, which economic forces are stronger than any political efforts which may be brought to bear in opposition.

On top of all this Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER of Maine said the Mead committee (formerly Truman committee) will insist upon the speedy, just, and antimonopolistic disposal of Government steel plants for postwar operation. He upheld the Western States in their determination to obtain an equitable position in steel, so the West may manufacture steel products on a fair competitive basis with manufacturers in other sections of the country.

The railroads made haste to inform the conferees that the West can look to them to assist, by appropriate rate action, the realization of western ambitions.

This boils down to the exciting truth that the Western States have given good and proper notice:

1. That if anybody has an idea the war-built western steel industry can be scrapped and the pre-war status quo be restored he had better rid himself quickly of that idea.

2. That a surprisingly large market for steel will develop under western post-war industrial programs and the steel makers who possess the Geneva and Fontana facilities should have an advantage over others seeking to sell in this market.

3. That the West will insist upon receiving price benefits to flow from the location of steel plants in proximity to western users of steel and no longer will endure the practice of charging prices for western steel as if it were made in Pittsburgh or Chicago with the cost of a long haul added to the price although the long haul never is made.

This is the war of nerves that is preceding an actual industrial revolution, but there are plenty of signs that the war of nerves may be

so effective as to bring about the results desired. For persons who have taken the time to investigate have reported that the West means business and the West is united and cooperative as it never was before. Making use of a heroic quotation, "We have just begun to fight."

Radio Station WHA, University of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. HENRY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to express my sincere greetings and congratulations to the University of Wisconsin radio station WHA, and its staff, for its record of service to the State of Wisconsin and for its position of leadership in the Nation, by including the text of Joint Resolution No. 38, which was adopted by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Wisconsin on February 21, 1945:

Resolution congratulating radio station WHA and its staff upon its completion of 25 years of service to the people of the State, and commemorating its founding

Whereas the University of Wisconsin radio station WHA, situated on the campus of the university in the city of Madison, county of Dane, in the State of Wisconsin, has completed 25 years of broadcasting service to the State; and

Whereas Station WHA is identified as the oldest station in the Nation, having begun its scheduled program service as early as February 1919; and

Whereas Station WHA has maintained a position of national leadership in radio education, with a record of 22 program awards and honors won in competition in the American exhibition of education radio programs during the years from 1937 to 1944, and is the recipient of Variety Magazine's 1938 award for outstanding public service broadcasting and the George Foster Peabody award for educational program excellence in 1943; and

Whereas Station WHA brings to the farmers and homemakers of the State daily programs of practical benefit and educational value; and

Whereas Station WHA inaugurated the programs known as the School of the Air and the College of the Air in the State of Wisconsin, providing instructive courses from the kindergarten to the university level for school and home listening; and

Whereas Station WHA affords generous opportunities for practical study, training, and experience in radio leading to professional careers for many students: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature hereby extend to the University of Wisconsin radio station WHA and its staff sincere greetings and congratulations on its twenty-sixth anniversary for its record of service to the State and its position of leadership in the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That a plaque commemorating the founding of the University of Wisconsin radio station WHA be placed by the board of regents of the university with the assistance of the State engineer at a suitable location on the university campus in Madison, to observe appropriately this historic contribution to the development of radio broadcasting.

By Senators Madsen and Knowles.

Was read.

The joint resolution was considered at this time, upon motion of Senator Madsen, with unanimous consent.

The joint resolution was adopted.

Ordered messaged to the assembly at once.

Disposal of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, the American people would like to know just where their tax dollars go in connection with the disposal of surplus property. The clothing, trucks, and hundreds of other items being used by the armed forces were purchased with funds levied from the people of America and with funds borrowed on their credit which their grandchildren will be repaying. They therefore have a right to know as much as possible about the disposal of those goods which are declared surplus to the needs of the armed forces. We passed legislation here setting up an organization to direct the disposal of surplus property, and perhaps as a whole that organization will function well, but I have taken note of incidents which seem not in accord with the intent of Congress in connection with surplus property. I wish to direct attention to a matter which if indicative of a widespread policy forbodes scandal and loss for the people of the country.

This matter was brought to my attention by an American soldier who sent me a copy of an advertisement from a Birmingham, Ala., newspaper. The advertisement included the following information:

Paul has to move by January 10.

Due to conditions over which we have no control, our lease has been terminated and we are forced to vacate our present location by January 10. We have just been in the market and have huge supplies of used Army goods on hand. Therefore, we are sacrificing entire stock of used United States Army goods at ridiculous prices. Special discounts on quantity purchases.

Twenty-five thousand used United States Army raincoats. A gondola car has just arrived with thousands of used good Army raincoats. All coats are in A–1 condition. Buy two or three at this low price. $1.25.

Three thousand five hundred used United States Army steel lockers. A regular $6.95 value for a low price. Used steel lockers, each with tray. Ideal for storage uses—for tools, for odds and ends. A splendid value at $1.50.

Ten thousand pairs used United States Army shoes. All shoes have good uppers and double soles. Ideal for workmen and sportsmen. You'll have to wait on yourself. No shoe stamp necessary. $1.50.

Mail orders filled. Add 25 cents for handling charges. Make checks payable to Paul Locascio, 2221 First Avenue, N., Birmingham.

The soldier who wrote me added "I know Army units which need A–1 raincoats" and "the Army will not sell rebuilts to its members at the above prices."

My first quarrel is with the Army for disposing of such property as surplus. Surely there are men in the service who will in the future need raincoats and who will need shoes and steel lockers. It is entirely possible that the raincoats and shoes are actually not good enough for men in the service. They may be too worn for use; but surely a steel locker which is used for storage purposes would not so deteriorate that it would be worthless to the Army and not needed at some time.

In the second place, I cannot understand why one individual is permitted to acquire goods of this nature in such bulk.

Finally, I fail to see how these goods can be sold at the prices given. Surely if this dealer is selling raincoats at $1.25, lockers at $1.50, and shoes at $1.50 he purchased them—I presume through the Procurement Office of the Treasury Department—at a much lower figure. It would be interesting to know just what the American taxpayers paid for each one of these raincoats, each one of the lockers, and each pair of the shoes. I assume that these goods were sold to the highest bidder. Would it not have been wiser to cancel the sale, readvertise the goods, and try to get a better price for them?

This war is not over by a long shot. If the end of the war were in sight and the Army and Surplus Property Administration were afraid they were going to get caught with a lot of not-too-attractive surplus material on hand, there might have been some excuse for dumping it in this manner. But good raincoats are hard to get and so are shoes and steel lockers, and the chances are they will continue to be hard to get for quite some months yet. This fact further underscores my contention that it is ridiculous to dispose of these goods at what this Birmingham dealer refers to as "ridiculous prices." If he can sell them at ridiculous prices, he bought them at ridiculous prices, and the American people who paid for them in the beginning are the losers.

I hope that this House will keep the Surplus Property situation under the closest scrutiny and keep such incidents as this to which I have referred at a minimum. If we do not, then I predict that the virtual giving away of our surplus property will be the major scandal of this war.

The Ruhr Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting

the column Random Thoughts, written by Henry J. Haskell, editor of the Kansas City Star, and printed in that paper on Sunday, February 25, because of its reference to the Ruhr River Valley in Germany, which our troops are now fighting to capture.

Mr. Haskell's description of the great strategic importance of the Ruhr Valley's war production to the Nazi War effort is such that I know every Member of the Congress will want to read it. I am certain that when you read it, you will be better able to understand the real reason why the Germans have fought so stubbornly to protect the valley and why our air forces have pounded away at it for months.

It is possible that in the German strategy of warfare that so many troops were withdrawn from the eastern front that the Russian Army was able to forge ahead rapidly, more rapidly than American, Canadian, and British troops have on the western front. Certainly, Germany's manpower yet remaining would not have been able to fight at top efficiency on both the eastern and western fronts and my reading of Mr. Haskell's article has led me to believe that Nazi generals would have chosen to protect the Ruhr at the expense of everything else.

Mr. Haskell's column is as follows:

RANDOM THOUGHTS

Twenty-odd years ago the Ruhr was much in the news as it is today. At that time the French were occupying the district in order to collect reparations, much to the indignation of the Germans and many sympathetic British and Americans. The Germans protested payment was impossible—and then when their turn came in the Second World War they ruthlessly collected from the conquered countries far more than they had been called on to pay after the first war.

We happened to be in Paris in 1923 and we kept hearing about trouble in the Ruhr until we were goaded into going there to look things over. It was an overnight run of 12 hours from Paris to Dusseldorf, a city of 500,000 that stands on the east bank of the Rhine which at this place is about the size of the Missouri at Kansas City.

The Ruhr gets its name from the river Ruhr which empties into the Rhine 20 miles north of Dusseldorf. Normally the district is a beehive of coal and steel lying between the Ruhr River and the Rhine Canal. It is shaped like a piece of pie. The point of the piece is at the junction of the Rhine and the Ruhr. The pie extends about 40 miles to the east and is perhaps 20 miles wide at its widest point. It includes an important part of German industry with the big Krupp works at Essen as its chief glory.

We had heard numerous complaints of the harshness and brutality of the French forces of occupation. At least one American liberal weekly was having fits about it. So every chance we had we inquired of Germans as to what they knew. All of them had heard tales but these were vague. They chiefly centered about the misconduct of French Moorish troops toward German women. So we called on General Degoutte, commanding the forces of occupation, for explicit information. He sent for the records. Thirteen complaints had been received. On investigation and trial, four stood up and the soldiers involved had been punished. But, referring to older records, the general said there had been just as many instances of this sort before the war when German garrisons were in the Ruhr.

When the French moved into the district to try to collect reparations they had been met by passive resistance and the closing of many factories, so there was an unemployment problem. General Degoutte, who seemed a humane man, deplored the suffering this had occasioned among families. The responsibility, he said, lay with the German Government. If it had made an honest attempt to live up to the treaty there would have been no Ruhr occupation. As to trouble between the French soldiers and the German population, he insisted it was negligible. Indeed, he had had to issue an order against too much fraternizing between the troops and the civilians.

If we would like to conduct a personal investigation of conditions, he would be glad to provide facilities. Lieutenant Labouchere responded to his ring. The lieutenant, a handsome, agreeable young man with an Oxford accent, was a cousin of the British journalist Labouchere, familiarly known as "Labby," who long published a weekly paper in London. It was agreed that the officer would call at the hotel the next morning with a military car to take us on a tour of inspection.

When we started out Labouchere's great ambition seemed to be to make sure that we talked with as many Germans as possible. Otherwise our reports might be challenged at home as one-sided. We had a military map showing the coal mines, of which there must have been hundreds, and we drove for 30 miles through what seemed one endless city studded with the stacks of factories.

Our way lay through the Rhine Valley to Duisburg at the mouth of the Ruhr, which was about like the Kaw at Kansas City. There we crossed into Ruhrort, the largest river port in the world with 23 miles of docks. It is the center of a great system of inland waterways and in normal times handles 20,000,000 tons of freight a year. All this in barges that do not draw more than 8 feet of water. Shows what can be done with a 10-foot channel, and what might be done with a 9-foot channel in the Missouri.

We reached the Kaiserhof hotel at Essen in time for luncheon with a group of smart French engineer officers and then the lieutenant turned us loose at Krupp's to get the German side. The original plant was built around a coal mine and as it expanded the mines expanded so that on the occasion of our visit the buildings were four and a half miles long by two wide, and the company got all the coal it needed for operating with 50,000 men from under the site of the plant. Most of its ore at that time came from Sweden.

An official of Krupp's took us in charge. He spoke excellent but gloomy English. Under questioning he admitted that for a year during the period of greatest inflation the company had got its work done virtually for nothing. That is, it had paid the workers in scrip to be redeemed in currency that was almost worthless when it reached Essen. Also, as we recollect, the company had wiped out its bonded debt without expense when the gold mark, 25 cents, was worth a trillion paper marks, and the British Government was able to buy a consulate by foreclosing a large mortgage for exactly tuppence ha' penny, or 5 cents.

As we were to learn later the opportunity to beat down wages and get rid of debts was what prompted the big industrialists to bring on the inflation that was so ruinous to the middle class Germans. When the big boys had got all the profits possible out of the inflation they permitted Dr. Schacht to stop it overnight.

Taxes were next on the Krupp man's list. They were ruinous, he said. But when pressed with the figures we had been able to gather in Dusseldorf, he admitted that the government had been able to collect only nominal taxes for the 2 preceding years. So the company wasn't in real distress over taxes.

Although we didn't know it at the time, we later came to recognize all such abounding wails, which wouldn't bear investigation, as part of the German plan to organize world sympathy on the ground that the German lamb had been brutally assailed by the surrounding wolves.

Our informant was sure the French were out to ruin the Ruhr and he predicted that grass would be growing in the streets of Essen within 5 years. In the light of events it is too bad he wasn't right.

"Look at the Ruhr," he proceeded, according to our notes of the conversation. "We produced here normally every day coal enough to load a procession of trains, and there were additional hundreds of trains of raw material and finished products. It was a most complicated transportation system. We had everything worked out with electric switches and an intricate schedule for shunting cars. The French came in and disrupted it all. They have wedged the switches and sent a few trains back and forth, operating them like tram cars, and not daring to send them closer than an hour apart. This in the Ruhr where we used to run a train every minute."

Some of these details we think are still pertinent. If the efficient operation of the Ruhr district 20 years ago required the running of a train a minute, we don't see how there could have been much production in the last few months under the heavy bombing that has been constantly carried on.

Address of Maj. Gen. Archer L. Lerch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Maj. Gen. Archer L. Lerch, the Provost Marshal General, to the Forum of the Cooperative Committee, Wednesday, February 28, 1945:

On December 7, 1941, the United States took its first prisoner of war in World War No. 2—the Japanese sailor manning the baby submarine caught at Pearl Harbor. He is in the United States today, but is far from alone. As of February 15, 1945, there were 359,624 prisoners of war held in the continental limits of the United States—306,226 Germans, 50,570 Italians, 2,828 Japanese. They were held at 141 base camps and 313 branch camps, located in every State in the Union.

My purpose is to tell you what the War Department is doing with these hundreds of thousands of prisoners. I propose to tell you how we work them, how we feed them, how we guard them, and how we carry out the terms of the Geneva Convention. I shall try to make a clear presentation of the War Department's program for handling enemy prisoners of war in this country.

First, let me say that our policies in handling prisoners of war have changed greatly with experience. In 1941 and in 1942 we considered prisoners only as a security problem. They were a necessary result of warfare and were a drain on the manpower of our Army, which had to furnish guards and administrative overhead to run the camps. We locked them up tightly in barbed-wire enclosures, we posted guards around the fences, fed them, housed them—but got nothing in return for our trouble except the insignificant labor that they did within the enclosure, mostly directed toward their own housekeeping work.

They were nothing but an economic and administrative burden.

As the war progressed, however, and we got thousands of new prisoners, we began to look upon them as an untouched pool of available manpower, present in this country at a time when manpower was a desperately needed commodity. In the latter part of 1942 and early 1943 our work program began to get under way—modestly at first, to be sure, and confined almost entirely to work on Army posts. The prisoners were put to work for post engineers, building and repairing roads, doing carpentry and various forms of maintenance labor; for the post quartermaster, where they worked in the laundries and as stock clerks; for the post motor pools, where they greased, washed, repaired, and serviced nontactical vehicles.

By 1943, the manpower problem was becoming even more acute, but at the same time our prisoners were increasing in number, due to the German reverses in Africa. From June 1943 through January 1944, thousands of prisoners—former members of the Afrika Korps—were shipped to this country.

So, in this country, we found ourselves in this position—we had a manpower shortage but we had the men to help overcome that shortage—prisoners of war. We therefore inaugurated our contract labor program, which I would like to explain to you in some detail.

In effect, the program simply is this:

We told the farmers and the contractors of the Nation that they could use prisoner of war labor under two conditions:

1. That under no circumstances could prisoner labor compete with free labor;

2. That under no circumstances could one employer use prisoners at a lower wage than he would have to pay civilians because that would result in one employer being subsidized to the detriment of his neighbor.

Then we set up safeguards to insure that our two policies were carried out. To insure that prisoners do not compete with free labor, we made it mandatory that every prospective employer of prisoner of war labor first obtain certification from the local office of the War Manpower Commission that there is no free civilian labor in the community to do the type of job that he needs done.

We insured fair application for our second policy by having the same local representative of the War Manpower Commission certify the prevailing wage for that type of labor.

When those two steps have been completed, the prospective employer can come to the Army and the Army will furnish him prisoners if they are available.

Now you may wonder about the pay of prisoners. Let me assure you that the prisoners never see the money paid for their labor by the contractor. The contractor's check is deposited directly into the Treasury of the United States. The prisoners receive only the 80 cents a day proposed by this country to Germany at the beginning of the war as the pay of all prisoners of war, who work. Germany works our men and pays them 70 pfennigs a day which I am told is equivalent in purchasing power to the 80 cents that we pay their prisoners.

That's the way we set up the program. Now let's see how it's working. You'll probably be surprised to know that it has developed into a $100,000,000-a-year business. One hundred million dollars—that's the amount realized by the Government of the United States from the labor of prisoners of war during 1944. Here's how the $100,000,00 sum was realized:

Private contractors paid the Government over $22,000,000 after deducting contract allowances for transportation, housing, and subsistence. This profit to the Government was possible because of the program I have just outlined to you—because we required the employer to pay the same rate per unit of work completed that he would have paid free civilian labor had it been available but we paid the prisoners who did the work only 80 cents per man per day—80 cents in canteen coupons, incidentally. We don't give them any cash.

The War Department realized an estimated saving of over $80,000,000 from the prisoners who did work on Army posts, camps, and stations throughout the country. Prisoners working for the Army performed a total of 19,567,719 man-days of work, ranging from such highly skilled work as watch repair to common maintenance labor.

You may be interested in knowing the total man-days worked for private contractors during 1944. Altogether, the prisoners did 10,181,275 man-days of work for contract employers. The bulk of this work was in agriculture, which accounted for 5,705,909 man-days.

From one border to the other, the prisoners worked on the Nation's farms, replacing the farm labor that had gone to war or had migrated to industrial towns attracted by higher paid war jobs. In the South the prisoners picked cotton, cut sugarcane, harvested peanuts and tobacco, cut pulpwood. In the West they gathered the sugar beets and grains. In the North and East they canned fruit and vegetables and harvested many other farm crops. In two counties alone in Kentucky they were credited with saving 2,200 acres of tobacco last fall. I have a letter from the county agent of Franklin County, Ky., in which he says: "I feel sure that at least 1,200 acres of tobacco alone were saved in Franklin County, which would have been lost had we not been able to secure prisoner-of-war labor." And a letter from the president of Woodford County, Ky., Farm Bureau, in which he says: "You may be interested to know the prisoners helped to save approximately 1,000 acres of tobacco in this county."

In addition, they worked for private contractors and for Government installations.

This work program, I assure you, does not violate in any way terms of the Geneva convention.

Let's talk for a few minutes about the Geneva Convention.

The Geneva Convention, which is adhered to by the War Department, is law. I would like to emphasize that point. It was signed by the several powers on July 27, 1929, was ratified by the Senate of the United States on January 7, 1932, signed by the President on January 16, 1932, deposited with the Government of Switzerland on February 4, 1932, and proclaimed to the world by the President of the United States on August 4, 1932. That convention was ratified and proclaimed in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. Article 6 of the Constitution provides that "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land. * * *"

That treaty was made in time of peace when presumably heads were cool and presumably reason prevailed. The world generally was most critical during World War No. 1 when the German Kaiser described the treaties by which his nation was bound as "scraps of paper." It is the solemn duty of the War Department, at least until "the supreme law of the land" has been amended by authority competent to amend it, to carry out the provisions of the law.

A few pertinent provisions of the Geneva Convention are here cited:

(a) They (meaning prisoners of war) must at all times be humanely treated and protected, particularly against acts of violence, insults, and public curiosity.

(b) Prisoners of war have the right to have their person and their honor respected.

(c) The power detaining prisoners of war is bound to provide for their maintenance.

(d) Prisoners of war shall be lodged in buildings or in barracks affording all possible guaranties of hygiene and healthfulness.

(e) The food ration of prisoners of war shall be equal in quantity and quality to that of troops at base camps.

(f) Canteens shall be installed in all camps where prisoners may obtain, at the local market price, food products and ordinary objects.

(g) The use of tobacco shall be permitted.

(h) So far as possible, belligerents shall encourage intellectual diversions and sports organized by prisoners of war.

(i) Belligerents may utilize the labor of able prisoners of war, according to their rank and aptitude, officers and persons of equivalent status excepted.

(j) It is forbidden to use prisoners of war at unhealthful or dangerous work.

(k) Labor furnished by prisoners of war shall have no direct relation with war operations. It is especially prohibited to use prisoners for manufacturing and transporting arms or munitions of any kind, or for transporting material intended for combatant units.

(l) Punishments other than those provided for the same acts for soldiers of the national armies may not be imposed upon prisoners of war by the military authorities and courts of the detaining power.

(m) In no case may prisoners of war be transferred to penitentiary establishments (prisons, penitentiaries, convict prisons, etc.) there to undergo disciplinary punishment.

(n) Prisoners of war shall be subject to the laws, regulations, and orders enforced in the armies of the detaining power.

(o) Subject to the approval of the camp commander, prisoners of war are allowed to appoint their own spokesman. In officer camps the senior officer is the spokesman. The last provision is not construed to require us to maintain in the spokesman's position any individual who refuses to cooperate with the American authorities. In many cases noncooperative spokesmen have been relieved and replaced by others who were willing to cooperate.

Any deviation on our part from terms of the Geneva Convention probably would result in instant retaliation by the German Government against the thousands of American prisoners of war held by Germany.

The War Department has an abundance of evidence which leads it to believe that our treatment of German prisoners of war has had a direct effect in securing better treatment of American prisoners held by Germany. There was a recent item in the New York Times to the effect that French and Russian prisoners in Germany have been reduced to eating rats. That isn't true of Americans. Our information indicates that American prisoners receive between 1,800 and 2,000 calories of food per day from the Germans. That is the same ration fed the German soldier at base camps and it is the same that the German civilian gets. It isn't as much as the average American civilian eats. It isn't as much as the American soldier at a base camp eats. The Red Cross supplements that diet with a weekly 11-pound parcel which results in the American prisoner of war in Germany receiving 3,500 calories of food per day—which is as much as the average American civilian gets.

In an article appearing in the Washington Sunday Star on February 18, 1945, Maurice Pate, of the American Red Cross, said:

"The greatest single factor which gives us strength in getting relief and maintaining regular communication with our prisoner kin is the scrupulous attitude of the American Army in fulfilling the Treaty of Geneva toward enemy prisoners. Some have lightly called this policy of our Army mollycoddling. The truth is that the Army has maintained the highest discipline in handling enemy prisoners. It treats these men strictly but fairly and has obtained from them millions of valuable man-work hours." Also not to

be overlooked is the fact that strict adherence to the Geneva convention by the American forces has served to lower the fighting morale of the German troops.

A story in point was filed recently by Victor O. Jones correspondent for North American Newspaper Alliance from somewhere in Holland. Mr. Jones had watched in amazement as Ninth Army troops took strong fortifications around Bruchelen without resistance. Mr. Jones talked to some of the prisoners and then he wrote:

"We asked all the prisoners whether they had been afraid of mistreatment after capture. They all said their officers had told them they'd be shot or tortured, but that they hadn't believed it because they had letters from captured comrades who told them British and American treatment of prisoners was excellent.

"It may burn you up to hear that German prisoners are getting cigarettes when you can't, but it's not a big price to pay when you can get guys like these to come out of strong bunkers without firing a shot. After the Ninth Army troops took Bruchelen without resistance they were surprised by the strength of some of its fortifications. The main body of Germans had retired, but a die-hard rear guard had been left behind with instructions to fight to the last bullet. If they'd done so our casualties might have been much heavier than they were. From that point of view, our policy of living up to the Geneva Convention is smart tactics, even without considering other angles."

All individuals who have anything to do with the prisoner-of-war program have constantly in mind one dominating thought, and that is to do everything humanly possible to insure that our own people in the hands of the enemy have all of the benefits of the Geneva Convention which it is possible for us to get for them, and to insure in every way possible their early return to their homes in this country in as good physical and mental condition as is possible. To accomplish this we are ever on the alert to avoid anything which will give the enemy an excuse for failing to give to our men everything to which they are entitled or cause the enemy to do anything which would interfere in any way with their return to their homes in good physical and mental health.

The War Department believes it essential to pursue a program which will protect the Americans in enemy hands and eventually bring them safely back to the homes they have so gallantly defended. The necessity for such a policy was recognized by the House Military Affairs Committee, which, following an investigation which failed to substantiate any of the numerous coddling rumors, reported as follows:

"The provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1929 are obviously being carried out to the letter and it is well indeed that such is the case, since the slightest deviation therefrom on our part would instantly result in more than retaliatory measures on the part of our enemies against American prisoners of war in their hands. Such a contingency must not be overlooked for a single instant."

Now let's talk a little about so-called Nazi domination of the camps. A lot has been said about that, one way or the other. The public has received much misinformation on the subject. A writer for a magazine of wide circulation and splendid reputation did a story on prisoner-of-war camps which was published last fall. So far as I have been able to determine, that writer had never been in a prisoner-of-war camp, and had not talked to anyone in the Provost Marshal General's Office or in the office of the Bureau of Public Relations. Unfortunately, the article was republished in a popular magazine digest which has a circulation of several millions. The article was replete with errors and untrue statements. The War Department has always welcomed editors, publishers, and accredited writers to any camp they wish to visit. The writer in question chose to write without knowing the facts. I'd like to give you the facts.

The War Department early became aware that Nazi elements would try to dominate the camps, and early measures were adopted to cope with the situation. It has not been easy; the very nature of the problem indicates that it would not be easy.

It required painstaking intelligence work, screening and more screening to separate the good from the bad. Mistakes have been made, but they have been few considering the magnitude of the job and the difficulties under which it proceeded. Over 300,000 Germans—enough to completely populate a city the size of Jersey City, Denver, or Omaha—have poured into this country from inbound troop transports bound for prisoner-of-war camps. Some among them were Gestapo men, but they all looked alike, talked alike, and to an untrained eye, thought alike. There were eyes in the War Department, however, that were not untrained, and today the known trouble makers have been segregated. The noncooperative prisoners are in separate compounds or separate camps from the cooperative prisoners. Officers are segregated from enlisted men. No prisoner of war exercises command over any other prisoner of war.

An additional precaution has been taken. Every camp has posted on the prisoner-of-war bulletin board a notice stating that any prisoner who fears for his own safety need only report that fear to the nearest American officer or enlisted man and he will be given protection.

Now, that method of handling the prisoners is working. Altogether we have had only five murders and two forced suicides that could be attributed to Nazi methods. Those accused of the crimes have been tried. The sentences have not been officially announced. We have had none since April 1944. That's not a high record. The murder and suicide rate among German prisoners of war is lower than the rate shown by insurance statistics for the general German public in time of peace.

There has been a great deal of interest in another subject—escapes of prisoners of war. So let's discuss escapes. As of February 26—last Monday—there had been 1,354 escapes, but only 19 (13 Germans and 6 Italians) were at large on that day.[1] That figure fluctuates from day to day. All 25 prisoners from the highly publicized Papago Park escape have been recaptured.

The total number of escapes sounds large, but let's look at the reason for them. If the War Department and the American people were willing to place all prisoners of war behind barbed wire, feed them, care for them, but get nothing in return for their trouble, then I believe we could prevent practically all escapes.

The War Department, however, does not think that such a program is justified during a time of war and during a time of manpower shortage. Instead it has worked the prisoners. I have outlined that work program earlier in this article—a work program that resulted in a total of 29,750,992 man-days of work by prisoners of war during 1944 at an estimated value to the Government of $102,000,000.

Now balance that record against the escapes—"absentees" would be a better word since none of the escapes have been permanent and most have consisted simply in having a prisoner slip away from a work detail, only to be picked up a few hours later and returned to camp. A compilation of periods escaped prisoners were at large during the period from November 1942 to December 31, 1944, shows that 648 prisoners were at large 1 day or less; 148 were at large 2 days; 111 were at large 3 days; 48 were at large 4 days; 31 were at large 5 days; 116 were at large 5 to 14 days; 31 were at large 14 or more days.

[1] On March 1, 1945, the number was 12, 6 Germans and 6 Italians.

Now, even though we do send the prisoners out to work rather than keep them behind permanent walls and receive no labor from them, our escape rate is practically the same as the escape rate from Federal penitentiaries. During the year ending June 30, 1944, the Federal prisons had an average population of 15,691, from which 60 men escaped, for a rate of 0.44 percent. During a like period we had an average population of 288,292, from which there were 1,036 escapes, for a rate of 0.45 percent.

We have shot 56 prisoners who attempted to escape. Thirty-five of these died; 21 were wounded. Our guards have been taught to shoot to kill, if necessary, to prevent escape.

The threat of sabotage of escaped prisoners of war has not materialized. To date there have been no reports of sabotage or attempts to commit sabotage by escaped prisoners of war and nearly every offense committed by them can be traced to their efforts to elude capture. Of the 15 crimes reported as having been committed by escaped prisoners of war, and for which the prisoners of war were tried by courts martial, 12 involved theft of motor vehicles. The remainder were thefts of clothes, money, and other valuables obviously intended for use in furthering their escape. So much for German prisoners of war.

Finally a word about Italian Service Units, who they are and what they do.

Italian prisoners are divided into two groups. One group, largely composed of Fascists, are treated as regular prisoners of war. The other group consists of prisoners of war who have volunteered to assist our war effort. They have been formed into Italian Service Units organized along the lines of American Service Units.

The status of those Italian Service Units has often been misunderstood. There often has been confusion between regular Italian prisoners of war and members of Italian Service Units. Stories of freedom given to I. S. U.'s have been exaggerated. Here are the facts:

These men are strictly volunteers. Before they are assigned to the units they must state in writing: "I promise that I will work in behalf of the United States of America at any place on any task except actual combat, and that I will assist the United States to the best of my ability in the prosecution of its cause against the common enemy, Germany." They are then carefully examined by our military intelligence and assigned only if approved as trustworthy. If at any time they fail to carry out their work they are immediately returned to the regular prisoner-of-war status.

Though in a special status, the I. S. U. men are still prisoners of war. From the standpoint of the value we receive, the big difference is that they can be used on any task short of combat, whereas regular prisoners of war cannot be used in tasks having direct relation with war operations. Their contribution to the war effort is impressive. They have been turning in better than 1,000,000 man-days of work a month for us.

These 33,000 volunteers have been formed into 192 Italian Service Units located at 66 different stations scattered through 25 States, from Oregon to Louisiana, from California to New England, on the Canadian and Mexican borders, on the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico. They are worked in general depots, arsenals, ordnance installations, ports of embarkation, Army posts, camps, and stations. They load and unload trucks and railroad cars and ships, they crate and handle heavy equipment, they build roads, salvage and reclaim many items, they repair and process vehicles and serve as clerks, to name but a few of the many things they do. They are not permitted to work directly with or around explosives, which is about their only restriction.

For the 6-month period ending December 31, 1944, members of Italian Service Units

contributed over 6,000,000 man-days, exclusive of time lost because of sickness or other reasons. The chief of transportation utilized over 2,000,000 man-days at ports of embarkation and holding and reconsigning points where these units expedited the dispatch of war material overseas. The New York port of embarkation alone used 585,352 of these man-days during this period. The chief of ordnance used 1,364,374 man-days at ordnance depots and arsenals where units were engaged in assisting in the shipment of vital ordnance matériel to the ports of embarkation. The Quartermaster General used nearly 800,000 man-days in the preparation of supplies for shipment to the ports. The chief of engineers used over 333,000 man-days. Posts, camps, and stations used nearly 750,000 man-days devoted to repair of motor vehicles and their reconditioning and preparation for overseas shipment, salvage, and general housekeeping and maintenance.

In all instances where Italian Service Units have been used, they have supplemented American civilian labor where an acute shortage threatened to disrupt operations essential to the war effort.

Officials have declared flatly that without the services of these men their shipping schedules of critically needed matériel could not have been met, that bottlenecks could not have been overcome, and that production could not have been increased.

For all their work, they are the lowest paid class of workers in our war effort. They get $24 a month, one third of which is in cash. In many places they work a 58-hour week and, where their program calls for orientation courses, special training and drills in addition to their work, they put in 66 hours a week. At one ordnance depot, 215 I. S. U.'s raised $155 for the National War Fund out of their $8 a month in cash.

Despite all reports, their privileges are relatively few. In view of their co-belligerent status, the stigma of wearing "PW" stamped clothing is removed and they are issued United States uniforms (normally class B) with an "Italy" insignia on the left shoulder, and with plain bone buttons in place of regulation metal buttons. They are not enlisted in our Army. They are allowed to go about their work without armed guards, but under supervision. They are permitted to make visits to post exchanges, theaters, and chapels on the post, and occasional group recreational trips off military reservations under the supervision of American military personnel. If transportation is required on these trips, the men charter and pay for the bus out of their earnings. Only short trips are authorized. The War Department also permits them to be visited by friends and relatives of whom they have many in this country. Those privileges can be restricted any time the post commander considers it desirable.

The I. S. U. adds up very simply: we use the work these men do because it helps shorten the war.

While members of Italian Service Units are still prisoners of war, it must be remembered that Italy has recently received sweeping concessions from the Allies. She can now appoint and receive ambassadors and ministers to and from other nations. She has regained the right to enact her own laws and decrees without submitting them to the Allies for approval. She may appoint, without Allied approval, all but a few highly important officials. In short, as stated in a United Press dispatch from Rome on February 25, 1945, she has all but regained her complete independence. Remember this when you think of Italian service units, and when you read about certain privileges given to them which are not given to other prisoners of war.

I have mentioned the fact that the War Department has always welcomed editors, publishers, and accredited writers to any camp they wish to visit. To those who are working on special stories which may touch upon parts of the prisoner-of-war program which for policy reasons have not been publicized, off-the-record conferences have been granted for the purpose of insuring the accuracy of the story and protecting the program. In spite of this, the War Department has been constantly subjected to what appears to be, in some cases, deliberate harassment, and in many, many cases, well-meant, but ill-founded criticism. The activities of radio commentators and writers have resulted in thousands of letters from persons all over the country. It is the policy of the War Department to answer each of these letters individually and carefully. We believe that anyone who takes the time to write a letter with reference to prisoners of war is entitled to a careful reply. Preparation of those replies requires thousands of much-needed man-hours. We are glad to answer those letters. That is part of our job. If we have any complaint, it is against those who are in a position to tell the truth to the public but who, failing to avail themselves of opportunities to check their information for accuracy, encourage the writing of letters based on inaccurate information which they have given. A recent example is a story which received Nation-wide publicity to the effect that the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot was manufacturing 200,000 pairs of pajamas for German prisoners of war. That story brought in some 125 letters, each of which required an explanation to the effect that the 200,000 pairs of pajamas were being made, not for German prisoners of war, but for our own people in the hands of the Germans.

In view of the fact that any minor incident relating to prisoners of war appears to have great news value, you may well expect in the future, as in the past, to hear and read of incidents involving mishandling of prisoners of war. When you hear them or read them I trust that you will consider that there are some twenty or thirty thousand American officers and soldiers handling some 350,000 prisoners of war. No matter how well intentioned or how industrious each of the American officers and soldiers may be, sometime, somewhere some of them are certain to make mistakes. All I can ask of you is that you do not permit the relation of a few of the incidents to convince you of the instability of the whole program.

There is evidence to indicate that some of the unfortunate incidents, such as the recent case of the hand-painted Nazi rag-flag at Papago Park, have been the direct result of prisoners' desire to obtain unfavorable publicity for their captors. If so, they have found plenty of encouragement among a few writers and commentators who have failed to check the accuracy of their stories prior to publication.

The War Department realizes that the handling of over a third of a million enemy soldiers and the obtaining of the maximum return from their labor is a tremendous job, but we feel it is not alone a War Department job—it is the Nation's job. It is your job as well as mine. It is well, therefore, that we counsel together, frankly, openly, and understandingly, to the end that the job may be well done.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a resolution passed by the New Jersey State Legislative Board of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen sent to me by Mr. John Kortes, legislative representative:

Whereas the development of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project will divert men and materials from the defense and other industrial plants where they are most urgently needed at present, and will be in the future as a post-war readjustment measure; and

Whereas the development of the proposed waterway cannot be considered as a post-war or national defense measure because our men will return and find their jobs gone and even under the most optimistic circumstances as a defense measure, it would take until the late sixties of this century to complete if started now; and

Whereas the development of this waterway would divert port tonnage from the existing railway and terminal facilities on the Atlantic Seaboard and add a destructive element of competition to the existing railroads and industrial terminal facilities on this Atlantic Seaboard, which have been developed out of private funds and the sweat and blood of those of us who are here and now employed, together with those who have left to fight for our country, this was built and organized to serve the existing and adequate shipping and industrial terminals, thereby effecting seriously the eastern seaboard and depriving these workers of a livelihood in those States; and

Whereas, the desirability of the waterway as a transportation facility is open to serious question, enough to warrant defeat of this measure, because the waterway could be used only 7 months of the year, and expenditure of large sums of public money for the creation of a new part-time facility to serve a limited area of the country is an economically unsound use of public funds; and

Whereas the United States, under the agreement with Canada, is called upon to bear a disproportionate share of the costs, while advantages which might ensue would largely benefit Canada; and

Whereas the United States through the waterway would involve another risk of attack, which fact will require a still further expenditure for the protection of our shores from the north, which we believe would require a new treaty to be written between these two nations; Therefore be it

Resolved, also by the Members entrusted with this most vital legislation effecting the eastern seaboard that a vote of "Nay" be entered for them on the proposed St. Lawrence waterway bill, H. R. 671.

Philadelphia Should Be Designated as Permanent Home of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we stand upon the threshold of great events. There is none more important than the conference to be held at San Francisco, Calif., opening April 25, 1945.

At this conference 39 nations of the world will gather to create a pact to make secure the future peace of the world.

If such an agreement is to prove successful, in the years ahead, it must recognize and establish those principles of liberty, freedom, and democracy that were first enunciated at Philadelphia, Pa., as the foundation of this great Nation.

In view of this no city in all the world could more appropriately be designated as the permanent home of the United Nations.

In this connection I desire to call attention to a well-considered and forceful editorial appearing March 5, 1945, in the Philadelphia Record, of which J. David Stern is publisher, reading as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, HOME OF UNITED NATIONS

The City of Brotherly Love should be the permanent home of the United Nations.

Independence Hall, recognized throughout the world as the birthplace of political liberty and democracy, is the shrine around which the United Nations Council buildings should be grouped.

Modern air travel neutralizes geographic position. Since all parts of the world are within 60 hours of each other, we need no longer choose a location because of travel convenience.

Freed from space consideration, this modern world can give due weight to spiritual values.

Philadelphia, more than any other city in the world, embodies those spiritual values which would inspire and strengthen the United Nations Council.

Its very name is an inspiration as are the ideals of its founder, William Penn, a pioneer in liberalism and tolerance. Its most illustrious statesman, Benjamin Franklin, was America's first "Citizen of the world," who was almost as familiar a figure in Paris and London as on Chestnut Street.

Because we live so close to Independence Hall, we may not fully appreciate its significance to the rest of the world. In this building was formulated the most effective Constitution in the history of the world, as well as the principles of national freedom and individual rights. These must be the fundamentals of an organization designed to preserve world peace.

It is most fortunate that this building is so beautiful from an architectural standpoint. Its fine proportions and quiet dignity have impressed the thousands of pilgrims from all parts of the globe who have visited the New World's shrine of liberty.

It is easy to visualize Independence Hall as the center of a group of buildings designed to house a world organization. Already the Independence Hall Association has planned and advocated removing all buildings in front of Independence Hall between Fifth and Sixth and extending a great mall northward to the Delaware River Bridge Plaza.

Enlarging this project somewhat, plenty of room would be provided for the United Nations establishment in a section of the city which is largely obsolescent. From a mere materialistic standpoint, Philadelphia could well afford to donate all necessary land for such a development as well as to extend broad and convenient boulevards to appropriate airfields and seaplane bases.

Just as when distinguished company is coming for dinner, the home is spruced up so Philadelphia would be awakened from its lethargy to clean up its rivers and streets, remove the Chinese wall, beautify the approaches to the city and improve other areas which we have allowed to deteriorate.

There are many reasons why the United Nations should not move into the buildings of the League of Nations in Geneva. Not only would such a connection with a dismal failure in world relations be a bad beginning, but Europe, storm center of the world, is not the logical place for the peace center of a new world.

We believe the peoples of this earth have greater confidence in America's strict adherence to its professed ideals and principles than they have in any other country. The pessimists see the greatest danger to future peace in the rivalry of Great Britain and Russia for dominance in Europe. While in past ages the high mountains of Switzerland immunized it from European conflict, the development of the airplane has leveled those mountains so that today, politically speaking, Switzerland is in the center of a dangerous plateau.

This reasoning would appeal not only to France and smaller European countries, but to the peoples of Asia, Australia, and Africa. The only objection might come from South American republics, some of which are still jealous of their great northern neighbor.

Thanks to the inspired leadership of President Roosevelt, this Nation has won a dominant position in world affairs. Its generous treatment of its allies entitles it to prime consideration in choosing a location for world headquarters.

The greatest democracy in world history, it has developed an enlightened attitude towards smaller nations as evidenced by granting independence to the Philippines and its good-neighbor policy in South America.

Therefore, it is most fitting that the home of the United Nations should be within our borders. It is most fitting that the men and women who administer the world organization should gain daily inspiration from the shrine where the ideals of modern government were born. It is peculiarly appropriate that the organization dedicated to world peace should make its home in this great city whose founder dedicated it by name to the highest ethical concept—the universal brotherhood of man.

The RECORD calls upon the good citizens of Philadelphia to take immediate steps to present the claim of Philadelphia to its just heritage.

Copies of this editorial are being sent to the appropriate officials, including the mayor of Philadelphia, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, our Representatives in the United States Senate and House of Representatives, as well as to the President of the United States.

What Industry Wants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRITZ G. LANHAM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. LANHAM. In accordance with permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I am inserting for the information of the Congress an editorial entitled "What Industry Wants," which appeared recently in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram and several other papers:

WHAT INDUSTRY WANTS

James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, in an address to the Alabama State State Chamber of Commerce in Birmingham, expressed great faith in the future industrial development of the South, and at the same time threw out a suggestion which, if heeded, might materially speed that development. He pointed out that the constitutions, laws, and tax systems of the Southern States have been built through the years to fit the needs of an agricultural community where the dependence for the great bulk of revenue is upon ad valorem taxes. While not posing as either a tax expert or a lawyer, he called attention to the fact that there may be in some of these States laws that bar their industrialization. There is food for thought in the suggestion which local and regional chambers of commerce would do well to consider carefully.

Mr. Farley, whose wide acquaintance with businessmen and political figures throughout the country has put him in position to know whereof he speaks, said that what investors first look for in seeking locale for an operation is stability and fair laws which are fairly administered. "No man," he said, "can afford to invest funds in an area that lacks staunchness, continuity, and philosophy in government. Constant change, new panaceas, and wild thetories in government frighten investment away. Take stock of your situation; eliminate unfair and arbitrary barriers, and induce business to come."

That sounds like plain, down-to-earth common sense, as was his admonition that the South "make no effort to buy business." He deprecated the practice of giving free sites to industries, years of tax exemption, special concessions, and such things as an inducement to locate in a given place. Mr. Farley undoubtedly is correct when he says that legitimate business does not ask and would not have such baubles, and the business that does demand them is worth looking into.

Drafting of Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the policy which is now being so aggressively followed by the President, General Hershey, and many of the local draft boards, of taking into the military forces the young, the experienced, technically trained, and mechanically qualified farmers of this country, is such a live issue, and the present apparent shortage of foodstuffs and the need for increased production as announced by the War Food Administrator prompts me to place in the RECORD the constructive letter which is written by an important farmer who resides in my district, Mr. Walter Nobis, of Fowler, Mich.

The letter follows:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

FOWLER, MICH., *February 11, 1945.*

DEAR EDITOR: People don't understand. I have lived all my life on the farm. Someone must tell the people what us farmers really do to keep life in the human body. So I will try to explain the best I can.

Where does the medicine come from which is healing thousands of wounded soldiers, besides all the other people here on earth? Peppermint oil comes from the farm as well as other oils and ingredients of salves; all gauze which is used to wrap wounds comes from the farm.

The shoes which you are wearing today come from some farm animal's hide. The clothing you and I are wearing today comes from some farm. All the food that you and I live on is a product of the farm. Your automobile, the gas and oil, the fabric in the cushions, the steel in its body, the tires on its wheels are all farm products. The radio you are listening to is a farm product. Yes, the table and all your furniture comes from some trees grown on some farm. Your cooking ware, your rugs, carpets, linoleum, all come from the farm.

The house you are living in; all the material such as lumber, cement, bricks, plaster, paper, paint, and varnish come from the farm. The tents that our soldiers are living in, their shoes, and all their clothing are farm products. The gas you cook with and the pipes that carry it through to your stove all come from the farm. The wire that brings you electricity and the dynamos that make the electricity are made from farm products.

Some of the city folks think they could get along without the farmers. The paper you are reading now or perhaps you have been reading God's Book, the Bible—this paper and the ink used in printing on it are farm products. If you are a smoker the tobacco and also the paper in your cigarette or cigar are products of the farm.

I could write much more about the farm. Only 16 percent of the population of the United States are farmers. In peacetime as well as war we have produced for our country. We have produced much food and clothing for lend-lease as well as for our soldiers and civilian population.

We want you people in the cities to have what you want to eat. You are entitled to have a living, but our President has ordered Hershey to take the farmers from the farm and the draft boards are doing it now. We farmers have pleaded with our draft boards. We have asked our Government time and time again to leave us enough help so we can give you what you need. We have been turned down. Our President says farming isn't essential.

Food is getting scarce. When you go to your grocery now and ask for some certain food and the grocer says he is out—well, that is already bad. But when you come direct to the farmer as many of you city people are already doing, or to the country grocery store, and find that they haven't got what you want—and this is already happening—I warn you, it will get worse. But I ask you not to get mad at us farmers. Put the blame where it rightly belongs. We farmers want you to have what you want and when you want it.

We farmers are not organized and maybe it is God's will that we don't organize. Sometimes a large organization makes wrong decisions which benefit but a few and drag all the other members down instead of up. Maybe this would happen if we farmers were organized and our leader would call a strike. You people in the city would suffer.

No, we farmers don't want to strike. We want to feed you the best we know how.

Have you ever given it a thought that we farmers are supplying the finished product which is so essential to your life and also most of the raw materials which you work into a finished product. This is what gives you a job and pays you money so you can buy the food we farmers are so glad to produce for you.

Don't damn us farmers if you can't get what you want to eat. But pray to your God to give us men that will leave us help on the farm so we can produce.

We know that all are not farmers. We also know that all are not machinists. Everyone at his or her place. Too many lifetime farmers have already been taken from the farms. I pray to my God to put fear in the heart of the man who places his hand on the Bible and swears his allegiance to God and country. This is too many times done, but soon forgotten. But, remember, God does not forget.

WALTER NOBIS.

Lend-Leasing of Post-War Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the United States News:

LEND-LEASING OF POST-WAR AID—INDUSTRIAL ASSISTANCE TO FRANCE AS PATTERN OF NEW UNITED STATES POLICY

THIRTY-YEAR PAYMENT PERIOD, WITH LOW INTEREST RATES, TO SPEED ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Lend-lease for war, amounting to date to more than $38,000,000,000, now is put to its first use as a means of post-war financing for America's Allies. The starting amount—$900,000,000 to France—is modest, but may be accepted as a symbol of more to come.

Russia is reported to be interested in negotiating about $6,000,000,000 of post-war loans on a lend-lease basis. Britain may want a substantial amount if other countries find that this means of financing is satisfactory. China, too, will be in the market and there may be others.

Use of lend-lease as a lending agency accomplishes a number of purposes. For one thing, it skirts the Johnson Act, which now bars loans to nations in default on their debts to the United States. France could not obtain a loan except through lend-lease until repeal of the Johnson Act. The same is true of Britain and Russia. For another thing, lend-lease terms can be lenient. The French are to be given 30 years to pay for their lend-lease goods at 2⅜ percent interest.

At the same time restrictions are being imposed. Goods involved in any lend-lease agreements must be delivered by July 1, 1948, unless Congress extends the act. Deliveries also must be related to defense—at least indirectly. Shipments cannot include luxuries, such as household vacuum cleaners or passenger cars.

An issue about lend-lease is being raised as a result of these developments. Lend-lease began as a device to remove the dollar sign from munitions shipments. Goods were shipped according to need. Settlements were deferred. All shipments were designed to bolster the fighting power of allies. That was and is the war phase of lend-lease.

However, the Lend-Lease Act contains section 3–c, which has escaped general attention, although the section has been described in detail in the United States News. This section permits post-war deals to be made if they are negotiated before July 1, 1945, and provide for deliveries before July 1, 1948. Now the Administration is asking for an extension of the act and of section 3–c as well.

That would enable the Administration to ship vast quantities of tools and machines and supplies for post-war rebuilding for as long as 3 years after the end of the war with Japan. The type and volume of shipments could be determined by the President. The Lend-Lease Administration still has almost $30,000,000,000 which could be used for this purpose.

Opposition to post-war use of lend-lease already is developing among Republicans in Congress. Closed hearings are being held by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and Representative VORYS (Republican), of Ohio, heads a group now trying to impose a flat ban against using lend-lease for post-war purposes. The group also wants to eliminate section 3–c from the act.

The French agreement—the first to be reached under section 3–c—is expected to point up the present examination of the lend-lease program.

What the French get, actually, is equipment and supplies to restore their war-battered industry. The $900,000,000 worth of heavy equipment will go far toward repairing and rebuilding the French transportation system. It includes locomotives, freight cars, merchant ships, harbor craft, barges, and a fishing fleet. Also, the agreement provides for metal-working machinery, mining machinery, and tools to rebuild the French armaments industry. These can be bought for a 20-percent down payment and annual installments for 30 years at 2⅜ percent interest.

Another $1,675,000,000 is promised in industrial supplies. About half of this is to be cotton cloth to stock the textile industry, steel, and other metals, chemicals, synthetic rubber, drugs, and medical supplies. Food for war workers, gasoline and oil, hand tools, trucks, and other short-lived equipment, as well as the shipping required for delivery, also are provided. If these supplies are not used for war production, they can be bought on the same terms as the heavier goods.

A new Russian agreement now is being negotiated along lines of the deal made with France. Russia is in the market for vast quantities of machinery and supplies to speed the industrialization of the country. The figure often reported—$6,000,000,000—amounts to almost as much lend-lease, including purely military supplies, as the Soviet Government has received during the war. In other words, Russia seeks easy terms for as much peacetime equipment as has been delivered in war equipment.

The type of material Russia wants is indicated from deliveries already made. These include $890,000,000 worth of machine tools for Russian war plants, thousands of locomotives and railroad cars, 487,000 tons of railroad rails, 2,120,000 tons of steel, and 733,000 tons of other metals. After the war, Russia will need power plants, telephone, telegraph and radio equipment, as well as industrial machinery and supplies.

Ownership of tools and equipment delivered under Lend-Lease remains with the United States Government. The French agreement is a sign, however, that deals will be made to transfer title to Allied governments after the war. Some machine tools already have been sold to Britain, and section 3–c could be used for more deliveries. The British, for example, must build 450,000 new houses quickly and now are getting 30,000 prefabricated houses under Lend-Lease. They also want to modernize coal mines, textile mills and other plants, which could be interpreted as being as important against Japan as French industry now is against Germany. Under the same reasoning, China's needs would be larger.

The French agreement thus is a clue that the Administration plans to use its Lend-Lease authority as a pump-priming device to maintain United States exports until other arrangements can be worked out.

Jersey Earthquake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein a release issued by the New Jersey Taxpayers Association entitled "Jersey Earthquake."

This has to do with the proposed construction of a deep-water canal across the State of New Jersey to accommodate sea-going ships. The cost is estimated to be in the neighborhood of $200,000,000, and practically every civic body in the State from the Governor and the State legislature down has protested against its construction.

One aspect which is of great concern in this proposal is that it would seriously jeopardize the potable water supply of the entire northerly part of the State, thereby affecting industries large and small, to say nothing of the homes located in cities, as well as in the country.

JERSEY EARTHQUAKE

Keep the salt water out of that family tea kettle! This is not idle advice, but a warning on what may happen if efforts to rejuvenate the dormant New Jersey ship canal project prove successful.

How can sea water get into that tea kettle? The digging of the ship canal would cut like an earthquake across the waist of the State at its narrowest width, drain off many wells supplying farms and communities in the area and let in salt water from the sea to mix with the fresh water in the locks.

The seepage of sea water into Jersey's drinking water supply would be only a foretaste, as it were, of the many other penalties that the State would suffer by the digging of the ship canal. At least 15 square miles of rich, income-producing farmland in Somerset and Hunterdon Counties would be inundated and several village communities wiped out by the construction of a gigantic reservoir needed in the project. Across State, the canal would cut three main trunk railroad lines and 29 public highways. To knit the rupture of these traffic lanes, the State would be compelled to build high-level bridges across the canal at 15 crossings. Add to this schedule of dollar miseries stored up for the Garden State, an annual loss of more than $1,500,000 in local tax ratables and over $1,000,000 in farm products, and the full implications of a trans-State ship canal begin to emerge.

For over 30 years the Army turned thumbs down on this canal project as impractical, unnecessary, and excessive in cost for the benefits claimed for it. But in 1942 the Army approved the project and a $199,000,000 canal construction bill was introduced in the House by Representative Sutphin, of New Jersey. The New Jersey Legislature memorialized Congress to defeat the project and the Sutphin bill died in the House. Within recent weeks, somebody has applied the pulmotor to this old horse and the ancient animal is trying to get up on his legs again.

In a timely warning, the New Jersey Taxpayers Association declares that "the Nation can ill afford an outlay of between two hundred and three hundred million dollars for this project whose usefulness is open to doubt," and adds: "Nor is the State of New Jersey in a position to bear the huge expenditure of public funds which the project would entail."

This man-made earthquake across the good lands of New Jersey would rock the taxpayers from Sussex to Cape May.

Little Preference To Be Shown Veterans and Farmers in Disposition of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Robert A. Hurley of the Surplus Property Board.

I am disappointed to learn that veterans and farmers will receive no appreciable preference in the disposition of surplus property. It is my purpose to endeavor to obtain for veterans and farmers a meaningful preference. I feel the membership of the Congress intended that veterans and farmers receive a worthwhile preference when the Surplus Property Act was passed.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1945.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letters of February 8 and 12, inquiring about the preference to be accorded to farmers and veterans in the purchase of surplus property.

While there is still some disagreement about provisions of the Surplus Property Act, our lawyers are of the opinion that there is no way under the act that any price preference can be extended to veterans or farmers. Their preference exists in an opportunity to buy before the property is offered for sale to others except to Federal, State, and local governments and nonprofit institutions, which have a higher priority under the law.

As you know, further provisions of the act limit the preference to veterans to assistance in the establishment and maintenance of their own small business, professional, or agricultural enterprise. Section 17 provides in addition that farmers and farmer cooperative associations shall have surplus property offered in such quantities in rural areas and in such manner that they will have equal opportunity with others to purchase surplus property. We are now working on regulations to be issued by the Surplus Property Board which will so far as possible fulfill all of these priorities. You will recognize, however, that we can go only so far in our rules as the disposal agencies which actually sell the property are equipped with personnel and money to conduct such operations. The more we try to sell to individuals, the more expensive the operations become and the more difficulty we have under present manpower shortages in securing competent personnel.

I want to assure you that all of us are acutely conscious of the problem you raise and we will do everything in our power to find a satisfactory solution in accordance with the spirit of the act.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. HURLEY,
Surplus Property Board.

Federal Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE B. BATES

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

FEDERAL LOANS

The President deserves warm congratulations on his choice of Judge Fred Vinson, one of the Nation's ablest and most seasoned public servants, to fill the office of Federal Loan Administrator. The office is one which has tremendous implications for our postwar economy. The powers inherent in it, and the very broad uses to which they can be put, were recognized by both the proponents and opponents of the George bill through which Congress recently divorced the Government's several lending agencies from the Department of Commerce. Wisely and effectively administered, these agencies can prove a potent force in the promotion of full production and employment.

Judge Vinson is, from every point of view, the logical choice for the post. As Director of Economic Stabilization, he has won the respect even of those upon whom he found it necessary to impose the curbs his office was established to administer. He has displayed strength, poise and judgment in dealing with the powerful forces which, left unrestrained, would have wholly disrupted the stabilization program. He has had broad experience with the country's economic needs and problems and has shown imagination and insight in his approach to them. He will bring to his new assignment a practical outlook not limited to conventional banking concepts and at the same time the kind of vision that is rooted in realism.

Judge Vinson will take over the lending agencies in what is essentially a time of transition. Their war activities are now nearing completion. They must begin planning for the tasks of reconversion and postwar expansion. It is a good time, therefore, to make a thoroughgoing study of the war activities engaged in by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Defense Plant Corporation, the Metal Reserve Company, the Rubber Reserve Company and the other quasi-independent corporate bodies under Jesse Jones' stewardship. Judge Vinson should be enabled to assume his responsibilities without any embarrassments hanging over from the past. In justice to himself as well as to the American public, he should insist upon a searching investigation of these agencies by the Comptroller General.

The R. F. C. was empowered to make loans to any business enterprise when capital or credit, at prevailing rates for the character of the loan applied for, were not otherwise available. This is a power which can serve greatly to foster new undertakings and,

through expanding competition, to keep the free enterprise system genuinely free. But it will advance this purpose only if its lending functions are energetically, yet discriminatingly, applied. Credit is like some drugs. In the hands of those who know its powers but also its dangers, it is helpful and healing. With misuse, with carelessness, with habitual indulgence to excess, it can become demoralizing, disintegrating and destructive. Judge Vinson, we believe, has the will to use Government credit effectively for the common welfare and the judgment to use it wisely.

The Royalty Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star:

THE ROYALTY ISSUE

There is doubt in the minds of some that John L. Lewis is wholly serious in his attempt to levy what is in effect a private tax of 10 cents on each ton of coal mined, the proceeds to be paid into a union fund which unquestionably would be controlled by him. Mr. Lewis seems to be serious enough. He has served notice that the coal operators must accede the miners the right to live—which in his estimation means yielding to his demands. "If you don't accede it," he says, "we will take it anyhow." Furthermore, Mr. Lewis has a perfectly valid precedent in the Government's weak surrender to James C. Petrillo, head of the American Federation of Musicians, who demanded and secured the right to levy a union tax on the manufacture of phonograph records. If the consuming public can be taxed for the benefit of the musicians, Mr. Lewis might ask, why cannot the consumers be taxed for the benefit of the miners?

Events will show whether the mine union head intends to make a fight on this point. But the fact that he has made the demand, coupled with Mr. Petrillo's earlier success in the same field, should be sufficient to impress anyone with the seriousness of the issue which has been raised.

There is a distinction to be made between the Lewis methods and his stated objectives. Mr. Lewis says that the $60,000,000 a year which would be raised by the 10-cent royalty would be used to provide the miners with such things as medical service, hospitalization, and health insurance, and for their economic protection. That the miners, not to mention millions of other workers, need better health facilities is hardly debatable. And they will get them, in one way or another. But it does not follow that the public should submit to a private tax by Mr. Lewis to that end.

His inclusion of the economic protection objective raises immediate doubts. That could mean anything he wanted it to mean, including, in peacetime, political contributions. But this is an issue which goes deeper than doubt as to the validity of one of Mr. Lewis' objectives. It involves a principle of primary importance.

If a union has the right to levy a private tax for a desirable purpose, it has the right to levy a tax for any purpose not specifically forbidden by law. And, except in wartime, the law puts virtually no restraint on unions in this respect. Furthermore, if it is right to levy a 10-cent tax on the production of a ton of coal, what assurance is there that the tax will not be boosted to a dollar a few years hence? And if it is right for unions to tax the production or sale of coal and phonograph records, there is not the slightest reason why they should not levy similar taxes on the production of automobiles or washing machines or clothing or even a loaf of bread.

Since these taxes ultimately would be paid to the unions by the consuming public, and since the public would have no effective control over the union officials levying the taxes, it seems obvious that a serious question of public policy is involved. In that sense, this is not a dispute between Mr. Lewis and the coal operators, but rather a dispute to which the consumers of every union-made product are actual or potential parties.

National Board of Rural Letter Carriers Association—Comments on H. R. 2071

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the National Rural Letter Carrier:

H. R. 2071

We are all much interested at this time in H. R. 2071, the bill which would reclassify the salaries of postal employees.

Your national board members, while in session here in Washington, have spent much time studying this legislation and discussing it with Members of Congress. As we have said before, the bill as introduced is not considered "perfect" so far as rural carriers are concerned. However, we are requesting that some changes be made in the legislation before it is taken up in the House for consideration there.

Certainly, from a broad, over-all viewpoint, this legislation is such that it well merits the support of the Congress and of the public in general. It can "stand on its own feet" in most respects, and we cannot help but feel that when the proper time comes the Members of Congress will be willing to give it favorable consideration.

When the so-called $400 bill was up in the Seventy-eighth Congress it was very evident that the general public throughout the country is convinced that postal employees need and deserve an increase in pay. When the general public lets its sentiments be so well known as was the case during the Seventy-eighth Congress there must be merit involved.

The postal employees have carried on in spite of additional work, increased living costs, and many other handicaps resulting from present-day conditions. Theirs is a service to the people of America, and wartime conditions haven't stopped that service. The postal employee deals in a commodity which cannot be weighed in pounds or sold on a dollar-and-cents basis. He deals in service to the American public, and we do not believe that at this time the American public and the Members of Congress will fail to recognize this fact.

Federal Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Judge Fred M. Vinson by the President to the important office of Federal Loan Administrator to succeed the Hon. Jesse Jones has met with the hearty approval, I am sure, of all Members of both Houses of Congress who personally know the distinguished jurist.

Fred Vinson has made good on every job he has ever tackled and there is no question but that he will do so again in this, his latest and most important field of endeavor.

Under the leave granted me I am including as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in today's Washington Post, one of the Nation's widely read and influential daily newspapers. The editorial in question follows:

FEDERAL LOANS

The President deserves warm congratulations on his choice of Judge Fred Vinson, one of the Nation's ablest and most seasoned public servants, to fill the office of Federal Loan Administrator. The office is one which has tremendous implications for our postwar economy. The powers inherent in it, and the very broad uses to which they can be put, were recognized by both the proponents and opponents of the George bill, through which Congress recently divorced the Government's several lending agencies from the Department of Commerce. Wisely and effectively administered, these agencies can prove a potent force in the promotion of full protection and employment.

Judge Vinson is, from every point of view, the logical choice for the post. As Director of Economic Stabilization, he has won the respect even of those upon whom he found it necessary to impose the curbs his office was established to administer. He has displayed strength, poise, and judgment in dealing with the powerful forces which, left unrestrained, would have wholly disrupted the stabilization program. He has had broad experience with the country's economic needs and problems and has shown imagination and insight in his approach to them. He will bring to his new assignment a practical outlook not limited to conventional banking concepts and at the same time the kind of vision that is rooted in realism.

Judge Vinson will take over the lending agencies in what is essentially a time of transition. Their war activities are now nearing completion. They must begin planning for the tasks of reconversion and post-war expansion. It is a good time, therefore, to make a thoroughgoing study of the war activities engaged in by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Defense Plant Corporation, the Metals Reserve Company, the Rubber Reserve Company and the other quasi independent corporate bodies under Jesse Jones' stewardship. Judge Vinson should be enabled to assume his responsibilities without any embarrassments hanging over from the past. In justice to himself as well as to the American public, he should insist upon a searcing investigation of these agencies by the Comptroller General.

The R. F. C. was empowered to make loans to any business enterprise when capital or

credit, at prevailing rates for the character of the loan applied for, were not otherwise available. This is a power which can serve greatly to foster new undertakings and, through expanding competition, to keep the free enterprise system genuinely free. But it will advance this purpose only if its lending functions are energetically, yet discriminatingly, applied. Credit is like some drugs. In the hands of those who know its powers but also its dangers, it is helpful and healing. With misuse, with carelessness, with habitual indulgence to excess, it can become demoralizing, disintegrating, and destructive. Judge Vinson, we believe, has the will to use Government credit effectively for the common welfare and the judgment to use it wisely.

The Price of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement to the press by Senator SCRUGHAM of Nevada, and an article from the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner:

Senator JAMES G. SCRUGHAM, Democrat, of Nevada, coauthor with Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, Democrat, of Arizona, of a bill to increase the price of gold to $56 per ounce instead of reducing the gold reserve to 25 percent, today took sharp issue with W. Randolph Burgess, president of the American Bankers Association, on the latter's statement that increasing the price of gold would be more inflationary than decreasing the gold reserve.

The Nevada Senator said that judging from statements by Gov. Marriner Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board and Burgess' statement yesterday before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, inflation already has occurred and this appears to be an attempt to adjust the gold reserve to permit still greater expansion of the currency.

"Mr. Burgess," commented Senator SCRUGHAM, "stated that he is a hard-money man. Yet he is deliberately playing into the hands of the managed currency clique by committing himself to the principle of shrinking the gold backing behind Federal Reserve notes. This seems to me completely illogical. I do not believe that increasing the price of gold is one whit more inflationary than gradually traveling down the path to a 100 percent managed currency.

"When the price of gold last was raised no dire consequences resulted. This was carried out by the Government at the recommendation of Professor Warren, an outstanding economist. Now that a similar recommendation has been made by Members of Congress it is declared to be all wrong.

"There obviously is no more danger to war bond holders in a $56 price than in reducing the reserves proportionately. As a matter of fact, the value of gold should increase as world trade expands to form a solid foundation for that trade and to maintain the confidence of the people. Obviously, if currency expansion has reached the point testified to by Eccles and Burgess we must have more gold and at a higher price in order to support it. It was not long ago that we heard complaints about having too much gold—now apparently we have too little and have to spread it thin. Let us stop being inconsistent and go forward with orthodox banking with plenty of metallic reserves."

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of March 1, 1945]

ADVANTAGES IN GOLD PRICE BOOST POINTED BY BANKER

(By Carl S. Kelty)

Proposal to increase the United States buying price for gold to $56 an ounce from the current $35 already has touched off a wave of discussion pro and con. The program was advanced formally by introduction of a bill in the United States Senate by Senators SCRUGHAM (Democrat), Nevada, and MCFARLAND (Democrat), Arizona.

Certain advantages which would accrue to the national economy from the proposed boost in the price of gold were pointed out in Los Angeles by Victor H. Rossetti, leading banker. Mr. Rossetti is longtime president of the Los Angeles Clearing House Association and president of the Farmers' and Merchants' National Bank. (He himself always places his bank presidency first.)

The program was advanced by the Senators as an alternative to legislation permitting reduction of the gold reserve coverage to 25 percent of Federal Reserve System obligations.

Mr. Rossetti did not comment himself definitely in favor of the plan offered by the Senators, but suggested the primary importance of maintaining a metallic basis for the country's currency and credit structure. He said if the price of gold were fixed by international agreement the fact would tend to create confidence in currencies everywhere, serving as a sustaining influence in our world economy.

The United States Treasury statement issued yesterday in Washington showed total holdings of monetary gold amounted to $20,506,144,592 on February 26. An advance in the price of gold from $35 to $56 would equal 60 percent, and applied to the Treasury's gold assets would increase their value by $12,308,682,355.

Mr. Rossetti commented that the United States contribution to the proposed world bank might be taken from the "profit" arising from his mark-up. He said he favored the bank as planned at the Bretton Woods Conference, but was still on the fence respecting the international fund.

He pointed to the latest issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin showing gold assets on November 30 last were represented by $18,581,000,000 Treasury gold certificates, $1,800,000,000 in the exchange stabilization fund, $143,936,342 balance of increment arising from reduction in the weight of the gold dollar, and $156,039,431 held as a reserve against United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

The bank president emphasized that he felt a metallic media base nonvariable in value character was essential to a stable currency and credit structure upon which the national economy rests.

"Admittedly gold is the monarch of our economy, otherwise why the present gold reserve requirement of 40 percent against our outstanding Federal Reserve notes and 35 percent against deposits" he asked, "with reduction of such percentages to an over-all 25 percent being now proposed.

"Also, capital of the proposed International Bank is to be gold holdings of the subscribing nations.

"No one man has the solution," he commented, "but in the light of discussion the answer will be found."

An additional advantage which might be expected to follow an increase in the price of gold, Mr. Rossetti said, would be to stimulate employment in gold mining and the purchase of mining machinery and equipment.

"If the proposed increase in price would incite overproduction, as contended by some," he continued, "increased labor and material costs would tend to restrain that trend, and if needs be, an excise tax could be imposed, with increment accruing to the Government of the producing nation."

This country has been losing gold to our Latin-American neighbors as the result of our purchases of commodities at greatly inflated prices, he observed. Would there not be some justification, he asked, for paying for such imports in gold at an appreciated value?

Stop Appeasing Franco Fascist Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 16, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include hereinbelow self-explanatory newspaper articles discussing Franco Fascist Spain, careful reading of which I urge upon my colleagues:

[From the Columbia (S. C.) Daily Record]

COMMON SENSE IN DIPLOMACY

The Government of Guatemala has severed diplomatic relations with the Franco Government in Spain.

The Franco regime, the Guatemalans set out, is "of a totalitarian type whose ideology and procedure are repugnant to the principles of the Guatemalan revolution and the postulates of a democracy. The Spanish Falange constitutes a reactionary focus whose maneuvers represent a risk for continental security and perturb the tranquillity and peace of the Guatemalan Republic."

These charges are, of course, true. They have been true ever since Franco came to power in Spain with the help of Mussolini and Hitler. They apply with equal force to every republic in the Western Hemisphere which subscribes to democratic institutions.

And, therefore, Guatemala's downright and straightforward action is perhaps even a little embarrassing to the United States, the sponsor of the Monroe Doctrine, which still maintains amicable relations with the Franco regime. The trouble with Guatemala is that it is trying to apply common sense to diplomacy.

[From the Chicago Sun]

CHURCHILL AND FRANCO

Winston Churchill may be little interested in encouraging Spanish democracy. There are no signs that he has ever been much disturbed by Spanish fascism as such. But there is one thing about Mr. Churchill: He detests snakes in the grass. Therefore when a sneaking Franco assumed that, just because Mr. Churchill was opposed to communism, he might be inclined to double-cross Britain's ally Russia by entering a pact with Spain against the spread of bolshevism, the puppet butcher of Madrid made a fatal mistake.

That is the prime explanation for the fearful whiplashing which Mr. Churchill, as reported by Frederick Kuh, of our London bureau, recently administered to Franco in reply to the latter's communication offering such an alliance. Obviously, also, the Prime

Minister could have had nothing but contempt for Franco's offer to mediate between Allies and Axis. But the suggestion of an anti-Russian alliance was the unforgivable sin. How Josef Stalin must have enjoyed the copies of the interchange of letters with Franco which Mr. Churchill sent him.

Presumably, Mr. Churchill's rage, having destroyed the kindly sentiments which he expressed toward Franco last spring, will hasten the Caudillo's inevitable fall. If only Don Juan the Bourbon, who hopes to replace him, would write a letter as loathsome as Franco's to Mr. Churchill, we might really find the Prime Minister on democracy's side as regards Spain.

Meantime, for the United States, the pertinent thing to say to Franco is what little Guatemala, alone among American nations, has had the courage to say so far: The Franco regime is repugnant to democracy and us; Falange activities menace American security; therefore we break relations.

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Daily Citizen]

BRASS IN MADRID

Francisco Franco, the little dictator of Fascist Spain, has a colossal nerve. Recently he proposed to Prime Minister Churchill that Spain and Britain unite in effect against Russia, which has a 20-year treaty of mutual alliance with Great Britain.

The correspondence has been kept secret, but it is reported that Mr. Churchill used cold and biting terms in rebuffing this piece of effrontery. It would be refreshing if the democratic world could be let in on the language of the Churchillian rebuke. All too recently it has suffered in silence as Franco plied it with scorn.

Spain under Franco has earned no right to decent commerce with the United Nations. In all probability the Franco dictatorship realizes this. It is making a brash effort to gain the good graces of the winning side in a war which had its inception on Spanish soil.

The effort will fail. It will fail because Britons and Americans and certainly Russians find themselves repelled by all that is Francoist Spain.

Tens of thousands of Spanish Republicans still languish in Spanish jails. Even if the blandishments of Franco could be accepted, his rule has increased rather than relieved the misery of the Spanish masses. Freedom of worship is prohibited in that country, and there has been consistent persecution of Protestant clergymen. So much for domestic Spain.

As a European power, the Spanish Nation has sided shamelessly with the Axis. It is said that Mr. Churchill returned to Madrid a bill of particulars in this respect. We have only to reread recent European history to gain an inkling of Spain's acts of hostility and to read documents made public a few months ago by Ex-Ambassador Hayes to learn the whole story.

The Franco appeal to Britain is a fantastic misreading of the whole spirit and temper of the United Nations grand alliance. The Iberian dictator has lost his grip of realities: he speaks for a Spain of inquisitions and galleons that is out of place in the modern world.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch]

STRAWS IN THE SPANISH WIND

Franco Spain's pretensions of neutrality, and occasionally of friendship for the Allies, are of such transparent phoniness that nobody should be fooled. The reaction to recent events, as reported to the New York Times by a Madrid correspondent, shows plainly enough where official sympathies really lie.

The Spanish press, the reporter says, expresses considerable concern over the new French-Russian treaty. Following the established Fascist line, it views this as a dangerous symptom of communism's march to power, and discusses at length what one publication calls "the Red-infiltrated committees of liberation" over Europe. Another popular topic is the Nazi drive on the western front, which brings forth large headlines, prominent display of German communiques, and dire anouncement of Allied disaster.

Another item of evidence that Spain still clings loyally to the Axis is the speech of Lord Templewood, formerly Sir Samuel Hoare, a few days after his retirement as British Ambassador to Madrid. Here was a veteran appeaser, one of the ardent advocates of friendship with Franco, telling the House of Lords that Spain, during the greater part of his stay there, was virtually a German-occupied country, where the Gestapo spied on him, attempted to buy off his staff, and stirred up anti-British riots. The state of affairs in Spain must have been bad indeed to bring denunciation from this advocate of temporizing policies.

These are just a few among the many straws in the wind to indicate that the Spanish regime is just as pro-Axis as in the days when Franco used to congratulate Hitler openly on his victories.

The Nurse Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, once again Congress is called upon to rectify an error apparently made by those in charge here in the War Department.

I deeply regret that we are asked to resort to the drafting of nurses and I sincerely hope that through the planned concentrated effort of recruiting these vitally necessary nurses to start on March 5, that the 16,000 to 18,000 nurses now needed, will have volunteered before this bill goes into effect.

Those Members of Congress, who have this particular problem on hand and who have visited our hospitals, both abroad and here at home, have testified as to the dire need for these gallant women. Therefore, I intend to support the bill, which, although in its present form is not satisfactory, I feel certain will be amended to come nearer satisfying all concerned. It is the solemn duty of the Congress to see to it that the men in our armed forces have adequate nursing care.

If we need 60,000 nurses to give our boys, sick and wounded, prompt and careful attention, then we must have the nurses. To save the lives of our soldiers would justify a vote for this bill.

However, we cannot help but wonder the whys and wherefores of some things we have heard and know from our own experiences.

I recall one case that was brought to my attention, when a perfectly healthy young girl, a graduate nurse, was rejected for being 15 pounds overweight. As I recollect she reduced about 6 pounds but still was rejected. This girl was so disheartened that I can well imagine the feeling of those hundreds of other patriotic young ladies who have been rejected because they were a mite too short or a trifle too tall. I understand they have recently decided to waive some of these minor rigid qualifications.

To date these nurses in the service have worked so strenuously and have done such an admirable service for our country that we naturally hesitate when asked to vote for a bill which will take away from these nurses any display of voluntary patriotism.

As a Member of the Congress, I must face the facts in the case with the view of being of all possible aid to our boys who are now fighting a war that this Nation might live in peace.

Kick-backs on Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments became alarmed last year over the practice by subcontractors under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost reimbursable contracts of the United States of paying fees or kickbacks, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable prime contractors or of higher tier subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders.

As a result of findings made by the Comptroller General's office, I introduced in this session H. R. 131, for the purpose of preventing payment of kickbacks by subcontractors and to authorize the General Accounting Office to examine the books of subcontractors under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost reimbursable contracts of the United States. Hearings were held on H. R. 131 by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Hon. Lindsay Warren, our able Comptroller General, appeared before the committee and made a most convincing argument in favor of passage of some legislation on this subject. Mr. Warren pointed out several cases where huge fees had been paid by subcontractors to obtain contracts, and, of course, in the settlement of the accounts of the prime contractor, these kick-backs were eventually paid by the taxpayers of the United States. This practice is commonly known as commercial bribery, but under existing law there is no way to prohibit such evil practices.

Representatives of the War Department, Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission appeared before the committee. These representatives all favored legislation to stop payment of kick-backs, but opposed the section authorizing audits of subcontractors by the General Accounting Office. The Com-

mittee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments feels that the General Accounting Office should audit the expenditure of every dollar of the taxpayers' money. The committee also felt that a penal provision should be included in the legislation. As a result of our hearings, the bill was redrafted and H. R. 2284 was reported by the committee, which included penal provisions.

We realize that in wartime, cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contracts are necessary in order to meet production demands of our armed forces. We realize that battle tests show the immediate necessity of change and improvements of weapons of war, and we do not have time to prepare specifications and let contracts under competitive bids. We realize that a contractor, knowing that a few days after he has started work on a contract would be called upon by representatives of the armed forces to make drastic changes in design which would require re-tooling at great additional cost, would not be willing to bid on such contract. We want our armed forces to have the best equipment available, and would not for 1 minute stand for freezing designs when we know that those designs are made obsolete by battle tests.

It has been estimated by some that the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contracts have cost the taxpayers of this country $50,000,000,000. Of course, we do not object to spending every dollar necessary to win this war and save as many lives of our boys as possible; but we do object to spending one dollar unnecessarily.

This week a bill will pass the House to raise the debt limit to $300,000,000,000. The interest alone on this staggering sum will amount to almost $7,000,000,000 annually. We know that a minimum of $5,000,000,000 per year will be required to pay compensation, insurance, pensions, hospitalization, and training of our returning veterans. We know that after this war we of necessity will have to maintain a strong army and navy. If we keep the weapons of war apace with the times, we must spend a minimum of $10,000,000,000 per year on our armed forces. The normal functions of our Government will require the expenditure of a minimum of $8,000,000,000 per year. We must provide a debt-retirement fund to pay off the staggering war debt, and this will require billions more. We cannot afford to drain off all the tax money, for a sufficient amount must be left to our States and local political subdivisions to carry on their normal functions and to meet the tremendous impact of unemployment after the war. It does not take a mathematician or an economist to figure out why it is necessary for us now to save every dollar possible. We must be prepared for our national income to drop to $100,000,000,000 or less, unless we have inflation. Unborn generations will be paying this war debt. If we permit unnecessary waste, these unborn generations might decide to repudiate our war debt.

Our system of private enterprise will face a severe test when this war is over. We know that less than 1 percent of the subcontractors have been guilty of paying kick-backs, but this 1 percent might be used by some rabble rouser to convince uninformed people that our system of private enterprise is all wrong and that Government ownership should extend to all fields of endeavor.

Some people say that investigations should not be made while we are waging war. I know and you know that sooner or later investigations will be made. If we have any dirty linen, we should wash it now, and if we wait until after the war is over, when people have forgotten the threats to our existence, when people are struggling for a mere existence, the linen might be badly torn.

No honest subcontractor has anything to fear by having his books examined by the General Accounting Office. This procedure will protect the honest subcontractor. It will remove any suspicion that might now exist, and give him a clean bill of health. The mere fact that there is such a law as H. R. 2284 on the statute books will prevent the vicious practice of kick-backs and will save millions of dollars. I sincerely trust that this bill will become law in the early future. Its passage will convince the people that the Congress of the United States is making an effort to protect their tax dollars.

Petroleum Administration for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a letter addressed by a constituent, Mr. Ernest C. Bratt, to the Attorney General of the United States under date of March 2, 1945.

As will be noted the letter is written on behalf of the small oil companies doing business in these war times and finding themselves in an unfavorable position due to the operation of Directive 59 and certain orders issued by the Petroleum Administration for War.

The letter contends that the direct result of the combination of P. A. W. orders and Directive 59 is to deny the right of the small operator to share proportionately with major oil companies and other large operators the available petroleum products, the ultimate result of which is the impoverishment of the small operators while the balance sheets of the large ones show ever greater profits.

The letter states the conviction that the small oil company should be permitted to import petroleum products in accordance with the original regulation No. 1 of the Defense Supplies Corporation and that its amendment No. 3 and all orders and directives to the contrary, issued by P. A. W., are discriminatory, monopolistic, and detrimental to the war effort.

The letter follows:

STERLING STATIONS, INC.,
Fitchburg, Mass., March 2, 1945.

The Honorable FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: As a small oil company doing business in these wartimes we find ourselves in an unfavorable position due to the operation of Directive 59 and certain orders issued by the Petroleum Administration for War.

This letter is addressed to you because under Directive 59 there seems to be absolutely no provision for relief provided for others than original suppliers of that directive, which is a voluntary agreement of major oil companies and some of the large independent operators, sanctioned by the War Production Board by authority of the President under Public Law 603.

We wish to call to your attention certain facts in connection with the operations of Petroleum Administration for War and Defense Supplies Corporation which we consider are entirely at variance with the principles of American government and which tend to restrain trade and encourage monopolistic practices.

It appears to us P. A. W. is using its powers to make Directive 59 a vehicle for setting up and maintaining monopolies and to restrain small operators from obtaining equality of treatment in the matter of supplies of gasoline and heating oils as well as equal compensation under the provisions of Petroleum Compensatory Adjustments Regulation No. 1 of Defense Supplies Corporation.

D. S. C. by amendment No. 3 to regulation No. 1 actually implements P. A. W.'s Petroleum Administration Order No. 5.

By definition Directive 59 proclaims certain arbitrarily selected companies as original suppliers. This directive was largely the product of officials of these original suppliers.

P. A. W., which is administered by governmental edict, is likewise staffed, especially in its key positions by personnel who are on loan from the largest of these same original suppliers.

With the above facts in mind, we refer to the order issued by Petroleum Administration for War, PAO 5, which as now amended virtually prohibits (except by special permits) the importation into district 1 of heating oils, gasoline or products to be used in blending of motor fuels by others than original suppliers; thereby eliminating the possibility of independent marketers to augment their supplies with which to meet their rationed demands.

In a letter dated July 1, 1943, W. P. B.—

Charged O. P. A. with the petroleum rationing program by which authority it establishes the rationed demand—

Charged P. A. W. with the petroleum supply program by which authority it controls available supplies.

We contend that P. A. W.'s actions since January 21, 1943, have been such as to funnel supplies through these arbitrarily selected agencies called "original suppliers," rather than encourage and facilitate movements of gasoline and fuel oils into district 1. We give you, for instance, these facts that there is purchasable quantities of heating oils and gasoline from time to time which are not brought into district 1 by these original suppliers. These supplies, for which transportation is also available, would be, and have been from time to time, made available to such independent operators as ourselves, but because of the application of PAO 5, and its various amendments, we have been unable to obtain the necessary permits for such imports. We understand that these original suppliers are not interested in importing all the gasoline and fuel oils that are available for the simple reason they cannot control its distribution after

the material is received and hence would be taking upon themselves operations from which they would derive only the very small profit allowed them in the handling of such material under Directive 59.

As a result there are shortages of heating oils and gasoline which could be relieved at least in part by importations of small companies if PAO 5 had not been issued.

PAO 5 as originally issued simply barred shipments of gasoline into district 1 by tank car except to original suppliers and on permit. On September 24, 1943, P. A. W. issued an amendment which broadened the scope of the original order so that shipments into district 1 by tank car, boxcar, inland waterways tanks or barge were barred, and it also extended the order to include any of the so-called principal products, which meant that it now included kerosene and fuel oil as well as gasoline.

The latest amendment goes still further and interprets "principal petroleum products" to mean automotive gasoline or any petroleum component which is used for automotive gasoline, or the ultimate use of which is for blending into automotive gasoline; in addition to fuel oils.

Under PAO 5 and its amendment it is possible for small operators to import materials covered by it only as permits are issued. When the order was originally made effective, such permits were readily obtainable. Shortly afterwards, however, P. A. W. required sales and purchase figures before considering applications for permits. Printed forms for obtaining such figures were not available because such forms required approval of the Budget Commissioner. P. A. W. bypassed such approval and simply had forms mimeographed, which served their ends as well. Sales and purchase statistics over a period of years beginning with 1941 to the date of the current request were required to be furnished on such forms. Upon receipt of such inormation some permits were issued. Since that time, however, permits have been generally refused to small operators.

May we point out:

1. Regulation No. 1 of Defense Supplies Corporation, a subsidiary of R. F. C., and a Corporation set up with public funds, was originally written so as to permit anyone who had the facilities for so doing to import petroleum products into district 1 by tank car or any other method available. Through this Corporation the additional cost of importing material through these substitute methods was borne by the Corporation through a system whereby operations and costs were audited and D. S. C. collected a revenue from all such products brought into district 1 regardless of method, to help defray the cost of maintaining the Corporation.

2. By amendment No. 3 to its regulation No. 1, D. S. C. has changed its original regulation so that such imports are only paid for by D. S. C. when and if they are not in violation of any P. A. W. order, such violations being determined solely by P. A. W. This effectively forces compliance with P. A. W. orders as imports to district 1 by substitute method would be economically impossible without D. S. C. subsidies.

3. We cannot believe that Defense Supplies Corporation has the right to pay a so-called original supplier extra transportation costs for a movement of petroleum products from a point, for example, in district 3 to a point in district 1, and refuse another claimant such extra transportation costs for the identical movement of identical products. Such action appears definitely discriminatory.

After the importation of gasoline as such was prohibited, some independent operators classified as "secondaries" —a term used in Directive 59 to distinguish them from original suppliers and dealers—were able to find supplies of natural gasoline and naphtha, learn how blending of such materials was accomplished, and have thus obtained motor fuel for their legitimate rationed demands. Such imports, however, are prohibited by the latest amendment to P. A. O. 5, which is made effective as of March 1, 1945.

We have discussed with officials of P. A. W. in New York the fact that we and others have by this method augmented the supplies available for motor vehicles, and suggested, inasmuch as there has been no time in the past 2 years when there has been a sufficient supply of automotive gasoline to meet the demands as allowed by O. P. A., that we could see no reason for P. A. W.'s action in refusing to allow us to import such very necessary materials for the furtherance of not only civilian needs but the needs of war plants and war workers. The only reason for P. A. W.'s objection to our activities we have been able to obtain from such officials is that our imports created "maldistribution."

("Maldistribution" apparently means the distribution of rationed petroleum products other than in accordance with the 1941 historic sales position of original suppliers, and it does not take into account distribution according to ration demands authorized by O. P. A.)

A case which was pointed out is that of a retail dealers who obtained his gasoline from an original supplier and was satisfied as to the fairness of that original supplier in distributing available gasoline. This party, however, complained that a competitor in the position to import supplemental materials was able to have additional supplies and consequently complainant suggested that he receive part of such gasoline.

P. A. W., however, seems to take the position it would prefer to stop practically all imports by secondaries rather than find a better way of distributing them. This seems to us, in general, to be the attitude of P. A. W. Their principal desire appears to be the channeling of all materials through original suppliers and not the furtherance of all possible means of bringing supplies into district 1.

We contend that the direct result of the combination of P. A. W. orders and directive 59 is to deny the right of the small operator to share proportionately with major oil companies and other large operators the available petroleum products, the ultimate result of which is the impoverishment of the small operators while the balance sheets of the large ones show ever greater profits.

We are convinced that we should be permitted to import petroleum products in accordance with the original regulation No. 1 of the Defense Supplies Corporation, and that its amendment No. 3 and all orders and directives to the contrary, issued by P. A. W., are discriminatory, monopolistic, and detrimental to the war effort.

We urge your immediate consideration of the issues involved.

Respectfully submitted.

ERNEST C. BRATT.

4–H in Victory and in Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a copy of a speech made by Mr. Donald F. Sullivan, of Potsdam, N. Y., at the National 4–H Goals for Victory breakfast, at the Hotel Willard, Washington, D. C., on Tuesday, March 6, 1945. Mr. Sullivan is the winner of two 4–H national championships, winning the national boys' leadership contest and the national garden championship in the national junior vegetable growers' contest:

One of the finest opportunities 4–H offers its members is the chance to travel to important 4–H events and meet the people that attend them. However, an occasion like this is rare, and I consider it a great honor to have the privilege of addressing such a distinguished audience as this.

This week is National 4–H Mobilization Week all over America. This week farm boys and girls who are not already 4–H Club members are being given the opportunity to join. At this time many are finding out new facts about the many values of being a 4–H Club member, and a few are hearing about 4–H for the first time. It's always a pleasure for those of us who have been fortunate enough to have been 4–H members for some time, to tell these boys and girls just what 4–H can do for the individual, his family, and his community.

Briefly, 4–H Club work teaches the individual how to do his work more efficiently, how to keep accurate records, and make exhibits of work that has been well done; it teaches him how to think clearly—especially in working out his own problems; it develops character and it develops leadership ability in the individual.

Perhaps an example would illustrate this best. Three years ago a 10-year-old farm boy joined our 4–H Club. He was quite interested in poultry, so the first year, with money that he had earned by drawing wood to the house in his handwagon, he bought 25 chicks. He took care of them himself from the very start—saw to it that they had the proper food, good housing, etc. Of course he asked advice from his parents and 4–H leader occasionally, but he did all the work himself. When it came time for the county fair he exhibited, and was thrilled to win a blue ribbon on one of his pullets. This spurred him on, and the second year he quadrupled his project to 100 chicks, and also had a garden and dairy project. He took complete care of the garden—that was his own domain. That year he received several awards at the fair, and also received honors at the County Achievement Day—where 4–H boys and girls who have done outstanding work in their projects are given recognition. Last year, his third, he raised 300 chicks, added another calf to his growing herd, and of course, had the garden. He manages his own projects—decides where he will market his eggs and for how much, keeps excellent records, and is putting away a little money for good use later on. At the tender age of 13 this boy has practical experience in three lines of farming—through which improved methods have taught him how to do some kinds of work better than men twice or three times his age. He is truly learning by doing, but his work is not spectacular. It is only typical of that being done by the one and three-quarter million 4–H members in the United States.

4–H strives to develop leadership qualities in its members. The 4–H meeting, which is a monthly affair for every 4–H Club, helps best to develop that quality. The president and officers of the club have the responsibility of leading the club in its business meeting, and every member is held responsible for some task; whether it be planning a club exhibit, demonstration, leading singing or cheering. I like to think of a 4–H meeting as an "education in democracy." Members have an opportunity to express their own views, make decisions, and they must abide by them. Learning to think for themselves as they do, they go into the world with a head on their shoulders—with an ability to think their problems out clearly. Often we see boys and girls who are very shy and bashful at first, gradually emerge as real leaders as a result of this training. This training is of great

practical value to the community. Our community, for example, consistently looks to the 4–H Club for leadership in planning Red Cross benefits, obtaining subscriptions for War bonds ,and in collecting scrap. We obtained subscriptions for over $8,000 in bonds in the Fourth War Loan Drive, and collected over seven tons of paper last year. Communities always take pride in having organizations that will shoulder responsibilities like this.

Along with a program for "better living on the farm," I'm sure we'd all agree that a happy home is the goal of every family. And what will bring that out better than parent and children doing their work together, each one helping the other. Through a desire to have their children do well, parents usually work with and encourage them in their projects. This advice and help is always a stimulus to the 4–H member; and, the effect of helping their children use new and better methods often teaches the parents. So, in some cases, the old phrase, "Like father, like son" is often reversed. In like manner, this corporation in the home builds better families—more content than ever to enjoy the pleasures of home. Likewise, in these days when juvenile delinquency is a serious problem in many cities, we farm youth consider ourselves fortunate in having an organization that fosters the best social and recreational activities.

In building sound youth and strong leaders, 4–H is definitely looking toward the future. Every part of our program is aimed toward emphasizing practices that will be of use to these boys and girls when they are on their own. We should give serious thought to the importance of this. Today, our Nation's leaders are discussing the problems America will face in the post-war period. We should remember, however, that these men will not be facing these problems when they arise, they will not have to cope with them. No, these are the problems for future America, for the citizens of tomorrow, the youth of today. We will face serious, thought-provoking problems in that period. What, for example, is the answer to the problems of great food surpluses in the post-war period? We will be producing more than ever, but our present lend-lease market will be greatly diminished. Will it mean low prices, another depression? No; that won't happen, because we won't let it. There will be a need for greater efficiency on our part then and it will be up to us as individuals to utilize every method for more efficient food production that is advanced by our agricultural colleges, and as leaders we must spread these ideas to our neighborhoods and communities, so we can help to maintain and raise the standard of living of our communities. Indeed, the challenge is great, but with resourcefulness and aggressiveness we shall meet it and insure a better future for America.

Although the problems we will face are great, opportunity lies ahead. It only remains for us to develop those opportunities and become better farmers; yes, better Americans.

The Tydings Amendment, the Flannagan Resolution, and the Lemke Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to remind you, Mr. Speaker, of the serious situation which exists in the rural areas of the United States as the result of General Hershey's directive of January 3. We thought this was corrected by his telegram of January 22. We now find that telegram to have been largely ineffective, perhaps because of other information going out from the national office of selective service. It would seem, unfortunately, that the draft boards are expected to disregard what is generally called the Tydings amendment and to draft farm workers irrespective of their essential need in agriculture.

There was no such intention on the part of Congress when the Tydings amendment was adopted. I call attention today, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that this amendment was adopted subsequent to the passage of the Selective Service Act. There should be no question in the minds of anyone but that the Tydings amendment is the law right now.

What I want particularly to call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is what this present confusion is doing to the dairy business of the United States. I have in my hand a letter from the assistant secretary, and active manager, of the Natural Milk Producers Association of California. From his letter, I quote the following:

> The California dairy industry will certainly be wrecked if General Hershey persists in his announced intention of drafting all agricultural workers below 26 years of age. Of course, I am thinking of milkers, whose places simply cannot be filled by inexperienced men. After the original excitement about agricultural workers 2 months ago, the best advice we could get was that the Tydings amendment would protect bona fide milkers in these essential jobs. Now Hershey's statement as per the enclosed clipping, has today upset everyone again. One of our best dairymen, milking 180 cows at Hynes, has just phoned me that 3 of his regular milkers have been reclassified I–A and had their preinduction physical examination. Of course he has filed a Form 42–A appeal which may mean just nothing at all. He asks my advice as to selling his cows and quitting, thinking he had better do so while cows are getting a good price and before others get caught in the same way. What can I tell him? If I say the Tydings amendment clearly protects men regularly engaged in and necessary to agriculture, and he hangs on, and his men are drafted and he gets only a sacrifice price for his cows, who is to blame? The worst feature of this situation is the lack of integrity. Apparently no statement or promise from the administrative branch is worth anything.
>
> I cannot figure out this whole "manpower" mess, with shipyards here cutting down on working hourr and laying off men—7,500 in the last 3 weeks at Cal-Ship alone.

I call particular attention to the fact that men are actually being laid off in the shipyards in California, and I say this in view of the passage, under tremendous administration pressure, several weeks ago of the bill which makes it possible for civilians to be impressed into service in the United States. This was not the story we heard on the floor of the House, from the administration leaders, when the bill was under discussion.

This is the first time to my knowledge that the national office of Selective Service has stepped forward and simply said that the draft boards of the United States should ignore the law. Up to this time, General Hershey has attempted, in my opinion at least, to follow the law very carefully and to do a good job. The question naturally arises, therefore, Was this done of General Hershey's own initiative? The answer is obviously "no." Even his directive of January 3 says that it was the President himself, through Justice Byrnes, who decided that the Tydings amendment no longer had any force, and that the need of young men in the Army was greater than the need of these same young men on the farms, although taking them without replacements would mean shutting down the farms or closing the dairies. The Constitution says, as was pointed out on the floor of the other body, on February 8, that "the Congress shall have power to raise and support armies." When we have a situation where one man in the United States can, of his own authority, set aside the laws of Congress and say that they shall be disregarded, then we no longer function under constitutional government in the United States, even in time of war emergency.

The Flannagan resolution—House Joint Resolution 106—was passed more than a week ago. The Lemke resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 27—I understand from the majority leadership, is to be set for Friday. It is important that it pass. Congress is entitled to know the facts about this situation.

Proposed Amendments to Federal Trade Commission Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced H. R. 2390 which is a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act. The purposes of this proposal are:

First. To afford effective judicial review of the Commission's cease-and-desist orders;

Second. To limit the aggregate amount of penalties which may be assessed for a single violation of Commission orders; and

Third. To avoid conflict with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by defining more clearly the Commission's jurisdiction as to food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics.

1. EFFECTIVE JUDICIAL REVIEW

As the law is now, the scope of judicial review of the Commission's orders to cease and desist is so narrow as to afford hardly any relief at all. In an increasing number of cases the courts are declaring their impotence to review the findings of fact or the application of the remedy—or to prevent an unauthorized proceeding.

They hold that they may not act by injunction or by declaratory judgment

in advance of a Commission proceeding and final order. The latest holding on that was during the past year in *Miles Laboratories, Inc.*, v. *Federal Trade Commission* (140 Fed. (2d) 683, certiorari denied, 88 L. Ed. 1174), where, in so holding, the Court explained that "if the question were open it might very well be argued" that the company had not violated the law.

They hold that they may not act after a proceeding by the Commission where the findings of fact are "supported by evidence." A recent case which reviews numerous court decisions on the subject is Jacob Siegel Co. against Federal Trade Commission, decided November 30, 1944, by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. The court affirmed the Commission's order that the company cease using its trade-mark "Alpacuna" which it had used on overcoats for 14 years. As it did that, the court said it thought "strongly that the order is far too harsh."

On February 1, 1944, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit rendered a similar decision. It affirmed a Commission order, saying that the Supreme Court had as much circumscribed the powers of the courts to review the decisions of administrative tribunals in point of remedy as the powers have always been circumscribed in the review of facts. The Court said that if it thought itself free to control the remedy it "might be satisfied to modify the order"—*Herzfeld* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (140 Fed. (2d) 207, 208).

Likewise, the courts hold that they are bound by the Commission's judgment as to the quality and sufficiency of the evidence. In *Segal* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (142 Fed. (2d) 255) the Court observed that a part of the testimony was "obviously biased" and said:

> Even so, if the Commission wished to rely upon such testimony, we may not intervene, whatever might be our own indisposition to accept what he said.

The situation, therefore, is, as described by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (*John Bene* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (299 Fed. 468, 471)—that:

> The Trade Commission * * * is called upon simultaneously to enact the roles of complainant, jury, judge, and counsel.

Violations of its decisions—reached through the enactment of such combined roles—are punished by heavy monetary penalties. Such decisions are res judicata against the trial court—*U. S.* v. *Willard Tablet Co.* (141 Fed. (2d) 141); *U. S.* v. *5 Cases Capon Springs Water*, decided February 14, 1945, by United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. And the appellate courts are obliged to sustain its decisions in spite of the fact that the weight of the evidence may be strongly to the contrary. The courts need read only one side of the case, and, if they find any evidence there, the administrative action is to be sustained and the record to the contrary ignored.

The bill would cure this. It would enable the courts to examine the evidence on behalf of the respondent and to assure the decision of these cases according to the weight of the evidence. The amendment is not an innovation. The Walsh-Healey Act requires that the findings of the Secretary of Labor must be supported "by the preponderance of the evidence" (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 39). Under the Commodity Exchange Act orders of the Commission reviewing or revoking designations of contract markets must be supported "by the weight of the evidence" (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 9).

But, aside from any question of precedent, the nature of the Commission's proceedings is such as to make it highly appropriate for the courts to review the whole record of the evidence upon which the Commission has acted. Commission cases involve decision on pure questions of fact—questions peculiarly within the province of the courts. By empowering the courts to review the facts, the amendment draws upon the fundamental offices and the historical experience of the judiciary and operates to separate, in a substantial degree, the prosecution and judicial functions which, as the law now stands, are combined in the Commission.

The combination of these functions in Commission cases is an outgrowth of administrative law as applied to rate making and formulation of rules and regulations of general applicability. That type of administration is illustrated in proceedings to promulgate standards which are applicable to a class. Expert knowledge is required to formulate them and there is necessity that the standards be uniform throughout the whole country and as to all persons and commodities subject to them.

But it is an entirely different matter when that procedure is applied to the administrative adjudication of specific cases. For instance, it requires no expert knowledge on the part of the Federal Trade Commission to adjudicate questions of false advertising. The courts are competent to determine those questions. For generations courts have tried cases which involve fraud, deceit, perjury, slander, unfair competition. The courts are the real experts.

In addition, the proposed amendment would empower the courts to modify orders of the Commission as in the judgment of the reviewing court the circumstances of the case require.

2. LIMITATION OF THE AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF PENALTIES

As the law now stands, there is a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for violation of a Commission order to cease and desist. It is applicable to "each violation". In dealing with advertisements, for example, each advertisement could be a separate violation, and the aggregate multiplied by $5,000. This is not an extravagant statement. Advertisements are disseminated by various media—individual mailings, newspapers, magazines, radio, road signs, car cards, posters, circulars, and so forth. One advertisement, held to be a violation of a cease and desist order, could, for example, be multiplied as to the number of violations by every publication of the advertisement by these several means. Also, an order may include numerous prohibitions. One advertisement may violate several prohibitions in one order. Thus, the violations may be multiplied both by the number in a single advertisement and by the number of publications thereof.

So far there have been no cases in which judgments for excessive penalties have been entered. But they have been sought. For instance, in *U. S.* v. *Holst* (D. C. S. D. Iowa, 1939), the Government claimed penalties of $50,000. A consent judgment for $2,000 was entered. In *U. S.* v. *John Petrie* (D. C. Ill., 1939) penalties of $30,000 were sought. A judgment for $2,500 was secured. In *U. S.* v. *K & S. Sales Co.* (D. C. Ill., 1939) penalties of $10,000 were sought. Judgment for $4,500 was given. In *U. S.* v. *Piuma*, 40 Fed. Supp. 119 (D. C. Cal. 1941, aff'd. 126 Fed. (2d) 601, certiorari denied, 317 U. S. 637) a single advertisement was published in 13 different newspapers. The complaint charged each such publication as a separate violation, and asked $5,000 for each such violation. The court allowed an amount of $250 for each violation, or a total of $3,250.

The proposed amendment is for the purpose of putting a ceiling on the accumulation of penalties. The amount of the ceiling is not important. The principle is.

3. JURISDICTION OF THE COMMISSION AS TO FOOD, DRUGS, DEVICES, AND COSMETICS AND THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

The bill seeks to overcome conflict in jurisdiction with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, approved June 25, 1938 (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 301), which applies to the composition, labeling, and distribution of food, drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices. It is administered by the Food and Drug Administration of the Federal Security Agency. The Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended by the Wheeler-Lea Act, approved March 21, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 41), is designed to prevent the false advertisement of foods, drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices.

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Wheeler-Lea Act were enacted by the same Congress—the Seventy-fifth, third session. They were considered and reported by the same committee of the House of Representatives; that is, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and by the same subcommittee of that committee. It was the intention then to formulate a pattern of regulation which would operate smoothly as a whole without conflict between the two laws.

Conflict, however, has developed. It has grown largely out of the administration of section 15 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act. That section expressly excludes "labeling" from the definition of the term "false advertisement." The purpose of the exclusion was to prevent dual administration, the regulation of labeling being under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The Federal Trade Commission Act, however, does not define the word "labeling." The bill proposes that the definition which is contained in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act be incorporated expressly in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

There has also developed confusion as to the meaning of other provisions of section 15 (a)—those provisions which deal with failure of advertisements to reveal facts material in the light of express representations or material with respect to consequences which may result from use of a commodity to which an advertisement relates under the conditions prescribed in the advertisement, or under such conditions as are customary or usual. Those provisions were to reach advertisements which, although not false by express statement, were misleading by indirection, implication, and ambiguity. They were not requirements for advertisements to contain directions for using and various warnings with respect to contraindications—which matters are expressly dealt with in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as to labeling—unless the affirmative and express portions of the advertisements were such as to make some disclosure of directions or warnings necessary to avoid an otherwise misleading representation. Likewise, those provisions were not to require in advertisements warnings against use of a product for purposes and in ways not prescribed in the advertisement or not customary or usual.

It was thought that this had been made clear by the committee report in the House of Representatives on the Wheeler-Lea Act—Report No. 1613, August 19, 1937, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, page 5—and by the conference report—Report No. 1774, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, page 10. However, the section has been invoked in proceedings to order the inclusion in advertisements of warnings of various kinds, including warnings against excessive and unrecommended uses and use in cases involving idiosyncrasies or allergic conditions. It has also been utilized by the Commission upon occasion to accomplish what seemingly amounts to indirect control of labeling.

The proposed amendment of section 15 (a) seeks to overcome such confusion by deleting the language which has apparently been the basis for misunderstanding and by inserting language which more clearly expresses what the section sought to accomplish. The inserted language has been taken from the opinion of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Ninety-Five Barrels* (265 U. S. 438). Construing the phrase "false or misleading in any particular" in the Food and Drugs Act of 1906, the Court said pages 442–443:

> The statute is plain and direct. Its comprehensive terms condemn every statement, design, and device which may mislead or deceive. Deception may result from the use of statements not technically false, or which may be literally true. The aim of the statute is to prevent that resulting from indirection and ambiguity, as well as from statements which are false. It is not difficult to choose statements, designs, and devices which will not deceive. Those which are ambiguous and liable to mislead should be read favorably to the accomplishment of the purpose of the act.

The proposed new section in the bill is for the purpose of ending, by express statement, dual jurisdiction between the two statutes in question. In framing the section, language already used by the Congress has been employed—that is, the language used in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—to prevent dual jurisdiction with another statute; in that case the Meat Inspection Act (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 392). That some definite assurance is necessary is best shown in a statement by the Commission itself in a brief recently filed in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, *Dearborn Supply Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, decided December 23, 1944 (146 Fed. (2d) 5). The Commission said:

> The contention that the Commission has no jurisdiction over labeling (petitioner's brief, pp. 27–39) is based on the provision of section 15 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which "for the purposes of sections 12, 13, and 14" excludes "labeling" from the statute's definition of a "false advertisement" of foods, drugs, and cosmetcs (52 Stat. 116; 15 U. S. C. A., sec. 55). This exclusion, we think, was intended to apply only in proceedings under sections 13 and 14 of the statute (15 U. S. C. A., secs. 53, 54), to enjoin or criminally prosecute the dissemination of false advertisements in violation of section 12 (15 U. S. C. A., sec. 52), and was not intended as a limitation upon the Commission's jurisdiction to suppress false labeling by an administrative order to cease and desist.

The importance of correcting this conflicting situation, and the importance of providing effective judicial review, is emphasized by the decision in *United States* v. *Willard Tablet Co.* (141 Fed. (2d) 141). On March 7, 1944, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit held that a decision by the Federal Trade Commission was res judicata against the district court in a case brought by the Food and Drug Administration involving the same questions, saying:

> We, therefore, have the incongruous situation of one branch of the Government approving the method now pursued by the claimant and another branch seeking to condemn.

Radio Address of Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include my radio speech over WLAW, Lawrence, Mass., on the special radio broadcast of that station, in honor of the birthday of George Washington, February 22, 1945.

The address follows:

It is the American destiny that, in periods of crisis, we have a vast democratic reservoir of human resources, from which to draw the leadership that sees us through. Washington, Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt, in each of the trials that beset our developing nationhood, the opportunity and ability was there for democracy to prove its vitality, its wisdom, its evolutionary greatness.

These were men like ourselves, not kings or dictators. In the hearts of freemen everywhere, they justify belief in the fundamental goodness of the individual man.

George Washington, born an aristocrat, was a passionate believer in human liberty. On his plantation he employed both servants and slaves, and in his will he set the slaves free. In addition, he established a fund for the support of those who had worked for him for many years, so that the old slaves would not be left in want. Long before the Civil War, Washington and Randolph were the only ones out of all the southern planters of that time who disliked the custom of human slavery, who actually freed their slaves. Some of Washington's slaves lived for 40 years after he gave them freedom, and they lived in the peace and security which the benevolent Father of the Country provided for them.

From the classic busts and the commanding dignity of the paintings by which Washington is represented to us, we are apt to get the impression that he was a cold, aloof personality. On the contrary, he was a very human being.

Few people know that Washington laid out the District of Columbia. He picked out the 10-mile square and had it surveyed. He invested his own capital in real estate there in order to further the development of the area. Brick houses, intended to serve as residences for Congressmen, were built by him. Such foresight can be thoroughly appreciated in the city of Washington today, where some 30 new Congressmen have been unable to find living accommodations.

Washington, though a surveyor by profession, was also an accountant, a reclamation engineer, a builder of canals, a pioneer, a financier, and a college president.

His first business interest was in the management of his landed estates, comprising 9,000 acres of land along the banks of the Potomac. It was a poor business when he inherited it but he set to work with a will to make it prosper. He could see that the land was played out from the constant raising of tobacco crops so he developed the culture of wheat. He erected a distillery in order to make a different disposition of his product. He built a mill and sent the wheat into market under his own brand. Far ahead of his time, he realized the need for diversification in agriculture. Different crops were planted and prize blooded stock was imported to raise better cattle. Washington was constantly seeking improved agricultural implements. He was a creative farmer, who not only made a living out of the farm but greatly improved its value. Farmers of today will understand that this is no mean accomplishment in itself.

He had great faith in the West and sensed the part it was to play in the development of the young country. He was a builder of the canals that would help to bind the different parts of the Union together. History records that he was the first man to conceive the idea of the Erie Canal. He foresaw exactly what President Roosevelt has in mind; namely, the possibility of linking the Great Lakes with the Mississippi tributaries, particularly the Ohio, by a system of canals. Some of these canals were built and there is a project drawn up today for a great system of internal waterways in that region. George Washington was not only a great soldier and a great statesman, he was a typical American of his period. His curiosity about any and all things; his many activities; his business enterprise; his inflexible honesty and his feeling for his fellowmen; all these qualities, by his example, established a healthy standard for the new-born nation.

As Americans we laugh at the idea of supermen. We prefer our leaders to be representative of the people and personally interested in their welfare. We want human beings to lead us, not self-appointed Caesars. We cherish in them the feeling that they are with the people, as we cherish a friend or

good neighbor who is with us in time of trial. And so our hearts warm toward the figure of an officer from Virginia who wrote to the patriot leaders at Boston who were being punished by an alien authority because they stood up for human liberty, "If need be I will raise 1,000 men, subsist them at my own expense, and march myself at their head for the relief of Boston." That officer was George Washington.

We like to think of the time that he put up at Andover or the time he stopped to have his horse's shoe repaired at Marston's Forge in Methuen. Above all, we like to think of that historic day, July 3, 1775, when he took charge of the ragged Continental Army under the famous elm at Cambridge. Today we realize the great heart of the man as he reviewed the 16,000 raw troops he was to lead against the professional soldiers of a powerful enemy. His men were dressed in anything from motley uniforms to leather hunting coats and work clothes. They were armed with muskets of every size and variety. Few of them had any knowledge of soldiering or of the importance of military discipline.

The prospect must have seemed hopeless but there was not only skill and experience in this man Washington, there was character that makes for true leadership, that gives to the men who follow that extra margin of courage and faith that is needed to win. At the outset he refused to accept any pay for his services and dedicated himself to the task of vindicating the rights of man. In the face of impossible odds he overcame a long series of hardships and reverses and turned a succession of defeats into a great and final victory.

Never once did he falter in his purpose. The winter after Burgoyne's surrender was one of bitter privation for the American Army and the memory of it has come down to us as one of the most inspiring epics of courage in our history. While the enemy troops were feasting in Philadelphia, Washington's tattered legions were starving at Valley Forge. In this winter of extreme cold, the men had to sleep on the ground without blankets. Many were without shoes and their footsteps could be traced in blood upon the snow. Washington said of these martyrs to liberty; "Naked and starving as they are, we cannot enough admire the incomparable patience and fidelity of the soldiery." A doctor with the troops wrote: "Barefoot he labors through mud and cold with a song in his mouth, extolling the war and Washington." In the loyalty and devotion of the men, a loyalty rendered by free men with full heart and faith, we see the full measure of Washington's greatness.

Washington had been a member of the Virginia Assembly in colonial times, a soldier in the French and Indian War, a member of the Continental Congress, commander of the Revolutionary armies, a member of the convention that drafted the Constitution, the presiding officer of that body, to earn from his fellow Americans the tribute "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Unanimously the Presidential electors chose him to become the first Chief Executive of the United States. He was a military hero, but more than that, he was an American, and he angrily rejected those who advised that the new Nation should be governed by a monarchy or a dictatorship. Of his own free will he returned to Congress the symbol of his military authority, his commission, for once and for all. He did not have to depend upon force and fear for his fame. He was to be known through all of time as George Washington, a man among men, loved and respected alike by the free and those who yearn to be free.

Even at the greatest moment in his career he kept his head. During the journey from his home in Virginia to New York City he passed through one triumphal arch after another, welcomed along the way with lavish ceremonies and greeted by crowds that had come from all over the Nation to throw flowers at his feet. But the dignity of Washington, his everlasting sense of responsibility to the people, was above all petty vanity.

Just before he assumed the office of President he had written to a friend that his "feelings were not unlike those of a culprit going to his execution." His diary reveals that at this moment his mind was "oppressed with more anxious and painful sensations than he had words to express." These were not the thoughts of a man lusting for the false power of a tyrant. They were the confessions of a man ready to take the advice of the people, of his associates and friends, and to rule in the constitutional manner of the democratic way of life.

We reverence the name of George Washington * * * not as a demi god, but as a fellow human being whose uncompromising honesty and respect for the people, set an example that all of us might well follow.

How different was he from the raving demagogues and bullying dictators of today who are leading their peoples to destruction. Washington spoke as one of the many when in his inaugural address he said: "The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps, as deeply, as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

This was the great responsibility he enunciated for us. One great problem of the young democracy was that of making universal * * * in thought and action * * * the faith necessary to sustain it. And that problem remains with us each day of our national existence. At times we have been lulled into a feeling of false security * * * and at those times we came close to losing our national birthright. There are some among us who think that liberty was inherited and thus take it for granted. We, of this solemn year of 1945 know better. We know that democracy is ours to keep or lose, if we falter in our work or in our faith.

The lesser faith of the 1920's and 1930's must be redeemed by the greater faith of today. We are finding that faith again in many places, on the bloody beaches of Iwo Jima and in the anxiety and resignation that are testing so many of our homes.

It is not danger that troubles us. It is the lack of a clear and confident vision of our future that raises doubts in the minds and hearts of some of our citizens. Never before, even in the terrible winter of Valley Forge, on the fields of Gettysburg, or the Marne, have our people lost confidence in their destiny. The people were right, in the time of Woodrow Wilson, when they realized that their country had become a world power with responsibility to the world. They were right, under Roosevelt, when they realized that the Nation must organize itself against the violence of booms and depressions, and must solve the senseless riddle of want in the midst of plenty. If the faith of our people in these splendid objectives was not completely realized, they should not have surrendered to doubt.

In the present crisis we are prepared to surmount every ordeal, every set-back, and sacrifice on the road to final victory. But when that victory is won, the job remains half done. With renewed faith in our purpose, we must work through every difficulty, and every compromise, for the goal of world security that will enable us to develop the spiritual and cultural resources of our civilization.

We must see ourselves as a great nation and act accordingly. We are undecided and nervous because the responsibility for western civilization has passed into our hands. Confronted with this, there are some who look back longingly to the smaller duties of a simpler past.

Every great man in our history has pointed forward to the duty that is ours. Washington, the father of our country, was the first to point the way.

To honor him this day, let us hold high the faith in America which he bequeathed to us. Let us move forward through war and peace to feel again the exhilaration and confidence that have made us what we are. Then, and then only, shall we be equal to our mission.

Scrap Metal United States Sold to Japan Still Being Used to Kill Yanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on March 3, is a grim reminder of the administration's actions in permitting American scrap metal to be shipped to Japan before Pearl Harbor. It shows why Japan has been able to carry on the war against the United States:

SCRAP METAL UNITED STATES SOLD TO JAPS STILL BEING USED TO KILL YANKS

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 2.—American scrap metal exported to Japan under the Roosevelt administration before Pearl Harbor still is being used to kill and maim American fighting men after more than 3 years of war, it was disclosed today in a report issued by metallurgists of the Battelle Memorial Institute of Columbus.

The Battelle Institute is the largest independent industrial research organization in the world.

In a study made for the Army and Navy ordnance departments and the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the metallurgists used a spectroscope to identify American scrap as part of the metal being used in Japanese munitions.

SCRAP STILL IN USE

"The laboratory data shows, from the presence of residuals, that the scrap which the United States sold to Japan before the war plays a considerable part in the munitions being used against us," the report said.

Such residuals form a pattern, made up of certain characteristic percentages of metals, that could have come only from American scrap, the metallurgists explain. The spectroscope, used to identify the presence of atoms by the light they emit, shows whatever trace of any metal is present, even down to one part in a million.

HAD RAW MATERIALS

The report suggests that the Japanese did not have to extract the excess metals from the scrap because they were so well supplied with raw materials.

American exports of scrap metal to Japan during the years 1933 to 1940, inclusive, amounted to more than 10,000,000 tons, Department of Commerce figures show. Total exports for those years came to 20,000,000 tons.

In 1931, the United States exported 60,000 tons of iron and steel scrap to Japan, and in 1932 it exported 165,000 tons. Under the New Deal, for the years 1933 through 1940, the annual tonnage was 1,262,000 tons. The highest reported figure was for 1939, when it rose to 2,270,000 tons.

FLYNN IS CAUSTIC

Japan attacked China on July 7, 1937. John T. Flynn, in his article entitled "The Truth About Pearl Harbor," said: "Under our neutrality law * * * it became the duty of the President to stop all shipments of munitions to either country. The President, however, refused to do this." Flynn observed that "the Government sent its sympathy to China and its scrap iron to Japan."

On May 5, 1937, A. C. Moore, president of the Chicago Railway Equipment Co., protested to the administration as follows:

DISADVANTAGE TO UNITED STATES

"It would seem that it is not part of wisdom for this country to make it too easy for Japan and certain other countries to take large amounts of available scrap to be used in connection with armament expansion, to their own advantage and to the disadvantage of the United States."

It was not until late in 1940 that restrictions were placed by the New Deal on scrap shipments to Japan.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, our rural-electrification program has meant more to the farmers of this country than anything else ever undertaken by the Government of the United States.

After 12 years of service in this cause, in which I have gone through every phase of the program, I am prepared to say that nothing that has ever been done for the farmers of this Nation begins to compare with it.

Instead of being a socialistic program, it is the greatest promoter of individualism of any movement in which the farmers have been involved. They are paying for it themselves, and at the same time making their homes more pleasant, more profitable and more attractive.

The Rural Electrification Administration is today headed by Hon. William J. Neal, of New Hampshire. Under his leadership this program is progressing successfully and satisfactorily to the vast majority of the people involved.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting an address delivered by Administrator Neal before the third annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at San Antonio, Tex., on January 16, 1945.

It reads as follows:

I appreciate your invitation to appear on the opening day's program of this working conference. I am also happy to bring you at this time the greetings of Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and assure you of his abiding interest in the success of the R. E. A. program.

First, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate your Association upon its good fortune in securing such outstanding leaders in the field of rural service as those who are appearing upon your program.

This afternoon I propose to discuss the progress that has been made by the Rural Electrification Administration during the past year, and some of those immediate problems which must be given consideration by all of those who are interested in achieving our goal of bringing central station electric power to every farm home in America.

I am confident that there is no group that has a more sincere interest in the future success of rural electrification than the board members and managers of the cooperatives to whom this agency has loaned funds. As a farmer, as a former director of a R. E. A. cooperative, and as one who has completed more than 20 years of farm organization leadership, I have faith in the ability of rural people to chart a constructive program for their own advancement. At the same time, I cannot be unmindful of the responsibility which rests upon us together to meet the demands of future electric service that come from 6,000,000 rural families still in darkness.

You are not unfamiliar with the fact, I am sure, that during the past decade rural electrification has made tremendous strides. The R. E. A. Cooperatives may take justifiable pride in the part they have played in making this great record. Today more than 1,200,000 rural families, small businesses and community facilities are served by R. E. A. financed electric distribution cooperatives and power districts.

Since I last met with you in Chicago, we have been continuously endeavoring to meet our day to day operating problems in a more satisfactory manner. We have had the good fortune to benefit by some of the most favorable legislation since the inception of the program. We have, by greater unity in our efforts and better coordination of our activities with other public agencies, dealt with problems detrimental to the advancement of rural electrification; and we have achieved real success in bringing forth a program for the rapid electrification of rural America in the post-war period.

During the past fiscal year, which ended June 30, 1944, R. E. A. allotments were slightly less than $32,000,000, which is approximately five times the amount allotted during the preceding fiscal year. In the first half of our present fiscal year, R. E. A. has advanced to its cooperative borrowers $18,700,000, which is a quarter of a million dollars more than was advanced during the entire previous year.

R. E. A. borrowers are continuing to show, as in the past, that they are managing their business affairs soundly. At the end of December, delinquencies in the payment of principal and interest more than 30 days overdue were less than $280,000, compared with advance payments over amounts currently due of more than $18,000,000. In connection with these advance payments, however, we must remember that comparatively few borrowers have reached maximum debt service requirements.

As you know, wartime regulations limiting extension of electric facilities have changed from time to time during the year. Changes in these regulations have at times been liberalized and at times have become more restrictive. In the main, they have reflected the judgment of our war agencies in weighing the labor-saving advantages of electric power to farm production against the availability of critical materials used in the construction of these facilities. Our construction program in different sections of the country has reflected the application of these regulations to the type of farm production in the area. Notwithstanding these restrictions in the use of material and the extreme difficulty experienced by cooperative management in securing necessary manpower, R. E. A. borrowers have, for over a year, been bringing electric service, for the first time, to more than 10,000 farmers per month.

The current rate of farm connections is equivalent to approximately 50 percent of the greatest construction record ever achieved by R. E. A. in any pre-war year. According to the best available estimates, between 65 and 70 percent of all of the new farm connections during the past 18 months have been made by R. E. A.-financed systems.

The fact that the percentage of new farm connections to R. E. A. systems is of record-breaking proportions is a glowing tribute to the leadership of these farmer-owned cooperatives. It is no less an indication of the constructive assistance provided by R. E. A. personnel.

During the past 18 months Congress has dealt kindly with the R. E. A. program. Appropriations in each instance have been consistent with what appeared to be the requirements of the program at the time.

On September 21, the President signed the so-called Pace Act, which extended indefinitely the life of the Rural Electrification Administration, provided unlimited authorization for loan funds, permitted amortization of R. E. A. loans over a period of 35 years, and reduced the interest rate to 2 percent. This 2-percent rate represents a reduction in interest on our present loans of more than $2,000,000 annually and, together with the longer amortization period, will enhance immeasurably the ability of R. E. A. cooperatives to provide complete area-wide electrification. The fact should not go unnoticed that the major provisions of this constructive legislation have been advocated in vain by the friends of R. E. A. in Congress for several years. Success in this effort was finally achieved when the provisions of this legislation were included in a general farm measure and received the consideration of committees which were principally concerned with developing constructive agricultural progress.

Within the year there has been a rising tide of activity on the part of private power companies in many sections, and others unsympathetic with our cooperatives, to retard the prospect of securing low-cost electric power in rural areas. These efforts have taken various forms, included among them are so-called offers of rate reduction, which would reduce rates to what the utilities refer to as being properly considered "farm business," at the same time offering a restrictive or higher rate to loads of minimum kilovolt-ampere requirements or small rural communities of 250 inhabitants.

Such restrictions go far beyond the limitation on the definition of rural areas in the Rural Electrification Act. I have no hesitancy in telling you that until the time when the Congress sees fit to further restrict the Rural Electrification Act, it will not be our policy to give administrative approval to this type of contract.

These contracts with rate reductions and dual rate provisions are frequently accompanied by an insistent demand for a contract of longer term than that generally approved under established R. E. A. policies. The experience of R. E. A. has clearly shown that the trend of power costs is downward, particularly in those sections where there is immediate prospect of developing, in the public interest, the power resources of the area. Wholesale power without restrictive resale requirements is a necessary prerequisite to rapid area-wide electrification. Notwithstanding anything you may have heard to the contrary, you are definitely advised that there has been no change in R. E. A.'s policy on the approval of wholesale rate contracts nor is there any prospect of a change in that policy. I would like, also, to give you assurance that we do not intend arbitrarily to refuse administrative approval of fair contracts at reduced rates unless we feel sure, beyond a reasonable doubt, that more advantageous rates are a possibility in the not too far distant future.

That is exactly the position which was taken by R. E. A. in the consideration of recent proposals made to cooperatives in

Texas where restrictive rates were offered which seemed to be so low that it was difficult to refuse their acceptance.

The unreasonableness of the Commissions in two neighboring States in ordering restrictive rates of this type has resulted in the launching of a study to devise a plan for public power development throughout the entire Southwest. This study is being aggressively pursued under the leadership of the Southwestern Power Administration of the Department of the Interior. R. E. A. and the Department of Agriculture are cooperating wholeheartedly in an effort to complete the study at an early date. The magnitude of this plan and rural electrification's stake in its success is significant. In this vast area extending into 6 States there are more than 918,000 unserved farms and rural nonfarm dwellings. Power requirements for those consumers alone would ultimately exceed 1,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. Rates lower than any yet experienced in these States are a definite probability for all cooperatives in the area.

During the past year, I think we have made real progress in effecting more complete coordination of our efforts in the Pacific Northwest with the Bonneville Power Administration. This agency is making a tremendous contribution to the success of the R. E. A. program in that section of the country. The low cost of wholesale power to the cooperatives and the announcement of a 3½-mill ceiling a few months ago is making it possible for cooperatives to operate and meet their obligations with a density of eight-tenths of a consumer per mile. Our experience in the T. V. A. area, I am sure, will enable us to coordinate our progress most effectively in the great river valley plans now in prospect.

No doubt all of you have by now seen the R. E. A. statement entitled "Rural Electrification After the War." Many of you have helped, individually and jointly, in building up this study and in supplying the information on which this statement is based. The Rural Electrification Planning Committee of your association has made its contribution. You will, therefore, be pleased to know that it has been released as the official statement of the United States Department of Agriculture on this vital subject.

I feel sure that the principles and objectives set forth will be wholeheartedly supported by electric cooperatives everywhere. Here are the objectives: (1) Electric service to all rural people, (2) full application of electricity to farm production and farm living, (3) full use of electricity for rural community welfare, and (4) full rural industrial use of electricity.

These objectives are an essential part of the constructive program for American agriculture which Secretary Wickard discussed last August before the House Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning. Rural electrification is absolutely essential in the attainment of the following eight major aims advanced by the Secretary: (1) Full production at maximum efficiency; (2) Equal living standards for farm and city families; (3) equal protection for all types of farmers; (4) soil conservation and improvement; (5) conservation and improvement of forest resources; (6) encouragement of the family type farm; (7) retirement of submarginal land and reclamation and cultivation of potentially good farm land; and (8) improvements in the marketing of farm products.

The desire of Congress to help rural people to help themselves with this great program for completing the electrification of rural America is clearly indicated in the recent passage of the Pace Act and in the introduction of legislation presented by Senator LUCAS of Illinois. The necessity for this latter type of legislation became clearly apparent as the preparation of R. E. A.'s plan for a post-war program advanced.

Comprehensive studies of the remaining unserved territory is necessary if construction of the facilities to serve all of the people in these areas is to be accomplished at the lowest possible cost consistent with sound engineering principles.

In addition to this, farmers, regulatory bodies, public agencies, and the R. E. A. cooperatives need the definite assurance that funds are available for not less than a 3-year constructive program on an area-wide basis. It is our considered opinion that if the R. E. A. as now constituted can have the support of this legislation it will be possible for electric service to be made available within 5 years after the war to the overwhelming majority of the 6,000,000 rural homes in America now without electric service. Such a program will open a market for industry and labor in this 5-year period of some $4,500,000,000.

Our conclusions are based upon the assumption that a considerable part of the electric connections of the future will be made by private utilities. They are based on the assumption that R. E. A. cooperatives now organized and yet to be organized will have the benefit of a moderate acquisition program at low-cost level and that they will have an opportunity to bring complete electric service in those areas which are rightfully theirs. It is based upon our faith in the public-spirited attitude of R. E. A. cooperative boards of directors and the resourcefulness of cooperative managers. It is based upon the assumption that the preparation, both on the part of R. E. A. and the cooperatives, which will be adequate to make it possible to launch a fast-moving, hard-hitting program as promptly as the availability of material and manpower will permit.

Such a program is a worthy challenge to R. E. A., to the Department of Agriculture, and to this association.

Nurses' Draft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the crusading spirit and self-sacrificing heroism of the angels of mercy and "sainted" women who have cared for our wounded, healed the sick and comforted the dying can be engendered by compulsion. Such selfless devotion to humanity, as has been shown by our war nurses, springs from innate impulses of nobility, not from regimentation.

In its unamended form, this bill is the rankest discrimination against one of the finest groups of women in the country. It is pyramided discrimination because it works not only against the class—the nurses, but a class within the class—the cadets. Fortunately this has been corrected by amendment. In effect this bill will dry up the voluntary response of high-minded young women for the nursing profession and this will lead ultimately and inevitably to the necessity for permanently drafting all student nurses. In turn, other professions and callings will have to be tapped by compulsion to supply the needs of industry, finance and public-service activities. Then we will have total regimentation of women as they have in certain European nations and which some people want here where the status of woman is little above that of the medieval serf. This process degrades and debases the dignity, beauty, grace, and spiritual and moral qualities of women and is totally unworthy of our American way of life, in fact, it is obnoxious to all our conceptions of the high estate and respected station of American mothers, sisters, wives, and sweethearts whom we do not like to regard as potential draftees.

When we drafted men we did not single out mechanics or cooks. By the same token, it is unfair to draft women solely because they are nurses. Who would presume to question the inspiring record of our war nurses, who have rallied voluntarily and willingly to the urgent and most compelling calls of duty from the fox holes of Bataan, and the malarial swamps of the South Pacific to the deserts of Africa and the icy blasts of the Arctic.

To draft nurses now without giving them the same chance that the WAC's and the WAVES and other servicewomen had to enlist of their own accord, in an effort to hide the blunders and bad judgment of others, is absolutely indefensible. It is an unwarranted stigma and I repeat, the rankest discrimination against one of the finest groups of women in America.

And for what? Resolved to finality, according to the Army, just to raise about 5,000 women for service as nurses. About 9,000 colored nurses have not been utilized, about 2,500 male nurses are unused. About 2,000 conscientious objectors willing to do nursing work have not been called; no effort has been made to utilize some of the personnel of other women's services, or some of the limited-service groups, although practically every hospital in the country is efficiently serviced by student nurses properly supervised.

No real, determined recruitment drive has been instituted by the Army up to this time in order to get required nurses by voluntary means, though the admiral in charge of Navy nurses has stated that the results of his modest drive for recruits were most gratifying. The Navy does not need this draft, and neither does the Army, if it makes a real recruitment drive.

Why not try the voluntary method, the American method, before resorting to compulsion? It is reasonable to suppose that our devoted patriotic nurses would respond in sufficient numbers with the right kind of an appeal and much faster than a similar number can be secured under the selective service system. And there are many fine nurses over 45 years of age who would respond if given a chance.

The nurses earnestly want to serve. They want to meet all the needs of the wounded, the disabled, and the sick. All citizens and certainly every Member of this body, wants to make sure that our

boys are adequately cared for. It is late indeed for some people in responsibility to be awakening to the fact that all-out war means casualties and casualties mean hospitals, doctors, and nurses in quality, distribution, and sufficiency, and in time.

There is abundant authority in the record of these hearings to warrant the convicton that nurses can be procured more quickly, more satisfactorily and more efficiently through voluntary methods based on an appeal to patriotism under the leadership of their own group, rather than by totalitarian coercion. Let us give these noble women the chance to demonstrate, as I am confident they will, that they are ready and willing to do their full duty. Sixteen thousand of them have applied for enlistment since January 6. Get behind a recruiting drive now and in my opinion the desired number of nurses will soon be obtained. Compulsory draft should be the very last, and not the first, resort. Let us cling to the American way until it is demonstrated to be unworkable and unsuited to our requirements. Let us not stigmatize these fine women, because unlike some other groups, they are without strong organized support but, helpless and defenseless, relying solely on Congress for justice.

I will for these reasons vote against the draft of women nurses.

The Flag on Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address from Guam by Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal on February 25, 1945:

Up the precipitous side of a 600-foot extinct volcano, so precipitous that it seemed almost vertical, went a platoon of American marines. Even through a glass they seemed tiny figures scrambling skyward against a background of blue. And then a few minutes later, from the thousands of throats, upon ships, on land and on the sea came the sudden cry, "There goes the flag."

That was how the Stars and Stripes went up in the first island of Japan's outer rim of island defenses. It was at 11, Friday, February 23, 9, Thursday night, New York. We saw that flag going up half way on the journey to shore with Lt. Gen. Holland Smith, of the United States marines. It was the high point in a week of hard fighting, fighting which continues and will continue for some days to come. The Japs don't want to lose Iwo Jima. It's the first step in a sequence of doom for their homeland. They have put into it every kind of defense and they have had years to plan that defense.

As you know by now, Iwo Jima is a tiny island 5 miles by 2½, coming to a tapering point at its southern end. Its terrain, unlike that of some other atolls we have taken, rises some distance from the sea, Mount Suribachi, where our flag went up on Thursday, being its highest point. Its beaches are soft volvanic ash, so loose and crumbling that one marine said it was like trying to dig a fox hole in a bag of wheat.

The Japs took full and skillful advantage of that terrain and of the fact that there could be no technical surprise as to where an enemy would land. We had to land on the beaches and it had to be a frontal assault. They had planted mortars, rocket-gun emplacements, and artillery all over that grim and barren island, so that there were streams of converging fire at the beachhead on which the marines had to come scrambling in from the sea.

Iwo Jima had had a powerful working over even before the 800 ships of Vice Admiral Turner's expeditionary force launched their attack 1 week ago today. It had been hit by the bombers of the Army Air Forces for 70 days in succession. Three days before D-day our battleships, our cruisers, and our destroyers pounded the island with naval gun fire. Each day since then they have poured thousands of tons of 16-, 14-, 8-, 6-, and 5-inch shells into its defenses. Even the 40-millimeter antiaircraft guns have been employed against that shore line. The escort carriers put on air strikes with torpedo planes, dive bombers, and rockets, sometimes as many as 20 missions a day. And just to help out in between their missions of bombing Japan the planes of the fast carriers of Admiral Spruance's fifth fleet, as well as some of the battleships of that same aggregation of power, joined up after their first raid on Japan to contribute to the pounding. All of this tremendous weight of metal thrown at Iwo Jima did not extinguish its defenses.

The Japs, as they had done at Tarawa and at Kwajalein and at Saipan and Guam, had deep burrows under the shelving ridges of Mount Suribachi and caves along the rising shore line to the north. Some of these caves had connecting galleries and they will be taking dead Japs, and some live Japs even, out of them probably for many weeks to come.

But in spite of all the skill of the Japanese defenses, the marines went ashore and they have exacted since a 4-to-1 toll in death from our enemies.

Let me interject here that the tremendous stream of metal thrown on Iwo Jima sharpens again the necessity for the continued output of munitions in our plants at home. Only because of that rain of metal could the island be reduced at all. Because of it our ratio of losses is far less than it otherwise would have been.

As Fleet Admiral Nimitz has said, it was our policy in the past to have an unstoppable margin of power in these attacks—a steam roller, as he puts it. That steam roller saves us many lives. It will take the output, however, of many factories and hard work by all hands in those factories for months to come if we are to keep that edge of power.

I came from Iwo Jima by destroyer to this island of Guam—now, you might say, the Times Square of the Pacific. In the 7 months since we landed Guam has been transformed. The Seabees have built 150 miles of roads. They put in air fields; they built hospitals, and are now building a naval drydock. The Navy has restored the native villages and 20,000 of these amiable people have trouped back from the hills to take up life again in villages that have been made available to them by the Americans. And churches have been reestablished; 6,000 of their children are attending schools with native teachers. They are violently pro-American.

America is on the march in the Pacific—a march back to civilization, order, and decency. You can see it in islands like Guam and Saipan; you can see it in the glad and serene faces of the natives who again are clean and well fed.

The way back is being cleared by fighting men from every State in our Union—bluejackets, marines, soldiers, and airmen. You can be confident of them, of naval airmen who have done a tremendous job in this Iwo Jima operation, of the marines, of the Army forces. And you can be confident of their leaders—of men like Fleet Admiral Nimitz, Vice Admiral Turner, Lieutenant General Harmon, Lt. Gen. Holland Smith, Major General LeMay, of the Twenty-first Bomber Command; and finally of that glorious aggregation of fighting men, the Fifth Amphibious Corps of the marines, which under Lt. Gen. Harry Schmidt's direction, is leading the fighting at Iwo Jima.

It's a great team and Americans can be proud of it and of the country that produced them.

The Need for Small Dams Becomes Apparent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bedford (Ind.) Daily Times-Mail:

THE NEED FOR SMALL DAMS BECOMES APPARENT

Whether Congressman EARL WILSON'S proposal for a series of small dams is the proper substitute for the proposed big Shoals Dam is something for the engineers to settle. But, any person who took a quick glance Monday at White River, or any of the small creeks which form its tributaries, will realize that our Congressman is on very firm ground in advocating small dams for this area, regardless of the outcome of the Shoals project.

We happened to see Leatherwood Creek, It has risen from a tiny stream to a torrent overnight. Every other creek in the county has done the same thing.

The most striking aspect of the week was the muddy, brown color of the water. It takes no engineering experience to see that the best topsoil in the county was being washed away.

Highways can be blocked by water. That is a temporary condition, but soil carried away is gone forever, and this county cannot afford to have its soil carried down the river. There has been too much erosion already, and this is a type of damage which cannot be repaired.

Congressman WILSON is one of the few people who have had a broad gage view of the entire water problem in southern Indiana. He opposed the Shoals Dam because he felt that in doing so he was representing the wishes of the majority of the people in his district. Rightfully, he views his job as that of a representative.

There is very much more to the water problem in this area than mere flood control for the White, Wabash, Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers. Monday morning certainly proved that. The biggest problem is to keep local rainfall for local use, to prevent soil erosion, to raise the underground water level so that wells and springs will not dry up in the early summer, so that Lawrence County farmers will not have to haul water for themselves and their livestock; so that Leatherwood and all the other creeks in the county will not jump from a dry bed to flood within 24 hours. Those vital aspects of water control have been largely overlooked. It is a mistake to

call the situation by the name "flood control"; it should be called water control and preservation. How many thousand cubic feet of soil were washed away Monday would be difficult to estimate, but it is a stupendous amount, and exactly the same thing happens every time this area has a heavy rainfall. We can expect about five or six more similar experiences before the summer dry spell. This is what EARL WILSON wants to correct.

Water is a terrific force. It was the original source of power for American industry. It has produced great wealth when regulated. When unregulated, it has been the Nation's greatest expense. The cost of the 1937 flood in property destruction alone would have more than paid for all the dams which need to be built. The Nation paid the price of neglect, and will pay it again unless proper precautions are taken to prevent any further repetitions.

Missouri has set an excellent example of water control. The topography of the country in Missouri is quite similar to that of Indiana, flat or rolling in the north, and hilly in the south. The University of Missouri took the leadership of the water-control movement, and has succeeded amazingly well. Recent reports made by Chester Davis, president of the St. Louis Federal Reserve Bank, indicate that almost every Missouri farm now has a pond of water. Some of these ponds have been built privately; many have been built by State and county officials. One positive result of this program has been a marked decline in the number of dry wells. Southern Indiana could do very well to follow this splendid example. The movement must be widespread. Individual efforts, no matter how praiseworthy, can accomplish little. The project must cover a large area.

Monday morning should put an end to the dispute about the Shoals Dam. Perhaps the big dam is a national need. Certainly small dams and ponds are an immediate local need. The productivity of Lawrence County farms, especially those on hillsides, has been declining for years; chiefly due to the sudden heavy rains and the swollen creeks of muddy, brown water. The time for action is right now. Every rainfall aggravates the situation.

Office of Price Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, approximately 1 week ago today three Congressmen—two Democrats and one Republican—were grossly insulted and put out of an O. P. A. advisory committee meeting by O. P. A. officials while they were doing their duty as duly elected officials of the Government and elected representatives of the people, when they attempted to attend an important strawberry advisory committee meeting at the request of their constituents back home.

Being one of those three, I can assure the membership that it was only at the urgent request of my constituents and at the request of the Louisiana advisory committee member, who was elected by the O. P. A., that I was present.

The meeting was vitally important to the people of my district, since the State of Louisiana is the largest strawberry producing State in the United States.

I had thought that with this unusual, unfair, and grossly insulting treatment toward Members of this body, namely, Mr. JENNINGS and Mr. EARTHMAN, of Tennessee, and myself, that Mr. Chester Bowles would at least have the courtesy to apologize for the action of his department to the whole membership for this gross mistreatment and insult. However, 1 week has gone by and not a word from Mr. Bowles. I personally know of my own knowledge that Mr. Bowles had full knowledge of the whole affair since it occurred 1 week ago. This Congress has been good to Mr. Bowles, and, notwithstanding the high-handed, insulting, and, in many instances, unfair treatment of various Members of Congress, it has always given him the benefit of the doubt. Frankly, by such continued acts of the O. P. A., and by his silence, he has thereby demonstrated that he holds for Congress contempt rather than an attitude of appreciation for what Congress has done for him.

As far as I am personally concerned, the O. P. A. did me a favor by asking me to leave the advisory committee meeting, as I think from the usual results of such meetings that very little is accomplished, in view of the present O. P. A. attitude, and I was thereby spared a very boring day with arrogant and bigoted subordinates whom Mr. Bowles has put in charge of all policies of the O. P. A.

I cannot help but believe and realize that Chester Bowles is responsible for the direct and gross maladjustment and maladministration of many departments of the O. P. A. He has begged for mercy from this body when he has wanted something like the continuation of an O. P. A. act, of the passage of a bill that his attorneys have prepared, or adequate funds to more than take care of his overstaffed bureaucracy with the cunning and smoothness of an actor of the Barrymore type. He is the best I have ever seen when it comes to currying favor or favorable feeling toward him with a few leaders in this Congress. At whitewashing, evading issues, and insulting the rank and file membership of Congress, he is the best that Washington has ever seen. Congress has given every department head the benefit of the doubt once. If he takes advantage of the situation, it is his fault the first time. If he does so the second time, Congressmen consider it is their fault and, frankly, from what many members have told me, they are sick, tired, and disgusted with Chester Bowles and his O. P. A. I am sure that every Member of this House feels that there should be a price control act, but, on the other hand, they do not feel that they, as duly elected representatives of the people that form a distinct branch of this Government, should thereby have to suffer the arrogance, intolerance, and gross insults of a bureau chief like Chester Bowles.

Frankly, from my experience, while I have not necessarily been successful with every request that was sought by me for a constituent of my district from other department heads, still I have always been treated with decency, courtesy, and as a duly elected representative of the people by every department in Washington with the exception of the O. P. A. I do not believe that the membership of this House will tolerate any department head that allows his department to grossly and unfairly mistreat and insult one, two, three, or more members of this body. Leon Henderson was not a big enough man to browbeat Congress and I do not think that Chester Bowles is either. In fact, I doubt that at any time when the O. P. A. was under the control of Henderson that there was such a disorganized mess of chaos as now exists under the arbitrary, arrogant, and uncalled for dictatorial rule of Chester Bowles.

Red Cross Month

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is Red Cross month. During this month, the Red Cross is asking for $200,000,000 from the people of America to carry on its work. That sounds like a huge sum. But when you measure those dollars in the terms of the aid and comfort and relief they will bring to thousands of our fighting men all over the world, you will never be able to give enough.

Today, I would like to ask you to stop for a few minutes and think of just what your contribution to the Red Cross accomplishes. Some of us are not fully aware of just what the Red Cross does for our armed forces. Some of us are inclined to think vaguely of the Red Cross as an organization set apart from our daily lives, to which we are asked to give each year. But the Red Cross is us. It is you and I and the man next door. The Red Cross is our medium for helping and comforting and cheering our loved ones overseas.

When we give to the Red Cross, we are providing a tired soldier with a bed in which to sleep in one of the hundreds of Red Cross Clubs scattered all over the world today. We are providing a lonely soldier with companionship and entertainment, a chance to talk to someone from home. When we give to the Red Cross, we are reassuring an anxious soldier by making it possible for him to hear through the Red Cross that his wife and baby are doing well. When we give to the Red Cross, we are providing a hungry soldier behind the barbed wire of a prisoner-of-war camp with food. We are providing a wounded soldier, desperately in need of blood, with life.

The Red Cross has over 7,000 men and women serving our armed forces overseas. They are stationed wherever our fighting men may be—at isolated bases in Alaska, in north Africa, on the Italian line, in China and India and Burma, the islands of the Pacific, Belgium, Germany, and France.

They are the field directors who crawl into fox holes to deliver a reassuring

word from home, to distribute comfort articles, cigarettes and gum. They are the clubmobile girls who serve hot coffee and doughnuts up near the front where the shells are crashing. They are the hospital workers, bringing to our wounded the small extra comforts and attentions we would bring them were they at home—writing a letter for a boy whose hands are hurt, reading to a boy who is blind. They are the club workers whose Red Cross Clubs range from a grass shack in New Guinea or a Nissen hut in Iceland to a palace in Italy, a chateau in France * * * clubs which they have made as much like home as possible, clubs in which our G. I.'s can find American food, American music, companionship and entertainment and help.

These Red Cross workers are serving our fighting men for us—they are comforting and cheering and helping them in our name. When we give to the Red Cross, we are making this service possible, we are giving to our own boys now thousands of miles from home. Through these workers, in the services they offer, our men feel the touch of home, feel us near them and behind them and with them no matter how far away they now may be. Theirs is the need we must meet, theirs is the want we must fill. It is up to us to keep the Red Cross at their side.

Veterans' Investigation

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, because of numerous very serious, well authenticated complaints that have reached me requesting my official intercession and action, and that are arriving daily in increasing volume, I have today introduced a resolution to investigate alleged intolerable conditions and other irregularities affecting our returned veterans hospitalized in Government institutions throughout the country and in overseas theaters.

These complaints, as to the hospitals they embrace, indicate a general unsatisfactory atmosphere which more closely resembles concentration camps than hospitals—harsh discipline, poor food, unreasonable restrictive regulations, inadequate treatment, and inconsiderate attitudes on the part of superiors, and are so broad in scope and serious in character as to be beyond total correction by the agencies in charge of the various hospitals involved without congressional action.

So general are these criticisms and complaints about the administration of several Government hospitals that I believe that the whole question of the care and treatment of our returned veterans, particularly those unfortunates who are psychoneurotic or mentally afflicted as a result of war service, and who have in some cases undergone horrifying experiences on battle fronts overseas, ought to be carefully reviewed by the Congress. Indeed all aspects of veterans' relief and rights must be reviewed.

Everyone agrees that we must maintain the very highest standards in dealing with the supremely urgent problem of the care of the wounded and the mentally afflicted, and, therefore, if reports reaching me are true, even in part, the situation cannot be corrected too quickly. A fearless investigation will enable Congress to act. It will stimulate early correction.

The American people insist that these boys who have offered their all to their country and have returned broken in body or mind shall be given the best treatment that can be procured in wholesome, pleasant surroundings under considerate supervision, so they will feel that they are not ordinary soldiers in the ranks subject to harsh rigorous military discipline, but rather are truly the wards of the Government upon whom every possible solicitude is being bestowed looking to their early restoration to full health and strength and, where possible, to civilian life. Of course, for those unfortunates who cannot be so restored, there should be most humane and considerate treatment. Such policies, if wisely administered, would not impair or thwart the maintenance of order and sound discipline in veterans' institutions, and I refer to all institutions where veterans are being treated.

I am conscious that these problems are of great breadth and that the large influx of wounded and disabled presents unusual difficulties that ought to have been anticipated and provided for. I do not impugn the sincerity or good intentions of the officials in charge of our Government hospital programs. Most of them are conscientiously striving to discharge the duties imposed upon them, and most of them are doing a good job in the light of existing facilities and available personnel.

But there are evidences of uncoordinated efforts, retarded execution of previous plans for necessary expansion, unsound over-all administrative policies and failure to meet the urgent necessities of thousands of war heroes who have returned from the fighting fronts wounded, battle-scarred, and mentally upset.

I am very much disappointed that the Board of Hospitalization of the Veterans' Administration has not acted as yet upon the proposal that I made some time ago to institute smaller rest homes throughout the country where nervous and mental cases might be hospitalized in environments removed from the institutionalized routine of larger hospital units whose atmosphere often aggravates, rather than improves, frequently occurring types of mental disorder.

I have had my attention directed to pathetic cases of boys who have returned home, shell-shocked and mentally broken, yet who are not so seriously afflicted as to be put into overcrowded surroundings with incurable cases. The fact regrettably is at present, that in some hospitals the various types of mental cases are not segregated and I think this is not only most unfair to the boys themselves, but, if permitted to continue, will produce most unsatisfactory conditions that will retard or prevent the recovery of many boys who, with proper treatment, care, and secluded environment might be speedily restored to full mental and physical vigor.

There is no room for the philosophy of the "brass hat" or "mailed-fist institutionalized dictator" in the care and treatment of our veterans. We must have an ample number of the most capable, most kindhearted and sympathetic qualified men, professional and otherwise, that can be found, and we intend to see to it that we will have them. Billions are being and will be spent for this purpose and we want concrete results. We will not tolerate incompetence, arrogance, carelessness, and harsh, ruthless discipline in connection with the treatment of these heroes. They will be dealt with humanly and decently, so far as possible, just as they would be dealt with in their own homes by their own doctors and families, and that spirit and intent of Congress must and will be given effect.

The problem of care and treatment for all our wounded, disabled, and mentally afflicted veterans is one of the greatest rehabilitation problems and most sacred trust we have, and it cannot be complicated by unwise and improvident administration. We must put it on a firm basis and weed out at once those administrators and those policies which are leading to criticism.

This proposed investigation will disclose all the facts relating to undesirable conditions in Government hospitals and permit curative remedies. It will also keep efficiency at a high pitch, put a stop to abuses and maltreatment, where uncovered, and result in beneficial expansion and integration of the whole hospital-rehabilitation program.

Every phase of rehabilitation and hospitalization, care, treatment, rights, benefits, and privileges must be investigated, including the quality and adequacy of medical and nursing services.

In bringing forward at this time the very critical question of hospitalization and care of returning veterans, I am acting with certain reluctance and hesitancy. It is not at all pleasant for me to have to present evidence to this House which, if true, is in effect a scathing indictment of the Veterans' Administration. I am conscious of the past meritorious service rendered to thousands of veterans by that agency. I am aware also of the high concept of duty and the long years of devoted public service rendered by General Hines whom I hold in highest respect as to his character, ability, zeal, and sincerity. Very many other executives and employees of the Veterans Administration have contributed valuable service to the Nation and our veterans.

I have also been conscious of the very heavy burdens of administration imposed on this agency by the accumulation of

new legislation dealing with the problems of World War No. 2 and like all other Members of this Congress have been willing to permit reasonable time and opportunity for adjustment and adaptation to these new laws and grave new problems.

For these reasons, like other Members, I am sure, I have been patiently waiting to observe some evidence that the Veterans' Administration was taking up the slack, so to speak, and grappling successfully with these new and pressing problems. In fairness, I admit that progress has been made in some directions, and to some limited extent. The backlog of cases waiting determination has been gradually cut down though the number is still very substantial and many veterans are suffering inordinate and unreasonable delays and thereby hardship and misery, because of failure to settle their cases expeditiously. Desirable expansion of facilities has been accomplished, new construction undertaken, new district offices opened, additional personnel hired, but the capacity of the program still lags far behind the needs and demands of the veteran. What is worse, in its broader aspects, little or no headway has been made in replacing outmoded and out-dated policies and techniques with the new available advances of science and medicine which are required to adapt the work and methods of this agency to the modernized world.

Rightly or wrongly, the impression is quite general throughout the country that the Veterans' Administration is moribund and ineffectual—frozen to bureaucratic modes developed within its framework for over a quarter of a century, not possessed of the vitality, the fresh point of view or the administrative capacity to take hold of and successfully solve the multifold and gigantic problems of hospitalization and rehabilitation that must be solved and solved completely and promptly in order to prevent suffering, misery, and death and indeed to insure humane treatment and just consideration to millions of our returning heroes.

An article in the March issue of Cosmopolitan magazine entitled "Third Rate Medicine for First Rate Men" collates and presents startling and convincing evidence that many of our veterans are being neglected and denied the basic rights, benefits, and privileges which Congress has provided for them. This very comprehensive and well documented article which, through the courtesy of the publishers, I have the privilege to place on the desk of every Member of Congress, constitutes a challenge to this body which in the interests of humanity and justice and regardless of any other consideration of personality or past merit must be promptly accepted by the House.

If the shocking facts presented in detail by this article are true, then the Congress cannot move too quickly to eradicate the unsavory conditions and failures that have resulted in such horrible and incredible treatment of our gallant war heroes.

Let me touch briefly upon a few of the basic specifications against the administration of veterans' legislation as evidenced by material I have in my files.

First. Bureaucratic red tape throttling the granting of relief, loans, and educational privileges authorized by the G. I. bill of rights.

Second. That the latest advances of medical science have not been comprehensively or fully utilized, particularly in the treatment of tuberculosis or psychiatric patients.

Third. Overcrowding of hospitals, whereby available space is taken up to accommodate more than the capacity originally provided.

Fourth. Unreasonable delays in adjudicating cases.

Fifth. Narrow interpretation of the G. I. bill resulting in the denial of grants of loans and educational privileges.

Sixth. Failure to expand hospital construction program rapidly enough, thereby making overcrowding necessary.

Seventh. Inadequate numbers of doctors and nurses to carry the load.

Eighth. Inadequate research activities and many other serious difficulties and shortcomings.

Mr. Speaker, that is just part of the sad story told by one of our country's most substantial and reputable periodicals. Coupled with the other evidence of delay, neglect, failure to realize or grapple with the magnitude of the problems confronting it, lack of comprehension and grasp of the broader enlightened policies required by new developments in science and medicine, failure to break away from old and outmoded techniques of an established bureaucracy and launch forth boldly upon new methods and new facilities, the contents of this article demand an immediate, thorough, and impartial investigation by this body.

This inquiry cannot be further delayed. If these facts are true and correct, if these charges can be substantiated in whole or in part, then the Congress must take speedy and effective action to apply drastic corrective remedies. Such an inquiry would be just to all concerned. It would give those involved an opportunity to meet and, if possible, refute the charges made. It would enable Congress to acquire all the pertinent facts relating to the whole question of the administration of veterans' legislation. It would lay a firm foundation for additional necessary laws.

I urge the Rules Committee to report this resolution back to the House forthwith, or as soon as possible, with the recommendation that it be passed. This is the only way we can do complete justice to the millions of brave American boys who have offered and sacrificed their life's blood and their all in order to save our democracy and our country. For us to do less is a dishonor and stigma upon the sacred cause for which they fought and died. In the name of our gallant sons who have fallen in battle, I earnestly urge the early adoption of this resolution. It follows:

Resolved, That a committee comprised of five members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and six other Members of the House, all to be designated by the Speaker or a duly authorized subcommittee or subcommittees thereof, is authorized to conduct an investigation into alleged intolerable conditions, irregularities, and hindrances affecting war veterans and members of the armed forces in connection with hospitalization, medical and nursing services, compensation, pensions, vocational guidance, and training, and all other matters bearing upon the welfare of veterans and their dependents regarding rights, benefits, privileges, and preferences to which these groups may be entitled under existing legislation.

The committee shall investigate all hospital facilities, the status, needs, and progress of the hospital-construction program, other facilities contemplated by present legislation, the personnel, the food, the discipline, restrictive regulations, care and treatment, and all other matters affecting the rehabilitation and care of returned veterans, with particular reference to wards of the Government, now hospitalized in Government institutions, wherever situated, and to prepare and submit to Congress recommendations for remedial legislation to eliminate undesirable conditions, unsatisfactory administrative practices, to provide abundant facilities, and to insure efficient, proper, and generous care and treatment for patients in Government institutions, veterans, and service men and women.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation and changes of policy and program as it deems desirable.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, or elsewhere, if deemed necessary, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Public Health and the Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Public Health and the Doctors," which I delivered at the New York Times Hall in New York City on February 7, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First I want to read a story that appeared recently in the columns of the illustrious newspaper that is sponsoring this forum:

"DONATIONS MAY SAVE EYESIGHT OF GIRL, 4

"ASHTABULA, OHIO, December 25.—Because of the generosity of friends, neighbors, and total strangers who read of her plight, 4-year-old Barbara Ann Rigo will have a chance this Christmas for one of the greatest of all gifts—normal sight.

"For the past year Barbara has been losing the sight of her right eye as the result of a growth which, doctors said, could be removed only by surgery. To be successful the operation must be performed within the next 5 or 6 months.

"The little girl's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Rigo, Jr., have been saving and scrimping during the year from her father's salary as a railroad employee to raise money for the operation.

"Recently, when they had just about reached their goal Mrs. Rigo lost her purse, containing all their savings, in Pittsburgh, where she was visiting relatives.

"Readers of a Pittsburgh paper which printed a story on her loss contributed $150 toward replacing the savings, and friends and neighbors of the Rigos chipped in to make up the difference.

"The happy parents completed arrangements yesterday to have the operation performed at a hospital in Pontiac, Mich., as soon as possible."

Now, when I first read this story, I was filled with a sense of shame. Shame that such a thing should happen in this country where we have the best medical skill and equipment in the world. Shame that the Rigo family should have to skimp and save for a year before they could afford the operation to save their little girl's eyesight. Shame because, when misfortune befell them, they had to depend upon the charity of friends, neighbors, and total strangers.

In its broader outlines, the story of the Rigo family is not unusual. Inability to secure medical care when needed is characteristic of many American families.

The results of this tragic deficiency in American life are to be seen in the selective service rejection rates which were revealed last July to the Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education, of which I am chairman.

We discovered, at the July hearings, that four and one-half million young men in the prime of life had been found unfit to serve their country as soldiers because of physical and mental defects. In all, between eight and nine million men—about 40 percent of the 22,000,000 men of military age—are unfit for general military duty.

Moreover, and this is the most telling fact—at least one-sixth of the rejected men had defects which could be easily remedied. This in itself is a serious indictment. But additional evidence of neglect is afforded by a study which compared the selective service medical records of men in Hagerstown, Md., with the school health records obtained by examination of the same individuals during their childhood. The comparison showed that many of the defects for which men were rejected had been discovered as much as 15 years earlier while the registrants were students in high school and grade school. In the intervening years, nothing had been done about them.

The chief reason for this dismal state of affairs becomes clear when we contrast the high cost of good medical care with the low income levels of a majority of the American people.

Authoritative and conservative estimates show that the average cost of good medical care today is about $150 per family per year. This would be 5 percent of the income of a family that receives $3,000 a year. Seventy percent of the families in the United States, however, have incomes of less than $3,000, and 50 percent have less than $2,000. Even if we leave out of consideration entirely the fact that many families have need of medical services costing much more than the average figure of $150 a year, it is evident that a majority of the population cannot meet the costs of proper medical attention.

Seemingly, the only solution of this problem is a method of payment by which the risks may be distributed among a substantial proportion of the people and the costs of illness over a long period of time.

Today there is general agreement on this score among all serious and open-minded students of the subject. All except a few die-hards who refuse to be moved by facts now accept the principle of prepayment, and I believe this represents real progress over the unenlightened invective that pervaded the atmosphere in such discussions at this not very many years ago. There is still sharp disagreement, however, over the form that the prepayment system and the group financing shall take.

Advocates of voluntary insurance claim that such plans will eventually meet the needs of most of the people. Others assert that voluntary systems can never reach a really significant proportion of the population, and that compulsory health insurance and tax-supported services must be provided if anything like full coverage is to be achieved.

You have heard arguments on both sides of this question tonight. The Senate committee, of which I am chairman, has not yet decided which of these alternatives combines the most advantages and promises the most in terms of greater health, happiness, productivity, and longevity. We do not feel that, as far as we are concerned, all the evidence is in. We have listened receptively to all who have shown a sincere desire to solve this perplexing problem in a way that will benefit the people and make America a stronger, more vigorous nation. We shall continue to conduct our inquiry in this spirit, and we are willing to try to reconcile opposing viewpoints in a way that will be fair to all groups concerned.

But we are not going to settle for half-way measures or patchwork proposals. If the voluntary systems offered are to gain our approval, they must meet certain conditions.

First, the medical care given must be complete care. By that I mean hospitalization, general medical care, including all modern diagnostic and preventive services, and dental care. Insurance against so-called catastrophic illness, or aganist a portion of the medical bill, will not suffice, because we do not want people to wait until a catastrophe strikes before they see the doctor.

Secondly, the cost of the service to the individual must be low enough so that most of the people can be included in the system. Unless we achieve full employment at high wages, this will require governmental subsidies.

Thirdly, the service rendered must be of high quality and so organized that it can be provided economically. This means additional facilities, more and better-trained doctors, and group practice. We cannot accept pill-bag medicine or a fee-for-service system in which every specialist to whom a patient is referred during the course of an illness gets a separate fee. Such an arrangement would be prohibitively expensive. Also, it would be unsatisfactory from the standpoint of coordination of the various doctors' findings.

It is because of the obvious lack of modern clinical facilities in many parts of the country that the committee has recommended a hospital and health center planning and construction program to cover the entire Nation. We propose networks of facilities integrated on a regional or State basis so as to make high-quality care available to every citizen regardless of where he may live. This recommendation has been embodied in a bill, S. 191, upon which we expect to hold hearings soon.

We have made this recommendation first because the need is obvious and agreement in the need is general. But facilities alone are not enough. We must also see to it that people will be able to use the facilities. This will require health insurance and tax-supported services for those ineligible for insurance or unable to afford it.

We must also have more trained personnel to staff our medical facilities. We propose Federal loans or scholarships to medical and dental students, with special incentives to induce young practitioners to settle in rural and other shortage areas. We believe that returning medical officers should also be encouraged to take up rural practice.

Finally, we propose that the Government continue in peace, as it has in war, to aid medical research.

Achievement of a national health program rests, in the last analysis, with the people themselves. They must want it and they must work for it. I sincerely believe that the people do want such a program, and that they are willing to work for it. But they must have something definite to mobilize for—they must have a program to rally around. The mapping of the broad outlines of such a program is the job of Government in consultation with the representatives of the American Medical Association and other professional societies, the trade unions, business and consumer organizations, leaders of enlightened public opinion, like the New York Times, and far-sighted citizens like our gracious hostess, Mrs. A. H. Sulzberger, who organized this forum.

The program I have just described has been evolved in this manner—the democratic manner. We do not intend to regiment doctors or to interfere with the right of any patient to choose his physician.

It is admittedly a program that is broad in outline, and many of the details are lacking. But at least we are on our way. With the marvelous resources at our disposal there is no reason why we should not develop the finest health program the world has ever known.

Address by Hon. Walter F. George, of Georgia, on Freedom of Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able radio address on the subject Freedom of Religion, delivered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on March 4.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This morning I am speaking upon the Baptist Hour, and it is fit that I should dwell for a few moments upon the part Baptists have played in the establishment of religious freedom.

The Constitution of the United States, which public servants are sworn to support, provides the legal basis for the freedoms the people of this country now enjoy. This immortal document, as school children know, is divided into three parts: The Preamble, the Constitution proper, and the Amendments.

The Preamble sets forth the aims of the Government and is as follows: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do establish and ordain this Constitution for the United States of America." The founding fathers, in these terse and profoundly meaningful words describe the ends they sought through the establishment of a central Federal Government.

The Constitution set up the machinery for a democratic government and its framers endeavored, as far as humanly possible, to

safeguard the rights and to conserve the interests, common to all the people. In this document only one reference was made to religion. And yet it must be remembered that the basic philosophy underlying the Constitution is the concept of human liberty as the inalienable rights of the individual as a responsible moral being.

The closing words of article VI declare that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust." Under this, no man, legally chosen, could be deprived of serving his country on account of either his religion or his lack of religion. Justice Joseph Story, commenting on this clause said that "it had a higher object; to cut off forever any pretense of any alliance between church and state in the National Government." This, however, was not the interpretation placed upon article VI when the document was presented to the several States for ratification. Throughout the country the fight raged and the proposed Constitution in general, in particular, and in detail was strongly assailed and stoutly defended. The point at which it was most strongly criticized was its lack of a bill of rights. The charge was made that the framers of the Constitution had provided no adequate guarantees for the preservation of the human rights for which the glorious revolution had been undertaken and for which the Revolutionary War had been fought. The American Bill of Rights must be rightly interpreted as a reaffirmation of those immemorial rights of free men sacred against all government, whether local or general.

Thomas Jefferson wrote from Paris in 1788 that "were I in America, I would advocate it (the Constitution) warmly till nine (States) should have adopted, and then just as warmly take the other side till the declaration of rights is annexed to it."

The State conventions of New York, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Virginia, North Carolina, and Rhode Island expressed anxiety because civil and religious liberty had not been fully safeguarded. Several of these States previously had enacted a State declaration or bill of rights. Virginia hung in the balance. Patrick Henry, George Mason, James Monroe, Benjamin Harrison, John Tyler, William Grayson, and other leaders opposed the adoption of the Constitution. James Madison returned late to enter the State campaign. The Baptists, now grown to be the most numerous religious body in the State, were the protagonists of complete religious freedom. For 2 hours Madison addressed the crowd, made up largely of Baptists that had assembled at Orange Court House, and when he finished Elder John Leland, the foremost Baptist minister of that day, urged everyone to vote for James Madison as their representative to the State convention called to ratify the Constitution. He was elected. In the meeting of that body Madison, through argument, persuasion, and promises, won the vote for adoption.

Between 1766 and 1778, 42 Baptist ministers had been arrested and imprisoned by the Colonial authorities of Virginia, acting in accordance with existing laws, and the charge against each of them was preaching the Gospel contrary to the canons of the Established Church. Patrick Henry pleaded in their defense. Thomas Jefferson sought to protect them through the introduction of a bill known as "An act for establishing religious freedom," which became law in 1786. But the man to whom all lovers of religious liberty in this country owe the greatest debt is James Madison, who richly deserves the title which history has bestowed upon him, namely, "The Father of the Constitution." This man appeared repeatedly in the court of his own country to defend Baptist nonconformists. In 1774 he denounced that diabolical, hell-conveived principle of persecution that had thrust many Baptist ministers into jail. In 1776 he supported Jefferson's measure for religious freedom, and in 1786 successfully carried through its enactment by the Virginia Assembly. In 1788, he pledged his efforts to secure amendments to the new Constitution, that would be incorporated as a bill of rights, and when the new Congress met, he fulfilled his pledge, and on December 15, 1791, he witnessed a great scene, the incorporation of the first 10 amendments, our Bill of Rights, which become thereby a part of the fundamental law of the land. The first of these amendments to the Constitution is the foundation of complete freedom of religion in the United States: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The first declaration in support of religious liberty ever uttered in the English language was made by the General Baptists in 1611, who had fled from England to Holland, in order to escape persecution. A portion of this group returned to their native land. One pastor after another was imprisoned in Newgate jail. The faithful congregation continued to meet somewhere in Old London, and from this dingy meetinghouse "there flashed out, first in England, the absolute doctrine of religious liberty." In 1614, Leonard Busher, a Baptist layman, addressed to James I "A Plea for Liberty of Conscience." In 1620, a group of Baptists made A Most Humble Supplication to the King's Majesty for religious freedom. In 1636, Roger Williams and his fellow believers in religious liberty formed a compact made by the new settlers of Providence Plantations, by which they were to be governed. In the interest of freedom of conscience they limited the power of this government to "only in civil matters." This was the first community in Christian history from A.D. 320 to A.D. 1636 in which religious freedom was fully assured. In 1663, Dr. John Clarke, pastor of the Newport Baptist Church, Rhode Island, secured from Charles II, a royal charter which set up the first government under the English crown which guaranteed "full liberty in religious concernments." In 1774, Isaac Backus, representing the Warren and other Baptist associations, made the first plea to the Continental Congress that religious as well as political freedom should be sought for in the conflict upon which this country was about to enter. In 1774 the Baptists of Virginia were the first religious body to declare their support of the American Revolution. In 1788, the Baptists of the United States stood unitedly for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution that would provide religious freedom.

John Locke, the eighteenth century philosopher, declared that "the Baptists were the first and only propounders of absolute liberty, just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty," and George Bancroft, statesman and historian, asserted that "freedom of conscience, unlimited freedom of mind was first a trophy of the Baptists."

In 1788, 13 small colonies separated by distance, cultural background, and religious beliefs were seeking to form a single national organization. Today a world, brought through the radio and the airplane into relations closer than our colonial fathers ever dreamed to be possible, is trying to form a single world organization. For its full realization the United Nations need to agree upon common aims, and these should be set forth in an international preamble, a world constitution, erecting the machinery for a working cooperation of the United Nations, and an international bill of rights in which the basic, inalienable rights of mankind shall be declared and means provided for their protection.

The United Nations stand today where our forefathers stood more than a century and a half ago. The wisdom of the decisions they made in 1788 and in 1791 are evidenced in the freedom our citizens enjoy and in the progress our Nation has made. Because of this America has an unescapable obligation to lead the United Nations into a world organization, embodying the principles and safeguarding the freedoms that have made the United States the freest, the greatest, and the most prosperous nation on earth. Freedom of religion is vital and essential to any world organization that shall endure and prosper.

Twenty-six years ago Woodrow Wilson, in whom centered the hopes of millions eager for the freedoms we enjoyed in America, presented a plan for a league of nations to secure peace and democracy for all. The World War had ended. The peace delegations of the nations were gathered in Paris. President Wilson presented to the commission on the drafting of the covenant for the League of Nations a proposed covenant that embodied the ideals and principles that have made our Nation free. Article VII of Mr. Wilson's covenant dealt with the freedom of religion and read as follows:

"Realizing religious persecution and intolerance as fertile sources of war, the powers signatory hereby agree, and the League of Nations shall exact from all states seeking admission to it, the promise that they will make no law prohibiting or interfering with the free exercise of religion, and that they will in no way discriminate, either in law or in fact, against those who practice any particular creed, religion, or belief, whose practices are not inconsistent with public order or public peace."

From February 3 to February 13, 1919, the Commission on the Drafting of the Covenant of the League considered this proposal, which was, in effect, the international proscription of religious persecution. On February 13, in the absence of President Wilson, the other members took final action. On that fatal day the Commission decided that, "in view of the complications of this question, it would be preferable to omit this article altogether," and perhaps in so doing the seeds of World War No. 2 were sown. Had President Wilson's proposal been adopted and properly implemented by the nations composing the League of Nations, the whole course of recent history would have been radically changed. The persecution of the Jews and other religious minorities would have been prevented and the whole world wolud have known a new birth of freedom.

The Baptists played an important part in the securing for this Nation the benefits of religious liberty. They face today a far greater opportunity than that which confronted our spiritual forefathers. They are called to bring to bear their influence upon those who shall participate in the Conference of the United Nations when they meet together to create a world organization having for its object the maintenance of a just and durable peace. The Baptists of America cannot do better than to endorse in principle the proposal made by President Wilson and secure the signatures, not only of the Baptists of this Nation, now more than 11,000,000 in number, but also the signatures of other millions of Americans of other congregations who share with them a like devotion to freedom of religion.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in

the RECORD a statement which I received from Mr. Ralph M. Andrews, executive vice president of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, Buffalo, N. Y.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT—JOINT STATEMENT OF THE NIAGARA FRONTIER

The Niagara Frontier reasserts its continued unqualified opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The project would be economically unsound and a waste of public funds. It would be harmful to labor, industry, and existing transportation agencies. It is not needed because present transportation and power facilities have stood the test of peak wartime production and have proved ample to carry the load. If considered at all, it should come before the United States Senate in treaty form in compliance with the Constitution. The following unitedly subscribe to this statement:

Black Rock Manufacturers Association, John P. Maddigan, president; Broadway - Fillmore Association, Thomas A. Boris, managing director; Buffalo Business Federation (representing 43 civic associations), Samuel D. Lunt, president; Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, George A. Newbury, president; Buffalo City Planning Association, Inc., Milton C. Guggenheim, president; Buffalo Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. George M. Nelson, president; Buffalo Food Brokers Association, W. J. Reilly, president; Buffalo Foreign Trade Association, Aubrey W. Crawford, president; Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce, Harry H. Schall, president; Buffalo Passenger Association, W. I. Gates, president; Buffalo Traffic Club, Robert T. Loveland, president; Building and Construction Trades Council of Buffalo and Vicinity, C. J. Rosenberger, secretary; Building Owners and Managers Association of Buffalo, Alan F. Schnell, secretary; Central Railway Club of Buffalo, W. J. Sheridan, president; City of Buffalo, Mayor Joseph J. Kelly; Corn Exchange of Buffalo, O. E. Auerbach, president; Delaware Avenue Association, Inc., Carlton C. Jewett, president; Elmwood Business Association, Inc., Robert W. Hopkins, secretary; Erie County Board of Supervisors, Roy R. Brockett, chairman; Fillmore Avenue Businessmen's Association, Arthur E. Lawrence, secretary; Flour, Feed, and Cereal Workers' Union, Local 19184, A. F. L., David Jameson, financial secretary; Forest District Civic Association, George A. East, president; Frontier Laundry Council, Harry D. Wemple, secretary-treasurer; Genesee-Jefferson Businessmen's and Taxpayers' Association, Inc., Dr. Charles D. Blaser, president; Genesee-Walden Businessmen's Association, George J. Sattler, president; Grain Elevator Employees Local 1286, Owen J. Kavanagh, president; Grain Shovelers Union Local 109, I. L. A., Thomas F. Merrick, president; Great Lakes District, International Longshoremen's Association, Simon P. O'Brien, president; International Longshoremen's Association, Local 1622, Edward J. Hennessey, president; International Shipmasters Association (Buffalo Lodge), O. A. Toale, president; Lackawanna Chamber of Commerce, Theodore Wiencek, executive secretary; Lockport Chamber of Commerce, Mrs. A. Milne Judd, secretary; Main Street Association, Alan F. Schnell, manager; Master Plumbers Association of Buffalo, N. Y., Frank G. Dittly, president; Medical Society, county of Erie, Louise W. Beamis, M. D., secretary; Niagara Frontier Industrial Traffic League, Karl S. Wright, president; Niagara Frontier Planning Association, Dr. J. Albert Hobbie, president; Niagara Frontier Planning Board, Chauncey J. Hamlin, chairman; Niagara Frontier Society of Industrial Engineers, P. J. Pakurar, president; Niagara Frontier Superintendents Association, Charles H. Youst, chairman; North Jefferson Businessmen's Association, J. Leslie DeYot, president; Pioneer Civic Association of South Buffalo, Hugh R. Shreenan, president; Port of Buffalo Defense Committee, Thomas C. O'Brien, chairman; Propeller Club, George W. Martin, president; Railroad Workers League of Western New York (representing 21 railroad brotherhoods and auxiliaries), Christy A. Buscaglia, counsel; Railway Business Women's Association of the Niagara Frontier, Helen M. Bruell, president; Real Estate Owners Taxpayers League, Inc., Wm. J. J. Kunzie, president; Shirley-Summit Park Association, Benjamin Eichberg, secretary; South Buffalo Business Men's Association, Inc., A. R. Boulden, secretary; Town Club, Inc., Mrs. George E. Prechtel, president; Transportation Club of Buffalo, Harry K. Thomas, president; Trucking Federation of Niagara Frontier, Carl L. Biers, president; United Taxpayers' League of Buffalo, Inc., E. C. St. Clair, secretary; War Emergency Committee of Standard Railway Labor Organizations, S. W. Dobbins, chairman; West Side Businessmen's Association, Inc., Thomas Reppenhagen, president; William Street Businessmen's Association, Inc., Michael Reinhardt, president.

The Christian Church: What of Its Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., on January 31, 1945, at a dinner given by the Protestant Council of the City of New York to launch a wider program of service to church and community by the council and its six constituent organizations. This council was formed to promote the coordination of different religious and welfare activities in New York, and one of its foremost aims is to obtain a continually closer relationship with the Catholic and Jewish faiths, in the belief that sectarian differences must be laid aside if the greater goal is to be attained. Seldom has there appeared in our time a more moving statement of the great principles of our faith than that found in Mr. Rockefeller's address. He expresses the thoughts of millions in this country, and outside of it as well, who share his vision and long for its realization.

The address follows:

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH: WHAT OF ITS FUTURE?

(By John D. Rockefeller, Jr.)

Not many weeks or months had elapsed after this World War began before there was presented to our vision a picture so horrible it hardly seemed that it could be true.

It appeared that hell had broken loose and that millions of evil spirits had become incarnate in human form and were going about the earth committing atrocities and acts of cruelty beyond belief.

In the face of this awful picture it is not strange that we should ask ourselves the question, Has Christianity failed?

But there is another picture which the war has painted. In it we see millions of men and women who are exemplifying in their daily lives, in the most commonplace fashion, unselfishness, generosity, loyalty, self-sacrifice, and other characteristics and qualities which command the admiration of the world. Unconsciously these people are reflecting Christ's spirit. Whether they know it or not, their inspiration comes from the God of all good deeds. Yet many of them have no church affiliations, for too often the church seems to them quite apart from their lives, an institution which has little contact with or understanding of their problems, since theirs is fundamentally a religion of deeds, not of creeds; expressed in life, not in words.

We turn from this picture with a glow in our hearts and say with renewed faith: "Christianity has not failed; churches may have failed, but not Christianity. For never in the history of the world was Christianity a more vital force in human life than it is today."

THE CHURCH REBORN

In the presence of this great host of noble men and women, who, generally, have not come from the church, although directly or indirectly all have been more or less influenced by it; who, many of them, have faced death, have lived a life far worse than death, have sacrificed their all, we ask, "What of the future of the Christian church?"

Will these people, after the experience through which they have passed, find in the church generally as it exists today the recognition, the association, the guidance, and the inspiration which they need and have a right to expect? Regretfully we must answer, "No." For the church has learned too little to speak their language, to think in terms of their environment, to meet their needs.

If this be true, one of two things is inevitable. Either this unorganized spiritual force which is silently dominating millions of lives will not be conserved, or the church must have a new birth if it is to meet this marvelous opportunity and great human need.

Let us picture, for a moment, this reborn church.

It would be the church of the Living God.

Its terms of admission would be love for God, as He is revealed in Christ and His living spirit, and the vital translation of that love into a Christlike life.

Its atmosphere would be one of warmth, freedom, and joy, so sympathetically and distinctly manifest as to attract and win into its fellowship all those who are striving to live useful and worthy lives.

It would pronounce ordinance, ritual, cred, all nonessential for admission into the Kingdom of God or His church. A life, not a creed, would be the test.

Its object would be to promote applied religion, not theoretical religion.

As its first concern it would encourage Christian living 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year.

It would be the church of all the people, of everyone who is fighting sin and trying to establish righteousness; the church of the rich and the poor, the wise and the ignorant, the high and the low—a true democracy.

Its ministers would be trained not only in the seminaries, but in some form of work-a-day life, so that they might acquire a personal knowledge of practical problems. Thus they would live in closer touch with humanity, would better understand and sympathize with human difficulties, and would exert their influence as much in living as in preaching.

A UNITED CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP

Would that I had the power to bring to your minds the vision as it unfolds before me.

I see all denominational emphasis set aside.

I see cooperation, not competition.

In the large cities I see great religious centers, wisely located, adequately equipped, strongly supported, ably led, inspiring their members to participation in all community matters.

In smaller places, instead of half a dozen dying churches, competing with each other, I see one or two strong churches, uniting the Christian life of the town; great economy in plant, in money, in service, in leadership; the money thus saved available for home and foreign mission.

I see the church, through its members, molding the thought of the world and leading in all great movements.

I see it literally establishing the Kingdom of God on earth.

Shall some such vision as this be realized? Upon the answer to that depends in large measure the future of the Christian church.

We have been considering the demand for a united Christian church from the point of view of the world's need for Christian leadership. There is another motive, not less compelling, urging the churches on toward that end. It is the necessity for cooperation if the forces of righteousness are to triumph in the eternal warfare against the forces of evil. The forces of evil, united on the common ground of their nefarious interests, are ever ready for aggressive action; while the forces of righteousness although seeking a common goal are frequently so preoccupied with their individual interests and petty differences that their attack upon the common foe is too often belated and not infrequently scattered and ineffective.

Christian men and women must come to see that only by the fullest cooperation and the setting aside of emphasis on nonessentials can the many branches of the Christian church, standing together on the common ground of Christianity, hope for victory in this great warfare against sin.

THE SPIRIT GIVETH LIFE

When Christ came into the world, He found the church loaded down with ritual and formalism. Every minutest detail of daily life was regulated by religious enactment. In the eyes of the church the most religious man was not he who gave to the poor, who helped the unfortunate, who was unselfish, meek and lowly, but he who kept most punctiliously every jot and tittle of the law. The spirit of religion had been displaced by empty form.

To establish spiritual righteousness in the world, to build up an internal rather than an external religion, to emphasize the responsibility of the individual to his Maker, was Christ's mission on earth.

Few and simple were the forms He set up or sanctioned, such as baptism and the Lord's Supper, but they were wonderfully beautiful and filled with sacred inspiration.

Baptism is an ordinance of profound symbolic meaning. Christ Himself was baptized. He did not, however, make baptism a condition of church membership.

The Lord's Supper is a sacrament, also rich in symbolic beauty. In this day of materialism, far be it from any true follower of Christ to minimize the spiritual value of these symbols; rather should they be preserved and guarded.

On the other hand, in the face of the great problems of sin, of evil, and of spiritual hunger which confront the world today, can we imagine that, were Christ to come to earth again, He would regard the observance or nonobservance of these and other ordinances and individual beliefs, or the manner in which they are observed, as of sufficient importance to justify controversy among His followers, and their separation into rival factions?

Can we fancy Him giving His approval to such a course, resulting as it does too often in relaxing the warfare against the common enemy, sin, and in causing men to forget their common responsibility, the needy brother?

THE SOUL AND ITS GOD

Let ordinance, creed, ritual, form, Biblical interpretation, theology, all be used to enrich worship, and to bring the believer into a fuller understanding of Him Whom we worship, as each individual or separate church may find them helpful toward that end. But God forbid that they should ever, any of them, divert the attention from, or be regarded as a substitute for, that personal, spiritual relation between the soul and its God which is the essence of true religion.

God forbid that they should be allowed to cause divisions among the followers of Christ or be set up as barriers at the door of any branch of the church of the Living God.

What the world craves today is a more spiritual and less formal religion. To the man or woman facing death, great conflict, the big problems of human life, the forms of religion are of minor concern, while the spirit of religion is a desperately needed source of inspiration, comfort, and strength.

I plead not for a modification of form but for its subordination to the spirit; not for the abolishing of ordinance and sacrament but for their voluntary rather than obligatory observance.

As we face then the world's need of great spiritual leadership, that humanity may be brought into vital daily relationships with a living God, and that all the forces of righteousness may be united in an eternal warfare against the forces of evil, we ask again the question, "What of the future of the Christian church?" This is the answer which I give you:

If the various divisions of the church as it is organized today catch the vision, have the breadth, the tolerance, the courage, and, setting aside all nonessentials, all barriers, will stand upon the bedrock principles of God's love and Christ's living spirit, "not satisfied," as Donald Hankey has said, "until the church is the church of all good men and women, until all good thoughts and deeds are laid at the feet of the Lord of all good life," the church of the living God will come into being, ushering in a new era of Christian unity.

What an opportunity. What a privilege. What a duty. In God's name, I ask, does anyone dare let it pass?

WHAT MEN SEEK IN THE CHURCH

What I have said thus far is the substance of an address which I made during the First World War. The convictions then expressed have only grown upon me with the passing years. I voice them tonight with even greater assurance as to their timeliness and present applicability. The bitter lessons taught by World War No. 1 have not saved us from the vastly greater conflagration of today. Nor has the church during the past quarter century put its house in order and with unity of action opposed the advancing hordes of the godless.

Today, as always, humanity craves the substance of religion; while churches too often emphasize the form. Men have long looked to the Christian church for religious training and spiritual inspiration that they may acquire both the knowledge and the will to make wise decisions and to take right actions in their daily lives. Their natural craving for religious guidance must not be repelled by alphabetical lists of denominational churches and agencies, when what they seek is so fundamental, and sectarian differences are so superficial. Rather should they be able to get in any Christian church, whatever the style of its architecture or the shade of its belief, the spiritual wisdom and strength which they need to fit them for practical daily living.

To say that no progress has been made toward the resolving of denominational barriers during this quarter century would be unjust to various groups which have made earnest efforts along those lines and definite advance. But to say that any broadly conceived, concerted movement to that end is under way, which is generally participated in, would be equally untrue.

Toward religious cooperation more progress has been made, although it has been too slow and too little. The movement in the interest of which we are gathered here tonight gives promise of significant possibilities in cooperation. Six interdenominational groups representing Protestant interests in Greater New York have come together in the Protestant Council of the City of New York to confer together, to plan together, to finance their needs together, and let us hope increasingly work together. The relationship is as yet only partially developed. There are many questions to be worked out. How successful and effective the organization may become, time only will tell. But granting its weaknesses and imperfections, like the Dumbarton Oaks conference in the political field, it is a start in the right direction. It is an important experiment in religious and welfare cooperation on a significant scale.

On February 3, 1943, the cargo transport *Dorchester* was torpedoed at 1:15 a. m. and sank within 25 minutes in iceberg waters, 90 miles from Greenland. As the ship went down, four chaplains—one a Catholic, one a Jew, two Protestants—were on the deck encouraging the men and passing out life belts. When there were no life belts left, they took off their own and gave them away. These chaplains were last seen standing arm in arm praying.

As they went to their death united in the service of their common Lord, so let us, the living members of the great religious faiths they represent, go forward, shoulder to shoulder, as a united army, fighting evil, establishing righteousness, brothers in service, sons of the one God and Father of us all.

Cartels: What Shall We Do About Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cartels: What Shall We Do About Them?" written by Milo Perkins.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing this article. The estimated cost is $169, but I believe that it would be abundantly worth while to have the article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARTELS: WHAT SHALL WE DO ABOUT THEM?

(By Milo Perkins)

Completely open competition in international trade is dead for the foreseeable future. Businessmen of several foreign nations have already decided to conduct a large part of their foreign trade after the war through cartels, and it seems certain that their governments will support them. This decision will not only affect every American who does business abroad, but will deeply influence the domestic economy of the United States. This is a fact which there's no getting round.

Obviously most Americans don't like it. President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull have both recently denounced cartels, as have other American leaders ranging from Thurman Arnold to Eric Johnston. A devastating case has been made against cartel operations in the past few years. The popular imagination has been caught by congressional revelations indicating that the Nazis outwitted us by using their industrial combines to make cartel deals with our firms—deals which helped the German war effort and damaged ours.

We Americans still believe in free markets where the best man has a sporting chance to win. We distrust big combinations of industrial power, and cartels are certainly powerful. If tariffs are to be written for American industries we prefer that our own Government should write them; cartels in effect often write their own prohibitive tariffs when they agree to parcel out countries to their members on a monopoly basis. We believe in a free enterprise system, with its profits and loss; cartels seek to establish a controlled profit system without loss. The whole notion of cartelized foreign trade goes against our grain.

But it will do us little good simply to wave our arms—as we have been doing—in righteous indignation. We'll have to do better than that or we shall be outsmarted and outgeneraled.

The first thing we must do—and it had better be soon—is to face the facts as to what cartels are, why they are, and what the chances are of their being eliminated from international trade after the war, or even relegated to a minor role. Then we may be able to decide on an American policy which will have a chance of working.

First of all, what are international cartels and what do they do?

They might be described, loosely, as world-wide trusts, combines, or monopolies. An international cartel is an agreement among producers in various countries for joint action to achieve stability in a given industry. Sometimes this means raising prices and trying to hold them up, sometimes it means trying to avoid a price collapse which would bring heavy losses. In either case, the cartel tries to increase the income of its members by weakening competition. All cartels are in business to keep prices at levels which could not be held if free competition existed. (This is particularly true in times of depression; in good times, cartel prices are occasionally lower than the prices that would result from free competition.)

Cartels are very numerous. In 1939, according to one count, there were no less than 179 world-wide cartel arrangements, of which 133 covered manufactured goods, 32 covered minerals, and 14 covered agricultural products and services. Out of the total of 179, American firms participated in 109. (Since then the Department of Justice has started proceedings against some 40 of these, and it is said that 15 or 20 more are scheduled for investigation.) Many cartel arrangements have been in abeyance during the war, either because connections with cartel members in enemy countries have been cut or because war operations have been so profitable as to make cartel restrictions unnecessary to bolster up the companies' income; but in the two decades before the war they had been making rapid strides.

Not only were there strictly foreign cartels, many of long standing, in which no American firms participated directly but which covered commodities we needed to import, such as rubber, tea, quebracho, quinine, tin, nickel, and industrial diamonds; but there were also cartels in which American firms joined—in chemicals, plastics, pharmaceuticals, electric lamps, photographic materials, aluminum, magnesium, and other metals. Sometimes the member companies made a single agreement; sometimes there was a series of little agreements on specific products made by a single industry (these were frequently informal and very hard to prove).

The devices used by cartels to stabilize prices have been many and ingenious. Sometimes they have done outright price fixing. Sometimes they have divided markets between members so as to give them monopolies in specified sales areas: "You let me have Europe to myself and I'll let you have the United States." At other times cartels have not only done this but have joined hands in developing the market in a third area. For example, not only did Du Pont and Imperial Chemical Industries agree that Du Pont should have the United States market and that I. C. I. should have most of the British Empire but the two companies worked together through jointly owned subsidiaries in Argentina and Brazil. These companies, known as Duperial, sold the products of both members. South American businessmen feel that the cartel thus discouraged the growth of South American chemical industries.

Sometimes cartels have rigidly limited each member company's production and have relied on that rather than upon specific price agreements, to keep prices in line. (Members have been fined for exceeding their quotas, the amount of the fine being distributed among the other companies. The German steel industry, for example, paid a fine of some $10,000,000 in 1 year during the 1930's while it was producing more than its cartel allocation permitted.)

Another thing that cartel members often do is to swap patents and technical processes. This gives each member a pool of scientific knowledge much bigger than it could command by itself. It also saves the time that might be lost in lawsuits over patent rights (and thus sometimes enables you and me to get the product more quickly). The swapping of patents may take place without any money changing hands—just a gentlemen's agreement to keep out of each other's backyards—or a considerable sum may be paid in cash. Suppose, for example, that a European company holds a patent on a chemical which can be used in several different trades. It may say to an American company, "I'll let you use my patent, but only on condition that you use it only in such-and-such a trade and in such-and-such an area"; in a case like that there may be a cash payment.

Obviously the firm which can make an international patent swap gets a big advantage over its rivals at home—though it is hard to say how much of this advantage comes directly from the swap and how much of it comes from the fact that in this scientific age the big company with a well-financed research staff and an international sales organization has a tremendous lead over its smaller competitors anyhow.

Before the war, certain American electrical-equipment companies got a distinct advantage from being tied in, through patent agreements, with a well-organized international cartel. It has been charged that you and I paid higher prices for electric light bulbs as a result, and that the use of fluorescent lighting in our homes was delayed.

Patent arrangements usually protect American companies from foreign competition (because the foreign companies stay out of the United States market) and frequently from domestic competition (because their American rivals don't hold the necessary patents).

Such patent agreements can lead to gross abuses. An arrangement among American, British, and German chemical companies made possible the sale of the same plastic material to commercial molders at 85 cents a pound and to dental laboratories at $45 a pound; it has even been charged that research men were put to work to adulterate the material for the 85-cent market, without injuring its quality, in order to protect the $45 market. International patent agreements may also endanger our military security, as did those which restricted the production of magnesium in this country before the war in order to protect the market for aluminum. But things do not always work that way. Our American bombing missions over Germany have used 100-octane gas, synthetic rubber tires, and synthetic toluene explosives, all based on German patents acquired for $35,000,000 in a deal made in 1929, and subsequently improved in American laboratories.

It may be argued that by exchanging patents and processes, cartels help the world-wide development of scientific and technological knowledge. But clearly they do not always pass on the full benefits of their research to consumers in all the countries where they operate. The general public wants to see inventors rewarded, but after that it wants to see new inventions and new processes used.

II

Very well, then. Why can't we Americans just decide that we will have none of this?

We know that cartels would have rougher going after the war if goods moved as freely among countries as they now move among our 48 States—and that if this were to happen, the world would have more production, more economic opportunity, more employment, higher living standards, and a better environment for political democracy. We know, too, that if all governments encouraged open competition and did away with restrictive trade devices such as export and import quotas, blocked currencies, and exchange manipulation, American business could give a good account of itself in international trade, despite its higher wage levels. Why, then, shouldn't we simply legislate that no American firm shall have anything to do with a cartel, and hope that the rest of the world will follow suit?

The answer is: Because American business even at its strongest is relatively helpless against the competition of well-organized foreign businesses supported by the power of their governments. It's the entry of foreign governments into the picture that makes the difference.

For the truth is that our Government is the only government in the world that is actively opposed to centralized controls over foreign trade.

Take a look at the world scene. Obviously the Russian Government monopolies bear a much closer resemblance to cartel units than to private concerns, and are much more at home in a cartelized world than in a world of free competition. Smaller European countries like Belgium and Holland and Switzerland have permitted cartels in the past and

are forced to use them once the big powers use them. And the cartelized control of industry is an easy, stable way of doing business in a semiclosed economy like Britain's.

Many American businessmen were amazed to read the recent statement of Lord McGowan, chairman of Imperial Chemical Industries, that British manufacturers "have ceased to believe in the superiority of free and extreme competition and have moved a long way in the direction of cooperation in industry and central action by the Government." But it is symbolic of the revolution in British thinking that has occurred during the past few years. Knowing that they must have full employment in Britain after the war, and that their plight will be desperate unless they have greatly increased exports of goods and services, most of the British believe that they cannot rely upon competition to achieve this end, and therefore look without alarm upon the prospect of using cartels under Government guidance.

Other nations, feeling that after the war they will not be able to sell enough of what they produce to protect their foreign exchange positions, will feel forced to limit what their people may import. (New Zealand, for example, has announced that she will continue such a policy, which she has had since 1938.) Even weak nations, if they resort to quotas and blocked currencies, can lick strong American companies operating in their countries on a competitive basis. They can even establish cartels by government decree, in which American exporters have to take part unless they pull out of these nations' markets altogether. Take, for instance, the cartels by government decree that were set up in several Latin-American and European countries in the twenties and thirties to deal with the oil business.

Here's how it's done. The government—of a Latin-American country, let us say—sponsors a company of its own, and then calls in the privately owned foreign companies and tells them that it wishes its company to get a certain percentage of the business at what amounts to a government-approved price. It suggests that all these companies get together, discuss the matter, and come back with an agreement as to the percentage of the business which is to be allocated to each of them. If the American company doesn't join in such an agreement, the American company doesn't do business in that country.

Our State Department is unlikely to bring any real pressure to bear to break up such arrangements. It probably would regard any such move as interference with the other country's internal policy—an invasion of its sovereignty. And no American firm is strong enough to buck such arrangements by itself. Either it must have the support of the State Department in its insistence on doing business competitively, or it must be permitted, with diplomatic backing, to do business on a cartel basis in that country. The only other alternative is to pull out—and our need for foreign markets won't allow that to happen very often.

This trend toward cartelization abroad is likely to be intensified by another fact. The world supply of goods of many sorts is bound to exceed the effective demand as soon as we get beyond the "catch-up" period immediately after the war. New synthetic products and substitute products developed under the stress of war will be competing with natural products as soon as these become available once more. Rubber is an outstanding example—though the rubber situation will not be critical for the first 2 or 3 years after the war. When heavy surpluses reappear, there will be a loud call everywhere for stabilized marketing operations to avoid bankruptcy in producing countries; and the United Nations will be likely to resort to government-sponsored cartels as one of several stabilizing mechanisms. If by that time we have entered a United Nations' organization to keep the peace, there will be large economic areas where we shall want to collaborate with other member nations on world-wide marketing problems. To do otherwise would be to engage in economic warfare against our present allies. So here again the pressure of circumstances will tend to make us accept cartels because other nations accept them.

We shall be much more likely to accept them than we now believe. Our opposition to them is really a half-hearted opposition. We Americans preach free competition but we don't really practice what we preach. We moralize about the competitive way to business men in other nations, and then cling to tariff schedules so high that foreign businessmen can't enter the United States market with their own goods to compete with us.

Now there is a parallel here which it is well to bear in mind. American firms have joined international cartels in the past less to get foreign business than to keep competitive foreign products out of the rich American market. Cartel agreements have frequently fenced in that market more effectively than any tariff. For instance, the Du Pont-I. C. I. agreement has been the equivalent of a prohibitive tariff on a long list of British chemicals in the United States and vice versa. There is little doubt that a sizable part of American business will want to join cartels after the war to protect its domestic market, and it is likely that popular opinion will back such a move exactly as it has backed the imposition of high American tariffs. For as a people we are still under the delusion that the way to be prosperous is to sell as much as we can abroad and to buy as little as we can from abroad.

Already we Americans have gone a lot further toward giving up free competition here at home than most of us realize. Our support of it is stronger in our speeches than in our action. We love to tell each other with a good deal of righteousness that free competition is the American way. But in the marketplace there's a wide gap between our oratory and our actions.

Not only does our tariff shut out foreign goods to prevent price-cutting from abroad in our home markets, but our patent laws underwrite monopoly most effectively in the fields where science has made its greatest progress. Under the Miller-Tydings Act, manufacturers and retailers can now act jointly to control sales prices of items such as food and drugs; this is in effect an abrogation of the Sherman Antitrust Act in a segment of the economy that affects the cost of living for every one of us as a consumer. For several years the Guffey Coal Act has attempted to protect coal operators from the effects of competition by enforcing minimum prices. Oil is now produced in the United States under strict proration to prevent competition in the production end of the business from wasting a vital national resource. And our labor legislation and our agricultural legislation both succeed in protecting millions of individual Americans from the strictest competition.

Several pieces of labor legislation do this by granting certain union activities immunity from the antitrust laws, and by legalizing group action in contrast to individual action by separate workers. I am not concerned here with abuses under such legislation by some union officials any more than I am concerned with abuses by some manufacturers; both of them take place outside the law. I am concerned with the extent to which our Government, in segment after segment of our economy, has passed laws to save people from the loss part of the profit-and-loss system.

Nowhere is the trend any clearer than it is in American agriculture. The same fluid milk sells today in the New York City milkshed at a dozen different prices, all supported by law and all designed to make us pay about twice as much for fluid milk in bottles for our families to drink as processors pay for the same milk to manufacture into cheese or butter or ice cream. It's as neat a domestic cartel for a selected group of farmers as human ingenuity ever devised—and much more subtle than the tax on oleomargarine, pushed through by the dairy industry to protect butter prices.

Indeed it can be said that virtually all American agriculture is now cartelized to save farmers from the agony of open competition when overproduction depresses price levels after the war. The last O. P. A. Act included an extraordinary provision, which won the support of both parties, guaranteeing American farmers 90 percent of "parity price," or more, for most of the crops they will produce for 2 years after the official proclamation of peace. Since the signing of the peace treaty may be delayed for 2 or 3 years after the shooting stops, our farmers may be spared the rigors of competition for 4 or 5 years after the Axis folds—even though this costs the rest of the country several billion dollars a year. No appropriation has yet been made, but the legislative promise is on the books. This little-noticed piece of legislation is certainly a flagrant departure from the principle of free competition.

Nor have we Americans limited such measures to the domestic field. We are also parties to international price-stabilization agreements on such imported agricultural commodities as sugar and coffee. Through the International Sugar Agreement of 1937 we acted with other important producing and consuming nations to lift the world sugar industry out of the depressed state into which it had fallen. We likewise actively promoted the Inter-American Coffee Agreement of 1940 in order to help the Latin-American countries to market one of their main crops at a profit—a crop on which prices had dropped and stocks had piled up alarmingly. (Incidentally, wholesale prices now are nearly double what they were in 1939, before the agreement was put into effect.) And we have already given tentative backing to a similar proposal on wheat moving in international trade after the war.

Furthermore, a strong case has recently been advanced for handling both our international communications business and our international air transport business after the war through "chosen instruments"—companies that would be given a virtual monopoly with diplomatic backing. This would mean abandoning the principle of free competition in these fields, too. And beyond that, it would mean that either company could use our Government as a major source of strength, while our Government could use either company as an adjunct in protecting American interests throughout the world.

I am not trying here either to attack or to support legislation which takes the sharpest teeth out of competition for farmers, for workers, or for businessmen. The point I am making is simply that we have gone a long, long way in the direction of protecting ourselves from the very competition that we laud so highly in our speeches. Too long a way, in all likelihood, to go backward.

This does not mean that the disciples of Thurman Arnold and Eric Johnston should abandon their battle for free enterprise as against international cartelization. It does not mean that it's time to give up the fight on every possible front for a freer economy. But it does mean that it's time to rearrange the line of battle to take account of actual circumstances. It means that we Americans have got to operate in the world as it is today and not in the fairyland of our own oratory. The wider the gap between our preaching and our practice, the sillier we look to other nations. It's time

for us to make our foreign trade policy fit the realities of an era which has already gone a long way toward cartelization.

III

The first job to be done is to break up the German-dominated cartel system which the Nazis have imposed on European industry in the past 4 years and to destroy the power of the huge monopolies in both Germany and Japan. Such economic disarmament is a very large order. Although our own Government is committed to this policy, there is as yet no United Nations agreement on it nor on a program as to how it is to be done. This is the first cartel problem to be tackled, if a scramble for control of the German cartels by separate members of the United Nations is to be avoided. Specific programs, industry by industry, for the decartelization of Nazi and Japanese enterprise remain to be developed.

No one can suggest with finality what our eventual policy toward cartels should be. That policy will be evolving for several years. If the United Nations build an effective organization for keeping the peace, an atmosphere for genuine international cooperation on economic matters will be created. If, on the other hand, the world drifts into great regions which are more or less self-sufficient, there may be little chance for any real collaboration on a world-wide basis. Our own internal political situation will be a key factor in the final decision.

We may, therefore, want our businessmen to work with the businessmen of other nations in certain cartels, or we may be forced to build great combines of our own for foreign-trade purposes as offsets to Russian and British combines. Were this to happen, we might see a great resurgence of activity under a modified Webb-Pomerene Act. Events themselves will have to determine our final course.

In the meantime, however, these preliminary steps and principles seem to make sense:

1. Registration: We need a law which will require the national registration of cartel arrangements. American business firms should register proposed international agreements which fix prices; or which allocate territories, fields of industrial activity, or markets; or which limit production. They should register them with an appropriate agency of our Government, designated by Congress. Since cartel operations are intimately bound up with our foreign policy, the logical agency for this assignment would be our State Department. (Businessmen are apprehensive about any growth in Washington bureaus, but the answer in this case is to find men who are capable of handling these increased responsibilities.)

All registered agreements should be made available to Congress and to the public, unless military security dictates otherwise. Commercial trade secrets should not be divulged in such publicity, however, and care should be taken not to injure the position of American firms with their foreign competitors by disclosing strictly commercial information whose release would serve no public purpose.

Such registration would eliminate the secrecy which has usually surrounded cartel agreements in the past. Exposing them to critical public review would be a first step toward eliminating some of their more restrictive practices. By conducting this operation so far as possible in a goldfish bowl, business would have a chance to tell the public its side of the story. It certainly did an ineffective job in this field before the war.

Legislation along these lines has already been introduced in Congress. In hearings before the O'Mahoney subcommittee of the Senate Judicary Committee in May 1944, Ralph W. Gallagher, chairman of the board of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, expressed approval of the registration idea. A proposal to register cartel agreements with the British Board of Trade has also gained support in England.

2. Review. In addition to registration, the enabling legislation should provide for setting up, within the State Department, a quasi-judicial Board of International Trade. This Board should be empowered to review all cartel registrations which are filed and to approve or disapprove them. After filing, hearings before this Board could be requested by:

(a) The Department of Justice if it fears a violation of the antitrust laws within the United States.

(b) The American corporation which has filed the agreement and which wants a yes or no answer so that it can do its business with dispatch.

(c) Any interested business firm not a party to the cartel agreement but presumably within the same industry, and therefore vitally affected.

The Board, with the Secretary of State acting as Chairman, might have eight other members. These could be the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce, the Attorney General, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and two men of high national standing to represent the public. Each Board member should have an alternate, and the Board as a whole should have an executive secretary with a competent staff which could be established within the State Department. The Board of International Trade should count on analysis by the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Labor, as well as by other Government agencies whenever this is appropriate in carrying out its assignments.

The enabling legislation establishing this Board should set up broad principles to guide it in its decisions as to approving or disapproving cartel arrangements. These principles should include consideration of:

1. Our military security;
2. Our foreign policy;
3. The effect of any agreement on the volume of our international trade.
4. The effect of any agreement on sales, prices, the volume and costs of production, and the status of labor in the industry making the application; and
5. The effect of the agreement on our domestic economy.

The board would have to reach its decisions quickly. We must never forget that most business firms in other countries will not be subject to these restrictions, and, after the initial examination, the board should have the continuing function of reviewing all agreements which it approves. The full effects on our economy of approved cartel arrangements may not be apparent for 2 or 3 years after they are entered into; therefore, annual reports to the board on the functioning of the cartels by the American members should be required. Such progress reports would make for more continuity and consistency of policy as between government and business in this field. We have had all too little of it in the past.

The board itself should review regularly all approved cartel arrangements for their operating effects on our domestic economy, on our foreign policy, and on our military security. It should submit its own annual report on these matters to Congress.

There will be times when it will be necessary to revoke or modify the previous approval of cartel arrangements after hearings and due notice. This will be inevitable in a changing world. But so long as board approval is in effect any American firms participating in approved cartels should be granted immunity from prosecution under our antitrust laws, provided they operate within the framework of the approval granted them. This should be stated clearly in the enabling legislation, insofar as it applies to our foreign trade.

The British are also considering similar review functions. In the recent White Paper on Employment Policy, it was emphasized that the British Government "will therefore seek the power to inform themselves of the extent and effect of restrictive agreements and of the activities of combines; and to take appropriate action to check practices which may bring advantages to sectional producing interests but work to the detriment of the country as a whole."

Any mechanism for dealing with cartels obviously needs enough flexibility to meet changing conditions. The mechanism that I have just suggested is based on the assumption that if we found it advantageous for American companies to enter certain cartel arrangements after the war, we would want responsible public review and a continuing appraisal of their operations. It also assumes that since cartelization is a privilege and not a right, and since foreign policy is involved, American firms should not be subjected to prosecution by the Department of Justice so long as their cartel operations come within an approval granted by the Board of International Trade. (The antitrust laws were not designed to implement our foreign policy, whereas this proposed legislation is designed to do just that. Our foreign trade necessities in the present world situation require it.) Finally, it assumes that national action along these lines would enable us to take a more responsible part in formulating international cartel policies together with the other United Nations.

3. International commodity agreements: We may want to use, as we have in the past, the device of the international commodity agreement to meet problems of chronic oversupply—in wheat, sugar, and coffee, for example; and we may need to apply it to postwar surpluses in metals, too.

This means, in effect, intergovernmental cartels, and carries the danger that the regulating group may become identified with the group under regulation and forget the general public interest. This is a danger we must recognize and guard against as best we can, not only in the administrative set-up under a particular commodity agreement but in providing for reports by it to the board of international trade. This board should be empowered to pass upon all international commodity agreements.

Marketing programs to achieve world-wide stability in many a specific industry may be entirely justifiable in the post-war years. The alternative may be bankruptcy for business, unemployment for labor, and lower tax revenues for governments. Food-surplus problems do not have to be cured wholly by acreage and marketing restrictions, however; school-lunch programs on an international scale already exist, and their expansion could provide a method of eating the surplus which would raise health standards at the same time. Each situation requires separate treatment on its merits.

We may also want to use international commodity agreements to conserve, on an international scale, the natural resources of important raw materials. The recent Anglo-American oil agreement is a good example. This is now pending before the Senate as a treaty. It provides for international cooperation in the development and marketing of petroleum products, but is not a cartel in the ordinarily accepted usage of that word.

On the other hand, it does not contemplate wide-open competition in the production end of the oil business. It is really an extension, on an international scale, of the principles of the interstate oil compact which we were obliged to adopt here in the United States. No outright price fixing is contemplated, but a regulation of production for export is recognized as necessary both to protect petroleum resources and to promote orderly marketing on an international scale.

Commodity agreements call for international boards or committees for their supervision. Insofar as possible, they should act as umpires rather than as administrative

bodies. Business sacrifices a certain amount of its freedom when it comes under the jurisdiction of such agencies. There is no way to avoid this in large segments of our foreign trade, however. Any business big enough to be cartelized is big enough to have a direct effect upon the public interest. Hence some degree of public review is necessary.

So much for public regulation. But it can do only part of the job. The rest will have to be done by business itself.

If cartels are to survive for the long pull, they must do three things better than noncartelized business, even if this means lower profits. First of all, they must offer consumers better products at lower prices, just as soon as new inventions and technological changes make these possible. In the second place, they must fight positively for an expansion of markets. In a world where every nation wants a bigger slice of the trade pie after the war than before it, the only thing that can relieve the international tensions will be a bigger international pie. And in the third place they must offer labor opportunities for advancement, a chance to participate in savings and insurance plans, and stability of employment at gradually increasing annual wages. The business reasons for not exploiting labor are quite as strong as the humanitarian ones: good wages in the tin mines, for example, will mean broader markets for the gadgets which the industrialized nations will be wanting to export.

IV

The steps which I have just suggested do not add up to a panacea for the cartel problem. There is no single, easy answer. Rather, our problem is to shape the various forms of both competition and monopoly into useful instruments for our national and international policies.

Some kinds of foreign trade are best suited to competitive enterprise—like automobiles, textiles, and manufactured consumers' goods in which there is considerable variation in quality. Others can be handled better by cooperation among countries—raw materials like sugar, coffee, petroleum, certain metals, and probably rubber. Still others will remain in a no-man's land until the ultimate postwar relationships among the United Nations become clearer.

We should prepare for any eventuality, however, and do it promptly in the little time that's left to us. We must act swiftly if we are to remain a first-class power in world affairs. International diplomacy, military security, and economic policy are no longer separate; we must integrate them into a vigorous, cohesive foreign policy if our leadership in the modern world is to be alert and effective.

With our major foreign competitors in world markets already operating as closed economies—or moving rapidly in that direction—we are likely to find free competition in many fields as obsolete after the war as a model T Ford. Where we cannot have free competition, we may be faced with cartels whether we like them or not. Where we cannot eliminate the cartels, we must gradually perfect new ways to make them into instruments which will serve the public interest.

Army Nurse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert a short poem authored by Maj. Frederick W. Waite, a most distinguished American soldier who has devoted many years of his life to the service. For quite a period of time Major Waite was stationed at Camp McCain, which is located in the district that I have the honor to represent.

My attention was first directed to the composition by a distinguished Mississippian, Mrs. Sarah C. McCorkle, president of the North Mississippi Department of the American Legion Auxiliary.

I think it most fitting that the poem be inserted in the RECORD at a time when the House has under consideration the so-called nurse draft bill, which I trust will be passed before the day ends.

The poem follows:

ARMY NURSE

He's waiting for a nurse to cleanse him;
The wounded doughboy with body caked in mud,
While his thoughts of the battle go dim,
Where he has spilled life's precious blood;
He's waiting for that loving and healing care,
That only an American Army nurse can give,
For she, alone, understands his bewildered stare,
During those hours of agony he must live;
The wounded doughboy, with body caked in mud,
And that Army nurse, fighting by his side,
In this world, drenched from a hatred flood,
Let her courage and gallantry be our guide.

—*Frederick W. Waite.*

Poem Appearing in Boston Post by Henry Gillen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following very excellent poem by Henry Gillen, which appeared in the March 5, 1945, issue of the Boston (Mass.) Post:

THE BOSTON MASSACRE 1770–1945

(By Henry Gillen)

Does anyone ask why the flags are hung? Does anyone wonder the bells have rung? Have some of our foemen met death, in a gallant victory, a wondrous feat? No, we are marking an ancient day, which the tides of time could not wash away, something the Tories in cap and gown, labored to blacken to please a crown, and the name of the "mobsters" to heroes give, who offered their lives that freedom live.

There are only stones in the Town House square, but the silent cobbles are eloquent there, circle on circle to mark the place, where Negro, Celtic and Saxon race mingled the blood that was brave and proud, in the foremost ranks of the angered crowd, with courage a saber and right a shield, and an unarmed justice that would not yield, though the menacing guns were grim and bright, of the red-backed Fascists there that night.

To be remembered for stout deeds done, not when the day is flecked with sun, but capped with darkness and foes are nigh, and death and the devil ride the sky, is honor that comes to the high estate, in medals and monuments for the great, but rarely rare for the also ran, the humble fellow, the common man, who swings pickaxes and delves with spades, and dies on his own crude barricades.

Yet not forgotten the decades through, now that the battle flames anew, and young men fearlessly fight again, in the Aachen snow and the Leyte rain, in 1,000 streets and 100 squares, the wide world over in tyrants' lairs, the wide world over through blood and tears, the memory gleams from the yesteryears, of Attucks and Caldwell, Gray and Carr, and Maverick bright as the morning star.

Suffer Little Children To Come Unto You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Suffer Little Children to Come Unto You," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and member of Salaam Temple's crippled children committee, before a group of public spirited citizens in West Orange, N. J., on the afternoon of March 6, 1945, and broadcast over radio station WAAT.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to speak to you this evening about crippled children. The hardest battles are fought and the most glorious victories are won not in wars between men but in wars of men against hardship and handicap, against disease and death.

For 23 years the members of the Mystic Shrine have fought against the things, hidden and known, which cripple little children, which twist their limbs and bodies out of shape, strike them down in many ways, and hang over them like swords of doom.

This, briefly, is the story of the Shriners' hospitals which mend broken little bodies and transform them into normal boys and girls who become upstanding men and women. The love of little children has turned the members of the Shrine into ministers of healing and happiness. The Red Fez takes its place with the Red Cross and the Red Seals as an emblem of mercy and loving kindness.

This great institution had its beginning 25 years ago when W. Freeland Kendrick, who was then the head of our order, visited a hospital for crippled children in Philadelphia. He took four of these little human wrecks, as he called them, for an auto ride. Their thin, frail bodies, their misshapen limbs made a lasting impression upon him. But being a good citizen he did not express his sympathy in tears. He resolved to find a way to give crippled children whose parents are financially unable to provide necessary surgical care a chance for life.

Kendrick's conscience would not let him rest. He told and retold his story to his fellow Shriners and other public-spirited citizens. "Let there be life," he pleaded, "life for little boys and girls who without help are sentenced to death, or life worse than death, as incurable cripples."

The members of the Mystic Shrine and nonmembers of our order heeded his plea. The first Shriners' Hospital for crippled children was opened in Shreveport, La., in the latter part of 1922 with 50 beds. Today there are 850 beds in 15 different Shrine Hospitals in the United States, Canada, and the Territory of Hawaii, caring for these little patients. Another unit will be dedicated this week in Mexico City, where the need is most urgent.

Requirements for admission are few and simple. The children must be under 14 years of age, without parents or guardians financially able to pay for surgical treatment, and there must be a reasonable hope that with proper surgical treatment, they will become useful citizens and not charges upon the communities in which they live. Only children suffering from some deformity of limbs or spine are admitted. There are no barriers of race, religion or color. These suffering little children are near and dear to our hearts and no expense is too great to liberate them from their misfortunes.

To date, including "out patients," we have restored approximately 100,000 maimed children so they can take their normal place in our society. Forty thousand have been treated in our "out patient" departments. More than a hundred of the crippled children who were treated in our hospitals are now fighting in our armed forces. Raymond Reeves came to our Portland, Oreg., Hospital a cripple. We sent him forth cured and strong. Before he was captured by the Japanese he courageously rendered his Nation noble service. When peace comes he will, we hope, be absorbed by our human family as any other normal citizen.

The work of the Shriners' Hospitals has not been in the headlines of the newspapers, but it is deeply etched in the hearts of every member of the Ancient and Accepted Order of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, many nonmembers who have supported this work, and the hearts of the thousands of former patients who were rehabilitated and now stand erect and discharge their responsibilities as good citizens.

Here is the record of the Shriners' Hospitals during the past year: 20,888 crippled children were treated at our clinics apart from the bed patients.

These hospitals provided 1,776 braces; made 11,000 X-rays; applied 9,000 cases; gave nearly 25,000 physical therapy treatments; performed 4,800 operations on 2,700 patients; discharged 2,600 little boys and girls who, in a noble sense, were recreated; spent efficiently more than $1,000,000 in healing and rebuilding the unfortunate and underprivileged.

Most people know Shriners by the red fez and colorful costumes. But behind all our fun and frolic is the burning spiritual aim to be of help to our fellowmen, regardless of race, color, or creed. That desire crystallized into this most appealing of all services to mankind when our past imperial potentate, W. Freeland Kendrick, took the four little human wrecks for an automobile ride.

Tonight I plead for funds with which to make certain that our work not only will go on, but will be enlarged. Never has there been a struggle that could be more justly termed "a holy war." The thousands that are in our hospitals and clinics need braces, X-ray, physiotherapy. They need the skill of the finest surgeons. Hundreds are on our waiting lists. The longer they wait, the longer will it take to help them. And there are thousands more. If we had the means, we could reach out to more of them and say, "Come, here is life and hope."

We need more than $1,000,000 in 1945. What is it worth to you to save a crippled child? Put it this way: Suppose one were brought into your home this very minute, carried like a puppet because his limbs were too thin and weak to bear the weight of his body; suppose you were taken to the bedside of one whose parents are financially unable to buy the brace without which he could never walk. What would you give to change that picture of helplessness into one of happiness? Giving is living—to give to others is to make your own life sublime.

Life membership in our Shrine hospitals for Shriners and nonmembers of the order costs only $60. This will underwrite the cost in our hospital for 12 days for some little crippled boy or girl. In a sense, $60 will buy one-fifth of a new lifetime for a crippled child. Can you think of a better investment?

A few weeks ago we received a letter from a former patient in our Philadelphia hospital:

"In 1934, when I was 6 years of age, I spent my first Christmas away from home. That Christmas was spent in the Shriners' Hospital. Tonight, when I heard that Vox Pop program from there, it brought back many memories. I have come to love that hospital because the nurses and doctors made it possible for me to walk, dance, skate, play basketball and do about everything other girls do. They gave me hope and confidence in myself. I will never forget or cease to appreciate what was done for me."

To walk, to dance, to skate, to play basketball, and to do about everything other girls do, to get married, to rear a family—this is the world of tomorrow for which we Americans are fighting. This is the world to which every little boy and girl has a right to look forward.

There is something of the divine in each of us, for we have been made in His image; there is something of the Saviour in each of us, for the sufferings of little children touch us to the quick.

It is not I who speak to you tonight. In larger measure, I am the voice of hundreds of children in our country, in Canada, in Hawaii, in Mexico, and elsewhere who want to walk, to dance, to skate, to play basketball, and do things that other normal boys and girls do. To give as many of them as possible a new lease on life is divine.

In all reverence, I would repeat the words of Holy Writ—"Suffer little children to come unto you," and then rephrase them—"Help us to bring into our hospitals the little children who suffer that we may lead them from the valley of the shadow of despair to the hills of health, of hope, and of happiness."

First American Patrol To Cross the Rhine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke about the reference in section 7 of the committee substitute to paragraph (5), subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940, known as the Second War Powers Act. I also made brief remarks on the pending amendment, which I heartily favor in the interest of the members of the armed forces.

Today, Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate, on the eve of this vote, to discuss further the pending legislation designed to assist our heroes. However, there appeared in the Charleston, S. C., News and Courier, an article which I request be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article reads in part as follows:

A Charleston man, Capt. George L. Youngblood, led the first American patrol to reach the east bank of the Rhine River, crossing the heavily mined Adolf Hitler Bridge near Uerdingen, press services reported last night.

Two officers and 17 enlisted men who volunteered for the bridge crossing received Silver Star medals in recognition of their heroism.

They were the first men of an invading army to cross the German Rhine since the days of the Napoleonic wars more than 125 years ago.

Mr. President, the people of South Carolina are proud of the excellent record which their sons are making in the armed forces. Time will not permit me to go into a detailed discussion of what the sons of South Carolina have accomplshed; but this being such an unusual feat, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPTAIN YOUNGBLOOD LEADS FIRST AMERICAN PATROL ACROSS RHINE

A Charleston man, Capt. George L. Youngblood, led the first American patrol to reach the east bank of the Rhine River, crossing the heavily mined Adolf Hitler Bridge near Uerdingen, press services reported last night.

Two officers and 17 enlisted men who volunteered for the bridge crossing received Silver Star medals in recognition of their heroism.

They were the first men of an invading army to cross the German Rhine since the days of the Napoleonic wars more than 125 years ago.

Captain Youngblood's patrol consisting of combat engineers and infantrymen crossed the bridge late Saturday.

Later, a six-man patrol led by Lt. Guy Amspoker, of Macon, made the perilous mission. Just 15 minutes after his patrol came back Nazi engineers pulled the switches that blew up the 1,420-foot long Adolf Hitler Bridge at 7 a. m.

TURNED BACK BY FLAMES

A towering fire at the Nazi-held approach to the bridge turned both American patrols back.

Col. Sidney R. Hinds, of Nashville, commander of a combat force of the Second Armored Division, described Captain Youngblood as the "bravest man in the Army"

Captain Youngblood's wife, the former Miss Margaret Willard, and 2½-year-old son, George, Jr., live at 27 George Street. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. B. M. Youngblood, reside at 16 Bennett Street.

The feat of Captain Youngblood and his men was described in detail last night in news stories moving over the wires of the Associated Press, the International News Service, and United Press. He had been decorated twice before.

Frank Coniff, of the International News Service, said that Captain Youngblood "with his soft, drawling voice" concealed the tenseness of the situation as the first patrol of 10 combat engineers and 3 infantrymen crept silently out on the bridge approaches at 10:30 o'clock Saturday night.

Captain Youngblood, he reported, had known for 3 days that he would lead this historic mission over the Hitler Bridge—one of Germany's greatest engineering edifices which carries the famous "autobahn" (superhighway) across the Rhine to Berlin.

SHELLS TEAR OVERHEAD

A burning, three-story building on the Nazi-held side of the river cast a flickering red reflection as they crawled forward and

Youngblood and his men heard both American and German shells angrily rasping overhead. But not a single volunteer turned back.

"Our job," Youngblood told the news writer, "was to check the bridge for demolitions, find any charges that we could and determine if it was passable for our tanks.

"We climbed on the bridge and started over it as quietly as possible. We checked the bridge's superstructure and its columns. We cut every wire we saw—about a half dozen in all. I detailed three men to cover us by keeping their eyes on the Jerry positions."

These three men were Pvt. Einar Waldal, 34, of Sentinel Butte, N. Dak.; Pvt. George Soules, 24, of Horton, N. Y.; and Sgt. Herbert Steube, 25, of Pass Christian, Miss. They crouched on the bridge with rifles ready while the engineers proceeded.

"The first thing that stopped us about 100 feet out was a 15-foot gap in the pavement," Captain Youngblood continued.

"It would have stopped vehicles. We got past that by climbing along the railing. We could look down and see the Rhine's water less than 75 feet below."

GUN FIRES DOWN BRIDGE

"The thing that really bothered us was a gun which kept firing straight down the bridge's axis from our side of the river at 2-minute intervals. More than once shrapnel spread over us. Man, we were sweating out that gun.

"But we kept going and working as we went. A big fire halted us finally. We just couldn't go any farther. The fire came either from burning tar in the roadway of the bridge or from thermite grenades (chemical flames) left by the Nazis."

The men stopped about 75 feet from the flames. But at this juncture one of them—Pvt. Harold Florando, of the Bronx, N. Y.—crawled farther on alone. He reached a point only 15 feet from the fire.

"It was a blinding fire," he said a little later.

"I couldn't see past it. Besides, the shells from that gun were landing every 2 minutes right in the flames. I had to crawl back."

The group finally retreated, still cutting wires on their way back. The patrol found no explosive charges prepared by the Nazis. Youngblood said he did see one square box which he forgot to carry back with him.

JUST A DAY'S WORK

"It was just an ordinary day's work in some respects," he remarked. "But I guess all of us were mighty excited. That was the Adolf Hitler Bridge and more than once we wished we had had him there with us."

Besides those already mentioned, Youngblood's patrol included Sgt. James Boley, 21, Furman, Ala.; Sgt. Dalton Griffith, 28, Petersburg, Ind.; Pvt. Dewey Herron, 26, Martin, Ga., all combat engineers; and Pvt. Harvey Sheffield, 23, Atlanta, Ga.; Pvt. Arnaldo Galineo, Del Rio, Tex., and Sgt. Jake Williamson, Dallas, Tex.

All are members of the Second Armored Division.

The patrol, led by Lt. Amspoker, crossed the bridge at 5:30 Sunday morning. They spent a solid hour on the span inspecting its condition. Their worst fear was that Nazi burp guns would open up on them.

The men received the Silver Star awards en masse from Brig. Gen. Isaac White, commander of the Ninth Army's Second Armored Division. They were still weary as a result of their experiences.

Hal Boyle, of the Associated Press, said that it was one of the promptest group awards on record.

"It was made for one of the bravest feats of the war—crawling out on the shell-raked suspension bridge in the darkness and trying to find and cut the wires leading to tons of hidden dynamite which might explode at any minute.

"It was a glorious failure. They were driven back by flames from burning tar on the bridge roadway which had been ignited by grenades and which silhouetted them to enemy gunners."

THIRD DECORATION

Boyle said that Captain Youngblood had been decorated previously for heroism after he cleared a minefield under fire.

His family last night said that he recently received a Bronze Star medal, but they did not know for what it had been awarded. Possibly this was the award referred to by Boyle.

He had prior to that received the Silver Star medal for blowing a bridge 3 miles behind the enemy lines in France. This action occurred last August 8. Captain Youngblood worked on the bridge in the very face of the enemy, the citation said.

He told Earl Mazo, army correspondent, in France last September that one of his two ambitions was to build the bridge over the Rhine across which the American troops will pour into Germany. The other is to be present when his son enters The Citadel in 1959.

Captain Youngblood was graduated at The Citadel in 1935. He was prominent in boxing and football at the college.

His most recent letter to his family said that he was in Belgium after the liquidation of the German bulge in the Ardennes. At that time, he reported there was very little action.

Columbia River Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article by Richard L. Neuberger, a distinguished author from the Pacific Northwest, on the proposed Columbia River Authority.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER POWER CITADEL

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

A COLUMBIA RIVER AUTHORITY

There is no "brownout" of lights in the Columbia River Basin, for electricity there comes from falling plumes of water. These plumes tumble seaward forever, regardless of wars or rumor or wars. The late J. D. Ross, one of President Roosevelt's early advisers on natural resources, liked to speak of Bonneville Dam as "a coal mine which will never thin out, an oil well which will never run dry." His description is particularly pertinent today, when the W. P. B. order cutting down the use of electricity to save fuels has no application in the water power citadel of the Nation.

The Columbia River, surging through rocky gorges to the Pacific, booms this continent's loudest anthem of hydroelectric energy. Nearly half of the potential water power of the entire land is locked within its drainage area. One dam on the Columbia, the stupendous irrigation project at Grand Coulee, can generate as much juice as all 22 dams in the Tennessee Valley Authority. "This is unbelievable!" exclaimed Waldemar Borquist, chairman of Sweden's Royal Board of Waterfalls, as he inspected the huge Coulee power plant.

The geographic combination of heavy snows and high mountains has made the Columbia unexcelled as a source of power. Drought never slackens its force. On its 1,490-mile course it drops nearly 10,000 feet. Great ranges—the Rockies, the Cascades, the Bitterroots, the Selkirks—pay it tribute in melting glaciers. Figures tell the story. Grand Coulee has a capacity of 1,800,000 kilowatts. This equals the whole T. V. A. It eclipses by three times the vast Dnieperstroy project in Russia. It dwarfs Niagara Falls. In fact, housewives in the Pacific Northwest use 70 percent more electricity than the national average.

Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington, youngest Member of the upper House, has decided that a Columbia River Authority is the most efficient way to administer and develop this fabulous supply of hydroelectric energy. Recently he introduced a bill (S. 460) calling for a regional authority in the Pacific Northwest which will include portions of seven big States—Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada.

Bill's provisions

In large measure MITCHELL'S bill is patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority. It provides for an autonomous three-man board of directors such as David E. Lilienthal now heads in T. V. A. However, there is one important distinction. The T. V. A. reports directly to Congress and the President. Under the Mitchell proposal the directors of the Columbia River Authority would report to the Secretary of the Interior, in whose Department are numerous agencies directly concerned with the development of the far West.

MITCHELL believes the method of reporting at Cabinet level is necessary to coordinate the policies and acts of the Columbia River Authority with those of such similar authorities as Congress might establish in other watersheds. The possibility of conflict between authorities is not out of the question. For example, the proposed agencies for the Columbia and Missouri Valleys would touch at the Continental Divide in western Montana. The Secretary of the Interior could resolve any dispute over water rights, power rates, and other questions.

But basically MITCHELL sees his Columbia River Authority as a step to decentralize sovereignty in a vast region. "The various States of the Northwest," he says, "will be able to deal with a more accessible regional agency instead of dealing with the heads of numerous departments and bureaus in the National Capital. This will be a regional organization, functioning within the region affected and responsive to the needs of the region. None of the powers and functions of the States will be abridged."

Vital to conservation

The contemplated Columbia River Authority, in MITCHELL'S opinion, is vital to both the conservation and development of the basic resources of the far West. Although the region contains half the country's timber, half the minerals, and half the fish, it has only 11 percent of the total manufacturing capacity. This colonial empire status compels the West to survive economically on the exploitation and reduction of natural resources. "The Columbia Basin States," claims MITCHELL, "must expand their manufacturing capability if they are to receive their proportionate part of the national income."

MITCHELL believes that the proposed Columbia River Authority would bring about a regional economy based on local processing of the West's raw materials, rather than shipment of those materials to other areas for manufacturing. "Seventy-five percent of the country's wartime electrical expansion," he points out, "is concentrated in the far

Western States. The metals of this war and the metals of the future will be electrometals, manufactured where low-cost water power is available."

Yet the production of power is only one phase of the development of the Columbia River. Grand Coulee Dam, greatest single source of electricity on earth, is not primarily a power project at all. Its main purpose is irrigation of 1,250,000 acres of dry land in the center of the State of Washington. This land now is sagebrush. With water it will raise peaches, alfalfa, celery, corn, and 100 other crops. The 25,000 new farms thus created will be available to servicemen returning from battle.

Bonneville Dam, another river barrier supplying huge quantities of power, is also a navigation project. Through the Bonneville lift locks, highest in the world, ships can steam through the Cascade Mountains and into the inland empire. Congress has recently authorized construction of a dam at Umatilla Rapids, Oreg., midway between Bonneville and Grand Coulee. This project would generate power, reclaim land, and make navigation possible all the way to Lewiston, Idaho, at the foot of Hells Canyon on the Snake River, deepest chasm of the North American continent.

Secretary Ickes wants the Umatilla project named McNary Dam after the late Charles Linza McNary, senior Senator from Oregon and Republican minority leader, who was one of the pioneer advocates of the development of the Columbia River. Senator MITCHELL contends that his regional authority would tie together all these diverse undertakings. "It would," he says, "transfer operations to the region without bureaucratic domination. It also would provide a means for the development and maintenance of an over-all unified plan for the development of the water, land, and mineral resources of the Columbia Basin."

National 4–H Clubs' Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning to participate in a national 4–H Club breakfast meeting attended by 4–H Club leaders, the Vice President, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, and his assistant, Mr. Hill, several Members of the Congress, and representatives of various Government agencies having to do with youth.

4–H Club work is under the supervision of the extension service of the State agricultural colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture cooperating.

4–H boys and girls are practicing democratic procedure with refreshing simplicity and sincerity.

Largest rural youth organization in the world, the 4–H Clubs number 1,700,000 boys and girls between the ages of 10 and 21 years enrolled in 75,000 clubs throughout the United States as well as in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

The results in character are inestimable. Since Pearl Harbor the wartime accomplishments have been as follows:

Production	
Victory garden products—acres	400,000
Poultry products—birds	33,000,000
Dairy cattle—animals	300,000
Livestock—animals	1,600,000
Peanuts, soybeans, and other legumes—acres	200,000
Conservation	
Members canning, storing, and drying food	1,000,000
Products canned—quarts	47,000,000
Members repairing and remaking clothing	1,500,000
Members caring for farm machinery	900,000
Members removing farm and home accident hazards	1,300,000
Members checking food and health habits	2,300,000
Members having periodic health examinations	550,000
Service	
Members demonstrating wartime practices to others	900,000
Members taking first aid and home nursing	500,000
Meals prepared in keeping with nutritional needs of family	37,000,000
Members increasing farm fuel supplies	700,000
Scrap collected—pounds	300,000,000
War bonds or stamps purchased or sold to others	$140,000,000
Former 4–H members in the armed forces	800,000

I am happy to include in my remarks the little speech made by Ann Lee Tipton, 10 years a member of the 4–H Clubs:

I find it an unusual pleasure to be here this morning to share with you some idea of the 4–H youth organiaztion at present in our war effort and in our post-war plans. I say an unusual pleasure because it is a rare opportunity to speak with Government officials and other leaders regarding 4–H experiences and achievements and their value to youth.

Those of you who have read The Prophet, by Kahlil Gibran, recall the chapter entitled "Work," wherein the prophet told us that—

"Work is love made visible.

"And if you cannot work with love but only with distaste, it is better that you should leave your work and sit at the gate of the temple and take alms of those who work with joy.

"For if you bake bread with indifference, you bake a bitter bread that feeds but half man's hunger.

"And if you grudge the crushing of the grapes, your grudge distills a poison in the wine.

"And if you sing though as angels, and love not the singing, you muffle man's ears to the voices of the day and the voices of the night."

I like that chapter, because to me it indirectly expresses 4–H Club work. This organization has well fulfilled its purpose of serving the rural youth with an incentive to make their best better, creating a genuine love for the job that must be done—not always a pleasant one, but one in which 4–H dignifies the work of the hands and helps youth to find personal joy and pleasure in a task well done.

And just what are some of these tasks well done? When you casually pick up a newspaper and notice such an item as "4–H Boy Feeds a Fighter for One Year," you are reading about a rural youth who has produced enough food for a soldier overseas for 1 year. A task indeed well done. You'll be hearing more of the contribution made by 4–H boys from Don Sullivan. But I would like to spend a few minutes with you to say that 4–H girls are doing their share too. They have learned that if we are to be a strong Nation, to protect our country against aggression from without as well as hunger and despair from within, we must be a strong people. To accomplish such a feat, we must be well fed, adequately clothed, and satisfactorily sheltered. 4–H girls have proven their worthiness in such undertakings.

In my county in nearby Maryland, 4-H girls have canned over 4,500 quarts of food. Think what the State and Nation has on record for 1944. Nearly 1,000 meals have been planned and prepared according to dietary needs. Girls in my county have also busied themselves with making the home a more cheerful place in which to live, creating more pleasant surroundings. And they have eliminated that old question so often asked of Dad, "Can I have a new dress?" by using their sewing skills learned through 4–H training schools and making their own, not only clothing themselves adequately but attractively. I know of 1 girl in Montgomery County who used all 3 skills to a money-making advantage. Through the foods training she had in 4–H she was able to make cup cakes, cookies, fudge, and chocolate-dipped mints and sell them twice weekly at a small food market to which she had access. With the slow but sure income she was able to redecorate her bedroom, purchasing unpainted furniture and refinishing it herself. With her needle she was able to make curtains, slip covers, and linens, not only creating a more individual room, expressing her personality, but one in which the results were accredited to her and to 4–H training. But likewise 4–H girls have been concerned with community activities. Evidence of their desire to be soldiers on the home front is shown by 4–H'ers participation in Red Cross sewing classes and bandage-rolling courses. Bond purchases by Montgomery County 4–H girls total $13,750 alone, while salvage drives this past year produced a figure of 8,000 pounds.

You have seen in figures the contribution of 4–H's in terms of war, but there is another side, perhaps intangible, but a real preparation for our post-war world. It has been the experience of 4–H's to work together in planning for recreational gatherings of the community's young people in healthful and wholesome activities. They are accepting community responsibilities in the school, the church, and the home (the three units that go to make up any community), laying the very foundation for tomorrow's leaders. They are planning for educational night classes and trade schools. They are deeply concerned with the acceptance of the returning soldier. And they are rounding out their wholesome attitude on life by participation in church activities. If we should call this big business, no ifs, it is, and one in which the grand total would be producing good American citizens, honest, progressive, intellectual, and dependable.

4–H work has been recognized by many outside organizations. For this recognition, we as 4–H members are most grateful. This recognition has presented itself in many ways, but one of the most recent and thrilling rewards has been that given us by the United States Maritime Commission in its selection of 4–H Clubs to sponsor Liberty ships. There have been 42 such cargo vessels christened by 4–H members and named by them in honor of outstanding leaders in the field of agriculture. I can assure you that those who witnessed the christening of the Liberty ship, the *S. M. Shoemaker*, by Maryland 4–H's in Baltimore last August, share with me the thrill that came when that great hulk of massive silver-gray steel, so majestic and beautiful, and yet so strong and straight, slipped without sound down the way. As she turned in the clear, sparkling water, the sun shining brightly on her silver coat, each of us thought of this ship, built in only 28 days, a master product of time and man, as one ship nearer to victory. One ship that might battle its way in the South Pacific, the Aleutians, or on its journeys to Europe, but on whatever far-flung battle front, one ship that would prove to the

world the unconquerable spirit of the American people to preserve the rights of democracy, a democracy of which the 4–H was proud to be a part.

Contrast such a picture with one in Germany, comprised of Hitler youth, hatred, hysteria, and hunger, and you can readily see why we are so strongly determined to accept our responsibilities for tomorrow, by planning and building today for an everlasting peace in a world in which an army of youth are expressing themselves as the generation of that tomorrow when they say—

"I pledge my head to clearer thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to larger service, and my health to better living for my club, my community, and my country."

The Star and the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent editorial, entitled "The Star and the Peace," from the Kansas City Star of Monday, March 5, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STAR AND THE PEACE

The character of some of the congressional comments on the President's report of the Yalta conference is disturbing. The President makes as full a report as is possible at this time of one of the momentous events of world history. He tells of remarkable progress made by the three great powers in laying plans for enduring peace. The hope of countless American fathers and mothers for saving their children from another horrible world war rests in these plans.

Yet the contemptuous comment of one Senator is that there was "nothing new" in what the President said, and another that the President was "trying to sell the country a bill of goods."

Frankly such remarks seem to the Star to reveal an incredible levity toward problems involving the destiny of civilization itself. So far as can now be judged the Yalta conference was inspired by high purposes in line with the aspirations of everyday men and women to abolish mass violence from mankind. The future of the world rests on developing and confirming the decisions there made.

Those who sneer at the results and impugn the motives of the negotiators are doing what they can to sacrifice the future on the altar of petty political advantage.

As its readers well know The Star has been no partisan of the Roosevelt administration. It has criticized many of the administration's domestic policies. But in foreign affairs, as the aggressor nations began to show their hand, this newspaper believed that President Roosevelt was speaking in the authentic voice of the American people who saw their way of life endangered.

No peace-loving nation will go into war unless its vital interests are threatened. When the storm broke over Europe in 1939, the Star believed the President was justified in thinking that Great Britain and France could handle the situation without the United States, if it should become the arsenal of democracy and supply them munitions. When this hope vanished with the collapse of France, the Star actively supported the various measures undertaken by the administration to help the gravely menaced British while this Nation prepared for the inevitable war.

The progress of events, the ruthless mass brutalities of Germans and Japanese, taught the American people what the triumph of the Axis Powers would mean. With Pearl Harbor and the declarations of war by Japan, Germany, and Italy, public sentiment solidified. As the Star saw the situation at the time and as it sees it now, the people were and are united in two overriding aims—the complete defeat of their enemies and the determination to make a lasting peace.

In the last election they gave Mr. Roosevelt a mandate to continue to direct the war effort and to represent the United States in the peace negotiations. The Star, which did not support the President for a fourth term, insisted even then there was no place for partisan politics in fighting the war and framing the peace. So long as the President continues to give evidence of his desire and ability to work in harmony with our great allies to bring the sort of peace for which the Nation longs, this newspaper expects to support his efforts. It believes the people expect a simila attitude on the part of their elected Representatives at Washington, and in this expectation they are immensely in earnest.

The decisions made at Yalta and those to be made at San Francisco are too momentous to be regarded from a standpoint of partisan advantage. They should be open to honest discussion and honest criticism. But it would be intolerable to approach them in a picayunish, faultfinding spirit. Senators and Representatives who fail to meet the problems of the peace in a broad way will find they have totally misjudged the spirit of America.

United States Opposition to Private Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Opposes Private Cartels, Clayton Explains to Latins," written by Mr. Herbert B. Elliston, associate editor of the Washington Post, and published in the Washington Post of March 7, 1945. The article deals with Secretary Clayton's exposition of cartels at Mexico City, pointing out that in his judgment there are good cartels and bad cartels. I believe that the discussion is most timely.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OPPOSES PRIVATE CARTELS, CLAYTON EXPLAINS TO LATINS

(By Herbert B. Elliston)

MEXICO CITY, March 6.—William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, gave to the Inter-American Conference today the first definite and detailed statement of United States policy on cartels.

On this subject the economic charter accepted here pledges the signatories not to countenance cartels or other private business arrangements which obstruct international trade, stifle competition, and interfere with the maximum efficiency of production and truly competitive prices to consumers.

Asked to explain what was meant by cartels, Clayton said that the United States delegation meant business arrangements with the emphasis on private ones. Thus by implication he indorsed cartels under government supervision.

Later he amplified his definition as follows: "Distinction can be drawn between private cartel arrangements which have to do with the fixing of prices, the allocation of markets and the control of production for private profit, particularly when such agreements are made by such industries with a limited number of products, as the chemical industry and an international agreement under government auspices which relates to commodities which have developed unmarketable supplies and which concern raw materials in the production of which millions of producers are involved. We can defend the latter while we condemn the former."

LATINS SEE NO EVIL

The Latins attach importance to this distinction since they do not necessarily see, as many Americans do, any particular evil in cartels. Indeed they wish to develop cartels with the United States on certain items of commerce which have a common concern for the Americas. But the Latins in this and other items have had to be content with promises rather than pacts.

Under a pledge that there will be orderly adjustment of war contracts for their primary products, the Latins have been assured of a cushion during the transition period between war and peace and the pledge if acted upon in the spirit in which it has been given will prevent the dislocations in Latin-American economies which occurred after the last war. In some respects the pledge is predicated on legislative action as for instance in connection with stock piling.

As part of the transition program the Latins may maintain exchange control of import quotas under the Bretton Woods agreement. This is very important to the Latin Americas. In war they have built up sizable balances in America which they could not turn into American goods because of our inability to supply those goods. They will make a draft on America's machinery as soon as America's mills are reconverted to peace.

DON'T WANT LUXURIES

The Latins will keep exchange-control because they don't want to see their American balances spent in luxuries. They want to control their imports so as to give American machinery priority.

The Latins asked at this conference for aid on the American side in giving their machinery requirements priority in our postwar foreign trade. This the United States delegation could not promise. But the suggestion was made that encouragement would be given to trade bodies in America to make special arrangements for the accommodation of Latin-American requirements. This might mean anything or nothing but the Latins seem satisfied.

The main reliance which the Latins have been asked to accept is that the administration is committed to the maximization of industrial production in peace as in war. Such a policy, it is felt, will help to shore up the primary producers in the Latin Americas as in other areas. This is the United States reply to Chile, disturbed over prospective falling off of copper buying, and Brazil, as the major coffee producer. As one United States delegate put it, everybody would like to have his income guaranteed for 50 years. All we can do is to try to maintain our economic situation at home

in such a way as to provide the conditions enabling other countries to keep up employment and economic health.

The clause in the economic charter calling for a general "reduction of trade barriers" has been amended so as not to inhibit Latin Americans from protecting their infant industries. It has been recognized that in the original wording there was a conflict between encouragement of industrialization below the Rio Grande and insistence on demobilization of tariff barriers.

Throughout the parley, America's cotton subsidy program has drawn persistent fire from Brazil, Peru, and Mexico, and a resolution was drawn up by way of condemnation. This has been withdrawn, but not in private, and the United States delegation has promised to renew the fight at home against such subsidies which, of course, are a violation of the economic charter of the Americas. The United States farm representatives attached to the United States delegation have been told pretty plainly what Latin Americans think of the difference between our precept and performance. However, all in all, the economic charter and the transition pledges are taken at face value with hopes kindled that they will bear fruit by Clayton's sober exposition of United States limitations and his ready willingness to hear and consider prospective Latin-American troubles.

Drafting of Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I fully recognize that we must rely upon the statements made by our military authorities as to the need for trained nurses to take care of the disabled men wounded in combat. If the passage of this bill, to draft nurses, depended upon my vote, I would vote for it. The bill will no doubt pass by a large majority. My vote against the bill is a vote of protest against the attitude expressed by some that the nurses of this country are not willing to patriotically do their duty without being drafted. More than 44,000 female nurses have volunteered for military service. They are doing a heroic job in taking care of wounded and sick men in all branches of the service, and I sincerely believe that the additional nurses needed can be secured by voluntary methods if the proper methods are used by the War Department.

Those who cast reflection upon the patriotism of the nursing profession, and on the splendid women who have dedicated their lives to relieve human suffering, cannot be fully aware of the sacrifices being made by these white angels of mercy. They are patriotically serving humanity on both the battle and civilian fronts. I am satisfied a sufficient number will volunteer for service in the Army, if given the opportunity to do so. Why, I understand that more than 12,000 registered nurses have volunteered since the first of the year, but the Army has taken less than 3,000. It is very difficult to understand the reason why the Army does not take the nurses who are ready and willing to serve. For some unknown reason certain leaders in the Army demand the draft system, instead of fully using the volunteer method.

It is my hope that the Senate will amend the bill, so that the War Department will be required to use the volunteer method for securing the necessary nurses for at least 30 days before the draft system is put into operation. Further, both male and female nurses should be used, and there should be no discrimination on account of color or creed. Our wounded and sick men in all branches of the military service are entitled to the best of care, and I know that the trained nurses of this country will respond to the call for such duty, and will gladly serve without being forced to do so by this or any other law.

Training for Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me on February 23 to insert several newspaper articles and editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit an editorial from the New York Sun titled "Training for Battle":

TRAINING FOR BATTLE

Because he had received evidence of more than one instance of boys of 18 and 19 being sent into combat only 4 or 5 months after induction, Senator TAFT recently raised the question of whether or not the War Department was acting in good faith in this matter. When Congress lowered the draft age to 18, the Senate amended the bill to allow those of 18 or 19 to be sent overseas for combat duty only after a year's training. That amendment was eliminated in conference, largely because of General Marshall's representation that it would impose an almost impossible administrative burden on the War Department.

Certainly nobody who reads the letter which General Marshall wrote on this subject on October 23, 1942, can accuse the Chief of Staff of bad faith. He made a clear distinction between the time required to train an individual and that required to train a division. He went on to say that a mechanic in a ground crew could be properly trained in from 18 to 36 weeks, a radio operator in from 3 to 5 months, and a rifleman in 13 weeks. A rifleman, wrote General Marshall, at the end of his basic training is ready to take his place in an experienced squad without handicap to the squad or to himself. Certainly there was nothing in General Marshall's letter to encourage the belief that if Congress would agree to drop the amendment, the War Department would follow a rigid rule in keeping with the amendment.

From other sources, however, Congress certainly could have gained the impression of such an implicit bargain. Secretary of War Stimson, at the hearings on the 1942 bill, said that the intention of the department was to give all 18- and 19-year-olds a year's training "as far as possible and as far as unexpected emergencies may allow." Senator GURNEY, arguing against retention of the Senate amendment, said he had received the assurance of Army officers that inducted men would receive every bit of training necessary and that most of those intended for combat units would get 12 months' training. Subsequently the basic training period was extended from 13 to 17 weeks and only recently reduced to 15 weeks.

Even as recently as December 7, 1944, Under Secretary of War Patterson said: "In general, a minimum of approximately 8 months elapses between an individual's induction and his assignment * * * to an active sector of the front." This statement, of course, was made before the German counter-offensive, which may have created the battle emergencies of which Secretary Stimson spoke in Friday's statement as the compelling reason for changes in the War Department's training policy.

What does not seem to be in dispute is that some Members of Congress did understand that there was an implicit bargain. If Messrs. Stimson and Patterson and some unidentified Army officers had let the Marshall letter stand alone, honest and unambiguous, no Member of Congress would have reason to feel disillusioned and deceived.

Draft of Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARCH 2, 1945.

Col. C. W. GOBLE,
State Director, Selective Service
Headquarters, Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR COLONEL GOBLE: The board read with interest the articles in the Blade of February 28, relative to the affidavits made by the Agriculture War Board, which was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 27, 1945.

This article alleges that local board No. 22 violated the Tydings amendment and that local board No. 22 was dictated to in the matter of classification by a representative of Selective Service Headquarters.

The board has not violated the Tydings amendment inasmuch as every man between the ages of 18 and 26 years who was removed from II–C and placed in I–A and ordered up for preinduction physical examination to determine his physical status was given ample opportunity to affirmatively prove that he was entitled to a II–C classification.

Registrants were advised that they could file any new information regarding their status, and the Agriculture War Board was also advised that they, too, could file with the board any information which, in their opinion, had a bearing on the registrant's request for deferment. These cases were carefully reviewed by the board and in every case an appeal was taken.

At the present time all of these cases are before the appeal board. Board No. 22 has not issued a notice of induction to any of these registrants. When these cases are returned from the appeal board, they will again be reviewed to determine if the thinking of the appeal board coincides with the thinking of this board. Board No. 22 interprets the Tydings amendment to mean that every II–C classification given under this amendment is subject to review by the appeal board.

The newspaper article further states that Lieutenant Dwyer had issued an order to reclassify every II–C registrant between the ages of 18 and 26 years to I–A. This he did not do, and we would not have done so even

though ordered by headquarters if, in our opinion, the registrant was entitled to a II–C classification.

This board deeply resents such a statement, inasmuch as classification is a prerogative of the local board and, therefore, a local board cannot be ordered to classify any particular registrant or group of registrants.

Very truly yours,

D. D. HATCHER,
Chairman, Local Board No. 22.

Copies to Lewis B. Hershey, Homer Ramey, Toledo Blade.

Off to a Good Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 7, 1945:

OFF TO A GOOD START

The outlook for comprehensive reorganization of Congress appears brighter today than at any time since a handful of determined legislators and political scientists began working on the problem several years ago. For a time it appeared that the tragic death of Senator MALONEY, head of the Senate-House Committee on Congress, might disrupt the plans for a penetrating survey of our National Legislature. Now, however, the committee has made a remarkable come-back. It has named Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., as its new chairman, reappointed Representative MIKE MONRONEY vice chairman, and chosen Dr. George B. Galloway to head its research staff.

Senator LA FOLLETTE is as closely identified with the move to strengthen Congress as Senator MALONEY was. His elevation to the chairmanship not only assures the committee of vigorous leadership but also emphasizes its nonpartisan character. The Wisconsin Progressive was obviously given this assignment solely because of his long experience in the Senate and his interest in the subject. Indeed, he has already made studies of his own and on the basis of those studies has sought to improve the workings of the Senate. A year and a half ago he proposed that the rules of the Senate be modified to reduce the number of standing committees from 33 to 13. He has persistently sought to relieve Members of Congress of trivial chores and center their attention on major issues of national policy.

Like many other thoughtful legislators, Senator LA FOLLETTE also knows that Congress has little chance of maintaining its role as the chief policy-making agency of a great Nation if its Members are able to devote an average of only about 10 percent of their time to legislation. "No person familiar with the situation in the Senate today," he said in discussing his resolution, "can deny that there is a pressing need for committee reorganization and for the streamlining of the legislative branch of the Government if it is to survive in the struggle for power which is bound to continue."

Further guarantee that the study now actually launched will be no superficial cloak for the granting of new congressional privileges may be found in the appointment of Dr. Galloway. As head of the American Political Science Association's Committee on Congress, Dr. Galloway has made the most thorough exploration of this subject that we know of. Nor has he peered into it from an ivory tower. He has worked actively with Members of Congress, understands their viewpoints, and has their confidence. Like Senator LA FOLLETTE, he sees the problem not as the inauguration of a series of pin-point reforms but as a major task of adjusting our legislative machinery to the exacting demands of this complicated and turbulent age.

At bottom it is a question of preserving democracy. In this country Congress is the body that speaks for the people in the shaping of domestic policy and in approving much of our foreign policy. It must be equal to its enlarged responsibilities or we shall have to resign ourselves to some form of executive control. The reorganization of congressional committees, the granting of adequate staffs, the establishment of a pensions system, the centralization of leadership and improvement of relations with the Executive are only means to the end of strengthening our representative system. This major objective appears to be the point of take-off for the special committee's study, as it was for Dr. Galloway's report to the A. P. S. A. If Congress follows through in this important undertaking, it may well prove to be a landmark in the history of self-government in the United States.

Physical Fitness Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 6, 1945:

PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAM

As ranking minority member of the House Subcommittee on District Appropriations, Representative KARL STEFAN of Nebraska took a leading part in enlarging the physical fitness program in the Washington public schools. He recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a special report from Superintendent of Schools Robert L. Haycock which shows that in spite of shortages of instructor personnel the program has been highly successful and after the war will continue to receive emphasis as an important part of school training.

Since Pearl Harbor the program has been directed, in the case of boys, toward preparing them for induction and the physical conditioning that follows. But it now includes all high school boys and girls, and over 27,000 of them have had the advantages of the training since our entry into the war. Positive results are being recorded, to show the physical improvement in children directly attributable to supervised exercise. Tests have been designed to indicate a youth's performance in relation to normal standards, what he is expected to be able to do at a given age and the extent to which he benefits from training.

Whether or not the Nation adopts a system of compulsory military training after the war, there is little doubt that physical education will receive more attention in the preparatory schools than ever before. One explanation offered for the large percentage of rejections of young women for the military services is the lack, generally speaking, of physical training. The Committee on Physical Fitness of the Federal Security Agency, for example, finds that fewer than half the girls in 900 school systems receive any physical training the last 2 years of high school. A survey by the American Youth Council indicated that 62 percent of young women between the ages of 16 and 24 had no form of physical recreation.

An essential purpose of the physical fitness courses in the Washington public schools has been to bring to children who do not take part in formal athletics or military drill a systematic course in physical training which has the double purpose of helping to reveal remedial defects and to improve physical condition. The appropriations committees of Congress should take real satisfaction in the results indicated by Dr. Haycock's report to Mr. STEFAN—results which indicate the even greater progress to be anticipated after the war.

Days of Decision and Peacemakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Francisco Monitor of January 26, 1945:

DAYS OF DECISION AND PEACEMAKERS—FEIGHAN, LAFOLLETTE, AND WEISS

(By the Reverend E. A. Conway, S. J., social action department, National Catholic Welfare Conference)

Strange signs and portents appeared in the House of Representatives the other day. Strange words were uttered there—words like morality, justice, altruism, unselfishness, religious spirit, human brotherhood, God, the moral law, the common good, moral necessity, and international morality.

Portentous was the fact that they were uttered by a Catholic, a Protestant, and a Jew, all speaking to the same point, and all aroused by what they considered a defection from the high principles which should guide our country in these days of critical decisions.

These phenomena appeared, I suspect, because Senator VANDENBERG made a little slip a week ago in his otherwise unexceptionable address on foreign policy. The senior Michigan Senator had said: "Now, I am not so impractical as to expect my country to act on any final motive other than self-interest. I know of no reason why it should. That is what nations are for."

In the House rose hard-hitting Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Cleveland, Ohio, supported by Congressman LAFOLLETTE, of Indiana, and SAMUEL WEISS, of Pennsylvania, to declare that he viewed with real concern "the assertion made recently that our country cannot be expected to act on any final motive other than self-interest." After remarking that "the most enlightened selfishness will not get us very far in the titanic tasks that lie before us," the Cleveland Catholic then declared, "The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that more and more people are becoming convinced that the peace which we are about to set up can only be secure under the moral law that comes from God."

MORE PROFOUND THAN THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

Mr. FEIGHAN, after more of the same strong medicine, then presented a resolution calling upon Congress to affirm its adherence to the seven principles of the trifaith "Pattern for Peace" "as the basis for the establishment of peace and a just world order."

In a prepared address Congressman LAFOLLETTE supported his colleague "impelled by the crucial importance of impending decisions," and by the conviction that "something new must be added to our statecraft—a deeper sense of the demands which are made upon us by that basic morality which governs Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and pagans alike."

"There is at the present time," declared the Indiana Congressman, "a widespread popular demand for the clarification of our war and our peace aims. I can think of no better way to satisfy that legitimate expression of the public will than the immediate affirmation of these principles as the basis of our national policy. They are as a fact, as even a cursory glance will show, far more complete and far more profound than the Atlantic Charter itself.

"There is a deeper reason," he continued, "for our making this affirmation at the present juncture. The Axis has not attacked only the United Nations. It has attacked the basic principles of human conduct which, for centuries, have united the nations. It has not only violated the law of nations, it has proclaimed a new law, a new order, governed by rules of its own making. As we victoriously repel this attempt to subvert civilization's traditional morality, it is timely, I suggest, to reaffirm the postulates of that moral order to which the President referred in his address of January 6, 1941."

THE SIXTY-FOUR DOLLAR QUESTION

Congressman WEISS spoke eloquently to the same point, and he congratulated Congressman FEIGHAN for having arranged for the joint presentation of this unprecedented resolution. Space does not permit quotation of some of his attacks upon low-level diplomacy. You should read all three speeches and the resolution in their entirety. You can, if you will write any of the three Congressmen for a reprint of them.

NOTE.—Congressman LAFOLLETTE observed that "Christians are becoming more and more vigilant and persistent in concerted action to bring the moral and spiritual resources of their faith to bear continuously upon the problem of world order." Perhaps we are. We could prove it by concerted action in support of the resolution introduced by FEIGHAN, LAFOLLETTE and WEISS. This is what is known as a concurrent resolution. It must first pass the House, and then be reintroduced in the Senate. It won't pass the House unless its sponsors receive concerted public support. Will they get it? That is the $64 question.

NOTE 2.—Said Congressman LAFOLLETTE: "I, for one, would not wish to brave their (the people's) righteous indignation if these basic principles which, as the Protestant leaders said, 'must find expression in national policies,' were either minimized or contravened." Far better an ounce of concerted effort now than a pound of righteous indignation later.

Construction of a Veterans' Hospital, Broome County, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, even before the present war, the need for a veterans' hospital in the Triple Cities area was evident. Since the war began, the facility at Bath and the Rhoads General Hospital in Utica are becoming more and more overcrowded as the casualty lists continue to grow.

The Southern Tier has given her sons freely to the armed forces. There is not a section in the country where the torch of patriotism lights the way more brightly.

Therefore, thousands of men will come back to our valleys faced with the problem of obtaining medical treatment. Much of this treatment may be temporary and the veteran will find himself able to take his place in a normal job. But later he may need further medical attention. This should be available to him in his own home section.

However, a vast number of veterans will be in great need of permanent medical care. They will need this care often and it will have to be available on the spot. They will need this care the rest of their lives.

It is not fair to expect veterans from Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and vicinity to travel long distances in order to go to a veterans' hospital. The only fair way is to bring the hospital to the veterans of our section.

My bill provides for the immediate construction of this important project. It will take care of any unemployment among building tradesmen and skilled construction workers for a long time back home.

In order to live up to the provisions of the G. I. bill of rights which Congress passed last year, we should start right away on a program of hospital construction and the Triple Cities area should be first on the must list.

The O. P. A. Program—The Merchant's Point of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, once in a while it is good business policy to take account of stock. It is always worth while to find out what the other fellow thinks. A man cannot always be right, though some are hard to dissuade of the notion that they can do no wrong.

The consumer, John Q. Public, has had much to say about the iniquities and discriminations, the arbitrary rulings involving regimentation and alleged breaches of faith which have come out of O. P. A. headquarters.

I am convinced that the people are for price control. They shun the specter of inflation. No agency in the land is more misguidedly, if unintentionally, yet deliberately leading the way to that possible ultimatum, than is the O. P. A., and the people are not fooled. Prices are not controlled.

They will not respond to appeals for support of a program which any man who reads intelligently must know will not accomplish, what even its sponsors may hope. I give them credit for being well-intentioned.

So just for once why not take a look at what the merchants of the country, long-suffering "serfs," as they have been, in an attempt to cooperate to keep prices down, have to say.

Here is an article from the New York Times of Sunday last which deserves to be read by those who are genuinely interested, nonpartisanly, in avoiding inflation, or better, may I say, controlling it, since despite all the efforts of O. P. A. it is here, and that is the answer to the O. P. A. program. It has not been successful. It should be changed. It can only be altered by amendments to the law, under which it was created.

Under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include this article as an extension of my remarks:

THE MERCHANT'S POINT OF VIEW

(By C. F. Hughes)

In section 2 (A) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, the following provisions appear:

"Before issuing any regulation or order under the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Administrator shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with representative members of the industry which will be affected by such regulation or order. In the case of any commodity for which a maximum price has been established, the Administrator shall, at the request of any substantial portion of the industry subject to such maximum price regulation or order of the Administrator, appoint an industry advisory committee or committees, either national or regional or both, consisting of such number of representatives of the industry as may be necessary in order to constitute a committee truly representative of the industry or of the industry in such region, as the case may be. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members and shall meet at the call of the chairman. The Administrator shall from time to time, at the request of the committee, advise and consult with the committee with respect to the regulation or order, and with respect to the form thereof, and classifications, differentiations, and adjustments therein. The committee may make such recommendation to the Administrator as it deems advisable. Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, without regard to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, issue temporary regulations or orders establishing as a maximum price or maximum prices, the price or prices prevailing with respect to any commodity or commodities within 5 days prior to the date of issuance of such temporary regulations or orders; but any such temporary regulation or order shall be effective for not more than 60 days, and may be replaced by a regulation or order issued under the foregoing provisions of this subsection."

Last summer when Congress went into O. P. A. affairs quite thoroughly, the issue of industry consultation received considerable emphasis from business interests. Price Administrator Chester Bowles offered assurances that more trade consultation would be invited and he saw to it that a number of additional advisory committees were set up.

O. P. A. officials have appeared before the Senate Banking Committee, which is considering extension of the price act, and so far

the matter of consultation has not become a major subject. Before the Smith committee of the House tomorrow, however, a series of hearings begin at which strong protest will be raised against the new M–388 order and the coming maximum average price order on this very score. The Smith committee was set up to investigate the abuse of executive power by Government agencies.

M–388 is the regulation already announced through which it is hoped to channel textile materials and apparel into lower-price channels. It is a War Production Board order designed to overcome the errors made by O. P. A. in permitting apparel manufacturers to profit by certain loopholes in the General Maximum Price Regulation by moving into higher price lines.

What happened in apparel was similar to what happened with hamburgers when a piece of onion or tomato was thrown in to get an extra 10 cents. Minor changes were made and something new had been added, particularly to the price because quotations could be adjusted to the closest competitor or on a comparable basis.

After almost 3 years of this kind of price control, the O. P. A. finds it necessary to channel goods into the vacuum which has appeared in low-end supply and mainly because new and huge military requirements have also shown up after 3 years of war. Whether these military needs are warranted is still an unanswered question which gives all signs of going unanswered for some time to come regardless of the paramount interests involved.

Whether the War Production Board is governed in a case which is essentially a price case by the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act is a nice point on M–388. The orders are described as joint action by W. P. B. and O. P. A. The board orders the channeling through priorities for material and also requires reports on apparel production by price lines which is usually a function of O. P. A. The purpose of the regulation is a price rollback, so it is assumed that the price act provisions apply.

Since this is the assumption, the history of the regulations recounts a first meeting on January 23 when various trade interests were called to Washington to see the new order and "like it." According to reliable trade sources, the advisory committees never got a chance at the regulation. They heard that such an order was "in the works" but some members did not have even this knowledge. When the new program was unveiled late in January it was described as a skeleton. Base periods, quotas, and cut-off prices were all unrevealed and therefore intelligent consideration was denied as a prominent woolen manufacturer commented, adding in paraphrase of Churchill, "never was so little known by so many about so much."

It was at a subsequent hearing that the threat was made which has finally resulted in the sessions of the Smith committee that start tomorrow in Washington. Besides charging outright violation of the Price Control Act in this and other instances, the contention of trade interests will be that the effect of the new orders will defeat the very purposes for which they were drawn. Reduced instead of expanded low-cost production is the trade foretrade forecost, and unemployment as well.

In the fabric markets, authoritative opinion holds that supply has been well maintained, considering severe manpower difficulties, traced to cloth finishing premiums allowed by O. P. A. and to the upping of prices throughout the apparel industries due to lack of prompt and firm enforcement. A case is cited where yardage in the grey at 80 cents has been sold for $1.35 after finishing against a normal price of 75 cents. The dress made of it was priced at $69.50.

Such examples make what appears to be a prima facie argument for squeezing the extra profits out of cloth processing, apparel manufacturing and retailing of the product and yet, as indicated, the disruption of a drastic changeover now is not only apt to reduce production but also to cut off supplies from better grade stores and fill others up with goods that may prove all but unsalable.

In conclusion it may be pointed out that textile, as well as clothing and apparent manufacturers, in 1944 did not make the exceptional gains in profits which were imagined. The National City Bank report for the year on net income after taxes for these groups showed these reductions under 1943: For 33 cotton-goods manufacturers, 15.2 percent; for 39 other textile producers, 0.8 percent; and for 17 clothing and apparel manufacturers, 0.6 percent. For 715 companies in the tabulation of 1944 net earnings, the average gain was 3.5 percent. The percentage of return to net worth was a little above the average of 8.8 percent for 2 of these groups. Thus, cotton goods was 7.4 percent; other textile products, 9.1 percent; and clothing and apparel, 7.6 percent.

"OPEN CAPACITY" REPORTS

Additional evidence that "hog wild" procurement by the armed services is disrupting the orderly flow of materials and components which is essential for speedy and efficient war production was observed in the week, although certain critical programs were officially reported as improved. Decision of the War Production Board to issue reports on available manufacturing capacity twice a month was regarded in some quarters as a bid for regaining some control of the situation before it becomes too badly snarled.

Under this program the W. P. B. has obtained agreement of the military services, it was asserted, to check the list of "open capacity" plants before placing direct war contracts so that production schedules may be speeded up. The list will include all plants with 100 or more workers or 50,000 square feet or more of plant space that are being released for new production. Meantime, plants with subcontracts to offer may apply at the local W. P. B. offices for information on "open capacity." These lists ought to clear up some of the fog about urgent needs that find no production facilities or manpower available.

In trade during the week the recent steady pace was maintained and shortages were more pronounced as a result. Department-store sales for the period ended February 24 were 20 percent above a year ago as against a gain of 24 percent in the preceding week.

Address by Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, at Jackson Day Victory Dinner, February 24, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include my remarks as follows at the Jackson Day victory dinner in Boston, Mass., February 24, 1945:

When Andrew Jackson was elected to the Presidency for the second time, one of his enemies, and he had plenty of them, said: "He can be President for life if he chooses." [Pause.]

I mention this in passing because I believe we find a parallel in the Democratic Party and its leaders of today. For Andrew Jackson was a human being before all else * * * he was close to the people in the true American way and they honored him with their trust and support.

When Old Hickory, as President, made his triumphal tour of the Eastern States, he must have called upon all his soldierly courage as he approached Massachusetts. True, he was coming by express invitation of the State legislature, but Massachusetts was not quite as democratic as it is now. The general court, which in 1815 had thanked the Almighty for the victory at New Orleans without mentioning General Jackson's name, felt it no longer necessary to ignore the man whose stand against nullification had won approval from the great Massachusetts statesman, Daniel Webster. A military review was scheduled to take place on Boston Common. Jackson galloped easily along the line of troops, the cabinet officers, and other notables trotting along as best they could.

"Where is the Vice President?" exclaimed Old Hickory as he drew up his horse to take the soldiers' salute.

One of his aides answered: "About as nearly on the fence as a gentleman of his positive political convictions can get." For the Vice President's nervous horse had shied against a fence and refused to budge. General Jackson looked and laughed. "And you've matched him with a horse even more noncommital than his rider!"

Beacon Street then, as now, did not warm to a Democrat, even though he was President. When the parade passed through this sacred territory, there was the silence of a graveyard—until a window suddenly flew up and a little girl appeared, waving a handkerchief. It seems that a certain Republican merchant was standing well back from the window, where he could see without being seen. In spite of the east wind, the warmth of Jackson's personality penetrated even to that chill parlor on Beacon Street. The merchant thawed. "Do someone come here," he shouted to the behind-the-scene Republicans in the room, "and salute the old man!" And a little, unspoiled child came to the window to greet the President, generously doing what her father could not bring himself to do. If that same merchant were living in 1944, on November 4, 1944, he might have found himself in Fenway Park, unashamedly cheering another great President of the United States, one Franklin D. Roosevelt. For even some of our Republican brethren can thaw in the presence of inspiring leadership.

However, it took Andrew Jackson to start the ball a-rolling. The President of Harvard College was a man of action as well as a scholar. Calling the overseers of the college together, he obtained approval of a resolution to confer a degree of doctor of laws on Jackson. John Quincy Adams nearly had a stroke when he heard it passed. Was there no way, he asked, to prevent this outrage? "None," replied the educator. "As the people of the United States have twice decided that this man knows law enough to be their President, it is not for Harvard College to maintain that they are mistaken."

Harvard showed its wisdom for it saw the handwriting of the future. The tide of a new "people's party" was coming in. In membership and doctrines it stemmed from the left wing of the revolutionary movement that had won independence for America. It found its spokesman in a son of the soil, a pioneer, with all the courage and love of humanity which he inherited from his Irish forebears—rough and ready Andrew Jackson.

He had never publicly proclaimed himself a Democrat. But the people adopted him as their champion, in contrast to the aloof and high-toned Republican leadership of the time. And so the cleavage became marked, with the name Democrat standing for "the people" and the label Republican representing special and exclusive economic interests.

For the first time, the men and women of America saw the issues clearly drawn. On the wave of this popular feeling, Jackson was reelected to the Presidency. With but two exceptions, the party which his personality and policies created, carried every election from 1828 to 1856.

In 1836 Jackson, by his appointment of Roger Taney as Chief Justice, did much to alter the controlling social philosophy of the United States Supreme Court. This event marked the beginning of an era that was to see the Court interpret the liberal spirit which had as its goal the greater well-being of common men. That same humane tradition was to find its highest expression in our time, spelled out in the social wisdom inspired by Democratic leadership.

Jackson was a pioneer, an experimenter, and so are we today. Our purpose is to broaden the base of democracy, not limit it. We do not turn our backs on change, as the opposition party does. As mature and realistic men and women we know that certain changes are inevitable. And so we go forward to meet and solve the challenging problems of today, giving to the people a practical government, in step with life itself. We do not hoard ability. We put it to work for the greater good of all. That is the political creed we inherit from Jackson, which we share with Roosevelt, and to which we rededicate ourselves tonight.

Jackson and Roosevelt, in many ways they are alike. Wealth and power opposed them, but the people loyally supported them. Both men understood the people of the United States with an instinctive sympathy that won genuine devotion. The gifts which Jackson brought to the Presidency were not alone successful in the management of domestic policy. His conduct of foreign affairs raised the prestige of the young American Nation to a high level. Genuine respect abroad for American rights began with Jackson. It is finding fulfillment in world leadership with Roosevelt.

When Jackson finally laid down his burden he did not realize the impression he had made on his time. Posterity gave to him an honor not previously given to any other man, that of marking out a period in our national history and calling it by his name. Today that is being duplicated. The achievements of our President, both at home and abroad, will most certainly give to our age the name of the Roosevelt era.

The opposition party speaks for narrow interests, but the Democrats represent the mass of the people. In the Jacksonian tradition, we develop our leaders from the rank and file of American life and train them never to lose the common touch. God grant that it may ever be so.

On the domestic scene our party has added economic democracy to the charter of American liberties. On the world scene we are working toward an extension of democracy which will lead to a peace among all men. We realize that the eventual elimination of war itself will be the greatest achievement of mankind.

There are those who seek to stop us by calling us visionaries. In doing so, they grudgingly admit our leadership. For the Democratic Party has always dared, as Jackson and Roosevelt dared, to tackle problems, not avoid them; to experiment with possible solutions until we invent one that works. We are pioneering in government and bringing to it the energy and enterprise that is typically American.

We approach the great tasks ahead of us with faith and with courage. The problems are great, but our will to overcome them is equal to the challenge. We do not propose to let America wither on the vine. We have our ears to the people and we know that the ferment of a century is at work. Our fighting men and women, our laborers in the field and factory, are looking forward to a better America, and they intend to get it.

The stand-patters will be brushed aside. Only those who keep pace with, or anticipate the energy, the intelligence, and the conscience that vitalize our people, will be worthy to represent them.

America is young in spirit and so is the Democratic Party. Across a century of time we see Andrew Jackson, as fresh, human, and creative as the frontier itself. For a moment we think of him as a leader of today.

There is but one difference. We stand on the threshhold of new and unexplored frontiers. As members of the Democratic Party we face forward to the unknown and with human effort—under divine guidance—we shall help our people through the wilderness of social and economic problems that lie ahead.

This is not only Jacksonian democracy, and the democracy of Franklin Roosevelt. It is the people's democracy—in control of its own destiny.

Go to It, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most striking editorial printed anywhere in the United States on the President's report of the Yalta Conference appeared in the Indianapolis Star on Friday, March 2. This editorial is attracting a great deal of attention and comment throughout the country. The editorial is all the more striking because of the background of that able newspaper's history.

The Indianapolis Star has roundly condemned many of the policies of the New Deal, regarding them as economically unsound and fallacious. But while the Star believes in the principles of the Republican Party its high character and unquestioned integrity have given it a reputation of dealing fairly and justly with opposing personalities and forces, so that even Democrats in Indiana are accustomed to say "If you see it in the Star it is so." This rare faculty of objectivity, of being able to appraise with fairness and fidelity the work of either political friend or political opponent, shines through the Star's editorial on the President's message, which is an all-out endorsement of the President in respect to foreign affairs as revealed in the message. The editorial, entitled "Go to It, Mr. President" is as follows:

GO TO IT, MR. PRESIDENT

That was a great report to the American people, Mr. President. You spoke to all the people as the representative of all the people. Your report and your comments were frank and presented in simple language which all can understand and which the American people appreciate.

There was not one word of incrimination in anything you said. You frankly declared your understanding of, your support of, and your allegiance to the Constitution. You told the world that the peace will not be your peace, not a Democratic Party peace, not a Republican Party peace, but a people's peace based on what the American people know and applaud as plain, common sense.

In your report you were a leader in every sense of the word, Mr. President. You told us what we wanted to know You promised to keep us advised. You gave assurances of thoroughgoing bipartisan representation in international conferences planning for world organization and international cooperation. You brilliantly avoided the mistake of your illustrious predecessor, Woodrow Wilson.

We have opposed you bitterly in the past on many issues, mainly on your multiple-term ambitions, but on the basis of your report yesterday and on your assurances of adherence to common sense and constitutional processes we pledge you our wholehearted support in your determination to create a world organization based on international good will and understanding.

Go to it, Mr. President. The American people are for you and with you. But for the sake of America and the world, stay on the beam.

The Bretton Woods Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are enemies within our gates. An assault by foreign agents aided and abetted by domestic quislings is now being organized to gain control of the resources of this Republic. It is a stealthy and insidious conspiracy to bleed our taxpayers for the benefit of defaulting nations. A horde of foreign propagandists are doing the spadework for the greatest financial raid ever attempted against the resources of a nation by other nations in the history of mankind. Every type of agency by which reason can be dethroned will be wheeled into action. The press, radio, the movies, telephone, paid speakers, the magazines are day by day being regimented and supplied with material, not with the idea of presenting facts, but to whip the public mind into a spell of emotionalism that will cause the mass mind to accept the theory that the United States should ignore the plight of its own people and devote all of its resources to its defaulting and impecunious neighbors. Under leave to extend, as a part of my speech, I include an editorial from the Herald Tribune of March 4, 1945:

THE BRETTON WOODS ISSUE

There is a disturbing accumulation of evidence that the administration is determined to employ the most ruthless strong-arm tactics to drive through Congress without alteration the so-called Bretton Woods program, on which hearings are scheduled to begin this week before the House Ways and Means Committee.

For some time past there have been reports that sponsors of this legislation have boasted that they had "greased the wheels" to slide the measure through. Events have shown that such reports were not without foundation. When the House was being reorganized in January membership of the Banking and Currency Committee, according to George B. Bryant, Jr., Washington correspondent of the Wall Street Journal, in a recent dispatch to that newspaper, was selected with unusual care. The five Democratic vacancies on this committee—which

will have much to say about continuing New Deal financial and economic controls, in addition to its international financial plans—were filled with Democrats of the New Deal school, and it was then expanded to include two more. This new committee, which the administration refers to as "streamlined," and Republicans as "stacked," had its trial test a month ago on the George bill, and for the first time in recent years the Democratic Members voted as a unit in opposition to a Republican-spansored measure. Next, when the Wagner-Spence bill, designed to give legislative effect to the Bretton Woods program, was introduced it was revealed that it proposed to finance the initial needs of the monetary fund from the so-called gold profits in the present stabilization fund. Critics of this procedure interpret it as a device for bypassing the Appropriations Committee.

But a more insidious weapon than any of these is the studied effort on the part of the administration to tie the issue of all-or-none accepance of the Treasury program with the issue of isolation. The theme is constantly reiterated that, as Dean Acheson, of the State Department, put it before representatives of 104 national organizations invited to Washington for a pep talk by the Treasury on Wednesday, other nations "would be chilled toward Dumbarton Oaks" if the Bretton Woods "proposals for international cooperation in the financial field" are rejected.

It would be a grave error of Republican leadership to permit itself to be maneuvered into a false position before the public on this measure, for the issue of isolationism here is a synthetic one, created for purely political purposes. The $18,000,000,000 financial set-up which is conveniently referred to as the Bretton Woods program did not emanate with that Conference nor was it drawn up under any authorization from Congress. It was developed out of plans produced by Lord Keynes and associates on behalf of the British Treasury and Dr. Harry White and others acting for our Treasury, and as presented at Bretton Woods represented a tentative agreement among unnamed technical experts of 30 nations. Discussions at Bretton Woods were confined rigidly to this joint statement of principles, and no attempt was made to explore other proposals. Largely because of this limitation on discussion, the delegates were not authorized to bind their respective governments. Lord Keynes himself made this unequivocally clear when he declared:

"We [the British delegation], in common with other delegations, reserve the opinion of our government on the document as a whole and on every part of it. * * * We do not even recommend our governments to adopt the result. We merely submit it for what it is worth to the attention of the legislators concerned."

In other words, the so-called Bretton Woods program was never intended as anything but a starting point for legislative action to achieve the objective it seeks. It is a complete distortion of the facts to imply that any modification of that agreement could be construed as in any sense a repudiation of the achievements of Dumbarton Oaks.

Nurse Draft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on the nurse draft bill made over the Columbia network in the Congress Speaks series, from the studies of WTOP in Washington, on Tuesday, March 6, 1945:

For a number of months it has been known that the need for more nurses in the armed services was becoming increasingly acute. This situation was brought into the open on January 6, 1945, when the President of the United States sent his state of the Union message to Congress. In the course of his message he said:

"One of the most urgent immediate requirements of the armed forces is more nurses. Last April the Army requirement for nurses was set at 50,000. Actual strength of nurses was then 40,000. Since that time the Army has tried to raise the additional 10,000. Active recruiting has been carried on, but the net gain in 8 months has been only 2,000. There are now 42,000 nurses in the Army.

"Recent estimates have increased the number needed to 60,000. That means that 18,000 additional nurses must be obtained for the Army alone, and the Navy requires 2,000 additional nurses."

This plea for more nurses for the armed services was publicized throughout the entire Nation, and at that time there was available as a reservoir from which these needs could be drawn of some 280,000 registered nurses, and some additional qualified but unregistered nurses. Every paper in the country picked up the cry for more nurses, and some 13,000 inquiries were received by the services within a few weeks after the President's address. Many of the so-called applications indicated that the nurses would not be available for many months and many showed on their face that the nurses were not eligible because of lack of sufficient training or because of physical defects. Out of this great reservoir to date, only 2,000 additional nurses have been obtained, leaving the present needs of the Army at 16,000 nurses and the present needs of the Navy at 2,000 additional.

To maintain the proper standard for nursing, one nurse should have control over not more than 12 patients, but under present conditions, in the continental United States, nurses are required to take charge of more than 24 patients. The great difficulty is, of course, that the number of patients is constantly increasing. As long as this war continues, one of the tragic realities is that our men are going to be wounded and they are going to get sick. Figures from World War No. 1, as taken from the files of the Veterans Administration, indicate that the total number of hospital patients will not be reduced by the cessation of fighting. These figures show, on the contrary, that while the slightly injured soldiers get well and leave the hospitals, unfortunately thousands upon thousands of sick and injured servicemen must be additionally hospitalized as time goes on. Certainly, as long as this war lasts, we must expect additional wounded and sick men to enter our hospitals and require medical attention. The problem is not, then, one which we can hope to see relieved at any time within the near future, even though the war in Europe is successfully ended.

To illustrate what I mean, I want to remind you that we presently have in our service hospitals approximately 500,000 sick and wounded. Of this number some 280,000 are in hospitals overseas and 210,000 are in hospitals in this country. Our hospitalized men are being returned from overseas at the rate of more than 1,000 per day to fill up our hospitals over here; and as a result of this, recently 11 hospital units were sent overseas without any nurses with them. The War Department reports that 3,200 nurses are needed overseas at this very hour to fill up the tables of organization requirements to the full number of nurses needed. If we are to give rest to those heroic nurses who have been working month after month overseas, some for as long as 3 years—and bring some of these gallant young women back to the United States under the rotation policy of the War and Navy Departments, an additional 5,000 nurses will be needed. In other words, at this very hour, in the crisis of battle which is wounding our men and placing them in hospitals both on the Atlantic and Pacific fronts, we need 8,300 more nurses immediately.

My friends, H. R. 2277, commonly known as the nurse draft bill, is due to pass the House of Representatives by a heavy vote tomorrow afternoon. This bill will, in my judgment, cure our troubles and give to us the nurses which our soldiers and sailors on hospital beds need very badly at this moment. This bill provides for the registration, selection and induction of qualified nurses for the land and naval forces. It provides that every qualified unmarried female nurse between the ages of 20 and 45 shall be eligible for selection into the armed services as a nurse. The policy of the War Department is to offer these young women commissions as second lieutenants and of the Navy commissions as ensigns. Salaries and allowances as such will make the pay $2,590 per year.

One of the features of this bill, which must not be overlooked, is the method by which selection shall be made. The Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member, realized that while the needs of the armed services are paramount, it is certainly not desirable to disturb greatly the civilian requirements for nurses. With this in mind, the committee wrote into this bill a provision that no nurse shall be available for induction into service if the Procurement and Assignment Service, functioning through its local, State and National Committee, shall have certified that this person is engaged in essential nursing service. These committees are to be civilian committees, composed largely of representatives from the nursing and hospital organizations throughout the United States, and these committees will be located in communities throughout the country. These committees, under the terms of this bill, will decide on what nurses are engaged in essential nursing service, and when this decision is certified to the local draft board, it will have the effect of preventing induction. Persons complaining of the action of one of the committees shall have the right of appeal to the local draft board as provided by the Selective Service Act.

As a result of this arrangement, the necessary requirements in the civilian economy will be fully cared for. No community, because of its patriotism and its desire to serve in this great humanitarian work, will be completely stripped of its hospital and institutional needs. No city or State should suffer a breakdown in operations because of local shortages. Only those nurses who are not essential will be taken from their civilian jobs and be eligible for induction into the armed services.

My friends, we realize further that the Veterans' Administration must not be stripped completely of its personnel. Our wounded and sick come from the Army and the Navy into the veterans' facilities and we have therefore placed this great agency of the Government as second only to the Army and the Navy. Under the terms of this bill, no person shall be inducted from the Veterans' Administration without the written approval of the Director of this Administration who, as you know, is Gen. Frank T. Hines.

The problem of obtaining sufficient nurses for the needs of our armed services is a difficult one; but it is one which must be solved. It is estimated that 27,000 registered nurses may be spared for this purpose without much disturbing the home front. To permit the shortage to continue when our men on 56 fighting fronts of the world are being killed and wounded by the hundreds of thousands is intolerable. Red-blooded,

patriotic Americans will not permit this situation to continue.

I have recently returned, my friends, from an inspection trip to the battlefields of Europe. On this trip, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I was given an opportunity of seeing the Army hospital facilities of England, France and Italy. Accompanied by other members of the committee, I visited these hospitals, inspected their equipment, discussed their problems with the doctors and the nurses, and talked with the wounded and the sick. I saw the front line first-aid stations, the evacuation hospitals located at convenient distances from the front, the great base hospitals in the rear and even the specialized services hospitals. I saw many types of cases and many types of wounds; and I obtained the viewpoint of those sick and wounded men able to talk and to tell me of their troubles.

At every turn I was told of the shortage of nurses. I was told that if a wounded man reaches the hospital and receives competent medical and nursing care within 2 to 4 hours after being wounded, his chances of recovery are 90 percent. On the other hand, if he does not reach the hospital until 24 to 48 hours after being wounded and does not receive competent medical and nursing attention until this time has passed, his chances of recovery are reduced to 10 percent. Each day that you arise from your slumber in comfortable homes, thousands of miles from the battle fronts, you may know that 1,600 of our men will be wounded in battle and will be rushed to these hospitals. Each day that goes by will see, according to our present figures, 6,500 go to the hospitals from sickness and nonbattle injuries, a total, my friends, to be daily received by our service hospitals of 8,100 cases. It is unthinkable that these should not receive prompt and adequate hospitalization treatment. A failure on our part and a failure on the part of the nursing staff will mean that many men will die each day needlessly as a sacrifice to our failure to provide adequate hospital facilities for them.

My friends, these young women are patriotic. I saw these young women in the hospitals ministering with tender care to the sick and the wounded. I saw them in the operating rooms, the sick wards, and with the perambulator cases. In their white aprons, they moved noiselessly from bed to bed, performing their duties and ministering to the needs of those who called. Long hours and grueling toil over many months are evidenced on tired faces and weary limbs. Ever with sincerity and with earnestness, they enter into the daily cares of the hospital and render a service to their patients, the value of which cannot be estimated in financial worth. Their work is priceless—the result in achievement is little short of miraculous. Americans should be deeply grateful to these young women.

This legislation was approved by every organization of nurses which came before the Military Affairs Committee. It bears the approval of the War Manpower Commission, Selective Service, and it is "must legislation" on the calendar of the War and Navy Departments.

American Tanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter written to me by Corp. Rufus E. Webb, somewhere in Germany, and an article appearing in the Stars and Stripes, February 23, 1945, edition:

SOMEWHERE IN GERMANY,
February 22, 1945.

Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am not in the habit of writing to my Congressman, but what I'm writing about means a lot to me. In fact it may mean either life or death.

The reason, or I should say another reason, I'm writing is the fact I read a report one of the Congressmen made that toured the European theaters of operations. The report stated that one of our high-ranking generals said that our American tanks were an equal match for any German tank. As a "tanker" that has seen and been in quite a few battles I know that isn't true.

I am enclosing an article from the Stars and Stripes that tells the story very well. Several of my buddies have commented on it and think it tells all.

My fellow soldiers and I would appreciate it if you could inform your honorable colleagues about how we, the men who fight in the tanks, feel about it.

I am not from the division that is mentioned in the article I am enclosing. I am in the Seventh Armored Division.

I will close now. Thanking you for your valuable time which I have taken.

Sincerely,

Corp. RUFUS E. WEBB.

P. S.—My home is in Flat River. I have a wife and one child at home.

SHELLS BOUNCE OFF TIGERS, VETERAN UNITED STATES TANKMEN SAY

(By Ernest Leiser)

WITH SECOND ARMORED DIVISION, February 22.—They were working on the Shermans, or fixing up the mud-clogged roads, and batting the breeze as they worked. Staff Sgt. Ernest Holland, of Milan, Mo., who's been with the Second Armored for more than 3 years, was saying, "We're just out-tanked and outgunned, that's all. We don't mind the lack of armor on our tanks as much as the lack of firepower. But it's mighty aggravating to let fly with everything you've got and just have the shells bounce off the front of the Jerry tanks.

"We can knock them out with flank shots, but it's tough to do a thing with that snout pointed toward us."

Sgt. John Gorzalski, of Milwaukee, who has had six tanks knocked out from under him, added, "You can't go against a Tiger with a peashooter."

"Don't misunderstand us," said T/5 Francis Griffin, of Philadelphia, bow gunner of Holland's tank. "All we want is a better gun, and we'll be ready to tackle any of them."

Staff Sgt. Raymond E. Kasner, of Rosebud, Tex., who has been a tanker since October 1942, and who was recently made a platoon sergeant as well as tank commander, indicated his boys tackle them anyhow.

MORE GUTS

"We've got more men with more guts than the Jerries," he said, "and no matter what they still get in there and fight."

Kasner figures he's lucky. He's the only tank commander around here who hasn't had at least one tank shot from beneath him.

"Our tank guns just won't penetrate the King Tiger or the Panther from the front," he said, adding, however, that at short range Shermans could stop the Mark IV's even from the front, "provided you get the first shot." He thought that the new 76 millimeter gun was a "step in the right direction."

Corp. Frederick Pape, of Quanah, Tex., agreed that it was rough going up against bigger tanks and better guns—but, he said, "we do it, anyway."

Farther down the road, Capt. James Burt, of South Lee, Mass., commanding officer of H Company of the Sixty-sixth Armored Regiment, was going around taking a look at the tanks and their equipment.

"You know," he said, "our morale would be a lot better if there weren't so many cock-and-bull stories in the papers about how our tanks are world beaters.

"You see, when the layman reads that we've knocked out twice as many Jerry tanks as they have of ours, he doesn't realize that it's not our tanks alone that did the job. It's tanks, plus artillery, plus planes, plus guts."

One tanker ventured the opinion that planes accounted for most of the enemy tanks.

BROAD AND LOW

Burt continued: "We lose four or five tanks, and then the boys on the busted-up tanks have the guts to go out and do it again."

His remedies, like those of his men, were "better guns and thicker front plates." He said, "They tell us we're more mobile than the German tanks, but they can turn on a dime." He added that the Shermans were too high, and that "we need 'em broad and low."

Kasner, one of Burt's platoon sergeants, said it was lucky we have "so many" tanks. "That's the only way we can outmaneuver and flank them. If they'd give me a Mark V, I'd take on any of the bastards."

Finally they got around to talking about the infantryman.

"I'm willing to let the doughs have all the credit for this war, despite our gripes," Holland said. And Staff Sgt. Edward Kunkel, of La Mesa, Tex., summed up the way they all felt: "Even if our tanks aren't up to the Jerries', I'd rather be in one of them than in the Infantry."

The Flag on Mount Suribachi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest pictures coming out of this war is the picture of the United States marines planting the American flag on top of Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima. It typifies more clearly than words can express the esprit d' corps of the marines and furnishes for all of us a thrilling example of how the Corps always accomplishes its objectives. As Lt. Gen. Holland Smith has well said, "The fight for Iwo Jima is the toughest in the 168-year history of the Marine Corps," but we know and the marines will furnish final proof of that knowledge that Iwo Jima will be taken and one more stepping stone on the road to Japan will be ours.

I should like to see the Treasury Departm. .t use this picture as the symbol of the Seventh War Loan drive coming up shortly. If we as a people will show the same determination as these marines we can do our part in keeping the flag flying high at home as they have done

in keeping it flying on foreign battlefields.

One of the five boys shown in this remarkable picture of Mount Suribachi is Louis C. Charlo, grandson of the great Chief Charlo of Nez Perce war fame and son of Mr. and Mrs. Antoine Charlo, of Evaro, Mont. This Indian boy, this real American, is to be congratulated on the part he played in this epic action and we of Montana and the Nation at large pay homage to him for his devotion to duty, his courage and his determination. He is a real marine and as such he has exemplified in action the attributes which have made the Marine Corps the real fighting organization it always has been through all the years of its magnificent history.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including in the RECORD a short statement concerning Louis Charlo taken from the Daily Missoulian, Friday, March 2, 1945:

ERROR DISGUISES FAMOUS NAME'S PART IN EXPLOIT

An error in one syllable of a name proved an effective if unintentional disguise in an Associated Press dispatch from Iwo Jima last Saturday, and thereby deprived a certain young Evaro marine of immediate recognition of the fact that he had not only distinguished himself, but also shed further glory on a name already illustrious in Montana history. The 18-year-old private, first class, who was headlined as one of the four marines who made up the first group to scale the hard-won peak of volcanic Mount Suribachi, was not somebody named Charles, but none other than Louis C. Charlo, grandson of the great Chief Charlo of Nez Perce war fame, and son of Mr. and Mrs. Antoine Charlo of Evaro.

Private Charlo enlisted in the Marine Corps in Missoula in November 1943 at the age of 17 years, left for boot training in San Diego December 13 of the same year, and has been overseas 7 months.

The Late Senator William M. Calder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial on the death of the Honorable William M. Calder which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on March 5, 1945:

WILLIAM M. CALDER

Former Senator William M. Calder's death leaves a wide gap in the ranks of true Brooklynites of whom it must be said they devote their entire energies to the welfare of the borough. Senator Calder was one of these in the fullest sense. Churchman, public servant, civic worker, and builder, his performance will be long remembered.

In Congress, where he started in 1905, he looked out for the welfare of his district to such an extent that he soon became known as the Errand Boy Congressman. After a long career as Representative he was elected to the Senate in 1915, serving until 1923.

Now, when we know the full meaning of the necessity of having the world's most powerful Navy, it is interesting to recall that early in his political career he advocated just that, saying: "Not for the purpose of national aggrandizement, but for the maintenance of naval stations and naval bases to compel the respect for the flag which has not always been accorded it."

Carbon Black Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal of March 4, 1945:

CARBON BLACK SHORTAGES PERIL WHOLE WAR EFFORT—TIRE CUT-BACKS VIEWED CERTAIN

(By Charles C. Miller)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation's critical carbon black program is so badly scrambled that it seriously threatens United States military operations all over the world.

Other grave consequences of W. P. B.'s failure to gear carbon black production to rapidly expanding military tire production were disclosed by highest Government sources here Saturday night.

They include:

Shortening the workweek in the overloaded tire industry to allow carbon black output to catch up.

Extremely heavy cutbacks in already meager civilian tire production.

Further curtailment in bus and truck tires with serious consequences to the creaking, over-the-road transportation system.

The shortage has been coming on since August. It has been bad since November.

It reached a crisis here last week and boiled over in a series of day and night sessions between representatives of W. P. B., the War Department, War Mobilizer Byrnes' office and everybody else in any way connected with the program.

Some heads may fall. There are plenty of blunt statements in both the War Department and W. P. B.'s Rubber Bureau to the effect that: "They ought to * * *."

Meantime, big question in the industry is, "Who is to blame?"

The answer appears to be the chemicals division of the War Production Board.

W. P. B. Operations Chief Hiland G. Batcheller inferentially put the finger on that division in a statement clearing industry, the War Department, and the W. P. B. Rubber Bureau headed by James F. Clark.

Industry has been calling for carbon black ever since shortages began to build up last summer. W. P. B. pointed out that the War Department's tire needs have rocketed almost week by week since November, but that it is in the clear on stating requirements.

At the same time it was noted that the Rubber Bureau has been on record with requests for expanding carbon black production with each new jump in tire demands.

"Crux of it," Batcheller's office told the Beacon Journal, "is that the chemicals division didn't believe industry, labor, and the Rubber Bureau when they promised to meet every new goal.

"Industry and labor have performed an incredible production miracle. They have completely outstripped supply. It was a question of the rubber team running away from the chemicals team."

As a result of the chemical division's failure to step up production, some of the big Akron companies are already 35 percent short of minimum carbon black requirements for March.

Best opinion here is that the carbon black shortages and Sunday layoffs will cost the Army tens of thousands of top-urgency combat tires.

To offset as much military loss as possible, industry will have to dip heavily into carbon black now going into passenger tires and into tires for farm implements, trucks, and busses.

Some officials think no more than 12,000,000 passenger tires can be built this year. That is 33 percent under 1944's comparative "dribble" of 18,000,000 casings. It might even run to 50 percent.

No production increases in those lines can possibly be scheduled until June or July, when new carbon black plants now being rushed through construction on highest priorities come into production.

Batcheller said that the carbon black shortage "may" force the tire industry back to a 6-day week.

It can be reported here that it "will."

A War Department spokesman expressed outright alarm. He said:

"There's no point in kidding anyone. This hurts and its hurts bad. We need every tire we can get now—even a tire. This is going to cost us tens of thousands of tires. It gives our plans and operations in both the Pacific and European theaters a serious setback."

Army officials are hopeful that Sunday work may have to be discontinued no more than for 3 or 4 weeks. Rubber bureau officials observed, "We'll be lucky if we can go back on 7 days by June."

The Bretton Woods Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the statement of Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, before the Banking and Currency Committee today on the Bretton Woods proposals:

The legislation which you have been good enough to ask me to discuss with you today is perhaps the most important measure for post-war international cooperation yet to come before Congress.

Right at the outset, therefore, I would like you to know that I have examined it just as carefully as I know how, and I am convinced of one fundamental fact. The Bretton Woods agreements are good for every American citizen.

I have been in close contact with every step of their development. I have watched the many months of arduous preliminary work. I have taken part in the deliberations of the conference at Bretton Woods, N. H. I have studied the discussion that has taken place in the 7 months since then. And I can assure you that the program we are advocating is definitely good busines for the United States.

The Bretton Woods agreements, it is true, deal with the rather technical questions of national currencies and international credits. But they present a very simple issue—stability and order instead of insecurity and chaos.

Furthermore, these agreements can be translated into the basic necessities of life

for the American people. They involve jobs and profits. They help determine the fate of both new and old enterprises. They govern the amount of food on the family table, the money for a new radio, school books for the children. Our country has as much to gain, perhaps more than any other, from passage of the legislation now before you.

The Bretton Woods agreements are a firm step toward the solution of two problems which concern the American people more than anything except only the progress of our fighting men overseas. These problems are the organization of world security and the development of the world's resources for the benefit of all its people. Of course, the two objectives are as interdependent as the blades of a pair of scissors. One will not work very well without the other.

Legislation to carry out the Bretton Woods program is the first practical test of our willingness to cooperate in the work of world reconstruction and stabilization. It is also one very important step toward the orderly, expanding foreign trade upon which the future prosperity of our agriculture and our industry depends.

At Bretton Woods, the representatives of 44 United Nations agreed upon the creation of an international monetary fund and an international bank for reconstruction and development. The Members of Congress who were part of our delegation and contributed much to the success of the conference know that there was no trace of partisan politics in our deliberations. Nor has partisanship intruded itself into the issue since then.

We were seeking a solution to one of the world's knottiest problems. Only the good will, good sense, and sincerity of all the 44 nations could have found it. And I am confident that we did find it.

The monetary fund provides machinery for preventing or if need be repairng the dislocation of international exchange rates. Stability in these rates means that all the nations can enter into world commerce without resorting to cutthroat competition. In world trade, such throat-cutting in the 1930's took the form of currency depreciation, blocked funds, import quotas, multiple currencies, and trade preferences. Desperate nations tried to save themselves at the expense of their neighbors. The result was injury to both. The trade of the United States suffered heavily from discriminatory practices of this kind. Our foreign commerce, which had fallen off sharply during the depression, made substantial gains where trade was free, but failed to recover and even lost ground in trade with those countries which had set up monetary barriers against us.

One of the chief contributions to peace that the Bretton Woods program offers is that it will free the small and even the middle-sized nations from the danger of economic aggression by more powerful neighbors. The lesser nation will no longer be obliged to look to a single powerful country for monetary support or capital for development, and have to make dangerous political and economic concessions in the process. Political independence in the past has often proved to be a sham when economic independence did not go with it.

Under the Bretton Woods agreements, both will be strengthened. The smaller countries can come to the international fund for monetary aid and to the world bank for reconstruction and development funds. Loans will be made without political strings and without forcing the borrower into unnatural or undesirable trade relationships.

Therefore, in considering the legislation to carry out the Bretton Woods program, the choice before us is the fundamental one of economic isolationism versus United States cooperation in the rebuilding of a peaceful world. We know that economic security in the midst of political chaos is impossible. But political security in the midst of economic chaos is equally impossible. The Bretton Woods agreements are a part of the over-all program to achieve both political and economic security.

Power politics, in the sense of the bullying of small nations by big ones and of weak nations by powerful ones, has become a term of reproach in the world. The United Nations hope to abolish it from the earth. But power economics may be just as dangerous, for if it is not the root of all evil in international affairs it is at the very least a frequent cause of conflict. The legislation before this committee offers what I am convinced is our best hope of banishing that, too.

Of course, no program that the wisdom of men could devise can possibly prevent a repetition of the tragedies of the thirties unless there is a will to carry it out. Obviously, governments first of all must want to achieve monetary stability. The fact that 44 delegations approved the monetary fund was the substantial evidence of their desire for stabilization. The legislation before your committee is simply the machinery through which that will can be expressed.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is designed to stimulate the reconstruction of war-torn countries and the necessary development in all countries. It is strictly confined to loans for thoroughly productive purposes. It is hedged about with safeguards to insure sound practices. Its functions have been formulated so that private finance will be rather helped than hindered by its operation.

The practical benefits of the program are so great and so obvious that I should like to summarize them briefly. But it must be understood that the success of the Bretton Woods agreements, and the success of any other international agreements or national policies, depend upon other progressive and intelligent measures to insure the economic health of the world.

As an important part of the machinery for establishing peace and promoting a profitable and useful commerce after the war, the Bretton Woods agreements will do or contribute to the doing of these things:

They will offer a medium for stabilizing exchange rates through which the foreign business of American firms can be carried out in an orderly manner and on an expanding scale. Anyone who had to grope his business way through the maze of fluctuating currencies between the two World Wars will appreciate the value of this.

The agreements will be an equal benefit to American companies with branches abroad. In all too many cases in the past, the profits of those branches were frozen. The Bretton Woods program will facilitate the payment of the legitimate profits of American branches abroad by any member nation.

Because it offers a method for stabilizing currencies, the monetary fund is a long step toward eliminating some of the most dangerous restrictions on foreign trade. It removes the excuse for the tangle of import quotas, discriminatory tariffs and other desperate measures which added so many difficulties to the friendly economic relations between nations in the thirties.

The operation of the bank will offer the best protection the American investor has ever enjoyed in the field of foreign finance. The facilities of the bank are to be such that the private American purchaser of foreign bonds will know that impartial experts have considered the purpose of the loan sound. If the bank's own money goes into floating the issue, the loan will also be guaranteed by the borrowing country and by all the resources of the bank as derived from 44 member nations. People who bought certain foreign bonds during the twenties will realize how great a boon this can be.

In effect, the bank discourages the borrowing country from seeking money that it cannot use productively and repay in full. It protects the lender from putting his money into investments that are not sound either because the borrower is over-extended or because the purpose of the loan is not genuinely useful.

In the post-war world there will be many demands for reconstruction and new development which will not offer an attractive return to private finance. Or perhaps they will seem too risky to the private financier. These loans the bank would be prepared to make itself at low rates of interest or to guarantee for the private financing group. The obvious result will be speedier rebuilding of the nations which are America's customers and the development of new resources and new sources of wealth in countries which will be better customers than before.

In short, the whole program becomes the foundation for protection of investors, a program which will encourage productive investments abroad. It becomes the basis for stabilizing foreign trade, which is essential to full production and full employment in the United States.

Of course, that foundation must be built upon. The walls and roof are quite as important. But let us do first things first. The walls will totter and the roof fall in on us unless we have the firm foundation. That is provided in the Bretton Woods agreements and in the legislation for putting them into effect.

I should like to enter a plea here to avoid delay in building our foundation. Time is the most valuable commodity we have. I do not urge haste in the deliberations of this committee or the Congress. I am sure that the more you study the facts the more you will approve of the Bretton Woods proposals. As I have tried to indicate, these are essentially the establishment of stable exchange arrangements for the world's commerce. In my own experience as an advocate of Bretton Woods in these last few months, I have found that an open mind and understanding of the principles of the agreements is followed by approval.

The delay I would wish to avoid is not the delay of full and frank discussion. It is the delay that would be caused by attempting to convene another conference if these agreements should be rejected. At Bretton Woods we had our chance to begin building postwar monetary stability. We made the most of it. But it is unlikely that this opportunity will come again to our generaton.

There is another point even more important, if that is possible. The fate of more than the Bretton Woods agreements hangs upon the action of Congress at this time. Favorable action on the bills before you will provide the most heartening evidence you can give that we in the United States are thoroughly sincere in our devotion to the principles of international cooperation. You will have added deeds to the words of hope which linked the United Nations in a great alliance for peace.

The world security organization which was outlined at Dumbarton Oaks and will be completed, we all hope, at San Francisco needs the Bretton Woods agreements.

We cannot say that we will join the other nations in an organization to maintain peace, but will not help to remove one of the most dangerous causes of war—economic dislocations. We cannot say we believe in cooperation to beat fascism, but will not cooperate in the removal of one of fascism's chief weapons—economic aggression. We cannot say we want equality of all nations and leave some of them at the financial mercy of others.

We are committed by all that we have said and done in these last 4 years to a community of power in the world, not to the irresponsible, unilateral wielding of power. The Bretton Woods agreements offer us the machinery for bringing the strength of 44 nations to the task of stabilizing the media by which peoples exchange their goods, conduct business with each other, and provide for a mutual rise in standards of living.

The men who will follow me in putting this case before you will amplify these arguments. They will give you the whole record, and for my part I am eager that the record speak for us. The facts, all the facts and nothing but the facts are what this committee and both Houses of the Congress will want. Perhaps the most important fact of all is that we are facing one of those critical moments in history to which future generations will look back and say:

"There the world was at a turning point."

The stupendous task for us—for you in the Congress and us in the executive departments of Government—is to act now so that those future generations also will say:

"Thank God, they took the right turning."

The Crimean Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, sufficient time has now elapsed since the announcement of February 12, 1945, of the results of the Crimean Conference to allow for a sober reflection of the results achieved and their implication. With some of the basic results of the conference held at Yalta from February 4 to February 11, there is little serious disagreement. Germany must be fully and completely defeated. Her military power must be destroyed. The creation of a new league of nations whereby peaceful solution of war-producing issues can be settled gives added and new encouragement for a peaceful era. Some assistance in the speedy and victorious conclusion of the Pacific war on the part of Russia is hopefully anticipated. We have reversed our policy of delaying the settlement of political questions until after the war and have agreed to participate in the settlement of political issues as they arise.

The last of these basic results has caused considerable apprehension which is not entirely without merit. We had not only agreed to participate but proceeded to immediately participate in the attempted solution of some of the most vexing problems whose happy solution would have immeasurably contributed to the peace of the world. In this regard a marked departure from the principles of the Atlantic Charter was noted. We have veered sharply from our course Mr. Churchill characterized as the aim of the Atlantic Charter when he said, "The goal toward which the British Commonwealth and the United States mean to make their way."

This goal was urged upon and accepted by all the freedom loving peoples of the world and ourselves as the great objective of the new world order for the successful achievement of which the United States entered into this war. That the Atlantic Charter portrayed our desires was evidenced by the wide and unanimous acceptance given to it by the United States not as a mere aspiration but as an assurance of things yet to come. We continued in our desires and remained steadfast in our convictions that the successful achievement of a permanent peace must rest upon a foundation made solid and secure by the combination of two vital and necessary ingredients, each as equally important as the other, and without the one, the other in and of itself is incapable of securing a permanent peace to the entire world. These two ingredients were a just peace and the establishment of an international agency for the maintenance of a just peace.

Our concept of what was a just peace had been embodied in the principles of the Atlantic Charter which became the battle cry of all the United Nations. In it was embodied the bill of rights of the entire world; in it was the salvation of the entire world. This peace was to be secured by the establishment of an international organization implemented with the necessary force and empowered to take the necessary speedy action to prevent any future disruption of the peace of the world. Toward both of these two essentials we had made notable progress. The first, by the Atlantic Charter and the second by Dumbarton Oaks.

Prior to the advent of Dumbarton Oaks, the entire foundation of the United Nations rested upon the Atlantic Charter. All of the members comprising the United Nations signed a pledge not to negotiate a separate armistice or treaty and this pledge was preceded by a formal adoption and reaffirmation of the Atlantic Charter by all the signatories to the pledge. Since the signing of this pledge and the military successes on the various battle fronts, differences have arisen between the members of the United Nations and these differences became greater and greater until a vast chasm was precipitated by the recent Greek and Polish situations. These differences were so greatly reflected in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference that they presented an insurmountable obstacle to a full and adequate understanding. Such events have greatly disturbed the American people to such an extent that they began to despair whether a permanent peace is attainable.

We have witnessed a gradual and disastrous drifting from our original aims, with the result that our determination for a strong international organization for the maintenance of permanent peace is constantly being weakened. There must be a return to the fundamentals, and the Atlantic Charter and the Dumbarton Oaks must supplement each other.

Gratification has been expressed by an Acting Secretary of State with the Crimean Conference for "its reaffirmation in our faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter" or, as the communique itself says under the heading "Declaration of liberated Europe," "this is a principle of the Atlantic Charter—the right of all the peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to the peoples who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations."

Ominous is the silence as to Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Esthonia, and most disquieting is the fate of Poland. The unity achieved at Yalta was achieved at a price, and that price was not negligible. The solution of the Polish problem by no stretch of the imagination can be said to accord with the Atlantic Charter. Some may claim minor concessions on the part of Russia to American and British difference. There are to be digressions of 3 to 5 miles in Poland's favor in some regions east of the so-called Curzon line. Hope had been expressed this would be of sufficient latitude to include the thoroughly Polish city of Lwow, but the recent report of Mr. Churchill to the Commons apparently denies any foundation for such hope.

As a further alleged concession the base of the Soviet-sponsored government is to be broadened by the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles from abroad. But who are to be these democratic leaders and whose lexicon will be consulted to determine whether they are "democratic" leaders. A gratifying and encouraging aspect is the provision that after the creation of the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity has been formed, there is secured the pledge of "holding free unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot." This is indeed at least a recognition of the fundamental right of a free people and one is forced to wonder why similar provision was not made to determine the wishes of the inhabitants of the territory east of the Curzon line and in the Galician area, which was not embraced within the Curzon line and was never under Russian rule prior to the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact. But even here the test is yet to come and future events have yet to determine the final results of this provision.

The disappointments of the conference are bitter and can be offset only by the guaranty that the new Poland will be a great nation and that in the future the United States as well as Great Britain and Russia will join in defending the new borders. For more than 5 years this great nation has expended all its treasure and manhood in resisting the Nazi hordes. It was the first nation to have called a halt to Hitler's demands and to stand its ground and give battle to a vastly superior enemy. For this the freedom-loving nations must be eternally grateful. Once more this great nation has been called upon to make an equally great sacrifice in order to contribute of herself to the peace of the world. We must not fail her again for if we do the future peace of the world, now already precariously in the balance, will be a mocking failure.

Lend-Lease a Tool for Planners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article by Edna Lonigan from Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly of March 20, 1945:

LEND-LEASE A TOOL FOR PLANNERS—HELPS WAR EFFORT ABROAD BUT PERMITS NEW CONTROLS AT HOME

(By Edna Lonigan)

Lend-lease voted by Congress to apply direct aid to the war effort of the United Nations has developed into an influence on the internal economy of the United States which goes far beyond the original intent of the law.

Lend-lease is a means of sharing our productive capacity with our allies as we did in the First World War. At home, however, lend-lease is a Government purchasing program with something like $70,000,000,000 to spend.

In 1917–18 foreign Governments received funds outright and bought their own supplies. Under lend-lease foreign governments receive a "book credit" and the American Government buys what they need. This change makes the Federal Executive the dominant influence in markets for nearly all goods and services. And because of the almost complete absence of information about the home aspects of lend-lease, it's almost impossible for Congress or the public to gage the effect on our economic life.

President Roosevelt has said we have abolished the dollar sign in loans to our allies. But we cannot abolish it in purchases on our farms and factories, nor in the value of capital goods acquired by the Federal Government. The true import of the President's statement was that we had abolished all familiar forms of accounting. Instead of following the effects of Federal financing by simple arithmetic, it now is necessary to follow a whole network of legal, economic, and administrative relationships.

ORIGINAL APPROPRIATIONS $69,000,000,000

Lend-lease does not publish the total funds it has to work with. Congress appropriated $24,700,000,000 directly to the President for lend-lease purposes, but that's only a fraction of its working capital. In addition, Congress has authorized transfer from War, Navy, and Maritime Commission funds to the lend-lease account of over $44,500,000,000. Original appropriations thus are somewhere above $69,000,000,000, but allowance also must be made for the fact that lend-lease is a revolving fund. Contrary to congressional rule that all income of Government agencies shall revert to the general funds, to be spent only if Congress approves a new appropriation, lend-lease repayments go back to the appropriation from which they came, so there is no visible ceiling on lend-lease funds.

The lend-lease authority does not report how much of this larger total is spent or obligated. Published reports refer to goods transferred, where title passes to foreign countries. That item now is over $18,000,000,000. But, obviously, lend-lease must have large holdings in partly finished form, and in stock piles. Lend-lease also has many operations that never end in transfers of title. It owns or rents in this country, warehouses, factories, ships, and planes. It transfers supplies across Asia and Africa, and has provided railroads, airports, storage, repair, and assembly plants in many parts of the world. There is a margin of $50,000,000,000 that may be thus accounted for. Congress so far has not been able to get a complete report on these activities.

There is no question in Congress about the full and accurate accounting for such expenditures. Federal accounting procedures are precise and thorough. There is no doubt in Congress that these programs are being administered with brilliant skill and dynamic energy. But they are making great structural changes in the American economy and government, greater than anything required for military purposes. Simple accounting reports of goods transferred give no adequate information by which either Congress or the public can judge such changes.

The difficulties are legal and administrative. The law has been so drawn, and the administrative system so devised, that the lend-lease authority has virtually unlimited powers, and the work of tracing their effects lies completely outside the area of traditional accounting. By simple changes in law and procedure, devices built up over centuries to insure that legislatures shall have full information on executive spending have been sunk without a trace. Creation of new procedures to measure subtle economic and governmental changes is being carried on by Congress under almost incredible handicaps.

HOW LEND-LEASE IS SET UP

The Administration has given a lively account of the work of the Lend-Lease Administration, but that is only a minor part of the lend-lease authority. The Office of Lend-Lease, or O. L. L. A., takes control of goods when they are ready for transfer to other countries. That's merely the final stage of the purchasing system. The real power is in the network of purchasing agencies that buys for it, and the overhead agency that coordinates all the parts.

Lend-lease operations were first organized by Harry Hopkins. Then the Office of Lend-Lease Administration was created, under E. R. Stettinius, and Mr. Hopkins became chairman of the Munitions Assignment Board. This signaled the divorce of the general policy-making powers from the transfer functions of the act. The various procurement agencies became the buying arms of the lend-lease authority, the Munitions Assignment Board became the coordinating agency, and O. L. L. A. became its agent for that part of the program which the public and Congress gave complete assent.

The provision in the law that articles might be bought by the War and other departments and later transferred to lend-lease account is the device which makes the confused network possible. Its effect is to increase Federal purchasing of agricultural and industrial goods above that needed for the armed forces, and to make it difficult to follow what the lend-lease authority is doing.

Administratively then, the lend-lease authority is not a single agency but a congeries of agencies or a kind of governmental "holding company," including the Munitions Assignment Board, the other combined boards, O. L. L. A., the Army Service Forces, the Maritime Commission, the Commodity Credit Corporation and many other Federal agencies using lend-lease funds or powers. The Navy's connection seems to be limited to purchase of petroleum as agent for lend-lease. The recent transfer of O. L. L. A. to the Foreign Economic Administration makes no difference in this network.

The Munitions Assignment Board provides the coordinating function. It directs the flow of munitions, between the armed forces of the Allies and of the United States, and between one theater of war or another. All members of the Munitions Assignment Board are active in the armed forces, except the chairman. On him falls the whole responsibility for the civilian economy. By definition in the Lend-Lease Act, munitions include almost all agricultural and industrial goods. Since the Munitions Assignment Board is an international body it is questionable whether Congress has any authority over it, or whether it can call upon its chairman for information about the large area of lend-lease operations outside the range of Mr. Stettinius and O. L. L. A.

Lend-lease is, to quote Mr. Stettinius, "a claim against a fungible and fluid stream of lend-lease procurement." That is, lend-lease is not an agency, but a process for redirecting a share of all agricultural and industrial goods in the market toward the Federal Government. Meanwhile, Congress can't find out what has been bought, on what terms, or what is being done with it. It cannot get a clear picture of the effect of this purchasing on the free economy, or on the finances of government.

The lend-lease "holding company" buys meat, butter, eggs, tanks, airplanes, machine tools, professional services, and entire industrial plants. Statements that lend-lease transfers only 5 percent of all meat, or 23 percent of all cheese supplies, ignore the fact that only a small fraction of any market is necessary for control. Schacht in Germany and Lenin in Russia realized that control of the comparatively small fraction of the market entering into foreign trade was enough to give the Government control of the whole economy.

SYSTEM RESTRICTS FREE COMMERCE

This new system has serious effects on the freedom of markets. Not only is lend-lease piling its purchases upon those for the military, but the remaining free market thus is much smaller, and less able to bear the wider swings. This administrative purchasing is subject to no price control. It can outbid other buyers. It can pick and choose its firms. Orders are bracketed under "military and lend-lease," so that textiles for African natives receive the preferential treatment designed for blankets for our soldiers in Italy. Lend-lease orders have priorities assigned by the Army for goods which they themselves may be going to use, since allocation takes place only at the final stage.

By its price and purchasing policies, the lend-lease authority can raise or lower the income of sections or industries anywhere in the country.

Lend-lease also has made substantial contributions to the capital and organization of American industry. It has invested money in plant and equipment of Ford, General Motors, Sperry Gyroscope, and many other firms, and in construction of war plants and storage depots in 32 of the 48 States. It is paying for new industrial designs and financing technical and experimental work. "Lend-lease," says O. L. L. A., "played a part in the development of the air ferry route to the Middle East and Russia. * * * helped finance development of docks, warehouses, supply depots, assembly and repair shops throughout the Red Sea-Persian Gulf area; building of pipe lines to carry oil to naval and air bases; the shipment of road-building equipment * * * and rails, freight cars, and locomotives to expand the capacity of primitive railroads."

Some of these capital expenditures are reported by O. L. L. A., but are all of them? Obviously, all are not transferred to foreign ownership. What is the legal nature of the ownership of facilities that remain in Federal hands? If capital facilities are built by the Army under the lend-lease powers, does that give the administration more freedom in disposing of them than if they had been built by the Army for itself? Who owns the new facilities of the Trans-Iranian Railroad? Could American rights in this newly reconstructed road be exchanged for Persian oil wells? If so, who would own the oil wells? And where would the income from these wells go?

No answers to these questions are to be found in Mr. Stettinius' book. But the answers are not military secrets to be kept from the American people because they might be of advantage to the enemy. There is no visible reason why the administration should have gone to such lengths to render obscure what it was doing.

PRESIDENT'S POWERS ALMOST UNLIMITED

Part of the answer is to be found in the powers conveyed to the Executive by the act. Under it the President is authorized to manufacture or otherwise procure any article that he defines as a defense article,

which gives him power to manufacture anything at all, except a few minor luxuries. The original appropriation was for $1,300,000,000, and so the general wording may not have seemed important to Congress, but now, when the appropriations near $70,000,000,000, the importance of the unlimited powers is great. The President also is empowered to lease-lend "or otherwise dispose of" such articles. And the last phrase would cover setting up railroads, air lines, and oil wells in foreign countries without transferring them to foreign governments. Repayment may be in "any direct or indirect benefit" the President approves. The administration, having given tanks to Russia, can take payment in gold, newsprint, shipping services, or articles to be exchanged with Latin America. Thus the Executive was given control not only of all manufacturing but also of post-war foreign trade. When these powers expire, the President still has 3 years to complete contracts entered into before the expiration of the law. The act significally omits any statement abcut disposal of property left on hand when the law expires which apparently would be subject solely to the control of the President in office.

The President has made no secret of the importance of lend-lease for post-war trade and foreign reconstruction, saying: "The program under lend-lease and reciprocal lend-lease * * * is designed * * * to help lay the foundatons for post-war settlements and international prosperity."

The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreements provide that all purchasing for U. N. R. R. A. is to be done by the combined boards. U. N. R. R. A., like O. L. L. A., will be part of the land-lease "corporation." U. N. R. R. A., like O. L. L. A., will be a distributing agency only. The purchasing function, which affects every farmer, manufacturers, merchant, and investor in the United States, which can make or break any industry or section, will be retained by the lend-lease authority. U. N. R. R. A. is specifically barred from reconstruction activities. After demonstrating a good relief program for a year or so it will give way to the lend-lease mechanism, which now possessses all the powers necessary for long-term industrialization of agricultural nations or reconstruction of backward areas.

The machinery is equally ready for post-war foreign trade. Donald Nelson has described the opportunity for the United States to supply capital goods for Russia, but seemed to think Government supervision would be necessary because American industry would not be willing to trade with Russia, or Russia with private industry. Mr. Stettinius also referred to difficulty in getting industrialists to take war orders for Russia. Both forgot that American industrialists were supplying Russia with capital goods, designs, managers, and engineers through the years of the 5-year plans and that the Soviet Government has been unstinting in its expressions of gratitude. The lend-lease authority has drawn all agriculture and industry into its folds, and many good reasons will be found why the coils should not be unwound.

OPENS ROAD TO POST-WAR CONTROL

There is an inevitable progression in planning, from civil public works to industrial public works, from payments and orders to local civil governments to hire men, to orders and payments to private industry for the same purpose. Only one step must be taken. Civil public works require no market, whereas industrial public works must have market outlets. The Government now is prepared to market products either in post-war foreign trade, in reconstruction, or in domestic programs like food stamps or sewing rooms, with which the relief and agricultural agencies have been experimenting for 12 years.

Briefly, we now have in the larger lend-lease program all the powers and controls necessary for a shift from free markets to governmentally administered economy, and none of it was necessary to aid our allies. Canada has given $1,000,000,000 (equal to $12,000,000,000 for us) to the allies, but Canada made lend-lease an outright gift. Foreign nations knew how much money they would have; they had every incentive to use it economically; there could be no post-war dispute over what had been given and what had been lent; and no difficulties from capital holdings the Canadian Government might accumulate. Whether or not Canada's solution is best, our solution raises questions on which it is imperative to have more light.

F. H. A. Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: Although for obvious reasons during the war emergency the F. H. A. has not made its customary periodical reports to Congressmen and Senators on F. H. A. operations in their States, I feel this practice should now be resumed.

The F. H. A., as you know, operates entirely through the private capital of local financial institutions. It insures the loans these institutions make for property repair and mortgages for the purchase of homes and the construction of new homes.

At the end of June 1944, a total of $31,685,083 lent by these institutions has enabled 83,326 Wisconsin families to maintain or improve their properties, while over 11,846 families have been able to buy or build homes through mortgage loans in the original face amount of $57,358,094.

In addition, 2,495 families of war workers, newly arrived in war congested areas in Wisconsin, have been provided with homes through mortgage loans amounting to over $12,172,250.

These same figures for any specific county or counties are available and I shall be glad to send them to you if you so desire.

The F. H. A. has for over 5 years been paying all operating expenses and losses of its mortgage insurance programs, at the same time adding substantially to its insurance reserves, which now total more than $97,000,000. Losses have been only a fraction of one percent. Likewise, the property repair program is currently paying its own way from revenues derived from insurance premiums and for nearly a year collections on defaulted loans have shown a substantial margin over claims paid.

I am particularly happy to advise you that within 60 to 90 days the F. H. A. will start distribution of mortgage prepayment dividends to 13,000 home buyers who paid off their mortgages in full during the calendar year 1944. These mortgages were in group accounts which had developed credit balances by January 1, 1944. These dividends will range from a few dollars to nearly $200 each.

I am sure you will agree this is a gratifying record.

Sincerely yours,

ABNER H. FERGUSON,
Commissioner.

Filipino Guerrillas Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include in my remarks an overseas broadcast made for myself on March 5, 1945:

The steady progress of the campaign for the liberation of the Philippines is due in great measure to the ability of Filipinos and Americans to fight side by side in war as they have worked side by side in peace.

Americans—civilians and members of the armed forces alike—know and appreciate the important contribution to our common cause of the Filipino guerrilla forces. In these groups American-Filipino cooperation has attained its highest degree of efficiency. American fighting men have survived 3 years of Japanese occupation through the sacrifices of Filipinos. In return, the military and technical training of the Americans were put to use by the Filipino guerrillas to build a groundwork for the eventual liberation.

In the preliberation period the Japanese garrisons were kept continually off balance by the swift attacks of guerrilla bolo brigades. Outstanding Japanese offenders were executed. Food and munitions were seized. Prisoners were rescued. Strategically important Japanese documents mysteriously disappeared, only to reappear in allied hands. Key points in the Japanese defense system were destroyed. Concerted attempts at long-term Japanese planning were disrupted.

When triphibious operations were undertaken by Americans against Leyte, Samar, Mindoro, and Luzon, the Filipino guerrillas climaxed their 3 years of uninterrupted conflict with the Japanese aggressor by increasing their usefulness to their American allies. Isolated Japanese garrisons fell before the guerrilla onslaught. There was no security anywhere for Japanese lines of communication by land. The value of the guerrilla knowledge of diffiult terrain was matched by their knowledge of Japanese psychology gained through months of bitter experience.

The cumulative combat skill of the Filipino guerrillas, acquired by constant contact with the enemy, is only beginning to pay off in results. Here in the United States, we are cheered by news of such vital guerilla achievements as those in the coastal province of Ilocos Norte where, through successful guerrilla action, thousands of Japanese soldiers have been killed in what the Japanese themselves once considered impregnable mountain fortresses.

Although much has been accomplished toward the complete liberation of the Philippines, much still remains to be done. I have every confidence in the courage, the tenacity, and the fighting ability of the Filipino guerrillas. It is these qualities which will keep them on the alert until, through our common effort, the last Japanese is driven from the soil of the Philippines.

President's Speech Before Joint Session of Congress Well Received

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article entitled "Pin All Hopes on Roosevelt," by Robert L. Norton, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, March 4, 1945:

PIN ALL HOPES ON ROOSEVELT—AMERICAN PEOPLE CONCERNED OVER HIS HEALTH—CONGRESS LIKELY TO BACK MAJOR PEACE PLANS

(By Robert L. Norton)

WASHINGTON, March 3.—The joint session of Congress which met to receive the report of the President, was as much concerned with how Mr. Roosevelt looked as with what he said. In fact, when Members were asked to comment on the President's address, invariably, they evidenced the keenest interest in his physical appearance.

It was apparent that the President was conscious of their close inspection. Since he referred to his shedding of 10 pounds of steel braces and took occasion to mention widespread rumors as to the condition of his health, asserting with a smile that he had not been ill and that he was feeling fit, refreshed and inspired. It is not to be denied, however, that the consensus of opinion among the Members was that the President looked thin and tired and that the old-time ring in his voice was missing. For the first time, in any public speech, the President referred to his physical condition.

The general tenor of the remarks confirmed our own observation. But it is not to be wondered at that this is the case, considering the tremendous burden of the responsibility which he is carrying and the physical hardships imposed by a 14,000-mile trip.

HAS BOUNDLESS COURAGE

The matter of the President's health is of vital concern to the American people and to millions of other peoples throughout the world, whose hopes of ultimate peace and some measure of security in their lives rest upon his potent leadership. Rather than have hundreds of false rumors bandied about the country, it should be understood and emphasized that on the assurance of Vice Admiral McIntire the President is in "tip-top" physical condition. This is the answer which has been made to the solicitous inquiries of the President's closest friends and the leaders of his party in Congress, and it has been confirmed by Mr. Roosevelt himself.

There is a unanimous tribute on all sides to the magnificent physical courage of the President, which is well justified. He radiates cheerfulness and a buoyancy of spirit over the accomplishments of the Crimea Conference.

REPORT WELL RECEIVED

On the whole, the President's report was well received by Congress. There was, of course, the usual criticism, some sour and some sincere. Not a few Members thought the report lacked in detail, by comparison with the report of Mr. Churchill to the British Parliament. Others were disappointed over the lack of information about the voting powers of the Big Three in the preliminary agreements at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference.

But it was promised by Mr. Roosevelt that the procedure of voting in the security council would be announced within a short time and that this agreement, founded in justice, will go far to assure international cooperation in the maintenance of peace. It was largely a matter of legislative procedure, the President said.

VOTING PACT VASTLY VITAL

It is likely that whatever may be the announced terms of the voting agreement, it will be seized upon by the noninterventionists in Congress as a controversial point. And also, whatever the agreement, it will be highly important in determining the future course of the United States when peace is threatened by an aggressor, more particularly if, sometime in the future, that aggressor should happen to be one of the more powerful nations. Upon this voting agreement depends the action to be taken by this Government in the use of our armed forces in Europe, or elsewhere to preserve the peace. Virtually what is involved is a declaration of war.

The terms of this voting agreement will also play a large part in the decision of Congress as to whether in case of aggression our armed forces may be ordered to the field of action by the President without reference to Congress or whether the constitutional provision that only Congress shall declare a state of war will be observed.

ONE GREAT ADVANTAGE

It is bound to be a bone of contention in Congress as was article 10 at the Versailles peace conference. President Wilson was never able to convince the opponents of the League throughout the country and in Congress that the United States could not be outvoted in the council of the League by Great Britain and her dominions. The battle in the Senate turned on this issue finally and it resulted as much as did anything else in the rejection of the treaty.

As the President points out, however, this time there is the great advantage of attempting an agreement upon the terms of the peace structure in advance of the defeat of Germany.

World War No. 1 came to an end without a clear-cut commitment from our Allies. And thereafter there was a series of compromises which whittled away at the original objectives of the league.

HOW WILSON LOST PRESTIGE

In his book The Time for Decision, former Under Secretary of State Sumner Wells recalls: "One of the chief reasons for the compromises which President Wilson felt obliged to accept at Paris was the fact that the United States had made no effort to reach any prior understanding with its allies on political and territorial problems."

And it is a matter of recorded history that on September 3, 1918, Colonel House, as Mr. Wilson's personal representative at the peace conference, wrote the President: "As the Allies succeed, your influence will diminish. This is inevitable. By the time of the peace conference you will be nearing the end of your second term (regarded as automatic retirement in those ancient days) and this too will be something of a challenge to those, both at home and abroad, who have the will to oppose you. Therefore, I believe that you should commit the Allies now to as much of your program as is possible."

CONCILIATORY ATTITUDE

Mr. Roosevelt told Congress that "this time we shall not make the mistake of waiting until the end of the war to set up the machinery of peace. This time, as we fight together to get the war over quickly, we work together to keep it from happening again."

The attitude of the President toward Congress was plainly conciliatory. He reminded the Senate that he was well aware of the fact that the charter of the peace to be agreed upon at San Francisco must be approved by a two-thirds vote and said that he spent a lot of time explaining this constitutional limitation to both the Russians and the English.

Seeking the approval of the Senate the President stressed the fact that both parties were equally represented at the San Francisco conference. He remarked that Republicans as well as Democrats wanted peace and that world peace is not a party question, any more than a military victory.

COMPARISON OF REPORTS

It is interesting to compare the reports of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt. There was biting comment in Congress that Mr. Roosevelt's report smacked somewhat of a travelogue and was far less informative on a number of political questions than that made by the British Prime Minister. But a close reading of the main points of both speeches shows that there was entire agreement and a remarkable unanimity of viewpoint on all of the important issues which have been raised thus far.

The Polish settlement, more than any other action taken by the Big Three, has aroused criticism in Congress and expression of the opinion that the agreement was violative of the spirit as well as the letter of the Atlantic Charter.

SALIENT PARAGRAPHS COMPARED

Let's contrast, or rather compare, salient paragraphs from the two leaders affecting the agreement. Thus both agreed that it was a compromise. Said Mr. Roosevelt:

"The decision with respect to the boundaries of Poland was a compromise, under which, however, the Poles will receive compensation in territory in the north and west in change. Our objective was to help create a strong, independent, and prosperous nation with a government ultimately to be selected by the Polish people themselves. To achieve this objective, it was necessary to provide for the formation of a new government more representative than had been possible when Poland was enslaved. Accordingly, steps were taken at Yalta to reorganize the existing provisional government in Poland on a broader democratic basis, so as to include democratic leaders now in Poland and those abroad. This new, reorganized government will be recognized by all of us as the temporary government of Poland. However, the new Polish government will be pledged to a free election as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and a secret ballot. I am convinced that the agreement on Poland, under the circumstances, is the most hopeful agreement possible for a free, independent, and prosperous Polish state."

CHURCHILL FAR MORE MILITANT

Mr. Churchill was far more militant in defending the attitude of Russia toward Poland, however, than was Mr. Roosevelt. Thus the British Prime Minister pointed out that "but for the prodigious exertions and sacrifices of Russia, Poland was doomed to utter destruction at the hands of the Germans. Not only Poland as a nation and a state, but the Poles as a race were doomed by Hitler to be destroyed or reduced to a servile state."

Mr. Roosevelt conceded a compromise on the Polish settlement. Mr. Churchill denied "a questionable compromise," stating: "In supporting the Russian claim for the Curzon line I repudiate and repulse any suggestion that we are making a questionable compromise or yielding to force or fear, and I assert with the utmost conviction the broad justice of the policy upon which for the first time, all the three great Allies have now taken their stand.

FERVENT TRIBUTE TO RUSSIA

"Three and a half million Polish Jews are said to have been actually slaughtered. It is certain that enormous numbers have perished in one of the most horrifying acts of

cruelty which have ever darkened the passage of man. When the Germans clearly avowed their intention of making the Poles a subject and lower-grade race under the Herrenvolk, suddenly, by a superb effort of military force and skill, Russian armies in little more than 3 weeks have advanced from the Vistula to the Oder, driving the Germans in ruins before them and freeing the whole of Poland from the foul cruelty and oppression under which the Poles were writhing. But for the prodigious exertions and sacrifices of Russia, Poland was doomed to utter destruction at the hands of the Germans. Not only Poland as a state and nation, but the Poles as a race were doomed by Hitler to be destroyed or reduced to a servile state."

CHURCHILL FRANK ABOUT ISSUE

Mr. Roosevelt was silent over the objections of the provisional Polish Government in London while Mr. Churchill took it to task in no uncertain terms. "There would have been no Lublin provisional government or Lublin committee if the Polish Government in London had accepted our faithful counsel of a year ago. They would have entered into Poland as its actual Government. They would have entered with the liberating armies of Russia. But these opportunities were cast aside and meanwhile complete expulsion of Germans from Poland had taken place.

"I decline absolutely to embark upon a discussion about Russian good faith. It is quite evident that these matters touch the whole future of the world. Terrible, indeed, would be the fortunes of mankind if some awful schism arose between the Western democracies and the Russian people, if all future world organizations were rent asunder and a new cataclysm of inconceivable violence destroyed what is left of the treasures and liberties of mankind."

QUESTION OF RUSSIA AND JAPAN

Mr. Roosevelt's report was the more concise. It contained all the essential facts of the agreement at the Yalta conference but left out other discussions, as for instance the entrance of Turkey into the war, and its significance. As usual Mr. Churchill was superbly eloquent. He touched on the Italian situation which Mr. Roosevelt hardly mentioned.

One got the impression from Mr. Roosevelt's speech that he was only intent upon hitting the high spots. Both men insisted that France had been fully recognized in the future conduct of Europe, even although De Gaulle had not been invited to the conference.

Of course, the great question in the minds of Congress and the American people is whether Russia will join in the war against Japan. There was nothing in the statements of either Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Churchill to indicate if this had been a subject of discussion with Stalin.

There was, however, little complaint on this score here since the general feeling of Congress is that any action by Russia must of necessity wait upon the defeat of Germany.

Little question is left but that today, in its present temper, Congress is disposed to back up the President on the great objectives of the San Francisco conference. But plenty of obstacles remain to be overcome before the world organization is formed.

It was thought by some members that the President would take up the matter of manpower in his address since he is known to be dissatisfied with the confusing report of the Senate committee and inclined to the May bill, as passed by the House. Pending the holding of the peace conference at San Francisco, which the President plans to attend personally, numerous domestic issues will engage his attention, as for instance, the program for taking care of post-war unemployment and the whole matter of rationing, prices, and war production, affected by a score of pending bills.

Following his plan to cooperate with Congress the President plans a conference of leaders of both parties, likely to be held Wednesday of this week.

Government Waste of Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the production of paper appears on the most recent list of critical occupations compiled pursuant to Executive order by War Manpower Commission. For some time the production of logs and lumber has been considered one of the most critically important occupations in the country. To the list of occupations in wood consuming industries has now been added the production of paper.

We have been spending publicly and privately huge sums to stimulate the production of wood, from which most paper is made. Yet, in spite of dwindling pulp-wood piles, drastic shortages of pulp and the resulting critical paper supply situation, the colossal waste of paper in this country goes on. The responsibility for a great share of this waste is right here in Washington. I received yesterday a 32-page bulletin of the Department of Agriculture, No. 882, dated January 1945, entitled "South American Leaf Blight of Hevea Rubber Trees." It is printed on an excellent grade of coated paper, and is profusely illustrated. The bulletin was sent to me not by the Department of Agriculture, but by a constituent in New Hampshire who received it unsolicited. I have no doubt that the contents of this publication are of great value to those concerned with the growing of rubber. However, the sending of such material, unsolicited, into States where the subject matter is of little, if any, concern is inexcusable in these times.

Illustrative of the harm which such waste does to our productive effort, I include a letter from Mr. Andrew Felker, commissioner of agriculture of my State. No one in New Hampshire has labored more industriously to maintain high-production levels of commodities essential to the conduct of the war. This letter is an able commentary upon the waste of vitally needed commodities by agencies of Federal Government:

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Concord, N. H., February 28, 1945.

Hon. SHERMAN ADAMS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADAMS: I am sending to you under separate cover a copy of the Southside Virginia News, special number bringing forth the idea that we are so short of paper this entire issue is published for the purpose of promoting the cutting of lumber, pulp especially. You know what the tremendous effort is in New Hampshire, and New England followed suit. We are turning heaven and earth in response to the appeal to get out pulp. You know even better than I.

With this paper I am sending you a copy of a United States Department of Agriculture bulletin. In the first place do not slip on it. You are liable to slip and even break a leg or your neck, and none of us up here in New Hampshire want that to happen. That emphasizes the quality of the paper. Second, look at the title. The information may be worth a lot in South America or in some sections of the United States or Mexico where Hevea rubber trees may be planted and grown, but Henry Ford and some of the others have not succeeded yet in growing in this country large commercial orchards of rubber trees. I am assuming that copies of this bulletin have been made available in large quantities throughout the United States. If this was the only bulletin of similar nature that was coming to my desk and the desks of others up here, we would not think so much about it, but every morning the mail brings to my desk many of these bulletins. I wonder a bit about what some of the other men think, who are trying to get our farmers to cut trees from which paper may be made to meet the great emergency, whether the United States needs to waste it faster than we can produce it. These bulletins and hundreds of others are not worth the paper it is printed on for the use of such men as myself interested in doing all we can to win the war by saving paper and lots of other things. I do not suppose there is any way to cut out this huge waste, but I am telling you how I feel about it. The paper just goes to show how all of us everywhere are struggling to meet the demands to produce for the war.

Yours truly,

ANDREW L. FELKER,
Commissioner.

Portion of Article To Appear in Encyclopedia Americana on Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, special permission has been given by the Encyclopedia Americana to the author of the article on cartels which is shortly to be printed in Encyclopedia Americana for its inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The author, Mr. Howard W. Ambruster of Westfield, N. J., has suggested to me that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and since there is so much discussion of the problem of cartels and so much need for a clear understanding of just what that word means, I am asking consent to include with my remarks on three occasions portions of Mr. Ambruster's article.

It is understood that this material cannot be reproduced except by special permission from the Encyclopedia Americana.

There follows the second portion of the article:

SINCE THE 1870'S

The beginning of the era of the modern Kartell in Germany appears to have occurred during the years of economic depression in the 1870's. The development of large-scale corporate production in industry was then taking place, and in the United States the counterpart of this German form of integration of industry took the form of mergers, combinations, and trusts. In each case the purpose was to restrain competition. German coal, iron, potash, paper, and other basic industries were among the first to be cartelized. In the half century which followed there was hardly a crude material or manufactured article, the producers of which did not participate in national or international cartels, or in trade associations, syndicates, or private treaties which were based upon the theory of the cartel. It is not possible to determine the exact number of either the domestic cartels in any one nation or of the international cartels which have been in existence at any time since their origin. In Germany various authorities have estimated the numbers of industrial cartels to have been as follows: Four in 1865; 70 in 1887; 143 in 1895; 300 in 1900; 600 in 1911; 1,500 in 1924; 2,100 in 1930. A German Government estimate in 1925 gave the total number of cartels in that country as 3,000, of which 2,500 were industrial; 400 wholesale and 150 retail.

PRODUCTS CONTROLLED BY INTERNATIONAL CARTELS

Among the natural products and fabricated substances of articles which have been cartelized by some type of international agreement are such basic materials as coal, coke, rubber, borax, tobacco, leather, glue, oils, fats, diamonds; all of the essentital industrial metals and their alloys; numerous fabricated metal products and machinery; many important chemicals and manufactured chemical products, both organic and inorganic, including explosives, dyestuffs, pharmaceuticals, and agricultural chemicals; glass products and ceramics; wood pulp and paper; textile fibers and fabrics; foodstuffs such as sugar and wheat; manufactured industrial products including railroad cars and household appliances. Also such services as ocean shipping rates, marine insurance, cable and radio transmission, distribution of motion-picture films.

INCREASE OF INTERNATIONAL CARTELS SINCE THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Prior to the First World War some 114 international cartels were known to exist but in the era of cartel expansion which followed this war these international associations increased in such endless variety that it is impossible to estimate their number.

As compared with the trust or combine the international cartel is a protean, almost shapeless structure which at times may not be recognized as such. Nor can it be comprehended through presentation of a diagrammatic chart or formula except one which could depict a myriad of devices by which world supply and distribution of any single commodity, or of a tremendous number of materials, supposedly produced by independent enterprises, are secretly controlled by a single directive privately administered. Such cartels usually originate with a relatively simple alliance of a few competing firms, operating in only a limited territory. But the purpose and the scope invariably reach out, the cartel grows and grows, and if the accomplishment of its greater purpose may so require, the penetration proceeds beyond the industry itself into an effort to influence the social, financial, and governmental structures of each country in which it operates.

For example, such international cartels as those which dominated the world's supply of crude rubber, quinine, and tin prior to the Second World War are frequently cited as collective private monopolies of vital necessities affecting transportation, health, housing, and food conservation. The United States had no domestic supply of these commodities, whereas the private owners had the open or tacit assistance of their own governments in exacting at times exorbitant prices which unduly restricted the quantities of these products available during peacetime for the United States and other countries.

In the case of rubber, excess cultivation was regulated so rigidly in producing countries that exportation was forbidden of any leaves, flowers, seeds, buds, twigs, branches, roots, or any living portion of a rubber plant that might be used to propagate rubber. Restrictions on the cultivation of cinchona bark, for quinine production, were also severe, and the world consumers of tin were dependent upon arbitrary releases from an international pool at fixed prices.

Of a very different character, the international aluminum cartel, founded originally on the basis of a patented process and regrouped later withcut the participation of the United States, was held together by close cooperation of its members in the control and allotment of the raw materials and power required for production of the metal and a rigid division of markets.

In finished manufactured products an example frequently cited is the international incandescent lamp cartel which associated 42 companies located in various countries of North and South America, Europe, Asia, and Australia, all operating under cross licenses of patents through leadership of the International General Electric Co. of New York.

GERMAN DYE TRUST, THE SUPER CARTEL

Unquestionably, the best illustration of the gradual emergence of the super world cartel with all of its manifestations is the Interessengemeinschaft Farbenindustrie Aktien-Gesellschaft (which literally translated means "community of interests in the dye-manufacturing companies"), commonly known as I. G. Farben, or the German Dye Trust. This combination was organized in 1925 and 1926 under the direction of 2 leading German chemists, Dr. Carl Duisberg and Dr. Carl Bosch, as a merger of 13 key firms making dyes and chemicals, most of which had been tied together previously, in 1919, as I. G. Dyes, Inc.; in 1916 as a single cartel and in 1904 in 2 smaller cartels. Those 2 original cartels were composed of 6 of Germany's oldest coal-tar-dye companies which dated back almost to the middle of the nineteenth century. The I. G. Farben merger with assets which totaled over 2,000,000,000 reichsmarks (about $500,000,000) within 3 years of its formation, brought under 1 control large productions or the essentials of monopoly in Germany of coal-tar dyes and intermediates; atmospheric nitrogen, war explosives, and commercial powders; heavy chemicals, acids and electrochemical products, fertilizers, and insecticides, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, rayon, and synthetic plastics, photographic supplies and films; synthetic petroleum gasoline, rubber substitutes, copper, magnesium, aluminum, and several of the precious metals with their alloys; coal, lignite, and fuel briquets; along with a vast number of other products, the total of which constituted a large segment of the necessities of national welfare in peace and for munitions of war. The predecessors of I. G. Farben had long exerted a great power in Germany both before and during World War No. 1. When formed, this giant trust became overnight the largest corporate structure in Germany. In addition to 100-percent ownership or stock control of some 50 different concerns, I. G. Farben acquired large blocs of stock which amounted to management control of another half hundred established companies. This trust was also a domestic factor in no less than 70 cartels, each of which included independent makers of 1 or more of its products.

I. G. Farben was also tied in with the second largest combination in Germany, the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, or United Steel Works; by ownership of a large block of the latter's securities, having representation on its board; and sharing ownership of the soft coal and steel combine known as Rheinische Stahlwerke. The United Steel Works was put together in 1926 by Fritz Thyssen with an original capital of 800,000,000 marks, as merger of his own iron and steel interests with those of Hugo Stinnes and several others which were in financial difficulties. It included coal, coke, iron ore, pig iron, steel and fabricated products such as machinery, bridges, and ships, etc., and controlled from 40 to 50 percent of the German output of these products, thus becoming the leader of the country's heavy industries over the Krupp interests.

The various iron and steel industries in Germany had been among the earliest to be cartelized and most of the producers of heavy steel products had been brought into one cartel, Stahlwerksverband, in 1904; this lapsed during the First World War and was reorganized after the war ended. In 1924 the steel ingot cartel, Rohstahlgemeinschaft, was formed to include about 94 percent of the German steel ingot output. Each branch of the industry had its separate cartel and Thyssen's new trust along with the other larger producers belonged to practically all of these associations.

In 1926, I. G. Farben, through existing arrangements of firms taken into it, was already a member of numerous international associations and agreements including the aluminum cartel; and then began an expansion of its foreign activities in Europe, North and South America, and Asia. No single great international chemical cartel was formed as such, but rather I. G. Farben, as the world's largest single entity in the chemical industries, became the dominant party in countless production and marketing agreements, patent licensing and trade-mark tie-ups, and other cartel alliances arranged by Dr. Duisberg and Dr. Bosch with individual companies, small groups, or domestic cartels in other countries. Concealed and open ownership of foreign subsidiaries formed an important phase of this super-cartelization of the world's chemical and allied industries.

At the same time I. G. Farben's associate in the steel trust, Fritz Thyssen, was organizing the International Steel Entente which was signed up in September 1926 by German, French, and Luxembourg producers, replacing former international understandings and eventually taking in all of the principal iron and steel interests of continental Europe outside of Russia.

There is thus presented in brief outline the picture of how a great number of legally independent German enterprises, some of them organized during the first half of the nineteenth century, were repeatedly tied together, some in small cartels, some in small mergers, then in larger cartels and larger mergers, until at the beginning of the decade prior to the Second World War they had become integrated in two gigantic mergers—chemical, heavy industries, and munitions—which were tied together themselves and, variously, were also tied into countless other domestic and foreign companies through national and international cartels and subsidiaries, and extended into almost every nation of the world. In industry, finance, and political power, the leaders of the I. G. Farben group dominated Germany and also wielded tremendous influence in other countries, including their opponents in the First World War—the United States, Great Britain, and France.

Many authorities agree that in the exercise of illegitimate power through cartel affiliations these German industrial leaders played an all-important part in the downfall of the Weimar Republic, the accession of Hitler and the Nazi Party to active control of the Ger-

man state; and the rearming of Germany before and during the Second World War. Several of these leaders, including Duisberg and Bosch, had occupied important official positions in the Kaiser's war set-up during the First World War and had continued their political activities from the earliest war period. Dr. Bosch became a member of the Reichstag and, until he died in 1940, occupied a high place in the Hitler government. Dr. Hermann Schmidt, another chairman of the Farben board, was also a member of the Reichstag. Thyssen, until he publicly broke with Hitler, was highly influential in the affairs of the state.

As an example of how this influence was exerted, another member of the board of I. G. Farben, Dr. Clemens Lammers, had become a member of the Reichstag during the early days of the German Republic and, as such, played an important part in the World Economic Conference held by the League of Nations at Geneva in 1927 when he represented Germany and was delegated to advise the conference on the status of cartel legislation in different countries. Dr. Lammers presented to the conference a set of guiding principles concerning cartels in which among other dicta he alleged that the foremost purpose of cartels was in lowering costs and improving products; that legal cartel control existed in only a few countries; that the international cartel, as an expression of cooperation among nations, should be voluntary; and that efforts to interfere with the operations of cartels by means of an international court were unwise. Dr. Lammers also advocated the education of public opinion that cartels were indispensable for the general welfare of the masses and urged that America should shape its measures pertaining to international cartels accordingly.

Demand had been made that the League of Nations, through this World Economic Conference, should provide a solution for the problem of privately directed international cartel activities, but the delegates appeared to accept Dr. Lammers' advice by rejecting establishment of international control as having no prospects, also by reporting that cartels were a phenomenon arising from economic necessity which might benefit both workers and consumers.

As an aftermath of the far-reaching penetration of the super-cartel group into German economy and government, the integration of the dye and steel trust activities with the Hitler regime in the guise of government control progressed rapidly during the years immediately preceding the Second World War. The Thyssen interests were more or less absorbed by the Hermann Goering Iron Works combination and, after the conquest by Hitler of other European countries, another manifestation of the progress of international cartelization occurred when I. G. Farben and the Reichswerke Hermann Goering began merging in their own corporate structures the independent companies of other countries which during the pre-war period had voluntarily become members of the cartels dominated by the Germans.

AMERICAN PARTICIPATION REVEALED

Meanwhile in the United States in 1936, the Senate Committee on Investigation of the Munitions Industry listed over 400 international agreements in the chemical field, most of which were tied indirectly or directly with I. G. Farben. This Senate committee, describing some of these agreements as cartel arrangements, stated that they were a threat to the military safety of the United States because of information relative to munitions which thus became available to foreign governments, and because of the effect of such economic relations upon the policy of governments.

With the beginning of the Second World War the United States Department of Justice began a series of investigations into the activities of I. G. Farben and other international cartels in this country which resulted in numerous indictments, informations, civil complaints, and consent decrees, charging conspiracies in restraint of trade, to violate the Sherman Act of 1890; the antitrust amendments of the Wilson Tariff Act of 1894, and the Clayton Act of 1914. In over 25 of these prosecutions I. G. Farben, its American subsidiaries, and certain of their executives were named as defendants or coconspirators, or as involved in some activity complained of. More than 50 of the leading American producers of chemicals, oil, and allied materials, with numerous individual executives, were also accused, along with an even greater number of foreign companies located in North and South America, Europe, and Asia. The actions variously complained of included the usual types of cartel regulations such as division of world markets, restriction of imports and exports to and from the United States, limitation on American production, price fixing, use of exclusive selling agencies, pooling of profits and of patents and processes. Concealment by I. G. Farben of ownership of some of its subsidiaries was also charged.

The products included in these agreements in which I. G. Farben was thus involved with American companies included substantially all kinds of chemicals, dyestuffs, nitrogen fertilizers and explosives, oil products, magnesium, synthetic rubber, pharmaceuticals, plastic airplane glass, titanium, and a long list of other products made from chemical bases. Some of these court actions were concluded during the progress of the war with fines totaling over $250,000 and consent decrees signed by American defendants; others were postponed for the duration of the war.

A criminal prosecution resulting from an antitrust investigation was brought against the head of Chemnyco, Inc., one of I. G. Farben's American subsidiaries, for destroying records of the company which had been subpenaed by a grand jury. This resulted in a plea of guilty and a fine of $1,000, the defendant, Rudolf Ilgner, being a brother of the head of I. G. Farben's secret information bureau in Germany. Numerous other relatives of I. G. Farben executives were involved in these antitrust cases as officers of American companies.

Investigations by several other United States Senate committees while the war was in progress revealed voluminous data relative to the activities of I. G. Farben and other international cartels in the United States, and charges were publicly made that such arrangements had resulted in control and shortages of essential war materials; also that vital military information had been thus sent abroad, and espionage and sabotage facilitated. The Alien Property Custodian in 1942 seized several subsidiary companies and thousands of patents as properties of I. G. Farben. All of these incidents involving this supercartel prior to or during the Second World War were similar in many respects to incidents of the First World War which involved activities in the United States of the predecessors of I. G. Farben, then known as the German dye cartel.

America's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of America's foreign policy, delivered by me over radio station WRC, Washington, D. C., on March 2, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience. First, I want to thank the National Broadcasting Co. for making its facilities available so that we might think together tonight on a subject of vital importance to all of us—the subject of America's foreign policy.

The subject of foreign policy is a big one. It is bigger than any man, any group, any State. It is a subject that should have the earnest consideration of persons in our Nation, or any nation. It reaches into the White House. It reaches into the miner's cabin. It reaches out to every farm, to every factory, to every field.

Every citizen has to contribute to the total war effort. In a very real sense, the action of every American determines how the war will go. Likewise, in just as real a sense, every one of us has a responsibility in determining the peace. Every one of us has a stake in the peace just as every one of us has a stake in the war. The outcome of what we—you and I and every American—think and do in the coming days will determine the very future of our own families.

Foreign policy, I reiterate, is not a subject to be shunted off on a few experts in the Department of State in Washington to worry about. It is not something that we can shove onto the shoulders of the President of the United States, whoever he may be or however strong his shoulders. It is not something that can be made to read pleasantly simply by letting a so-called authority reach into a file case and bring forth a mimeographed answer that is correct to the last word.

No, my fellow citizens, our foreign policy today and tomorrow is a problem for you as well as for your elected officials, regardless of party. We must wage peace, as we are waging war, through the participation of every man in this Nation.

If we are going to wage peace successfully, we must be sure that we develop in advance the best possible machinery for that purpose. When America set out to arm for this global conflict, every facility needed was available in full measure. American labor, American management, and American materials put into the field the greatest quantities of war material ever imagined possible. We could do that because we had a good system, which was and is working pretty good despite a lot of tinkering.

Now what can we—you and I and every American—do to make a system that will bring us a just and lasting peace? I do not come to this microphone tonight with any idea in mind that I know all the answers to all the pressing national and international problems that face us.

I regret that I do not have a specific program that I can unveil to you and claim that it is the perfect program. No man could come to you with such a program tonight. There simply is no such program in existence.

There is no man on the national scene—no; not one—who can claim that through the years he has been both omniscient and prescient in foreign affairs.

I repeat, I have no particular program, but I do have some ideas and I have some ideals concerning the type of peace we should make and the kind of thinking we must do, as a people.

First, I believe history has proved that the American people—in the long run—do not like secrecy in foreign affairs. I realize, as well as anyone, that the State Department cannot afford to issue a news release every

time some new industry in a foreign country wants to get an export or import license. I realize that certain exploratory talks might be made in confidence, until some definite proposals or agreements are under discussion. But I believe that on the important things, such as the determination of our long-term agreements with other nations, the American people have a right to know exactly what is under consideration. They have a right to know details.

The American people can take good news and bad. Experience has shown that they can be calm in the face of the greatest of dangers. So I condemn, for the people and in their name, the secrecy that pervades so much of our foreign policy today. Let the people know. The people are fighting this war and they have a right to consider and determine a people's peace.

Secondly, I believe that the people must be more wary of their Government's proposals and more demanding of their elected officials, particularly on foreign policy, no matter what political administration happens to be in power. We must not now or ever fail to challenge proposals that are put to us if we think they should be challenged. We must not now or ever submit to undue secrecy of action on the part of our highest or of our lowest officials.

As others have pointed out many times before, the present administration appears to persist in working in deep secrecy on plan after plan, then suddenly springing the completed plan on the public and fighting back if there is the slightest objection to any part of the plan.

Just the other day, we learned that the Americans and the British, apparently after some months of having planned to do it, had sold the Polish people down the river. By the fifth partition of Poland, the three principal participants at Yalta revealed an ugly strain of power politics mixed up with expediency. The agreement made by the so-called Big Three at Yalta calls for a division of Poland in order to establish a buffer state for the largest and strongest power on the Continent.

Just how would we in America feel if, at some future date, the same authorities decided that the United States should be given a portion of Canada or a portion of Mexico as a buffer against possible aggression? Wouldn't it be far better to follow the old adage of doing unto others as we would have them do unto us?

Those of us who have criticized that portion of the Yalta Agreement relating to Poland already have been labeled as Fascists by the official Russian publications and have been labeled everything from die-hards to obstructionists by certain newspapers in this country.

I will not comment on this further than to remind you that when Great Britain, with the warm approval of the entire free world, entered this war against Germany, it was for the declared purpose of adhering to a pledge to protect the territorial integrity of Poland. It is a pathetic fact which I must remind you of, that the Polish Nation is not our enemy but our ally.

Thirdly, I feel very keenly that any plans into which we enter, any program we adopt, any agreements we make, must be based on the best interests of America. There are those who say that there is little reason to believe that the best interests of America are being sacrificed to foreign governments, but I do not agree with them.

When you learn that the President of the United States took with him to Teheran a man who formerly wrote for the Communist Daily Worker and never made any secret of his friendship for known Communists, you begin to wonder whether or not our best interests are being guarded. And when you contemplate the huge amounts of money and materials that are being poured into foreign nations under various excuses, if you are a thoughtful man the knowledge will give you pause.

We are being presented with many plans that deserve the deepest of study. Here in Washington last summer there was held the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, which ended with a program that was hailed by most participating nations. The Department of State, since Dumbarton Oaks, has blossomed out with a regular propaganda campaign, designed it would appear, to make any opposition seem to be thoughtless obstructionism. Through the most widely read journals of opinion, through daily news releases, and in other ways, the Department of State is doing its best to make you and me swallow the Dumbarton Oaks proposals without changing the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

I am not rejecting Dumbarton Oaks. Yet, I say it is not perfect and I reserve the right—as you should reserve the right—to criticize that program, or any other program presented. We might well ask, in the face of all the propaganda, if there is any need for Americans to think about foreign policy? It would seem, from the campaign that has been developed, that the last word has been said concerning future peace and that we have only to cross our arms, go into a benign sleep and let the Department of State handle everything.

In several weeks, April 25, there will be convened at San Francisco another conference of representatives of the United Nations. Together with all Americans of both parties I am hoping that this conference, working open and above board, will bring forth proposals that will be acceptable generally to all of us. But here again, I insert a note of caution—let's study all that is said and done with an open mind, thinking always of what our Nation can reasonably do to play a vital part in the plans for a lasting peace.

So while I have not come tonight with any definite, concrete proposals by which you and I could be assured that we and our children and our children's children could live without the threat of war all the days of our lives and of their lives, I do come with a concrete fact; that fact is that you and I and every American must—not should or ought to—but must examine carefully, study unceasingly, every foreign policy proposal that is put forth by any group.

As we read and hear of our unprecedented victories on the battlefields, you and I have a great pride in our American youths who have gone out to win this war. Only the other day, many were mere youths, riding bicycles home from school, driving their tin lizzies, or getting a sundae at the corner drug store. Today they are doing a man's job on the battlefields of the world. From the approaches to Tokyo our sons are proving that Americans are unbeaten and unbeatable.

We have never been beaten in war. We must not now be beaten in peace.

Open covenants openly arrived at may this time bring us the peace for which we are paying such a great price. This is my prayer and I believe the prayer of America.

Letter Concerning Our Foreign Policy at Conclusion of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following letter sent me by Mr. Frank E. Lawrence, 381 Main Street, Groveland, Mass., giving me the prevailing opinion of the people with whom he spoke on his extensive travels through the Eastern States. You will note the subject matter is concerning our foreign policy at the conclusion of the war:

GROVELAND, MASS., *February 15, 1945.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of Congress from Massachusetts, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: In my occupation as an industrial engineer my work takes me to all parts of the State and to many cities throughout the Eastern States, both North and South.

The great majority of thinking people with whom I come in contact have very decided opinions on what should be the basic foreign policy of this country as it concerns the future safety of the country and the maintenance of a lasting peace following the conclusion of this war.

I take this opportunity of acquainting you with the prevailing opinion, as I understand it, and for what it may be worth to you.

First. Germany and Japan should be made to pay, and pay in full, for the damage they have done not alone to property but to humanity as well. They should be split up and those who have suffered at their hands should take over and impose retribution. If Russia demands German labor battalions, that is all right with us, and Russia will not ask us anyhow, thank goodness. Germany and Japan should never again be more than fourth-rate powers.

Second. The present potential powerful influence of this country (powerful if our administration makes it so), by reason of our preeminence in military, industrial, and financial means, should be used economically and politically, to bring about a functioning United Nations organization to outlaw war. The only powers which can impose peace are Britain, Russia, and the United States of America.

Third. This country should no longer be the goat; to pay for everything; for rehabilitation of all countries all over the world, whether or not they were victims of the aggressors. We should not again step aside and claim nothing in return. Most of the countries which will be helped to their feet can pay in resources, natural or other, and in bases or other facilities needed in the future growth of this country.

Britain is even now securing its position in the Mediterranean and elsewhere and will undoubtedly do so in Asia, so that whether or not the concert of nations functions in the future, its interests will be preserved. This is as it should be, as far as we are concerned, because the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States must inevitably be drawn together, whether they desire it or not. What affects the destiny of one affects the other as well.

Russia is taking over what she wants in Europe as she conquers it, and will do so in Asia at the appropriate time. She is doing this regardless of what this country, or the rest of the world thinks. She will enter the conferences of the United Nations with a fait accompli as regards all of the countries of eastern Europe which she desires as satellites in her orbit. We have had to sell out Poland and forget the Atlantic Charter just to have Russia go along in what is hoped will be a united effort to prevent future wars.

Russia is on the road to becoming the strongest power in the world and will be the principal opposite to this country for many years to come; it is to be hoped that we will be friendly opposites. Russia's form of government is its own affair so long as it does not attempt to impose it on us or on those countries which are, and will be, in our

sphere of influence. We would like to see it evolve into more of a free, democratic form, but we will not try to influence it. Likewise we want no influence the other way. It is recommended that every member of the Congress of the United States read The Real Soviet Russia by David I. Dallin, published by the Yale University Press. It contains a fund of useful information.

The cost to this country is too high in lives, resources and wealth to have to step aside once again, taking nothing in return for what we have contributed. We must maintain supremacy in the air and at sea. Our air and ocean fleets are by far the most powerful in the world and must be maintained so, certainly until they are no longer needed to protect ourselves, and that will be quite a long time, even after a United Nations has started to function.

We should secure those bases around the world which will be essential in the operation of the air and water fleets; in the Atlantic; Greenland, Iceland, the Azores and Canaries, Dakar, Natal (or other Brazil base), the West Indies, Bermuda, and so forth; likewise in the Pacific we shall need bases and islands throughout that ocean from Galapagos to the Bonins and from the Aleutians to the Indian Ocean. This country should not take "no" to requests for them.

De Gaulle says France will now create a great naval and air base at Dakar (presumbly with American money and materials). France should be refused any help whatsoever, except what applies while our armies are occupied with the German war, until she hands over the bases this country needs in the Atlantic and Pacific and elsewhere; or at the least, they should be controlled by the International set-up of the United Nations, with full use guaranteed to this country for military and commercial purposes.

We favor no help, once the German war is won, to any country, ally or other, unless and until we receive in return what we need from them to balance the score. It is all right to maintain an altruistic attitude, but no longer at the sole expense of the American taxpayer.

That taxpayer now resents the fact that supplies, such as meat and butter, to mention only two, are being lend-leased generally. If these go to people who have been starved, they are welcome to all of it, but we suspect that much of it is going where it is not more needed than at home, and these taxpayers would like to have a small share at least.

The taxpayer is also not in favor of buying its favored political set-up in liberated—or other—countries. If they want to try out ideological formulas which are foreign to us, and which they may eventually regret, that should be their business. They should learn their lesson in their own way.

I am addressing the above to you and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from Massachusetts and South Carolina, because I wish to acquaint you—in both of my States—with what many of your constituents are thinking and talking.

Yours very respectfully,

FRANK E. LAWRENCE.

Hon. Fred M. Vinson

REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I grew up a close neighbor to the Honorable Fred M. Vinson. I have known him from his boyhood days and have practiced law with him. Frequently we were antagonists as far only as the lawsuit was concerned.

The Nashville Tennesseean has editorially stated its views with respect to him so much better than I am able to that I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks and include that editorial with reference to the appointment of Mr. Vinson as Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

VINSON OVER THE BILLIONS

Since it has been clear that the President had decided to not appoint Mr. Jesse Jones at the head of the great Federal lending agency that had been built up under his direction, the question of a successor has engaged all the guessers.

The President's choice, announced yesterday, apparently enjoys the rare success of making everybody happy.

Judge Fred M. Vinson is a sound and able man, sage in the expression of political views, and trusted alike by liberals and conservatives in Congress Formerly, as Congressman from Kentucky, a Member of the lawmaking body, the new Federal Loan Administrator has the benefit of close personal acquaintance with many of the Senators who have to pass on his nomination. His record as justice of the United States Circuit Court for the District of Columbia speaks convincingly for his fairness, and his acts as Stabilization Director as well as those throughout his brilliant career have shown firmness and courage and understanding of national business and economic affairs.

What new policies, if any, Mr. Vinson will bring to the Loan Administration, time must show. It is significant, however, that his appointment is hailed with equal warmth by Jesse Jones and Henry Wallace, by Senator TAFT and Senator PEPPER. Business and labor, if spokesmen of these groups reflect the general view, welcome the appointment—and the common people throughout the land who do not have frequent contact with the finance agencies grouped under the Loan Administrator but who do have a healthy appreciation of the public stake in the billions of Federal credit, will place their confidence in Judge Vinson upon his record and reputation.

The President is to be congratulated for so felicitous a selection, and Mr. Vinson for the cordial acclaim his appointment has received.

Henry Hughes Crompton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a poem written by Bill Taylor and dedicated to his friend and our friend, the well-liked Henry H. Crompton, 170 Lowell Street, Methuen, Mass., who on last Sunday, March 4, 1945, completed 50 years of valuable service as the organist of St. George's Ebenezer Primitive Methodist Church.

The occasion was satisfactorily observed by the Reverend Pastor Stanley Mott Sprague, and the parishoners of that church with a golden jubilee celebration on that day in St. Georges Church. The program contained the following statement of appreciation:

The first Sunday in March, 50 years ago, Henry Hughes Crompton became organist of the old Ebenezer Church. During the intervening years he has played to the glory of God and for the enrichment of the spiritual and esthetic life of the many who have worshiped both in the old and in the new church. One thing has been characteristic of his playing during all those years; namely, he has never tried to display his own ability or the power and range of the instrument upon which he played, at the expense of the primary purpose of his position. He has truly led us in worship. His music and anthems have been selected with this in mind. In thus placing himself in the background, he has made his position a vehicle of expression of the quiet faith in God which he possesses, and thus God has been glorified.

St. George's Church is proud today to pay honor to this one who has been an outstanding leader in the church and community, and who has lived an exemplary life before us. We feel, however, that the best way we can honor him is to dedicate this service to the honor and praise of God. To the church he has given and continues to give his unstinting service, and the members and friends of St. George's Church feel desirous of expressing their congratulations and gratitude and best wishes through this medium.

It is our hope that this service, and the reception to follow, dedicated as a sacrifice of praise to our Heavenly Father, will also become to Mr. Crompton an expression of love and esteem. May this day remain as a bright jewel in the crown of sacred memories, to the one whom we honor and for whom we pray the continued benediction of the presence of God.

I wish to join with all the friends, relatives, and acquaintances of Henry Hughes Crompton and especially the townspeople of the town of Methuen in extending to Henry H. Crompton our best wishes and wholehearted congratulations. For many years he has served the people of the town of Methuen with high honor, deepest respect and with the greatest admiration as a member of the board of assessors, and we all sincerely hope and pray that he will continue to render the same valuable service to the parishioners of St. George's Church as organist and to the people of the town of Methuen as their assessor and their public servant.

TO MY FRIEND, HENRY H. COMPTON

Music in the soul—the gift of God to man;
It rings in the rich man's castle, and enters
the poor man's plan.
It resounds in hymns of gladness in the bells
at eventide,
But in the soul of the organ, the spirit of
God resides.

It appeals to man at Christmas and again
at Eastertide,
To the man on his ship in the darkness,
roaming the ocean wide.
Its beauty is everlasting, to everlasting it
shall ring,
But when it comes from the organ, the very
angels sing.

Its magic is all-inspiring, to sinner and to saint,
It tears at the heart-strings sometimes, when it utters its sad plaint;
When the joy of life seems to vanish at the loss of some dear friend,
Then it lifts our hearts in gladness, and we know this is not the end.

It brings us new hopes in the darkness, when the load is hard to bear,
And it reminds us to remember that "God is ev'rywhere."
To take heart in the midst of life's sorrow, and bids us be of good cheer,
That the sun will shine again tomorrow, and our rough road will be clear.

Thus the music of the organ spreads its message far and wide,
And the music at evening lingers o'er God's own countryside.
But few men have had God's blessing, through joy and sorrow and tears,
To preside at one church's organ for over 50 years.

May God in His infinite wisdom grant you more blessings rare,
And when we meet over Jordan, find you the organist there.

—*Bill Taylor.*

Economic Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post this morning:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Commencement of hearings on the Bretton Woods agreements means that Congress is now getting down to cases with respect to international cooperation. Up to now we have dealt largely in generalities and resolutions or, as in the case of U. N. R. R. A., with temporary devices designed to meet a specific emergency. The International Monetary Fund and Bank agreed upon at the Bretton Woods Conference are long-term propositions aimed at the establishment of enduring order in the economic sphere, just as the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are aimed at the establishment of permanent political machinery to curb aggression. They represent, therefor, the first concrete test of congressional willingness to endorse the practical measures for international cooperation agreed upon by representatives of the United Nations.

Secretary Morgenthau presented the argument for endorsement of the Bretton Woods measures with admirable clarity, dignity, and restraint. In his testimony yesterday before the House Banking and Currency Committee he by no means sought to dodge an evaluation of the fund and the bank on their merits. But he emphasized very properly, in our judgment that favorable action by Congress will be taken as a sign that "we in the United States are thoroughly sincere in our devotion to the principles of international cooperation." If there are imperfections in the machinery proposed, they can be corrected once the machinery is set in motion. It can be set in motion, however, only if we, along with other nations, are ready to waive superficial differences for the sake of basic agreement.

"We cannot say," declared the Secretary, "that we will join the other nations in an organization to maintain peace, but will not help to remove one of the most dangerous causes of war—economic dislocations. We cannot say we believe in cooperation to beat fascism but will not cooperate in the removal of one of fascism's chief weapons—economic aggression. We cannot say we want equality of all nations and leave some of them at the financial mercy of others." Here is the real importance of the Bretton Woods agreements—they strike at the root cause of international disunity.

Respecting the Bank for International Reconstruction and Development, there seems to be little disagreement. It would supplement private finance in making loans for productive purposes to war-ravaged and industrially underdeveloped countries. The monetary fund, however, is the subject of considerable controversy; it has been vehemently assailed by the American Bankers Association. The purpose of the fund would be to achieve and maintain stability in the rates of international exchange. Such stability, it seems plain to us, is indispensable to any sound international lending policy and to the revival of trade on which repayment of loans must depend.

That the American Bankers Association does not reflect the views of all American bankers was made plain the other day by a report to Congress on the Bretton Woods agreements by the Independent Bankers Association, which has a membership of over 2,000 country banks. "While we can hardly claim to speak for Wall Street," the secretary of this group pointedly observed in a letter to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Banking and Currency, "we do believe we can speak for Main Street." Main Street bankers may do very little international financing, but they know that the welfare of their communities depends in no small measure upon the development of an orderly and expanding world economy. They go directly to the heart of the matter, we think, when they say that the Bretton Woods agreements "present a very simple issue—stability and order instead of insecurity and chaos."

Smoke Ordinances of Midwestern Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 24, 1945.*
Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Knowing of your interest in the welfare of the Illinois mining industry, I am enclosing, for your perusal, a copy of a letter I forwarded to Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, which deals with the St. Louis smoke ordinance.

You will note in the letter that I have pointed out where more than 25,000,000 car miles are wasted annually, and an unnecessary burden placed on rail transportation through the maintenance of smoke ordinances in midwestern cities.

I am hopeful that Mr. Byrnes will prevail upon the city officials of St. Louis to voluntarily set aside their ordinance for the duration so that Illinois mines will maintain full employment throughout the year. If this is done, eastern coal will remain in the East, which is its natural market, and Illinois coal will again supply its rightful market.

Thanking you for any assistance you may render in this matter, and commending you for your militant action on all matters of public interest, I am

Sincerely,

CAL. D. JOHNSON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 23, 1945.*
Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Director, Office of War Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Noting the intensive drive initiated by your office to conserve both manpower and facilities, may I call to your attention the smoke ordinances of mid-western cities.

May I cite, as an example, the city of St. Louis, Mo., which for more than a century obtained her fuel supply from Illinois coal fields lying within a radius of 20 to 50 miles. In 1939, a rigid smoke ordinance was enacted which forces the importation of more than 1,500,000 tons each year from West Virginia and Arkansas coal fields which are 400 to 600 miles distant from St. Louis, thus wasting approximately 25,000,000 car-miles annually.

The importation of this coal not only caused idleness among miners but also forced dozens of Illinois mines to be closed and junked, that formerly produced coal for the St. Louis market. Illinois coal is permitted in St. Louis today for use in mechanically fired equipment, but approximately a 2,000,000-ton market has been lost to Illinois mines through the restrictions which force the small home owner and renter to purchase high grade fuels for all hand-fired equipment.

I am enclosing a clipping from the Granite City Press Record which states that coal production in Madison County, Ill., declined in 1944 from 1943, and that where some years ago 4,000,000 tons of coal were produced annually, only 2,114,632 tons were produced in 1944. It further states that 10 mines are now idle and that those operating worked only an average of 232 days in 1944. A similar situation exists in adjoining St. Clair County where dozens of mines have been closed and junked in recent years. These 2 counties lie directly across the Mississippi River from St. Louis, Mo.

Geologists estimate that Illinois fuel beds contain approximately 200,000,000,000 tons of bituminous coal, and although it has been mined commercially since 1828, only 6 percent of the total has been removed. Illinois mines experience difficulty in disposing of lump coal during the summer months, and as a result, miners do not have full-time employment during that period. This coal could be stored in dealers' yards and used to meet fuel emergencies, if existing smoke ordinances were eliminated and Illinois coal accepted for use in hand-fired equipment. Illinois coal sells in St. Louis for approximately $5 per ton, compared to $9 per ton for eastern bituminous and Arkansas semianthracite coal.

I am informed that owners of the Radium Coal Mine, located at Belleville, Ill., 14 miles from St. Louis, are contemplating junking that property because of their inability to reopen and operate at a profit. This mine is known as one of the best in southern Illinois, but has not been operated in recent years because of the inability to find a market. This condition is due largely to the St. Louis smoke ordinance.

Trusting you will investigate this matter thoroughly, and that this ordinance can be

set aside during the emergency, thus utilizing to the fullest, the existing manpower and facilities of the Illinois coal fields, I am

Sincerely,

CALVIN D. JOHNSON,
Former Congressman from the Twenty-second District of Illinois.

Arkansas River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FADJO CRAVENS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a brief article by Mr. C. F. Byrns appearing in the Fort Smith Times-Record of Fort Smith, Ark., on March 5, 1945, as follows:

THE LEGISLATURE TAKES A STAND ON THE METHOD OF ARKANSAS RIVER DEVELOPMENT

(By C. F. Byrns)

The Arkansas Legislature has adopted a resolution declaring its full support of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in its program for full development of the Arkansas River, and its opposition to the creation of an Arkansas Valley Authority.

A concurrent resolution expressing that position was passed, first in the senate and then in the house, late in the week. It will be used as part of the testimony in the hearing on May 7 at Little Rock before the Board of Review of the Corps of Engineers, to show the sentiment of the people of Arkansas on this program.

There was no controversy about it. There is no evidence that I know about of any substantial support in this State for creation of an authority to develop the Arkansas River. Our people who are familiar with the program and the prospects for immediate post-war work on the river-control system recognize that the Corps of Engineers is the agency which logically should carry to completion the plans the engineers have developed in recent years of intensive study.

In eastern Oklahoma, especially around Muskogee, there has recently been considerable agitation for creation of an Arkansas Valley Authority to take over the development of the river. Some of its supporters, doubtless, sincerely believe that power should be the chief objective of a river control program and rightly believe that an authority approach means first emphasis on power and secondary interest in flood control, navigation and other uses of the waters of the Arkansas drainage system. Some of the supporters, perhaps, are not fully advised of all that is involved in a choice between the Corps of Engineers and the proposed authority to do the job.

As readers of this column know, I have much admiration for the work the Tennessee Valley Authority has done in its own area. But I do not believe that it is sound for us in the Arkansas Valley to advocate an authority for our river. There are many reasons, which seem to me quite sound.

I prefer the democratic approach of the Corps of Engineers to the centralized control of the authority. Work done by the Corps of Engineers is under control of Congress at every step and its actual construction is usually dependent upon local support. The people finally decide whether it is good policy. The engineers do it only when their nonpolitical professional judgment tells them it is economically feasible and productive of more benefit than it costs. The authority, in the Tennessee Valley and in any other place an authority may be created, has autocratic powers, which it can exercise autocratically or democratically as it sees fit. At all events, it is beyond control of the people most affected.

The Corps of Engineers already has planned and has had approved by Congress 20 flood-control reservoirs in the Arkansas Basin, of which 5 have been built (1 of them by the Grand River Dam Authority in Oklahoma), 4 are in various stages of construction, and 11 are approved but await congressional appropriations after the war. In addition the engineers have congressional approval for $12,150,000 worth of levees between Tulsa and Pine Bluff. These projects will substantially control floods on the Arkansas.

In addition the Corps of Engineers has planned a comprehensive program of navigation, irrigation, power, additional flood control, and silt control for the entire drainage area from Tulsa to the mouth. That program is up for approval now by the Board of Review of the Corps of Engineers. Its approval and its early construction are fundamental to our economic development in this valley.

If the people of the Arkansas Valley now go chasing off after authority rainbows, it is certain the Corps of Engineers program would be delayed for an indefinite time. It is likewise certain that the Corps of Engineers will not be nearly so interested in early completion of our authorized flood works if it becomes apparent that the whole project which they have planned is to be taken away from the Engineers and handed to an authority.

I want to see the river controlled. I want to see the work done as quickly as possible. We need to get this comprehensive plan approved and built in the first 5 years after the war. I think it is short-sighted to turn aside from a program so nearly assured and follow a will-o'-the-wisp which might easily turn out to be disappointing illusion.

The Senator From Kansas Pays Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent given me by the House, I have the honor of including in the RECORD a very interesting and timely statement of the senior Senator from my own State of Kansas, being a tribute of our distinguished Senator to our native State.

This tribute was made by Senator CAPPER on the fiftieth anniversary of the fellowship breakfast of the International Reform Federation held in the Senate dining room of the Capitol on January 19, 1945, and reprinted in the February 1945 issue of the Progress magazine edited by Dr. Clinton N. Howard.

I feel sure the Members of Congress as well as others who have access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will enjoy reading it:

THE SENATOR FROM KANSAS PAYS TRIBUTE

My good friend Clinton Howard, whom we recognize and honor as one of the most useful men of the Nation, has suggested to me that I say something about Kansas and some Kansans who may have done some good in the world, or at least stirred up some commotions. I am happy to comply. Next to a Californian's ambition to talk about his climate is a Kansan's zeal to talk about Kansas and Kansans.

Occasionally Kansas is referred to as a "state of mind," a place from which come crusaders, freaks, droughts, blizzards, cyclones, dust bowls, wheat, and Republican majorities. Now some of these claims for—or charges against—Kansas are like the premature report of Mark Twain's death—slightly exaggerated.

I hope you notice the motif in these election returns: Twice for the Democrats and three times for the Republicans, in regular sequence over a half century. It might be said that we two-step with the donkey but waltz with the elephant.

I don't know whether the Senate of the United States realizes what it owes to Kansas. My native State of Kansas today has six Senators—not just two but six. And they cover a wide range of territory, geographically and politically. They are CLYDE M. REED and myself, elected from Kansas. There also are these Kansas products in the Senate: JOHN THOMAS, of Idaho; ED JOHNSON, of Colorado; CARL HATCH, of New Mexico; and LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas. The late Senator Borah was a student of the University of Kansas and started the practice of law in Lyons, Kans. Vice President Charles Curtis and Gov. Alf Landon, Republican candidate for President, were both Kansans.

I tell you, we Kansans ride high, wide, and handsome—and sometimes in strange company, I must admit.

I claim that Kansans are natural crusaders and pioneers. We started out, nationally speaking, with John Brown, of Osawatomie—a fanatic, yes; but a fanatic crusading for a worthy ideal, and with the courage to die in the cause he espoused. Kansas is proud of John Brown. The late William Allen White, of Emporia, was Kansas' first citizen for many years, a really great editor. There was John P. St. John, 4 years Governor of Kansas, a national prohibition leader, and candidate for President in his day; a great champion of a sober America. Dr. Charles M. Sheldon, of Topeka, who wrote, In His Steps. There was Mrs. Henry W. Peabody, reformer, editor, missionary, who raised a million dollars for the medical college for women in Vellure, India, on her return to the United States. Martin and Osa Johnson, who showed us Africa and wildlife all over the world, came from Chanute, Kans.

Amelia Earhart, first woman to fly the ocean, was an Atchison, Kans., girl. A fearless fighter for a good cause, Carrie Nation, whose hatchet became as famous in America as David's sling among the Philistines—she was another Kansan who dared to do.

Gen. Dwight Eisenhower comes of a famous Kansas family—has four brothers born in Kansas and still living there. In World War No. 1 Gen. James G. Harbord was one of the outstanding generals; another Kansas product.

The late Gen. Hugh "Iron Pants" Johnson, another fighter for what he believed in, came from Fort Scott, Kans.

Raymond Clapper, perhaps the Nation's No. 1 reporter-columnist at the time of his death, was a Kansan.

Walter Johnson, a graduate of the Kansas University, one of the best loved ball players in the history of the national game, got his start in Coffeyville, Kans. Kansas had a world champion in the fistic ring at one time—Jess Willard, of Lawrence, Kans. Glenn Cunningham, a dry, champion long-distance runner for years and years, is a Kansan, and I could name another score of nationally known Kansans in professional, business, agricultural, and theological life, most of whom were at least attempting to furnish moral leadership in

their own fields. Many were crusaders and pioneers. Kansas pioneered in the fight to abolish slavery; was one of the first States to adopt State-wide woman suffrage; led and is still leading in the attempt to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor; and still is, we believe, the driest State in the Union.

At the close of the Senator's address he was given an ovation. Mr. Howard upbraided the Senator for omitting the most distinguished Kansan of them all, Senator ARTHUR CAPPER who is the dean of the delegation from his State and who has been elected five times as United States Senator. Attention was also called to the fact that Senator CAPPER'S newspapers and magazines with more than 4,000,000 circulation will not carry a liquor advertisement and whose radio stations covering the entire State do not advertise any alcoholic beverages. He is the moral mentor of the Senate and the champion of every good cause.

Maj. Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article that has been brought to my attention, prepared by Lt. Col. J. K. Stacy of the Army Quartermaster Corps, relating to the splendid work being accomplished by Maj. Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn, who is now serving as quartermaster for the European theater of operations.

The writer of this article, Lt. Col. J. K. Stacy, had the honor of serving for a period of 3 years under the command of Major General Littlejohn and is now on active duty in Washington, D. C., after 26 months' duty in the European theater of operations.

Personally, I feel that Maj. Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn has rendered most valuable and exceptionally well-qualified service on his particular job outside of the continental United States. He is one of our high-ranking officials in the War Department who has given unselfishly and unstintingly of his work, his time, and his effort in providing the men of our armed forces with the necessities of life so that they may be successful in carrying on the war to a successful climax.

The article follows:

IT WILL BE DONE

When and where a man is born makes little difference in his life. It is the things that he does between birth and death that really count. However, Maj. Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn was born in South Carolina in 1890 and at the present time is very much alive—acting "in the living presence, heart within and God o'erhead."

General Littlejohn is chief quartermaster in the European theater of operations. That means the feeding, clothing, sleeping, and to some degree housing of the troops in the European theater of operations. General Littlejohn came to England realizing that he had a big job to do. The superiors that sent him here also knew he had difficult work and sent him with every trust that he would carry the message to Garcia, and in no way have they been disappointed. He saw his task and he did it, in fact he has exceeded the expectations of everyone.

Let us deal with the characteristics that have made him a leader of men and that account for his achieving so much. General Littlejohn is in the broadest sense of that word a man—innately a gentleman, leaning to the rough and ready type. He figures from the small to the great. To illustrate, I heard him give the following instructions: "Find out how long 10 cans of tomatoes will be used in feeding 10 men, multiply that by the given number of men for 12 months. * * * Following this procedure, arrangements will then be made to have these (food) items shipped here as they are needed. This plan is quite simple, but to carry it out will require perseverance, planning, and hard work." He is a man of vision and his greatest desire is that soldiers are always properly fed and properly clothed. To that end, his eternal vigilance and bulldog tenacity have been directed and the reward for his efforts has been that no soldier in the United Kingdom has gone hungry or cold.

General Littlejohn is a man who makes every experience in his life count. He learned at the United States Military Academy that one of the cardinal points of winning a battle was simple and direct methods. Putting into practice that lesson has enabled him to use and develop many mediocre men into excellent personnel. Developing and making men work as a harmonious whole has enabled him to carry out his schedule on time, getting the maximum results out of the minimum time, effort, and money expended. In completing a lecture at one time his conclusion was, "You now know the plan of the game. I am passing the ball to you. Are you going to carry it? If so, we will make a touchdown. If you fail, it will prolong the war. Play ball. Let's win the game." Every man within the sound of his voice left the room with a determination to be a better officer and to support General Littlejohn's plan to the limit of his ability.

General Littlejohn's past training has particularly fitted him for his work as chief quartermaster for one of the most important theaters of operations. He graduated from the academy in 1912, and, after serving in many places in the United States, his last assignment before going to Washington and later to England was in the Philippine Islands. Importing many supplies into the Philippines was most excellent training in shipping and "the battle of ship-tons" is the cardinal point in supplying the troops in Europe. Ship-tons per cubic foot per man was figured out by General Littlejohn, and he knew exactly the tons and supplies that would be required to supply his army in the United Kingdom. Charts were made showing this, and he could refer to these charts at any time and tell exactly what was needed for the time, what was coming, and what the future requirements would be. His planning for future needs by charts that were easily understood and making his plans so thoroughly (I have heard him say, "This must be planned from soup to nuts") made it possible for him to get the greatest good from the people who were working with him. His conferences and directions are always simple and direct. Once a rather long and complicated system of filing was presented to him, and when it was completed his only remark was, "When this plan is followed, what I want to know is can you find a paper?"

For his work here he was awarded the D. S. M. The citation is as follows:

"Brig. Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn, chief quartermaster, Services of Supply, European theater of operations, awarded Distinguished Service Medal, with the following citation:

"'Brig. Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn, United States Army, for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service in a position of great responsibility as chief quartermaster during the initial organization of the Services of Supply, European theater of operations, and later as deputy commanding general, Services of Supply, European theater of operations, from June 1942 to November 8, 1942. General Littlejohn demonstrated marked aggressiveness, exceptional organizing ability, and a superior quality of leadership in rapidly establishing a quartermaster service throughout the theater which met and solved the many unexpected and seemingly insurmountable problems of supply. By his broad experience, foresight, and splendid ability he created an organization which was largely instrumental under his leadership in solving many complex problems in the organization and supply of the African task force. His untiring efforts and devotion to duty in this connection contributed markedly to the successful landing of this force in north Africa on November 8, 1942.'"

The part General Littlejohn played in supplying the troops and in the mounting of the African campaign was an accomplishment of which anyone would be justly proud. The language in the citation says so much in so few words of the part he played in the enterprise that drove the Axis from Africa.

The ability to seek out a problem, discover its possible solutions, and carry them to a successful conclusion is one of General Littlejohn's keynotes. This is aptly demonstrated by the way he attacked the problem of packaging Army supplies which truly became a staff officer's headache when big volume movement of overseas supplies began. A package was needed which gave better strength for rough handling, water resistance for beach-head operations, and would be lighter in weight and consume less shipping space than the existing wooden box. An additional specification called for the box to be made of a material which would be useful salvage in the United Kingdom.

General Littlejohn jumped wholeheartedly into this job and after lengthy periods of practical experimentation, came out with a triple-threat solution—three type boxes, known as V-1, V-2, and V-3. V-1 was an all-kraft, waterproof, solid fiber box which met all requirements, and could be increased in strength by double thickness when necessary. It was the perfect box for beach-head landing of supplies. V-2, a solid, fiber box, made with a percentage of waste paper, was approved for lend-lease shipments where transshipment and outdoor storage are not involved. V-3 is a corrugated, all-kraft box also approved for lend-lease shipments. Being of 100-percent kraft, it fulfilled the salvage requirement since the United Kingdom is in great need of kraft pulp.

To fill the Army's shopping basket by local purchase was one of the problems which confronted General Littlejohn as chief quartermaster of the E. T. O. The problem staring him right in the eye was this: For every 0.8 ounces of supplies he could procure in the United Kingdom, one more .30-caliber rifle bullet could be shipped over from the United States. The figures give his answer. In an 18-month period from July 1942 through December 1943, he procured 1,388,585 ship tons of supplies in the British Isles. This compares favorably with the 2-year period of June 1917 through May 1919 when 1,918,594 ship tons of quartermaster supplies were procured. All this General Littlejohn did in face of the fact that the British were hard put to supply themselves in almost everything as compared with the World War No. 1 when Denmark, Norway, and other neutrals furnished them with food and other goods. Thus another battle in the war of "ship tons" was won.

General Littlejohn enjoys the respect of all who work with him. Everyone connected with him feels his interest in them. He truly

has a heart of gold and I think his friends undoubtedly like him but their admiration for his ability and sterling qualities far exceeds any mere quality of admiration. His untiring work and his desire to do everything he does well, and that indescribable quality of character that enables him to command, makes him an unquestionable leader. His spirit of fairness is never influenced by rank or person. Everything with the General must be right and though he may condemn the part of the work that does not come up to his standard of excellence, the person concerned feels that, even though his labor has not been 100 percent perfect and while the General has found fault, no one else would be allowed to criticize. He never covers a lack of knowledge with criticism of "spit and polish," or finding a little dust back of a post some place, but he looks at the situation in a big, manly, just way. In supplies he expects to see that there is a sufficient stock level to last the men who are to be cared for. If he ever errs it is always on the side of humanity. An enlisted man said the following words in regard to him: "He puts socks on our feet, hats on our heads, food in our bellies, and tents overhead."

He is married to Mary Lambert, of Connecticut, who has traveled in matrimony harmoniously with him since 1918.

General Littlejohn has continued to grow in military strength and stature since he was admitted as a student to the Military Academy and, while he has accomplished almost wonders in the past, those who know him feel that his greatest work is yet before him. This war has really given him an opportunity to show the truly big man that he is.

He has a big job. He is "carrying the ball" in the game of life as he carried it successfully on the academy team. The excellent way he is supplying the troops needs no praise, it speaks for itself. Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn is of measureless value to the Army of the United States.

The Flood in the Ohio Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I made a short speech on the above subject and at that time I got leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

I have already stated that the word "Ohio" means beautiful river, and I have already stated that while the flood conditions in the Ohio Valley are very bad and have brought great sorrow and discomfort to many of the fine people living in that valley, I am glad to report that the flood will not reach the proportions of the 1937 flood, for which we are all very thankful.

From experience the people in the Ohio Valley have learned that there is nothing they can do to stay the murky tide as it quietly encroaches upon them and upon their homes. They wait developments with great interest and great caution. They have learned how to take care of themselves and their property, but in spite of all they can do and all anybody can do for them they are forced to leave their homes and to seek safety somewhere else. When these people return to their homes they will find destruction the like of which nobody can appreciate except a person who has had experience. They will need relief in many ways.

I am glad that the great Red Cross is already at work. I remember that it was in the 1913 flood that I first became familiar with the activities of this great institution. It is truly the great mother of the world. I have had several conversations with Red Cross authorities here in Washington with reference to the situation in the various cities and communities of my district. I am sure from the reports that they bring me that their men and women are doing their part. I have communicated with practically every community in my district and have offered to do whatever I can to relieve the situation.

While the great flood of 1937 was raging I am proud of the fact that my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and myself and others were able to secure the passage through Congress of an act setting up the Disaster Loan Corporation. In the 1937 flood that Corporation functioned efficiently up and down the Ohio River. I was glad to have accompanied those in charge of this great work into the various communities in my district where very substantial relief was extended.

About the same time we were able to pass legislation that gave the municipalities an opportunity to cooperate with the Government in plans for the construction of flood walls. My home city of Ironton was the first city in the Nation to meet all of the requirements of the legislation prescribed by Congress and that community was the first community in the country to complete a flood wall that protects the community completely and adequately. This was accomplished by the city of Ironton putting up approximately $750,000 with which rights of way were purchased. The Government then came forward with a sufficient amount of money to construct the flood wall and the earthworks connected therewith. This work has been so satisfactory that I daresay that the flood wall has paid for itself twice over in the amount of savings that it has effected for the people of that city.

To show how much the flood control system is appreciated in my city, I am setting forth a telegram which I have this day received from Mr. Ralph F. Mittendorf, who is the city manager for the city of Ironton:

Flood control system working perfectly. Had erected 7 floodgates and have all 10 pumping stations in operation. Ironton citizens appreciate this protection work and ask that you express our gratitude and appreciation to proper Washington authorities. We anticipate stage of approximately 62 feet which can be handled without difficulty.

I am sorry that every community along the Ohio River has not been able to avail itself of the law providing for the construction of flood walls. Many communities are too small and the tax duplicate is not sufficient to justify their coming forward with the contribution required under the law. I hope that the time may come when these requirements may be lowered and when all the communities may receive flood protection.

The Army engineers and many others interested in the floods in the Ohio Valley have been giving consideration to plans that would impound great quantities of water at the headwaters of the rivers and creeks. If this could be done, much of the ravages of the floods could be prevented.

Of course, these projects could not have been taken up and pressed to conclusion during wartimes. When the war is over, I hope that these plans may be carried out, which will be greatly to the benefit of all the residents in the Ohio Valley.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of American foreign policy delivered by me on March 2, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the past century Americans have been preoccupied with the development of our vast country that has now become the productive marvel and envy of all the earth. Concern with foreign affairs, however, was not a matter to which the average American needed to give attention of any kind.

As a result, Americans in general are more nearly illiterate concerning international problems than almost any other civilized people on the earth since in most other countries the problems of survival, in the face of the enemies on every hand, have compelled their people to have daily in mind the imperative necessity of a carefully formulated foreign policy.

American foreign policy has been a very vague term to the average American. Senator CONNALLY, in refuting the suggestion that we have no foreign policy, made the following statement: "I challenge those who say the United States has no foreign policy. Of course we have no foreign policy in the sense of grabbing territories all over the earth and seeking preferential trade advantages. However, American hopes for international peace, for self-determination of peoples, for the rights of small nations, for the sanctity of treaties and international obligations are well known."

With all deference to Senator CONNALLY, for whom I have the highest regard, it would not seem that the items which he enunciates would properly come under the heading of foreign policy, but rather under the heading of the high moral code to which millions of Americans subscribe and which we hope to see become the guiding principle of the new world order that we so fervently seek.

Foreign policy, on the other hand, is concerned primarily with the preservation of the national interests of our country. This predicates not the arrival of the millennium but a world in which other countries are concerned primarily with their national interests and perhaps even with the advance-

ment of their national interest by acquisition of trade or territory.

Really it would seem more accurate to say that the only foreign policy which America has practiced for a century has been the Monroe Doctrine which has been consistently supported by all administrations, declaring the determination of the United States that it could not view without concern the extension of any foreign systems to this hemisphere. The correlative portion of the Monroe Doctrine declared that the United States similarly would not interfere with the affairs of Europe. This is frequently forgotten.

Here was a clear unilateral declaration of a sphere of influence which has been recognized with very few challenges from abroad throughout the past century.

France, with some aid from England, came into Mexico with Emperor Maximilian during the Civil War but shortly after withdrew, with English support withdrawn. President Cleveland was obliged to use strong language in the Venezuela episode during his second administration. In large measure, however, the proper concern of America for the security and independence of the western hemisphere has been recognized by foreign government.

During our lifetime without provocation upon our part, we have twice been plunged into world-wide wars. Theodore Roosevelt, in 1916, described us as "drifting stern foremost into war." Certainly America has not been the moving spirit in these foreign entanglements, but has been reluctantly drawn into the fray.

These two experiences have brought home to us with appalling force and at tremendous sacrifice the realization that we can no longer ignore developments overseas.

In determining our course during the next few months and years in justice to our sons who have sacrificed so much and in seeking the solution of the problem of world-wide peace, we must move away from any silly sentimentality into a realistic recognition of the forces which are loose throughout this world and come to realize that the millennium may not be depended upon to dawn, whatever may be the arrangements that are made at the conclusion of this strife.

History is strewn with the records and the wrecks of the agreements that have been made looking to a more stable world order, and yet have failed to preserve peace beyond a generation.

We must be careful also not to be influenced unduly by illusive hopes. There are certain ideas that have very wide acceptation which do not find particular warrant in the history of modern times.

I speak as one who, 25 years ago, fresh from the last war, helped organize in Maine the League to Enforce Peace, and one who has continued to support every measure looking to a more stable world order.

For instance, there is the idea—now rather generally accepted in America—that a league of nations or association of nations is the sine qua non of peace and at the same time the guaranty of peace.

Let us look over this idea in the light of our own knowledge of history, first, as to whether or not an association of nations is a guaranty of peace. We here on this continent carried out a great experiment a century and a half ago with an association of 13 sovereign States designed to form a more perfect Union. There was surely much to promise success in this great venture with a homogeneous population distributed along the Atlantic seaboard and with all the ties of sentiment born of the Revolutionary struggle to bind us into a more sacred union. Yet at the end of 75 years we fought one of the bloodiest civil wars in all history to determine whether any union so conceived and so dedicated could permanently endure.

As one flies around the world and sees the seething ferment of hundreds of millions of people of varying races and creeds and ideologies scattered throughout the Middle East and the Orient (Anglo-Saxon civilization represents only 10 percent), one realizes the tremendous challenge to achieve any sort of amalgamation that shall guarantee enduring reconciliation of their ideals. Problems of territory and trade and ideas of government have terrific impacts in all the seething continents of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and this must all be taken into account in the great problem with which we, of this generation, are now faced.

This will indicate to us that an association of nations is not necessarily a guaranty that our troubles are at an end, and must lead us to realize that something else is also required.

Meanwhile we need only consult the observations of our own lifetime to realize that we, ourselves, were born in a century that knew no world-wide strife. From 1815 with the fall of Napoleon at Waterloo, to 1914 when Germany challenged British sea power, there was no global war.

In our own country we had the Mexican War, the Spanish War, and our own Civil War, or the War between the States as we now learn to call it in Washington.

In Europe there were the Franco-Prussian War and the Crimean War and the wars of Central Europe and the Balkans. In Africa there was the Boer War and the Egyptian War. In Asia there were the Sino-Japanese and the Russo-Japanese Wars. All of these conflicts were isolated, however, within their continents, and this was due in no small measure to the prudent exercise of British sea power which gave us the Pax Brittanica of the century now past.

Some ask whether this period of comparative peace was not due to difficulties of world-wide communications. A glance back to the eighteenth century demolished this explanation. In our country we are familiar with the almost constant French and Indian Wars of the 1700's which were simply an offshoot of wars originating in Madrid, Paris, and London as the declining Spanish Empire and France and England struggled for supremacy throughout the world.

In Ceylon last year I stayed in a British Government house built by the Dutch in 1780 and taken from them by the British not long thereafter. All around the world there are these monuments to the strife that raged throughout the eighteenth century until British sea power finally became dominant with the downfall of Napoleon and the disappearance of the Spanish Empire overseas.

History then would teach us that an association of nations is not an absolute essential to the avoidance of world-wide strife and, on the other hand, an association of sovereign states is not necessarily a guarantee of peace.

Something much other is required, and that is a nation that is prepared and informed as to its national interests and resources and devotes itself to the accumulation of that power that will promote both world peace and its own protection in a more and more chaotic world.

Let us approach this problem individually as the "devil's advocate" in order to make sure we are not deceiving ourselves or others as to what we may expect. As intelligent citizens of the world we must realize the problems which are faced particularly by our great allies overseas, Britain and Russia.

As we properly explore the history of the foreign policy of our allies in order to determine so far as practicable what may be expected, it is also essential that we should examine our own record with some care in order to avoid any sentimental hypocrisy that may interpose difficulties in our dealing with our allies.

The Monroe Doctrine was a purely self-serving unilateral declaration of a sphere of influence. Certainly no one will contend that it was designed primarily to extend to our neighbors the blessings of democracy since many of these countries in the century past have had decidedly dictatorial regimes and others under the forms of democracies have had Presidents who remained in office for as much as 16 years defying every definition of democracy as conceived by Thomas Jefferson.

Abraham Lincoln denounced in unmeasured terms our participation in the Mexican War and our acquisition of both Texas and California.

The Russian Government of today occasionally intimates that the action of the Czar in selling their Alaskan gold mine to us for $7,000,000 was ultra vires and that Alaska is still a part of the sacred soil of Russia.

Meanwhile in Panama not even Theodore Roosevelt ever contended that it was merely an interesting coincidence that the Marines landed the next morning after the revolution began and in Hawaii stories are still told of the back-garden gate through which an American Minister was wont to communicate with certain irregular elements in the population designed to advance the American position in the Pacific.

America unquestionably has a far better record than any other great nation insofar as international idealism is concerned but our record is not without spot.

If Americans wish to understand the complex ramifications of the present international crisis, they would do well to read William B. Ziff's recently issued book, The Gentlemen Talk of Peace. This monumental work on the nature of war and peace with its brilliant analysis of the situation today gives a remarkably clear picture of the world in which we live. It might well be required reading for all Americans. A study of this profound and scholarly work does not lead us to envision the immediate arrival of the millennium.

While we keep our eyes upon the stars we must still keep our feet upon the ground. This is the lesson taught us by the events of today, as well as the historic course of human relationships which are so ably analyzed in Mr. Ziff's most timely work.

Winston Churchill declared proudly, "I did not become the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire," and he added later as a warning to us, "Let us not talk too much about a brave new world." These are grim reminders that we live in a world in which individual and national ambitions and interests still have sway and that we must not plan our future on the basis of all other nations necessarily being motivated by as high principles as our own.

Stalin has had the bitter experience of guarding his nation from the recurring invasions that have threatened its existence now for many years. Seeking a friendly government in states bordering on his own. Stalin proceeds to assure himself that if a world order does not emerge in which he may find security that he shall not have fought this war in vain. That is the answer to his determined move in the Baltic States, in Poland, in the Soviet Government now formed in Hungary, and explains the major interest he is now showing in the affairs of the Balkans.

Surely America will ponder long and carefully before entering into commitments to guarantee any particular solution of the problems of Central Europe with all the racial entanglements and economic difficulties with which these countries have been so long plagued.

The Vandenberg proposal to guarantee the continuing disarmament of Germany and Japan is a far more practical approach. Rarely has the man, the moment, and the message manifested a more happy harmony.

America must be careful to guard against the tendency in modern time to defer to the views of one or another individuality whether it be our favorite columnist or commentator. Here is the very essence of totalitarianism following indiscriminately the one

upon whom we depend for the answer to all problems outside our daily experience.

If democracies are to function and survive, they must develop a public opinion dedicated to the support of a foreign policy that considers our own national interests.

Lord Halifax has said that Britain, in the future, must be a junior partner of the United States. If we are to be a senior partner, we must be far more adult in our behavior than we have shown ourselves hitherto.

The conflicting factions that have hitherto prevailed in our State Department made it impossible for any foreign government at any time to know upon what they could depend so far as America was concerned. Without undertaking to fix the responsibility during the regime of the much-beloved and much-respected Secretary, Cordell Hull, there was never a time when he had the full and unqualified support and backing of the President of the United States.

Nor was Sumner Welles entirely responsible for the division which prevailed during his period as Under Secretary of State, since it was impossible for him to refuse to deal with the President or with Mr. Harry Hopkins, who frequently represented the President, or even with Mrs. Roosevelt. As a result of the long and intimate family relations that had prevailed, and the occasional absences of Secretary Hull, the situation grew more and more acute and the confusion was confounded by another point of view expressed by Adolf Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, and by another faction within the Department, so that foreign diplomats were naturally bewildered as to the direction of American foreign policy.

Even the most acute observers in Washington are puzzled as to what may be expected in coming months in the development of American policy—domestic and foreign.

It would be difficult to conceive of a more radical reorientation of policy than was represented in the appointments in the State Department following the retirement of Secretary Hull.

The most encouraging aspect of the situation is the obvious emphasis upon coordination and integration of activities under competent leadership.

Mr. Hull was an extremely able man and possessed the confidence of the Congress to an unprecedented degree. Secretary Hull, however, never enjoyed the full confidence of the President and many things were done in foreign affairs of which Secretary Hull was not immediately apprised.

In addition, Secretary Hull was not primarily an executive and without the full backing of the President was never able to enforce the discipline within his organization which was essential to have it function as a successful team.

Secretary Stettinius has both ability and character and a background of executive experience with the benefit of observing for a year the confusion and chaos that had long prevailed within the State Department. It is generally assumed that the revolutionary reorganization which he has carried out represents his considered conclusion as to how American foreign policy may be made, in the language of Walt Whitman, to "cohere into an orb."

Napoleon declared that "One bad general is better than two good generals." Decision and continuity and consistency in the State Department as represented by this reorganization may lay a firm foundation for American education and progress in international affairs.

The rest of the world has been abundantly justified in criticizing the incoherence and inconsistency of American foreign policy.

No human being can always get the right answer all the time but others are entitled at least to expect that one shall make up his mind and stick to it for an appropriate period.

How far Secretary Stettinius may be successful in bringing some sense of discipline into the functioning of the President in foreign affairs remains the great question mark.

Hull was unfortunately left home from Teheran. Many of our later troubles may have stemmed from that simple fact. Fortunately, Stettinius—possibly at the eleventh hour—was taken to Yalta. Unfortunately, Harry Hopkins still seemed to be the No. 2 man in Europe, so far as the press preliminaries of the conference were concerned.

In their great task Stettinius and his associates are entitled to the complete cooperation, certainly for a trial period, of every American, including the President of the United States.

American foreign policy cannot be developed nor handled by wisecracks at press conferences nor by back-stairs irresponsible gossip nor by unofficial agents holding no responsible office under the Government of the United States comparable with the powers which some have presumed to exercise.

Churchill pays careful heed to the British Foreign Office. Let us never forget that Britain has gone a considerable distance in the last century under the guidance of the British Foreign Office, irrespective of the successive Prime Ministers who have flitted across the stage. Britain loses battles but wins wars—and that is true of its diplomats as well as its generals.

Surveying the sorry scene in Europe, one is more and more impressed with the primary concern of Britain and Russia for the solution of their problems, whether it be in the future security of Russia against aggressive attack from its European neighbors or the preservation by Britain of the life line of the British Empire, running through the Mediterranean and concern with the future attitude of Italy and Greece and the other countries bordering on the Mediterranean.

Looking back a century to the profound success of the Monroe Doctrine (a purely unilateral declaration of a sphere of influence) in preserving the American hemisphere from outside aggression one may look forward a century to the possibility of preserving peace in the Pacific and possibly preventing another era of global strife through the medium of a stronger China.

Here would seem to be a justified risk in the development of this great country which has been a bulwark of peace for centuries without end. Here is a country that has preserved its agricultural economy by offering the world an example of a soil that is 60 percent more fertile than the world average in the production of rice, 40 percent in barley, and 26 percent in cotton, in contrast with the utter exhaustion of the soil of India, as the dung of their cattle has been used for fuel instead of the replenishment of the earth.

Eight great dynasties have ruled in China in forty centuries and have been models of administration in their place in history. In our own time we have seen China in a disintegrating period in the decline of the Manchu dynasty but there are many indications of a new spirit of unity and progress that offers hope for peace in the Pacific and perhaps throughout the world.

To be sure, one must take risks, and there will not be lacking those who are concerned with the dangers of the growth of a great power in the Orient.

One must only comment that this power is altogether likely to develop under Soviet tutelage, if it does not come with American assistance. Surely one cannot view with equanimity the evolution of a Soviet system reaching from the Baltic in the north to the Pacific in the east and the Persian Gulf in the south. In such a system that would embrace territories and resources such as no nation has ever known, and more than 600,000,000 people, one might well find the totalitarian heaven of which some may dream, but a heaven that might well spell a totalitarian hell for many minorities within and without who might need to be liquidated in order to achieve the dream of peace.

With Britain and Russia somewhat preoccupied in reconstruction for the next quarter of a century, and with the immediate and pressing problem of Europe on their doorsteps, it might well be America would be permitted to contribute to the development of a China which might offer a bulwark for peace, not only in Asia but in the great area of the earth washed by the waters of the Pacific.

Such, at any rate, is a possibility in American foreign policy that may well be seriously considered.

Meanwhile, America, with or without an association of nations—and I am one of those who has dedicated my efforts throughout the past two decades to a better understanding of this problem and to the development of some form of association calculated to discourage war—must yet recognize the absolute necessity of an America that shall be informed and prepared and alert.

To this end America needs a State Department that shall reflect the vigor and vitality represented by the recent reorganization.

America also needs and must have an all-American communication system extending around the world, to tell the story of America to the other peoples of the earth, undiluted and uncensored, and to enable America to receive undiluted and uncensored the story of other peoples of the earth. All too long American communications have been depending upon the collaboration of other powers.

America also needs and must have an all-American air system to use the air bases which we have developed throughout the world at an expense of $500,000,000. As Americans are able in this next century to visit the other sections of the earth, through the marvels of air transportation, that may take us in 2 days to any portion of the earth at an expense that will be within the means of middle class Americans, we shall have an opportunity to see the glories and ruins of other civilizations and also the sink-holes and cesspools in which these wars are bred.

In this way America will come to know the world and the world will come to know America as it comes in contact with middle-class Americans, rather than the rich playboys who have all too long misrepresented America to the world.

America also needs and must have an all-American merchant marine to use the 40,000,000 tons of merchant shipping, with which we shall end this war, built by the American taxpayers at an expense of nearly $20,000,000,000 and carrying one-third to one-half of the American foreign trade.

Here is the challenge to America as America takes its place at the council tables of the nations, ready to have its proper voice in the decisions of the future as to the peace of the world.

Never again must America be plunged into strife without volition upon its part by the gradual encroachment of struggles born far from our shores but leading America eventually to war, whether it be the death of an archduke in Austria or the problem of the Polish boundary.

America must be heard first, rather than last. Never again must America be drawn in to determine at tremendous sacrifice the final issue of these struggles, but rather, have its voice heard in preliminary discussions and determine the course which may be calculated to preserve the peace.

In order to achieve this goal there must not be sole dependence upon a Congress or a President, but rather upon the informed and alert intelligence of the great mass of citi-

zens of the United States if we are to be true to our democratic traditions and direct the course of our own destiny.

This is the challenge to Americans everywhere as we prepare the way for the return of our 11,000,000 sons who are now in service, and seek to give to them a guarantee that their sons shall not be compelled in their day to make a similar sacrifice.

Portion of Article To Appear in Encyclopedia Americana on Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, special permission has been given by the Encyclopedia Americana to the author of the article on cartels which is shortly to be printed in Encyclopedia Americana for its inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The author, Mr. Howard W. Ambruster, of Westfield, N. J., has suggested to me that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and since there is so much discussion of the problem of cartels and so much need for a clear understanding of just what that word means, I am asking consent to include with my remarks on three occasions portions of Mr. Ambruster's article.

It is understood that this material cannot be reproduced except by special permission from the Encyclopedia Americana.

There follows the third portion of the article:

Statutory control: In the United States restrictive trade agreements have by no means been limited to associates of the German supercartel and ever since the various antitrust laws, including the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914, were passed, many of the prosecutions brought under them have been based upon understandings between legally independent enterprises which come within the definition of cartel agreements. A typical case was one in which the defense was that the agreement complained of was made necessary by vicious price cutting. This appears to be the most potent argument for the cartel theory which its advocates have ever advanced; but in this case (*United States* v. *Addyston Pipe & Steel Co.* (85 Fed. 271, 1898)) Chief Justice William Howard Taft, then Federal circuit judge, declared that contracts made with a view to check ruinous competition were illegal, being in restraint of trade. As a later example may be cited prosecution and fines of nine cheese companies in 1944 for a cartel-like, price-fixing conspiracy.

Although the American antitrust laws forbid all understandings between separate enterprises which may restrain trade and the courts have invariably upheld these statutes as applicable to cartel associations, several statutes have been enacted which appeared to legalize restraints upon competition more or less privately arranged. The most important of these was the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, which approved codes of fair competition and under which, until it was declared invalid in 1935, a total of 874 codes were approved by the National Recovery Administration (N. R. A.). These codes contained almost countless provisions to govern independent enterprises which directly or indirectly controlled selling prices and in some instances restricted production or allocated markets, all of which arrangements met the cartel definition.

Other legislation which appeared to legalize certain cartel practices included the Federal bituminous coal statutes of 1935 and 1937 relating to production and prices; the so-called hot-oil State and Federal laws of the 1930's restricting production and marketing; State and Federal laws governing trucking rates; the Capper-Volstead Act of 1922 authorizing cooperative agricultural marketing; and numerous State fair-trade laws, followed in 1937 by amendment to the antitrust laws known as the Miller-Tydings Act which legalized resale price maintenance where State laws so permitted.

Export associations, or cartels for foreign sales, were definitely legalized in the United States by the Webb-Pomerene Act of 1918, and the Federal Trade Commission has reported that 118 such associations were formed under this statute with an annual average of 50 in operation. This law provided that domestic producers could form associations of the cartel type for the export of their products, but it also specifically forbade restraint of trade within the United States.

Regardless of these exceptions it has been said that, as compared with the attitude of other countries, the policy of the United States Government has been against cartels; that of England has been tolerance; and that of Germany, official encouragement.

In Great Britain the common law, legal tradition, and national individualism have long opposed contracts restraining trade but court decisions have varied and it has been found not illegal to form cartel associations. Also, in certain industries, notably coal, the essentials of cartelization have been required by statute. The Board of Trade, since 1920, has been authorized to inquire into the operation of cartels but has made little use of this power.

Of British Empire countries, Canada has had a special cartel law by which the lowering of tariff duties might be utilized in order to check excessive prices thus brought about. New Zealand has also made use of tariff reductions as reprisal for cartel increase in prices on commodities. And Russia, prior to the revolution, did likewise. German law originally forbade any arrangements which were against public policy or should injure others, but the law against restraint of trade was ambiguous, and in the early days of modern cartel development the Bavarian supreme court held that businessmen in an industry suffering from a depression could legally agree among themselves to limit production and raise prices.

In the period following the First World War protests at the activities of domestic cartels resulted in the German cartel court law of 1923 providing for the regulation of such agreements in the public interest. No drastic action came from this court and, following the economic crisis of 1930 and 1933, final power over cartels was given to the minister of economics. From then on, in Germany cartels gradually lost their natural or economic functions and became directly an important phase of the Government structure.

Earlier protests against cartel abuses had resulted in 1926 in an official investigational body the "enqueteausschuss" to inquire into causes of economic distress. This agency made extensive studies of cartel policy and laws relating thereto, finally reporting that it had no fixed ideas as to what should be done about the cartels inside Germany and that it would be impracticable to attempt to establish international control of world cartels. Other countries where national or international cartels have operated usually have had special statutes against restraints of trade, most of which were enacted long before the era of the modern cartel, and have been enforced against these associations only to a limited extent.

The French cartels, called comptoirs or syndicates, existed from the last quarter of the nineteenth century in defiance of the French Penal Code; then in 1926 were legalized with a restriction to what were defined as normal profits. In Denmark, Holland, and Sweden, after the First World War, official investigations were held on the subject of cartel control, with the result only that Sweden in 1925, began the appointment of experts to supervise such associations. In Norway laws were passed in 1920 and 1926 compelling cartels (and trusts) to supply information, and for their regulation by administrative bodies. It would appear that the maximum of statutory control of cartels which existed outside of the United States during their period of development in the early part of the twentieth century consisted mainly of oldtime restrictions against unfair competition, monopoly and profiteering, along with a few newly adopted provisions for some kind of administrative supervisions for some kind of administrative supervision of cartels.

Effects of tariff barriers: The relationship of tariff protection to the formation of both national and international cartels has been frequently discussed in the literature but there appears to be no unanimity of opinion as to whether the erection or the lowering of tariff barriers has any definite effect upon the efforts of producers to cartelize an industry. It has also been pointed out that the international cartel can by its own private devices defeat the governmental tariff policy of any nation, either by dumping its product below cost through the duties of a high tariff in order to destroy a protected industry; or by arbitrarily fixing a higher price for shipments into an area in which the duty on an article which must be imported has been removed in order to lower the domestic price.

From time to time, suggestions have been made for unifying cartel law in the countries where the problem has arisen. Some authorities have been of the opinion that the difficulties of doing this are too considerable. Other students appear to believe that the real problem has been the difficulty in enforcing existing laws of many countries which forbid the principle on which the cartel is organized. It might be summed up that in every country cartels have been forbidden in theory but accepted (to some degree) in practice.

Advocates of the cartel as an economic necessity or a device which is beneficial to the public welfare usually ignore its monopolistic aspects and argue that it is an aid to economic stability or equilibrium in the industry which is cartelized. After the First World War in the era of cartel expansion its advocates began to use the word "rationalization" as a comprehensive description of the purpose and scope of these industrial agreements. The accepted definitions of this word indicate its customary application to mental processes, usually in a relative sense; so it appears necessary to examine the application of the word to the cartel in terms which relate to such organizations. As representative of the viewpoint of advocates of the cartel, the report of the Economic Conference of the League of Nations in 1927, already mentioned, stated its understanding of rationalization to be "the methods of technique and of organization designed to secure the minimum of waste of either effort or material. It includes the scientific organization of labors, standardization of both material and of products, simplification of processes, improvements in the system of transport and marketing."

The report went on to say that the benefits of rationalism and scientific management were unanimously recognized by the conference and asserted the need of greater efforts in this field. The conference report finally expressed the conclusion that the judicious and constant application of rationalization was calculated to secure greater security and a higher standard in the conditions of life to the community; lower prices and better goods to the consumer; and higher and steadier remuneration to the producers.

The implication in this discussion of rationalization—that the coordination of effort inherent to the application of scientific management in an industrial plant is the ultimate aim of the cartel and that higher standards of living and lower prices are among its contemplated results—appears confusing when compared with the accepted definitions of the cartel available in the literature on this subject. Confusion is also apparent when considering the accepted definition of rationalization in this application, in the fact that although the purpose of the cartel, to influence competition, is usually rational from the viewpoint of its members, and may be rational from that of its employees, its aims may be, and usually are, irrational from the viewpoint of the cartel's competitors and its customers; and can hardly be considered as rational from the viewpoint of those workers who may be deprived of employment by cartel restrictions of production.

A somewhat different approach to this concept of cartel was expressed in 1928 by William T. Daugherty, United States Trade Commissioner at Berlin, who reported "rationalization begun after the inflation period in Germany, was being sought internationally in the interests of lowering costs by combating overproduction by allocating markets" and that such arrangements involved price fixing.

One of the most elaborate summaries of the benefits sought from the formation of cartels was presented to the T. N. E. C. in 1940, by Dr. Theodore J. Kreps, its economic adviser, and professor of business economics at Stanford University, as follows:

"(1) Lower costs of production because (a) methods of production are standardized through mutual agreement; (b) rate of production is kept at a more uniform level; (c) competitive overexpansion is reduced; (d) risk premium is less, and less stock is necessary to meet unexpected demands; (e) cartel research institutes are established, patents and processes pooled; (f) problems of management are solved in mutual conference.

"(2) Lower marketing costs because (a) advertising is done by cartel (syndicate) rather than individual enterprise; (b) terms of trade are made uniform, preventing unfair competition; (c) transportation expenses to uneconomical markets are eliminated through allocation of markets; (d) exploitation of seller or purchaser of cartel products is avoided through conclusion of intercartel agreements.

"(3) Smoothing out cyclical ups and and downs: (a) Greater equilibrium is obtained between productive capacity, production and consumption; (b) rate of employment is less subject to severe fluctuations; (c) prices are kept at a more stable level."

The comment has been made that many of the benefits indicated by this list are not germane to cartels and can be readily obtained without the intervention of such arrangements; also that these benefits are not by any means assured through the cartelization of an industry. It has been frequently argued that cartel operations do not necessarily mean high prices because efficient production and growing markets may both be stimulated by low prices; also that cartels are considered a stabilizing force because they possess the power to purge business of excesses of competition. Sir Felix J. C. Pole, as chairman of the Associated Electrical Industries, Ltd., a British concern, has advanced the argument that the cartel is designed to prevent extreme or unfair competition and to include the interchange of scientific knowledge, patent rights, and standardization of products.

One of the most forthright expressions of American approval of the theory upon which cartelization is justified was issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in 1939 when it recommended "such modification of the antitrust laws as would make clear the legality of agreements increasing the possibilities of keeping production in proper relation to consumption, with protection of the public interest at all times through Government supervision of such agreements."

Lord Harry Duncan McGowan, head of Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd., of Great Britain, which had world-wide cartel agreements with I. G. Farben and others from its earliest days, replied to criticism in the House of Lords in July 1944 with the emphatic statement that many British manufacturers had "ceased to believe in the inherent superiority of free or extreme competition" and that the purpose of the international cartel was to "regulate but not to abolish competition."

A somewhat unique argument in favor of cartels was advanced, during the era preceding the Second World War, by Baron Alfred M. Melchett, organizer of Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd., who called the international cartel "one of the greatest factors toward international peace."

The cartel and state socialism: As opposed to the corporate owners of cartelized industry, Earl Browder, then general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States, was publicly quoted in 1944 as appearing to approve such devices when he stated that "monopolies and cartels are the natural form of capitalistic economy in its higher stage of development" and that "it is impossible for America to go back to the premonopoly stage." From a somewhat similar approach David H. Macgregor, English writer on the subject, has pointed out the evolutionary significance of the cartel as a step towards socialism, citing the creation of compulsory cartels in England and Germany. It has appeared in a number of instances that a cartelized industry has moved almost automatically into state socialism, as was the case when the German potash law of 1919 placed the management of this industry in the hands of a government council or Reichskalirat. So it would appear that among those who may approve the cartel as a useful phenomenon of economic progress are the followers of Karl Marx who hold that the accumulation of wealth and resulting concentration of economic power must ultimately result in the socialism of industry.

Political power: Some observers have also pointed out that cartelization and its attendant self rule by big business, in Germany, and to a lesser degree in Italy, played an all-important part in the development of totalitarianism and the corporate state in these countries. It might be said that one of the most forceful arguments which has been advanced against the cartel is the aspect of political power which is sought, and at times exercised, by its leaders, especially those of the great international cartels.

Dr. Callmann in his T. N. E. C. testimony expressed the opinion that the cartel movement and self-government of industry are identical and quoted American and German authorities in order to point out the dangers implicit in the tendency of the cartel to acquire influence over such governmental agencies as might interfere with the management and control of cartel activities. John T. Flynn, American economist, has traced the rise of fascism in Germany through the self-rule of industrialists and financiers to the government control of all business, and the armament program to relieve unemployment. Guentner Reiman, German-American economist, in his book The Vampire Economy also refers to the political power sought by cartel leaders in order to safeguard their positions against both social revolutionary forces and business competitors.

Dr. Callmann summed up his conclusion on this aspect of the subject by saying that cartels are a great danger to democracy and that in pre-war Germany eventually, no one knew who had whom on the leash—the industry the government or the government the industry. It has been said to be a moot point as to whether Hitler used the cartels for his purpose or the cartels used Hitler for their purpose. That the I. G. Farben-Steel cartel group helped to finance Hitler's rise to power, and to weaken Germany's intended victims, is indisputable.

Another argument relating to the political influence created by the concentration of industry in the cartels is the fact that labor, therefore, finds it necessary to organize in larger groups and fights for greater political power; so that these two struggling groups grow to powerful states within the state to an extent which may render representatives of the public interest helpless.

Meyer's Lexikon in 1927 stated that among the monopolistic disadvantages of the kartel were the lack of incentive for its members to improve manufacturing processes or the quality of their products; also that firms competing with kartel members were destroyed. Those who criticize the price-fixing proclivities of the cartel have pointed out that all excess profits thus secured by restraint of competition become in effect a private tax levied upon the public without specific warrant of law. This point was raised in 1930 by the editor of the Prager Tagblatt, Walter Wannemacher, who stated that the German people were paying annually to the cartels in excess prices 1,000,-700,000 marks. This sum, equal to $400,000,-000, was equivalent to about one-sixth of the total German Government revenue in that year.

In addition to other criticisms of all types of monopoly which have been mentioned, objection has been made to the defensive purpose of the cartel in discouraging others from engaging in production of like commodities; the charge being that this characteristic becomes a privately operated regimentation of human effort which must result in killing initiative and promoting servility among those who otherwise would respond to the incentive of free enterprise. The problem of the cartel appears to be: Shall it be tolerated, controlled, or abolished?

Bibliography: Liefmann, R., Les Caracteres et Modalites des Cartels, Revue d'Economie Politique, July 1899; Hirst, F. W., Monopolies, Trusts, and Kartels (London, 1905); Report, Alien Property Custodian (Washington, 1919); Delahanty, T. W., German Dyestuff Industry (U. S. Department of Commerce, 1924); Levy, H., Monopolies, Cartels, and Trusts (New York, 1927); Domeratzky, L., The International Cartel Movement (U. S. Department of Commerce, 1928); Tschierschky, S., Review of New Legislation re Cartels (League of Nations, 1932); Callmann, R., Das Deutsche Kartellrecht (Berlin, 1934); Report, Special Committee on Investigation Munitions Industry (U. S. Senate, 1936); Pitigliani, F., Development of Italian Cartels Under Fascism, Journal of Political Economy, 1940; hearings (U. S. Senate Committee on Patents, 1942); Reports, Subcommittee on War Mobilization (U. S. Senate Committee on Military Affairs, 1944).

HOWARD W. AMBRUSTER,
Consulting Engineer.

The German Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Miami Daily News entitled "Our Knottiest Problem: The German Character," by Col. S. G. Shartle, United States Army, retired, who served for many years' in the American Embassy in Berlin as our military attaché, who was American military observer with the German Armies, 1914 and 1915; who was chief of staff, American section, Allied Armistice Commission; and who is the author of a very illuminating book, Spa, Versailles, Munich. I think his contribution is most helpful at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR KNOTTIEST PROBLEM: THE GERMAN CHARACTER

(By Col. S. G. Shartle)

I knew Germany and the Germans before they had slain Siegfried, that stalwart hero of the northern sagas, whose enchanted sword defended the spirit of freedom, killed dragons of evil, and sustained in men a hope for the better things of life. Yes; before the First World War there were good Germans, people decent by our standards, earnest souls with high ideals and patient industry, learned men, scientists, artists—a progressive civilization that had developed mostly from the south, for there the first contacts with our Greek and Roman worlds were made.

The Bavarians, the Swabians, the Franconians, and the Low Saxons, ancient tribes of south and western Germany, had been subject to the influence of Roman civilization and later Italian and French, for centuries before the Prussians were touched. Mostly from these older provinces came the world-famous scholars, poets, and musicians of Germany.

I found in this modern progressive state an orderly society, comfortable living conditions, an intriguing romanticism lightening dullness and rigidity of form, activities of great professional interest to me and to my country.

As to German traits of character, I shall let a German scholar speak, Eugene Diesel, in Germany and the Germans (1929): "Great richness and variety of character, from splendid Siegfried to brooding Hagen; unusual violence and quarrelsomeness; loyalty to principle and leader, but treachery where there is no binding principle. The love of wandering, readiness for war and the chase; long, solemn drinking bouts; passion for nature; sudden enthusiasms; but quickness to take offense, quickness in retaliation, jealousy and vindictiveness. Tragic emotion, the ever-present threat of impending disaster, an atmosphere of stifling gloom, the lack of any firm stability and cohesion."

Complicating the Christian inheritance from the south was a leaven of materialism, cynical philosophy, and a moody strenuousness and harshness of life that we may identify with Prussianism. Symbolizing the brighter side of Germany by the spirit of Siegfried, we as naturally turn to Wotan and his fellow gods to represent the Prussians in our allegory. And the relation is not so fanciful, when we remember that they came under the influence of Christianity, and then only by force, a thousand years after the Germans of the Rhineland.

The affinity, too, is striking, when we consider the characteristics of the Prussians and their pagan gods. Wotan maintained discipline and had a code of honor for his own caste, but for lesser creatures and the "common man" these superbeings had no constraining qualms in the use of expediency, treachery, murderous punishment, or annihilation to gain an end. We need only to read Wagner's Ring of the Nibelungen to understand the amorality of these gods, as he has portrayed them. There is another resemblance between today's nazi-ism, the quintessence of Prussianism, and this paganism, namely, a fatalistic acceptance of what the leaders ordain.

Of course, geographical Prussia of today contains probably a small proportion of the ancient Borussi, a mixture of Slavs and various German tribes. But to the spirit of their Junkers, we can ascribe much of Germany's history for the last 300 years, from the time of the Great Elector (1640–88), through Frederick the Great (1740–86) and Bismarck (prime minister 1862–90), to the Nazi regime, none of them lovers of constitutional liberty. Since the formation of the empire in 1870, Prussian militarism has been supreme. We have to deal now with a Prussianized Germany, that is, a Germany in which this ancient ferment has been brought to a head by a group of fantics, who boast of the dubious virtues of their pagan gods.

Hitler in Mein Kampf, so far as we can extract any philosophic thought from this literary hodge podge, draws largely (without giving credit) from Houston Stewart Chamberlain, certainly in the development of his superrace theory and its corrollaries. Chamberlain was the son-in-law of Wagner, of whose life and works he made a psychological study.

Wagner fitted the Norse myths into an operatic exposition of the philosophy of the moody Schopenhauer, and thus established a cult that has had a great influence on German thought. We need but mention Wagner's shrine at Bayreuth and the annual musical festivals there. Thus these old gods are playing their part in Germany's present-day tragedy.

It is this superrace dream of the leaders of a nation grown powerful at the expense of its neighbors, through Prussian instigation, that has aroused the world. And now the tragedy is ending with the Goetterdaemmerung. The Twilight of the Gods, the last of the Ring. But this time it must be more than their twilight. They and their mythical influence on German thought must be destroyed. For only by the stamping out of Prussianism can the German people be brought into honorable cooperation with their fellow humans.

I have emphasized what seems to me a malign influence in the development of a people otherwise fitted by talent and worthy characteristics to take a promising part in shaping the world. Of course, it would be an error to seek to explain historical events by assigning one or even a multitude of causes, a point made laboriously by Tolstoi in his War and Peace.

When trying to analyze history even with a greater perspective than we now have of this century's events we are confronted with a number of human imponderables that reduces us often to mere reporting. Yet now in order to bring back into the family of nations one that has gone berserk, as did the warriors in the Norse legends, it is necessary to understand, not only the symptoms but the underlying causes that have made this madness possible.

One of the objectives our three great leaders set down at Yalta is to stamp out nazi-ism. What are the conditions that will confront us after crushing German military power? I have said that there were in Germany many decent, high-minded people. Perhaps some of them, beyond the emigrees, have survived. But they are the old and powerless. We know, indisputably, that the greater part of the youth are trained fanatics. These will have to be curbed by force. And no plan that envisages less than the ruthless destruction of Prussianism, as defined, and the supervision of the training of youth for two generations or more, will insure the final goal—a nation that can be trusted and honored as a cooperative member of the family of nations.

This tutelage need not be harsh and onerous, but it must be effective. We have a nation to make over, or at least the eradication of some deeply rooted mores of pagan descent, but there is a nucleus within of well-disposed humans. On these and the implementation of the ideals of the Atlantic Charter we must depend.

If I were choosing a slogan for the supervising council, I should go to Emerson and set down his words: "To gain a friend, be a friend." A friend, however, is not a wobbly weakling, who warms himself by indiscriminate indulgence of those he would influence. There will be many Germans who will try to take advantage of kindness. But there will also be sober Germans who will respond to a combination of fair dealing and firmness. Obedience to authority is ingrained and that will help.

Recalling some of the wheedling, whining, protesting, tearful memorials, and argumentative demands of the German representatives on the Armistice Commission at Spa (1918–19), I have some appreciation of the greater task ahead for a post-war governing authority in this land of chaos. I fear that only supersolons and saints, combined, can succeed. Immediacy must be tempered by the long view. Actions stimulated by vengeance and vindictiveness, commercial advantages, and political power, whether detrimental to allies or the prostrate enemy should be avoided. I saw too much of this at the end of the last war on the part of some of our associates, brave in war but not wise in peace. The traders were busy with their order books in Germany before the peace treaty was signed, and Shylock was out for his pound of flesh.

Now, this is not to argue that the war criminals shall not be punished and nazi-ism rooted out tooth and nail. Their elimination, however, should be considered a means to an end, not the main objective. The solution of the German problem will require a major operation, but let us keep in mind the cure sought—the reform of Deutschtum and with it the establishment of a long peace.

International Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] at a dinner

given by the independent citizens' committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions in New York City on February 18, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Basic in any plan for maintaining international security is the necessity for juridical machinery empowered to adjudicate controversies over the international economic claims and policies of the world's family of nations. International security and international economic exploitation are not marriageable. Our first objective toward the goal of international security and permanent peace must be to eliminate as much as good faith alliances can eliminate the danger of military aggression by outlaw nations. I believe that the principles and objectives of the Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta Conferences offer the only immediate hope for freedom from another world war within another 25 years.

However, time has a tendency to erode social institutions as well as our physical environment. Even if we could satisfy the demands of the perfectionists in the peace plans which will eventually be adopted at the close of this war, nevertheless the ravages of time would crumble them unless they are built on the dynamic laws of social growth and change rather than the statics of fixity and inevitable deterioration.

A great step forward will have been taken when we adopt a code of international law and order backed up by adequate police power to maintain international security from military aggression. If our generation can make that contribution to the advancement of man's humanity to man, it will have kept faith with all that has gone before and much which can come hereafter.

Hence our immediate objective in the development of a world order of international security must be the demilitarization of Germany and Japan and the empowering of a council of the family of nations to oppose with force if necessary any military aggression by any nation.

However, let us not lose sight of the fact that the principles of the Atlantic Charter are not compatible with any world organization designed to prevent war, even though the dominant nations in that organization are the United States, England, Russia, France, and China, unless the organization also provides machinery for preventing economic as well as military exploitation.

Granted that the first need for international security is machinery for controlling military aggression, we must not lose sight of the fact that economic warfare has been the forerunner of most military wars and the chief causitive factor producing many wars. International economic security for many nations, if not for all, is probably decades away. Economic exploitation, like all sin, springs from the nature of man and his inherent selfishness. Sentiment and probably idealism have little place in a discussion of international economics except on the part of those of us who believe that even practical realism isn't very practical or real unless it recognizes the superiority of human values over material things, even when material tests are applied to international economic values.

Equality of economic opportunity so glibly spoken of by many professed idealists is neither very desirable or possible if its accomplishment is to be sought overnight. Those who emote about it, but fail to recognize its social relationship to the social, educational, and economic maturity of a people, overlook, I fear, the cruelty that would accompany an attempt to bring about equality of economic opportunity the world around in a decade or in two or longer in some parts of the world. International security cannot be accomplished on the economic front by those who seem to think that progress is synonomous with social avalanche or economic revolution.

To strike a balance of conscionable compromise in our approaches to the many facets of the great task of building and steadily improving a world order of international security, is the trust and opportunity of the statesmen of the world—not only political statesmen, but statesmen of industry, agriculture, labor, business, and the professions as well.

Only by conscionable compromises on the many fronts of human controversies which affect our international relations, can we help to build a world order of international security.

Thus, those American bankers who seem to be so unalterably opposed to the principles of Bretton Woods, must give greater evidence that tney appreciate the fact that international security, militarily or economically, cannot be maintained unless the stability of foreign exchange is maintained. Granted that instability of foreign exchange may be the source of great revenue for some world bankers, it is also one of the causes of great international insecurity. This is just one specific instance in which I think an economic group should be willing to accept a conscionable compromise in the interest of greater international economic security and cooperation among nations on the economic front.

I am one who believes that the United States can best protect both its sovereignty as a nation and its economic self interest so essential to maintaining our political democracy and our American economic way of life by active participation in an international organization which seeks by way of conscionable compromises to so adjust the relations between nations in accordance with rules of reason and common sense as to maintain and perpetuate international security.

Knights of Columbus Educational Trust Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me with respect to the Knights of Columbus educational trust fund for the benefit of orphaned sons and daughters of members of the Knights of Columbus who may lose their lives in World War No. 2, or who may become totally disabled from military causes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to call attention to the excellent post-war educational plan recently inaugurated by Knights of Columbus. It is known as the educational trust fund by the Knights of Columbus.

It is a fund of $1,000,000 that is being raised by the members of this organization to provide a college education for the orphan sons and daughters of the members of the society who may lose their lives in World War No. 2, or who may become totally disabled from military causes.

It is stated that more than 90,000 Knights of Columbus have entered the armed forces of the United States and the Allied Nations and that up to the present date more than 1,000 members have lost their lives or are missing in action.

Statistics are being collected as to name, present age, status, and school age of the children of members of the armed forces so that the benefits may accrue as soon as possible.

This program was submitted to the Veterans' Administration and met with the approval of General Hines and his staff. No legislation up to the present time provides any plan for the college education of the children of veterans who have lost their lives in combat, so the Knights of Columbus plan is original and will be especially helpful to children of the group of veterans for whom it seeks to provide educational opportunities. Certainly such a humanitarian undertaking by this fraternal society will receive the approval and gratitude of all Americans, and I venture to hope that it may lead to similar action on the part of other Nation-wide fraternal organizations.

Operations of the F. H. A. in Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Abner H. Ferguson, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, relative to the operations of that Administration in Utah.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1945.

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator THOMAS: Although for obvious reasons during the war emergency the F. H. A. has not made its customary periodical reports to Senators and Congressmen on F. H. A. operations in their States, I feel this practice should now be resumed.

The F. H. A., as you know, operates entirely through the private capital of local financial institutions. It insures the loans these institutions make for property repair and mortgages for the purchase of homes and the construction of new homes.

At the end of June 1944, a total of $9,860,685 lent by these institutions has enabled 30,122 Utah families to maintain or improve their properties, while over 8,920 families have been able to buy or build homes through mortgage loans amounting to over $34,896,815.

In addition, 5,971 families of war workers, newly arrived in war congested areas in Utah, have been provided with homes through mortgage loans amounting to over $28,008,400.

The F. H. A. has for over 5 years been paying all operating expenses and losses of its mortgage insurance programs, at the same time adding substantially to its insurance reserves, which now total more than $97,000,000. Losses have been only a fraction of 1 percent. Likewise, the property repair pro-

gram is currently paying its own way from revenues derived from insurance premiums and for nearly a year collections on defaulted loans have shown a substantial margin over claims paid.

I am particularly happy to advise you that within 60 to 90 days the F. H. A. will start distribution of mortgage prepayment dividends to 13,000 home buyers who paid off their mortgages in full during the calendar year 1944. These mortgages were in group accounts which had developed credit balances by January 1, 1944. These dividends will range from a few dollars to nearly $200 each.

I am sure you will agree this is a gratifying record.

Sincerely yours,

ABNER H. FERGUSON,
Commissioner.

United Nations Conference at San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on the 6th of March 1945 the Secretary of State issued two statements announcing the issuance of invitations to the United Nations Conference to be held at San Francisco on April 25, 1945, and giving an explanation of the provisions of the text on voting procedure in the security council of the general international organization proposed at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. I ask unanimous consent that the statements be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF STATEMENT MADE BY THE HONORABLE EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR., SECRETARY OF STATE, AT MEXICO CITY, AT THE CHAPULTEPEC CASTLE ON MARCH 5, 1945

I am happy to be able to make a most significant announcement, here in Mexico City, concerning the future world organization for peace and security.

As I arise to speak the Government of the United States, acting on behalf of the sponsoring Governments—the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China—is transmitting invitations to the United Nations Conference to be held at San Francisco on April 25.

I regret exceedingly that the Provisional Government of France has not accepted our invitation to become one of the sponsoring countries for the San Francisco Conference.

Issuance of the formal invitation to meet only 7 weeks from now in San Francisco is another step toward a goal which is in the minds and in the hearts of all of us—establishment of an enduring peace after victory in this war.

In October 1943 the signatories of the Moscow Declaration pledged themselves to cooperate with each other and with the other nations devoted to peace in creating a general international organization for the maintenance of peace and security.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference was the next step necessary in the carrying out of this vast program. From that conference there emerged the proposals which we are studying here in Mexico City.

The conversations at Dumbarton Oaks left open the question of voting procedure in the Security Council. A proposal on this subject has now been agreed upon in the manner stated in the text of the invitation to the San Francisco Conference, which I shall read to you in a moment. This was one of the great accomplishments under President Roosevelt's leadership at the Crimea Conference.

In Mexico City the 20 countries here represented are taking another important step toward the establishment of a world organization. Our task here has been to exchange views, and to clarify our thoughts, on the essential features of the world organization of the future and on the relationship to it of our own inter-American system, and thus to prepare ourselves more fully for the work to be undertaken at San Francisco.

It is my great pleasure now to read to you the text of the invitation to the Conference, which includes the proposed provisions for voting in the Security Council.

"The Government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Republic of China, invites your Government to send representatives to a Conference of the United Nations to be held on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco in the United States of America to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"The above-named Governments suggest that the Conference consider as affording a basis for such a charter the Proposals for the Establishment of a General International Organization, which were made public last October as a result of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and which have now been supplemented by the following provisions for section C of chapter VI:

" 'C. Voting:

" '1. Each member of the Security Council should have one vote.

" '2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.

" '3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members, including the concurring vote of permanent members, provided that, in decisions under chapter VIII, section A, and under the second sentence of paragraph 1 of chapter VIII, section C, a party to a dispute should abstain from voting.'

"Further information as to arrangements will be transmitted subsequently. In the event that your Government desires in advance of the Conference to present views or comments concerning the proposals, the Government of the United States of America will be pleased to transmit such views and comments to the other participating governments."

The proposed provisions for voting in the Security Council are those which were presented by the President of the United States at the Crimea Conference; they were there agreed to by Great Britain and by the Soviet Union and have since been approved by China.

I wish at this time to comment to you briefly on the significance of the proposal on voting procedure. This procedure means that whenever any member of the Council—including any permanent member—is a party to a dispute, that member cannot vote in any decision of the Council involving peaceful settlement of that dispute. Consequently, the Council can examine the dispute thoroughly and the remaining members can make recommendations to all the parties to the dispute as to methods and procedures for settling it. They can refer the legal aspects of the dispute to the international court for advice. They can refer the dispute to the general assembly if they wish; and they can take any other appropriate steps short of enforcement measures to obtain a settlement of that dispute without the vote of the member of the Security Council involved in the dispute.

This means that all members of the Security Council when they are parties to a dispute will be on the same footing before this Council. It means that no nation in the world will be denied the right to have a fair hearing of its case in the Security Council, and that the equal, democratic rights of all nations will be respected.

If the dispute is not settled by such means, the major question before the Council is whether force needs to be employed. In that event, it is necessary that the vote of the permanent members of the Council be unanimous. They are the nations which possess in sufficient degree the industrial and military strength to prevent aggression. However, the decision of the Council can be reached in such a case only by a majority of seven members, which means that the permanent members cannot alone decide to take action. It also means that the nonpermanent members can prevent action.

I am happy to say that I have here to hand to each of you a more detailed memorandum on the voting procedure which I am sure you will wish to study.

The invitation to the San Francisco Conference suggests that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals be considered as affording a basis for the charter of the world organization. It is the wish of the United States, as it is, I am confident, of the other sponsoring nations, that there should also be the fullest opportunity at that conference for consideration of the views and suggestions of all the participating governments. I know that the contributions of the distinguished statesmen of the American republics will be most valuable in the writing of the charter.

The responsibility for the establishment and maintenance of a peaceful world order is the common responsibility of all the United Nations. It is on them that the duty has now fallen to write a charter for the international organization so firmly rooted in the realities of the world as it is and so clearly expressing the free and democratic ideals for which the United Nations stand, that it will truly represent both the will of the peoples of the world for lasting peace and their capacity actually to build and to maintain such a peace together.

We have the opportunity. We have the will. May God grant us the vision and the strength to sustain us. It is my faith that together we will build this world of freedom and security—a world at peace at last.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR.

Today, with the issuance of the invitations to the San Francisco Conference, there have been made public the provisions of the text on voting procedure in the Security Council of the general international organization proposed at Dumbarton Oaks.

The practical effect of these provisions, taken together, is that a difference is made, so far as voting is concerned, between the quasi-judicial function of the Security Council in promoting the pacific settlement of disputes and the political function of the Council in taking action for the maintenance of peace and security.

Where the Council is engaged in performing its quasi-judicial function of promoting pacific settlement of disputes, no nation, large or small, should be above the law. This means that no nation, large or small, if a party to a dispute, would participate in the decisions of the Security Council on questions like the following:

(a) Whether a matter should be investigated;

(b) Whether the dispute or situation is of such a nature that its continuation is likely to threaten the peace;

(c) Whether the Council should call on the parties to settle a dispute by means of their own choice;

(d) Whether, if the dispute is referred to the Council, a recommendation should be made as to methods and procedures of settlement;

(e) Whether the Council should make such recommendations before the dispute is referred to it;

(f) What should be the nature of this recommendation;

(g) Whether the legal aspect of the dispute should be referred to the court for advice;

(h) Whether a regional agency should be asked to concern itself with the dispute; and

(i) Whether the dispute should be referred to the general assembly.

Where the Council is engaged in performing its political functions of action for maintenance of peace and security, a difference is made between the permanent members of the Council and other nations for the practical reason that the permanent members of the Council must, as a matter of necessity, bear the principal responsibility for action. Unanimous agreement among the permanent members of the Council is therefore requisite. In such matters, therefore, the concurrence of all the permanent members would be required. Examples are:

(a) Determination of the existence of a threat or breach of the peace;

(b) Use of force or other enforcement measures;

(c) Approval of agreements for supply of armed forces;

(d) Matters relating to the regulation of armaments; and

(e) Matters concerning the suspension and expulsion of members, and the admission of new members.

At the Crimea Conference the Government of the United States of America was authorized, on behalf of the three Governments there represented, to consult the Government of the Republic of China and the Provisional Government of the French Republic in order to invite them to sponsor invitations jointly with the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to a conference of United Nations called to meet at San Francisco on April 25, 1945.

Those consultations have now been held. The Government of the Republic of China has agreed to join in sponsoring invitations to the San Francisco Conference. The Provisional Government of the French Republic has agreed to participate in the Conference but, after consultation with the sponsoring Governments, the Provisional Government—which did not participate in the Dumbarton Oaks conversations—is not joining in sponsoring the invitations.

Today, at noon Washington time, representatives of the Government of the United States of America stationed at various capitals throughout the world are presenting to to the Government of 39 different United Nations the following invitation:

"The Government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialistic Republics, and the Republic of China, invites the Government of (name of government invited was inserted here) to send representatives to a conference of the United Nations to be held on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco in the United States of America to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The above-named governments suggest that the conference consider as affording a basis for such a charter the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization, which were made public last October as a result of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and which have now been supplemented by the following provisions for section C of chapter VI:

"C. Voting:

"1. Each member of the Security Council should have one vote.

"2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.

"3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under chapter VIII, section A, and under the second sentence of paragraph 1 of chapter VIII, section C, a party to a dispute should abstain from voting."

Further information as to arrangements will be transmitted subsequently. In the event that the Government of (name of government invited was inserted here) desires in advance of the Conference to present views or comments concerning the proposals, the Government of the United States of America will be pleased to transmit such views and comments to the other participating governments.

The invitation has been presented to the Governments of the following United Nations: Commonwealth of Australia, Kingdom of Belgium, Republic of Bolivia, United States of Brazil, Canada, Republic of Chile, Republic of Colombia, Republic of Costa Rica, Republic of Cuba, Czechoslovak Republic, Dominican Republic, Republic of Ecuador, Kingdom of Egypt, Empire of Ethiopia, Kingdom of Greece, Republic of Guatemala, Republic of Haiti, Republic of Honduras, India, Empire of Iran, Kingdom of Iraq, the Republic of Liberia, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, United Mexican States, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Dominion of New Zealand, Republic of Nicaragua, Kingdom of Norway, Republic of Panama, Republic of Paraguay, Republic of Peru, Commonwealth of the Philippines, Republic of El Salvador, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the Republic of Turkey, Union of South Africa, Oriental Republic of Uruguay, United States of Venezuela, Kingdom of Yugoslavia.

Threats From National Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 26), 1945

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Threats From National Socialism," published in the Charlotte Observer of February 13, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREATS FROM NATIONAL SOCIALISM

Henry A. Wallace is a symbol of a philosophy of government for this Nation which accounts for the raging and furious controversy in Congress as to whether he should be confirmed as Secretary of Commerce.

He is the embodiment of an issue that is fairly in the face of the people of this country for future finality of decision.

Stripped of all of its external camouflage that issue is simply this:

Is America to continue to be the America that it has been or is it to be something else?

More concretely, is this Nation to preserve its democratic traditions and principles or is it to be converted to national socialism?

National socialism has been an odorous phrase with the American people. Indeed, more than odorous; abominable and repulsive.

National socialism is what they have had in Germany. It is Hitler's baby. It is called nazi-ism. And the countries of our western world are spending oceans of blood to destroy it in the war for defense of civilized virtues.

National socialism is also a child of Mussolini. He called it fascism, but, essentially and fundamentally it worked upon the same principle as that upon which national socialism must always operate.

National socialism is likewise the creation of Russia. Stalin doesn't call it that. He calls it communism. But communism, like fascism, is twin-born with national socialism.

So, after all, what America faces is but another name for what Berlin has, and what Rome had before our soldiers and those of England, the great western democracies drove Mussolini from his throne seat.

So, also, what we face in America is, by another name, what Moscow still has and which Stalin seems to be determined to spread as far as possible across all the peoples and governments of Europe; perhaps, he hopes even the whole world.

These are hard sayings. They link the United States with what we have always in this country conceived to be at opposite ends with our democracy.

National socialism is struggling to become the dominant social, political, and economic philosophy of this country.

And Henry A. Wallace, good, earnest, capable, honest, and personally upright man that he is, is its major prophet.

What is national socialism? Well, whatever else it may be, it is founded upon the principle that the state is the supreme authority over all individual affairs of its people.

This is what it has been in Rome, and is now in Berlin and Moscow.

The fear is that what Mr. Wallace advocates is, in principle, too close to these apostacies to suit a free America.

They may deny and resent the imputation, but the trends and facts of their political preachments will not be brushed aside by the pious and even honest dreams of the utopianists.

National socialism represents the accumulation of all legislative control over all the people of America. If allowed to come to its full ripening it would mean that the end has come not only to private enterprise but to democracy in America.

National socialism would destroy the foundations upon which America's economic life has been created.

That means, for one thing, that the American tradition disappears, that the American way of life as we have always known it is scuttled. It would mean in the end that our Government would become a government not founded upon the law and the Constitution but upon the whims and caprices of bureaucrats.

Or call them by an even sterner name, dictators.

This is not what they would like to be called, but this is what they would inevitably become if the philosophy of Mr. Wallace and his supporters should prevail.

They might be benevolent dictators, at least at first, but they would rule, nevertheless, with a hand of iron and steel over all the existing freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution. The principles they propose would give them no other option or alternative.

Do you wish to know what has always been the print of the feet of national socialism coming into power, the historical and plain print of its feet?

First, the people are made to feel that they are incapable and incompetent to overcome their own handicaps and master their own difficulties.

Again, every vestage of local selflessness there is held up before them the lovely and benign face and form of an all-powerful government upon which they may lean for succor, to which they may look for guidance, and from which they may derive every cure for their ills from its magic apothecary.

Once in this state of mind of help—government must be subordinated if not entirely eliminated. When a central government becomes totalitarian nothing is left in the way of authority for the state and lesser units of government to do except as they are told they must do.

A third step is to discredit and to ridicule whatever form of popular government may exist. This would mean, in America's case, our constitutional principles.

A fourth way by which democracy is destroyed is that of the intimidation and defeat of men of independent minds in high places of public authority.

They are rebuked by special interests, they are threatened by separate blocs of voters, they are coerced and threatened by selfish and power-crazy organized minorities.

Another step in the direction of national socialism is the destruction of individual incentive to be thrifty, industrious, and self-reliant.

The weapon that is used to achieve this end is very old and familiar. It is that of taxation.

What incentive is left today to any young American to go into business for himself, to make a success of it, to accumulate his earnings in order to expand his business activities, to establish an enterprise of his own, when the Government comes right along behind him to take its toll of almost all that he has accumulated, thereby rendering it impossible for him to grow and expand?

A further process by which national socialism is established is that of controlling the free activities of the citizens.

Instead of having a government undergirded by law, a government comes into being by which the people are governed by the dictates of a directive.

Of course, that is merely another way of saying that a government of men would succeed a government of laws. And when any people come to that sorry and tragic pass they have come to the end of the rope in a democracy.

These are merely some of the signs of the approaches of national socialism. We submit that all of these signs and more are already written in large letters against the sky of America.

Let us go back to the beginning. National socialism in its simplest and clearest form produces the all powerful central government with supreme authority over the people, arrogating to itself the right to destroy the rights which a free people are guaranteed under the Constitution.

Mr. Wallace veers too far to the left of this philosophy. Many of his economic views are sound. America of the future must have more creative jobs and higher wages, but these should come from private enterprise and not Federal bounties if national socialism is to be kept out of our economic system.

All the leaners, shirkers, slackers, and those who never hope to go far on the momentum of their own dreaming and planning, are satisfied to have a national government that will keep them up and standing on public crutches.

But that is not the process by which a people wax strong or a nation grows great.

It is one of the major and most menacing delusions of modern times that the need is for strong government instead of wise government which is invested with the virtues of insight, dignity, moderation, justice, tolerance, and a sharp sense of social values.

Strong governments force men into artificial loyalty to their slogans. But wise governments draw men into authentic loyalty to their good purposes.

Dictatorship, which is another name for centralized authority and which, in turn, is another name for national socialism, offers the surest way to strong government.

But democracy offers us the surest possibility of wise and constructive government.

The epic struggle between these two basic conceptions and philosophies of government, if we interpret correctly the present trend, is well on the way toward a decision in this country. While we are in the midst of a revolutionary war spawned by tyrants abroad who created strong governments, we are also in the midst of a revolution here at home which threatens the foundation of our democracy which Hitler and Hirohito and Mussolini hate.

What a Young Naval Hero Wrote His Mom and Dad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as we scan the long list of mounting casualties from the several war fronts of the world, we are daily reminded of the grim realities of war.

Under the leave granted me, I am including as a part of my remarks for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, excerpts from several letters written home to his parents by a gallant young naval officer, Ensign Roland F. Johnson, who recently joined the growing caravan of American sons who have paid the supreme sacrifice.

Roland Johnson was the only son of Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Johnson, of Houston, Tex., where he also resided prior to this war and where he was engaged in the practice of law. He had gained a State-wide reputation as a brilliant and unusually successful attorney before the courts of that State.

The young flight officer, who had completed many dangerous missions in the southwest Pacific, had received several decorations and commendations for his outstanding feats in combat, including a personal letter of commendation from Admiral Nimitz, but like other American heroes, was so modest that he much preferred no publicity concerning his many combat victories. He was one of my several beloved nephews who entered the armed services and the second nephew who has lost his life during this tragic war. His bombing plane, VP-13, carrying a crew of 12 other fine young men, crashed and burned over a tiny unnamed island in the Pacific, causing the total destruction of all the crew. For that reason, no funeral could be held. However, beautiful and impressive memorial services were held in his memory, consisting entirely of excerpts from letters written to his parents, in which he poured out his devotion to them, to his God, and to his country. I attended the services.

Not only because of my admiration and deep affection for him, but for the reason that I am hopeful that quotations from several of his thought-provoking letters will be of interest and inspiration to other men and officers in the armed forces, as well as consolation to other grief-stricken parents who also have sacrificed their sons, I am submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD portions of some of Ensign Johnson's letters to his devoted parents, as follows:

HIS FIRST LETTER HOME

DEAR MOM AND DAD: I am convinced that the fighting forces and the Governments of Germany and Japan must be broken before there can be any lasting peace. I believe these two nations will overrun our country, and conquer it unless our military forces prevent it. These beliefs of mine are fundamentally reasoned, undisputed truths. They are not schoolboy fancies. Time was when I was not convinced of some of them, but events of recent months have proven them to me. There are still some who insist that Germany and Japan have no designs on our country. To those I can only say, they are already here. They are here now. We can't send a ship from a Gulf port without the realization of the possibilities. Hundreds of American ships have been sunk within sight of our coast. The war has already been brought to us. You have to see only one seaman, his eyes blinded and his body burned, spitting oil from his seared lungs to realize this.

I want Germany and Japan stopped before their armies get to our country, not after. I don't want the United States to be the scene of a single battle. I have talked with too many boys who have seen those battlefields.

My conviction then is that we must defeat the armies of Japan and Germany now. I believe their defeat to be more important than I am. I believe it must be done for you and the Nation, and I believe I ought to be a part of it, and I want to be a part of it.

It is easy to fall into the thinking that my part will be so insignificant as to be of no material consequence. This is uneasy reasoning. No one man is important alone, but as a part of the whole he becomes so. I just want to be a part of the whole and some way do my part.

EXPRESSES FAITH IN GOD

I realize that your chief concern is of my being hurt. These chances are little greater in the Air Service than in other branches. Apparently, the odds have little to do with it anyway. Babies die before they have even begun to breathe. People step off a curb into it. Others pick up the wrong bottle from the medicine cabinet. Some put their hand on a live wire. An unloaded gun goes off. A tire blows out. All of this with no plan or design, without any reason that is apparent to us. But I believe there is a plan. I believe God Almighty let's us each go as He has willed it. I believe God makes a decision in each case.

FROM PREFLIGHT SCHOOL

ATHENS, GA., *October 1, 1942.*

The courses here last about 3 months—then another school for 3 months of basic training—another 3 months secondary, then advance, and after that additional specialized training. In spite of their pressing need of pilots, the Navy is lengthening rather than shortening the courses, on the growing realization that one good pilot is worth ten mediocre ones.

* * * * *

We have been moving so fast that this is literally the first opportunity that I have had to sit down. We get up at 6 o'clock and turn in about 10 p. m. and, believe me, this bunk with no innerspring mattress really feels good. You wouldn't recognize me—no hair at all and I have gained about 4 pounds. They surely pour the groceries to us. No liberty except Saturday and Sunday afternoons. Everyone must go to chapel Sunday morning. All in all, I know I am going to like it here. Never felt better.

PRAISES ARMY CHAPLAIN

Chapel services today seemed to be a fine combination of Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Episcopalian all rolled into one. After a couple of good old Baptist hymns, the chaplain preached a good sermon on Missing Things in Life. During the course of it, he made the point that the Old Testament emphasized godliness based on fear of punishment. That the New Testament, in the story of Jesus, directing us to pattern our lives after His, placed fear in the background and based His program on love. This is a sounder foundation for our Christian faith. Not a hope of reward or a fear of retribution so much as a love for doing the right thing from the sheer joy of doing it, because it is the happier, fuller thing to do. This doctrine appeals to me; I don't know whether it is good Baptist theology or not.

A GOOD NAME VERSUS GREAT RICHES

I have been reading Proverbs 22. There is something in the opening lines that I have been thinking about today, "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favor rather than silver and gold." This is to be both an inspiration and a reminder. I recall how many times I have met people and told them that I was your son and proudly observed their respect and approval of you. One only gains that good name by living a Christian life. It is my determination to be similarly regarded in the community where I live.

Also, I notice in the last verse of the same chapter an admonition to those ill-thinking persons who might misinterpret the scripture as an approbation (in disregard for riches) of slothful living, where it is said, "Seest thou a man diligent in his business, he shall stand before Kings—He shall not stand before mean men." As I see it then, riches must not be our goal in life, but neither can we be a good Christian if we fail to pursue our business diligently.

REFRESHING MY FAITH

Took Sunday afternoon off to go to a church social for cadets at the Presbyterian Church. I am rooming with a Presbyterian minister's son. These Presbyterians here are on their toes. Had punch, cookies, sandwiches and lots of pretty girls to serve them. It was my first visit out of the barracks—sure enjoyed it.

Sunday I was read Matthew 10–28 and found this verse where Jesus said, "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." I have never read this verse before and have received a lot from refreshing my faith with the truth of it.

THANKSGIVING AND CHRISTMAS

Thanksgiving was just another work day but the football game yesterday was a good game. Naturally, I was very pleased to learn about A. & M. As a result of the game a chap across the hall must make up my bunk for the next 7 days.

* * * * *

This doesn't seem like Christmas day. We have just returned from church services which were beautiful. I am sure that in most of the world today that people's hearts are as full of hope as yours and mine that the next Christmas will find us home again with the world at peace. Although circumstances prevented my being able to manifest my love for, and appreciation of you in the proper material way this Christmas, please remember that they are ever with you.

* * * * *

The chaplain ended his prayer this morning with a New Year's wish. I thought it excellent and repeat it for you, "May we all be of utility during the coming year to our God and our country."

WANTS GAYEST TIE YOU CAN FIND

Dad, since I seldom write you separately from my joint letters to you and Mom, I'm going to take time out from my studies to let you know a little of what goes on in my mind. Yesterday I was thumbing through a magazine and came to a full-page advertisement of the most beautiful necktie illustrations I have ever seen. It was all highly colored silk foulard, and in the background a guy in bathing trunks was lolling on a beach with a good-looking girl. Somehow that ad symbolized for me the old light-hearted days. It was the epitome of being able personally to do what I wanted to do. It was home—the ranch—the office—college—the country club on Saturday afternoon. Everything all rolled into one, and I thought with all my heart, "I hope I can put on a tie like that again some day." So just to experiment I showed the ad to some of the corpsmen and cadets here and found that they are all thinking pretty much the same as I am. The substance of it all is that these fellows all feel about like I do: We don't like this war—it isn't pleasant—it isn't nice. It's dirty and foul and miserable, but most of them are like myself, impatient to be about the job of it—it's sort of like cleaning a commode that has to be cleaned.

Well, Dad, that's about the story, but I am really serious about this tie business. When this thing is over and I come in on that train, I want you to meet me at the station with the loudest, gayest tie you can find.

SAYS "DON'T WORRY ABOUT ME"

Don't worry about me. Accidents here are so rare as to be of no consideration. Am awfully sorry that I can't finish in time to be home Easter. I'll think of you both and offer a prayer that this war will be over soon and that we will be all right and that we may draw ourselves closer to God.

* * * * *

I ran across the best book I've read in a long time, most interesting, and a real inspiration, "The Return to Religion," by Henry C. Link. I know you would enjoy it. I believe every person between 15 and 18 should read it, particularly if attending college.

* * * * *

I got the assignment to patrol bomber for final squadron that I wanted. We will train in a PBY—a flying boat.

FROM A FATHER'S DAY LETTER

Tomorrow is Father's Day, I'll call if I can and if I can't get through I will wire. One way or other you must know Dad how very much I love you and wish to be with you. The finest heritage a boy can have is the respect others have for him when, like myself, they say "He is Wylie's and Esta's boy." So I hope I can live up to what people expect of me. At any rate, you have breathed into me a set of rules, a philosophy, a religion that will sustain me. If there is a failure it will be my moral fiber, not yours.

Every young man has, I suppose, some man he wants to pattern his life after—mine are Dad and Judge Kennerly.

The war is here. There is absolutely nothing we can do about it except let it run its course. But there is something we can do about ourselves—live the best, most Christian-like lives we know how. I think Grandmother Johnson left Dad something like that. She might have become discouraged, but she never gave up. And you have passed it on to me. It's worth more than all the houses and cars in the world, and it is not rationed. So for tomorrow, I want to thank my mother and dad. Tonight I am within one flight of being through here. Only a final check left. If all goes well, tomorrow night I'll be waiting recommissioning next Tuesday. And since this first round is almost over, pardon a second's reminiscence—this has been the best thing that ever happened to me, regardless of what might follow. I want you to know and realize this; things too easy had left a pretty soft foundation under your son. He was getting a bit arrogant, intolerant, egocentric. This has made me quite tolerant of the people around me, and I hope, more understanding. These boys are young, refreshingly so, and grand when the going gets tough.

FROM THE CENTRAL PACIFIC

I join wholeheartedly in wishing for an early termination of this war. For an opportunity to again live a normal, comfortable life, but I'm also aware that that isn't an end—am ready to play whatever part the Lord wants for me—my only prayer is that I may fulfill whatever He expects of me and do it well.

Don't worry about me—I'm going to be all right—I know you shall be very worried so I can only remind you again, that I'll try at all times to do what I sincerely believe God wants of me, and if He has some use for me that I can know about I'll try my best to carry it through.

Of course, it is foolish to ignore the possibility of bodily destruction, which isn't very important if I can be of some service. Christ said He was giving us an eleventh commandment, "To love one another, and that no greater love can any man show than to give his life for another." So, if something should happen to me just have faith in the Lord. If He wants me to come back I'll be home in about 18 months, a much better man than when you saw me last.

* * * * *

There isn't a thing I want for Christmas. I wouldn't have room to take care of it, and it couldn't reach me by Christmas anyway, but I do wish that you would take the money that you would have spent on me and buy Christmas presents for the children of my young friends in Houston.

A card is about all you can get from me for Christmas, but you know you are always in my heart and I'll be praying that day and every day for the continued use of your lives in a Christian manner and for your good health and happiness.

* * * * *

Here it is New Year's Day with quite a distance separating us. It seems plain we cannot hope to be home during this year, although I do believe I'll get to see you.

DISCUSSES GENUINE HAPPINESS

I am beginning to believe that happiness is an inner thing with little connection to the comforts of the body or fine plumage. When we get down to it, if this life only means the house we live in, the clothes we wear, or a full stomach, it is not even worth the effort of living. It's either spiritual and moral, or it's not worth having at all.

I have just read the eighth chapter of Romans, from it I have received strength for my faith. I can't help but wonder from time to time about the never-ending fight within myself. The frequent falls and

doubts. The unsatisfactory thoughts that pop, unwanted, into my head. Of course a literal interpretation of Romans vii: 25 would be comforting, but unfortunately, it does not appear to me the mind and flesh can be so nicely separated, but rather that the latter tends to extend its influence, producing a rather prevalent kind of procrastination. This seems to be what he is talking about in Romans viii: 5. The tussle goes on though, for me anyway. It isn't a matter that can be settled and comfortably or even possibly followed. I have to be constantly forgiven. So I fear my foundation is lacking in something.

I have just completed reading the New Testament and received more from the writings of Paul than any other part, I think. There is so much that is obscure to me I am beginning at Genesis again, perhaps it will become clearer.

CONFLICTS BETWEEN FLESHLY AND SPIRITUAL DESIRES

I love your letter, appreciate your remarks about my religious foundation, but am afraid that they are a bit tempered by your love. As early as Exodus xvii: 16 I find reference to the conflict. Paul discusses it in Romans xvii: 18 and we get a promise in Romans viii: 11 that under the new covenant God will help us by implanting in the right-thinking man the spirit, which implies that to the right-thinking man there should be no conflict, the old fleshly desires under the law being removed by the spirit. The only conclusion I can reach is that I've got a long way to go in purging myself, making myself properly receptive, to permit myself to be governed by spiritual desires. But I'll get there.

THE MAN NOBODY KNOWS

I've recently finished a book, I believe you have it at home, The Man Nobody Knows, by Bruce Barton. He being in the advertising business, writes of the life of Jesus, and concludes with "Christ was the greatest advertiser of all time." He attributes the spread of Christianity to its good advertising principles: Have something to say, a message; have something to sell that is a bargain; say it briefly, simply, and sincerely No one who reads that book could fail, any more than anyone who reads one chapter in the New Testament could fail, to believe in Christ.

CLEARS STUMPS, COCONUT TREES

We are at a recently acquired place, which was leveled by us when taken. It is little more than stumps of coconut trees, bomb holes and rubble. The sea is wonderful swimming, so clear that you can see the shells at 40 feet on the bottom, which is of fine coral sand. There are plenty of fish, but my technique at catching them isn't so hot. We are very fortunate on personal conveniences, fresh-water showers, good food served in proper Navy style. We are living closer together than before, and everyone in the squadron has become more companionable, and it is a pleasant sort of life. Time doesn't weigh too heavily.

There is enough to do, and we fly with regularity, going rather far into enemy waters. We see enemy planes most every flight but find that they give us plenty of room. We are better equipped than anything the enemy has, as is evidenced by the fact that our squadron has two Jap bombers and a submarine to its credit and we have not had a hole put in one of our aircraft to date. Our operations are conducted with care and skill, with much consideration for our safety, and with no unnecessary chances taken. We have been doing a good job with every expectation of continuing to have the same results. Now, if your knowing this causes any undue anxiety I will regret having written it, but I believe you will be happier knowing this much about what I am doing.

GETS FIRST AIR MEDAL

Mom writes of her anxiety over her letters becoming dull by the sameness of them—states that there is little to write. How often I hear that same complaint here, and I sit down to write with the same feeling. It's relative I imagine—what you are familiar with you presume others are—believe me, nothing you do in the day, however, inconsequential it may appear to you, could be dull here. A simple thing like going to the drug store would be news here, for there isn't one within several thousand miles of us.

The high point in my Navy career to date was my navigation of a three-plane section 2,200-mile night bombing raid on Wake Island. With nothing but water under us, we made the trip three times without being off course, straight to the target and back with no planes lost. I understand that even the lowly ensigns are to get the air medal.

WHEN SEA GIVES UP DEAD

I recently had access to a Time magazine of April 24 and particularly commend to your reading a letter titled "When the sea shall give up her dead." If I could add a postscript to it I'd quote Luke ii: 4. Those words at Christ's birth show its terms and keynote His ministry. The good tidings He was to bring were for all mankind a rebirth of God's relationship with man, not merely Israel. He was to add love as a commandment, and God was promising, under Christ, the end of blood baths.

As expressed, peace on earth is inseparable from good will among and toward men. If God had formulated that plan this year rather than 2,000 years ago, He could not have more pointedly directed the way. There are only 2 planks in the platform—2 not 14, in his instructions.

First. Keep God first.

Second. Good will for, and toward all men.

And any so-called plan for peace that isn't premised on God, and the companion principle of brotherly love, will fail. Peace isn't to be based on killing men, organized pressure groups or formidable arms. Perhaps truces, yes, but there is only one road to permanent peace. As a war, this one in which we are engaged is a humdinger—but as a means of permanent peace, it is a grisly, horrible joke. Our own country has wandered so far from its Godly inception; votes rather than God directs its leadership. God receives blasphemy far oftener than prayer. We must put our own spiritual house in order before we can have peace. Two lines of poetry from that letter will stay with me.

"Life to be sure, is nothing much to love,
But young men think it is, and we are young."

FIGHTER SQUADRON GETS THIRD AND FOURTH BOMBERS

Our squadron got its third Jap bomber the other day. Nip A. A. fire continues to be erratic and highly inaccurate when properly approached. We have been within 1,400 miles of Tokyo with no ill effects. Feel great. Sunday is Mother's Day and I'll say a prayer of appreciation for you, Mom.

I am fine but will be ready for leave any time they decide to give it. The squadron got its fourth Jap bomber the other day and our commander is calling us fighter patrol squadron 13 now.

Enclosed is a photograph of me getting a very small decoration. Probably about the millionth like it since the war began, but I am sending it to you, thinking you would like to see how my mustache is coming along. You will note that I am about the same weight but a little more stoop-shouldered.

WOULD AID NEEDY BOYS AFTER WAR

Some time ago Mom wrote that she was going to practically have a girls' camp at the ranch this summer. I've got a wonderful idea for after the war, for me. I'm going to find some acreage on a river close to town, and for two weeks every summer give a hundred or so boys, who have never known such environment, a free vacation. The Navy is full of boys who would be a lot different today if, when they were growing up, they could have gone to such a place. It's too late when they grow up. I know that I can find a lot of people who feel like I do, who would be glad to give their vacation time helping me run it. There won't be a paid person in it except, perhaps the cooks. It would pay big dividends, not only to the boys but to the fellows who helped me run it. For a while, a few years, I might have to hit up a few of my friends to help stand the expenses, but when I get to making some money I could stand the expense myself. I believe the Boy Scouts have something like this down on the bay, but it can't possibly take care of the need. There are entirely too many boys who need this sort of thing. And the kind of boys I have in mind couldn't afford to belong to the Scouts in the first place.

Lots of love, and more love.

ROLAND.

P. S.—Whatever happens, keep your chin up—both of you.

The Next Step in World Peace Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press, one of the great newspapers of Michigan:

THE NEXT STEP

The invitations are out for the United Nations Conference at San Francisco on April 25.

As the date for the momentous gathering approaches the emotional appeal in this country to get behind Dumbarton Oaks will increase in fervor and insistence. That is as it should be.

Yet it might be well to pause for a moment to consider what the San Francisco Conference is and is not.

The first thing to remember is that it is not a peace conference in the ordinary sense of the term. The United States, Great Britain, and Russia will determine the nature of the peace to be imposed on Germany. The United States, Great Britain, and China—with Russia, if it comes into the Pacific war—will decide the kind of peace Japan will have to accept.

The sole function of the United Nations conference next month will be to create, if possible, a world-wide security organization to replace the League of Nations, as an instrument for preserving peace after it has been won.

As a basis for discussion, the plan evolved by the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China at Dumbarton Oaks last year will top the agenda.

Yet there is no assurance that this plan will be adopted, as a whole and without amendment.

Various proposals for changes have been suggested by Canada and other "middle countries," as well as by smaller countries, which seek a larger voice in the vital decisions to be entrusted to the Security Council.

The French provisional government declined to act as a sponsor for the United Nations conference because it was not a party to either the Dumbarton Oaks or the Yalta Conference, where decisions were taken that affect it in important respects. Among the most delicate problems at San Francisco will be to fit the Dumbarton Oaks and the French plans together so that the rivets won't stick out and tear any flesh.

The points upon which the Big Four agreed at Dumbarton Oaks were declared at the time to be only "tentative and exploratory."

The extent to which amendments are permitted before the final draft is made will determine whether the new world organization is to rest on the will of four or five great powers or on a broader base in public opinion in little countries, as well as big ones.

A good deal of unnecessary excitement was worked up over Stalin's insistence that in the Security Council no force should be applied to any permanent member, accused of aggression, without its having first the right of veto.

At Yalta Stalin got what he wanted—a realistic recognition that you can't coerce great powers except by war.

Assume, for instance, that in the course of time China or Russia, or the United States, should determine on a course of aggression, which threatened international peace.

Would it be stopped by sanctions voted against it by the other members of the Security Council?

What it probably would do, if force were attempted, would be to withdraw from the organization, as Japan, Germany, and Italy did from the League of Nations.

We Americans should be able to get the point.

Although we have a more binding Constitution than any likely to be drawn up at San Francisco, we had to fight a long and bloody war to keep the Southern States in the Union.

The only way by which any member of the proposed world organization could be kept in it, if it wished to withdraw, would be by war.

A weakness? Yes. An imperfect world is not yet ready for a perfect security organization.

We must build brick by brick for a posterity to which Churchill, Stalin, and Roosevelt will be merely names. We cannot foresee all the political changes that will take place in the next century or even half-century.

Yet if we begin to speculate on that subject we risk losing sight of the vital task immediately ahead of us—which is to form a security organization that will bring peace in our time and insure it for as long as the Big Five can hold together.

We have to move forward step by step. The first was taken at Dumbarton Oaks. The next will be taken at San Francisco.

Extension of Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following minority views on H. R. 2013, the Bloom bill, extending lend-lease until 1949:

We should continue mutual military aid among our allies until we have defeated our enemies. One of the means of carrying out that policy is the so-called Lend-Lease Act. We believe it should be continued in force for another year, from June 30, 1945, for this purpose and from year to year so long as the war continues.

The majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee, however, has recommended a bill, H. R. 2013, extending lend-lease until June 30, 1949 with no limitations on the use of lend-lease as a post-war mechanism. This period is too long and this post-war power is too broad.

I. WHAT THE LEND-LEASE LAW NOW PROVIDES

The majority report says "the original Lend-Lease Act had a life of 2 years." This is not correct. The original act had a life of 5 years, providing 2 years for the making of contracts and agreements, and an additional 3 years for carrying them out. This 3-year addition, which is often overlooked, is becoming increasingly important. The law has been extended twice. Each time both of the termination dates, the 2-year period and the 3-year period, have been extended a year. Thus, lend-lease powers may now be exercised not merely until July 1, 1945, but to July 1, 1948. This 3-year period is not a clean-up period but section 3c specifically provides that "until July 1, 1948 any of such powers may be exercised to the extent necessary to carry out a contract or agreement with such a foreign government made before July 1, 1945."

II. WHAT THE ADMINISTRATION SAYS ABOUT LEND-LEASE

President Roosevelt in his letter transmitting the seventeenth lend-lease report, November 1944, said "lend-lease and reverse lend-lease are a system of combined war supply. It should end with the war."

Mr. Leo T. Crowley, Lend-Lease Administrator, said to our committee "the Lend-Lease Act is a war supply measure * * * the post-war reconstruction problem abroad, is a separate subject for the consideration of Congress * * * lend-lease will not be used for the purpose of post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction."

Secretary of War Stimson said at our hearings "Lend-lease should not be carried further after the war is over without the full consent of Congress to every step. It has been defended by me and by the others, who have argued here, for what it was worth for a military defense. But now, anything further inthe way of civilian action in peacetime or in the post-war time, must, of course, have the consent of Congress and not be carried out without that consent."

These positive and unequivocal views of the officials charged with administration of lend-lease, from the President down, show what they think should be the limitations on lend-lease. We thoroughly agree and believe limitations of lend-lease to war purposes should be expressed in the law.

III. WHAT THE COMMITTEE BILL PROVIDES

The committee bill extends the power to make agreements to July 1, 1946, and to carry out agreements to July 1, 1949. The bill also extends the revolving fund under section 6b to July 1, 1949. Under section 6b, money received for lend-lease articles is again available for expenditure for lend-lease without further appropriation by Congress. This fund now exceeds $489,000,000 and the proceeds from existing or future agreements will be added to it.

We supported in committee the 1-year extension period for making lend-lease agreements and contracts, but attempted to eliminate the extension of the period for carrying out such agreements and contracts until July 30, 1949. We also attempted without success to provide specifically that no agreements for post-war relief, rehabilitation, or reconstruction should be made. We were willing that agreements should be made for the post-war purchase by foreign governments of war materials furnished or agreed to be furnished by our country for use in the prosecution of the present war, but this compromise was defeated. Thus the bill comes to the floor with an unlimited extension of lend-lease to June 30, 1949.

IV. THE NEED FOR LIMITATIONS

Two arguments were used against our proposal: First, that the law already contained such limitations, and, second, that such limitations should not be placed upon the Executive. The utter inconsistency of these two arguments is obvious. We wish to comment on each of them.

First, as to the argument that the Lend-Lease Act is solely a war-supply measure:

This act was passed in March 1941, not as a war measure, but in peacetime as a peace measure. Its title is "To promote the defense of the United States." There is not a word about war in it. On the contrary, section 3 d and e purported to preserve our neutrality. The majority report from the House Foreign Affairs Committee, January 30, 1941, said: "It is the considered view of your committee, insofar as human minds can evaluate the situation, that the probable effect of the bill will be to keep us out of war rather than to get us into it." On the other hand, the minority report stated of lend-lease: "The oldest and last constitutional democracy surrenders its freedom under the pretext of avoiding war, with the probable result that the newest dictatorship will soon go to war." At that time the majority said lend-lease was a peace measure, the minority said it was a war measure. Within less than a year lend-lease became a war measure, as the minority had predicted. Now the majority of the same committee are claiming that this lend-lease extension is solely a war measure, and the minority are insisting that it shall be limited as a war measure, and not turned into a post-war measure. Under the circumstances, there can be no valid objection to writing specifically in the lend-lease extension the meaning the majority claim for it, when they are unable to point out any language of the act to support their interpretation.

Last year in extending lend-lease the Wadsworth amendment was adopted which provided that the President should not incur any obligations with respect to post-war economy or military policy "except in accordance with established Constitutional procedure." Under the French agreement our country incurs obligations with respect to post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction. This agreement was entered into under the Lend-Lease Act which was passed in accordance with established constitutional procedure. Therefore, the power exists to make post-war commitments under the Lend-Lease Act and the administration has already used that power. Mr. Oscar Cox, who drafted the Lend-Lease Act and who is now Deputy Administrator of Lend-Lease, said in the hearings that lend-lease could be used after the war to supply the combined occupation forces, or food for the German civilians (see hearings, pp. 52–53). Thus, the real author of lend-lease agrees with the minority, that the present lend-lease powers, unless limited by Congress, may be used after the war.

Second, as to the argument that Congress should not limit the powers of the Executive:

This argument, of course, completely contradicts the proposition that the Executive has no such power. Since the Chief Executive has said that lend-lease should end with the war and the officials administering the law have made similar statements, we cannot see how the writing of the policy into the law could embarrass the Executive. We have been urged to extend lend-lease to 1949, into another presidential administration, so as to avoid tying the hands of the President in advance. A more fundamental factor is involved. We have a duty to avoid tying

the hands of Congress so far in advance. Congress will still be in session and will enact any laws that are necessary when they become necessary.

V. POST-WAR LEND-LEASE

The French agreement, released February 28, 1945, is by its very terms a post-war agreement. It provides that the two Governments "desire to insure the continuing provisions of such articles, services, facilities, or information without interruption owing to any uncertainty as to the date when the military resistance of the common enemy may cease; and desire to insure further that such articles * * * shall be disposed of and transferred following a determination by the President that such aid is no longer necessary to the prosecution of the war." The agreement provides for our furnishing $1,675,000,000 of raw material, food, petroleum supplies, and freight charges, and $900,000,000 of locomotives, watercraft, metal working machinery, and industrial equipment. Payment is to be made over a period of 30 years with interest at 2⅜ percent. It was explained to the committee that all of these were war supplies, which would be necessary for the prosecution of the war if it lasts long enough; that these supplies also had post-war values, and that due to the uncertainty of the war's end, provision was made for payment instead of the usual lend-lease arrangement. We were told that some of these supplies would take many months to prepare, some of them 8 to 12 months. Obviously, they will be of no value in the war effort if they are not completed before the war ends. We do not make any predictions as to the end of the war, but we believe our agreement with the French certainly is liberal as to what are war necessities. The amendments we offered, however, would permit carrying out the French agreement, and would even permit the making of other similar war supply agreements, but would forbid agreements that were clearly for post-war relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction. Since these amendments were defeated there is a possibility of further war supply agreements under the Lend-Lease Act which will affect our post-war economy for years to come and involve billions of dollars.

The press has carried references to negotiations with Russia involving $6,000,000,000 for post-war purposes. The press has also referred to arrangements for $6,000,000,000 of lend-lease to the British after the conclusion of the war in Europe up until the end of the war with Japan, including 2½ billion dollars of civilian lend-lease to be sent to England. We now have lend-lease agreements with 47 countries and identical master lend-lease agreements with 13 countries including Britain, Russia, and China. The terms of these agreements are very broad. Article VIII of each agreement provides "it shall continue in force until a date agreed upon by the two governments." The whole Dumbarton Oaks idea of collective security means that the defense of each country against agression is vital to the defense of every other country. The lend-lease law authorizes the President to furnish anything to "any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States." The broad definition of defense articles gives the President power to carry out the collective security formula by supporting the post-war economy of any country whose defense he deems vital to our defense.

VI. WHO BENEFITS BY LEND-LEASE EXTENSION TO 1949?

Not a single example will be found in the hearings nor in the committee report of a transaction or transfer that needs to be postponed until 1949. Not a single example is given of a transfer in 1949 which would benefit the United States. On the other hand, the French agreement may establish a post-war precedent of 30-year loans short-circuiting the Johnson Act which will be of questionable benefit to us. If we carry lend-lease forward a year at a time and instances arise where extension for particular countries or particular items would be for our benefit, Congress can then make provision for such extensions. If we make a blanket 4-year extension at this time it may turn out to be, not a clean-up period as the majority suggest, but a cleaned-up or cluttered-up period for our country.

VII. THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

Any long-time post-war lend-lease agreements would be subject to future action by Congress in appropriating money to carry them out. Congress has exactly the same future control and responsibility in appropriating to carry out a treaty. We believe, however, that there should be congressional approval of our post-war plans and policies before they become binding agreements. Such plans and policies should not be submitted to Congress merely for appropriations to carry them out, with the threat that failure to do so would mean a default upon an agreement legally entered into by our country. Once our country determines upon a policy, Congress can be relied upon to implement that policy by appropriations. On the other hand, if an attempt should be made to circumvent Congress in determining our post-war policies, we might have a domestic issue raised which would be disastrous at home and abroad. We believe the majority of the American people who favor our assuming increased international obligations are at the same time determined that we shall not use our international commitments as a means of changing our form of government here at home. We believe that our country should participate in the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace, as provided in the Fulbright resolution. Congress has aided in the creation of U. N. R. R. A., to take care of post-war relief and rehabilitation. The Bretton Woods proposal of an international reconstruction bank will shortly be before Congress. We supported an American bank of reconstruction last year when this was before our committee. We believe that post-war machinery for securing peace should be submitted to Congress. The war-making power should have something to say about whether peace-making machinery is appropriate and adequate.

The undersigned are all Republicans. We wish to do our part in determining a foreign policy which is not a Democratic policy or a Republican policy, but an American peace policy. As President Roosevelt said on March 1, using almost the very words of Governor Dewey "The structure of world peace cannot be the work of one man, or one party, or one nation." Limitations on lend-lease which we are proposing are the very limitations which the President and his officials have approved. To omit these limitations is to grant post-war powers to the President which he has not asked for. To write in the limitations which we suggest is merely to have Congress take a coordinate place in stating the foreign policy of our country.

The issue on extension of lend-lease is, therefore, not whether we are for or against mutual military aid during the war, for we are for it and are ready to vote for another year's extension of such aid. The issue is not whether we are for participating in establishing and maintaining peace. If the machinery proposed for this purpose is appropriate and adequate, we are for it. The issue is simply whether or not Congress wishes to extend the lend-lease power, administration and practices into the post-war period. We believe we should not. Lend-lease failed as a measure to keep us out of war. If it is projected into the post-war period it may again fail to keep us out of war. For unity, we should confine its extension to the field in which we are all united on lend-lease, as a mutual war-aid measure. Post-war relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction policies should be separately and specifically authorized by Congress.

We shall submit amendments on the floor to carry out the views herein expressed.

ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD.
JOHN M. VORYS.
KARL E. MUNDT.
BARTEL J. JONKMAN.
LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

German "Slave Labor" Seen Opposed in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Star of March 5, 1945:

GERMAN "SLAVE LABOR" SEEN OPPOSED IN UNITED STATES—PEOPLE WOULDN'T BACK ROOSEVELT IN SUCH ACTION, WRITER BELIEVES

(By David Lawrence)

Although President Roosevelt told a press conference last week that he thought it would not be a bad idea for German ex-soldiers to repair the devastation in Russia after the war, it is doubtful whether Mr. Roosevelt eventually will have the support of the American people when the implications of his latest statement are fully explained to them.

If any German soldiers or their leaders, or both, have individually been guilty of atrocities or cruelties, then hard labor in Russia or elsewhere is too good for them. They should be punished severely and every trace of nazi-ism rooted out of Germany.

But the American people are at heart neither brutish nor vengeful. The young men or old men who have been drafted at the point of a gun into the German Army are entitled to the same treatment as other German civilians after the war is over. President Roosevelt has publicly proclaimed that the Allies have no intention of enslaving the German people. Yet his subsequent comment about the use of German ex-soldiers as forced labor in Russia after the war would seem to indicate the opposite.

TRAGIC MISTAKE

If the President's remark was studied comment and he really has made a compromise with the Stalin view about using forced labor from Germany, then indeed there must be grave concern over the influence which the totalitarian Stalin and the chauvinistic Churchill have begun to exert upon the once liberal-minded Mr. Roosevelt. If a few days of intimate association at Yalta can make such a profound change in the President's outlook on the psychological factors that may prevent an enduring peace from being realized, then there must be added to the already tragic mistakes of the Yalta Conference new revelations of the abandonment of moral principle, and the turn to a might-makes-right doctrine.

What must the German Army think of the recent calls to surrender going over the loudspeakers from our troops urging them to give

up and promising humane treatment when Goebbels and his publicity machine now broadcast the news that every American newspaper carried last week quoting Mr. Roosevelt as saying he doesn't think it's a bad idea for German ex-soldiers, after long years in the trenches, to go to Russia to become labor slaves under Stalin?

How much more resistance will be stirred up by that argument which Mr. Roosevelt has handed to the Nazis? How many more American boys will have to pay with their lives in a prolonged war because of Mr. Roosevelt's carelessness of utterance or regrettable misrepresentation of the spirit of fair play which actuates the American people?

Isn't the forced-labor policy calculated to stimulate the German underground after the war? Can there really be peace when relatives of these German ex-soldiers know that their kin will not be coming home to them because they will be held in bondage even after the war is at an end? Was this one of the great compromises of Yalta and are there any other surrenders to brutishness that have not yet become public?

NO PEACE BY THE SWORD

Maybe the whole forced-labor scheme will come to naught when the passions of war cool off. One brief visit to a devastated area in Russia and President Roosevelt seems to have lost his long-range perspective. Maybe he will recover it some day when he sees photographs of the devastation wrought on German cities by our own bombs. What he must ultimately learn is that peace by the sword has never conquered a virile and resourceful people who become the victims of an inhumane or unjust peace.

Once upon a time there was an American President who said something about a peace with malice toward none and charity toward all, and once upon a time Jesus said a great many things about human brotherhood. But apparently in this "practical" age of brutality, all this is brushed aside as impertinent "perfectionism."

It will be very difficult in years to come to give this antiperfectionist line of thought as the explanation for the killing of thousands upon thousands of American boys by snipers and underground guerrillas, as we keep up huge standing armies by means of compulsory military service in so-called peacetime so as to police 80,000,000 embittered persons in Germany—all this because we lack in the leadership of the Allied Governments today men of vision or understanding of what really is involved in the simple word "peace."

O. P. A. Rulings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. EARTHMAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that not only does agriculture have cause to be aggrieved because of the unfair tactics of O. P. A., but many others have had similar experiences, including the lumber industry of America. I here insert an editorial from the Southern Lumberman, issued March 1, 1945, which is self-explanatory.

I learned from this editorial that conditions have been made so critical because of O. P. A. rulings that the lumber industry finds itself in desperation to such an extent that they are calling a meeting in Washington of the Southern Pine War Committee to take some action in the way of insisting upon the establishment of a new state of mind within O. P. A. The lumber industry of the Nation insists, and feels that they have the right to demand that they be treated with consideration, respect, and understanding by O. P. A.

This is just another one of the many cases of unjustifiable abuse of a group who are made to be either afraid lest they be forced to endure more hardships or hopelessly disgusted. More and more as I receive communications from all over the United States, from all realms of business, I am convinced that Congress and all of its committees, dealing with such subjects, should take immediate and drastic steps to rid O. P. A., which could be a beneficial agency if properly administered, of such individuals who would destroy it, as well as the business of America.

The editorial follows:

NEED FOR RELIEF

There is a crying need in the lumber industry for the establishment of a more understanding and cooperative spirit on the part of the Office of Price Administration toward the industry. It is the function of the O. P. A. to limit prices for the purpose of preventing inflation, and this has been accepted as a proper exercise of the wartime powers of the Government. At the same time, it should be possible to conduct the affairs of the office in such a manner as not to hamper the processes of the industry to such an extent as to create confusion, stifle incentive, and retard production. It was the avowed and generally understood intent of the original price-control legislation not to interfere with the established customs of industry, but in the application of the O. P. A. regulations to the lumber industry this principle seems to have been forgotten or overlooked.

An excellent example of the vacillation, indecision, and muddled thinking back of too many of the O. P. A. rulings was afforded by its gyrations in connection with the matter of invoicing random lengths. There were interpretations, rulings, amendments, conferences, understandings, and misunderstandings in endless and confusing sequence which finally drove the Southern Pine War Committee to the desperate expedient of appealing to the War Production Board for relief from a condition described as chaotic. All of this might easily have been avoided in the first place by an investigation into the prevailing customs of the trade, or remedied subsequently by a prompt and clearly expressed amendment. It was apparent to everybody that the course being pursued by the O. P. A. was interfering with the production and procurement of lumber for the war effort; but this seemed to make no difference to the O. P. A.

In this instance it was the Southern pine industry which was the sufferer, but this was just one of many straws showing the direction in which the O. P. A. wind is blowing so far as the lumber industry is concerned. There is hardly a lumberman who has not some tale to tell of the O. P. A.'s lack of understanding or indifference or whatever it is that causes the trouble.

There will be meetings in Washington next week of the Southern Pine War Committee and the Southern Pine Industry Advisory Committee. At these meetings these committees, speaking for the entire Southern pine industry and particularly speaking on the basis of that industry's struggle to supply the lumber needed for the war effort, might well take some action in the way of insisting upon the establishment of a new state of mind within the O. P. A. The lumbermen want to supply the lumber needed by the Government; they are willing to have the Government fix the price it will pay for the lumber; but they have a right to insist that they be treated with consideration, respect, and understanding by all the agencies of the Government entrusted with the administration of the wartime regulations.

Points of Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorial from the Grade A News of February 1945, which is not only timely but vital to the people of Wisconsin:

POINTS OF INTEREST

The demand for butter is falling off at an alarming rate.

Lines of consumers waiting their turn to buy a quarter pound of butter, are, like nylon stockings, a thing of the past.

Stores throughout the Middle West report ample supplies to meet the demand. Some are unable to dispose of what butter they have.

No one need look very far to find the cause of this.

The new red point program assigning higher point values to a wide range of cheaper cuts of beef and pork is rapidly putting the finishing touches to butter.

Ever since January first when a long line of meat items formerly point free was put back on the ration list, the handwriting has been on the wall.

Much has been said about the reluctance of consumers to pay 24 red points for a pound of butter.

But with the new red point meat requirements, housewives just don't have 24 red points to spend for a pound of butter, willing or not.

Nor 20, nor 10, nor even 5.

Even if the supply of butter were materially higher, the public would be unable to buy it.

With the present limited supply of meat available for civilian needs and no relief in sight before next fall, lowerng red points for butter would be a useless gesture.

Is all this part of a plan to carry out Dr. Mordecai Ezekial's proposal to eliminate butter entirely from the American table?

Just why should the purchase of butter require red points anyhow?

Why not an issue of points for butter—let's have them "yellow"—separate and apart from red points for meat?

Just because meat is scarce is that any reason why a housewife should be unable to buy butter when it is available?

More butter should be manufactured. More butter would be manufactured if the proper pricing arrangements were made.

The dairy industry cannot hope for postwar prosperity without broad consumption of butter.

But lowering red point requirements on butter is not the answer now. Consumers must be permitted to buy whatever is available. And quickly.

Act of Chapultepec

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of March 7, 1945:

ACT OF CHAPULTEPEC

The Act of Chapultepec drawn up at the Inter-American Conference in Mexico City marks the beginning of a historic new phase in the growth of the "good neighbor" policy among the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

More than a century ago, by unilaterally proclaiming the Monroe Doctrine, the United States took it upon itself to protect the whole hemisphere from Old World aggressors. Then, through the course of years, particularly through the past two decades, there evolved a common hemispheric front against any attempt by any non-American state to violate the political independence or territorial integrity of any of the Americas.

The special significance of the Act of Chapultepec is that the common front now undertakes to move in unison not merely against non-American aggressor states but against American aggressor states as well. Under the procedure agreed upon, the signatories, whenever aggression occurs or seems to be in the making, would consult among themselves to decide upon peace-preserving measures. Depending on the gravity of the situation, these measures would range from relatively mild diplomatic action to the joint use of armed force against the offending power.

Already approved in committee—which assures its adoption by the conference as a whole—the act is meant to take immediate effect and be operative for the duration of the war—a fact which must seem especially meaningful to Argentina, the maverick of the hemisphere and the only nonsignatory among the Americas. As for the postwar period, the act is designed to be perpetuated in treaty form as a regional arrangement for maintaining hemispheric peace within the over-all framework of the general world security organization to be worked out at the forthcoming United Nations Conference in San Francisco.

Is This the Time To Call for Conscription?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks an editorial recently published in the St. Louis Star-Times:

IS THIS THE TIME TO CALL FOR CONSCRIPTION?

The Army and the Navy want to put every physically fit young man into uniform for a year of peace-time service so that, in the future, the United States may quickly mobilize a large fighting force. They want the Congress to authorize a permanent system of peacetime military conscription.

A great many people apparently are in favor of the proposal, yet it represents such a drastic departure from the accepted American way of life that conscription in any form should not be adopted without the most solemn deliberation.

Let it be said at once that such universal training is not undemocratic. Quite the contrary, it is the very essence of democracy that every citizen without exception should be compelled to contribute to the defense of the Nation according to his fitness and his means.

Such service would be an abridgement of personal freedom—perhaps unavoidable—among a people who value freedom above everything. One of the chief inducements to the immigration which built up this country was the desire to escape service in the conscript armies of Europe. So far, we Americans, although we have found it necessary to accept wider and wider extensions of governmental power, still like to believe that the happiest of men is the one with whose life government has the least to do.

Many of the unofficial advocates of military training today favor it for nonmilitary reasons. Thus there are those who are appalled at the fact that wartime conscription demonstrated our people to be less literate than the Japanese. They see in compulsory service an opportunity to correct this. They want to make the armed forces, in effect, a part of our educational system, a sort of supplement to the public schools. As President Hutchins of the University of Chicago argues, these people are on the wrong track.

The Army is one of the last agencies which should be called on to correct this situation. John J. McCloy, Assistant Secretary of War, is one of the first to admit this. Indeed, the Army has minimal educational standards for admission to its ranks which would keep out those most in need of schooling.

A similar argument will answer those who believe that Army training would raise the physical standards of our young men—standards which the draft proved to be woefully low. Of course, such a program could improve the health of those fit for it. But, again, those in greatest need would not be benefited because they would be excluded by the Army's minimum physical requirements.

Others support conscription on the grounds it would reduce labor surpluses. However, such a half-solution of the unemployment problem would be almost as bad as an outright confession of failure. Our economy will be in a bad way, indeed, if it needs such desperate help.

There is only one reason which can justify conscription—military necessity.

That is the basis on which the War Department is making its request. It believes that universal service is "the only practical democratic and economic method of achieving national security" in an era in which the V–2 may be the puniest of weapons and in which we will not be able to count on the oceans or other countries to protect us against sudden and devastating attack.

If there is another war, the devil, indeed, will catch the hindmost. If we are to prepare for it, we shall need even more than a growing pool of trained reserves. We shall need to have continuing research on new weapons, and we shall have to keep a considerable part of our industrial plant on a war footing. That might mean many Federal controls and high taxes in peacetime, but men alone will not be enough.

But are we moving into such a threatening era? Can we not organize the world for peace? Is it not possible to get rid of universal military service elsewhere, instead of adding the United States to the list of nations maintaining themselves as armed camps?

Should we not wait until we learn the details of the proposed collective security system before we decide to supplement with conscription the already huge post-war army and navy on which our military leaders are planning? How can we know now how large a fighting force we will really need to be safe? If we decide on conscription in advance of this knowledge, will not every other nation virtually be forced to follow our example? Will not the peace-makers come to the peace table knowing that every country is arming itself against every other country, no matter what the statesmen may do? How could that enhance the chances for peace in the world or hold forth any hope for reducing the vast debts with which all nations are burdened?

We do not want to see the one-sided disarmament which followed the last war. We want no more of the ostrich statesmanship which permitted Germany to rearm. We do not again want to see the British or the Russians holding the fort while we get ready to fight. If it is to be a fighting world, we want to be ready from the start.

Yet we hope that the world's statesmen will succeed this time in organizing a real and lasting peace. They should have their chance before we decide for peace-time conscription.

We may have to come to it—and in the near future. We may even have to worry whether a constantly changing army of civilians can be a safeguard against the professional war machines on which other nations are likely to rely. The democratic way may not even be the safest way. But an America in which every young man is compelled to be a soldier will be very different from the America we have so far known and loved.

Certainly we should not rush into such a new order unless it really is found to be a military necessity. In that event we will have no choice but to adopt compulsory peacetime training and like it.

The Rogers Bill—H. R. 327

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission given me, I am including herein a letter endorsing the Rogers bill, H. R. 327, which letter states in a concise way reasons why this bill should be enacted into law. It is as follows:

ADRIAN, MICH., *March 6, 1945.*

Representative EARL C. MICHENER,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MICHENER: The Lenawee registered nurses and members of the Lenawee District Nurses Association of the Michigan State Nurses Association sincerely request you to vote "Yes" on the H. R. 327 bill, because—

1. It would place Veterans' Administration nurses who are eligible for the Corps on a par with those of the Army, Navy, and United States Public Health Service.

2. It would create a sound opportunity for a career in Veterans' Administration nursing.

3. It would provide the nurse protection, stabilize benefits, and establish high standards for Veterans' Administration nurses.

4. It would give Veterans' Administration nurses needed prestige within the profession.

Under the present civil-service status there is no safeguard for Veterans' Administration nurses, since Civil Service cannot protect standards and qualifications.

There is no inducement now for a nurse to continue in the service of the Veterans' Administration—since the President's appeal for nurses to care for the men in Army and Navy hospitals, the increase in resignations has been alarming. Is it reasonable to suppose that a man's life is of greater concern to the nursing profession when he is actively engaged in the service of his country than, when as a result of that service, he becomes the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration?

The establishment of a Nurse Corps for the Veterans' Administration will not adversely effect any nurse now in the employ of the Veterans' Administration; those nurses who do not qualify for the Corps will retain their civil-service benefits.

Those nurses who do qualify will, in addition to the benefits stated above, be eligible for the benefits under the G. I. bill—which benefits are now provided for the nurses in the Army and Navy Corps.

Yours very truly,

MRS. MARY B. KINGSBURY,
Registered Nurse, Chairman of Lenawee District Nurses Association Legislative Committee.

Night Visit to the Barn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the editorial headed "Night Visit to the Barn" which appeared in last Sunday's issue of the Washington Star was so true to farm life and a deserved tribute to the watchful care a good farmer gives his livestock that I am including it in my remarks.

This editorial must pull at the very heartstrings of everyone who has loved and cared for livestock. Nothing on the farm is more conducive to a good night's rest on a cold, stormy winter night than the satisfaction that livestock is properly bedded, gates closed, windmill shut off, and poultry houses locked. Under the watchful eye of a good Collie, who sleeps in a kennel, where he can survey the entire barnyard, everything is secure till day breaks the next morning.

NIGHT VISIT TO BARN

There is something about a good farmer and his feeling for his livestock that is difficult to express in words. It has been said that the eye of the true husbandman is an important yardstick when it comes to keeping the cattle in good bloom. Perhaps that is why many men follow a traditional ritual of a night visit to the barn.

The average country man likes to go to bed early. The winter evenings follow a more or less standard pattern. The family gathers around the table and stove in the kitchen or else pulls the chairs in a half circle around the base burner in the living room. While the young folks do their homework, read magazines, or look through the mail-order catalogs, father goes through the daily papers, reads the farm journals, or during the late winter evenings, goes through the seed catalogs. Maybe there is popcorn, and likely father wants a dish of cold, juicy, crunchy Northern Spies. But when it gets around 9 o'clock, he puts on his overshoes, cap, sheep-lined jacket, lights kerosene lantern, and goes out for his night visit to the barn.

To a man who likes livestock, there is nothing else in the day's routine to compare to this last look around before going to bed. The work of the day is done. A man knows that the chances are 99 to 1 that everything is safe and secure, but he could not go to bed easy in his mind unless he had this last inspection. It is good to see the milkers in the tie-up. Most of them are lying down, chewing their cuds. They are well bedded in crisp straw or fresh, tangy sawdust. The horses, crunching on good clover and timothy, turn their heads to look at their master as he glances in the stalls to see that halters are not twisted. The calves and young stock crowd to the gates of their pens for the caressing rub behind ears they have come to expect.

All is calm and safe. As the farmer closes the barn door and goes across the snowy yard, the kerosene lantern throws long shadows on the dim whiteness. As he goes through the woodshed, the light picks glances at the ordered tiers of oak, maple, beech, and ash. Back in the cozy kitchen, he blows out the lantern and sets it on the shelf above the sink. The night visit to the barn is over. Now the farmstead can settle to rest.

Yalta Agreements Concerning Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the United Polish Press of America, Chicago, Ill., appealing to the Government of the United States, the Congress and to the public opinion of the American Nation and the whole world, that the unjust decisions of the Yalta Conference, concerning Poland, be revised in a spirit of equity and good conscience:

Upon report of the unjust Yalta decision relative to Poland, we, the editors and journalists, representing 41 Polish newspapers in the United States with a total weekly circulation of 1,200,000, gathered at a conference in Chicago, Ill., on February 18, 1945, declare as follows:

Our conference is being held on the eve of our national holiday—the birthday of George Washington, at whose side Polish soldiers and Polish generals fought for freedom and independence of America, and who bequeathed to us the love of liberty and justice.

Mindful of the fact that in defending Poland's cause we are defending at the same time the moral principles for which the United States is now waging war;

Realizing that the partition of Poland will result in tragic consequences to America and the whole world, foreboding disaster to a peace based upon principles of injustice;

We resolve that:

The decisions of the Yalta Conference concerning Poland are incompatible with the spirit of Christian civilization, because they violate its moral foundations;

They are incompatible with the principles of free nations, because they violate the rights of such nations;

They are incompatible with international law, because they were made without the participation of Poland and are to be imposed on her by force;

They are incompatible with the traditions of the United States which has always stood in defense of wronged nations;

They are incompatible with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, because all the United Nations have accepted these principles as a symbol in their fight against the use of force;

They are incompatible with the commitments of the United Nations, who officially recognize the Polish Government in London.

Poland, during 5½ years of fighting, gave proof of unexampled sacrifices, heroism, and faithful loyalty toward her allies, and she has a right to rely upon the unalterable loyalty on their part.

The Yalta decisions deprive Poland of a part of her ancient lands which integrally belong to her and are essential to the welfare of the Polish Nation.

The Yalta decisions cancel not only the voluntary treaty of Riga, but also all commitments subscribed to by the Allies with Poland.

The Yalta decisions nullify the agreement of General Sikorski with Russia entered into with the approval of England.

The Yalta decisions are in reality a fifth partition of Poland.

Poland was deprived of the power and right to self determination.

The Polish lands in the west, as Opeln Silesia, Pomerania, which includes East Prussia, rightfully belong to Poland and cannot be considered as compensation for lands seized in the east and the establishment of her eastern borders should be made dependent on the establishment of her western borders.

As a tragic evidence of what Poland will be met with, are the mass arrests, exile and execution of former members of the home army in disregard of their fullest sacrifices and heroism in their fight against the Germans. We fear that the same fate awaits all Polish soldiers, who have fought and are fighting on all battle fronts of the world for democracy's victory.

As Americans dedicated to the freedom of nations, we feel duty bound, in the name of justice, to take a stand in defense of the full rights of our ally—Poland.

In the belief, that the Yalta decisions are not final, we appeal to the Government of the United States the Congress and to the public opinion of the free and great American Nation and to the whole world, that the unjust decisions of the Yalta Conference, concerning Poland, be revised in a spirit of equity and good conscience.

ZYGMUNT STEFANOWICZ,
PETER YOLLES,
ADOLF CEPURA,
ADAM OLSZEWSKI,
JADWIGA KARLOWICZOWA,
Resolution Committee.

The resolution committee also recommends and the Conference adopts the following motions:

We, the representatives of the Polish newspapers and newspapermen's associations, gathered in conference, express our vote of fullest confidence to the executive board of the Polish American Congress, and we here state that we espouse the activity of the Congress and that we resolve to cooperate with it as the only legal and real representative body of Americans of Polish origin.

We appeal strongly to all Americans of Polish descent to continue purchasing of war bonds to help hasten the complete victory over our enemies—Germany and Japan.

Farm Machinery Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I find that a highly reputable hardware firm has felt it necessary to explain through a paid advertisement why it cannot furnish the farmers with essential farm machinery and household necessities. The stock pile of farm machinery and parts which our farmers need are to be piled "hither and yon" throughout Europe and Africa, where they will be unused by the natives and destined to rust out:

In our mail last Monday morning we received five letters.

Their contents were so typical of the inconsistent way of doing business we thought our customers would like to know their messages:

No. 1. "We are sorry but we can ship no more barn equipment until further notice."

No. 2. "Sorry to inform you that we have been compelled to discontinue building farm-type fanning mills."

No. 3. "On our records we do not find that you bought any pump jacks from us in 1941, hence you have not quota with us."

No. 4. "Sorry we are unable to make shipment now of your order of September 1944 for wallpaper. Your order will come in small lots from time to time as it becomes available."

No. 5. "Now is the time for baseball uniforms. We have available now for the manufacture of the finest types of lettering and emblems on bowling shirts—sportswear, etc. We can give 10 days delivery. We guarantee our work for color and fastness. Samples and prices on request."

You see how it is, shortages of farm machinery, delays for the materials to redecorate your home, but no shortages or delays in this line of sporting goods.

If we cannot supply your everyday needs it is not because we have not tried.

Many of the most critical needs of the farmer are not available.

You probably wonder, as we do, what kind of businessmen control these regulations.

The letters referred to above are on file in our office and may be inspected any time by anyone.

I wonder whether the following items under the united relief—U. N. R. R. A.—farm machinery program will produce more food here than they are likely to do when shipped abroad as now planned:

Here is where the farm machinery is allotted: 30,000 tractors to be sent to all parts of Europe; 30,000 plows to be scattered all over Europe, paid for with American dollars; 30,000 separators, 50,000 mowers, 17,000 reapers, 22,000 horse-drawn hay rakes, 40,000 harrows, 12,000 binders, 30,000 pieces of farm machinery to The Netherlands, 15,000 pieces of equipment to Belgium and Luxemburg, 14,000 to Czechoslovakia, 21,000 to Denmark, 212,000 to France, 8,900 to Greece, 12,000 to Norway, 115,000 to Poland, 36,000 to Yugoslavia, 30,000 to the Baltic states, 10,000 to Italy, 13,000 of spare parts which are not available to our own farmers.

Is Communism a Threat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Daily Tribune of Royal Oak, Mich., on the subject Is Communism a Threat? It is a threat to the freedom of America. It is a philosophy repugnant to every concept of freedom and every American principle. It denies God. It denies that man has a spiritual side. It is infiltrating into the minds of unthinking Americans. It is being sold to unthinking people. Its whole totalitarian concept is to keep the common man common. This is a timely editorial and should be read by every American.

PERSONALLY SPEAKING

(By Floyd J. Miller)

IS COMMUNISM A THREAT?

Are you worrying yourself sick for fear that communism is going to take over the United States? That's ridiculous.

Are you blithely ignoring communism? That's not only ridiculous. It's highly dangerous.

Sounds like double talk, eh? Well, it isn't. It is merely my way of saying that we have to use our common sense in considering the threat of communism in this country. We need reason, not emotion.

Recently I received a long letter from a friend in uniform. He has been away from this country for many months. He gets only partial reports of what is going on here. He fears that the Communists are moving right into Washington and gradually taking over. He's pretty worried about the whole situation.

Are half the countries of Europe to be communistic after the war? Is it to spread to South America? Will it wreck the United States? These are some of the questions that are vexing him.

My friend writes a lot about Democracy. He believes in it; so thoroughly that he has been in two wars to defend it and has spent many years in public service in peacetime. Yet I am afraid that when you come right down to the rock-bottom fact, he lacks confidence in the ability of the American people to practice it.

LITTLE FAITH IN DEMOCRACY

Many others, especially business and professional men, are similarly afflicted by such a wild fear of communism that they have lost their belief in the American people—and in the strength of democracy itself.

They lie awake nights seeing communistic pink elephants. They sweat and struggle during the daytime to (as they see it) fight against communism. They are so taken up with this idea that they have little time or strength left to fight for democracy.

They forget that America was founded and made great by men who had ideas and who were willing to risk everything in striving for these. They have lost sight of the fact that positive ideas, not negative ones, are always, in the end, the winners.

If we could today, in an instant, wipe out every person and every nation that supports communism, we would not get rid of it. For communism is not a thing. It is an idea.

If it is a good idea it will prevail. Wiping out half the population of the world would not prevent its springing up again.

Personally, I do not believe that communism is the idea the world is going to follow. It is not half as good an idea as democracy.

But we must realize that a lot of the stuff that has been paraded as democracy has been pretty sad. It has had the outward appearance, but not the inner substance of democracy. That is why clever men who either just mistaken or just vicious, or both, have developed another idea which they have claimed is better than democracy.

It seems to me the business men who make the most noise about communism often miss the point completely. They should welcome the appearance of this newer doctrine because it offers what they are always shouting for—competition. That is the very backbone of free enterprise.

SHOULD GREET COMPETITION

The businessman who has the best article of merchandise should welcome competition from anyone who has an inferior product. It really gives him a chance to show his stuff. It presents an opportunity for comparsion by the customer; a chance to really sell him for keeps.

Exactly the same is true of an idea. The presence of one that has much of the appearance of democracy, but not its genuine value or wearing qualities, gives democracy a chance to profit by the comparison.

Communism can never win the world, because it is based in the assertion that man is entirely social and materialistic. That is false.

Communism denies the spiritual side of man's nature. It declares that he has no rights as an individual; that he is merely part of society, or the state.

Of course it can make a great showing—temporarily—if it gives individuals a greater material prosperity than they have ever before experienced. That has been the case in Russia.

But greater material prosperity for the Russians means greater education. And education makes men ask questions. It makes them conscious of their existence as individuals. It enables them, in spite of all repressions, to realize that they have a spiritual side; that there is a God as well as physical possessions and intellectual diverions.

Are we in the United States, then, just to sit around and wait for Russia or other communistic countries to realize their mistakes? That's not my idea. For that will be a long process; short, in reality, as a period of history, but long in comparison with the lives of us, the individuals thinking about this matter.

No, our answer to communism is to make democracy work better. It is to realize that every criticism of business and industry is not a sly communistic plot; that there are always failures and that we must correct them.

We need to spend more time out sweating in the fields, and less staying in a gloomy room and looking under the bed.

Armed Forces in India Want Their Beer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is read by our armed forces even in far-off India.

This morning I received a letter from Second Lt. Jim J. Conlon, Four Hundred

and Ninety-seventh Service Squadron, Forty-fourth Service Group, A. P. O. 487, Postmaster, New York, N. Y., in which he states he read my extension of remarks entitled "Armed Forces Have a Priority on Beer."

The letter shows the feeling of the men in our armed forces and the enjoyment they have in a glass of beer. It confirms the statement I made in the interest of the morale of those serving in the Army and Navy, when I said the Congress would make a grave mistake if it deprived them of a bottle of beer.

Under the permission granted me, I include Lieutenant Conlon's letter as part of my remarks. It follows:

FOUR HUNDRED AND NINETY-SEVENTH SERVICE SQUADRON,
FORTY-FOURTH SERVICE GROUP,
A. P. O. No. 487,
c/o *Postmaster, New York City,*
February 21, 1945.

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just concluded reading your extension of remarks which appeared on page A481 in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of February 6, 1945, entitled "Armed Forces Have a Priority on Beer."

Your article stated that some people feel that the armed forces should be deprived of beer during the period of the war. I believe that I could stand as one for all the soldiers in India in negation to this thoughtlessness.

Here in India we are rationed to one case (24 bottles) of beer (sometimes less) per month. It gets mighty hot over here, Mr. COCHRAN, so hot that sometimes you can't touch a 'plane that your hand doesn't blister. Ice is at a premium so that most of the times we drink our beer warm. There is plenty of work for us to do and we work hard. But when night time rolls around we like to sit in a tent and talk about the good times we have had, and the good times we are going to have when we get back—over a bottle of beer. The people that feel that we should be deprived of a bottle of beer should come over here for just a few days.

Thank you, sir, for defending our right to a little enjoyment.

Sincerely,

JIM J. CONLON,
Second Lieutenant, A. U. S.

The Act of Chapultepec: "Essayons"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, Vermonters are particularly interested in the conference in Mexico, for two reasons: the first is that its distinguished senior Senator is the leading representative of the legislative branch of the Government in attendance; second, that this act of Chapultepec is the second in the drama in which Vermont has played a conspicuous part.

You may recall that Gen. Truman B. Ransom, a Vermonter, who resigned as president of Norwich University to enter his country's service, led the attack, and gave his life to compel the surrender of that well-nigh impregnable fortress at Chapultepec, almost 100 years ago, September 13, 1847, to be exact.

History records that when the commanding general issued the order to the effect that the fortress should be captured and reduced, General Ransom said: "Essayons," or being translated "I will try," which is the motto of all Norwich men since that day.

History repeats itself. We are now undertaking to establish an enduring peace. The senior Senator from Vermont, from that historic fortress at Chapultepec, again, may well adopt the motto of Norwich in his efforts to produce an enduring peace among all nations—"Essayons."

In that connection, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 4, entitled "The Act of Chapultepec":

THE ACT OF CHAPULTEPEC

The Act of Chapultepec, already accepted by the Commission on Inter-American Affairs and virtually certain of formal indorsement by the Mexico City Conference, may well stand in history as the most significant single step in the development of international policy in the Western Hemisphere since the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine more than a century ago. Yet it is equally important as the climax of a slow process of trial and error, of gradually crystallizing sentiment.

In hemispheric affairs the contribution of the Monroe Doctrine has been a vital one. The doctrine, and the consciousness of the people of the United States that the principles of the doctrine represented matters essential to the security of their country and their system of government, formed the shield behind which the concept of hemispheric unity was able to grow. It was an act of power, an act, in the eyes of many European statesmen of the old school, such as Bismarck, of impudence. Yet it succeeded in its main objective—that of preventing the New Yorld from becoming such open cockpits of contending alien interests as Asia and Africa. It did not function perfectly; it was sometimes abused by its sponsors and often feared by those whom it was intended to protect. But that it served its great end was demonstrated most effectively by the recital of accepted rules of international conduct embodied in the Act of Chapultepec.

From the unilateral concept of the Monroe Doctrine, American policy broadened into multilateral collaboration in peace and war. It was a collaboration that was not highly formalized and certainy not rigid. For the most part it dealt with situations as they arose. But the large degree of unity attained by the Americas in the face of German and Japanese aggression demonstrated that collaboration on that level could be effective and could, in time, be transformed into a formal security organization by nations already practiced in cooperative effort. This transformaton is now taking place at Mexico City.

The Act of Chapultepec will not be the last word. In part it is a measure directed at maintaining American security during the current war, and it may well be modified when peace comes. It must be adapted to the broader framework of the world organization which is in the process of being constructed. But it can also provide valuable lessons for those who struggle with the problems of world peace.

Necessary Railroad Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, there is a very important question which confronts the American people and that is "What legislation is most vital at this time to insure the continuation of the kind of railroad transportation which this country needs and must have?" At the height of the war effort, and in the post-war period, we must see to it that our railroad transportation facilities are kept in a high degree of efficiency. Every man and woman in the United States knows of the job which confronted the railroads and the wonderful way they have done that job. Everyone knows they have transported war materials and members of the armed forces in this country with a very high degree of efficiency.

Even as these transportation facilities are indispensable in time of war, they are likewise indispensable in the peace which will follow this war. To my mind the Congress should take whatever action is necessary to maintain the efficiency of the railroads in the peace to come and also as an adjunct of the national defense of the future.

Today I introduced a bill, H. R. 2536, which has for its purpose the removal of a great part of the uncertainty and confusion which has hampered, and which will hamper, the railroads to a great extent if this or some similar bill is not passed.

For 50 years or more the Interstate Commerce Commission, one Government agency which has enjoyed the confidence of the people of the country, has been regulating the railroads so as to insure reasonable and nondiscriminatory rates and fair practices.

The Interstate Commerce Commission was set up as, and is, the arm of the Congress for the purpose of insuring reasonable and nondiscriminatory rates and fair practices, as I have said before, and the Congress has relied upon the Interstate Commerce Commission for these many years.

In recent years, and especially at the present time, there is uncertainty and confusion concerning the application of the antitrust laws to railroads and other surface carriers. This situation has brought about a condition which requires and demands an immediate, commonsense remedy.

It is a matter of general knowledge that the carriers cannot serve two masters; therefore, it becomes the duty of the Congress to say which Government agency, or department, shall have control of the regulation of the railroads and other carriers.

The bill that has been introduced today seeks to remove the uncertainty and confusion and places the regulation under

the agency of Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and makes it entirely clear that the antitrust laws are to be applied to common carriers in a way which will not prevent or obstruct the carrying out of the will of Congress, as contained in the Transportation Act of 1940.

Care has been taken in drafting the bill to guard the public interest in accordance with the provisions of the national transportation policy.

The treatment which this bill gives to surface carriers is similar to that now given to air carriers under the Civil Aeronautics Act.

The bill contains the following provision:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by adding after section 5 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5a. (1) As used in this section, the term 'carrier' means any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III, or any freight forwarder subject to part IV, of this act, and the term 'antitrust laws' has the meaning assigned to such term in section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914.

"(2) Any carrier, party to an agreement (other than for a pooling, division, consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, acquisition, or other transaction to which section 5 is applicable) between or among any two or more carriers may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, and the Commission shall by order approve any such agreement if it finds that, by reason of furtherance of the national transportation policy declared in this act, the relief provided in paragraph (3) should apply with respect to the making and carrying out of such agreement; otherwise the application shall be denied. The approval of the Commission shall be granted subject to such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe as necessary to enable it to grant its approval in accordance with the standard above set forth. The Commission shall by order terminate its approval of any such agreement, previously approved by it, or modify any terms and conditions upon which such approval was granted, if it finds such action necessary in order that the standard above set forth may be complied with. No order shall be entered under this section except after notice and opportunity for hearing and the effective date of any order of termination shall be postponed for such period as the Commission determines to be reasonably necessary to avoid undue hardship. The Commission shall not approve any agreement which establishes a procedure for the determination of any matter through joint consideration unless under the agreement reasonable opportunity, in the light of the matter involved, to act contrary to the determination arrived at through such procedure is afforded to each party to the agreement which did not concur in such determination.

"(3) Parties to any agreement approved by the Commission under paragraph (2), and other persons, are hereby relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws with respect to the making of such agreement, and with respect to the carrying out of such agreement in conformity with its provisions and in conformity with such terms and conditions as may have been prescribed by the Commission.

"(4) Any action of the Commission under this section in approving an agreement, or in denying an application for such approval, or in terminating its approval of an agreement, or in prescribing the terms and conditions upon which its approval is to be granted, or in modifying such terms and conditions, shall be construed as having effect solely with reference to the applicability of the relief provisions of paragraph (3)."

The Seabees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Shirley Povich, from the Washington Post of March 7, 1945:

EVEN MARINES LIKE SEABEES, ROUGH, TOUGH MIRACLE MEN

(By Shirley Povich)

ADVANCE PACIFIC HEADQUARTERS, GUAM, February 25 (Delayed).—The Seabees are the characters of this Pacific war, I've learned. Even the marines, who don't like anybody except the marines, like the Seabees—even admire 'em. That's the test.

It's all simple enough to understand. Everybody on this island and every other island in the Pacific is indebted to the Seabees for something, at some time. You can't ever get mad at the guys who do things for you.

They'll fix your broken belt buckle, or they'll sling together a nice movie theater—in about the same time, which is quick. They'll repair the intricate plumbing in your cigarette lighter, or maybe you'd like a 40-room Quonset hut for tomorrow. It's just a breeze for the Seabees. They are the collective Mr. Fixit, umpteen thousand strong.

They're the Navy's construction battalions, and they're as liable to be hitting the beaches with the assault troops as they are to be primping a nice little rock garden for battalion headquarters. They're everywhere.

They're bluff and hearty citizens—constructioneers who admit to nothing they can't do. As the saying goes, the difficult tasks are a pipe for the Seabees—the impossible just takes a little longer.

Seabee bosses, most of them, are fresh out of the contracting business in civil life since Pearl Harbor. Most of the Seabee officers are solid, middle-aged citizens you'd find bossing any construction job back home before the war. They know the score when, for example, the admiral would like a 100-office headquarters erected with sewerage, showers and, oh, yes, a nice highway from the beach. The Seabees just whip out the tools and go to work.

Navy regulations don't always mean a whole lot to the Seabees. The shore patrols have almost given up trying to make the rootin', tootin' Seabees conform to form. They ignore uniform regulations and saunter about in the oddest get-ups, dungarees, old caps, unbuttoned shirts, everything that is calculated to make the formal Navy man swoon at such individuality.

They work hard, and they play hard. Seabee officers take the reasonable view that the former forgives the latter. The Seabees can raise plenty of hell when it's fun they're looking for. Not much is said about it.

LOOKING DOWN ON C. I. N. C. P. A. C.

The miracles they perform for other outfits they match with little jobs they do for themselves. C. I. N. C. P. A. C.—that's the admiral—picked out what appeared to be the choice spot for his headquarters here.

The Seabees let him have everything he wanted, and built him a small town.

Then they went to work for themselves. They constructed Seabee headquarters on a peak. Now, two Seabee battalions literally look down on C. I. N. C. P. A. C.

At Pearl Harbor, I saw a Seabee job. They built a 15,000-seat stadium to house the Nimitz Bowl football game between the Army and Navy All-Stars. They tossed up an amphi-theater in a hurry and then, on the last day before the game, learned there were no provisions in the Navy's building program for seats for the Seabees. Without asking, they built an extra section for themselves, on an elevation, and the next day they were sitting in the best seats in the park.

ALL THIS AND A BRASS RAIL

Guam's officers' club for the headquarters people is all right. The Seabees built it, complete with bar. But you ought to see the Seabees' own club quarters. Not only a bar, but very comfy, with brass rail.

They're the champion souvenir people of this Pacific war, incidentally. Their bulldozers uproot many a Jap weapon as keepsake.

In a financial way, the Seabees do all right. At a B–29 base here, the chaplain squawked when a Super-Fortress, distinguished by a beautifully painted nude on its fuselage, drifted into camp. The aviator-artist wasn't on the trip. For 30 bucks, they hired a Seabee to paint swimming trunks and a bras on the lady.

There's no ceiling on the ingenuity of the Seabees. They run a regular souvenir business in the Pacific. Other Navy outfits beat a track to the Seabees for mementoes, and pay fancy prices.

A Jap flag, replete with red meat ball in the center and Japanese characters scrawled beneath, fetched a Seabee 60 bucks from a Navy yeoman.

BUT HE KEPT THE SIXTY

There was a bit of a stink about that. Intelligence officers were forced to confess to the yeoman that the Jap flag was an American sugar sack that had fallen into Seabee hands, that the red center was the handiwork of Seabee artists; that the Jap writing wasn't Jap writing at all, just a Seabee's idea of what Jap writing ought to look like. But he didn't get his 60 bucks back.

The secret weapon of this war is the Seabees' bulldozers. They knock over trees, hillsides, moderate-sized volcanoes, and anything else on the elimination list. At work, the Seabee bulldozer drivers always have an audience of men from other outfits, enchanted by the results the bulldozers get.

Machinist Mate (2d cl.) George Winston Allen, of Texas, a bulldozer jockey, was pounding away near the jungle edge on a Marianas island the other night after dark when his headlight suddenly spotlighted four Japs sitting on a log. They had been watching the operation, apparently quite fascinated by it all. The Japs were doubtless thinking of their own dinky garage, showers, and, oh, yes, a nice highway from the beach. The Seabees just whip out the tools and go to work.

Seabee Allen didn't let the incident disturb him. "It's all in the night's work," he said. "I've decided to elect those four Japs to my 'sidewalk superintendents' club.' It's growing."

Forest Products of the Pacific Northwest Helping to Win War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the States of Oregon and Washington is growing the largest stand of virgin timber we have left in the United States. It has been drawn upon for immense quantities of wood products for war purposes. This great asset is being consumed at a rapid rate, far beyond nature's power to reproduce it.

It is unfortunate that only a third of the wood content of a tree that is cut for commercial purposes is utilized as lumber. It has been estimated that a ton of wood for each thousand board feet of lumber is contained in the sawdust, slabs, and edgings, in addition to several tons that are left in the forest from the limbs and other noncommercial wood products not utilized. There are, however, large values left in these wood products which could be saved through scientific processes.

The Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has been doing an outstanding work in the development of uses for wood products and in wood utilization for new purposes. There is established in Portland, in my district, the Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station, which is carrying on a most useful work in determining processes and uses for forestry products to the end that the full tree, when it is cut for commercial purposes, may be utilized. This station is in need of funds, and a modest appropriation of $50,000 annually has been requested for that purpose. The legislature of my State, which is now in session, recently passed House Joint Memorial No. 4, petitioning the Congress of the United States to appropriate this sum for the establishment of a Forest Utilization Services unit to carry on this useful work on the ground in the Northwest where these large timber assets are located.

The Portland Chamber of Commerce has likewise urged that this appropriation be granted and that an additional appropriation be given to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., to carry on its work in this field.

I appeared today before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which has jurisdiction over appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and urged that these appropriations be granted, and I respectfully request that the Congress give its approval to these appropriations when the bill reaches the floor so that the timber resources of the Northwest may be fully utilized. In this connection it should be remembered that the Federal Government itself owns considerably more than 50 percent of the standing timber of the Northwest and is directly interested in the full utilization of these forest products.

I include as a part of these remarks the memorial of the Oregon State Legislature and the resolution of the Portland Chamber of Commerce to which I have referred, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the future development of the lumber industry of Oregon and Washington is closely linked with the development of new processes for the improvement of lumber and the use of wood now wasted in the manufacture of lumber; and

Whereas these developments will only come through research in the nature of wood, the discovery of methods for its new and better use, and through the secondary research necessary for the economic application of new methods when developed; and

Whereas the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., and the Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station, located at Portland, Oreg., and operating in Oregon and Washington, have made notable contributions to such developments in the past; and

Whereas post-war development of new and better uses of wood in Oregon and Washington should be further expanded through the work of these organizations: It is therefore

Resolved, That—

1. The appropriations to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., should be increased by $1,500,000 annually, beginning July 1, 1945, and that this sum should be specifically used for the development of new and better uses for wood; and that

2. There should be appropriated not less than $50,000 annually to the Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station at Portland, Oreg., for the establishment of a wood-utilization unit. This unit should consist of a group of men especially trained in the various fields of wood technology. It should be the duty of this unit to take the problems in wood utilization which are peculiar to the States of Oregon and Washington to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, to aid there in the technical solution of these problems, and to bring to the States of Oregon and Washington the results of such research in form most applicable to industrial use.

It should be further understood that the work of the wood-utilization unit at the Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station at Portland and the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison should be conducted in the closest possible cooperation with work in these fields now under way at the Oregon Forest Products Laboratory at Corvallis, the University of Washington, at Seattle, and any industrial groups or concerns now engaged in such research.

House Joint Memorial 4

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:

Whereas timber stands in the Pacific Northwest, both public and private, are being cut at an accelerated rate, far beyond the natural growth of the timber; and

Whereas, in converting timber to lumber, less than one-third of the tree is utilized as lumber. About a ton of wood per thousand board-feet of lumber is left at the sawmill as sawdust, slabs, and edgings, while about 8 tons are left in the woods as tops, limbs, broken and cull logs, cull trees, and noncommercial species. Such wood is perfectly good chemical raw material; and

Whereas diversified utilization of timber, taking the forest crop as it comes and using those portions of it for those uses to which they are best suited, will eliminate this extravagant waste of a dwindling natural resource; and

Whereas the full utilization of timber products and waste material not only means the answer to future employment but the maintaining of many important communities as well: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring). That the Forty-third Regular Assembly of the Oregon Legislature petition the Congress of the United States to appropriate an additional $50,000 to the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station for the establishment of a forest-utilization services unit to bring the results of wood utilization research to the forest industries of the Pacific Northwest; to take the problems of industry needing solution to the forest products laboratory of the United States Forest Service and to conduct other urgently needed work such as participating in local pilot plant demonstrations of promising new processes and products; and be it further

Resolved, That adequate Federal appropriations be provided the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service which would enable it to make full use of its present facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to both branches of the Congress of the United States, the Department of Agriculture, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by the house February 14, 1945.
EUGENE E. MARSH,
Speaker of the House.
Adopted by the senate February 28, 1945.
HOWARD C. BELTON,
President of the Senate.

Mississippi's "Angels of Bataan" Come Home

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday in my home town of Tupelo, Miss., there was held one of the most unusual celebrations in the history of this country, when a young lady, Lt. Inez McDonald, a nurse who was captured at Corregidor, and who has been recently released from a Japanese prison, came home and gave an account of her experiences as a prisoner of those savage apes we are fighting in the Pacific.

I am inserting a report of her homecoming, as well as her statement, in the RECORD, and I want all of you to read it.

I hope those individuals who are going around trying to get us to coddle the Japs will understand that we are up against one of the most savage, ruthless, and repulsive enemies that civilization has ever known. I think you will come to that conclusion when you read this young lady's statement.

The matter referred to follows:

ROUSING WELCOME AWAITS HEROIC ARMY NURSES FREED BY YANKS FROM JAP PRISON CAMP IN MANILA AFTER WEARY MONTHS OF HUNGER AND HARDSHIP AS CAPTIVES OF THE JAPANESE

(By Robert Talley)

Back from Bataan, from Corregidor, from nearly 3 years in a filthy Jap prison camp in Manila.

Lt. Inez McDonald, a slim, blond Army nurse who weighs just 110 pounds with all her medals on, is preparing today at her farm home at Plantersville, Miss., Tupelo, for the most terrifying experience of her life.

That experience isn't the almost daily rain of Japanese bombs that she underwent as she bandaged the wounds and gave blood plasma to American soldiers on Bataan. It isn't the grim and hopeless days that she spent in the dark tunnels of Corregidor's stony fortress as the Japs drew ever closer. And it isn't the long and weary months that she lived as a prisoner of war in Manila's Santo Tomas University, to which she was subsequently taken. * * * No, nothing like that at all.

What probably will upset Lieutenant McDonald's strict professional composure and cause her star-studded service ribbons to flutter on the breast of her neat-fitting Army nurse's uniform in her quivering excitement is the home-coming reception that Tupelo plans for her Tuesday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock. It promises to be the biggest event in Tupelo since the 1936 tornado that blew down nearly 500 houses in that little city, and only slightly less violent in its intensity.

"I'm dreading it—why should they want to make so much fuss over me?" Lieutenant McDonald said a few minutes after she arrived at Memphis airport Friday on an American Airlines plane from California. "But I'll go through with it, if that's what they want—and I will say it's a lot more than I deserve."

There was drama in her arrival at Memphis Airport, the human drama of parents greeting a daughter returned from heroism, hardship and hunger whom they had not seen for 4 long and worried years.

For hours before the delayed plane arrived the parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. A. McDonald, typical Mississippi farm folk, sat nervously in the airport waiting room. Mr. McDonald struggled bravely to carry on a pleasant conversation with a reporter. Mrs. McDonald, the mother, just sat and thought and said nothing. With them were their youngest daughter, Miss Jimmie Lou McDonald, a cadet nurse at Kennedy General Hospital here, and Charles Monts, Plantersville merchant and old-time friend of the family.

MOMENT OF EMOTION FOR ENTIRE FAMILY

At 4:08 p. m. the waiting room's loud speaker rumbled: "Flight No. 10, arriving from California, will land in 5 minutes. Passengers will debark at Gate No. 4."

Electrically, it seemed, Mr. McDonald forgot all about his pleasant conversation with the reporter and Mrs. McDonald's eyes, wet with expectancy, suddenly sparkled. They hurried to Gate No. 4, got an attendant's permission to pass out to the concrete landing apron.

"That's her. See her waving through the window at us," shouted Miss Jimmie Lou McDonald as the big silvery American air liner taxied up to the gate and coughed to a stop.

Mr. and Mrs. McDonald, aflutter with excitement and tears, were waiting at the foot of the passenger ramp when it was pushed up to the door of the big plane.

Lieutenant McDonald, a thin figure in her Army nurse's uniform, rushed down the ramp into her parents' arms.

"Honey, thank God," were the only audible words, for by that time they had her around the neck and whatever else was said was lost in a welter of sobs and kisses.

A short time later, Lieutenant McDonald, her parents, her sister, and Mr. Monts entered the McDonald auto and departed for their farm home near Tupelo. Mrs. McDonald, the mother, was still crying.

BROTHER'S UNIT FIRST TO REACH THE RHINE

Even as Inez McDonald landed at Memphis airport, the telegraph wires were clicking with more astounding news about her family—her eldest brother, Lieut Col. Leniel E. McDonald, commander of an outfit of Infantry Rangers in Germany, had commanded the first American fighting unit to reach the Rhine.

And so, Tuesday afternoon, Lieutenant McDonald's big homecoming celebration at Tupelo that had to be postponed from Friday afternoon because of the bad flying weather that delayed her arrival in Memphis, will take place. Schools and stores will be closed and the entire town will turn out.

Inez McDonald, who took her nurse's training in Memphis, is one of those 68 "Angels of Bataan" who are now returning to their homes all over the United States. Behind them lie 3 months of unanswered fire on that bloody peninsula, hopeless days in Corregidor's gloomy caverns, and nearly a year of semistarvation in a Jap prison camp in the Philippines. Of these heroic nurses, President Roosevelt recently said: "You have served valiantly in foreign lands, and suffered greatly."

PHILADELPHIA, MISS., NURSE ANOTHER BATAAN ANGEL

Another of these "Angles of Bataan" is Lieut. Imogene Kennedy of Philadelphia, Miss., for whom a similar celebration was waiting in her home town. Both attended the University of Tennessee's School of Nursing at Memphis and trained at John Gaston Hospital here, although in different years. Miss McDonald and Miss Kennedy landed back in America last week at San Francisco, after an airplane flight from the Philippines.

But let's get back to Lieutenant McDonald's gala homecoming at Tupelo on Tuesday afternoon, which probably will upset her professional composure that even Japanese bombs and bullets failed to waver. Her emotional reactions about that homecoming celebration are easy to explain—after all, women are only women, regardless of what kind of clothes they wear.

On Tuesday afternoon at 2: 30 o'clock, here is what Nurse Inez McDonald will see:

From her farm home at Plantersville she will be driven, in her parents' car, to the fairgrounds at Tupelo. Arriving there, she will see a parade all lined up and waiting. Mayor J. P. Nanney will be there to lead it. The colorfully uniformed musicians in the band of the Tupelo High School, which she once attended, will have their shiny instruments poised and waiting. The color bearers of Lee County American Legion Post, No. 49, will be standing there with their fluttering flags. So will the ladies of Tupelo's American Legion Auxiliary, the town's military personnel of Army and Navy recruiting officers, and hundreds of Tupelo school kids all lined up and waving tiny American flags.

TUPELO WILL ACCLAIM DISTINGUISHED DAUGHTER

Nurse Inez McDonald will transfer to an open car, the top down and decorated with flags and bunting, in which Mayor Nanney will sit beside her as they lead the parade. With them will be John K. Grower, the energetic manager of Tupelo's two movie theaters, the Lyric and the Strand, and "the one-man committee on arrangements," whom Mayor Nanney will introduce as "Inez, he's the guy who planned all this—and you've got to go through with it; you can't let John down." And in the same car will be Lieutenant McDonald's parents.

In the second open-top auto will be Cadet Nurse Jimmie Lou McDonald and other members of the family. The third car will contain Capt. Sam Lumpkin, former speaker of the Mississippi House of Representatives and now commander of the Lee County American Legion Post; Mrs. L. D. Biggerstaff, president of the Tupelo Legion Auxiliary, and other Legion officials.

A lot of Tupelo citizens will march, too, including members of the Pilot Club, organization of business and professional women, who will carry a huge American flag (18 by 30 feet) between them like a blanket, holding to its edges. Then Tupelo members of the Mississippi State Guard, in uniform and with rifles on their shoulders, under Capt. Louis Cook and Lt. Bill Patton. After that, hundreds of flag-waving school kids.

Down Main, Green, Jefferson, and Broadway the parade will wend its way to the courthouse, where a reviewing stand has been erected on the lawn. There the homecoming exercises in Inez McDonald's honor will take place. The program will open with the playing of the Star-Spangled Banner by the high-school band and a prayer by the Reverend H. R. Holcomb, pastor of Tupelo's First Baptist Church, who will offer thanks for Lieutenant McDonald's "safe return to her native soil after many trying months of heroism, hardship, and danger."

Several nurses from Tupelo's Northeast Mississippi Hospital, precise in their crisp white uniforms and starched caps, will step forward and present Lieutenant McDonald with a bouquet of roses.

This done, Mayor Nanney will arise and present her with a 14-inch gold key, and ringed to it will be 22 smaller cardboard keys. The big key will be lettered, "Key to the city of Tupelo" on one side and, on the other side, "Presented to Lt. Inez McDonald for meritorious service to her country."

Then Mayor Nanney will call her attention to the 22 small keys attached to the big key.

"These," he will say, "are the symbolic keys to 22 of Tupelo's leading stores, business houses, beauty parlors, cafes, and restaurants. "They will unlock the doors of these establishments just as you have unlocked the doors of our hearts; with these keys, enter these places and take whatever you want. It is waiting there for you, gladly."

Mrs. Biggerstaff, of the Legion Auxiliary, will introduce Captain Lumpkin, Legion commander, who will deliver the formal address of welcome. Then he will present Lieutenant McDonald with a mahogany chest of silverware, purchased with money contributed by the citizens of Tupelo. Inscribed on a silver plate on the chest's cover will be: "Presented to Lieutenant McDonald, an angel of Bataan, by the citizens of Tupelo, Miss., 1945."

Honors have come to Lieutenant McDonald—the wan, frail figure bearing the unmistakable stamp of hunger in a Japanese prison camp—who landed at Memphis Airport Friday afternoon, and they have come the hard way.

"Why should anybody care about all that now?" Miss McDonald demurred to her interviewer. "I'd rather forget it—honest."

But the reporter persisted, and she complied.

She talked like a woman who was trying to forget a bad dream. She was slim and small, her blond hair was smooth and glossy and was drawn neatly into a bun on the back of her neck. Her nails were dainty and crimson-tipped. Despite her thin frame, she looked far younger than her 33 years.

She was still very feminine despite her Army uniform (she was wearing a new uniform, as her old uniforms are too large for

her now, since her days of hunger in a Jap prison camp) and her numerous decorations gleamed proudly on the front of her olive-drab tunic. Crowding each other for space there, it seemed, were the Presidential Unit Citation (with two Oak Leaf Clusters), the Bronze Star for gallantry, the Asiatic Service Ribbon, the pre-Pearl Harbor Ribbon, and the new Philippines Liberation Ribbon.

HIT THE DIRT WHEN BOMBS CAME

She told her story like a person ferreting in the past, like one striving to piece together the fragments of a half-forgotten dream.

"When you hear that scream high overhead you know that means bombs and you hit the dirt," she said. "No, you don't just hit the dirt; you eat it. You grab it with your fingers and you push it into your face—and you pray.

"The day I was at Little Baguio I did that. The bomb came down on a hospital ward nearby. I lay flat on the floor of the ward and while I was there the bamboo and tar paper flew up into the air and came down all over me. I lay there for a few seconds. The air was full of dust and smoke.

"Then I got up and walked over to the bomb crater. It was from here to about that building out there—maybe it was 20 yards, if that's 20 yards. Then I went back to the ward, for I wanted to see how many of my patients had been hit. Some were. I really don't know how many were killed at that time.

"I knew one, though, a boy I'd worked with, a Medical Corps man. He was a swell kid. Everybody looked strange, smeared with dust and blood and talking excitedly and loud. I guess I looked odd, too. I remember that a couple of days later I found a wad of chewing gum in my hair. It was blown there by the bomb. I don't know yet where it came from."

CORREGIDOR—AND THEN THE BEASTLY JAPS

The trim little figure straightened up, alertly. Her voice began to lose its faint trace of suppressed emotion.

"That was 2 days before Bataan fell," she went on. "Honest to God, my heart broke when Bataan surrendered. I knew we were beaten then. I never believed that Corregidor would hold out or that help would come after that. None of us had ever believed that those silly little Japs could ever beat us—they just couldn't—but they did."

As Bataan was lost, the battered remnants of its heroic American defenders fell back to Corregidor.

"We were ordered down to the water's edge and told to climb into some little harbor boats," Lieutenant McDonald went on. "It was then about 8 o'clock at night, I guess. We got to Corregidor about 2 in the morning. I remember we crawled along a narrow plank from the boat to the dock. We could still hear firing on Bataan. It was pitch dark.

"But, gee, we felt safe in those deep tunnels of Corregidor. Who wouldn't, after having been exposed to bombing in the open? I was glad to get away from the bombs that at first I almost cried. Later, we used to sit there and laugh when the concussion of falling Jap bombs shook the tunnels. We could afford to laugh then, for we were under 64 feet of solid rock. The only thing we were afraid of was being trapped down there by an explosion."

Lieutenant McDonald described life in the dark tunnels of Corregidor as the Americans made their last valiant stand against hopeless odds.

"The food wasn't bad," she said. "We always had enough to eat. But sometimes I wondered if all the boys did. But we didn't have much time for worry; there was plenty of work that needed to be done. We were too busy hurrying from one casualty to another. Quinine was very scarce for fever patients. Malaria and dysentery cases outnumbered the wounded much of the time."

WORKED ALL DAY

"As time passed, some of the nurses were evacuated. No, I don't know how they were chosen. But I never expected to get away. I just worked all day, or all night—there wasn't much difference between day and night down there in our hole in that rock. We worked pretty hard. We got mighty tired. We slept all right, for even the Jap bombs falling on the rock overhead couldn't keep us awake after so long a time."

Lieutenant McDonald stopped to light a cigarette. She used a Ronson lighter that she had bought last week in Honolulu. It was the first purchase she had made since her return to civilization.

"It seems strange now to think that I can take a bath whenever I want to," she resumed. "There wasn't much water to bathe with on Corregidor. There was only one tank. It was turned on at a certain time every night and turned off a few minutes later. More than once I've got soaped all over, and then the water went off. But at least we nurses had a bathhouse. That was better than at Hospital No. 2 on Bataan, where the nurses often had to bathe in a creek."

Corregidor fell on May 6, 1942.

JAPS CAME, THEN HUNGER

"After the Japs came to Corregidor we started to get hungry," Lieutenant McDonald continued. "It's funny how hunger affects your whole way of living. It seemed that every book or old magazine we picked up told about people eating—families sitting down to a big dinner table, or somebody going into a restaurant. It seems all those characters did was eat. Funny, you never notice such things until you get hungry.

"The Japs kept us there in the tunnels until June 25. They didn't bother us nurses—they came poking and grinning around sometimes, but they never molested us. We just went ahead taking care of our American boys. That kept us busy nearly all the time. The Japs turned off so many lights and dimmed so many others that we lost our only source of relaxation—we couldn't play bridge any more during our brief off-hours.

REWASHED USED GAUZE

"Medical supplies ran low. We kept using and rewashing bloody gauze bandages, and sterilizing them again. You can't wash adhesive tape, so we measured out our tape in little tiny pieces—just enough to bandage the wound and no more. The other day when I saw doctors at Letterman General Hospital in San Francisco tear off long strips of adhesive tape I felt funny. I wanted to say, 'Not so much, doctor; take it easy.'"

On June 25, Lieutenant McDonald and other nurses were taken on a Jap freighter from Corregidor to Manila.

"There were some civilian women in our group and the Japs put them in Santo Tomas, their internment camp for civilians," she went on. "We nurses never expected to go any place but with our wounded men, so we could be with our boys, but the Japs fastened us up in two rooms—all 70 of us—in the Santa Catalina girls' dormitory, next to Santo Tomas University. We slept in one room and had a few tables and chairs in the other.

"Every day we were taken outside by Jap guards and exercised, 1 hour in the morning and 1 hour in the afternoon—when it wasn't raining. Most of the time it was raining."

At Santo Tomas prison camp, the prisoners fell by slow degrees into their strange way of life. Getting enough to eat was the most important thing in life. Keeping clean amid those filthy surroundings was the next. Everything else seemed trivial."

JAP MILITARY WERE BEASTS

"Later, we lived in the classrooms of Santo Tomas University," Lieutenant McDonald went on. "We cooked our meals over charcoal, on a funny little stove, and used pottery pots to cook in.

"We did our own laundry and saved every scrap of soap for it. We worked 4 hours a day in the prison hospital. It was sort of like general duty in a hospital at home—not wounded men, but sick people. There was a lot of broken glass around the grounds from the bombing of Manila, and we treated an awful lot of people for cut feet. Again, we carefully saved our gauze and rewashed it.

"At first we were under civilian Japs. They weren't so bad. They seldom came around, and seemed to treat us like human beings. But in December 1943, the Jap military took over. Santo Tomas became a military prison and we had to bow to every stinking little Jap soldier that we encountered. On a good day we would run into only two or three of the little beasts."

As time wore on, the months passed slowly and drearily in Santo Tomas prison.

FOOD WORSENED AS JAPS LOST

"Every time the Japs lost another island, the food got worse," Lieutenant McDonald said. "But we knew what was going on, for rumors buzzed around the camp constantly, and these rumors had a strange way of coming true. Eventually, I learned what I had long suspected—that there were several hidden radios in Santo Tomas. Some of the men who knew signal corps work had contrived radio sets out of odds and ends. I'll bet we knew more about American victories—and faster—than you did back home."

At last came the moment that Lieutenant McDonald and the other American prisoners at Santo Tomas had awaited so long. It came at night, and at first they didn't recognize it for what it was—liberation.

THEN CAME THE YANKS

"We heard shots down the road," she said. "Then suddenly the whole sky was lighted with flares and searchlights. We hung out the windows and stared in amazement—what was going on?

"Then they came bursting through the gates of Santo Tomas—the Yanks and the tanks and the tanks and the Yanks—and, goodness, were we glad to see them!"

Nurse McDonald's pale blue eyes were shining now, her soft voice was quavering with excitement.

"And the Yank out front, the fellow who led them through the gates, was from my own State—Maj. Robert E. Lee, of Philadelphia, Miss., she exclaimed. "I was so happy I could have hugged and kissed him."

Another nurse prisoner at Santo Tomas who was liberated on that historic night was Lieutenant Kennedy, also from Philadelphia, Miss. She and Lieutenant McDonald had served at different field hospitals on Bataan, but had been together since Corregidor. Together they had gone through the months of little hope and less food.

Lieutenant McDonald and Lieutenant Kennedy have a lot more in common. Both are Mississippians; both attended University of Tennessee School of Medicine in Memphis and trained at John Gaston Hospital here, though in different years.

Lieutenant McDonald, whose parents operate a small farm at Plantersville, near Tupelo, attended Tupelo High School before she came to Memphis to begin her nursing course. After her graduation in December 1934, she engaged in private duty nursing here for a while, mostly at Isolation Hospital.

In August 1936 she joined the staff of Army and Navy General Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark., to be a civilian nurse. Determined to be an Army nurse but 5 pounds underweight, she made up this weight and was accepted

by the Army in April 1937. She served for a time at an Army Air Force hospital at Maxwell Field, Ala., and then, in the summer of 1941, she was transferred to the Philippines. She was assigned to Fort William McKinley, near Manila, and when the war came on in December 1941 she was one of the first Army nurses to go to Bataan.

REACHED RHINE FIRST

She comes from a military family. In addition to her sister, Cadet Nurse Jimmie Lou McDonald, she has three brothers in the service.

Her eldest brother, Lieut. Col. Leniel E. McDonald, a graduate of Mississippi State, is now in Germany with an outfit of infantry Rangers, and dispatches just Friday reported his was the first American unit to reach the Rhine. Another brother, Corp. Quinlan McDonald, is an antiaircraft gunner in Belgium. A younger brother, Apprentice Seaman Raymond V. McDonald, is now at home on furlough from the Navy. Another sister, Miss Katherine McDonald, is at home, and another brother, Preston McDonald, lives in Meridian, Miss.

Lieutenant Kennedy, now 26, finished her nurse's training at John Gaston Hospital here in September 1940 and, after a few months of private duty, joined the Army in March 1941, and was stationed at Fort Benning, Ga. The following September she was sent to the Philippine Islands.

A big home-coming celebration for Lieutenant Kennedy, due to arrive by airplane at Jackson, Miss., Friday night, was scheduled to be held in Philadelphia yesterday morning. Mayor Marshall Prince and other Philadelphians escorted Mrs. Mittie Kennedy, the nurse's widowed mother, to Jackson, 80 miles away, to greet her.

BIG CELEBRATION PLANNED

Plans called for a big parade, followed by the official welcome on the courthouse grounds at which Mayor Prince would deliver the official welcome and Dr. Walter L. Johnson, pastor of Philadelphia's First Baptist Church, would preside. Mrs. A. B. McGraw was to present Nurse Kennedy with emblematic keys to all the stores in town, entitling her to enter and take what she pleased. An Army band from Key Field, Meridian, Miss., was to be on hand, as well as Colonel Peterson, the commanding officer, and his staff. Representative Arthur Winstead and Mrs. Tom Bailey, representing Governor Bailey, were among notables to attend. General chairman of arrangements was B. J. Milling, superintendent of the Neshoba County Schools, and Red Cross chairman for the county.

"We'll make Tupelo's celebration look tame in comparison," asserted Duke Thornton, one of Philadelphia's leading citizens. "You see we've got an 'Angel of Bataan,' too."

Union Leaders Threatened by Mob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if Walter P. Reuther and Richard T. Frankensteen, U. A. W. C. I. O. union officials, are familiar with the prophet, Hosea, who wrote, "For they have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind," and with the statement of St. Matthew, who declared, "For all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword"; and if they remembered their own past actions, they were not surprised when last week members of their own union booed them from the platform, following the methods and procedure which Reuther and Frankensteen have taught them, and it became necessary to prevent a group of strikers from mobbing Acting President George F. Addes and Vice President Richard T. Frankensteen.

Reuther and Frankensteen have long advocated and used violence in their war against employers. Now they find the members of their own union turning on them and using the same methods. They should not complain.

But the people have the right to complain because the strikes threw more than 30,000 workers out of employment in war industries; threatened to make over 100,000 idle; interfered with the production of B–29 bombers and other war material which is absolutely necessary if lives are to be saved.

From the March 3 issue of the Sturgis Daily Journal, published at Sturgis, Mich., comes an editorial which reads as follows:

OUTLAW THESE SHAMEFUL STRIKES

"Of all times to strike!"

This bitterly indignant exclamation, heard on every hand, needed no explanation in view of the shocking news from Detroit.

It was the same old sickening story of a body blow to the Nation's war effort, dealt below the belt by workers who had no more right to desert their posts of duty than soldiers on the firing line.

When those 14,000 men quit work at the Dodge plant last Friday they knew well the disastrous consequences of their utterly inexcusable act.

They knew, none better, that at this most crucial stage of the entire war the immense plant's production of B–29 bomber engines, of antiaircraft guns, of rockets and tanks and trucks would be brought to a standstill while the strikers wrangled over the discharge of a few fellow employees accused of loafing on the job.

Government agencies were available to settle the dispute, and labor has learned that it generally gets what it wants.

There's a law requiring notice of intention to strike. The law was trampled under foot in the mad rush of the strikers to run away from their work.

At that very moment sons and brothers of these deserters were rushing too; they were plunging ahead with no thought of self, amidst a storm of shells and bullets, to come to grips with our country's enemies.

But they can't fight with bare hands. Without a constant, ever-increasing flow of weapons and munitions even these bravest of men would be face to face with defeat.

In this most critical hour, how can any man who calls himself an American be so completely callous to his responsibility as to strike against his fellow citizens who are fighting his battle and risking all for their country's safety?

What good is a "no strike" pledge when it can be broken, as it so frequently has been since it was given 3 years ago, with perfect impunity?

These questions apply with equal force to John L. Lewis, who is threatening, for the fourth time during the Nation's emergency, to call a strike of his soft coal miners.

Even before negotiations with the operators, set for next Thursday, have begun, Boss Lewis, with the usual chip on his shoulder, serves notice that he may order his men to walk out on April 1.

Taking advantage of a glaring weakness of the Smith-Connally Act, Lewis holds the threat of still another strike over the heads of the Government and the American people, a strike whose reprehensibility would not be diminished by its technical legality.

Lewis' policy committee met this week in Washington to formulate demands for a new contract. And its first action was to brandish the big stick—not a very hopeful augury for the success of the bargaining program. His accompanying diatribe against the "hostile actions of the operators and the Government" has a strange sound coming from a man who has just announced his readiness to tie up vital supplies for the war effort.

Boss Lewis assails the so-called anti-strike law, but not because of its weakness. The law needs strengthening because it is a compromise with the sound principle that no one has a right to strike against the Nation.

Lewis' menacing attitude and the outrageous situation in Detroit make plainer than ever Congress' duty to outlaw all strikes that would block war production.

Mr. Speaker, many of these strikes would fail if the practice of keeping workers from the plant through the use of a massed picket line was ended.

The prosecuting attorney and the sheriff of the county of Wayne have a remedy at hand. If they refuse to act, the attorney general of Michigan and the Governor of the State have authority to act, for they, too, are charged with the duty of seeing that the law is enforced.

Governor Murphy, at the time of the sit-down strikes, ignored the law because he said he did not want bloodshed. Today we are at war and more and more blood will be shed—the blood of our men who are fighting overseas—if they do not get the bombers, the munitions of war, which they need to carry on the battle; which they need for their own protection.

Yet, the strikers in Detroit are refusing to permit the munitions of war to go through. If the press states the truth, massed picket lines have prevented workers who wanted to return to their jobs from going into the factories.

I say the remedy is already on the statute books of Michigan. Section 17 of Public Act No. 177 of the Public Acts of the State of Michigan for the year 1939 makes it a criminal offense for anyone to, by force or violence or threat of the same, interfere with any worker going to his job.

All the sheriff or the prosecutor of Wayne County needs to do to end the massed picket line is to enforce that statute. Picketing is lawful, but massed picket lines which prevent workers going to their jobs are not. If they fail in their duty, the Governor of Michigan, Harry Kelly, who is himself a veteran of the First World War, who left a leg in France, who certainly knows the feelings of the soldiers, has ample authority to call upon the law-enforcing officers of Michigan to remove the picket lines where they interfere with war production.

If he has not the manpower available for that purpose, he can call upon the Federal Government, and most of us believe that one company of marines, or from any other branch of the service, will

take care of the picket lines for him and do it in a legal, lawful, but effective manner and without bloodshed.

If the law can take the young man from his home and send him to a post abroad where he meets death, there is no reason why it cannot, from a picket line, yank the striker who, by threat of force, prevents that young man's brother or father or sister from going to work in a war production plant.

Debt Limit $300,000,000,000—Stop or Go Over the Precipice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make some observations on H. R. 2404, a bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes.

Many Members of Congress, other persons in civil life, editors, and radio commentators for a year or more have been predicting that the national debt at the conclusion of this war would reach the staggering sum of $300,000,000,000.

Last year Congress passed an act fixing the debt limit at $260,000,000,000. The bill before us, H. R. 2404, makes this prediction a reality. It increases and fixes the debt limit at $300,000,000,000; and the record discloses that those who should know are of the opinion that the national debt will exceed that sum before July 1, 1946. This represents a national debt of approximately $10,000 on an average for each and every family of the United States, and this debt is a first mortgage and lien on every dollar of personal and real property of every person in the United States. The interest on this national debt will be approximately $3,000,000,000 a year. If we paid nothing more than the interest and three billions annually on the principal, it would require approximately 100 years to pay this debt.

But of course there will be other demands that must be met. The time is not far distant when it will require more than four billions annually under our present laws to take care of the veterans and their dependents. It will require other billions annually to maintain our Army and Navy, other billions to take care of social security and carry on the manifold activities of the Government.

We have now more than 3,250,000 Federal officeholders. It takes several billions annually to pay their salaries.

Of course, if the war is not over by June 30, 1946, the national debt will continue to increase. It will not likely end before that date in the Pacific.

Several years ago on the floor of the House I said that taxes would increase and that the national debt would increase so long as the New Deal administration continued in power. There has been a steady increase in the national debt ever since Mr. Roosevelt came into office—in fact, in peacetime during his administration he increased the national debt about forty-eight billions. He has had put through Congress 12 or 13 major tax bills during his 12 years of office, each one of them increasing the tax burden and tax load of the American people. The Federal Government will collect this fiscal year in taxes and revenue $45,730,000,000, and yet there will be a deficit for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, of $53,183,000,000.

This administration has set up some 60 Federal corporations and agencies with the power to borrow and issue bonds and disburse the proceeds. These have issued bonds and borrowed money running into many billions. The principal and interest of these bonds have been guaranteed by the United States.

Mr. Bell, of the Treasury Department, testified before the Ways and Means Committee that the unpaid and unliquidated obligations on war contracts as of date December 31, 1944, totaled $62,983,000,000.

The Government owes and will owe on postal savings accounts and interest more than $2,000,000,000.

When we speak of the national debt being $258,000,000,000, as of June 30, 1945, this is based on money that has been appropriated and paid out. It does not include all of these other obligations that I have enumerated. These other obligations, if now paid, would add from fifty to a hundred billions more to the national debt and, therefore, as a matter of fact, the national debt now far exceeds $300,000,000,000.

All of the obligations of the United States Government will likely amount to $400,000,000,000 instead of $300,000,000,000 by June 30, 1946.

In order to get a more perfect picture of the fiscal affairs of this Nation, let us compare the expenditures of the 12 years of Roosevelt's administration with the 144 years of our other Presidents and their administrations, for instance, during the 8 years that George Washington was President, his administration expended $34,088,566.

In the 8 years of Andrew Jackson's administration he expended $152,969,098.

During the 4 years of Abraham Lincoln's administration, which included the Civil War, the receipts amounted to $763,026,123, and he expended $3,352,380,410, and had a deficit of $2,589,354,287.

In the 4 years of William McKinley's administration with the Spanish Amercan War, receipts were $2,076,208,146 and expenditures were $2,093,918,534. In the McKinley administration there was a deficit of $17,710,388.

In the 8 years of Woodrow Wilson's administration, including World War No. 1, receipts amounted to $24,375,781,688 and expenditures were $46,938,260,143 leaving a deficit of $22,562,478,455.

In the 144½ years from Washington down to Franklin D. Roosevelt the total receipts of the Federal Government were $91,586,706,130. The expenditures were $112,203,367,065. The total deficit was $20,617,290,935. With that $112,203,367,065 was paid off the cost of fighting the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World War No. 1 and a score of Indian wars and developed this great country from 13 small colonies on the Atlantic coast and extended its boundaries to the Pacific, with 48 States and our foreign possessions.

Now let us see what amount of money has been taken in and how much expended in the 12 years under President Roosevelt:

Receipts $160,073,270,770; expenditures $369,791,966,466. Deficit, $209,718,695,689, bringing the national debt from twenty-two billions plus when he assumed office up to approximately two hundred and fifty-eight billions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945. But this does not include fifty or a hundred billions additional sums for which the United States Government is responsible under his administration, but has not been satisfied.

Mr. Roosevelt's administration in 12 years has collected in taxes and revenues from the American people almost twice as much as all the administrations from George Washington down to Roosevelt in 144½ years; and President Roosevelt has spent in his administration more than 3 times as much in 12 years as all of his predecessors spent in 144½ years. He has created over 10 times as much deficit in 12 years as all of his predecessors created in 144½ years.

OUR FIRST DUTY IS TO OUR COUNTRY AND DEFENDERS

Every Member of Congress and every loyal American is willing to expend every dollar and to make every sacrifice necessary to the winning of the war at the earliest moment possible, but the American people do not approve of the wanton and reckless waste of their bonds and tax money and neither do they approve of the graft or that we bankrupt our own country by an overgenerous use of our tax and bond money to aid everybody in the world who calls on us for aid.

Since we have become involved in World War No. 2, according to the best information I can obtain, our Government has expended more and assumed more obligations than all of the Allied nations, and also including Germany, Italy, and Japan. We have been expending more than two times as much as the British Empire, Russia, and China. We will increase our national debt more than fifty-three billion for this fiscal year. Great Britain will increase hers about six and one-half billions. This could not be unless there was a great deal of inexcusable waste as well as graft. Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, a former Member of this House from North Carolina, and a very able and courageous man, who was appointed to his present high position by President Roosevelt and whose business it is to scrutinize the expenditures of the Government, according to press reports, stated recently that there was ample evidence to indicate that the Government has lost in graft on cost-plus fee contracts and in other matters in connection with the war probably

fifty billions. Hundreds of unnecessary projects have been undertaken and abandoned, which, in the aggregate, cost the taxpayers of this Nation billions of dollars. We have had representatives of our Government and the President going about over the world handling out large sums of money, equipment, and other materials. We have given away under the so-called lend-lease approximately thirty-six billions. A lot of this was necessary and helpful, and about that we have no complaint. We have given billions of dollars in so-called lend-lease to Central and South American countries, and with the exception of a small contingent from Brazil we know of no other contingent or body of men from any of the Central and South American countries shouldering guns and helping us in this great war. Many of us are alarmed over the proposals of the administration to hand out large sums of money, materials, and equipment to the various countries of the world at the close of this war. If this course is followed through we can expect our national debt to rise to four hundred billions and this policy will mean not only an increase in our national debt but a further increase in the tax burden of the American people.

Some of our crystal gazers have plans in mind to build factories, open mines, construct railroads, and air lines in the various countries of the world out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the American people. This simply means that we propose to finance competitors of American industry, agriculture, and labor. If all of the property owned by the American people, both real and personal, was sold at 50 percent more than its appraised value, it would not pay off the present debts and obligations of the United States Government. It is high time that every Member of Congress and every person holding a responsible position in this administration, as well as the American people generally, should take stock of this situation and take steps to prevent another increase in the national debt limit, and an increase in the tax burden. When our 12,000,000 young men return to their homes and loved ones, in my opinion, there will be nothing so disappointing to them as the great debt and the heavy tax burden they will find on their return and which they in a large measure must shoulder and carry throughout their lives. We must wherever and whenever possible prevent the unnecessary expenditure of a single dollar. We must set ourselves to the great task of reducing the national debt and the tax burden. We cannot continue in the course that we have followed for the last 12 years under the present administration. If we do, it means nothing less than repudiation or uncontrolled inflation, and if repudiation or uncontrolled inflation comes, that will mean the end of this Republic. A totalitarian government of communism or fascism will rise on the ruins. In my opinion, there has never been a time in the history of this country when the freedom and prosperity of the people of this nation was in as much danger as it is today. I know there are many who argue that this big debt was due to the war. We are not complaining about the money that was expended in carrying on and winning the war. Billions of dollars of this debt were created before the war in burning pigs, plowing under and destroying farm products, and in boondoggling projects and other billions have been squandered, wasted, and grafted.

Treatment of Disabled Veterans by Gen. Frank T. Hines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and report:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, March 8, 1945.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Committee on World War Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANKIN: As chairman of the committee handling veterans' affairs, I feel that you should know that as soon as there came to my attention a current magazine article alleging irregularities in the treatment of patients in the veterans' hospitals, I instituted a Nation-wide survey.

There have already gone forward orders to each station to furnish without delay all pertinent information on conditions in each hospital. These reports will cover medical treatment, quality, quantity, preparation, and variety of food, personnel needs, standard of personnel, and overcrowding, condition of medical equipment, recreational facilities, canteen service, and other material.

As soon as these reports are available they will be studied in the central office and a completely candid report will be furnished your committee.

I have also wired the national commanders of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, inviting them to come to Washington in the immediate future for conference on this subject. I believe these veterans' organizations can be most helpful in ascertaining the true facts covering our medical and hospital program.

There is attached a report on the progress of our administration of legislation approved for World War No. 2 veterans and their dependents.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

FIELD ORGANIZATION

(Sec. 101, Public Law 346, 78th Cong.)

Since the passage of the above-referred-to legislation the Veterans' Administration has authorized 194 contact units and 86 branch offices. Certain of the branch offices authorized were originally authorized as contact units. In addition, a new regional office was established in Washington, D. C., and regional office activities were separated from combined facilities to be located in New York City, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Kansas City, Boston, and Newark. The Veterans' Administration has contact representatives on duty in 155 Army and Navy installations, including the 17 Army separation centers and the 2 Navy redistribution centers. It also renders itinerant contact service to other Army and Navy installations, to offices of the United States Employment Service, the Selective Service System, and information service centers operated by local communities. Continuous studies are being made as to establishment of new contact units, branch offices, and removal of regional office activities from combined facilities.

Status of World War No. 2 pension claims as of Jan. 31, 1945

	Disability	Death
Filed	655,193	94,735
Adjudicated	589,564	72,138
Pending	65,629	22,597
Active	377,436	55,159

NOTE.—Pending disability claims consist largely of claims filed after discharge from military service where the man was not discharged for disability. As to pending death claims, many of these are pending the submission of necessary evidence.

Hospitalization

	Tuberculosis	Neuropsychiatric	General	Total
Total hospital admissions, Dec. 1, 1941, through Jan. 31, 1945	35,260	78,133	425,703	539,096
World War No. 2	13,123	39,271	84,566	136,960
Percent World War No. 2	37.22	50.26	19.82	25.40
Hospital admissions, World War No. 2, Dec. 1, 1941, through Jan. 31, 1945:				
Service-connected	8,838	15,883	13,651	38,372
Non-service-connected	4,285	23,388	70,915	98,588
Percent service-connected	67.35	40.44	16.14	28.02
Total discharges (hospital), World War No. 2, Dec. 1, 1941, through Jan. 31, 1945	9,890	29,628	79,022	118,540
Average days' hospitalization, World War No. 2, for those discharged	103.4	44	23.9	35
Total remaining under hospitalization Nov. 30, 1941	5,071	34,631	19,308	59,010
Total remaining under hospitalization Jan. 31, 1945	7,263	42,760	20,415	70,438
World War No. 2, remaining under hospitalization Jan. 31, 1945	3,233	9,643	5,544	18,420
Veterans' Administration hospital beds in operation:				
Nov. 30, 1941	5,193	35,902	20,750	61,845
Jan. 31, 1945	7,762	45,317	22,623	75,702
Veterans' Administration hospital beds under construction or for which funds are available	425	17,097	2,784	20,306
Veterans' Administration hospital beds included in 1946 budget	3,400	2,700	8,000	14,100
Veterans' Administration hospital beds to be available in 1947, excluding domiciliary facilities	11,587	65,114	33,407	110,108

EXHIBIT A

Applications for training as of Jan. 31, 1945

(Public Law No. 16)

Number of applications filed, 51,570—distributed as follows:	
Cases pending (21.34 percent)	11,007
Advisement not initiated	1,312
Advisement not completed	6,566
Induction pending	3,129
Cases deferred or denied (52.78 percent)	27,220
Applicant medically not feasible	8,789

Number of applications filed, 51,570—distributed as follows—Continued.	
Cases deferred or denied—Con.	
Need for training denied	3,477
Application approved—induction declined	2,009
Employed	5,505
Training not desired	5,794
No response	6,473
Placed in employment	170
In training (20.71 percent)	10,676
Institutional training	7,713
Professional, technical, managerial	5,274
Clerical and sales	729
Service occupations	116
Agricultural and kindred	191
Trade and industrial	1,403
Job training	2,963
Professional, technical, managerial	349
Clerical and sales	151
Service occupations	79
Agricultural and kindred	78
Trade and industrial	2,306
Training terminated (5.17 percent)	2,667
Rehabilitated	311
Interrupted	1,494
Discontinued	862

EXHIBIT B

Applications for education or training as of Jan. 31, 1945

(Public Law No. 346)

Number of applications filed, 45,137—distributed as follows:	
Cases pending—eligibility not determined	3,972
Cases, eligibility determined	41,165
Denied	1,776
Allowed	39,389
Net yet entered into course of education or training	22,540
Total in education or training status	15,002
Institutional training	14,599
Below college	456
Junior college	256
Teachers' college and normal school	364
College, university and professional	10,912
Trade schools and business colleges	2,611
Job training	403
Professional and managerial	41
Clerical and sales	20
Service occupations	15
Agricultural and kindred	6
Trade and industrial	321
Total discontinued	1,847
Course completed	106
Course interrupted	582
Progress unsatisfactory	59
Voluntarily discontinued	727
To enter training under part VII	373

Readjustment allowances

For week ending—	Number	Amount
Sept. 30, 1944	5,464	$116,897
Oct. 28, 1944	10,103	225,211
Nov. 25, 1944	12,184	303,755
Dec. 30, 1944	17,453	399,394
Jan. 27, 1945	25,991	637,435
Feb. 3, 1945	25,693	602,025
Feb. 10, 1945	27,877	627,757
Feb. 17, 1945	26,407	613,623
Total amount to Feb. 17, 1945		8,399,001

Loan-guaranty operations

	Home	Farm	Business	Total
Number of eligibility certificates issued	10,435	519	889	11,843
Number of loan guaranties issued	1,389	3	14	1,406
Number of loan guaranties rejected	300	9	4	304
Total amount of guaranties issued to date	$2,393,275	$4,000	$19,468	$2,416,743

National service life insurance

Total number of applications received to date	16,982,500
Estimated amount of insurance represented by applications received	$130,120,264,500
Average amount approved to date:	
By policy	$7,649.43
By life	$9,174.05

	Contract insurance	Gratuitous insurance	Grand total
Total number of claims received	227,993	10,511	238,504
Total number of claims allowed	210,765	6,440	217,205
Total number of claims disallowed	2,167	3,130	5,297
Total number of claims otherwise disposed of			4
Total number of claims pending	15,057	941	15,998
Total amount of insurance awarded			$1,380,465,144

America's Mass Persecution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for 3 years the smear brigade, using the United States Department of Justice, has been persecuting American citizens.

There are Federal statutes which clearly define seditious actions and there are Federal courts in every State competent and with ample assistance to bring to trial anyone guilty of a violation of a Federal statute.

But because certain individuals criticized the New Deal; because others were anti-Semitic, they were joined in a blanket indictment and charged with a conspiracy to undermine the morale of the American servicemen.

The Washington Post, which, if it did not instigate the persecution at least participated in its prosecution, was finally, after 2 years, forced to admit that the proceeding was a farce.

Now there is talk that the indictment as to most of the defendants will be dismissed; that only a few will be persecuted. The charges have heretofore been dropped against some of the defendants; at least one died and the trials of others have been severed.

An editorial from the Chicago Tribune of March 6, 1945, gives an accurate account, insofar as it goes, of the proceedings, which smacks largely of the methods of Stalin and of Hitler. The editorial is as follows:

THE SEDITION FARCE RESUMED

Justice T. Alan Goldsborough quailed perceptibly when the sedition case was turned loose in his courtroom on Thursday.

After listening to the babel customary to that proceeding, the judge observed that "if the attitude that exists here today prevails it would be impossible to try the case." This is perhaps the wisest statement regarding this legal monstrosity that has been heard in two and a half years.

In an attempt to transplant a Russian propaganda trial to an American courtroom, the administration named as defendants the most astonishing aggregation of crackpots ever brought together, and brought on a hearing which made a travesty of legal procedure for 8 months, until the harried judge died and a mistrial resulted. No different conduct could be expected if the case were again brought to trial. As Justice Goldsborough observed, a court does not have the right to stop attorneys from protecting as they see fit the rights of their clients. Even leaving out of consideration the character of the clients in this case, the vague and tenuous nature of the charges brought by the prosecution makes an orderly trial impossible.

Leaving out of consideration the few Nazi agents who were added for window dressing and have already been tried on other charges and sentenced to long prison terms, the defendants in the sedition case have only one thing in common. They hate Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal and have expressed their hatred in violent terms. A good many of them are anti-Semitic, but they cannot be indicted for that by a Federal grand jury. A number of them, if they are not crazy enough to be committed, certainly are not models of rationality. None of them had a tenth of the notoriety that they achieved through the Government's prosecution. Few of them were acquainted with each other, yet the Government undertook to prove that they had all engaged in a monster conspiracy against their country.

Actually the purpose of the trial was, by picking a few obscure, usually poor, friendless, and frequently despicable persons as defendants, to intimidate any criticism of Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal. In that the prosecution failed. The defendants made use of the courtroom as a forum in which to amplify 20 times over the crackpot ideas that otherwise would have gone largely unnoticed.

The defendants have been subjected to most serious violations of their civil rights. By the improper use of the conspiracy charge they were dragged thousands of miles from their homes to face trial, and have been forced to provide bail or sit in jail while the charges have been dragged through three successive indictments, over 2½ years. If the administration really believes that the defendants have committed any crimes, it should be anxious to bring them to trial in

an orderly proceedings in which it would be possible for a judge and jury to reach a verdict. As Justice Goldsborough said, that is impossible in the present case.

Determination of guilt or innocence would be relatively simple if the present conspiracy indictment were dismissed and those charged with overt acts to the alleged conspiracy were indicted for those acts in the districts in which they were committed, and brought to trial singly. That, however, is a procedure that the administration is not likely to attempt, because it knows that it could not prove its case against very many of the present defendants under such circumstances.

The defendants were indicted three times. The first two indictments were abandoned by the prosecution because of legal defects discovered in them, and the trial eventually took place on the third indictment. Mr. Rogge, the prosecutor, was asked before Justice Goldsborough why the first two indictments have not been dismissed. He asserted that they had been allowed to stand as a favor to the defendants, because the latter had posted bonds under the first one and if it were dismissed they would be put to the expense of finding new bail. If his statement were true, there should have been no objection to dismissing some defendants who were named in the first indictment and not in the later ones. When this was brought to Mr. Rogge's attention, he replied that the indictments had been left standing so that the Department of Justice could further check the records of these defendants.

No better proof could be had that the Department of Justice regards the sedition indictments as instruments of persecution rather than prosecution.

Meeting of Red River Valley Improvement Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, during the month of January of this year, at Shreveport, La., the Red River Valley Improvement Association held a most important meeting. In attendance at this meeting were representatives from the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana. These prominent businessmen and civic leaders met for the purpose of further laying plans to bring about the more complete development of that portion of the Southwest commonly known as the Nile River Valley of the Southwest, for the reason that our land in this the Red River Valley is as fertile as that of the fabulous valley of the Nile.

The prime purpose of this particular meeting was to discuss the possibility of navigation on Red River. In fully developing this subject, of course, the problems of channel improvement and flood control came in for general discussion. During the course of the session, a number of excellent addresses were delivered; and I arose today to ask that the outstanding speech of Hon. DeWitt L. Pyburn, director of the Department of Public Works of Louisiana, and of Hon. Leo M. Odom, chief engineer of the Department of Public Works of Louisiana, be set forth in full under my remarks.

They are as follows:

ADDRESS OF DEWITT L. PYBURN, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, STATE OF LOUISIANA

The Red River Valley Improvement Association can point with pride to notable successes in past years in development of this valley. In putting across projects of any kind, intelligent and vigorous promotion is one of the prime requirements. The Red River Valley Improvement Association has furnished this driving force for many fine projects in the past, and I feel sure that in the future it will not be found wanting. The Red River Valley has many natural blessings, but as is usually the case, the Lord in creating this great valley did not lay the bounties on a silver tray. The wealth of this valley has been hard to get at but very great when it was obtained.

The first and most difficult developments were made by the pioneers who cleared the wilderness, fought the floods, and were primarily responsible for the great advances made in this valley to this day. The hardships incidental to overflow from the river, inadequate transportation, and, above all, poor drainage were faced and survived and overcome to an extent sufficient for a certain amount of prosperity or the better lands of the valley. It became apparent very early, however, that uncoordinated individual activities had definite limits. Levee districts, drainage districts, and State organizations were quickly formed to go after these problems in a more thorough manner. By the efforts of these agencies great additional fertile areas have been brought into cultivation, and protection from floods has been very much improved. The assumption by the United States, through the Army engineers, of a large percentage of the responsibility for flood control in the lower part of the valley has been a great step forward in that direction.

Today we stand at another crossroad. The local agencies which have done such a great work in improving land and bettering living conditions by drainage have about reached their limit. The hundreds of thousands of acres yet remaining to be developed in this valley and the hundreds of thousands of other acres now in cultivation, but which suffer severe losses from poor drainage periodically, cannot be helped very much more by the individual separate agencies that were responsible for the last phase of development. In order to make further progress, and to bring about the prosperity and wealth latent in the fertile soil here, it will be necessary for much more expensive and extensive developments to be constructed. This state of affairs has been reached, not only in the Red River Valley, but generally throughout the State. This improvement of small streams and the construction of canals such as come within the financial ability of the levee and drainage districts has about reached its limit in every part of Louisiana. In order for more development to be made possible it will be necessary to work on the large outfall streams so that smaller drainage programs can be made effective.

The Department of Public Works of the State of Louisiana has prepared a comprehensive drainage program for the alluvial and prairie lands in the State. The prosecution of this program was authorized by Act 58 of the 1944 State legislature. We believe that funds for construction will be provided in the near future.

The State-wide drainage program will provide adequate drainage for the 11,000,000 acres of farm land where 50 percent of the State's population resides, extending into portions of 47 parishes.

This program contemplates the combined efforts of Federal, State, and parish agencies. The Federal Government, through the War Department, is expected to bear the cost of enlarging and improving the navigable streams of the State which will provide main drainage outfalls. The passage of the present flood-control bill by Congress insures their recognition of the Federal responsibility for these streams and actually includes authorization for improvement of a number of main outfall streams.

The State's functions in this program are:

1. Promoting projects to be constructed by the Federal Government.
2. Furnishing the local financial assistance required by the Federal Government in connection with these Federal projects.
3. Designing comprehensive drainage systems leading into the main outfalls.
4. Providing financial assistance to the parishes and levee boards in carrying out parish-wide drainage programs.

This State-wide program will improve 8,000,000 acres of existing farm lands. Losses throughout the State approximating $25,000,000 annually will be eliminated. Value of lands will be increased $240,000,000. Farm income will increase at least twofold, or about $240,000,000 annually. Approximately 20,000 new farms of 160 acres each can be added to cultivated lands of Louisiana.

For the area on the right bank of the Red River, the Red River Lateral Canal will provide the main outfalls required from Shreveport to the Mississippi River backwater area. All along the route of this canal thousands upon thousands of acres of lands will be made suitable for agriculture by its construction.

The Department of Public Works is preparing a detailed study of the benefits on account of improved drainage which would accrue from the construction of the lateral canal and, although we have left a great amount of work to do, it seems probable that the benefits due to drainage improvements alone would more than justify the expense of its construction.

I want to assure you that this Department is going to do everything possible to help secure for the Red River Valley the Red River Lateral Canal which seems to me to be so vitally necessary to the valley's growth and prosperity.

ADDRESS OF LEO M. ODOM, CHIEF ENGINEER, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, STATE OF LOUISIANA

The object of my talk today is simply to discuss modern inland navigation such as will be available to the people of this valley when the Red River Lateral Canal is constructed.

I am glad to have this opportunity to speak to the Red River Valley Improvement Association about inland water transportation. I spent several years of my life on the design and construction of inland waterways, and I have seen with my own eyes the great development that has occurred in a relatively short time after these improvements have been provided. I am, therefore, thoroughly sold on navigation as a spur to the growth and improvement of the regions it serves.

When this valley was settled, navigation constituted the first method of transportation, and most of the freight was hauled that way in spite of tremendous difficulties until about 60 years ago. About that time the railroads began to furnish a much more dependable and flexible service, and traffic on Red River rapidly disappeared. The present generation in this valley knows very little about navigation as a means of hauling freight, and much of that knowledge is obscured by the romantic stories that have

survived about the colorful characters who carried on this dangerous and difficult business. Regardless of romance, no amount of subsidy could have kept navigation alive on an uncontrolled Red River to Shreveport in the face of the competition of the railroads and, much later, of the highways and pipe lines. The craft of a half century ago were also unequal to the task. As the interchange of goods with other parts of the country and of the world became more common, it was unthinkable that freight would forsake its newer facilities which offered everyday, dependable, regular service for the risky, uncertain, and often, more expensive river route. It would be well if we bid goodbye, with whatever regrets we may have, to the rip-roaring, swearing side-wheeler captains and their roustabouts. They served their part in the development of America along with the Conestoga wagon and the flint-lock rifle. The transportation pattern of today has no place for them.

Modern inland water transportation is a new industry. It furnishes a very cheap method of hauling, but only if channels are dependable and if sufficient freight can be obtained to justify regular schedules and modern warehouses and unloading facilities. A modern barge line requires considerable investment and reasonable assurance of successful operation must be apparent before it will be undertaken, even if excellent channels are available.

Local inhabitants of an area wherein a navigation project is desired may have several reasons for wanting it, but the main and most proper reason should be, and usually is, that it is hoped that the project will result in development of the resources of the area and increased prosperity for its citizens. The State government and the Federal Government also have this end in view, but the Federal Government is interested mainly in the over-all transportation picture.

In order for the Nation to prosper, it is imperative that all of its functions be handled with as little expenditure as possible in man-hours and materials. Since transportation is one of the most important functions in the economy of the Nation in peacetime and is absolutely vital to success in war, the Federal Government has always taken a very active interest in development of transportation facilities. Navigation on improved dependable channels by modern methods provides, in most cases, the cheapest means of transporting bulk goods. It, therefore, has a definite place in the transportation pattern of the Nation.

At its greatest final development as an element in the transportation pattern, waterway transportation will be restricted by nature to a small portion of the country. As it happens, the areas where waterways are practicable are the most fertile and productive and densely inhabited. The possession of waterway transportation will undoubtedly prove to be vital to the growth of cities and whole sections of this country as competition becomes keener and the great advantage of low-cost bulk-freight movement becomes clearer. Here in Louisiana, and in the Red River Valley, we should realize that there is a national modern inland water transportation system, that all communities denied its cheap rates will suffer in competition with communities so blessed, and that we have the great natural advantages of flat terrain and abundant rainfall which make construction of modern waterways practicable. We have the great physical advantage here that the construction of a modern waterway is feasible. Areas less fortunately favored by nature may suffer serious set-backs to growth and development in the future. The modern barge-line traffic was only approaching maturity at the beginning of this war. The war has greatly expanded it and it has become firmly rooted in the Nation's system.

The only agency that could possibly construct this waterway is the Government of the United States, and the money must be obtained from the Congress for its construction. In other words, the money of all the people must be obtained to help build up this small portion of the Nation.

Congress has now ordered the Army engineers to look at our project and report back to it as to whether the interest of the Nation as a whole would be served by its construction. I believe that it will. I believe that the construction of this waterway will not merely result in cheapened freight rates, but that by placing this valley in a better position, because of cheap hauling of bulk commodities here, the development will be so stimulated that not only will prosperity in general be increased but the traffic in the higher valued commodities on the railroads will greatly expand.

But we have a lot of work to do to get this project over. We cannot get it over by wishing nor just by saying we think it would be a good thing. In order to get the Congress to appropriate the $50,000,000 necessary for its construction we have got to put forth a reasonable and logical picture of what it will do for the valley and for the Nation, and give definite assurance that the necessary steps for growth of traffic will be taken once the waterway is constructed.

Our Government is our servant in this country, but it is the servant of all the people. We can not, therefore, demand from our Government for curselves what would be against the interest of others, or something that we do not plan to use.

The advantages of modern waterway transportation are great and the greatest thing this association could obtain for this valley at this time is this lateral canal. But we must all work together and convince the Army engineers and Congress that it has a place in the Nation's transportation system and that we mean business about the use of it once we get it, or I do not think we ever shall. Our small delegations in Congress have a hard enough time getting the appropriations which we can show definite justification for. They certainly cannot force the Members from the other 47 States to give us this big project just because we asked for it.

The department of public works of the State of Louisiana is making an economic study in which the effect of this waterway upon the whole economy of this section will be considered. A brief in support of the project will be prepared and submitted to the Army engineers as soon as our information is assembled. We know how to make a study like this and we know the type of information and arguments to which the Army engineers will pay attention. I believe that we can justify this project on its merits and if we can, I know we will get a favorable report from the Army engineers. With such a report our delegation in Congress will have something to work on and can direct their efforts toward getting the project authorized, with good chances for success.

Too Many Silk Gloves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including an editorial from the Midland Daily News, of Midland, Mich. The sentiment expressed therein, I believe, speaks the mind and thought of every individual in this country who has any regard for our armed forces on the fighting fronts or for the welfare of this country. It should be publicized everywhere throughout the country. It is timely. It points directly to action which is inevitable unless conditions are soon changed.

The editorial follows:

TO US IT LOOKS LIKE TOO MANY SILK GLOVES

"In war just one thing matters—keeping the flow of production to the fighting fronts and delivering the goods on time. The finest tank in the world is of no use delivered to a dead soldier the day after a battle." (Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War.)

People are getting fed up on these current strikes in Detroit war plants which curb the production of B–29 parts, rockets, tanks, and guns, and a host of other war supplies. They are beginning to lose interest in the cause of such strikes—whether the blame falls on labor or management. Some 161 strikes since Pearl Harbor in Briggs alone is too much. It doesn't make sense.

Labor leaders tried to stop the strikes. Their please fell on deaf ears. Government officials tried in a soft-spoken way. Nothing happened. Production stopped. The supply lines for boys at the front were cut.

What kind of America is this, anyhow? These men had better ask themselves: "Shall we be traitors to our own flesh and blood? Shall we leave them out there facing a cunning and well-armed enemy and let them die for lack of arms?"

This is serious. The coddling period is past. The Government needs a decisive, final policy. It needs to be tough in its enforcement, whether the culprit is labor or management.

Labor and management can get along. They do get along right here in Midland, which can be proud of having had not one strike since Pearl Harbor. Full production every day. Grievances? Sure, but settled promptly through wise labor and management leaders. These men are building confidence in labor and its ability to cooperate; to produce, to settle grievances * * * and do it without stoppage.

Front line soldiers carry out orders in the fight with the enemy or face being shot. Production line soldiers (including workmen and managers) can cut off their supplies, thumb their noses at Washington and get nothing more drastic than a pat on the wrist. When is a traitor and what is a treasonable act? Our boys can answer and the answer will not be pleasant. It's time to take off the silk gloves, go after this strike trouble roughshod and clean it up so that we will convince our boys in the armed forces that this is a country which will back them up; a country worth fighting and dying for. Uniforms for all will be the other alternative, and Army pay and subsistence.

The Dangers of Our Outmoded Electoral System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address delivered by me at the meeting of the Ohio Bar Associa-

tion, Columbus, Ohio, on November 10, 1944. The address is as follows:

The election on Tuesday was not sufficiently close to bring about a constitutional quarrel, as a result of the electoral system as set up in our basic laws. There were, however, during the campaign evidences of what may happen in the future which would upset the tranquillity of the Nation. Most certainly during the next few years and before we enter into another Presidential contest a thorough study of our electoral system should be made by leading constitutional lawyers throughout the country and by a congressional committee. We should not wait until a catastrophe is upon the Nation before remedying some of the apparent defects. Although the question here presented may be academic for the next 3 years, it is an interesting one to lawyers and it is one that should be given legislative consideration before we enter into the heat of another political contest.

In approaching the defects of our electoral system as applied to modern-day political practices, it is necessary to go back and see just what our founding fathers had in mind. Their plan was quite a different animal from the streamlined version we know today. Some day, unless we meet and remedy the imperfection, we will be faced with a crisis of the first magnitude.

The question of how the Chief Executive should be elected presented almost insurmountable difficulties to the men who wrote the Constitution. "If the tranquillity of the Nation is to be disturbed," said Chancelor Kent, "and its liberties endangered by struggle for power, it will be upon this subject of choice for President."

All sorts of plans were proposed, one that the President be chosen by Congress was adopted, and afterward rejected. Another, that the "National Executive" be elected by the Governors of the States was rejected. Gradually the idea of an election indirectly by the people gained ground until at last it was agreed that the choice should be made by electors appointed by the legislators of the States; this was a compromise between the large and the small States. The method was intended to place absolute control in the choice of the President in the small body of citizens selected by the several States. It was intended to avoid on the one hand the popular tumult and passion that a direct election by the people might involve, and on the other hand, it was intended to avoid legislative domination of the Executive by the Congress. Each State was to have electors equal in number to its Senators and Representatives, who were to meet in that State on the same day on which the electors met in all other States. It was thought that each separate State group would be unaware of the decision of the others. The State, if it wished, would have the authority to select electors from the chamber of commerce or any other set of individuals. In the early days of the Republic the electors were not elected at all, but were appointed by the legislatures. South Carolina followed this practice until 1868. The original provision of the Constitution provided that after the President was chosen the person having the greatest number of electoral votes was to be Vice President.

Only a few years were needed to develop some of the worst imperfections of the original electoral plan. As early as 1797 a proposed amendment sought to require the electors to distinguish in their ballots between candidates for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency, but it was not until a real crisis arose which threatened the life of the Republic that some defects were cured. John Adams became Vice President in 1789, though he did not receive half the votes.

In 1800 Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr received the same number of votes—73—and each a majority. It was well known that the electors desired Jefferson for President and Burr for Vice President. This demonstrated the unwisdom of voting for both President and Vice President upon the same ballot. It proved the possibility of electing a President from one party and a Vice President from another, and it showed the danger of a tie vote and opened the door to bargains and coalitions. Jefferson was a Republican and Burr a Federalist. Party and personal feeling ran high. High-handed methods were seriously proposed and revolution was threatened. Hamilton, a Federalist, but a hater of Burr, is given credit patriotically for bringing about Jefferson's election on the thirty-sixth ballot, although he regarded Jefferson as "an atheist in religion and a fanatic in politics." It will be remembered that it was Burr who later killed Hamilton in a duel.

The Jefferson-Burr controversy threatened a dissolution of the Government. It was said that the country escaped from a civil war only from the prevalence of that kind temper and magnanimity in the Congress which prevailed in the convention itself. It was seriously proposed to pass a law to create a President in which the person was to be named, leaving the votes and choice of the people out of consideration altogether. Had this been effected, it was freely predicted that such person's head would not have remained on his shoulders for 24 hours afterward. Jefferson himself, in a letter to Monroe, said that the "day such an act passed the Middle States would arm."

This was the first time a Presidential election had been thrown into the House of Representatives, and it nearly wrecked the young Republic.

This controversy resulted in the passage of the twelfth amendment in 1804. The main features of the amendment were that the electors were to vote separately for President and Vice President. If no person received the electoral majority for President, the House of Representatives is to choose from the three highest instead of the five highest as provided originally in the Constitution.

The second and last time an election was thrown into the House of Representatives was in 1824, just 120 years ago. In the electoral college there were 182 votes, of which Andrew Jackson had 99, John Quincy Adams 84, William H. Crawford 41, and Henry Clay 37. Jackson had a plurality of 50,000 in the popular vote. There was no question as to the election of John C. Calhoun as Vice President.

Henry Clay was Speaker of the House at that time. Before the day for counting the votes a great scandal arose. Charges of corruption were made against Clay, which were investigated without result. The situation was one which invited intrigue, and no doubt there was much bargaining and attempted trading of votes. Excitement ran high. A coalition between the followers of Clay and those of Adams resulted in the election of John Quincy Adams on the first ballot. Clay, on account of being fourth in the electoral college, was eliminated in the House. If the old provision of voting for the five highest on the list had not been changed to the three highest, Clay instead of Adams probably would have been the choice. Adams when a Senator had opposed the change from five to three, and had his argument prevailed it is unlikely he would have become President.

In a very short time after the birth of the republic the motivating reasons for the electoral college were either forgotten or abandoned. The electors, whether chosen by the legislatures of the States, as they were originally, or by the popular suffrage, as they now are, became and now are only puppets, selected under a moral restraint to vote for the particular person who represented the preference of the appointing power, whether that be the legislature or the more popular suffrage of the people. So it has come to pass that this curious machinery of the electoral college has become only a mode of casting the vote for that candidate who is the favorite of a majority of the people within the particular State electing the elector.

It is recorded that three electors voted for John Adams against their party, and that one Federalist elector in Pennsylvania voted for Jefferson, but this was before the party system, as we now understand it, came into being.

Nowhere in the Constitution is there any mention of candidate for President or Vice President. Political parties were not contemplated by our Constitution writers. The Constitution only refers to electors who have a legal right to choose anyone they wish for President and Vice President. Political parties are merely instruments used to promote the candidacy of some favorite of that group. They have no constitutional control over the action of the electors.

Then, too, Presidential electors are State officers and not Federal officers. Even though they act under the Constitution, they are no more officers of the United States than are members of a State legislature.

Through political parties we have evolved a system for the naming and electing a President never contemplated by the founding fathers. Our present practice is in fact contrary to their declared intent. We cling to the form but disregard the substance. We are using an expedient gadget which distorts constitutional principles.

Well, during this past campaign the electoral college was resurrected from its innocuous desuetude and brought forth as a live and threatening issue. In Texas 15 of the original electors vowed they would vote for some one other than their party's nominee. Electors in other States had the same purpose. Had the action of the second Democratic Convention in Texas in selecting new electors not been sustained by the Texas court, Roosevelt would have 15 less electoral votes pledged to him today.

The people of the United States have become accustomed to the idea they are voting for a person for President and a person for Vice President. The electors on the ballots are puppets insofar as they are concerned. And yet they may in future years find that they are voting blindfolded or even exactly opposite to their desire. When this occurs, and it surely will unless the system is changed, many thousands of Americans are going to be awfully upset to find their will miscarried. And the country may be brought near revolution in some future January when the electoral college selects a President against the wishes of the majority of the people.

Therefore the system should be changed. We should make our basic law conform to the method practiced for 140 years. At present we are circumventing the clear intent of the Constitution. The dangerous camouflage should be removed. The possibility of fraud and connivance should be eliminated. The people should be allowed to vote for the President by direct vote. Election by either popular vote or by unit vote of the States would be infinitely better than the present risk we are running. The unit system for States would leave the respective States with the same influence in Presidential elections they now enjoy. Election by a national popular vote would give some States a temporary advantage of power, but within a few years this would be equalized. It is the democratic way and in the long run would result in a more even distribution of political benefits. I believe, though, that a constitutional amendment to change the elector system and substitute a unit plan would have the best chance of adoption.

I am very hopeful the lawyers of America may take the lead in proposing a constitutional amendment to revise our election system before it confronts the Nation with a disastrous crisis.

There is another grave danger in our electoral system. It might result in some future election being thrown into the House of Representatives. And unless by statute we make provision for an Acting President, the Nation might find itself with no Chief Executive.

Suppose we had a close election and a number of electors against their party's will voted for some third person for President, or suppose we had a third political party which governed several electoral votes. In either event, if no candidate secured a majority of the electoral votes the election would be thrown into the House of Representatives. In that event, some future inauguration day might find us with no Chief Executive.

It could happen this way. A new Congress meets on January 3 following each Presidential election. Control of the new Congress would be bitterly contested in a close election. When it meets on January 3 it would have to organize. It could not organize until it elected a Speaker. This may not be possible for weeks or months. Deadlocks have occurred in the past. One lasted several months. Should the deadlock over the Speakership not be broken by January 6, the two Houses of Congress could not even meet in joint session on that date to count the electoral vote, much less proceed to the election of a President or Vice President. Assuming, however, the prompt election of a Speaker of the House, the peril of having no President is not avoided. A majority, which is 266, of the electoral votes is necessary to elect. The rebel electors or electors of a third party might deprive any candidate of a majority. The election is then thrown into the House. The Members would then proceed to vote for President. No other business would be in order. With inauguration on January 20, the House Members would only have 12 weekdays to make a choice. Each State would have but one vote depending upon its political complexion in the House. Based upon the pre-November 7 picture, three States—Washington, West Virginia, and Idaho—having an equal number of Democrats and Republicans, would have no vote. The voting might result in a tie or a deadlock. The preelection representation gave the Democrats 24 States, the Republicans 21.

If the House has the duty of electing a President, the election of a Vice President automatically evolves upon the Senate. The Vice President, if elected, would act as President until the House elected one. But the Senate might not be able to elect a Vice President. A majority of the whole number of Senators is necessary for a choice. Third-party Senators, absent Senators, or vacancies might make a majority impossible. Furthermore, a constitutional quorum of two-thirds is necessary to elect a Vice President. It would be an easy matter to prevent the required number from assembling. Even with a quorum present, some Senators might refuse to vote.

Then there is the remote possibility of the death or disqualification of both the President-elect and Vice-President-elect before inauguration day. What would we do then? The Succession Act, passing the office down through the Cabinet, only applies after a President has taken the oath of office. These risks were real even before the twentieth amendment, when inauguration day was March 4. They are enhanced with passage of the Norris amendment. Section 3 recognizes the peril and the absolute necessity of a remedy. It gives Congress the right to designate some person, any person, to act as President and thereby avoid a hiatus in the office of Chief Executive.

On April 19, 1940, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2532, to implement the twentieth amendment and avoid this genuine and grave danger to the Republic. This proposal was that the Speaker of the House, if one had been elected, and the President pro tempore of the Senate, if the Speakership had not been settled, should act as President until one had been elected and qualified. This bill passed the House in the Seventy-seventh Congress, but was pigeonholed in the Senate. In the Seventy-eighth Congress I filed the same bill, H. R. 678 was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary, but for one reason or another it has slumbered for a year and will expire on January 3 in the tender custody of the Committee on Rules.

In the bill to meet the defect, I named the Speaker of the House as first choice for acting President for these good reasons. He will have been newly elected by the people as a Representative and by his colleagues who are "fresh from the voters" as Speaker. In a lesser degree the same can be said of the President of the Senate pro tempore. The argument against naming the Speaker or President of the Senate pro tempore to act as President is that they would serve in a dual capacity, that there would be too much intermingling of their executive and legislative business. The Cabinet, beginning with the Secretary of State, has been suggested as an alternate. This is objectionable because the old Cabinet might be a repudiated administration and furthermore the members of the Cabinet are not elected officials. It is only necessary that they have the sanction of one man. The paramount issue is not over who is to act. I am not greatly concerned as to the person. The burning necessity is that someone be designated and that it be done at once. Some people have an idea that the Succession Act of 1886 is all we need. They think it would require the Secretary of State to act as President in this dilemma. This is a mistake. The Succession Act only applies after a President is in office. Succession comes to the Cabinet only upon death, removal, resignation, or inability of the President or Vice President. Failure of Congress to elect certainly does not fall under any one of those heads. The third section of the twentieth amendment is ample proof that Congress and the people recognize the Succession Act does not meet the problem.

This bill and a revision of our electoral system by Constitutional Amendment should be high on our legislative agenda. The nation looks to the Bar for guidance in matters of this kind. Let's act before the tragic event is upon us. To wait until the catastrophe is upon us would be wicked and unpardonable negligence.

The Flag Above Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] recently introduced a bill which has for its purpose the erection of a war memorial in the Capital City in commemoration of our fighting marines who have done such heroic work in the prosecution of the war against the Japanese in the Pacific. Their capture of Iwo Jima will be one of the great accomplishments on the part of our fighting men in World War No. 2. The picture which inspired the legislation, to which I refer, showing five marines planting the flag on the summit of Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima will, without question, be enshrined in the history of the glorious achievements of our fighting heroes.

The Oregonian, published in my district, in its issue of March 3, 1945, published an editorial which I am sure will be of interest to the Members of Congress while considering this legislation. It is an outstanding tribute to our fighting marines in connection with their achievements in the South Pacific culminating in the raising of the Stars and Stripes above Iwo Jima. The editorial is as follows:

THE FLAG ABOVE IWO JIMA

The greatest war picture so far—and it won't be surpassed—is that of the five marines raising Old Glory atop Suribachi, when the volcano of death had been taken. The striving figures whose hands clutch the flagstaff, the helmeted heads, and aslant above them, whipping in the sea wind, the colors. Correspondents who watched from boats offshore of Iwo Jima, the far figures tiny to them, the flag a miniature, wrote that their hearts were lifted as their visions blurred. How the sight of it, at the summit, must have gladdened our troops. Then they knew, if ever they had doubted that the enemy could not withstand them—for the steep sides of Suribachi, streaming Japanese firepower, had been stormed. Look, Mac, there's the flag!

The Japs have an emperor, still working the mossy old dodge of divinity, who means Japan to them, whether samurai or peasant. We have the Stars and Stripes to signify our America, her past, present, and future. Time was when our attitude toward the flag, the same flag that flies from Iwo Jima's volcanic height, was characterized by what seemed a casual attitude, if not one of cynicism. Who could have known in those careless days that under the froth and the wisecracks the current yet ran strong and deep? Beyond the seas our envious, secret enemies watched us. Such a people—they said—are without patriotism. The Americans are weaklings and fools. We were a people who laughed when somebody wrote (they say it was Eugene Field) a rhyme about the traditional American glorification of the flag.

> "He marched up to the cannon,
> With the colors in his hand;
> And he was blown to pieces
> To the music of the band."

And now, well, we are amused only to think of our amusement that used to be, and we see that it meant little more than mere idleness.

Do you remember a song of the War with Spain? It was called Just Break the News to Mother. It was a song about the flag and of devotion to the flag as a symbol of everything, and when we sang it at the time of San Juan Hill, our eyes were wet for its youthful hero who wasn't coming home. Remember? The flag went down in the fighting, and the captain called for a volunteer and a boy shouted, "I will! I'll bring it back, or die!" And in the song he brought it back—and died. As time passed, and sophistication flourished, it seemed to us that the old song about the flag was—well—perhaps a trifle mawkish. There was too much of sentiment in it. The war scene had dimmed. We smiled at the song.

Have another look at that impromptu grouping of marines in the picture of the boys and the flag on the cindered hill of Suribachi. Can you smile at the old song now? Though it isn't our sort of song today, you will find that you cannot smile. Fashions in sentiment change, as to the media of

expression, but sentiment does not. American boys who won't come home, nor ever shall see their kindred once more, helped put the flag where it waves. And inside us, deep down, welling up to our throats, is that identical emotion which made the correspondents blink their eyes, from the ships that lay offshore that day; the selfsame emotion that a simpler people experienced when they sang or listened to the old song. Who is of the sophisticates now?

Forever America, and forever Americans. Forever the flag! The more one looks at that picture of the flag-raising on Iwo Jima the firmer becomes one's conviction of the dauntless permanency of the American spirit. But we've done with talking of that. What we started to say is that the more one looks at that greatest of front-line pictures, the surer one is that a sculptor—the best that we have, whoever he may be—should be commissioned to do it in bronze, just as it is. It should stand, heroic in proportions as in theme, in our Nation's capital city, in testimony to the flag and its valor. This already has been proposed in Congress. And we repeat this suggestion to Washington, to our Members of Congress, and to all Americans who may know how to begin the undertaking.

The Ohio River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, every few years the Ohio River goes on a rampage and sweeps over its banks from Portsmouth, Ohio, to Cincinnati, down through Louisville to do untold damage. Up at Pittsburgh the converging waters of three rivers periodically invade the Golden Triangle to submerge the business section of one of the Nation's largest cities.

Congress now has before it a proposal to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on a project to harness the waters of the Missouri River. Irrigation, power production, and the checking of soil erosion are parts of the program contemplated for the Missouri. Almost every year, several million acres of farming land are swept by the waters of Big Muddy.

No one objects to the program for making the Missouri stop misbehaving. But in all the concern for this section of the Nation, the Ohio River area is being largely forgotten. Help the folks down Missouri way, sure; but let us help the people of Ohio, too. The facts and figures show that the people of Ohio have contributed 12 cents out of every dollar spent by the Federal Government in the improvement and development of Bonneville, and Grand Coulee Dams in Washington and Oregon, the Central Valley irrigation projects in California, the Boulder Dam in Arizona and California. Ohio folks recognize that what helps the entire Nation helps them, but there are many direct improvements which are necessary right in our own State that have gone by the board. It is certainly time to remember the Ohio, while we are not forgetting the Missouri.

Relations Between United States and France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to discuss the very important subject of relations between the United States and France.

President Roosevelt's assertion in his recent address before Congress that it is sometimes necessary to deal with "prima donnas" in handling world affairs was generally interpreted as being directed at General de Gaulle. The President's remark was most unfortunate and untimely.

There are different reports of the failure of the President and General de Gaulle to meet for a conference during the President's overseas trip, but whatever may have been the circumstances the fact remains that the indirect criticism of the French leader is detrimental to the friendly relations between the United States and France. Furthermore, there is nothing definite to indicate that General de Gaulle deliberately avoided a meeting.

The French people are an industrious, warm-hearted, liberty-loving people who believe in right and justice. Despite their unfortunate experiences at the hands of certain of their own officials during the present war, and their tragic history in World War No. 1, they have remained true, as a nation, to their beliefs and fundamental principles. They have a high regard for this country and are grateful for the help our Nation has given them. They wish to continue a friendly relationship, and the American people also desire to maintain this cooperation. The fact that so many of our own people are of French descent makes this bond of fellowship all the stronger.

I am certain that France, with the same courage and determination shown in the past, will solve present troubles and emerge strong and vigorous to take an important and rightful place in world affairs.

Americans admire the spirit of the French people and have always sympathized with them in their difficulties. Much depends upon the preservation of the ties between the two countries. The American people are not particularly concerned with the political fortunes of French leaders, but they are greatly interested in the reestablishment of a free, happy and prosperous France. Everything possible should be done to convey to the French people that they have the support and goodwill and friendship of the United States. Caution should be exercised to avoid any statements or actions by representatives of this government that would tend to create misunderstanding or doubt among the citizens of France over our attitude toward them—an attitude of respect and admiration that is greater and broader than any personality or any issue.

The Quakers and Peacetime Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, ever since the day that William Penn met with the Indians under the spreading branches of a Pennsylvania tree and made a treaty of friendship and amity with the red men, the Society of Friends has been a constructive force in the upbuilding and advancement of America.

Today the representatives of this patriotic, religious organization come to us in the hours of stress and uncertainty to point the way and advise us as to the course to be followed in preserving American ideals and the principles of good government.

It is my privilege to present for the consideration of my colleagues a communication from the representative of the Society of Friends inserted herewith:

SALEM, OHIO, *February 10, 1945.*

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: You who have been placed in positions of responsibility by the votes of a great Nation have been and are now facing truly difficult times and momentous decisions. You have a responsibility toward those whose votes have made each of you the representatives of certain sections of the country, but a much greater responsibility toward the wider and more far-reaching welfare of the Nation as a whole. The urge comes to you from various groups to pass laws which may enhance in some way a specific interest of each group rather than the well-being of the whole people.

Almost the whole history of this country has been that of a free and peace-loving Nation. In these difficult times you are being urged to establish peacetime military training for every able-bodied youth just arriving at the age of manhood. Such a law may do more to convert our beloved Nation into a military power than any law which has ever been placed upon the statute books. It is the kind of a law which has made Germany and Japan and almost every other country of Europe a training ground for the slaughter of men and the destruction of cities.

To escape this compulsory training and service many people were induced to leave their native homeland and come to the United States for its promise of freedom from the philosophy of war and killing and the consequent coercion of their lives and destinies.

Conscription in these countries has not promoted peace. It has not prevented invasion. It has not tended to develop a strong and virile people, but rather has been used in many cases to build up armies of the finest and best manhood for tyrants to use for their own ends of power and aggrandizement, leaving the weaker and less fit to propagate sons and daughters for the future.

Are we ready to adopt the philosophy that nations are great in proportion to the size and efficiency of their armies and navies and air forces? If we go back to the early history of the United States, we find the men who were outstanding in the councils of the people were jealous of their freedom from great military power and were apprehensive of any action which should tend to promote such power. The founders of this Nation were very clear in their opposition to the building and maintenance of a large army in peacetime. Are we, by adopting a compulsory military training law, ready to drop such a fundamental heritage as has been woven into the very fabric of our national life as one of the bulwarks of freedom and democracy?

If we adopt such preparation for war as peacetime conscription for training men and building a colossal military machine, thus using the same kind of tactics against which our men are fighting and giving their lives, the people of the world will probably conclude, if they have not already done so, that our promise of a lasting peace and helpful cooperation are insincere. They will lose faith in us and then will revert to the same old race for armaments as has been going on through most of Europe's recent history.

The United States now has a wonderful opportunity to demonstrate the power of kindness and cooperation. It has inspired hope in the hearts of downtrodden peoples with the promise of peace and a helping hand as set forth in the Atlantic Charter. Is that hope to die because we have repudiated those promises and those ideals?

Religious liberty was one of the foundation stones of this Nation. Religion has been one of its motivating factors from the beginning down through the years. In the Constitutional Convention, when it had reached an impasse, Benjamin Franklin, addressing the presiding officer, George Washington, said: "In this situation of this assembly, groping, as it were, in the dark to find political truth and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Light to illumine our understandings? The longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?" Upon the motion of Franklin, prayers were then held every morning before starting the work of the day imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessings upon the deliberations of the assembly. From that time, we are told, they began to make progress, and when William Pitt read the completed Constitution he exclaimed, "It will be the wonder and admiration of all future generations and the model of all future constitutions."

Again, when someone remarked to Lincoln that he hoped God was on our side Lincoln's reply was, "My concern is not so much whether God is on our side. My great concern is to be on God's side, for God is always right."

Let us "Keep God in American history." May our beloved country go forward with His blessing, still proclaiming hope to oppressed peoples and demonstrating by its action that there are still those in the world who care and are ready to extend a helping hand. And may you who are in a position to guide the destinies of this Nation, who have great decisions to make which will affect mankind not only now but down through the years to come, may you seek for that "Wisdom that is from above and that is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy."

Very sincerely,

CHARLES P. MORLAN.

Bretton Woods Pact and Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of February 17, 1945:

BRETTON WOODS PACT AND ISOLATIONISM

Another concrete test in Congress on what promises to be a series of acts implementing our participation in international agreements is now in the making in connection with the proposals which grew out of the Bretton Woods Conference. The test will come when Congress debates subscription by the United States of $2,700,000,000 to an $8,800,000,000 stabilization fund and of $3,100,000,000 to the capital of a $9,000,000,000 international bank which the Bretton Woods Conference proposed.

The importance of this test is suggested by Secretary Morgenthau when he told a Nationwide radio broadcast that the Bretton Woods agreements were "a symbol of the end of economic isolationism in the United States." Broadly speaking, Mr. Morgenthau is right. There has been an end, we hope, not only to economic, but also political, isolationism on the part of the United States. But Mr. Morgenthau makes a mistake when he infers, as he did in this speech, that the Bretton Woods Conference was the final word and that any suggestion for changing the specific program as laid down at that meeting is simply the voice of economic isolationism.

There is ample room for difference of opinion wholly within the obvious desire of everyone to arrive at workable international economic agreement on some of the specific proposals made by Bretton Woods. The American Bankers Association, for instance, has taken an objective point of view in its desire to construct what Mr. Morgenthau describes to be "a concrete avenue toward international cooperation on the economic front." But its attitude cannot be called isolationist when it approves the idea of an international bank but would modify the fund's policies and perhaps combine it with the bank.

America is not alone in criticizing details of the Bretton Woods proposals. British opinion is also divided, but for different reasons.

Some Britons feel that it would force them back to the gold standard while some American critics are equally sure that it would debase the dollar. Such differences are inevitable, but they should not obscure the most important contribution that an agreement based on Bretton Woods could make. Its contribution should be to remove, as far as it is possible by international monetary agreement, the underlying causes of failure to stabilize currencies after the last war and the resultant economic instability which contributed to world depression and this war. In reaching such an agreement Morgenthau's loose talk about isolationism is no help.

American World Policy for Peace and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, Commander Harold E. Stassen, our former Governor of Minnesota, is one of the first authentic voices to speak from the almost 15,000,000 young Americans who are or have been in our armed forces in this war. I believe he expresses in forthright and compelling terms the basic views and resolves of the vast majority of these men and women and of the whole American people.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a speech given on March 7, 1945, by Commander Stassen in Minneapolis and over a Nation-wide radio hook-up:

Governor Thye, President Coffey, friends, and fellow citizens, in these last 3 years, America, with her allies, has won a long series of brilliant historic victories in this war. The names stand out as grim markers of our march toward victory, from Guadalcanal and Casablanca to Iwo Jima and the Rhine.

These battles will be symbols for generations of how Americans, who love peace, can and will fight when they must.

The superb productive power of our country has played a heavy part in these victories and has contributed to the strength of the other United Nations. American labor, management, capital, and agriculture are entitled to high commendation for their performance. The flow of supplies and munitions and ships and planes and guns has been nothing short of a miracle.

The victories have been actually won by the unbelievably heroic and effective fighting of those wisecracking, good-natured, beloved American sons of yours on the battlefronts of the world.

They take off from rolling carrier decks, or advanced airfields, penetrate thick, soupy weather, fight their way to enemy strongholds and deal devastating blows. They wade into beaches in wave after wave regardless of the whir of machine guns, the wham of mortars, and the blast of bombs. They slog and worm their way up to blast and burn pill boxes and caves. They stand by their guns and pour out their fire in the face of diving planes or roaring counterfire, or charging tanks. They take their guns, their planes, their tanks, their ships, their subs, their small boats, anywhere and everywhere to strike an enemy or support a pal. They die doing these things. They die, and others like them take their places.

With splendid military leadership from the commander in chief, and from generals like Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur and Arnold, and Vandegrift, and from admirals like King, Leahy, Nimitz and Halsey, they have brought us within sight of the final victory.

That final victory must be our No. 1 aim until the last enemy has surrendered. Nothing must divert us from following through to early, complete winning of the war. Each new quota of supplies and munitions and men to meet the fluctuating needs of the shifting types of battle must be promptly met. We must not listen to the siren call of reconversion until we can re-

convert together in peace. Each new battle must be fought with vigor and with skill.

But it is right and proper and urgent that we in service, when the opportunity presents itself, and you at home, proceed to think through the world policy of America for peace, lest we lose much of what we are fighting for.

As you know, the President has invited me to serve as a member of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations, and I have accepted.

It will be my endeavor to study and to learn as much as possible of the information, ideas and viewpoints of the people of America on the questions coming up at this conference. I have consulted and will consult with leaders of our Government and of my Republican Party; of church, of labor, agriculture, and business; of women, of youth and of veterans. But I will not seek to nor claim to represent any of them as special groups at San Francisco. I will consider it my duty to represent my country as a whole as I see its best welfare, and to be individually responsible for my actions. It will be my aim to assist in securing a result of this crucial conference which will be supported by the overwhelming majority of the people of America, and by substantially all of the other United Nations. This means, of course, that the result will not be, and cannot be, entirely in accord with any nation's or any person's individual views. But, I cannot say too emphatically, that the alternative to finding the areas of agreement is to do nothing at all. And nothing at all would start us on our way along the short road of inaction, to worldwide depressions and to the next and most tragic world war.

That is not an acceptable alternative.

It is of tremendous importance that the principles which will guide our actions in the years to come be formulated and clarified and tempered in the heat of free discussion now, so that they may be clearly and definitely set before the world.

To stimulate this search, speaking only for myself, I frankly state what I consider should be the seven cardinal points of our future world policy:

1. That as a nation we will join with our present allies at San Francisco to build a definite continuing organization of the United Nations of the World, based on justice and law, and insured by force. That we will seek to gradually develop a new and higher level of government, with legislative, judicial, and executive functions, and with worldwide jurisdiction, for the future peace, progress, and well-being of mankind. That we are and will continue to be interested in what happens in every other part of the globe. That this is one world.

Nor can I speak those last two words without pausing to pay a tribute to him who made them mean more than mere words, more than a symbol, the veritable keystone to a living cause and hope for mankind—Wendell Willkie.

2. That we do not subscribe to the extreme view of nationalistic sovereignty, that we realize that neither this Nation, nor other nation can be a law unto itself in the modern world, and that we are willing to delegate a limited portion of our national sovereignty to our United Nations organization, so that it may be effective in the tasks we expect it to accomplish. That we hold that true sovereignty rests in the people, and that there is and must be a law of humanity above and beyond the narrow rule of nationalistic, absolute sovereignty.

3. That we consider that the future welfare and peace and happiness of the people of America is inseparably intertwined with the future welfare and peace and happiness of the men and women and children of the world.

4. That we will use the enormous productive capacity of America and the reservoirs of capital and credit and technical skill to contribute to the gradual advancement of the standards of living of the peoples of the world, not as recipients of charity but as self-respecting men and women of dignity and of pride.

5. That we believe in the freedom of information through press and radio and school and forum as a vital factor in the peace and progress of the world and in the fulfillment of the dignity of man.

6. That those who were aggressors in this war shall be stripped of all means to make war and shall remain so stripped. That we propose to remain strong on land, at sea, and in the air, and will join with Russia and Great Britain, China and France, and the other United Nations in furnishing police power in the world.

7. That we are and propose to remain a democracy of free citizens with an economic system of private capital and individual enterprise. That we will constantly seek to improve the functioning of our system, both as to freedom and equality of our citizens and as to the success and adequacy of our economy. That we will explain our system to the world, but will leave it to the peoples in each nation to decide for themselves their own form of government so long as they do not trample on basic human rights, or threaten the peace of the world, or transgress upon their neighbors. That we will permit our own citizens to learn of any other form of government they wish to study, but will not permit any other government to actively seek to undermine our own.

Obviously each of these cardinal points could well be the subject of a major address. Within the limits of my time this evening I will discuss them in turn.

It is very generally agreed now that an international organization should be formed and that the United Nations should be the basis of such an organization.

I am not one of those who feel that the organization must take some certain detailed, exact form. I believe there are many forms that would be a definite step forward and would make a constructive contribution.

I hope that it will include some method of developing basic world-wide law. It should make possible the future enactment of a fundamental code of human rights. The beginning may be very small. But even if we started with the enactment of one law, a law that no country, in time of peace, shall execute a human being without just trial, it would be a significant step. We sometimes fail to realize that there is no such world law today. The Nazi storm troopers and Gestapo who dragged civilians from their houses in Germany and summarily shot them were violating every moral code we know of, but they were not violating any international law, because there is none to protect a human being within a nation. This starkly silhouettes the tragic slowness of the development of society on the world level.

We know full well that Nazi aggression actually started, not when Hitler marched across his borders but rather when he first ruthlessly trampled the rights of men within Germany.

From small beginnings, gradually the rights of freedom of worship, of fair trial, of freedom of speech and press, the right of the worker to organize, and the prevention of discrimination should be developed. With it should be stated the world-wide laws or rules against aggression, for the flight of aircraft, for the use of ports and canals, the restriction of armaments, the availability of resources, the advancement of health and education, and the prevention of unjust confiscation of property.

Obviously, if we are to have laws, we must have a court to administer these laws. Clearly, then, a United Nations court of some type with world-wide jurisdiction is essential.

It is equally clear that a police force of some nature is mandatory to enforce the decisions of the court if order and justice is to be respected and maintained. This definitely does not mean an all-powerful international police force of a superstate.

Let us clarify our thinking.

If either the United States, or Russia, or Great Britain decide in the next 25 years to make war, then there will be another world war, and no organization, or league, or union, or treaties will stop it. But I do not believe any of these countries will want to make war. Each knows the horrors of war. Each has so much to gain by not making war. Each has a great future in the peaceful development of its resources and its standing in the world.

They will not always see problems alike. They will not always please each other. But in the main, they must and should work out their differences of views and find the way for joint action. The Yalta Conference was a very important indication that this can and will be done. Clearly, then, our policies should be based on the development of the world with these three desiring peace.

A note of caution should also be sounded, however, that we should definitely envisage a system of laws and justice and a moral code supported by police force, and must not permit the development of a continuing system of world power and force without law.

The United Nations should also develop an effective and just method of trusteeships for use in governing territories that for reasons of extreme military importance, or inability of self-government, or peculiar economic position, or seizure from an enemy, can best be held in a form of joint United Nations title, rather than in the title of any individual nation. The enlightened interest of the world and the human rights of the people concerned should both be carefully safeguarded. The trustee may be either one of the United Nations, or the United Nations organization itself.

Let us also make it clear that the United Nations organization does not mean breaking up any of the stable associations of nations and peoples now in existence. It is definitely not adverse to the British Commonwealth of Nations, nor to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, nor to the United States of America, nor to the various associations of nations through treaties and friendships. On the contrary, we seek to build on these cornerstones of stability a world-wide beginning for order and justice and peace in place of chaos and tragedy and war.

Tremendous steps have been taken in recent months toward the fulfillment of this first cardinal point of our world policy.

With the background of the Atlantic Charter and the commitments of Secretary Hull's conference at Moscow, the declarations of Teheran, the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks, the decisions at Yalta, the President's excellent message to Congress last week, and the never-ending wholesome study and discussion throughout America have brought us to the eve of the San Francisco Conference for the drafting of a definite framework for continuing United Nations action in peace, with the overwhelming support of the people of the country and of the United States Senate for the steps proposed.

We should look, therefore, upon the San Francisco Conference as a golden opportunity to win a beachhead in the battle for a just and lasting peace.

The beachhead is of crucial importance, and requires many sacrifices and never-ending determination.

And, also, the beachhead is not the final goal, but only the jumping-off place for the long, hard drive toward victory.

So it will be, and must be recognized to be, at San Francisco. The results of a successful conference will be of incalculable importance, but they will not be the final answer to our world problems for peace. They will only be the first step. Continuing interest of the American people, continuing devotion of their Government, the approval and support of the proposals by the Senate, and then the steady growth and development of the United Nations organization will be essential if we are to have anything more than a precarious beachhead.

In a discussion of the development of a new and higher level of government you frequently hear the rejoinder, yes, that would be a good step but it would violate the rule of absolute nationalistic sovereignty.

Let us meet this issue squarely.

I do not want my country to face another generation of youth marching off to the horrors of war and say "We could have prevented the development of this conflict but we had to cling to the extreme principle of absolute nationalistic sovereignty." That will not be an acceptable answer.

There may be many diplomats who do not know it; there may be many political leaders who are afraid to admit it; there may be many people who do not understand it, but the extreme possibility of absolute nationalistic sovereignty is of the middle ages and it is dead. It died with the airplane, the radio, the rocket, and the robomb.

It its place we must develop the new principle of the rights, duties, and responsibilities of each nation to the other nations and of each man and each woman to the other people of the world.

No nation has any right in the modern world to do as it pleases without regard to the effects of its actions upon the peoples of other nations. True sovereignty rests in the people, and the people know that for their own future welfare they must exercise a portion of that sovereignty on a world level in place of the nationalistic level.

Just as each freeman must so limit his liberty of action so that he does not injure his neighbor, so each nation must limit its action so that it does not injure its neighbor. And in one world today, the nations of the world are all neighbors.

One of the most striking facts which has been demonstrated in this war is the enormous productive capacity of America. It has been a huge power for destruction and for victory.

It can be an equally great power for world construction and progress after the war if we but lift our eyes to its opportunities and responsibilities and take the necessary steps for world stability.

This will require increased investments by American capital in the resources and facilities of other nations, and increased trade with lower tariffs throughout the world. We must explode the narrow view that if we develop production in other parts of the world we will preempt our own markets. We will create markets as we develop means to produce. Producers are consumers. The capacity of the human race to consume is just as great as the capacity of the human race to produce. Of course, there are and will be acute problems of distribution. But we can either fight over a shrinking wealth or work together to participate in an expanding production and the wealth of the future.

Vast sums of charitable assistance will be needed in the immediate post-war period, but this should be definitely separated from the careful investment of capital in the long-term development of other nations. It is better that American capital be invested and reinvested in various countries of the world to assist in raising their standards of living and indirectly develop jobs in America in the process, than that it be sterile and stagnant in America.

This does not mean a Santa Claus role. Most of the peoples of the world do not want charity beyond the war emergency conditions. They want to be self-reliant. They want to rebuild their own homes and develop their own economy. It is healthy and wholesome for them and for the world that they should.

But it will mean long-term investments and reinvestments.

Nor is this all just an idealistic dream. Never did a country for its own sake more need to clear the cobwebs from its thinking. Never did a country for its own sake more need to appraise the value and the purpose of its great productive strength.

If it does not lift its eyes and use its brain and its brawn for progress of the world, it will wither and deteriorate in petty internal struggles over the division of a shrinking economy.

But, if it contributes to the progress of the world, it will itself share in that progress in high standards of living, a richer life, and peace.

This is also true of other peoples. Any attempt to profit by one nation at the expense of other people will fail. If it meets with temporary success it will soon be lost in either the whirlpool of depression or the cauldron of war. We cannot have continued economic warfare and continued military peace.

The world must advance together and there is room in the world for all the peoples who live in it.

World opinion is almost unanimous that the Germans and the Japanese must be stripped of their means of making war. This can best be done by joint action of the victorious nations through the United Nations organization, with a continuing joint occupation and inspection.

Under that military rule all indemnities and penalties and reparations should take place. Then and only then the gradual development of self-government should be permitted to arise. It should begin in the localities and in the schools and slowly develop as the capacity and desire for nonaggressive, peaceful, and successful administration is demonstrated.

Freedom of information to the citizens of these countries must be a fundamental rule. Open to the children of Germany and Japan and Italy the full access to the radios and publications and books of the world, and if we are right in our basic concepts in America, and I believe we are, in a generation or two we will have a different Germany and a different Japan. When the change is demonstrated they should be permitted to become self-governing and be granted membership in the world organization, but even then there is no reason why they should be permitted to rearm, and there is every reason to prevent them from rearming. We will be saying in effect to the conquered nations, "We will permit you to rise again as successful, self-governing constructive nations, if you so desire, but we will not permit you to rise again as a military power, whatever may be your protestations or intentions."

We ourselves should remain strong. We should maintain a powerful, modern Navy. We should keep an alert, up-to-date Air Force. We should constantly train an efficient land force.

We should do this to fulfill the police force responsibility which will be ours in enforcing and supporting the world code of justice and the United Nations organization and also to assure our own future security and progress. We should make it plain that much as we want peace we will fight again, and will fight anyone who basically violates world justice and seeks to flaunt our policies and tries to make might right. This position, I am convinced, is more likely to maintain peace than an announced policy of making ourselves weak and of not fighting even though provoked.

To those who scoff at thoughts like these expressed tonight as abstract idealism I simply ask that you look out upon the world-wide tragedy of war today. When the terror of war has reached the grand scale that it has today it is time for some thinking for peace on a grand scale. And I add that I will work with you with just as much hard-shelled realism on the emergency of today and with just as much down to earth practicalism on the problems of tomorow.

But our ideals will determine the all-important question of the basic course that we take.

We need not scoffers today. We need men. Men to assault the pill boxes of lethargy—the emplacements of prejudice—the spitting guns of intolerance. Men who are willing to fall in the assault so that others may carry the day. It will take that to build the world. It will take that to raise the standards of mankind—to make freedom and liberty and peace—living symbols to men and women and children—and not mere words in speeches or in charters.

Our fighting men want America to have a world policy for peace that is as big, as definite, and as successful as has been our strategy for war.

It will take time and it will cost.

But the alternative makes it worth the cost.

They do not want you to surrender before the counterattacking assault waves of cynicism this best hope of enduring peace on earth.

Some people say that our democracy is not perfect and that there is discrimination and inequality and apathy and corruption. They are right. Some say that our economic system has not functioned perfectly and that there are maladjustments and sufferings and faulty distributions. They are right.

But neither of these facts are any reason for waiting for the correction of these imperfections before we step forward to fulfill the world leadership which it is mandatory that we exercise.

We must advance on both the world front and the domestic front at the same time. In fact, they are in large measure interdependent.

I speak not of a Utopia. I speak not of a human race suddenly turned angelic.

There will be selfishness and greed and corruption and narrowness and intolerance in the world tomorrow and tomorrow's tomorrow. But pray God, we may have the courage and the wisdom and the vision to raise a definite standard that will appeal to the best that is in man, and then strive mightily toward that goal.

Federal Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, most of the agencies created under the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt have accomplished much to help the rank and file of our people. It would require considerable time and space to enumerate the many benefits resulting from the social reforms inaugurated by a progressive Congress under the leadership of the President since 1933.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a few of the achievements of one of the most successful agencies of the Federal Government created to help the home owners throughout the Nation. I refer to the Federal Housing Administration.

The F. H. A. operates entirely through private capital of local financial institutions. It insures the loans these institutions make for property repair and mortgages for the purchase of homes and the construction of new homes. It has done a remarkable job in every part of the country.

I am indebted to the Honorable Abner H. Ferguson, Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, for the following detailed report on the operations of F. H. A. in Illinois to the end of June 1944:

A total of $110,383,299 lent by private local financial institutions, under F. H. A. encouragement and guaranteed against loss, has enabled 298,650 Illinois families to maintain or improve their properties, while over 70,018 families have been able to build or buy homes through mortgage loans in the original face amount of $370,790,994.

In addition, 13,425 families of war workers, newly arrived in war congested areas in Illinois, have been provided with homes through mortgage loans amounting to over $68,753,550.

The F. H. A. has for over 5 years been paying all operating expenses and losses of its mortgage insurance programs, at the same time adding substantially to its insurance reserves which now total more than $97,000,000. Losses have been only a fraction of 1 percent. Likewise, the property-repair program is currently paying its own way from revenues derived from insurance premiums and for nearly a year collections on defaulted loans have shown a substantial margin over claims paid.

According to Mr. Ferguson, within 60 to 90 days the F. H. A. will start distribution of mortgage prepayment dividends to 13,000 home buyers who paid off their mortgages in full during the calendar year of 1944. These mortgages were in group accounts which had developed credit balances by January 1, 1944. These dividends will range from a few dollars to nearly $200 each.

I am certain the Members of the House will agree this is a gratifying record.

Leadership—That Which Leads or Directs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Nor'easter, Philadelphia, Pa., for March 1945:

LEADERSHIP—THAT WHICH LEADS OR DIRECTS

Sports, social activities, business, politics, all support leaders; sometimes they are strong, brilliant, accomplishing results, at other periods mediocre, merely carrying on. Versatile leaders keep abreast of the times, forsee and plan for future activity as well as direct immediate operations. Leadership must sustain itself to a great extent, however; individuals, groups, organizations, will follow able leadership but will also gradually desert that which proves itself inefficient and fails to produce results.

Political thinking has and is changing in many ways; different theories, new programs, readjustments are in process and the trends and final procedures depend much on the leadership displayed. The originality of thought, the approach to subjects, the application of regulations, the executive ability to guide and please, and the last is important to any leadership striving for permanency, are all phases of leadership.

Political leadership attracts attention as something apart from business and living realities, and yet it is an important and integral part of American progress; it is continually before the public and continuously discussed and commented upon. Important communities and States through volume of population or industrial or commercial achievements are watched, criticised, or acclaimed on account of pressure they can exert by the leadership they maintain.

Industrial Philadelphia and diversified Pennsylvania are as important cogs in any political regime as in the industrial world, commercial progress or professional advancement and are watched and studied by other political units.

Both major parties have their peaks and valleys of attainments and popularity. Not long ago the Democratic leadership in Pennsylvania encountered serious internal strife that weakened it at that time. Today the Republican Party in Philadelphia and Pennsylvania is lacking in virile qualities and has lost popularity through lack of strong leadership, at least Northeast Philadelphia is so viewing it.

The reason is simple. The Republican Party has been the majority party in Philadelphia for many decades; it has been the majority party in Pennsylvania for a long time with one recent exception and thus could control legislation in practically all cases. Northeast Philadelphia, an important industrial area with a fast-growing population, has had problems, serious to its existence and yet such that the authorities of a second-class city, and the legislature of a small State would have easily disposed of as they arose.

Philadelphia and Pennsylvania have not met these problems, let alone solved them, but rather avoided them and alibied their way out.

Three items the solutions of which have been avoided, neglected, and postponed are, as follows:

1. Affecting the citizens: Equitable representation has been denied the citizens of Northeast Philadelphia in direct contradiction to the State constitution, solely to preserve certain political leadership. A letter covering the subject to the Governor appears in this issue. His reply states he believes in separation of executive and legislative branches of the Government and does not favor must legislation. It should be remembered that the chairman of the Republican city committee of Philadelphia is a member of the Governor's cabinet, and there are obligations to the people as well as to the politicians which real leadership acknowledges.

2. Affecting industry: Tremendous damage has been placed on northeast industrial companies for a long time due to flood conditions. The city recently started working on the physical aspect of this condition, but has never done anything constructive regarding the legislative aspect. Industries have been damaged, have been driven out of business, and workers have lost employment. It need never have reached the conditions of today under capable leadership.

3. Affecting war work: Philadelphia has been without air service for more than a year and has wrangled over $200,000 in order to open the northeast airport. A letter sent to city council embodying one to the mayor appears in this issue presenting the facts of the case. Other cities one-fifth in size are planning operations out of all proportion with Philadelphia action. The city recently started to act in this matter after northeast criticism. Alert leadership would have brought earlier action.

Here are three instances of matters of vital interest to a third of a million people of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania that any second-class city or small State would have taken in their stride.

Northeast Philadelphia is a substantial community, a city in itself. It sees obligations that should be met and it visualizes splendid possibilities in the future; it will carry its share of any load, it will cooperate with any constructive advancement, but it sees a vital need for real leadership now and in the days ahead.

There is no reason why Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, too, cannot benefit by politics, by two strong parties, playing politics, if you will, but in a forcible manner by capable leaders with the requirements of the people continually under consideration and vision for the future as a guide.

Real leadership recognizes conditions, meets issues, secures results.

The Mailman's Motto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item:

SERVICE THAT BRINGS A SMILE

"Service with a smile" is the motto of the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association. It is not only service with a smile but it is a service which brings a smile of joy into the lives of thousands of people throughout the country every day.

In no other period of history have the daily visits of the rural letter carrier been so important to the people who depend on this service for their mail.

All up and down the rural routes of America are homes from which members have gone forth to help fight for the freedom which our pioneering ancestors founded in this country.

Hardly less important than food is the mail which comes and goes through the services of the rural carrier. In fact, we often read and hear stories about the men in far away places considering mail from home as even more important than food.

Yes; the rural service is not only "Service with a smile"—it is service which brings a smile into the war-disrupted lives of thousands of our people.

Bankers' Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes from the Washington Daily News:

BANKERS' STRATEGY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The principal organized opposition to the Bretton Woods proposals for international governmental machinery in the economic and financial rehabilitation field, which is complementary to the political organization embodied in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and, equally important, comes from the American Bankers Association.

The association has laid its recommendations, drafted by a special committee, before Congress, which is now beginning to consider this vital program in hearings of the House Banking Committee. These recommendations call for modifications in the proposed International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and for elimination of the second agency, the International Monetary Fund. The association committee advocates that some features of the Monetary Fund, which is to assist in stabilization of currencies, be embodied in the bank.

Because of the importance of the plans for economic rehabilitation of war-devastated countries and for restoration of trade in peacetime, which were formulated by representatives of 44 nations at Bretton Woods, N. H., last July, and because of the influence of the American Bankers Association, it is pertinent to inquire into the attitude of the association and how it was developed.

In the first place, the American Bankers Association, as a body, has never passed upon the Bretton Woods proposals.

At its annual convention last September it delegated a committee to state its position, the so-called administrative committee, of which the chairman is W. Randolph Burgess, vice chairman of the board of National City Bank, New York, and president of the American Bankers Association. This committee approved recommendations to Congress proposed by three other committees of the association.

These recommendations have not been resubmitted to the association as a whole, which has some 14,000 members.

Furthermore, an examination of the personnel of these committees shows the presence of the big New York City banks, including those engaged in international finance, which, if the American Bankers Association operates like other such groups, would be a predominating influence, especially in matters dealing with international finance. There are evidences of this influence.

It is also interesting and significant that this same group of bankers first approved of the fund and opposed the bank. The position now has been reversed, which seems to indicate a capricious attitude.

But, despite the committee's antagonistic attitude, there are many bankers who approve the program in its entirety, including southern and western bankers not closely affiliated with the Wall Street group. The Independent Bankers Association, comprising some 2,000 country banks, has memorialized Congress in favor of the program. Some outstanding individual bankers are for it, such as Edward E. Brown, chairman of the board, First National Bank of Chicago, who recently made a speech approving it as the most practical program possible. Outstanding economists have endorsed it.

The strategy of the international bankers who are trying to hamstring the program is an obvious and familiar one, to amend and make reservations, to stall, to kill by indirection.

This is a real test, in advance of the San Francisco United Nations Conference, of the sincerity of Congress in international cooperation.

The big bankers know their way around Washington, and are clever. They were familiar figures here once a few years ago, during the early days of the New Deal, when some of their own international financial operations of the twenties which went sour were revealed to the public in the Senate Banking Committee investigation.

This raises the question as to how valuable their advice may be.

Drafting of Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the House has just passed a bill for the drafting of nurses. In view of the arguments made as to the critical character of the need for the immediate services of Army and Navy nurses, I desire to read from a letter received this morning from one of my constituents. I quote:

December 7, 1944, I graduated from nurses' training from St. Barnabas Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn. Ever since then I have been trying to become a member of the Navy Nurse Corps. I took my State board examinations on January 8 and 9 in St. Paul, Minn.

They informed us that we could make application to the armed forces before receiving our final returns on the examinations. It was at this time that I filled out my first application blanks for the Navy Nurse Corps.

After a period of 6 weeks had gone by and I hadn't received my orders to report for my physical examination, I decided something should be done.

I reported to the Office of Naval Officer Procurement. There I filled out a complete new set of application papers. At the same time they authorized my papers and passed me on my physical examination.

Then I had to notify the Procurement and Assignment Service for Nurses so they could reclassify me I-A. I explained to them that my papers were ready to go to Washington and would they please act immediately. That was nearly 3 weeks ago. Two days ago I received my first notice that they had finally reclassified me.

This morning I received the enclosed letter, which I answered immediately.

When I passed my physical exam they said that within 3 weeks I would receive my final orders. Consequently I gave up my job as a general-duty nurse at St. Barnabas Hospital in Minneapolis and came home to get my personal affairs straightened out.

Now, as I see it, I will have to wait 3 more weeks before I hear anything further.

Just what is the trouble? Every place you go you hear about the drastic need for nurses in military service and about the draft bill. And yet they are just this slow about taking those of us that are more than willing to go.

Bob and Don are both in the South Pacific, and that is where I belong.

I fully realize I have to go through a basic training period first. But isn't there some way we can speed things up so that I could get into the Navy and feel that I am doing my part. More than anything else, I want to eventually be stationed on a hospital ship.

If it takes them as long to draft the nurses as it does to accept the enlisted ones, our boys will be home before we can get over there to give them our much-needed aid.

Thanking you in advance for anything you may be able to do to speed up this matter, I remain.

Mr. Speaker, need I say anything more? This letter clearly and succinctly states the case.

Amendment of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was approved by the members of the Nevada State Legislature and ably expresses the feelings of the majority of the residents of my State. I concur wholeheartedly with the statements contained and respectfully submit the expressions to the Members of this Congress:

Assembly Joint Resolution 10

Assembly joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to permit old-age pensioners to earn wages without penalty

Whereas the American people are engaged in a war which has utilized the services of younger men and women throughout the entire Nation; and

Whereas because of this condition an acute labor shortage has developed to such an extent that it has become the No. 1 problem of our Government; and

Whereas many old-age pensioners are able to perform many types of work that would relieve the labor situation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly). That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to amend the present restrictions in the Social Security Act to the end that any person who receives or is eligible to receive old-age assistance shall be permitted to do and perform odd jobs of labor, caretaking, and similar classes of casual work not in the general course of a trade or business, at such rates of pay commensurate with their abilities to perform the same, but in any event, in an amount not to exceed $25 in any one month without being penalized therefor; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this joint resolution be transmitted by the secretary of State of the State of Nevada to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to our congressional Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to the presiding officers of each State legislature now in session.

PETER A. BURKE,
Speaker of the Assembly.
VAIL PITTMAN,
President of the Senate.
J. E. SPRINGMEYER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
F. BUCKINGHAM,
Secretary of the Senate.

State of Nevada Executive Department, approved February 28, 1945.

E. P. CARVILLE, *Governor.*

Letter From Frank Scully, a Hollywood Democrat, to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
White House, Washington, D. C.
(Hold 'till called for.)

MY DEAR PREZ: I don't see why I can't write a letter to you accentuating the positive of a domestic problem that is definitely lousing up the war effort. I refer to housing.

This is not a problem which personally crowds you or me, because you live rent-free at the White House and the old homestead at Hyde Park, whereas I have Bedside Manor in Hollywood and a desert hideaway on Mount Sinus at 29 Palms. But it affects about everybody else.

Your boys wouldn't think of shipping recruits out to a camp without first building barracks, yet they shipped a half a million defense workers into Los Angeles without providing homes for them. More, they barred anybody else from building them. Thus, they made two bottlenecks and closed both of them.

BIOLOGY IN SPITE OF WAR

Well, biology has a way of going on even in wartime. As a result, Los Angeles is bulging at the seams. Families are being evicted wherever you turn. And they are your babies, Mr. Prez. You stopped traffic in steaks and shoes. You rationed gas. You put ceilings on rents. Excellent! But you let people buy and sell real estate in a closed market and gave the new buyer permission to throw out the tenant.

As a result, owners have sold their own homes for as little as a lousy $500 profit and bought next door, ousting a tenant who had lived there for as much as 8 years or more. Mothers with babies have been denied the right to rent. Some, about to have babies, have had to hunt and hunt for homes until they have scared tax drivers with a phobia against doubling as midwives. I know one mother who has had to go from Hollywood to Susanville, a jump of several hundred miles by bus, to find a place with a relative where a new-born baby would be welcome.

MAKE HOME FIT FAMILY

Canada solved the problem of migratory homeseekers by issuing licenses limiting the renter or buyer to a home comparable to the size of his family. Is it too late to do this here?

Lucien A. Sauvage, an attorney, has given me a copy of a letter he has written to some local softies who want to take in a dog that killed a child and have succeeded in preventing the dog from being done away with. He has asked if they would be equally kind to a mother and five children. He even wondered, if the dog is such a good killer, why he couldn't be shipped to the South Pacific and the father of the five children released from military duty in his stead.

WHY NOT RATION ROOMS?

Well, Mr. Prez, all this is symptomatic, and it becomes my duty to ask a few questions. If housing is so acute in most parts of Los Angeles I can assure you it isn't like that all over town. On one side of me is a house with five bedrooms and three baths. Two well heeled alien refugees occupy it. On the other side is a house of three bedrooms and two baths. Two natives occupy it. Our house has three bedrooms and two baths. Six people occupy it. Around Beverly Hills are hundreds of houses of 10 and 20 rooms. They are frequently occupied by 2 or 3 persons.

Now what I want to know is this: Why aren't rooms rationed as equitably as food? Why not two rooms per person? Does any childless couple deserve to enjoy the freedom of a 10-room house, while a family of 6 suffers the tyranny of 2 rooms, or even none?

THEY'LL SCREAM "COMMUNISM"

Okay, I hear people screaming, maybe even you, "communism." But is this other thing democracy? The family is the basis of American life and it's being kicked around like a football, all for a lousy fear of the invasion of private property rights. Millions of boys have been stripped of every right and nobody has thought it unpardonable. What is there so sacred about the rest of us? Should any of us hoard privileges which those who are protecting us from outright slaughter are denied?

All right, so 20 years ago the Russians cut up apartments and houses and even rooms, and rationed them to take care of a housing shortage. So what? It got them out of a housing bottleneck, didn't it?

FAIR TO EVERYBODY

They did it because they didn't see the point of young Russians freezing to death in the streets or fields, while other Russians had too many rooms to sleep in all of them. They did it because they needed those children to grow up and save their country from an inevitable invasion. They like privacy as much as anybody, but they don't think it is exclusively the prerogative of those who already have it, and certainly not of those who have too much of it.

It would be swell if people would open up their hearts and homes and solve this problem voluntarily. But you know they won't. It's been urgent for 2 years and they have done absolutely nothing about it, except to aggravate it by more greed.

ONE MORE DIRECTIVE NEEDED

So all I'm asking you to do, Frank, is to put the needle into the O. P. A. and W. P. B. boys, or, better, into Jimmy Byrnes. Tell him to issue one more directive. What will one more be among so many? Tell him that charity, which is the soul of Christianity, begins at home and that the new order of the day is "Share the rooms. Two to a customer. No more."

The way I believe there will be enough to go 'round. And if not, for Pete's sake, have the Seabees piece out the difference with Quonset or Nissen huts or even some old barracks.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND HOMES SHORT

I'm writing this on stationery of an extinct low-cost-housing project. Seven or eight years ago I was chairman of its labor relations committee, which consisted additionally of C. J. Haggerty, president of the California A. F. of L., and Rabbi Coffee, of San Francisco. The project was set up to build at least 100,000 low-cost homes around Los Angeles at no down payment to deserving people if permitted and to kick back all the rebates from mass building to the home owners. O. R. Angelillo resigned as your farm-loan registrar of the Western States to head this project. He was assured of every Government aid. Well, he got his back broken from both the banks and the Government agencies, and Los Angeles is now 100,000 houses poorer. So don't blame us for the shortage. We did our best and your boys did their worst.

So I remain, as one enjoying all the comforts of light housekeeping, but with a heavy heart for those denied same, your devoted county committeeman from the fifty-seventh assembly district, Hollywood.

Faithfully ever,

FRANK SCULLY.

Hawaii Troops on European Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein some observations and information on the record of troops from the Territory of Hawaii in the European theater of war that came to my attention as a result of my tour of the battle fronts in this area as a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs. I believe this record is of sufficient interest and significance to warrant the attention of Members of Congress.

Like the youth in all other parts of our country, the young men and women of the Territory of Hawaii have found their way into most branches of the armed services.

The record of their service and sacrifices reflects the same fine patriotism that has marked the performance of our young people in all phases of the war.

The full impact of the tragedy of Pearl Harbor was felt in all its treachery and fury by every man, woman, and child in the Territory of Hawaii. The people of the islands responded then, and in the months that followed, to the responsibilities of life in a combat zone in a spirit that has prompted Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, the commanding officer for the Army in the Pacific Ocean areas, to describe the population of the Islands as the most war-conscious community in the country.

The demands that were made on the people of Hawaii on what was, in fact, a battle front, but for them actually the home front, were numerous, and many of them of an extraordinary character. The response was in the best traditions of America. It has won the praise of members of the Cabinet and many high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy.

But the service of the people has not been confined to the Territory of Hawaii alone. The sons and daughters of the Islands have found their way to all the major battle fronts. Their participation has reflected the best traditions of our country.

It is only natural that a very large portion of the young men and women from Hawaii should be in service on the Pacific front. The number who are on other fronts is, however, very considerable.

I was able to learn at first hand something of their service on the European battle front as a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs that toured these areas during November and December of 1944. I heard from their officers and the men with whom they had fought something of their record, and was gratified to be told repeatedly of the high regard in which they were held.

I found young men and women from Hawaii in London under fire of buzz

bombs; along the docks of Liverpool operating ships of supply; in eastern England piloting bombers; in Paris grappling with problems of military government; at Rheims in the Red Cross; in combat on the German and Italian border; in Italy flying Army transport planes; in Rome in hospitals; and in the Service of Supply at Florence.

They are serving their country as individuals who have found their way into these varied activities without regard to the section of the country from which they were either selected or volunteered. Many achievements have attested to the fine record they are making.

The policy of the War Department in not concentrating in the same unit young men from the same districts has placed many of them with troops from other parts of the country. There is, however, one exception to this policy that has attracted an unusual amount of interest. The record of this group, moreover, reflects impressively the results of long years of training provided principally in the school system of the Islands for the responsibilities of American citizenship.

These troops were organized into a separate unit as the result of the War Department's decision to place Americans of Japanese ancestry, who were in the United States Army in Hawaii at the outbreak of war, in combat in the European theater of war, under the immediate leadership of officers of the Reserve or National Guard of Hawaii. Most of the latter were of Caucasian antecedents.

The attack of December 7, 1941, found more than a thousand Americans of Japanese ancestry among the large number of young men of the Islands on duty in the Territory of Hawaii as soldiers of the United States Army.

Most of the officers had begun their active service during the emergency preceding the outbreak of war. They had received their training in the National Guard or Reserve Officers' Training Corps. The enlisted men included a few members of the National Guard.

By far the largest part of these men had been called into the service in the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth drafts under the Selective Service Act beginning December 10, 1940, and continuing until February 7, 1942. After the latter date the operation of the Selective Service Act, so far as Americans of Japanese ancestry were concerned, was suspended.

Shortly thereafter a large number of Americans of Japanese ancestry, who had volunteered for service in the Hawaii Territorial Guard, a home guard organization, following the outbreak of war, and who were being used to guard utilities and other vital installations, were inactivated. Many of them subsequently volunteered for a labor battalion in which they did much useful work, but their services as soldiers in uniform were discontinued.

And in June of 1942, almost simultaneously with the Battle of Midway, the One Hundredth Infantry was formed out of the Americans of Japanese ancestry already serving in the Regular Army with other troops and sent to Camp McCoy, Wis., and later, Camp Shelby, Miss., for battle training.

There were about 1,300 men, all from Hawaii, in the original unit. Of this number, slightly more than 100 were still in the service of the One Hundredth Infantry when I visited this unit on the Franco-Italian front last December. They now constitute a part of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team, into which Americans of Japanese ancestry from other parts of the country have been assembled.

PRAISED IN INFANTRY JOURNAL

The One Hundredth Infantry went overseas in the summer of 1943. In the fall of that year it joined the veteran Thirty-fourth Division in Italy. In an article in the December issue of the Infantry Journal Lt. Col. James J. Gillespie and Capt. Lawrence E. McBride said this unit "helped mightily in the crossing of the Volturno, spearheaded the crossing of the Rapido, fought in and around Cassino, and after the capture of Rome helped in the pursuit of the Germans up Italy's boot."

In a maneuver along the Volturno, prompted by a determination to rescue a missing lieutenant, these troops are credited in this article with "the first American bayonet attack in Italy."

Through the winter of 1943 and 1944 they were in the thick of the fighting in Italy. Their losses were very heavy.

RECEIVED PRESIDENTIAL CITATION

The One Hundredth Infantry Battalion was awarded a Presidential citation on August 10, 1944. It was presented by Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark. The battalion was cited for outstanding performance of duty in action on June 26 and 27, 1944, in the vicinity of Belvedere and Sassetta, Italy.

After reciting the detail of the maneuver the citation read:

Doggedly the members of the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion fought their way into the strongly defended positions. The stubborn desire of the men to close with a numerically superior enemy, and the rapidity with which they fought enabled the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion to destroy completely the right-flank positions of a German army, killing at least 178 Germans, wounding approximately 20, capturing 73, and forcing the remainder of a completely disrupted battalion to surrender approximately 10 kilometers of ground. In addition, large quantities of enemy weapons, vehicles, and equipment were either captured or destroyed, while the American infantry division operating in the sector was able to continue its rapid advance.

The fortitude and intepidity displayed by the officers and men of the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion reflect the finest traditions of the Army of the United States.

By that time, more than 1,000 men of the unit had received the Purple Heart.

The total of individual awards to this unit of boys from Hawaii by this time included 3 Legion of Merit Medals, 16 Distinguished Service Crosses, 57 Bronze Stars, 61 Silver Stars, over 1,000 Purple Hearts, and over 15 battlefield promotions from noncommissioned to commissioned officers.

NINE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED VOLUNTEERED IN HAWAII

The record of these men was having an important influence at home. The War Department decided to call for volunteers among Americans of Japanese ancestry. Its original quota for Hawaii was fixed at 1,500, but more than 9,500 in Hawaii answered the call for service, and in the spring of 1943 some 2,600 were accepted and went into training.

Soon afterward the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team, composed of Americans of Japanese ancestry in the States as well as Hawaii, was organized and trained at Camp Shelby, Miss. Inspired by the record of the One Hundredth Infantry, this unit proceeded from the outset to make for itself a record that won strong approval in the War Department.

The Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team left the United States on the 1st of May 1943 from the Newport News, Va., port of embarkation. It arrived in Naples 28 days later.

The One Hundredth Infantry thereafter became a part of this combat team.

The Four Hundred and Forty-second went into action below Suvereto, Italy, on June 26 and remained in the line constantly until July 23. During that time it liberated some 11 villages and towns. It cracked the so-called Little Cassino line which served as the main German line of resistance before Leghorn, Pisa, Florence, and the Arno River.

FIRST IN LEGHORN

Troops from the unit were the first in the historic and important port of Leghorn. Members of the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, acting as the First Battalion of this unit, were among the first infantry troops to enter the city. In the meanwhile, protecting the entire land flank and making the entry into Leghorn possible, were the Second and Third Battalions of the Four Hundred and Forty-second.

A few days later, a volunteer reconnaissance patrol from the Third Battalion became the first Allied soldiers to penetrate into the city of Pisa. Just about the same time, other patrols from the Second Battalion reached the Pisa airport and the bridges crossing the Arno River into the city.

After these actions, the Four Hundred and Forty-second combat team was relieved for a period of almost a month to rest.

On August 20, the unit was returned to action, the One Hundredth near Pisa and the rest of the combat team near Florence. These troops relieved an entire British division in this sector on the southern banks of the Arno River and west of Florence. The combat team was committed to holding action until the first of September when it became the spearhead of the great Allied drive to cross the Arno. Members of this unit were the first American troops to ford the historic and strategic river.

PRAISED BY FIELD MARSHAL

It was during their assignment near Florence that the Four Hundred and Forty-second combat team was selected as a model of operation for official observers from the Brazilian Expeditionary Forces to look into. Field Marshal Sir Harold Alexander, Allied Supreme Commander in the Mediterranean, visited the command post of the Four Hundred and

Forty-second and paid high tribute to the record of these troops.

The unit was withdrawn from the lines on September 5, transported to Naples, and then shipped to southern France.

The Four Hundred and Forty-second unit went into the lines again in the Vosges Mountains of northeastern France for the Allied offensive on October 15. The unit was assigned to take four key elevations dominating the city of Bruyeres, the key communications and road center leading into Germany proper. Three or four other regiments previously had been repulsed in attacks on these strongly fortified areas. Three days later Bruyeres was liberated.

In this engagement, the Four Hundred and Forty-second experienced extremely difficult fighting. It suffered heavy casualties. Captured German documents showed the German main lines of resistance in this area. The Four Hundred and Forty-second operational charts showed this unit was right in the middle of them.

The commanding generals of the Seventh Army and the Sixth Army Group praised this unit for its part in breaking the stalemate that came after the victorious Allied sweep through southern and eastern France had slowed down to a stop. The break-through at Belfort Gap and the capture of Strasbourg came as sequels to the liberation of Bruyeres and vicinity.

The Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team was sent to the rescue of the "lost battalion." This was the first battalion of the One Hundred and Forty-first Infantry. From October 27 to 30, the men of the unit fought through rough, heavily wooded terrain to reach the battalion when it did not believe it could hold out much longer. The casualties suffered by the Four Hundred and Forty-second in successfully carrying out this mission numbered almost three times the number of the men rescued.

Because of the terrific losses sustained by the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team in this sector, it was relieved on November 17 and sent to the Franco-Italian border to recuperate while holding the lines.

ON FRANCO-ITALIAN FRONT

I visited the officers and men of this unit on the Franco-Italian front on December 13, under an arrangement that had been made for me by the commanding officer at Marseille. Instead of proceeding to Naples with the other members of the House Committee on Military Affairs, I was able as a result of this arrangement to travel some 150 kilometers to the point where these men were situated.

I found the officers in command at this front, and in immediate command of the unit, enthusiastic in their praise of the members of their command, and the latter intense in their devotion to their officers.

The esprit de corps of the officers and the men was exceptionally good.

In talks that I made to the officers, I expressed the deep appreciation of the people of Hawaii for the great sacrifices they were making and the fine leadership they were providing for the young men from the Territory. I was happy to tell a group of men who were assembled to hear me talk that in a tour of the Islands last summer I had found the people of the Territory immensely proud of the record that had been made by the members of the One Hundredth Infantry and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team from Hawaii, and looking forward eagerly to their return to their homes in the Islands is not only a spirit of appreciation for their service but in hopes they could again find place for a useful and a happy life among these Islands.

HAWAII GRATEFUL FOR SACRIFICES

I was anxious that these men should not have the feeling apparently prevalent at that time at other points on the European front among our troops that the enormous sacrifices that were being made were not appreciated by the folks on the home front. I also wanted them to know that Hawaii had not departed from the tolerance that marked the relationship of people of the unusually diverse races of those Islands.

I found not only among the men in immediate command of these troops, but also among those of highest rank in this theater, that these men were held in very high regard for their record as combat troops and splendid conduct while off duty. The officer in command of the Four Hundred and Forty-second said that there had not been a single case of absence without leave since it was organized.

The record of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team was the subject of an article in the supplement of Beachhead News of Sunday, November 12, 1944. The Beachhead News, issued in Italy for American troops, carries the legend under its title, This Newspaper Must Not Fall Into Enemy Hands. Three of the four pages of this issue were devoted to an article entitled "Under Stars and Stripes—Japanese-American Volunteers Fighting for Four Freedoms—'Best Outfit in Army,' C. O. Claims," by Pvt. Joseph E. Palmer, a staff writer. After quoting the enthusiastic praise of Lt. Col. Virgil R. Miller, executive officer of the Four Hundred and Forty-second, about this outfit, the article says:

You hear a lot of questions about the paradox arising when Japanese-Americans fight allies of Japan. How do the boys of the Four Hundred and Forty-second feel about it? Is there any trace of remorse? etc., etc.

Well, to start with, it is estimated that at least 90 percent of those in the Combat Team who volunteered from Hawaii, either saw the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor or had relatives injured in it. That explains a little, doesn't it?

When MacArthur's forces stormed shore in the Philippines on Leyte Island, the invasion was marked by a big cheering section from the Four Hundred and Forty-second.

Sgt. Royal Manaka, for instance, had this exclamation to make when informed of the Philippine invasion:

"That's the biggest news since D-day in Normandy."

"I hope they get worse than they gave us at Pearl Harbor," offered Sgt. Jitsui Yoshida, who saw the attack in Hawaii and won't forget it.

JAPAN NEXT

But it was left for Sgt. George Y. Morikawa, who resided for 12 years in Japan, to express the fondest hope of all members of the combat team. Said he, "Soon they'll be able to bomb Japan like Germany—that'll be the end of Japan as such."

"What we want to do is win the war and get home as quickly as possible—just like everyone else," explained Corp. Fred T. Matsuo. "It would be the same thing if we were fighting the Japs—we'd kill 'em just the same."

TROOPS PRAISE RECORD

The Stars and Stripes in its letter column at this time carried the following:

LAUD JAPANESE-AMERICANS

DEAR EDITOR: We've seen beaucoup combat and feel qualified to pass judgment on combat troops. A short time ago my platoon came in contact with a part of a Jap-American unit. We have seen them in action and we label them the best of our troops. They are very aggressive in attack and have no regard for casualties while attacking. They know their weapons and employ them to the best advantage—they use them all. Their fox holes are well camouflaged and are constructed for fighting purposes and not for a comfortable night's sleep.

I noticed especially the equipment they carried. Judging them by equipment alone, they would have been called rookies. They carried compasses, field glasses, telephones, bayonets, and other items frequently "lost" by our troops. In addition to this equipment, they also carry overcoats and blankets. Yet these Jap-Americans have fought with us around Cassino and Rome and we know that they are not rookies, but exceptionally damn good soldiers.

Such soldiers are deserving of citizenship—much more than a lot of blue-blooded Americans who have their citizenship handed down to them for two or three generations. These Jap-Americans are fighting to prove they are worthy and are doing a good job—ask the Jerries. (Lt. W. I. Siebold.)

* * * We should like to read a substantial article on the Jap-American soldiers. They have had more than a year of actual combat, and it was they who recently displayed their ability by taking the pressure off the "lost battalion." It is an honor to witness these men in combat. (Staff Sgt. Tom Clark.)

* * * We, as infantrymen, realize what a tough squeeze the "lost battalion" had, but it was the Jap-Americans who fought their way through to them. They seem to be getting as much credit as Paul Revere's horse. (Tech. Sgt. L. B. Maples.)

* * * Not a "bitch" or a praise. Just a request for credit where it is due—to the Jap-Americans for their recent exploits. (Sgt. Joe Balsano.)

MAJOR GENERAL'S OPINION

The Stars and Stripes of December 11, 1944, reports a speech of Maj. Gen. John E. Dahlquist, commander of the Thirty-sixth Division, at an infantry regimental citation ceremony in the vicinity of Lepanges in northeastern France.

SPECIAL TRIBUTE PAID TO FOUR HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND FOR BATTLE DEEDS

(By a Staff Correspondent)

WITH THE SEVENTH ARMY, December 10.—Special tribute was paid to the fighting qualities of the officers and men of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Japanese-American Combat Team by Maj. Gen. John E. Dahlquist, commander of the Thirty-sixth Division, at an infantry regimental citation ceremony held recently in the vicinity of Lepanges in northeastern France.

After personally decorating 20 Americans of Japanese descent and paying his respects

to 8 who received their awards posthumously, General Dahlquist told the assembled regiment: "We have only the utmost admiration for you and what you have accomplished. No fighting, no finer soldierly qualities have ever been witnessed by the United States Army in its long history."

Speaking of Seventh Army operations in the Thirty-sixth Division sector, spearheaded by the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team, the general credited the regiment, which had already won fame in eastern France by making contact with the "lost battalion," with gaining all its objectives through some of the most difficult terrain in the world.

The same generous feeling of comradeship and mutual trust permeates the comments concerning these men among troops in the Italian theater where the record of their performance in combat is widely and favorably known.

I was told by Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark, then in command of the Fifth Army, and Lt. Gen. Lucian K. Truscott, Jr., just as he was about to assume this command, that the record of these men reflected great credit not only to themselves as American citizens but upon the Territory from which they had been drawn.

The service of which they were proudest, however, and the unit with which these men have always been proud to be identified is the Thirty-fourth Division, with whose command I had a most interesting conversation during our tour of the Italian front.

MAJOR GENERAL BOLTE'S LETTER

Maj. Gen. Charles L. Bolte not only commanded these troops while in training in the States, but subsequently in action in Italy. His opportunities for observing them before, during, and after combat have been unusual. In consequence of this conversation, General Bolte has addressed a letter to me under date of January 7 concerning their service, which is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS,
THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
A. P. O. No. 34, care Postmaster,
New York, N. Y., January 7, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FARRINGTON: This letter is written as a result of our conversation during your recent visit to the Fifth Army front in Italy. Because I have the honor to command the Thirty-fourth Infantry Division and because the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion (Separate) and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team (-1 Bn) were a part of my command for a period, you asked me what had been my experience with, and opinion of, those two organizations composed of Americans of Japanese ancestry.

The One Hundredth Infantry Battalion (Separate) joined the division September 8, 1943, and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team (less one battalion) joined the division June 10, 1944. While attached to this division the One Hundredth Battalion was in combat for 182 days and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team for 28 days. I assumed command of the division July 21, 1944, and both of the above mentioned were relieved from duty with the division August 15, 1944, for use in another theater. During my period of command the One Hundredth Battalion was not employed in actual combat, but the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team was employed for 2½ days. I might say here that prior to transfer overseas I had a brief acquaintance with the One Hundredth Battalion, but a more extended opportunity to observe the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team at Camp Shelby, Miss., during their training periods. The latter was under my command for a series of maneuvers in the De Soto National Forest, and I acquired the affection and respect for them which comes only from having exercised command of good troops.

I shall not attempt to cite or describe the accomplishments of these units in battle, or the human cost in their attainments. These data, which arose largely during operations before I assumed command, are in the possession of the War Department, and are, no doubt, familiar to you.

It cannot but be a source of great pride to the men of these units, in which I am privileged to share in some small measure, that under conditions which tended to make their service difficult, they stood shoulder to shoulder with comrades in arms and performed their grim tasks with a patriotic courage and loyal devotion which are not to be minimized. Their discipline and general conduct have been exceptional, and I would be pleased to have them again under my command. Many of the men came from the Territory which you represent officially, and I believe you, too, may well be proud of their service to their country.

The feeling of comradeship which grew up between these two units and the Thirty-fourth Division can well be illustrated by the fact that the One Hundredth Battalion and later the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team were authorized by the division commander to wear the insignia of this division. The granting of this authority was viewed with favor by both officers and men of the Thirty-fourth.

It was a pleasure to participate in acquainting you with the conditions and situation on this front, and your visit did much to stimulate the high spirit of the personnel of this division.

CHARLES L. BOLTE,
Major General,
United States Army, Commanding.

The letter from General Bolte testifies eloquently to the tolerance and generous spirit of the men who have so ably led these young men into battle. Like the blunt comment of the men in the ranks who fought and died with these boys from Hawaii, it breathes fair play and the human sympathies that have united in this country people of such diverse racial origins.

The people of the Territory of Hawaii are particularly proud of this record. It attests eloquently to the success of the efforts in these Islands to unite in loyal service to our country the descendants of people of many races. Not the least of these are the boys whose ancestors, a generation or two ago, came from the country with whom we are now engaged in such bitter conflict.

These young men are fighting as Americans against these same people so that they, too, may enjoy the great privileges of American citizenship.

Beyond this, they are demonstrating in their service, and by the lives they have given, their allegiance to this country.

I am confident the record is one in which every American who believes in the fundamental principles that have united us in this great fight for liberty and freedom should find inspiration and hope for the future greatness of this country.

Unique Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the March number of the American Mercury magazine, there appears an article contributed by Robert W. Mitchell, now editor and publisher of the Rutland Herald, Rutland, Vt., entitled "Unique Vermont."

As a newspaper reporter and State capitol correspondent for the Rutland Herald and Burlington Free Press, and a native Vermonter, he is very well qualified to have written such an article, which is receiving very favorable comment country-wide, by those competent to judge, who have had an opportunity to read it.

In order that it may have a wider and more extended public reading, under leave heretofore granted, I am including it as an extension of my remarks:

UNIQUE VERMONT

(By Robert W. Mitchell)

One of Vermont's Democratic leaders, Park H. Pollard, was once advised by Calvin Coolidge either to move to some other State or to change his party affiliation if he were really politically ambitious. The advice of Coolidge was sound enough, as his own career illustrated, but it was ignored by Pollard, who is still a Democrat, still in Vermont—and who has never held State office.

In the field of political novelties, Vermont has a place all its own. It is the only State that has maintained steadfast loyalty to the Republican Party in both State and National elections since the party was organized, 90 years ago. In fact, even before that time, Vermont was well known for its independence of political trends sweeping the other States. It was the only State in the Union that gave its electoral votes to William Wirt, the anti-Masonic candidate, when Andrew Jackson was reelected President in 1832.

In 1936 it may have been a novel experience for Maine to be a member of a minority of two, but not for Vermont, whose voters had not forgotten the election of 1912, when the State supported William Howard Taft. On that occasion Utah was the only other Taft State.

The closest Franklin D. Roosevelt ever came to victory in Vermont was in 1940, when he won a popular vote of 64,269, which was 14,102 short of Wendell Willkie's total and the narrowest margin on record for a Democratic candidate for President in Vermont.

Though no Democrat has held elective State office or won a seat in Congress from Vermont since the first Republican State convention was held in 1854, this consistent record has no great importance politically. The State hasn't enough votes to excite much interest from the national leadership of either party as far as campaigning is concerned. However, leaders of both parties are puzzled by the phenomenon of this one-party State and interested in it as a symbol. They want to know why it is Vermont rather than any other State that demonstrates this tenacity of affiliation—not only what there is about the State that makes it persistently Republican but also what there is about the Vermont Republicans that keeps their State so uniquely loyal to them.

II

Vermont has no single distinguishing characteristic that sets it apart from other States

as it is set apart in politics. There is no single obvious link between its politics and the nature of its people, its economics, or its geography. The reasons why Vermont has remained consistently Republican cannot be summed up neatly in a paragraph, as it is possible to sum up the basis for one-party control in the solid South. Many elements are involved, any one of which might be common to other States, but it is the combination of elements that is unique.

Perhaps the most important reason is the fact that Vermont is dominated politically by the voters of nonindustrial towns and cities. It has remained a State of small towns and has only 8 cities, the largest having a population of 27,686. It is an agricultural State, and dairying is the leading farm occupation. As the leading dairy producer of New England, the State has needed and obtained tariff protection against milk imported from Canada. In earlier years the tariff helped Vermont wool and iron production and was a big factor in building the marble industry.

New England is famous for its conservatism and Vermont epitomizes this characteristic to a high degree. The Republicans' sound money policy was always popular with the thrifty Yankee farmers. In regard to liquor, conservatism was carried to what some might consider an extreme. The State had prohibition from 1852 to 1903 and a local-option liquor law from 1903 until national prohibition—evidence of an attitude more in line with Republican than with Democratic Party policy.

Another important factor to be considered is a historic one. It was the intense antislavery feeling in Vermont that accounted for the strong start of the Republican Party, bringing under one party label a coalition of Whigs and antislavery or free-soil Democrats.

Lawrence Brainerd, of St. Albans, Vt., a former Free Soil Democrat, called to order the first Republican national convention in Philadelphia, June 17, 1856. Brainerd had previously been one of the leaders in calling a convention of antislavery groups in 1854, which was Vermont's first Republican State convention. The candidate for Governor who was nominated at this convention refused to accept the nomination and the new party endorsed the Whig candidate, Stephen Royce, who had won the 1854 election. Governor Royce was reelected in 1855 on a ticket which was referred to as Republican by at least two Vermont newspapers and in 1856 the coalition officially adopted the Republican name.

This early Republican tendency in Vermont was solidified a few years later by Redfield Proctor, who became, consecutively, Governor, United States Senator, and Secretary of War. Proctor strengthened the new party by building an organization around returned Civil War veterans. He was said to have had at least one of these veterans in every town in the State, and for a half century or more the pro- or anti-Proctor tag was of key importance in Republican nominating conventions and primaries.

Once well established, the Republican Party's success has been cumulative. Vermonters like to serve in public office, and they know that the best way to be elected is on the Republican ticket.

Yet being in a Republican rut hasn't developed machine politics in Vermont. The party is under such loose control from the top that it is wide open for any newcomer who wants to go through the preliminaries and doesn't expect to be elected Governor or Congressman on the first try. You can run for any office in Vermont on the Republican ticket without permission from any individual or organization. The party has no boss, unofficial or otherwise.

Candidates who seek the Vermont governorship have been most successful in recent years with the advancement technique. The procedure starts with service in the legislature, election to the speakership of the house and then serving as lieutenant governor. Vermont hasn't had a governor for more than 20 years who didn't have legislative seasoning before reaching the top.

The Republican State committee has little power in Vermont. One reason is lack of control over patronage, and another is lack of control over candidates. A Vermont governor goes his own way, making appointments as he chooses without ever consulting the party chairman or any member of the State organization. The State committee does not allow this situation to prevail unopposed. Only this year State Chairman James F. Dewey called on the governor and the State delegation in Congress to adopt a system of patronage consultation with the State committee. All four men stepped on the proposal decisively.

Vermont Democrats run their party in an altogether different way. All candidates for State office and Congress are carefully chosen by the organization leadership in advance of the primary. The Democratic primary has become a method of endorsing the nominees already chosen either by the Democratic State committee or by convention in the old style. The organization candidates are never apposed in the primary.

The Democratic Party is tightly controlled from the top by a group of five or six men. The same candidates run repeatedly in election after election and newcomers have difficulty breaking into this exclusive coterie of losers. As a result, some disgruntled young Democratis feel that the leadership of their party is more interested in maintaining its control of the organization than it is in conducting a winning election campaign against the Republicans.

III

Vermont has reason to be satisfied with its continued Republican administrations, which are frequently more liberal than the party platforms would indicate. The Republicans promise little and do more, which is rather unorthodox in politics. The party seldom leads in espousing a liberal cause, but many Republican candidates use the party label and develop their own kind of program.

Controversial issue are often taken to the people. The referendum has repeatedly been used by the Vermont Legislature to settle troublesome questions and avoid responsibility. The Republican Party has unquestionably used it for political purposes to avoid too close identification with one side or the other of closely contested issues, but it has been good strategy. For example, the referendum was used in 1936 to decide whether the State would permit the Federal Government to build a $15,000,000 parkway through the State. The issue, which was decided in the negative, was the cause of the bitterest political fight in recent Vermont history, yet neither of the two men who won the governorship during the period took any public stand on the question.

The short, 2-year tenure in office for Vermont governors has been a major factor in the relatively high quality of Vermont Republican politics. No governor has remained in office more than 4 years since 1809. The honor is passed around and no individual ever obtains a strong enough grip on the State as a popular leader to upset the tradition. Vermonters have no fear of a one-man monopoly in their State government. Unless a governor is running for renomination for his second term, there is usually keen competition in the Republican primary. Local contests in the primary also help to stimulate interest and a division within the party, which has a healthy effect in the absence of more serious competition from the Democrats.

The standard of ability for men who hold public office in Vermont may often leave much to be desired, but their record for honesty is far above the average in politics, and this clean record is an outstanding reason why the voters have not felt impelled to change to another party. Most States have had political scandals which discredit the party in power and result in waves of reform that sweep the minority party into office, but scandal and graft have never been a problem to the Vermont Republicans.

The late William Allen White, who used to visit in Vermont at the home of Dorothy Canfield Fisher, the novelist, refused at first to believe that there was no corruption in a party so long in power. He admitted later, however, after a study of conditions in Vermont, that the State was so small and everyone seemed to know so much about his neighbor's business that graft was practically impossible.

There is no reason to suppose that because Vermont is for all practical purposes a one-party State its residents have no interest in political affairs. The Republicans have not stayed in power because of apathy on the part of the voters. Under the town system of government, with the old annual town meetings, and with a 276-member legislature including a representative from each town, Vermont has a large number of public offices for a small State. This helps to stimulate voting, particularly since in the small communities of which Vermont is primarily composed the voters know most of the candidates personally.

Not only is there a high degree of interest in voting in Vermont; there is also a remarkable lack of restriction upon the privilege. In 1940 Vermont had 191,273 registered voters, of whom 143,000 voted in the general election, from a population of 359,000. It makes an interesting comparison with Georgia, for example, one of the one-party States of the Solid South, which has a population of 3,123,723 and cast only 311,556 votes in 1940. In this respect Vermont may well be proud to be called unique.

Construction of Veterans' Hospital at Fort Wayne, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution 24

Whereas the United States Government proposes to build Veterans' Administration hospitals in various localities to care for the wounded and incapacitated veterans of World War No. 2; and

Whereas the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., would be an ideal location for a Veterans' Administration hospital: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Fort Wayne, Ind., That the proper Federal authorities in charge of the program of building Veterans' Administration hospitals be advised that the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., will gladly cooperate with the Federal Government for the erection and building of a Veterans' Administration hospital in or near the city of Fort Wayne, Ind.; and be it further

Resolved, That the within resolution be made a matter of record and that copies be sent to Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Senator RAYMOND WILLIS and Congressman GEORGE W. GILLIE.

Arno C. Spiegel, Frank W. King, Jr., Ben F. Bennett, Harry Hamm, Wm. H. Knoche, Harry M. McMillen, Edw. H. Fisher, Harold A. Hart, Paul C. Wolf.

Two-thirds Rule as to Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edwin Borchard, Hotchkiss professor of law, Yale University:

THE TWO-THIRDS RULE AS TO TREATIES—A CHANGE OPPOSED

(By Edwin Borchard, Hotchkiss professor of law, Yale University)

The Committee on International Law of the New York State Bar Association has recommended, by a majority of 11 to 2, that the Constitution of the United States be amended to enable the President to conclude treaties, provided he obtains the advice and consent of a majority of the members present in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

To this recommendation I shall address this paper. Its purpose will be to show the recommendation is unsound and that it should be disapproved.

I

The proposed amendment has one advantage over other recent plans to change the two-thirds rule of the Constitution—it is a lawful method of making the change. That is more than can be said for the frequently misused executive agreement, which is characterized by some proponents of the suggested amendment as an evasion of the Constitution.

The proposal to make the change finds its most recent source in the grievance, assumed to be valid, that the Senate of the United States prevented this Government from adhering to the Covenant of the League of Nations and thus contributed to the present disaster. It finds its current motivation in the apprehension that the proposed peace treaties or the Security League to Enforce the Peace, might not be promising enough to command the support of two-thirds of the Senate, and that to facilitate the adoption of these still unknown treaties a less cumbersome legislative approval is required. Charges are made that the two-thirds rule is undemocratic, obstructive, and inefficient.

To determine the validity of these objections and charges, some inquiry is required into the historical reasons for the treaty-making rule, into the record of the Senate, into the probable effects of the new proposed rule, and some discussion is necessary of the reasons advanced in the report of the House Judiciary Committee, December 13, 1944, adopted in the report of your committee, as to why a change in the Constitution becomes necessary or desirable.

II

The modern movement to reform the Constitution may be said to have begun shortly after the treaty with Spain of 1898 was approved by the narrow margin of one vote. Perhaps the minority, in opposing the Philippine annexation, was better advised. It received special impetus after 1905 from Secretary Hay's denunciation of the Senate for substituting the word "treaty" (requiring Senate approval) for the words "special agreement" in the proposed arbitration treaties of 1904, a change which Theodore Roosevelt rightly thougt, in view of the reservations of "vital interests," "independence," and "national honor," was of no special importance. Perhaps it would have been preferable to leave the arbitration treaties unamended, although an agreement to arbitrate everything except that which is important does not add much to the judicial function. It cannot be said to have prevented the submission of any dispute which the Department of State wished to arbitrate.

As to the present grievance of the proponents, found in the unwillingness of the Senate to adhere without reservations to the Covenant of the League and in attributing to the Senate responsibilities for the current crash, no assumption could have less substantive foundation or do greater injustice to the Senators who made an effort by the reservations to protect the interests of the United States. To ask the United States willy-nilly to support without precautions an unprecedented scheme which might entail ruinous and unknown obligations is to ask too much.

Three votes on United States adhesion to the League Covenant were taken. The first, on November 19, 1919, rejected the Lodge resolution of ratification with the Senate reservations, by 39 in favor and 55 against, and on reconsideration, 41 to 51; the second, the Underwood resolution of unconditional ratification was defeated, 38 to 53. In the next session of Congress, on March 19, 1920, the Lodge resolution was again submitted to a vote. This time it received 49 "yeas" and 35 "nays." President Wilson, who throughout had exhibited very little capacity to cooperate with a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power, exhorted the Democratic membership to disapprove the treaty with its reservations, although Earl Grey had written a letter to the New York Times expressing the belief that Great Britain could safely accept the reservations. Many Democrats voted against the resolution. Had President Wilson not insisted upon opposition to the reservations, it is probable that the Covenant would have been accepted.

Thomas W. Lamont, one of the attendants at Versailles and an important figure in the negotiation of some of its clauses, has recently remarked:

"As has been many times pointed out since 1920, had the administration at that time been content to accept American participation in the League on a somewhat more limited scale rather than on the basis of wholesale commitments, our Senate might well have accepted the League Covenant. It was upon the administration's insistence that the Democratic Senators voted against acceptance of the Covenant with reservations and thereby automatically voted to defeat the treaty."

III

Historical reasons for the two-thirds rule: The Senate was expected to play a prominent part in the treaty-making power. Before the Articles of Confederation, unanimity of the States was required. Under the articles, adopted in 1781, 9 States out of 13 had to approve treaties. It was therefore natural that the several plans under consideration at the Constitutional Convention made two-thirds of the Senators representing the States necessary for ratification. Not until September 4, 1787, 13 days before final adjournment, was the President brought into the picture at all. The evolution of the compromise has been often discussed. The two-thirds rule on treaties was adopted by 9 States to 1, Delaware voting in the negative and Connecticut dividing. While Madison proposed an exception for peace treaties, this was not adopted. The motion of Pennsylvania's representative, James Wilson, to bring in the House as a coordinate approver, was defeated 10 to 1. Alexander Hamilton considered the clause "one of the best digested parts of the plan." Story considered it a power which could not have been "better deposited, with a view to its safety and efficiency." Many of the participants, realizing the importance of a treaty with a foreign power, considered two-thirds too small rather than too large a protection. That was the view in some of the ratifying States, particularly the small States, who did not wish to be overruled by a mere majority. Virginia valued the right to navigate the Mississippi, which the Northeastern States were disposed to bargain away. Others valued the Atlantic fisheries. While some of the original reasons for excluding the House from participation in treaty approval—the necessity for secrecy and for speed, the short sessions, the short terms of House Members, and the fluctuating membership—might not today be convincing, others are still valid, and new reasons, such as the expansion of Executive power, have accrued. With 298 House Members east of the Mississippi and 137 from the West, it is still possible for the small States to be outvoted on sectional issues.

The location of the word "advice" in the clause "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," following the word "power," indicates that the President was to consult the Senate in the progress of the negotiations. While George Washington soon abandoned the process of oral consultation, his successors have on many occasions sought the advice of the Senate before concluding their negotiation. Wilson's view that the Senate could be confronted with a completed treaty, which he purported to make it difficult to change, is not the better view of the meaning of the constitutional provision. It can be contended, as Senator OVERTON did recently, that the making of reservations or Senate conditions upon its consent constitutes advice to the President. At all events, even though the Senate is no longer the executive council originally contemplated, if the advice should be sought, as is proper, before the negotiation is completed, then it would be necessary, if the new amendment is to go into effect, to consult the House of Representatives as well as the Senate. That would not exactly make for speed, but adds a new encumbrance to the process. If, on the other hand, the House is merely to be added to the Senate in the approval of an Executive fait accompli, the constitutional "advice" becomes a dead letter and is disregarded. The function of the House in any event would probably not be deliberative, as in the Senate, but would become perfunctory, which hardly adds to constitutional safeguards.

Record of the Senate: It might be supposed from the criticisms heard that the Senate had not fulfilled its constitutional functions or had so used the two-thirds rule as to obstruct the will of the Nation. This charge has little foundation. Even the alleged example of the Covenant of the League shows not a single Senator who lost his seat in the 1920 elections because of his position on that treaty. Public opinion is emotional. While it may once have seemingly approved the covenant, not knowing its content or realizing its implications, opinion changed under better instructions.

Nearly 1,000 treaties have been adopted, and of the 820 signed by the United States from 1789 to 1928, 24 were never submitted to the Senate and 9 were withdrawn by the President. Of the 787 submitted, 47 were never acted on, 15 rejected, and 162 amended. In other words, the Senate intervened in the making of 234 treaties, and by and large either improved the treaty by so doing or saved the country from unfortunate commitments. Secretary Hay's remark that "but one thing is certain, (the treaty) will never leave the arena alive" is not borne out by the evidence. It is an interesting subject of speculation whether any better result would have been achieved had the House been added to a majority of the Senate as a "ratifying" body.

Figures are sometimes adduced designed to show that a small minority of Senators from the populous States could block a large majority of the Senators from the less populous States. Such figures have no justification in experience. Senators rarely cast their votes according to the size of their States.

It is not possible to prove that a considered public opinion has opposed a final Senate vote or that a minority of the Senators defied public opinion in voting as they did. The necessity of obtaining a two-thirds vote assures a good treaty rather than the hasty or emotional consideration which a bare majority might reflect. Had the oil agreement of August 1944 not been submitted in the form of a treaty, this vulnerable agreement, contrary to the interests of the industry and probably of the country, would have been adopted by Executive agreement or approved by a majority possibly influenced by the Executive. The fact, as reported, that a new treaty will now be drafted is evidence that the Senate two-thirds rule has valuable functions to perform in the assurance of a treaty beneficial to the country. It is stated in some quarters that majority control by House and Senate means in fact Executive control, since the President can exert patronage and other pressures on a bare majority if necessary. The two-thirds rule places the Senate in an independent position beyond Presidential control, even if his party should command a bare majority.

Effects of the change: It is said that the two-thirds rule requirement enables a minority to control the majority, which the new rule would obviate. It is also said that politics controls the minority one-third plus 1. It is fashionable in certain quarters to believe that Senator Lodge's personal antagonism to President Wilson caused the rejection of the Treaty of Versailles. All these are myths. It may be true that occasionally politics has entered into the consideration of the question. This is not necessarily reprehensible and cannot be foreclosed in a popular government. Politics has in fact played a minor role, since most treaties are adopted with relative speed and not on party considerations. From 1899 to 1909 the Democrats controlled less than one-third of the Senate. From 1932 to 1942 the Republicans had the same experience. While the role of politics is minor, antagonism to a particular President or Secretary of State accounts for some votes. If the Constitution should now be changed making bare majorities adequate, politics would be likely to become a much more important factor in the consideration of treaties. If the two Houses did not belong to the same party or to the President's party, the chances are that the defeat of the President's treaties would become a political issue, a fact which might defeat many treaties. The assumption that ratification would by the amendment become much easier, may be mistaken.

Besides, proponents have in mind just one treaty or a set of treaties, namely, the forthcoming peace treaties and the machinery for enforcing them. All human experience contests the view that peace among nations can be enforced by any one or more of them, that their will and the law are identical, or that any country can be guaranteed against the result of its own ineptitude. Demographic considerations enter. Yet on the gamble that experience is wrong, many would upset the Constitution of the United States for the long future.

The decisive control over the vagaries of an Executive exerted by the two-thirds rule is compatible with an unchangeable administration. Majority control might possibly be considered if this were a parliamentary government, in which the administration could be removed if it incurred the displeasure of the people. The proposed amendment includes no such proviso, and is therefore inadequate.

There is another and fundamental reason why the two-thirds rule, a linchpin of the Constitution, and taken for granted in the matter of impeachment, overriding a veto, and expulsion of a member, should not be changed. A treaty is something quite different from a statute. A treaty binds the nation and cannot be changed by an act of legislation. A statute can be. A treaty may deal with any power suitable to negotiation with a foreign country. A Federal statute can deal only with such powers as Congress possesses. But by making a treaty with a foreign country, say, Canada, like the Migratory Bird Treaty of 1918, Congress can obtain for itself the implementing power to enact legislation which could not rest on any other basis than a treaty. A treaty overrides all State laws. By making the treaty-ratifying power of Congress equivalent to that needed for a statute, a bare majority of those present, Congress will thus be enabled to arrogate to itself not merely the limited powers named in the Constitution but the unlimited powers of a treaty, thus overriding the States and reducing them to innocuousness. A treaty is the practical equivalent of a constitutional amendment, the submission of which requires two-thirds vote of the Senate. But the proposed majority-approved treaty, reducing a treaty to the congressional requirements merely of a statute, has nevertheless the force of an amendment, while escaping the two-thirds requirement and ratification by three-fourths of the States.

The proposed amendment could thus serve to arrogate to Congress complete legislative power over the internal affairs of the Nation and would thus distort the Constitution in a most fundamental aspect. No other reason is necessary to indicate the unwisdom of the proposed amendment.

IV

Let us now examine the considerations advanced in the committee report in support of the proposed amendment. Relying on the House Judiciary Committee, your committee repeats that—

"The maintenance of the two-thirds rule, instead of working to maintain a great power in the Senate, is actually taking that power away from the Senate.

"Congress should act as a check upon the treaty-making powers of the President, but by maintaining a rule which prevents negotiations which the people desire, the Congress is on the road to eliminating itself from this important function of Government."

It was the Senate and not Congress which was to act as a check upon the treaty-making powers of the President, and there is no evidence that the two-thirds rule prevents negotiations which the people desire. But the point of these two paragraphs is that if the Senate insists on its constitutional prerogative, the President will circumvent both Senate and Congress by making his compacts with foreign countries in the form of executive agreements. During the last 7 years this has in fact largely taken place. But this is not in accordance with the Constitution; it is directly contrary to the Constitution. The inflation of the Executive power and the deflation of the Senate is, in addition, a departure from the constitutional duties assigned to these public officials.

The gist of the argument of the two paragraphs is that unless the Senate abandons the Constitution and consents to a change, an unconstitutional form of executive government will replace the Constitution. This argument may appeal to some gentlemen as a sound one, but I should think most Americans would repel the suggestion. Mr. Fraser has mentioned the statistics which are reiterated in the table. I have devoted an article to the question whether the Executive agreement shall replace the treaty, and will not here repeat the argument.[1] It is a danger without a doubt. But the willingness of the Senate to abandon its constitutional prerogatives will hardly be promoted by the suggestion that an unlawful method of change will overcome their reluctance.

[1] "Shall the Executive Agreement Replace the Treaty?" ((September 1944), 53 Yale Law Jour. 664.)

Number of treaties and executive agreements published to Jan. 1, 1945

	Treaties	Executive agreements
Year of official printing:		
1930	25	11
1931	13	14
1932	11	16
1933	9	11
1934	14	16
1935	25	10
1936	8	16
1937	15	10
1938	12	24
1939	10	26
1940	12	20
1941	15	39
1942	6	52
1943	4	71
1944	0	71

Here it should be said that the recent method of sending an Executive agreement to the Congress for its information—where congressional support is deemed desirable—is particularly vulnerable to constitutional attack. The agreement is not submitted to the Congress and cannot be changed or amended in the slightest degree. By a separate bill it is approved or disapproved by reference. This is an unsustainable method of evading the Senate's concurrent power over treaties, which at least can be considered with a view to amendment.

The third argument in support of the amendment reads:

"The record of the Senate in handling treaties of peace is long, and it is disturbingly bad."

The record of the Senate is necessarily nearly as long as the history of the Nation, for which fact we should be grateful and for which the Senate can hardly be held responsible. As to whether its record is bad, a consultation of chapter VI of the book of Prof. Denna Frank Fleming, a severe critic of the Senate's two-thirds rule, indicates no such record of inefficiency or impropriety in dealing with our treaties of peace as the report might indicate. Beginning with the Jay treaty of 1794, not technically a treaty of peace but more important than the peace of 1783, the record of the Senate is amazingly good. It amended comparatively few treaties and generally to their advantage. Had Senator Hoar succeeded in eliminating from the Treaty with Spain the provision for acquisition of the Philippines, we might have been even more grateful. The Senate actually did not balk at the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, as well it might have, but concentrated its objections and reservations on the obligations imposed on the United States by the experimental covenant of the League of Nations. The reason for the failure of that treaty was the device of tying the covenant and the League together in one document, and the President's objection to approval of the reservations by the Democratic Senators.

The fourth objection cited in support of the proposed amendment reads:

"From the moment the United States became a world power as a result of the Spanish-American War, the Senate has frustrated every significant move to make it possible for the country to participate in settling international disputes.

Nothing could be more misleading than this paragraph. The United States was a world power from the beginning. It simply did not become imperialistic until 1898. It is true that from 1897 to 1911 the Senate was somewhat skeptical about the conclusion of grandiose agreements for the arbitration of future disputes, except those that are important. They rejected the first Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, and they attached important reservations to Secretary Hay's treaties, reservations which Mr. Hay considered fatal. Secretary Root met the Senate's objections in 1908 by submitting to it the compromis of any particular arbitration, whereupon 22 arbitration

treaties were signed. They made amendments to the Taft-Knox treaties of 1911, which President Taft declined to accept. These arbitration treaties were a response to the predilections of the period, which found it fashionable to propose abstract agreements to arbitrate future disputes, which on negotiation had to be narrowed to a point where the commitment weakened rather than promoted arbitration. They were not agreements to arbitrate a specific issue. No evidence can be cited of cases in which the Senate frustrated in a specific case by disproving a protocol or compromise the American practice of arbitrating legal questions. The draftsman of the report must be able to cite cases in which the State Department was willing to arbitrate specific issues—a willingness which was frustrated by Senate opposition. It is believed that no such evidence exists.

Under the Root treaties of 1908, the important fisheries arbitration was held with Great Britain at the Hague in 1910, and the claims arbitration under the Convention of August 18, 1910. Other arbitrations have been held under the Hague Convention before the Permanent Court of Arbitration or by individual agreement for an ad hoc tribunal. The 1922 Washington treaties were approved. An arbitration convention with the Latin-American countries was signed in 1929. The Rio agreement of 1933 was promptly ratified. The Kellogg Pact was uncritically accepted. If the report refers to the Senate objection to the Permanent Court of International Justice, it may be said that few American questions could have been submitted to that tribunal. The Senate's objection to the Covenant and Court Statute related to the procedure for soliciting advisory opinions by the Council of the League. The Court was largely concerned with construing the meaning of doubtful clauses in the peace treaties and deciding other European questions. I know of no case which was refused arbitration because of the Senate's objection to adherence to the Court protocol. But I have a nostalgic regret that we shall never return to the good old days when the signature of an abstract arbitration treaty excited the Nation.

V

We come now to other considerations advanced by the report in support of the proposed amendment. It speaks of the "need for promptitude in decision." Reference to Mr. Dangerfield's table on page 104 of his book, In Defense of the Senate, discloses that from the time of President Washington to that of President Coolidge, the long delays of a treaty have occurred in the Department of State before submission to the Senate or after action by the Senate. The Senate delays, strange as it may seem, have been relatively short. On one day Mr. McClure states that 13 treaties were approved without change. While a few treaties have lingered long, one of President W. H. Harrison having been in the Senate for 361 days, the average is about 30 to 60 days. The charge of excessive delay cannot legitimately be laid at the door of the Senate.

It is true that lack of cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches of our Government is accountable for some of the objections. The objection of the Senate to Secretary of State Seward and Secretary of State Hay had something to do with their failure to enlist the cooperation of the Senate. Nothing can change such possibilities of friction—not even the amendment. But the practical impossibility of a unified party control ovtr two-thirds of the Senate seems to me a desirable rather than an undesirable feature of the American Government. Majority control in foreign affairs would expose the Senate to the influences of patronage, purge, logrolling, and other kinds of pressure noticeable in ordinary legislation. The two-thirds rule helps to place Senators above such influences. The provisions of treaties, notably those of a treaty of peace, are as fundamentally important as the provisions of the Constitution itself, and should not merely represent the views of the party that may have a bare majority in Congress.

In all constitutions of which I am aware, important decisions must be made by two-thirds or greater majority. The Dumbarton Oaks draft, chapter V, section C, provides:

"2. Important decisions of the General Assembly, including recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security; election of members of the Security Council; election of members of the Economic and Social Council; admission of members, suspension of the exercise of the rights and privileges of members, and expulsion of members; and budgetary questions, should be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting. On other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, the decisions of the General Assembly should be made by a simple majority vote."

It is no objection to a legislative body that it has a "natural tendency" to debate. That, I thought, is one of its main functions. If we are to deprive a legislative body of the power to clarify, object and debate, it would be more feasible to abolish it entirely.

Reference is also made to specific treaties, the failure to approve which is criticized. In most cases many considerations enter into the Senate's refusal to approve a particular treaty. The annexation of Texas by a treaty of 1844 failed because it was feared by northerners that Texas would become a slave-holding Territory, because President Tyler was unpopular in the Senate, and because Mexico had threatened to make the treaty a casus belli. Under Polk's administration in 1845, Texas was annexed by joint resolution of Congress. But for the controversy concerning slavery there would have been no appreciable opposition to the treaty acquisition of Texas.

The Virgin Islands were offered to the United States by treaty in 1867 for seven and a half million dollars. The treaty never was discussed in the Senate. Historians attribute opposition to the treaty to Senate hostility to Secretary Seward. President Grant did not renew the proposal. But in 1902 a treaty for annexation was concluded at a price of five millions, Denmark to assume a series of obligations. It was the Danish Parliament, not the American Senate, which frustrated that treaty. Purchase was not finally effected until August 1916, when the Panama Canal made possession of the Virgin Islands seem imperative. They then cost twenty-five millions. But in 1867 their acquisition did not seem important, and the opposition to imperialism was great.

The Bayard-Chamberlain treaty of 1888 was defeated because the Committee on Foreign Relations advised rejection, denied Presidential power to negotiate the treaty without previous consent of the Senate, and raised other intrinsic objections to the treaty, particularly the belief that it would lead to free trade. But the particular reason the citation appears inappropriate in this connection is that it was defeated by a vote of 28 for and 30 against, so that even under the proposed amendment it would have been lost. The two-thirds rule had nothing to do with its defeat.

Mr. Fleming lists in chapter IV of his book the few treaties rejected by the Senate, and explains the variety of reasons which militated against their acceptance. He says that only seven had a majority, but not the required two-thirds, and the treaties defeated comprise but a very small percent of those considered. He adds that "five-sixths of all treaties laid before it (the Senate) have been approved unconditionally."

An argument advanced in support of the change is that Congress declares war and should therefore have the power to pass on the treaties of peace. Apart from the fact that Congress seems to have had difficulty in extricating itself from the 1917 war, as witness the Knox-Porter resolution of June 2, 1921, there is no analogy between the two powers. Congress is supposed to initiate a declaration of war. When war impends there is little time or opportunity for debate, since the foundation has been laid by diplomacy. Nor are the issues at stake often of a controversial nature. But treaties of peace are drafted by the Executive after long negotiation. They need the check of Senate control. They fix the conditions of future life and are usually exceedingly controversial. It is necessary to debate them at length and in detail. The two-thirds rule prevents the ill-considered or hasty adoption of a treaty before the public can be fully advised of what is under consideration. Submission to the House would add only confusion and probable delay, if debated, or be perfunctory and subject to political pressures, if not.

This paper has intentionally avoided thus far any discussion of the practical feasibility of adopting the proposed amendment. It has confined itself to the merits. It should be said, however, that in addition to House Resolution 320, reported out by the Judiciary Committee, resolutions for the proposed amendment have been introduced in the Senate by ex-Senator Gillette and others. Some advocate as a substitute for the two-thirds Senate approval a majority of the Senate or a majority of both Houses. These resolutions cannot command even majority support in the Senate committee to which they have been referred, for as yet they have not been reported out. Recently the New York Times took a poll on this question among the Senators who were candidates for election to the new Senate. The results were not encouraging. Among the 62 senatorial candidates polled, 24 did not answer the inquiry, 18 were in favor of the amendment, 8 were against it, 10 were noncommittal, and 2 agreed to submit it to the votes of the States. It is apparent that it will be difficult to enlist the votes of two-thirds of the Senate for submission of such an amendment.

Nor does there seem to be a sufficient public demand for such a change in the Constitution to justify a belief that three-quarters of the States will ratify the proposed amendment. Indeed, as former Ambassador Gibson points out, if an amendment is to be considered, it must be much more fundamental than the present proposal, which merely adds the House to the Senate as a ratifying body and substitutes a majority for the existing two-thirds. We should find a method analogous to the old French system, by which an informed group of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and perhaps of the House should be called into conference by the Department of State and participate as an executive or advisory council in the making of treaties. This might insure a sounder and less vulnerable treaty with probable legislative support.

On the whole question of an amendment it seems likely that the nature of the problem which will confront the new Congress and its successors for the next few years will be of a character so profound that there will be little opportunity to consider such a formal change in the Constitution as is embodied in the proposed amendment.

Emissary to the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important theaters of war is in

China, where our Chinese Allies have been resisting the Japanese barbarians for nearly a decade. Perhaps in this theater will be delivered the final thrust against Japan. Recently the Congress was honored when the President of the United States selected a Member of this body to go to China and bring back a report on the progress of the war there. The Member thus entrusted with a mission of such significance was our popular and distinguished colleague from the First Montana District.

All of us have listened with interest to the information and facts which the gentleman from Montana, MIKE MANSFIELD, has brought back from the Chinese theater of war. And I am sure that we all have sensed the solid background of knowledge from which Mike made his observations. More than 20 years ago Mike served in China with that splendid and outstanding military organization, the United States Marines. During the First World War he was Montana's youngest serviceman overseas, donning a uniform when he was only 14 years old.

Eventually the tangled web of war, politics, and economics in China will have to be unraveled before we can defeat Japanese military power on the continent of Asia. The knowledge, information, and skill of such observers as our colleague, the gentleman from Montana, MIKE MANSFIELD, will be invaluable to that process. In addition, it is especially helpful to have as a Member of the Congress a man who has seen for himself the conditions and situations which actually obtain in China today.

I should like to conclude this brief tribute to Mike with inclusion in the RECORD of an article about him by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, which appears in the current issue of the Progressive. The title of the article is "Emissary to the Orient," and it describes the career and achievements of our illustrious colleague.

The article follows:

EMISSARY TO THE ORIENT

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

MIKE MANSFIELD'S rugged congressional district in western Montana includes a long stretch of the Continental Divide which the United States Geological Survey calls "the Chinese Wall." It is a towering cliff broken into seams and crags that look like gargoyles on a great cathedral. The layers of basalt and granite are serried with many colors. Creeks on one side of "the Chinese Wall" flow to the Columbia River and the Pacific Ocean. Water on the other slope joins the Missouri Valley and eventually reaches the Gulf of Mexico.

MIKE MANSFIELD was pretty sure a few months ago that this frowning precipice, "the Chinese Wall," would be as close as the Representative from the First Montana District was going to get to China. Then he received a summons to the White House.

"Mike," said President Roosevelt, "you served in China in the Marines. You know something about the Orient. I've had reports from economists and trained military experts. Now I want a report on what an average, intelligent American civilian thinks of the situation out there. Will you go?"

"Yes, sir; Mr. President," answered Mike.

VETERAN OF THREE SERVICES

Three weeks later Mike was on his way across the globe to China in a C-54 transport of the United States Army Air Forces. The material collected on that eventful trip provided the basis for the series of articles on China which recently appeared in the Progressive under Mike's by-line.

Congress is full of interesting individuals with colorful careers behind them, but MIKE MANSFIELD'S life sets a new record in this respect. He has been everything from a marine sergeant to a college professor, with time out for mining engineering in between.

Mike was born 42 years ago this month in the town where he now lives, Missoula, Mont. At the age of 14 he left school and joined the United States Navy, serving on a cruiser during the First World War. He was one of the youngest men in uniform and Montana's youngest veteran overseas, where he fought for 10 months. After the armistice he enlisted in the Army and then served a hitch in the Marine Corps. While with the marines he served in China from 1920 until 1922.

Mike is the only Member of Congress who has seen duty in all three major fighting services—the Army, Navy, and Marines.

In 1922 Mike returned to Montana. He had no high-school education. His career consisted exclusively of military service. But Mike went to the Butte and Missoula libraries and studied. He read the classics—Shakespeare, Milton, Carlyle, Emerson's essays, Lincoln's speeches, Jefferson's writings. He worked for 9 years in the copper mines beneath Butte's "Richest Hill on Earth." He started as a mucker, miner, and sampler.

Then Mike took the college entrance examinations at the Montana School of Mines. Despite his home-made high-school education, he passed. So Mike became a mining engineer. He went to the University of Montana, too, the only university in the U. S. A. with a full-fledged mountain on its campus—Sentinel Peak. He took both his bachelor's and master's degrees, majoring in Far Eastern history.

So by 1933 the ex-marine sergeant, the boy who never went to high school, was a professor of far eastern history at the University of Montana. Mike married Maureen Hayes, a Butte girl, and now they have one child, a daughter, Anne, who is 6 years old.

In 1942 Jeannette Rankin retired from Congress and Mike was elected to succeed her. Last November he was reelected overwhelmingly. Mike—his full name is MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD—is a liberal. When he announced for the House of Representatives, here are a few of the things he said:

"The farmer constitutes 23 percent of our total population but receives only about 7 percent of the national income. He is entitled to parity in his struggle with industry. If the farmer is to continue to produce for victory, he must be assured of sufficient help and fair prices."

"I believe in the cause and rights of labor."

"Small business must be helped so that it can survive. Legislation must be enacted to safeguard small businesses and the people depending upon them."

"Federal pensions for the aged and security for the young must be granted as a matter of right."

"Service pay for our U. S. soldiers must be continued after they come home and until they receive paying jobs under good conditions. If this country is worthy of defense—and it is—then it must support and help the boys who are sacrificing their lives to bring us victory."

FROM FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO MONTANA'S

MIKE MANSFIELD, the author of these sentiments, is a lean, dark-haired young man who perennially smokes a pipe. He is calm and collected; the excitement and drama of politics seldom perturb him. Many people in Montana believe Mike will be a United States Senator or Governor of the State some day, but he says he is taking things as they come.

Mike is keenly interested in Montana. When he first came to Washington he was appointed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, a great honor for a freshman Representative. Yet he resigned his membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee last month when his colleague from Montana, Jim O'Connor, died suddenly of a heart attack. The reason is that Mike is taking over O'Connor's old posts on such committees as Reclamation and Irrigation, Indian Affairs, and Public Lands.

"I regret leaving the Foreign Affairs Committee," said Mike. "Yet I realize that public lands, irrigation, and the welfare of Indians are topics closer to the State of Montana. My job in Congress is to represent Montana."

There is much interest nationally now in various proposals for river authorities patterned after T. V. A. MIKE MANSFIELD is the only Member of Congress whose district would be divided between two of the regional agencies. Part of the First Montana District would be in the Columbia Basin Authority as proposed by Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington, and the remainder of the district would be in the Missouri Valley Authority as proposed by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana.

The Continental Divide, running through Mike's constituency like a great bastion, separates the waters which flow to the Pacific and those which eventually join the Atlantic. But regardless of which direction the creeks and rivers flow, Mike favors regional development of the resources of Montana under the pattern originally established by the T. V. A. "I only hope all progressives can get together on a unified plan," he recently said.

MIKE MANSFIELD is one of the younger men in Congress. At the age of 42 he still has much of his political career ahead of him. He comes from the far West, a region on the march. He is looking toward the Orient, toward Alaska, toward the trade routes and markets of the future. He is proud of the fact that Great Falls, Mont., is the taking-off point on the great new air route which stretches across Alaska and across the Canadian Arctic to Soviet Russia. "We are on the brink of a vast new Pacific era," Mike declared not long ago. "In that era the United States must join hands with China and other Pacific nations, in an international effort to restore trade and end the rivalries and hatreds of war."

Rodger Young

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, from up in my district, I want to pay tribute to a courageous soldier who not only gave his life for his country,, but that his comrades might live.

He was the first to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor in the Thirty-seventh Division from Ohio, now fighting in the South Pacific.

His distinguished service will be especially memoralized on March 25 at Fremont in my district, where the Army, his State of Ohio, and the home folks, will bring back home and dedicate forever the sacred memory of the boy buried under the little cross on New Georgia in the South Pacific.

His simple courage and sacrifice pictures the unsung American foot-soldier,

and was put in words by Pvt. Frank Loesser, a noted composer, in his ballad "Rodger Young," and, Mr. Speaker, I quote it for the RECORD:

RODGER YOUNG

Oh, they've got no time for glory in the Infantry,
Oh, they've got no use for praises loudly sung,
But in every soldier's heart in all the Infantry
Shines the name, shines the name of Rodger Young.
Shines the name of Rodger Young,
Fought and died for the men he marched among,
To the everlasting glory of the Infantry,
Lives the story of Private Young.

Caught in ambush lay a company of riflemen,
Just grenades against machine guns in the gloom,
Caught in ambush till this one of twenty riflemen
Volunteered, volunteered to meet his doom.
Volunteered Rodger Young,
Fought and died for the men he marched among,
In the everlasting annals of the Infantry,
Glows the last deed of Private Rodger Young.

It was he who drew the fire of the enemy,
That a company of men might live to fight,
And before the deadly fire of the enemy,
Stood the man, stood the man we hail tonight,
Stood the man Rodger Young,
Fought and died for the men he marched among,
Like the everlasting courage of the Infantry,
Was the courage of Private Rodger Young.

On the island of New Georgia in the Solomons,
Stands a simple wooden cross alone to tell,
That beneath the silent coral of the Solomons,
Sleeps a man, sleeps a man who's remembered well.
Sleeps a man, Rodger Young,
Fought and died for the men he marched among,
In the everlasting spirit of the Infantry,
Breathes the spirit of Private Rodger Young.

No, they've got no time for glory in the Infantry,
No, they've got no use for praises loudly sung,
But in every soldier's heart in all the Infantry,
Shines the name, shines the name of Rodger Young,
Shines the name of Rodger Young,
Fought and died for the men he marched among,
To the everlasting glory of the Infantry,
Lives the story of Private Rodger Young.

It has been especially presented and the ballad sung over the Nation-wide network on the stage-door-canteen program from New York, and Rodger Young may well become the theme song of the Infantry.

In this war, as in every war, it has been the infantryman's peculiar lot to do the most of the hardest fighting. You cannot knock out a specific enemy machine gun from the bombardier's seat in a plane, from the bridge of a giant battleship, or from a camouflaged battery of long-range artillery. It has to be done from close up by the men who fight close up—the Infantry. The Infantry riflemen, who are always at the front of our battle lines, take the greatest risks, endure the greatest hardships, suffer the greatest number of casualties, and often get the least credit for their efforts of any of the members of our fighting forces. When an infantryman is singled out from among other infantrymen to receive the Medal of Honor, our country's highest reward—and those who have been so honored do not comprise thousands or even hundreds but a mere handful—he has to be good.

Rodger Wilton Young was awarded the Medal of Honor, posthumously, for his outstanding bravery while serving as a rifleman in Company B, One Hundred and Forty-eighth Infantry Regiment, Thirty-seventh Infantry Division. His official citation read:

For distinguishing himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action with the enemy on New Georgia, Solomon Islands. On July 31, 1943, the Infantry company of which Private Young was a member was ordered to make a limited withdrawal from the battle line in order to adjust the battalion's position for the night. At this time Private Young's platoon was engaged with the enemy in a dense jungle where observation was very limited. The platoon suddenly was pinned down by intense fire from a Japanese machine gun concealed on high ground only 75 yards away. The initial burst wounded Private Young. As the platoon started to obey the order to withdraw, Private Young called out that he could see the enemy emplacement, whereupon he started creeping toward it. Another burst from the machine gun wounded him the second time. Despite his wounds he continued his heroic advance, attracting enemy fire and answering with rifle fire. When he was close enough to his objective he began throwing grenades and while doing so was hit again and killed. Private Young's bold action in closing with this Japanese pillbox and thus diverting its fire permitted his platoon to disengage itself, without loss, and was responsible for several enemy casualties.

There was, of course, more to the story than just that. Eyewitnesses have agreed that Rodger Young deliberately moved toward that machine gun to sacrifice himself so that they might survive. "It happened in a very critical moment," one private of Company B later wrote to Young's father, "and if that bit of strategy had failed we all would have been sunk."

Technical Sgt. Walter J. Rigby, a boyhood friend of Young's from Green Springs, Ohio, where he and Rodger went to school together, was Young's platoon leader at the time the infantryman went resolutely forward to his death. "If it had not been for his heroism," Rigby has since said, "our platoon could not have successfully withdrawn. The machine gun was in such a position that it could well have covered the whole front of our platoon."

The engagement in which Young was killed was part of a drive that culminated in the seizure by American forces of the important Munda Airfield on New Georgia. The Japs fought every step of the way, often from coral pillboxes so well hidden in the jungle undergrowth that a burst of fire from them was the first warning our troops had of their presence. It was by a machine gun hastily dug in to delay the Americans' advance that Rodger Young was killed.

"My platoon was in the middle," Sergeant Rigby has said, "we were under rifle fire, and all of a sudden this machine gun opened up. Rodger Young started firing back at it. Then the machine gun picked him up. He fired a couple of more rounds, and then he was hit. He kept on going forward, throwing grenades and firing his rifle. I do not know whether or not his grenades knocked that machine gun out, but I do know that by the time he was killed that gun had stopped firing."

In a letter to Young's mother, written several months after his death, the regimental commander of the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Infantry told her that "his act of courage, bravery, gallantry, and devotion to duty was an inspiration to us all." The officer, Col. Lawrence K. White, of St. Louis, added: "Private Young fought and gave his life in order that you and his other relatives and friends might continue to enjoy our American way of life. Now that he has so gloriously paid the supreme sacrifice we pledge to assume that responsibility for him and to continue to fight until the loss of Private Young and our other comrades in arms are avenged and the enemy is brought to unconditional surrender. We are indeed proud to be members of Private Young's regiment."

On February 4, 1945, the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Infantry, Private Young's regiment, under Colonel White, led the march of the Thirty-seventh Infantry Division into liberated Manila. The pledge to a dead hero had been faithfully fulfilled.

Rodger Young was born in Tiffin, Ohio, on April 28, 1918. He had three brothers, two of them older, and one sister. His oldest brother, George Webster, is now a staff sergeant and recently returned to overseas duty from a furlough home after 2½ years' service in the South Pacific. Their father, Nicholas E. Young, is chief engineer of the Clyde Porcelain Steel Corporation of Clyde, Ohio, where the Youngs lived at the time of Rodger's entrance into the Army on October 15, 1940. Mr. Young is now in charge of war production—tank treads and tank-engine compartment doors—at the company's plant in Baltimore, the Baltimore Enamel & Novelty Co. He lives with Mrs. Young at 4002 Chesley Avenue, Baltimore 6, Md.

As a boy, Rodger lived the typical life of a child growing up, in moderate circumstances, in a small Ohio town. He attended school in Green Springs, a few miles from Tiffin, and moved with his family to Clyde just before the outbreak of war. He liked Clyde, was proud of living there, and, when his family was breaking ground for a new house a few months after he had entered the Army, he came home on furlough and delightedly took photographs of the excavating with his own camera. He had long been an indefatigable amateur photographer.

Rodger liked to fish and hunt, and spent a good deal of his time stalking cottontails near his home. He acquired the nickname of Fuzzy early in life when watching his father shoot a rabbit, he exclaimed, "Gee, look at the fuzz fly." On week ends, the family used to take picnic lunches and swim and fish in Sandusky Bay. He worked on odd jobs as a boy, picking raspberries during the berry season at from 5 to 8 cents a

box, for instance, and serving as a newsboy for the Toledo News-Bee with such conspicuous enthusiasm that he won trips to Cleveland, Akron, and Chicago, during the World's Fair, as well as a new balloon-tire bicycle.

He left the Green Springs High School, where he had been an average student, after his junior year, and went to work as a laborer for the same plant in which his father—along with his brother Dick—had been working for several years.

Rodger's marksmanship training stood him in good stead when he joined the Army. His own platoon sergeant described him as the best shot in their company, and he was an expert with the M-1 rifle with which he was armed at the time of his death. His skill with weapons may have been partly responsible for the sacrificial deed which cost him his life. He may have felt that his superior marksmanship made him one of the few men in his outfit who had the slightest chance of knocking out the Jap machine gun that had the doughboys pinned to the dank ground in that New Georgia jungle.

Rodger joined Company B of the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Infantry—the Fremont company of the Ohio National Guard—in January 1938, when he was 19. He had always been small, and at that time weighed 125 pounds and stood 5 feet 2 inches. He gained about 10 pounds and 2½ more inches afterwards, but he was still one of the smallest men in his outfit. Nevertheless, he never dropped back on a march. He was one of the most popular men in his outfit, frequently, after the Thirty-seventh went overseas early in 1942, being called upon to entertain his buddies on whatever musical instruments happened to be around. He played the harmonica, guitar, and banjo, and often played in a family orchestra in Ohio—his mother at the piano, his father at the clarinet, and the other young Youngs playing a variety of other instruments.

As members of the Ohio National Guard, Rodger and his brother George went on active duty in October 1940 when the guard units were activated as the Thirty-seventh Infantry—Buckeye—Division, under Maj. Gen. Robert S. Beightler, who still commands the division and was the first National Guard commander to lead his outfit into battle in this war. The division trained at Camp Shelby, Miss., and later moved to the Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pa., before embarking for the Pacific. At the time he left the country, Rodger was a sergeant and a squad leader.

When his parents were notified on August 25, 1943, that he had died nearly a month before—they did not know until the following January that he had been awarded the Medal of Honor—they were surprised to learn that he was a private, not having heard of his having been reduced in rank. They made inquiries, and finally learned the truth in a letter from the company clerk of his company.

Rodger had for some time had trouble with both his sight and his hearing. He had to wear glasses, and had been slightly deaf ever since being knocked down during a high-school basketball game in Green Springs. As an instructor on the rifle range at Camp Shelby, he had been exposed to so much continuous small-arms firing that his ear trouble had been aggravated, and when he went to the Pacific—training at the Fijis, on Guadalcanal, and on the Russell Islands before moving up to New Georgia for his first combat—his ears got even worse. Army doctors could do little for him, and there seemed to be a possibility that he might get a medical discharge. But that wasn't what worried Rodger.

What worried him was that his subnormal hearing might interfere with his command duties as a squad leader. He was afraid that he might muss some important oral message—or some significant jungle sound—and as a result endanger the lives of the men under him. So he went to his company commander and voluntarily asked to be reduced. His request was reluctantly granted.

Private Rodger Young, ordinary rifleman, was the first Ohio Infantry rifleman to receive the Medal of Honor in this war. One other member of the Thirty-seventh Infantry Division, Pvt. Frank J. Petrarca, of Cleveland, was also awarded the decoration posthumously. He was a medical aid man, and died, coincidentally, on the same day as Rodger Young.

More than a year after Rodger Young's heroic death, his story came to the attention of Pvt. (1st. cl.) Frank Loesser, who had already established himself as a writer of popular war songs—as well as many other popular songs such as Jingle Jangle Jingle, Small Fry, I Don't Want to Walk Without You Baby. Murder, He Says, and They Are Either Too Young or Too Old—by composing Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition, What Do You Do In the Infantry?, In My Arms, and First Class Private Mary Brown. In What Do You Do in the Infantry? Private Loesser had answered his own question with the words "You march, you march, you march." After writing that song, he realized that infantrymen do a great many more important things. He wanted to write a ballad honoring the Infantry and its incomparable men. He has done it; its name is "Rodger Young."

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

The President of the United States takes pride in awarding the Medal of Honor posthumously to Pvt. Rodger W. Young, Company B, One Hundred and Forty-eighth Infantry, United States Army, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For distinguishing himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action with the enemy on New Georgia, Solomon Islands. On July 31, 1943, the Infantry company, of which Private Young was a member, was ordered to make a limited withdrawal from the battle line in order to adjust the battalion's position for the night. At this time, Private Young's platoon was engaged with the enemy in a dense jungle where observation was very limited. The platoon suddenly was pinned down by intense fire from a Japanese machine gun concealed on higher ground only 75 yards away. The initial burst wounded Private Young. As the platoon started to obey the order to withdraw, Private Young called out that he could see the enemy emplacement, whereupon he started creeping toward it. Another burst from the machine gun wounded him the second time. Despite his wounds, he continued his heroic advance, attracting enemy fire and answering with rifle fire. When he was close enough to his objective, he began throwing hand grenades and while doing so was hit again and killed. Private Young's bold action in closing with this Japanese pillbox and thus diverting its fire, permitted his platoon to disengage itself, without loss, and was responsible for several enemy casualties."

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

[From Life magazine]

THE BALLAD OF RODGER YOUNG—AN INFANTRY PRIVATE WHO BECAME A HERO INSPIRES A STIRRING NEW SONG

Rodger Young, of Tiffin, Ohio, was one of the smallest men in Company B of the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Regiment in the Thirty-seventh Infantry Division. He wore glasses part of the time because of a basketball injury and he could not hear very well. But he was a good soldier, and at Munda on New Georgia Island in the South Pacific on July 31, 1943, Rodger Young became a hero.

The Infantry has many heroes. Most of them are usung. But a stirring new ballad called "Rodger Young" has just been published. Its words and music are by Pvt. (1st cl.) Frank Loesser, who wrote Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition. Infantry officers who have heard it hope that "Rodger Young" may become an official Infantry song, comparable to those of the Artillery and Air Forces. On the following pages is a biography of Rodger Young and, on page 117, the song that has been written about him.

Rodger Young was a corporal in the National Guard when it was activated in 1940. He was a sergeant and a squad leader when he sailed for the Pacific in 1942. In the Fiji Islands, Guadalcanal, and the Russells the Thirty-seventh Division got advanced training. On New Georgia Island it got its first taste of combat.

Just before the New Georgia landing Sergeant Young had been worrying that his subnormal hearing might interfere with his command duties as a squad leader and endanger his men. He requested and was granted a demotion to private. A week later, at Munda, his platoon was ambushed by a hidden Japanese machine gun. Young spotted it, realized that fast action might save his platoon. He attacked, singleheaded. What happened is told tersely in the citation with which President Roosevelt posthumously gave Rodger Young the country's highest award for heroism, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Obstra Principiis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 9, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News Sentinel, which was reprinted in a recent issue of the National Republic:

OBSTRA PRINCIPIIS

Father William Smith, of the Crown Heights (Brooklyn) School for Catholic Workmen, warns that although "supposedly the Communist Party" has been dissolved as a political entity," still "no man in his right mind will be led to believe that the Commies have given up political activity."

Father Smith, being a man of intellectual honesty and clear perception, is disturbed over the indisputable fact that the Communists "have moved into P. A. C. with the blessing of its chairman, Sidney Hillman," and that "they have been discovered worming their way into key positions, not only in the labor unions, but in every branch of the military service."

Finally, as one of the best-respected members of the Catholic clergy in America, Father Smith quite candidly asserts that "if Catholic leaders among the C. I. O. officials have approved this open alliance of the C. I. O. and the Communists, our respect for them is swiftly on the down-grade, and our former support of the C. I. O. will be lessened in the future."

Pointing out that in his own area, "there is a union of 12,000 members absolutely controlled by no more than 150 Communists," the Brooklyn priest appeals for an end of "head-in-the-sand" attitudes, and admonishes—

"We must take things as they are; we cannot transfer them to a vacuum or write about them as though they existed in the abstract * * * nor, I would add, as they exist on paper."

In full agreement with Father Smith, one of the most distinguished of his fellow-priests, the venerable Father James M. Gillis, repeats the injunction of Ovid, Obsta principiis:

"Resist beginnings. All too late the cure, when ills have gathered strength by long delay."

A few years hence, Father Gillis suspects, everyone will be asking: "How did this abominable atheism, this un-American, anti-Christian system of thought and action, ever get such a hold upon our country?"

Such questions, of course, will be belated—and may well be futile—unless the warnings of such clear-sighted, realistic men of God are heeded right now.

Father Gillis is certainly right when he declares that all who pooh-pooh such warnings "may think themselves optimists or liberals, but they are living in a fool's paradise."

Among those who are still criticizing Great Britain for interfering in the political situation in Greece, there seems to be lack of comprehension as to what obviously went on. It seems very plain that Churchill interfered in Greece only after the Communists tried to seize control of the Government by force of arms. If the ELAS, which appears to be a distinct minority, had got in control, it naturally would have rigged the elections so that they came out like some of Mr. Stalin's plebiscites in Poland, or some of Hitler's, a few years ago, in Austria. There is little doubt in the minds of most alert persons that the Communist uprisings in Greece were Moscow-inspired and directed. We believe subsequent events will prove Churchill did Greece a signal favor when he balked the Red coup d'état.

Inter-American Conference at Mexico City

REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from Mexico City, where I attended the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace. This Conference surpassed all expectations, both for the significance of its accomplishments and the depth of the international friendship which it revealed.

The Republic of Mexico was a splendid host for this Conference, which held its meetings in the Chamber of Deputies and the magnificent Chapultepec Castle. The Mexican people manifested the same cordiality as the chiefs of their Government, and every delegation seemed to feel the pervasive good will.

A group from the Congress of the United States acted as advisers to the United States delegate, the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State. Members of this group were Senator TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator WARREN AUSTIN, of Vermont, Representative EDITH N. ROGERS, of Massachusetts, and myself.

We were invited to participate in all the labors of the Conference, and were impressed not only by the agreements reached, but also by the democratic procedures which were adopted—especially the open treatment to the press.

In my personal opinion, the most significant acts of the Conference were, first, the resolution which endorses the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a basis for the world security organization and favors participation of the American republics in the world organization, when established; second, the act of Chapultepec, which provides that all the republics of the hemisphere will share the responsibility of resisting aggression, whether from within or without the hemisphere; and third, the program to strengthen the inter-American system with a reorganized governing board of the Pan American Union as the central agency in inter-American relations.

The Conference has helped the war effort by resolutions which strengthen controls against subversive activities of Axis agents, and deny refuge to war criminals in this hemisphere. The economic resolutions assure the steady flow of essential war materials from other republics to the United States during the war, and at the same time outline the measures which will be needed when the termination of the war necessitates transitional readjustments toward normal commerce and industry.

In my opinion, the accomplishments of the Conference will commend themselves to the House of Representatives as being in conformity with the views of that body on these matters, and I believe that the act of Mexico City has already attracted and merited the approval of the public in the United States and the other American republics.

I think that my own State of Texas, no less than all others of the United States, will ultimately benefit greatly by the provision made for satisfactory post-war economic relations. The tremendous publicity attending every phase of the Conference undoubtedly will help eventually to expand the prospective great volume of business and tourist travel between the United States and Mexico.

Lend-Lease Agreement With France Signed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown, well-known and able newspaper commentator.

In view of the legislation facing the Congress, and the implications of such legislation, no Member of the House or the Senate should fail to read this splendid article:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

The State Department's lend-lease agreement just signed with France, under which that country will get an undetermined sum for the war, and $2,575,000,000 for post-war reconstruction, is probably perfectly legal.

But it is a use of American financial resources that was not in the minds of the gentlemen of the Congress when lend-lease was enacted in 1941, wholly as a measure of our own national defense.

As has been so often the case in New Deal legislation, the real meat is concealed in the clauses of "exceptions," the "fine print," as it were.

Thus under section 3 C of the original lend-lease law, under which the post-war reconstruction billions are to go to France, it is provided that after June 30, 1945, "Neither the President nor the head of any department or agency shall exercise any of the powers, except—

"Except that until July 1, 1948, any of such powers may be exercised to the extent necessary to carry out a contract or agreement * * * made before July 1, 1945."

The French agreement of course beats the gun of July 1, by a comfortable margin. It provides for repayment by France on all civilian materials accepted after the war ends.

France being already in default to the United States on World War No. 1 it is of course problematical whether this provision is anything more than a friendly wink at an old friend.

No one underestimates the great necessity of France. But there is strong misgivings in Congress as to the ability of the United States to continue indefinitely its generous role of Santa Claus to all the world.

In addition to Soviet Russia, which is reported to be seeking $6,000,000,000 in heavy goods under a provision similar to that in the French agreement, there are said to be a dozen other countries also looking hopefully toward the United States Treasury.

It had been assumed that post-war reconstruction in various of the so-called United Nations were to be provided for under the twin multi-billion-dollar schemes of an international monetary fund, and an international bank, under the Bretton Woods agreement.

It also will be recalled that President Roosevelt has now before Congress a recommendation for the repeal of the Johnson Act, which prohibits private capital loans to debtor nations.

Until that act was passed the United States had financed the world from the private pocketbook of its citizens to the tune of about $5,000,000,000.

The Bretton Woods agreement is coming under an increasingly close scrutiny in Congress. The bills now before Senate and House to carry out its provisions may be a long time in getting through those bodies.

In fact hearings on the House bill will not begin until next week.

Thus the French agreement, which is a sort of trail blazer, indicates perhaps an unwillingness on the part of the administration to await the slow processes of Bretton Woods.

Meanwhile, a bill is before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to extend the lend-lease law for a year from June 30 of this year.

The committee probably is unanimous in favor of the continued extension of military aid, but a hitch has occurred over an entirely new provision, which would extend the power to carry out contracts or agreements already entered into, not for the heretofore period of 3 years, which would bring the period to June 30, 1948, but for 4 years, which would bring it to June 30, 1949.

This, it will be noted, would extend the period for which contracts with foreign governments might be made good by this Government throughout the whole of the Roosevelt fourth term, and into the next Presidential administration which will begin on January 20, 1949.

Census Bureau Report on Women

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of March 5 there was an article by Jerry Kluttz headed "Census Bureau tells about women—in $2,000,000 volume." The writer of the article was evidently misinformed on his facts. Mr. J. C. Capt, Director of the Census, advises me that the information in the volume to which Mr. Kluttz refers was secured in the regular Decennial Census of 1940 and also the census of 1910. The information was collated from one of a number of questions asked in the regular census and no one could fix the cost of simply one question. As to the cost of printing the volume, Mr. Capt advises that instead of costing $2,000,000, as Mr. Kluttz says, the direct cost incurred in printing the report amounted to less than $2,000. The statement was so misleading that it is felt this correction should be made. Mr. Capt has set forth the facts in a letter to me which I am including with my remarks.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, March 6, 1945.

Hon. A. LEONARD ALLEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ALLEN: This letter is written with reference to a statement in the Monday, March 5, issue of the Washington Post, by Jerry Kluttz, that a cost of $2,000,000 was involved in the publication of a recent report by the Bureau of the Census entitled "Differential Fertility: 1940 and 1910—Women by Number of Children Under Five Years Old."

For your information, the direct costs incurred in printing this report amounted to less than $2,000. Of this amount, $750 covered the cost of preparing typed manuscript for the printer, and $1,132.62 was the actual printing bill, according to advice from the Government Printing Office. In the interest of economy, the report was printed by photolithographic method at about one-third the cost of the standard letterpress method.

The basic cost of collecting the information, processing it manually and mechanically, was part of the total cost of conducting the Sixteenth Decennial Census required by the Constitution and the Decennial Census Act. The data utilized in preparing this report would have been collected, as it was in 1940 and in 1910, whether or not this specific report was prepared. Even though already incurred for other purposes of the census, the indirect cost back of this project can be estimated after a fashion on a prorated basis. Accountants generally recognize that this is a difficult problem, however, because it involves joint cost allocations. Arbitrary application of joint cost factors would make the apportioned cost of compiling this report about $49,000 out of the total cost of the population census.

The statistics published in the instant report were based upon information collected in the Sixteenth Decennial Census of the United States conducted in 1940 and the Thirteenth Decennial Census conducted in 1910. They were compiled and published at a low cost because they are a by-product of the inquiries on age and sex which were included in the Census of Population schedule. Ever since the census of 1850, there have been questions on sex and age.

This volume has been published by the Bureau to provide information essential to the prediction of population trends in the United States, and thus deals with a subject that is of the most urgent importance, both in consideration of future national security and of post-war markets and reconstruction. A knowledge of future population trends of this Nation and of other nations of the world will be one of the most important factors to be taken into consideration in international relationships, migration policy, and the maintenance of the peace. Not only are population trends of fundamental importance in the determination of post-war markets, both domestic and international, but military policy itself is dependent upon a knowledge of present and potential manpower of this and other nations.

The statistics presented in the report are useful in forecasting population problems arising from low birth rates and from differences in the reproduction rates of various social and economic groups of the population. This report presents statistics on the fertility of native white and Negro women 15 to 49 years old in the United States, according to the social and economic characteristics of the woman and her family.

By an interesting coincidence, there appeared in the same issue of the Washington Post, in the column adjoining the Kluttz piece, a report from Paris by Edward T. Folliard which bore the headline: "Dwindling Births in France Peril Nation's Future Power." Obviously it is more important that Americans be informed on the factors which have a bearing upon America's future status in the world, and it is also vitally important that American businessmen in planning their programs of production, marketing, and distribution be fully apprised of the factors bearing on the future size of the population which constitutes their market.

The trend of the birth rate in the United States has been generally downward for many years. In the decade of 1930–39, the birth rate fell below the level required for the permanent maintenance of the population. A low point was reached in 1933–34. Despite a temporary increase in the birth rates in recent years, due to the accelerated marriage rate as a consequence in part of improved economic conditions and in part of wartime influences, the downward trend is expected to continue. The statistics presented in this report provide the basis for forecasting the effect upon the Nation's future population of the indicated trends.

It is of further interest to note that the Population Association of America in the January 1945 edition of Population Index, page 7, at the conclusion of a lengthy review of the Census Bureau's report, says:

"The Bureau is to be congratulated on producing with neat economy, high technical efficiency, and timeliness, a body of information that is essential to the proper appraisal of the Nation's population position at the end of the interwar period."

I am enclosing a photostatic copy of the articles by Kluttz and Folliard referred to above.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. CAPT,
Director.

Freedom of the Press

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am devoutly interested in extension of the principles of freedom of the press, freedom of international news exchange, and that all news everywhere shall be equally available at the source to all without delay or hindrance, and I do not want to see any agency given any exclusiveness or any advantage in the matter of availability of Government news. Truthful and unbiased news only can be guaranteed the public when there is equal availability at the source and no favoritism in its transmission.

Convinced of this, it must be the people who shall secure the guaranty of a free press, and any country that comes out of this war with power to impose the terms of peace should insist upon not only a free press but freedom of international news exchange. I come to this conclusion because, having had no freedom of the press in the world and no means of international exchange of unbiased news, this war that now is had to be.

It is for the reasons I have stated, Mr. Speaker, that I direct the attention of the House this afternoon to an article by Mr. Kent Cooper, executive director of the Associated Press, which appeared in the magazine section of the New York Times for Sunday, March 11, 1945.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that the said article be inserted in the Appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TO PREVENT WAR—NO NEWS BLACK-OUT

(By Kent Cooper, executive director of the Associated Press)

I

Nestled in a small space not far from the north bank of the Thames in battle-scarred London is Printing House Square. There—through all that has happened to the British in more than 150 years—there is still published a newspaper called The Times. In its fifty-thousandth issue recently it reviewed the century and a half of its existence, commented on the difficulties of publication,

shortage of materials and of staff, the dangers of continued effort in wartime, and concluded:

"Though, before the sixty-thousandth issue of The Times makes its appearance, science may well have revolutionized the mechanism by which the written word is reproduced and distributed, the fundamentals of journalism will not vary. It will still be the duty of a newspaper to hold fast to the distinction between fact and opinion and, whatever views it may hold and express, furnish for the readers' judgment a supply of news as full and impartial as energy and good faith can make it."

Unfortunately, that declaration of the function of newspapers could not have defined the actualities of newspaper publication in many lands before the war. If it could, there would have been no war. And that is just how transcendently important to peace is "a supply of news as full and impartial as energy and good faith can make it." For news is the sole basis upon which men promptly learn and judge the thoughts and actions of their fellow men who are beyond their immediate local acquaintance.

If, in the news processes, there is intentional and persistent distortion of facts with the purpose of inciting prejudice, men will respond to the passions thus aroused. When the people of one nation are thus incited against the peoples of other nations, the result is war.

The part false news plays in bringing about war is as amazing in its extent as it is little understood. Malevolent-minded governments long have recognized the power of news. Tainting and distorting it, they have used it to serve their selfish purposes. Benevolent and peace-minded governments have not concerned themselves about these distortions by others—until war has overtaken them.

Every country, even though only partly civilized, has laws to punish those who intentionally poison the food of others. Through jealousy or in revenge such crimes have been committed, but usually only one or two lives have been placed in jeopardy. No fiend has yet concocted an attempt to poison the bodies of an entire population of his own or another country. But through jealousy or in revenge there are fiends who, through the news, have successfully poisoned the minds, not of one or two persons, but of a whole nation.

For an understanding of how news has come to play so important a part in the lives of civilized men let us go back to the beginning. Once the town crier spread the news. Then came the newspaper, supplemented later by the broadcasting station. The marvel known as electricity served to bring men into closer knowledge of one another. Actually, the first practical application of electricity for the benefit of the whole people was to bring the news from far and wide. The telegraph, cable, telephone, and finally the wireless annihilated the distance between nations and between individual communities.

In this country each locality was linked with all others, and our whole life integrated into one homogeneous national community. And yet our conception of the importance of news dissemination and publication, for which science furnishes means of instantaneous world-wide transmission, remained provincial; or perhaps we ignored the subject altogether. The news was one of the things to which we had become so accustomed that we thought about it only when we could not get it. While we had seen, unconsciously, what it had done to unify our own country, we had never realized fully that it contributed more than anything else to synchronized thinking and action.

The news could never have served us as it did and does serve us had it not been for the freedom of the press, which made the printing of that news possible. We had our freedom, we had a press free of Government control which stood guard for that freedom. Satisfied with our own development, we did not greatly concern ourselves with the affairs of the world. Then from our provincial dreaming we were twice rudely awakened to find that science had indeed made our globe smaller. News could no longer be confined principally to our own activities, and with the coming of the Second World War we began to ask ourselves where these wars are bred.

II

The history of the European press in the years that preceded the present war reveals clearly how large a part poisoned news played in bringing on the war. That poison was of two kinds—a kind of gray poison that was doing its work almost everywhere in Europe and in Asia before the advent of Hitler, and the utterly black poison that came with the Hitler-Goebbels scourge.

Even in the years before the Nazi blackout, events had given little comfort to those who believed that freedom of information and an honest, responsible press were the surest shields of peace. In almost no country was the truth faced. Typical of the situation, and possibly in its worst form, was what was happening in France from 1919 to 1939.

Not only were Havas, the French news agency, and the French Government in effective league to prevent the full picture of world developments from reaching the French people, but the French press itself all but abdicated its proper responsibilities and functions. Long before the Second World War fell upon the bewildered French people they had been deserted by all but a small fraction of their press.

Newspapers were largely subsidized in one fashion or another. Editors and reporters frequently were on government, party, or business pay rolls and many newspapers were directly controlled by political or financial groups. News columns were bought as a common practice. This was true particularly of the Paris press. There were some independent newspapers, but most of these were in the provinces. The character of the French press was a mighty contribution to the disunity and confusion in which France marched to her catastrophe in 1939–40. And this was the picture in a nation that was considered a democracy.

But the blackest poison was that generated in the thirties in Germany, Japan, and Italy. Then the suffocation of truth in the news was put on a totalitarian basis.

Freedom of the press died with all the other freedoms in Germany on the night of January 30, 1933, when Hitler became chancellor. Newspapers and radio became instruments of a regime with criminal purposes. Editors and reporters became functionaries of the state. Journalism was defined by law as a public task regulated by the state. The Ministry of Propaganda and Public Enlightenment was established under Goebbels. All media of information and expression were crushed into the Nazi mold, all bent to the purpose of whipping the German people into that fanatical frenzy necessary to the savage purposes of the Nazi dictator. By 1939 it was done; the Germans were ready to assume the responsibility for plunging the world into war.

Japan's road into the darkness was similar. The press of Japan never had been free of rigorous Government control, but in the late 1920's there was developing a small group of Japanese newspapermen and thinkers, with an enlightened conception of the responsibilities of the press and the importance of truth in the news transmitted from one country to another. Some beginnings were made toward adaptation of the cooperative principle of news-agency operations.

When the militarists on September 18, 1931, embarked on the conquest of Manchuria and seized the reins of power in Tokyo, they began a revolution of which the significance was little understood abroad. The small element of the press that valued the small measure of freedom previously enjoyed was among the first victims. Terrorism, intimidation, powerful pressures were enlisted to bring the whole press into line. Even the comparatively liberal Asahi newspapers of Tokyo and Osaka eventually had to succumb.

The story of the Italian press under Mussolini's dictatorship followed what we now recognize as the pattern for destroying all freedom of the press.

III

The deep night that blotted out the truth in Germany, Japan, and Italy need not fall on any country again, nor need there be maintained in most countries a murky twilight as far as knowledge of other peoples is concerned. Since it has been proved that poisoned news can generate a war its antithesis, truthful news, should have a chance to prove that it can maintain the peace. Truthful news and a free press can do more than anything to avert war, but the acceptance of both must be real and sincere, not lip service paid to the ideals of a free press in countries which pride themselves on democratic institutions.

We should realize today as we should have 25 years ago that members of this great world family of human beings are either not well enough acquainted or not acquainted at all. Since they do not all live in physical proximity, they can come to know each other only by what they hear and what they read. An exchange of truthful international news would bring acquaintance, and the result of acquaintance would be world-wide community of interest.

If we are convinced that for an enduring peace an international community of interest should be established, we should see to it that America holds out inexorably for the two things that make world-wide community of interest possible—a world-wide free press and a communications system adapted to serve the press everywhere in a truly practical manner.

For myself, I would proclaim now that we expect to accomplish this in the peace. I would not wait until the war ends, would not leave these vital elements to be tossed around upon the sea of indecision and intrigue which always prevail in peace negotiations.

The establishment of a free press involves no expenditures, though it does involve a great deal of practical enlightenment on how newspapers through advertising and subscription rates can maintain themselves independent of political or private subsidy. On the other hand, an international communications system would cost a great deal of money, but it would not cost more than a fraction of 1 percent of the cost of world armament.

With these two instruments available for the establishment of an international community of interest, we shall have at least a groundwork for what might seem now to be utopian.

The blessings of adequate communications and a free press surely were not given to us to exploit solely for our own benefit and to keep just for ourselves. Here in the United States the principle of true and unbiased news was first developed. If we would keep out of another war, then in self-interest we should see to it that the principle is given to the world in a militant effort to improve international relations. Availability of the

truth, the most powerful force in the world, through a free press served by an adequate system of world-wide communications established for the purpose, should be our aim. For we should not forget that when we plan to enshrine freedom in any field the first requisite is the right to know.

Bretton Woods—Why the Hurry?

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the evident interest which the general public is manifesting in the Bretton Woods plan is a very fine reaction to the situation generally so far as the body politic is concerned.

As evidenced by the many letters and telegrams I have received pro and con with respect to the consideration which it is insisted ought to be given to the matter by the Congress, this plan for international monetary stabilization and the establishment of a world bank has aroused general public interest. That is good, anyway. The arguments offered me are both for and against the plan itself as announced. This is a peoples' war and a peace for posterity which we contemplate.

It cannot be successfully denied that the plan furnishes a substantial basis and a foundation, at least, for action. That is not to say that its particular recommendations and the methods of accomplishment it proposes should be adopted by Congress in toto or as written without and until after very careful consideration by the representatives of the people.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, appearing before the House Banking and Currency Committee, suggested that the response of all sections and groups in the country to the proposals makes it clear that the people are determined to meet resolutely the tasks and responsibilities of international collaboration and warned that the world faces only tragic woe if nations are permitted after the war to slip into a new wave of economic warfare.

C. I. O.

Philip Murray, chairman of the powerful C. I. O., wrote the chairman of the committee to the effect that his organization pledged its support to the commitment of the United States to the Bretton Woods program, not dotting an "i" or crossing a "t."

THE PEOPLE

On the other hand, those who oppose the plan suggest, among other things, that the agreement constitutes an effort to evade the constitutional provision for ratification of treaties by the Senate; fails to set up sufficient safeguards for vital American interests; makes it possible for representatives of foreign governments to destroy American export markets by placing control of our tariff policies in foreign hands, and by so doing opens American markets to an influx of foreign products; ratifies defaults of foreign debtors and merges the sovereignty of the United States in the machinery of a supergovernment; all of which charges are interesting, if true.

If the plan does, in effect, or in fact, commit us to an international W. P. A. program, and other programs of a similar nature, as it is alleged to do by its opponents, then, of course, it should not be adopted as written. It should be so modified as not to do those things, for that spells the beginning of the end of democracy.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Dr. White, the Treasury Department's Assistant Secretary, says that America did not get everything out of the Bretton Woods Conference but stands to gain more than any other nation. He insists that world recovery and future peace will be impossible unless we have the stabilization agreement and the international bank called for in the Bretton Woods agreement. Only the intense consciousness of the nations of the world that only some such system of economic cooperation can and will save us from an era of tragic chaos, could have effected the adoption of the agreement by the representatives of the people who shape the central-bank and treasury policies of all the interested countries.

LEND-LEASE

If lend-lease is to provide equipment for post-war use under provisions for repayment over a long term of years, then the question arises—and it is a highly pertinent one, for our resources are limited and daily growing more and more so—Why is it necessary for us to become participants in a world bank or why should be enlarge the Export-Import Bank? We should take time to find the right answers.

It has been said, and truly, that "We cannot continue for several years after the war to supply billions of equipment to foreign countries and, in addition, lend billions of dollars to foreigners that would entail further inroads on our supplies of essential goods and machinery, without consideration for domestic needs. This is not an argument against participation in the world bank or extension of long-term loans but, rather, a warning that we must make sure that our promises do not exceed our ability to perform."

There are a good many people who express concern because of the alleged determination of the administration to drive the Senate to early and favorable action. A poll of the Senate, so it is alleged, shows a majority sentiment for approval, but some amendments have been suggested.

WORLD-WIDE NEW DEAL

Some people do not forget that Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace, according to the newspapers, said at Omaha in 1942, "the United Nations are fighting for a world-wide New Deal" after the war. It is agreed that if such is the case and a world-wide New Neal is contemplated, it would most easily be brought about by means of international economic agreements.

MARK SULLIVAN

My attention has been called also to the fact that Mark Sullivan has recently said that—

MRS. ROOSEVELT AND WORLD REVOLUTION

Mrs. Roosevelt, in a magazine article written in 1942, entitled "What We Are Fighting For," went further than Wallace. She said the war is a kind of world revolution. That she understood this to include economic revolution is shown by her statement that one of the objectives of the war is a world economy guaranteeing to all people free trade and access to raw materials.

A world-wide New Deal, as predicted and approved by Wallace, would mean application to the world as a whole of the New Deal instrumentalities already practiced in the United States.

SECRETARY MORGENTHAU

Then, there are a lot of people in this country who are not so sure that Secretary Morgenthau's advice is always so good with respect to international finance They cite cases to support their arguments; what they say should at least invite our careful attention.

NONCOMMITTAL

I have not committed myself. I admit that I am inclined to favor adoption of the plan substantially as drawn. However, I have to be shown that the plan will work out as its advocates declare it will and not as it opponents say it is bound to work out, disastrously to demoncracy.

Of one thing I am sure and that is that there is no need for such a great power politics rush. Since time permits, why not do as careful and considered a job, in the interest of the future in the present, as can be done in advance?

PERPETUAL PEACE

We are working for perpetual peace. It can neither be planned hastily, nor achieved without due deliberation. We will make time and save time by taking time to know what, in these times, we are undertaking to do in perpetuity.

THE WAR

The war is far from over and haste makes waste.

U. S. S. "Helena" Receives First Navy Unit Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I received the news this morning when I was informed that the U. S. S. *Helena*, sunk at Kula Gulf, was the first naval vessel to receive the newly created Navy unit citation.

We of Montana are extremely proud of this great honor, The part played by

the *Helena* in getting our country's counteroffensive started against Japan was outstanding. She was a real fighting ship and though she was eventually sunk she exacted a huge toll in Japanese ships and personnel before she went to the bottom.

The new U. S. S. *Helena*, when completed, will carry on the glorious tradition of her predecessor. We of Montana will watch with interest her progress and in time we will have the same pride in her that we had in the old *Helena*.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting an article from this morning's Washington Post as well as a previous exchange of correspondence covering an awarding of the Presidential citation unit between President Franklin D. Roosevelt and myself.

[From the Washington Post of March 12, 1945]

CRUISER "HELENA" FIRST NAVY SHIP TO WIN UNIT CITATION

The light cruiser *Helena*, one of the fightingest ships of the fleet until a Japanese torpedo sent it to the bottom of Kula Gulf, became last night the first naval vessel to win the newly created Navy unit citation.

All personnel serving aboard the ship during one or more of the three engagements in which the *Helena* distinguished herself are authorized to wear the unit commendation ribbon.

The ship's citation commends her for "outstanding heroism" in action in the central Solomon Islands.

In the night battle of Guadalcanal, the *Helena* was credited with "rallying our own forces after the flagship had been disabled and contributing to the enemy's defeat."

APRIL 3, 1944.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing you in behalf of the citizens of the State of Montana to request that a Presidential unit citation be granted the U. S. S. *Helena*, sunk in the Battle of Kula Gulf, and its crew. It is not necessary for me to go into detail concerning the many magnificent exploits of that ship, named after the capital of my State, but suffice it to say that in all her 13 major naval engagements the *Helena* performed its part extraordinarily well and was responsible for a great loss in tonnage and personnel in the Japanese Fleet.

We in Montana feel a special pride in the *Helena* because of her exploits and because of the fame it has brought to our capital. The exploits of the *Helena* were vividly brought to the attention of the people of Montana during the Third War Loan drive, and as a result our allotment was oversubscribed tremendously. The story of the *Helena* has been carried in all our newspapers, and its heroism is known to every man, women, and child in Montana.

Will you please give this matter your most serious and earnest consideration?

Most respectfully.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 20, 1944.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I am glad to have your letter of April 3, 1944, by which you recommend the U. S. S. *Helena* for the Presidential unit citation. I followed with interest the many fine performances of the *Helena* during the course of her career, and I was, therefore, glad to forward your recommendation to the Navy Department Board of Decorations and Medals for consideration. That Board has before it all of the facts about all ships in the Navy, and it recommends awards for outstanding service in the same manner that it does for individuals.

I am informed that, fine as was the record of the *Helena*, the standards of her contemporaries are also so high that she cannot, in fairness to others, be singled out for individual citation. The acts of many of her personnel have been recognized by citations, and I join with you in applauding those citations.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Sgt. Alexander Drabik, of Holland, Ohio, First Doughboy To Cross Rhine River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, confusing statements have been made on the floor of the House as to who was the first American soldier to cross the Rhine. In asking permission to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an article from the Toledo Blade of Saturday, March 10, an Associated Press dispatch indicating that the first American soldier to cross the Rhine was Sgt. Alexander A. Drabik, of Holland, Ohio.

I am most happy and proud to announce also that the Ninth Armored Division was under the command of Maj. Gen. John W. Leonard, a native Toledoan.

SGT. ALEXANDER DRABIK, OF HOLLAND, OHIO, FIRST DOUGHBOY TO CROSS RHINE RIVER

(By Don Whitehead)

ON THE RHINE BRIDGEHEAD, March 10.—A 34-year-old Ohio sergeant has been singled out as the man first across the Rhine in the daring establishment of the United States First Army's bridgehead.

Without detracting glory from other soldiers in the history-making coup, Brig. Gen. William M. Hoge, Lexington, Mo., whose Ninth Armored Forces took the Remagen Bridge, named Sgt. Alexander A. Drabik, butcher boy of Holland, Ohio, as the outstanding hero of the day.

General Hoge said yesterday a careful check disclosed Sergeant Drabik actually was the first American to step on the east bank of the river in the forefront of 10 riflemen shooting as they ran in a wild dash which so astounded the Germans they failed to blow up the vital structure.

Also in the vanguard of the first Americans over the river was Lt. Emmet Burrows, Jersey City, N. J., officer whose platoon was in the initial fighting.

And today it was disclosed that the first tank to roll into the now solidly held bridgehead carried sons of four States.

Hitting the shore Wednesday, the tank was manned by Sgt. William B. Goodson, Rushville, Ind.; Corp. William E. Richards, Shrewsbury, W. Va.; Pvt. Berthold Fried, Shade Hill, S. Dak.; and T/4 Robert A. Jones, McKee, Ky.

Sergeant Goodson was in command as the iron war horse crashed through the murky night, Private Fried, the cannoneer; Corporal Richard, the gunner, and T/4 Jones at the controls.

Sergeant Drabik was called to General Hoge's command post yesterday to be interviewed.

Still grimy from combat and cradling an M–1 gun in his arm, the raw-boned Ohioan spoke in simple, matter of fact phrases of one of the war's most dramatic moments.

"It was like this," he said. "Lieutenant Timmerman (Lt. Carl Timmerman, West Point, Nebr.) told us to go across the bridge, with the first platoon leading.

"I've got the third platoon of a rifle company. We had fought through Remagen to the river and our company was at the edge of the town about 200 yards from the bridge.

"I waited until the first platoon got out on the bridge, but they were held up by machine gun and sniper fire from those big stone towers at the eastern end.

"When I brought up my men the first platoon was keeping the Geramns in the tower busy. So I went by them and yelled to my men to go across, firing into the tunnels in the hill on the other side."

Sergeant Drabik said the first platoon had the Germans "pretty well down" with their fire.

"We ran down the middle of the bridge, shooting as we went. I didn't stop because I knew if I kept moving they couldn't hit me. My men were in squad column and not one of them was hit.

"All of them are good boys. Eight of us have been together since I went into the Army in November 1942.

"We had a machine-gun squad coming up behind us to clear out the tunnel in the hill, but they were not firing because there was too much danger they would hit us.

"What were the Germans firing at us? Well, I swear I don't remember. It's funny, but there was so much shooting I don't even remember whether there was any artillery.

"I kept thinking if we could keep the Germans on the run and win out, then we could cross the Rhine on their own bridge.

"That's what I kept thinking. I didn't think much about them blowing up the bridge while we were on it, although I figured anything could happen. All I was worrying about was getting over and organizing the other end so we could get our armor and men across.

"We got past the towers all right and the first platoon came in behind us and cleaned them out. Then I go to the end of the bridge to see if any of the enemy were around. We left the Germans in the tunnel to the machine gunners.

"We ran down about 200 yards and then I got my men into skirmish line to hold the enemy if they did come. We took cover in some bomb craters. Then we just sat and waited for the others to come in.

"That's the way it was."

RHINE CROSSING TURNED INTO SHOW FOR TOLEDO BY GENERAL, SERGEANT—NATIVES OF LUCAS COUNTY LED YANKS STORMING BRIDGE

(By Eleanor Coakley)

Looking at the crossing of the Rhine from the viewpoint of the folks back home, it seems to be pretty much Toledo's show.

It was the Ninth Armored Division of Maj. Gen. John W. Leonard, native Toledoan, which captured the Remagen bridge, and it was Sgt. Alexander A. Drabik, Holland and Toledo, who was first across the bridge, leading his platoon through a barrage of enemy machine-gun and sniper fire.

Sergeant Drabik's parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Drabik, Sr., received the news of their son's heroism with pride and joy but little surprise.

HERO IN MANEUVERS

He was a hero before he ever left overseas, his father revealed, relating how the

sergeant had rescued a group of some 120 men lost in the California brush land while on maneuvers.

Born on the 80-acre farm in Wolfinger Road near Crissey Road, where his parents still live, Alex was a farmer first and last, his father said.

Although he took a job with the Folger Packing Co., he worked in the fields in his free hours, "as long as it was light," Mr. Drabik continued. He's still planning to come back to farming.

CHARACTERISTIC SHYNESS

The 34-year-old soldier-farmer has the characteristic shyness of so many heroes.

"When he was home on leave he took the chevrons off his sleeve," his parents related. "He didn't want to be anything but a common soldier."

"Alex was the most bashful guy you ever saw when it came to meeting girls," a cousin, Walter Drabik, told the Blade. "I used to see him help his father slaughter pigs on the farm, and later he slaughtered pigs at the slaughterhouse. Nothing ever bothered him but girls."

Sergeant Drabik may have inherited his shyness from his gray-haired mother, who demurred at having her picture taken and appealed to her husband for confirmation of the news that their son was a hero.

MOTHER VERY PROUD

When reassured, she spoke quietly in Polish, "I am very proud."

A brother, Victor, was less restrained. Throwing his hat into the air, he shouted, "Hurrah for Alex."

Two other brothers, John, Jr., and Charles, live near Toledo. Alex is the youngest of the 4 and one of 10 children.

Mr. and Mrs. Drabik came to this country from Germany in 1898 and all but the eldest of their children were born here.

Mr. Drabik, who is 82, is carrying on alone on the farm, but says he won't be able to do much this spring without Alex. All the other sons have left the farm for homes of their own.

Sergeant Drabik was inducted October 25, 1942, and received his basic training at Fort Riley, Kans. He received additional instruction in camps in California and Louisiana and served as an instructor before going overseas last August.

Ship Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter on the subject of ship construction from Admiral Vickery and a summary from the Maritime Commission showing tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program through February 1945:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Believing it will be of interest to you, I am enclosing a tabulation showing monthly deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program to the end of February 1945.

During February, American merchant shipyards delivered 125 vessels of 1,300,340 tons deadweight. As of March 1, deliveries since the United States' entry into the war totaled 4,573 ships with an aggregate tonnage of more than 46,000,000. This represents an average output over a period of 1,179 days, of 3.9 ships—39,300 tons—every 24 hours.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner.

Dead-weight tonnage of ships delivered under the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program

Month	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
January		30,330	47,200	197,628	1,007,680	1,204,730	1,229,296
February	31,230	31,628	40,500	289,549	1,236,481	1,372,864	1,300,340
March	18,230	44,627	108,700	291,473	1,513,244	1,538,357	
April	25,042	64,219	131,200	401,632	1,603,307	1,593,691	
May	34,340	44,457	98,600	619,779	1,782,836	1,537,915	
June	31,594	32,399	81,700	749,654	1,670,442	1,379,994	
July	18,440	105,121	127,441	791,667	1,669,341	1,274,453	
August	33,796	31,514	112,042	752,774	1,690,411	1,157,602	
September	37,459	40,738	86,185	1,016,112	1,652,571	1,185,997	
October	17,840	59,658	75,296	889,737	1,675,311	1,310,295	
November	37,524	90,245	138,254	892,536	1,692,763	1,430,660	
December	55,724	62,924	92,175	1,197,191	2,044,239	1,361,908	
Total dead-weight tons	341,219	637,860	1,139,293	8,089,732	19,238,626	16,348,446	
Number of ships	28	54	103	746	1,896	1,677	

Late-Shift Workers Find Curfew Tough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a news article which appeared in yesterday's Times-Herald:

Postmidnight hungry Washingtonians and visiting servicemen are finding the Capital a hard place in which to munch a hamburger or dawdle over doughnuts and coffee—all because of the much debated Byrnes curfew.

Workingmen and women, who get off after midnight also claim the curfew is a real hardship. Many of them have worked for hours and say they feel the need of and should be able to get, a good meal.

But their eating problem, none too good at best because of their odd hours, is made worse as they become lost in the hordes of pleasure-bent patrons who storm every available all-night beanery with the 12 o'clock closing of other places.

Saturday, particularly, when thousands of servicemen are in the city on week end passes, finds the all-night spots jammed to the doors.

This past week end found many who couldn't get a seat in the crowded beaneries. Some of them bought coffee and sandwiches "to go" and repaired to the nearest automobile running board where they munched away.

Police, the War Hospitality Committee, information booths at Union Station, and even the Library of Congress get calls from strangers who want to know where to go in the search for food.

The Texas Chili Parlor, 1900 block Pennsylvania Avenue NW., which is fighting the midnight closing, had to turn hundreds away yesterday morning, according to Mrs. Barbara Abbott, night manager.

White Towers, Blue Bell, and other chain shops were jammed. Long lines formed outside the California Kitchen and the one or two other all-night spots where the menu is slightly more elaborate than hamburger, doughnuts, and coffee.

Under the Byrnes curfew order, only eating places which customarily remained open all night may stay open past midnight.

The Lamplighters Club, an after-hours entertainment spot which opens at 12: 02 a. m., is a second place which is fighting the curfew. Owners of the establishment point to the fact that they're closed at the hour the curfew takes effect, but open later in the day—2 minutes later.

Mr. Speaker, on March 5 I introduced H. R. 162, which was referred to the House Rules Committee, calling for an investigation into the facts which prompted the so-called curfew order.

I ascertained first that no written order actually had gone out from Mr. Byrnes.

Secondly, I questioned the constitutionality of the order as the War Manpower Commission proposed to enforce it.

If it was to save light and coal, as the press implied, rationing was the method to use as it is used to conserve tires, gasoline, sugar, and other products.

If it was to save manpower—we have the draft and Congress is already at work on the manpower problem.

In the same edition in which the aforementioned column appeared, there is a seven-column picture showing long lines of servicemen and swingshifters waiting after midnight to get into one of the few Washington restaurants which do not serve liquor. The hardship imposed upon these patriotic people is obvious. There are millions like them in every big city.

Further studied consideration of the curfew order makes it appear to me more and more like another dictatorial decree intended to condition our people for the very kind of despotism against which our boys and girls are fighting.

I am informed that the Manpower Commissioner is considering certain revisions in this order. I am awaiting an announcement anxiously. Unless these revisions are in line with constitutional mandates, I shall continue to press vigorously for investigation or legislation, if necessary, to correct this situation.

District of Columbia Population Up 35 Percent in 4 Years; 48 Percent Rise in Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, as Will Rogers was accustomed to say, all I know about it is what I read in the papers, from which it appears that there has been a 35-percent increase in the population of the District between April 1940 and July 1, 1944, or a population of 926,260 as of last July.

Incidentally, despite the fact that six or seven, perhaps more, millions of men have been sent overseas, the total continental population has increased from 131,669,175 to 132,563,271 in the 4-year period.

As against this population increase in the District, the man responsible for purchases for the city's public hospitals and institutions reveals the fact that food prices were 48 percent higher than in the pre-Pearl Harbor period. This was within the O. P. A.'s province to try to control.

I suppose you know that:

The municipal government has discontinued clam and oyster dishes on its institutions' menus because clams have advanced 159 percent in price between September 1941 and September 1944, while oyster prices increased 130 percent in the same period, Brennan said.

Fresh fruit and vegetable costs have risen all the way from 21 percent for celery to 239 percent for apples, his report added. White potatoes rose 173 percent in price over the 3-year period, while corn jumped 181 percent and carrots 169 percent.

FISH UP 120 PERCENT, MEAT, 34 PERCENT

Fish products were 120 percent more expensive and meat averaged a 34-percent increase. No fair comparison on the relative prices of fresh meat can be made, however, Brennan insisted, since the "quality of meats now being ordered is inferior to quality received in 1941" and "contractors have the right to supply only what is available to them under Government quotas."

The purchasing officer said Government agricultural price supports and subsidies have made it difficult to reconcile some of the increases.

FLOUR UP MORE THAN BREAD

Unless subsidies keep the prices of bakery products down, he explained, there is no apparent reason for hard and soft wheat flour costs increasing 72 percent in the last 3 years while Procurement Division contractors supply bread and rolls at prices only 10 percent higher than in 1941.

Average increases as reported in percentages by Brennan for 15 major foodstuffs are: Fresh fruits and vegetables, 98; butter, 20; poultry, 60; fish, 120; eggs, 34½; milk, 10; cream, 45; flour, 72; sugar, 20; oleomargarine, 32; coffee, 33; bread and rolls, 10; canned fruits and vegetables and juices, 65; meat and meat products, 34; and lard, 57.

So the question arises country-wide, Why spend so much money to support the Office of Price Administration to protect us against the inevitable because of the unworkable set-up, legislatively and administratively?

Prices are not being controlled. That is evident. They cannot be controlled under the law as written. That is obvious.

The proof of the pudding is found in the facts the people have to swallow. Why do they choke themselves to death?

Address by Hon. Jose Castillo Torre Welcoming Delegates to a Meeting of the Permanent Commission of the Congress of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, on February 28 there was held a session of the Permanent Commission of the Congress of Parliament of Mexico, in the Chamber of Deputies, at which delegates from the American republics were welcomed. In welcoming the delegates Hon. Jose Castillo Torre, a Senator from Yucatan, delivered an address which to me appears to be so important from a historic point of view, giving the background of the amicable relationships among the American republics, that I caused the address to be translated into English, and I now ask unanimous consent to have the English translation of it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the translation of the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Translation]

Honorable representatives of the United States and Hispanic America, I realize that my weak voice does not possess the eloquence called for by this magnificent occasion, on which the Permanent Commission of the Mexican Congress welcomes you as legislators in the service of democracy and the ideal of solidarity of the American nations. Destiny has charged me with a great honor, a rare opportunity, that of speaking before those who are masters of the art of expression and who so thoroughly know the secrets of eloquence.

Since it is not from temerity that I speak, but rather in faithful discharge of an honorable duty, I ask your indulgence, honorable representatives. Counting upon it as a good omen, may I begin this greeting by stating that the friendship of Mexico for her sister republics of America has always been unblemished and complete, generous and gallant, disinterested and wholly noble, like that which impelled the famous Baron von Humboldt to journey 40 days up the Magdalena River to show his affection for the learned José Celestino Mutis.

It is fitting to add that Mexico considers her friendship equally reciprocated by your own. Have you not come from afar, so that under the blue transparency of our mountain-rimmed sky—a clear and limpid crystal of historic perfection—we may cut the moral diamond of a more just, a more human, concept of the world and of life? In this spirit did Emerson, his imagination caught by the splendor of a star, cross the Atlantic to meet Carlyle.

The root of our common destiny, honorable representatives, go far back into the world of the captaincies general and the viceroyships, of mendicant missionaries and soldiers of fortune. The same many-hued tradition is woven into the fabric of the history of our peoples, and colors that fabric with the development of political and social institutions. The same high wind of adventure and danger on the Atlantic seaways blew upon the caravels which carried our forefathers beyond the Sea of Darkness, that superstition invented by Egyptian high priests of Isis around the mythical and opulent palace of Poseidon, the city of Atlantis with its golden gates. Our kindship, therefore, dates back many centuries, and our friendship springs from the mutual enjoyment of the glorious inheritance carved by our forefathers along the mountain chains extending from the highlands of Nebraska to the southern confines of Chile. These forebears still bring us together around the family hearth to listen to tales of their deeds. The memory of these deeds vivifies the past and illumines it with the brilliant procession of explorers of the Amazon, the seekers of Cibola and Quivira, wayfarers to the Spice Islands, and caballeros bewitched by the enchantment of El Dorado.

Memory bows to these iron-willed ancestors who journeyed from one tropic clime to another, from Cancer to Capricorn and back again, who daringly explored the mouths of great rivers, and fearlessly lost themselves in the depths of great forests. And this took place, honorable representatives, in the Homeric age of the Conquest, in time of Hernán Cortés, and Pedro de Alvarado, of Pizarro and Valdivia; a time when Alvar Núñez de Vaca covered 700 leagues in a few days, and when the extraordinary Vasco Núñez de Balboa discovered the magnificence of the Pacific Ocean; an epoch in which our Indian forebears replied to our white forebears with the massacre of the Bay of Mala Pelea, the fire of Tenoxtitlán, the heroism of Cuauhtémoc, the stoic grandeur of the bronze-haired Inca, and the indomitable bravery of the Aracuanian. [Loud applause.]

Then, honorable representatives, came the forefathers of colonial times, of the days of independence, of the difficult forging of our Nation. All those ancestors now protect us with their name, guide us with their invisible hands, wise and hallowed, and point out to our countries their direction and destiny.

It is impossible to think of the destiny of our America without turning our eyes to the past and meditating on the heights which dominate the panorama of history and light it with an unending procession of torches. Each hero is like a pinnacle in the mountain chain of that history, and each heroic deed is like a torch on the summit of that pinnacle.

Let us pause and gaze upon those heights, which have been the Mount Sinai of American solidarity. And what do we behold? A great sunlight which bathes the peak in colors reminiscent of the insignia of Great Colombia. The landscape is filled with deafening noise, wherein may be heard a blare of trumpets and clang of armor in the mad gallop of a thousand horses. The wind which blows is the same wind that opened its shining red fan over the fields of Boyacá and

Carabobo, of Junín and Pichincha. On high appears the face of the hero surrounded by his captains and soldiers. The southwest wind blowing from cold heights tanned their skins and the love of liberty inflamed their souls. The vigor of life gives movement to the picture and lends imposing majesty to the voice which proclaims the unity of America.

What sound is that which rings on the mountainside and echoes over rushing streams? It is the voice of Simon Bolivar.

One hundred and thirty years have passed, honorable representatives, since the day when the liberator announced, in his famous letter from Jamaica, that the hour would strike when the peoples of America would unite in an august congress to consider the problems of war and peace with peoples of other parts of the world. Through the years, at quickened pace in recent times, American solidarity has perfected its beautiful rhythm. The declaration which ended the Chaco war and demonstrated the effectiveness of the solidarity of the Continent; the Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, held at Buenos Aires; the Eighth Pan American Conference of Lima; the Consultative Meetings of Panama, Habana, and Rio de Janeiro; the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace now taking place in Mexico City; all these things unmistakably proclaim that the transmuting power of time, the father of history, has brought into living reality the dream of Simon Bolivar. [Applause.]

We should acknowledge here, honorable representatives, that continental solidarity is indebted to the United States for the marvelous binding power of democracy, and that our Hispanic American nations found in it the republican creed which meant to them, as the famous Chilean thinker, Jose Victoriano Lastarria realize, the possibility of regenerating their European political heritage based on the Roman principle of force, on the imperium unum, chief inspiration of the despotism of ancient kings and modern Caesars.

Community of political ideas—the democracy of the North is already an accepted dogma for our America—represents a human factor of solidarity as profound as that of language and race.

If the United States of America has influenced the regeneration of the political customs of our continent, it is because that Nation was born of the most enlightened republican thought of England. It is because North American democracy was born, not in 1776 in Virginia, but in the long and bloody battles fought in defense of liberty and justice by the indomitable English barons against their early kings. The emigrants who landed during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries on the coasts of Virginia and New England were descendants of those English barons. The Puritans of Plymouth, the Mayflower Pilgrims who came to Cape Cod, as well as later colonists who were to become the founders of the greatest and most flourishing Republic in the world, were heirs of the men who forced the Magna Carta upon King John, defended the prerogatives of Parliament, won the right of habeas corpus from the Stuarts, and obtained the Bill of Rights from William of Orange.

The Republic was already conceived, as the honorable Representatives are all well aware, in the English Puritan doctrines of the eighteenth century. This is why American colonial documents or charters abounded in the purest democratic principles, as befitted the men who proclaimed them and who were equal in station and fortune, men who knew how to share their faith and their sufferings. That is why the King of England could remark that the Charter of Massachusetts was based on freedom of conscience.

Freedom of conscience, the cornerstone of democracy, brings to memory one of the most generous and notable men in the history of the United States. I refer to Roger Williams, the young Protestant pastor of Salem. The memory of Roger Williams is a symbol of the eternal battle waged by the defenders of liberty against the standard-bearers of despotism. It rises in glorious splendor, shining in the annals of America at the zenith of its historic sky, as if to lure a thunderbolt at the tyrants who, fighting against the eternal principles of the justice of life, stubbornly worship hatred and death at the bloody altar of our iron age. [Long applause.]

Roger Williams was a victim of political despotism and endured the bitterness of religious intolerance like so many other unfortunates of yesterday, today, and tomorrow; but far from being dismayed by misfortune, and obeying one of those voices of eternity which inspire and guide the immortals, he resolved to found the city of Providence that it might serve as a refuge for all those who were oppressed.

How brightly shines the name of Roger Williams, honorable representatives, through the shadows which darken our world with the cruelest suffering; and how firm must be the faith in a system of democratic liberty that enables a country to give to the world the high example of virtue of the founder of Providence. [Applause.]

We believe that the good-neighbor policy is a further expression of the love of liberty, respect for justice and moral teaching of men like the founder of Providence; we have faith that each day will increase the influence of George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Jefferson, Franklin, Lincoln, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt; we believe that the good-neighbor policy will rest upon foundations of concrete and eloquent deeds; that it will not operate in a vacuum, but be able to achieve, through vigorous and common effort, true solidarity in the field of material progress and in the mighty realm of the spirit. We believe that the tragic countenance of the filibuster Walker will disappear forever from the horizon, and that this time it will not be Aaron Burr's criminal rashness which will murder Alexander Hamilton, but rather will it be Hamilton who will punish Aaron Burr.

We shall not conclude this brief and modest greeting, honorable representatives of the United States and of Spanish America, without first paying heartfelt and grateful tribute to the millions of men who are fighting for democracy and for world freedom. We know that their sacrifice is the price of the life of tomorrow.

On the vast altar of war, the United States is placing the incalculable wealth of the blood of its finest and most generous youth. On the same pyre Hispanic American youths are offering the tribute of their simple and unstinting lives. There is no circle more sublime than the sacred one of heriosm and death, nor is there one in which the destinies of the two Americas could more rightly be fused.

Tinged with the blood of heroes, the America of the future can already be perceived—an America, one and indivisable.

Soon, honorable representatives, you will be returning to your homes. When you do and whenever you pluck a petal from the flower of nostalgia, remember that Mexico is a vibrant arrow in the quiver of America; remember that with good reason history called the greatest Mexican warrior by the symbolic and celestial name of Ilhuicamina: "the hunter of heaven."

This is the time for action and for remembrance and for a united course. And, according to the words of Martí, the bleeding hero of Dos Rios, we must march in "closed ranks, like the silver in the heart of the Andes"; we must mark, I make bold to say, in a compact group, like the arrows in the quiver of Ilhuicamina. [Long and hearty applause.]

Unanswered Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unanswered Questions," by David Lawrence, which appeared in the United States News for March 9, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

(By David Lawrence)

AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE RIGHT TO KNOW ALL THE FACTS BEFORE THEY ARE COMMITTED TO PARTICIPATION IN EUROPEAN AFFAIRS—LASTING PEACE CANNOT COME FROM BROKEN PLEDGES OR COMPROMISES BY HEADS OF STATES IN PERSONAL CONFERENCES

Decisions of far-reaching importance affecting all of us have been made. The American people face a new role in world affairs. They have been committed by their President to intimate participation in European affairs, European controversies and European politics. But we are told that this cannot be helped, that there is no middle ground, that we must accept our full measure of responsibility if we want peace.

But what shall be the method of our participation, the process by which we exercise our influence as well as our power in the stages leading up to the emergency? Shall it be a game of chance in which we do not know the cards till the show-down comes or shall it be a partnership of free peoples in which we and other peoples have access to all the facts before commitments or decisions are reached?

Clearly we may all agree with the objective—world peace—and yet disagree with the system of personal and private conferences whereby three men carve up European territory without allowing the corrective influences of public opinion to be operative and without, indeed, taking the people into their confidence on the reasons why pledges solemnly given already during this war are casually, if not flagrantly, disregarded by our allies. If we are to build a peace, we cannot do so by condoning the aggressive behavior of the head of a state who is not responsible to any Parliament or Congress, nor can we look with pride on the two other heads of state who now defend their "compromises" and destruction of principle on the ground that expediency and "give-an-take" left no alternative.

Is this the new order in the world—the reign of law and justice? Are we to establish a set of councils and boards in the United Nations organization which are to go through the motions of handling international problems while actually three men, sitting down in secrecy and seclusion, trade with one another? And are we then to be confronted with an accomplished fact and told there is nothing else we can do but accept what has been agreed upon?

Let us, therefore, insist through our legislative body that frank and full answers be given to pertinent questions. Let our people go into Europe at least with their eyes wide open and their facts before them. Here are some of the questions that should be answered satisfactorily by our own Government

if the American people are wholeheartedly to commit themselves to compulsory military service, burdensome taxes, and a big standing army in order to police Europe or at least to prevent it from breaking out in a third world war:

1. Why was no verbatim record kept of what each of the "Big Three" said at the Yalta Conference? If the Prime Minister had a record kept of what he said, why have we no record of what Marshal Stalin or our President also said?

2. What are "some of the other arrangements made at Yalta" which the President, in his prepared text given to the press before he spoke to Congress, said would require ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate?

3. Why does the President say now that at Teheran in December 1943 long-range military plans were laid but "no political arrangements were made and none attempted," when Prime Minister Churchill in his speech to the House of Commons on December 15, 1944, and again last week, told how he raised the question of the Polish boundary at Teheran and agreed with Marshal Stalin on the Curzon line? Why was this information withheld from the American people during 1944?

4. If, as the President now says, the 14 months between Teheran and Yalta made too long a lapse "without conferences of civilian representatives of the three major powers," why didn't the Secretaries of State meet and why is the idea of "periodic meetings of the Foreign Secretaries of Great Britain, Russia, and the United States at intervals of 3 or 4 months" offered suddenly now as a new discovery in diplomatic intercourse and as a great accomplishment of the Yalta Conference? Didn't Secretary Hull go to Moscow in November 1943 and meet there with the Foreign Secretaries of Britain and Russia?

5. Supposing we grant that there was comradeship and good feeling when President Roosevelt yielded to Marshal Stalin and made possible unanimous agreement, does this augur well for the affairs of the United States in the next 25 or 50 years when these same three men may be subtracted by fate from sitting together as the heads of state? What access have we to Russian public opinion and can we be sure that decisions as to war or peace will be made by the Russian people and not by their totalitarian executive, and isn't this the crux of the whole problem however much we want to camouflage our concessions to the "might makes right" doctrine which really won out at Yalta?

6. Why didn't the European Advisory Commission, created at Teheran and sitting in London ever since, deal with the questions that arose in Italy and Greece and Poland? What assurance has the world that if joint action was discarded when publicly pledged once, it will not be discarded again when it suits the convenience of any state to take unilateral action?

7. Why was the military coordination announced so enthusiastically at Yalta not achieved before Yalta? Why was there an announcement at Teheran telling the people that military coordination had been agreed upon between Russia, Britain, and the United States? Who violated that pledge, and what were the circumstances of the default on a public pledge?

8. Why does the President say that "by compelling reparations in kind—in plants, in machinery, in rolling stock, and raw materials—we shall avoid the mistake that we and other people made after the last war—the demanding of reparations in the form of money which Germany could never pay"? Doesn't he recall that the Versailles Treaty set forth in detail the reparations that Germany did pay in kind till her materials and money were depleted and she finally went bankrupt in 1923, only to make her economic recovery later in a spirit of revenge which gave Hitler his chance to put over national socialism on the bitter and distraught German people?

9. Does the President think that because he says "we do not want the German people to starve or to become a burden on the rest of the world," he can prevent this from happening if he lets Russia handle reparations from Moscow, drafting forced labor in Germany, and if Germany is divided up in such a way that it has no chance for economic sustenance? Will not the German people in desperation find guerrilla warfare and underground sniping their only alternative, so that American forces will be kept there indefinitely or so that Russia may ultimately communize Germany and the Balkans and keep Europe in a turmoil to settle the consequences of which we must now pledge the use of our might in a third World War?

10. What reply can the President make to the American people who took the words of the Atlantic Charter as seriously as he now asks them to take the words of the Yalta communique or the words of his address to Congress? What explanation has he to make of the "territorial aggrandizement" whereby Russia grabbed Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania and refuses even to discuss their future status? What has he to say about creation of a puppet government by Russia at Lublin and of a proposed expulsion of millions of Poles from their homes?

Maybe the answer to all of this lies in the simple phrase interpolated almost wistfully by the President as he was concluding his address to Congress. He was saying: "The Crimean Conference was a successful effort by the three leading nations to find again a common ground of peace. It spells"—here Mr. Roosevelt almost whispered the next four words—"it ought to spell—the end of the system of unilateral action and exclusive alliances and spheres of influence and balances of power and all the other expedients that have been tried for centuries, and have always failed."

Yes, it ought to spell the end of power politics and of the grab method. But will it? And must we guarantee these border settlements and pay the bill for the economic upheavals and bitterness of resistance that flows therefrom—pay with the lives of our sons and grandsons as well as with our treasure? Or are we to be told by the guilty minds of the sinners that what we ask is but impertinent perfectionism and that in this practical world we must give up ideals and principles and give way to opportunism and the makeshifts of expediency, ignoring our responsibility to innocent men, women, and children who are all creatures of God and deserve justice irrespective of any punishment that must necessarily be meted out to the criminal or the lawless?

Where is the international morality we have striven for so long?

Where is the courage to challenge the compromises and the appeasements that mean not yet the unconditional surrender of our enemies but already the unconditional surrender of our souls and our consciences to the old, old doctrine that might makes right?

Shall we—in Congress, in the press, and in the gatherings of freemen everywhere—acquiesce because it is the easiest course to follow? Shall we exchange the comfort of a craven acquiescence for the courage to speak out against the mistakes that mean more bloodshed tomorrow and for years to come? That is the unanswered question on which hinges the great decision that faces the American people today.

Tribute to Andrew Furuseth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, recently as a member of the Board of Visitors on the part of the Senate I visited the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and I noticed among those especially honored was Andrew Furuseth, who during his lifetime has contributed greatly to improvement in labor conditions of seamen of the United States.

I have been advised today that this is the ninety-first anniversary of the birthday of Andrew Furuseth, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum with regard to his career, which has been obtained from the library of the American Federation of Labor.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Andrew Furuseth, president of the International Seamen's Union, was born in Romedal, Norway, on March 12, 1854, the son of Andreas Nielsen Furuseth and Martha Jensdatter. He was the fourth child of eight born to them. The family was very poor, according to Mr. Furuseth, and at the age of 8 he was fostered away from his parents until confirmed.

Mr. Furuseth went to sea in 1873 and sailed successively on Norwegian, Swedish, English, French, German, and American ships. He came to the United States in 1880 and almost immediately began his agitation for a change in the status of seamen. In 1887 he was elected secretary of the Pacific Coast Seamen's Union, subsequently named the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, and at that time an organized struggle was initiated to change the status of seamen from what approximated serfdom to a standard of comparative freedom.

As early as 1890, when Mr. Furuseth was a delegate to an international seamen's conference at Glasgow, he championed his views on the freedom of the sailor.

A detailed story of the life accomplishment of Mr. Furuseth is told in a book called The Sailors' Union of the Pacific by Dr. Paul S. Taylor, of the University of California, published in 1923.

Mr. Furuseth began his work in Washington in 1893 and successive sessions of Congress by a series of legislative enactments responded to his seemingly irresistible pleas for freedom for seamen.

It should be noted that until success crowned Mr. Furuseth's legislative campaign American seamen could not strike after signing of shipping articles. The penalties for striking or quitting the ship had been unchanged for centuries, and it was Mr. Furuseth's self-selected task to abolish these penalties.

The principal laws passed by Congress to bring about these changes are:

1. The Maguire Act of 1895.
2. The White Act of 1898.
3. The La Follette Act of 1915.

By the passage of these measures American seamen were by degrees made freemen and now have the legal right to quit their jobs in any safe harbor anywhere on earth.

It is significant that although 22 years have passed since the enactment of the La Follette law no other nation has to date granted the same rights to seamen.

Probably the principal episode in Mr. Furuseth's life was the preparation and passage of the La Follette Seamen's Act of March 4, 1915, which virtually completed his life work of making the American seaman a free man.

Mr. Furuseth prepared most of the data for the committees of the House and the Senate and submitted numerous pamphlets, of which he was the sole author, in support of this measure. At that time, this legislation was criticized as being inimical to American shipping but since the passage of the act it has been recognized even by shipowners that it was a much needed reform.

For many years past Mr. Furuseth has been president of the International Seamen's Union, with headquarters at Washington, D. C., where, until recently, he has been in constant attendance at congressional committees on behalf of seamen. He was largely responsible for that portion of the Jones Act of March 5, 1920, which gave added benefits to seamen, and never until sickness compelled him to retire did he fail to raise his voice for those who go down to the sea in ships.

The principal accomplishment of Mr. Furuseth can be said to be that in an entirely unselfish manner he has, almost single handed, been responsible for changing the legal status of seamen in the United States from that of a comparative serf or peon to that of a free-born American citizen. This reform he has accomplished in a lawful manner. He has addressed himself to the agencies of law and order that are in existence in the United States. He has convinced Members of the House and Senate of the justice of the seamen's cause and, accordingly, the statutes of the United States have been amended so as to provide for the freedom which the seaman of today has.

While having only an elementary education, Mr. Furuseth, by self study, became a learned and cultured student of the law and of economics. He is the author of innumerable pamphlets which have been submitted to the respective bodies of Congress in support of seamen's bills, as well as articles in technical, professional, and trade magazines.

Mr. Furuseth attended numerous international conferences and was a respected and beloved delegate to the conventions of the American Federation of Labor ever since the International Seamen's Union became a part of the American Federation of Labor in 1892.

During his long period of association with the seamen's union, Mr. Furuseth consistently refused to accept more than an absolute minimum salary to enable him to keep body and soul together. His labor has been entirely unselfish, and for nearly a half a century his every effort has been a disinterested one to elevate the status of those who man our ships.

Mr. Furuseth often told his intimate friends that the only person who was really independent was one who had nothing and wanted nothing—for himself. He, himself, lived that sort of a life.

Service of United Press to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from United Press Associations and my reply thereto:

UNITED PRESS ASSOCIATIONS,
New York City, March 7, 1945.

The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I was very much interested in your remarks to the House on March 6, commenting favorably upon the recent inauguration of a service to newspapers in India by our friends of the Associated Press. Now here is some more good news which you and your colleagues of the House undoubtedly will be glad to hear:

The United Press, which established direct telegraphic service to newspapers in India during August of 1942 (being the first American press association to do so), has grown steadily there, and has expanded further within the last week. United Press has continued until this year to supply the only American news service in that vast and important area.

Incidentally, United Press is the only American press association sending telegraph news direct to China, South Africa, Egypt, Portugal, Switzerland, and other overseas countries. We have been pioneers in the foreign-news field for more than a generation.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH L. JONES.

MARCH 9, 1945.

Mr. JOSEPH L. JONES,
United Press Associations,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. JONES: I have your letter of March 7, and I am glad to have the information concerning your telegraphic service to newspapers in India.

I shall make it my business to put same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Special Stamp Commemorating Valor of United States Marines on Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Star entitled "Flag Raising Stamp." This editorial comments upon the suggestion I have made to the Postmaster General that the remarkable photograph, taken on Iwo Jima by Associated Press photograph Joe Rosenthal, of the raising of the flag on Mount Suribachi be used as the central design of a special stamp honoring the valor and sacrifice of the United States Marine Corps.

I also ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD an article by James Waldo Fawcett from the Washington Star of Sunday, March 11, 1945, with reference to the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, March 12, 1945]

FLAG-RAISING STAMP

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, formerly was First Assistant Postmaster General, and he therefore knows from experience the importance of the designs of postage stamps as media for the widest possible democratization of ideas. More than a century ago, Sir Rowland Hill, sponsoring the famous Penny Back, of Great Britain, employed a profile portrait of Queen Victoria as the central motif of the composition reproduced thereon—and thus started the procedure which rendered his sovereign the most widely known woman in the world. The same principle was followed in 1849 when the first postal labels of the United States were produced, one showing Benjamin Franklin and another George Washington. It also motivated Napoleon III when he substituted his own effigy for the symbolic likeness of the Goddess Ceres on the adhesives of France in 1852.

What Senator O'MAHONEY currently suggests is that the photograph of the raising of the Stars and Stripes on Mount Suribachi on the island of Iwo, published in the Star for February 24 and 25, be adapted for use as the main feature of a 3-cent stamp as "a memorial to (the) valor and sacrifice" of the Marine Corps. Concerning the picture, he has declared to Kent Cooper, executive director of the Associated Press: "No war report or communiqué, no speech or statement that has been written or spoken since Pearl Harbor, and certainly no news picture is to be compared with it in dramatic appeal." A large public undoubtedly shares this opinion. The photograph is so truly a "natural" that it requires no explanation, needs no argument. Part of its power of attraction is its simplicity. It could not have been posed. The story it tells is the story of the whole tremendous effort of the double war. It represents men—four striving marines—in the act of affirming the basic ideal of their lives in battle on a mountain top. They are putting the Star-Spangled Banner against an enemy sky, where it will fly as a promise of still other victories.

Senator O'MAHONEY has proposed the stamp in especial homage to the Marine Corps, but his letter to Postmaster General Frank C. Walker also carries the suggestion that similar labels be issued for all other branches of the national service.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of March 11, 1945]

STAMPS

(By James Waldo Fawcett)

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, former First Assistant Postmaster General, has proposed that the photograph of the raising of the Star-Spangled Banner on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, reproduced in the Star for February 24 and 25, be adapted for use as a design for a 3-cent postage stamp.

Concerning the photograph as such, the Senator wrote to Kent Cooper, executive director of the Associated Press:

"The raising of the flag on Mount Suribachi is a photograph that should never be forgotten. No war report or communique, no speech or statement that has been written or spoken since Pearl Harbor, and certainly no news picture is to be compared with it in dramatic appeal. It is a memorial to the men in whose blood our victory is being written. It is a reminder of the ideals for which we fight.

"Old Glory is floating from the summit of Mount Suribachi, where it was planted by the marines. May it be a prophesy that the freedom and justice for which it stands shall speedily be extended to all peoples and all nations.

"I feel that the Associated Press is to be congratulated for having given this photograph to the world. I write to thank you and the photographer who made it to ask if I may have an original print and to suggest that the Associated Press formally dedicate it to the United States Marines who won the victory that made the photograph possible."

Mr. O'MAHONEY next addressed Postmaster General Frank C. Walker in a letter reading:

"I am sure, like everybody else in the country, you were mightily impressed by the Associated Press photograph of the raising of the flag on Mount Suribachi. This was not only a great news picture but a moving appeal to the patriotic instincts of every citizen.

"I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have written to Kent Cooper of the Associated Press in New York and a copy of the story of the photographer who made the picture, the latter having been furnished me by Paul Miller of the A. P. bureau here in Washington. My purpose in writing to you now is to suggest that out of recognition of the heroic performance of the marines in the Pacific war and as a memorial to their valor and sacrifice, the Post Office Department issue a commemorative stamp, with this photograph as the central design.

"I have long thought that a special stamp should be issued to honor each branch of the service. Now that the opportunity is presented to portray in such dramatic manner the victory on Iwo Jima, I hope that you may feel inclined to sponsor the issue."

The Senator likewise sent to Lt. Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, the following communication:

"The dramatic and deeply moving Associated Press photograph of the raising of the flag on Suribachi has prompted me to write to the Associated Press suggesting that the photograph be formally dedicated to the United States marines, and to the Postmaster General suggesting that it be used as the central design of a special stamp commemorating the achievements and sacrifices of the gallant soldiers under your command.

"I can add nothing to what I have said in these two letters except to assure you that I know the whole country is inexpressibly proud of the United States Marine Corps."

All three letters were dated yesterday. They are published in this space because they are authentic footnotes to the philatelic history of present times.

Joe Rosenthal, an Associated Press photographer working for the photographic pool on Iwo Jima, was the camera artist who made the original picture, radioed by the Navy from Guam to San Francisco. The men shown in the act of raising the flag on the crest of the extinct volcano are marines of Company E, Second Battalion, Twenty-eighth Regiment, Fifth Division, one of whom has been identified as Platoon Sgt. Ernest Ivy Thomas, of Tallahassee, Fla.

Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the theory that sometimes a word of criticism is helpful, I am inserting herein, under permission granted, an editorial from the Westmoreland Observer, published at Greensburg, Pa., on March 1, of this year.

Apparently the editor is dissatisfied, as apparently, if you read the public press, many of our people are dissatisfied, because of the lack of a vigorous opposition to the New Deal, the internationalists, and all those who think that it is our duty as a Nation not only to fight and win the war brought on by other nations, but to repair the damage suffered by other nations during the war.

Some internationalists not only want to rebuild the cities, the harbors, the docks, the warehouses, which were destroyed during the war, but they wish to use our taxpayers' money to establish and build in other lands industrial facilities which will put those countries into competition, not only with our manufacturers, but with the workers of this country who are engaged in industrial production.

In brief, they wish to establish in other countries, through the use of United States funds, business enterprises which will come into direct competition with domestic production.

That appears to be the New Deal program and because of a lack of opposition to that program comes the editorial to which I have referred and which reads as follows:

"ME TOO" PARTY BECOMES RIDICULOUS—DECADENT G. O. P. FAILS NATION IN TIME OF CRISIS, LEADERSHIP BANKRUPT

While the American people cry out for relief from the oppression and tyranny of the alien New Deal-Communist plunder bund, the Republican Party presents a spectacle of inertia unparallel in the political history of this Republic. The mouselike sneaks of "me too, but" to every fresh assault by the Roosevelt administration upon the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is convincing citizens all over the country that they can expect nothing from the Republican Party.

In its blind and weasel-worded acceptance of the Dumbarton "Hoax" taking the party lock, stock, and barrel into the internationalist camp, its trailing along with the administration in the slave bill, its burst of timorous applause at the recent Yalta Conference in which Mr. Roosevelt came home in a barrel, the Republican Party has forfeited the respect and confidence of the more than twenty-three million American citizens who voted for its candidates last November.

Even the principles espoused by the party in the recent campaign seems to have had no substance than the evanescent campaign oratory of the late unlamented Wendell Willkie. One Republican plank in particular that could at least serve to annoy the new dealers was that proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the Presidential tenure to office to two terms.

But no such resolution has been introduced in this Congress. Unquestionably a great deal of congressional support could be secured for a resolution of this nature if the Republican Party was solidly behind it. There are many Southern Democrats who would be only too happy to support the movement.

Undoubtedly public opinion would overwhelmingly endorse an amendment to the Constitution limiting Presidential office holding. The people everywhere have become alarmed at the menace of perpetual occupancy of the White House by one man, they realize now how difficult it is to dislodge an ambitious politician who has been left in office too long, and decides to hold on for life.

What more popular issue could be presented in Congress, in these days when totalitarianism is sweeping the world, and which has brought destruction of liberty, war, carnage, poverty, and chaos in its wake? But nary a chirp out of the Republican Party on this vital issue. We find many Republican Congressmen and Senators too busy trying to appease Sidney Hillman and Mr. Roosevelt, believing that they can get the support of the P. A. C. in their campaigns for reelection next year.

The good of the country, the liberty of the people and the security of the Nation are all given secondary, if any, consideration in the councils of both major political parties. In this respect the Republicans are not one whit better than the lying, thieving, predatory New Deal.

Millions of working people who have been herded into labor unions against their will and exploited for the personal profit of racketeering and Communist labor leaders by the connivance of the Roosevelt administration are crying out for release from this galling yoke of semislavery. But did the Republican Party and candidate Dewey hold out one particle of hope for relief from this un-American oppression of the common people? No, the G. O. P. endorsed the Wagner Labor Relations Act and promised to continue it.

What relief from the arrogant, foolish, and unnecessary regulations and regimentations perpetrated upon all American citizens did the party of Lincoln—shame on the metaphor—offer the harassed people in last year's campaign? None; only we can do it better—maybe, a little less painfully.

What had the Republican Party to offer, what has it to offer today, to millions of thrifty-class citizens who see their savings being filched away from them, their businesses ruined, their investments destroyed by taxes and pernicious regulations, and their homes, farms, and real-estate holdings ruined by arbitrary rules and destructive taxation? What opposition, what resistance, does the Republican Party give to the diabolically clever conspiracy of the New Deal-Communist cabal to destroy and impoverish the great American middle class, which constitutes 75 percent of American citizens and is the backbone of the Nation?

None. The Republican Party and its present leadership has nothing to offer the American voter but cringing, fawning subservience to the alien collectivist philosophy of the New Deal. With 23,000,000 American citizens voting their militant opposition to the rotten, corrupt, deceitful, lying New Deal-Communist gang, the Republican Party stands trembling and craven, a spectacle of cowardice unparalleled, afraid to take a stand, afraid to fight for the rights of the people under the Constitution—afraid to strike a blow for our great Republic.

America needs a new political party; not a third party, but a real red-blooded, fighting American Party, organized in every city, town, village, hamlet, and township to supplant the defunct Republican Party so "that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Latvian History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of March 11, 1945:

LATVIAN HISTORY

A COMMUNICATION

It is to be regretted that the chapter on Latvia of an Intelligent American's Guide to the Peace, with all due respect for the good intentions of the general editor, Mr. Sumner Welles, contains many inaccuracies.

As is known, the Baltic States were not originally parts of Russia. For instance, the core of Latvia, the Ducky of Kurland, was annexed only in 1795. The nonnumerous German landed nobles and the invading Russians combined to dominate and exploit the Latvians constituting more than absolute majority of the population. The Latvian autonomous movement, which culminated in a revolution in 1905, was mercilessly suppressed by Russian punitive troops led by German landed noblemen disguised as honorary police officers.

However, in 1914 the Latvians did not rise against Russia but voluntarily took up arms against the German invader. Only a few of these Latvian rifles, referred to by the author, turned bolshevistic in 1917. The majority followed the Latvian national committee, which on November 18, 1917, proclaimed Latvia's secession from bolshevik Russia.

This Latvian National Army, formed not by Germans but by the Latvians themselves, and commanded not by a British officer but by a Latvian, Gen. J. Balodis, who was knighted by the King of England, jointly with the Estonian Army defeated the German von der Goltz corps in June 1919, the Bermondt Russian interventionist group in November 1919.

Not the "German-backed" (in April 1919) puppet government in Libau of the stooge, A. Niedra, generally despised by Latvians, but the legally elected democratic Latvian government of K. Ulmanis, a graduate of Nebraska State University, was recognized by the Allies already in 1918. Also the Soviet Government in 1920 signed a basic peace treaty with K. Ulmanis. The frontier was agreed upon on an ethnographic basis. Thus there are no "Russian districts" in Latvia, and the Russian minority forms only 10 percent of the entire population.

Contrary to the Guide, independence was not disastrous for Latvia, as may be seen from the following: Latvia, a country with a population one eighty-fifth as large and an area one three-hundred-and-twentieth as great as that of Russia, used 19 times more artificial fertilizers and had more cattle per hectare of agricultural land than Soviet Russia. In 1938 Latvia produced per capita 50 times more butter, 5 times more milk, and 4 times more meat than Soviet Russia. The yields of Latvian crops do not have to be compared with the Balkans, for they were certainly larger than those of Soviet Russia. Also the standard of living, social insurance, and the purchasing power of a laborer's wages or of a bushel of rye flour were far higher in Latvia than in Russia. Latvia had no unemployment, was economically self-supporting, had accumulated national wealth of $1,500,000,000, and had a national income of $400,000,000 and a favorable balance of payments. Russia's part in Latvia's foreign trade amounted to only 3 percent. In 1939 Latvia redeemed its 6-percent bonds in the United States.

Latvia's constitutional reform to introduce strong national unity is called "fascist" by the Guide. Actually all "isms" were forbidden in Latvia: Nazism, fascism, and communism. No such thing existed as a Latvian foreign policy controlled by a German minority which formed only 2.96 percent of the population. Latvia was never offered an Anglo-Russian guarantee in 1939, which is one of the reasons why it signed a nonagression treaty on June 7, 1939, with Germany. Another was that it had become known that Soviet Russia had reached a secret understanding with Germany. This was disclosed in August 1939 and let loose the present war. As in the Brest-Litovsk Treaty of 1918, both these great powers conspired against the Baltic States and Poland, which fact the author of the Guide does not mention at all.

The Guide makes a very mean insinuation in stating that the Latvian Government in 1940 fled with many German noblemen to the Reich. All Germans had voluntarily left Latvia by 1939. President Ulmanis, who accepted the armed ultimatum to allow the Red Army to enter Latvia freely and to form a "Latvian government friendly to Soviet Russia," was deported to the U. S. S. R. together with his deposed cabinet ministers even before the annexation of Latvia.

The author of the Guide continuously speaks of some mysterious plebiscites in the Baltic which, as he states, were held to ratify the new status. However, he advisedly ignores the declaration of the United States Government of July 23, 1940, condemning the devious processes and predatory acts of Soviet Russia in the Baltic. He also fails to mention the Baltic peoples' struggles against both occupations—Bolshevik and Nazi. Most ridiculous of all, he invents certain violently pro-Nazi Latvian noblemen. For his information, the Latvians have no aristocracy.

Not a word is said in the Guide of the fact that instead of an inter-Allied committee, the liberated Baltic states in the fall of 1944 were taken over by the Bolshevik puppet regimes of 1940. The author complacently excuses himself for discussing the Baltic states separately because their new position has not as yet been internationally ratified. I firmly hope that no really democratic state will ever recognize the annexation of the Baltic states.

Dr. ALFRED BILMANIS,
Latvian Minister.

WASHINGTON, *March 5, 1945.*

Nurses for the Wounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with more than 2,000,000 men actually fighting a cruel, efficient, and desperate foe, we know that, until the victory has been won, an ever-increasing number of wounded will need the care of nurses. We know that, long after this war is over, hundreds of thousands of veterans will, for years, need expert nursing.

Knowing this, the House tried to meet the need by enacting, in compliance with the administration's demand, legislation drafting all graduate, registered nurses, age 21 to 45, who belong to the Nurses Association, who were not married prior to June 15, 1945, who do not have dependent children.

The armed service is in a measure at fault; for it overestimated in one instance by 10,000 the number of nurses needed. It has refused to accept qualified male nurses and many qualified female volunteers.

If nurses are to be drafted into the military service, soon the number available will be exhausted. Young women who would ordinarily take up nursing as their life work will refuse to enter training when they realize they will have no opportunity for civilian nursing; that, taken into the service, they may be sent abroad and, like our troops, in the postwar period, be assigned to work under the command of British or Russian officers or the officers of our allies. If nurses are drafted, logically a law must be enacted drafting young women for training as nurses.

There is another angle to the situation. The average baby girl is born with the nursing instinct. This is shown soon after she as able to walk or talk by her desire for a doll, be it made of nothing more than a stick and rags. Upon it she lavishes her affection; to its care she devotes hours of her time. The sisters and the mothers are the ones who bind up and treat the stubbed toe, the blackened eye, the sprained limb, of the son, the brother, the husband.

THERE IS A REMEDY

Every woman is a potential nurse and never a slacker. If the nursing course is shortened, as well as it might be; if hospitals with less than 100 beds are permitted to train nurses; if more nursing schools are established, nurses by the thousands—sisters, wives, and mothers—will insist upon entering the service in order to be near and care for the wounded.

It has been the custom of the armed service to refuse many a nurse because she was not a member of the nurses association, because she was not a certain age, or did not possess certain physical qualifications—this I know.

While it is a fact that our sick and wounded in the service need more nurses, it is also a fact that this administration does not propose to use them unless they come in through the administration's door and submit to being used and ordered into service everywhere in the world.

That the nurses—the Angels of Mercy—are treated unfairly is shown by the fact that, while the House, at the administration's demand, passed a bill to draft nurses, the Senate, under control of the administration, defeated by a vote of 60 to 23 a proposition to draft men from 18 to 45 for essential war work and then, by a vote of 54 to 27, turned down the so-called loafer amendment, which would have compelled induction of men up to 45 into the Army unless they were employed in a war-supporting occupation or profession.

Later, the Senate voted to give the W. M. C. authority to determine the number of workers who should be employed in any particular plant or industry, but did not provide for the punishment of those who refused to accept a job in a war plant.

Nursing is an exacting, arduous, and many times an extremely disagreeable profession. Nevertheless, volunteer nurses have, to a large extent, met, and if all qualified be taken, will meet the needs of the service. Yet the administration insists that they be drafted. They would not have been drafted had the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. opposed drafting them as it opposed drafting workers.

You and I also know that the Congress has refused to force the administration to put an end to the strikes which are limiting the production of B–29 bombers and other war implements and materials which, if supplied in sufficient numbers, would lessen the number, not only of the wounded, but of those who must die.

The answer to the need of the armed services for nurses is, (a) the acceptance of those nurses who are qualified, even though they do not belong to a particular organization; (b) a shortened course of instruction; (c) the establishment of more schools for nurses; (d) the voluntary system coupled with (e) adequate pay—pay similar to that given workers in war plants; and (f) a change from a 12-hour tour of duty to an 8-hour shift, wherever possible.

Poland After Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Andre Visson, from the Washington Post of March 11, 1945:

POLAND AFTER YALTA

(By Andre Visson)

UNITED NATIONS' INSIDE FRONT

Washington, London, and Moscow discovered that they were not in complete agreement as to the part which the Lublin Government is called on to play in the establishment of the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity, on the creation of which the Big Three agreed at Yalta.

Both Washington and London took the view that the Lublin Government should disappear completely as a political entity. Its members were, of course, expected to enter the new government and the possibility was not excluded that they might find themselves the majority, should it not prove possible to gather a sufficiently important number of Polish democratic leaders from Poland itself and from abroad. But the Lublin Government in Washington's and London't interpretation of the Yalta declaration, should not form the basis for the new Polish Government of National Unity.

Moscow, on the other hand, takes the view that the Lublin Government does constitute the logical and legal basis for the new Polish Government. The Soviet diplomats justify this view by referring to the text of the Yalta declaration.

This text reads, indeed, that "the provisional government which is now functioning in Poland should therefore be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad."

Question of interpretation

Moscow's interpretation of that passage is that the Lublin government must be the original basis, to be broadened by the inclusion of additional elements, of the new Polish Government. Moscow's emphasis is put on the words "should * * * be reorganized." It appears, indeed, that if the Big Three agreed on the principle of "reorganigation of the Lublin government, they have implicitly recognized the Lublin government as the starting point of the establishment of the new government.

Washington and London must realize that the wording used at Yalta was not very happy (the Lublin government should rather be replaced and not reorganized), but they insist on their interpretation of the passage on Poland, and put the emphasis on the words "broader democratic basis," and especially on the "inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad."

This discussion, which developed during the last 10 days between the diplomatic chancelleries of the Big Three capitals, is not a quarrel of casuistic diplomats. It is of immediate—and most important—political significance. Should Washington and London accept Moscow's viewpoint, the Lublin Poles, who, incidentally, have already moved to Warsaw and refuse to be described as Lublin Poles, would have the initiative and also the decisive word in the consultations with the Polish democratic leaders who may be added to their team.

Anglo-American view

In the opinion of Washington and London, the initiative of consultation, according to the Yalta agreement, should rest with the three-man commission in Moscow—Foreign Commissar Viacheslav Molatov, United States Ambassador Averell Harriman, and British Ambassador Sir Archibald Clark Kerr.

Those three men have, indeed, been invested with the authority "to consult in first instance in Moscow with members of the present provisional government and with other Polish democratic leaders from within Poland and from abroad, with a view to the reorganization of the present government along the above lines."

The above-quoted passage from the Yalta declaration reinforces the American and British viewpoint on the Lublin Poles as one of the elements in the new government. But the repeated use of the word "reorganization," appears to support the Soviet thesis of the Lublin Poles as the basis of the new provisional government.

The efforts of Allied diplomats have been devoted to the indispensable harmonization of those different interpretations of the Yalta formula. As long as this harmonization is in doubt it is, indeed, impossible to proceed with the consultations. There is, however, an earnest desire in Washington, London, and in Moscow to have agreement in time for Poland to be represented at the San Francisco Conference by a Polish government recognized by all the Big Three Powers.

Durbrow's mission

In his efforts to achieve this indispensable agreement in Moscow Ambassador Harriman will be assisted by Elbridge Durbrow, the State Department's Chief of the Eastern European Division, who left Washington last week for Moscow, and plans to stay there 4 to 6 weeks. Mr. Durbrow, who was stationed both in Moscow and in Warsaw, is especially familiar with Polish problems, on which he worked during the last 3 years in Washington.

The divergencies in the interpretation of the Yalta formula for the solution of the Polish problem explain the irritation with which Mr. Eden spoke this week before the Parliament of the Lublin Poles.

The Lublin Poles are reported to consider themselves as the decisive factor in the Polish situation. They would like to decide which of the Polish leaders should be invited to Moscow for consulation, and they have already exercised their veto against Andrei Vitos of the Polish Peasant Party, who was a member of the Lublin committee but resigned because of disagreement over the technical application of the land distribution reforms.

While no Polish leaders, either from Poland or from abroad, can be invited to Moscow for consultation as long as the Big Three are not agreed among themselves on the interpretation of the Yalta formula, a number of names have been unofficially discussed in Moscow.

Possible leaders

Both Washington and London would welcome the adherence of such Polish leaders as Stanislaw Mikolajczyk or Stanislaw Grabski who enjoyed the confidence of Polish democrats in pre-war Poland. Of the names of Poles from Poland suggested as possible members of the new government, most are unknown in political circles. The resistance brought to the fore new men, who are not as yet known to the masses. As to the 74-year-old Archbishop Prince Sapieha mentioned as a possible leader, his adherence will probably be conditioned by the turn which the relations between the Vatican and the Kremlin may take within the coming weeks.

Mikolajczyk is known to be willing to answer the call from Moscow. But he is reported to have made known to the British his conditions. He wants to see all deportations cease and all those in concentration camps released. He wants no influence exerted at the elections by Soviet groups; that freedom of speech and of the press should be restored, and foreign correspondents be admitted into Poland. He desires that only persons of Polish nationality should be allowed to vote. Polish soldiers, serving outside Poland, should be entitled to vote either directly or by postal ballot. The elections should be conducted under the supervision of a neutral or inter-Allied commission.

A veteran Allied diplomatic observer in Washington remarked that the sincerity of the Polish elections is, indeed, infinitely more important than the composition of a provisional Polish Government. But the best possible composition of the provisional government is nevertheless a guaranty of the sincerity of the elections to be conducted by this government.

Mason City Newspaper Applauds Mundt's Proposal for International Peace Patrol of the Air to Protect a Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House I am inserting herewith a radio commentary appearing on the front page of the March 5 issue of the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette over the name of its managing editor, W. Earl Hall. It contains a discussion and evaluation of the proposal which I made on the floor of the House January 30 outlining the reasons why, in my opinion, an appropriately organized peace patrol of the air can successfully eliminate the scourge of war from ever again stalking its bloody path over the face of the earth.

Mr. Hall is an experienced and able world observer who has traveled in many countries and lectured widely on international problems. Like all other Americans of good repute, he abhors war. Like the rest of us he is tussling with the problem of effectuating a pro-

gram which will prevent future wars. Unlike too many counselors on the problem of preserving permanent peace, moreover, Mr. Hall recognizes the necessity of getting down to specifications and details and realizes that good intentions and euphonious rhetoric will never outlaw war.

Resounding resolutions and delightful declarations are commendable expressions of good intention, but what is desperately needed today is greater attention to the details and mechanics of a program appropriately devised to make the recurrence of great wars a complete impossibility. This can be achieved. But it can only be achieved if and when great nations as well as small are willing to dedicate an effective portion of their armed might to preventing war rather than simply and only engaging in rival armament races with the pious hope that the arms they build will never be used for anything more significant than museum pieces.

If the world will agree to utilize military air power solely for patrolling the peace in this modern universe it will have found at long last an effective method of using force to prevent any nation, great or small, from waging aggressive war against its neighbors. It is a challenge to the good intentions of the world and to the willingness of all of us to set military air power apart as an instrument of peace rather than adding it to the other weapons of war with which nations in the future will equip themselves for another global conflict waged by total populations in which casualties among women and children may well outrun the casualties among the fighting forces.

Today's most devastating falcons of war can become the world's most effective harbinger of peace, if we exercise sufficient moral courage now to dedicate military air power to the task of preventing future wars.

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(A radio commentary by W. Earl Hall, managing editor)

Broadcast schedule

KGLO, Mason City, Sunday, 1:45 p. m.
WOI, Ames, Wednesday, 5:30 p. m.
WSUI, Iowa City, Wednesday, 7:45 p. m.
WTAL, Quincy, Ill., Thursday, 6:30 p. m.
KSCJ, Sioux City, Saturday, 6 p. m.

YES, WE'VE GOT TO ACCENT THE POSITIVE

There's a song on the air these days called Accentuate the Positive. I hear it just about every time I turn on my radio. It made its appearance in a movie. Then the radio bands took it up.

Considered as a song, it would be all right with me if the crooners quit crooning it. After its first rendition or two I got the point of it. No further repetition is needed so far as I am concerned.

But, believe it or not, there's a moral in it that has real and pointed application to our thinking on future international affairs. Here's what I mean:

Talk to the average man on the street and he'll readily agree that some measures should be taken to insure against another war—to make the peace last. But ask him specifically how this is to be done and 99 times out of 100, he'll shrug his shoulders. He doesn't know—and neither do I.

In other words, all of us—and I mean that, all of us—are for the idea of preserving the peace—in the abstract. But we aren't getting down to cases. In a way, I suppose, we're minimizing the negative but we aren't up to this time doing a very good job of accentuating the positive.

One day before very long, however, we're going to have to snap out of our reverie. While we may not be called upon to draw the blueprints for that peace to come, we are going to have to pass on it. And by we, I mean America.

In our generalized, somewhat fuzzy thinking, most of us are agreed that some kind of agency is going to have to be created for enforcing peace against those nations which aren't committed to the idea. If we have an eye in our head and a brain cell working, we must recognize that the lack of such an agency was the fundamental shortcoming of the old League of Nations.

All right, we're agreed on the necessity for some kind of peace-enforcing machinery. But what kind shall it be? There are many, many kinds. There are numerous ways in which the post-war world organization might proceed.

We might, for example, have one vast, super-super army, navy, and air force operating on orders out of a world capital. Minnesota's young Governor, Harold Stassen, once suggested in a magazine article that Panama City be that world capital.

This approach presupposes the establishment of a closely knit United States of the World. Critics of this course condemn it as a world superstate. While there are some good, valid arguments for such an approach, events of the past 2 years have made it clear that it isn't going to come to pass. Britain doesn't want it; Russia doesn't want it; United States may or may not want it—I don't know.

What is ever so much more likely is a revival of the League of Nations, perhaps with a new name. A step toward that goal is going to be taken at the world conference of foreign ministers in San Francisco in April. Steps have been taken toward it at Moscow, Casablanca, Cairo, Teheran, and, most recently, at Yalta.

But no decision has yet been reached, or even seriously considered, so far as I know, with respect to the actual machinery for enforcing the peace. That, incidentally, is the one greatest problem facing the world today, next, of course, to bringing the war to a victorious conclusion.

The big question yet to be answered is, To what extent shall the world organization have control over the military might of the world? Shall power and authority be left with the constituent nations, or shall power and authority be taken over by the world organization itself?

Or, putting it another way—as a matter of accentuating the positive—what would happen if at some future time Germany got out of bounds again and threatened the peace of the world? Would quelling her be the job of the world organization—or would the task be left to Russia and France or Russia alone?

At this time, of course, this world question is more or less academic. But the time is coming when the issue involved is going to have to be met head-on and in specific terms. And that's just what KARL MUNDT, Representative from South Dakota, did the other day in an address in the lower House of Congress on the subject, "Peace—If We Want It."

I found a very special interest in the address, above and beyond the fact that it was a thought-stimulating effort. Mr. MUNDT is my good personal friend. I was with him and his congressional colleague, JAMES RICHARDS, of South Carolina, in the European war theater last fall. I know that he knows whereof he speaks.

In an able way Mr. MUNDT laid the foundation for his specific proposal for enforcing the peace. He pointed out that wanting peace and having peace are two quite different things. He foresaw the real possibility that the nations now united in war may not continue united in peace. In this observation, history is distinctly on his side—even contemporary history. Italy and Japan were both our allies in the last war.

"While we in the United States," he observed, "are of one mind that imperialism and aggression shall never form a part of our national policy, we must realize that no matter how sacred our own good intentions are, the citizens of other lands need more than that to induce them to accept for themselves restrictions and regulations which we in this republic might prefer to see applied only to others, not to ourselves. Self-interest is still a prime rule of survival for all nations, great or small."

To this, however, the South Dakota Congressman added:

"While the problems that must yet be solved are prodigious in the matter of developing an international organization which we can all support, I am not one of those who hold the pessimistic view that it cannot be done. We shall and we must continue trying."

"No recital of pious platitudes and glittering principles," Mr. MUNDT continued, "no matter how long or eloquent, will assure the world of lasting peace. It is the method and machinery for putting those pretty phrases into actual operation which puts reality into our rhetoric. * * * It's the specific proposals, the concrete plans, the devilish little details that make or mar the achievements of idealism."

All of this, of course, in better and stronger language than I've used, is what I've been trying to say thus far in this commentary. I think, therefore we are ready now to look at Mr. MUNDT's specific plan—his "path to permanent peace."

His proposal, boiled down, is the organization of an international peace patrol of the air which would dedicate the airplane in the post-war world, primarily, to the job of patrolling the world's armament factories and to bombing into oblivion at the very outset the armies and navies of any country which might in the future move its military establishments beyond its own borders or away from its own shores in aggressive warfare.

At the start—and this was by way of suggestion—Mr. MUNDT would have 5,000 military planes selected from the best now being operated by the armed services of the United Nations, with 1,000 planes being home-based on each of 5 strategically situated air bases in the world. This number could be reduced or expanded as future developments dictated. So also could the number of bases.

"Due consideration," Mr. MUNDT suggested, "should be given to selecting a proper ratio of fighter and bomber planes, of superbombers and of transports, of photographic observation planes, of amphibious and land based planes and of all modern types of military planes.

"Quotas for volunteers to man these planes and officer their operation might well follow the general percentages of men whom the respective members of the United Nations now have engaged in the aviation services."

Control under the Mundt plan would reside in the international peace patrol of the air in the hands of the joint Chiefs of Staff of United States, England, Russia, China, and France after the pattern of the supreme headquarters of Allied forces now operating under General Eisenhower in Europe.

General policy would be determined by the individual countries, but there would always be full authority for the air patrol to strike at once when necessary "in conformity with clearly defined policies governing the extent

of its activities and determined upon in advance by the governments thus cooperating."

Mr. MUNDT suggests the utilization of strategically located air bases already in existence, as follows: Stephensville, Newfoundland; Preswick, Scotland; Cairo, Egypt; Natal, Brazil; and one of the great air bases in China which American Army units have built. Commercial use of the bases would not be barred. Financing would be on an equitable contributing basis by the nations.

In a 10-point argument supporting his plan, Mr. MUNDT—

Praises the effectiveness of aviation.

Urges divesting enemy nations of their war-making potential, proposes a check on the world's preparations for war.

Suggests a distinctive coloring for air patrol planes and a distinctive uniform for air patrol members.

Recommends a limitation on armaments with an emphasis on planes.

Stresses the need for early action.

Offers a plan for including other nations in the patrol.

Outlines a program under which the ranks of the air patrol could be filled by volunteer enlistment by American lads desirous of making aviation a career.

"Members of this peace patrol," Mr. MUNDT explained, "would function not as Americans or as Russians or as Britons but members of an international police force, directed by an international control board, striking down wars virtually before they have had a day in which to get under way.

"This force would strike not as a war commitment by any of the participating powers but as an avenging force for peace, representing the convictions of all countries that war is never again to be used as a means of aggrandizement or as a device for seeking justice against real or imaginary wrongs."

Mr. MUNDT has discussed his program with many people, both in this country and in Europe, one of them his good friend, Col. Roscoe Turner, of Indianapolis.

"They have assured me," he declared, "that by reserving to air power the missions of peace, we can prevent nations from acquiring the essential machinery for war."

This, in outline, at least, is the peace-enforcing agency which KARL MUNDT in his introductory summation characterized in these words:

"I believe the establishment of an international peace patrol of the air can successfully, definitely, and permanently avert another major war. I say this categorically and without reservation. I believe the time is here when the world can have permanent peace if it wants permanent peace.

"It can have permanent peace without nations seriously sacrificing their sovereignty, without their foregoing their cultural or political ideals and without the expenditure of such enormous sums for national armaments that economic progress and human happiness are denied to common citizens."

My purpose in presenting the plan thus fully in this commentary is to stimulate some thinking on the specific and tangibles involved in insuring the world's peace. It's this rather than a desire to sell a bill of goods.

I don't know for sure that this scheme would work. Neither does KARL MUNDT. But it's obvious that he has been giving the subject a lot of sound sober thought. That's what all our other national leaders need to do. That's what you and I need to do.

We're for peace. Oh, sure. But are we willing to accept the responsibilities and pay the price of maintaining peace? Mr. MUNDT is everlastingly right in his observation that "no recital of pious platitudes and glittering principles, no matter how eloquent" will do the job.

Returning to my starting premise, we need to "accentuate the positive."

International Aviation's New Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "International Aviation's New Charter," delivered by Mr. L. Welch Pogue, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, before a meeting of the Council on World Affairs, at Kansas City, Mo., February 10, 1945.

I have asked the Public Printer for an estimate of the cost of printing the address and have a letter from him stating that it will cost $114.40.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL AVIATION'S NEW CHARTER

(By L. Welch Pogue, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, delivered before a meeting of the Council on World Affairs at Kansas City, Mo., on February 10, 1945)

When your invitation to speak came to me it was an honor and a privilege which I accepted promptly. I want to take this opportunity to enlist your support in a great cause, important to you, to Kansas City, to our Nation, to the world.

The Chicago International Civil Aviation Conference raised that curtain upon new and exciting scenes in the play of international cooperation. The interest of every delegate seemed world-wide. The evidence was clear that our political thinking was expanding with a shrinking world.

A century ago our ancestors here in the Middle West did not concern themselves about a Europe or an Asia safely anchored to the other side of the world. But the airplane has brought us within a few hours of every man everywhere. We have learned—and are still learning—that we must concern ourselves constantly with the other side of the globe. Our horizons have been pushed back. Once strange and distant peoples are now our neighbors. An emerging planetary economy is making for a world interdependence. These developments in modern life demand a new era in international cooperation. The airplane is at once a principal cause of this new world and a principal means of attaining the new and richer world civilization which it promises.

As men gain perspective by the passage of time, they will be increasingly impressed by the magnificent achievements of the Chicago conference. I intend to tell you about three of the most vital of those achievements—all in the realm of international cooperation. They are, first, the creation of a world-wide aviation organization having broad and important functions in both safety and economic matters; second, the opening[1] of the ocean of air for transit purposes and of airports for refueling and other nontraffic purposes to peaceful navigation by international air lines; and, third, the offering to the world of the principle of freedom to establish international air lines between contracting states without special agreements much as ships are free to sail the seas.

The creation of a world aviation organization is a milestone of progress in the cause of aviation and of international cooperation. Its only predecessor (established under the Paris Convention of 1919) did not have adequate functions or world coverage to meet future needs. The new international civil aviation organization has been vitally needed, and its structure and functions give it a scope equal to the task before it. Of course, the performance of the organization is still to be tested, but the start of its existence is bright with promise.

This world organization is established under the new Convention on International Civil Aviation offered by the Chicago conference.[2] It provides for an assembly in which each country is to have one vote, thus providing for the juridical equality of sovereign nations. Twenty-one nations are to be represented on the international council—the "board of directors" of this world organization. Of these, eight are to be nations constituting those of chief importance in air transport, five constituting those not otherwise included which make the largest contribution to the provision of facilities for international civil air navigaton, and eight not otherwse included whose election will insure that all major geographic areas of the world are represented.[3]

The functions of the council include the responsibility of adopting and keeping up-to-date many technical rules and regulations (as annexes to the convention) relating to international aviation safety matters, including, for example, communications, procedures, and systems, rules of the air, and air

[1] Subject to ratification or confirmation of the signatures of those signing the basic documents to be described later.

[2] Up to January 31, 1945, it had been signed by 39 nations out of the 54 represented at the Chicago conference.

[3] The countries elected to the interim council at the Chicago conference in the different categories are as follows: (1) Countries of chief importance in air transport: United States, United Kingdom, Netherlands, France, Brazil, Mexico, Belgium; (2) Countries not otherwise included which make the largest contribution to the provision of facilities for international civil air navigation: Canada, India, Norway, Iraq, Peru; (3) Countries not otherwise included whose election will insure that all major geographical areas of the world are represented: China, Australia, Egypt, Czechoslovagia, Turkey, El Salvador, Chile, Colombia.

One place was left vacant in the first category so that in case Russia should adhere to the convention she can fill that vacancy. In the original election Cuba was included in the second category but at the final session of the conference Norway first and then Cuba magnanimously, and in one of the most outstanding gestures of international cooperation that could possibly be witnessed, offered to withdraw in favor of India. This was done in recognition of the admittedly great contribution to the provision of facilities for international civil air navigation accorded by India and of the fact that over 400,000,000 people are surely entitled to representation. The Conference spontaneously gave prolonged applause to these grand acts. Cuba's offer was accepted. The conference thus closed on a note of international cooperation which should serve as the basic motif for the International Council's deliberations for years to come. Certainly those at the Chicago conference will not forget these splendid acts on the part of Norway and Cuba.

traffic control practices; [4] acting as a sounding board for world public opinion on international aviation matters; recording and publishing information regarding air-line operation; investigating and reporting in the field of air navigation and air transportation; assisting with the provision of airports and other air navigation facilities; recording and making public agreements between nations and between nations and air lines relating to international air transportation; and acting as an agency for hearing certain complaints, making recommendations, and in some cases deciding disputes.

Here we have a design for international collaboration in a field where the self-interest of all demands that it be a success. Let us see that it is. It will be a tragedy if it is not put into force as promptly as possible.

The opening of the ocean of air to peaceful international air-line transit-use is another milestone of progress. That result alone would have justified the Conference.

Before you can discharge and take on passengers and cargo at a foreign point you must first get there. In most cases intervening countries, many of which may be adequately served by other services, must be crossed. The question of the right to get there is the first problem we meet in the international air riddle.[5] Thus, even though the ocean of air flows over every large city of the world, if the international air lines of the world do not have the right to get to them, they will not be on the great air trade and travel routes of the future. Only if the intervening countries are willing to permit their air space to be used by such air lines will these cities be adequately served. To meet this need the Conference produced and opened for signature the international air services transit agreement, sometimes called the two freedoms agreement. Actually these freedoms are privileges mutually exchanged between nations for their mutual advantage.[6]

The first of these freedoms is the privilege accorded by each signing nation to the aircraft operated in civil air transportation by each other signing nation to fly in transit through its air space. The second of these freedoms is the privilege accorded by each signing nation to the aircraft operated in civil air transportation of each other signing nation to make nontraffic stops within its territory in order to take on gasoline and oil, to make repairs, to take refuge from storm, or to meet an emergency.[6] This means, in effect, that even if, as in the past, bilateral arrangements for the establishment of commercial outlets—that is, the right to discharge and take on passengers and cargo—are to be required in the future, any nation can deal directly with any other nation anywhere in the world for a commercial outlet without having to worry about its ability to get there insofar as the use of the air space over intervening countries is concerned. In this respect the exchange of these two privileges puts landlocked countries and cities on a basis as favorable as countries located on the borders of the oceans insofar as transoceanic air operations are concerned. The historic importance of opening this great door to international air transportation cannot be overemphasized.

If nations generally accept the principles of commercial air transit and nontraffic stop, will they go further and open their public airports for use by international air lines as their ports are open to steamship lines? The Chicago Conference opened the door here, again, to freedom. It offered to the world the International Air Transport Agreement.[7] While it has not yet been accepted as widely as the transit agreement, it will open skyways in the world which many will want to get on. Peoples, particularly those in smaller countries, are going to want air service and the advantages of being on the great air trade and travel routes of the future.

The Chicago conference transport agreement, in addition to incluring the right of commercial air transit and of nontraffic stop includes the right to conduct international air-line service on any route constituting a reasonably direct line out from and back to the homeland and to discharge and take on passengers, mail, and cargo in any of the contracting states over whose territory such route passes. Of course, no international air line is to have the right, unless it is specifically given, to carry traffic originating and terminating within the territory of any foreign state. This transport agreement does not undertake to control rates, routes, operators of routes, frequencies, or other competitive or political problems. To the extent that this multilateral agreement is accepted by nations of the world [8] it opens up the world to the free establishment of international routes, the principal limitation being that they must be reasonably direct out from and back to the homeland.[9]

This transport agreement was presented to the conference near its close. Before that time, the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States had negotiated at length but unsuccessfully to reach such an agreement on the establishment of interational air-line service as would permit the inclusion of the agreed provisions in the main convention itself. Earnest efforts were made to work out provisions for economic regulatory control over international air transportation services. If such provisions could have been included in the convention, the subjects they would have dealt with would have included the determination of routes to be operated and who is to operate them, the regulation of rates, the amount of aircraft capacity to be operated on the international routes, and other economic and political matters.

One of the chief difficulties related to the method of determining the amount of service to be allowed each international operator, i. e., pay-load capacity which in layman's language means what you can carry and charge for. There seemed to be general agreement on the point that the service operated should not unreasonably exceed the traffic offering. In meeting this objective what method should be used in determining the amount of service which could be operated? One view was that service along an international route, however long it might be, should be based upon the traffic embarking in the home state for each of the different points along the route. In other words, no traffic picked up anywhere outside of the home state, could serve as the basis for increasing the service offered anywhere on the route. The other view was that service along such an international route should be based upon all the international traffic offered to the operator along the route whether embarked in the home state or at other points on the route. It would be almost impossible for any of the smaller nations to develop an international air-line business of any volume except as between the homeland the immediate neighboring states if the services operated should be based solely upon the traffic embarked in the home state; and, according to American experience, it would make it extremely difficult for any long-range international operation to be operated even by the larger nations free from heavy subsidy. This is because, generally speaking, the terminal-to-terminal traffic will be so light as to make the line inefficient and uneconomical.

The fundamental issue in this respect could be stated in terms of whether the nations of the world, whether large or small, should have an open opportunity to participate in international business wherever it can be developed.

After long effort to work out provisions for economic regulatory control, it was finally clear that no suitable formula could be found upon which agreement could be reached at this time. These unsettled questions were referred by unanimous resolution developed at Chicago and unanimously recommended by the conference to all nations for use in any bilateral agreements authorizing such routes. The most important provisions of these standard clauses are: First, that discrimination in certain fields against any country or its air lines is forbidden; second, the building up of air blocs by the use of express contractual clauses providing for the exclusive use of air space by any nation or its air lines in any part of the world is outlawed; and third, the making of international air transport agreements whether between countries or between a country and an air line is required to be filed with the international body and made public. The conference thus unanimously voted to eliminate the era of secret agreements in the field of international air transportation.

---

[4] These technical annexes to the convention currently cover the following subjects: Airways systems, communications procedures and systems, rules of the air, air traffic control practices, standards governing the licensing of operating and mechanical personnel, log book requirements, airworthiness requirements for civil aircraft engaging in international air navigation, aircraft registration and identification marks, meteorological protection of international aeronautics, aeronautical maps and charts, customs procedures and manifests, search and rescue, and investigation of accidents.

[5] See Common Sense in Aviation Thinking, an address which I delivered before the Aviation Day meeting of the Greater Twin Cities Chapter, National Aeronautics Association at Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., on April 9, 1943.

[6] Up to January 31, 1945, this two-freedoms agreement had been signed by 32 of the 54 nations represented at Chicago.

[7] Up to January 31, 1945, this transport agreement had been signed by 21 of the 54 nations represented at the Chicago conference.

[8] Only states which are members of the International Civil Aviation Organization can become parties to the transit agreement or to the transport agreement. The International Civil Aviation Organization, established by the Convention on International Civil Aviation, provides that it shall be open for adherence by members of the United Nations and states associated with them and states which remain neutral during the present world conflict (art. 92 (a)). It further provides (art. 9) that "states other than those provided for in article 91" (in which it is stated that the convention shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states), "and 92 (a) may, subject to approval by any general international organization set up by the nations of the world to preserve peace, be admitted to participation in this convention by means of a four-fifths vote of the assembly and on such conditions as the assembly may prescribe; provided that in each case the assent of each state invaded or attacked during the present war by the state seeking admission shall be necessary." The minutes of the conference show that it was generally understood that the present war extends back to the time when Italy attacked Ethiopia.

[9] Realizing that, of course, not all countries will adhere to the Five Freedoms Document and that even with respect to those that do so there may well be an interim period during which international air lines must be operated, some standard clauses for bilateral agreements providing for air routes were

of the conference to the interim council with instructions to give them continuing study and to submit a report thereon with recommendations to the interim assembly as soon as practicable.

I am not one of those who feels sad because all of these problems were not settled at Chicago. The failure to decide them erroneously was a much greater success than would have been agreement on any unsound basis.

The attitude of many countries today with respect to the air trade and travel routes of the future is in marked contrast to what it was when international air transportation was not a business but was primarily an instrument of national policy. In the early days of its development, as history shows, every nation was very jealous of its position and inclined to exact the highest price possible for the use of its airspace by any international air line desiring the privilege of flying through it. However, now that the world is becoming really air-minded and that international air transportation holds such promise of developing rich trade and travel routes, perhaps as great or greater than any we have known in the past, a new attitude is appearing. At the Chicago conference there was a succession of calls at the Civil Aeronautics Board's office by delegates from smaller nations. Uniformly they desired to be on the air trade and travel routes of the future. They were concerned about the possibility of being left off those routes. They seemed to be acutely conscious of the lesson taught by history that cities and nations have grown great by being on the world's trade and travel routes. These representatives often insisted upon presenting their whole case even though agreement with the principles which they stood for was instantly forthcoming. Any dog-in-the-manger attitude with respect to the reservation of airspace which might have existed 10 years ago seemed to have disappeared.

When it became clear that agreement on economic regulatory controls could not be reached at this time, the United States, in line with this very marked desire on the part of smaller nations of the world to secure adequate service, and a distinct lack of interest on their part in rigid economic controls over this service, proposed to the conference the transport agreement which I have already discussed.

At this point you may ask what has been the history of trade and travel upon the sea. In the first place, all agree that peoples have from the dawn of history desired to trade with other peoples. Indeed, this has been the means in many instances of building great cities and nations. Phoenicia, Carthage, Amsterdam, New York—these giants fed and grew great on trade and travel. It may be stated as a basic principle of the law of nations that, with only a few exceptions, the citizens of every nation are free in peacetime to travel to every other nation and to trade with its citizens.[10]

In the case of the sea, history proved the folly of the attempts of some nations, powerful though they were at the time, to get and keep possession of the water highways of the world. Time tests all men and their schemes. Only sound principles endure. And so it was that over a substantial period of time, particularly within the past century and a half, the principle of the freedom of the seas became well established; the right to engage in international trade and travel in peacetime on the water and into every port is unquestioned. In fact, the violation of the principle constitutes an unfriendly act. The vessels of any nation, large or small, generally speaking, can call freely at any port in the world in peacetime and render the service required for international trade and travel by sea, subject only to the customs, immigration, public health, and other regulations applying generally.[11] The sea and all ports of call are, in general, now free to all who render the service of sea transportation. Is the air space above the sea equally free? All admit that it is.[12] Why then are not airports adjacent to the oceans open to the service of international air transportation as ports of call are to shipping? There seems to be no good answer. There never has been. You then ask, "Is history to repeat itself? Are we to go through the bloody business of opening up the air to international air services as our ancestors did for the sea? Can we not learn a lesson from history? Can we not here, with a few strokes of the pen, save centuries of struggle?" The Chicago conference said we can.

Like the sea, the air started as a closed sky, blind to history's lessons. For 25 years it fretted under restrictions and barriers. The Chicago conference gave the key with which the world can open the door to freedom.

International air transportation is not in the sunny afternoon of its life. It is not even in the midmorning. In fact, the sun of its day is only at the dawning. It needs your help to start its day right. These three great achievements for aviation of the Chicago conference require the support of our public opinion. The world organization, the transit agreement, and the air-transport agreement are three chapters in international aviation's new charter for this great boon to mankind. I urge you to support them.

America was opened up by men seeking freedom and an open opportunity in a fair field. We are the sons and daughters of those men. As we open up the air, let us emulate their illustrious example

[10] See a statement similar to this and an exposition of its meaning and justification by Hugo Grotius in Magoffin, Grotius on the Freedom of the Seas (1916), p. 7. This is a translation by Magoffin of the brief prepared by Grotius about 1602. This brief was a landmark in the development of the principle of the freedom of the seas.

[11] G. H. Hackworth, legal adviser of the Department of State, in his well-known work entitled "Digest of International Law" [Green Haywood Hackworth, "Digest of International Law" (1941), vol. II, p. 653] outlines briefly pertinent portions of the history of the development of the principle of freedom of the seas. He points out that Venice at one time levied tribute on all vessels navigating the Adriatic; and that in 1493 Pope Alexander VI conferred on Spain and Portugal "the whole undiscovered regions of the world." All undiscovered regions of the world west of a line from pole to pole 100 miles west of the Azores were given to Spain and everything east of that line to Portugal. These Nations promptly declared themselves sovereigns over sea as well as land with respect to those grants respectively; whereupon Queen Elizabeth asserted claim to the North Sea, the English Channel, and the Bay of Biscay as far south as the coast of Spain. Naturally, the Netherlands Government disagreed with this whole arrangement. All of these Nations except Spain were interested in the East India trade. Mr. Hackworth then quotes approvingly from the author, Thomas Callander Wade, in stating: "Throughout the writings of the later jurists of all countries we find a steady progress toward the principle of the absolute freedom of the sea. By the nineteenth century this freedom had become axiomatic. The controversy had come to be of only historical interest, as an illustration of an obsolete theory and an example of the evolution of legal thought and international practice. The high sea, therefore, is now free to all. Even though a state were powerful enough to possess it, the claim to exercise rights of sovereignty over it would not now be recognized as just, not so much by reason of the difficulty of effective possession, as because no good reason for its possession could be put forward."

[12] See Oliver J. Lissitzyn, "International Air Transport and National Policy" (1942), p. 402.

Where Are We Going To Get the Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under legislation which has passed the House and moved over to the Senate, the national-debt ceiling will be increased from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000. The administration anticipates that the public debt will reach $292,000,000,000 by June 30, 1946. This is the seventh time since 1934 that Congress has been asked to raise the limit on the national debt. During that same period, 11 major revenue bills were enacted, each one increasing the tax burden carried by the American people.

When the New Deal came into power in 1933, the national debt was under $21,000,000,000. Today it is $233,000,000,000. Prior to our entrance into the war, the debt limit had been increased by stages to $65,000,000,000. Subsequent years the increases have been as follows:

Nineteen hundred and forty-two to $125,000,000,000.

Nineteen hundred and forty-three to $210,000,000,000.

Nineteen hundred and forty-four to $260,000,000,000.

The contemplated Federal debt of $300,000,000,000 will be a charge of nearly $10,000 on each of the estimated 30,000,000 families in the United States, which means a share of the debt for every citizen—man, woman and newborn babe—of considerably over $2,000.

The exigencies of war, as well as the necessity of protecting our people who have responded so patriotically to the bond-buying program, compelled many of us, but reluctantly, to acquiesce in the increase of the debt limit. We have done it reluctantly because we have been unable to prevent the administration's continued waste in nonwar expenditures.

The House Committee on Banking and Currency has commenced hearings on the Bretton Woods plan. This plan calls for a $9,000,000,000 world bank to make reconstruction loans in the post-war period and further calls for a monetary fund of approximately the same size to stabilize national currencies. The Bretton Woods plan was the result of the work of representatives of 44 nations in session last summer. Not one of the other nations has as yet approved the plan, but Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau is attempting to rush United States approval through before the Conference at San Francisco, April 25. It is asking the impossible for both branches of Congress to digest and to give thoughtful consideration to this gigantic proposal in so short a time.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has reported out legislation extending lend-lease for another year, or until June 30, 1946. A fight on the House floor is expected to develop on proposals to prohibit the use of lend-lease for post-war rehabilitation or reconstruction. For, with U. N. R. R. A., the Export-Import Bank, Bretton Woods, lend-lease, and so forth, the New Deal would have several agencies competing in the matter of spreading Uncle Sam's treasure over the world.

I have no doubt but what America will recognize and discharge her humanitarian and sensible responsibilities in the post-war world, but if some of these schemes cannot be checked, we will see the same confusion and muddle which the New Deal has created on the domestic scene.

We now have lend-lease agreements with 47 countries of the world. Lend-lease aid up to the end of December exceeded $35,000,000,000. In addition to direct lend-lease, we have also consigned supplies to American commanding generals in the total sum of $788,000,000 to be transferred by them to our allies—mostly to the French in north Africa and to China. The principal recipients of our lend-lease aid have been:

United Kingdom	$11,300,000,000
Russia	7,400,000,000
China and India	1,700,000,000
Australia and New Zealand	1,100,000,000

As against the lend-lease totals of upward of $35,000,000,000, we have received reverse lend-lease aid from four nations, United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and India for a total of less than $4,000,000,000.

The State Department recently announced a new kind of lend-lease agreement, a contract to supply the French Government with two and a half billion dollars in various kinds of military and civilian supplies. Testimony given the House committee fixed a year as the time required to prepare some of these supplies.

Newspaper reports refer to negotiations with Russia involving six billions for post-war purposes and a similar figure for Great Britan.

One point seems plain: the appropriations for Uncle Sam's part in the post-war world should follow, rather than precede, a congressional determination of just what are to be our post-war plans and policies. After that, Congress can be relied upon to carry out those plans and policies by any needed appropriations.

The President's budget message for the fiscal year which begins July 1 estimates expenditures of eighty-two and one-half billion and estimates receipts at forty-one and two-tenths billion, leaving an estimated Federal deficit for the next fiscal year of $41,300,000,000. The most significant figures in the new budget program are the nonwar costs. For the coming year, they are estimated at more than $13,000,000,000—twice what they were just before the war and five times as high as the average of the 1920's.

Interest on the public debt alone is fixed at $4,500,000,000 with veterans' pensions and benefits exceeding $2,500,000,000, and neither of these figures has reached its peak.

The item of interest on the public debt alone is considerably greater than the total expenses of the Federal Government in the 1920's.

WHERE ARE WE GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

It is well enough to be thinking about U. N. R. R. A., Bretton Woods, lend-lease, the Export-Import Bank, and so forth, and we will be thinking about them. What is more, America will be doing something about them, but at the same time, this Government must give some thought to the solvency of this Republic and the burden of the American taxpayer, both present and future.

On the 1st day of February, the House passed the so-called work-or-go-to-jail bill. We were told that it was a matter of great urgency—that it had to be done with great haste—that no amendment should be added to the administration's bill—not even the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." As this is written, more than 5 weeks have passed and the measure is still under discussion. And so many changes have been written into the bill that it does not look like its former self.

Trouble is that there are too many people in this administration whose chief solution for every problem is to further regiment the American people, or to appropriate another billion dollars.

Statement of Hon. Chester Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1945.

To All Members of Congress:

I have made it a fundamental part of our O. P. A. policy during the 20 months I have been in Washington to work closely with the Members of Congress, and to see that they receive at all times any information which they may wish on any subject connected with our operation. Each week our staff holds numerous meetings with Senators and Members of the House. Our weekly congressional mail averages some 300 letters—all of which we try to answer as promptly and as fully as possible.

For this reason I am very much disturbed by an incident involving three Members of Congress which occurred last week in connection with one of our industry advisory committee meetings. Although many thousands of meetings with industry advisory groups have been held with O. P. A. during the last year, this is the first problem of this kind which has arisen.

I have investigated it thoroughly, and I feel the situation was largely due to a misunderstanding. I am anxious that this misunderstanding be corrected promptly and completely.

Let me first describe the system of industry consultation which O. P. A. has set up. As you will remember, in the Price Control Act the Administrator was required to consult "insofar as practicable" with representative groups before the issuance of a regulation. After a regulation is issued, the Administrator must appoint an industry advisory committee upon the request of "a substantial portion of an industry." Actually, we have gone much further than the wording or even the intent of this language in seeking the advice and counsel of industry in the development of our regulations. There are now established 536 formal industry advisory committees, in addition to 824 informal trade cooperating committees. During the last 12 months I am told that over 15,000 meetings have been held with industry and trade groups in the national office alone.

The membership of our 536 formal industry advisory committees are selected with considerable care. First the make-up of the industry itself is analyzed from a standpoint of large, small, and medium size firms, geographical distribution, members and nonmembers of trade associations, etc. In other words, we go to considerable lengths to see that the membership of each committee reflects the actual make-up of the industry itself.

Moreover, we carefully specify that the members of these committees should not, in any sense, "represent" the firms by whom they are employed. We have asked them to divorce themselves, insofar as possible, from their individual problems and come to us as representatives of the industry as a whole. These committees, as we see them, are working groups, and each member must have actual first-hand, day-to-day experience in the industry which he represents. They bring to our O. P. A. operations precise information on the business practices of their industry or trade, its structure, merchandising, and pricing methods, its pricing differentials and classifications, and other special features.

Of course, these committees do not establish prices. Price levels and individual price adjustments are made in accordance with the law passed by Congress, interpreted by standards developed by O. P. A. and explained to Congress, and approved in the courts. But these committees perform an invaluable service in advising the O. P. A. organization on how effective price control can be established in their industry with the least possible disruption of business practices and procedures.

We are frequently pressed to invite outsiders to meetings of these industry advisory committees. These requests come from trade association representatives, labor leaders who have a specific interest in the industry under consideration. Members of the trade which distribute the products manufactured or grown by a particular industry, representatives of the trade press, representatives of consumer organizations, etc., also make such requests.

We have coisistently maintained, however, that if these committees are to carry out the expressed purposes laid down by Congress, they should be small working groups thoroughly familiar with the specific industry problems and, as far as possible, an actual cross section of the industry itself. We have also felt that the membership of each committee in general should be restricted to no more than 15 individuals, for purposes of working efficiency.

It seemed clear that (and this opinion has been concurred in by members of the industry advisory committees themselves) any other procedure would quickly turn these committee meetings into time-consuming

forums, where special pressures would be applied, and special cases pleaded to the detriment of other interests. Under such circumstances, the balance of various group interests which we have tried carefully to reflect in each committee would be destroyed or rendered ineffectual.

On relatively few occasions have Members of Congress asked to attend these Industry Advisory Committee meetings. Until the incident of 10 days ago, in each case when such a request has been received, we have explained the purposes and the general makeup of these committees, and the Congressman has promptly withdrawn his request.

After carefully considering the policy which would best serve the purpose of these Industry Advisory Committees as laid down by Congress, it seems to me that we have been right in maintaining our meetings on a closed basis. However, I am anxious to modify this policy promptly if Members of Congress feel, in view of the circumstances which I have described, that they should attend.

I will appreciate it if you will give me your own views as to whether or not you feel that our policy in respect to these meetings should be modified. If it is your feeling and the feeling of a sizeable group in Congress that we have been wrong, we shall promptly change the policy which we have been following for the last 2 years.

In any event we will, of course, continue to welcome frank and open discussion with Members of Congress on any problem which affects them or their constituents. We are anxious to have Members of Congress use to the fullest extent the facilities which we have established to help them secure prompt and complete information on our operations in all its details.

Very sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Crossing of the Rhine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, probably there has been no achievement which has been received with such great acclaim, since D-day, as has the crossing of the River Rhine. From the meager reports received our forces have completely surprised the enemy and they have established, not alone a bridgehead, but they have established their offensive, across the Rhine, in Germany, and much nearer Berlin, and the heart of Germany, than they have been before. It is reported that this great thrust forward will result in the end of this war much sooner than it was contemplated, and information has been received from captured Germans, of that fast fading army of the Nazis, that their Army will be unable to hold out long. From some sources it has been stated, by German prisoners of war, that the German Army will be unable to hold out longer than 10 days.

Every American hopes that the end of the war in Europe is near at hand. Our troops have waged an unceasing war; they have gone forward without any thought of fear; they have exemplified the true American traditions in war; and they have given an account of themselves such as will be written in the pages of our future history. It is the fervent wish of every American that this European war will soon be over, that victory will be ours, and that we may, then, win the peace as a lasting and a permanent peace for our country and our people. And, too, when this war ends in Europe we will buckle on the armor just a little tighter, and with our forces concentrated in the South Pacific, with all of our allies, we will quite soon defeat Japan, and this war will end. What a happy day we will witness when that end comes. Then, that is not all, because it is the wish, the will, and the hope that our boys who have fought so gallantly throughout this terrible war will be sent back to their homes as quickly as possible so they may again establish themselves in the arts and trades of civil life, with the aid of every American. We have many important days ahead—we have some tragic days ahead—because we must win the peace. The treaties of peace must be sound, they must be definite, and they must preserve throughout the future years the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a short editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News, of recent date, which follows:

THIS IS IT

This is the biggest thing since D-day. And a greater surprise. Everybody knew the invasion was coming, including the enemy. But this caught them off guard—completely. The rule books says that when an army breaks through strong fortified positions and races miles across prepared defenses and takes great cities, then it must stop to consolidate. Especially if there is a water obstacle to cross, much less the biggest river barrier in all Europe. That barrier had not been breached since Napoleon.

But Eisenhower threw away the rule book. So did Lieutenants Timmerman and Burroughs and their infantry company that made the miracle crossing of the Rhine, Lieutenant Colonel Engemann, Maj. Murray Seevers and the commanders all the way up to SHEAF.

The unexpected did it.

Though daring—and luck—got the troops across, more was required to hold the precious bridgehead those first critical 30 hours. That is where the preparedness came in. Though the first company came upon this opportunity by chance, when headed in another direction, it was under orders to be on the watch for any such break.

And the high command was ready to take full advantage of the break when it came. Otherwise there would not have been enough troops and armor to take the dominating height beyond, and expand the bridgehead. This, at least, is the way the amazing story is pieced together from those stirring front-line dispatches.

That the enemy is now wheeling into position for counterattack as soon as possible must be taken for granted. That he will fight as he never has fought before must be expected. For the heart of Germany can be pierced from that bridgehead east of the Rhine, and it is now or never for Hitler's crack legions.

But at the beginning of this mighty battle, American daring has won the initial advantage—a momentous advantage, which might have cost months of bloody sacrifice. And thanks to the heroism of our Canadian and British allies in the north, Patton's breakthrough around Coblenz, and the Americans and French in the south—all covered by a victorious air force—Eisenhower's whole line moves.

A proud and grateful America salutes the gallant Allied armies.

The Coming Economic World Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, throughout this Nation schools are being set up, in fact many of them are now in operation, with paid teachers to educate the citizens with reference to the Bretton Woods proposal. These internationalists who are promoting the exploitation of the American taxpayers look upon the taxpayers as weak kindergarten children, sufficiently gullible to be imposed upon by this attempted international swindle. I believe that if sufficient time is permitted for the people to digest what is being offered by these promoters, this Bretton Woods proposal will be rejected. The methods by which internationalists, aided by our own quislings, are attempting to cram this proposal down the throats of the American people, is one of the most arrogant of any foreign attempt so far brought to light. If the American people permit these alien raiders of our treasury to succeed in their plan, then there is little left for the American taxpayers to do other than to become the tax slaves of impecunious and defaulting foreign nations. Under leave to extend I am inserting an article which appeared in the American Scholar during the winter of 1944 and 1945 entitled "The Coming Economic World Pattern," by Henry Hazlitt:

THE COMING ECONOMIC WORLD PATTERN

(By Henry Hazlitt)

FREE TRADE OR STATE DOMINATION?

Freedom of trade, in the eyes of Adam Smith and his nineteenth-century successors in the liberal tradition, meant freedom from government interference. All that the "classical" economists asked of governments in the field of international trade was that they should permit it to occur. They wanted a removal of prohibitions and of nearly all tariffs. But they did not ask for positive "encouragement" or artificial stimulants. They were as much opposed to bounties as they were to barriers.

What the older liberals meant by freedom, in short, was freedom of the individual citizen. They asked that he be free to sell his goods to whatever country and whatever market would pay him the best price for them. They asked that he be free to buy whatever he wanted wherever he could get it cheapest. They argued that these freedoms were not only good in themselves but that they represented by far the best means to bring about the most efficient division of labor and to maximize world production and world consumption. All they asked of government was that it enforce the laws against fraud,

force, and theft, and that it refrain from debasing the currency.

The world barriers to international trade in the 1930's, for which every large nation was in part responsible, but in the erection of which the totalitarian governments went to the greatest lengths, brought about such chaos that few responsible persons now undertake to defend them. High tariffs, import quotas, export subsidies, competitive currency depreciation, blocked currencies, bilateral arrangements, forced barter—all these are today deplored by lip in all respectable circles. The demand now is for international cooperation.

I

But when the concrete proposals for this international cooperation are examined, it turns out to be something radically different from the international cooperation hoped for by the older liberals. It is not the freedom of the private citizens of any country to trade with the private citizens of any other. It is not primarily the cooperation among private citizens of different countries at all. It is primarily cooperation among governments. As in the thirties, it is governments that are going to take the matter in hand. But instead, as in the wicked thirties, of restricting trade and making economic war upon each other, this time, we are told, the governments are going to direct and stimulate trade in the interests of peace.

It is a pleasant fantasy but there are the gravest reasons for doubting that it will ever be realized. There are the strongest reasons, on the other hand, for fearing that this kind of intergovernmental cooperation will break down, and that when it does the resulting chaos in international trade and economic relations will be greater than ever.

For Government officials, even when they really understand (which is very rarely) the basic economic forces that they are trying to control, are almost never disinterested. They are almost certain to reflect the special interests of some political pressure group. The interests of the pressure groups represented by the bureaucrats of one nation are certain to clash with those of the pressure groups represented by the bureaucrats of another. And these conflicting interests, precisely because they are represented by their respective governments, are far more likely to clash openly, directly, and politically than in a world of genuine free trade.

But perhaps, before we come back to these larger issues, it would be well to examine in detail the leading proposals so far put forward for the post-war economic world.

The agreements reached by the experts at Bretton Woods seem to typify the intended shape of things to come. The proposed international monetary fund has as one of its ostensible purposes the promotion of "exchange stability." Now the way to secure exchange stability, as worked out before the First World War, was clear. A nation kept its own currency sound. It made it convertible on demand into a definite and fixed quantity of gold. To make sure that the promise to pay that fixed quantity of gold would be kept, it saw to it that there was not an excessive expansion of bank credit. It saw to it also that the central government did not issue such a volume of debt that its ability to maintain interest on that debt and to retire it would come into question. A nation saw to it that the government's bonds were sold to the public, so that they were paid for out of real savings and not merely out of the creation of additional bank credit. If a government were to meet all these requirements it had to balance its burget, or at least make certain that its budget was not too long or too heavily out of balance.

When the public was confident, as a result of these conditions, that the promise of gold convertibility would be kept, a nation's currency in the foreign exchange market was stabilized (with comparatively minute fluctuations) in terms of this fixed gold value. The currencies of other countries were likewise fixed in terms of definite gold values. As each currency was held, by each country's own policy, to the value of a fixed quantity of gold, it followed that each gold currency was necessarily fixed in terms of every other. General exchange stability was preserved.

This was the international gold standard. It was a form of international cooperation worked out and perfected through the centuries. It reached its highest development in the latter part of the nineteenth century and in the present century before the First World War.

II

One will look in vain through the articles of agreement on the International Monetary Fund for any reference to balanced budgets, to limitations on internal credit expansion, or to any definite requirement for gold convertibility. How, then, does the fund propose to maintain international currency stability? Instead of contemplating that each currency shall be separately anchored to gold, and that each nation shall be responsible for maintaining that link so far as its own currency is concerned, the fund proposes that every currency be tied directly to every other. This is to be done by forcing the strong currencies automatically to support the weaker.

Suppose, to take a fictitious example, that the Ruritanian rurita has a par value of 20 cents in terms of American dollars. Suppose it has a sinking spell, or that everybody shows a sudden desire to get rid of ruritas and to acquire dollars instead. It becomes the duty of the fund to supply these dollars, at least up to an amount stipulated in advance in the articles of agreement. The fund must keep buying the ruritas at 20 cents. It must do this regardless of whether the rurita is sinking because the Ruritanians are buying more goods from the outside world than they have the exports or credit to pay for, or because Ruritania is having a revolution, or because it has a Fascist government that has just announced that it is expropriating the property of some minority group, or because it has a budget deficit brought about by a heavy armament program, or simply because it is grinding out too much paper money on its printing presses.

Now the real value of the rurita, left to the natural play of supply and demand, may be only 2 cents. Nevertheless, it must continue to be bought by the fund at 20 cents. But if, as is most probable, it is being bought by dollars, this means that American taxpayers are buying 2-cent ruritas for 20 cents, thereby immediately losing 90 percent of their investment on each purchase, while they pay for Ruritania's luxury imports, her armament program, or her Fascist experiment.

But does the International Monetary Fund, though it explicitly lists that objective among its purposes, even contemplate exchange stability? On the contrary, it clearly contemplates a great deal of exchange instability. It provides, first of all, that any nation may at any time devalue its currency 10 percent. It is explicitly stipulated that "the fund shall raise no objection." Any nation may propose a devaluation of its currency by another 10 percent, and the fund must either concur or object within 72 hours. The practical effect of this pressure for a quick answer will be to give the benefit of the doubt to the nation that wants to devaluate. If a nation wishes to devalue its currency even further, it must consult the fund. But if the fund refuses its request the member can simply withdraw, without advance notice, if it prefers further devaluation to whatever additional automatic credit it might still be entitled to in the fund.

But the most ominous provision of the fund, from an inflationary standpoint, is that which permits it by a majority of the total voting power to make "uniform proportionate changes in the par values of the currencies of all members." Each such change must be approved also by every member that has 10 percent or more of the total of the quotas. It is true that an individual member of the fund, if it decides within 72 hours, may be allowed to keep the par value of its currency unchanged; but as devaluation of all other currencies would be certain to cause a prompt drop of commodity prices within a nondevaluing nation, all nations would be virtually forced to participate in the devaluation.

Now this provision of the fund is a provision for periodic world inflation. The historic instances in which the par value of the monetary unit has been increased are so rare as to be negligible. The practical political pressures are always in the other direction. So we are safe in assuming that the uniform proportionate changes referred to by the fund mean uniform proportionate devaluations. Devaluation is the modern euphemism for debasement of the coinage. It always means repudiation. It means that the promise to pay a certain definite weight of gold has been broken, and that the devaluing government, for its bonds or currency notes, will pay a smaller weight of gold.

III

When a nation devalues by acting alone, all this is plain enough. Foreigners who hold bank deposits in that nation, or exchange bills drawn on that nation, or any obligation of that nation stated in terms of its own currency, know that they have been cheated. The value of their claims in terms of their own currency immediately drops by the percentage of the devaluation. They will be paid only 90 or 80 or 50 cents on the dollar. All this makes devaluation morally embarrassing to the devaluing nation.

There are other embarrassing effects. Devaluation seldom comes out of a clear sky. It follows an overexpansion of the Government's debt or currency notes on an overexpansion of internal bank credit. Foreigners, reading these signs, begin to withdraw their deposits. The nation's own citizens, seeking to protect their own position, begin to transfer their deposits to other countries that look safer. This is called the flight of capital. The politicians in power, and economic writers who reflect their point of view, seek to put the blame, not on the government that has made its credit and intentions questionable, but on the creditors who question them. They call the money of these creditors hot money—though it is, of course, merely money that is trying to leave hot places. In spite of this modern vocabulary, nations are still embarrassed by this flight of capital and this public evidence of distrust. Moreover, it is a blow to national pride and prestige for a nation's currency to sell at a discount in the foreign exchange markets.

It is obvious that a uniform depreciation of all currencies would either remove or conceal most of these embarrassing results to a single government. Though the dollar, say, would go to a discount of 25 or 50 percent, the man in the street would hardly suspect it at first because all the external measuring rods would have shrunk in exact proportion. A hundred dollars would still be worth the same number of pounds, francs, marks, lire, rubles, and so on, as before, and vice versa, because they would be different pounds, francs, and rubles as well as dollars. Relative foreign exchange rates would remain unchanged. There would be no flight of capital, because every place to which it could go would be equally disadvantageous. The provision in the fund for world inflation, in brief, is a provision to make resort to inflation easy, smooth, and above all respectable.

But the real harm that inflation would do would be no less under world-wide inflation than under national inflation. Commodity prices would rise. Everybody's cost of living would go up. Those who lived on pensions, either private or part of government social security systems, would find them buying

less than before. The holders of government securities would find the real value of their securities greatly cut. All those with fixed incomes would find themselves subjected to an invisible but real and ungraduated income tax (in addition to the government's acknowledged graduate income tax). All those with savings accounts and insurance policies would find them cut by an invisible but real and uniform capital levy. In short, private citizens, as before, would be cheated by their governments; but the government propaganda agencies would assure them that the latest inflation had merely ushered in a new paradise.

The proposed International Monetary Fund is bad from so many aspects that it is difficult to know in advance which danger will prove the most serious. By keeping up exchange rates by artificial means, buying currencies at par regardless of their real market value, and making devaluation easy and respectable, the way will be celared for encouraging every government in power to follow the easy political path. It can continue to pay heavy subsidies to all sorts of pressure groups, to embark on public works and patronage on a grand scale, and to tax lightly, thus continuing chronic budget deficits and financing them by added debt.

But all this will not give us free exchange markets. The fund agreement does not say in so many words whether there will be a free foreign exchange market or not. But it provides for the continuance of controls during an indefinite transition period, and it encourages permanent controls over capital movements. To control international capital movements would in practice require supervision and policing of all exchange transactions. In practice, therefore, people could not buy or sell abroad, or travel, without going through a great maze of red tape to get permission from their government to do so. They would lose the power to dispose of their property as they wished to, or to emigrate and take their money with them. Government power over the lives and actions of its citizens would be extended in yet further directions. Still more former freedoms would be abridged or circumscribed.

IV

Let us turn from the proposed international monetary fund to the proposed international bank for reconstruction and development. Here at least is an institution in which, with proper safeguards, the possibilities for good might outweigh the possibilities for harm. The bank, apart from its unnecessarily large subscribed capital—$9,100,000,000—is set up on a comparatively conservative basis. It is not to lend or guarantee loans for more than the full amount of its unimpaired subscribed capital, reserves, and surplus. It is not to make loans on an automatic basis, like the fund. It can exercise discretion. A project, for example, for which funds are being asked must be deemed meritorious by a committee selected by the bank. The borrower must be "in position to meet its obligations."

Such a bank, in the decade immediately following the war, could perform a useful service. In particular, it could make loans to stabilize their currency to those nations that show a genuine will and capacity to do so. Whether the proposed international bank would provide a better medium for this purpose than the existing American Export-Import Bank is a question of practical judgment. The international bank would have the advantage of symbolizing international cooperation. There would be psychological and political advantages in making individual nations responsible for payment of their debts to a bank representing 45 different nations rather than to a bank merely representing 1. On the other hand, while the United States would supply the lion's share of the lendable funds of such a bank, and probably assume an even greater share of the risks, and while most of the loans would doubtless be floated in this market, our Government would have much less to say about the loans and the conditions attached to them than it it were making them alone. While it is true that the American representative on the bank would be technically free to veto a proposed loan made in dollars in this market, it might be made very embarrassing for him to do this.

It is not necessary here to weigh the relative merits of the proposed international bank and our existing Export-Import Bank as a medium for making international stabilization loans. But it is important to point out that there are only two sound reasons why governments, either individually or jointly, should engage at this time in the business of international lending at all. The first is the whole record of default and repudiation of foreign loans in the inter-war period. This was brought about to some extent by real embarrassment on the part of debtors, but even more by the prevailing antiforeign and anticapitalistic ideology which regards the foreign lender, not as a man who takes risks and supplies essential aid, but as an exploiter, who throttles the native economy. This record of default and repudiation has led to at least a temporary reluctance of private investors to make further foreign loans. The second reason why government intervention is now needed is that the terrific disruption brought about by war will make it extremely difficult for some nations to stabilize their currencies without outside help.

But whatever governmental institutions are used to make such loans should be temporary in nature. They should confine themselves to currency-stabilization loans only. Where help is needed for humanitarian reasons it should be granted freely and generously as a pure gift. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration already exists for this purpose. Its scope may need to be expanded. But everything above this should be placed on a strictly business basis. It will never be placed on such a basis if it is managed by governments. Where loans are made by private groups, risking their own funds, they will be made, in the overwhelming main, where the risks seem smallest and the chance of profit greatest. Under these conditions world resources are likely to be utilized in the most efficient manner. But where loans are made by Government officials who risk other peoples' funds and not their own, they are bound to be made primarily for political reasons and will often be wasteful from an economic point of view.

It is contemplated that the loans guaranteed by the proposed international bank will be guaranteed first of all by some Government. If the project for which the loan is made is located in Ruritania, for example, the Ruritanian Government or central bank would have to guarantee the loan before the international bank would do so. This would, of course, reduce the risk assumed by the international bank. On the other hand, it would enable it to make loans only to projects that had home government support. The home government, by this power to give or refuse guaranties, would exercise a great influence on the development and direction of home industry. It would be in a stronger position than otherwise to grant or withhold political favors. It is important to keep in mind that a government would be less likely to think of the broad economic effects of such loans than of their effects in increasing the potential armament program or the economic self-sufficiency of their country in time of war. These considerations, however, would not be the same as those that would lead to the most efficient utilization of world resources. Quite the contrary.

V

I have dwelt at length upon the proposed international fund and bank because these are specific proposals that have already been presented in detail. Space unfortunately does not permit an adequate analysis of the proposals for international commodity controls in the post-war period. At the moment of writing only one of these—the Anglo-American oil agreement—has reached the stage of presentation to the public. But indications from many sides have already made it clear that what is being contemplated is a revival and extension on a far greater scale of the type of international commodity controls of the thirties. This seems likely to apply, if the planners have their way, to cotton, wheat, sugar, coffee, tin, beef, tea, rubber, wool, copper, nitrates, cocoa, and quinine. Controls for some of these existed before the war. Many of these peacetime controls have merely allowed to remain dormant.

The chief controls have proved disastrous failures. Almost invariably they follow the same general pattern. Ostensibly the effort always is merely to stabilize the price of the commodity. But in every instance (except in one or two where a temporary control has been imposed by some single powerful governmental buyer) the interests of the producers have been put first. The result in every such instance is that the price is fixed above the level that market conditions justify. To compensate for this, a proportional restriction of output is usually placed on each producer subject to the control. This has several immediately bad effects. It means that total world production is cut. The world's consumers are able to enjoy less of that product than they would have enjoyed without restriction. The world is just that much poorer. Consumers are forced to pay higher prices than otherwise for that product. They have just that much less to spend on other products.

A uniform proportional restriction means, on the one hand, that the efficient low-cost producers are not permitted to turn out all of the output that they can at a low price. It means, on the other hand, that the inefficient high-cost producers are artificially kept in business. This increases the average cost of producing the product. It is being produced less efficiently than otherwise. The inefficient marginal producer thus artificially kept in that line of production continues to tie up land, labor, and capital that could much more profitably and efficiently be devoted to other uses.

If this artificial restriction of output does not take place, unsold surpluses of the overpriced commodity continue to pile up until the market for that product finally collapses to a far greater extent than if the control program had never been put into effect. Or producers outside the restriction program, stimulated by the artificial rise in price, expand their own production enormously. This is what happened to the British rubber restriction and the American cotton restriction programs. In either case the collapse of prices finally goes to catastrophic lengths that would never have been reached without the restriction scheme. The plan that started out so bravely to "stabilize" prices and conditions brings incomparably greater instability than the free forces of the market could possibly have brought.

Of course, the international commodity controls after the war, we are told, are going to avoid all these errors. This time prices are going to be fixed that are "fair," not only for producers but for consumers. Producing and consuming nations are going to agree on just what these fair prices are, because no one will be unreasonable. Fixed prices will necessarily involve "just" allotments and allocations for production and consumption as among nations, but only cynics will anticipate any unseemly international disputes regarding these. Finally, by the greatest miracle of all, this post-war world of superinternational controls and coercions is also going to be a world of "free" international trade.

Just what the planners mean by free trade in this connection I am not sure, but we can

be sure of some of the things they do not mean. They do not mean the freedom of ordinary people to buy and sell, lend and borrow, at whatever prices or rates they like and wherever they find it most profitable to do so. They do not mean the freedom of the plain citizen to raise as much of a given crop as he wishes, to come and go at will, to settle where he pleases, to take his capital and other belongings with him. They mean, I suspect, the freedom of bureaucrats to settle these matters for him. And they tell him that if he docilely obeys the bureaucrats he will be rewarded by a rise in his living standards. But if the planners succeed in tying up the idea of international cooperation with the idea of increased State domination and control over economic life, the international controls of the future seem only too likely to follow the pattern of the past, in which case the plain man's living standards will decline with his liberties.

Main Versus Wall Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes, from the Washington Daily News of March 12, 1945:

MAIN VERSUS WALL STREET

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The fight which big international banking houses are beginning to stir up against the Bretton Woods agreements for an international bank and a fund to stabilize currencies is similar to the recurrent battle of Wall Street against Main Street ever since the New Deal began.

In the background, operating behind the cover of opposition raised by the American Bankers Association, are the same big New York City banking interests which fought through the years against numerous domestic reforms, banking and otherwise, created by the New Deal.

Gradually they have lost the power they once wielded in Washington with removal of the financial capital from New York to this city. But they don't give up easily. They have had a big stake in international finance. They fear that the Bretton Woods proposals, just beginning to be considered in Congress, will bring their international operations too much under control of this and other governments, just as the banking, stock exchange, and other New Deal regulatory measures curbed the control they once exercised domestically.

Make no mistake about it. This is a basic fight. The stakes are high. It is a battle for power.

It represents, on the one hand, an effort by the people of the world, in keeping with the issues of this war, to have some control through agencies created by their governments of those financial interests which hitherto have operated beyond the pale of government. On the other hand, it represents the fight of those international financial interests to retain control.

The Bretton Woods proposals would give governments more control over credit needed to rebuild the devastated areas and promote trade, though they represent nothing in any way revolutionary, since private bankers still would have a vast field of operation, probably larger than ever before.

The committees of the American Bankers Association, in which the big international bankers were very influential, would accept the international bank with some modification but are for elimination entirely of the monetary fund for stabilization of currencies.

They say, wait; wait 5 years perhaps before setting up such a stabilization fund. Their argument is that things in war-torn countries are too unsettled. The purpose of those representatives of 44 nations at Bretton Woods was to be ready to move in promptly, else there will be virtual chaos. This was well put by a private banker, Edward E. Brown, chairman of the board, First National Bank of Chicago, who has endorsed Bretton Woods:

"If the nations of Europe are to get on their feet and are not to fall into chaos, it is necessary that at the earliest possible date they have currencies with some degree of stability and which can be recognized and used as a basis for international trade. * * * Reconstruction and currency confidence go together. To say that one must precede the other is like saying the egg must precede the hen. To say that currency stabilization must be preceded by economic reconstruction, balanced foreign trade and balanced budgets is to put off the possibility of all these for at least a generation."

The bankers fighting Bretton Woods make a point of the mistakes after the last war, both by governments and by private bankers. Their mistakes are a matter of voluminous record in documents of public hearings by the Senate Banking Committee in 1933 and 1934—the German bonds, Peruvian bonds, Cuban bonds, City of Rio de Janeiro bonds, which filled bank vaults in this country and, when they went scur, contributed to the banking collapse.

On behalf of the Bretton Woods agreements, it is argued that an international bank, on which are represented all the nations, would check such improvident and reckless loans.

Castle Point Veterans' Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, a telegram from Mr. William R. Cleary, commander, Disabled American Veterans, United States Veterans' Hospital, at Castle Point, N. Y., reads as follows:

Respectfully request that you read article in March issue Cosmopolitan magazine concerning conditions here at this hospital. Situation here is as described in article. Food situation very bad on infirmary ward. Will you follow this through for us.

Mr. Speaker, the Castle Point Veterans' Hospital is in my district. I sincerely hope every Member of this body will take the time to read the Cosmopolitan article referred to. This is the first time that my attention has been called to the deplorable conditions that apparently exist in this Veterans' Facility. Then to think that those in authority in the Veterans' Administration have had these conditions brought to their attention over and over again, with apparently nothing being done to correct this disgraceful situation, does make one fighting mad.

I heartily endorse the resolution introduced by Congressman PHILBIN, and I urge the Rules Committee to report the resolution back to the House for immediate action. A thorough investigation of all of our veterans' hospitals must be made and I sincerely hope the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will welcome this proposal. Even the Veterans' Administration should welcome it in order that these accusations may be proven false or true.

We hear so much today about the wonderful medical care our soldiers received. We can honestly believe these statements. I have personally visited several patients at Walter Reed Hospital and they all have praised the doctors and nurses and have repeatedly stated that they did not want for a thing. That is fine. That is the way it should be. But why this apparent change, after receiving an honorable discharge, and why should these same heroes suffer from lack of care in our veterans' hospitals?

I have served in the Congress for a period of a little over 2 years, and never have I seen the Congress refuse to appropriate funds for our veterans. It certainly is not the lack of money. The records show that our Federal veterans' hospitals spend much more per patient than any of our State and county hospitals.

To return again to the Castle Point situation. It is not only the care and treatment of the patients that is being criticized but also the food. Mr. Maisel in his article states that last September a petition signed by over 400 patients begging for better food had been filed.

Three weeks after this petition was filed, he visited the hospital to find on the trays of a dozen patients for the day's main meal: one small pot of cold tea; two thin slices of white bread; a tiny pat of butter; a few thin slices of broken-down stewed peaches; and a beef stew containing six or seven tiny chunks of greasy meat swimming in fast congealing gravy, "all cold as the grave," he says.

Now, my colleagues, I know you will agree with me that it is not a very enticing meal. That is not the way we Members of the Congress expect our disabled veterans to eat. Good wholesome food with plenty of rest are two of the most necessary requisites for tubercular cases no matter where they are being cared for.

Since this hospital was built to care for 479 patients and there were 582 patients listed on October 3, 1944, the hospital was already overcrowded and the colonel in charge told Mr. Maisel that by taking advantage of day rooms, diet kitchens, and so forth, they had made room for 625 beds. We simply cannot overcrowd tuberculosis patients. This type of disease calls for airy and sunny rooms with ample space to offset all possible chances of further infection.

No wonder these hospitals are having high death rates and numerous runaways. These hospitals must be enlarged and other facilities must be built. These men and women offered their lives for us and I know the American people would prefer to see their money spent to take

care of our disabled veterans rather than to see their tax dollars floating away on some of the other silly Federal projects we all have heard about.

We need men and women to look after these hospitals who have some of the milk of human kindness left in them. Men and women who are sympathetic. If we cannot get them with the present rate of pay, then let us correct that. Let us have enough doctors and nurses in order that these veterans may have all the necessary care required to lift this deplorable record of "cured" and "arrested cases."

We must have a change that will attract first-rate doctors and nurses so that these unfortunate victims of the war will have abundant facilities to assure them the best of care and treatment and as a result we Americans can feel proud of our Government hospitals.

Bretton Woods Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star:

ON THE OTHER HAND—CHANGES SUGGESTED BY BANKERS TO BRETTON WOODS PACT QUESTIONED

(By Lowell Mellett)

At Bretton Woods representatives of the 44 United Nations reached complete agreement on a plan for world-wide monetary stabilization. Ratification of this plan by each of the governments is necessary to put it into effect, and Congress is now studying its terms. Congress can either ratify or reject or modify. Rejection appears to be unlikely, since nearly everybody approves or professes to approve of the general purpose, but the agreement is in danger, nevertheless.

Some of the country's largest bankers, speaking through the American Bankers' Association, are proposing that the agreement be changed in a number of ways. Since any such changes would have to be accepted by all the 44 countries and since each of the governments would be free to follow our example and offer further modifications, which in turn would have to be considered by all countries and accepted or rejected, the process of getting together might become endless. There are those who believe that some of the bankers, at least, are not unmindful of all this. The same process was used in the Senate to prevent our adherence to the League of Nations.

RAISES QUESTION

This brings up the question of whether Congress should look to the bankers for wisdom on this subject.

It is hard to recall any improvement in the American banking system which was not opposed to the country's important bankers when first proposed. Even the Federal Reserve System met with vigorous opposition. Nelson Aldrich, a great name in financial circles back in 1913, said: "It threatens to upset business and to produce the evil results it was projected to cure." H. Barton Hepburn, of Chase National, said the bill "as it stands would sound the death knell of the national banks."

An editorial in the American Banker called the measure "unconstitutional, socialistic, and revolutionary."

Following the banking collapse of 1933, one of the steps taken by Congress to strengthen our financial system was the separation of investment banking from commercial banking. The effect has been beneficial, but the legislation was opposed by men like W. C. Potter, head of the Guaranty Trust Co., who called the proposal "the most disastrous I have ever heard." His fears were shared by the great J. P. Morgan, who predicted that the legislation would cripple the underwriting business.

One of the greatest measures ever enacted by Congress for the benefit of depositors—and bankers—was the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. Yet here is what Francis H. Sisson, vice president of the American Bankers' Association, said in a telegram to members of the association in 1933:

"The American Bankers' Association fights to the last ditch against the guaranty provision of the Glass-Steagall bill as unsound, unscientific, unjust, and dangerous."

In a telegram to President Roosevelt the association declared that "putting into effect the deposit insurance provisions would involve genuine and serious danger."

FOUGHT SECURITIES ACT

That same year the Nation's big bankers lined up in the same way against the Securities Act. The bill was condemned as a measure which would hinder legitimate business without accomplishing any essential purpose. Leonard P. Ayres, vice president, Cleveland Trust Co., blamed the "act as an important factor in contributing to the stoppage of the flow of new capital into enterprise."

The Banking Act of 1935 increasing the authority of the Federal Reserve Board over the policies of member banks seems to have worked out pretty well, but at the time of its passage James J. Warburg, vice chairman of the Bank of Manhattan, suffered an acute case of jitters. He testified as follows: "I shall confine myself to a discussion of title 2 which deals with the proposed amendments to the Federal Reserve Act. I shall do this for the same reason that if some one were to say to me, 'I am going to do three things to you: Buy you a dinner, buy you a drink, and cut your throat.' I would not waste much time choosing my drink or ordering my dinner. Let me state that I am unequivocally opposed."

In the light of the record the bankers have made in the field of national legislation, it is likely that Congress will not be too greatly moved by their opposition to the Bretton Woods agreement. Obviously the bankers could be wrong.

California and United Nations Peace Conference, April 25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted by unanimous consent, I desire to make a few remarks about the strategic geographical importance and significance of the San Francisco United Nations Peace Conference on April 25; and to include in my remarks a significant editorial by Elithe C. Brunton, editor of the Long Beach Pacific News, published in my home city in California. Mrs. Brunton is the editorial genius of this busy paper, and her husband, William J. Brunton, is a member of the Long Beach City Council. Her editorial pen is recognized as one of the most accurate, penetrating, and constructive of the women writers of our coast.

This editorial is significant of the thinking and appreciation of the people of California generally. The fact that it is written and published in a newspaper in the Eighteenth Congressional District, just about 500 miles from San Francisco, indicates that California is a geographical unit, regardless of the distance from the site of the United Nations Peace Conference. It shows that there is thinking, working, and praying for an era, as this splendid editorial says, of "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

As Congressman from the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California, and all of which congressional district is outside of the great Pacific coast metropolis, Los Angeles, and yet still all in Los Angeles County, I have sent back to community and group leaders, regardless of political party, the following written communication:

Wars must cease. I urge utmost study Dumbarton Oaks, also Allied Nations Conference, San Francisco, April 25, by everybody, regardless of political affiliation. Unlimited emphasis, work, cooperation, prayers by individuals and groups. That result of Conference shall be beginning of enduring world peace. Work and pray unceasingly.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that not only in California but all over the Nation we Congressmen from every State should do nothing less than to do our full duty to activate and encourage everyone in our respective congressional districts to work and pray unceasingly that the mental and spiritual forces of our Nation shall constructively contribute to the thinking and spirit of this United Nations Peace Conference in my native State at San Francisco. I believe no Member of this great legislative body, regardless of party or political attitude, will desire anything less for this great Peace Conference than that it shall result triumphantly in establishing secure, sincere foundations for the working machinery for an enduring world peace. Cynicism, criticism, the lack of faith, the lack of hope—these weaknesses have no place in the thinking and prayers of any American who sincerely desires that there be peace on earth and good will toward all men.

While California is conscious, as it has a right to be, of its geographic and strategic industrial, commercial, and economic significance, California citizens are increasingly placing their heads, their hearts, and their prayers in an attitude and objective of an enduring world peace.

The thought-provoking editorial which I refer to follows:

UNITED NATIONS PEACE MEETING

The designation of San Francisco as the meeting place for the momentous United Nations Peace Conference on April 25 is not only a unique tribute for the city by the

Golden Gate, but it is also a recognition of the growing importance of the State of California and the Pacific Basin.

Every community in our State should feel that it has a share in the honor which the historic gathering will bring to the west coast. This conference may prove to be the most important in all history. Here the representatives of 39 nations will gather to lay the foundation of a lasting peace. If they succeed in building a sound foundation—and the world must pray that they will—the name of San Francisco will be synonymous with a new era of "peace on earth, good will toward men."

The geographical importance of California as the gateway to the Orient has already been brought into sharp focus by the announcement of the meeting. Primarily, however, the selection of a California city for an event of such world importance emphasizes the fact that the Golden State has become a world center in the business, finance, farming, and trade.

California farm products are sold round the world; California's multi-billion dollar movie industry is world-wide in scope; California's biggest bank with resources of approximately four and a half billion dollars is the world's second largest bank; ships from California ports sail the seven seas. Our yards and factories have turned out many hundreds of vessels, many thousands of planes.

Years ago it was predicted that the Pacific Coast would eventually become the center of American population, business, and industry. We Californians have always had faith in the greatness of our State.

The choice of San Francisco as the meeting place for the peace conference confirms that faith.

Meeting of White-Collar Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Baltimore Sun:

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 10, 1945]

D'ALESANDRO REPUDIATES MEETING HERE—SESSION CALLED FOR TOMORROW BY WHITE-COLLAR COMMITTEE

Representatives D'ALESANDRO and FALLON, of Baltimore, and BALDWIN, a part of whose district is in the city, yesterday announced they would not attend a meeting called by the committee of white-collar and fixed-income workers for tomorrow at the Young Women's Christian Association, on the ground that political views of some of the sponsors are absolutely abhorrent to the Congressmen.

After a conference in the Capitol, Mr. FALLON and Mr. BALDWIN sent Mr. D'ALESANDRO to the radio to make the announcement. The committee sponsoring the affair had announced the Congressmen would attend.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO, in his broadcast from a station in the Capitol Building, asserted some of the sponsors are "practically known as communistic sympathizers and supporters."

INVITED LAST AUGUST

In explanation of the broadcast, Mr. D'ALESANDRO said last night that last August he and other congressional candidates received an invitation from the Provisional Committee of White-Collar and Fixed Income Workers to attend a conference at a later date on pending congressional legislation relating to wages of white-collar workers.

The invitation, he said, carried the names of Governor O'Conor, Senators Radcliffe and Tydings, Dr. David E. Weglein, superintendent of public instruction; Mrs. William Bauernschmidt, executive secretary of the Public School Association, and other personages in Baltimore and Maryland "who are known to be solid, conservative, true, loyal American citizens."

GIVEN HANDBILL

Mr. D'ALESANDRO said the first knowledge he had of tomorrow's meeting was a handbill given him yesterday by one of his constituents. None of the sponsoring committees, he said, had discussed the meeting either with him or with other members of the Baltimore congressional delegation.

NAMED AS SPONSORS

He asserted the names of Governor O'Conor, Senator Tydings and Radcliffe, Dr. Weglein, Mrs. Bauernschmidt and others on the original list did not appear on the notice for tomorrow's meeting. Representatives FALLON, BALDWIN and himself were named among the sponsors of the meeting on the notice, Mr. D'ALESANDRO said.

Others named on the notice as sponsors, Mr. D'ALESANDRO added, were Miss Angela Bambace, chairman of the Baltimore branch, International Ladies Garment Workers Union (A. F. of L.); Walter McManamon, president of the Industrial Union Council (C. I. O.); Sidney Katz, State secretary of the C. I. O.; Carl Murphy, publisher of the Afro-American; Miss Elisabeth Gilman, Socialist party leader; Mrs. Lillian M. Jackson, president Baltimore branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Mrs. Juanita Jackson Mitchell, director of the Citizens' Committee for Justice.

Mrs. Violet Hill Whyte, first Negro policewoman in Baltimore; Dr. Herman Seidel, leader of Histadruth, labor party of the Zionist movement; Dr. Eleanor Pancoast, professor of economics, Goucher College; Mrs. Leon Ginsberg, a leader in the Child Study Association; Dr. Hans Froelicher, headmaster of the Park School; the Reverend Dr. Don Frank Fenn, rector of St. Michael and All Angels' Protestant Episcopal Church; Duke Avnet, leader of the Baltimore branch, National Lawyers' Guild; the Reverend Dr. Morris Lazaron, rabbi of Madison Avenue Congregation; Rabbi Morris Rosenblatt, Frank T. Rhoad, Jr., and Miss Dorthea Novius.

KILGORE LISTED AS SPEAKER

Senator KILGORE, of West Virigina, was listed as the principal speaker. A registration fee of 50 cents would be charged for the afternoon session, but the evening meeting, at which Senator KILGORE will speak, will be free to the public, the announcement said.

"Under any other set of circumstances, Congressmen FALLON, BALDWIN and myself would be only too happy to sit on the same platform with the esteemed Senator from West Virginia," Mr. D'ALESANDRO said in his broadcast. "However, when we find that a certain group has taken advantage of this opportunity to push themselves in along with my fellow Congressmen and myself, we are forced to make this statement at this time—that we do not plan to be present at this meeting. Why?

"ABSOLUTELY ABHORRENT"

"Because on this circular that I have in my hand there are listed persons whose political views are absolutely abhorrent to my fellow-Congressmen and myself, as well as to practically 100 percent of our fellow-Americans. These people of whom I speak are practically known as communistic sympathizers and supporters.

"Under these circumstances, we feel certain that Senator KILGORE, as well as others who understand and sympathize with the purpose of this meeting, recognize the fact that my fellow Congressmen and myself are entirely in accord and wish to give our support toward a better deal for the white-collar and fixed-income workers.

"However, these sympathies on our part do not force us to publicly sit with those who espouse a philosophy which advocated the teachings of Karl Marx."

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 12, 1945]

SENATOR CHAVEZ FAILS TO APPEAR—DECLINES TO ADDRESS WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS

A conference on problems of white collar and fixed income workers was thrown into confusion yesterday afternoon at the Young Womei's Christian Association when Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, declined to address an evening meeting unless Senator GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, who could not be found, sat on the platform with him.

Gabriel Stickle, conference committee chairman and a member of the United Federal Workers of America (C. I. O.), announced that Senator CHAVEZ primarily was motivated by an announcement late last week by Representatives THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR., GEORGE H. FALLON, and H. STREETT BALDWIN that, although listed as sponsors of the meeting, they would not attend.

D'ALESANDRO ISSUES STATEMENT

Mr. D'ALESANDRO, in a broadcast, explained that some of the listed sponsors were "absolutely abhorrent" to the Congressmen and that some of them "are practically known as Communistic sympathizers and supporters."

While leaders held a sudden meeting following an afternoon panel discussion on the subject of the conference to determine what to do about the night session, Representative D'ALESANDRO issued a statement asserting he and his colleagues are intensely interested in the status of white collar and fixed income workers and pending legislation affecting them. He referred to a telegram received by one of his constituents and signed by a sponsor of the white-collar group which, Mr. D'ALESANDRO said, referred to him and his colleagues as Red baiters.

"IF—SHOE FITS ANYONE"

"If our alleged Red baiting shoe fits anyone at the meeting, let it stay on that foot," Mr. D'ALESANDRO's statement said. "Is it not strange that the telegram indicates a very special consciousness of Red baiting? Our failure to cooperate in this conference is based on the make-up of the so-called sponsors of the conference."

CANCELED ADDRESS

Meanwhile, on the floor of the conference a speaker charged Mr. D'ALESANDRO with attempting to sabotage the meeting at which Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia, originally was scheduled to be the principal speaker at the night session. He was forced to cancel the engagement because of an important engagement in his home State. Senator CHAVEZ was then named as a substitute.

Mr. Strickle disclosed that those in charge of the program had tried to persuade Senator CHAVEZ throughout Saturday afternoon and yesterday to keep the engagement, but he adamantly refused unless Senator RADCLIFFE was present. Vain efforts were made to find Senator RADCLIFFE, whose telephone, it was said, was out of order.

DESIRED MARYLANDERS PRESENT

In Washington last night Senator CHAVEZ said, "I would have been delighted to take the place of Senator KILGORE, but when I read in the Baltimore Sun that their local representatives in Congress objected to being present and the two Senators from Maryland were not going to be there, I did not feel justified in attending. If any representative from Maryland or any Senator from

Maryland had been present, I would have been glad to go."

There were some in the conference corridors who suggested that the three Congressmen tried to torpedo the meeting at the instigation of William Curran, Democratic leader.

LAST-MINUTE SPEAKERS URGED

When it was apparent that Senator CHAVEZ would not come to Baltimore from Washington, it was suggested at the suddenly called meeting of conference leaders that former Representative Daniel Ellison or the Rev. Dr. Morris Lazaron, rabbi of the Madison Avenue Congregation, or Dr. Florence Bamberger, director of Teachers College, Johns Hopkins University, be invited as last-minute pinch-hitter speakers.

However, it was finally agreed that the night session take the form of a round-table discussion without a principal speaker.

A. J. Allen, executive of the local Urban League branch, ironically asked, "Is it necessary to have Senator RADCLIFFE on the stage to give a tone of respectability to this conference?" Senator RADCLIFFE, listed as a sponsor, did not remove his name from the sponsor list, it was announced, and nothing had been heard from him.

MEETING SLATED APRIL 5

It was decided to hold another meeting on April 5 after Joseph H. Levy, vice president of the United Office and Professional Workers of America; Dr. Alvin Schlinder, professor of education at the University of Maryland, and Miss Olivia Israeli, director of negotiation of the United Federal Workers of America, had summed up at the evening round-table panel discussions of the afternoon.

Besides the U. O. P. W. A. and the U. F. W. A., the other program sponsors were the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, all C. I. O. affiliates, and the business and professional women's department of the Young Women's Christian Association.

H. O. L. C. in Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD a letter I received from John H. Fahey, Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, reporting on the progress of liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in my home State. The letter follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN
BANK ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1945.

Hon. AIME J. FORAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FORAND: On January 24, 1944, I wrote you giving you some current facts concerning the progress of liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, particularly the record of its accomplishment in your State. The figures which I gave you then were as of the close of business December 31, 1943. Since that time even greater progress has been made and I now present to you figures as of December 31, 1944, which reflect the progress made during this 12-month period.

You will recall that out of a total of nearly 2,000,000 applications filed throughout the United States and its possessions during the period from June 13, 1933 through June 12, 1936, 1,017,821 loans were closed having a dollar value including subsequent advances, chiefly for taxes, repairs, and other necessary expenses, of nearly three and a half billion dollars.

Since June 12, 1936, at which time the Corporation's lending activities ceased, it has been engaged in a rapid yet orderly liquidation of its assets. As of December 31, 1943, a total of $2,051,677,951 had been liquidated, or 53.9 percent. As of December 31, 1944, 1 year later, a total of $2,385,938,826, or over 68.4 percent, had been liquidated. In other words, during the 12-month period from December 31, 1943, to December 31, 1944, the Corporation liquidated a total of $334,260,875. Out of a cumulative total of 197,945 properties which the Corporation was forced to acquire, there remained on hand as of December 31, 1944, a total of but 1,935 properties and compares with 12,744 properties on hand as of December 31, 1943.

Out of the total number of loans made, 6,118 were closed in the State of Rhode Island representing an aggregate amount of $27,390,954. In this connection you will be interested in knowing that, according to the 1940 housing census, 58.7 percent of all owner-occupied, nonfarm dwelling units in the State of Rhode Island were under mortgage, and 16.2 percent of these mortgages were refinanced by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

As of December 31, 1943, the total amount of outstanding loans of the Corporation in Rhode Island, together with the value of the properties acquired, had been reduced through collections and the sale of its properties to a balance of $12,530,253, a liquidation equivalent to 54.2 percent. As of December 31, 1944, the amount of the outstanding loans and the value of the properties acquired had been reduced to a balance of $9,977,118, equivalent to 63.6 percent, or a liquidation of $2,553,135 during the 12-month period.

A total of 1,994 borrowers have paid their accounts in full as of December 31, 1944. This represents an increase of 624 over the figure reported to you as of December 31, 1943. A total of 768 borrowers in the State of Rhode Island are now making monthly payments in excess of the amount required under their contracts. This represents an increase of 297 over the figure previously reported to you.

The Corporation was obliged to take over through foreclosure in the State of Rhode Island a cumulative total of 1,455 properties. As of December 31, 1944, 1,447 properties have been sold, representing a liquidation of acquired properties in your State equivalent to 99.5 percent.

According to the present trends of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation's income and expense and the projection of these into the future, if the present loan balances are liquidated in accordance with amortization schedules, the Corporation should not only be able to cover all future expenses but also be able to wipe out its present deficit and thus make possible the return to the Federal Government of the entire original $200,000,000 capital of the Corporation advanced in 1933 by the Secretary of the Treasury.

We believe that the Corporation's record will be a source of pride to you and to the Congress which passed the original Home Owners' Loan Corporation legislation which has proven to be one of the most advanced measures ever undertaken in any country for the encouragement and maintenance of home ownership.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FAHEY,
Commissioner.

Should the Veteran's Family Favor Bretton Woods?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address delivered by myself over N. B. C. Friday evening, March 9, 1945:

Fellow Americans, before I talk about the Bretton Woods scheme let me ask you, How many times lately have you seen a notice in your local paper reading about like this?

"Pvt. Larry Mitchell was killed in action in Germany on January 25. In addition to his widow, Betty, he leaves two small children, Jack, aged 3 years, and a daughter whom he had never seen, Jane, 7 months."

The foregoing notice is imaginary, but there is nothing imaginary about that heartbreaking message now coming to thousands and thousands of American homes. No glamorous victory communiqués should remove from my mind or yours the haunting tragedy of that dread message. You and I know that broken homes and blasted lives are the inevitable cost of war—part of the price of victory. We cannot change that situation.

But when the young wife receives that message there is created for you and me a sacred obligation. We have a solemn duty to the humble fireside of that widow and her orphaned children. We have a responsibility to that 7-month-old daughter, Jane, whose life will never be brightened by a hug from the strong and loving arms of her father. He died a hero's death obeying the commands of his Government.

We who stayed at home have a duty toward those children and their mother in the long, lonesome years ahead. Fellow Americans, will we fulfill that trust?

Today the answer of all of us is "Yes; by all means." But keeping that faith will not be easy. Already we have ignored many warning signals.

GOVERNMENT AND ATLANTIC CHARTER

The keeping of that faith is in the hands of the Government. But government everywhere in late years, including our own, has found it easier to make promises than to keep them. Most of us believed in the Atlantic Charter. But those of us who are honest with ourselves, and most Americans are, know that the Atlantic Charter has been broken and betrayed, as Poland, Finland, and other small countries have learned so bitterly in being cut up. That charter evidenced a great purpose. But while governments still talk about it, by their deeds and actions they have destroyed the charter.

You may ask, what has the abandonment of the Atlantic Charter got to do with the widow of Private Mitchell and her small children? It has a vital connection.

The future of the widows and orphans of this war depend on the modest pension payments which the Government has promised them.

You and I are in favor of paying those pensions, aren't we? You want those pensions to be paid on time, paid fairly, and in honest dollars. That's what the American people expect to do for those who have sacrificed. That is the least we can do in simple justice.

But here is the significant point. If the American people become beaten and bankrupt from reckless spending all over the

world, they would not be able to make those payments in honest dollars. That is a simple statement of fact.

Right here you may interrupt and say, "There is no danger of that. Our Government in Washington would not allow that to happen." You might add, "You folks in Washington must protect us from reckless spending and from inflation." And you are right—that is our job.

HIGH PRESSURE USED ON BRETTON WOODS

But the skids are now being greased to high-pressure Congress into approving a scheme hatched up last summer at Bretton Woods. It is called the Bretton Woods Stabilization Fund and International Bank. On the radio, through the press, and by other propaganda means, they are ballyhooing this Bretton Woods scheme just as they did with the Atlantic Charter.

And, as in the case of the charter, they give you a very appealing sales talk. They claim this scheme will make 60,000,000 jobs for Americans. They claim it is necessary to insure world peace. They claim it will enable Europe to rebuild itself. They claim it will guarantee good feeling and prosperity for the world. They make all these claims and more too. And everything claimed is a noble purpose that you and I would like to see come about—just as we all would like to go to Heaven some day.

To try this global holding company scheme, they want to risk more billions of our fast-disappearing assets. They demand that Congress O. K. this experiment. The result would be that America would largely guarantee the paper money and debts of the rest of the world, a few countries excepted. That is the speculative venture they want to try with the trust funds of America's war victims.

Many well-meaning folks honestly believe in this experiment, just as they believed in the Atlantic Charter. Other promoters of this scheme are of a different breed. They are the cunning people who know this hand-out pours gasoline on the smoldering fires of inflation. They are now getting rich by trading real estate, buying property, and speculating in a riotous stock market while patriots are buying bonds. These shrewd manipulators welcome this raid on the Treasury of the United States. Why? Because they know that as our gold and other assets are sent abroad, inflation will speed up. Their opportunities for black market gains and bootleg profits will multiply.

On the other hand, I understand the fond hopes of the "global do-gooders" who worship the Bretton Woods schemes because they believe it will bring peace and prosperity. But I solemnly question the wisdom of any experiment that will put tremendous amounts of our assets into a speculative pool to create artificial values for foreign currencies. And that is what the Bretton Woods fund does, no matter how they dress it up.

Moreover, the Bretton Woods schemes are in addition to many others now in operation, and which are scoop-shoveling our savings, our goods, and resources into Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, Australia, and the islands of the seven seas.

OUR RESOURCES ARE NOT UNLIMITED

Should we approve of more schemes of this kind now?

Not until America has clearly demonstrated its ability to make good on its promises to the widows and orphans of this war; its promises to the wounded veterans of this conflict; its promises to the millions of youngsters who are relying on the pledges of the G. I. bill. Against our Government, these Americans hold a claim which must have priority over global experiments. Bretton Woods would put our own patriots at the end of the pay-check line at our Treasury.

These patriots have the first claim against the Treasury of the United States. Their claim has been written in tears and blood in the foxholes of a hundred battlefields, and on the shifting currents of the seven seas.

These heroic dead are gone. They cannot plead for their loved ones. They left no propaganda machine like that of the promoters of Bretton Woods. The claims of these heroes have only begun to be presented. They must be paid. But they cannot, and will not, be paid if the United States Treasury cupboard becomes bare. The Treasury of the United States has no unlimited power to make payments. The Treasury does not create the goods to pay these claims.

The American housewife had a lesson along this line last Christmas on ration stamps. You remember how the Government promised you that ration stamps were to be good indefinitely. Then one fine morning you awoke and the Government had repudiated and canceled those ration stamps. Why? Because they had issued too many stamps compared with the amount of food available. With all their experts, they had made a colossal mistake—so gigantic that the great Government of the United States was forced to break its promises to its citizens. What did we learn from that failure? There were several lessons, but here is the most important:

When a Government promises too much, it breaks its pledges.

We found the Government can issue food ration stamps, but it cannot create the food to make good on those stamps. They simply issued too many promises. That is exactly what will happen if America sets out to insure the debts and currencies of the world. The Government would mean well, of course, just as Mr. Bowles did on the ration stamps. But we will be unable to make good on our sacred obligations at home if we are first bled white by fantastic handouts abroad.

ONLY A REALISTIC APPROACH IS CONSTRUCTIVE

So we must work out these problems realistically and constructively. In measuring our ability to help other peoples, the warning of the canceled ration stamps is plain. When a Government promises too much, it fails to keep its pledges. We, the American people, have now had this lesson twice. We have had it on the ration stamps at home and the Atlantic Charter abroad. We have had our fingers burned two times, not because of our mistakes as citizens, but because our Government officials promised too much.

Only a vigorous protest by the people can stop this scheme. Will you do your part to protect the young patriots who are counting on the G. I. bill?

Then, you must let your Congressman and your Senator know that you expect them to protect our war victims first. Only by your voices can this scheme be stopped.

The fate of the widow of Private Mitchell, the future of his fatherless son and daughter, largely rest in your hands. The lonely fireside of these little families must not be haunted either by the poverty of inflation or the tyranny of a perpetual O. P. A. gestapo.

No nation can repudiate the sacred pledges made to its fighting heroes and remain a land of righteousness and justice. The G. I. bill must never go into the ashcan like the Atlantic Charter. The widows and orphans and wounded must never see their claims treated like the carefully saved ration stamps. You and I must save them from this Bretton Woods danger. That is our duty as forward-looking and constructive citizens.

In measuring this and every hand-out experiment, we may well be guided by the words of one of the great humanitarians of all times, St. Paul, who, in the First Epistle to Timothy, admonished him in these solemn words, "But if any provide not for his own, and specially not for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

Only an America that plays square with its own war victims can help constructively and effectively the suffering people of other lands. Accordingly, our first financial job is to put our own house in order.

In your personal affairs, the only permanent way to prosperity is a balanced budget. Likewise, in the Nation the only permanent way to prosperity is a balanced budget. Unless that goal is achieved all post-war plans for ourselves and for the world will collapse like Hitler's conquests.

F. H. A. in Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include therein a letter which I have received from Abner H. Ferguson, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, giving an up-to-date picture of the fine record of that agency in my home State:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1945.

Hon. AIME J. FORAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORAND: Although for obvious reasons during the war emergency the F. H. A. has not made its customary periodical reports to Congressmen and Senators on F. H. A. operations in their States, I feel this practice should now be resumed.

The F. H. A., as you know, operates entirely through the private capital of local financial institutions. It insures the loans these institutions make for property repair and mortgages for the purchase of homes and the construction of new homes.

At the end of June 1944, a total of $12,595,589 lent by these institutions has enabled 29,559 Rhode Island families to maintain or improve their properties, while 3,364 families have been able to buy or build homes through mortgage loans in the original face amount of $15,334,520.

In addition, 926 families of war workers, newly arrived in war congested areas in Rhode Island, have been provided with homes through mortgage loans amounting to $4,612,350.

These same figures for any specific county or counties are available and I shall be glad to send them to you if you so desire.

The F. H. A. has for over 5 years been paying all operating expenses and losses of its mortgage-insurance programs, at the same time adding substantially to its insurance reserves, which now total more than $97,000,000. Losses have been only a fraction of 1 percent. Likewise, the property repair program is currently paying its own way from revenues derived from insurance premiums and for nearly a year collections on defaulted loans have shown a substantial margin over claims paid.

I am particularly happy to advise you that within 60 to 90 days the F. H. A. will start distribution of mortgage-prepayment dividends to 13,000 home buyers who paid off their mortgages in full during the calendar

year 1944. These mortgages were in group accounts which had developed credit balances by January 1, 1944. These dividends will range from a few dollars to nearly $200 each.

I am sure you will agree this is a gratifying record.

Sincerely yours,

ABNER H. FERGUSON,
Commissioner.

Rehabilitation of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT K. HENRY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body appreciates, from the volume of mail received at his office from bewildered veterans of this war returning to civilian life, that a small percentage of them realize how to go about securing the benefits provided for them under the G. I. bill of rights.

The veteran who comes back is not the same boy who went away, and although the Federal Government can furnish the money for helping him, his family and his local community must do the work of rehabilitating him so that he can take his place in work and in society.

I have the plan for organization of Wisconsin's Waukesha County Veterans' Rehabilitation Committee, which I want to bring to the attention of this Congress. Waukesha County has pioneered in the field of veterans' rehabilitation and has set up a plan in which complete coordination and cooperation have been obtained.

In many cities throughout the Nation the home folks are sitting back and letting the returned veterans shift for themselves, perhaps because they have heard so much about the wonderful benefits that the Federal Government has provided for them. They believe that all a veteran has to do is go home and wait for the benefits to be delivered to him.

How well we know this is not true. We remember what followed the last war. The discharged veterans, entirely out of this world because of their experiences and bewildered by a return to civilian life and the complex problems that they had not known when they enlisted or were drafted, didn't know how, didn't seem to care, or were wholly incapable of obtaining the benefits that were provided for them by the Government. The veterans' organizations, the Red Cross, and the other agencies did their best to help, and did a fine job, but nevertheless, many of the boys went along for years without obtaining their just rewards. This is borne out by the fact that 25 years after the last war many ex-service men are being paid disability compensations in lump sums or their widows and children are just being apprised of what is due them.

The following excerpt is taken from Willard Wallar's Veteran Comes Back and is a part of the Waukesha County Committee's printed plan:

With admirable efficiency the armed forces which took our boys away will return them to our doorsteps, in reasonably good physical condition, a little spending money in their pockets, some words of counsel ringing in their ears.

Then the Army's job is done and ours begins. This veteran, this boy next door whom today we know as G. I. Joe, is our responsibility.

What we need is a complete program—a set of coordinated activities to restore the veteran to his place in society. In such a program, which must go far beyond what already has been set up, every branch of Government, Federal, State, and local, would have its proper part, and every private organization, every citizen, would find a job to do. Even the utmost wisdom and generosity on the part of the Federal and State Governments will be of no avail unless the local communities do their part. The G. I. bill of rights will be worse than useless if the veteran's neighbors, friends, and relatives lack the energy and sense to make it work.

Every citizen in Waukesha County has decided that all information available relating to a discharged veteran's problems should be taken to the veteran rather than to force him to seek out the information from different Government agencies; that war does something to people, and that veterans separated from their homes and loved ones, whether subjected to actual combat or not, are entitled to everything a grateful people can do for them in order to assist them to take up their position in civilian life again. The following is an example of the certificate handed the newly returned veteran by the Waukesha County citizens who call upon him:

WELCOME HOME, JOHN DOE

You have been away from your friends and loved ones serving your beloved country in the armed services of the United States of America in the Second World War.

We, the people of your home community, welcome you home and express to you the sincere appreciation and gratitude of your community, State, and Nation for services well rendered.

You have made great sacrifices for us during your period of service and we in return humbly offer our services to you in order to assist you to regain your place in the civilian life of your community.

You have worked hard in order to help save a free and liberty-loving America. Let us now work together to preserve that freedom and liberty for the generations to come.

The Waukesha County Veterans' Rehabilitation Committee gets the names and addresses of all veterans from the draft boards as soon as they register their discharge from service. They send a trained visiting committee to each veteran's home to welcome him back, inform him of his rights, and learn what help he would like. They arrange interviews with expert committees to find the veteran a job, help him get a pension, assist him to medical or hospital care, arrange for his education, advise him on a loan, inquire into his religious preference, and aid in vocational training. Each veteran's case is continued until he is completely settled and getting along all right.

This remarkable plan is in printed form, setting out in detail the job of each citizen and showing how each civic organization is coordinated in a complete working unit. I commend the citizens of Waukesha County, and especially those persons who had the foresight and determination back in 1943 to formulate this workable plan, which has been so effectively operating since February of 1944.

Five hundred and thirty-two veterans who returned to the community before the plan was working were not overlooked. The committee ferreted out these men, and responsible citizens called upon them and aided in setting them right.

If you are interested in becoming a part of an organization in your local community and desirous of studying the successful plan to which I have referred, I am sure you will find the committee, which has taken such a preeminent place in local rehabilitation, ready to lend assistance by furnishing every detail of the plan.

Naturally, I am proud that Waukesha County is in my congressional district, and I shall be happy to have you contact me for additional information.

Propaganda and Half Truths by Government Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the grave threat to our freedom that is now coming from the clever use of propaganda methods by hundreds of writers in Government agencies is well described in the editorial that follows.

This editorial, written by Glenn E. Bunnell, editor of the Stuart (Nebr.) Advocate, appeared in that newspaper on March 8, 1945. Mr. Bunnell is far enough removed from the turmoil in Washington to have a clear picture of the dangers in Government propaganda and half truths.

We have long ago learned to discount news stories from Germany and Japan because it has been proven that they color these reports with progaganda for the purpose of deceiving us or their own people. However, many people are not aware that in a measure, we are faced with the same thing here at home.

No; our Government does not publish wild reports of unwon victories, such as is the custom of enemy propagandists, the American people are too enlightened for that. They use a more subtle method to sell the people on a proposed Government project, or method in which an old program is being administered.

When the need arises the Government blankets the press and radio with statements by a score of high officials, supporting the administration policy. Here newsmen are made the unwilling tools of Government propagandists. For statements by high Government officials make news, whether they make sense or not. News reels and the stage and screen are also propaganda mediums used by the Government. In addition to the

actual propaganda pictures issued, we will note that in no picture do you find anything that opposes Government policy and often support of Government programs. Every gob in our Navy and every G. I. in our Army will agree that their branch of the service is not nearly as glamorous as it is pictured on the silver screen.

In recent months the Government has used a lot of high powered propaganda in attempting to put over the Federal ballot, the food subsidy program, the work, fight, or jail legislation, and many other similar administration programs.

Is the propaganda put out by our Government bad, you ask? No; not all of it. If it is truthful, and is put out for the purpose of education it is fine; but when untruths, half truths, and personal opinion are published as facts, then it is very apt to be bad.

So effective has Government propaganda been that youngsters of 12 or 14 look askance at their parents if they find fault with New Deal policy.

It is time we stopped to think. To think for ourselves. Don't let the secretary of some bureau do it for you. Even if all elected officials and the appointed heads of departments and bureaus were honest (and unfortunately all of them are not), they can and do make mistakes. Examine their statements and apply the rules of reason and logic, in short think for yourself. Don't be lulled to sleep in the belief that we have to take it as it comes. We don't. This is still "the land of the free and the home of the brave," where all men were created equal; the New Deal, notwithstanding.

The foregoing charges and suggestions might seem to be revolutionary, unless we remember that in America we have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; and that the men who run the Government are servants of the people and should be kept subservient to the will of the great majority. If to some it may seem unpatriotic to oppose certain actions of the Government in time of war, it must be called to mind that this war is being fought to insure a way of life in which people are the masters of their Government and not the servants of it, as is the case in Germany and Japan. There would be no object in winning our freedom from foreign dictators only to lose that freedom here at home. We must see to it that the extraordinary powers granted to our elected servants as a war measure, are not abused, we must see to it that such powers are used only to win the war, and not to subject us to the control of our servants in Washington.

We must always remain alert, and not allow high wages, good prices, and propaganda to lull us to sleep. An alert, aggressive citizenry can never be enslaved by government. We are free now and we should fight both at home and abroad to maintain that freedom we in America have always enjoyed.

A Boy Beneath a Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a poem which was written by Mr. Frank M. Crawford, of Connersville, Ind., after the death of his fine grandson, Crawford E. Handley, in combat in this war. This young soldier was universally loved and respected by all who knew him. He has given up his all for his country, and his name is now recorded in the list of our Nation's heroes. The words coming from the grandfather of this boy came truly from his soul—pleading for the better things of life to come because his grandson and all other boys who die in this war have made the supreme sacrifice for us.

Mr. Speaker, I know this devoted and distressed grandfather, the author of this poem. He is one of our finest citizens. It was my pleasure to have known his grandson, Crawford E. Handley—one of the finest lads it has been my privilege to know. This boy has gone—but the message contained in the following verse will live forever.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the poem, written by the grandfather of this boy, which follows:

A BOY BENEATH A CROSS

He asked for no reward
This boy beneath the cross,
He only answered duty's call
And reckoned not his loss.

He braved the desert's burning sand,
The mountains bitter cold;
He gave his life for native land,
He did not ask for gold.

He fought where freedom's flag unfurled,
This boy with life to give;
He fought and died that you might live
To build a better world.

What will you do, who here remain,
For him who lies below,
In word or deed that he may know
He did not die in vain?

Search deep your soul; make solemn vow
To him beneath the cross—
That what you have, you give it now
To recompense his loss.

If you will give and not complain,
This boy who cannot see—
Will know he did not die in vain,
To keep a nation free.

You should, like him, think not of gold
Nor should you reckon loss;
Work, give, nor naught withhold—
From him beneath the cross.

—*Frank M. Crawford.*

CONNERSVILLE, IND.

Development of the Arkansas River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am including a concurrent resolution adopted recently by the General Assembly of Arkansas and signed on March 6, 1945, by Hon. Ben Laney, Governor of that State. The resolution deals with the policy to be followed in the future development of the Arkansas River Valley in the interest of flood control, navigation, irrigation, and incidental power development and is as follows:

Concurrent resolution endorsing the flood-control program planned by the United States engineers and authorized by Congress for and within the several river basins of Arkansas; opposing the establishment of an Arkansas Valley Authority and requesting that the river basins of Arkansas be developed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army

Whereas Arkansas is a State of many rivers, some having their source within and flowing through the States, others having their source outside and beyond State boundaries but flowing through or alongside of the State, and floods upon these streams constitute a menace to the lives, lands, and properties of our citizens; and

Whereas in 1936 based upon reports made and filed by the United States engineers, Congress enacted into public law the omnibus Flood Control Act, authorizing the construction of certain public works for flood control, and for other purposes, on the rivers of the Nation, and said law established a "declaration of policy"; and

Whereas said declaration of policy, among other things, states in part, "that it is the sense of Congress that flood control on navigable waters and their tributaries is a proper activity of the Federal Government in cooperation with States, their political subdivisions and localities," and that "Federal investigations and imprisonments of rivers and other waterway for flood control and allied purposes shall be under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers"; and

Whereas in conformance with the declared policy of Congress the Chief of Engineers ordered and directed the United States engineer districts of Vicksburg, Memphis, Little Rock, and Tulsa to investigate, study, and report upon definite flood-control projects upon the Mississippi, Arkansas, White, Black, St. Francis, and Ouachita Rivers for the purpose of ascertaining what flood-control works, such as dams, reservoirs, levees, sea walls, revetments, and channel clearances, should be constructed in the watersheds of the aforementioned rivers for the benefit and protection of the people; and

Whereas based upon the findings and reports of the engineers Congress—prior to the war—authorized to be appropriated $363,445,000 for flood-control work and structures in the basins of the Arkansas, White, St. Francis, and Ouachita Rivers. The engineers had completed, in whole or in part, approximately $109,470,000 of the authorized projects when, owing to the war, further work on our rivers was suspended, and there remains approximately $253,975,000 of authorizations for flood-control structures for these basins; and

Whereas a thorough investigation of the water resources of the Arkansas River Basin in Arkansas and Oklahoma has been made and a report thereon set forth, a comprehensive plan of development has been prepared by a special board of engineers, including the division engineer, southwestern division, which, if approved and authorized, will involve the expenditure of additional Federal funds in the amount of $446,118,000 upon the Arkansas River and tributaries in Arkansas and Oklahoma; and

Whereas in order that interested parties may express their views and present additional statements and argumets concerning the advisability of the United States undertaking these vast improvements, the board of engineers for rivers and harbors will hold a hearing beginning at 9 a. m., May 7, 1945, in Little Rock, Ark., in the exhibition hall, Robinson Memorial Auditorium, Garland Street entrance, and all interested parties are invited to be present or represented at the hearing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fifth General Assembly of Arkansas, That we favor the democratic method of development, construction,

and operation of the river basins' projects in the State of Arkansas by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and we are opposed to the creation of a valley authority; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States make available to the United States Army engineers sufficient funds to construct and operate all the projects necessary and incident to a comprehensive plan of flood control, including the attendant benefits of navigation, irrigation, and incidental power, whenever economically sound, and that such construction and operation be expedited in the aid of the past-war effort; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, to the United States Senators and Congressmen of this and neighboring States having a direct interest in the river basins aforementioned.

A New Kind of Tribute to a Fallen Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, war is not glamorous as it is sometimes portrayed. War is not an exciting adventure. We read of victories, citations, and awards to our troops for gallantry in action. We are prone to accept the bright and reject that which pictures the dark side of world conflict. There is an overemphasis placed on advances made by our armies and little is said of the price paid which made those advances possible. We should come to realize that when our men gain small ground of a few hundred yards the fighting is hardest and the casualties are greatest.

It is frightening to realize that, in a large measure, there exists on the home front an attitude of complacency, a feeling that the war is about over and the boys will soon be marching down Broadway with a proud and victorious tread. We seem to think we have done all required of us if we buy a few 3-percent War bonds, pay taxes, and conserve food and gasoline. Such an attitude is a result of not knowing the realities of modern warfare with all its destructiveness and horrors.

There are thousands of families who know what war really means. I have in mind those who have received heartrending telegrams from The Adjutant General at Washington: "I regret to inform you"——

Such a telegram was received by Mrs. J. C. Privett, of Blytheville, Ark., announcing that her husband, Pvt. (1st cl.) Privett, had paid the supreme price in battle at Luxembourg. In a recent edition of the Memphis Commercial Appeal is a photograph of Mrs. Privett and her 8 children, 4 sons and 4 daughters, taken on the porch of their rented home at Blytheville. It is believed that Private Privett was the first father of 8, all of whom are under 13, to fall in battle during the war.

A memorial is being planned by a group of Blytheville citizens in his honor. A memorial, not of marble, stone, or granite, but a lasting tribute emblematic of what he died to preserve and defend—a home. No more fitting monument could be erected than a home to house and shelter the helpmate and children of one who laid down his life for the safety and well-being of his loved ones as well as all of us.

This shrine will be built only a few miles distant from the life-size statue to Arkansas' most distinguished soldier of World War I, Herman Davis, which stands in Davis Park at Manila, Ark.

It is a great and alluring thing for the Blytheville people and those from over Arkansas and nearby States to contribute a home in memory of this soldier. Although he cannot enjoy it, the home is a symbol of peace, contentment, and American ideals.

Home's not merely four square walls,
Though with pictures hung and gilded;
Home is where affection calls,
Filled with shrines the heart has builded.
Home—go watch the faithful dove,
Sailing 'neath the heaven above us;
Home is where there's one to love.

Home is where there's one to love us.
Home's not merely roof and room—
It needs something to endear it;
Home is where the heart can bloom,
Where there's some kind lip to cheer it.
What is home with none to meet,
None to welcome, none to greet us?
Home is sweet—and only sweet—
Where there's one we love to meet us.

Repeal of Use Tax on Automobiles and Boats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials, one of which appeared in the Ocala Star-Banner on February 4, 1945, and one which appeared in the Lake Worth Herald, March 1, 1945:

[From the Ocala (Fla.) Star-Banner of February 4, 1945]

ROGERS HEARD FROM

Congressman DWIGHT ROGERS, who was elected in the November balloting to represent the new Sixth Florida District in Congress, has been heard from. He has introduced a bill to abolish the annual Federal use tax on automobiles and motorboats.

"With conditions as they are, so that car and boat owners are allowed only partial use of their vehicles, I believe it is unfair to require payment of this tax," ROGERS told a newspaper reporter.

Representative ROGERS has something there; and he would have something even though there was no gasoline and tire shortage to curtail use of autos and boats. The Federal Government, which extracts enormous sums from the pockets of everybody with its income, excess-profits, internal-revenue, and other forms of taxes, never should have gone out after a $5 use tax from auto and boat owners. The $5 tax is chickenfeed so far as the Government is concerned, and a nuisance to those who have to pay it. The auto owner has to pay plenty of taxes without having this $5 stamp tax added.

Sentiment outside Congress is decidedly in favor of abolishing the tax, and several attempts have been made by Members of Congress to put through a repeal bill, with no success. Having started this early in the session, it may be that our freshman Congressman will have better success than others who have tried it. He should have the active support of auto and boat owners who have been unjustly penalized by the Federal stamp tax.

[From the Lake Worth (Fla.) Herald of March 1, 1945]

OUT WITH USELESS TAX

Getting rid of the $5 useless automobile tax saddled annually by the Federal Government is purposed by Congressman DWIGHT L. ROGERS, first Representative from the new Sixth Florida District, most concisely.

The whole bill is but nine lines long, with the kick in the seventh, eighth, and ninth lines, which read:

"Repeal of the tax: The tax imposed by this section is hereby repealed to become effective June 30, 1945."

The measure likewise affects boats.

The Herald greatly favors repeal of this tax on the grounds of its inapplication to the day it is levied. In other words, it is not enforceable; or if it be enforceable, it is not enforced.

Some slight attention is paid to it for a few days after it is due in July by a few revenue agents who catch the downtown folk. But from the 1st of August to the 1st of next July nothing is done about it. Nobody is arrested as an example.

If the money be needed, then let the Federal Government make it mandatory on States, before they issue automobile licenses, to be certain that the useless tax is paid, thus making it in truth a use tax.

The Herald commends Representative ROGERS for his introduction of the bill, which not only is sour because of the shoddy manner of enforcement but for the further reason that it is levied on the "use" of the costliest necessity man can own. What with nylons and all, it still is cheaper to maintain the wife.

Moreover America is not a land where folks are in favor of paying taxes for use of something they pay, and pay, and pay for.

The White Flowering Dogwood—A Memorial to War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced H. R. 4740, to designate the white flowering American dogwood as the national flower of the United States, to honor the memory of the veterans who fell in this war. It was not acted upon during the Seventy-eighth Congress and has been reintroduced as H. R. 2358. Last year I called attention to the fact that in May of each year in normal times 500,000 tourists visit the national cemetery at Valley Forge to see the dogwoods in bloom, planted there by loving hands to honor the mem-

ory of Revolutionary heroes. I called attention to the plan of our Government to establish at least one national cemetery in every State as the last resting place of the heroes of this war, and expressed the hope that those cemeteries would be beautified and adorned by the planting of white flowering dogwoods, which each year would symbolize a rebirth, whose white petals would symbolize purity, and whose flowering cross would symbolize vicarious sacrifice.

The following letter from a friend in Oregon indicates that the Pacific coast, as well as the Atlantic coast, is interested in this memorial project. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the letter from Mrs. Mary T. Roberts, of Portland, Oreg., and copy of the poem enclosed with it, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 9, 1945.*

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your proposal of the naming of the dogwood flower as the flower to honor our men lost in this war has the approval of many here. It also inspired me to write a poem last spring, as it may have done several others.

My mother had loved her dogwood so very much and left notes on the subject which mentioned the falling of the petals upon the soldier's graves. I tried to keep her thought when I wrote my poem. It really is more hers than mine. She left us in June 1932 and her notes were written in October the fall before.

The poem was printed here in the Oregon Journal, May 29, 1944. If you care to use it in any way you may. My sister receives the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each time and we see poems that have been read by the Members.

I have had many poems in local papers and the National Historical Magazine (D. A. R.), published there in your city, had two of mine, one in December 1940 and in September 1941. I am a member of the Verseweavers Society.

We have a son in the Coast Guard and like all good Americans have a deep interest in the servicemen. Any honor we can give them is but a part of what they are worthy of.

The dogwood blooms here are different from the ones we had in Indiana (my birthplace) as many have five leaves. We have two trees and they are very beautiful. I enclose one bloom which has the four petals, the cross-like form, but without the indented leaf edge of the eastern flowers.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARY T. ROBERTS.

MEMORIAL FLOWER

The sleeping trees awaken under springtime's warming sun,
And quickly life is surging—a miracle has begun.
The dogwood on the hill has tucked white flowers in her hair;
The wind, in playful mood, has scattered petals everywhere.

In fall, when frost has turned the dogwood leaves to gold and red,
They shower earthward, where lie our honored soldier dead,
To weave a warm and leafy blanket, softly, gently laid,
As if a loving tribute to our soldiers thus is paid.

Each spring there's resurrection, even of the smallest things;
If God can make the flowers bloom, can't He give souls their wings?

—*Mary T. Roberts.*

Report of Judicial Council of California to California State Legislature on Problems of Administrative Law Agrees With Views of Smith Committee Minority Report on Same Subject

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Smith Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies issued on August 25, 1944, a report on the problem of administrative law. In connection with this report, a minority of the committee, consisting of the gentleman from New York, Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY, and myself, filed what we termed an "additional report on administration law." In this report we agreed with the basic contentions of the majority about the need for the setting up of definite standards of administrative procedure and definite protection of the citizen against arbitrary action by administrative agencies. We concluded as follows:

The objective of securing at one and the same time the necessary contribution of administrative agencies to the efficient functioning of government in a modern nation and, on the other hand, protection for all citizens from arbitrary action by such agencies cannot be achieved, in our opinion, by the application of any one method or the passage of one piece of legislation. All four of the causes of the problem recited above must be dealt with. But one method which must, we believe, be used is the setting up of an orderly code of procedure or administrative law to govern the action of administrative agencies. We are not prepared as yet to endorse any particular one of the variety of bills which have been introduced on this subject. We do believe, however, that any legislation proposed to be adopted by the Congress on this subject should include the following points:

1. The requirement that adequate public information be published by all agencies so that every interested citizen in the United States can have full knowledge of what its rules and regulations and method of procedure are.

2. The requirement that agencies must give due consideration to substantial proposals for the adoption of rules by such agencies which in the judgment of citizens or groups of citizens would be salutary to the orderly functioning of the agencies.

3. There should be effective separation of the judicial function of any administrative agency from its prosecuting functions.

4. Substantive rules should not be adopted by agencies without opportunity for comment by those affected thereby.

5. Whereas it is probably impossible to require declaratory judgments by administrative agencies in every case where any citizen may have reason, justifiable or otherwise, for asking for such an order, nonetheless there are certain types of cases where a requirement that a declaratory order be issued would seem to be justified. Among such cases are those where an individual requests a declaratory judgment as to whether practices which he has followed customarily in the past are or are not lawful ones.

6. Finally, judicial review should be provided as to every order or rule which is in the nature of an order—at least, at the point where action is taken to enforce such an order or rule.

It is important, however, that in adopting legislation in the field of administrative law consideration be given to the particular and specialized problems with which different agences must deal. The ideal, though admittedly difficult, solution would be the passage by Congress of a carefully devised code of administrative law especially adapted to the work of each separate agency and it may well be that this will be the ultimate solution which must be applied to the problem. Meanwhile, it is necessary that care be exercised lest, in an attempt to accomplish worth-while broad objectives, action be taken which might actually harm the general public interest by severely crippling the work of particular agencies whose activities under present-day conditions could not safely be dispensed with.

I am encouraged to find that the Judicial Council of California, which was commissioned by the State legislature to make a study of California administrative procedure within that State, came to very much the same conclusions as those reached by Mr. DELANEY and myself, and I, therefore, include herewith for the sake of comparison the concluding paragraphs from an article entitled "California's Approach to the Improvement of Administrative Procedure," which appeared in the California Law Review for December 1944. It will be clear that both the report of Mr. DELANEY and myself and the California report hold that while it is necessary to set up standards of administrative procedure, the only way in all probability in which that can be done with complete success is if each agency, or at any rate, each group of agencies whose problems are similar and whose general method of operation is alike, is dealt with in a separate statute.

The proposals offered by the Judicial Council of California do not follow the gradual educational theory of the majority of the attorney general's committee and the Benjamin Report. Nor are they based upon the proposition that a single general statute can be drafted by the legislature under which all types of administrative action and all administrative agencies can be covered. The council's proposed statute expresses the conviction that legislative standards of fair procedure can be set up, but that they must be devised with specific reference to particular problems and functions. The administrative procedure statute proposed by the judicial council is intended to cover the formal, adjudicatory proceedings of State licensing and disciplining agencies and provides definite legislative requirements for the kind of proceeding involved. It is a specific prescription for a specific ailment in the body politic. It is true, of course, that the underlying principles of the council's proposals can be adapted to the action of any administrative agency. That adaptation, however, must be founded upon a careful examination and analysis of the administrative structure rather than upon a priori conclusions. If the California Legislature pursues the policy which it has inaugurated, a detailed code of administrative procedure may result. But it will be a code framed item by item and with specific reference to each kind of administrative problem. It is the council's theory, in other words, that there is no easy legislative answer to the problems involved but that any legislative solution must be founded upon a kind of laboratory analysis and recommendation. The council's proposals, therefore, are more

modest in scope than are certain of the statutes proposed elsewhere, but they furnish the legislature with the ground work for far more detailed standards of fair administative procedure than have been offered in other States.

These differences in theory should not obscure the obligation which the council's work owes to similar studies made in other jurisdictions, though the ideas have been materially altered in adapting them to the needs of this State. For example, both the report of the attorney general's committee and the Benjamin Report emphasized the need for creating a permanent agency in State government which could exert a continuous pressure in the direction of improving administrative procedure. The former report contemplated that such an agency would also supervise the efforts of "hearing commissioners" who were to be trained and qualified persons used in the process of administrative adjudication. Such a provision for continuous improvement in California's administrative system has been incorporated in the council's proposals, and the agency entrusted with that responsibility has also been given supervision over a panel of hearing officers whose services will be required in the process of administrative adjudication if the council's proposals are adopted.

The State of California, acting through its legislature, has undertaken the improvement of administrative procedure. In this article an attempt has been made to describe the approach which has been adopted in the solution of this problem. It is an approach which involves legislation, and the legislature has wisely provided for an intensive examination of the practical considerations upon which any legislation must depend. The duty of making this investigation was assigned to the judicial council, and insofar as the council's proposals can be said to represent California's approach to the improvement of administrative procedure, it is an approach based upon the premises that any workable solution requires careful and precise legislative action, action which concentrates upon limited objectives and proceeds one step at a time.

Text of Fort Gibson Resolution Adopted by Arkansas Valley Authority Association of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1945, a group met at Fort Gibson, Muskogee County, Okla., which is in my congressional district, and formed an Arkansas Valley Authority Association of Oklahoma. After the association was formed, a resolution was adopted petitioning the Congress of the United States to create by law an Arkansas Valley Authority for the development of the Arkansas River watershed from the Mississippi River all the way up to its source in Colorado.

Under leave given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include copy of the text of the resolution adopted by the Arkansas Valley Authority Association of Oklahoma:

Whereas President Roosevelt has for many years advocated the establishment of separate authorities to deal with the development of certain river basins where several States are involved—the general functions and purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority to serve as a pattern for similar developments—and has recommended to Congress the creation of an Authority for the development of the Arkansas River watershed from the Mississippi all the way up to its source in Colorado; and

Whereas the citizens of the Arkansas River Basin have long sensed the possibilities for the development of the natural resources of the Arkansas River and its tributaries and have sought to bring it about without result; and

Whereas we have been witnessing and suffering from repeated floods; idle and wasted water power; clogged river channels. We are victims of the repeated paradox of too much or too little water, in the wrong places at the wrong times; and

Whereas piecemeal efforts at development for some purposes have been made over a period of many years. But the people know that the results fall far short of the needs of the region. Millions of dollars have been spent to improve the river and to reclaim the land. Levees have been built and rebuilt year after year in efforts to check the ravages of floods. Certain irrigation projects have been constructed and reservoirs have been built for flood control. But the people know from their own experience that something is wrong. Something is missing. They know that the over-all development, commensurate with the potential strength of the Arkansas Valley, has not beeen accomplished.

Instead, we have found the various and piecemeal developments conflicting with one another. Although they are all dealing with the same river, the interests of one section of the valley view with concern and are fearful of the effect of projects in other parts of the region. These differences of view are brought to the fore at the present time by the conflict between the proponents of two plans, both of which are claimed to be comprehensive. One is the plan of the United States Army engineers, which is aimed at providing flood control and navigation on the river. The other is that of other agencies, which proposes a system of reservoirs to provide water for power. There is a conflict between the two plans as to the reservoirs to be built and the uses to which the impounded waters shall be put.

The conflict between these two plans epitomizes the reason for failure to achieve proper development of the river. The simple fact is that the methods which have been applied to the problem of the Arkansas Basin have not been suited to the job. Each of the many agencies of the Federal Government is expected and authorized to become familiar with only a part of the river. Each agency is concerned with only a part of the many purposes to which the river can be put.

The several States comprising the Arkansas Valley have not been able to guide the development of the whole river. Each State government has a primary concern with the problems lying within its own boundaries. But our river knows no State lines. It flows where it will. Its waters pass from one State to another. The task, dictated by the nature of the river itself, is too big and too complex for a single State or a group of States to undertake.

There are also those groups having a special interest in some special part of a river valley development. Naturally they concern themselves only with that part of a valley development which they believe will satisfy their particular interest, be it a navigable channel for river commerce, a dam for hydroelectricity, a reservoir to control floods, or a reservoir to store water to irrigate the arid lands. Each special-interest group seems bent on satisfying its own needs first with little regard for the effects its proposals, if adopted, may have upon other groups.

Out of these circumstances of confusion of purpose and conflict of interest one clear fact is beginning to emerge: The Arkansas Valley—its resources of life-giving and life-destroying water, its forest, it minerals, and its soils—will not achieve its God-given destiny until we learn to see and understand the river and the valley as a whole, as a working unit, as a heritage of resources that can be developed for many purposes within the framework of a general plan.

So long as we hack the river to pieces and parcel it out to this agency and that agency, to that interest and that interest, stalemate, inaction, and a declining economy will be our reward.

We need to view the river and its valley as a whole. We need a remedy for the arbitrary division of interest and responsibility among Federal agencies to which the river has been partitioned and assigned.

We need to recognze that the differences which separate the interests must somehow be reconciled. We cannot make much progress in this reconciliation until we have an acceptable and authoritative body of facts and engineering judgments drawn together for the river resources as a whole.

At the present time those interested in water for irrigation and reclamation fear those interests on the lower river who want floods controlled and a navigable channel on the lower Arkansas, and both fear those interested in power dams. Each interest group seems assumed that these objectives are in conflict. Each seems to assume that there cannot be enough water in the Arkansas Basin to permit progress in the achievement of all four objectives, and each group is supported in that assumption by the technical and engineering judgments of agencies assigned to further one use of the river with little regard for the feasibility of its use for other purposes.

This confusion of expert advice will continue unless there is established a single agency with responsibility to all interest and for all uses of the river. This agency should be created by Congress. It should be located in the Arkansas Valley region. It should be independent of the existing Federal executive departments. It should be under a mandate to develop its plans and recommendations and to carry them out in close cooperation with the agencies of the States and the Federal Government.

This new agency should be responsible to the people of the Arkansas Valley through the Congress and the President. It should be authorized to develop and carry out a unified plan to achieve the full development and use of the river and its resources, such as—

1. The periodic floods should be measurably controlled and the damages minimized.
2. The development of navigation for cheap transportation.
3. The rivers should be harnessed and put to work to provide electric power for homes, farms, and industry.
4. The basis resources of soil fertility should be protected and built up to sustain a permanent and prosperous agriculture.
5. Industry should be developed—industry indigenous to the area and based on its raw materials, spreading its activity and the opportunities for employment widely throughout the territory and not concentrated in a few congested areas.
6. The arid and semiarid lands of the upper basin should be irrigated and made rich and productive: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we firmly and earnestly petition the President and the Congress of the United States to give force and effect to the foregoing conclusions by creating an Arkansas Valley Authority; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

Adopted by unanimous vote of the Arkansas Valley Authority Association of Oklahoma in the town hall at Fort Gibson, Okla., Friday, January 26, 1945.

Angels of Mercy Drafted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the subject itself bespeaks a contradiction of words. We have learned to think of angels as messengers of God to man, to show man a way out of his difficulties. They seem to have supernatural wisdom and are sympathetic. Man was created a little lower than the angels. Think of these mercy messengers being drafted by men! It is a contradiction in terms to say that men are drafting the angels of mercy.

Our nurses have long been looked upon and called angels of mercy. They have come to us when we were not able to care for ourselves and have ministered unto us in the darkest hours. Next to our mothers, their mercy has transcended that of any other profession or class of people. They have always responded to the call of suffering humanity. They are still doing so. But we in Congress have been asked to draft them to perform their ministrations of mercy for our wounded and sick casualties of the battlefield. It is unthinkable that we should have to draft nurses. We do not have to draft them. They are available if and whenever given an opportunity to show mercy and minister to the needs of our boys who have fallen in line of battle. It is a reflection upon this honorable profession to talk about drafting nurses. It is a serious reflection upon the profession and those who seek to draft them to say that this group of our population has failed to respond to the call so urgently needed.

But this is a day of drafting. It is a day of conscription. Drafting and conscripting seem to be the order of the hour at Washington. There seems to be a tendency to get away from the idea of allowing people to volunteer as patriots. Someone wants to dictate, regiment, control, and arbitrarily draft everyone into some form of service for the Government.

Recently, the House of Representatives passed a bill seeking to draft labor. We were told it was imminently necessary that it be enacted immediately, that there was a shortage of manpower, that the essential war industries had to have men work in their plants and that they would not be able to get them unless they were drafted. That was approximately 2 months ago. The House passed the bill more than a month ago. The Senate refused to adopt the same bill that was passed by the House, but has just rewritten the measure to suit the ideas of its members. No law conscripting labor has yet been finally passed. It is to be hoped that none will be passed which will destroy free labor in America and will make it possible for large corporations and individuals to make a profit on the cost-plus-fee basis that so iniquitously prevails throughout this country, out of the sweat of conscripted, forced, or slave labor.

We have been told that the Army and Navy need a lot of nurses. No one seems to know just how many they need. Figures vary, depending upon the source from which they come and the time the estimates are made. Everyone thought we had all the nurses we needed until sometime in December when we were suddenly told we were far short of the requirements. Apparently, those in authority were not willing to approach the problem on the basis that members of this noble profession might volunteer their services. Some have even said that all people should be drafted, all men and all women. Some go so far as to say that capital and property should be conscripted. Of course, there are those who would make us all cogs in the machinery of the state and subject to a dictator or the regimentation of those in actual or assumed authority.

The question of drafting nurses has come as a shock to the finer sensibilities of the people. It is interesting to observe the provisions of H. R. 2277, as the same was reported out by the House Committee on Military Affairs and was passed with numerous amendments by the House last week. An analysis of this bill as originally presented is illuminating. It was first sought to have Congress declare "that to provide adequate nursing care for the armed forces of the United States it is imperative to secure immediately the services of additional trained and qualified nurses."

Then section 2 of the bill provided that every female residing in the United States who on the day of registration fixed by the act was between 20 and 45 years of age and was a registered nurse anywhere in the United States or a graduate of a school of nursing and eligible for examination to become a registered nurse, should become subject to registration and selection for and induction into the land and naval forces of the United States under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with certain exceptions. The bill then specifically provided that no such registrant under the act should be ordered to report for induction "until after all qualified graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps registered with such board, who are not deferred pursuant to the provisions of this act, have been ordered to report for induction." After certain provisions were made requiring the registrants to meet the requirements of the land or naval forces before induction, the bill provides the President shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry the act into effect and that the "regulations may provide for the classification, selection for induction, and induction of females pursuant to this act under procedures and quotas different from those governing men." Section 5 makes the act applicable "to unmarried women only, but shall not affect the voluntary recruitment of any qualified women for the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, or the Nurse Corps of Naval Reserve, or the appointment of members of such corps as commissioned officers as now provided by law."

In an effort to stress the importance and urgency of the prompt passage of the bill, the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House stated "that we have today in hospitals throughout the world more than 520,000 wounded men and that they are coming back from field installations to hospitals at the rate of 16,000 per day and that the number is on the increase." No one stated how many of these are American boys.

In the arguments and discussions in the House, the following facts were brought out: In 1940 there were less than 1,000 in the Army Nurse Corps. On December 31, 1944, there were 42,000. As of that date 81,000 nurses had volunteered. Every quota was met until May 1944. The Surgeon General submitted a request for 50,000 nurses to the General Staff. Plans were under way for a recruitment program and for a complete registration of the nurses of the country between the ages of 20 and 65 years when the War Department, on December 5, 1943, announced that only 40,000 nurses would be needed. Already 36,000 or 37,000 had been secured. Hence the O. W. I. did not go forward with its recruitment program when only 3,500 nurses were involved. Less than 4 months later the War Department found it necessary to increase the number to 50,000, the number originally requested by the Surgeon General. Now they say they want 60,000. Who knows? Whom shall we believe?

The let-down in the effort was a felt factor. The success of our forces in France further retarded the voluntary enlistment. Naturally the nurses felt they would not be needed and ceased to come in voluntarily. In the fall the Surgeon General sent out a recruitment letter for 27,000 nurses. Organized advertising methods were employed. Apparently no further word was received from the Army until December 20. Large sums of money were contributed by advertisers to stimulate the patriotic interest for nurses to volunteer. Many believe that if the country, and particularly the nursing profession, had been thoroughly aware of the needs as fast as they appeared and if there had not been such strictness in the requirements for eligibility, all nursing quotas would have been filled rapidly.

Last fall we were told that victory was just around the corner and the European war would soon be over. Labor, nurses, everyone began to look out for themselves a little. They sought new lines of employment. They began to leave the defense industries in great numbers. From what we were told, all had a right to believe it was using good judgment to find permanent employment in some industry that would continue to operate after the cessation of hostilities. The nurses could not be blamed for heeding the same suggestions and following the same psychology.

There are several phases of this bill that inherently were not right. In fact, the bill was almost completely rewritten in the House of Representatives while it was under consideration there. The original draft provided for the registration and drafting of only female nurses.

Why the authors of the bill objected to the inclusion of male nurses was never explained to the satisfaction of many Members of the House. Someone said there are 2,000 registered male nurses in the United States Army, only 20 percent or approximately 400 of whom have commissions as nurses. About 1,600 are buck privates or working in some capacity other than that for which they have been prepared and so highly trained. As a matter of common sense, everyone knows there are many cases where a male nurse is preferable to a female nurse among the Army casualties. Their services certainly should be used instead of drawing so heavily upon the female nurses. Likewise, there are estimated to be some 5,000 or 6,000 other registered male nurses in the United States, not in the service, many of whom can be used to great advantage.

It was further brought out that there are some 9,000 Negro nurses, perhaps all females, and only 330 of these have been used in the various nursing corps for wounded servicemen. It is unthinkable that the services of these people are not being used. This should supply us with anywhere from 4,000 to 6,000 additional nurses, depending upon how many meet the required arbitrary tests of the Army.

The bill as it originally was presented to the House last week directed the drafting of female nurses, young girls from the United States Cadet Nurse Corps, before resorting to the older female nurses. The only explanation ever offered for this was that these cadet nurses had received a part of their training at the expense of the Federal Government. The truth of the matter seems to be that some of them had already begun their training at their own expense and that of their families, and that the Government supplemented this and finished paying for their training courses. Others who entered later have had their courses financed to date entirely by Federal aid. These girls average very young. Apparently 25 percent are under 20 years of age, 43 percent under 21 years, 15 percent under 22 years, and 7 percent under 23 years. In other words, very few are over 23 years of age. Experience has taught the Red Cross that they should not send girls into the nursing service or into any overseas branch of their service until they are at least 25 years of age. But the nurse draft bill sought to take these Cadet Nurse Corps girls, 80 percent of whom were below 23 years of age, and send them into the most trying positions for overseas duty. If the question is put directly to the father or mother of the girl of such tender years, they are almost sure to appreciate the danger that lurks ahead and suggest that the more experienced and older nurses be sent first and the younger ones sent only when it becomes absolutely necessary and the supply of older ones is exhausted. Numerous letters that have been written by the boys in overseas service in this war indicate very clearly that younger nurses should not be taken first. In many instances they have plead with their fathers and mothers not to permit their younger sisters to volunteer for such service.

The argument that the Government has paid part of the expenses in educating and training them to become nurses is very weak when all of the facts are shown. At the time these girls were persuaded to enter the nursing profession, they were asked to sign a contract which stated:

> I agree, if accepted, I will be available for military or other Federal governmental or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war.

But remember that most of these girls were only 18 or 19 years old and without any prior business experience. They did not appreciate the technical language of the contract they were required to sign. They relied upon the statements put out by the Government in pamphlets and folders to induce them to enter the service. One of these distributed by the United States Public Health Service to lure these girls into this profession and branch of the service was in the form of a small pamphlet. On the back of this pamphlet these words appear:

> Enlist today in a proud profession. The corps requires you to make but one promise, that you will remain in essential nursing, civilian or military, for the duration of the war. The choice is yours.

Our girls and their parents, many of whom are not versed in law, have a right to rely upon those apparently in power and assuming authority and the statements that they made. This literature published by our Government to induce these children to enter the service should contain only statements of fact, and the children and their parents have a moral right to rely upon the statements made therein. This should be far more binding upon the Government than the strict letter of the law when dealing with these people of immature years, some of them yet minors under the age of 18 years. Furthermore, the Government conceivably was just as much interested in providing a new group of nurses for our civilian population as for the needs of our servicemen. It is wholly conceivable that the Public Health Service had in mind at the time it issued these circulars they would use these cadet nurses for the civilians and relieve the older and more experienced nurses from home duties and enable the oldsters to nurse the wounded and sick of our armed forces.

Volunteer nurse organizations are helping most nobly to nurse the sick in our hospitals at home in order to relieve the trained nurses there and enable them to go into foreign lands or into our Army and Navy hospitals. Many, many reports were made by Members of the House that their respective districts had great numbers of nurses who had volunteered for service but had not been accepted, for reasons not explained. No one knows the total of such cases in the United States. All of these should be accepted before the young girls are drafted or before even the older ones are drafted. They are continuing to volunteer every day and the noble profession of nursing will see that this is done, if they are not drafted. Many believe that all requirements can be met without the draft.

In one hospital, 30 out of 31 nurses graduated on March 2 volunteered, took their physical and passed. Many more similar instances could be cited, running into the thousands of immediately available nurses ready to volunteer and who have volunteered their services. Some have been waiting for assignments for 30 days or more and are wondering when they will be called. Add to this the great untold volume of immediately available qualified and certified volunteers, the several thousand male nurses, and the several thousand Negro female nurses, it is reasonable to anticipate that practically the entire present alleged need of nurses between now and July 1, of 20,000 or any other required number, will be available.

The Navy has resorted to the voluntary method and has succeeded, without asking for a draft of nurses for the Navy Nurse Corps. In many newspapers there have appeared articles during the last few days stating that the Navy has successfully recruited further volunteer nurses. Why cannot the Army do the same? The Army is about three times as large as the Navy, and the Army Nurse Corps is necessarily about three times the size of the Navy Nurse Corps. But there should be no difference in principle, if the Army made the work of nursing as attractive and inviting as the Navy has and if those in charge had wanted volunteers.

Nurses' associations, clubs, hospitals, and such organizations have wired us repeatedly from our districts and States that this bill should not be passed in its original form, and that there is no need to draft nurses. It certainly is apparent that there would be no need for this draft bill if the Army had resorted to the voluntary method and was willing to accept male nurses, Negro nurses, and give the voluntary system a fair chance. Potent facts supporting these statements were brought out in the arguments and several amendments were offered, many of which passed the House, incorporating some of these provisions in the bill. What the Senate will do with the bill no one can safely predict at this time.

But the order of the hour seems to be to draft people, to coerce them. Representatives of industry, labor, and agriculture alike were almost unanimous in denying that the labor draft bill was necessary. But we were told it was necessary, and it passed under the hue and cry that the Army officials said it was necessary to sustain the war effort. The same tactics and language were used in connection with the drafting of nurses. Possibly it is only another step for the drafting of all of our American women for some form of service under bureaucratic dictation and regimentation. The draft of labor and of nurses, it may be predicted, will be followed by the drafting of women for war plant and military service.

If the American people were told the truth about what is going on and kept informed and if they could rely upon promises and information furnished by the various bureaus and other controlling

agencies of Government, it is easy to conceive that they would become more interested in carrying on this war to a speedy and successful conclusion by contributing their money, their labor, themselves, and their children, to hasten a final and conclusive victory. Slave labor or conscripted labor will not produce anything like as much in comparison as free labor. Drafted nurses will not perform the same service with as much interest and sympathy and effectiveness as nurses who volunteer their services. The same will be true with reference to conscripted people in any branch of the service. Furthermore, this will tend to demoralize the home, the basis of our civilization. The sacredness of the home will be seriously impaired and the morale of our people shocked to think that the Congress of the United States has seen fit to go from a system of obtaining volunteer nurses to that of requisitioning, conscripting, or drafting of members of this noble profession.

Shall we resort to the same tactics that were pursued by Hitler in Germany? Shall we be frightened into heeding the call to duty? Or, rather, should we not appeal to the patriotic instincts of men and women to rally to their country's call? The American people will do it if approached in the right way. They will do it if they are permitted to come into an open door with truth and confidence staring them straight in the fact. But the American people have never accepted the principle of being forced or drafted or required to do something because some higher official, be he executive or military, tells them that they must do it.

Never before in the history of the world has anyone told us that it would be necessary to draft these angels of mercy, as we so fondly call and recognize them. Never before has anyone said that our youthful and inexperienced children of the fairer sex should be sent into the horrors of war before their older sisters of more experience and judgment are sent. It is not only the effect it will have upon the people at home, but it stands to reason that more efficient service can be rendered our worthy sons if the more experienced and better trained nurses and people of more mature judgment are sent to their bedsides.

Another serious apprehension is that the drafting of nurses, as this bill originally sought to do, and perhaps as it even has been amended by the House, will discourage other girls from entering the profession. Their parents will not so readily consent and the whole program of future recruitment is likely to fail. The available statistics and the experiences of nurses' training schools and hospitals today show that this reaction has already become pronounced by the fact that fewer girls are entering the profession during the past few months.

The thousands of Negro nurses can render a valuable service, and will do so if given an opportunity. It was stated on the floor that some 2 weeks ago a Negro nurse, who had graduated as valedictorian of her class in the Central High School of Cleveland, made application to join the Army Nurse Corps. The Army official wrote her:

> The Surgeon General directs me to inform you that your application is rejected because there are no facilities for colored cadets in the Army hospitals.

Someone has said that there is not a Negro nurse in the Navy Nurse Corps, and that there are only approximately 330 Negro nurses who have received commissions in the Army out of a group of 8,000 Negro graduate nurses. The Negroes are especially fitted for this work and we have many Negroes in the service who are entitled to have nurses of their own race attend them when they are so readily available. It seems foolish to use the excuse that there are no facilities for such nurses. Likewise, it was argued by those who opposed the drafting of male nurses that they had not had training in certain special lines which had been offered in the courses of training for female nurses. Someone suggested that one of the courses not offered to male nurses which was offered to female nurses in their training course is that of obstetrics. How foolish such arguments and how inapplicable to the issue!

The Army could easily relax its rigid requirements and restrictions, admit those who lack an inch or two of the height required for nurses, or who are a few pounds underweight or overweight, and take in this vast army of volunteer nurses who are available, and let them go to the bedsides of our wounded soldiers. The American way suggests that we do not permit the drafting of this self-sacrificing element of our population, simply because somebody has misjudged, miscalculated, bungled, or otherwise failed to follow the American method and obtain the nursing quota now said to be required. It is not a question of condemning but it is a question of saying to any branch of our Government that our freedom-loving citizens insist that they be given the facts and be allowed the privilege of volunteering their services for the good of our country, rather than that they be drafted. Most of all, we should apply this to our daughters and our sisters who have dedicated their lives to the service of disease and sick humanity. We owe them that protection and we should be courageous enough to demand that those in authority respect the ideals of our Government, which will in no way impede the progress of the war nor delay the ultimate victory. No one has criticized the other branches of service for following these time-honored traditions. Why not make it universal?

The people do not want these angels of mercy drafted. They have not been convinced that it is either right or necessary. Nurses have always responded when duty called. Their lives have been pledged to sacrificial service. They are not slackers, and Congress should not so brand them by enacting a law which will besmirch the fair name of their profession. The followers of Florence Nightingale are entitled to everlasting honor and our highest esteem. They should not be drafted.

What Are We Fighting in Asia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Norman Thomas, appearing in the March 7 issue of Human Events:

FOR WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING IN ASIA?

(By Norman Thomas)

In Europe, lack of any clear-cut American policy other than unconditional surrender of our enemies has already made us partners to perfidy in Poland.

This lack is costing the lives of thousands of our sons who perish unnecessarily from a German resistance sustained by expectation of annihilation. It is impossible to describe, or even to imagine, the devastation that will be Europe; a whole continent which will live chiefly for its hates. For the white race this second world war within a generation is an approach to suicide at the very moment when white arrogance to the awakening colored races is unabated.

Yet the cost of unlimited war in Europe may, even so, prove less than the cost in Asia. We expect prodigies of valor and endurance from our sons, in war against Japan, yet have no apparent plan for any use of victory to justify the cost.

At Cairo nothing was assured to Asia other than the destruction of Japanese power. As a byproduct, Korea was indeed promised independence. But this promise was unmatched by any pledge whatsoever to Indochina, the Dutch East Indies, Burma, and Malaya, which regions are presumably to be returned to white empires utterly incapable of regaining them save by American blood, or of holding them even for a generation save as we dedicate our children's future to their support.

For the Japanese people unconditional surrender has been interpreted, by American spokesmen, as the preliminary to the forcible destruction of the whole Japanese economy and its political order.

II

Already it must be evident to informed Japanese that Japan has lost the war. Conceivably the struggle need not progress to such annihilation as Germany faces in order to persuade some Japanese Government to accept terms adequate to peace. But if nothing is offered except destruction and the indefinite occupation of the homeland by foreign armies, the Japanese will fight in every city as they fought in Saipan, Manila and Iwo. It is difficult to overestimate the frightful cost of this unlimited victory unaccompanied by any political offensive directed toward peace.

Thousands upon thousands more of our boys will then die in a war for them more brutally cruel than the German, a war without mercy in which few prisoners are taken, a war accurately described in certain of its aspects as "an organized race riot." One scarcely dares to speculate on the consequence to American ideals of humanity, and to the hope of racial brotherhood, as a result of this orgy of destruction wherein victory requires wholesale slaughter of the foe.

We know and justly denounce Japanese cruelty; what we have not recognized is a corresponding American blood lust which makes souvenirs out of the bones of the slain and drives the saintly Kagawa to denounce "occidental" brutality. The Japanese

failure to unite Asia against the white man's empire in no small part was due to Japanese arrogance and cruelty. What the Japanese could not do, our own unlimited war with its inevitable accompaniment of devastation may yet accomplish.

And for what ends? With what motives do we wage unlimited war? For the thrill of vicarious glory, pride in brute supremacy, the material satisfactions of jobs, high wages and profits for which others pay in blood? That is to lower ourselves to the plane of our enemies.

We rationalize unlimited war by declaring that Pearl Harbor was the attack of a thug on a man intent only on minding his own business. It is no justification of Japanese militarism to accept the argument powerfully set forth in John T. Flynn's pamphlet on The Truth About Pearl Harbor that the administration's policy led logically to attack even though the President neither expected nor desired it at Pearl Harbor.

III

We further rationalize our emotions by saying that only the complete destruction of the Japanese Nation will give us peace. This is to ignore the causes of war in general, of this war in particular, and to deny the Christian doctrine of the dynamic power of intelligent good will. It is to ignore the fact that total victory of itself will not solve the problem. The Japanese cannot be totally destroyed and, if they could, there would be more war over the filling of the vacuum thus created.

China will not be strong enough to police Japan. She herself may conceivably become the Poland of the Far East before the Big Three have finished their work. Our indefinite policing of Japan will be very expensive and provocative of a racial hate which will spread through Asia.

Did we learn nothing from the tragedy of reconstruction in the South following our Civil War? Certainly there are no Japanese elements which we can use successfully under our continuing power. To their countrymen, such supporters in unconditional surrender would be worse than Quislings.

The ultimate beneficiary of total victory without a program can only be Stalin or his successor. I think it probable that at his own time, and on his own terms, Stalin will join Roosevelt in the Asiatic war. Mr. Edgar Snow, who can hardly be accused of russophobia, says in the current number of the Saturday Evening Post "Soviet diplomacy will make maximum use of the bargaining value of its strategic postion in the Far East when pressing home its case at Allied conference tables * * * Not till the moment when she can do so with the least possible risk commensurate with the great aims at stake, not till Japan is nearing collapse, will the Soviet Government call upon its people to intervene in a decisive way."

The Asiatic war will give the Kremlin as many chances to profit by Roosevelt's lack of constructive policy as Russia has had in eastern Europe. Conceivably Stalin can stay out of this war and successfully maneuver so that eventually the U. S. S. R. will reap whatever fruits there are to follow the destruction of Japanese power.

But in our own interest Stalin's support against Japan should only be sought or accepted on clear-cut terms appropriate to lasting peace. The cry is already heard that we must accept perfidy in the Polish settlement to obtain Stalin's help in the Far East. That is only the first installment of the price ideals will have to pay for our failure to proclaim to the whole world, as well as to the Japanese people, the terms on which we are willing to make peace.

IV

Those terms must include freedom for all the victims of Japanese aggression and the disarmament of Japan. They should be of a nature to stimulate whatever liberal and democratic forces there are in Japan as against the war lords. By all means they should be of a nature to bring home to the Japanese people a sense of the price they have paid for their devotion to militarism and empire.

It must, however, be apparent to all that no people can be taught to reject imperialism by those who themselves persist in practicing it. No tough and resilient people can be kept permanently disarmed in a world of competitively armed empires whose rival interests will make them seek allies. Effective collective security requires general disarmament. Organized cooperation must be among nations freed of foreign yokes. White imperialism, as well as Japanese, must be ended, and guidance for backward peoples must be under international authority. The benefits of economic and political cooperation must be open to all peoples, including our present enemies, who are willing to abide by its conditions.

A proclamation of peace terms along these lines would probably work no immediate miracle; it might fall on deaf ears. But so great would be the reward of success to us and all mankind that this sort of peace offensive is imperative. The time to undertake it is now. To delay is to sacrifice more young Americans whose lives may still be spared; it is to magnify every difficulty of the eventual settlement.

Tribute to Henry A. Wallace by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I broadcast over the Blue Network on January 26, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I never more heartily wished for the perfection of television and the broadcasting of the proceedings of the Congress by radio than when a quiet, assured, simple-mannered and simply dressed man yesterday morning in a crowded committee room came alone, facing a hostile committee, and spoke little about his own future but movingly about the future of America. If the people could have seen and heard Henry A. Wallace as we in that room saw him and heard him, seeing and hearing as they would, not through the prejudice of partisanship, or self-interest, or class interest, but only as the people, who wanted the office of Secretary of Commerce and of Loan Administrator run for the benefit of all of the people, there is no doubt about Mr. Wallace's confirmation by the Senate.

If you could have seen and heard Mr. Wallace and felt the earnestness with which he pleaded the case of all the people of America, not just the favored few, you would have understood why something unusual in American politics is happening—that is, the prayer meetings for the confirmation of Henry A. Wallace which are being held about over the country.

I am not surprised that Mr. David Stern, of the Philadelphia Record, states that Mr. Wallace's address to the committee was the greatest document in statesmanship in this generation.

Let me quote some of the stirring things Mr. Wallace said. He began as follows:

"Obviously, I am deeply concerned with any proposal that has for its purpose the stripping of the Department of Commerce of its present lending functions. I would be less than frank if I were to give you the impression that my concern springs solely from the fact that important functions are being carved out from under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. You know and I know, that even greater significance is the fact that my nomination as Secretary of Commerce was the occasion for this particular proposal.

"There are some who have suggested—perhaps in an effort to save my feelings or face—that this separation of the lending functions from the Commerce Department is desirable of my alleged 'lack of experience' in such field. Let me say that this talk does not fool me or the American public. You know and I know that it is not a question of my 'lack of experience.' Rather it is a case of not liking the experience I have.

"Let me be specific. For 8 years I was Secretary of Agriculture. During that period Commodity Credit Corporation, the Farm Security Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Rural Electrification Administration were under my supervision. During that period these agencies loaned over $6,000,000,000. We made 11,500,000 separate commodity credit loans and 1,208,000 rural rehabilitation loans. We arranged the financing to permit 20,184 tenant farmers to buy their own farms.

"The real motive underlying these suggestions for stripping the Department of Commerce of its vast financial power has, of course, nothing to do with my competence to administer these powers. The real issue is whether or not the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its giant subsidiaries are be used only to help big business or whether these powers are also to be used to help little business to help carry out the President's commitment of 60,000,000 jobs.

"In other words the question is really one of whether this committee, the Congress and the American public want these enormous financial powers utilized and invested in a free America—in a prosperous America."

Mr. Wallace asked the following question:

"Shall we approach the problems of peace with the same boldness of conception, the same courage and determination as we have approached the problems of war?"

He gives the answer:

"In the answer to these questions lies the future of America. To anyone who has faith in America the answer is clear. The American people are prepared to meet the problems of peace in the same inspiring way that they have met the problems of war. The American people are resolved that we shall insure that the youth of this Nation will never again be called upon to fight in another war.

"And the American people are equally resolved that when our boys return home from this war they shall come back to the brightest possible, the freest possible, the finest possible place on the face of this earth—to a place where all persons, regardless of race, color, creed or place of birth, shall live in peace, honor and dignity—free from want and free from fear."

Mr. Wallace next gave allegiance to the economic bill of rights employed in the President's message not long ago to Congress.

ECONOMIC "BILL OF RIGHTS"

"The economic bill of rights as embodied in the President's message to Congress last January is:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation;

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

"The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

"The right of every family to a decent home;

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident and unemployment;

"The right to a good education.

"We need more hospitals and doctors. We should make sure that such facilities are available and that we build hospitals in every community, rural and urban, that does not now have such facilities for all of its people.

"But this health program must be achieved in the American way. Every person should have the right to go to the doctor and hospital of their own choosing.

"If the Congress does not feel that the powers of the R. F. C. should be exercised in such a way as to further the objectives which I have set forth here, then I respectfully urge the Congress to take the R. F. C. out from under the control of the Commerce Department. For I can tell you here and now that if the R. F. C. is left in the Commerce Department, I will use its powers in the interests of all the American people."

Mr. Wallace emphasizes the war:

"We must now devote all our efforts, and when I say all I mean all, to winning the war. I propose to leave no stone unturned, if confirmed as Secretary of Commerce, to see that every branch, every activity of the Department of Commerce and the agencies under its control, is directed toward the sole purpose of helping to bring the war to a successful and speedy close and of returning our boys home as soon as possible.

"If the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries will remain within the Department of Commerce, I pledge myself to utilize all its powers and resources directly toward speeding up the war effort. But there is one thing that I would like to say in closing: If we are to win this war speedily, we on the home front must all coordinate our efforts to that goal. We must all stick together and work together, as the boys are doing over there. We must bury whatever personal differences stand in the way of attaining that No. 1 goal before us. This is no time for personal and petty controversy.

"Whether the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries are included in the Department of Commerce or not, I will concentrate all of my efforts and the efforts of the Department under me to the winning of the war. I want to make it clear that if it is decided that the R. F. C. should not remain with the Commerce Department, I will carry on the job of Secretary of Commerce until the war ends.

"No soldier on the battlefields can do less than carry out his assignment. Certainly, we on the home front cannot hesitate to do anything less. Both must give their all to the common cause."

One of Mr. Wallace's critics charged that he believed in the dangerous doctrine of wanting to build a better world. To that charge Henry A. Wallace pleads guilty, for he knows that it is for a better world that boys and girls who have not yet got to live are giving their lives, their faces, their future, in every part of the world. He knows that it is for a better world that millions one day held the tears out of their eyes as they said good-bye to many who will never come back. It is for a better world that many an infant gave a father she will never see. Yes, Henry Wallace's fight is your fight and mine. If you believe in having a man in the President's Cabinet to help the President and all those who are fighting for that better world, you will, no doubt, if you do not add your own to the prayers of those who are praying, hope that their prayers will be answered. Your message should reach the Senate by Tuesday.

White Americans Betrayed

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, "using 22 pens," signed the so-called Fair Employment Practice law, passed by the legislature of that State, which will go down in history as the greatest betrayal of the white Americans of New York that State has ever known.

The approval of this measure seems to have been the "hand of Esau and the voice of Jacob."

The object of it is the persecution of white Americans and to finally drive them from the business world.

The people of New York had reason to expect something better from this Charlie McCarthy who now presides over that great Commonwealth, but after his silly performances in the campaign last year, I am sure that many of them were not surprised.

In that campaign he reminded me of Mark Twain's Jumping Frog. His left-wing advisers began rolling super New Deal pellets at him. He swallowed them as they came, until he got so heavy he could hardly get his feet off the platform. He rapidly diminished in stature, like a receding picture, until the night of his final fireside chatter all one could see was a little bemustached midget saying "Now I lay me down to sleep."

As I said on this floor some time ago, the white gentiles of this country still have some rights left, and should be protected from the persecutions they are now compelled to endure. If this drive continues unabated they will be driven entirely from the business world and from the professions, as well as from public life.

Remember that something like 98 percent of the men who are dying on the high seas and the battle fronts of the world to protect American institutions in this war are white gentiles. Yet when one speaks up in their behalf on this floor, in the press, on the radio, or elsewhere, we hear the whine of "anti-Semitism" or the cry of "race prejudice."

The Communist Daily Worker, as well as PM, its uptown edition, and Earl Browder, the head of the Communist Party, are now gloating over Governor Dewey's capitulation. They are saying, in the words of Holy Writ, "He came to us a stranger, and we took him in."

Now the Congress of the United States is being asked to support this persecution of American businessmen throughout the country by the passage of the bill to make permanent the so-called F. E. P. C., which has been set up here in Washington without any legal authority whatsoever, and which is devoting its time to harassing white Americans throughout the country who are trying to carry on their business affairs while their sons are fighting and dying to save this Republic.

If this is the kind of stuff that is going to be forced on the American people at home, I submit we had better look into all these international compacts before we adopt something that might injure, if not destroy, the very freedom for which these boys are now offering up their lives.

Now let us look into this F. E. P. C. that this bill would legalize and make permanent. Remember they want to make it permanent because the appropriations for it are now made without authority of law, and are subject to points of order on the floor of the House.

For the information of the Congress I am going to give you the personnel of this supergovernment that is assuming the power to destroy business enterprise throughout the country, and which probably will soon be invading the schools of the land.

Read it carefully and see how many white gentile Americans you find on the list: only about 1 out of 10. I am taking this list from the records of the central office here in Washington. Here it is:

COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Office of the Chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Maceo	Hearings examiner.	Colored	5,600
Bloch, Emanuel	Hearings examiner.	White	5,600
Cooper, Evelyn	Hearings examiner.	White	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to chairman.	White	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to deputy.	Colored	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Banting, Myra	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes, and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

This is the organization Members of Congress are now being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

FIELD OPERATIONS

Here is the Division of Field Operations:

Field operations

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	$6,500
Mitchell, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Peall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Saito, Otome	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

You will note it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote and with whom they may associate.

By the way, it would be interesting to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

Members of Congress had better do this now before they get caught in this trap because this question of un-American activities is going to be made an issue in every congressional district next year; beginning with the primaries.

The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him, and shout to the people of his district that "I am a Republican," or "I am a Democrat."

More than a million young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

Now, as the old farmer said, take a squint at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt, and how dozens of white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer.

Here is the list:

Review and Analysis Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst.	Colored	3,800
Colightly, Cornelius.	Compliance analyst.	Colored	3,200
Hemphill, India	Compliance analyst.	Colored	2,600
Coan, Carol	Compliance analyst.	White	2,600
Davis, Joy P	Compliance analyst.	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

You will note it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

Now if you sign this petition to bring out this bill, or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war, are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

LEGAL DIVISION

But if you want a real laugh, look at this Legal Division:

Legal Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reeves, Frank D	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	Attorney	White	4,600
Gordon, Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

You will note it consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold. If you want to know who Simon Stickgold is, probably Sidney Hillman can give you the information.

INFORMATION DIVISION

Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit you write to this Division.

Information Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	$3,800
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

Budget and Administration

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer.	Colored	3,200
Baker, Vivian D	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	2,000
Jackson, Bosales A	Clerk-typist	Colored	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A	Clerk-typist	Colored	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	Colored	1,440
Selby, Ralph R	Chief, fiscal	Colored	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B	Voucher auditor	Colored	2,000
Nelson, Otelia	Accounting clerk	Colored	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth.	Accounting clerk	Colored	1,620
Brent, Pearl T	Accounting clerk	Colored	1,620

This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

Now, here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

Mail and files

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored	$2,000
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	Colored	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	Colored	1,620
Phillips, Rose	File clerk	Colored	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	Colored	1,380
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	Colored	1,440

You will note that this Division is composed entirely of Negroes—no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

Now let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

Regional office, New York

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H.	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Jones, Madison S	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
Jones, Robert G	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
Donovan, Daniel R	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	2,000
Asepha, Tillie	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,620
Schwartz, Sonia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,620

This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessmen of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution, the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

Regional office, Philadelphia

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Greenblatt, Mildred.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Manly, Milo A	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
Risk, Samuel R	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Grinnage, Willard	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,440

You will note that it is composed of 8 individuals—5 Negroes and 3 whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area.

REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Now, here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

Regional office, Washington, D. C.

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Kahn, Alice	Fair-practice examiner.	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

Now let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

Regional office, Cleveland

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William.	Regional director.	Colored	$4,600
Abbott, Olcott R.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Glore, Lethia	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Berniza	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Wasem, Edna	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note that it is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by this group?

CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

Cincinnati

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner.	White	$4,600
----------	Clerk-stenographer.	----------	1,800

DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

Detroit

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$4,600
Sese, Doris K.	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,620

You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentlemen from Detroit when you get home next summer if you support this vicious measure.

REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

Here is the list of the regional office in the Windy City:

Regional office, Chicago

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elner	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Gibson Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
Schultz, Joy	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Williams, Le Roy	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

You will note it is composed of five Negroes, two whites, Joy Schultz and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, "We have no Negro members on our board of directors." Then the question came back, "Why haven't you?" This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us, and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer.	White	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

Regional office, Kansas City

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Ormabee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Schlien, Helene G.	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,620

You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

St. Louis

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Armatha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

You will note that it consists of two Negroes and one white. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

Regional office, Dallas

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.	----------	3,200
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Cutleben, seems to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, director, held the same postion he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

Regional office, New Orleans

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	$3,800
Morton, James H.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Ronning, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent white people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

Regional office, San Francisco

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Ross, Bernard	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	White	2,000
Mazen, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

Los Angeles

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera G.	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Lerna, Marie	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,620

You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group; but from what I can hear it is not pleasant to contemplate, to say the least of it.

Mr. Speaker, large numbers of these people have been reported by the Dies committee as being affiliated with subversive front organizations. I shall not go into that record here; but as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities I favor the passage of legislation that will bar any individual from holding any official position in this Government who is now or has at any time been affiliated with subversive activities or subversive organizations of any kind.

This F. E. P. C. is a supergovernment, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed or destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

We have no right to pass such a drastic, revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, if not our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American institutions.

As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

This is a battle for the survival of free government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

It is a battle to save America for Americans.

Dumbarton Oaks Conference Commitments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Strange Alibi Seen on Oaks Commitments," written by David Lawrence and published in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a statement made in the article. The statement is as follows:

It was common knowledge last autumn that Russia objected to empowering the Council to make any decision on enforcement of peace which did not give her a veto.

I do not like to say to the Senate I told you so previously, but anyone who is at all familiar with the Russian Government or the Russian psychology must know that Russia never would consent to any other government saying when she was an aggressor or that they could tell her to stop aggression if she intended to start it. After the Dumbarton Oaks Conference adjourned a great many newspapermen came to me and asked if I would agree to the action taken there. I said at all times that Russia would be the one that would object. It should be recalled that it was the so-called isolationists back in 1918, when the Versailles Treaty was before the Senate, who objected, and said that the United States should have a veto so that other nations could not involve the United States. This time it was Russia that took the position that the so-called isolationists took at that time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"STRANGE ALIBI" SEEN ON OAKS COMMITMENTS

(By David Lawrence)

Everybody would agree that where military questions are involved there should be secrecy, but it has never been asserted by any responsible section of American public opinion that our Government had the right to make secret commitments or to fail to tell the people opportunely about decisions affecting post-war policy.

Yet one of the biggest decisions already taken by our Government toward the future international peace organization was made secretly and now the excuse is being publicized that the American Senate would not have approved if the course had been otherwise.

Last summer and autumn conferences were in progress relating to the charter of the proposed United Nations organization. The meeting at Dumbarton Oaks was participated in by representatives of Great Britain, Russia, and the United States. The press was excluded on the ground that the Conference was preliminary in nature, that the Russians insisted on secrecy, that nothing final was being decided anyway, and that whatever was drafted would be sumbitted for approval to each government and in our case, of course, the Senate is a part of the Government under the Constitution.

MANY SWALLOWED EXCUSE

Many stanch supporters of the administration swallowed that excuse and indignantly characterized persons who felt the step was a piece of trickery in diplomacy as obstructionists or perfectionists. But it turns out now that the draft of what was done at Dumbarton Oaks was not submitted to the Senate for formal consideration or for amendment at all, and that what was agreed to at Dumbarton Oaks now goes before the San Francisco Conference without change and when it comes out of the San Francisco Conference it will have to be approved or rejected by our Senate without a chance for amendment.

Why were the American people not told what their own Government stood for last October at Dumbarton Oaks on the matter of voting procedure for the security council? Did our delegates favor the giving of a veto to any one of the major powers so that each big nation would in effect sit in judgment on its own acts?

It was common knowledge last autumn that Russia objected to empowering the Council to make any decision on enforcement of peace which did not give her a veto. What was the American Government's view? This was kept from the American people and they were given no opportunity between October 1944 and February 1945, when the Yalta Conference was held, to discuss or debate the matter on the basis of authoritative information. Now they are being told that the United States Senate would never have approved of anything but a veto for the United States, anyway, but how do those who take that view know?

The truth is, The isolationists, in the 1920's, took the position that America must retain the right of veto, but, after two world wars, it was thought by some of us that the isolationists were defeated, and certainly in view of the last election, when the result was widely heralded as a defeat for isolationists, one wonders why the President suddenly veered to the isolationist argument.

SLOGAN FORGOTTEN

The record of the Senate in being unwilling to submit issues to arbitration is, of course, bad, but who ventures to say with assurance that the American Senate today would refuse to permit the Security Council to investigate any international dispute in which the United States was a party and would refuse in advance the award of a court of international justice that might adjudge us to have been in the wrong?

Certainly a Senate that was supposed to be ready to approve Senator BALL'S proposition, whereby Congress need not be asked for additional authority to use armed forces when a breach of the peace occurs, could hardly be charged now with a refusal to ratify a treaty in which all nations, large and small, would be required to submit to the majority vote of the council or at least the unanimous vote of all governments except parties to the dispute.

But why should anyone in the executive branch attempt to speak for the Senate in advance? Why shouldn't the American Government view on voting procedure have been made public last October so that the people and the Senate could have debated it? The answer probably is that the administration decided after all that secret diplomacy was best.

This certainly isn't in conformity with the slogan of the World War which promised an end to the vice of secret diplomacy and offered in its place a formula of candor and publicity epigrammatically phrased by the

late President Wilson as "open covenants openly arrived at." Dumbarton Oaks is an example of the exact opposite. And now reports are being circulated, inspired by the administration, to the effect that the voting procedure adopted at Yalta for the Security Council was not so much an appeasement of Marshal Stalin as an appeasement of the Senate and particularly the Republicans in the Senate.

It's a strange alibi.

Raising of the American Flag Over Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1945

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senate was good enough yesterday to grant unanimous consent for the insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD of a letter which I wrote to Mr. Kent Cooper, head of the Associated Press, congratulating that organization upon the memorable photograph of the raising of our flag on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, taken by Associated Press photographer, Joe Rosenthal.

I am now in receipt of a letter from Mr. Paul Miller, assistant general manager of the Associated Press, sending me a copy of Mr. Rosenthal's story of how he came to make the photograph. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Miller's letter and Mr. Rosenthal's story be printed in the Apendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and story were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1945.

The Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Thank you for the copy of your letter to Mr. Cooper. I want you to know how much your interest is appreciated.

It occurs to me you might like to see Joe Rosenthal's own story about that picture, just as received on our wires today. I attach a copy.

With best wishes to you,
Sincerely yours,

PAUL MILLER.

MOUNT SURIBACHI
(By Joe Rosenthal)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The picture of a group of United States marines raising the flag atop Mount Suribachi on the south end of Iwo Island has been acclaimed all over the Nation as one of the most dramatic pictures of the war. The photographer who took that picture is Joe Rosenthal, a short, jolly, wiry, mustached fellow who will go anywhere to record a stirring action. Here, for the first time he tells the background of that Suribachi picture.)

GUAM, March 7.—"See that spot of red on the mountainside?" the bos'n shouted above the noise of our landing craft nearing the shore at the base of Suribachi Yama.

"A group of marines is climbing up to plant our flag up there. I heard it from the radioman."

He was plenty excited—and so was I.

The fall of this 560-foot fortress in 4 days of gallant marine fighting was a great thing. A good story and we should have good pictures.

So in I went, back to more of that slogging through the deep volcanic sand, warily sidestepping the numerous Japanese mines. On, past the culverts where the Japanese dead lay among the wreckage of their gun positions and up the steep, winding, always sandy trail.

Marine Pvt. Bob Campbell, a San Francisco buddy of mine, and Sgt. Bill Janausk, of Tacoma, Wash., were with me and carried firearms for protection (which is disallowed to correspondents).

There was still an occasional sharp crack of rifle fire close by and the mountainside had a porcupine appearance of bristling all over, what with machine and antiaircraft guns peering from the dugouts, fox holes, and caves. There was little sign of life from these enemy spots, however. Our men were systematically "blowing out" these places and we had to be on our toes to keep clear of our own demolition squads.

As the trail became steeper, our panting progress slowed to a few yards at a time. I began to wonder and hope that this was worth the effort when suddenly over the brow of the topmost ridge we could spy men working with the flagpole they had so laboriously brought up about three-quarters of an hour ahead of us.

I came up and stood by a few minutes until they were ready to swing the flag-bearing pole into position.

I crowded back on the inner edge of the volcano's rim, back as far as I could, in order to include all I could into the scene within the angle covered by my camera lens.

I rolled up a couple of large stones and a Japanese sandbag to raise my short height clear of an intervening obstruction. I followed up this shot with another of a group of cheering marines and then I tried to find the four men I heard were the actual instigators of the grand adventure. But they had scattered to their units and I finally gave it up and descended the mountain to get the pictures out and on their way to possible publication.

The way down was quite a bit easier, the path becoming well worn and men were carrying ammunition, supplies, food, and rations necessary for complete occupation of this stronghold.

The marine history will record Iwo Jima as high in their many gallant actions in the Pacific war.

I have two very vivid memories: The fury of their D-day assault and the thrill of that lofty flag-raising episode.

It is hard now in the quiet atmosphere of this advance base to find words for it. The marines at Iwo Jima were magnificent.

War Plant Investigations in Detroit

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in reading in the papers this morning the result of the investigation in the war plants in Detroit. That brought to my mind, when I read of the tremendous waste of manpower, the idleness and the loafing that some of the very able Members of the House insisted that we pass a bill which failed to provide for investigation of such instances and which would drive more men into the war plants of the Nation at the expense of the Government, without securing greater production.

Mr. Speaker, this body made a great mistake in passing the May committee bill. This body should now try to overcome, and rectify its error. The Senate bill recently passed is a distinct improvement over the House bill; however, I believe the Members of this House can and should improve it and place itself in a position to bring about such improvement.

Management and labor both this week in Detroit where a Senate committee is making an investigation, state that production can be increased from 15 to 40 percent by utilizing men already employed. The Senate committee is uncovering shocking and I might say almost a treasonable waste of manpower. The Members of this House can yet so act as to help solve the manpower problem and save our taxpayers billions of dollars. It can also help to bring about greater production. The conditions prevailing in Detroit, prevail all over the Nation.

What we need is hundreds of investigations in all plants. This rotten mess should be exposed and cleaned up everywhere. Why does not the administration step to one side, withdraw its opposition, and allow legislation to be passed that will do the job? Is the administration determined to keep the people and the press from learning how badly it has bungled in the handling of labor and production in building our war machine?

Crowding more men taken from the farms and civilian industry into these already overstaffed plants will only make matters worse and add to the national debt. Congress can and should prevent such action.

Consent by Supreme Court To Hear Argument in Hatch Act Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story from yesterday's Washington Evening Star. The title of the story is "Supreme Court Agrees to Hear Argument in Hatch Act Case."

I merely wish to say in this connection, Mr. President, that I am very glad the Supreme Court has taken jurisdiction of this case, and I am hopeful that a decision will soon be rendered, because the action that was brought charges that the act violates certain constitutional rights, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly,

and other matters which are of far more importance than the political activity of Federal employees.

I, of course, have my own views as to the constitutionality of the act. Briefly I may say that every person is guaranteed freedom of speech, freedom of political activity, freedom of assembly, and every other constitutional right. I would be the last person in this body to seek to deprive any citizen of those rights, but I may add that no person has a constitutional right to work for the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT AGREES TO HEAR ARGUMENTS IN HATCH ACT CASE—U. F. W. APPEAL PROVIDES FIRST MAJOR TEST OF CURB ON UNITED STATES WORKERS' POLITICAL ACTIVITY

The way was cleared today for the first Supreme Court test of the Hatch Act barring political activity by Government employees. The Court agreed to hear a case instituted by the C. I. O. United Federal Workers of America which charged the prohibition violates the constitutional rights of "freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly."

The Court announced that the issue of jurisdiction raised by the Government would be considered when the case came up for argument on its merits. The date of argument is still to be fixed.

The union appealed to the Supreme Court after a three-judge district court here refused to enjoin the Civil Service Commission from enforcing the law.

The Government had urged that the appeal be rejected, a Justice Department brief contending that it had not been filed within the time allotted for such proceedings, and that the Court therefore could not take jurisdiction.

The act was passed in 1939, and an earlier case had given the Court an opportunity to pass on its validity, but the litigation was decided on other grounds.

The provision attacked provides for the dismissal of officers and employees of the executive agencies who "take any active part in political management or political campaigns." Exempted are the official family of the President, heads and assistant heads of agencies, and policy-making officials.

The union said this difference as between groups was discriminatory. The lower court responded that those persons exempted "are in a very large measure political. No one supposes they would not change with the changing of administrations."

The Court said the legislation "does not seek to take away from a Government employee his right to vote, nor his right to express his opinion on all political subjects." What it does do, it was added, is to regulate the conduct of nonclassified employees in the same measure as that of civil-service workers, and correspondingly to safeguard them from the insecurity of tenure attributable to political affiliation.

Fair Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in Passenger Transport for February 16, 1945:

FAIR ENOUGH

The past month has seen an increasing number of sore spots in the transit map of the country. By sore spots, we mean communities that are displeased with their transit operation and are trying to do something about it.

In their approach to the problem many of these communities, the civic organizations which serve them, and their respective local newspapers have taken a shortsighted attitude toward the operating company supplying the service. Delegations have been sent to Washington; mass protest meetings have been held; resolutions have been sent to governmental authorities; mayors and councilmen have made fiery speeches and given equally fiery interviews; newspapers have editorialized and investigated.

For the most part, the weight of all these protestations has been directed at the local transit company itself or its responsible operating officials. This attitude has been taken despite the excellent wartime records of the transit industry—despite the knowledge of Federal regulatory action and the shortages in manpower, replacement and maintenance parts, and new transit vehicles.

But little has been accomplished, not because the transit industry and its operating components haven't tried, not because the riding public and their elected servants haven't fought, but because in this critical war era tanks and guns and ships come first. That is the truth of the matter.

It is refreshing therefore to find one sore spot—Brooklyn—where leadership has arisen that is both fair-minded and forward-looking. Read what Harold Arens, president of the South Brooklyn Board of Trade has to say on the subject:

"We accept the fact that the present transportation situation is critical and may get worse before the war is over, but we also feel that little can be gained by the current wave of complaints which are negative criticism.

"Therefore we plan to discuss the advisability of forming a borough-wide committee, composed of representative Brooklyn leaders to conduct a continuing survey of the borough's transit needs. Such a group will be of great value by consulting with officials charged with operating the transit system and will be in a position to keep these officials alert, not only to the general needs of the people of Brooklyn, but also to the specific needs of various neighborhoods."

That's fair enough. It is to be hoped that other communities will follow Brooklyn's lead in this matter, for any local transit company will surely welcome the active cooperation and study which such a civic enterprise makes possible.

Keeping the Agricultural Record Straight, No. I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, several times I have heard of the profits of the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with various activities. One of these so-called profit operations has been on peanuts.

The Commodity Credit Corporation takes over the whole crop and has a monopoly of the business. They can charge all the traffic will bear and the consumer is compelled to pay 30 cents per pound in the shell and 40 to 50 cents per pound or more when shelled.

The profits on the peanuts sold to the public is some $30 per ton as would be expected of any monopoly.

The following is a letter from the Commodity Credit Corporation as of February 26, 1945:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1945.

Hon REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: Reference is made to our telephone conversation of February 23 in which you requested certain information concerning the peanut programs for the 1943 and 1944 crops.

Following is the data requested for the 1943 crop (round figures):

	Tons	Loss	Gain
Farmers' stock peanuts purchased by Commodity Credit Corporation	888,884		
Sold to shellers	644,000		$19,000,000
Sold to crushers	212,000	$11,000,000	
Sold for seed at no gain or loss	28,000		
Fire and shrinkage loss	4,000	180,000	
Peanut butter subsidy payments		8,250,000	
Loss on crushing of No. 2 shelled peanuts	8,000	780,000	
Interest payments		145,000	
Administrative and other expenses of the cooperative producer associations acting as designated agencies of Commodity Credit Corporation		280,000	
Grading expenses paid to the Fruit and Vegetable Branch, U. S. Department of Agriculture		190,000	
Total		20,825,000	19,000,000
Approximate net loss		1,825,000	

These figures show the picture to January 1, 1945. After January 1, there has been additional loss resulting from the crushing of No. 2 shelled peanuts and from subsidy payments on peanut butter manufactured from 1943-crop peanuts.

As to the 1944 crop, our best estimates indicate that the loss will not exceed $10,000,000. You realize, of course, that this greater loss is partly due to the fact that the prices paid producers were approximately $20 per ton higher than those paid under the 1943-crop program.

Sincerely yours,

W. T. PARKER,
Chief, Peanut Section, Oilseeds Division.

It is evident that when $160 is paid for a ton of peanuts yielding 600 pounds of oil the oil costs the Government some 26 cents per pound or twice the O. P. A. ceiling of 13 cents per pound. A 100-percent subsidy for the oil is a rather large subsidy for a vegetable oil or any other product.

This letter shows the true picture. It shows that the Commodity Credit Corporation has not make any profit and in fact is taking a loss on the crop. I am not discussing the wisdom of the program—I am proving that loose statements of new dealers in connection with profits are of little value.

This is just one more of the many examples.

The National Debt and Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter which I received from Mr. Arthur G. Sherman, of Detroit, Mich. Mr. Sherman is a friend and a constituent. Although he has been devoted to the war effort and has saved the Government vast sums of money, nevertheless he has found time to delve into the economic problems of our country. In this letter he discusses one aspect which is worthy of consideration:

DETROIT, MICH., *February 24, 1945.*
The Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RABAUT: Here is the reason why we will never be able to pay off the national debt through income-tax collections.

The national debt represents the accumulated savings of those who had income in excess of their current living needs before or during the war which made it possible for them to invest their surplus income (amounting to $300,000,000,000) in Government bonds.

If we have good business after the war, this same group will continue to have income in excess of their current requirements and will not need to cash their bonds for living or business expenses. In fact, they will continue to accumulate additional surplus funds with which they will desire to buy additional Government securities.

Now, if under these conditions we try to pay off the national debt through the collection of income taxes, we will be confronted with the following facts:

To pay income taxes we must produce and sell goods and services so that the goods and services can be converted into dollars which can be paid to the United States Treasury. The Treasury can then pay the bondholders the dollars so collected to retire the bonds. Now the bondholders must step into the market and buy the goods and services their bond dollars represented or these goods and services will not be consumed and it will be impossible for the people to sell more goods or services to raise more tax dollars. Such a surplus of unconsumed products will force a shut-down of business and precipitate a panic.

The fact that the bondholders represent that portion of our population which had income in excess of their need to the tune of $300,000,000,000, and current income in times of prosperity in continuing excess of current requirements, should show the folly of trying to convert their bonds into goods and services which they don't want and cannot consume.

To present this problem in just a little different manner, let us assume that the $300,000,000,000 national debt is owned by the richest 10 percent of the population. (Most likely within a few years after the end of the war, most of the E bonds in the hands of the workingman will have been cashed and replaced by bonds purchased by the banks and the wealthy.) On the basis of our 1930 to 1939 standard of living, 10 percent of the population would normally consume some $6,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. As the bondholders we are speaking of comprise the richest 10 percent of the population, we could allow them a better than average standard of living and assume that this 10 percent of the population would consume one and one-half times the average share, giving them nine billions of income and consumption power.

Now, if we propose to pay off the national debt at the rate of $9,000,000,000 per year, this 10 percent of the population which has a normal income of $9,000,000,000 would at once be forced to consume another $9,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. Instead of eating three meals daily, they would have to eat six meals per day, sleep in two beds every day, wear two suits of clothes, etc. If, in addition to the principal payment on the bond, we include the interest payment due this group on the national debt, we must add another six to nine billions of dollars to the sum they must consume, making this group eat (on the average) nine meals per day, etc. This is of course impossible due to the human limitation of one stomach per person.

It is equally absurd to expect this group to find suitable source of investment opportunity for these excess dollars. In the pre-war period this same group could not find investment opportunity for a far smaller surplus, which caused the worst depression in our history. To consider exporting this surplus would amount to giving away products our own people need.

Careful study cannot fail to convince the thoughtful that we dare not collect income taxes to pay either the interest or principal on the national debt unless we want to precipiate an immediae post-war panic which will make our last depression look like good times.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR G. SHERMAN.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the matter of Federal aid for education is a subject which is being widely discussed at this time, both in and out of Congress. This matter is one of great importance and up to date at least it has been very controversial.

Perhaps the most serious objection which has been advanced to Federal aid is based upon the fear that this will mean Federal control of education. This question is discussed in a letter which I have recently received from Dr. Bryan S. Stoffer, president of Washburn Municipal University, Topeka, Kans. It seems to me that the suggestions which Dr. Stoffer makes with respect to this matter should be thoroughly discussed and considered, and for that reason, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am submitting Dr. Stoffer's letter herewith:

WASHBURN MUNICIPAL UNIVERSITY,
Topeka, Kans., March 5, 1945.
Congressman CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOPE: For some time bills have been introduced into the Congress of the United States providing for Federal aid for teachers' salaries. There are two major reasons advanced for such an appropriation. First, there is gross inequality in the amount of money available for the support of the schools in the various sections of the United States. Second, teachers' salaries in many areas are unduly low, resulting in a very serious school situation. Both of the above reasons are sound and deserve very serious consideration.

Unfortunately, there are implications involved in such appropriations other than the raising of salaries for village teachers. While the bills in question indicate that the appropriation is to be made directly to States concerned without restrictions, it is evident that there is a very real danger of the possibility of Federal control either directly or indirectly, not only of the teacher's position, but also of his ideology. I recognize that there is a similar danger to local autonomy if and when the States of the Union make contributions to local units for educational purposes. However, in the latter case any political danger involved would be limited strictly to one State area and probably would be checked before any very serious results could follow.

On the other hand, if Federal control of education should become a reality, it would be a very long step toward totalitarianism, both in the form of control and in ideology. We have seen enough of this type of control in other parts of the world to force us to scrutinize very carefully any proposal which has the slightest possibility in this direction.

I have served abroad for 12 years in south India under an educational system which had government grants both for teachers' salaries and for buildings. Again and again I was reminded by members of the faculty that it would be unwise for the institution and the teachers of the institution to express themselves forcibly upon certain very critical public issues. Such an expression might result in the loss of the grant from the provincial government. Not only was this the result when certain specific issues came before the province, but also members of the faculty were very hesitant to make their opinions known, fearing that it might result in the loss of salary. In such situations, freedom of thought and expression was very decidedly limited.

Having had this experience over a period of 12 years, I am convinced that any program in the United States which might eventually lead to such a situation would be decidedly unwise. I realize fully that the present bills expressly forbid any dictation by the Federal Government. However, if and when grants are made over long periods of time, it is only natural and normal that the organizations making the grants will tend to insist upon more and more control and direction.

I appreciate the force of the argument that a great deal of wealth migrates from the hinterland into the great cities. Much of this wealth is taxed not in the hinterland, but in the States where these cities are located. As in the case of Federal grants for highways, so also, I believe, a compromise measure might be adopted wherein Federal grants might be made available for buildings and equipment in local areas. Such grants would tend to return to the hinterlands some of the wealth which in reality they have produced and which ought to be used for the education of the children who live in those hinterlands. Furthermore, many of these children will later migrate to the great centers, and unless they are given equal opportunity in the field of education, even the cities themselves will suffer serious handicaps therefrom. Grants for building purposes need not and cannot very well result in Federal dictation except possibly in the standards necessary in construction of the buildings. As far as I can see this would not be a handicap, but probably should be done in any case. The danger of Federal control would be practically eliminated, even as it is in the case of the public highways. The local areas being

relieved of a part of the burden in the construction of the buildings would be able, with their more limited resources, to use all of their funds for the payment of teachers' salaries and current expenses.

I am making this suggestion at the present time, believing that it may be one way of solving the problem which is before the Nation. Such Federal grants to institutions under public control should not be limited to elementary and secondary schools, but should also be made available to institutions of higher education.

In case there should be a real problem of unemployment following the war, a Federal program of this type would help to meet the unemployment situation and would be decidedly constructive and for the permanent benefit of the young people of America. Since the payment of the current huge Federal debt will very largely devolve upon the young of the oncoming generations, it seems to me that as much as possible should be done to provide for their welfare in a constructive fashion.

If this suggestion should meet with your approval, I shall be very glad to have you make any use of it that you desire. I am sending copies of this same letter to other Congressmen and Senators in our area.

With appreciation of the splendid service which you are now rendering, and with every personal good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

BRYAN S. STOFFER.

Lower Taxes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial on the subject of lower taxes, which appeared recently in the Chelsea Evening Record, Chelsea, Mass.:

LOWER TAXES?

The other day the House Appropriations Committee took a significant step when it earmarked four and a half billion dollars for payment of interest on the national debt. Two years hence the charges will be near the $6,000,000,000 mark, judging from anticipated costs of the war.

Add to that heavy expenditures toward rehabilitating and caring for our disabled veterans, carrying the cost of everyday Federal government with its record load of Government employees (some call them bureaucrats), and maintaining adequate national defense—and it may be seen at a glance that Uncle Sam's post-war financial burden is going to be a heavy one. What is left will go toward amortization of the huge public debt.

What then may we expect in the way of tax deduction—individual and corporate?

The answer seems to be: Comparatively little.

The thought of reduced taxes is, of course, a popular one. Wage earners, and those of Chelsea are no exception, look with increasing interest toward the day when payroll deductions will be a thing of the past, when the tax rate will have been cut drastically and when March 15 will hold no terrors. That is, for the nonce, wishful thinking. It is only natural that our legislators—who are basically politicians with an ear to the ground—will be thinking in terms of tax relief for their constituents. Faced with the tremendous task of raising enormous sums for National Government, there is little they can do.

At the moment tax planners are trying to work out some means of reducing taxes for the low-income group, and of cutting corporation taxes so that more money may be attracted to the investment field, thus assuring more industries and more jobs.

There is little likelihood that there will be any change whatsoever in 1945 rates. They will apply throughout the year. There is a chance that 1946 rates may be cut for the last 6 months if Japan is defeated by mid-year. The broader outlook is that 1947 will be the first year in which any major tax adjustments may be expected.

Off to a Good Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 7, 1945:

OFF TO A GOOD START

The outlook for comprehensive reorganization of Congress appears brighter today than at any time since a handful of determined legislators and political scientists began working on the problem several years ago. For a time it appeared that the tragic death of Senator Maloney, head of the Senate-House Committee on Congress, might disrupt the plans for a penetrating survey of our National Legislature. Now, however, the committee has made a remarkable come-back. It has named Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., as its new chairman, reappointed Representative MIKE MONRONEY vice chairman and chosen Dr. George B. Galloway to head its research staff.

Senator LA FOLLETTE is as closely identified with the move to strengthen Congress as Senator Maloney was. His elevation to the chairmanship not only assures the committee of vigorous leadership but also emphasizes its nonpartisan character. The Wisconsin Progressive was obviously given this assignment solely because of his long experience in the Senate and his interest in the subject. Indeed, he has already made studies of his own and on the basis of those studies has sought to improve the workings of the Senate. A year and a half ago he proposed that the rules of the Senate be modified to reduce the number of standing committees from 33 to 13. He has persistently sought to relieve Members of Congress of trivial chores and center their attention on major issues of national policy.

Like many other thoughtful legislators, Senator LA FOLLETTE also knows that Congress has little chance of maintaining its role as the chief policy-making agency of a great Nation if its Members are able to devote an average of only about 10 percent of their time to legislation. "No person familiar with the situation in the Senate today," he said in discussing his resolution, "can deny that there is a pressing need for committee reorganization and for the streamlining of the legislative branch of the Government if it is to survive in the struggle for power which is bound to continue."

Further guaranty that the study now actually launched will be no superficial cloak for the granting of new congressional privileges may be found in the appointment of Dr. Galloway. As head of the American Political Science Association's Committee on Congress, Dr. Galloway has made the most thorough exploration of this subject that we know of. Nor has he peered into it from an ivory tower. He has worked actively with Members of Congress, understands their viewpoints and has their confidence. Like Senator LA FOLLETTE, he sees the problem not as the inauguration of a series of pin-point reforms but as a major task of adjusting our legislative machinery to the exacting demands of this complicated and turbulent age.

At bottom it is a question of preserving democracy. In this country Congress is the body that speaks for the people in the shaping of domestic policy and in approving much of our foreign policy. It must be equal to its enlarged responsibilities or we shall have to resign ourselves to some form of executive control. The reorganization of congressional committees, the granting of adequate staffs, the establishment of a pensions system, the centralization of leadership and improvement of relations with the Executive are only means to the end of strengthening our representative system. This major objective appears to be the point of take-off for the special committee's study, as it was for Dr. Galloway's report to the A. P. S. A. If Congress follows through in this important undertaking, it may well prove to be a landmark in the history of self-government in the United States.

Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a letter which I have received from Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1945.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN SPENCE: I am writing to advise you of the support of the American Farm Bureau Federation of pending legislation to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, and provide an increase in its maximum borrowing limit, so as to enable it to carry on its functions. We also favor a proposed amendment to H. R. 2023, now pending before the House, which would include the so-called Taft amendment, now contained in S. 298, but with certain changes.

One proposed change would provide an increase of $68,000,000 in the funds for dairy production payments, in addition to the amount permitted under the bill as passed by the Senate. Another proposed change would make available the subsidy funds on a yearly basis instead of a 6-month basis.

As you know, we have consistently opposed subsidies in lieu of price adjustments, but until the present policy of subsidy payments is discontinued, it is vitally necessary to provide adequate funds to enable farmers to offset their increased costs and meet their production goals.

If these increased funds are provided, it will make it possible to avert the reduction

in dairy production payments to milk producers, which was recently announced. Unless this situation is corrected, it may result in a serious reduction in milk production.

It is vitally important that Congress act speedily in this legislation, so that farmers, before completing their production plans for this year, may be assured that adequate authority and funds will be available to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out its price-support programs.

You are at liberty to use this letter in any manner you see fit in behalf of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL, *President.*

Delegation of Power by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. EARTHMAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, while at this point I do not subscribe wholly to the contentions of the writer of the following editorial, which I wish to insert, realizing the necessity in time of war of unusual power being given to our President in order to expedite victory, however I feel that the following editorial is worthy of our careful consideration that we, as Members of Congress, might not be unmindful of the reaction of the general public toward our responsibility for their protection from error in government:

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) Daily News of March 10, 1945]

WHAT FOOLS THESE CONGRESSMEN BE

Never in the history of the Constitution of the United States has the people's governing body—the Congress—been so grossly insulted as it was the other afternoon by a Rooseveltian stooge by the name of Mrs. Ethel Gilbert, head of the O. P. A. Office of Industry Advisory Committee, when she ordered Representatives "JIMMY" MORRISON, HAROLD EARTHMAN, and JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., to leave a meeting between O. P. A. heads and strawberry growers of the South. The growers had requested the presence of MORRISON, a Democrat from Louisiana; EARTHMAN, Democrat, and JENNINGS, Republican, both of Tennessee, at the meeting for their own protection.

The three Congressmen, acting the roles of chastised school children, accepted this woman's directive to leave the room while members of the Office of Price Administration's price panel "fixed" prices on strawberries.

What fools these two Democrats and one Republican were to permit themselves to be pushed around by a woman who wastes her time and our money sitting around Washington thinking up little rules that exclude Representatives of the people at meetings where she enacts the role of a czarina.

What fools our Congressmen have made of themselves in permitting Franklin Delano Roosevelt to set himself up as lord and master of the O. P. A., which in turn has permitted him to hand down this kind of advice to a woman, who flaunts Congress' mistake of giving her and F. D. R. such far-reaching powers.

When Congressman MORRISON demanded the reasons for his exclusion from the meeting he was told in no kindly tones by Mrs. Gilbert that she controlled the policy for these industry advisory meetings and that she would not let Senators and Representatives attend. When the gentleman from Louisiana demanded to know by what authority she exercised this power he was immediately informed by Mrs. Gilbert:

"The authority you Congressmen gave me—believe me, I use it."

Right here is the initial warning to all Congressmen that unless they immediately strip the President of many of his dictatorial powers the Constitution of the United States will find itself classified with the Atlantic Charter—a piece of paper that's not worth the words written on it.

Such things as the chasing of three of our Congressmen from an O. P. A. meeting by a power-crazed skirted dictator must be stamped out the way we would a rattlesnake before it had a chance to strike the second time. Certainly, if she is permitted to get away with barring Congressmen from her secret meetings there is no reason for us to believe otherwise than she will take advantage of the millions of innocents who are forced to abide by the O. P. A. rules.

The Congress of the United States has been made to appear very foolish in the eyes of the American people, and unless it corrects its policy of blind obedience of all Presidential directives it will go down in history as having been inhabited by more fools than any other law-making body in the world.

I, too, feel, with all there is within me, that it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to use its authority in behalf of the people, lest we become weak, blind fools in their estimation.

If conditions are not right with the agencies of our Government, then let us admit it, face it, and fix it. This applies to O. P. A. also.

Resolutions Urging Immediate Relief to Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein resolutions memorializing the War Food Administration for immediate relief to farmers in the existing emergency pertaining to the hay situation.

Resolutions memorializing the War Food Administration for immediate relief to farmers in the existing emergency pertaining to the hay situation

Whereas the present critical conditions pertaining to the supply of feed for livestock are causing enormous loss to Massachusetts dairy farmers who are faced with the problem of purchasing hay at $50 per ton which causes their costs for said feed to exceed their income from dairying operations; and

Whereas hundreds of farmers have gone into debt by reason of said feed situation and find that their credit has been greatly impaired; and

Whereas said farmers by reason of said conditions, and also due to their inability to better their financial status because of the governmental regulation of prices, are faced with impoverishment, and unless immediate relief from their serious financial predicament is provided, they will be forced to sell their cows for slaughter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the War Food Administration to immediately take such action as may be necessary to put into effect the following proposals:

1. The extension of the 90 cents per hundred milk subsidy, so called, to July 1 in the current year;

2. The immediate payment of the present subsidy for the months of January and February in the current year;

3. Monthly payments of the subsidy until July in the current year;

4. Continuance of efforts to provide adequate facilities for shipping and transporting feed for livestock;

5. An investigation of the entire problem of such feed supply, particularly with a view to determining whether there is any so-called holding back of hay for the purpose of influencing the price thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the State secretary to the War Food Administrator and to the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth.

In House of Representatives, adopted, March 8, 1945.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

In Senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 8, 1945.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

Bretton Woods Means 5,000,000 Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended me, I would like to include the following discussion of the Bretton Woods agreements, published in pamphlet form by the Congress of Industrial Organizations. I know that Members of the House are vitally interested in the position of organized labor on so important an issue as Bretton Woods. The full text of the pamphlet follows:

FIVE MILLION JOBS FOR UNITED STATES

Jobs for 5,000,000 American workers from foreign trade are in sight—when Congress passes a law ratifying an agreement made in a little New Hampshire resort town in the summer of 1944.

The agreement, which went under a long official title, "United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference," was signed by the United States and by 43 other countries. It aims to do four basic things:

1. Guarantee jobs and prosperity for all countries through free international trade.

2. Prevent financial and economic aggression of the kind that helped Germany and Japan prepare for this war.

3. Make it impossible for financial interests in this and other countries to help foreign aggressors, the way Germany and Japan were helped before this war.

4. Raise the standard of living in backward countries to the point where they can buy the things we make.

JOBS FIRST

First, the question of jobs for American workers. President Roosevelt and C. I. O. president Murray have set the goal at 60,000,000 jobs to keep America secure and prosperous after the war.

A big slice of these jobs must come from foreign trade. As President Murray has pointed out in his C. I. O. reemployment plan:

"The continued prosperity of Americans is directly tied to the prosperity of people of all other nations. In addition to a domestic program for full production in the United States, there must be a vigorous long-term program of international commerce."

Now, foreign trade doesn't just happen. People in other countries have to have something more than just the desire for American goods. They have to have the money to buy them with.

In the days before this war, people who wanted to buy goods from other countries got the money only when and if private banking interests were pleased to let them have it.

REMEMBER THE THIRTIES?

Frequently these private banking interests took advantage of weaker or more backward nations to exploit them and their people by keeping them backward.

Those who remember the thirties will recall how some countries deliberately drove down the value of their own money in order to undercut other countries on exports.

The other countries then, of course, tried the same thing. This destroyed world trade. And with that destruction of world trade came, also, in the thirties, the most terrible depression in history and the preparation for World War No. 2.

The only countries that profited out of this world-trade chaos were the Fascist countries preparing for war. They used their superior economic strength to force weaker countries to give them valuable raw materials in exchange for worthless goods. This was done by the Nazis, who paid for imports in blocked marks, spendable only in Germany. For these blocked marks the exporting country usually got nothing better than harmonicas or aspirin.

HOW IT WORKS

Foreign trade is a two-way street. To sell goods to a country, you have to buy things in return. One country cannot expect to go indefinitely selling to its neighbors unless its neighbors can sell to it.

For steady payment you need steady currencies. A United States exporter must be sure of getting his price for his exports in dollars. A Frenchman buying United States goods must be sure of a steady price that he pays for them in francs. If the rate of exchange—that is, the number of francs it takes to equal a United States dollar, changes sharply against the franc, the deal is off because it will take many more francs to buy the same amount of United States goods.

Neither the United States exporter nor his European customer control the rate of exchange. All they know is that suddenly the cost of the United States product to the European customer has been jerked up—and the customer for United States goods is jerked away.

All the United States exporter can do is to try to cut his price, which usually means an attempt at a wage cut, or stop exporting, which means lay-offs.

THE FUND

This is where the international monetary fund proposed at Bretton Woods comes in. Countries whose currencies may be threatened with a deep cut in exchange value can come to the fund and borrow either gold or dollars or some other exchange medium to restore their own currency to health.

Thus they will not be forced to drive their own currencies down in order to stimulate exports and cut down on imports. Weaker countries will be protected against the "harmonica and aspirin" kind of deal that helped Germany arm for World War No. 2.

THE BANK

But stable currencies are not enough. Countries wasted by war and undeveloped countries will need loans to rebuild and to develop. They will need money to help them get started on buying American products.

This is where the Bank for International Reconstruction and Development proposed at Bretton Woods comes in. Long-term loans will be guaranteed by the bank, after investigation to make sure the borrowing country plans to use the money in a productive way and, therefore, will be able to repay the loan.

Control of these loans will not be with one banker or with a group of bankers. Control will be with the United Nations, which will see to it that loans do not mean exploitation and imperialism as they used to mean.

PROFIT FOR ALL

As United States Treasury Secretary Morgenthau has said of Bretton Woods, loans will be made "to promote sound industry and increase industrial and agricultural production in nations whose economic potentialities have not yet been developed."

Our hope for 5,000,000 jobs through foreign trade lies in the industrialization of nations and continents such as China, Africa, Latin America, India, and a big expansion of industry in the Soviet Union.

This means profit for all. We do not have to be afraid of competition from these countries. On the contrary, the more they are built up, the more they can buy from us. Canada is a highly industrialized country and has always been one of our best customers.

In a peaceful and stable world, made possible by the Bretton Woods kind of planning, the fact that millions of people have well-paid jobs in other countries will mean millions of well-paid jobs for us.

WHAT'S ITS COST?

What is the cost of Bretton Woods? The new bank and the new fund will, of course, take money to set up and run. It will be a pretty big investment to start with, $10,000,000,000 for the bank and $8,800,0000,000 for the fund.

The United States' share of this investment in world stability will be $3,200,000,000 for the bank and $2,800,000,000 for the fund. The United States is the world's richest country, and will have the largest say in controlling both bank and fund.

This money is invested, not spent. Countries that borrow from both the bank and the fund will repay the loans. The fact that loans will be made only for productive purposes is the guaranty of that.

WHO'S AGAINST IT?

You might think that there would be no opposition to such a sound and sensible plan as Bretton Woods. At the time the agreement was worked out in the summer of 1944, there was very little—and it wasn't vocal.

Only a handful of die-hard Republicans, led by Senator TAFT in Congress, opposed Bretton Woods then. TAFT'S criticism was the false one that it would cost United States taxpayers a lot of money. He ignored the fact that our share of the total—$6,000,000,000—is an investment, not an expenditure.

But since the agreement was signed a small section of big bankers in this country and in England has decided to oppose Bretton Woods. Not too publicly, of course, but the decision has been made to fight it.

This decision is based on a professed fear that Bretton Woods will wipe out private banking. This is not so, since banks will continue to make loans—supervised by the Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

THE REAL REASON

The real reason behind this minority opposition is a hankering for the "good old days" of uncontrolled currency manipulation, uncontrolled lending, and speculative profits for the few.

The big banks didn't lose anything when countries such as Germany defaulted on loans. That loss was taken by the suckers who bought German bonds from the banks. In the same way, a handful of banks made big profits on loans to "backward" countries that were used, not for production, but solely for the purpose of extracting high interest rates.

UP TO CONGRESS

The Bretton Woods agreement is up to Congress, which will have to pass a law authorizing the United States to join in the bank and the fund and appropriating the money for the original investment.

Congress thus has to decide whether or not we will have those 5,000,000 jobs in foreign trade. A bill to do this is being prepared, will be offered early in 1945.

Start writing your Congressman and your two Senators now. Urge them to make Bretton Woods a reality by voting the full amount needed from the United States to start it working. Urge them to reject all limiting or crippling amendments.

Five million jobs isn't hay.

The Insurance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement with reference to the merchant marine moratorium bill recently enacted:

The effect of this act is to establish as far as can be done a moratorium until January 1, 1948, insofar as the effect of the Supreme Court decision in the Southeastern Underwriters Association case is concerned, except that boycott, coercion, and intimidation are not included in that moratorium. This moratorium or suspension is for the purpose of giving an opportunity for the States, the insurance companies, Congress, and the people of the country to determine what ought to be done. First, to adjust the confused situation in which we find ourselves as a result of the Supreme Court decision referred to; and second, to determine where the control of the insurance business should lie.

It seems clear that in order for the States to have a chance to retain that control, they must demonstrate their ability properly to govern the business of insurance. Insurance companies should do their best to remove from their practices anything which may be detrimental to the public interest. In my mind there is something far more important involved than insurance. This shifting of governmental power away from the States to the Federal organization is an increasing threat against our democratic system of Government. Federal organization cannot handle all of this business except by bureaucratic control. It is fortunate for us that there is considerable sentiment developing in this country that if we are to preserve free government, responsibilities of general government must be established and remain in the States. If that is done, and only if it is done, will there be a chance to reduce the Federal business

sufficiently to bring it within human comprehension and make it possible for the Federal organization to be governed by laws enacted by the Congress rather than by directive eminating from an appointed personnel.

Needed Workers Being Turned Away Because of Lack of Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended me, I wish to call the attention of the House to the continued plight of workers in the vast war production centers of Seattle and Bremerton, and their desperate need for housing. Eighty-eight percent of all our war production there is going into the Pacific for the defeat of Japan.

Earlier, I appealed to this House, informing Members of the great increase in our population, of the heroic efforts of our citizens on the war-production lines, of the plight of workers, sleeping in cars, in tents, in lean-to's, and even in caves in the hills. I told of the tremendous ever-growing production records of our aircraft and shipbuilding industries, and of the War Manpower Commission's declaration that 26,000 more workers are needed in this already crowded area.

Listening to this and similar pleas of representatives of like localities, the House passed a deficiency appropriation to provide us with $84,000,000 in temporary public housing.

This was most welcome but still small relief, for Seattle and Bremerton could have used the entire appropriation and still be without adequate housing for our loyal war workers. Of the $84,000,000, the Federal Housing Agency did allocate some $9,000,000 to this area to construct about 2,200 family units and 2,000 dormitory units.

Yet when I had the privilege of speaking to the House on this subject previously, we needed some 30,000 additional housing units.

I have just been informed that in the past 54 days, 1,187 desperately needed workers have migrated to Seattle—come to this section voluntarily because of their own desires to be of help in our great war effort—and all of them have had to leave, to return to their former homes, to migrate elsewhere in their search of a job in the war effort. This, because, now as ever in our history, men cannot work where they cannot live.

Within the next few days, the House Banking and Currency Committee will have before it a request for $100,000,000 Federal Housing Agency Title VI insurance, to insure the building by private industry of private housing.

In my district, private builders are willing and ready to erect housing, if we can only provide them with the insurance. This is not spending of public funds, this is simple investment. It is the Government's own recoverable investment of $100,000,000 in the war effort and in the future of the Nation.

Private industry will erect these homes. Private industry will manage them. From the rentals, our Government will be repaid. And for this investment, we shall receive as a bonus, production and more production for the winning of the war.

I am informed that private builders in my district are ready and willing to erect $10,800,000 in new homes for our war workers. I have today received the following telegrams, which I would like to call to the attention of the House:

The first is from the Seattle Master Builders. It reads:

> We respectfully urge immediate consideration and action on $100,000,000 title VI insurance with favorable report for the full amount because of serious housing shortage in this area which is curtailing maximum war production.
>
> Boeing alone reports 1,187 workers arriving here voluntarily in the past 54 days, unable to remain for employment because no housing accommodations available. Statistics from War Housing Center reveal that 81 percent of title VI housing has been occupied by in-migrant war workers and 100 percent of all title VI housing has been occupied by certified war workers.
>
> War production officials state 88 percent of all war production in this area now going to Pacific theater with program calling for constant increasing production and amplification after victory in Europe.
>
> F. H. A. title VI funds have been exhausted since February 1, resulting in production standstill. If legislation, authorizing immediate title VI authority, is made available this program can commence immediately. Anything that can be done to expedite passage of this authority will speed housing for these essential war workers.

The second telegram is from the Aeronautical District Lodge, No. 751, of the International Association of Machinists, A. F. of L., the organization of which every one of the devoted war workers at Boeing's great plants in our area is a member, and which speaks for them. It reads:

> We are advised that $100,000,000 F. H. A. title VI authorization bill has been referred to House Banking and Currency Committee. Will appreciate your efforts to obtain favorable action through the committee and obtain cooperation of the congressional delegation. Serious housing shortage this area curtailing maximum war production. Boeing reports 1,187 workers arrived here voluntarily in the past 54 days, but were unable to remain for employment because no housing accommodations are available.

These messages speak eloquently of the desire of both labor and industry to speed our war production and to do their full share toward providing for the housing needs of workers who will contribute to this tremendous effort. I am confident that the House will again hear the plea that comes from all the war centers. I hope that this Congress will speedily act so that private builders, too, can get the backing they should have to help them construct further needed war housing.

Easier Than Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, up to now one executive agency was evidently giving away America fast enough. With reference to post-war ships, the State Department, by so-called post-war lend-lease, was doing its level best to give away to France under the so-called agreement of February 28, 1945, deep-water ships to the tune of one hundred and forty millions; harbor watercraft, thirty-two millions; fishing fleets, eight millions; inland watercraft, fifty millions; and two hundred and twenty millions for boat charters and freight costs.

While this was going merrily on the Maritime Commission, since the fall of 1944, was busy and is now busily engaged in trying to push through quickly a so-called ship sales bill, being H. R. 1425, for the disposition of our merchant fleet now built, being built, and built after the war.

The terms of disposition are especially favorable to foreign buyers over domestic buyers for giving away our merchant fleet.

But the State Department evidently just heard about it on Friday last. It is possibly much better for giving away our merchant marine than lend-lease, that the State Department is dropping its so-called post-war lend-lease as to giving France deep-water ships for $140,000,000 and relying on Maritime Commission-sponsored ship-disposal bill. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that there are probably plans of giving away, even more favorable than lend-lease.

Four Years of Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Chelsea Record of Saturday, March 10, 1945, entitled "Four Years of Lend-Lease."

This editorial is most appropriate at this particular time in view of the fact that we have under discussion in the House today H. R. 2013, a bill to extend for 1 year the provision of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, which is commonly known as the lend-lease bill.

As one who has consistently supported this measure in the past and will vote

for final passage of this bill this year, I wish to commend the editorial staff of the Chelsea Record for their timely article:

FOUR YEARS OF LEND-LEASE

It was 4 years ago tomorrow that President Roosevelt signed the lend-lease bill, thus placing America's gigantic industrial potential in opposition to the aggressors.

Lend-lease was a step which has been costly to the American taxpayer and succeeding generations of the species, but it was action which bolstered the cause of those defending the world against tyranny in coarser and more horrible forms. Likewise it was the indirect means of saving the lives of many Americans. It saved the lives of fighting men; it saved the lives of civilians.

It was a courageous step which America took—coming as it did at a time when Axis power was in the ascendency—but it was a move without which we would have ultimately been lost. Without lend-lease armaments and foods Britain and Russia and China must surely have gone to the wall. They lived on to fight other and more victorious battles. Lend-lease gave us time to prepare, to equip our soldiers and sailors for the job ahead. It kept the war from our own shores. It is even possible that, without lend-lease, America itself might by this time be hanging on the ropes.

America has proved not only its humanitarian tendencies and its fearlessness of the oppressors, it likewise has given the world an example of practical cooperation.

Four Figures of Jesus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday evening, February 21, Dr. Frederick K. Stamm, pastor of the First Congregational Church of Chicago, was a Lenten speaker at the Church of the Savior, in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, as the guest of Dr. Verner S. Mumbulo, pastor of the church. Dr. Stamm's sermon, The Four Figures of Jesus, was most inspiring.

Mr. Speaker, with permission of Dr. Stamm, and by unanimous consent of the House, I include this sermon:

Dr. Marcus Dods, the great British theologian of the past century, said near the close of his life: "I do not envy those who have to fight the battle of Christianity in the twentieth century. And yet perhaps I do, but it will be a stiff fight." Just how he was able to make such an accurate prophecy I do not know, but it is quite evident that to keep Christian ideals uppermost in the minds of people in this year of our Lord 1945, is not an easy task. Values which we thought were pretty deeply rooted in the minds and hearts of people everywhere, seem to have taken wings and flown away before a situation with which we hardly know how to deal, except on the basis of the old principle of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."

Of one thing we may be sure, whether we like it or not, and that is, many old things have passed away. Traditions which we so tenaciously held must now be severely scrutinized. We must now ask ourselves whether the things we held dear are after all very important, and whether some other things which we lightly regarded must now be looked upon as decidedly necessary. We sometimes hear it said that our generation does not have the faith of the former generation. We are not as good as our fathers, do not have the same faith, and are not as honest as were they. But can this be true? I prefer to believe that we are as good as any generation which has preceded ours. But we are not good enough. We are trying to face a world on fire with a faith that was adequate for a day when the world moved along smoothly, when our economic structure provided a living for anyone who was willing to work, when democracies were taken for granted, and when wars were fought with popguns instead of fire-spitting planes and steel tanks. We have a minimum of faith for a maximum complex situation.

Desdemona in Shakespeare's play said to Othello, "I do love thee! And when I love thee not, chaos comes back again." And that word may be applied to us as we ask once again, "Where does Jesus fit into the picture of the world as we see it spread out before us?" Chaos is surely here. We are chaotic in our thinking individually and collectively. If reports are anywhere near correct, Europe is a shambles, and the worst is not yet. In the midst of it all, the only way we seem to have of keeping the other side of the world from burning up completely, is to burn ourselves up. There can be only one reason for it, and that is, our minds have not been directed and controlled by the mind of Jesus. Nations have gone on their way unmindful of His place in the world, and individuals have scouted the idea that His teachings have anything to do with international relationships. When we do not love Him and His teachings, chaos comes back again.

Looking at Jesus it is not difficult to discover that He tortured men's minds and disturbed them. I wish I had time to give you the many instances when He caused men to grind their teeth at Him because He condemned their false religion, their lack of human brotherhood, their aloofness from the sinner, their unjust dealings with their neighbors, their lack of knowledge and vision as to what makes a nation great. They crucified Him not because He was evil but because He was too great for their small hearts.

Not only did He disturb them but He pursued them, and has been pursuing men ever since. You can never get away from the judgment of Jesus Christ. If you do wrong, He doesn't leave. If the world crucifies Him, He breaks the door of His tomb and confronts it with His goodness. Francis Thompson was right when he said:

"I hid * * *
From those strong feet that followed, followed after.
But with unhurrying chase
And unperturbed pace,
Deliberate speed, majestic instancy
They beat—and a voice beat
More instant than the feet—
'All things betray thee, who betrayest Me.'"

Then, too, Jesus was a searcher of men's hearts. If you watch the crowds following in the wake of His footsteps, you'll understand how some of them held out their hands to Him, waited for His blessing, and how many of them turned up their noses, left off following Him, and went their own way. It is said of old Samuel Butler that he came down to breakfast one Christmas morning, stretched himself and seated himself at the breakfast table, and said, "Well, this is the birthday of the hook-nosed Nazarene." That was the expression of a self-contented man. In contrast to this year hear the words of a redeemed sinner in John Masefield's The Everlasting Mercy:

"O truth, O strength, O gleaming share,
O patient eyes that watch the goal,
O ploughman of the sinner's soul,
O Jesus, drive the coulter deep
To plough this living man from sleep."

And now as Jesus moves across the pages of the world's history, I'd like to have you see four figures of Him. I don't know all the answers about Jesus, but if He is going to stand up at all in the midst of our perplexed world, we've got to see Him as He presents Himself in such vivid outline before us. First of all He was a fisherman. I don't know that He ever cast a net into the Sea of Galilee, and I can understand how dubious the disciples were that day when they had caught nothing, and heard Him say, "Cast the net on the right side." But He was a fisherman, nevertheless. "As He walked by the sea, and saw men casting their nets, He said, 'Follow Me.'" That is not an exhaustive picture of Jesus, but it has its place. Something was happening in the hearts of people, some readiness to respond to a great truth, and He needed a few men who would follow Him, who had the ability to catch His spirit and proclaim His message. There was a divine urgency about Him as He stood alone and said, "Follow Me." Charles, the craven king in the story of St. Joan, said to the maid of Orleans, "You people with your heads in the sky spend all your time turning the world upside down." That's exactly what Jesus had come to do, to turn the world upside down. He saw what the world needed, and He couldn't let it alone, even though it was perfectly content with its manner of living.

We've got to say that Jesus was bent on saving whatever was of value in the world. And the world is not all bad. There are values which have been covered up and lost, just as the coin which dropped from the woman's hand and rolled off into a corner or underneath the rug, was lost for the time. (Just as the one sheep in its stupidity wandered away from the flock and got caught in the thicket, and needed to be brought back to the sheepfold.) There is more in this figure of Jesus as a fisherman than I am able to give you today, but it ought to mean at least to you what it meant to Mr. and Mrs. William E. Gladstone in a day when poor creatures wandered in the streets of London seeking rest and finding none. Sometimes they would go out at night and wait in Picadilly Square to bring love and shelter to the flotsam and jetsam of society.

And on many an occasion Mrs. Gladstone threw her cloak over some bedraggled Magdalene. It ought to mean at least as much as it did to John Wesley when he felt constrained to go out and rescue drunkards and murderers. "It was our constant theme," he said. "But in doing this, we were assaulted and abused on every side. We were represented as mad dogs. We were stoned in the streets, and several times narrowly escaped with our lives. * * * But this moved us not." A fisherman was John Wesley, for the values that still were present in men and society. And when you see Jesus, you must account for Him first of all on the basis that He too was a fisherman, a being who moved steadily through life under the compulsion of divine insistence and compassion.

The second figure that we have of Jesus is that of a teacher. See how men came to Him. They heard Him pray, and said "Teach us to pray." They heard Him talk about first things in life, and asked, "What is the first commandment?" They heard Him talk about salvation and asked, "Who can be saved?" They asked about their social obligations, about their relation to God, and how they could find life. Not a day passed without His being asked to explain this or that. He told them that if they wanted to be right they would have to do right to their fellows. If they wanted to

overcome evil they could do it only by doing good. If their prayers would amount to anything their lives would have to go out in love, not only to their own class, but to all classes.

And so the world, in order to explain Him calls Him Emmanuel, God with us. He walks with men as their companion, pointing out this truth of life, and that teaching men life's deepest and most lasting lessons, and opening up a highway to God. How desperately during His lifetime did He try to make people understand the nature of God. So concerned was He about drawing a true picture of God that men sneeringly asked, "Art thou the Son of God?"

Down through these ages Jesus has stood as a teacher. But the world hasn't always been a good pupil. It gets tangled up in its own philosophies, ruins itself by its own wisdom, and then wonders why God doesn't do something about it. We want peace in the world, but we won't pursue the ways of peace. We want brotherhood, but our little prejudices and selfish methods get in the way of brotherhood. (The parable of the good Samaritan is a lovely story, but it is one thing to read it and weep over it, but quite a difficult task to live it.) The world will never follow the teachings of Jesus until the causes for which He lived and died rest as heavily upon the world's conscience as they rested upon His heart and mind.

The third figure of Jesus is that of a healer. The lepers which lined the roadside held up their fleshless hands and cried, "Have mercy upon us." The blind pleaded for sight. Fathers of sick little children urged Him, "Come down ere my child die". Indeed He was constantly stooping beside this bed of pain, going through that door of sorrow, and restoring self-respect to this man and to that woman. The word "compassion" shines on every page of the gospels and lights up Jesus as a healer, so that even today sufferers can believe that—

"The healing of His seamless dress
Is by our beds of pain,
We touch Him in life's throng and press
And we are whole again."

Our hospitals grew out of the tender compassion of Jesus for the ills of mankind. And after years of sacrifice on the part of doctors and surgeons, psychologists and psychiatrists, other laws of healing are being discovered. Streams of energy are being tapped to preserve and restore health. We are learning not only the laws of physical health, but likewise the laws of mental and spiritual health. Get a man to have the right mental outlook, enable him to lay hold upon the great spiritual laws of the universe, and at once you have him emancipated from his fears, his phobias, his defeatism. I wonder sometimes how often Jesus is standing by sick beds, alongside of people whose life is a miserable existence, and whispering into their ears, "If only you knew the laws which are here for your use; if only you knew how life could change if you would find your life in God's universal laws."

But there is one other figure of Jesus which we would not dare to leave out of this characterization. It is the figure of a shepherd. "I am the Good Shepheard." And when you hear Him referring to Himself as that, you have the picture of a sheep entangled in the thicket, lost, and almost dead. It got lost through its stupidity and needs someone to direct it toward home.

If ever this world needed shepherding it needs it now. Since war was declared hysteria has gripped the minds of people all over the world, making them say things and do things which we thought impossible. One day I went from the radio studio to hear another preacher. And how he preached. When I went from that service I said to myself, "Now I can think straight again, for the preacher with true spiritual insight has directed my thinking Godward. I've heard a true voice in the midst of a babel of voices." That was the voice of one pulpit, and I'm sure there are hundreds of other heaven-born prophecies being proclaimed in this land. And as I went from that service I had another thought. I wished that alongside of that voice in the church there would be equally significant prophecies uttered by men who sit in places of influence in the Government. Men who are not gripped by hysteria themselves, but who can speak forth words of truth and soberness in a day when other men's minds are confused and tangled in a maze of conflicting emotions.

Of one thing we can be sure, and that is, that Jesus would never have referred to Himself as the Good Shepherd unless He was prepared to defend with His life the values wrapped up in redemptive love. And the only defense He had was a cruel cross upon which He gave His life in order that men might be brought back to the bosom and mind of God. "The Good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep."

I can wish for no less than this at the close of these years of mental and spiritual degeneracy that people everywhere should begin to hear the voice of the fisherman, "Follow Me" to listen to Him as He sits before us as the Great Teacher; to feel Him as the Healer of our diseases, and to say with the Psalmist, "The Lord is my Shepherd," who rescues me from stupidly being caught in other paths than the paths that lead to peace.

High Tribute Paid to Lynn Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following letter written by William J. Kenealy, S. J., chaplain, U. S. N. R., January 28, 1945, to Mr. and Mrs. William H. Murphy, 216 Walnut Street, West Lynn, Mass., parents of William H. Murphy, Jr., seaman (1st cl.), U. S. N. R., who gave his life in his country's service:

CHAPLAIN IN GLOWING TRIBUTE TO LYNN HERO

The following tribute is of interest in connection with a visit paid by Navy Chaplain William J. Kenealy, S. J., United States Naval Reserve, to the family of William H. Murphy, Jr., 216 Walnut Street.

Chaplain Jeremiah F. Gearan, former curate at the Sacred Heart, who has served in the same area with Father Kenealy and who is mentioned in the letter, was paying his last visit to the rectory on the same evening and thus an unexpected overnight reunion of the two chaplains made a memorable occasion for all concerned.

Both concurred in the opinion that Billy Murphy was one of those rare souls which God sprinkles here and there among us from time to time—a soul of such outstanding inspiration to all who knew him, including the priests themselves—inspiration coupled with retiring modesty, genuine piety, and even a desire for suffering, that praise of him takes on the form of wondering whether he was not truly a person bordering upon sainthood.

The Lynn Telegram-News prints in full this extraordinary letter of sympathy to stricken parents, feeling that its words of comfort and reassurance are not confined merely to its actual recipients but overflow to console the grief of all gold-star mothers and fathers.

JANUARY 28, 1945.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM H. MURPHY,
West Lynn, Massachusetts.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. MURPHY: By this time you have received the official notification, from the Secretary of the Navy, of the heroic death of your beloved son, William Henry Murphy, seaman (1st. cl.), U. S. N. R. Kindly allow me as the Catholic Chaplain of the U. S. S. ——— to extend to you, and through you to Billy's other loved ones, my heartfelt sympathy in your hour of bereavement. The heaviest burden of sorrow is indeed yours, yet please be assured that you do not mourn alone. You grieve for a good and devoted son, all hands aboard the ——— sorrow for a loyal and respected shipmate; and I am greatly saddened by the loss of one of the best he'pers—by word and example—any Catholic priest ever had aboard a battleship.

Billy spent a great deal of his free time with me and with my yeoman, Johnnie Shovlin, who was one of his closest friends. He helped us with arrangements for Mass and other Catholic activities. I believe that Billy went to Mass and received Holy Communion every single day aboard the ——— unless actual watch prevented. He was one of the most outstanding Catholic boys on the ship. And he was very popular with everybody.

As you know, military censorship will not allow me to give you many details of Billy's death. However this much I can say: Billy died at his battle station, in action with the enemy, in Lingayen Gulf, Luzon, P. I., on the 6th of January, about 20 minutes past 5 in the afternoon. We had gone to our battle stations quite some time before this. As is customary when we go to battle stations on the ———, I had recited the Our Father, the Hail Mary, the Act of Contrition and had given general absolution over the ship's public-address system.

Death was almost instantaneous for Billy. I arrived on the scene immediately after he was injured and I can assure you that he did not suffer any long or severe pain. He received the last sacraments and the plenary indulgence at the hour of death. You need have no fear for Billy. God will reward you in His own way for bringing into the world and training such a wonderful, wholesome, clean, and inspiring boy. I am sure that he is with God this moment.

Because of battle conditions and the imminence of renewed enemy attack, it was necessary for me to bury Billy at sea early the following morning, in fact before dawn on the 7th of January. However, at the first opportunity, when combat conditions made it safe to have the greater part of the crew topside, a formal military mass and memorial service was conducted for Billy and his shipmates who had made the supreme sacrifice for the country and the homes they loved. The military mass was celebrated this morning, Sunday, January 28. Many hundreds of the officers and men crowded the huge quarterdeck and overflowed to the top of the gun turrets and the superstructure to pray for the souls and to honor the memory of our honored dead. It was a beautiful and inspiring scene. If you could have been present, I know you would have been comforted. But the best I can do is to enclose a program of the mass in this letter.

Do not think for one moment that Billy died or was buried among strangers. Our sailors in the Pacific, despite the grimness of war, perhaps even because of it, have an affection and devotion for their shipmates which is wonderful to behold. It is really a tenderness and love for one another which blooms stronger and more beautiful as the danger increases and the going gets tougher. It comes to full flower when we nurse our injured, attend our dying and bury our dead. All pretense is gone. We weep without shame. We pray, in private and in public,

that the almighty and merciful God will receive and cherish for all eternity the beloved shipmates whom He created and whom He has recalled to Himself.

Yes; Billy died for those he loved. And he died among those he loved and was buried with great tenderness by those who loved him. Nevertheless, your greatest consolation must come from the good God who from all eternity has loved both Billy and you. It was He who said to us: "I am the Resurrection and the Life. He who believes in Me, even if he die shall live and whoever lives and believe in Me shall never die." Billy did believe in Him. He had the faith. And he lived the faith fully, courageously, and inspiringly.

All of us at a time like this need to remind ourselves that death, as sad as it is, is not a permanent but only a temporary separation from those we love. Death is not the end. It is in reality only the beginning of that unspeakably glorious life which knows no disappointment or pain or sorrow or death, but which is everlasting life with the God of Infinite Love. It should make the thought of our own passing more easy, to realize that our loved ones who have gone before, will be waiting to greet us in a reunion of unending joy, through the Love and Mercy of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Some few months ago, when the ——— anchored for a short time near a Pacific island, I met Father Jerry Gearan, of West Lynn. He asked for Billy and tried to get out to the ship to see him but was unable to make the trip. But from what he told me about Billy, I gather that Billy was the same marvelous lad at home in the States as he was out here in the Pacific. Coxswain Russell Brennan, Billy's friend on another battleship, was able to visit him a few times and I was able to visit Russell's ship to tell him personally about Billy's death. Unfortunately, I was on my way to a destroyer to say mass and I had to make my talk with Russell extremely brief. He was terribly affected by the news and I think a little note from you would help him considerably. I know that you have his address and I cannot mention the name of his ship.

This is about all that I can tell you by mail. There is just a possibility that I may be home on leave before many months. If so, since I live at Boston College, I will be sure to visit you. In the meantime, please accept my deepest sympathy. I will not forget Billy or yourselves at the Holy Sacrific of the mass. May our Divine Lord and His Blessed Mother give to Billy eternal happiness and to his good parents the reward and consolation of leading an immortal soul straight to the Heart of God.

Devotedly yours in Christ,

(Rev.) WILLIAM J. KENEALY, S. J.,
Chaplain, U. S. N. R.

Father Kenealy is on leave of absence from his duties as dean of Boston College Law School.

The Nurses' Draft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of H. R. 2277, a bill to provide adequate nurses for our wounded in the military services, there can be no just criticism of the earnest desire of every Member of the House to provide adequate medical nursing care for our men and women in the armed forces. There is, however, an honest difference of opinion as to the best method to be employed in order to achieve that worthy objective. Should it be by the voluntary system or by compulsion?

Let us examine briefly some of the background of this vital problem. Immediately after our entrance into the war estimates were made of the number of nurses needed. As the war progressed the quotas were increased. The magnificent response can be shown by mentioning some figures. In 1940 there were less than 1,000 in the Army Nurse Corps. By December 31, 1944, there were 44,000. Over 52,000 were in the various services, and approximately 81,000 had volunteered. It is a significant fact that until May 1944 every quota was met.

Some additional facts will make it apparent why results have not been more favorable since that date. Plans for a recruitment program were drawn up in the fall of 1943, and were ready to be put into effect when the War Department, on December 5, 1943, announced that only 40,000 nurses would be needed. Nearly 37,000 were then in the service. Later, however, the Department changed its estimates and decided to increase the number to 50,000, and then to 60,000, but the tempo had bogged down. A wave of optimism was sweeping the country, fanned by the favorable progress of our armed forces, and the predictions of victory in Europe during 1944 by many of the leaders in military and civilian life. A natural let-down occurred which affected all the people, including the nurses. We had been progressing satisfactorily under the voluntary method up to the time when a rejuvenated recruiting program was abandoned, and thereafter due to a further let-down caused chiefly, as Surgeon General Parran said, by a false peace psychology.

The important requirement, therefore, would be to re-create a war psychology The President's speech on January 8 would have been the ideal time to have launched a Nation-wide drive, organized like a bond drive, in every community throughout the United States. Prior to that time, the War Advertising Council, realizing the need for a dramatic appeal, had drawn up plans for a national advertising campaign. On October 12, 1944, one of the members of the J. Walter Thompson Co. accepted the responsibility for the drive. For some unknown reason, no further word was heard from the Army until December 20, after which the advertisers got busy and raised $10,000,000 for their campaign. Again, more delay until March 5, 1945, when the drive finally got started.

In the meantime, this bill was introduced in the House which proposes for the first time in the history of this country and, I am told, for the first time in the history of the world, to draft nurses; to conscript and thereby to discriminate against a special group who have throughout the years demonstrated their sincere and conscientious devotion to duty. We are saying, in effect, that they would not assume their duty voluntarily so they must be forced to go.

Since January 8, when the President announced the urgent need for 18,000 nurses, until February 24, 13,848 had volunteered. Of this number the Red Cross reported on March 4 that 9,641 had already been certified to the Army and Navy. Despite this result and regardless of the fact that the recruitment drive mentioned previously did not start until last week, March 5, we now propose to draft this particular group from among the women. A fair appraisal of the matter indicates that a reasonable trial of the recruitment campaign has not been given. I believe that nurses can and will be secured more quickly and in adequate numbers by the voluntary system, if properly organized, than by the compulsion method proposed in this bill.

Because of this belief and the other reasons stated, I am voting against this bill.

Statements have been made during the discussions on the floor of the House concerning the attitude of the nurses themselves. Two letters written by nurses in the Army Nurse Corps, on duty overseas, were sent to me by a constituent, which I now make a part of the RECORD:

FROM OVERSEAS, *February 27, 1945.*

NURSE SHORTAGE

DEAR YANK: We have been recently informed that there is a good possibility of drafting nurses for the service. It really makes us think. How can a just government designate one particular organization of women to be the victims without a mass conscription of all? After all, this is a democracy that we're wading through and for, or at least that was our assumption when we volunteered.

Are we any more essential than women in industry? No—and we'll tell you why. It's not the shortage of nurses, but rotten administration, poor distribution, and improper use of our professional abilities that put us on the high-priority list.

Nursing itself is more than a full-time job, but we are forced to enact the dual role of both nurse and company clerk. Most of our time is wasted on filling out endless numbers of forms, and other clerical work that could easily be performed by any eighth-grade student.

What little leisure time we have is wasted on classes, which being repetitious in themselves are an insult to any nurses's intelligence.

Furthermore, after a tedious 12-hour night stretch, we are compelled to awaken at an early hour, and perform an hour of close-order drill, calisthenics, and other stupid antics.

Can you blame nurses for refusing to join, when they can work in Army hospitals, and still retain their civilian status, without being encumbered by the vast number of rules, regulations, and restrictions that put us more on the level of a wayward child than a professional woman?

Yes—the need for nurses, and nursing care is acute, but we cannot adequately perform the role of nurse, secretary, and basic trainee.

We can assure you that this is not the petty complaining of a disgruntled few, but constitutes a widespread grievance within our organization.

TWO LIEUTENANTS, A. N. C.

Copy of V-mail letter received at district No. 1 headquarters February 27, 1945:

SOMEWHERE IN FRANCE,
February 17, 1945.

DEAR MISS ———: As you see, I have arrived in France. At this time I am anxious to express my views on the nurses' conscription bill and would also like your views on it.

Therefore I shan't tell you much about myself at this writing.

I have been in the Army 10 months. Have been activating since October 10, 1944. Since that time have only done 3 weeks of actual nursing. Since coming to the continent we have had continuous silly training programs on calisthenics, road hikes, drills, and lectures which are constantly repeated. Our living conditions are horrid and rugged—that is a mild word for it. All this would compensate if we were doing nursing, which is what we came into the service to do. Where we are located there are hundreds of nurses. I understand there are thousands of nurses in the E. T. U. alone. We are getting stagnant from lack of nursing duties. The nurses conscription bill as a whole we feel is a farce, not needed and a political push. This would put nursing back to the dark ages of Florence Nightingale's time when nursing was not an honorable profession.

We hate to think that from now on the Government will control all nurses and nursing, body, soul, and mind. We hope something will be done to avert this before it is too late.

Pardon this odd letter, but please honor me with an answer and your feelings and reactions to this bill.

I shall promise to write more about what I am doing and my whereabouts in a later letter. Give my regards to my friends. How have you been of late and what is going on at district 1 headquarters these days?

Sincerely,

Lt. ———, A. N. C.

Address by Strickland Gillilan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, today, March 13, is the forty-eighth anniversary of the appearance in Life magazine—the oldtime humor standard of that day—of a dialectic poem written by that dean of American humorists, Strickland Gillilan. The poem was Off Agin, On Agin, Gone Agin, Finnigin. The humor of Strickland Gillilan has entertained, as well as enlightened, millions of people in America during the last half century. He was born in my State of Ohio and still looks upon Ohio as his home although for many years he has "temporarily resided," as he puts it, in Washington.

Strickland Gillilan recently made a luncheon address to the Rotary Club of Cincinnati, Ohio, in which he took occasion, in his humorous manner, to say a few words concerning the governmental bureaus in Washington and, incidentally, concerning the Congress. His statement was, in part, as follows:

I like to get out of Washington now and then because of green-eyed jealousy. I am merely a professional humorist myself and I can't stand the competition from Government. Those who are doing their stuff and spending yours are so much funnier without turning a hair than I am when I "bust the britchin" that I burn up with envy. I can't even start a laugh down there. Why there are those who eat pie with a knife. If any of those boys are ever found with their throats slit from ear to ear, Edgar Hoover's G-boys will call it an inside job. And there are others who risk the sight of at least one eye from a protruding spoon handle everytime they drink their coffee. I refer, of course, to those who drink it out of the cup. But not all of those who drink it out of the saucer blow it. The more refined ones fan it with their hats.

Now you know that I know that you know that not all are of that type. There have been—perhaps still are—and will be some Congressman of that kind, but they are by no means numerous. To apply such statements to Congress is merely our loose, unfair and unjustified manner of speaking of Congress. There are statesmen in both branches of our national legislature who, if Webster and Clay and Calhoun and Blaine and those other congressional giants of other days were still living—men who, because they have been dead so long, are bigger now than they were while alive—there are men in Congress today that measure right up to those old colossi of patriotism and wisdom. You remember when a few years ago an attempt was made to expand the Supreme Court to the numerical strength of the standing Army a lot of the boys got up on their hind legs and fairly yelled "You can't do that to our Constitution and to us" and it was not done.

But there are some of the lower type there and those are the ones who should command our immediate and concentrated attention. First, I'd like to know if any of you folks have ever complained about what you considered the low standard of public servants. If you did, don't do it any more. No misfit in an elective office should be blamed for being there. It isn't his fault. He didn't put himself there. He didn't hide his weaknesses and he didn't elect himself. For every crackpot or incompetent noodlehead in Congress—either branch—there are from 10,000 to 50,000 crackpots, incompetent noodleheaded voters in his electorate who put him there with full knowledge of what they were doing to themselves and to the rest of the country. When you find a belt buckle or a side comb in the soup, you don't cuss that belt buckle or side comb do you? No. You say, "How come that fool cook uses the soup pot for a trash basket?" The thing out of place isn't to be censured. Whoever put it there is the miscreant and shoul' bear the blame and the punishment. They are the ones to be turned over the punitive knee of the parental public.

No stream of legislation or other public service can rise higher than its source—the voters. So you voters quit cussing Congress and start using something north of your ears in selecting its Members.

Pay of Military Personnel in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

TULSA, OKLA., *March 8, 1945.*

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: One of my sons in the Army Air Forces is now in the Philippines and is paid in Philippine currency, notwithstanding, as I understand, the law provides for payment in United States currency. Several days ago he ran out of air mail stamps and the Army post office at his station did not have any stamps. However, he found stamps at a Navy post office at or near his station, but Philippine money was refused in payment for such stamps. He was thus forced to hunt around and find someone with United States money before he could purchase such stamps.

It is possible that this is one way the Army uses to encourage the use of V-mail, but it is our experience that V-mail takes from 16 to 26 days to get through. Such a matter as this cannot be entirely excused by lack of airplane space when planes are used for attendance at gangster politicians' funerals and transportation of dogs.

The reason I am addressing you is that I notice that matters pertaining to the currency with which military personnel is paid has been mentioned a number of times in Congress and you will note that I am sending a copy of this letter to the Secretary of War.

I am sorry that my first letter to you is of this nature, but we do not like to have our boys kicked around, notwithstanding we have to put up with a lot of it unnecessarily at home.

With my kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

TED H. HAMMETT.

A Union Man's Suggestions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a man who says that he a member of a local union at Bronson, Mich., comes a mimeographed letter which reads as follows:

BRONSON, MICH., *March 7, 1945.*

DEAR SIR: For the past several years I have been connected with our local union as an officer and member, and have followed the trend and problems rather closely, hence my opinion to you.

Today there is an unhealthy trend in the assessing of special dues upon employers as the Petrillo assessments upon recordings, and the restriction of nonprofessional use of amateur organizations on radio stations.

In my opinion, union dues should be limited to 12 monthly payments, in no case to exceed $1.50 per month and one special assessment of not to exceed 1 month's dues.

Today we are faced with the Lewis royalty plan which in my estimation is a vicious attempt to tax without legally constituted law by a State or national branch of Government, and unless these practices are stopped, once and for all, God only knows where it may end. Too much money in union treasuries to me is a very dangerous thing to union membership as a whole. It tends to make the national leaders too arrogant and inconsiderate of the members' welfare.

The trend in unions today toward closed shops to me seems very un-American, directly contrary to the constituted rights of United States citizens. Union membership should be entirely voluntary in order to force leadership to give its membership value received or lose their position.

Coercion and intimidation are dangerously prevalent against anyone who chooses to differ with the leaders of today. The fear

of these throttles the assertion of opinion by, in many cases, majority of members who have absolutely no protection from the radical and hoodlum elements who will stop at no ends to continue their control.

If the union movement is to survive; and it must—we must have laws regulating union activity sufficiently severe, and justly enforced, to give union membership protection from coercion and intimidation.

Every union member must be made legally responsible for damage to individual's property and persons also for damage to employer's properties and persons, applied to union officers and members alike whether of local, State, or national importance and authority.

Such law shall be made equally severe against employers who commit offenses against unions or members directly or through their hired representatives.

All cases must be fairly and justly prosecuted by established court procedure.

I believe that labor disturbances should be policed by the armed services of the United States as local police have neither the numerical strength nor moral inclination to do a fair job of preserving order, hence the deplorable conditions of the past at such times.

I express these opinions in a sincere and friendly spirit towards both labor and management, as each cannot survive without the other, therefore are intimately dependent upon each other.

I think the Little Steel Formula has been generally successful, but could be worked out to allow some of the unfortunate cases, to have reviews to allow them to reach the level of the high levels which are granted within areas and have been in effect during the war. This I do not think dangerous as I am acquainted with many cases which are unjustly low.

I regret the lack of education to make this message as intelligible and expressive as I would choose, but hope you can understand my feeling regarding the importance of it.

Strikes should be outlawed for the duration of war.

Respectfully,

ALTO FAIR.

P. S.—I would appreciate if you could use your influence upon other Michigan Representatives and Senators if this finds favor with you.

The foregoing was addressed to the Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER, and was referred by him to me.

On the assumption that the writer wanted the Congressmen to know his views, I am inserting it in the RECORD.

Cigarettes and Meat Plentiful Within Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. *Speaker*, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of March 8, 1945:

CIGARETTES AND MEAT PLENTIFUL WITHIN CANADA

(By Earl Banner)

MONTREAL, March 8.—Canada may be having its troubles with military conscription, but no one can find fault with its method of taking care of civilian needs in wartime.

If Americans could awaken tomorrow to find themselves similarly blessed, here are the things they would notice first:

1. A plentiful supply of all types of meat at reasonable prices.
2. Plenty of butter and milk.
3. No cigarette or liquor shortage.
4. No fuel shortage.
5. No scarcity of women's or children's clothing.

You find out about the plentiful supply of cigarettes first. As you walk through Windsor Station from the train you are impressed by the stacks of cigarettes at all the newsstands and the absence of lines of would-be purchasers.

Cigarette smokers here are not furtive. They name right out loud the brand they want—and two of the biggest sellers are brands once sold in American tobacco stores.

There's one draw-back to this otherwise pleasant situation, however. The price Canadians pay for their smokes is exorbitant, by American standards. For 18 cigarettes you are charged 33 cents. It's a great help for a man who wants to cut down.

But the most astounding difference is in the meat supply. Canada has been off meat rationing for 1 year.

Even small neighborhood markets display a complete line of meats and you rub your eyes in astonishment the first time you see such a display, but the scene quickly becomes commonplace. Shop windows contain temptingly arranged platters of choice beef, pork, and lamb cuts against a background of hanging beef quarters.

Most Canadians are aware that the meat supply in the States is slim and getting slimmer. Most of them wonder why.

A waiter in one large restaurant put it this way: "Why can't we share, eh? We have so much and you have so little. It rotted in our warehouses just before rationing was taken off. It just doesn't make sense."

According to the statistics branch of the wartime price and trade board here, the cost of living in Canada has risen but 1.9 percent since November 1941. The cost of food has gone up 3.9 percent, rent up 7 percent; fuel and lighting down 4.1 percent; clothing up 1.3 percent; home furnishings and services up 0.4 percent.

Canadians are quick to point out, however, that this index does not include taxes. They are among the heaviest-taxed free peoples of the world. Income taxes take a big chunk out of the individual's pay check. A bachelor earning $2,000 a year pays a tax of $433; childless couples on the same salary pay $232, with one dependent $162, two dependents $108. Childless couples with an income of $3,000 pay $582, with one dependent $445, with two dependents $333, and $279 if they have three dependents.

News From Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

ELECTIONS IN KRAKÓW

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1945, the so-called provisional government in Lublin held elections in the city and Province of Kraków (Cracow). The result was that a certain Mr. Saruk, sent from Lublin under a false name of Michalski, is the mayor of the city of Kraków. Mr. Walas, allegedly representative of the Democratic Party, is assistant to the mayor. The city council, county council (Rada Powiatowa) were elected the same way—representing all political parties. Engineer Mitera is Governor of Kraków. The system of organizing the administration and self-government by the provisional government has the known and old pattern: First of all, there is sent to the locality the so-called operation group which comprises a group of entrusted, specially trained in the U. S. S. R., Communists. They organize the administration and self-government according to the instructions received from the Communist Party, the N. K. V. D. and the Russian commanders of the armies.

ECONOMIC SITUATION

The economic situation and food supply are in a critical stage. The Polish population was especially affected by the order practically canceling the value of all currencies. According to the new regulations, the exchange is 500 zlotys emitted by the German occupation equal to 1 zloty emitted by the provisional government in Lublin. For 1 zloty of the present currency, it is not possible to purchase enough food for 1 day for one family.

On February 1, the provisional government issued new ration points for food. Only those who can prove that they are working are entitled to receive points.

In country places the food situation is almost as critical as in the towns because of requisitions made by the Red Army. In most parts of Poland starvation prevails. The soldiers of the Red Army received permission to send food packages weighing no more than 5 kilograms—about 10 pounds—from Poland to U. S. S. R.

POLISH HOME ARMY

One of the Polish Home Army regiments, cooperating with the Red Army in the region of Nisko and Sandomierz, and after having mopped up the defending German soldiers, was surrounded and fired upon by the Red Army. The result was that the regiment had killed about 200 Germans and lost about 30 percent of its soldiers killed by the Red Army. The Polish Home Army, before its dissolution, was cooperating everywhere with the Red Army in the common fight with the Germans.

The Seventy-second Brigade of Infantry was fighting in the region of Kozienice, helping the Red army. In the region of Radom, other Polish Home Army units helped the Red army, saving all military objectives—bridges, and so forth. In spite of that, on the "liberated territories," the new authorities started immediately to methodically exterminate the Polish Home Army. In the region of Radom, hundreds of soldiers and officers were arrested, including two officers of the Paratroop Brigade, from the Polish Army stationed in Great Britain. Those two officers were arrested under suspicion of collaboration with Great Britain. They participated with the British forces on the western front.

In the region of Sandomierz, during several months of the Russian occupation, according to the opinion of the resi-

dents, the arrests outnumbered those under 5 years of German occupation. Judges and lawyers are being arrested in the first place.

Frequent changes of high ranking people in the administration add to the general chaos. The city of Kielce has its fourth governor since the liberation and its sixth mayor. According to the news obtained from Poland, the population is not working with the authorities enforced by the occupant.

In the region of Bialystok and Grodno, immediately after the expulsion of Germans, mass arrests followed. From November 8 to November 15, 1944—within 2 weeks—143 cattle cars were loaded with Poles and sent eastward. Up to January 1, 1945, the number of arrests in Grodno reached 5,000 and in Bialystok they reached 10,000 Poles. Arrests of soldiers and officers of the home army are being executed with all the brutality. During the questioning, it is revealed, the victims are beaten with barbed wire and bones are broken.

ARMY

Drafting to the Polish Army under the occupation was officially postponed until March 1, 1945, but actually it is being executed by force and by rounding up people in the streets and threatening them with punishment.

SOUTHEAST POLAND

From January 3 to 16 mass arrests were executed in southeastern Poland. Sixty percent of the victims were Poles, and among them 21 professors of universities, priests, and professionals, as well as workers and socialists. In certain localities arrests made among the Polish peasants are three times larger than during the German occupation. Furthermore, there is violence and rape of women.

Of those arrested between August 1944 and January 1945 about 2,000 persons were sent to labor camps near Voroshilovgrad.

It should be emphasized that most of the arrests were made under the accusation of collaboration with Germany because of possession of postal stamps with the effigy of Hitler. These stamps were used by the post office under German occupation.

UNIVERSITIES

The Catholic University in Lublin has been changed to a state university and the faculty of theology has been closed. The text of the vow of the Lublin "government" completely eliminates all phrases pertaining to religion.

HOW THE COMMITTEE OF LIBERATION WAS CHANGED TO THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

According to plans prepared in advance, the Russian commanding officers organized meetings in different localities. The presiding committees were composed of representatives of the P. P. R.—Polish Worker Party, Communist Party supported by Moscow. There were present as overseers members of the N. K. V. D. in uniforms and civilian clothes to observe the public. Thus all motions were unanimously carried out and voted upon.

The provisional government is introducing total social reform, based on compulsory organization or monopoly.

For the country and rural districts there is the "Peasant Self-help"—"Samopomoc chłopska"—compulsory membership. This organization covers the entire country and all groups of peasants. All the farmers and landless population receive compulsory membership. The enforcement is based on the fact that Peasant Self-help is the owner of all the grains and seeds. All key positions in Peasant Self-help are occupied by members of P. P. R. with only few exceptions for the peasant party at Lublin. The existence of any other organization is forbidden.

"Społem"—"Common"—in the same way is a cooperative organization.

Movie theaters and moving pictures are to remain the property of a monopolistic corporation taken over from the Germans.

Publishing and distribution of newspapers, books, and magazines is to be centralized in one institution which allegedly shall be a cooperative of readers. The basis for this institution shall be Ruch—pre-war distributing agency in Poland.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Bertold has announced at the Peasant Congress, on December 30, 1944, the results of the agrarian reform. From his reports, it follows that 204,508 hectares have been distributed among 17,321 families of farm workers, 16,736 landless families, 69,328 small farm families, 1,934 families of invalids of this war, 4,349 large families.

KATYN

Among the executed persons in Sophia was Professor Markow, professor of criminology. For his participation in the German commission which investigated the graves of Polish officers murdered in Katyn, he was executed by the Russians. In another group of the executed persons can be found the names of several newspapermen who published the German version of this murder.

INDUSTRY

The Germans have evacuated the machinery and installations from the C. O. P.—central industrial region—in Poland, into Germany.

ADMINISTRATION

The provisional government in Lublin is sending to all the cities in Poland, groups of specially trained men to organize the administration starting from the top. In these groups the leading party is the Polish Workers' Party—P. P. R.—Communists.

In Warsaw the administration is organized by two Communists—Gomólka and Minc. In Kielce, Colonel Ochab is the chief of administration. Colonel Ochab was in the rank of a second lieutenant until February 1944. At present he is a colonel and a vice minister of interior. Ochab was sentenced in Poland for Communistic activities in the army. He has been bestowed with the order of the Red Star, and his wife is an officer in the Communist N. K. V. D.

The main activity of the administration at the present time is to organize special tribunals for the purpose of sentencing spies, Fascists, and reactionaries, which, in practice, means soldiers of the Polish home army and members of the underground administration.

ARMY

Radio Lublin announced on February 21, 1945, a special program for the Polish Army abroad entitled "Victors and Midgets"—ridiculing the participation of the Polish armed forces in the British Army. Quoting some of the sentences, they are:

> You were cheated when you were sent from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to Iran and you are still shedding your blood on foreign soils alongside with the heroic Englishmen, brave Australians, fearless New Zealanders, and very courageous Indians. You have lost the most magnificent opportunity to secure victory on your own soil.

TWENTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF LENIN

In Lublin the Polish Soviet Society organized the ceremony to commemorate the twenty-first anniversary of the death of Lenin. All prominent personalities of the Provisional Government in Lublin participated. Mr. Jozef Wassowski was the first speaker. In his speech he emphasized Lenin's friendship for Poland and announced that they will erect a monument to Lenin in Warsaw, with the following inscription: "To the outstanding apostle of freedom—grateful Polish Nation."

ADMINISTRATION

As in 1939, the Russians are widening the railroad tracks in Poland. All railroad service is militarized and the court-martial is applied to its service. Throughout Poland the Central European time has been changed to Moscow time, which is 2 hours earlier.

NEWS RECEIVED FROM KRAKOW JANUARY 6, 1945

First. The extermination of churches, clergy, and so forth, by N. K. V. D. in full swing.

Second. Four hundred and seventeen Roman Catholic priests from the Lublin dioceses expatriated.

Third. Twelve priests—professors at the Lublin Catholic University—shot.

Fourth. The Capuchin Order in Lublin liquidated.

Fifth. Beginning of a mass exportation of Polish children, from the Tarnow region alone—800 children were sent in the eastern direction.

Colloquy by Hon. Edwin Arthur Hall, of New York, With Bob Evans, C. B. S. News Analyst, Over Station WFBL, Syracuse, N. Y., March 9, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast:

Mr. EVANS. Yes; Congressman HALL, who represents Broome, Chenango, and Madison Counties, is with us again this evening. Several weeks ago Mr. HALL discussed veterans and veterans' legislation. Since then he has been keeping an eye on these measures, making his contribution to see that the G. I. bill of rights is enforced to the letter, and, for that matter, enhanced, when the time comes to extend and amplify the G. I. bill. However, we are not going to go into the ramifications of the G. I. bill this evening. Mr. HALL is here to talk about subsidies and their effect on the American farmer.

Representative HALL. That's my subject, Bob. But now that I'm an old experienced hand on your broadcasts, suppose we follow procedure. You tell first what's been happening in Washington this week, and afterward we'll talk about subsidies.

Mr. EVANS. All right, Ed, and thank you.

1. And now Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL on subsidies.

Representative HALL. Well, Bob, the big-city consumer has been given to believe in the past few years that the lot of the dairy farmer has been made consistently better. From her sources of information the city housewife concludes that dairymen are reaping the benefits of the high prices she is paying for milk and that they are in a position to really make money.

Mr. EVANS. 2. Well, Ed, is it your contention that the farmer is not making money?

Representative HALL. Oh, no, I do not for a minute, dispute the truth of the statement that income to the producer from milk and other dairy products has increased considerably during the past decade. If income alone had increased, there would be no dispute today about the true economic position of the dairy farmer.

Mr. EVANS. 3. But the dairy farmer's cost have gone up too.

Representative HALL. Unfortunately, yes; the cost of production of milk has risen by such leaps and bounds that it has left income far behind. Indeed, according to letters I have received from the rural sections of my district, in the Counties of Broome, Chenango, and Madison, it is well-nigh impossible to meet production costs with revenue from present milk prices.

Mr. EVANS. 4. But it seems to me, Ed, that the administration took some section action on this—if I remember correctly.

Representative HALL. The Federal Government recognized this situation a couple of years ago when the milk subsidy proposal was first made. In vain did the Representatives in Congress from upstate New York and other northeastern districts protest against the milk subsidy as a method of meeting the problem of the farmers' increased costs.

Mr. EVANS. 5. In other words, it's your contention that the milk subsidy doesn't solve the problem.

Representative HALL. In my opinion, Bob, the only satisfactory way, in a nation of free economy for any group, whether it be the farmer or workingman or industrialist, to pay his own way and realize the fruits of his labors, is for him to be guaranteed a fair price for his product or his hire. But for any government to subsidize that group and to carry them along while they would otherwise be losing money, making up the amount to them that they would be running in the red, is sure folly. It does not permanently remedy the trouble, nor does it increase the self-respect of that group.

Mr. EVANS. 6. You suggest another procedure, Ed?

Representative HALL. The dairy farmer of the Northeast has always been a self-respecting citizen. He has worked hard, but he has been able to make his own way and has depended upon no man or government for his honest living. I believe it is imperative that he be guaranteed his cost of production, but I do not believe a satisfactory solution will ever be gained by continuing indefinitely the payment, on the part of the Government, of milk subsidies.

Ever since Pearl Harbor the farmers of the country have been called upon to extend their efforts to increase production of vital food items. In 1944 the dairy farmers of the country, in line with the general program of all farmers, increased their milk production by a substantial percentage.

They would have done even better had there not been untold handicaps placed in their way.

Mr. EVANS. 7. Handicaps?

Representative HALL. In the first place, their failure to obtain the price on milk they felt should be paid them in the general market placed a natural barrier upon too great an increase. Then, in the recent order which went out from the War Manpower Commission, to take the farm youth of the country into the armed forces, many skilled and valuable farm workers, as well as entrepreneurs were lost to agriculture in general. This loss was felt even more acutely by the dairy industry because this is a year-round business and requires more trained and experienced helpers than any other branch of farming.

Yet, in spite of these handicaps, the dairy farmer has continued to increase his production. Unfortunately, he is rapidly approaching a crisis because, on every side, the cost of operation is carrying him farther and farther into the red.

Mr. EVANS. 8. A crisis, Ed?

Representative HALL. Yes, Bob; I refer to the owner of the family size farm. It is necessary for him to obtain the services of a hired man and his wages are running as high as $150 a month. Everyone knows the terrific cost of dairy feed, with hay $35 a ton in some instances and straw $20. When one takes into consideration the additional money which must be put into upkeep, repairs, and machinery, it is astounding to understand how the dairy farmer can make ends meet.

Mr. EVANS. 9. Well, do you contend that the subsidies do not help the situation?

Representative HALL. Bob, all this time there seems to be so little conception of or sympthy with this dire state of affairs—at least from those in authority in Washington. The best example of this was the recent order which came from War Food Administration to cut the 80-cent subsidy now being paid to dairy farmers for each 100 pounds of milk to 35 cents per 100 pounds. This, to me, is the worst blunder which could possibly be made at the very time when even subsidies have become a blessing to the effort the farmer is making in producing food for victory.

Mr. EVANS. 10. Well, Ed, what's to be done? You say you are opposed to subsidies; yet now when a subsidy is reduced, you object.

Representative HALL. No man in Congress fought harder than I did against the original subsidy proposal. No man deplores the present method of the Government making up the cost of production to the dairy farmer by the payment of subsidies more than I do. But, it is certainly no time to discontinue the program, no matter how unsatisfactory it may prove in the long run, without the substitution of some other method that will work better. Therefore, I protest the reduction of the present subsidy to dairy farmers which is scheduled to take place on April 1 for a 3-month period, and frankly state that I believe the 80 cents should be increased to $1.

Mr. EVANS. 11. But this would increase the whole general over-all cost. Presumably to to the consumer, the housewife, as well.

Representative HALL. Bear in mind that this was not my idea in the first place, and that I will gladly vote to discontinue the whole subsidy program any time the War Food Administration wants to guarantee the farmer his cost of production by a more logical method. It is no time, however, to "clip" the farmer because he has responded to the war effort as much as any other part of our society. He is doing a magnificent job in the face of obstacles which would discourage the most patient and persevering citizen. I am for giving him a hand—not for taking away even a crude prop with which the Government has consented to furnish him. Let us hope, therefore, that the dairy farmer will have encouragement on April 1 to continue his vital work in the Nation's food program by changing on the part of the War Food Administration of this subsidy reduction with the result of an increase to $1.

Mr. EVANS. 12. There's something coming up in Congress on this, isn't there, Ed?

Representative HALL. Today, the House started debating the bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation for another year. There is a section of that bill which outlines the future policy of the Government toward the whole subsidy program.

It is my understanding that several amendments will be presented to the subsidy section to improve the whole picture. I, myself, am thinking about offering an amendment which will make milk subsidies uniform all over the country.

I am doing this because I believe the dairymen of the New York milkshed are being discriminated against by less subsidy amounts than some other States are receiving. The dairy business is uniform all over the country, and I see no reason why the Government should not regard all sections uniformly.

It is my intention, also, if no member of the Banking and Currency Committee does so, to present an amendment providing for an increase to $1 per hundred pounds after April 1, instead of the reduction to 35 cents which the War Food Administration now proposes.

After all, Bob, the dairy farmer is doing a great patriotic job of producing vital food for our Nation, and we must encourage his effort rather than hinder him.

Mr. EVANS. All right, Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, and we are grateful to you for presenting your views on the subject of subsidies at this time.

Address of Assistant Secretary of the Navy H. Struve Hensel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Assistant Secretary of the Navy H. Struve Hensel before the Navy Industries Association dinner, Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, New York, N. Y., March 8, 1945:

I wish that tonight our positions could be reversed. I wish that I were sitting in your places listening to you talk to me. I would not only be more comfortable but I am sure that the Navy would benefit greatly.

While mechanically that feat of combining many voices into one is still beyond us, I like to think that such is the aim of this association. Your charter, it seems to me, is both a license and a mandate for you collectively to familiarize yourself with the Navy and to convey to the Navy the thoughts and suggestions of industry. The statement of your purposes emphasizes the importance of mutual understanding and the need of as-

sistance to the Navy. Association of industrial concerns may not be novel but this one is definitely embarked on a new course—the establishment of closer day-to-day working relations between Government and industry. Our success will depend on our determination and our application.

It is most important that Government receive the full benefit of industrial experience. Government of today is vastly different from government at the turn of this century. It involves much more than a knowledge of parliamentary procedure and statute law. It depends on much more than political philosophies. In many respects it is the apotheosis of big business. And in the term "big business" I include all of the facets of business—labor and management—production and distribution.

The men in Government today are involved with almost every problem which besets you. Government is concerned almost more with economics and trade relations than with politics. The intricacies of labor and industrial relationships, banking principles and transportation practices compete for the attention of Government with health programs, plans for soil reclamation, and studies on the conservation of national resources. I do not go as far as the cynics who argue that democracy depends on the maintenance of a high standard of living. At the same time there is a small germ of truth there. The economic well-being of the country as a whole is most important.

The future decisions of Government will affect your private life and commerce as never before. We must establish firmly the basic foundations of life—food, clothing, shelter, and security for our people. All other nations will be struggling with the same question. Our solutions must be related to their solutions. The hope of peace will be found, in my opinion, in the successful determination of the bases of sound economic life. If our economy is not firmly established, peace will have to be imposed on the world. I do not see how it can flourish by itself.

In a sense the problems of the individual in Government are much worse than in business. The men in Government are expected to be experts on everything. Specialization so prevalent now in the commercial world is creeping but slowly into the executive departments. For obvious practical reasons, it has made little headway in Congress. Legislators and administrators are faced with staggering problems of factual research and analysis. They do their best. They undertake their tasks with the greatest sincerity and with a strong desire to achieve the right result. They would be the first to admit the appalling breadth of their jobs and their inability to cover the whole field as they would wish. The full background of this country's experience must be made available to them.

The expansion of Government has also resulted in a multiplication of its mechanical problems. The mere administration of an executive department would be a challenge to any industrial manager. Administration has become almost as important as general policies. The correlation of bureaus and subsidiary divisions and the proper separation of functions are subjects for long study and continuous readjustment. We, too, wrestle with inventory control, usage factors, and obsolescence. In many respects our problems are surprisingly similar to yours and your experience can be extremely helpful to us.

The future presents a real challenge. If we are to benefit from the Nation's collective skills and knowledge, you must make yourselves felt. You must take an active and continuous interest in Government at all times. You should not wait for Government to take the lead. I look forward to the day when you no longer ask, "What is Government going to do?" but come forward with plans and the statement, "This is what Government should do." Business should anticipate the difficulties and should come forward with ideas of its own fashioning. I know of no better source for the programs of the future. I can guarantee that your views on all subjects will be most welcome. That does not mean that your ideas will always be accepted. On the contrary, there will be disappointments. Your ideas will at times be rejected. That is inevitable in a democracy. I am sure, however, that in a short time you can develop a standing that will make consultation of your group almost imperative.

I can assure you that, during the 4 years I have spent in Government constructive ideas have always been extremely welcome. The need for new ideas is continuously expanding. It will expand further. We can no more return to the world of the twenties or thirties than the chicken can return to the egg.

I am not suggesting that you enter party politics. There has been too much reliance, I think, on that approach. It has confined our interest in government to the occasional financial contribution and some feverish excitement at widely separated intervals. It has obscured the need for study and knowledge. Seemingly bound to that approach, we have forgotten that on many problems there can be no split into parties. The conduct of the war and the establishment of peace on a sound basis are obviously beyond party politics. We have all agreed on that and have gained in effectiveness. I could list many other problems which I think are in the same category. Such list would range from new credit vehicles and sound labor relations to taxes and tariffs. I could also mention the problems of interstate commerce and of foreign cartels. The field for joint and nonpartisan effort is enormous. The need for special knowledge—an application of the combined experience of all—is just as great.

These future problems cannot be avoided. They are with us now. If government is forced to act on its own, it will act. It has no alternative. But the appropriateness of the action will be another question. To my mind, our success as a Nation will be greatly affected by the extent to which you play your part—by the extent to which you suggest ways and means of proceeding. It seems to me this is not only your responsibility. It is a part of intelligent self help. Your very future is intertwined with the success or failure of our Nation.

Government cannot longer be permitted to exist as an organization centered in Washington apart from our day to day life. Government belongs to each of us. It is a personal function. The strangeness which has existed between government and industry must be swept away. We must become much more aware of our need for internal unity. We must all understand that to be free we must be strong and that to be strong we must be unified in purposes and effort. We must think, feel, and act much more as a nation. Special interests will have to be subordinated to the general good.

There remains the question of how and where.

You have made two forward steps. You have formed this Association and you have started to acquire a familiarity with the Navy. Through orientation courses, the Navy, its purposes and needs, are becoming known to you. But that is only a start. It is intended only to stimulate your interest. We hope you will probe and examine further.

The same approach could be extended to other fields. There is much to be learned about all Departments. You need to know more about Congress and its manner of operation—about the theory back of the Bureau of the Budget—about the day-to-day operations of the Comptroller General. You must become more aware of how things are done. The aura of mystery which now seems to surround government must be swept away.

The final step is to make your ideas and comments known. In the case of this association, I expect to have direct and continuous contact with your representatives. In addition, I hope everyone wanting to make a suggestion will feel free to make it directly to my office. The front door will always be open and that approach will be always available. As a matter of fact, the front door approach is practicable in every department and at the office of every Congressman. I can assure you that. in spite of the popular belief to the contrary, special go-between agents are not necessary. Furthermore, if your ideas are not accepted and you believe in them, go to the people. Washington is very sensitive to popular will. You must make every effort to sell the ideas you generate.

The development of this new association with government cannot be left to chance. You cannot count on knowledge and ideas springing up like weeds of the field. Success will take a conscious effort—hard work. I know you are busy. But it is absolutely essential for this additional work to be done.

Insofar as the Navy is concerned, I feel that I have your pledge of partnership. I feel that you are already committed to the extra work involved.

When I assumed my present duties and was assigned the procurement problems of the Navy, I resolved to press you into consulting service and to seek your views on our difficult problems. I would like to start tonight. In the balance of my statement I want to lay before you the serious problem of maintaining the necessary volume of war production under present circumstances. The country needs your thoughts and suggestions.

Today we face a matériel crisis. For some months over-all war production has failed to fulfill our planned programs. Some special programs have been pushed ahead as "must programs" but other programs not so designated have suffered. Today even the must programs are threatened. Furthermore, the conclusion is inescapable that, if nothing effective is done, the decline will continue and grow. A substantial number of shipyards are behind in scheduled ship construction. The ammunition program is not up to planned requirements. Tanks, trucks, and textiles are not being produced in desired volumes.

Let me give you some specific examples from Navy experience. In the Charleston Navy Yard six high-speed transports were delayed from 99 to 119 days. At the Bethlehem yard at San Francisco, 12 destroyers were delayed from 98 to 151 days. At the same yard, a light cruiser was delayed a month. The aircraft carrier, *Tarawa*, will not be completed for several months after the scheduled date. Six desperately needed hospital ships were delayed 3 to 6 months in 1944. The cruiser, *New Orleans*, docked not long ago after having been at sea since mid-1943. She had fought through 9 engagements. Many of her complement, however, had to miss shore leave because there were not sufficient on-shore electricians to complete necessary electrical work. The carrier and cruiser programs which we tried so hard to advance are not meeting our desires or our anticipations of last fall.

As I see it—we cannot permit any decline in production which will weaken our war effort. The men fighting and dying at the front must have everything they need. I see no other alternative for us. American lives cannot be gambled on the hope that maybe the scheduled production is unnecessary. We cannot take the chance that perhaps conditions will improve by themselves.

Our first steps, therefore, should be to try to discover the sources of the falling off of production. We can identify quickly some

of the fields in which we know there are no deficiencies. Except for some very special programs, we can state with assurance that there is no lack of productive capacity. There are no real shortages of machines or plants or raw materials in the ground.

The other major ingredient is manpower. What do we know about that? Out of the welter of conflicting opinions, two facts are clear. First, there are less men and women on the job in critical industries than there were a year ago. Second, the labor turn-over, always bad, has become most inordinate.

Being realists, we can quickly narrow the possible solutions to two. Either the reduced manpower can with our improved mechanical efficiency be speeded up to produce enough, or we need more manpower. The one place where there can be no compromise is in respect of the quality and quantity of war production.

The argument that in some localities there are manpower surpluses does not lead us anywhere unless we can do something to utilize those surpluses. The existence of such individual surpluses does not contradict any of the basic facts; i. e., that there are less war workers over all than there were a year ago or that war production has declined. Furthermore, we must remember that all surpluses are not usable. Shortages usually cumulate and are not always offset by surpluses. A surplus of unskilled laborers does not help a shortage of electricians. Electricians in Seattle are not much help in Houston. The work cannot always be brought to the men. And our Mohamets are not so willing to go to the mountain.

Nevertheless, we are doing our best to beat the problem of unused surpluses of manpower. As soon as a surplus is discovered, a complete study is begun. Work for all present surpluses of manpower is definitely our goal. Perhaps we are not accomplishing all that we should, but we are doing our best. The job is not an easy one. I must admit that I become disheartened when workers refuse to move to the areas where they are needed and when workers refuse to take jobs with less pay. I think of how the draft took men away from the country and away from their homes to fight. I think of the debt we all owe to our combat troops. I think of a lot of things. But I come back to some fundamental ideas. It does not help the war to pin the blame on someone. There is no use worrying about inefficiencies and deficiencies which cannot be corrected. The only goal is increased production and the only sensible points of attack are those which offer some promise of quick improvement.

I then conclude that we have little hope of improving management during the war, and particularly during the critical next 6 months. Management is stretched very thin. In places the level of efficiency is low. It would be wonderful if some sharp words would improve everything. But they will not. The sum total of our managerial skill is at work. No replacements are available for the inefficient. Improvement in our techniques and procedures may be possible but it is too slow.

Perhaps the greatest loss of workers has occurred in our basic industries. The coal mining industry in 1944 lost 39,000 workers out of a total of 442,000 at the start of the year—a 9 percent drop. The coal mines cannot be moved to the workers and I know of no way to conjure out of the ground the coal that would have been mined by the 39,000 missing men. The steel mills and related raw material supplies lost 45,000 workers in 1944—nearly a 7 percent drop. The copper, lead, and zinc mining and manufacturing industries in 1944 lost 37,000 workers—a drop of 20 percent. Similar losses occurred in the aluminum, lumber, textile, chemical, and transportation fields. Production curves have followed the manpower curves downward. From these basic industries, the declines are spreading in ever widening circles through our entire economy.

Coal mining is perhaps the most basic industry. If it fails, I do not know where the failure will stop. In 1944 we produced approximately 620,000,000 tons of coal. In 1945 we need the same amount. With the present working force, we can hope for no more than 570,000,000 tons. I should add that the miners now at work are older on the average than before and consequently tire more easily. There is also a danger of further loss in production as a result of the threatened strike. This deficiency has not yet been felt. We cannot afford to have it felt. Somehow and some way we must mine the necessary coal.

The prospects in the steel industry are equally discouraging. Our steel production is so preempted by the war effort that it is almost impossible to support war production by cuts in civilian uses. Cuts in steel production will be reflected by equivalent cuts in war production. For the first time in some period the Navy in the coming quarter will suffer an arbitrary cut in its steel quota. What that will mean to our programs remains to be seen. Again we cannot afford to find out. Only 65 percent of the requirements for internal combustion engine blocks and heads is being met. The shortage of grey iron and malleable castings has already affected adversely the production of heavy trucks and repair parts for naval vessels. The anticipated deficit of lead for storage batteries may put several million private automobiles off the road this year. A 10 percent reduction in the 1945 aircraft program is feared because of a shortage of aluminum.

There is a sketch of the problem. I do not want to advocate particular solutions. I want you to develop the answers. But I do want to suggest that your answers must satisfy a single requirement. War production for the men at the front must be increased. There have been too many smoke screens designed solely to duck the blame for failure. I am not interested in alibis. I am interested solely in results. In the smoke screen class I put the arguments about War and Navy Department inefficiency, industrial managerial negligence, labor slavery, and any other proposition which leads to delay or inaction. Such arguments offer no solution. In the same class I put the argument that we cannot force men to work to make profits for another. The implication in that approach is that we can do nothing because liberty is more precious than life. I do not think the argument will hold water, and I would suffer quite a bit of self-imposed slavery at fair wages to save the lives of a very few marines. The worker will always be paid much more than his brother gets for fighting. Furthermore, even the fighter is in a sense helping to make a profit for the supplier. His wants create the demand for goods out of which the supplier makes a profit. That is inherent in our economic system.

In spite of my desire to leave solutions to you, I want to make one suggestion. If the excessive labor turn-over could be stopped, efficiency and production would automatically rise. That alone would not solve the whole problem but it would go a long way in the right direction. I do not, however, see how the present labor turn-over can be effectively stopped without some additional statutory authority being conferred.

In a few months we will know whether we have solved the problem. Either production will rise or we will fail to meet our quotas. Explanations will not do us any good then. Who will be blamed and what excuses will be accepted in the event of failure—I do not know. I do not really care. Failure to support our fighting men will be more than enough sorrow for me. If that should ever happen, the blame will rightly fall on all of us—on some of us for lack of vision—on others for lack of eloquence and force. In any event, none of us will escape the reproaches of conscience if we let our men down.

Address of Gen. Frank T. Hines on Treatment of Veterans in Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address of Gen. Frank T. Hines, head of the Veterans' Administration, delivered over the radio here in Washington on March 11, 1945.

You will note that this address is largely in the form of answers to questions propounded to General Hines touching the hospitalization of World War veterans.

The matter referred to follows:

Commander KRUM. And now General Hines, what is your reaction to these attacks that have been directed at your administration?

General HINES. Mr. Krum, I know that you don't expect me to answer or deny every accusuation that is hurled at the Veterans' Administration, and I have no intention of attempting any such thing until I have all of the facts in my hands. In this case, I intend to get the facts. But I do say now, with absolute confidence, that any charges that the Veterans' Administration is giving third-rate medicine to war veterans and following antiquated methods in their operation, is entirely unfounded. And further, the medicinal service of our hospitals is up to the highest professional and ethical standards of the medical profession, and our hospitals are on a par with any in this country. And I challenge anyone to refute that statement.

I am making a thorough investigation of every hospital. In addition, in order that all the facts may be known to the American people, I have invited the national commanders of the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars to meet with me tomorrow here in Washington, and go into the whole question of veterans' hospitalization. I know, too, that millions of veterans who have been treated in veterans' facilities during the past 20 years, will also make their views known.

And I intend that the facts and all the facts developed shall be given to the public, without any attempt to embellish or belittle.

Meanwhile, I know the heart of the Nation is vitally concerned with the medical care afforded our veterans. It is my responsibility as head of the Veterans' Administration to build and operate the system of hospitals that has been established for veterans by a grateful Nation, and to see that they provide the very best care that may be had.

Articles glibly decrying the medical and professional qualifications of physicians and the principles of treatment employed in our hospitals, have, I know, created anxiety among parents, friends, and veterans themselves.

So far as I know, none of these writers is a physician and none has lived with this problem. Their investigations have occupied but little of their time.

Commander KRUM. Now, General Hines, as head of the Veterans' Administration, would you mind telling us the kind of physicians and surgeons you employ?

General HINES. They are of the finest. In fact, every Veterans' Administration physician must be a graduate of a class A school, and have completed an internship in a recognized hospital.

Before we can employ them they must be accredited by the Civil Service Commission. The quality of medical attention given by the armed services has been praised in the same articles which criticized the Veterans' Administration. Yet when this Nation went to war, 400 of our doctors left and entered the military service. So 400 of our doctors are actually among the highly qualified medical men who are praised for the service they are giving troops.

Further, because of the shortage of personnel this created, the armed services have loaned us 300 doctors to replace our losses; some of them were doctors who had formerly served with us, others were not. So we have actually lost only 100 doctors because of the war.

In view of this I believe it is reasonable to assume that patients in veterans' hospitals are receiving approximately the same quality of treatment they received when they were in active service.

Commander KRUM. General Hines, you must also have a great shortage of nurses which handicaps your operation?

General HINES. Yes, Commander Krum; I don't, however, want to imply that the service we are rendering is entirely perfect or even up to the standards I myself would like to see maintained. Shortage of personnel due to war conditions makes this impossible, and although the generosity of the armed services has done much to fill the depleted ranks of our medical staff, we are still woefully lacking in nurses, technicians, and social workers. The importance of these skilled groups cannot be overemphasized. The Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the United States of America today are short more than 1,000 nurses alone, and this is expected to become more acute in the next few months.

Commander KRUM. I have seen criticisms of the Veterans' Administration charging the death rate in their hospitals are high. What have you got to say about this?

General HINES. Since the Veterans Administration was established we have had almost 3,000,000 admissions to our hospitals. Out of this number, of course, it isn't difficult to find someone willing or even anxious to find fault with the service he has received.

I doubt if there is a doctor in practice or a hospital in existence entirely free from criticism from former patients.

Many of our patients are old, they are the fighters of former wars and they seldom go to a hospital until they are in a very bad physical condition. It is not unusual for many of these old timers to die but I'll challenge anyone to say that the death rate among younger men and particularly veterans of this war, is any higher in a Veterans Administration facility than it would be in any other hospital in the country.

Let's remember the Spanish War was 47 years ago. The average age of veterans from that war is now 70 years. World War No. 1 was 26 years ago, and the average age of those veterans is now 52 years.

Men in these groups, and there are now about 4,000,000 of them, are encountering the diseases of middle age, diseases of the heart, the kidneys, the digestive system. They come to us ill, many of them desperately ill; we do all that is possible for them. But men of this age do not recover from sickness with the same resilience as younger men. Many of them do not come to our hospitals until their illnesses are far advanced and the chance of recovery is minimized.

I know that the death rate among these groups is higher today than it was 20 years ago, when our patients were more nearly the ages of the men who are coming from this war. These younger men now represent nearly 20 percent of all patients in our hospitals. Many of them are critically ill and have come to us directly from military hospitals. Many are heartsick and war weary and are anxious to go home.

For many, we are a haven and we try to give them the best modern medical service can provide, but those who are homesick and are able to leave the hospital, may do so. We cannot force them to stay and accept treatment, and we cannot penalize them for leaving against medical advice. What police authority we have is limited to those who are committed to our care by the courts of the Nation, and those are the only men over whom we can exercise any compulsion. It has been charged that more veterans receiving compensation die outside of hospitals than die in them. This is cited as evidence that our hospital service is poor. Many of the veterans who die outside of our hospitals, have never been in one of them and we have no authority to require that they enter them. I can't see that this statement is any more significant than it is to say more people die outside of hospitals than in them.

Commander KRUM. General Hines, what is your answer to the charge that "Only one patient in six ever leaves Veterans' Administration hospitals labeled 'cured.'"

General HINES. Let me remind you that in some diseases, particularly tuberculosis, virtually no patient is ever labeled cured. With this in mind let me give you the record of accomplishments in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Since 1930, over 2,000,000 patients have been discharged from Veterans' Administration hospitals. Of these, 70 percent have left as "cured" or "improved," 8.5 percent have been unimproved, and less than 7 percent died. The balance were in for examination and observation only. To give you some idea of the volume of work involved in the operation of these hospitals let me say, that during the year 1944 we made over 300,000 X-ray examinations of hospital patients, and over 4,000,000 laboratory tests. And the 188,000 patients discharged last year underwent 60,000 major and minor operations.

Commander KRUM. General Hines, what do you say we localize this discussion for a moment. You have a hospital here in Washington at Mount Alto, and I would like to ask you some questions about it.

General HINES. All right, Commander.

Commander KRUM. How many patients are now in Mount Alto?

General HINES. As of midnight, March 8, 1945, there were 305 patients.

Commander KRUM. What is their average age?

General HINES. The average age of all combined is 50 years.

Commander KRUM. How many of these patients come from the different wars?

General HINES. Well, there are around 190 from World War No. 1, 73 from World War No. 2, 26 come from the Spanish-American War, 12 were in our peacetime military service and there were others with various service to their credit.

Commander KRUM. How many World War No. 2 patients have you had altogether would you say?

General HINES. The first veteran of World War No. 2 was admitted on December 15, 1942. Since then we have treated 1,788 World War No. 2 veterans.

Commander KRUM. General, how many World War No. 2 veterans would you say, have died at Mount Alto?

General HINES. The records show only 29, or less than 2 percent.

Commander KRUM. That certainly is a long way from what has been charged of one out of six patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals are dying. Now as to the food. What are the people in Mount Alto eating today? If you have it, I would like their dinner menu.

General HINES. Their dinner menu this noon consisted of: Soup and crackers, fried chicken, mashed potatoes and gravy, celery hearts, ice cream sandwiches, hot rolls and butter, and coffee.

This menu is, of course, typical of Sunday dinners served not only at Mount Alto, but in Veterans' Administration facilities all over the county.

Commander KRUM. How many of the patients in Mount Alto are actually confined to their beds?

General HINES. As of Friday noon, 69 patients ate at the main dining hall, while 236 were either in bed or in their wards.

Commander KRUM. I presume these 236 patients are fed on trays carried to their bedsides. Do they get the same food that is served in the general mess?

General HINES. Generally, but many patients require special diets. They are prepared under the special supervision of highly trained dieticians, either in the main kitchen or in the ward diet kitchen, and each patient gets the food best for his particular case as ordered by the hospital physician.

Vocational Guidance Clinics for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a resolution unanimously adopted by the board of supervisors in the great county of Los Angeles, in my native State of California. Certainly, it will be recognized by all Members of this House that no county in this Nation has more reason to be presently and vitally concerned about the economic and social security and welfare of returning veterans in all phases of the problem of adjustment and readjustment to industry. The text of this resolution fully and clearly specifies the problem involved and very emphatically shows that vocational guidance clinics are most essential.

I urge that this further necessary assistance and protection to the veterans of our Nation be given by providing adequate moneys for these vocational-guidance clinics.

The resolution follows:

OFFICE OF THE BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
February 20, 1945.

The Board met in regular session. Present: Supervisors William A. Smith, chairman presiding, Leonard J. Roach, John Anson Ford, Raymond V. Darby, and Roger W. Jessup; and J. F. Moroney, clerk, by Alice Burks, deputy clerk.

In re return of discharged veterans: Resolution urging Congress to enact legislation to provide vocational guidance clinics.

On motion of Supervisor Jessup, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be, and the same is hereby adopted, to wit:

"Whereas the return and discharge of thousands of veterans of the present war has created a serious social problem in this community because of the difficulty which many of them are encountering in adjusting themselves to civilian employment conditions; and

"Whereas vast numbers of these returned veterans, still distressed by the harrowing experiences which their patriotic services have entailed, are perplexed by the problem of finding jobs for which they are best fitted by reasons of training, temperament, and health; and

"Whereas officials of welfare agencies who are daily contacting these veterans emphasize the urgent need for vocational guidance clinics where trained counselors could hear the problems of these men and aid them in finding proper employment; and

"Whereas the many benefits and privilges which the Federal Government has created for the discharged veterans do not include vocational guidance service of this kind; and

"Whereas, vocational guidance clinics of this type are also needed here to serve the many war workers who have come to Los Angeles, many of whom have never before engaged in industrial employment and who are having difficulty in adjusting themselves to their altered employment status; and

"Whereas it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to ameliorate this situation by enacting legislation which would provide for the type of vocational guidance set forth herein; and

"Whereas it is of immediate concern to the county of Los Angeles that these veterans and these war workers be assisted in rehabilitating themselves as useful and contented citizens: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That Congress be urged to establish machinery for providing the type of consultation and rehabilitation service described herein; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Clerk of the Board be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the two California Senators and to the Members of the Los Angeles County delegation in the House of Representatives; and be it further

"Resolved, That the county health officer be instructed to make a survey of the conditions which are existing among socially maladjusted veterans and war workers to determine what steps can be taken by this county to alleviate the conditions herein described."

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on February 20, 1945, and is entered in the minutes of said board.

[SEAL] J. F. MORONEY,
County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and Ex-officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Said County.
By ALICE BURKS,
Deputy.

O. P. A. Regulations Affecting Hotel Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. EARTHMAN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD an article from the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., of recent date, which tells its own story.

It is not my intention, nor desire, to destroy the effectiveness of O. P. A. but instead, to call attention to such things that need correction in order that this vital agency might more successfully combat the great problem of inflation. This is our country and our Government, and O. P. A. should correct its own mistakes and if they refuse, then it is undeniably the responsibility of the Congress.

Now, of all times, every department of government should work as never before to gain and maintain the full confidence of all the people rather than to create friction and distrust.

The article follows:

ANSLEY HOTEL TO CLOSE—O. P. A. CEILINGS CITED

The Ansley Hotel, 57-room establishment at 614 Broadway, will be closed tomorrow afternoon because new rates established by the Office of Price Administration have caused an operating loss "too great to continue," Ansley A. Dickson, owner of the hotel, said today.

Dickson said that the O. P. A. had ordered the rates cut on approximately 45 rooms in both the annex, where there are 23 rooms, and in the main building, where there are 34 rooms.

"Where we have been charging $1 single and $2 double in the annex, the O. P. A. has ordered us to charge $1 and $1.50; and where we have been charging $2 single and $3 double in the main part the O. P. A. has forced us to charge $1.25 and $1.75," Dickson declared.

"We tried to operate a week under these new forced rates and the loss was too great to continue. Therefore we are closing up and the hotel will be padlocked as of 4 p. m. tomorrow."

Dickson claimed that the previous rates were the same as had always been charged at the hotel. It had not been a practice of the hotel, however, to keep a ledger on room rates and thus there was no available record of rates other than affidavits from regular patrons of the hotel, Dickson said.

O. P. A. ATTITUDE

The O. P. A. informed Dickson that "under the rent-control regulation, when the Director finds rooms in hotels renting much higher than similar rooms in comparable hotels it is his duty to reduce them to comparable values. * * * We reduced the rents on rooms ranging from $3 to $6 per day to the rates being charged by the Nash Hotel, the Bell Hotel, the Savoy Hotel, and the Tulane Hotel. If these hotels which we have used for comparables can operate at a profit, we see no reason why the Ansley cannot also operate at a profit."

In this regard Dickson contended that his overhead for a 57-room hotel is only a few dollars less than that of a 200-room hotel such as the Tulane.

Among letters which Dickson had from regular patrons expressing satisfaction with the Ansley's rates and service was one from Maj. S. F. Drew, of the Marine Corps recruiting station, with which Dickson has had a contract for the past 2½ or 3 years. Major Drew wrote that previous contracts with other hotels had not been satisfactory, but that the arrangement with the Ansley had been satisfactory.

Dickson will request a review of the orders from the Nashville area rent office in both regional and national offices.

MERCHANTS HOTEL

Also owner of the 40-room Merchants Hotel at 403 Broadway, Dickson said a rate sheet he had received from the O. P. A. for the Merchants Hotel would force him to close that establishment as well if they became effective.

Frank F. Sturm, area rent director, said the rate sheets probably will become effective next week.

Commenting on the rate reductions, Sturm explained "we reduce rates by comparability with similar rooms, and here we used the Nash, Bell, Tulane, and Savoy Hotels and adjusted rates according to those."

Sturm pointed out further that it was principally the higher priced Ansley rooms which were affected by the cut, and stated that "Dickson had some low-priced rooms we didn't cut."

Sturm affirmed that the cut was particularly aimed at rooms for which Dickson charged from $3 to $6 a day. He adds, however, that "some $2 rooms were reduced, but there was no reduction on any $1 and $1.50 single rooms."

In regard to Dickson's request for a review of the orders, Sturm explained that the local O. P. A. office will send the request, within 20 days from the time Dickson filed it, to the regional office in Atlanta for further investigation. Dickson awaits that verdict and then is permitted to request the regional office to send it to the national office for consideration.

Sturm explained further that "if Dickson still is not satisfied, he can ask that it be appealed to the Emergency Court of Appeals, where the case will be tried without fees."

The Marine Nobody Knew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very interesting article which has come to my attention that appeared in the March edition of the Leatherneck, magazine of the marines, written by Tech. Sgt. Pete Zurlinden, a United States Marine Corps combat correspondent, in reference to the heroism and bravery of an 18-year-old boy by the name of Pvt. Norman Arsenault, who was a resident of my home city of Lawrence, Mass. The attitude taken by Private Arsenault in a real emergency in combat on the shores of Saipan on July 8, 1944, is typical of many of our American boys who are performing so valiantly in the services of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps in combating the enemy in all fronts throughout the world and on the seas of battle. His neighbors, friends, and associates in the city of Lawrence and the entire people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are extremely proud of his acts and accomplishments in fighting the fanatical and atrocious Japs. We are extremely thankful to him for the fact that before meeting his Maker that he put to death so many of the enemy so that his buddies could make a change in fighting operations which resulted in the saving of the lives of his fighting mates in the United States marines.

The article follows:

MARINE NOBODY KNEW

This is the story of the marine that nobody knew. It's the story of Pvt. Norman Arsenault, of Lawrence, Mass., who knew one moment of heroic greatness before Japanese bullets cut him down while he waded, hip-deep, in reef waters off Saipan's shores, July 8, 1944.

Private Arsenault never had known warfare before he came to the Marianas on June 15. One reason was that he didn't reach his eighteenth birthday until last May and wasn't sent overseas until shortly after Tarawa.

Young, medium-sized, Arsenault looked older than his 18 years, yet it was probably because of youthful shyness that he wasn't much of a mixer. He did not smoke nor did he curse. His buddies can recall little about him before that vivid afternoon when he gave his own life saving theirs.

Several times, they say, they had wondered whether his heart was in this grim business of carrying the fight to the Japs, because while he did his job and did it well, he seldom extended himself. Now they think he must have been saving himself for just exactly the kind of a situation that developed—a situation they'll never forget, just as they'll never forget Private Arsenault, as long as they live.

The Jap was in a corner. The marine advance up Saipan's western coast from Tanapag Harbor to Mount Marpi was moving inexorably to a conclusion. Arsenault and the Second Marine Regiment's Third Battalion suddenly executed a flanking movement; the plan—to sweep toward the sea and over the cliffs between Kaberra Pass and the ocean, then north again.

The Third Battalion drove down to the water's edge. Then it reformed its lines, but while this was being done Japanese pockets, dug in the caves abreast the shore, had to be cleaned out.

Arsenault's platoon was ordered to go to work on a length of the coast that looked like an inverted capital "L." About 6 yards of crumbled limestone boulders separated a 7-foot cliff from the sea. His platoon scrambled over the cliff-face, dropping to the boulders.

Too late they saw that a deep crevice in the face of the tiny cliff was teeming with Japs, prone on their bellies, who opened up with one of the most murderous rifle and machine gun barrages the outfit yet had met.

Arsenault was on the extreme left flank. He, too, was pinned down amongst the boulders. Jap bullets splattered limestone chunks down onto their helmets, sending up a tinny noise that sounded like somebody emptying a trash can into a wagon.

Because most of the outfit were machine gunners, who had been ordered to arm with carbines for the mop-up, there wasn't a heavy weapon in the crowd. For 15 minutes the Japs peppered every Marine who attempted to move. There apparently was nothing anybody could do about it until young Arsenault reached his decision.

From his place on the left, he bounded to his feet, carbine gripped tightly in his hands. Instead of making a dash to try for the safety atop the cliff, Private Arsenault ran speedily to the rear, striding some 20 yards into the reef-water.

When he had gone as far as he wished, he reversed himself, facing the Japs in the caves, and began to pump carbine bullets into the crevice. More than 50 enemy guns were quickly turned on him.

Nobody knows what saved him in those first few moments when hundreds of enemy bullets were zinging toward him, some rippling the water as they lashed into the surf in front of him. But he continued to fire until his ammunition was exhausted.

While the youngster was keeping the Japs so occupied, almost half of his platoon scrambled from their positions behind the boulders and dashed to safety atop the cliff. But in this position they were powerless to help Arsenault.

Out of ammunition, he sloshed through the water back to buddies still hoping to get out from under gunfire, borrowed as many ammunition clips as he could, and went back to take up where he had left off.

Again the Japs tried to pinpoint him in their murderous fire. But he kept firing his carbine almost as fast as an automatic weapon until his platoon had been completely evacuated from in front of the cliff. A sergeant ordered him to come in out of the water, to try and make it up the cliff himself.

Arsenault laughed merrily, emptied another clip into the crevice and then started back. He had just taken his fourth step when they saw him stiffen; then saw the bullet wound in his head. He slumped slowly into the water until his buddies saw him disappear beneath the surface.

That night Private Arsenault was avenged. His platoon set up a line about 100 yards from the cliff, knowing the Japs would come up rather than face dynamite and other demolition extermination the next morning. With plenty of mortar illumination, the platoon killed Japs by the handful the moment they became silhouetted against the water.

In the morning they recovered Arsenault's body. While they carried it back to the rear for burial, others in the platoon investigated the crevice into which he had poured more than 100 rounds of ammunition.

Jap bodies were sprawled throughout it. More than 20 dead were certain victims of his carbine. Others might have been. The lad none of them had ever got to really know had proved a real fighting marine, one of their own beyond the shadow of doubt.

TECH. SGT. PETE ZURLINDEN,
United States Marine Corps Combat Correspondent.

Program for Education of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. GIBSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to authorize correspondence schools to participate in the program for the education of veterans as provided in Public Law No. 346 and which is commonly referred to as the G. I. bill of rights.

The Veterans' Administration has construed this law as excluding from its provisions correspondence schools and unless the amendment that I have today offered is enacted into law irrespective of the convenience and wishes of a given veteran he will not be permitted to participate in the advantages held out by many correspondence schools under the privileges of the said Public Law No. 346.

To begin with it was my understanding that it was the intent of Congress to definitely provide that the veteran may select the school of his own choice with provisions only that his choice must be exercised in favor of a school which had been certified by a State or its authority. In many cases the circumstances would be such that if a veteran is not permitted to take a correspondence course he would be precluded from taking advantage of the benefits of the said law. Furthermore, this amendment would not effect the rights of any veteran as in no case would his right of free choice be impaired. This amendment would only give him the right, if he so desired, to take the correspondence course. We should not complain if it was his wishes based on his circumstances to take this course, as it would certainly be of less cost to the Federal Government. Were it not true that this amendment gave only a privilege, and in no way takes away a right, I would not offer or support it. I hope the membership of the House may look with favor on this amendment.

To Prevent War—No News Black-out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times Magazine of Sunday, March 11, 1945, by Kent Cooper, executive director of the Associated Press, entitled "To Prevent War—No News Black-out":

TO PREVENT WAR—NO NEWS BLACK-OUT

(By Kent Cooper, executive director of the Associated Press)

I

Nestled in a small space not far from the north bank of the Thames in battle-scarred London is Printing House Square. There—through all that has happened to the British in more than a hundred and fifty years—there is still published a newspaper called The Times. In its fifty-thousandth issue recently it reviewed the century and a half of its existence, commented on the difficulties of publication, shortage of materials and of staff, the dangers of continued effort in wartime, and concluded:

"Though, before the sixty-thousandth issue of The Times makes its appearance, science may well have revolutionized the mechanism by which the written word is reproduced and distributed, the fundamentals of journalism will not vary. It will still be the duty of a newspaper to hold fast to the distinction between fact and opinion and, whatever views it may hold and express, to furnish for the readers' judgment a supply of news as full and impartial as energy and good faith can make it."

Unfortunately, that declaration of the function of newspapers could not have defined the actualities of newspaper publication in many lands before the war. If it could, there would have been no war. And that is just how transcendently important to peace is "a supply of news as full and impartial as energy and good faith can make it." For news is the sole basis upon which men promptly learn and judge the thoughts and actions of their fellow men who are beyond their immediate local acquaintance.

If, in the news processes, there is intentional and persistent distortion of facts with the purpose of inciting prejudice, men will respond to the passions thus aroused. When the people of one nation are thus incited against the peoples of other nations, the result is war.

The part false news plays in bringing about war is as amazing in its extent as it is little understood. Malevolent-minded governments long have recognized the power of news. Tainting and distorting it, they have used it to serve their selfish purposes. Benevolent- and peace-minded governments have not concerned themselves about these distortions by others—until war has overtaken them.

Every country, even though only partly civilized, has laws to punish those who intentionally poison the food of others. Through jealousy or in revenge such crimes have been committed, but usually only one or two lives have been placed in jeopardy. No fiend has yet concocted an attempt to poison the bodies of an entire population of his own or another country. But through jealousy or in revenge there are fiends who, through the news, have successfully poisoned the minds, not of one or two persons but of a whole nation.

For an understanding of how news has come to play so important a part in the lives of civilized men let us go back to the beginning. Once the town crier spread the news. Then came the newspaper, supplemented later by the broadcasting station. The marvel known as electricity served to bring men into closer knowledge of one another. Actually, the first practical application of electricity for the benefit of the whole people was to bring the news from far and wide. The telegraph, cable, telephone, and finally the wireless annihilated the distance between nations and between individual communities.

In this country each locality was linked with all others and our whole life integrated into one homogeneous national community. And yet our conception of the importance of news dissemination and publication, for which science furnishes means of instantaneous world-wide transmission, remained provincial; or perhaps we ignored the subject altogether. The news was one of the things to which we had become so accustomed that we thought about it only when we could not get it. While we had seen, unconsciously, what it had done to unify our own country, we had never realized fully that it contributed more than anything else to synchronized thinking and action.

The news could never have served us as it did and does serve us had it not been for the freedom of the press, which made the printing of that news possible. We had our freedom, we had a press free of Government control which stood guard for that freedom. Satisfied with our own development, we did not greatly concern ourselves with the affairs of the world. Then from our provincial dreaming we were twice rudely awakened to find that science had indeed made our globe smaller. News could no longer be confined principally to our own activities. And with the coming of the Second World War we began to ask ourselves where these wars are bred.

II

The history of the European press in the years that preceded the present war reveals clearly how large a part poisoned news played in bringing on the war. That poison was of two kinds—a kind of gray poison that was doing its work almost everywhere in Europe and in Asia before the advent of Hitler, and the utterly black poison that came with the Hitler-Goebbels scourge.

Even in the years before the Nazi blackout, events had given little comfort to those who believed that freedom of information and an honest, responsible press were the surest shields of peace. In almost no country was the truth faced. Typical of the situation, and possibly in its worst form, was what was happening in France from 1919 to 1939.

Not only were Havas, the French news agency, and the French Government in effective league to prevent the full picture of world developments from reaching the French people, but the French press itself all but abdicated its proper responsibilities and functions. Long before the Second World War fell upon the bewildered French people they had been deserted by all but a small fraction of their press.

Newspapers were largely subsidized, in one fashion or another. Editors and reporters frequently were on government, party, or business pay rolls and many newspapers were directly contolled by political or financial groups. News columns were bought as a common practice. This was true particularly of the Paris press. There were some independent newspapers, but most of these were in the provinces. The character of the French press was a mighty contribution to the disunity and confusion in which France marched to her catastrophe in 1939–40. And this was the picture in a nation that was considered a democracy.

But the blackest poison was that generated in the thirties in Germany, Japan, and Italy. Then the suffocation of truth in the news was put on a totalitarian basis.

Freedom of the press died with all the other freedoms in Germany on the night of January 30, 1933, when Hitler became chancellor. Newspapers and radio became instruments of a regime with criminal purposes. Editors and reporters became functionaries of the state. Journalism was defined by law as a "public task regulated by the state." The ministry of propaganda and public enlightenment was established under Goebbels. All media of information and expression were crushed into the Nazi mold, all bent to the purpose of whipping the German people into that fanatical frenzy necessary to the savage purposes of the Nazi dictator. By 1939 it was done; the Germans were ready to assume the responsibility for plunging the world into war.

Japan's road into the darkness was similar. The press of Japan never had been free of rigorous government control, but in the late 1920's there was developing a small group of Japanese newspapermen and thinkers with an enlightened conception of the responsibilities of the press and the importance of truth in the news transmitted from one country to another. Some beginnings were made toward adaptation of the cooperative principle of news agency operations.

When the militarists on September 18, 1931, embarked on the conquest of Manchuria and seized the reins of power in Tokyo, they began a revolution of which the significance was little understood abroad. The small element of the press that valued the small measure of freedom previously enjoyed was among the first victims. Terrorism, intimidation, powerful pressures were enlisted to bring the whole press into line. Even the comparatively liberal Asahi newspapers of Tokyo and Osaka eventually had to succumb.

The story of the Italian press under Mussolini's dictatorship followed what we now recognize as the pattern for destroying all freedom of the press.

III

The deep night that blotted out the truth in Germany, Japan, and Italy need not fall on any country again, nor need there be maintained in most countries a murky twilight as far as knowledge of other peoples is concerned. Since it has been proved that poisoned news can generate a war, its antithesis, truthful news, should have a chance to prove that it can maintain the peace. Truthful news and a free press can do more than anything to avert war, but the acceptance of both must be real and sincere, not lip service paid to the ideals of a free press in countries which pride themselves on democratic institutions.

We should realize today, as we should have 25 years ago, that members of this great world family of human beings are either not well enough acquainted or not acquainted at all. Since they do not all live in physical proximity, they can come to know each other only by what they hear and what they read. An exchange of truthful international news would bring acquaintance, and the result of acquaintance would be world-wide community of interest.

If we are convinced that for an enduring peace an international community of interest should be established, we should see to it that America holds out inexorably for the two things that make world-wide community of interest possible—a world-wide free press and a communications system adapted to serve the press everywhere in a truly practical manner.

For myself, I would proclaim now that we expect to accomplish this in the peace. I would not wait until the war ends, would not leave these vital elements to be tossed around upon the sea of indecision and intrigue which always prevail in peace negotiations.

The establishment of a free press involves no expenditures, though it does involve a great deal of practical enlightenment on how newspapers through advertising and subscription rates can maintain themselves independent of political or private subsidy. On the other hand, an international communications system would cost a great deal of money, but it would not cost more than a fraction of 1 percent of the cost of world armament.

With these two instruments available for the establishment of an international community of interest, we shall have at least a groundwork for what might seem now to be utopian.

The blessings of adequate communications and a free press surely were not given to us to exploit solely for our own benefit and to keep just for ourselves. Here in the United States the principle of true and unbiased news was first developed. If we would keep out of another war, then in self-interest we should see to it that the principle is given to the world in a militant effort to improve international relations. Availability of the truth, the most powerful force in the world, through a free press served by an adequate system of world-wide communications established for the purpose, should be our aim. For we should not forget that when we plan to enshrine freedom in any field, the first requisite is the right to know.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Constantine Brown which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., on Tuesday, March 6, 1945:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The Polish problem, at least so far as the American and British Governments are concerned, is not yet settled. The solution appears to depend on whether Archbishop Prince Sapieha, head of the Krakow archbishopric, is prepared to accept the thankless

task of becoming leader of the Polish Government of National Unity which was created, on paper, at the Yalta Conference.

Pope Pius is reported to have been approached by American emissaries, such as Harry Hopkins and Ed Flynn, with the view to counseling the Polish archbishop to accept the assignment. There is no definite news whether the Vatican has taken the suggested steps or what the reaction of the Polish prelate has been.

The 74-year-old archbishop is a member of an old aristocratic family, tracing his ancestry back to the twelfth century. He is known to be very proud and independent. It was he who objected to the interment of the late Marshal Pilsudsky in the royal crypt in the Krakow Cathedral. During the 5 years of German occupation of Krakow he stubbornly refused to receive the representatives of Hitler, including Governor General Frank, who used threats and cajolery in an effort to obtain an interview with this intransigent prince of the church.

To Frank's threat he let it be known that life is far less important than principle. Throughout the German occupation of his city he did not permit any of the German hierarchy to enter his cathedral. While Archbishop Sapieha cannot be described as a popular man with the masses he is highly respected for his unbending attitude.

Because neither the British nor the American Governments could swallow the idea of employing men of the Lublin Committee at the head of the compromise Polish Government and, on the other hand, Premier Stalin was equally determined not to have any dealings with members of the Polish Government in exile, the thought occurred to the representatives of the western democracies that Archbishop Sapieha might be the ideal man for the job. Should he accept the responsibility of heading the new Polish Government the future steps taken in Poland would not appear in the eyes of the world as being unilateral actions of the U. S. S. R.

For the time being, it is not known whether the archbishop is going to accept. He has been approached from various quarters and urged to take over the job which, thankless as it is, might help his country. But it is assumed in some official quarters here that he has presented certain minimum conditions and demanded guaranties that they would be put in effect before he definitely makes up his mind.

In the meantime, neither the American nor the British Government is as happy as they appeared at first over the Polish solution.

Prime Minister Churchill seems to have some misgivings about the future witchhunting to which the returning Polish soldiers may be subjected after the fighting in Europe is over, and he has offered British citizenship to these men to enable them to find a home in England or any of the British possessions which may be able to receive them.

Foreign Secretary Eden is not convinced that the Yalta compromise is final. In his speech of last Wednesday before the House of Commons which for some reason or other was not fully reported in the American press, Mr. Eden reiterated the British Government's dislike for the Lublin committee which "His Majesty's Government does not regard as representative of Poland at all."

The foreign secretary added that the representative of that committee, who had made "an unfavorable impression on Mr. Churchill and myself when we met them in Moscow," had caused the Lublin radio station to pour out streams of contentious stuff after the Yalta Conference. But what is surprising to read in Mr. Eden's speech is his statement that "we have recognized the government in London and shall continue to recognize it until a new government is created" and added emphatically, "if it is created at all."

Mr. Eden ended his reference to Poland's difficult political conditions by saying that the new government would have Britain's approval "only if it is broadly representative of the Polish people."

It has been frequently emphasized that the fate of Poland has become of paramount importance in the United States, Great Britain and all the other countries in Europe, not for sentimental reasons, but because it is the touchstone which will show whether the Big Three intend to live up to the principles of the Atlantic Charter or have discarded it in all but name.

Address Before Chamber of Commerce, Gardner, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Gardner Chamber of Commerce, Gardner, Mass., March 13, 1945:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen and friends, I respond this evening to the very kind invitation of your officers and committee with a deep sense of honor and genuine pleasure. The work which your outstanding chamber is contributing during these troubled days is so very important and so essential, not only to the war effort, in which we all take such overpowering interest, but also to the well-being, stability, and prosperity of this beautiful and constructive community, that it is a matter for special commendation.

As some of you may know, the work of the chamber of commerce and its affiliated organizations has long been close to my heart and has also commanded my deep interest and attention. Both as an individual citizen and as your Congressman, I have had many occasions to observe and certainly to recognize and highly appraise the great amount of public good that this organization has done; its substantial help in solving many complex local problems its invariable response through its united membership to every worthy appeal in behalf of community and country; and its ever-present zeal, unselfishly and generously expressed, to advance, as it has a right to do under our American system, the special interests of its members, but, also and more importantly, the high-minded and invaluable cooperation that it has rendered to many great public causes which have been of inestimable benefit to all the citizens of the city, State, and Nation.

First of all then this evening, I must offer my heartiest congratulations to your fine group of public-spirited citizens, both men and women, who have made this organization the vital and constructive force that it is in the affairs of this city and in the far more important work of promoting our common war effort, which is steadily but inexorably moving toward victory and peace. Every member of this body—indeed, every citizen of Gardner—may well take justifiable pride in the achievements and accomplishments of this chamber, and no more abundant evidence could be found for past successes and the present vitality and spirit of this chamber than the splendid enthusiastic outpouring of your fellow members and citizens, men and women alike, who by their presence in such large numbers have graced this occasion this evening.

I referred a moment ago to the fact that one of the purposes of this organization has been and is to advance the interests of its membership in their particular business affairs, but of course you have had a much broader and a much more unselfish purpose. You have been genuinely concerned with the progress of your city, your great Commonwealth, and your beloved Nation. You have taken a sincere and effective part in promoting prosperous conditions in all your business relationships that have inevitably resulted in enriching the life of the entire community. In more ways than I could mention, after the fashion of true, untrammeled Americanism you have generously given of your time, efforts, and finances to every worthy charity, and public and patriotic object, and these efforts on your part have redounded, I repeat, to the interest of every group and class who reside within this city and to the larger benefit and interest of the country which we all desire to serve these days with all our hearts. That you will continue in this spirit of mutual helpfulness with this purpose of promoting the common good to serve and enhance legitimate private objects and commendable public ends, I have not the slightest doubt.

During the past few years the burdens of all-out global war have fallen upon all our people with ever-increasing intensity. Unprecedented taxes, sweeping and exceptional interferences with management and labor, control of basic materials, price and wage regulations that in peacetime would be entirely unwarranted if not unconstitutional, and a host of other encroachments upon the affairs and daily lives, liberties, and property of our citizens deemed necessary by the desperate need for total and effective mobilization of all our resources for the successful prosecution of the war, have been our lot. But these burdens, as onerous and perplexing as some of them undoubtedly have been, in the main have not affected, for the most part, the material or economic conditions of our people.

We should never overlook, indeed we can never forget, the most frightful burden of all this terrible war has imposed, and that is the demand that it has made upon all our able-bodied young manhood who have been called upon to leave their schools and their work, their homes, and their loved ones to face death, if necessary, in defense of our democracy against ruthless enemies on widely separated foreign battlefields. Nor can we ever forget they are emblazoned in gold upon the most heroic and glorious pages of American history, the valor, the indomitable spirit, and the immeasurable sacrifices of those who have offered their life's blood and in such large numbers have paid the supreme sacrifice to sustain our country's cause in this most destructive and horrible of all world wars.

In the homes of America where grief-stricken mothers mourn the loss of their loved ones and still other mothers, their hearts filled with anxiety and sorrow, keep their lonely vigil by day and by night, these burdens have been most keenly felt, and whatever else has been or will be required of us before this conflict comes to an end, it is our solemn duty as Americans to recognize the great debt we owe as a Nation to the brave boys and patriotic families upon whom the weightiest, most sorrowful burdens of war have fallen.

I am sure that I am speaking earnestly for everyone gathered here tonight and for every true citizen of the land when I say that regardless of the other costs of this war, regardless of taxes, the staggering debt, and other many material demands upon our people, it is our firm purpose to keep before us at all times, with deepest appreciation and gratitude that cannot truly or adequately be exressed, the inutterable sacrifices of those who have struggled, bled, suffered, and died

to maintain our country as a sanctuary of freedom and opportunity.

It is clear as we meet here this evening that one phase of the war in Europe is rapidly moving toward its close though the end is unpredictable and may well be preceded by obstinate resistance and additional heavy casualties. Unfortunately, however, that successful result, welcome and gratifying as it is, will not finish our ordeal. Another determined enemy fighting with fanaticism and desperation must be overcome and conquered in territory remote from the shores of America. I will not venture tonight to prophesy the duration of the war against Japan but would point out that according to our military experts the problems involved in conducting that war are gigantic.

If we meet with the same kind of resistance that we have met up to this time in the Pacific, stupendous military and naval operations embracing massive quantities of materials and supplies, thousands of ships, airplanes, tanks, other engines of destruction and millions of American boys will be required to gain victory. While there is always the hope and the possibility that the terrible punishment being visited upon them by naval bombardment and all-out aerial bombing may suddenly crack the Japanese morale and lead to capitulation, as realists, our military and naval leaders cannot afford to rely on that eventuality. When the Nazis are overpowered, these leaders must straightaway concentrate full attention and energy upon the vigorous and unrelenting prosecution of the Japanese war, and our people on the home front, not to speak of our gallant armed forces, must steel themselves with renewed determination, perseverence, and courage to the demands and requirements and consequences of extended warfare, firm in our common faith that, whatever may befall us, we will continue until we have completely overpowered the enemy, or brought him to surrender.

When that day of deliverance and liberation from horror, suffering, and sacrifice comes, as we hope and pray it will come in the not too distant future, our Nation will be confronted with another set of complex and most difficult problems which almost escape the imagination.

First and foremost, of course, when victory has been achieved, we must immediately turn our attention to the making of a just and durable peace. If civilization, as we have known it, is to survive, war as an instrument for settling international disputes will have to be outlawed, and the nations of the earth, large and small, secure in their right to self-determination and freedom, must take full responsibility for keeping and maintaining the peace. Let us make it clear that our country, which has contributed and sacrificed so much of its wealth and blood to suppress tyranny and oppression, is prepared, in good faith and with high purpose, to join in the perfection of those arrangements and undertakings which may be necessary through wholehearted international cooperation to make another great war unthinkable and impossible.

The old systems of power politics, spheres of influence, secret understandings between nations to exploit territories and peoples have served only to breed wars. In renouncing them, it is our clear duty to recognize the fact that only a peace based on justice and humanity can possibly endure; that if we would avoid the repetition of the slaughter of the flower of our youth, the repetition of the spectacle of 17- and 18-year-old boys being torn from their homes and loved ones and fed as cannon fodder into the maws of international selfishness, greed, and lust for power, we of this generation must insist upon the kind of peace that can and will be maintained in this world for centuries to come. We must keep before our minds always that no peace machinery and no peace instrumentalities, however elaborate, can be effective to accomplish these ends unless the underlying treaties and agreements which they seek to enforce are honorable and just and accord to all other nations, the powerful and the weak alike, their God-given right to freedom and self-determination. Any other kind of a peace which permits the previous tragic methods of power politics and exploitation to continue in any part of the world will merely be sowing the dragonseeds of another horrible world conflict that will spell the ruin of modern civilization and leave the world in shambles and destruction. There can be no compromise on this issue. As Americans, as Christians, as human beings who abide by the judgments of the Almighty and who love our fellow men, we must pledge our energies, efforts, and resources to the realization and attainment of a just, durable peace that will make it impossible ever again, so far as we can assure it, for power-crazed despots and fanatical tyrants to threaten our liberties, slaughter the flower of our youth and turn the whole world into a turmoil of destruction and death.

I would like also to refer briefly to two other very important matters, first, the need, more urgent than ever while our boys are away, of upholding, maintaining, and preserving the principles for which they fight and die—the American principles of freedom and opportunity which have served as the basis for the unequaled prosperity and happiness which our country has enpoyed in the past.

It is an undoubted fact that historically war is a time of social unrest. But it is also a time when radical activity reaches its peak. Throughout the world and in our own country this war has been no exception. Much of the world is being brought into the orbit of absolute, despotic systems of government totally at variance with the democratic ideals of our own. While we fight for freedom at such tremendous cost, apparently successful assaults are being made upon free institutions in many countries. Americans cannot look upon these changes and developments with approval or complacency because to a very great extent they have nullified, and if continued will entirely nullify, all of the enlightened principles of democracy which have been our alleged objectives in the war. These radical movements are not evolutionary; they do not seek improvement by orderly growth, they are revolutionary and seek to destroy, in fact in some areas they have destroyed representative government and civil liberties—freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and all the other freedoms of individual thought and action upon which true Americans and all believers in democracy lay so much emphasis. Thus, for many parts of the world the war for liberation from tyranny, in which American arms have played such a notable part, may simply serve to change the controls, so to speak, may simply serve to transfer the sovereignty of some nations from one group of tyrants to another, may simply serve to effectuate the complete destruction of democratic forms and substitute arbitrary totalitarian creeds which repress the dignity and liberty of the individual, stultify initiative and blanket all basic freedoms under the stagnating, stultifying influence of radical collectivism and regimentation.

That these influences are actively at work within our own country is abundantly clear. They are at work in every community, in every strata of American life, they are at work in our legislative halls. Even at this crucial time of peril to our institutions and our democracy they are carrying forward their carefully planned objectives to reshape and remake our social and economic institutions. Some of them openly preach and advocate the doctrines of Communism or Fascism or other socialized economic organization alien to our American tradition.

Step by step, piece by piece, often under the guise of promoting the war effort, these dangerous forces of radical social change have beer infiltrating into our economic and governmental structure. Taken individually, their proposals are apparently ofttimes calculated to mobilize the country more effectively for war. Taken as a whole, however, the net effect of their proposals is to fasten new controls upon business, industry, labor, education, the family, and the people themselves which, in truth, will destroy their rights as individual citizens and ultimately enlist them as subjects of a vast regimented federalized bureaucracy possessed of full power and control over all business, the individual worker, and the individual citizen. If these aims can be accomplished during wartime on the theory that they are required for efficient prosecution of the war, or on any other theory, because of misunderstanding or inertia, before the people realize it all Americans will be fitted into the totalitarian straitjacket and American freedom, opportunity and civil liberties will be things of the past.

This sweeping concentration of arbitrary governmental power I refer to is not confined, let me reiterate, to business and management alone, but would also embrace even the humblest worker in the land.

These proposals are in violation of the plainest lessons of history and our experience in this war. American industry, the American farmer and American labor working hand in hand in voluntary cooperation animated by the spirit of patriotism have together achieved the greatest production miracle of all time. They have not only furnished the foodstuffs and fashioned the equipment, the weapons and the materials to supply our own armies and navies but also to supply in titanic quantities the armies and navies and civilian populations of our allies. This accomplishment is not in any sense attributable to bureaucratic controls which in some instances have been necessary to allocate materials and prevent inflation, and which in some instances have exercised a hampering influence on production, but they are due preponderantly and unquestionably to the genius, the organizing ability and the zeal of free enterprise and the skill, the reliability and the unexampled loyalty and devotion of free American workers than whom there is no finer or more highly productive labor in the whole world.

The American people want to get on swiftly with this war and they are prepared unitedly and willingly to bear any burdens and to make any sacrifices that are necessary to win it at the very earliest moment. The are eager for victory, peace, and the early return of their sons. But they do not want, and they will not tolerate, any further meddling by radicals, reformers, and visionaries with the fundamental basic institutions and patterns of our country. They do not want and will not tolerate, unreasonable restrictions on free management, small business, and our devoted American laboring men and women by the millions who have demonstrated unmistakably to the whole world that under our free way of life and our free methods of work, voluntary response, and application to duty that they are capable of producing speedy concrete results more astounding in scope and character than were ever produced by any people in the entire history of the world.

The next matter I wanted to mention is the question of post-war organization of our American economy which is of greatest importance to all. With a national debt of $300,000,000,000 or conceivably even $400,000,000,000 by the time the war is ended, a sum which far exceeds the total assessed valuation of all the wealth in the Nation, 50,000,000 Americans will have to pay very heavy taxes for years and years to come in order to meet

the obligations of the Federal Government and to save the country from bankruptcy. It will cost, for example, over $6,000,000,000 a year alone, and possibly more, to meet the interest payment on the national debt, which is over $2,000,000,000 more than the normal peacetime cost of running the whole Government of the United States. It will require a sum of money estimated by some experts to be in the neighborhood of twelve to fifteen billions of dollars a year to meet our post-war obligations to the gallant veterans of this war and their dependents and I think that everyone will agree with me that these are primary obligations which will have to be met in a wholehearted spirit of gratitude and generosity for those who have made such striking and unspeakable sacrifices to perpetuate our democracy.

These expenditures do not take into account what may well be necessary to provide for pressing post-war needs for readjustment, reconversion, and rehabilitation of American industry, the encouragement of foreign trade and for assuring to our worthy laboring groups who are truly the veterans of industry, aids to full employment and decent high-standard social security, health, and general welfare opportunities. With such a prospect there will be occasion for intensified demands and propaganda by radical groups even before the war has ended and in fact some of these demands are now being made and urged.

When victory comes, America will be at the crossroads of her future destiny. Will we yield to the importunities, the threats, and oily promises of radical reformers, and like the Greeks, the Romans, and other peoples of historic fame, join in our own self-destruction and patiently sit back and watch the decay and disintegration of the greatest free government and the greatest, most fruitful, and most beneficient economic system ever devised by man? Or will we, with the brave, resolute spirit of our gallant sons who are fighting successfully and marching forward to victory against our foreign enemies, accept the great challenge of American history and demonstrate that we, as a people, still possess the vigor, the genius, the ability, the backbone and the courage, and yes—the sense of social justice—to grapple with these problems manfully and fairly and solve them in the American tradition and in the American way?

For myself, and I am sure for an overwhelming number of the American people, I know what course we ought to choose and what course we will choose. With justice and mercy toward all the nations of the world and with justice, equity, fairness, and toleration toward all groups of our own people undaunted and fearless, confident and optimistic, we will move as promptly as we can, and as vigorously as we must, to reorder our own affairs, to recapture and revitalize our democratic institutions, to clear away the wreckage and ruin—material, moral, and human—that has been left in the wake of this horrible war, to bestow solicitous, merciful, and just care upon our veterans and their dependents, to take the fetters off American enterprise, and to strike the shackles from free American farmers and workers so that once again every citizen of our great country whatever his origin, race, creed, or station in life, however humble he may be, will have the opportunity again and in the future, under our Constitution and free institutions, consecrated by the precious blood of our sons, to work out his own destiny under the American flag, so that the wounds of war may be healed, class strife and bitterness may be dissipated, and the sunlight of peace, amity, and friendliness may shine upon our land and upon the world and so that as Americans we may go forward, God willing, to brighter, healthier, happier, and more prosperous days for all our people.

Lo! The Poor Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most complete reversals of form ever witnessed in Indian legislation was seen in the Supreme Court yesterday when that body, reversing the policy of 150 years in liberally construing Indian treaties, held against the Shoshone Indians in a claim dating from 1863.

The opinion of the concurring judges shows an utter unfamiliarity with the method of governing Indians in this country and, as I see it, the effect of this decision is to relegate the American Indian to virtual peonage. To my knowledge, it is the first time that a decision of the Supreme Court on Indian claims has so shocked the conscience of the press that it has felt bound to editorialize that decision.

I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that in effect the editorial favors an Indian Claims Commission as the only forum of equitable relief for the Indian. May I say that a Special Investigating Committee of the Seventy-eighth Congress, of which I had the honor to be vice chairman, has already recommended such legislation and that the Indian Affairs Committee of the House is about ready to report out that legislation.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial in the RECORD at this point:

LO! THE POOR INDIAN

One of the strangest opinions to be handed down by the Supreme Court in recent years was read from the bench yesterday. Justice Reed spoke for the Court, although his opinion reflected the views of only three of the Court's nine members. Justices Jackson and Black teetered on the fence through four pages of a concurring opinion, leaning heavily toward support of the Shoshone Indians' claims and then flipping to the Court's conclusion against them. Justices Frankfurter and Murphy joined Justice Douglas in his dissent and then Justice Murphy wrote a long dissent of his own, apparently to show that he was doubly repelled by the majority's conclusion. Justice Roberts dissented without writing an opinion.

It was an old treaty with the Northwest bands of Shoshone Indians signed at Box Elder, Utah, in 1863, that produced this five-way split. The Court was called upon to determine whether that treaty recognized title on the part of the Indians to 15,000,000 acres of land in the Western States. The Indians were seeking damages amounting to $15,000,000 for loss of those lands. To find the meaning of an 82-year-old treaty with nomadic tribes who kept no records and did not understand the English language was admittedly a difficult task. We have a good deal of sympathy with the contention of Justices Jackson and Black that the Court "could not satisfactorily apply legal technique to the interpretation" of such a document.

The white man had ruthlessly encroached upon the Indians' hunting lands and killed off their game. Left destitute, the natives began to prey upon caravans of white pioneers moving westward. United States troops reduced the Indians to submission. Then a treaty was signed granting the whites transit right over Indian lands and in return giving supplies and recognizing their "claim" to vast tracts of lands. To be sure, the language of the treaty suggests that something less than title to the land in our language was intended. But the Indians had no word or even the concept of legal title. They wanted only the right to roam over the lands and hunt as their ancestors had done for centuries. That right, of course, has been taken from them.

Because of the great advantage of the learned white man dictating terms to the illiterate conquered natives, the Supreme Court has heretofore resolved ambiguities in such treaties in favor of the Indians. Five Justices made vigorous pleas for similar treatment of the conquered aborigines in this case. But Justices Jackson and Black addressed their appeals to Congress. Even if the Court had found favor of the Shoshones, they pointed out, the only effect would have been to allow for attorney fees and to earmark the balance of the recovered fund in the Treasury for future appropriation in the interest of health, education, and industrial advancement of the Indians. In these circumstances they felt that Congress should take over the whole problem of aiding these peoples whom we have despoiled.

By casting their vote the other way, the two pivotal Justices would have effectively dumped the problem into the lap of Congress. As matters stand, they have merely handed down an essay on the Government's moral responsibility. We hope that Congress will heed their advice, but we are not convinced that the Court has done its full duty to right the wronge inflicted on this minority. Incidentally, these opinions, revealing as they do the shameful conduct of the master race in America toward conquered peoples, will make good reading for those critics who think that full justice in all parts of the world must be a condition precedent to our joining an international organization to keep the peace.

The Manpower Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARCH 9, 1945.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have heard so much about this work or draft bill and as my blood is just boiling, I thought I would let off a little steam. I am one of the many war workers and I get tired of hearing about this not enough production. If the men were turned loose where they could work instead of held up so production would be hindered, we would all have a better production and better morale too.

Here at Tulsa in the war plants they have too many men and no one to let us go on and turn out these planes. The main fellows take a plane ready to fly, get a bunch on it just to tear it back up so the mechanics

will have something to do to them the next day. They have capable men to take care, but they want production cut so they can hire and make more money.

I think something should be done. Every time someone is coming around they hear it and tell everyone to act busy. So the best way to find out for yourself is to find someone to work two or three months time to see how much fraud there is and I feel it's in all Government-owned plants.

I have two brothers in the Army and I'm as anxious to have this thing over as you, and I thought it my duty to write to you as my representative to let you know and there are millions like me over there. I won't sign my name for reasons, but I'm glad to help, so I will sign just

X.

P. S.—You understand these plants in Tulsa are on a cost-plus basis. I think that is detrimental to the war effort. This is not my viewpoint alone in this letter, it is of millions who work in these war plants.

O. P. A. Poultry Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of one of the greatest poultry-producing areas in the United States, I take pleasure in presenting herewith a resolution adopted by the poultrymen's department of the Los Angeles County Farm Bureau, in which I heartily concur. The resolution follows:

Whereas recent publicity in metropolitan newspapers has claimed sales of poultry meat 10 to 15 cents above legal ceilings, and

Whereas in 1943 California Farm Bureau Federation submitted from southern California on January 20 and from northern California on March 11 to O. P. A. briefs requesting establishment of ceiling for poultry meat at 37 cents for broilers, 35 cents for fryers, and 28 cents for fowl, which reflected costs at that time, and also was the general market price just prior to reduction of prices by O. P. A., and

Whereas the poultrymen's department of Los Angeles County Farm Bureau feels that existing black-market conditions have been created by inequitable, below-cost-of-production poultry meat ceilings which would not have been the case had the briefs submitted in 1943 been put into effect, because prices actually did continue generally at about the suggested level until recently; and

Whereas War Food Administration has for this year requested increases in production of poultry meat to relieve other meat shortages; and

Whereas supplies of poultry meat for civilians and military needs are still today inadequate; and

Whereas cost of labor since January 1943 has risen and at the same time the efficiency of labor has decreased and general poultry supplies and equipment have increased in cost; and

Whereas contrary to statements recently issued by the regional office of the Office of Price Administration—

(a) mortality has increased in the last 2 years due to a new disease, pneumoencephalitis, and a greater amount of other diseases such as bronchitis and coryza;

(b) Greater over-all output has actually resulted in relatively higher costs of production due to decreased labor efficiency and poorer feeds and limited equipment;

(c) Mash formulas have been fixed beyond the control of the poultryman and feed costs have risen considerably, regardless of anyone's idea of what should have happened. Typical net mill door Los Angeles prices on January 25, 1943, and March 8, 1945, are:

Corn	$2.63	$2.82
Barley	2.35	2.90
Milo	2.43	2.68
Free wheat	2.50	3.08
Government wheat	2.30	2.84
Mash, 2½-ton lots:		
Chick starter	3.50	3.80
Broiler-fryer	3.10	3.41

Whereas, in line with Government policy to produce more pounds of meat, it is desirable there be an incentive to produce heavier birds, a combined price for all young meat birds should be based on the price for the heavier weights, thus making a combined young-bird price of around 36 cents desirable; and

Whereas the poultrymen's department of Los Angeles County Farm Bureau feels that a proper increase in the ceiling will result in the return of poultry to the normal channels of trade and greater poultry meat production, which will ultimately result in a decline of present prices to consumers and elimination of the black-market problem; and

Whereas it always has been, and is at present, the sincere desire of the poultrymen's department and its members to operate their businesses legally and in accordance with the best war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the poultrymen's department of Los Angeles County Farm Bureau urgently requests the War Food Administration and Office of Price Administration to adjust the base ceiling prices in Los Angeles marketing area for locally produced broilers, fryers, and roasters to 36 cents per pound, and for fowl to 28 cents per pound.

Adopted by poultrymen's department, Los Angeles County Farm Bureau, March 7, 1945.

Communication for Transmission to President Benes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a communication which was presented by Mr. Peter H. Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, to Dr. Vladimir Hurban, the Czechoslovak Ambassador in Washington, for transmission to President Benes on the momentous occasion of his return to Czechoslovakia from which he has been exiled since 1938:

On behalf of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, I wish to express our feelings of exaltation upon your return to liberated Czechoslovakia.

In the face of the moral disintegration and treachery of the Chamberlain appeasement era, you kept steadfast confidence that decent humanity would ultimately vindicate itself. It has taken a staggering toll of blood and sacrifice but that vindication is now within view, through the dark forces of national selfishness and greed have not yet been completely eradicated.

To us Hebrews, a nation most dreadfully afflicted in this struggle, your prophetic vision remains an inspiring symbol of faith and endurance, and though we are still the one people most attacked by foe and most forgotten by friend, the true justice of our cause gives us the confidence that we too will soon regain the dignity of man as a free nation, living on the soil of our forefathers with true amity and friendship with our neighbors and all the peoples of the world.

With the crushing of barbarous Germany in sight and the dawning of a new era, we extend our felicitations to you and to the people of Czechoslovakia who are truly fortunate in having a president of your great historic stature.

Address of Hon. Helen Gahagan Douglas, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Helen Gahagan Douglas at the World Unity Rally at Madison Square Garden on March 12, 1945:

In an article appearing in Newsweek during December 1944 entitled "The Future of War," Major General Fuller has this to say:

"Though religious, esthetic, and other ideals have given culture to man, what we call civilization—our way of living—has in the main been fostered by discovery and invention. Thus, step by step, one invention or discovery after another—fire through friction, the bow, the wheel, the sail, smelting, forging, the use of gunpowder and of steam, oil and electricity—have led man from one phase of civilization into another. Yet it is war rather than peace which fructifies many of these discoveries. So often is this the case that it would seem Providence had decreed that man's creative endeavors could only be rapidly brought to fruition by calling in his destructive propensities."

Is man then most highly creative when he is most destructive? Or is he most highly creative when his need seems greatest?

I think that is the answer. Man uses his creative abilities to the utmost in war because survival is obviously at stake.

Our creative abilities have been marshalled for war as they have never been marshalled for peace—because the danger was immediate. We could feel it and see it.

In this war, we organized man, machines, science and government to see to it that we are the victors. We are all united in this all consuming determination.

But if for war, why not for peace?

Why can we not muster our creative abilities and use science to free men as well as to destroy them?

Why can we not use science to secure jobs, health, education, travel, creative recreation?

Why can we not use science to promote human relations?

In the past, in times of peace, we have relaxed. We have not fully used our creative abilities to provide a better life for men.

There has been no pressing fear to drive us on, no common goal to hold us all together—nothing that we could see or feel which insisted that we do the job.

But today science has taught us that we must learn to get along together or perish in another war. To get along together, the people on the earth must be able to live with a minimum of decency and security.

No wonder people are beginning to ask on every hand, "If for war, why not for peace?"

There is today a general understanding abroad that it is as important to organize for peace as it is for war. That it is as important to fight against poverty and depressions as it is to fight a deadly enemy. Want and depression are the enemy of the people—the enemy of peace.

Had we in the thirties produced as we have in the forties, Hitler would not have dared to try to enslave the world.

Women all over the world are concerned with the peace. A woman can no longer do her job by minding her own business. The business of bringing up her family, of keeping her home and of working, if necessary, outside of the home are all dependent for their success upon living in a harmonious world, in a world where there are jobs and all that goes with them.

I know that the cornerstone of the future political world is a world organization as outlined in the Dumbarton Oaks agreements. I know that the cornerstone of the future economic world is to be found in the Bretton Woods agreements. And I know, too, that these agreements, which are the foundation of world security and world trade, cannot succeed unless we have a prosperous and healthy America.

Full employment will insure a prosperous and healthy America. We can't have full employment by just wishing for it or by all agreeing that it would be very nice. We must have a plan.

As a housewife, as a mother with my husband overseas, I have little patience with the allergy of some toward plans. Fascism and nazi-ism would have overrun the earth's surface if we had not marshalled our forces according to a well laid plan to oppose them. A home is run on a plan, budgets are worked out by plan, we make plans for our children, schools and colleges have plans, a business works by plan, any shop or factory has a plan.

And now the demand on the part of the free people of this country that mass unemployment shall not be allowed to come back is so insistent that a plan must be made.

The future concerns all of us. Therefore, the plan to insure that future must be undertaken by government.

We have the beginnings of such a plan in the Murray-Patman bill for full employment. The bill is a blue print to fulfill President Roosevelt's promise of 60,000,000 post-war jobs. The purposes of the bill are to promote free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in order to secure full production and to assure the existence at all times of employment opportunities sufficient to provide jobs for all.

The Murray-Patman bill provides that the President shall submit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session a national production and employment budget.

This budget will state:

1. The estimated number of people who will be needing jobs for the coming year.

2. An estimate of the amount of capital necessary to be invested and spent by private enterprise, consumers, and Government to provide these jobs.

3. The probable amount which will come from private and public investment and expenditure for the year.

4. The deficiency, if any, to provide full production and full employment.

5. A program for increasing private investment and expenditure to meet this deficiency, if any.

6. A program for supplementing private investment and expenditure by Federal investment and expenditure to close any remaining employment gap.

Of course, to make the sixth point work, further legislation is necessary. For example, the extension of the social-security program, authorization for a shelf of housing and public works projects, river developments such as the proposed Missouri Valley Authority and most importantly, liberal and flexible policies on Federal finance and distribution of Government-held plants.

An early enactment of this bill will help the war effort. It will stimulate production by assuring jobs after the war. Moreover, it will decerase shifts in employment now and after VE-day.

This is an orderly beginning because it begins at the beginning. With a future of full employment, a guaranteed annual wage can become a reality.

Full employment is not only a national but an international problem. It is the key to future world peace.

That is why the World Trade Union Conference in London was so important. It is right that the working men and women of the world should band together. Their will and determination will be needed to insure the world we are about to enter.

Our great President has said this will be a people's peace. Yes, this peace will be a people's peace, for we are all neighbors on this shrinking globe, and it is important that we understand that our future cannot be built by 3 men at Yalta alone or by the representatives of 44 nations in San Francisco. It will take the concerted efforts of all of us to do the job.

An ever-growing understanding between peoples is necessary to support a world organization. We must work for that understanding. There are really no greater differences between the nations who will be partners in the world organization than there are between the States of our own great democracy.

When there are differences of interest between States, delegations don't pack up their bags and go home. For instance, the freight rates which have been adjusted to the seeming benefit of the industrialized East at the expense of southern and far western States have not broken up Congress. We Americans have developed an instinct for staying together to solve our differences. This must be our inspiration to the world. The greater good holds us together just as the greater good must hold the nations together in the future.

In a world where science tells us that tomorrow we may be able to harness the sun's rays, in a world where we will soon be able to unlock the energy stored within the atom, the people of the earth now have a common concern—survival. In this decisive moment, labor—organized labor—has a leading responsibility. "If for war, why not for peace?" can be the slogan. This must be a people's peace.

Value of Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I was on the floor of the House yesterday during most of the discussion of the lend-lease bill, but unfortunately, at the moment of final vote I was called from the floor on a matter of great importance to my district. Of course, my vote was not necessary because the overwhelming support of the extension of lend-lease by the House was a foregone conclusion. However, I am reluctant not to briefly record my views and what, I believe, also represents the views of the people of my district.

Lend-lease, which when originally proposed in 1941 was a new departure in government, has been a major factor in winning this war, in shortening its duration, and in saving the lives of countless thousands of American soldiers. The arms which we have furnished to our gallant allies have been used to a great advantage, and it has been estimated that in the recent Russian advance, half of the transport used in that gigantic effort has been furnished by the United States.

Of course, this has been very expensive. All phases of war are very expensive, but the cost in dollars cannot be measured against the saving of American lives.

I am happy that the House acted so promptly in extending this act, and particularly happy that it was passed almost unanimously. Prosecution of war is and should remain the first object to which the Congress should devote its whole effort.

Japanese Atrocities in the Philippine Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HEADQUARTERS,
THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
Philippine Islands, February 25, 1945.

THE HONORABLE FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. BOLTON: Thank you so much for your wonderful letter of the 4th, and for the heart-warming expression of confidence in us which you wrote. It meant a great deal to me and I wish it were possible for me to show such letters to all of the officers and men of my division—for it is their hard work and their courage and determination which inspire letters such as yours.

As I write this the final phase of the campaign has been reached and only a little mopping-up remains to be done. The enemy has been destroyed but his destruction was not cheap and before we had wiped him out he reduced this once beautiful city to an utter shambles. As long as I have fought the Japanese I never dreamed that even he would be capable of the heinous crimes he committed here. I am unable adequately to describe the unutterable atrocities he committed against thousands of men, women, children, and even babies. My heart is sick

from what I have seen. It is almost incredible that such beasts could exist in the human form. It is too much to expect our people at home even to believe what we have seen for nothing in their experience could have prepared them for it. Surely if there is justice in this world the Japanese people will not be permitteed to escape from this war with only a military defeat.

Thank you again for your wonderful letter. With my warmest personal regards, I am

Cordially,

ROBT. S. BEIGHTLER,
Major General, United States Army,
Commanding.

The Manpower Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Arthur L. Williston, of Dedham, Mass.:

FACTS AND DATA REGARDING THE MANPOWER ISSUE

These facts fall naturally under the following heads:

1. Shortages of weapons, materials, and supplies * * * and the consequent unnecessary loss of life.
2. The nature and the extent of the manpower requirements. And procedures by means of which these can readily be met when each registrant with a needed skill is classified and can be called by name.
3. The Selective Service System as the natural agency.
4. Absenteeism, turnover, and labor stabilization.
5. The ineffectiveness and futility of all of the sanctions, directives, and procedures that the War Manpower Commission has adopted, or is recommending for adoption, including its centralized attempts to control and employment ceilings.
6. The sources and the nature of the opposition to national war service.
7. The attitude of industry.
8. The experience of other democratic countries where national war service has been thoroughly tried.
9. The successful experience of the Selective Service System and the local draft boards.
10. The defective character of the Senate committee's substituted Kilgore bill.
11. The Bailey-May bill now imperative.
12. The real issue when reduced to its simplest terms.

1. SHORTAGES AND UNNECESSARY LOSS OF LIFE

This is not a question of just filling the existing war contracts. The matter is far more critical. War with Germany is very far from over. The toughest fighting lies months ahead—perhaps many months if the German Army retreats to the mountains. And the war with Japan when it reaches the continent of Asia, as is likely, may be seriously prolonged. The question, consequently is one of developing a maximum effort in order to overpower these two determined enemies in the shortest time, thus saving untold human lives.

It is perfectly obvious that with more weapons, more ammunition, more supplies, more and more transportation, and more men of right age for replacements at all the fighting fronts, we can crush these enemies faster, and can give them less time to entrench and mass strength.

In general, in an absolute sense, our war production has been magnificent. But relative to the need of destroying the enemy in the shortest time, in many items it has been insufficient. In many particulars it has fallen far below what we can do, and must do.

Schedules in many, many items have been cut and trimmed and cut again far below the needs because of shortages of materials—shortages of copper, of lumber, of rubber, of cords for tires, of steel, of coal, etc.—and each one of these shortages is a manpower shortage.

As a single illustration of the effect, the invasion of France was delayed beyond dates originally planned because of shortages of facilities, and each day and week and month of delay gave the enemy time to move troops and to build up resistance, all of which was paid for in thousands upon thousands of added casualties.

And this list of specific shortages varies from time to time, but continuously it has been a long list—each item caused by failure to have the right men at the right place at the right time.

2. THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS

The shortages of manpower in total are relatively small in proportion to our population. Nevertheless, they are critical, and they seriously affect the progress of the war.

These shortages in the main are shortages of specific skills and experience. In almost every instance surveys have shown that men or women with the required skills are to be found in sufficient numbers in the immediate vicinity in nonessential occupations. Their absence causes great trouble.

To illustrate, everyone knows what would happen to an army in the field without any sergeants or officers of supply. It would be almost worthless. And every army has to have its quota of men of all grades from privates and corporals up through the ranks, lieutenants, captains to officers of top command, all in proper proportion.

And each industry is organized in just the same way. Each requires the corresponding grades of skill and experience. Each has to have its nonskilled, semiskilled, and its skilled workers, its subforemen, foremen, inspectors, supervisors, superintendents, and what not, all the way up the line, and all in the right number.

With any of these key skills or special abilities lacking, there is almost hopeless confusion, and production suffers most seriously.

The shortage of a few thousand skilled miners in the copper mines has slowed up the entire war production ever since Pearl Harbor, and schedules have had to be limited to the insufficient copper production.

This illustration might be multiplied with parallel examples of shortage of skilled workers in lumbering industries, iron mines, ballbearing works. B–29 airplane factories in the Pacific Northwest, managerial experience in the shipyards of the Atlantic coast—and scores of others. Collectively the total effect is extraordinarily serious.

Beyond all question this has slowed up, and is slowing up, and will continue to slow up the progress of the war at a terrible cost in blood until it is corrected.

3. THE ONLY PRACTICAL METHOD OF CORRECTION

And it is perfectly obvious that there is but one practical method of correction. A way must be found to classify all types of workers occupationally and to call them individually by name so those who can change their jobs with least hardship, and who are found to be essential to the war effort, may intelligently volunteer or be asked to transfer.

And it is equally obvious that the 6,500 local draft boards, who are familiar with the experience records and home condition of the registrants, are the only practical agency to make the selection of the persons to transfer.

4. ABSENTEEISM, TURN-OVER, AND LACK OF STABILIZATION

With absenteeism and turn-over running at the excessively high rates that still prevail in a very large number of important war production plants, effective organization is quite impossible. Under such circumstances efficient production schedules cannot be maintained, and output of war material is delayed beyond reason.

Group action, admonition or exhortation of workers is found to have little effect. Again, it is only the draft board who can deal with workers individually, who are the only appropriate agency to correct this situation

5. THE INEFFECTIVENESS AND FUTILITY OF PRESENT MANPOWER PROCEDURES

In May 1942, nearly 3 years ago, the War Manpower Commission in the Baltimore area tried out its first experiments with an intensive campaign of persuasion to make its "voluntary manpower efforts" effective. It failed here utterly. With an untapped labor reservoir of 371,000 persons, a figure more than 50 percent larger, the total number of workers then employed in war industries in the Baltimore area, the Commission altogether failed to supply from these local sources even one third of the 32,000 estimated additional workers needed.

And the United States Employment Service after calling for interview 2,734 selected rgistrants, succeeded in placing in war jobs less than 1 percent of those called.

The results here given are typical. Failure in one industrial area after another has followed failure. In no case did the Commission cure the difficulties encountered.

In Dayton, Ohio, in the summer of 1943, after a much advertised and expensive campaign, turn-over in the air fields was still at the rate of 88 percent per year. And, with a poll showing 108,000 unemployed women in the area, an intensive effort to increase the number of women in war work resulted in an addition of only 255 workers or but six-tenths of 1 percent.

In the fall of the same year, the widely heralded west coast plan was put into effect, and after 4 months trial:

1. The major evils still persisted.
2. Labor shortages still existed in aircraft industries, and in ship building and ship repair were still critically serious.
3. Labor turn-over and quitting of war jobs remained at an extremely high level.
4. There still remained the failure to reach the very large unused and potentially available labor resources of the area.
5. But worse than all, important features of the over-all war-production programs were curtailed, delayed, or altogether removed from the area.
6. And the regimentation and restrictions caused bitterness, distress, and resentment, and tended to disturb the general economy and morale of the area.

In the spring of 1944, the average turnover for the aircraft industry of the country, even including the more stable plants, was still at the rate of 75 percent per year.

Just imagine the total loss in aircraft production over say a 2-year period due to the disorganizing influence of such a turn-over—hiring and training 100 persons each year in order to retain 25 workers.

And more recent surveys in Detroit, Boston, New Bedford, and Newark show even more distressing results as the situation becomes more complicated and the measures of the War Manpower Commission become more restrictive.

And perhaps the most unfortunate influence of the sanctions and regulations of the Commission is that in total effect they tend

to reduce total war production instead of increasing it.

It is a tragic fact that the total volume of war production shipped overseas for 1944 was less than the corresponding amount for 1943.

At present, too, there are nearly 200 of the so-called labor shortage areas in the United States including almost every important industrial area in the country in which the above restrictions are being applied, with the above unfortunate result.

With such a record of continuous failure, how is it possible for any Member of Congress to seriously consider using this agency as a means of improving the manpower problems in time of war.

6. THE SOURCE OF OPPOSITION TO NATIONAL WAR SERVICE

During the hearings, lasting for many months before both the Committees on Military Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the only opposition to national war service of consequence was from top leaders of organized labor.

Please read with care the enclosed pamphlet giving a summation of the testimony presented by these labor leaders.

Their arguments, and they have presented no new arguments since, are entirely without validity and again and again have been completely refuted.

They claim that they will support national war service when it becomes necessary. Surely that has arrived, and long ago.

The claim of unconstitutionality has been thoroughly reputed by the best constitutional authorities.

The claim of slave labor would be ridiculous if they had not so confused the issue as to cause delay and thus tragically prolong the war.

Capital and industry are already conscripted. The Government has legal authority to take over any plant and management that fails to cooperate as requested in the war effort.

To claim that for a worker to be requested to work on a Government contract or in an effort that the Government declares is essential to the conduct of the war at wages and under conditions that the Government sets and supervises, and on production for which the Government sets the price, is any different from a soldier working for an Army officer who receives the pay that the Government gives is so far fetched in time of war as to be unworthy of serious thought.

Furthermore the rank and file of men in organized labor do not privately support their leaders. They have their proportion of sons and near relatives at the fighting fronts. They understand the issue and they do not want this war unnecessarily prolonged.

The polls in the intensely organized areas show in general about the same large majority in favor of national war service as polls in other areas.

And, personally, I have interviewed hundreds of these men. Because of my educational experience in helping their cause they talk frankly with me. And I have yet to find a single instance of a worker who took the slave-labor claim seriously.

And likewise the claim that volunteer labor will do a better job than Government-directed labor is equally false.

In fact, this claim is, in my opinion, the worst insult that I have ever known to be directed toward a thoroughly loyal group of men.

Organized workers, by and large, are as patriotic as the boys in the service, and are as ready to serve their Government and protect their country and their homes as are the servicemen.

The real difficulty which seriously affects the top leaders of organized labor is that national war service would tend to decrease the flow of money into their swollen treasuries and would thus tend to decrease their political power.

Such legislation would make for the duration of the war further labor organization with high initiation fees very difficult.

7. THE ATTITUDE OF INDUSTRY

The opposition of business and industry is half-hearted. Their representatives did not appear at the protracted open hearings of Senate and House committees in regard to this issue 2 years ago.

For the most part the men in these fields have not read the bills and do not understand the terms. They have been misled by the highly paid propaganda of labor, and they see things in the light of the situation within the four walls of their own plants.

They greatly dread increased Government regimentation. But they do not know that the substitution of 6,500 local draft boards of unpaid volunteers for the Federal Manpower Commission would definitely decrease Government regimentation.

And they shrink from open opposition to the leaders of organized labor.

A good example of the above is found in a carefully prepared letter to the New York Times under date of February 10, 1945, by Ira Mosher, president of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Mr. Mosher is emphatically in favor of whatever will give the fighting men the best support, and will most surely bring the war to the most prompt conclusion.

But he simply does not know the facts regarding the three points upon which he bases his argument:

First. He calls for "action at the local level." And he does not know that the draft boards distributed in 6,500 different localities are far nearer the local level than are the two-hundred-odd centrally controlled offices of the War Manpower Commission.

Second. Mr. Mosher believes in democratic procedures, but he does not know that these draft boards scattered as they are throughout the country, made up of unpaid volunteers and close to the people, are far more democratic in their procedures than are "employment ceilings", "controlled referrals" and "compulsory releases" under statutory authority of the politically controlled War Manpower Commission.

Third, Mr. Mosher rightly claims that the problem is not one of millions and is not one for dragnet solution. But, he does not know that the draft boards make selection, as need requires, one by one; and that by contrast the autocratic regulations of the central commission are for more of the dragnet variety.

This blundering in thinking is typical. And, one of the chief errors in this whole situation is that both organized industry and organized labor and the War Manpower Commission, controlled as it is by organized labor, unconsciously and consciously endeavor to keep all war production within the ranks of the 12,000,000 organized workers.

They fail to consider the 48,000,000 unorganized workers who desire to play their appropriate part in winning the war.

It is for the Congress to see that these 48,000,000 citizens get their fair and proper consideration.

8. THE EXPERIENCE OF OTHER DEMOCRATIC COUNTRIES

The Senators must know that in Australia, New Zealand, England, and even Canada, that national war service has worked effectively and without trouble.

The people in those democratic countries take the compulsory law just as we in America take our compulsory school laws. There is close parallelism between them. Both are for the preservation of our democratic institutions.

And the Senators must know, too, that with 3 years' experience in England there have been fewer instances requiring the need of penalties than with us in the United States, even in proportion to population, with our compulsory school laws.

Even in Canada where in certain Provinces there has been definite objection to the military selective service, nevertheless, national war service has been taken in the stride as a matter of course and taken with a smile.

No one in Canada, with a population like our own, speaks of slave labor. But neither Mr. William Green nor Mr. Philip Murray resided in Canada.

If national war service works so well in these other countries, is it not almost ridiculous to deny its usefulness here?

9. THE SUCCESSFUL EXPERIENCE OF THE DRAFT BOARDS

During World War No. 1, I personally had a most interesting and valuable experience with the skillful working of the local draft boards. The pains that they took and excellence of their work in selecting qualified persons according to specifications were truly remarkable.

The boards sent for training in technical and skilled occupations 23,000 men. Hardly without exception, these men filled the requirements. And if, in even a single instance, there had been 1 case where a registrant felt either injustice or undue hardship, it would have come to my attention. I recall no such instance.

And the morale of these men was really most remarkable. I would like to dwell upon it at length.

Throughout the country there were about 350,000 men selected in a similar way. I was familiar with the results, and they were uniformly excellent in all sections.

If only the shipbuilding plants and the aircraft factories and the other rapidly developed war industries could have their personnel selected with the corresponding care and skill, it would be a marvelous boon to them and to the country.

10. THE DEFECTIVE SENATE COMMITTEE'S SUBSTITUTE KILGORE BILL

I hope the Senators will carefully contrast the futile and defective Kilgore substitute bill with the workings of a true national war service law.

* * * * *

And the War Manpower Commission has no facilities for classifying or selecting the persons of the needed skills, which is the vital need. With these key skills or special abilities lacking there is great confusion.

* * * * *

11. THE PROVISIONS OF THE BAILEY-MAY BILL WHICH NOW IS IMPERATIVE

This bill is extremely simple and democratic. It rests upon the principle of equal obligation for all men between the ages of 18 and 45, and is just.

The Selective Service System—that is the local draft boards in whose fairness and wise judgment the public has learned to have confidence—is to be utilized to register and classify those persons who are liable for service.

With aid and advice from other Government agencies it shall be the responsibility of the draft boards (the neighbors who know the home conditions of the registrants) to classify them occupationally, and to make all selections, if and when necessary. And this classification is an essential feature of the law.

This law makes an effective war-production program possible, and furnishes for the first time a procedure for classifying all the skills and abilities of people, and for then obtaining the relatively few persons who are needed to accept jobs in places where the war absolutely requires them. No plan is possible—the required labor is known to be available.

But, it is found true that nearly everybody wants to help the war effort when it is clearly and definitely indicated where his abilities are required. Consequently, these provisions of the law will be taken as a matter of course.

This bill furnishes for manpower problems the only practical answer that has been suggested, because it defines duty and obligation and gives direction to each individual.

No one need fear that the law would work arbitrarily or unfairly. It provides traveling expenses, appropriate compensations, and in no way interferes with existing labor regulations, nor with the procedures of the military selective-service law. And, the law automatically terminates at the close of the war.

12. THE REAL ISSUE REDUCED TO ITS SIMPLEST TERMS

The issue reduced to its simplest terms is extraordinarily simple.

On the one hand is the Bailey-May bill, without weakening amendments, endorsed with overwhelming testimony, and demanded by War and Navy Departments and officers responsible for winning the war. A vote that will shorten the war and save life.

On the other hand is a vote to increase the cash in the treasuries of organized labor and thus to enhance the political power of their top leaders.

And, if American history is a guide, sooner or later the reaction of the American people to this latter course will be sharp and severe indeed.

The Veterans' Part in Our Peace Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Tuesday, March 13, 1945, commenting upon Gov. Dwight Green's recent letter to Senator VANDENBERG and Representative EATON:

GOVERNOR GREEN'S LETTER

Governor Green's letter to Senator VANDENBERG and Representative EATON is a reminder to them that the Republican Party has a foreign policy, which they in particular are pledged to follow, since they both helped draft it.

It is likewise a reminder to the whole American delegation that however secluded a chamber they may select for bargaining or intrigue, someone will be looking over their shoulder. When Governor Green asserts that the men who are fighting the war must make the peace, he is preaching not simply justice but practicality as well. Even if the American delegation were possessed of superhuman vision and unselfishness, and their colleagues from other nation were equally disinterested and wise, the San Francisco Conference could only propose, not dispose.

The disposal will be at the hands of the 13,000,000 men who are now bearing arms for this country. No formality, no empty promulgation of treaties, no congressional ratification under pressure, can alter this fact. Any undertakings by this Nation will be valid only insofar as they appear wise to the veterans, who upon their return are going to be the predominant political force in the United States. It is they who are acting while the planners are talking. They know the realities of the war. They have a clearer picture of our allies, and our enemies as well, than have the people at home, who must depend for that picture on the distorted glass of a dozen propaganda bureaus.

Governor Green conceded in his letter the impracticality of taking a poll in the Army and Navy to determine whether its members want an international organization and, if so, what kind they want. They can only express themselves when they regain the complete political freedom that goes with civilian life. It may be contended, by those anxious to commit the United States to a course which they mistakenly view as irrevocable, that it is impossible for the veterans to express themselves. The answer is that nothing done now can be irrevocable. The veterans will hold the veto.

Yalta stripped most of the sham from the proposals to be presented at San Francisco, it is not a league of nations that is to be constructed, but a new holy alliance. The voting arrangement that came out of Yalta makes it certain that no one can use the proposed new international organization to question or dispute the spoils of the strong. The charter recognizes that only the voices of the strong shall be effective. The little countries can debate, but they cannot act, nor can they force action against the will of any one of the Big Three. There are only three, Russia, Britain, and the United States; France and China do not count. They have not and will not have for decades the military power to put weight behind their words. And of the three, Britain's only hope of survival as a major power, is to play its two partners off against each other. The United States and Russia will hold the real power in the post-war world. The hope of peace rests not in any debating society but in the fact that as yet we and the Russians have no large or irreconcilable conflicts of interests.

The proposed league has lost its reputation before it is formed. The partition of Poland, the other day's unilateral action of the Russians in restoring Transylvania to Rumania, the refusal to honor the British pledge to the Lebanese and Syrians that they would be treated as free nations if they would renounce the authority of Vichy France, have thoroughly disillusioned the world. The little nations know before they sign that the league will never save them. At the best it will be only a paternalistic force to prevent them from cutting each other's throats.

Some of our internationalists have mourned plaintively that their propaganda has fallen on sterile ground among our armies fighting in Europe. The soldiers there are interested in only one thing, to whip the Nazis and come home. They do not feel themselves to be saviors of all the nations of the world. It is well that they feel as they do. Their disillusionment will be less bitter when they return and see the fraud enacted in their absence.

Mel Price Gets Off on the Right Foot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the St. Louis (Mo.) Labor Journal of March 8, 1945, which pays merited tribute to our distinguished colleague, MELVIN PRICE, from the Twenty-second Congressional District of Illinois:

MEL PRICE GETS OFF ON THE RIGHT FOOT

The Labor Journal is glad to take this opportunity to congratulate MELVIN (MEL) PRICE, freshman Congressman from the Illinois Twenty-second District on his record thus far in the Congress of the United States.

His stand on vital issues has proven sound.

This is true with special force in the matter of veteran's legislation in which his stand obviously is based on practical appreciation of the fact that veterans of this war will be the backbone of the country for the next 50 years.

In his consideration of veterans' problems PRICE fortunately is not an arm-chair theorist whose only knowledge of the Army has been gained at second hand. Nor did he learn about the veterans as a commissioned officer.

No; PRICE, himself, was a G. I. Joe. He had become a corporal just before his discharge to assume his duties as Representative in Congress. For almost a year prior thereto he had been a private.

Thus you have a man who is familiar with the hopes and aspirations of the enlisted men and who is in position to judge whether their best interests are being served by legislative proposals.

More power to him, and may he continue in the course that he has set for himself, confident that his constituents will be duly grateful and show that gratitude at the right time.

The Intent of Congress With Reference to the Regulation of the Business of Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD with reference to the moratorium bill recently enacted—the bill to express the intent of Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance—I submit the following statement which I hope will be of some assistance to all who are concerned. There is certainly a very broad concern.

The effect of this act is to establish as far as can be done a moratorium until January 1, 1948, insofar as the effect of the Supreme Court decision in the Southeastern Underwriters Association case is concerned, except that boycott, coercion, and intimidation are not included in that moratorium. This moratorium or suspension is for the purpose of giving an opportunity for the States, the insurance companies, Congress, and the people of the country generally, to determine what can be done to adjust the confused situation in which we find ourselves as a result of the Supreme Court decision referred to, and to determine as a people where the control of the insurance business should lie.

I respectfully submit to the States that for them to have a chance to retain the control of the business of insurance—and it seems to me the preponderance of judgment is that they should—they must demonstrate their ability properly to gov-

ern the business of insurance. Insurance companies should do their best to remove from their practices anything which may be detrimental to the public interest. In my mind there is something far more important involved than insurance. This shifting of governmental power away from the States to the Federal organization is an increasing threat against our democratic system of government. Federal organization cannot handle all of this accumulating business except by bureaucratic control. It is fortunate for us that there is considerable sentiment developing in this country that if we are to preserve free government, responsibilities for general government must be established in and must remain in the States. It seems clear that if that is done, and only if it is done, will there be a chance to reduce the Federal business sufficiently to bring it within human comprehension and make it possible for the Federal organization to be governed by laws enacted by the Congress rather than by directive emanating from an appointed personnel.

The following is the conference report, which by its adoption has become the law. The vote in the House on this report was practically unanimous; the vote in the Senate was 68 for, and 8 against. This report is not long. It ought to be understood by the people:

EXPRESSING THE INTENT OF CONGRESS WITH REFERENCE TO THE REGULATION OF THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States.

"SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

"(b) No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically relates to the business of insurance: *Provided*, That after January 1, 1948, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law.

"SEC. 3. (a) Until January 1, 1948, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct thereof.

"(b) Nothing contained in this act shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

"SEC. 4 Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the act of July 5, 1935, as amended, known as the National Labor Relations Act, or the act of June 25, 1938, as amended, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or the act of June 5, 1920, known as the Merchant Marine Act of 1920.

"SEC. 5. As used in this act, the term 'State' includes the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 6. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected."

And the House agree to the same.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
C. E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Hon. Robert L. Doughton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, our beloved and distinguished colleague, ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, recently entered upon his eighteenth term as a Member of this body and when he completes this term he will have given to the people of North Carolina and the Nation 36 years of outstanding service. The people of North Carolina have faith in BOB DOUGHTON, as have his colleagues in the House. That faith is founded upon his solidity of character, industry, and an exemplary life. The great faith that the people of North Carolina have in our able and conscientious colleague is admirably attested by an editorial which appeared in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of February 10, which I insert at this point as a part of my remarks:

THAT'S FAITH

Faith shown in Representative ROBERT DOUGHTON by residents of the northwestern counties of North Carolina has apparently no limits.

A slice of Wilkes County wants to be annexed by Caldwell County in order to avoid being flooded by the upper Yadkin flood control dam and proposed project.

Representative DOUGHTON was reported to have said that none of Caldwell County would ever be flooded no matter what shape the project took. So, an annexation bill has been presented to the legislature.

These trustful people—not now in his district—wouldn't move an inch if annexed by Caldwell. They would be just as close as ever to the river and the dam. Their bottom lands wouldn't be transported one foot. The Yadkin, dammed, could rise within sight of them and the waters come backing up to the corn crib—but not if they were in Caldwell County. Farmer Bob said so. That's all they wanted, just his word. If he said Caldwell wouldn't be flooded, it wouldn't. It couldn't be. If they wore the Caldwell label they would be safe. He would protect them.

A man doesn't get a reputation like that overnight nor inspire such faith unless he has shown himself faithful in many things, big and little, for a long time.

It is a great compliment these people pay him; this simple, blind trust that his word is always good; that what he says stands and that if he promises anything it will be just that way.

They believe he can keep the floods away; that they are safe with him. And if he says Caldwell County will not be flooded the chances are about 100 to 0 that it will not be flooded.

For the Biggest Army, Navy, and Air Force in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial by David Lawrence, appearing in the United States News of March 16, 1945:

FOR THE BIGGEST ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE IN THE WORLD

(By David Lawrence)

Yalta has changed the face of modern history.

From an era in which collective security has been the primary objective, the pendulum has swung now to an era in which all the major nations are to be above the law prescribed for the smaller nations.

Surrender No. 1 at Yalta was acquiescence in the seizure of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania by Stalin in 1940 when he was a partner of Hitler.

Surrender No. 2 was the ratification of a deal made in 1943 between Stalin and Churchill to take away from Poland—an ally—one-third of her territory.

Surrender No. 3 was the acceptance of Stalin's demand, first raised at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, that Russia reserve a power of veto over the security council of the proposed United Nations charter. Hence all major powers now will sit in judgment on their own acts and decide their own disputes in international affairs without being required to submit either to arbitration or conciliation unless all major powers agree to such submission.

Cumbersome procedural voting, according to the formula just announced, is to determine whether a dispute is even to be investigated. In the old League of Nations covenant not only was investigation of disputes by the council written into the original charter and made an obligation in advance on the part of every member, but once the investigation was made and decisions published, the members of the League were bound by their agreement not to go to war against the side that complied with the recommendation. Even the party that did not wish to comply was required to wait 3 months before resorting to force. Violation was

specified to be an act of war against all members.

MORAL FORCE DEFEATED

Under the Yalta formula, when the results of the investigation are published nothing can be done about it on the Security Council if one of the parties to the dispute happens to be a major power.

This, for all practical purposes, means that a combination of physical forces is not to be set up to enforce peace as we were promised in the Presidential campaign in 1944. It means also that moral force—the power of publicity in disputes—is to be seriously curtailed in its effectiveness because there is no provision for mandatory publicity within any country which is a member of the United Nations.

Russia, for instance, does not have freedom of the press and need not publish the findings of the Security Council to her people or, indeed, anything about the views of other peoples. We have seen how between 1933 and 1939 in Germany, and in Japan also, the peoples there were not permitted to know of the conciliatory efforts of other nations friendly to them. Instead, speeches of hate and antagonisms were published widely, and the other powers were always represented as the aggressors.

NO SAFETY WITH TOTALITARIANISM

So long as there remains in the world a single totalitarian state where there is no access to public opinion and where one man, without consulting the people's will in either a parliament or a congress, can make a deal with some other ruler and plunge this country into war—as happened in 1939 when Hitler and Stalin plotted together—there is no safety for an unarmed democracy.

If the world cannot rely on moral force—and apparently as long as dictatorship and totalitarianism wield power over large areas we cannot rely on it—there must be reliance on physical force.

It is significant to note that the newspapers which editorially sounded off so quickly their applause for the Yalta communique are now conceding that the voting formula is a disappointment. But they reiterate the platitude that, of course, the important thing is unity, and the spirit behind the major governments.

True enough, unity depends on the spirit of peoples. But how much chance is there for solidarity of peoples when dictatorships kill the freedom of the press, or freedom of information, as the President phrases it?

And if there is no freedom of worship, how much chance is there for the development of those aspirations to civilized order which could come from the spiritual impulses of a free people?

Moral force suffered its worst defeat of our times at Yalta and subsequently in the American press. The alternative is a reliance on physical force.

But where does this leave the United States?

Does it not mean that, just as Stalin insisted that a defense line miles and miles away from a soon-to-be-dismembered Germany must be Russian for security reasons, we too must look to our own security?

The best defense is a line that keeps the potential enemy as far away from our shores as possible. We must prevent the building of submarine or air bases or rocket bases within reach of our country. We can no longer depend on a fleet to patrol the coasts of continental United States. We must base our fleet and air forces thousands and thousands of miles away from continental United States.

If the might-makes-right rule is to prevail, then the United States must have bases in Africa to prevent any enemy from flying bombers across the Atlantic or occupying any of the string or air and submarine bases that start at Casablanca or Dakar and threaten the approaches to North and South American coasts.

We must not give up any bases in the Atlantic or the Pacific—some of them won at the heavy cost of American lives.

The Third World War must be kept far away from our shores. Never again must we permit an enemy to approach as close to our coast as Pearl Harbor.

To man these bases and to defend ourselves, we shall need the largest army, the largest navy, the largest air force in the world. We must expand our Marine Corps into the largest amphibious force the world has even known, with a big enough corps in the Atlantic and in the Pacific, respectively, to garrison bases from north to south where a potential enemy might attack. We must particularly fortify and enlarge our bases in Alaska, which represents a dangerous approach to our Pacific coast by air.

OUR PEACEFUL AIMS

We should not aim at any country as a potential enemy, for we have no offensive designs and no purpose to commit an act of aggression. But we should aim our theoretical defense against all countries that could by a combination of alliances wage war against us.

But, it will be asked, isn't this turning the clock back? Doesn't this mean heavy taxes and burdens on our economy that we had hoped to reduce materially.

Yes, it is turning the clock back. But the initiative was taken as a consequence of totalitarianism which for expediency reasons, we have apparently chosen to condone in one case and condemn in another.

This does not mean we must pursue such a policy of bigger armament indefinitely. Our objective should be to express American policy in terms of physical might—because that unhappily is the language the European rulers understand—and when we have demonstrated that we mean not to dominate the world but only to make our own defenses secure and that an armament race against us is futile, we can again ask other nations to join us in a system of collective security to make possible a reduction of armament.

THE PRICE OF SECURITY

We are in this war and have raised an Army of 8,200,000 men and a Navy of 4,000,000 because we found to our sorrow that we could not rely for our defense on the British Fleet or the French Army. We divided our one-ocean fleet in 1940 and 1941 and sent much of it to the Atlantic to help the British, and thus exposed ourselves to an attack from Japan in the Pacific. We neglected to build up airpower and amphibious forces to protect the Philippines. We now must retain a two-ocean Navy and enough airpower to make impossible another such attack on our interests or possessions. We cannot rely on Britain or France or Russia or any other power to defend the people of the United States. We recently planned to rely on a combination of all major powers in a new international league to enforce peace, but this has been made impossible now by the unilateral attitudes displayed at Yalta and by the sacrifice of the collective-security principle in the new voting procedure announced last week as having been agreed on.

We have assumed, moreover, a vast responsibility by our signature to the Act of Chapultepec. We are about to guarantee each of the nations of the Western Hemisphere against aggression. This is a large order, and we must not allow our means of enforcing such obligations again to run behind our diplomacy.

Will it not mean military cliques, compulsory military service in peacetime? Yes, and it may mean factors of greed and selfishness as always happens in an armament economy. But all these disadvantages may be the price the United States will have to pay for the failure of Allied statesmanship to build the United Nations organization on a basis of true collaboration and mutual responsibility. It is the price we have to pay for proclaiming high-sounding pledges in the Atlantic Charter of 1941 only to discard them in 1945 when one ruler puts selfish interests above the law, and other heads of States agree and call it unity.

The only safe course now is for the United States to rely on its own power in the coming era of power politics.

Democracy and Public Supervision of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me I desire to insert in the RECORD a timely and thought-provoking article by Norman Bohn, president of the British-Norwegian Chamber of Commerce, entitled "Democracy and Public Supervision of Industry." My purpose in bringing this ably prepared article to the attention of the House and to the country is in the hope that it may contribute something toward the solution of our post-war problems. The article follows:

[From the Norseman of May-June 1944]

DEMOCRACY AND PUBLIC SUPERVISION OF INDUSTRY

(By Norman Bohn)

The present spate of discussion upon planning and control reminds me of a phrase used by Ivor Brown "everyone mapping the New Jerusalem and nobody remembering the Old Adam." Yet if the family is to remain the social unit, then the Old Adam in the shape of the acquisitive instinct is bound to assert itself, and must be fitted in to the framework of our post-war society.

Of course a good deal of the urge for planning springs from a well-deserved admiration for the achievements of the Russians, as well as from a recognition of the successful organization of industry for war by the governments of democratic countries. Let us remember, however, that the first fruits under a new system often grow from seed sown under the old. All the belligerent governments employ machinery and use technical progress which they have inherited from private enterprise. No doubt existing equipment and processes have been developed under the stimulus of war, which in itself provides a patriotic incentive comparable to that of personal interest, but there is no evidence that government direction can produce conditions conducive to creative enterprise in peacetime, when economic cost cannot be disregarded.

Although much has been learned under pressure of hostilities, for "necessity is the mother of invention," wartime industrial experience offers no criterion for winning the peace. In democratic countries production must proceed with an eye to the variety, adaptability, and flexibility required for overseas trade, whereas government control owes its success to either the degree of isolation attained, or to its ability to ignore any commercial measurement of cost.

Wars can be won by arms. Peace can be lost by politics. It would be a tragedy indeed if, in trying to solve the problems of

peace, we were to lose the political freedom so dearly bought in war. Total war compels us to a certain degree of totalitarianism, and our enthusiasm for our great European ally may lead us to undervalue our democratic heritage. After all, Russia is not a democracy. It is a federal union of states organized to secure the economic possibilities denied to their peoples by the czarist regime. On the basis of this primarily economic society the Russians are beginning to erect the structure of their political liberties, and before the war an important advance was made by the establishment of the Stalin constitution. In democratic countries, on the other hand, economic progress has followed and been dependent upon the extension of political freedom.

So we come to what seems to me to be the essence of our problem today. Can we have planning and control under Government auspices without jeopardizing our democratic principles, and, if so, how? And how are we going to maintain the voluntary associations of organized interest or opinion, such as trades unions, chambers of commerce, employers' associations, which are indispensable to democracy? Before the war democratic people were inclined to take their political liberties for granted. In some countries such freedoms were rather lightly surrendered in exchange for loose assurances of ordered progress and social security. The result was fascism, under various names, with all the cruelty, horror, and degradation it has wrought. It is all too clear in the countries suffering German occupation that political freedom is not only valuable for its own sake, but also as the essential guarantee against servitude or slavery. We must take care that in planning for our material welfare we do not put on the shackles of economic bondage and thereby invalidate our political liberties. A paternal government may be benevolent (as in Russia), or it may be or become tyrannical (as in Germany). Now the democratic idea is that governments should not have the power to be either; they should be merely the instruments by which "government of the people, for the people, by the people" is carried on. How can we resolve this dilemma, of wishing to give governments power to plan for good yet to prevent them from, willy nilly, undermining the freedoms enjoyed by the citizen?

Another aspect of this question is that in democratic countries there does not exist, apart from war improvisation, the organization and administrative machinery necessary for the efficient control of industry. The integration of national industry whereby each factory and each branch of production could be fitted into a national plan might well occupy a decade, even if it could be done at all under the continual and inevitable fluctuations inseparable from extensive overseas trade. Its operation in Russia involved the acceptance by the people of a harsh discipline, which in their case was relieved by the crusading spirit aroused by the prospect of victory on the home front; of better times ahead than those people had ever enjoyed. The same cooperation is hardly to be expected from the democratic peoples who chafe under controls and associate them with the lowered standards of living due to the war. By and large, I am inclined to agree with the view stated in the program for reconstruction by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce:

"Not unless personal initiative is encouraged and allowed freely to function, can we hope so to limit the tasks of the state as to make possible an efficient performance of them."

It should not escape attention that a certain element of defeatism is discernible in this urge for planning: a desire to shift burdens onto the state. Those who wish to float on the broad stream of the national endeavor should remember that a river cannot rise higher than its source and rarely attains greatness unless fed by contributories. The river of national progress will soon dry up unless it is constantly fed by the springs of enterprise.

The broad division of democratic political parties is between those of the right, who support private enterprise with the minimum of Government interference, and those of the left who favor a large measure of nationalization of the means of production. There should be a middle course, the way of compromise so dear to the heart of the democrat, if only we can discover it.

I submit that, after a period of transition from war to peace economy, a solution of this problem might be found through the organization and development in democratic countries of an annual census of production, adapted and extended so as to include distribution and some other services. Each undertaking could, in addition to more general information, be required to furnish particulars as to the percentages of gross and net profit to turn-over, the percentage relationship between wages and materials and wages and profits, the unit cost and sale price, the proportion of advertising for home and export sales respectively, the proportion of production exported, and so on. A secial department of each nation's ministry of commerce could be organized to receive, record and compare these returns, which should be treated as confidential except when incorporated in the record of any one industry. There would then exist in official archives the material necessary for a complete review of the nation's production and trade, and from this could be evolved a method of "remote control" by legislation. In course of time this department could organize a system of works inspection by an official corps of those trained in scientific management and costing, supplemented by technicians for the various branches. This corps could be recruited in the main from that branch of the accountancy profession which specializes in works costing in contrast to financial accountancy. Each inspection should be made in the light of the annual return of the undertaking, and its object should be to confer with the management and workers with a view to the promotion of efficiency. This scheme, if as feasible as it seems, offers the following major advantages:

1. The day by day control of industry, etc., would be left in the hands of existing owners and management, whose initiative and enterprise would be unhampered by official interference except through general regulations imposed by legislation.

2. Government relations with industry, etc., would be guided and conducted by those with knowledge of industrial problems, not as at present by civil servants trained in office administration.

3. The workers would feel that their interests were protected by public authority. This should help to prevent trade disputes.

No doubt there are many objections that could be advanced against this proposal, some arising because in this brief outline it is impossible to discuss many variations which might be necessary to adapt the system to the peculiar conditions of some industries and some countries. Broadly, however, I would suggest that industrialists should not allow themselves to be led by usage and tradition into the belief that public interest in industry must always be confined to the granting of protective tariffs or other State assistance. On the other hand, workers who believe in nationalization would do well to remember that they may thereby lose the right to strike or even to change their jobs. Would it not be better to confine democratic assemblies, such as Parliament or the Storting, to the role of legislative chambers and courts of equity rather than convert them into national boards of directors?

A systematic annual census of production should also provide the information required for the control of combines and cartels. Lord McGowan, chairman of Imperial Chemical Industries, has suggested that the agreements by which these cartels are created should be registered with the governments concerned. This would certainly be a valuable safeguard, but the implications of these cartel agreements would still call for close scrutiny. For example, it ought to be widely understood that import and export statistics cannot afford evidence of the degree of trade reciprocity between two countries if one of them is prevented by cartels from obtaining certain commodities in the other.

This brings me to another important issue that may hang upon the method of democratic control of industry. In the decade before the war, governments in every country became closely identified with many forms of economic nationalism, and it is almost certain that suspicion will attach to any goods produced for export in nationalized industries. Under private enterprise invoices between seller and buyer must, in most cases, reflect commercial costs of production, and it is upon the acceptance of these invoices that ad valorem tariff administration depends. Apart from the danger of a fresh orgy of heavy specific tariffs, it may be doubted whether sufficient versatility and elasticity could be preserved under impersonal public management. These and other considerations lead me to the conclusion that if industry is placed under government control, then we must abandon hope of a freer and expanding international trade. Governments can set trade free; they cannot conduct free trade.

Finally, the information provided by an annual census of production should also enable governments to form their fiscal policies on the facts, instead of being the butts, as hitherto, of a public often ill informed, prejudiced, and misled by nationalist and protectionist propaganda. It is to be hoped that in the expanding world economy to which we all aspire after the war, it will be unnecessary for every country to protect every bit of productive industry with little regard to its real value to the national economy and with no regard to the damage inflicted upon natural industries overseas. If only the world can shake off the economic defeatism of the thirties, if only we can destroy the fallacy that we have at any time come anywhere near the limit of world trade, then there should be room for every reasonably efficient industry wherever situated. But if, at any rate for a time, it is necessary to parcel out overseas markets, then such a census will at least afford a basis upon which each nation can decide, from a long-term point of view, as to which of its industries are most important and in accordance with its national traditions. If there must be a division of markets then it should be carried out in a spirit of give and take, and vested interests should not be allowed to rob the world of the benefit of the international division of labor. The aim of democratic governments should be to advance the welfare of their peoples, and that can best be done in the economic sphere by releasing them from the burden of maintaining industries which are not self-supporting, and granting freedom to all nations from the threat that special skill, or enterprise or the exploitation and development of natural resources, or national aptitudes, will be strangled or offset by higher trade barriers abroad.

Within the limits of this essay it is impossible to examine all the many facets of this great problem, but I hope the foregoing will suffice to convey a warning that in considering planning schemes democratic peoples should remember that constant vigilance is the price of freedom. Planning and democracy cannot easily be reconciled, but I believe that a marriage can be arranged if partisans do not forbid the banns.

Outstanding Americans Hail War Department's Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended me, I want to call the attention of the House to a statement in support of the War Department's sound position in judging the loyalty of members of the armed forces.

As I said upon the floor of the House recently, the War Department has selected the only possible yardstick of loyalty—one which is American and democratic and one which meets the rigid tests of time and practice.

I am happy that so many outstanding Americans from all walks of life have now informed Members of Congress, and the War Department of their understanding of this yardstick, that "the basic consideration is not the propriety of the individual's opinions; but his loyalty to the United States."

The statement, which was presented to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], chairman of the subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee, to the Secretary of War, and to all Members of Congress by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, was signed by a distinguished list of Americans. These included 37 religious leaders, 12 businessmen and industrialists, 34 Negro leaders, 8 authors, 6 civic leaders, 4 doctors and dentists, 7 persons from stage and screen, 10 artists, 7 farm leaders, 12 editors, and 18 labor leaders.

The statement and its signers follow:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF ARMY ORDER REGARDING CRITERIA FOR JUDGING LOYALTY IN GRANTING COMMISSIONS AND IN MAKING OTHER ARMY APPOINTMENTS, MARCH 1945

With regard to the question of rendering Communists and Communist sympathizers eligible for Army commissions, we support the War Department position as reported in the press that in granting commissions and making various other Army assignments the basic consideration is not the propriety of the individual's opinions; but his loyalty to the United States. Any position short of this would constitute a denial of constitutional rights, would fail to utilize all qualified soldiers, and would undermine national unity. The question of what one thinks of Communist philosophy is not involved. The issue is one of full utilization on a democratic basis of all forces dedicated to winning the war. Using this as a yardstick, the Army has apparently taken its position as a result of the excellent record of Communists and so-called Communists, including a number who have been cited for gallantry and a number who have died in action. The War Department's order is common sense and the only sound policy for a democracy. It carries out our country's stated policies of unity of all forces seriously supporting the war effort. It is consistent with our close cooperation with the Soviet Union and with other United Nations members, whose governments include Communists, for winning the war and building a durable peace. The virulent opposition of the Chicago Tribune and other divisive forces must not be permitted to block the War Department's sound democratic decision.

Signed:

Bishop Henry W. Hobson, Southern Ohio Protestant Episcopal Church, Cincinnati; Joseph E. Davies; Bishop Lewis O. Hartman; Dr. Frank P. Graham, president, University of North Carolina; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise; Mayor Cornelius Scully, city of Pittsburgh; Judge Patrick H. O'Brien, Detroit; Fredric March; Godfrey L. Cabot, manufacturer, Boston; Dr. Arthur Upham Pope; Reid Robinson, president, International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers of America; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union; William Rose Benet; Lloyd K. Garrison, National War Labor Board; Mrs. Charlotte Hawkins Brown, president, Palmer Institute; William G. Nunn, managing editor, Pittsburgh Courier; Bishop David Henry Sims, African Methodist Episcopal Church, Philadelphia; Mrs. Samuel Spiegel, Women's League of United Synagogues of America; Arthur B. Spingarn, president, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; C. C. Burlingham, lawyer, New York City; George Marshall, chairman, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

Louis Adamic, author, New Jersey; James Luther Adams, professor of theology, University of Chicago; Raymond Pace Alexander, lawyer, Philadelphia; R. B. Allen, executive dean, University of Illinois, Urbana; Rev. Elmer J. F. Arndt, chairman, Commission on Christian Social Action of Evangelical and Reformed Church, professor, Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo.; Miss Frances P. Arnold, branch adviser, Girls Friendly Society, New York City; Samuel L. M. Barlow, New York City; Mrs. Charlotta A. Bass, editor, The Eagle, Los Angeles; Howard Bay, scenic designer, New York City; Bishop William Y. Bell, African Methodist Episcopal Church, Cordele, Ga.; William Y. Bell, Jr., southern field division, National Urban League, Atlanta; Thomas H. Benton, artist; H. D. Bollinger, secretary, department of student work, Board of Education of Methodist Church, Nashville; Louis B. Boudin, lawyer, New York City; John S. R. Bourne, chairman, New England Committee for Equal Opportunity, Boston; Dr. W. Russell Bowie, Union Theological Seminary, New York City; Rev. Dr. Edwin A. Brown, Wesley Foundation, Ohio University, Columbus; Dr. B. R. Brazeal, chairman, economics department, Morehouse College, Atlanta; Rev. Emery Stevens Bucke, editor, The Zions Herald, Boston.

Henrietta Buckmaster, author, New York City; Dr. Evelin Burns, economist, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Hugh Cabot, surgeon, Needham, Mass.; Angus Cameron, vice president, Little Brown Co., Boston; D. W. Chapman, president, Montana Farmers Union, Great Falls; Prof. Emanuel Chapman, Hunter College, New York City; Thomas W. Cheek, president, Oklahoma Farmers Union, Oklahoma City; Dean Baugh, executive secretary, Oklahoma State Federation of Labor, Oklahoma City; Dr. Rufus E. Clement, president, Atlanta University; Rabbi Henry Cohen, Galveston; George W. Coleman, author, Boston; Rev. Elbert M. Conover, director, The Interdenominational Bureau of Architecture, New York City; Dr. Albert Sprague Coolidge, Harvard University, Cambridge; Leroy E. Cowles, president, University of Utah, Salt Lake City; Henry K. Craft, executive secretary, Harlem Branch Y. M. C. A., New York City; Bartley C. Crum, lawyer, San Francisco; Bishop Ralph Spaulding Cushman, Methodist Church, St. Paul; Bishop Cameron J. Davis, Protestant Episcopal Church of Western New York, Buffalo; Frank Marshall Davis, executive editor, Associated Negro Press, Chicago; Dr. Mark A. Dawber, executive secretary, Home Missions Council of North America; John Warren Day, dean, Grace Cathedral, Topeka; C. L. Dellums, vice president, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Oakland, Calif.

Annetta Dieckmann, Y. W. C. A., Chicago; Dr. Arnold Donawa, president, Harlem Dental Association, New York City; Theodore Dreiser, author, Los Angeles; Guy Pene DuBois, artist, New York City; Henry Epstein, lawyer, New York City; Mark Ethridge, editor, Courier-Journal, Louisville; Philip Evergood, artist, New York City; Howard Fast, author, New York City; Rabbi William H. Fineshriber, Philadelphia; Ira M. Finley, president, Oklahoma Division General Welfare Federation of America, editor, General Welfare Reporter; Abram Flaxer, president, State, County and Municipal Workers of America, New York City; Rev. Joseph Fletcher, professor of pastoral theology, Episcopal Theological School, Boston; Edward Flore, general president, Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Alliance and Bartenders International, A. F. of L., Buffalo; Dr. E. Franklin Frazier, Howard University, Washington, D. C.; Rev. Stephen Fritchman, editor, The Christian Register, American Unitarian Association, Boston; Rev. G. Shubert Frye, president, Presbyterian Fellowship for Social Action, Syracuse; A. V. Galbraith, headmaster, Willisten Academy, Easthampton, Mass.; Salvatore Gentile, Waiters and Waitresses Union, Local 1, A. F. of L., New York City.

Edwin Goodell, architect, Boston; Bishop S. L. Greene, African Methodist Episcopal Church, Little Rock; Bishop J. A. Gregg, Kansas City.

Dr. Benjamin C. Gruenberg, educator, New York City; Mrs. Grace Towne Hamilton, Urban League, Atlanta; Rev. Corliss P. Hargraves, Methodist Church, Nashville; Thomas Porter Hardman, dean, College of Law, University of West Virginia; Albert J. Harno, dean, College of Law, University of Illinois; Laurenz Harris, businessman, Chicago; M. Lafayette Harris, president, Philander Smith College, Little Rock; Mrs. Hugo Hartmann, president, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Winnetka, Ill.; William H. Hastie, dean, Howard University Law School; Alma Hauck, secretary, Chain Service, Restaurant Employees Union, Local 42, A. F. of L.; E. M. Helvey, businessman, Cleveland; Dr. Thomas N. Hepburn, Hartford; Rev. Charles A. Hill, Detroit; Leslie Pinckney Hill, president, Cheyney Training School for Teachers, Pennsylvania; Dr. Hamilton Holt, president, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; Charles H. Houston, lawyer, Washington, D. C.; Stanley M. Isaacs, New York City councilman; D. V. Jamison, president, National Baptist Convention U. S. A., Selma, Ala.; Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president, Howard University; Levi Jolley, editor-manager, Afro-American, Baltimore; Dr. David D. Jones, president, Bennett College, Greensboro, N. C.; J. F. Jurich, president, International Fishermen & Allied Workers, Seattle; Francis Fisher Kane, lawyer, Philadelphia; Rockwell Kent, artist, Ausable Forks, N. Y.; Dorothy Kenyon, lawyer, New York City; Leon Kroll, artist, New York City; Rev. Dr. John H. Lathrop, Unitarian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Ira Latimer, executive secretary, Chicago Civil Liberties Committee, Chicago; John Howard Lawson, playwright, Hollywood.

Rev. Frank A. Lindhorst, Methodist Church, Des Moines, Iowa; Dr. Rayford Logan, Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Howard University; Herbert E. Marks, music publisher, New York City; Raymond Massey, actor, New York City; O. H. Mastin, secretary, Alabama Farmers Union, Birmingham; F. O. Matthiessen, professor, Harvard University; Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president, Morehouse College, Atlanta; Louis F. McCabe, lawyer, Philadelphia; John T. McManus, New York City; Rev. Jack A. McMichael, executive secretary, Methodist Federation for Social Services, New York City.

Carey McWilliams, lawyer and author, Los Angeles; Thomas Mann, author, Santa Monica, Calif.; James J. McClendon, M. D., president, Detroit National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; James H. McGill, McGill Manufacturing Co., Valparaiso, Ind.; Dr. John Howard Melish, Protestant

Episcopal Church, Brooklyn; Lewis Merrill, president, United Office & Professional Workers of America; Jerome Michael, Columbia University Law School, New York; Bishop Walter Mitchell, Protestant Episcopal Church, Phoenix, Ariz.; Rev. Richard Morford, New York City; Rabbi Julian Morgenstern, Cincinnati; William Morris, theatrical agent, New York City; Bishop Arthur W. Moulton, Protestant Episcopal Church, Salt Lake City; A. H. Murray, Washington State Grange, Seattle; Dr. Alonzo F. Myers, New York University.

Austin Norris, managing editor, Pittsburgh Courier; Mrs. Sadie Ornitz, Hollywood Women's Council; Bishop Edward L. Parsons, Episcopal Church, San Francisco; Ralph W. Parsons, Victory Mutual Life Insurance Co., New York City; Judge Nathan D. Perlman, New York City; Lewis Perry, principal, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H.; Rabbi David Philipson, dean of American Reform Rabbis; Jordan Pola, business agent, Waiters & Waitresses Union Local 1, A. F. of L.; Martin Popper, national executive secretary, National Lawyers Guild; Edward D. Porter, chairman, Greater Pittsburgh Citizens Coordinating Committee; John Rey, secretary, Cooks, Pastry Cooks and Assistants Union, Local 89, A. F. of L.; Paul Robeson, actor, New York City; Prof. E. A. Ross, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Bishop William Scarlett, Protestant Episcopal Church, St. Louis; William Jay Schieffiin, chemist, New York City.

Arthur Schnabel, pianist, Los Angeles; Prof. Harlow Shapley, Harvard University; Rev. D. R. Sharpe, director, Cleveland Baptist Association; James E. Shepard, president, North Carolina State College for Negroes, Durham; Prof. John F. Shepard, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Rev. Dr. Guy Emery Shipler, editor, the Churchman, New York City; William L. Shirer, radio commentator, New York City; Rev. Elwood M. Smith, Detroit Council of Churches; Harvey R. Solberg, president, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, Denver; Raphael Soyer, artist, New York City; Mrs. Mabel K. Staupers, executive secretary, National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses, New York City; Estelle M. Sternberger, radio commentator, New York City; Thelma Stevens, religious leader, New York City; Donald Ogden Stewart, playwright, Cambridge, Mass.; August Leroy Strand, president, Oregon State College, Corvallis; Dr. Alva W. Taylor, editor, Mountain Life, secretary-treasurer, Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

James T. Taylor, North Carolina College for Negroes, Durham; C. P. Underwood, principal, Glen Iris Grammar School, Birmingham, Ala.; J. Thomas Walker, vice president, Pilgrim Health & Life Insurance Co., Augusta, Ga.; Justice James S. Watson, New York City; Max Weber, artist, Great Neck, N. Y.; Glenway Wescott, author, New York City; Hon. James H. Wolfe, chief justice, supreme court, Salt Lake City; Archie Wright, president, Northeastern Division, National Farmers Union, Ogdensburg, N. Y.

William Zorach, sculptor, Brooklyn, N. Y.; C. M. Finfrock acting dean, Western Reserve University Law School, Cleveland; Right Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Albany, N. Y.; Edward Hoffman, business representative, Waiters and Waitresses Union Local 2 of Brooklyn and Queens, A. F. of L., New York; Saul Mills, secretary-treasurer, Greater New York Industrial Union Council, C. I. O., New York; Lewis Allan Berne, president, Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists & Technicians; Grant W. Oakes, chairman, United Farm and Metal Workers of America; Joseph Selly, president, American Communications Association; Arthur Stein, United Federal Workers of America; Michael J. Quill, president, Transport Workers Union of America; Donald Henderson, president, Food, Tobacco, Agricultural & Allied Workers Union of America; Morris Muster, president, United Furniture Workers of America.

Frank McGrath, president, United Shoe Workers of America; Julius Emspak, secretary-treasurer, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America; Olin Downes, music critic, New York City; Frederick Myers, National Maritime Union of America.

All titles and organizational designations here are for identification only, and do not connote organizational support.

South Faces Bright Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial which appeared in the Ft. Smith Times-Record:

SOUTH FACES BRIGHT FUTURE

Will the South after the war continue to answer the description President Roosevelt once gave of it—that of economic problem No. 1?

That remark caused considerable protest in the South at the time it was made. Yet, remembering that the President was referring only to the South's economic situation, it must be admitted that he had reason for his comment. Back of it was the old story of agricultural dominance in the South, which, as James A. Farley recently pointed out in a speech at Birmingham, Ala., meant a lower total gross income in dollars per average family, a higher birth rate, a higher death rate, and a lower school attendance than in other parts of the Nation.

Farley pointed out that the often-heard remark that the South is the last frontier in this Nation can mean only that it is the industrial frontier—"that it is the section of the Nation where industry has developed least and has more room for expansion." Like many others who have seen the wartime industrial development of the South, he extolled this section's resources which present possibilities for industrial development, commented on the added advantage the South has in the possession of a great market close at hand, and added that it has now proved it has another essential—a population capable of training to any degree of skill in industrial work.

Of special interest were two bits of advice given Alabamans by Farley. The first of these was that Southern States will be wise to consider whether, as a result of their agricultural economy, their tax systems may be such as to place an undue share of the tax burden on the assets of an industrial enterprise and thus discourage development. The second was that the South make no effort to buy business through special grants, guaranties, and concessions to industries. "Substantial concerns," he said, "do not ask or expect these baubles." He urged the Southern States to make those adjustments obviously needed to encourage industrial development, adding, "Make up the bed with a good mattress and a good spring, have clean linen and let the bed be inviting, but charge the going rate for the lodging."

The advice of the former Postmaster General is good. In the main it has been echoed by many a nationally known man since the South's wartime industry has given dramatic proof of its possibilities in peacetime. Incidentally it is of interest to note that Mills B. Lane, of Atlanta, Ga., known as the dean of southern bankers, declared the other day that the South is no longer dependent upon northern sources for financial backing. "The South," he said, "stands on the threshold of the greatest industrial expansion in its history. The deposits and resources of our banks * * * will be adequate to meet any loan requirement, even of the largest industrial unit."

The Georgian may be right. Certainly much industrial development can be financed with southern money. But northern money, too, is welcome in this long-awaited industrialization, so long as it is available under conditions which do not exploit the South. It should be remembered, though, that it will be foolish passively to await development. It must be invited, planned, urged—and the initiative must come from the South.

American-Filipino Soldiers in Mindanao

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include with my remarks an overseas broadcast made for me on March 12, 1945:

It is to be expected that when the veterans of Maj. Gen. Jens A. Doe's Forty-first Division landed on Mindanao in the twenty-first triphibious operation undertaken by the American forces engaged in the liberation of the Philippines they met the same high degree of cooperation with the Filipino guerrillas on Mindanao that has characterized action throughout the campaign.

Here in the United States, Americans have long held a sincere appreciation of the contribution of the guerrillas of Mindanao. Prior to the recent landings, Mindanao's freedom-loving guerrillas carried on their unrelenting warfare against the Japanese under the most difficult conditions. Not only did they have to contend with a large Japanese garrison, but they armed themselves and fought their battles under the daily watchfulness of some 26,000 Japanese colonists who had infiltrated into this area before Pearl Harbor. For some time the Mindanao guerrillas have been a source of supply for their comrades in the neighboring islands, even as the discipline and organization of their fighting group has served as a model for other similar groups throughout the Philippines.

Not only have Filipino guerrillas distinguished themselves in direct warfare against the Japanese. Their never-to-be-forgotten participation in such missions of mercy as the expedition to release the prisoners of Cabanatuan, in conjunction with the Alamo Scouts and the Sixth Ranger Battalion, is a tribute to the enduring strength of Filipino-American relationships, unabated during 3 years of Japanese occupation.

From the northernmost province of Luzon to the southernmost province of Mindanao, the undying devotion of Filipino guerrillas to the cause of liberation has more than justified the lasting faith and confidence of Americans. It is heartening to know that the Philippines can build for the future in peace on the same organized thinking and disciplined action which have formed the basis of Filipino guerrilla operations against the Japanese aggressor.

At His Side

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

AT HIS SIDE: THE AMERICAN RED CROSS OVERSEAS IN WORLD WAR NO. 2, BY GEORGE KORSON, TO BE PUBLISHED MARCH 19 BY COWARD-M'CANN, NEW YORK

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the first book to be published about the American Red Cross overseas in World War No. 2, At His Side, by George Korson, capsules United States military campaigns and shows how closely Red Cross operations are integrated with those of the fighting forces.

Beginning with the account of how the Red Cross went into action 2 minutes after the first bombs fell on Pearl Harbor, the book plots the course of the Red Cross program overseas as it moved with our troops into England, Australia, Burma, China, India, North Africa, France, Belgium, Germany, the islands of the South and Southwest Pacific, and to the Philippines with MacArthur. It describes what is being done for the American soldiers in Alaska, Greenland, Iceland, Brazil, the Caribbean, and Iran.

This book also tells of the prisoner-of-war program of the American Red Cross and how the organization, through the International Red Cross Committee, reaches into the prisoner-of-war camps with medical supplies and clothing and food. It describes how the organization has aided merchant seamen in all parts of the world. And it tells of the part the Red Cross nursing service has played in this war. Many of the incidents in the book are told in the words of the Red Cross men and women who participated in them.

At His Side is the story of Red Cross men—former football coaches, salesmen, hotel managers, and college professors, many of them veterans of the last war, who preferred overseas service with the Red Cross to the security of the home front. And it is the story of the Red Cross women—former stenographers, fashion designers, editors, and salesgirls who rapidly adjusted to life in tents with mud for floors and no plumbing.

These Red Cross workers go into battle areas without benefit of military training and quickly learn the shortest route to a foxhole or a ditch when the enemy opens fire. Like the soldiers themselves, some have been killed in action, some have been decorated for bravery, and many have led a charmed life.

The chapter on the steamship *Mactan's* escape from Manila in January 1942 has timely significance now in view of General MacArthur's return to Manila with his victorious troops. Told for the most part in the words of the Red Cross Field Director Irving Williams, who was in charge of the ship with its cargo of wounded servicemen, the story of the 27-day trip from Manila to Sydney gives another picture of the teamwork between Americans and Filipinos.

There is the story of Field Director Thomas "Tiny" Montgomery, former Stanford University athlete, whose height of 6 feet 8½ inches proved a liability as far as induction into the armed forces was concerned, but did not prevent his being accepted by the overseas service of the American Red Cross. Montgomery was with the marines on Guadalcanal during their final drive against the Japanese.

On the advice of the marines, Montgomery took with him to Guadalcanal: 4,000 books, 2,000 sewing kits, 2,500 cakes of soap, 1,000 cigars, 500 cans of snuff, 250 packs of chewing tobacco, 600 tins of pipe tobacco, 2,500 toothbrushes, 40,000 sheets of stationery, 15,000 envelopes, 1,000 decks of card, 5,000 packs of gum, 500 pounds of candy, $1,000 worth of games, $700 worth of fishing tackle, $400 worth of athletic gear, $200 worth of musical instruments (harmonicas, banjos, ukuleles, and so forth); three portable phonographs with $300 worth of records, two shortwave radios, a sewing machine, a washing machine, and—a piano.

From Burma comes the behind-the-scenes story of Merrill's Marauders told by one of the Red Cross workers assigned to the recreation club built especially for the Marauders. And from France and Italy have come many other stories of Red Cross girls driving clubmobiles up to the front lines to take doughnuts and hot coffee to the men. These stories are recounted in Korson's At His Side.

Through these personal stories the activities of the American Red Cross are shown in their full scope. Chapter titles indicate the global coverage of the book: Pearl Harbor, the S. S. *Mactan's* Escape from Manila, Australia and the Southwest Pacific, the Buna Campaign, Guadalcanal, El Alamein to Tripoli, the North African Campaign, China—Burma—India, Along Allied Supply Lines, New Guinea to the Philippines—Island Hopping with MacArthur, Glory and Death in Sicily—Italy, in Great Britain Preparing for D-Day, On to Berlin.

George Korson, who is a member of the American National Red Cross staff, took 6 months' leave to write the book. He obtained much of his information from official Red Cross files and from the workers themselves through interviews. An editorial committee of top Red Cross executives helped him check his figures and facts. So did Army and Navy officials. Korson, a former newspaperman, is the author of four other books.

KORSON WRITES RED CROSS EPIC—FORMER RECORD REPORTER RECORDS HEROIC DEEDS IN WORLD WAR NO. 2

At His Side, the first book about the American Red Cross overseas in World War No. 2, to be published March 19 by Coward-McCann, is written by George Korson, formerly of Wilkes-Barre, whose books on mining folklore are well known to Pennsylvanians.

A member of the American National Red Cross staff since March 1942, Mr. Korson wrote the new book while on leave of absence and obtained much of his information from official Red Cross files and from the Red Cross overseas workers themselves.

About 40 Pennsylvanians who have been overseas with the Red Cross are mentioned in the book. Many of the incidents in the book are told in the words of the Red Cross men and women who participated in them. At His Side is the story of Red Cross men—former football coaches, salesmen, hotel managers, and college professors, many of them veterans of the last war, who preferred overseas service with the Red Cross to the security of the home front. Men like James P. Shaw, former director of the Neighborhood House in Erie, whose rescue of survivors from a bombed ship in Sicily is described in At His Side. As a result of this rescue, Shaw was awarded the Silver Star by the War Department, the first Red Cross man in World War No. 2 to be so honored.

And it is the story of the Red Cross women—former stenographers, fashion designers, editors, and salesgirls who rapidly adjusted to life in tents with mud for floors and no plumbing. Women like Joan Walsh of Philadelphia and Ada Wattenmaker of Charleroi, clubmobilers in France who ploughed through knee-deep mud to take doughnuts and coffee and song to the men in the front lines.

He was the founder and director of the Pennsylvania Folk Festival, witnessed by some 50,000 persons during its 4-year history—Allentown, 1935; Bucknell University, Lewisburg, 1936 and 1937; and Beaver College, Jenkintown (in connection with Swedish Tercentenary celebration) in 1938.

Mr. Korson was graduated from Wilkes-Barre High School and studied at Columbia University. He started his career as a reporter on the Wilkes-Barre Record and subsequently served as reporter on the Pottsville Republican and the Allentown Chronicle & News, among other newspapers in a 15-year newspaper career.

Hemisphere Ties, Labor and the State Department

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the reinforced liberal group in Congress along with labor and liberals throughout the hemisphere will watch the Department of State closely during 1945. Organized labor and liberals intend to have a voice in world affairs.

In Latin America, the Confederation of Latin-American Workers under Vicente Lombardo Toledano mobilized its members for vital war production and now seeks to unite closely with workers of this country, Russia, and Britain, to secure the peace. The American Federation of Labor, Rail Brotherhoods, Congress of Industrial Organizations, and both the National Citizens and C. I. O. Political Action Committees likewise are determined that labor shall participate fully in our foreign policy. Labor wants to "extend the New Deal in the new world," and the P. A. C. proposes to broaden its scope so as to "get in the world at large the kind of good-neighbor policy we have in the Americas." Liberals and a growing number of women's groups know that our chief good-will asset in Latin America is Roosevelt-Wallace idealism. Until our diplomats learn this, our diplomacy will remain sterile.

Labor will have the full support of the progressive group in Congress in its le-

gitimate ambition for an international role. Working together, we can see to it that the powerful Department of State, which holds so many of the keys to the winning both of the war and the peace, gives the American people the kind of liberal foreign policy for which they voted last November. Progressives in Congress can see to it that the State Department balances the ultraconservative new team of top officials by appointing liberals to every division and every embassy.

I propose to examine the badly needed streamlining of the antiquated State Department in terms of hemisphere unity and the interests of labor As one active among the progressive group in the House of Representatives, I call the attention of liberals everywhere to the unparalleled opportunity before Secretary of State Stettinius and his new team to give the United States a democratic and effective foreign policy. Liberal Members favor abandonment of the Senatorial two-thirds approval of treaties which helped pave the path toward a second world war, and favor majority approval of treaties by both Houses as a move toward greater democracy and national and world security

As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I am glad that President Roosevelt and Secretary Stettinius seek an additional $28,000,000 for the next fiscal year to expand, modernize, and strengthen our Department of Peace. Columnist Marquis Childs fears that Congress will slash even this modest increase for our first line of defense, this small insurance premium on our vast investment for security and peace. Congressional liberals will vote the increase but will in turn expect more liberal foreign policies and more democratic hiring of personnel, preferably through Civil Service.

I shall speak further on this, but first I want to praise President Roosevelt for appointing Nelson A. Rockefeller and Archibald MacLeish to the streamlined State Department, which needs many more such men to balance the entrenched career tories. In the crucial years ahead we need a strong, democratic Department of State to help unify the United Nations, protect freedom, promote trade, and maintain prosperity and peace abroad so we may enjoy it at home.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER'S TASK

The appointment of Nelson A. Rockefeller to be Assistant Secretary of State for Latin-American relations is important because of the criticism from all sides of our bungling of the crisis in hemisphere affairs. Many Latin Americans disapprove the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and our appeasement of dictators, who have been aided, whitewashed and given lend-lease arms. Several republics have asked to be represented at the peace conference, and seek assurances regarding the rights of small nations. Experts are worried about economic and political unrest in the other American republics, which may seek to play off Britain, Russia, and the United States against each other. Hence it is urgent that we achieve hemisphere unity and cooperation.

Nelson Rockefeller must face the issues raised by the Peruvian progressive, Dr. Luis Alberto Sanchez in the January 1945 Inter-American magazine. The good-neighbor policy in the opinion of Sanchez is almost a war casualty, a victim of fear that our armed forces fight for democracy in the Old World while our tory diplomats betray it in the New World. These men have committed errors which, if not quickly corrected, may undo the good work accomplished by the Office of Inter-American Affairs, headed by Nelson Rockefeller for over 4 years. I have lauded Mr. Rockfeller's achievements as coordinator in my speeches of May 1 and September 20, 1944.

Latin-American dictatorships bolstered by us crush freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from want and fear. They ban legislatures and free elections, charges the Peruvian Sanchez, himself exiled to pro-labor Chile. This situation threatens continental unity and mocks our ideals. Expediency is the shameful excuse for our pressure on certain Latin-American countries, notably Argentina, and our appeasement of vicious tyrants in others. The war has further impoverished the poor and enriched the wealthy in Latin America, declares Dr. Sanchez. Living costs have skyrocketed with inflation, which is hard to control in poorly organized and largely illiterate lands. The common people have yet to receive material or moral benefits from the war. Sanchez says that unless we convince Latin America of the nonimperialistic aims of this war, we will have ploughed the sea. He suggests a Western Hemisphere charter and the setting of democratic standards which the American Republics would have to live up to before joining the United Nations.

The prolabor New York Post recently reviewed inter-American events of 1944, pointing to revolutions in six republics; unrest and economic troubles in all of them, charged persecution of Protestants, and expressed resentment of State Department support of dictators. The Post cited International Labor Office reports of "unspeakable" living conditions among the sickly and undernourished masses, asking how we can trade with people suffering such misery. The answer lies in a revised good-neighbor policy with even more emphasis on labor relations, diet, health, social welfare, and the lifting by cooperative efforts of living levels.

ROCKEFELLER AND LABOR

The Department of State should greatly enlarge its Division of International Labor, Social and Health Affairs, the new name for Dr. Otis E. Mulliken's small Division of Labor Relations, which I praised in my speech of September 20. This division might compile and publish a Who's Who in Labor and Social Welfare in Latin America to answer criticism of the lack of labor information and ties during this era of crisis. As I have stated before, such a book would prove an invaluable reference for the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and many Government agencies. I hope, moreover, that Mr. Rockefeller will see that labor attachés are sent to most of our embassies and to our consulates general in such growing industrial centers as Monterrey in Mexico and Sao Paulo, "the Los Angeles of Brazil."

PRAISE OF ROCKEFELLER'S APPOINTMENT

The brilliantly edited international daily, The Christian Science Monitor, which so ably reports the intrigues of Spanish falangism and Argentine fascism, is pleased with the selection of Rockefeller. The Monitor wrote that his 4 years as Coordinator gave him experience which "will be utilized to help rebuild the good-neighbor policy into an effective hemisphere program."

Sumner Welles recently wrote of Rockefeller that he is liked by Latin Americans and has devotedly served the ideal of inter-American solidarity. Mr. Welles hopes that Rockefeller will "arrest the disastrous recent deterioration in our relations." Edgar Ansel Mowrer feels that a conference to reformulate the good-neighbor policy and settle the vexatious Argentine situation is urgent. Mowrer adds that the Americas have not sacrificed for victory over fascism in order to permit Argentina to become a refuge for the tyranny of Madrid and Berlin.

The New York Post praised Rockefeller as "a capable, energetic, democratic young man" who has stressed social and economic aid, leaving liberals few grounds for criticism.

The naming of Rockefeller resulted in many eulogies in Latin America of C. I. A. A.'s educational, health, sanitation, and transportation activities, and of President Roosevelt's policies. A typical editorial saw the appointment as Presidential approval of Rockefeller's work and an indication of Mr. Roosevelt's desire to devote more attention to Latin American problems. The editorial termed "Rockefeller a dynamic young statesman who has worked for the welfare of all classes, truly a democratization of diplomacy."

Rockefeller told the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations last December that democracy must be a vital force constantly working for the well-being of the peoples of the Americas, and that we must find solutions which benefit all. He expects to heed congressional views, which is wise since Congress is far closer to the people than are our diplomats.

The New Republic denounced the choice of Clayton, Dunn, and Holmes as Assistant Secretaries, but was less critical of Rockefeller, saying in part:

> There is little doubt that Nelson Rockefeller will be able to do his present job better from within the State Department. There are indications that he has demanded a free hand, in which case it is pretty certain that he will insist on an improved system of reporting by our embassy staffs, which are such notoriously inadequate sources of information today, and that Latin-American affairs generally will be better off than now.

The Office of Inter-American Affairs under Wallace K. Harrison, coarchitect of Rockefeller Center, as Deputy Coordinator, will seek an appropriation for the next fiscal year. C. I. A. A.'s strictly wartime activities are expected to be gradually liquidated, and much of its personnel and program it is hoped will be integrated into permanent Government

agencies. However, many C. I. A. A. employees and officials will presumably quit Government, since they had little or no previous experience in the Latin American field and were hastily hired to do an emergency job. I am anxious as a member of the Appropriations Committee to see the best of C. I. A. A.'s social and economic work continued for as long as necessary to assure mutually profitable hemisphere cooperation and commerce.

ROCKEFELLER'S TEAM

Assistant Secretary of State Rockefeller as head of the Office of American Republic Affairs will have under him divisions for Brazil, Argentina, for the rest of South America, for Mexico, and the Caribbean and Central America, and a sixth of analysis and liaison. Much of the liaison will be with Mulliken's Labor Division and with Archibald MacLeish's Office of Public and Cultural Affairs.

I feel that The New Republic in criticizing Mr. Rockefeller in December for "exceptionally bad judgment in choice of staff" for C. I. A. A. was too severe. Several of his assistant coordinators have done excellent work, especially in the field of direct economic and social aid. Nevertheless, I have heard unfavorable reports about some high officials chosen by Mr. Rockefeller. Rafael Creamuno, Rockefeller's vice-chairman of the Inter-American Development Commission, is considered thoroughly reactionary. John Lockwood, selected by Rockefeller to be his No. 2 aide in State, is said to have little knowledge of the languages, people or problems of Latin America. Avra Warren, Rockefeller's chief aide in State as Director of the Office of American Republic Affairs, was vehemently assailed by PM and progressive publications for his policies as chief of the Visa Division in 1938–41. Warren was accused of denying visas to scores of European exiles with splendid anti-Fascist records and of admitting to this country many rich, reactionary members of the international white trash. Perhaps he merely carried out the orders of career tories like Grew and Dunn. In any case, Mr. Rockefeller would do well to have Warren transferred and persuade the highly capable and liberal Laurence Duggan to return to this work which he handled so well. Mr. Duggan has the confidence of liberals of the Americas and of many Members of Congress.

If Mr. Warren stays on, I trust he has profited from what he has seen of Latin American mass misery, from the sweltering tropical plantation gangs of Negroes to the shivering, ill-clad, hungry miners of the bleak Bolivian plateau. The Bolivian tin contract renewal offers this wealthy nation a chance to help Bolivia's wretched miners through labor clauses. Martin Kyne, Catholic liberal and C. I. O. member of the group probing Bolivian labor conditions, recently hit State Department efforts to betray Bolivian labor and benefit the tin tycoons. If Warren wants more data on this issue, he can get it from Dr. Ernesto Galarza, the crusading Mexican who heads the Pan American Union's Labor Division. Dr. Galarza risked his career recently in forcing our diplomats to study the tragic situation which culminated in the Catavi massacre. He won his fight, but unhappily a revolution in Bolivia brought to power totalitarian elements which need to be put under the same spotlight as the Argentine militarists.

Incidentally, Mr. Rockefeller might cooperate with the Treasury Department in helping to finance the war by forcing Bolivia's bloated tin tycoon Patino to disgorge some of his ill-gotten fortune, largest of any Latin American. Patino lives in splendor in the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City and is a notorious tax-dodger, as are his children, who married into the fascistic ranks of Europe's nobility.

Throughout the reorganized department, most officials come from prosperous backgrounds in the Northeastern States. The old-school-tie personnel policy has apparently become a habit in the State Department. But it must cease. Pacific coast and midwestern universities have been training men and women for years, yet the State Department has continued to recruit its officials from the Northeast. I will explain my remedy for this shortly.

ARCHIBALD MAC LEISH, SPOKESMAN OF DEMOCRACY

If for no other reason than his courageous stand on Spain, both in 1936–39 and before the Senate Committee, I approve the appointment of Archibald MacLeish to be Assistant Secretary of State for public and cultural affairs. Librarian of Congress since 1939, he has always opposed the fatal policies of sycophantic fellows like Dunn, who stood by while the Axis destroyed the Spanish republic and won its first great victory against us.

Probably I was the first Member of Congress to say publicly that Archibald MacLeish is the type of official whom we need in the State Department to counteract Wall Street betrayers of freedom. On March 25, 1941, I told this body that Mr. MacLeish is the ideal official to lead our cultural war for democracy. I pointed out that he won his spurs fearlessly defending Loyalist Spain, and that he believed in organized labor and in making the Americas a bulwark of democracy. MacLeish feels deeply about the problems of racial injustice, the exploitation of labor, and poverty like the poverty of Puerto Rico, about which Congress must legislate soon and drastically or face loss of prestige for our Nation in Latin America.

Sumner Welles, whose fame in Latin America rivals that of President Roosevelt and Henry Wallace, lauded MacLeish recently. Welles declared that nothing is more important than a full understanding of our foreign policy by the American people, and that only a drastic change in the State Department's public relations policy can bring this about. Welles charged that our former policy seemed to be to disseminate only such facts as the "omniscient" department deemed good for the people to know. Welles added:

> Obviously no democratic control of the foreign policy of this Nation can be hoped for under such conditions. Mr. MacLeish is ideally qualified to reverse this trend. He has preached democracy. He also believes in its practical application. He will be an eloquent and liberal spokesman for the Department.

Friends of mine have had disillusioning experiences in trying to get information from the State Department's divisions of public and cultural relations, meeting stony silence, evasion, or delaying tactics, for which Michael McDermott was considered chiefly responsible. Now named a special assistant to the Secretary, McDermott is utterly unfit for any post involving freedom of the press, which he betrayed for years. He should be retired to well-earned obscurity.

Mr. MacLeish understands the issues at stake in the restoration of unity among the American republics. In 1938, he published in Fortune magazine articles on Argentina and Chile after visiting South America. His analyses are still commented on, being mentioned in December in New York by the visiting Latin-American women journalists brought here by the Office of Inter-American Affairs. He understands my resolution to break with Franco, since he knows the damage done to the good-neighbor policy to continued appeasement of falangism.

The Christian Science Monitor likes MacLeish and wants him to "let the winds of information and public opinion blow through the musty department corridors," and is glad that he plans to make cultural relations the "friendship of peoples for peoples." The Monitor in December charged that our foreign policy has not been "frankly, continuously or intelligently expounded to the American people," and asks for full press frankness to insure public support or needed criticism of department plans. The paper wants a diplomatic chief of staff to balance the combined Army-Navy Chiefs of Staff.

MacLeish will be keenly interested in Waverly Root's Secret History of the War which supplies monumental evidence on the terrible price paid for our diplomats' stupidity in stubbornly clinging to appeasement of Japan, Vichy, and Spain, disastrous blunders against which I pleaded in vain for years. Root ascribes this folly to State Department misinformation, shortsightedness, small-mindedness and zeal for self-justification. Journalists like Root have penetrated "the pretense and hypocrisy with which governments hide reality from their peoples." He wants writers to war ceaselessly against secret officialdom, for if the latter wins, "there will be no more journalists in the future, only scribes setting down slavishly what they are told to write."

Archibald MacLeish is one of the outstanding spokesmen of our way of life, and as such will doubtless seek to publicize notable examples of democratic achievement everywhere. Of special interest is the new democratic ferment in the coffee Republic of Guatemala, which in 1944 ousted its benevolent tyrant and is now engaged in a remarkable experiment. New ministries of labor and public works, health, and welfare, and of national economy are now functioning. A new constitution is being drafted

by the reform regime with provisions for votes for women, greater rights for labor and the exploited and landless Indian majority, and full freedom for all. The Guatemalan Army's new oath pledges soldiers to oppose anti-democratic officers, something unique. A Guatemalan reform leader in New York in January credited much of this democratic ferment to our information program, and said that the changes in governmental structure and plans were influenced by the sanitation and basic economy programs of C. I. A. A.

Mr. MacLeish will want his staff to study and publicize many movements for human betterment on which the peace must be built. There are many experts and scholars able to help him. Among them are Robert J. Watt and Boris Shishkin of the A. F. of L.; Mrs. Maria Astigarraga Hoge, California lecturer; Hubert Herring of the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America; Jacob Potofsky and his associates of the C. I. O. Committee on Latin American Affairs; Prof. L. A. Mander of my State university in Seattle; Prof. J. Fred Rippy, economic historian of Chicago; Dr. A. Curtis Wilgus of the Latin American Economic Institute, to which I belong; and Professors Bolton, Simpson, and Sauer, of Berkeley.

John S. Dickey is director under MacLeish of the Office of Public Affairs. Dickey attended Dartmouth with Rockefeller and served with him in C. I. A. A. The New York Post hails MacLeish's appointment and terms Dickey "one of the most promising young liberals in the whole State Department." But the Post wonders how MacLeish, Dickey, Wilder Foote, and Homer Byington as the new team for publicity will work with the unpopular, reactionary, and superfluous McDermott. The paper in January carried a blast by Philip Wylie, the noted author who served with MacLeish in the Office of Facts and Figures in 1942, at McDermott's incompetent set-up which for years kept news from our people. Wylie suggests that Stettinius fire about one thousand "uppah clawss" State Department employees and hire a thousand who know what American voters think, as well as what can be traded advantageously with Latin America.

I. F. Stone, the tireless contributor to PM and The Nation, who rivals Drew Pearson as an exposer of spiritual wickedness in high places, wrote a pointed editorial in PM in December captioned "Let's end hush-hush diplomacy." Stone wants our diplomacy to be widely discussed and, if necessary, sharply questioned. This would strengthen our position. Latin-Americans feel better about the future when liberals in and out of Congress concern themselves with our diplomacy. MacLeish as an expert on human feelings and aspirations knows this to be true.

MAC LEISH AND CULTURAL COOPERATION

Dr. Bryn J. Hovde, Chief of the important Division of Cultural Cooperation under MacLeish, is apparently one of the few examples of new blood and a fresh, practical viewpoint resulting from the reorganization. Mr. Herschel Brickell has been promoted from senior cultural-relations officer at our Embassy in Bogotá to help Raymund Zwemer handle cultural cooperation with Latin America, long the chief concern of Hovde's Division. I do not know whether Brickell's new book deals with the dire need for mass education in health, housing, and agricultural and industrial skills, which should be a major aim of our activities abroad. I hope that Mr. Brickell and Mr. Zwemer will make this their chief interest and will give labor and progressives a large voice in these matters, since workers are the majority of the people of the world.

In any case, Dr. Hovde knows a great deal about housing, social welfare, and cooperatives as means for raising standards of living. He wrote several volumes on Scandinavia, which has sent thousands of its sons and daughters to the Evergreen State of Washington. Governor Wallgren, Senator Magnuson, Paul and Ernest Olson, and a host of other leaders of labor and liberal politics in my State are of Scandinavian descent. They have helped make Washington the most progressive State in the Union, with the most progressive delegation in Congress. Bryn Hovde is a practical former professor who for years directed public welfare and then housing in the great labor city of Pittsburgh. It is gratifying to see a specialist on basic problems head cultural cooperation, since he knows the needs of the common man.

Our cultural attachés and visiting professors might be chosen for Latin America from among those willing and able to produce a useful book like the new volume Costa Rican Life, by Profs. John and Mavis Biesanz.

The American Story is the title of MacLeish's latest book, a collaboration with Muna Lee, wife of the dynamic laborite whose party swept the elections in Puerto Rico in November, Luis Munoz Marin. The Christian Science Monitor captioned its laudatory review "The common experience of the Americas." The novelist of racial understanding, Howard Faust, whote in PM that these 10 radio plays contain a very real good-neighbor policy which promises well for future hemispheric unity. Norman Corwin, C. B. S. producer-director of radio plays, calls MacLeish the first top-rank United States poet to produce by radio gems of lyricism and historic depth. The reviewers agree that MacLeish has brought stirringly to life their past for both North and South America.

DEMOCRATIZING THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Coronet magazine, in October 1944, published my article Why Not a West Point for Diplomats? Now is a good time for all departmental and Foreign Service personnel to be put under civil service and for us to plan a foreign-service academy. Let us recruit Americans of ability, regardless of sex, race, or ancestry. Coronet might let the Department study the entries in its $1,000 contest for the best letters on this topic. Since foreign policy is the key to preventing further world strife, I propose to introduce legislation to put the State Department under civil service and to create a foreign-service academy.

The Inter-American for January 1945 contains a letter from a Californian who favors rigorous training for young Americans for Latin-American service with either Government or business. Markets and friendship are at stake, and we must improve our training centers or create a new special institute. He urges that the teachers fluent in the languages and with years of experience and residence there be paid well. Then we can hope to meet the competition with other powers for markets and friendship. All such thinking is in the right direction.

If we had had a democratic Department of State before Pearl Harbor, it would have heeded my warning of March 25, 1941, to abandon expediency lest the Axis prepare unpleasant surprises for which we might be unwarned and unprepared. If we had a democratic department today, it would at once cease appeasing dictatorships in Spain, Portugal, and Latin America, and would create an enlightened, modern, liberal foreign policy suitable for the world's greatest democracy.

Julius C. Holmes, assistant secretary for personnel and administration, has a chance to disprove the charges made against him by democratizing the Department. Not till this is done will we have a sound foreign policy as our first line of defense in the troubled years ahead. Our diplomats must be men able to understand the liberal aims of our people. Personnel is the key, as I pointed out in the hearings on the National War Agencies appropriation 2 years ago. It is up to the A. F. of L. and the Political Action Committee to make known to the Department labor's aims, so that the common man will come into his century as in Henry Wallace's memorable address.

General Holmes can demand the selection of personnel for the departmental and foreign services which will bring this about. Every embassy should be staffed with attachés drawn from the ranks of women's groups, labor unions, and small business. We need representatives abroad who really have worked to improve our way of life, not more men from Harvard and the Boston and New York elite.

An excellent blueprint for further reorganization is in the little volume entitled "A Modern Foreign Policy for the United States," by Joseph M. Jones, who quit the Department in despair to join

THE OTHER TOP OFFICIALS

Progressives in Congress should periodically ask Under Secretary Grew and the Assistant Secretaries about the progress made in improving the Department's efficiency and in democratization. Will Clayton, whose record contains unsavory exploitation of North and South American labor in his cotton empire, should be queried regularly about labor's rights in our Government's foreign deals, and about cartels. An excellent letter on Clayton from James Patton, of the Farmers Union, appears in the Senate hearings of December. Dunn should be influenced to draft the note breaking relations with his fascist friend Franco. And incidentally, I note that the jobs of

both Dunn and Holmes are supposed to be temporary.

The New Republic says of the tory members of the new team that they are men who cannot work with Soviet Russia, a labor government in Britain, or new republican regimes in Spain, Portugal, or Brazil "except on terms of stiff formality, hostility, or contempt." We can only hope that this view is not justified, and see that our diplomacy deals firmly with Spanish and Argentine fascism, and fairly with the popular movements sweeping the world.

Liberals may be suspicious of Dunn, Clayton, Grew, and Holmes. But they approve of many of the new advisers and assistant chiefs of ability and progressive ideals. Some of them are Dean Grayson Kefauver and Prof. Graham Stuart, of Stanford; George L. Warren, the expert on refugees; Dr. Roland Hussey, Los Angeles specialist on Latin America; Dr. Dudley Phelps; the liberal molasses magnate Charles Taussig; Dr. Kenneth Landon, a Quaker expert on southwest Asia; and Burke Knapp, a former Rhodes scholar from the Pacific Northwest. To get more men like these, I would like to see all salaries raised sharply. It is urgent that we put our best young men and women in the State Department in 1945–46.

As the bloody battle against Japan continues, let us hope that Mr. Grew is seeking to persuade war-weary Soviet Russia, despite the loss of millions of lives, to help us defeat Japan. We may wish to ask Mr. Grew if it is still planned to spare Emperor Hirohito from death by bombing or post-war execution as a war criminal. Can Mr. Grew say whether killing Hirohito now would not save thousands of lives and billions of dollars by shortening the war? Could bombing Hirohito increase Japanese fanaticism and resistance, already at their peak, or would the removal of the head of Japan's state religion of world conquest disrupt Nipponese civilian and military morale? Does Mr. Grew expect to use Hirohito after victory to crush labor and leftists in Japan who might seek to set up a republic, in the manner of British Tory intervention in hapless Greece? The Under Secretary can make up for some of his errors while Ambassador to Tokyo by renouncing expediency entirely.

Marquis Childs put it well when he said that the times cry out for men unafraid to think along bold new lines. I hope that the new team meets this challenge. President Roosevelt promised to replace any who betray democracy, and liberals should help the President watch those with poor records. I. F. Stone put the liberal postion clearly by stating that we have great faith in President Roosevelt, but realize that he does his best when prodded.

OUR AMBASSADORS TO LATIN AMERICA

Charles Anderson Gauld, a specialist on Latin-American labor and economic development, who comes from my State of Washington, suggests using the qualifications of the Honorable Morris L. Cooke as a yardstick for measuring prospective Ambassadors to Latin America. Because of the growing importance of economic forces, we need envoys able to recommend sound, cooperative steps whereby our capital, technicians, and equipment can join those of Latin America to develop mutually profitable trade and enterprises.

Morris L. Cooke has served our Government with distinction as an engineer of broad vision and practical achievements. He is no appeaser of dictators and wears no old school tie. In his youth Mr. Cooke worked as a machinist and in a shipyard and is prolabor. His rise as a consulting engineer was not due to marrying wealth, the success formula of many career diplomats, but to hard work and ability. Mr. Cooke's volume, Brazil on the March, is a real contribution to inter-American economic cooperation and points the way to the building of markets which we will badly need to avoid post-war unemployment, Charles Gauld informs me. If all our ambassadors in future are chosen from among men of Morris Cooke's caliber the good-neighbor policy will pay dividends to the entire continent.

THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR SPANISH FREEDOM

I do not wish to close without reviewing the work of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom, which seeks to arouse Nation-wide support for my resolution to break with the Nazi-Falangist regime of Franco. This step would speed victory over both nazi-ism and Argentine fascism, help guarantee lasting peace, and do wonders for the good-neighbor policy.

The committee, which is headed by the Methodist bishop of Boston, Lewis O. Hartman, is located at 55 West Forty-second Street in New York. There Miss Jean Campbell helps Allan Chase and other experts on Franco and Falangism wage a campaign to free Spain. I would like to mention some of the authorities on the board who resent further appeasement of Franco because of the deep injury to hemisphere unity.

Perhaps the foremost is Dr. John A. Mackay, president of Princeton Theological Seminary, and an outstanding liberal leader of my church. Dr. Mackay studied at Scottish and Spanish universities before lecturing throughout Latin America. He has written several fine volumes involving spiritual and social problems in the other republics. So also have Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, of the University of Pennsylvania, and Dr. W. Stanley Rycroft, head of the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America, whose news letter exposes Falangist propaganda against freedom of religion. Kenneth Leslie, editor of the Protestant magazine, is on the board. So is Dr. Frederick A. Blossom, of the Library of Congress, a scholar and veteran of the progressive movement who wants to see a liberal lobby established in the Capital to do research for the liberal bloc in Congress. Finally, there are Benjamin C. Marsh, the tireless director of the People's Lobby, and Congressman A. CLAYTON POWELL.

And I must mention another committee sponsor, the noted New York radio commentator William Gailmor, with whom I spoke on Spain December 20 before the Citizens Committee of the Upper West Side in Manhattan. On January 2, I addressed the mass meeting organized in Madison Square Garden by the Nation Associates, labor and liberal groups, and Catholic laymen like Prof. Francis McMahon, of Chicago, and James B. Carey, of the C. I. O. The meeting was told that the war will not be won until Spain is liberated.

The Nation Associates, of which Freda Kirchwey and Alvarez del Vayo are leaders, plans to have its anti-Franco committee join forces with the American Committee for Spanish Freedom. This will involve some prominent people like Senator Guffey, whose friend, the progressive publisher of the Philadelphia Record, David Stern, is staunchly anti-Franco and alert to State Department tricks. C. B. Baldwin of the P. A. C.; Rockwell Kent, the famed artist; Bruce Bliven, of the New Republic; and Prof. Stephen Duggan, father of Laurence Duggan, are others.

The committee is delighted that several Latin-American Republics, including Cuba, are studying congressional resolutions to break with Franco. Guatemala recently severed diplomatic relations with Fascist Spain. Habana University students threaten to strike unless the Fascist Spanish ambassador is expelled from Cuba for his antidemocratic intrigues. Also, French progressives have formed a committee to help Loyalists in France and to overthrow Franco. It now remains for the United States Congress to set an example.

If we wish to prevent a third world war, we must see that Fascism does not shift its base from Berlin to Madrid and Buenos Aires. We must help restore the Spanish Republic, and help destroy dictatorship everywhere. The world cannot exist half Fascist and half free.

Pvt. Clifton Jarnigan

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, "Killed in action"—these fateful words appeared above the picture of a private soldier in his home-town paper. Beneath the picture is this short recital:

Pvt. Clifton Jarnigan, son of Mr. and Mrs. Clint Jarnigan, Route 3, Clinton, was killed in action February 5 in Germany.

In these brief words are compressed the supreme sacrifice of this 18-year-old Anderson County, Tenn., boy and the tragic sorrow of his parents, his brothers and sisters.

Jarnigan was inducted on July 5, 1944, and had been overseas about 2 months.

Every member of our armed forces is a potential hero. In this war death is no respecter of persons—generals, colonels, majors, captains, and lieutenants have mingled their blood and given their lives side by side with the noncommissioned officers and the private soldiers.

In brave deeds beyond the call of duty, men and boys from every rank have

written their names high on the scroll of fame. And countless thousands have gone to their death in heroic and selfless sacrifice, unheralded and unsung. And of each and every one of them it may be said, "He is dead on the field of honor."

We know not the circumstances under which Pvt. Clifton Jarnigan gave his life. When the command to advance was given, it was—

His not to make reply,
His not to reason why,
His but to do or die.

With the dews of youth yet damp upon his brow, he may have died instantly. If he was fatally wounded and lingered in pain and anguish before death in mercy came, we may well think that before his ears became cold and dull he heard again his father's voice, and felt once more upon his wasted brow his mother's loving kiss.

To his father and his mother, to his brothers and sisters, to all who knew and loved him, he is from henceforth but a memory. They may call but he will not answer; they may reach out but they cannot touch him. This boy is but one of the thousands whose dead and broken bodies will pave the roads to Tokyo and to Berlin.

From the time this boy was large enough to work he was employed by Judge T. L. Seeber, county judge of Anderson County. Judge Seeber is a veteran of World War No. 1, and I insert as a part of these remarks a letter from him on the death of this brave boy, condemning the War Department's practice of putting 18-year-old boys into combat without 1 year's training, and certainly without the adequate training Congress, the boys, and their parents were assured they would be given:

ANDERSON COUNTY,
STATE OF TENNESSEE,
Clinton, March 3, 1945.

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENNINGS: Our people here are very much disturbed over the fact that the 18-year old boys are being rushed into the front lines of battle in Europe with practically no training at all.

On behalf of the mothers of this district, I am asking that you get with your colleagues and start a fight that will stop this outrageous practice.

I am enclosing a clipping taken from the Knoxville News Sentinel, dated March 1, 1945, in which General Marshall is purported to state that a boy can receive sufficient military training in a period of 13 weeks. Any man who has ever been in the Army knows that 13 weeks is not sufficient training for a lad of 18 years to go into combat against the steel helmeted Huns of Germany.

I am enclosing a picture of a boy who has worked for me most of the time since he was big enough. He was just an awkward, country lad, who received very little education and knew nothing of the world outside of a few miles radius of his home. The footnote on the clipping tells a true story of what so often happens to such kids who have received only a few weeks' training.

There is something wrong with a Nation that has to rush its children into the front lines at the age of 18, with 13 weeks' training.

Yours very truly,

T. L. SEEBER.

Americans Betrayed

REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 12, Mr. Thomas E. Dewey, "using 22 pens," signed the fair employment practice law passed by the Legislature of New York State, which will go down in history as one of the greatest advances in law making that that State has ever known.

The approval of this measure came from every political, religious, social, educational and trade-union group in New York State. The members of the Democratic Party voted for it 100 percent and the vast majority of the Republican Party did likewise. Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish church groups supported it wholeheartedly. In truth, it received the greatest support that any legislation had received in the history of the State of New York.

I rise to speak today because a few perverted un-Americans have distorted the truth concerning this act. It is high time that we start winning the war at home as well as abroad; that we make America safe for democracy as well as the world. It is my intention, therefore, to refute these distortions. Fortunately, there are only a few such souls left in this Nation and their number is rapidly dwindling. They are the buffoons of American life, but they are still so twisted, so perverted, so vicious, so malicious, so pernicious, so Fascist that they must be revealed for their un-Americanism.

Any fair-thinking American will respect another's point of view even though he radically disagrees, but none of us will respect a point of view that is based upon distortions.

Distortion No. 1 is that the New York State Fair Employment Practice Act was a betrayal of the white Americans of New York. The Senate of New York State is composed entirely of whites and the lower house is 97 percent white; yet these two houses virtually unanimously passed the State F. E. P. C.

Distortion No. 2 is the use of Biblical quotations to support race hating, and other forms of antireligious prejudice. I am a minister of the Gospel, pastor of the largest Protestant church of this country and the second oldest Baptist Church in the city of New York. From the depths of my religious convictions I state that anyone who is vicious enough to use the word of God to support hatred will be dealt with by a God of vengeance and that God might use the people to execute His own wrath.

Distortion No. 3 is the statement that the object of the F. E. P. C. was to persecute white Americans and drive them from the business world. Recently 300 employers were chosen at random by the National Urban League for a survey. They were employers who had never used Negro workers. They now use such workers in all capacities. They were asked if they would retain Negro workers in the post-war period. Two hundred and forty-two of them said that they definitely would because Negro workers are just as good as workers of any other race. Henry Ford proved this long before this war or the concept of a F. E. P. C. was born.

Distortion No. 4 states that the white gentiles of this country still have some rights left. This is true. Fortunately, the best thinking, and, therefore, the majority of the white gentiles of this country, have consistently fought for, not the rights of whites only, but for the rights of all Americans. Only a limited few who are vicious disgraces to the white race and any other race have continued to try to make America a stewing pot instead of a melting pot, but they have failed.

Distortion No. 5 is one of the most vicious distortions ever conceived. It is stated that 98 percent of the men dying in this war are white gentiles. Over 30,000,000 of those already killed came from two oriental countries. The American men whose lives have been placed upon the high altar of patriotism came from every race, color, and creed in our national life.

Distortion No. 6 is that the present temporary F. E. P. C. has harassed white Americans. If it had not been for the work of the temporary F. E. P. C. over 10 percent of this Nation would not be engaged now in turning out the material of warfare. American workers, black and white, Jew and gentile, Protestant and Catholic, have given to our Nation the armament for the greatest Navy and Army that any country has ever possessed.

The truth of it is the people are on the march and they are going to crush every Fascist, not only in Europe and in Japan, but also in America. The people, together, united, are not going to stand much longer for any rabble-rousing, demagogic, son of a Fascist to continue to besmirch the name of these our United States with outright, downright, filthy distortions.

Man's Best Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, not only is the dog man's best friend in peacetime, but he has proven himself as man's best friend on the field of battle. It is because of the splendid service rendered to our armed forces on many foreign battlefields that many people feel that the dog has now earned his freedom from the cruelty of vivisection.

No harm can be done to hear all sides on this issue. It is for that reason that I include in my remarks the following article by Lionell Calhoun Moise:

America's valiant canine soldiers, it seems, may win a fifth freedom for all the oppressed and hapless dogs of the country, freedom from cruel and useless vivisection.

It's a very necessary and important freedom, too, as you know if you read an article titled "Torture—the Reward of Man's Best Friend," which appeared in the American Weekly October 29 last.

The article told of a bill pending before Congress which would specifically prohibit the vivisection of dogs in the District of Columbia.

The bill has again come up before the new Congress just convened. And this time, it has the support of countless humanitarians who are determined that America's canine war heroes shall at least be protected from the indescribable tortures of the vivisection table.

How the public feels about this particular phase of the matter is attested in a flood of letters that have poured in upon Congressmen from pet-lovers throughout the Union.

Copies of many of these letters were sent to the American Weekly.

"My husband's life," writes the wife of an Illinois soldier, "was saved by an Army dog who found him while he was bleeding to death in a Philippine jungle. A Jap sniper kept shooting at the dog, but he wouldn't leave. Finally, the Jap hit him, but the dog remained until help came.

"Fortunately, this dog survived. Yet I have to face the fact that some day, after the war is over, this noble animal may become just another victim for the vivisectionists—a quivering bundle of pain to be carved and probed and mutilated until merciful death comes at last.

"Something just has to be done about this terrible business, and the time for Congress to do it is now. Otherwise, there are going to be a lot of soldiers who will have something to say about it later. And, while our war dogs don't have a vote, their human buddies have."

Many other letters of like content could be quoted—all showing that the loyal service of the K-9 corps in the current war has awakened people anew to the unique qualities of man's most faithful friend.

Some of the writers—though not many—are doctors. Generally, the medical profession is on the side of vivisection, contending that it is necessary to experiment on animals in order to save human lives, and that, in most cases, the subjects are anesthetized and are insensible to pain during the vivisection process.

This is unanimously disputed, however, by officials of antivivisection societies, who particularly cite reports in medical journals describing experiments in which the animals are kept alive for long periods and subjected to repeated operations.

Included in this category are experiments in bone and skin grafting, in the removal of glands and organs, and in operations on the brain, nerves, and eyes. The most ardent defenders of vivisection concede that, in research of this type, the unfortunate victim suffers prolonged and excruciating torture, often extending over weeks and months.

The position of the antivivisectionists is expressed by James P. Briggs, of Washington, D. C., president of the National Society for the Humane Regulation of Vivisection, which sponsored the pending measure.

"The torture of animals in the name of science," he says, "will never be stopped except by law.

"Just recently the general public has begun to realize that there are no such laws in the United States—that vivisection is actually regulated only by the vivisectionists themselves.

"This understanding can be credited chiefly to that great humanitarian, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, who, through his newspapers and magazines, has been so influential in promoting the cause of kindness to our animal friends everywhere.

"Of course, it is not enough to apply that prohibition only to the District of Columbia. But it is a start in the right direction, and one that I am confident will lead to the eventual outlawing of cruel, unnecessary, and unregulated animal experimentation throughout the country."

The proposed measure was introduced in both Houses last year. In the present Congress it was introduced by Representative WILLIAM LEMKE, Republican, of North Dakota.

To aid its passage, he urges all humanitarians to write their Congressmen. And, he adds, it may be well to remind them of the canine heroes who will return to homes from which a loved master or mistress has mysteriously vanished.

Such pathetic orphans of war will need special protection against the fate that has overtaken many another "lost" dog—the noose in the dark, the sinister scent of the soundproof kennel, the horrible and pitiful awakening beneath the vivisector's knife.

Canol Project Finally Abandoned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant chapters in our production program to provide our gallant men on their march to victory is the Canol development by the Army at Whitehorse, Canada.

The War Department announced a few days ago this costly project would be terminated June 30. It is now revealed that the date for shutting down the Canol project has been moved up from June 30 to April 1. It is well understood the War Department had good intentions early in the war in establishing this project regardless of the cost to the taxpayers of this country. The judgment to construct the Canol project was questioned from many sources. The attitude of those responsible for this tremendous and costly development has, as time has shown, been most unwise.

It is claimed by those who advocated the establishment of the Canol project that it was an absolute necessity to provide refined products in that area for our defense. The difficulty of getting the materials and supplies in the Whitehorse area was tremendous. Those who thought such an adventure wholly unwise contended that it would not provide sufficient gasoline and oil to justify the undertaking.

The result has been that $134,000,000 of the taxpayers' money has gone into this project and been completely wasted. It is a travesty on our people who will pay for this unfortunate experience.

In addition to costing the taxpayers of this country $134,000,000 and perhaps more, hundreds of men skilled and experienced in the production and refining of petroleum have been used in connection with this project and thereby made no contribution to the war program. It is tragic to think that these men could have been used to a tremendous advantage and have during all of these months been frozen on this worthless project. The petroleum industry, the refiners throughout the country, have been crying for men and I am advised that had these men on the Canol project been permitted to give their time and efforts in the refineries of this country, it would have increased the production of 100 octane by several thousand barrels per day.

Even if such a costly adventure had been justified early in the war, millions of dollars could have been saved by the taxpayers of this country and our manpower shortage partially alleviated by its abandonment when it became obvious that no worthwhile contribution to the war could possibly be made. There could be no justification for the continued waste of money and manpower, when there was no longer a threat of any enemy invasion more than 2 years ago.

The question may well be asked why we cannot liquidate the project, and at least salvage a large part of the money expended. It is well known that Canada has an option to buy this property at its appraised value, but it is hardly thinkable that even Canada would pay any substantial amount for a project whose value would be practically nil compared with the cost. Certainly in view of the limited production yielded from this project, no one would want to pay a substantial sum for it.

It seems to me that responsible persons should give a thorough accounting to the Congress and to the people of this country in connection with this project, and we should give immediate consideration as to its disposition and the possibility of realizing even a small percentage of the millions of dollars unjustly and unwisely spent.

The Big Bankers and Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address entitled "The Big Bankers and Bretton Woods," by Rev. E. A. Conway, S. J., of the Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Bretton Woods agreements on an international bank and a monetary fund have been presented to both House and Senate.

Already the lines are forming for a fierce debate. The outcome of that debate will go

far toward revealing how the general Dumbarton Oaks plan will fare when the final treaty is submitted for ratification.

Opposition is coming chiefly from the big bankers, through the American Bankers Association. The association, while favoring the international bank, is widely propagandizing against the international monetary fund. In favor of both the bank and the fund are the Farm Bureau, the National Grange, the Farmers' Union, the A. F. L., and the C. I. O.

In anticipation of the coming debate on the economic questions affecting world peace it might be profitable to recall one of the most important sections of the recent bishops' statement on international order. Heretofore this section has not received the attention it deserves. In its report, Judging the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, just off the press, the Catholic Association for International Peace puts special emphasis on the passages which the bishops devote to the economic question.

BISHOPS ON STEWARDSHIP

The bishops declare: "Nations rich in natural resources must remember that ownership of property never dispenses from the social obligations of stewardship."

To what nation on earth is that sentence more applicable than to the United States?

The bishops continue: "Nations gifted with inventive and productive genius are obligated to serve the reasonable needs of other nations. Nations should open, under effective guaranties, world lanes of commerce and world avenues of communication to all law-abiding countries. Protective national legislation for legitimate national economic interests must not impede the flow of international commerce and the right social function of international exchange."

The Bretton Woods conferees urged that in addition to implementing the specific monetary and financial measures which were the subject of the conference, the participating governments should agree on ways and means of:

1. Reducing obstacles to international trade and promoting mutually advantageous international commercial relations.

2. Bringing about the orderly marketing of staple commodities, at prices fair to the producer and consumer alike.

3. Facilitating the harmonization of national policies of member states designed to promote and maintain high levels of employment and progressively rising standards of living.

Until these objectives are attained, objectives the bishops have emphasized, the political measures outlined in the Dumbarton Oaks plan will not avail much.

THE AMERICAN DOG IN THE MANGER

We would be well advised to watch carefully how the principles outlined by the bishops are heeded in the coming discussions. And we would do well to remember that no nation violated these principles more flagrantly during those years in the 1920's when the conditions that contributed to the rise of Hitlerism were developing.

We then had about one-seventeenth of the world's population. We occupied about one-twentieth of the earth. Yet normally we produced more than two-thirds of the world's oil, three-fifths of the world's corn, more than half of the world's cotton and lumber, and far more than our proportion of the wheat, livestock, and coal of the world. We not only produced, but we possessed, an overwhelming proportion of the automobiles, trucks, telephones, bathtubs, and radios in the world.

Undeniably, we were "gifted with inventive and productive genius, with which we were obligated to serve the reasonable needs of other nations," to quote the bishops. We should have "opened world lanes of commerce * * * to all law-abiding countries." That was common sense as well as good morals, because it is neither reasonable nor moral for one-seventeenth of the world's population to use up nearly half of the world's oil, corn, cotton, lumber, and so on.

But somehow, after the First World War, we became sold on the idea that our prosperity depended on our building tariff walls so high that would-be competitors could not get their goods into our land. Other nations, too, built up their tariff walls, and tried to make themselves economically independent, but succeeded only in aggravating international frictions.

A LESSON WE MUST LEARN

Are the big bankers just a new breed of Bourbons, who forget nothing, neither do they learn anything? Will they try to make us repeat the mistaken foreign trade policy which contributed to the depression of the thirties, and helped to bring on the Second World War?

Today the United States is even more predominantly the wealthiest, the most productive, and the most inventive nation on the earth. Our obligations to the rest of the world have grown correspondingly. After this war we shall be like a poker player who has won virtually all the chips in the game. Either we must take the other players' I. O. U.'s and distribute some chips among the other players, or the game will break up. And if the game of international trade should break up, we would experience the worst depression in world history, and the rise of a new crop of dictators to take advantage of the miseries of men.

The debate in Congress on the Bretton Woods agreements will bear watching. Let's watch with one eye on the bishops' statement of principles governing the "social obligations of stewardship."

Bretton Woods Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Samuel Grafton and published in the Philadelphia Record of February 27, 1945, and an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of February 14, 1945, both dealing with the subject of the Bretton Woods agreement.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of February 27, 1945]

I'D RATHER BE RIGHT

(By Samuel Grafton)

A number of American bankers want us to kill the most important half of the Bretton Woods agreement. They do not want this country to put $2,750,000,000 into a world stabilization fund. They say it would be risky. They say we might lose our money. And, to be sure, $2,750,000,000 is no pittance, or tip. That is an impressive amount of dollars. It is—how shall I put it, to show how truly vast it is?—why, it is the amount we spend every 10 days to keep the war going.

We might lose part of our $2,750,000,000, the American Bankers' Association says, if we invested it in a world stabilization fund to keep the peace going, not for 10 days, but for a hundred years. It seems fairly peculiar that no one worries about whether a General Sherman tank is a gilt-edged investment, or about the amortization rate on an antiaircraft gun, for it has none. And who will pay for the smashed landing boats at Iwo Jima? I leave out the question of the smashed lives, for they are carried in a separate account.

A MAINTENANCE FUND

The bankers are not convincing when they talk about the "risk" of putting something less than $3,000,000,000 into a world stabilization fund to insure a peace which will have cost us more than three hundreds of billions of dollars to buy. The next peace will be the most expensive property the American people will ever have bought.

Certainly it is not an extravagant suggestion that we put an amount equal to less than 1 percent of the purchase price into a maintenance fund to keep the property in good condition. It costs that much, or more, to keep any property running, just to do an occasional paint job, and keep the sidewalk clean.

WERE WE SAFE?

But suppose we don't do it? Would that be safe? We didn't do it last time. We didn't set up a world stabilization fund after the last war. Did we avoid a "risk" thereby? Yes, if the bankers' committees are right in their present argument. We must have been very safe after the last war, because we didn't take any wild chances with a world fund. But I turn to a 1941 publication of the Council on Foreign Relations, entitled, "Dollars in Latin America," and I find a table telling about American bonds on which the world had defaulted. As of December 31, 1939, the last year of approximately normal business, the world had defaulted on $3,335,000,000 of our bonds, an amount almost $600,000,000 greater than the amount we are now asked to put into a stabilization fund.

It is a matter of simple historical fact that these bonds were sold to Americans by substantially the same interests which today declare that a world stabilization fund involves a wild risk.

There was no stabilization fund last time; oh, no, nothing dangerous like that. We played it safe. So safe that by the end of 1938, 77 percent of our Latin-American bonds were in default while 45 percent of our European bonds were in the same unhappy condition. A chief reason for default was the violent gyration of foreign exchange values, so that in one year a South American country might have to put up 2 pesos to get a dollar with which to pay off, and in another year 5 pesos for $1.

After a while this becomes monotonous, and you stop putting up pesos.

WHAT IF WE FAILED?

A world fund would tend to keep all currencies level, and even. We are told it might fail. What if it did fail? Even so, we would lose rather less than last time; while if it succeeded the next generation might save a handsome sum on tanks, ships, planes, and other such costly items.

It is true that the banking interest might lose control over the trade in foreign exchange; one man's safety is another man's poison. But if we are going to lose $3,000,000,000 again let's lose it gloriously, this time, in a bid for a stable world; instead of losing it sordidly and privately, and without dignity or grace or greatness.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of February 14, 1945]

RATIFY BRETTON WOODS PROPOSALS

The Bretton Woods proposals for an international bank and an international fund to

facilitate rebuilding of war-ruined industries and to encourage consequent revival of world trade must be accepted by each of the 44 governments represented at the conference, if they are to participate.

Without acceptance by the United States and Britain and Russia, it is doubtful that the bank or fund could prove effective. It is for this reason that President Roosevelt has twice urged Congress to take the lead in ratifying the Bretton Woods proposals.

The arguments for ratification seem overwhelming, with the objections running more to details than to principles. The feeling of Bretton Woods proponents is that if the United States starts quibbling over details, and sets a pattern for other nations to quibble, the entire work of the conference may prove in vain.

No one, even with the greatest optimism, believes that the bank or fund would solve all, or even most, of the problems of foreign exchange and international trade. But the proposals offer hope that some difficulties can be minimized.

In this country, and in England, the principal objections come from bankers, though not from all by any means. Some of the best financial men advocate ratification of the Bretton Woods proposals. Part of the hostility is merely opposition to anything new. Wall Street, for instance, opposed the Federal Reserve System when it was first proposed. One writer has said there is opposition by some bankers who have a kind of "dog in the manger attitude and no program for the revival of international lending, but hate to see the Government do it."

In view of the billions of dollars unwisely lent abroad by bankers in the twenties, and subsequently lost by American investors, it does not seem reasonable that the objections of these gentlemen should be given great weight.

A good many of the suggestions of the American Bankers' Association are thoughtful, but—since they agree in principle with the Bretton Woods outline—it would seem wiser to ratify the proposals as the 44 nations worked them out than to risk losing all by starting a confusing series of amendments and changes.

The Bretton Woods proposals, as the President has pointed out to Congress, are not panaceas, nor do they stand by themselves. They are part of several closely related plans for international cooperation—like U. N. R. R. A., Dumbarton Oaks, the Crimea Conference and the forthcoming meeting at San Francisco.

With all of these undertakings we must build toward a peace to be secured by international cooperation. The Bretton Woods proposals should be ratified.

The West Offers Opportunities for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, when the 12,000,000 men and women now in our armed services return to the pursuits of peace, following total victory over our ruthless enemies, they will be confronted with the grave and difficult problem of readjustment and rehabilitation.

Most of them in due time will want to marry, establish homes, and live in peace with their neighbors. It will require much fortitude for them to successfully find their proper niche in our civic life. They will need all the assistance and encouragement that we can possibly give them.

Last Tuesday evening our distinguished and able colleague from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System a remarkable address which is filled with faith, hope, and encouragement for our returning heroes. I wish it could fall into the hands of every discharged service man and woman. Indeed, it would be well if every citizen of our country could read it. It is full of sound sense, wise counsel, and heartening cheer. It will fire the imagination of the dullest mind and give hope to the despairing heart.

For nearly 30 years Congressman KNUTSON has represented his State and Nation in the Congress of the United States. He is the ranking Republican Member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee and is a keen student of politics, economics, and finance. Because of his vast fund of knowledge gained through long experience, earnest study, and wide travels, he is eminently qualified to speak with authority on almost any subject of national importance. He knows our country well and is steeped in our best American traditions. In this age of cynicism, skepticism, and despair, we need the spirit of optimism, the fire of faith, and the ray of hope that his address contains.

HAROLD KNUTSON knows and appreciates the past but he lives in the present and looks to the future. His inspiring and challenging address follows:

Many Americans may indulge the delusion that with the end of the war our troubles will be over. As a matter of fact they will have just begun. Indeed, those who have given thought to the matter, know that peace will bring the greatest crisis in American history.

We shall have 12,000,000 soldiers waiting for demobilization. We have promised to give them jobs, and that is a promise we intend to keep. But at the same time we shall have 20,000,000 war workers who must shift from war work to the products of peace. We must find jobs for them also. We shall have a war debt of $300,000,000,000, with a burden of war taxes that only the richest nation on earth can bear and then only if its manpower and its resources are employed to the last man, the last dollar, and the last acre.

We face one great problem at the outset. The industrial centers of the East are overcrowded. The population map of the United States looks like a bus, with all the congestion at the front end. What we need is to distribute this surplus population to the rear of the bus. Then the bus will ride more easily, and we will all be happier and more prosperous. If we do not do this, we face a serious danger of unemployment and disorder when our returning soldiers crowd into these congested areas.

So I have come to the microphone tonight, to inject into our discussions of post-war planning, a note of courage, of optimism, and of hope. I have come here to tell you how, with the help of our returning soldiers, and the vast forces we have mobilized for war, we can build a greater America by creating in the States west of the Mississippi River, the world's newest and greatest industrial empire.

The program I offer you will bring home our soldiers from overseas, furnish employment for our demobilized armies, convert our war factories to the products of peace, and put our billions of war-saved dollars to work in the United States. The opportunity is an inspiring challenge to our statesmen, to our industrial leadership, and to our free American enterprise.

We did the same thing once before—80 years ago—at the end of the Civil War. Then we converted the same Western States into the world's greatest agricultural empire by giving homesteads to the soldiers of the Civil War. Today the West offers far greater opportunities, not for farms but for industries. If 10,000,000 soldiers or war workers and their families make their new homes in the States west of the Mississippi, the West will have a greater population than the whole United States had 50 years ago. With them would go from fifty to one hundred billion dollars of new investment capital—the most richly endowed migration that has ever built an empire.

About 100,000,000 people in the United States are thinking now about what they are going to do after the war—and what our country is going to do. In Congress we have spent much of the past year on that problem. We have discussed demobilization, unemployment, conversion, termination of war contracts, and adjustment of soldiers' pay, to say nothing of debt limits, post-war taxes, and relief for Europe.

As minority leader of the House Ways and Means Committee, I have spent day after day listening to hearings, and night after night reading programs and projects and proposals of what must be done to save this country from disaster when the guns are silent and the sun of peace shines on the desolate ruins of war.

Most of the testimony we have heard and most of the proposals we have read have been filled with forebodings of disaster. We have been warned that we will have 20,000,000 unemployed; that there will be no work for our returning soldiers, so that they will have to stay in the Army or go on relief. Others have told us that we must send our war savings to Europe and Asia, so they can buy our products and keep our factories working. Then we must keep our soldiers abroad to police our debtors and to collect our debts, and if we want our money back we must buy what Europe produces, even if we have to close our factories and lower our wages and our standards of living to do so.

Then they point to our great burden of debt and tell us that the United States has reached the end of its rope. We cannot expand our industries or our commerce; we cannot increase our production. All we can do, say these pessimists, is to resubdivide what we have and spread it out more evenly. Our frontiers are gone. Capitalism is through. Only communism can save us.

They tell us that private enterprise, individual initiative, and ambitious manhood were all right when the country was young. Then land was free. Then the Nation was being built. But the building is finished, and there is nothing left to be done today. We have reached the farthest frontier. The farthest horizon lies under our feet—only the abyss of disaster beckons the daring man who would march farther.

Nonsense! America has just begun to grow. Our future lies ahead. The troubles that lie behind us—even the two world wars into which we have poured our manhood and our wealth—are but the childhood sicknesses of the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

If peace is to be won, if the Nation is to be restored to prosperity, there can be but one way—and that is to use private American enterprise and individual initiative to give employment to our homecoming armies and to put our billions of war-earned and war-saved dollars to work in the United States.

The plan which I believe will best accomplish this—among all the programs which have come before Congress—is the work of my old-time newspaper and radio friend, Oswald F. Schuette, of Chicago, and Washington. He was a war correspondent in the First World War and has been for 25 years an outstanding writer on national and international affairs, as well as an adviser on industrial problems. He is an enthusiastic believer in the future of the United States and of the contribution which our great continental empire will make in the rebuilding of the world. He emphasizes the important distinction we must make between a continental empire and a colonial empire. A continental empire exploits the resources of its territories for the benefit of its people. A colonial empire exploits the people of its colonies for the benefit of a favored few.

We had the same problem of debts and demobilization at the end of the Civil War, and then we solved them by the same means which are at our command today. To understand just what those problems were, think of what we would have had to do in 1865, if the Mississippi River had been the western boundary of our war-wracked Republic, and if the Pacific Ocean had come to the Twin Cities and St. Louis.

The factories of the North were as surcharged in 1865 as they are now with war contracts which peace would cancel. To find work for the million Union soldiers who returned from the battlefields, 2,000,000 workers would have been dropped from the overloaded pay rolls. No Government relief that was then available could have bridged such a gap.

What did we do? We opened the great frontiers of the West. We gave each soldier a certificate good for $200 worth of land and told him to go out and find it. Citizens who were not soldiers could buy the same homestead at the land office for $1.25 an acre. We gave these men no further help—no Government-guaranteed loans, no pledge of unemployment relief, no subsidy. We said, "Go west, young man," and the ambitious men who went west to open that prairie frontier, converted our Western States into the world's greatest agricultural empire. For 35 years—to the turn of the century—it absorbed all our surplus money, energy, and men, and half of Europe's.

The miracle of that day can be repeated now by reopening the same frontier of the West, this time as the frontier of an industrial empire instead of an agricultural domain. For the West has resources in raw materials and power for industry greater than its resources for agriculture. Its mines and quarries, its oil wells, and its water power are richer than its farms and its forests.

It is the lesson of history that every great crisis brings with it the forces needed for its solution. Whether the event is to be a catastrophe or an opportunity depends upon wise leadership—wise leadership and vision.

We have all heard the story of the great Chicago fire. It is part of the thrilling history of the Northwest. I heard it in all its dramatic detail from my father. When that fire swept Chicago in October 1871 the city had 300,000 people. The fire destroyed half their homes, two-thirds of their factories and all of the business district—with a loss of $200,000,000. That was an enormous sum in those days. To make it worse, the insurance companies went into bankruptcy.

Let us say this for the Chicago pioneers: They did not come to Washington to ask either for a Government subsidy or for Government planning. By their own initiative, and with private loans, these men built, on the ashes of their homes and hopes, a billion-dollar city. The fire, and the building of the new city, brought to the shore of Lake Michigan a tide of money, material, and, above all, ambitious men. High wages and high prices were no obstacle. Time was the important element. Farmers drove their teams 60 miles to Chicago that winter—because a man and team could earn $6 a day hauling ashes to the lake. Nor was it only Chicago that felt this revival. The fire brought a tide of prosperity to all the surrounding States, and presently—because it was the metropolis of this great area—Chicago became the second city on the American Continent.

This is no isolated instance of the way in which fearless, ambitious men can turn defeat into victory. Twice in the last 50 years, the hardy pioneers of my own State of Minnesota have done the same thing although on a smaller scale. The first came after the great forest fire that swept the Hinckley area in 1894, and the second was the aftermath of the devastating Cloquet forest fire in 1918. In both, the rebuilding of cities and villages was a miracle of the power of men to overcome disasters, when they have the will to victory.

The plan proposed by Mr. Schuette to create a new industrial empire in the West calls for no Government planning and no Government subsidy.

Instead, it will utilize the great, half-developed natural resources of those States, converting them into new sources of national wealth. It will give better distribution in people and production throughout our country. It will relieve the congested population which has dragged down the standards of living in so many overcrowded eastern communities.

The first beneficiary of the conversion of the agricultural West into an industrial empire will be the factories and the workers of the East. For these will supply the billions of dollars worth of plants, machinery, transportation and other equipment necessary to create this new empire. The East was the greatest beneficiary of the agricultural empire which developed the western prairies after the Civil War.

In the first crucial post-war years, it will be the products of eastern factories which will build and equip the new cities, new farms, new factories, and new mines in the West. As a result, there should be an immediate and enormous expansion of the producing and consuming capacity of the entire United States—enough to increase our normal annual income to $150,000,000,000 a year. The initial construction work alone, in building and equipment the new industries, farms and residences, would absorb a huge capital investment. The progressive industrial corporations of the East—Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, United States Steel, Bethlehem, Du Pont, International Harvester, General Electric, Westinghouse, Aluminum, Pullman, to name but a few—will not wait long before they will erect branch factories in the midst of this new empire, in addition to the great war plants already constructed there. With such a tide of west-bound migration of consumers and purchasing power, they will realize that no foreign market can equal our own great West.

The second great beneficiary of this empire will be the railroads of the West. The creation of the new empire will increase their traffic and equalize their east and west bound hauls, thus making possible the general lowering of rates.

So I expect the railroads—which played so important a part in pioneering the agricultural West—to play an even more important part in the promotion of the new industrial West.

For therein lies the dynamic power of the Schuette plan. With their high standard of living, their initial consuming capacity, and the great wealth which the new pioneers will create beyond these new frontiers, there will arise an irresistible power to attract even more men and more money to accelerate the exploitation of the West. This will be no slow migration like that which followed the Civil War.

When the soldiers of that conflict went west to claim their $200 worth of homestead lands they had little capital, except their character and their courage, with which to conquer the trackless wilderness of that day, and to convert it into homes and farms. Only one railroad had been built across the mountains and it was unfinished. There were few cities and fewer roads—the men who went west left civilization behind them.

The veterans of the present war who will answer the new call to "Go West" will find a different welcome. The West now offers them modern cities, comfortable homes, highways, railroads, air routes, churches, schools, hospitals, movies, and above all, a hospitality that is the proudest boast of our American civilization.

But the settlers of today will not go west without capital, as they did 80 years ago. Congress has already authorized the governmental guaranty, for each veteran, of one-half of a loan—up to $4,000—to buy a house, a farm, or a business enterprise. No tide of migration in history ever brought with it such an immediate power to buy and to build.

Other soldiers will go west to obtain the education which Congress has promised to give them at Government expense. They are entitled to choose their own schools. Those who decide to go to western high schools, colleges, and universities will find them as fine as any in the United States, and it will be a rare student who will go to a western school and then return to the east to live.

The first step in carrying out this ambitious plan will be to start soldiers and war workers—and their wives, mothers and sweethearts—to thinking about the great opportunities which the West has to offer them. The Government as such should take no part in this urging. The West should say "Come west, America," but no one should undertake to tell anyone, soldier or worker, where he must go. The future settlers will decide for themselves where they want to live. The attractions of the West will be their best guide. The West—through its railroads, its chambers of commerce, its civic organizations, its banks and industries, its newspapers and radio stations—will have no difficulty in helping prospective settlers to find the specific opportunities that will best meet their specific needs.

The important thing is that such a migration will of itself be the power that will create the new empire. The producers it brings with it, will at the same time be the consumers that will keep the producers at work.

The point which all must remember is that no single State or group of States can solve this problem for itself. Even a great State like California or Minnesota cannot solve the problem alone. The new industries which the war has brought to these States cannot be converted to peacetime profits unless there are customers enough west of the Mississippi to buy their products.

Only the creation of an empire of truly continental size, capable of absorbing 10,000,000 men and $100,000,000,000, can give to this program the dynamic momentum necessary to meet the crisis of peace. Only in that way can an empire be created that will overcome all economic uncertainties and all political controversies, and turn the eyes and hopes of America to the boundless heritage of its Golden West.

Iowa on the Road to Joining Arkansas and Wisconsin in Repealing Former Endorsement of Vicious Twenty-second Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to extend my remarks on the activities of the Committee for Constitutional Government and other proponents of the proposed twenty-second amendment to include an excerpt from the publication of the Honorable W. D. Jamieson, a former Member of this House from the State of Iowa, and also a former member of the Iowa State Senate.

Senator Jamieson publishes a very interesting paper, which he calls the Window Seat, with which a great number of you are familiar—a paper which contains a lot of common-sense philosophy and an analysis of national events in a friendly, homespun way.

Not long ago Senator Jamieson called me to inquire about the group advocating the twenty-second amendment and about the proposal. Senator Jamieson had just discovered this plot and was instantly aroused. I do not mention this with any thought except to show that the activities of the proponents were so devoid of announcements of results that it escaped the attention of almost everyone of those whose aim is to keep abreast of all such developments. You would think that a group sponsoring an amendment and interested in its adoption would grasp at every success and publicize it to as great an extent as possible; but no. Not in this case. This was something that should be promoted in a roundabout way through back doors and would not stand up for general public scrutiny.

In 1941 the House and Senate of Iowa passed a resolution endorsing the twenty-second amendment. This was House Concurrent Resolution 15.

On January 23 of this year a number of members of the Iowa House introduced House Concurrent Resolution 9, which would rescind the former endorsing resolution. Some of these legislators wrote me and commended me for my part in bringing out the truth on this subject. On February 14 the House of Representatives of Iowa passed this rescinding resolution unanimously. The Iowa Senate now must concur in this action to remove the name of Iowa from the list of States which endorses this scheme to benefit the rich. The March 1945 issue of the Railroad Trainman says it would be tax relief to the greedy, not to the needy.

Senator Jamieson wrote me a few days ago relative to the Iowa situation, as follows:

I am grateful to you for your good letter of March 6, giving interesting and helpful details about the Iowa situation in connection with the disastrous amendment proposed by the Gannett crowd. I read it with keen interest and with benefit.

You will be glad to know that as a result of your explanation about the situation in my home State, I have sent to each one of our State officials and to our 50 members of the State senate a copy of the enclosed Window Seat. I hope it will help set our good State right.

As you can see, I handled this amendment proposition without gloves. You are at liberty to use it in any way in which you think it will serve our common purpose in that matter; namely to kill this wicked proposition.

Your statement Wednesday night that none of the proponents of this amendment nor any of those favoring it had the superb nerve to appear at the hearing before the Maryland General Assembly is revealing. I declare, I don't see how these folks could have accomplished so much and not have had the whole country making terrific protest.

My hat is off to you, sir, and to my friend. The country is better off because you are in Congress.

Cordially.

W. D. JAMIESON.

Following is what Senator Jamieson had to say about the proposed amendment and its proponents in the March 14, 1945, issue of the Window Seat. I think this will be of interest to the Members of this body from Iowa and to the legislators of the Iowa State Legislature and to the citizens of that State:

AMAZING

It is hard to believe, yet it is true, that a little group of reactionaries of the worst hue—the "Gannett group" of New York City, under the holy name of Committee for Constitutional Government—are trying to sneak through an amendment to the Constitution to limit the powers of Congress to tax incomes not more than 25 percent. The amazing thing is the progress they have made.

Corporations and money-making people could make incomes by the millions, yet 25 percent is all the Congress could tax them to pay our war debt and to run the Government.

If you think this through, you will soon see that this would allow the rich to get away from paying their fair share, while it would tax the little fellow beyond his ability to pay. Further, it would prevent the Government from extending social security and education, and doing many other things in the interest of the common people.

You should do everything you can to kill this rotten and sneaking effort.

FACTS

This slick gang, this millionaire tax-dodging group, has for one of its brains a cunning fellow by the name of Rumely, who was convicted as a German agent in World War No. 1.

Its scheme was turned down by Congress.

It seems to have money without limit to carry on its sneaking, undercover lobbying.

It refused to disclose this money source to a Congress committee last fall.

It is taking an unused scheme, that of getting two-thirds of our State legislatures—32—to ask Congress to call a constitutional convention to pass on their low scheme. If they do get these 32, Congress must call.

A millionaire who now pays $800,000 tax out of his $1,000,000 income would only pay $250,000 under this rich tax-dodging scheme, while the little fellow with a $2,000 income, who now pays $175, would then pay $500.

It would cripple the Nation viciously.

My friends, don't let this innocent-looking little package explode—it has enough dynamite in it to destroy us.

ASLEEP

Yes; nearly all of us except the gang who are working their heads off quietly to put this awful thing through, have been asleep at the switch.

For instance—did you know that 17 of our State legislatures have passed this resolution? I didn't. Many of the members of the legislatures themselves didn't know it—sometimes passed in the rush of the last day.

Arkansas and Wisconsin passed it, but a year or more later, when their eyes were opened, rescinded. Pennsylvania passed it, and the Governor vetoed it. But I doubt if the governor has any part in a resolution of this kind. Where I put "yes" after the State it means a rescinding resolution has been offered—passed one house in cases.

Illinois, yes; Iowa, yes; Massachusetts, yes; Michigan, yes; New Jersey, yes; Rhode Island, yes; Alabama, Delaware, Kentucky, Maine, Mississippi, New Hampshire, and Wyoming—15 still valid and 17 to go.

GET BUSY

Please do. Here is a place where good citizens can show themselves.

If the people knew all about this it wouldn't have a chance in the world.

EVEN IOWA

Yes, I'm sorry to say, our general assembly passed this vicious resolution, without knowing what it is.

This State has almost everything to lose by it and little to gain.

But I'm thankful that when our boys woke up the house voted to rescind, and I'm told it's now in the senate. If I were back there again as a member of that senate I'd be the busy lad undoing that mistake.

GREAT CREDIT

If this wicked thing is killed deader'n a nit, our country will owe a big debt to Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, the vigorous fighter for the good of the common people who hails from Texas.

He says it is "the millionaire's amendment to make the rich richer and the poor poorer." And how right he is.

My hat's off to you WRIGHT PATMAN.

Senatorial Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senatorial Cooperation" published in the Washington Post of March 6, 1945. It gives great praise to Members of this honorable body. I feel that we cannot too often say the good about each other. I am very happy to ask that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORIAL COOPERATION

The job of advising and consenting, which is the Senate's prerogative in our treaty relations with the world, has been given a new definition at Mexico City. Hitherto the initiative in treaty making has been retained by

the Executive. All Presidents have been jealous of it. But at Mexico City Senator AUSTIN took the ball as soon as he arrived here and we were treated to the spectacle of a Senator determining the administration's approach to the continental security pact, and an opposition Senator at that. It was the earnest and disinterested Vermonter who framed the formula on which action was taken Saturday at Mexico City. Senator CONNALLY made senatorial intervention complete by adding to the declaration what might be called the Connally reservation. Not the slightest resentment has been caused by this senatorial intervention; indeed, it has been welcomed, for, as Assistant Secretary Rockefeller says: "The administration wants to know what it can deliver to our Latin-American friends." Senator AUSTIN'S work is especially the object of comprehensive compliments.

The phenomenon is all the more notable because, along with the Senators, the administration included in its advisorate in Mexico City representatives of business, agriculture, and labor. All of them took an active part in framing the economic proposals. Assistant Secretary Clayton saw to that. The readiness, even eagerness, of the administration to consult with all interested parties will have two results. One will be that the resolutions arrived at in Mexico City will be heavily buttressed with support from quarters outside the administration when they are offered for American approval and action. The other result will be personal. Men of the most diverse interests and backgrounds have been working together in the United States delegation. They have been working together so harmoniously that a friendly feeling has been generated which will yield fruit in domestic affairs. It is one of the minor miracles here, for instance, to hear James G. Patton, president of the Farmers Union, praising Assistant Secretary Clayton. The American correspondents have been gladdened to witness these representative spokesmen, one after another, stand up in the conferences with the world's press and testify by their presence and their words to our domestic cooperation. What their hearers, the delegates, will say when they get home may be imagined. It will certainly enhance good will for America. To have seen this cooperation in the United States delegation at Mexico City is to have one's faith renewed in the ability of men around a table, granted they are reasonable men, to reach an agreement.

The phenomenon we have been watching in Mexico City of this kind of advisorate in action deserves to be cultivated. The job confronting the United States is to make our Government system more viable for our positive world tasks of tomorrow. Our separation of powers was devised on the assumption that we should always be negative and on the defensive in a tyrant world. That is why the domestic machinery creaks when foreign relations are involved. The necessary lubricant is precisely the kind which has been applied to the relations we have seen developing in Mexico City.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Star of March 13, 1945:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

In the last two weeks Rumania—a small country compared with the great European powers—has become the most sensitive point in the relationship among the Big Three concerning the carrying out of the Yalta agreements. Although only meager reports are being published about developments in Bucharest, the highest authorities in Washington and London admit that they are concerned.

The Rumanian personalities involved in the recent political seesaw are of little consequence. What is worrying our State Department and the British foreign office is that so soon after the Crimean Conference was ended in full harmony, the ugly head of "unilateral action" seems to have been raised again.

Soon after Mr. Roosevelt's return to Washington a political crisis developed in Bucharest. Gen. Nicholae Radescu, who had been appointed Premier of Rumania with the full approval of the Russian Government, was overthrown by the new "Democratic Front."

Thus far nothing happened to upset the Yalta apple cart. King Michael advised the representatives of the Big Three that he was charging Prince Barbu Stirbey with the task of forming a new government. In the meantime, Vice Commissar Andri Vishinsky flew over from Moscow and took the whole matter in hand. When Stirbey was unable to form the government, Peter Groza, a man known for communistic leanings, was placed at the head of the cabinet. The political views of the new Prime Minister are of no consequence to Washington and London. But the British and American Governments were astonished that they had not been consulted when Groza was selected by Vishinsky to head the new administration.

During the ministerial crisis, some of the highest officials in Rumania are reported to have appealed to American authorities in Bucharest for shelter on the plea that their lives were endangered by the purges which the new government had pledged itself to carry out. The Americans informed Washington that these people had made the appeals on the ground that they were political refugees. In order not to upset the Yalta agreement Washington decided to turn them down.

Giving the men refuge would have been interpreted by Moscow as a "unilateral action" and the American Government was determined to do nothing which would give Premier Stalin the impression that we were disregarding the Crimea agreements. The British Government, however, was more disturbed by this unilateral action of Vice Commissar Vishinsky and when the former Rumanian Premier, General Radescu, appealed for refuge he was allowed to come to the British Legation and thus enjoy immunity from arrest. The Foreign Office decided to mark its attitude by making public its decision to shelter Radescu as a political refugee.

According to reports which the United States Government has been receiving from Rumania, the Communist Party represents only about 5 percent of the total Rumanian population. In order to strengthen the hands of Premier Groza, Moscow announced last Saturday that the portion of Transylvania which had been handed over to the Hungarians by the previous Fascist Government of King Michael, was being returned to the Rumanians.

This was another bombshell thrown at the State Department and the Foreign Office.

Hungary, like Rumania, had signed an armistice with the Big Three. According to the Yalta agreements, the Russians were not entitled to dispose of the territories of either satellite without previous consultation and agreement with Washington and London. It is probable that neither the United States nor the British Government would have objected either to the placement of Groza at the head of the Bucharest Government or to the return of Transylvania to its rightful owners.

But since it had been agreed at the Crimea Conference that none of the three governments would do anything without consulting the others, the single-handed action of the Soviet Government necessarily was regarded as a departure from the agreements signed less than a month ago.

The whole matter is now being taken up with the Moscow Government by Ambassador Harriman and it is hoped that he will obtain some satisfactory explanation together with a promise that the Yalta agreements henceforth will be scrupulously observed.

Rail Unions Reject This Imposture—Claim That Workers Favor Limiting Taxing Power of Congress Is Without Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of permission duly granted, I extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of inserting an able editorial which appeared on the 10th of March in Labor, the outstanding national weekly newspaper owned and published by 15 standard railroad labor organizations of the United States. In this editorial the author, Mr. Edward Keating, a distinguished former Member of the House, blasts to oblivion a brazen propaganda article in support of an amendment to the Constitution which is demanded by organized wealth to prohibit Congress from levying a tax of more than 25 percent on incomes, inheritances, and gifts. The article which Mr. Keating annihilated appeared in a comparatively insignificant publication entitled "The Railroad Workers' Journal," which the legitimate American labor movement has never recognized. The editorial is as follows:

RAIL UNIONS REJECT THIS IMPOSTURE—CLAIM THAT WORKERS FAVOR LIMITING TAXING POWER OF CONGRESS IS WITHOUT FOUNDATION—STORY OF MAURICE FRANKS

One of the most brazen fakes ever perpetrated against our national lawmakers has just been called to the attention of Labor by Members of Congress.

On several occasions we have registered vigorous opposition to a proposal put forward by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., to write into the Federal Constitution a provision forbidding Congress to levy a tax of more than 25 percent on incomes, inheritances, and gifts.

Obviously, such a constitutional amendment would benefit the very rich and would increase the tax burdens of Americans of modest incomes.

The Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., is spending tremendous sums on propaganda to advance its pet scheme. Its

latest contribution is an article from the Railroad Workers' Journal. It was written by Robert D. Dresser, and argues that the 25-percent limitation would be of inestimable benefit to American workers.

We don't know Mr. Dresser, but we do know the Railroad Workers' Journal. It is edited by Maurice Franks and is described as the official organ of the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc.

It is doubtful if this organization has a thousand dues-paying members. The American labor movement has never recognized it. Apparently the chief object of its existence is to provide background for the Railroad Workers' Journal. Thereby hangs a strange tale.

Years ago Maurice Franks entered into a contract with the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc., by which he was to run the Railroad Workers' Journal and divide the receipts with the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc.

Since then Franks has concentrated on two lines of activity—abusing labor unions at meetings of chambers of commerce and similar organizations and conducting advertising campaigns among businessmen who like to hear labor unions denounced and who may imagine their ads will appear in a magazine of general circulation.

How much Franks has been able to clean up, Labor does not know.

Now he has joined forces with the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., and is endeavoring to make it appear to Members of Congress and others that the railroad workers favor the vicious proposal to hamstring the taxing powers of Congress. There is no foundation for that claim, Labor reiterates:

"The Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc., is in no sense representative of the standard railroad labor organizations, which have a membership of more than 1,500,000; the Railroad Workers' Journal is more of an advertising medium than a labor newspaper; and, so far as we know, no responsible labor organization has ever indorsed the proposed 25 percent limitation on incomes, inheritances, and gifts."

Address of Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. LANE POWERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding general, Army Service Forces, over Columbia Broadcasting System, Friday, March 9, 1945:

Today, on our third anniversary, I address myself to the men and women of Army Service Forces. I want to talk to those of you here at home, and to those other millions trained in A. S. F., who serve with our armies overseas.

We were born in a moment of urgency and urgency has driven us ever since. After 3 hard years, let us look backward for a moment and then forward to the tasks ahead. Let us take stock of our position today and ask ourselves how well we are prepared for the future.

A year ago I reported to you on our accomplishments in 1943. We were proud of that record; we had every right to be proud. But let us now compare it with 1944.

Last year we increased production by $2,000,000,000. We shipped overseas nearly 50,000,000 tons of supplies as compared with less than 29,000,000 in 1943. We carried 3,000,000 men overseas, a million more than in the previous year. We dispatched three times as much soldier mail, nearly three times as many overseas radio messages, did three times more work in our maintenance shops, paid out twice as much money in family allowance accounts.

Statistics, however, do not tell the whole story.

They don't indicate the quality of medical care or the effort involved in setting up convalescent hospitals. They don't show the superb service rendered by Army communications 24 hours a day, linking the battlefronts with the War Department.

In 1944 we established a correction division in the Adjutant General's Office to supervise rehabilitation centers and disciplinary barracks. We opened redistribution stations for personnel returned from overseas.

We all know what the encouragement and guidance of the chaplains mean to our soldiers everywhere.

We have extended our program to provide information, off-duty education, and recreation to our soldiers. They are well informed, but they have never been propagandized.

In dollar value 20 percent of our contracts in 1944 went to small businesses compared with only 13 percent in 1943. This is a decided improvement, and I congratulate you on it.

In the year prices in A. S. F. contracts declined 5 percent. We continued to meet our lend-lease commitments.

Even under extreme conditions no overcrowded ports marred the record of the Transportation Corps and of the railroads. This is an outstanding achievement.

We have closed about one-fourth the capacity of the posts we manage in the United States and are holding them ready for troops back from Europe for redeployment or return to their homes.

Perhaps our most noteworthy achievement last year was handling supplies for the European invasion. It required all our power of divination and ingenuity to insure that we had what the troops needed where it was needed. We met every requirement on more than 200 critical items. We met all last-minute requests.

Since then demands that tax the entire resources of the Nation in their fulfillment have been laid on us.

Nor have we forgotten the needs of our troops in the Pacific. We even sent supplies directly for new bases before our troops made their landings.

In 2 months we ship overseas as much tonnage as went to General Pershing in all of World War No. 1. In 1 month in Europe we fired as many artillery shells as General Pershing's army fired in the whole of the other war. Our military railway service reaches across western Europe, Asia, and north Africa. Sixteen hundred ships under direction of the Transportation Corps carry men and supplies around the globe.

This war has demonstrated clearly the importance of supply as a factor in military strategy. It is a war of supply. In Europe we have fought the Germans on a basis of manpower equality, most of the time with one American against one or more Germans. Our air strength, artillery, and other equipment gave us the preponderance of power. We hear that the Russians in their offensives have a strength of three or four to one against the Germans but they have fewer supplies. The difference in supply superiority and in mobility between the Germans and the Americans is the contribution of the Army Service Forces.

Our production goals for 1945 are larger than ever because in Europe we need more heavy guns, ammunition, tanks, more of everything than was expected and more than was used in previous campaigns. We need supplies to equip French troops, supplies for the Philippine Army, for the Russian Army, and for the Chinese. The supplies provided our allies are well spent. Their effort is heroic and they need our help.

Overseas civilian supply is an increasing problem. As we liberate new areas we must rehabilitate their plants, utilities, railroads, and farms to help them support themselves. Even aside from our eagerness to help our friends, we cannot have starvation and unrest behind our fighting fronts. We use French railroads from the ports to our front lines. Already we have sent to France some seventeen hundred locomotives and 20,000 freight cars and 600 other locomotives are on the way. We have rebuilt 7,000 miles of railroad in France and Belgium including hundreds of long bridges. We use French production facilities as far as we can to make tires and clothes, and even heavy equipment needed by our troops. As we liberate more territory demand for civilian supplies will rise. Finally more will be needed for prisoners of war.

Some 400 items are now in short supply. Only the utmost production effort will meet our need.

At some time we must face the problem of redeployment. When it comes we must handle our part efficiently and expeditiously. We will face a big load in moving troops back to this country, handling their furloughs, reequipping them and shipping them to the Pacific. There will be a movement of men and supply directly from Europe to the Orient. Our job will be larger, not smaller, after VE-day. We will rejoice when Hitler is defeated but it will be too early for celebration or relaxation.

The war in the Pacific will be hard and it may be long. It will require great effort to defeat the fanatically stubborn, close-knit power of the Japanese.

At best our losses will be heavy. Operations of greatly increased scope and magnitude in the Pacific will be required to assemble and drive home the preponderance of force necessary to assure the complete defeat of Japan. Everyone of us must remember this every day.

The redeployment problem is by all odds the most difficult the War Department has yet had to face. At the same time our troops move into position to occupy Germany we must inventory and rewarehouse millions of tons of supplies and equipment. Some must be set aside for troops who remain, some be rehabilitated and supplemented for those who go direct to the Orient. New staging areas and port facilities must be provided. Procedures must be installed for controlling the whole business.

Equipment for troops redeployed here must be returned from Europe and supplemented from new production. Camps must be reopened and stocked with training equipment while slow-moving items are being shifted to the Orient to be ready there when the troops arrive. All of this must be woven into intricate shipping schedules. On the receiving end, great reception centers and staging areas will be required to bring men and equipment together and to put the finishing touches on training prior to assault.

During this period, production schedules must be adjusted to fit shipping and training schedules. Some increases will be needed for certain items, as for example, tropical clothing. We dare not fail to meet the load placed on us. We must move in order and with precision, yet must take our redeployment with maximum speed to end the war. There will be a general feeling at this time that the game is in its last inning and war weariness will provoke criticism which will be the result of brittle tempers, understand-

able impatience and just plain being fed up with the whole business.

I tell you again this will be by far the toughest assignment the War Department has ever had and we in the Army Service Forces will bear the brunt of it. I know you will accept the challenge and see it through.

Once more let me say, I am proud of the performance of the Army Service Forces in 1944. I deeply appreciate what all of you have done. We have worked closely together. I know what you have done to make this record possible and I want you to know my deep gratitude for this accomplisment.

Rev. Duncan Howiett's Sermon on Cord Mill Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following sermon by Rev. Duncan Howiett entitled "The Truth in the Cord Mill Crisis" at the Unitarian Church, March 4, 1945, which was published in the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass., March 5:

The city of New Bedford has been much in the Nation's news of late. The efforts of W. M. C. to transfer workers forcibly from one mill to another has met with determined opposition on the part of the community as a whole. The facts have become confused and often the issues lost sight of. The patriotism of the city is in question.

In view of all this, it seemed to me someone in a neutral position should speak on the situation as a whole, summing up the pertinent facts, and pointing out the issues involved without bias and without partisanship. Insofar as it is possible for humans to be nonpartisan and without bias, I shall attempt to present the situation as best I have been able to determine it after a lengthy investigation and careful thought.

WHAT ARE THESE FACTS?

Last September the Priorities Committee of W. M. C. granted first priority on manpower to the Fisk and Firestone mills in this city. Early this year the Army and W. P. B. asked all the tire mills to go on a 7-day, three-shift basis for the next 90 days because there was an impending shortage of tires. This order included the two tire and cord mills in New Bedford, Fisk and Firestone. Each was already on a three-shift basis, but schedules were advanced to 7 days a week. A bottleneck occurred, however, when the cord mills were unable to man their third (night or so-called graveyard) shift. This precipitated the trouble.

W. M. C. is not attempting to start a third shift at the tire cord mills. They have always run on three shifts, and did so even before the defense program was started. Furthermore, until the defense program began, these mills had no trouble manning their third shift. Each had a list of applicants. With the coming of the defense and war programs, other mills increased their first and second shifts, new mills came into operation, and many workers were drawn off into more attractive positions with more attractive hours.

New Bedford is not the only city in which tire cord is manufactured. Its output is but a small percent of the total. Elsewhere the third shift is no better manned than it is here. But New Bedford is the only city where a large number of other textile mills are also present, which creates a labor pool from which to draw. This is why the crisis arose here rather than elsewhere. W. M. C. chose this city as the one best suited to the forcible transfer of workers.

New Bedford men, capital, and labor alike, maintain that workers could have been provided for the tire-cord mills on a voluntary basis. When it became apparent that Fisk and Firestone could not man their third shifts, the New Bedford Cotton Manufacturers Association amassed a list by name, address, and job classification of 3,700 former workers who had worked within the last 14 months, not now employed in any of the mills of the association, and in conference with a W. P. B. representative and the unions, agreed to a plan to canvass the workers, the C. I. O. carrying the brunt of the canvass.

BLIZZARD OCCURRED

This agreement was concluded on Friday, February 9, at a conference at which representatives of the New Bedford Cotton Manufacturers Association, the unions, the W. P. B., and the Fisk and Firestone mills were present. Representatives of W. M. C. did not appear. The canvass was made Saturday. Out of the first 60 people canvassed, 20 agreed to report to work Monday. On Sunday came the blizzard, which halted traffic everywhere. None of the workers showed up Monday. Tuesday, before there was any opportunity for a check-back, W. M. C. ordered forced transfers, which brought to an end the efforts of a voluntary solution of the problem.

But the forced transfers produced few, if any, recruits for the tire-cord mills. Why? What is a forced transfer anyway? It is an order by W. M. C. that a certain plant release a certain worker. The worker is then required to report to U. S. E. S. for a new assignment, and he must take the job to which he is assigned or he cannot work at all, for no one else is permitted to hire him, including his old employer.

A worker can appeal a forced transfer, however, which is the stage the tire-cord situation reached in New Bedford last week. One of the chief grounds of appeal is that the conditions surrounding the new work are substandard. This has been the chief ground of the appeals of the workers in New Bedford from assignment in the tire-cord mills. They allege that the work load is heavier; the yarn is heavier, the bobbins much larger, the laps are larger and have to be changed more often, the slubber bobbins are much heavier, the doffing is more frequent, the frames are much higher and longer, making a greater distance for the worker to travel. Yet they allege a worker usually must man more sides than in a fine-goods mill where the work is much lighter. Moreover, it is alleged that the use of the heavier yarn makes very much more lint in the air. All these factors tend to make work at the cord mills less desirable in the eyes of the workers.

They say the 7-cent differential which W. L. B. has allowed is not enough to make the work attractive. Many of the workers (about three-eighths) whom W. M. C. seeks to transfer are women who would feel the increase in work load greatly. And many of these have only returned to the work they are now doing on a patriotic basis. Many are unable to do the heavier work.

MOVE FUNDAMENTAL

W. M. C. has also recognized the inability of a worker to undertake a job assigned to him because of his health as a valid ground of appeal. This might seem an easy explanation of the W. M. C. complaint that only cripples had been referred to it, but all these so-called cripples were at work in other mills in the city when referred. It should also be said that referrals have in every case been made from the bottom of the seniority lists according to the union contract. The mills had no power to select the infirm for referral even if they had wanted to.

Down beneath a worker's natural aversion to leave his present job, down beneath the usual aversion to carrying a heavier work load than necessary, there are motives far more fundamental which are keeping the workers out of the night shift at the tire cord mills. Most of these workers have men very close to them facing the enemy overseas. Iwo Jima is not so far from New Bedford as some might think. Brothers, fathers, husbands, and sweethearts of New Bedford workers are there, and they are with Eisenhower and MacArthur, too. The workers know what production means to the fighting man overseas.

Consider the record of this city for patriotism: Almost complete freedom from strikes, Army and Navy E's flying everywhere, some plants having been awarded several; War bonds oversubscribed in each drive, and the Red Cross blood bank more than supplied on its quarterly visits. Why, in view of all this and with the rest of the Nation calling in question its patriotism, has New Bedford failed even under duress to transfer workers to the tire cord mills?

The real reasons are these: The workers are not reassured by the fact that labor disputes at both mills are now pending before W. L. B. Workers at these mills are not given company-provided insurance as they are at the other textile mills in the city.

MEANS GREAT DEAL

Most important of all the deep-seated complaints of the workers, however, is the fact that the transferees have no assurance they will not lose their seniority rights. Seniority means a great deal to the worker. It can only be built up through long and faithful service at one plant. It gives him all sorts of privileges, among them vacations with pay and promotion status. Seniority gives the worker a right to keep his job if the mill cuts down production and has to lay off some of the help. The longer a worker remains in a plant, the higher his rating against a lay-off. Many of the proposed transferees already have several years of work accumulated for their seniority status.

Some people have forgotten the depression in the midst of this war boom. But it is so recent, that when I came to this city only 7 years ago, members of this parish who could not find employment were begging me to try to help them get work on W. P. A. During that awful period, New Bedford people were hungry and they were cold and there is a lively fear that those days may come again.

But I do not believe even these factors would dissaude New Bedford workers from manning the third shift at the tire cord mills if they believed that the lives of their loved ones depended upon it. They are not convinced that these forcible transfers are necessary, and for two reasons. In the first place they know from its past record that when W. P. B. wants a product and at once, it has been able to get it. The fact that the demand for more cord was made some weeks ago and W. P. B. has not caused an uproar because of the delay makes them feel that the need is not as immediate and pressing as it would seem.

In the second place, the fact that other mills have held themselves ready to make the cord, first at the rate of 50,000 pounds a week and now at 100,000 pounds a week, and that this offer was not taken up, at least pending a solution of the cord mill manpower problem, and has now been refused, makes the workers feel the need is not as immediate as they have been told. New Bedford citizens, workers, and employers alike, have the impression that the issue is not really tire cord at all. To this commuity, the issue seems to be the right and need of

a Government agency forcibly to transfer workers from one job to another, to the great disadvantage of the worker.

To sum up, New Bedford believes this whole thing could have been done voluntarily. New Bedford wants to know why it was not done voluntarily and why the workers' rights are not safeguarded. This is why New Bedford has opposed and continues to oppose the forced transferals of its workers under a directive of W. M. C.

The stand which has been taken by the people of New Bedford in this controversy is on a fundamental issue. It is an issue involving the rights of American citizens; it is an issue involving the rights of men. Let us look at this issue for a moment.

A Government like ours exists to protect the rights of the governed, the inalienable rights with which the people are endowed by their Creator. This is why Governments are instituted among men. We hold this to be self-evident, and have so held since the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

Persecuting America's Best Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial very graphically illustrates one of the most justifiable criticisms of O. P. A.; that is, the action of certain individuals in the Compliance Department without due regard to the effectiveness of industry:

PERSECUTING AMERICA'S BEST CITIZENS

(By C. C. Crow)

Like Hitler's expiring Gestapo, the Enforcement Division of the Lumber Section of O. P. A. in Portland is now bringing into final play all of the ruthless vindictiveness that has characterized its high-handed career of persecution.

For complete indifference to the established processes of administering justice, the history of the activities of the enforcement division of O. P. A. is a record of abuse of authority and the exercising of punitive judicial power which has made this organization a constant liability to the war program as it has run amuck in the ranks of those engaged in doing something genuinely constructive. From the unfortunate victims of the coercive blackjacking of this O. P. A. Enforcement Division huge sums of money have been taken in the form of fines for loosely established and more loosely calculated, alleged evasions of the terms of price ceilings. Often intricate and complicated in their draft, clear interpretation has not been possible even by the original authors after other legal crackpots have put into words and phrases a conglomeration of meaningless and disconnected provisions that have opened wide the gate for administrative impositions on the unfortunate and busy groups of our citizens engaged in the production and distribution of timber products.

Staffed for the most part by men whose limited experience has deprived them of the responsible jobs in private industry this O. P. A. band of time teredos has come to learn that as a bureau they are held in low esteem and consequently this realization has developed an esprit de corps that has carried them to great extremes.

Busy men and concerns engaged in producing and getting to our fighting forces needed lumber supplies have in cases too numerous to mention here, submitted to outrageous impositions from these New Deal ax men and have paid "kangaroo court" fines for baseless charges, not due to any sense of guilt but because they could not afford the time and expense to go into court over the amounts involved. In instances without number lumbermen have been told by their attorneys, "from the standpoint of constitutional law these charges are without foundation and you can go into court and beat the O. P. A., if you can get into a court which is not presided over by another New Deal appointee and in this connection the higher up you go the poorer your chances are and we advise paying the extortion and going about your business, because they are out to get you one way or another and the soundness of their accusations is the least important."

Now as time has moved along the attitude of intolerance in the O. P. A. enforcement division has grown with it. When the worst scrub in this marauding organization comes back to the office and reports that he has been offended by some hounded executive, that unfortunate individual is due to get a working-over.

The above statements are best proved by reciting a specific case. The Goose Lake Box Co., at Lakeview, Oreg., operating by Sam Jaksick, stepped out of the ranks of mediocrity and into the spotlight by being awarded the Army and Navy E for practical patriotism and distinguished service in supplying the Government with lumber required in carrying on the war. This aroused the jealousy of another Government employee in another entirely different department contacting the pine manufacturers and soon an automobile, burning scarce gasoline and wearing out scarcer tires, was on its long way to the Goose Lake plant to dig up something, somehow.

To make a long story short, an O. P. A. field man slipped into the Goose Lake plant one day like a skunk crawling into a poultry house full of laying hens and proceeded to hunt for something wrong. Without any permission whatever he shut down various parts of the operation so that he might query the employees who were busy trying to make lumber to help support the boys in the foxholes. Finally, when his arrogant obstruction became unbearable he was summarily ordered from the property, something that should have been done 5 minutes after he entered. What did this do? When the supersnooper returned to headquarters and reported the temerity and insubordination of Sam Jaksick in insisting that he and his men be allowed to produce lumber for the Government, Goose Lake's fate was sealed.

Recently the O. P. A. filed charges against Goose Lake Box, assessing a triple fine and asking the right to impose a further penalty on another separate charge involving some 280 carloads of lumber and a correspondingly large sum of money.

In the meantime, what has happened? Out of a clear sky the Army and Navy has awarded the Goose Lake Box Co. a second E, and written them as follows:

"To the Men and Women of the Goose Lake Box Co., Lakeview, Lake County, Oreg.:

"I am pleased to inform you that you have won for the second time the Army-Navy production award for meritorious services on the production front.

"You have continued to maintain the high standard which you set for yourselves and which won you distinction more than 6 months ago. You may well be proud of your achievement.

"The White Star, which the renewal adds to your Army-Navy production award flag, is the symbol of appreciation from our Armed Forces for your continued and determined effort and patriotism."

Who is best qualified to appraise the service and lumber which has been supplied to the Government during this emergency, a small group of nondescript bureaucrats or the Army and Navy heads who have been using this lumber?

In receiving the second E award the Goose Lake Box Co. stands by itself, as this recognition for service performed and the good quality of material supplied has been given to no other manufacturer of pine in the entire West, and that is a real record.

The youthful attorney who heads the enforcement division's office of O. P. A. in Portland is the same man who was caught redhanded last summer on a long fishing trip which he made that involved traveling over 400 miles in an automobile operated by one of his field men, who was paid for its use by the Government. Fine sense of honor by a man who is receiving his monthly stipend for the purpose of enforcing the law and war regulations instead of deliberately doing something widely publicized as forbidden.

Sam Jaksick has made a contribution to his country in helping to win the war and has gone far beyond his outstanding record of supplying lumber for the Army and Navy, which has been publicly proclaimed as a top job. Sam Jaksick has also given to the war his 19-year-old son, a promising lad who was late last year so seriously wounded while serving with the Army in Europe that he will be a cripple the remainder of his life. While the head of the enforcement division of the O. P. A. office was on a fishing trip being made with Government-bought gasoline this boy of Sam Jaksick's was in the service of his country, working for a mere pittance and his reward is a shattered body. Would you enjoy this if you were Sam Jaksick? Would it kindle love and kindness in your heart to know that your own son was lying in a hospital in France terribly crippled, while a band of able-bodied O. P. A. employees, all of whom should have long since either been working in the shipyards or serving in the Army, was descending upon you purely for spite and pique, trying to intimidate you into paying a fine on a charge of which you were not guilty?

War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes should order the Portland office of the enforcement division of O. P. A. closed at once and the men and women employed there placed on essential jobs, preferably in the Army, Navy, or the shipyards. Sam Jaksick should be immediately relieved of the persecution of boondoggling imposers, who have from the start been a liability to the war program, having done nothing but annoy and delay those patriotic men like Sam Jaksick and hundreds of other producers of lumber who, in spite of O. P. A. snoopers and not with their aid, have made a maximum contribution toward winning the war.

The Manpower Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I make a brief statement in reference to the manpower situation, and include a letter from one of my constituents.

The R. D. Grier & Sons Co., of Salisbury, Md., is one of our largest business concerns. They have made a study of

the manpower situation in Wicomico County, the largest county from a population standpoint in my district, and they have ascertained that there are today over 500 men classified as IV–F who are able to work and who are not working. We desperately need the May bill to take care of the situation.

The letter follows:

THE R. D. GRIER & SONS CO.,
Salisbury, Md., March 7, 1945.

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS.
Senator GEORGE RADCLIFFE.
Congressman DUDLEY C. ROE.

GENTLEMEN: We have all been reading with a great deal of interest the labor bills that have been presented in Congress and from newspaper reports it seems as though nothing will be done, and that we will be left without any legislation requiring people to work.

The records indicate that about one-third of the men between the ages of 18 and 38 are rejected by selective service boards of examination for one reason or another and are classified in IV–F. In this particular county, Wicomico, we have some over 3,000 in the armed forces. We have over 1,000 classified as IV–F. There are approximately one-half of these, or about 500, who are working or who are physically disqualified for work. The other half, about 500, are loafers, some of whom do not work at all and are on relief; others work 2 or 3 days a week.

If some legislation could be enacted whereby local draft boards would still retain supervision over these IV–F registrants that they be compelled to work their full week or be reclassified in I–A and accepted by the armed forces for some kind of duty which they could perform, or be given a term in jail, I feel confident that we could put to work on a more or less steady basis 500 men in this county, and I think this would be true with every other county—that is, in their relative proportions, depending of course upon the size of the county and the number of registrants.

We hear complaints from every source that as soon as a man is classified in IV–F he immediately becomes indifferent toward his responsibilities to the farm or industry. There, of course, may be some out of the 500 in this class who may be able to produce a doctor's certificate as to their inability to work. These, of course, would have to be released from any penalty which could be imposed. We are all quite anxious that some legislation be enacted whereby this particular class of man can be made to work in some essential job.

Very respectfully yours,
RALPH H. GRIER.

Baseball in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read newspaper stories in the past few days to the effect President Roosevelt has expressed his desire to see baseball carry on this season, despite wartime difficulties. The President told newsmen that he is all in favor of baseball as long as it does not require perfectly healthy people who could be doing more useful war work.

Baseball has asked no special favors and it has been granted none. It has contributed much to the war effort and it is my hope that the game will be continued to provide healthy relaxation for the men in service and for the war workers of the country.

I am indebted to Mr. Clark C. Griffith, president of the Washington American League Baseball Club, for the following summary of the contribution baseball has made to the war effort since Pearl Harbor:

THE CONTRIBUTION SINCE PEARL HARBOR

American baseball has played to 100,000,000 paid attendance throughout the Nation.

More than 4,000,000 soldiers and sailors have been admitted free to major league parks alone.

More than 6,000 men from organized baseball have been inducted in the armed forces.

More than 800 exhibition games have been played in various Army camps, cantonments, hospitals, etc., by major league clubs alone.

More than 5,500 major league players and officials have made personal appearances at camps and hospitals to entertain men in uniform.

Six individual groups of from 5 to 6 men each, have visited every foreign war theater under the auspices of U. S. O. to entertain front line troops with baseball gossip and information. (This at the requests of the commanding generals in the various theaters).

Major league baseball alone has purchased and shipped to men overseas and in camps and hospitals 30,748 dozen baseballs; 88,383 bats; 52,922 rule books; 2,160 complete catching outfits.

Major league baseball alone has bought and provided more than 15,000 copies of the Sporting News each week for the armed forces.

Major league baseball has contributed to the war charities $2,716,289.20.

Major league baseball has been credited by the United States Treasury Department for the direct sale of War bonds totaling $1,227,923,225.

Baseball has been credited by the American Red Cross with obtaining blood donations totaling 450,000 pints.

The American League world series picture has been shipped, at the request of the armed forces, to every single war front and has been viewed by probably 15,000,000 men and women in uniform.

Radio furnishes to 8,000,000 shut-ins baseball broadcasts.

Recent surveys show 35 percent of the radio audience tune in on baseball programs.

A recently completed survey reveals that 78 percent of all men and 38 percent of all women in the United States read the sports pages.

Col. J. M. Johnston of the O. D. T. has congratulated baseball for its splendid cooperation.

Tydings Amendment Still Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a number of letters from the farmers of my district indicating that the drafting of boys from the farms and further curtailing production of farm products and food for our fighting men continues, apparently disregardful of and still ignoring the Tydings amendment.

There seems altogether too much of a tendency on the part of bureaus to construe the acts of Congress to suit the convenience of the particular bureau to which the act is applicable. The Tydings amendment enacted by the last Congress has been disgracefully ignored by many draft boards, as has been pointed out by numerous Members of Congress from this floor during the present session.

A few days ago I received from one of my farmer constituents, whose name I cannot use for he fears it would make his plight the worse, which is typical of many other letters I have received from different parts of my district:

FEBRUARY 27, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am a farmer and stockman, and if ever in my life I need help, it is now. As Draft Board No. 2 at Pawhuska, Osage County, has classed my boy I–A and will take him in March or April, leaving me to take care of a big crop of wheat, oats, and barley, and other rowed crops. We have 358 acres of farm land besides cattle and other farm stock. My boy has 56 units to his credit. I told the board according to the Tydings' amendment he was entitled to a deferment, and he said, "To hell with the Tydings' amendment."

We are giving our boys to fight dictatorism, and I hope our Government will not allow it to be practiced in our own country. I am not the only man that says this about Board No. 2.

If taking all of our farm help is necessary and our Government says so, then I say, "O. K." But I don't believe in a draft board taking charge and using their own judgment over our United States governing body. Farm help is impossible to obtain, as labor can go to other work for more money and short hours, and where they don't have to wade snow and mud and milk kicking cows and be exposed to all kinds of weather.

Now for myself, I am 62 years old, been in the care of a doctor for the past 2 years with high blood pressure and leakage of the heart, and I am not able to do hard work. I have another boy that wears a steel brace on one leg, has bone trouble, has broken it five times, 16 years old, and I can't depend on him. Now, if you Government men think this boy of mine that they are drafting is worth more in the Army than he is on the farm, it is all O. K. with me. He is 19 years old, 6 feet high, and sound as a button. He is a good farmer and a good hand with a tractor. We have a M. Farmall and plenty of tools to go with it.

Now if this boy is entitled to a deferment in your judgment, I would be grateful to you for you to see that he is treated according to law and order.

Immediately upon receipt of the above letter I addressed the local draft board having jurisdiction of this case, calling its attention to the fact that the Tydings amendment is just as much the law of the land as any other portion of the Selective Service Act. I also referred to General Hershey's statement to the effect that there was no intention on his part to circumvent the provisions of the Tydings amendment and that he had sent out a corrective or explanatory order, which, in my opinon, was not much better than the original directive. I suggested to

the board that it attempt to comply with all provisions of the Selective Service Act, including the Tydings amendment. I have had no reply from the local draft board.

However, this morning I am in receipt of a letter from the author of the letter above quoted, my farmer constituent, in which he says:

We got notice yesterday that—

Naming the son—

is to be inducted the 21st of March. So you'll have to hurry if there's anything can be done.

It thus appears that the provisions of the Tydings amendment are still being ignored with impunity.

Federal Judges' Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following preambles and resolutions unanimously adopted by the board of directors of the New York County Lawyers' Association at its meeting held at the association building at 14 Vesey Street, New York 7, N. Y., on March 12, 1945:

Whereas the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives of the United States heretofore has been advised under date of June 17, 1944, that the committee on the Federal courts of the New York County Lawyers' Association approved salary increases for district judges, particularly in metropolitan areas; and

Whereas since that time a bill (H. R. 2181, 1st sess., 79th Cong.) has been introduced by Representative HOBBS and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary whereby flat increases of $5,000 per annum would be made in the salaries, not only of district judges but also of supreme court justices, circuit, and other judges therein enumerated; and

Whereas the committee on the Federal courts of the New York County Lawyers' Association has approved unanimously the increases in judicial salaries recommended in said bill and has requested the board of directors of the association to approve the same: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the New York County Lawyers' Association approves the salary increases for the Federal judiciary as enumerated in the Hobbs bill (H. R. 2181, 1st sess., 79th Cong.) and authorizes the committee on the Federal courts of the association to support the same, and to transmit its report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

Resolved further, That the board of directors record its opinion that such salary increases are so necessary at the present time that the provisions of the Hobbs bill (H. R. 2181, 1st sess., 79th Cong) deferring its effective date until the termination of the Stabilization Act of 1942 should be eliminated from the measure.

TERENCE J. MCMANUS,
Secretary.

Maj. Paul Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the March 8, 1945, issue of the Chicago Daily News.

I had the honor to serve in the City Council of Chicago with former Alderman Paul Douglas, husband of the distinguished Congresswoman at large from the State of Illinois, Mrs. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS. In the city council, Alderman Douglas distinguished himself as a champion for the underprivileged minority groups and made one of the most outstanding records of any man who ever served in that body:

MAJ. PAUL DOUGLAS

Chicagoans will be gratified to learn that former Alderman Paul Douglas has been promoted to the rank of major of the Marine Corps and has been awarded the Bronze Star for meritorious service in the Pacific theater.

Opposed to war by training and conviction, Major Douglas nevertheless felt compelled to champion support by this country of the nations resisting Axis aggression. Having taken that stand, he felt compelled to assume an active role in the war once we became involved in it. Despite the fact that he was past military age, he waived exemption and enlisted in the Marines. He went through the vigorous battle training, was commissioned, sought and received an assignment at the front.

Last fall he was wounded in action, but his wife, EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, was running for election to Congress. Major Douglas had announcement of his wound held up until after election day. Chicagoans can be proud of Major Douglas. They will hope that he may soon be back and that he will become an even greater force for good in Chicago affairs. Chicago needs men like him.

Further Editorial Comment on Franco Fascist Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I have a resolution pending in the Congress, purporting to express the sentiment of the House of Representatives to the effect that the United States should sever diplomatic relations with Franco Fascist Spain.

There is overwhelming sentiment throughout the country in support of this proposal. Newspaper editorials and radio commentators have pointed out how inconsistent it is for us to claim our devotion to democracy and our antipathy to fascism while, at the same time, we continue to appease fascism's stepchild, Franco Spain.

In this connection, I draw the attention of my colleagues to some recent vigorous editorials in the Nation's dailies.

Here they are:

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of February 1, 1945]

FRANCO REBUFFED

Generalissimo Francisco Franco's course since, through the farce of "nonintervention" and the active assistance of Hitler and Mussolini, he gained control of Spain, has been a devious one indeed. When the Hitler forces were spreading through Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France, Franco showed every evidence of being greatly pleased at the success of his benefactor. When Mussolini fell upon his prostrate and defeated neighbor so as to be in at the kill, the Spanish dictator was still glad. Totalitarianism was showing that it was the form of government which, through efficiency, could overcome the decadent democracies and force its will upon the world.

Then, partly because one of these decaying democracies was able to achieve a miracle of production and turn the tide against the Nazis, the world picture changed, and Franco was an uneasy witness of a decline in the greatness of those who had established him in power in Spain. But to this moment, though it has been obvious that Germany had failed in this attempt to dominate the world, Franco has persisted in aiding the Germans by whatever means he could command, while at the same time addressing fair words to the British and Americans.

It was from Spain that innocent shipment of oranges went to feed British children, only to explode with hidden bombs on arrival in English ports. It was from Spain that a picked force went out to join the battle against the Russians. It was from Spain, allegedly, that many a submarine sneaked out to sink American and British shipping. It was the Spanish threat which delayed our progress through north Africa, because Franco chose the moment of our landings to increase the strength of his garrisons in Spanish Morocco.

No wonder many expressed surprise that shipments of American and British supplies were permitted to go to Spain, to keep this unneutral fellow neutral. Everyone knew that Spain's neutrality was all too similar to that of Mussolini, who stayed neutral only until the opportunity arose to seize a portion of France. Had things gone differently, few doubt that Franco would have taken advantage of British weakness to seize Gibraltar and announce that he, too, was at war with the democracies.

Now this little dictator, seeing that his friends are lost and can offer him no further assistance, has had the impertinence to address a message to Churchill suggesting that, since Germany is defeated, Europe is threatened with Sovietization, and proposing that he negotiate a peace between Germany and Britain, and then Spain and Britain may take the lead in organizing western Europe to save it from communism. One correspondent reports that Franco explained this new proposal as stemming from his Christian principles. In any event, he proposed a world security organization in which Spain and Britain would be the main pillars.

Mr. Churchill has been condemned for his dallying with this little admirer of Hitler and Mussolini, but this time the British Prime Minister responded with a slap from which Franco may not soon recover. Mr. Churchill spurned the Spanish offer to act as

mediator between Germany and Britain and discounted the alleged threat of Russia, and not only did he do this, but he sent a copy of his message to Moscow, so that the Russians might know how Britain stood in the matter. Furthermore, according to some reports, he advised Franco that it was most unlikely that the Spanish dictator would have any part in the peace negotiations or any immediate role in the United Nations organization.

Mr. Churchill is right in thus rebuffing the generalissimo. While Franco has not been an actual belligerent, his actions have cost us ships and time and lives. He deserves to be treated with coolness and suspicion.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 1, 1945]

A SPADE IS A SPADE

There is a refreshing directness and simplicity about the explanation by the Guatemalan Government of its severance of diplomatic relations with the Franco government in Spain. The Franco regime, in the words of an official Guatemalan decree, is "of a totalitarian type whose ideology and procedure are repugnant to the principles of the Guatemalan revolution and the postulates of a democracy. The Spanish Falange constitutes a reactionary focus whose maneuvers represent a risk for continental security and perturb the transquillity and peace of the Guatemalan Republic." The charges are, of course, undeniable. They are common knowledge. They apply with equal force to every republic of this hemisphere which subscribes to democratic institutions, not excluding the United States of America.

The Guatemalan reaction, however, is highly irregular. As diplomacy is conducted nowadays, the totalitarian nature of the Franco regime simply affords a reason for strengthening our ties of friendship with it. And the mere fact that its creature, the Falange, is striving to undermine Pan-American unity and our democratic form of government suggests only that we should turn the other cheek. The Guatemalans apparently still regard this as an ideological war and have gone so far as to put a literal interpretation upon President Roosevelt's assertion, made in 1943, that "we will have no truck with fascism in any way, shape, or manner. We will permit no vestige of fascism to remain."

The Guatemalan action is not only unconventional; it is downright embarrassing. For here is the United States, sponsor of the Monroe Doctrine, on terms of perfect amity with a European government which is perturbing the tranquillity and peace of one of our good neighbors. It is a trifle irksome, too, to have the leadership in championing democratic postulates wrested from us so unceremoniously by a country which makes no pretense of being a great world power. There is no justification for what Guatemala has done to us—no justification save candor and conviction and common sense.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times of February 9, 1945]

CHURCHILL'S INDIGNATION HAMMERS FRANCO'S BRASS

For sheer, unmitigated gall, there is no matching the Spanish usurper, Gen. Francisco Franco. The way the man who came into power on Nazi and Fascist bayonets struts around as a friend of the Allies is almost beyond belief.

A new and amazing example of his effrontery was revealed yesterday by Frederick Kuh, London correspondent of the St. Louis Star-Times and the Chicago Sun. Kuh was able to disclose that El Caudillo had not only offered to negotiate a peace between the Allies and the two remaining Axis partners, Germany and Japan, but that he had also brazenly proposed a British-Spanish alliance against the Soviet Union.

His nerve, however, served a good purpose, since it brought forth from Winston Churchill a withering rejection. The Prime Minister went out of his way to tell Franco that Great Britain was not interested in maintaining his tyrannical regime in Spain, that London could support only governments which "draw their stability from popular support."

This is a heartening clarification of the traditional British stand against the enemies of democracy. It is doubly welcome because, during the course of the war, London has maintained a rather close relationship with Madrid. Of course, this has been largely a matter of expediency—a matter of maintaining opportunities for preclusive buying and other devices calculated to prevent Hitler from having his own way altogether in Spain. Yet, sometimes a troubling question arose as to whether or not some of the British Tories hoped that it might mean rather more than that. Churchill's rebuff ought to end that doubt.

Since the English Prime Minister sent copies of Franco's letter and of his reply to Joseph Stalin, one may also hope that the incident strengthened British-Russian relations and, therefore, contributed to the solidarity of the United Nations as a whole.

Of course, it is inconceivable that the British—who have moved immeasurably beyond the appeasement policy of Chamberlain's day—should have given a serious thought to an alliance against their puissant Russian ally. That he deemed it possible serves as a measure of Franco's brass. Friends of freedom can rejoice because Winston Churchill has smitten that base metal with a mighty hammer-blow of indignation.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express of February 11, 1945]

CHURCHILL CUT THE GROUND FROM UNDER FRANCO

Prime Minister Churchill must have been a great disappointment and surprise to Spain's double-dealing Franco. When, last November, the corrupt Fascist stooge wrote to Mr. Churchill to propose (1) that Spain and Britain join in a western European bloc against Russia, and (2) that Franco act as mediator between Germany and the Allies, he presumed that Britain's and Spain's interests were intertwined. Moreover, he had ample ground for that presumption—a quarter century, no less, of British antagonism to the Soviet Union, climaxed by British complaisance while Franco assassinated the Spanish people's legal, established republic. He even had heard Mr. Churchill speak kindly words for Spain to Commons earlier that year.

One can only imagine Franco's chagrin and amazement, therefore, when Mr. Churchill curtly and coldly about-faced in November and informed him that Britain now must align itself with Russia and the United States to preserve world peace. What is more, Mr. Churchill—taking no chances—sent copies of his reply to President Roosevelt and Premier Stalin. It was a fierce British-lion roar at the Spanish jackal—and it would have been terribly impressive 9 years ago.

Thus Mr. Churchill contributed to Franco's political maturity. What the latter had not realized was the extent to which realism and de facto force always have shaped British foreign policy. In 1936, Franco had the force at his disposal, and Britain and France thought that force worked to their benefit, regardless of moral issues and even ultimate realistic ends. Now, Franco has no force—and beyond any possible question, the Soviet Union has plenty.

Moreover, it may be just possible that Mr. Churchill also has learned a lesson. It may be that he now perceives the fact that British stubbornness in backing reaction everywhere no longer is acceptable to a majority of the world's peoples. It may be that part of the veil was lifted from that fact in Italy, part in Greece, another part in Poland, more in Belgium—whose British-supported Premier Pierlot recently resigned, with his cabinet—and even some in China, where the British have gained popular antagonism as intense as that in India.

It could be, in short, that Mr. Churchill and his kind see the writing on the wall. Or it could be that the only writing he perceives is that being scribed by Soviet Union power. A British diplomat has asserted that Britain would make a pact with the devil if it would further the Empire's interests. Whether Britain still regards the Soviet Union as the devil, or whether it has discerned the end of exploitation, is a question which only time can answer.

Chicago Considers Its Parks for Public, Not for Tourists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of March 10, 1945:

CHICAGO CONSIDERS ITS PARKS FOR PUBLIC, NOT FOR TOURISTS

(By Dorothea Kahn)

CHICAGO, March 10.—A modern attitude toward parks, which looks upon them as play centers for the neighborhood to be located where the people are, and not as municipal decoration to be shown off to visitors, is implied in a bond proposition which is to go before the voters here in the June election.

The Chicago Park District is attacking the problem of "the forgotten neighborhood." It has surveyed the city to find out what areas are too far from existing parks for their residents to make good use of them, and now proposes to give every such neighborhood convenient access to a recreation space with trees and gardens. It proposes acquisition of 43 new small parks.

This is in line with the ideas of other planning agencies here. The Chicago Plan Commission has pointed out a need for more small parks. And already a considerable number of them have been established. Aside from the well known big parks—Lincoln, Garfield, Humbolt, Jackson—there are numbers of smaller ones making up a total of 135.

There are also 41 municipal playgrounds, 12 playlots, 7 playfields, and 69 playgrounds attached to schools and operated by the board of education and the county forest preserves. You'd think that with all this Chicago would have enough place to play, but the Chicago Park District study revealed a great many areas too far from any park to be classified as having park service.

PARKS IN SLUM AREAS

The plan which the district now offers for civic consideration calls for new parks ranging in size from 8 to 23 acres. Some would be right in the slums.

Lack of recreational areas is one thing that has helped make these areas slums, say the park people. They hold that the districts might not have become blighted if they had been supplied with a good neighborhood center, a field house where adults could meet and play games, learn crafts, hold contests,

and where youngsters could find after-school recreation. The slum areas which the city hopes to rehabilitate after the war will have a first call on the new parks.

But the plan does not neglect those better neighborhoods which are also without park service. It proposes providing them with parks to help them maintain their present standards. Then there are new sections in outlying districts which also need play spaces if they are to get off to a good start.

Not all of the 135 older parks are up to standard, either, as the Chicago Park District measures standards, and it intends to include them in its new park plan. There are to be new field houses, swimming pools, and other improvements for old parks which lack them.

HOW PROGRAM FIGURES OUT

All this will cost some $60,000,000, the Park District estimates. And how will the district get the $60,000,000 when taxes are already burdensome? There won't need to be a cent of new taxes levied, R. J. Dunham, president of the Chicago Park District, promises.

Here's how he figures it. Park finances are new in good shape, he reports. Each year the district pays off $6,000,000 in bonds. If the voters approve the new bond issue, it would be possible to issue $6,000,000 in new bonds each year as that amount of old ones is paid off. The debt would thus remain stationary. In 10 years, the entire $60,000,000 program would be financed.

At that point the Park District could resume debt reduction. Since new bonds can be financed at a lower rate of interest than the old ones, there would also be a reduction in interest payments, and this would offset increased maintenance costs, according to Mr. Dunham. By 1974, expenditures for the new park plan would be paid off, he states.

Chicago's existing park system is excellent in many respects, but it is felt now that the lake front has been somewhat overemphasized. There has been a tendency to add new parks where land could be acquired easily by the process of filling in the lake. The time has come, therefore, the planners feel, to pay more attention to the city's interior.

This does not mean that there will be no more lake-front development. Lincoln Park, on the north side of Chicago, which has been growing steadily by the "made land" process, is to be further extended. About $8,400,000 in the new park plan has been earmarked for extension of this lakeside park to the north city limits.

'Mid the Ruins of Garapan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Pvt. (1st cl.) Jackson Hospers, of Orange City, Iowa, in my congressional district, recently composed a war poem entitled "'Mid the Ruins of Garapan." Until June 1944 Garapan was the capital of Saipan.

This poem is one of several writings by Jackson Hospers, who enlisted in the Army 2½ years ago. For the past 1½ years he has been on board an Army troop transport in ship's complement and has touched nearly all the Pacific island groups.

The sight of Garapan, the blasted capital of Saipan, has especially impressed him. In this poem he has expressed his deep and innermost feelings of the despair and the resurging hope experienced there.

Private (1st cl.) Hospers voices the thoughts of uncounted numbers of fighting and praying boys everywhere and adds emphasis, we believe, to those who have already spoken and who have made the supreme sacrifice. The poem is dedicated to the freedom-loving people of the United States of America, and it is with a great deal of pride that I present it as a part of these remarks to the Congress and to the Nation so that all who love liberty and freedom may read it and drink in the lesson it attempts to tell.

The poem follows:

'MID THE RUINS OF GARAPAN

(Until June 1944 Garapan was the capital of Saipan)

Here, in ashes, is an image of hell itself,
A story of ruin, told in expanses of rubble,
A city in shambles, eclipsed by the forces of destruction,
A bleak and despairing picture of desolation,
Where one perceives a sordid, dark'ning vision
Of battle and horror, blood, mud, and death,
A released intensity, expressed in final issue—
An orgasm of hate and terror, bitterness and fear.

One actually sees but little things—
Painted china cups in a garden of flowers,
Broken to bits;
A well at the end of a pleasant path,
Its windlass and wooden bucket smashed, its opening
A bomb crater;
An oriental painting, detailed and colorful,
Split and torn;
An arch to a Shinto temple grounds,
Strangely unharmed.

This was the white-faced city of Garapan,
An oriental citadel, a fortress of death,
A succor for an empire's life and breath,
A capital for the ugly designs of Japan.

Here on this tortured plain of blasted hopes
An ironic pride wells within the soul—
This beautiful, precise destruction,
This mission of war,
Was accomplished by men who believe in peace,
And ask no more, except that peace endure.

The civilization and blood of Japan,
Its factories and wheels,
Its planes and machines,
Hold but a single meaning to its autocratic rulers:
Control of the earth—
With freedom a word but dimly remembered;
Regimentation in its stead,
With all completely subservient
To a nation entirely given
To a studied refinement of savagery;
With every member of every race
Obsequiously bowing to the Emperor of the Rising Sun,
The vain, inhuman ruler of a servile world,
Where men become
But chattel.

And here is our answer—
Here is Garapan;
Let them see—those who presume
So to lower
The dignity
Of man.

The appalling spirit of waste and death which imbues this place,
Becomes a monstrous specter of challenge and accusation
Of the perverted intelligence of men, and nations, and the human race,
Which conceives in prodigies and miracles, yet fails in its own salvation.

This lurid, ghastly phantasm extends a possessive hand
Over us, the dead, over this razed city and wasted land,
And to us, this image of war, this specter of humanity's cancer,
Queries in scornful tones of the peoples of freedom for answer:

"How do you presume
To prevent such destruction,
In a world completely torn
By perpetual injustice and greed?
You babble of world cooperation—
But what nation has fought for anything
But for itself?
What is war
But an inexorable pattern of human nature?
What beginning has not ended in this?
What path is there to follow,
What course to chart,
What hope
Of avoiding such ruination
In every generation?"

Strongly incensed, strangely impelled,
We now answer this weird hallucination—

"The imbuing light of freedom points the way,
The practical measure, the motion and direction,
With the right of men to be men, not perfection,
As a criterion for the policies of the day."

And thought goes on:

We who believe in freedom
Must resolve from scenes like this,
To know what to fight for,
And when to fight.

We must know
That when the women and children of China
Are burned to death in the streets of Nanking,
It is of our immediate concern!

And we must know
That when any nation
Enforces prostitution, and concentration camps, and slavery
Upon another nation,
This, too, is of our immediate concern!

First in our hearts is to save our own—
The ones we love, the land we've known,
Our right to choose, our joy in play,
Our right to speak, a time to pray—
These we have held are the soul of life;
These we have held thru time and strife.

But this is not enough
To those who have known the meaning of freedom;
Theirs, too, is the cause of justice,
Without which freedom cannot grow
Or be maintained;
We, ourselves, must represent these things,
So that, from us, others may know their meaning
And be encouraged—
For in this lies our contribution
To the true progress
Of man.

Nor is a larger plan beyond our conception,
If first we perceive our inevitable obligation
To the fundamental right of all nations and men to live
With the means to create their own economic salvation.

In this America has the strength to give
A further support to a constitution of nations
Creating a supreme authority to render decisions,
And the immediate military force to perform them with emphasis.

The larger plan may fail again,
But never again let us hear the report:
"It failed for lack of American support—
The hand was not strong which fought for all men."

Let us prepare for the challenge, if we do not succeed,
Formulate and act on this plan, again and again,
Until, with vigilance, we attain a workable security,
And man has defeated the perversity of man.

And we turn to face the apparition,
To say again,
"The imbuing light of freedom points the way—"
But the specter fades,
The spell is gone.

Here is this field of rubble!

—*Jackson Hospers.*

Resolution Filed in Massachusetts Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution relative to the San Francisco Peace Conference, sent me by Mr. Thomas Dorgan, clerk, Superior Court, Suffolk County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, filed in the Massachusetts Legislature March 12, 1945:

Resolution relative to the San Francisco Peace Conference April 25, 1945, to invite all legitimate neutral countries and the legitimate Polish Government to the conference

Resolved, That the House of Representatives and the General Court of Massachusetts affirms its conviction and belief that the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" were not only to take care of the big nations but the small nations as well, and they are indispensable to the maintenance of any modern civilization, and views with alarm any violation of these sacred principles; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to the Members thereof representing this Commonwealth.

Caliber of Administration Keymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent from the Washington Evening Star:

CALIBER OF ADMINISTRATION'S KEYMEN IS DECREASING STEADILY, OBSERVER ASSERTS

(By Frank R. Kent)

It has been contended that the real trouble with the Roosevelt administration is more the caliber of its keymen than the basic unsoundness of its policies. An argument can be made both ways on this, but certainly the percentage of competency at the start not only was below average but the trend has been down.

Attention to this again has been drawn by recent Roosevelt appointments. Take, first, the case of Mr. Jesse Jones, whose splendid service was stressed by the President in the same letter in which he explained he was naming Mr. Wallace as a reward for his political support.

Mr. Jones is by no means perfect, but no one has ever seriously questioned his competency. On the other hand, none save his partial friends pretends to believe Mr. Wallace a competent Administrator. He now seems in a position for which he is unfitted by taste, temperament, and experience.

Even after he had ousted Mr. Jones from the Commerce secretaryship, it might have been possible for Mr. Roosevelt to have kept him as head of the Federal loan agencies, with which Congress had refused to trust Mr. Wallace. If competency had been an objective, Mr. Roosevelt must have made that effort. Instead, he read Mr. Jones wholly out of the Government service and transferred Judge Vinson from Economic Stabilizer to Federal Loan Administrator.

RECOGNIZED FACT

Mr. Vinson had a good record as Economic Stabilizer. He had shown ability and firmness in resisting labor pressure. Probably he will make a good head of the F. L. A. But Mr. Vinson would be the first to admit that neither his training nor ability put him on a par with Mr. Jones in this field.

This is said not to disparage Mr. Vinson but simply as a recognized fact.

Following the shifting of Mr. Vinson to the F. L. A., Mr. Roosevelt shifted Mr. William H. Davis from Chairman of the War Labor Board to Economic Stabilizer. Here again the trend is down.

Just as Mr. Vinson is not up to Mr. Jones, there is no reason to believe Mr. Davis will be as good as Mr. Vinson. Nothing in his record on the W. L. B. justifies the hope. As one critic expressed it, he has an inclination toward "rubbery floors and wavery ceilings." He has incurred the enmity of the labor bosses without gaining the confidence of industry. He is a sincere and honest man but apparently not gifted with the power of quick decision and strong stands.

But for the firmness of Mr. Vinson, the labor sabotage of the Little Steel formula would have been far greater. It is disturbing to see Mr. Davis stepping into a new post which requires fast thinking and an ability to say "No"—and mean it.

Then the President had to fill Mr. Davis' place. This he did by naming as Chairman of the War Labor Board, Dr. George Taylor, who has been, like Mr. Davis, one of its public members.

WANTED TO GO HOME

Dr. Taylor did not aspire to the place. He wanted to go home—and it is hard to blame him. He has kindly feeling toward the labor bosses and has been in tune with Mr. Davis' policies. He is expected to function along the Davis lines.

With Mr. Davis, instead of Mr. Vinson, holding the veto power this would indicate more concessions and a further weakening of the anti-inflation lines. Adding to all this his effort to make Mr. Aubrey Williams, the former social worker and favorite of Mrs. Roosevelt, head of the Rural Electrification Administration, where he would control $600,000,000, support is given the idea that Mr. Roosevelt is less concerned with competency now than before.

And when it is considered how quickly competent men like Mr. Lewis W. Douglas, Mr. John W. Hanes, and the late George Peek eliminated themselves from his previous administration it can well be argued that competency never was a prime requisite with Mr. Roosevelt.

In these appointments it hardly can be claimed the President sought the most available competent men. On the contrary, once he had displaced Mr. Jones he obviously took the easiest way, which was to shift things around.

Thus he got the whole business off his mind and was able again to concentrate on the international problem in which he takes such delight. These are the only things that interest him now. Domestic affairs have become an increasing bore.

Whether the men selected for domestic posts are the most competent to be had seems to him now of trivial importance. His place in history will be measured by what he achieves in global war and global peace, not in the domestic field.

That is said to be his attitude, and perhaps it is a natural one. His lowered vitality (due to advancing years) and his increasing deafness enhance his tendency to push aside controversial home matters—particularly those concerning finance and economics, in which fields he was never happy.

What thrills him these days are international conferences. Upon these he thrives. They are a tonic, mentally and physically. By contrast, domestic affairs are dull and drab, a strain on his patience, depressing to his spirit.

All of which is easy to understand but unfortunate for the Nation as a whole. After the war our domestic problems will be great, grave, and acute. If they are not effectively dealt with, the consequences could be only less disastrous than military defeat.

After the war will come the most critical peacetime period in our history. That, then, we should be in the hands of incompetents is an appalling thought.

Delegation of Power by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following letter is typical of hundreds of letters I have recently received from my constituents expressing in their own language their feelings and attitudes on the subjects discussed in this letter:

PRYOR, OKLA., *March 12, 1945.*

Mr. SCHWABE.

DEAR SIR: I am only an Oklahoma farmer and Jersey milker. Am not supposed to know very much. However I have one matter I wish you to ever keep before the House. Here it is. Please don't all you statesmen give over to the President. Keep the power where it belongs. Don't give the reins into the hands of any one man. Any one man who wants everything under his thumb is not fit to have it that way. Don't give in to peacetime drafting. We have never had it that way, and still don't want it so.

If farm production is vital don't take any more of our young farmers away. A city guy is no more good on a farm than a farm lad is in the President's chair.

This is the way one Oklahoma farmer looks at it. No, not only one but many. Thank you and good luck.

BALDWIN MILLER.

Chester Bowles' Mimeographed Letter to All Congressmen Was "Like the Voice of Jacob but the Hand of Esau"—Evidently Mr. Bowles Fails To Practice What He Preaches—He Should Change His Ways or Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chester Bowles in a letter to all Congressmen wrote with such tender affection that it amazed one to think that this was the same Mr. Bowles who treats the rank and file of Congressmen with contempt when they wish to see him or his departments on behalf of their constituents' business. The following letter is in answer to his:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1945.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: This is to acknowledge receipt of your mimeographed letter to all Members of Congress of March 10 with regard to the recent action in refusing to admit three Members of Congress to a strawberry hearing. Being one of those Members, I feel that such action was arbitrary, unpardonable, unreasonable, and that you should take immediate steps to do something about the whole situation.

Frankly, I believe that if you would spend your time cooperating with Congressmen and trying to unravel and untangle stupid blunders made through maladministration of many of your departments, instead of trying to impress Congress and the rest of the country with your arrogant and dictatorial methods, I feel sure that the people of this Nation would be better off.

As an example, in my State the meat situation in New Orleans is in a horrible, deplorable mess, and with the hundreds of thousands of war workers, the situation is growing more tense each day. The whole mess is laid at your door and for 2 weeks the O. P. A. has done nothing about it. The same condition exists in Baton Rouge, La., capital of the State, where high octane refineries, synethetic rubber plants, chemical plants, and many other war plants are located. They have been without sufficient supply of meat for the past month and consumers, producers, and butchers all place the blame squarely on the O. P. A.

Getting back to your letter, I cannot help but feel that it is the voice of Jacob but the hand of Esau. You evidently do not practice what you preach, as in the letter your words are so tender in your affection toward Congressmen that one would think after reading same you welcome them with open arms when they call on you for cooperation or help in connection with the problems of their constituents. As a typical example of how you fail to practice what you preach, how can you make anyone believe that you are sincere or consistent? You said in your letter how much you cooperated with Congressmen, yet your actions are completely opposite. As an example, I was at a meeting with two other Congressmen—one from Louisiana and one from Texas—concerning the stupid, unfair, and arbitrary ruling on the sweetpotato industry. That was more than 4 weeks ago and your department heads have yet to send a letter, give us a telephone call, or do anything except completely ignore us on a matter which is vital to our constituents and which should have had a decision within a week or, anyhow, 10 days at the most.

Unfortunately, all of your arbitrary and dictatorial policies are stupid sins which you and your arrogant heads do not have to pay for, but which react to the discredit and harm of the Democratic Party. Unfortunately, we Congressmen, who have to face the people every 2 years, have to answer for your stupid, unwarranted, and blundering sins of mismanagement and chaos.

I think it is high time you either changed your policy or let somebody step into the O. P. A. that will put up a sincere effort in trying to do a good job for the people of this Nation at such a trying time. Frankly, from your actions I cannot help but feel that you are taking advantage of a high position of trust and honor that this administration has given you and that you have not only imposed upon but taken advantage of the trust and latitude that has been bestowed upon you by a liberal and generous Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Miles City Star, Miles City, Mont., of March 11, 1945, on the proposed Missouri Valley Authority:

IS MORRIS L. COOKE ON FEDERAL PAY ROLL?

Morris L. Cooke has been boomed by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch as a great engineer in connection with that inherited paper's attempt to put over a program of something akin to totalitarianism. At the moment they are concentrating their efforts on the Missouri Valley, but the national socializers say:

"We need not even stick to rivers. * * * The Tennessee Basin is not the only section of the South that is amendable to regional treatment. Upper New England is a region. California is a region. Or we can make regions in terms of cattle, or cereals, or mines, but of course, above all, in terms of people and the way they earn their livings."

You'll find that dogma of totalitarianism in The Valley and Its People—A Portrait of T. V. A., written by one R. L. Duffus and collaborated in by Charles Krutch and his associates of the Graphics Department of the Tennessee Valley Authority. (This last quotation from the front cover of the book, itself.)

Behind this totalitarian movement you will find such great inherited fortunes as that of Mr. Pulitzer who owns the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and its twin, the Star-Times; that of Marshall Field III and his Chicago Sun, recently established by him with that inherited wealth; that of the Biddle family, represented by Fiddle-Piddle Biddle, now gracing the Attorney General's office of the United States; the Carnegie Foundation, operating on the willed wealth of Andrew Carnegie; and even our own Senator MURRAY of Montana, who inherited his fortune from an uncle who made it in Butte.

Behind it you will also find the Farmers Union (from which first came the cry about 60,000,000 jobs—a figure "sound economists" say cannot be reached without taking the wives out of the homes and putting them to work). The C. I. O. unions are also plugging for this spread of totalitarianism.

Now, then why do we find inherited fortunes linking up with organizations like the Farmers Union and the C. I. O.? It could be that inherited wealth in America sees what happened to inherited wealth in Europe and England during the last 25 years. The inherited wealth of Europe has disappeared. The landed aristocracy of England is as poor as an aristocracy of church mice. They will never be rich again, unless they go to work. The same is true of France, Italy, Belgium, and Holland. In Germany the thieving Nazis of the Goering-Goebbels type robbed and pillaged the inherited wealth of the Fritz Thyssen and Krupp gang; the Junkers of Prussia lived off the country much as the landed aristocracy of England lived. The few great families of Japan controlling the finances and trade of that nation are headed for the scrap heap.

All their money has been swept away. Can it be that the inherited wealth of America is trying to work out a totalitarian form of government in which it will reign supreme, with the Farmers Union people and the C. I. O. followers plowing the fields and turning the wheels of industry to maintain this wealthy aristocracy of America?

Doesn't it strike you strange that the Carnegie Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation have to interest themselves in such things as studies of Montana to see whether we are enjoying the abundant life, when the country is full of orphanages trying to rise and support thousands and thousands of ill-fed, ill-kept children? Doesn't it seem strange that they would be throwing their money away on socialistic book writers and dreamy-eyed professors in Montana, who could earn a living for themselves if they really wanted to work? That is what is going on in Montana at the present moment, for the purpose of converting our people over to a totalitarian way of thinking. But our orphanages in this State are not getting any of that inherited wealth to put life and vitality into the bodies of the unfortunates who are there through no fault of their own.

All of which brings us around to this man, Cooke. We can't find out whether or not he is on the Government pay roll at the moment, but somebody is financing him in his efforts. Furthermore, we do know that he has been a Government pay-roll rooster in the past. At one time he was Rural Electrification Administrator (this is the job for which the "pinks" have been shoving Aubrey Williams off on us). Later, Brother Cooke was technical consultant to the Labor Division of the Office of Production Management. (The title ought to have been good for at least a salary of $25,000 a year.) More recently he has been chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the National Resources Board. He was one of the birds, along with Rex Tugwell, who advocated depopulating this country back in 1936 and giving it back to the Indians. So we may well assume that Mr. Cooke is still resting on a fat Government job somewhere in Washington, while he sends out letters by the thousands on a letterhead called Friends of the Missouri Valley. Said letterhead also bears the information: "Dedicated to the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority."

In his letter this missionary to the underprivileged of the West doesn't ask for any money with which to finance his organization. Now, that is strange, or is it? A fat Government job at the taxpayers' expense would do that. Or even the Carnegie Foundation or any of the other inherited wealth structures mentioned might provide the

funds. (We understand he and our Senator MURRAY are very intimate.) But at any rate Mr. Cooke just wants "the privilege of listing you among our sponsors with the understanding that it involves no commitment other than your personal approval of an authority for the Missouri Valley."

We think it is time Congress looked into the activities of Mr. Cooke. We ought to know if Mr. Cooke is sitting on the Government pay roll. We ought to know if entrenched government, represented by this bare-faced effort of Mr. Cooke, is engaged in a movement to socialize or nationalize this country. We ought to know if the Fritz Thyssens of America have teamed up with the dreamers and crackpots to put over the totalitarian form of government in America that has wrecked all the world, with the exception of England and the United States.

We should also remember that we do not find the great family fortune of Henry Ford engaged in any of this shenaniganing. Mr. Ford is too busy making weapons to win the war. Mr. Ford is too busy trying to give his workers the full benefit of their efforts without tying them to a family foundation. Henry Ford's grandson said the other day: "No wages are high that are earned."

If you are one of the middle class of America—and most of us are—which is being ground to bits between the inherited wealth of the Marshall Fields and the Jim Murrays on the one hand and the "I don't wanta works" on the other hand, we suggest you get busy and start writing Senators and Congressmen. First write your own Representatives, but then pick out some of those you read about from day to day in the newspapers and write to them. A good one to write to first, about this fellow Cooke, would be Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, who seems to know a lot about Aubrey Williams. He might know just as much about Cooke.

Concerning Independence for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from speeches at India Independence Day meeting, January 29, National Press Club auditorium, auspices National Committee for India's Freedom, by Dr. Syud Hossain, chairman, National Committee for India's Freedom; Hon. John M. Coffee, Member of Congress from the State of Washington; Dr. Krishnalal Shridharani, author, My India, My America; Dr. Anup Singh, editor, Voice of India; Louis Bromfield, author. Guest of honor was Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, foremost Indian leader, first woman Cabinet Minister, sister of Nehru:

EXCERPT FROM REMARKS BY THE CHAIRMAN, DR. SYUD HOSSAIN

Dr. HOSSAIN. India has become America's problem and by the same token every decent, educated enlightened man and woman in America must acquire a factual and authentic knowledge of India—of her historical background, of her present policies, and of her spiritual need and aspirations.

I want to read to you one sentence from the first American envoy to India broadcast on the soil of India. Colonel Johnson said:

"There is no goal for us and for you except victory and in that victory, may I say on behalf of the President of the United States that we propose to bring to the problem of eventual peace no less than to the battlefield of the immediate war, an aroused conscience, our highest resolves and our loftiest ideals. To those high ends we are dedicating our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

These solemn words constitute the covenant between the peoples of India and the peoples of America, and we are met together tonight, among other things, to bring home to you the reality of that relationship.

I want also to make it clear to you that we the people of India have not now, and have never had, any kind of unkindness toward the people of England. I claim that we have treated the people of England with greater forbearance than any people with whom they have been associated in their recorded history, including the United States of America.

On the other hand, I don't want to leave any doubt that we in India look upon the British Tories and upon the British Imperial system and upon this unholy system of colonization which has been the ruination of the world and is today involving the United States of America in deadly tragedy as a wrong thing and foul thing, irrespective of who practices it.

India asks and seeks nothing from America except understanding and certainly, representing an eternal and righteous cause of human freedom, we are entitled to your moral support and sympathy.

I want to call upon the first speaker tonight, the Honorable JOHN M. COFFEE. He is a very honored and beloved man, not only among Americans, but among many of us, because he is a man who has stood for principle and is standing for love of India. He is here primarily because he is a good American, a forward-looking man, and a liberal in his instincts. Furthermore, we have a personal relationship to him. He did us the great honor a year ago to preside in this same hall over the celebration of the India Independence Day.

Congressman JOHN M. COFFEE. Ladies and gentlemen, some of you were here a year ago, I hope, and some of you were not. I hope this will be the prelude to your visiting many other meetings dedicated to encouraging and supporting freedom-for-India movements. This is not the first time in which I participated in mass meetings designed to bring aid and comfort and practical support to the struggling people of India.

I have fought for the peoples of Yugoslavia and I stayed with the fight until I was finally able to help persuade democratic peoples of the world, and particularly the United States, that there was another Messiah and another Saviour in the person of Marshal Tito, who was really carrying the fight against the enemy. I have been on the side of the democratic peoples of Spain ever since the Civil War commenced, crusading to the end that the United States should recognize that they have an enemy over here in the Fascist Spanish Government in the person of the Falangists and Franco, and that we should sever diplomatic relations with Spain and stop appeasing fascism in any form.

I was one of those who was opposed to shipping scrap iron and material of war to Japan. I introduced the first bill in Congress in 1937 to interdict the shipment of war materials and the granting of credits to Japan, and I am bold enough to assert that we would not be engaged in a war with Japan today if these things had been done. This is not an isolated fight in India. India is only a part of the pattern of oppressed peoples throughout the centuries, fighting to attain their freedom. I quote one thing which is the theme of our meeting, and that is the statement made by Lord Birkenhead to students of Oxford University during 1927. I think it well for us to hear some of the statements made by leading English conservatives. I am quoting Lord Birkenhead in his advice to the students:

"India is our prize possession. We in England who have to live on the Indians must live in it. It is the task for you younger generations of Englishmen to hold India to the last drop of your blood."

That is the theme about which we are going to hear some discussion tonight. India has been the so-called gem in the British Empire. It is the source from which comes, they think, much of their wealth. Actually, it is but a relative handful of Englishmen, who are sent down to India to exploit the unhappy people who reside there. There are 390,000,000 citizens of that subcontinent, who have been kept divided along lines of ostensible religious schisms for 150 years to prevent them from getting together so that the Englishman may be able to present a picture to the world of division in India. Those divisions are not real or genuine, but are fostered and encouraged and stimulated for no other purpose than to be able to present a picture to the world of a disunited India, so that the British may be able to say, "How are you going to give the Indian peoples independence when the Moslems and the Hindus themselves cannot get together?" We in America believe in freedom for all people. Vice President Wallace said this is a people's war, and this is the people's century—the twentieth century—and that is the keystone of this war. The underlying principle of the war may be summed up by the statement that we are fighting for a free world versus a slave world.

You will recall that the late Wendell Willkie wrote a rather notable book called One World. He spoke about the reservoir of good will in Asia, and he spoke about the need for an end of colonization in the world because that has been the main source of wars in the last 300 years.

The American people are in essence opposed to the exploitation of peoples, whether at the hands of the Germans, Russians, Italians, Japanese, British, or any other country, whether of the United Nations or of the Axis group, because we don't believe in the subjugation of peoples. We believe in according them true freedom, and over in Asia we are feeding the flames of discontent and revolt when we refuse to lend a helping hand and give our sympthy to the Indian peoples. How can they believe that we adhere to the Atlantic Charter when they see us apparently standing supinely by, and witness continued exploitation of the Indian people. Yes, the British Conservatives have a great deal to answer for in India. Our quarrel is with the Tory who would continue to exploit the citizens of India and not with the British people.

We are here to welcome some distinguished guests in the Nation's Capital. We are welcoming two of our colleagues in the Congress. We welcome one of the most distinguished women in the world, and, incidentally, India has produced many distinguished women, and distinguished and cultured men, but the Orient is marked by the two outstanding and distinguished women, Madam Chiang Kai-shek and Madam Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit—our own honored guest who is the final speaker on the program tonight. I hope you ladies and gentlemen will notice the culture and perfect diction which characterize this speaker and her speech. I regard her as one of the outstanding and most most cultured women prominent in the world affairs today, and she is only typical of a large number who are associated with her

in this great work, upon which she is engaged and it gives me a great honor and great privilege to be invited as one to participate in the effort of 390,000,000 people. Just think. Three hundred and ninety million people out of a world population of only 2,000,000,000—20 percent of the world population, who are still exploited in the year of our Lord 1945, and who ask only our help and sympathy and our backing that they may continue this crusade until success is theirs. Their ambition is to achieve independence for India. Thank you.

Dr. SHRIDHARANI. A full-dress conference of the United States is in the offing. Who will represent India? The Indian officials who have recently cluttered up the official Washington? Most of them are regarded as Quislings in India. They are the hand-picked puppets of the British. The only people—the only leaders who can really represent India are the leaders, and I believe that by your adding your voice to the others, that these real representatives of India will be invited to the confines of the mighty. I believe that in you cooperating with us, and we with you, we can insist on a better peace. I believe that democracy is the first victory to be won in India.

Dr. SINGH. I shall read one or two statements that Mr. Churchill made long before he became the Prime Minister; and need I say that he has not changed his point of view. Some time ago Churchill stated, and I quote: "The loss of India would mark and consummate the downfall of the British Empire. That great organism would pass at a stroke out of life into history. From such a catastrophe there could be no recovery." Referring to Mr. Gandhi, Mr. Churchill said: "I am against this surrender to Gandhi. I am against these conversations and agreements between Lord Irwin and Mr. Gandhi. Gandhi stands for the expulsion of the British from India. Gandhi stands for the substitution of Brahmin domination for British rule in India. You will never be able to come to terms with Gandhi."

I would like you to remember the observation that your great humorist, Mark Twain, once made. "The trouble with most of the people," he said, "is not that they don't know enough, but most of what they know ain't so." And most of what you hear about India ain't so.

Mr. LOUIS BROOMFIELD. The day of imperialism, of the large, scattered, far-flung empire is done. It is done for a practical and physical reason. That kind of empire can no longer be held together or protected because the peoples in those dominions, commonwealths, and colonies are going to go their own way in this new world.

India is geographically a self-contained nation, with unlimited manpower. The future of the world belongs to those nations. It cannot be otherwise.

I am glad to have lived my 48 years today. There is only one reason why I would wish I were 25 years younger, and that is because I would today be in India, side by side with Mrs. Pandit and the other leaders, carrying on the fight for what is going to be and is already one of the great adventures of humankind. It is the awakening, the struggling, the rise of a very great people and a very great civilization.

Dr. HOSSIAN. The man who read out the Declaration of Indian Independence was Mrs. Pandit's brother, who is president of the Indian National Congress, on January 26, 1930, he read out this declaration. I am not going to read the full text of it, but perhaps a sentence or two, which may bring home to you the implications and the intrinsic characteristic of that declaration.

"We believe that it is the inalienable right of the Indian people, as of any other people, to have freedom and to enjoy the fruits of their toil, and have the necessities of life so that they may have full opportunity of growth.

"We believe also that if any government deprives a people of these rights and oppresses them the people have a right to alter it or abolish it.

"The British Government in India has not only deprived the Indian people of their freedom but has based itself on the exploitation of the masses, and has ruined India economically, politically, culturally, and spiritually."

Mrs. PANDIT. We are meeting tonight partly in celebration of India's Declaration of Independence. Dr. Shridharani has just mentioned to you that the reason why a nation still struggling for freedom observe their independence was partly due to your influence over us. Well, that is a happy idea and I am glad of it, but another reason why we observe a day of independence before the independence has been achieved is because it is so essential to those who suffer for a cause to have some one day in the year marked out from the rest in which they can rededicate themselves to the cause again with fresh strength, and you know the road we have to travel, and you have to travel, is a very weary road. The revolution in our country is not one in which we use force. We don't have armies; we don't have guns and ammunition and airplanes and armament. Our revolution is along peaceful lines and therefore we have to do again and again and again acts which have to be done in cold blood, and which lead to sacrifices and tragedy.

And today, when we see this spectacle in India, that while the whole world is engaged in a war supposed to be a war for freedom, a war for security and happiness and peace, we have in India no security, no peace, and no happiness. India is a land which for many years now has gotten accustomed to living in a state of apathy. There is no happiness in our hearts; there is no energy that can make us take part in the work of the world; in the joy and inspiration that free peoples have. The only thing we can do is to carry on this struggle of will for our freedom, because freedom in itself is desirable, and we want it for ourselves, but also because we realize very keenly the fact that Indian independence is something much larger than the issue of independence being given to 400,000,000 people It is a question of the independence of all those suppressed people in all parts of the world, and therefore, when we fight for our independence, we link it up also with the question of independence everywhere. Understand, I am speaking of freedom, and when we talk of freedom for India we link with it the freedom of the world, because we understand the great force for good India can be if she is free. On the other hand, an India enslaved will mean bitterness and discontent for a very large portion of the globe, and, no matter how many Dumbarton Oaks you have sitting here in the United States, they will not be able to solve the peace that they seek, because you cannot expect to put large portions of the world territory into cold storage and forget about them.

Thus in India thousands of men and women have been thrown in prison without a trial. We have seen young boys and girls arrested merely for going out in a peaceful procession carrying banners, shouting slogans, demanding release of their leaders. We have seen groups consisting of girls and boys from 16 and 17 to 23 and 24 years shot at. I have picked up the bodies of boys who have fallen, and subsequently died.

We don't want freedom given to us by way of charity. We are paying the price, but I want you to know how heavy that price is, because so often you are given a picture of India as a land, a disunited land, with so many problems that one cannot understand them; so many languages that you can't count them; so many religions that the people are steeped in prejudice and can't see the light of reason. I am not going to contradict any of these things. There is not enough time to go on contradicting things so utterly stupid that they don't require an affirmation or contradiction; but I want to point out to you this fact, that in a country as vast as India, in a country with a population as large as that of India, how do you expect it possible to have this vast majority of people to live together amicably? It is not possible in any country claiming to have democratic ideals. It is not possible for a people to work toward democracy to so attune themselves to one pattern that there is no difference between them at all. That can only happen in a Nazi country, and God forbid we should have a swastika in order to achieve freedom.

We were one of the first countries to point out the tragedy toward which fascism was leading the world. We threw our weight against fascism at a time when the leaders of Allied nations upheld that policy. When an explanation was demanded many years ago in the House of Commons regarding Britain's policies toward Japanese aggression toward China, we recognized it as a menace which would lead the world into the situation in which you and I find ourselves today. So, when you hear of the differences in India, the troubles and fights and quarrels, please remember that none of these differences, none of these quarrels, none of these religions and languages are such that they need hinder the freedom of India even for 1 day, and I will tell you another thing, and perhaps something new for you. There is only one religion in India today, which is above all other religions, and every self-respecting man and woman and child in India adheres to that religion, and that is the religion of India's freedom.

And there is only one slogan in India today, and that is, we say to the British, "Quit India as quickly as you can and leave us to our fate. You have borne the white man's burden long enough. For God's sake, put it down."

And so, I have come to America not to paint any lurid picture of India's suffering, but to tell you how much the people of India are looking toward America, not for help, because that would really be valueless, but we do want and what we do expect from you is your understanding of our problems. I know that sympathy exists in the American mind. I had enough evidence of it even before I came here, and since I came here the warmth of the American people, their generosity, their eagerness to know about what is happening in other lands, has been such a heartening and reassuring experience that I have no doubt in my mind that the people of this country do stand for something more than the mere winning of a war, but I warn you, when you think of India, to know the real India, not that of an arrogant young man who spends 3 weeks in India's culture of 500 years, and writes his impressions. Not the India of Beverley Nichols.

India stands for the democratic idea. She tries to weld her people together to work in such a way that they not only make themselves fine and strong and free, but also so that they may help wherever freedom is attacked, and join up with the forces of progress; and this picture is one which strengthens us today, which helps us to bear any sort of tragedy or difficulty which may come in our path. The problem of India is actually a very simple problem. You have been told about the division existing in India. I will tell you of the similarities. In India the main political party, to which I have the honor to belong, has always worked for the people, and we have just heard part of the declaration of independence read out to us, which shows the ideals we have for the future of India, and if you will bring your mind back to the declara-

tion of independence, you will see that the terms are similar, the ideals are similar, and our object is similar to yours. But over and above this, we have another thing which is known as the declaration of rights. By this declaration the Indian National Congress has made it possible for anybody within the Congress, and we hope later on within India, irrespective of class, creed, or section, to rise to their full capacities. Men and women work in our organization side by side. There is no bar against section. We have women in India today, not that woman of which one reads lovely, intriguing American stories; the dainty, fragile, little woman with a beautiful form, and anklets and bracelets and other lovely things, but the new woman, because there is no use for a clinging vine—there isn't any place to cling to any more. The Indian woman today symbolizes India. She is a fine, free, strong comrade to the man of India, and this is one of the changes that has taken place in India. Another is the comradeship growing up between all peoples that think alike. The main thing is the freedom of India, and we don't bother whether I go to a temple and my friend goes to a mosque.

Some of you are aware that for two and a half years India had autonomous government in 7 out of 11 government provinces. These provinces were run by congress governments, and for two and a half years the Congress worked for the people through representatives selected by the people, and during that short period of two and a half years you will be surprised to know what we have achieved. You are told that the literacy of India is 7 or 8 percent; I think it is. Recently I mentioned this to somebody, and this lady said to me, "Oh, but isn't it a fact that if the British had not been there, you wouldn't even have had that much." So I said to her: "The British have been with us for 200 years. For two and a half years the people have tried to rule themselves, within a limited constitution, and within those two and a half years the literacy went up 100 percent." The same with other questions. India has no medical aid, barring big cities, and the villagers work in the good earth all day, and at night they lie down; sometimes there is a shelter, and maybe there is no shelter; and if he and his family are lucky, they live, and, if not, they die, and nothing very much is done. There are several reasons for this. There are high salaries that have to be paid to Government servants especially brought to India to rule. And why bother to save people anyway, for goodness sakes, with such a big population which goes on increasing. That is the divine way of ending matters as painlessly as possible.

I was traveling in Bengal, and that whole area is in charge of your boys. The actual railroad is run by American boys, and for 2 or 3 hours it was just a military station. There were American boys there and a few Britishers. They didn't know who I was, and I asked some of them to tell me how they were doing, how they liked being in England. One young Britisher, about 25 years or so, was talking diligently, and I said to him, "Are you socialistic?" "I damn well am, and I'm fed up," so I said, "Why, why are you fed up? Didn't you want to enlist?" He said, "I'm fed up with fighting these blankety-blankety wars for the benefit of Churchill's grandsons. We want to go home and live in peace."

And that is why India demands her freedom, so that people may go back to their homes and demand peace. Enough of exploitation, of colonization. These words are beginning to stink and no decent people want them, and yet, when the time comes to raise our voices against them we just don't. The human race is an apathetic race. We have power, we have votes, there are many things in our hands which we can use, many weapons, but we just don't want to arouse ourselves. We prefer the dangers we know to the dangers unknown, and if there are a few countries in which there is trouble brewing, we think, "Well, if there is no war in my time, that's good enough."

We want equality in the world. We want equality for the individual and only on those grounds can the world be built up. I am not interested in whether Mr. Churchill goes in a consultation with Mr. Roosevelt, or Stalin, or whoever the Big Four might be. I am not interested in them. If we understand the problem and raise our voices, we can make these big four or five bow to our decision, and this is the time, because the war is drawing to a close, and any day we may find ourselves facing issues which demand an answer.

Proposed F. E. P. C. Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a jurist in the New York Herald Tribune of March 4, 1945, gives his reaction to the effect of the enactment of the Ives bill, which recently became a law with the approval of Governor Dewey, as follows:

SEES FLAWS IN IVES BILL—JUSTICE O'BRIEN OF THE DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT IN JAMAICA FINDS SERIOUS OBJECTIONS

To the New York Herald Tribune:

The "antidiscrimination" label pinned on the Ives-Quinn bill undoubtedly deceived many citizens.

The label of the bill secured the wide support of an unsuspecting American people traditionally opposed to any kind of discrimination; it diverted public attention away from its real objectives, and finally it checked, if not altogether destroyed, opposition.

The American people do not know the dangerous provisions of the bill, since its details have not been printed in any newspaper—a major strategic triumph.

Americans of all religions have fallen into the trap. At one blow, in one single bill, it controls education, religion, employers, employees, labor unions, and the entire business structure.

Politically its passage by the assembly is a major communistic triumph. To overawe the Democrats, to split the Republicans, was a master stroke of vast advantage to the Liberal party.

The bill deprives the employers of trial by jury, it eliminates the protection of the age-old rules of evidence. It gives the commissioners power to judge not only actual "discrimination" but also the "intent" to discriminate as well as the failure to "cooperate."

It authorizes full power over education, superseding our entire educational program not only in public schools but in parochial and all other schools.

It gives the commissioners full power over employers, the unions, and permits them to up-grade or down-grade the vast number of workers now fully protected by their unions. The wording of the bill so indicates. The bill reads that the commission is authorized "to take such * * * affirmative action, including hiring, reinstatement, or up-grading of employees with or without back pay."

One can well imagine the chaos and disorder that will ensue when the commissioners attempt the "up-grading" of employees. One may well envision the resulting disruption of the employer's business as the up-graders step up and the ungraders step down.

The bill creates a vast bureaucracy. There is no limit to the number of paid agents, attorneys, clerks, etc.

The bill not only permits the appointment without any limit all over the State of paid agents, but provides also for an unlimited number of "advisory" agents and conciliation councils.

Significant is the power of the commission permitting these unpaid agents to collect money for their "actual and necessary traveling expenses."

Not only this, but the commission is to supply these volunteer or nonpaid agents with a paid technical and clerical staff. This opens a veritable floodgate of expenditures. The bill also authorizes the printing of unlimited publications and other research data.

Is all of this American? Many of us do not believe it is. These are but some of the dangerous features of the bill. Haste is a mistake. The bill requires further careful consideration and study.

HERBERT A. O'BRIEN.

JAMAICA, N. Y., *March 2, 1945.*

A Labor Leader Pleads for New Enterprises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Matthew Woll from the Reader's Digest of December 1944:

A LABOR LEADER PLEADS FOR NEW ENTERPRISES

(Condensed from Future)

By Matthew Woll

One of the most important things this country must do is to foster a healthy birth rate of new businesses, if we are to be ready for the great change-over from war work to peaceful production. There is always a high death rate; recorded business failures range between 12,000 and 15,000 a year in normal times, and many more thousands of enterprises quietly fold up without going through a formal legal process. Every death of a business throws people out of work, reduces by a few or by thousands the number of available jobs.

In the past we could count on a business birth rate which, like our human birth rate, would more than offset the deaths. After the war I do not think we can count on this, unless we wipe out some of the restrictions which add up to throttling birth control.

This is the way businesses are born: An ingenious and industrious mechanic devises a new and better way of doing an old task, or he invents a new product. With his own savings, and perhaps the savings of some friends, he sets up a little shop of his own. He employs a few men, eventually hundreds of men; and not infrequently his little enterprise becomes a great industry giving work to thousands.

We have always thought of this as a typical American story—this system of opportunity for individual enterprise—despite its admitted imperfections. It has worked, in the main; it has, over the years, provided an ever-improving standard of living for an ever-increasing number of workers.

But now our Federal tax system, which has grown up haphazardly, and besides has been distorted by war necessities, strongly discourages anyone from bringing a new business into the economic world.

For example, if the mechanic I mentioned wants to start his own shop now, the tax outlook is enough to deter him.

New business ventures do not commonly make money from the outset. The little shop probably will lose money for 3 or 4 years. Then, its early mistakes corrected, its reputation established, its clientele built up, the shop begins to earn profits. Thereupon the tax collector steps in. Taking no reasonable account of the losses incurred in the struggle to get established, he taxes the earnings heavily. "Heads, I win; tails, you lose," says the tax law.

Suppose the new shop does somehow keep out of the red from the start, manages to break even, or a little better, and at the end of the inevitable lean period of the early years begins to earn a reasonable return on the capital invested. The tax laws do not call such earnings reasonable at all; they call the increase over the meager returns of the early years excess profits and soak them—soak them hard.

In spite of this, our ambitious mechanic perseveres, puts earnings back into the business, buying new and better machines, hiring more and more people. Eventually, because he is old and wants to retire, or maybe because he wants to start another business, he sells out. Then he is taxed on capital gains. He originally put in perhaps $10,000; he sold out for $100,000; most of this represents income he denied himself over the years, sacrifices he made to build up his business. But the tax laws treat him just the same as if he had won $90,000 in a lucky fling on the stock exchange.

Suppose he doesn't sell out. His corporation pays an income tax on its earnings. The stockholders get their dividends—and pay more income taxes on the dividends. This may not mean much to the man who has bought 10 shares of some big corporation as a place for some of his savings, but it is particularly discouraging to the smaller business, owned by the men who operate it. They and their business both have to pay taxes on the same earnings.

The giants of industry are not all of America by any means. They count for less, in the long run, than the little firms employing 15 or 30 people, managed by ambitious, imaginative employers, dreaming of growth. These are enterprises started by men who saved and borrowed capital while they were at the bench. Such enterprisers are the backbone of a free United States. Furthermore, this is the way most new things get their start, and without new processes and new products we are lost in the post-war world, on both the home and international fronts.

Lockheed Aircraft Corporation began to build planes in 1933. It had only a few thousand dollars, lots of borrowed money, liabilities far in excess of its assets. It fought its way ahead with venturesome courage. Now, as we all know, it employs thousands of workers and is an important part of our national strength. Harvard University's School of Business recently analyzed the history of the company, year by year, and showed that under present tax laws it could never have grown—or even survived. Yet, as Harvard remarks, "unless risk-taking of the type illustrated by Lockheed is multiplied many times over in the post-war economy, the Nation's hopes for peacetime prosperity, and high employment by private enterprise, will be tragically shattered."

But risk-taking won't be multiplied unless there's an incentive. It's human and entirely American to start a new business in the hope of profit. It's not human nature to risk money and effort with small chance of profit. To recognize this in our tax legislation is simple logic.

There are many steps which may be taken for expanding production and employment after the war without relying at all on Government help. All that Congress need say to business is, "If you take a chance with your money and go into a new line or broaden your present activities, you are doing your country a service. You're employing more people and giving your fellow citizens a new or improved product. So, as a reward for taking this risk, we'll give you some consideration in your tax bill."

New enterprises might be given freedom from all taxes for, say 3 to 5 years. Or these businesses might be taxed more lightly than old, less daring concerns, for a certain time. However, such special consideration should not be allowed a company that denies its employees equal consideration—that is, the right to promote their economic welfare.

Special provision might be made for the averaging of losses by new firms over a 5-year rather than a 12-month calendar. There is no lack of possible methods. Once our tax policy recognizes that we must encourage the birth rate of new business, the details can be worked out.

We shall win the bitterest war this Nation ever has known through the magnificent efforts of our fighting men and of the men and women who are producing the implements of victory. We shall win largely because of the qualities our way of life has developed in us—resourcefulness, ingenuity, individual initiative. These are the qualities which regimentation thwarts.

When this war is won the millions of men now in uniform, the millions of war workers, will need peacetime jobs. These energetic, intelligent, ambitious workers—the best in the world—will not tolerate a protracted period of idleness and frustration. They will demand and they will get jobs somehow from someone. The question is, How and from whom?

If business should fail in this greatest test I fear the result would be that the people would demand that the Government provide work. I, for one, do not want to see individual opportunity and freedom smothered by such state capitalism.

Payments on our wartime obligations, in addition to other services which will be the duty of our Federal Government, will increase our annual Budget to somewhere around $200,000,000,000. We shall be able to meet that Budget with normal taxation if we have a high national income which can come only from a high level of production and a high degree of employment. The graduated income tax should be our main dependence with every person making a contribution though for some people it might be only nominal. At the same time should come relief from the hidden burden of indirect taxation.

There is no time to lose. Overnight the problem of employing millions may be upon us, and when it arrives enterprising men and capital must not be in hiding awaiting a "favorable tax climate." The duty of Congress to act in time before the end of the war and before the job problem arises is inescapable.

Is There a Divorce Evil?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the Honorable Paul W. Alexander, judge of the Court of Common Pleas, Division of Domestic Relations, and Juvenile Court of Lucas County, Ohio, together with an article, Is There a Divorce Evil, contained in the April 1945 issue of the Ohio Magazine.

Judge Alexander has served as national president of Juvenile Judges of the United States of America and is one of the most constructive forward looking men of our country:

COUNTY OF LUCAS,
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
Toledo, Ohio, March 13, 1945.

Hon. HOMER A. RAMEY,
Congressman, Ninth District of Ohio,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HOMER: I was greatly rejoiced to read in the local papers not long ago a wire story to the effect that you had again taken up the cudgels in favor of uniform divorce and marriage codes. I remember when Senator CAPPER tried to start the ball rolling back in 1923. It's a long, hard row to hoe, and maybe you and I will never live to see the day it comes to pass, but that doesn't mean it shouldn't come to pass. No more does it justify any of us in quitting trying.

I was personally flattered to realize that I had been thinking along somewhat the same lines as you. I believe you are the first person in captivity who has given such national publicity to the evils of the traveling marriage. I am enclosing a little magazine with reprint of speech I made last fall before the Ohio State bar. At items 7 and 8, page 23, you will see how my thinking has gone along with yours. Hope you don't mind.

I am looking forward eagerly to hearing you when you appear before the bar association next Saturday noon.

With best regards, I am,

Yours faithfully,

Judge PAUL W. ALEXANDER.

IS THERE A DIVORCE EVIL?

(By Judge Paul W. Alexander, of Toledo)

It has been said that, strictly speaking, there is no such thing as a divorce evil.

This, in face of a national divorce rate that has doubled in the decade from 1933 to 1943, a rate that rose still more sharply in 1944, a rate that threatens to zoom out of sight immediately following the war.

And this, right here in Ohio where the divorce rate appears to be about double that of the rest of the Nation, where the metropolitan rate increased 15 percent from 1943 to 1944 (first 8 months), where the rate for the whole State increased 29 percent from 1940 to 1943.

And this in a State which, according to Judge Carl A. Weinman, of Steubenville, whose scholarly studies of the problem have received national recognition, has one-eighteenth of the country's population and one-seventh of her divorces, a State where the number of divorces sought in 1944 (on basis of first 8 months) increased over 1943 as follows: Franklin County, 23 percent; Hamilton, 20 percent; Summit, 20 percent; Lucas, 15 percent; Mahoning, 13 percent; Montgomery, 11 percent; Cuyahoga, 10 percent; Stark, 5 percent.

Strictly speaking, there is no divorce evil. This is true even in Ohio where there are more than twice as many divorce suits filed in common pleas court as all other civil actions put together; where the divorce industry has become big business to the extent that in 1944 (first 8 months), 80 percent of the cases filed in common pleas court in Montgomery County were divorce cases; 75 percent in Franklin; 69 percent in Lucas; 69 percent in Stark; 68 percent in Summit;

67 percent in Hamilton; 64 percent in Cuyahoga, and 54 percent in Mahoning.

Can anyone in the light of such facts and figures suggest there's really no such thing as a divorce evil, and still be in his right mind? To what weird theory has he fallen a victim?

We fellows who sit daily in the divorce courts, especially in the urban counties of Ohio, and listen to the devastating stories of hundreds, thousands, yes, tens of thousands of marriages gone on the rocks—we have no time for fancy theorizing.

JUDGES FACE REALITIES

We are up against plain bald facts of life, sordid details, stark realities. And, in course of time, certain elementary fundamental truths manage to penetrate our innermost consciousness.

First, let's glance at a few of these elementary truths, then figure out for ourselves whether there's really a divorce evil, and if so, the nature of it and what can be done about it.

People think divorces destroy marriages, break families, disrupt homes—that's why they speak of the divorce evil. And you can't blame them, for that's what they've always been taught by lawyers, judges, clergymen, editors, and teachers.

One learned professor puts it this way in a current law review:[1] "Divorce—a legal concept—may dissolve a legal status, but the results are a broken family."

I dare say not one person in a thousand would take exception to that statement. It is the commonly accepted view. But—well, here goes:

Elementary truth No. 1: The broken family is not the result of the divorce; the divorce is the result of the broken family.

Elementary truth No. 2 (another legal concept): Divorce is granted only for cause; ground for divorce must exist before the action can even be started.

Elementary truth No. 3 (a realistic concept): The parties in actual fact divorce themselves. "Divorce" comes from the Latin divortere, to turn apart, come to the parting of the ways, separate; and spouses separate themselves—the court doesn't separate them.

In the last 4,000 cases coming before me the parties had already been separated an average of 2.7 years before appearing in court.

Elementary truth No. 4: The divorce decree is primarily a finding of fact ("the court finds, etc."), an official recognition of a reality, a preexisting state of affairs created by the parties or one of them.

After the finding, the decree severs the legal tie which theoretically still binds the parties, and this automatically restores them to their status quo ante bellum.

Elementary truth No. 5: The right to remarry is not granted or created by the divorce. It is conferred by the substantive law of the state over which the divorce court has no control whatsoever.

Elementary truth No. 6: What really disrupts families, destroys homes, orphans children is not the law or the court or the judge or the decree, but drunkenness, cruelty, neglect, desertion, infidelity of one or both spouses.

Elementary truth No. 7: It is the marriage that has failed before the case reaches the divorce court. The marriage did not weld a union strong enough to withstand the inevitable stresses and strains and prevent the party or parties from destroying their own happiness and home.

Elementary truth No. 8: The marriage fails because of the inherent character defects of one or both of the individuals who married.

The drunkenness, cruelty, neglect, desertion, infidelity which are the apparent causes of the wrecked marriage are symptoms of manifestations of an underlying selfishness of character.

Frankly, many judges do not accept this view, preferring to hold that "sex incompatibility is the greatest single cause of divorce" and go no deeper than that. But that selfishness or inconsiderateness is the foremost single factor making for marital unhappiness is borne out by the most comprehensive scientific study of the question I know of: Terman, Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness.

Elementary truth No. 9: Countless individuals are born with or develop (or both) personalities such that they fail to get along with their employers, fellow employees, subordinates, neighbors, tradesmen, relatives. Yet we place them in the most intimate human relationship conceivable, one often requiring the most delicate and difficult personal sacrifices and adjustments—matrimony—and act surprised and grieved when they fail there too. Marriages have been failing since the days of Hammurabi.

Elementary truth No. 10: The parties themselves kill off the marriage; the divorce trial is merely the autopsy; the divorce decree is merely the legal interment.

Elementary truth No. 11: The individuals and the marriage having failed, the divorce comes along and it too fails.

It fails to attack the cause; it doesn't even attempt to cure the real evil or rectify the situation.

I doesn't give the marriage or the family a shot in the arm. It merely amputates the offending member.

Elementary truth No. 12: For the courts to "grant fewer divorces" is not the answer.

First, no court may arbitrarily deny, a divorce. If the parties are legally entitled to it—and they almost always are—the court must grant it.

Second, the divorce judges of Ohio and of America, I am persuaded, are scrutinizing every case and doing everything they conscientiously can to put on the brakes. They are more painfully conscious than anyone else of the cancer gnawing at the vital spot of the Nation—its family life.

They are in the difficult position of dispensing daily something which public opinion permits and provides for, yet disapproves on general principles.

Third, since 1875 the divorce judges of Ohio with astonishing uniformity have granted only about 70 percent of the divorces sought; the rest are voluntarily dismissed, dismissed for want of prosecution, or denied.

Fourth, by the time the case gets before the court both parties want the divorce pretty badly, with few exceptions. Merely to deny it does not resurrect the marriage or reunite the parties in wedlock or restore the family—it usually makes a bad matter worse.

Elementary 13: It is useless to look to the courts themselves to stem the stampede to the divorce mill; they can't close their doors or regulate their intake.

Much more sensible to look to the source of the evil—to the cause rather than the effect.

You wouldn't try to stop a typhoid epidemic by calling on the hospitals to close their doors or slow up their treatment of the patients. You would look to the source of the infection.

Elementary 14: Last and most important of all: The problem presented each time a marriage goes on the rocks is so much more social than legal, that to try to find a practical and humane solution by means of our present antediluvian legal machinery is pretty much like trying to perform a surgical operation with hammer and chisel.

JUDGES CONCUR

I have never met a judge with any considerable experience in divorce court who did not more or less heartily concur in this view.

Well, how about it? Is there really a divorce evil? Or does the evil lie not so much with divorce as with the marriage; not so much with marriage as with the individuals who marry?

Is the greater cause for concern that so many spouses are seeking divorce or that so many spouses have ground for divorce? Figure it out for yourself.

Personally I do not subscribe to the defeatist attitude that nothing can be done about it. Obviously the point of attack should be the cause not the symptom.

ATTACK THE CAUSE

And we have no business to quit trying because the forces of religion, education, and all that is good have not exactly succeeded in eradicating from human nature the evil that lies at the root of the problem.

But in these remarks I propose to address myself solely to what can be done about the instrument employed by society to perform the operation, to cut the matrimonial tie—the legal machinery. This machinery originally came into being for quite a different purpose. In fact, justiciable divorce were still unknown for centuries after it was developed. It is now supported by statutory framework.

But we still insist on running our divorces through the same old mill. The fact is that many more progressive and beneficial improvements have been made in the rules of football in the last four decades than have been made in the rules we still apply to divorce cases in the last four centuries.

Studies have been made and books have been written, but suffice it to say here that our legal instrument is one of ineffable ineptitude.

LEGISLATIVE REFORMS

Improvement in the instrument, the statutory framework, are constantly being proposed. Among the possible legislative reforms that would at least bear looking into are the following:

1. Ohio has 10 statutory grounds of divorce. Some are anomalous, some vague. Authorities both inside and outside the State have long maintained the grounds should be fewer and better defined.

2. The interlocutory decree—a provision forbidding divorced parties to remarry until certain time has elapsed—has much to recommend it, although it is by no means a panacea.

It is in vogue in both conservative and progressive jurisdictions, for example, England and California.

3. A simple amendment would clear up the confusion in the minds of bench, bar, and litigants since the decision of the Supreme Court in the Tucker case concerning commencement of an action against an Ohio resident temporarily out of the State, for example, in military serice.

4. In 1937 England broadened her divorce laws but at the same time adopted an interesting provision possibly intended to curb hasty and ill-considered marriages.

The act provides that with certain exceptions one may not obtain a divorce until after at least 3 years of marriage. The war descended too soon afterward to permit any valid appraisal of the efficacy of this brake.

5. In pre-war Germany the domestic relations courts had a sort of prosecuting attorney to represent the State in each divorce action, make investigations, cross-examine witnesses, etc.

A former judge of the Berlin court tells me the idea was good but the operation not so good, due mainly to maladministration and political influence.

Most American law books say the State is a party to every divorce case. But the State is one party that is never represented in court.

Social theorists glibly say, "Why, the judge represents the State. First, the judge couldn't; second, he shouldn't.

He couldn't because he lacks the facilities, resources, and time of an attorney to do a

[1] Law and Contemporary Problems, X, 697.

good job of representing the State or anybody else.

He shouldn't because he is bound by tradition and ethics to be neutral, disinterested, impartial not only as between the parties themselves but as between the parties, or either of them, and the State.

6. Last summer Russia repudiated her easy divorce system, whereby spouses could all but legally divorce themselves at will, and issued a decree establishing a system similar to those in most of our States, and surpassing some.

One provision requires the presence of both parties in court at the hearing; another requires the court to attempt a reconciliation before proceeding.

Also, officials are required to make the marriage ceremony more solemn.

7. Migratory divorce, that is, establishing a residence in Reno and getting a divorce there instead of in Ohio, has received much publicity.

This is but one of many defects in the American divorce system that can be cured only by a nationally uniform divorce code.

8. Migratory marriage, that is, going some place else instead of staying home to get married, has received comparatively little publicity. Yet an undue proportion of such marriages wind up in the divorce court.

It looks as if this were one of the defects of the American marriage system that can be cured only by a nationally uniform marriage code.

9. Last spring Judge Weinman in a symposium of the Ohio State Bar Association advocated a conciliation docket in cases where minor children are involved. This appears to have many of the features of the Children's Court of Conciliation of Los Angeles County.

It was my privilege to sit with the founder of that court, the famous Judge Ben B. Lindsey, not long before his death, and to study its operation intimately. The ideas of Judge Weinman and Judge Lindsey seem to me to merit consideration.

10. Ultimately the divorce court will be socialized, all over the Nation.

OHIO SHOULD LEAD

Why shouldn't Ohio take the initiative?

We took the children out of the adult criminal courts and put them into a socialized court, the juvenile court.

It didn't stop juvenile delinquency. It wasn't supposed to.

It was supposed to handle the children only after they had become delinquent. And in the main it has turned in an excellent performance.

Since the problems in a divorce case are so much more social than legal, why isn't it logical to take the embattled spouses out of the antiquated old divorce mill with its creaking legalistic machinery and put them into a socialized court, as we have done with the juveniles?

This won't stop marital unhappiness, but it could handle the delicate and difficult problems presented by the spouses and their children more intelligently, humanely, and practically, with better results to both the individuals and society.

In the course as we now must proceed we compel the parties to engage in a kind of warfare, which in about 95 percent of the cases is a sham battle waged against the little man who isn't there, the absent defendant. Isn't it about time we got civilized and renounced war as an instrument of domestic relations policy?

OHIO'S DIVORCE COMMISSION

About 8 years ago the Governor of Ohio appointed a commission to draft modern marriage and divorce codes. The late United States Circuit Judge H. W. Arant, former dean of the Ohio State University College of Law, was chairman.

Six years ago the very scholarly results of the commission's long and thorough study were submitted to the general assembly. But the marriage and divorce problem was not acute at that time and the new codes were not adopted.

Today the problem is decidedly acute. And with the end of the war it will become definitely worse. The divorce rate increased 45 percent after the last war.

So, now is the accepted time to do something about it.

I therefore join with judges, lawyers and many good people of Ohio in the hope a new governor's commission may be appointed to make a new study and submit a new marriage and divorce code that will prove acceptable to an enlightened new legislature, and contribute something to the mitigation of the existing evil, whether you choose to call it a divorce evil, a marriage evil, or the evil of the individuals—or all three.

The Bread Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Northwestern Miller:

THE BREAD CRISIS

Since the beginning of this war, during the rationing ups and downs of virtually every other food, the bread and flour industries have been in the remarkable position of being able to serve this country and every nation that eats from its helping hand all the products of wheat that have been required.

Hungry civilians of liberated nations have come to consider the generous and immediate gifts of white flour and bread as symbols of American strength and willingness to help. More quickly than any other single thing, bread seems to refuel the flagging spirits of the hungry. It is a weapon of minor cost and exceeding great strength.

At home in America no one has thought since the early rush for flour that we ever would have trouble supplying any need that arose. It has been the one food that always has been ready to fill the grocery basket when other foods became scarce.

But today there is a great and imminent danger that conditions beyond the control or appeal of the miller will strangle the liberal production of flour and rob this country of its greatest material asset just when it could do its most effective work in implementing the war and strengthening the opportunity for harmony.

We summarize these conditions not as a complaint of the miller but as an appeal to those in power who may have overlooked the necessity of keeping flour industries high on the list of priority production. There is nothing in the situation that confronts the production of flour that cannot be remedied if those in control of manpower and transportation consider it important enough to solve.

THE PROBLEM OF TRANSPORTATION

Steady and maddening movement of boxcars away from the wheat country to the busy industrial centers, is the cause of the immediate crisis in milling. At the moment, mills are running on what little wheat they have left and shipping their flour and feed in the boxcars they can wheedle locally from friendly agents. But no wheat of consequence is coming in as the flour goes out. Many mills are down to a few weeks' production. Their wheat stocks are getting out of balance to the extent that few are able to supply their trade with the exact type of flour contracted. Weeks are being shortened to extend the run and retain labor. Even if boxcars were rushed to the wheat country today, they would not arirve in time to keep many mills from sharply reducing their production.

Emergency action to send boxcars into the wheat country is needed to get wheat to the mills and flour to mills' customers. This transportation is needed also to make way for a new wheat crop less than 4 months away. It is needed at the moment, as well, to carry millions of bushels of wheat to seaports to satisfy the special and undoubtedly vital demand of the military forces.

Half measures tried in the last few weeks to bring empties into this critical area have failed because of high priority demand all along the route. Each war industry has its own high place to fill in the demands of the war, and War Production Board officials who have gone all out to satisfy every Army requisition have perhaps failed to balance this demand with a common-sense knowledge of the need for equitable division of transportation among the vital industries.

THE PROBLEM OF MANPOWER

If transportation were to be provided tomorrow to the many mills that already are on short wheat rations, most of them would be able to step their production up only fractionally before labor shortage would level them off again. In fact, the shortage of labor is becoming so acute in some mills that customers who are normally served out of the warehouse must wait until loading help can be obtained, while the "big bag," easy-to-load flour goes out first.

In this regard, flour millers have faced a lack of sympathetic interest in the United States Employment Service and War Manpower Commission, which have such important and dramatic jobs to do in filling the needs of new war industries that they forget the status of the flour mills. So few men are needed to produce this basic food that the milling industry could well be taken care of among the top priority manufacturers without causing a drain on any of the users of great numbers of workers. The W. M. C. could afford to march along in this food production crisis to the extent of emphasizing to its local employment offices the simple fact that producing needed flour is just as important as making bullets.

THE PROBLEM OF THE SUBSIDY

If these functional problems of producing flour are solved, millers still cannot offer flour freely until they get a clearance on the subsidy question. It is likely that a decision on the extension of the subsidy will be delayed, and for the same reasons that these other problems have not already been attacked and solved. Few realize the importance of the manufacture of flour until it no longer is obtainable.

It is obvious that the subsidy extension will be made or that the price of flour and bread will be permitted to rise to equal the market price of wheat. But until that time millers are as effectively tied in their ability to sell flour as they are by the shortage of wheat, cars, and men. This purely synthetic road block cannot be permitted to stay in the way of flour sales too long. It should be apparent to Congress and certainly to administrators who now have savvy of flour milling that the subsidy question cannot be decided late in June without causing a great upheaval in the production of flour.

THE PROBLEM OF RUNNING A BUSINESS

Should the administration give the "all clear" to flour milling by achieving an immediate and satisfactory solution to these prob-

lems, millers still would have their heads and hands full of a multitude of troubles, many that may become serious.

Difficulty in obtaining sacks for flour daily becomes greater. Bag companies are selling and rationing with good judgment, and at the moment stand with flour millers among the industries that have done an unusually good job in the face of heart-breaking handicaps. But the makers of bags must also have additional recognition from authorities to continue this record. They, too, should get a higher manpower priority with local U. S. E. S. offices in many cases where their importance does not appear as great or dramatic as that of the munitions plant down the street. It is obvious that flour cannot be shipped without bags. Lack of them would be as serious a bottleneck as the shortage of transportation.

A miller, to explain briefly his problems in matters not of general interest, can show where hedging his flour sales now is impossible. He can point to the great hazard that confronts him where he has sold flour 3 months ahead and has wheat only for 1. Yes; he has wheat bought, but it may not arrive in time to grind before June 30. He may have futures bought, but the insecurity of that mechanism already has been demonstrated. Actual wheat is needed to cover a flour sale. The uncertainty of getting the wheat, no matter in what form it is now purchased, presents a business and financial hazard that has never before faced the milling industry.

A PROBLEM FOR THE FLOUR BUYER

To the multitude of flour buyers who have rarely experienced a time when money would not buy for them the kind of flour they wanted, we express these dangers not to encourage wild and unreasoned flour buying at a time when millers are in no position to take care of it, but rather to ask their indulgence while the Government takes cognizance of this situation and together with the milling industry works out of an extremely difficult situation.

Those who understand the science of milling know that careful blends of wheat are necessary to make the kind of flour bakers and family flour merchants require. In the press of milling flour literally from the bottom of the bin, no longer can these exact blends be achieved. Flour in these times simply must be made in many cases out of the wheat that is there to mill, if, indeed, any is there at all.

Tolerance in asking for shipment, tolerance in using flour that heretofore has been unquestioned but now may wander from the established quality line, and patient cooperation are necessary if we are to succeed in working out of this bread crisis. Not even rushing of transportation to the milling industry will avoid further shipment and quality trouble. No flat and uncompromising demands from the flour buyer will help. His greatest assistance will be in adding his request to that of the milling industry to give the production and movement of flour an ace-high priority.

Now while the white heat of clinching a victory is getting most of our attention, and while the immediate high priority work of helping distressed countries leaps up to even greater importance than in the past, it is possible that many emergency demands will cut across other important functions and in doing so jeopardize the over-all program. It is our function not to argue exclusively for flour and bread, but to add our insistent counsel to the voices of others in achieving balance at a moment when serious neglect would have tragic consequences.

To those who may have access to the ear of government, we suggest these punch arguments:

Flour is converted from wheat into food more quickly and efficiently than any other product. From a practical standpoint, it uses men and equipment more efficiently than any other food processing operation.

Flour is by long odds the most welcome of foods both to fighting men and to the hungry populations we are attempting to feed.

Although it is necessary to bring wheat to the idle mills of Europe, the lag in restoring the operations of these mills is necessarily so great that wheat should not realistically gain a priority over flour simply to hurry those industries back into operation.

Lack of flour would cause a more serious food disturbance in this country than we have had heretofore.

It would also rob our occupation forces of a weapon of great value.

It would suddenly bring the American public face to face with an unexpected shortage that inevitably would result in a wholly needless rationing of flour, and at a time when wheat supplies never have been more plentiful.

The crisis is upon us. It must be met at once.

THE NORTHWESTERN MILLER.

Address by Secretary Morgenthau at Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Secretary Morgenthau before the Foreign Policy Association and the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association, Minneapolis, Minn., on March 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

These last few weeks have been filled with tremendous events. Besides the stirring news from the fighting fronts, we are beginning to see the outlines of the post-war world. A program for peace is taking shape before our eyes.

Following the general acceptance of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals we have had the great news of the Yalta meeting and the increased Western Hemisphere unity portrayed at Mexico City. Now we look forward to the meeting which we hope may prove most fruitful, the conference of the United Nations in San Francisco next month.

I have come here to talk about an essential segment of the peace program, prepared at another conference of the United Nations held at Bretton Woods, N. H., last summer. There, representatives of 44 nations drew up agreements to establish an international monetary fund and an international bank for reconstruction and development.

I have been in close touch with every stage of the progress of these agreements, through 2 years of preliminary work, through the conference itself and through the discussions since then. I can assure you that they are definitely good business for the United States.

They are more than that.

Unless they are put into effect the strides toward peace and security at Dumbarton Oaks, at Mexico City, and at Yalta, as well as the further steps that will be taken at San Francisco, may end only in frustration. Peace to be secure must rest on the firm foundation of thriving industry within nations and profitable and expanding commerce between them.

The Bretton Woods agreements deal with two great problems. One is the problem of providing capital to repair the devastation of war and for development purposes. The other is the problem of establishing a system of fair monetary practices that will promote trade instead of hindering it. The solution proposed is the creation of two institutions, the fund and the bank. Early in our discussions, we considered joining the functions of the bank and the fund in one establishment. We found good reasons for not doing that. I think you may want to know what these reasons were, now that the question has again been raised.

The two deal with entirely different problems. They will need staffs with entirely different training.

The bank will be concerned exclusively with long-term investments for productive purposes—loans for 20 to 30 years, or even longer. Its staff will have to study the long-term debt positions of various countries, their places in world trade, the worth of the project for which the loan is intended. The bank will have only investment problems. The fund is not an investment institution at all. It will be concerned exclusively with fluctuations in the exchange markets, with seasonal and other factors affecting the exchanges.

Whether to join the fund and the bank in one institution is not a question of form. It goes to the very heart of the stabilization problem. Those who argue for one institution think of currency stabilization as a matter of making loans. That is not our conception of the problem at all. We think the issue goes much deeper. We believe the essential aspect of the fund to be the setting of standards for fair dealing in our money rates. Giving help to some countries to maintain the standards once they are set is incidental to the attainment of this main objective. Long-term stabilization loans to a few countries would be a poor substitute for broad and constant cooperation in meeting international currency problems. That can be secured only through a fund which is concerned exclusively with bringing all countries together to work for currency stability.

The fundamental reason for monetary disorder after the last war was failure to understand the necessity for international cooperation in dealing with this problem. Each country was left to its own devices. Before 1922, only eight countries were on the gold standard. By 1928, through real sacrifices, about 45 had made a precarious return to gold—some with the help of stabilization loans. But the first serious pressure was too much for them. The wolf pack of exchange speculators was on the prowl, seeking our weak currencies to destroy, and adding immeasurably to the difficulties of the countries which sought individually to maintain currency stability. One by one countries were forced off the gold standard until by 1936 only seven were left. The world was back where it had started 14 years before.

But that doesn't tell the whole story. This was an era of economic warfare. The weapons were currency manipulation and other forms of discrimination. The aim of each country was to save itself at the expense of others. The bilateral clearing agreement was the most destructive of these weapons because it was in fact part of Germany's preparation for war.

This is how it worked: In 1932, when everyone found markets very scarce, Germany agreed, for example, with some Balkan countries, to buy most of their wheat and raw materials at good prices in marks. But the Balkan merchant did not get marks. These were paid into the reichsbank. The Balkan countries then had to buy goods in Germany to get the value of those marks. The

Balkan importer paid into his central bank the price of the German goods, and only then could the seller of the wheat or other raw material get his money.

As a matter of policy, Germany bought much and sold little. She was generally a year behind in meeting clearing obligations, and then frequently forced the Balkans to take articles they didn't need or want simply so they could pay their own exporters. Too often they got harmonicas and aspirin when they needed locomotives and dynamos.

Through these agreements Germany tied the economy of neighboring countries to the German war machine, so that when she began her war she would have access to raw materials. In self-defense other nations were forced to adopt similar measures.

A tangle of discrimination and preference spread over Europe, and even to the Western Hemisphere, to the great cost of American exporters and the peace of the world. By 1938 Germany alone had 36 bilateral clearing agreements, Italy and Greece 28 each, Turkey 23, and so on. The only country in Europe that had none was Albania.

The fund, through international cooperation, will deal with the situation that led to this confusion. Each member country will define its currency in terms of gold and undertake to keep it stable. A country which runs into trouble will not have to act alone. It will not need to use devices that spread depression. It will be able to consult with others through the fund and get help to maintain stability.

To sum up in simple terms: The fund is a means of getting countries to work with each other and not against each other on currency problems. The fund sets standards for exchange practice and rules for fair dealing. You can see that essentially this is not the business of a lending agency.

Now I want to talk to you about the bank.

There is the same contrast between foreign loan operations under the bank and those under the system in use before the war. In the past when countries needed foreign capital they too often had to give away some of their independence to get it. And they usually paid high interest rates in the bargain.

For instance, a great many of you will remember Kreuger and Toll. Frequently when a European country was seeking foreign loans, Kreuger would turn up in the finance minister's office. He was glad to oblige with quite a large loan. All he asked was the country's match monopoly, and of course profitable rates, too. Kreuger then sold not only the bonds he took for the loan, but in some instances forged duplicate sets of them as well. Some of you in this audience may still hold Kreuger and Toll securities. You know what they are worth.

Kreuger was not the only operator in those days. Undeveloped countries seeking foreign loans frequently secured from other sources loans that cost them too much and were often tainted with fraud. Many of them were squandered on projects which could never pay off. There was little or no supervision to make sure the money was spent for productive purposes. In too many cases there was little prospect that the investor would get his money back.

That was the system under which Americans used to lend money abroad. By 1939, not counting the World War No. 1 loans, more than 40 cents of every dollar they had lent to foreign countries since 1919 had gone into default.

The International Bank will make it possible for countries to obtain capital for worthwhile, productive projects. The bank will guarantee loans for such purposes so that they will be attractive to the private investor on reasonable terms. And there will be no need for a country to give the lender a match monopoly or a salt monopoly, or to pledge its sovereignty in the form of an assignment of custom revenues. There will be no need for these methods because the bank will undertake loans only where the project is productive, only where the charges are fair, and only where the borrower can service the loan.

There is urgent need for such productive investment. We cannot have a prompt restoration of the producing and consuming power of the world while Europe lies in ruins and great areas of the earth remain undeveloped.

To sum up in simple terms: The bank is a cooperative method of providing capital for productive purposes to countries that need capital for reconstruction and development. Its purpose is to safeguard the interests of the borrower and the investor. That's what the bank is and what the bank does. And you can see that the bank's business is lending, not monetary stabilization.

The Bretton Woods program offers currency stability to facilitate trade, and credit protection for sound international loans. Both will benefit the American people through an increased and more stable market for their products.

The experience of our generation has proved to us that a well-balanced prosperity for our country depends on a vigorous foreign trade. Ten percent of our jobs in agriculture and industry depend directly upon international commerce. That was true in the high employment years of 1929 and 1937, but the sharp decline in foreign trade in 1932 had much to do with the severity of the depression. Now let's see what discriminatory exchange regulations and fluctuating currency meant to the Twin Cities and the Northwest. Countries abroad found it impossible to buy your wheat and flour, and the same was true of exports of hardware and of machinery.

No major commodity lost so large a part of its foreign market as wheat. In the years 1925–1928 the United States exported $239,000,000 worth a year, which was 21 percent of production. In 1931–34, the era of exchange discrimination, this had fallen to $38,000,000, which was only 8 percent of our production.

As a result, wheat growers were forced to dump their crops at any price. The farmer in the Red River Valley was being squeezed, as truly as if he had caught his hand in a threshing machine, by the exchange rates of the rupee and the yuan and the peso. The instability of foreign currencies was one of the chief reasons why No. 1 Dark Northern, which sold for $1.64 a bushel in Minneapolis in May 1928, brought 49 cents in December 1932. It helps explain why flour sold here for $8.68 a barrel in May 1928, and $4.02 in November 1932.

Of course, the Bretton Woods agreements by themselves are not going to restore our foreign markets for wheat or anything else. But they are a necessary first step toward getting and keeping those markets for thousands of American products. New exchange restrictions anywhere in the world can close them.

We have all seen it happen. Our exports of commodities and of manufactured goods reached a high point between the two wars, but in the thirties our farmers and our manufacturers alike fought a losing and hopeless battle to restore their export sales in the face of depreciated currencies, quotas, and other barriers set up against us. The men thrown out of jobs because of this lost trade became very poor customers for all the products of American industry and agriculture. All these restrictions had much to do with intensifying and prolonging the great depression.

To prevent this chain of disasters being repeated after this war is it not perfectly plain that the first thing we need is a sincere desire on the part of all governments to work together to prevent them? The Bretton Woods agreements are the expression of a unanimous will on the part of the 44 United Nations to work together to that end.

I wish it were possible to describe the manner in which that will was expressed at Bretton Woods by representatives of 44 nations covering the whole range of the world in size, stage of industrialism, customs, and economic conditions. They succeeded in shaping a thoroughly workmanlike program because they knew that we must either create an orderly system now or sink back later into the chaos of individual expedients and devil take the hindmost. They were animated by the new international spirit.

Let me give you perhaps the most dramatic example that occurred. In the list of subscriptions to the bank Russia had been put down for $900,000,000. This is a tremendous sum for a country whose richest area—bigger than any other country in Europe—has been ravaged with the utmost brutality by the Nazis. On the last day of the conference, after the subscriptions were closed and all countries had agreed on the allocation of subscriptions, Russia announced that she would increase her subscription to $1,200,000,000; Russia assumed that additional $300,000,000 obligation, not because there could be any direct advantage to the Soviet Union but in order to create a stronger bank with a larger capital—able to contribute that such more to the rebuilding of the world. This is a symbol of her determination to cooperate wholeheartedly with us and the other United Nations in the task of reconstruction and development.

The Bretton Woods agreements were conceived in the very practical spirit of cooperation. They represent the first such set of resolutions presented to our people for achievement of the ideals for which we are fighting. They can be an inspiration to all the other meetings of the United Nations and an example of how the most difficult problems can be overcome through mutual good will.

The legislation to carry out the Bretton Woods program is now before Congress. Its approval will show that the United States is thoroughly in earnest about joining with other nations to achieve international security.

At Bretton Woods we proved that delegates from the governments of most of the world could meet together and consider ways of helping each other. This is the international spirit of the United Nations, the ideal for which Americans are dying today. It is our task at home to live for that ideal.

It is because I feel deeply that the Bretton Woods agreements are so much a part of this new spirit, are so essential to its development, that I have been urging their acceptance. We are called upon in these times to express and to act upon our faith in mankind. At Bretton Woods we set our hands to a very real expression of our faith in the capacity of men to work together as partners in peace.

I believe the American people are determined for their part to do just that. Our generation has been given a new vision of the world. It is as though we were seeing the earth whole for the first time. Perhaps you remember how it was when you made your first long airplane trip. Soaring over our country, you got a new perspective of it, a new glimpse of its magnificence and the interdependence of its people. And it might have been that as the plane flew in from the West you were in darkness, but ahead you could see the dawn.

We of the United Nations know that, although the night is still all around us, we will come out into the light of a new day with its new opportunities for creating a better and safer world.

Congressional Control of the Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, all Members concerned with the strengthening of Congress will find the article by Leonard D. White, president of the American Political Science Associations of interest. I especially recommend it for the consideration of the earnest and useful group composing the LaFollette committee. The article was prepared for delivery at the presidential address at the fortieth annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. The meeting, on account of travel and hotel congestion, was canceled. The article is as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE

Since the English Revolution of 1688, it has been a part of the Anglo-American tradition that elected representative assemblies control the policies and acts of the executive branch of the government. This doctrine was firmly embedded in the American State and Federal constitutions. With some wartime reservations, it has been universally accepted throughout our country. At the present time, however, there is an uneasy feeling that practice does not square with theory. There is even a suspicion that practice contradicts theory—that a vast body of officials has in fact escaped the possibility of control by the people's representatives.

The trends of the last half-century have certainly complicated the problem of congressional authority over administration. This has occurred in part because administration has made impressive gains in effective organization and operation, while relatively Congress has stood still. Within the administrative system there has developed a capacity for self-direction which might well challenge the dominance of Congress, if Congress continues to be the laggard partner in the governmental team.

The fact that Congress has declined in public esteem and in comparison with the executive branch is so apparent that Congress itself is preparing to take reformatory steps. I do not propose to discuss the difficult problem of congressional organization. I merely argue that reform is essential if Congress intends to control administration. I must, however, make some assumptions about the future organization of Congress, since if it remains unreformed I despair of effective and intelligent control over the public service. For the purpose of this discussion, I therefore assume (1) that the majority party in each House will assert more effective power to control its own members and the business of Congress; (2) that congressional committees will be reduced in number and made responsible to each House; and (3) that the seniority rule will be abolished. These are minimum requirements, however difficult of realization.

Some contend that no improvements in Congress are likely to be enough; that the range and complexity of public administration are such that its control by a representative assembly has become impossible. The author of The Managerial Revolution argued that officials have already usurped the very essence of congressional power by determining public policy. Officials are certainly active participants. Some believe that Congress has lost the capacity to arrive at a formulation of policy except under compulsion from outside, especially the compulsion of the executive branch. There is much in the record to support this view. Some claim that the "bureaucracy" has acquired a capacity for resistance which puts it beyond the reach of amateurs. There is evidence to sustain this contention. We can all agree that the mere existence of a Federal civilian Army probably destined to remain at not less than a million and a half, armed with wide discretionary powers and possessing both intelligence and a sense of direction, presents a problem of control. If we intend to remain citizens of a republic and masters of our future, we may well take note.

I assert, nevertheless, that congressional control of the administrative system is not only democratically essential but also technically feasible. It is not feasible, however, on the pattern of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, projected into the twentieth. The forms of control which Congress now understands and tries to use are not especially good for control and are sometimes bad for administration. They need to be thoughtfully reconsidered.

The indictment against the existing system of congressional control is impressive. It is basically control over details, not over essentials. It is negative and repressive rather than positive and constructive. It reflects fear rather than confidence. It is sometimes irresponsible. It is based on no rational plan, but is an accumulation of particulars whose consequences are seldom seen in perspective. Congress has done both too much and too little in trying to discharge this phase of its responsibilities. It needs a Committee on Congressional Management to do for it what the President's Committee on Administrative Management did for him.

Without presenting the specifications of the indictment, a few particulars may be suggested by way of illustration. The Statutes at Large and the annual appropriation acts are cluttered with a mass of detailed prohibitions and limitations upon administrative action. They represent in part a process of legislation by exasperation. Unfortunately, these often petty restrictions tend to continue and to accumulate. They hamper good administration and miss the mark as a means of control.

The mass of legislation governing the housekeeping activities of Government departments became so great by 1930 that escape was necessary for the pioneering ventures of the New Deal. Congress deliberately released the Tennessee Valley Authority and some other Government corporations from part of the restrictions placed upon older established agencies. The General Accounting Office and Congress itself have both looked upon this freedom with a jaundiced eye, and it tends gradually to disappear. One may take the view that a degree of freedom was good for the T. V. A. and would also be good in due measure for the whole Federal system. Congress has apparently taken the view that freedom is progressively less good for the T. V. A. and is dangerous in principle.

Obviously, Congress is in error when it asserts control by making particular administrative decisions. This temptation, however continues to be strong. For example, Congress requires senatorial confirmation of appointments of certain middle management officials. This is an invasion of an area definitely administrative, not policy making. It is motivated either by a taste for patronage or by the natural desire of Congressmen to protect themselves against the political consequences of administrative bungling in their States or districts. The attempt of Congress to force the removal of three named persons—Messrs. Lovett, Dodd, and Watson—is an example of congressional interference at its lowest level. In still another direction Congress recently invaded the proper field of administrative decision by reserving the right to decide from time to time how much oil could be produced from certain naval reserves. The President protested this action, but was forced to yield.

These criticisms of some of the forms of congressional control of the administrative system are not intended to cast any doubt on the desirability or necessity of such control. I would argue, indeed, that we need increasingly effective supervision by Congress as the powers of officials increase, their discretion expands, and their numbers multiply. My argument is that we are likely to get progressively less effective supervision unless Congress changes its tactics and strengthens its own position.

The task is to devise a system of congressional control which will be adequate to democratic purposes without at the same time impairing the capacity of public officials to operate efficiently. This balance cannot be attained by any simple formula. A solution is complicated by the fact that Congress (the controlling body) is "a numerous assembly" unaccustomed to close internal discipline, with a changing personnel periodically absent from the seat of government, whereas the public service (the agency to be controlled) constitutes a vast permanent hierarchy of trained, professional, and relatively disciplined officials.

The two essential objects which Congress must achieve are, first, to insure that its mandates on public policy prevail, and, second, to insure that the execution of public policy avoids waste, incompetence, and unnecessary public inconvenience. I propose to explore each of these essentials in turn.

II

Congress in theory has, of course, complete control of public policy, at least in the domestic field. Some Congressmen believe that they are losing control of policy, because bills originate elsewhere, because departments and agencies are developing their rule-making powers on an ever-increasing scale, because they suspect their policy is not always fully observed in the course of administration, and because they fear administrative action may foreclose a future policy decision by Congress.

Although it is important to conserve congressional control of policy, it is not necessary or desirable to require Congressmen to originate all the bills. Congress first shared this duty with officials in September 1789, when it asked Alexander Hamilton to bring in recommendations on the public revenue and discharged its own committee from further consideration of this subject. In recent years, the administrative agencies have carried an ever larger part of the task of policy initiation and first formulation, and properly so.

The need for effective coordination of administrative rules with statutes presents a more important consideration. One of the most effective means of securing an appropriate control of the rule-making power, without hampering administrative operations, is to follow the procedure applied in 1939 in connection with plans for administrative reorganization. Here the initiative lay with the President, who was authorized to prepare plans for submission to Congress. Each plan was to lay on the table for 60 days and to become effective unless, within this period, the two Houses disapproved by a concurrent resolution.

Except in emergency cases, Congress might properly require basic administrative rules

imposing obligations upon citizens to be reported to it in this manner, and to be subject to a legislative veto. This practice has long been accepted by the British House of Commons in dealing with provisional orders.

It is also important to insure that administrative action accords with congressional policy and to give Congress a more effective sense of participation in early stages of policy formation. The policy conferences which Secretary Hull held with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee suggest a useful line of experiment. A large part of the major issues of public policy could be included within a small number of such conferences: For example, foreign policy, including military and naval programs; fiscal policy; social-security policy, and veterans' benefits; business policy; and resources policy.

This proposal assumes, let me repeat, that the committee system has been reformed, that the seniority rule has been abandoned, that the majority party has accepted effective responsibility for directing the business of Congress, and that consequently confidential discussions of policy will not be reported to the press. Policy conferences would be seriously handicapped as long as the seniority rule prevails; length of service on a committee is no guarantee of party confidence or personal restraint. Such conferences would be devoted to broad policy orientation rather than to the terms of a particular bill; indeed, they should normally precede the stage of bill drafting. They would occur at frequent intervals, and would be participated in only by members of the majority party. On the administrative side, the participants would include department and agency heads and their policy advisers; members of permanent staffs would be present only to furnish data, for otherwise their status would be undetermined with a change of party.

It is unnecessary to argue that Congress can secure firmer control of policy by enacting laws which are neither vague nor ambiguous. These criteria are impossible to achieve when the mind of Congress is confused or divided. Unfortunate is the lot of the official who has then to decide his course of action; he must make his own contribution to policy,with the high probability that he will offend one section of congressional opinion. To Congressmen may be commended the moral virtue of charity as they review the decisions of their agents.

Apart from the gains arising from greater precision in drafting legislation, I would therefore argue that Congress may be better assured of genuine control of policy by adopting the provisional-order technique as a means of reviewing administrative rules, and by cultivating policy conferences with top executive officials in the most important and most controversial areas of public action.

The House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies recently recommended another type of policy control, a permanent joint standing committee to ascertain whether the laws are executed according to the intent of Congress. I doubt whether any single committee can advise the departments and agencies of the intent of Congress throughout the length and breadth of public policy as stated in Federal legislation. There are other and better ways of determining the intent of Congress; and it is not necessary to set up a standing committee to prevent deliberate neglect or defiance of the will of Congress by any administrative agency.

III

The second major objective of congressional control is to insure that public policy is executed efficiently without waste, and without undue public inconvenience. Congress has a duty to watch the course of administration, consult with officials, criticize administrative policies and performance, and conduct formal investigations. But it can make its contribution to efficiency only by a substantial degree of abnegation—by giving up the practice of criticizing details in favor of a genuine over-all supervision achieved through a few really effective administrative controls within the executive branch.

If Congress must, in its own interest, forego control of details, what form of action can it undertake to compel high standards of performance? The answer is, it must concern itself with the improvement of the administrative system, and with creating the conditions of employment which attract a superior type of public official. Congress needs to face the task of creating a system which tends to produce competence rather than incompetence, responsibility rather than irresponsibility. If incompetence does occur, the essential question for Congress to ask is: What is wrong with the system of administration or the quality of management which permitted it to develop? The essential remedy for Congress to apply is not to discipline individuals or agencies (although discipline may sometimes be necessary), but to insist upon the improvement of the system and the quality of management. Only by bringing the administrative system to a high point of perfection can official stagnation or incompetence be reduced to the minimum which an imperfect world must tolerate.

The historic instrument of congressional criticism and investigation is the standing or special committee. The Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, the Civil Service Committee of the House, and the Truman committee illustrate what can be achieved under favorable circumstances and with stable leadership. These forms of legislative control are pervasive and important. An intelligent public official proceeds on the assumption that he may have to explain his every act before a congressional committee. While this is a salutary climate for official life, it can quickly induce an insidious form of sleeping sickness unless Congress exercises its power with restraint, and constructively. A hostile remark by a Congressman in a committee hearing, or even worse on the floor of the House, induces tremors throughout the official world. But congressional wrath is not necessarily control, and official trepidation not necessarily conformity. The problem remains of translating undoubted congressional influence on administrative performance into intelligent ultimate control of standards of administrative excellence.

It has been proposed to increase the influence of the present committees by attaching to each of them a small staff of experts, who could balance the influence of the experts who speak for the departments and agencies. The proposal to equip committees with technical staffs raises some serious questions. It would probably increase the potential rivalry between the subject-matter committees and the Appropriations Committees. It would also lessen the probability—remote enough at best—of substituting joint committees for separate, independent, and sometimes hostile committees of the two Houses. It would set the stage for conflict between two sets of "experts," or potentially three—one in the House, one in the Senate, and one in the department. It would incur the danger of administrative management by a committee chairman and his experts. Much worse, it would fasten the present committee structure upon Congress; for the existing vested interests of chairmen would be buttressed by those of technical staffs. I do not, therefore, favor staffs for congressional committees until the committee system itself has been reformed. A rational committee system, however, would strengthen the case for small committee staffs. I do not need to add that a system which allotted one committee to each department, agency, authority, office, corporation, and commission would not be rational; it would be positively dangerous.

Parenthetically, one improvement is greatly needed in committee contacts—an improvement too subtle to be subject to legislation or standing orders. I refer to the need for protecting officials and citizens against the unintelligent and intemperate attacks to which they are sometimes subjected by committee members. Two instances will illustrate my point: The attacks upon officials of the Tennessee Valley Authority at hearings in the Senate, and the recent investigation of the Federal Communications Commission in the House. Congress can ill afford to allow such displays of arrogance or such punitive expeditions. They impair respect for Congress and for Congressmen, and raise questions about congressional powers which ought not to be open to discussion.

IV

The apparent dilemma presented by the need for legislative control of a powerful public service and the need for relative freedom of official action to secure sound management is in truth a perplexing one. As a student of public administration, I probably am more sensitive to the need for a free hand for officials, at least in the service functions of government. But Congress must have ultimate control of policy and its execution. I urge that it settle on principle and avoid detail. To control policy as it is defined in administrative rules, the provisional-order technique deserves attention. To participate in policy in its formative stages, the device of congresisonal-executive policy conferences might be useful. To insure high standards of administrative performance, Congress can make its greatest contribution by building up the administrative system and by depending largely on its internal controls. A reformed committee system would continue the function of consultation, criticism, and occasional investigation; but as committees become more powerful, they need to be on guard lest they take over in fact some of the responsibilities of administration. The greatest single asset of Congress to guarantee sound administration might be a transformed General Accounting Office, restricted to an audit but strengthened to become an office of administrative intelligence acting on behalf of the two Houses. These innovations would, in my judgment, help achieve a satisfactory balance; they would go far to strengthen Congress without impairing the necessary authority of the executive branch of the Government.

In closing this paper I reemphasize familiar ground—the great objectives to be secured by congressional control of administration. They are close to the heart of democratic institutions, since an uncontrolled body of permanent officials and employees would almost certainly degenerate into a bureaucracy, with all the unpleasant connotations of that word. It is the duty of Congress to be ever on guard against official sloth, stupidity, arrogance, or corruption. Apart from the courts, the elected representative is the principal protection of the humble citizen against abuse of the great powers which officials possess. We must always remember, however, that power may be beneficent; and in a democracy it is presumed to be directed toward beneficent ends. Congress faces, therefore, a delicate problem of balance—it must control with enough certainty of touch to guarantee a responsible and responsive public service; but it must refrain from impairing the capacity of the public service to achieve the great social purposes to which it is dedicated.

Address by Hon. John L. McClellan to the General Assembly of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and informative address delivered by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] to a joint session of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas on February 26 of this year.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Laney, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the general assembly, and friends, 2 years ago yesterday, in response to an invitation extended by concurrent resolution, I had by first experience and very great pleasure of addressing a joint assembly of the Arkansas Legislature. I cherish the memory of that delightful occasion, for I can never forget the many fine manifestations of friendship, expressions of confidence, and words of encouragement so generously accorded to me by those of you and others who were then serving as members of these two legislative bodies. So, I am most happy indeed to have the privilege again and to tell you that I am deeply grateful for the honor you have conferred by your invitation and by your presence here this afternoon.

I can think of no group or audience among my people whom I might address that could possibly have keener appreciation and a more sympathetic understanding of the services I try to perform as a United States Senator than do you. As members of the State legislature your duties and responsibilities are substantially and correspondingly the same to our State that mine are to the Nation. Although we labor in legislative fields of separate and distinct jurisdictions, you and I have much in common in the nature of the duties and the services we perform to our State and to the Nation respectively.

In view of the established separate jurisdictions of State and Federal Governments to which I have referred, and which we all recognize, I think it would be unpardonably presumptuous of me if I should attempt to make use of this occasion to inject my own opinions into your deliberations or try to influence unduly your decisions respecting matters and issues which you have under consideration and which involve exclusively laws and functions of State government. I certainly would not purposely or knowingly encroach upon any prerogative that is yours nor in any way usurp authority or power that is by law vested in the governor as the chief executive of our State. I deem it far more appropriate that I should undertake to confine my remarks to subjects and issues more directly related to policies and problems of the National Government and with respect to which all our citizens have a common and profound interest.

It is impossible to talk to you about affairs of state without referring to world affairs and the awful war in which we are engaged and which is of paramount concern to all of us.

Never in all time have two words been more significantly poignant in all languages and on every tongue as are now the words, "war" and "peace." These words in stark reality have taken on import and meaning broader in scope and more fateful in consequence than our intellectual and spiritual cognizance has ever reckoned with in the past. The ultimate destiny of what we proudly acclaim as modern civilization is embraced in and will be determined as a result of our labors and living as human beings in one state and condition or the other, either in war or in peace.

For the past 4½ years the bloodiest, deadliest, most brutal and destructive war has raged upon the earth with ever-increasing ferociousness and intensity—a war not of our making and not of our choosing but from which we could not escape and in which we inevitably became involved. Like other peaceful peoples and nations, we were, without offense or provocation, treacherously attacked by the damnable and savage forces of tyranny and would-be world conquerors. We had no alternative. It was either surrender and die or fight and win if we were to survive. We chose to fight, we are going to win, we shall survive. And here and now let me state with all emphasis and without reservation or equivocation, we owe and shall owe our continued existence as a nation of free peoples to the men and women in our armed services on land, on sea, and in the air who have actually marched into the jaws of death and spilled their blood and risked and given their lives to save America and the world from the awful, unthinkable fate that would have been imposed on us by a victorious Germany and Japan. I do not mean to minimize or disregard the sacrifices and miraculous achievements of our people on the home front. We can take justifiable pride in the accomplishments of our people—in the magnificent contribution made by all classes and groups of labor, of agriculture, of business, of industry, and of all other segments of our people. We have startled the world and surprised ourselves in the results achieved. But, notwithstanding all that we have done on the home front, I am sure that we all feel that to the personnel of our fighting forces, both to the dead and the living, belongs all credit, all glory, and all honor for winning this war.

The time for decision on the issue of "war" and "peace" with its influences on and consequences to the future hopes and aspirations of mankind has arrived. We cannot evade or postpone it until a more propitious time or favorable season. If the people and governments of the world elect to continue the barbaric practice of settling international disputes by war, and further pursue the dangerous and destructive philosophy that "might makes right," we shall certainly doom the whole world to chaos and civilization to rapid and irrevocable extinction. We shall simply again, figuratively speaking, crucify the Christ and Saviour of mankind on a cross of brutal heathenism and rejection.

On the other hand, if the nations and governments of the world will universally adopt and pursue the philosophy that "right makes might," and rigidly adhere to it, and practice it by collaboration and cooperation, we can for many centuries to come remove and eliminate, on a broad scale at least, the scourge of war from the face of the earth. The choice is ours, and by use of the word or term "ours," I mean and include all of the civilized peoples of the world. The choice is "ours"—yours and mine—your country's and mine. Not that we have all the responsibility or all power in compelling the right choice or to determine the fate of the whole world. We do not have—but I do say without fear of successful challenge from any source, that the major and primary responsibility is ours. I make the assertion that the responsibility rests primarily upon us simply because we, of all peoples, have been more richly blessed and are now endowed with more material and, I hope, more spiritual power than any other country. We must recognize that if we are to continue to be the beneficiaries of the advantages and progress that have been so bountifully dispensed unto us as a Nation, then we must accept and meet intelligently and courageously the challenge of world leadership in the establishing of justice among nations and enduring peace on the earth.

It will be said that wars cannot be prevented. We hear talk now that in some quarters of the world plans are already being made for World War No. 3. But I am persuaded that by the time this war ends, and certainly if we go on through with it to decisive victory and "unconditional surrender" with the complete destruction, insofar as it is humanly possible, of those forces that have instigated wars of aggression, all people including those of aggressor nations, will hunger for peace as never before, and if the United Nations in the wake of victory will provide the instrumentality of an international organization to preserve peace, it can be done—we can succeed and then, and only then, can we truly say in the fullest sense that our brave boys have not died in vain.

There will be some few among us who will say that all of our efforts in that direction will be wasted and futile. I am hoping they are wrong. It should by now be recognized by everyone that unless the civilized nations do resort to other and different means than those employed in the past, there will be another war. We have to try something else—something different. I am fully convinced that if the three big powers—Russia, Britain, and the United States—will work together after victory in the same spirit of unity and cooperation that has dominated their actions in fighting the war against the common enemy, world peace can be maintained, and if necessary enforced for the next century, at least, and possibly indefinitely. With Russia, Great Britain, and the United States working and cooperating together and keeping would-be aggressor nations disarmed, there will not be another war of any magnitude. No power or combination of powers could possibly rise against these three great countries. They now have and will continue to have the combined power to insure the peace of the world. If they do not work together and do not use their joint powers to build a lasting and permanent peace, then a third world war will be inevitable.

We have made a start. We have begun laying the foundation for the structure of peace. I think we may say that the first contribution in that direction was the Atlantic Charter, the principles enunciated by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill during their conference at sea in August 1941. The next step was the passing by the House and Senate resolutions favoring the establishment of an international organization for the preservation of the peace of the world. Further progress has been made in the Conference of the Big Three at Tehran, the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and the recent Conference at Yalta. All of these have been steadily building toward an international security program. We have, soon to come, and we can certainly look forward to it, I think, with great hope the Conference to be held in San Francisco next April, at which time representatives of the governments of all the United Nations will participate and will attempt to write a charter and put into concrete form the fundamental or basic agreement for this international peace-preserving and security organization.

We do not expect the work at that Conference to be perfect. Doubtless, no country

or government will find, when it is finally drafted, that it meets their every expectation. No doubt, it will have flaws; it will have some provisions with which we may disagree, but I am sure we all hope that there shall not be cause for such disagreement that would compel the rejection of the plan by either of the three big powers. If we can produce at the San Francisco Conference in April a basic charter of agreement to which all peace-loving peoples and governments of the earth can repair with confidence, then all humanity can take on new hope and renewed faith and move forward in progress, in peace, and security; yes, move onward and upward in paths of constructive pursuits rather than go backward and downward in the destructive and horrible enterprise of war.

This job of constructing permanent peace may be regarded as transcending all other objectives of all nations and all peoples. That which is next in importance for us is the preservation in America of our own freedom, of our democracy, and our way of life, and the system of government that has been tried and tested and which made it possible for us to develop into the strongest Nation in the world. After winning this war and after starting on the right road to lasting peace, it is possible that we could so far forget what made our country great, and by carelessness and indifference fail to protect and preserve the fundamentals of our own system of government as to endanger and maybe lose much of what we have in the past regarded as our precious and priceless heritage.

There are some who want to make over our Government. They would disregard the fundamental laws of the land, our Constitution, and contend that this great document has long since served its usefulness. They would so radically and basically change our system that we would be governed more and more by men rather than by laws. There is much evidence of a strong trend in that direction. No doubt, the Congress is partly to blame for this, but it must be remembered that in general the Congress reflects the will of the people.

As an illustration of this trend of which I speak, through February 6 of this year the 27 war-related agencies of the Government had issued 32,500 directives, regulations, or orders which have the effect of law and which regulate business activities and the lives of our people.

Of this number, 14,053 were issued by O. P. A. alone. In addition to the directives, orders, and regulations issued by war-related governmental agencies, the President of the United States has issued 3,793 Executive directives having the force and effect of law. Of course, we attribute all of this to the war, and we might readily conceive that the war is wholly responsible for the use of this method and the extent of the regulations imposed by this process rather than by acts of Congress, but that is not altogether true and when this war ends, this practice must be stopped or, at least, tremendously curtailed, and the Congress must again assume its full functions and the responsibility that is reposed in it by the Constitution. For that reason, I shall want to see the Congress act promptly, just as swiftly as conditions will permit, to reclaim its powers and to cease delegating to administrative agencies many of the powers and duties that the Congress should perform itself by writing into the law, into acts of Congress, insofar as it is practicable and possible, the rules and regulations by which the lives of our people are to be governed. Bureaucratic rule must be checked. Liberties cannot be preserved if this trend continues and is permitted to flourish and operate extensively in the post-war period.

We are all concerned and anxious about full employment for our people. Much is said today about the Government providing 60,000,000 jobs to take care of our returning soldiers and our war workers and others in the post-war period. So far as I know, sixty million may be an arbitrary figure. I do not say that many jobs will not be needed, but whether it is fifty million or sixty million, what we have in mind is full employment so that everybody who is willing to work may be given the opportunity to work at fair wages and under good working conditions.

Frankly, I believe that this obligation can be met, and that we can reach the goal of full employment without destroying or materially impairing our system of free enterprise. I believe this goal can be attained without extensive Government control of business, and without continuous and indiscriminative deficit spending of taxpayers' money. We all recognize that there are just two ways that full employment can be provided. One is by the investment of private capital, by the enterprise of the individual citizen, and by the industrial and business institutions of our country both large and small.

The other alternative to insure full employment is for the Government to assume full responsibility and provide made-work jobs by pursuing a policy of continuous heavy borrowing and deficit spending. We must decide which of these two policies and programs we shall pursue in the hope of providing full employment and prosperity.

I favor the former. I believe every effort should be made to preserve our system of free enterprise. I recognize that some governmental assistance to business, and some Government spending on worth-while projets is and will be necessary. But, such Government spending and Federal assistance should be limited to the real necessities of the situation, and restricted to that character of projects and public improvements that build our country and add something of material value. I have in mind such improvements as roads, the development of our water resources, flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, soil conservation, forest preservation, and such other public improvements of a character that is primarily the Federal Government's responsibility, and which, when constructed, adds to the capital wealth of the Nation.

In other words, we should try to make any deficit spending on the part of the Federal Government in the post-war period the exception rather than the rule.

I have faith that private enterprise can still be the instrumentality through which we can provide full employment and reasonable prosperity for our people and by that process continue to raise our standard of living and build America stronger year by year.

We shall begin the post-war period with a greater reservoir of private capital available for investment than ever before in the history of our Nation. We have some $26,000,000,000 of money in circulation. There is more money in banks, in War bonds, in savings, and more money belonging to, and in the possession of, individual citizens of this country than ever before. Taxes, we know, will of necessity have to be kept high to meet the cost of Government. I do not anticipate that we shall be able to operate this Government, service the national debt, meet the additional costs of caring for veterans, and maintaining a two-ocean Navy, a large Army and Air Force for less than twenty-five or thirty billion dollars annually. This means too that we must keep the national income high. We cannot pay $30,000,000,000 in taxes to the Federal Government except that we have a high national income. That means that wage rates must be maintained somewhere near their present levels. The price of agricultural products must also be maintained. We have to face these realities and deal with them realistically.

We shall need to revise our tax laws—stabilize Federal taxes so that our industries and businesses can safely and accurately reckon with this factor in planning investments, production expansion, and business operation. By so doing we will stimulate initiative on the part of individual citizens and encourage the investment of private capital. Perpetual deficit spending on the part of government is not only wrong but, if persisted in too long, it will lead to disaster. Certainly, I know that we can provide 60,000,000 jobs or more by pursuing that policy. By borrowing and spending enough, we can insure and guarantee it for a time—just how long, I do not know; maybe for 10 years; maybe for a quarter of a century—but some day and possibly sooner than we would want to admit we will face a real crisis that could result in the loss of individual liberty and the end of free enterprise. In other words, our system of government would undergo a change from a democracy, where men are free, to an autocracy, where the individual would become substantially the property and servant of the state.

Not only will the pursuit of the policy of continuous large deficit spending endanger our liberties but it is morally wrong. We can make America synthetically prosperous by spending to insure a standard of life beyond what we of this generation can pay for out of our own labors and ingenuity. But with a $300,000,000,000 national debt at the end of this war every dollar of deficit spending thereafter to make ourselves prosperous will be charged against the next generation. I do not believe we of this generation have any moral right to spend from the earnings, the sweat, and toil of children yet unborn simply to provide ourselves with more comfort, security, and prosperity.

The outlook for business and employment in the post-war era is not so dark and dreary as some would paint it. There will still be great opportunities. Our domestic needs and the demands of our people for domestic services and goods, necessary and essential to rehabilitate us to our peacetime standard of living, will be immense, and will within itself insure opportunities of employment for millions of our people. There may be a brief period during the time of reconversion that there will be unemployment, but within a reasonable time the wheels of industry should again be rolling and producing at substantially full capacity.

We, of course, should strive every way possible to implement our own markets with trade in foreign countries. The peoples of those countries that have been overrun, pillaged, and plundered, and whose homes, shops, industries, and cities have been destroyed in this war will need to rebuild. Only our own country will have the productive power and capacity to provide most of the goods and services that they will demand and have to acquire. Above all, they are going to need tools with which to rebuild and to expand their own industries and productive facilities. They will buy from us; there is hardly any other market to which they can go. We shall need to find a way to make it possible for them to pay for what they get from us. In many instances, and with most countries and governments, I believe we, to a very large extent, can exchange our products for goods of theirs, primarily for raw materials that are not abundant in our own country. It is possible for us to make loans to many of those countries on a sound basis and on terms that they can meet. Some risks will be incurred and some losses sustained in this operation, but losses need not be great if our Government will adhere to business principles in these transactions rather than proceed on the theory and with the intent of trying to be a Santa Claus to the world.

With the heavy demands of our own people for goods and services that they need, and which our own industries can supply, coupled with what foreign countries will buy from

us, there will be the opportunity to provide full employment and reasonable prosperity in America without the necessity of our Government pursuing fiscal policies that will lead to certain financial ruin and the ultimate loss of democracy as our system of government in this country.

Is This Joint Action?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hartford Courant of March 15, 1945:

IS THIS JOINT ACTION?

The Yalta declaration on liberated Europe lifted the world up on wings of a new hope that a way out of that troubled continent's political problems might be found. It substituted for the unilateral power politics practiced by Russia in Poland and by Britain in Greece last fall agreement by the United States, Britain, and Russia to "concert during the temporary period of instability the policies of these three Governments." The Big Three together would assist the people of the liberated countries and former Axis satellites "to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems."

This agreement to concert the actions of the Big Three Nations was the keystone of the new arch of peace. On it depended the Yalta promises of enabling the liberated peoples "to create democratic institutions of their own choice," to establish "conditions of internal peace," to form interim governments "broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population" and to speed "free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people."

What is now happening in the Balkan and central European countries, alas, contradicts these bright promises. In Rumania, Russia enjoys a controlling position, with British and American representatives on the Commission of Control cast largely in the role of spectators. In Bulgaria a similar situation exists. In Greece the Moscow radio is announcing that the Plastiras government plans to annihilate all left-wing departments of the state machinery. In Yugoslavia the leftist forces under Marshal Tito, while still cooperating with the old democratic parties, hold a dominating position in the provisional government. In Czechoslovakia, now about to resume an independent life under President Eduard Benes, a Slovak Communist spokesman is talking of a virtually autonomous Slovak State. In Poland we have yet to see that reorganization "on a broader democratic basis" of the Moscow-sponsored government that was promised at Yalta.

All this points to a future situation as ugly as that which the Yalta Conference supposedly ended. Continued lone-wolf action by Russia will lead to renewed doubts and suspicions that will endanger the prospect of a European peace that is as democratic and orderly as the post-war chaos will allow, and will threaten the general security organization to be drawn up at the San Francisco Conference as well.

The Crimean Conference, said President Roosevelt in his report to Congress, spells, or at least ought to spell, "the end of the system of unilateral action and exclusive alliances and spheres of influence and balances of power and all the other expedients that have been tried for centuries, and have always failed." "If, as it seems, Russia's present and contemplated actions contradict the plain meaning of the Yalta declaration on liberated Europe, it is clearly incumbent upon Mr. Roosevelt to burn up the wires and air waves between Washington and London and Moscow before the hope of a decent peace once more vanishes.

Meat Shortage Could Have Been Avoided

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the meat situation is desperate in the country and will get worse. Were it not for the patriotic patience of the people, the complaints would be louder. Some of the large cities are protesting and the governors of some States are claiming discrimination against their people.

This is largely due to the New Deal philosophy of scarcity. The New Deal never loses an opportunity to regiment. Many things have happened to show the fallacy of this unwise doctrine.

The Republican congressional food-study committee has for months protested against this policy. It has repeatedly pointed out the reason for the shortage of beef. It is due to the failure to permit the meat producers to produce to the maximum capacity.

The feeder is a most important factor in the production of beef. He is the man who puts the last and best two or three hundred pounds on the live animal. The feeder has been practically put out of business and meat production has been reduced by millions of pounds.

The New Deal program has disorganized the whole meat-producing industry from the rancher to the butcher, who distributes the meat to the housewife.

WHERE NOBODY IS SATISFIED, THERE MUST BE SOMETHING WRONG

A few days ago representatives of the slaughterers and butchers of the Eastern States met in Washington and complained against the conduct of the O. P. A. A representative of one of the largest groups insisted that authority and responsibility should be placed in one single agency.

The Republican congressional food-study committee introduced legislation in the last session of Congress seeking to establish one central agency for the handling of food. This bill was approved by the Committee on Agriculture of the House. The bill was reintroduced.

Pork, poultry, mutton, and lamb production is being reduced rapidly. Fish is about the only meat left.

Black markets flourish everywhere. The people are told to be patient. That does not solve the serious problem.

Veteran's Social Security Payments

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, some few years ago, the Congress passed the Social Security Act compelling employers to pay into a fund for the future benefit of employees.

Since the enactment we have gone to war, with the Government now the employer of millions in the armed forces.

However, the Government, even though compelling employers to pay into this fund, does not, itself, take the place of the former employer and pay into the social-security fund, even though these men in the armed forces were obliged to lose their former employer, who paid into the social-security fund.

In order that these men now in the armed forces may be protected in their social-security payments, I have introduced the following bill:

A bill amending title II of the Social Security Act to provide for crediting service in the armed forces for old-age and survivors' insurance benefits.

Be it enacted, etc., That title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"MILITARY SERVICE

"SEC. 210. (a) Any individual who has attained the age of 65 and who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war as declared by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and was honorably discharged therefrom, shall be deemed for the purposes of this title to have been paid on and for each day in the period of his active military or naval service occurring after September 30, 1940, and prior to the one hundred and eightieth day after such termination, wages at the annual rate of $1,600, except that if such individual began such service after September 30, 1939, and was paid in the four quarters immediately preceding the quarter in which he began such service, total wages in excess of $1,600, such annual rate shall be the amount equal to such total wages: *Provided*, That the amount of wages deemed to have been paid in any calendar year under this section shall not in any case exceed such amount as would make his total wages in such year (including any wages, as defined in sec. 209, paid him in such year) more than $3,000.

"(b) As used in this section (1) the term 'military or naval service' means service in the land or naval forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard, the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Naval Reserve, the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard Reserve, and the Marine Corps Women's Reserve; and (2) the term 'quarter' shall have the meaning assigned to such term in subsection (g) of section 209.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the trust fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to meet the additional costs of payments under this title, and of administration, arising by reason of the provisions of this section."

Amendment to Servicemen's Allowance Act of 1942

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend subsection (b) of section 210 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, as follows:

In case of the desertion or imprisonment or other disciplinary proceedings of any enlisted man or woman under such circumstances that pay allowances to dependent or dependents are discontinued, the secretary of the department concerned shall be authorized and empowered, upon a sufficient showing that the discontinuance of said pay and allowances is working a hardship upon the said dependent or dependents, to reinstate such pay and allowances, in full, in the same manner as originally authorized and to the fullest extent of the entitlement except that nothing herein shall prohibit any department for disciplinary reasons, from terminating or suspending in whole or in par, direct pay to said enlisted man.

Abraham Lincoln was against the Army and Navy practice of punishing a soldier by withholding his pay or the allowances that were due his dependents. When the Army failed to act on his recommendation for relief in these matters, he settled the situation with a three-word admonition to the then Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton, as follows: "Please do it."

As bearing on this important subject, I read from a recent newspaper excerpt from the Washington Star:

Abraham Lincoln was against the Army practice of punishing a soldier by withholding his pay, and when the Army failed to act on his recommendation for relief, he settled the matter with a three-word admonition to the then Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton, March 1, 1864. Lincoln stated the case: "A poor widow, by the name of Baird, has a son in the Army, that for some offense has been sentenced to serve a long time without pay, or at most with very little pay. I do not like this punishment of withholding pay—it falls so very hard upon poor families. After he had been serving in this way for several months, at the tearful appeal of the poor mother, I made a direction that he be allowed to enlist for a new term, on the same condition as others. She now comes and says she cannot get it acted upon." Then the President concluded his letter to the Secretary of War—"Please do it."

The Crimean Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following declaration of the supreme board of the Polish Women's Alliance of America relative to the Crimean Conference:

DECLARATION OF THE SUPREME BOARD OF THE POLISH WOMEN'S ALLIANCE OF AMERICA RELATIVE TO THE CRIMEAN CONFERENCE

After a careful study of the policies agreed upon at the Conference at Yalta, we women of Polish extraction approaching this subject from an American point of view cannot understand how a country as liberty loving as the United States of America could agree to the overwhelming demands of Russia for Polish territory, and through this directly aiding and abetting her in extending her influence throughout Europe and the world.

If we study the map of Europe after taking into consideration a defeated Germany and the occupation of the Reich by the American, English, and Soviet Armies, we can see from a geographic position a Poland firmly in the clutches of Russia. This position is as dangerous as was her German neighbor and starts her off to slow extermination.

We are profoundly disturbed by this gross injustice to the people of Poland not because we share a common heritage of blood but because, like the average American woman, we demand a better solution to this problem, which we believe, as it stands now, will plunge the world into another war. We ask, Is this the reward that awaits the Polish soldier for his daring on all the fighting fronts?

Is this the reward that awaits the Polish mothers for sending their men to battle in defense of the rights of others?

We ask again, Is this the reward awaiting the Polish nation for defending her lands and other lands at all times when freedom was at stake?

The Polish people fought their German aggressor; can it be that the world now condones the invasion from the east and at the same time condemns the invader from the west?

Our position is very clear. We shall never acknowedge the aggression and the outrages committed upon the land of our forefathers, nor upon any other lands. In anticipation of any changes favorable to the Polish nation we are at the same time prepared for even a greater disenchantment, to which we shall react not with tears and supplications for mercy but shall expend our energies in building a resistance with such strength of character that even the mightiest enemy cannot tear down.

We admit today we are weak and are no match for brutal force, but we solemnly promise the American Nation though they deal us even a deadlier blow than this that we shall not waver in our obligations as pledged in the allegiance to her flag, under whose stars and stripes millions first saw the light of day, and under whose stars and stripes countless numbers of our members and their loved ones are fighting all over the globe.

We implore our women in this time of sorrow and national mourning to persevere in dignity Teach the children to love the United States of America as the land of liberty, and spread this gospel of love until it permeates the hearts of all Americans who believe in the principles of freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of speech, and freedom from superior forces in religious, political, and moral life.

Tell the children that these ideals must serve as a beacon light to this Nation or else she will become a tool for hidden crimes and a bargainer for evil.

Tell them "to err is human" and that the nation eventually will follow in the footpaths of her founders and makers of the Constitution, and that in love, great love beyond measure, there is also strength.

Teach the little ones to love truth, freedom, and beauty though there be none around them.

Teach them to sacrifice their blood and fortunes for their country. Tell them of our flag—that the lights in the stars have not gone out, that they are dimmed, and that great love and devotion will make them more brilliant again.

Teach the children thrift; tell them to save their pennies and dollars for bonds to win the war, and when they ask innocently if these bonds will purchase bullets to strike at the hearts of our loved ones across the ocean, assure them that he who breaks faith with our American ideals shall be judged by history and future generations for this treacherous act.

Preserve dignity and honor to the end and let not malice enter your hearts. The destiny of this world is in the hands of God and not in the hands of the dictators.

POLISH WOMEN'S ALLIANCE
OF AMERICA.

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 1945.*

A Just Wage Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the National Rural Letter Carrier:

A JUST WAGE INCREASE

The Federal Government's most neglected group of employees—the men and women in the Postal Service—may at last receive a long-delayed measure of justice.

During the last Congress more than a score of bills was presented to increase the salaries of these workers and to correct inequities in overtime compensation.

One of these bills was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives.

It failed of action in the Senate before the Congress expired.

Meanwhile, however, Representative THOMAS G. BURCH, of Virginia, chairman of the House Post Office Committee, was working on a comprehensive bill to effect a complete reclassification of postal employees—the first such general reorganization to be proposed in 20 years.

This bill has now been completed in conference of the Post Office Department, representatives of the employees and members of the congressional committee, and has been introduced in the House.

The Burch bill combines various benefits proposed in the 26 separate bills that were offered last year.

More important, it changes the entire wage structure that has been in effect.

The bill has three main provisions:

1. All classifications of postal workers would be upgraded. A clerk now in the $1,700–$2,100 grade would be raised to $2,700 minimum.

2. Overtime payments, which are now computed upon obsolete and inconsistent bases, resulting sometimes in an employee receiving less pay for overtime work than for normal time, would be regularized at time-and-a-half for overtime on a 40-hour-week standard.

3. "Longevity" increases—annual automatic salary raises which tend to keep workers in the service—would be granted for 11 years, instead of 5 years, as at present.

Representative BURCH'S bill will not only give postal workers better pay from the low-

est to the highest brackets—it will substitute an orderly general law for what has become a mass of piecemeal measures because of frequent amendments to the 1925 law.

Any benefit that it may confer is well deserved by the postal workers.

The Government has no employees who are more loyal in its service or of whom higher standards are required.

The manner in which they have been financially neglected, while virtually all other classes of workers have had large pay-envelope increases and while the costs of living have been ascending, has been discreditable.

The Burch bill is the best legislation proposed in their behalf since 1925.

Mailmen are now receiving, as a wartime concession, a temporary cost-of-living bonus of $300 a year.

This arrangement will terminate on June 30.

Congress should pass the Burch bill without fail before that date.

A Soldier's Letter to His Dad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a letter from Lt. Robert Hardart which appeared in the Fordham Ram, the college newspaper of Fordham University. To my mind the letter deserves the widest publicity, because it unconsciously depicts the courage of our American troops and tells us, who are at home, how victories are won. I confess that tears were in my eyes before I read the concluding line of this letter, for young "Bob" Hardart, when he was still a boy in college, was a visitor, on occasions, at my home.

It is hard for me now to realize that this handsome young chap, who had before him everything the world could give, who cheerfully chatted with me in my home, who was the friend, pal, and trackmate of my own son, now serving in the A. A. C. S. in Egypt, is the veteran who so bravely faces the future.

While at Fordham University, Lieutenant Hardart was the collegiate boxing champion, cheer leader, and captain of the cross-country team. By his classmates he was voted the "most likely to succeed." I believe that "Bob" Hardart will still succeed—his is the hero's courage. To those at home who gripe at the inconveniences and petty annoyances that come as a result of the war, I commend this letter from this soldier and hero, Lt. "Bob" Hardart, to his affectionate father:

Lt. Bob Hardart, '42, former boxer, cheerleader, captain of cross-country team, voted "most likely to succeed" in senior poll, wrote the following letter to his father:

DEAR POP: Here we are again. Things are coming along fine. It's slow work, but I'm improving daily. Just had a long talk, yesterday, with my nurse, and she convinced me that I should tell you what I'm going to. You will have to know it eventually, but I was going to put it off as long as possible.

First of all, I want you to know that I'm really cheerful and looking forward to getting home and learning to live a kind of new and different life. Instead of being blue and discouraged, I am very happy and have plenty of faith in a happy future. Now I'll tell you what happened to me. So kind of brace yourself.

My legs were pretty badly wounded, but in time will be as good as new. However, I lost my right arm just below the elbow. Right now I can't see, but with the facilities in the hospitals at home, the eye doctor here tells me there is a slight chance that they can make me see. However, I'm not really counting too much on that, because I feel that I will remain this way.

Well, dad, that is the story. I hated to tell you, but I know you would have wanted to know. For "gosh sakes," please don't feel sorry for me. If you could see me here in the hospital, and all the fun I'm having—kidding the nurses and talking with all the swell visitors we have, you would say: "there is nothing wrong with that guy, send him back to duty." I've still got a lot to live for, and that plus my faith will probably make me the happiest fellow in town.

By the way, a British major visited us the other night and we chatted for 2 interesting hours. Next day we got a box from him with a quart of milk, a bunch of apples, and two bottles of beer. Wasn't that swell of him?

Say, I'm running overtime. You are getting more than you deserve. In closing, besides sending my love to all, I beg you to believe me when I say I am happy and contented and have a great faith and hope in the future.

Lovingly,

BOB.

Address by Herbert Brownell, Jr., at Lincoln, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Herbert Brownell, Jr., chairman of the Republican National Committee, at Lincoln, Nebr., on Thursday, March 8. Lincoln is the home town of Herbert Brownell and he was welcomed with a great reception. He delivered a speech which I think is of interest not only to Republicans but to Democrats as well.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that it will cost $130 to print the address in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Governor Griswold, Governor Blue, Governor Vivian, and members of the Lancaster County Republican Committee, my return today to Lincoln, where I spent so many years of my life and where I attended the public schools and State University, has been a most happy and heartening one. The hospitality and enthusiasm which Nebraska Republicans have shown here tonight indicates why they win elections so often. It is a great honor to meet here with three of the Republican Party's great leaders in public life—the governors of three Middle Western States which went Republican from the top to the bottom of the ticket in the historic Presidential campaign of 1944. Each one of these Republican governors is an asset to our party and a vigorous and successful leader of public opinion here in the heart of America. One reason I am proud to serve as chairman of our Republican National Committee is that our party is presenting to the Nation an increasing number of able, progressive statesmen such as the distinguished chief executives who are with us tonight.

Here in my native State I wish to pay tribute to the Representatives whom the voters of Nebraska have sent to guard their interests and present their point of view in the Congress at Washington—a solid Republican delegation. My political duties require me to spend a good deal of time in Washington these days, and I can say without hesitation that the leadership displayed in the United States Senate by Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, Republican whip, and Senator HUGH BUTLER, is a credit to this State. I sincerely appreciate the support they are giving to the program of the Republican National Committee. In the House of Representatives, this State has splendid representation in four public servants of character and ability, CARL CURTIS, HOWARD BUFFETT, KARL STEFAN, and A. L. MILLER.

On behalf of the officers and members of the Republican National Committee, I wish to thank the Republicans and all anti-new dealers of this State, and of the adjoining States for the overwhelming support which they gave to our party last November by voting for our great standard bearers in that campaign, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey and Gov. John W. Bricker.

By leading the way to victory in your States in that election, you have earned the right to a leading role in the formulation of policy for our party in the months ahead. Accordingly, it is most fitting that I shall present for your consideration this evening some of the organization plans of the Republican Party for victory on a Nation-wide scale in 1946 and 1948.

The Republican Party is one of the great unwritten institutions of government in our country. Our political evolution has been such that our two major political parties are today as much a part of government, in an institutional sense, as are any of the governmental institutions which are spelled out in the Constitution. We, as members or supporters of the Republican Party therefore have obligations and responsibilities extending far beyond those of any social organization because it is through the party machinery that the Nation governs itself. Particularly is this true if you believe as I do that the Republican Party will soon be called upon to assume broader national responsibilities.

One preliminary, but very important, step has already been taken to enable our party to function energetically and successfully. Our party leaders and the great rank and file of 22,000,000 voters who supported our ticket in the November election agreed that a full-time, all-year-round national party organization is needed to win. Too often our headquarters has "shut up shop" after a Presidential election and merely marked time until the nominating convention 4 years hence. Then a flood of volunteer workers and a hastily improvised and financed central headquarters spends 4 feverish months assisting our candidates in presenting our case to the voters.

I am pleased to be able to state that the Republican National Committee, meeting in January in Indianapolis, voted unanimously to place the activities of the Party organization nationally on a full-time, all-year-round

basis, with an enlarged staff of trained personnel, to conduct an intensive 2-year campaign with the immediate objective of winning control of the Congress in 1946.

This calls for increased organizational strength of the national committee in the fields of radio, press and magazine publicity. It is being built up. It calls for an adequate and competent research department. It is being built up. Above all it calls for the development, and the full understanding throughout the party and the country, of the ideas and principles for which we stand. No business is better than the products it makes. No political party is better than the ideas for which it seeks the support of the people. I am now able to announce that our new organization will be set up and the key personnel selected by the 1st of April. I think you will agree with me that this is very good news.

Time doesn't permit me to detail all of the measures taken and proposed to be taken to carry out the mandate of the national committee. I shall, therefore, limit myself this evening to a brief discussion of the thoughts of some of us about the ideas which our party stands for and through which it proposes to achieve not just political victory but a better nation for all the people. As I said at Indianapolis, what is best for the United States is best for the Republican Party. We do not propose or desire to win elections at the expense of the welfare of our country.

The temptation of the opposition party to confine itself to criticism of the party in power is hard to resist. It is sometimes the easier path to follow. I do not minimize the importance of such criticism. It is a primary function of the opposition party. Of course, we intend to follow closely and criticize, where justifiable, the policies and actions of the New Deal.

But the Republican Party cannot be content to sit by and simply snipe at the New Deal. It must be a party of opposition in the broadest sense of the word. It must not only oppose unsound doctrines, practices, and policies; it must go much further. It must produce for the benefit of the country the best possible program around which all of our people, particularly our youth, can rally; a constructive, inspiring, forward-looking program; a program worthy of a party whose spirit is young, healthy, vigorous, and confident; a program worthy of a party desirous, able, and prepared to take on its full measure of State and National responsibility; and a program which is so sound, so intelligently designed to meet the new and vast problems engendered by the war, and so forthrightly honest that every thoughtful, self-reliant citizen, young or old, can proudly say, "That's the kind of political philosophy I want and our country needs; that's a program I want to fight for."

That program will deal with all of the important national and international issues of the day—notably world peace, reemployment, provision for our veterans, taxation, progress in science and education, agriculture, honesty in government, social security, and world trade. But to bind it all together—to give it character, vitality, and substance—we must set forth and emphasize the basic Republican philosophy.

The first step in developing such a program is to formulate and express the spirit that gives it life and inspiration; the keynote with which the whole score must be in harmony; the yardstick by which its individual elements will be measured.

There are three main principles upon which there may be some misunderstanding or some misinformation but on which I believe the domestic welfare of our country depends, namely, (1) a representative, constitutional form of government, (2) a creative and productive free enterprise economy, and (3) a government dedicated to the efficient assumption of its social, humanitarian, and economic responsibilities. All my remarks are based on the certainty of a complete military victory whose only uncertainty is one of time. But with the advent of peace, we will again face some basic issues which war silenced but did not settle. In addition there will be vast and complex new issues resulting from the war.

Even a modest knowledge of recent history indicates that two diametrically opposed philosophies of government exist in the world today. In some countries, one doctrine is in the ascendency; in some, the other. But the contending influences of both pervade all nations including our own.

One doctrine seeks to make the central government supreme in all matters. It proceeds from the thesis that the government is all-important and that the individual exists only as a statistical cipher and as a pawn or servant. It assumes that ordinary people are weak, foolish, ignorant, and helpless, and in need of close and constant guardianship and guidance by the state. It undertakes to plan in detail for the whole national economy and to regiment the people into its master plan—always, however, from the point of view of creating citizens who will be of greater service to the state. It goes on the theory that the omniscient and omnipotent government can best provide food, shelter, occupation, and security for its citizens; and it makes the grievous error that this is all they want or need. Assuming that men live by bread alone, it offers no food for the spirit, no hope for the soul.

In contrast with the great regimented mass of the people who bear the burdens there are assumed to be a comparatively small group or party who will direct this state machine and who will enjoy most of the benefits. They are the self-styled wise, the powerful, and the privileged ones. They undertake to think for the rest, to plan for the rest, to direct and regiment the rest as they see fit—in the name of the national welfare. This is the totalitarian doctrine, the doctrine of regimentation and of privilege. Of course, these privileged few do not describe their government to the common man quite as we have described it here. They speak only of the fact that the common man will gain more security under such a system. When the privileged few in power promise, for example, that the government will guarantee jobs, they willfully omit to point out that if the government guarantees jobs then everyone must, as a permanent proposition, submit himself or herself to the bureaucrats of government who will tell him what job he shall take in order to receive this security, where his job is to be located, what hours he shall work, what pay he shall receive, and what working conditions he shall endure, and what assessments he shall pay out of his pay envelope to support activities which the government decrees are for his benefit.

The other doctrine proceeds from the theory that the human being is all-important and that the government exists to serve his welfare. It is based on the conviction that there is a tremendous reserve of wisdom and creative power in the people. It maintains that the amount of government necessary to create fair and stable conditions is the right amount of government for the general welfare. It assumes that the people themselves are competent to select their government, and, in a broad sense, to select their national and individual goals and to plan the road by which they choose to reach them. It charges government with the obligation of carrying out the wishes of the people, of serving them wherever government must and should serve but always as a helpful and useful friend. It means a government insistent on providing that all citizens have full and equal opportunity—not privileges for the few and obligations for the many. **This is the doctrine of creativeness, liberty, and of opportunity.**

These two doctrines are as far apart as the poles of the earth and as different as oil and water. They will not mix. There can be no compromise between them. Our reason tells us so. Our experience confirms it. We will have to make our choice on one side or the other.

I do not pretend, particularly in my present position, to possess the impartiality of a philosopher, but as I observe our two parties, I perceive that the New Deal is fast becoming the party of regimentation and special privilege. During the New Deal years tremendous new instrumentalities of power have been given to our Federal Government. It is almost inevitable that the administration in power so long, with these new instrumentalities of power, should become the party of regimentation and privilege. New evidences of privilege under the New Deal crop out every day in the news headlines. Special privileges in appointments to high offices for those who walked the New Deal chalk line in the campaign. Special trips to Moscow for the city bosses. Special exemptions from wartime regulations to the Petrillos. Special and excessive red-tape regulations and taxes which put small business and small agriculture at a competitive disadvantage. Special favors to bureaus which propagandize for the New Deal. Special financing to war contractors who head up campaign committees. Special privileges to bureaucrats to do the thinking and planning which rightfully belong to the people themselves. Taken together, these privileges form barriers to equal opportunity and to individual initiative which are insuperable. The list of privileges is a long one, and when the war pressure eases, it becomes increasingly clear that the American electorate will turn thumbs down on the party of regimentation and special privilege.

The New Deal tried to work both sides of the street and failed. One day it professes to be for free enterprise. The next it appropriates millions for Government competition with private industry. Yesterday it was for planned scarcity. Today it talks about programed abundance. The result in the past was increasing confusion and discouragement of our people accompanied by an overwhelming volume of unemployment, terminated only by the outbreak of war.

Maybe a purely totalitarian or State-directed economy could prevent unemployment. It has never yet done so apart from war. But we know that a Government which tries to be for one doctrine today and for the other tomorrow—or even for both at the same time—cannot accomplish it. On the other hand, we know that the creative enterprise system has raised the standard of living of man beyond anything ever known before in history.

The position of the Republican Party on these issues must be made clear to all beyond the shadow of a doubt. We stand for the freedom of choice of the individual. We stand for the obligation of the Government to create and maintain conditions which afford the widest individual liberty and freedom of choice, and we stand for the fullest possible opportunity for the individual to develop his capabilities for his own good and the good of the community. The vigorous, liberal leaders of the Republican Party in the Halls of Congress and the State capitols furnish the brightest promise in all the country for progressive Government, under Constitutional safeguards, with full realization that creative enterprise—not regimentation and privilege—will bring greater wealth, happiness and liberty to our citizens.

Those who came to this country in the early years, or even throughout the nineteenth century, did not come here in quest of privilege. To them America, above all, spelled liberty and opportunity.

American had, and still has, great natural advantages—tremendous territory, vast natural resources, great agricultural fertility blest with salubrious and varied climate,

long coast lines opening the gates of commerce across the seas to the east, the south, and the west. Our population has drawn its strength from the most courageous, venturesome, and enterprising people of many lands. But it is not our area that has made us great. Some other nations have larger territory. It is not the size of our population. Some others are more populous. It is not our resources. Some others may even have more of these. What is unique in America, and that to which we owe our greatness, is the combination of all these with a full measure of liberty and opportunity, and an effective utilization of the enormous creative energies of our people. This has enabled our people to develop our resources and to raise our standard of living beyond anything ever known in the history of mankind.

We Americans have an inherent aversion to privilege wherever we see and recognize it. It is opposed to the most basic elements of our tradition. It contradicts our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, our Bill of Rights. It is the enemy of progress, whether it raises its ugly head in Wall Street, in big business, in bureaucratic centralized government or in labor unions or otherwise. We don't like racial privilege, religious privilege, economic privilege, or political privilege. We don't like the man who cuts in at the head of the movie line, the cigarette line, or the economic or political line. We know that privilege is not creative, that it is not productive, that it does not raise the general standard of living one iota. It is the exact opposite of all of these. It is the Maginot Line of the greedy and the incompetent. It vests in those who have not earned and do not deserve, that which others could earn and deserve.

Conversely, they want opportunity. They know that opportunity is the exact opposite of privilege. That it is creative, productive. That it offers every man a chance to expand his abilities to the utmost of his just deserts. Every town and hamlet in the country has its story of some home boy who seized his opportunity and made good. He is the hero of his community. Americans want opportunity for themselves and for their children, just as their parents and their grandparents had it. Their fervent hope is that at the end of this war, opportunities may be opened to all, particularly to our young people, our returning veterans, and even to all of the oppressed, afflicted, and unfortunate. For in this, they see not only our own peace and prosperity, but that of the whole world.

We want a kind of society in which our ablest people, regardless of the station of life into which they were born, may rise through their own creative efforts. Our Nation has become and will continue great only to the extent that it makes possible the rise of talent in every field of endeavor. A free and creative society makes this possible. No single man and no small group of men even though in possession of the vast machinery of the modern state can hope to rival the material and spiritual productiveness of a people left free to develop their own energies and talents. Then and only then can we achieve the full security that only a prosperous society can achieve. A prosperous and healthy nation, like a prosperous and healthy family, is alone capable of caring for its sick and unfortunates.

Our opportunities for the future may be different in kind from those of the past, but they will be no less in degree. On the contrary, they will be even greater. It would be tragic indeed if by our great advances of the past we had built toward restriction rather than toward expansion of opportunity. Fortunately, this is not the case. I invite your attention to the great new opportunities and brilliant future in the chemical industry, in aviation, in electronics, in building, in agricultural methods and products, and in countless new service industries—big and small. These will make new chances available to office, factory, mine, and field workers—to management and investor alike—if only we free our productive powers of the shackles of regimentation and privilege. And in the wake of this development can come the most important achievement of all—a culturally and socially fuller and richer life for all the people.

The key to prosperity in our way of living and in our tradition, has been liberty and opportunity, not regimentation and privilege. Each passing year has brought new revelations of the wisdom, the initiative, and the creative power of our people. No small group of bureaucrats has ever had, or will ever have, anything to equal it. It is humanly impossible for any group of bureaucrats to think of or regulate the millions of details which constitute the fabric of a modern society. Our future does not lie in the restraints and restrictions of regimentation and privilege which kill the aspirations of men. It does depend upon loosening the energy, the resourcefulness, and the ingenuity of our people by removing obstacles to expanding opportunity.

Accordingly, as we develop our legislative programs for our party, I am confident that they will be geared to individual initiative, creative enterprise, and expanding opportunity. The only privilege the Republican Party will advocate will be the sacred privilege of liberty and opportunity for all. The only privileged class that we will tolerate will be the underprivileged. To them we will endeavor to afford greater opportunities for health, for education, for self-improvement, and for economic betterment. But the great majority of our people, many statements to the contrary notwithstanding, are not underprivileged. All they want is to see their white alley and the chance to move down it as a result of their own efforts.

I do not mean to say that government—National, State, or local—should abandon its many proper functions. Quite the contrary. It is the business of government to see that those basic economic and social conditions exist that are essential to the development of equal opportunity. This is not abdication by government. It is the exact opposite. It is the exercise of its highest and most difficult functions. This is the type of government toward which the Republican Party aims. We want to see every statute, rule, and regulation on the books tested by such doctrine. We want to see every plank in our platform tested by such doctrine; and we want to see every law and action that takes place when we come into power, conform to such doctrine.

Some political philosophers have found difficulty in reconciling the concept of liberty with security. In many ways superficially they appear contradictory. I think it can safely be said that security, like true happiness, cannot be obtained by direct approach, but is a byproduct or result of other conditions. Strangely enough, in this country, whose people and traditions have in years gone by, laid least emphasis on security, security has been found in greatest measure. Security is the byproduct of economic and social surpluses. We want far greater security for all our people than they have ever had before. We will fight for a fair and equitable allocation of the wealth our Nation can create if given the opportunity. But we maintain that security is not achieved by dividing up the production of a throttled economy but by the equitable distribution of the products of a creative, healthy, and prosperous society.

I believe that in this observation lies the truth that security is the offspring of liberty and opportunity, and that unless we can maintain our liberties, unless we can maintain our opportunities, the pursuit of security will be in vain.

The history of American progress—indeed the history of all human progress—is the story of the expanding circumference of human liberty and opportunity. The Republican program must be, and will be, in harmony with the march of progress.

This, then, is the essence of the spirit of the program of the Republican Party. We want no doctrine of regimentation and privilege; we want no part of antiquated or reactionary doctrines. Out of the crucible of years of depression, suffering, and tragedy, we must and will distill an inspiring program of new hope based on basic truths, a program pointing the way to recapture that progress, that unity, that creative power, which belongs to Americans as a heritage of the past and a promise of the future.

That is what you want. It is what I want. I believe it is what the American people want—and so far as it is within my power by reason of my party position, the Republican Party program for the future shall be designed to expose every superficial plan which is a step consciously or unconsciously made up the road toward regimentation and privilege, and to promote affirmatively measures for a rebirth for all our people of American liberty and opportunity on a vaster scale than ever was known before.

Home, Strange Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we are well aware that many long and hard battles lie between us and the end of the war, but it is never too early to plan for the peace. Demobilization of our armed forces will bring its problems and we as a people must be prepared to meet them. The problem of readjustment for some eleven or twelve million Americans will be most difficult at best, and we as a people should do everything we can to help lighten the shock of this human reconstruction and rehabilitation.

The current issue of the Army and Navy Journal contains a very worthy and thought-provoking article by Admiral William H. Standley, United States Navy, retired. That same issue of that authoritative journal comments editorially upon the suggestions made in Admiral Standley's article.

Admiral Standley has urged that every American soldier or sailor, who has seen service abroad, be given at least 1 month's leave with pay prior to his discharge from the service. In support of his suggestion, he cites his own personal experiences when he had his first month's leave from the United States Naval Academy. He recalls how the month's leave at home, while still in uniform, went a long way to help him toward a realistic adjustment of his lot.

Based upon the quoted comments of General Hershey that the fall of Germany will release one or two million men from the armed services, and his further statement that "if we let out 1,000 men

an hour, it will take 10 months to get rid of 2,000,000 or 2,500,000 men." There is every reason in the world why favorable consideration should be given Admiral Standley's proposal. All of these men will be anxious to get back home and their famillies will want them home. If leave can be given them while they are still in uniform, while they are awaiting the orderly processes of demobilization, it will, I feel certain, go a long way in relieving the demands of the man in uniform and their families, and at the same time, lessen the shock to them of their sudden release back to civilian life. There may be some cases where immediate and final release is possible and desirable, but in a great majority of cases, I feel that the recommendations that are made in this interesting article could well be followed by the War and Navy Departments. The article by Admiral Standley and the editorial comment thereon follow:

HOME, STRANGE HOME

(Not the least of the problems of post-war readjustment, is that of the serviceman in returning to his civilian pursuit and surroundings. Awaiting take-off at an African port, Admiral Standley, who has seen the problem in action, pondered the subject. The following article records his thoughts. Admiral Standley, who has been through three major wars, was formerly Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, Commander of the Battle Force, United States Fleet, Chief of Naval Operations, and Ambassador to Russia, is now serving with the Office of Strategic Services.)

(By Admiral William H. Standley, United States Navy, Retired)

I was sitting in the waiting room of the Naval Air Transport Service at Port Lyautey waiting for the take-off of a Navy transport plane C-54, upon which I was to return to America.

Waiting is typical of air travel; one is never sure he will take off at the predicted hour. We had arrived the previous afternoon and expected to take off within the hour. This was extended to 2 hours, then the time was set for midnight, but the incoming plane had not arrived so the time was advanced to about 6 a. m. We would be called in time. We were called at 7:15 and hurried through breakfast, to be told that the departure was delayed until 10. When we received this news I was looking at a sign over the door of the restaurant which read, "It takes time to spare to travel by air, by Harry Gair," and I thought "How true!" Our departure was delayed for one thing or another for periods of 20 minutes to an hour until we finally got away at 2:24 p. m.

I had been away from America some 3 weeks, during which time I had seen and heard much. I had visited the Allied activities in north Africa and Italy. I had been given an audience by the Pope and by Marshal Badoglio; and lunched with Marshal Tito and the Prime Minister of Yugoslavia; had dined with Commissioner and Lady McMillan, with Ambassador Murphy in Naples, with Ambassador Kirk in Rome, with the High Command Generals Sir Maitland Wilson, Devers, Patch, Alexander, Lemmtzer, Barr, and Air Marshal Slesser; and finally had tea with our Ambassador to the Vatican, Ambassador Taylor, and Mrs. Taylor, and with my good friend Bishop Spellman. I had been in contact with soldiers and sailors of the Allied Nations—G. I. boys from America, including loyal Japanese, Britain, Canada, South Africa, France, Poland, Greece, and Italy—all in this comparatively restricted area, working feverishly but in deadly earnest to the same end—victory. I had seen the men of the services doing a grand job, and my trip was made possible by the efficient transport services operated by the Army and the Navy.

To while away the time while waiting, I was absently thumbing through the pages of the August 14 issue of Life when the picture and caption of the half-page advertisement of Time, on page 79, suddenly stood out like a sore thumb. It treats of a subject to which I have given much thought, for example, the unexpected difficulties which will beset our boys on their return home.

The opening lines of the advertisement are expressive of my thoughts concerning the return of these boys, and I shall take the liberty of quoting—

"He dreamed of home and longed for it, day and night for years. And now * * *

"There's something wrong. He's changed * * * or it's changed * * * or else it hasn't when it seems to him it should have changed.

"The folks who haven't gone through what he's been through or seen the things he's seen * * * who haven't lived his life with its terrific extremes of hairstrung responsibility and fatalistic waiting; how can they understand?

"They want to help; they hover over him with a frustrated, loving, puzzled concern that can find no outlet."

General Hershey recently stated that the fall of Germany will release "between one and two million men from the armed services," that "when the war is over people want their boys to come home," and that "if we let out 1,000 an hour it will take 10 months to get rid of two million to two and a half million men."

The foregoing advertisement continues to voice my thoughts when it says that we must not wait for the boys to come home before we act; we must do something now. And I offer that urge as my excuse for this effort. As a first step in our desire to help our boys readjust themselves to changed conditions and viewpoints, I urge that Congress enact a law requiring that every American soldier or sailor who has seen service abroad be given at least one month's leave with pay prior to discharge from the service. In support of this suggestion I offer the following experiences incident to my own military service.

Prior to leaving to take the entrance examinations to the Naval Academy, I had hardly been beyond the limits of the county and had never been away from mother, family, and friends for more than a week at a time. The parting was a terrible wrench to the heartstrings, and throughout my plebe year at the academy I was looking forward to my first leave in anticipation of the grand time I would have when again with home and friends. The reunion was all that I anticipated; my old friends were glad to see me and I was delighed to be with them again. But in a few days something seemed to be out of adjustment. My friends were all busy and, in the main, pursuing the same objectives they were before I left. They had time for entertainments and amusements in the evening and their days were fully occupied as of old. With me, however, it was different. I had acquired new interests, new objectives. In the the day time I was unoccupied and lonely, and having passed out of their orbit of activities and interests I could not fully appreciate and enjoy the evenings with my friends as I had formerly done. As a result, before the month was up I was tired of doing nothing and was anxious to get back to the routine duties at the Naval Academy.

Many of our boys will be in exactly the same status as I was when I had my first month's leave from the academy. A month's leave at home while still in service, in uniform, will not only help them toward a realistic readjustment but will prevent them squandering whatever bonus they may receive on discharge.

When this war is over, there will be, as there was at the end of the last war, a grand scramble to get home. The boys will all want their discharges immediately, and, of course, this will be impossible. Inevitably there will be much dissatisfaction and annoyance at the delay, and when finally discharged many will leave the service with a feeling of frustration and bitterness which could be avoided if, as their services could be dispensed with, they were given a month's leave and furnished transportation to their homes immediately upon their arrival in the United States.

When the armistice was signed at the end of the last war the Secretary of the Navy was quoted in the evening papers with the statement "Now the war is over we can all go home." I was commandant of midshipmen at the time, and when I arrived at my office early the next morning a midshipman was waiting to see me. He said he wished to submit a request and handed me a paper which proved to be his resignation as midshipman at the United States Naval Academy. I sensed an epidemic as a result of the Secretary's statement and sparred for time. The young man said he had his father's permission, as required by the academy regulations, and that now the war was over he wished to continue his pre-war studies. Usually I would have forwarded the request with a recommendation that it be approved, but an inner voice seemed to warn me to take time to think it over, so I told the young man that I would give the request careful consideration and inform him later of my decision. It was fortunate that I did this, for by office hours the next morning I had over 30 midshipmen's resignations on my desk. After carefully checking each one, I sent for the group. I pointed out to them that when they entered the academy they were of draft age, that, of course, no one believed they entered the academy to avoid the draft but that they entered in good faith with every intention of making the Navy their career. I stated that if, however, they left the academy now there would surely be some of their buddies who had not escaped the draft who would point the accusing finger and utter with contempt the words "draft dodger." I told them I was sure they had not realized this, but at any rate I did not intend to let them place themselves in such a position so I would not forward any of their requests but would return them to the signer instead. That cured the epidemic, and as to the soundness of my decision the following will testify.

Some months later, influence in the higher echelon prevailed upon the academy authorities to permit the son of a prominent official to resign. This resignation had no effect on the other students, except that it brought on fisticuff. A classmate met the ex-midshipman in the corridor with his resignation in his hand. The news having spread, the classmate as he passed hissed "draft dodger," and the ex-midshipman demanded satisfaction for the insult, which he got in the way of a good licking.

At the closing out of the war I was in command of the battleship *Virginia* at the Boston Navy Yard. We had orders to discharge the eligibles as rapidly as possible. There were some 300 men to go out. With a reduced and also vanishing clerical force, we could not handle more than 10 discharges a day, so the men were arranged in a priority list based on conditions as nearly equitable and fair as we could make them. This list was published and the men, knowing to the

day when they would be discharged and free to plan accordingly, were satisfied and content to wait. However, political pressure became very heavy, and in a few days orders began to come from Washington to make a special case of John Doe, who was probably well down on the list, and give him discharge immediately. This upset the order of discharge and resulted in discontent all down the line, usually causing displaced boys to write home about it, and then would come more special order discharge. Because of this, many youngsters left the service with feelings of disgust and bitterness.

All this would have been avoided and can be avoided when the boys come home from the present war if they are given at least a month's leave immediately after their services can be spared—a month's leave to go home, in uniform and with full pay, to see their wives, their children, their mothers, and their sweethearts. Such a respite would give them a chance, without the necessity of trying to plunge right back into civilian life, to see what conditions are, what has to be done, what they can do; so when they do get their discharge they will be far better fitted in every way to resume their places as useful citizens of the United States of America.

[From the Army and Navy Journal of March 10, 1945]

The plan for helping to ease the veterans of this war in their transition from service ways to civilian life, as presented by Admiral Standley on the first page of this issue of the Army and Navy Journal, should commend itself to Congress and the military and naval authorities by the very simplicity of its operation and administration as well as by its effectiveness and economy. The mechanics of issuing final discharges from the armed forces are not simple. There are many steps which must be taken to safeguard the interests of the individual and the Government, many records which must be assembled and financial transactions to be completed before the man is legally out of the service. Even if the decision to reduce the services to a peacetime basis were made at once and 1,000 men were discharged per hour, it would take 10 months to complete the discharge of 2,500,000 men, as Admiral Standley points out. During the period between the termination of hostilities and the time of actual discharge the men are restless and dissatisfied, long for home and the return to civilian pleasures and pursuits. Then, plunged directly into the home atmosphere, so different from camps and stations, with all his old friends busy with their tasks of earning a living, there follows a period of difficult readjustment. Under Admiral Standley's plan, the servicemen would be given a month's furlough to go home as soon as feasible after their return to the continental United States. This would be no loss to the military organizations, which would themselves be involved in a period of transition, and would be of comparatively small expense because the pay of the men and their subsistence would have to go on, anyway. Its advantages would be legion—it would satisfy the longing of the men to get home as soon as possible, would give them 30 days to be around their community in their uniform and on active duty, would enable them to renew business contacts or look for new ones. Furthermore, their return to their organization to await final discharge would afford an opportunity to consider their civilian life and business from all angles, make plans based on late and intimate knowledge, so that when they finally break off their military attachments they would know exactly what to expect in picking up the threads of their old civilian life. The plan is so simple and sound that we hope it will be put into operation.

Opposition To Changing the Two-Thirds Rule as to Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Two-Thirds Rule as to Treaties—A Change Opposed," delivered by Edwin Borchard, Hotchkiss professor of law at Yale University. The estimate of the Public Printer for printing this address is $221.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TWO-THIRDS RULE AS TO TREATIES—A CHANGE OPPOSED

(By Edwin Borchard, Hotchkiss professor of law, Yale University)

The Committee on International Law of the New York State Bar Association has recommended, by a majority of 11 to 2, that the Constitution of the United States be amended to enable the President to conclude treaties, provided he obtains the advice and consent of a majority of the Members present in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

To this recommendation I shall address this paper. Its purpose will be to show that the recommendation is unsound and that it should be disapproved.

I

The proposed amendment has one advantage over other recent plans to change the two-thirds rule of the Constitution—it is a lawful method of making the change. That is more than can be said for the frequently misused Executive agreement,[1] which is characterized by some proponents of the suggested amendment as an evasion of the Constitution.[2]

The proposal to make the change finds its most recent source in the grievance, assumed to be valid, that the Senate of the United States prevented this Government from adhering to the Covenant of the League of Nations and thus contributed to the present disaster. It finds its current motivation in the apprehension that the proposed peace treaties or the Security League to Enforce the Peace, might not be promising enough to command the support of two-thirds of the Senate, and that to facilitate the adoption of these still unknown treaties a less cumbersome legislative approval is required. Charges are made that the two-thirds rule is undemocratic, obstructive, and inefficient.

To determine the validity of these objections and charges, some inquiry is required into the historical reasons for the treaty-making rule, into the record of the Senate, into the probable effects of the new proposed rule, and some discussion is necessary of the reasons advanced in the report of the House Judiciary Committee, December 13, 1944.[3] adopted in the report of your committee, as to why a change in the Constitution becomes necessary or desirable.

II

The modern movement to reform the Constitution may be said to have begun shortly after the Treaty with Spain of 1898 was approved by the narrow margin of one vote.[4] Perhaps the minority, in opposing the Philippine annexation, was better advised. It received special impetus after 1905 from Secretary Hay's denunciation of the Senate for substituting the word "treaty" (requiring Senate approval) for the words "special agreement" in the proposed arbitration treaties of 1904, a change which Theodore Roosevelt rightly thought, in view of the reservations of "vital interests," "independence," and "national honor," was of no special importance. Perhaps it would have been preferable to leave the arbitration treaties unamended, although an agreement to arbitrate everything except that which is important does not add much to the judicial function. It cannot be said to have prevented the submission of any dispute which the Department of State wished to arbitrate.

As to the present grievance of the proponents, found in the unwillingness of the Senate to adhere without reservations to the Covenant of the League and in attributing to the Senate responsibilities for the current crash, no assumption could have less substantive foundation or do greater injustice to the Senators who made an effort by the reservations to protect the interests of the United

---

[1] Wallace McClure, International Executive Agreements, New York, 1941; Edward S. Corwin, The Constitution and World Organization, Princeton, 1944.

[2] The New York Times characterizes the evasion by executive agreement as dishonest—Editorial, Approval of Treaties, April 17, 1944. Kenneth Colegrove, The American Senate and World Peace, New York, 1944, pp. 31, 95, 105, 110.

[3] H. Rept. 2061, 78th Cong., 2d Sess., to accompany H. J. Res. 320. "Amendment to the Constitution with respect to treaty ratification," submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER.

[4] R. Earl McClendon in his article, The Two-Thirds Rule in Senate Action Upon Treaties, 1789–1901 ((1932) 26 Am. Jour. Int. Law 37 at 39), lists the following efforts to amend the treaty-making power or abolish Senate control:

"Twice in 1899, shortly after the close of the Spanish-American War, an effort was made in the House of Representatives to have adopted a joint resolution offering a proposed constitutional amendment which would allow the President and a bare majority of the Senate to make peace treaties. In March 1920 there was introduced in the Senate itself a joint resolution proposing an amendment whereby the President and "a majority of the Senate present" would be permitted to conclude all types of treaties. A similar resolution was offered in the House of Representatives the following December. Neither proposal proceeded beyond the committee stage, but subsequently the attempt was made two separate times in the Senate. Meanwhile other and more radical changes in the treaty-making power were suggested. On July 28, 1919, there was introduced in the lower house of Congress a resolution looking toward an amendment which would permit the House of Representatives to share with the Senate the power of approving treaties. No action was taken, but within the following 9 years it was introduced no less than four more times. Finally one proposed change would necessitate a popular vote for the approval of 'certain' treaties."

These proposals were advanced before the current crop in 1943–44. Cf. Herbert Wright in (October 1944) 38 Am. Jour. Int. Law 642, note 1, and Colegrove, *op. cit.* 170.

States.[5] To ask the United States willy-nilly to support without precautions an unprecedented scheme which might entail ruinous and unknown obligations is to ask too much.

Three votes on United States adhesion to the League covenant were taken. The first, on November 19, 1919, rejected the Lodge resolution of ratification with the Senate reservations by 39 in favor and 55 against, and on reconsideration, 41 to 51; the second, the Underwood resolution of unconditional ratification was defeated, 38 to 53. In the next session of Congress, on March 19, 1920, the Lodge resolution was again submitted to a vote. This time it received 49 yeas and 35 nays.[6] President Wilson, who throughout had exhibited very little capacity to cooperate with a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power,[7] exhorted the Democratic membership to disapprove the treaty with its reservations, although Earl Grey had written a letter to the New York Times [8] expressing the belief that Great Britain could safely accept the reservations. Many Democrats voted against the resolution. Had President Wilson not insisted upon opposition to the reservations, it is probable that the covenant would have been accepted.

[5] Roscoe C. McCulloch, The Truth Will Keep Us Free: Who Defeated Ratification of the League of Nations, Columbus (Ohio), 1944, *passim*.

Although the League of Nations was inherently incapable of performing the peace-preserving functions expected from it and is severely condemned by many publicists (see Sumner Welles, The Time for Decision, New York, 1944, *passim*), the United States Senate is still criticized for not having adhered. It would seem that the Senate deserves praise for its foresight and prescience. That the Treaty of Versailles laid the foundation for this war, see references to William C. Bullitt, W. D. Herridge, Robert M. La Follette, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, and F. A. Voigt, editor of the Nineteenth Century and After ((London) (November 1944) 30 Am. Bar. Assoc. Jour. 608).

[6] Carl B. Swisher, American Constitutional Government, Boston, 1943, p. 680; Herbert Wright in loc. cit. 646, where the vote is analyzed.

[7] Forrest R. Black, "The United States Senate and the Treaty Power" (1931–32), 4 Rocky Mt. Law Rev. 1 at 9–10:

"Of all the treaties that have been negotiated by the Executive without the advice of the Senate, the Treaty of Versailles is the most notorious example. This treaty was negotiated in secret, and the Senate was kept in the dark during the whole period of the negotiation. Not only did the President, by his interpretation of the treaty clause make the word 'advice' mere surplusage, but he also attempted to interfere with the Senate in the exercise of its constitutional function of giving consent. Although posing as the exponent of open covenants, openly arrived at, when he finally decided to present the treaty in its completed form to the Senate he actually refused to submit, with the treaty, the discussions and minutes of the peace conference. * * * In the nominal interests of peace, we behold the spectacle of the Executive, attempting to bring unfair political pressure upon an uninformed Senate. After depriving a coordinate department of its constitutional right to the facts, he proceeded to appeal to the country, claiming to have a monopoly on the plans for the peace of the world. And in order that the emasculation of the coordinate power of the Senate might be complete, he so drafted the treaty and the Covenant, that they could not be separated and could not be voted on separately on their merits."

[8] Letter to the London Times, published in the New York Times, February 1, 1920. The letter was endorsed by the British and French press. See Denna F. Fleming, the United States and the League of Nations, New York, 1932, pp. 411–413.

Thomas W. Lamont, one of the attendants at Versailles and an important figure in the negotiation of some of its clauses, has recently remarked:

"As has been many times pointed out since 1920, had the administration at that time been content to accept American participation in the League on a somewhat more limited scale rather than on the basis of wholesale commitments, our Senate might well have accepted the League covenant. It was upon the administration's insistence that the Democratic Senators voted against acceptance of the covenant with reservations and thereby automatically voted to defeat the treaty." [9]

III

Historical reasons for the two-thirds rule

The Senate was expected to play a prominent part in the treaty-making power. Before the Articles of Confederation, unanimity of the States was required. Under the Articles, adopted in 1781, 9 States out of 13 had to approve treaties. It was therefore natural that the several plans under consideration at the Constitutional Convention made two-thirds of the Senators representing the States necessary for ratification.[10] Not until September 4, 1787, 13 days before final adjournment, was the President brought into the picture at all. The evolution of the compromise has been often discussed. The two-thirds rule on treaties was adopted by 9 States to 1, Delaware voting in the negative and Connecticut dividing. While Madison proposed an exception for peace treaties, this was not adopted. The motion of Pennsylvania's representative, James Wilson, to bring in the House as a coordinate approver, was defeated 10 to 1.[10a] Alexander Hamilton considered the clause "one of the best digested parts of the plan." [11] Story considered it a power which could not have been "better deposited, with a view to its safety and efficiency." [12] Many of the participants, realizing the importance of a treaty with a foreign power, considered two-thirds too small rather than too large a protection. That was the view in some of the ratifying States, particularly the small States, who did not wish to be overruled by a mere majority. Virginia valued the right to navigate the Mississippi which the Northeastern States were disposed to bargain away. Others valued the Atlantic fisheries. While some of the original reasons for excluding the House from participation in treaty approval—the necessity for secrecy and for speed, the short sessions, the short terms of House Members and the fluctuating membership—might not today be convincing, others are still valid and new reasons, such as the expansion of Executive power, have accrued.[13] With 298 House Members east of the Mississippi and 137 from the West, it is still possible for the small States to be outvoted on sectional issues.

The location of the word "advice" in the clause "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," following the word "power," indicates that the President was to consult the Senate in the progress of the negotiations. While George Washington soon abandoned the process of oral consultation, his successors have on many occasions sought the advice of the Senate before concluding their negotiation.[14] Wilson's view that the

[9] Letter to the editor of the New York Times, Sunday, April 23, 1944.

[10] See Robert M.. La Follette, the Treaty-Making Power of the Constitution (1919), 4 Marquette Law Rev. 167, 171.

[10a] For a summary of the debates in the convention, see S. B. Crandall. Treaties: Their Making and Enforcement (2d ed.), Washington, D. C., 1916, pp. 44–46.

[11] It was known to be a very broad power, hence needed to be carefully guarded by the two-thirds Senate approval. Said Hamilton, in one of his Camillus papers: But from the best opportunity of knowing the fact, I aver, that it was understood by all to be the intent of the provision to give to that power the most ample latitude—to render it competent to all the stipulations, which the exigencies of national affairs might require; competent to the making of treaties of alliance, treaties of commerce, treaties of peace, and every other species of convention usual among nations; and competent, in the course of its exercise for these purposes, to control and bind the legislative power of Congress. And it was emphatically for this reason, that it was so carefully guarded; the cooperation of two-thirds of the Senate, with the President, being required to make any treaty whatever. (The Works of Alexander Hamilton (John C. Hamilton, ed.), VII, New York, 1850–51, p. 518, quoted by Henry S. Fraser in S. Doc. No. 244, 78th Cong. 2d sess.)

[12] He considered the two-thirds rule "a sufficient guaranty against any wanton sacrifice of private rights, or any betrayal of public privileges." Joseph Story, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States (5th ed.), vol. 2, Boston, 1891, p. 342.

Coming down to more modern times, John W. Davis closed his account of the treaty-making power with the following remark:

"Looking back upon a diplomatic history which is is not without its chapters of success, they feel that on the whole the scheme the fathers builded has served the children well. With a conservatism in matters of government as great perhaps as that of any people in the world, they will suffer much inconvenience and run the risk of occasional misunderstanding before they make a change." (Treaty-making Power in the United States (1920), 6 Am. Bar Assoc. Jour. 1 at 7.)

Representative Sol Bloom, who seeks a change in the treaty power (Treaty-making Power: Fourteen Points Showing Why the Treaty-making Power Should Be Shared by the House of Representatives, 1944), was last year an admirer. Bloom, Our Heritage, New York, 1944, p. 385.

[13] Mr. McClendon thinks the effects of the two-thirds rule have been "practically negligible" in the period covered by his study (loc. cit., pp. 55–56). Ex-Senator Gillette, who introduced several resolutions looking to an amendment, thinks the original reasons for excluding the House still cogent. He would oppose the amendment for House participation now under discussion. The American Forum of the Air, May 30, 1944, No. 22, p. 5.

[14] See Robert M. La Follette, The Treaty-Making Power of the Constitution (1919), 4 Marquette Law Rev. 167; Henry Cabot Lodge, The Treaty-Making Powers of the Senate (1902), 31 Scribner's Magazine 33; Forrest R. Black, The United States Senate and the Treaty Power (1931–32), 4 Rocky Mt. Law Rev. 1. Says Professor Black:

"It does not mean that the President must, in all cases, seek advice before he enters into the preliminary stage of a negotiation. The President, as the Chief Executive, may take the initiative in the field of foreign relations, but when a treaty is under negotiation the Senate has a constitutional right to know the facts and to give advice. It is implicit in the very idea of making the Senate an advisory body to the President, that the Senate shall have the privilege of being an informed adviser (p. 5).

"From this brief historical presentation it appears that, broadly speaking, there have been two interpretations of the treaty clause. The one, which we will term the Washingtonian, views the role of the Senate as an integral part of the treaty making function, which may be exercised at any stage of a negotiation; the other, which we will term the Wilsonian, considers the function of the Senate merely to give sanction to a treaty that is already drafted" (p. 11).

Senate could be confronted with a completed treaty, which he purported to make it difficult to change, is not the better view of the meaning of the constitutional provision.[15] It can be contended, as Senator Overton did recently, that the making of reservations or Senate conditions upon its consent constitutes advice to the President. At all events, even though the Senate is no longer the executive council originally contemplated, if the advice should be sought, as is proper, before the negotiation is completed, then it would be necessary, if the new amendment is to go into effect, to consult the House of Representatives as well as the Senate. That would not exactly make for speed, but adds a new encumbrance to the process. If, on the other hand, the House is merely to be added to the Senate in the approval of an executive fait accompli, the constitutional "advice" becomes a dead letter and is disregarded. The function of the House in any event would probably not be deliberative, as is the Senate, but would become perfunctory, which hardly adds to constitutional safeguards.

Record of the Senate

It might be supposed from the criticisms heard that the Senate had not fulfilled its constitutional functions or had so used the two-thirds rule as to obstruct the will of the Nation. This charge has little foundation. Even the alleged example of the Covenant of the League shows not a single Senator who lost his seat in the 1920 elections because of his position on that treaty. Public opinion is emotional. While it may once have seemingly approved the Covenant, not knowing its content or realizing its implications, opinion changed under better instructio..

Nearly 1,000 treaties have been adopted, and of the 820 signed by the United States from 1789 to 1928, 24 were never submitted to the Senate and 9 were withdrawn by the President. Of the 787 submitted, 47 were never acted on, 15 were rejected, and 162 amended.[16] In other words, the Senate intervened in the making of 234 treaties,[17] and by and large either improved the treaty by so doing or saved the country from unfortunate commitments. Secretary Hay's remark that "but one thing is certain, (the treaty) will never leave the arena alive," is not borne out by the evidence. It is an interesting subject of speculation whether any better result would have been achieved had the House been added to a majority of the Senate as a "ratifying" body. Figures are sometimes adduced designed to show that a small minority of Senators from the populous States could block a large majority of the Senators from the less populous States. Such figures have no justification in experience. Senators rarely cast their votes according to the size of their States.[18]

It is not possible to prove that a considered public opinion has opposed a final Senate vote or that a minority of the Senators defied public opinion in voting as they did. The necessity of obtaining a two-thirds vote assures a good treaty rather than the hasty or emotional consideration which a bare majority might reflect. Had the oil agreement of August 1944 not been submitted in the form of a treaty, this vulnerable agreement, contrary to the interests of the industry and probably of the country, would have been adopted by executive agreement or approved by a majority possibly influenced by the Executive.[19] The fact, as reported,[20] that a new treaty will now be drafted is evidence that the Senate two-thirds rule has valuable functions to perform in the assurance of a treaty beneficial to the country. It is stated in some quarters that majority control by House and Senate means in fact Executive control, since the President can exert patronage and other pressures on a bare majority if necessary. The two-thirds rule places the Senate in an independent position beyond Presidential control even if his party should command a bare majority.

Effects of the change

It is said that the two-thirds requirement enables a minority to control the majority, which the new rule would obviate. It is also said that politics controls the minority one-third plus one. It is fashionable in certain quarters to believe that Senator Lodge's personal antagonism to President Wilson caused the rejection of the Treaty of Versailles. All these are myths. It may be true that occasionally politics has entered into the consideration of the question. This is not necessarily reprehensible and cannot be foreclosed in a popular government. Politics has in fact played a minor role, since most treaties are adopted with relative speed and not on party considerations.[21] From 1899 to 1909 the Democrats controlled less than one-third of the Senate. From 1932 to 1942 the Republicans had the same experience. While the role of politics is minor, antagonism to a particular President or Secretary of State accounts for some votes. If the Constitution should now be changed making bare majorities adequate, politics would be likely to become a much more important factor in the consideration of treaties. If the two Houses did not belong to the same party or to the President's party, the chances are that the defeat of the President's treaties would become a political issue, a fact which might defeat many treaties. The assumption that ratification would by the amendment become much easier, may be mistaken.

Besides, proponents have in mind just one treaty or a set of treaties, namely, the forthcoming peace treaties and the machinery for enforcing them. All human experience contests the view that peace among nations can be enforced by any one or more of them, that their will and the law are identical, or that any country can be guaranteed against the result of its own ineptitude. Demographic considerations enter. Yet on the gamble that experience is wrong, many would upset the Constitution of the United States for the long future.

The decisive control over the vagaries of an Executive exerted by the two-thirds rule is compatible with an unchangeable administration. Majority control might possibly be considered if this were a parliamentary government, in which the administration could be removed if it incurred the displeasure of the people. The proposed amendment includes no such proviso, and is therefore inadequate.

There is another fundamental reason why the two-thirds rule, a linchpin of the Constitution, and taken for granted in the matter of impeachment,[22] overriding a veto, and expulsion of a Member, should not be changed. A treaty is something quite different from a statute. A treaty binds the Nation and cannot be changed by an act of legislation. A statute can be. A treaty may deal with any power suitable to negotiation with a foreign country. A Federal statute can deal only with such powers as Congress possesses. But by making a treaty with a foreign country—say, Canada—like the Migratory Bird Treaty of 1918, Congress can obtain for itself the implementing power to enact legislation which could not rest on any other basis than a treaty.[23] A treaty overrides all State law.[24] By making the treaty-ratifying power of Congress equivalent to that needed for a statute, a bare majority of those present, Congress will thus be enabled to arrogate to itself not merely the limited powers named in the Constitution but the unlimited powers of a treaty, thus overriding the States and reducing them to innocuousness.[25] A treaty is the practical equivalent of a constitutional amendment, the submission of which requires two-thirds vote of the Senate. But

---

[15] Black, loc. cit. pp. 5, 12.

[16] Royden W. Dangerfield, In Defense of the Senate, Norman (Okla.), 1933, p. 256. See also Denna F. Fleming, The Treaty Veto of the American Senate, New York, 1930, p. 50. See ch. IV of Fleming, and McClendon, loc. cit. pp. 41 et seq., for an analysis of the rejected treaties. See the figures presented by McClendon, loc. cit. pp. 40, 55. Only seven treaties were ultimately defeated by the two-thirds rule. Fleming, op. cit. 50; McClendon, loc. cit., p. 55.

[17] Mr. Fraser, in his minority report, reduces the Senate record to percentages, concluding, on the authority of Mr. Herbert Wright, that 71 percent were approved without amendment, and 18 percent were amended. Of the remaining 11 percent, the Senate rejected a little over 1½ percent, took no final action on nearly 7½ percent, and a little over 2 per cent were withdrawn. Considering that for the most part the Senate had no hand in negotiation but only acted after a draft was submitted, this is a very creditable record, and not one indicating necessity for a new method of approval.

[18] Mr. Fraser shows that under the proposed rule, 50 Senators representing the 25 least populous States containing less than one-fifth of the total population, could adopt a treaty in the face of 46 Senators from the 23 most populous States, containing over four-fifths of the population. While theoretically possible, such a juxtaposition of votes is most unlikely to occur. Matters of this kind were considered by the draftsmen of the Constitutional Convention. Mr. Herbert Wright, loc. cit., p. 645, deals with the possibility of a minority blocking a majority of public opinion or population.

[19] See article by J. H. Carmical, "Foreign Policy Drawn Up by P(etroleum) I(ndustry) W(ar) C(ouncil)," New York Times, December 11, 1944.

[20] Raymond J. Blair, "U. S. and Britain Study Change in Oil Agreement," New York Herald-Tribune, December 27, 1944, p. 1.

[21] W. Stull Holt, Treaties Defeated by the Senate, Baltimore, 1933, is inclined to overemphasize the effect of politics in defeating treaties. McClendon, loc. cit., p. 41, considers that "party politics was a minor factor" in the rejection of the 16 treaties he notes down to 1901. Some of these were adopted on reconsideration, with or without changes.

[22] Andrew Johnson was saved from impeachment by 1 vote, 35 to 19. It would have been unfortunate if a bare majority could have impeached him.

[23] *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416 (1920)). See comments of Julian P. Boyd, "The Expanding Treaty Power," (1928) 6 No. Car. Law Rev. 428 at 441 et seq., and Chandler P. Anderson, "The Extension of Congressional Jurisdiction by the Treaty-Making Power," (1920) 14 Am. Jour. Int. Law 400.

[24] On the supersession of State laws by treaties, see Boyd, loc. cit., p. 436.

[25] This is what is accomplished by the proposed oil agreement with Great Britain (New York Times, Aug. 9, 1944), submitted to the Senate Aug. 24, 1944. The Federal Government obtains the power—not warranted by the Constitution—to fix production quotas in the States, to make market allocations, to fix prices, to regulate conservation, to regulate the domestic oil business, to regulate "the production, processing, transportation, and distribution of petroleum" throughout the United States. It takes these powers from the States. Carmical, loc. cit. See also the objection of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association to the creation by treaty with Mexico of an administrative agency in perpetuity and escaping the control of Congress, (November 1944) 30 Am. Bar. Assoc. Jour. 629, 647, 659.

the proposed majority-approved treaty, reducing a treaty to the congressional requirements merely of a statute, has nevertheless the force of an amendment, while escaping the two-thirds requirement and ratification by three-fourths of the States.

The proposed amendment could thus serve to arrogate to Congress complete legislative power over the internal affairs of the Nation and would thus distort the Constitution in a most fundamental aspect. No other reason is necessary to indicate the unwisdom of the proposed amendment.

IV

Let us now examine the considerations advanced in the committee report in support of the proposed amendment. Relying on the House Judiciary Committee, your committee repeats that—

"The maintenance of the two-thirds rule, instead of working to maintain a great power in the Senate, is actually taking that power away from the Senate.

"Congress should act as a check upon the treaty-making powers of the President, but by maintaining a rule which prevents negotiations which the people desire, the Congress is on the road to eliminating itself from this important function of government."

It was the Senate and not Congress which was to act as a check upon the treaty-making powers of the President, and there is no evidence that the two-thirds rule prevents negotiations which the people desire. But the point of these two paragraphs is that if the Senate insists on its constitutional prerogative, the President will circumvent both Senate and Congress by making his compacts with foreign countries in the form of executive agreements. During the last 7 years this has in fact largely taken place. But this is not in accordance with the Constitution; it is directly contrary to the Constitution. The inflaton of the Executive power and the deflation of the Senate is, in addition, a departure from the constitutional duties assigned to these public officials.

The gist of the argument of the two paragraphs is that unless the Senate abandons the Constitution and consents to a change, an unconstitutional form of executive government will replace the Constitution. This argument may appeal to some gentlemen as a sound one, but I should think most Americans would repel the suggestion. Mr. Fraser has mentioned the statistics which are reiterated in a footnote.[26] I have devoted an article to the question whether the Executive agreement shall replace the treaty, and will not here repeat the argument.[27] It is a danger without a doubt. But the willingness of the Senate to abandon its constitutional prerogatives will hardly be promoted by the suggestion that an unlawful method of change will overcome their reluctance.

[26] Number of treaties and executive agreements published (to January 1, 1945):

Year of official printing	Treaties	Executive agreements
1930	25	11
1931	13	14
1932	11	16
1933	9	11
1934	14	16
1935	25	10
1936	8	16
1937	15	10
1938	12	24
1939	10	26
1940	12	20
1941	15	39
1942	6	52
1943	4	71
1944	0	71

[27] "Shall the Executive Agreement Replace the Treaty?" (September 1944) 53 Yale Law Jour. 664.

Here it should be said that the recent method of sending an executive agreement to the Congress "for its information"—where congressional support is deemed desirable—is particularly vulnerable to constitutional attack. The agreement is not "submitted" to the Congress and cannot be changed or amended in the slightest degree. By a separate bill it is approved or disapproved by reference. This is an unsustainable method of evading the Senate's concurrent power over treaties, which at least can be considered with a view to amendment.

The third argument in support of the amendment reads:

"The record of the Senate in handling treaties of peace is long, and it is disturbingly bad."

The record of the Senate is necessarily nearly as long as the history of the Nation, for which fact we should be grateful and for which the Senate can hardly be held responsible. As to whether its record is bad, a consultation of chapter VI of the book of Professor Denna Frank Fleming, [28] a severe critic of the Senate's two-thirds rule, indicates no such record of inefficiency or impropriety in dealing with our treaties of peace as the report might indicate. Beginning with the Jay Treaty of 1794, not technically a treaty of peace but more important than the peace of 1783, the record of the Senate is amazingly good. It amended comparatively few treaties and generally to their advantage. Had Senator Hoar succeeded in eliminating from the Treaty with Spain the provision for acquisition of the Philippines, we might have been even more grateful. The Senate actually did not balk at the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, as well it might have, but concentrated its objections and reservations on the obligations imposed on the United States by the experimental Covenant of the League of Nations. The reason for the failure of that treaty was the device of tying the covenant and the League together in one document, and the President's objection to approval of the reservations by the Democratic Senators.[29]

The fourth objection cited in support of the proposed amendment reads:

"From the moment the United States became a world power as a result of the Spanish-American War, the Senate has frustrated every significant move to make it possible for the country to participate in settling international disputes."

Nothing could be more misleading than this paragraph. The United States was a world power from the beginning. It simply did not become imperialistic until 1898. It is true that from 1897 to 1911 the Senate was somewhat skeptical about the conclusion of grandiose agreements for the arbitration of future disputes, except those that are important. They rejected the first Hay-Pauncefote treaty; and they attached important reservations to Secretary's Hay's treaties, reservations which Mr. Hay considered fatal. Secretary Root met the Senate's objections in 1908 by submitting to it the compromise of any particular arbitration, whereupon 22 arbitration treaties were signed. They made amendments to the Taft-Knox treaties of 1911,[30] which President Taft declined to accept. These arbitration treaties were a response to the predilections of the period, which found it fashionable to propose abstract agreements to arbitrate future disputes, which on negotiation had to be narrowed to a point where the commitment weakened rather than promoted arbitration. They were not agreements to arbitrate a specific issue. No evidence can be cited of cases in which the Senate frustrated in a specific case, by disapproving a protocol or compromise, the American practice of arbitrating legal questions. The draftsman of the report must be able to cite cases in which the State Department was willing to arbitrate specific issues, a willingness which was frustrated by Senate opposition. It is believed that no such evidence exists.

Under the Root treaties of 1908, the important fisheries arbitration was held with Great Britain at The Hague in 1910, and the claims arbitration under the convention of August 18, 1910. Other arbitrations have been held under the Hague Convention before the Permanent Court of Arbitration or by individual agreement for an ad hoc tribunal. The 1922 Washington treaties were approved. An arbitration convention with the Latin-American countries was signed in 1929.[31] The Rio agreement of 1933 was promptly ratified. The Kellogg Pact was uncritically accepted. If the report refers to the Senate objection to the Permanent Court of International Justice it may be said that few American questions could have been submitted to that tribunal. The Senate's objection to the covenant and court statute related to the procedure for soliciting advisory opinions by the council of the League. The court was largely concerned with construing the meaning of doubtful clauses in the peace treaties and deciding other European questions. I know of no case which was refused arbitration because of the Senate's objection to adherence to the court protocol. But I have a nostalgic regret that we shall never return to the good old days when the signature of an abstract arbitration treaty excited the Nation.

V.

We come now to other considerations advanced by the report in support of the proposed amendment. It speaks of the "need for promptitude in decision." Reference to Mr. Dangerfield's table on page 104 of his book "In Defense of the Senate" [32] discloses that from the time of President Washington to that of President Coolidge, the long delays of a treaty have occurred in the Department of State before submission to the Senate or after action by the Senate. The Senate delays, strange as it may seem have been relatively short. On one day, Mr. McClure states that 13 treaties were approved without change.[33] While a few treaties have lingered long, one of President W. H. Harrison having been in the Senate for 361 days, the average is about 30 to 60 days. The charge of excessive delay cannot legitimately be laid at the door of the Senate.

It is true that lack of cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government is accountable for some of the objections. The objection of the Senate to Secretary of State Seward and Secretary of State Hay had something to do with their failure to enlist the cooperation of the Senate. Nothing can change such possibilities of friction—not even the amendment. But the "practical impossibility of a unified party control over two-thirds of the Senate" seems to me a desirable rather than an undesirable feature of the American Government. Majority control in foreign affairs would expose the Senate to the influences of patronage, purge, logrolling and other kinds of pressure noticeable in ordinary legislation. The two-thirds rule helps to place Senators above such influences. The provisions of treaties, notably those of a treaty of peace, are as fundamentally important as the provisions of the Constitution itself, and should not merely represent the views of the party that may have a bare majority in Congress.

In all constitutions of which I am aware, important decisions must be made by two-thirds or greater majority. The Dumbarton Oaks draft, chapter V, section C, provides:

[28] Op. cit., p. 117.

[29] Supra.

[30] Fleming, op. cit., ch. V, pp. 77 et seq.

[31] Treaty Series 886.

[32] Dangerfield, op. cit., p. 104.

[33] McClure, op. cit., p. 377. See also, Wright, loc. cit., p. 650, note.

"2. Important decisions of the General Assembly, including recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security; election of members of the security council; election of members of the economic and social council; admission of members, suspension of the exercise of the rights and privileges of members, and expulsion of members; and budgetary questions, should be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting. On other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, the decisions of the General Assembly should be made by a simple majority vote." [34]

It is no objection to a legislative body that it has a "natural tendency" to debate. That, I thought, is one of its main functions. If we are to deprive a legislative body of the power to clarify, object, and debate, it would be more feasible to abolish it entirely.

Reference is also made to specific treaties, the failure to approve which is criticized. In most cases many considerations enter into the Senate's refusal to approve a particular treaty. The annexation of Texas by a treaty of 1844 [35] failed because it was feared by northerners that Texas would become a slave-holding territory, because President Tyler was unpopular in the Senate, and because Mexico had threatened to make the treaty a casus belli. Under Polk's Administration in 1845, Texas was annexed by joint resolution of Congress. But for the controversy concerning slavery there would have been no appreciable opposition to the treaty acquisition of Texas.

The Virgin Islands were offered to the United States by treaty in 1867, for $7,500,000. The treaty never was discussed in the Senate.[36] Historians attribute opposition to the treaty to Senate hostility to Secretary Seward. President Grant did not renew the proposal. But in 1902 a treaty for annexation was concluded at a price of five millions, Denmark to assume a series of obligations. It was the Danish Parliament, not the American Senate which frustrated that treaty.[37] Purchase was not finally effected until August 1916.[38] when the Panama Canal made possession of the Virgin Islands seem imperative. They then cost twenty-five millions. But in 1867 their acquisition did not seem important, and the opposition to imperialism was great.

The Bayard-Chamberlin treaty of 1888 [39] was defeated because the Committee on Foreign Relations advised rejection, denied presidential power to negotiate the treaty without previous consent of the Senate, and raised other intrinsic objections to the treaty, particularly the belief that it would lead to free trade. But the particular reason the citation appears inappropriate in this connection is that it was defeated by a vote of 28 for and 30 against, so that even under the proposed amendment it would have been lost. The two-thirds rule had nothing to do with its defeat.

Mr. Fleming lists in chapter IV of his book the few treaties rejected by the Senate,[40] and explains the variety of reasons which militated against their acceptance. He says that only seven had a majority, but not the required two-thirds, and the treaties defeated comprise but a very small percent of those considered. He adds [41] that "five-sixths of all treaties laid before it (the Senate) have been approved unconditionally."

An argument advanced in support of the change is that Congress declares war and should therefore have the power to pass on the treaties of peace. Apart from the fact that Congress seems to have had difficulty in extricating itself from the 1917 war, as witness the Knox-Porter Resolution of July 2, 1921, there is no analogy between the two powers. Congress is supposed to initiate a declaration of war. When war impends there is little time or opportunity for debate, since the foundation has been laid by diplomacy. Nor are the issues at stake often of a controversial nature. But treaties of peace are drafted by the Executive after long negotiation. They need the check of Senate control. They fix the conditions of future life and are usually exceedingly controversial. It is necessary to debate them at length and in detail. The two-thirds rule prevents the ill-considered or hasty adoption of a treaty before the public can be fully advised of what is under consideration. Submission to the House would add only confusion and probable delay, if debated, or be perfunctory and subject to political pressures, if not.

This paper has intentionally avoided thus far any discussion of the practical feasibility of adopting the proposed amendment. It has confined itself to the merits. It should be said, however, that in addition to House Resolution 320, reported out by the Judiciary Committee, resolutions for the proposed amendment have been introduced in the Senate by ex-Senator Gillette [42] and others. Some advocate as a substitute for the two-thirds Senate approval a majority of the Senate or a majority of both Houses. These resolutions cannot command even majority support in the Senate committee to which they have been referred, for as yet they have not been reported out. Recently the New York Times took a poll on this question among the Senators who were candidates for election to the new Senate.[43] The results were not encouraging. Among the 62 senatorial candidates polled, 24 did not answer the inquiry, 18 were in favor of the amendment, 8 were against it, 10 were noncomittal, and 2 agreed to submit it to the votes of the States. It is apparent that it will be difficult to enlist the votes of two-thirds of the Senate for submission of such an amendment.

Nor does there seem to be a sufficient public demand for such a change in the Constitution to justify a belief that three-quarters of the States will ratify the proposed amendment. Indeed, as former Ambassador Gibson points out,[44] if an amendment is to be considered it must be much more fundamental than the present proposal, which merely adds the House to the Senate as a ratifying body and substitutes a majority for the existing two-thirds. We should find a method analogous to the old French system, by which an informed group of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and perhaps of the House should be called into conference by the Department of State and participate as an executive or advisory council in the making of treaties. This might insure a sounder and less vulnerable treaty with probable legislative support.

On the whole question of an amendment, it seems likely that the nature of the problems which will confront the new Congress and its successors for the next few years will be of a character so profound that there will be little opportunity to consider such a formal change in the Constitution as is embodied in the proposed amendment.

[34] Department of State Bulletin, vol. XI, No. 276, October 8, 1944, p. 369. See also Interim Food and Agriculture Conference draft: Recommendations to governments for national action requires two-thirds approval, as do proposals for conventions among members, constitutional amendments, etc. See art. III, p. 8, arts. II, IV, VII, XIII, XX. See also art. VIIIa of the U. N. R. R. A. Agreement, Department of State Bulletin, vol. VIII, No. 207, June 12, 1943, pp. 523–527. The Bretton Woods Monetary Fund agreement provides for a four-fifths majority for any change in quotas; and no change can be made without consent of the member concerned.

[35] Fleming, op. cit., p. 66.

[36] Dangerfield, op. cit., p. 222; Fleming, op. cit., p. 62.

[37] Foreign Relations 1917, pp. 457, 529.

[38] Ibid., p. 659.

[39] Fleming, op. cit., p. 68.

[40] Op. cit., pp. 50 et seq.; McClendon, loc. cit., pp. 41 et seq.

[41] P. 50.

[42] Colegrove, op. cit., p. 170.

[43] New York Times, October 1 and 2, 1944.

[44] Hugh Gibson, The Road to Foreign Policy, New York, 1944, ch. 13, p. 174.

Is Admiral Ramsey, Chief of Aeronautics, Willing To Protect the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation in the Production of Defective Navy Planes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1945, a San Diego coroner's jury rendered this amazing verdict in connection with an investigation of a Navy-type plane that had crashed, killing the test pilot and five of his crew members:

We, the jury, find that any criminal negligence would rest with the Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corporation due to gross negligence and lax and haphazard methods of inspection. (Source: San Diego Union, January 6, 1945.)

This jury found that 96 bolt holes out of a total of 116 had never been filled in splicing the panel to the inner wing of the ill-fated airship that was being tested for purchase by the Navy Department.

On November 28, 1944, Joseph Leib, Washington writer, called the original newspaper clipping of the accident to the attention of the Navy Department. Here are two interesting letters from Admiral D. C. Ramsey, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics:

DECEMBER 4, 1944.

MY DEAR MR. LEIB: The Secretary of the Navy had referred your letter of 28 November to me as a matter under the cognizance of the Bureau of Aeronautics. The Bureau of Aeronautics representative at the plant of the Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft Corporation, San Diego, Calif., informed the Navy Department immediately following the accident to which you refer and stated that an investigation was under way to determine the cause and sequence of events leading to this crash and the fatalities involved. In addition, a further investigation has been initiated to check in detail the functioning of the contractor's inspection system in order to insure structural integrity of all aircraft which reach flight status. The official report of the accident has not yet reached the Navy Department, and, therefore, the full details are not yet known here.

Thank you for your interest in this matter. With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

D. C. RAMSEY,
Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

DECEMBER 29, 1944.

DEAR MR. LEIB: Thank you for your letter of December 19 and your continuing interest in air safety.

Your partial quotation from my letter of December 4 was accurate. Apparently, however, you draw an inaccurate conclusion from the words quoted.

The contractors' inspection system is a regular procedure applied to each plane during its construction. There was no intention of suggesting that any inspection was or is to be initiated after a crash instead of being a regular procedure before flight.

Existing inspection procedures are the result of long experience. When an error does occur in the functioning thereof, appropriate remedial action is taken promptly.

As stated to you in my letter of December 4, immediately after the crash the Navy Department started two investigations, one seeking to determine the cause and results of the crash, another to check in detail the functioning of the existing contractors' inspection system.

I will be glad to discuss this matter further with you in person if you desire.

Sincerely,

D. C. RAMSEY,
Rear Admiral, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

Now, according to a letter from the San Diego, district attorney addressed to Governor Warren, of California, the Navy Department refused to take any further action against the aircraft corporation and apparently was satisfied with conditions at this plant.

However, during the coroner's jury investigation Lt. Robert A. Burbick, Navy senior engineering officer assigned to the plant, testified that 98 bolts for which holes were provided in the steel splice frame never had been installed.

Burbick said, under questioning of Coroner Floyd F. Jones, that he examined the plane within 15 minutes after the crash and found omission of splice bolts to be the cause of the crash.

Arlie L. Anderson, civilian inspector employed by the Navy, told the jury that he was required to make only "spot checks" and that his work-sheet stamp did not signify that he had examined an entire plane.

Clarence R. Alexander who was a swing-shift foreman when the plane was assembled, testified his stamp "FM32" appeared on an assembly station work sheet that indicated the splice had been inspected. With his stamp appeared a plant inspection stamp "1025" and a naval stamp "USN–162."

This testimony, obviously, does not speak well for the Navy's own inspection system and it might be worth while for Admiral Ramsey to initiate a study of his own investigators.

On January 23, 1945, the Washington Star carried a story announcing that Joseph H. Famme, acting chief designing engineer for the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, had returned to the United States from England after having been loaned to the Army Air Forces to make a comprehensive study abroad in the hope that something could be done to reduce the startling number of crashes of the B–24's. These ships cost the American taxpayers $300,000 each.

In this connection I have a letter from an official of the Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft Corporation charging that the production situation at the San Diego factory is very unfavorable and if not immediately corrected will affect the safety of aircraft produced by this company for the armed services.

I shall be pleased to submit this amazing document to a proper and responsible congressional committee for further study. It is reprehensible that an official of this corporation should find it necessary to appeal to Congress to correct this deplorable situation. I have been asked to hold his name in confidence but I have permission to turn it over to a congressional committee. Here is the letter:

JANUARY 21, 1945.

I desire to provide you with pertinent information regarding the aircraft manufactured by Consolidated-Vultee Corporation; and unless measures are taken to correct certain existing conditions, aircraft accidents will continue to occur at the same rate, if not greater than in the past.

Since the fatal accident of last November, caused by a wing breaking loose on a Navy PB4Y–2 bomber on its first flight, I would especially like to mention facts pertaining to other airplanes.

On one of the 4Y–3 type airplanes (a transport version of the PB4Y–2) lend-leased to the British, recently put into operation by the Royal Air Force Ferrying Command, the following was noted on January 11, 1945:

Before installing additional fuel cells for overseas operation, after all original test flights had been made, the internal wing splice bolts (same as those missing in the wing of airplane that crashed) were inspected for proper installation.

Approximately one-half of them were found to be loose, not only in one but both wings. Those bolts were loose enough that they could be turned just by the weight of a wrench. This indicates that when the original installation was made someone had only tightened or torqued part of them and forgot to tighten the nuts on the others. Also, the inspector had not checked all of them and was not performing his duty in this case. I think it is easy to realize how serious this may have been had the necessity arisen for any violent maneuvers during the test flights of this airplane. The bolts which were properly tightened carried all of the load; if they had broken, it is quite likely the others would have broken, too, when receiving the shock.

(At this point this official gave the British serial number of this plane.)

As you know, our company is building the B–32 bombers, and an assembly line is being set up for that purpose. Several of these planes were built some time ago in the experimental department of the San Diego division, and our plant at Fort Worth has recently completed a number of the latest model, one of which was flown to San Diego a few weeks ago. Through a reliable source I have received information that this airplane was very poorly assembled, requiring practically an overhaul before airworthy.

Many rivets throughout the airplane were improperly installed and large numbers of them were omitted entirely. In some places where holes had been drilled for rivets the fasteners were still in them. (These fasteners are only for the purpose of holding the material together while assembling and must be removed to install the rivets, as they have no strength value.)

The exhaust system on one of the engines had not been correctly installed and the area around it not properly protected, part of which had burned through and may have caused a serious fire while in flight.

Altogether, I have been told there were about 2,000 discrepancies found on this airplane by the inspection department. With this information it isn't difficult to determine the elements responsible for this deplorable condition.

In my opinion, I believe the management is responsible for the existing situation. Apparently not enough emphasis is made to influence the employees to do a good, thorough job. Instead, they are encouraged to do just enough to get by inspection. Cases arise when an inspector's judgment is overruled by the management of the production department.

In other words, the inspection department does not have the authority they should and are controlled by the production department which is responsible for the lowering of the general aircraft standards. Both Army and Navy inspectors seem to be restricted in many respects which is detrimental, also.

The condition can be remedied by requiring management to encourage the employees to improve their workmanship. Of course, management will say this will slow down production, because they seem more interested in getting out the planes than improving the quality of them.

However, I know that this improved method would result in increased production in a very short time because there would be very little rework required, as has been necessary in the past.

For example, the air lines require their personnel exercise care and diligence in the performance of their duties and there is no reason, why this method could not be just as successful in the aircraft industries.

Another unfavorable situation exists in the flight department. Not only is the quality of workmanship low, but there is a great deal of waste of both material and manpower.

Employees are encouraged to work overtime, when it is not necessary. I have seen men idle half of their regular hours and still be asked to work overtime.

Being that many like to receive time and one-half pay for hours worked overtime, they gladly accept this request.

In my opinion, orders should be given the company at once to cut out this needless expense to the Government.

I believe this information is sufficient for the present time to enable you to take steps to rectify this deplorable situation.

For further details regarding this case, see Appendix of the RECORD, pages A517–A518 and A823–A824.

Labor Views Patent Abuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, president of the tariff group of that body and one of the finest of the labor leaders in this country, addressing the New York Patent Law Association, March 13, 1945, directed attention to the fact that America is the only major nation which permits goods or articles, protected by home patents, to be produced in foreign countries under labor conditions declared substandard by their own laws, and shipped into home markets.

Those who are posing as friends of the American working man and who boast of the beneficial legislation which has in the last few years been enacted to better our standards of living should stop, look, and listen. Surely, if we deny the right of transportation in interstate

commerce to goods which were produced in American factories, under substandard conditions, there is no good reason why we should permit competitive goods, produced under what we have legislatively defined to be substandard conditions, to be shipped into our American markets in order that a comparative few should secure larger profits.

It is gratifying to note that the intelligent and constructive leadership of the American Federation of Labor, as represented by Matthew Woll, no doubt realizing the need of protecting the job opportunities of America's workers, are mindful of the fact that trade barriers against our goods, which are in fact embargoes, exist in these potential foreign markets, and that they are far more effective trade barriers than any tariff rates which might be imposed by us.

The question of patents and patent legislation has many angles, and is one which requires deep study before one can arrive at a definite conclusion.

The question as to whether or not alleged authorities, who for many years have engaged in foreign trade, now holding high public office, should be allowed to continue to mislead the American people by promises of increased export trade into markets where legislative embargoes now exist, is one the answer to which is clear. This deliberate misleading of the American people by paid propagandists over the radio and through the press in the interest of those who would sell America down the river should be stopped.

I deem it a privilege to include the address of Matthew Woll as a part of my remarks, and I recommend to each of my colleagues a careful reading of the same:

Until recent years American workers have given little attention to the subject of patents. Lately, however, they have shown an increasing interest in this subject. Presently they are seriously concerned about future possibilities in the realm of world commercial relationships. Exclusive grants of the right to prohibit or exclude others from making, using, or selling an inventor's creation or discovery necessarily are included.

The National Patent Planning Committee, in its report of 1943, stated quite accurately that "the strongest industrial nations have the cost effective patent systems."

We may rightfully claim to be the strongest industrial nation in the world. We have become a great industrial nation because of our spirit of free enterprise and our national zest for striving toward new horizons. Those who, in the early years of the Republic, pioneered against most difficult odds, toiled principally with their hands.

FREE ENTERPRISE—FREE LABOR

As a result of this free pioneering spirit, and as a consequence of the desire to lighten the burden of fellow workers, as well as to benefit themselves, new devices, productive machinery, and industrial and commercial relations were developed laying the foundation upon which was built the greatest nation in the world. Ours, truly, is a land of free enterprise and free labor—the wellspring of an industrial capacity which has outstripped the productivity of all other nations, especially those using feudal, slave, or totalitarian, which includes forced labor.

The miracle of the twentieth century is that American workers toil fewer hours for more wages, work under better, more humane conditions, and still outproduce the industrial plants of any other country of the world. This miracle was made possible by the genius of the inventors whom our forefathers sought to encourage and protect under our patent system.

Without benefit of extensive laboratories, and often the victims of exploitation, pioneer inventors received small compensation for their creations or discoveries, altogether all out of proportion to the sacrifices entailed. However, this was the joy of creation—the immense satisfaction of creating that which did not exist before.

Americans always have been an inventive people. It is said that more than three-fourths of the industrial wealth of our country is attributable directly or indirectly to the inventive genius of our people, as represented by patent rights. Many instances might be cited wherein craftsmen conceived and developed processes and mechanical devices which have revolutionized production and transportation and have laid the foundation for the remarkable rise of our industrial and agricultural life. Workers may rightfully claim to have made great contributions to the phenomenal progress of America.

PUBLIC INTEREST TO BE SERVED

Because of the importance of invention and discovery to the industrial progress of the country, the authors of the Constitution delegated authority to Congress to promote the progress of science and the useful arts by securing for a limited time, to authors and inventors, the exclusive right to their writings, discoveries, and inventions. On this foundation our patent system is based. Regardless of whether a patent right is considered a public franchise, in the broad powers delegated to it, Congress may well regulate the use of exclusive grants to be exercised under patent authority in the public interest.

The welfare of the country as a whole, not the welfare of the individual inventor, is of primary consideration. The inventor is presumed to have produced something of public value. It is only in consideration of a public service rendered or to be rendered that the Government has provided extraordinary privileges for the inventor.

It is said "like begets like." So every invention carries with it the seeds of further inventions, not only because of improvements upon the original invention but because of the new knowledge which every invention gives the public. Inventions, too, are unlimited. It is not possible that inventions can keep stride with knowledge, nor that science applied to industry may keep abreast of pure science. The field of inventiveness and of discovery, like pure science, is limitless.

EMPIRES BUILT ON PATENTS

However, great economic changes have taken place since the present patent laws first were enacted. A technological revolution has taken place. Then, too, new and larger forms of industrial organization have been evolved. Corporate, rather than individual, enterprises abound today in our industrial and commercial life. Vast industrial empires have developed and constantly have extended their influence and control and patents have contribute largely to that end. Consequently, earnings and incomes have risen to undreamt of heights. It is estimated that prior to the present war at least 50 patents have each yielded in profits more than $1,000,000 a year, that 300 have each yielded more than $500,000 a year; 500 to 800 have each yielded from $250,000 to $500,000 a year, and between 15,000 to 20,000 have each yielded more than $100,000 a year. Many of our patents are said to produce for their owners fortunes larger than they could ever hope to earn in salaries or wages. It is evident, therefore, that we have entered a new era in the field of patents which requires a new appraisal and evaluation both from the standpoint of the individual inventor and the public to be served.

In our employment relations it is rather noticeable and regrettable that the rights of employer and employee, with regard to inventions, are not more fully and more accurately understood and more fairly administered. The law would seem quite clear that there is no obligation on the part of the employee to assign to his employer patents obtained for inventions made in the course of employment. Such an obligation can be created only by voluntary agreement, expressed or implied. Nevertheless, we find an increasing tendency of patent agreements being required of employees as a condition incidental to employment.

These agreements commonly cover all employees and require the employees not only to disclose all or any inventions made or conceived along the lines of the company's work and investigation but to execute documents essential and required to vest exclusive rights to ownership and use in the company.

While there seems to be a trend toward liberalization of compensation policy in this regard, nevertheless, such requirements as a condition precedent to employment are wholly unwarranted. In most instances they do not express the free will of the employee. Such requirements fairly may be said to involve an undue, if not coercive, element in our employment relations. This practice does not permit that freedom of contract which rightfully should prevail.

UNFAIR LABOR RELATIONS

Patent laws designed to protect the individual inventor against exploitation and promote the public good may and, in many instances, have had contrary results. In some instances they have been used to exploit the general public by circumventing the anti-trust laws. Obviously, patent laws are designed to protect the owners of patents, as well as the inventors. Thus, it has become possible for an entire industrial organization to own all the patents necessary for an entire industry. It can then license others on terms which give it control of prices, as well as production. Naturally, limitations come to be placed upon such practices by legal decisions and limitations, as is well evidenced in the confused line of decisions on the pooling of patents.

It is urged that the disclosure of agreements dealing with patents would minimize the abuses which arise by virtue of secret, improper, and even illegal agreements. Undoubtedly, the recording of all such agreements would lessen the abuses now practiced. It is doubtful, though, whether such recording would in itself prevent these evils and abuses.

In addition, it never was made clear just what constituted a patentable invention. This has led to much confusion and adroit maneuvering. Infringement suits are costly and uncertain. Operating under forces which make it one of the instruments of organized control over industry, this uncertainty as to what is or is not a patentable invention, and, the possibility of infringements upon it has become a combination of law and of mechanics under which almost any results might be achieved. Certainly the public good is not advanced or protected under such circumstances.

To prevent such abuses and manipulations it is urged that the term of patent be reduced to 20 years from date of filing in the Patent Office. While the reduction in the term of patent protection may lessen some evils due to these practices, it is questionable whether such reduction would go to the root of the evil.

PATENT ABUSES

Then, again, the practice of corporate enterprise hiring men to make inventions as their agents has increased in recent years.

Thus the patent laws, designed to protect individual inventors have become effective instruments in evading the real objective of these laws and have provided an effective means of escaping the disorganizing force of too logical an application of the antitrust laws.

It was also alleged, at one time in the councils of the American Federation of Labor, that under guise of protective features of our patent laws, many useful and valuable inventions were either unused or misused and that monopolies thus had come to profit a comparative few of our citizens instead of benefiting the many. It was urged that our laws be so amended as to require holders of American patents to so work and operate them as would result in actual production within the United States of the article disclosed in such patents in reasonable quantities and within a reasonable time. The American Federation of Labor, while quite unprepared at the time to reach a definite and final conclusion, did direct further study, inquiry, and improvement.

COMPULSORY LICENSES

While it is alleged that practical considerations made such a requirement undesirable, nevertheless some 35 nations of the world do require that patents issued by them must be utilized. At least they require that patented articles must be produced in the country which issues the patent. Failure to do so can lead to revocation or the issuance of a license to others to manufacture or produce under such patent.

It is interesting to note here that while the National Patent Planning Commission, in its report of 1943 states that "it would not be advantageous to incorporate such a general system in our patent laws," meaning compulsory licensing, nevertheless the Commission recommended a statutory provision as being essential and necessary to the national defense, or required by the public health or public safety. This is a direct admission of the validity of the principle involved, and indicates that its application is a matter of discrimination and judgment. If, therefore, such a principle and practice is sound and is required by the public health and safety, may it not also be said to be sound and essential as applied to our public economy—the public welfare—the public well-being?

It is being recognized generally that industry the world over is becoming more and more Americanized. The penetration of European industry by American inventions is one of the outstanding features in recent years. To a great extent this penetration has been made possible by the protection accorded inventions. It is said in some cases that Europe has held more promise to American inventors, or owners of patents, than America itself.

JOBS TRANSFERRED TO FOREIGN NATIONS

It is alleged also that because of compulsory license features of patent laws of other nations American manufacturers and owners of patents have found it desirable, if not necessary, to manufacture abroad. Surveys made and statistics compiled by Government agencies indicate that branch factories have been built in foreign countries, that licenses have been issued to producers in foreign countries to produce articles, the patents upon which were granted in the United States. Regardless of whether this practice is attributable to foreign patent laws, the fact remains that such developments do have a deleterious effect upon our own economy, and do affect our domestic investors as well as our workers.

With the world demoralized from an industrial point of view, and with the greatest world demand for durable goods for machine tools ever experienced; with practically no financial resources to assure prompt purchase payments, either by foreign governments, groups, or individuals, or a combination of the two, it is reasonable to assume that American capital will be attracted primarily in the establishment of original or branch factories abroad, or will associate itself with foreign capital in so doing. Undoubtedly one of the outlets for international investment will be the supply of foreign demand. It is equally certain that in time such investments and establishment of factories abroad will be used to market the goods so produced in foreign countries, in our domestic market which, in the final analysis, is the most lucrative market in the world.

Such a situation is not inconceivable. This sort of development had its origin even before the war, and has made considerable progress up to Pearl Harbor. With impoverished labor throughout the world, the danger of such dormant tendencies is greatly increased.

Labor of America is fully aware of these possible consequences inherent in post-war developments and in which the patent laws of the world will play an important part.

Together with these features of our patent laws, inherently related to them exist American tariff provisions which, at present, restrict the importation into our country of any trade-marked article without the written consent of the owner or holder of the trade mark. Under these provisions, the owners or holders of American or European trade marks not only may deprive American workers of opportunities of employment, but the American public may also be required to pay a greater price for the foreign produced article than the owner of his license may require for the same article by peoples of other lands.

Furthermore, America now is asked to enter an era of surplus production in order to meet the immediate demands of a devastated Europe and Asia. We have been told that a surplus production economy will provide employment approximately to 60,000,000 of our working population. Surplus production for the next few years will be welcomed by these devastated lands. It may prove helpful in meeting our own immediate reemployment problems, due to reconversion. Nevertheless, with foreign industries newly equipped with automatic machinery, managed by modern American methods, with low labor standards prevailing abroad, we may well, in subsequent years, find that foreign patent laws with their compulsory license features will contribute greatly to the curtailment of the foreign market for surplus American production.

Organized labor is not unmindful of future disastrous results likely to follow. It is seriously disturbed by the possible consequences of some of our proposed post-war plans, in which patents as well as other trade barriers are involved.

Perhaps the most important of all questions is the one embracing the future world of patents in the changing relationships taking place among the governments of the world. There is no doubt that post-war Europe will become increasingly collectivist. Private capitalism, as we Americans understand the term, is on the decline in the rest of the world.

TOTALITARIANISM PROMOTED

As collectivism grows in strength, so parliamentary and democratic governments diminish in power and influence. Undoubtedly exports and imports as well as patents will come under even greater governmental control. With more strict government limitation, if not restriction, imposed on private ownership, what condition will govern? It is evident that our system of patents will be seriously affected and must be modified to meet changing world conditions and relations.

In this regard, the Russian situation is particularly interesting. The Russian patent system, like all Russian activity, is designed to strengthen the totalitarian controls which obtain in that country. To that end all the resources of the country are exploited. There is no room in the Soviet system for investment of foreign capital. Its requirements from the outside world are limited to obtaining assistance in organizing its industries and in setting up its factories in accordance with the best known practices for organization and operation of business establishments.

The industrial system, then, is dominated by the government so that there is no opportunity for private individuals to engage in privately-owned enterprises, and to make a private profit. All profits accrue to the government.

While the Russian patent system may follow in form the patent system of other countries, this is probable only because Russia has not yet devised a patent system entirely satisfactory to Soviet domestic economy.

Like any other patent system, it is designed to encourage invention by its own people, and to encourage foreigners to disclose their inventions to Russia and to make them available to it for use.

The Russian patent system embodies one feature not found in systems of other countries, in that it provides means to enable inventors to exploit such of their inventions which are considered of utility to the national economy.

A planned national economy such as that of Russia does not provide for private economy. This patent system which, by its very nature, sets up private enterprise, is designed to put the Central Government in control of any rights which are granted, so that no power over industrial organization can remain in the hands of private individuals who might thereby guide, to some extent, the natonal economy. This has been accomplished by a series of simple expedients, harmless enough in appearance, but, which readily can be administered in such fashion as to gain the desired result.

If a patent holder in Russia is to dispose of his patent rights, he must do so to a Government-owned industry, there being no other industries in Russia. If a foreign citizen or industry is to dispose of his or its invention, they can only dispose of it to a Government industry only if the Soviet Government deems it necessary or useful to the national economy, and then it must be done within 3 years. Otherwise, a compulsory license will be granted and the price of the invention is fixed by a Government board of arbitration.

Where the Government industries are unwilling to wait 3 years to acquire an invention, they may arrange for its purchase or terms satisfactory to the patent owner. However, this system precludes the possibility even of preventing the use of the invention for any length of time; for example, to permit the patent owner to import materials into Russia or to prevent the Russians from duplicating it if they saw fit.

AMERICA ALONE PERMITS IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN-MADE PATENTED GOODS

In other words, the patent system of Russia, which will serve as a pattern and guide for other countries, particularly those coming within the sphere of influence of Russia, will leave a foreign person or industry entirely to the tender mercies of Russia. Foreigners only can deal with Russian industries at their own risk. Only where Russia is anxious to acquire foreign technical service, patents involving material or processes used in connection with such technical assistance may Russian-controlled products be sold under negotiated and, in instances, fair terms. Likewise, where an article is imported and not manufactured in Russia, a foreign patent holder in Russia gains an advantage over a competitor attempting to sell an infringing article. On the other hand there is no possible way in which he can prevent the use of his patent, or even dictate the manner in which it may be used.

Conversely, we here in America are the only nation which offers freely and without limitation to Russia, and to all other nationals the opportunity for exclusive production rights. We also grant them the opportunity for the exclusive control of our home market in which to exploit patented inventions to the great detriment of our home industries, workers, and the public generally.

In the light of post-war possibilities it would be well to reappraise the whole of our patent system.

FREE ENTERPRISE SHOULD BE PROTECTED

We quite agree with the National Patent Planning Committee in its comments upon our present patent system, when it says, "as with any system of long standing, conditions arise which were not foreseen at the time of its establishment." We concur in the recommendation of the Commission that "the American patent system should be adjusted to meet existing conditions without destroying its basic principles."

We urge, however, that the basic principles should be so applied as to assure the distribution of benefits of patented inventions to all of our people and not permit manipulation and abuses which result in the enrichment of a comparatively few. We urge also that our patent system be so constituted and administered as to assume the perpetuation of our free-enterprise system and not permit of its use as a means of developing great private monopolies or empires which, with tendencies of unrestraint, ultimately can result only in undermining and destroying our American democracy and our American way of life.

The security and perpetuity of our freedom, free enterprise, and our free labor must not be sacrificed for immediate profits.

To that end we favor a thorough, unbiased, and unprejudiced study and inquiry of this whole subject and the enactment of laws which will provide for a constructive and progressive system of patented enterprise.

Limit on Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star, of March 15, 1945:

LIMIT ON LEND-LEASE

In its overwhelming vote extending the life of the Lend-Lease Act for another year, the House has adopted a wholly pertinent amendment barring use of the act for post-war relief, rehabilitation, or reconstruction. The size of the vote—354 to 28—is a tribute to the excellence of lend-lease as a weapon essential to victory, but the restricting provision makes clear at the same time that congressional sentiment is strongly opposed to having the measure operate beyond the point of military need.

Enacted originally to promote the defense of the United States, lend-lease, both in intent and function, has been a military project from the start, and as such, operating reciprocally among the Allies, it has played a powerful and decisive role in making certain the ultimate defeat of the Axis. But though its purpose and application have thus been clear, there have been some misgivings of late that it might be employed in such a way as to make this country a kind of "lady bountiful" in the immediate post-war period. The amendment passed by the House serves, accordingly, as a timely restatement of what the measure is meant to be, so that neither here nor abroad should there be any mistaken notion about it.

Though advanced by Republicans, the amendment was promptly accepted by administration leaders. Actually, the administration itself has declared on more than one occasion that the act will cease operating as soon as hostilities come to an end, and just a few months ago a joint London-Washington statement announced that lend-lease shipments to Britain would probably be cut in half this year and that the British would pay cash for supplies not related to the prosecution of the war. The fact that Japan still will remain to be beaten after Germany goes down tends to complicate the situation, but the rule applying to Britain is presumably meant to apply generally, with lend-lease being adjusted among all the United Nations in accordance with changing military requirements.

This is as it should be. The vast job of relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction belongs to U. N. R. R. A., the projected world bank and similar agencies already existing or being planned. Lease-lend, as its own formal title declares and as the new House amendment reaffirms, is strictly a war measure designed to last no longer than the war itself. To use it as something more than that would be to violate its avowed purpose, play Santa Claus and delay the return of normal international economic processes.

Investigations of Military Affairs Committee of House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, many formal public documents are issued from time to time concerning the work of the Committee on Military Affairs, and, although some publicity is achieved in the press and over the air, as a member of that committee, I want to give you a short but comprehensive outline of some of the praiseworthy accomplishments of the committee. In making this possible the Military Affairs Committee has functioned with the able assistance of its general counsel, H. Ralph Burton and his active staff.

Investigations which have engaged the attention of the committee during the Seventy-eighth Congress have ranged from safeguarding the lives of military aviators to protecting the interests of American taxpayers. Many matters have been presented for consideration, the mere presentation of which has often been speedily followed by agency rectification, making further congressional action unnecessary. Thus the investigative activities of the committee have prevented as well as cured unhealthy bureaucratic condition. Some investigations of the national war effort have included those in the category of military secrets which, because of the nature of the subjects involved, cannot be publicized while the war is in progress.

A painstaking and exhaustive investigation of airplane accidents was prompted by reported questionable practices of a company enjoying a monopoly in the sale to the Army of fueling systems of the type known as "hydraulic," operated on the theory that water and gasoline do not mix and whereby gasoline is forced into planes by the upward pressure of water against it. Favoritism shown by certain Army officers for a particular fueling system was halted; payments of inordinate commissions to salesmen were ended; better and safer fueling systems were assured for the future; and military aviation hazards were decreased as the efficiency of the air arm was increased.

A shocking glider fatality at Lambert Field, St. Louis, in which the mayor and other important officials were killed, resulted in a thorough investigation by the committee. The accident was caused, apparently, by faulty construction which had not been detected because of nonexistent or wholly inadequate inspection service. Assurances were given to the committee that corrective measures, including complete and rigorous inspection service, would be instituted at once. To make doubly sure, a committee investigator conducted another inquiry about a month later from which it was established that all assurances given the committee had been faithfully carried out and the methods adopted were adequate and effective.

The Military Affairs Committee entertained charges which were brought to its attention in reference to certain corporations engaged in the manufacture of military aircraft. This investigation revealed that vast sums of Federal money were being spent in experimental aircraft projects. They also revealed that the War Department had entered into contracts supplementary to these experimental projects for the manufacture of plywood planes, and the Defense Plant Corporation had spent vast sums of money in the construction on behalf of these contractors. Only six airplanes were built and none of them fully met specifications, and all were refused by the Army. In all, there were something like $400,000,000 in contracts for the building of wooden cargo planes, and the committee investigations resulted in convincing everyone that this experimental project was not practical. In its abandonment, it resulted in the saving to our people of sums exceeding $300,000,000.

An investigation by the committee grew out of charges that gambling, prostitution on the premises, equipment-renting rackets, the burying of scrap metal, and general waste were prevalent at the Orangeburg Staging Area, Rockland County, N. Y. The staging area—later named Camp Shanks—was constructed for the purpose of housing troops prior to service overseas. The committee investigation was suspended with the understanding that the Department of Justice was to take the matter in hand through the institution of criminal proceedings. However, some 8 months later, hearings were held before the committee at which several witnesses

formerly connected with the camp construction were heard. Impressed greatly by revelations of the committee, the Department of Justice authorized the impaneling of a Federal grand jury to probe the situation from every angle. The grand jury is now questioning witnesses.

As a result of the committee's investigation of the British Operational Training Unit, Nassau, British West Indies, numerous irregularities were to a large extent eliminated and millions of dollars saved to the taxpayers. The irregularities were connected with rentals of equipment, auditing of accounts, purchase of materials, storage of gasoline, sales of Government property, dismissal of employees, misuse of Government transportation equipment, leasing of a yacht and a hotel, and extraordinary privileges according to personnel, all connected with the construction of airfields and auxiliaries by the United States Corps of Engineers with lend-lease funds. On completion, the installations were turned over to the British Government.

Inquiries relating to accounting in war contracts, particularly to the cost allocation of salaries and bonuses paid to administrative officials in industry, engaged in the attention of the committee for a protracted period. The importance of its study was emphasized by the discovery that inordinate increases in salaries in addition to bonuses were being paid to executives in both upper and lower ranks of industrial enterprises, apparently in defiance of instructions contained in the Auditors' Manual issued by the executive accountant and auditor of the Army Air Forces. Increases in salaries ran as high as 400 percent, while increases given to those earning less than $10,000 a year seldom went above 25 percent. A large portion of the increased salaries was charged to Government contracts. Many executives connected with organizations now operating on war contracts had formerly been paid high salaries because of ability to procure commercial business and to promote the sale of their organizations' product to civilian buyers, but such talents were not at all essential to the work they were currently performing. As a result of this investigation and the committee's recommendations prompted thereby, efficient and constructive measures have been instituted and inestimable savings in war production costs effected.

Growing out of a number of investigations made by this committee into sales of surplus property were savings of considerable sums to the Government, the admonishment and disciplining of several officers for failure properly to protect the Government's interests, and the institution of changes to insure a more rigorous supervision of these surplus sales activities and the enforcement of all regulations governing the sale and disposal of salvaged property. The idea firmly implanted in the minds of authorities in control of salvage, that the committee is alert to sales activities, has been highly salutary in assuring more careful disposals of surplus. It may confidently be stated that the savings to the Government resulting from the watchfulness of the committee over this single activity, far more than balanced the dollars expended by the committee for all its investigations during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

An investigation by the committee forestalled what might eventually have proved detrimental to allied occupational procedure and strategy. It saved Federal funds appropriated for specialized training from diversion to subversive use. It served as a warning to some educational institutions. During November 1943 a series of articles appeared in the public press alleging that certain teachings not in accord with the American philosophy of government were being incorporated in the curriculum at Cornell University in connection with a new Army specialized training program schedule. A careful study of the allegations was made, with the result that the teacher who was the chief offender soon afterward severed his connection with the university.

Studies and investigations of the Selective Service System were long, detailed, and arduous but resulted in a general clarification of this complex subject. Particular consideration was given to the growing practice, both in Government and industry, of deferring men of draft age, by which the Nation's manpower pool had been dangerously depleted. Throughout the testimony of various Government officials on the subject of occupational deferments—classes II–A and II–B—which had been requested by the agencies, there was evidence that a great many Government employees had requested their own deferment without the knowledge of the agency involved or were put in deferred classifications by their local boards after they had filed impressive-looking applications. These and kindred irregularities were halted. An exhaustive search of existing statutes containing provisions affecting the various manpower problems at issue and applicable to the question before the committee resulted in the conclusion by the committee that the Selective Service System, the Army, the Navy, and the War Manpower Commission in cooperation were legally empowered to meet all of the exigencies presented in relation to the manpower situation.

The initiation of an investigation by the committee was followed by official action which forced the termination of an activity strongly resembling a racket calculated to mulct indirectly the Federal Government of sums which ultimately would have run into hundreds of millions of dollars. Furthermore the efforts of the committee earned and received the unstinted commendation of outstanding national organizations, many of whom held as their cardinal tenet that labor is not a commodity for sale on the auction block or in the market place. The investigation concerned itself with the growing practice, engaged in by so-called engineering service companies, of enticing employees having certain specialized skills from plants engaged in war production and subsequently selling their skills under contract to the same or other war contractors at exorbiant rates, resulting in an unjustifiable increase in the costs of war contractors. Apparently the practice began as early as 1940, but it was not until late in 1943 and early in 1944 that any attempt on the part of responsible Government agencies was made to put a stop to it, and no definite action was taken to do so until after the committee had begun its investigations in industrial centers. Eventually the Office of War Information announced a program adopted by the National War Labor Board, the War Manpower Commission, the War and Navy Departments, and the Maritime Commission for combating on several fronts the so-called engineering service companies. A recapitulation of five agreements of one company alone with these employment agencies shows an ultimate cost to the Government of the United States for war labor renting of $1,384,000.

Reports of racial animosities and labor unrest culminating in an unauthorized work stoppage on D-day, and numerous complaints received were considered sufficiently important to require an immediate first-hand investigation of conditions at the Wright Aeronautical Corporation, Lockland, Ohio, which is engaged in the manufacture of aircraft engines. It seems that some action on the part of the management in changing personnel in the plant and placing seven Negro men in a shop with white employees, both men and women, resulted in a strike. Some twelve to fifteen thousand white employees left their work, and temporarily crippled production at the plant. The mere fact that a representative of the Committee on Military Affairs was on the premises contributed in considerable measure to the resumption of normal conditions there.

Hearings before a special committee brought out the fact that in August 1943 a Puerto Rican corporation chartered a War Shipping Administration cargo vessel for the purpose of shipping 1,359,000 gallons of molasses to New Orleans consigned to the shippers only. The cargo was unsold practically up to the arrival of the ship at its destination, whereupon it was offered for sale to a private trader in the United States. The purchase was made at 18 cents a gallon for the entire cargo at the suggestion of the Molasses Section of the War Production Board. This same cargo could have been purchased by the Defense Supplies Corporation, a Federal agency, in Puerto Rico at 5 to 6 cents a gallon plus 6 to 7 cents a gallon for transportation if any means thereof had been made available by the War Shipping Administration. Complaints had been made that, at the instance of the War Production Board, cargo ships for the transportation of molasses from the Caribbean area were being assigned to private industry, while shipping facilities for the same product were denied the Defense Supplies Corporation, a Government agency. Had this practice been permitted to continue uninterrupted, it is probable that tremendous profits would have been made at the expense of the Government and would have been added to the costs of living in the United States.

Covering an extended period prior to final passage of the Contract Settlement

Act of 1944, a careful study of the procedures by the War Department, as well as other agencies, occupied the attention of the committee. Illustrative of distinct benefits resulting from a limited survey of negotiations preceding final settlement of terminated contracts is the case of the K. B. Noble Co., of Hartford, Conn. Upon cancelation of a contract with this company by the War Department, it developed that the contractor was left with a surplus of electrical equipment and parts to the approximate value of $58,000, which, under War Department regulations, must be disposed of either by the contractor or the Department. Of this amount, $8,000 was absorbed by the contractor, leaving $50,000 worth of equipment to be sold. After following established procedures, it was sold to the highest bidder, a junk dealer, for $6,000. Within a period of about 2 weeks thereafter this junk dealer was able to sell a very small portion of this equipment, having a very high priority, to a manufacturer for about $12,000, leaving the greater part of the material still to be sold, thus inordinately increasing his gains, since, regardless of sale price, it would all be profit. Although there was no evidence of fraud in the sale of this equipment, the transaction very definitely did show, as in other instances, that the procedures which had been established by the War Department were not sufficiently precise to protect the interests of the Government in the disposition of surplus property. When this matter was called to its attention, the War Department gave assurance that remedial measures would be instituted.

Charges were filed with the committee that the construction of the Gopher Ordnance Plant at Rosemont, Minn., was characterized by excessive personnel, incompetence, extravangance, and waste. All instances of irregularities found by the committee representatives were called to the attention of the Army officers in charge and the officials of the contractor, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. Corrective measures were promptly instituted and assurance were given to the committee that others would follow. The plant was designed to produce 300 tons of smokeless powder a day, but no powder was ever produced. On April 10, 1943, after spending nearly $78,000,000 on the project, the War Department ordered construction work discontinued on 3 of the 6 production lines, and the remaining 3 put in stand-by condition, on the ground that existing plants could meet all requirements for the remainder of the year.

Early in the year 1944, when military operations in the European area were increased in tempo and intensity, the numbers of battle casualties brought to our shores showed a pronounced and steady increase. The thought occurred to countless patriotic citizens that if hospital facilities here were not keeping pace in mathematical precision with the steadily augmenting needs, something should be done about it promptly. Rumors of a disquieting nature had been current for some time that sick and wounded soldiers in many instances were being crowded into crude, uncomfortable, makeshift hospital buildings, often inadequately equipped and insufficiently staffed with doctors, nurses, and attendants. Committee investigators visited and inspected 89 Army hospitals in 20 States and the District of Columbia prior to the expiration of the Seventy-eighth Congress. Whatever may have been the situation prior to the committee's investigations, with few exceptions the results following the investigations have been decidedly reassuring. The committee has made it a point to report needs instantly to the proper authorities in Washington for appropriate action, and the appropriate action has been salutary. The survey is being continued for the Seventy-ninth Congress. Its purpose, of course, is to make assurance doubly sure that our hospitalized soldiers from overseas combat areas are receiving the best possible care and treatment.

Rumors having become widely circulated that prisoners of war in the United States were being coddled, that there was too much hobnobbing between prisoners and civilians, and that escapes of the former were too frequent, a thorough investigation of the whole subject was undertaken in November 1944, at which time nearly 335,000 war prisoners were held in the continental United States. More recent figures indicate a total of nearly 360,000. The investigation also considered available information concerning American prisoners of war in the custody of Germany and of Japan. Briefly the following points were developed by the committee:

First. That the provisions of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention of July 27, 1929, to which the United States is a party, and Germany and Japan are signatories, although the latter has never ratified it, have been observed punctiliously by the United States, and in the main by Germany and in a lesser degree by Japan. Germany has adopted a less liberal interpretation of some portions of the convention than has our Government, due, possibly, to the exigencies of its own situation. The same may be said of Japan in greater degree, 56 percent of whose 16,000 war prisoners are held in the Philippines and 39 percent in Japan proper, the China mainland, and Manchuria. Japanese living and dietary standards are extremely hard on American soldiers.

Second. Prison posts in the United States provide comfortable quarters, good food, freedom of worship, somewhat restricted entertainment and recreation, and firm discipline. Medical care is excellent. German prison quarters lack sufficient heat. Recreational privileges are good. There is freedom of religious exercise. Medical care is excellent. Japanese prison housing is substandard. Heating, ventilation and sanitary facilities are lacking. Bedding is painfully inadequate and food is scanty with a rice base. Various churches and religious organizations provide some reading and recreational equipment. Religious activity is of necessity something of a hybrid type with Japanese priests occasionally officiating. Medical care is Spartan in its simplicity.

Third. There has been no coddling of prisoners in American camps, but they are humanely treated. In one or two instances there was rather too much fraternizing between prisoners and civilians. That has been stopped. Needless to say, the brutal militarism of both Germany and Japan admits of no coddling of American prisoners.

Fourth. Labor imposed by American authority on prisoners of war is beneficial to themselves, by way of their savings and maintenance of health and mental cheerfulness, and to the Government which has paid much of the expense of prison maintenance with payments made by employers for this war-captive work, about 70 percent of which is in agriculture. The prisoners work slowly but efficiently and thoroughly. They are never sent into any community to work unless there is a labor shortage and the need therefor is certified by the War Manpower Commission. Prisoner labor is utilized in agricultural, pastoral, food processing, forestry pursuits, a dozen of the trades, and repair work. Wages paid war-prison labor by American employers average about $3.50 a day of 9 hours. Of this wage the Government reserves all but 80 cents or its equivalent, which is paid to the worker who also gets 10 cents a day whether he works or not. American privates at labor in Germany receive the equivalent of 28 cents a day in addition to food and housing. In Japan they receive the equivalent of 2½ cents a day with rice and straw mat. They are utilized in mechanical industries, factories, roads, airfields, docks, and mines.

The provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1929 are being carried out by us to the letter and it is well indeed that such is the case, since the slightest deviation therefrom on our part might instantly result in more than retaliatory measures on the part of our enemies against American prisoners of war in their hands. Such a contingency must not be overlooked.

Ample information has been made public by the committee to reassure those whose fears and susceptibilities had been harrowed by rumors and tales which may have been manifestations of enemy propaganda.

The foregoing is a brief résumé of the high spots in the investigation made by the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives under joint resolution of this body. I have not thought to go into minute details regarding this investigation, nor have I sought to cover every subject which has been a matter of investigation under this authority. The matters referred to are largely those of general public interest throughout Congress as well as the country.

It is needless that I emphasize the tremendous savings of money resulting from these investigations. The investigations have been handled in such a way as not to impede or embarrass the war effort. The committee has not strived to develop news of sensational interest or those things which necessarily make headlines in the columns of the daily press or which blares over the radio. The committee has in every case attempted to

exert a corrective restraint when correction was found to be possible, and in this respect the committee has largely received the support and cooperation of the War Department. From reading even this short statement, the tremendous savings to the United States as a result of these continued and at times very vigorous investigations are obvious to anyone making even a cursory investigation of the work of this committee. It is not possible to put down with reasonable exactitude the definite figures indicating the savings. Regardless of this fact, these savings run well up in comparison with the gigantic figures such as we see in appropriation bills of this Congress, and, in my judgment, the country should feel justifiable pride in the knowledge that the House of Representatives is making a forthright vigorous and unsensational effort to correct abuses and reduce expenditures in the war program—without hurting the war effort.

I would not want this House to feel that the entire field of fertile investigation has been covered by our committee. In my judgment the surface has hardly been scratched. Many of the investigations cannot be pushed thoroughly and vigorously at the present time due to the imperative need of winning this war. Many of them come to the surface only with the further development or determination of the war program. Others will come to light as further time passes. Investigations of this character involve matters which should be pursued vigorously, fearlessly, and relentlessly.

I think the report to date is such as to have merited the commendation and approval of this body as is indicated by the continuation of the investigations authorized of the Military Committee for another 2 years. I think the House can take this record of investigatory accomplishment to the country as one of the real achievements of the House of Representatives during the extremely distressing times of the great war. I hope that these investigations in the future will proceed with even more vigor and aggressiveness than has been their course in the past.

Air Power Is Peace Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the aircraft industry is a vital and important part of the economic life of the Nation and especially of southern California. Mr. Donald Douglas is a pioneer in the industry and one of the principal manufacturers of airplanes. His genius and skill have been an invaluable help to winning the war. The Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., has plants located in Santa Monica, Long Beach, and El Segundo, in California; Oklahoma City and Tulsa, in Oklahoma; and Chicago, in Illinois. Two hundred and fifty thousand employees had to be trained to man these plants.

Mr. Douglas and the aircraft industry as a whole are concerned about the future of aviation and about the reconversion to peacetime production.

The Members of the House of Representatives should also be concerned about the future of this vital industry. I hope all Members will read the following excerpt from the speech Mr. Douglas made recently at the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce at the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, Calif.:

How well we of the aviation industry continue to serve air power depends on how clearly the American people and Congress see that air power is peace power. Under existing conditions the industry, itself, cannot write the answers. It cannot of its own right make the blueprints of the post-war period. It could not, while war production came first, take the time, it could not spare the energy and effort, to plan and prepare for the future while more and better airplanes were needed for victory.

Not until our enemies are completely crushed and the Government gives the word, can we relax our production efforts for war and begin to work on peacetime projects. A limited amount of discussion has been held, but most of our attention in this direction has been strategic only—we found it necessary on occasions to tell our workers something of the possibilities of the future to make them stay on the job now.

We, in the aircraft industry, must stick to our posts. We must be in the vanguard of progress, and at the same time protect the very last batch of rearguard of production, holding the fort until the last shot is fired.

This places extra responsibility on the Government and on the American people to see that air power, guardian of liberty and progress in aviation, is not lost in the shuffle. The Government should see to it that no unreasonable or unnecessary obstacles are placed in the path of the aircraft industry when it finally gets the green light for the post-war start.

Congress and the American people should see to it that the industry, which after all is only men and women, their savings and their jobs, is not tangled up with red tape, with long debates, with political witch hunts and accounting inquisitions. We have had little time or opportunity to work on new commercial designs, on airport developments, on international agreements, on special surveys—on all the things you do when the world is at peace and individual initiative and enterprise can have free play.

Before we can make the most of post-war possibilities, for our own workers and for preservation of air power, before we can translate into everyday life of all peoples the dearly won accomplishments of aviation in this war, there must be intelligent and sympathetic understanding, and action, on such matters as surplus disposal, contract terminations, and a hundred and one related subjects involved in a transition from an all-time high mark in war production to a reasonable and financially sound basis of peacetime pursuits.

In the dark and doubtful days of the war, when the current slogan was, "It is later than you think," and Hitler's great war machine thundered irresistibly across Europe and Africa, war production, very properly, had the right-of-way.

"Plenty and on time" was the keynote. Everything else was of secondary importance. Every department, every division, every bureau, every official in the Government stood ready to help industry slide into high gear. It was an up-hill pull, and everyone was ready to put his shoulder to the wheel.

The job was started, organized, accelerated. It is rolling in high gear today, rolling beyond all expectations, rolling hand in hand with victory, because private enterprise and labor under necessary wartime regulations still managed to retain most of the original spirit of typical American teamwork.

When war ends the aircraft industry will find itself on peaks it can never hope to occupy permanently. The curve of sound reconversion will be downward. Our national economy cannot support production of $20,000,000,000 in airplanes a year. The journey downward from production hill will be fraught with difficulties and hazards. National welfare, if not appreciation for a job well done, demands that the industry be helped in this perilous journey. National Government cannot say to us and to industry generally, "From here on it's everyone for himself".

We think our wartime accomplishments, our record, and our task in days to come entitle us, as an industry, to fair and friendly treatment. We seek no special rewards. We have done our job well and on time, but so have many others. Compared to the sacrifices and deeds of the millions who endured hardships in thousands of camps and battles, of the men who stormed the beaches and paid with their sweat and blood for victory already achieved and still to come, our part was small, indeed. Yet the men at Midway, in the Solomons, on the Salerno and Normandy beaches, on Tarawa, Saipan, Luzon, Guam and Iwo Jima—the Americans on the Rhine and in liberated countries, our own troops and naval forces everywhere had a better chance to survive because American-built aircraft—fighters, bombers, and transports—were overhead on a thousand battle-fronts and horizons.

Scores of thousands of our boys, your kin and mine, are back with us today, and hundreds of thousands of others will come back to us in the future, alive and ready to play a useful part in the new world of tomorrow, because American built air power drove the enemy from the skies and from the oceans.

The millions who will come back and those who will never return have a right to expect that in exchange for what they gave, we do not falter or fail in years to come to make air power real peace power.

Utah House of Representatives Passes Important Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, every time the subject of money is mentioned, a seriously large number of people say "that is something I do not understand. It is too complicated for me." I have never believed it was too complicated for the average person to understand. The main difficulty has been that the important facts regarding money have not been made generally available to the American people. Therefore the action of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Utah in passing the following bill by a vote of 37 to 16 is, in my opinion, a most encouraging and constructive sign.

It will be noted that under the terms of this bill, the text of which follows, there would be instruction in the schools in the State of Utah on the fundamental matters regarding the monetary system of the United States.

H. B. 99

A bill providing that the State school system include a course of instruction in all junior and senior high schools, colleges, and universities on the subject of money and its relationship to economic and political affairs and prescribing the duties of the State superintendent of public instruction in relation thereto

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

SECTION 1. All junior and senior high schools, colleges, and universities in this State, including city schools of the first and second class, shall hereafter include in their curriculum and course of study the subject of money, including its history, philosophy, functions, and relationship to economic and political affairs, and all other subjects concerning its operation and use in the United States of America and elsewhere.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this act, the State superintendent of public instruction shall prepare, not later than September 1, 1945, teaching materials and materials of instruction, bulletins, courses of study, and visual educational aids, such as in his judgment will best explain to the understanding of students the following popular theories on the issue of money:

(a) An explanation of debt-money (bank credit) which is created by banks operating under the Federal Reserve Act, and loaned into circulation at interest.

(b) The theory of 100 cents on the dollar back of all demand bank deposits which could mean money issued by the Treasurer of the United States to take up Government bonds.

(c) Labor monetary educational committee's theory of money, which is that money issued by the Treasury and paid to labor, and for material in the building of public highways, power dams, flood-control, and such other public projects as may be authorized by Congress, thereby adding new wealth to the Nation, in like number of dollars created.

SEC. 3. Pursuant to the provisions of section 75–16–1, Utah Code Annotated 1943, the State course study committee is authorized and directed to prepare material on the money question for study in the public schools. Said committee shall call upon experts who have made a thorough study of the money question for assistance in compiling such material.

SEC. 4. The State superintendent of public instruction shall act as administrator, exercising all executive functions in connection with the carrying out of the purpose of this act. No extra compensation shall be paid to him for his services; and he shall make a detailed report of his activities hereunder to the legislature of 1947.

SEC. 5. It shall be mandatory upon the superintendent of public instruction to enforce the provisions of this act.

Blast Hirohito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. HEDRICK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette:

BLAST HIROHITO

It must come with considerable surprise to our Army, Navy, and marines to hear that the bombing of the royal palace in Tokyo is being carefully avoided. They must wonder how anyone would want to protect the person of the Japanese Emperor and leader.

Yet, it is a fact that our Air Forces have been carefully instructed to avoid damaging the palace or any of the grounds lest they might hurt the Emperor. One wonders if the crew of a B–29, that was so careless as to drop a bomb near the palace stables recently, caught hell for it.

We have seen no adequate explanation of why any such orders should have been given. It has been suggested that if the Emperor, who is supposed to be a sacred personage, should be killed or even injured, that would awaken the Japanese to fanaticism. Also, it has been suggested that Hirohito and his military staff must be preserved so that the Allies will have some authorities to deal with when the time comes to dictate the peace terms.

Whose shallow thinking is this? Members of our State Department? If so, by what authority does the State Department give orders to our Army and Navy? By what right does it thus interfere with our fighting forces? By what course of reason does it arrive at the conclusion that it is wise to regard the Japanese Emperor's person as something sacred?

All over America and Britain goes up the demand, "Bomb Hirohito and the imperial palace." And there certainly is not a soldier, sailor, or marine who does not cry out for that action. All want to know how it would be possible to make the Japanese more fanatical than they are already, and why it should be necessary to deal with any part of the Japanese Government when we are ready to go in and take the country over.

Regardless of what the policy of our State Department may be, this is a war, and the military and naval forces should conduct it with free hand. They know what has to be done and how to do it. Why, in the name of all that is holy, should the State Department have a right to interfere?

Have you talked with a marine who has seen action in the Pacific? If not, then do so at the first opportunity. He will tell you that the Japanese are, without exception, the lowest order of beasts. He will, confidentially, reveal the fact that the marines take no prisoners, that they look upon the Japanese are venomous vipers that must be exterminated. These marines speak with authority, for have they not heard—some of them experienced—the most horrible cruelties and utter debaucheries practiced by the brown skunks?

Is the State Department getting ready to appease the Japanese after we have chastised them? Remember, the State Department has a disgraceful record of appeasement that goes back long before we got into the war and has continued since. For instance, look up the record of appeasement of General Francisco Franco, Spanish dictator, who seized power without authority and holds it against the desires of a great people.

The British Foreign Office has taken the position that Hirohito and his palace and grounds must be protected. Our State Department has backed it up. Again we ape the British Foreign Office. Are our State Department and the British Foreign Office wiser than the vast majority of the American and British people?

We say with all earnestness that if our State Department wants to run this war then:

To hell with the State Department.

International Cooperation To Prevent War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter directed to the President of the United States under date of February 28, 1945, by all of the newly-elected Republican Members of the United States House of Representatives, as follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1945.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As newly elected Republican Members of Congress we desire to express our conviction that the American people seek more than anything else assurance of freedom from future wars.

We believe that the people will support a sound program of International cooperation which gives reasonable promise of preventing war and of promoting understanding and good will among nations. It seems to us that the policy outlined by our party at Mackinac offers the basis for such a program.

We are sure that the American people will much more readily approve the proposals for a lasting peace if reports of progress are made from time to time. We therefore urge you to inform the people as fully as possible of the plans that are being discussed.

You may be assured that we will consider any plan for permanent world peace which may evolve from these conferences strictly on its merits and without partisanship.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT K. HENRY, Wisconsin; SHERMAN ADAMS, New Hampshire; JOHN W. BYRNES, Wisconsin; EWARD J. ELSAESSER, New York; HOWARD E. CAMPBELL, Pennsylvania; RALPH W. GWINN, New York; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, California; HENRY J. LATHAM, New York; JAMES G. FULTON, Pennsylvania; T. MILLET HAND, New Jersey; CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey; EDGAR A. SHARP, New York; JOHN W. HESELTON, Massachusetts; JAMES I. DOLLIVER, Iowa; ALBERT M. COLE, Kansas; AUGUSTUS W. BENNET, New York; GEORGE B. SCHWABE, Oklahoma.

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, entitled "Lend-Lease," which appeared in the New York Times of March 15, 1945:

LEND-LEASE

By an overwhelming majority of 354 to 28 the House of Representatives has voted to extend lend-lease for another year. Its act of approval carries a proviso that no funds appropriated under this program shall be used for post-war relief, rehabilitation, or reconstruction. This reservation, adopted on the initiative of Republican committee members, is a perfectly proper one. Lend-lease is a war measure. There will be need of large post-war contributions by the United States for purposes of relief, and of wise lending for purposes of rehabilitation and reconstruction; but these activities can and should be managed independently of lend-lease and under the auspices of other agencies. The President himself said in his most recent report to Congress on the operation of this fund that "lend-lease and reverse lend-lease are a system of combined war supply," and that "they should end with the war." The bill as passed by the House and now sent to the Senate extends the life of the original act until June 20, 1946—there will have to be an additional extension, of course, if the war with Japan is not finished by that time—and provides a clean-up period until June 30, 1949, under which agreements can be fulfilled.

Lend-lease is so important to the whole war effort that the wonder is that 28 Members of the House—1 Democrat and 27 Republicans, mostly from the Middle West—could be found to vote against it. What do these Members mean by their opposition? Plainly they mean that they do not want weapons made in American factories to be used against Germany and Japan by the armies of the nations which we have made our Allies. But the necessary corollary of this is that all of the fighting done with American weapons on all of the fronts against Germany and Japan must be done by young American boys. What does this profit us? How does it shorten the war? How does it save American lives? How does it save even American dollars?

The votes of these 28 are evidence that in some quarters the delusion still persists that lend-lease is a favor to other nations. It is no favor to other nations. It is a way of making use of the good efforts of willing allies for the purpose of helping us defeat in the shortest possible time two savage enemies who made war on us.

Meat Situation in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present to the House today a telegram just received from my constituency. It presents a real challenge to Government in the meat crisis we are now experiencing. The telegram reads as follows:

Meat situation in northern New Jersey very serious. Have not been able to purchase 1 pound of fresh pork, poultry, or veal for the past 3 weeks for our 23 meat markets serving Passiac, Bergen, Morris, and part of Essex Counties. Meat packers claim between 60 and 80 percent of products being set aside for Army and lend-lease. Beef and lamb supply approximately 15 percent of our supply based on 1942 purchases. The only source of supply left appears to be the black-market beef available at from 15 to 20 cents per pound above the wholesale ceilings. It is time to call a halt to the mismanagement of the civilian food supply and to the drastic demand of the O. P. A. point values. Butter sale practically stopped. Consumer does not have the points to buy.

V. S. GRASSEY,
President, Great Eastern Stores.
PATERSON, N. J.

I desire to compliment the Sundstrom committee for probing this matter and I hope that the Government will move promptly to help both industry and consumer beat the black market. Defeat in this fight is unthinkable.

Representation of Veterans at Peace Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD a resolution which was introduced by Representative Cousins and others in the Texas House of Representatives and adopted by that body March 5, 1945:

H. R. 128

Whereas a resolution has been presented to the House of Representatives at Washington, voicing a plea that veterans of World War No. 1 be represented at the World Peace Conference; and

Whereas the American veterans of World War No. 2 are interested in, and have asked for, this same representation at the Peace Conference; and

Whereas the men who do the fighting should be the men who make the peace, as they know the situation vastly better than someone who has not been at the front or even in uniform; and

Whereas Texas now has almost 800,000 men in the service, many of them fully qualified, both by experience and ability, to sit at this conference table for peace: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That we do ask our Congressmen in Washington to support this measure and use every effort in their power to see that representatives of veterans of World War No. 2, as well as World War No. 1, be at the Conference for World Peace which meets in San Francisco; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen in Washington, and that a certified copy, signed by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, be sent to the secretary of the American Veterans of World War No. 2; and it is so resolved.

Problems of War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the Foreign Policy Association, at a luncheon in New York on last Saturday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I deeply appreciate the invitation which brings me here on this occasion, as well as the opportunity which it affords to all of us to discuss with frankness and objectivity the problems of war and peace which now face the United States and the whole world.

For more than a century we have been accustomed to the use of the historical injunction "in time of peace prepare for war." This is undoubtedly the foundation of a wise foresight and precaution intended to guard us against surprise or impotency in the event of an attack upon our Nation or in the event of the necessity for defending our interests at home or throughout the world.

It seems to me that in the present circumstances which confront the world it would be equally wise to adopt an additional slogan: "In time of war prepare for peace."

Our Nation and all the United Nations are engaged now in the greatest war in all history. I think it is true beyond question that none of these United Nations desired this war, and it is equally true that none of them were prepared for it. In spite of the obvious preparation of the Nazis in Germany and the war lords in Japan for an aggressive war toward which they were looking, the peace-loving nations were so anxious to avoid war that they were unwilling to gird themselves by suitable preparation either to avoid it or to defend themselves when it should come. This is certainly true of the United States and of Great Britain, and of Russia, and of China, and it is equally true of the victims of aggression located nearest the seat of danger.

All of our national energies and all of the cooperated energies of the United Nations are now concentrated on the winning of this war and the defeat of the brutal aggression which has accompanied it at the earliest possible date and in the completest manner. It would be stupid to consider any other program at present except the total defeat and the total surrender of the Nazis and the Japanese and all that they represent, both in theory and in practice.

There is no alternative that any sensible or patriotic American can contemplate.

However, the necessity for the earliest and most complete victory over our enemies should not be allowed to blind us to the obligation which confronts us as a Nation and as a world to bring out of this war the organized processes by which a similar catastrophe may be avoided in the future.

It would be futile to occupy your time and mine in recounting our mistakes in this regard in past years unless we may profit by them. It has always seemed strange to me that in this Christian world and this Christian era of man's history mankind could not organize for peace as well as for war. Indeed, organize for peace instead of war; and if we have not learned our lesson by our present experiences, it would be difficult to understand what sort of disaster might overcome the people of the world that would teach them that the world should organize for peace instead of war. The attempt to do this in various parts of the world and in various stages of human history I need not now attempt to recount. The most notable effort previous to the present program occurred a quarter of a century ago. That effort failed. It failed in this country because, unfortunately, the issue became involved in partisan politics. I say this without impugning the motives of anybody or questioning their sincerity. Nevertheless, it did happen.

Fortunately, we have sought, and thus far succeeded, to lift the proposal for world organization for peace above the petty considerations of partisan politics, and we have sought to elevate it to the high level of consideration which embraces all political faiths, all colors, all creeds, and all nationalities.

This has been the spirit in which the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were conceived and carried out. Under the leadership of Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Democrats and Republicans in equal number were constantly in conference in a solemn effort to work out a program which would not only meet the approval of the American people, but which would also find support among all the United Nations and would be effective in accomplishing the purpose for which it was intended.

Following these preliminary conferences and efforts, running through a period of more than a year, the Dumbarton Oaks Conference was initiated, and the results of that conference have been made public.

It was impossible in these preliminary stages to have all of the United Nations represented at that conference. It was obvious then and is obvious now that certain great and powerful nations upon which rests the responsibility of defeating the Nazi program would have to assume the responsibility of first proposing a world organization that would avoid another similar infliction upon mankind The Dumbarton Oaks Conference for 6 weeks labored in the spirit of solemn responsibility and in a desire to produce a program that would save humanity from another war. I feel that all those who participated in it, without regard to politics or nationality, are entitled to the commendation and the thanks of all lovers of peace for producing a formula around which it may be possible for all the United Nations and, ultimately, the world to rally.

This formula was not perfect and cannot be expected to be perfect when it is submitted to the San Francisco Conference, or when it emerges from that conference. No human document that ever formed the basis for cooperative action among peoples or nations was a perfect document. The Constitution of the United States, under which we have lived for a hundred and fifty years and have grown into one of the greatest Nations in all history, was not a perfect document. The first Congress that met after its ratification submitted 12 amendments to the States. Ten of them were adopted and are now known as the Bill of Rights of the American people. Altogether we have amended that document some 21 times, and we may amend it in the future as conditions and circumstances require, for, as Jefferson said, "No live generation is compelled to be bound by a dead generation." This is not only true in government, but in science, religion, education, and economic development of a people.

It is a tribute to the unselfish desire of all the nations involved to hand down to future generations a program that will preserve them from war and economic chaos that they were able to agree upon about 90 percent of all of the different questions that arose for discussion in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. Some of the problems not there settled were solved at Yalta, and others by negotiation and international communication, and all of them will be submitted to and will, in my opinion, be formulated at San Francisco in a document that will constitute one of the great charters of human liberty and liberation of human history.

It is impossible in the time allotted to me on this occasion to go into any details with respect to the machinery through which the peace of the world may be preserved. We do know that in spite of its high resolves and its notable ambitions for peace and the serious work in which it engaged to that end, the League of Nations of a quarter of a century ago fell short of the requirements essential to the preservation of a peaceful world. The extent to which these failures may be attributed to our failure to enter that organization is now an academic question and ought not now to serve for the creation of any prejudices or preconception of ideas regarding the new effort to preserve peace.

We all recognize now that unless the new organization is entered into wholeheartedly by all of the great powers of the world, it likewise will fall short of success. We all realize now that any such organization must be equipped with power—a degree of power not possessed by any previous international organization. Of course, it must have the facilities and the machinery for negotiation, for peaceful conference, for diplomatic persuasion, and for the opinion of mankind to be brought to bear upon any recalcitrant nation which seeks again to bring war and chaos to mankind. These facilities are provided in the Council of Safety and in the Assembly set up in the Dumbarton Oaks program, but beyond this machinery for negotiation this organization must have power to enforce its decisions in whatever action it may decide to take against aggression in its incipiency.

And it is a matter for congratulation that all the nations now involved in this tremendous effort recognize the need for bringing to bear against an aggressor not only the united opinion of mankind but sufficient power and force to make it impossible for another aggressor to get very far in his designs for world conquest.

As I have already indicated, it would be fantastic to have expected that either at Dumbarton Oaks or at Yalta or at San Francisco a perfect document could emanate. Undoubtedly conditions will arise in the future which will require modifications in the light of experience, but the only alternative to the formation of such an organization is the prospect of another war in another generation, or sooner, and another era of economic, social, and political chaos which might destroy civilization itself.

Heretofore, arguments have been advanced to the effect that our part of the contribution to maintain such a world organization would be greater than our Nation ought to bear. We are now spending for war purposes alone approximately $90,000,000,000 a year. In the last 3 years we have authorized the expenditure of approximately $300,000,000,000 and we are now in the process of raising the debt limit of the United States to the incredible sum of $300,000,000,000. This represents a sum equal to the total wealth of our Nation two or three decades ago. This sum would be sufficient to maintain our share of the expenditure involved in the maintenance of a world organization for peace for a thousand years.

Similar comparisons can be made by the other nations which have been required to assume the burden of throwing back the hordes of brutality and world domination. If all the money expended by all the nations since the 1st of September 1939 as a result of this war could be devoted to the development of our natural resources, the education of our people, the advancement of the arts and sciences, and the effort to bring to every human being in the world life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, it would be impossible to visualize the high standard of living and of life that would come to our people and to the world.

Undoubtedly disagreements will arise, as they have arisen, over questions of boundary between nations, spheres of influence among nations, and the share of world trade and commerce which all nations will be seeking. But the ultimate question of boundaries need not deter us in bringing about at the earliest possible moment such a united effort among all the nations as will rescue mankind from all the horrors of war.

There is, according to my judgment, an unbroken line of progress and of determination from Dumbarton Oaks to Yalta and to San Francisco, together with intervening stations such as Quebec, Teheran, and Malta, which we cannot afford to break. Neither should we allow any shades of difference over voting procedures in the international organization to appall us with fear. One of the arguments against the last effort of mankind to organize for peace, and one of the arguments against our entering into that effort, was the claim that we would be outvoted by other nations where our interests were vitally involved. Certainly the agreement as to voting procedure which was reached in Yalta is as much a protection to the United States as it is to any other nation, and it certainly dissipates the argument or the claim that our Nation would be subject to the will of other nations without the power of veto where our vital interests of a military or economic standpoint will be involved.

In brief, looking at the plight of mankind all over the world at present, looking at the threatened destruction of civilization itself, looking at the universal hope of a vast and overwhelming majority of all the people of the world for a respite and a deliverance from the fear which they have been forced to endure and the sacrifices which they have made and are making, and must continue to make unless our present efforts succeed, I cherish the hope and the belief, and I think our people cherish the determination, that we shall accept as a Nation and as a people the responsibility of sharing in the guidance and direction of mankind toward a goal loftier than the sordid brutality of war, and loftier than the purely selfish contemplations of any nation or any group of nations which may conceive it to be within its power to thwart the peoples of the world and thus thwart the ambitions of 2,000,000,000 human beings for the happiness which comes to the peaceful life and the security in which that peaceful life may be preserved.

Why Fool Ourselves?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, altogether too many of us believe, or act as though we believed, all our problems here at home and abroad would be solved if we would furnish all people everywhere comfortable homes, a good living, and what clothing they wanted. We have gotten into that frame of mind because we are naturally charitable. That is an American characteristic. On top of that, a group of so-called intellectuals, people with more education than experience and common sense; people who have not had to earn a living the hard way, who are capable of expressing themselves plausibly, have, through press and radio, painted a glowing picture of a future world in which everyone will be happy.

The solution is not so simple. It is a physical impossibility for us to feed, clothe, and shelter everyone. Neither our productive ability nor our resources are sufficient to accomplish that very

laudable purpose. Nevertheless, the administration is putting on the heat to compel Congress to establish a world bank and a world monetary fund, into which we will immediately pour $5,925,000,000, which we will be forced to borrow—most of which the returning veterans and their children for many generations will be repaying—the money to be used to aid in rehabilitating war-damaged nations.

Here at home, we have been kidding ourselves into the belief that we can get something for nothing. To prevent inflation, Congress gave the President authority to create O. P. A., whose duty it is to hold down prices. O. P. A. established price ceilings on merchandise and instituted rationing. But it did not work, because some of the prices, when the cost of labor was taken into consideration, were so low that the food or merchandise could not be produced except at a loss, and people try to avoid doing business at a loss.

Then, to get production, the Commodity Credit Corporation was given money to pay the producer a sum equal to the difference between the cost of production and the ceiling price established by O. P. A. When it was found that farmers would not sell milk to make butter because the butter could not be sold at a profit, the Government spent $120,000,000 on butter roll-back subsidies; on flour, it spent $90,000,000. The Defense Supplies Corporation last year allocated $25,000,000 for sugar.

The roll-back on beef is 2 cents a pound, and has already cost the Federal Government $650,000,000, and we are now paying over $40,000,000 a month to take care of the roll-back on meat. The Defense Supplies Corporation paid $6,500,000 per month for subsidies on butter which went abroad. On meat, which was shipped abroad, we are paying a monthly subsidy of $2,500,000.

THE CATCH

The catch is that those who eat the beef and the butter and those who produce the milk and raise the cattle are taxed to make the payments to themselves, and, in addition, they pay a tidy sum to the bureaucrats for administrative expenses; and—in addition—many a taxpayer who does not receive the benefit of a roll-back still is taxed to pay those who do.

AMERICA FIRST

Some of us have vigorously and consistently insisted that a super-structure cannot be erected without a firm foundation; that we will not be able to help others unless we maintain ourselves in fighting and productive condition, think of America first.

But the President and his advisers still seem to feel that a sound foundation here at home is not necessary, or that in some mysterious way the United States will be able to feed and care for everyone everywhere in the world, for, on March 16, after the statements hereinafter quoted were made on the floor of the Senate; after it was charged that, in England, there are from 100,000,000 to 700,000,000 tons of food supplies, he told his press conference, as reported in the Washington administration paper, that the "decent" people of the United States would tighten their belts to feed others, meaning that those of us who did not agree with administration policies were not "decent."

The President said he did not think the American people had suffered greatly in the war thus far and the First Lady is purported to have said, in substance, that she had not noticed any shortage in food. That last statement is probably true, for an outfit that will request priority on a plane for a dog, when there are thousands of wounded Americans who might be returned from England, would not be likely to suffer for food or anything else.

The President's statements that he did not think the American people had suffered greatly in the war or that they would suffer from lack of food, that those who did not agree with his policy were not decent, were typically Rooseveltian, and carried the implication that our people are selfish, when, as a matter of fact, 75 percent of the fighting men on the western front are American boys; when we are carrying on the Pacific war almost alone. Iwo alone cost the lives of 4,189 of our boys, and this administration proposes, when the Pacific war is over, those islands which the Japs took from the British Empire and from the Netherlands will be given back to them, with all the fortifications and facilities for which we have paid so dearly in money and in that most precious thing of all—the blood and the lives of our young boys.

We have been, we are, pouring, and it is now proposed, after the war is over, to pour, billions upon billions of dollars worth of food and material into foreign lands. The truth is that the New Dealers having started, long before the war, on a campaign of spending and regimentation; on remaking America because they insist that government under the Constitution belongs to the "horse and buggy" days; upon imposing their ideas and their form of government upon other people, just will not stop. They now seek to use the whole world as a field for their experiments in every phase of human endeavor, with American youth and the American taxpayers paying the cost.

Prices have gone so high; necessities of life—food and clothing, for example—so scarce that some of the internationalists are frightened. U. N. R. R. A.—against which I voted—with American dollars has been trying to make the people of other countries happy and comfortable by giving them not only food, clothing, but many things they were not accustomed to have.

But a Democrat from Mississippi apparently has enough, for in the Senate he served notice that he would introduce legislation to see that America is fed first. Among other things, he said:

> A deplorable condition exists in the South, where one of the main staples of the farm workers' diet is salt meat. Practically the entire salt-meat supply has been going to Russia, and there is none available in America.

He said:

> We all believe in giving Russia, China, and Europe all the food we can spare.

Then asked:

> How can we feed them when the diet of the farmers who are expected to produce food is inadequate?

Speaking about the shipment of unnecessary food to Ethiopia; pointing out that it was a "fertile land, capable of feeding itself," he asked:

> When did Ethiopia come into the war? Why should America go without adequate food to supply Ethiopia?

It was further threatened that, unless Foreign Economic Administrator Leo T. Crowley dammed the flow abroad of food needed in the United States, legislation would be introduced to see that America was fed first.

All of which leads to the thought that possibly—just possibly—we are on the way back to sane, sound thinking. That as to our foreign policy, we finally realize, in view of the statements of Stalin and Churchill, of Senator VANDENBERG and Governor Stassen, that, unless we want to sacrifice not only our natural and accumulated resources, but our young men and women in continued war, we will be forced, not only to first feed America, but to keep her interests ever first in our minds in our international dealings.

Here at home, we gain little or nothing by taxing everyone to give special benefits to a favored class. That policy, followed long enough, will make paupers of many of us; establish what we have always protested—a privileged, favored class. Why not, here at home, have first in mind the interests of the whole country, rather than the interests of this or that minority pressure group?

Justice Unit Scored on Corrupt Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

JUSTICE UNIT SCORED ON CORRUPT ELECTIONS—DEPARTMENT WON'T ENFORCE LAWS AGAINST OWN PARTY, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

Although the Senate Committee Investigating Campaign Expenditures wrote a 250-page report, it did not put its finger on the real reason why American political elections are corrupt.

That reason is the failure of the prosecuting arm of the Government to enforce the law against members of its own political party.

So long as the Justice Department is responsible to a successful candidate for the Presidency, no questions will ever be pursued which touch the supporters of that candidacy.

The Senate committee has reported, for instance, that existing statutes are construed by the Justice Department to mean that labor unions are banned from making contributions during a campaign, but that they can

expend out of their treasuries any amount they please which has been accumulated before a campaign or during a campaign.

FINE DISTINCTION DRAWN

A fine distinction is being drawn by the Justice Department between contributions and expenditures—something that somehow never emerged until labor unions wanted to spend their dues to carry on political campaigns.

Yet the Congress, in the Smith-Connally law, specifically added labor unions to the scope of the Federal Corrupt Practices' Act, putting them on a parity with corporations and banks. Does anyone believe that if the corporations in the last campaign had spent out of their treasuries money to advance the candidacy of a Republican and there had been no ban on labor-union contributions, the Justice Department would have found no basis for a prosecution?

The answer is that corporations know the laws will be enforced against them and it is doubtful whether any such expenditures were made by them. Individuals prominent in business did contribute, as the law permits, out of their own pockets.

The Justice Department ought to be made a separate and independent agency of the Government, just as is the office of the Controller General, where the executive in charge is appointed for a term of 15 years and is subject to removal only by Congress.

The Justice Department is related to the judicial branch of the Government, which, under the original concept of the Constitution, was to have been independent of the executive or legislative branches. Law enforcement, broadly speaking, is a Presidential function, to be sure, but Congress may by statute delegate to commissions or boards or departments special enforcement tasks.

OTHER LAW AGENCIES

Thus, while the general public may not realize it, all the law-enforcement activities of the Federal Government have not, by any means, been vested by Congress in the Justice Department. Even detective agencies exist in other departments because of a desire to have a staff familiar with the enforcement problems related to particular laws.

There is no reason, therefore, why Congress should not entrust to a special agency responsible only to the legislative branch of the Government or else to the courts the task of enforcing laws relating to elections and campaign expenditures.

There would be fewer violations of law and fewer quibbles and circumventions if the political parties and groups knew that the election laws would really be enforced. Often, too, because it is not politically desirable to proceed against the supporters of the party in power, the opposition party likewise derives a certain immunity.

It certainly is ironical to see the American Government attempting to advise liberated countries in Europe how to handle so-called free elections when the election laws of the United States are so flagrantly flouted.

Congress Has Appropriated and Made Available Sixty-four Billions for Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1945

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Lend-Lease Act was passed by Congress and approved March 11, 1941. The bill (H. R. 2013), before the House for consideration, provides for the fourth extension of that act.

When the original bill was considered by Congress it was urged by the administration and the Democratic leaders of the House and Senate that this measure was necessary to keep the United States out of the then World War that was raging in the various parts of the world. The bill was passed, but it did not keep us out of war. Some favoring the legislation were frank enough to admit that we were taking a step that would likely involve us in the war by taking sides and furnishing war materials to some of the warring nations. It should not have been named lend-lease—we did not lend or lease. We have been and are giving nearly all of these billions away—the debt will never be paid nor materials returned.

Our former distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, urged that we pass the so-called reciprocal trade-agreement law, and if that were passed it would bring about world peace and we would avoid war. Of course, we know now how dismally this prophecy failed.

The President in 1935 urged Congress to pass the Neutrality Act and stated that if that act were passed it would keep us from being involved in another world war. At the behest of the President this act was strengthened by amendments adopted by Congress in 1936, 1937, and 1938. However, about November 1939 the President called Congress into extraordinary session and urged Congress to greatly amend and to repeal in many respects the Neutrality Act. He stated that this should be done in order that our country might be neutral and sell war supplies to a group of warring nations. Our country would make profits out of these war transactions, and this repeal of the Neutrality Act would keep us out of war. Of course, it sounded cockeyed to me then, and it has ever since. How could we strengthen our neutrality by furnishing war materials to one group of warring nations and how could we keep our country out of war in this way? And in the long run how could we hope to make any profits by being involved in the world conflict?

Some Democratic spokesmen admitted that the repeal of our Neutrality Act was a long step toward war. Mr. Churchill, Prime Minister of the British Empire, stated that all they needed was equipment to fight, that they had the manpower, they did not need American boys. He also stated that they would buy, pay for, and take title for American war supplies. But we all know now that the repeal of our Neutrality Act did not keep us out of war and that we have not made any profits out of those transactions, and we have up to this time given directly to Great Britain and the British Empire approximately twenty-five billions in munitions of war, food, clothing, services, and so forth, and through the Army and Navy Departments we have given additional large amounts of munitions, other war materials, food, clothing, and so forth. These include locomotives, railroad cars, steel rails, tools, and almost everything.

It is claimed that Great Britain and other parts of the British Empire have given to us in reverse lend-lease approximately four billions; but a lot of the items on being examined bring a blush to our faces. Some time ago we discovered that the British had made one claim of approximately one hundred and seventy-five millions when the American officials estimated that the claim should not have been more than ten millions. It is a difficult matter to find out just how much has been given away under this lend-lease program and what each country has received of these benefits.

On page 2122 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of date March 13, 1945, in order to secure the information as to just how much Congress has appropriated and made available under lend-lease up to June 30, 1945, I asked Mr. VORYS, of Ohio, a very able member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the House that had this bill under consideration, the following question:

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What sum of money in the aggregate has been appropriated up to the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1945?

Mr. VORYS. We have already appropriated and made available through transfers sixty-four billions.

Some other members of the Foreign Relations Committee insist that the amount is 68 billions.

Approximately 36 billions of this sum have been transferred directly from our Government to the Allied Governments. Ninety-eight percent, according to the report of the Foreign Relations Committee, has gone to the British Empire—Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, India, and to British South Africa, and to Russia, France, and China.

The British Empire has received directly more than twenty-five billions of this sum; Russia about eight billions; China approximately one billion; and approximately three billions to France and some other Allied countries.

The President, through the Army and Navy, is authorized to disburse the balance making up the sixty-four billions, to Allied countries.

It is urged that we must continue lend-lease in order to expedite the winning of the war. I have all the time and I do still favor our country doing her full share in the winning of the war. We are in the war. Every loyal American citizen should do all in his power to bring the war to a speedy and successful conclusion.

My objection to the bill before us is that our country is not protected. The administration and the American people generally feel that this lend-lease give-away proposition should cease when the war ceases. We expect the war in Europe to end by July 1, 1945, or before, and this lend-lease to Europe should end when the war in Europe ends. Lend-lease should not then go to any country that will not give us active aid in the war in the Pacific. This bill would extend the lend-lease for at least 1 year, with other provisions that would permit lend-lease operations to continue until

1949. Those who are in favor of restricting the lend-lease to countries aiding us and up to the end of the war, agree that this bill does not protect our country. There are big loopholes and we know how this administration takes advantage of all loopholes and sometimes they break through when there is no hole at all. There are other programs to help to take care of needy after the war.

If lend-lease or give-away is necessary to win the war, let us confine these operations to winning the war and when the war is over, stop this tremendous burden upon the taxpayers of our country. We are the sworn Representatives of the American people and it is up to us to see to it that the bond and tax money of the American people is used for winning of the war and not to be Santa Claus to at least a billion people in all parts of the world.

HAS OUR COUNTRY DONE AND IS SHE DOING HER PART?

Every measure that comes up, some persons in and out of Congress who have never worn their country's uniform and have given no sons and daughters for service in this great war insist that we should vote every proposal that is brought before us, and approved by these superpatriots. If we refuse they tell us who have boys in the service we are not interested in our boys.

Those in the service must desire us to uphold the Constitution of our country, preserve the freedom of the American people, and protect our Nation from bankruptcy and economic ruin. To hear some of these persons speak you would think that the United States has been niggardly in aid to our allies. I wish to repeat that our country has been and is spending more money than all of the Allied Nations and our enemy nations put together in this war. We had about 5,000,000 men under arms in World War No. 1 and nearly two and a half million were sent overseas. Our country spent, up to the signing of the armistice, according to the reports of the Treasury Department, approximately twenty-one billions. The United States Congress has already appropriated and made available for lend-lease 3 times that sum, and the end is not yet.

The other day the House increased the debt limit of this Nation to three hundred billions, and we were told by the representatives of the Treasury Department that they would be back in February or March of 1946 and urge Congress to raise the debt limit to perhaps three hundred and fifty billions; and that may not be the end. Our national debt has increased more than the combined national debts of all the Allied Nations.

During the present year the American people will pay in Federal revenues and taxes over $45,750,000,000. This is more than will be paid in taxes by the people of all the Allied Nations. In World War No. 1 the American people paid in a single year approximately twelve billions in taxes, but this year the American people will pay nearly four times that sum.

Under the 8 years of President Wilson, the American people paid in taxes $24,375,781,688, and there were expended in the 8 years of his administration, including expenses of World War No. 1 and the loans we made to our allies, $46,938,260,143.

In the 12 years of President Roosevelt's administration the American people paid in Federal revenues and taxes $160,073,270,770 and there have been expended $399,791,966,466. In other words, the Roosevelt administration in 12 years expended nearly two hundred and ten billions more than it has taken in.

I wish to repeat another comparison that I made on the debt-limit bill Thursday, March 8, 1945: In all of the administrations of all the Presidents through 144 years, from Washington down to F. D. R., the total receipts of the Federal Government were $91,586,706,120 and the expenditures were $112,203,367,065, and in those 144 years there was a total deficiency of $20,617,290,935.

On June 30, 1945, the estimated deficiency will be approximately two hundred and fifty-eight billions.

SACRIFICE OF MEN

We have been discussing dollars, but the greatest contribution our country has made in this war in behalf of our allies has been in men.

We had voted to free the Philippine Islands before this war started. Practically all of the fighting that has been done since we became involved in this war has been on the soil of our allies and as direct aids to them. Our casualties in dead, wounded, and missing will soon reach the 1,000,000 mark, and the chances are that they will reach 1,500,000 before the war is over.

We have 5 armies on the western front; France has 1 small army; the British Empire has 2. Mr. Churchill stated recently that we have more than twice as many men on the western front as the British Empire. We have put approximately 14,000,000 men in uniform. We have provided practically all of our equipment, and we have furnished tons of billions of dollars' worth of equipment and supplies to our allies. We have spent billions in constructing air bases, helping build railroads and furnish equipment, building highways, and rebuilding ports and utilities and transporting hundreds of millions of tons of supplies to our allies, and spent other billions in repairing and reconstructing ships and other equipment belonging to our allies; and one can scarcely estimate the amount of food, clothing, and other supplies that we have sent to the Allies. We have provided at least 85 percent or more of the men, ships, and equipment in the Pacific war and in recovering territory of our allies, and we have had very little help from Great Britain and no help from Russia, in the Pacific. Our allies have much more at stake in the Pacific than we have. While our main allies, Britain and Russia, have made secure their great empires for the future. Very little has been done for our own country.

I am merely pointing out that the American people have played their part well. They have not only been just; they have been generous to a fault with our allies. While British ships are in the Indian Ocean and near to the possessions of Great Britain in India and in China, she has not yet helped us to make an assault on Japan. And while we have been pouring supplies into Russia, she has not so much as raised her hand in our behalf against the Japs. She has, however, from year to year renewed the Japs' fishing rights in Russian waters and enabled the Japs to get ample fish supplies with which to feed her armed forces and civilian population to fight this war.

According to the words of the President and other high officials, we have not the slightest intimation from Russia that she will help us fight the Japs. Mr. Churchill has assured us that Britain will help us fight the Japs; but when the war is over, Great Britain will have made India secure for herself and her interests in Burma, and she will have recovered control over Singapore, Shanghai, and Hong Kong. Russia has gobbled up Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and parts of Poland, Finland, Rumania, and control in other countries.

If we are to secure any concessions or benefits from our allies out of this war, it has not been made known to the American people.

We have done and we shall continue to do all in our power to help win the war as speedily as possible; but at the same time we must not destroy the economic structure and bankrupt our country. These millions of American boys and their children will have to pay a large part of the debt and the interest that is being piled up. This will mean a tax burden almost unbearable. Many parts of the British Empire boast of the fact that they do not have conscription of their young men and do not have O. P. A. regulations.

Our young men have not been spared. We have stripped our farms, factories, shops, and mines. We have given to our allies in the way of foodstuffs such enormous quantities as threatens a food shortage in this country. I tremble to think what the result would be if we were to have a general drought in this country in 1945 or 1946.

We have sent to foreign countries for relief and for purposes other than military, in the last 22 months, approximately 3,000,000,000 pounds of meat and 300,000,000 pounds of butter, as well as hundreds of millions of pounds of other food products. These did not go to our armed forces or to any of the armed forces of our allies.

There are estimated to be 30,000,000 families in the United States. This meat and butter would have furnished 100 pounds of meat and 10 pounds of butter for each American family.

I wish to repeat my opposition to this bill is that it does not limit lend-lease or give-away to the end of the war but will permit large commitments to be made within the next year and they will have until 1949 to carry out these commitments.

Let lend-lease for Europe end when the war ends in Europe and then confine lend-lease to those who aid us in winning the war in the Pacific. Great sums of lend-lease have gone to Turkey, Spain, Central and South America without substantial aid from them in our war effort.

In addition to all of these supplies and services that we have rendered to our allies, the American people have given huge sums of money, clothing, and equipment through the Red Cross and various agencies to the people of our allied countries. Those who have recently visited France, including Fulton Lewis, Jr., state that the French have plenty of food except in Paris and the shortage there is due to lack of transportation, and that they have plenty of food in Belgium. American soldiers reported that they found the French farmers had plenty of food. Let us help all we can; but let us not forget that we are borrowing the money, issuing bonds that must be paid by the American people through a hundred or more years of sacrifice and denials to themselves, to their children and children's children, including those who are fighting our battles throughout the world. There are many groups of so-called liberals, I mean liberal with the taxpayers' money, going over this world giving away our resources and making commitments involving billions of dollars after the war. Congress and the American people should be on the alert and save something for our defenders and their dependents and for all of our people. We have already granted pensions to 350,000 disabled veterans of World War No. 2. We shall have many big obligations to meet. We must not waste a dollar and spend only what may be just and necessary.

The Crisis in Technical Manpower

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleges reports that out of a normal class of 100 members studying chemistry and the sciences, they have now one girl, two IV–F's and two I–A men. I am a member of that very justly famous Cosmos Club in Washington. Several noted scientists and educators in the last several months have often appealed to me to express to the House their fears and anxieties over the present situation. Other countries have conserved the number of their scientists and engineers and even increased their numbers during this war period. A decade will follow before we will have completely recovered our former position. Will you please read these remarks concerning the subject entitled "The Crisis in Technical Manpower"?

The United States today faces a crisis that has seldom been equaled in its history. It is deliberately wasting one of its precious heritages and wantonly destroying a resource that should be utilized to its fullest extent in fighting the war, a resource that would provide new industries for industrial expansion after the war is won. That raw material is trained manpower in the scientific fields. I have spoken to several authorities on this subject and they agree that the crisis in the supply of trained men is most serious to the security of the Nation. Technical personnel are vital to a Nation at war as can be seen in the two reports, one from Field Marshal Kesselring at the end of the campaign in Africa when he said that the superiority of the American tanks was the determining factor in the victory of the Allies in the desert battle. The other report is from American soldiers, as quoted in the papers recently, that the German tanks in the present battle in Germany were so superior to ours that they felt it is not worth the bother of giving tanks a pet name because they knew that the life of the tank would be a short one against the superior German machines.

There is a little moral to that story—development of war weapons never stops. The Germans entered this war with a deadly plane—the Stuka. The Allies soon developed planes that conquered that menace, only to find that the Germans had something better in the Messerschmidt. Then when we exceeded the Messerschmidt, they came out with jet-propelled planes that are reported, in the public press, to fly rings around the Allied planes. When the perfected bomber defense for the British Isles made it practically impossible for the enemy to successfully raid the city of London, the Germans sprang on the shocked world, not one, but two models of the flying robot bomb. Now we in turn are overcoming these and other new weapons with radar and our marked superiority in rockets and their new propellants. Let us not forget for one moment this unpleasant fact—we are fighting a clever, scientific, enemy. They never have stopped inventing and perfecting. When one model is deemed unfit, others are made to take its place and to do this Germany must obviously have a reserve of trained capable scientific men. The question in my mind today is simply this—what are the Germans concocting in their laboratories now—what horrible weapon will they spring on civilization today, tomorrow, or even in the next war which many are convinced they are planning. And if today we were to receive news from the front that they had unleashed some new and terrible invention, what could we do about it?

We might point to diplomatic agreements and war covenants. Our writers could speak of the inhumane Germans, editorials would cry out against this new violation of the human spirit and freedom, but these effusions would not for the least fraction of time stop the enemy from using the weapon. All we could do would be to go to a little band of men known as scientists and ask them to pull something out of their hats to stop the new destruction. And these new measures would not be devised by some jockey who has been forced out of his occupation into a defense plant. If complicated organic chemicals were needed in the research, they could not be made by an ex-bartender, no matter how good he was at cocktail mixing. The men who pace invention and development are, in the main, trained men—men who have put in years of study in college and who have been doing research work or running plants since their graduation and acceptance into that little group of scientists upon whom most of our industrial progress rests. Such men should not be in the armed forces as combat troops. Such men are needed in the laboratories and factories of the Nation. Only then can they give to our troops their fullest ability to help.

Today, once again, there is a distinct threat that the production armies and the research teams, already depleted and reduced in rank, will be seriously affected by the latest draft rulings to take all fit men up to 30 years of age. The scientific societies have been pointing out the necessity of conserving trained men ever since the war started. In 1942, shortly after Pearl Harbor, the American Chemical Society, a federally incorporated society comprised of some 40,000 chemists, was warning the Nation that the production arm was essential to the success of our arms and that chemists, chemical engineers, physicists, and other essential technical men are officers of the production army. It cannot function without them. In February 1942 there were only 300 chemists and chemical engineers in the service, and even then the technical organizations were decrying their loss. Back in 1940 Selective Service was warned about impending shortages and classified chemists and chemical engineers as groups in which it is expected that the demand currently exceeds, or in the immediate future will exceed, the supply of qualified workers. Why, we might ask, has this declaration and the warnings been ignored?

In 1944, the American Chemical Society sent to the President of the United States a letter urging that the reservoir of trained chemists and physicists be not reduced further. The President replied, stating that the special need for such men in industry would be kept in mind, and a reproduction of his letter is printed in Chemical and Engineering News, March 25, 1944. At that time it was pointed out that a further reduction in the number of industrial scientists would be disastrous. This was at the time that the Army was advancing the blanket draft to include the men up to 26 years of age, the idea being that almost, regardless of occupation, men would be inducted into the armed forces. Little was done to prevent the indiscriminate drafting of such men, and today there are some 17,000 chemists and chemical engineers in the armed forces. Once again these trained men are facing a depletion of their numbers as Selective Service has moved the deferment age up to 30 and may soon raise this to 33. How can we in the United States expect to meet a challenge to our industrial supremacy if we continue to remove from positions of research and responsibility those very men upon whom we rely for the continued expansion of our positions?

Over a year ago the Saturday Evening Post in an editorial pleaded with the selective service of the Nation to be just that—selective. In it, and I quote, they said:

In its most recent attitude, as expressed in orders to local draft boards, Selective Service

appears to take the view that men needed for war production are never young men. Already men under 22 are being refused occupational deferment for any reason, and it is expected that this limit will soon be raised to 26. Boards still may defer men with engineering degrees, but some industries report that selective-service officials show little disposition to exercise this discretion. The theory behind this attitude must be that nobody in the twenties can actually be indispensable in the war industries. What are the facts?

The failure of so many people to understand the part being played by young men on the industrial front is partially explained by the fact that we still do not understand the full meaning of the truism that this is a war of machines. The battle is the pay-off, and we can understand the necessity for discipline, rigorous training, and careful selection of personnel in preparation for combat. But we do not even now appreciate the need for young keymen in war industries, where pace, imagination, and a certain brash disregard for precedent are needed if we are to keep our fighting men better equipped than those who oppose them.

There are in the Nation, according to the best surveys now available, some 85,000 chemists and chemical engineers, 78,000 mechanical and electrical engineers, 12,000 other engineers, a total of 179,000. Surely this handful can be spared, especially since our security depends upon them.

It was over a year ago that Dr. Charles L. Parsons, secretary of the American Chemical Society, in a meeting called for the express purpose of appealing to Selective Service to be cautious in its drafting of trained men, said, in part:

The following statement has been reported to us. The classification officer addressing a company of basic trainees at Camp Sibert, Ala., said:

"I know that there are many chemists and chemical engineers among you who hope that they will have an opportunity to do research or technical work in the Army. I must assure you that the Army has about 100 times as many chemists and chemical engineers as it can possibly employ in such capacities, since most of the research work requiring chemists or chemical engineers is well taken care of, mostly by civil servants."

While blanket deferment is not advocated, a blanket draft seems imminent. Competent chemists, chemical engineers, or other scientists should not be permitted to serve in a nontechnical capacity, either in or out of uniform. Scientists, certainly those in the draft age not in uniform, should be put in uniform or given some special insignia to remove the slacker stigma. Our young technologists are not slackers; they are anxious to serve America where they can serve her best. Their scientific occupations on the average are as dangerous as if they were inducted into the Army.

The solemn warnings of men in position to survey and evaluate the facts must not be ignored. If the blanket draft of men up to the age of 30 is carried out, it is expected that 50 percent of all our trained men would be affected. Men that have been trained in the sciences are surely more valuable to a mobilized nation in doing the things in which they are expert. Is it not logical to assume that a physicist contributes more to victory when he is perfecting a thing such as radar, or a new fire control apparatus for big guns, than he would be driving an army truck or policing the parade grounds for cigarette butts? The scientists of our Nation, I am sure, agree with Dr. Parsons when he states that they ought—whether in uniform or not—be doing the things that are really a contribution to the strength of the country.

However, the problem is not simply solved by deferring scientific men. The crisis facing us at this time is twofold, for not only is the present backlog of trained men threatened but the rapidly expanding technical industries and research programs of this Nation are in great need of trained men—and our colleges and universities cannot supply them. To many this is a problem of coequal seriousness with that of drafting the men we now have. The reason is one of time. It takes 6 years to train men and we must have these men available. We must continue to expand our frontiers in science, for the nation that is second in science today is second in everything, including the ability to protect those cherished liberties for which we are now fighting. Without a supply of trained men constantly flowing into industry we lose ground that never will be recovered.

In the January 1945 issue of the Review of Scientific Instruments the editor, in commenting on the decline of graduates in universities, said:

In a report of the Parliamentary and Scientific Committee entitled "Scientific Research and the Universities in Post-War Britain," the following statement appeared:

"We have more than doubled the output of engineers and physicists during the war. The implementation of any thoroughgoing post-war reorganization of research and technological development will require an equal or even greater expansion in trained personnel. Our universities will, therefore, need to handle ultimately something like two or three times the 1938-39 number of science and technology students on this account, plus the future increase in developments foreshadowed in connection with science teaching in schools."

"This," comments the editor of the magazine, Dr. Gaylord P. Harnwell, "represents a very different accomplishment and direction of future planning than we can 'point to' in this country."

The trained personnel now in the country are succeeding beyond the realm of imagination in scientific endeavor and accomplishment. Here is what one of the country's outstanding scientists has to say about the crisis. He is Arthur Holly Compton, of the University of Chicago, an outstanding physicist, a Nobel prize winner, and a man held in reverent admiration for his keenness of intellect and his outstanding accomplishments. He stated in a Nation-wide broadcast that:

The international competition for leadership in science, though on a friendly basis, is, nevertheless, intense. I recall in 1927 commenting to the director of Germany's great National Institute of Physics and Chemistry with regard to the high quality of his scientific instruments. Though Germany was complaining then of her poverty, in our country no universities or Government laboratories could afford such equipment. The reason, said Dr. Paschen, was not far to seek. The Reichstag was determined to give all possible support to German science. They no longer had any Kaiser, nor any army. In what could they take pride? "Their men of science," they said; "let's make of them the best in the world."

This was the spirit that has enabled our enemy to match step by step the combined technical developments of ourselves and our allies. It is true that when the Nazis came into power the study of fundamental science was greatly curtailed, and even the technical schools fell to, roughly, 25 percent of their full enrollment, as they were building up their armies just before 1939. Yet this did not go as far toward destroying their scientific strength as we have gone in weakening our own science in this war. Just as the war began the Germans came to realize the danger to their future because of their failure to train enough scientific and technical men. They set aside an increased group of young men best qualified for science and barred them from entering the armed forces.

At least until perhaps very recently these students have been continuing their training for careers in science and technology. The result is that the German war industries and research organizations have an indefinitely continuing supply of fully trained men.

Our national policy with regard to the training of scientific men has been precisely the reverse. We have gambled on a short war. Science professors and students alike have left the universities. All their effort is concentrated on devising and developing new and improved weapons. Because we were caught unprepared for a war in which scientific developments have become so vital, this has seemed to be the only possible procedure. Yet now practically no students over 18, except a few IV-F's, are studying science.

If the war could have been completed within a year or two, this policy would have been a good one. The idea is that everyone puts all that he has into the fight now and gets it over with, and then all return as promptly as conditions permit, to resume their normal tasks. But the war in Europe has already been going for over 6 years, and our 3 years of intense effort have not shown us clear evidence of an early victory. If the war should continue for as long as it has already been fought, our present policy of no advanced scientific and technical training will spell national disaster.

It takes at least 6 years for a capable 18-year-old to train himself for effective scientific research. Even if we should start now to resume such training, it will thus be at least 6 years before a normal supply of young professionals will again be available to our laboratories. Can we afford to wait any longer?

This is a situation of national concern which needs to be carefully watched, lest, when the war is won, we may find that we have gained a pyrrhic victory, having lost so much of our technical strength that we shall be unable to carry on the great task of world leadership which we now see before us.

But men of science are not alone in their pleas for a sensible evaluation of the best means of conserving the Nation's resource of technical men.

The Worcester (Mass.) Telegram stated recently that:

Experts have agreed that the present clamor about a manpower shortage arises less from a shortage of ordinary unskilled labor than from an acute shortage of highly trained personnel that could not be replaced when they were drafted.

And further in the same editorial:

There has been considerable confusion about the drafting of skilled workers ever since the war began, and it has been suggested that a true policy of selective service, operating as its name implies it should, might have avoided much of the skilled labor shortage.

This situation was more or less predicted when in 1942 an official publication of the American Chemical Society printed an observation of C. L. Parsons, its secretary, that "personnel, not material, will be the bottleneck; largely through waste."

Or the Toledo Blade of February 1 of this year in commenting on scientists and the draft:

The view that students of science should not be drafted to serve in the war machine may be regarded as an extreme one right now by many who feel that in the enormous upheaval of war, students of any class must take their chances with everyone else in being assigned to battle duties. However, just as the radical ideas of one era often come to be regarded as stodgy conservatism of the next, it is probable that public opinion of the future will include amazement at the waste of specialists in World War II.

There are reasons for the present indifference concerning this waste. In the past, there has not been sufficient relationship between ability and the opportunity for a scientific training. Many of the graduates and post-graduate students of our scientific schools have been lucky enough to belong to families of sufficient wealth to bear the expense involved. While this fact is no reflection upon their ability, true democracy, it seems to us, should mean that mental qualifications should be considered first in higher education for the ultimate benefit of the Nation, and that the matter of money should not enter the picture at all. Probably some method or methods of financing higher education for apt students handicapped by finances in the future will be accepted as a matter of course in the natural evolution of efficiency.

Science—all science—has made such wonderful strides in spite of these fetters that anyone can visualize what immense progress must be made in that future era when scientific education becomes dependent solely on aptitude. That this progress should be interrupted by the absence of an entire generation of scientists is so contrary to reason that, from the standpoint of national defense alone, a provision will conceivably be incorporated into our regulations whereby our scientific youth will not be drafted in the next war to serve in capacities unrelated to their knowledge and ability. Great Britain learned that lesson from the last war.

America did not learn the lesson, presumably because we were not in the war long enough, and Britain's example was ignored. Soldiers of this war and veterans of the last could give some startling information concerning the lack of consideration of aptitudes in military assignments.

True democracy requires universal service in times of emergency, but it should be service according to ability if for no other reason than that such a selective system could be expected to win the war more quickly and to provide for recovery and future progress more readily. No question of individual partiality should be involved, and we do not believe it too much to expect that this principle will eventually reach universal acceptance.

But it has been the men directly engaged in the study of science that have issued the broadest and most comprehensive warnings. In the Scientific Monthly of January 1945, Mr. M. H. Trytten, Director of the Office of Scientific Personnel, states that—

We have failed to safeguard our supply of men trained to carry on in the technical field, and that we have not guarded our scientific and engineering preeminence.

This is a serious charge to make to those responsible for the future of our country.

Henry A. Barton, in his report as director of the American Institute of Physics, states that, "Rightly or wrongly some of the seed corn of American scientific progress for years has been ground up to make a day's feed for the war machines."

These men of science are warning the country of a folly that will have serious repercussions in the days to come. One of the last things that Thomas Midgley said to his fellow chemists before his death was that the Nation must become aware of the fact that science is power, and the chemists should bring to the attention of the people and the men responsible for the administration of the welfare of the people—

That France fell in 40 days before the German onslaught partially, if not largely, because it failed to appreciate that science is power, because it continued to believe and trust in Napoleon's out-dated and out-moded philosophy that God is on the side of the army with the most guns, because it failed to be technologically strong to meet any emergency.

And how has this Nation tried to keep technologically strong? By the reverse process of cutting off the supply of trained men and of wasting the abilities of those already trained. In pre-war we had about 200 doctor of philosophy graduates a year in physics, the number is now about 50. In mathematics it has decreased from over a hundred, to less than 50. Geology graduates in the doctoral category have dropped roughly to one-third; chemistry in 1944 trained less than 200 doctors, where once the supply was inadequate at about 700, and both chemical and engineering post-graduate study is now down practically to zero.

And for those who think inadequately and hastily trained men will provide the stopgap, they will first have to explain away the clean-cut statement of Dr. James B. Conant, chemist and president of Harvard University, to the effect that "10 second-rate men are no substitute for one first-class man."

America needs trained scientists, and to waste them or to fail to provide them is a slow method of committing national suicide. Even now, the national roster of scientific personnel estimates that if the war ends this year, the country will have a deficit of over 9,000 trained chemists and chemical engineers and—should the war and our present method of wasting our trained men continue until 1947 there will be a deficit of over 20,000 in the same fields. Other estimates state that at present we are short 1,800 trained physicists, and at least 1,100 mathematicians, and this estimate was made on the assumption that all such personnel in the Army and Navy had been returned.

In the magazine Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, there recently appeared an editorial, Only God and a Few Humans Know. This has been placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A486, by Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, and I will only refer to the letter quoted in the editorial which tells of the serious decrease in enrollment of our technical colleges. There a head of a chemistry department states:

Instead of a normal senior class of chemists and chemical engineers of about 100, I met my senior class on Monday consisting of 1 girl, 2 IV-F men, and 2 men in I-A who will almost certainly be called before they can graduate in February. This is the class which ordinarily would graduate in June. In other words, it is our normal class. At the present time, instead of having about 80 graduate students in chemistry and chemical engineering, we have 4 girls, and 4 IV-F men. Of the girls, 1 is married to a staff member, and the other is an alien.

Certainly if our Nation is to be strong, and if we are to prosper as we must in future world's economy, it is imperative that we do something about this serious situation. In the matter of keeping technical students in college, in the matter of guaranteeing a supply of trained men for the post-war, our allies could teach us a few lessons. They have insisted on maintaining students in college, counting on this investment to pay dividends later on. Russia, it has been said, considers education so important that one of the first acts when a town is liberated is to set up schools for supplying trained personnel.

I asked a person closer to this problem than anyone in the United States to comment on the course we are following today, and he supplied me with this closing paragraph:

American technology has given birth to the greatest power of all time. Today we are drying up prosperity at its source. Public opinion of the future will view with amazement the waste of scientists in World War No. 2, will applaud the unequaled accomplishments of the few who were utilized, and will condemn the lack of trained personnel in the economic competition that is to come. Our children and our grandchildren will not forgive the loss of an entire generation of scientists, a disaster that can easily be avoided.

St. Patrick's Day Address by Hon. Robert E. Hannegan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at a St. Patrick's Day dinner at Rochester, N. Y., on March 17, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have always liked St. Patrick's Day gatherings. You meet people of so many different nationalities.

In years past our Irish forebears here in America singled out March 17 as their day. Now it's different. St. Patrick's Day in

America has come to be pretty much an all-American day. It is a legitimate opportunity for all Americans to say what they like about the Irish.

Those of us with Irish blood have no objection.

There are a great many of us. I don't think Americans generally realize how many. Three centuries ago half the people in America of trans-Atlantic origin were Irish. During the decade 1650–59 60,000 came over. And in 1789 a historian wrote, "For the past 70 or 80 years no nation has contributed so much to the population of America as Ireland."

I take it he was referring to immigration. But we did our share in contributing to the population in every way possible.

Today America has Ireland in the blood. Just what that ingredient means in the life stream of a nation is brought out in a little story concerning a certain despotic King of England in the past.

The King took ill, and blood transfusions were necessary. But the land was searched, and no one could be found with just the right kind of blood; no one, that is, except one lone Irishman who was traveling in the country. From this Irishman the blood was taken. When the first transfusion was made the King opened his eyes. With the second transfusion he sat up in bed. And with the third transfusion he jumped out of bed and roared, "To hell with the King of England!"

But America today not only has Ireland in the blood—more important, America, fighting the good fight for man's freedom, follows a pattern of ideals that was Irish a thousand years before Christopher Columbus found these shores.

Ireland, the spirit of Ireland, fights on for freedom through a mighty roster, hundreds of thousands of gallant young men wearing the uniform of the American armed forces, and bearing the names of Irish ancestors.

The spirit of Ireland fights for a lasting peace and a saner, more decent world, through millions of American citizens who bear Irish names. They have joined hands with other millions whose names go back to England, France, Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and a score of other countries.

The Nazi Goebbels did his best to convince us that this fighting community of nations was not genuine, could not stick together. His propaganda machine worked overtime to that end. But the lines of steel which he said were imaginary are now drawn tight on Nazi Germany's throat. They are real enough to crush the greatest force that ever threatened the liberty of mankind. And they are also real enough to unite the peoples of the world in a permanent peace.

We have now, on our side of the Atlantic, those who want to convince us that our program for a permanent peace is not real, that it won't work.

Fellow citizens, those of our own people who do not wish to see the makings of peace before their very eyes today are even blinder than the German people who could not see the makings of war across the Atlantic Ocean when they sneered at our democracy's fighting power a few years ago.

With the leadership that we have, the peace that we shall make will be as genuine and solid in the councils of nations as the victory that we are achieving on the field of battle. Deny the possibility of the one and you deny the reality of the other.

I say this is true with the leadership that we have—the leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is the leadership that was given a mandate last November by the people of America to carry on.

And I wish to repeat here what I said a few weeks ago in Washington at a gathering of the Presidential electors. It is this:

The victory of Franklin D. Roosevelt at the polls last November, great as its importance was to the Democratic Party, was of yet greater importance to America. That victory was more important to America than it could have been to any one party, interest, group, or individual in America.

Why was this so? It may be pointed out that on the great issues of war and peace—on such broad objectives as speedy and unconditional victory over our enemies, international cooperation, post-war employment, social security—on these basic aims, the stated principles of the Republican Party were closely patterned after the Roosevelt program.

Most Republicans wanted to see this fulfillment of America's destiny. All but a small number of the 48,000,000 voters of 1944, Democratic and Republican, shared alike this resolve to go forward on the road that our country had been traveling.

Why, then, was the reelection of Roosevelt so vital to our Nation and its future?

The fight to preserve freedom is worldwide. The edifice that must be built to protect our freedom and to insure our national safety from future aggressions will be—must be—a world edifice.

And the architect of that edifice must therefore command the confidence, the trust, of all peoples of the world.

President Roosevelt has earned, and today completely commands that trust. No man since the time of Abraham Lincoln has been called upon to prove himself so thoroughly, and has so thoroughly succeeded, as has Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Today as our country stands ready to enter into the greatest undertaking of mankind—the end of wars—we are secure in the knowledge that whatever is done by the leaders in this undertaking will not be hindered by distrust, subverted by the scheming of reactionaries, or hamstrung by the hatreds of isolationists.

Not unless we, as a people, allow a reactionary, isolationist minority among us once more to pull the wool over our eyes, as they did a quarter of a century ago, can this happen. The danger of letting it happen lies not with our leadership, but with ourselves. The responsibility for preventing it lies not with our elected Government, but with our electorate—the millions of citizens who choose that Government—and who will again be faced with a choice in November of 1946.

No nation, certainly no democratic nation, is guaranteed the continued enjoyment of great leadership without returning to that leadership the continued support of the people.

For this reason, as we place our confidence in the President's proven statesmanship, he in turn relies upon us for our continuing support.

In this sense, a vote cast for President Roosevelt in the election of last November was something more than a vote for an individual, more than the endorsement of a personality. Your vote for the President was also your pledge of support for the policies that are inseparable from the man. With the fate of our Nation at stake, that vote was not only a privilege, but the acknowledgment of a duty as well—the duty of backing up the broad program for which this man stands.

If I am correct in this, then I believe it follows that the citizen's responsibility is also the party's responsibility. Just as the ballot of last November was an acknowledgment of a duty by each of us individually—in the same sense, our party's nomination of the President was also a pledge of continuing party support.

And in that sense, we of the Democratic Party, who constitute a political division in America, today acknowledge a stewardship, a responsibility beyond that which a political party is ordinarily called upon to accept.

This responsibility of the party is to back the policies of the President on which he won his election. This stewardshp is to muster the maximum of public support for those policies, to unite the American people, whatever their traditional politics may have been in less strenuous, less crucial times—to unite them now behind the administration's efforts to bring our country and the world triumphantly through this crisis.

For us Democrats, then, here in New York and throughout the Nation, I believe the watchword from this time on should be:

"Follow through."

Now, how can the Democratic Party carry out this responsibility? What must we do to "follow through"?

In terms of action, our next goal is victory at the polls in 1946. We hope and believe that the war will be over before the congressional election of 1946. But the task of building the peace will undoubtedly be a continuing one, and the new Congress will share that task with the Executive.

I cannot emphasize too strongly, therefore, the importance of the elections 2 years hence. The choices that our people make then will have a most vital bearing on the preservation of world peace, on everything that we are fighting for now.

We know the people of America will demand a membership in Congress of men and women who understand the President's program for making a permanent peace, and who will back him up in his resolve to see that program work, and we Democrats expect to be the party that will fill this need of the people.

They will be men who have thoroughly informed themselves of the organization for peace as it was roughed out at Dumbarton Oaks and as it will be perfected in the San Francisco and subsequent meetings.

They will be men who understand the rightness and the necessity for workable mechanics of international finance in a peace-preserving world—the mechanics originally proposed in the Bretton Woods Conference.

They will be men and women who know what the people want—these Members of the next Congress—and who have the courage to see that they get it. That means, my friends, they will be Democrats.

If in the coming sessions of Congress we find a Republican minority in Congress who still mouth international cooperation at us while they try to throw sand into the machinery we are building to make cooperation work, we will be ready for them in 1946.

We will have their records We know their game—from the blustering of the isolationists to the treachery of the perfectionists. It was all revealed to us a quarter of a century ago. We will be able in the campaign of 1946 to spot the "yes, but" boys. We remember how their predecessors in Congress used that "yes, but" technique to stab peace in the back after World War No. 1. "Yes" they are for international cooperation, "but" they are against every honest, practical measure to put the principle in operation.

The Republicans are in the minority in Congress, and the "yes, but" boys, we hope, will be in the minority even within the Republican Party. But they have money power behind them and they have lung power within them. They are still acceptable to the powerful little clique that has kept its grip on the leadership of the Republican Party.

This Republican leadership, you may be very sure, will be hard at work from now on to win the congressional elections. And men will run for Congress who are determined to block and barricade this Nation against any real international security, men who still are hoping that they will be able some day to force our country back into the war-breeding ground of isolationism.

And we can lick this group in 1946. And we must lick them. And as for ourselves, let us be able to say to our President that the Democratic Party's slate for the next Congress will be a slate of Americans whose souls have been tried by the times and have not been found wanting. It will be a slate of patriot-statesmen.

I can give you an example of the kind of patriot-statesman to whom I refer. An excellent example. We have him here with us tonight. You have recently reelected him to the United States Senate—Senator BOB WAGNER.

I can give you people of New York another example of the kind of patriot-statesman we shall support with all the resources at our command. We have him, too, with us tonight—Senator JIM MEAD.

Whether it be for the mayoralties of our cities, the governorships of our States, or for our representation in the National Legislature, these are the type of men we shall choose and back in the elections to come.

In building up local support for the caliber of men we want in the Congress of 1946, again we must shape our strategy around the Roosevelt post-war program.

Because that program is broad world wide in its embrace—we of the Democratic Party shall have to broaden our own scope of activities and contacts accordingly.

In the last election we saw the value of doing this. We were assisted and encouraged by the efforts of many individuals and organizations working and fighting for our party's principles. Roosevelt was elected, not by labor alone, not by business alone, not by the farmers or the professional men or the soldiers and sailors alone, but by a joining of hands among all these and many other groups of Americans.

Never before in our party's history have we had extended to us the willing support, the eagerness to help, from so many sources, so many walks of life, from such a broad and varied majority of the American citizenry, that we are offered today.

I do not propose to keep the door of our Democratic house shut to these newcomers simply because they are not or have not been members of the Democratic Party in the past. I do not propose to brush off their offers of assistance, or treat them lightly.

I know why thousands and hundreds of thousands of one-time Republicans have forsaken their party. I know why they are here at our door.

They are Republicans, but in a conflict on principle, they have been driven out of their own political house.

I know why millions who make up what we call the "independent vote" have turned again and again to the Democratic Party over recent years, why they vote for our candidates, why they even go out and work and fight for them.

They are independents, but since 1932 they have been voting Democratic on principle—the general principle of a better "break" for the people of this Nation.

It seems to me most fitting that on this day which is dear to the Irish heart, we Americans should think and speak of a permanent guaranty of liberty for all peoples.

Once, long ago, an Irish lad in his twenties stood before a court in Dublin and heard a judge sentence him to be hanged. His name was Robert Emmet, and the crime that he had committed was to search and fight for that same guaranty of liberty for his people.

When he asked if he had anything to say before the execution of his sentence, Robert Emmet addressed the court in words that are remembered today.

"I wished," he said, "to procure for my country the guaranty which Washington procured for America. These were my objects: Not to receive new taskmasters, but to expel old tyrants. In the dignity of freedom I would have fought upon the threshold of my country, and its enemy should enter only by passing over my lifeless corpse.

"I have but one request to ask at my departure from this world," he went on. "It is the charity of silence; that no man write my epitaph; for, as no man who knows my motives dares now vindicate them, let not prejudice or ignorance asperse them. Let them and me rest in obscurity and peace, and my tomb remain uninscribed, and my memory in oblivion, until other times and other men can do justice to my character."

A century and a half have gone by since young Robert Emmet spoke those words. That last request—the charity of silence—was not granted him. His words have gone ringing down through the years. But today—today we can, in good conscience, honor the memory of Robert Emmet, and to his poor, pitifully youthful shade, we can say:

"The men who can do justice to your character—to yours and that of every other brave spirit that fought for freedom—are here. Not for Ireland, but for the world, is the great guaranty now being made. A free and warless world will be the epitaph which these times and these men will write for you and for those who followed you and fought your fight."

And Robert Emmet, if he hears, may rest in peace. For men who dare to demand an end of oppressions, an end of wars, are speaking and acting. The time has come when they need not be silent.

Overtime Compensation of Federal Employees

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, for many years, thousands of employees of the Federal Government have not received just overtime compensation. Due to different methods employed in computing the overtime pay of Federal employees, some have fared far better than others. During the war period, hundreds of thousands of American citizens have suffered because of the failure of the Government to remedy this inequitable condition which has been brought repeatedly to the attention of Congress, the various departments involved and the President. In order to remedy this situation, I introduced legislation in the last Congress which would place all Federal employees on an equal basis in the computation of their overtime pay and which would provide for them true time and one-half rates of pay for overtime work. I reintroduced this bill, H. R. 108, in the present Congress.

Chairman ROBERT RAMSPECK of the Committee on the Civil Service has kindly sent to me a copy of the report of the United States Civil Service Commission upon this proposed legislation. In view of this report, it is my hope that the House Committee on the Civil Service will give Congress the opportunity to vote on H. R. 108 and provide by law the means for giving true time and one-half rate of pay for overtime work to the several hundred thousand employees against whom discrimination is now practiced by reason of existing laws and regulations.

I am pleased to call to your attention that the legislation proposed in H. R. 108 would be in accord with the President's program and that the United States Civil Service Commission recommends favorable action upon this provision in this bill:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1945.

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman, House Committee on the Civil Service, House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: This is in compliance with your requests of January 4 and January 9, 1945, previously acknowledged, for our comments on H. R. 108 and H. R. 487, which are identical bills to amend the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943, Public Law, No. 49, Seventy-eighth Congress.

The purpose of these bills is to—

1. Repeal the present provision that overtime pay shall be computed on only so much of an employee's annual salary as does not exceed a rate of $2,900 per annum.

2. Repeal the present provision that departments and agencies may elect to grant employees compensatory time off from duty in lieu of overtime pay for work in excess of 48 hours in any administrative workweek.

3. Substitute a divisor of 260 in lieu of the present divisor of 360 for converting annual rates into daily rates for overtime pay computation purposes.

In his Budget message to Congress for the fiscal year 1946, after referring to the need for reexamining the entire subject of hours of work and pay prior to the expiration of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943, the President recommended that the Congress enact permanent legislation which would authorize overtime compensation at true time and one-half rates.

The Commission recommends favorable action on the provisions of these bills with the exception of the discontinuance of authority to departments and agencies to grant compensatory time off from duty in lieu of overtime pay, for work in excess of 48 hours a week. To eliminate this provision would remove an item of flexibility in the administration of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943, which we believe should be retained.

We very strongly favor the change proposed by H. R. 108 and H. R. 487, with respect to the divisor to be used in converting annual rates to daily and hourly rates for overtime pay computation purposes.

Government employees generally are paid at basic annual, daily, or hourly rates. There is no statute establishing a uniform rule for converting these basic pay rates into overtime pay rates. In fact, existing law requires inconsistency.

In order to compute overtime earnings, it is first necessary to determine the overtime rate per hour. Under Public Law 49 and under daily and hourly wage schedules, the overtime rate per hour is one and one-half times the straight-time hourly rate. An inconsistency occurs, however, in computing the straight-time hourly rate.

The statutory method for computing straight-time hourly rates from annual rates is first to divide the annual rate by 360 (to give the straight-time daily rate) and then to divide this daily rate by 8 (to give the straight-time hourly rate). This formula is predicated on the theory that annual workers are paid for 360 days' work in the year, or 2,880 hours. At present, however, the basic workweek for annual-salaried workers is 40 hours a week. Work above that is overtime service. The year's work corresponding to the year's basic salary thus in fact consists of a basic work period of 40 times 52, or 2,080 hours, or 260 days.

Although the same basic work year of 2,080 hours is recognized in computing overtime pay for wage-board employees, it cannot be recognized for employees under Public Law 49 without new legislation.

An illustration will show the effect of the difference in the two methods.

A mechanic whose basic workweek is 40 hours works 48 hours in 1 week. For the 8

hours of overtime service he receives the equivalent of 12 hours (8×1½) pay at his straight hourly rate, or an increase of twelve-fortieths of his basic weekly earnings. This is a 30 percent increase.

A stock clerk in the same plant whose basic workweek is 40 hours works 48 hours in the same week. For the extra 8 hours of overtime he is paid one three-hundred-and-sixtieth of his annual basic rate (1/360 × 1/8 × 8), times one and one-half. This is equivalent to a weekly increase of one two-hundred-and-fortieth of his basic annual earnings, or a weekly increase of fifty-two two-hundred-and-fortieths of his basic weekly earnings. This is a 21.67 percent increase.

Thus the mechanic and the stock clerk under the same circumstances receive a 30-percent and a 21.67-percent increase, respectively, over basic weekly earnings.

This difference is also clearly illustrated in the case of employees whose annual earnings are substantially the same without overtime, e. g., a mechanical employee, paid at $1.20 an hour and a salaried draftsman paid at $2,500 a year. For working regular 40-hour schedules for 52 weeks the mechanic would be paid $2,496 and the draftsman $2,500. For each hour in excess of 40 hours a week the mechanic is paid one and one-half times $1.20, or $1.80. The draftsman is paid $1.30 ($2,500 divided by 360, divided by 8, multiplied by 1½) for each overtime hour, or 50 cents per hour less than the mechanic, although their straight-time annual earnings are substantially the same rate.

We believe this inconsistency should be corrected.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of overtime-pay legislation, such as is proposed in title II of the proposed bill presented to the Speaker of the House on February 21, 1945, and referred to your committee (now title II of H. R. 2497), would be in accord with the President's program.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

Address to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick by Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, Saturday evening last the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of the District of Columbia held their annual meeting. It was presided over by William Montgomery, the president of the Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co. of the District of Columbia, one of the distinguished and successful insurance executives of the United States. The address of the evening was delivered by Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University in his customary scholarly and eloquent manner. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The immortality which clings to certain great names across the centuries is sure index of something permanent and universal in them which transcends time, space, and locality. These recurring memories and the personality they recall were not always on the side of the angels, but often perpetuate the salutary warning attaching to certain evil influences such as Nero, Ivan the Terrible, Machiavelli, and Hitler. Parallel with these remmberances of disservice to humanity runs the record of heroic and sacrificial devotion to higher purposes, such as St. Francis of Assisi exemplified, or Sir Thomas More, Simon Bolivar, Pasteur, Washington, and Lincoln. This juxtaposition of contending forces in the age-old panorama of evolving social forms carries the germ of a philosophy of history which is the only satisfying explanation of human destiny. Human betterment, it would appear, is inseparably connected with conflict and contradiction.

One historic phase in this unending drama was enacted on Easter morning of the year 432 of the Christian era on a hill called Tara in the province of Meath on a far-off Atlantic island known to Strabo the Greek geographer as Hibernia. The first monarch of the land, surrounded by his great council of fellow kings and judges, attended by his bards, his minstrels, and his pagan priests called Druids, sat in royal ceremony awaiting the arrival of a visitor who had sought conference with the five kingdoms there united under the Celtic constitutions. That assembly had convened there for centuries in governance of a people whose ancestry has been traced back to those ancient Greeks whose civilization dotted the islands and shores both of the Aegean and the Mediterranean long before the legions of Caesar created the far-flung Roman Empire.

Into that convocation of Ireland's governing officials strode a majestic figure whose very aspect struck a responsive chord in the hearts and intellects of men sensitive to the dignity of authoritative bearing and accustomed to pageantry. This imposing messenger from the imperial city on the Tiber, now become the central shrine of Christianity, had voyaged by land and sea to this outpost of Europe, this furthermost island of the then-known world, to confront and evangelize a paganism which was destined to undergo such regeneration of spirit as would merit for that little island throughout succeeding centuries the high privilege of becoming the fruitful motherland and fountainhead of saints and Christian scholars.

This legate, who bore to Ireland the tidings first heard by shepherds on the hills of Bethlehem, came by his impressive bearing and confident demeanor through an inheritance of birth which had been further enriched by association with great souls and great events. His father, Calpurnius, was a Roman of the Romans, a decurio in Gaul or Britain and descended from a family of rank. His mother, Conchessa, was probably a native of north Britain and relative of the renowned patron of Gaul, St. Martin of Tours.

It was an age of Titans and epoch-making figures in the Christian church. Patrick moved through an era made illustrious by names such as the great Augustine of Hippo who next to Saint Paul molded the intellectual content of the nascent Christian faith and composed that immortal masterpiece, "The City of God." Jerome of the soaring vision was alive, translating the Scriptures into the Vulgate version. Ambrose of Milan was still the redoubtable bulwark of the spiritual against the arrogance of the temporal power wielded by the Emperor Theodosius whom the archbishop had halted at the door of his cathedral and bade fall on his royal knees, like any sinner, and ask God's pardon for that heinous crime of mass murder committed against the people of Thessalonica. Saint Leo the Great was in his prime, soon to become the pontiff unafraid who turned Attila, King of the Huns, and later Genseric, King of the Vandals, from their fury of destruction. The gentle Saint Martin of Tours was founding monasticism in the West, while in the Orient, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius and the golden-tongued John Chrysostom had but shortly left the scene of their earthly labors and heroic pioneering for Christianity in the eastern empire. This was the air that Patrick breathed. He shared the contagion of greatness which it carried from Constantinople to the English Channel and was raised by it to peerage in that galaxy of saints, pontiffs, apostles, and missionaries who made the fourth and fifth centuries the golden age of church history.

And now in the maturity of his manhood, somewhere between his forty-fifth and fiftieth year, he stands before his appointed adversaries, a bishop of the Christian church commissioned to a most important apostolate by a great pontiff and a great saint, Celestine I. With Patrick, the cross of Christ entered the proud banquent hall of Tara where the invincible eagles of conquering Rome had never penetrated. In that unarmed figure advancing to the throne of an alien king guarded by alert warriors, we see a superb symbol of the passing of the secular Roman Empire to be succeeded by a new universal faith, the Pax Christiana, which caught the torch from Caesar's faltering hand and set the times ablaze with the dynamic of a new spiritual kingdom not of this world.

The scene which then unfolded in the great hall of Tara marked a definite transitional moment in the chronicles of western Europe. Once again was demonstrated the pregnant truth that history is made by historic men cast to the stature of the times. It was not a Carthagenian Army that crossed the Alps—it was Hannibal. It was not three frail caravels manned by Spanish seamen who dared the unknown perils of unexplored oceans to discover the Americas—it was the obstinate vision of one man named Christopher Columbus. It was not a demoralized army of tattered Continentals who survived Valley Forge to emerge in victory—it was the iron will of one man on his knees in the snows, George Washington. It was not the crozier, nor the mitre, nor the cope, nor yet the choice of an opportune moment when Caesar was in retreat that changed the history of the Irish people and made that island a reservoir of faith and education for the Continent in succeeding generations—it was the indomitable faith coupled with the unflinching courage of Patrick cooperating with the designs of Providence and using every human instrumentality at the right moment. It is not enough to be right in the affairs of men. One must be right at the right moment. It can be as disastrous to be wrong at the right moment as right at the wrong moment.

Unlike the skeptical Greeks in the Aeropagus, these Celts did not say to this other Paul, "We will hear thee again concerning this matter," but made their choice between Christ and Baal then and there as Irishmen have been doing from that day onward. It is related that the chief of the bards, one Dubthach by name, ranking next in authority to the king, finally rose in his place, harp in hand and proclaimed: "Hear me, oh high king and chieftains of the land. I now declare that this man who comes to us speaks from God; that he brings a message from God. I bow before Patrick's God. He is the true God, and as long as I live this harp of mine shall never sound again save to the praises of Christianity and its God."

That pledge has been kept for over 15 centuries of intermittent prosperity and vicissitude. No important heresy, so far as I know, has ever originated in Ireland, though much robust controversy respecting theology

has flourished there. Theological differences have even been known to percolate into civic and social relations. That must have been the mood of the lady of Dublin who had no love for the Jesuits a generation or two ago. She was seated next to a distinguished Irishman, Gen. William Francis Butler, who had served with much honor in the British Army particularly in Egypt and on the Nile. It would appear that Dublin had been shocked and stunned by a crime of rare occurrence in that capital. A young girl had been kidnapped, and as a result both press and private quarters were fairly buzzing with gossip, rumor, and speculation. Leaning over to her dinner partner the dowager whispered: "General, don't you suspect the Jesuits had something to do with that ghastly kidnaping?" The grizzled old warrior comforted her by explaining: "No, madame. You know the Catholic Church has a special order for that." "I knew it," she whispered triumphantly. "Who are they?" "The Trappists," he replied.

The total acceptance of Christianity by the Irish people and their integral loyalty to its credo ranks as the outstanding characteristic of Patrick's achievement. Whereas other pagan lands had brutally martyred the first missionaries or Christianity or submitted slowly and painfully to the yoke of Christ, as the Teutonic tribes did, the Irish nation looked upon the Cross and recognized the face of Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Light of the World. In that integral acceptance of the supernatural we find the key of her long history and a powerful answer to many of the vicissitudes she has suffered. She was sealed from the beginning to two loyalties—love of the ancient faith and love of the soil which Patrick consecrated by his labors, his mysticism, his miracles, and his vision of the role of pain in the Christian economy of salvation.

When his days were done, at the age of 76, he saw a whole land evangelized and he alone of all his great contemporaries of the Christian West had the unique privilege of finding a people predominantly pagan on his arrival and leaving them wholly Christian at his death. This amazing transformation was accomplished in 30 years. If, as the Emperor Augustine could say of Rome, "I found it a city of brick and left it a city of marble," Patrick could say before the judgment seat of God, "I found them bound to idolatry and superstition; I left them consecrated forever to Thy Divine Son made man of Mary and crucified for our salvation."

These two loves characterizing the Irish people run, like a golden and a silver thread, respectively, through the warp and woof of Irish character wherever found—and that means everywhere. The fabric of the historical pattern woven for them thereafter on the loom of time was frequently crimson-hued. The slender thread of burnished gold was often dyed in the red of persecution, while the gleaming silver thread of legitimate national aspiration often grew tarnished and undistinguishable under political absorption. But true metal resists even fire and is shaped to forms of beauty under the hammer. For 300 years Danish invaders inundated and scourged the land but did not succeed in quenching the sanctuary lamps in Glendalough.

For 700 more years the Anglo-Saxon invaders sought to extinguish both the ancestral faith and the stubborn sense of nationality. At one time it was by direct assault and force of arms, at another period by penal laws and transportation of thousands into slavery, then by seduction of a maneuvered parliamentary union and always by calumny or subtle falsification of history, such as Froude, the visiting English historian, attempted in this country in 1872 until he was routed by the facile pen and eloquent tongue of the celebrated Dominican, Rev. Thomas Burke.

We have considered thus far the genius of the Irish people viewed collectively as a nation. What of them as individuals? Not all are saints but all know what sanctity is and revere it humbly, which is the difference between a contrite sinner and a scoffing skeptic. Even in his cups an Irishman knows the eye of God is upon him. His religious faith at home, on his native soil, is incorruptible, for it has been tried in fire. It is usually under the seduction of complete freedom abroad, by alien enticement or prosperity that he loses his faith—and even that paradox is comparatively rare. That is why Ireland's saints have sometimes prayed to keep her poor—if riches are to lead to that sin of pride by which the angels fell. Irish womanhood has sanctified the purity of maidens and ennobled the chastity of wedlock. Your Irishman is not a stranger to violence but is quick to forgive and forget. In that respect he is a paradoxical reservoir of vehemence and humility.

He does not hate his adversary though he will battle him to that hell of Connaught which Cromwell once decreed for all nonconforming Celts. I verily do not believe that Irishmen in Ireland hate the English as violently as second- or third-generation Irishmen do from the safe distance of America. Or if they do, their attitude is likely to rest on a sort of theological premise similar to that manifested by the young man who recently said to his parish priest:

"I hope that man Hitler ends up in hell." To which the good pastor replied, "Come, come, my boy, don't be as un-Christian and uncharitable as that." "But Father," insisted the impatient Hotspur, "what's the use of having a devil at all, at all, if he doesn't get Hitler. The Church shouldn't have him around."

The Irish immigrant to America has easily adapted himself to her institutions, her laws, her culture, and traditions. He is assimilated into the American democracy without difficulty and has rendered loyal service in its defense. He is rarely found among the radical elements of the left wing, though he will gladly lead a revolt against injustice wherever found, and has been known to engage in a brawl with the policeman on his rounds. His rebellion is against injustice and oppressive government, not against the principle of authority. No figure wields more authority over him than his priest in whom he recognizes a representative, however human, of Him who is the source of all the law and order by which creation moves.

It is sometimes alleged that Irish politicians and prominent Americans of Irish extraction have sinned against the public welfare with much facility and special grossness. Doubtless Irishmen have gone to jail for high crimes and low misdemeanors, and it is entirely possible that some are still at large who should be jailed. But it is wholly unreasonable to indict the vast unpublicized majority for the sins of the notorious few. When an Irishman succumbs to an unholy greed for gold or goes wrong in other ways, I concede you he can become as offensive and criminal as any of those eminent persons with non-Celtic names who have graced the apartments at Sing Sing, or smoothly plundered and wrecked an important railroad in New England, or pauperized innocent widows and orphans by unctuous manipulation of worthless securities. It is an ancient but ever odious device of bigotry to attribute and transfer individual wrongdoing to an entire racial, religious, or political collectivity rather than lay it to the common weaknesses of human nature persisting in all the sons of Adam, be they Catholic, Protestant, Jew, or atheist.

For every unworthy Roland discovered by the scavengers someone will quickly dredge up an Oliver of different faith until dangerous hatreds infect the entire body politic where unity and mutual respect are so desperately needed. The shallows of a river are the points of babbling noises and friction; the deep volume of water flows majestically and silently to meet the sea. So it is with the river of life, and so let it be with our judgments on the currents of our neighbors' conduct as they empty into the ocean of eternity.

The double seal which Patrick imprinted on Irish souls—acceptance of Christianity even to the shedding of lifeblood in its defense and a flaming patriotism—will be challenged more than ever, I suspect, in the uncertain and perilous social upheavals which will undoubtedly afflict all the survivors of the present world tragedy. Eire, it is said, will be excluded from the ultimate peace conference which will attempt to liquidate the curse of war and the hatreds now devastating Europe and Asia. But let her be of good heart. Perhaps she will one day account it a blessing not to have cooperated in the injustice now being contrived against another Catholic nation of central Europe in appeasement of atheistic communism. Ireland's destiny has never been that of a great power as power is measured in the eyes of men. Her strength has been rooted in the power of her will to freedom, in her unshakable loyalty to the supernatural in man and in the election of a Wolfe Tone, a Grattan, a Robert Emmet, a Daniel O'Connell, and a Parnell to die on their feet rather than to live crouched on their knees before any totalitarian aggressor.

May the Lord of Hosts still keep her within the shadow of His outstretched hands even though their juncture forms a cross, and grant her Patrick's shield of sanctity, wisdom, fortitude, and clearness of vision in the darkness of the present hour. She will preserve the integrity of her soul and make a new Tara so long as she builds it of the rock from which she has been hewn.

All-American Flag Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "All-American Flag Line," made by me this morning before the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With many others, I share a vision of America's destiny as the outstanding power in world air transportation. I am determined to do what I can to bring about fulfillment of that destiny. I believe adoption by this country of the policy set forth in the bill S. 326 is essential to achieving that objective.

I believe that the proposal for a single American-flag line in international air transportation, with all existing American air carriers participating in its management and direction, and sharing in its profits, will mean unprecedented growth for American aviation and new prosperity for the domestic air lines of this country, as well as giving this Nation the inside track to the commerce

and industry which world-wide air transportation is certain to develop.

Whether we like it or not, we are going to be forced into active competition with foreign nations in a struggle for control of global air transportation. We must either hold our own in that struggle or be forced into a secondary position in world affairs, for world trade will hold the key to international preeminence and national prosperity after the war, and within the span of a few years air transport will be the keystone of world trade.

In the post-war world, far more than in the pre-war world, commercial air lines will provide the key to economic development and exploitation. If this Nation can achieve and maintain the supremacy in world aviation which is her natural destiny, American prominence in world affairs will be assured for the next three generations. If we fail to meet this challenge, and allow any other nation or combination of nations to take over the position of leadership in world aviation which should be ours, we shall soon and long have cause to regret it. We shall see our natural markets weaned away from us. New markets will be developed primarily for the benefit of other nations. Our own consumers will be unable to purchase important articles without paying tribute to the foreign carrier which brought them to our shores.

If this situation were clearly understood by the great mass of the American people, there would be only one possible answer to the question of whether we should enter the field of international aviation in the post-war world with anything less than the maximum potential of our entire air transport industry, unified for the greatest possible efficiency, and backed to the limit by all the resources and facilities of our Government. That answer, the enlightened answer, the prudent answer, is the answer embodies in Senate bill 326.

The bill would create a federally chartered private corporation, with potential working capital in excess of $1,000,000,000, to be known as the All-American Flag Line. This corporation would be composed of air carriers now holding certificates under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, except air carriers whose operations are wholly within the Territory of Alaska.

Creation of this corporation would effect a pooling of all the resources, both domestic and foreign, of the air-transport industry, to forge a new agency able to make the commerce of the United States first in the air all over the world. This new agency would have back of it not only the full strength of this unity of all factions of the air-transport industry of the United States concerned with foreign air transportation, but also all available facilities of the Government of the United States, to enable it to carry out the purpose for which it is being created.

This corporation would, therefore, have active partners operating throughout the United States to funnel international business into designated points of entry or departure. Likewise, these interstate air-carrier partners would pick up and disperse throughout the United States the international air traffic which is brought to our shores by the All-American Flag Line, or by any foreign air carriers. I believe this offers an unbeatable combination.

The bill prohibits the All-American Flag Line, or any foreign air carrier, from engaging in interstate air transportation, and specific provisions of the bill prevent any one air carrier from owning a controlling interest in the All-American Flag Line.

Remember, the pace of the world is geared to transportation, and aviation is the instrumentality which will set the pace in the foreign trade and passenger field after the war. We cannot afford to come out second best in the race for air commerce in the markets of the world. That is why this bill proposes to put the entire facilities of the air-transport industry and the full weight of the Government of the United States back of the All-American Flag Line.

In considering the question of our international air policy, even more than in considering the question of our domestic air policy, national security is of primary importance. Our national policy in regard to international civil aviation must be shaped and formed with a view to full recognition of the military requirements for national defense.

One essential prerequisite of adequate national defense is a powerful air force. To have a powerful air force in time of war, we must have, in time of peace, the civilian components which will go to make up wartime air power. We must have a strong air transport system; a system with air bases, airway facilities, and aircraft which shall be readily adaptable to military use.

This transport system must either be subject to some form of governmental control which will insure that proper weight shall be given to military considerations at all times, or else it must be actually operated by the military. I anticipate that we shall be under strong pressure from the War Department, after this war, to provide for continued operation of the Air Transport Command on a world-wide basis, as a direct adjunct of the Army. The Air Transport Command is today the greatest international air carrier of persons and property in the world. It has recently begun to carry civilian passengers for pay. If this policy is continued after the war, the Air Transport Command will be a far greater threat to private enterprise in aviation than the All-American Flag Line proposed by this bill could ever be. Remember that the All-American Flag Line, while it will be subject to a large measure of Government control through the Civil Aeronautics Board, will be a private enterprise, in which all existing United States air carriers will share.

I believe the provisions of this bill are adequate to insure the development of international air transportation under the United States flag in such a way that all its facilities—its air bases, its aircraft, its traffic-control installations, even its personnel—will be available and readily adaptable for military purposes in time of war. I do not believe that, from a national security standpoint, the proposal for a number of smaller independent companies, competing one against the other, is nearly so acceptable.

This bill has been called a chosen instrument bill.

If we are going to bandy the phrase "chosen instrument" back and forth, we should have a clear understanding of what we mean by that phrase. The bill does not propose a "chosen instrument" in the sense in which that phrase is most commonly accepted. It does not propose to take some existing air line and make it the favored company. The "chosen instrument" under this bill will not be an instrument picked from stock and given some sort of royal seal of approval; it will be an instrument forged for the specific purpose for which it is to be used, from all the best elements of the aviation industry of this Nation.

In this sense of the phrase, when we send a team of athletes to compete with foreign nations in the Olympic games, that team is a "chosen instrument." We do not send to Europe the outstanding college track team of the Nation. We do not pick two or three or four outstanding college teams and send them across the water to compete in different events. We combine all of the best talent and ability and skill which the country affords, and we weld that talent and ability and skill into one team, and that team goes to the Olympic games to represent the United States of America.

Another word which should have a little preliminary attention in connection with the discussion of this bill is the word "monopoly." This is a word which has been both freely and loosely used by opponents of this bill. "Monopoly" is an unpopular word in this country. It is so unpopular that a great many people will oppose anything that is tagged with the monopoly handle. Of course, calling a thing a monopoly does not make it so. There is nothing inherently wrong in the word "monopoly," anyway. The Post Office Department is a monopoly—a monopoly in the public interest. Does calling it a monopoly make you dissatisfied with the Post Office Department?

Webster's Collegiate Dictionary says that in popular use "monopoly" means "any control (of any commodity or service) in a given market as enables the one having this control to raise the price of a commodity or service materially above the price fixed by free competition." Under this definition, the all-American Flag Line would not be a monopoly, for it would have to meet the competition of foreign air lines in prices and services. At most, the proposed All-American Flag Line would be a monopoly in operation; clearly it would not be a monopoly of control, for every United States air carrier would participate. A much better term than "monopoly" is "co-operative." The All-American Flag Line would be a joint enterprise by all the domestic carriers of this country, providing them an outlet to the commerce of the world for the passengers and goods they transport to our shores, and bringing to this country from all the world air traffic in which our domestic carriers would share.

At the present time, Pan American Airways has a virtual monopoly on international air transportation under the American flag. Only one other company is licensed to engage in such transportation. This bill provides that international air transportation under the American flag, and the profits therefrom, shall be shared by 20 different air lines. Instead of owning 90 or 95 percent of the entire system, Pan American Airways would not be able to own more than 25 percent.

If each licensed air carrier in the United States subscribes for the maximum amount of voting stock in the proposed community company, to which it is entitled under terms of the bill, no one carrier, nor two, nor even three, will have voting control; and every air carrier will subscribe to this stock if S. 326 becomes law; make no mistake about that.

Any claim that small air carriers would be frozen out because they would be unable to subscribe to $5,000,000 worth of stock in the All-American Flag Line can only be made by a man with his tongue in his cheek, or a man with no understanding of finance. Stock in the flag line will be a gilt-edged investment. It will pay a guaranteed minimum interest of 6 percent, and might pay as high as 8 percent. Any person or company entitled to subscribe to any amount of that kind of stock can easily raise the money to do so.

The stock percentages provided for in the bill are based upon the proportionate volume of business done by the different air line companies in a given year. On this basis, I have figured out what the approximate holdings of voting stock in the All-American Flag Line would be.

Pan American Airways would have $50,000,000 worth, or 25 percent of the voting stock. American Airlines would have about $25,000,000, or 12½ percent. United Airlines would have approximately $22,000,000, or about 11 percent. Those three companies together could only control a maximum of 48½ percent. Transcontinental & Western Air would have about $15,500,000, or between 7 and 8 percent of the voting stock. Eastern Airlines would have about $12,500,000 worth of stock, slightly over 6 percent. Each of the remaining 15 air carriers would have $5,000,000 worth of stock, or 2½ percent of the total.

The 15 air lines which would each hold 2½ percent of the total voting stock are All-American, American Export, Braniff, Chicago & Southern, Colonial, Continental, Delta, Essair, Hawaiian, Mid-Continent, National, Northeast Airlines, Northwest Airlines, Pennsylvania Central, and Western Airlines.

I discussed this bill on the American Forum of the Air last week. During that discussion, one of my distinguished colleagues on the panel suggested that the whole proposed financial structure of the All-American Flag Line was bad because the bill provides for subscriptions to capital stock of the company within 30 days after the act becomes effective. I understand that view was borrowed from a report by the three gentlemen who constitute the aviation committee of the New York Chamber of Commerce. Now, in my judgment, 30 days is ample time. We know that every aviation company is going to want all of the stock it can get, and we know there will be no problem of financing. But if it is the judgment of this committee that 30 days is not long enough, then let us amend the bill to provide for a longer period. That is a minor matter. It is absurd to damn the bill because of a single provision. I am not wedded to any single provision in this bill. All I am advocating here is a principle. I think the bill provides a reasonable and workable plan; but I shall not resist any amendment which leaves the principle intact.

I have been in public life for 40 years. My record is fairly well known. I have always fought to maintain the principle of free competition as part of the American way of life. I have been accused of sacrificing that principle in advocating an All-American Flag Line for international air transportation. Gentlemen, the problem with which we are dealing involves our national interest to a vital degree. Would you have me say, "If the national interest conflicts with one of my principles, damn the national interest"?

Competition in international aviation will be between nations. If we have several carriers in the field, the operations of those carriers as between themselves will not be competition, but internal strife.

The job American aviation will have to do in the post-war world is to carry the American flag to the four corners of the earth and maintain this country's prestige and influence throughout the all-encircling ocean of the air. To whatever extent different sections of American aviation squabble between themselves for routes and profits, they will be hampering the performance of this major job.

"Controlled competition" is a catch phrase which is freely used by opponents of this bill; but as they use it, it does not mean competition at all; it simply means regional monopolies.

Does the Southern Pacific Railroad compete with the Baltimore & Ohio? You would have exactly the same degree of competition between a carrier operating across the North Atlantic, and a carrier operating across the Pacific.

Those who advocate dividing our international air commerce into several zones, and then letting one company operate in each zone, are in no position to point their fingers at this bill and cry, "Shame! Monopoly!" They are proposing several monopolies; and the monopolies they propose would be real monopolies, for all aviation interests would not share in fair proportion, as they would under this bill. Far from it. Under the zone plan a few companies would get all the profits; the rest would get nothing.

Now, what are the specific provisions of this bill? I shall run through them briefly.

Subsection 1 (a) creates the Corporation to be known as All-American Flag Line, Inc.

Subsection 1 (b) defines the general purposes of the Corporation.

Subsection 1 (c) provides for establishment by the Corporation of branch offices or agencies.

Subsection 1 (d) sets forth the powers of the Corporation. Included are all of the usual corporate powers necessary to carry out the purposes of this Corporation. Also included is the power to acquire or control subsidiaries in the furtherance of its corporate purposes. If you want a zone system, with several different air carriers, each operating in a separate sphere of influence, you can have it under this bill.

Subsection 1 (e) puts back of the Coporation all of the aid, other than direct financial assistance, available from any department or agency of the United States Government.

Section 2 covers issuance of stock by the Corporation.

Capital stock is divided into two classes: Class A stock, which will be issued in the amount of $200,000,000, and which will be the voting stock of the Corporation, and class B stock, which will be issued only in exchange for assets owned by class A stockholders, used in foreign air transportation, and useful to the Corporation.

Class A stock will pay dividends at the rate of between 6 and 8 percent depending on earnings.

Class B stock will pay reasonable dividends based upon the earnings of the Corporation.

I call the attention of the committee to a typographical error on page 5 of the bill in line 23, where the syllable "tors" has been inserted after the word "approval."

Subsection 2 (e) limits the holder of class A stock to licensed air carriers, not including air carriers operating wholly in Alaska.

Subsection 2 (f) sets up a minimum limitation of $5,000,000, and a maximum of $50,000,000, on the amount of class A stock which any eligible air carrier may purchase.

Subsection 2 (g) provides for reallocation of any stock for which an eligible air carrier fails to apply. It also provides that no stockholder shall at any time hold more than $50,000,000 worth of class A stock. As I have mentioned, the provision in this section for stock subscription within 30 days after the effective date of the act has been assailed; and I shall have no objection to providing for a longer period.

Subsection 2 (h) provides for cash payment of subscriptions to class A stock and prohibits class A stock from being traded on any stock exchange or curb market. It also prohibits sale or transfer of class A stock without approval of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Subsection 2 (i) provides that class B stock shall only be issued as payment for assets purchased from class A stockholders.

Subsection 3 (a) requires that a subscriber to class A stock must agree to sell to the Corporation upon demand any of its assets used in foreign air transportation at fair market value in exchange for class B stock.

Subsection 3 (b) provides for appraisal of the fair market value of properties to be sold under the provisions of the previous subsection.

Section 4 provides that the board of directors of the corporation shall consist of 1 member designated by each class A stockholder plus 10 additional members to be elected annually by all class A stockholders. This means 30 directors, of whom the 4 largest air lines could not possibly control more than 14.

Section 5 governs issuance of notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations by the Corporation and fixes the limit on such obligations at three times the amount of issued capital stock. It provides that any issue of securities by the Corporation shall require approval of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. It requires that all obligations of the Corporation shall be secured by assets of the Corporation. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase securities issued by the Corporation.

Section 6 (a) provides for organization of the Corporation within 60 days after the act becomes effective.

Section 7 directs the C. A. B. to issue the Corporation a certificate as an air carrier in foreign air transportation.

Section 8 provides for extension of service by the Corporation where required in the Nation's interest. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is empowered to require any such extension upon certification by the Secretary of State that such action is necessary either for the maintenance of cooperative relationships between the United States and any foreign country, or in the furtherance of national policy, or for the performance of a treaty obligation. Where an extension of service is so required this section makes provision for direct payments to the Corporation within the limitations of appropriations made by the Congress for such payments, so as to guarantee to the Corporation reasonable compensation for the service it is required to perform.

Section 9 prohibits the All-American Flag Line or any subsidiary from holding a license to engage in interstate air commerce or a certificate to engage in interstate air transportation.

Section 10 makes the All-American Flag Line the only air carrier in international air transportation which shall be authorized to transport United States mail.

Section 11 provides for consultation between the Secretary of State and the Civil Aeronautics Authority with regard to negotiation of agreements with foreign governments affecting or in connection with air navigation or air commerce. It provides that the Secretary of State may negotiate agreements with foreign governments for the benefit of the All-American Flag Line, and provides further that the Secretary of State shall make available all the services and facilities of the State Department in the furtherance of such negotiations. It prohibits the State Department from negotiating agreements with any foreign government for the benefit of any other air carrier engaged in international air transportation. Those provisions are important.

Our international air commerce must have the Government behind it. A foreign nation dealing for landing rights will vastly prefer to deal with a government than to deal directly with private enterprise. If we are competing with the British for some landing right, and our approach is made by a private company while the British Government handles the deal for British overseas airways, we are licked before we start.

Section 12 provides that the All-American Flag Line shall be subject to all the provisions of Federal statutes applicable to other air carriers.

Section 13 is the usual separability clause.

Section 14 provides that the act shall become effective 60 days after the date of its enactment, with a proviso that this effective date may be extended, at the discretion of the Civil Aeronautics Administration up to a maximum of 180 days.

With that summary of the bill in mind, let us consider what has been the experience of other countries in the field of international air commerce.

The first air line in Europe was a small British company started in 1919, to operate to Paris and to Holland. Within a few months there were four separate British air lines operating to different points on the Continent, three French air lines, three German lines, and a Dutch line, known as KLM.

It is significant to note that there was only one Dutch line. Within a very short time it became apparent that the Dutch company was able to play the British and French and German companies one against the other, to the great benefit of the Dutch. The British were the first to take realistic action in self-defense. A Royal commission was set

up to consider the situation. This commission recommended legislation requiring the merger of the several British companies into a single company, privately owned. Such legislation was passed and the new company, known as Imperial Airways, was designated to fly all Empire routes, which at that time were the only service of interest to the British Government.

The principle thus adopted by the British was followed by nearly all the other European governments within the following 5 or 10 years.

At first there were attempts by several governments to institute some sort of zone arrangement, with different airlines operating in different spheres of influence; but finally, in each case, in every important nation of the world, the government policy was set up that a single company should represent the nation in the field of international air commerce.

Each of the governments which took this action did so on the basis of several important considerations. In the first place, it was, as I have pointed out, an action in self-defense to avoid cutthroat competition between the countries and nationals abroad, and to prevent foreign flag companies, such as the Dutch KLM, from playing them off one against the other. The new policy also permitted and facilitated diplomatic support of the air line in other countries, in seeking to secure not only operating rights but also the numerous other important concessions which must be secured in order to operate. Another reason for the action taken was to avoid subsidizing private competitive lines in the international field. Considerations of national prestige were also important.

It may be profitable to look closely at some of the attempts to establish zone systems in international aviation and see why they failed.

As I pointed out earlier, British Imperial Airways was designated as the national company for Great Britain, to operate throughout the world on Empire trade routes. This company had no interest in serving the continent at that time; its chief job was to bind the Empire together. Later, another privately owned company, known as British Airways, was set up to operate to the Continent and to Scandinavia.

Though these two companies were not interested directly in the same field, and though they operated in separate spheres of influence, almost immediately there was conflict of interest between them. That conflict was so sharply criticized in debates in Parliament that in 1939 Great Britain swung over to the single-company policy and created the British Overseas Airways Corporation, commonly known as B. O. A. C., to be the Government national air line for Great Britain.

The French Government made an attempt to operate a zone system for 5 or 6 years. There were five French international air lines. One, known as Aero Postale, operated from France to South America by way of Africa and across the north coast of South America to the French possessions in the Caribbean. Another French line extended through Africa to Madagascar. A third reached out from France through the Orient to French Indochina. A fourth French line served Germany and northern Europe. The fifth line was the important route to London.

Each of these five companies was protected by an agreement with the French Government designed to prevent any other French line from operating in its particular zone. Each French company, in other words, was the representative of France in its own sphere of influence, and these spheres were defined and separated.

Not one of these five companies wanted a unified French air line. Each one wanted to continue as the big frog in its own puddle. Debate in the French Chamber of Deputies extended over a period of many weeks, and after long deliberation the French Government decided that, in spite of the zone system, the five companies were being played off, one against the other, by the national companies of other nations, and the French, after this long and well-considered debate, adopted the policy of a single company, privately owned. Such a company, known as Air France, was promptly organized.

Germany had two air lines for many years operating in separate spheres of influence. But Germany also learned from experience and decided, in the national interest, to merge its lines into a single carrier. The result was the Lufthansa, the line which was responsible, more than any other single factor, for Germany's phenomenal success in international trade, particularly with South America.

Japan originally had three separate companies—one supported by Mitsui, another by Mitsubishi, and the third supported by the South Manchurian Railroad. As in the case of other countries, conflicts of interest arose, and the Japanese Government eventually insisted that the three separate lines be merged into a single company, known as Dai Nippon.

Before the war, 26 nations of the world were interested in international air transportation, and 25 of them had adopted the official policy of concentrating their efforts behind a single airline. The United States, while it did not adopt such a policy officially, actually operated on the same basis, for only one United States flag line, Pan-American Airways, was active in the foreign air transportation filed prior to the war.

In this connection, I should like to comment upon the report filed by the State Department on the bill, S. 326. This report states: "It is often assumed that most of the leading nations have adopted in full measure the single-company principle, and that this was done because of unsatisfactory experience with other alternatives. As a matter of fact, the experience of other countries is so varied that very few definite conclusions can be drawn."

The most charitable comment I can make upon that statement is that it is somewhat misleading.

The State Department report attempts to support that misleading statement by dividing the nations of the world into several different groups according to their policies with regard to international aviation. The distinction between groups, which the Department makes, rests upon factors other than the single question of whether the country does have a single company policy in international air commerce.

The Department's report states that Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Norway, Poland, Rumania, Russia, South Africa, Spain, and Yugoslavia all adopted the single-company policy; and then puts these nations in a separate category because they also have a single-company policy for domestic air service. This distinction is unimportant because our own policy with regard to domestic aviation is not here under consideration.

The State Department says that Great Britain is to be included among the countries adhering to the single-company policy except—and I quote—"except for the continued existence of certain small unsubsidized British flag lines to the Continent and to Eire." That distinction is unimportant for several reasons. In the first place, the "small unsubsidized lines" have ceased operations. What is more important, the new British policy in international air commerce, announced only last week, provides for unified control of all international air transportation under the British flag. I shall have more to say about the new British policy a little later. In any event, the question of operations by "small unsubsidized lines" is not involved, because there is nothing in the bill (S. 326) which would prevent the operation of such lines under the American flag.

The State Department reports that—and I quote—"France, Italy, and the Netherlands subsidized their international services through more than one company, although in general their routes did not duplicate each other." That statement is in the past tense, and so it may be considered partially correct, but it is certainly not up to date. It is not even recent information. I have already pointed out to the committee what actually occurred in the case of France and how France came to adopt and did adopt the single-company policy. The Netherlands, despite the State Department's report, had a single air line from the beginning.

The State Department reports—and I quote: "The United States, Canada, Australia, India, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, and Peru have followed the policy of regulated competition with respect to domestic air services, but this principle was not extended by all of these countries to their international operations."

That is a weasel-worded statement if I ever saw one.

That statement is certainly intended to carry the implication that at least some of these countries did extend the policy of regulated competition to their international operations. On the contrary, however, so far as I know, not one of them did. Canada certainly did not.

Nearly 2 years ago Prime Minister Mackenzie King, of Canada, made a very clear statement of Canada's policy with regard to international aviation. That policy, to which Canada adheres today, was stated by Prime Minister King in April 1943 as follows:

"Trans-Canada Airlines has by its charter the right to operate international air transport services and has already been designated as the instrument of the Canadian Government in air transport service across the North Atlantic and in Canadian services to the United States. The fact that international negotiations of great importance must surely take place confirms the wisdom of government policy under which its freedom of action in international negotiations is not limited by the existence of private interests in international air transport services."

So we see that Canada supports a single company, Trans-Canada Airways, as its national instrument in domestic air transportation. Australia did not put several different air lines into the international field. Air Minister Arthur Drakeford, of Australia, outlined Australia's position with regard to international aviation about the end of last September. He said Australia favors operation and ownership of all international air trunk routes by an international air authority, or, in the alternative, a government-owned British Commonwealth system. Only this month Australia has adopted a policy under which she will nationalize her internal air lines. The United States may have adopted a policy of regulated competition for its international air services, but the proof of the pudding is in the eating; and the United States had only one air line flying international routes before the war.

I do not wish to enter into controversy with the State Department. The fact remains, regardless of the Department's report, that the experience of every major nation which has engaged in international air transportation has indicated not merely the desirability, but the necessity, in the national interest, of adopting the single-company principle.

Besides the State Department, several other Government departments have filed reports on the bill S. 326. Each of these reports is worthy of analysis, and they undoubtedly will be analyzed and discussed before consideration of this measure is completed. I shall not attempt such discussion today. I should like to point out in passing that each of these reports must be considered as a whole and must be carefully weighed, and fact separated

from opinion, in determining the extent to which the Congress should be guided by these expressions from the departments. It will not be sufficient to quote a paragraph here and a sentence there to build up a case.

A few minutes ago I spoke of the fact that the British Government last week made public a white paper outlining its proposal for operations in the field of international aviation. There seems to be some difference between what this proposal involves and what the British say it involves.

The British white paper explaining the Empire's new air-transport policy, refers to the policy as an abandonment of the single-company idea. The white paper declares:

"The Government is convinced that the policy of a single chosen instrument, whatever may have been its merits in the past, is unsuited to deal with the great expansion of the future. There must, therefore, be several air-transport undertakings. A single entity, even if it could effectively include and use all the varied experience of aviation and transportation which it is necessary to bring in, would be too large and far-flung.

"Moreover, while it is clearly desirable to eliminate wasteful competition between British operators on the same route, it is none the less desirable both to avoid a sealed pattern of management and to encourage different managements to try out their own ideas. This would in no way prevent the constant pooling of experience."

It is literally true that the British propose to set up three companies, each to operate in a different sphere of influence. However—and this is important—all three companies are to function under Government control, and apparently all three are to be dominated by British Overseas Airways Corporation.

The first sphere of influence set up, which the British classify as "Commonwealth air routes," will include routes to the United States, China, and the Far East. Operations in this sphere of influence are to be conducted directly by B. O. A. C.

The second sphere of influence, which the British call Empire air routes, will include routes internal to the British Isles and between points in the United Kingdom. Operations in this sphere of influence are to be conducted by a company to be formed by representatives of British railroads, short sea-shipping companies, travel agencies, and the B. O. A. C. and other pre-war air operators.

The third sphere of influence designated by the British includes routes to South America. Operations in this sphere are to be conducted by a new company which will include representation from B. O. A. C., ocean-shipping lines, and travel agencies.

Lord Swinton will continue to appoint directors of B. O. A. C., and will also approve representatives named to the boards of the other two companies. That means unified control.

The British announcement specifically states that B. O. A. C. will take part in the capital and management of the two new corporations.

The three corporations will "jointly create and manage a combined organization for overhaul of aircraft and a combined training establishment for flying and technical staff."

Commenting on the British announcement, the chairman of the board of B. O. A. C. said he welcomed the announcement as forming "a reasonable and workable basis for developing British air transport." And he added: "Britain can now get down to the job of making British air transport second to none, and that is just what we are going to do."

Reuter's News Agency reports today that British Government officials expressed the opinion the first British plane opening commercial service to South America would take off for its initial trip within 6 months. This is certainly a far cry from postponing action until the war is over. The British are going ahead full steam, while the United States quibbles and procrastinates.

The British policy seems to have two major points: Participation by all air lines, and completely unified control in international air transportation. Both these points are in line with the philosophy embodied in the bill, S. 326. Because I know there will be those who will attempt to quibble over what the British proposal means, I should like to point out what I know is obvious to those who like the members of this committee, really understand this problem: Namely, that the most important factor of the British plan is unified control in international operations, with the full weight of the Government backing up those operations. This is the principle which the bill, S. 326, stands for. I should like to point out further that under the provisions of S. 326 it would be entirely possible, and might be desirable, for the all-American flag line to set up several subsidiary organizations, under unified control, to operate different routes.

Setting up several separate routes independent of each other would be much less desirable, from many standpoints. Let me point out one or two reasons why. In the first place, the sphere of influence plan differs from the all-American flag line plan about the way a number of separate little sticks differ from a big stick. We need a big stick in international aviation, to protect our national interest. Air line tycoons who state, in effect, that they would rather be the king frog in a small puddle under the sphere of influence plan than share the limelight under the all-American flag line plan are ignoring the national interest and voicing a completely selfish attitude.

Deciding which carrier gets which sphere of influence would be no small job. The North Atlantic route will be highly profitable. There will be "gravy" in it. The Pacific route will require a substantial subsidy. Under the sphere of influence plan, how will we determine who gets the "gravy route"? Furthermore, shall we let the profits from the North Atlantic route go into the coffers of a private company while the taxpayers dig down to provide a subsidy for unprofitable routes? It must be obvious that from the taxpayer's standpoint it would be preferable to let profitable operations help finance those which are less profitable, and provide subsidy only as it is required by the over-all picture. Another consideration here is that a single company could utilize its equipment and personnel much more effectively than a number of small companies, with resulting savings in operating cost, which in turn would reduce the total amount of subsidy required.

Whatever policy we adopt with regard to the United States flag air lines which are to operate on world routes, we are going to find the military leaders in this country insisting that, for reasons of national security, the communications system serving our international airways outside the continental limits of the United States be owned or controlled in its entirety by a single agency, either owned or rigidly controlled by the Government. There will be many good reasons advanced why our airways communications system should be so controlled. It is important to the national security to know that in case of war, our military agencies can assume immediate control over that communcations system. I submit that under the provisions of the bill S. 326, the requirements of the military with regard to airways communications will be satisfactorily met. If we adopt a policy of letting a number of smaller companies operate internationally, then we shall have to deal separately with this problem of communications; and, in order to satisfy the military, we shall have to say to those various companies: "You cannot set up and maintain and operate your own communications systems; we are going to create an agency to do it for you." I do not believe that will be a happy solution to the problem.

What I have just said is a very sketchy mention of a very important subject. Much more remains to be said on this subject; and what I have said has been only for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to some of the problems involved.

Now let me turn to another phase of this subject.

This country has traditionally followed a policy of freedom of the seas. We have fostered and encouraged the widest freedom of competition in ocean trade. What has been the result? In 1815, 90 percent of all American overseas trade was carried in American-flag ships. By 1860, that share had been reduced to 66 percent. In 1900, only 9 percent of American overseas trade was carried in ships flying the American flag; and between 1900 and 1914, the proportion varied between 9 and 10 percent.

The First World War brought a shipping boom, and the portion of our overseas trade carried in our own ships rose to about 50 percent in 1922. It steadily declined from that level for the next two decades, and in 1939 was less than 15 percent.

In the passenger business, especially, foreign vessels were predominant; and in the boom years of the tourist traffic more than 80 percent of the money paid out as fares, by Americans traveling overseas, went to foreign ship owners. American ships increasingly sought the protection of coastwise trade, from which foreign vessels were excluded; and by 1939 only 23 percent of the United States ocean-going tonnage was engaged in foreign commerce, as against 61 percent which had been so engaged in 1920. Attempts to subsidize and otherwise assist American shipping were made, notably under the Merchant Marine Acts of 1928 and 1936; but the portion of United States trade carried in domestic vessels continued to decrease, and the ratio of receipts to payments continued to decline.

Since the beginning of the present war, we have seen a tremendous resurgence of American shipping; and I point out that this has been brought about by unified control of the American merchant marine under the United States Maritime Commission. I have little doubt that if, after this war, we throw overboard the lessons the war has taught, change our shipping policy from unity to disunity, and face the world once more with a multiplicity of shipping lines flying the American flag, all competing with each other as well as with foreign lines, we shall again see the American Merchant Marine wither and shrivel.

Why is it that foreign competition was able to drive our shipping from the high seas? The answer is that foreign competition was not "free and fair" competition as Americans understand that term. The foreign shipping lines had two great advantages, low wage levels and Government subsidies. Furthermore, those lines were backed 100 percent by their respective governments, and they were not competing with other lines under the same flag.

Those same advantages which foreign competitors of our shipping lines enjoyed will be dominant factors in international air transportation, to an even greater degree than they were in pre-war ocean traffic.

It is easy for me to understand why the foreign interests which profited so largely by the decline of American shipping under freedom of the seas should be so desperately anxious to get the United States committed to a policy of freedom of the air. It is not so easy to understand or explain why Americans should advocate a policy which all experience in the field has clearly indicated to be prejudicial to the best interests of this Nation.

In the formulation of America's policy with regard to international air commerce I advocate both caution and realism. By realism I mean a recognition of the facts we face.

By caution I do not mean delay. We have already delayed too long. It is because of the very urgency for adopting a policy immediately that we must be cautious, in the adoption of that policy, not to make a commitment or take a stand which will be irrevocable or which will tie our hands in dealing with the problem as it may develop in the future. We must adopt a policy. We must do it now. But we do not have to adopt our final policy at this time. We must avoid freezing our policy prematurely. We must avoid reducing our freedom of choice. We must avoid weakening our bargaining position with the other nations of the world.

An especially prudent choice—a cautious choice, if you please—will be the adoption of the principle involved in Senate bill 326. Unifying our international aviation effort in a single American-flag company will give us the maximum competitive strength to enter upon world competition. It will provide the best possible protection for American jobs and wage standards. It will also give us an opportunity to continue our study of the problem, to learn by our own experience, meanwhile preserving our freedom of choice. If we now adopt this policy, we can change it at will if it later proves unsatisfactory. I do not anticipate that it will prove unsatisfactory, but if it did we should be in a position to adopt a different policy. On the other hand, if we now adopt a policy of limited competition, granting franchises and building up equities which we shall be forced to recognize thereafter; if we now commit ourselves to a policy of freedom of the air under which foreign-flag air lines may tap this country's air traffic at its sources, rather than at our shores; if we adopt any other policy which has been advanced, except the policy in this bill, then we shall be restricting our freedom of choice for the future. I hope that point will be given the most serious consideration even by those who disagree with my own sincere conviction that any other policy than the policy embodied in this bill will be inherently detrimental to the best interests of the United States.

The Democratic Party's Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Democratic Party's Legislative Program," delivered by Hon. Paul E. Fitzpatrick, New York Democratic State chairman, on March 11, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is not an election year and partisan politics has no place in what I have to say to you this evening. Nor should Governor Dewey toss into the political arena an issue which all fair-minded citizens hoped to keep out of politics. The Ives-Quinn anti-discrimination bill was enacted because of the unanimous support of the Democratic legislators as contrasted with the bitter opposition of some Republicans in both houses. Instead of taking personal credit for this result the Governor should acknowledge his debt to those most deserving. The law will attain its objective only if wisely administered and we will watch the character of the Governor's appointees and will be vigilant in following their official acts. On them depends the success or failure of the law.

Here in New York another session of the State legislature is fast drawing to a close. With the approval of the executive budget during the past week the policies which the Dewey administration intends to follow during the year ahead are now clear and the picture is disheartening. Unless forthright and vigorous action is taken by the State legislature during the 2 weeks before adjournment, the year 1945 will long be remembered as the year of the great fumble.

Because the time is so short and so much remains to be done the Democratic Party has decided to go to the people in its appeal for enactment of a constructive legislative program before the time runs out. As chairman of the Democratic State Committee, I earnestly desire to lay before the people of New York a program which will assure a faithful discharge of the obligations now facing the State. Only with your help can anything be achieved before the legislature adjourns.

To conserve your time, I am going to confine myself to the specific points where the Republican administration has been unwilling or unable to supply the leadership essential if these issues are to be met.

In modern government the executive budget has come to be looked upon as the most efficient tool for formulating and carrying out the State's program. The executive budget is the creation of the Democratic Party. It was championed by Alfred E. Smith who, as Governor, for years fought reactionary Republican legislatures to establish it as the law of the State. Governor Dewey's conception of the nature and purpose of the executive budget does not instill confidence in those who have followed either his public pronouncements or his actions.

The State constitution calls for a balanced budget. It was never contemplated that the State through its revenue-raising policies should make a profit on the taxpayer. The Democratic Party believes that the constitution does not permit the deliberate underestimate of revenues and the deliberate overestimate of expenditures in order to create a surplus. Governor Dewey's budget for 1945 is guilty of this distortion.

Let this be clear: We have approved the establishment of a post-war reconstruction fund created from actual savings out of the State's revenues. We have not opposed the freezing of sums of money found on hand at the end of a fiscal year. But this is vastly different from what Governor Dewey is now doing. This year he has deliberately contrived a budget that will admittedly produce a surplus which, in his message to the legislators, he asks to be frozen in advance. At the same time, he deliberately ignores the current needs of local government.

The present policy of hoarding millions of dollars by the State while the municipalities have insufficient revenue to meet war-time needs reflects poor management and limited vision. The welfare of the municipalities is tied up with the welfare of the State. War-time conditions have thrust upon the municipalities additional expenditures. Their physical plants have been overloaded; local governmental personnel have suffered severe hardship through their inability to stretch an inflexible pay check to cover increased living costs. Concurrently, existing constitutional limitations and necessary wartime controls have prevented the municipalities from augmenting their income from their chief source of revenue, the general property tax.

The same wartime conditions which have brought financial embarrassment to the municipalities have brought unprecedented surpluses to the State. Common sense dictates that some equitable readjustment be made. As an immediate stopgap measure we have introduced bills for "unfreezing" $75,000,000 of the existing surplus in order that the municipalities may escape permanent injury. We hope these bills will be approved.

The Democratic Party has also recommended legislation which would give every employee of the State, irrespective of his present salary, a war emergency compensation at the rate of $500 annually. The increased cost of the necessities of life falls more heavily upon the shoulders of employees in the low income brackets and the reason for a flat increase in dollars and cents is to cover this increased cost.

Governor Dewey's proposal for war emergency compensation on the varied percentage basis discriminates against the employees in the lower income brackets. Under his proposal, 95 percent of the State employees would receive less than $500 as annual war emergency compensation, whereas a small percent of the employees who are in the higher income brackets would receive as much as $1,000. For example, under his proposal, employees of mental institutions would receive as little as $240 a year, compared to the $500 they would receive under the Democratic proposal.

In keeping with the times the Democratic Party urges the adoption of the pay-as-you-go plan for payment of the State income tax. No reduction in the State's income is involved in the change-over, but the step will reduce confusion by bringing State and Federal procedures into line. The success and popularity of the Federal pay-as-you-go system has already demonstrated its superiority. I sincerely hope that petty partisan considerations will not stand in the way of its adoption.

I turn to another area where there is great need for action instead of verbal sympathy, namely, agriculture. To the end that the farmer may receive a just return for his labors and that life on the farm be made more desirable, certain existing evils must be eliminated and a constructive program for rural New York put into effect at once.

Milk is the State's No. 1 agricultural business. And no matter how you look at it there is something very wrong with the milk business. We urge an immediate and thorough milk investigation by the legislature to ascertain whether the spread between the price paid by the consumer and the price paid to the farmer is excessive. We also advocate that electricity and rural telephone service be put in reach of every farmer without making him pay excessive rates, pole-setting or other so-called service charges. In line with previous democratic policy we pledge our continued support to better medical service, better health and better education in our rural areas.

The slum clearance and low-rent housing program which was inaugurated and made such splendid progress during the Lehman administration has run into rough weather during the past two and a half years, notwithstanding the intensified needs for housing which wartime conditions have brought. One wonders whether Governor Dewey believes in public housing. His request for only $35,000,000 for low-rent housing and slum clearance projects is merely a political gesture; it would be humorous were it not so tragic. Let us remember in this connection that Mr. Dewey and his Republican legislature "forgot" in 1943 to pass the necessary legislation and in so doing halted the housing program.

To make sure the housing program will be continued, we urge that the legislature vote the balance of $115,000,000 for loans now. We also propose to keep the housing program alive by a referendum to increase the amount of subsidy to $4,000,000 annually. Unless these measures are passed post-war housing will remain an empty phrase.

Since the enactment of the unemployment insurance law, the Democratic Party has consistently sponsored amendments to keep pace with changing conditions. In keeping with this policy, we have this year recommended that the waiting period for unemployment insurance benefits be reduced to 4 days, and that the benefit payments be increased to 26 weeks. These changes anticipate the demands which will be made upon unemployment insurance during the post-war reconversion period. Six months is a minimum within which such reconversion may get under way.

We are opposed to any system of merit rating which discriminates against seasonal occupations or industries. We are opposed to the Young-Demo bill and Wicks-Stephens bill on merit rating because they violate the foregoing principle. We favor the Falk-Gugino bill, which recognizes merit rating on a sound and equitable basis, and will give this proposal our wholehearted support.

Wartime conditions have not left our schools untouched. Due to changing times, the original Friedsam formula which determined the allocation of State financial aid for education has become outmoded. Last year, under constant prodding by the Democratic Party, the Governor reluctantly permitted the allotment of some additional funds. The amount allotted was not adequate and the schools have continued to lose their best teachers. Teachers are today notoriously underpaid.

We have proposed a flat 20-percent increase over the amount which the Friedsam formula would provide. This is a realistic and direct approach; it avoids the delay inherent in the preparation and enactment of any new formula and permits a solution this month of the difficulties besetting the school boards throughout the State.

Another unfortunate byproduct of the war is the increased rate of juvenile delinquency. The absence of working mothers from the home and other unavoidable factors have hit New York State especially hard. By 1944 juvenile delinquency had risen 53 percent over the last peacetime year, but no new institutional facilities have been created to care for these children. The resulting congestion has produced conditions which cannot be ignored any longer.

The Democratic Party has introduced a bill which proposes that the State prepare to meet its responsibility for the adequate care of delinquent, mentally ill, and mentally deficient children to the extent that private institutions or private agencies fail to meet these needs.

Rent control continues a critical and unsolved problem. Democratic demands for rent-control legislation last year were ignored. Under persistent pressure from us, Governor Dewey this year finally recommended legislation freezing rents on loft buildings, but he continued to ignore the equally serious need for similar limits on office and store rents.

The Republican Party recommended that rents on loft buildings be frozen at a rate of 25 percent in excess of the rental prevailing on March 1, 1943. It opposed amendments offered by the Democratic Party to include offices and stores. Under the driving force of our party, the Republicans were forced to make a turn-about-face and to reduce the ceiling on loft rents from 25 percent in excess of those prevailing on March 1, 1943, to 15 percent.

The emergency confronting tenants in stores and office buildings has become increasingly grave. We hope that because of our vigorous fight remedial legislation freezing rents in stores and offices will be enacted at this session.

The needs of the returning veteran are uppermost in the minds of us all. Our gratitude for what they have done cannot be measured in material terms, but no one questions their rights to all the material benefits we can make available to them. The interests of the veteran will be best served if the State and Federal Governments collaborate to that end rather than attempt to compete with one another. The Federal G. I. bill of rights is a big step in the right direction. The Democratic Party decries Governor Dewey's attempt to derive political advantage from the needs of the veterans. We believe the G. I. bill of rights should be liberalized and expanded until it meets completely the needs of the veterans.

I close on an old, yet still unremedied issue—the soldier vote. The Democratic Party recommends that the provisions of the State soldier vote bill be liberalized so as to permit applications for a soldier's ballot by any person on behalf of the serviceman. We recommend that the provisions of this law be made available to members of the merchant marine and those members of the Red Cross and other supplemental services engaged in war work on foreign soil. We also recommend that the soldier-vote law be amended to permit the receipt of ballots up to December 10 if they are postmarked before election day.

At no time in our State's history was it more imperative that the Democratic Party be the driving force for liberal, progressive and humane government. We welcome the support of all who endorse our stand.

The Way to 60,000,000 Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Marshall Field before the Advertisers' Club of Cincinnati on March 7, 1945. This article is a clear and explicit statement of the issues which face the country and the solutions which are necessary to be found to meet them.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing this address. The estimated cost is $121.40.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAY TO 60,000,000 JOBS IS THROUGH GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION

I am one of those who believe that full employment has to be worked for—worked and planned and sweated for, with all the resources of economic wisdom and political skill this American democracy can mobilize.

It may seem strange that this proposition should even have to be stated. Isn't everybody in favor of full employment? Yes, everybody is, in the same sense that everybody is in favor of good health. But some people want, and others do not want the Nation to take specific steps and adopt specific laws which will make full employment possible. Some people want, and others do not want, to safeguard the Nation in advance against the causes of mass unemployment.

That is how we are dividing today. The fight in Congress over the confirmation of Henry Wallace has clearly set forth the division. On one side are people like * * * Senator TAFT, who say frankly that Government ought not to undertake any guaranty of jobs at fair wages, lest it enter on a novel and dangerous course; who say we must leave the problem of fourteen to nineteen million people, which is the estimated addition to the 1940 employment figures that will have to be taken care of post-war, to the so-called natural forces of private enterprise; who say we must hope, but not act, for full employment.

And on the other side stand the Henry Wallaces, the Beardsley Rumls, the Senator Murrays, and the uncounted millions of plain people who say that the risk of idleness and frustration and disenchantment for 11,000,000 war veterans and 20,000,000 war workers is too great a risk for our democracy and our system of private initiative to incur.

It should not be necessary for advertising men to question their own stake in full employment. Advertising is a function of distribution. It contributes to, and at the same time depends upon, the mass production and low unit prices for which American industry has distinguished itself. The area of advertising's usefulness widens as full employment and full use of our productive resources is approached.

WORK MEANS SPENDING POWER

Obviously, it would be of little benefit to advertise to consumers who had lost their purchasing power. Obviously, then, the primary interest of every person in the advertising business, as, indeed, of everybody else, should be directed toward the maintenance of the maximum possible purchasing power, widely diffused.

Advertising confronts a great future and the opportunity to perform a great service. New products will be coming on the market after the war, and to attain the volume needed for low prices, advertisers must assume the responsibility of informing the community of these new goods. But first of all, the community must have the ability to buy. We shall make a serious mistake if we blindly assume that the mere potentiality of new products will of itself create that ability to buy. As a recent writer in Harper's magazine has pointed out, the development of new products may change the employment picture in particular industries, but we have no assurance that it will create enough net addition to total employment to overcome the great gap between wartime employment and peace.

What are the prerequisites of full employment? The first and greatest of them was suggested by a study made during the long depression by the Brookings Institution, the last volume and summary of which was entitled "Income and Economic Progress." The conclusion of this study pointed a road toward prosperity which I think we might all agree on. It consists of furnishing the maximum amount of goods at the lowest possible price. The role played by consumption on this highway to prosperity is indicated by the effects of maldistribution of income upon economic progress in the past.

As the Brookings Institution study showed, the great purchasing power for consumer goods lies in family incomes of less than $5,000 a year. After you cross that point, in general, your money does not go primarily into the purchase of consumer goods, but is saved and finds its way into the formation of capital. So much of the national income had drifted into the hands of a small proportion of the population with incomes over $5,000 that the power to consume failed to keep pace with our power to produce. I think the study showed that 50 percent of the national increment of wealth went to less than 2 percent of the population.

NO MONEY—THE ROOT OF ALL EVIL

This maddeningly frustrating spectacle of a capacity to produce running out of all proportion to the customers' ability to buy lay at the root of the depression, and it lies at the root of our post-war employment problem. If the large number of families with incomes of less than $1,000 in peacetime could be lifted above that income category; if those who normally earn between $1,000 and $1,500 could be lifted to $2,000; and the $2,000 group to $2,500—the consumption so engendered would not only absorb the existing capacity of our capital plant, but would require considerable new development of it. In short, a vast new market for all varieties of goods lies right here in our own back yard.

I have not seen any study of income groups as of today. But my guess is that, though maldistribution of income still exists in some degree, the desiderata of the Brookings study—the conditions of prosperity which is laid down—must be fairly close to realization, at least temporarily. It is bitterly sad that it has taken the greatest of all wars to accomplish a volume and distribution of income sufficient to provide full employment.

The question is whether we are going back, after the war, to the kind of situation which existed before. If we take the road of wage cutting and deflation then we are surely headed for another depression, just as surely as the sun rises in the morning.

The great industries of this country have demonstrated to the world, over and over again, that low wages are not the way to get low-priced goods. Low prices are made possible by volume output, which cuts overhead costs per unit, encourages the most efficient methods of manufacture and economic purchase of raw materials. Charles Wilson of General Electric recognized this when he recently said that the efforts of his company would be directed toward maintaining prewar sales prices and also maintaining the present scale of take-home pay for workers.

A strange fallacy has crept into the thinking of too many of us. It may have arisen from what is often called the Manchester school of economics. It is the theory that there is just so much in the world to be divided, and that the prosperity of one person or group necessarily takes away wealth from those already in possession of it.

When you examine this theory, you will find no difficulty in recognizing its fallacy. In fact, precisely the opposite is true, as the whole history of America shows. The newly prosperous person becomes a customer and contributes greater wealth to those who have it. The creation of new markets benefits all society together, not just the recipients of the new income.

NO PROSPERITY WITHOUT SECURITY

I believe this is just as true of a nation as of an individual or a business. In the immediate heat and pressure of competition it is very easy to lose sight of this truism; but the prosperity even of this country, with its great internal resources, has always been adversely affected by financial crises and lack of purchasing power abroad.

This is one reason why there is such an overwhelming desire for an international organization that will keep the peace. It is realized that we cannot have material prosperity in a state of fear and threat of war, surrounded by impoverished nations. We must help the war-torn and so-called backward peoples to become customers, who can contribute to the world's wealth and so to our own. We must help them with our technical knowledge. We must give them credit. We must maintain continuous and constantly widening cultural and political relations with them.

Essential as it is to accept the oneness of the world and live on good terms with our neighbors, we must not fall into the error of supposing that all our problems can be solved by the magic formula of foreign trade. We could double or triple our pre-war foreign trade and still not attain full employment. The real creation of volume must always depend upon our home market.

That is why you and I, and every American, must be interested in the maintenance of high wages. That is why the farmer should be just as interested in the maintenance of high wages as any union man—for where else will he sell the products of his farm, if not to the industrial and service workers of the cities and towns? Of course, the farmer is interested in cheap clothing, cheap machinery, and maximum purchasing power for all the goods he has to buy. But if he gets them cheaply at the expense of the worker's wages, he cannot help but get them at the price of losing his real market.

The corollary of high wages for those who are working is an adequate, which means an expanded, social security system for those who for any reason are not working. The social purpose in both cases is the same, not only to give the individual a measure of economic justice, but to give society the benefit of his sustained purchasing power. We must rapidly undertake to provide complete protection against loss of income due to unemployment, ill health, disability or old age.

Our experience with social security since 1935 has amply demonstrated the validity of this approach to the problems of modern industrialism, as has the experience of many other countries more advanced along this road than we. On this foundation we must build securely, so that all groups may be covered and all receive adequate benefits in return for joint contributions by the worker, the employer, and the Government.

A case in point is the provision of unemployment compensation for industrial workers during the reconversion period after war production is cut back. The plain fact is that we have failed, as a Nation, to shoulder our responsibilities fully in this regard.

DEPRESSION MAY BE AROUND THE CORNER

All of us want the reconversion period to be as short as possible; we know that if we permit deflationary tendencies to get a grip on the economy during that period of changeover from war to peace production, we may have great difficulty in starting the machine again at capacity output. The situation calls for adequate unemployment compensation to carry industrial workers through this period without exhausting all their savings, on which we are going to be so dependent for the resumption of peacetime production.

Yet Congress has failed to establish standards of compensation which most experts agree are necessary. Too many of us have turned a blind eye to the needs of the country. We have refused to see that it is to our own advantage to incur the necessary debt and pay the necessary taxes to build this economic bridge across the gulf of reconversion.

Once we have gained the other shore of the transition period, we shall have much to do if we would prevent a short, sharp restocking boom from dissolving swiftly into a major depression. Neither social security nor the abstract principle of high wages will serve our needs. As we learned from the last depression, high wages may be subscribed to by most of our industrialists while the national income is up, but if we once get into that fatal down spiral of depression, the principle collapses under the hard blows of every-day practices.

Two employers may agree perfectly that wages should be high; but when they are desperately competing for business on a declining market each perforce must lay principle aside. Wages fall off and purchasing power falls off not because anybody consciously wills it so, but because the implacable force of circumstance sets in motion events which no single employer or union is able to resist.

The trick, then, is to forestall that first fatal decline, which if left unchecked compounds itself into disaster. For this I see no plausible alternative to bold and dynamic planning, democratically controlled and operating within the framework of our ideals of individual liberty.

GOVERNMENT MUST PLAY ITS ROLE

When we ask who shall do the planning, I see no plausible alternative to Government. With the best will in the world, thousands of corporate and individual employers cannot merge their efforts to maintain capacity operations. Like the blind men and the elephant, each is restricted to his own field, his own sector of the economy. Each sees a part of the picture, but not the whole of it.

The surveys of post-war prospects for private employment, such as those conducted by the Committee for Economic Development, illustrate this point perfectly. When an employer is asked how many jobs he expects to have available after the war, he always predicates his answer upon the existence of a certain volume of business. Add up all the estimates, and you get an impressive total.

But this question remains to be answered: Who shall see to it that the total volume of business remains at the level required to enable all these employers to do the business they want to do? To my mind, there is only one agency that can see the economy whole and take the steps necessary to keep it operating at a high level, and that is government.

What must Government do to discharge this responsibility? Of course, we must have a variety of measures, a multiplicity of approaches. No single panacea can meet the problem. Much has been said of tax reform, and no one can doubt that some fundamental readjustments in the tax structure are overdue, not only reduction of wartime rates, but deeper changes designed to stimulate the growth of new business and provide the maximum incentive for risk taking.

Frankly, I am not nearly so worried as some seem to be on the question of incentive for risk capital. The basic incentive for risk capital will be there, without a doubt, if the purchasing power for goods and services can be maintained. Taxes must be reduced on low incomes first—so that families with such incomes will have the maximum purchasing power and thus overcome the lack of balance revealed by the Brookings Institution studies.

THE LITTLE MAN MUST GET SHARE OF LOANS

In addition to tax readjustment, other measures of stimulating investment will suggest themselves. For example, the policies followed by the great Federal lending agencies will deeply affect the future of our economic structure. With or without Jesse Jones—and the verdict at present appears to be without—I think no man can doubt that the lending agencies are here to stay. We must see to it that they perform their functions throughout the economy and not just in the big-business area of it.

Where adequate financing on reasonable terms is not available to small business from private sources, the lending agencies can fill the gap. They can be of tremendous value, particularly in enabling small business to make use of converted wartime plants. If we can transform only a part of our huge war investment into a source of development for new and competing enterprise, we shall have salvaged some of the heavy cost of war.

Let me give you one more example of ways in which the Government can stimulate private investment and so provide employment. We confront today one of the greatest housing shortages in our history. The demand for good homes, making the most of scientific and industrial advances, is almost beyond calculation. Yet good housing in the past has been beyond reach of the majority of the population, and there is every likelihood that, unless Government acts, it will remain so for many years to come.

A vast new housing market can be opened up by resolute and many-sided public initiative to clear the shameful blighted areas of our cities, to reduce the costs of home financing, to cut construction cost through the elimination of trade barriers and artificial restraints, and to induce private capital, such as that commanded by our great insurance companies, to flow into this field.

Finally, in addition to tax measures and to indirect stimulation of private investment, there remains the field of direct public investment, planned and timed to exert maximum effect in supplementing the activities of private enterprise. Let us recognize frankly that public investment, under our system, is only one form of private enterprise. When the Government builds a post office or a dam, it employs private contractors just like any other employer, and if the project is financed by borrowing, goes to the private-capital market for the money just like any other borrower. Thus, there is nothing antagonistic to our system in the mere fact of public investment.

Furthermore, for many of these investments, if the initiative does not come from the public it will not come from anybody. That is especially true of regional resource developments like the Tennessee Valley Authority, which I hope to see extended to the other major basins of our country in time.

WHAT WE NEED ARE MORE T. V. A.'S

Who shall say that the T. V. A. has not paid for itself many times over not only in its contribution to the war, but in its lifting of the living standards and incomes of people who have thus become better customers for the Nation's goods? Similarly, there are other areas of socially useful public investment which will pay dividends in the long run.

America needs better education, particularly in rural areas and some of the less fortunate States. America needs highways and airports, better nutrition, and medical care, recreation facilities, and the development of all its resources. These needs, I am wholly confident, will be met somehow. The choice lies between meeting them in piecemeal, helter-skelter, immature fashion, on the basis of hasty improvisation in times of emergency, or meeting them boldly and courageously in such a manner as to provide maximum stimulus to private employment.

Always these considerations lead us to the great question, Where is the money coming from? This is supposed to be a stopper. When that question is raised, we are supposed to abandon all our high-flown notions and crawl back into the shell of a balanced budget, even if 15,000,000 restless and politically unstable men without jobs threaten the very foundation of our society.

The plain fact is, of course, as we learned in the thirties, that whatever the cost of full employment may be, we can bear it much better than we can bear the dreadful cost of unemployment. Idle men and idle factories cost us $200,000,000,000, virtually as much as this greatest of all wars during the depression. We could have produced $200,000,000,000 of wealth during those 10 years had we managed to keep at work all those able and willing to work.

I believe in a balanced budget as much as anybody, but it seems to me we have learned one great lesson—that in a modern depression, balancing the Budget simply won't get us out of it. We cannot get full employment merely by balancing the Budget, but we can get a balanced budget by achieving full employment. The costs of our Government's post-war program can be met by increasing the total wealth produced, and when we have full employment we can easily support the Federal Budget taxes alone if we wish to do so.

MURRAY BILL A SAMPLE OF WISE PLANNING

I go back to what I regard as the first essential for full employment—planning. After all, we can argue about what Government might do, or could do, or should do, in all these various fields, but in fact all of these arguments come second to planning. Unless we plan, we shall not know what has to be done. Unless we plan, our Government's inevitable obligation to deal with economic adversity will be discharged in hit-or-miss fashion as it was during the 1930's. Unless we plan, we shall have to devote all our energies to meeting emergencies after they have happened, instead of preventing them from happening.

That is why I strongly support the so-called full employment bill recently introduced by Senators MURRAY, WAGNER, THOMAS of Utah, and O'MAHONEY. This is not a bill to undertake any particular measures for full employment, but a bill establishing the planning machinery by which our Government could intelligently decide what steps should be taken. Under the bill, the President would be required to present each year estimates of the prospective employment in private enterprise and, if this estimate indicated less than reasonably full employment, to propose a program for meeting the deficit. His message would then go to a joint committee of Congress which would hold hearings, pursue its own investigations, and report to both branches what action should or should not be taken.

Thus, all we do in this bill is to say that it is a good idea for the Government to find out in advance whether the people are likely to have jobs, and, if not, to study in advance what might be done to make more jobs available. It seems to me that something like the Murray bill represents the absolute minimum of our social obligations.

I wonder why it is that anybody who talks of full employment is looked upon by so many as a visionary and an impractical idealist. Perhaps it is the working of the Manchesterian fallacy in the back of these critics' minds. The same type of person who would build a wall around this country and let the rest of the world go hang generally also thinks he can prosper no matter what happens to his neighbors.

Industry in this country has proved its magnificent capacity for production. We have all heard of complicated weapons or war machines that are being made for the Government today in great volume at a quarter or a third of the cost of the original models. Production is not and will not be our post-war problem. The maintenance and distribution of purchasing power are the problems that we shall need to solve.

Advertising men have the same stake in this problem as all business. I should like to see them recognize that stake by joining the great crusade to save democracy and save our system of private initiative by protecting it from the dangerous menace of mass unemployment.

Let us not again set our sights too low, as we did for a time in converting to war industry in 1940 and 1941. Let us get the sights for nothing less than full employment and drive to that objective with the same irresistible force which is carrying us to total victory over our Fascist enemies.

Address by Nat Bass at Sergeant Meyer Levin Memorial Hall Association Dinner

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Nat Bass, president of the Hebrew Educational Society of Brooklyn, at the Sgt. Meyer Levin, Memorial Hall Association dinner, Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, N. Y., March 7, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Toastmaster Nathaniel Kaplan, Mr. and Mrs. Levin, parents of our hero, Judge Livingston, and fellow Americans, when your commander, Nathan Tobin, and his committee, called on me to participate in this occasion, I cheerfully accepted, because I believe the time has come when all of us should be eager to do something about tomorrow today, and not to wait for the "V" day whistles to wake us up.

You may remember the old moral, "a half-baked bird can give you an awful belly-ache." Well, victory alone will not release us from bondage, for we're not merely fighting the nations who have warred upon us. We are fighting to establish law and order among men. Graver crises may well lie ahead of us; who knows. When Johnny Veteran comes marching home, will he find peace at home? Or has he returned to an America, in which dangerous and bitter battles are being waged against religious and racial minorities?

If I correctly understand the significant purposes of this occasion, it is to the end that "intolerance and suspicion" be stamped out, and to help make all citizens good neighbors, and to "turn our words into deeds", so as to help prevent the possible resentments and discontents, among our millions of returning veterans, from providing a tempting field of action for demagogs and racketeers.

I feel this problem does not wait on the end of the war; it is most immediate. Selective Service reports already 40,000 servicemen are being discharged each month, and already some leading bigots and rabble rousers have begun to cast their nets.

The Jewish people of this country have contributed their full share to the Army and Navy. They too have paid the price in blood, in tears, in sweat, and in toil. It is but right that the Jewish people shall enjoy the benefits all of us are determined to forge out of victory. The four freedoms are meant for us as well as other peoples, and we must be determined to enjoy equal rights with all other individuals. For these things, we are willing to fight.

Now, my friends, let us be honest with ourselves, and not act individually like ostriches, and face the facts. The roots of anti-Semitism exist in the hearts of too many people, it grows out of man's primitive instincts, his fear of insecurity, his need to blame someone—his longing to feel superior. Just as a child, who bumps his head against an open door, will blame the door for hurting him, so men today seek to find something or someone to blame for their difficulties or failures.

Sure, it is easier to stop looking for the causes of poverty, unemployment, and war, which are difficult to understand, and merely find a convenient scapegoat; but are we going to sit back and let those avowed anti-Semitic bigots scheme to attract our returning war veterans? Or are we at least interested in making some attempt at an investment with a human return? To ask the question, I am sure, is but to answer it. For we must not forget that the way to feel safe is never to feel secure, and that the most devastating criticism of any deserving cause is indifference.

Now for the lighter and more concrete end of tonight's purposes. Of course, to much of America, Brooklyn is that queer place where

baseball players originate and eccentric citizens speak a language all their own. But heroes grow in Brooklyn, too.

There was Meyer Levin. He paid Japan the first installment of a vengeance debt. He was one of our typical youngsters, who grew up in a congested neighborhood of Brooklyn—the son of a tailor—and the first American to sink a Japanese battleship, with Capt. Colin Kelly at the controls.

The record shows that Meyer Levin took part in more than 60 combat flights during the following 12 months. For his bravery in action at the Coral Sea and in Manila, where he made many hazardous flights for General MacArthur, he won the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Silver Star, two Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Purple Heart. In January 1943 he died—as he had lived—a hero.

And you may be interested to know that through the efforts of some patriotic individuals here tonight, at the United States Military Academy at West Point a room is named in perpetual honor of Sgt. Meyer Levin, of Brooklyn, the tailor's son, who never got to West Point.

Now, instead of erecting just a picturesque statue of a man on horseback, as they did for heroes in times past, we propose to erect a monument that will live forever. A Sgt. Meyer Levin Memorial Hall Building, with an auditorium, recreation facilities, meeting rooms, something the whole community can use to meet a civic need. And which will stand as a symbol for all, of liberty, of decency, and fair dealing for everyone of every faith. For, by example, we are merely striving to help make a community, one in which people will be united by their purposes, rather than divided by their color or faith.

Yes, and remember by our actions, now, on the home front, we must earn the respect of our boys in the service, and prove to them that we lived in comparative comfort and security not for ourselves but for one another. We must impress our returning soldiers that this war has taught us all that it is not enough to live and let live, but to live and help live. Our answer to the German's "tomorrow the world" must be "one world tomorrow." And as I look into your faces of approval, I feel certain everyone here to a man will become a happy helper to the noble purposes of the Sgt. Meyer Levin Memorial Hall Association—now.

The Road Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the Baltimore Sun of March 14 there was published a very thoughtful and sound article under the name of John W. Owens, who I believe is editor or one of the editors of the Baltimore Sun. The title of the article is "The Road Ahead." It discusses specifically the relation between the United States and Russia. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROAD AHEAD

(By John W. Owens)

As the dominating positions of the United States and Russia in the handling of international affairs become more clearly evident, attention could wisely be given to two conditions in the relations between the nations.

First, objectively, two nations of immense power could scarcely have less of cause of collision. They are on different sides of the world. Living far apart, each has abundant area within its boundaries to permit full room for its people today and tomorrow. Each has fabulous natural resources with which to employ its people's energies and to enrich their lives. Each has had in the past, and will have after the war, access to such outlying raw materials as may be necessary to supplement its own riches. Each is in possession of technical skills adequate to full utilization of materials. Each, in short, could live within its own borders and enjoy the maximum degree of self-sufficiency possible in this world; each, by adding rational trade with the balance of the world, could lift its standard of living to the highest level now possible. And neither has distant possessions which necessarily impinge upon the other's possessions.

Second, subjectively, these two nations have many differences that could, were negligence, stupidity, or malice in control, result in grave dangers in their relations. In origins, they are as far apart as in distance. They are as far apart in much else. Their languages ar different. Their cultures are different. Their habits are different. Their institutions are different. Their political theories are different. Their economic systems are different. In the whole of ideology they are poles apart. And each brings to its causes vitality probably unequaled in other nations. The United States remains the foremost exemplar of capitalism, with all its political implications, and Russia stands the foremost exemplar of socialism, with all its political implications, though each school is in process of some modification.

On the face of things, the future relations of the United States and Russia, for good or evil, will turn not upon interests; future relations will turn upon thought and emotion. Thought and emotion in the United States and Russia could take such form that ultimately national interests would be involved. But, as of today, relations between the two nations will be for good or for evil according to the nature of thought and emotion.

When we have reached that point in measuring relations between the two vast nations, we are compelled to recognize that on the way people think and feel in the United States and in the Soviet Union depends much of the future of the world, as that future opens before us in the light we now have. For, if the United States and Russia master their thought and emotion, if they direct thought and emotion into cooperative channels in the affairs of the world, they can assure peace and order. They can, though other nations lag, make the proposed world organization a functioning instrument of law. Other nations cannot wreck that organization if the United States and Russia will that it shall function. On the other hand, if the United States and Russia permit their thought and emotion to be governed negligently, or stupidly, or maliciously, they can assure turmoil and danger which could sprout into war and anarchy. Let these two vast nations go wrong in their relations, and all other nations cannot make the proposed world organization a functioning instrument of law. All other nations cannot save that organization if the United States and Russia, by quarrels and hatreds, will that it shall not function.

That ought to determine the course of Americans. We see about us, in the loss of billions of treasure and millions of young lives, the price to be paid in this world when turmoil and danger are allowed to run their course and to invite war and anarchy. With that before our eyes as the alternative to peace and order, Americans ought to know that decency in thought and emotion in both of the two vast, dominating nations is the pearl without price. And a people who have as much of fair play in their composition as have Americans ought to know that if we are to win decency in thought and emotion, the place to begin is at home—whatever the controversies of the past.

One word may be said on what is usually called the practical side. Many conservative people in this country fear the spread of communism. They ought to fix firmly in their heads the obvious political fact that communism will not spread in this country through the evangelism of Mr. Earl Browder or any of the evangelists of reddish hue. Communism will spread among the masses of this country, if it spreads at all, through the effects of economic disaster. And the most practical men ought to know from the lessons of the twenties and thirties that the deepest cause of economic disaster is turmoil in international affairs. Since turmoil is inevitable without Russo-American understanding, the course to be followed by practical men ought not to need labored argument.

Something To Bargain With

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Maurice R. Franks, editor of the official organ published by the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc.

Mr. Franks, who is an intelligent, conscientious labor leader, talks the kind of common sense that is necessary if labor unions are to be successful and serve their membership in the only way that will bring fruits to them because it makes fruit grow on the American individual enterprise system.

We must get back to this type of common sense if we are to rebuild this country after the war, and establish sound, human, and equitable principles governing the relationship between employer and employee on the one hand and between employer and employee and the consuming American public on the other hand.

I believe this editorial is well worth the time it will take for Senators to read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMETHING TO BARGAIN WITH

The big cry of the workingman has been for his right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of his own choosing. This cry was heard by many political officeholders over a period of several generations, but yet, it has only been in the last decade that it has become recognized by law, and the citizenry as a whole, that workers do have the right to collective bargaining.

Many businessmen, who just a few years ago hated the word "union," have, through contractual relations with them, come to the realization that unionism is not just something out of Hades. They realize the fact that when unions are properly operated, they can be beneficial, not only to their workers, but to themselves as well.

In order for the workers fully to enjoy the fruits of their great victory, the recognition

by law of their right to bargain with their employers, they must encourage every idea lending itself toward this attainment. In line with this suggestion, it may be a good idea for some of our labor leaders to look up the definition of the word "bargain" and they will find it means: "(1) An agreement between parties to a transaction, settling what each shall give and receive; a contract regarding terms of sale and purchase; as, to make a bargain. (2) Such an agreement viewed in its results as: He made a bad bargain, or the agreement is advantageous."

Examination of many contracts on collective bargaining makes one wonder just where the "bargain" comes in. Many of these documents practically tell the employer that, for the consideration of being allowed the use of so many workers, on conditions not always in accord with good business acumen, he will be allowed to operate his business. In other words, through this condition of unionism, a monopoly is created whereby the customer of unionism, the employer, must pay the monopolist any price quoted, and under any condition. This practice certainly cannot be in accord with the intent of the law covering collective bargaining. Until unions come forward with a plan within the meaning of the word "bargain," they will never be accepted or respected as a necessary part of our American way of life.

The only actual difference today between the average union worker and nonunion worker is a membership card, and it costs more to hire a union worker. Little has been done to make the union worker stand out as a better craftsman than the nonunion worker, as, for instance, the bricklayer, who is capable of and willing to lay 1,800 bricks per day, is forced down to the level of the man who can or is willing to lay only 600 bricks. This condition absolutely discourages incentive because why should a bricklayer capable of and willing to lay 1,800 bricks give full performance when he can only receive the same compensation as his fellow craftsman who is not able or willing to do a full day's work?

Many labor leaders are under the impression that holding down production guarantees better union stability because, through this system, more men are required to perform a task, thereby enhancing the union membership. Nothing could be further from the truth. Common economics proves the contrary. Just to give you an illustration of the fallacy of this idea, let us take a railroad switchman, earning in the neighborhood of $7 per day, who to my mind is as important to society as a bricklayer. As a matter of fact, the bricklayer could not lay the bricks unless the switchman plays his part in the hauling of the bricks or the material required to make the bricks. But when the switchman wants to build a home which necessitates the services of the bricklayer he is forced to pay the bricklayer his scale of wages, which is practically twice as much as his own.

You may say, "Well, it is not unreasonable that a bricklayer's compensation is considerably more than that paid a switchman. After all, the bricklayer does not work the entire year in his occupation, as does the switchman. He is fortunate if he works 9 months." On this point I do agree. However, I also say that the switchman is entitled to value received for his money. But he does not get it.

In order for a switchman to hold his job, he must perform a full day's work for a full day's pay. Unless he does, he will not be tolerated, even by his fellow workers, because he would be the means of tying up a railroad yard. But the bricklayer who is capable of laying 1,800 bricks a day, through the present-day system of unionism, is held down to one-third of that amount, thereby causing an immediate imposition on the switchman for double of his wages. In other words, the switchman must pay $14 per day of his wages to receive one-third of a day's work from the bricklayer, or $42 of his earnings, 6 day's work, to get 1 day's production from the bricklayer. If this is not inequitable, I want to know just what it really is.

It is not only unfair to the switchman, but, in the long run, unfair to the bricklayer as well. It places the switchman in a position of not being able to afford a brick home, and the bricklayer in a position of not being able to apply his craftsmanship as he should, with the inevitable result that the building of homes by craftsmen is rapidly going into oblivion, thereby encouraging houses void of the bricklayer's skill.

In case you do not know just what I mean, ask any architect about prefabricated houses, which can be assembled without the help of skilled craftsmen, bricklayers, carpenters, plumbers, and the like. These prefabricated houses can be assembled by most anyone in less time than it takes for a good craftsman to do a poor day's work. This example can be applied right down through industry, where good workers are being penalized because of poor workers. Therefore, it is obvious that a forward step in the direction of promoting incentive and rewarding the capable and conscientious worker, would be to classify them in accordance with their ability to produce; of course, starting with an ample minimum wage, and a reasonable maximum enticement.

As industry is progressing today, it is only a matter of time when the skilled worker will have become a thing of the past. Through our present system of unionism, incentive is definitely being curbed. It is recognized by students of human nature, that all men are not created equal from the standpoint of ability. Some are endowed with abilities far superior to their fellow workers. This being the case, why should unions be the means of retarding progress, which, in the final analysis will boomerang.

No fair person desires to make a slave out of the incompetent worker through starvation wages, and no fair person wishes to stifle the ability of the capable, energetic, and honorable worker. If all labor leaders only received the same compensation, and recognition in their role as leaders as they did in their actual occupation, I venture to say there would be very few labor leaders. So you can well understand that this suggestion of classifying labor is very elastic, because it definitely encourages incentive.

Unions must realize that their longevity is entirely dependent upon the success of capitalistic enterprise. When this is more fully understood, unions will cooperate with management and look upon the industrialist as a partner in industry. No partnership was ever successful, void of a condition of trust and cooperation.

The main reason why many labor unions of today are not being whole-heartedly accepted by the employers, is simply because they lack that "something to bargain with."

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor.

Nonferrous Metals: Labor's Victory Program for War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Nonferrous Metals: Labor's Victory Program for War and Peace."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NONFERROUS METALS: LABOR'S VICTORY PROGRAM FOR WAR AND PEACE

("In the midst of war surplus materials resulting from the miracle of production have become a menace to post-war prosperity and a genuine peace."—Reid Robinson, president, International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers (C. I. O.).)

The following outline of labor's victory program for war and peace in the field of nonferrous metals covers three time periods which will demand major shifts in policy and program to meet changing conditions and new problems. The first of these periods is from the present until the military victory over the Axis has been won; [1] the second is the short-run period from the end of the shooting war until the decisions at the peace conference have been made; and the third is the long-run post-war period following the peace conference.

With the industrial war machine now functioning at top speed, the immediate major concern in dealing with the problem of surplus materials before victory is won is to avoid premature and short-sighted actions, stimulated by the fear of a post-war collapse in metal markets, which will slow down the war machine and prevent an early defeat of the Axis. A conservative forecast of the nonferrous metals needed for post-war consumption in the manufacture of peacetime products (see Appendix A) clearly indicate that such fears are groundless provided steps are take to accumulate in Government stock piles inventories of the metals that are in temporary surplus as measured by wartime needs. All that is apparently needed to absorb such temporary surpluses is an expansion of the authority delegated to the War Production Board that will permit increases in the stock pile goals now prevailing to a level more reasonably in line with estimated requirements for post-war consumption.

The major concern in the second period is twofold; first, to be prepared for the transfer of existing controls from the temporary war agencies to more permanent peacetime organizations immediately upon the cessation of hostilities—congressional enactments to provide for this shift should be immediately formulated—and, second, to see that such measures as are taken in this connection provide a basis for post-war controls to conserve resources, to stabilize the domestic metals and minerals industry and to set an example to the rest of the world, in line with the Fulbright and Connally resolutions, that will encourage international collaboration for the establishment of permanent peace by putting this program into effect throughout the Western Hemisphere prior to the eventual submission to the peace conference of a similar program for the rest of the world.

The major concern in the third period is to be prepared with a specific over-all program for metals and minerals that will carry out the provisions of the Atlantic Charter with respect to free access to raw materials and give substance to the commitments made to the common people of all the world at Moscow and Teheran.

---

[1] The first period might be subdivided into two shorter periods, one until the European war is won and the other until the Japs have been beaten. However, neither the timing nor the order of occurrence of these events is clear; moreover, for each of these periods only minor shifts in policy will be necessary to achieve a partial reconversion to civilian production as changes in the requirements for war production permit.

In this connection the concluding section of this outline (see appendix B) presents for consideration a proposed international agreement to develop national programs of conservation and stabilization for the metals and minerals industry in which the structure and major functions of the proposed constituent organizational units involved in the agreement are described. In such programs, "conservation is defined to mean not hoarding but rather orderly and efficient use in the interest of national welfare, both in war and peace, without unnecessary waste either of the physical resources or the human elements involved in their extraction."[2] Stabilization means the same in terms of general objectives but has particular reference to market changes and the waste resulting from unnecessary fluctuations in prices, and in inventories held by producers, fabricators and other consumers of nonferrous metals, as well as fluctuations in employment and wage standards at mines, smelters, refineries, brass mills, and other segments of the metals industry.

BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

Several important factual considerations are basic to a proper evaluation of labor's program.

1. There has been a serious depletion of irreplaceable mineral resources, particularly those of higher grades and a resultant marked tendency toward higher costs of extraction for a substantial proportion of the domestic output of our more important nonferrous metals. This fact has tremendous national significance both from the standpoint of the post-war future of the economy and the nonferrous metals industry in particular as well as for the immediate situation in which irreparable damage may be done by removing special incentives to the mining of low-grade, high-cost ores containing those metals whose supply is now sufficient to meet military requirements. Such action would force a sudden depression upon the underground mines in the industry and lead to the premature abandonment and irrevocable loss of huge tonnages of low-grades ores.

2. There will be an assured post-war expansion in domestic requirements for copper, lead, and zinc, beyond the capacity of our domestic mines to supply even if the post-war level of national income is not sufficiently high to achieve full employment of the manpower that will be available. Unless arrangements can be made to obtain available supplies from other countries, the post-war domestic shortage of nonferrous metals might become a major obstacle to plans for post-war expansion to achieve full employment in the United States.

The prospect of post-war domestic shortages of important nonferrous metals points clearly to the immediate need for congressional action to provide means for the accumulation of stock piles of those metals which are in temporary surplus as measured by war needs. It also suggests the importance of maintaining and developing the good neighbor policy in the field of foreign relations and the advisability in this connection of continuing the present foreign procurement of metals whose supply is no longer in critical shortage for war needs, but which will provide a necessary supplement to the domestic supplies needed for post-war consumption at levels of national income sufficiently high to provide full employment.

3. The cost differentials between different mines producing the same metals are wide and relatively fixed because they depend for the most part upon the character of the particular mineral deposit—grade of ore, width of vein, etc., or upon the kind of mining techniques which can be used to exploit the deposit—stoping, block caving, or open-pit steamshovelling. As a result, competition in the metal mining industry in contrast to competition in manufacturing does not tend to equalize costs as between different producing units. Nature rather than management makes a mine high-cost or low-cost.

These characteristics justify the special price treatment which has been accorded to high-cost producers in the nonferrous metal mining industry during the war under the Government's premium price plan. Labor supported this plan and contributed to its establishment. The same facts plus the post-war need for the metal justify the continuation of such special price treatment after the war, but in a form modified to fit the needs of conservation and stabilization.

At the same time these same characteristics point to the need of Government control over competition that will prevent large monopoly holders of low-cost metals resources from accumulating and unloading speculative inventories, disrupting metal markets, creating ghost towns, and reducing hard-won wage and working standards.

4. Some of the metals and minerals urgently required in large volume for military purposes and now in surplus supply do not have substantial peacetime uses. This difference is fundamental and should indicate the need for a different and special treatment for wartime metals that are not needed for peacetime purposes when supply goals for military requirements for these metals have been reached. The decision on such matters should reside primarily in the hands of those responsible for our military preparedness. Care should be taken, however, to avoid possible interpretations that the accumulation of national stock piles of these wartime metals is in preparation for another war. Such interpretations would endanger the whole policy of international collaboration to establish a basis for permanent peace.

5. Wartime experience in dealing with the problem of supplying our metal mines with sufficient skilled labor to achieve production goals for the munitions program clearly demonstrates the need for general improvement in wage and working standards as well as in housing and other community facilities for the mining camps of the industry if we are going to provide the supplies of nonferrous metals necessary to meet post-war requirements.

6. Wartime experience has also demonstrated that high prices for metals under conditions in which the minerals resources are fixed and limited in supply do not attract substantial increases in production. In copper, for example, notwithstanding premium prices in the neighborhood of 27 cents a pound no new large deposits previously unknown were uncovered. Moreover, high prices in the post-war period for metals to be sold to fabricators and other consumers will be limited by price competition from substitute materials. Such considerations support a policy of selective pricing to procure the needed output from high-cost mines and one substantially lower open market price for the fabricators and other consumers of nonferrous metals.

PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Provide for an interim extension and expansion of the powers now delegated to wartime agencies—the W. P. B. and M. R. C. in particular—

(i) to permit Government stock piles and procurement of metals and minerals having substantial peacetime uses, beyond the limits set by war requirements for such metals and minerals and consistent with a national policy of conservation; and

(ii) to permit the continuation of "subsidy" payments when W. P. B. production and stock-pile goals for war requirements are attained and when such payments are justified under the national conservation policy, as a form of conservation payments to prevent the loss of mineral resources through mine shut-downs resulting from the elimination of subsidy payments.

2. Take congressional action now to definitely establish a consistent national policy of conservation for our mineral resources. Such policy to be implemented—

(a) by the establishment as soon as possible of a National Minerals Resources Board consisting of representatives from appropriate Government agencies—

(i) to develop guiding principles and a unified program of conservation for our mineral resources; and

(ii) during the war period to advise the W. P. B. on appropriate conservation principles to be followed for metals eligible for special prices or subsidies; and

(iii) at the close of the war when special powers granted to existing governmental agencies have expired to assume directive control over such policies and functions as are now performed by these agencies with respect to the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc as well as in the field of Metals Reserve procurement and stock piling of strategic metals and minerals;

(b) by a post-war system of conservation payments as an alternative to, or substitute for, the present subsidy system for increased production of strategic metals and minerals in order to prevent the loss of mineral resources resulting from the elimination of incentive subsidies remaining at the close of the war;

(c) by the accumulation of buffer stocks of metals and minerals having substantial peacetime uses, for purposes of achieving price stability for such as are included in the conservation program;

(d) by making exploratory representation through appropriate governmental channels to metals-producing countries of the Western Hemisphere with the objective of reaching an international agreement—

(i) to establish uniform national policies of conservation consistent with that established for the United States;

(ii) and make appropriate credit and trading arrangements to permit the accumulation and exchange of Government surplus stocks.

[2] National Resources Board. Report December 1, 1934, Mineral Policy, p. 32.

Are Hospitalized Veterans Being Treated Right?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House today to a news item which appeared in the Times-Herald this morning. The news item states that veterans are leaving hospitals before they should do so partly because their pensions are reduced while in the hospital. Might it not be well for the Committee on Pensions to make a careful and thorough investigation to determine the facts in the case so that appropriate legislation may be introduced and passed, if deemed advisable?

To assist in arriving at a conclusion as to what to do, a sampling of opinions of veterans in a certain number of hospitals

could well be included in such investigation.

The news item reads as follows:

PENSIONS OF VETS IN HOSPITALS CUT

Yanks are leaving Veterans' Administration hospitals against medical advice partly because of reduction of pensions or compensation during hospitalization, Omar B. Ketchum suggested yesterday.

Ketchum, national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, said a service-connected disabled veteran, without dependents, might suffer a pension decrease of $80 a month, merely by staying in a hospital.

Speaking in the first of a series of weekly broadcasts over WOL, he commended Veterans' Administrator Hines for urging veterans' groups to survey agency hospitals.

How About U. N. R. R. A.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in view of the panning U. N. R. R. A. has been receiving, the following article from Business Week for March 3 should be of interest to the House. As one who supported U. N. R. R. A. legislation in Congress, and who feels it has a great humanitarian task to perform, I have been disappointed and impatient at the delays in getting relief started. This article explains some of the delays, shows that a lot has already been accomplished, and that much more will soon be done. This is good news, for you cannot declare a moratorium on starvation, sickness, and homelessness. Starving, sick, and homeless people cannot wait indefinitely.

The article follows:

U. N. R. R. A. GETS READY TO ROLL—FRANCE, BELGIUM, AND THE NETHERLANDS DROP SELF-SUFFICIENCY STAND, AND UNITED NATIONS' RELIEF AGENCY AT LAST GETS GREEN LIGHT FOR EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE IN LIBERATED NATIONS

Considerations of sovereignty, prestige, and protocol have been submerged by the threats of starvation and political turmoil which now haunt the leaders of France, Belgium, and the Netherlands. These countries have finally turned for aid to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

SELF-SUFFICIENCY FAILS

At Atlantic City, birthplace of U. N. R. R. A., these well-heeled nations—and later Norway—turned a proud and chilly back on the infant international agency created to minister to war-ravished peoples. It was all right for the poor Greeks and Yugoslavs to turn to U. N. R. R. A., but the rich western European states were jealous of intervention, sure of their power, and anxious to sustain authority by holding the reins of relief and rehabilitation.

But each of these governments, as it endeavored to procure and distribute civilian relief, was confronted with forces it could not master—shortages of supply, of authority, and of shipping. This week in Washington the U. N. R. R. A. Council agreed to rush emergency relief goods into western Europe from stock piles in the United Kingdom.

With this decision, U. N. R. R. A. came into its own. Until now it has been one of the most misunderstood and oft-maligned of intergovernmental agencies.

Actually U. N. R. R. A. has suffered no more violently from the birth pangs of organization than most wartime national agencies; it has had fewer internecine rows, pulled fewer boners, and hewn closer to objectives than many another agency.

FOR EMERGENCIES ONLY

U. N. R. R. A.'s job cannot be understood until multiple misconceptions have been dispersed:

1. U. N. R. R. A. is not an American-dominated agency, even though more than two-thirds of its funds come from the United States. It is an instrument of 44 United Nations. Its director general—former Gov. Herbert H. Lehman of New York—has put aside American allegiance to become an international servant, a world citizen.

2. U. N. R. R. A. is not to be blamed for the unhappy destination of Italy, for until last September U. N. R. R. A. had no responsibility for relief in former enemy territory. Now its $50,000,000 minimum aid program in Italy (restricted to helping mothers and children) is rolling smoothly under a mission headed by S. M. Keeny, a veteran of the American Relief Administration of World War fame.

3. U. N. R. R. A. cannot operate until it has been authorized to do so by the military and governmental authority of a liberated area. Thus it was barred from western Europe by the self-sufficient stand of the local governments—except for U. N. R. R. A. missions invited by the military; it entered Greece by military request; it is working with the military in Yugoslavia; it is readying a mission to follow relief goods en route to Czechoslovakia and Poland.

4. By its charter U. N. R. R. A. cannot do more than help people to help themselves. It cannot help those who have not asked for help. It normally has no relief responsibility until after a nominal 6-month military period during which relief is provided by the Army Civil Affairs Branch (G–5). It cannot extend more than emergency short-term aid—no industrial rebuilding, no T. V. A.'s, no tampering with time-worn economic patterns.

OPERATIONS RESTRICTED

But despite all these limitations, U. N. R. R. A. has done an admirable job. It has even entered liberated areas with Allied military forces, although the first experiment at jumping the gun in this way was a tragic mistake.

U. N. R. R. A. sent 113 workers into Greece with the British troops, since the country had been evacuated by the Germans and hostilities had ceased. But the civil warfare in Athens and environs resulted in the wounding of 9 U. N. R. R. A. workers and the death of 1; on the advice of military authorities all but 40 U. N. R. R. A. representatives were withdrawn. The remaining workers continued distribution of food and clothing in noncombat zones. U. N. R. R. A. has delivered hundreds of thousands of tons of food to Greece (while, up to January, civilian supply shipments to France totaled only 175,000 tons).

With the western European nations excluded—until the decision this week to permit emergency aid from U. N. R. R. A.-owned stocks in Britain—the only other areas of operation were Italy (the $50,000,000 minimum-aid project), Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

OBSTACLES OVERCOME

U. N. R. R. A. aid to Yugoslavia is on two levels. In advance of the termination of hostilities, Allied military chiefs asked U. N. R. R. A. to assist with relief, and an agreement was signed outlining areas of authority. An U. N. R. R. A. mission is now at work in Yugoslavia in liaison with the military. In preparation for the second phase, negotiations with the de facto government of Yugoslavia to determine U. N. R. R. A.'s role after the end of hostilities are now going on.

Czechoslovakia and Poland invited U. N. R. R. A. aid, but means of delivering the goods were lacking. An initial shipment of a few tons of medical aid was flown to Moscow from Britain and assured transit to eastern Czechoslovakia.

This week, following a Soviet invitation to use the Rumanian ports of Galatia and Constanta, U. N. R. R. A. shipped enough medical units to supply 100,000 people for 1 month with complete hospital set-ups, including X-ray equipment and mobile medical-aid units. These are destined for the use of a Czech medical mission already in the field; U. N. R. R. A. observers will follow to work in both Czechoslovakia and Poland.

FUNDS CAME SLOWLY

Before U. N. R. R. A. was prepared to act in any capacity a lot had to be accomplished. Relief planning had started several years ago in London, and the study of requirements and supply was continued by U. N. R. R. A. for months before the agency swung into action.

U. N. R. R. A.'s operating funds came slowly—even the United States took 9 months to appropriate 60 percent of its quota, and tied strings to 45 percent of that. So far, some 30 noninvaded countries have set aside $1,800,000,000 to U. N. R. R. A.'s account. The goal exceeds $2,000,000,000. Because the bulk of U. N. R. R. A.'s requirements is noncritical (such as cotton and wheat) or semiperishable (such as milk and flour), and can be procured quickly, actual expenditures have been small although large sums have been earmarked for specific purposes.

SUPPLY TASK IS COMPLEX

U. N. R. R. A.'s problems of procurement, stock piling, shipment overseas, and final distribution are all complicated. For one thing, 90 percent of each country's money contribution is, by agreement, to be spent on supplies in that country. This means shopping in thirty-odd nations, each desperately conscious of wartime shortages of civilian goods and equally anxious to move war-accumulated surpluses.

For goods in short supply U. N. R. R. A. must turn to the United States-British-Canadian combined boards, and compete with the needs of the military, civilian, and export claimants at the national level in each country.

NEEDS GEARED TO WAR

As a claimant agency U. N. R. R. A. must schedule its needs far in advance. Its programs are based on estimates of country-by-country requirements calculated in 6-month blocks extending over a period of 18 months following liberation. Its schedules are inevitably keyed to the war's progress.

Consequently, allocations from supplies in the United States, or Canada, or the United Kingdom may be ticketed for U. N. R. R. A. and then returned to the national pool if they are not lifted by U. N. R. R. A. for delivery to a freed area. Some goods of a noncritical nature can be stock-piled. Some others, requiring time to fabricate (such as locomotives, mobile repair units, and farm implements), must be ordered long before they are needed.

WORLD WIDE IN SCOPE

From the start U. N. R. R. A. has surveyed relief needs on a world-wide basis, and its programs are keyed to these over-all requirements to assure equitable distribution among needy countries. Consequently, even the programs of countries paying their own way (such as France and Belgium) are studied

by U. N. R. R. A. The Supply Section of U. N. R. R. A. advises the combined boards on whether these requests are justifiable or likely to infringe upon available supplies for other areas to be liberated later.

In fact, U. N. R. R. A. has helped the paying countries. It has procured for them $75,000,000 of relief goods and transferred to them an additional $30,000,000 of goods from its stock piles.

WAR REFUGEES AIDED

But U. N. R. R. A.'s activities do not end with the planning, procurement, and distribution of relief goods. A multilateral agreement between the United Nations has put in U. N. R. R. A.'s lap the job of returning millions of displaced persons to their homeland, and at the frantic request of Allied military chiefs U. N. R. R. A. missions are already at work in Europe.

Ten days ago U. N. R. R. A., which now employs only about 2,000 persons for all its operations, was asked by Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force, to send 1,200 workers to staff 100 refugee centers in Germany. There are some 9,000,000 foreigners in the Reich today and many are crossing to Allied territory every day. Before U. N. R. R. A. had caught its breath after this premature and unexpected demand (Germany is still quite a combat zone), S. H. A. E. F. boosted its ante to 450 centers, which will require the recruiting of between 4,500 and 6,000 U. N. R. R. A. workers.

SANITATION SUPERVISED

Some 40,000 refugees are already being cared for in U. N. R. R. A. camps in north Africa, and last week another 3,000 were on their way from asylum in Switzerland.

Since the revision of the International Sanitation Convention last year, U. N. R. R. A. has taken over administration of the regulations and last month began publication of the Epidemiological Information Bulletin, a bimonthly report to health officers of all nations on the incidence and control of epidemic diseases. Experts from the Health Research Unit of the League of Nations have joined U. N. R. R. A.'s staff to assist with the work.

TECHNICAL AID GIVEN

Among its many other activities, technical and engineering sections of U. N. R. R. A. have been quietly at work preparing guidebooks and manuals for distribution in liberated areas. These include instructions for remaking clothing, medical guides and instructions for labeling and using drugs, and technical guides for the reconstruction of damaged industrial and utility facilities.

Of special interest to American and allied businessmen, however, are the instruction booklets which will accompany machinery taken into Europe by U. N. R. R. A. Manufacturers and U. N. R. R. A technicians are preparing simple instructions in French and English on the use of farm equipment and other types of machinery to be provided by the United States, Canada, and Britain. The various national governments will be expected to translate the instructions into the local language. Seed guides and farming information are likewise being prepared by a technical staff working in London.

AHEAD OF SCHEDULE

So far U. N. R. R. A. has been asked to begin its work in a half-dozen areas well in advance of the scheduled date. It has not yet fallen down on the job.

But Director General Lehman has admitted now that the planning stage is almost past. So U. N. R. R. A.'s big job lies ahead. It remains to be seen whether an international agency can operate in the face of continuing supply shortages and shipping limitations—on which the military still has first call—and accomplish the task set for it by the United Nations.

Treatment of Disabled Veterans in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much propaganda spread recently concerning the treatment of our disabled veterans in Government hospitals that I think it is well to have the views of men who are familiar with the situation from actual experience.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter I received this morning from Dr. V. L. Smith, 834 Medical Arts Building, Dallas, Tex., together with the statement to which he makes reference.

The material is as follows:

DALLAS, TEX., *March 16, 1945.*

Hon. JOHN RANKIN,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: I am enclosing copy of reply to an article appearing in the Cosmopolitan, and as you are chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House, and have always been the friend of veterans, especially of the disabled, I send you this for your information.

As to conditions in our veterans' facility in Texas, they are of the highest order, and we know General Hines is on the job and want him retained. While Texas might be just a little split on regular and some other branch of Democrats, I can assure you the veterans of Texas are almost unanimously for Frank T. Hines. And Mr. RANKIN, you'll get anything you ask out of the D. A. V.'s of Texas. We admire and love you for your unselfish efforts in our behalf.

With all best wishes sir, I am,

Sincerely,

V. L. SMITH, M. D.

Dr. Smith's reply to the article appearing in the Cosmopolitan magazine reads as follows:

In a recent article in a national magazine serious charges were brought against the Veterans' Administration, and especially the medical personnel, in which they are charged with being incompetent, bureaucratic, and callous.

After many years' service with several of the veterans' organizations, assisting them in caring for the sick and disabled of their organizations, both service-connected and nonservice-connected cases, and having to deal with the Veterans' Administration, I am positive the conditions complained of in the article do not obtain in Texas. I am a general practitioner of medicine and know the profession in Texas, especially the medical personnel of the Veterans' Administration, many of whom are nationally, State, and locally known for their medical attainments. I have been brought in direct contact with them through my position for over 2 years as State commander of the Disabled American Veterans in 1942-43 and 1943-44. As senior vice commander in 1941-42, I visited every veterans' facility in the State, made personal inspection and contacted the veterans themselves, and usually without a representative of the Veterans' Administration being present, and only grievances of minor nature were ever offered as to their treatment, food, quarters, recreation, and entertainment. These, when called to the attention of the medical officer in charge, were immediately corrected.

The facility in Waco, which is for psychiatric and nervous veterans, is in charge of Dr. H. Rubin, who knows, and can call the name of almost every veteran in the institution, and they in turn know the doctor. He has a corps of highly trained and competent medical men and women on his staff, specialists in mental and nervous diseases. He is a strict disciplinarian, and requires service of his staff, and no word of complaint has been offered about the treatment received either medical or civil.

The Veterans' Administration facility in Dallas is rather new, and is in charge of Dr. C. L. Magruder, medical officer, and he has a competent staff of physicians, laymen, and women. This is a general medical hospital, and their turn-over in patients is somewhat more than other hospitals. They have a fine corps of specialists and consultants, and the entire personnel is always on the job, considerate and courteous and interested in giving the best service possible to their wards. Because of the varied nature of their diseases and disabilities, it is much more difficult to meet and satisfy the demands and requirements of patients in a general medical hospital, yet only criticism of minor nature has been made here.

The facility at Legion is a tubercular hospital, and until just recently was in charge of Dr. Frank Brewer, medical officer, who has been succeeded by Dr. C. I. Moore, and staffed by as competent medical men as could be found in any hospital—specialists in every phase of tubercular diagnosis, and treatment always abreast of, and many times ahead of, the most modern methods of caring for this type of patient. They are not only prepared, but I know many, many veterans that are alive today because these very men gave them the advantages of modern treatment—heliotherapy, pneumothorax, thoraco-plastic compression, and phrenic evulsion. The very nature of their disease tends to make them cynical and fatalist in their attitudes—these attributes alone requiring unusual tact and judgment and with all no complaints were ever uttered as to the treatment and care given them. If, on occasion their coffee was cold, or food not particularly appetizing, it required only a word to get these attended to.

In the several facilities of Texas the several ex-servicemen's organizations maintain a liaison and service officer, whose duty it is to visit and assist all patients and invite them to make criticism, or offer suggestions as to improvement of service, and I am sure no material abuses could exist without their knowledge, and if such appeared they would be immediately taken up by their local, State, or national departments, and if the medical service rendered our disabled comrades in the Veterans' Administration facilities in Texas could be classed as third rate, then let's have more of it.

I have attended a majority of the national conventions of the Disabled American Veterans, and at each Gen. Frank Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, has been present with the chiefs of staff of the respective departments and held schools of instructions with the national service officers of Disabled American Veterans keeping them posted on procedure and interpretation of laws passed by the Congress for veterans' benefit, and requesting reports from all service officers as to difficulties or problems met with as a result of their contact. The Veterans' Administration also assisted the legislative program by constructive criticism and suggestions to further the interest of the disabled veteran, the widows, and orphans of deceased veterans.

I quote from General Hines' first order after assuming his duties as director to all medical officers, rating officials, and other employees:

"Fairness and courtesy must at all times be shown to ex-servicemen by the medical

officers and all other employees whose duties bring them in contact, directly or indirectly, with the Administration's claimants."

There has been more criticism over the assignment of Army medical personnel to duty in the facilities for the past 2 years than any other; the ex-servicemen seem to desire to get away from anything pertaining to the Army or Navy in a medical way. They do insist, however, upon ex-service medical officers being placed in charge of facilities.

It would appear also that the author of the criticism overlooked or did not know that a large number of doctors manning the several staffs of the facilities were medical officers of World War No. 1, who know the ex-serviceman and his needs. Also, that the medical staff of the veterans' facilities hold daily staff meetings and preceding Pearl Harbor post-graduate courses were held and the doctors required to keep abreast with the most recent advances in medicine and surgery.

I have purposely avoided any statistical matter, but as criticism was made that only a few cases were cured and a small number improved will make the observation that most patients entering the facilities enter with disabilities of a permanent nature, most of them incurred as a result of their military service and for which they receive compensation; many show an increase of disability as a result of natural progress, others by aggravation and by changes that take place through the several decades of life.

Again, it is to be remembered that the Congress passes the laws under which the veterans' facilities are administered, and the veterans are permitted to elect whether or not they take the treatment recommended.

Dr. V. L. SMITH, M. D.

DALLAS, TEX.

Food Shortage

REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, according to the report issued by the War Food Administration and the O. P. A. we are headed for a very serious food shortage in this country. The farmers of the country have produced an abundance of food for the people of the United States, as well as to take care of our armed forces and to meet other commitments, but if a food shortage is developing for the American people, it is the duty of Congress to investigate and determine the reasons for that shortage. In order to develop this information, I have introduced a resolution today directing the Committee on Agriculture to make a searching investigation of food supplies and to find out what commitments have been made by the Federal Government throughout the world in connection with the food stocks that we now have on hand. I discussed this matter in the Committee on Agriculture this morning, and I hope they can get busy in accordance with the resolution and find out what difficulties exist and try to correct them.

Resolution for investigation of food supplies and commitments

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives is hereby directed and authorized to immediately investigate the food supply situation in the United States.

The said Committee on Agriculture is empowered to subpena witnesses and to require the production of records from any or all Federal agencies disclosing information on supplies of food and commitments made for the distribution of such food. The committee is also directed to fully investigate the reasons for the development of food shortages.

The said Committee on Agriculture is directed to hold its hearings in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, and any person or official who refuses to testify before said committee and refuses to give true statements as to food supplies and commitments shall be considered in contempt. The said Committee on Agriculture is directed to report its findings to the House of Representatives on or before April 15, 1945.

The said Committee on Agriculture is authorized to use available funds heretofore provided by the House of Representatives for the marketing investigation in its inquiry athorized by this resolution.

United States-Mexico Colorado River Treaty Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a roster of the important organizations who are in opposition to the present form of the Colorado River treaty provisions. The California congressional delegation is in agreement on the urgency of the settlement of points of difference between the United States and all foreign nations, but we feel that a great injury is being dealt the State of California in the terms of the treaty as now written:

FARM, LABOR, VETERANS, AND PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON RECORD AGAINST VARIOUS PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED TREATY

National Grange.

State Farm Bureaus of Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Montana, and California.

American Federation of Labor.

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Railway Labor Executives Association.

Colorado River Water Users Conference (80 percent of American water rights on Colorado River).

American Society of Civil Engineers, Intermountain Section.

Arizona Water Users (representing 85 percent of Arizona's water rights on Colorado River, including Salt River Valley Water Users Association, Yuma Conservation Club, Gila Valley Irrigation District, Arizona Highline Reclamation Association).

Utah Water Users (representing a large part of Utah's water rights on Colorado River, including Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City, Provo River Water Users' Association, St. George and Washington Canal Co., Price Bench Canal Co., all 13 irrigation companies on Virgin River).

Wyoming Water Users (representing 100 percent of Wyoming's Colorado River water rights, including Wyoming Wool Growers' Association, Wyoming Stock Growers' Association, Colorado River Water User's Association of Wyoming, Black Fork Irrigation and Power Project, Green River Basin Development Association).

California Water Users (representing 100 percent of California's Colorado River water rights).

Nevada Water Users (representing 100 percent of Nevada's Colorado River water rights).

American Bar Association is opposed to certain administrative provisions.

Veterans of Foreign Wars are against any provisions depriving veterans of legal rights to water.

Nation-wide Airport Program Needed—C. A. A. Advisory Service Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it had been my intention, had I been able to do so on Friday, to offer an amendment to H. R. 2603 to increase the appropriation for the airport advisory service of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The reduction in the funds to carry on the airport advisory service for the fiscal year of 1946 from the amount of $425,000, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, to $300,000, as approved by the Appropriations Committee of the House, and by the House itself today, will necessitate a cutting of the existing staff of approximately 200 persons needed to perform this work to about 65.

The demands from States, cities, and many civic bodies for expert advice from the C. A. A. on the planning, development and construction of airports, and on airport legislation, including local and State zoning and airport enabling legislation, has grown tremendously in recent years. The interest in planning and development of adequate airport facilities is widespread throughout the Nation and local officials of government naturally turn to the Federal agency, in charge of aeronautics, to obtain proper assistance.

The present work load in this respect is such that it cannot be properly handled with less than 200 employees, including both Washington and field. It is obvious that if only $300,000, sufficient for only 65 employees, is appropriated, it will be impossible to perform this service with any degree of effectiveness. Over 20 percent of the requests for such service emanate from Members of Congress on behalf of their constituents. If the proposed small staff is authorized for this work and backlog of such requests will immediately develop to a point where six to eight months may elapse between the time a Member of Congress requests

such advisory assistance until such assistance could be given by the C. A. A.

Harm and costly mistakes will follow the lack of expert airport advisory direction in the planning and development of airports without necessary advice. It is quite apparent that a sizeable portion of the cost of airport development will be borne by the Federal Government in the post-war expansion of aviation and the $125,000 which would be saved by the reduction is insignificant compared to the cost of the mistakes which undoubtedly will be made without such expert advice, and will have to be paid for proportionately by the Federal Government.

It is therefore unquestionably in the interest of the Federal Government to make available the small amount of Federal funds required to assure the proper direction, guidance, and planning of our national airport system, and I hope the Senate will provide the amount of $966,000 requested for this purpose from the Bureau of the Budget by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. Speaker, hearings are now in progress before the Senate Commerce committee on airport legislation. I hope the House will act in the near future that both bodies may act promptly that this Nation may soon begin an adequate airport construction program.

The Washington (D. C.) Post commented today on the need for the Federal Government to lead the way in this field. The editorial follows:

AID FOR AIRPORTS

Postwar employment openings for millions of demobilized servicemen and warworkers are not going to be found by pursuing a do-nothing policy. Nor can we banish unemployment by providing fake jobs at Federal expense. However, there are various ways in which the Federal Government can assist the expansion of private industry and thus help to create permanent jobs without squandering public money or impairing private initiative. One such promising opportunity would be afforded by Federal grants for airport construction, as provided for in bills currently being considered by an aviation subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee.

Since the Civil Aeronautics Administration is within the Department of Commerce, Secretary Wallace has had the congenial task of appearing before the subcommittee on behalf of legislation authorizing the Federal Government to make grants to State and local governments on a matching basis for airport construction. He pointed out that "a constructive program of Federal-aid highway development adopted by the Congress at the close of the last World War laid the foundation for the development of our great automobile industry. The expansion of our airport system," he added, "will have a major influence on the rate of growth of our civil aviation industry, particularly insofar as the manufacture and use of personal airplanes are concerned."

Assistant Secretary of Commerce Burden explained that the present system of airports is seriously deficient, since construction has been concentrated during the war on very large airports, chiefly with a view to military requirements. Our present airport system, he says, "could barely accommodate physically the number of civil aircraft which can be expected during the first 2 or 3 post-war years. Moreover, in a large number of cases existing airports are so inadequately planned and so inconveniently located as to prove a serious obstacle to the expansion of civil aviation." Mr. Burden estimates that the more than 3,000 additional airports proposed by the C. A. A. would provide permanent employment for from 80,000 to 100,000 persons. That total is exclusive of the 400,000 new jobs to be created within the next 8 or 10 years through the anticipated expansion of the civil aviation industry.

The construction of airports, furthermore, would provide a large volume of temporary employment. The cost of the developmental program outlined some time ago by the C. A. A. is put at a billion and a quarter dollars, with the Federal Government contributing one-half that sum. The annual Federal outlay over a 10-year period would, therefore, amount to about $62,500,000. That would be a small price to pay for the benefits accruing to workers, to the traveling public, and the Nation, whose national defenses would be strengthened by additional airports serving as potential military bases and as training centers for fliers.

Airport construction is a form of public works greatly needed to develop our system of public transportation. Such outlays would build up, not tear down, private industry. But it takes time to inaugurate an ambitious construction program entailing cooperation with local governments. For that reason enabling legislation should be passed promptly so that there need be no delay in getting to work when the war comes to an end.

Farm Loans for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the G. I. bill of rights so that returning veterans can more easily secure farms upon their return to civil life. This bill provides loans at 3-percent annual interest and up to 100 percent of the valuation of a farm. It provides that they may be repaid during a period of not to exceed 40 years.

The bill also provides that the cooperation of county veterans' organizations shall be called upon to help administer it.

Under it the veteran can use his own judgment as to how he will operate his farm.

It has been introduced as the result of a study by a number of my colleagues. They are: Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts, Hon. JOHN ROBSION of Kentucky, Hon. JOHN JENNINGS of Tennessee, Hon. LAWRENCE SMITH of Wisconsin, Hon. HENRY DWORSHAK of Idaho, Hon. C. W. BISHOP of Illinois, Hon. CARL ANDERSEN of Minnesota, Hon. KARL MUNDT of South Dakota, Hon. EARL LEWIS of Ohio, Hon. GERALD LANDIS of Indiana, Hon. CHARLES ROBERTSON of North Dakota, Hon. MAX SCHWABE of Missouri, Hon. A. L. MILLER of Nebraska, Hon. J. GLENN BEALL of Maryland, Hon. FRED BRADLEY of Michigan, Hon. HARRIS ELLSWORTH of Oregon, Hon. WALT HORAN of Washington, Hon. ROSS RIZLEY of Oklahoma, Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL of Colorado, Hon. FRANK BARRETT of Wyoming, Hon. JOHN BUTLER of New York, Hon. THOMAS D. WINTER of Kansas, and Hon. HUBERT ELLIS, of West Virginia.

In order that the Members may have ready access to the features of the bill, I include a copy in my remarks as follows:

A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, G. I. bill of rights, pertaining to loans for the purpose of purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property to provide more adequate and effective farm-loan benefits

Be it enacted, etc., That title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944, is amended by adding after section 505, the following:

"SPECIAL FARM-LOAN PROVISIONS

"SEC. 506. That there is authorized to be appropriated $200,000,000 and thereafter such sums as may be necessary to enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make loans in the United States and in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and in Puerto Rico, to persons eligible to receive the benefits of sections 506 to 511, inclusive, to enable such persons to acquire farms.

"COUNTY COMMITTEES AND LOANS

"SEC. 507 (a) A county committee shall be appointed to appraise and approve loans by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"(b) The county appraisal committee shall consist of three members.

"(c) A county appraisal committee shall be appointed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, preferably from lists of names recommended by the duly constituted veterans' organizations of the county, or by the county board of supervisors, or by the county commissioners.

"(d) Applications for loan are to be accepted by the duly organized veterans' groups of the county, by the county agricultural agent, or by the county veterans' service officer of the county.

"(e) The committee shall meet on the call of the county agricultural agent of the county or on the call of such other person as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may designate. The Secretary shall prescribe rules governing the procedures of the committee, furnish forms and equipment necessary for the performance of their duties, and authorize and provide for the compensation of such clerical assistance as he deems may be required by the committee. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to appoint the county agricultural agent or any other individual as secretary of the committee.

"(f) If any county does not have a county agricultural agent, a duly constituted veterans' organization, or a county veterans' service officer, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to make use of the personnel of adjacent counties.

"(g) No certification under this section shall be made with respect to any farm in which any member of the committee, or any person related to such member within the third degree of consanguinity or affinity, has any property interest, direct or indirect, or in which they or either of the have had such interest within 1 year prior to the date of certification.

"TERMS OF LOANS

"SEC. 508. (a) Loans made under this act shall be in such amounts as may be necessary to enable the veteran to acquire a farm and for the necessary repairs and improvements thereon and shall be secured by a first mortgage or deed of trust on the farm.

"(b) The instruments under which the loan is made and security given therefor shall—

"(1) Provide for repayment of the loan within an agreed period of not more than 40 years from the making of the loan.

"(2) Provide for the payment of interest on the unpaid balance of the loan at the rate of 3 percent per annum.

"(3) Provide for a loan not to exceed 100 percent of the appraised value of the farm unit.

"(4) Provide for a loan not to exceed $12,000 on any one farm.

"(5) Provide for the repayment of the unpaid balance of the loan together with interest thereon in installments in accordance with amortization schedules prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"(6) Be in such form and contain such covenants as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall prescribe to secure payment of the unpaid balance of the loan.

"(7) Provide that the borrower shall pay taxes and assessments on the farm to the proper taxing authorities and insure and pay for insurance on the farm buildings.

"ELIGIBILITY FOR LOANS

"SEC. 509 (a). As to provisions of sections 506 to 511 inclusive, any veteran with a discharge other than dishonorable is eligible for a loan.

"(b) Any veteran with a farm loan at the present time is eligible to make application for loan under the provisions of this act.

"DISTRIBUTION OF LOANS

"SEC. 510. In making loans under section 505 to 511 inclusive of title III the amount which is devoted to such purposes shall be distributed on the basis determined and authorized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

"SEC. 511. For the purposes of sections 506 to 511 of this title III, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall have power to—

"(a) Appoint (without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations) and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary.

"(b) Make contract for services and purchases of supplies without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 41, sec. 5) when the aggregate amount involved is less than $300.

"(c) Make payments prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office.

"(d) Acquire land and interests therein without regard to section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

"(e) Compromise claims and obligations arising under, and adjust and modify the terms of mortgages, leases, contracts, and agreements entered into pursuant to sections 506 to 511 inclusive of title III as circumstances may require.

"(f) Collect all claims and obligations arising under this title III, or under any mortgage, lease, contract, or agreement entered into pursuant to sections 506 to 511 inclusive, and, if in his judgment necessary and advisable, to pursue the same to final collection in any court having jurisdiction: *Provided*, That the prosecution and defense of all litigation under the provisions of sections 506 to 511 inclusive of title III shall be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General, and the legal representation shall be by the United States attorneys for the district, respectively, in which such litigation may arise, or by such other attorney or attorneys as may, under the law be designated by the Attorney General.

"(g) Make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of section 506–511 inclusive of title III."

Marvin Roth, of Daytona Beach, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HENDRICKS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we know how appointments to West Point and Annapolis are coveted by so many fine young men in our districts. It certainly is a rare thing to have one of these appointments turned down after it has been offered.

Recently I offered an appointment to Marvin Roth, of Daytona Beach, Fla., and it caught up with him in the front lines. He declined the appointment, preferring to stay there on the job. I received a letter from his father, for which I am asking permission to include in the RECORD because of the fine letter that he wrote to his father, Mack Roth. This boy is an honor to his country.

The letter follows:

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA., *March 14, 1945.*
Honorable JOE HENDRICKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your offer of appointment of my son Sgt. Marvin Roth, * * * to the United States Naval Academy, caught up with him at the front lines of the Seventh Army.

Marvin writes me that he turned down your very kind and generous offer. He wants to stay with the boys. Because I think you should be very proud to have selected such a boy for appointment, prompts me to write you and tell you what he said in his letter and point out why it is that our American boys will never be defeated by any country, no matter who the enemy is. Its the spirit of boys such as my son that makes us all proud of being Americans.

Quote from Marvin's letter: "So you can see that the life of a soldier in combat is pretty easy when he is not busy dodging bullets, and with the psychology that I use, even the falling of artillery 50 feet away isn't such a rugged thing. Too many men go into action with a fear of being hit, while if you watch the odds, you've safe as can be. I honestly believe this sitting back safe from the normal battle conditions is more trying on the nerves than actual fighting. Waiting and watching has never been to my liking, and it's making me restless, as I have always been in the past. All the fellows that are with me seem to be perfectly content to remain here for the duration, but war hasn't disillusioned me yet, so I'm still 'raring to go.' I wonder if my attitude will ever change, but when I really think about it, I believe I'll always crave the excitement and adventure of the unknown. I've listened to the fellows talk about going home, and that if they get there, no power will induce them to ever return overseas; but my mind doesn't function that way, and I've been able to make myself perfectly comfortable and content regardless of where I am at. That's why I refused Congressman HENDRICK'S appointment when it caught up with me at the front. I'll be back soon enough, so don't worry." End of quote.

Not one boy in a thousand would have refused your appointment, especially while dodging bullets and living in fox holes. My son has had four years of R. O. T. C. in military colleges, and when the need for paratroopers became great, he wanted to transfer to that branch of service, from the Infantry branch that he was in. He could not at that time transfer in rank, so resigned the R. O. T. C. and his commission as second lieutenant to be a buck private in the paratroops. I dare state that very few men in the Army ever did a thing like that. Since he has transferred however, I understand that one can now transfer in rank. I hated to see him lose his R. O. T. C. standing after completing four years of that work and hope some day the War Department will reinstate those who resigned before the new rules went into effect.

Please pardon my bragging. He may not win medals but if he had accepted your appointment he would have brought you credit, as he will his country.

With kindest regards and best wishes,
Sincerely and cordially yours,
MACK ROTH.

A Primer of "Peace"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the United States News:

A PRIMER OF PEACE—THE ELEMENTS OF TRUE PEACE AND THE FORCES WHICH PREVENT OR PROMOTE ITS ATTAINMENT—FINAL ANSWER LIES IN PRACTICE OF CHRISTIAN DECENCY BY MEN AND NATIONS IN RELATIONS WITH EACH OTHER

(By David Lawrence)

What is the definition of "peace" as the term is used by modern governments?

Peace is envisoned as a state of continued submission by a people defeated in war—an acceptance of complete subjugation for an indefinite period of time.

How long does the defeated nation stay subjugated?

Only as long as just treatment is accorded. Otherwise a defeated people will contrive by one means or another to throw off the yoke of bondage as soon as sufficient economic strength is developed to resume the war, either alone or with new allies.

Why doesn't the defeated nation usually stay subjugated?

Because when an armistice is signed the war really does not end. The peace terms imposed continue the war for the defeated. Punitive measures, usually called a "hard peace," keep the spirit of resistance alive. Even if dormant on the surface, eventually the desire for revenge asserts itself underneath and the defeated people begin to scheme and plot a way to get revenge and recover what they have lost.

But cannot the conquerors keep such a defeated and obviously weak nation from rearming and bringing on another war?

Not unless the defeated people become convinced that they have more to gain by remaining at peace than by resorting to force, and not unless occupying armies are maintained for 20 or 30 years in a conquered country at a heavy cost in lives and money, as the French underground movement can inform us after four years of German occupation.

But would not any people have more to gain by preserving the lives of their youth and staying at peace?

Many persons cherish honor above life itself and many persons believe that death on the battlefield is better than slow starvation or economic strangulation for their families. The imposition of slave labor is not a persuasive way to instill a will to peace.

But do not the conquering nations usually give the defeated peoples a chance to live?

They, of course, express such a desire and many elements among them honestly intend to give the vanquished a chance, but these elements are usually shouted down and accused of wanting a soft peace or of allowing their humane sympathies to influence them unduly.

Should we not punish the war criminals and impose penalties on Germany?

Yes, every single one of them should be tried and the guilty hanged as an example. Definite penalties should be imposed on the German people that are economically bearable and of fixed duration. But even when we have done this, we have not come to the root of the problem. The war criminals of the 1920's on the Allied side who allowed the economic plight of 90,000,000 human beings in central Europe to become so desperate that they were receptive to any leadership or program—even war—as the only way out of economic anarchy were likewise guilty. But those Allied leaders have long since passed from the stage and their acts have escaped review in a welter of alibis and explanations that always focus on Germany's refusal to accept subjugation or on her plots for revenge but rarely weigh the effects of the blunders made by the Allied Governments and their indifferent peoples. We must avoid the emergence of a new set of war criminals of our own who by their blindness to or negligence of the needs of conquered populations can bring on World War No. 3.

Will the next war be begun by Germany?

Not necessarily. Germany may next time play the role of junior partner to a new dictator, who may arise in France or elsewhere and who may attempt to consolidate all the countries with grievances. Italy, France, Poland, Finland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey will come out of this war feeling they have been made the pawns of the major powers. Discordant elements abound which, together with the peoples of the dismembered areas of Germany and Austria, may furnish the sinews of new and strange alinements. The fight between "left" and "right" will not end with the present war. As long as Russian totalitarianism is not superseded by democracy and individual freedom, there will be a fear of Russia and a tendency to form continental alliances against Russia.

Will not the United Nations organization be able to prevent a third world war?

Not unless it is considerably changed at San Francisco from its proposed charter. For a clique of major powers already has decided that dictatorships and totalitarianism are internal matters and of no external significance, that if powerful nations want to go to war nothing can be done in advance to persuade or compel them to do otherwise, and that a system of collective security or self-discipline for all is too idealistic.

Is there any way to get a real peace—one that will endure at least for several decades?

Yes; there is a way. It means the establishment of a tribunal of justice with all nations committed to enforce its awards. We must first, however, concede that a court inflamed by passion or bitterness is not calculated to influence the loser to accept his loss or to convince him that he had had a fair trial and that he must seek compensation in fields of endeavor other than those which led him astray. A league of victors, on the other hand, which practices self-restraint and does not allow the spirit of revenge to write the peace terms but objectively, earnestly and sincerely seeks to produce an economic equilibrium in the world so that all peoples may have a chance for employment and for a decent standard of living, could become truly a constructive organization. It could bring real peace. America has enough influence in the world today to assume leadership in the attainment of such a peace.

Why then do we not set up such an organization?

Because too often nowadays the press, radio, and the movies arouse our brutish instincts and not our sense of justice. Atrocity stories and scenes of devastation influence people to succumb to short-sighted slogans. The people should be reminded of the true origins of international friction and of the provocations to war. Our leaders of Government and public opinion and most of their followers profess to believe in the tenets of Christian philosophy but, when confronted with the problem of practical application, they prefer to consider these principles as merely desirable goals for perfectionists—something to be striven for and perhaps attained in the future but certainly not now. Nearly 2,000 years have passed since those basic principles of human brotherhood were promulgated and yet we are told we must not strive today to do too much. There is always some far-off time when the world is expected to develop Christian decency—but, of course, not now.

What are the principal barriers between present-day policies and the achievement of the ideal state of peace on earth?

Propaganda of emotion rather than facts, selfishness on the part of governmental leaders here and abroad who are afraid to face perhaps a temporary loss of political power and to tell the people the truth about the essentials of peace, greed on the part of commercial interests that want territory and resources for exploitation, pride on the part of those who have led millions of youth to their deaths and who glorify military achievement as a mark of virility, and, finally, lack of candor on the part of statesmen of today who know better but who refuse to admit the errors of the 1920's or to admit the truth about the world's failure in 1919 to follow the epochal proposals of an American President. In vain did Woodrow Wilson cry out for a "peace without victory" as a means of healing the wounds of mankind. In that much-misunderstood phrase—which really meant peace without the abuse of victory—lay the key to a constructive peace.

Revenge does not restore the lives lost in battle nor, as modern penology teaches us, does excessive punishment rehabilitate a criminal or keep criminal instincts from being engendered for the first time among masses of men, women, and children who feel they should not be made to suffer for the crimes of ruthless rulers. Millions of Germans still in Nazi concentration camps and the countless relatives of those on the Hitler "purge" lists can testify to the efforts at resistance by an unarmed populace in a Gestapo-controlled state.

When leaders among us are willing to become martyrs for truth and to preach and practice the philosophy of human kindness and justice—even as some of our countrymen laugh at them for their pains—there can be the beginnings of a long peace. It is the most inexpensive price the world will ever be asked to pay—simple sacrifice of stubborn pride and perhaps of a few worldly possessions which we cannot take away with us anyway.

In essence, it demands from all of us—leaders and followers—the surrender of the supreme ego to the Supreme Being. Perhaps God has been waiting patiently for men to learn how to live together in peace before bestowing His blessings. We must deserve peace before we are permitted to enjoy it. Wars are man-made—and so are years of genuine peace.

The "Gripsholm"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wausau (Wis.) Daily Record-Herald of March 3, 1945:

THE DRIFTER

The Drifter notes by the papers that the *Gripsholm* is at sea again, carrying across the ocean to a neutral port a cargo of Axis diplomats and civilians who have been interned in this country. In Portugal she will set them ashore and load up a similar group of American diplomats, consuls, reporters, and other civilians who have until recently been interned by the Vichy government. The return-trip passengers are already awaiting the little Swedish liner at Lisbon, and their dispatches have told how eagerly they are awaiting the opportunity to board her and head for home.

The *Gripsholm* will be full of history and incident when this war is over. More than any civilian vessel sailing the seven seas will she be freighted with historic memories. The plain, factual statements of her log would make a best seller, one would suppose, and if there is a member of her crew with a gift for writing he should find material for half a dozen books in what he has seen and heard aboard her. She's a neutral link between bitter enemies, sailing always on a voyage of humanity and mercy, and for thousands she has been the gateway from despair to new hope.

On the *Gripsholm* anxious married couples have been reunited after months of imprisonment, during which neither knew if the other were still living. On her, children have been born, old friends have met after long separation, and pining prisoners, suffering from worry and despondency, have miraculously been returned to health and hope.

She has seen the arrogant Japs, "interned" in the lap of American luxury at Virginia Hot Springs, parade down her gang-plank with golf clubs and cases of American liquors and other luxuries, while gaunt, half-clothed, pain-wracked Americans waited in painful eagerness to march up the gang-plank and put forever behind them the memories of Japanese prison cruelty and deprivation.

I think the story of the *Gripsholm* that will longest be remembered is that of the bountiful hospitality prepared by her ship's company for those poor, half-starved Americans whom she took aboard at Siego Suarez in Madagascar after they had been unloaded by some Nipponese "kaisha" or other, after a long voyage on which they were fed on rice and pickled fish. Do you recall the elaborate "smorgasbord" that the Swedish captain and crew prepared for our emaciated compatriots? It had everything, the dispatches reported, that ever was served in a smorgasbord—which means that it must have looked like Heaven's own bounty to men and women who for months and years had been living on the yellow man's meager wartime rations.

I recall that some of them broke down and wept at the sight of the high-piled tables of dainties; that others gorged themselves to the point of illness—and that many of them found themselves unable to eat at all, or at least to do more than nibble, because their stomachs had so shrunken from the insufficient Japanese supplies.

That was a gesture which showed, if proof were needed, where Sweden's sympathies and hopes lie in this war. The Swedes are neutral, but that doesn't prevent them from knowing the difference between Axis perfidy and the half-bewildered, dogged determination of the United Nations.

I think the American Congress during or after this war, ought to cite for decoration, by a special medal, the officers and crew of the *Gripsholm* for this and a hundred other instances of kindness and sympathy for our sorely beset countrymen. We should be first-class ingrates if we did not realize how much their kindness has meant to so many Americans—and those of other United Nations who have come back with them from the dark places of the earth.

The *Gripsholm*, I understand, isn't one of the world's luxury liners. She's a middle-sized ship, built for tourist-cargo service—not exactly a tramp, but certainly not a floating palace. But what a castle of refuge and security she must have seemed to the hundreds who have boarded her in out-of-the-way ports halfway around the world after having been long in the power of unscrupulous enemies. She's well-found, I'm sure, for nobody in this world loves the pleasures of the table more than the Swedes. But her plain staterooms and clean, pleasant saloons must have seemed like the suburban areas of Paradise to most of her passengers.

They say her passengers, from hard-boiled military attachés to missionaries, from old men to children, invariably line her rail to cheer the Goddess of Liberty as she comes up New York harbor, and those who aren't crying too hard raise the national anthem. One can well believe it—for what American with their experiences would not give thanks with all his heart to see the mighty towers of New York City, and to know that mile upon fruitful mile of his own country stretches across the continent behind them?

The Drifter has never seen the *Gripsholm*, but he hopes to do so one day. I'd kind o' like to tell the sturdy little ship how much she's appreciated for what she's done for us and ours.

MARK R. BYERS.

Establishment of Government General Hospital at Fort Huachuca, Ariz.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

House Memorial 4

Memorial requesting the establishment of a Government hospital at Fort Huachuca

To the SECRETARY OF WAR OF THE UNITED STATES:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

The experience following World War No. 1 with respect to the care and hospitalization of returned veterans suggests that early steps should be taken for the establishment of adequate hospital facilities for returning soldiers of the present war.

At the military reservation of Fort Huachuca, in southern Arizona, will be found an ideal location for a veterans' hospital of large capacity.

Fort Huachuca, situated on the eastern slope of the Huachuca mountain range in Cochise County, at an elevation of approximately 3,200 feet, possesses one of the mildest year-around climates in the Nation, a condition highly important in the care and treatment of the classes of cases which are the inevitable product of war.

Early in the present war, the facilities at Fort Huachuca were greatly expanded by the War Department, and many permanent installations made at large expense. At the time of such construction it was planned to accommodate approximately 25,000 military personnel. However, fast-moving events have reduced the military requirements of the reservation to a comparatively small force.

Since the present buildings at Fort Huachuca are mostly new, facilities for the care of personnel installed, and the reservation being maintained, the establishment of a general Government hospital would require only a small additional investment for the remodeling and conversion of the facilities for the purposes of a hospital.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

1. That the Secretary of War give careful consideration to the merits of Fort Huachuca as a location for a general Government hospital for sick and disabled returning soldiers.

Adopted by the house of representatives February 21, 1945.

What Seamen's Bill of Rights Means in a Hospital Ward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, which has been given me, I am including a letter which comes to me from the United States Marine Hospital in Seattle. The letter is written by one of our merchant seamen, one of those who contracted tuberculosis in carrying the goods across the dangerous Pacific. He is one of the many war casualties among the great men who keep our bridge of ships intact, who defy death, and whose courage and determination is second to none among the heroes of this war.

He writes to me because my office forwarded to him a copy of H. R. 2346, the seamen's bill of rights, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Mr. J. HARDIN PETERSON, which would extend benefits to our brave and patriotic merchant seamen.

The letter speaks most eloquently and I take great pleasure in reading it:

MY DEAR SIR: First let me thank you for sending me the seaman's bill and the letter. I am happy to inform you that this legislation would benefit me better than I dreamed anything could.

The present bill fortunately includes those of us who served in the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps. I had about 18 months of foreign duty, including 6 months of foreign sea duty in this outfit.

I also have circulated the bill to the other seamen in the TB wards. You see, we had all heard much of the bill in our union papers, etc., but to actually read and hash over the real goods was like lifting a veil from a mystery.

Most of the fellows said it was almost too good to be true, especially the disability benefits. I wish that every legislator in Washington, D. C., who happens to be undecided or opposed to this legislation could take a trip through this TB ward and talk to the men.

Morale has gone decidedly up. Moreover, this bill will not only help our dependents and alleviate our financial troubles while we are here, but it will encourage us to stick with the cure until we get well. Furthermore, it will mean so much toward helping us stay well. We won't have to worry about going back to work too soon after being discharged; to say nothing about those of us who will never be able to work again.

Very truly yours,

L. H. MATHISEN.

Rehabilitation of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the problems of the 25,000,000 physically handicapped, both military and civilian, are engaging the attention not only of the Congress, primarily through the work of our House Labor Subcommittee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped, but of outside organizations and the public generally.

In that connection, I am including below the address I made on March 14, 1945, before Washington Lodge No. 2, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, along with introductory remarks of the national president, Mr. Paul A. Strachan:

ADDRESS OF PAUL A. STRACHAN, PRESIDENT AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, INC.

President Walsh and friends, I am glad to see an interested, large group here tonight. I am reminded that in September 1940, we couldn't get a handful of people together, to discuss the problems of the 25,000,000 physically handicapped, but, now, we seem to be making progress. Yes, we are moving steadily along.

I believe today there is a feeling on the part of the general public, and of governmental and private agencies at interest that is going to be very helpful to our movement, but, there is no question about it, we all have much to learn. Indeed, we have only started learning.

I can well appreciate, perhaps more than some of you, what it has meant to see this rising tide of public interest in the disabled. I assure you, without reflection upon individuals present, some of us wore out an awful lot of shoes 4 years ago, trying to get public and private agencies to take hold of his thing, and we were laughed at, or ignored. We were told, "We don't want to be bothered with the handicapped!"

We have made very definite progress in another direction. Certainly, it goes without

saying that no national program for handicapped can ever be successful unless it is understood and supported by the Congress of the United States. I know that when we first began canvassing the Hill there was little or no interest. There was a feeling, "Well, we'll get around to this, after while."

I have said before, and again emphasize, if this job is not done right, so far as Congress is concerned, it is not Congress' fault, but our fault. If we do not educate Congressmen, if we do not stand at their elbow and give them continuous jogs, they can too easily forget, because they have many other matters to think of. So, again I say, keep punching; keep reminding them, and they need reminding, continual reminding.

Our first step, of course, toward real victory, the beginning of the work, in my view, was the establishment of the House Labor Subcommittee to investigate aid to the physically handicapped. Now, the picture is much clearer, in some respects, because, prior to that committee, while there were separate groups representing blind, deaf, hard of hearing, polios, cardiacs, tuberculosis, and so forth, there were very few people who had any conception of the whole picture, and there was no approach to an over-all basis. But now, we are learning. We are learning, it is true, the hard way. We know we are learning, because we have to learn, and Congress is learning faster, too, because it must learn.

I am proud that this organization was successful in establishing the investigating committee, and I feel still prouder that what it has already accomplished, in the brief 4½ months of its existence, has laid the ground work of the greatest job yet done for the handicapped. Still, I know that, if only 7 out of an estimated 118 groups of handicapped have testified before that committee, the surface has been but barely scratched and we must continue and complete the work of that committee, by all means.

Now I can tell you something that I believe will make you feel good. As you know, we have been working very hard to have the House reconstitute the committee. Yesterday the House Rules Committee unanimously and favorably reported to the House, House Resolution 45, to continue and complete the work. That, I believe, is the forerunner of favorable action by the House. It is now on the Calendar and I hope the resolution will be taken up very soon.

We have, then, continued to go forward. Let us continue to fight, so that we won't stop with half a victory, or even two-thirds of one, but finish the job. We must devise and execute a program to cover all the disabled. Post-war reconversion and reconstruction will bog down unless we find a way to take care of these disabled people so that they will be tax-paying, self-respecting citizens, not moochers, nor those compelled by defect, injury, or disease to live in enforced idleness, but producers.

That is the program of this federation. We have not requested any special favors for the handicapped. We have demanded only equality of opportunity, and abolition of unfair discrimination. We have said that the responsibility of the Nation to the handicapped is to treat, train, and place these people, insofar as possible, in position to earn their own living, wholly, or in part, and that is still the program of A. F. P. H.

In happier years, it was my job to cover 13 Southern States and very, very frequently I visited, and in fact, made headquarters for a time, in the grand old State of Alabama. I found it to be truly a wonderful place. It had in it all of the natural resources that a State could wish. It had forests, water power, coal and iron, and above all, it had fine people. I am very happy to say that I made many friends in that State. In fact, I believe I once knew a politician in every whistle-stop in it and naturally it still occupies a very soft spot in my affections.

I have to keep an eye on a number of my friends from Alabama in Congress, in order to help them live up to the high standards I demand of those from Alabama. In course of watching public men for some 30 years, off and on, I have marked them down into two classifications—the ones who do things, and the ones who say they'll do things. My conception of the highest exemplification of public service is that of a Member of Congress who stays on the job in season and out of season, and who believes there can be no greater accolade than giving his best at all times for the people.

It is a pleasure to know that there are many in Congress like that. I can call a long roll of them myself, and in introducing the next speaker I can say that he is one of those "who does things." He is liberal where he should be liberal, and tough where he should be tough, and I have seen him steadily progress toward the ideal of statesmanship ever since he came to Congress.

Some of you doubtless remember Woodrow Wilson's statement to the effect that "in Washington some men grow, while others just swell." The next speaker, very definitely, is one of those "who grew."

I know he has a deep interest in the welfare of the handicapped. He has manifested that on many occasions. He is not like those whom we sometimes meet in public life who too easily promise, "Yes; count me in," when the battle is imminent, but when the guns begin to shoot, they ain't there. John is one of those who will always be found ready to do his part when needed, and that is my kind of people.

I take real pleasure in introducing to you our friend Representative JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

Mr. President, in coming before you tonight, I do so as one long interested in the great work you are doing. To rebuild our physically handicapped men and women is an economic necessity and is, also, I believe, carrying out one of God's own mandates, to restore the ill and injured to usefulness. We should plan wisely, thoroughly, and extensively, now, not only for those in need of immediate rehabilitation, but for all those who will become afflicted in the years to come.

My good friend and your faithful and energetic federation president, Paul Strachan, suggested something to me a few days ago that had never occurred to me before. It was the analogy between the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped and the rehabilitation of a great area in my section through Federal establishment of the T. V. A. Other sections of the United States could be used perhaps as well—our rehabilitation work has been widespread. However, I can speak to you as one who has seen the miracle of rehabilitation come to pass under my own eyes in the T. V. A. area. I have witnessed the mightiest transformation ever performed by human hands in all the world's history. I have seen the wastelands, the denuded forests, the dissipated energies of countless streams of our beloved Southland rebuilt, conserved, and put to work for the benefit of the whole Nation, through exemplification of the very principle your federation is advocating, respecting restoration of physically handicapped people.

T. V. A. took a section of this country which was truly physically handicapped and through its systematic rehabilitative processes, brought that section to a pitch of physical perfection never before attained. It transformed, as I have said, waste into productive energy. It made more than two blades of grass grow where only one grew before, or, to illustrate more clearly, as Chairman Lilienthal of T. V. A. has said, "It made two bulbs glow where only one glew before!"

If we will but look at the composite picture of T. V. A. we will see that although its outward manifestations—its tremendous dams, the creation of miles and miles of inland water transport routes, its scientific and practical control of soil erosion and development of soils, cattle, sheep, yes, even chickens and bees—are awe-inspiring in their magnitude, but the real benefit of all this effort has been in the development and uplifting of our people.

We have seen a growing threat of poverty transformed into promising prosperity and comfort; we have seen an increasing betterment of education. We have witnessed, as corollaries, the upsurge of industrial and agricultural production, and, above all, the great improvement of health.

These things, cumulatively, I believe, have added up to providing in T. V. A. the mightiest weapon for war and the strongest stabilizer for peace the United States has ever seen.

If such a rehabilitation project will work in the T. V. A. area, it will work in any other section of the country, and I hope that our first post-war project will be to engirdle our beloved America with a series of T. V. A.'s, so that all parts of the Nation may have the same opportunities and the same benefits from scientific engineering and planned design for better living.

And this same principle of human engineering should and must be applied to the 25,000,000 physically handicapped citizens of our Nation. If, as we have indubitably proven, such benefits may flow from T. V. A. engineering, then we may be sure that a sound, practical program for all physically handicapped people, built to the scale of need and properly administered, will produce even greater benefits.

In that connection your federation is to be commended for having initiated, through passage of House Resolution 230, the work of the House Labor Subcommittee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped. For the first time in history, it opened the door to knowledge of essential facts about the handicapped, without which the Congress could not design nor enact appropriate remedial legislation. Just yesterday the Rules Committee reported favorably on a resolution to continue this work.

In this connection I should like to pay my compliments to the great interest shown in this work by Congressman KELLEY of Pennsylvania. He and his subcommittee are to be highly commended for the manner in which the hearings have been conducted and for the tireless effort to get at the real facts upon which to recommend legislation to Congress.

As we study the report and hearings of the committee, it is clear that, as yet, no adequate program has been either devised or applied to cover the needs of the handicapped.

I believe the chief reason for this is, and has been, the lack of knowledge on the part of the public, as well as our legislators, about disabled people in general. I confess I was surprised indeed to note the gigantic numbers of handicapped, in the various categories. It had never occurred to me, for example, and I do not believe the average American citizen realizes, that there are some 13,000,000 cardiacs in this country; nearly a million amputees; 230,000 blind; 10,000,000 children with visual defects; 700,000 children who are epileptics; 120,000 totally deaf; and 10,000,000 hard of hearing. Because the committee has only begun its work, it is manifest that there are many other groups, which, for lack of time, have not as yet been surveyed and which will add tremendously to the aggregate.

This, to me, was a staggering blow. As a citizen, I am concerned to note that this appalling situation exists. As a legislator, concerned with the Nation's welfare, I want to do something concrete to remedy this condition.

Chiseled in imperishable granite at the entrance to our Federal Archives Building, are the words: "All That is Past, is Prologue." So it is with the work that has been done thus far in this field, particularly since the passage in 1920, of the first Federal Vocational Training Act. It is plain that the work has just begun. We in Government, both State and Federal, have been derelict in promoting a program, largely, I believe, because of our great ignorance of the true facts.

Since 1920, for illustration, following passage of the act, down to date, only a grand total of some 205,122 persons have been rehabilitated by Federal-State means. Since it appears that in the same period, from 600,000 to 1,000,000 citizens, or an average of 800,000 yearly, have been incapacitated in some degree, exclusive of the mounting military casualty lists, then we know that, as against that figure the number rehabilitated, approximating an average of 8,500 yearly, is truly picayune, and wholly unworthy of the needs of the handicapped, or the Nation.

Referring again to our lack of knowledge of the bigness and seriousness of this problem, I cannot believe that people generally realize that we are having a total casualty list on the home front of 800,000 a year. Only recently the whole country was again reminded of the great cost of this war when we were told that our total casualties since December 7, 1941—more than 3 years—had been about 800,000. And yet rather unconcerned we go about our business with an equal number of casualties here every year.

It is true that under the stern spur of wartime necessity, larger efforts are being made, but it is clear that even now there must be better coordination, more extensive surveys upon which to base rehabilitation programs, and, above all, more individual service to the handicapped in the form of medical treatment, training, and placement.

A nation which relegates approximately 800,000 of its citizens each year to the human scrap pile is making for insecurity, not security, of both itself and its citizens.

That condition is wrong. It must be rectified for the sake of the Nation's safety. I am glad, indeed, that A. F. P. H. is carrying on the fight, as it has already demonstrated, beyond shadow of doubt, that there must be a militant, powerful organization, campaigning ceaselessly, to force public attention and public action, on behalf of the physically handicapped.

The Congress will respond favorably. I am sure of that. But you must not expect us at a time when we are engrossed in wartime effort to pilot our Nation through the numerous reefs and shoals of domestic and foreign problems, to respond to you, unless you see to it that we are apprized of the facts, and are given a sound program to meet your needs. We must, as Members of Congress, be convinced of the need—the imperative need—for action. That is your job, and you must do it.

I am absolutely opposed to unfair discrimination against the handicapped in employment. It seems to me that any intelligent employer must realize that the preponderant number of employables left in the country today are those who have some degree of physical disability, and every effort should be made to utilize the skills and aptitudes of these people, in work for which they are suitable.

I particularly disapprove discrimination against the handicapped in Government service. It is a sad commentary, indeed, upon our great Government when it has denied, in great part up to the beginning of this war, opportunity to the physically handicapped for obtaining civil-service employment. The Civil Service Commission is to be commended for its present efforts in this direction, but it is clear that appointing officers of some of the departments and establishments still need education on this point.

I voted for House Resolution 230, and I am supporting, as a continuing proposition, House Resolution 45, as the work of the House Committee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped, which has been so well begun, must be completed. I promise to do all possible to that end.

You have, in A. F. P. H., one of the greatest potential forces for good in the Nation. You have a tremendous field—25,000,000 handicapped, and their friends. You properly build your federation upon the theory that the greatest public service you can render is service to your own people.

You teach the physically handicapped to stand upon their own feet, and fight their own battles. You inculcate in them the feeling of pride and independence that comes, inevitably, from transforming a person from enforced idleness to productive work. You show them that their physical handicaps need not deter them from great achievements, and point out to them that some of our greatest men and women who ever lived, and particularly those in our own country, have been physically handicapped—Edison, Steinmetz, Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Jackson, Helen Keller—those are only a few. We may even reflect upon the fact that our great leader of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, is one of you.

But all of them, as well as countless thousands of leaders who achieve their goals despite physical handicaps, had faith. Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. I urge all of you to keep your faith. Have faith in yourselves, and then live up to that faith by constant effort to improve yourselves.

If you do this, you will not only better yourself, but you will strengthen our Nation, which needs the loyal, unselfish service of every one of its citizens to withstand the severe rigors of war, and to speed the final victory that will restore the happier days of peace.

Wall Street or Main Street?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for March 15, 1945:

WALL STREET OR MAIN STREET?

While Bretton Woods has been marking time legislatively, it is becoming increasingly clear that the American people aren't yet hypnotized by the Wall Street bankers' barrage of technical criticisms of the proposed international monetary fund, well termed by Assistant Secretary of State Acheson, "a substitute for international monetary warfare."

They now know that the much-heralded Burgess report backing the bank but blasting the fund was not laid before the American Bankers' Association in convention assembled but is the work of a big-banker-dominated commission under the association's auspices, and was issued without prior approval by A. B. A.'s rank and file. Thomas L. Stokes, Scripps-Howard's columnist, says this illustrates the way the big bankers are trying to kill the Bretton Woods plan because it might cut into their profits and power in the post-war world

The bankers of Main Street promptly registered their disagreement with their Wall Street cousins. The Independent Bankers' Association, with national headquarters in Sauk Center, Minn.—whose Main Street was immortalized by Sinclair Lewis—a body recognized as representing the country banker's point of view, has approved the fund as well as the bank. It reported to Congress that the technical details of the fund "are as sound and as workable as it is possible to formulate in advance of an actual trial and tested experience."

This, we believe, represents the mood of the people. The Main Street banker is close enough to them to appreciate their determination that America won't upset the international apple cart this time because of either isolationism or just plain greed.

The little banker knows what Secretary Morgenthau meant last week by his appeal to the House Committee on Banking and Currency for the quick passage of the legislation to implement our participation in both fund and bank. He knows how important it is that the assembling delegates to the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations, beginning April 25, have this exhibit A of our sincerity in the cause of international economic peace.

Payments for Certain Indian Lands in Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Senate Concurrent Memorial 3

Concurrent memorial requesting the Congress to pass S. 114, to pay for lands of the San Carlos strip ceded by the Apache Indians

To the Congress of the United States of America:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

There is pending in the Congress a bill (S. 114) to authorize payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896 (29 Stat. 353), reopening the lands to mineral entry, and making them a part of the public domain.

The bill in question is designed to rectify errors made by governmental agencies in permitting citizens to homestead lands in the so-called San Carlos strip and in issuing patents to the State of Arizona and leases to other persons for lands therein, whereas, under the agreement above referrd to, the land should have been opened to mineral entry only.

The proposed bill appears to provide the only equitable method of preserving the rights of all parties concerned, and all parties concerned favor passage of the measure. It is unjust that citizens who have expended much time and money in developing lands

in the San Carlos strip should be ousted therefrom, when the fault lies not with the citizens but with governmental agencies. It is likewise unjust that the lands be used without compensating the San Carlos Apache Indians therefor, and it appears that, if other settlement be not soon made, the Indians and the Indian Service will demand complete restoration of the lands involved.

It is fitting, also, to call attention to the fact that the longer action is postponed the more complicated the condition becomes. The situation should not be aggravated by continued delay.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, the House of Representatives concurring, prays:

1, That the Congress of the United States speedily enact S. 114, authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for lands ceded by them, and reopening those lands to mineral entry, in order to settle for all time the confusing and conflictnig claims to the lands, and to do justice to all parties.

Adopted by the senate, February 24, 1945.

Adopted by the house, February 28, 1945.

American Merchant Marine: What Shall We Do With It After the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I addressed the People's Lobby Conference on the subject of merchant marine in the post-war era. Many citizens throughout America are vitally concerned with the role to be played by America's merchant marine, constructed during the war and financed by Uncle Sam.

Recently, an editorial appeared in the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, which refers to my address and to certain of the points adverted to therein. The editorial is as follows:

SHIPS AS AGENTS OF PEACE

A merchant marine is a vital factor for war or for peace, and as Congressman JOHN M. COFFEE told the People's Lobby Conference in Washington recently, we must determine which ours is to be before fighting ends. The United States Maritime Commission has reported that, in spite of past and prospective losses, the Government will own a fleet of about 50,000,000 deadweight tons at the end of the war—as much as the entire world's merchant shipping in 1939. How will we use this great economic weapon?

The shipowners have made it plain that they expect the early restoration of their carrying trade. Almon E. Roth, the president of the National Federation of American Shipping, testified before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries last year that "if we do not get into it at an early date, we will see our British cousins and the Scandinavians going in."

But Arthur E. Phillips, for the C. I. O. Maritime Committee, termed shipping an international industry, and said that continued and increased United Nations collaboration is a prerequisite for profitable post-war shipping operations.

If the operators' attitude prevails, we will hold on to all our tonnage and dominate the shipping routes of the seven seas. Britain, Norway, Sweden, Holland, Belgium, and France will have little chance to come back effectively against our immense fleet or against our propensity to use subsidies to meet any differences in operating efficiencies or costs.

Britain will come out of this war with a merchant fleet greatly reduced in tonnage, but with shipping know-how among the few assets not greatly diminished by war losses.

The way United Nations shipping has been pooled in the war has contributed greatly to our extraordinary logistical achievements. Can we work out a plan for some sort of pooling after the war? As Mr. COFFEE says, any other course is likely to prove a challenge, if not a threat, to peace.

Proposed National Institute of Dental Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of editorials published in magazines devoted to the profession of dentistry, relating to a bill which I have introduced, designed to establish a national institute of dental research.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal of Dentistry of March 1945]

A NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

A bill which provides for a dental-research institute in the United States Public Health Service has been introduced in the Senate by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana. The enactment of this bill will speed up the progress of scientific knowledge, so that dentists and other health professions will be able to do vastly more than they can do today in preventing dental diseases. The American Dental Association and the dental profession of the United States strongly supports the proposals of this bill. To the public, this dental-research program offers the hope of bringing, in the future, immeasurable relief from suffering, and tremendous improvement of positive health, in return for expenditures that would be relatively trivial.

The bill proposes that there should be established a national institute of dental research, as a division of the National Institute of Health in the United States Public Health Service. The dental research that is already being done by the Public Health Service and other agencies, public or private, would be greatly increased under arrangements that assure coordination of the new and the old activities.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is to direct the new institute and its work. To assist him, there would be created a national advisory dental-research council, to include—in addition to the Surgeon General who will be chairman—six appointed members, at least four of whom shall be dentists, to be selected from leading authorities.

The institute is to conduct and aid research on the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions; to promote coordination of dental research to provide fellowships in the institute and make grants-in-aid to universities and other institutions; to secure the consultation services of other experts; and to cooperate with State health agencies. The institute is authorized to receive gifts from private sources.

The Surgeon General is required to make a full report to Congress each year. To give effect to this program, the bill proposes that Congress should authorize appropriations, up to a maximum of $1,000,000, to erect and equip a suitable building after the war; and up to a maximum of $730,000 a year to provide a budget to carry out the program.

This is a bill proposing that we should make a good investment in the future health of the people. It should be promptly enacted by Congress. Practicing dentists can make themselves and the voice of their patients heard. This apportunity should be taken advantage of for the greater health of the public. Write your Senators and the Congressman from your district today.

[From the Fortnightly Review of February 1945]

SENATOR MURRAY INTRODUCES A BILL FOR DENTAL RESEARCH—PROPOSES A NATIONAL INSTITUTE TO AID AND ENCOURAGE STUDIES OF DENTAL DISEASES

A bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States on January 10 by Senator JAMES MURRAY of Montana, who recently spoke before a joint meeting of the Illinois State and Chicago Dental Societies, to provide a dental research institute in the United States Public Health Service. It proposes that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service direct the new institute in its work. To assist him, there would be created a National Advisory Dental Research Council to include six appointed members, at least four of whom shall be dentists, selected from leading authorities.

SCOPE

The institute is to conduct and aid research on the cause, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and condiitions; to promote coordination of dental research; to provide fellowships in the institute and make grants-in-aid to universities and other institutions; to secure the consultation service of other experts and to cooperate with State health agencies. The institute is authorized to receive gifts from private sources and the Surgeon General is required to make annually a full report to Congress.

APPROPRIATION

It seeks authorization for an appropriation up to $1,000,000 to erect and equip a suitable building after the war and a maximum of $730,000 a year for a budget to carry on the program.

Senator MURRAY points out that modern dentistry is 100 years old and that in the course of the century dentistry has made tremendous progress. While American dentistry is second to none in the world, the dental profession and public-health leaders are not satisfied; they are anxious to speed up the progress of scientific knowledge so that much more can be accomplished in preventing dental diseases and in curing what cannot be prevented.

SENATOR COMMENTS

In support of his bill the Senator states: "Dental diseases and conditions, in damage to health and working power, now cost untold amounts every year, amounts which are probably to be measured in billions of dollars, to say nothing of human suffering and unhappiness. In addition, the people of the United States spend several hundred million dollars a year on dental services, even though they are receiving only a minor part of the dental care they really need. It is therefore good economy and good sense that we should

invest an amount equal to a very small fraction of these sums in learning more about the cause of dental diseases, in inventing new and better methods of treatment, and in improving the efficiency and economy of dental care.

"The dental profession of the United States strongly supports the proposals of this bill. I am sure that many other professional groups that are interested in the improvement of health will also support it as a much-needed and useful step. To the public this dental research program offers the hope of bringing, in the future, immeasurable relief from suffering, and tremendous improvement of positive health, in return for expenditures that would be relatively trivial.

"This is a bill proposing that we should make a good investment in the future health of the people. It should be promptly enacted by Congress."

[From the Journal of the American Dental Association of February 1945]

A NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR DENTAL RESEARCH

A bill has been introduced into the United States Senate authorizing the appropriation of $1,730,000 for the erection of a national institute for dental research and for fostering dental research by public and private agencies. The National Institute for Dental Research would be a part of the National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Md., which is under the direction of the United States Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency. Similar institutes have already been authorized for research on cancer and tuberculosis and one has recently been proposed for mental hygiene. The dental institute will be erected and equipped at a cost of $1,000,000, while the remainder of the funds authorized will be used to aid dental research by public and private agencies under the direction of the Surgeon General.

The bill was introduced by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana, who, on two previous occasions sponsored bills for dental research. The present bill exceeds both of those efforts in scope and importance. Senator MURRAY has again given evidence of his substantial interest in providing a scientific approach to the problem of improved national dental health.

The new research bill is the translation into legislation of the first part of the program that has been declared repeatedly by the American Dental Association to be the basis of a successful, long-range program for dental health in this country. At the last annual meeting of the house of delegates in Chicago, the committee on legislation was instructed to make all three points of the A. D. A. program effective through legislation. Dental health education and dental care, the remaining two points, will be treated in bills to be introduced at a later date.

The passage of this bill by Congress will insure a constructive beginning on a national program for dental health. Such legislation deserves the interest and constructive support of both the public and the profession.

[From the Illinois State Dental Journal of February 1945]

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MONTANA, ON THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH, AND TO AID AND ENCOURAGE DENTAL STUDIES THAT WILL ADVANCE THE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF DENTAL DISEASES

I have today introduced in the Senate of the United States a bill to provide for a dental research institute in the United States Public Health Service.

Dental diseases and conditions are the most common ailments of man. They cause untold suffering and harm. Selective-service examinations showed that defects of the teeth and other dental diseases and conditions were a most common cause of rejection even among the younger men.

In spite of the tremendous advances of science, the causes of dental decay are partly or largely unknown. The methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment for many dental conditions are still limited or uncertain in value.

Modern dentistry is just about one hundred years old. In the course of that century, dentistry has made tremendous progress. American dentistry is second to none in the world. Still our dental profession and our public health leaders are not satisfied. They are anxious to speed up the progress of scientific knowledge, so that dentists and other health professions will be able to do vastly more than they can do today in preventing dental diseases and curing what cannot be prevented. One of the most important and promising ways to progress is through well equipped research.

The dental profession of the United States strongly supports the proposals of this bill. I am sure that many other professional groups that are interested in the improvement of health will also support it as a much needed and useful step. To the public, this dental research program offers the hope of bringing, in the future, immeasurable relief from suffering, and tremendous improvement of positive health, in return for expenditures that would be relatively trivial.

My bill proposes that there should be established a National Institute of Dental Research, as a division of he National Institute of Health in the United States Public Health Service. The dental research that is already being done by the Public Health Service and other agencies, public or private, would be greatly increased under arrangements that assure coordination of the new and the old activities.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is to direct the new institute and its work. To assist him, there would be created a national advisory dental research council, to include—in addition to the Surgeon General who will be chairman—six appointed members—at least four of whom shall be dentists—to be selected from leading authorities.

The institute is to conduct and aid research on the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions; to promote coordination of dental research; to provide fellowships in the institute and make grants-in-aid to universities and other institutions; to secure the consultation services of other experts; and to cooperate with State health agencies.

The institute is authorized to receive gifts from private sources.

The Surgeon General is required to make a full report to Congress each year.

To give effect to this program, the bill proposes that Congress should authorize appropriations, up to a maximum of $1,000,000, to erect and equip a suitable building after the war; and up to a maximum of $730,000 a year to provide a budget to carry out the program.

Dental diseases and conditions, in damage to health and working power, now cost untold amounts every year, amounts which are probably to be measured in billions of dollars, to say nothing of human suffering and unhappiness. In addition, the people of the United States spend several hundred million dollars a year on dental services, even though they are receiving only a minor part of the dental care they really need. It is, therefore, good economy and good sense that we should invest an amount equal to a very small fraction of these sums in learning more about the causes of dental diseases, in inventing new and better methods of treatment, and in improving the efficiency and economy of dental care.

This is a bill proposing that we should make a good investment in the future health of the people. It should be promptly enacted by Congress.

[From the Pennsylvania State Dental Journal of February 1945]

A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, United States Senator from Montana, introduced a bill in the Senate on January 10, 1944, to establish a National Institute of Dental Research, and to aid and encourage dental studies that will advance the prevention and treatment of dental diseases.

The bill proposes that there should be established a National Institute of Dental Research, as a Division of the National Institute of Health in the United States Public Health Service. The dental research that is already being done by the Public Health Service and other agencies, public or private, would be greatly increased under arrangements that assure coordination of the new and the old activities.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is to direct the new institute and its work. To assist him, there would be created a National Advisory Dental Research Council, to include—in addition to the Surgeon General who will be chairman—six appointed members—at least four of whom shall be dentists—to be selected from leading authorities.

The institute is to conduct and aid research on the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions; to promote coordination of dental research; to provide fellowships in the institute and make grants-in-aid to universities and other institutions; to secure the consultation services of other experts; and to cooperate with State health agencies.

The institute is authorized to receive gifts from private sources.

The Surgeon General is required to make a full report to Congress each year.

To give effect to this program, the bill proposes that Congress should authorize appropriations, up to a maximum of $1,000,000, to erect and equip a suitable building after the war; and up to a maximum of $730,000 a year to provide a budget to carry out the program.

The outline of the bill in essence is in agreement with the first of the revised principles as recommended by the Council on Dental Health of the American Dental Association.

Important points to be noted in the bill are:

1. Of the 6 appointed members of this Advisory Dental Research Council, 4 shall be dentists selected from the leading authorities in the profession.

2. To promote coordination of dental research, it provides for fellowships in the institute and will make grant-in-aid to universities and other institutions and will cooperate with state health agencies.

3. The institute is authorized to receive gifts from private sources.

The passage of this bill is the impetus that dentistry needs. It can be the beginning of a tidal wave of endowments from private sources for dental research. Medicine has been the recipient of many millions of dollars and has been able to encourage research work in that field. Dentistry has lacked the required personnel of research workers because of the insecurity of financial assurance needed for devoting a life time to dental research.

To see this same Senator MURRAY, who was a cosponsor of the Wagner-Murray-Dingle bill, take cognizance that the over-all picture

of social assistance must begin with research is an encouraging sign and proves that through education and by personal contact with the profession the problems of dentistry can even permeate into the Congress of the United States.

Two Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 5 I made a speech in the House in which I discussed in general the problem of dollar-a-year men and specifically spoke about the connections of Mr. T. K. Quinn with the War Production Board.

Without further comment, I am asking consent out of consideration for Mr. Quinn to insert in the RECORD a copy of Mr. Quinn's letter to me commenting on my speech and my reply to him:

T. K. QUINN CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 14, 1945.

Mr. (H)ORACE JERRY VOORHIS,
Congressman, Twelfth California District, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have just seen your completely surprising attack on me spread over four pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 822, 823, 824, and 825, of the February 5 issue. You could hardly be further from the truth were you in Germany or Japan, where such vilification would be more appropriate.

In this first reply I suppose I should give you the benefit of the doubt and assume that you were simply taken in and used as a mouthpiece by more sinister job holders fighting for a place on the Government pay roll. The material for the misrepresentations you make was gathered in part by a disgruntled employee whom I could not conscientiously promote to a vacancy he coveted. His contemporary heads of sections were unanimously opposed to his promotion and confirmed my judgment of his incompetence now emphasized by the grudge he bears against me which you voice. He appears to seek a continuing Government job at the taxpayers' expense.

I was formerly in the business of advertising, industrial and public relations, as this letterhead indicates, but I lost my contacts and accounts during, and because of, my service in Washington. Months ago I planned the entirely different national merchandising business in which I am now wholly employed. A dozen trade and business papers have carried articles on it during the past 3 months. You could easily have found this out.

I have never, nor do I now, nor have I planned for 1 minute on capitalizing for profit my Washington experience which, of course, makes your whole calumnious attack a tissue of completely false abuse which can only be excused on the ground that you didn't know what you were saying.

You, sir, are now in the unenviable position of attacking, with a reputation-destroying attempt, a citizen who sacrificed his remunerative position of many years' standing to serve his country in wartime without compensation or expectation of reward; and of using your immunity and the Government time and printing press to publish false allegations. At the moment I can think of nothing meaner or more contemptible.

As to the condition of the War Production Drive Division when I assumed charge, or my work there, I shall not comment except to say that after a year and a half there were 1,800 labor-management committees, many of them inactive, when I took office, and over 5,000 live and active ones when I left a year and a half later. Donald Nelson who has the facts or the vice chairmen, William Batt, Clinton Golden, Joseph Keenan, or Highland Batcheller could have set you straight for the price of a telephone call. Instead you chose the counsel of a disgruntled subordinate. You are quite misinformed as to what was accomplished. I have letters from hundreds of war plants commending my work, as well as from many labor leaders and officials in Washington.

The forthcoming Labor and Management Committee Manual is replete with evidence.

There were no funds or approvals for publishing the record or documenting the experience and technique. So I undertook to do it myself fully anticipating a loss and a further contribution to labor and management teamwork, which is almost a religion with me. Here again you wantonly accuse me of trying to make a private profit notwithstanding my own published statement (printed in the book) that any income beyond costs will be donated to the American Red Cross.

My whole and sole interest in the manual is to get it published for the present and future good of the cause and harmonious industrial relations. We solicited orders in the L-M News at the time it was expected that the Government would print the manual, as it may very well have done. Several officials favored that course, as I did. It took me 2 months to get a decision which was finally negative.

Let me make to you this proposal—

If you will assume my costs of over $5,000, under audit, I'll turn over to you ever cent of the income from the book, provided you also will agree to absorb any loss and donate any possible profit to the Red Cross, as I have. You say you favor the labor and management committee program. Here is an opportunity to prove it. I never heard from you while we were developing the program.

You say with respect to my statement that the book would be sold on a nonprofit basis that you have "only my word" for that. You say that your speech was made not in criticism of an individual, but we have only your word for that You say that you have no animus against me, but we have only your word for that. If you believe the charges you have made, then you ought to feel the same animosity you should bear toward any common crook.

It seems inconceivable to you that there are patriots and dollar-a-year men who will contribute, if necessary, everything they have to their country—except their integrity and reputation—which you now seek in my case, so meanly to destroy.

Your whole speech is so full of errors, misstatements, and subtle implications that it would take pages to correct them.

The War Production Drive Division budget was cut in 1944. We had reduced the personnel under Budget orders to one-half by December 1944. There were to be further major cuts by March 1945, all planned. It was certainly intended to discontinue the division, as such, and as it should be, when the extreme production pressure could be lifted. There was a change of face with the German break-through in Belgium and many of those who had been predicting an early end of the war ran for cover and looked for scapegoats. I favored continuation of the Division without reduction until the war in Europe is over but was forced to accept reductions in the fall of 1944.

The L-M Weekly newspaper which you quote was established by me in September 1943. To get it started I had to underwrite the cost of the first two issues myself because of Government red tape. Perhaps only a dollar-a-year man would or could do that. The Government afterward paid the bill when even the unimaginative could see the value of the paper—after it was printed. However, I personally paid the first salary of the editor who helped make it successful and that cost has never been repaid to me nor do I expect it to be. My alternative was to accept an editor, under pressure, a less competent, political henchman, like the one you champion, which I refused to do.

Your statement that I tried to hire the employees and take over the drive is entirely false and senseless. I did employ one man, when we were required to reduce the personnel, to come with me in my new business as an accountant and analyist. Neither of us has ever done any labor-management work since his employment except to produce the book.

I could go on, but perhaps you have read enough. What I expect and hope from you is a full retraction. I am not unused to the methods of publicity or too poor to see that every official, war plant, and newspaper in the country gets all the facts. Still I prefer to believe that after further investigation which you should have made before your attack, you will be man enough to admit your error and withdraw your completely false allegations.

Very truly yours,

T. K. QUINN.

MARCH 12, 1945.

Mr. T. K. QUINN,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. QUINN: I am in receipt of your letter of February 14 commenting upon my speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5 (in which I discussed the work of the war-production drive of the War Production Board and your connections therewith.

In the first place, I can assure you that the information which I received did not come from any "disgruntled employee," as your letter indicates. Quite the contrary is the truth. Furthermore, when you suggest that I should have checked the matters discussed with officials of the War Production Board, I am able to tell you that I did so before the speech was made and that I should not have made the speech otherwise.

The basic difference between us seems to be your opinion that the War Production Drive should be discontinued as soon as possible, whereas I believe that the work of Government in promoting cooperative relationships between management and labor should be continued as vigorously as possible into the indefinite future. A careful reading of my speech will show, I am confident, that I did not at any point attempt to judge the motives which prompted your action, and I repeat the statement made in the speech that I have no animus toward you or any other individual but that I do believe the dollar-a-year system is a serious mistake of Government policy; that I have believed this for a long time; that I felt that certain circumstances connected with your relationship with the Government in that capacity illustrated its weakness.

I should like to point out that in my speech where I commended the work of the war-production drive I made no exception of the period during which you were in charge of it. I believe that the drive was, generally speaking, a success all the way through, both during the period when you were in charge of it and before and after it.

You will not find in my speech criticism, of the work which was done by yourself while you were head of this drive excepting such criticism as relates first to your announcement on your own personal stationery while you were still an official of the drive to the effect that the drive was going to be discontinued and excepting again the rather close

relationship between your work as head of this drive and the publishing of the booklet which your company is now carrying on.

My feeling about these matters is not limited to the War Production Board or to dollar-a-year men. I enclose copy of the resolution which I have introduced in the House for an investigation of the influences of former employees of the Government upon decisions of another department.

It is true I have been definitely under the impression that your company was continuing with the work of advertising and performing services in the field of industrial relations and the letterhead upon which you wrote your letter to me tended to bear that out.

I did not state in my speech that you were making a profit out of the sale of the book. I did state that your company was a profit-making enterprise and that it was selling the book which contained the material developed by a Government agency with which you were formerly connected. I have no means of knowing whether on this particular book any profit is being made. But you tell me no profit is being made on it, and I am perfectly willing to take your word for it. The War Production Board assures me that all the material contained in that book is available at no cost to anyone in the ranks of industry or labor who may desire it.

Your action in underwriting the cost of the issues of the Labor-Management weekly newspapers is certainly to be commended and I am very glad to do so herewith. I am glad you were reimbursed and did not have to sustain personal loss.

I still believe that it was not right for you while still an official of the War Production Board and in your capacity as a private businessman either to indicate that the War Production drive was going to be terminated or to indicate that the materials made available as the result of that drive would be sold whether at a profit or otherwise by your own company.

In one respect at least I do not blame you for being angry. The reason I say this is because the same sort of thing has happened in a good many other cases. There are unfortunately the cases of lawyers formerly employed by the Government who have subsequently made a very lucrative business out of representing private clients before Government agencies, thus capitalizing upon their governmental experience and the cases of other dollar-a-year men who have acted in similar fashion. In other words, the points wherein I criticized your action are no doubt equally applicable in other instances. But this only reinforces the reasons which I had for trying to point out the weaknesses of the dollar-a-year system.

If you want me to do so I stand ready to insert your letter to me of February 14 together with this reply of mine in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is certainly not my desire and never has been to put you in any position of not having an opportunity to make reply through the columns of the RECORD in which my original speech appeared.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WDRC Sunday, March 18, 1945:

There is a great deal of speculation in Washington these days about what will come out of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco. Although it is recognized that the delegates have a tremendous task before them, the general feeling is that the prospects are good for setting up the framework of a world security council.

The Conference is being widely discussed not only by statesmen, diplomats, and politicians, but by the peoples of all the United Nations who are wondering whether it will result in a practicable, workable international organization, capable of solving the many complex problems of the peace. Men and women throughout the world are waiting to hear what the plans are with regard to national security and economic cooperation.

But above all, the peoples of war-town Europe and Asia are anxious to learn what measures will be taken to safeguard the personal freedoms of the common man. For there is a mounting conviction that the protection of basic human rights must be the foundation of any system of global law and order; that unless the United Nations jointly undertake to guarantee individual liberty, all our planning will be powerless to prevent another war.

Many people who have been giving serious thought to the post-war period have come to this conclusion: that the future international organization must not only iron out complex problems of relationships between different countries, but must also provide legal guaranties of freedom of worship, speech, and assembly, and equal justice under the law, for all people in every country of the world.

John W. Davis, nominee for President in 1924, on behalf of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, called for machinery that would provide for a commission on human rights. President Roosevelt stressed the essential place of human rights when he rallied the world to the Four Freedoms as a common goal.

Commander Stassen in his Nation-wide radio address of March 7 gave a very interesting statement of how progress in this field might be made. He said, "The beginning may be very small, but even if we started with the enactment of one law, a law that no country, in time of peace, shall execute a human being without just trial, it would be a significant step. We sometimes fail to realize that there is no such world law today. The Nazi stormtroopers and Gestapo who dragged civilians from their houses in Germany and summarily shot them were violating every moral code we know of but were not violating any international law because there is none to protect a human being within a nation. We know full well that Nazi aggression actually started, not when Hitler marched across his borders, but rather when he ruthlessly trampled the rights of men within Germany. The rights of freedom of worship, of fair trial, of freedom of speech and press, the right of the worker to organize, and the prevention of discrimination should be developed."

With that purpose in mind, 150 distinguished Americans from all walks of life, have signed a document urging the United Nations to create a permanent Commission on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. Their statement of purposes expresses the belief, shared by all far-sighted Americans, that the struggle for human rights and the struggle for peace are two sides of the same coin.

This document says in part: "At Dumbarton Oaks the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China took a momentous step in the age-long struggle for liberty by proposing to give international sanction to human rights. They proclaimed that in order to create 'conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations' there must be international action to 'promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.' Thus they recognized that the violation of human rights anywhere may be a threat to world peace everywhere. To safeguard these rights they open the way for a permanent agency within the coming world organization."

Establishment of such an agency would be a tremendous step forward toward the goal of freedom for all, regardless of race, nationality or religious faith. And equally important, it would help up avoid disastrous errors of the past, when we failed to recognize, until too late, that attacks upon the rights of individuals or groups within a country were actually the first steps toward foreign aggression and war.

None of us enjoy recalling our mistakes. Such reminders are often painful, but they can serve as guides to future action. So I want to go back for a moment, to the days when we Americans thought we could isolate ourselves from events beyond our own borders. When fascism came to Italy, we did not see that it was any affair of ours. Besides, Mussolini made the trains run on time, and the beggars were cleaned out of the streets of Rome. Bombs dropping on the defenseless people of Ethiopia didn't leave huge craters in the streets of Hartford or Bridgeport.

And when a wild-eyed fanatic from a beer hall in Munich became Chancelor of Germany, it created very little stir in America. When Hitler's storm troopers attacked innocent Jews, threw priests and ministers into concentration camps, and broke up trade-union meetings, many of us were shocked; but still we said that events in Germany were the business of the German people and no concern of ours. Finally, however, when the Nazis and Fascists, firmly entrenched at home, started marching toward world conquest, we began to realize the reckless folly of our shortsightedness. By that time, Hitler had seized the Rhineland, Austria, and Czechoslovakia; Albania and Greece had fallen, and the invasion of Poland was launched.

The freedom-loving peoples finally shook themselves free of appeasement and hesitation, and joined hands in a world-wide unity which slowly but surely turned the tide. Today, the enemy is being pounded from all sides, with no hope of salvation.

Thus, Hitler gave us an object lesson, and we learned one truth we will never forget—that when the oppression of one group is allowed to go unchallenged, the rights of all are in danger.

Protecting the rights of others, therefore, is no longer a matter of altruism, but of hard-headed, practical self-interest. We dare not return to the old system where every nation is a law unto itself in the treatment of its citizens. Just as nations must be safeguarded against aggressions by other States, so must the people within each country be assured of international defense against arbitrary violation of their basic human rights.

In a sense, this is not a new concept. It is in fact, a logical advance in the march toward freedom which began in a meadow at Runnymede, when King John of England signed the Magna Carta over 700 years ago. Let's face the facts of the changing times. The airplane, the radio, and other marvels of modern science have made our world very small. As a result, nations have become so dependent on each other that the fate of their citizens can no longer be considered a domestic concern.

The job of setting the world in order is a slow and laborious one, but we have a great opportunity to make a start in that direction. The creation of a commission on human rights will not automatically end injustice

and the menace of aggression, but it will provide us with the machinery whereby such evils may eventually be eliminated.

Its success will depend in great measure upon our determination to support such an agency. The United Nations must be prepared to take steps against power-hungry leaders in any country who stir up racial and religious prejudice and make scapegoats of minorities as a device to gain tyrannical control.

We can do it if we will. The plain people of the world, when they get together, are an irresistible force. That has been proven in the desperate crisis of war. But the problems of peace require of us an equal measure of devotion. If only we can go on in the spirit of comradeship, freely discussing and solving any differences which may arise between us, subordinating selfish national and personal interests to the need for unity, we can secure the goals for which at this very moment American boys are fighting and dying on distant battlefields.

The forces of reaction and bigotry will try to undermine our efforts. Reliable reports indicate that the Nazis are making their own post-war plans. In preparation for inevitable military defeat, they have already set up an underground propaganda network on an international scale. Their agents will try to sabotage cooperation between the democracies, and deprive the new world organization of any unified backing.

It is not always easy to spot these enemies, but we have the experience of the past to help us. We must be on guard against those who are contemptuous of human rights. At San Francisco we can lay out blueprints to safeguard these rights. And if the people continue to stand together in defense of liberty for all, we may at last be opening the door to peace and universal justice.

Representation at Peace Table of Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN: Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I include the following resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut:

Resolution memorializing Congress concerning representation at the peace table of members of the armed forces.

Whereas the American soldiers have fought with unequaled courage, valor, and bravery, moving always forward from victory to victory, spilling their very lifeblood that our cherished American ideals might not perish: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress is petitioned to take suitable action to provide that the 12,000,000 men of the armed forces be represented at the peace conference, that there be selected one member from the personnel of the enlisted men of the Army, one from the Navy, one from the Air Force, one from the Marine Corps, and one from the merchant marine, to have their part in the deliberations for the peace of the world, and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the house and senate are directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each of the Connecticut Members of Congress.

Asking Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a short visit to my district. The people there feel, just as I find people everywhere feel, that the war in Europe is fast approaching decisive military action that must bring it to a reasonably early end. Press and radio reports have quoted high authority as placing the end of the European war at varying dates, none of which go beyond July. Whether these estimates be right or wrong, I suppose no layman should say. Nevertheless, the people here at home, the parents and wives and families of the men doing the fighting, the man in the street, the clerk in the store, the farmer behind the plow, the worker in the industrial plant; the average American who is working overtime to help get the job done, who is enduring food shortages, being regulated by bureaucrats and wild-eyed theorists; Mr. John Q. Public who is doing the work, supplying the know-how, and paying the taxes, has a right to wonder. He is willing to make any necessary sacrifice but he is beginning to have some pertinent thoughts that rouse uneasiness in his mind. He has been told that the Pacific war has taken only 40 percent of the Nation's war effort, obviously the other 60 percent is being exerted in the European theater. Can the Japanese war be expected to increase two and one-half times in tempo? Of course not. Distances and shipping facilities alone would preclude that. Military men do not expect it. So why should not the American people be a bit skeptical of the continued pressure and drives for further regulation and regimentation? Why should not he expect a reasonable return of civilian goods to the market?

The truth of the matter is that he does expect it. He feels that he is being badly treated and possibly deceived. He has vivid recollections of the cancelation of ration points by O. P. A. less than 3 months ago and feels that by this action his Government broke faith. He feels that the Government, his Government of which he is supposed to be the master, has reversed the normal procedure of government serving the people and has contemptuously attempted to make the people the servants and slaves of the government and its bureaucrats. He believes in his right to constitutional democratic government. He believes in free speech and will deny it to no one, but he also believes it should be honest speech. He knows he has been the victim of much propaganda that was Government inspired. Naturally he is just a bit doubtful just now and with General Ayres and the Washington Post is asking why. I offer the editorial below. It speaks for itself:

ASKING WHY

Gen. Leonard P. Ayres, well known business analyst for the Cleveland Trust Co., considers it a "curious anomaly that while we are watching one of our wars draw toward its end, we are acting as though we were convinced that both of them were going to continue indefinitely." It is, indeed, hard for the average civilian to understand why production of goods for civilian use should actually be cut down and munitions orders be stepped up, with cut-backs in the offing as the close of the war in Europe approaches. For we cannot possibly need as much for the conduct of one war as for two. And in any case there are limits to the quantity of materials and supplies that can be moved out of the country into the Pacific areas.

No really satisfactory explanations have been given for the increased demands of the armed forces, the clamor for additional manpower when labor is known to be inefficiently utilized, and the virtual abandonment of spot reconversion plans. There is little open complaining but an undercurrent of doubt and dissatisfaction is making itself evident in thinly veiled criticism of the erratic programming of the armed services and the consequent interruption to a steady flow of war materials and essential supplies. A general uneasiness among war workers is also a sign that the public simply does not give credence to vague suggestions that the war in the Pacific will engage our energies and resources so fully as to preclude substantial cut-backs in the war program after the fall of Germany.

Finally, comments such as those voiced by the cautious General Ayres are an indication that the home front is doubtful whether all the sacrifices now being demanded of civilians are really necessary or justify extra deprivations imposed by the ultra caution of those made wary by past mistakes of underestimate.

William Jennings Bryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, this is the birthday of William Jennings Bryan. Far be it from me to make any attempt to pay proper tribute to this great man. Suffice it to say that because of his interest in the common man he was and is known as the Great Commoner. It was an honor to Florida that Williams Jennings Bryan was a citizen of our State. Our beloved chaplain, the Rev. James Shera Montgomery, known in his newspaper days as "Gummy," and loved by every Member of this House, pays this tribute to William Jennings Bryan:

I believe that America has a Providence. Things do not come to pass in the founding of any country just by chance. So we revert to our political history for a moment and call to mind that outstanding character in our political and religious life, William Jennings Bryan. Disregarding the controversy of that era, it must be concluded that there was an unseeing hand shaping and directing the destiny of our country. I knew Mr. Bryan personally. One Sunday morning

in Calvary Methodist Church in this city, while I was its pastor, Mr. Bryan preached for me and in his introductory words he commended me to the chaplaincy of the House of Representatives. He was assuredly and truly called the Great Commoner. His heart and thought were ever in the interest of the common man. He was the forerunner of a new era which more and more is bearing a fine fruition. He was a prophet and a preacher of righteousness. He lived on a very high political plane but he also lived devotedly on a very high level of Christian life and character. I regard him as one of the outstanding churchmen, not only of his day but of our day. It would be wise indeed for this young generation to know more and more of this great soul who was the teacher and preacher of political and Christian rightecusness.

Radio Address of Lothrop Stoddard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Lothrop Stoddard, delivered March 18, 1945:

On both sides of the world the war grinds bloodily on toward an eventual conclusion which is almost mathematically certain, even though the timing cannot accurately be foretold. Under such circumstances, the interest of far-sighted persons tends increasingly toward the shaping of the post-war future. Such thinking is quickened by the imminence of the San Francisco Conference, now less than 6 weeks away, whose outcome will go far to determine the nature of the post-war period. But that outcome will, in turn, depend to a considerable degree on the state of public opinion, especially here in the United States. Unfortunately this country seems to be heading into a serious domestic crisis which coincides with an equally serious diplomatic crisis involving the very essence of the Yalta agreement between Soviet Russia and its western allies. I shall defer discussion of the foreign scene until the outcome of current events in Romania and elsewhere make clearer the moot question of Moscow's intentions and good faith. This Sunday I propose to survey the domestic situation in its relation to foreign affairs. For it would seem obvious that if our domestic economy continues to deteriorate at its present rapid rate, public opinion will tend to react violently against the monumental commitments and contingent sacrifices which, under the international programs elaborated at Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, and Mexico City, the United States is supposed to assume. From the purely psychological aspect, the inherent validity or invalidity of those programs is of secondary importance. The primary question is, What will be the national state of mind if a coincidence of domestic and foreign crises this spring raises a wave of popular antagonism and disiliusionment, with its immediate reaction upon Congress, and even upon the Executive branch of Government.

The complex difficulties under which we labor are of long standing. They began when our original role under lend-lease as the pseudoneutral "arsenal of the democracies" was expanded into that of a belligerent in a gigantic two-front war compounded with enormously intensified lend-lease efforts, and still later further complicated by prospective post-war commitments on a prodigious scale. Conservative economists have long been warning that only the wisest and most comprehensive planning could enable even so strong and wealthy a country as the United States to keep up so gruelling a pace and carry so heavy a load. But every well-informed person knows that our wartime economy has evolved largely through improvisation, compromise, the pulling and hauling of pressure groups, and partisan politics. The result has been an enormous amount of waste, extravagance, mismanagement, slackness, profiteering, and downright corruption. And the bitterest fruits of those unwholesome growths have been, for the average citizen, the unending shortages and uncertainties which do so much to make life hard and exasperating—the more so as many of them appear to be either partially or mainly avoidable.

To discuss or even to catalog the shortcomings of our wartime economy would be profitless, since they are all too well known to each of my radio listeners. It will suffice to discuss briefly the current meat crisis, which threatens to be not merely a bad shortage but an actual famine. The sad story was succinctly told in a United Press dispatch of last Tuesday from Chicago, the meat-packing center of the country. It reads:

"The worst meat shortage since the start of the war has cleaned out butchers' counters from one end of the United States to the other. A United Press survey tonight revealed that in nearly every area of the country the better grades of meat have disappeared. Producers, wholesalers, and retailers agreed gloomily that months may elapse before these meats again will be on the counter. A familiar spiral of events revealed itself in the meat picture. Customers thwarted in their hunt for fresh meat swamped retailers with demands for fish. As fish became scarce under the impact of the new customer pressure, the scramble switched to poultry. That in turn led to a War Food Administration order establishing priorities for poultry supplies. In places where a housewife could still find some meat, it was mainly cold cuts and canned or luncheon meats. Runs on supplies of these, forecasting their early disappearance, were reported. * * * The Meat Trade Institute reported that less than 5,000,000 pounds of meat a week was available for home use, compared with a normal consumption of 20,000,000 pounds. The institute said the situation had been aggravated by the worst black market in the country. It estimated that 90 percent of meat in New York City was moving into retail channels at above-ceiling prices. Even at Dallas, Tex., in the heart of the cattle country, it was reported that throughout southwest areas the shortage was unprecedented. The shortage has hit civilians dining out just as it has home diners. Quick-lunch stands are closing everywhere, as are barbecue pits and hamburger shops."

The impending meat famine is, of course, merely the most acute of a long series, most of which tend to get worse rather than better. How far can they be explained by the stock alibis of military needs, increased civilian consumption, labor shortages, and lend-lease shipments abroad? Before going too far into that maze of arguments, suppose we take a look across our northern border and see how our good neighbors the Canadians manage their national housekeeping. Let me quote some excerpts from a recent series of articles by an American journalist who is making an investigatory trip through the Dominion. Writes Willard Edwards:

"The cream is thicker, once you cross the border into Canada. That's just one of the scores of little items which appeal to the American visitor who has been fretting under our wartime bans and restrictions. The Dominion has not found it necessary to invoke those limitations on living, even though it has been formally at war 2 years longer than the United States. It looks with mild amusement, tinged with scorn, upon what it views as hysteria which has prompted a midnight curfew, abolition of conventions and horse racing, curbs on sports, limitation of outdoor electric displays, and rationing of a great variety of commodities. * * * There are only three edibles rationed in Canada—butter, sugar, and preserves. Butter rationing is a joke by comparison with the American system, half a pound being allowed per week for each person in the family. Few Canadians use all the butter coupons given them. Restaurants parcel out two lumps of sugar for each cup of coffee. Coupon allowances for preserves and jams are generous.

"There is a nostalgic pleasure in wandering through a Canadian meat market, gazing on a vast arrangement of beef, lamb, pork, chickens, turkeys, ducks, and cheese—all available without a ration book. On grocery store shelves are ration-free cans of peaches and pineapples (80 blue points in the United States) and bottles of catsup, canned milk and other canned goods upon which large ration point values have been set in the United States. Liquor is practically the only commodity now easier to obtain at home. But you can step into a Canadian cigar store and buy a dozen packs of cigarettes if you so desire. You can sit in a shoe store while a deferential salesman displays a wide variety of handsome brogans for your approval at from $6 up, according to your pocketbook. No limitations on purchases. No coupons. Food prices in public restaurants are generally lower and the portions more generous. A thick sirloin steak in a leading hotel costs $1.75. A club sandwich, crammed with bacon and slices of chicken, was 60 cents. In a cheap but clean restaurant, a plate lunch of pork chops, fried potatoes, salad and coffee cost an incredible 30 cents. Rich ice cream is plentiful. There's no rationing of fuel oil. New home construction is widespread—enough to care for the gain in population."

Well, that's the general picture across our northern border. How have the Canadians done it, despite the fact that the Dominion has been in the war 2 years longer than we and has unquestionably done as much, if not more, than we have in every branch of the war effort, in proportion to its percentage of population? The basic answer is quite simple. Early in the war, Canada established a scientifically worked-out system of overhead war controls, playing no class or sectional favorites and holding the balance even between industry, business, labor, and agriculture. The result has been stable price levels, virtually no shortages, and a smoothness of everyday living which should make us green with envy.

Now, with all allowances which may be made for differentials between Canada and the United States, something must be very wrong with the picture here when a new super agency headed by War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes has had to be hastily set up to investigate and, if possible, end chaotic conditions which threaten our domestic economy and our war effort. The howls which have at once arisen from every department threatened with curtailments testify to the magnitude of our commitments, especially abroad, and I cannot think that the President has clarified the situation by his assertion that the American people will have further to tighten their belts, speaking as he did before any evidence had been adduced as to how much of the trouble is due to inefficiency, waste, or overlapping, uncoordinated demands of governmental agencies. As conditions get harder, the American public is going to demand both factual explanations and remedial action before they are in a mood either to tighten their belts now or promise to keep them tightened after the fighting stops.

The example of Canada today is bound to make a deepening impression on American public opinion, just as the Dominion's far wiser handling of the liquor problem did so much to hasten the abandonment of our ignoble experiment. A people will put up with a great deal up to a certain point. Then, even a relatively slight worsening of a bad situation may act as a sort of detonating incident, precipitating a major change in the public temper out of all seeming relation to its proximate cause. Unless I am much mistaken, the American people are about ripe for such a psychological shift, and drastic remedial action regarding our domestic economy can alone avert it. The effect of a sharply changed attitude of mind would inevitably be reflected in the popular attitude toward foreign as well as domestic problems. In addition, the simultaneous impact of a diplomatic crisis over Rumania and other points of difference between Soviet Russia and the western signatories of the Yalta agreement would both compound and intensify the temper of American public opinion.

All this is one important background factor against the coming San Francisco Conference which many foreign commentators overlook, but which I believe should be closely watched and carefully kept in mind.

Democracy in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting copy af a questionnaire which on January 23, 1945, I attempted to place in the hands of as many citizens of my district as possible. I fully realize it was humanly impossible to secure the opinions of all of my constituents, but believe the replies received fully cover the majority of the opinions.

I am also including an article that appeared in the Columbus Dispatch on March 11, 1945. The results obtained, as set forth in this article prove to me that the people, which it is my honor to represent, are anxious to express their views on issues before Congress for consideration. As long as I am in Congress, it will be my aim to endeavor to learn the opinions of my constituents and will always welcome their suggestions. I am one, Mr. Speaker, who firmly believes that the people back home are a part, and want to remain a part, of our National Government.

QUESTIONNAIRE

From Hon. J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Member of Congress, Seventeenth Ohio District:

(1) Do you favor a national work-service law (giving authority to the Director of War Mobilization to determine where you shall work—refusal of which would be civilian penalty)?
Yes _____. No _____.
Remarks:

(2) Do you favor drafting of nurses?
Yes _____. No _____.
Remarks:

(3) Do you favor drafting the IV-F's?
Yes _____. No _____.
Remarks:

(4) Should IV-F's be given full veteran benefits?
Yes _____. No _____.
Remarks:

(5) Do you favor compulsory peacetime military training?
Yes _____. No _____.
Remarks:

(6) Should compulsory peacetime military training be devoted solely to military, or should it include courses in educational, social, and religious subjects—the type of training the National Youth Administration previously gave?
Yes _____. No _____.
Remarks:

(7) Do you favor United States becoming a member of a world peace organization?
Yes _____. No _____.
Remarks:

(8) Would you favor No. 7 if Russia and England refused to apply the principles of the Atlantic Charter to the small nations (not allow them to become active members of a world league)?
Yes _____. No _____.
Remarks:

(9) Do you favor Senator VANDENBERG'S plan of beginning a league now before the war is ended?
Yes _____. No _____.
Remarks:

Signature _____.
Address _____.
Occupation _____.
Date _____.

Please write on the back of this page your comments on what the peace proposal should contain and how the Axis nations should be governed.

Please return to 1534 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch of March 11, 1945]

WASHINGTON, March 10.—What 725 citizens in the Seventeenth Ohio District think of a world peace organization, peacetime military training, drafting of nurses, and other momentous questions was reported today by Representative J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of West Lafayette, in a tabulation of answers to questionnaires he sent out recently.

The Seventeenth District comprises Ashland, Richland, Coshocton, Delaware, Licking, and Knox Counties.

This is the third year that he has taken this means of sounding out his constituents on public questions, and he received the greatest response of all. The first year there were only 300 replies to 1,200 questionnaires; last year, 500; and this year, 725 out of 1,200.

So successful has this method become, Congressman MCGREGOR reports, that some 15 or 20 other Congressmen are thinking of trying it out on their districts. He has had a number call on him this year to request copies of his questions.

Replies were received from Democrats and Republicans, ministers, lawyers, beauty-parlor operators, blacksmiths, mechanics, school teachers, housewives, etc. In addition, the questions were discussed at civic clubs and lodge meetings, and answers tabulated.

One garageman wrote the Congressman:

"This paper was handed to me by a friend of mine, and it being the first time I have known of a Representative of the people at Washington being interested enough in the people back home to go to the trouble to try to find out what they wanted in the way of new laws, I thought I should take time to answer it."

So did the head of a $30,000,000 concern, a noted author, an Army officer now on duty in another State.

"When one gets answers like this," said MCGREGOR, "I feel that one is getting the real views of the people, not answers from pressure groups."

He compiled not only answers from the total but replies according to special types or occupations of voters.

Results were as follows:

A total of 559 voters opposed a national work service law which would have the authority to determine where they would work and include a civilian penalty for refusal. There were 159 favoring this. Farmers for the most part were opposed to this, voting 68 to 20. Labor groups opposed it 54 to 11; housewives, 42 to 12; businessmen, 110 to 25; professional people, 67 to 38; and attendants at club meetings, 145 to 95.

The vote opposing the draft of nurses stood 394 to 311. Farmers favored this 45 to 40 but labor opposed the draft of women 45 to 24. Housewives opposed it 31 to 25, businessmen 70 to 66, and professional people 67 to 38. Club members on the other hand favored it 132 to 111.

There was a vote of 419 to 265 in favor of drafting the IV-F's. Farmers favored this by a narrow margin of 49 to 37. Labor voted for this 35 to 25, housewives by a like margin of 33 to 23, businessmen by a somewhat wider margin of 78 to 58, professional people by a vote of 63 to 38 and club members by the wide margin of 152 to 88.

To the question whether IV-F's should be given full veteran benefits, 388 voted for this to 271 opposed. Farmers said "no" by a vote of 44 to 36; labor, by the difference of 3 votes, 30 against and 27 for; housewives said "yes," 28 to 25; while businessmen said "no" by 71 to 57; and professional people "no," 54 to 46. Club members, however, voted for giving the IV-F's full benefits, 204 to 46.

To the question: Do you favor compulsory peacetime military training? 387 said "no" and 327 "yes." Votes by groups on this question were, farmers, 77 opposed, 27 for; labor, opposed, 56 to 27; housewives, opposed, 49 to 26; businessmen, for, 81 to 57; professional, for, 59 to 45; club members for, 185 to 54.

Should compulsory military training include educational, social, and religious subjects, that is, the type of training the National Youth Administration gave? To this 385 said "yes" and 205 "no." Farmers were almost evenly divided on the matter; businessmen favored it 76 to 35; professional men voted for it 56 to 30; and club members endorsed it 151 to 53 votes.

Constituents voted overwhelmingly in favor of the United States becoming a member of a world peace organization. Totals stood 655 for to 48 against. Businessmen registering the most nos on this, 17 no and 120 for. Farmers voted 83 to 2 for it; labor, 52 to 10; housewives, 55 to 2; and professional people, 29 to 9; and club members, 226 to 10.

The vote was opposed, however, when MCGREGOR asked if his district would favor United States entry into a world peace organization if Russia and England refused to apply the Atlantic Charter principles to small nations, not allowing them to become active members of a world league.

To this, a total of 406 voters said no and 259, yes. Farmers as a group said they would be opposed to United States membership in such an organization under these circumstances. They voted 51 to 28. Labor taking a similar view voted 39 to 14; housweives, 40 to 11; businessmen, 82 to 48, and club members, 136 to 92. However, professional people voted in favor of United States membership, regardless, by a vote of 59 to 46.

A total of 519 Ohioans in the Seventh district favored Senator VANDENBERG'S plan of beginning a league now before the war is ended, as compared with 160 opposed. Farmers voted 69 to 16 for this; labor, 40 to 20; housewives, 45 to 4; businessmen, 112 to 19; professional people, 76 to 21; and club members, 167 to 51.

In addition to his poll, MCGREGOR said he would continue his practice of meeting constituents at various courthouses in his district during the summer at which time dis-

cussions on these questions will continue. He remains at each courthouse 2 days to contact any persons interested in seeing him on any matter.

Wisconsin and Iowa Join Arkansas in Passage of Rescinding Resolution on Former Endorsement of "Twenty-second Amendment"—Other States on Road to Joining Arkansas, Wisconsin, and Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the truth will out. The activities of the Gannett - Pettingill - McClure - Rumley syndicate are backfiring in their faces. With pious mein, a proponent of the proposed "twenty-second amendment" had the audacity to state that their ambition was to bring their proposed amendment to the people so that the people could decide whether to accept or reject it. The proponent added that the Committee for Constitutional Government wanted the proposed amendment submitted to the Nation for discussion and cation "on its merits." He further stated that Congress should discontinue "suppressing" the proposal.

Well, the proponents are being taken at their word. The proposed amendment is being submitted to the Nation—not only to that selected segment of the population whom they would prefer to have pass judgment, but the whole Nation, the people as a whole, as a result of all the free publicity which I have been more than glad to contribute to the cause. To this has been added the free publicity that many, many educators, officials of national and local organizations, State legislators, radio commentators, newspapermen, and others, who are also glad to contribute toward the national discussion which the Committee for Constitutional Government declares it wants.

The Committee for Constitutional Government has as its goal the dissemination of over 20,000,000 pieces of literature during the year 1945.

I shall do my bit to see that the real truth, and not just this misleading propaganda, reaches the recipients of their leaflets and other American citizens. With the splendid cooperation of those who have joined in this fight, we will reach as many citizens as we can and we will see what judgment the Nation will pass on the so-called twenty-second amendment.

The Gannett proposal is now being studied on its merits for the first time and appropriate action is already being taken by some of the States—States which in the past several years had put their too hasty stamp of approval on the amendment by passing resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of proposing that the Committee for Constitutional Government's amendment be added to our Constitution and the sixteenth amendment repealed.

Now let us see what actions are already being taken after due consideration and discussion of the proposed amendment. Following are some reports of actions taken since January 1, 1945:

ARKANSAS

I have told you that the State of Arkansas was the first to take its name off the list of States which had endorsed the resolution. The legislators of that State are to be commended for their willingness and courage to admit an error and to do the people of their State the justice of rectifying that error.

In the rescinding resolution adopted by those legislators, we find the following very significant words:

The purport of this resolution (the former endorsing resolution) was misunderstood by various members of the house and senate.

WISCONSIN

I am happy to inform you that the State of Wisconsin has joined the State of Arkansas in passing a rescinding resolution. I have a letter, dated February 8, 1945, from a member of the Wisconsin Legislature, from which I quote:

In the 1943 session of the Wisconsin Legislature a joint resolution was passed calling for an amending of the Federal Constitution limiting taxes to 25 percent. A copy of your speech regarding this matter which was made in the House last year very startlingly pointed out my error in supporting this legislation. There is now pending in this session of the legislature a joint resolution rescinding our previous action. I wonder if at this time you could forward me another copy and in brief some other material to support the passage of this new resolution.

And now I am in receipt of information announcing that this rescinding resolution has passed. I quote from this letter:

You will probably be interested to learn that Wisconsin has rescinded the action of the 1943 legislature, which had previously memorialized Congress to call a convention relative to the limitation on taxes imposed by Congress. I am enclosing herewith a copy of Joint Resolution 11A. This was unanimously adopted by the assembly on February 14 (by a vote of 90 to 0) and was concurred in by the senate on February 20 without a roll-call vote. It is my understanding that the action in the senate was unanimous, although I am not positive of this.

Another State has had the opportunity to discuss the proposed amendment on its merits—and Wisconsin has acted accordingly.

IOWA

I am also very pleased to advise you that Iowa has joined Arkansas and Wisconsin in repealing the former endorsing action it had taken.

The endorsing resolution—House Concurrent Resolution No. 15—was passed in 1941 by the Forty-ninth General Assembly of Iowa.

However, a rescinding resolution—House Concurrent Resolution No. 9—was introduced on January 23 of this year by 12 members of Iowa's House.

On February 14 a letter was written to me by one of the sponsors which informed me "enclosed you will find House Concurrent Resolution No. 9 which passed the house this morning unanimously."

And now I am in receipt of a letter from this same member which was written on March 15, from which I quote:

This is with reference to recent communication regarding House Concurrent Resolution No. 9, which passed the Senate March 14. Enclosed you will find Senate Journal of March 14; note on pages 635 and 636 the results. It is a victory for Iowa.

SCORE GOING BACKWARD—NOT FORWARD

I wonder if Mr. Gannett will give much space in his papers to that bit of news or whether Mr. Pettengill will mention it in his propaganda leaflets which he so busily turns out for the Committee for Constitutional Government. I wonder if these propaganda leaflets will still continue to proclaim that 17—in some instances proponents claim even 18—States have endorsed its proposal or whether they will come out and admit that their score is going backward instead of forward.

To my knowledge, they can now lay claim to only 14 endorsing resolutions. If I am mistaken, I should very much appreciate being so advised and advised where I am in error.

My records indicate that the following 17 States have passed endorsing resolutions at any time: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. From this list of 17 States we can cross off Arkansas, bringing the score down to 16; next we can cross off Wisconsin, the score going down to 15; and now as a result of Iowa's rescinding resolution, we can cross off another, leaving 14 which the proponents can claim.

Now I would like to pass on to you information which has been sent me about the action of some of these 14 States indicating that they, too, are on the road to refuting their former endorsement. The legislators and citizens of these States are finding out the true motives of the men behind the Committee for Constitutional Government, have analyzed their activities, and have discovered that this is nothing more and nothing less than a vicious plot to lower the taxes of a selfish group of millionaires and to transfer this portion of the tax revenue to those of our citizens in the lower-income brackets. It is being referred to daily as a tax-dodging scheme.

ILLINOIS

The Illinois Legislature passed an endorsing resolution in May of 1943, House Joint Resolution 32. On January 8, 1945, a rescinding resolution was introduced to rescind the 1943 action. I am pleased to announce that Illinois is on the road to joining Arkansas, Wisconsin, and Iowa in repealing the endorsing resolution. A telegram from a member of the Illinois House of Representatives on

March 13 reported: "Illinois House of Representatives repealed committee for constitutional government resolution."

INDIANA

The State of Indiana also has a rescinding resolution before its legislature, House Concurrent Resolution 5. It was introduced on January 17, 1945. As you know, Indiana passed an endorsing resolution back in 1943. According to a letter from a State official, "It was adopted by a voice vote and later concurred in by the Senate by a similar type of vote. It is not necessary for the Governor in this State to sign a resolution of this type to make it valid and Governor Schricker did not sign it." I have not yet heard of any action having been taken on the proposed rescinding resolution in Indiana.

MASSACHUSETTS

A rescinding resolution was introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature on February 20, 1945, House Resolution 1081. I have no record of any action having been taken on this resolution to date.

MICHIGAN

The Michigan Legislature passed endorsing Senate Concurrent Resolution 20 on May 16, 1941. However, I am informed that three rescinding resolutions are now up for consideration. One of these rescinding resolutions also contains the significant phrase that the purport of the endorsing resolution passed in 1941 "was misunderstood by various members of the House and Senate."

NEW JERSEY

The New Jersey Legislature adopted Senate Joint Resolution No. 3 on February 25, 1944, proposing the adoption of the twenty-second amendment. I am now advised that there was introduced on January 22, 1945, a resolution to rescind Senate Joint Resolution 3. The rescinding resolution is at the present time in committee, and there seems to be some fear on the part of the rescinding resolution movement's supporters that there will be difficulty in having the resolution brought out on the floor for consideration.

I have in my files a letter from an official of the State of Maine, the legislature of which passed an endorsing resolution in 1941, and I quote from that letter:

The records of the Eighty-ninth Legislature of Maine indicate that a resolution memorializing Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts was presented in the Senate by Senator Brown, of Aroostook, and was tabled by that gentleman on April 10 pending adoption. This was taken from the table and read and adopted by the senate on April 15 without debate. The house of representatives read and adopted same on April 17, 1941. I find no record of any debate in the house of representatives, the adoption of the resolution having been unanimous.

Without debate in the House and without debate in the Senate if that information is correct. A resolution of such tremendous and evil portent and one sponsored by an organization whose main spring was a convicted German agent—a man who took money from the Imperial German Government to buy a New York newspaper, the Evening Mail, back during the last war, to use as a German propaganda vehicle. This man, Edward A. Rumely, took money from the German Government to place advertisements in the newspapers of the United States in order to influence American citizens toward a more sympathetic understanding of the "poor Germans" and their sad plight. This shows the members of these legislatures were misinformed about this proposal.

Let us not, however, be lulled into a false sense of complacency as a result of these displays of corrective action by some of our State legislatures and let us not permit ourselves to think that the battle is won. Far be it from me to underestimate the cleverness of the sponsoring group. Its spark plugs were not picked without careful analysis of their qualifications. Rumely, the master mind, was picked by the German Government to do some of its dirty work once, and we should certainly have learned by now that the Germans are masters at subversive activities and propaganda, and should assume that they would expect its agents to be quite clever.

PENNSYLVANIA

We have gone on the assumption that Governor Martin's veto of the 1943 endorsing resolution constituted an annulment. However, some of the legislators of that State are now attempting to remove all doubt as to the present status in Pennsylvania. I have been advised that a rescinding resolution was introduced February 21.

RHODE ISLAND

This State is another that passed an endorsing resolution and is now considering a rescinding action. The rescinding resolution is H. 626, introduced during the present session.

I wish that I could have printed in the RECORD a copy of a Fitzpatrick cartoon which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 12, 1945. That cartoon is more striking and to the point as to the motives of the proponents than I could explain in thousands of words. It shows a group of big-money men with the dollar sign on their backs pushing the 25-percent tax-limit amendment along, and under this very splendid cartoon is the title "The Doughboys at Home Prepare Their Defenses." Mr. Fitzpatrick has certainly captured the complete story in the product of his drawing board. This is one occasion that I would enjoy the privilege of inserting in the RECORD something besides figures and words.

I would very much appreciate hearing from anyone who has information as to any activity in the various State legislatures either for or against the proposed twenty-second amendment. Some weeks ago I had printed a pamphlet containing some of my speeches on this subject and which contained a chart showing the status of endorsing resolutions in all of the States. I have revised that chart from additional information I have gathered, but all information pertinent to this subject would be appreciated, as the actions of the various legislatures will make constant revisions necessary. The whole sneak attack on our Constitution has been so quietly executed that even information from the State officials is subject to error. For instance, I wrote last year to an official in Florida asking for the status of any such resolution. His reply stated that to his knowledge no such resolution had ever been proposed in his State.

Only recently, however, I received a letter from this same official advising me that another search disclosed that a "twenty-second amendment" memorial was introduced in 1941 in the Florida Senate but was not favorably acted upon. The same is true of South Carolina—a letter from one official states that no resolution has been offered, while another official has sent me a journal of proceedings for 1944 which shows introduction of an endorsing resolution but unfavorable action.

WYOMING

Wyoming, the first State to endorse the "twenty-second amendment" considered a rescinding resolution during the present year but failed to adopt it, permitting its name to remain on the Committee for Constitutional Government's "honor roll" for the present.

For the information of the Members and others, I wish to submit a chart which will show at a glance the status of either an endorsing or rescinding resolution in any of the States.

This chart is compiled from information which has been sent me in the form of letters from officials of the various States, from letters received from individuals who are interested in the proposals, and from press clippings. Being compiled from such a wide range of sources, and because of the constant changes in status, the accuracy cannot be guaranteed, and I would sincerely welcome having called to my attention any discrepancies in the formation thus presented:

	Endorsing resolution introduced	Passed House	Passed Senate	Endorsing resolution adopted	Rescinding resolution introduced	Action on rescinding resolution
Alabama	June 22, 1943 (H. J. R. No. 66).	Yes	Yes	July 8, 1943		
Arizona [1]	None					
Arkansas [1]	1943 (S. C. R. No. 10)	Yes	Yes	1943 [2]	1945 (H. C. R. No. 4)	Rescinding resolution adopted.
California	June 7, 1944 (A. J. R. No. 5).	No	No			
Colorado	1943 (H. J. M. No. 5)	No	No			

Footnotes at end of table.

	Endorsing resolution introduced	Passed House	Passed Senate	Endorsing resolution adopted	Rescinding resolution introduced	Action on rescinding resolution
Connecticut [1]	Jan. 17, 1945 (S. J. R. No. 11). Jan. 31, 1945 (H. J. R. No. 155). Jan. 31, 1945 (H. J. R. No. 221).	No	No			
Delaware	1943 (S. C. R. No. 6)	Yes, 23-0	Yes, 10-6	Apr. 22, 1943		
Florida	1941	No	No			
Georgia	1945	No action to date	No action to date			
Idaho [1]	None					
Illinois	Apr. 13, 1943 (H. J. R. No. 32).	Yes, May 15, 1943	Yes, May 26, 1943	May 26, 1943	Jan. 8, 1945 (H. J. R. No. 7).	Passed house. No senate action to date.
Indiana [1]	Feb. 5, 1943 (H. C. R. No. 10).	Yes	Yes	1943	Jan. 17, 1945 (H. C. R. No. 5).	In committee.
Iowa	1941 (H. C. R. No. 15)	Yes	Yes	1941 [2]	Jan. 23, 1945 (H. C. R. No. 9).	Passed House unanimously Feb. 14, 1945. Passed Senate Mar. 14, 1945.
Kansas	1945	No action to date	No action to date			
Kentucky	Mar. 8, 1944 (H. R. No. 79).	Yes	Yes	Mar. 20, 1944 [4]		
Louisiana	May 15, 1944 (S. C. R. No. 2).	No, 23-54, May 18, 1944.	Yes, 30-7, May 16, 1944.			
Maine	Apr. 10, 1941	Yes, Apr. 17, 1941	Yes, Apr. 15, 1941	Apr. 17, 1941		
Maryland [5]	Jan. 24, 1945 (S. J. R. No. 2).	No action to date	No action to date			
Massachusetts	Apr. 24, 1941 (S. No. 658)	Yes, Apr. 29, 1941	Yes, Apr. 29, 1941	Apr. 29, 1941	Feb. 20, 1945 (H. No. 1081).	No action to date.
Michigan	1941 (S. C. R. No. 20)	Yes, May 16, 1941	Yes, Apr. 29, 1941	May 16, 1941	H. C. R. No. 23 and H. C. R. No. 24.	In committee.
Minnesota	None					
Mississippi	1940 (S. C. R. No. 14)	Yes, Apr. 29, 1940	Yes, Apr. 29, 1940	Apr. 29, 1940		
Missouri	None					
Montana [1]	1941 (H. J. R. No. 4)	No	No			
	Feb. 1, 1945 (H. J. R. No. 6). [6]	No	No			
Nebraska	Jan. 29, 1945 (Res. No. 5)	No action to date	No action to date			
Nevada	None					
New Hampshire	Apr. 1, 1943	Yes, Apr. 13, 1943	Yes, Apr. 22, 1943	Apr. 24, 1943		
New Jersey	1944	Yes	Yes	Feb. 25, 1944	Jan. 22, 1945 (A. J. R. No. 1).	In committee.
New Mexico	1945 (H. J. R. No. 13)	No	No			
	1945 (S. J. R. No. 9)	No	No			
New York	1944	No	No			
	Feb. 7, 1945 (S. 1008)	No	No			
	1945 (assembly 1122)	No	No			
North Carolina	None					
North Dakota [1]	None					
Ohio	1943 (H. J. R. No. 48)	No	No			
	1943 (S. J. R. No. 19)	No	Yes			
	Jan. 30, 1945 (H. J. R. No. 16).	No action to date	No action to date			
	1945 (S. J. R. No. 16)					
Oklahoma	None					
Oregon	Feb. 2, 1945 (H. J. R. No. 5).	No	No			
Pennsylvania	Mar. 31, 1943	Yes	Yes	Vetoed [7]	Feb. 21, 1945	In committee.
Rhode Island	1940 (S. 80)	Yes	Yes	Mar. 15, 1940	1945 (H. 626)	
South Carolina	Feb. 3, 1944 (S. 753)	No	No			
South Dakota [1]	Jan. 17, 1945 (H. C. R. No. 1).	No., 22-51	No			
Tennessee [1]	1945	No	Yes			
Texas	1943 (H. C. R. No. 37)	No	Yes			
	1945	In committee				
Utah	None					
Vermont	None					
Virginia	Feb. 23, 1944 (H. J. R. No. 19).	Yes	No			
Washington	None					
West Virginia [1]	1945 (H. C. R. No. 5)	No., 69-16	No			
Wisconsin	Apr. 14, 1943 (J. R. No. 75)	Yes, 44-34	Yes, 17-9	1943 [2]	Jan. 18, 1945 (J. R. No. 11A).	Rescinding resolution adopted.
Wyoming [1]	1939 (H. J. M. No. 6)	Yes	Yes	Feb. 23, 1939	1945	Failed to pass.

[1] 1945 session of legislature adjourned.
[2] Rescinded by House and Senate.
[3] At executive session of committee on Mar. 15, 1945, formal request to withdraw the resolutions was approved.
[4] Rescinded by House.
[5] At conference between proponents and opponents, proponents acknowledged defeat if vote were taken on floor on S. J. R. No. 2. Therefore it was decided to recommit to committee with general understanding that this action would kill the resolution.
[6] Killed at suggestion of author and recommendation of committee.
[7] Vetoed by Governor.

Adjournments (information as of Mar. 12, 1945): Arizona, Mar. 10, 1945; Arkansas, Mar. 8, 1945; Idaho, Mar. 9, 1945; Indiana, Mar. 5, 1945; Montana, Mar. 1, 1945; North Dakota, Mar. 3, 1945. Subject to call of presiding officers: South Dakota, Mar. 2, 1945; Tennessee, Mar. 2, 1945; West Virginia, Mar. 10, 1945; Wyoming, Feb. 17, 1945; Georgia recessed Mar. 3 to reconvene Jan. 7, 1946.

What the People Are Thinking Back Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a substantial taxpayer and employer:

LA CROSSE, WIS., *March 13, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Congressman, Third Wisconsin District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: As one of your constituents in this congressional district, may I express to you my personal viewpoint concerning the proposed increase in salary for Congressman and Senators. Also the proposal to establish a lifetime annuity for the Members of the House and/or Senate who have served their constituencies and country sufficiently well to have been reelected to the House or Senate for a given number of terms.

It is my firm belief that a substantial increase in salary would definitely attract to both Houses the highest type of citizen. I don't mean this as a reflection on the caliber of our present Representatives and Senators, but I do recognize that there are many people of unusual and outstanding ability who cannot afford to sacrifice their private business or profession for the instability of political life, as a Congressman or Senator. These people, in my opinion, could render outstanding service to the United States and their constituencies. And with some reasonable assurance that their future would be provided for in a substantial way, these men might and probably would be attracted to public service in one or the other of the two Houses of Congress.

I believe it is of vital importance to this country, especially in the unsettled years that lie ahead, that we have in both Houses not only men of unquestioned integrity, but of the highest intellect and broadest statesmanship. May I repeat that I firmly believe the proposed set-up for lifetime annuities would attract many men who now dare not jeopardize their personal position and the welfare of their families.

I am writing this to you in the hope that my feeble voice may in some manner influence the attitude of the Congress and Senate on this proposal to the end that it may be promptly enacted into law.

Respectfully yours,

J. N. DRIBBEN.

The Price We Must Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the serious problems that have confronted our Nation because of a global war need not be restated here. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the problems of life so far as our Nation is concerned will not end with the end of the war. We must of necessity make tangible definite plans for that post-war period and we must come to recognize that, if we are to sustain the principles of democracy which can only be sustained by an enlightened America.

And it is therefore imperative that we study and that we read and that we come to know the problems that will face us in that post-war period. We cannot, under any circumstances, be too familiar with the many phases of this situation.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article taken from the Saturday Evening Post, the author of which is Demaree Bess dealing with this important post-war period, and I commend it to all Members of the Congress and to the people of the Nation for a matter of careful study:

THE PRICE WE MUST PAY

(By Demaree Bess)

PARIS.—Traveling around with the American Army in Europe last autumn, I saw that many of our generals shared with most civilians at that time the hope that the war in Europe could be finished in 1944. Those generals pictured that war in military terms, and it seemed to them, just as it did to millions of civilians, that a military victory over Germany was very close. This expectation was entirely reasonable because, from a purely military viewpoint, the Germans were indeed beaten last autumn. The situation was as unfavorable to the German Army in October 1944 as it was in October 1918. But this time there was one great difference compared to 1918, and that difference was political.

We might have ended the war last autumn in Europe by offering the Germans a negotiated peace. We might even have achieved "unconditional surrender" then if the Allies had been solely interested in Germany's military defeat. In other words, our troops might have got to Berlin months earlier if Russia hadn't been concerned with Poland and the Baltic and the Balkans; if Britain hadn't cared a hoot about what happened in the Mediterranean; if the American Government had been satisfied only with forcing the German Army to surrender. But not one of the Allies chose to take this quick way out. Instead, all of them agreed that it was absolutely essential not merely to defeat the German Army, but also to secure definite political objectives. The stakes the Allied Governments were playing for were so high that they were considered worth, if need be, several additional months of warfare.

This is by no means the first time during this war that political events have overshadowed military events. This occurred at the very beginning, in 1939, when Stalin's deal with Hitler was much more sensational than any of the early fighting. It happened again during the Allied invasion of north Africa, when many Americans were more excited by disclosure of our negotiations with Admiral Darlan and General Giraud than they were by the valiant deeds of our untried soldiers. This often has been the case in Poland also, where disputes between Polish and Russian politicians sometimes got more attention than advances of the Red Army. And all over Europe, ever since last October, politics in Greece and Belgium, Italy and France, have repeatedly distracted public interest from some of the most impressive battles in history.

It is not difficult to understand why European peoples are thus concerned about European politics, but it is not so obvious—until we examine the matter carefully—why Americans should be equally concerned with the complex affairs of this troubled continent. In any event, whether we fully realize it or not, we now are deeply involved in this European political situation, so deeply involved that our Government has shown itself willing to prolong the war in order to achieve our international political objectives. Unconditional surrender must be regarded as a political objective because it involves the elimination of Germany as an independent nation, with all the consequent rearrangement of Europe which that implies. It has been supported by those Americans who feel that this is the only way to make sure that Germany doesn't start another war a generation hence.

But even those Americans who are most insistent upon unconditional surrender sometimes have failed to perceive responsibilities which this objective carries with it for us. Germany's absolute defeat leaves a great hole in Europe which must be filled up with something. Our Russian and British allies understand that very well, which explains much of their recent "power politics" so disturbing to many Americans. We merely delude ourselves if we think that we also are not mixed up in this power politics, that we alone are solely interested in knocking out the rowdy who started the brawl in Europe.

WAR OBJECTIVES AND POST-WAR OBJECTIVES

A conspicuous instance of this type of thinking appeared in an article in the Army and Navy Journal, which I happened to see reprinted in our Army newspaper, the Stars and Stripes, while I was visiting an American Infantry division at the front early last December. According to this article: "British and Russian preoccupation with objectives other than the defeat of Germany was responsible for allied failure to achieve expectations in the United States that the war in Europe would be over by now. Since D-day in France, greater preoccupation has been shown by Russia in her Baltic and Balkan campaigns intended to insure her security, and by Great Britain in Italy, Greece, and Albania to protect her life line through the Mediterranean to India than in achievement of the prime objective of our American armies—prompt defeat of Germany."

As I read that dispatch, I wondered what the soldiers around me were thinking about it. The had been fighting for weeks in mud and rain and cold, and they were more disappointed than even the Army and Navy Journal that the Germans still showed no signs of quitting. I was considerably relieved when I talked with some of these men and found they had not even read this dispatch. They were too much preoccupied with the current battle to have thought for anything but the business in hand. I think this was very fortunate, because the brief quotation from the Army and Navy Journal gave the false impression that our Russian and British allies were engaged in selfish politics, and thus prolonging the war, while we Americans were completely absorbed in winning it.

Actually, Americans cannot rightly claim that we are less responsible for the present situation in Europe than any of the other Allies. We have voluntarily assumed a central role in that great power combination which is designed to reorganize Europe, and we are closely cooperating with both Russia and Britain not only in military matters but also in this post-war reorganization program.

All through this war a curious idea has been prevalent that these military and political affairs are entirely separate, having no connection with each other, whereas it is quite apparent that every campaign in Europe has had political as well as military objectives. There is not the slightest doubt that the strategy of the war against Germany has been influenced, time and again, by the particular interests of one or another Allied Power, and in some cases this may have prolonged the fighting.

For instance, there has been persistent discussion and even some conflict about which of us should liberate which country. Russia, for example, has preferred to do the liberating in countries where Russian post-war influence is likely to be predominant, and the same is true of Great Britain. Where disputes have arisen on such matters, it has taken a little time to straighten them out, and military operations have thus had to be subordinated occasionally to political considerations.

One of the most striking instances of such political influence upon the actual conduct of the war occurred in the Balkans, where Russian and British interests do not always coincide. Last summer the Russians had a choice between several campaigns, and if their sole interest had been to get the war finished in a hurry, they might have done better to concentrate at once their offensive power in drives through Poland and east Prussia. But the Russians are constantly looking far ahead, and they chose instead to sweep through the Balkans first, liberating Rumania and Bulgaria, and then pushing on into Hungary.

In like manner some British campaigns have been planned not only to beat Germany but also to consolidate British post-war influence in all those countries where British sea power and economic interests have made Britain traditionally predominant. One of these places is Greece, which explains why British troops shot down Greek factionalists who tried to take advantage of the war to establish the form of government they preferred. When disturbances occurred in Belgium and Italy, British interference followed as inevitably as Russian interference did in eastern Europe.

There can be no denying that in these instances our Russian and British Allies have used their armies for political as well as military purposes. We know in detail what the British have done in their areas because American correspondents have been freely admitted there. But in most cases we have only indirect reports of what the Russians did in most places, since American reporters were not generally permitted to see these happenings for themselves.

Nevertheless, the Russians certainly did not attempt to conceal their political objec-

tives. It is quite evident that Russia has more clear-cut aims than any other Allied country, and that she has been more tenacious in getting what she wants. The Soviet Government has been entirely frank in its intentions to reabsorb the three Baltic states as well as portions of Poland, Finland, and Rumania. It has not disguised its plans to create pro-Russian governments in Bulgaria, Hungary, Jugoslavia, and Finland. It has concluded a military alliance with France, and it has pressed for the overthrow of Franco in Spain.

Similarly, the British also have contrived their own post-war settlements while the war itself was still in progress. They have offset Russian moves with their own countermoves, yielding to Russia on one point in order to gain another. British statesmen are working from a permanent set of blueprints, upon principles devised long ago to safeguard the interests of the British Empire.

All this jockeying has been abhorrent to many Americans who would like to believe that it makes no difference what European countries are liberated by which Allied power. But we are in a coalition war, and our allies believe that it makes a great deal of difference. Wherever Russian armies penetrated, they set up governments approved by the Soviet regime, and wherever British armies penetrated, they backed governments friendly to themselves. Perhaps some international organization will arise sometime to make such matters inconsequential, but no such organization has yet taken definite shape.

It is obvious, then, what are the high stakes for which Russia and Britain have fought in Europe, stakes which have justified them in prolonging their war against Germany beyond a mere military defeat. Our allies have been determined to safeguard their own war aims promptly, even though they have had to fight extra battles to accomplish their purposes.

What many Americans overlook is that we, too, have had a share in prolonging the war in Europe because we, too, were aiming at political objectives. Our Government has taken the lead in demanding a hard peace for Germany, a peace so hard that it could be achieved only by the hardest kind of war. It was our President who devised the formula of unconditional surrender at the Casablanca Conference in January 1943. It is upon that formula that the entire subsequent program for Germany and Europe has been constructed.

When President Roosevelt first used "unconditional surrender" to express the Allied war aims, the phrase did not appeal either to Prime Minister Churchill or to Marshal Stalin. Churchill at the time was careful to disclaim his own responsibility for it, and Stalin was still using his group of captured German generals to assure the German people that he had no intention of destroying Germany or even the German Army.

It seemed then that the Russians and the British might be more disposed to favor a soft peace for Germany than we Americans were, and protests against any possible compromise with the enemy were more vigorous in the United States than anywhere else. But our allies undertook no peace negotiations with Germany—and thereby they joined with us in prolonging the war—because they agreed that it was better to fight it out for higher stakes.

When Allied victories last autumn were not followed up with peace proposals to the German people, our statesmen were severely criticized by many groups who condemned this unconditional-surrender formula. One such critic, the British Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, retired, described Allied statesmanship as idiotic, and he blamed Allied propagandists for dragging out the war unnecessarily. According to General Fuller's analysis, the war was kept going last September only because Allied politicians "pumped new life into the expiring Reich."

The farther our soldiers advanced, he said, the more Allied leaders threatened. They spoke of reducing Germany to an agricultural country, of giving the Rhineland to France, of handing over East Prussia to Russia, of delivering Brandenburg and Silesia to Poland. There was open talk of deporting millions of Germans into Russia for slave labor, of killing thousands of German leaders as war criminals, of cramming 80,000,000 Germans into about half of their pre-war territory. In other words, Fuller asserted, they did their best to convince the Germans that they had nothing to gain by surrender.

General Fuller contended that the Allied leaders should have backed up our military victories with a peace offensive, and thus hastened the end of the war. But this retired British general, like some other observers in Allied countries, completely failed to distinguish between so-called threats and genuine war aims. Most of the threats which he mentioned had become details of the Allied program for eliminating Germany as an independent nation. One or another of the great powers intended to carry out every one of these steps.

We Americans cannot properly claim that we have not been informed of these political objectives. Well in advance of last November's elections, President Roosevelt made it transparently clear that he supported a program for Germany which no German group could be expected to accept voluntarily. During the second Quebec conference, the President even expressed qualified approval of the extreme Morgenthau plan. Those who wanted the European war to end last autumn with a negotiated peace apparently did not perceive that matters had already gone too far, that we were committed to fight not only for a military victory but also for a fundamental revolution in Europe. Because the defeat of Germany involves infinitely more now than the end of a mere military contest. Hitler has turned Europe upside down, and Americans have committed themselves to assist not only in putting the continent together again but also in molding it in entirely new forms, political, economic, and social.

This expansion of the European war into the broader aspects of a fundamental revolution can be primarily traced back to Adolf Hitler and his associates. When the blitzkrieg was launched in May 1940, I wrote, in Paris, an article for the Post entitled, "Winner Takes All," in which I pointed out that the Germans had possessed a choice between two types of war, a limited military contest and a totalitarian struggle. Some of Hitler's advisers were strongly in favor of limited objectives, but the more extreme members of the Nazi Party urged an all-out effort. These two groups argued all through the winter of 1939–40—that period which we called the phony war—until the policy of the second group was accepted.

The extent of Hitler's ambition was clearly revealed when he announced, at the outset of the blitzkrieg that he proposed to set up a system in Europe which would endure for a thousand years. He was not seeking only a military victory; he intended to make over the whole of established Europe according to Nazi ideology. And as quickly as the Germans occupied any country, they immediately began to apply their blueprints for this "new order." The stakes in Europe thereupon became not only war but also revolution. If Germany won, then Germany would direct this revolution. But if Germany lost, then her conquerors would also find a revolution on their hands.

Not one of the Allies was eager to accept this challenge from Hitler. The Russians, who know all about revolutions and who had not yet finished with the one they themselves started in 1917, were so reluctant to take on another that Stalin struck a bargain with Hitler, to keep out of the Nazis affair altogether. Britain and France were so reluctant to assume the burden of directing Europe that they deliberately looked the other way when Germany reoccupied the Rhineland; they signored the annexation of Austria and they sold Czechoslovakia down the river. And the United States was so reluctant to meddle in European politics that—for all our loud outcries against Hitler's treatment of the Jews, for all our tears over the fall of France, for all our alarm about German influence in South America—we refrained from completely getting into the conflict until Germany formally declared war against us.

Because all the Allies were dragged unwillingly into this war, it not unnaturally followed that at first they were able to agree only on beating Germany. If we reread the Atlantic Charter carefully, we can see that when it was published in August 1941 it seemed possible to us then that the war in Europe need not become a continental revolution. Its comparatively mild provisions, drawn up by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, still pictured the war in limited terms. All during the ensuing year our discussion about post-war Europe generally foresaw some kind of acceptable place for Germany, with no sweeping territorial changes in Europe, once Hitler and his Nazi system were overthrown.

It was not until the Teheran Conference, nearly two years and a half later, that these soft provisions of the Atlantic Charter were rendered finally inoperable by the unanimous adoption of President Roosevelt's newer policy of unconditional surrender. Those critics who have recently been complaining that Stalin and Churchill killed the Atlantic Charter by their action in Poland and Greece had failed to observe that the Atlantic Charter was killed from the day that the three greatest powers accepted unconditional surrender in its place.

The Teheran decisions thus marked a great turning point in European history, because the decision to break up post-war Germany created an immense vacuum in the heart of Europe—a vacuum which spread out beyond the borders of Germany east and south and west. Almost every political move made in Europe since Tehran can be explained as an attempt to fill that vacuum.

It is futile to insist now, as some Americans still do, that this process of filling the vacuum is "power politics," and should not have been permitted to interfere with the conduct of the war against Germany. Our Russian and British allies consider the filling of this vacuum as important as the military victory, and the very realistic post-war European system now arising from the ruins of Hitler's "new order" is as much an American creation as it is a Russian or British creation, because this system is a consequence of the Tehran agreements, to which we were a party.

The new Allied war aims were adopted so gradually that even now most of us probably do not comprehend how revolutionary our objectives really are. It is a curious fact that although the Allies expected Germany to collapse when our troops invaded that country, our armies actually reached the German frontiers before our statesmen were able to come to any agreement among themselves concerning the exact details of our plans.

The explanation for this is that, whereas the Nazi "new order" had been carefully drawn up before the outbreak of the war, the administrative plans of the Allies had to be developed while the war was in progress. The German armies, as they occupied one conquered country after another, were always accompanied by trained Nazi officials who were equipped with charts and statistics and schemes to enforce the "new order." Allied arrangements for liberated countries had to be compounded of the desires and

ambitions and ideals of several nations, until they became a patchwork of compromises.

The bare outlines of this Allied program were first revealed after the Moscow and Tehran Conferences in 1943. Since then—sometimes in secret and sometimes openly—Allied post-war plans for Europe have been slowly worked out. With a few comparatively unimportant exceptions the Crimea Conference of the Big Three merely put the final seal of its approval upon decisions which were the result of bargaining over months and even years. Yalta marked the culmination of processes set in motion at Casablanca in January 1948, and crystallized at Teheran 11 months later.

The new organization of the Continent is a great-power coalition, providing for the more or less permanent domination of Europe by Russia, Great Britain, the United States, and France. There is no place for Germany in this combination. The complete subjection of the Reich is to be accomplished first of all by absolute military defeat, after which Germany will be reduced to an inferior status, partly by territorial partition, partly by military occupation, and partly by destruction of its industrial power—the war-making power recently mentioned by President Roosevelt.

This post-war rule of Germany requires elaborate plans, and these have been worked out by the European Advisory Commission, a body originally confined to the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia, but to which France has been admitted since. These plans are so interesting and so important that I intend to write another article on this subject in the near future, but now it may suffice to say that the plans for Germany are in many respects the simplest part of the projected new European system. At least, the German people will have to do as they are ordered.

It is in other parts of Europe that the varying interests of the Four Power coalition are more apparent and more vexatious. Lately, however, the roles to be played by our allies have become quite clearly defined, not only in such published treaties as the Anglo-Soviet Alliance and the Franco-Soviet Alliance, but also through unpublished informal understandings. It is evident, for instance, that in countries occupied by the Red Army, the Russians are disposed to encourage drastic reforms, such as the breaking up of all large landholdings, the public ownership of much industry and the liquidation of all those elements which have been hostile to the Soviet Union in the past. The reforms already begun by the Russians are far reaching.

Great Britain on the contrary, has discouraged violent and sudden reforms in the countries she has liberated. In accordance with her traditional methods, she has tried to strengthen the position of constitutional monarchies and moderate elements. Yet the British concede that great changes are inevitable in Europe, including even transposition of vast populations from one district to another. On the whole, in spite of differences in outlook and some conflicts of interest, the British are cooperating closely with the Russians, both in conduct of the war and in reorganization of the Continent.

And what of America's role in the New Europe? Just what responsibilities does the Allied plan impose upon the people of the United States, and how long will these responsibilities last? How much will our European commitments cost, in terms of money and in terms of manpower? Is this new European organization a practicable program, a scheme which will accomplish its purposes well enough so that we can expect to support it indefinitely? In short, just what is our American stake in Europe?

Our chief stake, of course, is future peace. Peace is worth a great deal to Americans as well as to Europeans, and we can afford to pay a big price for it. But Europeans may be pardoned for being skeptical of such glittering generalities as that Americans propose to prevent future wars in Europe. Everyone, including Hitler himself, has professed that aim at every stage of this war. When Americans repeat that generality now, Europeans say, "Yes, to be sure, but just how do you propose to do it?"

In times past, the American people were more often inspired by temporary sentiments and emotions than by world interest or even self-interest, when some questions arose concerning Poland or Finland, France or Spain. American purposes in Europe have not been consistent, because we have not previously participated consistently in European affairs. But the last few months have shown us, if we did not realize it before, that when we got into the European war this time, we got into European politics for a long time to come.

Up to this moment, the traditional American attitude in Europe has been that of detachment, a word broader than isolationism and more fittingly expressive of the feelings of our people. This policy of detachment was our tradition, and now that we have abandoned it, an unprecedented situation confronts us. We have no age-old traditions to guide us or our statesmen in every European problem, such as the Russians and the British and the French have inherited from their forefathers.

The wholesale participation of the American people in European politics has now introduced a brand-new factor into the troubled affairs of this continent, a factor which, by its very newness, is more uncertain than anything being contributed by any of our allies. It is we Americans, at least as much as the Russians or the British, who have insisted upon making this a different kind of war from the First World War.

Throughout most of 1944, I have watched thousands of civilian employees of the American Government swarming into Europe, busily engaged in every kind of "experting," finance and trade, agriculture and industry, diplomacy and propaganda. Most Americans are novices at this kind of business and some of them have made some silly mistakes. Nevertheless, these untrained Americans have been assigned to help Europeans set up a substitute for Hitler's "new order," and they are valiantly doing the best they can.

While this American intervention annoys some Europeans, it very much impresses most of the people over here, because it seems to offer a hopeful prospect for their own future. Europeans realize that they are caught up in a revolution whose shape will be determined to some extent by whether Americans help to shape it or get disgusted and pull out. As for us, if we want the European revolution to take a shape which will be satisfactory to us, we then should make up our minds to stay in European politics for a long time to come. The chances are that we shall do so, because the only alternative would be to acknowledge that we have fought this war in vain.

Uncle Sam's Debt Creeping Toward $300,000,000,000—How Can We Handle It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include herewith with my remarks the column of Raymond Lonergan, appearing in the March 17 issue of Labor, the official publication of railroad-labor organizations:

UNCLE SAM'S DEBT CREEPING TOWARD $300,000,000,000—HOW CAN WE HANDLE IT?—VOORHIS SAYS PRESENT SET-UP PERMITS BANKS TO PROFIT WITHOUT RISK

(By Raymond Lonergan)

When "BOB" DOUGHTON came to Congress 34 years ago, the national debt was about $1,000,000,000. A few days ago DOUGHTON, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, persuaded the House, with only four dissenting votes, to boost the debt limit to $300,000,000,000. Of course, no nation in all history ever had a debt like that. Interest alone will soon call for $6,000,000,000 a year.

Probably before Uncle Sam finishes Hitler and Hirohito and cleans up the aftermath of this global conflict, the debt total will be $400,000,000,000 and maybe $500,000,000,000, and interest will be running around $10,000,000,000 a year, with no provision for payment on principal.

Naturally, the best minds in the House gravely debated how Congress should go about handling this staggering debt problem.

During a tilting match with GIFFORD (Rep., Mass.), VOORHIS of California explained how he would take care of at least a third of the debt—that is, the portion held by the banks.

HOW BANKS PROFIT

These financial institutions have purchased approximately $100,000,000,000 of Government bonds, but VOORHIS claims they have not invested a dollar of their own money.

Instead, they have given Uncle Sam a "credit" on their books. When he needs some extra cash, they supply it, but in the meantime they continue to draw interest on the face value of their bonds.

That's one reason why the banks are very prosperous just now. They are pocketing from one and one-half to two billion dollars in interest on Government securities and taking no risk.

Thus the banks are permitted, in a very real sense, to "make money," a function the Constitution confers exclusively on the Federal Congress.

His colleagues have a lot of respect for VOORHIS, and they listened intently as he declared we cannot achieve prosperity without revamping our banking system.

WAREHOUSES FOR MONEY

"The demand-deposit part of banking should be handled purely as a warehousing of money," VOORHIS said. "Every time a depositor puts a dollar in a bank that dollar should remain there until the depositor calls for it.

"Thus the deposits would be backed by a 100 percent reserve, instead of 20 percent as at present, and it would be impossible for the banks, on their own motion, to expand or contract credit."

The savings department and the loan and investment department of a bank would be separated from the demand-deposit department.

REAL MONEY VERSUS DEBT

At present, VOORHIS insisted, our productive power is "harnessed to our debts." Unless our debts increase, and, of course, this includes Government obligations, production eithers stops or begins to recede.

Instead of this, arrangement there should be ample real money to carry on the business of the Nation and keep production at a maximum, the Californian argued.

"I believe that in the future, when money must be created, it should be the Government that does it. I believe that if we do that and maintain a balance between the supply of purchasing power, on the one hand, and the volume of production on the other, we can keep the Government out of the banking business—that is, the business of lending money—and leave that real banking

business to the banking system, where it belongs."

A QUEER PROCEDURE

"But as a matter of actual fact, the Federal Government today gets its money by selling its securities to banks. They create the money to buy the securities, and in many instances, Government agencies—the R. F. C., for example—turn around in a bank's local community and make a loan that the bank should have made itself."

VOORHIS has made many converts in the House and his doctrine has attracted attention out through the country. He is one of the few men in public life who face the debt problem in a realistic way. Certainly it is difficult to answer his proposition:

If a Government bond, drawing interest, is good for its face value, why isn't Government currency, which doesn't pay any interest, equally good?

Both are based on the stability of the National Government, which up to date has never repudiated an obligation.

STORY OF THE GREENBACKS

VOORHIS' opponents are fond of recalling the greenbacks issued during the Civil War. "They fell to 30 cents on the dollar," they say.

VOORHIS replies that Lincoln issued two kinds of greenbacks. One was receivable for "all debts, both public and private." That greenback always sold at par.

The greenback, which dropped in value, had what was known as the exception clause—that is, it was good for all debts both public and private, except "interest on public debt and payment of import duties."

Thus Uncle Sam repudiated his own paper money. The merchant who imported goods from a foreign country had to go into the market to buy gold to pay his tariff charges. When the Government paid interest on its debt, it too had to buy gold in the market.

The result was just what might have been expected. The price of gold soared while the greenbacks which contained the exception clause went down.

T. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently an insertion was made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD quoting Mr. William Mitch in criticism of the T. V. A. An answer was made by Mr. Sam E. Roper, former president of the Alabama State Federation of Labor. Mr. Roper's statement appeared in the Birmingham News-Age-Herald of March 4, 1945. It follows:

LABOR

(By Robert W. Kincey)

Sam E. Roper, former president of the Alabama State Federation of Labor, and now president of the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council (A. F. of L.), herein sets out another side of the T. V. A. economic question in answer to a communication in this column by William Mitch, president of District 20, United Mine Workers of America. Mr. Roper's statement, in part and substantially, follows:

"In an article from the Birmingham News-Age-Herald, December 31, 1944, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, 1945, page A296, William Mitch, president of District 20, United Mine Workers of America, is quoted in several statements critical of Federal water-power developments and of the Tennessee Valley Authority in particular.

"According to the article, Mr. Mitch asserted the T. V. A. does not pay sufficient interest on the money invested, that it does not pay Federal taxes, and that the development of water power facilities for generation of electric power endangers the jobs of coal miners supplying steam-electric generating plants.

"All three of these contentions have a familiar ring to the people of the Tennessee Valley.

"One of the tricks of such propaganda is to include all of the investment in T. V. A. projects, navigation, flood control, fertilizer and munitions manufacture, agricultural tests and demonstrations, industrial and minerals research, and so on, as part of 'a Government-owned water-power project.' This Mr. Mitch has done, although these phases of Government activity are expected to yield no monetary return but are intended to pay for themselves in terms of public security and well-being.

"In discussing taxes and interests, Mr. Mitch, like the utility propagandists, has simply omitted to mention that the T. V. A. power operations each year return a substantial surplus over all costs of operation, including straight-line depreciation. In the fiscal year 1944, this surplus or net income amounted to $14,116,000 or about 40 percent of gross power revenue, which is, of course, the property of the people of the United States who own the T. V. A. With the $2,169,000 paid in lieu of taxes to States and counties under section 13 of the T. V. A. Act, the total provided by the T. V. A. power operations for public purposes amounted to about 46 percent of gross revenues, as Mr. Mitch could have learned by reading the T. V. A. annual report for 1944.

"Or, to look at it another way, the power net income before interest for the fiscal year 1944 represented a return of about 4 percent on the net average power investment for the year, a return which is well above the cost of money to the Government. The return was about 5 percent in the fiscal year 1943.

"The essential fact is that the T. V. A. power operations are returning gross revenues greatly in excess of power costs, and nothing would be gained by taking these net proceeds of public operation and shunting them into arbitrary public pockets labeled variously interest, taxes, and so on.

"These figures represent only the financial picture, without considering the public benefits which have resulted from the establishment of a tremendous new supply of power in the Tennessee Valley area. The T. V. A. power system supplied some 10,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of power annually, of which three-quarters is now going into war industry to produce aluminum, airplanes, ships' boilers, shells, munitions, Army clothing, and a host of the other materials for war. The vast industrial expansion made possible by T. V. A. power has benefited labor as well as other segments of the community by providing jobs and income, besides contributing immeasurably to the common defense. In the same way, the low-rate policy introduced in the southeast by the T. V. A. area has resulted in the lowering of electric bills of consumers; in the T. V. A. area, the savings in electric bills amount to $10,000,000 annually. It should not be lost on Mr. Mitch that since the advent of T. V. A. in 1933, the great power companies of Alabama and Georgia have forged to the front among privately owned public utilities in the country in providing domestic consumers with abundant electricity at low cost.

"On the basis of past record, Mr. Mitch's concern about coal likewise seems ill-founded. Statistics show that there has been a vast increase in the amount of coal used for generating electricity in the Tennessee Valley area, even prior to the war. In 1929, a peak year for power production in the Nation as well as the Southwest, the amount of coal used for generating electricity in Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi was 334,000 tons. By 1940 the total used in the same States was 1,346,000 tons, an increase of 303 percent, as compared with a national increase of 19 percent. In 1943, 2,369,000 tons were used, 609 percent above the 1929 level, as compared with the national increase of 61 percent.

"It is obviously unfair and grossly misleading to claim, as Mr. Mitch does, that if it were not for the T. V. A. the present power now being produced would all be generated from coal-burning steam-electric plants. Mr. Mitch and the miners can thank those who helped the Tennessee Valley get a T. V. A. on the job. It has helped the coal miners and operators, and many thousands of other members of organized labor who have had relations with T. V. A. in the construction and maintenance as well as the operating of this great program. I am sure Mr. Mitch and others recognize the relationship of the A. F. of L. through its building trades and other organizations with the T. V. A. The Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council has had a signed agreement with the Authority covering all employees coming within the jurisdiction of that group for a number of years, and it is conceded by labor in most of its various branches that the joint labor-relation program between T. V. A. and its labor organizations has done more toward building a real standard of living for the people of the valley."

Kansas City Office of Farm Credit Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in the Kansas City office of the Farm Credit Administration one employee, A. C. Utterback, for at least 6 months has been paid $700 per month for doing nothing.

In these days of manpower shortage this is astounding. Such waste of public funds when 50,000,000 taxpayers are making sacrificial contributions to our national Treasury is hard to understand.

The following news item from the Kansas City Star of March 14, tells the story:

SITS FOR $700 A MONTH—F. C. A. PAYS A. C. UTTERBACK FOR DOING NOTHING—THE SUPERVISING EXAMINER, AT ODDS WITH OTHER OFFICIALS, SPENDS HIS TIME IN A BARE OFFICE READING

Down on the lower level of the Municipal Auditorium, in space occupied by the Farm Credit Administration, a forgotten man sat as usual yesterday at an empty desk in a bare and unmarked office doing nothing and drawing $700 a month for it.

This forgotten man is A. C. Utterback, one of three supervising examiners for the F. C. A. His enforced idleness has continued for 6 months and no end to it is in sight. Utterback's troubles began in July, when he and his assistant, Roland W. Bush, filed a report on their examination of a Texas bank for cooperatives. The report made sensational charges.

HE IS PAID OVERTIME, TOO

October 18, 1944, Bush resigned so he could make public a charge that the F. C. A. was suppressing the report. A month before that Utterback had been called into the F. C. A. headquarters and assigned to his little cubbyhole office. He has reported for work daily, putting in a full workweek, sitting out also the regulation 8 hours overtime, and has continued to draw his pay. He is given $6 a day additional allowance because he is away from his home office at St. Paul.

An attempt to locate Utterback yesterday nearly failed. The young woman at the F. C. A. information desk couldn't find Utterback listed in the F. C. A. directory. She consulted a card-index system and shook her head. Supplied with a number believed to be that of Utterback's office, she still had no luck, but finally called the office next to it. The visitors were directed to that office. Utterback has no phone.

The heavy black numerals that designate the other offices on the long corridor do not mark Utterback's room. The numbers, however, had been applied lightly with a lead pencil. Utterback laid aside a book on accounting to greet his visitors, but he had little to say. The F. C. A. has advised him that any information he gives will be on his own responsibility.

REFUSED TO CHANGE REPORT

But Bush, acting in behalf of Utterback and himself, talked freely at the time of his resignation, charging that for political reasons Utterback was ordered to alter his report on the bank and that he had refused. It is for this refusal, Bush says, that Utterback is being kept inactive.

I. W. Duggan, Governor of the F. C. A., yesterday denied that Utterback had been asked to change his report on the bank. He said he had been asked only to include in the report evidence substantiating the charges. A second examination was made of the bank following Utterback's report, but Duggan declined to reveal the contents of the two reports or to discuss their differences, if any. The Governor said he felt such a discussion might improperly prejudice a final determination of Utterback's standing with the F. C. A.

Utterback originally tried to get a hearing on the entire matter by filing a grievance appeal under Department of Agriculture regulations. Later he dropped that approach to the termination of the stalemate and elected to sit tight.

HIS DISMISSAL ASKED

Duggan said that shortly after Christmas the F. C. A. personnel department preferred charges against Utterback with the office of personnel of the Department of Agriculture, asking his dismissal. These charges now are pending and Utterback has been asked to show cause why he should not be suspended pending settlement of the case. He has replied by letter to the suspension threat.

Utterback denied yesterday that he had been given notice of any charges filed against him. Duggan was not specific about the charges, saying only that they grew out of the report and circumstances surrounding the situation.

Duggan defended the wasting of $700 a month of tax money for Utterback's salary while he does nothing, by saying that the F. C. A. merely was following regulations set up to protect employees. He mentioned two attempts to bring the matter to a head, the grievance appeal that Utterback started and the more recent filing of dismissal charges against Utterback.

"I am doing all that I can to protect Utterback," Duggan said.

LOTS OF TIME REQUIRED

He mentioned also that it took a lot of time to prepare the charges and handle correspondence between the F. C. A. office in Kansas City and the Department of Agriculture in Washington.

Asked if there weren't other duties that could be assigned Utterback, Duggan said he was trained for accounting work and that under the circumstances he didn't feel justified in assigning Utterback to other types of work.

The F. C. A. governor said he had no idea how much longer the case would be under consideration. He pointed out that should the department decide to discharge Utterback he still had the right to appeal the decision to the Civil Service Commission.

Utterback, who has worked for the F. C. A. 10 years, said he would exhaust every appeal route left open to him. He declined to comment on Duggan's statement that he had refused to supply evidence to back up the charges made in the bank report, and went back to his reading, his only occupation the last 6 months. Yesterday the volume he was reading was entitled "Higher Accounting," but he reads newspapers, detective mystery stories, magazines, and gets a chuckle out of the comics, too.

Employees of the F. C. A. say he is one of the best-informed men in the building on current events.

Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the Department of Agriculture, under which the Farm Credit Administration functions, for a complete explanation. If a satisfactory explanation is not received I propose to offer a resolution seeking a full investigation of this whole matter.

Pohick Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon preached in Pohick Church, November 7, 1943, by the rector, C. E. Buxton, before three posts of the American Legion and Auxiliaries, Mount Vernon Chapter 22, Baltimore Chapter 122, Military Order of the Purple Heart, and other visiting members with ladies of the M. C. P. H. Auxiliaries, and visiting officers and men of the United States forces from Quantico and Fort Belvoir, and the regular congregation of the church:

St. Luke xxiii: 47: "Now when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God saying, 'Certainly this was a righteous man.' "—a text which has always engaged my attention for here was a captain in charge of a disagreeable duty, whose only deity was probably Caesar, who stood at the cross so close that he could see and hear everything, and when all was finished, he could as an honest soldier and man come to only one conclusion, to wit, without doubt this Jesus was one I call truly righteous—a remarkable witness from one who was surely not prejudiced for Him. We can better understand how Peter could and did make his answer "Thou art the Son of the living God,"—how the men of the assembly came back and reported, "never a man spake like this man." A soldier can indeed well appreciate this text of St. Luke xxiii: 47.

A double honor is ours today. One, enjoying the full measure of freedom of worship, we can honor our God in divine service, here in this historic church wherein have worshipped the good and great of many generations, and wherein have come as visitors and guests, like ourselves, men and women from far and near, whose names are writ on history's pages.

We who make this our church home consider it an honor, a democratic one for all pews are free, yet a privilege (as we are sure you do) to sit in the places of these splendid men and women who once occupied these boxes. You who sit in Washington's pew—Washington whom many hold as the greatest soldier and citizen of all ages; the pew of Col. Alexander Henderson who was on liberty's side, who with Washington and Mason were the Virginia commissioners who met with Maryland's Chase, Stone, and Jenifer to determine the navigation and jurisdiction of the waters of the Chesapeake who, thinking of the Marine Corps anniversary today, gave them a great general, Gen. Archibald Henderson and another son was Thomas, a famous surgeon of the Army and one of the founders of the theological seminary but a few miles away; one daughter married Gen. Francis Smith, superintendent of the Virginia Military Institute; the Fairfax pew, the Fairfaxes, intimately asscciated with Washington, Belvoir, Virginia, Pohick, Church neighbors they were, life-long friends, fellow vestrymen; the Mason, builders of this shrine, great men, their pews are side by side touching each other, just like you men sit at this time.

It is appropriate that the members of the Military Order of the Purple Heart sit in the pews of the one who founded your order of merit in 1782; you who wear the first American decoration for valor and the second oldest medal in all the world given to the military, or under special citation given by the Commander in Chief himself. You have made pilgrimages to Washington's headquarters, battlefields, and his home—now you have come to his home church, and perchance find it not hard to almost see or feel him sitting by your side. To the welcome already given you, we add the hope that along with Temple Hill and Mount Vernon you will include Pohick Church in your future itineraries—this is a standing invitation to you as it is to the American Legion, to come—I think a lovely, right, and most helpful thing for organizations to attend in a body divine service at least once a year.

It is quite as apropos that the members of the American Legion are here. Around you the pews of those who wrote and battled for liberty, the Washingtons and Custis, the Lees were not strangers here, Colonel Mason of '76, the Blackburns—how generously they gave of their fortunes; Peter Wagener, gallant major of the French and Indian Wars, and those to whom Baddock's men owed much that they were not all massacred—hardly a pew, if one, where did not sit those who took their muskets and swords when the call to arms came; 1812 and 1861–65, those who followed the Stars and Stripes and the Stars and Bars, and followed them well; the War with Spain, the World War No. 1—the names of those who made the supreme sacrifice from Mount Vernon and Lee districts are in bronze below the pulpit, a bronze dedicated by a President of the United States. A slab outside marks the resting place of those interred around this church. It commemorates the unknown dead parishioners of whom undoubtedly there are the soldiers of the early wars. Across from me is the pew of Parson Weems, once minister here, whose stories of Washington you learned when a child and every boy and girl knows. Rev. Lee Massey, his ashes are under this pulpit, his marker in the enclosure—lawyer, doctor, minister—while rector here he advised in law for the soldiers, and when the veterans grew aged and infirm he ministered to them as a physician. Pews of the ladies, whose fortitude and faith gave steel to the men they gave to their country, like women

of this time, and as the ladies of the auxiliaries present today gave. Brethren, you sit in the midst of memories of the immortals.

The second honor is that we are honored in having you with us, in your coming here humbly as men of God to worship with us, men not ashamed to pray, men who have sworn by all that is high and holy to ever stand for those principles our forefathers deemed worth their all, and you have proven this by your conduct and service for the United States of America. An honor to be here; an honor to have you here.

We gather this Sunday before the armistice in the midst of a global war, for unless something unforeseen happens, there is much bloody fighting to be done, and we at home have yet our high morale to keep, our determination to win, our sacrifices to be willingly made, our unlimited support to pay in many ways, as our share in all that a treacherous and evil enemy has forced upon us.

When the men of 1917–18 came home, they never dreamed their sons and daughters would be summoned to a conflict such as now engulfs the world—all because we as a nation, and others, failed to organize an enduring peace in the last post-war years. I am quite sure that all of us feel we have much to be repented of in what we did not do to insure a safe and secure world; we hesitate to cast the first stone very far.

But we do not want the mistake of "winning the war to lose the peace" to happen again, to recur: we have in our hearts and minds the overpowering desire for a just and durable peace. We know this must be based on righteousness; any other basis is a mockery; this does not leave out other factors, e. g., economic and social factors, but it does say you cannot make it a mere political peace and have any durable peace, for then the "four freedoms" and decency, honor, truth, respect for treaty and regard for pledged word will go into the discard as soon as some disgruntled loser of this war can rearm. We pray constantly for peace, that it come with such integrity that we can ask God's blessing on it.

The Legion in its last convention distinguished itself by an outstanding expression of foreign policy, reiterating its declaration of a year ago: "No peace, however welcome, however promising, can long endure, unless it be made secure by the nations which have won it; nations which must ever be prepared in every sense to fight for the right of free men and freedom-loving peoples. We cannot escape, we will not evade, our own responsibility for the maintenance of that peace. We must not forget our stake in it." It goes on to speak of the principles that must actuate such.

There is a piece—author unknown to me—written evidently by one who knew, as some of you know by experience the same scene, of a place in France—I read this and will explain shortly: "A wood, a blackened, blasted tree, here a piece of artillery, a rusty helmet left in the forest. The natives of the province called it the wood of fair waters, but that was many years ago. Then, cool, green-bordered paths stole their way between the trees, and frail little vines dipped and rose in the ripples of the silent pools. Belleau Wood is known for other, lesser things now; for a battle that raged and rumbled through the naked heat of a long summer day, for a shattering violence that destroyed all tall and perfect things. The wood where beauty lay slumbers now in the midst of inexpressible weariness. There are waters still, but they are merely sad little trenches where men crouched to hide from death. Or shallow pools where shells burst and the rain gathers in stagnant eddies. This is sacred ground—nothing has changed since that day of conflict—and yet all has changed. For out of the bruised and twisted trunks, new leaves of succeeding springtime are lifted to the sky where the larks, still bravely singing, fly. Under the rusting shells and broken guns, new life creeps furtively. Slowly, relentlessly, nature is coveting to herself all the little perishable things of hate man has made.

And from them great trees will grow, flowers will flourish and dip their plumes in silent waters, and content will walk again with love; the habitants will again call it the wood of fair waters, for as an ugly cross became the world's most radiant living tree, so our shattered dreams shall lead to a newer, higher life, if, if, we only will do what we know, what we know, what all of us of every nation knows—to love mercy, to do justly, and to walk humbly with our God—and not until then."[1]

I have read this, not only for memory's sake, not just because it is an exceptionally beautiful description, but to remind you of younger years how the soldier felt when he came back from the last war—hoping he had made the world safe for democracy. How his dreams have been shattered; why reverently he says, "Fear God," and not irreverently adds, "and keep your powder dry," until a better peace than the last one is with us.

Having in mind the text of the centurion, the experiences of the war we knew, and those our boys tell us of this one—"no one is an atheist in a foxhole" or in oil-slick waters or with one plane wing cracked and but one engine running—I want to commend One who knows all about you and is ever your friend "I call you friend," He says, and He proved his love for each one of us—"Greater love hath no man than he lay down his life for his friend." The man on the raft with Rickenbacker was practically an agnostic—he was; he is not now. Two men—one of the two last surviving officers of the original Black Watch, hung on a barbed wire at the edge of "no man's land—he was wounded seriously; the other of an equally famous regiment, the Princess Pats of Canada, who was covered with earth and mud, half buried in the nearby burst of a big shell, was bleeding profusely. Each said practically the same words, "Lord, if You help me get out of this, my life is yours afterward." They got out by almost a miracle—both are clergymen in the Episcopal Church today. Christ does not fail.

It is reported that there are 600 men in the Eighth Army who have already signified their intention of going into the ministry if they get through this war. People's minds are turned to the enduring values when dark days come—when it gets dark enough they see the stars and think. Christianity has never failed—the living, or rather lack of living, of it has failed and plunged the world into suffering and sorrow many a time. I commend the Lord of Righteousness to you as a daily comrade, true as steel.

To you of the Purple Heart who wear it for wounds received, the verses by Edward Shillito may appeal to you:

"If, when the doors are shut, thou drawest near,
Only reveal those hands, that side of thine,
We know today what wounds are, have no fear,
Show us the scars; we know the countersign.

"The other gods were strong, but thou wast weak;
They rode, but thou didst stumble to a throne;
But to our wounds, God's wounds alone canst speak,
And not a god hast wounds, but thou alone."

To each of you of the Purple Heart, those in service there is a very high standard which gives meaning to your uniform and enriches every bar, chevron, lace, badge, and medal worn thereon—when you face the front as one who counted not his life dear in perilous hour—the four-square standard of soldier, comrade, gentleman, man of God.

A quarter of a century has passed since 1918, when the November bugles blew "Cease firing," and a world went wild with joy of the armistice. With our thoughts oft far away with those who serve today on and under the sea, on land, and in the air, we keep our day of remembrance for those who from falling hands threw the torch, that they may know their torch is caught and we have not broken faith with those who "went west"— we shall not fail them. Within this circle of remembrance we place those of this war who have fallen and are falling, giving their last full measure of devotion.

May they enter more and more into the service and joy of the Lord, and with His servants everywhere win the eternal victory.

May God bless the right—and help us always to stand for and do the right—His will be done. Amen.

[1] Slightly altered (Wood of Fair Waters).

Relief of Certain Property Owners of Santa Cruz County, Ariz.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Senate Memorial 2

Memorial praying for the relief of certain property owners of Santa Cruz County

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

Through the establishment by the United States in 1898 of a 60-foot neutral strip of territory along the boundary between the United States and Mexico, the rights of persons owning property within said area were involved. Particularly were the rights of property owners within that portion of said neutral strip where the same passed through the territory now known as Santa Cruz County, Ariz., affected, inasmuch as the said strip at such location constituted a part of the city of Nogales, and later became what is now known as International Street in the said city of Nogales.

In the course of a determination of the rights of parties owning property within the said area, the Court of Claims of the United States on April 15, 1912, found that the following named persons were entitled to compensation in the amounts set forth respectively for the taking of their property within said neutral strip as it passed through Santa Cruz County: John T. Brickwood, $3,750; Edward Gaynor, $4,250; Theodore Gebler, $1,200; Lee W. Mix, $1,450; Arthur S. Peck, $2,350; Thomas S. Casanega, $500; Joseph D. Lusignan, $3,250; Joseph P. Berger, $1,800.

Despite the fact that said court found said persons entitled to compensation in the amounts above set forth, they have never been compensated for the loss of their property in accordance with the findings of the court, or at all, a failure which appears to constitute a clear violation of the provision of the Constitution of the United States that private property may not be taken for public use without compensating the owner therefor. Wherefore your memorialist, the

Senate of the State of Arizona, urgently requests—

1. That the Congress of the United States enact the necessary legislation to pay the persons above named the amounts awarded to them by the United States Court of Claims as compensation for the land taken by the United States in the establishment of said neutral strip along the boundary between the United States and Mexico.

Adopted by the senate by the following vote: February 22, 1945, unanimous.

Approved by the Governor, February 23, 1945.

Filed in the office of secretary of state, February 28, 1945.

Central Valley Recapture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to my attention information of the organization of a group in California whose purpose it is to place the great Central Valley reclamation project under the jurisdiction of the State by removing it from the jurisdiction of the United States Bureau of Reclamation. This interested me because of the enormous sums of money involved. I wanted to know how the State was going to finance the deal, so I wrote to Secretary of the Interior Ickes, presuming that he had been approached by the California group, which I understand is composed of very substantial citizens.

Apparently Secretary Ickes knew no more than I of what financial plans had been proposed under which California would assume the responsibility for this project, which, before it is completed, may run into more than $1,000,000,000 of expenditures. He did send me information regarding the organization of the California group, and a letter he had directed to Governor Warren, in which the Secretary also was seeking information. He has promised to let me know when he hears from the Governor.

There was one particularly interesting fact revealed in the material Secretary Ickes sent me—the fact that the California group apparently is not satisfied with the representation it is receiving from its present delegation in Congress, and intends to supplement it with an unofficial and more highly paid representative, who would receive $12,000 a year for his persuasive efforts. A $10,000 Sacramento representative and a $10,000 publicity man also are proposed.

For the information of the House I am inserting in the RECORD my correspondence on this subject with Secretary Ickes, and a copy of the letter he addressed to Governor Warren, which, I believe, violates no confidences. Since this situation involves the possible payment by the State of California to the Federal Government of more than $150,000,000, an unprecedented procedure, in exchange for tremendous productive properties, I feel sure it will interest all of you.

The correspondence follows:

MARCH 10, 1945.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ICKES: I have read recently of the organization of a California Water Council which apparently is endeavoring to build up sentiment for the transfer of the Central Valley Federal reclamation project to the State of California.

The gentlemen who are proposing this, I presume, have been in touch with you and have discussed financial arrangements under which the State might take over the enterprise which will be of concern to all Californians. It is my understanding that more than $150,000,000 already has been expended by the Bureau of Reclamation on this project, and that plans call for expenditure of hundreds of millions more.

My chief interest in writing you is to learn what proposals have been made regarding the financial obligations which the State would have to assume in taking over the project.

Some years ago, the voters of California approved a bond issue for the purpose of constructing the Central Valley project under State ownership. I took active part in the campaign for this bond issue, and the people of San Francisco voted strongly in favor of it. Indeed, the vote of the people of my city was a decisive factor in the passage of the bond issue. However, it was subsequently determined that the bonds as voted could not be marketed.

Then the State of California, largely through the efforts of its Representatives in Congress, prevailed upon the Federal Government to undertake the financing and construction of this great reclamation project. This has been done under your supervision. Naturally, as a Representative of California, I am very much interested in the proposals which are apparently being made now for the State to take over the project and assume financial responsibility for its completion.

I have heard that the group making these proposals intends to maintain a lobby in Washington to support their program, but I have no authentic information concerning this.

Any light you can throw upon proposed methods of financing the transfer of the project to State ownership and control, especially the manner in which the State would obtain the many hundreds of millions of dollars required at reasonable rates of interest, will be appreciated. That also raises the question whether irrigation water and electric current could be provided at low rates, and if repayment for the project includes payment of interest charges.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCK R. HAVENNER,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1945.

Hon. FRANCK R. HAVENNER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Your request of March 10 for a report on the organization of the California Water Council and what proposals have been made regarding the financial obligation that the State of California might assume in taking over the Central Valley project from the Bureau of Reclamation is at hand.

I regret that I cannot provide this information that you seek because no such proposal is before this Department. I also have been informed that some organization has been created under the name of the California Water Council that proposes to maintain at least one expensive lobbyist in Washington, as you report. It further proposes to maintain an additional lobbyist in Sacramento and, also, to engage in a publicity campaign to further the as yet not fully disclosed objectives of the California Water Council.

I have made an inquiry on this same subject of the Governor of California and transmitted to him certain reports covering the plans and expectations of this California Water Council, which I understand is a private organization. I enclose, in response to your congressional request for information, my inquiry. That embraces all of the information which has been made available to me.

I recall well your service to the State of California at the time its citizens strongly and successfully urged that the Federal Government, through the Public Works Administration, of which I was then Administrator, take over and proceed with the great Central Valley project. They did so on the basis that California was unable to carry forward the financing and construction of this tremendous development which will be of such widespread benefit to the people of the State. I was happy to be able to make the arrangements that California sought whereby irrigation water and electrical energy could be provided the people of California at low rates under the favorable Federal regulations providing for specified repayments from the beneficiaries. I am glad to be able to report that the construction has been driven forward by the Bureau of Reclamation with expenditures already approaching $150,000,000 from which California has already derived tremendous benefits, with further low-rate water and power still to come.

Any revision of these arrangements must naturally provide for repayment of Federal funds already expended, as well as assurance that the State, by some method as yet undisclosed, is prepared to take over responsibility for the investment already made and also the ultimate completion of the Central Valley project so that all of the benefits might be attained.

In the event that I receive further information which might more specifically answer your inquiry, I will be glad to make it available to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 7, 1945.

The Honorable EARL WARREN,
Governor of California,
Sacramento, Calif.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR WARREN: The question of whether the State of California is to assume the responsibilities of financing and constructing the Central Valley project has been placed before you by a recently organized State group. A committee headed by Milton L. Kidd, which included Edward Hyatt, State engineer, met with you to discuss this matter last January 18 and reported to the group they represented that your attitude was receptive.

A subsequent meeting was held in Fresno on January 26 at which Ronald B. Harris, of the Irrigation Districts Association, and Burnham Emerson, of the North Kern Water Storage District, submitted a draft of proposed legislation. On the following day pertinent legislation was introduced in the State Senate by Senators Crittenden, Deuel, Mixter, Fletcher, and Cunningham.

The committee which brought about this movement has proposed that it raise a yearly budget of $38,000 to forward its activities through a Washington representative, who would be paid $12,000 a year, a Sacramento representative at $10,000, and a publicity agent at $12,000.

Naturally, the activities in relation to the Central Valley of such a group of well-known California citizens interest me, since the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior has an investment of $157,180,000 in the Central Valley project, and has plans for its completion which would involve additional expenditure of more than $200,000,000 during the post-war period, in order that all of the farmers of present and potentially irrigated lands might be assured of adequate water permanently.

In addition, the Bureau has tentative plans that might result in the construction in the Central Valley after the war of works requiring hundreds of millions more. The reclamation law, of course, has provisions that have proved very useful in the development of the West, including the clause which enables advancement of Federal funds without collection of interest charges on the capital outlay. I assume, of course, that the State would wish to protect the project in the manner of these provisions in its legislation and with its credit and funds.

You will recall the circumstances under which the project became the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation in 1935, when the State of California was unable to negotiate satisfactory terms for the sale of an issue of $170,000,000 of revenue bonds, authorized by the legislation of 1933. At that time the State was glad to have the Federal Government assume the burden of financing this project under the favorable provision of the reclamation law. Ability of the State to assume such a burden now, it seems to me, should depend partly upon whether it could buy out the investment of the Federal Government and finance the remainder of the project and related works itself. In the intervening years, the reclamation engineers, working with your State water project authority, have elaborated the plans originally put forword.

If the State has arrived at a financial position where it is ready to reimburse the United States Treasury for expenditures already made in behalf of the people of California, and is further prepared to guarantee the additional financing necessary to complete the project within a reasonable number of years, the Department of the Interior is prepared to withdraw from the project. Before we hand back these responsibilities to the State, however, we feel that sufficient evidence should be presented to prove the willingness and ability of Californians to shoulder the burdens of this great enterprise.

Attached hereto are data regarding the organization of the group of prominent individuals which may help to throw some light on the situation.

I would very much like to have your views on this, because the Bureau of Reclamation has made many commitments in regard to further development, and because the doubts which have been raised by the proposal to have the State again assume the responsibilities of constructing the Central Valley project necessarily make us think twice before making further commitments, at least until the present uncertainty is resolved. Do you think the State is now prepared to resume full responsibility for the project? Any information you can give me on the financial problems involved will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours.

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Jefferson $100 Plate Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements:

JEFFERSON $100 PLATE

Chairman Hannegan, in his press notice of the dinners in honor of the author of the Declaration of Independence, names a sliding scale of prices per dinner plate. The prices vary from $25 per plate to $100.

There are $25 plates, $50 plates, and $100 plates. If the contents of the plate determine the price, the menu of Jefferson principles and policies might run something like this:

1. $25 plate: Author of the Declaration of Independence of British rule, as the soup course, plus the debt-extinguishment program of Jefferson as the main course without trimmings.

2. $50 plate: Above courses plus the following—(a) Jefferson's life record as a "Republican" plus (b) Jefferson's support of the American tradition that 2 terms in the White House are enough.

3. $100 plate: In addition to menu 1 and menu 2 above, the $100 plate gets the following list of hors-d'ouvres, side dishes, and desserts:

(a) Neutrality and avoidance of foreign entanglements.

(b) Government efficiency and economy.

(c) Eight annual Treasury surpluses in a row.

(d) Jefferson's Republican slogan—Equal rights to all—Special privileges to none. (P. S.—The New Deal version thereof as interpreted by the late Will Rogers—"Equal rights to none, special privileges to all.")

Thus for $100 per plate, the Hannegan-Hillman dinner serves 8 principles and policies of Thomas Jefferson in reverse.

If Jefferson's bill of rights—including freedom of speech, freedom of the press, rights of States, and protection of private property from seizure without due process to law—were also included in the Hannegan-Hillman dinner, the price thereof might be prohibitive to the rank and file of even the C. I. O.-P. A. C.

One of the most interesting Jeffersonian precedents for the fourth-termers to celebrate is Jefferson's continuous policy of a yearly Treasury surplus (see U. S. Treasury reports):

Fiscal year:	*Surplus, including debt retirements*
1801	$3,540,749
1802	7,133,676
1803	3,212,445
1804	3,106,865
1805	3,054,459
1806	5,756,314
1807	8,043,868
1808	7,128,170

In sharp contrast, the first 8 fiscal years of the New Deal prior to the present war showed eight consecutive annual Treasury deficits aggregating $30,000,000,000.

Jefferson cut down the public debt 8 years in a row, while the present fourth-termers increased the debt as well as the taxes 8 years in a row, before the war began.

Jefferson accomplished this financial achievement in efficiency and economy by resisting the ambition to build up his executive power by multiplication of bureaus and offices, at the expense of the States.

Were Jefferson alive today he might well cite the following paragraph from the Declaration of Independence, as an example of what the present incumbent has brought about in defiance of Jeffersonian principles:

"He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

This Jeffersonian doctrine might also be a good theme for the orator of the Jefferson Day dinner in Washington April 13, 1945.

Proof that Democrats were nonexistent in Jefferson's day is the official classification of the Ninth Congress in the second term of Jefferson:

United States Senate, 27 Republicans and 7 Federalists; Democrats 0.

House of Representatives, 119 Republicans and 25 Federalists; Democrats 0.

Both Houses, 146 Republicans and 32 Federalists; Democrats 0.

So the Jefferson birthday dinner presided over by Chairman Hannegan at the Mayflower on April 13, 1945, will celebrate the principles of the first Republican President and the measures of a Congress which stood—146 Republicans, 32 Federalists, and no Democrats—while paying $100 per plate for the privilege of commemorating the following achievements of Thomas Jefferson, the Republican:

The program for extinguishing the public debt.

An 8-year surplus in the United States Treasury without a deficit.

The American tradition that two terms in the White House are enough.

Neutrality and avoidance of foreign entanglements.

Government efficiency and economy without autocratic bureaus.

The American slogan: "Equal rights to all, special privileges to none."

Freedom of speech and freedom of the press without an O. W. I.

Protection of private property against seizure without due process of law.

And the Declaration of Independence against foreign rule and tribute in a Republic where Congress consists of 146 Republicans, 32 Federalists, and no Democrats.

That certainly is worth $100 per plate.

JEFFERSON WAS A "REPUBLICAN"

Under the new party management by Sidney Hillman and the C. I. O.-P. A. C., as recently announced through the press, there will be no more annual celebration of Jackson Day, and, in lieu thereof, the party will celebrate Jefferson's birthday.

The two outstanding political crimes for which Andrew Jacksoan has been indicted are:

1. On January 8, 1935, which for over a century has been known as "Jackson Day," Andrew Jackson paid off the last dollar of the public debt. How, indeed, could a party which has recently boosted the public debt limit to $300,000,000,000, take as godfather Andrew Jackson who, not only extinguished the debt, but claimed that debt-extinguishment was the greatest civic achievement of his administration?

2. Andrew Jackson perpetrated the further political crime of publishing in The Globe, on the morning of January 8, 1835, in the call for the first Jackson Day dinner, that this was a "Republican celebration":

[From The Globe, city of Washington, Thursday morning, January 8, 1835]

REPUBLICAN CELEBRATION

"The subscribers for the public dinner in this city, to be had this day, in honor of the Extinguishment of the National Debt, and Commemoration of the Battle of New Orleans, are requested to call for their tickets

at Brown's Hotel, prior to 5 o'clock p. m., this day.

"The dinner will be served at precisely 6 o'clock, at Brown's Hotel, at which time and place invited guests and subscribers are requested to attend.

"By order of the Committee of Arrangements.

"Thursday, January 8, 1935."

So after 109 years of celebrating Andrew Jackson as the godfather of the Democratic Party Jackson is to be thrown into the discard and the party will now celebrate Thomas Jefferson.

It is plain that the C. I. O.-P. A. C. managers of New Deal democracy have never yet read American history—not even the first inaugural message of Thomas Jefferson delivered to Congress March 4, 1801. Said Jefferson in classifying American citizens of that day:

"We are Republicans—we are Federalists."

There was no Democratic Party until the first Democratic National Convention held at Baltimore in 1836—10 years after Jefferson was in his grave.

Thomas Jefferson, in the scores of letters he wrote in building up his political following, invariably called himself and his followers Republicans. The word "democratic" was a smear word used by the Federalists to imply that Jeffersonians favored mob rule.

The first use of the term "Democratic" by the Republicans was after the Jefferson administration, when New York followers held what were termed "Democratic-Republican" caucuses. But in the South and West Jefferson followers continued to call themselves Republicans even for 30 years after the Jefferson inaugural message of March 4, 1801.

In the Rare Book Section of the Library of Congress there is preserved a small booklet giving the proceedings of the Republican Convention of the First Congressional District of Virginia in 1836. Virginia is Jefferson's own State. Yet what are now known as the Democrats of Virginia still in 1936 called their party Republican, following the example of Jefferson in 1801–10.

Of even greater significance than the party name is the economic fact that the debt-extinguishment program which Andrew Jackson completed on January 8, 1835, was Jefferson's own program.

Yearly debt extinguishment by gradual reduction installments was one of the first steps inaugurated by Jefferson and his Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin. Gallatin set up a sinking fund for debt extinguishment. Five Presidents and 16 Congresses—from 1801 to 1835—year after year, except during the War of 1812, joined in reducing the Revolutionary debt, until, on January 8, 1835, Andrew Jackson paid off the last debt installment completing the Jefferson-Gallatin debt-extinguishment program of 1801.

In switching from Jackson to Jefferson in their search for a godfather, the C. I. O.-P. A. C. edition of New Deal democracy has jumped from the frying pan into the fire. In Thomas Jefferson as godfather, the New Dealers are celebrating the birthday of the first Republican in American history, as well as the author of the Jefferson-Gallatin plan of abolishing the public debt.

But the New Deal democracy of today departs from Jeffersonian principles on more points than the two above named, as witness:

1. Thomas Jefferson favored what for 145 years was known as the American tradition of two terms in the White House enough. The New Dealers are pondering the question whether four terms are enough.

2. Thomas Jefferson deplored foreign entanglements. The party today, after cementing a three-power foreign alliance with $36,000,000,000 of lend-lease, now wants that alliance and lend-lease continued indefinitely into the post-war period.

3. Any Member of Congress now supporting Jeffersonian principles both in spirit and in letter is in danger of being smeared by the C. I. O.-P. A. C. as an isolationist, because Thomas Jefferson, like Washington, favored neutrality in our foreign relations.

The progress of debt extinguishment during Jefferson's two terms in the White House was as marked as the yearly increase of the public debt during the first three terms of the present incumbent.

Jefferson's second annual message, December 3, 1802, tells Congress that "upward of $8,000,000, principal and interest, of the public debt" is paid, and that a further sum of $4,500,000 is in course of payment.

Jefferson's third, fourth, and fifth annual messages made like reports of debt reduction, aggregating $18,000,000 of the principal and a like amount of interest on the debt.

Jefferson's sixth annual message reported $23,000,000 of the principal paid in addition to the interest paid, while his eighth and last message reported extinguishment of $33,580,000 of the principal in addition to the payment of a like amount of 6 and even 8 percent interest.

Except during the War of 1812, under the Madison administration, the Jefferson-Gallatin debt-extinguishing program was annually approved by Congress as a continuing institution. The Monroe administration reduced the debt annually, following the plan of Jefferson, as did the John Quincy Adams administration—all calling themselves Republican.

In 1825, John Quincy Adams reported to Congress that the principal of the public debt—including both the Revolutionary debt and that of the War of 1812—was now reduced to $81,000,000. Said Adams to the Nineteenth Congress:

"It is exceedingly desirable that it (the public debt) should be extinguished altogether. * * * And, when the pledge * * * to the public creditor shall have been redeemed by the entire discharge of the national debt, the swelling tide of wealth with which they replenish the common Treasury may be made to reflow in unfailing streams of improvement from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean."

Finally, ten years later, on January 8, 1835, a full generation after Jefferson made the first debt reduction, Andrew Jackson completed the job, and called for the "Republican Celebration"—which was officially announced in The Globe.

Five Presidents and 16 Congresses—most of whom, following Jefferson, calling themselves Republican—finally consummated the debt extinguishment begun by Thomas Jefferson on March 4, 1801. Andrew Jackson had the honor of finishing the job of which Jefferson was the architect and foundation builder.

Jefferson laid the first foundation stones as a Republican, and Jackson celebrated the completion of the job by holding a Republican celebration.

These are the two patriotic Americans—Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson—between whom today the C. I. O.-P. A. C. are trying to find a godfather. They have abjured Andrew Jackson because he was a debt extinguisher who called a Republican Celebration. They turn to Jefferson, who proclaimed himself a Republican and was the author of the debt-extinguishment job which Jackson completed. Were either Jackson or Jefferson alive today, would they admit paternity of a New Deal group which in 12 years has boosted the debt 12 years in a row and now climbs the Mount Ararat limit of $300,000,000,000?

The Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, this House, as the Government body immediately responsible to the people of the United States, cannot longer evade its responsibility in the acute food problem with which the Nation is now confronted.

The problem grows worse daily. Shortages increase daily. Announcements of future shortages pour forth daily from the press agents of the several executive agencies which are supposed to be providing a steady and adequate supply of food for our armies, our allies, and ourselves.

President Roosevelt has declared that no decent man will question the allotments of food to relief organizations and to foreign governments. But let me say that decency, like charity, begins at home. And when we hear that sufferers are running away from tuberculosis hospitals because those hospitals can provide only one-half of the minimum meat ration necessary to persons in their condition, then it becomes the duty of decent men to ask what is the matter and to insist upon righting the conditions.

Last week announcement was made of the formation of an interagency committee to study future allotments of food to the various agencies and enterprises engaged in relief work in liberated lands and conquered lands, and Saturday, a few days later, it was announced that civilian supplies of meat in the United States are to be reduced by 12 percent for the next 3 months.

This announcement comes on the heels of months of scarcity during which the American housewife has been unable to obtain a decent cut of meat for her family. It comes on the heels of the cancellation of red points that housewives had been saving to obtain decent cuts of meat for Christmas. Yet we are told that decent men should not say or do anything about it.

I believe that the most elementary decency requires that the proper committees of this House, without delay, determine the whys and wherefores of these shortages and find a way to eliminate them.

The American workingman and workingwoman cannot long continue the miraculous production of weapons and equipment of war which has made possible all of the Allied successes, if they are to be put on and kept upon an inadequate diet.

This House could make no greater contribution to the healthy prosecution of the war than by diligently inquiring into all aspects of the food situation—the amount of food available here, the amount piled up in foreign countries, the amount of American-produced food be-

ing distributed in foreign countries under various auspices, the degree to which these amounts are necessary as a part of the war effort, and, most importantly, the means and steps to be taken to increase domestic production of food to alleviate the existing acute shortage.

Without going into the matter of how much food has been shipped abroad—not for the use of our armies—I should like to point out the conviction I have had, and have stated on numerous occasions, that the production of food has been unnecessarily and unwisely discouraged. Government interference with the farmer and his markets has made it impossible for the producer of food to do the increased job which he must do to meet our own needs and the needs of others who have some claim upon us.

We have dozens of bureaus and agencies interfering with, harassing, and hopping on our farmers. The officers of most of these bureaus and agencies know little about the farmer, the farm, or its products, except that food is something you eat. That is about the outside limit of their knowledge.

This is not a new condition. It has been going on for years. It began when we followed Henry Wallace's orders to slaughter millions of little pigs. And through these years we have built up around the food producer an impassable fence of Government bungling and interference. We are now paying the price in the food shortage which many of us predicted was bound to come.

By governmental interference, schemes, projects, dreams, and contradictions of all the natural laws of food production and food distribution, we have reduced the American diet to a dangerous and unhealthy point.

Even the farmer, though he loves his soil and the products of his soil, cannot and will not work forever without some hope of profit.

But the Government has interfered with and disrupted his market. It has set prices for his produce at such ridiculously low retail levels that the farmer cannot sell even at the cost of production. The inevitable result is abandoned farms and decreased production.

The Government has interfered with farm manpower to a ridiculous extent, with the result that the farmer cannot get and cannot hold the help which is essential even to normal production, let alone the added production which is essential in wartime.

Beyond that, the President issued a directive to draft officials to ignore the Tydings amendment, with the result that the farms have been depleted of essential farm labor.

The Government has interfered with and made it impossible for the food producer to obtain machinery and equipment which are essential to the production of normal food supplies.

In short, it seems that the Government has done everything possible to discourage the food producer, to drive him out of business, and to create the food shortage which the American people—whether the President believes them decent or not—demand now to be alleviated.

On their record it is too much to expect that the very Federal agencies which are in a great measure responsible for the condition which now exists could be expected to do anything intelligent toward its alleviation.

The sole hope of the American people for a decent availability of an adequate food supply lies in this House of Representatives. It can determine what is wrong. It can insist that the wrong be righted. The time is now.

Rehabilitation in the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of Congress, as well as the public, would be much interested in the address made by Capt. Howard H. Montgomery, United States Navy, officer in charge of rehabilitation, United States Navy, before Washington (D. C.) Lodge, No. 2, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, along with the introductory remarks of President James E. Walsh, of Lodge No. 2, which are as follows:

President WALSH. As we know, the problems of disabled people are inextricably interwoven. In this instance we refer to those disabled, both in the service of our country and the civilian handicapped. Since we have in the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped both those in the armed forces and civilians as members, we are naturally anxious to know what has been done and what is planned on behalf of all groups.

We have learned that with its usual commendable foresight and energy the Navy has developed a splendid program for rehabilitation of the disabled. I am sure that each of you will feel highly edified by learning, at first-hand, the details and methods being developed by the Navy Department.

We are honored in having the officer in charge of rehabilitation, Navy Department, as a speaker this evening, and I take pleasure in introducing to you one of the foremost specialists in this field in the United States today, Capt. Howard H. Montgomery.

Captain MONTGOMERY. As it became apparent that the present war would be a long, hard, and costly undertaking, the thoughts of men and women in civilian life, as well as in the armed services, turned toward the inevitable casualties. It was the consensus of opinion that adequate treatment meant more than the best of medical and surgical attention. Military necessity demanded that every man possible be returned to active service as expeditiously as possible and ready to vigorously resume his regular duties. The country's debt of gratitude to those whose disabilities necessitated their return to civil life must be partly discharged by giving them every reasonable assistance in making a satisfactory readjustment. These considerations loomed large in the thoughts of the Medical Department of the Navy in planning for its care of the men and women of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

Trends of naval activity and experience with early casualties were carefully watched, reports of procedures in effect in Allied countries with longer war experience were reviewed, until about a year ago the Surgeon General announced the establishment of an office in the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery to develop, place in operation, and direct a rehabilitation program for the Medical Department of the Navy.

This program provides activities and services which may be required to supplement the ordinary or usual therapeutic procedures in order to achieve maximum adjustment of the patient, either for further military service or for return to civil life, with the least possible handicap from his disability. It includes physical and occupational therapy, education and training, education and vocational counseling, physical training, recreation, social service in its broad meaning, and for those returning to civil life assistance in their problems of readjustment.

This appeared to be a new departure in the Medical Department, but it was new only as a formally organized undertaking necessitated by wartime conditions. The ends it was intended to achieve have always been the basic aims of the Medical Department.

Rehabilitation is not considered a separate undertaking, started at some ill-defined stage in recovery, nor is it a procedure applicable only to a particular type of case. Rather, it is a process that starts as soon as a man comes under medical care—a process that includes all patients—and continues until the maximum benefit from the treatment has been attained and the man is ready to leave the hospital. It consists of the usual complete medical and surgical care supplemented by the services of the rehabilitation program which are designed to hasten recovery and return to duty in an optimum state of physical fitness with a minimum loss of adeptness in usual duties, or prepare the way for a satisfactory readjustment to civil life.

All naval hospitals in the United States have rehabilitation programs in operation which vary in details according to local peculiarities of construction, climatic conditions, and the type of patients that predominate. All hospitals, however, are general hospitals, in the sense that they are not limited to treatment of any particular type of case. Their patients consist of men and women admitted from nearby Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard activities, as well as casualities evacuated from combat areas. As a general rule, the patients received from nearby stations are admitted for acute conditions with complete recovery expected within a relatively short time. The patients received from the combat areas, however, as well as a certain percentage of local admissions, require prolonged periods of treatment before they are ready to leave the hospital, whether to return to duty or to civil life. Consequently, the rehabilitation effort in any one hospital, both in its treatment and in its supplementary activities, must be adapted to the needs of its particular patient population.

With the fact in mind that naval patients remain hospitalized until convalescence is complete, and thus have a considerable amount of time during which the need for active medical or surgical attention is decreasing and they feel increasingly fit, it becomes apparent that there is an opportunity for the rehabilitation program to come into full play.

The program operates in each hospital through a medical officer who is designated as rehabilitation officer, assisted by a rehabilitation board composed of medical officers and technical specialists who represent the various contributory activities. Inasmuch as the program supplements the usual procedures of medical and surgical

treatment, it is guided at all times by the ward medical officer responsible for the care of the individual patient. His recommendations as to types of activity and limitations on the extent of activity govern in all cases. He determines when these auxiliary activities should be introduced, and which ones will contribute most to recovery.

Physical medicine, which is interpreted to include both physical therapy and occupational therapy, is a phase of the program that is actually an integral part of the professional treatment. When indicated, physical therapy is prescribed and included in the patient's daily schedule, so that it may properly supplement the other rehabilitation procedures, especially when activity and exercise are concerned. Occupational therapy is used to promote recovery from physical conditions such as are encountered in orthopedic and surgical wards, and to aid in bringing about a healthy outlook. In certain neuropsychiatric and psychosomatic conditions, directed activity in pursuits that interest the patient will relieve tension, afford an outlet for energy, and build up confidence. The procedures employed are limited only by the ingenuity of the therapist in putting to use the facilities available in the hospital. Many naval procedures and many of the processes of industry require the use of muscles and joints which can be adapted to the aims of therapeusis. By judicious selection of the procedure to be used, the therapist materially decreases the need for teaching patients skills that are new to them, and can concentrate on obtaining the desired therapeutic result.

Physical training is another important feature of the rehabilitation program. A program of graduated physical activities is conducted as one means of preventing, as far as possible, the loss of physical efficiency that accompanies illness and its enforced inactivity and promoting an optimum state of general fitness. This program is designed to improve the strength, endurance, and coordination of the body and, by the use of selected games and sports, to incorporate psychological and sociological benefits as well.

Training, education, and counseling are other important features of the rehabilitation program, training and education particularly for men who are eventually returned to active duty, education and counseling more especially for those who will be discharged from the service. Many patients enter the hospitals from nearby duty stations because of acute conditions of short duration, but a considerable number, among them most of those evacuated from overseas, require prolonged periods of treatment. The type of training or educational project suitable for an individual patient must, therefore, be appropriate to his probable length of hospital residence. Many patients elect subjects related to their usual naval duties; others undertake courses in general education to add credits to their previous academic records. Courses of study which are prerequisite for promotion in enlisted ratings may be undertaken and the patients given credit for successful completion.

Educational and vocational counseling for patients who are to be discharged from the service for medical reasons is another important function—a part of the work that has assumed greater significance as the number of discharges has increased. Once it is determined that a patient will not return to active service, the educational officer reviews with him his total training and experience and learns his preference for his post-service career. Physical and psychological handicaps are evaluated by professional members of the staff.

On the basis of this general survey the patient is assisted in arriving at a decision which will be satisfying to him and, at the same time, be compatible with his handicaps. During the remainder of his hospital residence, he is encouraged to engage in studies or in practical work that will serve as groundwork on which he can build after he leaves the service. All that is done to prepare these men for civil life is coordinated with such civilian agencies as the Veterans' Administration. The objective is to assist each man to plan for his future, and to start him on a course of action in the hospital that may be continued in civilian life with a minimum loss of time.

Accurate and complete information as to what his rights and benefits may be is essential for every prospective dischargee as part of his preparation for return to civil life, and he needs advice and assistance in making claims for those which meet his particular situation. A civil readjustment program to do these things is in operation for all naval dischargees. In the hospitals this important function is performed by officers especially trained for this duty. These officers assist the dischargee with arrangements for effecting his plans for civil life, coordinate the efforts of the representatives assigned to work in the hospitals by the agencies and organizations interested in the welfare of veterans, and make sure that claims for benefits are properly completed and promptly forwarded.

During the entire period of hospitalization, careful attention is paid to the intangible but vital matter of personal morale. The duties of the chaplains are intimately related to this aspect of the program. Sympathetic man-to-man talks with the chaplain assist patients of sincere religious convictions, particularly those seriously ill or suffering from major injuries, to attain the peace of mind and spiritual well-being so essential to recovery. In addition, the chaplains, particularly those who have had overseas duty, have a knowledge of the problems of the men in the naval service and experience in their solution. Regular contacts between the chaplains and the patients are facilitated in every way.

Recreation, which is an essential part of any well-ordered life, assumes increased importance during hospitalization. This has been provided for in well-stock libraries of both books and musical recordings, radio sets, movies, and a wide variety of entertainments, parties, dances, and athletic facilities.

The workers of the American Red Cross perform innumerable personal services. Their trained workers in the hospitals and in the home communities assist in solving unsatisfactory family or home situations. They provide a varied program of diversional handicrafts, entertainments, and various kinds of recreational activities for convalescent patients, and they assist men undergoing discharge from the service in preparing claims for benefits under existing laws.

The blind, the deaf, and the amputee require a particular type of care and are, therefore, brought together in certain centers.

The United States Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa., is the center for care of both blind and deaf patients. The blind are immediately started on a course of social adjustment even while they are receiving whatever medical or surgical treatment that may be required. Their initial training includes steps to bring about a healthy psychological adjustment to the blindness, which, in most cases, has had a sudden onset rather than gradual development. They are taught to care for their personal needs, how to eat properly, how to move about freely and unescorted—in short, how to live as normally as possible despite their disability. They are instructed in typing and started on Braille. During their period of hospitalization, careful counseling on their future is conducted and they are given every opportunity and encouragement to prepare themselves for a satisfactory, economically useful life. These men are not discharged from the service until they are fully ready to start on their careers, whether in employment or in further education. There is the closest possible cooperation between the Navy and the Veterans' Administration in arrangements for the future of these men.

All cases of bilateral deafness of more than a stated degree are also concentrated at the naval hospital in Philadelphia. Personnel to instruct the deaf in lip reading and correct habits of speech, to assist them in their psychological adjustment to their loss of hearing, and to conduct the scientific fitting of hearing aids, have been assigned to duty there. These specialists have been furnished the special equipment required for a complete scientific program for the care of these patients.

Patients who have undergone amputation of an extremity are treated in either the naval hospital at Mare Island, Calif., or the naval hospital at Philadelphia. Surgery necessary to prepare the stump for prosthesis is carried out in these centers. Both hospitals have complete shops for the manufacture of artificial limbs. A temporary appliance is furnished the patient as soon as his stump is in condition to receive it. This is later replaced by a permanent type of prosthesis which the patient is taught to use satisfactorily before he is discharged from the hospital. As part of the training in using the appliance, patients are given opportunities for actual trial in activities in which they may wish to engage after discharge. Some of the amputees, particularly men who have made the service a career, return to active duty of a limited nature as soon as their prosthesis is comfortable and they are able to use it; others go directly from the hospital into suitable employment.

In practice, the program has two objectives: For patients who can be returned to active duty, its services are directed toward expediting their restoration to condition to carry on fully whatever arduous duties may be assigned to them and, at the same time, maintain or improve their adeptness for their usual assignments. For patient who must be returned to civil life for medical reasons its services are directed toward making efficient use of the time required for treatment of their disabilities to prepare them for a satisfactory readjustment to civil life.

It is realized that, although rehabilitation from a physical standpoint can be completed before they are discharged, only the groundwork for their social and economic rehabilitation can be laid. This can be carried through to completion only by the cooperative efforts of the men themselves and the communities to which they return.

It is important for those who are giving thought to the problems of the handicapped to keep in mind that a considerable proportion of men discharged for medical reasons are not handicapped in the sense that they use the word. Service in the Navy in time of war requires a degree of physical and mental stamina beyond that necessary for a very productive, successful, and satisfying life under civilian conditions. Discharge from the service for medical reasons in many cases means only inability to meet the requirements of a very special job—that of being a fighting man in a Navy at war—and not disability for the normal activities of life in a civilian status. There are, however, many others whose disabilities bring them into the realm of the handicapped. The crying need for manpower for production of materials of war has led to the employment of individuals with handicaps which, in other days, would have been a deterrent to even consideration of an application for a job. The excellent manner in which these handicapped people have acquitted themselves when given an opportunity, has been the best demonstration possible of the fallacies of previous thinking, and has opened up wide fields of opportunity for the handicapped casualties of war.

Issuance of War Bonds to Members of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the House a situation which seems to be prevalent, which is the undue delay in the issuance of War bonds which are being purchased by boys in the service and payment for which is deducted from their monthly pay.

In order that the House may understand what this situation is, I hereto attach a copy of a letter which I received from Mr. Sam Walker, service officer of Post No. 77, American Legion, Neffs, Ohio, in my district. I believe that those in charge of the issuance and delivery of War bonds purchased by our boys in the service should revise their procedure in such manner as to permit quick delivery of bonds. This seems to be a matter which, like most others of which the public complains, is a partial break-down of the executive branch of Government. The letter to which I refer is as follows:

NEFFS, OHIO, POST, NO. 77,
AMERICAN LEGION,
March 10, 1945.

Hon. EARL LEWIS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEWIS: As service officer of Neffs Post, No. 77, American Legion, have had quite a number of parents of soldiers come to me in recent months complaining of a rather questionable situation involving delay in issuance of war bonds being purchased by their sons in service and payment for which is deducted from their monthly pay.

This particular problem never seems to arise until the boys have gone overseas and then it seems the bonds stop coming although the money continues to be deducted from the soldier's pay.

Recently saw a letter issued from the war bond office in connection with this same matter in which it was stated that no bonds would be issued until the office had received confirmation from the commanding officer that payment for the bonds had been deducted from the soldier's pay and further that parents should wait at least three months before writing in about them.

Am fully appreciative of the fact that with so many men and women in the services and scattered everywhere over the globe as our forces are, it is bound to be a difficult matter to handle, yet would like to know if it is possible that the finance department of the Army in Washington doesn't know or have some record of every pay roll regardless of where the troops are stationed, and if so it surely should be no difficult matter to check if war bond payments were deducted or not.

Am also aware that many of the boys cancel their bond purchases upon going overseas but in the cases that have come to my attention I find that the parents have confirmation of the fact that the deductions are still being made from the soldier's pay yet the bonds are not being issued.

A goodly number of the folks have written in about the bonds but none so far have ever received replies from the war bond office and can personally state that isn't merely hearsay either for I have had the same situation to contend with as I have a son overseas who is buying a $25 bond each month and after some correspondence with him find that he is having the money deducted out of his pay each month and further that he never canceled his purchases.

My own case is typical of most of the cases coming to my attention. Our son went overseas in October 1944 and since that time we have received but one $25 bond, and doubt if we would have received that had I not written a rather nasty letter to the War bond office asking for some explanation of the matter and in about a week or so we received one bond for the month of October 1944 and none since, nor did I ever receive a letter in reply to mine. At present we have five bonds due and upon making inquiry find that most of the folks are in about the same situation.

Had an instance reported to me last night in which a solider purchased about $500 worth of bonds but only reecived half of them, and although the parents have written time and time again they have never been extended the courtesy of a reply, and after considerable discussion of this matter at our regular legion post meeting last night I was instructed to write you asking that you check into this matter and see what can be done to remedy the trouble.

You can readily see how much trouble this delay in the issuance of the bonds might cause in cases where the soldier is killed in action and the parents have to prove that the money was deducted from the soldier's pay or in a case such as that mentioned in the foregoing paragraph.

Will appreciate your office investigating this matter and advising me so that I may be in position to assist some of these folks as they come to me.

Thanking you for this favor, I am
Sincerely yours,

SAM WALKER,
Service Officer.

Iowa for Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Iowa have contributed liberally to the winning of the war. Their sons and daughters are on all of the battlefronts of the world. They have also contributed large amounts of money to every worthy cause connected with the war effort.

The people of Iowa, however, are a thrifty people. They believe in economy and are greatly disturbed over the fact that the Federal Government over a long period has appropriated more money than it has collected. The Iowa General Assembly, now in session, well expressed the sentiment of the people of Iowa when it adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, which I herewith set out as a part of these remarks, as follows:

Iowa Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

Whereas Congress annually for a long period has appropriated substantially more money than taxes levied; and

Whereas the Federal Government debt and need for operating funds in the post-war period will strain the fiscal foundations of our Government; and

Whereas fiscal stability under these conditions demands a constitutional directive which within definite limitations would compel the levying of taxes in at least an amount sufficient to equal expenditures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa (the House of Representatives concurring):

1. That the Congress of the United States be memoralized and urged to take immediate favorable action on Senate Joint Resolution 8 establishing a procedure by which Federal spending and Federal income would be balanced except in specified emergencies.

2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Iowa Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Judge Fred M. Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE B. BATES

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Cynthiana (Ky.) Democrat of March 15, 1945]

OUR FRED

Comment on the appointment of Fred Vinson to head the great Reconstruction Finance Corporation may be a trifle late at this time, but it is never too late to rejoice at this additional honor which has come to one whom the people of Harrison County long ago adopted as a favorite son.

His handling of the office of Director of Economic Stabilization was hailed on all sides as an accomplishment of the first order. It called for rare gifts both as a business and political executive. In many ways it was similar to the requirements of the Presidency itself.

His new duties are of the same kind. It is significant that leaders of both parties heartily approved of his appointment. They realize that he has the understanding, the courage and the character that are necessary to reconcile conflicting interests and opinions in the best interest of the country as a whole.

When the time comes to select a successor to President Roosevelt (and our Republican friends fervently hope this will be during their lifetime), we know of no one who will deserve more earnest and favorable consideration at the hands of the Democratic Party and the country than Fred Vinson.

We believe we are expressing the opinion and the sentiment of the people of this county when we say that there is no job too big, and no fortune too good, for our FRED.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of March 3, 1945]

AN EXCELLENT CHOICE FOR THE LOAN OFFICE

When it became apparent that the offices of Federal Loan Administrator and Secretary of Commerce would be separated, Henry A. Wallace said that he would accept the Secretaryship, but not "if there were serious danger

of a too-little and too-late man being appointed" to the lending job. Mr. Wallace and his opponents in the late controversy will all agree that Judge Vinson is no too-little and too-late man and is capable of vigilant as well as strong administration of the office.

And if, incidentally, Judge Vinson were a man of different concepts, Kentuckians might be bemoaning the fact that this change did not come a lot sooner so that Kentucky, instead of Texas, could have been showered with blessings, as Texas was by Jesse Jones. But the truth is that Judge Vinson's selection could not have meant, and will not mean, special favors for any State, including his own. And this is just one improvement that has been effected in the change of administrators.

Judge Vinson steps out of the hottest spot in the Government at Washington—the Directorship of Economic Stabilization. This office is the focal point at which the increasing inflationary pressures direct themselves, and its incumbent must be a man of granite and steel, as Judge Vinson is. If his successor is a weaker man, to any extent a complaisant man or a man who courts momentary popularity, then the transfer could be disastrous to the national economy. But unquestionably President Roosevelt knows all this as well as anybody else and has a suitably adamant successor to Judge Vinson in mind.

We Must Puncture Bubble That Calls for Federal Funds in Every Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, when the people of America sat down last week to figure out their income taxes—and with more difficulty to figure out how to pay them—many thought, no doubt, that this was just another tribulation caused by the war and that it would cease when victory is won.

While it is true that most of the money now being raised by the income tax is going into the war effort, those who look for an immediate and drastic reduction of this tax when the war is over are not facing the facts of practical life.

Actually, unless there is a radical revision of the course of our Government the income tax in its present heavy form or even heavier is going to be with us for many a long day. It is the price which the people must pay for big government. At least, it is one of the prices. The others are not so tangible but nonetheless real.

The lesson of income-tax day is that we cannot extend and extend and extend the functions of the Federal Government without somebody paying the cost. And the cost must be paid by all of us individual citizens. Soaking the rich, though popular, won't do it. It is now, and will be in the future, a matter of soaking everybody.

If the people would learn this lesson there would be an abrupt curtailment of Federal extension. There would be an abrupt end to the countless dreams of what the Federal Government can and should do. There would be an abrupt end to the pressure by this group and that group to get the Federal Government into this or that activity.

These dreams require financing, whether they envision the Federal Government participating in building more schools, providing hot lunches for school children, building nonpaying model communities, or harnessing the tides.

Somebody has to pay for these things and that somebody is the humble citizen who tries to solve the mysteries of the income tax.

Under the presently pending grandiose schemes for further socialization of our country during the post-war period the incubus of the Federal Government will become weightier and weightier upon the taxpayer. Millions and millions of dollars are called for to advance pet projects and selfishly demanded enterprises for the benefit of particular groups.

We have got to do one of two things. Either we must puncture the bubble that calls the Federal Government into every community to finance and control every enterprise and every citizen or we must reconcile ourselves to a steadily advancing income-tax bill.

The money to finance schemes is not going to come out of the same brains that cook up the schemes. It is going to come out of the pockets of the individual taxpayer whether he likes the schemes or not.

The octopuslike Federal Government which we now have and which is going to grow many more arms after the war feeds on a mighty diet of dollars, and every man and woman in America are going to be called upon to keep shoveling in money unless they—individually and collectively—join in cutting off these arms before it has to be fed.

It must be confessed that a lot of communities in our country think they are getting something for nothing when the Federal Government moves in to finance the latest program or project. They will learn that they are not.

Their citizens are going to pay and pay and pay. And they are going to pay in two ways. They are going to pay in money. But more important, they are going to pay by having the stifling hand of a Federal and necessarily distant Government always around their necks.

We ought to propound and insist upon a freedom to be added to the international list which is so blithely proclaimed and then so blandly ignored. That would be freedom from excessive government. And we ought to propound it on income-tax day.

It is worthy of note that on March 15, income-tax day, the Senate Finance Committee approved the bill already passed by the House which will raise the national debt limit to $300,000,000,000. And the Treasury on the same day announced that before the year was over that limit will again have to be raised.

Figure that out on your income-tax blank.

Treatment of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, among the sins that cry to heaven for vengeance must be the treatment that has been afforded to Poland. In the days when the war was young, Hilaire Belloc wrote that of all the political truths connected with our struggle the most obvious and important is that its test is Poland. Almost every Catholic writer with a sense of history and tradition has caught up the phrase "the test of Poland." They know with Chesterton that—

> Poland is the Catholic culture thrust like a sort of long sword blade between the Byzantine tradition of Muscovy and the materialism of Prussia.

They feel—contrary to the hypocritical modernism that religious motives in international politics must not be calculated nor even mentioned—the heinousness of Catholic Poland, steeped in western freedom and culture, to the bloody maws and manacled regimentation of atheistic Asiatics, for they well understand that American Catholics and Polish Catholics all are members of the mystical body of Christ the church. They remember the words of His Holiness, Pius XII, in this respect:

> But a body calls for a multiplicity of members, which are linked together in such a way as to help one another. And as in our mortal composite being, when one member suffers all other members share in its pain, and the healthy members come to the assistance of those ailing, so in the church the individual members do not live for themselves alone, but also help their fellows, and all work in mutual collaboration for their common effort and for the more perfect building up of the whole body.

On the shores of the Black Sea at Yalta, willy-nilly, whether we like it or not, as Americans we were represented by President Roosevelt in the fifth partition of Poland. If we remain silent and the decisions made on the Crimean Peninsula are confirmed at the conference to be convened shortly at San Francisco, we are as culpable as Pilate. No more than he can we wash our hands of the consequences. Does the Yalta decision in respect to Poland truly represent the will of the American people and measure up to their sense of justice and fair play? Let us—to resort to a favorite phrase of that able and fearless American, Al Smith—have a look at the record.

First. When the eastern boundary of pre-war Poland was set by the Treaty of Riga in 1921 the Poles surrendered their claim to 120,000 square miles of old Poland and left outside their boundaries 1,500,000 Poles. Inside the new Poland there were but 150,000 Russians. The Great Soviet Encyclopedia painstakingly points out that this was a Soviet victory, and that the terms of the treaty were

far less advantageous to Poland than those proposed by the Soviets themselves in April 1920. By nonaggression pacts signed in July 1932 and May 1934 the Soviets recognized these boundaries, and as late as July 28, 1941, after her nefarious deal with Hitler and his Nazis backfired, Soviet Russia again pledged her word to hold the same boundaries sacrosanct.

Second. In 1939 the war began because Poland bravely stood up against Nazi demands for 4,000,000 of her citizens and 19,000 square miles of her territory. The world acclaimed her gallantry, and France and England entered the war in her defense. The Soviet Union then delivered the coup de grace to Poland by knifing her in the back and straddled her prostrate body to join bloody hands with the Nazis. Those Poles who escaped the infamous partnership's clutch of death fought on in other lands. In the dark days when Britain stood alone against the spoilers Winston Churchill gave a stirring tribute to those few to whom, as never before in history, so many owed so much. It is a matter of record that one out of every eight planes destroyed over London and the channel in those grim, grave days was shot down by a Pole. When the thieves fell out, as they always do, the skies brightened for Poland and her warriors. The July 1941 treaty mentioned above in which Russia once more agreed to accept the pre-war Poland boundary was underscored by notes delivered to both Governments by British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden in which it was categorically stated that no territorial changes occurring since the war began would be recognized. Polish legions continued to fight in north Africa, Italy, Holland, Normandy, in Germany itself. Despite Polish service and the iron-clad British guaranty, on February 27, 1945, scarcely 3 years after Eden's notes, Winston Churchill had the effrontery to defend in Parliament the Soviet claims made at Yalta as "just and right." These claims, if the 1939 division of spoils is the indicator, when accepted, would transfer to Soviet Russia 13,000,000 Poles and 77,000 square miles. Over 50 percent of this territory was never part of Russia at any time prior to 1939, and in the whole territory less than 200,000 Russians reside. For what purpose other than aggrandizement is it necessary for a nation as large as the Soviet Union—180,000,000 people scattered over 8,000,000 square miles—to demand half the territory of a neighbor less than one-fiftieth of its size?

Third. The legitimate Polish Government is constantly berated as obstinate for refusing to journey to Moscow to play a minor role in the formation of a new government headed up by a Lublin group spawned in the Kremlin. This latter group, in a membership of 17, numbers 10 Communists and is led by President Boleslaw Berut, O. G. P. U. chieftain—as late as 1938—and Soviet citizen who was dismissed from a Polish federal job in 1935 for Communist activity. Its defense minister and army chief is the notorious Michal Zymierski, who was dismissed from the Polish Army after the last World War for accepting bribes from French munition makers. His record includes service in Red Spain under the alias of General Rola, and as colonel in the N. K. V. D., the Soviet secret police. The legitimate government may remember the words of the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, V. Molotov, addressed to the Supreme Soviet on October 31, 1939:

> One swift blow to Poland, first by the German Army and then by the Red Army, and nothing was left of this ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty.

Perhaps, too, they remember that even diplomats do not possess immunity in the land of the Soviets. After Russia attacked Poland nothing was ever heard again of Polish Consular General Matusinski at Kiev. Such proceedings are a far cry from the Atlantic Charter promulgated by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill in August 1941 and endorsed by Stalin in January 1942. Its second article provides:

> They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

And the third:

> They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Fourth. It is also impossible to reconcile President Roosevelt's "four freedoms" of January 1941 with the present course in Poland. The second, "freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world," are words that must choke in the throat of every Pole. What religious freedom can millions of Poles find under a government which has admitted but one Catholic priest—other than in concentration camps—since 1917; has no Catholic seminaries, nor will permit any; allows no religious instructions to children, even in churches, but officially promotes militant atheism; whose President, Kalinin, in 1944, said:

> We believe that religion is a misguiding institution and we struggle against it by education.

Of that Government, in 1941, President Roosevelt said:

> The Nazis are as ruthless as the Communists in the denial of God.

It was left for Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles to say in June of that same year:

> This Government has often stated, and in many of his public statements President Roosevelt has declared, that freedom to worship as their own conscience dictates is the great and fundamental right of all people. This right has been denied to their peoples by both the Nazi and Soviet Governments. To the people of the United States this and other doctrines of the communistic dictatorship are as intolerable and alien as are the principles and beliefs of the Nazi dictatorship.

A $2,000,000,000 Parity Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. The Rural New-Yorker, an outstanding farm paper, reveals in its editorial how the farmers are being made the victims of a New Deal fake parity price. The editorial charges that the "fake is deliberate, intentional, and fraudulent"; that "while it is permitted to continue, it is a reproach to our Government." The editorial further points out that "the effect is, of course, to reduce the farm income by $2,000,000,000 every year this parity fake is in effect."

This annual loss of $2,000,000,000 to the farmer as a result of New Deal tampering with the figures by which the parity price of farm products is determined is typical of the program of deceit practiced upon the farmers of the Nation. These political and bureaucratic frauds are concealed by such devices as a handout of subsidies in lieu of fair and honest prices for the products of the farmers.

Under leave to extend, I am including the editorial entitled "A $2,000,000,000 Parity Fraud" published in the Rural New-Yorker:

A $2,000,000,000 PARITY FRAUD

When the United States of America hung out its democratic shingle in 1789, it had a population of 4,000,000 people, mostly farmers, and a war debt of $83,762,172. Their Government was based on the moral law of God, which included the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule and a sense of justice. They pledged themselves to these ideals and implored Divine direction and help.

They had been dominated and oppressed. Now they were free and happy. They cleared the land, built homes and schools, colleges and churches. In 48 years they had paid their way, and paid every cent of the national debt.

These principles laid down by our forefathers were the controlling influence in our Nation until the close of the Civil War in 1865. After that, the bankers, the industrialists and the speculators dominated. Great enterprises were developed, corporations were created for banking, insurance, and various enterprises, and enormous fortunes were accumulated. Labor suffered great hardships in these times. Farmers suffered even more because of accumulated debts. Industries settled in large centers, and middlemen controlled the distribution of food and other materials.

The purpose of this story is to correct an abuse of this system of marketing farm products, and to encourage a larger farm production for the benefit of everyone who produces and eats food.

For three decades, political platforms, and candidates have promised farmers parity prices for their products. In good faith, this would simply mean cost of production (including economic distribution), taxes, and profit for farmers, just as industry rightly gets for itself. Instead, a monopoly of distribution alleged that from 1910 to 1914, farm and

industry prices were on a par. They therefore proposed to accept farm income for this period as a base and adjust farm prices for all future years as industry prices varied.

In 1920, when this scheme was proposed, the United States Department of Agriculture published the following table in its 1920 Year Book, page 806, table 297, as follows:

Estimated value of farm products 1910–14 based on prices at the farm

Year:	*Total value of crops and livestock*
1910	$9,037,000,000
1911	8,819,000,000
1912	9,343,000,000
1913	9,850,000,000
1914	9,895,000,000

The United States Department of Agriculture in volume 20, No. 3, July 1943, table 1, published the following table:

Gross farm income

Year:	*Total value of crops and livestock*
1910	$7,352,000,000
1911	7,081,000,000
1912	7,561,000,000
1913	7,821,000,000
1914	7,638,000,000

The figures in this report are for the same crops and the same years. The only difference is that they were published 23 years later. Note that the total annual value of the crops, including livestock, is substantially $2,000,000,000 less each year than the figures given for the same period as published by the same Department 23 years before.

The effect is, of course, to reduce the farm income by $2,000,000,000 every year this "parity" fake is in effect.

The Honorable Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture for the State of Georgia, was the first to discover this trick. He says: "The evidence seems to point that the release published in the year 1943 and now used to determine parity, has been tampered with in an intent to beat down farm prices at the 'fake parity' which is now in effect."

This fake is deliberate, intentional, and fraudulent. While it is permitted to continue, it is a reproach to our Government. It must be stopped and replaced by an honest cost-of-production base for the products of our farms.

Letter From Mr. Morgenthau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following self-explanatory letter from the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury:

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 15, 1945.

Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SHAFER: I have read with great interest the article by Junius B. Wood which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 27. It seems to me that Mr. Wood has presented the British problem very well and that the article should be of real value to all those who are concerned with the economic problems which will confront us after the war.

I am deeply troubled by Mr. Wood's conclusion that the future policy of the United States should not be formulated until Great Britain has determined whether it will adopt a policy of bilateralism, import and export controls, and other devices which restrict the growth of world trade. I believe that Mr. Wood has overlooked two extremely important factors.

The first of these is that the responsibility for establishing proper trade policies is a joint one of all United Nations. We should do everything we can to influence the adoption by Great Britain of trade policies that will not have adverse effects on our trade. The pattern which will be set in the immediate future is likely to govern international economic relations for a long time to come, and I am convinced that we must do all we can to see that this pattern is shaped to meet the needs of our own economy.

The second point which Mr. Wood has overlooked is very closely related to the first. It is the effect which the adoption by Britain of a policy of bilateralism and trade restriction would have on our own exports. During the 1930's, when bilateralism was coming into its own, it was the United States that suffered most from the resulting decline in world trade. This loss of trade was caused not by United States policies of restriction but, on the contrary, by policies adopted by other countries, including Great Britain.

What both Britain and the United States need after the war is an expansion and balanced growth of world trade. This can only be obtained by multilateral agreement to abandon restrictive policies. The Bretton Woods proposals do exactly that in the monetary and investment fields and, in view of this fact, I thought you would want to give further consideration to the conclusion Mr. Wood reaches in his article.

If you wish, I will be glad to arrange for a member of my staff to make an appointment with you to discuss these problems at greater length.

Sincerely yours,

H. MORGENTHAU, Jr.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Extending Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., of March 16, 1945.

EXTENDING LEND-LEASE

American public sentiment generally will approve the action of the House in Washington in adopting an amendment to the bill extending the Lend-Lease Act for another year, limiting the lend-lease program to war uses only. This amendment specifies that "nothing shall be construed to authorize the President to enter into or carry out any contract or agreement with a foreign government for post-war relief, post-war rehabilitation, or post-war reconstruction."

The value of lend-lease in the effort to defeat the Axis will be generally recognized. By this means weapons made in American factories were put into the hands of the nations that became our allies, thereby enabling them to keep up the fight against Germany and Japan. Thus two things were accomplished: The war was kept on foreign soil, and American soldiers were spared the job of bearing the whole brunt of the war.

There is a strong probability that without this program Britain and perhaps Russia would have gone down before the German onslaught. What that would have meant for us requires little imagination. Not only Britain and Russia were strengthened to survive, but the armies of many lesser nations were kept in the field against the Axis. In the final reckoning, lend-lease will be rated one of the potent factors leading to the defeat of both Germany and Japan.

But there is plainly a limit beyond which this program should not go. There is general agreement that lend-lease should continue until the fighting is done. But when that time comes, the purpose of lend-lease will have been fulfilled, and our own post-war economy will require that if further financial assistance is to be given our allies for relief or rehabilitation, special provision should be made by Congress for that purpose.

That is the intent of the amendment just passed by the House. This amendment does not say that further financial assistance shall not be given by the United States to help war-devastated countries to get back on their feet, but only that such assistance shall not be provided under the lend-lease program. Lend-lease is a war measure; post-war assistance should be put on another basis.

A. F. P. H. Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Labor, Subcommittee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped, made a report to the House at the close of the last session of Congress and recently distributed printed copies of its hearings. These documents have been referred to in an article in the Sign Post, the official organ of the Detroit Association of the Deaf. The article was written by Mr. Jay Cooke Howard, probably the foremost expert in the country upon the rehabilitation and placement of the deaf, and director of the division of the deaf and deafened of the Department of Labor and Industry of the State of Michigan.

Mr. Howard's article is as follows:

A. F. P. H. ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The report of the hearings before the House Labor Subcommittee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped, of which Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY was chairman, has been released. It is divided into 8 parts: (1) The Blind; (2) Poliomyelitis; (3) the Deaf and Hard of Hearing; (4) the hearing in New York City; (5) the hearing in Pittsburgh; (6) the hearing in Detroit; (7) Federal Aid to the Physically Handicapped; (8) Orthopedic Impairments, Disabled Seamen, etc.—in all, comprising 1,138 printed pages.

An imposing array of specialists appeared before the committee, including professors of Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, University of Michigan, University of Illinois, and many other leading universities and

colleges, high Federal, State and city officials, personnel directors of large corporations, hotel managers, labor leaders, United States Employment Service Consultants, vocational rehabilitation officials, directors of various foundations, caualty and security insurance executives, Directors of the War Manpower Commission, and many others too numerous to mention.

In this report there is more information on the handicapped and from a greater number of authorities, speaking for themselves, than was ever gathered together before. This is a monumental accomplishment and unstinted credit must be given to the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped for bringing about this investigation.

One cannot write a résumé of this report and do it justice. The men and women who appeared before this committee were enthusiasts, devoted to the great humanitarian task and everything they said pulsed with life. The members of the committee were keenly alive and brought every statement down to a practical application. It is such reading as one seldom finds, whether one is interested in a particular handicap, or the question as a whole.

Youth Guidance Community Program of Fraternal Order of Eagles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the Fraternal Order of Eagles is a powerful instrumentality in America that has taken a definite and conspicuous part in promoting the social and economic welfare of our people. This great organization has thrown its resources and its influence into the fight for workman's compensation, old-age pensions, mother's and child-welfare aids, employment stabilization program, and enlargement of the scope of social-security benefits. It is presently engaged throughout the country in an effort to develop ways and means to curb and cure juvenile delinquency and to establish a national program for youth guidance.

As evidence of the intensive character of this work being conducted by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, I am pleased to incorporate herein a letter from Judge Albert H. Schmidt, of Manitowoc, Wis., chairman of the Wisconsin Youth Guidance Committee of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, together with a report made by this committee under date of February 3, 1945. I trust that this report may receive the attention of the Members of Congress and the people of America who are vitally interested in this great problem:

MANITOWOC, WIS., *March 10, 1945.*

Congressman FRANK B. KEEFE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BROTHER KEEFE: As chairman of the Wisconsin State youth guidance committee of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, I beg to enclose a copy of the Eagles' State model youth guidance community program recently promulgated and which has already received national recognition. The curb and cure of crime and juvenile delinquency and the proper guidance of youth are of vital importance and concern to every American citizen, for they affect directly the security, the welfare, and the happiness of the American home and family, the cornerstone of our Republic. What subject could be of greater importance to the people of America? What subject is more important to the well-being of future generations?

I know you fully appreciate the immensity and the importance of the problem. No program however good and great and laudable or commendable can get very far, not even to first base, unless it has the support, the active support, of the rank and and file collectively and individually. The Eagles' youth-guidance program, a movement both State and National, is a big, a mighty big and hard job. We'll need a lot of help—the help of many willing hands and hearts and minds. This is not work for a day, a month, or a year, but for years to come, and will establish for all time a worth-while character-building program in behalf of the Fraternal Order of Eagles and America, locally and nationally. It will take time, courage, and persistent effort. It will be no easy task, but one worth while, rich in results and rewards, furnishing inspiring and fascinating work for all who participate, for it is work in behalf of all humanity. Thus a great, humanitarian, patriotic, producing, fighting fraternity, the Fraternal Order of Eagles will again pioneer and lend its powerful organized efforts in behalf of the security of that great American institution, the American family, that constitutes the American home, so vital to the welfare and the perpetuity of our Republic, as it did so successfully in the past in behalf of workmen's compensation, mother's pension, Mother's Day, old-age pension, stabilization of employment and social-security proposals, bringing sunshine and happiness into the homes and hearts of millions of Americans.

Wisconsin has never taken a back seat; Wisconsin has always led the way. May the Wisconsin State youth-guidance model community program become a pattern for the Nation.

We need especially wide and effective publicity. You are at liberty, therefore, to insert this letter and the enclosed model program in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in every other way publicize the same. Please keep me informed as to your efforts in this behalf.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,
Judge ALBERT H. SCHMIDT,
Chairman.

WISCONSIN STATE AERIE,
FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES,
STATE YOUTH GUIDANCE COMMITTEE,
Manitowoc, Wis., February 3, 1945.

Worthy president, secretary, and brother Eagles, the Wisconsin State Youth Guidance Committee of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, with a view toward developing a State-wide model program for every community in the State, under Fraternal Order of Eagles auspices, leadership, and direction, respectfully suggests the following:

1. The establishment of a school for adults, to direct parents in proper methods of child training, with classes for parents in general, delinquent parents, problem parents, and adults generally who contribute to the delinquency of minors, thus helping to eradicate the seeds of delinquency in the home and, generally, recognizing that parenthood is the most important job a human being ever undertakes. Juvenile judges, prosecuting and enforcement officers, and welfare and other agencies should be asked to cooperate by inviting or ordering parents of children who have been in trouble to attend such classes.

2. A police school for children, conducted by the police department, teaching respect for and obedience to constituted authority, respect for private property, respect for the rights of others, obedience to law, especially to bicycle, pedestrain, and other traffic rules, and generally to behave as good junior citizens.

3. The formation of youth and adult guidance committees in industry, agriculture, labor unions, fraternal and civic organizations, the churches, and the schools, such committees to visit and counsel parents whose children have been brought to the attention of the courts or social agencies and outline an individual program for each home; to help young people make necessary readjustments and assist those in family difficulties, such as poverty, death, or a broken home.

4. Have some local attorney, a member of the aerie, appear in court as a friend of the court in all cases relating to minors or in which adults contribute to the delinquency of minors.

5. The full-time use of all public and quasi-public buildings and facilities, including schools, churches, city, county, Federal, and fraternal buildings, all the year round, every day of the year, both night and day—most of which stand uselessly idle day after day and night after night, even for weeks and months at a time. The buildings and facilities are here, the belong to the people, why not use them every hour of every day? A survey and inventory of the total time of idleness would disclose a startling story of waste. The use of church rooms and halls for children in the neighborhood of all denominations would be commendable.

6. A stricter enforcement and more frequent and effective use of section 351.20 of the Wisconsin Statutes, providing that any persons, parents or others, encouraging, causing, or contributing to the delinquency are guilty of a crime and subject to imprisonment in the county jail for 1 year or to a fine of $500 or both.

7. A stricter and more uniform enforcement of all laws, rules, and regulations, with greater and more effective and intelligent attention given to prevention, not overlooking the improvement and modernizing of our laws.

8. Effective and impressive teaching of the Ten Commandments and a more general study and observance of the same.

9. Proper and effective discipline in the schools and other public places.

10. The protection of youth in public places and the prevention of the exploitation of youth.

11. Make every effort to determine and remove the causes of delinquency with predelinquency constantly in mind.

12. Ample recreation and social facilities and services, properly coordinated and supervised programs, with opportunities for young people to take part in community activities, such as health programs, self-policing, and other projects designed to awaken a sense of civic responsibility at an early age.

13. Proper employment of boys and girls under proper conditions.

14. Proper living, housing, and health conditions and services for children of every kind and condition, with health protection to stave off preventable physical and mental handicaps.

15. Proper schooling and spiritual guidance for all types of children, including instruction to develop self-discipline, self-reliance, self-restraint, and self-respect, including education that provides a basis for living in an integrated, constructive manner within society, that includes sufficient knowledge of the principles of conduct to prevent undesirable activities, as well as providing a first step toward useful employment and as to marriage and family life, as well as education for democracy.

16. Effective and intelligent handling of delinquent, neglected, and dependent children by the courts and other officials and agencies with suitable detention quarters, apart from the jail.

17. Bringing into unison, with but a single goal, the three great molding forces of American life—the home, the school, and the church.

18. Obtain the active help and support of all agencies, public and private, that deal with the welfare of youth. Cooperate with them.

19. Call a public meeting of all organizations and interested persons, so as to enlist the entire community in your program.

20. Invite the support of the press from time to time.

21. Have speakers, young and old, familiar with the subject address various groups, including the schools, churches, theaters, and radio.

22. Ask all clergymen to preach a series of sermons on the subject.

23. The suppression of the distribution, sale, or exhibition of obscene, salacious, or demoralizing literature and pictures.

24. Adequate crime-prevention service by the police and sheriff departments and all other agencies, both public and private.

25. A coordinated and cooperative relationship between police, sheriff, prosecutor, court, prison, parole, probation, and public health and welfare officials.

26. Higher qualifications and rigid requirements for public officials in this and allied work.

27. Establishment of mental hygiene, child guidance, and other types of clinics with a psychopathic laboratory for every community, whose advantages and facilities for study and research, with a competent psychiatrist, should be available to every court.

28. Special, concentrated, intelligent attention to social diseases, their prevention and eradication both as to adults and children. Syphilis is decidedly a youth problem, and is the one disease that most seriously affects the family life. In 1944 a total of 15,000 cases of syphilis among children under 15 was reported to health departments throughout the Nation. These reported cases, however, do not reflect an accurate picture of the entire number of infections among the 15-year-old group, because hundreds of cases are never reported. Gonorrhea has also increased alarmingly. America has completed only half the job conquering venereal diseases. Syphilis of the innocent is taking thousands of children's lives in America every year and condemning tens of thousands of others to misery. As the cure for syphilis is to prevent it, so also is that the cure for crime and juvenile delinquency.

Selective service medical examinations indicated that in 1941 more than 3,200,000 Americans had syphilis, 1 in every 42. Gonorrhea occurs 3 to 5 times more frequently than syphilis. In 1943, 600,000 new cases of syphilis were reported in the United States. Every year syphilis kills more than 30,000 of our babies before birth and afflicts 34,000 who are born with the disease. Seventy-five percent of the new gonorrhea cases occur in the age group 15 to 30 years. The cost of public care of the syphilis blind and insane is estimated at $41,000,000 a year. Crime costs the people of the United States $15,000,000 every year, or $120 for every man, woman, and child. For the first 6 months of 1943 arrests of under-age girls for "crimes against common decency" increased 69.5 percent over the same period in 1942. Sodomists and other moral perverts in ever-increasing numbers prey upon and despoil our youth in their devilish and devious ways. Wisconsin showed a progressive increase of 66.3 percent in juvenile delinquency from 1935–36 to 1939–40. In 1943 there were 3,785 serious crimes committed every day in the Nation, 1 for every 21 homes, 1 every 23 seconds, and arrests of boys under 17 increased 30 percent. A robbery occurred every 12 minutes, a burglary every 2 minutes, a larceny every 39 seconds, an automobile stolen every 8 minutes; 13 percent of all murderers arrested were under 21, as were 39 percent of all thieves, 32 percent of all rapists, 30 percent of all arsonists, and 65 percent of all thieves—all under 21. Nearly 23 percent of all persons arrested in 1943 were under 21. More boys of 17 and more girls of 18 were arrested than in any other age group and the arrests of girls in 1943 over 1941, the last peacetime year, increased 130 percent. Nearly a million and a half major crimes are committed in the United States every year, plus countless millions of lesser offenses. The problem is enormous—the necessity, the urgency to do something about it is immediate—now, today—not tomorrow.

29. Establishment of a coordinating central executive citizens' council representative of all interests, public and private, to plan and promulgate a comprehensive, long-range child-welfare program, eradicating duplication and community disorganization.

30. A Nation-wide, frank, fearless program of education by means of press, magazine, platform, pulpit, theater, and radio. A general public aroused to a full realization of the vital importance of the problems to such an extent and degree that the people will rise up as one man and demand and insist upon constructive, intelligent, and immediate action. Public opinion is a mighty force in every community. Without favorable public opinion, progress becomes difficult and actual accomplishment little. Public opinion should therefore be educated, molded, and aroused to demand the zealous protection and advancement of the children of the community, both privileged and underprivileged, at all times. These are not mere idle words—there is more significance in them than appears at first blush; for listen to what the delinquency committee of the White House Conference says: "All children, privileged and underprivileged, take what the community has to offer. Adults make the community what it is. When it does not satisfy the needs of its children or when it thwarts and exploits them, the adults are responsible, and no clinics, juvenile courts, or reformatory institutions can ever fully adjust the child. The community has not yet realized that it is responsible for building to satisfy the fundamental needs of the child, and that it must not only offer opportunity for creative play, companionship, and adventure, but must also protect children and young people from negative demoralizing recreation."

All Federal, State, and local agencies and organizations, governmental and otherwise, from the largest to the smallest, necessary to the successful, impartial, and courageous carrying forward of this great work so important to the welfare of all our people, can, we confidently believe, be intelligently and readily organized, unified, and mobilized into a powerful, patriotic, alive, and alert force and influence for righteousness and good, for law and order, for health and happiness, for the improvement of the human race—a relentless, fearless, fighting phalanx enlisted patriotically and permanently in the great war against crime, criminality, disease, and human delinquency—a mighty force and influence, becoming more powerful and effective year by year, that will be heard and heeded in the Halls of Congress at Washington and in every State capitol throughout the entire country. Only such a great, mighty, local, State, National, nonpolitical, nonsectarian, nonracial organization so constituted and functioning can sufficiently muster and openly exercise that independence of thought and action that courage, fearlessness, and confidence in its plans and purposes, its ideas and its ideals, necessary to successfully meet the challenge with the power, prestige, and influence necessary to carry forward to a successful and effective conclusion this great and important work so vital to the general welfare and well-being of all of our people and the perpetuity of the American Republic.

To help you to carry out the above program, or any program of your own suitable to your particular community, we enclose as a part hereof and for your use as a general guide or handbook the comprehensive and instructive 31-page pamphlet Controlling Juvenile Delinquency—A Community Program, by Katherine F. Lenroot, Chief of the United States Children's Bureau. Preserve it for frequent reference. Use it. "All Americans want this country to be a place where children can live in safety and grow in understanding of the part they must play in the Nation's future. If anywhere in the country any child lacks opportunity for home life, for health protection, for education, for moral or spiritual development, the strength of the Nation and its ability to cherish and advance the principles of democracy are thereby weakened." Our aims cannot be too high, our work too thorough, our endeavors begin too soon. Let no Eagle fail in his duty.

Please acknwledge receipt and report progress from time to time.

Fraternally yours in liberty, truth, justice, and equality.

Judge ALBERT H. SCHMIDT,
Manitowoc, Chairman,
Judge ROLAND J. STEINLE,
Milwaukee,
Judge OSCAR J. SCHMIEGE,
Appleton,
Judge DONALD W. GLEASON,
Green Bay,
Attorney JOHN P. MCEVOY,
Kenosha,
Wisconsin Youth Guidance Committee, F. O. E.

St. Patrick's Day Address by the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN, the distinguished Vice President of the United States, made an interesting and unusual address on St. Patrick's Day before the Irish Fellowship Club at the Stevens Hotel, in the city of Chicago. I ask unanimous consent that the address be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Mayor, members of the Irish Fellowship Club, and distinguished guests, it is always refreshing to be with the Irish, especially on St. Patrick's Day. You members of the Irish Fellowship Club, here in Chicago, are following a good old Irish custom. You are keeping alive your native pride.

Today the Irish people throughout the world pay homage to the good St. Patrick. Millions of other people, even those who do not follow his faith, have acquired a deep and abiding affection for the kindly saint from Ireland. St. Patrick has become an inspiration to all who know and admire his deeds and devotion. As you probably know,

marauders carried Patrick, at the tender age of 16, from his English home near the Severn to bondage in that part of Ireland now called Ulster.

During his 6 years of captivity, while tending the herds of Irish rulers, Patrick experienced a deep religious emotion, reflecting his early Christian training.

After a daring escape to the Continent, Patrick finally returned to Britain with a fervent desire to bring Christianity to the Irish. Despite opposition at home, Patrick went back to Gaul with a firm determination to prepare himself for his difficult mission to Ireland.

Consecrated in the year 432, Patrick finally became Bishop of Ireland, and began his missionary work where he once suffered the disgrace of slavery. In spreading the faith of his fathers, the good saint condemned slavery, fought racial discrimination, and sought to end the tragic isolation of Ireland from the civilization and culture of the outside world.

So many legends have grown up around the Patron Saint of Ireland, that it is rather difficult to distinguish fact from fiction.

Although it cannot be proven that St. Patrick actually drove the snakes from the Emerald Isle, we do know that he labored long and hard to expel all evil. In addition to his spiritual teaching, St. Patrick also introduced the learning of the age to Ireland, and brought the Irish to the rest of the world.

Today, America needs the benevolent aid of another St. Patrick.

Evil doctrines of discrimination frequently imported from gangster nations plague certain areas in America. Racial and religious intolerance is being preached and practiced here by agents of our enemies, as well as by innocent victims of their propaganda. With relentless determination, our deadly opponents still seek to apply the ancient doctrine of "divide and rule" in their drive for world domination.

Unfortunately, propaganda poison is exceedingly difficult to remove from our national bloodstream.

The after-effects of this poison may be felt for years to come, especially if we do not recognize its danger and actively combat its spread. No nation on earth is more vulnerable to intolerance and bigotry from America, for no nation is composed of more diverse races and differing creeds than this land of the free.

America became great by being a secure haven for freedom of thought and action.

Despite all our shortcomings, we in this country truly present an inspiring example to struggling humanity. We prove conclusively that people of every race and of every creed can dwell together in harmony.

Into the plain word—American—is fused all the ideals, hopes, inspiration, and faith of our people.

In fact, America has become the hope and inspiration of all oppressed people throughout the civilized world.

Here in Chicago you sense the ever-increasing, Nation-wide, heartfelt yearning for lasting peace.

Common sense requires that all Americans should take a good look at modern air maps. By air no place on the globe is more than 60 hours from your own municipal airport and this time is steadily decreasing.

However, I feel confident that just as the end of isolation in Ireland in St. Patrick's time was beneficial, so will the new era of international cooperation be a blessing for America and for the world.

No nation on this globe should be more internationally minded than America.

Whatever happens in any part of the world personally affects some of us.

When Ireland starved, we sympathized and contributed food; when the Germans murdered the Poles and persecuted the Jews, Americans wept for them. When the British bled at Dunkerque, Americans suffered with them; when Russia was overrun by the Nazis and China by the Japs, American hearts were with these unfortunate people.

In the light of history, it is not surprising that America has finally assumed world leadership.

What other nation has such an intimate understanding of the problems and aspirations of every race?

America was built and developed by members of every racial group.

Our powerful Nation has been welded into one mighty force for freedom by the united efforts of all our people. Our national motto, "E pluribus unum," indicates—one out of many.

To me this refers not merely to the many sovereign States, but also to the members of the many races and creeds, who retain their individual integrity, but become Americans all.

Today our heroic fighting men are again making it possible for America to preserve the ideals for which we stand. This war is a crusade.

When the cause is just the Irish simply cannot resist the call to duty.

There is something in the make-up of an Irishman which causes him to fight when a dictator attempts to push little people around.

The bigger the bully, the better the battle!

The more ruthless the opponent, the sweeter the victory!

Today America is engaged in the most ruthless conflict against the biggest bullies in the history of the world. It is victory or defeat. We win all—or nothing. This means survival or slavery.

St. Patrick in Ireland and Abraham Lincoln in America took a forthright position on the question of slavery.

They fought for the basic dignity of every human being.

They stressed the essential importance of the individual, regardless of race or creed.

The world today needs the spiritual guidance of inspired leaders, who can rise above creed or class, who can help humanity gain security.

If civilization intends to avoid destruction, nations must learn to live together in harmony with each other.

International organization can be successful only if all members of the family of nations actually abide by reasonable rules agreed to for the benefit of all. This requires self-restraint and tolerance. If each nation insists upon absolute freedom of action according to the legal concept of sovereignty, international anarchy become inevitable.

The recent meeting at Yalta, and the coming conference in San Francisco, indicate progress along the road to world order.

Such an international organization must be created as soon as possible.

We dare not postpone building storm shelters until storm clouds gather.

We must not wait for a perfect international plan.

Modern wars do not wait while statesmen plan future Utopias.

We must act and act promptly to check wars before they can get started.

As we united for victory, we must unite for peace.

In winning the peace, the moral strength of the Irish can be a most potent factor.

While the Government of Eire has remained neutral during the war, her sons have distinguished themselves in the armies of the United Nations.

In peace, as in war, the influence of the Irish in the cause of justice far exceeds the strength of their numbers.

It is hard to realize that the population of Chicago far exceeds that if Ireland, or that 100 years ago, the Emerald Isle had twice its present population.

Most of the sons of Ireland emigrated to America, where they made substantial contributions to our civilization. Irish scholars for centuries have been among the leaders in the academic world.

The founding of Trinity College at Dublin in 1591, and that of the University of Notre Dame at South Bend in 1842, are outstanding examples of how Irishmen have actively promoted higher learning throughout the world.

At schools supported by the Irish, mental and physical training are combined.

Football teams of Notre Dame for instance have become an American institution and represent the best in our tradition for fair play and clean sport.

Although individuals of many races and from distant lands became members of these great teams, the people usually refer to them as "the fighting Irish."

The spirit of teamwork and cooperation taught on the gridirons of America should extend to our national life.

Only by working together can we reach our national goal—victory. The United Nations also must work together, if we are to gain a just and lasting peace. That will require vision and hard work—tolerance—and practical idealism, by every race and every creed.

Peace, Realism, and the Balance of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1945

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Peace, Realism, and the Balance of Power," delivered by Hon. John Dickinson, general counsel of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and formerly Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and also at one time Assistant Attorney General of the United States.

The address was delivered at the midwinter meeting of the Maryland State Bar Association on January 20, 1945. It is an unusually scholarly and suggestive address, and one which I think should certainly be inserted in the RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that it will cost $208 to print the address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is appropriate that at a time like this members of the bar should feel concern about the largest and most important public questions confronting us, which are those of our international and world relationships—the great issues of peace and war, and the possibility of contributing somewhat, however little, to diminish the likelihood, or at least postpone the date of, another world cataclysm.

Ordinarily when lawyers interest themselves in international affairs, they are naturally tempted to direct their attention to matters which can be treated juridically in terms of law and courts. There is of course a place, and an important place, for courts and law in the international field, but it is clear, in the light of history and of the experience of our own generation, that the great international conflicts which menace civilization do not arise out of the kind of

disputes that can be decided in law courts. Rather they grow out of general considerations of national security and power, which, in the last analysis, are the same thing—out of the desire of a nation to acquire, or its fear to lose, the power which it feels essential to its security. Such questions are not amenable to judicial process.

These ultimate springs of international conflict are today of deep concern to everyone who by thought or action has a share in the formation of public opinion and who feels any sense of responsibility to do something toward safeguarding civilization, I take it that lawyers would include themselves in this group, and we are therefore under an obligation not merely to concern ourselves in our professional capacity about international law and the juridical aspects of international affairs, but also as citizens to participate in the worldwide discussion now being carried on in an effort to devise a basis for a more durable peace.

It is about some of the fundamental issues raised in that discussion, that I wish to speak to you; and I have chosen as my title, "Peace, Realism, and the Balance of Power," for the purpose of suggesting that, if the world is to find a way of escape from impending doom, it must be through the recognition of hard facts and not through appealing to the slogans of an abstract idealism.

I

Certainly there is no field of human thought or action where the need for idealism of the right kind, for idealism which can translate itself into beneficial results, is more urgent than in international relations; but a great tragedy may be preparing under our eyes through lack of adequate hardheadedness and respect for facts on the part of the American people where their thinking about international affairs is concerned.

We are justly entitled to pride ourselves as a nation on our idealism, but in those fields where it has been most conspicuous and successful it has rested on a basis of common sense and respect for the practical. It has been the idealism of Franklin and Jefferson and Edison, rather than of Rousseau and Fourier and Marx—the idealism of the inventor rather than of the visionary. No doubt all progress requires an element of hope and faith, of confidence in things unseen, a willingness to go beyond what has been done before, and to this extent implies that it is possible to sublimate human nature, and even political human nature, by infusing an element of the ideal. We can never afford, however, to advance so far in this direction as to ignore the known elements of a problem without courting failure and disaster.

It is important to understand this, because the time is at hand when we must make up our minds as to the kind of settlement we will try to bring about at the close of the war, or even sooner, for the purpose of minimizing the likelihood of future wars. At the close of the war we will have to deal with our enemies, but that will be the easier part of the task. Before the close of the war, and in fact here and now, we are having to deal with our friends—with our major allies and the smaller countries which are friendly to us—in such a way as to promote the outcome we desire.

This is not proving easy. We are learning the obvious—learning that all nations do not necessarily think alike, not even when they are allies; that not all have the same ideals and objectives, and that still we have to live with them, and may have to work with them. If we are to have international cooperation in war or peace, it must be with peoples and nations as they are, and not as we would like them to be.

We cannot solve this difficulty by withdrawing into isolation. Today isolation is a physical, no less than a moral, impossibility. We cannot accomplish anything by denying the facts of life which we do not happen to like. We cannot hope to shape the world according to our heart's desire by saying that if other nations do not conform to our ideals, we are not going to have a foreign policy. We must have a foreign policy, and it must be one which takes account of the known facts with respect to the purposes of other nations, including our allies.

The importance of these considerations lies in the fact that today the Allies are in such obvious disagreement with respect to many terms of the post-war settlement, that they are finding themselves unable to set up the kind of conference or council of political consultation which many friends of Allied unity regard as necessary, for fear of bringing their disagreements into the open and thereby impairing the effectiveness of their military cooperation. Everyone admits the desirability of reaching agreements, but agreement of many essential points seems so impossible that in important instances both of our allies have resorted to unilateral action to obtain objectives which they regard as essential to their security.

On one question after another, and in one country after another, Russia and England are pursuing independent policies which at the close of the war will present the world with accomplished facts about which nothing can then be done. Russia in particular is seeking to safeguard her security by building up a vast sphere of influence beyond her borders, and by bringing the smaller nations of eastern and southeastern Europe into the dependent relation of client states. England, to preserve the balance of power, is pursuing a similar course on a smaller scale elsewhere.

It would not be difficult in the light of history to understand this recourse to spheres of influence and the balance of power, were it not that our American idealism has in recent years taught us that these familiar traditional devices constitute sins against international righteousness and are inconsistent with the peace of the world. One Member of the United States Senate tells us that "wars are inevitable under the balance of power policy"; another contends that until Russia reverses its policy toward Lithuania, Estonia, Finland, and Poland, and until Britain abandons her colonial empire, we should refrain from cooperating in any world organization; and a prominent publicist warns us "not to tread the blood-stained path of power politics."

This idealistic revulsion against traditional devices has received official blessing from our own government. Less than a year ago, Secretary Hull, in an important statement, promised that under the new dispensation which will follow the present war, "there will no longer be need for spheres of influence, for alliances, for balance of power, or for any other of the special arrangements through which in the unhappy past the nations strove to safeguard their security or promote their interests."[1]

In the light of such views, does our idealism require us to insist that there must no longer be spheres of influence or an effort to preserve the balance of power? If so, does this mean that at the close of the war we should demand that our allies reverse their actions which we are now criticizing? Does it mean that if they fail to do so, we should refrain from cooperating with them in an international security organization? Are we to attach this degree of importance to spheres of influence and balance of power? The initial problem is one of understanding. What do these terms mean, and what is their significance for good or for ill?

II

Let us take a simple example which goes to the root of the matter. Suppose Germany or Spain, or even one of our allies, France or Russia, were to undertake to intervene in the affairs of Argentina or Bolivia or Venezuela? Would we tolerate it? The answer is given immediately by a reference to the Monroe Doctrine.

The Monroe Doctrine is the frankest and clearest declaration of an exclusive sphere of influence in the world. We say it is necessary to our security. We insist on it as a guarantee against aggression. At the close of the war we should, and probably will, insist on something similar in the Pacific. Can we blame other countries for doing the same thing? Can we say that in their case spheres of influence promote wars, while in our case the same principle is only a necessary safeguard of security?

Doubtless the answer will be made that this country has not abused, and does not intend to abuse, the Monroe Doctrine. Of course, that is so, but it does not answer the contention that the Monroe Doctrine establishes an exclusive sphere of influence. All that it signifies is that a sphere of influence may be either good or bad, depending on whether it is abused or not.

The problem of the sphere of influence always presents itself, and has always presented itself throughout human history, wherever there are small nations in proximity to relatively larger ones. The problem has been perennial. As long as the force of suggestion and imitation operates in human affairs, intrigues and confusion in one country are likely to spread across a boundary. Some small nations, notably Switzerland and in recent centuries the Scandinavian countries, have achieved a remarkable record for stable and orderly government, and have caused no problem to their neighbors, large or small. But unhappily, and with all due regard to the valuable contributions which small nations have made to human culture and progress, the record of many of them is of a different kind in the field of international politics. It has usually been found that disorderly conditions in a small country which is the neighbor of a large one are turned to the disadvantage of the latter. An indispensable condition of peace is to prevent this kind of internal confusion within one nation which is likely to spread to others. Unless the larger nation is willing to see such confusion in its smaller neighbors turned to its disadvantage, it cannot permit any power but itself to intervene in the picture. This is the basic principle of the sphere of influence; it is the basic principle of the Monroe Doctrine.

Of course a sphere of influence may be abused. It may be employed to enable the larger power to dominate, exploit, and oppress the smaller one, meddle in its internal affairs, and in effect deprive it of self-government. We do not believe we have done that under the Monroe Doctrine, and impartial history will no doubt acquit us, but voices will not be wanting to challenge our innocence. As a matter of fact, whenever a sphere of influence is asserted, it will always be charged that the independence of the smaller power is impaired. It need not be, except in the one particular of preventing the smaller nation from making trouble, or letting itself be used to make trouble, for the larger one. Such an impairment of independence is essential in the interest of peace. If not imposed by the larger power itself under the sphere-of-influence principle, some other and possibly more uncertain method of imposing it will have to be found.

The source of hostility to the sphere-of-influence principle is a sentimental insistence on the right of small nations to do as they choose and make as much trouble as they please, a right which is of course denied to larger countries. This sentimental claim of weak nations is one which throughout history, from the time of ancient Greece, has always been abused, and has in fact been

[1] Statement of Hon. Cordell Hull, March 22, 1944.

one of the most prolific causes of war. It is hardly necessary to remind ourselves that it was the intrigues and disorders among the small nations of the Balkans which set the stage and provided the conditions for the World War of 1914.

Not unlike the problem of small nations in certain respects is that of backward peoples and colonial dependencies. Here again public opinion in this country is largely under the influence of a sentimental idealization of the primitive. Because it is no doubt difficult to draw the exact line where primitivism ends and civilization begins, it is the fashion today in more departments of life than one to deny that any line exists, to exalt the primitive, and to insist that it has a right to be protected against civilizing influences.

This is another kind of sentimentalism which is not advantageous to peace. One of the things that primitive peoples most strongly insist on is the right to kill and enslave each other. Irrespective of whether the civilized peoples are entitled to interfere with these primitive practices for the good of the primitive peoples themselves, they certainly have such a right for the advancement of civilization and the maintenance of world peace. It is only by forgetting this elementary truth in the interest of an emotional sympathy for primitive peoples that the vast value of such an organization as the British Empire can be ignored. I can do no better than quote the following estimate of its achievement by a recent American writer. This is what he says:

"Considering its scope the British Commonwealth of Nations is the most remarkable political achievement in history. It has overcome more tyranny, supplied more safety, removed more fear, taught more justice, and given more freedom to more people than any other institution on earth. It is not only worth preserving in the interest of all free men, but unless Britain preserves her so-called empire, there will be no freedom for millions upon millions who are now as free as they can safely be * * *. Without the British Empire we are fighting for an unworkable world as far as free men are concerned, and for a world spotted with Fascists in one place and Communists in another. That is not going to be a peaceful world, which is the first thing we must fight for. That is a world in which there is no end of war. Talking about colonial freedom is one thing. Supplying it is quite another. Furthermore 80 percent of the colonials of the world could not, or would not, use their freedom to maintain freedom." [2]

Those who would cavil at this frank recognition of unpleasant truth need to be reminded that the worst enemy of liberty and justice is the unrealistic type of idealism which demands the kind of freedom that destroys freedom, and the kind of justice that treats unequal things as equal. War is certain to be promoted rather than prevented by subjecting backward peoples and small nations to temptations stronger than they can bear, and by imposing on them responsibilities which they are unable to discharge. A world in which all backward peoples and all little nations were free to indulge in all the political combinations and succumb to all the political temptations that they desired, would be the precise opposite of one where peace was reasonably secure and where the chances of war were minimized.

III

So much for spheres of influence and colonial empires; what of the balance of power? The balance of power is simply the oldest and most elementary device to accomplish the object we are today pursuing in our war against Hitler—to keep one nation from ruling the earth. The principle of the balance of power is that no single power shall be allowed to dominate the international scene—that power should be so subdivided and balanced between nations that no nation shall be strong enough and dominant enough to threaten and overawe the freedom of the rest.

Thus the principle of the balance of power is the necessary corrective and counterpoise to spheres of influence and colonial empires. One of the strongest and most valid objections against these is that they encourage a tendency toward expansion, aggression, and excessive power. The principle of the balance of power sets itself in opposition to that tendency. It aims to insure that no sphere of influence shall be extended so far that no empire shall grow so great as to make a single nation the unrivaled arbiter of the destiny of the world or the dictator of civilization. It does this by strengthening new centers of power and promoting alliances between relatively weak states to counterbalance those nations which show signs of aggressive growth. Most of us doubtless remember the historic words of Canning with respect to America, words which did not reveal their full meaning until almost a century after they were uttered in 1823:

"I have called a new world into existence to redress the balance of the old."

Throughout history, the balance of power has been the most usual and effective form of insurance against aggression. For two centuries and a half it has been the agency through which western civilization has again and again saved itself from successive attempts on the part of ambitious rulers and nations to achieve world supremacy. It was the device by which Louis XIV of France, the great monarch, was kept from crushing Europe. It was the device whereby Napoleon was prevented from establishing universal empire. It was the device which, during the happy days of the nineteenth century, preserved the peace of Europe with only minor interruptions for a hundred years. It was the device which checkmated the ambitions of Germany in the First World War. And in the present World War it was the fact that during the first 2 years of the war there was no balance of power, because of the alliance of Hitler with Stalin, which made Hitler's rape of western Europe possible, and indeed, inevitable.

Why, then, has the balance of power become anathema to international idealists and the chief bugbear of liberal thought? Simply, I believe, because of a basic misapprehension, a confusion of effect with cause. International idealists charge that the policy of striving for a balance of power is a cause of wars. It is not; rather it is the effect of the underlying rivalries and fears which may lead to wars, and it is their effect only in the sense that it is an attempt to counteract them in the interest of peace. Balance-of-power policy is a kind of automatic natural reaction which springs up whenever a state threatens to extend its ambitions too far. Those who would destroy it would destroy the surest and simplest check on aggression. I think it may be said with assurance that there would have been no Munich if in the nineteen thirties the western nations had not been too sophisticated and ashamed to play balance-of-power politics; and a succession of Munichs may be expected wherever the balance-of-power principle is abandoned or ignored.

However, the orthodox doctrine of international idealism today is that the principle of the balance of power must be given up; that it must be supplanted by some form of world association to keep the peace; that the only just and effective way to repress aggression is through the action of a central international agency supposedly representing the common interest and general good of all nations. A great deal of honest, sincere, and constructive thought in this country and throughout the world is being devoted to working out the structure of such an organization. These efforts are well spent and worth while. The time is overdue for the nations to have available an effective agency and clearing house for their problems. The point I wish to emphasize is that if such an organization is to realize its intended aim it must not rest on illusions and false hopes but on a frank recognition of inevitable forces and tendencies. This means that it must incorporate and make use of the balance-of-power principle and not seek to deny or ignore it; it must make room for spheres of influence and colonial dependencies; it must operate through and upon the international facts and forces which actually exist and adapt itself to them, rather than set its sights to the supposed conditions of a brave new world which never was on land or sea.

I submit that if one has even a slight knowledge of history or any acquaintance at all with the world about us today and with the way that men and groups behave it is clear that within any international organization or association that may be set up the principle of the balance of power and of spheres of influence will still continue to operate, possibly in a different form and doubtless by somewhat different methods, but with the same inevitability as in the unorganized world of past and present-day international politics. The mere setting up of an organization is not a panacea which will at once do away with the forces or effect a magical transformation of the tendencies which are at work in the world conditions from which we are seeking to escape. It will only alter their incidence and the environment within which they operate.

This does not mean, as hasty thinkers have a way of concluding, that it is therefore futile and useless to set up an international organization, or to seek to bring about a degree of closer international cooperation, and that attempts to do so should be abandoned. On the contrary the change in the environment which would be effected by the establishment of such an organization, and the resulting change in the methods through which international rivalry and competition would have to proceed in the future, may well produce highly beneficial consequences. They are certain to do so if, in shaping the new organization, due regard is paid to the continued operation of the forces with which it will have to deal, and if no false hopes are entertained which will leave it defenseless in the face of those forces. We can no more hope to build an international organization successfully without allowing for the continued operation of spheres of influence and the balance of power, than we could undertake to improve the health of human beings without taking into account the circulation of the blood and the processes of metabolism.

Let me illustrate from our own history. The formation of the Union in 1787 did not put an end to internal rivalries, expansionist ambitions or efforts to establish and maintain a sectional balance of power. It only altered the procedures and restricted the methods which those tendencies followed. After 1787 they necessarily had to proceed within the framework of the Union, and through the channels which the institutions of the Union provided. That was a great and beneficial advance, even though in the end the balance broke down and a civil war had to be fought before a new balance could establish itself.

If this has been the history of even such a close-knit organization as our own American Federal Union, there is no reason to suppose that the same kind of internal rivalries and the same kind of struggle for a balance of power will not continue even more definitely and decisively at work within the much looser framework of any international union that can be set up. This being so, it is imperative in shaping the plan and outline of the new organization to keep two points

[2] Henry J. Taylor, Men in Motion, pp. 95–96.

in the foreground: first, that the structure of the new agency shall be adapted to the recognition of spheres of influence and the continuance of efforts to maintain the balance of power; secondly, that it shall be built along such lines as to aid these policies and tendencies to promote peace rather than endanger it. On these two points it is of interest to inquire into the probable effect of the provisions contained in the so-called Dumbarton Oaks proposals, which are the official blueprint of international organization sponsored by the Allies.

IV

There are two respects in which the Dumbarton Oaks plan has significance for the matters here under discussion. The first is in connection with the important hiatus, or missing link, in the plan, about which so much has been said in the press.

This missing link in the Dumbarton Oaks plan relates to whether or not one of the four great powers shall be able to veto the application to it of sanctions by the proposed league for acts of aggression. It has been reported that certain of the Allies, including this country, were willing to forego this veto, and grant such a power to the league, but that Russia refused. Of course the effect of the veto, if retained, would be to prevent the league from serving as an instrumentality against aggression by the major powers. No decision was reached at Dumbarton Oaks on this point. The question was left open, and the plan as published simply states that, "the question of voting procedure in the security council is still under consideration."[3]

If it should ultimately be decided in the plan of the new league that the great powers can prevent action by the league with respect to their own aggressions, this would mean that as between them the league would be only a medium for conference and consultation, and not an enforcement agency, or agency of protection or security at all. In such event neither a great power nor a small nation would be able to rely on the league for protection against another great power. For protection against great powers the nations would have to make other arrangements.

It is not hard to foresee what these other arrangements would have to be. Of course they would have to be alliances, counteralliances and efforts to maintain the balance of power along precisely the lines which have always been familiar in the international politics of the past. In other words, on those terms the establishment of the new international security organization would not alter the conditions or methods through which so-called balance-of-power politics has always proceeded in the absence of an international organization. There would, however, be the assurance of meetings, discussions, and conferences between the powers at frequent intervals, which should prove highly valuable, and in addition the league would also have a power of enforcement against smaller nations in cases where the four great powers were able to agree.

However, it is highly questionable whether an international league should have a power of enforcement against smaller nations if its function with respect to the great powers themselves is limited to consultation and voluntary adjustment. There can hardly be much doubt that if ultimately the missing link in the Dumbarton Oaks plan is supplied by acceptance of the Russian view, the new organization should be divested of enforcement functions altogether, so that it may not enjoy these as against the smaller nations, while deprived of them with respect to the great powers. The league would then be merely an agency of consultation and wholly without so-called security functions. It is this kind of a purely consultative league which is apparently desired by so-called realistic thinkers, including Mr. Walter Lippmann, who has written that we should "base the new league not on the principle of enforcing peace, but on the principle of continual consultation."[4]

Our official governmental plan calls, of course, for much more than this. Cordell Hull and others have promised an organization which "must provide for the maintenance of adequate forces to preserve peace, and must provide the institutions and procedures for calling these forces into action to preserve peace."[5] In such an organization with actual powers of enforcement the relationship between the great powers and the smaller nations becomes obviously of the utmost importance, and has therefore quite naturally been the subject of the sharpest differences of opinion with respect to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The features of the proposals which bear on this problem of large powers and small powers constitute a second point at which to test the degree to which the proposed plan takes account of international realities.

The plan in this respect has been criticized for being too realistic. Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr, in a speech delivered in Baltimore last November, characterized it as after all nothing but an old-fashioned power alliance.[6] Certainly the Dumbarton Oaks plan is realistic in accepting the view that in international affairs the lead will inevitably be taken, and must be taken, by the great powers, and that it would be futile to construct an organization in which all nations, large and small, are supposed to have an equal voice. However, it recognizes that there would be grave disadvantages in not at least attempting to subject the great powers to some check through what may be called international public opinion as represented by the voices of the smaller nations. This the plan seeks to accomplish by its provisions prescribing membership in the council, which is intended to be the principal organ of the new league for decision and action. These provisions are that the council shall consist of 11 members, five of which are to be permanent members, representing the United States, Great Britain, Russia, China, and France, respectively, as great powers, while the remaining six, constituting a majority, shall be chosen for terms of 2 years each by the general assembly of the league in which all member States are to have an equal vote. It is apparently not contemplated that the votes of these smaller countries on the council would have to be unanimous.

Fair and reasonable as this solution might at first sight seem to be attention may be called to an important difficulty which it presents. That is that at the close of the present war, perhaps to a greater degree than ever before, most of the smaller countries of the world will tend to be mere dependencies and satellities of one or another of the great powers, or at least definitely within the sphere of influence of a great power. This is not a healthy condition, but it is one which will have to be reckoned with. Certainly it tends to make impossible that body of disinterested world opinion which is important in promoting an atmosphere favorable to peace, and which can only be supplied by a group of independent nations standing more or less on the sidelines in contests between the great powers.

If, as seems to be a fact, the number of such nations is diminishing, and more and more countries are coming to occupy the position of clients or dependents of a great power, the presence of such countries on the council of the new league would not add to the disinterestedness or impartiality of its decisions, but might even lead to unfairness in such decisions. Thus under the Dumbarton Oaks plan, the smaller nations who are to form a majority of the council might all be chosen from the sphere of influence of one or two of the great powers, and to that degree unduly enhance the voice and weight of those powers, while correspondingly decreasing the influence of the others. Under such circumstances, if the league were to have the enforcement functions contemplated by most of its advocates and were to undertake to order military sanctions against a power whose client states were only weakly represented, or not represented at all, in the council, there would inevitably be a feeling of injustice and resentment aroused by the league's action which would impair its moral effectiveness.

Some critics who are awake to this difficulty have proposed a solution which was not adopted in the Dumbarton Oaks plan. This is to organize the smaller countries on a regional basis and provide that each regional group shall be represented in the council. Such regional representation of the smaller countries would present difficulties of its own. On the one hand, the smaller countries in a given region, like the Americas or eastern Europe, might very well be all within the sphere of influence of a great power, such as the United States or Russia. In this event the regional representation of these powers in the council would simply have the effect of doubling the representation of the great power within whose sphere of influence they lie.

On the other hand, regional representation of small nations in the council might have a quite different result. It might lend strength to the group of small countries located in the area of a major power to encourage them to take a position of antagonism to that power. While the argument might be advanced that this would be advantageous as a way of curbing the ambitions of the great powers, it is by no means certain that this would be the case. On the contrary, it would certainly provide added incentive for the great powers to bring the smaller countries, lying within their sphere of influence, more effectively and completely under their domination, and to that extent promote a condition of affairs precisely the opposite of that which the advocates of international peace and cooperation desire to accomplish.

These considerations by no means require the conclusion that the effort to establish an international organization should be abandoned. They simply point out some of the difficulties inherent in the effort, and which need to be faced frankly. No good will come from closing our eyes. We can only hope to solve difficulties by recognizing them.

The source of the dilemma lies in two features of the plan of the proposed security organization—first, in the proposal to give the smaller countries a voice in the application of sanctions to the great powers, and, secondly, in the fact that so many of the smaller countries today are, and must necessarily be, within the sphere of influence of a great power. The effect of this combination is that anything approaching impartiality in the application of sanctions by the proposed league will be difficult to attain, and the claim of a decision to be impartial will almost certainly be challenged.

It is of course easy to say that sanctions should be applied, and will only be applied, to check actual aggression. Plausible as this may sound, it is a result easier to state in the abstract, than to achieve in reality. Aggression is not something which can be satisfactorily defined in advance, or upon which there can be reasonable asurance of disinterested agreement in an actual case. In the last analysis, a determination of what constitutes aggression will turn largely on the

[3] Proposals for the establishment of a general international organization (Dumbarton Oaks proposals), ch. VI, sec. C, New York Times, October 10, 1944, p. 12.

[4] Mr. Lippmann's column, Philadelphia Inquirer, June 3, 1944; see also April 27, 1944.

[5] New York Times, April 10, 1944.

[6] Baltimore Sun, November 2, 1944.

views, interests, ambitions, and fears of those who are called upon to make the determination. Any decision which a body like the security council proposed in the Dumbarton Oaks plan might reach as to whether an act of aggression has occurred would in many instances not carry with it that assurance of impartiality which it would have to have if it is to serve as the basis for a command by the league to its constituent member-states to use force against another state. It might well be regarded as no more than a command by a combination of states to other states, including this country, to go to war.

v.

In the light of these considerations it would seem not inappropriate to reexamine the provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations relating to the same matters. There is doubtless ground for valid criticism of certain provisions of the Covenant, as well as of the fatal caution and timidity which characterized the policy of the League. However, it may be stated with assurance that the failure of the League was certainly not due to the weakness of the Covenant. As a matter of fact, the League never used the full powers conferred by the Covenant. Its timidity and failure were due to the attitude of the public mind within the great powers and to the temper of the times during the decade of the 1920's. It is hardly likely that, given that attitude and temper, the result would have been different, no matter how much stronger the provisions of the Covenant had been. There is, therefore, no reason why the Covenant may not afford suggestions from which we can learn in attempting to deal with our present problems.

The pertinent provisions of the Covenant, as contained in the fifteenth and sixteenth articles, were that in the event of a controversy likely to result in war, the Council was called upon to investigate and report. If the report was unanimous, aside from the votes of the actual parties to the dispute, but only if it was unanimous, the members agreed that they would not go to war in violation of the recommendations of the report. If a member disregarded this obligation, it became the duty of the Council to recommend action to the other members. It is to be noted that this duty was limited to recommendation, and that no obligation to make war was imposed on the members.

These provisions, assuming that the will existed to carry them into effect—and of course in the absence of such willingness no provisions, however strong, would have any value—would seem to provide a solution for the dilemma presented under the Dumbarton Oaks plan. They provide definitely for something more than mere consultation. They stop short, however, of imposing an obligation which, because of the circumstances under which it may come into operation in particular cases, would run the risk of being disregarded and repudiated. It is well to remember that if we give to the new security organization a power to order us to make war under circumstances which, when they arise, are of such a character that we will be unwilling to make war, we should have done the greatest disservice to the cause when we seek to promote. If the sanctity of treaties is ever again to become an axiom of international law, there is nothing more important than to make sure that the obligations which are assumed by a treaty are of such a character that there will be no reasonable excuse for evading them. This is why the provision of the League covenant, which limits the function of the council to the making of a recommendation, seems preferable to vesting the council with authority to order the members to make war.

This does not imply that in the international arrangements to be established at the close of the war, the nations should be under no binding obligations. What has been said merely goes to the character of the obligation, and suggests that it should not take the form of an obligation to use military force when and as some other group or combination of powers may command. Binding obligations of a more definite and specific kind are, however, inevitably indicated as not only desirable but necessary on a far wider scale than ever before. These would naturally take the form of treaties of mutual aid and security between powers, large and small, which have interests in the same regions and areas. Undoubtedly this country will be called on to underwrite the settlement in western Europe and the Pacific, and of course we should do so. Probably our most serious blunder and omission at the close of the last war was not our failure to join the League of Nations, but our refusal to make the security pact with France to which President Wilson attempted to commit us. There should be no such failure again. However, it would certainly be unwise for us to guarantee settlements in areas where our interests are only slight and remote, as for example in the Balkans or the Near East. The mistake of article X of the League covenant was that it attempted to give universal extension and application to a principle which is sound within territorial limitations.

There is another kind of limitation which should be observed in the international commitments that we may expect to assume at the end of the war. This is a limitation with respect to time. It would be disastrous and fatal for the Allies to undertake to frame a settlement on the assumption, or with the intention, that it was to be permanent and unchangeable. On the contrary, all the treaties and obligations entering into the settlement should expressly and definitely provide for their reconsideration and possible amendment. This is essential in the interest of what Mr. John Foster Dulles has called peaceful change. The provision of adequate and workable institutional machinery for carrying through these revisions would be about the most valuable contribution that could be made to the cause of durable peace. It is, however, such an unspectacular matter that not much attention appears to be given to it.

With this parting suggestion, may I sum up what seem to me appropriate conclusions in the matter of bringing an international organization into conformity with the facts and realities of the international situation:

First, no international organization should have a power of enforcement against small countries which it does not possess against the great powers.

Secondly, because so many small countries are now within the sphere of influence of great powers, the presence of small countries on an international security council would not assure the impartiality of the decisions of the council, but might operate to enhance the influence of one great power against another.

Thirdly, and for the foregoing reasons, it would seem preferable to limit the power of an international security council, as under the covenant of the League of Nations, to the making of recommendations, rather than authorize it to command the application of military sanctions.

Fourthly, treaties of security and mutual assistance of a regional character should be entered into with a view to maintaining and preserving the balance of power.

Fifthly, all treaties should include a clause providing for their revision at reasonable intervals and by appropriate machinery.

Certainly these conclusions are neither exciting nor stimulating; they afford no occasion for a display of rhetoric; they do not touch the heart; and they are not calculated to evoke a surge of noble emotion. Nevertheless, in the end, the success or failure of the world's great experiment in durable peace will depend in large measure on such dry and unemotional details, and it is therefore appropriate, and especially for lawyers, who are by profession men of dry details, to give adequate consideration to them while the tumult and shouting engage the attention of the rest of the world.

Leave It to Texas

REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, we all remember the furore created last year when a survey was undertaken among college students covering their knowledge of American history. The results tended to show that our teaching methods were lax when it came to impressing the fundamentals of our history in the minds of our young men and women. This problem has worried me considerably and I find, after extensive research, that this survey did not include Texas and, furthermore, that while we Americans did not have the answers the people of Texas did. Personally, I think Texans, like Californians, are too modest, and I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to give credit to a State which too often hides its glorious past from the rest of us.

I am now quoting from the Montana Standard of March 16, 1945, published at Butte, the richest hill on earth, and as follows:

IS TEXAS LOOKING FOR TROUBLE?

As the word got around that Montana was to make Lewis and Clark honorary citizens of the State this summer in ceremonies from border to border, other States in the Union have been picking up their historical ears. Among these is Texas, the Lone Star State, whose claim to half ownership in the only dusty river in the world, the Rio Grande, never has been disputed.

The following includes some historical data as compiled by Fort Worth high school students:

"1492. Columbus discovers America. Contrary to rumor, he was not an Italian, but a Texan, who was recognized as royalty in Queen Isabella's court.

"1620: First Texans set foot on Plymouth Rock.

"1774: Texans organize Continental Congress.

"1775: Texans, always enemies of tyranny, begin the American War of Independence.

"1775: Paul Revere's ride. Paul was not from Texas, but his horse was.

"1776: Texans help Yankees draw up Declaration of Independence.

"1777: Washington crosses Delaware piloted by a Texan.

"1778: Valley Forge—one of the darkest moments in history, ranking next to the Alamo.

"1812: British discover naval supremacy of Texans.

"1845: The Union joins Texas.

"1898: Texans win Spanish-American War.

"1914: Texans complete Panama Canal.

"1918: Texans drive through Argonne and win World War.

"1920: Texas tries to warn the world that Wall Street crash is imminent.

"1941: United States caught napping at Pearl Harbor, calls on Texas to declare war on Japan.

"1943: Texans fight Nazi tanks barehanded.

"1944: Texans 'sparkplug' invasion of France and free Paris.

"1945: Texans get Hitler's goat at Berchtesgarden—Germany collapses."

Now we believe that the average Montanan can write more history in a minute than the average Texan can write in a day, even using a long-handled, asbestos covered pencil. Some of our best historical writers could start out with the Bibical reference to Montana and go on from there, up through the building of the Pyramids to what is commonly known as the Chinese wall. (The fact is one of our engineers, who had the contract for the building of Glacier National Park, did that little job out in China as a sideline.)

Montanans are disposed to deny credit to Columbus for discovering America because a few of them were on the beach to greet him when he landed.

These are just a few minor incidents in history in which Montanans played a leading role. Does Texas want a contest?

Recommendation for Amendments to M-388

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members have been deluged with protests against the pending W. P. B. regulations M-388 A, B, C. This order of W. P. B. seeks to bring back to the customers certain low- or medium-priced articles of clothing. I am in complete sympathy with the purpose of this directive. Every housewife in America knows that low- and medium-priced dresses, shirts, underwear, children's garments, and so forth, are scarce or nonexistent in their local retail stores. Many people whose incomes have not been increased should be able to purchase these articles.

Two factors have brought this condition about. The textile mills' output in utility yardage has been almost completely absorbed by military, lend-lease and U. N. R. R. A. needs. This automatically forced the manufacturers of clothing to use higher-priced yardage in their civilian clothing output. Of course the low-priced lines vanished and higher-priced lines took their place on the merchants' shelves. The mill owner, the manufacturer, and the retailer followed the line of least resistance; that is, it was more profitable to sell high-priced units than low-priced units and due to increased purchasing power of the average consumer, there was little sales resistance. The market could easily absorb all production although it was in higher prices per unit.

The second important factor has been the loopholes in the Price Control Act which made inevitable the disappearance of low-price lines. I will mention a few of the most important deficiencies in the price-control program.

First. The Congress prohibited the O. P. A. from prescribing quality standards which would be applicable to certain specific articles and price ranges.

Second. The Congress denied the O. P. A. adequate enforcement funds for the policing of price-control regulations.

Third. W. P. B. and O. P. A. regulations were too often drawn without proper consultation with the representatives of all parts of the specific industry affected.

Fourth. W. P. B. regulations in the field of material channeling, frequently had a discriminatory effect on small businesses and did not prevent the disappearance of basic low cost materials at the mill level.

Fifth. Geographical area customs, and distances from sources of raw or basic materials have not been given equitable consideration in compiling essential lists and enforcing time limits for inventory and conversion.

During the past 3 weeks the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed Their Authority has been holding hearings on the inequities of M-388. I have attended these hearings and presented a statement before this committee pointing out the mistakes of W. P. B. Directive M-388. In my opinion, this committee which I have supported since its inception, is making an earnest effort to hear all sides of this controversy.

The California congressional delegation has also considered this problem at some length and have addressed certain letters and recommendations to the W. P. B. and Office of Civilian Requirements. I have obtained unanimous consent to append these items to my remarks:

MARCH 20, 1945.

Hon. J. A. KRUG,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Mr. Joseph Gleitsman.)

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN: The California delegation is deeply concerned over the effects of the M-388 regulations on the textile manufacturing industry, particularly the sections which were considered to be discriminatory against west coast manufacturers. We realize the urgent necessity behind the issuance of these regulations. We believe certain amendments and provisions are imperative, and after careful study of the testimony given before the Smith committee and the problems facing our clothing manufacturers on the west coast, we respectfully urge your consideration of the enclosed recommendations.

Sincerely yours,
CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION,
JERRY VOORHIS,
Chairman of the Special Committee Considering M-388.
CHET HOLIFIELD.
HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS.
ELLIS E. PATTERSON.
CARL HINSHAW.
RICHARD J. WELCH.

MARCH 20, 1945.

Dr. WILLIAM Y. ELLIOTT,
Director, Civilian Requirements Branch, War Production Board, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. ELLIOTT: The California delegation is deeply concerned over the effects of the M-388 regulations on the textile manufacturing industry, particularly the sections which were considered to be discriminatory against west coast manufacturers. We realize the urgent necessity behind the issuance of these regulations. We believe certain amendments and provisions are imperative, and after careful study of the testimony given before the Smith committee and the problems facing our clothing manufacturers on the west coast, we respectfully urge your consideration of the enclosed recommendations.

Sincerely yours,
CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION,
JERRY VOORHIS,
Chairman of the Special Committee Considering M-388.
CHET HOLIFIELD.
HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS.
ELLIS E. PATTERSON.
CARL HINSHAW.
RICHARD J. WELCH.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDMENTS TO M-388

It is recommended that the inventory provisions of M-388 in paragraph 3290.351 (6) "Restrictions of manufacturers' inventories of textiles" be changed from "wherever located if title has passed to the manufacturer" to "after receipt at destination."

M-388 B. SYNTHETIC FIBER TEXTILES

It is recommended that there be added—

(1) Slacks (women's), all sizes, $3.75 each.

(2) Slack suits (women's), short sleeves, all sizes, $6.75 each.

(3) Slack suits (women's), long sleeves, all sizes, $7.75 each.

(4) Shirts (men's), all sizes, $36 per dozen.

(5) Jackets (women's), unlined, all sizes, $5.75 each.

M-388 C. WOOL AND WOOL TEXTILES

It is recommended that there be added—

(1) Coats (men's), separate, all sizes, $12.75 each.

(2) Trousers (men's), separate, all sizes, $8.50 each.

As this order, even if these recommendations are included in the amendments, will work a tremendous hardship on the needle industry of California, which has been built around active sportswear, it is recommended that just as soon as the serious fabric shortage created by the requirements of the armed forces is relieved that all restrictions created by this order be canceled.

It is also recommended that W. P. B. make available at the mill level the kind of piece goods and at prices which will permit the manufacturer to produce the low-end merchandise provided for in the order.

SUPPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN M-388

The request for the change in inventory restrictions is made due to the fact that goods in transit to the west coast take an average of approximately 30 days or more. Therefore, the manufacturer located closer to his sources of supply, all of which are located on the east coast, would have quite an advantage over the manufacturer located at greater distances from his sources of supply, and in many instances it would be impossible for the manufacturer on the west coast to comply with the provisions of the order due to having lost approximately half of the authorized period for the goods to reach his place of business.

It has been customary for many years for the manufacturers located on the west coast to carry considerably larger inventories of piece goods than this order now authorizes and which have been customarily carried by the manufacturers located close to their sources of supply. Therefore, this order as written today penalizes the manufacturers located at great distances from their sources of supply.

RE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCLUDING WOMEN'S SLACKS AND SLACK SUITS AND UNLINED JACKETS UNDER M-388 B, THE RAYON SCHEDULE

Statistics are available and have been furnished to the W. P. B. that the above-mentioned items are a part of the clothing worn by women while engaged in their customary occupations. In many instances the plants in which women are employed demand for safety reasons that slacks or slack suits be worn. A survey recently conducted in Los Angeles and San Francisco defense plants, which employ many, many thousands of women, indicated that approximately sixty-some-odd percent of all women checked during this survey wore either slacks or slack suits. In view of the fact that the order sets aside a considerable quantity of merchandise for women's dresses, women's suits, women's skirts, and women's blouses, it is believed that the provisions to include slacks and slack suits and jackets is a very fair request because of the large quantities used on the west coast, and the use of these garments will in fact help to conserve rayon piece goods, because when a woman wears slacks or a slack suit she usually does not wear a slip, a girdle, or stockings.

THE REQUESTED INCLUSION OF SHIRTS FOR MEN

Nowhere in the order are any men's rayon shirts of the type that are so prevalently used by men while engaged in their customary occupations—the open-neck or V-neck type shirt—authorized to be taken care of. There are only two classifications: (1) a sport shirt, short sleeve of cotton, and realistically speaking, there will be no cotton materials available for sometime to come; and (2) the wool work shirt, which has been interpreted to mean a shirt with a neckband. The survey above referred to indicates that the majority of men working in the defense plants wear the type of shirt that we have requested to be included in this order, and with the climatic conditions as they exist on the west coast and with the shortage of cotton materials for work shirts it becomes more important that the item referred to in our recommendations be included in this order.

RE M-388 C, WOOL AND WOOL SCHEDULE

This order provides for a man's suit at $32.25. Much material can be conserved and the consumer will receive the same utility value by the inclusion of the two items requested when the wool materials become available. At the price of $21.50 the separate coat and trousers will be produced, and as the survey again indicates, this is a very popular daily use item for a man while customarily engaged in his regular occupation.

In order for the manufacturer to be able to supply garments at the lower levels prescribed in this order it becomes absolutely necessary that the manufacturer be able to secure merchandise suitable for such production and at prices which will allow him to produce the garments at the prices set forth in the order. The prices suggested in the above amendments are much below the average or normal prices at which these garments have been sold by the manufacturers located on the west coast during the past years, are real values and will only produce plain garments having utilitarian value and cannot be classed in the customary sportswear category.

Curfew Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement issued by former Justice Byrnes, of the Supreme Court, now Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion; also an editorial from the New York Times of March 20, 1945, and an article by Arthur Krock from the same issue of that newspaper, all on the subject of curfew regulations.

There being no objection, the statement, article, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF BYRNES STATEMENT ON CURFEW

Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion James F. Byrnes said today that he was surprised by Mayor LaGuardia's announcement that places of entertainment in New York City could remain open until 1 o'clock.

He stated further that he had been pleased greatly with the Nation-wide cooperation which the Government had received in obtaining compliance with this war-conservation measure. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission has reported that there has been almost universal compliance throughout the country. Not only have local officials, particularly in the larger cities, given wholehearted support to the measure but the voluntary compliance by management of places of entertainment has been almost unanimous.

Justice Byrnes said he was gratified at the estimates of savings effected, the effect upon the manpower situation, absenteeism, transportation, and other problems affecting the war effort. He said:

"I recognize that the indirect sanctions which are available to the Federal Government do not lend themselves to the enforcement of such a request except in isolated instances of noncompliance. The available indirect sanctions cannot be effectively applied without the full cooperation of local authorities.

"The Government has no police force of its own available to discover local violations. It has no intention of building up such a force. It is obvious that this effort would in itself be a diversion from the war effort.

"I believe that a controversial enforcement of the measure in New York City without the support of local officials would be impossible. Any effort to this end would divert from the war effort.

"But the Government does not intend to withdraw its requests for places of entertainment to close at midnight.

"There have been no changes in the conditions which led to its issuance. It was one of a series of conservation measures designed to save coal, manpower, and transportation at a crucial period in the war. We cannot expect to obtain voluntary savings in the home unless we take other measures to convince the public that such savings are necessary. We must convince our fighting forces that the home front is prepared to sacrifice for their support.

"Our armies have gained a foothold on the far shores of the Rhine. American soldiers are fighting with determination against strong resistance to extend this bridgehead sufficiently for a final drive against Germany. We have gained Iwo Jima, but at a price which has warned us of the terrific fight ahead in the Pacific.

"Our casualties during the past 2 weeks are estimated at approximately 2,000 per day. At home we are still confronted with shortages in fuel, manpower, transportation, and other essential services. Now is not the time to relax in any way our effort at home.

"I am confident that after the defeat of Germany many of the existing shortages will disappear. I fully anticipate that then the conservation measures which have been imposed by the Government may be suspended or modified. Now we at home must give full support to our soldiers at the front. They are entitled to know that we are willing to make some small sacrifice before we call upon them to make the supreme sacrifice.

"Measures of this type adopted by the Federal Government must apply uniformly throughout the country. We cannot set one standard for New York City and another standard for the rest of the country.

"Therefore, I still ask the full cooperation of all local officials and of the public in support of this request. In those instances in which local officials report violations, the Government will apply those sanctions which are available for the purpose.

"The managers of places of entertainment have patriotically complied with the request. I am sure that the Government may count on their continued support of the established closing hour. I am equally confident that the large majority of the patrons of places of entertainment will support their Government in this conservation request.

"I am authorized to say that this appeal to the Nation has the full approval of the President of the United States."

[From the New York Times of March 20, 1945]

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SIEGE OF NEW YORK CITY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—They are saying harsh things today about Mayor LaGuardia, saying them in Washington, where he has long been considered the President's roving ally and the New Deal's general of irregulars. The remarks range from suggestions that the mayor has "taken New York City out of the Union" or "out of the war" to charges that, in adding an hour to the night life of the metropolis, he has threatened a break-down of that voluntary system of wartime compliances in which the President has taken such pride. Most of this, of course, is uttered in private; the issue raised is still too delicate for official blasts that may be forthcoming.

Although the stated and implied war powers of the Presidency, carried over from the past, have been added to since this war began by statute and by court and administrative interpretation, it has been high policy to get many things done by "request." The censorship code of the press and radio, except for direct powers of the military to suppress or proceed against certain publications informatory of the enemy, is voluntary. The ban on horse racing is in the same category. And when Administrator Byrnes of O. W. M. R. imposed the midnight curfew he put it in the form of a request.

But now Mayor La Guardia has withdrawn his acceptance of that request, and today the administration pondered for hours what to do about it. The immediate decision was to meet it with psychological warfare. That was the method employed by Mr. Byrnes in his statement today. And it was implicit also in the comment of some mayors of other large cities whose political alliance with the administration is close and of long standing. Their comment critical of New York City's

official position was being repeated here today with what suggested pride of authorship.

It may be the administration will find that it must defend voluntary compliance by stronger measures, should noncompliance spread by example and the European war continue to confound the prophets of an early finish. It may be the administration will continue passively to sit out the situation. For New York's problem is in a sense unique among all the cities of the United States: it is the largest port of embarkation and debarkation, its workers are more numerous and more dependent on all-night transport; and the immediate impression here is that the bulk of its citizenry supports the mayor.

But developments might force on the administration an ultimate choice between two alternatives: relax the curfew to the same degree Mr. LaGuardia has relaxed it; or proceed variously under the President's war powers to abolish or nullify the relaxation.

The decision of the United States district court in Chicago in the Montgomery Ward case indicates that an attempt to substitute Federal for local powers over the curfew would have to be carried to the Supreme Court, through the two inferior tribunals, before the administration could hope to have sustained such an exercise of Federal powers. By that time observance of the curfew might have broken down in many cities and a legal victory do more harm than good to the stated objective. Doubtless, however, United States district attorneys could quote a lot of law in favor of enforced compliance with the curfew: the President is empowered, for example, to place restrictions on trade and industry (which could be the denial of supplies, heat, light, power, and manpower).

But, as Administrator Byrnes conceded today, these are indirect sanctions which cannot be successfully invoked without the full cooperation of local authorities or unless the Government forms its own enforcement division, which, he said, the Government is unwilling to do. Therefore, if his statement remains policy, neither of the alternatives listed above will be chosen. The Administration will rely on the effects of psychological warfare, hoping that—in such instances as that of New York City—local public opinion will force the authorities to recomply, or the end of the war in Europe will come in time to prevent a protracted period of noncompliance anywhere.

This is probably the wisest course the President and Mr. Byrnes could take, and certainly it is the most prudent. Also it is typical of the O. W. M. R. Administrator's methods in Government until very recently, when complaints began to arise that he is an autocrat. He has always preferred persuasion to force, conciliation to attack, and example to precept. And he has never believed that the American people can be driven very successfully. The statement Mr. Byrnes issued today, in which the President's approval was explicitly stated, was reminiscent of others he has made in difficult situations.

The statement of policy was prudent for another reason, and this arises from the growing disturbance in Congress and among the public over food shortages and prophecies of worse to come. If responsible opinion were unanimous that these shortages are part of the cost of a war fought under as good domestic as military management, the threat the administration fears they may represent to international cooperation would not be troubling it so much. But many informed and responsible authorities are charging mismanagement and waste, and Congress is moving toward a vigorous investigation.

With such a prospect, an attempt to force curfew compliance on the largest city in the Nation might be harmful far beyond the local orbit.

[From the New York Times of March 20, 1945]

THE MAYOR ON A HIGH HORSE

When he told his radio audience on Sunday that he had changed the city's curfew hour from midnight to 1 a. m. Mayor LaGuardia said: "I have done something unusual this time." All he has done has been to treat, with contempt a wartime request of the Government of the United States, give the city a black eye, and declare null and void an act of the board of estimate and the city council.

The request for national observance of a midnight curfew made by Judge Byrnes, as Director of War Mobilization, was based purely on the special considerations of a wartime situation. It was not prompted by the "dry" organizations which once sponsored the experiment with Prohibition. It was prompted by a stated desire to save coal, transportation, and manpower in the fourth year of American participation in the greatest war in history. It was accepted as such by city governments in all parts of the country. Mayor LaGuardia himself issued a joint statement with the regional director of the War Manpower Commission "appealing to the public for its cooperation." The board of estimate and the city council, holding special meetings for the purpose, adopted legislation fixing the wartime curfew at midnight and giving the city legal authority to enforce it. Now Mr. LaGuardia decides that 1 a. m. is better than midnight, and tells the night clubs to go ahead with that arrangement on his own say-so.

The problems of enforcing a 12-o'clock curfew in a city like New York are many and difficult—so many and so difficult that Mr. LaGuardia could present a good case for a modification of the Government's proposal. But in the mayor's actual handling of the case the discourtesy to Judge Byrnes is obvious. The flouting of the Government's request is deliberate. The invitation to the rest of the country to believe the old libel that New York City puts pleasure above patriotism is unmistakable. As for the law passed by the board of estimate and the city council, fixing the curfew at midnight, Mr. LaGuardia announces airily: "We won't worry about that. We just won't report any violations until 1 o'clock."

If the mayor can do this with one law he can do it with any other law, and we shall have reached a point at which we won't need a legislative assembly in this city. Mr. LaGuardia can make his own laws in city hall. He is riding a very high horse indeed.

Poland and the Big Three

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter signed by Thomas W. Lamont and appearing in the Sunday New York Times of March 18 on the subject Poland and the Big Three.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLAND AND BIG THREE—ATTACKS HERE UPON YALTA ACTION VIEWED AS UNJUSTIFIED

(The writer of the following letter is chairman of J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc. In 1919 at Paris he was a representative of the Treasury on the American Commission to Negotiate Peace and was present at discussions having to do with the reconstitution of a Polish state.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Of all the momentous decisions made at the Crimean Conference, that concerning Poland seems to have aroused the most question. In fact, for weeks before the conference there was bitter American criticism of Russia's attitude. It still continues from some quarters. If, however, our American comment is to be informed and helpful, we must understand certain of the very important factors that the Big Three may well have had in mind in this matter.

Poland, lying at the crossroads between western and eastern Europe, has for centuries been a bone of contention. Thrice partitioned by its three powerful neighbors, it had no separate national existence from 1795 until 1919. Then at the Paris Peace Conference the Allies set up the new Polish state, taking care, in accord with both the American and British ethnological experts, to leave indefinite any boundaries east of the Curzon line.

POLES MOVED EAST

In 1918 Soviet Russia had, under unrelenting German duress, signed the humiliating peace of Brest-Litovsk, thereby losing great slices of Russian territory. Then she suffered grievously from the support her late allies gave to counter-revolutionary forces.

The Poles, noting this weakness, were able by force of arms in 1920, although against the urgent counsel of the Allies, to move into the region east of the Curzon Line, and in the Treaty of Riga in 1921 the Soviets finally conceded this territory.

Poland's terrible and ever-present misfortune as the border state has been that she could not maintain the position of neutrality that she sought as between Germany and Russia. Between World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 Polish leaders attempted to avoid the dilemma and to walk a tightrope. Not a democracy, Poland's great landlords, who dominated the country, feared the east rather than the west. The Polish Pact of 1934 with Germany was far more significant than a similar one with Russia, for the arrangement assured Hitler that on his all-important eastern front he would not have an unfriendly neighbor, and that his task of isolating Russia from France and England would be accomplished.

RUSSIA NEEDED TIME

But Poland's hope of neutrality was rudely shattered when Germany launched World War No. 2 and swiftly crushed the country. In the light of later events it seems likely that Russia's primary motive in dividing Poland with Germany was to gain time and additional room for defense; for Marshal Stalin knew his real enemy to be Germany. After the fall of France in 1940 Stalin is quoted by Walter Duranty as saying:

"The Nazis have not beaten England. Unless Hitler can cross the English Channel his war in the west is not won and when he understands that, he will be forced to reverse his direction and strike at us."

Thus it all becomes clearer why Russia has come back to her old principle of frontier defense dating back to the time of Peter the Great. Having twice within 30 years suffered from Germany the most sweeping devastation and appalling loss of life, the people of Russia do not intend to be caught again in the same way.

It is well, too, for us who are far from sympathetic to the Russian economic ideas to remember that the Russians have fought World Wars No. 1 and No. 2 at fearful sacrifice, and like Britain and America, have made a stupendous contribution to the saving of western civilization. For our own interests we must not let the "Russophobes" in our midst lead us up dangerous bypaths of distrust of our Russian ally.

COURAGE DEMONSTRATED

It is quite impossible for anyone to say that either Russia or Poland has been all right or all wrong. Naturally, the sufferings that Poland has endured make strong appeal to Americans who for years have had fear, reasonable or otherwise, of a Bolshevist menace. Poland has in the past had a history and culture that were brilliant and stimulating. The Poles are a gallant people. Nature did not design them to become the satellites of any other nation. In their desperate struggle against Germany the Poles have been fighting the battle of all free peoples and of civilization itself. Thus we could have wished that, if only in tribute to the heroic qualities of a fighting ally, the Russians had been able months ago to show a less intransigent attitude toward their weaker neighbor.

President Roosevelt, in his report to Congress, stated his opinion "that this agreement on Poland, under the circumstances, is the most hopeful agreement possible for a free, independent, and prosperous Polish state."

The new plan for Poland with its provisions for democratic procedure has the advantage that two of the three members of the Commission to set it up are our own capable Ambassador, Averell Harriman, and the experienced British Ambassador, Sir Archibald Clark Kerr. Perhaps our American critics will give them a chance to work things out, realizing meantime that in all these matters Russia's and Britain's activities come down to the same point—the necessity that our allies have been under of being forehanded against a third attempt at world domination by a fresh Germany. In Germany over the generations they may have changed the faces, or have taken on fresh names, but their technique of conquest has remained the same. In 1914 it was Belgium that was the first victim; in 1939 Poland; back in 1864 Denmark; in 1866 Austria; in 1870 France.

Just as in the case of Russia and Poland, many Americans have been highly critical of Britain's attitude as to Italy and Greece and have been demanding the immediate functioning of democratic processes. Of course, Mr. Churchill has more than once proclaimed the necessity of establishing governments of the people. But from the outlook of our own untouched countryside we can have little conception of the devastation, distress, and confusion of these liberated states, of the break-down in the fabric of society. The fact is that until available cargo space for food and other supplies materially increases, the hungry people will take limited interest in democratic legislative procedures. They ask for bread, and all there is available is a stone.

TRADE ROUTES IMPORTANT

American interests in the Mediterranean are certainly secondary to British. Yet it is of serious consequence to us that the Mediterranean littoral should be controlled by states friendly to our freedom of commerce through the Mediterranean and Suez Canal. We want to see an Italy and a Greece that cannot be used by a warlike Germany for its own purposes. We have only to recall the narrow margin by which the Suez Canal and its approaches were saved less than 3 years ago. Had Britain finally failed to throw back the Axis legions, their life line, the Suez Canal and the route to the East might have been gone. Our own operation in north Africa would have been far more difficult, our entire attack upon Japan in the Pacific indefinitely postponed and the war might have been lost.

If America had been plunged into any such imminent peril as these two of our allies were, our attitude of seeking safety first would have been equally insistent. Thus Russia may have been far too peremptory in her decision about the Polish boundary. Yet, if we thought, the approaches to the Panama Canal were threatened we should take whatever prompt action we thought essential. We are, and not unnaturally, most intolerant of anybody butting into what we feel are our affairs.

CASE IN POINT

Suppose we remind ourselves again that America has her Monroe Doctrine and her good-neighbor policy toward the score of nations from the Rio Grande south to the tip of Tierra del Fuego. We can hardly complain if Russia and Britain desire to be surrounded by friendly neighbors so as to prevent a possible new Germany from having readier means of access and attack.

I sometimes wonder whether in the field of international politics we American are not still living largely in an age of innocence. We declaim upon the virtues of democracy, and are inclined to thank God that we are not as other men are. But do we fully understand that as yet our strength has been largely economic? Feeling the oats of our powerful economic situation, we assume that we have the right to lay down the law generally in idealistic but not always workable terms. We demand that the European states, that have endured frightful sufferings and are still in the midst of the mess, promptly live up to our American ideals.

STEADINESS NECESSARY

The difficulty, however, is that our allies, the United Nations, and we ourselves are at present embarked upon a sea of troubles and are pursuing our perilous enterprises of winning the war and the peace in a craft that is not too steady and has many leaks. That is the reason why it is dangerous for us, with all our immense economic strength, to throw our weight about the boat and with our offhand orders create near panic among our fellow passengers, thus giving them perhaps the impression that, as 25 years ago, we shall be content to stand aside and fulfill our part in international cooperation simply by word of mouth, by precept rather than by example.

In this imperfect world there can be no complete solution of these post-war problems, no way to satisfy all the needs and aspirations of the widely disparate nations that inhabit this globe. The best that we can hope to do is to arrive at solutions that over the years are as nearly workable as possible. For us over here who, with all our priceless contribution to the winning of the war, with our grievous sacrifice in the lives of our gallant young men, have yet been far removed from bloody invasion and the imminent threat of a hideous foe—for us there is nothing so important as to awake and realize that the world is in an appalling state, that unity of effort is the only thing that can save it. We must be tolerant of the desperate attempts being made by our allies to meet their most pressing difficulties that chance not to be so immediate to America.

We, like Solomon, should ask from the Lord neither riches, power, nor long life, but for an understanding heart that we may deal wisely with the vast problems of our generation today.

THOMAS W. LAMONT.

NEW YORK, *March 15, 1945.*

Should Voting Age Be Lowered to 18? Wonderful Appeal by an Army Officer Who Has Made a Wonderful War Record

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about lowering the voting age from 21 years of age to 18 years of age. The State of Georgia has already made the initial step in one of the 48 States. Recently I was privileged to read one of the most comprehensive and appealing letters on this subject I have ever read. It is really thought provoking. It was from Lt. Ben H. Carpenter, Troop B, One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Cavalry, in the India-Burma theater, who enlisted when he became 18 years of age as a private in the Army. He is now past 20.

The question involved is whether or not one who is old enough to fight is old enough to vote. Of course, this is a matter under our form of government entirely up to the States, but I am convinced in my own mind, considering all facts and circumstances, that the voting age should be lowered to 18. I do not propose to try to find an excuse to justify my being against a proposal that would permit boys who are old enough to fight to cast a vote for the officials who represent them and concerning the problems involving their social and economic welfare. They are entitled to have a voice in the affairs of our Government.

Lieutenant Carpenter is the son of the No. 1 business and industrial leader in the southwestern part of the United States, Mr. John W. Carpenter, of Dallas, Tex. John W. Carpenter is president of the Texas Power & Light Co., one of Texas' greatest industries. He is president of the Gulf Southwest Agricultural and Industrial Conference and is president of many other industrial, business, and civic organizations in the Southwest. He is one of our finest and greatest leaders.

In a letter from Lieutenant Carpenter—written on election day, 1944—to his father and mother concerning the privilege of those arriving at the age of 18 years to vote, he said:

Well, here it is November 7. However, you won't vote till tomorrow in the States, since it's still November 6 there. I wonder how it will turn out. I guess we'll hear by radio soon.

Ever since I've been in the Army I've waited and wondered. I can't understand yet why the people of the individual States back home have not exercised their rights as they should. I am ashamed of the people of the State of Texas, and only those people of the State of Georgia can look thousands of their citizens in arms in the face when they return home. Here has been a chance of generations for the exponents of States' rights to exercise their beliefs. Here has

been a chance for the statesmen and citizens alike to hold onto that one central pillar of democracy which was the framework upon which our country and all democracies have been founded. That pillar, stated simply with the words "taxation without representation," was one of the main factors which drove our peoples to the American Continent and was the central pillar our Government was built around as the people pulled the English colonies away from the mother country into their own Government. After all these generations, here has risen a chance for the people at time of seriousness to once again restate their confidence in our form of government by doing something, by restrengthening that pillar, by not allowing taxation without representation.

But that is what is happening—taxation without representation. Not a taxation of property, nor of money, nor of worldly goods, but of life itself. Do the people in the States realize that a large percentage of the soldiers fighting this war overseas are not able to vote? They are by the will and votes of the people old enough, adult enough, experienced enough, developed enough to fight a war for their country and their beliefs, to give their lives, their time. Yet why are they not by the will of the people and their votes old enough, adult enough, experienced enough, developed enough to have a voice in the affairs of the country and principles they are defending? Why are they being taxed but not being given representation? The Federal system settled the two great suffrage problems, Negro suffrage and woman suffrage, but the Constitution left this greater suffrage problem up to the people of the individual States where it belonged according to that document. The people of Georgia did something about it; the people of Texas and other States did not—possibly they were too busy. The 18–21-year-old citizens of Georgia are fighting a war, being taxed, and also being represented by their right to vote. The 18–21-year-old citizens of Texas and other States, if they can be called "citizens," are fighting a war, being taxed, but are not being represented. True, they are old enough to have the responsibilities of giving their time and life for their country. They are physically and mentally capable. They are doing a good job. Many of them as officers and subordinate leaders are leading into successful battle their older fellow citizens. They have the responsibility of other lives in their hands, the direction of other operations. Many of those who are directed can vote while their leaders and those directing them cannot. Why are these people not old enough to have the responsibilities of giving their votes, old enough to have the privilege of representation in their country? Why? That's the unanswered question.

Why haven't the people spoken up and done something? That, too, is unanswered. By silence and failure to look at the issue even.

I am glad the people of Georgia aren't asleep.

All of this discussion has been in speculation and in serious but amused thought. I just wanted to state a case. Nothing will ever be done about it, I'm almost sure. But I've that much privilege, anyway—so I'll exercise it.

Enclosed you will find a clipping which might be of interest to you.

I am feeling fine tonight, even though it's hot enough for a stove oven in the day, it is getting extremely cold at night. Thanks to the fact that the monsoons are over, however.

TEXAS FLAG CARRIED INTO BATTLE BY LIEUTENANT CARPENTER'S ORGANIZATION

On February 2, 1945, after this letter was written, Lieutenant Carpenter's organization engaged the Japs in combat, which resulted in 520 Japanese being killed in this particular battle. On this occasion Lieutenant Carpenter's conduct was such that he was given the Silver Star for gallantry in action. In a letter to Mr. John W. Carpenter, dated February 15, 1945, Maj. Delbert M. Tanner, adjutant of the One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Cavalry, stated:

SILVER STAR FOR GALLANTRY IN ACTION ON THE FIELD OF BATTLE

The regiment far exceeded any expectations in combat. We had casualties, of course, but nothing in comparison to the enemy. I know of one Texas flag carried in the hottest fight by one of our corporals, who accounted for three enemy pill boxes himself, although wounded at the beginning of the engagement.

Ben was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action and also recommended for promotion on the field of battle as, I believe, Colonel Osborne told you in his letter the other day. Ben, during a heavy counterattack by the Japanese, found his troop C. O. had deserted his troop. It was well after dark and the situation was critical. Fire was intense and the troop was about to crack, when Ben came back to see what was the matter. He reorganized the troop, arranged for aid and ammunition, and later at midnight beat off a stronger and more determined attack. General Sultan personally pinned on his Silver Star. The whole regiment is proud of his achievement. Incidentally, the One Hundred and Twenty-fourth had six Silver Stars awarded and four of them were Texans. Ben came through the scrap without a scratch.

Can't tell much about the future, but the confidence and morale of the outfit, and its performance in battle, is a credit to Texas. Our colors are at the forward command post and add just a bit more to the pride and spirit of the regiment.

I may be doing Ben an injustice, but have an idea that he would not tell his part in this battle. I will forward you a copy of the citation in the near future.

In the Round-Up of March 1, 1945, which is published in the India-Burma Theater as an Army publication, it was stated:

Combat decorations were presented this week to members of the One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Cavalry and Four Hundred and Seventy-fifth Infantry Regiments of the Mars Task Force of Brig. Gen. John P. Willy by Lt. Gen. Dan L. Sultan, India-Burma Theater Commander.

The theater commander presented the Silver Star to two officers and five enlisted men of the Cavalry unit and awarded Silver Stars to two officers and four enlisted men of the Infantry Regiment, in addition to presenting decorations to four members of Merrill's Marauders now attached to the Four Hundred and Seventy-fifth.

The Cavalry decorations were for outstanding actions during the engagements that culminated February 2, with a lightning attack on the Japs concentrated at Hpa-Pen and Mong Noi, 30 miles south of the Ledo-Burma Road.

The Silver Star, third highest award for combat, was presented to the following: Lts. Leo T. Tynan, Jr., San Antonio and Benjamin H. Carpenter, Dallas; Staff Sgt. Joe W. Cantrell, Waco, Tex.; Sgt. James L. Speck, McKinney, Tex.; Pvts. (1st cl.) Bert W. Beacom, Jr., Taylorsport, Ky., and Maurice H. Hylton, Bluefield, W. Va.; Pvt. Solomon D. Cureton, Cove, Ark.

Carpenter led a charge to its objective, and then when the unit was counterattacked secured ammunition and reinforcements for it. Without regard for his own safety, he moved about the perimeter during successive counterattacks, aiding the men in repulsing each onslaught.

Statesmen may well ponder the wise suggestions and friendly advice of Lt. Ben Carpenter.

Exports of Farm Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I included the following letter and tables:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1945.

Hon. MALCOLM C. TARVER,
Chairman, Subcommittee of
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE TARVER: As you will recall, my colleagues and I appeared before the subcommittee on February 26, 1945, for the purpose of discussing with members of that subcommittee the exports of farm machinery.

In revising my remarks, I have found it possible to supply the committee most of the information which it requested. However, some of the detailed information necessary to an understanding of the current situation respecting farm machinery and, in particular, the more recent figures of exports could not be made part of the public record because of the security regulations. Accordingly, I have followed the practice of placing in the record detailed figures attributable to the calendar year 1943. Incidentally, these figures are later than any which we have previously been permitted to make public.

So that the committee may have a more up-to-date picture of the situation, I am enclosing with this letter similar figures to those included in the public record but extending through the calendar year 1944. I am certain that the members of the committee will regard these figures as confidential and to be used only for their own information.

On page 2112 of the typewritten record, I was asked for detailed information as to exports of farm machinery by principal types of machinery. In the public record I supplied detailed information with respect to four principal types of farm machinery and a summary table with respect to seven principal types, including the four types for which the detailed information was furnished. I am now enclosing similar information for the years 1943 and 1944, which are marked tables 1–A to 1–E, inclusive.

On page 2117 of the typewritten record, I was asked for information comparing the number of units of farm machinery exported to Canada per Canadian farm with the number of units made available in the United States per United States farm. Included in the public record will be comparative figures of that nature for wheel tractors and combines for the year 1943. I am now enclosing, marked "table 2," similar information for the year 1944.

On page 2125, I was asked for information respecting the export of farm machinery to

Latin America. Figures with respect to the year 1943 have been furnished for the record. I now enclose similar information with respect to the years 1943 and 1944, which I have marked "table 3."

On page 2133 of the typewritten record, information was requested as to any exports that might not have been included in the other figures submitted to the committee. This was in connection with my mention of 30,000 tons of carbon steel which had been allocated to the Foreign Economic Administration for farm machinery for use in liberated areas in order to assist the people of those liberated countries to achieve maximum agricultural production as rapidly as possible and thus prevent their making long-time claims upon the food resources of this country. As I then mentioned, very little of that machinery has been shipped at the present time. The detailed information with respect to the machinery scheduled both for the Army during the period in which it has responsibility for relief purposes and for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration cannot be made public for reasons of military security. However, for the confidential use of the committee, I am able to furnish a table, which I have marked "table 4," which I believe gives the required information.

As you probably know, some types of machinery which are considered to fall within the definition of farm machinery have been allocated to the armed forces for direct military purposes. None of the export figures submitted by me, either in the record or enclosed in this letter, take account of such of that machinery as may have been exported by the Army for military purposes abroad. Information respecting that type of export is not available to us.

I hope that this includes all the information which the committee desires. However, if additional information is required, please do not hesitate to call upon us again.

Sincerely yours,

H. W. PARISIUS,
Director, Office of Food Programs.

TABLE 1–A.—*Exports of wheel tractors to specified Foreign Economic Administration countries, 1943–44*

[In units]

	1943	1944	1944 exports in percent of total exports
Australia	1,995	6,527	33.2
Brazil	41	52	.3
Chile	17	193	1.0
Colombia	127	265	1.3
Egypt and Sudan	138	499	2.5
French North Africa	0	155	.8
India	82	12	.1
Mexico	1,274	1,835	9.3
New Zealand	1,339	1,890	9.6
Union of South Africa	669	2,137	10.9
United Kingdom	3,887	3,901	19.8
Uruguay	12	111	.6
Venezuela	160	363	1.8
Others	8,449	1,748	8.9
Total Foreign Economic Administration countries	10,294	19,688	100.1

TABLE 1–B.—*Exports of horse and power plows to specified Foreign Economic Administration countries, 1943–44*

[In units]

	1943	1944	1944 exports in percent of total exports
Bolivia	409	1,210	3.5
Brazil	717	878	2.5
Colombia	697	343	1.0
Cuba	440	329	.9
Dominican Republic	688	2,134	6.1
French North Africa	3,791	966	2.8
Mexico	7,582	13,707	39.2
New Zealand	282	320	.9
Paraguay	2 000	2,000	5.7
Peru	261	364	1.0
Turkey	0	4,722	13.5
Union of South Africa	4 387	3,158	9.0
Uruguay	1,021	540	1.5
Venezuela	225	309	.9
Others	5,464	4,024	11.5
Total Foreign Economic Administration countries	27,964	35,004	100.0

TABLE 1–C.—*Exports of grain binders to specified Foreign Economic Administration countries, 1943–44*

[In units]

	1943	1944	1944 exports in percent of total exports
Australia	248	3	0.2
British East Africa	84	0	0
Chile	5	93	5.9
Cuba	12	34	2.1
French North Africa	0	624	39.3
Mexico	41	79	5.0
New Zealand	174	100	6.3
Union of South Africa	319	466	29.4
Others	64	188	11.8
Total Foreign Economic Administration countries	947	1,587	100.0

TABLE 1–D.—*Exports of combines to specified Foreign Economic Administration countries, 1943–44*

[In units]

	1943	1944	1944 exports in percent of total exports
British East Africa	0	19	1.6
Chile	0	91	7.4
Colombia	33	36	2.9
Cuba	14	15	1.2
French North Africa	85	0	0
Mexico	40	82	6.7
New Zealand	565	94	7.7
Palestine	27	41	3.4
Turkey	0	28	2.3
United Kingdom	247	443	36.3
Venezuela	10	22	1.8
Others	145	351	28.7
Total Foreign Economic Administration countries	1,166	1,222	100.0

TABLE 1–E.—*Summary of production and export statistics of specified farm machinery, 1943–44*

[In units]

	Wheel tractors		Plows		Harrows		Drills		Cultivators		Grain binders		Combines	
	1943	1944	1943	1944	1943	1944	1943	1944	1943	1944	1943	1944	1943	1944
Total production	105,248	247,376	180,481	308,228	154,564	433,659	133,772	168,465	166,411	341,095	6,859	20,414	29,219	44,681
Total exports	18,213	41,037	29,814	39,041	6,720	13,543	4,715	7,865	14,135	17,520	1,027	2,254	2,454	4,112
Percent of production	17.3	16.6	16.5	12.7	4.3	3.1	4.1	4.7	8.5	5.1	15.0	11.0	8.4	9.2
Exports to Canada	7,919	21,349	1,850	4,037	555	2,012	585	2,459	878	3,759	80	667	1,288	2,890
Percent of total exports	43.5	52.0	6.2	10.3	8.3	14.9	12.4	31.3	6.2	21.5	7.8	29.6	52.5	70.3
Exports to Foreign Economic Administration countries	10,294	19,688	27,964	35.004	6,165	11,531	4,130	5,406	13,257	13,761	947	1,587	1,166	1,222
Percent of total exports	56.5	48.0	93.8	89.7	91.7	85.1	87.6	68.7	93.8	78.5	92.2	70.4	47.5	29.7
Percent of total productions	9.8	8.0	15.5	11.4	4.0	2.7	3.6	3.2	8.0	4.0	13.8	7.8	4.0	2.7
Exports to Latin America	1,843	8,232	14,467	22,620	3,823	8,931	813	1,500	8,375	9,613	79	225	120	262
Percent of total exports	10.2	7.9	48.5	57.9	56.9	65.9	17.2	19.1	59.3	54.9	7.7	10.0	4.9	6.4
Percent of Foreign Economic Administration exports	17.9	16.4	51.7	64.6	62.0	77.5	19.7	27.7	63.2	69.9	8.3	14.2	10.3	21.4
Lend-lease exports	8,044	14,600	8,595	6,847	1,326	1,783	2,473	3,268	3,585	3,626	780	1,220	928	863
Percent of total exports	44.2	35.6	28.8	17.5	19.7	13.2	52.4	41.6	25.3	20.7	75.9	54.1	37.8	21.0
Percent of Foreign Economic Administration exports	78.1	74.2	30.7	19.6	21.5	15.5	59.9	60.5	27.0	26.3	82.4	76.9	79.6	70.6
Percent of total production	7.6	5.9	4.8	2.2	.9	.4	2.2	1.9	2.2	1.1	11.4	6.0	3.2	1.9

TABLE 2.—*Proportional distribution of wheel tractors and combines, United States and Canada, 1944*

Number of farms, United States (1940 census) 6,096,799
Number of farms, Canada (1941 census) 734,700

	United States		Canada	
	Number sold domestically	Number sold per 1,000 farms	Number imported from United States	Number imported from United States per 1,000 farms
Wheel tractors	206,863	33.93	21,349	29.05
Combines	40,074	6.57	2,890	3.93

TABLE 3.—*Exports of principal types of farm machinery to the Latin-American countries, 1943–44*

[In units]

	Wheel tractors		Horse and power plows		Harrows		Drills		Cultivators		Grain binders		Combines	
	1943	1944	1943	1944	1943	1944	1943	1944	1943	1944	1943	1944	1943	1944
Argentina	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bolivia	37	47	409	1,210	113	48	20	5	7	6	0	0	17	1
Brazil	41	52	717	878	993	1,299	209	191	1,933	2,248	1	0	0	1
Chile	17	193	19	176	61	294	18	166	310	104	5	93	0	91
Colombia	127	265	697	343	72	250	20	20	79	113	7	2	33	36
Costa Rica	3	52	65	77	20	54	7	2	44	100	0	0	0	3
Cuba	14	48	440	329	36	87	30	24	43	225	12	34	14	15
Dominican Republic	12	18	688	2,134	43	662	0	510	210	666	0	0	0	0
El Salvador	0	4	84	213	2	3	0	13	65	156	0	0	1	0
Ecuador	7	23	41	26	37	68	7	0	13	70	5	2	3	2
Guatemala	3	17	92	154	10	21	13	40	55	24	0	0	0	0
Haiti	0	0	0	1	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Honduras	0	3	62	9	0	12	0	0	23	60	0	0	0	0
Mexico	1,274	1,840	7,582	13,707	1,810	5,510	363	43	4,464	5,007	41	79	40	82
Nicaragua	0	11	40	109	39	43	0	2	132	10	1	0	0	1
Panama	11	16	24	41	155	29	0	2	7	18	4	0	0	0
Paraguay	10	0	2,000	2,000	26	31	0	0	0	150	0	0	0	0
Peru	92	169	261	364	71	89	0	0	125	242	0	0	2	5
Uruguay	12	111	1,021	540	145	53	80	28	280	80	0	0	0	1
Venezuela	160	363	225	309	177	353	46	84	585	334	3	15	10	22
Total Latin America	1,843	3,232	14,467	22,620	3,823	8,931	813	1,500	8,375	9,613	79	225	120	262

TABLE 4—*Farm machinery: Liberated areas, as of March 7, 1945*

[In units]

	Army		United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration	
	Scheduled	Released	Scheduled	Released
Plows	17,050	1,690	10,900	1,204
Harrows	972	----------	2,478	----------
Harrow sections	3,600	----------	5,748	----------
Grain drills	4,675	854	150	150
Cultivators	----------	----------	5,100	751
Sprayers	23,000	----------	----------	----------
Mowers	5,500	----------	----------	----------
Rakes	----------	----------	3,700	200
Grain binders	----------	----------	2,250	----------
Trailers	3,550	400	----------	----------
Wheel tractors	----------	----------	13,000	4,960

Fair Employment Practices Commission

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post carries an article by Merlo Pusey entitled "Should F. E. P. C. Dictate Hiring Policies?" While I do not agree with all the writer said in his article, I would urge that every Member of this House read the article because it seems to me that it flashes a red light of warning in the face of this Congress in dealing with this very dangerous and explosive subject. I can think of no legislation introduced in Congress in my time that is so fraught with danger to the future peace and happiness of the American people as this legislation is. I think it is high time that the businessmen of the Nation wake up and get into this fight to try to prevent the enactment of this legislation. The article referred to is as follows:

JOB EQUALITY BILLS

(By Merlo Pusey)

SHOULD F. E. P. C. DICTATE HIRING POLICIES?

It is time for plain speaking about the fair-employment-practice bills. Straight-from-the-shoulder discussion has been meager to date because many officials, legislators, and commentators fear that candor will be mistaken for prejudice. If that timorous attitude prevails, we shall likely find on the statute books an unworkable law capable of plaguing the Nation more grievously than did prohibition.

Racial discrimination in the hiring and firing of men is unquestionably an evil. Any democratic government and any right-thinking individual must work toward its elimination. The Department of Labor might well have a unit devoted to the equalization of job opportunities. Congress has a clear-cut responsibility, moreover, to insist that labor unions claiming the right to bargain collectively for all employees in any given industry or craft open their membership to all workers in such industry or craft.

The labor movement has grown to its present strength under the protection of the National Labor Relations Act. It is grossly unfair to permit unions taking advantage of this machinery to exclude minority groups from the monopolistic bargaining agencies which they set up. Certainly any bargaining unit certified by the N. L. R. B. should be required to open its membership to Negroes and all other minority groups as a condition to the exercise of exclusive bargaining rights. Passage of a bill for that purpose would probably be the most effective action Congress could take to minimize discrimination on grounds of race or creed.

But sponsors of the bills now most actively before Congress go far beyond education in this field and assurance of bargaining representation for minority groups. They insist that a Fair Employment Practice Commission be assigned the impossible task of uprooting discriminatory practices by force. The proposed F. E. P. C. would be authorized to summon employers before it on charges of refusing to hire, of discharging, or otherwise discriminating against a person because of his race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. Employers found guilty of such unfair employment practices could be ordered to desist and those orders could be enforced in the courts. Back pay to persons so discharged could be ordered and employers could be forced to hire individuals against whom such discrimination had been practiced.

One difficulty with this procedure is, of course, the impossibility of determining whether racial or religious discrimination exists. If a Catholic applies for a job and a Protestant is hired, the former is likely to feel that he has been discriminated against. On what basis could a Federal agency decide such a dispute? The issue would be more clear-cut if a minority group were wholly excluded by an employer. But after that initial barrier had been broken down, where would the proposed F. E. P. C. draw the line? Would the employment of 5 Negroes and 500 whites in unskilled work in Washington be evidence of racial discrimination? There is no reasonable criterion that can be applied short of an invidious quota system.

It seems probable, moreover, that legislation of this sort would narrow the door of opportunity to minority groups instead of widening it. Every Negro fired could be expected to go to the F. E. P. C. with a complaint that he had been discriminated against because of his race. Complaints of this sort would probably involve employers in costly and time-consuming controversies even though they might have had other reasons for their discharges. As a result, employers would doubtless be more eager to keep to a minimum the number of Negroes hired in the first place.

Another real danger should be apparent to those who wish to see the maximum number of jobs created in the post-war era. To enforce such intangible rules as these bills lay down, the proposed F. E. P. C. would have to take a large measure of control over hiring. An arm of the Government would be telling employers whom they could hire, promote, and discharge. Many employers would be likely to conclude that business could not be successfully operated under such an additional handicap and give up the ghost.

Sponsors of this bill make the grave error of assuming that private business firms, large and small, are the equivalent of public institutions. Of course, they are not. Many employers have set up small plants, stores, or service establishments chiefly to give jobs to their sons, their relatives, their neighbors, or members of their church. That is their right in a democratic country. We cannot continue to destroy the motives that lead to the creation of new private enterprises without undermining the whole basis of our capitalistic system.

Maybe the authors of this bill are aiming at unloading a larger share of responsibility

for the creation of jobs upon the Government. Maybe we are entering an era in which the Government will exercise full control over our economy. But at least we ought to move forward with our eyes open and not progressively destroy the conditions under which business can function successfully while giving lip service to the idea of private initiative and free enterprise.

National Federation of Small Business

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Small Business, with headquarters at San Mateo, Calif., has been furnishing to small-business men in many communities throughout our country an opportunity to express to Members of Congress their opinion on various current public questions. The Federation selects a list of bills or proposals of interest to small-business men and furnishes ballots to each local group to be filled out and mailed to Members of Congress.

I am greatly encouraged to note that in a recent ballot, namely ballot No. 120, the small-business men of the country were asked to express their opinion on my bill, H. R. 52, and that 85 percent of them expressed their support of this measure and only 9 percent expressed opposition.

The bill in question is designed to assist smaller businesses in reconversion to peacetime production and to equalize the credit opportunities of small business as against those of big business by a system of insured loans through the Smaller War Plants Corporation, similar to the F. H. A. system.

I appreciate very deeply the support shown for this measure by the small-business men of the country and earnestly hope for favorable congressional action with regard to it.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of that bill may be included with my remarks. In accordance with the rule laid down by the Chair I therefore also ask consent that my remarks may appear in the Appendix.

H. R. 52

A bill to facilitate smaller war plants in reconversion to peacetime production; to assure the effective participation of Smaller War Plants Corporation in the reconversion period; to stimulate the development of new enterprises; to amend Public Law 603 (78th Cong.); and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are—

(a) To promote the war effort.

(b) To facilitate the conversion of smaller plants from war to peacetime production.

(c) To stimulate the expansion of peacetime production of small plants and the increased employment resulting therefrom.

(d) To encourage the development of new industries and enterprises.

(e) To furnish aid to war veterans.

SEC. 2. In order that Smaller War Plants Corporation may adequately function under Public Law 395 (78th Cong.), known as the Contract Settlement Act, under Public Law 457, known as the Surplus Property Act, under Public Law 458, known as the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, and under Public Law 603 (78th Cong.), as well as any other statutes relating to small business and looking to reconversion from war to peace, the life of the Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby extended until and including the 1st day of July 1948, and section 4 (d) of Public Law 603 is so amended. The Corporation shall hereafter be known as the Federal Small Business Corporation.

SEC. 3. The Corporation is hereby authorized to make or guarantee loans to small business enterprises upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by the board of directors of the Corporation for the purposes of—

(a) facilitating the conversion of small plants from war to peacetime production;

(b) reestablishing any small business concern which has been either partially or wholly curtailed in its operations or injured or destroyed by reason of the pressures of war;

(c) promoting the expansion of peacetime production;

(d) developing new industries or enterprises, engaged or about to be engaged in production;

(e) aiding any business, agricultural, or professional enterprises undertaken or pursued by war veterans.

SEC. 4. The Corporation is hereby specifically empowered to establish a system of credit insurance, which shall be available to qualified financial institutions making loans to small business concerns of the type which the Corporation has been authorized to make either under section 3 hereof or under any other statute. To that end it may issue either blanket or single policies insuring such financial institutions against the amount of the first loss in a sum not exceeding 20 percent of such loans, and may charge a reasonable fee for such credit insurance not exceeding 1½ percent of the total amount of the loans insured, which shall be added to the reserve fund which is hereby authorized to be established for that purpose.

SEC. 5. In addition to the duties and powers imposed on the Corporation by Public Law 603 and Public Law 395, or any other statute, it is hereby provided that the Corporation is authorized and empowered to furnish to small-business concerns, or new enterprises, and veterans, such technical and management service and assistance as they may from time to time require; to secure wherever feasible and place at their disposal, upon such terms and conditions as will conform with the purposes and objectives of this act, such patents, processes, facilities, or other technology as may be owned by any agency of the Government of the United States, or purchased or otherwise acquired by the Corporation from any private source.

SEC. 6. The Corporation is hereby authorized to rediscount notes, obligations, and other paper which it receives with Federal Reserve banks, subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by its board of directors.

SEC. 7. All of the facilities, services, and assistance furnished by the Federal Small Business Corporation shall be available to war veterans who shall be accorded a preference.

SEC. 8. The Chairman of Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby directed to make a survey and study in order to determine—

(a) what form or measure of tax relief is required in order to facilitate conversion of small business enterprises from war to peace;

(b) what additional legislation, if any, is required in order to facilitate small business concerns engaged in service, distribution, manufacturing, and other types of trade, commerce, and industry in the conduct of their post-war enterprises;

and to report thereon to the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate at the earliest practicable date.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. (a) "Financial institution": Any Federal Reserve bank or other public or private financing institution.

(b) The term "production" shall include any establishment engaged in manufacture, assembly, construction, mining, repair, and maintenance of any durable or consumers goods, or any facilities connected therewith.

(c) "Small-business concern" shall include any business establishment having 500 or less employees, as well as any institution which, by reason of its relative size and relative position in the industry, is determined by the Corporation to be a small-business concern: *Provided*, That is is not a subsidiary or affiliate of any concern dominant in its industry or business.

Iowa Poll Favors Peace Table Seat for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, you will note by this poll that the people of Iowa want those who have done all the physical suffering and all the fighting in this war to have their say as to the kind of a world we will have to live in after they have quieted the enemy guns all over the world.

That is as it should be. I have so expressed myself before gatherings of people in my district and here on many occasions, pointing out that unless our returning veterans approve of a peace treaty drawn and signed before they have a voice its force and effect will surely come to naught. We must keep in mind that our armed forces are composed of millions of men and women of mature age who had taken an active part in civic, economic, and political affairs before entering the service, and the minute they lay away their role of a soldier they will immediately enter the role of a citizen actively.

So, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I say again that we best make certain they be well pleased with what we do before we make too many pledges to the rest of the world which they now know so well by bitter experiences.

I am very sure the Iowa people have in this poll voiced the conviction of an overwhelming majority of the American people.

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register of March 18, 1945]

FAVOR PEACE TABLE SEAT FOR THE ARMED FORCES

A substantial majority of Iowans is in favor of the armed forces having a representative at the peace table, the Iowa poll shows.

Eighty-three percent of the Iowans interviewed expressed approval of such a move, and 46 percent of them believed a great deal of good would be accomplished if a veteran had a voice in making the peace.

Iowans also were in favor of having servicemen and women select their own representative to sit in at the peace conference.

THE IOWA POLL

The first question asked in the poll was: "Do you think it would be a good idea to have at least one veteran of this war sitting in on peace conferences after the war?"

The vote:

	Total	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes	83	84	82
No	4	4	5
Don't know	13	12	13

This question then was asked: "If a veteran of this war sits in on peace conferences how much do you think he will be able to accomplish toward a better peace—a great deal, very little, or nothing."

The answers:

	Total	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
A great deal	46	46	47
Very little	29	29	29
Nothing	8	11	6
No opinion	16	14	18

The next question was: "Would you be in favor of the men and women in uniform expressing a choice as to a veteran to sit in on the peace conferences?"

The replies:

	Total	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes	79	81	77
No	10	11	9
No opinion	11	8	14

To determine what influence past war experiences might have on the proposal to have a veteran sit in on peace conferences, the answers were separated on a basis of whether those interviewed were veterans of World War No. 1, or had members of their families who were. Their opinions:

	Yes, I am	Yes, member of family	No
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes	82	86	81
No	7	2	5
Don't know	11	12	14

The last question was: "Some people have said that the last war was won by the younger men in uniform and lost by older men at the peace conference. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?"

The answers:

	Total	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Agree	59	66	53
Disagree	13	13	14
No opinion	28	21	33

Navy Commander Harold E. Stassen, a serviceman, is a delegate to the United Nations Conference April 25 in San Francisco, Calif.

Address Delivered by Vice Admiral B. Moreell on the Occasion of the Laying of the Cornerstone for the United States Naval Hospital, Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Vice Admiral Ben Moreell, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, Chief of Bureau of Yards and Docks, United States Navy Department, Washington, D. C., delivered on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone for the United States Naval Hospital at Houston, Tex., March 10, 1945:

On this memorable occasion I bring to you greetings from the Secretary of the Navy, from the Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet and from Vice Admiral Ross T McIntire, Surgeon General of the Navy, who was unfortunately prevented, at the last moment, from making the trip. The Secretary had particularly desired to be with us today, but he has recently returned to Washington from a long absence during which he visited the Pacific Ocean combat areas and participated in the assault on the now famous Iwo Jima, where our marines are covering themselves with glory. His heavy official duties prevented his leaving Washington so soon after his return.

The taking of Iwo Jima for use as a base for our fighter planes to escort our bombers for the assault on Japan proper and for our bombers themselves has been pronounced by our high command to be absolutely essential for the successful conduct of our war in the Pacific. The fact that the action has been a costly one in the lives and limbs of our men is indicative of the value which the Japanese have placed on the retention of this base and on the denial of its use to our forces. The inordinately strong defenses which the Japanese have put forth to retain this island is evidence of the wisdom of the decision that this base must be taken, cost what it may. In effect, Iwo Jima will not only permit us to intensify our offensive operations against the Japanese homeland but, of equal importance, it will deny to the Japanese the use of this base for air attacks against our own installations in the Marianas Islands.

I have cited the action on Iwo Jima because it constitutes an outstanding example of our need for the finest of hospital facilities and for the type of structure and organization which we are commemorating here today. The large number of our casualties on Iwo Jima is indicative of the difficulties of things to come as we approach closer and closer to the heart of the Japanese Empire. Our progress toward ultimate victory will be marked by an increasing awareness of the value of the facilities which we are providing to take care of our sick and wounded as we go forward.

The American people may well take pride in the hospital and rehabilitation facilities which they have, through the medium of their Representatives in Congress, so generously provided for these purposes. I know, from talking with medical experts and from my own observations at home and in foreign countries, that no effort and no expense have been spared in providing for the care of our battle wounded and for those who have taken sick in the service of their country. The facilities made available and the personnel provided for these purposes constitute proof conclusive of the realization by the public and by those in responsible authority of the great debt which we owe to the men who go under fire in order that our liberties may be preserved.

Since the beginning of the emergency, generally taken for statistical purposes to be July 1, 1940, your Navy has expended for hospitals and dispensaries throughout the continental United States and in our outlying possessions of Hawaii, the Panama Canal Zone, and Puerto Rico, approximately $275,000,000, which has increased the bed capacity from a total of 6,000 to approximately 98,000 at the present time. In addition, the Navy has provided at advance bases in active theaters of war some 20,000 beds in mobile hospitals which can be taken up and moved forward as the fleet and land forces advance.

As the physical plant expanded, the personnel—doctors, nurses, administrative officers, hospital corpsmen, and WAVES assigned to hospital duties, have kept pace. The Navy has been fortunate in obtaining the enthusiastic support and the services of many of the outstanding medical men of this country so that it can be authoritatively stated that today the Navy has as fine a medical organization as the world has ever seen.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to pay tribute to the great medical organization of the United States Navy which is directed by the officers of the Medical Corps under the inspired leadership of Vice Admiral Ross T McIntire. I have seen their handiwork on the battlefield and in the rear areas, and I can personally testify that the American people can feel secure in the knowledge that their boys are receiving the finest medical attention that money can buy and science can devise. In conversation with the Secretary of the Navy day before yesterday, he made special mention of the speed with which our wounded were evacuated from Iwo Jima. He stated that he had seen in the Naval Hospital at Pearl Harbor boys who had been seriously wounded just 1 week before at Iwo Jima but who were now quite evidently on the road to recovery and who already wanted to return to the battle. All honor to the gallant and efficient officers and men of the Navy Medical Corps.

It is particularly appropriate that the State of Texas and the city of Houston should be the site of a great naval hospital. I recently had occasion to make a computation of the contribution which the State of Texas has made to my own organization, the Navy's construction battalions—known as the Seabees—and I found that Texas had contributed some 50 percent in excess of its quota, based on relative populations. I do not know whether this figure holds good for the other branches of the service but it is reasonable to assume that a comparable condition exists with respect to those branches. Texas has contributed both in quantity and in quality and in the number of those in high positions. The Navy itself is particularly fortunate in having as its commander in the war in the Pacific against the Japanese a distinguished son of Texas, Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, who has brought honor and glory to the Navy and to his native State.

Not only has Texas contributed to our military forces, but it has sent to Congress some of the most vigorous and effective supporters of the national defense and advocates of a bold and vigorous policy in the conduct of the war. Texas may well take pride in its great war record.

This great hospital, the cornerstone of which is being laid today, will have an ini-

tial capacity of 1,000 beds, calculated on the normal peacetime basis. It is recognized that in time of emergency we are justified in increasing this normal peacetime-rated capacity and that, if the exigencies of war demand, we will have to expand our wards. We have, therefore, designed the clinical, administrative and commissary facilities for 1,500 patients, but under emergency conditions they could accommodate some 2,000.

The present estimated cost of the work now programmed is $7,400,000.

We have tried to make this project, insofar as practicable, a product of Texas and the South. The plans and specifications have been prepared by Finn, Cummings, and Taylor local architects and engineers. The contractor for the first three buildings is the W. S. Bellows Construction Co. of Houston. The contractor for the foundations of the principal buildings is R. P. Farnsworth & Co., of New Orleans and Houston, and the successful bidder for the superstructure of the permanent buildings is James Stewart & Co., of New York and Dallas, Tex. It is expected that the contract for the remaining structures at this hospital, estimated to cost $2,600,000, will be awarded about the middle of April.

According to our present schedules, the construction will be sufficiently advanced to receive patients by January 1, 1946, with total completion of the facilities now planned by March 1, 1946.

Contrary to sometimes popular conception, there is a great deal of sentiment in war. The two-way pipe line of love and affection, kindness and compassion which runs from the folks back home clear out to the front-line trenches and back again is a most powerful sustaining force for the men who do the fighting. The great institution which will rise on this site is symbolic of this force and it constitutes substantial evidence to the men at the front of the sentiment of those they have left behind. This community, through its Representatives in Congress, has been vigorous in its support of this development. Not only has the Navy had moral support but it has also received a substantial material support in the contribution by the citizens of the community of the site for this hospital, a contribution which made possible this particular development.

In closing, I want to bespeak for our fighting men and women the continued and unstinting support which you have demonstrated to date. There seems to have developed, in the recent past, a feeling of unwarranted optimism with respect to our future operations in the Pacific Ocean. It was my privilege to discuss this matter with Fleet Admiral Nimitz in the very recent past and I can assure you that any optimism such as we felt toward the European war about 1 year ago, and which resulted in an unconscious relaxing of our efforts in support of that war, is entirely unwarranted. Our recent landings in the Philippines and on Iwo Jima mark a notable advance but they still leave us far from our ultimate goal. The fierce and costly resistance of the Japanese in the face of annihilating fire from our forces is indicative of the intensity of the campaign which lies ahead. A recent calculation indicates that the Japanese Empire now has under its domination approximately 2,950,000 square miles of territory and approximately 456,000,000 people. In the continental United States we have an area of 3,000,000 square miles with 132,000,000 people. Certainly no one would attempt to equate the productivity of the people and manufactories in the areas under Japanese control with our own. But it must be borne in mind that we are faced with the obligation of carrying the attack across vast oceans to distances varying from 7,000 to 9,000 miles, and that we must have great preponderance in quality and quantity of men and matériel if we are to achieve victory within a reasonable time and at minimum cost.

The game is not over until the final whistle blows, and I know that you share with me the feeling that we must not and will not let our fighting men and women down. This great city of Houston has made one of the outstanding production records of the war. I congratulate Houston and the State of Texas on their records, and I bespeak for the Navy your continued enthusiastic and high-spirited support of our operations.

Shall Grandfather Mountain Be Saved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE W. ERVIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is my duty to call to the attention of our Nation, and, particularly, to the people of North Carolina, the fact that Grandfather Mountain, the most rugged peak in the Blue Ridge Range, which is said to be geologically the most ancient of any mountain on the American Continent, is about to be subjected to commercial exploitation.

There are no Federal funds available at this time with which to purchase this property, and, in view of the size of the public debt after the war, we cannot rely upon any expectation that Federal funds will be available for this purpose after the war.

Therefore, it is my hope that the people of North Carolina, by private subscription, may see fit, without delay, to acquire this property and preserve it in its natural beauty.

It occurs to me that it would be appropriate for the people of the State to acquire and save it as a memorial to the patriots who will have sacrificed their lives in this war. A private subscription for such purposes could be deducted, in large measure, for income-tax purposes.

I hope that those North Carolinians who are interested in this matter will communicate with me by letter.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein two articles by Mr. Harlan P. Kelsey, who is one of our foremost advocates of preserving the beauties of our mountains for future generations:

GRANDFATHER MOUNTAIN—SHALL IT BE SAVED?

(By Harlan P. Kelsey, East Boxford, Mass.)

"In the morning of the world a mighty convulsion heaved heavenward the Appalachian System—first-born of earth's mountain ranges." Some geologists say 140,000,000 years ago, while others claim not less than 200,000,000 years' antiquity; and so Grandfather Mountain, most rugged, picturesque, and highest peak in the entire Blue Ridge Range was born.

Today this venerable landmark is clothed with an exquisite virgin mantle of rare forest trees and flowers; cold, tumbling brooks cascade down its steep slopes under dense canopies of white and purple rhododendrons and mountain laurel of almost unbelievable size and luxuriance; in May and June on more open ridges the flame azalea, most gorgeous of American shrubs, flashes fire, while charming alpine-like plants in a hundred varieties fill every nook and crevice on its craggy summits.

From the sides of Grandfather Mountain burst forth ice-cold springs, the headwaters of many streams flowing westward by way of the Great Appalachian Valley to water the broad Tennessee and Mississippi basins, and eastward through the Piedmont plains to the Atlantic Ocean. It is surely the "Grandfather of Waters." To the southwest, Grandfather Mountain's jagged cliffs plunge precipitously 2,000 feet into the forest-clad valleys where the Linville and Watauga Rivers, paradises of the trout angler, begin their long journeys to the sea; while to the north and east, long buttressed ridges slope away for miles, giving birth to a hundred tumbling streams that in the upper foothills of the Piedmont, join together to form the fruitful Catawba River, whose controlled waters are incessantly turning the powerful turbines that supply the electric energy for a new and amazing industrial Southland.

Just off the Blue Ridge Parkway and but a scant 10 miles to the southeast of Grandfather Mountain, the Linville River suddenly becomes the wildest and most picturesque stream of the Southern Appalachians, the valley culminating in a deep gorge with a descent of 2,000 feet in 20 miles from the beautiful Linville Falls to the foothills.

Grandfather Mountain towers above the surrounding mountains, and from its several summits a glorious panorama unfolds, with peaks and ridges rising one above and beyond another for 50 or a 100 miles to the south, the west and the north, impressing upon the observer in a manner not to be forgotten, the vastness of this region of mountains. "The varying degrees of haziness of the atmosphere, which has found expression in the name Blue Ridge, at times limits the distance of distinct vision, but it combines with the forest cover to soften the details and to render this Southern Appalachian landscape attractive beyond comparison".

This is the Land of the Sky, where the snowbird nests, and where on the heights in summer cool breezes are born, which forever sweeping downward temper the hot valleys and plains far below to the east, south, and west. The projection far into the Southland of these lofty ancient Appalachians, greatest masses of mountains east of the Rockies and the highest mountains covered with hardwood forest in America, profoundly affected the civilization that so soon after the discovery of America was to be imposed upon the Atlantic side of the continent.

To the steep mountainsides and into the fertile coves and valleys, came the hardiest and most virile of the invading tides of white men, to battle with nature and carve new homes out of the wilderness, inspired with the fierce desire for new freedoms, and security to work out their own destiny. And thereafter out of these same mountains have come brilliant statesmen and leaders in every line of endeavor to do their part in the building of a great America.

From the beginning these same energizing mountains have ever been the near and blessed Mecca for countless thousands of heat-weary dwellers of the lowlands of cotton, tobacco, and corn, a vast plain spread fan-like from a mountain base to the distant Atlantic and Gulf coastlines; for here in pure untainted air they found in overflowing abundance rest, health, and recreation, in a setting of grand and inspiring landscapes.

However with the insistent economic demands of a fast-growing population, the virgin resources of soil and forest have been far too ruthlessly exploited, with little thought of the future, and today the few remaining primeval wilderness areas are in imminent danger of despoliation. Already many of the choicest gems have been desecrated—some beyond regeneration, by cheap commercial exploitation for the temporary benefit of the few, the inevitable result of fatal complaisance and lack of intelligent

forethought and future planning for the good of all.

"The Blue Ridge Parkway is an elongated park with a scenic motorway designed expressly for the tourist, threading the picturesque mountains between the Shenandoah National Park, Virginia, and Great Smoky Mountains National Park, North Carolina and Tennessee. The parkway, first of its type and scale, will be 485 miles in length when completed. It averages 3,000 feet above sea level. It affords an unusual opportunity to view the natural beauty of a country heretofore virtually inaccessible—a country of bold panoramas, wild forest and exceptionally beautiful flora." [1]

At convenient intervals along this now famous parkway, recreation areas of outstanding scenic interest and varying from 500 to 10,000 acres in extent have been reserved, and provided with suitable camping facilities. The land for this unique scenic travelway, together with its protective park-owned right-of-way averaging 1,000 feet in width, was purchased by the States of Virginia and North Carolina, and transferred to the National Park Service in perpetuity, a most unusual and munificent gift to the people of our Nation. The war has halted construction, yet already more than 360 miles of the project have been brought to various stages of completion.

The amazing record of visitors to the Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountains National Parks, far outnumbering those to our older and larger parks in the West, is convincing evidence of the vital need for setting aside and preserving inviolate before it is too late, every remaining suitable area still available. Thus may be assured, the highest value-use for the health and recreational needs of a congested and increasing Atlantic seaboard and Mississippi Basin population. State parks answer the problem only in part.

Beyond all question, the most outstanding and superb feature along the entire Blue Ridge Parkway is Grandfather Mountain in North Carolina, about two-thirds of the way from Shenandoah to the Great Smoky Mountains. The National Park Service considers it to be a vitally needed addition to the parkway, it is yet to be acquired and today is threatened with immediate calamitous destruction of its virgin glories by lumbering operations and other commercial exploitation.

The case for Grandfather Mountain is clear cut and crystal clear. At the present time a 12,000-acre tract, including the dominant massif of Grandfather Mountain and its beautiful mate Grandmother Mountain, is offered for sale at a reasonable price. Together with contiguous lands partly now available it would constitute a superlative park of over 20,000 acres, with the highest naturalistic park standards, and be under the perpetual administration of the National Park Service.

If and when public ownership is consummated, the National Park Service plans the establishment of a major wayside rest and recreational camp on Grandmother Mountain in a suitable sheltered location adjoining the Blue Ridge Parkway, where it will in no way detract from or mar the naturalistic features of the park.

This is an urgent challenge not only to Grandfather Mountain's homeland State of North Carolina, but to the entire Nation. Is it not an inescapable duty our citizens of today owe to succeeding generations, to save this masterpiece of Nature intact and unsullied? It is certainly a service which when accomplished, will for all time greatly redound to the honor of those who have had a part in preventing its destruction.

[1] National Park Service statement.

SHALL GRANDFATHER MOUNTAIN BE SAVED?

(By Harlan P. Kelsey)

With the establisment of the Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountains National Parks, a hopeful and encouraging beginning was made to preserve unspoiled for all time the finest natural features of the southern Appalachians.

The Blue Ridge Parkway with its 447 miles of superb scenery linking these two parks, furthered the movement. At intervals along this parkway and its protected strips of wooded land that were donated by the States of Virginia and North Carolina notable sites have been chosen for minor parks wherein to provide rest and recreation camps for the traveler. Others are yet to be selected as the parkway nears completion.

By far the most superlative feature along the Blue Ridge Parkway is the famous Grandfather Mountain area, located about two-thirds of the distance from the Shenandoah to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park entrance. This is yet to be acquired, and now stands in imminent danger of irreparable despoilment by lumbering.

Grandfather Mountain and its contiguous, though more modest mate, Grandmother Mountain comprise an almost virgin area of forests, flowers, and cascades. For many miles the parkway hugs the northern and eastern slopes and ridges of Grandfather Mountain, affording spectacular views of hazy mountains and valleys and eastward lies the peaceful Piedmont region several thousand feet below. But a few feet short of 6,000 feet elevation, Grandfather Mountain is the highest and most rugged peak in the Blue Ridge Range and is said to be geologically the most ancient of any mountain on the American Continent.

With the projection of the Blue Ridge Parkway through this area, the National Park Service became interested in preserving it as a mountain park and in establishing a camp on Grandmother Mountain.

For several years the North Carolina Conservation and Development Commission has realized the importance of conserving the area and Mr. R. Bruce Etheridge, its director, has recently stated that his commission is in accord with efforts to accomplish this.

In a letter to the author dated February 7, 1944, Gov. J. Melville Broughton, of North Carolina, says, in part: "I have several times been over this area and have long felt that with its scenic grandeur, great variety of trees, and other resoures it ought to be set apart for public service. It would be a loss to the State and the Nation if this mountain and its immediate surroundings should be subjected to commercial exploitation."

Only recently were the owners of the Grandfather Mountain property able to name a price that seemed fairly reasonable to the National Park Service and others who might be interested in raising funds for its purchase.

The tract contains approximately 12,000 acres which, together with additional adjoining Government forest lands that eventually might be included, would comprise a park of over 22,000 acres.

Is the natural beauty of Grandfather Mountain to be lost forever by becoming the victim of commercialism, as have other gems in the Carolina mountains? That is a question that must be answered without delay by those who would save in its natural beauty the remnants of a glorious mountain region. Outstanding, unimpaired scenic and wildlife areas remaining in the eastern United States that may yet be saved to serve the spiritual and recreational needs of present and future generations are few. Postwar demands for jobs and the development of resources soon may put in jeopardy those areas that have escaped destruction.

Grandfather Mountain must be saved.

Federal Aid for Airports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me before the Commerce Committee on March 16 with reference to Senate bill 2, which is now pending in the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill provides for a national airport program upon which $1,000,000,000 would be expended by the Federal, State, and local governments. Half of this expenditure would be Federal, the other half would be matching funds provided at the State or local level.

This program would allow construction or improvement of some 6,000 airports, during the period of 5 years after the war, to meet the needs of post-war aviation, and to foster the growth of air transportation in this country.

Such an airport program would give civil aviation a real chance to expand rapidly after the war. It would also provide an outstandingly useful public works program of Nation-wide proportions, which should be undertaken immediately after the end of the war, so as to provide thousands of jobs for war workers during the period of reconversion from war work to civilian industry.

This bill seeks to effect a compromise between those who advocate an airport program on a Federal-State basis and those who support the Federal-city basis which has been used so successfully in developing in this country the greatest system of civil airports in the world. It is my thought that we should not be too hasty in wholly discarding the successful Federal-city basis of the past, and that it will take some time for the States which have done relatively little airport work up to the present time to secure the necessary legislation and financing for such a substantial program. I have accordingly divided the program between the States and the cities and counties. This is accomplished by assigning to States the construction of small airports, with the larger airports to be handled on a Federal-city basis.

I think it is pertinent to point out to the committe that this bill is no haphazard compilation of accumulated suggestions. It is not a first draft. It is not a bill introduced by request. It is an honest and painstaking effort to draft adequate legislation on an important subject. The author of this bill has attempted to familiarize himself with the subject of the legislation. For everything that is in the bill there is a reason. For many things which have been left out of this bill there is a reason why they have been left out. Those reasons have in each instance appeared sound to the author of the bill. If anyone will bring forward a reason why any provision of this bill should be changed, I shall be glad to assent to the change. If any good reason is advanced why matter which does not now appear in the bill should be included, I shall be glad to vote to include it. But I would warn the members of the committee of a fact with which I know they are all familiar; namely,

that even a small change in one section of a bill may necessitate other and more numerous and more extensive changes in other sections. A good bill is a well-rounded whole. Wherever there is reason for making a change, let us make it, but let us not lose sight of the fact that there must be a reason for the change.

In the drafting of this bill every effort was made to use, and to preserve by using, all of the best of previous legislation drafted on this subject, and to incorporate in this bill as well the best features of suggested legislation drafted by Government agencies. Accordingly, you will find in this bill many provisions which are similar to the provisions of other bills on this subject. In fact, it can be said and it will be said, that there is very little difference between some sections of this bill and the corresponding sections of certain other bills. In that connection I need not remind the committee that there is very little difference between a man and a woman.

I will not challenge any man who contends that this bill is not the best legislation on this subject which could be written. To challenge such a contention would be to claim perfection, and the author of this bill has never laid any claim to that attribute. On the other hand, I believe firmly that this bill is good legislation. I believe it is necessary legislation. It attacks a problem which I believe must be dealt with promptly, in the interests of the welfare of this Nation. I shall welcome discussion of any and all objections which may be raised to any provisions of this bill, but I shall have no patience with haggling or obstructionism. On my own part, I stand ready to go along with any reasonable amendments which may be proposed, to the end that we may have prompt action on the bill. I do not believe it is asking too much to hope that those who may differ with me on certain specific provisions of the measure will exhibit a similar attitude of willingness to compromise. The important thing is to avoid too much delay in dealing with this problem. I feel quite strongly that a Federal-aid airport program should be authorized in ample time to become a very definite and early part of our Government's operations immediately following the end of the present war. I believe we shall make a mistake if we have not provided the legislative framework for such a Federal-aid airport program by the time the war in Europe is over. If the present trend of events in the European war continues favorable, and that war is brought to a speedy conclusion, as I pray may be the case, then I feel we should redouble our efforts to report a satisfactory Federal-aid airport bill at the earliest possible date.

I have given attention to the airport problems of this Nation for many years and have introduced legislation upon various phases of this subject on several occasions in the past. The present bill may require changes to meet the present and reasonably prospective airport needs of the Nation. I shall oppose no change in the bill which will serve that purpose. In framing the bill, I sought and received the advice and criticism of many of those who are interested in the future of aviation in this country. The bill reflects much earnest study in an effort to formulate legislation which will best serve the public interest of this great Nation. I have no pride of authorship to the extent that I will fight for a single word or phrase of the bill just because I wrote it. What I am mainly concerned with is seeking prompt action on sound legislation to set up a national airport program. While I believe this bill is sound legislation, I shall go along with any amendment which will strengthen it.

In discussing the provisions of this bill section by section, I shall necessarily mention some of the many considerations underlying those provisions. I cannot, in the time available, either mention or discuss all the points which it will be necessary for this committee to consider. I shall try to cover most of them. I shall also try to recognize some of the very intelligent and constructive criticisms of this measure which have come to me since it was introduced.

I have been asked why this bill excludes from its provisions the territories of the United States.

The purpose of this bill is to set up a strictly continental airport system. That is the primary reason the bill does not include Hawaii and Alaska.

The problems involved in setting up airfields outside the continental limits of the United States are different from the problems presented in setting up a network of airports within the boundaries of this country. It has been the thought of all concerned that provision for airports outside the continental limits of the United States, or in Alaska, should be made the subject of separate legislation. It is my understanding that the Civil Aeronautics Authority concurs in this view, and that the War and Navy Departments likewise concur. The latter two departments have a substantial interest in the entire airport problem, but they have a much greater interest, from the standpoint of national defense, in airports which are to be constructed or improved in any of our Territories or possessions.

It is a question whether the system of State contributions of matching funds, which this bill would establish, might have to be modified if Hawaii and Alaska were to be included within the provisions of the bill.

I wish to make it clear that I should never lend my support to any measure which unfairly discriminated against Hawaii or Alaska, or which excluded those Territories from benefits to which they are properly entitled. It may be pointed out in this connection that construction of airfields has been extensive, in both Hawaii and Alaska, as part of our military installations. It seems entirely proper that the question of providing funds for construction of civil airports in those Territories should wait until the war is over and the War and Navy Departments have had an opportunity to evaluate the facilities available there, and determine which of those facilities should be retained for purposes of national defense, and the extent to which such facilities may be made available for civilian use.

The purpose of legislative definitions is to avoid unnecessary repetition in the body of the bill of the meaning intended by the use of certain terms. I believe that each definition in this bill clearly expresses the connotation intended by its use; so individual definitions will not be explained in detail here, except in one instance.

I call the committee's attention to the fact that there is a typographical error in section 2, line 6, on page 1. The word "context" is misspelled.

I also call the attention of the committee to a typographical error at line 22, on page 3. Line 21 has been repeated. Line 22 should read "accomplishment of a project."

In connection with the definition of "State airport agency," on page 5, beginning with line 3, it should be pointed out that this definition was specifically drafted so as not to be limited to a State Department of aeronautics, but so as to include any State agency which is provided by the legislature of the State with adequate powers to go forward with airport development. It is true that this definition leaves it to the discretion of the Administrator to say whether a State airport agency has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized. There may be those who will contend this is objectionable. It seems clear that there must be some standard; and it is entirely logical that this standard should be whether the agency has the necessary powers to operate under the act, rather than whether it meets, in form and organization, some arbitrary standard to be imposed by the Congress upon the States. My own view is that the Congress must write legislation with the assumption that it will be ably and honestly administered. Assuming able and honest administration of this bill, I do not believe any valid objection can be raised to the definition in queston. On the other hand, I should be disposed to go along with any suggested change which is administratively workable and which does not involve any unnecessary derogation of States' rights.

Section 3 of this bill, beginning on page 5, in line 18, does not create a new division within the Civil Aeronautics Administration. If simply gives legislative recognition to the existing organization of the Administration, and expresses the intent of the Congress that certain functions of the Administrator relative to airports and landing areas shall have centralized responsibility. In this section, several sections of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 are mentioned. These are sections which impose certain duties and obligations upon the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. I shall refer to them briefly for the information of the committee. Section 301 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 has to do with fostering air commerce. Section 302 concerns establishment of civil airways. Section 303 deals with limitations on the expenditure of Federal funds for airports and landing areas. Section 306 imposes a duty with regard to the collection and dissemination of information concerning airports and landing areas. Section 307 has to do with planning for airport development.

In performing the duties and functions imposed by the sections I have just mentioned, responsibility in the Civil Aeronautics Administration now is centralized. That has been an administrative matter. Section 3 of the bill now under consideration does not give nor purports to give to the Administrator the power to take over, operate, and maintain an airport, or any other power which the Administrator does not already have under existing legislation.

Section 4 gives the Administrator the necessary power to make grants of Federal funds to the States and cities for airport development. The program is divided equally on a Federal-city and a Federal-State basis.

This section sets up what has been called a dual program. It provides for a State program and an urban program. That is a matter of terminology. Actually, a single integrated program of airport construction is called for. Separation of this program at the point of initial consideration of project applications, into a State group and an urban group is the device chosen to meet strenuous objections from municipalities against a program channeled wholly through the States. In other words, this is a compromise proposal. I believe it is a happy compromise. It is my understanding that this program can be administrated without difficulty. It is my understanding that the Civil Aeronautics Administration shares this view.

It has been said that under this proposed program most airports would automatically be planned on a scale large enough to get them into the urban program. This implies that municipalities in general would be guilty of sharp practices and that the Administrator of Civil Aeronautic would condone such practices. I do not believe that is a sound implication. In any event, I cannot become greatly worried over a prediction that the bulk of airport construction will fall within the so-called urban program, because the bill specifically provides that funds to be expended under the urban program must be specifically earmarked for specific projects, by action of the Congress, before the money can be spent. If the Congress in its wisdom is to

approve every project—and that is what this bill provides—I am not greatly concerned about the danger that an unworthy or unsound project will get into the urban program.

If the compromise suggested in this section is eliminated from the bill, the committee will immediately be confronted with the problem of finding some other compromise which will satisfy the municipalities, or else the committee must choose the course of ignoring the views of those who represent municipalities, and report a bill which must be passed, if at all, over the opposition of the municipalities and their representative organizations.

It has been charged that the method provided in this bill for determining the class of airports would give the Administrator and a municipality a chance to bypass the State government. That is technically true. But any statement that a State would get only those airports which the C. A. A. did not want, cannot be supported without contending that the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics is opposed to dealing with the States. On the past record, the Administrator favors dealing with the States rather than with municipalities; and in any event, it must be obvious that neither a State nor a municipality would get Federal funds for any airport which the Civil Aeronautics Administration did not want, or which failed to fit into the national airport program. Under this bill the Civil Aeronautics Administration would have the final word on airports to be included in the program and airports to receive Federal funds. I believe that is a sound provision. I do not believe the Congress favors a policy of providing Federal funds for a construction program of any sort without holding a substantial measure of control over that program in the hands of a Federal agency. If those who criticize the provisions in this bill for such control are in favor of a program under which the Federal Government provides one-half the funds for an airport program but has no authority over the type or size or location of any airport to be built within the program, they are favoring a principle which I am confident will arouse strenuous opposition in both Houses of the Congress. I shall be numbered among that opposition.

Section 5 authorizes a Federal appropriation of $100,000,000 per year for 5 years, which when matched by an equal amount of State and city funds will provide the billion dollars needed to carry out the national airport plan. I realize that technically the C. A. A. plan calls for a slightly different amount but believe that if necessary we can amend this figure to conform to the C. A. A.'s plan before final adoption of this legislation. This bill also provides for a 5-year program instead of the 10-year program recommended by C. A. A., as I firmly believe that the sooner we get this program completed, the faster our civil aviation industry will grow. We should push rather than delay civil aviation so our Nation may speedily enjoy the great benefits of air travel.

The question has been raised whether it is necessary to provide, as this section does, that 5 percent of all the funds appropriated for the airport program shall be made available to the Administrator for planning, research, and other administrative expenses. I am open-minded in this question. It is my understanding that the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics feels a 5-percent allocation is necessary. If this is not the case, or if it can be shown that the Administrator is in error in holding such a view, I shall be willing to go along with any proposal for amendment of this provision.

This section contains a provision that up to 50 percent of the total funds appropriated may be spent on airports in the urban program. This is a maximum limitation. It is not a requirement that 50 percent of the funds appropriated shall be spent on airports in the urban program. Perhaps 50 percent is too large, and the limitation should be some lesser percentage. On the other hand, perhaps it should be greater than 50 percent. We must always remember that the bill provides that airport projects under the urban program shall be specifically approved by the Congress. With that check, we should not be concerned over whether the proportion fixed by the bill is too large. We should only be concerned with seeing that it is large enough to do equity to the municipalities of this country.

This section contains a provision, beginning at the end of line 13, page 7, authorizing an appropriation of $3,000,000 to the Civil Aeronautics Administration for preliminary planning and surveys. There is no provision in the bill to make funds available for preliminary planning by States or municipalities. This is an intentional omission. It should be borne in mind that certain planning costs of a project sponsor, whether a State or a municipality, will be shared by the Federal Government if and when the project is approved. This point is covered by the definition of "construction costs", on page 3, line 13. The point at issue, then, appears to be whether it is desirable to provide Federal money to the States for the planning of projects regardless of whether such projects are ever approved as part of the national airport program. I do not believe it is desirable to do so. The $3,000,000 appropriation for preliminary planning and surveys is made immediately available as I believe that such work should start at the earliest possible moment so as to have this program ready to go at once upon the end of the war. I have used the acceleration provision adopted in the post-war highway legislation so that the airport program can start even before the technical end of the war if such seems desirable.

Section 6 provides the legislative basis for the preparation and constant revision of a national airport plan. This plan will in turn be the basis of all airport development work upon which Federal funds are expended.

This section contains a provision for annual revision of the national airport plan, and I have heard criticism of that provision. Such criticism is argument for a program which has no flexibility, and under which a determination once arrived at would be as unchanging as the laws of the Medes and Persians, regardless of what changes might occur in population, industry, air traffic, or other factors. Obviously, the program must be able to change with changing conditions or it will accomplish little good. The purpose of the legislation which we are considering is not to freeze air transportation in this country but to help develop it toward its ultimate maximum. To the extent that we accomplish that objective, it will be necessary from time to time to make changes in the national airport program.

Under section 7 the C. A. A. is required to specify all projects which are to be developed in the urban program in a request to the Congress for funds with which to carry out this part of the national airport program. This gives the Congress an opportunity to review the Administrator's determination. The funds not appropriated in the urban program are then to go to the State program.

This section provides that projects in the urban program would be selected first; that is, they would be selected before selection of projects in the State program. That is because it is anticipated that the total of such projects would seldom equal the maximum limitation on funds provided for the urban program. The bill provides that all funds not specifically earmarked with the approval of the Congress, for projects in the urban program, shall be made available to projects in the State program. Selection of projects in the urban program is therefore a logical first step; a necessary provision to make possible fulfillment of the requirement that all projects in the urban program must be approved by the Congress before Federal funds for such projects are granted.

Provisions of this section authorizing States and State agencies to sponsor projects in the urban program, and permitting municipalities or other political subdivisions to sponsor projects in the State program, are designed to increase the flexibility of the program so as to achieve the largest measure of tangible results in the shortest possible time.

Section 8 apportions the Federal airport-aid funds among the States, one-half on the basis of population, one-half on the basis of area.

Provisions for reapportionment of funds, contains in subsection (C) on page 11, provide that if a State fails to use the full amount of any sum apportioned to it by either expending or obligating the funds apportioned the amount of such funds unused shall be reapportioned among those States in which substantially all currently apportioned funds have been matched by the State or by public agencies therein. The word "substantially" is used because a requirement for exact matching of all Federal funds might be technically a very difficult requirement to meet, and would, furthermore, impose a hardship upon States which might be able to provide most of the money necessary to match Federal funds, but not the whole amount. The alternative is to provide that reapportioned funds should be divided among all the States regardless of what percentage of Federal funds individual States may have matched. Upon first inspection there appears to be some argument in favor of this alternative. Upon closer examination it becomes obvious that it would be inefficient to allocate additional funds to a State which was unable to use a substantial portion of the funds already allocated. Any funds reallocated to such a State would necessarily remain idle until the appropriation lapsed, and would then fall back into the general fund of the Treasury without having served any useful purpose.

In section 9, on page 12 of the bill, in lines 6 and 7, language has been included which, upon careful reconsideration, I now believe should be eliminated. I refer to the phrase "or if the State is unable or unwilling to go forward with such project." It is my present thought that this language goes too far. Under this language a municipality would be able to go over the head of its State airport agency and seek approval of an airport project which did not fit into the State plan and which might, in the judgment of State aviation officials, be a potential "white elephant." I am willing that a municipality should have the opportunity to do this, provided it does so under the municipal program, where the proposed airport will be subject to a requirement that it shall be specifically approved by the Congress before funds are allocated. The general provisions under section 9 have been drafted with a view to permitting the speediest possible action under the proposed airport construction program. In line with this objective authority has been included for municipalities to sponsor projects under the State program, if located in a State in which no State airport agency exists. It is my present thought that this provision by itself goes far enough; and that if a State has created a State airport agency and that agency is functioning, then that agency should be in a position to control projects under the State program.

This section contains a provision, on page 13, beginning in line 4, under which the Administrator would not be authorized to approve any airport project unless the landing area, or the sight therefor, is wholly owned, in fee simple, absolute by a State or by a public agency. Such a provision has been urged, in connection with airport legislation, by numerous individuals and organizations. It has been strongly opposed by others. The purpose of the provision is to guard against

land speculation, and to avoid advance commitment of Federal funds to a project which involves any possibility that acquisition of the land therefor might necessitate payment of an excessive price, with unjustified profit to any individual. While I believe in this objective, my mind is not closed on the subject. I call to the attention of the committee the difference of opinion which exists on this question, and I shall be happy to abide by the decision of the committee in the determination of it.

My attention has been called to a situation in Birmingham, Ala., which has been cited as an argument for amendment of this provision requiring ownership in fee simple of the landing area of an airport. As it is represented to me, the Birmingham situation is this: The Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the Aviation Commission of Alabama, have plans for a new class 4 airport for the Birmingham district. The present municipal airport at Birmingham is not especially safe, due to the surrounding hills, and it cannot very well be expanded to any great extent. The Birmingham district is composed of small mountains and hills, and it has been difficult to find a location for the proposed new airport, on which approaches from all sides are clear. After much search, a site has been found which is only 7 miles from the Birmingham Courthouse, and which is out of the smoke zone of the valley in which Birmingham is located. This site has been determined to be the only suitable location for an airport within a radius of 25 miles from Birmingham. It is composed of a number of small hills located on a high plateau, and a first-class airport can be constructed on that location. The site is on a four-lane highway and easily accessible to Birmingham.

Underlying the property are coal mines. The mines are very deep, and would in no way interfere with an airport construction on the suface. A large part of the land included in the site is owned by the steel corporation which these coal mines serve. The corporation is willing to sell the property quite reasonably, giving title to the surface; but would not consider conveying a fee simple title, which would include valuable coal deposits underlying the property.

It is possible that similar situations exist or may arise in various other States. I believe it is for the committee to consider the desirability of attempting to amend the present language of the bill to meet such a situation.

As the language of the bill now stands, I believe a State or municipality would be entitled to include, as part of its contribution of funds to match the Federal allotment, any expenditures for development of an airport project, provided the work done fell within the limits of an approved project under the national airport program. The definition of "construction costs" in this bill, on page 3, line 13, includes "the making of field surveys, preparing plans and specifications, supervising and inspecting construction work, procuring the accomplishment of such work by contract, and acquiring property interests." While the bill provides, in section 9 (b), on page 13, line 4, that no project shall be approved "with respect to any airport the landing area of which, or the site therefor, is not wholly owned in fee simple, absolute by a State or by a public agency," the same subsection also provides, beginning in line 14, that "if and when a project is approved by the Administrator, however, such approval shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the United States for the payment of its proportional share of all the construction costs of the project." Considered in connection with the definition of "construction costs," which I have just read, I believe this language justifies my interpretation that a State or municipality would be able to take credit for expenditures, even expenditures for the acquisition of land, which fell within the limits of an approved project under the national airport program.

Suggestion has been made that a maximum limitation be placed upon the amount of such expenditures which might be considered as a contribution of matching funds, and it has also been suggested that some specific time limitation should be fixed, prior to which expenditures for airport construction would not be considered eligible for inclusion as a contribution of matching funds. Both these suggestions are extremely pertinent, and undoubtedly worthy of consideration. I can foresee considerable difficulty in working out satisfactory limitations of this nature; but perhaps the result would be worth the effort.

Section 10 provides the procedure for payment of Federal funds to States and cities for airport work undertaken pursuant to the bill.

Section 11, covering method of construction, minimum wages and maximum hours, and provisions giving employment preference to veterans and to local residents, is almost self-explanatory.

This section, which begins on page 14, line 20, is designed to afford maximum protection for labor, in the line with the best precedence set by previous legislation. It calls for establishment of minimum wage rates, and assures that contractors on airport projects shall pay such rates. It provides for a maximum workweek of 40 hours, except for executive, administrative, and supervisory positions. It provides that convict labor shall not be employed on any airport project under the program. Finally, it provides for employment preference first to honorably discharged veterans, and then in order, to residents of the municipality, county, and State in which an individual project is located.

This section also includes, in subsection (c), on page 16, provisions to require competitive bidding in the acquisition of supplies and materials.

I call the attention of the committee to a typographical error appearing on page 16 of the bill in line 15. Where the bill reads "title II," it should read "title III." The provisions of this title, which subsection (c) of section 11 of this act would make applicable to the airport program, call for preferential use of materials and articles produced and manufactured in the United States.

It has been said of section 12 that the requirements for eligibility to participate in the State program are too severe. I am open minded on this point. The provisions contained in this bill are in the nature of a compromise. It is my understanding that the Civil Aeronautics Administration would favor even stronger provisions than those contained in this bill. The question is, again, how much right the Federal Government is to have to control the program for which it is to supply half the money. I call the attention of the committee to the fact that subsection (b), beginning in line 8, on page 18, provides for suspension of six of these seven requirements, for a period of 3 years, so as to permit the airport program to get under way promptly and go forward effectively without hampering restrictions. Certainly, a period of 3 years is long enough to permit States desiring to participate in the program to enact the legislation necessary to comply with the eligibility requirements contained in this bill. Meanwhile, existing State airport laws would be utilized by the States and cities so that the airport program can go forward at once rather than wait for the adoption of new State laws and the raising of State funds to conform to a program proposed by the Congress.

Subsection (c), beginning on page 18, line 12, is another provision in the nature of a compromise. It does not attempt to say to the States that they cannot tax aviation activities. It does adopt the principle that the proceeds of certain specified taxes on aviation activities should be used for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports. This subsection is, therefore, on the middle ground. I shall not be greatly concerned if the committee in its wisdom desires to move somewhat to the right or to the left of this middle course. I should not care to go so far as to infringe upon the power of States to levy taxes, nor should I care to go so far in the other direction as to permit the proceeds from taxes on aviation fuel to be used for purposes not even remotely concerned with the development of aviation. Aviation in this country is not a cow to be milked; it is an infant to be nurtured.

In section 13, the project sponsorship provisions are in general believed to be reasonable, although a reasonable attitude by the C. A. A. Administrator is required on the accounting provisions.

Subparagraph (5) of this subsection provides for a standing system of accounting for airport accounts and records. There has been considerable objection to this provision since the bill was introduced. Much of this objection has been based upon the contention that the airport operator or operators should be entitled to keep their records upon any basis they may select, without any compulsion by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. I can appreciate the reasoning back of this objection, and I shall be willing to see this subparagraph amended to provide that "project" accounts and records, rather than "airport" accounts and records, shall be kept in accordance with a standard system.

At the same time, I can see many virtues in a standard system of accounting for all airports. A public airport is a public utility. Standard systems of accounting are prescribed for railroads, for common carriers by motor bus, for steamship lines, and for air carriers. But if the committee deems it desirable to adopt a different policy with regard to airports and to exempt airport operators from any provision for standard accounting except in connection with projects for constructing or improving airports, I shall, as I have stated, raise no objection to such an amendment.

On page 22 of the bill, in line 19, there appears a proviso designed to facilitate action by the Administrator to place an airport in a proper condition of maintenance when the airport operator is unable or unwilling to do so. The language of this proviso has been challenged by representatives of contractors on the ground that it opens the way for the Administrator to have the necessary work performed on a day-labor basis rather than by contract; and that such authority, if extended, might be abused.

I have not been completely convinced by the arguments advanced on this point, but I am open-minded on the question. I call it to the attention of the committee for consideration. It seems to me that some such authority is necessary for proper administration of the duty which would be imposed on the Administrator by the bill. Perhaps the committtee can work out some new language which would grant the necessary authority and at the same time prevent any such abuses as the contractors seem fearful might occur.

In subsection (b), beginning on page 20, line 21, an attempt has been made to work out a formula which will insure adequate maintenance of airports constructed or improved under the proposed program. Perhaps it is not a perfect formula. I shall be glad to go along with any proposal for a better formula. I am firmly convinced, however, of the soundness of the principle that any State or municipality or other public agency sponsoring an airport project should be willing to accept responsibility for maintaining the airport in a safe condition after it has been constructed. That principle is

all I shall fight for. The exact language contained in the bill which the committee reports will not be a matter concerning which I shall enter into controversy, so long as it preserves and protects the principle.

Section 14 is in the bill because I understand that some States and cities have had trouble acquiring land for airport purposes under their existing condemnation laws. This provision makes Federal condemnation powers available to States and cities, but only upon their specific request.

In section 15, the provisions for use of Government-owned land are in substance the same as those fund in similar legislation. The language was patterned after that in the Federal Aid Highway Act.

Section 16 covers reimbursement for damage to public airports by the Army or Navy. It is my understanding that neither the Army or Navy now have funds available for this purpose and in reason they should have. The C. A. A. is best able to evaluate the amount of such damage.

In connection with the authority contained for reimbursement of States or other public agencies for the rehabilitation or repair of public airports substantially damaged by the Army or the Navy, I have come to the conclusion that the language of the bill does not go far enough. I believe this subsection should be amended to provide also for reimbursement of the increased cost of operation and maintenance resulting from use of an airport by the Army or the Navy. This seems to me a reasonable proposal. In many cases, use of an airport by military planes may have resulted in very little physical damage to the airport; but in almost every instance, such use has resulted in a substantial increase in the cost of operation and maintenance. I believe it is only simple justice that such increased costs should be repaid at Federal expense.

The remaining sections of the bill, which cover reporting to Congress, penalties for false statements, preservation of the existing airport programs, and the effective date of the legislation are self-explanatory.

Gift of Original of Bill of Rights to Library of Congress by Barney Balaban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a few days ago a very great gift was made to the Library of Congress by Mr. Barney Balaban, president of the Paramount Pictures, Inc., namely, an enrolled copy of the original Bill of Rights. There was an appropriate ceremony in the Library of Congress at the time of the presentation and acceptance of this valuable gift. A newspaper release was issued by the Library describing the occasion, an address of acceptance was made by Hon. Luther H. Evans, Acting Librarian of Congress, and some brief and fitting remarks of presentation by the donor himself.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release, together with the remarks of presentation and acceptance, be admitted to the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIFT TO LIBRARY OF CONGRESS OF ORIGINAL OF BILL OF RIGHTS TO BE MARKED BY SPECIAL CEREMONIES WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21

Byron Price, Director of Censorship, will discuss the significance of the Bill of Rights in wartime at evening meeting in the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library.

Informal public ceremonies in the morning at the shrine housing the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and an evening lecture by Byron Price, Director of Censorship, on the Bill of Rights in wartime will mark the presentation to the Library of Congress on Wednesday, February 21, of one of the priceless originals of the Bill of Rights. The document, the gift to the American people of Barney Balaban, president of Paramount Pictures, Inc., is one of 14 copies engrossed in September 1789 at the order of the First Congress of the United States.

At 11 a. m. on Wednesday, Mr. Balaban will turn over to Luther H. Evans, the Acting Librarian of Congress, the copy he purchased for the Library as a token of gratitude for the freedom which his Russian-born parents found as immigrants to this country many years ago. The presentation will take place at the shrine, erected by special act of Congress approved March 20, 1922, to provide a place of permanent exhibition for the engrossed originals of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Postmaster General Frank C. Walker and Supreme Court Justices Robert H. Jackson and Felix Frankfurter will be among the officials present. Following the presentation, the Bill of Rights original will be placed on public exhibition in a specially constructed case next to the shrine.

Mr. Price's address will be part of another gathering held in the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library, beginning at 8:30 p. m., in recognition of the significance of Mr. Balaban's gift. Archibald MacLeish, Assistant Secretary of State and former Librarian of Congress, will preside. He will speak briefly on the historical background of the Bill of Rights as an introduction to Mr. Price's lecture on its importance in the world today.

The document presented by Mr. Balaban is an autograph engrossment on vellum measuring 29¼ inches in height and varying from 26¾ to 27½ inches in width. It is enclosed in a black and gold frame under glass. While it contains 12 proposed amendments, only 10 of these were ratified. The 2 which were not adopted were the first, which relates to the apportionment of Representatives in Congress, and the second, which concerns the fixing of compensation for Members of Congress. The remainder, comprising what is now called the Bill of Rights, affirmed such rights as freedom of speech, religion, and assembly and established regulations to govern criminal trials, search and seizure and confiscation.

Dated September 25, 1789, the document is one of the 13 copies submitted by Congress to each of the Original States. It bears the signature of Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, Speaker of the House of Representatives; John Adams, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; John Beckley, Clerk of the House of Representatives; and Sam A. Otis, Secretary of the Senate. Beckley's signature gives the document a special significance to its new custodians, inasmuch as President Jefferson appointed him the first Librarian of Congress in 1802.

Ranked by many authorities with the Magna Carta as a milestone in human progress, the Bill of Rights has heretofore been the only basic document of American history not included in the collections of the Library of Congress, although The National Archives possesses the fourteenth original copy reserved for the records of the Federal Government as well as another of the 13 other originals submitted to the States. Learning that the Library of Congress did not have an original of this document, Mr. Balaban in 1943 purchased his copy from Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach, book collector and merchant, for the purpose of donating it to the Library.

Since its purchase, the document has been on exhibition at the Subtreasury Building, site of Federal Hall, the original Capitol of the United States where the Bill of Rights was engrossed and signed, in New York City. Its exhibition there was sponsored by the book and author committee of the Treasury Department's War Finance Division, originally as part of the Fourth War Loan, and more recently as part of its "schools at war" program.

Under the "school at war" program, some 13,525 elementary and high schools throughout the United States and Alaska have received exact collotype facsimiles of the Library of Congress copy as a gift from Mr. Balaban through the Treasury Department. A copy is awarded by the Department to each school in which 90 percent of the students participate in the War Savings bonds program by purchasing at least one War Savings stamp each month

Because of the limited seating capacity, admission to Mr. Price's lecture will be by invitation only.

REMARKS OF MR. BARNEY BALABAN

The privilege of presenting this document to the Library of Congress is a source of deep satisfaction to me.

Upon learning that one of the original engrossments of the Bill of Rights was available and that the Library did not possess one, I was glad of the opportunity to restore it to the people in this way.

In acquiring it and in presenting it to you now, my feeling is one of humble gratitude for the freedom which my parents found when they came to this country nearly 70 years ago and for the opportunity made possible to them through these amendments to our Constitution.

I present it to you as a token of that gratitude.

REMARKS MADE BY LUTHER H. EVANS, ACTING LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS, ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION TO THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS OF A COPY OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS, BY BARNEY BALABAN, FEBRUARY 21, 1945

Mr. Balaban, I accept on behalf of the Library of Congress, and on behalf of the Government and people of the United States, one of the original enrolled copies of the Bill of Rights which you have so generously presented to me as Acting Librarian of Congress. Your patriotic and unselfish act is deeply appreciated and will be long remembered. The placing of a copy of the Bill of Rights at this shrine beside the Declaration of Independence and the original Constitution is particularly appropriate, because in the hearts of the people the three great documents of liberty under ordered government stand together as inseparable parts of the concept of America. It is well on this occasion to recall the vital connection which exists between them.

In the Declaration of Independence our forefathers enumerated the "long train of abuses and usurpations" and the violations by government of "unalienable rights" which made it necessary for them "to dissolve the political bands" which connected them with the mother country. The system of national government as it existed at that time and during the next decade was barely adequate to the task of waging the War of Independence to a successful conclusion it was not strong enough to provide the necessary

substitute in peacetime for the political bands which has been dissolved. A combination of excessive libertarianism and excessive state authority in affairs of national concern resulted after a few years of a peace in a situation from which the Nation's leaders sought an escape in the creation of a strong national government. The Constitution, which was wrought at Philadelphia in the hot summer of 1787, was the result of their efforts. But the pendulum was allowed to sing too far in the authoritarian direction, and liberties were taken for granted while delegations of authority were put in writing. No provision was made in the original Constitution for the protection from encroachment by the general government of many of the rights the violation of which by another government had brought forth the ringing charges of the Declaration of Independence, then 11 years old, but exceedingly fresh in the memories of men. Fresh in their minds also were the bills of rights which it was becoming a habit to include in State constitutions. The absence of guaranties of individual liberty became perhaps the strongest single argument against the ratification of the new instrument of government. In more than one State the campaign for ratification was won only because the Federalists gave a solemn promise to support amendments to the Constitution calculated to safeguard the liberties of the people as soon as the new government came into being.

In fulfillment of the solemn promise, President Washington asked the First Congress, in his inaugural address of April 30, 1789, to direct its attention to the matter of promoting "the characteristic rights of freemen" by the exercise of the amending power. Four days later, James Madison, one of the most eloquent advocates of a strong central government, and one of the principal authors of the new Constitution, notified the House of Representatives of his intention to propose amendments, and on June 8 he proposed 9 of them. After much debate as to the guaranties which were required to make liberty safe from the oppressions of government, the 12 proposed amendments which may be read on this parchment, were approved by joint resolution on September 25. A few days later they were sent to the 13 States for ratification by their legislatures. When the Virginia Legislature completed its act of ratification on December 15, 1791, the 10 amendments which we call the Bill of Rights came into effect.

These amendments are as follows:

"Congress of the United States begun and held at the city of New York, on Wednesday the 4th of March, 1789.

"The conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best ensure the beneficient ends of its institution.

"*Resolved, etc.*

"Amendment I: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

"Amendment II: A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

"Amendment III: No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

"Amendment IV: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

"Amendment V: No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb, nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

"Amendment VI: In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor; and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

"Amendment VII: In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

"Amendment VIII: Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

"Amendment IX: The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"Amendment X: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

To you, Mr. Balaban, we are grateful for the addition of that document to this shrine, which, together with its magnificent predecessors, presents to "a candid world" the independence, power, and freedom of a great people.

A. C. Utterback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1945.

Hon. MALCOLM C. TARVER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TARVER: In response to your telephone request for a report on Mr. A. C. Utterback, Supervising Examiner, Farm Credit Administration, there follows a brief review of the case supplemented by a more detailed factual statement.

In Mr. Uttterback's capacity as Supervising Examiner he was instructed by the Chief Examiner to make an examination of the Houston Bank for Cooperatives at Houston, Tex., which operates under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration. He commenced this assignment on April 1, 1944, and on May 4, 1944, he wrote the Chief Examiner taking the position that conditions in the bank were such that its management should be taken away from its president and that the bank be placed under special examination. The Chief Examiner talked with Mr. Utterback over the telephone and the Assistant Chief Examiner consulted with him in Houston. In their judgment, Mr. Utterback's recommendations were not supported by facts which would justify the suggested action. He was instructed to complete the examination and make his report. At no time have Mr. Utterback's official superiors suggested that he do other than submit facts which would support his conclusions, or confine his conclusions to such as are supported by the facts in accordance with established examination procedure.

Mr. Utterback never corrected his position in accordance with the instructions he received. Instead he submitted a voluminous but useless report containing conclusions which were not supported by the necessary evidential facts. Nevertheless, the Farm Credit Administration did not withhold Mr. Utterback's report, inadequate through it was, from the directors of the Houston Bank for Cooperatives. These directors are responsible for the management of the bank under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration. Three of their seven members are elected by farmer interests and a fourth is selected by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration from persons nominated by the farmer interests. The remaining three directors are appointed by the Governor. The Houston board of directors is intensely interested in the welfare of the institutions of which they are the directors, including the Federal Land Bank of Houston, the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Houston, the Production Credit Corporation of Houston, as well as the Houston Bank for Cooperatives. At their request the Utterback report was submitted to them, and they concurred in the conclusion of the Farm Credit Administration as to the inadequacy of the report.

Mr. Utterback's usefulness as an examiner was completely impaired by his work in connection with the examination of the Houston Bank for Cooperatives, and although the Farm Credit Administration has made an effort to avail itself of his services in some other capacity while he is still on the pay roll, the nature of the case is such as to make this difficult and unsatisfactory. The delay which has occurred in taking final action has been due almost entirely to the carrying out of sound personnel practices in the face of the circumstances of his particular case. These practices must be such as to protect an employee against arbitrary and unjust action on the part of his official superiors. Frequently they serve that purpose. In other cases they are taken advantage of by employees who are in the wrong, but the justification for the procedure is the protection which it gives to competent, conscientious employees.

The Department of Agriculture has established a procedure under which employees may appeal any grievance which they may have and which is not corrected by their supervisors. Mr. Utterback initiated action under this procedure but abandoned it before a hearing was held. Although Mr. Utterback did not complete the grievance procedure which he initiated under departmental rules, Mr. Roland Bush, whom he designated as his representative in the proceedings, gave a statement to the newspapers raising a question not only as to the good faith of the Farm Credit Administration in

its handling of the examination of the Houston Bank for Cooperatives, but also a question as to the soundness of the bank. Mr. Utterback unquestionably was a party to this action by Mr. Bush, who resigned immediately before giving his initial statement to the press. The Farm Credit Administration considers such conduct inconsistent with sound administration of its responsibilities.

Mr. Utterback is a veteran within the definition in the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and is entitled to the procedures prescribed by the act as a precedent to his dismissal from the service. Also, notwithstanding the unsoundness of Mr. Utterback's position with reference to his examination of the Houston Bank for Cooperatives, the Farm Credit Administration wished to have a proper examination completed before taking final action in Mr. Utterback's case. When a proper examination had been completed, it showed that there was no justification for the drastic recommendations and for the charges and implications of improper action on the part of officials of the Houston Bank for Cooperatives. After the completion of the report and a careful preparation by the Farm Credit Administration of a statement of the facts in his case, it was then necessary for the Farm Credit Administration, located at Kansas City pursuant to wartime decentralization, to submit the case to the offices of the Department of Agriculture in Washington, which, in turn gave the case careful consideration and exchanged views with the Kansas City office with reference to its proper handling.

The Farm Credit Administration has reached the conclusion that Mr. Utterback is not qualified to continue as an employee and that procedures complying with the requirements of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 and rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission for his removal from office should be undertaken.

The Farm Credit Administration is cooperating effectively and actively to make reductions in its personnel, as is indicated by the following table, showing personnel strength as of June 30, 1942, shortly after its principal offices were moved to Kansas City, and December 31, 1944.

June 30, 1942:	
Departmental	1,073
Field	297
Subtotal, central office	1,370
Emergency crop and feed loan regional offices	1,264
Total	2,634
Dec. 31, 1944:	
Departmental	592
Field	211
Subtotal, central office	803
Emergency crop and feed loan regional offices	1,317
Total	1,940

Enclosed herewith is a more detailed statement of the facts in Mr. Utterback's case.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. WARBURTON,
Deputy Governor.

STATEMENT ON THE CASE OF A. C. UTTERBACK, SUPERVISING EXAMINER, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, TO ACCOMPANY LETTER OF MARCH 19, 1945, TO HON. M. C. TARVER, OF GEORGIA

Under instructions from the Chief Examiner, Farm Credit Administration, an examination of the Houston Bank for Cooperatives was conducted by Mr. Utterback from April 1, 1944, to July 10, 1944, assisted part of the time by Farm Credit Examiner Roland W. Bush. Early in the course of the examination, Mr. Utterback wrote to the Chief Examiner, stating that he had found evidence of serious misconduct of the bank's affairs. The Assistant Chief Examiner went to Houston, reviewed the material assembled by Mr. Utterback, and advised him and the Chief Examiner that in his opinion this material did not warrant the charges of misconduct. After Mr. Utterback repeated these charges in subsequent letters to and telephone conversations with the Chief Examiner, the latter went to Houston, reviewed the subject with Mr. Utterback, and advised him that in his opinion Mr. Utterback's charges against the bank's personnel were not supported by the facts he had presented. The Chief Examiner instructed Mr. Utterback to complete the examination and make a full report of the facts.

Mr. Utterback submitted his report of the examination to the Chief Examiner on July 25, 1944. It contained several unsupported statements of conclusions charging or implying that personnel of the bank, as well as officers of a borrowing association, were guilty of serious misconduct. The Chief Examiner requested Mr. Utterback to eliminate or revise these unsupported statements of conclusion, most of which concerned a loan made to this association which Mr. Utterback's report classified in the group of loans which he believed would ultimately be paid in full but which had defects requiring special attention. Mr. Utterback refused to revise his report.

At the request of the Chief Examiner, one of the attorneys of the Solicitor's Office reviewed the portions of the report which Mr. Utterback pointed out to him as being pertinent to charges of violation of the Federal criminal statutes, and, in conference with Mr. Utterback and the Chief Examiner, the attorney advised them that the factual data pointed out to him would not, in his opinion, sustain any charge of criminal misconduct on the part of the bank's personnel. Mr. Utterback still refused to revise his report.

The Farm Credit Administration Examination Manual for guidance of the examiners in conducting examinations and preparing reports provides for a confidential supplement to examination reports to contain information regarding conditions which were disclosed during an examination in regard to the official personnel, the bank's functions, and operations, and suggestions in reference to improvements or procedures which have been developed. It is a well-established rule that an examiner's comments on matters which are controversial, and his opinions or inferences which are not conclusively established as facts, are to be omitted from the main report and, if reported, must be placed in the confidential supplement. Any failure to observe these requirements interferes seriously with the handling of these reports and the proper functioning of the Farm Credit Administration. Mr. Utterback included his unsupported opinions in the general rather than the confidential section of the report, in direct violation of the regular procedure.

In view of the inadequacy and uncertainty of the report prepared by Mr. Utterback and the consequent unwillingness of the Chief Examiner to endorse it, the Acting Supervising Examiner for the examination district which includes Houston was directed to conduct a reexamination of the Houston Bank for Cooperatives. This was begun on September 22, 1944. The reexamination report was submitted November 18, 1944, and was prepared in accordance with the examination requirements. This report did not support the charges and implications of misconduct on the part of the bank's officers made by Mr. Utterback.

Because of Mr. Utterback's approach in his examination and report on the Houston Bank and his failure to understand the impropriety of his conduct, the Farm Credit Administration concluded that he could not be entrusted to make further examinations. Mr. Utterback was so advised by the Chief Examiner and on September 5 was given an opportunity to resign, but declined to do so.

On September 25, Mr. Utterback informed the Chief of the Personnel Division, Farm Credit Administration, that he had a grievance to be presented under the personnel relations policy and procedure set forth in Secretary's Memorandum No. 753, revision 2, which prescribes the procedure for hearing employees' complaints and grievances, and requested that the Governor give him an oral interview. At the same time Mr. Utterback designated Roland W. Bush, the Farm Credit examiner who participated in the examination of the Houston bank as his representative. The Governor indicated that in view of all the circumstances he would prefer that the grievances be submitted in writing. A few days later Mr. Utterback and Mr. Bush requested that they be given an oral interview with the Governor, and indicated that if the request were not granted a story would be given to the newspapers. The Governor's decision was that any statement they wished to make should be in writing.

On October 3, 1944, Mr. Utterback wrote to the Governor formally requesting a hearing before a board of appeals under the provisions of the Secretary's memorandum referred to. Under this procedure the employee gives written notice of appeal, stating his grievance and naming his representative on the Appeal Board. The head of the Administration names a second representative on the board, and the two so-named representatives select a third. Mr. Utterback's letter of October 3 redesignated Mr. Bush as his representative, and the Governor proceeded to name the representative of the Farm Credit Administration and notified Mr. Bush accordingly. No reply was made by Mr. Utterback's representative to a letter from the Farm Credit Administration representative about selecting a third member, and the two members designated failed to meet and select the third representative within the time prescribed by the memorandum. Pursuant to the established procedure, the Governor named another representative of the Farm Credit Administration to serve on a new appeals board to be created, but Mr. Utterback did not name his representative.

On October 14, Mr. Utterback sent to the Governor a letter containing a further statement of his grievance, charging the Governor with suppressing the report which, he alleged, showed misconduct of the bank's affairs by its personnel. Some of the acts of misconduct by the bank's personnel alleged in the letter had not been mentioned in Mr. Utterback's examination report. Mr. Utterback sent to Mr. Bush, as his representative, copies of his letters of October 3 and October 14.

On October 15, Mr. Bush, who was then at his home in Houston on annual leave, telegraphed the Farm Credit Administration in Kansas City that he was resigning effective October 15 and was relinquishing his accrued leave. He further informed the Farm Credit Administration that he was doing this in order to be free to take action which he could not take as an employee of the Farm Credit Administration. On October 16 or 17, Mr. Bush gave the newspapers copies of Mr. Utterback's letters of October 3 and October 14 to the Governor, and made additional statements which have since appeared in the newspapers.

The Farm Credit Administration manual for the guidance of farm credit examiners provides that the report of the examiner is a strictly confidential communication to the Farm Credit Administration, and that all information obtained by the examiner relative to any institution or office examined by him must also be regarded as strictly confidential, to be imparted to no one other than the proper officials of the Farm Credit Administration or of the institution or office concerned, and that no opinion should be

expressed or no comment made regarding the condition of any institution or office, except to the proper officials thereof, without the special permission of the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. Utterback's two letters to the Governor contained information that came to his knowledge by reason of his examination of the bank and which was of a confidential and restricted nature. The furnishing of this information by Mr. Utterback to Mr. Bush and its subsequent release to the newspapers is considered by the Farm Credit Administration as being in violation of the regulations and definitely prejudicial to the best interests of the Houston Bank for Cooperatives and of the Government.

In each farm credit district, in accordance with the provisions of sections 640b–640g, title 12, United States Code, there is a Farm Credit Board consisting of seven directors. Three of these directors are elected, one by the national farm loan associations in the district, one by the production credit associations, and one by the cooperative associations borrowing from and owning stock in the district bank for cooperatives. Three directors are appointed by the Governor of Farm Credit Administration. The seventh membe. is appointed by the Governor from the three persons receiving the highest number of votes in a nominating ballot cast by the national farm loan associations. They constitute the board of directors for each of the four district institutions, namely, the Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, Production Credit Corporation, and bank for cooperatives.

In accordance with the usual procedure, two of the directors came to the Houston office on October 16, 2 days in advance of the date fixed for a regular meeting of the board, for a preliminary review of the district's affairs. On October 13 the acting supervising examiner, who was in charge of the reexamination, was instructed to inform these two board members that Mr. Utterback's examination report was considered unsatisfactory, that it could not be endorsed by the Farm Credit Administration as its official report, and that a new examination had therefore been ordered, but that Mr. Utterback's report would be shown to them if they wished to see it. At the request of the two members the report was shown to them. They agreed that it appeared to be unsatisfactory and that the Farm Credit Administration had taken the proper action in refusing to endorse the report.

When the Farm Credit Board of Houston met in regular session on October 18, 1944, Mr. Utterback's report was shown to the board members at their request. They expressed agreement that the conclusions stated in the report regarding misconduct of the bank's affairs were unfounded, and issued a statement which has appeared in the newspapers, reading in part as follows:

"After careful investigation we are able to assure all concerned that the bank is in a sound financial condition. We find no evidence of any dishonesty or misconduct on the part of any officer or employee of the bank."

This definitely refutes Mr. Utterback's allegation that his examination report was being suppressed.

On October 30, 1944, Mr. Utterback indicated in a letter to the governor that his grievance complaint was being abandoned. In this letter he advised the governor that, "as to my report on the Houston bank, Mr. Bush has a copy of it, and as he contemplates further action it is incumbent upon me to offer nothing additional to the facts contained in my letters of October 3 and October 14, 1944."

The delay in disposing of this matter and determining Mr. Utterback's future status as an employee of the Farm Credit Administration has been due to the necessity for making a reexamination of the bank; Mr. Utterback's filing of a notice for a hearing of a grievance under the provisions of the Secretary's memorandum referred to; and, inasmuch as Mr. Utterback is a veteran, the provisions of section 14 of the Veterans' Freference Act of 1944 and the Civil Service Commission's regulations pursuant thereto.

The Farm Credit Administration has concluded that, by reason of the foregoing, Mr. Utterback's usefulness is at an end and has recommended to the Department, in view of Mr. Utterback's refusal to tender his resignation, that he be removed. The Department is now considering the preferment of charges against Mr. Utterback, and he will be given an opportunity to make answer thereto, in accordance with the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act and the Civil Service rule with respect to removal in such cases.

She Couldn't Name One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Times of March 12, 1945:

SHE COULDN'T NAME ONE

Recently Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Texas Democrat, during a discussion on the House floor, got onto the subject of New Deal laws.

Well aware that most professional Republicans have now accepted the principles underlying such "reforms" as the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission, Social Security Act, and others, which many of them fought at the time they were proposed, he challenged any Member on the other side of the aisle to name one such basic New Deal law that should be repealed.

Up popped the "Give 'em hell, JESSIE" SUMNER, Illinois Congresswoman from down Iroquois County way. We reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just what happened:

"Mr. PATMAN. What are those New Deal laws? Our friends on the Republican side voted for every one of them. The Republican Party could very well be called a New Deal party, because they voted for all the New Deal laws. I do not believe the leader on the Republican side could name one New Deal law that the Republicans voted against, or would be willing to repeal if they came into power.

"Miss SUMNER. Will the gentleman yield? I think the gentleman should not forget that in 1939, the Republican Party voted unanimously against the $7,000,000,000 pump-priming bill, and the next day business started back up.

"Mr. PATMAN. 1939? Oh, that was just a temporary appropriation measure. I am talking about real, basic fundamental laws, New Deal laws. I would like the lady to name one she opposed.

"Miss SUMNER. To us $7,000,000,000 is real money.

"Mr. PATMAN. I know, but that was just a temporary proposition. I am talking about basic laws, permanent laws. Name one of them the lady opposed, so-called New Deal laws.

"Miss SUMNER. To do that would take the rest of the afternoon.

"Mr. PATMAN. No, name just one of them.

"Miss SUMNER. Very well, beginning with last week, the agricultural census bill.

"Mr. PATMAN. No, not last week; start with 1933 when the New Deal came into power and name any New Deal laws that the lady would repeal.

"Miss SUMNER. I was not a party to that.

"Mr. PATMAN. The gentlewoman would not be a party to repealing any of them, nor have I ever seen any bill that she has ever introduced seeking to repeal any of them. Neither would the American people be a party to repealing them. * * * I believe in a constructive, militant minority party, but why just criticize all the time? Why not help us construct? And then if we make mistakes show us how those mistakes can be corrected."

Well, it seems that Miss SUMNER could not name one basic New Deal innovation that she'd like to repeal. Miss SUMNER and every other Republican who found fault with needed New Deal reforms know that the people have accepted them and want to keep them. Governor Dewey recognized that when he ran for President last year.

Mr. PATMAN gave the party good advice when he warned against mere criticism. As time goes on, there will be new reforms the people will want, including world measures to preserve peace. If the Republican Party can learn, from the past, it will either agree, or suggest something better which will accomplish the result the people seek.

Too Little Training for Combat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the basic premises of military success that an army's strength is equal to the skill, power, and resistance of its foot soldiers. Planes play a tremendous role in paving the way for the infantryman, but in the last analysis it is the infantry regiment which must take the ground, destroy those defenses which even the most pulverizing air attack cannot yet reach, and hold the area won.

News out of the European theater in the past week has shown all too many cases of young boys 18 and 19 years of age with as little as 17 weeks of military service being killed in action. Four to 6 months of training barely suffice to strengthen the physical fiber of many soldiers, let alone teach them the highly specialized skills which a modern army employs in the use of new and formidable weapons. Surely, had not Congress been assured that the War Department intended to offer a year's training to our boys fresh from their high-school classrooms, there would have been great resistance to the establishment of the 18-year draft age.

More than this is the statement made by experienced soldiers that the presence of young and briefly trained men in their veteran outfits does not result in hastening the military maturity of the new additions; it more frequently tends to add difficulties to the tasks of the more

experienced. As the war moves along toward what appears to be rapidly approaching victory in Europe, it may be hoped that the military leadership of the War Department will modify this new practice.

Letter of Long Island General Assembly of the Fourth Degree, Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LONG ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
Brooklyn, N. Y., January 29, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Fourth Degree of the Knights of Columbus is dedicated specifically to the virtue of patriotism. There are 1,800 members of the Fourth Degree of the Long Island General Assembly. On the night of December 20, 1944, at Columbus Club, 1 Prospect Park West, Brooklyn, N. Y., the Long Island General Assembly of the Fourth Degree of the Knights of Columbus held its regular monthly meeting. By unanimous vote it was directed that the following facts and conclusions and petitions be sent to every Member of the Congress of the United States of America for appropriate action:

1. By repudiating the Polish government in exile in London, and by recognizing the communistically established and controlled so-called Lublin Committee in Moscow, Soviet Russia, who, side by side with Nazi Germany, ruthlessly invaded the Republic of Poland in September 1939, is seeking to take part of Poland into its communistic control, with a consequent denial of the Christian liberties of the Polish people in the part so desired by Soviet Russia.

In other words, Soviet Russia is attempting to hold on to the stolen goods which it received by treaty with Nazi Germany, after both had subjugated Poland in the beginning of the World War, and which it lost to Nazi Germany after communistic Russia and Nazi Germany ceased to be political and military allies in June 1941.

By its desire and plan to seize Polish territory, communistic Russia has violated the principles of the second proposal of the Atlantic Charter, which pledges our country to accept "no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

This contemplated territorial steal on the part of communistic Russia also violates the principles of the third proposal of the Atlantic Charter, which pledges our country "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

2. By requesting the Polish Nation to surrender part of Poland to communistic Russia, the British Government, speaking through Mr. Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister, has also violated the principles of the aforesaid second and third proposals of the Atlantic Charter.

By this course of action, the British Government has also violated its 1939 promise to restore the political and territorial integrity of Poland, that had been violated by the invasion of Nazi Germany and communistic Russia.

PETITIONS

1. In view of the foregoing facts, the Long Island General Assembly of the Fourth Degree of the Knights of Columbus petitions Congress to adopt the principles of the Atlantic Charter as the only principles upon which the future peace of the world can be secured.

2. The Long Island General Assembly of the Fourth Degree of the Knights of Columbus also petitions Congress to suspend the shipment of all lend-lease supplies to both communistic Russia and to Great Britain—

(a) Until Mr. Churchill, the Prime Minister, and the British Government declare their adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, and

(b) Until both communistic Russia and Great Britain have publicly guaranteed the territorial and political independence and integrity of the Polish nation as it existed in 1939 before the outbreak of the war.

VINCENT A. KELLY,
Faithful Navigator, Long Island General Assembly of the Fourth Degree, Knights of Columbus.

Shortage of Pork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Nebraska delegation in Congress, I wish to insert in the RECORD a petition received from members of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska and the reply thereto made by the Representatives and Senators in Congress:

Whereas there is a shortage of all meats in the United States, and especially pork; and

Whereas there has been an increased cost of production to the producer of meats; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration has placed a ceiling price on hogs below cattle and sheep; and

Whereas an increased production of pork could be encouraged by increasing the ceiling price on hogs by at least $1 per hundredweight.

Therefore, we, the undersigned members of the fifty-eighth session of the Nebraska State Legislature, petition the Members from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States, and in the House of Representatives of the United States, the War Food Administrator, and the Office of Price Administration, and each of you to take immediate action to increase the ceiling price on hogs by at least $1 per hundredweight.

Dwight W. Burney, Arthur Carmody, Ed Hoyt, George C. Weborg, Harry F. Burnham, John E. Mekota, Edwin Schultz, Lt. Gov. Roy W. Johnson, Cliff N. Ogden, Lloyd Cain, Thomas H. Adams, Roy B. Carlberg, J. H. Anderson, Don E. Hanna, Ladd J. Hubka, Joseph C. Reavis, Ed. F. Lusienski, Earl J. Lee, J. E. Conklin, Ray A. Babcock, Fred A. Mueller, H. P. Heiliger, A. J. Brodahl, Lester H. Anderson, Harry A. Foster, Harry L. Pizer, Fay Wood, D. Garber, William A. Crossland, John F. Doyle, Tom Dooley, Fred A. Seaton, Walter R. Raecke, Ernest C. Raasch (Norfolk), Sam Klaver, Charles Tvrdik, Sidney J. Cullingham, W. J. Norman, C. Petrus Peterson.

MARCH 20, 1945.

NEBRASKA STATE SENATORS,
Capitol Building, Lincoln, Nebr.

GENTLEMEN: We wish to acknowledge the letter of March 16, enclosing a petition signed by members of the State Legislature dealing with the shortage of meat and more particularly the shortage of pork.

We share your concern over this situation and we are of the opinion that the present meat shortage is due to unwise planning by Washington bureaus. Throughout the months and years, the President's executive agencies have turned a deaf ear to many constructive criticisms and suggestions. It has been pointed out to them not only by men in the Congress, but by leaders in Agriculture, that their regulations, rulings, and ceilings were producing empty feed lots and curtailing the production of both hogs and cattle.

In spite of this they blindly and stubbornly proceeded with their policies, laboring under the delusion that by paying cash subsidies from the public treasury they could solve any problem. They have failed to regard basic economic facts and laws and they have failed to understand that full production means more meat at lower prices.

We think your suggestion is good and ought to be adopted. In addition, the ceiling price on feeder pigs should be removed. Feeder pigs may be described as those weighing not more than 180 pounds each. Most of those feeder pigs are sold at public sale barns. If they were not subject to the ceiling price, the farmers could and would outbid the packers. The farmers would in turn feed some of this wet corn to them and return them to the market when they weighed about 330 pounds. The support price should be extended to hogs weighing up to 330 pounds.

At the present time, most of these feeder pigs are being bought by the packers. We submit that every time a feeder pig is withheld from the market until it becomes a 330-pound hog that the production of pork has been substantially doubled.

We also feel that increased cattle feeding should also be encouraged by making it possible for the feeder to realize a profit.

Following your directions, we are presenting your petition to the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration with the request that it be favorably considered. The Congress does not fix the ceiling, neither are they submitted to Congress for approval or disapproval.

Assuring you of our continued interest in this problem, we are

Yours truly,

KARL STEFAN,
Chairman, Nebraska Delegation.
HUGH BUTLER.
KENNETH S. WHERRY.
HOWARD H. BUFFETT.
A. L. MILLER.
CARL T. CURTIS.

Why Is Meat Scarce?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Government agencies dealing with food production have recently become alarmed at the small amount of meat which may be available for the military, civilian, and lend-lease requirements.

The pencil-pushing arm-chair planners in Government are responsible for the present dearth of meat in this country. They are responsible because they have not followed the considered judgment and advice of men in the livestock and meat-producing business. They have called conferences and have had advice, but these bureaucrats thought they knew more about the business of producing meat than the rancher and feeder knew. They have merely outsmarted themselves.

Many men in Congress protested vigorously when the roll-back on meat was put into effect. This was done over the objections of the War Food Administration and Chester Davis, the Administrator at that time, who shortly resigned.

One reason there is a shortage of meat is that the average animal being marketed is below weight. This is easily established by a review of the average live weight of cattle going to Federally inspected markets. The figures are as follows: The 1931 to 1940 November average was 929 pounds; the 1943 November average was 920 pounds; the 1944 November average was 885 pounds.

Last year the country butchered approximately 20,000,000 cattle. The cattle averaged 44 pounds lighter than before controls started—this shrink amounted to 880,000,000 pounds of meat. This is 7 pounds for every man, woman, and child in the United States, and it is practically all meat. In addition to that the quality of all the meat was distinctly down and the consumer is paying for the higher proportion of bone. The people to blame for this bungling policy are those in Government. They have given the country less meat, of a poorer quality, and at a higher cost.

The one thing Government food policy has produced is a shortage of meat and an increase in the black market. The black market thrives because of a scarcity of supply and the high demands of the consumer. Someone has said there is no need of crying over spilled milk, but I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that much more milk is about to be spilled unless the several Government agencies dealing not only in the production of meat but of all foods recognize the difficulties involved and take steps to make proper corrections.

There is a simple way to overcome the shortage of meat. It is to adjust the ceiling so that the feeder—the man who puts the extra meat on each animal—can be assured a fair profit. Eight hundred and eighty million more pounds of meat would blast the black market and provide meat for all needs. But no, the official price must be kept down as a trading point in dealing with wage ceilings. Thus the cost of living is kept down on paper, but the people are not getting meat, except those who are able to buy through the black market.

Yes; more milk will be spilled and more food will spoil or not be produced unless these wild-eyed, pied-piping bureaucrats cease to bedevil and demoralize the production of food. Their boondoggling practices so far have been nothing but lethal blows to the food-producing industry of the country.

Development of the Arkansas River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a statement of the issues involved in the determination of the policy to be followed in the development of the Arkansas River. This statement was prepared by Mr. C. F. Byrns, of Fort Smith, Ark., and appeared in the Southwest-Times Record published in that city under date of March 18, 1945, and is as follows:

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

Virtually all of us in the Arkansas Valley agree that the river should be harnessed to prevent flood destruction and to make possible the full use of the waters for the benefit of the people who live here.

There is some confusion about what can be done and what is the best way to go about it.

Public understanding of the questions now at issue is quite important. Hearings are to be held on May 4 and 5 at Tulsa and on May 7 at Little Rock which may have great influence on the future program on the river. Public sentiment about the whole matter will be important in determining what will be the verdict of the Board of Engineers, which is a sort of appellate court within the Corps of Engineers, now investigating the proposals for multiple-purpose development of the river.

This, then, is an effort to state as clearly as possible what the situation now is and what I think we ought to do about it.

Since 1936, by authority of Congress, the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, has been making investigations of the Arkansas drainage system, with a view to proper flood control, power production, irrigation, navigation, recreation, and other uses of the waters.

As a result of those studies, the Corps of Engineers has recommended and Congress has approved 20 reservoirs on the tributaries of the Arkansas for flood control, power, and other uses, which do not include navigation. Five of these 20 reservoirs have been built, 1 of them by the Grand River Dam Authority at Pensacola on Grand River in Oklahoma, the other 4 by the Corps of Engineers. Four others were underconstruction when war intervened and stopped work. Those 4 are ready for construction as soon as materials are available after the war emergency ends. The remaining 11 reservoirs have been approved or authorized and are ready for construction after the war when Congress makes the money available.

As a result of the 1943 flood, Congress asked the Corps of Engineers to investigate local protection works along the main stem of the Arkansas. That means levees and sea walls. Within 6 months, the engineers recommended $12,150,000 worth of levees and sea walls from Tulsa to Pine Bluff, including the sea walls at Fort Smith and Van Buren, and levees protecting important bottoms near here. That work has been authorized, and awaits appropriations, availability of materials, and local cooperation.

The approved reservoirs, plus the authorized levees, will give us substantial control of floods in the Arkansas, when all of them are in service. To get them built, we need vigorous and enthusiastic support from the people in the Arkansas Valley. Congress acts when it knows people want action.

Further responding to instructions from Congress, the Corps of Engineers has worked out a comprehensive plan for full development of the Arkansas River system, including additional flood control, navigation, irrigation, added power production, recreation, municipal and industrial water supplies, and other uses. That proposal is now under study by the Board of Engineers, which must approve it before it is sent to Congress for action. The hearings in May are part of that study. Public response is a vital factor in the final decision, because the engineers do things only when the people affected really want them.

A small group in the Muskogee area is urging now that an Arkansas Valley Authority be created to do the whole thing over and to take full responsibility for the river development, displacing the Corps of Engineers.

There are many reasons, often discussed here, why I think we should support the engineers and oppose an authority for this valley. Fundamentally, an authority will be concerned with power first and flood control and other uses as secondary issues. The engineers' first emphasis is always on flood control and navigation first, with whatever power is reasonably available without sacrifice of flood control. Clearly our interest lies with the engineers in that respect.

The engineers' plan is just what it is called—comprehensive. No authority could do more to develop the full uses of the rivers. We are far advanced with the engineers now, needing only an extra push of public support to assure the full program.

If we should reject the engineers now and advocate an authority we should be trading off a virtual certainty of the greatest value for an uncertain prospect of an unknown substitute somewhere further down the years. That kind of trade doesn't make sense.

Article in Boston Sunday Post by John Griffin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an article by John Griffin, which appeared in the Sunday, March 18, 1945, edition of the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Post, concerning the proposed strike of the United Mine Workers:

GOVERNMENT SPONSORING OF STRIKE VOTE REACHES NEW LOW IN ABSURDITY—WILL BE FIRST SHUT-DOWN PROMOTED BY GOVERNMENT ITSELF—INDUSTRY FACES COMPLETE STOPPAGE AS RESULT

(By John Griffin)

There is going to be an election in this country on March 28, but this time the men in the service overseas are not going to cast ballots, nor is the average citizen going to be given a chance to vote although he will be called upon to pay the expenses of the election.

This election will take place in 100 areas of the country which have been marked out by the National Labor Relations Board. Those voting will be members of the United Mine Workers. They will vote to decide

whether or not they want to strike in the event that their contract demands, recently set forth by John L. Lewis, are not met.

The ballot will contain only one question, as follows: "Do you wish to permit an interruption of war production in wartime as a result of this dispute?"

WILL COST $300,000

Agents of the National Labor Relations Board are now engaged in making arrangements for the balloting. Once the result has been tabulated, it will then be sent to the President of the United States. The election will cost the taxpayers of this country about $300,000.

There won't be any election on Iwo Jima or along the Rhine to see whether or not the fighting men of the United States will continue to fight. Nor will the citizens of this country have a chance to express, via ballots, whether or not they want to continue receiving coal and whether the plants which are producing war materials and the railroads that transport such materials should stop operating.

No, nothing of the sort. Instead, the citizens are requested by the politicians to go easy on the use of coal because Mr. Lewis and his miners might decide that they want to strike unless their demands are met. They are admonished to burn less fuel for fear there won't be any at all after the March 28 election.

All this, you understand, is strictly in accord with the law, for the system of having a union take a vote under the direction of the National War Labor Board before striking, is incorporated in the Smith-Connally Act.

John L. Lewis has done a lot for the miners who are members of his union, and in ordinary times this writer would be inclined to support the demands of the miners beyond ordinary limits, for surely coal mining is one of the most difficult jobs in the world, dangerous to health and usually underpaid.

UNION IMPROVED LOT

Without the work of the United Mine Workers the miners would still be working under some of the appalling conditions that used to prevail years ago. You can't get around that fact no matter how you try. Everything they have gained—and all of it was deserved—can be credited to the union.

They have had a long and persistent fight to improve their lot, and none of their successes have come easily. They will probably have to continue fighting in the future to gain some measurement of improvement. And good luck to them in the post-war future.

But when this spectacle of an election to decide whether or not the miners will interrupt the war production of the country unless they have their way is presented to the people, the depth of absurdity has been reached.

The union leaders assert that even if there is a war the rights of their members to strike still holds. They even go so far as to say that is what the American people are fighting for. They seem to be greatly impressed by their own argument that many, if not most of the miners, have sons or brothers in the fighting services and could therefore not possibly seek to damage the war effort.

Yet the people who were running night clubs and places of entertainment and their employees also have sons in the service and also have some rights, but the Government did not hesitate to tell them they must close up at midnight whether they liked it or not.

The Government did not hesitate to tell the race-track people to close and to order businessmen to give up their national conventions, and to order ordinary citizens to take less gasoline and house fuel in furtherance of the war effort.

HANDCUFFED NOW

But the Government seems completely handcuffed when it comes to dealing with the miners. All Government officials, or at least those who are responsible to the people, are opposed to strikes in the middle of the war effort.

President Roosevelt, at the time he vetoed the Smith-Connally Act and found it passed by Congress oved his veto, said: "I am unalterably opposed to strikes in wartime. I do not hesitate to use the powers of the Government to prevent them."

Yet here we find the Government making all the arrangements at the taxpayers' expense to conduct an election to see whether the miners will strike or not. The thing just doesn't make sense.

At the time of the above-mentioned veto, President Roosevelt cited particularly the provision for such an election as one of the chief reasons for his veto. He said that "far from discouraging strikes, the requirements for notice of a dispute's existence and a strike ballot would stimulate labor unrest and give Government sanction to strike agitations."

He was prophetic in that, for it has worked out in this case to give sanction to strike agitations. If the workers should decide in the balloting that they want to strike, they will have been supported by the Government, although almost everybody agrees that such a strike would be a terrific blow at the war effort.

PROBLEM NOT SOLVED

The whole matter of handling strikes during the war has been kicked around badly, but surely nothing quite as ridiculous as this situation has ever before turned up anywhere. There have been repeated no-strike pledges, yet the strikes have mounted up into the thousands.

But none of them has been promoted by the Government before. And in no instance has the public, which means millions of men and women who have sons and brothers facing death daily, been called upon to stand the expense of an election to see whether or not the war effort shall be crippled.

The whole thing is almost incredible, but there it is. And there apparently is nothing the citizens can do about it. They can wonder why, but they will get no answer. They can only stand amazed at the effort of the Government to force a group of New Bedford workers from one industry to another on the grounds that they are needed for vital production, and the same Government sponsoring an election to determine whether or not vital production shall stop entirely.

Letter of Merrill Woolen Mills Co., of Merrill, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MERRILL WOOLEN MILLS CO.,
Merrill, Wis., March 17, 1945.

Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Congressman, Tenth District,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ALVIN: Thanks much for the friendly interest you manifest in the recent application for Clicking machine priority and for your help with regard to this matter. We have for the time being dropped this and will subsequently refile as per your advice.

At this writing, we are completely overwhelmed and awe-stricken as well, over the mass of detail required for us to qualify to remain in business and comply with the joint orders of W. P. B. and O. P. A., affecting our industry and considered to roll back heavy outer woolen clothing prices by 20 percent for fall.

Chester Bowles, points out that this industry showed gross profits in 1936 to 1939 inclusive, of 2.2 percent on gross sales. In 1943, this industry he states shows profits of 11.2 percent on this same basis. This therefore is justifiable reason to reduce prices by 20 percent.

Has O. P. A. made any similar investigation as to what our Government is paying for their required war equipment? Have they investigated the war industries to determine what profits they made in 1943 doing business with Uncle Sam on needed war equipment? Have they asked for any roll-back in the cost of planes, of tanks, of guns, of trucks, of ammunition and all of this type of equipment?

In the first place, terms used in the orders we have are just about impossible to understand and impossible to comply with as outlined. What small business has the data and the records which enable them to cope with the information and data requested? What small business has a staff of attorneys, of legal counsel, of statisticians, that can understand and comply with the mass of detail they send a small concern such as ours?

They tell us how to compute direct costs of garments and in their instructions M. P. R. 572 we are told time-and-a-half labor is not and cannot be considered a cost as time alone must be taken. Why does one part of the Government pass a labor act making it mandatory to pay labor time and a half over 40 hours per week and another one come along and state this is not a direct cost of what is being produced? Why don't they get together and quit these conflicts and contradictory orders and regulations so a businessman may some time get to know where he is at in the conduct of business.

We have certain items in our business that today do not cost 100 percent more than they did a couple years ago but 300 percent more. Is this, then, an added cost of doing business? No; not according to O. P. A.

Items such as shipping costs, clerks, office, freight, taxes of all kinds, fuel, administrative costs, and all such items are not considered to be cost make-up items on these instructions.

Where is the money for these items to come from? We are asked to calculate our gross profit for 1943 and then to reduce that 20 percent for 1945. Does it take any stretch of the imagination for anyone not engaged in business to know that it costs more each and every year to conduct a business or have they some idea such costs are decreasing?

I have heard it repeated recently that every businessman in America violates the law 10 times every day in his conduct of business without even his own knowledge he is violating. Is that a situation to propound as one of merit or is it wrecking the nerves of men engaged in business all over America?

If it is the intent of our Government to use this war as the excuse to put every businessman out of business, why do they delay the day of hanging? Why not admit this to be the end and get it over with? If the New Dealers can operate business better than private business, why don't they prove that just a little in what they are undertaking?

I assure you that every businessman in my contacts is wondering what this is all about. Everywhere one hears them discuss the coming situation wondering what will be next detrimental to them. Small grocers, meat-market operators, and every type of business

are now being besieged with orders, regulations, checkers, enforcement officers, auditors, and what not delving into their daily operations, perpetrating that every man engaged in any kind of business is dishonest, is doing something wrong, is violating the law, and cannot otherwise be trusted to conduct his own little business. And to get this we are fighting a war, fighting to safeguard the "four freedoms," fighting to rid the world of oppressors, fighting to force upon the ignorant of the world the type of liberty we have enjoyed here which made this country the greatest Nation on earth. Where is there a businessman today that isn't sick of his business, that doesn't want to be a truck driver, or itch also to get on the Federal pay roll, which seems to be the ultimate design? I am conveying my feelings and those of countless thousands of other men engaged in small business, all of whom wonder what this is all about.

Yours very truly,

LYNDON B. EMERICH.

Wars Are Waged With Metals—Premiums Must Be Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the gentlemen my bill (H. R. 2660), for extending the life of certain subsidy programs, including the very vital production of critical and strategic metals and minerals desperately needed for the conduct of the war.

The Senate has just passed a similar bill, S. 502. One of the features of the Senate bill, and of mine, also, is a mandate that premiums for copper, lead, and zinc shall be continued until June 30, 1946—that is, for the fiscal year of 1946—and no authority has been granted to the agencies to cancel these premiums until the end of the fiscal year. They are permitted, however, to adjust premiums granted to individual mines so that such payments will be on an equitable basis.

My honorable colleague, Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, recently made a spirited exposition before this House of the enormous benefits conferred on our economy by the operation of the premium price plan. It is my recollection that he stated an expenditure of some $170,000,000 had resulted in an estimated saving of around $2,000,000,000.

As metals are the foundations of any war, a plan which will procure an adequate supply and at the same time save the Government and the public so much money must be meritorious.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a darker side to the matter. It is my belief that, while manufacturers and other war contractors have been and are being equitably dealt with, the agencies administering the premium price plan have set themselves up as arbiters over the very life and death of producers who, by reason of their dependence upon premiums, must take whatever the quota committee hands them. The margins allowed all too frequently are inadequate to permit reasonable returns on the investment and many producers whose mines will have to close at the termination of the premium price plan may never recover their wartime investment if the agencies are left in the saddle.

So seriously did the Senate consider this point that that body laid especial emphasis on a part of the bill which takes from the agencies their power to captiously close down 75 percent of America's non-ferrous mining industry by simple fiat.

The report of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on S. 502, to which my bill is the companion measure, states:

> It was felt (by the committee) that, without a specific authorization on a noncancelable basis, producers and employees alike would be unable to plan ahead, and this would react unfavorably upon production.

This is precisely my feeling and that of the vast majority of our producers. I am informed certain Government agency executives feel differently, but those men obviously speak with the Cabots and the Lodges of the mining industry and not with the common miner. Besides, many of the huge mining corporations have foreign properties and can make up their losses, if any, from their foreign investments.

The Senate committee also stated:

> As mining is dependent upon development work, and development work will only be done if there is a specific guaranty of reasonable prices for a reasonable time, permitting the rules of the premium price plan in this respect to be changeable or subject to cancelation at the will of the executive agencies would make it impossible for the mining industry, and particularly the small mines, to plan ahead on a definite basis.

The Senate also refused to guess when the war will end—a popular agency pastime—and said:

> It is not safe to discourage production in anticipation of the war ending prior to June 30, 1946.

Mr. Speaker, my great State of California has a vast resource of metals and minerals. We have produced energetically as and when the agencies called for them and under a wholly Government-controlled price system. The least that can be done is to offer a modicum of price security for a definite time, as the Senate pointed out forcefully. It is my belief that there is a resistance in the agencies responsible for the administration of the premium price plan to giving the mining industry this security, and that this resistance centers in the War Production Board, extraordinary to relate. One would think W. P. B. would be all out for production. This is its function, not to worry about the purse strings. That is a function of the Congress, although it is hard, sometimes, to get the executive agencies to appreciate that. In this case, for instance, it was clear the agencies expected Congress to sign a blank check and to announce the terms of the plan later.

But the Senate decided otherwise and so, I trust, will the House by adopting my bill or the Senate bill as it comes over with a proviso checking arbitrary and high-handed action on the part of the War Production Board.

Mr. Speaker, incidentally it might be a good idea for an appropriate committee of the House to take a good look at the Office of the Vice Chairman for Metals and Minerals. This is the policy-making group which eventually would decide, if left to its own devices and without congressional check, when premiums would be canceled. If it guesses no better than when it authorized the cancelation of the mercury and tungsten programs the first part of last year, this division is scarcely to be trusted.

As is common in the War Production Board and perhaps necessary, the office of the Metals and Minerals Vice Chairman is made up of men who never personally had to meet a pay roll in their lives, or struggled through the vicissitudes of making a small mine into a big mine. Some, in point of fact, have had little or nothing to do with mining. There are many fine, conscientious engineers in the division but whose experience principally has been that of hirelings of great mining trusts.

Mr. Speaker, I had occasion recently to inquire who heads the Office of the Vice Chairman for Metals and Minerals. It seems that Mr. Krug, in his wisdom, evidently believing that so highly a technical subject as producing the basic material for our war can be handled by any Tom, Dick, or Harry, has appointed a new vice chairman who is, I have not the slightest doubt, a fine and amiable gentleman whose qualifications and character are beyond reproach. But listen to this announcement I have just received from the War Production Board:

> Wednesday, February 28, 1945: "Appointment of William C. Keeley as consultant on production to the Chairman was announced today by the War Production Board. Mr. Keeley is vice president of the Air Reduction Co., Inc., New York City, with which company he has been associated for 24 years. Prior to that he was with General Motors Corporation. He is a resident of Fairfield, Conn."

Mr. Keeley actually has been made Vice Chairman for Metals and Minerals. Mr. Speaker, I ask the honorable gentlemen here, could anything be more ridiculous? As well put me in charge of a naval fleet. What bothers me is why a man with Mr. Keeley's qualifications would take such a job.

Before closing let us take a look at Mr. Keeley's deputy, Mr. James Douglas, a man reported to me to be of exceptional character and integrity, derived from an old and wealthy mining family, but who, as far as I can discover, has had little or no practical experience which would qualify him for what, in view of Mr. Keeley's lack of qualifications, amounts to the dictatorship of our Metals and Minerals program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for Congress to listen to the voice of industry, firmly make up its mind what is the proper and beneficial thing to do for the Nation, and firmly tell the executive agencies what they are expected to do. It is my earnest hope that our Committee on Banking and Currency will concur with the Senate in placing in the law the limitations upon the agencies I mentioned at the first part of my address.

Distrust in Military Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think a lot of people in the War Department are wondering right now whether Americans have lost their patriotism. The armed forces have been singularly disappointed in the small number of nurses who have volunteered, even though the urgency of the situation has been published in every conceivable manner.

I believe that the Army's chickens are finally coming home to roost. If my services were requested in the armed forces, and I was assured in official black and white that I would be commissioned shortly after enlistment, I would have to be governed by the knowledge that I could place no faith whatsoever in any of this recruiting propaganda.

The 12,335 men who enlisted in the War Training Service had solemn, official assurances—not once but many times—that they had an opportunity to qualify for commissions. They made untold sacrifices of time, money, and other opportunities, on the basis of those assurances; they fulfilled their share of the agreement in every respect. Yet the Army welshed on these assurances and gave those men the most shameful kicking around I have ever seen as a reward for their patriotism and sacrifice.

How can you expect people to rush to the colors the moment some general sounds an alarm? How can they know that they will not be swindled, degraded, humiliated, and financially ruined for their pains?

Congress has stood by and allowed the integrity of the United States Government to be compromised. More than a year has passed since the W. T. S. program was closed and its men thrown into the discard. Oh, there have been murmurs of objection in Congress, but the Army has its lobbyists, and all they had to do was whisper "Military necessity" and promptly all heads nodded wisely. Of course, the men are unfortunate, they say, but anyone who is not exactly bleeding and dying on the battle front has not any right to complain.

Well, that is all right—until you stop to consider what we are fighting for in the first place. It is not uncommon for man to love honor more than life itself. And if a man is wronged and humiliated to the point where he is distrustful of his own government, cynical of humanity and life itself, who is there to say that he is more fortunate than one who loses his life in battle?

The men of the War Training Service are suffering as a result of one of the most foolish, prodigal wastes of manpower yet to come to my attention. After hundreds of millions of dollars had been spent on their training—after they had endured many hardships in training on practically no pay at all for twice the period they should have been in training—they were washed out, for no other reason, it seems to me, than to make room for a group of smart society girls in uniforms tailored on Fifth Avenue.

The Army Air Forces did not already have too many noncombat pilots. They said so themselves in trying to put over the WASPS.

The Army Air Forces did not need these men in other capacities for which women are not suited, because they went right ahead and put them in activities where women are engaged. At first they did not know, apparently, what to do with them at all. It seems that the main idea was to get them out of the way.

I consider it imperative that we inquire into these things—even more so now when the whip is being cracked at the American people by the various agencies demanding manpower legislation.

Why is it that such a splendid group of men never had a chance? Why is it that destiny marked them for failure almost from the start? Why is it that the Army's well-oiled propaganda machine, which employs thousands of men to ballyhoo the various branches of service, never told the public about this deserving group of pilots? Why has the amazingly low accident and fatality record of the War Training Service been played down?

It adds up to this: The Army Air Forces have had manpower allotted to them lavishly and have used it the same way. In spite of General Arnold's statement that they have attempted to put square pegs in square holes and round pegs in round holes wherever possible, they have made KP's, radio mechanics, gunners, and flunkies out of seasoned airplane pilots and tried to make airplane pilots out of waitresses, beauticians, and society girls, at one and the same time.

They have got large numbers of men employed in "public relations"; they have men enough to put a variety of radio programs on the networks; they are in the vaudeville business; they can operate a call-for-and-deliver service for dogs. Still the armed forces are so badly in need of manpower that essential farm labor is being drafted at a time when we face unprecedented shortages of food.

Throughout the war Congress has had to act as a governor on the military machine. It has been our job to analyze and control, to some extent to act as arbiters between the needs of the civilian economy and the demands of the war effort. By helping to maintain a semblance of balance, we have been able to see the United States in a position of unequaled military strength. If we allow any agency to run hog wild, we tend to destroy that balance and the war effort suffers as a result.

In the case of the War Training Service men, as in any other case, the United States should be big enough, honorable enough, to conduct its business without welshing on its promises. If we treat men as these men have been treated, we suffer with them. Their disillusionment, distrust, and cynicism spread through the rest of the armed forces and into the civilian population, and you have Government in the position of creating its own "fifth column."

The trainees and instructors of the War Training Service have been victimized in a "heads I win, tails you lose" game. Every throw has been stacked against them. It is time they got a decent break.

Let us have some action on this and let us have action in the resolve that these men shall for once be given the benefit of any doubts that may arise.

They deserve it.

The Perfectionists and the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended to me, I wish to call the attention of the House to an editorial, appearing in the March 13, 1945, edition of the Seattle Times. While I do not agree with the editorial in every respect, this opinion of one of the outstanding newspapers on the Pacific coast and a leading organ of conservative opinion, is worth the attention of every Member of Congress.

I believe that our future peace is not so greatly threatened today by isolationists, as by perfectionists—those who want to dot every "i" and cross every "t". We cannot expect to find in Dumbarton Oaks or in the conference which is soon to open in San Francisco the whole answer to all the problems of securing the peace.

Just as our own Constitution was the result of compromise between conflicting points of view, so will be any charter of world peace. If we ask perfection now, if we seek to enforce our own particular and perfectionist point of view today against other prevailing views, then we shall surely have no organization of United Nations and we shall have no peace.

Much has been said by some of our perfectionists about the little nations. America's heart is a big heart and we are always impressed by the need to aid the weak or the oppressed. It is good that this is so. Little nations, even when they have been wrong, have had our sympathy.

There are some today who would play upon this deep sympathy and our own democratic traditions of protecting the weak, to redefine our attitude toward Dumbarton Oaks. These perfectionists are every bit as dangerous to us and to our future as are the most outspoken isolationists. Perhaps they are even more dangerous since their own righteousness intrigues us, and their own seeking for perfection catches our ear. Therefore, I believe the Seattle Times has made a considerable contribution to our thinking with the following editorial:

GOOD FAITH STILL THE BASIS OF HOPE FOR LASTING PEACE

Sir William Beveridge says the voting procedure in the proposed world peace or-

ganization, agreed on by the Big Three at Yalta, will provide "a short way to the Third World War." It will, he says, put the five permanent members of the Security Council above the law, which all other nations are expected to observe, and so drive those nations into separate alliances and spheres of influence.

In the general assembly of the proposed organization, each member nation, of whatever size, is to have 1 vote. The only question here is whether or not the British are to have 1 vote for each of their 5 major "nations," and the Soviet Union 1 vote for each of its 22 autonomous republics. Lesser states may well object to multiple voting by Britain and Russia.

But the peace organization must have leadership; and if any good results are to be achieved, leadership must be stabilized and dependable. That is why the Dumbarton Oaks planners would give permanent council seats to the five greater powers—the only powers capable of enforcing the "law" for themselves and for all concerned. To have leadership subject to change by shifting coalitions of small nations would mean utter confusion.

The member nations of the general assembly would have opportunity, every 2 years, to elect six of their number to the Security Council. That would be a majority of one over the five permanent council members. The permanent members could take no radical action, no extreme step, without the votes of at least two of the elective members. To that extent, which seems fairly sufficient, the smaller nations of the general assembly would influence and control the big fellows.

In recalling attention to such details of the Dumbarton Oaks plan, we do not necessarily subscribe to the opinion of enthusiasts that it is perfect in all respects. Actual and painful experiences cannot be forgotten. The League of Nations consisted of Council and Assembly. There were five permanent and nine elective seats in the Council. Twelve years ago the permanent Council members were France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, and Italy. No present need to recount ensuing events.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference did not produce an altogether new plan. The Covenant of the League of Nations provided the model. The plan now offered is freshly inspired and more firmly shaped. There can be no contention that the organization would be better guided under the leadership of five little nations.

Just as with the old League, success depends upon the good faith and continuing cooperation of the greater powers. Should they fall apart, the new league, whatever its name may be, will survive stress no better than the old. No coalition of lesser states could avert collapse.

The outcry for more power for the little nations, such as that voiced by Sir William Beveridge, is superficial and prejudicial. The world's hope for lasting peace can be fostered toward fulfillment only by a combination of nations strong enough to restrain themselves, while exercising salutary restraint of others.

A Telegram to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram to the President:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Poland, the first Allied belligerent in this war, will not be represented at the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. She will not participate in the conference, because the legal Polish Government, recognized as such for 5 years by the United States, Great Britain, and all other nations with the exception of Germany and Russia, is not invited. This is a tragic scandal almost unprecedented in diplomatic history, and yet it would be even worse to have Poland misrepresented at San Francisco by a government without any mandate from the Polish people, as some have proposed.

Any government that may be created by the commission in Moscow, headed by Mr. Molotov who signed the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, will not be recognized by the Polish people or by the friends of Poland throughout the world as anything more than an instrument of foreign powers, especially of the Soviet Government. The declaration of March 9 issued by our general organization, the American Polish Congress, stresses this beyond any doubt, and it is an expression of the views of the whole 6,000,000 community of Americans of Polish descent.

You and your colleagues, Mr. President, have promised a free election in Poland, and we welcome that promise. But we note with sadness that there is no possibility of such an election being held in time for the San Francisco Conference. There can be no free election in Poland as long as there is not even personal safety for the heroic leaders of the 5-year resistance to Nazi domination. The tragic conditions prevailing in Poland today have been revealed not only by the Polish underground, whose reports of German atrocities were always believed and always confirmed, but by members of the British Government, who have confirmed some of the terrible facts themselves in the House of Commons.

Because America at the Yalta Conference assumed coresponsibility for conditions in Poland our national honor is involved by every violation of civil liberty and human rights. We shall have the honor to submit a special memorandum to you giving the facts in our possession in which we make specific recommendations as to the only way America's promises can be carried out.

But it is already clear that in view of the absence of even elementary freedom in Poland, including freedom from fear, any such election held now before the conference would be a mockery.

We therefore respectfully suggest another method by which this injustice can at least be mitigated. Since Poland herself is not free to speak at San Francisco it is in America—not in Russia—that those can be found who have some right to speak for her.

We therefore appeal to you, Mr. President, to make it possible for the American Polish community to help the cause of Poland by choosing one or more of our number as observers to be attached to the American delegation at San Francisco. The presence of such observers would not only serve to reassure the hard-pressed Polish people that their interests would not be entirely forgotten at the conference, but it would convince the entire democratic world that the charter member of the United Nations would neither be utterly disregarded nor misrepresented at San Francisco.

There are many special reasons which justify such a request. It was in America that Poland was reborn during the last war, and it was your own great leader, Woodrow Wilson, who first proclaimed her rebirth in his Fourteen Points. It was his administration, of which you were a leading member, which implemented that promise by enlisting American Poles in the effort to reestablish Polish freedom.

In order to help create an independent Poland, a Polish army was raised in America with the full support and consent of the United States Government. Tens of thousands of Americans of Polish descent answered the call to volunteer. They fought and died for Polish independence, their bodies scattered on all the battlefields of the western front. So the Polish-American community invested not only their money but their blood for the re-creation of Poland in harmony with President Wilson's ideals.

Mr. Wilson's heritage was handed on to you, Mr. President, and it was presented to humanity in the Atlantic Charter as America's aims in this war for which our sons are fighting and dying on all the battlefronts of the world. As Americans of Polish descent who carry the responsibility for preserving the heritage of our father who fought in the last war and of our sons and brothers who are fighting now, we feel endowed with the moral right to have a voice in the settlements where Poland's existence is concerned. Since the legitimate Polish Government is not allowed to officially speak for her at San Francisco, let Americans of Polish descent at least be present as official observers.

For although the San Francisco Conference will not technically be concerned with the details of the Polish settlement it is concerned with the establishment of the international organization on which the future peace not only for America but for Poland will depend. The conditions in Poland today are sowing the seeds of future war so Poland's fate intimately concerns and may even determine the fate of the organization you hope to establish in San Francisco.

Respectfully yours,

COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN POLISH ASSOCIATIONS IN THE EAST,
JOS. S. KASZUBOWSKI, *President.*
REV. A. A. SKONIECKI,
Executive Secretary.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Guy Taylor Post, American Legion, of Albany, Tex.

This resolution explains the attitude and the feeling of the American Legion in general in regard to universal military training, which I understand will be submitted sometime in the near future by resolution known as the May bill. The resolution of the American Legion post is as follows:

Whereas the American Legion has for 25 years diligently and consistently petitioned the Congress of the United States to pass a law requiring universal military training for the protection and security of the Government and people; and

Whereas veterans of World War No. 1 are thoroughly convinced that universal military training is absolutely necessary to prevent future wars involving the Government of the United States, this conviction being shared by a large majority of veterans of World War No. 2, as indicated by a Gallup poll and personal opinions of returned veterans; and

Whereas the failure of Congress, following World War No. 1, to pass laws requiring necessary and adequate preparedness has proven to be a catastrophe of astronomical expenditure of lifeblood and material that we could ill afford: Therefore be it

Resolved, That members of Guy Taylor Post, No. 61, Department of Texas, American Legion, do hereby sincerely request and seriously urge the Congress of the United States Government to pass the universal military training program as submitted by the American Legion, as a measure of safety and means of preparedness against another world war in which we will surely be involved; be it further

Resolved, That all appeals, requests, and petitions made by isolationists and pacifists are repulsive to American patriots, destructive to the lives and property of American citizens and detrimental to the cause of peace and security of the Government and people; be it further

Resolved, That it is the sacred duty of Congress, insofar as possible, to secure the Government and people from war, and adequately prepare them against invasion or aggression by hostile governments; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator TOM CONNALLY, Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, Representative SAM RUSSELL, a copy to the press, and a copy reserved for the minutes of this post.

The above resolution passed unanimously by a large membership at regular meeting, March 1, 1945.

F. D. R. the Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, in the past there have been many comments by the Members of the House relative to the attitude of the press and radio commentators pertaining to the support and, in some instances, lack of support of the war program.

I am presenting the following comments published as an editorial in the San Bernardino Daily Sun, date lined Wednesday, February 28, 1945. The San Bernardino Sun is not an administration newspaper but, in my opinion, this editorial is one of the finest statements of fact I have had the pleasure of reading in a long time and I am presenting it to the Members of the House in order that they may have an opportunity to observe some newspapers in this country, although they are not administration-minded, are still capable of presenting to the people whom they serve a realistic picture of national interest that I think is most splendid.

F. D. R., THE LEADER

We listened the other night to a couple of radio commentators shriek to high heaven regarding phases of the American foreign policy that is now unfolding. The United States, so they charged, is coercing a group of small and defenseless nations to declare war on Germany. They implied Uncle Sam was using a club in the shape of a threat not to permit the small nations, including several in the Western Hemisphere, to participate in the San Francisco Conference and in the world league of tomorrow.

These same commentators 5 months ago were extravagant in their support of Franklin D. Roosevelt for President. Yet it is Mr. Roosevelt who is responsible for whatever may or may not have been said to the small nations of this hemisphere.

It is time for orderly thinking in this business of a foreign policy. Last fall the people of this country split up, chose their leaders, and went to the polls. The results were clear—this Nation elected to follow a course of leadership in world affairs. The time for recriminations over that issue has passed. Certainly those who followed Mr. Roosevelt last November must, by any sensible rule of public thinking, now lend him support in the course of world action which he clearly indicated last fall he intended to follow if elected. And we think the rest of us also have that obligation.

The people of this country certainly instructed Mr. Roosevelt to sit down with Messrs. Churchill and Stalin and formulate the best program he could for the creation of a world organization charged with the responsibility of preventing war and establishing justice for all nations, large and small.

To refuse to follow a leadership that undertakes such a global program is dangerous business. Mr. Roosevelt, with a mandate from the people of his Nation, had the right to make commitments. We think he errs in not making public the details of what is proposed, but nevertheless the people accepted his leadership and gave him specific authority to proceed with his foreign policy platform.

This Nation must have a foreign policy. It must be a policy to which the large majority of the people subscribe; otherwise it cannot be continuous and without continuity in our attitude toward world affairs there would be chaos ahead.

Mr. Roosevelt's leadership is the only leadership in foreign affairs. The opposition is without any plan of its own and is composed exclusively of dissenters who show no signs of agreeing among themselves.

We have no hope that the peace that will be written will be a perfect peace; that justice will be done to all peoples. Nevertheless, there has to be a peace, and we think Mr. Roosevelt will get the peace with the highest ideals that he can get. This criticism that Mr. Roosevelt lets the foreigns tell him what to do is distressing. Mr. Roosevelt could not, if he wanted to, dictate the thinking of all the conflicting interests in this world. He has to yield here and there if the greater cause of a world organization empowered to enforce peace and justice is to come out of this war.

Yet the two commentators to whom we referred at the opening of these editorial comments were boldly intimating that the President of the United States did only what "the foreigners" told him to do. And yet they did their bit to secure his reelection.

It is well known to all commentators that it is much easier to criticize a public leader than to defend him. The mob likes that kind of stuff. We respectfully suggest, however, that the interests of this Nation call for united support for Mr. Roosevelt in the field of foreign policy. He has little more to gain in this vale of tears than a place in history. To go down in history as a really great man he must do his share in world leadership to devise the kind of a world organization that can enforce justice for all peoples. Obviously that is what he is trying to do.

For those who desire to attract attention to themselves as dissenters there is the wide-open field of domestic politics. In that field the President is vulnerable in a dozen spots.

But in the field of international relations wise Americans will accept the leadership of the President, for if this Nation's leadership again fails in world affairs there can be no hope for the future. This world, including the United States of America, could not survive another world war.

Mr. Roosevelt is doing his part of the big job; the rest of us should at least do what we can to lighten the burden of his task.

Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

"WHERE THERE IS NO VISION THE PEOPLE PERISH."—PROVERBS: TWENTY-NINTH CHAPTER, EIGHTEENTH VERSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1945, the House had under consideration the separation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from the Department of Commerce. By a combination of circumstances, the confirmation of Mr. Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of the Department of Commerce depended on the passage of the George bill, Senate 375. The discussion of the merits of the bill was negligible. Those who opposed the bill attacked Mr. Wallace with a venom which I can only describe as fanatical. The bill was passed however, and Mr. Wallace has recently been confirmed as Secretary of the Department of Commerce. I am confident that he will do an outstanding piece of work in this position. His stature will increase in the critical years that lie ahead. In my speech of February 16 I showed where Mr. Wallace laid down a blueprint for the future.

Control of Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include an article from the Accounting Review, by Eric Lewis Kohler, a noted economist who has had wide experience in both Government and private accounting:

EXPENDITURE CONTROLS IN THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

(By E. L. Kohler)

PREPARATION OF ESTIMATES

Estimates of future expenditures originate annually within each spending agency. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 provides for the appointment by the head of each agency of a Budget officer who prepares such estimates, and the Bureau of the Budget each year issues regulations governing their form and content. For the old-line establish-

ments, the estimates for the fiscal year 1946 must be in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget by September 15, 1944; the war agencies, including the War and Navy Departments, will submit summary estimates on December 15, 1944, and detailed estimates, which will naturally differ in total from the preliminary figures, on March 15, 1945.

No uniformity exists among Government agencies as to the method followed by Budget officers in obtaining future estimates. Only the general content of the estimates presented to the Bureau of the Budget is prescribed. This consists of four items: a brief one- or two-page letter of transmittal which summarizes the agency's estimates; a proposed appropriation bill covering the estimates; a detailed list of jobs the total of which agrees with the labor cost appearing in the summary, a total of each of the other objects of expenditure such as travel and office supplies, and a functional recapitulation, if obtainable; and finally, a narrative describing the proposed expenditures, with particular emphasis upon changes in expenditures.

* * * * *

REVIEW BY THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Since 1939 the Bureau of the Budget has been an independent agency which has acted as a direct aid to the President in the preparation of the annual Budget called for by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921; it also aids him in other ways. To obtain the annual Budget it combines the estimates of the various agencies after their approval by the Estimates Division and the Bureau's top staff.

The Estimates Division consists of groups of specialists who follow the work programs of the agencies assigned to them, and the agencies in the preparation of their annual estimates, and advise with them during the year on any major problem that may affect the original work plan or the amount or nature of the expenditures authorized in appropriation acts. These specialists, after their review of formally prepared agency estimates, conduct hearings attended by agency heads and their assistants, thus obtaining a more accurate picture of prospective activities. The presentation of the agency's case follows whatever pattern the agency head may determine, and the hearings, which for the larger agencies may require several weeks, are informal. Additional information is frequently asked for, and a number of proposed activities may be eliminated. At the same time the opportunity is offered for policy discussions and clearance at a time and under conditions that cause the least embarrassment to the agency and its staff.

* * * * *

ACTION BY CONGRESS

Relations between the Congress and the spending agencies are maintained through standing committees and Appropriations Committees. The former exist only for the old-line establishments; war agencies have derived their authority largely from delegations of wartime powers conferred on the President by congressional acts. In general, the separation of authorization from appropriation has become a well-established working plan within the Congress. Appropriation bills of the old-line agencies are filled with parenthetical references to enabling statutes, and Members of both Houses are insistent on the omission from appropriation acts of legislation creating new powers or jurisdictions.

There is but one Appropriations Committee in each House, with, however, numerous subcommittees to which specific agencies are assigned and a deficiency subcommittee made up of other subcommittee chairmen. Assisting the committee are a clerk and a number of assistant clerks. By custom, appropriation bills are first considered by the House of Representatives, and it is there that they receive their principal review. Hearings are held by the Appropriations Committee of each House, but before the Senate committee they are usually limited to situations in which an agency is dissatisfied with the cuts which the House committee has made in the agency's proposals. The Senate as a rule acts on the basis of its consideration of the House bill, the agency justification, the transcript of the House hearings and the House report.

* * * * *

The spending power of the agencies has been curtailed by the adoption of numerous controls, the principal ones being:

1. Most appropriations extend over a single fiscal year. Obligations authorized must therefore be made within a relatively short period; to continue operations thereafter, the agency and its program must be again reviewed by the Appropriations Committee before the end of the period. Occasionally appropriations unspent at the end of a fiscal year do not lapse but, as in the case of current War and Navy appropriations, they may continue over a period not exceeding 2 years. A variant of this last procedure is found in contract authorizations, whereby a specific sum is named in an appropriation measure permitting the initiation of commitments in the current year and their payment in a subsequent year.

2. The House Appropriations Committee will consider no request for an appropriation that has not first cleared the Bureau of the Budget. This conforms to the indirect requirement of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 that "no request for an appropriation * * * shall be submitted to Congress or any committee thereof by any officer or employee * * * except on the request of either House of Congress." (NOTE.—This investigatory procedure has described it at length in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 89, p. 10994. Exposition of the safeguards that should accompany legislative investigations of executive agencies is both able and forthright.)

3. Independent investigations of spending agencies are made by the House Appropriations Committee whenever a subcommittee wishes further information. For this purpose experts from other agencies, employed under ingenious conditions which have been established by the committee to keep them away from politically-minded members, study the problems assigned to them, interview agency representatives, review procedures, and make independent reports to the committee, thereafter returning to the agency from which they were borrowed.

4. Limitations of various kinds may appear in appropriation legislation; some of them are inserted by the Bureau of the Budget, but the bulk of them have originated at one time or another in the House Appropriations Committee. Although the Federal system of appropriations is commonly referred to as a lump-sum-appropriation system, the effect of the various forms of limitations, particularly in recent years, has been to create a hybrid which approaches the detailed-appropriation plan of some States and many municipal bodies. A common limitation is the top figure set for certain types of expenditure within an appropriation. For example, the Securities and Exchange Commission is allowed to spend $4,651,704 during the current fiscal year, of which an allotment is made "not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of newspapers"; in addition to the total sum indicated it is permitted to spend $45,000 "for all printing and binding"; no other monetary amounts appear in the S. E. C.'s appropriation act.

Many of these monetary limitations are lost in history. Others, of comparatively recent origin, have been occasioned by agency abuses—at least the Congress has so regarded them—of unqualified spending privileges. Other monetary limitations which creep into the appropriations of various agencies relate to such items as travel, attendance at conventions, the purchase of automobiles, and the employment of consultants: particularly in instances in which the agency itself has, in the eyes of Congress, been at fault.

Limitations of a qualitative character appear everywhere in appropriation acts. The appropriation act covering the Department of Agriculture is a document of 45 pages, lump-sum amounts appear for more than 40 heterogeneous suborganizations, and there are more than 200 express limitations on various objects of expenditure. Most of the act is, however, a definition of the particular scope of activity which may be followed during te current year by the various suborganizations.

5. During hearings before the House Appropriations subcommittees, administrators have frequently been warned by committee members regarding the modification of practices followed by the agency. The impression may have been gained that certain activities or expenditures were contrary to congressional intent. The warnings may be no more than adjurations, but they are often regarded by the agency head as restricting his actions. The same may be said of formal committee statements which accompany the appropriation measures when they are reported back to the House or Senate. A committee cut in an appropriation request may be ascribed in a report to a particular item, but if the language of the act does not expressly prohibit, the agency is free to apply the cut to some other item; although if it does it may face a hostile subcommittee in the year following.

6. Interim contacts are a further source of congressional control over individual agencies. These contacts are of two types—voluntary from the point of view of the agency, or involuntary. The voluntary contact arises if a change in an agency's program is brought about by circumstances that could not be foreseen at the time when its future budget was under consideration, or if it finds it has underestimated its future financial requirements and now seeks what is known as a deficiency appropriation in order to carry through the year. At deficiency hearings, the progress to date of the agency's program or a section of it is commonly reviewed. The involuntary review may be made by one of the standing committees or by the Appropriations Committee, and is usually occasioned by criticisms of the agency's program.

When a large degree of policy making must be delegated to an agency or when a none-too-certain policy has just been created by the Congress, there has not infrequently been an agitation for congressional representation in the controlling group. Most Congressmen, however, appear to doubt the constitutionality of such a procedure and are afraid of the consequences that would arise from saddling administrative responsibilities on already overworked Senators and Representatives.

On the whole, the work by congressional committees on the affairs of agencies seems to outsiders to be as intelligent and well done as time permits, even though clouded on occasion by the public comments of individual Congressmen whose attempts at intervention in agency administration have been unsuccessful. Party differences have little effect on agency operations—a fact probably insufficiently appreciated outside of Washington. The lay criticism of agency activities, which has so often resulted in better administration of the Government's work program, has been one of the chief contributions by the Congress in the war of controls over administrative practices.

Telegram to the Members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from Joseph S. Kaszubowski, president, and Rev. A. A. Skoniecki, executive secretary, Coordinating Committee of American Polish Associations in the East:

After 5 years of indomitable struggle on our side as the first nation to fight Hitler, the Yalta agreements deprived Poland of 47 percent of her pre-war territory, one-third of her population, and 85 percent of her oil and natural gas. These sacrifices were imposed on the Polish people and the Polish Government without their consultation or consent.

Eleven million Polish citizens, most of them Catholics, were transferred to the jurisdiction of a totalitarian power without opportunity to vote on their own fate, in direct violation of the Atlantic Charter to which the honor of all the United Nations has been pledged.

As so-called compensation for these sacrifices and injustices Poland was offered the doubtful assets of hostile territory which may sow the seeds of future war; and the Polish people were promised their total freedom in what remains of Poland.

We charge that even that promise is not being kept.

The Polish Government in London has been informed through the Polish underground, whose reports of Nazi atrocities were tragically confirmed, that persecution is continuing in Poland under Russian occupation, even since the Yalta Conference. Some of these revelations were published in the New York Times of February 21. Others have been revealed since and their authenticity has been verified in the British Government.

On February 21 the Polish underground reported that deportations to Russia continue on a vast scale; that five permanent and several temporary concentration camps were opened by Russia for members of the home army and underground movement because there was no room in prison for all those arrested; that by October 10, 21,000 Poles had been arrested in the Lublin area alone.

These charges were confirmed by the British Government on February 20 when the Under Secretary of the Foreign Office, G. H. Hall, said in the House of Commons: "The British Government attaches great importance to the freeing by the Soviet Union of all members of the Polish underground and Army who fought against the Germans."

On March 1 the Polish Government announced that the wife of Premier Tomasz Arciszewski had been arrested by the N. K. V. D., Russian political police, on February 20, long after the Yalta Conference. She was working as an officer of the Polish Red Cross, and other Red Cross officers were arrested with her.

On March 7 Anthony Eden confirmed the truth of this charge in the House of Commons, reporting that Russia had promised to free Madam Arciszewski under pressure from the British Government, but saying nothing of the others arrested. Eden further confirmed the terrible conditions by calling on the Lublin Government to end persecution in Poland.

These facts are a challenge to the defense of the Yalta agreements by Mr. Churchill and by the President in his speech to Congress. They are a challenge to the American Congress because of the promises we have made to Poland.

The systematic war of extermination against the Polish underground, against all who led the Polish people in their 5 years' death struggle with Hitler goes on under a new guise. Hitler sought to destroy the Polish nation by killing all its educated democratic leaders because only a leaderless people can be enslaved. The Communist totalitarians now carry on where the Nazis left off.

As long as there is not even elementary personal security in Poland it is a mockery for the President and Mr. Churchill to speak of free elections. No one can dare speak of a free election if the heroes of the underground are treated as criminals; if there is no freedom of the press or assembly; if Russia, a totalitarian power, occupies Poland alone; if the 200,000 soldiers of the Polish Army who fought for our side on most of the bloodiest battlefields of this war are not allowed to vote; and if the millions of Poles deported to Germany or Russia are not returned.

A free election demands more than a secret ballot. It demands freedom to campaign, to organize parties, to nominate candidates, and to do all this without fear of reprisals. Above all, it demands freedom from fear. But none of these freedoms exist in Poland today.

At Yalta the American Government assumed coresponsibility for conditions in Poland; therefore we, too, are responsible for every violation of civil liberty and human rights which occurs in Poland today. We have made promises to the Polish people without securing the power to carry them out. It is the duty of the Congress to demand either that we are given that power or that we repudiate our responsibility before the world for what is done in Poland, partly in our name.

Unless American officials, social workers, and newspapermen can go to Poland now in sufficient numbers and with sufficient freedom to supervise conditions in the whole of Poland, our promises cannot be kept. We therefore call on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to fulfill its responsibility by calling a hearing on the situation in Poland. We request the right to appear before such a hearing where we will supply evidence to support every one of the statements in this telegram to help the committee in its decisions.

Veterans Hospital at Saratoga Springs, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in placing the following resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Resolution 44

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of Saratoga County, N. Y., hereby expresses its approval of the proposed erection by the Federal Government of a veterans' hospital at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., and urges its representatives in the Federal Government to take appropriate action to bring about the commencement of this project in the immediate future, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded by the clerk of this board to United States Senators WAGNER and MEAD, and Congressman DEAN TAYLOR.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Saratoga, ss:

I, George I. Yost, clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Saratoga County, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy, and the whole thereof, of a resolution duly adopted by the board of supervisors of said county, on the 12th day of March 1945.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed hereto the official seal of said board of supervisors, this 13th day of March 1945.

GEORGE I. YOST,
Clerk, Board of Supervisors,
Saratoga County.

This action on the part of the Board of Supervisors of Saratoga County, N. Y., in memorializing the representatives of the Federal Government to take appropriate and immediate action for the erection of a veterans' facility is indicative of the spirit that has followed the demand for a Federal hospital in Saratoga by the chamber of commerce, religious, civic, political, and social organizations, the Saratogian, and many individuals in the community.

As the Representative in Congress from the district embracing the County of Saratoga, I shall, in deference to the wishes of the community, continue my efforts toward the erection of a veterans' facility at Saratoga Springs.

The Pending Mexican Treaty Should Not Be Ratified Without Reservations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, at a time when such friendly and cooperative disposition exists between the United States and our neighbor of the South, it is unfortunate that the proposed Mexican treaty now pending in the Senate should have some unwarranted provisions which violate good governmental practice.

In my judgment this treaty should not be ratified as it stands. It should be adopted with reservations to correct these undesirable provisions, or referred for further negotiation to provide for their elimination. These provisions could be eliminated from the treaty without impairing the just rights of either of the two nations..

There are two fundamental objectionable phases of the treaty to which I call attention.

TREATY VIOLATES PRIOR OBLIGATIONS OF GOVERNMENT

The first is that the treaty, in violation of rights heretofore established in favor of the water users of the Colorado River project, transfers water rights and confers ownership in water and reservoirs

which now belong solely to the United States and its citizens.

The Colorado River project was established by law by a compact between the watershed States, approved by Congress, and by contracts with the Federal Government. It provides for the long-time allotment and use of the water of the Colorado River; and that all the waters impounded in Boulder Dam should be for exclusive use within the United States. The rights of the basin States to the use of that water are protected for the future with a clear recognition that the immediate consumptive use of the waters of the river was impossible and that the rights should be reserved and available for an orderly future development.

By the Colorado River compact, definite assurance was given to the upper and lower basins of proportional allotments for all time to come. The delivery of 7,500,000 acre-feet per year, on a basis of the average annual delivery of that quantity over 10-year periods, was assured the lower basin.

On the assurance of these provisions, water users in the lower basin entered into contracts with the United States in advance of any construction by the Government by which the repayment of the costs to the Government were assured.

On the faith of these assurances, the people of the lower basin obligated themselves to pay for waterworks and supply facilities, to transport such water to the places of use, to the extent of over $500,000,000 up to this time.

The treaty now comes into the situation and proposes to guarantee Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet per year. This amount is specifically guaranteed, notwithstanding prior committal to the lower basin, and is not based upon a 10-year average but requires this delivery every year.

In other words, notwithstanding the committal of the Government to the lower basin, the treaty comes along and gives a prior right out of those waters to Mexico.

The flow of the Colorado River greatly varies from year to year; sometimes an extreme deficiency of water covers several years. The object of the Boulder Canyon project and of the contemplated future developments on the Colorado River is to provide a storage that will reach over these years of deficient supply. The 10-year average provision is intended to assure, so far as is possible, this stabilized supply for use in the lower basin.

The provision to satisfy the annual demands of Mexico on a priority basis each year impairs the ability of the Government to keep its promises to the lower basin.

Prior to Boulder Dam, Mexico had applied to beneficial use not exceeding 750,000 acre-feet of water per year. This right was greatly impaired for the lack of any storage reservoirs and a great deficiency of the stream flow in some years.

It may be conceded that Mexico might properly expect a supply of water equal to her established uses from the normal flow of the river before Boulder Dam was constructed. If it be conceded that she should be given enlarged rights to use the waters of the Colorado, nevertheless provisions for such additional supply should be consistent with the obligations heretofore assumed by our Government to the people of our own country.

It violates good morals and good governmental practice for the Government to make a contract for the delivery of water to its citizens, and after they have acted upon that assumption by incurring obligations exceeding $500,000,000, to come along and give prior rights in the same waters to other users, either of our own or of Mexico. This subordinates the rights of existing users to these newly granted rights and thus impairs the ability of the Government to perform its obligation to existing users.

Under these circumstances, any provision for additional waters for Mexico should be consistent with prior engagements of our Government with American users. The water should be supplied to Mexico only out of quantities available after prior obligations to American users are fulfilled.

Water is the very life blood of our Colorado River Basin areas. Their development is limited by the ultimate water supply. Even under this vital importance of water, we might properly share with Mexico waters, if any, which time may prove available in excess of those now obligated.

EXTREME GRANT OF POWER TO COMMISSION

The second fundamental objection to the treaty, as I see it, is the extreme extent to which it goes in apparent abrogation of the ordinary functions of Congress and its normal control over administrative agencies. Powers are conferred upon a single Commissioner, subject only to the approval of the Secretary of State, to incur obligations against the Federal Government, acquire title to land; to construct, control and operate water, flood control, storage and hydroelectric projects, and confer on other nations joint ownership therein.

Apparently the only restraint provided against the abuse of these powers is the necessity of appropriations by Congress to carry out agreements made by the Commissioner. Such a remedy, however, cannot be applied without congressional repudiation of the solemn treaty obligations here proposed.

The Commission is, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, authorized to settle all disputes that may arise between the two nations and to interpret any provisions of the treaty which may be called in question, and this without any specific authority or approval of Congress and without the protective power that lies in a review of its decisions by the courts.

In practical effect, the ratification of this treaty as it stands would give this Commissioner in the name of our Government, and subject only to the approval of the Secretary of State, an irrevocable power of attorney to transfer title to properties of the United States, to construct and operate reservoirs, power-generating facilities, and to engage in the sale and distribution of water and power. The treaty is to be changed, modified, or terminated only by consent of both parties.

The authority to create such obligations against the United States now rests in Congress and its agencies that are specifically prepared to deal with such problems. The Office of the Secretary of State neither by its functions nor experience has any special qualifications for the design or execution of the work assigned to it by this treaty.

I shall not attempt to cite the numerous provisions of the treaty which I believe justify the criticism I have just expressed. These citations are readily available in the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and presentations made in opposition to this treaty.

ATTITUDE OF CALIFORNIA DELEGATION

As chairman of the California delegation, I presented at the Senate hearings a statement, signed by all the 23 members of the California delegation of the House opposing the ratification of the treaty as it stands. According to my way of thinking, these objectionable features are not necessary to accomplish the essential purposes of the treaty. Give Mexico such proper share of the water of the Colorado as may be warranted and give to the Commission such authority as is necessary to accomplish these purposes without granting to a single Commissioner, subject only to the approval of the Secretary of State, what I regard as a wholly unwarranted investment of power.

Our delegation has an utmost friendly feeling for our good neighbor Republic. We desire to concur in any proper arrangement that can be made for the benefit of Mexico without doing an injustice to our own country.

We regard it as extremely unfortunate if this treaty should be approved as it is now written. We deplore the necessity of appearing in opposition to provisions which we feel are so out of harmony with good governmental practice in the disposal of American rights and in the broad undefined irresponsible grant of power the treaty would confer upon a single commissioner. We would like to see the matter so handled that these unwarranted provision may be removed from the treaty either by negotiation or by reservations, and that the meritorious features of this treaty may be thus accomplished.

We feel it would be unfortunate that this controversy should be considered in advance of the meeting of the Allied Nations in San Francisco. The merits of this treaty should be considered without extraneous influences that tend to obscure its objectionable features. These objectionable provisions are so violative of good governmental practice that it is very unfortunate they should be embodied in a treaty, the general purposes of which are commendable. We sincerely hope that the treaty may be referred for further negotiation to eliminate these objectionable features or that suitable protection be secured by reservations.

Military Training of Teen-Age Draftees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, it was not the intention of Congress that teen-age boys should be sent to the battlefront without at least 1 year of training. The War Department cannot relieve themselves of this responsibility by stating that 12 months' training is not required by law. Those of us who remember the discussion on the drafting of teen-age boys well remember there was an implied understanding from the War Department that these boys would be given at least 1 year's training. Every mail brings in letters which are positive proof that the War Department has failed to give consideration to congressional intent. None of the writers of these letters are objecting to the drafting of the 18-year-old boys but they are insisting that they be given a training period of at least 1 year before they are sent overseas. Many of these same parents have older sons who are serving in the Army in some menial capacity and they object strenuously and rightfully so to having their 18-year-old boys sent to the battlefront within 3 months after induction.

Typical of the letters I have received are quotations from the following:

From Thomas County, Kans., a mother writes, referring to Senator TAFT's recent statement in this regard, and she says:

> Thank God that someone has had the courage to raise their voice in behalf of the teen-age boys who have been rushed to the battle front. I do not have a son in that group, but I have talked to many boys home on short leave at Christmas time who had been given their basic, flown home on 5-day furloughs, and then to Camp Meade to be sent overseas.

From Russell County, Kans., a mother writes as follows:

> I am writing you to protest something that I think is very unfair. My son is a private in the United States Infantry. He is just 18 years old, was drafted into the Army from Russell, and has been given 3½ months of infantry training, and now has to report to Fort Meade, Md., the 26th of this month for overseas. I do not like it. I think it is unfair and undemocratic. The Army has men in uniform lying around Russell and many other camps throughout the United States who have had 1, 2, and more years of training, who are 24 or 25 years and older, and yet our Government is very eager and anxious to take our boys of 18 years, and every one of them I know has to go right over, and I am pretty sure they have to go right into the front lines and fight and die.

From Rawlins County, Kans., I received a petition signed by over 40 citizens of that community. It reads as follows:

> MARCH 12, 1945.
>
> To the Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
>
> *Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:*
>
> We, the undersigned citizens of Rawlins County, Kans., respectfully ask you to give this petition your honest and diligent study and consideration.
>
> Our understanding of the draft law pertaining to the drafting of boys when they attain the age of 18 years, is that these 18-year-old boys would not be assigned to shipment overseas nor put into combat duty until they either had 12 months of training, or had attained the age of 19 years. It has come to our attention that some boys inducted at the age of 18 have been sent overseas within 3 months after induction. As far as we know, this is not according to the wishes of Congress nor is it embodied in the law pertaining to this subject.
>
> We are of the opinion that boys at the age of 18 are not properly fitted nor matured to be put into combat duty with 3- to 6-months training. On the contrary, we believe that boys of 18 must have at least 12 months training and have attained the age of 19 in order to put them into the proper condition for combat duty, and that anything less than 12 months training or a maturity of 19 leaves them under par for combat and for self-defense. Thus the casualties to our boys would materially increase and the death losses to our boys would be enlarged.
>
> Now we, the undersigned, earnestly petition you to use your best efforts in your office as representatives of the undersigned citizens, to see that our boys get a square deal in this matter. Our casualties are high enough among our best trained and matured troops, and it would seem that we at home should try and protect the boys all we could in this war.
>
> Respectfully submitted by:
>
> (SIGNATURES OMITTED.)

Resolution Adopted by the Order Sons of Italy in America, New York, N. Y., February 8, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

At this moment when Your Excellency, the President of our country, is meeting with, or about to meet with, the heads of the Governments of Great Britain and Russia in what promises to be the most momentous conference concerning the future well-being of the world in all history, we would respectfully call attention to the indescribable sufferings and hardships now being endured by the unfortunate people of Italy.

While it is true that an armistice was signed in September 1943 between the Kingdom of Italy and the governments of the United Nations whereby military action was suspended and a state of peace declared, that fact is that suffering, privation, hunger, and disease are more acute now than when open warfare was being waged in the so-called liberated regions, and this despite the repeated promises of economic readjustment and relief and the implied protection of the lofty aims of the Atlantic Charter.

It should be observed that the people of Italy are entitled to humane consideration, if for no other reason than the fact that having been the first to lose their liberties through the terrorism of their Nazi-Fascist oppressors, they were the first of all enslaved peoples to overthrow their oppressors and join hands militarily with the United Nations to expel the foe from their country. In this unequal struggle thousands have died, many of whom fought with their bare hands because arms were not procurable. These Italian patriots have fought the foe fearlessly on the field, underground, and in the air in every possible way since the armistice to bring victory to the allied cause. Resistance groups have been organized in the very midst of the enemy and await the signal for uprising when the time is ripe.

In this period since the armistice the plight of the Italian people has grown progressively worse politically as well as economically. Living conditions have reached the bare subsistence level in some regions while in other regions actual starvation is general. Disease among the old and the very young is decimating the cities and it will not be long before disintegration as a nation becomes a fact.

While we do not wish to criticize the policy of our Department of State with reference to the rehabilitation of Italy on the political side, it is a sad fact that the terms imposed by the armistice agreement are most harsh and severe. And when it is considered that the execution of the treaty terms have been left primarily to one major ally out of sympathy with the plight of the Italian people, an ally that steadfastly refuses to distinguish between the Italian people and their Fascist oppressors, contrary to every notion of human clemency and Christian forbearance, it becomes apparent that the situation will not change for the better save for a complete change in the system of control. Unless a change is made, revolution is inevitable. It is not an exaggeration to add that this revolution cannot long be delayed if we read between the lines of a statement issued by a former distinguished Under Secretary of State, who says:

"If the recent policy of studied insult, and of flagrant administrative inefficiency and neglect, pursued in varying degrees by the major powers, is persisted in, Italy will be plunged into a long protracted period of hopeless anarchy."

Long before and ever since the outbreak of hostilities, our organization has been solicitous of the welfare of the Italian people in the trying situation they found themselves, knowing well that they are a liberty-loving people who did not want war and were forced into it by a ruthless totalitarian government which enslaved, terrorized, and imprisoned them. They are paying a terrible price in suffering and destruction for the sins of a government which they were powerless to overthrow until the invasion by our American forces supplied the help and the means necessary.

We have made repeated pleas to the authorities in Washington to take heed to the terrible shortage of food in Italy and pointed out how vitally necessary it was to supply this lack to the starving masses if democracy is to be revived and the nation started on its way to rehabilitation. As late as last November, our supreme head, Judge Felix Forte, made representations as to the dire necessity for food in a personal interview with Your Excellency at the White House, in the course of which interview he requested aid in obtaining a vessel to be sent to Italy which our organization would stock with food and medical supplies. Your Excellency considered the matter and on November 3, 1944, replied to Judge Forte saying, among other things:

"I have been giving consideration to the question of whether a special appeal might be made for a million dollars to finance a relief ship to Italy. On the whole, I think it would probably be unwise in view of the fact that private funds are now available to provide all the relief supplies that our shipping will permit to be sent.

"You will be interested to know that I have arranged with the Allied Control Commission to increase the food allotment to

300 grams a day for all the people in those parts of Italy which we control, and we are also going to get some trucks in there so that it can be distributed properly."

At this late day—although months have passed since Your Excellency's directive raising the food ration was made—the sad fact is that the increase ordered has not been put into effect. We are informed by revelations in the press, confirmed by responsible officials, that the failure was due to British opposition. As this opposition appears to be a matter of policy on the part of those who raise it, and will, in all likelihood, continue undiminished and take different forms, to the further harassment of the people of Italy, it behooves us as the largest organization of American citizens of Italian origin in the Nation, and because it is the right and moral duty of every citizen of the United States, irrespective of his origin or racial stock, to ask consideration for the people of any friendly nation on the grounds of humanity and justice—it behooves us, we respectfully repeat, to request Your Excellency to make proper representations at the ensuing conference of the three major powers now about to take place concerning the critical situation of the Italian people and the government they are trying to establish: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Your Excellency be and is hereby respectfully petitioned to make known to the conference aforesaid—

1. That the arrangement now in effect in Italy and other areas permitting unilateral action without previous consultation and consent of the other powers involved in the matter of the supply, shipment, and distribution of food and other relief, be discontinued.

2. As a step in the relief of the food shortage in Italy, the powers involved permit the allocation of vessels formerly constituting the Italian Navy to be used as food transports, following the example just recently set by the War Shipping Administration which has turned back to the French some French ships recently used by it.

3. That the status of Italy be changed from that of a cobelligerent to that of a full ally and, thereupon, Italy be made eligible for lend-lease aid, to the end that the present economic distress may be relieved by the resumption of industry and production made possible through said aid in order to help Italy help herself.

4. That regardless of previous political ideologies held, or thought to have been held, by the people of Italy, the stark truth is that starvation, hunger, and disease are now prevalent throughout the country, that money is worthless, and civilian morale has fallen so low as to bring the country to the verge of social revolution. In this posture of affairs it would be un-Christian and inhuman because of past errors to withhold food, using it as a lever of punishment, or discrimination, or to force the choice of a government or its personnel to the liking of any particular power now concerned.

5. That the terms of the Atlantic Charter be applied for the benefit of the people of Italy, particularly the following:

(a) That sovereign rights and self-government be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

(b) The right to choose the form of government under which they live.

(c) That there be no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.

(d) That there be no territorial changes, which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes and forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States.

For the Committee to Promote World Peace, Supreme Lodge, Order Sons of Italy in America:

FRANK J. V. GIMINO,
Chairman.
SALVATORE LO PRESTI.
FRANK PALLERIA.
Judge EUGENE V. ALESSANDRONI.
Judge FRANCIS GIACCONE.

Control of Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, legislation for the control of water pollution has repeatedly in the past Congresses, and in the present one, been introduced. It is my understanding that 9 years have elapsed since the original legislation was introduced in the Congress, and to date, even in the face of dire necessity for the control of water pollution, final enactment thereof has not been had.

In the present Congress companion bills H. R. 519, by Representative MUNDT, and S. 535 by Senator MYERS, have been introduced. The urgent necessity of the enactment of such legislation has become acutely recognized, particularly at this time when post-war plans and programs are being proposed and advocated.

The Izaak Walton League of America, in an article published in the issue of February 1945 of State Government, stresses the importance of pollution control as a post-war public works opportunity for the States. I quote some brief extracts therefrom, as follows:

The criterion for approval should be broad public benefits on the long-time basis, rather than mere temporary financial advantage to a particular locality; and the restoration of natural resources impaired or destroyed by mistakes of the past rather than a new construction program which may further damage our natural resource base. Water pollution is a national problem that has defied the efforts of State and local enforcement agencies these many years. Congress has wrestled with the problem for 8 years without specific accomplishment. What more logical public works programs could be found for the benefit of all the people of the United States than a frontal attack on water pollution as a number one post-war public works project?

* * * * *

While offending municipalities were putting in sewage treatment plants, with State or Federal aid, others which had previously done so could select other public works.

* * * * *

It would provide employment where employment will be most needed because the degree of water pollution is in close ratio to the density of population.

Federal control of pollution has been an important factor in the opposition which prevented passage in the past of legislation proposing Federal control, as well as the continued opposition of industrial polluters to any positive control thereof.

These forms of opposition must be recognized, and as the aforementioned article of the Izaak Walton League, adds:

It logically follows that control of pollution should be uniform and Nation-wide, thereby putting all industries on a common basis and causing the argument of competitive disadvantage to evaporate into thin air.

The pending legislation referred to has the endorsement of the Izaak Walton League of America, as emphasized by its statement that it favors national legislation to control pollution on a uniform basis throughout the Nation, with a distinct provision that the State governments and any interstate compact that may be formed, will be given full opportunity to take the needed action for correction before the Federal authority is invoked. We believe such legislation would be a powerful aid to the States that want to do the job, and we believe it is essential to bring the recalcitrants into line—and there will always be recalcitrants in anything of this nature.

The League sets forth most timely that this problem of water pollution is a vital and immediate problem which is ideally suited for post-war work; it should be a challenge to the States to prove that State governments can and will function in this field. The problem is squarely in the lap of the States. If they tackle it immediately and aggressively there will be no need of Federal control. If they fail, that failure will invite Federal control.

In closing, attention is drawn to section 5 of the Mundt and Myers bills, as follows:

SEC. 5. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress in the administration of this act to encourage State and inter-State compact agencies to exercise their statutory authority in prevention and abatement of pollution, and that action by the Federal board will be taken only after such existing authorities have been given an opportunity to act, and 6 months after written notice by the Board have failed to do so.

The members of the Izaak Walton League in the district I represent are strongly and unanimously in favor of the pending legislation, and I trust it will be made the subject of prompt hearings by the committees of Congress having jurisdiction, receive their favorable reports, and be enacted into law at the earliest possible time.

Relation of the District of Columbia to the National Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, two recent editorials in the Washington Evening Star are of special interest and deserve careful reading by Members of the

Senate and House of Representatives. They are both excellent and informative discussions of subjects of timely interest regarding the District of Columbia and its relation to the National Government.

The first of these editorials appeared on May 16 under the title "The Fundamental Remedy," and treated of the voteless and unrepresented plight of the people of the District of Columbia and supported, as a solution of this problem of fair government, the pending proposed amendment to the Constitution, which provides that "there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine"—Senate Joint Resolution 9 and House Joint Resolution 62.

The editorial also emphasizes the value both to the Congress and to these, now unrepresented, fellow citizens of such grant of the franchise and representation.

The second editorial, under the heading "Not Onerous—If Tried," appeared under date of March 20 and discusses the alleged onerous burden on Members of the Congress acting as members of a local legislative body for the National Capital community. This is pertinent to testimony before the congressional joint committee now engaged in the task of endeavoring to formulate a modified plan for congressional procedure which will eliminate some of the cumbersome methods and increase greatly the efficiency and thoroughness of our National Legislature.

The irony of the situation lies in the fact that the Members of the Congress who most loudly complain of the onerous burden of performing their legislative duties for the District of Columbia, as required by the Constitution, are usually among those who have habitually avoided assuming such burden.

For the information of the Senate I ask that the two editorials be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUNDAMENTAL REMEDY

A more efficient discharge by Congress of its constitutionally derived, exclusive legislative control over the District of Columbia would undoubtedly accompany voting representation of Washingtonians in Congress and the electoral college.

It is gratifying that this fact—for it is undoubtedly a fact—was discussed with manifest approval at the meeting yesterday of the joint committee on reorganizing Congress. Representative SUMNERS of Texas, the respected chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and a veteran in Congress, expressed the same thought recently in his argument for the Sumners-Capper resolution.

In explaining the resolution Mr. SUMNERS pointed out that it "gives to the Congress, which has the constitutional responsibility for providing the government for the District, an opportunity to use the additional facility which this resolution, if adopted, would provide. * * * It would be a valuable aid to the Congress in the discharge of that responsibility. It would make it possible for the Congress in its judgment to have the people of the District send up to the Congress, to become a part of the Congress, their selected Representatives to be spokesmen for the people of the District in the council that is to determine their government. * * * That is the proposition from the Congress' standpoint. When some proposition comes up affecting the people of the District of Columbia, I would like to have somebody here who is a part of the District of Columbia, who represents the people, who is a spokesman for the people of the District. I would like to have him handy—handy all the time to consult with about these things."

Members of Congress are finding it increasingly difficult to meet the complex problems of a municipality as large as Washington and at the same time to discharge their obligations to their own voting constituents. The present system is admittedly cumbersome and, as Senator LA FOLLETTE pointed out yesterday, at times borders on the ridiculous in the necessarily detailed consideration by Congress of essentially trivial local matters.

Some improvement undoubtedly would follow a more specific delegation of authority to the Commissioners, and Chairman RANDOLPH, of the House District Committee, is sound in his suggestion of a joint committee on the District of Columbia. But the paramount objective is voting representation for the Washingtonian in his government, which is the National Government. From that would follow, in the natural course of events, the remedy for most of the things that are wrong in the relationship between Congress and the Washington community. For that is fundamental to all improvement.

[From the Evening Star of March 20, 1945]

NOT ONEROUS—IF TRIED

Some Members of Congress undoubtedly feel that service on the District Committees is onerous and, feeling as they do, avoid it. Yet few of those who complain about the burden of local legislation speak from any personal experience of fatigue in its consideration.

Some Members of Congress also look on work with the District Committees as politically hazardous. Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, says that sometimes the voting constituents resent it. Chairman RANDOLPH, of the House District Committee, who really works for the District, says he was embarrassed in the past campaign by an opponent's attempt to make capital of his alleged preoccupation with local bills. Yet, Mr. RANDOLPH was reelected. Members of Congress who have made themselves annoyingly conspicuous in local matters have been defeated at home. But the Star knows of no defeat attributed to really constructive work for Washington by such men as Mr. RANDOLPH.

The fact is that the men in Congress who have accomplished most for the welfare and development of the American Capital have looked on their labors in local affairs as an opportunity for national service rather than as a politically dangerous or onerous burden. They have taken seriously the constitutional provision which places control over the seat of Government exclusively with Congress. The people of the United States are proud of their Capital and are indebted to the Members who have played a part in its improvement. They are pleased rather than resentful.

There should be practical methods of avoiding congressional concern with trivial District legislation which could as well be the subject of local regulations, issued by the Commissioners under grants of authority in such matters. The Hébert bill, approved in the last Congress, continued a progressive movement in that direction begun several years ago. A joint committee on the District of Columbia, as suggested by Mr. RANDOLPH, has many things to commend it as was shown by former Senator King, long a Senate District Committee chairman, in joint consideration by the two legislative committees of the District's liquor law. Greater prestige should attach to service on District committees, a matter to which the leadership in both Houses could appropriately give some attention.

But it is to be doubted that Congress will ever delegate much of its exclusive legislative control over the District or share it in any mutually satisfactory manner with a local government. For despite the occasional suggestions to the contrary, Congress is jealous of its control over the District. The additional power that Congress needs is the power to admit the people of the District to voting representation in their Government; to create, here in Washington, a voting constituency whose representatives in Congress will receive the respect accorded their peers.

Unrepresented, politically impotent people may expect the contemptuous indifference of their rulers, some of whom will always look upon them as the recipients of royal favor which it may be necessary, if onerous, occasionally to bestow.

The Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Stettinius Called Brave or Innocent," by David Lawrence, and recently published in the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STETTINIUS CALLED BRAVE OR INNOCENT—WRITER ASKS IF SECRETARY OF STATE KNOWS FACTS OF INTERNATIONAL LIFE

(By David Lawrence)

Secretary of State Stettinius is certainly a courageous man, or perhaps he has the strength of innocence. He has just inquired about published reports of Soviet Russia's unilateral action in setting up the beginnings of a puppet government in Rumania which appears to be a violation of the spirit as well as the letter of the Yalta agreement. Doesn't he now he must not question what was done at Yalta or what Russia does on her own?

The Associated Press declares that "under apparent Russian pressure, the Rumanian Government of Premier Radescu was overthrown and succeeded on March 6 by the administration of Premier Groza of the Communist-controlled National Democratic Front."

Now the Secretary of State, in a formal statement, says:

"We think that some aspects of the political situation require consultation among the three principal Allies and we are discussing the situation with the British and Soviet Governments."

FACTS OF INTERNATIONAL LIFE

Doesn't Mr. Stettinius realize that a great victory for Allied unity was achieved at Yalta and that the important thing is the Allied accord and that any questioning of what

Russia has done is merely furnishing ammunition to Goebbels and Hitler in their effort to create dissension among the Allies?

Or does Mr. Stettinius really know the facts of international life, which are that might makes right and that pledges solemnly promised even as little as a month ago can be disregarded by any of the big powers with impunity? If he persists in asking questions, he may be called a perfectionist or characterized as one of those idealists who believes that international agreements mean what they say.

There is a war on, and to question Russia's motives in seeking to communize the smaller states within her sphere of influence will bring down upon Mr. Stettinius the denunciation of the Communist press in this country and abroad.

And also what does the Associated Press mean by reporting the following piece of news, which so many observers would doubtless wish had been suppressed:

"Foreign Minister Eden publicly told the House of Commons this week what had been commonly talked about by Allied diplomats for many days, that it was the Moscow Government, acting without consultation with the United States and Britain, which ousted the Radescu administration and helped set up the present regime."

Isn't this just another case of unilateral action which, quite recently, President Roosevelt promise the Congress wouldn't happen again, as it did in Greece, Italy, and Poland, and that hereafter such matters in Europe would be handled by joint action of all three Allied Governments? The creation of the puppet government at Lublin was glossed over by the President and Prime Minister Churchill, and, to be consistent, Mr. Stettinius should really ignore what has happened in Rumania.

For several days official Washington has been buzzing with stories about the violation by Russia of the Yalta agreement, but American officials did not permit any confirmation. The President in his press conference this week waved aside questions about it and directed inquirers to the State Department.

ASSOCIATED PRESS PULLED CURTAIN

The Associated Press, however, has pulled the curtain, as the following quotation from its Washington dispatch reveals:

"The Crimea Conference ended February 11. About that time there was increasing criticism in the Soviet press of the Radescu administration. It was blamed for failing to eliminate Nazi-Fascist elements and for inability to maintain order. Those criticisms were generally rejected here. Washington considered the Radescu government bumbling but about the best that could be done in the circumstances.

"On February 27 the Russian Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Vishinsky, arrived in Bucharest. He had an immediate audience with King Mihai.

"On February 28 Radescu was dismissed * * * the leaders of the two largest parties refused to join the Groza administration on the ground that they would not submit to minority control."

Doesn't Secretary Stettinius know that this is the modern or practical way to ascertain the "freely expressed wishes of the people" as provided in the Atlantic Charter?

The thing for Mr. Stettinius to have done was not to write notes to Russia about it but to wait till the next meeting of the Big Three, when the matter could be regarded as an accomplished fact and when announcement could be made of the appointment of another joint commission to deal with liberated areas—as was done at Teheran in 1943 and at Yalta last month—after which a chorus of approval and praise for the great Allied unity achieved would be forthcoming. That is the pattern for appeasement which has been set for this war period anyway.

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the following article by John O'Donnell from the Washington Times-Herald:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

If the citizens of the Republic wish to get a rough idea of what their rulers have in mind in the way of global propaganda for New Deal ideas, control of information, and news on a world-wide scale, we suggest that they pay very close attention to what is now taking shape in testimony offered to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee.

Under discussion, sponsored by the administration, is a proposal that is astounding in its boldness and scope.

No trivial censorship of news here, or two-bit discrimination against papers disliked by the White House. Or a casual outburst of blah by Government press agents and fobbed off as honest reporting. Nothing as petty as that. This is the real thing.

It's a plan for Government control in the coming brave new world of international communications through which must pass all messages—every reporter's dispatch written to tell the American people what's going on abroad and, just as importantly, every dispatch designed to inform the rest of the world how we're doing here and what we're thinking.

The proposal is to take all the existing means of telecommunication—cable, radio, telephone, telegraph, telephoto, facsimile, all long-distance communications by electrical means—put them into one big monopoly and then give officials of the administration the right to have the final say or veto power on how things will be run.

It means that such great communication companies as International Telephone and Telegraph, R. C. A. Communications, Western Union, Press Wireless, etc., merge under Government supervision into one big outfit. And that after the merger the decision regarding facilities for transmission of news stories, or radio news broadcasts, or news pictures, will, in the final analysis, rest on the decisions of five appointees of the President—the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Commerce, and the Postmaster General.

What is in the back of the mind of the long-range New Deal global planners here in Washington is the creation of one great universal one-world belt of electrical transmission of knowledge by which the peoples of the world will get mental nourishment and entertainment; what the political propaganda engineers controlling the switch decide is best.

The proposal now before the Senate committee is the first step.

It could control international broadcasts and frequencies so far as the No. 1 nation of the world is concerned under a system which will take a lot of word twisting to make out anything except Government ownership and White House control.

Just how much strength the proposal will develop is uncertain at this date. Certainly the White House is behind it with all pressure, and some of the great corporations—R. C. A. and International Tel and Tel—are going along with the proposal.

Significantly, the service engineers who are aiding the Army and Navy spokesmen in these opening rounds were in private life important individuals in the communications corporations.

Secretary of the Navy Forrestal surprised some of the questioning Senators—Montana's Chairman BURTON WHEELER and Kansas' CLYDE REED—with the far-reaching proposals of the Navy for this post-war set-up.

Forrestal came out flat-footed with the demand in the interests of national defense that the consolidation should "be mandatory," and must not be "total, not partial."

WHEELER asked the important question:

"How would press and radio, devoted exclusively to gathering news, in any way interfere with your over-all Government policy?"

The youthful Navy Secretary stuck to his guns: "You can't separate the segment from the whole."

Now this administration line reverses the New Deal policy back in the piping days of peace. In 1933, during his first months in the White House, F. D. R. appointed a commission to study just this question of Government ownership and operation of communications. F. D. R.'s commission turned down the proposal because of these objections:

1. The danger of political domination and interference.
2. Government red type.
3. The charge that the Government does not conduct its business economically.
4. The conjecture that Government ownership would discourage initiative, technical research, and advancement.
5. The belief that the communication service under Government ownership in foreign countries is inferior to ours under private ownership.
6. The belief that the people do not want Government ownership.

The Basis for the Independence of the Republic of Lithuania

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 and 24, 1945, the American Lithuanian Mission meets in Washington to bring the cause of small nations and particularly Lithuania into a clearer perspective before our officials. As a part of this Mission, Members of Congress are being invited to a dinner at the Hotel Statler on March 23, at 7 p. m., where a preview of a short subject film will be shown depicting Lithuania's progress during the period of independence. A group of service mothers, whose sons are serving in Uncle Sam's armed forces, are bringing a petition with hundreds of thousands of signatures addressed to President Roosevelt, requesting that he support the Lithuanian cause for independence.

The success of the above program will lead to a constructive rebuilding of public opinion among the Americans of Lithuanian origin. It is part of our war effort that a permanent peace program have the wholehearted support and confidence of our citizens. We will have such support and confidence of the Americans of Lithuanian descent if our Government

supports the principles of the Atlantic Charter to which it dedicated itself when we entered the present conflict.

The Republic of Lithuania was established on February 16, 1918, as a modern nation under a constitutional government. However, from the earliest times it had developed its own language, similar to the ancient Sanskrit, and its own culture and traditions. Its people are not related to the Slavs, but have been welded together into a distinct nationality through common interests and ideals.

The Atlantic Charter, proclaimed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on August 14, 1941, sets forth as one of the principles for which we are fighting the Axis, the right of small nations to self-determination and independence. The charter states:

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

In a speech on September 12, 1943, Secretary of State Cordell Hull reaffirmed these principles in declaring:

All peoples who, with a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, have qualified themselves to assume and to discharge the responsibilities of liberty are entitled to its enjoyment.

Each sovereign nation, large or small, is in law and under law the equal of every other nation.

All nations, large and small, which respect the rights of others, are entitled to freedom from outside interference in their internal affairs.

No people have a stronger claim to the right of self-government and independence than do the 3,000,000 people of Lithuania. This independence was lost for no other reason than its geographical location. It is occupied by other nations during World War No. 2 for the same reason that the countries of Belgium and Czechoslovakia are now occupied.

The Republic of Lithuania has maintained friendly relations with its neighbors. When it asks for independence, it asks only that its national identity, its culture, language, and traditions be preserved.

At the present time, a nonagression treaty is still in effect between the Republic of Lithuania and Soviet Russia, signed on September 28, 1926, and subsequently extended to December 31, 1945.

The nonaggression pact contained the following articles:

Article 2: The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other.

Article 3: Each of the two contracting parties undertakes to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party.

Article 5: Should a conflict arise, and if impossible to liquidate it in a diplomatic way, both contracting parties agree in such cases to nominate conciliatory commissions.

On October 10, 1939, Lithuania and Russia entered into a mutual assistance pact. Article 7 reads:

The realization of this treaty must not infringe the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, especially the structure of their state, their economic and social systems, military instruments, and altogether the principles on nonintervention of one state in the internal affairs of another state.

Americans of Lithuanian descent are mighty proud to be citizens of the United States. And as Americans they are doing their share in fighting this war. The records of the Treasury Department in Washington will reveal that Americans of Lithuanian descent have purchased in excess of their quota of War bonds and that they are among the first at the head of the list of nationality groups. The fact that many of them have only been Americans for one generation or possibly two gives them a stronger appreciation of the blessings of American citizenship. More so, perhaps, than is the appreciation of many of our fellow citizens whose families have never known another land since the Mayflower established one of its first beachheads on this continent.

It is only natural, though, that they have an affection for the land of their forefathers, just as our fellow Americans are concerned with other lands. Many have a special concern for China or France, for England or Switzerland, Americans of Lithuanian descent have a special concern for Lithuania.

We, Americans, are sending our boys overseas to fight our enemy primarily because we do not want them to have to do this same fighting on our very coast lines or even on our mountain ridges. But we are also in this world conflict to rid the world of Fascist aggressors, and to reestablish freedom and independence in those countries whose innocent peoples have been trampled upon. We had hoped that Lithuania was one of the small nations whose rights and independence would be respected and restored after the war.

But, there are some people who say, despite the pronouncement of the Atlantic Charter, Lithuania should not be given its independence, but, on the contrary, should become one of Russia's 16 spheres of influence. This development, I believe, does not square with the letter or the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, and is a violation of the treaties which have existed and are still in effect between Lithuania and Russia. We believe from our first-hand knowledge that the people of Lithuania do not want a partial autonomy under the influence of any power whatsoever, but rather do they want the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania, the independence Lithuania won 26 years ago, and the independence Lithuania deserves to have and keep in the post-war world.

The State Department has continued to recognize the Lithuanian Minister to the United States. However, there has been no report that Lithuania's future was discussed at any of the Big Three conferences. There was no mention of Lithuania in the Yalta declaration, nor in the President's recent report to Congress. Hence, Americans of Lithuanian descent are deeply concerned about the future of Lithuania's independence.

World Watches Debate on Bretton Woods Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 23, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House on February 23, 1945, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several newspaper articles and editorials, I submit an article by John H. Crider, The World Watches Debate on Bretton Woods Bill, which appeared in the New York Times on February 18, 1945:

WORLD WATCHES DEBATE ON BRETTON WOODS BILL—BANKERS' VIEWS SHARPEN THE FIGHT OVER PROPOSED MONETARY FUND

(By John H. Crider)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—The Bretton Woods agreement, conceived by 44 nations last July in the calm of a New Hampshire plateau under the shadow of the Presidential Range of the White Mountains, started its stormy course through the houses of Congress this week, while all of the other 43 signatory nations watched to see what the United States would do.

The bill embodying the Bretton Woods proposals for an international monetary fund and a bank for reconstruction and development was introduced on Thursday, only a few days after President Roosevelt had urged prompt action in a message in which he said it would be a tragedy if differences of opinion on minor details should lead us to sacrifice the basic agreement achieved on the major problems.

The reference to differences of opinion on minor details was generally regarded in Washington as relating to the objections raised by American bankers to the proposed fund about 2 weeks ago. But what are the monetary and financial measures which provoke so much debate?

The Bretton Woods proposals grew out of about 2 years of prior consultation between the technical experts of the various countries with regard to the fund, and a somewhat shorter period with regard to the bank.

PROBLEMS INVOLVED

To discuss what the proposals are, it is first essential to understand the problems to which they are addressed. The fund is designed to prevent or minimize the possibilities of the temporary shortages of foreign exchange which sometimes cause nations to resort to violent nationalistic and discriminatory monetary practices, such as were common during the turbulent trade conditions of most of the 1930's.

The bank is designed to pool the resources and responsibility of the nations in meeting the valid needs of countries for loans with which to reconstruct war-torn areas, rehabilitate their industries, or promote general improvement in economic conditions.

While both projects are novel in that never before have so many countries of the world joined for action to promote the conditions of healthy international trade and finance, they are in reality merely universal applications of stabilization and banking techniques which have been tried out in more limited areas in the past.

OLD IDEAS APPLIED

The United States' share in the proposed $9,100,000,000 capital of the bank would be $3,175,000,000, of which only a small part

would need to be paid in at the outset. Our share in the voting power would be 31.4 percent.

The bank would be much more conservative in its reserve-to-loan ratios than any commercial bank in the United States, the agreement providing for 100-percent capital, reserve and surplus backing of all loans, guaranties and participations. The bulk of the bank's business would be in guaranteeing private commercial loans, as not more than 20 percent of its capital could be used for loans of its own.

The bank is not only much easier to understand than the fund, it is not even controversial.

In trying to visualize what the monetary fund is all about an American might imagine that each of the 48 States had different kinds of money. He might also imagine how difficult it would be to carry on trade between the States if these currencies were always fluctuating in value.

PARALLEL IN WORLD TRADE

It is exactly that way in trade between the nations when currencies are unstable, but it is even worse when nations engage in the competitive currency practices which were popular during the thirties, when, without notice, countries would alter the value of their currencies in surprise moves to gain temporary advantage.

Above all of its many other features, the one held most important by the fund's proponents is that its general acceptance would assure notice of intention to revalue currencies and, after an opening revaluation of no more than 10 percent, no changes could be made in currency value without approval of the fund.

What is important is the assurance of prior consultation. This would be something new in this world and is generally regarded as one of the most commendable features of the fund.

On the mechanical side, the fund is an international pool of $8,800,000,000 in gold and currencies which would supply central banks of member countries with such foreign currencies as they do not possess, owing to temporary shortages, with which to make possible payments for imports on current trade account.

OUR SHARE IN FUND

The United States' contribution to the fund would be $2,750,000,000. It would have 28 percent of the total voting power, against 26 percent for the British Commonwealth.

The economic policy committee of the American Bankers Association made public a report 2 weeks ago which framed the issue for the coming debate.

The bankers, shy of the fund, which they regard as novel and embodying "lending methods that are unproved and impractical," would scrap this half of the 44-nation agreement. They would retain just the bank, permitting it to perform very limited stabilization functions compared with those proposed for the fund.

The issue, then, is whether the tentative 44-nation proposal for a virtually universal monetary pool to stabilize currencies on a semiautomatic basis should be scrapped in favor of the much more cautious borrower-lender proposal of the American bankers.

The basic argument of the bankers against the fund is that member countries would be entitled to use of the resources as a matter of right and would, therefore, be obtaining loans of currency by right rather than on the basis of sound banking criteria.

POINTS IN ARGUMENT

Much of this argument turns on the points (1) whether the advances are in fact loans, and (2) whether the use of the fund's resources is as unrestricted as the following generalized discussion in section 3 on page 8 of the bankers' report suggests:

"Under the system of quotas in the fund, a member country would be virtually entitled to borrow ir certain specified annual amounts from the international pool of resources, provided the purposes of such borrowing were represented by it to accord with the broad purposes of the fund. The borrowing would be subject to certain limitations, but with no stipulation that the loans should be good loans ca—once a country has been admitted to full rights of membership—that the loans should be based on prior consideration of the economic condition and prospects cf the borrowing countries."

On the other hand, Treasury sponsors of the fund regard the withdrawing of currency from the fund as "purchases," as distinguished from "loans."

One factor in the banker attitude which has attracted attention of officials here is that some of their most prominent spokesmen committed themselves as opposed to the indicated Government approach to the currency stabilization problem even before the Bretton Woods Conference had reached its conclusions. Much of the reasoning of New York bankers originated with Dean John H. Williams, of the Harvard Graduate School of Public Administration, who also is vice chairman of the New York Federal Reserve Bank and one of that institution's most esteemed advisers.

Dean Williams, from the earliest discussion of the international stabilization proposal, has held to the idea that the "key country" approach was the real and most simple solution to the problem—that if the dollar and pound sterling were kept in line, the other currencies would not fluctuate dangerously.

The Administration's objection to this approach, aside from technical considerations, is that the whole post-war international structure is based upon the concept of multilateralism, if not universalism, and that to limit such an important part of the total economic structure as currency stabilization to a few countries would be diametrically opposed to that principle.

European Confederation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the subject of a European confederation, written by Dorothy Thompson, and recently published in the Washington Star. The article advocates the same kind of a program which I have already proposed for Europe, namely, a confederation of European states.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Fifteen distinguished Europeans, or Americans of European background, most of them scholars, from 10 European countries, have addressed a declaration and appeal to the President and Congress, asking support for the establishment of an all-European confederation at the end of the war, and setting forth eight points in support and description of such a program.

The idea is not new. It has been advocated for years by the pan-European movement headed by Richard Goudenhove-Kalergi. It has had the support in Britain of eminent publicists, such as Sir Walter Layton. It is believed that Mr. Churchill supports it, and edged toward it in his famous Guild Hall speech, calling for a council of Europe, and a council of Asia, to be established after the war.

As the great power world emerges, the problem of post-war Europe becomes more and more urgent. Will Europe fall into social and political anarchy? Are all the petty and anachronistic sovereignties to be restored? Has not this way demonstrated the essential weakness of all the European States? And has it not also proved that this weakness is a temptation to direct aggression, and to indirect interventionisms, spheres of influence, and all the other power games which led to this dreadful struggle? Is Europe, as a civilization and culture, finished? Is it to be further Balkanized, or will there again in some future, be an attempt to write it under another domination, by force or the threat of force?

These leading questions have so far not received a statesmanlike answer. In fact, reading the various declarations, from Tehran, for instance, or from Yalta, one receives the impression that Europe, that great complex of 350,000,000 people, is henceforth of negligible importance.

Yet the answer to these questions lies in the heart of the German problem. This column has contended—with perhaps boring repetitiveness—that there is no solution to the German problem until the European problem, of which it is a part, is solved. If the European problem is solved, the German problem can be. And only if the European problem is solved can the world count on peace. The authors of the Declaration of European Interdependence know it. They advance the same thesis as that of Albert Guerard, in his new book published by the Stanford University Press, "Europe, Free and United." I hope it gets the attention ,in high places, that it deserves.

The thesis of the declaration is:

1. That the nations of Europe constitute by reasons of geography and history an interdependent region of the world.

2. That nothing short of confederation can secure for Europe lasting peace, speedy recovery, and personal liberty.

3. That a confederation authority should create a confederation armed force to protect all European peoples against aggression and tyranny.

4. That no fourth Reich should ever be established, but when Hitlerism and pan-German imperialism have been overcome the various states of the Reich should enter the confederation.

5. That the confederation should protect all Europeans against racial, social, and religious discrimination and guarantee civil liberties and cultural autonomies.

6. That a social bill of rights should aim at assuring all Europeans "freedom from want."

7. That the confederation should gradually liquidate all inter-European trade barriers and transform Europe into a single market with a common currency and a coordinated transportation system.

8. That within these limits of continental solidarity the European confederation should respect the various democratic constitutions of its member states and guarantee their security and equality.

Sooner or later Europe must emerge free and united, or Europe will be, as the authors of this declaration state, an all but certain source of another war, as well as a breeding ground for tyranny, putsches, and adventurisms of all sorts. Never in modern history has Europe been so fragmented, especially economically, as it has been since the last war. In England especially there is growing dismay lest a broken Europe slowly drag down with it the whole of western civilization.

Above all, the United States, out of her own wonderful experience of the Union of the States, should support a European confederation plan. Victory must be translated into new life, and that means a modern political, social, and economic system.

Rejections From the Armed Forces

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion on the floor of the House recently with respect to rejections of men inducted into the armed forces in the various States. I am sure the House and the the country will be interested in a sample report I secured from General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, covering a period of 6 months from February 1943 to August 1943, including all men examined for the armed forces.

I am glad to report that the physical perfection and health of Kansas' young men is far above the average of those of other States called for physical examination in selective service. Kansas is a close second from the top among the States of the Union with a percentage of 25.4 Oregon being first, having 24.4. The percentage in many States runs more than 50 percent. The average for the country is 39.2. A complete list of the States and the average during the 6 months' period is included herewith.

Your attention is also called to the fact that in World War No. 1 Kansas ranked first in the Nation with respect to physical perfection and health of men inducted into the armed forces. Kansas people have good reason to be proud of this record.

A list of all States and their percentages of rejections during the period mentioned is as follows:

Percent of rejections per 100 registrants

Oregon	24.4
Kansas	25.4
Utah	26.1
Washington	28.2
Wyoming	29.1
Idaho	29.3
Connecticut	31.0
South Dakota	31.1
Nebraska	31.6
Pennsylvania	31.8
Delaware	31.9
Illinois	32.9
Nevada	32.9
New Jersey	33.0
Iowa	33.1
North Dakota	33.8
California	35.6
Minnesota	35.7
Ohio	35.8
Indiana	36.2
Montana	36.5
Missouri	37.2
Rhode Island	37.3
Maryland	37.4
Michigan	37.4
Maine	37.5
Massachusetts	37.7
New York	37.7
West Virginia	37.7
New Hampshire	38.9
Wisconsin	38.9
Arizona	39.0
National average	39.2
New Mexico	40.1
Oklahoma	40.6
Texas	42.9
Colorado	43.1
Tennessee	44.7
Mississippi	45.0
District of Columbia	45.4
Kentucky	45.4
Vermont	45.7
Alabama	49.0
Georgia	51.5
Virginia	52.2
Louisiana	52.6
Florida	53.2
Arkansas	55.9
South Carolina	55.9
North Carolina	56.8

Poland, 1922 to 1939; a Nation Is Built Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Ann Su Cardwell, that appeared in the Detroit News of March 20, 1945:

POLAND, 1922 TO 1939; A NATION IS BUILT UP

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Ann Su Cardwell, an American student of eastern European affairs, lived in Poland 17 years. She speaks and reads Polish, has traveled over the country from one end to the other, knows Poland's neighbors. For several years she has been contributing to American magazines and newspapers on European questions and is the author of Poland and Russia: The Last Quarter Century, now in its third printing. Miss Cardwell has written a series of articles for the News in which she describes the Poland she saw between World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.)

(By Ann Su Cardwell)

Poland between two wars is a Poland I know. I went there in 1922, just after the Polish-Bolshevik war, and left September 17, 1939—the day the Red armies, after the German invasion of western Poland, invaded and occupied the eastern portion. I can, therefore, begin at the beginning. The story requires a book; here it is limited to a few paragraphs.

In 1919 the three partitioned parts of the Polish commonwealth united after more than a century of separation. Economically the new Poland was backward. The partitioning powers had not been interested in developing Polish agriculture or industry. The German-controlled area had been the most advanced, the Russian the most backward. The large inherited peasant population in former Russian Poland was poor and 70-percent illiterate. One area had lived under German law and administration, another under Austrian, the third under Russian. The same applies to school systems and currency. Imagine the confusion when the Poles threw off the foreign yokes.

War destruction in Poland exceeded that suffered in any other country. The withdrawing occupying powers had stripped factories and land of products and equipment. Some 1,800,000 buildings had been destroyed. Poverty, devastation and dilapidation characterized the Poland I saw in 1922.

Beggars were omnipresent and that winter I saw people who were not beggars barefoot in the snow. My red-cheeked sons were stared at as if they were children from another world—as indeed they were.

Yet with all the terrible price Poland had paid for freedom it got no reparations. On the contrary, certain liabilities were imposed on the new state in the liquidation of the old Austro-Hungarian empire. Germany, the defeated enemy, received huge British and American loans; Poland got very little.

With these brief references to the general situation, discouraging in every aspect, let us see what the Poles, rejoicing in their newfound freedom, accomplished in the 20 years fate allotted them.

The first achievement was unification. Proud of their Polish citizenship, in an amazingly short time the Poles had set up their national administrative, legislative, and judicial machinery. Experts were sent abroad to study educational systems, municipal government, housing, banking—everything. The Poles, laying foundations of national life, were eager to profit from the experience of other peoples.

The rural problem was the first approached. A program was inaugurated and by 1938, 6,560,000 acres of land had been parcelled, by which action 153,600 new homesteads averaging 23 acres had been created and 503,000 dwarf holdings enlarged.

Equally important was consolidation of scattered strips. In former Russian Poland division of land among heirs had resulted in the existence of fields in some instances only a few feet wide. A man might own several of them, widely separated. Obviously consolidation, through exchange, was beneficial to all concerned. A total of 859,000 workable farms had been the result of consolidation by 1938.

UP FROM A BATTLEFIELD

Rural life practically had to start anew, for five-sixths of Poland was not only supplying the home market, but exporting grain, livestock, meat, and dairy products in large quantities. Polish ham was well known in America. Bacon, sausages, and a score of other items were figuring more and more on Polish export lists. Poland, famous for its horses, had state and privately owned stud farms and exported horses to all parts of the world.

Agriculture could not provide occupation and income for the large rural population. Immediate rehabilitation of damaged industries and establishment of new ones was a necessity.

Lodz, under the Germans a great textile center, quickly regained its reputation as the "city of a thousand smokestacks," surpassed its earlier records in supplying the West with fine cottons and the East with exotic goods. Lodz and Bielsk were both noted for their woolens. In other centers plants producing railroad rolling stock, machine tools, farm machinery, and armament arose, and Poland not only supplied her own needs in these respects, but exported. Chemical and drug industries flourished, fertilizer being an extremely important item.

Hemp and flax thrive in Poland and almost every peasant cottage has its loom. How many lengths of homespun linen I have bought from the women who wove it. In

the last years of free Poland factories were entering this field and well I remember the flourishing and fascinating shop the Vilno producers opened in Warsaw. That was just one of thousands of newer and smaller industries over the country.

GERMANS' OUTPUT BETTERED

Everybody has heard about upper Silesian coal. But not all know that when the Germans had to relinquish this area in 1919 to the Poles they jeered at the idea that Poles could operate the coal and ore mines and that the Poles even bettered production and kept it at a high level when coal mining was termed a "contracting industry."

Polish forests had suffered severely during the war, but, thanks to wise reforestation, Polish lumber was a leading export.

Finally there was the great central industrial district project of the later thirties, comprising an area equal to one-fifth of Poland. Here heavy industries were being developed, away from the danger to which those in Upper Silesia were subjected through proximity to Germany. Cheap electric power was drawing all sorts of private industries. This project was destined to raise the level of life both of that depressed area and of the eastern provinces to tie all Poland together economically and at the same time drain off the excess rural population into industry.

Production implied delivery, which in turn necessitated transportation and communication improvement. Highways and streets were resurfaced, and what that means you cannot appreciate unless you have walked or ridden over the "cats' heads," as the Poles called the cobbles of Russian days.

River regulation was begun. Rivers, especially the Vistula, are important in freight transportation. A railroad was built, connecting the coal fields with Gdynia, Poland's one port, which—a fisher hamlet in 1924—in 1938 had the largest turn-over—9,173,438 tons—of all the Baltic ports, while that of Danzig, which had so feared Gdynia's rise, trebled its average during the three most prosperous years under Prussian rule.

SCHOOL SYSTEM SET UP

The Poles had to establish a school system to serve millions demanding education, when every cabinet minister was, with good reason, asking that his field be given priority in the budget.

The army had to be built up and maintained; defense of the state is the first principle when there is an uncertain neighbor on either side. The ministry of social welfare had to have funds; people could not be left to starve until work was found.

Yet gradually classes moved from makeshift quarters into well-equipped modern school buildings, the adopted educational system was put into effect, and by 1939 Poland had one of the most progressive school systems in Europe, with compulsory school laws and 91 percent attendance.

The social program of Poland was far more progressive than the American. Take only the matter of health insurance. Membership was compulsory for all employed whose monthly salary was below 750 zloty (roughly $70). Domestic workers' assessments were paid by the employer. I know, having paid them for 17 years. But when my cook was in a hospital for 6 weeks neither she nor I paid anything.

As for the appearance of the country, the Poland of 1939 was very different from that gray, drab, poverty-stricken land of 1922. Peasant cottages had been repaired and newroofed and thousands of new ones built. Good modern business and apartment houses replaced ancient city structures; attractive residential suburbs appeared. Parks and playgrounds were a feature of every community. Splendid museums, built wing at a time and housing patiently assembled collections, and small regional museums—for every Polish locality has historic associations in which it takes great pride—arose.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING

The Poles made long-term plans, thinking in years and not in weeks, carrying out those plans by stages, as they had the means.

They wanted a beautiful as well as a prosperous Poland. In summer, for example, Warsaw was a mass of flowers. An English house guest with us one year was continually exclaiming over the cleanliness of Warsaw streets, the innumerable window-boxes of blossoms and trailing vines, the perfectly kept parks and flower- and tree-bordered avenues.

Dr. W. J. Rose, who had known Poland at its worst, after a summer tour of the country in 1938 came in exclaiming, "At last we have the Poland we dreamed about!"

Perhaps he was a bit exuberant. There was still much room for improvement, of course. No one knew that so well as the Poles themselves.

"If only we could have had 10 years more," they said sadly in September 1939. But what they did achieve in 20 years was a convincing demonstration of their ability both to plan wisely and to execute those plans.

Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of permission duly granted, I extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of inserting two editorials from the Philadelphia Record, which are as follows:

BRETTON WOODS ALSO VITAL TO WORLD PEACE

Adolf Hitler was the spawn of a German depression.

That is a fact none of us should forget during the critical days ahead in which President Roosevelt will be rounding out his program for an enduring peace.

It has not been emphasized nearly enough that the Roosevelt program has two parts, that the two parts dovetail, and that both are essential.

The one peace program is political. It was begun at Dumbarton Oaks; will be carried on at San Francisco.

The other peace program is economic. It was begun at Bretton Woods; is now being weighed by the Congress of the United States.

NOT ARMS ALONE

The Dumbarton Oaks program is immensely important. But man cannot preserve a stable, peaceful world by arms alone. All the police forces in America were no answer to the great depression of 1929–33.

That's why the Record is publishing a detailed and simplified explanation of this part of the Roosevelt program. It is called "Mr. Abbott Leads His Wife Through Bretton Woods." It is contained in a pamphlet supplementing this issue of the Record "digest."

Our purpose in offering this explanation in words that anybody can understand is to drive home the fact that if our people do not stand by the President in supporting this program the speculators who waxed fat on unstable foreign exchange in the past, the vultures who preyed on impoverished governments and peoples, may either scuttle the Bretton Woods program or gain control of it through dangerous amendments.

HOW MANY CARE?

It all depends on how many people understand, and care.

Dumbarton Oaks will probably succeed because the power of public opinion is behind it.

If Americans understood Bretton Woods as clearly, they would be as united behind that, too.

Already the monetary experts of 44 other nations have agreed on this program. That in itself is a great achievement. So we suggest that you read carefully Mr. Abbott Leads His Wife Through Bretton Woods.

Then write your Congressmen and Senators and urge them to support the Bretton Woods program 100 percent, and to oppose any chiseling or crippling amendments.

History tells us that when masses of people cry in vain "When do we eat?" it is not long before they mutter "When do we fight?"

A NEW LINE TO HOLD

When President Roosevelt made Fred M. Vinson the Nation's Director of Economic Stabilization, and told him to hold the line against inflation—

Vinson held the line.

He held it against all comers. He held it ably and diplomatically, without creating needless ill will.

Now Fred Vinson has a new line to hold, as Federal Loan Administrator.

Instead of holding the line against inflation after the war he'll have to hold the line against deflation.

It will be a line of jobs to stem depression before it starts.

Naturally we are glad that in his first press conference since taking his new post—the post stripped from Henry Wallace's Commerce Department—Vinson plumps squarely for the Roosevelt program of 60,000,000 jobs.

There is much that can be done by the Federal Loan Administration when peace comes. And we are only too glad to take Vinson at his word—that it will be done.

With the same determination and courage, we are sure Vinson can hold the line against deflation after the war as successfully as he has held it against inflation during the war.

Predischarge Leave Favored To Ease Return to Civilian Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maj. George Fielding Eliot:

PREDISCHARGE LEAVE FAVORED TO EASE RETURN TO CIVILIAN LIFE—CONGRESS IS URGED TO APPROVE ADMIRAL STANDLEY'S PLAN FOR 30-DAY FURLOUGHS TO PERMIT SERVICEMEN TO READJUST SELVES IN OWN HOMES

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

Here is a truly splendid suggestion.

It comes from Admiral William H. Standley, United States Navy, former Chief of Naval Operations and commander, Battle Force, United States Fleet, and it appears in the current (March 10) issue of the Army and Navy Journal.

Admiral Standley suggests that every American soldier, sailor, and marine who has seen foreign service shall, when he is returned to the United States for final discharge, be given a month's leave at the earliest moment that his services can be spared in order that he

may go home and spend that time with his family in readjusting himself to civilian life and renewing those home-town contacts with which he has lost touch during his period of service.

CAN SEE ABOUT OLD JOB

Then, when he is finally discharged, he will not be thrown all at once and without any preparation into scenes and conditions which will have changed greatly while he has been away. He will be more or less prepared, both psychologically and economically, for the new conditions under which he must live. He will have a chance to learn something of what has been happening at home. His old friends, who will have acquired new interests and new ideas while he has been gone, will not seem so strange to him. He will have a chance to think things over, to adjust himself, to make plans. He will have a chance to see about his old job, or a new one; to get some idea of where and how he is going to live; perhaps to make tentative arrangements for a new home. There is every possible advantage, to the individual and to the Nation, in thus cushioning the shock of change from the military life to the civilian life.

It takes a long time to discharge millions of men from the service. As Admiral Standley points out, "even if we discharge 1,000 men an hour, it would take 10 months to get rid of 2,500,000 men"—and the fall of Germany may, according to some estimates, permit the release of that many. The end of the Japanese war will result, of course, in the discharge of many more millions.

Now, this writer knows from experience that the period between the close of hostilities and actual discharge is the most trying ordeal a citizen soldier can go through. Most soldiers do not see any reason why they cannot go home immediately. They enlisted to fight for their country; they won the fight; they want to go home. There is an essential justice in this point of view with which it is impossible to argue. Yet, as the Army and Navy Journal says editorially in commenting on Admiral Standley's suggestion: "The mechanics of issuing final discharges from the armed forces are not simple. There are many steps which must be taken to safeguard the interests of the individual and of the Government, many records which must be completed before the man is legally out of the service."

PROCESS CANNOT BE HURRIED

This process cannot be hurried too much. If it is, it provides a vast legacy of trouble for the future. No one who has had any experience with the affairs of veterans of the last war will suggest that we seek any short cuts in the process of making sure that every record is complete and every individual case receives all proper attention. But soldiers back from the wars, held in camps scattered throughout the country awaiting discharge, are not happy men. They are miserable, restless, impatient, sometimes even mutinous. To such men the boon of 30 days' home leave at the earliest possible moment after their return from abroad would make all the difference in the world.

Furthermore—again to quote the Army and Navy Journal—"their return to their organization to await final discharge would afford an opportunity to consider their civilian life and business from all angles, make plans based on late and intimate knowledge, so that when they finally break off their military attachments, they would know exactly what to expect in picking up the threads of their old civilian life." The period of readjustment through which each of these men must pass—and we must remember that some of them will have been away from home for years—will be difficult enough at best. Admiral Standley's plan makes the change in easy stages instead of suddenly and abruptly.

Moreover, the admiral suggests that the Congress should make provision by law for this period of leave, thus making it mandatory upon the military and naval authorities instead of a privilege to be granted or withheld as individual commanders may think proper. It is to be hoped that so simple and sound a means of helping millions of young Americans to make this great change will commend itself to the Congress.

By enacting Admiral Standley's plan into law, the Congress will be contributing as much to the sum total of human happiness and national well-being as with any statute that it has ever ordered to be engrossed on parchment.

Detroit Asks Direct Air Service to South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Mr. Allen Dean, manager, transportation bureau, Detroit Board of Commerce:

DETROIT ASKS DIRECT AIR SERVICE TO SOUTH

Detroit's railroad service with Florida is the poorest of any major American city. Its air service is also wholly inadequate.

Of the 6 principal cities of the North—New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, and Baltimore—Detroit reaches the least number of metropolitan districts in the Southeast by one-plane service—Detroit reaches 8, New York 28, Chicago 18, Philadelphia 25, Cleveland 11, Baltimore 19.

If we are meticulously fair and add to the one-plane cities, those reached by one-carrier service, we find that only Cleveland has less service than Detroit—Detroit then reaches a total by one-carrier service of 19 cites, Cleveland 17, New York 31, Chicago 32, Philadelphia 31, Baltimore 30.

The fastest passenger train from Detroit to Jacksonville takes 32½ hours for the 1,110 miles—an average speed of slightly over 31 miles an hour. The Seaboard Railway maintains a 51 mile-an-hour clip between New York and Jacksonville, the Burlington Zephyrs 64 miles an hour between Chicago and Denver, the Rock Island Rockets 52 miles an hour on a similar run. Even on a relatively unimportant run like Chicago-Dalhart, Tex., the Rock Island averages 40 miles per hour.

Let's look at Detroit's present air service with Florida. The volume of traffic moves via either Washington or Chicago to take advantage of two-carrier connecting service. The fares via those routes are $15 higher than over the shorter three-carrier route via Cincinnati. Thus the public shrinks away from three-carrier service at a $15 saving and trusts itself to the least number of companies available.

What do the applicants hold out for our people with their proposed services?

1. Direct one-plane service over a 1,200-mile route where only two-carrier and three-carrier services now exist.

2. A reduction of 4 hours' elapsed time to Jacksonville and 5 hours to Miami, with the use of four-engined equipment.

3. A service to important intermediate points such as Columbus, Charleston, and Roanoke where only connecting service is now available and to the Piedmont area where present surface and air services are particularly poor.

Detroit is unique among air-line stations. With the poor air-line service that existed during the Board's survey months, Detroit never ranked lower than fifth. In September 1940, fourth.

Now that the Board has recognized and ministered somewhat to Detroit's needs in the Memphis and New York cases, we are confident of becoming one of the Nation's heaviest-volume traffic centers.

There is every reason why Detroit can support this Florida route. The 3,000,000 people living within 1 hour's driving time of our airport are largely employed in manufacturing products which are distributed worldwide and which return a value that is third only among American cities and produce wages for workers that likewise aggregate third highest in the country.

It is the fourth city of the land in population, fifth in retail sales, sixth in wholesale sales, third in value of manufactured products, third in the value added by manufacture, third in individual income-tax returns, and third in air express.

But, of course, Detroit will not need to support the route all alone. In Michigan and Ohio in 1940, the principal northern traffic generators for the route, there were 12,000,000 people. Further, encompassed within the 260,000 square miles of Southeastern States on this route there were 15,000,000 other people.

Aside from the fact that Florida and Michigan are two of the most important resort States in the United States and thereby generate a high volume of traffic, there are considerable other reason why shorter, cheaper, direct air service is justifiable.

Detroit is an important producer of consumer goods. They are distributed in heavy volume in the Southern States along the route here proposed.

The first of these commodities in volume, I hardly need mention because it is so well identified with Detroit. But I will point out that Detroit, with but 1.2 percent of the country's population, produced 41.2 percent of the motor vehicles and motor-vehicle parts; and, further, that in 1941, 3,396 dealers in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia, sold 2,750,000 vehicles.

There are other commodities that are produced in our city and sold in substantial quantities in the affected areas: Refrigerators, household appliances, business machines, iron and steel products, paints, drugs and pharmaceuticals, chemicals and allied products, machine tools, and other metal-working machinery.

We did a detailed analysis of the distribution system of 4 typical Detroit firms—Eureka Vacuum Cleaner Co., Chevrolet, Chrysler, Nash-Kelvinator Corporation (Kelvinator division). We learned that they had 700 dealers, branches, warehouses, and representatives in the corridor of this route.

In another study we found that 600 companies domiciled in the southern cities maintained establishments in our community.

We have a great stake in the international aspects of this route, too. Detroit has 500 exporters and the out-State cities of Michigan another 300 exporters. Many of them do business in the Caribbean area and in other South American countries. In fact, one-fifth of all 1940 automotive exports went to South America, and a fine prospect for post-war expansion is fully expected as a compliment of the good-neighbor policy.

You are accustomed to being told of the convenience to passengers that arises out of dealing with just one company from origin to destination. This is very real. At present it is probably the most important argument in favor of through routes.

But we in Detroit see another vital need for our gaining all the one-company services our economics can justify. I am speaking of air cargo; and I am not talking strictly of the desirability of escaping transfer of lading. I am thinking of the specific commodity rates that the carriers must install if they are to gain any appreciable amount of freight. They cannot expect that the air express rates or even the rates they are now publishing in their freight tariffs to make serious contributions to any great volume.

They will soon get down to making rates between specific points that are designed to move particular traffic. If there is a through one-company route between the origin and destination the problem will be simple. But, if two or more lines must squabble over both the level of the experimental rate and how they are going to divide the revenue, there will be much delay and perhaps indefinite postponement.

Ultimately cargo will return several times the revenue that passengers will. We have only to look at the amount of transportation that goes into our shelter, our food, our clothing and our recreation as compared with the number of personal trips that we take to appreciate how this may well be possible.

We have made some cargo studies of the hauling of tomatoes and strawberries from Florida and Louisiana to Detroit in converted surplus military aircraft operated as contract carriers. Return loads would be of manufactured goods for cities near to the growing fields. The charges we found could be way under anything the common carriers have ever looked at. Yet, I know that those carriers subject to your jurisdiction will want to tap that traffic. You can make that possible by installing direct service to high-capacity consuming points such as Detroit.

Detroit needs from this proceeding: (1) a through one-carrier service with as many cities of the South as possible; (2) a high-class through operation between the winter playground of Florida and the summer playground of Michigan, and (3) a service to as many intermediate points as possible.

It is not pleasant to be forced to argue a choice as between carriers. But, we feel duty-bound to point out to you that the principal city on this route is Detroit, that Detroit's greatest need must be the concern of the Board.

National Airlines is of minor importance to Detroit. There are no cities on National's route that we cannot reach as well or better via existing routes or via that here recommended for Eastern. Further, National has just acquired a gigantic operation between Jacksonville and New York which it has exploited but very little. This service should be given to a carrier that can activate it immediately.

Pennsylvana-Central Airlines is in somewhat the same fix as National. It has just acquired two of the most lucrative routes in the country—New York entry and Detroit-Chicago nonstop. It has launched the Chicago service with 7 daily round trips and will probably double that as soon as possible; certainly the volume is there. It is now straining to open the New York route, which will certainly entertain a terrific volume of service. P. C. A. would connect Detroit with no new stations other than the proposed route.

The same is true of America. And Detroit needs to break out of that category of reaching less stations without transfer than any other major city. This is our chance. It may not come again in a generation—this opportunity to get on the lines of Eastern that lace and interlace the whole South.

We, therefore, urge that the board authorize a Detroit-Miami route and that it certificate Eastern Air Lines to operate it.

The Battle of Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a radio address of Mr. Herbert Bratter made over the Columbia Broadcasting System through the facilities of WTOP, Washington, D. C., Saturday, March 17, 1945, 10:45 to 11 p. m., relating to the agreements made at the Bretton Woods Conference.

Mr. Bratter is Washington correspondent for the magazine Banking, and former Department of Commerce and Treasury Department monetary expert. The topic of Mr. Bratter's address is the Battle of Bretton Woods.

Washington has been seeing the opening stages of what history may record as the Battle of Bretton Woods. Never have we had an issue quite like this one; never such an unprecedented Government publicity campaign; lobbying such as to entirely dwarf the gold and silver campaigns of the early 1930's.

The very matters at issue are open evidence of how far we Americans have moved toward statism since the carefree days of the 1920's.

If you are a typical American listening to this broadcast from Washington, you are doubtless all for "international cooperation" of every kind. When World War No. 1 ended, you were 3 years old. You personally remember nothing of the international cooperation that followed the big armistice. You probably have never heard of the billions this country lent abroad in the 1920's, or of the defaults which followed that lending.

As the typical American, you live in Indiana, 550 miles from Washington; and Bretton Woods, N. H., is about 900 miles away from you. So you may feel that you do not know as much as you ought to know about the Bretton Woods agreements, which the newspapers and radio have been mentioning so much, all of a sudden.

In this short broadcast, I can tell you only a little about those agreements, which fill nearly 100 pages with legal and financial phraseology. Even in moneywise London experts are arguing heatedly about the meaning of Bretton Woods; warning their own people and us that it is foolhardy to hurry into a plan, the leading members of which have diametrically different interpretations of what it means.

The ancestors of the Bretton Woods program were drawn up by technicians in the United States Treasury and by Lord Keynes and his staff in London. At various times technicians of other governments were consulted; at first only informally, later more formally. In the end, the experts' program for monetary and financial stabilization was publicly unveiled in London and Washington. To consider that program—but only that program—the United States Government last summer convoked at Bretton Woods a full-dress intergovernmental conference of 44 United and Associated Nations. That conference was not at the technicians' level, but at the political level; and political forces distorted somewhat the carefully measured scheme of the experts.

While the Bretton Woods Agreements reflect the wishes of militarily important countries, basically they constitute a marriage of the original, and in important respects, incompatible British and Americans plans.

At Bretton Woods, as I have mentioned, there were 44 national delegations. All were heard; but actually, a few big governments dominated the proceedings. There was our own large delegation, headed by Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau. There was the British delegation under Lord Keynes. And there were the Chinese, who padded their already unnecessarily large contingent with a miscellaneous personnel because of the prestige which they imagine mere numbers would give.

Also, there were many small delegations. Guatemala's, for example, consisted of only a single university student; Guatemala's lonely technician. I recall that one of the busy Russian delegates commented a bit enviously that delegates of the smaller countries could enjoy their holiday at Bretton Woods, swimming in the outdoor pool, and playing golf and tennis, while the big countries worked.

Just what is a Bretton Woods technician? He is an official who buys and sells foreign currency for his treasury; a man who can pick up the overseas phone and lend a few million dollars to stabilize some troubled currency abroad. The civil-service rolls probably call him an economist. He is most likely a former college professor. He may or may not have a passion for anonymity, but a passion he certainly possesses, for his is the power and the glory—and the salary, incidentally, is not at all bad compared with what the university used to pay.

The Bretton Woods Conference agreed to submit to the governments, although without any recommendation, the two agreements—one for an international monetary fund; the other for an international bank for reconstruction and development. That is the program which is now being high pressured in Congress and throughout the country.

The fund would make loans to its members for currency stabilization—short-term loans presumably, but not solely.

The bank would make or guarantee long-term loans, maturing sometime around 1980.

If the monetary unit of China, for example, showed weakness, that country, as a member of the fund, could apply to the fund for relief. If Russia wanted to build a dam, or Mexico a highway, they would presumably receive long-term assistance.

In the fund and the bank, at the start, the principal assets would be the dollars which the United States would pay in. Our total commitments would be about $6,000,000,000; although the fund and bank both would be enabled by the terms of the agreements to apply to us for more dollars later. Our legal commitment would approximate $6,000,000,000. Our moral commitment, as the prime authors of the plan and as the too-anxious hosts at Bretton Woods, no one can measure.

The Administration is very proud and extremely earnest about the plan. Many able spokesmen have been working both days and nights to get the plan adopted. They say Bretton Woods is the first test of our willingness to cooperate for an enduring peace.

Indeed we are told lasting peace is not possible at all without this fund and this bank; that Congress must approve Bretton Woods before the San Francisco International Conference meets next month; or at the very least, before the San Francisco meeting is concluded.

Secretary Morgenthau has frankly undertaken to sell the program to the Nation. And by selling, he doesn't mean any half-way publicity measures. He has employed a publicity man solely to promote Bretton Woods.

For months there have been articles by advocates of the fund and bank in all sorts of private and public publications. Thousands of reprints of those articles have been distributed.

Columnists and radio commentators have taken lunch with the Treasury's Secretary, with Bretton Woods served for desert. The movies have not been overlooked. Government speakers have been dispatched to all parts of the country to address any group willing to listen. On one recent occasion, the mountain was brought to Mohammed, when 106 pressure groups were invited to send representatives to an all-day lecture course in Washington.

You may wonder, has this program any opponents. For a long time they were not, but now you can hear them get up an argument on Bretton Woods at the drop of a hat.

The most conspicuous skeptics are bankers. This isn't so hard to understand, because bankers cannot get used to the idea of a lending institution in which our dollars are lent by a board of directors on which the borrowers with bad debts records themselves sit. Also, many bankers—and others too—object to the fund since, as they see it, the borrowers would have an automatic right under very flexible safeguards to borrow within more or less arbitrary quotas. When bankers are against something, it is popular here to argue that that something must be good. Somewhat like the Jews in Hitler-Germany, the bankers are a handy whipping boy here. And do not think that the advocates of Bretton Woods don't know it.

Because foreign exchange and investment is something which certain bankers know better than any other group of taxpayers, the two reports issued by various bankers' committees last month deserve examination on their merits. The authors of those reports, it may be noted in passing, while criticising the proposed fund, endorse the Bretton Woods Bank. And they also endorse other lending proposals of the Administration.

Unfortunately, high Treasury officials have taken the eye off the ball by questioning the motives of bankers and others who oppose the Bretton Woods Fund. They state or imply that such opponents are a small and unrepresentative group of Wall Street international bankers who seek, if not profit, its from speculating in exchange, then power.

When the American Bankers Association has to decide a problem involving savings banks, they naturally appoint a committee of savings bankers to make a study and report. So with Bretton Woods; the bankers naturally appointed committees of members familiar with international exchange. These committees contained bankers from all parts of the country. Only 9 of the 42 A. B. A. committee members were New York bankers.

So I repeat; what those committees had to say about Bretton Woods should be examined dispassionately and not elbowed aside with appeals to emotion, such as we have been hearing. Believe it or not, Bretton Woods supporters have searched as far back as 1913 to support their statement that banker are blind and unprogressive when they do not support the Bretton Woods program; progressive when they do it. They tell us that bankers opposed the Federal Reserve Act; that they opposed Federal Deposit Insurance. Well, if the bankers association or its committee did oppose deposit insurance, so did Senator CARTER GLASS; and so did Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The bankers did not poll the Nation's 15,000 banks before making their Bretton Woods report. At the same time other organizations have come out for Bretton Woods without having polled their membership.

You can see that the Bretton Woods debate in Washington is getting derailed. The country is interested in the meaning of Bretton Woods and not in motives and personalities, which only confuse the issue.

Here are the outstanding points about the Bretton Woods program:

1. Both the fund and the bank would lend American dollars abroad, would stimulate foreign purchases of our goods with our money. By lending dollars, the fund aims to eliminate so-called currency wars. It seeks international trade balanced at a high level, not by Bulgaria's accepting payment for its exports in the form of harmonicas and aspirin, but by the United States, the world's banker, either taking the harmonicas and aspirin, or else not getting paid in full.

2. The fund and bank would stimulate our exports, would make jobs here. They would contribute toward the so long sought goal of full employment in the years just ahead.

3. The Bretton Woods bill would, for most countries, repeal our Johnson Act of 1934, the act prohibiting foreign governments not up to date on their debts to our Treasury from borrowing more money in Wall Street. This repeal would make possible the outflow abroad of billions of American private capital, for investment in new foreign bonds.

Such an outflow of money eventually would far exceed the $6,000,000,000 to which, under the bill, our Government would be committed.

4. Viewed in perspective, the fund and bank are only a small part of a much vaster plan to lend and lend-lease abroad. The Export-Import Bank is certain to be expanded severalfold. And private businesses are being urged to extend credits and invest abroad and so to make exports and jobs for workers. The Undersecretary of Commerce has made the incredible observation that we can go on making well conceived foreign investments indefinitely—something like Tennyson's brook—without ever bringing repayment home.

Post-war lend-lease commitments totaling a rumored $20,000,000,000, and on 30-year repayment terms, are under consideration, and the first such loan, to France, has actually been announced; with a clause providing for practical cancelation if repayment becomes inconvenient.

5. These enormous Government export plans, which in most respects are unopposed if not actually endorsed by leading agricultural, labor, manufacturing, and banking organizations, constitute an unthought-through plan for trying to make prosperity. Unless our tariffs are materially reduced, there will not be the remotest chance that we can recover all we put into this great lend-and-export boom.

Such a dreamer's program of making jobs will cover up the basic economic problem of post-war America and the post-war world. For a few years it may give us the semblance of prosperity. But, if the outside debtor world this time makes a real effort to repay the loans, there will still be the insuperable obstacle of America's tariff policy.

For example, if we lend China the additional billions which some Chinese leaders want for that country's industrialization, and, if thereby China's coolie labor is enabled to lay electric-light bulbs, vacuum cleaners, sheets, bicycles, radios, and whatnot behind our tariff walls, shall we welcome that development? Will our labor leaders who are now supporting the idea of big foreign loans and our manufacturers close down gracefully?

Not on your life. They will even object to Chinese cheap-labor competition in our export markets.

This tremendous lend-and-export program is not a plan. It is a half plan which, a writer in the February issue of Harper's Magazine strikingly argues, "can only lead us to World War No. 3, rather than to the promised peace."

Perhaps there is no satisfactory solution. Maybe there is no easy escape from the painful readjustment from the exertions of global war to peaceful employment. If Bretton Woods loans would help us make five or six million jobs for Americans we need to find out at what cost to us in depleted natural resources. And we need to know something about the lend-lease and other plans for distributing our taxpayers' dollars, your dollars, through political bodies in exchange for foreign I O U's with escape clauses.

Even Dr. Harry White, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, before he joined the Government service stated: "The assumption that capital exports benefit both the lending country and the world at large is not unassailable * * * capital exports are not always beneficial to the exporting country.[1]

It looks like this whole proposition should be carefully thought through, lest it fall through.

The Only Hope of Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "The Only Hope of Victory," delivered by Clarence Budington Kelland, National Republican committeeman for Arizona, at Lincoln Day meeting, Nogales, Ariz., February 12, 1945:

We have met tonight to venerate the memory of Abraham Lincoln, first Republican President of the United States. It seems to me that there is no more reverend way to pay tribute to the memory of this greatest of Americans than to seek, by study of his character and of his words, to find and to express what advice he might desire to give, in these tragic days, to the great political party of which he was the leader.

He would have looked backward at 12 years of defeat, and he would have sought to determine the reasons for our defeats, and the reasons why, in four national campaigns the voters of this country have retained in power an administration whose principles are the contrary of the principles which were his own. He would have studied and weighed, in an effort to discover why the voters of the United States maintained in power an administration they mistrusted; whose intentions they feared; with whose planning of our domestic life they disagreed; and whose integrity they doubted.

I am confident he would have reached the conclusion that these New Deal victories were not the result of superior political organization on the part of our opponents; not because of vast sums of money squandered to influence votes; not because of spurious humanitarian principles, nor because of alliance with such radical organizations as the Committee for Political Action. Most certainly he would have been assured in his fine mind that these victories were not the result of splendid principles calculated to better the common condition of our citizens and to make of America a finer, happier, healthier land.

He would have found, I fear, that our defeats were due to ourselves and our own leadership. He would have found, I fear, that most notably in the election campaigns of 1940 and of 1944, the Republican Party was

[1] Harry D. White, the French International Accounts, 1880–1913; Harvard Economic Studies; Cambridge, 1933, p. 311.

lacking in that most vital of all political assets—the courage to stand for what it knew was right and to condemn boldly what it knew was wrong.

The Republican Party for 8 years has not stood like a rock; it has allowed itself to be blown aimlessly about like a tumbleweed.

The Republican Party has compromised its integrity in an effort to make itself attractive to voters it never can win. It has sold its birthright for a mess of pottage. It has tried to be all things to all men. It has side-tepped. It has appeased. It has been untrue to its traditions in a scramble for votes. With weak-kneed opportunism it has out-promised the New Deal. In two elections it fished for votes with New Deal bait—and came home with no fish.

The Republican Party will never win again until it has courage to say to the people of the United States, "Damn the votes. These are the principles we stand for and will fight for. This is our platform in which we believe and on which we will stand because we know it is good for our Nation. Because we know that only by making it the law of the land can this Republic be restored, the freedom of the individual be reestablished, the moral fiber of the Nation be brought to life again, and happiness, security, serenity, liberty, and opportunity be guaranteed to every man, woman, and child within our borders."

The only way the Republican Party can marshal votes behind its banner is by casting away forever the demagog's method of winning votes. The only way the Republican Party can win the next election is by opposing what seems to be popular and by standing fearlessly for what is right.

A thousand men in a thousand places from coast to coast have asked me, "What has the Republican Party to offer?"

That is a question the Republican Party must answer, and answer quickly. It will not be enough to answer it with philippic against Franklin Roosevelt. It will not be enough to answer it by saying that we stand for most of the things the New Deal stands for, but that we can administer them more efficiently.

We must have the courage to tell the country that we do not stand for most of the things the New Deal stands for; and we must specify the things we oppose and give our reasons. But that will not be enough. In this world you get nowhere merely by accusing other people of doing wrong; you must tell them what you will do that is right, and you must make them believe that you mean what you say.

You cannot sell your bill of goods by telling the customers that your competitor carries an inferior line of merchandise. You must stock your shelves with honest wares, honestly manufactured and worth the customer's money. And you must advertise those wares and display those wares until the customers see for themselves that you are running a better store than the firm across the street. You must convince them that you carry in stock articles it is to their advantage to buy, and that your business methods are honest and that you stand back of your advertisements.

I am a Republican. I am proud of the history and the accomplishments of my party, and of the merchandise it has carried upon its shelves from the day Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated until the day Franklin Roosevelt was inauguarated. But, since the New Deal went into business I cannot be proud of my party nor of its merchandising methods, nor of the shoddy stock of goods it has placed upon its shelves. We have lost because we have deserved to lose; and we will never win until we burn our shoddy stock and replace it with cloth that is all wool and a yard wide. Nor until we change our business methods and reorganize our affairs and our management and convince the public that courage, integrity, true patriotism, and a desire to serve our country honorably are once more the backbone of our party.

We must not be afraid of the word "conservative" in this day when the multitude is shouting the word "radical." To conserve means to save. It does not mean a shellback who does not believe in human progress. It does not mean a flint heart who has no sympathy for the poor and the hungry and the oppressed. It does not mean a reactionary who places property rights above human rights. It does not mean a fool who believes we can go back to the bad old days of greed and exploitation and unregulated gouging of the people by the avaricious. It means—the word "conservative" means—a man who labors to save. First, to save the Nation from ruin; second, to save the individual from the serfdom of regimentation; third, to save the sacred right of equal opportunity for all; fourth, to save the right of every man to make the most of his abilities in the business or calling which he chooses, and the right to lay aside and keep his surplus earnings to insure him security in old age. And next it means to save, to conserve, to insure those national morals, that national virtue, which made this Nation great and rich and happy for a hundred and fifty years. That is the meaning of conservative. The Republican Party must adopt it and make it its own, and have courage to use it as a challenge and a watchword and a battle cry in the tragic days that lie before us.

The Republican Party must realize and emphasize the truth, made manifest in the dictator countries in Europe, that there is but one road to freedom and stability, and that is the road of true democracy. It must realize and preach to the people that the road to the greatest happiness for the greatest number can never come from aping and adopting the slogans of socialism or nazi-ism or communism—which after all end in one and the same thing. It must prove to all that illusory social gains are not worth the real moral losses they cause.

It must announce the great truth that democracy seeks equality in liberty; the New Deal trend seeks equality in restraint and servitude. A great Frenchman saw and stated this a hundred years ago. Democracy fights for equality among freemen; the New Deal fights for equality among servants of the state.

The Republican Party must realize and state as the text of its revival sermons that democratic socialism, the end and aim of the New Deal—and the great Utopia toward which Europe has been traveling for a generation—results not in happiness, freedom, security for all; but inevitably in unhappiness, misery, coercion of the individual to the point of serfdom, and in the end to dictatorship, tyranny, and the loss of all those great benefits for which mankind had been fighting and dying for a hundred years.

My faith in the American people is firm. If they are given the opportunity to choose between right and wrong they will make the good choice. The Republican Party must give them the chance to choose.

The New Deal has been positive, concrete, and definite in stating its principles and its aims. The Nation knows what the New Deal stands for. A positive program must always win against an indefinite program or no program at all. Bad principles will win if no good principles are stated in opposition to them. You cannot beat an army with a mob. You cannot upset a lie with a mere denial and without a statement of the truth; you cannot make the people choose between something and nothing which is what we have been trying to do. You can't smash a rock with a puffball.

Therefore we must set definite program against definite program, concrete principles against concrete principles. We must make the difference plain as black and white. We must give the voters of America a chance to choose between a definite thing and a definite thing. We must force a choice. We must give an opportunity to choose. The New Deal has told us what they have to offer; we must tell the Nation what we have to offer.

You cannot bamboozle an intelligent people forever. Not if the opposition to the bamboozling offers integrity and honesty and right thinking in its place. But you can sell a fake patent medicine forever to a community that has no doctor. We have been sick. The New Deal has sold its Umatilla Indian quack remedy to a nation suffering from cramps in the stomach. Because there has been no doctor to diagnose and to prescribe. The Republican Party must be the doctor and it must write its prescription calling for honest drugs expertly compounded by a chemist. The New Deal has been trying to cure a national cancer with incantations, spells, and vanilla-flavorerd rain water. The Republican Party must prove that cancer can be cured only by an operation, and it must prove that it has the skill and the surgical instruments to operate successfully.

In the past two elections the Republican Party has nominated for the high office of national surgeon two different men. We lost those two elections—and why? Because both of our candidates for the high position promised 10-percent knife work and 90-percent spells, incantations and flavored rain water. The answer of the country was emphatic that they preferred a full-fledged medicine man to a 10-percent doctor.

Upon foreign issues we have spoken well. We have stated our position insofar as it can be stated until all the post-war facts are in our possession. We cannot speak with exact definiteness until we know in what respects our allies, Great Britain and Russia, will be willing to cooperate with us to prevent future wars; until we are informed of their territorial war aims. We have defined our position and our willingness to do our part, and the country is satisfied with our declaration.

But there remain vital domestic matters, the most important of which I shall list. Until we make clear to the voters what we have to offer with respect to these, and until we compel them to believe in our sincerity they will not entrust us with the administration of our affairs.

First in importance—and it comes close to solving the whole problem if it be guaranteed to us—is the matter of the civil rights and privileges of the individual. This is the very foundation of democracy. All else is erected upon it. Nothing can stand and be permanent unless the foundation of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness be made certain and indestructible to the common man.

Under the guise of war necessity we have been required to surrender our personal rights to freedom of action. We have not been watchful. We have given up more than was essential in our common eagerness to bring the war to a speedy and victorious conclusion.

These rights must be returned to us when peace shall come, not curtailed but enlarged, and so surrounded by safeguards that they never can be taken away from us again.

The matter is simple. Each and every individual, every man, woman, and child must be guaranteed in his rights to live his life as he shall choose within the framework of just laws enacted for the protection of his neighbors. He shall be guaranteed in his rights to maintain his home, to create a family and to educate it, and within his doors to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. He shall be assured of the right to choose whatever calling may appeal to him as a means of livelihood. He shall be assured of the right to change that calling at will. He shall be assured of the right to utilize his savings to go into business if he desires, and to conduct that business without improper meddling by any governmental agency. He shall be permitted to compete fairly with his business rivals. He shall be permitted to conduct his store, his shop, his factory, his farm according to his own best

judgment and not in accord with a set of rules devised by some Government bureau. He shall be permitted to buy upon an open, competitive market, and to sell upon an open, competitive market. The only laws that shall circumscribe and limit his freedom of action and his freedom of will shall be those properly enacted to protect his neighbors from dishonesty, his competitors from unfair practices, and his employees from injustice. Within these limits his will shall be his law, and his success shall be limited only by his individual ability. He shall be permitted to make a profit, and the amount of that profit shall be limited only by regulations against greed, extortion, cheating, exploitation of his employees, and impairing the health of his neighbors, customers, and employees. He shall be permitted to invest his surplus earnings in any manner he shall deem wise, and so to lay up a reserve to support him in his old age or incapacity, or to tide him over bad times in business. He shall not be limited in the amount of his sales or his production or his crops, and the prices at which he shall sell shall be limited, not by artificial regulation but by the laws of supply and demand. He shall be permitted to buy where he will and to sell where he will; to advertise, to use his skill and his sagacity to make the most of his opportunities. He shall be permitted to risk has capital in new ventures and to derive an adequate profit from such ventures. He shall not be cramped, hampered, supervised, or otherwise meddled with except as the laws of health and of honest business and the protection of the public shall require. He shall be a freeman, encouraged to do his best, to achieve his utmost, and by his own success to contribute to the general welfare and prosperity of the Nation.

If the Republican Party will affirm and guarantee these individual rights it will have gone far to cure the ills from which this Nation has suffered and bring us back to safety, security, and true prosperity.

Second, the Republican Party must take a definite, fair, and statesmanlike position upon the question of labor.

Every intelligent man knows that one of the greatest stabilizing forces in the world is organized labor. So long as labor is permitted to organize socialism, communism, nazi-ism fascism, cannot come into control of the state. Before any one of these parties can impose itself upon the Nation it must first destroy organized labor and organized religion. The right of any individual to associate himself with other individuals for their common protection and betterment is an essential part of democracy. But to make their will and their desires effective democratic processes must govern the union as well as the Nation. Union action must come as the result of the will of a majority of its members just as national action must come as a result of the will of the majority of the Nation's citizens. There must be no dictatorship in labor unions as there must be no dictatorship in the Nation. Each union must be a republic within a republic, acting as a unit for the benefit of its members, dealing for them, bargaining for them, negotiating for them.

But, just as monopolies are abhorrent in business, so monopolies are abhorrent in labor. Just as business must be fairly supervised to prevent excesses and injury to the people, so must labor be supervised for the same reason. The individual must be assured of protection against labor exactly as the individual must be assured of protection against capital. Every individual shall be defended in his right to join a labor organization, but equally every man must be defended in his right to refrain from joining a labor organization if he believes he can do better for himself as an individual. He must be protected in his right to seek employment wherever he desires, and he shall not be excluded from employment because he is not a member of any organized body.

Concentrations of capital are forbidden to contribute money to any political party or organization; concentrations of labor, for the same reason, should be forbidden to contribute money to any political party or organization. And neither capital nor labor should be permitted to evade the law by subterfuge.

The Republican Party must constitute itself the defender and the champion of organized labor against the New Deal which, by devious methods, dear to the heart of revolutionists, has sought to undermine the integrity and the strength of organized labor. But it must also champion the rights of the individual laborer who, for reasons sufficient to himself, declines to become a member of nonmembership; no man must be deprived of the right to earn a living by reason of nonmembership; no man must be deprived of a right to earn a living because he becomes a member.

Third, the Republican Party must pledge itself to revise and to make efficient our present cumbersome, inequitable, and blundering system of taxation. We must tax for revenue and not for revolution. We shall, for years to come, be crushed under a great burden of taxation. But that burden must be made as light as possible to the individual and to the industry of the Nation. It must be given stability so that the individual will know what he will have to pay and for a reasonable time into the future, in order that he may plan to meet the requirements and organize his affairs. Taxes must be fairly distributed. They must be so levied as to encourage and not to discourage; to create and not to destroy.

Fourth, the Republican Party must pledge itself to decrease the powers of the Federal Government and to increase the powers of the several States. It must divest itself of powers and responsibilities better performed by the States, and it must compel the States to assume those powers and responsibilities. Local self-government must be strengthened; centralized government must be lessened and distributed.

Fifth, the Republican Party must realize and state with all the power at its command that the greatest course that could fall upon any nation would be complete economic security for every citizen. If, through Government bounty we free every citizen from anxiety as to the future financial security of himself and his family you destroy the greatest asset of the Nation. And that is the ambition of its citizens to better themselves. If a man knows that he and his family will be supported by a beneficent state he will not have the greatest impelling reason to support himself and his family. The greatest spur to endeavor in the world is fear; the most appalling catastrophe that could overtake any nation would be the removal of that spur. If, by some fantastic miracle every man, woman, and child in America could be assured of enough money to supply his needs, then the nation would die. Only that nation lives and becomes great which supplies, not state-given security, but the opportunity to become secure through the initiative, the industry, the economy, the foresight, the invention, and the integrity of each citizen. Only that state is great which provides opportunity, equal for all. The Republican Party must say to the Nation that it will guarantee to every man the right and the opportunity to work and to save for himself, to amass a competence, and to earn happiness and leisure and plenty; but that it will not go along with those who would remove ambition, initiative, and driving force of necessity by insuring to all that they will be secure without earning their security.

We cannot go back to the old days of "root hog or die"—though it was that practice which made this Nation the magnificent structure that it is. We must care for the sick, we must keep starvation and misery from the door of the unfit and the helpless aged, and the worthy who have, through no fault of their own, fallen upon evil days. We must give sufficient aid in flood, famine, and calamity. But, in season and out of season, by day and by night, we must preach the doctrine that the dignity of man, the integrity of the individual demand that he exert himself to the utmost to provide for himself, to support his wife, his children, his aged parents—and that the only thing that can be safely guaranteed to him is the opportunity to work, to earn, to save, and to become secure through his own splendid efforts. We must guarantee opportunity; the citizen must avail himself of it—under any other way of life the Nation dies.

These are but a few of the points upon which the Republican Party must make itself clear. The rest are supplemental. I believe that Abraham Lincoln would be in agreement with each of them and that he would applaud our party if it took its stand upon them.

Let us then—our Republican Party—be bold, be courageous, be daring to stand for what we know is right. This Nation will know the right when it sees it, and will rally around the cause of right, of wisdom, of integrity. Down this road, and only down this road, does victory lie—and with victory the safety and permanence and happiness and serenity of this land that we love.

Understanding France Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include part of the excellent address of Maury Maverick, Chairman of S. W. P. C., delivered before France Forever Society, Washington, D. C., March 15, 1945. The address is as follows:

A NATION OF SMALL BUSINESS AND SMALL FARMERS

France at the outbreak of this war was a nation of small farmers, of thousands of small plants and small businesses. It also had great combines, cartels, big monopolies, as any nation has. There were large textile, iron, and steel factories. But the heart of French industry was small business.

France produced about five-sixths of its own food before the war. Now little or no food is coming in, and French farm production has been greatly reduced because there is an acute shortage of fertilizer, and most farm implements have worn out. The war has prevented the making of new implements or the delivering of them if made. Lack of transportation makes it difficult to distribute even the reduced food supply available to the French people, especially in the urban centers.

Iron and steel manufacture was the chief industry of France before the war. It is now laid low.

Textiles ranked second, and textiles are laid low.

Mining was a great industry, but even before the war, a third of French coal was imported.

The conclusion is that France was not wholly self-sufficient before the war.

This will help us understand the desperate plight of the French people today. Likewise, we must remember the ordeals, the strains, the depletions, the stresses, the losses of nearly 6 years of war, catastrophe, horror, occupation.

WHAT GERMANY DID TO FRANCE

Germany enslaves and deports French labor; likewise robs her of production

Let us consider the condition of France today. Approximately 400,000 soldiers, sailors, and civilians have been killed. Three million Frenchmen were taken to Germany as prisoners of war or as forced laborers. Over a million French homes have been destroyed.

First in occupied France, and then all over France, the Germans destroyed the basis of French economy, which was ordinary little business, and the free-enterprise system. This they did to compel all raw materials to go to big businesses, so airplanes and munitions would be fabricated for Germany. In such manner were the people of France robbed by the Nazis.

France was forced to produce much war equipment for German account. Indeed, France produced 22 percent of the trucks used by Germany, 10 percent of locomotives, 12 percent of airplane engines, 6 percent of aircraft, plus practically the total ouput of steel, iron and textiles. Practically none of this production was available to the civilian population.

This meant that there was a sharp decrease in the production of consumers' goods—clothing, shoes, processed foods, and the like—for French civilians. Many Frenchmen have not obtained any consumers' goods whatsoever since the war began. The list is endless; it is the list of consumers' goods, no tooth paste or tooth brushes, socks, shoes, and the most primitive necessities of sanitation or cooking.

During the German occupation, the French standard of living dropped precipitately and seriously. Food and goods were shipped to Germany in great quantities. Millions of tons of grain, meat, vegetables and fruit were sent to Germany—seized away from the children and people of France. Besides the coal, steel, iron and food, French shipping was seized by Germans. Foreign commerce ceased for France, except forced trading with Spain and Germany, and a very small or negligible amount with close-by neutral countries, while the blockade in effect meant France had no foreign trade. There was transportation by rail, canal and truck for a low level of subsistence, but that was all.

Germany commits actual thievery of money from French people—Steals banking system and purloins by printing francs

Germany levied tribute on France. In 1939, France had 130,000,000,000 francs in circulation. The Germans printed francs and brought this total up to 600,000,000,000—an increase of 360 percent. This and other measures wrecked the franc and the French financial system.

Due to the increasingly bad industrial situation and worsened living conditions, the death rate among old people and children greatly increased, and births decreased. In Paris I visited a police station. The sergeant showed me death certificates of many old people, who, being missed by their neighbors, were found to have died of cold and starvation in their beds. Also I saw death certificates of many children who had died from malnutrition or from diseases aggravated by malnutrition.

Now let us understand the psychological repercussions of allied occupation and intelligently analyze rather than smugly moralize.

Destruction in fight for liberation necessarily had some bad psychological effects

No Frenchman criticized the Americans for the cost of liberation.

But there are situations which we as Americans must understand.

First, even though we brought in our own food, the food supplies available to the French people, particularly in urban centers, have declined alarmingly since the liberation. Hunger and starvation cannot be answered by flowery speeches on liberty.

Second, the Germans stole the French financial system, controlled the franc, inflated it, and then wrecked the whole system. Then they "paid" lavishly with these stolen francs for goods and services, a roundabout substitute for stealing it all in the first place. This will someday be known among intellectuals as the mystic prestidigitation of purloining the French financial system, but among the common people as the gymnastics of Nazi thievery. And the day must come when France will get revenge upon these barbarian burglars and murderers.

We Americans honestly attempted to cooperate in giving France a sound financial system. Indeed, it is based on an agreement with the French themselves, setting the franc at 50 to to the dollar. But because of the unfortunate circumstances we have mentioned, this attempt to stabilize the franc has not worked out well.

When the value of the franc was set at 50 to the dollar, it was greatly overvalued and created an artificial condition of exchange for France, also made prices high to Americans in France. It created an active, monstrous black market in money. Anyhow, so long as there is little or no industry or deliverable food in France, francs and dollars cannot buy much of anything at any price. These are statements of fact, not criticism.

All I say is, something must be done, and done soon.

The foregoing conditions—the lack of industry and employment, the hunger, the suffering, can be remedied only by the rehabilitation of French industry from the ground up, starting now. France must have shipping. It must have raw materials.

Can it be done?

Yes—at least we can make a substantial beginning.

WHAT FRANCE IS LIKE TODAY

Most of the physical plant for manufacture—85 percent still remains intact—and there is manpower available.

But transportation, insofar as the civilian economic life of France itself is concerned, is so badly crippled as to be almost nonexistent. What there is is used for military operations practically altogether. The plants and manpower are largely unused because of the lack of fuel, transportation, and industrial electricity, and because of the weakness of the semi-starving population.

Manpower of France in desperate condition—3,000,000 in Germany, heavy unemployment and disorganization in France

Now about manpower. Before the war, France had a labor force of 10,000,000 industrial workers. This has been reduced by war and Nazi occupation. Since 3,000,000 Frenchmen are still in Germany, there are only about six or seven million left. Of these a million are totally idle and three million more have been thrown out of work by factory shut-downs due to shortages of raw materials and coal.

FUEL: THERE IS NO OIL, NOT MUCH WOOD, AND COAL PRODUCTION IS WAY DOWN

Let us look at the fuel situation in France. This means coal. There is no oil available, because our French and American and other Allied soldiers must use all the oil that is brought in the country. France does not have much wood. There are no candles, tallow, or fats for heat or light. When I was in France as a soldier in 1918, I saw people praying before tallow candles; now in churches people pray before artificial candles by inserting weak light bulbs, and there is no light at all in some churches.

Coal mining has been held back by lack of mine props which come from the forests—usually small trunks. This is now being remedied by the use of concrete props, and in some mines coal production is back to 80 percent of pre-war production. But it will be months before French coal production hits a higher level, nor is it known when coal can be imported. And even when coal is mined, the shortage of cars and trucks makes it impossible to move much to the factories, powerhouses, and homes where it is needed. Get this point, it's important: Even if you had coal, you couldn't move it to the user.

The electric power plant of France is about 90-percent intact, and repairs are being made. When coal can be made available to the powerhouses, the normal supply of electricity can quickly be made available.

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

Highways have been badly worn, many worn out; and many bridges destroyed. The Germans destroyed half the French motor vehicles during the retreat. Most of those which remain are old, half worn out, and cannot be operated because of shortages of tires, batteries, and gasoline.

The railroads, freight yards, and stations were bombed by our soldiers or destroyed by the Maquis to disable the Germans, and we already know the Germans destroyed or stole many cars and locomotives as they left; we know that when trains left for Germany they left never to return. The crippling of transportation keeps fuel from factories and homes and food from the cities and towns.

The waterways of France have been blocked. Some have been blocked by being bombed. Many of the dams and locks had been torn out or blown up by the Germans. Fallen bridges, and wrecked barges, obstruct transportation even now. Floods prevented barges from getting under bridges. In addition, during this worst of winters in 50 years, some rivers and canals have been frozen over.

Inflation is terrible—Only a very few rich can buy clothing and many other articles

The clothing situation is as bad, if not worse, than the food supply. When I left France, I gave away a worn suit. I priced the comparative value of this suit, and even at second hand, it would have cost at least $200. New suits cost $350 to $400. Neckties $15, shoes $50 to $100.

Oh, yes, you can still buy things in France. But only the few rich, the collaborators and racketeers who use the black market can get what they want.

You can buy medicines and antitoxins—that is, one-tenth of 1 percent of the population. At that, medicine sometimes would not do any good anyway. Resistance to diseases is reduced by cold and starvation. The contraction of many diseases, especially colds and pulmonary disorders, is increased. Tuberculosis is on the gain. There are fewer doctors in France than ever before. Hospital equipment has deteriorated, being practically absent in some places, and there are not enough nurses. Many hospitals are practically without heat.

Again I merely cite these as facts. I am not trying to be dramatic. But I do say that something has got to be done about it.

These facts should be widely known.

I say again, we must act upon these facts.

SOME THINGS WE HAVE DONE FOR FRANCE

What I have just told you makes it clear that we must help to remedy specific hardships, and what we must do to help France get on her feet. We have made some beginning on this.

We have helped to start France fighting her old foe, Germany, which she is anxious to do. Because we respect French courage, military leadership, and ability, we have equipped eight French divisions and have agreed to help equip eight more, along with many air-combat units. Because we respect the fighting French sailor, we have repaired and modernized a score of French naval vessels and transferred to France some 200 of our own naval craft. Altogether, we have provided the French Navy with $200,000,000

worth of materials and services since D-day. Because we can get value received, we plan to award to French industries contracts which in 1945 are expected to reach a billion dollars worth of military supplies to be made in France. These French contracts for French production are being given under reverse lend-lease and represent one of France's contributions to the common war effort. However, I must add, nowhere all the essential raw materials have yet been shipped. I call upon the American people to note that we respect the honor and integrity of France.

The American Army has rebuilt the destroyed French port facilities of Cherbourg and LeHarve sufficiently for maximum unloadings of war materials. Our Army has repaired most of the main highway bridges necessary for military operations. We have rebuilt main-line railroad bridges and eliminated long detours, almost entirely for military purposes. French civilian life is not provided for. We have helped to clean out the waterways and repair dams and locks. We have restored most of the utilities and sewage-disposal plants of bombed cities. Down to March 9, 1945, we had sent 273,010 tons of civilian supplies to France, which was very little indeed, but a start. We have assigned 31 ships to carry civilian goods to France in the first quarter of 1945. Of these, 9 or 10 ships have actually arrived in France. This may be increased in April.

A lend-lease agreement with the French was signed on February 28, 1945. This lend-lease arrangement provides for $2,575,000,000 worth of raw materials, food, rolling stock for railroads, essential heavy capital goods and machinery, desperately needed for the prosecution of the war. Though this material is specifically designated for aid in the Franco-American war effort, it is provided that France may buy long-life supplies which may have peacetime uses and any balance of supplies which may not be delivered in time for use in the war. The payments are to be made by France over a long period of time.

A FIVE-STAR MILITARY (AND CIVILIAN) PROGRAM TO HELP FRANCE

Here is a five-star program for the rehabilitation of France.

1. As a national policy we must want, and insure, a healthy and strong France in order to help win the war and hasten victory, to have good commercial relations in the future, and to maintain a strong military ally in the generations to come.

2. We must have more shipments by faster turn-arounds, unloadings, and distributions within France. This is crucial and is emphasized as a single point. Unless France has the needed goods within France, she cannot help herself or help us.

3. We must get more raw materials, food, and medicine to France. French industry and French life cannot fully contribute to the United Nations war effort, unless France has the materials for manufacture, plus some starters such as food, medicine, and other consumer goods.

4. Enough Allied civilians, technicians, should be established in France, just as in the War Production Board, and the Ministry of Supply and other necessary civilians with appropriate knowledge are now utilized in other nations. Some problems of France are grave, needing immediate attention, and military men should not be forced to give their time to such problems.

5. Let us promote understanding and good relations between the United States and France. One way is the exchange of 25,000 each of our citizens for training and education in each other's country.

Concerning this last point, my suggestion is a specific one. Let us bring to the United States at our expense on any available shipping, not necessarily passenger ships, 25,000 French men and boys and offer them training and education. These men could attend our universities, schools and colleges. They can go to our smaller war plants and our giant factories. They can learn American mass production. Remember, France has been in a technical and scientific black-out for nearly 5 years; let us teach these men all we can, and let them learn all they can.

By helping France, we help ourselves

Fellow Americans, let me return to the very beginning of my address. We love France. We must help France restore herself. We must do so, not only because we are indebted to France for past aid and because we love her. We must rebuild France because of our sense of honor, our respect for public morality, and our prestige in the world—indeed, for the sake of our very existence.

Let me repeat and emphasize that I do not recommend anything in the way of aiding France that would, in the slightest diminish the extent or effectiveness of our military effort in Europe. On the contrary, it would quicken our war effort.

In this war, one cannot divorce the military scene from the human beings who reside in France, any more than we can ignore 130,000,000 American civilians here in America. If the civilian front in France should be torn to pieces by further distress and resentment—and even if not by distress, by collapse—this may well prolong the war. And even if it does not prolong the war, it will bring us greater miseries in the future, lasting wounds, and more wars again. I do not suggest that France, patriotic and brave, may rise against the American people. The patience of France is great, but we must not overtax it.

We must do our duty to France and do it now.

Here is a word of caution, and let freedom-loving nations remember it as long as they care to exist. The warning is, beware of the Nazi, Prussian, and German military madness forever. Defeated, the Germans will go underground. At the moment of our victory, they will begin their work of disruption. The Nazis will speak darkly of the Bolshevik menace; they will do everything in their power to confound the allies, to encourage the democracies to fall out with one another so that they, the Nazis, can rise again, and try once more to destroy us.

If I have one solemn prayer, it is that our children and our children's children will not fall for such horrible lies and propaganda. When I returned from the last war I did so quite gayly, naively believing war was "over." And now our sons are fighting and dying again, this time all over the world.

Pray God we shall not be stupid enough for the same thing to happen to our grandchildren.

And we who are Americans, let us bow our heads in prayer for the French who are now in Nazi prison camps. We pray God for their return to their motherland, the great Republic of France, and we pledge our arms, our blood, and our honor that this shall be done.

My friends, there is one thing that we must have today: courage. Give us bravery, give us manhood, give us spirit. And we Americans now salute the Tricolor of the Republic of France.

But let me repeat and emphasize a point in my closing remarks; let my remark be realistic. It is that there can be no liberty without food and clothing. There can be no culture without factories running and homes heated.

But besides the food and clothing which is essential to liberty is the true spirit of America and the true spirit of France. Let us not forget the American Revolution and the ringing words of our great philosopher and patriot, Thomas Jefferson, the author of our Declaration of Independence. Let neither Frenchmen nor Americans forget the old and calm-souled man, Dr. Benjamin Franklin, nor that great and young man, General Lafayette, our friend in the time of our own Revolution for liberty and independence.

Let us not forget the French Revolution. The political philosophy of France—that of culture, progress, education, freedom of religion, press, and speech—must rise and flower once again.

But let us also feel in our breast the soft, the sentimental, but yet the military and strident tones of the Marseillaise. March on! We in America have heard the march of liberty, the cadenced step of our soldiers.

With freedom in her heart, yet let France hear the shrill cry of liberty once again. Let the French Navy sail the Seven Seas and her ensigns and symbols will carry the power of a proud nation all over the world.

With liberty in the breast of every Frenchman, let also France hear the cadenced step of her brave soldiers, protecting the liberty of their beautiful land, as well as the liberty of a new and enlightened world.

With equality in her heart for mankind, let us, in America, return that feeling, and freely respond to this equality she so richly deserves.

With fraternity in the hearts of all Frenchmen, and fraternity in our hearts for France, let France also, a great political power, live with other nations in true fraternity.

Liberty! Equality! Fraternity!

Fellow Americans, there is such a thing as triumph and glory. The day will yet come, and may we hasten it, when the troops of France, accompanied by her brave allies, shall march down the Champs de Elyses in final triumph; and this time of the march of our troops under the arc will not be an empty march, but will be a symbol of enduring peace, of modern science for production, for a high standard of living, and for the military power, and the security of a great and powerful nation, the Republic of France.

Vive la France!

Red Tape and Buck Passing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, we are headed for a serious jam in the entire administration of veterans' affairs. The Cleveland Plain Dealer this past week end printed a series of stories dealing with the problems faced by returning war veterans which closely parallel the experiences of soldiers coming home to other communities. These articles report the disillusionment of our veterans. Rights which they believed guaranteed under the famous G. I. bill of rights, in the hands of routine-minded, uninformed, bureaucratic employees become meaningless. The report of a soldier seeking to reopen his business and finding it impossible to obtain materials from the W. P. B. while those who stayed at home continued to receive such materials is unfortunately all too common.

Another story revealing the refusal of the O. D. T. to cooperate in furnishing gasoline for a truck necessary to a small business after the truck had been purchased and the business begun, also illustrates the manner in which petty restrictions can destroy hope and confidence in our returning servicemen. There is mounting evidence that the confusion in the minds of the veterans is shared by those administrators who are supposed to

know the servicemen's rights. We are beginning to hear complaints that the entire purpose of Congress in authorizing loans to veterans is being hamstrung in some quarters. The G. I. bill of rights is being entangled by red tape and buck-passing. Men going to one office are sent to another and after being driven from pillar to post become embittered and resentful. This state of affairs affecting able-bodied servicemen taken in conjunction with recent national reports of hopelessly antiquated administration by our Veterans' Administration affecting disabled veterans make it imperative that steps be taken at once to clarify and reconstruct the entire administration of servicemen's affairs. I feel strongly that we must immediately make plans for intelligent work on behalf of our servicemen of every category. If they are to be given the treatment and assistance which their sacrifices merit, we must at once provide in every large metropolitan area for a central clearing house which will give correct information at one place to every returning veteran. We must provide at this place methods whereby all the available benefits to which veterans are entitled can be processed. Such a veterans' center ought to have the proper information dealing with the care, hospitalization, pension rights, and other servicemen's benefits to which our veterans are entitled under the law. Nothing short of such a system will begin to compensate these men and their families for the suffering and depredation they have undergone on behalf of all of us at home.

Polish Government Note on San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following:

Below is the full text of the Polish Government note dealing with the fact that Poland has not been invited to participate in the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. The note was delivered March 12 to the American, British, and Chinese Governments and communicated to all United Nations as well as neutral governments:

"On March 15, 1945, the Polish Government learned from a radio broadcast and from the press, that the Government of the United States had sent, on their behalf and on that of Great Britain, China, and the Soviet Union, an invitation to 39 States to take part in a United Nations Conference to be held on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco, to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Polish Government notes that it has not received an invitation to take part in this conference, despite the fact that Poland was one of the original signers of the United Nations declaration January 1, 1942, in Washington.

"Considering that the Polish Nation took up arms in the defense of freedom, security and right on September 1, 1939 and was the first nation to make a stand against German aggression, and that from that time on, relentlessly and regardless of the sacrifice, it has been fighting at home and abroad, on land, on sea and in the air; considering also, that the Polish Nation has fought the longest in the defense of these ideals, it has sustained in relation to its potentialities heavier losses in human life and property than any other nation in the world, furthermore, considering that the war, begun in the defense of Poland, has created a spirit of unity among free nations of the world which led to promulgation and realization of the ideals of the United Nations; and finally, considering that at the San Francisco Conference the United Nations are to create a permanent world peace organization for the prevention of future aggression which is to be based on the respect of law and the sovereign equality of all peace-loving nations—the Polish Government as the sole legal and independent representative of the Polish state, emphatically insists on its indisputable right to take part in the world security conference and solemnly protests against its omission from invitations to the San Francisco Conference.

"The Polish Government wishes to state that not inviting to the San Francisco Conference Poland, whose constitutional President and Government are generally recognized by all the United Nations with the exception of only one of the powers and also by neutral states, is the first disquieting case of the application of the right to veto by a great power, which has been made even before the United Nations have approved or accepted proposals concerning an international security organization.

"The Polish Government has already submitted certain preliminary suggestions on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and intended participating to the fullest in the work of setting up an international security organization. In these circumstances, the Polish Government declares that it has been deprived of the possibility of presenting to the conference their considered comments on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, also on the suggestions regarding the voting procedure in the security council worked out at the Crimea Conference."

Cost of Production of Wool, Sheep, and Lambs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting a document prepared by the United States Tariff Commission estimating the cost of production of wool, sheep, and lambs in 1944 campared with costs in 1940–43. I am inserting this information in the RECORD because of a statement made in the committee's report of the Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1946. On page 13 of that report the committee says:

One of the matters falling within the province of the work under this appropriation is the regulation of grazing on national-forest ranges and the fixing of grazing fees therefor. The committee, from evidence presented, was impressed with the need for revising grazing fees upward in view of the increased value to stock raisers of the grazing privilege. Such an upward revision would be more in keeping with the present price levels of livestock and livestock products.

In view of this statement, I am submitting this report of the Tariff Commission which shows that the production of wool, sheep, and lambs were produced at a loss as shown by the Commission's report:

COSTS OF PRODUCTION OF WOOL, SHEEP, AND LAMBS IN 1944

In 1943 and 1944 the Tariff Commission issued reports[1] showing the costs of producing wool, sheep, and lambs (excluding and including interest) in 1940–43. These reports were based on data supplied through the cooperation of the Farm Credit Administration. The present report summarizes the costs presented in the two earlier reports and gives in addition estimated costs of producing wool and sheep and lambs in 1944. The estimated costs for 1944 were obtained by the Commission at the request of a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

In obtaining the estimated cost for 1944, the Commission prepared schedules calling for the required information. These schedules were sent to field offices of the Farm Credit Administration (production credit associations), to banks making loans to sheep ranchers in competition with the Farm Credit Administration in the same areas, and to a few leading ranchers. The completed schedules which were returned to the Commission provided estimates for 1,038 ranches in 11 of the 13 States in the western region. The 11 States were South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Texas, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, Oregon, California, and New Mexico, which together account for over 96 percent of all the stock sheep in the western region. The two States for which data were not obtained were Arizona and Washington, which are of minor importance in the production of wool, sheep, and lambs and their inclusion in the survey would not have changed the results to any significant extent.

The estimated costs of producing wool and sheep and lambs for 1944 are summarized in table 1 and compared with reported costs for 1940, 1941, 1942, and 1943. Table 2, from which table 1 was prepared, presents the data in detail. Although the costs presented in these tables relate to a varying number of ranches and to a varying number of States, it is believed that the reported costs given for 1940–43 and the estimated costs for 1944, are in general representative for these periods of the costs of producing wool and sheep and lambs in the western region as a whole. It should be noted, however, that the data represent ranching operations under war conditions and are not necessarily indicative of costs in this country in more normal periods or appropriate for comparison with costs in other countries under more normal conditions of production. Perhaps the greatest question as to the representativeness of the data arises in the case of the data for 1943, which relate only to 233 ranches in 9[2] of the 13 States in the western region. On account of the limited number of ranches and States covered by the 1943 reported costs, the Commission obtained estimates of the cost actually incurred in that year for the larger number of ranches

[1] The first report, the Costs of Wool, Sheep, and Lambs, 1940–43, was issued in May 1943 and the second report, Cost of Production of Wool in 1943, was issued in June 1944.

[2] These nine States are South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Texas, Nevada, Utah, and Oregon, and account for about 81 percent of all stock sheep in the western region.

(1,038)[3] and States (11)[3] for which it obtained estimates of 1944 costs. The estimate costs for 1943 were not significally different from the reported costs for 1943 shown in tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 shows ranch income from wool and sheep and lambs, costs of production, and the profit or loss on ranching operations for 1940–44. As previously noted, the figures for 1940–43 were prepared by the Commission from data supplied by the Farm Credit Administration; those for 1944 were based upon estimates supplied by the Farm Credit Administration, banks, and others. Costs are shown both excluding and including interest, that is, interest actually paid on money borrowed and interest imputed on the rancher's equity or on his own capital invested in sheep and in ranch property. The data pertaining to wool are shown both per head of sheep inspected and per pound of wool; data for sheep and lambs and for sheep, lambs, and wool combined are shown per head inspected.

As shown in table 1, income from wool, sheep, and lambs combined increased sharply from 1940 to 1942 and declined in 1943. It will[4] probably decline still further in 1944 but will still be about 27 percent larger than the $5.26 per head reported in 1940. Estimated total cost per head (including an allowance of 65 cents per head for the managerial services of the ranch operator) both excluding and including interest actually paid and interest imputed on the rancher's equity, increased continuously from 1940 to 1943 and will probably increase again in 1944. The cost, excluding interest, of $6.71 per head in 1944 is 64 percent higher than the $4.10 reported in 1940. The cost, including interest, of $7.88 per head in 1944 is about 50 percent higher than the $5.32 per head reported in 1940. The profit per head, with interest excluded from cost, amounted to $1.17 in 1940, was $2.39 in 1942, was $1.18 in 1943, and there will probably be a loss of about 5 cents per head in 1944. With interest included in cost, ranch operations resulted in a loss[5] of 6 cents in 1940, a profit of $1.14 in 1942, and will result in an estimated loss of $1.22 in 1944.

Income from sheep and lambs increased much more in 1940–42 than income from wool. It declined substantially in 1943, however, whereas income from wool increased slightly. Both items are expected to be smaller in 1944 than they were in 1943. Costs of wool, and of sheep and lambs, both excluding and including interest, rose continuously after 1940. The net profit from sheep and lambs, with interest excluded from costs, was 70 cents per head in 1940, was $1.49 in 1942, was 76 cents in 1943, and will probably be about 18 cents per head in 1944. The profit from wool, with interest excluded from costs, was 46 cents per head in 1940; was 90 cents in 1942; and was 42 cents in 1943. A loss of 23 cents per head is indicated for 1944. With interest included in cost, the profit from sheep and lambs of 6 cents per head in 1940 compares with an indicated loss of 42 cents per head in 1944. In the case of wool there was a loss of 12 cents per head in 1940, profits of 31 and 35 cents respectively in the next 2 years, a loss of 23 cents in 1943, and a loss of 80 cents per head is indicated for 1944.

It will be noted from table 1 that the trend of profits and losses on wool is about the same irrespective of whether the data are expressed per pound of wool produced or per head of sheep inspected. With interest excluded from cost, profits of 5 to 11 cents per pound were made in the first 4 years of the 5-year period, and a loss of 3.1 cents per pound is indicated for 1944. With interest included in cost, there was a loss of 1.5 cents per pound in 1940 compared with profits of about 4 cents in 1941–42, and a probable loss of 2.9 cents in 1943. A loss of 10.8 cents per pound is indicated for 1944.

TABLE 1.—*Wool, sheep, and lambs: Income, approximate cost, and profit or loss, for a specified number of ranches in a specified number of States, 1940–44*

[Joint costs prorated according to ratio of income from wool and from sheep and lambs to total income in each year]

Item	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Number of ranches reporting	532	532	326	233	1,038
Number of States covered	[1] 13	[1] 13	[2] 12	[3] 9	[4] 11
	Per head of sheep inspected				
Wool, sheep, and lambs:					
Income [5]	$5.26	$6.83	$7.57	$6.96	$6.66
Cost:					
Excluding interest	4.10	4.59	5.18	5.78	6.71
Including interest	5.32	5.86	6.43	7.08	7.88
Profit (+) or loss [6] (−):					
Excluding interest from cost	+1.17	+2.24	+2.39	+1.18	−.05
Including interest in cost	−.06	+.97	+1.14	−.12	−1.22
Sheep and lambs:					
Income [5]	2.74	3.76	4.23	3.50	3.42
Cost:					
Excluding interest	2.04	2.40	2.74	2.74	3.24
Including interest	2.68	3.10	3.44	3.39	3.84
Profit (+) or loss [6] (−):					
Excluding interest from cost	+.70	+1.36	+1.49	+.76	+.18
Including interest in cost	+.06	+.66	+.79	+.11	−.42
Wool:					
Income [5]	2.52	3.07	3.34	3.46	3.24
Cost:					
Excluding interest	2.06	2.19	2.44	3.04	3.47
Including interest	2.64	2.76	2.99	3.69	4.04
Profit (+) or loss [6] (−):					
Excluding interest from cost	+.46	+.88	+.90	+.42	−.23
Including interest in cost	−.12	+.31	+.35	−.23	−.80
	Per pound of wool produced				
Wool:					
Income [5]	$0.300	$0.358	$0.417	$0.432	$0.438
Cost:					
Excluding interest	.246	.256	.302	.380	.469
Including interest	.315	.322	.371	.461	.546
Profit (+) or loss [6] (−):					
Excluding interest from cost	+.054	+.102	+.115	+.052	−.031
Including interest in cost	−.015	+.036	+.046	−.029	−.108
	Percent				
Ratio of income from wool to total income	47.8	45.0	44.2	49.8	48.7
	Pounds per head of sheep inspected				
Average weight of fleeces	8.4	8.6	8.1	8.0	7.4

[1] South Dakota, Texas, and the far West (Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California).
[2] The foregoing, exclusive of Washington.
[3] The foregoing States, exclusive of Washington, California, Arizona, and New Mexico.
[4] The foregoing States, exclusive of Washington and Arizona.
[5] See footnote 7, table 2.
[6] A "loss" in the sense that failure to obtain a return in excess of 5 percent on total investment, and to obtain in addition 65 cents per head of sheep inspected for managerial services of the ranch operator is a loss.

Source: Based on table 2.

[3] Included were like estimates for 972 ranches in the 9 States.
[4] For convenience the future tense is used in referring to 1944. The phrase used here is equivalent to "will probably prove to have declined."
[5] "Loss," in the sense that failure to obtain a return in excess of 5 percent on total investment, and to obtain in addition 65 cents per head of sheep inspected, for managerial services of the ranch operator is a loss.

TABLE 2.—*Wool, sheep, and lambs: Production data, income, and approximate costs, for a specified number of ranches in a specified number of States, 1940–44*

[Joint costs prorated according to ratio of income from wool and from sheep and lambs to total income in each year]

Item	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Number of ranches reporting	532	532	326	233	1,038
Number of States covered	[1] 13	[1] 13	[2] 12	[2] 9	[4] 11
	Production data				
Average number of sheep per ranch: [3]					
1. All sheep inspected	3,126	3,092	2,946	3,295	2,957
2. Breeding ewes inspected	2,543	2,579	2,451	2,788	2,501
3. Average value per head, all sheep	$7.86	$8.41	$8.48	$9.01	$8.13
4. Average ranch equity per head, all sheep	$8.22	$8.31	$7.74	$7.64	$7.99
5. Number of sheep shorn, per ranch	2,951	2,917	2,756	3,081	2,750
Wool produced:					
6. Pounds per head shorn	8.9	9.1	8.6	8.5	7.9
7. Pounds per head inspected	8.4	8.6	8.1	8.0	7.4
8. Number of ewes lambing	2,398	2,431	2,298	2,599	2,314
Lambs matured:					
9. Number per 100 ewes inspected	78	82	77	72	73
10. Number per 100 sheep inspected	63	68	64	67	68
	Sales prices				
11. Lambs, per head sold	$5.20	$6.72	$7.59	$7.75	$7.59
12. Wool, per pound	.29	.347	.393	.412	.416
	Income, per head inspected				
Sheep and lambs, proceeds from sales:					
13. Lambs	$2.82	$3.67	$4.10	$3.41	$3.34
14. Sheep	.52	.77	.66	.72	.68
15. Inventory change [5]	−.02	+.35	+.28	+.05	+.05
16. Purchases of sheep and lambs (deduction)	.66	1.14	.97	.86	.82
17. Sheep and lambs, net proceeds	2.66	3.65	4.07	3.32	3.25
18. Wool, proceeds from sales	2.44	2.97	3.22	3.29	3.08
19. Other ranch income, chiefly from sheep and lamb pelts	.16	.21	.28	.35	.33
20. Total ranch income	5.26	6.83	7.57	6.96	6.66
21. Ratio of income from wool to total income [7] ..... percent	47.8	45.0	44.2	49.8	48.7
	Operating expense, per head inspected				
22. Joint operating expense [8]	$3.90	$4.36	$4.91	$5.45	$6.32
23. Charged to sheep and lambs	2.04	2.40	2.74	2.74	3.24
24. Charged to wool	1.86	1.96	2.17	2.71	3.08
25. Shearing charge	.20	.23	.27	.33	.39
26. Total charge to wool	2.06	2.19	2.44	3.04	3.47
27. Total expense, excluding interest	4.10	4.59	5.18	5.78	6.71
28. Interest paid	.42	.44	.44	.47	.36
29. Interest imputed at 5 percent, on ranch equity	.41	.41	.39	.38	.40
30. Interest imputed at 5 percent, on sheep investment	.39	.42	.42	.45	.41
31. Total interest	1.22	1.27	1.25	1.30	1.17
32. Charged to sheep and lambs	.64	.70	.70	.65	.60
33. Charged to wool	.58	.57	.55	.65	.57
34. Total expense, including interest	5.32	5.86	6.43	7.08	7.88
35. Charged to sheep and lambs	2.68	3.10	3.44	3.39	3.84
36. Charged to wool	2.64	2.76	2.99	3.69	4.04

[1] Western South Dakota, Texas, and the far West (Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California).
[2] The foregoing States, exclusive of Washington.
[3] The foregoing States, exclusive of Washington, California, Arizona, and New Mexico.
[4] The foregoing States, exclusive of Washington and Arizona.
[5] Fall count, beginning of the operating year.
[6] On basis of opening inventory values for each age group in the herd.
[7] Based on ratio of item 18 to sum of items 17 and 18; item 19 prorated in the same ratio.
[8] Excluding family expense, shearing, and interest paid, but including managerial expense of 65 cents per head inspected.

Source: Basic data supplied by the Farm Credit Administration (columns 1 to 4) and by the Administration and other lending agencies (column 5); cost analysis made by the U. S. Tariff Commission.

BASIC DATA AND METHOD OF ADJUSTMENT

The costs of producing wool, sheep, and lambs presented in this report were derived from basic data covering the operations of individual ranches. As already indicated, the basic data for 1944 represent estimates of the Farm Credit Administration and certain private banks which also make loans to sheep ranchers in the same areas. The data for 1940–43, however, are based on actual reports in each year by ranchers who borrowed from the Farm Credit Administration.

The Farm Credit Administration, in order not to disclose confidential data pertaining to individual ranches, has always submitted the basic data to the Commission either in the form of area averages for different areas within the respective States or in the form of State averages. (For administrative purposes the Farm Credit Administration divides most States into two or more areas.) When in the form of area averages, the data for each area within a State were weighted by the total number of ranches covered in the respective areas to obtain a weighted average for the State. The averages of each State were then weighted by the total number of stock sheep [6] in the State to obtain a weighted average for all the States covered by the survey.

The Commission attempted to obtain estimated prices in 1944 of wool, sheep, and lambs at the time it obtained the data from which were prepared the estimated costs given in this report. Though the response with respect to cost data was satisfactory, comparatively little information on prices was obtained owing to the fact that at the time the survey was made the ranchers had not made sufficient sales of their products to be in a position to estimate prices for 1944. In the present report, therefore, prices of wool, sheep, and lambs and ranch income for 1944 were derived from estimated prices issued by the Department of Agriculture.

An item of "other ranch income," chiefly from the sale of sheep and lamb pelts, was included in "total ranch income." It was distributed about equally between wool and sheep and lambs. Over a period of years the wool pulled from pelts is approximately as valuable as the skin or "slat" from which it is pulled.

Except for shearing costs, which are charged to wool alone, all operating costs and interest (paid and imputed) are allocated to wool, and to sheep and lambs, on the basis of the relative importance of income from wool and from sheep and lambs during the given year. The Commission has included in operating costs a managerial allowance of 65 cents per head of sheep inspected

[6] Stock sheep consist of animals, largely ewes, retained on the ranches for breeding and maintenance as distinguished from sheep and lambs retained for fattening preparatory to slaughter, that is, animals "on feed." The figures used in weighting the data were the average number of stock sheep in each State in the western region on January 1, as estimated by the Department of Agriculture.

at the beginning of the operating year.[7] This is the only allowance made in costs for the labor of the operator and his family. (The results obtained by a different method of allocating joint costs for the years 1940–43 are discussed on pages 12–13 of the costs of wool production in 1943, issued by the Commission in June 1944.)

In determining the equity in the ranch property (land, buildings, wagons, etc.) per head of sheep inspected for each year, the total investment per ranch in 1941 (about December 1, 1940) was divided by the number of sheep inspected at the beginning of each year. Interest on ranch investment was computed at 5 percent (item 29 in table 2).

In order to determine investment in sheep, the Commission obtained from the Farm Credit Administration the average value of sheep per head inspected in 1941 and 1942, the only years for which such data were available. These values were adjusted to obtain investment in sheep for 1940, 1943, and 1944, by using the same percentage differences found in changes in the values of all sheep in the western region on January 1 in the respective years, as reported by the Department of Agriculture. Interest on these sheep investment values was computed at 5 percent (item 30 in table 2).

The value of sheep and of fixed capital in ranches does not account for all the capital required for ranch operation. Short-term outlays are made throughout the year for feed, wages, supplies, and so forth. The interest actually paid by the reporting ranches on borrowed capital was smaller in years after 1941 because the ranchers borrowed less than formerly for such current expenses and covered more of them from their own funds. Data are not available which would allow an accurate estimate of the total amount of the interest allowance which might be properly imputed as cost resulting from this greater use of the rancher's own funds. An adjustment of 2 to 3 cents per head was made in the item of interest paid shown for 1942, 1943, and 1944 in order to offset this omission.

[7] The sheep on a ranch at the beginning of an operating year (about December 1) are inspected by field agents of the local production credit associations. These associations, in effect, are field offices of the Farm Credit Administration and make the loans to ranchers. The allowance of 65 cents per head agrees with conclusions of the United States Forest Service in a pre-war investigation of various cost factors in the far West. On a ranch which carries about 3,000 sheep into the winter, this allowance is equivalent to the salary of a good foreman under conditions of normal cost. In 1943 this allowance averaged about one-fourth larger, and in 1944 about one-seventh smaller, than the loans made for family living expenses.

Work or Jail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK FELLOWS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Hon. James B. Perkins, of Boothbay Harbor, Maine, delivered February 8, 1945, at Augusta, Maine, in the Maine House of Representatives:

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the unanimous ought-to-be adopted report of the Committee on Federal Relations on this bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker and members of the house, I never have, and I never again expect to address this or any other body in any more serious a manner than I do at the present time.

While at home over this week end, I noted in my county paper a little prayer which I would like to call to your attention.

"Dear Lord
Lest I continue
My complacent way;
Help me to remember
Somewhere out there
A man died for me today.

As long as there be war;
I then must
Ask and answer
Am I worth dying for?"

Each one of us must answer that question for himself. I only know that I would not meet that test unless I spoke to you today about the dearest thing that you and I possess: our liberty and our freedom. I speak to you today, not only as a member of this house, but as a student of my profession.

These are the days when the world and our own liberty here, must be saved by the efforts and sacrifices of the ordinary man and the ordinary lawyer, when this ordinary man gathers from his familiar way of life, from the traditions and the practice and the wide companionship of his craft, all that he has and is and throws it humbly and resolutely into the struggle which will decide whether our American way of life, that liberty under the law and our Constitution, which he can understand, if he cannot define it, shall perish from the earth.

The ordinary lawyer shares and rejoices in the memory of the great masters of the common law—he draws his inspiration from their learning, their wisdom and their example. But he makes his own contribution. He has learnt, and in none too easy a school, to think honestly, to speak fearlessly, not, I hope, to rate himself too highly, to understand the troubles and difficulties of other men and to give himself ungrudgingly in their service.

When we became involved in this conflict, there were many who prophesied that total war would prove incompatible with the essential civil freedoms. This is where the danger lies. I, however, do not believe it is necessary to give up or sacrifice any of our freedoms to win this war. To believe otherwise is to say that democracy is a failure and that we must have a totalitarian government. To this I cannot agree.

I look to the court for approval.

In *Ex parte Milligan*, 4 Wallace at page 120, Mr. Justice Davis, of the Supreme Court of the United States, said:

"The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men at all times and under all circumstances. No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy and despotism, but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false; for the Government within the Constitution has all the powers granted to it which are necessary to preserve its existence." Thus spoke the Court.

It is one of the examples of living in times like these that life becomes reduced to simple issues—life and death—and as in the question now before this House—liberty and voluntary servitude.

The pursuit of these virtues to which I have just alluded by the ordinary lawyer, though they may not be colorful, does not mean that we lawyers are untouched by the fire of enthusiasm. There are causes for which we, like others, are prepared to die. One such cause there is that will always be sacred to us and that now stands assailed—the cause of liberty under the law.

We know what liberty means. It is a tradition which we share, for which our forefathers died, for which we risked our lives and our sons now risk theirs.

And we lawyers, as practitioners of the common law, have had committed to us to carry in our day and generation the eternal torch of liberty and justice. Today men stalk through the world and even in our own beloved country to put that light out, to set up the relentless and miserable darkness of an iron tyranny in the place of the immortal lamp of liberty. The lamp is ours to shield with our lives, our bodies, our minds, and our spirits, with all we have and are. And we cannot fail.

Walls and cities may fall, but that lamp will stand. Men may die, and we among them, but that lamp will burn on. We are mortal men and our poor lights must some day flicker and burn out. But that lamp is eternal and can never be quenched. For, in very truth, that lamp, the lamp of liberty, the lamp of law and life, is kindled by the light which lighteth every man who comes into the world.

I light my lamp, this morning, at Runnymede, at the signing of the Mayflower Compact, at Lexington, and Concord, and at Gettysburg.

The crusade for liberty will continue as long as there prevails the pursuit of human happiness. God not only made man in His image; He breathed into him the breath of life and kindled within him that infinite spark, and he will be free—if he desires liberty above all earthly things.

The question now before this house, is whether or not we shall send a memorial or petition to Congress in opposition to any law which would authorize and empower anyone to compel men, now free, to work for a private employer who would make a profit on his labor.

Such a law violates the thirteenth amendment to our Federal Constitution, which is as follows:

"SECTION 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

What is "involuntary servitude"?

To compel one to labor for a private employer, who would make a profit on one's labor is "involuntary servitude."

The bill now before Congress is known as the May bill, and relates only to those between the ages of 18 and 45—the age limits are unimportant. It is my contention that Congress does not have the power to compel anyone of whatever age to work for a private employer. Our sons and daughters may be victorious over the enemy on foreign fields, but we, who have the guardianship of the home front, shall have lost the war here, if Congress passes this legislation, and we shall have betrayed those who have died and those who will die for the preservation of our American way of life. For our liberty and our freedom are its very keystone. Take that away and there is nothing left.

At the beginning of this session, we took a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Two years ago in this very hall, our then Governor delivered a message in which he said:

"You and I are trustees at this time for a freedom and a kind of government which has been obtained at the cost of tremendous human sacrifice in the past and is now being

maintained by further sacrifices of our own sons of this generation.

"To let deteriorate this right of free representative government would be to betray a trust; to build and strengthen it so that it may remain a symbol worth fighting for and a living force to help those who have preserved it, is the solemn duty of us who now remain at home.

"May God guide us in this sacred trust."

Thus spake the Governor.

A so-called National Service Act was recommended to Congress by the President in his message on January 11, 1944, over a year ago.

In his message, he said:

"A national-service law—which, for the duration of the war, will prevent strikes and with certain appropriate exceptions, will make available for war production or any other essential service, every able-bodied adult of the Nation." This means men and women of whatever age.

At the same time he suggested four other measures, and said:

"These five measures form a just and equitable whole. I would not recommend a National Service Act unless other laws were passed to keep down the cost of living, to share equitably the burdens of taxation, to hold the stabilization line, and to prevent profits."

These measures were not passed. The need for this law is not nearly so great as it was a year ago.

The President also said:

"The Federal Government already has the basic power to draft capital and property of all kinds for war purposes on a basis of just compensation."

What he should have said is that the Government can take private property for a public purpose, under the law of eminent domain, if the Government pays for it, but the Federal Government or anyone else, cannot take private property for a private purpose, even if it does pay for it. And the Government cannot take the liberty of even one of the most humble of our citizens and make him work for a private employer, because that is involuntary servitude and specifically prohibited by the thirteenth amendment.

If the Government wants to take over all the factories and operate them for the benefit of the Government, without profit to anyone else—the situation is entirely different. Ever since the above message—the proponents of such legislation have steadily advocated its passage by the Congress. The best statement of their position has been contained in the editorials of the New York Times, and always in these words—they have repeated them at least a dozen times in the last year:

"If it is fair and proper and consistent with democracy for the Government to select a man for military duty and send him for an indefinite period across the seas to endure hardship and danger, then it is no less fair and proper and consistent with democracy to require another man to do war work at home, if and when necessary to meet the Nation's needs. Recognition of the essential soundness of this principle has been forced on other democracies by the crisis in which we are involved. Britain, Australia, and New Zealand all have National Service Acts, including compulsory powers. These countries are no less jealous than we are of individual rights and civil liberties."

The trouble with that position and that editorial is that it does not tell the whole truth; England does not have a written constitution. We have. We fought a war more than 150 years ago to get away from the sort of government that they have over there.

I am filled with dismay when a newspaper like the New York Times and leading commentators advocate a "work or jail" bill—when they know it violates the fundamental law of our land.

Mr. Justice Davis, to whom I have alluded, has said that the Constitution cannot be violated in time of war any more than in time of peace.

This statement on the question of a National Service Act omits consideration of every vital question which it raised, but no omission is so remarkable as that of an even passing reference to the fact that such an act would be in direct violation of the thirteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, which prohibits involuntary servitude. They do not pay any attention to the Constitution.

Instead, this statement fallaciously assumes an exact analogy between conscription of the individual for military service in defense of his country and his conscription for employment in privately owned and controlled industry. The duty of the citizen to fight for his country is discharged under the direct command of its military organization, with the President as Commander in Chief. For labor conscription to be analogous, the Federal Government would have to nationalize war industry, in order that the conscripted worker might produce under the direct command of his Government, with no profits from his labor accruing to private individuals.

Such an act if it means anything at all, means coercion.

It means that the Government shall be empowered to decide where and how every American required to register for service shall be employed and that the individual shall be forced to accept work assigned at the wages fixed without regard to his personal interest or preference or his previous capacity to earn. And since there was not included confiscation of war industries among the conditions precedent to such Service Act, it means also that the conscripts would be forced by the Government to work for private profit.

But forced labor for private profit is involuntary servitude and has been so recognized by our courts.

In our law dictionaries involuntary servitude is defined as: "The condition of one who is compelled by force, coercion, or imprisonment, and against his will, to labor for another, whether he is paid for it or not."

Such proposed legislation is clearly unconstitutional.

The fact is, that free American labor has far outstripped the slave labor of the Axis. The fact is—that when our ally Stalin, raised his glass at Teheran and toasted the American machines without which the United Nations could not have won the great victories so far won, he was toasting the achievement of free American labor. It is astonishing and affirming to be confronted with this proposal to reward the American people who have wrought this miracle by depriving them of their constitutional freedom of the person—the dearest freedom of them all—on the ground that enslavement will make them more productive.

On January 23, 1944, 12 days after the President had delivered the message to which I have alluded, there appeared in the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times, an article by James B. Reston entitled "If We Have National Service," which is the authority for the statements that I now make. That article was cabled from London to the New York Times.

What were the conditions under which England, having no written constitution, passed its Service Act?

It is May 22, 1940. The House of Commons met in a mood of impending disaster. The new Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, had gone to France. The aged white-wigged Speaker opened the session appropriately enough by announcing the death of a member. Across the channel the Germans had taken Brussels, reached the old battlefield of the Somme, familiar to some of you boys here, and captured British general headquarters at Arras—the Belgian Government had fled to Bruges, Boulogne was falling, and the British Expeditionary Force was retreating to a small French coastal town called Dunkerque. It was in these dark days that the ordinary man in England sailed across the channel in his little ship and trusted his life to God and his memory to his friends.

This, in brief, was the situation when at 3:26 o'clock in the afternoon, Clement Attlee, the Lord Privy Seal, rose in the House and asked for immediate passage of an extraordinary emergency-powers bill.

In less than 2 hours the House had passed into law the severest act in the history of the British Parliament; together with an order in council, which it sanctioned. The act, among other things, conferred upon the Minister of Labor and National Service power to direct any person in Great Britain to perform any service in any place in the United Kingdom, to take over any piece of property for any purpose which he deemed necessary, and to place a 100-percent tax on all excess profits made out of the war.

Under like circumstances, the President would have, under our Constitution, declared martial law.

What are conditions here in America now? The Germans are not at our gates; neither have we any Dunkerque. On the contrary, the best argument against the necessity of such an act is, that the Russians have crossed the Oder, and are now within 30 miles of Berlin; our own lads are through the Siegfried line, and the Germans are doomed. In the South Pacific, MacArthur is in Manila, and the sword of impending doom is steadily approaching the heart of Japan.

What have they done in England under this act?

I quote from Mr. Reston's article:

"Tens and hundreds of thousands of men and women have been moved from their normal communities and their normal jobs and have been dumped into sections of the country and into work which they knew nothing about. These migrant workers have often had to live in homes much worse than even the temporary structures thrown up for our workers at home in America, and, in many cases, they have been billeted compulsorily in homes where they were not wanted.

"Whole towns in Scotland have been stripped of their young women, who have been moved into England to supply the labor shortage in aircraft factories, and the British people would be the last to claim that this vast migration of women and men, with its doubling up of families in unnatural surroundings, has been accomplished without unfortunate moral and social effects."

Does anyone want this in America? Can it be possible that there is anyone who thinks that any law conferring such powers is constitutional in view of the positive and definite language of the thirteenth amendment?

Jefferson may have violated the Constitution in the purchase of Louisiana, but later days proved his wisdom; we forgave him, and Congress ratified his action.

Lincoln may have violated the Constitution when he suspended the writ of habeas corpus, and advised his general there to defy the writ, although it was issued by the Chief Justice himself. What was the situation? There was rioting in Baltimore; the southern sympathizers were numerous; Lincoln put them in jail and by his action saved Maryland and other border States to the Union. Lincoln may have violated the Constitution when he issued his Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves in the rebellious States as a war measure. This did not abolish slavery as an institution; that was done by the thirteenth amendment.

But the situation is far different when our Congress, with no emergency, votes to give anyone the power to compel a freeman to work for a private employer.

When that day comes, America is no longer the land of the free. And the Bill of Rights, that charter of civil liberties, as well as the thirteenth amendment, have become mere scraps of paper.

In any event, I feel that those who have someone near and dear to them over there, or who have already lost someone near and dear to them, will understand what I am trying to say. The ideals of America have a real meaning to them. The mothers and fathers of America are not walking with Pleasure in these anxious days, but with Sorrow.

"I walked a mile with Pleasure,
She chatted all the way;
But she left me none the wiser
For all she had to say.

"I walked a mile with Sorrow
And never a word said she;
But, oh! the things I learned from her
When Sorrow walked with me."

What are we fighting for? What are our sons dying to preserve?

There may be confusion in the minds of some, but there is none in mine, nor do I believe there is any in your minds, or in the minds of our boys over there.

Certain facts are crystal clear.

Clearly we fight to destroy Hitler and Hirohito and their plans for world domination. But we also fight for the preservation of our liberty, for the right to rule ourselves in our chosen way.

But, unless, while winning the war, we yet would lose, it must be equally clear that we are fighting to preserve our Constitution. We must defend that Constitution, as well as our rights, with our lives.

Only thus can we defend our constitutional form of government, from which spring all our liberties—all that makes the lives of freemen worth living.

The liberty of America is its very soul. And the act now pending in Congress would destroy it—would destroy the very thing for which our boys have died and are dying, as I speak here this morning.

What is this liberty?—What is this freedom?

You understand what I mean, even if you cannot define it. If you do not know what I mean, go out into the open and lift up your eyes unto the hills from whence cometh all courage and strength. Look to the hills, and you will then know what I mean, what it is that our boys are dying for—freedom, liberty—our American way of life and all that goes to make it up, but the greatest of these is liberty.

We cannot betray these boys who died and who will die for liberty and freedom, these boys of ours whom we shall never see until the resurrection.

And as we vote on the pending question before this house, let us hope that those boys of ours from their places beyond the stars will say, "Yes, they were worth dying for."

And let us, by the same token, say to them:

"They shall not grow old, as we who are left grow old,
Age shall not weary them, nor the years condemn,
At the going down of the sun in the morning,
We shall remember them."

[Applause.]

Joseph F. Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Joseph F. Kelly, administrative assistant in New York City to the Atlantic coast director, War Shipping Administration, is paid deserved tribute in a special article in the March issue of the Marine News, the occasion being the beginning of his tenth year of service for the Government.

"Joe" Kelly, as he is known throughout shipping circles along the Atlantic coast, signed up with the old Shipping Board early in 1936. One of his first assignments, according to the Marine News, was the establishment of the Food Inspection Service. Later he was named as marine adviser to Henry Schweinhaut, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, during some marine investigations. Early in 1941 he made an inspection of eastern port facilities for lend-lease operations, and in 1942 he was named special investigator for the House Naval Affairs subcommittee inquiring into the *Normandy* disaster.

More recently he has handled censorship and has directed the War Shipping Administration's public relations in the New York area.

Summarizing its tribute the Marine News concludes:

Despite his many duties and continual clutching of the telephone to answer questions from all sides, all day long, "Joe" Kelly found time to think out loud for the inauguration of one of the most gratifying tributes yet made to the American merchant marine—the 1-minute silent period observed on Maritime Day, May 22, 1944, in remembrance of those who died at sea. At his request the mayor of the city of New York issued a proclamation commemorating this day, and New York again set the example for the rest of the country.

The Marine News is but reflecting the feeling in maritime circles by setting forth this brief summary of the progressive activities of one of the most colorful, hard-working, and always helpful personalities rounding out his tenth anniversary with Government shipping agencies, the possessor of an always open-minded attitude and an eagerness to aid wherever any problem should arise in the marine field in wartime as in peacetime. We congratulate "Joe" Kelly and are grateful for his grasp of the wide range of duties his fine work involves as he enters his tenth year of maritime activities.

Memorandum of Scottish Polish Society to Anthony Eden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following:

The Scottish Polish Society, Scottish organization of friends of Poland, sent the following memorandum (March 9) to British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden. The memorandum deals with issues arising from the Yalta decisions on Poland:

"1. The Scottish Polish Society admits, that for the moment it may be necessary for military reasons to have some Russian control in what was pre-1939 Poland, but it is its definite and sincere conviction that in regard to the future of the inhabitants of those parts of the Ukraine and White Russia forming part of Poland in 1939, no final decision should be made without giving the population an opportunity of voicing their desires free from external influence. In short, the decision must be that of the people concerned, and so give them the freedom for which we are fighting. It is, therefore, asked: (a) Will His Majesty's Government guarantee that the peoples within the frontier of Poland in 1939 be given a future in accordance with Churchill's definition of 'title deeds' of freedom included in his farewell message to the Italian people on August 28, 1944, and in particular, will His Majesty's Government guarantee to give their peoples as defined above the right stated in Churchill's first point, namely, free expression of opinion and of opposition to and criticism of the Government of the day? (b) Will His Majesty's Government guarantee the same rights to the people of Poland within such boundaries as may be finally agreed between a Polish Government genuinely representative of the Polish people and the three great powers, signatories to the Yalta declaration?

"2. In addition to the above, the Scottish Polish Society desires an assurance from His Majesty's Government on the following points:

"(a) Immediate cessation of deportation to Russia those who were Polish citizens in 1939, and the repatriation of all such Polish citizens who have been deported since September 1939 by Russia and Germany.

"(b) That the Polish forces serving with the western Allies be given the right to vote and a free and unfettered opportunity officially recognized and organized as accorded to the British forces to submit the mandate of their desires regarding the future of their country.

"(c) The Scottish Polish Society is seriously perturbed at the reported arrest and confinement in concentration camps of members of the Polish Home Army and the underground administration loyal to the Polish Government in London which is recognized by His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States.

"(d) Will His Majesty's Government approach the Soviet Government immediately, to permit a committee consisting of Scots and Poles to enter Poland at once, with full facilities to move by any means of transport to any part of or place in Poland, and to visit anyone in Poland, and to invite two representatives of the Scottish Polish Society to serve on this committee? After 6 years, during which the Polish people have been denied all contact with western Europe, and with Great Britain in particular, it is necessary for the healthy development of Poland that these contacts be renewed. It is hoped that the committee of Scots and Poles will consist of competent representatives of various aspects of public and social life; the aim of the committee is to renew those extranational relations with corresponding groups in Poland and which have been served by the war.

"(e) Will His Majesty's Government give an assurance that steps will be taken to enable the International Red Cross and U. N. R. R. A. to enter Poland at once, with full facilities to assist in the rehabilitation of the country and representatives of the press to be present to transmit information to the world as to existing conditions?

"(f) Will His Majesty's Government give assurance that there will be no general election in Poland until those deported have returned and arrangement can be made for the fighting forces and prisoners of war to take part and, further, that such elections shall be supervised by a commission appointed by His Majesty's Government and the Governments of the United States of America and France, to insure as far as it is humanly possible that every citizen is given full opportunity of voting according to his convictions without fear of subsequent victimization?"

Address of Hon. William L. Clayton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, before the Women's National Press Club, Washington, D. C., March 13, 1945:

The post-war foreign policy of the Department of State centers in measures and instrumentalities for the preservation of peace in the world.

The peace structure must be seen as a great arch supported by two strong columns, one political and the other economic.

If either column fails, the whole structure collapses.

Political peace will not long endure if economic warfare is to continue throughout the world in the way in which it was waged during the period between the two World Wars.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals represent our foreign policy for the maintenance and promotion of peace through international organization.

Our foreign economic policy revolves around an expansion in world economy—free and equal access for all nations to the trade and raw materials of the world, increased production, much greater exchange of goods and services between nations, and higher levels of living for all peoples everywhere.

Now, there is not one single element of the Santa Claus philosophy in this policy.

On the contrary, quite aside from the question of future peace, the United States will be one of its principal beneficiaries.

Next to this question of future peace and security, the post-war problem which concerns the greatest number of people in the United States is the problem of employment. This is doubtless also true of every other section of the world which has been fortunate enough to escape physical destruction in this war and the hunger and misery and desolation which have followed.

In these latter areas, preoccupations are even more elemental—food, clothing, housing, reconstruction.

The United States is the country in best position to supply promptly the machinery, tools, equipment, and technical knowledge necessary for rebuilding devastated areas and for developing the resources of other parts of the world.

The difficulty will be for these areas to find the dollars with which to pay for such goods and services. They cannot promptly pay in their own goods because they have neither the goods nor the necessary facilities for producing them. Even if it were otherwise, our tariff walls would largely prevent payment in this way.

It is definitely in the interest of the United States to assist in reconstruction and development. If we are to reach a high level of employment, we must have immediate markets for our surplus production of the very kind of goods which many countries will so desperately need. Moreover, the normal life and productive capacity of the world must be restored and expanded as quickly as possible if we are to have markets for our surplus peacetime production of all kinds of goods.

Now, it has been estimated that if we supply these demands, our exports may exceed our imports in the first 5 years after the war by a total of fifteen to twenty billions of dollars.

This huge excess will be balanced in several ways:

By the use of existing gold and dollar balances held by the rest of the world, by credits extended by the proposed International Bank if it should be adopted, by other credit facilities, private and governmental, and by the investments of American business concerns and American citizens in industrial and commercial activities abroad.

What we come to then is a great expansion in the creditor position which the United States already occupies in the world.

This creditor position developed as a result of the First World War.

A debtor Nation for over 100 years, we were unable quickly to adjust ourselves to the circumstances of a world creditor in which position we were suddenly and accidentally thrust.

We continued to act as a debtor, refusing, by three separate advances in tariffs and by other means, to accept payment from the rest of the world of the sums which they owed us.

Now we find ourselves inevitably approaching a status in which the world will be indebted to us in much greater sums than ever before.

For the most part, we must take payment in goods and services and we can only get paid in this way if world-wide discriminations in trade are eliminated and tariffs and other barriers to the exchange of goods and services are reduced.

We may never wish to bring back to the United States the principal sum of our foreign loans and investments, but we will certainly wish to receive the interest and dividends and this will involve for us an excess of imports over exports.

Failure to recognize this position and to adjust to it will inevitably result in the sacrifice of a large part of our foreign loans and investments, resulting in charges of bad faith and the creation of international irritations of a serious character.

Most wars originate in economic causes.

The bounties of nature are distributed unequally over the earth.

Some countres are rich in one resource and some in another; still others possess almost no subsoil resources.

Hence, equality of opportunity for development in the modern world is only possible if all nations have free and equal access to the trade and raw materials of the world.

It is not enough to say that the raw materials are available to all who have the desire and the means to purchase.

Trade discriminations and excessive tariffs are just as effective in barring access to raw materials as any other method, and are highly provocative.

The most elaborate political and military arrangements for the preservation of physical peace will soon disintegrate in an atmosphere of bitterness created by international economic warfare.

As the greatest military, economic, and financial power in the world, the United States faces colossal responsibilities and opportunities. It cannot meet these responsibilities, it cannot grasp these opportunities in an atmosphere of economic isolationism such as that created by our policies following the First World War, culminating in the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill which practically destroyed our international trade and provoked retaliatory measures on the part of 31 nations.

Democracy and free enterprise will not survive another world war.

For the second time in this generation, our country is faced with the responsibilities and opportunities of world leadership.

At the end of the First World War, we stepped aside and the mantle fell to the ground. This time, the mantle is already around our shoulders, and a devastated and terrified world is hopefully looking to us to show the way back to peace and life.

We can do this, but only if our wisdom and vision are equal to our power and influence.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, the widespread public interest in freedom of the press and its extension to all nations is heartening to those of us who look hopefully toward a post-war world in which cooperation among all peoples will guarantee enduring peace. I hope that the plans laid at the coming San Francisco Peace Conference will include provision for the free exchange of news.

A democratic country which permits government control of its press to exist cannot long remain free, and an organization of nations to maintain peace would have little chance for fulfillment of its purposes if the truth and information essential to an understanding of each other were withheld from the people in those nations.

History has demonstrated conclusively that under the protection of a government-controlled press, war-making leaders have been able to throw the world into conflict before being checked by their own people or by peace-loving countries. It is my firm belief that if the people of any nation had a thorough understanding of the peoples of all other nations, it would be difficult for any war lord to lead them into war against their fellow men. Without the free exchange of news that understanding would be impossible to attain.

Many groups and many individuals have spoken out in favor of adoption by the United Nations Conference at San Francisco of plans calling for free exchange of information and news among the nations of the world. On February 6, 1945, the Costello Post of the American Legion, largest post in the District of Columbia, adopted a free-press resolution, and is now launching a movement to have veterans' organizations throughout the Nation push the proposition to a successful conclusion. I am glad to include here a copy of that resolution and two newspaper clippings concerning this action:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader of March 2, 1945]

LEGION URGED TO ENDORSE NEWS FLOW

WASHINGTON, March 2.—American Legion posts throughout the country are being urged to endorse the principle of a free flow of world news as an essential to establishment of permanent peace.

Members of the Vincent B. Costello Post of Washington are seeking Nation-wide support of their pledged "efforts toward the incorporation of a charter of freedom of news and communications in the forthcoming peace settlements."

Officials of the post, largest in the District of Columbia, today mailed to 500 Legion organizations copies of a resolution expressing enthusiastic approval of the free-press principles advocated by Mr. Kent Cooper, general manager of the Associated Press.

Joseph Leib, of Arlington, Va., vice commander of the post and author of the resolution, said he thought "every veteran should consider this proposal seriously."

"It is of vital concern to every one of them," he told a reporter. "We know that the press of Europe has always been controlled, and the people of that Continent knew and read in their newspapers only what the war lords wanted them to see. This must not happen again.

"The membership of the American Legion should be wholeheartedly behind this great objective of a world free press. I sincerely hope that Legion posts throughout America will push the Associated Press proposal to a successful conclusion."

[From the New York Times of March 18, 1945]

STETTINIUS ENDORSES FREE WORLD NEWS

WASHINGTON, March 17.—Secretary Stettinius "earnestly" hopes that the principle of free exchange of news will be included in international peace plans adopted by the United Nations at San Francisco in April.

He declared in a letter made public today by Joseph Leib, of Arlington, Va., that international acceptance of the idea would be an important contribution toward lasting peace.

Mr. Leib, vice commander of the Vincent B. Costello Post of the American Legion, sponsored a resolution urging that "free press principles advocated by Kent Cooper, general manager of the Associated Press," be included in the peace treaty. Mr. Leib, who made public Mr. Stettinius' comment, had sent the Secretary a copy of the resolution. Mr. Stettinius' reply said:

"The whole question of freedom of information has been under study in the Department of State for some time. It is our view that the acceptance by the United Nations of the principle of free access to and free exchange of information would be an important contribution toward establishing a permanent peace".

Recalling that the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City adopted a resolution calling for free exchange of information, the Secretary added:

"I think you will agree that the acceptance of the principles urged by the United States delegation at this conference is a long step forward."

[From the Costello News of March 1, 1945]

FREE PRESS

A resolution endorsing the principles of free press as adopted by our post at its February 6 meeting:

"Whereas it is our contention that the adoption of the principle of a free flow of world news would be instrumental in paving the way toward a more permanent peace;

"Whereas recognizing that international exchange of truthful, unbiased news throughout the world, free from any government or private control and unhampered by greed or prejudice, is in part essential to the maintenance of peace and universal cooperation; and

"Whereas both great political parties have embodied said theory in party platforms, and in a concurrent resolution recently adopted by the Congress of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia is authorized and directed to express its enthusiastic approval of the free-press principle advocated by Mr. Kent Cooper, general manager of the Associated Press, and pledge our efforts toward the incorporation of a charter of freedom of news and communications in the forthcoming peace settlements."

THOMAS COSTELLO,
Commander.
DAVID E. MILLER,
Adjutant.

Dumbarton Oaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of March 21, 1945, by Ernest Lindley:

DUMBARTON OAKS

(By Ernest Lindley)

AMENDMENTS WILL BE OFFERED

Although the Dumbarton Oaks agreement has, on the whole, weathered critical examination, a number of amendments will be offered at San Francisco and at least a few almost certainly will have to be adopted.

Senator VANDENBERG wants to be sure that the world organization will have power to review and revise political settlements made during the present war. Under Dumbarton Oaks, it already has been given that power, and more. According to the agreement, any situation may be brought to the attention of the world organization. Whether the situation in question arose from a political settlement made during this war or from one made earlier would make no difference. But the Senator apparently wants the final charter of the world organization to be more explicit about this.

The voting procedure agreed upon at Yalta almost certainly will be opposed by some of the smaller nations. But there is little likelihood that it will be altered in any important way. Whether a great power has, or is denied, the right to veto action against itself is a question rather far removed from reality. Either way, a great power cannot be restrained or coerced without a major war, and the other great nations will not restrain or coerce it unless they consider the issue important enough to justify fighting a major war. It would seem honest intellectually to recognize this by permitting a great power to veto action against iself.

Sumner Welles has suggested that the proposed Big Five—the United States, Soviet Union, Britain, China, and France—be made a Big Six by giving Brazil a permanent seat on the world security council, with a corresponding increase in the total size of the council from 11 to 13 members. Some of the other Latin-American nations probably will be less interested in that than in making sure that one or two of the temporary seats on the council are always filled from the Western Hemisphere.

The San Francisco Conference clearly will have to go into the question of regional security arrangements more thoroughly than was done at Dumbarton Oaks. Regional arrangements were specifically authorized at Dumbarton Oaks. But the tendency there was to heap the responsibility for keeping the peace on the world organization instead of decentralizing it. Under Dumbarton Oaks the nations of the Western Hemisphere could not act to preserve the peace within the hemisphere without the prior authorization of the world security council. This discovery came as a shock to many during the discussions at Mexico City which led to the Act of Chapultepec.

Regional agreements and all special alliances must be consistent with the purposes and principles of the world security organization as the Act of Chapultepec certainly is. If the close neighbors of a threatening aggressor can deal with him effectively, so much the better. The world organization would want to be sure that they were, in fact, dealing with a threat to the peace and not ganging up on an innocent party. But this safeguard might be established without requiring a prior authorization from the world security organization before a regional group could act. The close neighbors usually know what is going on sooner than more distant observers do. In most cases, what should cause concern to the world organization is not regional action to curb an aggressor, but failure by the regional group to act promptly and effectively.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial on St. Patrick's Day which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., March 18, 1945:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Yesterday was St. Patrick's day!

Throughout the length and breadth of the world, wherever Irishmen traverse this temporal coil, the patron saint of the Emerald Isle was honored. Honored for his having performed one of the greatest miracles in the history of mankind, when he converted an entire pagan nation without the shedding of a single drop of blood.

In the paralyzing cold of the silent north; beneath the blistering rays of an equatorial sun; in the east and in the west, Erin's sons and daughters observed, in a fitting manner, the anniversary of St. Patrick, whose undying spirit still roams the moors and glens of the land of saints and scholars, and in truth, is present in every nation under God's canopy, blessed by the presence of native-born Irish or their illustrious progeny.

St. Patrick was honored in the steaming, smelly, insect-infested jungles of Iwo Jima when her courageous sons and daughters, fighting under the Stars and Stripes of freedom, hummed The Wearin' of the Green to the accompaniment of the staccato notes of machine guns. St. Patrick was honored within the very precincts of the reich's holy soil as the intrepid descendants of the fighting race crossed the much vaunted Rhine whistling the River Shannon to the deep-throated, reverberating tones of the mighty howitzers. In fact, Ireland and St. Patrick were honored in every section of the globe where stricken liberty lay bleeding and in need of succor, by the Irish and their offspring, who today, as in days of yore, are found fighting and dying for the preservation of the God-given rights of man.

One cannot think of the Irish without thinking of their great contribution to America.

The Irish were trail blazers in the early history of this country; sturdy, God-loving, stout-hearted men and women before whose powerful blows great forests fell prostrate, and under whose magic touch thriving cities came into being, roads were built where highways never ran, shining steel rails pierced the hinterlands, and civilization's boundaries extended through unchartered wildernesses, which rang with their cheery song and hearty, fearless laughter.

The Irish were great teachers in the early days of America, even as they are today. Driven from their homeland by cruel and vicious laws, what was Ireland's loss became America's great gain. Teachers with the spirit of missionaries, they roamed the primeval forests and taught the children of the colonists to love that which had been denied them in their native land. So effective were their techniques that when the tyrant king attempted to deny them their inherent rights, they took up arms and won for America the freedom which we hold today so priceless.

The Irish were and still are great statesmen. Statesmen whose passionate appeals whipped the spark of patriotism into a great conflagration which loosed the shackles of tyranny from people in bondage and made them freemen. Soldiers, pioneers, teachers, builders, poets, literati, and statesmen, the Irish in America have made a contribution to our way of life that merits the eternal gratitude of all America.

We need not go back into the weighty tomes of by-gone days to find proof of this. If we but gaze about us, we will see incontrovertible evidence of the greatness of the Celt and his descendants. We need but to look to our great Governor, Maurice J. Tobin, to see the heights to which the Irish have risen in honor, esteem, love and appreciation, here in America. Maurice J. Tobin is more than a great Governor; he is more than a brilliant statesman; he is more than a kind and sympathetic humanitarian; he is more than a courageous leader and fearless champion of the rights of the people; he is the symbol of America at her very best. He is the hope of every child born into humble circumstances; he is the inspiration of the youth of vision; he is the fulfillment of the promise which was made to posterity by the founding fathers; the promise of equality, opportunity, justice, and tolerance.

Let the little men of this age as in other days, filled with envy, jealousy or other ignoble emotions, endeavor to impede his progress, their efforts will be of no avail. For fate, noting the heritage that was transmitted to him at birth by his devoted parents; noting his acquired and perfected talents; noting his manly qualities; decreed that he is a man of destiny.

Erin go Bragh!

Address by Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, Before the Polish Relief Committee, Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech which I made before the Polish Relief Committee in Lawrence, Mass., March 18, 1945:

The Polish Nation has given to the world some of the most inspiring examples of courage, and at a time when larger and stronger nations were surrendering to Nazi blackmail. Poland knew that she could not hope to defeat the giant militarism of her greedy neighbor. But Poland knew that she was right in defending her sovereignty against unwarranted attack. With passionate faith in freedom she fought against the brutal onslaught of Nazi barbarism. She fought and bled and to the world it seemed that Poland had died. The Nazis, however, were not sure. The Gestapo set up its gangster rule, determined to suppress all flickering signs of life. Hitler ordered that this nation should be exterminated. But somehow, in spite of overwhelming tyranny, the Poles fought on, fought on with heartening words and too few weapons, in the back streets of cities, in the forests, and in the new dimension of war, the underground. The Nazis used planes and tanks, bribery, and torture against this will-of-the-wisp enemy but German patrols continually disappeared and trains were systematically wrecked. The Nazis had occupied Poland but they had not conquered her. The great material power of militarism was powerless against the spirit of the Polish people.

To a world confused and weakened by Nazi propaganda, the tenacious resistance of the Poles was an inspiring "shot in the arm." Why did these men fight on against impossible odds. Because they did not waver in their belief that the goal of man is freedom, not slavery.

And so, all over the world, ordinary men were encouraged to face the task of beating back the menace of modern tyranny. In the critical days of 1940, when the fate of all humanity was at stake, these men of many nations fought wing to wing in the skies over Britain, fought day in and day out to hold back the Nazi storm of destruction.

You and I will never forget those grim days when the few fought against the many and the end of all that we cherished most seemed near. But they held and the world took hope again. Conspicuous among those few to whom we owe so much, were Poles who had escaped from the Nazi yoke to write one of the most inspiring pages of history in the flaming skies over Britain and the English Channel.

Since then they have fought the common enemy in Africa, and in Normandy. They are fighting him in Holland, Italy, and in Germany. For 5½ years they fought him at home with a will and ingenuity unequaled in this or any other war. Surrounded by Nazis and covered by Nazis they nevertheless managed to mobilize an army and in August of 1944 they rose against their oppressors in the now famous battle of Warsaw. For 63 heroic days they held out against greatly superior forces in one of the most remarkable uprisings in military experience. This epic stand required bravery of the highest order but more than that, it demanded the organizational skill and the adaptability one finds only in a freedom-loving people. Though now but a ghost of her former self, Warsaw will rise again and her name will stir men centuries from now as a shining symbol of the dignity of man.

The democratic faith of the Polish people was refined and strengthened in spite of the terrible sacrifices she endured. The Christian Labor Party, the Peasant Party, the Nationalist and Socialist Parties had no place in the government that ruled Poland in the years before the present war. Those in power at the time believed that the structure of Polish politics should be strong and centralized, in conformity with the regimes of its powerful eastern and western neighbors. In view of the constant international tension, the government discouraged parliamentary and democratic movements, allowing them no voice in the administration of the country. These parties, in turn, reacted by refusing to enter the elections.

With the coming of war, all these restrictions disappeared. The underground state which was formed, returned to the still older traditions of Polish parliamentary democracy. The people were fighting not only for freedom but for a greater measure of freedom, economic as well as political. They fought together as brothers-in-arms, not for any particular class or faction, but for the common welfare. For this, unknown to some people, is a war within a war. Outwardly, we fight against Fascist cruelty and aggression. We also fight against the injustices that exist within every country. For the people in every nation are dissatisfied with things as they were. Their eyes are lifted to new horizons and they are determined to make this a better world for the hundreds of millions who are suppressed. How to maintain our liberties and still solve the great problems which the machine age has imposed on society, this is the great challenge facing all nations and peoples today.

We who have followed the struggles of the Polish underground have been amazed by their ability to organize and govern, even under the heel of the conqueror. The secret press has flourished; secret schools have been established; traitors are tried and punished and the underground even found ways and means to finance its many activities. All this was splendid proof of the vitality of the Polish people; of their determination to govern themselves under any and all conditions.

The German occupation was never recognized. In Poland, alone of all the occupied countries, the word "collaboration" was unknown. To her eternal glory, her people were completely faithful to their birthright. To them freedom meant all or nothing.

As the war in Europe nears an end, the question of Poland looms large in the councils of the Allied Nations. Upon the just solution of her case will depend the confidence of the world in the peace that follows. This is indeed the test. Will Poland retain all her old borders, including the vexing problem of the Corridor which disturbed Europe for so many years, or will some compromise, some adjustment be necessay under the pressure of power politics? Will the Polish people have the opportunity to freely choose the men who are to represent them in the government?

What happened at Yalta? What the future holds for Poland was not fully decided, but on the question of boundaries, the leaders of the "Big Three" expressed agreement. Russia seeks the eastern two-fifths of prewar Poland, all territory east of the Curzon line proposed after the last war. This runs from the southernmost point of Lithuania through Brest-Litovsk and down to the Czechoslovak border in the Carpathians. Much of this large tract is taken up by the Pripet marshes; the rest is agricultural. For these losses along the eastern frontier, it was said that Poland would receive "substantial accessions" in the north and west which might include agricultural East Prussia and part of industrial Silesia.

Politically, also, the Polish people were expected to agree to certain changes. The Government in exile in London, which rejected the revision of boundaries was bypassed. The so-called Lublin government, put forward by the Russians now functioning in Poland was to be recognized, provided that it would add representative elements from within Poland and from abroad. At Yalta, it was said that this government was to be a provisional one, that as soon as possible, free elections would be held to determine the wishes of the people.

Many Americans are genuinely disturbed by this turn of events. They believe that the Yalta decisions are a repudiation of the

high sentiments expressed in the Atlantic Charter, that rallying cry for freedom which was drawn up at a time when our fortunes were low and we appealed to liberty-loving men the world over to join us in resistance to aggression. Points one and two of this charter state clearly: "Their countries (meaning the United States and Great Britain as signatories and Russia which later endorsed it)—seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other"; and they "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned."

We have witnessed in 1939, the tragic consequences of appeasement. Not only did it fail to stop this war but it encouraged aggression because it was a confession of weakness, both moral and material. We believe that any present or future appeasement will undo the very ends that we are working and fighting and dying for.

A new world—one in which the constituent members must work together—lies before us. In that world, the United States because of its prestige and because of the moral worth it has established in the eyes of all people, must assume the burdens of great leadership. The responsibility will be heavy and the precedents we set by our example will influence the course of history for centuries to come. It is no easy matter, and we shall not always find that our viewpoint is shared and supported by others in the family of nations. But we mean to do our level best. We shall never forget that we are sons and daughters of a nation founded on the ideals of fair play and human brotherhood. As one of the major architects of world security and world justice, we know that we must start right. The conscience of the American people will never be satisfied with anything less.

This brings us to the coming conference to be held at San Francisco starting April 25. The United States will have six delegates in attendance, some Democrats and some Republicans. In this nonpartisan atmosphere shall be voiced a truly representative and American viewpoint. Many subjects will be discussed and many important decisions will be made at this full United Nations conference.

In the true American tradition you are holding this meeting to mobilize public opinion in support of Poland's cause. And you may wonder, as I do, why Poland must plead her case when she was the first to resist Nazi aggression, the first to inspire a spiritually weakened world with the fervor of moral greatness. It is hard to believe, even now, that this nation which sacrificed more on the altar of freedom than any other should be forced to stand as a suppliant and not as a judge. For her whole record during this assault on civilization has been one of leadership in defense of the rights of man and for the democratic ideals of genuine Christian culture.

What the future holds for Poland was not fully decided at Yalta. Therein lies the hope that an aroused public opinion may have some influence on the forthcoming deliberations at San Francisco. For the door has not been closed. The people of the United States, which means the United States, have yet to be heard from. Five weeks remain for that opinion to form and to express itself. Through protest meetings like this one, you are helping to crystallize that opinion and to set in motion a tide of opposition that will speak, not only for Poland but for the aroused conscience of the American people.

Our first objective is to win this war. Our second objective, in many ways a more difficult one, is to establish the foundations for a just and lasting peace. Any treaty which simply extends, though in another form, the tensions following the last World War, will only give us a breathing spell between this, the present war, and a yet more terrible conflict to follow.

On this one point the American people are unanimous in their resolve. There must not be another world tragedy. We expect our leaders to summon every resource of mind and soul; to work persistently and successfully toward this goal. We sought no material gain from the last war and we seek none now. We seek no tribute for ourselves in the form of land, reparations, or economic conquest. We do, however, want a moral basis for international relations. And that basis must be law, before which all nations, the weak, the strong, the small, the large, must stand, equal alike in their rights and their responsibilities. This, then, we have a right to expect from our allies, the establishment of a collective system for world security and a world court to settle disputes among the nations. As this is all we ask, we have a right to insist upon it. I am certain that the people in all countries are with us in this, even though some of their leaders are not. Now is the time for American public opinion, free in its thought and its expression, to come forward not only with logic but with a flaming passion for truth and justice, with a moral fervor that will be heard and felt around the world.

Poland is the first test of our ability for world leadership. We have the material might and the potential moral right. The question is: "Shall the indignation of the American people make itself felt before it is too late?"

April 25, that is the deadline. The merits of Poland's case must be brought to the attention of our delegates before that date. This is the wish of most Americans, but it must be reinforced by democratic action, by resolutions, letters, and telegrams, by personal representations to the delegates. As your Congressman, I stand ready at all times to help in any way within my power for a free, complete, and united Poland.

Address of Hon. Charles P. Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in asking consent to include with my remarks the text of an address delivered by Hon. Charles P. Taft, Acting Chairman of the War Relief Control Board, before the Potomac Cooperative Federation, on Tuesday, February 27, 1945.

In this speech Mr. Taft outlines the general programs of relief for distressed peoples:

You of this cooperative federation, as well as the cooperatives associated with your national organization, are deeply concerned with the situation of cooperatives in the liberated areas, and you have launched a drive to give them advice and assistance. I propose tonight to describe how the governments, the public organizations, and the private organizations function in the occupied and liberated areas, in order to show you the framework within which your assistance must be given. That requires me to describe first what the governments and U. N. R. R. A. and the American and International Red Cross do in those areas, for the private agency function will normally be a supplementary and residual one.

There is the greatest confusion in this country with reference to the function of U. N. R. R. A., even among those whose experience or present duties should lead them to understand. That makes it necessary to give a clear and authoritative explanation. I shall cover the Nazi-occupied areas first and then the liberated areas.

In the Nazi-occupied areas only certain church organizations, the International Red Cross and the World Council of the Y. M. C. A. may go, and even those agencies have their troubles in some places. They serve prisoner-of-war camps and civilian internees. The Red Cross has the administration of the Geneva Convention of 1929, which establishes the sanitary and nutritional standards of these camps. It handles the food packages and comfort kits which are sent through the blockade by the national Red Cross societies, like the American or British Red Cross, or by private relief agencies, like United Yugoslav Relief, or by national governments, or by United States lend-lease on behalf of national governments eligible for such aid. Some food packages have even been sent by direct mail.

The World Council of the Y. M. C. A., represented in the United States by War Prisoners Aid, furnishes (1) books, athletic goods, and similar articles; (2) morale, athletic, and organizational service in the camps.

The Greek relief scheme was a special project administered by the Swedish Red Cross and the International Red Cross to meet the special needs of the starving population of Greece, and has continued in part since liberation.

The War Refugee Board (Stettinius, Stimson, Morgenthau) leads and coordinates the efforts of the interested private groups to rescue the individuals who suffer from the special attentions of the Gestapo within Axis territory. Its emergency work for any individual ends as he reaches an area where other private or public agencies can begin to function in his service.

So much for the Nazi-occupied areas.

The first thing one must appreciate about the liberated areas is the state of the commercial economy when an area is liberated. Under the Germans there was a stringently regulated economy with rationing, price control, and reasonably adequate distribution. If the front area between the armies is stable for a while, the towns are devastated. Even if the front moves fast, the Germans take or destroy, or our airmen destroy, all transport and bridges. When our Army civil affairs organization comes in all business and all distribution is stopped and very likely completely upset, yet, strangely enough, many people have money of some kind. What is needed therefore at once in all cases is primarily civilian supplies and only secondarily relief. This was true in north Africa and it was true in France.

The United States "relief" organization in north Africa, the forerunner of U. N. R. R. A., arranged for supplies to come to the north African ports, took them over, arranged with the Army for transportation to other depots by rail or ship, secured trucks and took the supplies inland to the important towns, and had a 1- or 2-day sale in each town. The mayor made up a list of his citizens and distributed tickets to them. For a few he indicated they could not pay. The people took the goods then needed, turned in the tickets, and paid for them, unless the ticket indicated otherwise. While the distribution organization had a net loss, it was nothing like what had been expected.

The process in France was different, but was built on that experience. The Greek process was the same except that the free distribution was relatively greater, the revolution upset things, and the inflation and currency situation complicated them further. So it may be said that the term "relief" is a good deal of a misnomer for what is done in the first emergency period after the military turns over. It is civilian supply, with

only a proportion of free distribution. It is not a social welfare operation.

The second completely erroneous impression about the liberated areas held by most Americans, I find, is that U. N. R. R. A. operates in all countries, France, Belgium, or Germany, for instance. Even the Times of London erred in this regard in a recent editorial on French supply problems. Mr. Richard Law had to correct this idea in Parliament 2 weeks ago.

Who, then, does handle this problem of emergency civilian supply immediately after liberation? So far as the American side is concerned, the President placed the major responsibility on the Army for the military period. That, in turn, has two phases. Close behind the fighting it is handled by G–5 of the Army, as seen in recent stories from the Philippines. But as soon as possible the Army turns it over either to the indigenous government or to U. N. R. R. A., even though the Army still retains the over-all responsibility. Thus, in France or Belgium, although it is still the military period for supply purposes, the supplies are turned over to the Government for distribution. In Greece it was the Army, using U. N. R. R. A. personnel and at Army expense until the revolution forced the civilian personnel out.

Well, you say, where does U. N. R. R. A. come in at all? What does U. N. R. R. A. do with all that money, then?

When any one of the Allied Governments does not have foreign exchange with which to pay for the necessary supplies, it may request U. N. R. R. A. to come in and provide the goods. The Greeks, for example, have made that request, and U. N. R. R. A. will operate there.

At some cut-off date the Army withdraws entirely, and the government takes over. It gets its own shipping allocation and takes over also the goods in the Army pipe line. So in Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland it will be U. N. R. R. A. which will then assume the responsibility for securing allocations for procurement, shipping, and major distribution. But even in supply matters, U. N. R. R. A. is a supervisory service organization, not a glorified international family welfare society.

France, Belgium, Holland, and Norway have not as yet asked for U. N. R. R. A.'s help in normal-civilian supply, and U. N. R. R. A. does not operate there in supply matters. It will operate in Greece, Yugoslavia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, by request and agreement of the governments. But you must understand that in those countries it is doing a government job, parallel to that of the French or Norwegian Governments in their territory. It is not doing an individual case-work relief job. Like France or Belgium, it will get an allocation of ships for its areas. It is a part of the total governmental supply service, whose objective is to get goods into regular channels of distribution for civilian use. Its first assigned ship is soon leaving for the Black Sea, with goods for Poland and Czechoslovakia.

I should note that at the suggestion of the European Council of U. N. R. R. A., proposals have now been approved for the extension of U. N. R. R. A.'s functions in relief into the paying countries. This would be an emergency type of assistance, worked out on a mutually satisfactory basis, and deserves thorough investigation.

U. N. R. R. A., however, does have a unique major responsibility in connection with supply. It is required to review all the governmental supply programs, including its own, and to insure that the standards of supply in each Allied country are as nearly equal to each other as circumstances will permit, especially in those essential items like clothing, textiles, or fats and oils, which are desperately short. It is the equalization board, so to speak.

Does U. N. R. R. A. operate in the ex-enemy territories? Only if the U. N. R. R A. council specifically approves, and it may be said that the democratically organized U. N. R. R. A. council is not enthusiastic about doing it. In the case of Italy the council finally voted $50,000,000 for special foods for mothers and children in Italy and for Italian refugees in Italy who had been driven out of their home towns, as well as for some of its general health work.

U. N. R. R. A. has another major responsibility which does take it into ex-enemy territory. It is the helper and expediter in connection with displaced persons of Allied nationality. The Allied nations send liaison officers into Germany or Italy to screen and repatriate their nationals, but U. N. R. R. A. helps S. H. A. E. F., which makes the general plans and has to take care of the many for whom no government will take responsibility. U. N. R. R. A. is managing a number of refugee camps in north Africa, and in cooperation with the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees is planning for the vanguard of stateless persons who will be the most tragic backwash of this war.

Apart from supply, U. N. R. R. A. may be requested to provide advisory services of many kinds, in the fields of health, welfare and agricultural and other rehabilitation. Many governments have already made such requests, and no question of ability to pay is involved.

The major U. N. R. R. A. responsibility among these is in the field of health, already mentioned in Italy. It is, in cooperation with the armies and the governments, giving leadership in preventing disease and epidemics in all areas. There has been less said about this, although in many ways it is the most important of its functions. The top medical officer of U. N. R. R. A. is Dr. Wilbur Sawyer, formerly of the Rockefeller Foundation.

I have spoken about the immediate emergency supply problem after liberation. But that, too, gives a most incomplete picture. Neither the armies nor U. N. R. R. A. nor the paying governments can go on indefinitely in the wholesale distribution business. Besides, the armies as they move forward take the trucks along. They fix the main bridges but not the back roads. They bring some seed and fish nets and agricultural machinery, but not much. They are faced with the restoration of a working economy, and one does not realize what a complicated system feeds and clothes and pays us all until one has to build it from the ground up.

In that rebuilding process one finds at once that trucks and factories need spare parts or complete rebuilding of machinery. Then they need fuel and raw materials. Even if the raw materials and fuel are within the country, there is no adequate way to transport them. When the first coal barges came down the canals and the Seine to Paris the populace turned out with music and flags to greet them, like a victorious fleet of battleships. Gradually, the old channels of traffic were smoothed out and restored, and the ports partially opened up and then came global shortages of material, steel, or textiles, or many others, and shortages of ships to bring any of them.

As one is faced with competing demands, for ammunition or tents or uniforms or food for the troops on the two great world battle grounds, who is to choose whether MacArthur shall move into Manila, or Eisenhower toward Berlin—or Frenchmen or Greeks shall be given work to do, useful, necessary work in necessary plants, that may prevent unrest and even revolution?

One first effort obviously must be to see whether it is better to ship raw materials to France or Belgium to be fabricated, instead of shipping the fabricated goods across the ocean. Then the utilization of shipping must be studied to make sure every ship has the optimum use. That is being done. And it may well be hoped that the choice will never have to be made between progress on both fronts at once, and chaos in the liberated countries. Nevertheless, in the last analysis no one of the Allied Nations can afford to allow chaos to exist, comparable in any way to the cruel domination of the Nazis, even for a few months. The Government of the United States cannot permit that to happen. We are fighting for liberty, not chaos, and there is no short cut.

In this major supply of the raw materials of a reviving economy in a liberated area, U. N. R. R. A. has only a limited responsibility. Its terms of reference in the field of rehabilitation are specifically limited to those activities which are necessary to relief. "The Administration cannot be called upon to help restore continuous employment in the world," is the language of Resolution 12 at the Atlantic City meeting of the U. N. R. R. A. Council. Its functions cannot go very much beyond the same scope as Army supply in the military period before U. N. R. R. A or the governments take over.

One more operation needs to be described—the relief work of the Red Cross—before I come to the private agencies.

It should be noted first that the American Red Cross does not usually operate abroad itself except in the service of the American soldier and sailor. In foreign countries its operations are through the national Red Cross societies or the International Red Cross. Its responsibilities for prisoners of war and internees have already been described. The great bulk of its funds, raised from the American public, go for the recreation service of the armed forces abroad, including the Red Cross clubs and hotels, for the services to individual soldiers and sailors in connection with their families and dependents, and for the recreation and other lay services and supplies in hospitals.

But the Red Cross does have civilian relief responsibilities in addition to peace- or wartime disaster relief. It spends for this about $5,000,000 a year of its own funds, and it has now spent nearly all of the $85,000,000 appropriated by Congress to the President during 5 years, since early 1940, for the purchase and transportation of relief supplies, to be procured exclusively in the United States, for distribution abroad, "through the American Red Cross or such governmental or other agencies as he may designate."

None of these Government funds, as a matter of Red Cross and congressional policy, has been spent in Axis-occupied territory. They have gone principally for medical supplies of all kinds, and textiles which the chapters make up into garments.

The Red Cross has, of course, made in its chapters large amounts of bandages, and new garments, which have been stock-piled and shipped out to the countries in greatest need. The Red Cross has been the principal shipping agency for its own goods and those of private agencies to Europe and elsewhere.

Everything I have said to this point has been a matter of public record, but it is extraordinary how many intelligent supporters, and even officers of private relief, are firmly convinced that only through American relief for Graustark or Ruritania will Graustarkians or Ruritanians be fed or clothed.

Consider the cost of feeding 40,000,000 Italians 2,000 calories a day, or even the cost of that part of the 2,000-calories diet that must come from overseas. No private agency could do even a fraction of it, to say nothing of fuel and clothing and medicine and shelter. That is not the job of the private agency. It is a basic, public, governmental responsibility.

The major problem today is not supply, but transportation, and only a government can compete with military demands today and get ships allocated. A private agency can only ship filler cargo, which is most helpful, but only a filler.

Finally, the bulk of the supplies sent are for distribution through regular civilian channels, not for "give away." The head of one recently liberated state has insisted on

this, as he said, to preserve the morale of his people, and called for the chance to work, not gifts; supplies through which jobs can be provided, not hand-outs.

Well, you may ask, what can the private agency do? It can do a lot, but it must have a full understanding of the problem, and knowledge of how to fit its supplementary gifts and services into these other basic and established programs. Enthusiasm and promotional ability are fine in a private agency staff, but what a mess these qualities can make in the absence of sound administrative experience in the welfare field.

Here are what the private agencies can do and are doing effectively:

They can provide special food and services for specialized groups, like mothers, children, or students.

They can make or collect garments, new or used.

They can give leadership in recreational and morale work.

They can care for refugees who for one reason or another are not cared for by any government This is one of the largest single fields of service.

Obviously, their appeals for funds and costs of administration need to be regulated, and their use of the funds supervised. That is the job of the President's War Relief Control Board.

We have reduced the foreign relief agencies to a limited number of international agencies, like the American Friends Service Committee, or the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, and to one or two agencies for each country to be served. Having started from over 60 agencies for Britain alone, for example, we think that is not a bad job.

To simplify the appeals, we organized the National War Fund, which includes 60 percent of the money, and many of the agencies. The times of all appeals are adjusted to avoid interferences. The War Fund Budget Committee reviews all requests of its agencies and fixes totals subject to approval of the War Relief Control Board. The others are reviewed by the Board itself.

But the great problem remains of coordination of efforts in the field. The Board first helped to establish firmly the Council of Voluntary Agencies which brings together, not for money raising, but for coordination of programs, all agencies, in or out of the War Fund. This is related to the War Fund policies under the leadership of President Henry Wriston of Brown. This council has committees for each country where all agencies contributing to that country are brought together.

The Board is now taking one more step. We called together last week the first of a series of conferences, one on each country, at which we have presented the Army program, the program of that country's government, the U. N. R. R. A. program, the Red Cross program, and the private agency programs. That gives an essential over-all picture of the need and how it may be met in each place.

The next step is coordination in the foreign country. In the military period it is obviously up to the Army, and under its control. In France or Belgium, for example, the Government thereafter takes over through some agency of government, and exercises general supervision. In the U. N. R. R. A. countries, U. N. R. R. A. by the agreement has that control. Proposals have recently been discussed, suggesting that such control should be extended to the paying countries, but this Government has not concurred. As I have said, U. N. R. R. A. must see to it that what goes to liberated areas goes on an equal basis to all countries, but supervision of the private agencies is clearly the job of the Government when it is in charge of civilian supply and relief distribution.

But in addition to Government supervision over them the agencies themselves need to work together. No less than 32 agencies want to send something to France. American Relief for France covers half the amount, and the Friends and Joint Distribution Committee 30 percent more. But the others should have their chance, too, and the need is great. An excellent pattern has been worked out in Italy. Mr. Myron Taylor has organized a coordinating and distributing organization over there. He is the head of American voluntary relief, and his director is a former Red Cross director. He works through an Italian committee, including representatives of the Italian Government, Italian Red Cross, the church, and Italian labor organizations. His main contact in the United States is with American Relief for Italy, the largest single organization for Italy on this side of the water, and all must work through these two. We have already set out to secure similar results in the Philippines, and after that will come France.

So in each country as the situation develops, the War Relief Control Board expects to lend its assistance to see to it (1) that there is a single main "country" organization in the United States; (2) that all organizations interested in that country work with the "country" organizaion in planning; (3) that there is an integrated operation of American relief activities in the foreign country itself, under American leadership.

I understand that your freedom fund proposals have nothing to do with money relief, but it might well be that you would wish to relate your advice and assistance to this operation in the foreign country.

Thus we hope that to match basic governmental provisions for civilian supply, there will be developed an adequate machinery to express freely, not the divisions of foreign politics, or of domestic either, but the generous humanitarian impulses of the whole American people for victims of war and aggression.

Statistical Summary, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, each month the Bureau of Agricultural Economics issues a summary showing the farm supply situation, the farm labor situation, and so forth. In connection with the current discussion of food shortages and farm products shortages it has occurred to me that it would be very helpful to the Members of the House to study this summary for March, as it outlines the cattle, hogs, wheat, and so forth, on hand. I believe it will be very helpful to the Members to have this information before them, so I include it as a part of my remarks:

STATISTICAL SUMMARY, BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, MARCH 12, 1945

SHARP DECREASE IN LIVESTOCK NUMBERS

Annual livestock inventory as of January 1 showed marked decline in numbers last year. During 1944 number of cattle decreased from 82.3 million head to 81.8 million; hogs from 83.8 million to 60.7 million; sheep from 51.8 million to 47.9 million; milk cows alone held their own in numbers, 27.7 million to 27.8 million; but there was a record slaughter of calves.

Total farm value of livestock, including poultry, fell from $9,500,000,000 a year ago to $8,900,000,000 at beginning of 1945.

FEWER GRAIN-EATING ANIMALS

The number of grain-consuming animals (horses, mules, cattle, sheep, hogs, and chickens) expressed in turns of animal units—each unit equivalent to 1 cow—stood at 147 million this January, compared with a peak of 171 million in January 1944; with 160 million in 1943 and a low of 120 million in 1935.

Thus the upswing in livestock production, which went on from 1938 up to 1944, was reversed last year and set into a sharp decline.

MORE MATURE CATTLE THAN YEAR AGO BUT FEWER CALVES

The number of steers on farms and ranches increased 158,000 last year and totaled 7.6 million head this January 1. The number of beef cows and heifers also increased almost 600,000 in the year. Number of milk cows also increased slightly (five-tenths of 1 percent), standing at 27.8 million head this January, an all-time high.

Calf numbers, off 7 percent in the year, showed sharpest decrease ever recorded; stood at 19.1 million head this January, compared with 20.5 million year previous. Calf slaughter last year was around 14 million head, a record.

ELEVEN PERCENT FEWER CHICKENS

Number of chickens on farms fell 11 percent, from 576,000,000 a year ago to 511,000,000 this year. Turkeys decreased only slightly, 7,600,000 to 7,500,000. Lower egg and higher feed prices last year presumably was the main reason. Flocks this January averaged 59 percent pullets, 33 percent hens, 8 percent other chickens. Whereas chickens are on the decline, holdings of turkey breeder hens are 6 percent above last year.

THE VANISHING HORSE

Draft animals have been declining steadily steadily in favor of mechanical power. Number horses and colts decreased last year from 9,300,000 to 8,900,000, smallest since 1874. Number of mules down from 3,500,000 to 3,400,000. Average farm value of horses this year $65, down about $14 below previous year—help shortages makes demand for tractors rather than horses. Number colts raised in 1944 estimated at 372,000, fewest in the 25 years of record. At present rate of decline, will be about 10,000,000 horses and mules on farms and ranches by 1950, compared with 12,400,000 now and high point of 26,700,000 in 1917.

DAIRY PRODUCTION

Production of milk on farms in 1944 amounted to 119,200,000,000 pounds, compared with 118,100,000,000 in 1943, and 103,600,000,000 for the 1935–39 average. Output of creamery butter, 1,486,000,000 pounds in 1944, compared with 1,673,000,000 in 1943 and 1,691,000,000 for the average. American cheese production, 800,000,000 pounds in 1944, compared with 765,000,000 in 1943, and 509,000,000 average. Evaporated and condensed milk output, 3,757,000,000 pounds in 1944, compared with 3,352,000,000 in 1943, and 2,225,000,000 the average.

Present forecasts suggest slightly less total milk output for 1945, slightly less butter, slightly more cheese and condensed and evaporated milk.

DECREASING WOOL PRODUCTION

Production of wool, shorn and pulled, in 1944 estimated 418,000,000 pounds, of which 384,000,000 pounds was shorn and around 65,000,000 pulled wool. This compares with 450,000,000 pounds in 1943 and a 10-year average (1933–42) of 434,000,000. The num-

ber of sheep shorn in 1944 was estimated at 44,300,000 head, about 9 percent fewer than were shorn in 1943. The average weight of fleece in 1944 was 7.83 pounds, compared with 7.91 pounds in 1943.

MARKETING CHARGES

Charges for marketing a family market basket of farm foods amounted to $218 in January, same as in December. This represented a decline of about 2 percent from previous January but was 8 percent above the 1935–39 average of $201.

The farmer's share of the consumer's dollar spent for farm foods stood at 55 cents in January, same as in December. This share equalled the record high of 1918.

Retail cost of the family market basket of foods (average for family of three) rose from $453 in December to $455 in January 1945, matching high point of 1944.

MORE GRAIN FEED BUT LESS HAY

Stocks of corn and oats on farms, at terminal markets, and Government owned, January 1, were equal to about forty-nine one hundredths ton per grain-consuming animal unit on farms. This quantity was 26 percent more than a year earlier, but was slightly less than in preceding 3 years of large supplies. Stocks of hay on farms, January 1, per hay-consuming animal unit, were 1 percent smaller than a year pervious and 7 percent below average for that date during 1939–43.

FARM PRODUCT PRICES DOWN A LITTLE

General prices received by farmers for their products stood at an index of 199 percent of prewar (1909–19 taken as 100) in mid-February. This was a decline of 2 points from the previous month and compared with 195 a year previous. Farm product prices averaged 116 percent of parity, compared with 117 in January and 115 in February last year. Marked declines were shown from the previous month in indexes of truck crops, eggs, dairy products and cotton. Food grains remained at 169, fruit rose 6 points to 211, meat animals up 6 to 209. Cotton, corn, and wheat prices were still below parity in mid-February but most other major products were well above.

RECORD ORANGE CROP

Record orange crop, 105,000,000 boxes, estimated for 1944–45, compared with 103,000,000 a year ago and 85,000,000 in 1942–43. Florida tangerine crop placed at 4,100,000 boxes, half a million more than last season but 100,000 less than in 1942–43. Total grapefruit output estimated 51,191,000 boxes, compared with last season's record crop of 55,970,000 boxes and 50,481,000 produced in 1942–43. Prospective California lemon crop 13,321,000 boxes, 21 percent above last year but 11 percent below the 1942–43 crop of 14,940,000 boxes.

MORE MOHAIR

Mohair production in the 7 leading States in 1944 estimated at 20,581,000 pounds, which was 2 percent increase over the 20,196,000 pounds produced in 1943, and 14 percent above the 10-year average (1933–42). The number of goats clipped in 1944 was 4,130,000 head, smallest number since 1939; compared with 4,284,000 clipped in in 1943. Average quantity of hair per goat and kid clipped was 5 pounds in 1944, compared with 4.7 pounds in 1943.

MEAT PRODUCTION

Number cattle slaughtered under Federal inspection in January 1945 was 1,284,000 head, compared with 1,141,000 in January 1944. Number calves slaughtered 560,000, compared with 468,000 year ago. Hogs slaughtered 5,299,000 head, compared with 7,839,000 year ago. Sheep and lambs 2,073,000, compared with 1,933,000 last year. Thus it will be seen that slaughter of cattle, calves, sheep, and lambs is running considerably higher this winter than last, while the slaughter of hogs has fallen off sharply.

The total dressed weight of meat (excluding condemned) represented by the above slaughter figures in January was as follows: Beef, 618,000,000 pounds, compared with 582,000,000 a year previous; veal, 60,000,000 pounds, compared with 49,000,000 a year ago; pork (carcass weight), 978,000,000, compared with 1,476,000,000 a year ago; pork, excluding lard, 761,000,000, compared with 1,112,000,000 a year ago; lamb and mutton, 90,000,000, compared with 81,000,000 a year ago.

Cattle and hogs are running lighter weights this winter than last, while calves average heavier. Average live weights this January: Cattle, 940 pounds, compared with 969 pounds a year previous; hogs, 244 pounds, compared with 249 a year ago; calves, 198 pounds, compared with 191 pounds last year.

NUMBER OF FARM WORKERS DOWN

Number of workers on farms February 1 totaled 8,051,000, about 4 percent under a year previous and 11 percent below February average, 1935–39. Employment was lowest for date in 2 decades of record, a fact perhaps partly due to bad weather. Number of family workers, 6,557,000 or a decline of 14,000 in a month, and compared with 6,702,000 the previous February. Number hired workers increased 60,000 during month to a total of 1,494,000 by February 1, compared with 1,681,000 a year previous. Both family and hired workers are lowest February numbers of record.

Number of foreign workers on farms (transported by W. P. A.) January 31, 1945: Mexicans, 29,590; Jamaicans, 4,250; Bahamians, 4,580; Newfoundlanders, 791.

FARMERS' INCOME

Farmers' cash receipts during January 1945 from products sold amounted to $1,630,000,000, compared with $1,628,000,000 the previous January. These figures included $70,000,000 of Government payments this January, compared with $92,000,000 the year previous.

Parity prices for farm products and actual prices received

Commodity and unit	Actual price		Parity price Feb. 15, 1945
	Jan. 15, 1945	Feb. 15, 1945	
Wheat, bushel_dollars	1.46	1.47	1.52
Corn, bushel_____do	1.07	1.06	1.10
Oats, bushel_____do	.72	.73	.683
Cotton, pound_cents	20.20	19.19	21.33
Potatoes, bushel dollars	1.58	1.65	1.25
Hogs, 100 pounds_do	13.80	14.00	12.50
Beef cattle, 100 pounds_____do	11.70	12.10	9.32
Veal calves, 100 pounds_____do	13.20	13.60	11.60
Lambs, 100 pounds ___do	13.00	13.60	10.10
Butterfat, pound cents	50.9	50.8	46.3
Milk, wholesale, 100 pounds_____dollars	3.35	3.31	[1] 2.82
Chickens, live, pound cents	24.2	24.5	19.6
Eggs, dozen_____do	41.0	35.8	[1] 34.0

[1] Adjusted for seasonal variation.

Current indexes for agriculture

Index numbers	Base period	February 1945
Prices received by farmers	1910–14=100	199
Prices paid by farmers, interest and taxes	1910–14=100	172
Parity ratio	1910–14=100	116
Wholesale prices of food	1910–14=100	163
Retail prices of food	1910–14=100	[1] 177
Farm wage rates	1910–14=100	324
Weekly factory earnings	1910–14=100	[2] 429

[1] January figure.
[2] Factory pay roll per employed worker adjusted for seasonal variation.

Current index for agriculture—Continued

Ratios	Long-time February average	February 1945
Hog-corn ratio, United States	12.5	13.2
Butterfat-feed ratio, United States	24.8	26.4
Milk-feed ratio, United States	1.27	1.49
Egg-feed ratio United States	11.6	12.5

Production comparisons	January-December 1943	January-December 1944
Milk (billion pounds)	118.1	119.2
Eggs (billions)	54.2	57.5
Beef (dry weight, million pounds)	5,970	6,665
Lamb and mutton (dry weight, million pounds)	958	887
Pork and lard (million pounds)	12,161	12,698
All meats (dry weight, million pounds)	19,686	21,166

Membership Rolls of the Democratic Steering Committee From Its Inauguration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A53, the gentleman from Missouri, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, extended his remarks and included the membership rolls of the Democratic Steering Committee from its inauguration down to and including the Seventy-seventh Congress, and also included the chairmen of the Democratic caucus down to and including the Seventy-eighth Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I now include the membership rolls of the Democratic Steering Committee from its inauguration to the Seventy-third Congress down to and including the Seventy-ninth Congress:

DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEES

SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS

Robert Crosser, chairman.

William P. Connery, Massachusetts; John F. Boylan, New York; Patrick J. Boland, Pennsylvania; Patrick H. Drewry, Virginia; E. E. Cox, Georgia; Lister Hill, Alabama; William V. Gregory, Kentucky; Robert Crosser, Ohio; William H. Larrabee, Indiana; Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois; Ralph F. Lozier, Missouri; W. W. Hastings, Oklahoma; Sam Rayburn, Texas; Edward T. Taylor, Colorado; Sam B. Hill, Washington.

Ex officio: Henry T. Rainey, Illinois, Speaker; Joseph W. Byrns, Tennessee, floor leader; Clarence F. Lea, California, caucus chairman; Edward W. Pou, North Carolina, chairman, Rules Committee; Patrick J. Boland, Pennsylvania, chairman, whip.

SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

Adolph J. Sabath, chairman.

William P. Connery, Massachusetts, John J. Boylan, New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Zebulon Weaver, North Carolina; Hampton P. Fulmer, South Carolina; Lister Hill, Alabama; W. V. Gregory, Kentucky; Robert Crosser, Ohio; William H. Larrabee,

Indiana; Adolph Sabath, Illinois, Clarence Cannon, Missouri; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; Luther Johnson, Texas; James G. Scrugham, Nevada; Clarence F. Lea, California.

Ex officio: Joseph W. Byrns, Tennessee, Speaker; William B. Bankhead, Alabama, floor leader; Edward T. Taylor, Colorado, caucus chairman; John J. O'Connor, New York, chairman, Rules Committee; Patrick J. Boland, Pennsylvania, whip.

SEVENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

Jed Johnson, chairman.

William P. Connery, Massachusetts; John T. Boylan, New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; T. Alan Goldsborough, Maryland; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; Lister Hill, Alabama; John E. Miller, Arkansas; Robert Crosser, Ohio; William H. Larrabee, Indiana; Adolph Sabath, Illinois; Clarence Cannon, Missouri; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; Luther Johnson, Texas; James G. Scrugham, Nevada; Walter M. Pierce, Oregon.

Ex officio: William B. Bankhead, Alabama, Speaker; Sam Rayburn, Texas, floor leader; Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina, caucus chairman; John J. O'Connor, New York, chairman, Rules Committee; Patrick J. Boland, Pennsylvania, whip.

SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

James G. Scrugham, chairman.

Joseph E. Casey, Massachusetts; William T. Byrne, New York; Charles I. Faddis, Pennsylvania; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; Malcolm C. Tarver, Georgia; Wall Doxey, Mississippi; Jere Cooper, Tennessee; Robert Crosser, Ohio; William H. Larrabee, Indiana; Harry P. Beam, Illinois; Clarence Cannon, Missouri; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; Marvin Jones, Texas; James G. Scrugham, Nevada; Charles Kramer, California.

Ex officio: William B. Bankhead, Alabama, Speaker; Sam Rayburn, Texas, floor leader; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts, caucus chairman; Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina, chairman, Ways and Means Committee; Edward T. Taylor, Colorado, chairman, Appropriations Committee; A. J. Sabath, Illinois, chairman, Rules Committee; Patrick J. Boland, Pennsylvania, whip.

SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Clarence Cannon, chairman.

Le Roy D. Downs, Connecticut; William T. Byrne, New York; Francis J. Myers, Pennsylvania; John H. Kerr, North Carolina; James P. Richards, South Carolina; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Jere Cooper, Tennessee; Robert Crosser, Ohio; William H. Larrabee, Indiana; Harry P. Beam, Illinois; John J. Cochran, Missouri; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; Luther A. Johnson, Texas; James G. Scrugham, Nevada; Harry R. Sheppard, California.

Ex officio: Sam Rayburn, Texas, Speaker; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts, floor leader; Richard M. Duncan, Missouri, chairman, caucus; Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina, chairman, Ways and Means Committee; Clarence Cannon, Missouri, chairman, Appropriations Committee; Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois, chairman, Rules Committee; Patrick J. Boland, Pennsylvania, whip.

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Robert Crosser, chairman.

Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; William T. Byrne, New York; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., Maryland; John H. Kerr, North Carolina; Paul Brown, Georgia; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; Joe Starnes, Alabama; Will M. Whittington, Mississippi; Virgil Chapman, Kentucky; Jere Cooper, Tennessee; Robert Crosser, Ohio; John Lesinski, Michigan; Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois; Orville Zimmerman, Missouri; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; Wright Patman, Texas; J. W. Robinson, Utah; Ed. V. Izac, California.

Ex officio: Sam Rayburn, Texas, Speaker; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts, floor leader; Harry R. Sheppard, California, chairman, caucus; Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina, chairman, Ways and Means Committee; Clarence Cannon, Missouri, chairman, Appropriations Committee; Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois, chairman, Rules Committee; Robert Ramspeck, Georgia, whip.

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Will M. Whittington, chairman.

Herman P. Kopplemann, Connecticut; William T. Byrne, New York; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; John H. Kerr, North Carolina; Thomas G. Burch, Virginia; Paul Brown, Georgia; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; Will M. Whittington, Mississippi; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; Fadjo Cravens, Arkansas; Virgil Chapman, Kentucky; Robert Crosser, Ohio; John Lesinski, Michigan; Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; R. Ewing Thomason, Texas; J. W. Robinson, Utah; Henry M. Jackson, Washington.

Ex-officio: Sam Rayburn, Texas, Speaker; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts, floor leader; Robert Ramspeck, Georgia, whip; Jere Cooper, Tennessee, chairman, caucus; Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina, chairman, Ways and Means Committee; Clarence Cannon, Missouri, chairman, Appropriations Committee; Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois, chairman, Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the available list of chairmen who have presided over the Democratic caucus. Unfortunately the list is fragmentary as no known record remains of the proceedings of any session prior to the Thirty-first Congress:

Congress	Chairman
31st (1849-51)	James Thompson (Pennsylvania).
32d (1851-53)	
33d (1853-55)	Edson B. Olds (Ohio).
34th (1855-57)	George W. Jones (Tennessee).
35th (1857-59)	
36th (1859-61)	George S. Houston (Alabama).
37th (1861-63)	
38th (1863-65)	
39th (1865-67)	
40th (1867-69)	
41st (1869-71)	Samuel J. Randall (Pennsylvania). William E. Niblack (Indiana).
42d (1871-73)	
43d (1873-75)	William E. Niblack (Indiana).
44th (1875-77)	L. Q. C. Lamar (Mississippi).
45th (1877-79)	Hiester Clymer (Pennsylvania).
46th (1879-81)	John F. House (Tennessee).
47th (1881-83)	
48th (1883-85)	George W. Geddes (Ohio).
49th (1885-87)	J. Randolph Tucker (Virginia).
50th (1887-89)	Samuel S. Cox (New York). James B. McCreary (Kentucky).
51st (1889-91)	William S. Holman (Indiana).
52d (1891-93)	Do.
53d (1893-95)	Do.
54th (1895-97)	David B. Culberson (Texas).
55th (1897-99)	James D. Richardson (Tennessee).
56th (1899-1901)	James Hay (Virginia).
57th (1901-03)	Do.
58th (1903-05)	Do.
59th (1905-07)	Robert L. Henry (Texas).
60th (1907-09)	Henry D. Clayton (Alabama).
61st (1909-11)	Do.
62d (1911-13)	James Hay (Virginia). Albert S. Burleson (Texas).
63d (1913-15)	A. Mitchell Palmer (Pennsylvania).
64th (1915-17)	E. W. Saunders (Virginia).
65th (1917-19)	Do.
66th (1919-21)	Arthur G. Dewalt (Pennsylvania).
67th (1921-23)	Sam Rayburn (Texas).
68th (1923-25)	Henry T. Rainey (Illinois).
69th (1925-27)	Charles D. Carter (Oklahoma).
70th (1927-29)	Arthur H. Greenwood (Indiana).
71st (1929-31)	David H. Kincheloe (Kentucky).
72d (1931-33)	William W. Arnold (Illinois).
73d (1933-35)	Clarence F. Lea (California).
74th (1935-37)	Edward T. Taylor (Colorado).
75th (1937-39)	Robert L. Doughton (North Carolina).
76th (1939-41)	John W. McCormack (Massachusetts).
77th (1941-43)	Richard M. Duncan (Missouri).
78th (1943-45)	Harry R. Sheppard (California).
79th (1945-47)	Jere Cooper (Tennessee).

Less Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., of March 20, 1945:

LESS COAL

Again Washington bureaucrats are possessed by the false idea that early spring up here in New England means that houses do not have to be heated. From the Solid Fuels Administration, as the current instance in point, comes the order that all deliveries of anthracite and bituminous coal used for heating purposes shall be charged against the consumer's allotment for the 1945-46 season. Moreover, these consumers are to be limited to a maximum of 80 percent of their normal supply, compared with 87½ percent during the past two winters.

Every householder knows that coal must be conserved, and why. And few are the consumers who do not conscientiously try to cut down on their own tonnage. Thanks to efficient handling of burners, insulation, and anything but cosy room temperature they get along with considerably less coal than they would use if times were normal.

Average citizens also realize that Federal bureaucracy has its own problems. They have heard, for instance, that the estimated anthracite production during 1945 is expected to be 4,500,000 tons less than last year, that the estimated bituminous production will be 50,000,000 tons short. And John L. Lewis is no hero to them. They do not minimize the transportation, manpower, and economic problems imposed by war; and they want a part in helping to alleviate conditions.

But it is their opinion that this order charging coal deliveries after March 31 to next winter's scant supply is an example of crowding the mourners more than a little bit. Time was when it was the accepted practice to run boilers through April and well into May, not because folks here are "soft" but because of the inconsistencies of the weather. On their own initiative they have set back the dead line for letting out the fire. But they can't put it back to March 31 without jeopardizing health both this spring and next winter, especially when the maximum to be available has been cut to 7½ percent.

Erection of Veterans' Hospital at Brooklyn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which was sent to the Secretary of War by Mr. Harold J. Burke,

chairman of the committee for the erection of a veterans' hospital in Brooklyn:

COMMITTEE FOR THE ERECTION
OF A VETERANS' HOSPITAL IN BROOKLYN,
Brooklyn, N. Y., March 9, 1945.

The Honorable HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: After many years of persistant effort to present to the Veterans' Administration the facts favoring the erection of a veterans' hospital in Brooklyn, we the veterans of Brooklyn were finally rewarded for our activity by the Veterans' Administration's commitment to build a hospital facility in our borough.

The reasons for the urgency of immediate construction of this hospital, Mr. Secretary, should be apparent to you. They were presented to Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Veterans' Administrator, in a 40 page brochure; a copy of which is being forwarded to you. However, Sir, while the Veterans' Administration is prepared to begin building of the project immediately, your department is stalemating the action by its refusal to deed over a small portion of the many acres of Fort Hamilton in Brooklyn for the facility.

Fort Hamilton is an historic site of old Brooklyn. It is not for that reason alone however, that the people of Brooklyn are asking for it as the site of the veterans' hospital for their returning wounded sons, brothers and husbands. Fort Hamilton provides an excellent location because of its geography and because of the many other reasons that have made it acceptable to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Secretary, Brooklyn wants to know your position. Brooklyn wants to know whether you are willing to give up a portion of the Fort Hamilton land in return for the lives of several thousand casualties from our borough. We remind you, sir, that Brooklyn, as a borough, is greater in population than a number of States of our Nation, and that its record of achievement in the war effort is unparalleled.

Sir, Brooklyn has grown more than trees—it has grown the finest manhood in America, which it has not spared in order to bring victory to our country. Does Brooklyn, then, merit the deed to land at Fort Hamilton?

Your consideration must tell you that it does. In that case Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Veterans' Administrator, who has been most cooperative in our campaign, I feel certain will be happy to accept the deed in the name of the wounded veterans of Brooklyn.

Respectfully yours,
HAROLD J. BURKE,
Chairman.

Hay in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, there is a slang expression frequently heard when reference is made to a large amount of money or a great amount of wealth, which makes contrasts with the words "That ain't hay." From such slang expression one might suppose that hay is bulky in volume but slight in value. I do not know that we should ever think of hay as insignificant in value. Certainly hay has played a great part in the history of civilization. If you expand the word "hay" broadly enough to include all forage for animals, one could write an economic history of the human race, based upon the part that forage has played in supporting and determining man's spread over the face of the earth and in the stages of his development in civilization.

Hay in history hints at man's dependence upon his livestock and explains countless migrations and wars of conquest as nomadic peoples sought better pasture lands or fought with other nomads even as the tribesmen of Abram and Lot fought with each other before their leaders parted to go their separate ways. However, forage and pasture for livestock is not alone important in the nomadic stage of man's progress. In fact it has grown more important relatively when man turned to agriculture and a more settled way of life. Today the grass crop is relatively far more important in the general picture of agricultural production than the average person imagines it to be.

When I point with pride to a quarter million acres of land in the valley surrounding Phoenix, Ariz., and say that in the last 12 months these acres have produced on an average more than $165 per acre of food and fiber, I'm pointing to only a small spot of the total area of that State. Like other intermountain communities, four-fifths of the area of Arizona is uncultivated now and useful only for grazing. While this grazing portion does produce a total of considerable wealth, it is far less than it might produce under better management and man's scientific care. Everyone who has traveled throughout the West must have been impressed by the vast areas which can never be turned by the plow. These vast areas are not necessarily waste lands though they may convey that impression on first sight. The livestock industry of the West in general still holds first position in contributing to the Nation's wealth. While recognizing that fact we must deplore the additional fact that the livestock industry depending upon the natural pasturage is but a fraction of what it might be and should be.

It is with a great deal of satisfaction that I note on page 40 of the pending bill a sizable sum for range investigation. The terms is a broad one and I can see great possibilities in improving our ranges and conserving the soil. The protection of the vegetation on the water sheds will save much of later costs in connection with our irrigation projects. The head of one of the greatest irrigation projects in the West, who is a level-headed businessman has urged me to support this item in the agricultural appropriation bill. He is thinking less of pasturage on the watershed but more in hoping to minimize silting of the reservoirs on his $50,000,000 reclamation project.

How great would be the increase of the wealth of the Intermountain States, where more than 80 percent of the area is fit only for grazing, if man could double or treble the carrying capacity of the ranges. I think such can be done and I am not referring now to irrigation, important as that is to my way of thinking. Our ranges have been overgrazed, and given time nature could restore them, but that would take a long time. I think the process can be shortened by proper reseeding of the overgrazed lands. New methods and new techniques have lately been developed. I have a firm conviction that this important work will pay many fold for our proper expenditures for it, and that good management requires us to do it. From every viewpoint we cannot afford not to do it.

Problem of Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, any realistic appraisal of the campaign for the liberation of the Philippines must take into consideration what has been accomplished and what remains to be accomplished—our liabilities as well as our assets.

One hundred and forty five thousand Japanese have been either killed or captured in the first 9 weeks of the Luzon operation—the numerical equivalent of 11 full Japanese divisions—bring to 282,000 the number of casualties the Japanese have suffered since our landing on Leyte. We have successfully completed 25 triphibious actions, the twenty-fifth being on the northwest shore of Luzon's Batangas Bay. From Manila's airfields and from those of central Luzon, American planes fan out to strike at enemy shipping from the Formosa Straits to Borneo. Our own lifeline of transport to Manila has been guarded by the liberation of the Lubang Islands, Verde, Marinduque, and Capul. From the airfields of Palawan and Mindanao oil-rich Borneo and the southern supply lines of Japan are being subjected to an unrelenting crossfire from the air.

In contrast to these accomplishments, it would seem at first glance that the Japanese could be easily wrested from their remaining foothold in the Philippines. Yet, such is not the case. It will take weeks, perhaps months, before the last of the Japanese invaders are either killed or captured. Much of the Mindanao Province of Zamboanga remains to be liberated. Cetabato and Davao, also on Mindanao, must be freed. The Japanese must be rooted from the Vosayan Islands of Cebu, Negros, and Panay. On Luzon, the campaign for liberation will go on until there are no Japanese in the mountainous terrain from Baguio to the north coast, in the Cagayan Valley, the Bicol region, and the Province of Tayabas.

The continuing cooperation extended to the American forces of liberation by

Filipino guerrillas that made all the Philippines a hostile territory for the Japanese can be expected as an important part of our future offensive pattern. The Filipino guerrillas on Luzon will furnish vital intelligence and go on with their slashing attacks against the Japanese aggressor. Yet, with the Japanese now concentrated in heavily fortified positions, it cannot be anticipated that these positions will readily fall before the comparatively light equipment of the Filipino guerrilla forces. We must and we will attack with our heavy combat weapons in close coordination with our Filipino allies. On Philippine islands other than Luzon the need for employment of American heavy combat weapons is equally great and, in those areas, the time of liberation depends to a great extent upon the availability of such weapons.

Filipinos and Americans alike have a great stake in driving the Japanese out of the Philippines. The total liberation of the Philippines will mean a tremendous advance toward complete defeat of the militarists of Japan—an event which will bring peace and security to both our peoples.

Renegotiation of Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of the War Contract Price Adjustment Board relating to renegotiation of war contracts, together with the letter of transmission and my reply thereto.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH D. McKELLAR,
United States Senator from Tennessee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McKELLAR: Knowing of your interest in the renegotiation of war contracts, I am sending you herewith a copy of news release which highlights some of the main achievements under contract renegotiation and is being issued for tomorrow's papers.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

MARCH 22, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War, the War Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Many, many thanks for your kind letter of the 21st, with enclosure about the operation of the renegotiation law.

This is great news for me, as the law was one of my bills and I took the greatest interest in getting it through.

I am taking the liberty of putting your letter and Colonel Hirsch's statement in the RECORD today.

With kindest regards and thanking you for sending it to me, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH McKELLAR.

As a result of renegotiation of war contracts in the past 3 years, contractors have refunded or agreed to refund more than $5,800,000,000 of excessive profits to the United States Treasury, Col. Maurice Hirsch, Chairman of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, announced today.

In addition, savings vast but impossible to estimate stem from the fact that contractors, knowing their earnings will be reviewed and any excessive profits recaptured, tend to avoid excessive profits by holding prices down when making contracts This is particularly true because of the announced principle in renegotiation that a contractor whose pricing policy on renegotiable business results in comparatively reasonable profit margins on his original billing prices should receive more favorable consideration than a contractor whose pricing policy results in substantially excessive profits.

"The sums saved to taxpayers through renegotiation and later procurement are great," Colonel Hirsch stated, "even allowing for the fact that a large part of the excessive earnings would even without renegotiation or price reductions ultimately be recaptured through Federal income and excess-profits taxes."

The cash refunds reflect for the most part the renegotiation or prices for the business of contractors in 1942 and 1943. Renegotiation for business in 1944 has just begun.

"The cooperation given by contractors to those administering the Renegotiation Act is well evidenced," Colonel Hirsch said, "by the record of renegotiations for the year 1943 which have been completed up to March 9, 1945, the most recent date for which full data is now compiled. As of that date the cases of more than 31,500 contractors had been reviewed for that year, in 24,395 of which no refund was required either because of the nonapplicability of the act or because no excessive profits appeared to have been realized. In over 7,000 of the cases, refunds were made under voluntary agreements entered into by the contractors. In only 175 cases was it necessary for the Government to use its authority to compel refunds. Up to March 9, 1945, only 19 of those cases had been appealed to the tax court."

Congress, by the Renegotiation Act, authorized the renegotiation of most Government war contracts and subcontracts as one means of eliminating excessive war profits, through the review of the earnings of war contractors. Contracts are ordinarily renegotiated on an over-all fiscal-year basis, and any portion of the profits found to be excessive must be refunded to the Government.

The Renegotiation Act applies to contracts of the War Department, Navy Department, Treasury Department, Maritime Commission, War Shipping Administration, and four of the subsidiaries of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and to related subcontracts. The War Contracts Price Adjustment Board is the statutory agency having authority in the administration of the act, but actual renegotiations are conducted under the direction of the price-adjustment boards of the Government agencies included under the act.

The savings resulting from the authority to renegotiate war contracts are of three types:

1. From refunds: The amount of renegotiation refunds relating to work already performed, and determined since the Renegotiation Act became effective on April 28, 1942, up to March 9, 1945, follows:

For business in—	*Amount of refund*
1942	$3,177,761,219
1943	2,577,994,520
1944	46,697,243
Total	5,802,452,932

Renegotiation of war business in 1942 is practically finished. However, about 15 percent of the assignments for renegotiation on business completed in 1943 are still in process. Renegotiation on 1944 business has just begun. Hence the total recovery for the entire period 1942–44 will be much greater than the amount above noted.

2. From price reductions under existing contracts: Under the present Renegotiation Act, the renegotiation agencies cannot require price reductions relating to future performance under renegotiated contracts but have the authority to enter into agreements providing for them. Under another provision of law the department can require such reductions in appropriate cases. Such reductions are accomplished by renegotiation agencies or by contracting officers or by the joint efforts of both. So far, these reductions, including both those in renegotiation and those resulting from other efforts of the departments, are estimated to aggregate at least as much as the refunds.

3. From contractors' voluntary price reductions on future contracts and future deliveries: Large savings result from the voluntary application of renegotiated prices to future contracts and from voluntary reduction in prices by companies which recognize that excessive prices will be reduced through renegotiation.

The amount of savings of this third type cannot be estimated with any accuracy. It is believed, however, that these savings exceed the savings through cash refunds and through application of lowered prices to existing contracts.

"Renegotiation," Colonel Hirsch stated, "is in addition an important tool for full and effective industrial mobilization. One of the factors considered in renegotiation is the efficiency of the contractor, with particular regard to the attainment of quantity and quality production, reduction of costs and economy in the use of materials, facilities and manpower. Renegotiation also concerns itself with the pricing policy of the contractor. Close pricing is regarded as a favorable factor. Close pricing is effective not only in relation to the savings accomplished for the Government, and not only because it is a deterrent to inflation, but also because it of itself impels efficient use of labor, materials and the other elements required in war production.

"Only in most infrequent and unusual cases does the recovery of excessive profits or the necessity of reducing prices under the amounts initially agreed upon result from any attempt on the part of the contractor to take advantage of the necessities of the Government in procuring for war.

"Excessive profits in almost every instance have arisen because neither the contractor nor the contracting officer was able in advance to estimate accurately the cost of the items required.

"Even after 3 years of war, in those cases where there are changes in required volume or in specifications of old products, demand for new products, modifications in processes, in skills, or in materials, or fluctuating costs, accurate initial pricing is difficult. Renegotiation is then effective in recovering for the Government any excessve profits which may result."

United Nations War Crimes Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the resolution (H. J. Res. 93) to create a commission to work with United Nations War Crimes Commission:

Right under our noses there seem to be numerous agencies set up to meet the problem of war criminals. The Navy Department has its Division of War Crimes under Admiral Gatch; the Army, under General Weir, has its Division of War Crimes, as has the State Department. What do we know about them? Is there any coordination among them? Are they, and to what extent, working in conjunction with the United Nations War Crimes Commission, now operating in London, or are they proceeding independently? Congress and the people are kept in the dark. Should Congress and the people continue in ignorance?

The questions in our minds pile up.

Has our country as yet developed a policy as to war crimes? If so, what is it? Numerous other countries have already announced their policy. Are the war criminals to be tried at all? What procedure, if any, is to be used in the trials of war criminals? What criminal codes and of what countries are involved? Are there to be new laws to fit new crimes or existing law utilized? Do laws exist to punish the perpetrators of the mass murders of their own nationals in the Reich? If new laws are invoked for past offenses, will they be ruled out as ex post facto? As far as I am concerned, I am willing to invoke new laws to fit the bestiality of the Axis. We have to stamp out the Nazi plague, and it can only be done completely by the punishment of war criminals, ex post facto laws notwithstanding. Are there to be international courts or any national courts or both? Will military tribunals or civil courts or both be set up? Certainly it is our concern when we recall that after the last war the American representatives joined with the Japanese to protest against the establishment of international tribunals to try the Huns and Junkers. A repetition of the farce of lack of trial and punishment of war criminals of the last war will not be countenanced. Then out of a list of 896 culprits only 12 were tried before the High German Court at Leipzig, 6 acquitted, and 6 convicted with nonsensically light sentences. Of the 6, 2 escaped and 4 spent 6 months in jail. That was the lamentable results—a mere international wink of the eye.

What shall we ultimately define to be a war crime? How much weight is to be attached to the defense of superior orders? What shall be done with heads of states? Shall they escape trial and be subject to political disposition only? Shall they be given the treatment accorded Napoleon and the Kaiser? Shall they be hanged on a gibbet five times higher than the one from which Haman was hanged? Shall they be summarily tried?

What shall be our attitude toward neutral countries who reserve the right to grant asylum to escaping war criminals? It is interesting to note that recently King Ibn Saud declared war on Germany and Japan but not unconditionally. He requested that the "zone of the holy shrines" be declared neutral. For the first time in modern war history such an exception is stipulated. If such condition is accepted, Moslem war criminals like the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem can escape into these zones and receive asylum therein. Japanese and Nazi war criminals can do likewise.

The questions I have asked are vital ones. Upon how they are answered will depend not only the stability of international relations but the successful maintenance of a durable peace.

This war is a prolongation of the last war. The boldness of the Junker and military caste received impetus from what they considered our soft-heartedness. Just punishment meted out this time will serve as a deterrent in the making of a third world war. When we survey the bestiality and brutality of the Axis jackals, the conclusion crushes in on us that should we permit the escape of those who have loosed such horror upon innocents we are thereby violating the laws of decency and condoning criminality in all its forms.

There are some, for instance, who feel that Hirohito and the ruling class of Japan should not be punished; that the Office of Mikado would remain intact, that the Mikado and his barons will be the only form of responsible life in Japan and, therefore, we'll need them to keep order. Some high officials have even objected to any irreverent reference to Hirohito and have asked that his palace be spared blasting from the air. These reservationists have recently received some severe jolts; their attitude has been gravely questioned. I question it. So does Admiral Halsey who recently said that of course during an overcast we might bomb the palace of the emperor, but he does hope that the emperor's white horse will be spared since he would like to ride him. I feel that the Mikado, be he god or devil (no matter how regarded), must go.

Actually, why was the resolution offered?

Firstly, because we get disquieting information about the activities or nonactivities of the United Nations War Crimes Commission. That Commission has been in session over a year and a half. Some will state much has been accomplished, but that it has been hamstrung by the British Foreign Office and/or by our State Department. Whichever is the case we ought to know. The people are entitled to know. This is a people's war; it is not a war between heads of states. This is a war against nazi-ism and fascism; it is a war against backstairs diplomacy; it is a war against secret covenants.

The work of the United Nations War Crimes Commission cannot remain secret. Whatever impedimenta exist in bringing its work to fruitful completion must be removed. If there are differences, those differences must be resolved in the open. Let the pitiless light of publicity reveal the places where ineptitude and indecision are crippling its efforts. The nation wants action; it is tired of waiting.

It is worthy of comment that a full-stage debate on war crimes was held in the House of Lords on March 21. The members' comments reflected reports of dissension within the War Crimes Commission and showed a marked disposition to question the vigor with which Nazi and Fascist punishment problem were being attacked. It is high time such a full-time debate were staged in the House.

The ex-chairman of the United Nations War Crimes Commission, Sir Cecil Hurst, wrote three letters to the British Foreign Office. The first, written last May, asked for the extension of the Commission's power to try the Nazis for crimes against their own nationals; that is, for crimes against the Jews and other minorities particularly. The reply came 4 months later from Anthony Eden, British Foreign Secretary, which, in common parlance, said, "No soap." Sir Cecil then wrote a second letter asking for international courts to try the Axis jackals like Hitler, Himmler, Quisling, and the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. Anthony Eden took 3 months to answer that one, and again it was "no soap." Does that mean that Hitler and his gang will not be tried by judicial processes, and is the possibility thus revealed that whatever punishment is meted out to these officers and officials may only be imposed, shall we say, as the result of the caprices of political leaders of the United Nations? They could decree that the criminals be shot or hanged, or, as in the case of the Kaiser, sentenced to comfortable exile. Or it might be that Herr Hitler and company will receive the Napoleon treatment. Such tender treatment for Hitler, murderer of millions, would be fitting, would it not?

The excuse given by Mr. Eden for the delay in answering the letters is that no central body exists in the United Nations to which such problems can be forwarded, and that the British Foreign Office is the most convenient channel.

Sir Cecil's third letter to the British Foreign Office was very properly a letter of resignation.

Meanwhile our representative, Herbert Claiborne Pell, has been shelved. Is this a temporary absence or a permanent one? What's behind this cloak of secrecy and silence? We are told he is out of the picture because of the failure on our part to appropriate moneys for representation on the United War Crimes Commission. We have now restored the appropriation in the sum of $25,000. What now?

It is customary for our representative on any commission abroad to report findings to our State Department or other accredited agencies. Reports must have been filed. What do they disclose? Are they on Mr. Hackworth's desk? Mr. Hackworth is legal adviser to the Secretary of State. It is natural for those to clear through him. Are they on his desk to gather the dust of centuries? It is imperative to know what the score is. It is not my purpose to have divulged matters that concern military security, but when it comes to the question of policy, bearing on the future peace, bearing on the sacrifices we are making and will be called upon to make in the future, we must not be kept in the dark.

We want American participation in the United Nations War Crimes Commission strengthened. That strength can the more readily be attained if the Members of Congress realize the magnitude of the problem. It is not a problem for diplomats only. In fact, it is interesting to note that the Soviet Commission of War Crimes, functioning independently, has not a single diplomat on it.

I cannot put my finger on the reason or reasons for the break-down of the United Nations War Crimes Commission. The fault may not lie with the Commission. It may lie elsewhere. Ought we not to know?

I am quite sure that the Commission realizes the need for prompt action, particularly in the examination of records and for the preservation of testimony and evidence. Witnesses disappear or become reluctant to testify. Accused defendants deliberately lose their identity. They assume other names and stations and become lost in the shift of population. Thousands of depositions must be taken while memory is still fresh. That's why it is so important to establish policy, for without a policy nobody can know in what direction to proceed. And their policy must be established with promptitude.

Furthermore we should be interested in learning something about the terms of surrender with reference to war criminals. It is all very well to provide for elaborate machinery for trials, but what does that avail if there be no defendants. The Lord Chancelor (Viscount Simon), speaking for the British Government in the House of Lords on October 7, 1942, said: "Named criminals wanted for war crimes should be caught and handed over at the time of, and as a condition of, the armistice, with the right to require the delivery of others as soon as the supplementary investigations are complete." He emphasized that his prerequisite to an armistice was agreed to by all the Allies.

In the collective declaration of the United Nations signed by Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt, the following appears: "At the time of granting of any armistice to any government which may be set up in Germany those German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party who have been responsible for or have taken a consenting part in atrocities, massacres, and executions will be sent back to the countries in which their abominable deeds were done in order that they may be judged and punished according to the laws of these liberated countries and of the free government which will be erected therein."

It is now pertinent to ask what of the Italian war brutes? And those of Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria? Were the war criminals handed over and apprehended as a condition of the armistice? Certainly this Congress should know about this. Where are these men? Are they in jail? Are they free? Are they to be tried? What of the members of the Gestapo and SS guards who have been caught in liberated countries and in the liberated parts of Germany? What are our plans for the punishment of men like Laval, Antonescu, and other Quislings?

Viscount Simon also stated in the House of Lords: "The Commission will investigate war crimes committed against nationals of the United Nations recording the testimony available, and the Commission will report from time to time to the Governments of those nations cases in which such crimes appear to have been committed, naming and identifying wherever possible the persons responsible."

Have such reports actually been filed from time to time with our own Government? Certainly, our Congress should know the contents of these reports, if any. I want to know, you want to know what these reports contain.

Recently, there appeared in Life magazine an article entitled "Dino Grandi Explains." He was one of the Fascist big four and is probably as much responsible for the havoc and crimes caused by the Fascists as anyone else. He seeks in this article to excuse these foul offenses. It shows the subtlety and cunning that will be used by the war criminals in an effort to save their own skins after they have been responsible for the torture and death of thousands of defenseless peoples. Of course, Count Grandi's apology won't wash, but the mere fact that the columns of Life were used is most significant. Grandi is now in Lisbon. It is mete for the group to be set up by my bill to go into the publication of articles of this kind, as well as what the fate of a Grandi shall be.

Recently, Mussolini's ex-chief of staff, Gen. Mario Roatta very conveniently escaped by walking out of a hospital in Rome. That was a very strange occurrence. What was behind it? The members of the High Commission for the Suppression of Fascists Crimes were very bitter about it and Count Carlo Sforza, head of the Commission recalled that when he had ordered his arrest he had been subjected to a lot of pressure and threats. Fascists are escaping and while Italy is not sitting with the United Nations War Commission, the problem of escaping Fascists is our concern.

A refreshing statement was made recently by Acting Secretary of State Grew. He said: "I wish, however, to state categorically that these proposals (meaning the punishment of war criminals) which cannot be published are as forthright and far-reaching as the objectives announced by the President which they are intended to implement. They provide for the punishment of German leaders and their associates for their responsibility for the whole broad criminal enterprise devised and executed with ruthless disregard of the very foundations of law and morality, including offenses wherever committed against the rules of war and against minority elements, Jewish and other groups and individuals."

However, we have had similar statements from the President, from former Secretary of State Hull, and others high in authority. We had the same kind of statements from similar officials before the end of the last war. They are meaningless unless implemented by action. Unless Congress takes a hand in the proceedings, the purpose of Mr. Grew's statement will evaporate in an atmosphere of apathy, indifference, and back-stage maneuvering.

The question might be asked: Why trials? The practice of the Nazis in their use of the charnel house and slave pens and asphyxiation chambers, the establishment of death camps such as Treblinka and Oscicien, the killing of prisoners of war contrary to the Hague Conventions both by the Nazis and Japanese must be made known to all. That is necessary so that we can trace to their source the basis for these foul practices and discover the history and motivation that activated the commission of such atrocities. The base must be found if we are to find the cure for so perverted an outlook of the German people. In this way we will be on guard against any subsequent development of so depraved an ideology and can study the economic and social soil that bred such monstrous crimes against humanity. There are many people who are skeptical about the reports of these atrocities. The trials will remove all doubt. Moreover, the future Hitlers will learn thereby that they cannot send to death millions of people and with impunity save their own skins. A trial will obviate the possibility of a martyr's death for these criminals. Certainly, we could have lynching parties and wholesale indiscriminate slaughter, but that would be revenge and not justice. Without trials, many innocent ones may suffer and to punish without trial is contrary to democratic processes. We are fighting to restore law and order and cannot begin a constructive rehabilitation based on our own lawlessness. We are a nation dedicated to the Anglo-Saxon tradition of fair trial. To punish indiscriminately would be taking a page out of the Nazi black book and reverting to their brutal way of life. We should not seek to inaugurate a saturnalia of blood.

The trials will promote the evolution of international law, a most significant factor in view of the coming international structure for peace.

In all this I have refrained from giving you the details of the foul offenses perpetrated by the Axis degenerates. I leave that to those who will follow. My only object is to point out to you the essentiality of Congress' interest in this over-all picture. This interest can best be exemplified by passing my resolution.

I feel strongly that the work of the United Nations War Crimes Commission will be barren unless Congress in some way takes a hand. The whole program or lack of program for the punishment of Axis criminals will remain a dark secret just as it was after the last war unless Congress steps in.

This committee may approve my bill with appropriate amendments, if necessary. The proposed commission should be in the nature of a watchdog. As soon as something goes amiss within the United Nations War Crimes Commission, that watchdog may bark and otherwise set up distress signals.

It is not only the right of this Congress, but also the duty of this Congress to play an important part in the question of Axis criminals. If Congress must prod the work of the present Commissio , as it appears it must, then let it prod. The criminal if left unpunished repeats his crime.

We have a stake in this matter; our children and their children have a stake and as guardians of the peace we cannot fail them.

The proposed commission can be composed of some of the members of this committee or in combination with other congressional committees to work in coordination with the United Nations War Crimes Commission, to keep abreast of its work, to keep the Congress informed and through the Congress the people. Remember the punishment of war criminals is inextricably interwoven with the peace.

A copy of the resolution follows:

House Joint Resolution 93

Joint resolution requesting the President to appoint a commission to cooperate with the United Nations War Crimes Commission, or any other agency or agencies of the United Nations in the preparation of definite plans for the punishment of war criminals of the Axis countries

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby requested to appoint a commission, whose duty it shall be to cooperate with the United Nations War Crimes Commission, or any other agency or agencies of the United Nations in the preparation of definite plans for the punishment of war criminals of the Axis countries.

SEC. 2. Such commission shall proceed as expeditiously as possible to prepare and propose plans for the punishment of such war criminals, regardless of whether their crimes have been against persons who are or were subjects of the Axis nations, and regardless of whether such crimes were committed within territory of the United Nations or that of the Axis countries.

SEC. 3. The sum of $50,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of defraying salaries and other expenses of such commission.

St. Patrick's Day Address by Paul E. Fitzpatrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Hon. Paul E. Fitzpatrick, St. Patrick's American Sons, delivered at the National Democratic Forum, National Democratic Club, New York City, on Saturday, March 17, 1945, and broadcast on a coast-to-coast net-

work over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a source of deep satisfaction to men and women of Irish blood that all our fellow Americans join with us so generously in the celebration of St. Patrick's Day. We gratefully acknowledge that it puts us in your debt. But we might just as well owe that much more, because the debt which Irish-Americans owe to America is so great that it can never be repaid, anyway. No group that has come to these shores owes more to this country than we do. To America we owe our escape from persecution, our religious and political liberty, freedom to work out our destinies, and the priceless boon of American citizenship.

It is as natural for an Irishman to love liberty as it is for the shamrock to grow in Ireland. And just as natural for him to fight oppression and tyranny. The battlefields of the world are marked with the graves of Irishmen who fell fighting to win freedom and liberty for the men and women of other races. In view of Ireland's own long struggle for freedom, it is easy to understand why Americans of Irish blood are so warmly sympathetic to the aspirations of the Jews for a Palestinian home state, to the hopes of the Poles for a free and independent Poland, and to the desires of all people for freedom and self-determination.

Even a royalist Irishman reacted quickly and surely to the free air of America. Sir Thomas Dongan came to New York as the Royal Governor of the Colony in 1683. He was not here long before he issued the Charter of Liberties and Privileges. Under it there was granted to all freedom of religion, immunity from martial law, a democratic election system, and trial by jury. The charter has served to this day as a pattern for religious tolerance and political freedom.

Thirteen of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were men of Irish blood. It was Patrick Henry who uttered the battle cry of freedom, "Give me liberty or give me death."

The illustrious Gen. John Sullivan began hostilities in the Revolutionary War by charging on Fort William and Mary. John Barry is known as the father of the American Navy. There were at least 20 Irish generals in the Continental Army, and the first general officer killed was the Irish-born Richard Montgomery.

Testimony has been given before the House of Commons that half of Washington's army was composed of Irishmen. And Mountjoy, addressing the British Parliament on the surrender of Cornwallis, exclaimed: "You have lost America by the Irish."

Is it any wonder that Washington made the saint's name his choice for the password on that March 17 when the British evacuated Boston? Or that at Valley Forge in the darkest days of the war he ordered an extra ration of spirits so that the saint's day would not pass without celebration? Or that the Father of our Country promptly became a member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick right here in New York?

In the war of 1812, the two naval heroes, Oliver Hazard Perry and Thomas McDonough were of Irish blood, as was that peerless leader, Andrew Jackson.

The rolls of the Civil War were ablaze with Irish names—to name but a few—General Meade, the victor at Gettysburg; Gen. Philip Kearney the hero of "Bloody Antietam"; New York's own Gen. Philip Sheridan; Gen. Patrick Meagher, who commanded the celebrated Irish Brigade which carried the green flag with the Stars and Stripes; and Michael Corcoran of New York's own "Sixty-ninth" which has won undying fame on every field where it fought.

In the Confederate camp were Pat Cleborne, Joseph Finnegan, Billy Mahone, and General Lee's master of strategy, Stonewall Jackson.

No story of the First World War is complete without mention of "Wild Bill" Donovan, Father Duffy, Joyce Kilmer, or your own Gen. Aleck Anderson, who served the "Sixty-ninth" valiantly in the First World War and died in the service of his country in this war.

And so it has been down through the years with these American sons of St. Patrick who have held honor and duty above life itself in their devotion to country and in their abhorrence of tyranny and oppression. Whether it was at Missionary Ridge, in the Argonne, or on far-away Makin, Irish blood was spilled generously. With their country in danger, only two things have counted, loyalty and courage.

Here is a bit of Clark's poetry that was a prime favorite of Theodore Roosevelt:

"Said Shea, 'It's thirty-odd years, bedad,
Since I charged to drum and fife
Up Marye's Heights; and my old canteen
Stopped a rebel ball on its way;
There were blossoms of blood on our sprigs
of green,
Kelly and Burke and Shea—
And the dead didn't brag.'
'Well, here's to the Flag!'
Said Kelly and Burke and Shea."

This country was stunned by the treacherous blow which was struck at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941—"that day which will live in infamy." We sensed the magnitude of our loss and rumor and fear made it seem greater than it was. But what heightened our fury was the feeling that we were the victims of foul play and treachery. And with it all came a paralyzing fear that we were dealing with a cruel and cunning foe who could make of our very virtues the weapons for our destruction. We may confess it now. We wondered how our boys who were taught decency and fair-play could be a match for the wily and fanatical Jap. Our boys had not been taught to kill and torture. It looked as if the Fascist poison in the education of youth had produced robots who were invincible. Witness the sad fate of Poland, France, Britain, Norway, Belgium, and Holland up to that time.

December the 10th was a black day for the United Nations forces in the Far East. The British battleships *Repulse* and *Prince of Wales* went down. The Cavite Navy Yard was almost completely destroyed by Japanese air attack. And enemy assault forces landed at three points on Luzon. Any one of these calamities would have been classed as a major catastrophe.

But on that very day when things seemed blackest we were electrified by the magnificent sacrifice of a young lad whom we will never forget—Colin Kelly. When that boy zoomed his plane in a power dive at the 29,000-ton Japanese battleship *Haruna* and destroyed it, then we knew that our boys were more than a match for them, that the courage born of decency, truth and ideals was greater than the fanaticism bred on poisonous lies, cunning and hatred of your fellow men.

One moment the master of youth's green hill with all that life holds dear before him, a wife and a child whom he would never see again, then those few fleeting moments in the furnace of decision forging the noblest of the virtues, loyalty and courage. Then the resolution to die as the eagle dies, alone. He ordered his crew to bail out, but Captain Kelly went down with his ship. One boy's life gone, but there remained an example never to be forgotten so long as courage is valued among men. How well his classmates at West Point had described him: "A combination of Irish blood and southern sunshine."

Colin Kelly's noble sacrifice inspired many another lad to exploits of sheerest grandeur. The Navy produced his rival in Lt. Eddie O'Hare.

We have plenty of aircraft carriers now, but in February 1942, Admiral Leary's southwest Pacific Fleet had only one "fighting lady," the *Lexington*. On the morning of February 20, his task force was intercepted by waves of Japanese bombers. When the last wave appeared on the horizon there was only one tiny wasp of a fighter between the nine Jap bombers and the task force. And the pilot of that lone plane was "Butch" O'Hare. The Jap formation was a V of V's and O'Hare whizzed past them out of gunshot, pivoted on one wingtip and came roaring back from the rear. Two of the enemy planes went down. O'Hare ducked under and came back. Three more went down. The whole affray was over in 4 minutes. In that time O'Hare had shot down five enemy bombers and scored hits on three others. O'Hare's last flight was on a mission so dangerous that he reserved it for himself. His deeds glorified Nathan Hale's proud boast: An American's only regret is that he has but one life to give for his country.

Who is there who heard and could forget President Roosevelt's matchless word picture of John James Powers, the lad who left behind as parting words to his buddies, "We'll lay it on their flight deck."

In the Revolutionary War it was the O'Brien brothers—and there were five of them—who started naval action in that war by the capture of three British warships. How different and yet how the same is the story of the five Sullivans. They enlisted together but with true Celtic stubbornness forced the Navy to waive its rule that brothers could not serve on the same ship. Happy-go-lucky lads united in their devotion to their country and to each other. When their ship was torpedoed all five were lost. In loyalty and courage, the story-tellers never matched this. "Greater love than this hath no man, that he should lay down his life for another."

And "Commando" Kelly, that one-man army and lovable scamp, all heart, courage, and spirit. He volunteered for successive missions of extreme peril. On the third mission he delivered effective and continuous fire until two rifles locked from overheating. He then picked up 60-millimeter mortar shells, pulled the safety pins and used the shells for grenades. When the position had to be evacuated he volunteered, and successfully covered the withdrawal of his detachment. In this action he was credited with killing 40 of the enemy. Just this last week he embarked upon a new and more perilous adventure. He took unto himself a wife, and may he and Mrs. Kelly enjoy long years of happy married life.

"Point Blank" Callaghan, Conroy, McGuire, Devereux, Finn, Flaherty, Walsh, and "Rosie" O'Donnell, who later led the first B–29 raid over Tokyo. The American answer to any call for surrender will always be the same as General McAuliffe gave at Bastogne, "Nuts."

It is only time which begrudges us the right to continue. And it is only because it is St. Patrick's Day that we have singled out his sons. The same can and must be said for men of every national derivation. Meyer Levin, Colin Kelly's bombardier, who returned to seek out glorious death after one miraculous escape. It was his unerring judgment which scored three direct hits on the *Haruna*. "Gabby" Gabreski, Don Gentile, Henry Mucci, John Bulkeley, Ted Lawson, Jimmy Doolittle, Dick Bong, and all those matchless heroes who have proved to

the world that free souls will conquer. Their battle cry has been:

"We shall die but we shall conquer,
By our blood shall freedom live."

Well may it be said in Winston Churchill's words, "Never in the history of the world have so many owed so much to so few."

These are some of the men who have fought, and many have died, to right the world's wrongs. And, because of their deeds, we see the promise of a better world to come. Let us hope that when this war is over no American father will ever again have to write these words to his son, "It is too bad this war could not have been delayed a few years, so that I could grow up again with you and do all the things I planned to do when you were old enough to go to school." This was the first and last letter to his son from Commander John J. Shea, of the ill-fated *Wasp*.

In the Dumbarton Oaks plan we have a promise of world order—a world in which outlaw nations will be bound to the peace.

In the words of the distinguished former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull:

"Peace, like liberty, requires constant devotion and ceaseless vigilance. But peace also requires institutions through which the will to peace can be translated into action. * * * We are fully aware that no institution—especially when it is of as great importance as the one now in our thoughts—will endure unless there is behind it considered and complete support. The will to peace must spring from the hearts and minds of men everywhere, if it is to achieve enduring peace."

Let us all give to the President that complete support which is so necessary to sustain him in the tasks which lie ahead.

There will be trying days to come. When the war in Europe is over, we must redouble our efforts in the Pacific. But may God soon bring final and complete victory to our standards. May He guide our great President in his noble efforts to insure that this holocaust of war will not be visited upon this peace-loving Nation again. And for our fighting forces, for our Commander in Chief and for our beloved country, may I close with this simple, very old-fashioned Irish prayer:

"May the road rise up to meet you
May the wind be always at your back,
And may God hold you
In the hollow of His hand."

Nomination of Aubrey W. Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Test for the Senate," published in the Washington Post of March 22, 1945. The editorial relates to the pending nomination of Aubrey W. Williams.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEST FOR THE SENATE

When Members of the Senate vote today on confirmation of Aubrey Williams as Administrator of the R. E. A., they should, we think, scrutinize their own consciences with special care. For, among other extraneous issues, the question of conscience has been introduced into the Williams case. It has been introduced in the form of an assault on the orthodoxy of Mr. Williams' religious faith. That such a question should be considered in connection with the Senate's decision on the fitness of a nominee for public office is not only wholly repugnant to American principles, but is also a clear violation of article VI of the Constitution. That article declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Senators who vote on Mr. Williams need to be very sure, therefore, that no question concerning his religious faith influences their own judgment in the smallest degree. Beyond this, it seems to us, they need to be sure that no question concerning his religious faith which may enter into the minds of any of their colleagues results in the defeat of his confirmation. The vote on Aubrey Williams is expected to be very close indeed. It may be decided by a margin of no more than one or two Senators—perhaps by the very Senators who so far forgot their own oath of office as to inject a religious test into the Senate's deliberations. If that should happen, it would reflect discredit upon the Senate as a whole.

The debate has been, in great part, in terms of his personal beliefs and has revealed only that he believes in the doctrine of human equality, in the right of citizens to organize and act collectively for the advancement of their political interests and in the use of the Government as an instrument to promote the general welfare. For these beliefs, he has been, as Senator LUCAS put it, "abused and maligned." The factor about him which, in our judgment, ought to govern the Senate's decision is simply this: Is he a public servant of proven capacity?

American Aid to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE M. REED

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "We Gave the Red Army Its Speed," by Ernest K. Lindley, from the Newsweek magazine of February 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE GAVE THE RED ARMY ITS SPEED

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

We, the American people, have a reputation abroad for being boastful. But at times we seem to be beset with the opposite fault. Since the Red armies began rolling again, the admiring inquiry: "How do they do it?" has been audible in Washington. There was nothing in the headlines—or in the dispatches from Moscow, Berlin, or other European capitals—to hint that these Russian victories were not wholly Russian achievements.

At last a few of our official spokesmen were moved to call attention to the fact that the United States was a direct contributor to, and partner of, the Red Army. Foreign Economic Administrator Leo Crowley issued a partial summary of lend-lease aid. Lt. Gen. Ira Eaker made bold to say that but for the work of American and British heavy bombers, the Russians would still be fighting somewhere near Moscow.

As Crowley reported, we have sent the Russians hundreds of thousands of motor vehicles, more than 12,000 planes, many thousands of tanks and self-propelled guns, thousands of railroad cars, more than a thousand locomotives, miles of track, and 60 ingenious rail-borne power plants. We have sent them 11,000,000 pairs of army boots, hundreds of millions of yards of cloth, thousands of machine tools, and many thousand tons of raw and semifinished materials.

Crowley touched only the high spots. In total volume, as he emphasized, we have provided only a small part of the equipment and supplies used by the Russians. But we have provided, in large quantities, critical items—especially transportation—without which the Red armies could not employ blitz tactics and very probably would still be fighting well inside their own country.

Our contribution did not end with the procurement and fabrication of these supplies. With the help of the British we had to deliver them. We had to build and man the cargo ships to carry them. We had to build and man the combat ships and the planes to escort the cargo ships through submarine-infested waters to the Persian Gulf and the White Sea ports. We had to contrive and manufacture devices for averting the U-boat peril. We had to build docks in the Persian Gulf and develop the rail and motor transport lines north through Iran. We had to expand the air ferry route across Africa and blaze the air trail across Canada to Fairbanks.

The exertions required for the delivery of lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union were immense. They involved the use of manpower probably equivalent to several Russian armies.

Then, too, as General Eaker pointed out, Americans and Britons built and flew the planes which beat down the Luftwaffe, steadily sapped Germany's capacity to make war, and, first in the Balkans and now in Germany, have given the Red armies direct tactical support by their attacks on enemy communication lines.

The last two American contributions to the advances of Uncle Joe's boys can be stated briefly: (1) The landing of large American armies in Europe and the destruction or capture by them of some 1,000,000 German fighting men, and (2) the great Pacific offensive beginning with the hair-line gamble on Guadalcanal in August 1942, which kept the Japanese out of Siberia. These enterprises required not only millions of men but a technology which the Russians have not yet attained, as well as skills in warfare and transport on the sea and in the air with which they have only a vague acquaintance. And they cost many American lives.

Of course, we did not do any of this out of altruism. We did it to win a war, or two wars, as quickly and efficiently as possible. The official American conception of the victory over Germany always held that the Russians would carry the major burden of the fighting on the ground. They have proved that this strategic diagnosis was correct and that our faith in their fighting ability, from their dark days in 1941 and 1942 until the present, was well founded.

The man who is carrying the ball on a particular play, especially if he makes a long gain, gets the plaudits of the crowd. Al-

though we give full credit to the fullback in this case, it is in the common interest to remind him, ourselves, and the spectators, including his own relatives, that he is only one man on a powerful, cooperative, and at times even self-effacing team.

The Key to Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1945

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very striking article entitled "The Key to Prosperity," written by E. H. Taylor, and published recently in the Country Gentleman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KEY TO PROSPERITY—NEW RESEARCH FINDINGS SHOW THAT HIGH FARM PRODUCTION AND INCOME ARE THE GUARANTY OF FULL FACTORY EMPLOYMENT AND NATIONAL PROSPERITY

(By E. H. Taylor)

The American people can have a national income of $140,000,000,000, necessary for full employment, after the war. But it depends on one definite requirement. This is an annual total farm income of around $20,000,000,000.

Whatever our after-war national income may be, it will inevitably be very close to seven times the total farm income. Whether we enjoy the prosperity that is possible or suffer a needless depression, this ratio will hold true.

All the major interests in our economy are geared to the same controlling factor. The value of manufactures, labor pay rolls and employment, retail sales, transportation income, and volume of construction work are limited by farm income. They follow its course, for better or worse, at an interval of roughly 3 to 6 months.

Our national balance sheet in any peacetime period, for all practical purposes, is regulated by the amount of farm production and the price levels at which it sells.

These significant findings are the result of a study made under the sponsorship of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture of the 48 States. Two years ago this bipartisan organization set up an educational and research committee to make a basic study of the American economy. One of the purposes was to determine just what conditions would create the income which would make full employment and the distribution of our factory goods possible. The results are being made fully public for the first time in this article.

It has been known for sometime that total farm income and factory pay rolls averaged practically the same amount over a long peacetime period. Also, that the volume of factory output was governed by the balance maintained between the prices of finished goods and farm products. Farm income was clearly a barometer of purchasing power. These facts were published by Country Gentleman in 1940.

Several men had been carrying on studies, which convinced them that the relationship of raw materials and farm income to the rest of our economic machine went much further and deeper. Among them were Carl H. Wilken, of the Raw Materials National Council, at Sioux City, Iowa; Charles B. Ray, engineer and business counselor, of Chicago; and Dr. John Lee Coulter, former president of North Dakota Agricultural College and one-time member of the United States Tariff Commission. These men were made members of the research staff and did the work that led to these important new findings.

Summed up, they show that raw-material income, most potently that of agriculture, is the prime mover in our national economy. They also demonstrate, for the first time, that there is a natural law—the law of exchange—which controls the whole complex system by which we live.

Raw-material income is the start of the cycle of exchange. It is the new wealth annually created by production. All other money, involved in the processes of manufacture and delivery to the consumers, is money temporarily borrowed from the store of capital already in existence and is returned to it when the finished goods are sold.

This much was fairly well known before. What the research men found is that there is a rate of turn-over to this raw-material income as it passes through the various stages of economic use. This is the key to the whole matter. For the national income is then simply the amount of raw-material income times the rate of turn-over. The Nation's wage fund, the manufacturing output possible, and the amount of public purchasing power are fixed by this turn of raw-material dollars.

Going back into the records for nearly a century, the research men found this rule constantly at work, setting the bounds of the Nation's income. The rule did not vary, but the rate of turn has accelerated, due to the increased efficiency in both raw-material production and manufacturing. In 1850 one-half of our labor force was required in the production of raw materials, and the turn-over was only twice. By 1925–29 our national efficiency had risen so that a much smaller part of our population was required to produce the raw materials and the turn for the 5-year period averaged 3.9. It is now up to a fivefold turn, with only one-fifth of our working population engaged in raw-material production. The other four-fifths are now enabled to earn their living by taking the raw materials to the factories, processing them, distributing the finished goods, and performing other services called for by our standard of living.

But the amount of raw-material production and the prices it brings determine the amount of national income that can be distributed among these other groups. The new income this provides is the starter for the whole machinery of exchange. If large, the machine runs at full speed. If small, the machine slows down and we have bad times. For the rate of turn-over operates as an economic constant.

Agriculture supplies 65 percent of our raw materials and its income is the most sensitive and powerful part of this combination. Its products are mostly the kind that are quickly used up, either in processing or direct consumption Iron, copper, coal, and oil can be held, and the income from them enters more slowly into the process of exchange. But farm products quickly become buying power. Also farm income is distributed among a much greater number of individuals and affects the buying power of vastly more communities over the Nation.

So the dollar of agricultural income has a larger influence and a higher rate of turnover. For the period from 1921 to 1940 the national income averaged $7 for each dollar of total farm income. This general average held during the good times of the 1920's, the depression and the unsuccessful efforts to restore prosperity in the 1930's. In each case the rise or fall of farm income preceded the same course of the rest of our economy.

Thus farm income appears to be the key factor in our system of making a living. It becomes of tremendous importance to all our after-war plans for the full use of our machines and tools and the employment of an increased labor force. These plans cannot work unless an adequate farm income is provided. For this research shows that the total fund to be distributed among all working groups and to finance the Government's obligations will approximate only seven times the total farm income.

In fact, as Carl H. Wilken, one of the men engaged in the research, remarked, "all other groups should insist on proper farm prices if they wish to have a job at an American price level."

Parity farm prices consequently become a national necessity. The United States has never had a depression when farm prices were at parity. Our troubles always came when farm prices fell out of line with others. And, as the charts accompanying this article graphically show, disaster soon overtook the other major elements in our economy. With a reduced farm income, every industrial and trade group lost its proportionate share of the turn-over that might have been had. The loss of national income or purchasing power, through the failure to maintain proper farm prices over the 1930–41 period, is put by this research study at the gigantic figure of $473,000,000,000—about the cost of the war.

WHEN ALL LOST

If anyone doubts the results of reduced farm income and the sequence of its results, 2 years stand as grim evidence. In 1928 and 1932 the farms of America produced substantially the same volume of all grains and livestock. But the market value or income from these products in 1932 was less than one-half what it was in 1928. The national income also dropped to less than one-half, maintaining an approximate 7-to-1 ratio. Factory pay rolls took a similar drop of more than one-half. Automobile production fell from more than 4,000,000 to 1,186,000 cars. Value of construction fell even more sharply, showing the more durable type of goods are the hardest hit by the loss of purchasing power generated by farm income.

Farm income reached its low in 1932, and started to move up again in 1933. But the other elements in our economy followed the natural lag behind it. Salaries and wages, value added by manufacture, construction, and transportation all reached their low in 1933 and did not start their recovery until the turn-over of increased farm dollars began to take effect. This was true through the whole outlay of consumer expenditures—for clothing, housing, insurance, auto registration fees, amusements, and education. All had to wait until the turn-over of new income reached them.

Another instance is what happened in the 2 years 1937–38. Farm income rose nearly $1,000,000,000 in 1937. National income went up approximately seven billion and we seemed to be pulling out of difficulty. But, with a larger farm production in 1938, prices weakened and farm income dropped almost exactly $1,000,000,000. National income fell almost exactly seven billion, with the loss spread all along the line. Manufacturing, employment, wages and salaries, construction, and transportation all suffered their proportionate cut. All started to rise again with the upturn in farm income in 1939.

WHEN CONSUMERS GAIN

The administration explained the 1938 recession by saying that Government spending had been reduced too soon. But Government spending merely represented money borrowed from the store of capital already in existence. The actual reason was the failure to maintain the flow of new income. It had slackened at its source—on the farms—and consumer purchasing power had fallen accordingly.

Consumers, this research shows, do not gain from low farm prices but always lose. At the bottom of the depression, although farm prices were disastrously low, the share of the consumers' total income required for food was the highest in a decade. This was because their total income was proportionately low. In 1938, when farm prices dropped, consumers did not benefit from lower food prices. The share of their income spent for food remained the same because their total income had declined in ratio with farm income. On the other hand, in 1943–44, although farm prices were at or above parity, the share of consumers' total income required for food has been the lowest in history. Their income has been at the highest level in history. Under normal peacetime conditions, the large balance left after food needs were satisfied would be spread over the whole outlay of employment-making wants—clothing, automobiles, housing and conveniences, radios, amusements, and many other items.

At the close of the war we shall require something like the present national income and balance of consumer purchasing power. These will be necessary to permit our factories to operate at full rate and new industries start up, to provide jobs for an increased working force and to finance the enormous Government debt. There is much debate about how we shall achieve all this.

The relevation of the effects of raw-material production and income on the whole national economy therefore has an especial timeliness. It shows the factor that is indispensable to a prosperous after-war condition. The record it discloses has too relentless a consistency to be merely a matter of coincidence.

Our farm production after the war will have to be higher than in the peacetime past if the growth in population and the food needs of a fully employed population are to be met. At parity prices, it is estimated, such a production would provide sufficient income to employ our full working force. The two requirements go together.

A parity—or equal exchange—price level for farm products, it thus becomes obvious, is not simply a matter of fairness to the people engaged in agriculture. It is a matter of direct self-interest to those in every other group in America. What they make, sell, and earn is equally at stake.

O. P. A. Says "It Isn't Necessary To Go to Church"

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, from up in my district I have received a letter concerning the very shabby treatment given by the Office of Price Administration in its allocation of gasoline to the wife of a Great Lakes ship captain.

These men are rendering most high service in the carrying of iron ore from the upper Lakes to Ohio for processing into guns and ammunition.

As you may know, life afloat does not have the convenience of living ashore, and the noble men who are engaged in ore carrying for the war cannot fit their 24-hour ship movements to meet trains and busses. These men who must live afloat for nearly 9 months are surely entitled to the company of their families for the few hours in port.

The wife of one of these men from the Lake port of Huron, Ohio, has made application for gasoline, stating all the facts, and was refused necessary gasoline by the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. Speaker, this is certainly poor treatment to those who are bending every effort to win this war, while at the same time the Office of Price Administration permits the use of untold gallons of gasoline for the lavish entertainment of Italian prisoners who refuse a gun to fight for their own country.

Yet the Office of Price Administration told this woman in refusal, that it isn't necessary to go to church, that it is not necessary to see your husband, and that it is not necessary to see a doctor.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the letters covering the present policy of the Office of Price Administration:

HURON, OHIO, *March 9, 1945.*

Mr. A. F. WEICHEL,
House Office Building.

DEAR MR. WEICHEL: You are certainly very familiar with this territory—and you know what means of transportation we have—but when they come out and tell you that you can't have gas to go to church with—because that isn't necessary—no wonder they make crooks of people.

Now my husband is a lake captain—and you know they get in at all hours of the day and night and isn't he entitled to get home—which he couldn't waiting on transportation. He works long hours from April until December, harder, I dare say than a lot of these O. P. A. guys.

HURON, OHIO, *March 9, 1945.*

Mr. L. R. COXE,
Office of Price Administration,
Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR MR. COXE: The following (in order) is what the ration board here read to me as having been written by you to them in answer to our request for additional gasoline rations—remember, I didn't read it, they read it to me:

First, that it isn't necessary to go to church.

Second, that it isn't necessary to go to see one's husband.

Third, that it isn't necessary to go to a doctor.

First. I thought that "Freedom of attending the church of one's choice" was one of the freedoms we were fighting for. Now the church of my choice is in Sandusky but I think I'm doing more for the community (and incidentally Christianity) in which we live by serving as organist and choir director, which involves practice; too, at a church here in Huron and you say that it isn't necessary; I wish you'd tell all churches that. A car is very necessary to get to any church on Sunday or any other day in Huron, regardless of the service.

Second. Did you ever try getting transportation, from say, Lorain, Toledo, Sandusky, or even in Huron, to Huron? Three-hour service in the daytime and none at night. How would anyone get from the depot in Sandusky at night? Did you ever try getting to these ore and coal docks without a car? Isn't my husband entitled to a little home life from April to December, and how would he get there if it wasn't for his own car? You go home every night, don't you? If I can't go to see my husband, who can I go to see? Also, did you ever try getting to Norwalk from Huron in a bus? It isn't always convenient for one's friends to bed you and board you; even our friend Eleanor Roosevelt hasn't given up her social activities entirely.

Third. Certainly, I can take a bus and train to Detroit, and I have, but under the following circumstances would you? One must leave Huron at 2:57 p. m., wait until 5:58 p. m., spend the night at a hotel to be at the office by or before noontime. The only train that leaves Detroit in the afternoon, that stops at Sandusky, is around 4:20, and we've never made it. A bus leaves at 11:30 p. m. and arrives in Huron around 3 a. m., then a walk of a quarter of a mile—would you ask your wife or daughter to do that? It's not only inconvenient but expensive. You can go and come in 1 day, whereas it's two nights and a day, the best part of a $50 War bond. Having the investment in the car anyway it costs less than a fifth of that.

MRS. CARLTON WM. YOUNG,
Chaska Beach, Huron, Ohio.

To Pitch Was His Job

REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the qualities that make for a good baseball player are the contributing factors in the making of good citizenship or being successful in any undertaking in which one may be engaged.

For many years I have held an extreme admiration for baseball's great stars, Ty Cobb, Rube Waddell, Honus Wagner, Walter Johnson, Tris Speaker, Babe Ruth, Lou Gehrig and many others whose names have been indelibly written in the national pastime's hall of fame. As a boy, although not being able to attend major league games, the records of the outstanding players were followed painstakingly through the newspapers from day to day.

A short time ago, a good friend of mine remarked in the House cloak room that he had been driving out in Maryland frequently on Sundays to visit Walter Johnson, the great Washington pitcher of other years. He stated that he had kept several fox hounds on the Johnson farm, which is about 30 miles from Washington. He asked me to accompany him the following Sunday and due to the high esteem I held for this player, whom history records as being one of the outstanding

performers of all time, I was glad to accept the invitation.

As we drove up to his 552-acre farm near Bethesda, Md., I had in my mind talking baseball to him. We found "the Big Train" out in his dairy barn where he was supervising the milking of 40 fine milk cows. "Do you attend the Washington Senator games often?" I enquired. "Have not been going to baseball games for several years," he came back. "Come in and see my cows. You know I furnish milk and butter to one of the leading Washington distributors." I was anxious to get him to talking about his 20 years as a big league pitcher. I asked him if he remembered the 4th of July 1927 game between the New York Yankees and the Washington Senators at the Yankee Stadium. He stated that he did not recall it. I told him that game was the only one I had seen him pitch. I was still persisting in drawing him out but of no avail. He just does not interest himself in anything except his family of three sons and two daughters, his farm, and his fox hounds. When he hung up his baseball cleats for the last time, he meant to put all he has in his business of being a good farmer and good citizen. He is still pitching just as hard in his work as he did when his blinding fast ball had made him a lasting niche in the hearts of all baseball fans.

Walter Johnson overcame many an obstacle in his early career as a pitcher. While pitching on the west coast in semiprofessional ball as a young man of 19, he was given a trial with the Tacoma, Wash., team. He pitched one game and was released. He was overanxious and nervous, which robbed him of his effectiveness. He tried to get other teams in the league to give him a chance to make good, but was unable to interest any of them. He fought hard to overcome his weaknesses which were discovered in the Tacoma try-out. He analyzed the situation from all sides and concluded that in order to be a successful pitcher he must learn not to worry about anything that may happen during the course of a game. When he came to Washington to pitch he was defeated in his first game by Detroit. The score was 3 to 2. This did not discourage Walter Johnson. He kept bearing down on every pitch while he was in the box. He refused to become rattled or excited. His job was to pitch, and pitch he did.

In September 1908 he exhibited the greatest pitching performance in the annals of the game. He pitched three successive shut-outs in 4 days against the New York Yankees. On Friday, September 4, he held the Yankees to six hits, his team winning 3 to 0; on Saturday, September 5, he volunteered to pitch when his roommate became ill and defeated the Yankees 6 to 0, holding them to four hits; on Monday, September 7—there was no Sunday game—he pitched the first game of a doubleheader, holding the New York team to three hits, Washington winning 4 to 0. He was warming up to pitch the second game of the twin bill when the manager of the team took his glove from his hand, over his protest, and sent him to the showers.

A speed-ball pitcher rarely lasts more than 5 or 6 seasons. Walter Johnson pitched for 20 years for the same major-league team.

As the years wore on, his fire ball had the same zip and his pitching form continued to improve. When every spring training season arrived the great pitcher reported in the pink of condition and stayed in fine condition throughout the season. In all of his years on the mound in the "big show" he never disputed an umpire's decision, he never argued with an opposing player, and was never put out of a game. We can learn much from this master of the diamond who first mastered himself.

Despite the many heart-rending disappointments of poor support from a team which did not win a pennant during 18 years, "the Big Train" never faltered. He fought as hard when he lost as when he won.

When I think of the man, Walter Johnson, who pressed on in the face of adversity, I am reminded of the poem from an unknown author which was found in the pocket of a fallen American doughboy on a French battlefield in World War No. 1:

When trouble slaps you in the face,
Don't turn your back and hide,
For he can find your hiding place,
And stick right by your side.

Slap back and when he sees your grit,
He'll leave without delay,
For he can whip the man who quits,
To fight some other day.

Oil Subsidies Have Failed; Oilmen Ask Price Increase

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 and 24 I had occasion to attend the national conference of the petroleum regulatory authorities in the conference room of the Secretary of the Interior here in Washington.

Many of the ablest oilmen of the Nation, who keep in constant touch with the production and refining of oil products and who are called upon to confer and advise with the Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Ickes, discussed in detail at this conference during those 2 days the oil situation as it has developed to date and with reference to civilian and military needs in the prosecution of the war.

Cooperating in this meeting, who helped to lead the discussions, were oil men now serving under the Petroleum Administration for War. These men explained by charts and graphs, as did other men who were not connected with the Secretary's office, the great demand and consumption of the oil of this country during the past 2 years and gave a vivid picture of the entire present oil situation in this country.

They were in general agreement that storage oil above ground had now been reduced to an all time minimum. In this connection they brought out the very important information that there is no longer any unused, untapped back log of oil so far as production is concerned and by that I mean they report that whereas in past years there was a reserve of oil not being used by reason of not allowing the wells to be pumped to capacity that that day has passed and that all of the wells of the Nation are now being pushed to their utmost, even to the detriment of the longevity of these wells in order to produce the necessary crude oil that is now going into civilian use, into the war effort, and in substantial amounts, to our allies.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Congress remembers the efforts we have made on the floor of the House in the past in an attempt to get an increase in the price of oil, and they will be interested in the findings of the National Conference of the Petroleum Regulatory Authorities. You will recall, after the House had passed in the Seventy-eighth Congress the bill for an increase in the price of oil, the bill was held up by the opposition of the administration in the Senate. You will also recall that when we attempted to extend the Price Control Act about a year ago that the majority leader of the House warned the Congress that if an increase in the price of oil was voted into the bill the President would veto it. You will also recall that some Members on the floor of the House said that subsidy was the proper relief for those in the production of oil, who were not getting sufficient returns to keep exploration and development going forward in an effort to get greater production for the Nation. And you will recall that the Administration later on, against the will of the Congress and in opposition to practically all of the oil men of the Nation, forced its will upon the industry and upon the Congress and decreed subsidies for oil rather than a raise in the price.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this group of able oil men who met here in Washington on February 23 and 24, unanimously agreed that subsidies have not increased production and that subsidies have not cured the matter complained of by oil producers and we Members of Congress who fought to get greater production of oil. There is practically no one in the Administration today that will even attempt to prove by argument facts or figures that subsidies now in use by the Administration are sufficiently increasing production.

It is a known fact by all of the oilmen of the Nation that the price of crude oil has been held down too low for almost 3 years now and that we must have an increase in price in order to get greater production. In fact, we may find ourselves running into an oil shortage, as we are approaching a meat shortage today, because of the unwise policies of

the O. P. A. and the administration responsible for such officials. Nothing short of a raise in the price of oil will bring about an increase in the production of oil.

Mr. Speaker, without further discussion of this matter, I want to insert a resolution by these oilmen, unanimously passed in their conference, declaring that subsidies have not met the problem and asking in this resolution to meet it as it should be met, with a raise in the price of crude oil.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Secretary of the Interior, who certainly knows more about oil production than Chester Bowles, at the head of the O. P. A., will keep up his fight which he has carried on for an increase in the price of oil. I hope the President of the United States and those advising him will change their position and grant an increase in the price of oil so that we may get the production that this country needs today and will continue to need to win this war.

I insert herewith the resolution referred to:

Be it resolved by the National Conference of Petroleum Regulatory Authorities at its meeting in Washington, D. C., on this 23d day of February 1945, That this conference reaffirm its position as heretofore expressed on various occasions that an increase in the price of crude oil is an imperative necessity to the petroleum industry in order to meet the necessary increased expenses attendant upon exploratory drilling in the search for new reserves and the cost of maintaining marginal production and secondary recovery operations. It is the further opinion of the conference that the subsidy program inaugurated by the Office of Price Administration is inadequate and is not a substitute for the price increase now so urgently needed; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly attested by the secretary, shall be forwarded to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator, and Judge Fred M. Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization.

Attest:

WALKER T. POUND,
Secretary.

Diplomatic Relations With Italy

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. CURLEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, early in May of 1944, House Joint Resolution 274 was referred for consideration to the Committee on Rules requesting the President of the United States to establish friendly diplomatic relations with Italy. The resolution read as follows:

Joint resolution requesting the President to establish friendly diplomatic relations with Italy

Whereas the President of the United States, acting with the full consent of the leaders of the United Nations has pledged the Italian people the right to a free and democratic government of their own choosing; and

Whereas the present government of Italy is preponderantly composed of the representatives of the six political parties, comprising every current of anti-Fascist and prodemocratic sentiment in Italy; and

Whereas these political parties therefore reflect the will of the Italian people not only of the liberated areas but of all of Italy; and

Whereas the presence of these Italian anti-Fascist and prodemocratic parties in the government of Italy offers clears assurance to the Italian people and to the world against unwanted forms of government in Italy, whether monarchial, dictatorial, or imperialistic; and

Whereas the resumption of full diplomatic relations between the United States and Italy and the recognition of the present Italian Government as a full and equal ally, entitled to lend-lease aid and to a proper role in the counsels of the United Nations will release untold energies of the Italian people in both the liberated and occupied areas of Italy to give their fullest support to crushing the Axis, thus striking a hard political and military blow against Hitler and his agent, Mussolini, and shortening the war with consequent saving of the lives of thousands of gallant American soldiers now fighting on Italian soil: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to direct the Secretary of State to resume friendly diplomatic relations between the United States and Italy, to extend lend-lease aid to Italy; and to use his good offices to the end that other United Nations resume diplomatic relations with Italy and that the United Nations recognize Italy as a full and equal ally.

The Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, in a radio address delivered April 9, 1944, before the women's division of the National Democratic Committee set forth his views, as follows:

In Italy our interests are likewise in assisting in the development at the earliest moment of a free and democratic Italian Government. Here again we wish to give every opportunity for a free expression of a free Italy. We had hoped that before this enough of Italy would have been freed so that we might have had at least a preliminary expression of that will. Events have not progressed according to our hopes. But there is already promise of success in the activities of the political parties which are currently holding conferences with a view to drawing up a program for the political reconstruction of their country along democratic lines. The Permanent Executive Junta is seeking a resolution which will provide for the cooperation of the liberal political groups within the Government. Thus, after 21 years, we see a rebirth of political consciousness and activity in Italy which points the way to the ultimate free expression of the Italian people in the choice of their government.

Nearly a year has elapsed since the presentation of the resolution and the declaration of the former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and it would appear in the light of recent events that have taken place in Italy that the time has arrived for favorable action upon this resolution. The number of persons of Italian origin serving with the Allied armies, plus the importance of providing an incentive for a greater participation by the people of Italy and a more friendly attitude toward our boys serving on the Italian war front would justify early and favorable action. There is ever present the danger of a repetition in Italy of what took place in Greece and the transformation from a friendly to an unfriendly attitude by a large percentage of the residents of Italy. Recent events in the German theater of war have been so encouraging as to justify the belief of a speedy ending of the war with Germany and the importance of full recognition of Italy as an ally justifies the adoption of favorable action upon the pending resolution. The opening of the Italian Embassy in Washington and the extension of a larger measure of lend-lease aid to the Italian people make inevitable the recognition of Italy as an equal ally, and it would appear the sooner this course is embarked upon the more productive of real benefit it should prove to be to our war aims and the safety and security of our boys fighting on the Italian front.

Address of John J. Reilly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent which I have received and in compliance with a request from my district, I am submitting for printing in the RECORD an address by Mr. John J. Reilly, a prominent citizen of Philadelphia.

Twenty-four years ago, having battled against the occupying power for 750 years, the Irish won a partial measure of freedom. The island was given the status of a British dominion, but 6 of its 32 counties were excluded and were attached to Great Britain.

This was not what the Irish had hoped for, but they decided to make the best of it. The country they took over was in a sorry plight. The population, which had been 9,000,000 80 years before, was now only 4,250,000, their land had been turned into a grazing ranch, and their industries had almost entirely vanished.

The new rulers took seriously in hand the task of reestablishing the country. They began by harnessing the Shannon to provide electric power. They established hundreds of industries to provide boots, clothes, furniture, building materials, and so forth. By 1940 they had erected more than 120,000 dwelling houses, largely through Government help. They began to utilize the huge turf resources of the country to replace imported coal. They took over the ranches and large estates and divided them into economic holdings, putting back the farmers on the land. They encouraged tillage farming, particularly the growing of wheat, which acreage increased from 20,000 to 600,000 in a few years. They stopped the imports of foodstuffs which had totaled $40,000,000 a year, and produced them from the soil of Ireland. By a guaranteed price they started and encouraged the growing of beets and erected 4 sugar refineries to provide the people with all their sugar requirements.

All this and much more they did mainly on current revenue. Borrowing was on such a small scale that the national debt in 1939

was not over $100,000,000. Mr. Horsfall Carter, an English critic (Atlantic Monthly, September 1938), said that after 17 years of self-government Ireland was economically one of the healthiest countries in Europe.

This progress was very rapid and successful, indeed, but it would have been far more so had it not been for the stupid and disastrous economic war waged against the country by Britain in the thirties. This arose over the dispute about the land annuities, amounting to nearly $30,000,000 annually, extracted by Britain up to 1932. When Mr. De Valera came into office in that year he stopped this payment on the grounds it was not legally due. He offered to submit the question to international arbitration—an offer which was refused. Instead, the British imposed penal tariffs on Irish livestock and produce going to England. The Irish Government retaliated by imposing punitive tariffs on British coal entering Ireland. The dispute lasted 6 years. It inflicted great hardship on the British coal-mining areas and all but ruined the Irish farmers. In 1938 the dispute was settled. The Irish agreed to pay a lump sum—$50,000,000—to Britain, and retained the annuities in the Irish treasury. It was during these negotiations that the British agreed to hand over the Irish ports, about which so much was heard later.

In the period under review the Irish made great strides in the political field. The Irish Government removed one by one the clauses of the 1921 treaty, which were repugnant to the peoples' ideas of freedom and democracy. The right of appeal from the Irish courts to the British Privy Council was removed, the oath of allegiance to the Crown was abolished, and the office of British Governor General in Ireland ceased to exist. All of these had been barriers to a better understanding between the peoples of Britain and Ireland. Only one now remained, namely, partition.

Partition had its origin in the controversy over the abortive Home Rule Act of 1912. The British Parliament enacted a law to give home rule to Ireland. Certain elements of the north-east protested vigorously, and raised a force called the Ulster volunteers, armed with guns imported from Germany, and pledged to resist the British Parliament. The Home Rule Act was suspended for the period of the Great War. Finally, it was never put into operation, although on the strength of it some 350,000 Irishmen, recruited by the Irish nationalist leader, John Redmond, had volunteered for the British forces, and some 50,000 of them had given their lives in France, in Belgium, and in the Dardanelles. Redmond died brokenhearted.

Another Home Rule Act, called the Partition Act, was enacted by the British Parliament in 1920. No Irish Members of Parliament voted for it, and its provisions were contrary to the wishes of four-fifths of the Irish people. In part, it set up as a political unit forming common territory with Great Britain, six of the Northeast counties, namely, Tyrone, Formanagh, Derry, Antrim, Down and Armagh. There was such bitter resentment in Ireland that in the following year a clause was inserted in the treaty, providing for the rectification of the boundary between the six counties and the rest of Ireland in accordance with the wishes of the people in the areas affected. Lloyd George had convinced the sponsors of the treaty, notably Arthur Griffith, that under this clause partition would come to an end. It was clear that if a vote was taken, two whole counties, Tyrone and Formanagh, would vote for union with the South, as would also South Armagh, South Down and Derry City. It was clear too that the remaining areas would be too small to continue on their own. As a matter of fact the vote was never taken, and the Irish rightly concluded that once again they had been deceived.

Mr. Griffith did not know that Lloyd George, the architect of the treaty, had written a secret letter to Eir Edward Carson in 1916 in which he stated that "We must make it clear that at the end of the provisional period Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland." (Life of Lord Carson, vol. 3, p. 166.)

The people who rule the partitioned area have no use for democracy. As soon as they took control, they abolished the proportional representation system of elections—still retained by the Dublin Parliament—because it gave adequate representation to minorities. Furthermore, it so gerrymandered the parliamentary and local government constituencies as to rob the Nationalists of anything like a fair representation. Thus, in Derry City, out of every five voters three are Nationalists, but in the city council, of every five members, three are Partitionists. In some areas it takes ten Nationalist voters to outvote two Partitionists.

There are 450,000 nationalists in the six counties, nearly two-fifths of the entire population. They are debarred from office both in the civil service and local government. The Honorable Frank Pakenham, professor of political economy at Cambridge (England) University, says, "The condition of this minority is unparalleled in any other part of these islands. It would not be tolerated in England for a moment. It is of a character probably conceived by the ordinary Englishman to be confined to central Europe." (English Daily Telegraph, January 20, 1938). Mr. Joseph Driscoll, special correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, writing in that paper on January 30, 1938, said that one-third of the population of the six counties was virtually debarred from holding public office.

Since the beginning of the six-county régime in 1920, the nationalists in the area have been subject to an almost continuous reign of terror. There is a special armed constabulary. This force, according to a protest submitted to Mr. Winston Churchill in 1940, had "incurred the odium attaching to a political force of the type familiar on the continent of Europe." The signatories to this protest included General Gough, Col. James Fitzmaurice, the Earl of Antrim, the Duke of St. Albans, the Earl of Ossory, Maj. Gen. Charles Grogen, Maj. Gen. Hugh Montgomery, Mr. Shane Leslie, Mr. Robert Lynd, and Mr. Stephen Gwynn.

One of the methods used by this partisan police force is to invade in the dead of night the houses of the nationalists, terrifying women and children at the point of the gun, and arresting every man in the house. Frequently those arrested are released after a few days only to find their employment gone. There have been numerous denunciations of this regime by Catholic bishops in the areas, by Protestant members of the Belfast Parliament and by members of the British Parliament.

Writing in the Progressive, Madison, Wis., on November 30, 1942, Mr. Frank C. Hanighen said, "I am not a Catholic, and therefore I can speak with an impartial nonsectarian viewpoint. My reporting excursion to the six counties before this war convinced me that the Catholic minority in these counties—about 40 percent of the population—is ruthlessly, and the word is 'ruthlessly,' oppressed by the Northern Ireland Government." In 1936 the British Council of Civil Liberties—a purely British body—issued a report by a commission of inquiry in which it was stated that in Northern Island the principle of habeas corpus—a fundamental of the British Constitution—had been completely abrogated and that the executive had been placed in a position paralleled only by continental dictatorships."

It would be strange if the Irish people, daily witnesses of this shameful regime, were not skeptical when they hear mention of the ideals for which this war is being fought. They know that this regime could have been brought to an end and the principles of justice and democracy established any time during the past 24 years without going to war with anyone.

In 1935 Mr. De Valera gave notice to the world that in the event of a European war Ireland would remain neutral. At the same time he gave an unsolicited undertaking that the Irish Government would not allow anyone to use Ireland as a base from which to attack Britain. When the war started the Government issued a formal announcement of neutrality. It was immediately demonstrated that this policy had the support of the entire country. In Britain the announcement was received with equanimity. Indeed, the only opinion voiced in that country was one of satisfaction that at long last England had a genuinely neutral Ireland on her flank. Seventy thousand Britishers took haven in Ireland.

A whole year elapsed and no one questioned the wisdom or sincerity of Ireland's attitude. Then, in November 1940, Mr. Churchill voiced regret that Britain did not have the use of the Irish ports in meeting the submarine menace. Immediately a whole barrage of abuse and misrepresentation of Ireland's position was let loose on both sides of the Atlantic. It was stated that Ireland's attitude was due to hatred of Britain based on past injustices. The Irish knew this was nonsense, and they pointed to the indisputable fact that the pro-British section of the Irish people were at one with all the others on the question.

As a matter of fact, anti-British feeling in Ireland had never been at a lower ebb. The Irish were not unmindful of the fact that Britain had shown due respect for the country's neutrality. They were beginning to look forward to the day when the wrong of partition might be righted and the long, long, dispute between the two peoples brought to an end. They realized, as that day came nearer, that the relationship between the two peoples should be based on mutual respect and good will, and that geography and economics alone could compel such an outcome. Since 1922, succeeding administrations in Ireland had kept that in mind. Mr. de Valera had given a pledge that Ireland would not be used as a base against England, and he and his people had taken steps to implement that pledge. It included, of course, measures to see that no espionage detrimental to British interests should be permitted. The measures taken were very thorough and very efficient. Notwithstanding this, newspapers and radio commentators poured forth the most extravagant stories. The German Legation was described as a vast center of espionage, and its staff was said to have been increased by hundreds. The London Times (July 17, 1940) printed a complete denial of this as a result of an investigation made by one of its special correspondents, who found that the legation staff consisted of not more than half a dozen men, with two or three women typists, and added "the stories of its activities as a vast center of espionage are without foundation."

The story that German submarines were being refueled on the Irish coast was echoed almost down to this day, although it was officially denied in the British House of Lords in 1940.

When America entered the war the alleged espionage activities of the German Legation in Dublin poured forth afresh. Mr. James

Welland, of the Chicago Sunday Times, made an investigation on the spot. He pointed out there were no means by which the Germans could send secret information to Berlin. He added, "It would not take the British long to protest if they picked up radio messages emanating from Dublin, and there have been no such protests." (Chicago Sunday Times, October 11, 1942.)

The Irish are a brave and tenacious people. They are proud of the record that from the year A. D. 1000 they fought against what seemed overwhelming odds for the principles of liberty, justice, and democracy. And today there are 175,000 Irishmen in the armed forces of the Allies and over 100,000 more in its direct war work in England. Ireland is a small country, just rising from her knees after centuries of subjection.

It has been repeated again and again that the Irish are ungrateful for the services rendered by the Allies, that but for Allied convoys they would have starved. This is not altogether true. All the supplies the Irish receive from overseas, with the exception of gasoline, are carried in their own ships, which do not sail in convoy. In the case of gasoline there was a special arrangement. At the beginning of the war Ireland had seven tankers, which she gave to Britain at Britain's request on the understanding that Ireland would receive her normal supplies of gasoline. This undertaking has not been carried out, but the Irish are generous enough to believe that this is not Britain's fault.

Judged by American standards, Ireland is a poor country, but judged by European standards, Ireland is fairly well off. A poor country could not as Ireland does, supply Britain with 2,000 head of cattle every day, as well as large quantities of poultry and dairy products. The Irish export to Britain $150,000,000 worth of food every year. Her total imports amount to about one-half of that figure. Ireland is not a debtor nation. She has always given more than she received.

Ireland's contribution to the world has not been small. She is a mother country whose children, wherever they have made their homes, are not unworthy citizens of the lands of their adoption. In one respect her service to humanity is perhaps unique. For 1,500 years, sons and daughters of Ireland have sought out every known land to bring to its people God's message of peace and good will. Yesterday, in the darkened medieval cities of Europe, as today in the desert wastes of Africa or the steaming jungles of Asia, they have labored without fee or reward, without even the hope of ever returning to the "fair hills of holy Ireland." They brought with them no bloody sword of conquest, no dream of earthly dominion. They brought only the word of a God of brotherhood, of peace, and of love.

Ireland has no thought of recompense for her sacrifice. From her rich store of spiritual strength she has always given gladly and openhandedly. She asks only the right to be judged fairly.

Dealers Organize Pulp Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am quoting below an article from the Savannah Morning News, of Savannah, Ga., dated Tuesday, March 20, 1945, concerning a resolution adopted by pulpwood dealers to stabilize industry and conserve resources:

About 25 pulpwood dealers from the southern States, after a 2-day session at the Hotel Savannah, yesterday formed an association to be known as the Pulpwood Dealers' Association of the South. This is the first producers' association to be organized in the South.

Albert Ernest, Savannahian, who is owner of the Dixie Wood Co., in Milledgeville, was elected temporary chairman, and James Lawton, of Soperton, acting secretary.

The entire organization will meet again on April 12 in Atlanta by which time the men appointed on the membership committee for the various States expect to have expanded the association to 150 members.

The pulpwood dealers passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the pulp and paper industry has invested in plant facilities more than $200,000,000;

"Whereas the industry's annual pulpwood requirements has a delivery value of approximately $75,000,000;

"Whereas the growing and harvesting of pulpwood is an important factor to southern agriculture; and

"Whereas this responsibility for the production of this critical war material belongs to a group of woodsmen known as the pulpwood dealers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, an association of the pulpwood dealers of the South is necessary for the purpose of:

"Increasing and stabilizing pulpwood production.

"Perpetuating forest resources of the South and preserving jobs of 50,000 forest workers engaged in pulpwood harvesting operations.

"Discussing the problems that confront the industry and thereby seeking solution to these problems."

Named on the membership committee and the territory which they are responsible for covering are R. T. Brassell, South Carolina; V. C. Walker, Georgia; Horace Tindal, Alabama; Carlton Stallworth, Mississippi.

On the production advisory committee to make a study of how to increase production are S. A. Allen, Savannah; Harley Langdale, Jr., Valdosta; B. E. Pelham, Ellaville; and Troy Brannan, Bowton, Ala.

The meeting was called by V. C. Walker, of Hazlehurst. The men who attended the sessions are representatives of the 300 pulpwood dealers in the South. The program of procedure will be laid out at the next meeting.

There are over 50,000 workers in the South engaged in this particular phase of the paper industry.

Industry Advisory Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. H. H. Hahn, secretary of the Nebraska Petroleum Marketers, Inc., on the subject of industry advisory committees.

Mr. Speaker, I have many times complained to the O. P. A. that they have failed to take the considered judgment and advice of the advisory committees which the law says must be consulted by the O. P. A. before regulations are put into effect.

The letter I am inserting, from Mr. Hahn, indicates that the Petroleum Industry Advisory Committee has been bypassed by the O. P. A. The members of this board and similar boards are called together to discuss matters that have been already decided upon by certain groups in the Office of Price Administration. I believe the O. P. A. has been violating the law by not first seeking their advice before making orders and directives effective.

NEBRASKA PETROLEUM MARKETERS, INC.,
March 19, 1945.

Congressman A. L. MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLER: Yesterday's World-Herald carried a story of your reactions to O. P. A.'s reported exclusion of congressional Representatives from the meetings of its so-called advisory committee meetings in Washington, D. C.

This is of particular interest to us because we reached the conclusion that there was too much secrecy attending the meetings and activities of O. P. A.'s industry advisory committees.

The writer has been a member of the Petroleum Industrial Advisory Committee and attended two meetings early in 1944. At that time I tried to find out just who made up the various committees that were supposed to advise O. P. A. regarding the regulations affecting the petroleum industry, particularly the marketing branch. I also endeavored to learn how often the committee met, whether or not I was advised of all meetings, and whether the committees were used to help the Office of Price Administration formulate rules and regulations that would be helpful to the rationing program and reasonable and fair to the small independent oilmen of the Midwest. Also, I have endeavored to obtain reports of the action taken at committee meetings.

My efforts were unsuccessful and our board of directors reached the conclusion that the expense of further participation in the activities of the advisory committee was unjustified under present conditions. The members of our board are convinced that the advisory committees are called together to discuss matters that have already been decided upon by certain elements in the Office of Price Administration and that, consequently, these meetings were simply a "window dressing" stunt.

Some time ago Mr. Chester A. Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, made a public statement that thousands of gasoline dealers were engaged in black-market activities because they had accepted counterfeit coupons in the course of trade.

Our organization thought his accusation was unfair and unjustified, and I am enclosing a copy of a resolution and statement adopted by our board of directors commenting on Mr. Bowles' statement and the unfortunate effects of some of O. P. A.'s policies as they affect the small independent dealers and jobbers of petroleum products.

In recent months we have had an industry advisory committee in the Omaha O. P. A. district. The members of this committee have spent several hours each week in assisting O. P. A. to effectuate its new bail-out policy for gasoline retailers. The committee

has served a good purpose and, in my opinion, has done more to encourage compliance with rationing regulations than all the rest of O. P. A.'s activities in this region. The work of this committee was carried on in cooperation with the officials of both the rationing and enforcement divisions of O. P. A. About 10 days ago the regional director of O. P. A. fired the four heads of the enforcement division in the Omaha office.

So far as I know, no member of the industry was given any indication that the Chicago O. P. A. officials were dissatisfied and no member of the industry has any knowledge of why the officials who had worked with our committee were dismissed.

It seems to me that you and other Members of our congressional delegation are on solid ground when you object to being barred from any meeting that has anything to do whatever with the rationing of any article or commodity. Certainly these things affect the daily lives of our people, and that effect alone is enough to justify the presence of our elected representatives of the people at any meeting where policies are adopted and procedures are outlined.

Further, it semes to me that O. P. A. would welcome the presence of Senators and Representatives, especially if they come from the Midwest. After all, it's much more difficult for us to attend meetings in Washington, D. C., than it is for the people living east of the Allegheny Mountains.

I am sure that our people appreciate your interest in these matters, especially in view of the fact that O. P. A. is asking Congress to extend and expand its powers.

Our people are in accord with the purposes of rationing, and we have endeavored to assist the Office of Price Administration to the limit of our ability. In my opinion, our chief difficulty has been to reach those who actually make the policies of O. P. A. and write its regulations.

We believe that your stand with respect to the secrecy of O. P. A. committee meetings will have a salutary effect if it does no more than direct pubic attention to the fact that too much of O. P. A.'s activities are conducted without public knowledge or approval.

We expect to have a meeting to discuss this and other phases of O. P. A.'s work within the next few days, and I will advise you following that meeting. With best personal regards and all good wishes, I remain,

Yours truly,

NEBRASKA PETROLEUM MARKETERS, INC.,
H. H. HAHN, *Secretary.*

Child Labor and School Attendance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on child labor and school attendance issued over the signatures of the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, executive secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities; the Right Reverend Monsignor John A. Ryan, director, social action department, N. C. W. C.; the Very Reverend Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, director, department of education, N. C. W. C.; and the Reverend Paul F. Tanner, director, youth department, N. C. W. C.:

Family and child life have endured many severe strains during the war. The call of the services and of war industries had deprived millions of families of their natural leaders. Many mothers have had to assume a dual role in the home. In addition, large numbers of them have wanted to do their part by entering into war work or by taking jobs that have been vacated by men called to the services or to war industry. As a result, these war dislocations have left millions of children and young people with the merest shreds of home life. Children and young people in large numbers have also heeded the call of war industry. They have felt that they too should contribute their share to the war effort. There has been a great exodus of young people between 16 and 17 from school into war industries and general commercial occupations. There has also been a considerable employment of boys and girls between 14 and 16.

Both State and Federal governments have relaxed child-labor standards in order to meet the war emergency. Not only have we had a relaxing of child labor standards, we have also had a very general break-down in the enforcement of existing standards.

As leaders, we may not take a pessimistic view of the influence of war on family and child life. We feel confident that the sufferings and tragedies of the war will bring a new awakening of religious faith; that is will bring man closer to his fellow man and to his God. We feel sure that it will bring the church closer to the lives of the people. We are aware also that the problems growing out of the war offer a new challenge to all our religious leaders, a challenge to develop a heroism that has been so characteristic of religious life in days of great emergency. It will also be a challenge to us to present practical programs for action which will make our people more conscious not only of their religious but also of their civic responsibilities.

In dealing with young boys and girls in our grade schools and high schools we should be conscious of the change that has come over their lives. They have developed a new sense of their own independence and importance. The new attitude of youth presents real problems for our educators. We must think more and more of ways and means of making the liberal arts a part not only of high school but also of grammar-school education. Too much of our discussion in regard to ways and means of making the school more challenging is centered around vocational education. However important or even necessary may be a certain amount of training in specialized vocations, it can never provide the foundation for a genuine democratic society; it can never prepare people to resist the shibboleths that make for a totalitarian order.

Every effort must be made to retain within the educational system students in our grade schools and high schools at the present time. Army and Navy officials have pointed out that those who are about to enter the services should as far as possible complete their high-school curriculum. This should be our attitude in regard to the students in our schools. We must contribute our part to making the present child labor and educational standards as effective as possible. This calls for a strict enforcement of child labor and school attendance laws. During the war many schools have come to take an easy-going attitude toward lack of school attendance. Children are thus greatly encouraged in habits of law-breaking.

One of the most important post-war problems will be that of inducing young people whose education was interrupted by the war to return to school. Many of these young men and women will have become accustomed to high wage standards and lavish spending. The schools must have a program that challenges the interest and imagination of these young people and it cannot be a merely vocational program.

A considerable number of young people who have gone to work prematurely during the war will want to continue in gainful employment and, while they may succeed to a degree, their lot will by no means be easy. Competition for jobs after the war is going to be intense. Discharged servicemen will have preference on every front and this is bound to make it more difficult for the succeeding generation.

Now is the time to prepare our program of post-war employment for children and young people. We must write into the statute books of the various States high standards of child labor and compulsory school attendance. The laws that we now write need not be put into effect until after the war, but we should be ready for after-war problems. We should have our legislation on the statute books and we should also have adequate provision for its enforcement. We should insist on having in our State laws a 16-year minimum age for all employment during school hours and for employment in manufacturing, mechanical, and processing establishments at any time. For all other employment State laws should require a 14-year minimum age for employment outside of school hours. Children under 16 should not be employed between 10 p. m. and 7 a. m. All State child-labor laws should require a maximum 8-hour day for combined school and work; they should also require a maximum 8-hour day, 40-hour week, with a 6-day week for all minors under 18.

One of the most serious child-labor problems in the United States is the employment of children of families engaged in large commercial agriculture. In some areas these families are constantly on the move. Even in places where they remain for a considerable period of time school facilities are inadequate. A number of the camps operated by the Office of Labor, War Food Administration, Department of Agriculture, have school facilities for the children of migratory workers. There is a great need for the extension of such educational facilities.

It is most important that there should be adequate State legislation covering the employment of children of migratory workers. Large numbers of very young children are now employed in harvesting and processing various types of agricultural products. There is no reason why these childen should not be included in State laws. They are vastly different from the children who work with their own fathers on one-family farms and on land owned or leased by their own families. There is no reason, moreover, why people operating large commercial farms should be exempt from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. They are engaged in the harvesting and processing of goods that enter into interstate commerce. They can no longer be placed in the category of ordinary farmers. They are really large commercial operators, and should be subject to the same legislation as the ordinary industrial enterprises.

Law alone cannot give us high standards of child labor or compulsory school attendance. Without proper understanding and vigilance on the part of the people our legislative standards will never be enforced. Child labor and compulsory school attendance should become topics for discussion in local parish and neighborhood groups. Local parish and neighborhood groups can contribute much toward the thinking of the community in regard to the education and employment of young people. These local groups should study and discuss the educational curricula

that is set up for young people. They should discuss employment opportunities for young people and the relationship of school programs to these opportunities. Education, like employment, cannot be separated from the community. It is something that calls for active participation by all the citizens.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, executive secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, director, Social Action Department, N. C. W. C.; Very Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, director, Department of Education, N. C. W. C.; Rev. Paul F. Tanner, director, Youth Department, N. C. W. C.

St. Patrick's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following St. Patrick's Day address delivered by Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Dever, United States Naval Reserve, March 17, 1945, before annual banquet of Ancient Order of Hibernians at Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

This, the anniversary of the death of St. Patrick, is the day when the sons and the daughters of the Gael gather in every clime and circumstance to express devotion to the isle which gave their fathers birth and to the saint who shattered the shackles of paganism and gave their mothers an undying faith in Him who has been the guide, the consolation, and the sustainer through grief-crowded centuries.

What we annually celebrate as another festival is, indeed, a most significant event.

Is it not typically Irish that it is not the birth, but rather the death of a national patron which we commemorate, showing an instinctive belief that death is not the end of life but truly the beginning; that man does not live for bread alone; that he has a higher destiny than the tradings of the market place and the rancor of the forum?

Is it not significant that the Irish Nation adopts as its hero not a general with the laurels of victory bought at the price of human suffering, not a statesman skilled in the Machiavellian wiles of international intrigue, not a fuehrer who boasts of a super race, but rather the apostle of one who taught "You shall love one another?"

Is it not significant that the idol of those of Irish blood is no Irishman at all? Or let me avoid a controversy. His own great "Confessio" proves he was not one by birth, but he surely was one when he died. His legacy to his adopted land was a rich spirituality which has steadily increased and through Irish missionaries sent to the four corners of the world with the light which was lit on Tara's Hill has banished the darkness of heathenism on all continents.

When he landed on the coast of Wicklow in 432, he defied a wrathful king—his druid advisers—and his pagan hordes—but Patrick sensed his Ireland—he converted the queen and under her patronage he converted the people—symbolic, of course, of the influence of Irish motherhood down through the years.

The little island which Patrick weaned from dark superstition to the foot of the cross is but a speck on the map of the globe—but it has been a treasure chest of Christian culture—a land of saints and scholars—a well-spring of democracy—but at what a price!

We do not gather to open old wounds or bewail ancient fates—but the Irish character defies understanding unless we know of the awful crucible of bloody oppression in which for 700 years its metal was tried—tried in a furnace of persecution seven times heated.

They could have bartered their chains for temporary expediency, they could have gained their beloved liberty at the price of leaving the teachings of Patrick.

"Ireland might have merged her identity and her faith in an alien empire and alien worship. But she fought and died; she starved and agonized; and in defeat she has conquered. He spirit still lives on."

Time will never erase from our memory the unsung heroes of those black decades of despair which Ireland knew in the eighteenth century. The hero priests who offered up their daily masses, even when the penal laws made that act of devotion to their Heavenly King punishable by death; the hedge schoolmasters, those heroes who kept the torch of education burning bright when the law ordained that the man who taught an Irish lad the alphabet should suffer ignominious death. Oh yes; they did hang men and women for no greater crime than the wearing of a sprig of green.

And the women of Ireland, those spiritual descendants of the saintly Bridget, who kept their little families together when their men were on the run, who brought up their children to love God and their fellow men, and to those whose virtue and courage we who gather here tonight owe all that we are and all that we hope to be.

Indeed, oppression and famine sent her sons to the four corners of the earth.

Aptly, indeed, have Irishmen who in the words of Emily Lawless were "fighters in every clime for every cause but our own" been called the wild geese of Ireland, for their talents have flown to every land where freedom needed a champion.

Brown, the Field Marshal of Austria, MacMahon, of France, Dillen and Walsh, Irish Generals of French armies who came with Lafayette to help win American independence, countless others, a Premier of Spain, a Captain General of Cuba, and the George Washington of Chile, Don Bernardo Higgins, of County Sligo.

It was 100 years ago—in 1845—that for the first time the potato crop failed. The great tragedy of the famine did not reach its crescendo until 2 years later. It was at this time that the great emigration to America took place.

It's rather trite to recount achievements of Irish immigrants in America. There is nary a profession, a science, an industry, or a trade but has felt the impact of their infusion into the stream of our national life.

Their brawn built the railroads which gird the Nation—the brains of their sons now guide them.

It is natural that a yearning for government pent up by centuries of denial should find its expression in a full participation in the public affairs of this Republic.

The Supreme Court, the Congress, State and local governments have felt the ancestral urge of those of Irish blood ever interested in bettering the lot of man and making the Jeffersonian pledge of equality of opportunity an economic reality rather than a philosophical dream.

To read the litany of Irish contribution would exceed my power of speech but I can recite a happy coincidence in the recent life of my home State of Massachusetts—illustrative of the sentiment I feel.

In Boston, in the last decade of the nineteenth century, two couples established humble American homes. Patrick Cushing, a blacksmith, and Mary Dahill, a colleen from Cork, were married at St. Eulalia's church in South Boston and to its baptismal font was brought their first son, Richard. James Tobin, a carpenter from Tipperary, and his bride, Margaret Daley from County Cork, lived on the other side of Mission Hill—and to a little wooden church brought their son, Maurice.

In devout American homes these boys were taught to meet the responsibilities of American manhood.

On November 7, 1944, Maurice J. Tobin was elected Governor of Massachusetts, and on November 8, 1944, Richard J. Cushing was installed as archbishop of Boston.

I stress American homes and American manhood because at times the fervor of our devotion to the land of our ancestors is misinterpreted as a dilution of our stalwart and thoroughgoing Americanism.

There is nothing incompatible between devotion to the land which gave our fathers birth and undeviating loyalty to the Republic which gave them and their children opportunity.

A man can love his mother and be faithful to his wife.

No immigrant has ever come to this sanctuary of freedom more willing to renounce foreign kings and potentates, more eager to embrace the opportunities and the obligations of the American way of life, than the grateful sons of Erin. None have more highly valued the ballot than the Hibernian long denied its privilege. His strain has never produced a traitor.

Many years ago John Randolph, of Roanoke, said, "I have seen a white crow and heard of black swans, but an Irish opponent of American liberty I never either saw or heard of."

No Irishman has ever raised the flag of revolution above the Stars and Stripes. They have come upon the platform of democracy with both feet and two fists.

John Boyle O'Reilly, great Irish bard and great American citizen, summed it up when he wrote:

"No treason we bring from Erin—
Nor bring we shame nor guilt!
The sword we hold may be broken,
But we have not dropped the hilt!
The wreath we bear to Columbia is
Twisted of thorns, not bays.
And the songs we sing are saddened
By thoughts of desolate days.
But the hearts we bring for freedom
Are washed in a surge of tears.
And we claim our right by a people's
Fight outliving a thousand years!"

What of the little island which nurtured culture and gave to the world its women and its men?

Is its role all played and its destiny history?

Is it preordained to be ever split and severed one part from another?

In a world propelled into war by the madness of dictators she has played her part. The blood of her sons has made scarlet every battlefield from Dunkerque to the Rhine; the strategy of a Montgomery, an Alexander, and a Dempsey have helped chart the road to victory.

That the courage of the Irish is ever in the spearhead of the cause of right and freedom, listen to history as recorded by "Believe It Or Not" Ripley:

That the first American to shoot a Jap was Mike Murphy.

The first American to sink a Jap battleship was Colin Kelly.

The first American to receive a Presidential citation was James Powers.

The first American pilot to bomb Berlin was William P. Owens.

The first American glider to land on D-day was Lt. Col. Michael Murphy.

The first American flier to down a Jap plane was Edwin O'Hara.

The first American bomber to blast Yawata was Lt. Col. Richard Kenny.

The first shot to liberate Bataan was fired by Lt. John F. Murphy.

The first American mother (and pray God the last) to lose five sons was Mrs. Thomas F. Sullivan.

Yet, while boys of Irish blood fighting under all flags of freedom have given their full measure of sacrifice with those of other strains, with a statesmanship which history will appraise, the defenseless shores and the cities of Eire were spared the ravages of war.

She can again, as in the ninth century, become the repository of western Christian culture—and send her missionaries into a Europe blackened and seared by the destruction of wars.

She again, and speaking as one who was in Belfast a few short months ago, will be a united nation—not through the negotiations of chancelors but by majority rule engendered by birth rate and migration—under the only constitution in the world which in its preamble is dedicated to the name of the Holy Trinity.

So, through her vale of tears, Eire can look confidently to the future.

The day is not far distant when we can repeat the words of a late governor of Tennessee:

"If I were a sculptor I would chisel in marble my ideal of a hero. I would make it the figure of an Irishman sacrificing his hopes and his life on the altar of his country, and I would carve on its pedestal the name of Robert Emmett.

"If I were a painter I would make the canvas eloquent with the deeds of the bravest people who ever lived, whose proud spirit no power can ever conquer and whose loyalty and devotion to the hopes of free government no tryant can ever crush. And I would write under the picture 'Ireland.'

"If I were a poet, I would touch the heart of humanity with the mournful threnody of Ireland's wrongs and Erin's woes. I would weave the shamrock and the rose into garlands of glory for the Emerald Isle, the land of martyrs and memories, the cradle of heroes, the nursery of liberty."

The day is not far distant when no longer shall we sing the jeremiad of Napperandy—"'Tis the most distressful country that ever I have seen."

The day is not far distant when at last the epitaph of Robert Emmett will be written.

The day is not far distant when the prophecy of John Boyle O'Reilly will come true—and let me conclude with it—

"All thy life has been a symbol
We can only read a part
God will flood thee yet with sunshine
For the woes which drench thy heart."

International Monetary Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a letter from Hon. M. S. Eccles, chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and a statement by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in regard to the proposed International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, March 21, 1945.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, House Banking
and Currency Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPENCE: For the consideration of your committee in connection with the bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (H. R. 2211), I am sending you herewith a brief statement by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System of its position in favor of the ratification of the Bretton Woods proposals. It would be appreciated if you would have this statement incorporated in the record of the hearings which are now being conducted by your committee.

Very truly yours,

M. S. ECCLES, *Chairman.*

P. S.—A sufficient number of copies of the statement are enclosed so that each member of your committee can be furnished with a copy.

INTERNATIONAL FUND AND BANK

(Statement by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System)

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is convinced that ratification of the Bretton Woods agreements would be an important step in the restoration of world trade and in safeguarding the interests of the United States in the post-war world.

I

Without the institutions proposed by these agreements we would be confronted with disrupted currency conditions and with trade and exchange policies and practices which foreign countries might be forced to adopt in self-preservation but which would nevertheless have disorganizing effects on world trade. In rebuilding the machinery of international finance after the war it will be vital to avoid the recurrence of practices which developed after the First World War, and to eliminate abuses which were prevalent in international lending. Effective action in these fields would form a counterpart to essential programs of domestic reconstruction. The greatest contribution to international prosperity and stability that the United States can make is to maintain full employment and a rising standard of living at home. In order to establish international trade on a sound and enduring foundation it must be based upon a balanced exchange of goods and services. On such a basis it will contribute an important steadying influence to our domestic economy.

The International Monetary and Financial Conference of representatives of 44 nations held last summer in Bretton Woods resulted in agreements for the creation of two new international financial institutions, the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The International Monetary Fund would exert an influence toward exchange stability and thus reduce the exchange risks for exporters and importers. It would require member countries to maintain established exchange rates and would provide machinery for making in an orderly manner by mutual agreement such changes in exchange rates as may be necessary. Members undertake to eliminate as soon as possible monetary practices which interfered with the flow of world trade before the war, such as discriminatory exchange restrictions, multiple currency arrangements, and bilateral clearing agreements. It would help to give assurance to member countries that the proceeds of sales to any country could be used for the purchase of goods in any other country.

For the purpose of assisting member countries in maintaining their exchange rates, once they have been established, without resorting to harmful restrictions on trade, the fund would have resources in gold and various currencies which would be available for temporary use by members. It would afford member countries faced with heavy payments abroad a breathing spell during which to make necessary adjustments in their economies with a view to restoring equilibrium in their trade with the world. The fund would not be in essence a lending institution but a mechanism for converting local currencies contributed by members into a pool of international reserves, on which each country could draw in proportion to its contribution. While temporary shortages of foreign exchange could be met through use of the fund, members would be under pressure to restore the exchange to the fund as soon as possible in order to maintain its ability to serve other members.

As a companion institution to the fund, the Bank for Reconstruction and Development would be a lending institution to promote the international flow of long-term capital. It would make loans for productive and developmental purposes out of its own capital or out of funds borrowed in the market and would guarantee such loans offered to private investors. It is intended to make or guarantee such loans as would in the long run increase the borrower's ability to balance its international accounts. It would help to restore economies destroyed or disrupted by war, to reconvert their productive facilities, to peacetime needs, and to develop the resources of less-developed countries.

The bank would have a stabilizing influence on interest rates and other conditions for international loans and would tend to eliminate practices in international investment that have in the past resulted in excessive costs to borrowers and in losses to lenders. It would handle only loans that could not be obtained on reasonable terms without its support and would, therefore, in no way interfere with the flow of private funds into interational investments. At the same time it would make it possible for countries greatly in need of foreign resources to obtain necessary capital which might not otherwise be available to them on reasonable terms. The agreement provides that loans made or guaranteed by the bank must have the approval of the lending country. Consequently, the loans can and should be so timed as to diminish either inflationary or deflationary pressures, and to contribute to the maintenance of economic stability in this country.

II

From the point of view of the board of governors the establishment of the fund and the bank would be desirable because they would contribute to world recovery and to the maintenance of economic stability at a high level which is the main objective of the board's policy. The monetary and credit structure of this country is continually and seriously affected by international transactions. In the past this country's monetary authorities have had to meet difficult situations when our banking system was called upon to absorb an excessive amount of foreign bunds arising out of surplus commodity exports and capital movements from foreign countries. The adoption of the proposed agreements should help to moderate these disturbing influences.

III

In connection with the enabling legislation now before Congress, the board is strongly in favor of the addition of a provision for the establishment of a council or committee to provide the necessary direction and guidance to the representatives of the United States on the governing bodies of the fund and the bank and to interpret to them the international financial and monetary policies of the United States. Members of this council or committee should consist of the heads of the appropriate agencies of the Government to be designated by the President. It should be a small group, comprising not more than five members. Since the proposd institutions are to be permanent, it would be advisable to have the council provided by law rather than by Executive order or informal arrangement. The council would not only advise the American governors and directors on the fund and the bank of its views with respect to the financial and monetary policies of the United States but would also be authorized to act for the United States in matters which require approval under the agreements, except in cases in which the right to decide will be retained by Congress. Establishment of such a council would assure reasonable continuity in the interpretation of American international financial policy to this country's representatives on the bank and the fund. Provision for such a council in the enabling legislation would not call for any change or modification of the articles of agreement of the fund or bank.

Monetary and Credit Agreements Entered Into at Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. LINK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable M. S. Szymczak, member, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, entitled "Monetary and Credit Agreements Entered Into at Bretton Woods," delivered before the Illinois Manufacturers Association, at Chicago, Ill., on March 20, 1945:

Last August while in London I had opportunity to study the plans for reconstruction and post-war economic stability of some of the governments in exile—particularly Belgium. The problem is immense, and its solution, or lack of solution, will affect us. It is an international problem.

The American people want to know, and rightly so, what our Government is planning for the post-war era.

As you know, plans are well advanced for the establishment of a food and agricultural organization of the United Nations. The meeting at Yalta has cleared the path between Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco. And as the President told the country, on March 1 of this year after his return from Yalta, work is progressing on proposals to strengthen the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, to secure international agreement for the reduction of trade barriers, to control cartels, and to provide for the orderly marketing of world surpluses of certain commodities. Within the past few weeks considerable progress has been made at the Mexico City Conference in dealing cooperatively with problems of this hemisphere.

During much of the period between the First and Second World Wars, one of the greatest obstacles to the orderly exchange of goods and services between countries was the uncertainty and difficulty which surrounded payment for these goods and services. The conference held at Bretton Woods last summer—which I had the privilege of attending—agreed on far-reaching proposals designed to remove this obstacle and enabling legislation is now before our Congress.

What were the conditions in the two decades between the wars? Peace after the First World War was precarious and chaotic. In the political field many countries experienced revolutions and counterrevolutions, or at the least frequent changes of government. In the economic field, much industrial plant had to be rebuilt to serve the needs of peace instead of war, and overworked farm land had to be reconditioned. People who had gone without through the war years scrambled for the meager available supplies of consumer goods. Prices shot up and we experienced all over the world a post-war inflation. International exchange was out of joint. Commercial contacts, broken by the war, were difficult to restore. Exchange could not be found to buy the imports needed for reconstruction and to put national economies back into working order. Monetary disorders spread throughout the world. Those who could, shifted their funds about looking for a "sound" currency—one that had some stability.

It is generally known that before 1914 the value of most currencies had been expressed in terms of so many grains of gold. Since gold was a commodity accepted the world over, this as an easy means of comparing the relative values of different currencies. For example, the French franc was fixed by law at about one one-hundredth of an ounce of gold. The English pound sterling was fixed by law at about one-quarter of an ounce of gold. Therefore, by simple arithmetic, 1 pound sterling was the same as 25 francs or 1 franc was one twenty-fifth of a pound. Because of this fact, international trade could effect the exchange in goods based on a known relation between currencies of various countries.

With the outbreak of the First World War, most countries refused to permit the export of gold and their banks ceased to pay out gold to individuals. The gold standard was abandoned. After the war, however, every effort was bent to return to the gold standard. But it was not always possible and in some cases it was not desirable to return to the old values for the various monetary units. England, however, did; so strong was the desire to return to what was considered to be normal relations that, in 1925, a pound was declared to be worth as much in terms of gold as it had been before the war. But this was too high a value for the pound, and it proved a great strain to maintain that value. Unfortunately, there was no international machinery under the gold standard under which the rates could be altered. There was no flexibility. There was rigidity. A change in the par values of currencies was a major operation which had its repercussions on the economic nerve structure of world trade. On the other hand, France did not return to the old value for the franc. The impact of the war and reconstruction upon the French economy had lifted commodity prices and made goods much more expensive in France. That is, it took far more francs than before the war to buy the same quantity of goods. By the same token, it took more francs to buy a pound sterling; the exchange value of the franc fell. Then in 1926, the franc was stabilized at approximately 125 francs to the pound instead of 25, as before the war. There was no possibility of returning to the old parity, and France was realistic is not endeavoring to do so. But a flight of capital had preceded French stabilization and the return flow afterward aggravated the difficulties of other countries, especially England.

You can imagine, if you do not recall, how difficult it was to carry on international commercial and financial business under these changing and uncertain conditions. There was basic uncertainty in values, in prices, in exchange. These conditions were needlessly protracted because each country operated on its own. There was no comprehensive plan for collaboration and cooperative action to restore a functioning international monetary system. Small loans were made to some countries to help them stabilize their currencies; but this assistance was sporadic and uncoordinated. Each case was treated separately. Toward the end of the twenties it was vainly imagined that normalcy had been restored. But the difficulties in the international field were even worse in the thirties than in the preceding decade.

As conditions in the twenties had settled down there had begun to be a considerable volume of international investment. Part of this was in long-term loans on which the interest and amortization charges made a heavy call upon the borrower's foreign exchange resources. Much of it represented short-term lending, partly in the form of deposits in foreign banks and the purchase of speculative securities, partly the financing of trade. Large quantities of goods were imported by the debtor countries on credit. In many cases, borrowing far exceeded the capacity of the country to repay, especially since the funds borrowed were not used to enlarge the productive resources of the country. In time some countries had to pay more for the goods and services they bought, plus net credit charges, than they received from their own goods and services abroad—that is, their balance of payments was said to be unfavorable.

It appeared necessary to impose restrictions upon purchases and sales of foreign exchange and upon international trade because the ability of many countries to maintain their purchases abroad had come to depend on their ability to borrow abroad. Few were able to do so. At the end of 1935, virtually all intergovernmental debts—save that of Finland—and 38 percent of private bond issues were in default. At the end of the twenties, the volume of funds available for foreign investment began to dwindle; and finally, as confidence weakened, short-term funds began to be withdrawn. Debtor countries could not meet these drains except by shipping gold or using available foreign exchange. Obviously, there is a limit to this process. There was no machinery for international cooperative action to deal with such a situation. Each country felt that it was "on its own" and hastened to clamp on exchange and trade restrictions. Some hoped to stimulate their exports by making it cheaper for other countries to buy their goods. They did this by reducing the price of their currency. They depreciated. At the same time they tried to reduce their imports. The result was a general falling off in world trade. Exporting countries began to suffer from declining production and increasing unemployment. Countries whose economies were geared to a high level of imports could not find the exchange to pay for their imports. As a result the value of international trade in 1934 was only about one-half as great as it had been in 1929.

All this added up to the world-wide depression of the thirties which is still fresh in our memories. At that time I was here

in Chicago and well do I remember our situation, for I was then city comptroller. The banks were closed. Tax collection was held up by a reappraisal of real estate. And when we began again to collect taxes the depression was upon us and property holders were unable to pay taxes. People were out of work. Each blamed the other for the difficulties. Back of the domestic depression was a world economic situation.

To keep things moving even on a low level, countries began to make agreements with others on the basis of "I'll buy more from you if you will buy more from me." Trade was forced into bilateral channels. Countries no longer bought in the most advantageous market. They bought wherever they could make a deal through the maze of regulations and restrictions which hampered international exchanges. There is no need to describe here the devices—some of them ingenious and all of them intricate—which were invented in this deadly game of economic war. We know now that it was almost as destructive to national and international well-being as had been the actual hostilities of the First World War. And it laid the basis for the Second World War.

I have taken this much time to recall to you the handicaps which confronted international trade after the last war because some people appear to have forgotten them, or, at least, their memory has dimmed. But those who were alert to the dangers of a repetition of these conditions after this war have devoted time and energy to seeking a way to avoid such a recurrence if possible. Interested individuals began systematic study more than 3 years ago. After many conferences and discussions, preliminary, highly tentative proposals for an international monetary institution were presented to the public in April 1943. A draft for an international stabilization fund was published by the United States Treasury and a draft for an international clearing union was published by Great Britain. Both proposals were put forward to encourage all interested parties to contribute to the solution of the extremely complex problems involved. Both proposals were widely studied, compared, debated, and discussed, orally and in writing, by individuals, and in small and large groups here and abroad. As a result of the wide area of agreement that was found to exist, a joint statement of experts was published in April 1944. Further discussion culminated first in a preliminary meeting of representatives of many nations in Atlantic City in June and finally in the July Conference at Bretton Woods. The Bretton Woods agreements, especially the fund proposal, are designed to aid in achieving reasonable stability in the international monetary sphere in order to make possible a revival and expansion of world trade on a multilateral basis. They are a step—and a long step—in the right direction.

Admittedly the Bretton Woods agreements are not a panacea for all the ills of the world. Unless the major industrial countries, especially the United States, succeed in maintaining reasonable stability of employment at high levels there will be very little chance of avoiding the measures of economic warfare employed in the thirties. In effect, these were measures to "export unemployment." By importing as little as possible and exporting as much as possible, each country hoped to keep its own people working. There is reason to believe that the major countries now are determined by domestic measures to prevent wide fluctuations in employment. Economic stability and full employment in the United States are certainly an accepted aim and purpose. But these should be reenforced by a healthy condition of international trade. The acceptance of the Bretton Woods agreements will contribute in a substantial measure to the ability of countries to maintain employment at high levels without resorting to attempts to "export unemployment" to other countries.

If we are to have a healthy world trade, we need reasonable stability in foreign-exchange rates, and adequate credit distributed where it will do the most good in rebuilding and developing national economies. The Bretton Woods agreements are technical documents, the product of the experts of 44 nations, but they can be summed up simply. They spell out cooperation in the monetary and credit fields, and give detailed ways in which this cooperation can be achieved. The agreements provide for the establishment of two international institutions: An International Monetary Fund, and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The bank proposal is relatively simple. No serious differences of opinion arose in the negotiation of the bank agreement, which has received widespread support and approval. The bank follows a well-known pattern. Its job is to investigate projects for the reconstruction of war-torn areas, and for the development of backward lands for which long-term international loans are needed. When it is satisfied that a project is productive and that the borrowing country has a reasonable prospect of repaying the loan, the bank will see to it that the loan is forthcoming on reasonable terms. This does not imply the elimination of private investment but it is unlikely that enough private capital will be lent to countries in need of reconstruction or development without some encouragement, especially immediately after the war when conditions will be uncertain. The bank will operate for the most part either by guaranteeing loans made by private investors or by making loans with funds borrowed from private investors.

The benefits of the international bank will be many. It will help members to achieve stable economics. It will distribute the risks of international lending. Although we may furnish most of the loans which the bank guarantees, this country's share in meeting the risks involved will be only $3,000,000,000 as a consequence of its subscription to the bank. If international loans are made through the bank, the dangers of imperialistic lending will be avoided. International supervision of foreign loans will make it difficult for foreign loans to be used as an instrument of political policy. The conditions which surround the issues of debentures by the bank insure that they will be a prime investment security since the total of the bank's loans and guarantees may not exceed the amount of its capital, surplus, and reserves. Only one-fifth of the $9,100,000,000 subscribed by member governments can be used directly for making loans. The rest will remain in the form of unpaid subscriptions as a guarantee fund to meet any losses that the bank may incur.

The International Monetary Fund Agreement deals with a more difficult problem than does the bank. Wider differences of opinion had to be reconciled before the negotiations were concluded. Changes will have to be made in it from experience. There is provision for amendment and there is room through interpretation for adjustment to conditions as they arise. It aims to prevent a repetition of the chaos which followed the last war and of the destructive monetary practices of the thirties, both of which I have reviewed. It substitutes cooperative international decisions and international action for the state of affairs we had in the past when each country made its own decisions and acted alone in what it thought were its own interests.

Under the fund agreement each member establishes the gold value of its currency by agreement with the fund. Gold is still the most widely acceptable means of international payment. But this is not a return to the old gold standard. Although each country undertakes to maintain the established value of its currency at par, there is necessarily provision for altering the parity if it becomes evident that this value is too high or too low (because of changed conditions in the country's international position). The fund will approve only changes that are really necessary, and object to those which are not. This means that no country will be able to sell its currency cheaply—that is, to depreciate its money in order to secure a competitive advantage for its exports. We have learned that if this is done, other countries are not likely to stand by idly but will join in the scramble with disastrous consequences for all.

The agreement also eliminates special exchange rates for particular types of transactions. Germany was the country which developed this device most fully. In the years before the war there were all sorts of reichmarks, representing the receipts from different kinds of business with Germany. The non-German owner could not dispose of these freely since the use of each type was limited to a particular purpose such as to pay tourist expenses in Germany, to buy certain types of goods, and so on, and the value of each kind in terms of other currencies varied greatly. In this way Germany arbitrarily made it cheaper or more expensive to buy particular German goods or to sell particular commodities to Germany, and manipulated this device to obtain a competitive advantage in international trade.

The requirement that the fund approve necessary changes (after the first 10 percent) will also mean greater stability of exchange rates in the long run. Not only will unnecessary changes be eliminated, but necessary changes can be made in an orderly way before the situation is completely out of hand.

If French production costs (wages and other items) for instance, happen to rise much above production costs in England, French producers will gradually lose their foreign markets—both in England and in other countries—to British producers. French producers will lose even in their domestic market, as their high-cost goods are being increasingly displaced by lower-cost goods imported from Britain.

If the basic maladjustment in the cost structure is not the result of a temporary condition, but reflects a fundamental and lasting change. French production will eventually decrease, unemployment will rise and monetary reserves will be drained by the deficit in the balance of payments. The French currency will tend to fall in value, speculators will rush to buy foreign exchange and, in many cases, the resulting monetary depreciation of the French franc will be greater than what was really called for to correct the initial cost maladjustments. If an appropriate change is made in the value of the currency, relative to the currencies of other countries before this train of circumstances is set in motion, much confusion and distress will be avoided and the necessary adjustment can be an orderly one.

European currency history between the two wars illustrates this problem in the clearest possible way. As I said before in 1925, England went back on the gold standard at the pre-war gold parity, while continental countries depreciated their currency to a considerable extent. The resulting cost disparities between England and other countries resulted in a severe and protracted economic depression in Great Britain until the devaluation of the pound in 1931. As the pound declined further and further in the

following years, production costs in Europe increased in terms of sterling and, in turn, became completely out of line with British costs. The attempts of the gold block countries to maintain the parity of their currencies in the face of such heavy international cost disparities led to intense depression and unemployment and proved futile in the end. Belgium was the first country to bow to the inevitable. Her relaitvely prompt decision permitted her to limit the devaluation of the Belgian franc to only 28 percent. France meanwhile resisted to the last, with the result that the devaluation, when it came, depreciated the French franc by about 60 percent as compared with the Belgian 28 percent.

Under the agreement, also, all members promise to eliminate restrictions on foreign-exchange transactions as soon as possible. Of course, during the war, each country must keep strict supervision over its international transactions. I am not speaking of wartime controls but of the sort of regulations in effect before the war. Many countries at that time had less foreign exchange than they needed. That meant that importers in those countries were rationed as to the amount of foreign exchange they could use, and exporters were required to turn over their receipts to some governmental agency which parceled them out. This arrangement, as we have seen, interfered with normal trade, which was shifted into particular channels, and often led to the domination of the economy of one country by another for political ends.

The case of Germany and Hungary illustrates what happened. In preparation for war, Germany was anxious to acquire large stocks of goods, and was willing to pay well for them in German marks. The Hungarian Government had subsidized farm output in order to avoid bankruptcy of its farmers when agricultural priced in world markets dropped, and the prices of Hungarian wheat and meat were much higher than Germany would have had to pay elsewhere. But Germany could not buy elsewhere because it did not have the dollars or the pounds or the pesos to do so. An agreement was signed between Hungary and Germany whereby Germany agreed to take Hungarian goods at the high Hungarian prices and sell to Hungary German goods—also at high prices. The transactions were balanced against one another in a "clearing account." Each country tried to prevent an unsatisfied debt from piling up in the clearing account. Under this arrangement both Hungary and Germany were paying more than they should have for the goods which each imported from the other. Hungary lost its other markets because of its high prices and had to concentrate on the German market.

Germany began to dictate trade terms to Hungary, to tell it what sort of goods it must produce if Germany were to take them. When Germany went to war, the Hungarian economy was firmly tied to that of Germany and thus Hungary inevitably became a partner of the Axis.

This is the sort of thing we do not want to have happen again. Under the fund agreement, members undertake to abandon such bilateral clearing arrangements and discriminatory currency practices as give exporters special premiums if they ship goods to countries the currencies of which are particularly desired. This commitment applies to the abandonment of restrictions on foreign exchange transactions on current account; that is, those arising out of shipments of goods, tourists' expenditures, immigrant remittances, and the rendering of services. Members are permitted to control capital transactions such as money sent for deposit in foreign banks or for use in stock-market operations. Real investment can be encouraged and the speculative movement of funds limited; this will contribute substantially to international monetary stability.

It is not expected, of course, that the whole body of regulations over foreign-exchange transactions shall be done away with at once. Only confusion would result. The patient is very sick, and recovery, at best, can be only gradual. On the other hand, unless a concerted effort is made as soon as possible to eliminate such practices, there is grave danger that many countries will fall back on them to balance their international transactions after this war. They must have an alternative which will make such action unnecessary.

However earnestly the member countries may desire to live up to their agreements as far as exchange rates and exchange restrictions are concerned, it will not be easy for them to do so. To help them, a fund of almost $9,000,000,000 is to be established, made up of gold and the currencies of all the countries which are members. This fund will be used to assist member countries faced with temporary balance of payment difficulties such as might follow a bad crop or a loss of a market for a short period. Should the deficit prove to be more than temporary, the fund will continue to give the member assistance only if it takes adequate steps to correct the situation.

I have sketched briefly the mechanism of the fund, and indicated the aims which it is hoped it will achieve. Doubtless, you have all heard and read some criticism of this plan, and I should like to mention the main point around which this criticism centers. During the last 12 or 13 days I have been attending and closely following the hearings on the Bretton Woods proposals in the Banking and Currency Committee of our House of Representatives and feel that the quest for information concentrates mainly on this point.

It has been argued in some quarters that foreign countries will abuse their privilege of drawing on the fund and that the fund's resources will be wasted. The position taken by the critics is that in order to insure that members take advantage of the time during which they are drawing on the fund to correct the unbalance in their international position, aid should be given only after special investigation and agreement as to the conditions under which the funds are to be used. This view misinterprets the very essence and purpose of the fund.

A whole series of automatic and discretionary controls is specifically designed to prevent undue use of the fund by any member country and to insure wise use of the fund's resources.

Take, for example, the important automatic controls. Definite limits are established on the amount of foreign exchange a member may obtain from the fund in any single year or as a maximum over a period of years unless special permission is given to exceed these limits. Secondly, member countries must pay a small service charge on all foreign exchange purchased from the fund. In addition, an annual charge is levied on a member country using the fund. This charge increases, the larger the use of the fund's resources, and the longer the period over which the resources are used by a member country. Thus, constant pressure is put on a member country to reduce its drawing on the fund.

Another automatic control is the obligation of all member countries to repurchase their own currencies from the fund with gold or foreign exchange. This obligation is so framed as to require countries adequately supplied with gold and foreign exchange reserves to draw on them at the same rate that they draw on the fund. And it also requires (with qualifications) countries which are gaining gold and foreign exchange to use half of the amounts gained to reduce their drafts on the fund.

The discretionary controls are even more important than the automatic controls. The fund can postpone the beginning of its exchange operations until it is satisfied that most members are in sufficiently stable condition to warrant use of the fund's resources. Furthermore, once it has commenced general exchange operations it can postpone transactions with any individual country which is not in a position to make appropriate use of the fund's assistance.

Once the fund has begun operations with any member, however, that member can proceed with the assurance that it can come to the fund and receive help in meeting payments due for foreign goods and services without delay. This feature of the fund proposal lies at the very core of the whole agreement. It assures the availability of exchange. Since members can confidently expect assistance from the fund, they will be able to undertake to maintain stable exchange rates and to eliminate restrictions on foreign exchange transactions. In many cases the fact that assistance is forthcoming without delay will prevent temporary disturbances from having serious repercussions on the international position of other countries. If a drop in any single country's exports leads to defensive deflationary measures and restrictions on imports, that country's exchange difficulties will spread to other countries and a vicious circle of restrictions on trade and deflation will ensue.

Should the difficulties of a member country prove to be more than temporary, the fund has a very important discretionary power to insure that the country does take advantage of the time during which it is drawing on the fund to put its house in order and correct its position. The fund can stop a member from drawing on the fund if it is not using its resources in accordance with the purposes of the fund. The purposes as stated in the agreement make it quite clear that the fund is to be used to help countries meet temporary deficits and to give them time to correct more deep-seated maladjustments.

It is evident to me that the period during which the fund and the bank are needed most is the immediate post-war period before individual countries begin to impose new and additional restrictions on foreign exchange and foreign trade. Prompt establishment of the fund and the bank would also give member countries confidence which they must have to place their economic houses in order with the least possible delay.

It therefore seems to me that with the knowledge we have of the problems of the 1920's and the 1930's we have agreed at Bretton Woods with competent representatives of other countries on sound economic principles to help solve these problems and the solution of these problems is in our interest. Therefore the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development should, after due and proper consideration, be approved by our Congress.

War Manpower Commission at New Bedford, Mass.

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I read yesterday—many of you probably saw

it—that Executive orders are now the modern version of royal decrees which can bind us, even to treaties without ratification. I have asked to place in the RECORD an informative address relating to the unfortunate conditions in my city of New Bedford brought about by the War Manpower Commission. It is extremely unfortunate that such a situation is created anticipating the powers to be granted in the work-or-fight bill. The President sees fit, through the War Manpower Commission, to compel workers before Congress authorizes it. That is the way it is if Congress lets it be that way."

The address to which I referred follows:

THE TRUTH IN THE CORD MILL CRISIS

(By Duncan Howlett, Minister of the Unitarian Church, New Bedford, Mass.)

The city of New Bedford has been much in the Nation's news of late. The efforts of W. M. C. to transfer workers forcibly from one mill to another has met with determined opposition on the part of the community as a whole. The facts have become confused and often the issues lost sight of. The patriotism of the city is in question.

In view of all this, it seemed to me someone in a neutral position should speak on the situation as a whole, summing up the pertinent facts, and pointing out the issues involved without bias and without partisanship. Insofar as it is possible for humans to be nonpartisan and without bias, I shall attempt to present the situation as best I have been able to determine it after a lengthy investigation and careful thought.

I

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

Last September the Priorities Committee of W. M. C. granted first priority on manpower to the Fisk and Firestone mills in this city. Early this year the Army and W. P. B. asked all the tire mills to go on a 7-day, 3-shift basis for the next 90 days because there was an impending shortage of tires. This order included the two tire cord mills in New Bedford, Fisk and Firestone. Each was already on a three-shift basis, but schedules were advanced to 7 days a week. A bottleneck occurred, however, when the cord mills were unable to man their third (night or so-called graveyard) shift. This precipitated the trouble.

W. M. C. is not attempting to start a third shift at the tire cord mills. They have always run on 3 shifts and did so even before the defense program was started. Furthermore, until the defense program began, these mills had no trouble manning their third shift. Each had a list of applicants. With the coming of the defense and war programs, other mills increased their first and second shifts, new mills came into operation, and many workers were drawn off into more attractive positions with more attractive hours.

New Bedford is not the only city in which tire cord is manufactured. Its output is but a small percent of the total. Elsewhere the third shift is no better manned than it is here. But New Bedford is the only city where a large number of other textile mills are also present, which creates a labor pool from which to draw. This is why the crisis arose here rather than elsewhere. W. M. C. chose this city as the one best suited to the forcible transfer of workers.

New Bedford men, capital and labor alike, maintain that workers could have been provided for the tire cord mills on a voluntary basis. When it became apparent that Fisk and Firestone could not man their third shifts, the New Bedford Cotton Manufacturers Association amassed a list by name, address and job classification of 3,700 former workers who had worked within the last 14 months, not now employed in any of the mills of the association, and in conference with a W. P. B. representative and the unions, agreed to a plan to canvass the workers, the C. I. O. carrying the brunt of the canvass.

Blizzard occurred

This agreement was concluded on Friday, February 9, at a conference at which representatives of the New Bedford Cotton Manufacturers Association, the unions, W. P. B. and the Fisk and Firestone mills were present. Representatives of W. M. C. did not appear. The canvass was made Saturday. Out of the first 60 people canvassed, 20 agreed to report to work Monday. On Sunday came the blizzard which halted traffic everywhere. None of the workers showed up Monday. Tuesday, before there was any opportunity for a check back, W. M. C. ordered forced transfers which brought to an end the efforts of a voluntary solution of the problem.

But the forced transfers produced few, if any, recruits for the tire and cord mills. Why? What is a forced transfer anyway? It is an order by W. M. C. that a certain plant release a certain worker. The worker is then required to report to U. S. E. S. for a new assignment, and he must take the job to which he is assigned or he cannot work at all, for no one else is permitted to hire him, including his old employer.

A worker can appeal a forced transfer, however, which is the stage the tire cord situation reached in New Bedford last week. One of the chief grounds of appeal is that the conditions surrounding the new work are substandard. This has been the chief ground of the appeals of the workers in New Bedford from assignment in the tire-cord mills. They allege that the work load is heavier; the yarn is heavier, the bobbins much larger, the laps are larger and have to be changed more often, the slubber bobbins are much heavier, the doffing is more frequent, the frames are much higher and longer, making a greater distance for the worker to travel. Yet they allege a worker usually must man more sides than in a fine goods mill where the work is much lighter. Moreover it is alleged that the use of the heavier yarn makes very much more lint in the air. All these factors tend to make work at the cord mills less desirable in the eyes of the workers. They say the 7-cent differential which W. L. B. has allowed is not enough to make the work attractive. Many of the workers (about three-eighths whom W. M. C. seeks to transfer) are women who would feel the increased work load greatly. And many of these have only returned to the work they are now doing on a patriotic basis. Many are unable to do the heavier work.

Move fundamental

W. M. C. has also recognized the inability of a worker to undertake a job assigned to him because of his health as a valid ground of appeal. This might seem an easy explanation of the W. M. C. complaint that only cripples had been referred to it, but all these so-called cripples were at work in other mills in the city when referred. It should also be said that referrals have in every case been made from the bottom of the seniority lists according to the union contract. The mills had no power to select the infirm for referral even if they had wanted to.

Down beneath a worker's natural aversion to leave his present job, down beneath the usual aversion to carrying a heavier work load than necessary, there are motives far more fundamental which are keeping the workers out of the night shift at the tire cord mills. Most of these workers have men very close to them facing the enemy overseas. Iwo Jima is not so far from New Bedford as some might think. Brothers, fathers, husbands, and sweethearts of New Bedford workers are there, and they are with Eisenhower and MacArthur, too. The workers know what production means to the fighting man overseas.

Consider the record of this city for patriotism: Almost complete freedom from strikes, Army and Navy E's flying everywhere, some plants having been awarded several; War bonds oversubscribed in each drive, and the Red Cross blood bank more than supplied on its quarterly visits. Why in view of all this, and with the rest of the Nation calling in question its patriotism, has New Bedford failed even under duress to transfer workers to the tire cord mills?

The real reasons are these: The workers are not reassured by the fact that labor disputes at both mills are now pending before W. L. B. Workers at these mills are not given company-provided insurance as they are at the other textile mills in the city.

Means great deal

Most important of all the deep-seated complaints of the workers, however, is the fact that the transferees have no assurance they will not lose their seniority rights. Seniority means a great deal to the worker. It can only be built up through long and faithful service at one plant. It gives him all sorts of privileges, among them vacations with pay and promotion status. Seniority gives the worker a right to keep his job if the mill cuts down production and has to lay off some of the help. The longer a worker remains in a plant, the higher his rating against a lay-off. Many of the proposed transferees already have several years of work accumulated for their seniority status.

Some people have forgotten the depression in the midst of this war boom. But it is so recent, that when I came to this city only 7 years ago, members of this parish who could not find employment were begging me to try to help them get work on W. P. A. During that awful period, New Bedford people were hungry and they were cold and there is a lively fear that those days may come again.

But I do not believe even these factors would dissuade New Bedford workers from manning the third shift at the tire-cord mills if they believed that the lives of their loved ones depended upon it. They are not convinced that these forcible transfers are necessary, and for two reasons. In the first place they know from its past record that when W. P. B. wants a product and at once, it has been able to get it. The fact that the demand for more cord was made some weeks ago and W. P. B. has not caused an uproar because of the delay makes them feel that the need is not as immediate and pressing as it would seem.

In the second place, the fact that other mills have held themselves ready to make the cord, first at the rate of 50,000 pounds a week and now at 100,000 pounds a week, and that this offer was not taken up, at least pending a solution of the cord-mill manpower problem, and has now been refused, makes the workers feel the need is not as immediate as they have been told. New Bedford citizens, workers and employers alike, have the impression that the issue is not really tire cord at all. To this community, the issue seems to be the right and need of a Government agency forcibly to transfer workers from one job to another, to the great disadvantage of the worker.

To sum up, New Bedford believes this whole thing could have been done voluntarily. New Bedford wants to know why it was not done voluntarily and why the workers' rights are not safeguarded. This is why New Bedford has opposed and continues to oppose the

forced transferrals of its workers under a directive of W. M. C.

II

The stand which has been taken by the people of New Bedford in this controversy is on a fundamental issue. It is an issue involving the rights of American citizens; it is an issue involving the rights of men. Let us look at this issue for a moment.

A Government like ours exists to protect the rights of the governed, the inalienable rights with which the people are endowed by their Creator. This is why governments are instituted among men. We hold this to be self-evident, and have so held since the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

To protect the rights of the governed, that is to say, the citizens, such a government must regulate the lives of all its citizens to some extent. But how much? This is the question. At some point, regulation shifts from the protection of the rights of the many to the advancing of the rights of a few. Advancing regulation means shrinking liberties and shrinking rights after a certain point. At what point does this occur? At what point does the protection of the rights of some become the infringement of rights of others?

Are like evils

A democracy must provide enough regulation of the affairs of its citizens to maintain the rights of all. Too little regulation is as bad as too much. They are like evils. There must be a delicate balance between the two. Who is wise enough to draw so fine a line? Yet the line must be drawn. It has had to be drawn thousands and thousands of times in the history of this country. This line must be drawn as long as democracy endures, for democracy is nothing more than government where there is neither too little regulation nor too much, but just enough to maintain the general welfare.

In wartime the same rules do not apply. Human rights are everywhere suspended, some in part, some completely. In the drafting of men for the armed services, for example, there is a virtually complete suspension of human rights. There is no talk of the rights of a man pulled out of his job, interrupted in his career, torn from his family, and sent wherever the common defense finds it expedient for him to go. We do not talk of the rights of men in the armed services to freedom of speech, freedom from want, or freedom from fear. But we completely suspend his rights to all these things just the same.

The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness we regard as most fundamental of all. But where are the rights of a soldier to any of these? They are suspended for the duration. He surrenders his liberty, he pursues anything but happiness, and he may be called upon to forfeit his right to life. Thousands of our young men already have. No one knows better than our fighting men how utterly fantastic the assertion of individual human rights within the military system would be. We who remain safely behind on the home front cannot imagine the change in point of view we require of our young men and women when they enter the service of their country.

Obviously such regulation of the lives of a segment of the population is necessary or we would not do it in a democratic state. We are still living in an age of barbarism. The only way we can assure ourselves of the fundamental rights we cherish in the long years to come is to force our youth to surrender them utterly for the time being. But it is only for the time being, and both we and they know it.

Little in comparison

How dire is the necessity is shown by the segment of our citizenry of whom we ask this sacrifice. It is the segment we love the best to which we turn, our youth, our sons and daughters, our husbands and young womanhood with all the rich power and promise of life still before them. These whom we love the most we force to yield all that we ourselves hold most dear. Civilian rights are drastically curtailed in war-time too, but it is so little in comparison we feel small even to mention it.

I say we ask our youth to surrender all their rights now in order that the Nation as a whole may repossess these rights in the future. There could be no other justification. The possession of these rights by the citizen in the America of tomorrow is all that can justify us before God for the sacrifice we ask of our children today. Let us then be sure we are faithful to this trust.

There are those who say a drastic suspension of civilian rights must soon come also. Perhaps we have already arrived at a juncture in our war effort where labor too must be drafted. I do not know, but before so drastic a measure is taken, we ought to be certain every voluntary means available has first been exhausted. The suspension of rights is too serious a matter. It is the suspending of the very things in defense of which we have asked our young men to offer their lives.

If we have come to that junction in our Nation's history, we at least ought to be willing to say so, and then draft everybody, not a half hundred patriotic if bewildered workers in New Bedford. We ought to put civilian draftees in the same status in which the Army puts its men, pay them on the same basis and make no distinctions. For our Government to select 150 people out of its 130,000,000 population and compel them to work where and when it wills is an arbitrary suspension of the rights of individuals and sets a precedent of an ominous nature.

Is different

Drafting a man for labor is quite different from drafting him for the Army. The Army and Navy are branches of the Government, subject in the last analysis to civilian regulation. A citizen subject to a labor draft would be set to work in private industry, assigned to the place where he was most needed, at whatever job was chosen for him, at whatever shift his superiors designated. His hours and his pay likewise would be fixed.

Meanwhile, the industry for which he works remains in private hands, and is operated for a profit. What has happened to all the checks and balances between capital and labor we have built up in this country through long, troublesome years? The employee is at the mercy of the employer, for he has no redress. He can no longer quit or strike or work elsewhere. The law of supply and demand now forces the improvement of working conditions. But a labor draft law would be a green light for industrial tyrants. Now don't misunderstand me. All industrialists are not tyrants, but like the rest of us they probably have their fair share of them, and the working man needs as much protection from them as the employer needs from the labor leader who becomes a tyrant.

The unions are right. If labor is drafted, capital should be drafted too. You can't draft the one without making the other autonomous. The Government has got to take over completely or not at all. And if the Government regulates capital and labor to this extent, we shall have the corporate state in place of the American democracy which we inherited from our forefathers. Well, perhaps we ought to have that, too; some people think so. Logically there is no reason why all of us shouldn't be compelled to surrender our rights to the Government, exactly as our brothers and sisters in the armed services have done.

The need for a corporate state in America has yet to be demonstrated, it seems to me. Our sudden and overwhelming production of war materials has surpassed the expectations of the most sanguine. Our ability to operate a free economy under conditions of total war still amazes the world. Our relative freedom from strikes by voluntary agreement and without coercion leaves the cynics speechless. A heavy burden of proof lies on those who would change our form of government even in wartime, and even if only for the duration.

Thinks it impossible

Undoubtedly the day is dawning when a more highly integrated society will emerge from the social structure we have known. This will happen in America as elsewhere. Probably more, not less, regulation will be required to protect the rights of all as our political economy grows more complex. But let us never forget that we grow into the thing we most desperately hate—we grow to be like the monsters with which we are locked in mortal combat in the east and in the west, if we do not restrict every regulation however necessary in order to preserve fundamental human rights.

How do you do this in a corporate state? I think it is impossible. When regulation is added to regulation and official is added to official, you finally arrive at the point where the lives of all are regulated, and officials become agents to carry out the orders of those above them. The checks are gone, the balances destroyed. The door to tryranny is open to whomever has the will and the skill to seize the power. Our enemies have provided us with ample evidence of what can happen in the corporate state, to the citizens of that state and to its neighbors as well.

III

We have wandered far from the cord-mill crisis here in New Bedford, haven't we? But perhaps not farther than we ought to look. We are living through great days. We have seen empires fall; we see others falling; and the end of it all no man can see. We sense also that the social and economic changes of our day will be as great, if not greater, than the political upheavals. We are watching history in the making. The path our country follows will directly or indirectly influence the rest of the world. It is a breath-taking thought. The struggle to force workers into the cord mills here may play an important part in determining which way America will go. I repeat, it is a breath-taking thought.

Dimly, perhaps, we sense all this. Without looking quite so far ahead we sense the importance of the events transpiring in our midst. We believe the forced transfers of workers here is unnecessary and unfair and down underneath we sense we are resisting for reasons beyond our own workers, and beyond our own needs. High principle is involved, in the upholding of which this city is united, capital and labor, all races, sects, creeds, and parties.

When we sent our young men to the front, those young men in whose names we are bidden to submit to the forced transfer of workers, we, like all Americans, made them a promise. It was the only thing they have openly asked of us. "Keep America the same," they said. "Let us come back to the same kind of a country we left. It's the greatest one of them all." We made that promise to them, and, God willing, we shall keep it.

Most precious heritage

Among the things that characterized the country they left behind was freedom. Freedom is the most precious heritage of the American citizen. Freedom is the most precious possession of man, for without it he

is not a man but a beast of burden. Freedom is our best guaranty of selfhood, it is the essence of democracy, the antithesis of dictatorship; it is the spirit of America.

Then let us have equal rights to freedom for all. Let us not single out a few people and take their independence and their small gains from them when the ends we seek to achieve can be reached without encroaching upon the rights of citizens. Let us preserve at least as many rights as we can. Let us put human personality first always. Let us not forget the endowment of our Creator to each of us. Let us remember, in fine, that we do God's will insofar as we care for His children, that is to say, insofar as we guard the rights of our fellow man. Remembering this, let us continue in the faith of our forefathers, faith rooted in the wisdom, power, and majesty of Almighty God, issuing in the rights of man.

[From the Washington Post of March 21, 1945]

ATTEMPT TO SHIFT MEN TO NEW JOBS HELD PROPAGANDA MOVE

The War Manpower Commission's national management-labor policy committee charged last night that the forced labor-release plan for New Bedford, Mass., textile workers was deliberately planned to create a "failure" which could be used as propaganda for national service legislation.

The committee, announcing a break with War Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, in its attempt to throw out the controversial W. M. C. program in the New England city, charged that the manpower agency was used as a cat's-paw in the alleged propaganda scheme.

The committee said the New Bedford plan was put into effect by Government officials in Washington "who favored national service legislation," adding that at one stage W. M. C. compromise proposals affecting New Bedford "were ruled out by a War Department representative."

IN FORCE ABOUT A MONTH

The New Bedford plan, similar to W. M. C. programs in Allentown, Pa., and other cities, has been enforced approximately a month.

It was designed to force textile workers out of fine-goods mills in the area into labor-short tire-cord mills, but met with determined resistance.

Fine-goods workers refused to go to the lower-paying tire-cord mills with their lack of workers' benefits, and New Bedford labor, management, and civic representatives united in opposition to the program.

In a statement signed by six policy committee alternate members, the committee urged McNutt "to revoke immediately the 'forced release' order in New Bedford, wipe the slate clean and start out again on a fresh basis—a basis which is most likely to produce the necessary tire fabric and duck yarn."

McNutt later issued a statement in reply, advising that he would continue his New Bedford program until the community submits an acceptable substitute plan.

"Until such time as the local community of New Bedford submits a plan which gives concrete evidence that the staffing of the critical tire plants will be accomplished without delay," he said, "I have no alternative but to continue the application of the W. M. C. national program of war service transfers in New Bedford."

SHARES COMMITTEE'S REGRET

He joined with committee members in their "feeling of deep regret that after almost 3 years of harmonious agreement we have not been able to resolve differences of opinion in this instance."

He made no mention in his retort to the committee of its charge that the manpower agency was used as a cat's-paw in the alleged propaganda scheme.

The committee's statement, although signed by alternates, was said to be binding on the full committee. The group is the W. M. C. tool policy-making organization for management and labor.

"The committee feels," the statement said, "that applications of the 'forced release' program in New Bedford was for the purpose of lobbying the Congress in support of compulsory service legislation.

"We are convinced from the clear evidence, painstakingly reviewed during half a dozen long meetings that there was an attempt to create a situation which could be called failure of the (W. M. C.) voluntary method, so that force could be used.

"We resent this attempt to involve conscientious citizens of New Bedford in what they were told was a true recruitment program, only to have them find in the middle of their efforts that such was not the case."

SIGN FOR THREE GROUPS

The committee's statement was signed as follows:

For labor: Frank P. Fenton, director of organization, American Federation of Labor, and Ted F. Silvey, representing the Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, C. I. O.

For management: Joyce O'Hara, assistant to the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; S. Duncan Black, president, Black & Decker Manufacturing Co., and Dr. J. H. Parmalee, director of bureau of economics, Association of American Railroads.

For agriculture: Paul Sifton, director of public relations, National Farmers Union.

The Global Alphabet and the World Language Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to reprint the very excellent letter of ex-Senator Robert L. Owen, president of the World Language Foundation. Senator Owen ably outlines the support and enthusiasm that has come from both the educators and the average citizens for the use of the global alphabet to make possible international understanding of all races and creeds. The letter of Senator Owen follows:

WORLD LANGUAGE FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1945.

Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building.

MY DEAR MR. MONRONEY: Answering your inquiry with regard to the global alphabet and the World Language Foundation endorsed by the Oklahoma Delegation in their letter to Gov. Robert S. Kerr, Oklahoma, on February 10, I reply that the endorsements of the global alphabet come from those who make no pretense to learning as well as from the most learned.

John R. Carter, Eureka, Calif., who describes himself as an "ordinary workman of 63 years" who saw the global alphabet in Labor, of February 3, writes that he learned it with ease, can write it as rapidly as he can English, and wishes to devote the rest of his life to teaching it.

I quote from a letter from a master of arts and doctor of philosophy of the University of Virginia, Dr. Mead, who is devoting her life to this plan and has prepared the pattern for our language text.

"I regard the global alphabet as a miracle of prodigious value in advancing the cause of human knowledge, abolishing illiteracy, multiplying human production, and bringing about mutual understanding and brotherhood, and am dedicating myself to that cause. By using the phonetic alphabet, all the leading nations can be taught conversational English quickly, economically, using the 'each one teach one' system of Frank C. Laubach, Ph. D."

Mrs. Frances D. Dorman, teacher of the Ben Murch School, Washington, D. C., in a letter to me said:

"I have taught two classes of children to read and write the global alphabet. They could read it after a few hours of instruction and have been pleased with it. I have found no word in the English language that I could not write in the letters of the global alphabet.

"One of my children of 10 years of age speaks Portuguese, and I had her write in Portuguese the phrase, 'Can we go home?' I translated this in the global alphabet and found that my children could immediately read and intelligibly pronounce the Portuguese sentence. They were delighted to read the Portuguese. Of course, you would know this, but it surprised and pleased them because they could not read and intelligibly pronounce the Portuguese as written in Roman letters."

I expect to have ready for the compositor the texts teaching Spanish, Portuguese, and German by April 1, the Spanish being finished now. The Russian, English, and Chinese texts will be ready about the middle of May. The compositor's copy of all leading languages could be prepared within 60 days if properly financed. Such books could be sold at a very low price and yet sufficient to cover production, distribution, and expansion.

The global alphabet speaks for itself. It can be taught to an intelligent person in less than 2 hours of instruction. With it every language in the world can be written at high speed, printed, and correctly pronounced. Books in the global alphabet in all languages can be printed at half the cost in paper, doubling the service of available paper, requiring one-half the storage space, saving half the cost of transportation.

I am delighted with the endorsement of the Governor of Oklahoma, the president of the Agricultural and Mechanical College, by the president of the University of Oklahoma, and the approval of other educational authorities in that great progressive State.

I have the advice of a number of expert Chinese, including two obtained through the Chinese Embassy here, who regard the global alphabet as adequate for Chinese. The Chinese and Japanese experts of the War Information Board endorsed it. Dr. R. Walker Scott, professor of Japanese at Trinity College, who taught English 10 years in Tokyo to the Japanese, is one of my sponsors covering the Japanese language. Dr. Laubach, who has taught 84 languages, including the leading dialects of India, sponsors the global alphabet.

The global alphabet has been submitted to over a hundred expert linguists, none of whom have challenged the adequacy of the global alphabet for the purposes intended. Professor Pei, who had 60 experts cooperating with him, is one of my sponsors and has given his approval to the global alphabet.

With infinite pains and thousands of hours of study, I have made the letters of the global alphabet of the simplest forms humanly possible. No global letter conflicts with any other global letter. No global letter is ever silent. No global letter uses the form employed by any other alphabet in the world. Each global letter begins and ends on the center line of writing and is capable of high speed in writing with the pen. It can be learned by a child of 10 years of age in 2 hours.

Any language in the world can be intelligibly pronounced when written with the global alphabet. The letter of Chiang Kai-shek to me takes six times the amount of paper required for writing the same words in global letters.

Of no other alphabet in the world can these things be truly said. I challenge any responsible person to question the accuracy of my statements in this letter to you.

You will recall that the ministers of education of eight different nations in London last summer passed resolutions urgently recommending one world language after the war as a means of mutual understanding and of establishing durable peace.

Let me quote further the views of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt recently expressed:

"Some time I hope that everywhere throughout the world we will all learn one universal language in addition to our own, and that language, whatever it may be, will be a language which makes it possible for us to talk together no matter what our racial origin may be. At present, languages are so frequently a barrier that, if we could decide on one language which is learned all over the world, it would mean a great deal to the future understanding among people."

May I not invite your attention to the importance of these declarations from high sources, and suggest that you advise the people of Oklahoma of the facts supporting the sponsorship of the Oklahoma delegation. If our Government authorities and our leading businessmen should realize the colossal importance of this matter and give it adequate backing, I would predict that the English language could be made known conversationally to the majority of the people of the world within 2 years by a campaign which would pay its own way.

With kindest regards,

Your friend,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

Bretton Woods Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the crucial decisions we will have to make here within the next few weeks will be on the question of the ratification of the agreement reached at the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference—the Bretton Woods agreement. I hope that when we make our decision on this agreement that we do it with an eye to history. I cannot pretend to be an expert in monetary problems. The ways of international finance are as mysterious to me as they are to most people. But it is obvious that the countries of the world must work a new program of international financing if we are not to enter into the tremendous job of world reconstruction and rehabilitation in an atmosphere of economic antagonism. Unless some workable way of outlawing economic aggression is found, our hopes for the end of military aggression are futile. The Bretton Woods agreement, reached after conferences and discussion between representatives of 44 nations, recognizes the fact that an unbalanced international economy leads to war, and it seeks to achieve a greater balance through the creation of international monetary machinery. There may be disagreements as to the effectiveness of the proposals, there may be feelings that we didn't drive as hard a bargain as we should have, but a plan was agreed to, a plan that does work at least in the direction of international economic stability.

Linwood I. Noyes, publisher of one of the fine newspapers in my district, the Ironwood Daily Globe, and president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, recently wrote a very fine editorial which, it seemed to me, caught the essence of the problem confronting the Congress when it considers the ratification of the Bretton Woods agreement. I think this editorial is worthy of being reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and under unanimous consent, include it in my remarks:

BRETTON WOODS FIGHT

Wall Street is showing increased interest in the struggle in Congress over the acceptance of the Bretton Woods plan.

Financial leaders suggest that instead of a total commitment of $5,900,000,000 for the combined international bank and monetary fund the United States should subscribe only a little over three billions to the bank and its authority should be broadened to negotiate currency stabilization agreements. This arrangement would eliminate the monetary fund set-up entirely and thus save taxpayers' money. Another group recommends postponement of action on the fund "until basic conditions have become sufficiently stable."

Still a third group challenges these views, and these bankers are backed up by Treasury experts. They contend that the functions of the two institutions must be kept entirely separate; that the nature of banking activities—such as passing on loans—is very different from that of stabilization operations. If the two departments are merged, it will result in the wasteful practice of "the bank bailing out the fund."

Mr. Morgenthau's representatives in New York declare that Congress should either vote for the project without change or kill the entire program. Revisions now offered had already come before the Bretton Woods delegates and had been turned down; the nations will not take today exactly what they rejected yesterday. If lawmakers junk the plan, they may be held responsible by the public for wrecking the program for economic rehabilitation and mass employment set up by the fiscal authorities of 44 countries.

As we are the major financial power, Britain, Russia, and the others are waiting to take their cue from us. Financiers supporting the administration declare this is the first concrete test of American willingness to sign on the dotted line a document for permanent international organization.

The action of Congress will be a significant portent on the eve of the San Francisco Conference. If we back out now, it will be the tip-off to other governments that we are unwilling to play a leading role in world collaboration.

European chancelleries know our record on the League of Nations and the World Court. They recall that after the economic conference, instigated by Herbert Hoover, met in London in 1933 to stabilize international currencies and remove trade barriers—objectives of the Bretton Woods proposals—Franklin D. Roosevelt, the incoming President, withdrew his approval. Without us the affair was meaningless and the gathering failed to accomplish anything. From then on it was "every man for himself."

Treasury officials warn "this must not happen again."

Difficulties of Impounding Retirement Funds en Bloc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in the Seventy-eighth Congress, I introduced a bill which proposed to make a blanket impounding or disbursement of salary funds in any regular appropriation bill for the retirement fund with a view to saving considerable bookkeeping, time, and effort.

In November, toward the close of that Congress, I discussed the matter in some detail with Mr. Harry B. Mitchell, the president of the Civil Service Commission, who agreed to undertake a study to determine the practicability of the idea and the possible savings that would result. I now have a letter from Mr. Mitchell, transmitting a report of that study which, while disappointing in the results indicated, will be of interest to any Member of the House, or any student of governmental expenditures.

On the other hand, the inquiry, it is evident, has strengthened a conviction in the Civil Service Commission that steps should be taken to reduce the expense of maintaining individual retirement accounts.

The result has been to institute a survey by the Commission, the General Accounting Office, and the Bureau of the Budget to find a more satisfactory system for maintaining Federal employee service and retirement records as well as a more economical method of obtaining statistical records on personnel required by the various Federal agencies.

I, therefore, place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in accordance with permission previously granted by the House. The matter referred to follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,

Washington, D. C., March 20, 1945.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: In response to your letter of November 29, I asked our Retirement Division to go into the subject of possible saving as

a result of impounding 5 percent of appropriations for deposit in the civil service retirement and disability fund in order to eliminate the necessity for maintaining individual retirement accounts. The results of this inquiry are disappointing to me, as I know they will be to you. When I first spoke to the head of the Retirement Division on the subject, which was before my conversation with you, he expressed the opinion that a considerable saving could be made; but apparently research further into the plan proposed indicates that no saving would result, but rather the reverse.

For the first 2 years of the civil service retirement system I have now learned, the impounding system was in effect on an estimated basis. It was not satisfactory and was abandoned.

While the situation at that time was different, as only persons having a civil-service status were under its provisions, it is contended that the experience then and since indicate that as long as the Civil Service Retirement Act is a contributory system, records must be maintained to determine each employee's contributions. This is true even if all employees not covered by another retirement system were covered under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Even though the impounding method, if otherwise practical, could eliminate the necessity for currently maintaining these records, experience with the impounding method in 1920–22 indicates that the deferred construction of individual retirement accounts from service information is far more expensive and time-consuming and the results are much less correct than currently maintaining these records from pay-roll data.

However, even if the impounding method could eliminate the necessity for maintaining individual retirement accounts on a current basis, the study made indicates that the departments and agencies would have to determine each year how much was impounded for retirement from the salary of each employee for income-tax purposes. Once the amount of the deductions is determined, the expense of posting these amounts to retirement accounts is small.

Further difficulties in the impounding method arise due to the fact that appropriations are not usually made for salaries alone but include expenses, materials, and in some cases, funds for private contract work.

Finally, even if it were practical to make appropriations for salaries only, the difficulty of impounding the exact amounts due the fund would have to be overcome, inasmuch as these appropriations may not necessarily be spent or may be spent in part for terminal leave not covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act.

The Commission realizes that some definite steps should be taken to reduce the expense of maintaining individual retirement accounts under the Civil Service Retirement Act. Consequently, the Commission in cooperation with the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget is now making a survey not only to establish a more satisfactory system for maintaining Federal employee service records and retirement records, but also to obtain more economically the statistics on Federal personnel required by Federal departments and agencies and the Congress.

I regret that a more favorable report cannot be made in response to your letter of November 29. Detailed reasons for the conclusion reached are contained in the report enclosed.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

HARRY B. MITCHELL, *President.*

REPORT ON THE PRACTICABILITY OF IMPOUNDING 5 PERCENT OF SALARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPOSIT TO THE CREDIT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

I. NECESSITY FOR INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS UNDER A CONTRIBUTORY RETIREMENT SYSTEM

As long as the Civil Service Retirement Act continues to be a contributory retirement system, some record of the amounts deducted from the salary or compensation of individual employees must be maintained.

A. These accounts can either be established and maintained currently from pay-roll deduction accounts or be constructed when required. The disadvantages of constructing these individual retirement accounts after a period of time are as follows:

1. The construction of a retirement account from reports of personnel actions years after such service occurred would be difficult, time-consuming, expensive, and inaccurate. It would be necessary to increase greatly the number of reports of personnel actions which would be submitted to the Service Record Division of the Commission. Considerable expense would be involved in receiving and filing numerous reports of personnel actions which are not now received in the Commission. These would include reports of automatic salary promotions under the Classification Act of January 1923, as amended, reports of the number of hours worked each day at each pay rate, reports of the number of days worked at each daily rate, and reports of the amount earned each day at each piece-work rate. The volume of these additional reports would be very considerable, as over one-third of the employees in the Federal service are paid on a per diem, per hour, or piece work basis. Also, reports of all leave without pay of 1 hour or more would have to be sent to the Commission.

2. The construction of a record of retirement deductions from an employee record of service would require that an expensive control be established and maintained in the Commission to be sure that all reports of personnel actions are submitted. This would involve the return by departments and agencies of all reports of personnel actions, including spoiled forms, in order to account for all prenumbered forms which are issued.

3. Employees would be able to obtain only with great difficulty information as to amounts actually to their credit in the civil-service retirement and disability fund.

4. The Retirement Division of the Commission and the Board of Actuaries would not have the information required to administer properly the Civil Service Retirement Act.

B. Even if individual retirement accounts were constructed only when required for the payment of claims, the amount impounded from each employee's compensation would be required each year for income-tax purposes. Under the income-tax law, it is necessary for the departments and agencies to determine the total amount paid to an employee each calendar year or fraction thereof. If the impounding method were used, it would be necessary to determine the amount impounded from each employee's salary or compensation to obtain the total amount paid to him, including overtime. With the total impounded for each employee determined for income-tax purposes, the additional cost of posting this amount to an individual retirement account would be small.

C. The impounding method does not give an exact accounting control of the amounts actually due the civil-service retirement and disability fund.

1. If the impounding method were put into effect, pay-roll officials in the various departments and agencies stated that they would establish adjustment accounts in order to collect from the civil-service retirement and disability fund amounts impounded from their appropriations in excess of amounts due the fund. These adjustments could be determined either by maintaining individual retirement accounts for each employee (which would defeat the objective of impounding), or by establishing two types of pay rolls—one for those employees subject to the retirement act and one for those employees not subject to the Retirement Act. In the latter method, the amount due the retirement fund would be determined from pay-roll totals rather than from the deductions from the salary and wages of individual employees.

2. Under the impounding method interest would be paid as of the date the funds were impounded and deposited to the credit of the civil-service retirement and disability fund. This would result in considerable additional interest being paid to this fund. Under the present method, deposits are made to the fund only after the salary or compensation has been earned and paid.

3. Appropriations for salaries, if available, include funds which may be available for overtime pay. The impounding of these appropriations would result in overpayments to the retirement fund.

II. UNAVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS TO IMPOUND

In order to impound 5 percent of salary appropriations for deposit in the civil-service retirement and disability fund, it would be necessary that separate individual appropriations be made for salaries or personal services performed by employees. At present separate appropriations for salaries or personal services are not available in many departments and agencies for the following reasons:

A. In some departments and agencies it is not practical to make separate appropriations for salaries or personal services. For example, approriations for the navy yards (which now employ 600,000 workers) are made for the maintenance, construction, or repair of naval vessels. These funds are expended in varying proportions on each job for labor, material, and private-contract work.

B. In other departments and agencies, appropriations are made to cover both salaries and expenses in order to permit the maximum flexibility in the expenditure of the funds.

C. Certain appropriations in some departments and agencies, such as the Navy Department, are authorized to be expended over a period of several years.

D. Some corporations or agencies operate without appropriated funds. The present individual retirement account system, or a modification thereof, would necessarily have to be maintained for such corporations or agencies if the impounding method were used.

E. In some agencies the employees are subject to two or more retirement systems and separate appropriations are not made for those subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act. Such agencies include the Tennessee Valley Authority, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the District of Columbia government, the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, and the Panama Canal.

III. EVEN ASSUMING THAT A SEPARATE APPROPRIATION FOR SALARIES MIGHT BE PRACTICAL, DIFFICULTIES OR DISADVANTAGES WOULD ARISE IN IMPOUNDING THE EXACT AMOUNT DUE THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A. All moneys appropriated for salaries would not necessarily be expended in full during any fiscal year.

B. No retirement deductions are now taken from amounts paid separated employees or their estates for annual leave to their credit at date of separation.

C. With a separate appropriation for salaries and another for expenses, departments and agencies would find it more expensive to maintain two appropriation accounts than the one account now required.

D. Less freedom of administrative action would result if separate appropriation accounts for salaries and expenses were maintained. Under the current system of appropriations for salaries and expenses, administrators can choose the most effective means to accomplish their work. Witah separate appropriations for salaries and expenses, they might be forced to hire labor because of a fully encumbered expense appropriation account when it would be preferable to rent or buy machines or vice versa.

A Serviceman's Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Times of Sayre, Pa., entitled "A Serviceman's Solution":

A SERVICEMAN'S SOLUTION

This is an editorial by a young valley marine on the eve of D-day at Iwo Jima. It was written as a letter to his parents—a letter that he had good reason to know might be his last one. For that reason, and because of the fact that it treats of some serious national problems from the viewpoint of a man in the service, it deserves wholehearted attention, regardless of whether you agree or disagree with his conclusions. The letter follows:

"Note the date. Well, from here on in, the Japs will wish they never stuck out their neck, cause we are going to whack off every one we can find.

"I have your letter and although the present ship board facilities are not the best nor the mind in any reflective mood, there are a number of things I want to get on the record that I've been reading and mulling over recently.

"Aboard ship and going into combat again. You can see 'our side' is giving no quarter and we expect none. The basic rules of land warfare haven't changed. So should basic thinking and acting on parts of individuals at home remain constant. Unfortunately, for most people in war time, they do not. They earn large salaries, live in a world of 'Heaven-only-knows-what-will-happen-next' and off they go to live high, wide, and handsome—and I say it's wrong.

"And that's why I want to get the record straight and you to do me a favor or at least express my desires and thoughts to the Congressmen and Senators who allegedly represent me and the rest of us out here.

"First of all, I'm in favor of national legislation making military training compulsory. Compulsory for all kids 18 years old—2 years of it—and 2 full years. If I had had it and many of the rest of us there would have been a second thought given by aggressors and we would have been better able to deal with them—quicker. So let's see that law passed and now, quick.

"Secondly, a 'work or fight' law. Put on pressure for this. If we are required by law to do as we are told in the service, why not a 'IV-F'er' working where he is told, or needed most? Why should he enjoy such freedom in wartime? The sooner people in the United States realize that there is no democracy in wartime the sooner we will get home and get the war over. Certainly there is little democracy in service.

"In any event, let's stop this stalling around, wasting time. Russia has the answers while the United States still flounders around. Can democracy survive under such slowness? I for one think it can if our legislators move—and you are one to prod them—for me.

"Quit this discrimination against 'drafting nurses.' Draft all labor in the United States at once—'work or fight.' There is no middle way. How many years will it take for the average man to wake up? I say, he must be told. Not asked—told. Told now so the whole may survive."

State Sickness Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of March 20, 1945:

STATE SICKNESS PAY

When the State pays wage earners for being sick, it runs into some of the frailties of human nature, as Rhode Island's 2-year venture into cash sickness insurance evidences. Many more workers there have put in claims for payments than were found by medical examination to be justified. More checks have been issued during the past two Junes than in any other months, numerous employees apparently finding it handy to claim sickness and draw insurance money with the opening of the vacation season.

A number of workers have been prosecuted for fraud because, when receiving sickness benefits, they were caught at work, either on their regular jobs or at other employment. Despite official desire for change, much pressure has also developed for maintaining the present possibility of double payments. Besides receiving the cash sickness benefits, a person may draw workmen's compensation, group insurance, or other payments. Thus in some instances it may prove more profitable for a claimant to stay at home than go to work. Malingering has showed up. Whether payments should be made for nervousness, headaches, and alcoholism, or whether the official definition of sickness should be limited, is debated.

Some of the handicaps that have appeared in the cash sickness insurance system of Rhode Island are inherent. Others are peculiar to its newness and may be adjusted with longer operation. Up to now the experience with this American experiment hardly entitles it to be held up as a model for widespread adoption.

Up Front With Mauldin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to an article in this week's Saturday Evening Post regarding Sgt. Bill Mauldin, the outstanding cartoonist of the war.

Sergeant Mauldin has given the people at home a vivid picture of the real and terrible conditions under which the men who win the battles must fight with his drawings. They are more than cartoons—they are pictorial stories of the grim hardships and the everlasting sense of humor of the American fighting man.

Mauldin was discovered by the Forty-fifth Division News, edited by Sgt. Don Robinson. Lt. Col. Walter M. Harrison, public relations officer of the division while it was in training at Fort Sill, Okla., and Camp Barkeley, Tex., was the first to recognize the unusual talents of Sergeant Mauldin and was instrumental in having his first cartoons published commercially.

The story on Mauldin from the Washington News, reviewing the Saturday Evening Post article follows:

"AMONG THE GREAT OF THIS EARTH"

"The thousands of veterans of combat who have come home are trying hard to teach their wives and friends how to appreciate Bill Mauldin," says Frederick C. Painton in an article Up Front With Mauldin in the March 17 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. "If they succeed, a lot of people are going to understand for the first time what the war is really like to the men up there doing the shooting." Mauldin's cartoon appears exclusively in Washington in the Washington Daily News.

Referring to the Mauldin characters, Joe and Willie, Painton writes:

"In these two hollow-eyed, unshaven infantry characters he has immortalized the misery, the grandeur and the godlike patience—as well as the grim humor—of the front-line fighting man. Most of us in Italy and southern France knew long ago that Bill was a top-drawer cartoonist, but recently on a day in northern Italy, watching the Yanks slug their way through the Gothic line, I realized that Bill is among the great of this earth."

Mr. Painton gives a vivid picture of tragic-looking soldiers in the front line roaring with laughter at the sight of some Mauldin cartoons, and adds:

"I knew then Mauldin was great, because only his sardonic humor seems able to make these men, in constant peril of their lives, laugh at the torment of their own existence. And that genius has made him, in a little more than a year, the idol of combat men in north Africa and Italy, Sardinia, and Corsica, and now, at last, in France."

Painton points out that in this war and the last, Americans have been conditioned to war humor built around traditional gags that have little relation to war's reality, but Mauldin's drawings and humor portray for the first time the essential truth of front-

line life. It is through the understanding of these cartoons that there lies the best hope of understanding the returned veterans. He goes into detail about the absolute accuracy of the Mauldin drawings and says that the art staff of The Stars and Stripes have concluded "that Bill is in direct line of the great cartoonists who go back to Cruikshank and Tom Nast, and the famous cartoonists of the last war, Wallgren and Bruce Bairnsfather, creator of The Better 'Ole." He quotes Mauldin as saying he is very glad his cartoons are syndicated in the papers back home, and not only for the money.

"I want the people to know the front-line guys," Mauldin said. "We've been away from home a long, long time, and the combat troops don't realize things change. They think they'll find it just like it was and as they remember it. They're going to get a shock—many of the girls married, guys they knew going up in better jobs, towns changing. It's going to be tough on Joe and Willie when they come home. They have to adjust themselves. So, after the parades and the whoopee are over, I hope my cartoons will inspire the people to help these bewildered guys back into peacetime life."

Federal Reserve and the Bretton Woods Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM W. LINK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable M. S. Szymczak, member, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, entitled "Federal Reserve and the Bretton Woods Proposals," delivered before the Chicago chapters of the American Statistical Association and the American Marketing Association, at Chicago, Ill., on March 21, 1945:

The Bretton Woods agreements which are now being considered by the Congress are concerned with the international flow of money. This flow plays directly into the American money market. The agreements are, therefore, of great importance to the Federal Reserve System which is concerned primarily with our domestic monetary and credit problems. The Reserve System, especially through the Board of Governors, has participated in the development of the Bretton Woods proposals practically from the beginning. Interestingly enough, the history of the agreements thus far is not unlike the history of the Federal Reserve itself.

First of all, both the Bretton Woods agreements and the Federal Reserve Act arose out of inadequacies of existing institutions to meet pressing monetary and credit problems. The Federal Reserve System grew out of experience with periodic crises and money panics because there was something lacking in our banking system. There was no central banking authority. The Bretton Woods proposals grew out of experience between the First and Second World Wars when it became evident that the gold standard was also subject to crises and break-downs and that some new system of centralized resources was needed.

The banks in our country before the Federal Reserve Act was enacted were pretty much dependent on their own ability to survive a panic—especially as the panic hit the money centers where reserves from all over the country accumulated through correspondent bank relationships. In a crisis it was each bank for itself. Banks withdrew their funds from one another and, further than that, they began to call loans for payment—adopted a liquidation policy—at the very time when a policy of confidence was needed to weather the economic storm. The Federal Reserve gave such confidence by making credit available to the banks and this power, after the experience of 1929-32 was expanded by the Banking Act of 1935. The Federal Reserve Act is not perfect even now—after many years of experience and many amendments—but that the system is helpful to our economy, no informed person will deny.

Under the gold standard each country was pretty much dependent on its own ability to survive periods of difficulties. Individual countries adopted restrictive and deflationary measures in an attempt to weather their own crises. Such measures reduced other countries' sales abroad and aggravated the difficulties of other countries. The Bretton Woods agreements aim to give confidence to individual countries by making assistance available to meet difficulties when they occur.

Both the Federal Reserve and the Bretton Woods agreements marked the culmination of years of preparation. Intensive inquiry followed the panic of 1907. Important milestones on the long road were the Pujo investigation, the work of the National Monetary Commission, and extensive hearings before the Senate and the House Committees on Banking and Currency—the latter newly organized for the purpose. In addition, there were countless conversations, discussions, conferences, books, pamphlets, and articles. Out of all these emerged the original Federal Reserve Act.

Similarly, the idea of the Bretton Woods agreements is more than 3 years old. Sufficient preliminary work had been done to permit private circulation of a very rough draft of the fund proposal about 3 years ago. In April of 1943 a proposal for an international stabilization fund was published by the United States Treasury and a proposal for an international clearing union was published by the British. Both documents were offered to the public with the hope that all interested parties would contribute to the solution of the problems with which the proposals were concerned. Criticisms and suggestions were reflected in a revised draft of the fund published in August 1943. November of that year saw the first published version of the plan for an international bank. Conferences, including many with foreign experts and representatives, were held. As a result of the wide area of agreement that was found to exist, a joint statement of experts of many nations was issued in April 1944. Discussions culminated in a preliminary meeting in Atlantic City and finally in the 3-week conference of representatives of 44 nations at Bretton Woods in July 1944.

The Federal Reserve System has been intimately associated with the Bretton Woods proposals virtually from the beginning. Experts of the board's staff have conferred with experts from the Treasury and other governmental departments and have also participated in discussions with foreign representatives. Technicians of a number of Reserve banks joined them in the meetings at Atlantic City and Bretton Woods. The chairman of our board was a delegate to the Bretton Woods Conference.

The Bretton Woods proposals have repeated the history of the Federal Reserve in another respect. Although there has been all but universal agreement on objectives, there has not been universal agreement on a method of achieving the objectives. Opponents of the Reserve Act in 1913 argued that we should establish a single central banking institution. They also asserted that control should be by bankers, as experienced lenders, rather than by the public, which includes borrowers as well (industry, commerce, and agriculture). It was also argued that the proposed system was too complex to be understood or to be operated efficiently. Similar arguments over control and procedure have been leveled against the Bretton Woods agreements. It is argued that the fund is complex and that it will be controlled by borrowers (debtor countries) who will dissipate its resources.

It has also been argued that the directives of the fund agreement are too broad and vague to be of much significance. For instance, the term "fundamental disequilibrium" is not precisely defined in the agreement. But we have learned from our Federal Reserve experience that it is a mistake to make the basic terms of the law too detailed and restrictive. The history of the Federal Reserve Act has reflected the necessity of broadening its terms. It is only under general directives that effective operations and procedures can be evolved to deal with changing conditions. The place for precise definition is in administrative regulations and rulings, not in the basic law.

We should view the Bretton Woods proposals not as a perfect document but as an honest, intelligent, cooperative effort to deal with certain developments that may arise. We should remember also that even our Constitution required subsequent amendments as a result of experience. The same has been true of the Federal Reserve Act. It will be true of the Bretton Woods agreements. These agreements should be viewed in the spirit expressed by Woodrow Wilson in his first inaugural address:

"We shall deal with our economic system as it is and as it may be modified, not as it might be if we had a clean sheet of paper to write upon; and step by step we shall make it what it should be."

The Bretton Woods agreements are an attempt at international collaboration designed to help achieve monetary stability and extension of productive credit. They provide two international institutions to accomplish these objectives: an international monetary fund to promote currency stability and multilateral payments and an international bank for reconstruction and development to facilitate productive international loans.

Since the bank proposal represents no great deviation from traditional lending principles and practices, it is considered comparatively simple and has received widespread support and approval. The bank would make or guarantee at reasonable rates specific loans for productive purposes which the private market would be unwilling to make without a guaranty. Since the benefits of such loans for reconstruction and development would be world-wide, the bank would distribute any losses among its members in proportion to their stock ownership.

The International Monetary Fund would break new ground and this is the very reason why it is considered complicated. A good bit of the complexity arises from the desire to prevent abuse of this institution which would operate in a new field. The basic principles of the fund are not difficult to understand. The fund establishes rules of the game which are designed to promote interchangeability among member currencies at stable rates so that the international flow of goods may be kept at a high level. These rules are designed to achieve stability

such as once was provided by the gold standard and yet avoid the rigidities that led to periodic collapse of that standard. Each member would undertake to maintain the parity of its currency so long as underlying conditions made it possible but when a fundamental disequilibrium developed it would be permitted to make an appropriate change. The fund agreement recognizes that the undertaking of members to abide by the rules of the game would be difficult unless some means were provided to enable them to meet temporary adverse balances in their accounts with other countries. To meet this need each member would contribute to the fund an amount of gold and domestic currency equal to its quota and would receive in return a conditional right of access to the fund for limited amounts of foreign exchange. Although fear has been expressed in some quarters that the resources of the fund would be dissipated, adequate controls, both automatic and discretionary, are included in the agreement to prevent unwise use of the fund's resources.

The Federal Reserve is necessarily interested in both the technical and the policy aspects of the Bretton Woods agreements. The technical aspects, though important, need be mentioned only briefly. Both the fund and the bank, whose head offices would be in this country, would receive and make payments. They would possess valuable assets such as gold and securities that must be kept safe. There will be a multitude of transactions to be handled and recorded. It is difficult to imagine all the household details connected with the fiscal agency and depositary functions of the fund and the bank, but they are many and varied, and require the special and technical skill of trained and experienced executives. In the United States they would be handled by the Federal Reserve banks under the supervision and direction of our Board of Governors.

But the Federal Reserve has a much more fundamental interest in the operation of the proposed institutions. Broadly stated, the goal of the Federal Reserve is to help maintain through monetary and credit action a high level of production and employment. The monetary and credit structure of this country, however, is continually affected by international transactions. The fund and the bank would work toward a high and stable level of world trade and would, therefore, help attain our goal.

The disruptive practices that attended the reduction of world trade by about one-half between 1929 and 1934 and the periodic flights of "hot money" in the period between the wars contributed greatly to our difficulties and aggravated the monetary and credit problems of the Federal Reserve System. Through achieving a better international balance, the fund will help prevent a recurrence of the great gold in-flows of the 1930's with their attendant problems for the Federal Reserve System.

Precisely how the fund's operations will affect our monetary reserves depends on several factors. One of these is the form of the initial subscription.

The effect of the initial subscription depends on the source of the funds. The total subscription quota of the United States amounts to $2,750,000,000, one-quarter of which must be paid in gold. The enabling legislation now before Congress proposes that ultimately we should pay $1,800,000,000 of the subscription from our stabilization fund and the remaining $900,000,000 by Treasury borrowing in the market. At the outset, however, the fund agreement permits members to deposit non-interest-bearing demand notes in place of that portion of their currency which is not needed by the fund in current operations. The initial payment of our subscription, out of the $1,800,000,000 in our stabilization fund and by means of the special Treasury notes will not affect our money market, since funds will be neither withdrawn from nor transferred to the market.

If other members use the funds they own here to pay for the gold portion of their subscription, they might affect our market. There would be no effect, of course, if they simply utilized gold held here under earmark since that has already been removed from our gold stock. Use of any deposits they might have at the Federal Reserve banks would result in a reduction in the gold reserves of the Reserve banks, but would have no direct effect on our money market. To the extent that they draw funds from our money market, however—either directly through drafts on deposits at commercial banks, or indirectly, as through sales of United States Government securities they own—their gold subscriptions would have the same effect as an export of gold through commercial channels.

Such operations might call for Federal Reserve action in the open market or elsewhere in order to prevent disturbances in the credit situation.

More interesting are the possible effects of the fund's activities as a going concern. Over the long run, of course, it is hoped that the fund's holdings of member currencies would maintain relative stability, and there are numerous automatic and discretionary controls in the fund to achieve this result. But there would certainly be substantial use of the fund's dollars from time to time.

When other members in their current transactions pay the United States with dollars acquired from the fund, the effect is to increase our money supply. The fund may acquire the dollars from our initial currency subscription or sales of gold to us, or, to mention a somewhat remote possibility, by borrowing. To borrow in this country, the fund will need our Government's consent.

Use of our initial currency subscription, to the extent that it would be provided from the one and eight-tenths billion dollars in our stabilization fund, would increase the supply of money in our market. To the extent that it was provided by the Treasury borrowing from the market, no net effect would be produced since the fund would, through its members, return the money to the market. Similarly, provision of dollars through the fund's borrowing in our market would have no net effect. Acquisition of dollars through sales of gold would have the same effect on our money market as an import of gold.

The effects of operations of the International Bank in our money market would be less complicated than those of the fund and would in general leave the money supply and member bank reserves unaffected. They would, however, influence the capital market and the course of the business cycle. To use American resources the bank would need to have the consent of this country; and before consent was granted, presumably full consideration would be given by the monetary authorities to the effect of the proposed borrowing on the credit situation in the United States.

This analysis should make clear the great interest of the Federal Reserve in the plans, policies, and operations of the proposed institutions. If the fund and the bank achieve their objectives the Federal Reserve authorities will be greatly assisted in their tasks. The Federal Reserve System will not only be deeply concerned with the proper administration and success of the fund and the bank, but it will be immediately affected in many ways by their technical operations. It must be fully informed with regard to such operations and the Federal Reserve authorities must be in position to present their considered views to the United States Governors and Executive Directors of these two institutions in sufficient time.

From our Board's point of view, the establishment of the fund and the bank is highly desirable, because they would contribute to world recovery and to the maintenance of economic stability at a high level, which is the main objective of our System's policy.

Federal Government to Claim Tidelands and Submerged Lands

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 16, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, having previously received unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this vital subject, I call attention to all Members of the House to House Joint Resolution 122, filed by me on March 13, 1945. I also call attention to House Joint Resolution 118 and all resolutions which have recently been filed dealing with the important subject of tidelands and submerged lands and the quieting of titles, in the respective States of our great Union, to the lands beneath the tidewaters thereof, and also to lands beneath the navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States.

House Joint Resolution 122, filed by me as Congressman from the great Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California, was prepared by William Clary, acting as special assistant to the attorney general of the State of California.

Recently the honorable Secretary of the Interior personally stated to me in substance that as soon as the descriptions in certain applications on file in his office were made definite and certain, so as to eliminate overlapping, that he intended to grant applications for the purpose of drilling for oil in the Long Beach, Calif., area, as well as elsewhere; that he intended to let the courts determine the respective rights of the Federal and the State Governments; that he had felt for a long time that it was his duty to allow the courts to finally determine whether the jurisdiction and ownership of the tidelands under salt water and the submerged lands under fresh water were Federal or State owned; that if the courts of the last jurisdiction held that such lands were Federal owned, then, of course, the Federal Government might well expect that royalties already paid or accumulated would be Federal property. Gentlemen, in my district alone such royalties amount to several million dollars. Our Long Beach Harbor bonds, which are voted many years ago to begin and continue the construction of our great municipal harbor, are being paid off as they mature by income

from oil wells drilled within the corporate limits of the city of Long Beach on tidewater lands granted the city of Long Beach many years ago by the sovereign State of California. Furthermore, the present monthly income from wells on these lands to my city amounts to close to one-half million dollars. Furthermore, there are piers, docks, wharves, warehouses, and other harbor buildings and improvements, all of which are located on these tidelands involved. Furthermore, expensive, comprehensive plans for developing the greatest breakwater harbor in the Nation have already been made, and these anticipated expenses, as well as other budgetary items, have taken into account receipt of millions of dollars from oil wells on tidelands which were granted this city of mine by the State of California in its exclusive sovereignty over such matters.

Practically every State in the United States is vitally concerned. It is not a California problem—it is a Nation-wide problem. Not only the States on the Atlantic seaboard as well as the Pacific seaboard and the Gulf coast are concerned, but States having submerged lands under great rivers are likewise concerned.

Secretary of the Interior Ickes could not have been more prompt, courteous, or considerate than he was in seeing me, personally, on two occasions within several days, on this momentous matter. He was likewise frank and courteously emphatic that he, as Secretary of the Interior, had a duty to perform and that he intended to take such steps as would have the matter promptly determined.

I discovered this situation shortly after coming to Congress, January 3. There had been many rumors and reports current for many months before I came here it is said; but back in Long Beach, Calif., they had not been notified of any such emergency, and so had made their great harbor and other large municipal budgetary plans without taking into account the possibility of such a Federal claim being finally found valid by our courts of last jurisdiction.

Tideland oil income for many years has been and is presently of utmost importance to the city of Long Beach, Calif. I have heretofore said and now restate, that exclusive jurisdiction over tidelands to the 3-mile limit within the State of California boundaries rests exclusively within the sovereign State of California. This is true because such sovereignty over such lands was reserved by the sovereign State of California when admitted to the great Union of States. Likewise all other States upon entering the Union reserved like sovereignty in such matters. Therefore, it is of momentous concern to practically every State in our Union. Also, it not only concerns our tidelands and submerged waterways, as relates to drilling for oil or the extraction of other minerals; it relates to millions upon millions of dollars worth of harbor improvements and installations wherever constructed on such lands.

Acting as promptly as possible in ascertaining the actual facts from the office of the Secretary of the Interior, I immediately transmitted same to my home city of Long Beach, the Governor of the State of California, and to the attorney general of the State of California. Our attorney general promptly sent an able assistant attorney general to Washington to do whatever was necessary. House Joint Resolution 122 is the final result of his prompt work.

It is the established and unanimous judicial policy of our highest court decisions in the respective States and by the United States Supreme Court that at the conclusion of the Revolution each of the 13 States originally shaping our Republic became and was, in its own right and sovereignty, absolute owner of all lands beneath its tidewaters and of all lands beneath its navigable fresh waters within its own boundaries. Such has been the clear declaration of our highest courts for more than 100 years. Except, of course, unless there had previously been granted into different ownership, by the sovereignty having dominion over said territorial rights in such tidelands, previous to their acquisition or purchase by the United States of America.

Furthermore, the admitted record speaks loudly and clearly, that for over 100 years all executive departments of our great Government has likewise acted in accordance with this established and recognized rule of law and which rule has been uniformly declared by our highest courts. This complete uniformity, Mr. Speaker and Members, has therefore quite normally and naturally resulted in an established and accepted rule of property. On this established rule of property, States, cities, counties, harbor and port authorities, and hundreds of thousands of private citizens have accepted the same and have acted in good faith upon this rule of property. They have invested millions of dollars in reliance thereupon. They have shaped their property matters and their public policies and procedures upon this rule of property. Mr. Speaker, a rule of property once firmly accepted and established and relied upon over a long term of years in the history of a people is entitled to continue to be relied upon. There is no claim of fraud concerned here.

Under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, it appears in the years of 1937 and 1938, that about fifty applications were filed with the Department of the Interior to drill for oil on the California coast. Some of these were on tidelands within the city of Long Beach or immediate vicinity thereof. It is under some of these long pending applications that the honorable Secretary indicates he is going to grant drilling permits. Mr. Ickes reiterated to Mr. Vickers, our worthy city manager of Long Beach, and to me, together, substantially the same statements previously made to me alone.

Clearly, if the State of California and other States situated exactly the same in such matters, did not reserve unto themselves the exclusive ownership of these tideland waters along the coasts and the submerged waterways along the rivers, then clearly none of these States have since made any grants, leases or permits which are valid without Federal approval. These States, cities, counties and private parties, who have spent millions of dollars in improvements and developments on such tidelands and submerged lands, have made these improvements on Federal property; if this long established rule of law and property is now for the first time discarded, and the sovereignty of these States taken from them by judicial decision. To my home city of Long Beach, Calif., it means just this, to-wit: The sovereign State of California believing and in good faith, acting on this belief that it owned such tidelands, granted to the city of Long Beach tidelands within its corporate limits for the purpose of harbor, and park, recreational developments. The city of Long Beach accepted the grant in good faith and spent many millions of dollars in developing its tidelands. But Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, if the sovereign State of California did not own these tidelands, then it could not grant these lands to Long Beach for any purpose. What applies to the municipality of Long Beach applies to the municipalities on both seaboards and to other great harbors and ports both on salt-water frontage and on fresh-water frontage.

Having promptly notified the city attorney of Long Beach, Calif., of my discovery of the actual facts as they were, I received from him an important communication, a part of which I wish to include in my closing remarks. I quote from letter dated February 26, 1945, from Irving M. Smith, city attorney:

> I have received a copy of your letter addressed to Mayor Clarence Wagner, dated February 21, 1945, wherein you state that Secretary Ickes informed you that he intends to grant applications for oil leases under the Oil Leasing Act of 1920 upon tide and submerged lands within the city of Long Beach, and thereby leave it to the courts to determine as to whether the Federal Government or the States and grantees of the States own the tide and submerged lands within 3 miles offshore. Your letter indicates that the Secretary has some question in his mind as to the legal ownership of such lands not being in the Federal Government and that some attorneys have represented to him that there is grave question but what the title to said lands vests in the Federal Government.
>
> To me it seems very odd indeed that these gentlemen or any member of the bar should at this time honestly question that the legal title to all tide and submerged lands within 3 miles of the mean high tide line vests in the States adjoining the same or their grantees. This question was first decided 100 years ago in the opinion rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hogan* (3 How. 212, 44 U. S. 219), decided in 1845. In this case the United States had attempted to patent certain tide lands, and in this opinion by the Supreme Court it was held that the Federal Government could not convey title to such lands as the title thereto was in the State of Alabama. The Court stated:
>
> "First. The shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them were not granted by the Constitution of the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively.
>
> "Second. The new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the original States."

Since this decision by the United States Supreme Court, in the past 100 years said Court has repeatedly held that title to the tide and submerged lands is in the States and not the Federal Government. You might be interested in also reading a more recent decision upon the subject in the case of *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1).

Some specious contentions have been made and will again be made that the law with regard to the tide and submerged lands affecting those lying adjacent to California is different from that affecting said lands adjacent to the Gulf and Atlantic coast States. This argument is based upon a contention that in determining the title to the submerged lands lying adjacent to California, the old Spanish law must be applied and not the common law of England, and that due to some differences between the civil and Spanish law based upon the Napoleonic Code, the State of California did not, like the original colonial States and the States bordering the gulf, acquire title to its tide and submerged lands upon admission to the Union.

These gentlemen are attempting by some nefarious plan, hoping to gain title to our tide and submerged lands, to infer that California's title to its tide and submerged lands has never been litigated by the Supreme Court of the United States, and this is just as fallacious as their contentions. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Knight* v. *United States Land Association* (142 U. S. 161), decided in 1891, held that California, by admission to the Union, like all new States was admitted on equal footing with the Thirteen Original States, and acquired title to all the tide and submerged lands within 3 miles from shore. This decision was reaffirmed by said Court in the case of *Borax Consolidated, Ltd.* v. *Los Angeles*, (296 U. S. 10), decided in 1935. The Supreme Court of the State of California has rendered a number of decisions concurring with the opinions of the United States Supreme Court, one of said decisions being *Ord Land Co.* v. *Alamitos Land Co.* (199 Calif. 380). The above I am sure will suffice to convince you of the fallacy of the position of those who assert Federal ownership to California's tide and submerged lands, and I will therefore not burden you with citations of many decisions handed down over the past 100 years, repeatedly reaffirming our title.

I have asked the harbor department to forward to you a copy of maps relating to reclaimed tide and submerged lands of Long Beach and other ports of the Nation. This data will portray to you the tremendous scope of the question involved. Many billions of dollars have been expended by local governmental bodies, constructing improvements upon tide and submerged lands, to say nothing of the millions of dollars expended by our own city of Long Beach. One would surely think that the equity of the proposition militates against any litigation on the subject matter. If the Federal Government is now decreed to be the owner of tide and submerged lands, obviously it always was the owner of said lands. The city of Long Beach and every other port of the Nation will lose all their harbor improvements built upon reclaimed tide and submerged lands. If the Federal Government can legally grant oil leases on tide and submerged lands to private operators, I am sure you personally will vision the disastrous results affecting the public recreational beach areas in Long Beach and elsewhere throughout the State. The constant effort by land-grabbing schemers through some nefarious method to obtain possession of the greatest public asset that we and all other States have, i. e., our tide and submerged lands, in my opinion is not only clearly illegal but also lacking in morality. I cannot conceive of any person taking the position of these individuals without definitely having larceny in his heart. They definitely seek to obtain property rights without paying for them, and all of this regardless of the end result and effect upon the general welfare of our citizenry affected thereby.

May I congratulate you upon your interest and vigilance regarding this subject matter that so vitally affects not only the entire Nation but your own home city, and urge you to do everything within your power to arrest and defeat the apparent movement in Washington, through the Secretary of the Interior or any other channel, to attack the city's and the State's title to their tide and submerged lands.

IRVING M. SMITH,
City Attorney.

Mr. Speaker and Members, it is clearly not a case wherein it is necessary that these tide and submerged lands be thus claimed by the Federal Government in order to have same producing oil for war needs. These lands are already producing oil under the Petroleum Administration's jurisdiction, and if more oil is needed, I am told it can be efficiently and promptly produced. None of us are interested in keeping our great Nation from any need it has in war or peace of God-given resources, and in making this declaration of my own fundamental thinking, I still declare, nevertheless, it is not essentially in the public's interest that our Federal Government now undertake to recede from its established judicial and procedural policy and practices of over 100 years, and upset a fundamental property right and ownership which has naturally evolved out of the foundation principles of good faith and performance by the States of our Nation and by those who have subsequently, also in good faith and with reliance, acted upon and in accordance with these firmly established standards of human conduct as relates to this momentous matter.

From the very beginning of my discovering the proposals of the Department of the Interior, I began activating your interests against this proposal. I feel it my duty to urge you to fully inform yourselves at the earliest possible date and to join forces to enact the foundation principles as enunciated in this group of bills which have been recently filed, not only by myself and other Congressmen from California but by Congressmen from several other States as well.

O. P. A. Rulings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. EARTHMAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on certain occasions I have previously inserted news items which have shown the disastrous effect of O. P. A. rulings on various industries. Under leave to insert my remarks, I wish to include an article taken from the Nashville Banner of March 15 which gives a vivid picture of the effect of the O. P. A. price-setting on the laundry industry. It would seem that a senseless waste of manpower and time, together with the curtailment of a very useful service is being brought about by a brilliant O. P. A. decision to force the owners of the Babies' Valet Service to charge $1.45 to launder nine dozen rental diapers and at the same time permit them to charge $1.62 to launder nine dozen customer-owned diapers. In an effort to remain in business the owner must employ legal aid for endless conferences with O. P. A. attorneys whose bureaucratic jargon merely brings about a rehearing and another appeal.

We are sitting idly by while thousands of small businesses that could render a great service to their community are being forced out of business, not to aid in the winning of the war, but to satisfy the whims of these self-evaluated demigods who have fastened themselves upon the independent businesses of our Nation as the tentacles of a giant octopus.

DIAPER SERVICE MAY CLOSE UP—BLAMES O. P. A. RULING ON PRICES

A serious situation threatened Nashville today as the only rental diaper service in the city was expected to go out of business due to refusal of O. P. A. to give requested adjustment in the laundering prices of privately owned and rental diapers.

Mrs. E. G. Saverio, owner and operator of Babies' Valet Service at 318 Meridian Street, said she intended to sell her 50,000 rental diapers, as the maximum laundering price she was allowed to charge was far below the standard laundering price here.

She explained that her service afforded diapers for supply and laundry, and in order to maintain that service she had to pay taxes, insurance, etc., for their general maintenance.

Hundreds of people are being served daily, Mrs. Saverio said, with service being rendered to hospitals, day nurseries, children of war workers and other working mothers, mothers certified by doctors as unable to do their own laundry, and many other cases, according to War Production Board regulations.

REGULATIONS CITED

Mrs. Saverio stated that under O. P. A. regulations she was allowed to charge $1.62 to launder nine dozen customer-owned diapers, and that she was allowed to charge only $1.45 to launder a similar amount of her rental diapers.

Having appealed to O. P. A. about the middle of January to make an adjustment, she was informed by that agency yesterday afternoon that she might place a 10-percent blanket charge on both services, one service, or none.

In order to level the prices between the two services, Mrs. Saverio explained that she had suggested to the governmental agency to allow her a 20-percent increase on her rental diapers.

This she was refused, she said, with O. P. A. allowing her a 10-percent increase in her services which would bring her $1.59 to launder 9 dozens of her rental diapers.

This, she contends, is still below the standard laundering price in Nashville, and definitely below the $1.62 she is allowed to charge to launder privately owned diapers without the 10-percent increase included that she was granted by O. P. A.

If she accepted the agency's decision and placed a 10-percent increase on laundering privately owned diapers, Mrs. Saverio reasoned that it would throw her out of line with standard laundry prices in Nashville, and her customers owning diapers would take their business elsewhere.

"Under no circumstances do I intend to raise standard laundry prices," Mrs. Saverio asserted, declaring that "I can see no rhyme or reason why one group of people should be made to pay for what another group uses."

She explained that the reason she had suggested the adjustment was due to increased expenses with the operation of four trucks and installation of available machinery from time to time.

In the winter months, she declared, approximately 50,000 diapers were laundered in a week, with the number slacking off during the summer months.

A. H. Roberts, attorney for Mrs. Saverio, said he had been in conference with O. P. A. attorneys this morning and expected to be in conference with them again this afternoon, with decision of further action being delayed until after 3 p. m.

He explained that a rehearing of the case may be had here, and if that is unsatisfactory, another appeal may be made to the regional O. P. A. office in Atlanta, from where the first decision originated.

Meat Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post March 19, 1945.

Many months ago Mr. J. D. Shaw, owner of the Rose City Packing Co., Tyler, Tex., and I discussed the problems that face the small packers in particular with Mr. Chester Bowles, Mr. Greenlee, and Mr. Madigan. We were told the Office of Price Administration would make an effort to help small packers. We have had no decisive or definite answer from the Office of Price Administration that indicates that the agency has reached a decision on the case we presented them even though it has been more than a year since we presented our problem to them. I surely feel the Office of Price Administration should endeavor to take some action to eliminate some of the difficulties which are faced by small packers.

The article follows:

MEAT SHORTAGE ALMOST FAMINE, PACKERS' ORGANIZATION REPORTS

CHICAGO, March 18.—Severe and growing shortages of all kinds of meat for the American public, so serious that they are "bordering on a meat famine in many parts of the country," was reported today by the American Meat Institute.

Announcing results of a Nation-wide survey made for the Office of Price Administration, the Institute said:

"For the first time since meat rationing began, many meat items now are reported for the country as a whole as being 100 percent in short supply in relation to the needs of the trade; most beef and pork cuts reported as being over 97 percent in short supply.

"The severe and growing shortages * * * border on a meat famine in many parts of the country.

"The only exceptions to the extreme shortage are some sausage and variety meats, but even these are shorter than a month ago. * * *

"It is true, too, that the supply of meat for vital war purposes—for our Army and Navy—and for domestic consumers, undoubtedly will continue to get much worse before it gets any better. Reasons for this are:

"1. Uncontrolled, extensive and growing black market in all kinds of meat.

"2. Diversion of large quantities of meat from normal, legitimate commercial channels of trade—from which supplies for war purposes must be obtained.

"3. Regulations which have the effect of discouraging cattle feeders from taking more young range animals and bringing them to the maturity and weight of finished beef.

"4. Government price controls which have resulted in wholesale ceiling prices for meat—especially beef and pork—not being sufficient, in the case of legitimate operators, to reflect the prices paid currently for livestock."

Resolution of Peabody (Mass.) Lodge, No. 1409, B. P. O. E.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to include my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following resolution adopted February 12, 1945, by the Peabody Lodge, No. 1409, of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Peabody, Mass., condemning any public celebration of cessation of hostilities until the complete downfall of Japan:

"Whereas many persons and communities in the United States apparently are planning or at least expecting a great celebration when news of the surrender of Germany is received; and

"Whereas the cessation of hostilities against Germany does not signify the end of the war, but merely the opportunity to turn the entire resources of our Nation against the Japanese; and

"Whereas one or more years of desperate combat will still be required to totally defeat the Japanese after our entire resources can be turned against them, in which combat many fine Americans will be killed or maimed; and

"Whereas many people in the United States apparently do not realize the absolute necessity of destroying for at least a generation the capacity of the Japanese people and nation to wage wars of aggression, if any reasonable assurance of world peace is to be obtained for our children and grandchildren, nor do such people appear to realize that we were forced into the present war because the Japanese attacked us; and

"Whereas any celebration of the surrender of Germany would tend to plant in the minds of thoughtless people the erroneous idea that the war is practically over, and such celebration would tend to hamper the war effort and so give aid and comfort to our arch enemy, Japan: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Peabody Lodge, No. 1409, of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, a patriotic organization of American citizens, does hereby petition the Senators from Massachusetts and the Congressman from this district to immediately introduce into Congress a joint resolution condemning any public celebration of cessation of hostilities until the bestial, dastardly Japanese have been totally defeated and have surrendered unconditionally, such joint resolution to also request that the President of the United States, the Governors of the several States, and the mayors of all cities issue proclamations to this general effect, and calling upon all the people to rededicate themselves and their best efforts to furtherance of the war effort until we have accomplished the complete downfall of Japan; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be immediately sent by air mail special delivery to the Senators and Congressman stated herein, to the President of the United States, to the Governor of Massachusetts, and to the mayor and city council of Peabody."

The foregoing resolution was introduced at a regular meeting of Peabody Lodge, No. 1409, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, at Peabody, Mass., on Monday, February 12, 1945, under suspension of the rules, and duly passed upon recorded vote at said session.

FRANCIS W. HAYES,
Exalted Ruler.

Attest:

HENRY I. YALE,
Secretary.

How Poland Rallied To Fight Nazis Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Ann Su Cardwell, which appeared in the Detroit News of March 21, 1945:

HOW POLAND RALLIED TO FIGHT NAZIS ALONE—MISS CARDWELL DESCRIBES THE 35 DAYS OF HEROISM; ASSAILS RUSSIA'S PERFIDY

(By Ann Su Cardwell)

Before the ink was dry on the 1919 peace treaties Germany was plotting to get back surrendered territories, first on the list being the Polish Corridor.

The Poles, fully realizing the dangers of their situation and the inevitability of another war, hoped for time to prepare. Meanwhile, to the extent of their financial ability they equipped and trained an army.

Military service was compulsory but during my long residence in Poland I never heard a young man complain of it—and my acquaintance with young men was extensive. Civilian

organizations to cooperate actively with the army in time of war were formed. Membership was voluntary but regarded as an honor and a civic duty. Practically every adult and teen-age youth I knew belonged to one.

When in 1933 Marshal Pilsudski—one of the few statesmen of our time understanding central and eastern European historical currents—seeing what was ahead offered to attack Germany before the latter had attained too great strength. Britain and France refused. Events proved Pilsudski right. Hitler occupied one country after another. The Poles knew their time was coming; and they meant to fight.

Hitler pressed them to join him in attacking Russia and dividing the spoils; they refused. They had a nonaggression pact with the Soviets, proposed, be it noted, by the latter. They had a mutual assistance treaty with France, and in August 1939, they signed one with Britain.

POLAND FIGHTS ALONE

French diplomatic correspondence of 1939 shows that Germany was preparing to attack Poland that August. But Britain and France, unready, hoping to avoid war even when they knew that German troops were concentrating along Polish frontiers, bound Poland not to mobilize until last efforts toward peace had failed. Thus without declaration of war, Poland, only beginning mobilization, was invaded in the gray dawn of September 1, 1939.

The Poles faced the first blitzkrieg in history utterly alone.

Men, women, and children dug trenches, prepared shelters, got first-aid kits ready, followed instructions constantly coming over the radio. Men in the reserve hurried off to join their regiments.

The home defense, long since perfected, went on duty. Discipline was extraordinary. Class and party lines ceased to exist. In this war that had to come, as was universally agreed, these people were all Polish citizens fighting a hated enemy.

The only exceptions were members of the fifth column, which was organized down to the smallest detail, widespread, efficient, base and treacherous beyond description. Men and women who for years had passed as loyal Poles now showed their true colors.

From our Warsaw balcony I watched a man being taken from an adjoining building; he had been shooting at Polish pursuit planes during a raid just ended.

WHOLESALE SLAUGHTER

Cities and villages all over Poland were bombed the first day. Children at play, people on the roads, and in the fields were machine-gunned.

This was not war but wholesale slaughter and destruction.

Polish troops were forced back; but read what a Berlin magazine (The Signal, November 1943, 2 years and more after the invasion of Russia) says of the war in Poland: "It was worst of all, for they were an enemy who fought with incredible fury, unimaginable fanaticism and grim endurance."

"We can hold for a month," said the Poles. "By that time the British and French will be in." But British and French help never materialized.

Poles fit for military service were ordered east, preparatory to a second mobilization. With a committee from the ministry of social welfare organizing help for refugees from overrun western provinces, my husband and I were in the midst of that immense stream of young and middle-aged men heading east as fast as they could go.

THE RUSSIANS COME IN

Then Stalin struck. The nonaggression pact, the promise given in May that the Soviets would stand aside if Germany attacked Poland, were forgotten. And Poland, in the grip of two powerful antagonists, was helpless. Under "Stefan the Stubborn," the dauntless mayor of Warsaw, the capital fought for 27 days. The last battle of the Polish-German War, excluding guerrilla warfare which never stopped, occurred October 5.

Alone and attacked in the rear by a second predatory power, Poland fought Germany 35 days. In 1940, France, Belgium, and Holland, with Britain's help could hold but 39 days, despite the 8 months' time and valuable experience the Poles had given them.

After the Soviet perfidy the Poles had to think and act fast. The problem was—to get to their ally, France, and fight beside her. The Polish Government had been moving from place to place in order to carry on.

Pushed into southeastern Poland, between the Germans and Russians, it crossed into Rumania, with which it had treaty arrangements, expecting to pass to a friendly land and there establish itself. Rumania, dictated to by Germany, refused to honor the agreement and interned the Poles—Government officials, soldiers, aviators, and private citizens.

WORKERS FLEE, TOO

I watched thousands and thousands of men from the Polish forces, ordered out of Poland by the Polish Government, march across the Polish-Rumanian frontier on the night of September 17, while I waited my turn.

There were other thousands not yet in uniform, for the Soviet invasion had prevented further mobilization.

The September Polish contribution to what later became the United Nations' cause was very considerable. The Allies gained terribly needed time and experience. The Germans lost 91,279 men killed and 98,355 wounded, 1,000 planes shot down, 1,400 tanks destroyed and 2,600 so badly damaged that they required complete overhauling. After meeting the Poles, the Germans had to take many months to lick their wounds before turning west.

One further thought: Suppose Poland had agreed to join Hitler against the Soviet Union. What would have been the fate of that country and of unready Britain and France?